APR 30 1952

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 14

FEBRUARY 28, 1950, TO APRIL 20, 1950

(PAGES A1449 TO A2862)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Mar 30 1925

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Pricing Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, looking at the history of the investigations and orders of the Federal Trade Commission in reference to basing point practices, it is easy to feel that our real trouble is with a faulty interpretation of the antitrust laws by our administrative bodies and the courts. It is true that the philosophy and theory of economic practice held by some of the lawyers in the Department of Justice and by representatives of the Federal Trade Commission do not seem to square with what industry generally regards as good economic practice, which will be referred to later.

However, it is plain that the trouble goes deeper than that. The trouble comes, I think, from basically unsound provisions in our antitrust laws. These provisions lead to confusing interpretations which have produced serious results.

The present antitrust law incorporates the amendments of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936. When that legislation was pending in the House of Representatives, a member of the conference committee handling the bill stated: "You might as well know that this bill contains many inconsistencies and the courts will have the devil's own job to unravel the tangle." That has proven to be the case. We have had such a welter of decisions, both by the Federal Trade Commission and the courts, that lawyers scarcely know how to advise their clients.

The law as it now stands provides, in part, as follows:

United States Code, section 13 (a): It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce * * * to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly—or to injure or destroy or prevent competition. * * *

Section 13 (b): Upon proof being made * * * that there has been discrimination * * * the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section * * * provided, however, that nothing contained in * * * this title shall prevent a seller rebutting a prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

In the first Cement case, the Federal Trade Commission entered an order against the multiple basing point delivered price of cement. The court of appeals set it aside on September 20, 1946. In that case the court of appeals said:

Numerous bills have been introduced in Congress, seeking to outlaw the basing-price price system. Countless time has been spent in hearings by congressional committees before whom it has been assailed and defended. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bear mute but indisputable proof of the fact that Congress has repeatedly refused to declare its use illegal. * * * Notwithstanding this congressional attitude * * * this court is now urged to hold that this system is illegal per se * * * and to require that cement be sold on an f. o. b. basis. In our judgment, the question of whether the basing-point price system should be declared illegal rests clearly within the legislative domain.

However, the Supreme Court of the United States in the last Cement case held that the basing-point price system followed by the cement industry resulted in unlawful discriminations which substantially lessened competition and tended to create a monopoly in commerce. The Supreme Court did not agree with the court of appeals in the first Cement case that the question of illegality was one solely for Congress.

There were elements in the Cement case bearing on the point of conspiracy in restraint of trade which might not be found present in the pricing situation in other industries. These elements certainly contributed heavily to the final decision of the Supreme Court. Perhaps the basing point price systems of other industries would not be found to be unlawfully discriminatory. Basic industry, however, cannot be left in a state of uncertainty dependent upon what the Federal Trade Commission and the courts might declare in the future as to past practices.

Therefore, it seems clear that the problem should be attacked at its source and a good look taken at the provisions of the antitrust laws. Unfortunately, as long as any degree of uncertainty exists, the various schools of economic thinking move farther and farther apart. Since one school is represented by the present official attitude of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, supported by the language of the Supreme Court in the Cement case, it will be profitable to take a look at their philosophy on the basing point price question.

At a symposium under the Robinson-Patman Act held in New York on January 22, 1947, the associate general counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Walter B. Woodin, was asked the following question:

If (a manufacturer) ships into territory where he has to absorb some kind of freight in order to sell at all, is it your view that his action reduces competition and is inherently collusive?

Answer:

I would say that setting up a system in which not merely two but all members of the industry indulge in that systematic form of freight absorption, there is ground for the inference that it is the purpose to accomplish * * * indentity of delivered price, and, that being so, it raises a serious question under the statute whether that is good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

Mr. Woodin further stated:

They (manufacturers) are not at liberty under the law, as I see it, to go into distant markets and take less for their commodity than they get at home if the result be adverse to the interests of competition.

Whereupon, he was asked this question:

Would not the inevitable result of that theory be to destroy this country as a national economic unit and to break it up into a series of little "Balkan" principalities, each one of which would be dominated by local competitors—which would have definite boundary lines determined by freight, so that other people living outside any of those areas could not ship into an area which, freightwise, is nearer some mill other than their own?

Mr. Woodin answered:

A mill which cannot profitably absorb freight into a certain market by rail could profitably absorb it and could sell into that market and deliver into that market if they adopt a cheaper form of transportation.

He said further:

I personally have no enthusiasm about making a price level high enough to permit

everybody to sell everywhere * * * the question is whether we must have a national market for all of our products, or should have a national market for all of our products. Why not a series of sectional markets into which the people who can deliver there at the lowest cost because of their proximity to the delivery point? Why shouldn't they have a monopoly there, since you want to call it that, but it will consist only and result only from the fact that they are able to make a lower price that would keep other people out.

He was then asked:

If you had the country divided into separate economic units or little "Balkan" principalities, what motive would there be for any one inhabitant of any one of those "Balkan" countries to invade the territory of another? Would you not have in the end a far more rigid structure than you have at the present time because there would be no incentive to break that down?

Mr. Woodin answered:

I don't see how it can be any more rigid than we had it at the time when the cement base price went through the depression and for 5 years afterward without a change of 1 cent.

He was then asked:

But if the Commission * * * put every one of those cement mills in strait-jackets so that they could not lawfully ship into territory where they did not have the advantage in freight rates, do you think there would be any greater flexibility in cement prices?

Mr. Woodin answered:

I certainly do, and, in addition to flexibility, there would be a lower level. This whole delivered price philosophy makes the freight advantage the sole determinant * * * and that means that all the other advantages, consisting of differences in efficiency and manufacture and things of that kind, are simply swallowed up. They are not given the effect that they would have under a real competitive system.

Mr. Woodin further stated:

There is no way I know of in economics or law, and it probably isn't desirable anyway, to prevent the manufacturer that has the advantage in delivered cost from using it to make a lower price and keep his competitor across the country out of his market. I think it might be very desirable that he do so.

I have set forth these questions and answers at some length because I have not found any place a better statement of the underlying thinking of some of the representatives of our Government agencies on this particular point.

The question is whether or not, as a matter of economic development, Balkanizing the country from a business standpoint will produce lower prices than we now have under our basing-point systems. In some instances, there is no question but that it will increase prices. For example, take a basic commodity manufacturer who has no competition within a fairly large area. He will certainly raise his prices to the point where they will be just under a competitor's f. o. b. mill price plus freight.

But, in addition to the higher prices resulting from the Balkanization of the country, is the further fact that, for instance, a fabricator of steel will not know what his price is. If he is located in Youngstown, Ohio, his delivered steel price from Sharon and Youngstown will be less than his delivered steel price from Pittsburgh.

The development of the basing-point system of distributing basic commodities answered just that objection. The entire American economic system is based upon the historic patterns of distribution which have grown up over the years in American industry. I think it can be fairly said that the delivered-price system is a thoroughly American way of handling the distribution of basic commodities over large continental areas. No other nation has such widely dispersed production like we have. In no other country is the influence of a large continental area a real factor. Basing-point or delivery pricing is a system which industry and the public generally have considered good from an economic standpoint.

Thus, we have before us a first-class conflict between what people like us regard as sound business practice and what our administrative bodies and the United States Supreme Court regard as practice contrary to public policy.

We are never going to get the question settled until this conflict is reconciled. It seems to me it could be reconciled by amending the antitrust laws to provide that absorption of delivery costs will not be discrimination within the meaning of the first part of section 13 (a) and will not be prima facie evidence of a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Perhaps nothing more would be required than an amendment to section 13 (a) or 13 (b), as follows:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this title shall prevent a seller from absorbing delivery costs in good faith to meet or better the price of a competitor.

This follows language of section 13 (b) except that it reads "to meet or better" rather than "to meet." We have some court decisions which hold that the language of the present law means only "to meet" and not "to better."

In suggesting the above amendment to the present law, I have not overlooked other serious questions involved. From time to time, it has been proven that reduced prices, freight absorption, and the granting of services or facilities, have been used by sellers to lessen competition by driving out competitors; and this practice has contributed to the growth of monopoly. Therefore, the law must express a public policy against this and similar practices.

The amendment only makes it possible for a seller to absorb delivery costs in good faith to meet or better the price competition. The seller, under the suggested amendment, would still have to get as much for his product at a distant point as he gets at the mill location. He could, however, absorb delivery costs in every market in the country, to meet competition.

It seems to me further that this type of amendment would meet a good portion of the objection of the opposing school of thought, which is, in Mr. Woodin's words:

This whole delivered-price philosophy makes the freight advantage the sole determinant * * * and that means that all the other advantages, consisting of differences in efficiency and manufacture and things of that kind are simply swallowed up.

Permitting a seller to absorb freight in good faith to meet or better the price of a competitor would not make freight advantage the sole determinant.

The Coal Situation

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to once again remind the leadership of the Congress of the very serious situation confronting the Nation today because of the existing coal strike. I full well realize that this subject must be on the minds of many other Members of this body at this very moment. I am certain that I speak for a great many of them, and further I am very certain that I speak for the minority membership.

On January 6, 1950, I went to the White House to urge that the President recognize the serious situation existing and that he use his offices to prevent further human as well as economic suffering. This plea fell on deaf ears. On the following Monday, January 9, in company with many of my colleagues, I attended a meeting of the Members of the Congress from the Middle West to study what steps should be taken to remedy the situation. I am constrained to state that the attendance at that meeting was made up almost entirely of Members of the Republican Party.

On January 12, 1950, I introduced a concurrent resolution, along with several other Members of the Congress, directing the President that it was the sense of the Congress that he should take necessary remedial action.

On that same date I asked that the House consider these resolutions.

On January 26 I took the floor of this House and asked the Speaker to join with the leadership of the Senate in requesting the President of the United States to take the necessary action which would bring relief to the Nation. I explained then and in the past that the Congress had given the President the authority to act.

Now again today I make the plea to recognize the situation we have allowed the Nation to be placed in.

I believe that the people of this Nation are entitled to know the facts concerning the efforts we of the minority have made to forestall the crisis we have today:

First. We have asked the President to act. He has refused to do so until such a late date that the situation is completely out of hand and the health, safety, and welfare of the people have been seriously jeopardized.

Second. The leadership of this House as well as the leadership of the United

States Senate are in that position because they have large working majorities in both of the Houses of Congress. This leadership enjoys a personal conference with the President at least once each week. They either have failed to discuss this question with the President or they have failed to convince the President, who is of the same political faith as they, that he should act.

Third. Failing this, this same Democratic leadership has failed to take any action in the Congress. We must all know that they, and they alone, can take such action for they are the leaders of the majority party. We of the minority cannot even have our pleas considered because we are lacking in voting strength.

I have pointed out the above situation so as to make clear where the blame rests in this crisis and who must bear the responsibility for it. There is only one answer and that is the administration and the administration's leadership in the Congress.

I am certain that many, many Members will join with me in stating clearly that we have not in the past nor will we be guilty in the future of sacrificing the prestige of the Government on the political altar to gain political favor with group selfishness.

I state once and for all that I, as well as many Members of the Congress have taken every action possible to have obviated this coal situation, but our hands have thus far been tied, and they have been tied by the President and the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by me on February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 19)

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Congress has begun work on a new tax bill—a matter which affects every home and every individual in the United States.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about Federal taxes because they are divided into two main classifications—direct taxes, such as the income tax, and hidden taxes, which are included in the price of everything we buy.

Even those in the low-income brackets who pay no Federal income tax at all are not tax exempt. Many others who are subject to income taxes are not aware of how much more the Government is taking from their pockets through concealed taxation.

If our people realized that all of them, even those on the relief rolls, are paying heavy Federal taxes—then taxes all around would be lower today. Because, then, our people would rise up unanimously and would demand less spending and less waste in government.

You all know where I stand. I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which handles all tax legislation. On that committee I have been fighting consistently for lower taxes and government at lower cost. On the Senate floor and in public and private meetings I have been trying to make our people understand that taxes can be reduced only if the Government spending is cut down.

I think you will remember that during my term as Governor of Pennsylvania, we were able to reduce State taxes by $322,900,000. This was done despite increased appropriations for health, education, welfare, conservation, stream clearance, and mental and penal institutions.

At present, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is conducting hearings on the new tax bill which will include reduction of some of the Federal excise taxes. I have been fighting to reduce those taxes since I came to Washington. And I have been fighting to reduce and to disclose to the public the hidden taxes they pay, the ones they are not even aware of.

These excises and hidden taxes are not soak-the-rich taxes. They are poor man's taxes. They hit the poor harder than they hit the rich. I'll prove that to you in a moment.

Let us consider first the excise situation which affects every one of you. You pay it when you buy a radio set, when you go to the movies, when you buy an electric refrigerator, when you buy a wedding ring, an alarm clock, or an electric-light bulb.

You pay it when you buy a lipstick, or talcum powder, or even the oils and creams to soothe the chafed skin of a young baby.

You pay it on your monthly telephone bill, your gas and electric bill, your railroad or bus ticket, and when you send a telegram. You pay taxes on a thousand other things used in your daily living. This Government calls them luxuries.

They are unfair. They are discriminatory. All too often they are without rhyme or reason. And they hit the little fellow harder than the man with money.

I could go on indefinitely with these things. Now how is the little man hit? Well, it doesn't matter if you earned a million dollars or only a thousand dollars in 1949, you've got to pay the same tax for shaving lotion and baby oil, and telephone bills, and many other necessities of daily living.

These taxes have no relation to what you earn. They fall far more heavily on the poor man than on the man with a high income.

I want to assure you that I shall work without let-up in the Senate Finance Committee toward getting rid of these taxes. And I suggest that you write to your Congressmen and make your views known, too. Now is the time to do it.

Some of the excises are hidden taxes. By that I mean you do not pay them directly as tax, the way you do when you buy a woman's handbag, a wrist watch, or a can of talcum powder.

These excises are paid by the manufacturer but are concealed in the total purchase price you pay. You are not told that a part of the price is made up of taxes. All you know is that prices are high. You blame it on the manufacturer, and the dealer, without realizing how much is tax.

There are other concealed taxes, in addition to the excises.

I want to call attention particularly at this time to all these hidden taxes. They are part of the price of everything you buy: food, clothing, shelter, fuel and light, insurance, amusements, and even streetcar transportation.

I think that our people should make clear to Congress that they want as many as possible of the hidden taxes eliminated and that they want to know what taxes they pay. They don't want to be fooled.

Let me point out the huge amount of taxes which are concealed but which you pay just the same.

A recent survey disclosed that the cost of a pair of shoes includes no less than 502 hidden or indirect taxes. Can you imagine that?

That should give the mother who buys shoes for three or four children something to think about. She pays the taxes on the shoe factory, the machinery, the leather, the canvas lining of the shoes, the rubber heels, and everything else that entered into the making of the shoes. Can you imagine how much cheaper the shoes would be without those hidden taxes?

And let me remind you that shoes used to be cheaper back in the days before all the taxes were loaded on by the Federal, State, and local governments.

In the cost of a loaf of bread there are 151 different, distinct and separate taxes. In a quart of milk, 78 taxes. In a plow, 142 taxes. In a woman's cotton dress, 125 taxes. In a cake of soap, 154 different taxes. In a woman's hat, 150 taxes.

And in an egg—one of those surplus eggs that the Government buys up and stores in caves in the ground—100 different hidden taxes.

Do you know that about 25 percent of the rent you pay is hidden taxes?

All of these things were cheaper when taxes were lower and fewer. They will be cheaper again, if the public insists that the Government tax less and spend less.

Consider a new automobile. It has 206 hidden taxes. Suppose you buy a new car for about $1,600. Well, your taxes on that car—most of them hidden and indirect—come to about $350. Without those taxes you could buy the same automobile for $1,250.

Recently a research group made a study of how these hundreds of hidden taxes affect the little man.

It found a family of four whose only income was $80 a month. Imagine trying to live on that, without any taxes at all.

That family spent every penny trying to live. And of the $80 which it spent each month, $10.29 was taken away in hidden taxes. That poor family was paying out in taxes $123.48 a year.

Another survey was made of a family of four making $200 a month. That family paid out $26.23 each month in hidden taxes on food, clothing, shelter, and so on. It paid concealed taxes of $314.76 a year.

Here is an interesting angle. Neither of the wage earners were required to pay a penny in income taxes. Apparently they were tax exempt, but did not realize how much of their small income was actually being taken away by these painless, hidden taxes.

They thought the Government was not taxing them at all. They were unaware that 13 cents out of every dollar was quietly taken away from them by these hidden taxes.

In the same manner so many of our people are being fooled today.

Let us trace one of these items and see what is meant by hidden taxes. Take the cotton dress which has 125 different taxes by the time your wife buys it in the store.

You must start back with the bale of cotton. There are taxes on the land, on the farming implements, for the school district,

etc. These are included as part of the cost of raising the cotton and are passed along in the price of the bale.

Then at the cotton gin many other taxes are added and passed on to the plant where the cotton is spun and woven.

Then there is the factory where the dress is made which adds its taxes and passes them along to the wholesaler in the cost. And, of course, the accessories—the buttons and the trimmings—all came up from raw material and gathered taxes on the way.

The wholesaler has his taxes and the retailer has his. In order for them to make a profit and stay in business, these taxes must be added to the cost of the dress. Your wife pays.

It has been figured out that a simple cotton dress, costing $7.85 has no less than $2.20 worth of hidden taxes included in the price.

Why do we have all these hidden taxes? Why must they be piled up on top of the excise taxes, direct and indirect, and the heavy Federal income tax?

The answer is simple. We have them because of the high cost of Government.

We have them because the Federal Government is spending the people's earnings at the rate of more than $42,000,000,000 a year while State and local governments add more than twenty billion to the total.

We have them because we are burdened with a national debt that now stands at more than $256,000,000,000, and is climbing higher.

We have them because the administration had abandoned all thought of a balanced budget and is committed to a program of continued deficit financing.

And finally we have them because the administration does not dare let the people realize how heavily they are being taxed to meet the reckless spending.

So they conceal part of the taxes. And when taxes are hidden, they can be pushed on to more people. They can be—and are—foisted on to low-income people as well as those with higher incomes. And the low-income groups don't realize how much they are being taxed.

That is shrewd political trickery. It has been figured out very cleverly. Tax the rich man where it shows—on his corporation and his large income. It makes the people who aren't rich, and that's most of us, feel they are being favored.

Tax the poor man where it doesn't show, with hidden taxes that he doesn't realize he is being forced to pay.

There you have the formula which has emerged from this administration. Tax the rich where it shows and the poor where it doesn't show.

These things are something for you to think about.

And, if you ever want to get out from under this tax burden, they are something for you to shout about and act about.

Just as long as you fool yourselves that the Government is giving you a lot of things free, you are going to continue to pay these taxes.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

United States Headed for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the American Press in the February 1950 issue. This emphatically indicates that an overwhelming majority, 78 percent of the weekly newspaper editors of the Nation, fear that the United States is headed for socialism. This is another danger signal which should be heeded, so that this disastrous trend may be reversed.

The editorial follows:

SEVENTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF COUNTRY EDITORS FEAR UNITED STATES IS HEADED FOR SOCIALISM

This startling fact was unearthed by the American Press magazine as the result of a poll which it has been conducting for the primary purpose of finding out what the weekly newspaper editors of the United States think it is most important for Congress to accomplish at the present session.

The 3-page questionnaire, which was answered by over 500 editors representing every State in the Union, concluded with the question, "Do you fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism?" All but 22 percent answered "Yes."

The fear seems to be based on what many of the editors refer to as welfare-state measures, as well as on the size of the national debt, huge Government costs and an unbalanced budget. Many believe that Congress' action on compulsory health-insurance legislation will determine whether or not we are going socialistic. Eighty-nine percent of the editors expressed opposition to this measure.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

But of greatest immediate concern is Government finances. In answer to the question: "What do you consider to be the two most important things for Congress to accomplish at the new session?" 79 percent demanded a balanced budget, reduction of Government costs, or cuts in Federal pay rolls.

Although tax reforms were considered second most important need, only 21 percent asked for immediate tax reductions, regardless of whether or not the budget is balanced. Many of those felt that if taxes were reduced reduction in Government costs would thus be forced.

Thirty-nine percent said they favored tax reductions only if the budget can be balanced and another 36 percent advised leaving taxes as high as they are and create a surplus, if possible, to pay off the debt; 3 percent of the editors favored increasing taxes to meet the debt. But 85 percent would like to see the tax laws rewritten and simplified.

In addition to Government costs and finances, the five next most important things for Congress to do, in the opinion of the editors are:

Enact reforms proposed by Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and clarify foreign policy.

Strengthen and streamline defense; take action to restore the confidence of business in the future.

Sentiments of many of the editors were expressed by 359 who commented, "Unless our Government ceases to be the world's worst businessman, our burdens will continue to increase until a breaking point is reached. Why can't our so-called elected Representatives stop playing politics long enough to see the danger signs and get some sensible laws enacted to encourage free enterprise? What does a young man starting out have to look forward to under the present set-up? They, the lawmakers, seem to have forgotten the basic principles which have made this country as great and strong as it is to date."

Among the country editors, whose combined newspapers have a readership of around 70,000,000 people, only a handful of those replying to the questionnaire indicated general approval of the administration's domestic programs, but many felt that Congress was too steeped in politics to do anything about it. Fourteen of those replying to the question about the most important thing for Congress to do gave the facetious answer, "Go home" or "Adjourn," and many said, "Forget politics."

Remarks by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on the Signing of the Niagara Diversion Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued yesterday in connection with the signing, on February 27, 1950, of the Niagara Diversion Treaty between the United States and Canada.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to learn of the signature of the long-awaited treaty between Canada and the United States covering the added diversions from the Niagara River. This treaty has been signed as a supplement to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and as such carries out the promise given in that treaty for the use of the waters of the Niagara for the benefit of the peoples of the United States and Canada.

Under the terms of Executive agreements entered into during the course of the war, Canada has already been receiving the benefits of more water diversions than the United States. This was necessary at the time in order to permit Canada to make her great contribution to the common war effort.

Now we in the United States have the opportunity to make use of the great potential riches with which nature endowed us in the from of the Niagara. The drop of the Niagara waters from the level of Lake Erie to the level of Lake Ontario provides us with potentials for power as great or greater than the greatest hydro-power works in all of the United States. We can expect to be able to develop from these waters an increase of 1,132,000 kilowatts or 7,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours above the amount which we are already deriving from the Niagara. All this will be done, according to the terms of the treaty, without diminishing in any way the great scenic beauties of the Niagara Falls which have been the pride of New York State and of the United States for more than a century.

This development promises to the people of New York State a great new source of cheap power—power for farms, for homes, and for factories. New sources of electric energy and new comforts may be provided for tens of thousands of our farm dwellers and new employment to hundreds of thousands of our city workers.

I and all of us who have been working and studying the Niagara water-power development envison this development as a source of power in association with that

other great source of power potential in the same river basin, the St. Lawrence. If these two great projects are progressively and speedily brought into actual operation, not only New York State but all of the Northeast will be direct beneficiaries of this vast new source of man-saving energy. Of course New York State will receive the most immediate and the greatest direct benefit, but through these power projects there can be a new flowering of this entire area and a new dynamic growth in the entire region. No mere compilation of kilowatt-hours can describe the great additions to our national riches which are now in sight.

For many years I have been hoping for the day when these vast benefits for the people could begin to be derived from the Niagara. Many of the pioneers in hydroelectric development have been working for long years on this project. Many men have dreamed great dreams of what the Niagara could do for the people. Now these hopes, this work, and these dreams are one step closer to realization.

I shall press for the speedy ratification of this treaty when it is submitted to the Senate. The people of New York have reason to hail this day as a great day. The people of the Nation should likewise take note.

Relations Between Ireland and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of February 28, 1950, commenting on a dinner in honor of Sean Nunan, retiring Minister of Eire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—GILDING AN ANCIENT LINK BETWEEN TWO CAPITALS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—There was a stag dinner party tonight in honor of Sean Nunan, the retiring Minister of Eire, and certain recent developments suffused the occasion with an unusual degree of the wit and sentiment that always prevail when those of Irish stock foregather. This highly respected envoy was returning to Dublin, to the No. 2 post in the Foreign Office; his legation here and ours in Eire had been raised to embassies; the present United States Minister, George A. Garrett, was to be our first Ambassador to the Republic; and everyone was saying good things about Ireland's first Ambassador to Washington, John J. Hearne.

What more could possibly have been needed to make a warm-hearted occasion, further considering that Irishmen, transplanted or growing native, were those principally concerned?

The American politicians who attended must have come with a special glow under their shirt fronts. For long has it been known that the most popular thing an American politician can do, whatever his origin, unless his constituents are all descendants of the invading breed at Boyne Water and still embattled with King James, is to praise the Irish. Even in heavily Anglo-Saxon Mississippi the late Senator Byron Patton Harrison was the more beloved because he signed himself and was known only as Pat.

This sentimental warmth of feeling in the United States toward the Irish has been notably displayed once more by the welcome Washington gave to the news that the legation of Eire has been raised to an embassy. Except for the Vatican, where for 2 years there has been an Ambassador of Eire, the only major diplomatic post created by Dublin is the new one here.

DE VALERA'S VIEW

It is not the fault of the United States that the elevation was not made some years ago. But Eamon de Valera throughout the days of his primacy was, by the Washington test, the most unpopular type of administrator—he believed a nation should live within its income and also be frugal in spending the public revenues. Apparently on that same policy the Swiss maintain only a ministry here. An embassy costs more to operate than a legation, particularly in this Capital. And, though doubtless Mr. de Valera had other reasons for keeping only a Minister here when nearly every other small country in the world was substituting Ambassadors, his fiscal policy was always understood to be important among them.

Whatever his reasons, the envoy of Eire continued for a long time to follow in the protocols, and sit at dinner tables below the envoys of countries which were savage-infested wildernesses when St. Patrick was writing Foid Fiada, "The Cry of the Deer"; still were when Pierce Ferriter, last hold-out against Cromwell, who hanged him in 1653, was writing his poems; and were not much more when Owen Roe O'Sullivan's Jacobite verses were the vogue in 1790. Now, with the elevation of the Eire legate, there are to be 14 out of 52 in the diplomatic corps with the rank of Minister whom he will outrank in the capital of a nation which has so many links with his own.

In the protocols Ambassador Hearne will take his place just after the Ambassador of Guatemala and 10 files below the Ambassador of Israel, whose advent to Washington from the nation that reemerged from the rubble of history was the most romantic experience of the diplomatic corps here until the creation of an Irish Ambassador. Incidentally, both events touch on the statement by George William Russell that "after the spiritual powers there is nothing in the world more unconquerable than the spirit of nationality [which] * * * in Ireland will persist even though the mightiest of material powers be its neighbor."

CAREFULLY NEGOTIATED

There is no reason to believe that the pleasure in Washington over the new accord with Eire exceeds that in Dublin, or that Mr. Garrett's promotion is less popular there than here. He earned it on his official record of cooperation and accomplishment in the common interest of the two countries, and the new Ambassadress has won as many golden opinions as he has.

As dispatches to this newspaper have noted, an Irish heroine figures in the proceedings, which is traditional in the history of the land where, in County Roscommon, she was born. An enthusiastic Washington dispatch and the headline over it last Saturday related how Miss Mary Cummings, manager of the 1925 F Street Club, had made a one-woman campaign with high personages in Washington to elevate the two legations and to assure Mr. Garrett got the recognition he deserved.

But, despite the soft and gallant impeachment, it would be a mistake to assume that such matters are determined in clubs—either here or in Dublin—or that the President, acting somewhat like a kindly oriental despot, decides on Ambassadors because of such zeal as Miss Cummings displayed in this instance.

The transition of the legations to embassies was carefully negotiated for some time by the Department of State and the Department for External Affairs in Dublin, and then officially recommended to the President and the Prime Minister. Mr. Garrett was not only promoted on his record; he had many powerful endorsements from Democratic leaders in Congress.

What Miss Cummings did was to make sure that nobody forgot to see both things through. Including, by the way, the President.

Jaycee Distinguished Service Award to Alfred James Dickinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in connection with the Jaycee distinguished service award to Alfred James Dickinson, of Richmond, Va., who was named the outstanding young man of Virginia for 1949 by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce.

This is a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Dickinson and is a very high compliment, as this annual award by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Virginia is made only after the most exhaustive investigation and consideration to see that it is based upon merit, and is fully deserved.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANVILLE, February 25.—Alfred James Dickinson, 33, of Richmond, tonight was named the outstanding young man of Virginia for 1949 by the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce. Announcement of the recipient was made by Atty. Gen. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., at a banquet in Hotel Danville for directors and members of the Virginia junior chamber.

Attorney General Almond served with Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, president of Longwood College, and Russell B. Newton, president of Dan River Mills, as judges in the selection of Mr. Dickinson to receive the Jaycee distinguished service award. Mr. Dickinson was nominated by Walter B. Gillette. Robert L. Stone, of Richmond, was Jaycee chairman of the distinguished service award committee.

Mr. Dickinson, who last month was named Richmond's outstanding young man of 1949, has actively encouraged young men to take an interest in community and civic affairs. As president of the general alumni association of the University of Richmond, he urged the younger alumni to become active in alumni affairs. And as a member of the Richmond central committee of the American Legion, he emphasized the need for veterans to maintain unselfish motives. He has also given much time to obtaining financial aid for young men seeking higher education.

A native of Eufaula, Ala., Mr. Dickinson attended high school in Newport News. He was graduated from the University of Richmond in 1937 and from the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration in 1939.

He became personal assistant to the comptroller of the Virginia-Carolina Chemical

Corp. in 1939. Following service with the FBI and the Marine Corps, Air Combat Intelligence, he returned to the purchasing department of the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corp. where he was named acting manager in May 1947, and manager in July 1948.

His civic associations include: President, Richmond Junior Chamber of Commerce; past commander, American Legion Post 316, Richmond; and a member of American Red Cross, Richmond Tuberculosis Association, Public Relations Club of Richmond, Harvard Club of Virginia, Country Club of Virginia, Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Kappa, and Phi Gamma Delta. He is also a worker in the Richmond area community chest.

Mr. Dickinson is married and has two children.

Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there appeared in the February 27 edition of the Evening Star an editorial entitled "A Valuable Publicity Medium," which points out one of the fine services rendered by the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it is of value to the Congress and the people of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VALUABLE PUBLICITY MEDIUM

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, wants to abolish the Byrd Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the ground that it is used only as a publicity medium. But a lot of people who are more worried about Federal spending than Senator HUMPHREY seems to be will contend that the committee's publicity activities are a very good reason for continuing it in existence.

It is true that Senator BYRD and his colleagues of the joint group have publicized freely and often the inefficiencies and extravagances of the Government. The committee has kept the spotlight focused on the growing size of the executive establishment, a trend that is all the more disturbing in view of the fact that the war emergency ended nearly 5 years ago. It is hard to measure the benefits of this publicity in specific terms. There is good cause to believe, however, that the watchdog role of the Byrd committee has had a restraining effect not only on the departments and independent agencies but on Congress as well.

To those who regard governmental retrenchment and thrift as old-fashioned and unnecessary, the joint committee's frequent reports on Federal expansion and spending are understandably irritating. That, in itself, is as good an argument as any for making certain that the committee keeps up the good work. The relatively small cost of maintaining this congressional publicity medium is a profitable investment, the returns on which in terms of administrative savings can be large indeed.

Displaced Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to displaced persons legislation, from the Labor Record, of Joliet, Ill., for February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFL AND CIO REAFFIRM SUPPORT OF LIBERALIZED DP LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have recently reaffirmed their stand in favor of liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act.

The CIO voiced its approval of a DP bill submitted by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, as substitute legislation for the bill previously reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee by its chairman, Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada.

Both AFL and CIO reiterated their support of H. R. 4567, which is the liberalizing legislation enacted by the House of Representatives last session. In addition, they stated their opposition to amendments which seeks to prohibit further admissions of displaced persons whenever unemployment in the United States reaches 4,000,000 or whenever the number of married couples living in doubled-up dwelling units exceeds 2,000,000.

CIO Legislative Director Nathan Cowan declared: "We call upon the Senate to carry forward in the American tradition of equity, justice, and recognition of human dignity by passing at the earliest possible moment the substitute displaced persons bill offered by Senator KILGORE and his colleagues."

The AFL executive council issued a statement pointing out that the AFL would be the first to protest against legislation which actually undermines the job security of American workers or which really restricts their housing opportunities.

"But we know from experience," the AFL statement read, "that the admission of displaced persons at a limited rate, widely dispersed throughout the country and in practice dispatched to areas of labor shortage, does not in any way jeopardize employment opportunities of American workers nor seriously aggravate housing shortages."

KILGORE submitted his substitute bill with a minority report on the Judiciary Committee's displaced-persons bill. The report indicated that a majority of the committee members now favor amendments to the present DP law which are more liberal than those contained in the committee bill. Senators FRANK P. GRAHAM, Democrat, of North Carolina, and HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, joined with Senator KILGORE in signing the minority report. In addition, Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, signed a supplemental statement associating themselves with the views of the minority report, and two other Senators, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Democrat, of Maryland, and ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, filed a separate statement in which they advocated liberalizing the committee bill.

The substitute bill provides for the admission of 339,000 displaced persons, as in the House bill; retention of the International Refugee Organization definition of displaced person, which does not include German expellees; removal of the 40 percent—so-called Baltic—preference, the 30-percent agricultural requirement, and the in-camp priority; a more economic administration of the law; and a bar against the issuance of any visa to any person who has or does adhere to, advocate, and follow "the principles of any political and economic system or philosophy directed toward the destruction of free competitive enterprise and the revolutionary overthrow of representative governments."

Organized Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from a very fine west Texas newspaper, the San Angelo Standard-Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial, entitled "Gambling Problem," points up a growing national problem which Congress and the Nation must meet and solve in the near future.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAMBLING PROBLEM

The situation with respect to organized gambling, to which Mr. Truman recently called attention, is not a new one. It is, rather, a new phase of an old trouble, gangsterism.

When Federal prohibition was enacted, the opportunities in bootlegging tempted many members of the underworld and the powerful and unscrupulous bootleg gangs became such a stench in the country's nostrils that the eighteenth amendment was presently repealed. This forced the outlaw element to seek new fields for its activities. It turned for a while to "protection" racketeering, which in due time was largely broken up. It engaged in racketeering that involved many labor unions, and while this evil has not been wholly eliminated, by any means, it is less noisome than it formerly was.

Gambling in its various forms, from slot machines and policy games on up to racetrack betting, sumptuous poker-palaces and the field of sports in general offered a natural and inviting field for underworld figures. They have moved into it and it has become a highly organized activity, with many ramifications and with many devices for catering to the ever-present gambling spirit.

Probably it can be broken up, by united action on the part of law enforcement agencies, before it becomes too hateful. The public conscience, however, must be more fully aroused on the subject before anything effective can be done.

Addresses at Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Albert W. Hawkes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on October 27, 1949, a testimonial dinner was given to one of our former distinguished colleagues, Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, by the New Jersey Chapter of Pro America, at the Hotel Surburban, in East Orange, N. J. Mrs. George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Chapter of Pro America, presided and introduced the various speakers. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made by Mrs. Stringfellow be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the address by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and remarks by Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, in introducing our colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who made the principal address of the evening. I also ask that the address delivered by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. STRINGFELLOW. Pro America is composed of a group of citizens who place the welfare of their country above sectional and personal interest. Its purpose is to fight the destructive influences that imperil the sacred heritage bequeathed to us by our forefathers. There is gathered in this huge audience tonight to do honor to the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes, who served New Jersey and the Nation as United States Senator, citizens from as far west as Chicago and from as far south as Tennessee. We regret that the limitation of space prevented many of Senator Hawkes' friends and admirers from being here tonight to share in honoring this truly great American. Pro America is citing him as a good citizen because he has had the courage, character and tenacity of purpose to defend and support the ideals and principles which made this a great Nation.

One of, if not the most acute deficit in the world today, is intellectual integrity, an ingredient with which Senator Albert W. Hawkes is so richly endowed, and it is this priceless ingredient which attracts the members of Pro America to Senator Hawkes and others like him. Unfortunately, however, there are too few.

Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation, a statesman who has rendered remarkable service to the people of this State and Nation, has graciously accepted our invitation to act as toastmaster of this great dinner given in honor of his friend, Senator Albert W. Hawkes.

Hon. JAMES F. KEM. Dr. Eaton, Senator and Mrs. Hawkes, Mrs. Stringfellow, ladies and gentleman. After listening to Dr. EATON'S delicious shafts of humor, I am reminded that a young and aspiring author once asked Will Rogers if the field of humor was crowded. Will Rogers replied: "No; it isn't crowded, except when Congress is in session."

It is a privilege to be here tonight to join the friends and neighbors of the Hawkes in doing them honor. It was my good fortune to serve with Al Hawkes for 2 years in the United States Senate. I had the opportunity to observe, at close range, his courage and his forthrightness, his ability to think clearly, and to express himself so cogently that no man could misunderstand.

He believes in the American way of life, the American system of free enterprise and personal initiative. He believes in a solvent America; he opposes the doctrines of Karl Marx, whether they are paraded under the banner of communism or under the banner of socialism.

But from these principles he never bends a single inch before any wind or political expediency.

As all of you know, Senator Hawkes' career has been characterized by good judgment, but never was his good judgment shown quite so well as when he wooed and won the belle of Missouri, the prettiest girl in Warrensburg.

I am glad to be here tonight. I am not going to detain you because I know you are anxious to hear the great Senator from Virginia, Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, the principal speaker of the evening.

I do want to say, though, that we Missourians, Senator BYRD, claim a proprietary interest in the Hawkes. We extend them our best wishes and wish them many years of happiness.

Dr. EATON. It is with profound pleasure that I introduce the next speaker, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. I do not believe that we have in public life in this country a greater interpreter of the issues confronting the American people than Senator BYRD. His life is a great story. He was a member of the Virginia State Senate. He was Governor of Virginia. He has been since 1934 United States Senator from Virginia. And I have often said, knowing the representatives of that great State in both Houses of Congress for a long time that if we turned the Government of the United States to them—in spite of the fact that they bear the name Democrats—we would have an American Government of the highest possible type.

Senator BYRD, we welcome you as a true friend of our friend Senator Hawkes, as a great American, and as a Member of the House of Representatives I am happy to have the privilege of presenting a Senator.

Senator BYRD, we welcome you to New Jersey, and if ever you feel constrained to change your place of residence, you cannot find a finer place for raising apples, raising a disturbance, or raising anything you please, than in New Jersey.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD. Mr. Toastmaster, friends of Al Hawkes, I first want to thank my very dear friend, Congressman EATON, for the all-too-gracious introduction he has given me. He has the confidence and respect of the entire Congress of the United States, Republicans, Constitutional Democrats, and New Deal Democrats.

I bring to you the greetings of the old Commonwealth of Virginia, and I know there are thousands of Virginians who would like to be here tonight to pay tribute to our distinguished guest of honor, because they think as he does, and as you do.

I see by the pamphlet that was put at my table that this organization welcomes Republicans, Constitutional Democrats, and Independents. I see that nothing is said about New Deal Democrats or Fair Deal Democrats. I do not know whether that was an intentional omission or not. I assume that I can join under the title of Constitutional Democrats.

From time to time I am accused, in the Senate of the United States, of voting with the Republicans. In my last campaign for the Senate, I was accused by my opponent of voting with the Republicans 86 percent, and he said, in fact, that I voted with the Republicans more than they voted with themselves.

My reply to that was not to debate the issues, but merely to say that my name began with a "B," I stood at the front of the list and voted first, and the Republicans voted with me.

I am proud of the fact that I was one of 16 southern Democrats to stand shoulder to shoulder with Senator TAFT when the President of the United States endeavored to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. And had it not been for these southern Democrats who left their party on this issue, the Taft-Hartley Act would have been repealed, and that would have been a great and colossal catastrophe, let me say, ladies and gentlemen, to this great country of ours. [Great applause.]

I want to pay a simple tribute to a simple man—to one who is a great citizen; to one who symbolizes the true American spirit to as great a degree, I think, as any man I know. After all, simplicity of thought and action without subterfuge or evasion is one of the greatest of human attributes. Such simplicity has been the base of the lasting fame of one of the greatest of all Americans—Abraham Lincoln. To my mind, if there ever was a man who personified the ideal public servant, it is my friend, and your friend—Al Hawkes.

I have often thought that, while some men may accomplish great deeds and thereby advance the progress of the world, yet one of the greatest services any man can render is to become a symbol of a great cause for the public good.

Al Hawkes was one of the first to see our march to socialistic Government when he said in the Senate:

"Unless the people redeem their morals, rebuild their character, and recognize the mandates of their God differently than they are doing, they will not have the fiber and the courage to do the things necessary to pay for the preservation of individual freedom in its true sense.

"So long," said Senator Hawkes, "as the majority of our people seek to give less for a dollar, they will get less for a dollar, and if they are going to be led astray by the philosophy that you can get something for nothing, or that the world owes a living to the indolent, the shiftless, and the sluggards—there is no hope for the redemption of America.

"Honest people should beget honesty in their representatives, and intelligence in the selection of representatives is vital to the preservation of representative democracy."

For this program he began an unyielding campaign which he carried to the people and fought for on the floor of the Senate—to preserve the fundamental principles of Government that have made America great, and which present to us today our only hope for future progress. Thus, his prodigious efforts for soundness in Government made him, in the minds and hearts of millions of Americans, a symbol of truth and courage.

His great success as a businessman; his service as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce gave him a clearer sight than most of us could have of the imperative necessity of the continuation of the free enterprise system as the foundation stone of our democratic institutions.

He labored for the kind of Government which stimulates individual initiative, through a private enterprise system operating in the fullest freedom of democracy, to develop and produce more of what people need at a cost they can afford.

He fought the kind of Government which, through excessive spending, debt, and oppressive taxes, stifles individual initiative to the point that state subsidy and restriction,

and dole and regimentation are required to maintain a sham in the name of free enterprise and democracy.

He knew that without American solvency our constitutional freedoms will disappear at home and there will be no deterrent to communism abroad.

It was in this situation that vast new expenditures for federalized activities were proposed at home and vast new expenditures for economic, social, and military programs were proposed for nations abroad.

He said over and over again that our friends overseas who seek American aid and comfort must realize their only hope lies in our continued solvency. And, by the same token, those at home, who, through membership in pressure groups or otherwise, continue to wring more and more political pap from the Federal Treasury through extension of federalized programs, should not contend that they are not consciously promoting an economy to be planned and directed by the National Government at the expense of the free-enterprise system operating in the full freedom of democracy.

If increasing taxes or deficits to meet continuously higher Federal expenditures is to be our course, he argued, it is obvious that neither our system nor our form of government can endure. He emphasized that if this is to be our fate, there remain two all-important questions, and he asked: How long can what remains of our private enterprise system and our democratic form of government endure our folly? What will we contrive as a substitute for the doctrines which have made us great?

As to the answer to the first question, he said time and time again that red lights of danger are flashing now.

As to the answer to the second question, he said that he knew of no one who regards the British mess as something more desirable. It is probable though, he predicted, that whatever mechanism our pressure groups at home concoct will be worse.

What Al Hawkes stands for has been called capitalism, reaction, conservatism, feudalism, etc. What he has opposed has been called socialism, welfare state, statism, collectivism, etc. What these words mean, despite recent newspaper controversy, will make little difference in terms of freedom for individual initiative if we throw over our well-tried system and form of government.

I know of no man of my acquaintance—and I say this without flattery but with all the sincerity of my heart—I know of no person of my acquaintance who has given to his fellow citizens an example of unselfishness and selflessness in public service such as Al Hawkes has done for so many years and in so many ways. He numbers among his friends the rich and the poor, and it can be said of him that he is one of the most respected and beloved men from a very large circle of acquaintances.

He is a master of self-judgment and self-control. He possesses special qualities of mind and heart—qualities that are both natural and acquired.

My own devotion for Al Hawkes comes from two sources: One is my pure admiration for the man—for his ability and highly governed mind which has found pleasure in nothing but the true and the just. The other is his friendship for me, which he has shown in so many ways. I have never known a sweeter character or a friend I love more. I shall always treasure the numerous letters he has written me and his thoughtful kindness. To me, his character is carved out of the granite of true loyalty and sincerity. He has a private life and a public career which we may proudly hold up for emulation and tribute. I am sure that today the source of his greatest satisfaction comes from a gathering of his friends such as are here tonight and in their love and confidence.

To review his career is to pay tribute to the opportunities made possible to every man and woman in America today under a system of government which gives to every citizen an equal opportunity for success, depending upon their own ability and their own spirit. Here is a man beloved and honored as few men are. Why? Because, in this free country, he began his career at the bottom and, with an invincible spirit, he overcame all obstacles, and, as he climbed the ladder of business and political success, he kept his touch with those less fortunate than himself.

So, we, his friends, gather here tonight in this testimonial to a great character. We do so in the elation of a devoted admiration for Al Hawkes, the man; Al Hawkes, the devoted friend and admired public servant—the man whom every person in this room would be proud to emulate.

His real wealth is not in stocks, bonds, or buildings, but he has a wealth greater and more imperishable—a wealth of a myriad of life-long friends; the wealth of the consciousness that his life has been guided by the desire to lend a helping hand to those in distress and in need; to give comfort to the unhappy; to make living better for his friends and associates, and the consciousness on his part that he has met in the fullest measure every single responsibility that has come to him, both in his public and private life. I verily believe that his greatest pleasure is the opportunity to do a kindness; to give happiness and to help the under-privileged.

In my service in the United States Senate, I do not believe I have served with a Senator more fearless or more conscious of the necessity of preserving this great Nation from the inroads of state socialism, statism, collectivism, or whatever you may call it. He sacrificed his political career for his principles. As his close friend and intimate, I observed him in many trying situations and never once did he falter in doing the right thing, no matter how unpopular, for the moment, that action was.

When the Fair Employment Practices legislation was before the Senate, by general agreement of all Senators, Senator Hawkes made the most impressive and ablest argument against the passage of that legislation. I have no doubt he suffered for it among certain groups of the electorate of his State.

I feel tonight that perhaps the greatest compliment I can pay to Al Hawkes is to say that he stood foresquare on these great principles during his service in the Senate, just as did my distinguished colleague, the late Senator Carter Glass. If I were asked to name the two men who were willing, from my personal knowledge, to risk, without hesitation, their political fortunes in support of great principles, these are the two I would name. Knowing both men intimately, as I did, they had many characteristics in common.

On June 19, 1948, Al Hawkes delivered his valedictory address. On page 9060 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1948, there is this line following the ending of his speech:

"Applause, Senators rising."

In my 17 years of service in the Senate, I have seen this occur only two or three times. To those who are not familiar with the rules and customs of the Senate, it is difficult to appreciate the real significance of this ovation. The rules prohibit applause in the Senate. The rules prohibit the Senators from making a demonstration by rising as a body. Yet, as a tribute to the sincerity and indomitable spirit of this great public servant who had served in the Senate a much shorter time than most of his colleagues, he was accorded this unusual honor by the greatest deliberative body in the world. No man who ever served in the United States Senate could fail to be intensely proud of these three very uncommon words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—"Applause, Senators rising."

From this great speech of his, I will quote several sentences only. All of you should read it in full. He said, on that June day just before adjournment of the Senate:

"I have known for a great many years that the label Republican or Democrat is not the vital thing in the preservation of the United States of America. The great question is this: Does a citizen or representative of the people believe in the American system and wish to preserve and improve it, or is he one of those who wish to exchange a success for a failure, by following what I call un-American activities?

"My experience here will enable me to continue making a contribution toward the preservation of our form of government and our institutions.

"From the standpoint of service to his country, no man could fail to have sorrow and regret at leaving the Senate. No personal gratification in looking forward to more ease and comfort could possibly compensate for the loss of opportunity to continue in this great deliberative body as a servant of the people.

"There was nothing here I wanted for myself when I arrived, except the opportunity to serve the people and help preserve in our mutual interest the rights and opportunities which developed under our American system of freemen."

Al Hawkes is a shining example of that rare product of our public life—a statesman without fear and without reproach. Here is a man who is honored everywhere. He is known because his name means the conception of the highest type of public official—a gentleman unafraid; a statesman whose life and character provide an inspiration to the rest of us.

Samuel Butler said a long time ago that "every man's work is always a picture of himself." If this be true, then in the long perspective of the work of Albert W. Hawkes, his countrymen will find an enlightened vision that has enabled him to find the way of right service and a strong honesty that has kept him steadfastly on that way; a character that has been proof alike against the trials of dark times and the temptations of happier times; a life governed by convictions that constitute a compass by which he guides his ship of life and so keeps the ship true to the course of high honor and good conscience, whether the weather be fair or foul.

Of my own association with him and his many kind and considerate acts toward me, I can only speak with feeling of deep emotion. Our friendship has been close and intimate. One of the greatest privileges of my life—and one for which I shall be eternally grateful—is that of being his colleague, and, still better, of being a friend of Al Hawkes in our joint service in the Senate of the United States. I admire and love him with a deep devotion.

I like to think of Al Hawkes as a symbol of what the American citizen should desire to be, so as to preserve those things that have made America great, and standing for those things necessary to protect and fortify this great representative democracy bequeathed to us as a sacred heritage by the blood and labor of those who have gone before.

And so he stands, always for the things that are good in life; and for the things that will continue to make his country better. He has applied his rugged individual experiences to the benefit of all his fellow men.

He asks no quarter with justice. His forthrightness not infrequently brings criticism down upon him, but I have never known him to go long without vindication.

Like Benjamin Hill, he believes that:

"He who saves his country
Saves all things
And all things saved
Shall bless him.
But he who lets his country die
Lets all things die
And all things dying
Shall curse him."

A man who really made a great President, but who was never fully appreciated—John Tyler, of Virginia—when he resigned from the United States Senate because the Legislature of Virginia instructed him to take action contrary to his convictions, said:

"I shall carry with me into retirement the principles which I brought with me into public office and, by the surrender of the high station to which I was called by the voice of the people of Virginia, I shall set an example to my children which shall teach them to regard as nothing place and office when either is to be attained or held at the sacrifice of honor."

Al Hawkes, in a similar situation, would have done exactly as Senator Tyler—later President Tyler—because his devotion to principle outweighs every other consideration.

Tonight, the best that you and I can say to Al Hawkes is that he has kept the faith. He can live with his conscience, and his work as a leader has only just begun, because, if this Nation is to be saved, it can be done only by the courage and indomitable will, and the patriotism of such men as Al Hawkes.

I know I voice the hope of his many friends here tonight, and the many thousands elsewhere, in saying to him: May the Lord bless you and give you the happiness you so richly deserve in this life and, ultimately, the peace eternal for which all of us pray in the life to come. May you prosper in all you do, and we, your friends, want you to know of the depth of our love and appreciation for you; of our respect and affection for you and all of yours. I propose a toast to all of the Hawkeses: May their shadow never grow less. In the words of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I say: "Applause, Senators rising."

The Employment Assistance Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include my statement and analysis of a bill I have introduced today entitled "The Employment Assistance Act of 1950."

In July 1949 I joined with many other Members of the House and Senate in sponsoring the economic expansion bill, a measure that should already have become the law of the land.

If the economic expansion bill had become law, we would now have in effect a broad and balanced program to achieve the President's objective of a $300,000,000,000 economy within the next 4 or 5 years. We would not be in the position that we are in today of being unable to deal decisively with present areas of serious unemployment. We would not be in the position that we are in today of being insufficiently prepared for any possible failure of the economy to expand in the future.

It is high time that public hearings be held on the economic expansion bill by the Committees on Banking and Currency in both Houses of Congress. These hearings should start without delay.

But the unemployed men and women in California—and the unemployed men and women in other States throughout the country—are today in no position to wait upon the outcome of protracted hearings on a complex program. Many of them by this time have exhausted their unemployment-insurance benefits. They need immediate action.

For the last 2 years unemployment in California has been much more serious than unemployment in the United States as a whole. In 1948, unemployment in California averaged almost 300,000 persons—or 6.8 percent of the California labor force. This was twice the percentage of unemployment for the Nation as a whole. In 1949, the number of men and women out of work in California increased to an average of about 417,000—or close to 9.4 percent of the California labor force. If the number of unemployed in the United States had risen throughout the country to the same high level in 1949 as it did in California, we would have had in 1949 an army of unemployed made up of more than 5,800,000 people.

This unemployment situation in California is not concentrated in any one spot. It is distributed throughout the State. In November 1949, for example, all of the important labor-market areas were classified by the Labor Department as D areas—that is, areas having a labor surplus of 7 to 12 percent of the labor force. The only exception to this statement is San Diego—and San Diego was in the E classification, which means that more than 12 percent of the labor force in San Diego was unemployed.

These facts, in my judgment, call for immediate action.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill to provide for immediate action.

This bill is entitled "The Employment Assistance Act of 1950." Its purpose is dual. First, it provides a program for direct and prompt handling of serious unemployment wherever and whenever it arises. Second, it provides for the development of a long-range program for resources development and public works, the kind of long-range program which is indispensable if we are to be equipped to deal with local problems if and when they arise. Let me briefly summarize these provisions.

Title I sets forth the program for handling areas of serious unemployment.

Under section 101, the Secretary of Labor would make a detailed study of employment and unemployment, and certify to the President any area or industry in which special action is needed.

Under section 102, steps would be taken to channel government contracts or government loans to areas or industries that have been certified as serious unemployment areas. This would provide a statutory strengthening of the present operations along this line that are being handled in Mr. John Steelman's office in the White House.

Under section 103, there would be established a $2,200,000,000 emergency reserve fund for urban and rural unemployment. These funds would only be used for areas or industries certified under section 101 and where other Federal, State, or local funds would not be available in sufficient amounts. The money could be used to augment existing Federal works programs, to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a rural conservation program, and for grants to States and cities on a matching basis for both construction and nonconstruction projects. Part of this fund would also be available for increasing the funds available to the various Federal agencies for procurement and stock piling.

Under section 104, provision would be made to help unemployed workers obtain vocational education or training for positions that could thereby be obtained. The Labor Department would also be authorized to assist unemployed workers to move to other areas of the country where the local employment office certifies that jobs are available.

Title II sets forth a long-range program for resources development and public works.

Under section 201, the President would transmit to Congress in his annual Economic Report an appraisal of the long-range needs for resources development and public-works projects, both on a national and regional basis. Regional surveys of needs would be made through the appropriate Government agencies and with the assistance of State, local, and regional development agencies and of universities and colleges.

Section 202 provides for developing and maintaining at all times a large-scale shelf of plans for rural and urban projects. The objective would be to have at all times a shelf of projects. To promote a large-scale shelf of this type, a State and local advance planning fund would be established. From this fund non-interest-bearing loans would be made to cities and States for both the development of blueprints and the acquisition of sites. In addition, a Federal advance planning fund for $100,000,000 would be set up to assist Federal agencies in developing blueprints and acquiring sites.

Section 203 provides for direct credit assistance to city and State governments for the financing of work on resources development and public-works projects. Under this section, RFC loans up to a total limitation of $1,000,000,000 could be made at low-interest rates for periods of up to 60 years.

Title III contains the administrative provisions of the act. This title recognizes that the administration of the act must be vested in the President. The Council of Economic Advisers would assist the President by providing for the

preparation and maintenance of a national inventory of State, local, and Federal plans and operations with respect to resources development and public works. It would also advise him on the need for accelerating or decelerating the programs provided for under the act.

I should like at this point to quote from the lucid and enlightening economic analysis which was given to the President at the beginning of this year by the distinguished economists who comprise his Council of Economic Advisers. I quote from the section entitled "Economic Trouble Spots" in the Council's Annual Economic Review, which was transmitted to the Congress on January 6, 1950, together with the Economic Report of the President:

Despite the high levels of employment throughout the Nation, there are some areas with quite heavy unemployment, and with far less than maximum levels of production and business activity. This presents a challenge, because there cannot be maximum employment and production throughout the Nation so long as some areas are relatively depressed; and there is always danger that economic dislocations in spot areas may spread if they are not remedied.

The words of the President's economic advisers provide a warning that should not fall on deaf ears. The situation they describe provides a challenge that must not be dodged. It must be met; and if the economic trouble spots of today are not to drag the country down into a Nation-wide depression, it must be met promptly.

The Economic Assistance Act of 1950 which I am introducing today is the first concrete proposal that has yet been submitted to the Congress for meeting this challenge. I urge that committee hearings be initiated on this measure at once.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to include a letter which I have written to Representative EDWARD J. HART, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on February 25, 1950, requesting that his committee sponsor a study of the Pacific Coast States:

DEAR MR. HART: The joint committee's print, the Economy of the South, has been of great interest to me. Your recent subcommittee report on unemployment stressed the need for further regional studies. It is my understanding that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has asked the National Planning Association to sponsor a study of New England, and that a study may be suggested for the intermountain area.

I am writing you to inquire if it would be possible for the joint committee to request the National Planning Association to sponsor a study of the Pacific Coast States. The impact of Federal programs on this region has been and will in the future be tremendously significant in the development of this great region. I can assure you of a real interest on the part of labor, business, agriculture, educational institutions, private research organizations, foundations, and individuals in such an undertaking.

Your committee is in a unique position to study the regional problems and is to be commended for initiating the studies that you now have under way. I hope that something can be worked out for the far West.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

New Districts for Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the seventeenth decennial census to be taken beginning April 1, 1950, will reveal among other things the steady growth of our country—a gain of some twenty millions of people in the past 10 years. Some sections of the country have grown more rapidly than others. Some States will lose representation in the United States House of Representatives; others will gain. I include as a part of my remarks, a very interesting and instructive article styled, "How Reapportionment Works: New Districts for Old" from the Congress at Work section of Senior Scholastic Magazine for February 1950:

HOW REAPPORTIONMENT WORKS—NEW DISTRICTS FOR OLD

Do you live in one of the west coast States—California, Washington, or Oregon? Then it's a sure thing that your home State will soon have more seats in the House of Representatives than it now has. But if you're a New Yorker, a Pennsylvanian, or a Missourian your State will take a cut in its number of Congressmen.

Each State's number (or quota) of Representatives is based on its population. The quotas are reapportioned every 10 years, following Uncle Sam's regular census. The total number of Representatives is now fixed at 435. Therefore one State's gain—resulting from an increased share of our population—must be a sister State's loss. And the Pacific States, which have been on the receiving end of a huge westward migration in the past 10 years, are sure to be the biggest gainers after the 1950 census.

The Constitution provides (art. I, sec. 2) that "the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States." At first the States were allowed to select their Representatives by several different methods. But in 1842 Congress passed a law requiring that all States entitled to more than one Representative be divided into districts. Each Representative was to be elected by the voters of a district.

Later this law was amended to allow for the election of Representatives at Large for any additional Members which a State might be allotted after a new census. These Representatives at Large are elected by all the people of the State. Once a State is redistricted Representatives at Large are eliminated. (Redistricting may take years. Ohio and Connecticut still elect a Representative at Large on the basis of the 1940 reapportionment.)

Similarly, when a State's congressional quota is reduced, the State may elect all of its Representatives at Large, until new districts are set up.

When the First Congress met in 1789 there were 65 Members in the House of Representatives. Membership in the House increased steadily as the Nation's population grew and as new States were admitted. By 1840 there were 232 Members; by 1900 the House numbered 386. After the 1910 census the figure reached 435, and there it was pegged. Congress decided that this was the largest number of Congressmen which could work efficiently together.

Thus in 1920 Congress first faced the problem of reapportioning within the limit of 435 Members, rather than simply increasing the number of its Members. But Representatives from States which had lost population were reluctant to legislate their States—and perhaps themselves—out of House seats. Congress failed to act, and no change was made on the basis of the 1920 census.

In 1929 Congress passed a law to prevent this from happening again. The law stated that reapportionment must automatically follow each 10-year census, based on mathematical procedures. Reapportionment was carried out after the 1930 and 1940 censuses. The chart below predicts what will happen in 1950.

If a State loses one of its Representatives, this does not necessarily mean that the State's population has declined. It may simply mean that its population increase has not kept pace with the national rate. New York, for instance, has increased its population since 1940 by more than 6 percent. But the national gain since 1940 has been about 13 percent.

Those States which lose or gain Representatives are faced with the problem of redistricting their States. Redistricting is carried out by the State legislatures. Under ideal conditions here is how this is done: Let's take Oregon as an example. Oregon's 1,736,000 citizens will probably be entitled to five Representatives. The State's present four districts would be altered to make room for a fifth district, so that each Representative would have a district with about 347,200 people.

But attempts are sometimes made by the majority party in the State legislature to underplay the voting strength of its opponents. It does this by trying to crowd voters of the opposition parties into a few districts, and put its own voting strength into a larger number of smaller districts.

This practice often creates districts of odd shapes, and from this fact it gets its name—gerrymandering. Back in 1812 one of these oddly shaped districts was created in Massachusetts, when Elbridge Gerry was governor. A cartoonist discovered that this district could be made to look like a strange lizard, merely by adding claws, teeth, and wings. According to the story the cartoonist asked, "How's that for a salamander?" A bystander, who blamed the governor for the unfair redistricting, answered, "Better call it a gerrymander."

Congress tried to curtail gerrymandering in 1842 by ruling that congressional districts were to be of "contiguous and compact territory, and of approximately equal population. By now most State constitutions contain these same provisions, but they are not always strictly observed. In some cases legal action may be brought against the party creating gerrymandered districts. Some States make it possible to put the question up to the voters.

Will your State's representation change?

State	Population	A	B	C
Alabama	2,920,000	9	9	------
Arizona	745,000	2	2	------
Arkansas	1,964,000	7	6	------
California	10,665,000	23	31	------
Colorado	1,215,000	4	4	------
Connecticut	2,019,000	6	6	------
Delaware	311,000	1	1	------
Florida	2,494,000	6	7	------
Georgia	3,196,000	10	9	------
Idaho	592,000	2	2	------
Illinois	8,449,000	26	25	------
Indiana	3,994,000	11	12	------
Iowa	2,643,000	8	8	------
Kansas	1,947,000	6	6	------
Kentucky	2,893,000	9	8	------
Louisiana	2,630,000	8	8	------
Maine	909,000	3	3	------
Maryland	2,175,000	6	6	------
Massachusetts	4,713,000	14	14	------
Michigan	6,352,000	17	18	------
Minnesota	2,977,000	9	9	------
Mississippi	2,130,000	7	6	------
Missouri	3,935,000	13	12	------

Will your State's representation change?—Continued

State	Population	A	B	C
Montana	521,000	2	2	
Nebraska	1,285,000	4	4	
Nevada	174,000	1	1	
New Hampshire	544,000	2	2	
New Jersey	4,873,000	14	14	
New Mexico	589,000	2	2	
New York	14,392,000	45	42	
North Carolina	3,864,000	12	11	
North Dakota	605,000	2	2	
Ohio	7,989,000	23	23	
Oklahoma	2,302,000	8	7	
Oregon	1,736,000	4	5	
Pennsylvania	10,633,000	33	31	
Rhode Island	743,000	2	2	
South Carolina	2,001,000	6	6	
South Dakota	649,000	2	2	
Tennessee	3,234,000	10	9	
Texas	7,532,000	21	22	
Utah	682,000	2	2	
Vermont	369,000	1	1	
Virginia	3,102,000	9	9	
Washington	2,582,000	6	7	
West Virginia	1,941,000	6	6	
Wisconsin	3,355,000	10	10	
Wyoming	284,000	1	1	

NOTE.—Populations are 1949 Census Bureau estimates. Column A: Present representation in the House. Column B: "Best guess" on new distribution after the 1950 census. Column C: For you to fill in after the new reapportionment is made.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an article from part I of the same magazine headed "Counting 150,000,000 noses" which gives something of the history of the census in this country and discusses the plans presently being laid by the Bureau of the Census for the 1950 census.

COUNTING 150,000,000 NOSES

Mark Saturday, April 1, 1950, as a red-letter day on your calendar. It's not because we want you to start preparing April Fool's Day jokes for your friends now. But that is the day that Uncle Sam asks his 150,000,000 nieces and nephews to stand up and be counted.

Once every 10 years April 1 becomes C-day—the date chosen for the Decennial Census of Population of the United States. Every man, woman, and child is counted. This year more than 140,000 census takers (called enumerators) will visit every home in the land. In cities and towns it will take them as long as 2 weeks to reach everyone in their districts. In farming areas and remote regions like snow-swept plateaus of the Rockies, nose counting will not be completed until the end of April. In Alaska (for our Territories are included in the census), enumerators are already on their way to isolated Eskimo villages above the Arctic Circle.

While the census taker may not reach your home on April 1, he will be asking about you and your family and your home as of that date. The next-door neighbor's baby, born on March 31, will be counted as part of the family. But the television set your family buys on April 3 will not be counted as part of your family's household equipment, since it won't be in your living room on C-day.

The United States was the first nation to provide for a regular census of its population. Of course, we didn't take the first census. That goes back to Biblical days, when King David took a census of all men in Israel. But the United States was the first to arrange in advance for a census to be taken at certain intervals (in our case, every 10 years).

It came about as an almost accidental byproduct of that famous series of meetings in Philadelphia in 1787—when the United States Constitution was written in near-secrecy throughout a sweltering summer. After long argument the Constitution makers decided that the States should be equally represented in the United States Senate, but that they should be represented in proportion to their population in the House of Representatives. But how would the representation of each State be determined? Article I, section 2, of the Constitution answered the question: A fixed number of Representatives were chosen for the first meeting of Congress. Thereafter, Congress was to direct a census-taking every 10 years to determine population.

The first census was taken by United States marshals in 1790. As the decades rolled on new population censuses were taken, marking the growth and development of our Nation, and changing the representation of the States within the House of Representatives.

PAGING MR. JEFFERSON

From the very beginning our Nation's leaders decided that it would be valuable to learn more from the census than simply the total number of people. The 1790 census—the first one—determined how many men were over and under 16. This was intended to measure the possible military strength of the Nation. That first census was performed in a crude, fairly inaccurate manner. The census taker in Philadelphia, for instance, accidentally skipped Thomas Jefferson. The statesman had to pen his famous signature to a list posted in a public square for such overlooked citizens.

Each decade the census took on more importance and was performed more carefully and thoroughly. Congress decided, too, that the Government could make good use of additional facts, so new questions were added to the census—about schooling, jobs, age, and place of birth.

Soon it was decided that there should be other censuses beside the population count every 10 years. A census of manufacturing was started in 1810. Agriculture was added in 1840. But it was not until 1902 that a permanent Census Bureau of the Government was established. The Bureau, under the Department of Commerce, is now the year-around fact finder of the Nation.

Besides the population census, the Bureau makes censuses of manufacturing, business, and agriculture at 5-year intervals. The Bureau also makes monthly surveys on current population and business trends. For these surveys only a small sampling is taken, scientifically chosen to present an accurate picture of the Nation as a whole.

The mountainous stacks of statistics do not simply gather dust in Government storage space. Tabulations based on them are used, for instance, by manufacturers of diapers who want to learn about future increase in the number of their customers; by airlines plotting out new routes in areas of increased population; by labor and business groups to judge past, present, and future economic conditions; by social scientists studying how we live; and by Government agencies which must have a guide for their activities.

Individual Census Bureau figures (like your maiden aunt's age) are strictly confidential. But totals or averages of figures (like the number of unmarried women) are available to all, through books, pamphlets, and reports published by the Census Bureau.

Now, let's take a look at the 1950 census. What will the census enumerator ask you and your family?

On his giant-size chart the enumerator will make a record of these facts for every one of our 150,000,000 people: Name, relationship to the head of the family, race, sex, age, whether married or single, State or country of birth, whether the person is a citizen, whether he is working or not, and what kind of work he does.

The enumerator will ask additional questions of every fifth person: Where the person lived a year ago, where his parents were born, how far he has gone in school, whether or not he is a war veteran, and the income he received in 1949 from all sources, as well as the income received by his relatives in the same household.

The proposed question on income has met with some objection from a group of Republican Congressmen. They believe that it is unnecessary prying to ask a person exactly how much money he makes, particularly since he may have to reveal the information to an enumerator who may be his next-door neighbor.

However, the Census Bureau points out that this information, when assembled in totals and averages, will be useful to industries seeking markets for their goods, and for other purposes. In addition, the enumerator is sworn, under penalty, not to reveal the information to anyone.

But suppose a person does not wish to reveal his income to the enumerator. In this case he has the privilege of sending this information directly to the Census Bureau in an envelope supplied him by the enumerator. In this way the information will be known only to the Census Bureau in Washington. It cannot be used for any other purpose, such as taxation.

The 1950 census of housing will be taken at the same time as the population census. Your parents will be asked detailed questions about your apartment or home. The newest question on this housing census will be whether your family has a television set. Other standard questions refer to the number of rooms in the housing unit, the kind of plumbing, heating, and kitchen equipment, and the rent paid or value of the property.

For the Nation's 6,300,000 farm families the 1950 census means a little extra "paper work." For this year, too, the agriculture census will be taken. If you live on a farm, your family can expect to receive a questionnaire from the Government by mail. This is to be filled out by individual farmers. When the enumerator comes in April, he will pick up these completed forms, or help farmers complete them.

The 1950 census will have an international aspect. Plans have been worked out so that all Latin-American nations will be counting noses in 1950. (The only exception is Argentina, which took a census in 1947.) Many government workers from Latin America are in the United Staes now, being trained in modern methods of census taking. For a number of nations this will be the first complete population census. Population experts hope that eventually a world-wide census can be taken simultaneously in every nation.

With new electric machinery and thousands of extra workers, the Census Bureau will get to work on its gigantic counting job as soon as the census-takers have turned in their reports. By December 1, 1950, the Bureau must give President Truman the final population tally, so that reapportionment of the House of Representatives may take place promptly. Preliminary estimates of State and local populations will be available by early next summer.

WHAT WE WILL LEARN

Census experts already know some of the things which are certain to be revealed. These predictions are based on preliminary surveys of sample areas which are going on all the time. Some of these results will show:

1. Our total population will be slightly above 150,000,000—a gain of 19,000,000 over 1940. When congressional districts are rearranged to meet this increase, our Congressmen will each be representing an average of about 330,000 people, a 10 percent gain over 1940.

2. For the first time in our history, women will outnumber men. In 1940, men had the edge by half a million. Reason for the change is that immigration, which used to be in the millions every year, has declined sharply over the past several decades. The great majority of immigrants are men.

3. There will be an average of about 50 Americans to every square mile. In 1790

there were less than five people to every square mile.

4. The move from the farm to the city has continued. Statistics will probably show, too, that 9 out of 10 of those who left farms since 1940 are under 25 years of age. This is a serious problem for the future of American agriculture.

Nearly everyone realizes that it is only good citizenship to cooperate with the census-taking. We will all benefit from the information gained, and we're more than a little curious to know how much our State or community has gained in population over the past eventful decade. Answering questions for the census enumerator, courteously and accurately, is as much a civic duty as voting. The law provides a penalty for those who refuse to answer census questions or who make deliberately false answers. These penalties almost never have to be used, for citizens are eager to cooperate voluntarily.

Country Editors Fear Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks this date, I am pleased to include the following article from the current issue of the American Press, February 1950, entitled "Seventy-eight Percent of Country Editors Fear United States Is Headed for Socialism":

SEVENTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF COUNTRY EDITORS FEAR UNITED STATES IS HEADED FOR SOCIALISM

Over 500 editors, in reply to the American Press poll, tell what action they think Congress should take on leading issue of 1950.

A total of 78 percent of the country editors of America fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism.

This startling fact was unearthed by the American Press magazine as the result of a poll which it has been conducting for the primary purpose of finding out what the weekly newspaper editors of the United States think it is most important for Congress to accomplish at the present session.

The three-page questionnaire, which was answered by over 500 editors representing every State in the Union, concluded with the question, "Do you fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism?" All but 22 percent answered "Yes."

The fear seems to be based on what many of the editors refer to as welfare-state measures, as well as on the size of the national debt, huge Government costs, and an unbalanced budget. Many believe that Congress' action on compulsory health insurance legislation will determine whether or not we are going socialistic. Eighty-nine percent of the editors expressed opposition to this measure.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

But of greatest immediate concern is Government finances. In answer to the question: "What do you consider to be the two most important things for Congress to accomplish at the new session?" Seventy-nine percent demanded a balanced budget, reduction of Government costs or cuts in Federal pay rolls.

Although tax reforms were considered second most-important need, only 21 percent asked for immediate tax reductions, regardless of whether or not the budget is balanced. Many of those felt that if taxes were reduced reduction in Government costs would thus be forced.

Thirty-nine percent said they favored tax reductions only if the budget can be balanced, and another 36 percent advised leaving taxes as high as they are and create a surplus, if possible, to pay off the debt. Three percent of the editors favored increasing taxes to meet the debt. But 85 percent would like to see the tax laws rewritten and simplified.

In addition to Government costs and finances, the five next most important things for Congress to do, in the opinion of the editors, are:

Enact reforms proposed by Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and clarify foreign policy.

Strengthen and streamline defense.

Take action to restore the confidence of business in the future.

Sentiments of many of the editors were expressed by (359) who commented: "Unless our Government ceases to be the world's worst businessman, our burdens will continue to increase until a breaking point is reached. Why can't our so-called elected representatives stop playing politics long enough to see the danger signs and get some sensible laws enacted to encourage free enterprise? What does a young man starting out have to look forward to under the present set-up? They, the lawmakers, seem to have forgotten the basic principles which have made this country as great and strong as it is to date."

Among the country editors, whose combined newspapers have a readership of around 70,000,000 people, only a handful of those replying to the questionnaire indicated general approval of the administration's domestic programs, but many felt that Congress was too steeped in politics to do anything about it. Fourteen of those replying to the question about the most important thing for Congress to do gave the facetious answer, "Go home" or "Adjourn," and many said, "Forget politics."

A summary of the questions and answers follows, with typical comments:

LABOR LAWS

Question. What do you think should be done about the Taft-Hartley law?

Answer. Repealed, 5 percent; made less stringent, 11 percent; left as it is, 57 percent; made more stringent, 26 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

GOVERNMENT COSTS

Question. Assuming that everyone would like to see Government costs cut, check each of the following proposals which you think would be practical and advisable.

Answer (in order of mentions).

Major reduction in number of Federal employees, 90 percent.

Reduction of farm subsidies, 64 percent.

Across-the-board cut in funds provided for all Government departments, 62 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for social services, 53 percent.

Reduction of funds for aiding foreign countries, 54 percent.

Reduction of Federal funds for housing, 37 percent.

Reduction of funds for veterans, 31 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for schools, hospitals, and institutions, 21 percent.

Reduction in appropriations for armed forces, 20 percent.

INCOME TAXES

Question. Which of the following come closest to your views on what should be done about income taxes?

Answer (according to popularity).

Reduce taxes only if the budget can be balanced, 39 percent.

Leave taxes as they are to balance the budget and create a surplus if possible, 36 percent.

Reduce taxes by 20 percent immediately, regardless of whether the budget will or will not be balanced, 21 percent.

Increase taxes in order to help reduce the national debt, 3 percent.

No answer, 1 percent.

LUXURY TAXES

Question. Do you favor repeal of the so-called luxury taxes on cosmetics, furs, jewelry, etc.?

Answer. Yes, 62 percent; no, 37 percent; no answer, 1 percent .

LIQUOR AND CIGARETTE TAX

Question. Do you favor repeal, reduction, or increase of taxes on liquor and cigarettes?

Answer. Repeal, 3 percent; reduction, 21 percent; increase, 36 percent; no change, 30 percent; no answer, 10 percent.

INCOME-TAX LAW

Question: Would you like Congress to rewrite and simplify the income-tax law?

Answer: Yes, 85 percent; no, 11 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

EXEMPTIONS

Question. If income-tax law is simplified, would you favor elimination of all exemptions for contributions, medical expenses, etc., everything except deductions for dependents, to be offset by a lower over-all tax rate?

Answer. Yes, 55 percent; no, 37 percent; no answer, 8 percent.

PROPORTION OF TAX

Question. If income-tax law is rewritten, would you like to see a change in the proportion paid by various groups? If so, do you think reduction should be given to lower-income group, middle-income group, or high-income group?

Answer: No change, 34 percent; lower, 26 percent; middle, 33 percent; high, 7 percent.

SOCIAL-SECURITY EXPANSION

Question. Do you favor expansion of social security to include those not now covered by it?

Answer. Yes, 49 percent; no, 46 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

SOCIAL-SECURITY INCREASES

Question. Do you approve of increases in benefits from social security?

Answer. Yes, 36 percent; no, 59 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Question. Do you favor a Federal system of compulsory health insurance, to be paid by an additional pay-roll tax on employers and employees, plus funds from the Federal Treasury?

Answer. Yes, 8 percent; no, 89 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

LIQUOR-AD BAN

Question. Are you for or against the bill which would prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages?

Answer. For, 20 percent; against, 79 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

PROHIBITION

Question. Would you like to see the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages reenacted?

Answer. Yes. 14 percent; no, 86 percent.

MILITARY TRAINING

Question. Do you favor compulsory military training?

Answer. Yes, 57 percent; no, 41 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question. Do you agree with those who charge that the Department of Justice is discriminating against big business?

Answer. Yes, 55 percent; no, 38 percent; no answer, 7 percent.

CENTRALIZATION

Question. Do you think more governmental authority, and the expense it entails should be turned over to the States by the Federal Government?

Answer. Yes, 71 percent; no, 23 percent; no answer, 6 percent.

SOCIALISM

Question. Do you fear that our Nation is headed toward socialism?

Answer. Yes, 78 percent; no, 21 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Electrical Roll-Call Conduit

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution which would direct the Committee on Reconstruction and Remodeling of the House Chamber to install electrical conduits in the floor of the House in the event that some future Congress should adopt an electrical roll-call system for the House of Representatives. On the last two Calendar Wednesdays the House of Representatives must have been a very foolish spectacle indeed to those persons sitting in the galleries on either day.

On Wednesday, February 15, dilatory motions by various Members resulted in eight roll calls, which consumed slightly more than 4 hours. After sitting from 12 noon until 4:10 p. m., the House finally spent about 40 minutes considering legislation and then adjourned.

Wednesday last the House indulged in 11 roll calls, which consumed approximately 5½ hours, and which kept the House in session until 3:20 a. m. With an electrical roll-call system, not only would most of this time have been saved but dilatory motions would probably never have been made, because their effectiveness would have been reduced to a minimum. Therefore, the House of Representatives could have adjourned at 11 o'clock and still have had more time for actual debate and consideration.

The temper of the House was such at 3 a. m. that considered judgment was reduced to a minimum. The amendments adopted to the FEPC legislation were of such a nature that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] was impelled to remark facetiously, "Mr. Chairman, in view of the number of amendments that have been adopted, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder be adopted en masse."

These senseless maneuvers of the last 2 weeks merely emphasize the great amount of time lost in each session of Congress, going through the antiquated motions of roll and quorum calls, name by name.

Last session, when the Congress labored long and hard until October 19, some 25 or 30 legislative days were consumed entirely by this slow-motion roll call.

I do not say that an electrical system would reduce the time of the Congress spent in session, but it is a fact that such a system would allow more time for debate and consideration, or it would allow more time for a Member to spend in his office carrying on important work that necessitates his presence there.

I know that the proposal for an electrical roll-call system has not met with overwhelming support from some Members of the House. Therefore, the question arises, What are some of the disadvantages which would arise from the use of an electrical roll-call system?

Since the procedure would move much more rapidly, and there would only be 12 or 15 minutes for Members to assemble, it is very likely that some Members would miss more quorum calls than at present. On the other hand, with such a system, Members of Congress would not be encouraged to take advantage of the delay which now occurs when a quorum call or a roll call is under way.

Another objection which has been heard is that such a system would call for more recorded votes. This would not necessarily be the case, but would depend upon the adaptation of the electrical system to the rules of the House. However, for my part, I believe that the people are entitled to know how their Congressmen voted on every issue, and when I came to Congress, I never suspected that there would be so many times that we could act without being recorded for the people back home to read about it in the RECORD.

Probably another objection to an electrical system is that when the time came for voting, the results of the voting would be accomplished much more rapidly. In other words, the leadership on both sides of the House would have to do their work off the floor, rather than waiting for the confusion which ensues in a call by voice. I think that most of us would agree that party machinery would work with better oiled precision if more information was distributed before a Member actually came to the floor of the House.

I believe that the advantages of the electrical roll call system far outweigh the disadvantages. It has already been stated that approximately 25 legislative days would be saved per session by an electrical system. Surely, this in itself would warrant adoption because it would give much more time for consideration or debate, or for time spent in the Member's office.

With this system there would be much less confusion on the floor of the House. Each Member would have his own seat from which he would cast his vote. Surely this would present a much more orderly legislative picture to persons sitting in the gallery than the one we have now.

It was suggested by one Member that television be installed in the House Chamber to provide the people of America with a picture of their Congress at work. It seems evident to me that with the present system we could never afford to have a television picture of the workings of this body go out on radio and television waves to the people of America.

I think the automatic roll call system would call for better organized leadership in both parties which, in turn, would make for more orderly legislative procedure on the floor of the House.

It seems to me that the advantages of an electrical roll call system far outweigh the disadvantages, and the disadvantages that are present could be surmounted by better organization and a little more work.

The thing which should be of great concern to the House at this time is the necessity for laying electrical conduits in the floor at the time renovation of the lower part of the Chamber takes place at the end of this session of Congress. After spending millions of dollars to improve the Chamber future Congresses would greatly hesitate to tear up the floor, at great cost, to install a new system of recording the votes of the House. The decision to be made at this time is not whether we are going to adopt the electrical roll call system, but whether we are going to spend twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, and make it possible for a future Congress to adopt the system if it sees fit.

It would seem a grave error to me to fail to lay the electrical conduits in the floor when the Chamber renovation is undertaken at the end of this session.

Democracy is a developing thing. Legislative procedure should not be allowed to stand still. To repeat a statement I made last year, In the days of the jet plane, the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and the strato-rockets, is there any reason why we should cling to the antiquated roll call of 1789?

The Real Issue on Co-Op Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include my statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 23, at the hearings on tax revision under the subject of tax treatment of cooperatives:

Grover Cleveland once said that to "understand a problem one must first understand how it got to be a problem."

The current hearings on the tax status of cooperatives did not happen by accident. They have been forced upon the Ways and Means Committee as part of a concerted and very well-financed campaign against the cooperatives.

The campaign or attack is directed less against the cooperatives and their tax status than against the cooperatives as democratic, nonprofit business enterprises.

The Ways and Means Committee of this House of Congress held extensive and exhaustive hearings on this same subject a couple of years ago, and, with all of the evidence in, found no reason to change the current tax situation. Why, then are we forced

to these hearings today? Primarily because of the work of two organizations—the National Tax Equality Association and its parallel organization, the National Associated Businessmen, both of whom are under the guidance and direction of a team of highly skilled public relations counsels, Loring A. Schuler and Vernon Scott.

The National Tax Equality Association, according to the quarterly lobby reports No. A–1954–212–2541–2805 filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, collected more than $500,000 ($536,132.39) in 1949 which was devoted primarily to a running attack on the cooperatives.

We have no information as to the amount of money collected by the National Associated Businessmen. Their financial status would be of interest to this committee and to the Lobby Investigation Committee.

The National Tax Equality Association reported 138 contributors of $500 or more in 1949 of which 43 are power companies. The other large contributors are petroleum companies, grain dealers, and hardware dealers, all of whom have been upset because the farmers and consumers of America have taken advantage of their right to go into business for themselves.

You may ask why the power companies should be interested in the question of taxation of cooperatives. Their chief concern is with the rural electric cooperatives which have brought electric light and power to more than 2,500,000 American farm homes. The power companies were reluctant to provide power in America's rural areas until the cooperatives took the initiative under the Rural Electrification Administration. America has no finer institutions than these rural electric cooperatives as the continued active support of that program on Capitol Hill indicates.

The grain operators were the first to organize against the cooperatives. They took the initiative in forming first the League for the Protection of Private Enterprise which was then changed to become the Central Coordinating Group, Inc. and finally to become the National Tax Equality Association. The president of the National Tax Equality Association until very recently was Ben C. McCabe, Minneapolis grain man who was also president of the International Elevator Co. of that city. The grain dealers became exasperated when the farmers who grow the grain felt that they were not getting their fair share of the sales price of their product and decided to establish their own elevators and grain terminals.

The smoothest of the participants in the National Tax Equality Association are the oil companies which hit upon a rather effective formula for participating in this attack against cooperatives without subjecting themselves to unpleasant publicity. The only major oil company listed as a contributor to the National Tax Equality Association is the Standard Oil Co., Chicago (Standard of Indiana). The other oil companies have contributed in substantial quantities, but at the suggestions of the solicitors have made their contributions less than $500 a year. They are therefore not subject to listing when the lobby reports are filed with the Clerk of the House. The fact that they are contributing is indicated by a letter signed by T. A. Helling, president of the Eldorado Refining Co.; J. N. Champlin, president of the Champlin Refining Co., and H. E. Zoller, president of the Derby Oil Co. The letter was addressed to oil companies and followed the usual NTEA line by claiming quite falsely that the loss to the Treasury Department from Federal income tax over the next 5 years will be considerably in excess of $1,000,000,000.

The letter accuses the cooperatives of growing at a tremendous rate "out of money that you and I and other taxpayers must pay to support our Government." They accuse the cooperatives of constituting a political as well as a subsidized competitive threat.

Then to give the oil companies a quiet tip as to the amount of their contribution Messrs. Helling, Champlin, and Zoller conclude: "Our own contribution to aid in the fight has averaged from $200 to $300 this year. We would appreciate your consideration of a substantial contribution to help insure that the fight is successful. Any one of us will be glad to transmit your check to the National Tax Equality Association if you would like to send it in our care."

This pleasant little letter dated January 16, 1950, was followed by a letter from the National Tax Equality Association January 19, 1950, pointing out that the recipients have received letters from Messrs. Helling, Champlin, and Zoller and declaring: "We hope that your company will see fit to align itself with the many others in the industry who are supporting the fight, and I venture to suggest that a subscription to National Tax Equality Association of $100 would be in line with the support of other concerns of a size approximately equal to yours. Sincerely, Garner M. Lester, president."

This National Tax Equality Association has resorted to all of the familiar pressure gadgets typical in a lobbying organization. They printed several million "phony bucks" attacking the cooperatives. The bills were so nearly identical to United States currency that the Secret Service of the Treasury Department asked the National Tax Equality Association to stop circulating the propaganda throw-aways. Undoubtedly most, if not all, of the members of the Ways and Means Committee have had hundreds if not thousands of these sent to their desks during the last few months.

The most insidious trick of all was a "phony" Christmas card which the NTEA circulated in huge quantities with the request that they be mailed to Senators and Congressmen. One of my colleagues from a western State got 5,000 of these Christmas cards himself.

The latest device—as you might well suspect—is a chain letter urging that businessmen write the Members of the Congress and tie this campaign against the cooperatives into repeal of the wartime excise taxes. In this letter the National Tax Equality Association again says, "The Congress can raise $1,000,000,000 without increasing taxes by taxing the untaxed corporations." You will undoubtedly be subject soon to another deluge, for the letter calls for action saying, "If this is done millions of letters will reach the Congress this session and definite action will result." The authors of the letter fail to state what action they expect your committee to take. But they concluded with this pleasant little ditty:

"If you break this chain
Please don't complain
When excise taxes give you a pain
And income tax goes up again."

The chain letter carefully says, "Address Congressmen, care of the House Office Building; Senators, care of the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C."

Now, what is the fighting all about?

Congressman NOAH MASON has before this body a bill which would do two things. The first would repeal section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides tax exemption for agricultural cooperatives which choose to qualify for it.

The second part of Congressman MASON'S bill would put a direct, and I believe unconstitutional, tax on patronage savings which are returned to the members of the cooperative associations. By a great stretch of the imagination the Congressman has come to the conclusion that these repayments—which are in essence a return to the user of part of the price he paid for a commodity or service which he received—are the same as profits and are therefore income. The courts of the United States have consistently ruled that these are not profits and therefore are not subject to income tax.

Section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, adopted in 1916, was not a measure to confer a favor on cooperatives. It was part of the agricultural policy of the United States. It was an attempt to encourage the farmers to do things for themselves and to help bring America a more prosperous agriculture. It is very difficult for an organization to qualify under this provision; as a result less than half (only 5,000 of more than 10,000 eligible) of the cooperatives who might be eligible for it choose not to take advantage of it. This exemption from Federal income-tax payments is the only tax advantage extended to cooperatives of any kind. The cooperatives pay all other State, local, and Federal taxes. More than half of the farmers cooperatives pay Federal income taxes, and all of the city consumer cooperatives pay them since they have no possible exemption under the law.

The slogan "Tax the untaxed first" is designed to confuse and malign. It accuses the cooperatives of being tax-dodgers. I am surprised that the cooperatives have not filed libel suits against the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen for this frankly libelous slogan.

I believe that it will continue to be the agricultural policy of the United States to continue to encourage the agricultural cooperatives. If, however, that policy is to be changed, it should be changed only in the light of and after careful reexamination of our entire agricultural policy.

The real intent of the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen, however, is revealed in the final section of the Mason bill which would tax, in the hands of the cooperatives, the repayments which by law they are obligated to pay out to their members and which in no sense of the word can be interpreted as profits. This second section of the Mason bill would obviously penalize the cooperatives by placing on them a tax which is not placed on any other form of business enterprise. As you know, it is the right of any businessman at any time to pay a share of his earnings back to his customers and not pay tax on those refunds.

The cooperatives have, over the years, proved themselves to be business enterprises of which America may well be proud.

It would be a tragedy for this Congress to take action under pressures of the kinds which have been demonstrated before this committee in the last few months and the last few days.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I must once again urge immediate repeal of wartime excise taxes. These taxes were enacted during the war and there is no justification for their continuance. I rejoice that the House Ways and Means Committee has initiated action to eliminate them from the tax structure. I

have requested the Committee to include electric and gas cooking appliances and water heaters in the list of commodities to be relieved of wartime taxation.

On numerous occasions I have stated my opposition to these unwarranted taxes. It is most encouraging to note that President Truman, high Cabinet officers, and many colleagues in the Congress have taken the position that these onerous levies should be largely eliminated.

Many of these taxes strike at necessities, nonluxuries. Women's handbags for example are clearly articles of everyday use. How such an essential as baby oil ever was included in these taxable items is a mystery but obviously such a tax is entirely indefensible. In a degree the same is true of taxes on transportation, admissions, communications, and stoves and cooking appliances as well as other articles. The sole argument for such levies is that they are necessary in order to secure essential revenue for the Federal Government. There are many good economists in business and who believe that if these taxes were lifted the Treasury would greatly benefit by the increased income that would result to manufacturers, distributors, and retailers.

I fully recognize that it may be desirable or necessary to make up any financial deficiency which might result from the elimination of these taxes, yet it well may be that readjustment in current expenditures and new revenue from the industries affected by wartime excise taxes would enable the Congress to avoid the imposition of burdensome new taxes.

It is reassuring to note that the Ways and Means Committee is now working on repeal measures. Our financial and tax problems are extremely serious and undoubtedly complex and the sooner we move toward simplification of the tax structure and sound readjustment of our fiscal condition, the better assurance we will have of full employment, high wages, continued prosperity as security for the American people.

This Government and the incomparable economic system which supports it can be weakened and shattered and brought to a condition of stalemate and collapse by the evils of high taxes and regimentation. This is not theory. This is a fact which we have vividly before us in the experience and example of certain European countries which have wrecked their economy by overtaxing, overspending, overregulating business and social institutions. This is in truth the road to serfdom. If we would avoid similar experience the Congress must take action now to preserve the vitality and strength of the American productive machinery and thus secure, not for any class or group but for the average American citizen the fundamental God-given right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under a sound, progressive, healthy, and humane democracy.

Obviously it is the duty of Congress under the Constitution to promote the welfare of the American people. This can best be achieved by securing our freedoms to think, to speak, to believe and to work as unfettered Americans. Free initiative and enterprise is one of the strongest weapons the Nation possesses to insure prosperity and the national welfare and we must not permit these invaluable attributes to be stultified by excessive taxation and ultimately obliterated by regimented Government.

Seattle Voters Will Vote for Program of Decent Homes in Good Environment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks a local municipal election will take place in my home city of Seattle, Wash., which has Nation-wide importance. On March 14 the people of Seattle will vote to use or not to use Federal funds for low-rent public housing in Seattle.

Seattle, in these last few weeks, has become the battleground where the national real-estate lobby and its local adherents have taken up the selfish fight which they lost decisively in the Congress last year.

I need not remind the Members of this House of the vindictive boast with which the vanquished real-estate lobbyists retired from the congressional battlefield last summer. They then declared that having lost the issue in Washington they would take it up again in the local communities.

LOBBY CONTINUES FIGHT

Now they are trying to make good on that threat. They have turned their attention from Washington, D. C., to Seattle, Wash. There perhaps they thought their old and empty slogans would find a fertile field. Perhaps they believed Seattle was an easy place to start a national comeback. Evidently they thought that the citizens of Seattle were so uninformed as not to see through the falsification and name calling so as to find the real issue and the real answer.

I believe that they have misjudged our citizens. They have made the fatal error of thinking that the voter cannot understand the fundamental fact that a decent home and living environment are the rightful heritage of every American family and every American child. I believe that on March 14 the citizens of Seattle will vote overwhelmingly to bring public low-rent housing to Seattle for the benefit of low-income families now living in overcrowded, indecent, and insanitary places.

Last September in carrying out its responsibilities to the citizens of Seattle under State and Federal law, the Seattle Housing Authority recommended to the city council and the mayor that they join in an application to the Public Housing Administration for 1,221 additional units of low-rent public housing pursuant to the Housing Act of 1949. The city council after full public hearings endorsed the Housing Authority's application by a 7 to 2 majority.

Using the technique which the national real-estate lobby has recommended, and is using in numbers of smaller places throughout the Nation such as St. Petersburg, Fla., and Waco, Tex., the local adherents of that lobby decided to use referendum procedure to put the ordinance on the ballot in a municipal election. In a well-financed campaign, the necessary signatures were obtained on a referendum petition, and the issue went on the ballot.

DELAYING TACTICS USED

Why has this technique been used? First, because it delays the public low-rent housing program, and, secondly, because the lobbyists are hopeful that in an election with a small turn-out of voters they can hoodwink and frighten a sufficient minority to win. They would like to be able to point to Seattle as the first large city that had the opportunity to vote on the low-rent public housing program and to say the people turned it down.

My belief is that the real-estate lobby will be disappointed. Seattle civic leaders, Democrats, Republicans, church people, veterans' groups, and every segment of organized labor have joined together to support the principles of low-rent public housing. They have formed a Citizens' Housing Committee which is answering the real-estate lobby blow by blow and word for word. They are bringing the facts to the people and the facts speak for themselves.

On Sunday, February 19, the Seattle Times, a leading daily in my home city, called for the voters of Seattle to answer three questions before voting on the public-housing issue in the municipal election.

As a voter in Seattle, I want to answer these questions and state the reasons for my answers. If my responsibilities in Congress were not demanding my attention here, I should be answering these questions at home where I vote. As it is I shall cast an absentee ballot and vote to go forward with the low-rent public housing program in Seattle.

PRINCIPLE OF PUBLIC HOUSING HAS APPROVAL

First, the Seattle Times asks, "Do I approve the principle of public housing in general?" If the Seattle Times means the housing proposal on which Seattle votes March 14, my answer is clearly "Yes." By public housing I mean the low-rent public housing proposed by the Seattle Housing Authority and ratified by a forward-looking city council which was made possible by the program of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and expanded by the Housing Act of 1949.

This program provides homes only for families of low income who are unable to afford private, safe, and sanitary housing. I approve of such a program. That program assures a decent neighborhood environment to Seattle families not now being properly served by private housing. It assures these low-rent tenants a fair rent so that funds remain in order that they can feed and clothe their families adequately with the remainder of their incomes.

Yes, I believe wholeheartedly in a principle and a program which provides homes in a decent environment as the center of family life, rather than the sorry substitute of the street corner, the filthy alley, and the doorway of the crowded slum. I approve the principle of low-rent public housing for families which cannot afford decent private housing. In this, the only field where public housing is suggested, I agree with a well-known Seattle home builder who wrote me, "it has been utterly impossible for builders to cover this field."

SEATTLE NEEDS LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Secondly, the Seattle Times asks me as a voter whether Seattle genuinely needs additional low-rent public housing now. Again my answer is an emphatic "Yes."

The 1940 census found 25,000 substandard dwelling units in Seattle. The Seattle Housing Authority found in September 1949 that there were 18,500 low-income families who would be eligible for low-rent public housing of which 7,500 families were in great housing need. These statistics speak for themselves. They are bulwarked and underlined by my own personal knowledge of the hundreds of Seattle families now living in hotels and rooming houses not designed for family occupancy. They are high lighted by my own visits to the areas in my city where because of race or color hundreds of families are crowded into unhealthy slums. They are made vivid by my memories of the 2,800 units of temporary war housing in Seattle which are full of low- and middle-income families who cannot find adequate homes they can afford on the private market.

Finally, the Seattle Times asks should I as voter in the city election vote "Yes" on the referendum if there is a real need for the 1,221 units even if I do not believe in public housing. This question, resultant of the first two, I also answer "Yes" for the doubters.

Our fathers and our grandfathers who settled the Pacific Northwest came to a country where they could fashion with their own hands homes for themselves with the abundant materials available. During the war, and since, thousands upon thousands of new pioneers have come to my city and my State to find homes for themselves and their families. We take pride in our mounting population and the opportunities these newcomers find among us. But we cannot take pride in the dwellings in which they must live, if they are overcrowded and forced into substandard, inadequate shelter.

We in Seattle are proud of our city and its people. We want to be proud of the homes in which they live. In voting for further low-rent housing, we must remember the lesson of our only present low-rent public housing project, Yesler Terrace, with its 868 apartments.

YESLER TERRACE A GOOD EXAMPLE

In its short 8 years of life more than 2,900 families have lived in these Yesler Terrace apartments. Yesler Terrace has a great record of taking low-income families out of the slums and broken-down walk-ups, off the streets, and out of the trailer camps. It has given them a fresh and happy start in a good home in a fine neighborhood. It has launched them on the road to an income and an outlook which lead them to buy or rent the good homes provided by the private home-building industry.

Our first low-rent project has proved its worth to Seattle again and again. On March 14 I shall vote to bring more low-rent housing to Seattle so that the job started on Yesler Terrace can be completed and no low-income family by virtue of its income, its size, or its color shall be forced to live out its life in a slum.

Mr. Speaker, I believe calling this Seattle problem to the attention of the Members is fully justified because the real-estate lobby will not limit its activities to Seattle alone. As I have pointed out, there is a concerted Nation-wide drive to nullify the housing objectives we have endorsed in this Congress. To illustrate, I ask leave to include with these remarks the following excerpts from a dispatch which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 23, 1950:

HOME BUILDERS PLAN DETERMINED FIGHT TO STOP PUBLIC HOUSING

CHICAGO, February 23.—The Nation's home builders today prepared to carry on a determined fight in cities and towns in an attempt to stop public housing projects "at the local level."

This decision was reached after it was learned the association would seek to raise immediately more than $100,000 for a public-relations program.

Electing a President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States has recently passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 2, commonly known as the Lodge-Gossett resolution. This proposed constitutional amendment will in all probability come before the House of Representatives in the near future.

A former able and distinguished Member of this House, later a justice of the Kansas Supreme Court, the late Honorable Homer Hoch, took a great interest during his service in Congress in the questions involved in the election of the President and Vice President. The July 1944 issue of the Kansas Judicial Council Bulletin contained an article by Justice Hoch, entitled "Electing a President of the United States." I have seen no clearer or abler discussion of the question involved in the Lodge-Gossett resolution than is contained in this article by Justice Hoch. Because I believe that it should be read by every Member of the House of Representatives, I am including it herewith as a part of my remarks:

ELECTING A PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Justice Homer Hoch, Kansas Supreme Court)

Few people, apparently, regard the method provided by the Constitution for electing a President as a matter of much importance. Comment on the subject consists largely of facetious reference, every 4 years, to the electoral college. And yet, in the opinion of most students of government, this part of our constitutional machinery is not only undemocratic but has very serious defects fraught with real public dangers. To these defects and potential dangers we give little or no concern, our presidential elections having ridden along, in the main, on fairly even keel. Until some emergency arises in a time of tense public feeling which may precipitate a political crisis we just can't be bothered. It is quite like the traditional Irishman's leaky roof, which didn't need fixing while the weather was fair and couldn't be fixed when it was raining.

Briefly stated, the serious defects of the present system are: First, a President may be elected—and has been—not only without having received the most popular votes but without having received as many electoral votes as his principal opponent; second, the votes of the minority in each State are not only uncounted for the candidate for whom they are cast, but in effect are actually counted for the opposing candidate; third, the provisions for electing a President in case no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes are so defective that an impasse might easily occur, with no means provided in the Constitution for securing a President.

Debates in the Constitutional Convention related almost as much to the methods of selecting personnel as they did to the principles upon which the new Federal Government was to be established. And wisely so. Whatever the form of government, it must be administered by men, and while a government bad in substance cannot be sanctified by administration, a government good in principle may be perverted into tyranny by the men who run it. It was only natural, therefore, that having drawn the outlines of a central government of limited, delegated powers, with separate and coordinate branches for law making, law interpreting, and law enforcing, the Constitution Convention should debate at great length the methods of selecting those who were to exercise the various Federal powers.

It is, of course, out of the question to attempt, here, a review of those debates. The principal decisions which were reached as to the legislative and judicial branches are familiar to nearly all. The National Legislature was to be bicameral—with one Chamber directly representing the people, and the other representing the sovereign States. Without this major compromise between the large and small States, which gave representation in the House on the basis of population and gave each State the same representation in the Senate, the Constitution probably would not have been ratified. The principle of this compromise was carried over into the election of a President by giving to each State one electoral vote for each of its Representatives and its two Senators. Two important changes have been made as to election of Representatives and Senators. The Constitution originally provided, in effect, that in the apportionment of Representatives among the States a slave should be counted as three-fifths of a person. With the abolition of slavery this strange political and mathematical provision was formally eliminated by the fourteenth amendment. Senators were elected by the State legislatures until 1913, when the seventeenth amendment providing for their election by popular vote was adopted. As to the judiciary, one of the principal decisions of the framers of the Constitution was to fortify independence of judicial action by a life tenure for Federal judges. Whether this provision is a wise one has long been a question for debate. These and other interesting questions have more or less pertinent relation to our immediate subject but per-

missible length of this paper prevents their discussion here.

We come to the subject of this paper—the method provided for electing the executive head of the Federal Government. Few subjects before the Convention aroused such extended and acrimonious debate. At least four or five proposals were seriously considered. The so-called Virginia plan, the Pinkney plan, and the New Jersey plan all proposed that the President be elected by Congress. George Mason, of Virginia, one of the most active members of the Convention and a man with a distinguished record as a patriot and statesman, said that it was "as natural to refer the proper character for chief magistrate to the people as it would be to refer a trial of colors to a blind man." And because of his dissatisfaction with the Constitution as adopted he became one of three framers who refused to sign it, and together with Patrick Henry led the fight against its ratification by Virginia.

The Convention first adopted a resolution providing that Congress should name electors who in turn should select a President. Two days later the Convention reversed its action and provided for election of the electors by the State legislatures. A week later it again reversed itself and passed a resolution providing for election of the President directly by Congress, with a 7-year term. Finally the electoral-college system was adopted as we now have it, except for one important change, to be presently noted, which was made by the twelfth amendment in 1804. The plan was taken from a similar provision in the Constitution of Maryland. It was designed largely for a nonpartisan government—political parties not then having fully developed. Apparently the primary principle which the framers thought they were adopting was the selection of a President by a group of men especially fitted for the task. These electors were to select a President much as a board of directors selects a manager for a corporation. Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist: "It is equally desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements that were proper to govern their choice. A small number of persons, selected by their fellow citizens from the general mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to so complicated an investigation." It is one of the interesting developments of our constitutional history that without any change in the law this fundamental principle soon ceased to operate. The electors became mere instruments for registering the popular vote of the States. Nevertheless, the Hamilton theory was the one upon which the electoral system was based. After Washington's two terms, when Jefferson and Adams were the leading contenders, three electors who were members of the Jefferson party voted for Adams and yet their act aroused no public resentment. But the bitter controversies and personal animosities engendered in the 4 years of John Adams' term—largely by his temper and ineptitude in dealing with those around him—brought a radical change in sentiment concerning the election of a President. This turmoil terminated in the bitter Jefferson and Burr controversy in Congress. The Constitution provided that the electors should meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for two persons. No separate vote for President and Vice President was cast. These ballots were to be sealed and transmitted to the President of the Senate and by him opened and counted in the presence of the Senate and the House. The person receiving the highest vote was to be President and the next highest to be Vice President. At the first election Washington received 69 votes and John Adams 34, the latter thus becoming Vice President. In the election of 1796 Adams became President on a margin of only 3 votes over Jefferson, who became Vice President.

The election of 1800 was an intense one with Adams and Pinckney on one ticket and Jefferson and Burr on another. Jefferson and Burr each had 73 electoral votes and Adams and Pinckney 65. The Constitution provided, as heretofore noted, that each elector should vote for two persons, and it further provided that if there should be a tie vote the election should be made by the House of Representatives from among those whose votes were tied. Jefferson and Burr were tied. While there probably was not a single elector who voted for Burr with the intention that he should be President—the understanding being that he was to be Vice President if Jefferson were elected President—the constitutional provision as it then existed made it possible for the House to select either Jefferson or Burr. The feeling against Jefferson was intense among most of the Federalists, who were in full control of the House. And so a movement sprang up to name Burr instead of Jefferson. Not that the Federalists hated Burr less but that they hated Jefferson more. It was an unconscionable proposal—to which the brilliant but unprincipled Burr gave covert consent—but it would have prevailed had it not been for the opposition of a few Federalists, the most aggressive and influential one being Jefferson's arch political enemy, Alexander Hamilton. Had it not been for Hamilton, Burr probably would have been President instead of Jefferson. Hamilton wrote to Gouverneur Morris, "I trust the Federalists will not finally be so mad as to vote for Burr. I speak with intimate and accurate knowledge of character. His elevation can only promote the purposes of the desperate and the profligate. If there be a man in the world I ought to hate it is Jefferson. With Burr I have always been personally well, but the public good must be paramount to every private consideration." This service of Hamilton became an enduring monument to his high-mindedness.

As a result of this Jefferson-Burr incident the twelfth amendment was submitted and ratified in 1804. The electors now vote separately for President and Vice President, and in the case there is a tie vote for President, selection is made by the House from the three highest. In case there is a tie vote for Vice President, selection must be made by the Senate from the two highest on the list.

Both under the original Constitution and under the twelfth amendment the State legislatures have power to determine the method of naming electors. Originally electors were selected by the legislatures and as late as 1824 there were still six States that so selected them. South Carolina did not provide for election of the electors by the people until after the Civil War.

In 1824, at the close of the Monroe administration, there again occurred a bitter contest in the House of Representatives over the election of President, accompanied by personal charges and public scandal. That contest, which resulted from the unfortunate provisions of the Constitution, fomented strife and ill will which endured for many years. Out of a total popular vote of less than 400,000, Andrew Jackson had a majority of about 50,000 over John Quincy Adams, and had 99 electoral votes as against 84 for Adams. But Henry Clay and Crawford, of Georgia, who were also candidates, together had 87 electoral votes, which are sufficient to prevent Jackson having a majority of the total number. This threw the election into the House of Representatives, where Adams was elected by the vote of 13 States as against 7 for Jackson. Thus it came about that Jackson, with substantially more popular votes and with 15 more electoral votes than Adams, lost the Presidency and Adams won it. Had the times been just ripe for it, such a result might well have caused serious public uprising.

It would transgress the limits of this paper to narrate at length the circumstances and political upheaval incident to the Hayes-Tilden contest in 1876. The close of the election left the result in doubt. In four States contests took place with both sides claiming the electoral vote of the State. It is generally conceded that Tilden had a popular majority of approximately a quarter of a million. The 22 electoral votes in dispute were sufficient to turn the election either way. Public feeling ran high. Finally Congress—with doubtful constitutional warrant—created a commission to decide the contests from the disputed States. The commission, consisting of five Members from the House, five Members from the Senate, and five members of the Supreme Court, decided the various contests amidst the most intense excitement and bitterness, giving the election to Hayes by 1 electoral vote—185 to 184. Only wise counsel, to which Tilden patriotically contributed by his course of moderation, prevented uprising and possible civil war. All this would have been prevented by some simple changes in the constitutional provisions for election of a President.

I have not yet spoken of the most illogical and indefensible part of the present system. I refer to its disfranchisement, in every State, of the minority voters. A plurality of 1,000, of 100, even of 1 vote in a vote of 5,000,000 in New York State swings that State's 47 electoral votes. Thus, as many as two and a half million voters in that State may not only be denied representation in the electoral vote, but actually have their votes counted for the candidate they oppose. A like result does happen to all minority votes in every State every time we elect a President. I know of nothing in our constitutional system more illogical or undemocratic.

Not only is this disfranchisement of the minority voters in every State indefensible, in my opinion, but the provision for election by the House of Representatives in case of a tie is both illogical and inadequate for meeting contingencies. Although the apportionment of electoral votes among the States is based largely on population, the population factor is entirely disregarded when the election is thrown into the House. In that event each State has 1 vote. Nevada, with 1 Member and with 3 electoral votes, has the same 1 vote in a House election of a President as New York, with 45 members and 47 electoral votes. And if a State delegation in Congress happens to be tied, the State loses its vote entirely. Furthermore, the Constitution requires a majority of all the States to elect. It is surprising that a situation has not already arisen where no candidate could get a majority of the States. With three or more parties represented in the House it could easily happen that no eligible candidate could get a majority of all the States. It is true that if the House fails to elect a President the Vice President is to act as President, but a like provision obtains for election of a Vice President by the Senate and the Senate might easily be unable to elect a Vice President. If such a situation should arise the Constitution has no answer to it. Nor is there any provision for another election. What is the answer?

In itself the answer is not difficult. But unfortunately the obstacle of democratic inertia, of commanding the attention and convincing the understanding of the electorate to a point of action is very great. At various times in our history public-spirited men have sought to arouse public interest in the matter and to secure submission of a constitutional amendment, but to no avail. Senator Benton, of Missouri, agitated the subject in the eighteen twenties and thirties,

and in the seventies Senator Morton, of Indiana, made it his legislative hobby and submitted a very able and convincing committee report and recommendation. In the nineties DeArmond, of Missouri, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, submitted another and similar report. In recent years Congressman Lea, of California, able and public-spirited, has followed in their footsteps and has several times secured a favorable committee report. But always the deeply needed change gets lost in the maze of matters which carry a more immediate and material appeal to Members and to constituencies. We are waiting for the big rain before fixing the roof.

Space will not permit discussion of various proposals that have been made. I will therefore only briefly state the plan which seems to me to be the simplest, the fairest, and the most likely to be ratified if submitted as a constitutional amendment. The heart of the plan, which has been called the proportional plan, is to divide the electoral vote of each State in the same proportion as the popular vote of that State. For instance, if two-thirds of the Kansas voters vote for the Republican candidate and one-third for the Democratic candidate, the former would get two-thirds of our electoral votes and the latter would get one-third. Thus every voter, whether in the majority or in the minority, would have his vote registered and represented in the election of a President. No voter would be disfranchised, as millions of them virtually are now in every Presidential election. There are two reasons which appeal to me for favoring the submission of such an amendment rather than one which disregards the States entirely and determines the result on the popular vote of the country as a whole. The first reason is that it would preserve the principle of the compromise—to which reference has been made—between the large and small States in the creation of Congress—House Members according to the State population but equal representation in the Senate. This compromise tends to lessen somewhat the comparative influence of the large and rich States—a consideration which I believe has been proved fair and wholesome from the standpoint of national unity. To make the point plainer, the plan would not disturb the electoral apportionment which gives Kansas, and every other State, one elector for each Senator as well as one for each Member of the House. Election by the whole popular vote of the Nation, computed as a unit, would disregard the historic compromise between large and small States and give undue influence to the heavy population of certain States. The second reason is that there would be little hope of securing the adoption of an amendment which discarded the present allocation of electoral votes among the States and provided for election by the popular vote of the Nation as a whole.

In dividing the electoral vote of a State under the proportional plan, small fractional numbers would be disregarded unless necessary to determine the result. The technical features are simple enough, not difficult of operation, but need not here be discussed in detail. The plan would remove uncertainty, render the election of a President by the House of Representatives—with its potentialities of scandal and bitterness already demonstrated historically—forever unnecessary and take away the serious possibility that some day we may find ourselves without a President and with no constitutional way to get one. It would wipe out the present disfranchisement of minority voters in the several States and prevent any candidate with less electoral votes than his opponent from becoming President.

Secretary Acheson and the Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the New York Herald Tribune for February 28, 1950:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—ACHESON'S ASSERTION OF FRIENDSHIP FOR HISS CALLED EXAMPLE OF PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—Secretary of State Acheson stands in the middle of a cross-fire which may unfortunately have an adverse effect on the development of world politics at a critical time in history.

The Secretary, on the one hand, is accused of expressing friendship for a man convicted of perjury in a case involving the transmission of secrets to the Communist government in Moscow while, on the other hand, he is accused of standing too firmly against renewed discussions with that same Communist government and of being opposed to a new approach in Russian-American relations. On top of this come the criticisms directed toward the Department of State for alleged leanings toward the Communist regime in China and a considerable hullabaloo in Congress about disloyal employees in the Department of State said to have Communist sympathies.

The inconsistency of these different forms of attack is apparent, for obviously Mr. Acheson couldn't be a friend of communism in the Far East and opposed to it in Europe. The truth is that he is as deeply hostile to communism as anybody inside or outside the Government. The policy being adopted now in the Far East is one originating in military expediency rather than ideology, and it was decided on long before Mr. Acheson became Secretary of State—in fact, when General Marshall was at the helm.

CRITICIZED ON HISS CASE

Perhaps the most direct criticism of Mr. Acheson has come because of what he said after Alger Hiss was convicted. Many people hold that he has a right, of course, to entertain views of sympathy toward his friend and to doubt the guilt of Hiss but that, as Secretary of State, he shouldn't have commented at all. This is tantamount to saying that, when a man becomes a public official, he must cease to have human feelings and that a Secretary of State or any other public official is prohibited by political expediency from expressing himself on any moral question that arises.

Actually, when the Acheson nomination was up for confirmation, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee interjected the personal issue and asked Mr. Acheson about his friendship for Hiss, for whom he had acted for a brief interval as counsel before a House committee.

When the jury rendered its verdict of guilt, Mr. Acheson didn't attempt to dodge the inevitable recurrence of the same question when put to him by the reporters. He did not say, however, as has been misrepresented since, that he believed Hiss innocent. He expressed no view on that phase of it but simply pointed out, in effect, that, irrespective of whether Hiss went to jail or not, he would continue to give him his friendship.

CHRISTIAN SPIRIT

This is a far cry from condoning treason or any other crime. It assumed merely that Hiss, by the verdict if nothing else, had already received more punishment before his countrymen than a jail sentence could inflict. It assumed, too, that the rehabilitation of a man gone wrong is an obligation imposed on society as a whole—now recognized as an enlightened attitude in penology. It assumed also that the Christian spirit is not something to which men may pay lip service on Sundays but which they sometimes forget on week days because it might bring down upon them cynical charges of mawkishness or softness. There are many things more precious to Dean Acheson than public office, and one of them is the belief that a man must live with his conscience for years to come.

It is a sign of progress—not decadence—when public officials begin to have respect for moral values, courageously eschew hypocrisy and are ready to take the consequences of their utterances. It would be discouraging indeed if, amid all the professions of righteousness as contrasted with the atheistic world of communism, democracy which is so eloquent in its espousal of Christianity in the abstract should become critical of its concrete practice by high officials in the happenings of everyday life.

Truman Gives School Children Vacation—But in the Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's refusal to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act gives the school children of Flint an unwelcome vacation.

The following is what the Flint News Advertiser has to say editorially about the situation:

TRUMAN POLITICS CLOSE FLINT'S SCHOOLS

Flint today is getting a bitter taste of what Missouri politics, played to the hilt in the White House, can do to the national welfare.

Today's taste, bitter as it may be, will be nothing compared to the throat-choking pill to be administered in the next week or two as the coal strike throttles our industrial, educational, and social life.

All this because one man was so busy currying votes that he refused to recognize the emergency when it arose weeks and months ago.

Harry Truman has handled this strike as a Missouri politician, not as President of the United States—that's why 4,300 of our children are home from school today, perhaps 10,000 next week, fires dying down in homes and business places, and cities all over the country holding emergency meetings to save as much as possible out of the debacle.

Without going too far into the issues at stake in the strike—issues must become secondary when human suffering is a result—it is safe to say that John Lewis' United Mine Workers and the mine operators have been jockeying for position for months.

That, perhaps, is their privilege as long as no innocent bystanders got hurt.

Months ago, however, it became evident to anyone who could read the newspapers

that someone was going to get hurt pretty soon.

That was the time when Harry Truman, as referee, should have stepped in and blown the whistle. Harry, however, was too busy counting the house, looking for the congressional seats his party might pick up this fall and the votes he might garner himself in '52 if he could get out of the scrape without using that horrible old Taft-Hartley law.

Week after week, reporters trooped into the President's press conference and asked the same question. Did the President feel that the coal strike constituted a national emergency yet?

Week after week the answer was the same. No, the President didn't think there was an emergency. News-service reporters wrote that story so often that it grew monotonous.

A month ago, the director of the United States Bureau of Mines reported to the President that the supply of coal above ground was critically short.

Mr. Truman let another week pass even after this warning, then, instead of blowing the whistle with the Taft-Hartley law when he realized that the game was getting rough, he suggested a compromise to get the miners back in the pit.

That didn't work worth sour apples.

Finally, 2 weeks ago, the President reluctantly invoked the Taft-Hartley law.

Unfortunately, the ostrich had kept his head buried in the sand too long. The President's patience outlasted our coal piles.

Even if the coal miners should return to work now under a Taft-Hartley injunction to save their treasury from heavy fines, it will be weeks before new supplies of coal filter through to Flint.

Prompt, courageous action by our President as late as a month ago could have forestalled the inconvenience and outright suffering many persons in Flint now face. Instead, Harry Truman preferred to play it like a small-time politician.

How long must our school remain closed, our homes unheated because of these two-bit politics?

How stubborn can a Missouri mule get?

Needy Persons Compelled to Support Chrysler Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the UAW-CIO and its officers have much to say about civil rights, about discrimination.

The UAW-CIO's practices are to the contrary.

Note this letter from a union man:

Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: For God's sake don't repeal the Taft-Hartley law, especially where the contributions to politicians is concerned. If they do, when we (the common herd, as Roosevelt used to call us) get through feeding politicians, we won't have a dime, for every time they elect a new dog catcher up to Congressman, we would have to kick in. If you can change it so they can't assess us for strikes, it would help a lot, for I and my wife have been sick most of the winter and now we are assessed $12 for the Chrysler strike.

So keep the Taft-Hartley, only put teeth in it.

Tax Incentives for the Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while we are spending millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money in developing mining properties in foreign lands, I think the time has arrived when we should do something for our domestic metal-mining industry which faces very serious problems.

This is not merely the concern of the mining industry; it affects every single individual in the United States because the production of raw materials—the products from our mines, farms, and forests—form the arch which supports our entire domestic economy. The combined income of agriculture and mining is always one-fifth of our entire national income, and every billion-dollar loss to either agriculture or mining will cause a loss of $5,000,000,000 in our national income.

Mr. Paul B. Jessup, attorney, accountant, and comptroller of one of the largest mining companies in the Coeur d'Alene mining district of north Idaho has prepared the following paper relating to tax incentives for the mining industry which I trust will be read by my colleagues and all others interested in maintaining a stable domestic economy:

TAX TREATMENT FOR NEW MINING VENTURES AND PRODUCING MINES

INTRODUCTORY

Taxes are an important factor in the overall problem of incentives to mine exploration and development.

In general, three different methods have been employed to accomplish this incentive objective, namely, subsidies, income tax relief, and to a limited extent, RFC loans.

Other incentives that should be given consideration are (1) liberalization of the restrictions imposed upon mine financing by the Federal Securities Act of 1933. (2) Revision of the United States mineral laws, particularly the discovery requirements of the law.

You will note that subsidies will be discussed at other sessions of this meeting, along with the matter of the effect of the Securities Act on mine financing and the proposed revision of the mineral laws. Therefore, no time will be devoted to these matters, except to point out that they are a part of the incentive program.

TAX INCENTIVES

The topic for discussion at this session is that of tax treatment for new mining ventures and producing mines. It is obvious that the difference in the character of these activities require different tax treatment.

In general, tax relief to mining enterprises can be divided into two types, (1) relief to the enterprise itself, (2) relief to the owners of the enterprise. The latter becomes important when the enterprise is conducted under corporate form.

The tax relief that has been given by Congress has been devoted to the enterprise proper rather than to its owners.

RELIEF TO MINING ENTERPRISES

Tax relief to mining enterprises can be classified under the following headings:

1. Treatment of exploration and development costs.
2. Depletion allowances.
3. Depreciation and amortization allowances.
4. Loss carry-overs and carry-backs.
5. Outright tax reduction or tax elimination for a period of time (Canadian system).

The latter is a product of the Canadian income tax laws and has not been adopted in this country. The previous speaker on the program has adequately covered this item.

The treatment of the other items under our income tax laws presupposes the ultimate existence of a producing mine. This we all know can be an erroneous assumption. I will briefly discuss each of these items in the order enumerated.

1. Treatment of exploration and development costs: The present law permits the amortization of the cost of exploration and development over the life of the enterprise. This presupposes the existence of something valuable to extract as a basis of amortization. No special provision is made for the treatment of capital expenditures incurred in the hope of developing a valuable mine, which does not materialize, except under the general theory of abandonment.

Today most of the development and exploration activities are conducted by the larger and better financed mining corporations. Existing law requires the capitalization or exploration expenditures. If the exploration program is not successful, the only tax relief that can be secured is through abandonment, which is a stiff penalty to pay for the privilege, particularly where such activities are conducted in mineral ground owned by the concern doing the exploratory work.

In my opinion, the option given the oil industry of either capitalizing intangible drilling and development costs or charging the same off as an expense should likewise be accorded the metal-mining industry with respect to its intangible development and exploration costs. The additional privilege accorded the oil industry of charging off its capitalized intangible drilling costs as an ordinary loss during the year the well becomes completed and was nonproductive should also be given the metal-mining industry during the year its development or exploratory activities are terminated at any particular property as being fruitless.

The extension of these privileges to metal mining would be a substantial tax incentive to development and exploration. As the principle has already been established in the oil industry, Congress should have no legitimate objection to such extension.

2. Depletion allowances: Most of you are familiar with the depletion laws governing metal mines. For the benefit of those who are not, this privilege is accorded by law to producing mines either on a cost or percentage basis, whichever provides the greater allowance. The term cost is used to include March 1, 1913, value.

Percentage depletion for metal mines was adopted as a substitute for discovery depletion under the Revenue Act of 1932. The original law required the taxpayer to make an election on its first return whether or not to adopt the percentage method. If this election was not made, cost depletion was mandatory. The Revenue Act of 1942 disposed of this election requirement and provided that the deduction would be cost or percentage depletion, whichever was greater. In doing this, Congress simply accorded to the metal-mining industry the same right that had been granted the oil industry since the percentage-depletion deduction was granted the latter under the Revenue Act of 1926.

I shall not take the time to go into the pros and cons of the arguments which raged for years on the subject of percentage depletion,

which now seems firmly established. I do want to point out, however, that, in spite of the contention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the contrary, the present depletion laws are an all-important incentive to the metal-mining industry. I know from personal experience and observation that they provided a source of funds which are being utilized in exploratory and development activities. The only question in my mind is whether or not the existing percentage-depletion rate of 15 percent of the gross income from the property shouldn't be increased to a rate commensurate with the 27½ percent rate allowed the oil industry as an additional incentive to metal mining.

3. Depreciation and amortization allowances: Depreciation is allowed upon plant and equipment. The term "amortization" is usually applied to capital expenditures which do not have any tangible worth outside of their utilization in the mining enterprise, such as shafts and cross-cuts. After a mine has reached the producing stage such amortizable outlays are in the nature of deferred mining expenses which should be amortized over the life of the ore benefited by their installation. They should not be a part of the depletion base at this stage of the mining operation. The law should be clarified so that there can be no question on this matter. GCM 139543 is a sound statement of mine accounting principles, although questioned by some judicial decisions such as the Repplier Coal Company case.

Mine depreciation is usually calculated on the basis of a unit of time or unit of production. If the estimated life of the mine is less than the economic life of the depreciable asset, the depreciation should be based on the life of the mine often on a unit of production basis. If the reverse is true it is often calculated on a straight-line basis, using the economic life of the depreciable asset as the basis for the calculation. Normally, the unit of production basis for calculating depreciation is the most equitable method. It has the advantage of providing larger depreciation allowances in years of greater production and smaller allowances in years of lesser production. It also makes it more probable that the depreciable cost of the assets will be fully recovered when the mine is exhausted.

The subject of depreciation immediately brings to mind the matter of accelerated depreciation as an exploration and development incentive. There is no doubt that this would be beneficial. My own personal opinion is that the attitude of the Bureau in cutting down depreciation reductions over the past few years has not only resulted in an economic loss in wasted time on the part of the taxing authorities and taxpayers involved, but has also resulted in the Government's losing millions of dollars in tax revenues during the recent high tax rate years. If the law would permit the taxpayer to set its own depreciation method and rate so long as it was not entirely out of reason, the Government, over a period of time, would lose nothing, and eliminate useless arguments with taxpayers. Under these circumstances if the taxpayer made an error in deducting accelerated depreciation it would only have itself to blame.

4. Net loss carry-over and carry-back: During years of high tax rates loss carry-overs and carry-backs are of great importance from the standpoint of an equitable distribution of the tax burden. Without the allowance for losses beyond the year when they are incurred, taxpayers pay a very unequal rate of tax over a period of years. In addition, some of them lose substantially on depreciation and depletion deductions. It is unfortunate that the demands of governmental revenue require the computation of the income tax on an annual basis. Of the two, the loss carry-over is probably more important than the loss carry-back. It at least has the merit of not involving the administrative inconvenience that is occasioned by the latter. However, during high tax-rate periods, a fair and equitable distribution of the tax load should not be sacrificed for administrative convenience.

From the standpoint of an incentive for exploration and development there is a great deal to be said for the 2-year carry-back and the 5-year carry forward of losses. Under proper provisions permitting such losses in the original instance it could provide a corporate incentive to take risks on exploration and development programs. Also, wealthy individuals in high surtax brackets could well afford to risk their capital in natural-resource ventures. This is particularly true at the present time in the oil industry, where in addition to the loss deduction privileges allowed, the percentage depletion deduction rate of 27½ percent is in itself an incentive in the event the venture should prove successful. Similar treatment accorded the metal-mining industry might increase this type of risk capital.

RELIEF TO THE OWNERS OF NATURAL RESOURCES

So far our attention has been directed to the matter of incentives to the enterprise itself. As most enterprises of this character would undoubtedly be conducted in the corporate form, some consideration should be given the incentives for shareholders risking their investment in the same. This approach to the incentive problem has been conspicuous by its absence.

Generally speaking two things could be done to make natural-resource investments more attractive to corporate shareholders. They are as follows: (1) Provide for the recoupment of the shareholder's investment where the enterprise is profitable, and (2) facilitate the charge-off of stock losses where it proves unprofitable.

1. Recoupment of investment: Congress should consider the possibility of levying no tax upon dividends received from mining corporations until the shareholder's investment in the stock is entirely recouped. The shareholder in a wasting asset industry who holds his stock has received no profit until this eventuality occurs. Undoubtedly there may be some difficulties in working out such a plan, but I believe some fair plan could be developed to recognize this principle.

2. Facilitation of charge-offs: The law could certainly be improved in this respect. It is probably important from a mining-investment standpoint to retain the capital-gain provisions with respect to profits on the sale or exchange of mining stocks. However, from an investment standpoint, the allowance of ordinary losses on worthlessness, and the liberalization of the determination of the requirements for worthlessness, should merit serious consideration.

CONCLUSION

The particular points I have mentioned are not the only ones which need consideration. Nor are the remedies I have suggested the only ways in which improvement might be made. But I am convinced they would help and I am sure that we must have real improvement in our tax law if we are to foster and maintain our mining industry.

The Armament Race in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, more than a week ago, on Monday, February 20, I placed in the RECORD the text of a memorandum on the rearmament of the Arab states which had been submitted that day to the Department of State by a delegation of the American Zionist Council. On that occasion I said that the British rearmament of the Arabs will lead to a general armaments race in the Near East and to an inevitable renewal of warfare in that part of the world which will result in the most dire consequences.

I regret to note that the first half of that warning has already come true—much sooner than I anticipated. The armaments race in the Near East is now on in full swing. In view of this most rapid development, I now fear to think when the second half of my warning about the inevitable renewal of warfare and its dire consequences will come true, as it must if we proceed with our present blind policy.

We learned from yesterday's newspapers that Israel has approached our Government with a request that it be permitted to purchase arms in this country. Instead of devoting its full attention to settling its economic problems, absorb the many new immigrants who have entered Israel in the past year and a half, settle them in its rural and urban areas, and integrate them into its economy, Israel is now forced against its will to turn its attention to problems of rearmament, security of its population, and the future existence of the state.

The unfortunate part of it is that our country is, directly or indirectly, a partner to Britain's task of rearming the Arabs. American arms obtained by Britain from this country are being diverted to the Near East, where they are resold to Egypt and other Arab countries. I have always been a consistent supporter of economic aid to Britain, but, at the same time, it was always my feeling that such aid should be for specified purposes and within specific limitations of the United Nations Charter.

In fact, on January 24, 1949, I introduced a bill in this House to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress by adding the following proviso:

> No money under this act shall be granted, lent, or used to or for any country which violates any provision of the Charter of the United Nations or, directly or indirectly, engages in acts of aggression so long as such acts continue.

Mr. Speaker, Britain's action in arming the Arab states is a violation in spirit, if not in letter, of the UN Charter and will most assuredly lead to acts of aggression against a long-suffering and peaceful people. By our support and approval of Britain's action we are condoning such deeds and encouraging Arab aggression. We still have time to forestall bloodshed, but time is running out fast. We may awaken some fine morning to discover that we have a full-scale war on our hands in the Near East, and this time those forces who thrive on chaos and spread their ideologies in times of disorder may beat us to the punch.

Today's New York Herald Tribune has an excellent editorial on the subject,

Arms and the Near East, which I commend to the attention of all Members. It is as follows:

ARMS AND THE NEAR EAST

The latest Israeli request for permission to export arms from the United States and Great Britain illuminates the stark fact that there is no peace in the Near East. Britain, under her old treaties, has resumed the shipment of weapons to the Arab states; the United States has lifted its embargo on such exports in accordance with the United Nations decision, and has licensed some sales to Israel. An arms race is on in the wake of the Palestine war.

But, as in all similar situations, it is not the arms that constitute the real danger of war—rather it is the will to use them. Peace certainly would not be insured by continuing British military aid to the Arabs, while the Israelis were debarred from obtaining weapons from the west. It would not be forwarded if the United States and Great Britain were to enter into a competition to see which nation could supply the greatest amount of arms to the contending parties. Even a new embargo by the western powers, although it might reduce some of the tension in the Palestine region, would not necessarily remove the fundamental threat. Both sides would seek other sources of supply; and if they found them in the Communist bloc of states, the situation would be worsened all around.

The real answer to the problem does not lie in any juggling of arms shipments but in the conclusion of peace treaties among the nations involved in the Palestine embroglio. The present armistice must be replaced by a genuine agreement which will permit the necessarily slow growth of mutual trust and cooperation. A workable solution of the question of Jerusalem must be found, and the United Nations as a body, the United States and Great Britain as interested powers must exert their influence to bring the parties to terms.

The armistice agreements give a practical basis for a settlement; there have been substantial advances toward resolving disputes over boundaries, the refugees and the like. Both Israel and the Arab states have domestic problems which clamor for undivided attention, and make heavy demands upon all the resources of skill, energy, and wealth that are available. Neither side can hope to obtain more, in terms of national prosperity and stability, from war than it would achieve by peaceful methods; indeed, war promises only disaster. If peace, a real peace, were made the first objective on the agenda of Israel, the Arab states, the United States and Britain, the arms race would be relegated to a subsidiary importance, and would die away of inanition.

Income-Tax Exemption for the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation extending to the physically disabled the same $600 additional income-tax exemption now granted to the blind. By alleviating some of the Federal income-tax burden on these disabled persons who, in spite of their infirmities, have overcome great physical obstacles and have become productive citizens contributing to the welfare of their communities, we will lift some of them out of the borderline area of becoming public charges, and will encourage others to greater efforts toward becoming self-sustaining. The initial loss of actual revenue to the Federal Government as a result of this bill would be very small.

There are about 101,000 disabled in this country today who would be eligible under the bill and many of these do not have sufficient disability to be included. To qualify for the additional exemption the bill defines a "disabled individual" as—

An individual who, by reason of a medically demonstrable physical defect or infirmity (whether congenital or acquired by accident or illness), is permanently and totally incapacitated to perform normal remunerative employment or work, or has permanently lost the use of a hand or a foot, or has permanently lost his hearing or speech.

Milking the Long Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one certainly grows weary of seeing bad, big business after having lost a long legal fight to then rush into Congress and try to get a law passed legalizing for the future their previous wrongdoings. That is just what is sought to be done here today.

When this same bill was before the House of Representatives on July 7, 1949, I spoke at length against this legislation, as pages 9069 and 9070 of the permanent RECORD will disclose. I voted against this bill then, as I also did today.

This bill reeks with selfishness. Even in the face of the atomic and hydrogen bomb scare which requires the dispersing of perhaps all industry throughout the Republic, selfish, big business wants to still centralize it in the future as they have done in the past. The fate of the Republic does not seem to be of any importance to them as I view it.

Some time ago in a labor magazine I saw a cartoon entitled "Milking the Long Cow" which is very applicable to this bill, S. 1008, which was under consideration by the House today. This cartoon pictured a cow with one front foot planted in the Midwest and the other front foot in the State of Texas. The cow was eating the rich forage all about her. One hind foot of the cow was in New York and the other hind foot was in Pennsylvania. On each side of the cow was a man sitting on a milk stool, with a pail between his knees, and his head pressed firmly in the cow's flank, milking as fast as he could. That cartoon well illustrates the present bill.

I have urged all of my acquaintances, who are the real friends of small business, to vote against this bad, bad bill of the big, bad, business interests. Congress should not permit selfish, greedy, and all-consuming big businesses to milk the long cow any longer.

This morning the volatile, voluble, and valuable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] seemed to think that President Truman somehow was in a hole, which was a decidedly unrealistic statement to put it mildly, but anyone who voted to let the long cow be milked any longer, will be not only in a deep political hole but will have a 5-ton tombstone on that grave to keep him in it, with an inscription, I suppose thereon, "He sacrificed his political life to bad, big business' un-American thinking."

Aid to Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of February 26, 1950, entitled "Aid to Southeast Asia":

AID TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

The dispatch of a technical mission to Southeast Asia to study the fashion in which economic aid can be best used is a sound plan. It is earnestly to be hoped that the mission will have impressed upon it the need for prompt action. There are many things to be done and some of them will be more effective if they are done quickly.

The immediate problem throughout the area is the restoration of production. For the time being, at least, the stability of southeast Asia and its opportunity to make longer range advances in the whole balance of economy is dependent upon getting back into the world market with a specific group of raw materials. The various, and often commendable, plans for industrialization at different levels and for large-scale diversification of production will simply have to wait until the basic economy is put back on a level of paying its own way. What that boils down to is sugar, coconuts, hemp and tobacco in the Philippines, rubber, tin, kapok, pepper, pineapples and petroleum in Malaya and Indonesia, rice in Indochina and Thailand, and rice, oil and teak in Burma.

A viable economy of southeast Asia will have to be, for some years to come, an economy based on close connection with the needs of the Western World plus the production of rice for food needs in the deficit Asiatic areas. This is not economic "colonialism"; it is just plain common sense. It is not a matter of proving or disproving any group of economic and political theories; it is a matter of seeing to it that a large number of persons have enough to eat and that the sufficiency be provided as quickly as possible.

This economy cannot be restored, however, in a power vacuum. There must be some degree of political stability if products are to be grown and marketed. We have already seen what terrorism can do in Malaya and what civil unrest can do in Burma. Political insecurity can be quickly translated into economic stagnation.

The United States, therefore, must give some assurances in policy that will contribute to the desired and indeed imperative

political stability. A mission to study needs and how they can be met is a good thing. But we already face the accusation of "all talk and no deeds" in the Far East. The study of needs must be coupled with the firm resolve to meet those needs, not through some hopeful planning for the distant future but through assistance here and now.

The Purchasing Power of Our Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a very distinguished constituent, Charles G. Cady, of Weston's Mills, New York, dealing with some history on currency which is very pertinent to our present fiscal situation.

We are traveling rapidly towards currency depreciation, which means, of course, a form of national bankruptcy that leads to the reduction of the purchasing power of our dollar.

This, of course, will have a devastating effect upon the security of those who in years past purchased insurance policies paid for retirement, and put their hard-earned money into annuities. Even now there are those who are proposing to cover up our deficit until after this year's campaign by putting in a plan of anticipatory tax revision on corporations. This is not a new device. In some countries reckless spenders in charge of the government resorted to this fraud to cover up deficits and keep on spending.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting Mr. Cady's letter in the RECORD:

On the chance that the following may not have come to your attention, I am venturing to submit it to you for use whenever the occasion may arise.

When the war broke out by the American Colonists against the British Crown in 1775, the total money supply in the Colonies was about $10,000,000 in gold and silver coins—"Specie."

The new Continental Congress found taxation difficult and so turned to the printing press to finance its military expenses. It printed $2,000,000 of paper, redeemable in specie, dollar for dollar. It became popular. It was all the Congress intended to print. But it was such an easy way to meet the war expenses that the people demanded more of it be printed. While that first $2,000,000 had plenty of specie back of it, it circulated practically at par. But as more was issued it steadily depreciated. Prices rose rapidly and the value of the continental dollars in comparison with specie as rapidly fell.

The Continental Congress issued $6,000,000 of the paper money in 1775, and larger issues each year till it had printed $140,000,000 in 1779, only 4 years later. By 1780, or in 5 years, Congress had printed so much paper money that a paper dollar was worth in circulation, only 1 cent of real money. The current expression for uselessness was that "It was not worth a continental."

The Continental Congress and individual State governments tried every coercive means available to prevent the prevailing rise of prices. Price-control laws were passed. Also laws to compel creditors and merchants to accept continentals at par with specie. In 1775, Congress resolved "That if any person shall hereafter be so lost to all virtue and regard for his country as to refuse (to accept the continentals) such person shall be deemed an enemy of his country. General Putnam decreed that everyone refusing to receive continentals at par would have his goods seized and be imprisoned. The Council of Safety of Pennsylvania decreed that any violator of these control laws was a dangerous member of society, that the penalty for first offense would be the seizure of the goods and a heavy fine, and for the second offense, would be exiled from the State. Price control, particularly in Pennsylvania and New England, led to acute shortages and widespread violations. Self-appointed committees of citizens in New England looted stores at will, selling the goods from the shelves at fixed prices. The Council of Safety of Pennsylvania, learning that a cargo of salt was coming and that its price had been increased ordered it sold at a low price. From then till the end of the war, salt was almost unattainable in Pennsylvania. The Rhode Island State government decreed that if some people were in want and others were deemed to have too much, the justices of the peace might order the constables to break open the houses of the "haves" and supply the "have nots" with the goods at lawful prices (and the State was to pocket the proceeds). Connecticut decreed a rationing scheme prohibiting any person from buying more than a stipulated amount of food and other necessities. Purchases could not be made without a license from the State.

A discerning writer of that time, Peletiah Webster, summed up the experiment with the continental. "Paper money polluted the equity of our laws, turned them into engines of oppression, corrupted the justice of our public administration, destroyed the fortunes of thousands who had confidence in it." It went far to destroy the morality of our people.

Now note: In 1780 Congress repudiated its dollar for dollar promises and announced specie resumption at a rate of one specie dollar for 40 continentals. There followed a rapid fall in prices to a stable level.

Another writer of that day said: "It becomes rulers to learn from the catastrophe of our continental currency that money is upon a footing with commerce or religion. They all refuse to be the subject of law. It becomes the rulers of freemen to learn further that money is property, and that the least attempt to lessen its value in our pockets and chests is taxing us without our consent. It is the highest act of tyranny. We have tried every art and device to keep up the credit of paper money except one; we have never yet tried the effects of being honest."

Now, Mr. REED, do me one favor. Please look in your own pocketbook. You will find a $1 bill on which is printed "The United States will pay the bearer one silver dollar on demand." On your fives, tens, and twenties (I don't happen to go any higher), you will find "The United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand $5, $10, and $20." Another printed note, with nothing back of it but the promise to pay another of the same kind.

I worked hard, earned a little, saved a little, laid it away for that proverbial rainy day some 20 years ago. Then by Presidential decree my dollars were made worth only 58 cents each.

My sincere appreciation of your serious task.

RFC Pays for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it will probably come as a surprise to some Members in this House that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a money maker instead of a money loser. Despite the recent difficulties with the loan to the Lustron Corp.—which, incidentally, may still be saved—RFC's losses have been less than one-half of 1 percent. At the same time its net profits after payment of all expenses are reported to be about $573,000,000, more than half of which it returned to the United States Treasury in the form of dividends.

Many Members will be interested to read the brief article on the subject by Carl Levin, RFC: Money Maker, published in the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, February 19, 1950, which is as follows:

RFC: MONEY MAKER—POSSIBLE LOSS ON LUSTRON LOAN A RARITY IN HARD-BOILED AGENCY

(By Carl Levin)

WASHINGTON.—Government lending, at least when done by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, remains a profitable and sound operation even when it becomes necessary to foreclose, as it did last week, on a borrower owing $37,500,000.

The decision to institute foreclosure proceedings against the Lustron Corp., manufacturer of all-steel prefabricated homes, with possible resulting RFC losses of $30,000,000, caused no high fevers at RFC.

A perusal of RFC's profit-and-loss statement makes clear that RFC is a hard-boiled lending outfit which, while it helps business and thus the Nation's economy, is primarily in the business of making money.

The Government-owned lending corporation was founded by Congress in 1932. At the direction of Congress it was involved in subsidy payments, stock piling, and war-plant financing during the war, which were not calculated to be profitable. Now it is engaged only in lending and investment.

Excluding intragovernment financing, it has made loans and investments in excess of $10,150,000,000. Its losses, after all operating expenses, have amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount it has disbursed. Its net profits, after paying all of its expenses, plus interest on the money which it has borrowed, are in the vicinity of $573,000,000.

Under the present Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, which contains provisions fixing the amount of profits which RFC may retain, it has paid $308,700,000 of the $573,000,000 to the Treasury in the form of dividends.

As set up 18 years ago all of RFC's capital stock, $500,000,000 worth, was purchased by the Treasury. This gave the lending agency its original working capital. All but $100,000,000 worth of this has now been retired at par.

The agency formerly borrowed money from private lenders. Now all the money it needs to continue its lending operations is borrowed from the Treasury at an interest rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, ac-

cording to a congressionally dictated formula. The rate usually is about 2 percent, based on the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. The rate charged borrowers usually is about twice that, 4 percent.

Currently RFC owes the Government, on notes, about $1,222,000,000, but if its past performance is any criterion this money is more than safe. It will earn well despite foreclosures such as that of the Lustron Corp., the loans to which, in the first place, were of a special nature because of the Government's interest in helping solve the critical postwar housing shortage.

And even in the case of Lustron, RFC officials point out, a reorganization may yet save RFC's investment.

British Pendulum Swings Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 27, 1950, entitled "British Pendulum Swings Back." The Union is published in Manchester, N. H.

BRITISH PENDULUM SWINGS BACK

The result of the British election indicates a definite reversal of a totalitarian trend that has been spreading recently over the Western World. For although the Laborites won a slim majority, the reduction of their lead in the House of Commons from 180 seats to a bare 1, with 12 "ridings" still to be heard from, registers a heavy swing of popular sentiment from 5 years ago. The Laborites got less than 46 percent of the popular vote.

A party in power in Britain needs at least a majority of at least 30 to carry on, due to the number of Government officials drawn from the parliamentary membership who are not usually on hand to vote on the floor of the Commons. This means that the laborites today are faced with the alternative of forming a coalition government or of calling a new election as soon as essential legislation is out of the way. It is practically impossible for them to carry on alone. When this result is taken with the recent Socialist defeats in Australia and New Zealand, the significance is inescapable.

The drubbing given the Communists and fellow travelers in the election is another indication that a reaction against the leftist trend has set in in Britain. All Communist candidates—numbering 100 in all—together with those who expressed sympathy with Russia, were completely wiped out. Even Communist William Galacher, who had represented his district in Scotland for 15 years, was decisively defeated. For the first time in many years, the British Parliament will have no Communists or fellow travelers in its ranks.

The British people apparently are awakening to the direction in which the Labor government has been taking the country. They were beguiled for a time by the lure of the social so-called benefits the Laborites held before them, and did not realize that socialism leads inevitably to the destruction of all individual initiative and the fixing of the iron grip of statism on the people. Perhaps the nationalization of the steel industry, which the Laborites voted but held in abeyance until after the election, began to call their attention to the fact that a return of the Laborites for another 5 years would mean that the nation would be irrevocably committed to socialism.

They have drawn back from that result, and let us hope that if another general election is called soon, they will put the final veto on the issue. The British are a hard-headed people, rooted in the democratic tradition, and it is inconceivable that they would see the freedom for which they fought for centuries wiped out by a return of government regimentation in which they would once more become puppets of the state. We here in the United States will do well to study the British reaction, for the same paralysis of socialism is creeping over us under the influence of bureaucrats fascinated by the Socialist way.

Sean Nunan's Farewell Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD, the farewell speech of Sean Nunan, Minister of Ireland to the United States.

It was with a sense of sadness that many of us attended the testimonial dinner for Sean last night at the Carlton Hotel. We will miss his smile, his courtesy, and his indomitable courage. We will remember his refreshing humor, his understanding, and his spirit of tolerance.

We all hope that in his new position as Assistant Secretary for External Affairs he will be able to visit us often so that we may continue to work with and for one another. Sean Nunan has not only ably represented his country in Washington; he has also represented us to Ireland.

We rejoice that we have known Sean and we wish him the best of everything in the years ahead. To Mrs. Nunan and Sean we say good luck and Godspeed and we—with them—look forward to that great day when the word "partition" will be replaced by "united." Then, and only then, will Ireland really come into its own.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Honorable Sean Nunan, Minister of Ireland to the United States, follows:

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chief Justice, and my distinguished and dear friends, words are completely inadequate to express the very deep sense of gratitude I have in my heart for the many expressions of warm friendship made concerning me tonight, and for the wonderful friendship evidenced by the presence of such a distinguished gathering as is here.

I feel that personally I am not worthy of the honor you have done me, but I would be less than human if I did not feel tremendous pride and gratification at the tributes paid to me. I feel that in honoring me, Ireland's Minister to the United States, you are honoring Ireland—the motherland which cradled your forefathers and, indeed, some of you who are here tonight—the land whose people have contributed so greatly to the upbuilding and preservation of this great Republic of the United States. For the honor you pay to Ireland I am deeply grateful. For the tributes paid to me personally, I return a sincere, deep, and heartfelt "Thank you."

It is a difficult task for me to speak to you tonight, for my heart is heavy at the thought that I am saying "Goodbye" to so many dear and sincere friends of mine and of Ireland. "Goodbye" is a sad word, especially when a man reaches the three-score mark, and though I have every hope that I may come back occasionally, or some of you may come to Ireland, this may well be a final goodbye between some of us.

My heart is torn by two emotions—joy in the anticipation of going home to my own country, and sadness at the thought of leaving your great country—"the greater Ireland beyond the sea"—where so many of our people found refuge from an alien tyranny in years gone by, and where the opportunity of living as free men, which was denied them in their own country, was gladly afforded them. Which of these emotions will gain mastery in the years to come, I cannot say, but at the moment sadness is the predominant one.

When I look back over the period of 30 years since I first came to your shores, and recollect how the people of America helped my country in her efforts to attain independence, I am filled with gratitude. I came here in 1919 when the world was emerging from World War I, when America speaking through her great President, Woodrow Wilson, enunciated the ideal of the right of small nations to governments of their own choosing. We in Ireland had made our choice in 1916 and confirmed it in 1918—a Republic for all Ireland; but the will of the Irish people was denied by the then ruling power.

I came here with the President of the Irish Republic—Eamon De Valera—to plead Ireland's case to the liberty loving people of America and in the course of our stay here a drive for funds was made to enable the infant republic to survive. The people of America responded splendidly to the call and a sum of about $6,000,000 was subscribed for which bond certificates of the Irish Republic were issued. Without that financial help it would have been extremely difficult for the Irish Government to function. I had the honor of being the registrar of that bond issue and I say to you that it was one of the proudest moments of my life when the Irish Government repaid those bonds to the good people of America—and at $1.25 for each $1 subscribed. Those of you who remember that, were, I am sure, equally proud that Ireland did not default on her debt.

Ireland has come a long way since that time. Every vestige of allegiance or subservience to the power which for so many long and bitter years held our country in subjection has been obliterated in 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland by successive Irish governments, and a completely free and independent state is functioning there. But freedom and independence for three-quarters of the nation is not the ideal of the Irish Government or the Irish people. Complete freedom for, and the unity of, the whole of Ireland is the aim; but while great progress toward the attainment of that ideal has been made, the Republic of All Ireland has not yet been attained—because as you all know a part of our small island has been partitioned, despite the expressed voice of the Irish people. Our efforts to abolish the infamous border which divides our nation and country have been, and are still being, immensely aided by American opinion, and

Ireland will forever be grateful for the sympathy, and active assistance of her millions of friends in America.

I hope, and I believe, that in the final drive to that goal, Ireland can count on the continued sympathy and assistance of all lovers of true democracy in America, and that includes every American worthy of the name. We in Ireland want our country to be what your children proclaim America to be, when at assembly every morning they recite the Pledge to the Flag: "One Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

On the other side of the ledger is to be found the record of the part played by Irishmen in the establishment of this great Republic of the United States. Our people are always to be found in the forefront of the fight for freedom everywhere, and particularly so in this Republic in whose successful fight for freedom from an oppressor, they played no small part. It is a matter of great pride to an Irishman to remember that, in the Revolutionary War, 50 percent of Washington's Army was born in Ireland. In the Congressional Library here in the city of Washington there is a copy of the Royal Gazette of October 27, 1779, No. 321, which reports the evidence given by Mr. Joseph Galloway, Speaker of the House of Assembly of Pennsylvania, before the English House of Commons, which was inquiring into the reason for the Revolution. In the course of the examination, Mr. Galloway was asked: "That part of the rebel army that enlisted in the service of the Congress were they chiefly composed of natives of America, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, and Irish?" He replied: "The names and places of their nativity being taken down, I can answer the question with precision. There were scarcely one-fourth natives of America—about one-half Irish—the other fourth were English and Scotch." We recall with pride those Irishmen who signed the Declaration of Independence; those men of Irish descent who occupied the highest offices in this Republic—men such as President Andrew Jackson, who declared that he had not one drop of blood in his veins that was not Irish. And we are proud to know that men of Irish blood are still occupying—with honor and dignity—such offices; as witness, Secretary Tobin, Secretary Matthews, and the Attorney General, to name but a few. Nor should I fail to include the Chief Justice in that honor roll for he has Irish blood in his veins, otherwise he would not be a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

We glory in the knowledge that our people helped to bring freedom to this country, and we glory at the part they are playing to preserve that freedom, but it is saddening to reflect that the land from which they sprang does not yet completely enjoy the true freedom which they helped to bring to this great Nation.

Yet it is indeed most heartening to see in this room men who believed in, and worked for, Ireland's right to complete independence when I came here in 1919 and who, by their presence here, give evidence that they still are of that same belief.

I recollect meeting a tall, dark, and handsome young man in the city of Butte, Mont., in the year 1919, who was the driving force behind the Irish independence movement in the State of Montana at that time. He is still tall, dark, and handsome, though 31 years older. His name was, and is, JAMES E. MURRAY, now the distinguished Senator from that great State. His recent speech in the Senate on the question of partition is evidence that his belief in Ireland's right to unity is unchanged.

I also recollect that I sat on the same platform at an Irish independence meeting in Omaha, also in 1919, with the gentleman who is now the distinguished and able Secretary of the Navy. Evidently Secretary Matthews' belief is unchanged. And, that same year, at what I believe was one of the largest and most enthusiastic meetings in support of Irish independence ever held in Boston—and Boston has had many large and enthusiastic meetings—a young man of 18 years of age was definitely present. That young man is now the distinguished Secretary of Labor and our toastmaster tonight. I see, also, Dick Dalton who, when I came to New York in 1919 was treasurer of the Friends of Irish Freedom. And Joe Scott, whose message has just been read to you was in the forefront also 31 years ago. There are many such recollections crowding my memory tonight, but those I have mentioned will suffice as examples of the enduring belief of American citizens in the righteousness of Ireland's cause.

In my many years in America I have tried to interpret Ireland and her aspirations to the American people and from the evidence I have seen, and from the generous expressions made here tonight regarding my work, I feel that my efforts have not been in vain.

Not alone am I grateful to America for what she has done for my country, I am grateful for the opportunity she gave me personally. There was, as you may have noticed from the biographical sketch which the committee prepared and included on the program, an interregnum in my official career. I shall not discuss the reasons which brought it about. Anyhow, I came back to America in 1923 as an ordinary immigrant seeking to earn a living. I tried many things. I tried to sell bonds, for instance. But either I was no salesman or the people in New York did not have the same faith in the future of the corporations whose bonds I was trying to sell as the subscribers to the bonds of the Irish Republic had in the future of that Republic, because I sold very few bonds. I then transferred from the outside of the financial world to the inside and found myself as cashier in a stock-exchange house in Wall Street. During my years there, came the crash of 1929, with which, I am sure, most of you are familiar. Maybe you got burned as I did. I saw the ruin and despair which struck so many Americans then: I saw banks closed and people's savings gone, and I wondered would America ever recover from the blight that had fallen on her. It was then that the real fiber of the people showed itself. They did not spend too much time worrying about "what might have been," but under the bold leadership of their Government they buckled down to work and built up an even greater and more stable prosperity.

These experiences brought me into close touch with the man in the street—and I don't mean Wall Street exclusively—and gave me an understanding of the real America, such as I could never have obtained in official or diplomatic circles, and thereby, I believe, enabled me better to interpret America to my Government.

Yes, America has given me much, and in return I shall do all in my power to make stronger and better—if such be possible—the sincere bonds of friendship between our two countries.

I leave America with a heart overflowing with gratitude to the great people of a great country for the friendship they have shown to my country and to me. Part of me will always be here, for Mrs. Nunan—for whose love, help, and good counsel in all the ups and downs of my life I wish to pay public tribute. She would indeed be a proud woman could she but see this gathering in my honor, and she and I are leaving our only son—Dr. Seamus Nunan—here. He has chosen to be an American citizen—a good choice may I say—and to make his home in America. So to some slight degree I am giving something to America for all she has given me. I pray that Almighty God will continue to shower His blessings on your country and that peace and prosperity will be the lot of your people for all days.

I leave you, my dear friends, with a heavy heart, but I shall cherish always the memory of the wonderful friendship you have extended to me.

The memory of this evening will always remain with me as evidence of that friendship and this beautiful token which you have presented to me will be a constant reminder of it.

Again Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chief Justice, and my dear friends, thank you, and may God bless America.

Control of Congress Means Control of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for months the big labor bosses from Washington have brazenly published through the press that they are raising millions of dollars they will spend to defeat all of us Congressmen who refused to take their dictation, and who voted for the Taft-Hartley law.

They claim that if they can defeat seventeen to twenty of us in the House, and six in the Senate, they can control the Congress. The danger in this statement is, that they are stating a fact, which should alarm every citizen.

Control of the Congress means control of the Nation. Control of the Congress by these dictatorial labor leaders would give them the power to put over their entire legislative program, such as the repeal of any labor legislation now on the statute books, the enactment of the Brannan farm plan, socialized medicine, socialized housing, and any legislation they choose. It would bring a one-sided socialistic labor government into power that could regiment and control every activity of the American people. Their grab for this power should awaken everyone.

I am opposed to the big labor leaders, or any other group taking over control of this government. I know the farmers and businessmen are opposed to it. It would do great damage to everyone, including the rank and file of labor.

The big labor bosses have sent out orders that I must be defeated in the coming campaign. Under such orders their hatchet men, with the high sounding names of the Southern Illinois Labor League for Political Education, opened their campaign to defeat me at Harrisburg, Ill., on Sunday, January 22.

John Marchiando, of Springfield, Ill., State president of the Progressive Mine Workers, who recently called a strike of 15,000 Progressive miners in Illinois which helped to make worse the shortage of coal for everyone, adding to the chaos of the coal strike, came down to Harris-

burg as one of the chief speakers at the meeting and told them:

Congressman VURSELL must be defeated because he is an enemy of labor.

Of course, I am not, and have never been an enemy of labor.

At this meeting my congressional opponent on the Democratic ticket addressed the meeting, composed of some 250 labor leaders, and made them this amazing promise: He said, "As far as labor is concerned, you can write your own ticket if I go to Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in becoming a rubber stamp in the Congress for any one special group. No special group has ever had a pledge from me that it can write my legislative ticket or program in the Congress, and none will ever have such a pledge.

My policy has been to support legislation that is equally fair and just to all the people, including the three great segments of our economy—agriculture, labor, and business. I know that such legislation, fair to all, will bring the greatest prosperity to all of our citizens, including labor. That will continue to be my policy.

I am glad my opponent has squarely drawn the issue so the people of my district may understand what he stands for. Shall the Congress enact only the kind of legislation the big labor bosses want? Have not the 120,000,000 other citizens some rights that should be protected? I think they have.

The coal strike which has brought so much suffering to labor, industry, and the people generally is the best evidence of the chaos that will engulf the Nation if the big labor leaders are allowed to control the Congress and write their own ticket.

Mr. Speaker, such a statement to give a free rein to any group should defeat any candidate who makes it on any ticket.

How about the farmer, his wife, and family who work long hours to produce the food for our people and the hungry people of the world? Without his farm investment and effort, all the people would go hungry and there would be no prosperity in this country. The labor leaders are demanding the passage of the Brannan farm plan and socialized medicine. Ninety percent of the farmers are against both.

What about business concerns who invest billions in capital and employ millions of workers? Are they to be neglected and cast out as are the farmers?

It is wrong and dangerous to allow any one group to write a Congressman's legislative program. All of the great groups in our economy must be given equal and fair consideration in an attempt to do equal justice to all of them.

Let us preserve representative government and run the government in the interest of all the people, as the Constitution provides.

That will continue to be my policy. I do not believe the citizens of this district want the labor bosses to write their legislative ticket in the Congress. I am willing to trust the decision of our people on this most important issue.

Taxing Chartered Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of the Disabled American Veterans relative to certain recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury for legislation to tax the business income of corporations exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code:

The Disabled American Veterans is deeply concerned with the present hearings being conducted by the House Committee on Ways and Means insofar as they pertain to the taxing of the business income of certain exempt corporations.

The DAV is a congressionally chartered veterans' organization authorized an exemption from the payment of Federal income tax pursuant to section 101 (8) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The House Committee on Ways and Means is conducting hearings on a number of measures designed to "close the loopholes" in existing revenue laws. One proposal before the committee is H. R. 5064 introduced by Congressman NOAH MASON of Illinois, a member of the Ways and Means Committee. This measure is intended to subject the business income of corporations exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code to the payment of Federal income tax.

The term "business income" is defined in H. R. 5064 to mean "the gross income derived from any activity of a kind which is recognized as an ordinary trade or business activity commonly engaged in by other persons for profit."

The principal income of the DAV is derived from two sources; (1) donations from recipients of Ident-O-Tags and (2) appropriations from the DAV Service Foundation.

The Ident-O-Tag is a small replica of a State automobile license tag. These tags are mailed to approximately 30,000,000 registered automobile owners in the United States each year. Each recipient is requested to return 25 cents or more to the DAV and a record of the name and address of each recipient of a tag is maintained by the DAV. In the event of the loss of key rings or any other article to which the Ident-O-Tag is attached, it states on the reverse side of the tag that if the article is mailed to the DAV, postage free, it will be returned by the DAV to the rightful owner.

The DAV Service Foundation is a nonprofit Ohio corporation organized by the DAV and operating under the terms of a trust agreement with the DAV. The Service Foundation undertakes various fund-raising projects and from time to time transfers money from its accumulated trust funds to the DAV to defray the costs of operating the DAV rehabilitation program.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the gross income of the DAV from its Ident-O-Tag operation was $1,757,946.81. For the same period, the DAV received a transfer of funds from the DAV Service Foundation of $750,000. This makes a total gross income from these two sources of $2,507,946.81. The expense properly chargeable to the above items of income is $323,951.33, leaving a net income of $2,183,995.48.

The DAV maintains a full-time paid staff of approximately 250 national-service officers located in practically every facility of the Veterans' Administration throughout the United States. The function of these national-service officers is to assist veterans, the dependents of veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans in the proper presentation of their claims for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. This service is entirely free and no charge whatsoever is made to any claimant, nor is it necessary that the claimant seeking representation by the DAV service officer be a member of the organization. The annual pay roll to maintain our claims and rehabilitation service is approximately $1,600,000 annually.

Our concern with the present recommendations of the Treasury Department is that in their efforts to tax the income of certain religious, charitable, educational and nonprofit organizations from business sources unrelated to their corporate functions, the Congress might use language in drafting a tax bill that could be interpreted by the Treasury Department as subjecting the income of the DAV from the above-described sources to income tax. If this should happen, it would result in a tax, based on the above figures, of approximately $830,000. Obviously this organization could not stand such an increase in its operating costs and at the same time continue its service set-up.

ADDITIONAL INCREASE PROPOSED BY CONGRESS AFFECTING DAV

The House of Representatives on February 9, 1950, passed H. R. 2945, a bill to increase the postal rates, and this measure is now pending before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2945 increases third-class postal rates from 1 cent to 1½ cents per piece. If enacted into law, this measure will increase the third-class postage bill to the DAV by $150,000 annually.

If the House Committee on Ways and Means should favorably consider H. R. 5064 or similar legislation and the Senate should pass the already House-approved third-class postal increase it would result in increased annual cost to the DAV as follows:

	Present	Proposed
Cost of mailing 30,000,000 Ident-O-Tags	$300,000	$450,000
Federal income tax on income from Ident-O-Tags and DAV Service Foundation	None	830,000
Total	300,000	1,280,000

If the DAV should lose its tax-exempt status as a result of the enactment of H. R. 5064, or any other similar measure, and the Senate acts favorably on the House passed postal bill H. R. 2945, it can be seen from the above that it will have disastrous effects on our excellent veterans' claims service. We feel certain that the members of this committee and the Members of Congress generally do not intend to tax out of existence organizations performing a valuable public service to America's wartime disabled. We strongly urge each and every member of the committee to carefully consider the wording of any bill they report designed to tax the business income of exempt corporations. The definition of business income in any such amendment to the internal revenue laws should be carefully worded so that no ambiguity could possibly arise in the interpretation thereof by the Treasury Department and the courts. It should be made crystal clear that congressionally chartered veteran organizations performing a public service are not to lose their exempt status or that their sources of revenue shall not be defined as business income.

Russia Indoctrinating Japanese Prisoners With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following account of Russian tactics to indoctrinate Japanese prisoners of war with Communist ideals and advance the Red movement in Asia. These contents comprised my weekly newsletter, In Washington With HAROLD LOVRE, for the week of February 20:

A tale of the clever tactics of Russia to indoctrinate Japanese prisoners of war with Communist ideals to advance the Red movement in Asia and discredit American policy has recently unfolded. Maj. Gen. C. A. Willoughby, G–2 of General MacArthur's Tokyo occupation forces has made available to the writer an official report revealing an incredible tale of Russian brutality and cunningness which shocks the imagination. This special report from the Far East command shows unbelievable Russian tactics employed upon Japanese war prisoners, most of whom were held as slaves in Siberian labor camps.

THOUSANDS DIED

While the United States in 1946 repatriated every Japanese regardless of where he was held, the Russians retained more than 2,000,000 military and civilian personnel. The Russians have fallen considerably behind the agreed 50,000 deliveries per month, although ample shipping space for the returnees has been made available by the American Far East command. In June 1949 Russia reported only 95,000 Japanese left to be repatriated. Japanese figures, however, show that there were still 469,000 prisoners in Soviet hands. The remaining 374,000 are presumably dead, because repeated requests have met with no answer.

Tales of privation, brutal treatment, overwork, and lack of medical care brought back to the homeland by the Japanese repatriates provoke little sympathy from Americans familiar with the treatment our servicemen received at the hands of the Nipponese. Yet behind the scheme lies a fiendish plot.

PW'S COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATED

The cunning Russian policy was long range in scope. The sick and the old were either repatriated early or allowed to die. The remainder were forced to do hard manual labor without sufficient food and medical care. A team of 50 grave diggers in one Siberian labor camp could not bury the dead fast enough.

Internees were carefully screened. High-ranking officers were put in one camp; middle-grade officers in another; enlisted men in another. An appeal was made to the latter group through condemning the so-called military caste system. American policy in the Pacific was blamed for the abject misery under which the PW's were forced to exist. Shipping space was refused by the "American capitalistic conquerors," the Russians said.

In 1946, when conditions were at their worst, there began a vast centrifugal Communist indoctrination program. The older PW's with fixed ideas had already died or been shipped back home. The "enlightenment" program was designed to foster distrust of the Japanese and hatred toward the Americans. An anti-Fascist group was thrust among the PW's, whose only hope, after seeing their companions die by the hundreds of starvation, was repatriation. A newspaper, published by specially trained Japanese, set about molding opinion along the Communist line. Living conditions for the survivors gradually improved. Even the Russian standard of living on the outside raised slowly. Imperialism, capitalism, and the military system were condemned. Gradually the intelligentsia was singled out for more comprehensive "enlightenment."

BECOME RED AGENTS

Consequently PW's arriving in Japan last year were fat and well-kept. They staged Communist demonstrations in Tokyo, singing the Nationale and waving red flags. Each returnee had been forced to sign a pledge to overthrow the Emperor system, establish a Communist government in Japan, and to join and support the Japanese Communist Party. By accomplishing the seemingly impossible task of flexing the rigid Japanese mind, an effective group of Communist agents and agitators were spread out in Japan.

Needless to say, this phase of the cold war has caused headaches for MacArthur's headquarters, who have published the accounts of Russian brutality in an attempt to discredit the Russians and the Japanese Communist Party.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Fine Arts Club of Exira, Iowa, my own home town. I wish to commend and congratulate the members of the club for expressing in this manner their opposition to compulsory Federal medical treatment for the people of America. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of letting the thousands of people all over our land who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD know that these well-informed ladies want no part of compulsory or socialized medicine imposed on the people of America.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American working man, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fine Arts Club of Exira, Iowa, does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from the State of Iowa, and the Representative from our district, and that said Senators and Representative be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

MAXINE WELLS,
President.
EULA SPOO,
Secretary.

Dated this 14th day of February 1950.

Protest Against the Abduction of Greek Children During the Greek Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of the House to the text of a protest which has been addressed to the President by Americans of Greek descent, in the hope of expediting the repatriation of 25,000 Greek children cruelly abducted by Communist guerrillas during the Greek civil war.

Since the text of the protest graphically describes the terrible wrong done to Greece and thousands of its innocent children, I introduce here a copy of the protest as it appeared in the National Herald, a Greek-language newspaper, published in New York.

The protest reads:

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, many thousands of Greek children who have been forcibly abducted from their homes in Greece, are presently being detained in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany. The two unanimous resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly, one on November 27, 1948, and the other on November 17, 1949, which requested the prompt repatriation of these children have proved of no avail because of the lack of cooperation by the aforementioned governments.

It is necessary to put an end to this abominable crime against humanity. It is necessary to maintain law and order and to uphold the international authority of the United Nations' resolutions. It is upon these resolutions that the policies of all peace-loving nations, such as the United States, are based. As an American citizen, I strongly protest the flagrant disregard of the United Nations' resolutions which the above named governments have shown by continuing the

forcible detention of the Greek children. This is tantamount to the horrible crime of genocide.

I urge you, Mr. President, to call upon the United Nations Secretary General, the International Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies to continue and increase their noble efforts toward implementation of the United Nations' resolutions pertaining to the return of the Greek children. I urge you to call upon the honorable Members of the United States Congress and to direct the members of your State Department to support both morally and politically the United Nations' resolutions and to have their enforcement in mind when dealing with the aforementioned governments.

I know your special interest in this matter, Mr. President, I am certain that my protest will help to win this humanitarian battle to preserve basic human rights and freedoms in the world.

How Mr. Roosevelt Went to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on February 26:

Former Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain finally has dealt with American entry into World War II at Pearl Harbor. His recital, as it had appeared in the New York Times and Life magazine, should remove any surviving doubts about that historic episode. From the viewpoint of Mr. Churchill, Mr. Roosevelt, and the American war party, Pearl Harbor was not a disaster. It was a Godsend.

Mr. Churchill's narrative already had revealed that for a year and a half before the Japanese attack of December 7, 1941, he had pressed Mr. Roosevelt incessantly to get into the war at Britain's side. At the Atlantic Conference in August 1941, he informed Roosevelt's circle "that I would rather have an American declaration of war now and no supplies for 6 months than double the supplies and no declaration."

Recounting this to General Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, Churchill said: "We must not underrate his (Roosevelt's) constitutional difficulties. He may take action as Chief Executive, but only Congress can declare war. He went so far as to say to me, 'I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war they might argue about it for 3 months.'"

That was what Mr. Roosevelt was doing: making war. His problem was how to force a formal state of war upon the United States without having to rely upon the power solely reserved to Congress to declare war. Economic sanctions, unyielding diplomacy with Japan, and finally the tender of a humiliating series of demands accomplished the purpose. Pearl Harbor was the culmination of a calculated policy through which Roosevelt, by making war through the Presidential office, forced Congress to acknowledge the existence of war.

It will be remembered that the attack on the fleet in Hawaii was presented to the American people, who knew nothing at the time of this secret maneuvering, as a shocking surprise—an act of treachery on "a date which will live in infamy" by a nation which professed to be "looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific."

How do these professions look to Mr. Churchill? He notes that the economic embargoes imposed by Mr. Roosevelt and Britain on Japan constituted a stranglehold. He says that when Secretary of State Hull, on November 26, 1941, suddenly abandoned the project of a 3 months' standstill with Japan, embodying the hope of a general settlement of all issues, and instead presented his 10 demands to the Japanese envoys, their distress may well have been sincere. He recalls that from the end of 1940 the Americans had pierced Japan's secret ciphers and were decoding large numbers of Japan's military and diplomatic messages. He states that the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor in 1945–46 disclosed the failure to send positive alert orders through the military departments to their fleets and garrisons in exposed situations.

"I do not intend in these pages," writes Mr. Churchil, "to attempt to pronounce judgment upon this tremendous episode in American history. We know that all the great Americans around the President and in his confidence felt, as acutely as I did, the awful danger that Japan would attack British or Dutch possessions in the Far East, and would carefully avoid the United States, and that in consequence Congress would not sanction an American declaration of war. * * *

"The President and his trusted friends had long realized the grave risks of United States neutrality in the war against Hitler and all that he stood for, and had writhed under the restraints of a Congress whose House of Representatives had a few months before passed by only a single vote the necessary renewal of compulsory military service. * * * Roosevelt, Hull, Stimson, Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and, as a link between them all, Harry Hopkins, had but one mind. * * *

"A Japanese attack upon the United States was a vast simplification of their problems and their duty. How can we wonder that they regarded the actual form of the attack, or even its scale, as incomparably less important than the fact that the whole American Nation would be united for its own safety. * * * Moreover, they knew, earlier than we in Britain could know, the full and immediate purpose of their enemy."

They "knew the full and immediate purpose of their enemy." That is, they knew that the attack was coming and that it would fall on Pearl Harbor. But they did not order an all-out alert at Pearl Harbor. They let the blow fall on the fleet and 2,326 Americans who died. How could they know? Through the intercepted and decoded Japanese secret messages in their hands pointing to these very things. Why did they let Japan strike? Because it was "a vast simplification of their problems." It solved the difficulty of a Congress which would not declare war at Mr. Roosevelt's bidding. That problem had been outlined 13 days before the attack by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in saying of the Japanese:

"The question was how we should maneuver them into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."

This is what Mr. Churchill tells us of Roosevelt and his trusted friends, who did not trust Congress or the American people.

Of himself, Mr. Churchill tells us that, after the attack, he informed Mr. Roosevelt immediately by telephone, "This certainly simplifies things." He says that the two high-ranking American officials who received the news of the attack with him at his country seat, Ambassador John Winant and W. Averell Harriman, "took the shock with admirable fortitude," as if "they had been delivered from a long pain."

"No American," states Mr. Churchill, "will think it wrong of me if I proclaim that to have the United States at our side was to me the greatest joy. * * * I knew the United States was in the war, up to the neck and in to the death. So we had won after all. * * * We had won the war. England would live; Britain would live; the commonwealth of nations and the Empire would live. * * * We should not be wiped out. Our history would not come to an end. * * * I went to bed and slept the sleep of the saved and of the thankful."

It was a cry of pure exaltation. Mr. Churchill's unrelenting struggle had succeeded. He had accomplished the mission of having Roosevelt pull the American people into the war to save England.

Such is the story of the date which will live in infamy.

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the tremendous amount of sentiment in favor of wartime excise taxes.

On February 21 I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and conveyed to its membership the wishes of the majority of my constituents that wartime excise taxes be drastically reduced or repealed.

My statement before the House Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I represent approximately 300,000 people in the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania comprised of the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield. My purpose of appearing before you is to convey the wishes of the majority of my constituents that wartime excise taxes should be drastically reduced or repealed. My constituents are aware of the fact that the excise taxes were levied as a wartime measure and were supposed to be temporary.

For several year wide publicity has been given to the possibilities that Congress would repeal excise taxes. With the beginning of each session of Congress the story is renewed with the result that buyers resistance resembles a buyers strike.

In my congressional district, and I know it is the same in all other congressional districts, many firms are operating at a loss, while others have had to reduce operations and lay off employees. Without fear of contradiction I can assure you that some business firms in my congressional district have suffered a decline in business from 30 to 40 percent because of the retention of wartime excise taxes.

The losses to which I refer have by no means been confined to the so-called luxury items. Dealers in more essential products are also concerned over unfair and punitive excise taxes. For an illustration—taxes on transportation and communication were assessed solely to discourage wartime travel so that such systems would be readily available for war purposes rather than for the purpose of producing revenue.

The ordinary electric light bulb is in no sense a luxury, yet it is taxed 15 percent. On one hand we pride ourselves on the widespread use of electricity in American homes and industry. We have authorized the creation of the Rural Electrification

Administration to further the use of electricity and make it available to rural American. Then we come along and tax the electric light bulb which is an indispensable item in the use of electricity. This unfair and discriminatory excise tax on light bulbs is only one of many of these punitive taxes which should be repealed.

Another unfair and discriminatory tax is the 20 percent excise tax on the fur industry.

Since 1943 the excise tax on furs has produced revenues from $44,000,000 in 1943 to $97,000,000 in 1947. The fur industry, and especially the small furrier, has found it impossible to compete with other firms manufacturing wearing apparel that is sold tax free.

It is realized that the Federal Government needs tax revenue, but it is unfair to obtain such revenue by not only discriminating against an industry but threatening its very existence.

Let us consider the average American housewife who needs a warm winter coat, and who, by thrift and sacrifice, has saved $300 to buy a fur coat, and which she is certain to wear for at least 5 years.

When she visits her local store and selects her fur coat she finds that, instead of $300, the coat because of the excise tax, will cost her $360, or $60 more than she has to spend. Not having the extra $60 in her budget, she realizes she can purchase from another store a very fine fur trimmed cloth coat without paying any excise tax. This punitive tax drives this customer from the furrier to the store selling fur-trimmed cloth coats.

This situation is a serious one, not only for the fur industry, but especially for the small furrier.

In my congressional district furriers inform me that they have faced a buyers strike for many months. As a result they have had to reduce the number of employees 50 percent with the indication of a further reduction if the 20-percent excise tax on furs is not repealed.

Not only is the fur industry facing bankruptcy as a result of the buyers strike resulting from the 20-percent excise tax, but the importation of Russian furs is dealing a death blow to the industry.

Furriers in my congressional district employ on an average of 250 people and you all know what such employment means to the average community. I want you to know that the situation in the fur industry is desperate because of the 20-percent excise tax and I sincerely hope you intend to do something about it.

Another discriminatory tax that has lingered on since the close of World War II is the Federal amusement tax of 20 percent.

Like every congressional district I have many small movie theaters that provide the only form of recreation in many small industrial communities. We all know that a good movie furnishes needed relaxation during these trying days. Your physician will often tell you relax and forget your troubles. If you seek relaxation for your family by going to a neighborhood movie you are penalized 20 percent because the wartime excise tax is still in effect.

The excise taxes on freight, passenger travel, telegrams, telephone messages, jewelry, theater, luggage, furs, baby oil, and hundreds of other items too numerous to mention are hurting my constituents by destroying business, reducing employment and penalizing the American consumer when buying many of the necessities of life.

As I said in the beginning I am appearing before your committee on behalf of my constituents in the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. I join them in their vigorous protest over retention of wartime excise taxes and earnestly beseech you to take positive action by drastically reducing them or repealing them in their entirety.

Proposal for a Solution of Our Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Fred W. Stilwell, of Sutherland, Iowa, in my congressional district. Mr. Stilwell offers a solution of our agricultural problems which is worthy of attention and study by all those who are interested in finding a solution to a most perplexing problem. I know Mr. Stilwell will welcome any comments and suggestions which Members of Congress or other interested persons may care to make.

SUTHERLAND, IOWA, *February 22, 1950.*

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEVEN: The following letter is not written from the viewpoint of a politician but with a desire to offer a sound solution of our agricultural problems.

During, and after the late war every farmer and stock raiser was urged to produce every pound of food he could grow. The farmer responded most generously, and the result was a volume of products that not only kept our people well fed, but supplied our Army and much of Europe as well. Every foot of land that could be cultivated was broken up and planted. Up to the past year most of these products have been sold, even above what has been termed, parity prices. But things have changed.

For the present, at least, there is no war. Europe is again producing well toward what she needs, and the amount of her production will be increasing each year. For the above reasons, we are facing a different condition and common sense dictates that we take the necessary steps to meet the situation. Europe will not buy a dollar's worth of farm products that she can raise, for two reasons: First, she hasn't the money to pay for it, and second, our prices are so high that she will not buy from us, if she can get the products from some other scource.

The result is a diminishing market for our farm products. What is the answer? There are two ways to meet this situation: First, reduce the volume of products in proportion to the reduced demand or, second, let the price drop low enough to stimulate larger purchases. The producers will resent rapidly dropping prices, so there is only one other reasonable method of meeting the situation—reduce the supply. Our farmers are intelligent, fair-minded men and if the condition is placed clearly before them they will realize its justice. It is the only way to keep the price of farm products in line with other products which the farmer buys. There are millions of acres now under cultivation that should be planted in grass and given a chance to renew its fertility. It would of course reduce the total volume of crops, but there would be less cost for production.

In any manufacturing, wholesale, or retail business, the merchant or manufacturer studies the conditions and would not consider producing or buying goods in excess of what he could sell at a profit. The farmer should do the same. In the long run he will benefit from following this plan.

The present law provides that the Government shall buy, and take off the local market a sufficient amount of the surplus products to maintain parity prices. If they cannot be sold there is only one way to get rid of them—destroy them. This method cannot go on. The Secretary says it will cost the Government above $6,000,000,000 this year to maintain parity prices. Every cent of this money must be taken from the United States Treasury and paid for by extra taxes. There is a bottom to the Treasury. We are scraping that bottom now.

In lieu of the present plan, Secretary Brannan proposes what is being called the Brannan plan. This provides for a direct subsidy to farmers and sale of the product at what the market will pay. In a statement made by Mr. Brannan on April 7, 1949, he says: "A third advantage of this system is that it would allow farm income to remain at a high-enough level to sustain abundant production while retail prices sought their supply and demand level in the market place. This level is bound to be reasonable for consumers because of the larger supplies brought out."

This is the most pernicious bid for votes that was ever proposed. It appeals to the cupidity of producers by providing high returns to the producers and to the avariciousness of the consumers through promising them cheap farm products. It is a piece of political chicanery of such magnitude that it is almost unbelievable. In addition to this he proposes that farmers be compelled to report to the Secretary a detailed report on how much they produced. Failure to do so would subject them to a fine of $500 for each offense, and if they make an error in their report they would be subject to a fine of $1,000 and a year in jail. (Comments not necessary.)

I propose the following substitute for both the above-named bills:

First, provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify each producer what his allotment should be for the ensuing year.

Second, provide that each producer shall be required to acknowledge the receipt of the above request and send his agreement to comply. Those who have complied shall, before marketing time, send a statement to the Secretary, sworn to before a notary, that he has complied. Those who do this will be entitled to a subsidy of from 10 to 15 percent of the selling price of each product (amount to be fixed by congressional action). The total payment not to exceed the parity price. Those who failed to comply with the requirements may sell their products on the open market, but will not be entitled to a subsidy.

Third, provide that no one except owners or tenants of the property upon which the product is grown shall be entitled to subsidy.

Fourth, provide that the Government be not allowed to loan more than 75 percent of the prevailing market price on sealed products. No one who fails to comply with restrictions on acreage, as provided for above, shall be eligible to loans.

This proposed plan takes the matter of subsidies out of the hands of the Secretary and places it in the hands of Congress. It does, however, provide that the Secretary shall make the allotments. No other department or agency in the country is in a position to know better what the future market is likely to be. It is the intention to reduce acreage as nearly as possible to what will be required to supply what is needed. The subsidy is designed to take care of any discrepancies.

Most sincerely yours,

FRED W. STILWELL.

Rural Electrification Program Is an Investment in Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I had the privilege of attending the annual meeting of the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi REA Co-op at Sikeston, Mo. This is one of four REA Co-ops now serving the rural areas in the Tenth Congressional District where REA has played an important part in the development of one of the richest agricultural sections of this Nation. The growth of REA in southeast Missouri has been an inspiration to the people of that section who are looking forward to further expansion through the availability of a sufficient supply of power to satisfy the ever-increasing demands. I am confident that this demand will be met within a comparatively short time with the completion of the new generating plant being built by the M & A Co-op, which should be in operation this year, and with the completion of the SPA transmission lines, which are being extended into that section from the Bull Shoals and Norfork Dams.

In the following talk which was given at the annual meeting at Sikeston, attended by a crowd estimated at nearly 4,000 enthusiastic REA members and boosters, I pointed out some of the things which have been responsible for the growth of this cooperative, which are just as applicable to the other co-ops in the district which I have the honor and privilege of representing. Because of the pride I have in the record which has been written by the REA Co-ops in southeast Missouri, and in order that others may become better acquainted with this record, I am having my talk printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op, and my other friends who are here today to attend the thirteenth annual meeting of this successfully operated REA co-op which is today serving more than 6,300 families throughout this area of southeast Missouri, which I have the honor and privilege of representing in the Congress of the United States.

It goes without saying that it is a pleasure for me to be here with you, else I would not have traveled the more than 1,000 miles by air, bus, and automobile in order to be with you on this occasion. However, I do want to express my appreciation to Judge Proffer and the other members of your board, and to Manager Zaricor for their courtesy and thoughtfulness in inviting me to participate in this program. I also want to express my appreciation to the management of the radio stations throughout this area for permitting this portion of the program to be broadcast to their listeners. It does give me an opportunity to extend my greetings to hundreds of my friends throughout this area whom I will not be privileged to see in person on this short visit. To them as well as to the hundreds who are assembled here at the armory in Sikeston—I should have said thousands, because it is estimated that there are around 3,000 people here today—I would again express a reminder that your Congressman is always glad to hear from you, to have your views and suggestions, and to learn how I may serve you better as your Representative in Washington.

I have said that I am happy to be here, but may I also say that nothing gives me more pleasure than to address an audience such as this. This is a different type audience than many, for this is a forward-looking group, a progressive group, one that is looking ahead, striving for greater accomplishments. I learned long ago that the farm family that has once enjoyed electricity on the farm is not interested in looking back, and certainly there is no desire to return to the so-called good old days.

We have some old-timers in this audience, old-timers in the sense that they were among the first to recognize the opportunities that could come from identifying themselves with the REA movement.

While I am not so old in years, I am proud of the fact that I was permitted to have a part in the early development of the REA program here in Missouri. As a member of the Missouri State Legislature from 1935 to 1944, it was my privilege to sponsor in the Missouri State Senate some of the first REA legislation that was passed. Some of you younger people, and some of you older ones who have taken this program for granted, may need to be reminded occasionally that rural electrification was not handed to the people of this Nation on a silver platter. The rapid spread and growth of rural electrification in the 15 years since the late President Roosevelt established REA by Executive order has been due in large part to the initiative and to persistence of men and women such as you who were willing to give their time and who were willing to wage a fight to get the things they wanted.

We, who got in this fight back in 1935, 1936, and 1937, can tell you some of the opposition which was provided by the power trusts, who had their lobbyists working in every State legislature in an effort to prevent the passage of enabling legislation which permitted and authorized the establishment of REA co-ops such as we have here in southeast Missouri. And, out of fairness to them, I wish to say that the power trusts, and the privately owned utility companies were not the only ones who fought REA in the early days. Many of our very best people, friends of yours and mine, who were sincere in their actions, and who were conscientious in their beliefs, were not only unwilling to assist in bringing rural electrification to the farm homes, but were honestly opposed to REA.

Actually, some of those who are now the most enthusiastic boosters of REA were of the opinion that there was not sufficient demand for electricity on the farm to justify the building of the transmission lines. Others were conscientious in their belief that the REA was some sort of a socialistic move in that the REA co-ops would encroach upon the business and interfere with the services which they felt should be supplied by the private power companies.

True, for years, the private power trusts had preached that it was economically unsound to attempt to take electric service to the farm, except in those instances where the farm happened to be along the route of a secondary distribution system. And even then the rates were exorbitant, as many of you know. Some of you in this room know that in the middle thirties it was not uncommon for a farmer to pay for the building of his own transmission line in order to connect up with some private utility line, and the cost was such that about the only use to which electricity was put was to provide lights in the home, and possibly a family refrigerator or a small electric pump.

Under those conditions, is it any wonder that when REA was established, there were less than 18,000 farm homes in the entire State of Missouri that were receiving electric current from a central distribution system. And get this figure now, back when REA was established, only 6.4 percent of the farms in Missouri were enjoying this electric service. Yet today, more than 150,000 farms, or approximately 65 percent of all the farm homes in Missouri are enjoying electric service, thanks to the development and expansion of the REA program. I have watched the development and growth of this co-op, the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op, just as I have watched the similar development and growth of the Ozark border, the Black River, and the Pemiscot-Dunklin, and more recently the M & A Co-op, which is building the new generating plant at Poplar Bluff—I have watched the development of these Rural Electric Co-ops which serve this district because I have had a personal interest and a personal pride in having had a part in writing the legislation which has made possible this service which had so long been needed, and which you people, my people, here in southeast Missouri could never have had except for this REA program. This, in part explains why I am so happy to be here today, to join with you in this annual meeting, and to rejoice in the good news which is contained in the reports which have been made by your president, your secretary-treasurer, and your manager.

I am sure that each of you received as I did a copy of the operating statistics, showing the comparative annual statement for the past 4 years, and I am not going to take your time by reading this statement, but I would like to comment briefly on some of the figures that were contained therein.

From small beginnings you have grown in 11 or 12 years until you now have almost 1,300 miles of line energized, serving more than 6,300 farm homes and homes in small towns throughout this area. Furthermore, you represent a $2,000,000 local business—a business comparatively new to this community which you have developed. And when I say local business I mean everything the term should mean—you take a part in community affairs, you perform a community service, you pay taxes, and you are paying back interest on the money you borrowed for your start.

I doubt very seriously if anyone would suggest today that the REA is socialistic, either in its set-up, or in its democratic operation. True, the Federal Government has supplied the capital with which it was possible to finance the operation, but, as we all know, this money is being repaid with interest. As an evidence of the soundness of the financial set-up in this particular co-op, I am sure we are all proud of the fact that the Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op has not only met its payments as they have fallen due, but has actually paid nearly $30,000 in principal even before it came due. Other REA co-ops in Missouri have similar records of repayment of money borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration.

You have accomplished great things here—and you have demonstrated that you are going to keep on doing great things. You have translated the REA lending program into miles of line and into service for members. You people have taken an idea and have made that idea a reality.

As I said before, I am proud of you because you have done this yourselves, through the democratic organization of a rural electric cooperative. Your participation in the affairs of your cooperative—attending the annual meeting in full force—and I believe that we can say that this is a full-force meeting here today—and voicing your individual opinions on the various issues requiring decisions by your cooperative—this participation is what strengthens your co-op.

Every individual in a democracy—and every individual member of a cooperative—has a share and a responsibility in the way that democracy or that cooperative functions. Unless we exercise our rights to "say our piece," to cast our ballots, our democracy and our cooperative cannot function with complete effectiveness.

This annual meeting gives you an opportunity to exercise your rights—and that is why, again, I am glad we have such a large turn-out here today to participate in this election where you are going to elect your board of directors. Remember, that when you vote for your board of directors you are not throwing away your own responsibilities—you are merely designating certain people to act for you in certain instances. As your Representative in Congress represents responsible to you for their actions, just as your Representative in Congress represents you in Washington and appreciates the responsibility and the obligation he has in conveying your wishes, your views, and your vote into action there in Washington, and that is why I am always glad to hear from you and to have your views and your suggestions on how you would like for me to represent you in Congress.

This annual meeting gives you also an opportunity to look ahead to the job still to be done. Actually, you have two major jobs to do—individually and as a cooperative.

The first is to see that your neighbors get electricity. All farmers in this area still without electric service are looking to you to bring them electric power that will do for them what it has already done for you. As individuals you can help your cooperative by telling these people that you intend to remain loyal to them, loyal to the principle of cooperation until all are served—every farm family not only here in Missouri but throughout the Nation—that they may have the opportunity to have rural electrification which has meant so much to the development of this section and the entire United States.

The second job is to make and keep your cooperative strong and sound. This is a job your board of directors cannot do alone. It is a job which is up to each of you. Your relationship is not that of a stockholder who is interested only in net profits or net earnings. Your cooperative is not a dealer; who serves you for profit alone.

You are a member of a group organized to supply a service you all need and are unable to obtain as individuals. You got electricity because you demanded it and because your Government took an interest in having you get it. Right here I would like to pay tribute to the late Honorable Orville Zimmerman whom all of you knew and who also played a prominent part in the Congress of the United States in writing this legislation at the same time that I was in the State legislature helping write legislation to tie the Federal and State legislation together, and Orville Zimmerman should be remembered by this crowd here today. And here again I would remind you that this service was brought to you through REA after private power companies had failed to grasp the opportunity that they had. REA would never have been born if the power companies had gone out and served this rural area. Incidentally, I might add, many of these same power companies today readily admit that they "missed the boat." Some of these companies appear to be ready, and by their actions have indicated a desire to cooperate with our REA co-ops in supplying power which is so badly needed to meet the ever-increasing demand and I commend them for that action. On the other hand other companies do not show this same spirit, and REA cannot afford to place the future of its thousands of members in the hands of the private power industry. We must continue to develop new sources of power on which we can depend.

In that connection I would remind you that you do not have Government-owned power. This electric distribution system around Sikeston—the poles and wire and transformers and meters and all of that other equipment—this system does not belong to the Government. This system belongs to you. REA does not operate your system. You operate the system through your board of directors and through the personnel selected by that board of directors to represent you and to operate this co-op.

When REA was established only 17,893 farms, or 6.4 percent, in the State of Missouri were receiving central station electric service. By the end of June 1949, that figure had risen to 148,523 farms, or 61.1 percent.

REA loans in Missouri have been made to 48 borrowers, 47 of which are cooperatives. Already they are operating more than 47,800 miles of line serving more than 158,500 farms and other rural consumers.

Rural people made the year 1949 the biggest in the history of REA, just as you have made 1949 the biggest year in the history of your co-op. Even so, there is a long way to go, particularly here in Missouri. Our State falls below the national average in percentage of farms electrified. Approximately 94,400 farms in the State of Missouri are still without service.

The problems you face in seeing that the unserved farms may get electric service at the earliest possible time are to some extent the problems that all rural electric cooperatives face. It is harder to build lines—and make them pay out—when you have to reach farm homes in thinner areas, where the population is scattered, where farm income is not so high, where power supplies are inadequate, and where the land itself presents serious obstacles.

One of the toughest restricting factors to co-op expansion in Missouri has been the power shortage, and I know of no co-op in the whole country which has felt this need more keenly than you have here in southeast Missouri in this Scott-New Madrid-Mississippi Co-op. Because of the lack of generation and transmission facilities in Missouri, it has been necessary for cooperatives in Missouri to seek their own sources of electric power.

We think we now have a solution to the power shortage which has been hampering your own expansion. Through cooperation, you and some of your neighboring co-ops, have formed a power cooperative, which has received a $2,900,000 loan for a generating plant and 112 miles of transmission line. Already construction is far along on this M. & A. Co-op on its new 10,000-kw. generating plant, near Poplar Bluff.

It is estimated that the facilities of this dual-fuel generating plant will supply the power requirements of three cooperatives, one of whom you are, which are estimated at 9,350 kilowatts for 1953. M. & A. has also submitted an application for a loan to extend service to five more rural distribution systems. In addition it has entered into wholesale power contracts with Southwestern Power Administration on the assumption that it would need a supply of power for all eight distribution cooperatives. While your cooperative has been severely handicapped through its inability to secure a sufficient amount of power to meet its growing demands, and has been forced to pay in some instances nearly three times as much as is set out in the contract with Southwestern Power Administration, I can assure you that this condition is rapidly being taken care of. While it will probably be 3 years before all of the demands will be satisfied through the power which will be available over the SPA lines, the availability of power through the M. & A. generating plant will greatly alleviate the situation here in southeast Missouri during the next few months. I have just been informed that they expect to have the M. & A. plant in operation by June of this year, and we hope that some of that power will be available to this co-op to help meet some of its demands.

It took several cooperatives, working together, to obtain the loan funds to overcome the power-shortage obstacle—and the fight is not yet won. It is just as essential that we get our own house in shape and that our own members cooperate.

I understand that one of the problems hampering the completion of the transmission line authorized by the loan to the power co-op is the problem of obtaining rights-of-way and easements. This is something about which each one of you, individually, can do something. You can learn the facts—you can discover for yourselves what it means to your members in terms of lower costs to get these rights-of-way and easements as soon as possible. You can learn what it means to your members in terms of adequate and dependable power supplies to hasten the completion of these transmission lines.

Good service at the lowest cost possible is one of the keystones of a successful cooperative. This new generating plant and the proposed transmission line are essential to your continuing good service.

It is up to each one of you then to learn the facts, tell your neighbors, and do what you can to speed up your own program.

In cases where your lines must cross the property of people who are not members of your cooperative, it might be a good thing for some of you to call on this nonmember on a neighborly basis to tell him what your line means to the community, what it has done for you and your friends, and how it can help others.

Even though you have solved—or on the way of solving—your own power shortage, other co-ops are not so fortunate. Here in Missouri co-ops have faced one of the bitterest, most vicious fights in rural electrification history. Even though your own battle is won, this fight is still on, and it is up to you to lend your cooperative strength to those others within the State, and to those others across the country, who are still making every effort to get power to meet their urgent needs.

The right to generate and the right to buy direct from public power sources is your only protection from high rates and inadequate service. Whether or not you exercise this right, it does stand as a bulwark of strength for you in your negotiations with other suppliers.

This demand that has backed up on the farms, this demand that has been created here in your own cooperative, it was not created by any power company; it is a demand you, as a cooperative, helped to create. You opened up new markets. The fact that your requirements will keep on growing adds urgency to your cause. Lend your support then to the power fight anywhere in the country, for it is your fight too.

As the REA program advances rural people are placing heavier demands on REA borrowers for reliable service and for power sufficient to meet their ever-growing needs. REA estimates that co-op members who were getting service 5 years ago have about doubled their power consumption since that time. Here in your own co-op this demand has jumped from an average use of 93 kilowatt-hours per member in 1946 to 145 kilowatt-hours in 1949, with more than a 20-percent increase in the last year alone, and I know that all of you members realize how that need has grown.

Much of the future expansion of rural electrification will be in terms of use—putting electricity to work to save time, labor,

and money on the farm. Efficient use of electricity by co-op members is directly related to your co-ops' financial security; the member who is getting good value for every dollar he invests in electricity and electrical equipment is the one who is not only in a better position to pay his power bill, but also has reason to be more interested in his electric co-op. That represents a dollar-and-cents value to both the member and the co-op.

However, we should also look at the program in terms of the people themselves—the women who find their household tasks made easier, the men who find their farm chores a little lighter, the children who have light for school study—all because electricity has come to the community.

Comfort, health, and other intangibles which add up to better rural living have improved vastly with the coming of power lines. Young people, who otherwise might see a future for themselves only away from the farm, find their imagination fired by the potentialities of farming with electricity. With relief from some of the drudgery of farm work, with new opportunities for diversified farming ahead, these young people have a new incentive for staying on the land, to help build their communities, and to put to work their talents for production and leadership.

Electricity is bringing greater diversification to farming enterprise. Farmers with electricity are able to do more for themselves and with less dependence on far-away factors over which they have no control.

Rural electrification is adding to the Nation's grass roots stability by making possible the development in rural areas of new industries. These rural industries—more than 10,000 of which have sprung up across the country along rural electric lines—are offering part-time employment and greater stability of income to rural people. Our own alfalfa mills in this section are only one example.

And of course there is the contribution that rural electrification is making to our small towns and cities. As farm people are getting electricity and are putting it to work they are adding new wealth for the community—the kind of new wealth that creates more business and more prosperity.

Most all of us, whether we are members already served or whether we are only members of this community, have benefited from the coming of rural electrification. Some have benefited directly from the money spent for construction, farm and home wiring, electrical equipment, and from the pay roll of this co-op. Others have benefited indirectly through the increased farm income electricity has helped to make possible.

These benefits are neither static nor are they temporary. They will continue and become even greater as electricity is taken to other rural neighborhoods, and as it is used more intensively on the farms already electrified.

I have an idea that many of the merchants here in Sikeston could list direct benefits which they have received. REA's experience has shown that for every dollar invested in line construction the farm consumer spends $4.50 or more in wiring, plumbing, appliances, and other equipment, which depends on the installation of electric service.

This equipment they buy, however, is not limited to electrical items. With a pressure water system, using an electric motor as a power source, the farm family wants a modern bathroom with all the plumbing equipment, bathtubs and lavatories, showers and sinks.

And strangely enough—or maybe it isn't strange—when a farm house gets bright new electric lights to replace the kerosene lamps, or the old Aladdin lamps, the farm wife wants new wall paper, or new curtains. All of these purchases add to the wealth of the business community.

As you advance toward the completion of your area coverage—service to all within your reach—these effects will spread and the general welfare of all the people in this State will improve.

We have natural resources for profitable agriculture, industry, and trade all around us. With electricity available, not just here and there, but in every nook and corner, we will have the means of developing these resources to the full.

I hope that all of you, whether members of the cooperative or only members of the community, will look upon your rural electrification program as a community service. Rural electrification in the Bootheel is an investment in tomorrow.

What you have already done is visible evidence of the ability of farm people to build and operate their own businesses. You have proved it can be done.

Because of this fine record, I hope this cooperative, its members, its directors, its office personnel, its line crews, I hope that they will all look forward to the future, not content with the past.

Your rural electrification program is an investment in the future. Your accomplishments are an inspiration for all of us. With the past as a guide, then, let us look ahead to a brighter future for all of our farm people. I thank you.

Regimenting the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal of February 15, 1950:

REGIMENTING THE FARMER

Representative BOYD TACKETT, of Arkansas, has charged that the Interior Department is attempting to circumvent the will and intent of Congress at the expense of the more than 1,000,000 of the Nation's farmers who are still without the benefits of electric service. He stated that funds which should be loaned for the purpose of building distribution lines to unserved farmers are being used by the Rural Electrification Administration to construct unnecessary generating plants and transmission systems for the primary benefit of another Federal agency—the Southwestern Power Administration. He said further that the SPA is using the REA "to foster their grandiose scheme at any cost. This * * * is just another step toward complete Government regimentation of the farmers."

Representative TACKETT has introduced a bill to correct this situation.

These charges should not come as a surprise to anyone. For many years there has been a determined effort within the Federal Government to use any and all means to socialize the electric industry, and to effect a virtually unlimited expansion of the power of the Government over agriculture and all other enterprise. The Southwestern Power Administration, like all the other similar bodies, existing and proposed, is a major weapon in this effort. Huge tax sums have been wasted, at the expense of us all, on the unnecessary generating and transmission facilities of which Mr. TACKETT spoke.

Socialism comes high. No one can escape the cost—in money, in reduced opportunity, and in lost liberty. And unless the march of socialism is stopped in the United States, increasing taxes will bleed the people white.

Veterans' Education and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the report which the President recently submitted to the Congress he said, among other things concerning the veterans' education and training program:

The contribution which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has made to the postwar development of the Nation's most important resource—its young men and women—is very great. * * * For the great majority of those who have made use of the education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act the law has been of real and lasting service.

There have been many unjustified criticisms of this program—but notwithstanding these criticisms, there has been great and lasting and incalculable benefits from the education and training program. The President, General Gray, the VA Administrator, and others recognize this fact as do the veterans themselves.

In this connection, I desire to have included in the RECORD two editorials—one from the Disabled American Veterans publication and another from the Nashville Tennessean both of recent date.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

WELL SPENT

The Veterans' Administration has announced that a start is being made on the long task of closing down its veterans retraining and education program. As the curtain is lowered on this interesting demonstration of the gratitude of a democracy for the service of its young men in war, there will be discussions pro and con as to the benefits from the program.

For the expenditure of twenty-five to thirty billions of dollars by the greatest democratic nation in the world, what has it got to show?

First, according to a recent tabulation by AMVETS, World War II veterans organization, there have been nearly a million American boys and girls who have received a college education. Of this million more than 100,000 went on to graduate schools and a professional education. Not all of these veterans received their full college education at Government expense but all were well started and continued on their own after their GI benefits ran out.

Second, there were several million who received a trades education. In this field were centered some of the abuses of the Government's good intentions, which has led a minority to claim that all was wasted. A summary of the evidence would indicate that whatever their abuses may have been the benefits were sufficient to cancel them out.

The college education of a million American youths alone would appear as a long-range benefit sufficient to have justified the program. The Government has made a profitable investment playing the futures.

[From the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly]

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Considerable furor has been created by Veterans' Administrator Carl Gray's report to Congress on education and training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—commonly known as the GI bill.

The country's newspapers have been carrying front page stories which emphasize the tremendous cost of this program and how a great part of the funds is being wasted.

Last week President Truman called upon Congress to enact legislation which would eliminate fraud on the part of schools where veterans are training under the GI bill. He specifically called for strict control on the part of the VA to stop the belated growth of certain types of training where the veteran is being exploited at the cost of the taxpayer.

Certainly, the time has come to call a halt to fly-by-night schools whose chief interest is to rake in tuition fees from the Government without giving the veterans honest value in return.

In fact, such action should have been taken when the GI educational program was initiated.

From the standpoint of the DAV, however, current publicity regarding these abuses is detrimental and entirely unjust. The impression given the public in these reports is that all veteran training at Government expense is poorly managed and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

No mention is made of Public Law 16, the DAV law which is restricted solely to the training and education of disabled veterans. Training under this law is closely supervised by the VA, thereby eliminating graft and corruption on the part of the schools. Veterans are given vocational advisement, thus making it reasonably certain they are suited for the type of training contemplated.

Although press reports do not exonerate the Public Law 16 program from the general abuses of the GI bill, they cite cost figures which include all veteran education and training under both laws. Certainly this is not a fair or accurate report of the vocational rehabilitation program for disabled veterans.

In his recent report, Gray stated that the cost to the Federal Government for subsistence, tuition, equipment, books, and supplies under the GI bill has already exceeded $8,715,000,000. The press has done quite a job in emphasizing this tremendous cost but have failed to mention the comparatively small cost and lack of abuses under Public Law 16 training.

The entire cost of Public Law 16 since its beginning has been $1,000,000,000. In other words, Public Law 16 has cost the Government only one-ninth as much as the GI bill training.

These are facts the American public should know before condemning the entire veteran educational program.

Fifty States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the New York Times, of February 26, 1950, entitled "Fifty States":

FIFTY STATES

The question of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood is due to come before the House again this week. A bill to give statehood to Hawaii passed the House in 1947, and ever since then there has been considerable talk but no action. It seems to be indisputable that the bulk of the population of both territories wishes them to become States; the platforms of both major parties endorse the idea, differing only in degree of immediacy, and the historical development of the United States assuredly leads in this direction.

Although Alaska's population is only about 100,000 (of whom approximately two-thirds were born in the United States), there are more people in the area today than there were in at least a dozen of the continental territories at the time they became States of the Union. As for Hawaii, its 520,000 inhabitants are far more heterogeneous than those of Alaska; but even at that, almost 90 percent are American citizens, and the House report accompanying the statehood bill observes: "Certainly there is no area under United States jurisdiction where a greater complexity of races live so harmoniously."

The major objection in recent years to bringing either of these areas into the Union is the fact that they are not contiguous to the continental United States. Alaska is separated from this country by 870 miles of Canadian territory; Hawaii is 2,400 miles distant from the nearest point on the American mainland. This consideration would surely have been important in another era. But both Territories are less than 24 hours' flight from New York today, and thus they are actually far nearer in travel time than New York was to Boston when the Union was founded. With the annihiliation of distance there has likewise been annihilated the argument, based on distance, against statehood for these two areas, otherwise fully qualified to be integral parts of the Union.

Little Business and Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Industrial News Review:

LITTLE BUSINESS AND BIG GOVERNMENT

Nation's Business recently ran an article by Henry C. Link, of the Psychological Corporation, dealing with a survey made among little business to find out what this section of our industrial economy thinks of big business.

One of the questions was: "Would you rather compete with a private company (large or small) or with a Government corporation?" Ninety-two percent replied that they would rather compete with a private company, as against a mere 4 percent favoring a Government-owned business. The remaining 4 percent didn't know.

Another question asked: "Which, if any, of the following has produced the most difficult problems for your business: large companies, labor unions, Government bureaus, other small companies?" When the answers were tabulated, it was found that 58 percent said the Government bureaus had produced the toughest problems. Large companies and labor unions followed, with but 20 percent each.

It is clear from this that the smaller businesses of the country now realize that supergovernment is the worst menace they face—and that, though competition with other business may be difficult, to compete with Government is virtually impossible. Government has every advantage, it is free from taxes, regulation, and legislation that applies to other business. It makes laws to suit itself.

The people can control big business or little business. They can't control big government. It can hamstring and dominate all business, regardless of size.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the President of the United States by Hon. Adam Frick, of Portsmouth, Ohio:

DECEMBER 28, 1949.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT: Vacations are over. You are about to impress upon the National Congress factors which, without, will not be best for the general welfare of our Commonwealth. These, I am certain, you have in mind. This has been done annually, embracing the events written in the Nation's history.

Notwithstanding that this has been done regularly, there are practices that have grown up—maybe not intentionally—which operate to the harm of a group of our people whose contribution to our welfare has been immeasurable. I speak of our farm folk.

It would be impossible for a young man to encumber himself with an obligation such as necessary to the payment of a family-sized farm essential to finance current living standards in this era of our advanced civilization, which makes necessary the family automobile, the telephone, the refrigerator, the hot bath, electric pump, the tractor, the combine, the corn harvester, and all these delightful conveniences, arising out of countless profitable, industrial enterprises, with a profit motive as their objective, without a very substantial compensating increase from our agriculture, to finance all of these modern devices. Therefore, the migration of the rural youth from the farm to the rapidly increasing industrial centers. Of course, the propagandists of the press and radio and the bureaucrats who feed on statistics which arise out of crop juggling make believe that food supplies are overabundant, and that the huge quantities make for lower prices, while every other thing advances. That's no answer to the millions underfed in this Republic, with soil resources depleted; forcing crop yields per acre far beyond the physical resources of our less acres, at the moment, with population increasing by the millions annually.

There remains a solution to these out-of-balance conditions, so that there may be anchored at our farms, greater numbers than at the moment, that food for the starving millions may not decrease. Let that be a very important part of your annual message to the Congress. The few farmers are infinitely unable to cope with

the millions off the farms, in the hope of any relief, without Government intervention. Stop gambling in farmers' commodities and there will be little need of any other kind of farm program. If supply and demand really have any value in our national welfare, we better have a larger supply of farm folk, and that real soon. Keep these factors in mind in compiling your message to the Congress on the state of the Nation. Now a happy New Year.

Very truly,

ADAM FRICK.

Sugar Production for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for the consideration of the Congress a resolution which would raise the annual raw-sugar-production quota for Puerto Rico from 910,000 tons to 1,150,000 tons. My purpose in introducing this measure is to alleviate unemployment in the island, to eliminate the ever-recurring annual accumulations of burdensome surplus stocks of sugar and create extra income, which is so sorely needed.

Many of my colleagues in this Chamber today have visited Puerto Rico. I am sure they shared in the same general impression there. They were struck with Puerto Rico's magnificent beauty—the green, rolling hills reaching up toward the blue, sun-filled sky, the gorgeous splendor of exotic tropical flowers and rushing surf scampering over the golden sands of the beaches which nearly surround the island.

Another spectacle of beauty in Puerto Rico are the leafy fingers of the green sugarcane, forever waving and swaying in the breezes which blow constantly from the sea. These sugar fields are in abundant evidence wherever one travels in Puerto Rico. They have much more significance than their pleasant appeal to the eye. For they represent Puerto Rico's lifeblood—its one-crop economy—upon which Puerto Rico depends for a living. Without sugar there would be no work in the island. Upon sugar, to the near exclusion of everything else, Puerto Rico stakes its economic lot.

Many have asked me why my people put all of their eggs in one basket and all their fields in sugar. I am asked why there is not more truck gardening done and a diversified crop program. As a matter of fact, we do try, insofar as is economically feasible, to raise some foodstuffs for ourselves, but we are exceedingly limited in our opportunities in this respect. First of all, Puerto Rico is just 35 miles wide and a hundred miles long. That gives us only 3,500 square miles, a large part of which is untillable—a great deal of it, mountains.

Completely dependent upon this little dot of land in the Caribbean are nearly 2,225,000 people. Puerto Rico is one of the most densely populated areas in the world. The crowded conditions there have been described this way:

If all the people in the world should come to the United States, there would be here a density of population roughly comparable to that which now prevails in Puerto Rico where there are 625 people per square mile. Since Puerto Rico's is almost entirely an agricultural economy, the burden placed upon the land in supporting so many people is great and stands in the way of efforts to raise living standards.

Since Puerto Rico's only resources are the tillable soil, the climate, and the muscle of its toiling people, it becomes urgently necessary to use every inch of land with full consideration as to what the total dollar yield of that land will be. We have found only two ways of getting a greater dollar yield from the land. One way is to plant sugar cane. The other is to industrialize.

We have planted sugar cane for hundreds of years and we are just now starting to use some of the land for factories. We hope some day to have enough factories in Puerto Rico to solve most of our economic and social ills. Meanwhile, we must depend on sugar.

The result of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that Puerto Rico must import almost all of its food; nearly all of its clothing; and practically everything else it uses. These imports come from the United States in the form of cash purchases.

Unfortunately, Puerto Rico does not enjoy a favorable balance of trade with the mainland. Puerto Rico buys much more than it is able to sell. In 1947–1948, for example, purchases from the mainland amounted to $337,255,714, while Puerto Rico sold to the mainland goods amounting to $185,745,350. That $151,000,000 difference between these two figures has to be made up. Toward this end, some of the difference is made up by tourists traveling to Puerto Rico; some of it is made up by reason of the military forces stationed in Puerto Rico; some of it is made up by reason of various Federal services officed and operating in Puerto Rico; some of it comes from veteran benefits due our boys serving or having served under the colors, but it is an ever-present and always serious problem.

Mr. Speaker, because we live with this problem and are always keenly and consciously aware of it, we, in Puerto Rico, believe we should be permitted to more fully utilize our three natural resources of climate, muscle, and soil.

We are engaged in an all-out endeavor to help ourselves as much as we can. This we have called our Operation Bootstrap. We should like to raise and market, for domestic consumption, a quota of sugar more nearly in line with our ability to produce. This would be part of a correspondent Operation Boost from the Federal end.

When the Sugar Act of 1948 was enacted, the other domestic areas were assigned quotas for sugar production which reflected closely their ability to produce, or even better. Puerto Rico, on the other hand, was given a quota below its ability to produce.

The purpose of my resolution is to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 so as to correct this situation.

The amendment would increase Puerto Rico's quota by a net amount of 240,000 short tons annually. This would not in any way affect the quotas or production shares of other domestic areas, nor quotas agreed upon by treaty.

The present Sugar Act was adopted in 1947. During the previous year, under rationing, sugar consumption in the mainland, was under 6,000,000 tons. During 1947, when rationing was lifted, consumption was 7,448,000 tons, and for 1948, it was 7,343,000 tons. But in 1949, sugar consumption increased to 7,500,000 tons and the estimate for 1950 is again 7,500,000 tons. There is an evident tendency to increase. This fact, in itself, makes it appropriate now to reexamine and redetermine Puerto Rico's share under the domestic sugar production quotas.

This is an urgent matter to Puerto Rico. It would represent an additional income to the island of $25,000,000 per year. Twenty-five million dollars in Puerto Rico, where the only important disease comes from slow starvation, would mean 90 pounds of rice for every person in the island—rice purchased in Louisiana, Arkansas, or California. Twenty-five million dollars would represent additional purchasing power which would be exercised in the United States, thereby accruing to the economic advantage of the mainland worker, the mainland manufacturer, and the mainland farmer in Maine, New York, Illinois, California, Louisiana, Florida, and all the other States where Puerto Rico goes shopping. As it is, Puerto Rico's annual purchases from the mainland have been estimated to give permanent jobs the year around to 200,000 workers in the mainland.

Twenty-five million dollars of additional purchasing power for Puerto Rico is also a matter of direct concern to the mainland taxpayer. For Puerto Ricans would never be allowed by their fellow citizens of the mainland to starve. If we are unable or we are prevented from earning our livelihood, relief would certainly be forthcoming at the expense of the mainland taxpayer.

You see, Mr. Speaker, there is no American interest, whatsoever, which would be harmed in any way through the enactment of what I here propose. On the contrary, there are many classes of Americans who would benefit as a direct result of what I advocate. I hope that the Congress both assembled, and in the working commitees, will see fit to give this resolution prompt and favorable consideration and to speed it through the legislative machinery to early enactment.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial entitled "Progress on Civil Rights," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of February 27, 1950. The views expressed by this outstanding newspaper must strike a responsive note in the thinking of all those who believe that fair employment practices can be brought about by education and not by compulsion.

PROGRESS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

As we see it passage of a voluntary fair employment practices bill by the House of Representatives is a progressive step. It points the way to the kind of compromise measure which is not only most feasible politically but most likely to achieve real results in lessening discrimination.

The radicals on both sides of this question will disagree with our view. Those who believe they can establish social equality by passing a law denounce this measure as mere advice and toothless. Those who believe they can dam the tide of national conscience rising against discrimination denounce it as an entering wedge of Federal interference.

Fortunately neither extremist group can reasonably claim to represent the American people. Fortunately discussion of this subject promises to weaken both camps by showing how impracticable their positions are. Further debate should also help to hammer out workable legislation which will have a good chance of accomplishing progressive measures of reform.

The achievement of open debate was one of the hopeful things about the action in the House. For weeks opponents of FEPC have tried to block a vote, and in the process have blocked debate. Much of the debate on Wednesday was mere maneuver or emotion, but in the long night session and in final consideration of the McConnell bill and the various amendments tacked onto it the House came much closer to genuine study of the problem.

Another hopeful feature was that there were splits on both sides. Some of these were over strategy. One group of Dixiecrats accepted a voluntary FEPC as a means of avoiding a compulsory one. Others rejected it as a breach in the wall. For the same reasons—in reverse—the advocates of compulsion divided. Some regarded the McConnell bill as worse than nothing, others as a means of keeping the issue alive. But some of the divisions which drew from advocates and opponents of a compulsory plan enough votes to pass a voluntary plan may be credited to a growing appreciation of the merits of moderation.

Should the Senate now filibuster the McConnell bill to death, it will be clear that moderation still has a long way to go. But the House vote came on top of two other recent evidences of some softening of opinion in both parties. The new Republican policy statement retreats very definitely from the 1948 platform demand for a compulsory FEPC. And President Truman, who has been the outstanding Democratic advocate, has twice taken pains to declare that he does not want an FEPC which will deprive a citizen of the right to run his own business.

So much could be done by the methods of education, conciliation, and publicity provided in the House bill that the enemies of discrimination should be willing to try it. So much needs to be done that opponents of compulsion should welcome this better way.

World Federal Government Is the Way to National Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Stars and Stripes published in Washington had a very interesting front-page editorial in its issue of February 23 entitled "National Suicide." I commend it to all Members and especially to my colleagues who have introduced world-government resolutions:

NATIONAL SUICIDE

It has been nearly 3 months since this veterans' spokesman has commented on the several proposals being advanced to form a world government and, since, we have tried to show that its formation and American participation in it would mean the loss of our own constitutional freedoms, but the suggested monstrosity has gained startling headway, and we deem it essential to discuss it further and to issue another warning to our countrymen that the thing is an ever-present danger that must be scotched as would be a poisonous reptile.

When we last wrote about the question in December, there were known to be more than 700 chapters in this Nation composed of people who were engaged in trying to set up a superworld state in which we would lose our identity and have but 1 lone voice in shaping its conduct. There are doubtless many more such groups now, and, believe it or not, they are made up of reputable businessmen, educators, economists, and statesmen, all earnestly bent on preserving the peace, or, at least, they think they are. Over a period of years, 22 State legislatures had memorialized the Congress to express itself for a world union to supersede the United Nations, and 13 Senators and 96 Representatives had subscribed to resolutions that would mean the end of United States sovereignty.

Whether it has been because of our loss by treachery of the secret of atom bombs, or the new hydrogen bomb development, or by just plain skulduggery, we are not prepared to say, but the movement has gained momentum. Although the State of Georgia has reversed itself and the New York Legislature refused to pass upon the deal, some 40 Senators have indicated they are now for it, and a total of 111 House Members are enmeshed. Not only that, but a Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations has been holding hearings on the suggested world union for some time. In a sense we are glad of that, because witnesses for the proposition have been found to be so much at odds with each other over the form a world federation should take that the fallacies of the whole business are beginning to rise to the top like the fat on a mess of cold broth. Only last week it developed startlingly that well-intentioned Congressmen, who have sponsored supporting resolutions because they are greatly disturbed about unfolding world conditions and are desperately anxious to seek peaceful solutions, are riding the crest of a wave without knowing what is causing the disturbance. Therefore, we feel that they should once more be told what the Nation's veterans know about this matter and how they feel about it.

There are four principal groups and several lesser ones that advocate the one-government world that is being proposed to the Congress in one form or another. These are, foremost, the international Communists who are working skillfully all over the globe to bring about a world empire over which they can rule and in which freedom-loving peoples will have no part. With perhaps a couple of exceptions, no Congressman would knowingly support such a group, but many are doing it unwittingly. Then there is the Federal union or union-now movement, headed by a left-wing former Rhodes scholar, and it has an appreciable backing. A citizens' committee for United Nations reform would pursue similar objectives, including establishment of a world police force with exclusive possession of the atomic bomb to keep our citizenry in order. The World Government Association, Inc., composed of numerous prominent Americans, is another that is dissatisfied with our form of self-rule and believes it to be decadent, and there are more, but the largest, the most potent, and best organized is the United World Federalists, Inc., with a list of officers that reads like Who's Who and includes, among the great, United States Senators.

When sounding off to the uninitiated, and while claiming the support of those 150 or so Members of Congress who have introduced or have added their names to pending resolutions, they talk "peace" as their only objective. However, their own literature gives the lie to it. They say that their movement is the way to avoid war and preserve American independence, but their printed words spell out entirely the loss of nationalism as we know it. It admits frankly, if one will but read, that its members while endorsing the United Nations, will work to "transform it into a world federal government." That is the absolute minimum objective, its adherents say.

United World Federation, in brief—and these are their own words—is designed to replace the United States Government and all others with a single union having a common set-up for defense, a joint foreign policy, a single postal system, unified trade relations, a uniform currency and what not, but it puts the blinders on the American people by stating, "This is the only way to bring about peace." Stripped of deceptive and confusing language, every one of these schemes are naked attempts to scrap the American Constitution, bring about the surrender of our national sovereignty and our right to plot our own course in the world. They would alter our social and economic systems. Clearly, they seek the ceding of all powers of government to a superstate in which this country could have but one lone vote and would be controlled by aliens.

The UWF goes so far as to propose that once the United States of America goes into the United World Federation, it can never get out. Its objectives could not be more ruinous, if they were written by Joe Stalin himself.

It is pointed out that some of the major veterans' organizations have passed resolutions which look to a strengthening of the United Nations. They wish to have the much-abused veto power abolished and add to the effectiveness of the World Court. Some have sought control of armaments and of atomic energy, and even a world police force under proper direction. These were high-minded ideals purposed to pre-

serve American institutions and entailing no loss of sovereignty, but the One Worlders say "me too" and point out that these things are just what they desire, but without adding that they ultimately look ahead to something far more patent. These say that even the President is with them because he said, in 1945, that the world is no longer county-size, no longer State-size, no longer Nation-size. They know that Mr. Truman was speaking for support of the UN, but they are adept at twisting phrases to their own use, so they praise the vision of the Chief Executive, of the veterans' organizations and of every sucker on the long list of subscribers who have loaned their good names to a proposition that would sell down the river every cherished American institution, every freedom that is held dear by our people and every incentive this Nation has ever had, which led our youth to shed their blood and die, if need be, to protect our independence.

This is a vicious thing that faces our beloved America, all suggested in the name of peace. Already our citizens have paid dearly in money, in goods, and in blood to preserve the things in which we believe and for which we have sacrificed through the ages. The far-fetched proposals now being discussed are doubtless intended by some to save what is left of democratic processes, but they can no more work than partial communism could be successful. That is doubtless why they are supported strongly by every fuzzy-minded incompetent with head in the clouds and opposed by realists. It is the answer to the favorable propaganda of every left-wing newspaper and periodical in print, and it is why those who have faith in American concepts of freedom are found in the opposing columns. If the people of this land would preserve their present way of life, they will fight world government with all they have. If the veterans of the country do not make an issue of it, they will be breaking faith with their honored dead. Democracy and tyranny cannot yoke up and pull as a team. Every sensible person wants world peace as a reality, but seeking it by surrender of sovereign rights can mean nothing but national suicide.

New Effort To Squander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Leader and Arkansawyer, Stuttgart, Ark., for July 25, 1949:

NEW EFFORT TO SQUANDER

Another effort to squander millions of dollars in American taxpayers' money is before Congress at the present time. It is the request of the Southwest Power Administration for millions in funds to build power lines paralleling lines of privately owned, tax-paying utilities.

Down in Texas the SPA has an arrangement by which an electric company transports power generated at a Government dam to SPA customers. By using the electric company's lines, tax money is not spent for duplicating SPA lines at public expense. The contract between the electric company and SPA is a modern example of Government and business working together.

In Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Louisiana, and Mississippi—States in which the SPA also plans to expand its public-power system—the electric companies have offered to enter into a contract to do the same thing the Texas company is doing, transmit SPA power over their lines for the federally supported agency.

For several years SPA held the Texas contract up as a model, saying it wanted to work out such a plan in its other States. But now it appears that SPA has changed its mind. It doesn't want to use power company lines, but asks for millions of dollars from Congress to build duplicating power lines.

A Senate committee has reported that SPA should go ahead and work out a contract with the power companies to use their lines to haul its power from Government dams to its customers, the co-ops, municipalities, and others, who are given preference for the power.

If SPA were sincere when it said that the Texas contract is a good one, it should do as the Senate committee recommends and not seek to waste millions in tax funds for duplicating lines. In fact, the Senate and Congress shouldn't let it waste funds, and it is to be hoped the Arkansas delegation will help see to it that this is the result of pending congressional action.

Fair Employment Practices Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a moral question involving the dignity of the human being is the underlying cause of the problems facing the world today. I find this same question in the major issues confronting the Eighty-first Congress.

It is apparent to me that the reason for our existence on this earth is being bypassed and forgotten. We are here to serve God and our fellowmen. Our courageous founding fathers, in establishing on this North American Continent, a new Nation, realized and gave recognition to the moral law. They founded a Government which is the only one in the world today which recognizes the dignity of the human being, his civil, his social, and his spiritual rights.

Our Declaration of Independence clearly sets forth our duties as citizens of these United States in these words:

That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

To preserve these priceless principles, as trustees for our posterity, we must strengthen and support by Government action, legislation that will enforce these principles.

In this second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we have been called on to exert our powers to insure the rights of all our people in the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. This has been given the title of the civil-rights program. I support this program. For this reason, I voted against the McConnell amendment to the Fair Employment Practices bill. That this amendment was passed by the House by a vote of 221 to 178 is now history. I voted against the motion to recommit this bill because I knew that if such a motion carried, there would be no fair employment practices legislation enacted. When the vote on the final passage of this bill was taken, I voted for it. I did so in an effort to keep this measure alive, knowing that the bill would be referred to the Senate for action by that body. Had I voted against the final passage of this bill, it would have been a vote to kill FEPC for the session with no hope of reviving it until the next Congress. It was a poor alternative, but it was the only alternative.

Despite the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats, I feel that great strides have been made toward the enactment of a Fair Employment Practices Act. This measure is now before the people of the United States in this congressional election year.

Carrier "Leyte" Conversion Job Belongs in Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of February 23, 1950:

CARRIER "LEYTE" CONVERSION JOB BELONGS IN BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

The controversy over where the Navy's big carrier *Leyte* is to be converted—modernized and refitted to handle bigger planes—is important to Brooklyn. If the job is sent to the Norfolk Navy Yard instead of the Brooklyn Navy Yard thousands of Brooklynites face the loss of their jobs.

The work force at the Brooklyn Navy Yard has already been drastically cut as a result of last year's economy slashes. Brooklynites accepted the lay-offs at that time because they were necessary. But unnecessary dismissals, made solely because work that would normally be done in the Brooklyn yard is sent elsewhere, would be intolerable.

The Brooklyn Navy Yard should have its fair share of work. It has been described as the largest and best-equipped shipyard in the world. Its valuable equipment, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, should not be allowed to go to waste. What remains of its skilled force of technicians should not be cast adrift to disappear into other industries and other communities. They may be badly needed some day.

Among those battling to have the *Leyte* job assigned to Brooklyn is Local 43 of the A. F. of L. Boilermakers Brotherhood. Among the cogent arguments they make is that assignment of the job to Norfolk would mean a great deal of added expense to outfit the Norfolk yard to handle the big job. On the other hand, as the union points out, the Brooklyn yard is preeminently well equipped

for the job and has had two similar carrier conversions from which to gain all-important experience and know-how.

We are glad to support the local in its drive. We take it for granted that the full delegation of Brooklyn's Congressmen will do everything in their power to bring the *Leyte* conversion job to our local yard where it belongs.

Fearful Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Fearful Dilemma," which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News on Tuesday, February 28, 1950:

FEARFUL DILEMMA

Senator MURRAY, prolabor Montana Democrat, thinks there are only two ways to achieve lasting peace in the coal industry:

1. Nationalization: Government purchase and permanent operation of the mines.

2. Government control of coal production.

Neither way, Senator MURRAY concedes, could end the present crisis quickly. And Senator MORSE, prolabor Oregon Republican, asserts that nationalization would be a bad mistake; a step down the road to state socialism.

So it would be, and a long step. Government control of coal production would be a shorter step toward the same destination, one which most Americans do not want to reach.

But the country's need for coal is now desperate. And in and out of Congress, many are saying that if John L. Lewis and the mine owners do not agree, and if the miners continue to defy the Taft-Hartley Act injunction, the Government must seize and operate the mines.

Then what? Congress can give the Government seizure power. It cannot, under the Constitution, give the Government power to make individual miners work in involuntary servitude.

The Government might induce the miners to work by confiscating all profits from seized mines and by negotiating a contract with Mr. Lewis on his terms, as it has done before.

That, however, would make a lasting solution for the coal industry's grave problems more difficult to find. And at least some mine owners might be unwilling or unable to take back and operate their properties on Mr. Lewis' terms. So the Government could find itself in permanent possession of coal mines and traveling to state socialism.

Here, then, is a fearful dilemma, with no apparent good way out. And nobody is helping to find a way out by gloating, as some are, or by mourning, as others are, that existing law in the form of the Taft-Hartley Act has been tried and has failed to protect the country.

The Taft-Hartley Act authorizes Federal court injunctions as a method of halting or delaying strikes that imperil or threaten to imperil national health and safety—of providing time for efforts to promote peaceful settlements. In the present coal strike that method has not been fairly tried.

First, for many months, President Truman, Senator MURRAY, and others encouraged disrespect for and defiance of the Taft-Hartley Act by denouncing it in terms almost as violent and farfetched as those used by Mr. Lewis and other professional union leaders.

Then, long after the coal strike obviously menaced national health and safety, Mr. Truman refused to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. He waited until the country was almost out of coal and the crisis was full blown.

Mr. Truman waited too long. Mr. Truman, not the Taft-Hartley Act, has failed to protect the country.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on behalf of Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, New York City, October 31, 1949:

I am happy indeed to be addressing my fellow citizens of the State of New York on behalf of HERBERT H. LEHMAN, the candidate of the Democratic Party for the unexpired term in the United States Senate which was created by the resignation of Senator Robert F. Wagner. Our party is presenting to the voters for election to the great office of Senator one of its most distinguished sons, Governor LEHMAN.

When the voters 5 years ago reelected Senator Wagner, they decided between the parties, and they elected a Democrat to serve the 6-year term for which Senator Wagner was running. In ordinary course that Senatorial place would not have been contested again until next year. However, by reason of ill health Senator Wagner lately had to give up the office he had so honored. At the moment the incumbent in his position is a Republican, appointed interim Senator by a Republican governor to fill a place for which the voters had selected a Democrat. It is now time to reaffirm that party choice the voters made when they elected Senator Wagner, and in my judgment they are going to reaffirm it when they elect HERBERT H. LEHMAN United States Senator on November 8.

People everywhere are watching this contest. Our party could have made no better choice of candidate than HERBERT LEHMAN. He stands in the front ranks of leaders of our party in this State and in this Nation. For a high office that calls for many qualities of head and heart Governor LEHMAN is ideally suited.

The people of this State know Governor LEHMAN well, for 14 years, first as lieutenant governor and then for 10 years as governor, he became known, and favorably known, to every citizen of New York. During most of that time I was State chairman of my party, and in that position I had to deal with all groups and people interested in the affairs of the State. I had a chance to learn from them the good will they had toward HERBERT LEHMAN.

I have spoken of Governor LEHMAN'S 14 years of service in high State office. There are few records that approach his, either for length of service or quality of service. First, as lieutenant governor, when he took an important part in the administration headed by Governor Roosevelt, and later, as governor, when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, HERBERT LEHMAN got very deeply into the affairs and into the hearts of millions of people. He learned the problems of our State, which are the kind of problems that constantly must be in the mind of a United States Senator from New York.

New York is a great agricultural State, and Governor LEHMAN by zeal and hard work became a useful and effective champion of the farmers' position.

The period of Governor LEHMAN'S official term was a period of problems and of progress. The harsh realities of the great depression, and some older evils, were problems with which he was at grips daily. Thus, the HERBERT LEHMAN who will take office as United States Senator next January will be the same man who has shown us New Yorkers what he is for in the field of labor and social legislation. When he was governor these are the things he fought for:

A minimum-wage law for women and children.

An anti-injunction law in labor disputes.

Extension of the workmen's compensation law to cover all occupational diseases.

An act requiring jury trials in labor-injunction-contempt proceedings.

A law compelling payment of prevailing wage rates on public works.

A 40-hour, 5-day week for public-works contracts.

A law raising the age limit at which children could leave school and go to work.

An act to regulate industrial homework.

A law to abolish the "yellow dog" contract.

A law declaring that the labor of human beings was not a commodity.

Legislation in most of these matters is now in effect and you may be used to them. But the point I am making is that these laws were not in effect when HERBERT LEHMAN first took office. They are things for which he fought, and fought hard, against a hostile Republican legislature. Due to his persistence, and to the ratifying votes from the people of this State, the goals he set were reached.

I repeat—these things we now accept. But we must not forget that the man who was largely responsible for their acceptance in this State is the man who is now the Democratic candidate for United States Senator. His record affords impressive examples of what he is disposed to do and is able to do.

The period of the thirties was a period of improvement in the position of organized labor. In the early thirties many of the unions which are now vigorous were very weak. Some of the unions now most active in our community life did not event exist. Then came the Federal legislation sponsored by the Democratic Party, the Wagner Act. That act was the Magna Carta of labor. For the first time workers were really free to choose who should represent them in unfettered collective bargaining. At the same time the Federal act was adopted, we in New York, under the leadership of HERBERT LEHMAN, adopted the little Wagner Act, which deals with labor problems within the State. Our little Wagner Act stands on the books today practically as it was written. It is interesting to note that the men whom Governor LEHMAN appointed to the New York State Labor Relations Board managed its affairs so ably that one heard very little of the complaints and bickering that were commonly heard about the operations of the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, here in the State of New York we had under the leadership of Governor LEHMAN wise administration of far-reaching labor laws.

Sometimes when a politician interests himself as deeply as Governor LEHMAN has in labor, extension of social services, and agricultural problems, it is thought that he must necessarily be disinterested in or hostile to business. However, this unique man, who

spent the early part of his life in active business, has always found loyal supporters in the ranks of business and has never been accused of being a business baiter. He is too hard-headed and too wise to indulge in senseless sniping at the economic system which has produced great results in this country. He knows that our business system, soundly run, is the productive machine whence came the other benefits which I have just mentioned.

Governor LEHMAN is to be preferred over his opponent, therefore, by reason of much broader and sustained experience. He knows the affairs of every town and county in this State. He knows where the interests of those towns and counties mesh with the Federal Government. In the Senate he will be outstanding for his knowledge of local problems.

In the field of foreign affairs, so much the concern nowadays of the United States Senate, Governor LEHMAN is widely experienced. As Administrator of UNRRA he gained the world viewpoint. He was in many countries. He worked on countless problems. He advised and counseled with many people in many lands. His qualifications in this field are unique and distinguished. It is argued that his opponent is well qualified in this field, too, and I do not gainsay it. But competence in the foreign field is only a part of what we ask in a United States Senator. Our domestic problems need attention, too. No one can seriously dispute my statement that in the great domestic field Governor LEHMAN is infinitely better qualified than his opponent. He is closer to the people and has been closer to the people for many years than has his opponent, whose activities have been in other fields.

In my judgment over the last two decades the Democratic Party has at all times taken the lead in legislation and in administrative action leading to improvement in the life of all of us. Not everything that we have tried or have done has been perfectly done. But we have been trying, and trying hard, to promote the general welfare. We have not spent our time wringing our hands and moaning, saying "No, no, I wouldn't do this. No, no, I wouldn't do that. This is bad and that is bad."

In the 1948 election many people were surprised that President Truman was elected and that the Democratic Party was given another mandate of power. There was one factor operating that many forgot, the economic factor. At the time of the 1948 election economic conditions, while not perfect, were very good. That unquestionably had its effect on the election. In my judgment the average American decided in his own interest to make no change in the national administration because he thought it was doing a good job.

On that basis I think New York next week should elect a Democratic Senator, a supporter of the national administration which was approved last year by the voters. After all, we in New York number 10 percent of the people of the United States, and it seems inconsistent that we now have no Senator representing us who is a member of the national party which has so lately received the approval of the voters. Governor LEHMAN will immediately take a high place in the councils of our party in the Senate. His wisdom and experience, his strength and his humane attitudes, will be welcomed by his colleagues.

I have just returned from a long business trip abroad. In the few days I have had at home I have learned with satisfaction that HERBERT LEHMAN will be supported at the polls on November 8 by all the strong legions that have elected him so many times before. He deserves well of the State which he has served well. I am confident when the voters have thought things over, and have weighed the experience and character that this great New Yorker possesses, they will overwhelmingly elect him United States Senator.

Before I conclude my broadcast, may I say to those who may be listening that I am very much interested in the election of Supreme Court Justice Charles W. Froessel to the office of associate justice of the court of appeals. Justice Froessel has had a long and fine career before the bar and as a justice of the supreme court has made a most enviable record. He is well and favorably known throughout the State in fraternal and communal circles and his great host of friends, like myself, who know him intimately can testify to his worth, ability, and fitness for the high office for which he has been nominated by the Democratic Party. Let me say to those who may be listening to me that I am just as much interested in the election of Judge Froessel as I am in the election of former GOV. HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

The Politics of the Rules Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, public discussion of the operations and authority of the House of Representatives Committee on Rules has become so enmeshed among such glib phrases as "power grab" and "undemocratic" that I feel it highly worth while that some light be shed on the subject.

I doubt that any issue in recent years has been so misunderstood and misrepresented. There were two main reasons why I decided to vote to restore the rules which had been effective in the House for many years.

One. The most decisive influence on me was the question of whether we are going to make an effort to balance our national budget, or whether we would continue the "spendomania" which, I feel, will bankrupt our country unless it is halted.

Second. I had become increasingly convinced in the year that the change in rules had been in operation that the new method had not been properly thought out and had not proven successful.

To understand the importance of my first reason, we can examine the methods right in our California Legislature, where I had the honor to serve for 16 years. In Sacramento all spending bills reported out of standing committees must be sent to the ways and means committee. These measures are held up until the budget bill has been passed and signed by the governor. Then, in the wisdom of the ways and means committee, these bills are considered in light of ability to pay.

In Congress, bills authorizing expenditure of untold millions—even billions—of dollars are reported favorably by various committees. Only the Rules Committee had been set up to sift these bills, and its responsibility always has been to hold up measures which by their passage would upset the Government's financial condition.

Like the ways and means committee in Sacramento, the Rules Committee is the only body in the House which has an over-all view of the total cost of all proposed bills. No other committee can estimate accurately the effect of its legislation in relation to the total cost of all the measures reported by the other committees.

The so-called liberal rule instituted last year provided a way to bypass this check and bring out any bill some liberal-spending group wanted.

We must remember it was through watchdog tactics that the Rules Committee during the Eightieth Congress saved the taxpayers an estimated $14,000,000,000 in expenditures and balanced the budget for the first time since 1930. Funds were made available for the first time since that year to reduce our national debt.

When I voted for a return to the pre-1949 rules, I felt they must have had considerable merit. They were set up by the Democratic majority in the House in 1931, and served the purposes of the entire Roosevelt administration and Mr. Truman's first term, which included the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. They were satisfactory for 18 years. However, the 1948 Truman victory margin did not appear enough to administration strategists to push through their entire program. To strengthen their position, Truman forces enlarged the various committees and put the balance of committee power into the hands of Fair Deal supporters.

Then they pushed through the House, without permitting debate, a rule to let any committee chairman move a bill to the floor without clearance by the Rules Committee. This action may be taken at any time 21 days after the Rules Committee had received the bill; hence the name, "21-day rule."

The controversy concerning repeal of the 21-day rule and the restoration of the pre-1949 rules unfortunately centered around the Fair Employment Practices Commission legislation. It was said that since southern Democrats had heavy representation on the Rules Committee, they would continue to block the FEPC bill. When the 21-day rule was adopted this was one of the arguments set forth by those who favored the rules change.

I am sorry to say that some outside criticism was based on a misunderstanding of the House rules. Let me give you an example of how lacking some people are in information about the methods of Congress—and, unfortunately, they have spoken the loudest.

There is an aspirant to Congress in my district in California who recently said:

> SCUDDER's vote with the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition was a vote against effective democratic government—with a small "d"—and would have given a majority of one committee of the House of Representatives the power to decide what issues would be brought before Congress for debate and vote.
>
> That gag-rule vote might have been the means of blocking the consideration of Central Valley project measures and other bills

of interest to California as well as the President's civil-rights program, against which it ostensibly was aimed.

This is a total misstatement of fact. The truth is that no committee of Congress—the Rules Committee or any other—can keep a majority of the House from exercising its will.

There are four methods in existence which insure the consideration of any important legislation.

The first method is the discharge petition: Any time 218 Members of the House—a majority—sign a petition, the bill they seek to consider must be brought to the House floor for a vote.

The second method is Calendar Wednesday: Every Wednesday the Clerk of the House calls the Committee Calendar, and any committee chairman who gains recognition when his turn comes may call up any bill in his committee without going through the Rules Committee.

The third method is suspension of the rules: Any Member may ask for suspension of the rules on any bill, and if two-thirds of the Members present vote to suspend the rules, the bill must be considered.

The fourth method is unanimous consent: Any Member may be recognized and ask unanimous consent to consider a bill. If there is no objection, the bill then may be considered. This admittedly is the most difficult method on a controversial measure, since a single objection suffices to block consideration.

Now let us see how the rules of the House—particularly with respect to the 21-day rule, which was sponsored to save the President's civil-rights program—have operated in recent weeks.

The FEPC bill became eligible to be called up under the 21-day rule in August 1949, but although Congress stayed in session until October 19 no effort was made by the Democratic leadership to do anything about FEPC. When Congress reconvened, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] announced that he would not recognize him and the 21-day rule proved valueless in that respect.

Now, under what method did the FEPC legislation finally pass?

Finding it impossible to get any results from the 21-day rule, the proponents of FEPC brought it up under Calendar Wednesday and the bill was passed, with amendments, on February 22 and 23.

In other words, the FEPC bill finally was considered under a method that has existed in the House for 41 years and would have continued to exist, completely intact, whether the former power of the Rules Committee had been restored or not.

Consider this: In 14 months only two bills have been called up for consideration through the 21-day method and in both cases four other methods were available to bring the bills to the floor without going through the Rules Committee.

If there was a power grab involved in the controversy over the House rules, the 21-day rule itself constitutes the grab. The 21-day rule gives the Speaker of the House a great deal more power over legislation, as evidenced by the fact that Mr. LESINSKI never did receive recognition by the Speaker under the 21-day rule to bring FEPC to the House floor.

The rules of the House are very complex and I blame no one unfamiliar with legislative procedure for failure to understand their intricacies, but it should be remembered that the House consists of 435 Members and that every Congress sees approximately 20,000 legislative measures introduced. The rules of the House have been built out of practice and experience and they have been designed to make it possible for the most important legislation to have priority.

When the rules are tampered with in order to gain certain political objectives or to promote pet measures, the American people are done a great disservice.

What is needed in Congress is more serious and better-informed students of government who will consider the welfare of the people as a whole, and not bow to pressure to upset a tested and tried system simply to gain a single objective.

I think the preservation of the financial soundness of our Government is far too important to risk in such a haphazard fashion. I shall follow the dictates of my conscience in these matters and the knowledge that I have gained in my more than 17 years as a legislator and a Congressman. I am always willing to subscribe to change when change is necessary and beneficial and I always have done so, but I shall never misrepresent, or falsify, or veil my efforts behind any method to achieve any goal.

We must remember that necessary rules on legislative procedure, many times restrictive, have been largely responsible for the success of our form of government.

Free Federal Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at the request of Eliot Blackwelder, chairman, Palo Alto chapter, Atlantic Union Committee, I am including herewith a petition from various interested citizens in Palo Alto, Calif.:

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *February 15, 1950.*

Being convinced that a union of the free democratic nations of the world offers the best hope of maintaining peace and preserving the world from subjugation by the Communists, we, the undersigned citizens of Palo Alto and vicinity, in California, request Congress to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 107–111, introduced in July 1949, which authorizes the President to invite the nations which sponsored the North Atlantic treaty to send delegates to a convention "to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union."

Mrs. David Starr Jordan; Mrs. Jean B. Blackwelder; Dr. Karl Brandt, economist, Food Research Institute, Stanford University; Russel V. Lee, M. D., director of the Palo Alto Clinic; Tom C. Christy, president of T. C. Christy Co.; Dr. I. James Quillen, professor of education, Stanford University; Mrs. Grace Gates Mitchell; Prof. Joseph J. Graham; Prof. George E. Osborne, professor of law, Stanford University; Mrs. Ethel Smith Dalmadge; Dr. George S. Parks, professor of chemistry, Stanford University; Mr. Gerald R. Dalmadge; Mrs. Anne Parks; Mrs. A. L. Bruce; Mrs. Dorothy B. Wiggins; Dr. Arthur D. Howard, professor of geology, Stanford University; Mr. Almon W. Copley, electrical engineer (retired); Mr. Ithiel de Sola Pool, Hoover War Library; Mrs. Barbara W. Law; Dr. Gordon F. Ferris, professor of entomology, Stanford University; Dr. Eliot Blackwelder, professor of geology (retired); Dr. Robert E. Swain, professor of chemistry (retired); Dr. Ira L. Wiggins, director of the Natural History Museum, Stanford University.

Farm Bureau Group Backs Taxation of Co-op's Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I herewith request publication of the following article, appearing in the Washington Daily News, wherein it is reported that the American Farm Bureau Federation has adopted a most commendable position relative to the taxation of part of the profits of farm cooperatives:

FARM BUREAU GROUP BACKS TAXATION OF CO-OPS' PROFITS

(By James Daniel)

The American Farm Bureau Federation favors Federal taxation of part of the profits of farm cooperatives.

Breaking ranks with other farm organization, the powerful federation told the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee it believed co-ops should pay income taxes on profits which they did not return or assign to their patrons.

Such a policy would affect approximately half of the Nation's 10,000 farm cooperatives. These are the co-ops which claim full statutory tax exemption, including the privilege of building up cash reserves not treated as the property of patrons.

Donald Kirkpatrick, chief counsel for the Farm Bureau Federation, said his organization was unalterably and aggressively opposed, however, to applying the Federal corporation tax to profits which were distributed or clearly assigned to patrons. Such profits, he said, were really rebates and belonged to the patrons.

The federation's testimony caused a stir among witnesses gathered here to oppose a drive by the National Tax Equality Associ-

ation to have all co-op profits taxed at the same rate as ordinary corporation earnings. This rate is 38 percent after $50,000.

Mr. Kirkpatrick told the Ways and Means Committee there was some dispute as to who represented co-op patrons, the regular farm organizations or the associations established by co-op managements. He said the Farm Bureau Federation had encouraged its members to organize hundreds of co-ops and consequently felt entitled to speak for co-op patrons as federation members.

The Farmers Union, meanwhile, sided with the co-op leadership in opposing any Federal taxation of cooperatives. A National Grange representative said that elimination of the tax exemption would yield little Federal revenue.

All co-op and farm organization witnesses contended that co-op profits paid out in cash or some form of script, such as stock or certificates of indebtedness, should not be taxed while in the possession of the co-ops.

Ordinary corporations pay Federal income taxes before dividends are paid to stockholders. Stockholders then pay an additional tax on their dividends as personal income. But farm witnesses said co-ops primarily were in competition with partnerships and single-owner businesses, which escape the so-called double taxation of corporation profits.

Representative WILBUR M. MILLS, Democrat of Arkansas, said he had heard that many farmers didn't report co-op dividends on their personal income-tax returns. He suggested co-ops might withhold 10 percent of each dividend. At the end of a year, he said, farmers could apply the tax withheld to their own income-tax payment, or claim a rebate if the amount of their income-tax liability didn't require the full credit.

Slaves of Speculation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, through the years I have protested at every opportunity against the system whereby speculators are permitted to manipulate prices of food and fiber produced by the farmers of this Nation.

Through the years, vast fortunes have been amassed by men who are known as market traders but who in reality are nothing more than glorified gamblers. As far as the farmers are concerned, these men play with loaded dice and stacked decks for they can whipsaw the markets regardless of the adversities that bear down heavily on the unprotected producer of the raw material of the farms.

It has always been rather amusing to hear the hue and cry that is raised when efforts are made to legalize various forms of gambling in the States, Nation, and local communities yet a full blast of public indignation has never been turned upon this sinister and legalized gambling as practiced on the various grain and commodity exchanges.

How long would the manufacturers of tractors, automobiles, combines, and other products which the farmer must buy continue to pile up huge profits if the selling price of these products were subject to a speculative market? As a matter of fact, how long would the manufacturers and retailers of these and other products stay in business at all if their prices were whipsawed up and down, day by day, by a bunch of gamblers?

Would not it be just as logical to establish a so-called congressional exchange here in Washington, D. C., and permit a bunch of gamblers and speculators to fix the wages of Representatives and Senators each day on the basis of alleged accomplishment in the matter of legislation?

The time is long past due for abolishment of this form of victimizing those who produce the new wealth of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the following excellent article on this subject which is taken from the recent annual report of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, which maintains general offices at St. Paul, Minn.:

Far from the land and untouched by the seasons men stand in vast halls where a farmer is seldom seen and play the role of the Fates. It is nature who spins the thread, making it thick or thin. But these men draw it out and cut it off. These are the speculators on the trading floors of the grain exchanges. With a move of the hand they send the price of the farmers' grain climbing high or crashing down.

Often the farmer's grain has not been planted, very often it has not been harvested, but the prices are already made. In no other business is there a comparable situation of price-setting by men who neither produce nor use the product.

The greatest of these temples of chance which set the farmer's price is the Chicago Board of Trade. Its monument to free trading is the $25,000,000, 44-story Board of Trade building. It is topped with a giant statue of Ceres, Goddess of Grain, who looks down on the stone and brick and the milling throngs in La Salle Street. This is what the profits from the farmer's grain built, as it also helped build Chicago. There are similar markets in Minneapolis, Duluth, Kansas City, and Omaha. But the greatest of all is Chicago's. Very little actual grain is handled in Chicago, but the Chicago Board of Trade accounts for more than 80 percent of all futures trading on all markets.

When the Chicago Grain Exchange was organized in 1848, there were no grain hedges or futures trading. It did not become a general practice until 1854. And it was not until 1884 that the Supreme Court established that contracts for future delivery were valid.

That was the period, too, of frenzied speculative corners. Some of the operations of the speculators in the 1880's and 1890's seem almost unbelievable now. In May of 1887, one grain clique announced it held 10,000,000 bushels of cash wheat and had 30,000,000 more for June delivery. In one day the trading exceeded 100,000,000 bushels. Losses were more than $8,000,000. In another operation, a group of speculators reported it held 45,000,000 bushels, while another had 30,000,000. In that hectic year about 15 Board of Trade firms failed.

In 1888 the most powerful operator on the board of trade made himself famous and millions of dollars by a corner in wheat. Ten years later another Chicago millionaire dropped $10,000,000 in an unsuccessful effort to achieve the same goal. A meat packer by the name of Armour proved his nemesis. Armour sold wheat short and used icebreakers to get boatloads of grain out of Duluth and into Chicago in December in time to fulfill his contracts.

What did all these speculative frenzies have to do with the farmer? Nothing. There was no tangible evidence that the farmer had ever benefited, but plenty that he had been harmed. The public was aroused. Congress investigated.

The farmer wondered, and as he wondered his anger rose. What kind of a business was this that could buy and sell a hundred times over the actual amount of grain that is harvested in the United States? In the biggest futures trading year in its history in 1925, the Chicago Board of Trade recorded transactions on 26,900,000,000 bushels of grain. In that year the farmer harvested less than 5,000,000,000 bushels of grain. During the depression the futures trading dropped to 10,000,000,000 bushels in 1932. But that was still more than double the total of all the grain grown in the United States that year.

In 1922 the Federal Government stepped in to regulate grain trading with the establishment of the Grain Futures Administration. In 1936 Congress passed the more stringent Commodity Exchange Act, which opened the doors of the grain exchanges to the farmer and his cooperative. The futures market is, in fact, a speculative market. The grain traders say that it is the heart of existing grain trade mechanism.

But is it a necessity or a luxury? The farmer still wonders. Nearly all of the grain exchanges outside of the United States already are partly or wholly closed. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange has been operating on "half-time" for many years.

The farmer knows that speculation is only one force among many that set the price cycles. But like any form of gambling, it opens the market to hysterical panics and booms. During periods of inflation it helps to force prices up to levels which the consumer cannot afford to pay. During periods of depression it helps to force prices down to a level which bankrupts the farmer. The farmer has a right to ask, "Is this necessary?"

The size of the farmer's monthly telephone bill is not determined by the price at which American Telephone & Telegraph stock is quoted on the New York Stock Exchange. Neither is the price of a Chevrolet truck set by trading in General Motors stock.

Yet, the price of wheat that goes into bread, the wool and cotton that goes into clothes, is determined in substantial part by the futures prices on the New York and Chicago exchanges. The consumer has a right to join with the farmer and ask, "Is this necessary?"

Surplus Food Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I am including a list of names and addresses of State offices in North and South Dakota which can approve applications of welfare agencies for surplus food for distribution to needy families. This supplements the lists submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Oregon

[Mr. ANGELL], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA

North Dakota: O. F. Beyer, area supervisor, 623 Wabash, Chicago, Ill.

South Dakota: Harold S. Freeman, State superintendent of public instruction, Pierre, S. Dak.

Country Editors Say United States Headed for Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a most informative editorial from the Livingston Manor Times, of Livingston Manor, in my district:

COUNTRY EDITORS SAY UNITED STATES HEADED FOR SOCIALISM

A total of 78 percent of the country editors of America fear that our country is headed toward socialism, according to a survey conducted by the American Press magazine. A three-page questionnaire was sent to 500 country editors all over the United States, and included the editor of the Livingston Manor Times.

The survey is interesting because editors usually reflect the opinions of the average citizen in their community. Although tax reforms were included second in importance, the editors listed five important things for Congress to do, as follows:

Enact reforms proposed by the Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and streamline defense and take action to restore confidence of business in the future.

On the present Taft-Hartley bill, 57 percent voted to leave it as it is. Your editor, with 26 percent more, advised making it more stringent. Only 5 percent wanted it repealed.

In curtailment of Government costs, we joined with 90 percent other editors in suggesting a major reduction in the number of Federal employees; went along with 62 percent in favor of repeal of luxury taxes; voted with 85 percent in favor of income-tax simplification; voted with 49 percent in favor of social-security expansion; voted with 59 percent against any increase in social-security benefits; voted against any ban on liquor advertising with 79 percent of the editors; and voted with 57 percent in favor of compulsory military training.

Only 14 percent of the editors voted in favor of a return to prohibition, 86 percent including your editor voted against it. Only 23 percent voted that governmental authority and the expense it entails should remain as it is. This paper with 71 percent of the other editors felt that considerable authority should be returned to the States, to take care of their individual problems.

On the question of compulsory health insurance 89 percent voted in favor.

On the vote for a reduction of aid to foreign countries, 54 percent voted in favor of a reduction. (We voted to eliminate it entirely.)

On the vote for reduction of farm subsidies, 64 percent of the editors voted in favor of reduction. We voted to eliminate all subsidies, as unfair to the average citizen and taxpayer.

One of the closest fights was on the question of income taxes, showing 39 percent in favor of reducing taxes only if the budget can be balanced; 36 percent who voted to leave taxes as they are to balance the budget and create a surplus if possible and 21 percent who voted that taxes should be reduced 20 percent immediately, whether the budget is balanced or not. We voted with the 21 percent, as we felt that with a reduction in the number of Federal employees, reduction in subsidies and elimination of Marshall fund aid, and elimination of crackpot theories there would be more than ample to balance the budget.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We were surprised to learn that a majority of the country editors felt about the same as we do about national affairs. Even with a sharp curtailment in national expenditures it will take a lifetime of taxpaying by our children and grandchildren to take this Government out of the red. We could be a very happy Nation if we could eliminate the burden of taxation which now takes very close to 40 cents out of every dollar we earn. It is also interesting to realize that probably 50 percent of the editors who answered the questions sent out by the American Press Association were presumably democratic in policy, while they might not favor many of the theories of the New Deal or the Square or Fair Deal.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Not Just a Gesture," which appeared in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star on February 25, 1950, as follows:

NOT JUST A GESTURE

Passage of a substitute for the Administration's Fair Employment Practices bill by the House was not, as an ardent Fair Dealer put it, "just a gesture." It was a solid victory both for civil rights and for common sense. The House-passed bill creates an FEPC which would work closely with State and local agencies to discourage discrimination in employment because of race or religion. It would not have police powers of enforcement, which too many departments of government are using now to harass the people. It would have tremendous influence, however, through its power to investigate to publicize its findings and to persuade employers to bar discriminatory practices.

Prejudice is not something that can be forced out of existence by fines and imprisonment. It cannot be cured by police action, but only by education and publicity and voluntary acceptance of equal rights. This country is too big, and its social structure too varied for any single Federal agency to set out a rule of thumb banning employment discrimination that will be fair, just, and effective. Each community must work out its own problems.

What a Federal FEPC can do, is to show these communities how to ease discriminations, and to bring the full light of publicity on those areas where discrimination is the most severe. One of the main reasons for the existence of discrimination is public ignorance of the problems of those minorities that are hard pressed.

We hope the Senate follows the example of the big majority of the House and passes an FEPC bill which uses the means of persuasion and education rather than force. We congratulate every member of the Hoosier delegation in the House in both parties for his vote on this FEPC bill.

The American Press Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, according to an article in the American Press, February 1950 issue, 78 percent of country editors fear United States is headed for socialism. Over 500 editors in reply to the American Press poll, tell what action they think Congress should take on leading issues of 1950.

In answer to the question, "What do you consider to be the two most important things for Congress to accomplish at the new session?" 79 percent demanded a balanced budget, reduction of Government costs or cuts in Federal pay rolls; 85 percent would like to see the tax laws rewritten and simplified.

The editors also advocate the following:

Enact reforms proposed by Hoover Commission.

Curb welfare-state bills.

Strengthen and clarify foreign policy.

Strengthen and streamline defense.

Take action to restore the confidence of business in the future.

To the question: "Assuming that everyone would like to see Government costs cut, check each of the following proposals which you think would be practical and advisable," the following answers were forthcoming:

Major reduction in number of Federal employees, 90 percent.

Reduction of farm subsidies, 64 percent.

Across-the-board cut in funds provided for all Government departments, 62 percent.

Reduction of funds for aiding foreign countries, 54 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for social services, 53 percent.

Reduction of Federal funds for housing, 37 percent.

Reduction of funds for veterans, 31 percent.

Reduction of Federal expenditures for schools, hospitals, and institutions, 21 percent.

Reduction in appropriations for armed forces, 20 percent.

What editors want done about proposed legislation:

Compulsory health insurance: Yes, 8 percent; no, 89 percent; no answer, 3 percent.

Taft-Hartley law: Repeal, 5 percent; less stringent, 10 percent; no changes,

57 percent; more stringent, 26 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Liquor and cigarette taxes: Repeal, 3 percent; reduce, 21 percent; increase, 36 percent; no change, 30 percent; no answer, 10 percent.

Luxury taxes: Repeal, 62 percent; no, 37 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Income-tax simplification: Yes, 85 percent; no, 11 percent; no answer, 4 percent.

Social-security expansion: Yes, 49 percent; no, 46 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

Increase social-security benefits: Yes, 36 percent; no, 59 percent; no answer, 5 percent.

Ban on liquor ads: For, 20 percent; against, 79 percent; no answer, 1 percent.

Compulsory military training: For, 57 percent; against, 41 percent; no answer, 2 percent.

Last Year Out of Every Hundred Oil Wells Drilled, 85 Were Costly Failures—Only 15 Percent Resulted in Profit to the Operators—Producers Can Only Stay in Business by Discovering New Wells as Sources of Supply as Old Wells Run Dry—This Entails the Hazardous Risk of Even More Invested Capital

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the papers on Thursday last that congressional sanction will be sought to increase the importation of oil from foreign countries in order to increase dollar credits in Great Britain.

Almost immediately I came upon another similar proposal from a high official of Government. This time it was that Congress should provide unemployment wages to such of our workers as will lose their jobs due to the planned importation in the coming year of a billion dollars worth of foreign manufactured goods to be imported into this country, in order to give the foreign nations more dollar credits.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely against legislation looking to these ends. I am in favor of retaining American markets for all products of the soil and the toil of the peoples of our country to the American producers of those products, who work in the mines, the mills, in our factories, and on our farms.

There is still another economically unsound and fallacious proposal being considered as of this very hour by the Ways and Means Committee of this House. This, sir, has to do with changing the historic rate of depletion on our oil and gas wells in these United States. The immediate effect of that proposal, if enacted into law, would be to curtail, if not abate almost in toto, all exploratory operations looking to the development of new sources of oil and other petroleum products in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in life should be permitted to imperil the economic strength and the well-being of the people of these United States, for upon that strength, well-being, and security is dependent not alone the peace and security of our own Nation, but the peace and security of the world.

I have no conception whatever as to the mental processes that cause American public officials to even consider—much less make—such proposals.

First, we tax our people or put them under greater bonded debt to give billions of dollars in Marshall-plan aid to rehabilitate the foreign governments after we rebuild their industrial plants with that money and set them up in business to produce goods identical with those historically produced in America; next we proceed to make arrangements whereby the rehabilitated foreign industries and workers can drive our own manufacturers out of our own foreign markets with which we long served our manufactured goods.

Now the ECA wants the American consumers to buy these foreign made goods—pay them cash for what we import, shut down our own factories and tax our own people still more to pay unemployment wages to the American workers who lose their jobs as a result of the increased imports.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of this House giving serious consideration to such a proposal, regardless of the source from which it stems.

To dry up our domestic sources of oil would without question increase unemployment in these United States, decrease the availability of that highly strategic material to our armed forces and increase the cost of our national defense.

In my address to this House on the proposal to reduce the rate of depletion on oil and gas wells in order to increase the Federal revenue—and which talk I made last Wednesday, stated:

> Second only to the defense of this Nation and the continuing efforts to promote peace throughout the world, is the problem of keeping our people gainfully employed.
>
> For this Congress to upset the oil economy of our country would certainly add to the now increasing unemployment of our peoples, and certainly entail a loss to our own national economy which would outshadow any additional tax revenue that might temporarily be collected by the Federal Government in the next 12 or 24 months.
>
> Unemployment in these United States is now markedly on the increase. The United States Bureau of the Census reported that there are now four and one-half million unemployed in these United States. Furthermore, they pointed out that this figure had risen 1,000,000 between December and January—to a new postwar high of four and one-half million persons on the rolls of the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I further stated:

> If we change the historic rate of depletion now applied, the increased cost of maintaining the armed services of the Nation—which today use directly and indirectly hundreds of millions of gallons of various types of gasoline, lubricating oils, and gaseous fuels—will have to be met by increasing the appropriation which we in this Congress make annually for the support of our Army, Navy, and our Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, there was no menace to our national defense in World War I and World War II comparable to the danger and damage inflicted by the submarine blockade established by the Germans. This is a matter about which I am fully informed with respect to World War I inasmuch as it was a shipbuilding firm which I organized that won the award for having built more ships in United States Gulf ports in World War I than all other shipyards put together. World War I saw a frenzied rush to build ships in order to offset the losses from the pack of submarines that the German Kaiser had then unleashed against American shipping.

The same kind of submarine warfare was unleashed in World War II. Billions were spent to replace the ships that were being sunk practically every hour of the day and night.

It was not generally known during World War II, submarine sinkings had become so bad that all ships were under order to return to land-locked harbors at night if they were within a certain range of shore.

It is a matter of record that persons standing on the shore actually saw the enemy submarines chasing merchant vessels around a promontory in Mobile Bay.

It is common knowledge today that the greatest strength the Russians could pit against us would be that infamous pack of schnorkel submarines which they captured from the Germans—and the additional hundreds of that type now in course of construction in shipyards behind the iron curtain.

With these facts in mind, need I point out to this House what would happen if the next war found these United States wholly dependent upon foreign sources for oil. I would have you know that they would be so dependent were this Congress to change the existing rate of depletion on our oil wells.

As I stated last Thursday, the money which the independent, the wildcats, and the major oil companies reinvest in the exploration and the development of new oil fields in order to insure the domestic needs of this Nation is money which they recaptured from the capital invested in the oil wells which are now being or have been pumped dry during more than a quarter of a century that the developers of the petroleum industry have used this historically established rate of depletion.

The depletion reserves which they establish constitute sort of a revolving fund, which is constantly being reinvested, to insure this Nation an adequate supply of petroleum and petroleum products more needful and necessary each day to the defense of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am reliably and authoritatively informed that even under the rates now applicable to the petroleum industry with respect to depletion that profits in the oil industry during the past 25 years have averaged 25 percent less

than have the profits of the average manufacturing corporations in these United States. A comparative study between the profits of the petroleum industry and the manufacturing industry disclosed that only in the year of 1933 and in the darkest days of the depression did the oil industry show a greater return than that of manufacturers, and in that year the oil companies earned a mere 1 percent on the net worth.

In still another year—that of 1925—25 years ago—they earned as much as did the manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, in the year 1949 just closed—the profits of the oil industry showed a greater marked decline than those for industrial corporations in general. While the capital investment of the petroleum industry has been rapidly increased, the result has been that the rate of return on the net worth has probably dropped substantially below that of industrial corporations.

That fact becomes evident to even the most casual observer concerned with analyzing investment returns. In the 10-year period ending in 1948, and including all the so-called prosperous war years, the dividends paid by the large oil companies averaged less than 5 percent of the net worth, while dividends paid by industrial corporations was slightly more than 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I would have you and my colleagues who sit in this House realize that the oil companies of these United States have been compelled to sink back into exploratory and other development work more than half of all the earnings in order to replace the wells which have become depleted by pumping in order to provide the necessary expansion to keep up their operations.

Additionally thereto, they have been compelled to go into the market and borrow substantial sums of money as is evidenced by the fact that in the years 1944 to 1948, 21 of these companies secured more than a billion dollars of outside capital by borrowing and the issuance of outstanding stocks. All of these funds in addition to stockholders' earnings were retained in the business and reinvested in furthering the development of the industry.

It is highly significant that the stockholders' investment in 21 companies alone increased by nearly $5,000,000,000 between 1937 and 1938, whereas the average high and low quotations on the stocks of the companies' security values show an increase of but $3,200,000,000 in a highly inflated security market.

I am laboring this House with statistical figures because to my personal knowledge and experience they reflect a feeling on the part of investors that most of the funds invested in recent years have been made in high-cost property and which will be even less profitable properties than those which are now being pumped out and depleted.

Mr. Speaker, and it seems most appropriate that I should address you personally with respect to this question, because of the fact that your home town of Bonham, Tex., is virtually in the heart of America's greatest oil-producing area. I don't have to tell SAM RAYBURN that in exploring for oil only 15 out of every 100 wells drilled are productive of oil. Moreover, I don't have to remind the Speaker that in further development work in a discovered oil field 85 percent of all additional wells drilled are found to be dry holes.

I knew, Mr. Speaker, when I drilled Boykin Well No. 1 in Washington County, Ala., that despite the most incursive and intensive geodetic work and geology, and the use of the most modern and expensive methods of exploration, 85 percent of all wells drilled, at the loss of hundreds of millions of investment capital, were costly failures that brought in nothing but dry holes.

Mr. Speaker, so you see there is nothing new about the expenses of and the hazards faced by the oil industry as I have just recited them. It was because of these facts that the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, which met 25 years ago, realized that oil operators could only be expected to risk their capital if they were allowed to recover on successful ventures the costs on their unsuccessful ventures.

Because of the risks and the hazards involved in these oil operations, the operators, of a certainty, must be permitted to realize a gain on all of their successful wells in order to compensate for the loss that is made on the unsuccessful ones which they develop.

The question of the per centum rates of depletion has nothing to do with past costs. It is replacement cost which has to be counted as the capital necessary to be recovered before this Government begins to tax the oil properties if we are to encourage our operators into continuing to take the hazards of losing their capital in these financial risks.

This Congress has recognized that principle since the day that taxes were first made applicable to income by the Federal Government. In that act provision was made to permit oil and gas producers or at least those who were successful in the business to recover capital value.

It was because of the foregoing that the Sixty-ninth Congress authorized a percentage depletion allowance on the production of oil and gas. They did so because they recognized the tremendously hazardous nature of exploration by these resources and because unlike any other business transaction, oil production values and sale are the sole basic capital asset of the owners.

It was only after extended studies had been made looking to more extensive exploratory operations in developing new oil fields that the Sixty-ninth Congress gave consideration to a modification of existing laws with respect to the percentage of depletion allowance on oil and gas production.

In consideration of the peculiar financial hazards involved in oil and gas production, the Congress provided for depletion based on the discovery value in 1918.

Congress in 1926 modified the law to provide that depletion of independent producing leases would be calculated on the basis of 27.5 percent of the gross income or 50 percent of the net income on each lease, whichever was the smaller, and all experiences in the United States during the past 25 years clearly show that the national economy in general and our oil economy in particular has tremendously benefited by the foresight of that Congress.

During the quarter century that this present allowance has been in effect it has proven admirably suited to the purpose of increasing development of oil and gas resources, in promoting the national welfare and security, and by protecting the capital values of petroleum properties so that the operators are able to extend the proven reserves and thus insure replacement of the oil and gas produced and consumed.

Mr. Speaker, there are innumerable reasons, not alone for continuing existing provisions and rates, but vital economic and fundamentally sound financial reasons why this House should give due consideration to increasing rather than decreasing the existing provisions.

The principal reasons for the continuation of the existent 27½-percent rate—from the standpoint of costs—are as follows:

First. Inasmuch as the tax provisions now in effect have been a major factor in providing adequate supplies of petroleum at low prices to promote the national defense and security they have become part and parcel of the industry's cost and price structure. One cannot forget for a moment that under the beneficence of existing depletion rates the United States petroleum industry has increased the domestic production of liquid fuels more than 250 percent between the years 1926 and 1948 while at the same time, and despite ever-increasing labor, material, transportation costs and tax rates, the price of gasoline and petroleum products in general show but a percentage of increase in their selling prices as compared to all other commodities. I am authoritatively and reliably advised from wholly disinterested and unselfish sources that any downward revision in tax regulation with respect to depletion would not do otherwise than jeopardize the future domestic supplies and inevitably increase prices to the consumer.

Second. No one will gainsay the fact that an increase in taxes on petroleum products would result in increasing production costs at least to the amount of the additional taxes and thereby influence price to the consumer. More important still, is the fact that increased taxes on oil production would immediately reduce the incentive for exploratory and development work by inhibiting the more extensive use of new venture capital. Argument might be made that if the upward price adjustment of the finished product was made promptly enough the effect on incentive to develop new sources of supply might be minimized, but it would be minimized only at the expense of the consumer taxpayers in paying a higher price for the finished product.

It is always to be remembered that the United States Government itself is probably one of the largest single consumers of oil and gas in these United States. Therefore, the Federal Government

would itself be called upon to pay increased prices for all petroleum products as a direct result of congressional action in effecting a downward revision in rates applicable to the depletion on oil wells.

I am advised by one of the tax experts in the Ways and Means Committee that an increase in tax of 20 cents a barrel on oil would have to be offset by an advance in price of approximately 35 cents a barrel in order that the industry realize the same net income after paying a tax rate of 38 percent.

It is because of that fact that I have said that if prices did not immediately advance in the amount equal to the increase in cost that the incentive to develop new resources and new sources of oil and gas would be reduced and the supply of domestic oils soon decline.

Mr. Speaker, to you my colleagues who now sit on the House Ways and Means Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee, I would particularly direct your attention to the fact that a decline in supply would directly imperil the national security by reducing domestic productive capacity thus making the United States more and more dependent on foreign oil supplies.

The records of our Government clearly give evidence that the impact of any changes on petroleum prices would necessarily be sharp and prompt because current price levels only permit a moderate return on the industry's investment even under existing tax provisions. Normally, it would be expected and assumed that operations on petroleum discovery and production should return large earnings because of the enormous hazard involved. The records, however, disclose that the rate of return on investment in petroleum operations has generally been less than that for manufacturing industry as a whole. It is, therefore, inconsistent with good business practices for this Congress to expect anybody to continuing the risk of additional capital in further oil development unless prices advanced at least enough to compensate for the oil tax for the higher costs resulting in any change of regulations whatever that might effect the industry.

The fundamental need for full comprehension of the danger inherent in changing the present regulations made applicable to oil and gas production lies in the peculiar and hazardous nature of petroleum production. Unlike other business activities the production of oil and gas involves the sale of a basic asset which the operator must replace at considerable risk and steadily increasing costs in order to continue in business. The oil and gas reserves constitute the principal capital asset of all petroleum producers, be they "independent," "wildcat" or "major" producers. These assets are entirely used up in the act of production and can only be replaced by risking more new capital to locate and develop new reserves.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to encourage, or shall I say even permit, our petroleum producers to stay in business, if this Congress desires to encourage the further risk of the venture capital necessary to the expansion of our oil production, our tax laws must continue to provide for the producers to recover as capital the replacement cost of oil.

The percentage depletion as historically used and applied recognizes the fact that the income from oil and gas production includes a return of the capital value of the properties which cannot be taxed as current income. In the absence of the existing rate of percentage depletion efficient oil operators who have been successful in developing oil reserves at low costs would be discouraged by high taxes from producing from their properties and would generally make the sale by selling them to others.

Mr. Speaker, now note this well. The new owner to whom they might sell would have a cost basis for his depletion comparable with the allowance for the percentage depletion currently used and which should be permitted the original operator if he continued to produce the property.

What sense, I ask, is there, Mr. Speaker, in compelling the original producer to sell his property, that others may exploit it in order to meet the letter and the spirit of a thoroughly unsound legislative request made to alter the historic rate of 27.5 percent that has been in use for the last quarter of a century?

Mr. Speaker, time, experience, and the returns enjoyed, not alone in income to the Federal Treasury, but in the volume of petroleum products to the American people have proven to be a simple as well as equitable method of allowing producers of oil and gas to recover their replacement costs of that peculiar asset as it is produced and sold.

The percentage depletion of 27.5 percent of the gross income has operated to carry out the original intent and purpose of Congress in the Revenue Act of 1926 in order to take into account the risks which result in a high proportion of unsuccessful venture in order to encourage the operator to engage in the search for oil.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no single industry in these United States which even approximates the magnitude of the petroleum industry that is in any manner comparable to it. I speak from experience when I say that I have paid dearly for the knowledge gained of the subject upon which I am addressing my colleagues today.

There was no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow which I hit in the dry hole 7,500 feet below the surface on my property in Alabama. Needless to say, after I lost the money spent on that venturesome investment, I more or less quit the oil business the day I hit bottom, and am now one of the thousands of wildcatters who ventured their hard-earned cash and accumulated savings in the quest for oil.

Thank God, however, there still are intrepid men who have since come into my State and having both a deep knowledge of and faith in the exploratory operations, the surface and deep geology, are willing to carry on and bring in an oil field that I am as sure exists beneath the surface as I am sure that I am standing here on this floor.

The congressionally established percentage depletion allowance established by this Congress is the primary factor that will operate to stimulate the expansion and drilling necessary to provide the supply of liquid fuels required by a dynamic economy for both peace and war in our modern world.

Ponder upon one statement which I hitherto made when I pointed out that the domestic production of petroleum liquids has increased by more than two and one-half times between the years 1926 and 1948.

Mr. Speaker, that abundant supply of petroleum has revolutionized American life. It has increased the production of our farmers and our workers. It has made life more agreeable, more pleasant and of greater ease for everyone.

Because of the ample supplies of petroleum that have been generated under existing economic forces, the price of petroleum products from the lowest grade of its waxes to the highest grade of its oils made use of for medicinal purposes, the prices of petroleum products to our people here in these United States have been so low that the great mass of the people have enjoyed the benefits of its existence in our soils, its production and marketing by our industry to an extent unequaled anywhere else in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this. The price of gasoline in the service stations throughout the length and breadth of the United States today, exclusive of taxes, was only 1¼ cents per gallon more in 1949 than it was in 1926. This was again a mere 7 percent increase in price, as compared with an average increase of 55 percent for all other commodities, sold in general throughout our land.

The quality of gasoline sold, however, is so greatly superior to the quality of the gasoline sold in 1926 that the motorist of today can and does operate much heavier car, and for the same or less fuel cost per mile, than he drove the lighter car of 1926.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics—Index of Petroleum and Production Prices—shows that the price level in 1949 was only a mere 12 percent higher than in 1926, a gain far smaller than is the 55 percent advanced for commodities in general.

The marked success of the prevailing tax and other circumstances attending the production of adequate supplies of liquid fuels at low costs, does more to point out to this House the foolhardiness of risking a change that would destroy the adequacy and price of a commodity than all the words that can be spoken.

Mr. Speaker, custom and use by the petroleum industry have made the congressionally established tax provision applicable to that industry for the past quarter of a century an integral part of the economy under its costs and prices.

They have influenced the amount of oil discovered, the supply of oil, the cost

of production, and consequently the price of the finished product.

Moreover, the existing tax provisions have served the national interests by promoting the discovery and the development of oil, and by making available enormous quantities at low prices.

Cheap petroleum products have proven of inestimable worth to the entire national economy, to the great automobile industry, the rubber industry, to the highway-construction industry. Fuel oil has powered the locomotives on our great transcontinental railroads, our great steamships, and now it is largely heating our homes and institutions.

The enormous production of oil in these United States has stemmed out of and is directly traceable to the rates of depletion which made constant reinvestments possible. The Federal Government itself has received more money due to the special tax provision than it would ever have realized in the absence of such provision.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that the percentage-depletion allowance that this Congress in its wisdom extended to oil and gas production does not now nor has it ever applied to the refining, transportation and distribution of petroleum. These the Congress classified as being phases of business similar to, if not identical, to other American business enterprise in which the normal allowances for depletion is adequate to protect against the taxation of the capital invested as it is returned in the course of operations.

There is neither anything unjust, nor is there special treatment accorded to the American petroleum industry or the oil industry in general. They neither ask nor do they receive such special treatment. It was to the benefit of the Nation's economy that the Congress in its wisdom a quarter of a century ago enacted the legislation with respect to the rates of depletion on oil and gas development. That they were wise in doing it is made evident in every automobile that is traveling the highways of the United States today. It is evident in every oil burner installed to heat our homes, in every vehicle that we use in national defense whether it flies in the air, drives on land or floats or sinks into the ocean.

The winning of World War I and World War II has proven the wisdom of that Sixty-ninth Congress and the coming generations will bless us for continuing to make use of the experiences in the past and retaining the present rate of depletion.

Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the February 16 issue of the Pratt Union, a weekly newspaper published at Pratt, Kans.

I am glad to bring the views expressed in this editorial to the attention of the Congress and the country.

The basic troubles of the world, from war to human want, can in one way or another be charged to too much government. All-powerful government is simply a reflection of the loss of individual self-reliance, initiative, pride, independence of spirit, the will to work—the qualities which made possible the founding and the growth of this Republic. We, as a people, are fortunate that we have not yet gone so far on the welfare-state road that we cannot turn back. We can still save ourselves from the final disaster that has overcome so much of the world. But we, as a people, must do it ourselves. Big government will not do it for us. We must ask ourselves this question: "Are we willing, in return for a mirage of material security, for which we pay through exhorbitant taxation, to sacrifice those liberties for which men have fought and struggled for 2,000 years?"

Rearmament of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, unleave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to the Secretary of State, with enclosures:

FEBRUARY 17, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: I am enclosing a very interesting and informative letter that I have received from the Honorable Elihu D. Stone, of the American Zionist Council, 1200 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C., Mr. Stone living in Boston and being a lifelong resident of Boston. I have known Mr. Stone for the past 35 years. He and I served together as far back as 1920 in the Massachusetts Legislature. I consider him one of my closest friends and an honorable and trustworthy gentleman and a fine American. For a number of years he was Assistant United States Attorney in Massachusetts. I refer to his background as a lawyer, as an individual and as a legislator and the long years that I have known him, so you will understand the reasons for the confidence that I have in him and his opinions.

You will note the within letter relates to a very important subject. I understand that William Green, president of the A. F. of L. and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, have taken this matter up with President Truman and that the President has told them he would take it up with the State Department. As this is such a matter of far-reaching importance, I assume that the President will take it up with you.

I know that President Truman, you and I and all others who recognize history, are very happy to establish in Palestine a free and independent Jewish nation, and also that we are anxious to see a strong and stable government established in Israel.

I know that there is a tremendous amount of concern about the arms that are being furnished to the Arabs by the British Government. In view of the extreme tension in that section of the world and the threat that the giving of such arms to the Arab nations might be to the security of Israel, it seems to me to be a justifiable fear. Certainly, the United States would not directly or indirectly be a party to any situation that would result in an armament race being started now by the Israel and the Arab nations. I am sure that you are also aware that there is a tremendous interest in this situation in the United States, and it is not confined to Americans of Jewish blood.

The within letter presents the views of Mr. Stone, whose views I respect and I know that he would not set forth his views, as stated in the within letter, unless he honestly felt that the circumstances and events warranted it.

I am respectfully forwarding Mr. Stone's letter and request that it receive the serious and immediate consideration of you and the State Department. I will appreciate an early reply on this matter.

Sincerely yours.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL.
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1950.

Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I beg to be allowed the privilege of soliciting the exercise of your kind offices with reference to a problem in which American Jewry is deeply concerned—a problem of maintaining peace in the Near East.

As you know, through the United Jewish Appeal, American citizens of the Jewish faith are contributing millions of dollars to the Jewish Agency in Israel for the work of immigration and rehabilitation of tens of thousands of homeless Jews from Europe, known as the DP's, and from other countries.

However, it is distressing to learn from authoritative and reliable sources that peace in that part of the world is being threatened by the unprecedented rearmament of the Arab nations, particularly Egypt and Iraq, and that the source of the supply of arms is Great Britain.

I am enclosing herewith a memorandum which recites reliable facts relative to the Arab rearmament and the part played in it by England, as well as its accompanying threat of war based on authentic information coming from official and semiofficial Arab sources.

A study of the memorandum reveals warlike intentions of the neighboring Arab states against the State of Israel. They are energetically preparing themselves for what the Arab press describes as a "second round." The tremendous military appropriations in their budgets conclusively establishes extravagant military preparations on the part of the Arabs for action, and that action is intended against Israel—a fact which the Arabs do not conceal. The volume and the kind of arms purchased by the Arabs from England and other European nations cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination to be merely for the purpose of maintaining internal domestic tranquility.

Our own country, the United States of America, is deeply concerned in the maintenance of peace throughout the world, including the Near East. It is recognized that peace is indivisible; an aggressive military act anywhere is a disturbance of the peace everywhere.

The United States, under the Atlantic Pact, is supplying arms and ammunition to the western European nations, including England, which constitutes in effect, a replacement of the arms shipped by England to the Arab nations. In fact, we have reason to believe that a part of the surplus of American arms left in England is today in the possession of Egypt and other Arab states. Thus, in effect, the arms are being paid for by the American taxpayer and, indirectly, the

United States is contributing toward the rearmament of the Arab nations. As a direct result Israel is compelled to divert a large part of its financial resources for armaments in order to meet the terrible threat of war.

I sincerely hope that, consistent with your official position, you will deem it proper to communicate with the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, to the end that this terrible armament race of the Near East, which broods no good for mankind, shall be stopped.

Indeed, the Department of State is possessed of the appropriate means for the purpose of impressing England, and the other countries in western Europe, with the evil consequences of the delivering of arms to the Arab countries whose warlike designs against Israel is a matter of public record.

I know, Congressman, of your love of peace and I am aware of your sincere friendship for the infant state of Israel, and the great service that you have rendered to the reconstitution of that state—a service which we shall always recall with deep gratitude. I am persuaded that you will not fail to see the justice of this plea and that you will act accordingly.

I believe that the views expounded by me are representative of the feelings and sentiments of American Jewry as a whole and, particularly, of the American Zionist movement with which I am affiliated.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

MEMORANDUM ON REARMAMENT OF THE ARAB STATES

I

1. The Arab countries are now acquiring heavy arms which far exceed the necessities of defense or internal order. Even before the Security Council voted to lift the arms embargo on August 4, 1949, there were reports of an extraordinary arms program in Egypt. As soon as the embargo was lifted, these reports were confirmed.

2. The 1949–50 budget approved by the Egyptian Parliament is fixed at 187,457,280 Egyptian pounds, with income estimated at 157,827,500 pounds. Part of the deficit is to be financed from funds provided in 1948 under a special unexpended allocation for the Egyptian Army.

3. One-third of this budget—the extraordinary sum of £62,000,000 ($178,560,000)—is for rearmament.

4. Thus before the lifting of the arms embargo on June 9, 1949, the United Press reported that England had decided to lift the embargo and on June 18, 1949, the Manchester Guardian commented:

"The decision of the British Government to renew her supply of arms to the Arab countries, while Lausanne talks are carried out, sounds like a threat."

5. On September 4, 1949, after the arms embargo was lifted, the Beirut Broadcasting Station announced:

"During the Palestinian war an arrangement had been made to purchase several warships. The embargo detained the sending of the ships. Now, the embargo being lifted, the ships are due in Egypt. One ship is harbored in Malta and is ready to leave for Egypt. Three other ships are still in British ports and will be leaving for Egypt soon."

6. On October 17, 1949, the London correspondent of El Misri reported:

"A British source indicates the arms purchase of Egypt in Britain to be worth the sum of I£15,000,000."

7. Ten days later, October 27, 1949, the London Daily Telegraph said:

"It was announced here today that the Egyptian Government has approved the purchase from Britain of 61 military aircraft. This total is stated to comprise 40 Spitfire models, 9 Halifaxes, and 12 DH–113 night fighters, which were regarded here as a new type and hardly considered yet in the production stage. Egypt has a military mission at present in Britain. Spitfires are already in extensive use in the Egyptian Air Force, which is cooperating today with the RAF in a major exercise for the defense of the Suez Canal. The prospective purchases from Britain are part of a plan approved in May to spend about 53,000,000 pounds sterling on military equipment, including an armored division and an auxiliary air force. The Egyptian Government's intention to establish a factory in Egypt for the manufacture of 'fighter or Spitfire' planes and the agreement for this having been reached 'with a foreign goevrnment' were announced in the Senate here in July by the Minister of War and Marine, Haydar Pasha. The proportion of the cost of the aircraft from Britain that may be assigned against Egypt's sterling balances is not mentioned."

8. On October 31, 1949, the Overseas News Agency reported from London that the Egyptian airplane purchases include Vampire Mark Third fighters, which have a range of 1,080 miles, maximum speed of 580 miles, top ceiling of 37,000 feet, and equipment of four cannons. Another type of plane purchased by the Egyptians—the Venom—is still on the secret list, but is reported to be superior to the Vampire Jet.

9. This was confirmed on November 14, 1949, when the New York Times in a dispatch from London reported that an Egyptian purchasing mission had recently visited Britain and contracted with the DeHaviland Aircraft Co., Ltd., for a substantial order of jet fighter planes of the latest and swiftest model. It was unofficially reported that the mission had contracted for 5 full squadrons of Vampire Jet planes with all the necessary parts and spares—perhaps 75 or more—at a cost of about £30,000 each. These are to be developed by early 1951.

10. On November 13, 1949, the New York Post reported in a dispatch from London that the Egyptian purchasing mission was placing orders for $45,000,000 worth of artillery, jet aircraft, infantry equipment, and sea torpedo craft.

11. On November 18, 1949, the New York Compass reported in a dispatch from London that the Egyptians had signed a contract for immediate delivery of three more frigates from the British Navy, bringing Cairo's purchases up to six warships—three of which had been delivered. These ships, built between 1941 and 1943, have 2 4-inch guns and 10 antiaircraft guns, and are equipped with an antisubmarine weapon. Three ships delivered to the Royal Egyptian Navy have a displacement each of 1,470 tons, carrying 6 4-inch guns and 10 smaller guns. They have a complement of 180 men.

12. On January 25, 1950, a spokesman for the Government of Israel in Tel Aviv said that the Egyptian Government was also purchasing submarines, large quantities of tanks and artillery, as well as tens of thousands of automatic rifles, much of this in the form of American war surplus in Europe.

13. Egypt is not the only country involved in this rearmament program. On September 6, 1949, Emir Arselan, Lebanese Defense Minister, was quoted by Reuters to the effect that Lebanon had recently received from 5 to 10 training planes from England, and that another shipment was expected by the end of the month. On January 10, 1950, the Beirut Arabic radio reported that 20 aircraft had been sent from Egypt to Syria and another 20 would be sent shortly.

14. The Middle East Broadcasting Station announced on October 6, 1949:

"The Syrian Government is contacting the British aircraft manufacturers in order to buy from them airplanes. The Syrian Government also intends to send to England Syrian pilots to learn to pilot the jet airplanes."

15. On November 6, 1949, the United Press reported from Washington that middle-eastern countries—Saudi Arabia and others—had approached the United States for military aid and were seeking to participate in the $1,314,000,000 military-assistance program.

16. Manifestly, equipment of such range and striking power, as well as the armament plant recently purchased by Egypt from Germany, France, Sweden, and Italy, are intended for more than international order and security. While it is conceded that there may be internal unrest in Egypt—the inevitable consequence of poverty—the people are unarmed. Jet planes and tanks, destroyers, and submarines are not needed to subdue them.

II

17. It will be recalled that when the Security Council voted to lift the arms embargo on August 4, 1949, there was widespread concern lest an armament race develop in the Near East. Israel's representative, Aubrey S. Eban, told the Council:

"If the restraints imposed by the Security Council are entirely lifted and large-scale rearmament becomes the policy of Arab states, the Near East must become the scene of an armaments race. We ask ourselves whether the newly won peace is already so stable and so firm that it could easily survive the strains of that competition. The Security Council must take the responsibility of answering that question. For our part, we have no hesitation in saying that the most elementary prudence requires the maintenance of the Security Council's present arms policy. It is because we regard the armistice agreements as a highly notable and significant achievement that we urge the utmost caution on behalf of their preservation.

"The fact that the truce observer machinery is no longer to exist does not prevent the Security Council from affecting the arms policy of member states by a clear moral directive. Such an authoritative ruling by the Security Council would of itself, by the influence which it would exert on the arms supplying states, insulate the Near East against the worst dangers of an armaments race.

"In urging the clear expression of the Security Council's mature judgment, my delegation is conscious that this policy also conforms with the general welfare of the Near East. We do not profess to understand how, in the existing social and economic conditions of that area, any government can voluntarily wish to apply the greater part of its resources to the purchase of lethal weapons. The stability of democratic institutions throughout that region can be assured not by competition in the purchase of arms, but by cooperation in the tasks of social and economic development. This is the general doctrine which Israel upholds with respect to the needs of its regional environment. If the acquisition of arms is to be the main pursuit of all governments in this area, then in all questions arising between Israel and the Arab states the security consideration is bound to assume undue weight. In these circumstances we feel that there is nothing to be lost and much to be gained by calling upon member states to maintain the existing policy of the Security Council with respect to the supply of arms."

18. Members of the Security Council shared Mr. Eban's apprehension and there was general agreement that care and restraint must be exercised in the Middle East to prevent large-scale rearmament.

19. The representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Terrence Shone, said:

"In this connection, there is one matter to which Mr. Bunche referred briefly, and to which Mr. Eban referred at greater length this morning, and on which I should like to make a brief statement. I refer to the supply of war matériel. In this connection, I would again emphasize what I believe is

well known to members of this Council: the great respect which my government has paid to the requirements of the truce resolution (S. 723), despite our treaty obligations to Arab states. We are anxious to fulfill our engagements to them. This, of course, does not mean that we wish anything in the nature of an arms race, to which Mr. Eban made allusion, to develop in the Middle East or anywhere else. Far from it. Any supplies of arms which we may send would be for the internal security and defense requirements of the states concerned. These are legitimate requirements for any state, and, insofar as the Middle East is concerned, are indeed essential to the normal conditions which we wish to see restored. We, for our part, would not be in favor of middle eastern states acquiring war matériel in excess of their legitimate defense requirements, and we believe the states themselves would not wish to exceed such limitations."

20. Commenting on the statements of Mr. Eban and Sir Terrence Shone, Acting Mediator Bunche said:

"Certainly, should an arms race develop in that area as a result of the lifting of the existing injunction, it would not serve the interests of permanent peace in the Near East."

21. But Mr. Bunche pointed out that it would be impossible to maintain the arms embargo without proper truce-observation machinery. Continuing, he said:

"In the absence of a firm injunction coupled with observation machinery, the burden really seems to rest upon the states in a position to ship arms. Since there is no disarmament scheme of universal application, it would seem that the states of the Near East, as all others, would now be entitled to import such war materials as may be necessary to their national security.

"There are relatively few states in a position to ship arms in large quantities. Declarations by arms-exporting states that they would refrain from shipping heavy arms to any of the parties to the Palestine dispute in quantities clearly beyond the reasonable security needs of such parties will certainly be helpful and reassuring. In this regard I have heard with great interest the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom on this subject."

22. The statement by Senator AUSTIN strongly affirmed American opposition to a rearmament race, and he properly called for concentration of interest and concern in economic development, resettlement of refugees, the raising of standards of living. He stated:

"So far as the United States is concerned, it does not intend to allow the export of arms which would permit a competitive arms race in the area. Export of arms to that area of the world should be strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements, again as recommended by Mr. Bunche. We hope that prudence will prevail not only among the parties but among all nations of the world which are in a position to supply arms and that they will pursue a policy similar to that which we intend to pursue.

"It is essential that the resources of that area be used for peaceful purposes, for economic development, for the resettlement of refugees, and for the achievement of higher standards of living for the populations of the area. It would be tragic and wholly wrong if the resources of the area were to be dissipated in an unproductive area race."

23. Mr. Chauvel, of France, said:

"I do not think that any country represented here, nor any other country, has the slightest interest in unleashing an armaments race in the Near East or anywhere else."

24. These declarations surely must remain the settled policy of the great powers who are pledged to uphold the peace. Regretfully, the confidence expressed in August can no longer be justified.

III

25. It has been the hope of all friends of both the Jewish and Arab peoples that Israel and the Arab states would soon find it possible to transform their armistice agreements into final lasting peace settlements. It is the conviction of most observers—based on the successful negotiations of the armistice accords—that such a peace settlement can be consummated if Israel and the Arab states can engage in direct negotiations.

26. But it is clear that such negotiations will be retarded rather than accelerated if the balance is upset in the Near East, if one side is rearmed and if the interests of the people are diverted to military channels. There are still war parties in every Arab state who are eager for a second round in which they can recoup their losses, remove the stigma, and exculpate themselves from the responsibility of their last defeat.

27. It may be argued that it is not the purpose of the Arab states to use their arms against Israel. What better evidence is available than the declarations of the Arabs themselves? They are being given the tools. They have announced their intentions. They have no other identifiable enemy in sight. What basis is there for the belief that "the second round" is not, in fact, in preparation?

28. Thus Egyptian journalists have written freely of a renewal of hostilities despite the conclusion of the armistice agreement, and high officials in Arab governments have made their views public.

29. On March 9, 1949, Mohammed Et'Tabi wrote in Akhar Sa'A, a Cairo weekly:

"The armistice may possibly be permanent, the Palestine problem may possibly be settled. And such a 'peace' may be lasting, but this would be but an official peace between governments, because the Arab peoples * * * will never make their peace with the Jews, but will continue to proclaim the blood feud between them, which they will recall each time the fate of the hundreds of thousands of refugees at the hands of the Jews be recalled. * * * This the Arab people will remember to the end of time * * * until Allah sends a saviour. For a second Hitler will yet arise from among the Arab peoples and then, woe to the Jews."

30. On May 14, 1949, 1 year to the day after the Egyptian forces had launched their unsuccessful invasion of Palestine, the Akhbar El Yom, a Cairo paper of standing in the court, wrote:

"The Palestine war is not yet over. Egyptian blood which drenched the soil of Palestine has laid a path along which we are in duty bound to tread to clinch the victory for which our martyrs fought."

31. A spokesman of the Egyptian foreign office was quoted on June 30, 1949, by the Near East Broadcasting Station as follows:

"We are still at war with the Jews even though the Egyptian Army has ceased firing."

32. On September 29, 1949, the Cairo weekly, Akhar Sa'A, describing life in Israel, wrote:

"This is a short account but the enemy against whom we fought but yesterday and against whom we may still fight at any minute * * * the fight is not yet over."

33. In Iraq, government leaders constantly speak the language of war. Thus, on May 1, 1949, the Iraqi Ministry of Defense assured the people that Iraqi brigades returning from the Palestine war were coming back merely to rest and to prepare for the renewal of the Holy War at some opportune moment in the future.

34. The Foreign Minister of Iraq was reported by a Cairo daily, El Ahram, on May 4, 1949, as telling parliament:

"We must all unite in strong opposition to Zionism in order utterly to destroy it."

35. On June 28, 1949, Radio Baghdad broadcast:

"The Jews are our enemies irrespective of how conciliatory they may be, and irrespective of how peaceful their intentions. We shall never cease planning for the day of revenge, for the second round, when the Jews will be driven from our soil."

36. On September 10, 1949, the same station, in its English translation, stated:

"The Arabs are determined to continue their struggle against Zionism to the very end. This small group of adventurers and thieves will regret they ever aroused the Arab people to open conflict."

37. On August 9, 1949, Dr. Fadel Jamali, Iraq's delegate to the United Nations, stated in Baghdad, according to Falastin and the Near East Broadcasting station:

"Unless the ministries of education in the various Arab countries plan now to educate a new generation of active youth who will not be satisfied with words alone, there is no doubt that the Arabs will lose the second round [of the war against Israel] just as they lost the first."

38. Similar talk of a second round comes from Syria. On June 27, 1949, Radio Damascus stated:

"The Arabs have lost the first round of the Palestine war because they followed the advice of the British and the Americans. They will not be so short-sighted in the second round. * * * We must increase our military strength and build a large number of ammunition factories. Then we shall be victorious, and the Jews will be thrown into the sea."

39. Even though the Syrian-Israel armistice agreement had been concluded, Al Nazzer, a Syrian daily paper, wrote on July 23, 1949:

"We would say frankly to all the Arab states and to all the Arab people now that the curtain has finally fallen on what we hope to be the first round of the Palestine struggle—may this armistice be of short duration, during which time we may endeavor to reinforce ourselves and increase our potential in order that we may destroy the dangers which surround us before they succeed in destroying us."

40. In Lebanon, former Foreign Minister Camille Chamoun told the press on March 22, 1949:

"The war in Palestine will be renewed sooner or later. The Arabs cannot rely on the armistic agreement with the Jews."

41. And the pan-Arab newspaper, El-Khayat, wrote on June 16, 1949:

"We are at war with the Jews. * * * And this war will not end until either we destroy the Jewish state or the Jews succeed in cementing their borders from the Euphrates to the Nile and from the Red Sea to the Cedars of Lebanon."

IV

42. If it is not the purpose of the Arab countries to use these arms for a second assault against Israel, then one must ask why are they being rearmed at such fantastic cost? Is it the belief of the proponents of this rearmament program that the Arab states can be regarded as worthy and reliable allies of the democratic countries in the event of another world conflict?

43. Past experience answers these questions. In the Second World War, Egypt remained a nonbelligerent and although the country was invaded by General Rommel's forces, the Egyptian army remained passive and the defense of Egypt was left to the British Army, including thousands of recruits from the Jewish population of Palestine. It is an ironic commentary that British arms are now going to Egypt and may be used against those who were the sole allies of the democratic forces in the Near East in the last war.

44. In Iraq in 1941, Nazi forces seized control of the Government and were finally

eliminated only after a show-down with the British Army. Palestine Jews took part in that action and they were active also to remove Nazi influence from Syria and Lebanon. Throughout the entire war, the Arab world remained aloof, although many of its leaders, like the former Mufti of Jerusalem, were actively on the side of the Axis and made their headquarters in Berlin.

45. Can the democratic forces regard Egypt or Iraq, or any other Arab country, as a shield of substance in the light of the past record, and in the light of Arab weakness in the war in Palestine? Although their forces and their arms far exceeded those of the nascent state of Israel, they were quickly overwhelmed in battle. Does this type of alliance fit into the mosaic of democracy's defense?

46. Quite apart from our natural feeling of sympathy for our Jewish kinsmen in Israel, we deem it our duty as Americans vitally concerned about American policy in the Near East and American defenses throughout the world to express the strongest misgivings on the military support of a dubious ally. The fact that it is Britain which is extending this generous aid should not obscure the fact of indirect American participation, for it is surplus American army equipment that is being used in many cases, and it is the United States which is today providing arms for those same countries which divert their stocks to the Near East.

47. For their part, the Arab states have an obligation to their Arab brethren who, victims of the Arab aggression against Israel, were forced to leave Palestine and who today are homeless refugees. If the Arab governments were disposed to expend their funds for resettlement projects, they would make a constructive contribution not only toward the regeneration of a people for whose misery they are primarily responsible, but in the development of their own underdeveloped countries.

48. When one considers that the Arab states are called upon by the United Nations to contribute but $6,000,000 for the relief of the Arab refugees, a tiny fraction of the money that Egypt alone is spending for rearmament, the antisocial and wasteful character of the armament program becomes tragically plain.

49. The people of the Near East must have peace. It is for the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, and other great powers to use their best efforts to insure peace and tranquillity in the Near East so that its peoples may work together to raise the living standards of the entire area. To plunge these people into an armaments race is to serve the cause of their impoverishment, debasement, and destruction.

ELIHU D. STONE.

The Right To Compete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written by Ben Moreell, president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., which was sent to all employees and shareholders of Jones & Laughlin:

THE RIGHT TO COMPETE

To Our Customers:

Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. has carefully considered the recent decisions of the Federal courts in the Cement case and the Rigid Steel Conduit case and the interpretations placed upon those decisions by the Federal Trade Commission. As a result of this consideration and to avoid the possibility of violating these restrictive interpretations, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. reluctantly announces that, effective July 22, 1948, it will discontinue pricing its products on a competitive basis through freight absorption.

Prices are being announced today for all basic steel products produced at each of the corporation's plants. The cost to the customer henceforth will be, in each case, the price for the product at the producing plant plus the established charge for transportation.

In taking this action Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. wishes to emphasize that this change is not made willingly. The decisions of the courts and the Federal Trade Commission have caused this action on our part. We disagree with these decisions and their application to our business. We believe that the new system of pricing caused by these decisions is contrary to the best interests of our customers, our employees, our stockholders, and the communities in which our plants and our customers' plants are located. This new system of pricing will radically restrict Nation-wide competition.

We take no issue with the decisions of the Federal Trade Commission and the courts in enforcing the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Sherman Act, and the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act to the extent that they prohibit unfair methods of competition, price fixing, collusion, and monopolistic practices. The Commission and the courts, however, have gone far beyond these prohibitions, and in the opinion of many, including at least one member of the Federal Trade Commission, they have held that a general practice in which the seller absorbs transportation charges in order to meet competition in a distant market is itself illegal as a violation of statutory law. By these interpretations the Commission and the courts have, as a matter of plain fact, decidedly lessened, rather than promoted, competition.

We believe that an enforced continuation of this new pricing policy will promote monopolies in the areas immediately surrounding any given source of production by excluding competition from more distant sources, because of the transportation costs. In effect, a legal prohibition against meeting competition by absorbing freight will create tariff walls around each producing area. It will force the closing and relocation of mills and factories. It will restrict the sales of each company to the territory surrounding its own plant. It will curtail the development of low-cost production and distribution. It will deny to consumers a free choice of suppliers. It will lead to geographical concentration of industry, rather than dispersion which is desirable for national security. It will cost customers more money because they will pay more transportation costs when they buy from other than the nearest producer. Since costs will vary, depending upon the location of the supplier, consumers of steel will not be able to establish their costs in advance of actual purchases.

Jones & Laughlin believes that the Nation's basic industries and their customers, bound by such legal shackles, cannot continue the vigorous growth which is essential to the preservation of our country's industrial strength. We must seek relief from these bonds. We do not seek to perpetuate the basing-point system. We do not seek a rule which will permit the collection of phantom freight. All that we seek is the right to compete.

In order to restore this basic principle, we believe it is essential that the Congress amend the applicable laws. There should be no statutory prohibitions against charging lower mill prices to some customers than to others, when such lower prices are necessary to permit products to be sold in a distant market to compete with another producer more favorably located with respect to that market.

We are convinced that this position is economically sound and consistent with the meaning of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws as intended by the Congress. It is simple. It would not weaken the laws against price fixing, collusion, unfair competition, or monopolies.

A difference of opinion within the Federal Trade Commission itself and the dissenting opinions of the courts clearly indicate a need for clarifying legislation on this point.

The legislative history regarding attempts to outlaw the basing-point system by statute leaves no question that the Congress has not been willing to require uniform f. o. b. factory prices. The Supreme Court expressly recognized this in the Corn Products case in 1945. However, in the recent Cement case the Supreme Court has stated that the commonly used basing-point system is a violation of the Robinson Patman Act. In so doing, the Supreme Court has not sought to interpret the will of the Congress, but has engaged in judicial legislation.

We urge our customers and all others interested in the welfare of the country to give serious consideration to this matter. We believe that all will conclude, as we have, that prompt action by the Congress is essential if we are to continue to have the vigorous competition in this country which has been so fundamental to our national development.

Yours very truly,

BEN MOREELL,
President.

JULY 21, 1948.

General Motors Cost-of-Living Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the Members may be interested in the following remarks as broadcast by one of the very well informed radio commentators, the Washington correspondent, Joseph McCaffrey, on his weekly commentary over the Mutual Broadcasting System:

The announcement yesterday that General Motors, under its cost-of-living contract with the auto workers, will cut workers' wages 2 cents an hour and the price of its cars from $10 to $40, focuses attention on the coming contract negotiations this spring.

How well has the cost-of-living contract worked?

Management thinks it has worked most satisfactorily.

The General Motors executives are all for continuing the present contract as it is now written, for another year or, they hope, another 2 years.

But not so the Auto Workers Union.

The union leaders say they agreed to such a contract only because it was the only method by which they could break the united industry front against further wage boosts back in 1948. The union now would like to end the cost-of-living clause for a more liberal pension provision.

And this, if certain other factors are considered, may well mean a stalemate in negotiations.

Which will, in the end, mean a strike tying up one of the biggest auto plants in the Nation.

Here might well be an excellent opportunity for the Government to see if it can head off a strike before it happens.

And by this, I don't mean standing ready with the club of a court injunction.

Too often, the Government Mediation Service is called in after both parties have become so firmly entrenched in their positions that even the combined weight of the 12 apostles couldn't move them to agreement.

The time to begin heading off a strike is before the negotiations begin, before the bitterness has festered.

A strike may well be coming at General Motors, some people here claim to see it in the future—even before the parties involved start discussing a new contract.

Certainly the possibility of a strike at GM exists. Why not, because of that, begin now to determine how it can be—not just headed off—but settled, as strange as this may sound, before it happens.

The coal situation is an excellent example of how relations have deteriorated so that the lines have become so drawn, the negotiators so embittered, that not even the threat of a court injunction restores peace.

The General Motors situation, however, could well serve as a proving ground.

It may be something to think about and act upon now.

Substitute FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, February 26, 1950:

FATE OF SUBSTITUTE FEPC BILL UP TO SENATE

It is a source of real regret that the House failed to pass a strong fair employment practices bill along the lines the Truman administration proposed. The southern bloc's bitter fight waged against it was unfortunately aided by reactionary Republican elements. Certainly there has been a great need for this reform and when it is considered that conventions of both parties had endorsed the plan in principle there was good reason to have expected a different attitude when it reached the floor of the House.

After the administration bill had been defeated and a weakened version of FEPC was brought forward, loyal supporters of the original measure differed in their judgment as to the proper course to follow. Many, finding the substitute so weakened and without teeth, refused to go along. Others, including the entire Brooklyn delegation, supported it as the best that was possible to achieve at the moment. The final vote was 240 to 177.

Despite a natural disappointment, it does seem to us that those who made possible the passage of the substitute used the better judgment. Certainly they were realistic. With all its lack of teeth it does put the Federal Government on record against discrimination. We hope it will win the approval of the Senate so that some important ground breaking may now be done in this difficult field. It would be at least a step in the right direction.

Bill Boyd: The Oil Industry's No. 1 Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the February 1950 issue of the Petroleum Engineer concerning Mr. William R. Boyd, Jr., retiring president of the American Petroleum Institute.

Bill Boyd, without a doubt, has had the most distinguished career in the oil industry of any living man today. He is a resident of Teague, Tex., in the Sixth Congressional District which I represent, and has returned to his home there to establish his personal law office for consulting practice only.

Bill Boyd has never lost contact with the country and small community people whom he was reared with. He served as the mayor of their city at Teague and went on to reach the most responsible and highest position in the oil industry. However, upon his recent retirement as president of the American Petroleum Institute it was no great change for him to return to the rural and small community life as he was still the same Bill Boyd.

PETROLIC PERSONALITIES

(By Dick Sneddon)

HOME IS THE HERO

Teague and Freestone County in east Texas really killed the fatted calf on Wednesday, January 18, when its favorite son, Bill Boyd, Jr., for 29 years the Pasha of the petroleum people, threw aside his mace, doffed his ermine wrap, and snuck back, not furtively, but eagerly, to the homey haunts of his boyhood. It wasn't that there was anything callous or even casual about the way he had been treated by the oil folks, for Bill is probably the best known and most universally liked person in the industry. He no doubt could have had his choice of a hundred executive positions when he decided to resign one of the top posts in American oildom, but he chose, instead, to go back to the old friends and familiar scenes of his youth. That old home-town yen grows stronger with the years, and yielding to it is as human as tears and laughter.

One of the qualities that lifted Bill Boyd to such a high altitude in the greatest industry extant is what the public-speaking experts call "audience contact." No matter what your stature businesswise, when he talks to you he has the faculty of excluding, or at least appearing to exclude, everything and everyone else. It is just you and Bill Boyd in a private discussion of a moot point or a brief, highly confidential story exchange. He has a way of unobtrusively making your interests his, which at once conveys the idea that he likes you, so, of course, you go for him in a big way. Along with this natural-born capacity to make friends and keep them, he has a fine administrative talent that has enabled him, as prexy of American Petroleum Institute, to resolve any and all differences that have arisen, and to bind a complexity of keenly competitive pet oleum people into a harmonious and distinctly effective entity.

"DEAR HEARTS AND GENTLE PEOPLE"

But returning to the celebration: It all started with an open house in Bill's new office at the entrance to his farm lodge, midway between Teague and Fairfield on United States Highway 84. Here his right hand was shaken so often and so vigorously that the arm has lengthened appreciably. We have heard, indeed, that he can now tie his shoelaces without stooping. From his office the multitude surged out onto the farm property where the Lone Star Gas Co. spudded in an oil well, Bill Boyd No. 1, so that the neophyte farmer won't feel too strange around the place. Besides you can get dry cows as well as dry wells, and even on a farm it isn't good to put all your eggs in one basket. Our Teague operative tells us that the first thing Bill did when he arrived at the farm was to check up and see how many cows were flowing and how many were on the pump.

Active in the spudding in of the new well, incidentally, were such petrolic luminaries as R. L. Wheelock, vice president of API; D. A. Hulcy, of Dallas, president of Lone Star Gas Co.; and Raymond J. Dillard, an executive of the J. K. Hughes Oil Co. Then followed a street parade, free movies and congratulatory speeches by all sorts of VIP's, including Senator Tom Connally, Congressman Olin Teague, Lt. Gov. G. C. Morris; Hines H. Baker, president of Humble Oil Co.; W. Alton Jones, president of Cities Service Oil Co., and a raft of civic dignitaries and other notables, all of whom said so many nice things about Bill Boyd, we wouldn't be a bit surprised if that other Bill Boyd they call Hopalong Cassidy is insane with jealousy. There is no need to recite the long list of Bill Boyd's accomplishments here. Every oil man in America knows him as well as we do, and every last one of them will rejoice in Teague's official recognition of his good qualities and good works. Now as he turns independent operator and gentleman farmer these same oil men will be wishing him the most of the best—and so will we.

The Pittsburgh Area and F. O. B. Mill Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper presented to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States by Herbert Johnson, which I hope will throw some light on the basing-point issue:

THE PITTSBURGH AREA AND F. O. B. MILL PRICING

The chamber of commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., appreciates this opportunity to participate in the second 1948 economic institute of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, to discuss the interest which is at stake in the Pittsburgh area in the matter of delivered pricing. I, personally, am honored to have the privilege of presenting this problem on behalf of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

We believe that it was the intent of the Congress in enacting the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and other antitrust and antimonopoly statutes to protect the best interests of the entire economy. We believe that only by the administration of these laws to that end can the Nation be kept strong and free. Since all of these statutes and regulations are designed as rules and controls for business, we believe it is im-

perative that the rules be stated clearly and in terms comprehensible both to the interests subject to the regulation and to those who administer the controls. The present state of confusion as to the legality of any method of pricing other than straight f. o. b. mill pricing has been amply demonstrated not only in the 5 months since the decision in the Cement case became final, but also in the discussions of this institute.

It is not surprising that the Pittsburgh area should have been among the first to recognize the seriousness of the threat to competitive pricing and to attempt to appraise its impact upon the community. The cement industry and the steel industry were the first to announce their intention of abandoning former delivered-pricing practices. Had any incident been required to crystallize the problem for businessmen in the Pittsburgh district, these moves were sufficient.

The Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh has made a careful review of the entire problem in conjunction with the Smaller Manufacturers Council of Pittsburgh, sending out questionnaires to its entire membership and requesting expressions of opinion from all interested parties. Based on this survey, it is the consensus that mandatory f. o. b. mill pricing will be definitely detrimental to the best interests of Pittsburgh industry, large and small.

PITTSBURGH'S COMPETITIVE POSITION

Pittsburgh is universally known as a production center of iron and steel products. Despite the establishment and growth of steel-producing facilities in other sections of the United States, Pittsburgh is still the most important single producing location in the country. On the other hand, Pittsburgh industry has become remarkably diversified so that any consideration of the best interests of the community must take into account numerous industries in addition to iron and steel. For example, Pittsburgh is one of the principal centers of such important basic industries as aluminum, electrical equipment, glass, paint, food processing, coal chemicals, and petroleum products.

Pittsburgh is generally considered the home of giant industries. Although many large companies are located in Pittsburgh, such as United States Steel Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Gulf Oil Corp., H. J. Heinz Co., Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh Steel Co., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., nevertheless, there are many hundreds of small manufacturers and fabricators located in this area. The interests of these small manufacturers are a primary concern, not only of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh but of the community as a whole for its own welfare.

The Smaller Manufacturers Council, which is a part of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, has a membership of 235 firms ranging in size from companies employing 25 persons up to establishments with pay rolls of 500 people. This membership comprises approximately half of the total number of small manufacturers in the Pittsburgh district, according to a recent survey. All of these are important to the Pittsburgh area, not only in terms of their present significant contribution to the industry in the area but also because of their growth potential. In all probability, some of our large industries of tomorrow will develop from the smaller manufacturers of today.

The plight of these smaller manufacturers is a matter of great concern to the chamber of commerce. Many of these manufacturers depend upon widespread distribution of their products in order to maintain economical levels of production. By the same token, many of these manufacturers rely upon distant sources of raw materials. In a questionnaire circulated to members of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, approximately 75 percent of the companies replying stated that they were unable in normal times to secure their requirements of raw materials or to sell their normal production within a radius of 100 miles of Pittsburgh. From this, it is apparent that an important part of Pittsburgh's smaller manufacturers will be seriously affected if they or their suppliers are denied the privilege of competing outside their local areas.

The following quotations represent a few typical comments made by smaller manufacturers in response to the questionnaire on f. o. b. mill pricing:

"The f. o. b. mill-pricing system may greatly reduce our potential market when the supply exceeds the demand for our production unless new methods for protecting our competitive position are developed successfully.

"Our business is national and our customers' plants are widely scattered. As a result, where we have recently quoted f. o. b. mill, we have lost old and valued customers. We prefer a basing-point plan as the best method on which we can compete with steel companies nearer the user.

"To sell the products we manufacture on an f. o. b. plant price will curtail and limit our marketing area, reducing our volume by 60 to 70 percent. Because of the reduced volume, the cost to the consumer will increase. We are of the opinion that the volume of our products, needed for economical production will not be forthcoming from the reduced marketing area.

"Several of our customers in the Midwest are complaining bitterly about this change of delivery in the steel industry. They say it has been hard enough to stay in business with the normal steel shortage and now this new ruling has added greatly to their problems.

"We are reasonably competitive west of the Allegheny Mountains. We would lose 20 percent of our business by losing our eastern market. Our plant is too small to be involved in moving. We would probably close up in preference to moving."

POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF MANDATORY F. O. B. MILL PRICING ON THE PITTSBURGH DISTRICT

There has been a great deal of speculation about the probable effect upon the national economy of continuing restrictions against competitive selling through freight absorption. It was contended by the proponents of f. o. b. mill pricing that numerous substantial advantages would accrue to the Nation's economy. The prediction was made that manufacturing industry would be decentralized so that production centers would be located nearer to fabricators and consumers. It was also prophesied that distant steel buyers would be benefited due to the fact that steel producers, since they would no longer absorb freight, would be willing to sell in distant as well as local markets. Those who favored competitive methods of selling held opposite views. It was their position that basic industries could not be decentralized and relocated since in most cases their location is dictated by proximity to raw materials. It was further contended that steel producers would be even more reluctant to sell in distant markets on an f. o. b. mill basis because of the fact that they would normally be unable to compete on a price basis and would, therefore, secure business only in times of short supply when there was already an abundant demand near home.

In the case of the Pittsburgh district certain of these disputed effects are no longer speculative. No steel production has been relocated. Distant steel buyers are finding themselves in a worse situation than formerly. Some of these remote fabricators either have moved to the area or have announced their intentions of establishing operations in the Pittsburgh district in order to improve their steel-supply situation. This solution, however, is not available to all manufacturers. For financial or other reasons a great many of the customers of Pittsburgh's steel mills will be unable to relocate. As a result the steel producers in the Pittsburgh area will still have the problem of selling their production and the many hundreds of small manufacturers already in the Pittsburgh area will be unable to sell their normal output unless all sellers are again permitted to meet price competition in distant markets by the absorption of transportation charges.

CONCLUSION

We firmly believe that the Nation as a whole and the communities which comprise the country, together with all industry, are benefited by competition. In our opinion, competition is a matter of involving many factors. Sellers compete for customers' favor in terms of quality, service, availability, and delivery. Assuming approximate equality of these factors, cost to the customer at point of use is generally determinative. It is for this reason that competition results in substantial identity of prices, particularly in the case of raw materials or products produced to the customer's specification. It is only by permitting the seller to exercise his own discretion in the matter of freight absorption that competitive equality at destination can be maintained. Without such competitive equality there is, in our opinion, no competition.

Since we believe that it is the intent of the antitrust laws to stimulate rather than eliminate competition, it appears obvious that the opportunity to compete in terms of price must be maintained.

There is an old adage to the effect that it is unwise to break up a winning combination. We believe that the progress of American industry has demonstrated that the factors of competition and the rules which sellers believed encouraged them to be competitive have been highly successful. Certainly in the Pittsburgh area, if one were to judge solely by results, one could not help but conclude that the system must have been, if not perfect, at least extremely conducive to industrial growth and development. We see no advantage in changing the system and substituting a disputed theory for a proved practice.

If there have been abuses in the past under competitive pricing methods, the abuses should be eradicated, and we believe the antitrust laws should be maintained to assist in the prosecution of such evils. However, we are not in agreement with a proposal which to us appears equivalent to a suggestion that we sink the ship because a few barnacles have attached themselves to the hull.

John C. Calhoun, Chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, our fellow Texans need not be reminded of the able leadership that the chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee of Texas has demonstrated since September 1948. Many others among the

House of Representatives have experienced the warmth of his genuine friendship and his contagious humor. Mr. Calhoun is a resident of Corsicana, in the Sixth Texas District, which I am proud to represent in Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Clint Pace which appeared in the Dallas Morning News of January 22, 1950, about this leader that Texans are mighty proud of:

CALHOUN FINDS GOOD HUMOR CALMS DEMOCRATIC TEMPERS

(By Clint Pace)

CORSICANA, TEX, January 21.—Late on the evening of September 14, 1948, the telephone rang at John Calhoun's home in Corsicana.

It was a newspaper reporter calling. He asked if he was speaking to the John Calhoun who had just been elected chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee.

"No," said Calhoun, a roly-poly man of 67. "I'm John C. Calhoun. C, as in Calvin."

"That's what I thought," said the newspaper reporter. "You have just been elected State chairman at the Fort Worth convention."

"Well, I'll be ——," said Calhoun.

That was the introduction of John Calvin Calhoun, oil man, ex-mayor, domino player, part time politician and notary public to politics at the State level.

Since then, the happy Calhoun has become the laughing boy of Texas politics. Many times he has used his ready wit to stave off assorted political mayhem by members of the party's violently opposing factions. In 2 years, under Calhoun's soft-answer direction, the party's executive committee has moved from a brawling, aimless nest of trouble into a fairly well organized political unit.

Calhoun has always been a witty, humorous man, whose greatest jokes are on himself. But his quick wit has often been used to parry the thrusts of Democrats out to skin Democrats. When Calhoun took over the party leadership at the Fort Worth State convention in September 1948, he had become the referee of a continuing fight between liberals and conservatives. In many cases the differences had degenerated into personal feuds which dated back to the Austin convention in 1944.

The battle line was (and to an extent still is) drawn then. It was the Austin convention, in May, and the subsequent meeting in Dallas in September, which divided the party into New Dealers and Texas regulars and opened the first sores of a disease which threatened to ruin the party completely.

The disease was by no means cured in 1948, when Hillsboro's Bob Calvert declined to be State chairman again. The late Tom Tyson and Calvert decided that the new chairman would have to be a man acceptable to both hostile sides of the party and, therefore, must be a person who had taken a minor part in politics.

They settled on Beauford Jester's great and good friend, John Calhoun, of Corsicana, a man whom only a few delegates at the convention had ever heard of.

The vote was called on a motion to substitute Calhoun for Calvert, but the noes outrang the ayes. Yet Tyson, who later became secretary of the party, banged his gavel and announced Calhoun had been elected. There was a titter of laughter, but the delegates made no formal objection.

Calhoun might have been unacceptable to some of the liberals at the far left side, if they had known that Calhoun had committed, in 1944, the sin which the 1948 liberals found unforgivable. He had refused to bolt the May 1944 convention in Austin when the liberals marched out.

Calhoun, reviewing the bidding a few days ago, said his sympathies were with the bolting liberals.

"But my side was outvoted and I didn't think we should refuse to play simply because we couldn't pitch," he said.

The liberals, who had moved from the house to the senate chamber in the capitol, sent a message to Calhoun that he could be put on their list of delegates to the Chicago national convention. Calhoun refused the honor.

"I've never bolted a meeting yet," he told them. "I agree with your politics, but I'm a staying where I am because I believe in majority rule."

Four months later the liberals, in a riotous meeting in Dallas, recaptured control. But the big argument over Rooseveltian democracy had started and was to become the widest rift in the Texas party.

The differences had widened when the still-warring Democrats met in Fort Worth for the governors' convention in 1948. Calhoun had been left off the Navarro County list of delegates and on the night of his election to the party office was attending a rodeo. His mind was a long way from politics.

When he accepted the job with the blessing of another good friend, Beauford Jester, Calhoun knew he was starting to hoe the long row.

Part of the Calhoun political medicine was humor, liberally applied in the right places. And part was silence and soft answers which turned away wrath. Little by little he removed the cores of dissatisfaction by simply kidding them away or letting them die for want of discussion.

He believes now the party is farther away from revolt than it has been in 10 years. Part of that is because President Truman's victory in 1948 showed many Democrats that intraparty differences have little effect on the Nation's two-party system.

Calhoun is a strong advocate of the two-party system, but admits he doesn't care how small the Republican minority becomes. He is a New Dealer who believes history will make Franklin D. Roosevelt one of its all-time great men and Harry Truman one of its all-time great little men.

"I guess I wear the brass collar," he admitted. "But that doesn't mean that I believe everything the party does is exactly right.

"Little differences with the party doesn't mean anything, though. No man agrees with any other man 100 percent. No man agrees with everything in his lodge, his city council, or even his family.

"But I do believe in the broad base of the Democratic Party. It has done more for more people than any political organization in all history."

Calhoun believes agriculture is the key to the country's economy, and says only the Democrats have ever tried to improve the lot of the farmer.

"I don't care what you say," Calhoun declares. "Propped-up farm security is now our national security."

Why is he a New Dealer?

"Because you don't see old folks heading for the poor farm anymore. People trust their banks, and a workingman has a chance to be paid for what he contributes to his employer.

"You didn't have that under the old deal. It came about under the New Deal."

He believes in organized labor, but also thinks there should be a rule book by which both labor and management play, plus a referee to see that they stick to the rules.

Calhoun is not strictly the type person you would take for a liberal. He owns property, drives a new Cadillac, lives in a fine home and spends much of each day playing dominoes at the Corsicana Country Club. When he and his business partner and social pal, Joe Butler, want to spend a vacation in Florida, they just load up and go. When they get tired of loafing in the sunshine, they load up and come back.

He makes many jokes about the Democratic Party and tries to kid its members out of their differences with each other. He is interested in youngsters who give time to political thinking.

Not long ago he was addressing a group of Young Democrats in Dallas and told the story of the Arkansas farm woman who had 15 children. One day one of them fell into a barrel of tar. The mother ran to pull the sticky infant out. She looked at him a minute, then threw him back in the barrel.

"I can raise another one before I can clean you off," she said.

"That's how we feel about young Democrats," Calhoun went on. "We can train the young ones easier than we can clean up the old, party-bolting Democrats."

Calhoun was no more installed in the office of State chairman than a crisis arose. It concerned Wright Morrow, of Houston, whom the liberals wanted to throw out of the Democratic national executive committee because they felt he had not been as loyal to Truman as they were.

Calhoun remembered that Morrow had been nominated at the Brownwood convention 2 years before, had been confirmed by the national convention and the Philadelphia convention. That was majority and it was enough. Although he was on the short end of a 43-to-6 vote in the State committee, Calhoun stuck with Morrow. When the final fires died down, Morrow was retained on the national committee and serves there now.

After he was beaten in the committee meeting on the Morrow vote, Calhoun offered to resign as chairman. The committee refused his resignation. When Jester died, Calhoun—who believes the office of State chairman is the property of the governor's office—again offered to step down. Governor Allan Shivers asked him to stay on.

Calhoun served four terms as Corsicana mayor.

"This was after I had rendered the city notable service for 30 years as a notary public," Calhoun said. "I had one of the firmest notary seal squeezes in Navarro County."

Thirty-second Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians all over the world celebrated Republic of Lithuania Day, to commemorate the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic. This year again, as in the past, the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, celebrated the occasion with a banquet, which I was privileged to attend.

The Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore issued the following proclamations:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION: REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md., February 6, 1950.

Whereas in accordance with Joint Resolution No. 8 of the acts of the General Assem-

bly of Maryland of 1935, the Governor is directed to proclaim February 16 of each year for the observance and commemoration of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas, February 16, 1950, will mark the thirty-second anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania; and

Now, therefore, I, William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1950, as Republic of Lithuania Day and request that the flag of the United States be displayed on all government buildings and urge that our people observe that day by appropriate ceremonies.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland. Done at the city of Annapolis, this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty.

[SEAL] WILLIAM PRESTON LANE, Jr.

By the Governor:

VIVIAN V. SIMPSON, *Secretary of State.*

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., DESIGNATING THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1950, AS REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

Whereas February 16 of each year has, by an act of the Maryland Assembly, been designated as Republic of Lithuania Day, commemorating the founding of the Lithuanian Republic; and

Whereas with the present condition of world unrest and with a majority of continental Europe under the control of a government who denies every right to the peoples of these lands, the Republic of Lithuania has been temporarily deprived of its God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which is the rightful heritage of every nation; and

Whereas despite the fact that Lithuania only seeks to work out its destiny in accordance with the rights and privileges won in a long struggle to obtain its independence as a republic, a totalitarian government with its attendant evils has been forced upon the Republic of Lithuania by the armed might of an aggressor nation; and

Whereas as long as America and its democratic form of government survive, there will be hope in Lithuania and in all the ravaged nations of the earth, for a better day to come; and

Whereas Baltimore, along with many other cities and towns in our great Nation, sympathizes with, and is justly proud of, the many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry or birth, who have found a haven of security here in America, where they can enjoy the freedoms which are being denied them in their native land, and all citizens who love liberty join in the prayer that Lithuania will soon again be able to maintain its status as a free nation:

Now, therefore, I, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of the city of Baltimore, by the power invested with me, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1950, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Baltimore, and do urge all our citizens to give serious thought to the many cultural contributions made by Lithuania, and to the trials and tribulations that have befallen that country under the rule of an aggressor nation which temporarily deprives Lithuania of its rights and privileges as a free nation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 8th day of February in the year of our Lord 1950.

[SEAL] THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, it is my great pleasure to include in the RECORD, the remarks of the Reverend Louis J. Mendelis, pastor of St. Alphonsus Church; a translation of the speech delivered by the Honorable J. Kajeckas, attaché at the Lithuanian Legation; and my own remarks:

Mr. Chairman, before returning thanks to the good God for the blessings of this evening, may I be permitted, as pastor of St. Alphonsus Church and the spiritual leader of the 5,000 Lithuanians of Baltimore, in the name of more than 400 former displaced Lithuanians who have found a new home in Baltimore, to say a most profound thank you to our Congress and especially to our President, Mr. Truman, for the passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Because of this act, not only more than 17,000 Lithuanians have been able to come to this country and taste some of that liberty that we Americans enjoy but make a definite contribution to our cultural and social life here in America.

I personally, in the name of these future citizens of our land and in my own name wish to thank the gentlemen present here tonight, Hon. Messrs. SASSCER, GARMATZ, FALLON, and BOLTON, for their part in helping my fellow-correligionists to come to this country. I ask them to thank the other Members of our Congress, and, if any of them have occasion to see Mr. Truman to thank him in our behalf.

My fond hope is that the Displaced Persons Act will be extended, that others may be able to enter our country to enjoy the blessings of liberty that we do. I can assure the gentlemen from Washington here tonight that none of the Lithuanian DP's are subversive or unappreciative of our way of life. I am confident that, God willing and helping, they will make excellent citizens of our land.

Moreover, before saying the prayer, I wish to add that we Americans should be conscientious in the use of our right to vote. At every election, whether it be city, State or national, we should go to the polls and cast our ballot for the candidate that we feel will best serve the interest of our country. If we ever lose our liberties, if we do not have a more efficient Government, it is because we have failed to do our duty at the polls. For several years now, I have spoken from the pulpit and urged our congregation to be faithful in the exercise of our rights as citizens of this land. God bless and save America from any "ism" that will enslave our country and its people.

Rev. LOUIS J. MENDELIS, D. D.,
Pastor of St. Alphonsus Church.
FEBRUARY 16, 1950.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE J. KAJECKAS, ATTACHÉ, LITHUANIAN LEGATION, AT THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1950, IN BALTIMORE, MD.

On this Lithuanian Day, the Lithuanian people once more celebrate in mourning. One more commemoration of the resurrection of the Lithuanian state under the sign of Golgota. On this February 16, traditionally destined to rejoicing and to the enumeration of Lithuania's achievements, we are witnessing dreadful happenings affecting the Lithuanian people.

A Lithuanian in his homeland is not the host, but a slave. He is deprived not only of his homestead, of his generations-old modest belongings, but he is also expropriated of his labor, of his profession, of his family and of all his rights and freedoms. He no longer enjoys even the right to live, especially in his native country.

In Siberia, the Lithuanian deportees, who are still alive, are subjected to terrible physical and moral suffering. They have been deprived not only of their homeland, of their beloved ones, of all religious comfort, of all human rights and the minimum standard of living, but also of hope for a better future. These helpless victims are doomed to a slow death. This land of dread and fear is scattered with the bones of Lithuanian innocent people. From this paradise, as from Dante's pictured hell, there exists no way out under existing conditions.

Lithuanian refugees in western Germany are still suffering under the burden of exile, whereas, the lot of those scattered to the four winds, and who are now living in freedom, is not an easy one. The happiness and peace of mind of the Lithuanian Americans is also disturbed, for how can they enjoy life when their relatives and their beloved ones are being humiliated, deported, and murdered, when the country of their parents is plunged into blood and tears, converted into a huge cemetery, a land of misery and suffering? This cup of sorrow of the Lithuanian people unites us with all suffering Lithuanians, whether they are living beyond the seas, behind the iron curtain, or in the Siberian tundras. Nevertheless, we dare not despair. We shall never give comfort to the tyrant. If today we cannot rejoice, we at least can work for Lithuania's liberation. Until that day arrives, as we are deeply convinced it will, let us remind the world of the wrong inflicted on the Lithuanian nation, let us unmask the enemy of Lithuania and that of mankind, let us contribute to the liberation of Lithuania. Our efforts are not hopeless. No tyrant is eternal, and Lithuanians stand not alone. From the Baltic to the Black Sea, from Manchuria to India and Indochina, even within the Soviet Union's prewar boundaries, hundreds of millions of people are living under the same thought of liberation from the liberator. The free world understands and sympathizes with us. Year after year, the proclamations of the Governor of Maryland, as well as those of the heads of other States and cities, on Lithuania Day, and the presence of distinguished statesmen throughout America at observance ceremonies on that day, are vivid proof of that sympathy and solidarity. Also, in this connection, the following splendid editorial appeared in this morning's New York Times:

"LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

"With courage that rises above despair, the Lithuanian nation today observes the thirty-second anniversary of its independence with ceremonies which will unite Lithuanians everywhere except in Lithuania itself. This sturdy people, speaking one of the oldest living languages, proclaimed their independence amid the flames of the First World War on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian czars. Today, after another world war against tyranny and in defense of freedom, Lithuania, like the neighboring Baltic countries of Latvia and Estonia, is again under the iron heel of an oppressor. Only those who have escaped from this little country can still raise their voices in its behalf.

"The Soviet Government is attempting to Russify Lithuania by settling it with Russian Communists. According to charges submitted to the United Nations by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, some 600,000 Lithuanians out of a total population of less than 3,000,000 have already been deported to Russian slave-labor camps, killed, or starved to death, and the deportations are proceeding at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 each month. A Lithuanian underground is still active, and Lithuanian independence is still recognized by the Government of the United States."

On this occasion I recall an episode from the Crusades for the liberation of the Holy Land. A greatly beloved commander of one of the expeditionary forces died on the way. Before his death, his only request was that his heart be taken by his soldiers and buried in the Holy Land. His wish was fulfilled. Approaching the Holy Land, a fierce battle broke out. The expeditionary force began to waiver and defeat seemed imminent. At that critical moment, the commander in

charge flung into the midst of the enemy forces the heart of the beloved commander. Like lions, the soldiers fought to recover the heart from the enemy and won the battle.

We, too, must not fail to avenge the desecration of the heart of Lithuania.

The shadow of the enemy of Lithuania and of mankind is growing longer and longer. The dawn of Lithuania's liberation and freedom is growing brighter.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt once said to a delegation of Lithuanian Americans that Lithuania will be free again. We fervently hope that the day is not far distant when another President will be able to announce the longed-for words that Lithuania is free again.

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, OF MARYLAND

I consider it a real honor and privilege to be invited to attend this dinner commemorating the thirty-second anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania independence.

The celebration of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence is an event which is of significance, not only to Americans of Lithuanian descent, but to all Americans.

There are those who say that she has again lost her independence, but the United States Government does not. The United States Government has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and continues to recognize the representative of independent Lithuania accredited to this country.

Shall the United States continue to support the rights of small nations to self-determination, the right to free and unfettered elections, the right to liberty and representative government?

Certainly, as Americans, we want our country to uphold these principles throughout the world, for these principles are fundamental to the permanent peace and security of the United States.

No people have a stronger claim to the right of self-government than do the people of Lithuania.

From the earliest times, the Lithuanian people had developed their own language, similar to the anscient Sanskrit, their own culture and traditions, their own government, their own nation.

They are not related to the Russians or to any of the other Slavic peoples, but descended from an ancient people, of a distinct nationality.

It is, therefore, not surprising that they desire to retain independence and self-government as a means by which to preserve the ideals near and dear to them, their culture, language, in short, their way of life.

During its day of independence since the First World War, Lithuania demonstrated that it had a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

By its progress in its economic and cultural life, it demonstrated that its people were qualified to assume and discharge the responsibilities of independence.

It is apparent that on the basis of justice and right, on the basis of principles announced in the Atlantic Charter, no one should question Lithuania's right to independence.

But let there be no mistake where the United States stands. We have never condoned the acts of aggression as perpetrated by the Soviets. We refuse to recognize the predatory destruction of Lithuanian independence as valid.

We still regard Lithuania as an independent state.

On this anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we look forward to the day when we shall see Lithuania resume here admirable progress in self-government.

The spark of liberty has burned in the breasts of Lithuanians for centuries, and despite what has appeared at times to be overwhelming obstacles, the desire to be free has overcome all opposition.

It is my good fortune to know many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry. I can truthfully say you have added much to the civic welfare of your city, State, and Nation. You can very well feel proud of your achievements.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, the assembled group adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas by overwhelming military forces Soviet Russia occupied Lithuania in 1940 and now arbitrarily deprives Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia of their independent political life; and

"Whereas since the said occupation of Lithuania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics pursues a ruthless policy of planned liquidation, deportation and dispersion of the Lithuanian people in order to destroy the Lithuanian national entity; and

"Whereas the crime of genocide, which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is perpetrating upon the defenseless Lithuanian nation violates all principles of human rights and has been outlawed by the convention of the United Nations General Assembly; and

"Whereas the afore-stated genocide pact will be presented for action before the United States Senate: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That our representatives at the United Nations request that steps be taken by the General Assembly to impel the withdrawal of all Russian organizations from Lithuania; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States Government enter into no peace settlement without the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania and similar nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge our esteemed members of the United States Senate to ratify the genocide convention."

The foregoing resolutions were adopted by unanimous vote at the Thirty-second anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies held this 16th day of February 1950, in the Lithuanian Hall, Baltimore, Md.

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
MARTIN RAILA,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in further connection with the anniversary celebration, another meeting was held on February 19, at which time the group had the pleasure of hearing the Honorable P. Zadeikis, Lithuanian Minister to the United States. A translation of his speech follows:

ENGLISH VERISON OF A SPEECH DELIVERED BY P. ZADEIKIS, LITHUANIAN MINISTER, ON THE OCCASION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

While Lithuanians in the United States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and in other free countries, may freely express their feelings on this occasion, the situation in their homeland, now behind the iron curtain since 1944, is simply deplorable because of the heavy hand of the Soviet regime: Forcible collectivization of farming and the continued brutal deportations of Lithuanian families have made life miserable. Instead of joyous songs and colorful processions, deadly silence prevails, and fear of Soviet police reigns supreme in every corner of the land.

There is little doubt that the Kremlin potentates by employing means of economic destruction, Sovietization, Russification, and, above all, by means of forcible deportations of the Lithuanian citizenry, and genocide in general, seek to break the will of the Lithuanian people to be free and independent. Though Mr. Stalin often appears in the role of a modern czar, nevertheless, he remains the old Ivan the Terrible. Moscow's efforts will be in vain, for the Lithuanian nation has survived many crises in the past; the Lithuanians have even coined this popular expression: "Be what may, Lithuania will always stay."

The Lithuanian people lived for 120 years under czarist enslavement. They were forbidden to print and read Lithuanian books, and even Lithuania's name had been officially buried. But what happened? For every act of Russian onslaught, the Lithuanian people had developed countermeasures. They printed Ausra (the Dawn) and other periodicals and books in a neighboring country, and even in the United States, and smuggled them into Lithuania, regardless of severe penalties, including exile to Siberia. When, on February 16, 1918, the opportunity came, Lithuanians were ready for action to regain their long-cherished independence. Independence was proclaimed in the city of Vilnius, the country's historic capital. Many Lithuanians returned from abroad to help rebuild the country. The Lithuanian people succeeded in hoisting their national flag in Vilnius, in Kaunas, and in Klaipeda by the sea. We do not doubt that Lithuania eventually will regain her freedom, though we must realize that before our people will witness the dawn of liberty, global events may yet retard the advance of liberation.

I understand that the present unhappy situation in my homeland is not an isolated problem, but it is a part of the geopolitical problem of northeastern Europe, which, at the same time, is a problem of the future united Europe. The prevailing belief that Russian expansionism can be checked by peaceful means tends toward revision as the free countries of the western world are forced to bolster their own defenses for the sake of security. The old rule, "si vis pacem, para bellum," still lives despite the existence of the United Nations. The ravaging character of imperialistic bolshevism still refuses to be localized. As far as Lithuania's future is concerned, I am inclined to believe that her liberation will spring from the universal realization that the freedom of any nation is everybody's business, that appeasement of any dictatorship is dangerous and futile; on the other hand, the regime of terror might be just a sign of weakness of the Soviet dictatorship, obsessed with mania grandioza. But the Soviet regime inwardly is far from happy. Russian history tells us that for 1,000 years there had been no order in Russian lands, though the lands were rich. There is no order now in Soviet Russia, for stable order must rest on the free will of the people, and that is taboo in the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanians often hope that the United States would adopt a more resolute diplomatic action to aid Lithuania's liberation. In this respect, we must constantly bear in mind that the United States Government, relying on international law and moral principles, is pursuing vigorously a realistic policy of peace with justice, benefiting the chances of small nations, including Lithuania. It is not a minor matter that Lithuania is recognized as a sovereign state which maintains her legations and her consulates, though nearly 10 years have elapsed since the extortion of her freedom by the use of force and deceit which was perpetrated on June 15, 1940. The farsighted American policy of the continued recognition of our country, and of the nonrecognition of Soviet imperialistic designs, accords opportunities for our people, especially for those of us who are living in freedom, to contribute and to participate in activities which will shorten the period of eclipse and terror. The policy of self-aggrandizement, at the expense of smaller neighboring nations, must be stigmatized, and the ideals and the principles of the Atlantic Charter must be revitalized.

Lest We Forget—Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I bring to the attention of my colleagues that, on February 16, 1950, the people of Lithuania now living outside the orbit of the iron curtain, American citizens of Lithuanian extraction; yes, every lover of freedom, no matter in which country he resides, recalled that 32 years ago this small country of Lithuania regained her freedom and independence. Her people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty until they were again overrun by Russia.

Groups throughout this country assembled on February 16, 1950, and at these meetings remembered the peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, the Atlantic Charter, four freedoms, the United Nations Charter, the Yalta declaration, and the Potsdam agreement, and they wondered if these so-called solemn agreements had or have any sincere meaning to them, because they realize that this sturdy and freedom-loving country is now being destroyed as a nation and exterminated or enslaved as a people.

It is hoped that our Nation, and the other so-called democratic nations of the world will soon do a little more than acquiesce.

One of these meetings was held in my home city of Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society, and the following resolutions were enacted:

At a mass meeting held by Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society on February 12, 1950, at the Lithuanian Naturalization Club Hall, Worcester, Mass., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the 16th day of February 1950 marks the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic, and her demonstration to the world of her ability of self-democratic government and progress;

"Whereas the unlawful-by-force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by Russia and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destruction of her institutions, and her democratic form of government by Russia are continued at the present day;

"Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently and unilaterally violated all of the pacts or declarations solemnly underwritten by it, viz: Peace and nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, the Atlantic Charter, four freedoms, United Nations Charter, Yalta declaration, and the Potsdam agreement:

"Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania and the commitment of atrocities against her people, the destruction of her institutions and her democratic form of government, the violation of pacts and peace treaties;

"Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., petition the Government of the United States of America to repudiate and terminate all secret pacts concluded, without the consent or knowledge of the Congress of the United States at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, already unilaterally voided by Russia, and to reassert the principals of the Atlantic Charter by demanding that all Russian military forces, Government, and agents be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania and all other European countries now behind the iron curtain, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and that she be restored as a free and independent Republic among the nations of the world according to the principals enunciated in the Atlantic Charter.

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State the Honorable Dean Acheson, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the press."

MICHAEL ZEMAITAITIS,
Chairman.
JULIUS P. KISKIS,
Secretary.

Thirty-second Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of this body the very fine resolution adopted by the Waterbury Lithuanian-American Council on the observance of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

An appeal is made therein for simple justice for the now oppressed Lithuanian citizens.

The long proud adherence of the Lithuanians to democratic principles is ample evidence of their opposition to the terrifying tactics of the Russian dictatorship.

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn., February 25, 1950.
Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Taking cognizance of the unspeakable oppression, persecution, and systematic extermination of the people of Lithuania at the hands of the occupying Russian Soviet authorities, in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the obligations of membership in the United Nations, we, citizens of Waterbury, Conn., assembled on the 12th day of February 1950, at the St. Joseph's Hall, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of Societies, for the observance of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, appeal to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States—

To reaffirm the adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter in planning the restitution of peace;

To demand the withdrawal of the Russian armed forces, police, and political authorities from the territories of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

To ratify the convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide;

To take an active initiative in the United Nations in demanding liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and other countries now under the forcible enslavement by the Soviet Union;

To demand the punishment of the Russian Soviet criminals for the crimes of genocide perpetrated by them in occupied Lithuania and other countries outside the Soviet Union;

To enter into no discussions with Russia regarding the settlement of affairs pertaining to Lithuania and other countries without an active participation by representatives of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and representative bodies of other interested nations.

ALEXANDER J. ALEKSIS,
President.
NELL P. MESKUNAS,
Secretary.

Establishment of a Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of introducing a bill to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps as a companion to the one introduced in the other body by the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include my analysis of the need for this bill:

The Corps thus established would be charged with conservation of our natural resources which were of necessity so badly neglected during the war years, and the development of human resources through the training, education, and performance of useful work in conservation by the youthful citizens of this country.

The purpose of the Civilian Conservation Corps is twofold:

1. It is a long-range program—to conserve the water, soil, forest, and other natural resources of this country which have become so badly depleted.

2. It has a short term, immediate purpose—to relieve the growing unemployment of young men in this country. As of January 1950, there were over 1,000,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 24 who were out of employment and looking for it.

In the 1930's when an earlier CCC was established under President Roosevelt's farseeing eye, beginnings were made in such conservation. The Dust Bowls of Oklahoma; the perennial and drastic floods everywhere; the droughts in the Midwest; the ever-increasing gullies and arroyas, the overgrazed lands in the Southwest; the numerous roads, ditches, and canals, man-made erosion which accelerated geologic or natural erosion, all were dramatic examples of the need for constant watching, anticipating, preventing, and repairing of natural and man-made destruction of our natural resources.

The success of the earlier CCC, which was established on July 1, 1937, and liquidated by June 30, 1943, has been attested by both officials and enrollees. Many of them felt that a similar program should be organized directly after the war.

Conservation and protection of our natural resources is a problem common to all America and its citizens—particularly to those as yet unborn. A well-known eastern university recently established a department of conservation in recognition of the need for further and continuing work in this field.

Last year at this time there were 2,700,000 unemployed. This year, as of January 1950, there were 4½ million, an increase of 66 percent, and from 4.4 percent to 7.3 percent of the civilian labor force. The greatest rise in unemployment has been among men.

Coupled with the need for employment of our young citizens is the need for further education which many of them cannot afford and the need for continuing medical care which the recent war revealed as still inadequate for a large part of our population.

All of these are provided for in the bill.

It should be made very clear that this is a regular, continuing program of conservation.

It is not emergency.

It is not military.

It is an entirely voluntary program.

It conserves natural resources.

It conserves human resources.

The Tobacco Program Has Operated at a Profit Both to the Farmers and to Uncle Sam—Why Invite the Fate of Potatoes for a Farm Program That Is Successful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, at hearings conducted before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives during the past week, a statement was made by John M. Berry, New Castle, Ky., vice president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, opposing a graduated tax on cigarettes as proposed in H. R. 2016 and companion bills. Mr. Berry pointed out that the farm-loan program to support prices on burley tobacco through loans based on 90 percent of parity price has not cost the Government a cent, but on the contrary has made a profit of $10,000,000 from sales of tobacco in this country and abroad and has collected $15,000,000 in penalties on excess tobacco, making a total of $25,000,000 paid to the United States Treasury.

The tobacco program is one element of the farm program that is working satisfactorily. Why do we want to scuttle it with a tax change and invite the fate of potatoes?

Also, bear in mind that last year cigarettes paid $1,232,727,557.03 into the Federal Treasury. Uncle Sam is going to have to pay for it in two ways if a graduated tax is substituted. He will pay for the loss of revenue and he may have to pay to support the prices of a commodity that heretofore has never been on the sick list.

Mr. Berry said:

The organization for which I speak has been in the tobacco business as a grower organization for 29 years and since 1941 has been engaged under contract with Commodity Credit Corporation in the administration of the price-support program for Burley tobacco. It serves a membership of more than 225,000 tobacco growers in the States of Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Missouri. In this extensive undertaking this organization's work has been highly successful and profitable for both the producers of Burley tobacco and the United States Government. It has demonstrated that the program for tobacco is practicable. This organization has a happy, harmonious, and loyal membership, and it therefore presumes to speak on behalf of Burley tobacco growers in opposition to a graduated tax on cigarettes as proposed by H. R. 2016 and the companion bills.

The production of a crop of Burley tobacco requires skill, hard work, careful planning, much equipment and capital, and practically all of the time of an entire year. Tobacco in the States named where our membership resides is the money crop and the agricultural economy of those States rests upon the culture of Burley tobacco in proportion to the extent it is grown. In Kentucky it accounts for better than 60 percent of the farm income of the State, and for doubtless 80 percent of the income of those producing it. It is therefore, the chief business interest of hundreds of thousands of the citizens of all the States mentioned. All engaged in its culture strive from 1 year's end to the next to produce a finer quality and better product to satisfy what for years has been a constantly growing demand of the smoking public's discriminating taste for the better-blended cigarette.

On the auction market, while the manufacturers of the costlier popular brands of cigarettes, buy both the highest- and the medium-priced tobaccos, the growers see those manufacturers buy the bulk of their burley crop for the manufacture of cigarettes at those prices which make the high market averages; and they know at once that but for the use of their product in cigarettes, and in the better popular brands, the price for the bulk of their crop would be distressingly low. And the fear of low prices haunts the memory of every tobacco grower.

The so-called economy brands now represent only as variously estimated from 1 percent to 3 percent of the market and therefore account for the disappearance of only a negligible part of the burley growers' production. They know that and for that reason oppose an arbitrary classification of cigarette manufacturers for tax purposes that would burden and handicap the class that provides them the principal outlet for the product of their work and sweat and investment.

The differential proposed is 30 percent. All people and all businesses strive to achieve a lower tax bracket. And it would be the vainest waste of time to think the manufacturers of the popular and costlier brands of cigarettes would not devise every conceivable plan to accomplish the possible saving in tax. By the proposal the Government would invite their doing so. While there may be many, three such obvious plans—all costly to the growers—are that manufacturers will buy the higher quality grades of tobacco at much lower prices, or refrain from buying them at all, or substitute cheaper lower quality grades at very much lower prices to the growers; and produce cigarettes that will easily enable them to maintain their position in the competitive market.

The choice of costlier tobaccos which, in the present market principally account for the tobacco farmers' highly satisfactory income, will inevitably pile up in the hands of this and other similar organizations under loans; and the program which has proven to be so practicable and profitable to growers and Government alike will be jeopardized by the burden of these dearer and undisposable tobaccos.

While it may not be admitted that the so-called economy cigarette is an inferior product it is by these bills classed, or distinguished, because of its cheaper retail price. Tradewise the classification is unwarranted for the economy brands and the high-priced brands compete in the same market and cater to the same taste. Each would displace the other. Competitors; therefore, the Government should treat them as equals, and not subsidize the one and burden the other in violation of the true and correct conception of an excise tax, and at the expense of the hundreds of thousands of bystanding tobacco growers for whom this organization speaks.

Public Interest in Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two of the many news articles written by Bob Considine, of the International News Service. Since they have to do with alleged national syndicates of gamblers and racketeers, these articles are particularly timely in view of the fact that yesterday the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate approved Senate Resolution 202. This resolution authorizes the committee to investigate the use of the facilities of interstate commerce in furtherance of organized crime, which is in violation of the laws in the States where the crimes occur. The reports and conclusions set forth in these articles by Mr. Considine are additional evidence of the interest in ascertaining the full facts of this problem, and of having appropriate recommendations for legislation made to the Congress.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOODLUM EMPIRE

(Art. 1, February 13)

The subtle black stain of a hoodlum super-government, well protected politically, is slowly but surely spreading itself over the population centers of the United States.

Like communism, to which it has been compared by the director of the Greater Miami Crime Commission, it is superbly concealed, well-organized, and in some cases it has adopted the robes of legitimacy.

Unlike communism, it wallows in enormous profits, from gambling and other sources.

Abhoring violence as a rule, and letting cash and influence do their talking, the shrouded leaders of the hoodlum empire have expanded their influence from local police levels, to sheriffs, to mayors, to State legislatures, to governors, and either to—or toward—the Federal Government.

The national syndicate, which is operating more brazenly and with greater efficiency than ever before in the annals of crime, has its own cabinet, its own police forces, and what amounts to its own "foreign relations office"—emissaries and lobbyists planted in State capitals and apparently in Washington, D. C.

Wherever the syndicate moves, it corrupts.

William O'Dwyer, mayor of the Nation's greatest city, has publicly acknowledged that his own vast forces of law and order can no longer control one phase of the mob's operations—bookmaking. He has suggested, in effect, that the mob be legalized, in a desperate effort to stop the further pollution of New York police.

The mayors of such widely separated cities as New Orleans and Portland, Oreg., have informed their constituents that they are the targets of nationally operated mob efforts to remove them.

One branch of the national syndicate was powerful enough to make a deal with the elected officials of a certain Ohio city whereby on-the-lam hoodlums from other areas were given extra-territorial rights in that city, in exchange for the mobsters' protection of the city against lesser crimes.

In businessman roles, instead of frankly hoodlum roles, the national leaders of the syndicate have become powers in the political affairs of New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Atlantic City, Cleveland, Kansas City, Los Angeles, many smaller cities, and the States of Nevada and Florida.

Through campaign contributions and outright bribery, the syndicate has managed to reap favors that run the gamut from immunity to arrest to money-saving rezoning legislation for its ever-expanding real-estate holdings.

There is no racket too small to be overlooked. An honest Miami Beach councilman, Navy veteran, and lawyer, Melvin J. Richard, has told the Dade County grand jury that he was offered a $200,000-a-year income to countenance the operation of a simple punchboard racket.

The offer was made astutely, with a proposal to show him ways and means of remaining a white knight for better government. The gamblers' consternation was mighty when Richard rejected the offer. The syndicate's annual appropriation for "ice" (its bribes, political contributions, and sometimes ostentatious gifts to charities) can be estimated only by those accustomed to astronomical figures. The California Crime Commission, for example, estimates the "ice" for slot-machine protection alone at $400,000,000 in recent years.

The syndicate's armed forces no longer go in for such gaudy slayings as the St. Valentine's Day massacre. The top men of the organization continually counsel discretion, for shootings tend to rouse the suckers. The suckers, as any good syndicate man will tell you, are the people of the United States, ranging from the bootblack who plays his daily nickel on the numbers to high pressure $10,000-a-shot bettors who do business with the bigger bookmakers.

In the end, nobody can win except the men behind the bookie or the numbers writers. They have emerged from the underworld as reformed convicts of sometimes great standing in their communities. They know they cannot lose, for the American public will never stop gambling. They strive passionately for respectability, by and large, and stoop to violence only in great emergencies.

One of these emergencies arose a few years ago when Jack Le Tendre, New England gambler, resisted the attempt of New York gangsters to muscle into the rich sucker market of Broward County, Fla., which lies just to the north of Dade County—seat of Miami.

Le Tendre had built himself a nice place named La Boheme in Broward, where certain law officers now boldly permit the important New York mobsters Joe Odonis and Jake Lanskey to operate exclusively.

Le Tendre was told to split his swag from his gambling place or get out. He refused.

Then he made the mistake of returning to his native Woonsocket, R. I. He was murdered there—and thus the blood of the crime was kept off the record of the Miami area.

The others "play ball," content with the best set-up they've ever found in lives devoted almost exclusively to beating the law. They never had it better. They've found the perfect racket—gambling. And the perfect customers—an American public which refuses to take them very seriously, though these men are daily corrupting thousands of public servants.

The FBI cannot touch them because gambling, chief source of the syndicate leaders' income, is not a Federal offense.

The Treasury Department cannot touch them for, by and large, they pay their taxes almost religiously.

The Federal Communications Commission, which has power enough to put a radio-station owner out of business if he wears the wrong kind of necktie, either will not or cannot close down all the racing wire services which are the main arteries of the bookie business of the Nation.

If a man kidnaps another in this country, or transports a woman across a State line for immoral purposes, or steals a car and drives it out of the State, and is caught, the full weight of the Federal Government descends upon him, thanks to the Lindbergh, Mann and Dyer Acts.

But let him get caught operating a gambling game, which automatically means that he has spread incredible corruption in order to operate, and he pays a comparatively microscopic fine.

He has committed only a misdemeanor. The little jail sentence is usually forgotten.

Nobody in America can get very excited about the spread of gambling. The average American can see little moral difference between placing a legal bet on a horse at a track and betting on the same horse with a bookie, away from the track.

The same average American has been sold a nice bill of goods, too, on the character of the gambler with whom he does business. He thinks of him, at least when he's winning, as a fine home-loving fellow who is often the first to contribute to the bettor's favorite charity.

What he overlooks is that not one gambler of any dimension in the United States today can operate as an individual.

Everyone of any magnitude is a front man for an arm of the national syndicate composed of former and current gangsters with long records of murder, traffic in narcotics, kidnaping, extortion, prostitution, burglary, and what not.

There is absolutely no other way for a successful independent gambler to operate today.

He could set up his "book" in the middle of the Arizona Desert in the dead of night, but if he did a good business he'd shortly be working for the national syndicate, or he wouldn't be working at all.

The Nation-wide combination seems loosely knitted, for like all young empires it has its fraternal feuds, most of them based on territorial claims.

But the over-all picture shows a considerable cohesion, with a system of checks, controls, and counterbalances which makes the bawdy rule of the late Al Capone seem like a crude amateur's farce, performed for peanuts.

Like an octopus, the seemingly unrelated tentacles of the syndicate are in fact connected with a remote head.

The thing feeds voraciously on the venality of corrupt officials, the public's traditional apathy, the spew of respectability some of the top syndicate men emit, and the present inability of the American Government to combat the menace.

But jabbing at that head now are two determined United States Senators, ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and three public-spirited crime commissions, those of California, Chicago, and Greater Miami. They have demanded support from President Truman.

The counterattack inches slowly through labyrinths of circumstantial evidence. Sometimes the evidence is even flimsier. It is discouraging work, for the syndicate leaders have covered their trails superbly.

But the job goes on, for the men who are attending to it have uncovered enough to confirm their one great and appalling fear: that mob rule one day might supersede that under which 150,000,000 Americans now live.

(Art. 6, February 18)

How much money do Americans bet annually?

A confidential survey made for the Citizens' Committee of Massachusetts, Inc., places the figure at $21,500,000,000, a figure which does not include lotteries, raffles, carnival games, and other gambling facilities.

The survey supported its contention of vast gambling activities with the observation that some $28,000,000,000 in this country is now annually unaccounted for by Government expenditure statistics. Nor does this lost fortune show up in investment or savings-bank statistics.

It is reported that gambling on baseball now has reached the $5,000,000,000 a year mark, and that racing wire services controlled by the remnants of the Capone mob now stress baseball scores, in season, almost as much as racing results.

Most of the baseball betting, the survey showed, is done in New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Chicago, and Pittsburgh.

Betting on baseball in New York, it added, is "largely dominated by the Erickson-Costello group and its associates."

Before he died of bullets shot into him by Capone mobsters who wanted his business, "race wire king" James M. Ragen told police officers that Frank Costello's income from slot machines in Louisiana alone was $1,000,000 a year.

Costello denied that he is now associated with the slot-machine racket in that State or anywhere else, though his partner Phil Kastel, who once had White House habitue John Maragon on his pay roll, continues his gambling affiliations in the State.

No one can state with any complete conviction the scope of United States gambling.

But no one can deny that it is a breathtakingly big operation, and that the suckers are harvested by an efficient Nation-wide organization which has hosts of public officials in its pocket.

In some places the organization can operate successfully for reasons other than bribery. The Dade County (Fla.) grand jury last spring complained:

"We have been made keenly aware of the division of responsibility for the enforcement of the criminal laws in our community.

"There are the sheriff's department and the different police departments. There are the county solicitor's office and the State attorney's office.

"Such division of responsibilities leads readily to excuses for avoidance of responsibilities; to a 'hands-off' policy of matters which can be claimed to be within the jurisdiction of another official; to a cynical attitude that 'it is not within the province of my office or department to investigate so and such'; to a rendering impotent of our grand jury system."

In the same area a judge has ruled that citizens cannot come into his court to protest the presence in the community of known mobsters.

They must present their complaint to police authorities * * * which procedure tends to lead into the same blind alley of split authority mentioned by the grand jury.

In such a climate, the mobs make their progress.

In recent years it has become fashionable for top figures in the national syndicate to become associated in many legitimate businesses.

Frank Costello, for instance, is a holder of Wall Street property and other real estate in New York. He numbers among his friends an array of public servants, including judges, far removed from the arena of crime.

No one can tell how much else Costello, Erickson, Adonis, the Lansky brothers, Charles Fischetti, the Rosen mobsters, Mickey Cohen and others mentioned in this series really own.

Testimony taken during a court fight seeking to regain the Wofford Hotel of Miami Beach from the control of, among others, "Little Augie" Pisano, former Brooklyn racketeer, shows the difficulty of establishing who owns what and why.

Here are some of the bewildering questions and answers that came out of an interrogation of one of the defendants, Thomas A. Cassara. It was taken at Los Angeles on January 19, 1948:

"Did they ('Little Augie' and John Angersola, alias John King—a Cleveland gangster) ever tell you that they were the owners or were going to hold themselves out as being owners of the hotel?

"No, sir.

"Did you ever make any deal with them whereby they were to run that hotel?

"Well, if you want me to explain in detail——

"Just tell me if you made a deal with them.

"No, sir."

Then later:

"Who is Mr. King?

"This money I borrowed from him personally. He is a close personal friend of mine. His sole interest in the Wofford Hotel was to get back the return of moneys he had loaned to me.

"How much did you owe Mr. King and Mr. Kelly? (The latter is a reference to the late Jimmy Kelly, relative of "Little Augie" and former Greenwich Village night club proprietor and gambler.)

"I don't recall.

"Do you have the books to show it?

"They have."

And so it goes. Only the Federal Government, when empowered, will ever be able to unravel the mystery of deals, counter deals, links, counter links, half truths, evasions and the like which surround the operations of the syndicate chieftains and those on the outskirts.

Until the Federal Government does act, the several crime commissions will continue hammering away.

Often their accusations can be based on nothing more than the fact that this man of shady reputation is seen with that official of ostensibly good reputation—and curious things sometimes happen relating to that association.

But crime commissions have no police power. All they can do is urge the law-invoking authorities to take action. In this sometimes thankless and fruitless task, the voice of Dan Sullivan, Greater Miami's crime expert and former FBI man, is among the more eloquent.

"My own fear," he told me, "is that unless the trend toward gang government is stopped pretty soon we'll wind up with a secret hoodlum government greater than our Federal Government.

"The smooth leaders of the national syndicate, many of them now indistinguishable from reputable businessmen, are in fact so powerful that—by comparison—Al Capone was a piker * * * a stick-up kid compared to a hardened bank robber.

"They feed on a public failing which the public itself tends to condone—gambling.

"Gambling is like narcotics. The habit comes easy and is hard or impossible to stop. As a result, billions of dollars are being poured each year into a nonproductive operation, the national syndicate, and millions of it are being spent to corrode the officials who might stop the racket.

"We hear a lot to the effect that the boys have reformed; that their criminal records were compiled when they were fun-loving kids.

"That's a lot of bunk. They're still rotten, and if we can't get the Federal Government to clean them out, the very foundations of our society may collapse."

Distribution of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following is the list of State agencies, with addresses, authorized to approve applications for the distribution of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation to needy people within the State named.

It supplements the lists introduced into the RECORD on February 23 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]:

Florida: W. F. Catling, Director, Commodity District Welfare Department, 25 West Monroe Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

Alabama: A. R. Meadows, State Department of Education, 501 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

Georgia: J. T. DeFoor, Department of Education, 412 State Office Building, Atlanta, Ga.

North Carolina: J. P. Davis, Marketing Specialist, Department of Agriculture, Raleigh, N. C.

South Carolina: W. H. Garrison, State School Lunch Supervisor; Courtenay Bateman, Supervisor of Commodity District, 1230 Center Street, Room 212, Columbia, S. C.

Tennessee: T. Marshall Jones, Director, Department of Agriculture, 405 State Office Building, Nashville, Tenn.

Virginia: George Blake, Department of Agriculture, 1007½ East Main Street, Richmond, Va.

Tragic Plight of 28,000 Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Greek-American Political Club, of Cambridge, Mass., urging use of the moral prestige of the United States to remedy the abominable crime of forcible abduction of 28,000 Greek children by the Communist forces:

Whereas Americans of Hellenic descent, and particularly those descendants from Greece, are deeply concerned that 28,000 Greek children have been forcibly abducted from their homes by the Communist forces and are presently detained in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet occupation zone in Germany; and

Whereas the members of the Greek-American Political Club, headquarters at 504 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass., at a meeting held at our headquarters the 2d day of February 1950, on motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously resolved that—

1. This abominable crime against humanity in violation of the international authority of the United Nations' resolutions should be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

2. That the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 27, 1948, and November 17, 1949, requesting the prompt repatriation of these children should be promptly enforced, in order that confidence in the United Nations shall be maintained.

3. The Secretary General of the United Nations, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the League of Red Cross Societies are respectfully requested to continue their noble efforts toward implementation of the United Nations resolution pertaining to the return of the Greek children.

4. The President of the United States, the honorable Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and the United States Department of State, are respectfully petitioned to support through their moral and political prestige the United Nations' resolutions heretofore mentioned and to have their execution and implementation in mind when dealing with the Governments named above.

5. All American organizations and all individuals concerned with the preservation of elementary human rights and freedoms are called upon to demonstrate through their interest in this manner that the public opinion of the world's free countries is a decisive factor in winning battles for humanity.

6. That a copy of this resolution shall be signed by the President, Treasurer, and Secretary of the Organization and sent to His Excellency Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Honorable Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, President of the United Nations; the Honorable Trygve Lie, General Secretary of the United Nations; the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, United States Representative to the United Nations; the Honorable Warren Austin, head of the United States Delegation to the United Nations; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House

at Washington, D. C.; the director of the International Committee of the Red Cross at Geneva, Switzerland; the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator from Massachusetts; the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Senator from Massachusetts; the Honorable A. Kyrou, permanent delegate of Greece to the United Nations; His Eminence Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church; the Honorable Francis J. Myers, United States Senator from Pennsylvania; the Honorable John F. Kennedy, Member of Congress; the Honorable Christian Herter, Member of Congress; the Honorable John W. McCormack, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin, Members of Congress; and the Honorable Joseph Martin, Member of Congress and minority floor leader.

Respectfully submitted.

PETER G. PAPPADOPOULOS, *President.*
GREGORY LIACOPOULOS, *Secretary.*
PETER L. NICHOLAS, *Treasurer.*

Nixon to the Right—Douglas to the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, important news articles in California yesterday announced that the Honorable SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Senator from that State, had withdrawn as a candidate for reelection.

It was general knowledge about 10 days ago that our colleague, the gentlewoman, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, from California, was given an audience at the White House and there was speculation at the time as to whether or not she would be the administration's candidate in the coming senatorial election in that great State.

Since then, Eleanor Roosevelt, the surviving wife of ex-President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has written favorably of Mrs. DOUGLAS in her column and advised us of a dinner that Mrs. Roosevelt held in her honor.

We are also informed through the press that the past Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, is going to campaign for Mrs. DOUGLAS in California, and that the CIO has endorsed her in the senatorial election.

It, therefore, seems important that the conference between the Honorable SHERIDAN DOWNEY and President Truman on which Senator DOWNEY said he would predicate his final announcement of his candidacy for reelection, was canceled at the White House today.

It will also be important to the people of California who will have a real opportunity to express the attitude of the State in regard to further Government ownership of business operations and control through subsidization of the economic activities of that State.

We in the House will be privileged to see our colleague the gentlewoman from California, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, standing on the left of that issue with the support of the administration as an opponent to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON as the champion of the American free-enterprise system.

For the first time in several years the issues will be clearly drawn for the people of California as to whether or not they want government by understandable laws or through Executive decrees.

H-Bomb—Right Thinking Can Make H-Bomb a Deterrent to Catastrophic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial by Fred Burdick in the eighth anniversary edition of the Gist entitled "Right Thinking Can Make H-Bomb a Deterrent to Catastrophic War":

RIGHT THINKING CAN MAKE H-BOMB A DETERRENT TO CATASTROPHIC WAR

"Nothing is right or wrong but thinking makes it so."—Shakespeare.

Right and constructive thinking regarding the H-bomb and all improved methods of destroying millions of innocent children, women, and men in a few minutes can prevent such a catastrophe from happening. The danger is from the wrong thinking—the hatreds, resentments, fears, and suspicions—the thoughts of which wars are made. Right, Christian thinking will bring the peace everybody wants.

We are experimenting, not merely with new weapons, but with forces. And some scientists contend that chain reactions may get out of control with disastrous results. And such an authority on bacteriological warfare as Secretary General Brock Chisholm, of the World Health Organization, maintains that this weapon alone endangers humanity and warns that nations must learn to live together on this planet if they want to live.

When we recall what the black plague did to populations, we can give credence to the claim that man-made epidemics—purposely scattering many billions of germs—indeed menace all people of the civilized world and that the best chance of surviving a scientific war would be amongst the savages in the jungles of Africa, etc. The more realistic we are and the more we visualize the terrible possibilities of modern warfare the more likely we are to succeed in preventing such madness and getting the world on the road to peace, progress, and prosperity.

Top military men say no nation can really win a modern war. All would lose. Said Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in the New York Times of May 28, 1947:

"War is becoming more and more a matter of fire, famine and pestilence. We can make of this earth a flowering garden or a sterile desert."

He added that the stakes in this campaign (for peace) are not only civilization but humanity.

Many thinkers have held to the theory for long that in due time warfare would become so destructive and menacing to civilization and humanity that world leaders would have no alternative than to find and use peaceful means of solving international problems. That time has come. We have the necessary machinery in the United Nations, and all that is needed is for all its members to use its machinery, not just part of the time but all of the time, and to adhere to both the letter and the spirit of the great United Nations Charter. A life preserver is of no value to a drowning man unless he uses it.

What are the immediate, practical steps that can be taken to head off world catastrophe? The answer can be found in a Gist poll taken in recent months showing that 80.2 percent of the people and nearly as large a percentage of Members of Congress favored continuous efforts in the United Nations to reach agreement on control and reduction of all deadly weapons, including atom bombs.

HOTHEADS PROLONG THE COLD WAR—COOL HEADS CAN HASTEN WORLD PEACE

When spokesmen for great countries at United Nations meetings engage in tirades and "hit high C" in vituperative utterances, impugn motives, and make unfounded charges, such tactics intensify resentments, tensions, and fears, thus prolonging the cold war and delaying the day when nations can "beat their swords in plowshares" and devote their energies, resources, and wealth to constructive instead of destructive purposes, to creating instead of blowing up property, homes, and so forth. Although vitriolic ravings may make the headlines, fortunately for humanity and civilization cooler heads are really in control.

As to charges of "war mongering" the Gist can state that not one American Congressman wants to see a catastrophic, scientific, new world war. Top officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces have told congressional committees that they desire peace. The main purpose of the State Department is to build peace. And when President Truman says "I am working for peace and shall continue to work for peace" he means every word of it. There are diversities of roads to peace but there is but one goal. But to make progress we must have peace in our own hearts, and be sure we are on the right road.

Spokesmen for all major nations at the United Nations have declared that their governments want peace, which doubtless is true, but the fundamental prerequisite for dissipating the war clouds is eradication of or minimizing of international tensions, fears, suspicions, resentments, and hatreds. And we should add misunderstandings as they frequently are the basis of wrong conclusions, thinking, and emotions.

A black-out of all war talk by radio commentators and newspaper columnists, etc., and a cessation of expressions of ill-will and resentment toward world neighbors is suggested by Representative JAMES V. BUCKLEY, of Illinois, who believes such a thing would help tremendously in insuring world peace.

In concluding a recent NBC broadcast, Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, of North Carolina, expressed the thought that world peace can be aided by recognition and practicing of the principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

As we in America profess to be Christians, we should be the first to practice the Golden Rule: "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." It well has been said that the best sermon ever preached is setting a good example. Now may be a very propitious time to cut the vicious circle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and to substitute practicing Jesus' teachings.

Above all else just now, we need to have more faith in God and to know that there shall be fulfillment of, "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not take up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Economic Cooperation Administration

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is appalling to me to note the flagrant manner in which public funds are being used by bureaucrats to perpetuate themselves in office.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Times-Herald under date of Tuesday, February 21, wherein it tells that the ECA is enlarging its publicity staff in the battle for funds. To quote a paragraph from this article, it says that the ECA Information Director, Robert Mullen, revealed that he is looking for additional former newspaper and magazine writers to act as press agents for the Marshall plan.

It goes on to say that we are spending $285,000 to propagandize domestically the Marshall plan and to build support within the United States for the Marshall plan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations might well look into this domestic-propaganda campaign on the part of these bureaucrats before voting additional funds to that agency.

I include herewith the text of the news item:

ECA ENLARGING PUBLICITY STAFF IN BATTLE FOR FUNDS

(By Philip Warden)

The Economic Cooperation Administration yesterday enlarged its publicity machine in Washington as it girded for a stiff fight for its life in Congress starting today.

On the eve of a march to the Hill by ECA Administrator Hoffman and Secretary Acheson with a request for $2,950,000,000 to finance the Marshall plan another year, ECA put five new writers and a clerk on its information staff at an annual cost of $39,450.

SEEKING MORE WRITERS

In addition, a magazine consultant has been put on call for $50-a-day advice to the information staff when needed.

The ECA information director, Robert Mullen, revealed that he is looking for additional former newspaper and magazine writers to act as press agents for the Marshall plan. Present plans call for adding $61,000 to the $224,075 yearly expenditures of ECA's information section. Mullen has been authorized to spend up to $285,000 in this country on the ECA publicity machine.

Mullen said a big expansion also is under way in the information division of ECA in Europe. Expenditures there to tell Europeans about the Marshall plan are being boosted from $250,000 a year to $8,000,000. Part of the eight million will come from foreign currencies collected from the sale of Marshall plan goods by the European governments.

LIAISON WITH UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE

Mullen listed the new staff members as:

Andrew Berding, former $10,000-a-year man in ECA's information office in Rome, who will serve as Mullen's deputy and function primarily as liaison officer between ECA and the State Department's propaganda machine, United States Information Service.

Hugh Latham, new special assistant at $6,400 a year. Latham formerly worked for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Fortune magazine.

Harry Shinnick, former Washington newspaperman, a writer at $7,600 a year.

Willard Savoy, young Negro author of the book Alien Land. He will serve as a speech and magazine writer at $7,600 a year.

Norton Wood, picture editor of This Week magazine. He will take a leave of absence to work for ECA as an information specialist on pictures at $6,400 a year.

Thomas Mahoney, an employee of Young & Rubicam, New York advertising agency, consultant on the placement of magazine articles by ECA writers.

Mary Louise Parks, secretary to Helen Hamilton Woods, special consultant who directs ECA's propaganda to clubwomen.

The ECA press staff is expecting rough going before Congress for the next several weeks as the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate debate extension of the Marshall plan and its appropriation.

Tennessee Valley Authority Financial Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a financial statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Total funds made available to TVA and total investment as of June 30, 1949

1. Appropriations	$766,562,331
2. Transfer of property from other agencies	41,902,121
3. Proceeds from the sale of bonds	65,072,500
4. Net income from power operations	[1] 130,128,901
Total funds provided	1,003,665,853
5. Less following amounts:	
(a) Bond redemptions	13,572,500
(b) Payments to Treasury	33,970,333
(c) Net expense of non-income producing programs	115,299,795
Total	162,842,628
Total investment, June 30, 1949	840,823,225

[1] The net income from power operations figure of $130,128,901 is arrived at in the following manner:

Gross income from power	$366,687,585
Less following amounts:	
Depreciation	81,869,079
Interest (net)	5,180,538
Other expenses	149,489,067
Total	236,558,684
Net income from power	130,128,901

Total funds made available to TVA and total investment as of June 30, 1949—Con.

Funds paid into the Treasury:	
(1) From power proceeds	$26,059,019
(2) From activities other than power	7,911,314
Total	33,970,333
(3) Bonds retired from power proceeds	13,572,500
(4) For interest	6,325,407
Total	53,868,240

INVESTMENT IN POWER PROGRAM OF TVA

EXHIBIT I.—*TVA power program assets,*[1] *June 30, 1949*

The power investment includes the following assets:	
Completed plant in service	$510,433,479
Less reserve for depreciation	79,001,062
Net plant in service	431,432,417
Funds held for future use under sec. 26, in the form of cash and current receivables	5,174,680
Long-term receivables	17,282
Inventories	7,639,544
Total assets employed in power program	444,263,923
Construction in progress	28,483,065
Total	472,746,988
This investment was financed with capital from the following sources:	
U. S. Treasury funds:	
Appropriations and transfers of property:	
Total	317,177,105
Less payments under sec. 26	26,059,019
Net outstanding	291,118,086
Bonds:	
Issued	65,072,500
Retired	13,572,500
Net outstanding	51,500,000
Total U.S. Treasury funds outstanding	342,618,086
Earnings of the power business:	
Gross earnings	136,454,309
Less interest paid	6,325,407
The remainder represents the net earnings invested in power assets, including $39,631,519 paid to the Government for retirement of bonds and as an offset to appropriations and $90,497,383 used directly in the business	130,128,902
Total	472,746,988

[1] Exclusive of general assets not segregated by programs and exclusive of construction in progress relating to multiple-use facilities at projects for which an allocation of costs to programs has not yet been made.

EXHIBIT II.—*TVA power income and expense, by years, summarized from annual financial statements*

Fiscal year	Operating revenue	Operating expenses	Depreciation provisions and amortization	Net operating revenue	Interest income	Gross earnings
1933–1938	$6,732,447	$3,870,994	$3,610,118	($748,665)	$164,946	($583,719)
1939	5,507,077	2,332,604	1,731,593	1,442,880	95,954	1,538,834
1940	15,285,074	7,081,735	3,615,623	4,587,716	143,595	4,731,311
1941	21,137,371	9,264,242	4,546,547	7,326,582	148,798	7,475,380
1942	25,329,954	15,819,351	5,230,350	4,280,253	136,078	4,416,331
1943	31,674,210	11,935,739	[1] 7,937,886	11,800,585	126,559	[1] 11,927,144
1944	35,429,546	13,815,808	[1] 9,876,468	[1] 11,737,270	115,045	[1] 11,852,315
1945	39,383,231	12,891,642	[1] 8,885,757	[1] 17,605,832	102,409	[1] 17,708,241
1946	35,264,545	9,875,814	8,605,731	16,783,000	78,591	16,861,591
1947	44,144,090	13,588,931	8,716,410	21,838,749	25,198	21,863,947
1948	48,769,524	22,328,321	9,264,755	17,176,448	5,299	17,181,747
1949	58,030,516	26,683,886	9,867,841	21,478,789	2,398	21,481,187
Total	366,687,585	149,489,067	[1] 81,889,079	[1] 135,309,439	1,144,870	[1] 136,454,309

[1] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric plant acquisition adjustment by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

EXHIBIT III.—*Return on the TVA power investment*

Fiscal year	Average investment [1]	Gross earnings	Annual return on investment
			Percent
1941	$190,000,000	$7,475,380	3.9
1942	220,000,000	4,416,331	2.0
1943	295,000,000	13,927,144	4.7
1944	360,000,000	14,852,315	4.1
1945	390,000,000	18,708,241	4.8
1946	400,000,000	16,861,591	4.2
1947	400,000,000	21,863,947	5.5
1948	405,000,000	17,181,747	4.2
1949	430,000,000	21,481,187	5.0

SUMMARY

Fiscal year	Average investment	Gross earnings	Annual return on investment
			Percent
1934–40, 7 years. (development period)	$60,000,000	$5,686,426	1.4
1941–49, 9 years	345,000,000	[2] 130,767,883	4.2
1934–49, 16 years	220,000,000	[2] 136,454,309	3.9

[1] Average net book cost during the year of plant in service plus long-term receivables and an allowance for inventories and general plant used for the power program.
[2] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustments by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.

EXHIBIT IV.—*Disposition of gross TVA power earnings*

Fiscal year	Gross earnings (from exhibit II)	Disposition of gross earnings			
		Interest	Bond retirement	Paid to U. S. Treasury (sec. 26)	Used directly in the power business
1933–39	$955,115	$60,479			$894,636
1940	4,731,311	432,082			4,299,229
1941	7,475,380	484,602			6,990,778
1942	4,416,331	742,978			3,673,353
1943	[1] 11,927,144	778,291			[1] 11,148,853
1944	[1] 11,852,315	736,624	$2,000,000		[1] 9,115,691
1945	[1] 17,708,241	726,207	2,000,000		[1] 14,982,034
1946	16,861,591	647,867	2,300,000	$7,087,741	6,825,983
1947	21,863,947	615,570	2,272,500	7,971,278	11,004,599
1948	17,181,747	563,936	2,500,000	8,000,000	6,117,811
1949	21,481,187	536,771	2,500,000	3,000,000	15,444,416
Total	136,454,309	6,325,407	13,572,500	26,059,019	[2] 90,497,383

[1] Reflects accelerated amortization of electric plant acquisition adjustments by write-off against accumulated earnings: 1943, $2,000,000; 1944, $3,000,000; 1945, $1,000,000.
[2] $5,174,680 is in the form of cash and current receivables, a share of which will be paid to the Government within the current fiscal year.

Salute to Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, may I add my personal salute to Rotary International by including herein the following editorial which appeared in the Nutley Sun, Nutley, N. J., of February 24, 1950:

SALUTE TO ROTARY

Rotary International is 45 years old today. From a simple group of five or six young businessmen in Chicago who formed a habit of lunching together once a week, it has grown into a membership of 334,000 business and professional executives with 6,907 Rotary Clubs in 82 countries of this world.

There is a serious purpose behind Rotary. It sings with its meals, but it is no singing society. Rather, rotary is a world forum for men determined to promote a better understanding of all humans in the interests of world peace. Red Russia, bent on aggression, bans Rotary, and that is understandable and a wonderful tribute.

Rotary has assigned itself two missions. By monthly publications it reports the progress of the United Nations, to strengthen its prestige. Having raised $2,000,000 for an endowment fund it now selects 56 rotary fellows annually to go abroad for advanced study, thus spreading a wider knowledge of world affairs to further peace.

Both motives are excellent. By its application to its mission, Rotary fulfills its purpose to foster the ideal of service.

God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the subject God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb, delivered at the Washington Cathedral, in Washington, D. C., on February 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD, MAN, AND THE HYDROGEN BOMB

It is with deep feeling of humility that I address myself to the subject of the day—God, Man, and the Hydrogen Bomb. But man cannot escape coping with the harsh realities of international life. Man today spends more of the earth's resources, his wealth, and his genius on preparation for war and the ultimate destruction of human and religious values than he does on the creation of a living society based on the eternal religious principles of human brotherhood.

What the United States, for example, spends each week for military defense is what the Federal aid to education program proposes to spend for one whole year, and is as much as is being planned to spend for public health for one whole year, or for rural electrification for one whole year.

We meet here today on Ash Wednesday. We, with the millions in Christendom, today enter the lenten season. We begin the search into the recesses of our own souls; we come to grips with the facts of our own human inadequacy; we come to the ultimate realization that unless man prepares himself to commit an act of faith, he and his civilization may disintegrate.

On January 31 the President of the United States ordered the construction of the hydrogen bomb. On February 2 a noble American, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, made vivid for the American people the significance of the President's announcement. He challenged the world to turn from a path toward war and build for peace.

On February 4 a group of 12 of the country's leading physicists warned that one hydrogen bomb could wipe out any city in the world and release such enormous masses of lethal radiation as to make the affected area forbidden to habitation of human beings for perhaps centuries to come. They pleaded: "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb no matter how righteous its cause. This bomb is no longer a weapon of war, but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization itself."

On February 6, another distinguished American, the chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, declaring that "armies are not the answer to the settlement of international disputes," urged that the United States call an international conference for the specific purpose of achieving complete world disarmament.

On February 12 the world's leading scientist, Dr. Albert Einstein, stated that "the idea of achieving security through national armament is at the present state of military techniques a disastrous illusion * * * radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere

and hence annihilation of any life on earth has been brought within the range of technical possibility."

The threat of physical destruction is obvious to all serious and informed persons. Whatever faith in inevitable progress which those of us reared in the liberal tradition may have had is seriously shaken. Not only is the threat of physical disaster a grave one for the future of mankind, but the chronic threat of war, even without its advent, must inevitably create a state of perpetual crisis and resultant loss of human freedom. Fear can result in placing the control of man's destiny in the hands of just a few. Decisions in such an atmosphere must give special weight to the advice of those who specialize in violence. Under the stress of continuing war tension, the body politic may well transform itself into a garrison-prison state.

In much of the globe this process has gone far already. If the crisis continues, the process can appear in every country. Its success may call for no revolutionary seizure of power by totalitarian forces. The process has more in common with man's struggling in a bottomless bog.

The United States stands in 1950 at a high point of power. American strength is at present supreme from the Stetein-Trieste line and from Greece and Turkey westward to southern Korea and Japan. Command of the seas and the possession of land and carrier-based bombers which extend military might into the interior of continents have created a sphere of power which no nation in the history has ever approached.

The hard truth, however, is that while America stands powerful the idea of democracy which it represents is losing strength in the world.

In 1945 the hopes of the peoples of the world were stirred when the United States put aside its traditional reluctance to play an active role in international organizations and played host to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. The world looked to us, unscarred by the war, with our resources relatively untouched and our factories in full production, to lead in a harmonious search for lasting peace. In Europe, in Asia, in Africa—wherever men gathered—people recalled the hopes of the four freedoms and the promises of the Atlantic Charter.

What has happened? Today, in the spirit of Lent, Americans seek an explanation and yearn for a solution. The fear and mistrust within nations today is too obvious to need documentation. It is that which produces atomic and hydrogen bombs. Yet, in spite of possessing a stock pile of atomic bombs, and spending more than $15,000,000,000 a year on military preparedness, many Americans are still insecure. Here is further justification for further self-analysis and inquiry into better ways of seeking security and peace.

It is true, as our Secretary of State recently noted, that continuous self-criticism is a quality of all free people. It is an excellent quality. It comes only from freedom, and as he said, were its exercise permitted wherever men gather, the world would be much nearer peace.

How gratifying it would be were the citizens of the Soviet Union free to join with us in this lenten season to explore our consciences, criticize our governments, and join a world of free peoples in seeking a new approach toward our goal—peace, world brotherhood, and security.

Is it not our responsibility continuously and with perseverance to hold forth to the peoples of the world this dream and our hope for its fulfillment? Who can say that our voices would not reach through the barrier and give hope and inspiration where despair and hostility now rest?

Let us not ignore the deep-rooted contradictions between democracy and totalitarianism of any form, whether it be Communist or Fascist. Let us never cease expressing our indignation toward slavery, nor our vigilance in behalf of freedom. So long as there is oppression or injustice or totalitarian power in the world, there is conflict. We must, however, lift conflict out of the realm of war.

Our responsibility is to tell the peoples of the world that we, temporarily the mightiest of nations, are ready to join in an international effort to abolish war. We must resolve to take some of the imaginative daring which we have shown in the physical sciences to start a chain reaction among the peoples and governments of the world against this madness and insanity.

Here lies our strength. With a positive reaffirmation of our democratic faith, with a determination to protect freedom and resist totalitarianism, with an unequivocal declaration in behalf of an international agreement to abolish war and for universal disarmament, America would gain for itself moral supremacy in the world, and recapture, in the eyes of the world, leadership for peace.

The necessity for renewed and continuous negotiation is greater than ever before. Not only peace but our national interest impels us to make new efforts to negotiate. Once America gives up her active search for peace we lose all hope of reaching the peoples behind the iron curtain; we lose our ties with friendly peoples who hope for peace but see our bombs and fear war; and, perhaps most important, we lose the basic moral purpose which is the fabric of our democratic way of life.

History offers many examples of mortal conflicts between great movements which, with the passing of the years and the cooling of passions, have found it possible to resolve their conflicts without war. The conflict between the Moslem and the Christian worlds was finally resolved by the destruction of neither, in spite of the Moslem slogan "Face Islam or die."

Our first concrete proposal to the leaders of the Soviet Union must be to set up a conference on universal disarmament—universal not unilateral—with international guaranties of security. It is the responsibility of our heads of state to make unmistakably clear to the leaders of the Soviet Union our plans for such a positive proposal and issue an invitation that they join with us in submitting such a proposal to the United Nations.

We must also make it perfectly clear to the leaders of the Soviet Union that the alternative to peaceful negotiations and settlement could well mean turning the world into a battlefield which would make it the graveyard for the human race.

Our proposals for disarmament should include the absolute prohibition of the manufacture of weapons for mass destruction, limited not only to atomic and hydrogen bombs but to conventional armaments as well. We should stand ready to consider practical suggestions as to how necessary supervision and control can be exercised. We should stand ready to turn over our own stock piles of destruction to the United Nations as part of such an international agreement and in concert with all other nations of the world.

Significant as was the original Acheson-Lilienthal report from which the Baruch plan was devised, we must stand ready to broaden it by extending its coverage to all weapons. Now is the time to reexamine our original proposals and recognize the need for modifying them in the light of developments since 1946.

Our disarmament proposal must also include with it a plea for universal abolition of peacetime conscription. It is unnecessary to train young men and women for war in a world society dedicated to peace.

Such a program to be effective must be accompanied by provisions for a police force to maintain international security. The United Nations must be transformed into an organization capable of enforcing peace under law.

Carrying the banner of such an international program, the United States will find itself in partnership with the entire non-Soviet world. With such a program we present the leaders of the Soviet Union with a challenge. It is a challenge not only to its military power but to its very purposes, which are the ultimate roots of its power.

We would be affirming our faith that in the conflict of ideologies between democracy and Communist totalitarianism, democracy will prevail and we would be proclaiming to the leaders of the Soviet Union, "Dare you affirm less for your faith in communism?"

To strengthen our faith in democracy it must be an essential part of our international policy to enact a program for civil rights. Such a demonstration is essential if we are to convince the peoples of the world, particularly the millions in Asia and Africa, that we sincerely believe in democracy and human equality. It will be impossible for us to enlist the active support of the overwhelming numbers in the world who are colored and it will be impossible for us to gain their friendship so long as they come to equate American democracy with racial discrimination.

Our international policy must also encompass within it an economic program. President Truman's point 4 program must be the central focus of such an economic proposal. Our President said: "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas." It is essential that such a program be conducted through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. It must also encompass within it the vision of an interrelated world economy in which our Government, as the wealthiest in the world, makes a substantial contribution in a joint international effort against the enemies of men—hunger, misery, and despair.

With such a program we demonstrate to the Russian people, and certainly to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe, our basic striving for peace, for understanding, and for international justice. Let any Government who refuses our offer then face the responsibility in the eyes of the peoples of the world for continuing the race of humanity toward destruction.

At this moment in history the helpless and teeming millions of people, citizens of the world, anxiously look for a declaration of American foreign policy which will provide them with the hope that war is not inevitable and that peace can indeed be a reality for them and their children. Having offered our willingness to join as partners in the struggle for peace and against the real enemies of mankind, hunger, and poverty, we would gain for ourselves the friendship and loyalty of all the peoples of the world.

Here is a moral alternative to world chaos.

The Rise or Sunset of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

entitled "The Rise or Sunset of Peace," which I delivered before the American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RISE OR SUNSET OF PEACE

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Association of School Administrators, and guests, it is a great honor to be invited to address this convention. In these very critical days of world affairs it is a serious responsibility for a Member of the United States Senate to undertake a public discussion of any phase of American foreign policy.

I undertake that responsibility tonight because I think it is very important that the American people face up to world trends. It is particularly important that our educational institutions and the educators in charge of them marshal their forces of enlightenment behind the cause of winning the peace.

As one who taught for 20 years in various American colleges before entering political life, I know that America's educational system can be a very effective force in enlightening the American public on the facts of any great problem. Once the American people are fully informed about the facts in respect to world trends, I have complete confidence in their judgment on any proposed course of action. Each generation is called upon to face and solve at least one great crisis of its time. It is most likely that our generation will witness the sunrise or sunset of peace. The events of history written on the pages of our generation will determine the destiny of America, and for that matter of the world.

The American people—and not the American Government—will determine in the next few years whether the world will see a new birth of freedom or an autopsy of democracy—a sunrise of peace, or the dusk and darkness of war.

The Voice of America needs to be heard throughout America as well as throughout the rest of the world. Schools and colleges of our country—each and every one of them—need to throw their educational forces behind the cause of winning the peace. This is no time for a hush-hush policy on the part of school administrators when it comes to the use of school facilities for disseminating information about world affairs. The schools must help instruct the American public on the facts of the international situation. They must encourage faculty members, and students, too, to participate in public discussion on the many controversial issues that must be considered and solved in accordance with the facts if we are to win the peace. Some way, somehow, we must lead the American people to an enlightened understanding of the fact that peace does not just happen. Like war, it is the outgrowth of causes. Never was it more important that academic freedom in the sense of searching after and presenting the truth should prevail in America.

We must educate our people to an understanding that peace can result only from forging a chain of human causation. The struggle for peace, which is the major crisis of our generation, is a struggle for men's minds rather than for their emotions. It is a struggle for human decency rather than for human debauchery. It involves an appeal to reason. Peace can be won and maintained only if we can convince the American people and freedom-loving people elsewhere in the world that rules of reason, procedures of international justice, relinquishment of many selfish interests must be substituted in the thinking of people everywhere for the emotional nationalism that still dominates the world in spite of all our laudatory efforts to set up a system of international justice through law by way of the United Nations.

We need to face the fact that we will not see the sunrise of peace this year or next, but unless we see at least some of those early hour rays of a dawn of peace in the near future, mankind may awaken only to die in the pitch blackness of war.

Every institution of enlightenment in America, including the church, lodge, press, radio—every group where free men gather—and particularly the school—should join forces in the struggle for peace. We cannot win the peace by wishing for it, nor by blaming the politicians because we do not have it, nor by adopting the fatalistic attitude that war is inevitable, nor by placing all the blame on our enemies in the cold war now gripping the world.

We Americans need to ask ourselves some very blunt questions and be willing to face the realities of the answers. Are we adopting an escape from reality attitude in America toward the problems of winning the peace? Certainly, the answer is "No" if we are to be judged from the standpoint of our support of the United Nations, our spending of billions of the taxpayer's money, in the defense of Europe militarily and in the economic rehabilitation program for Europe under the Marshall plan. The answer is "No" if we are to be judged by the materialistic contributions we have made to date in many parts of the world to those people who have taken a stand for the freedom of the individual. Yet the fact remains that we have done none too well in holding our own in the cold war.

Seeking to analyze the problems which confront us in this fight to win the peace, we should not disparage or discredit the great contributions and many noble deeds which our Government and our people have performed for the cause of peace since the end of the war. It has been a glorious record—not deserving much of the criticism which has been heaped upon it. However, there is a great danger that because things do not seem to be going very well at the present moment, a feeling of hopelessness and discouragement will overcome the American people and they will acquiesce to the propaganda that is abroad in the land today that what we should do is walk out of Europe, turn our backs on Asia, build up huge armaments and defenses on our own land and try to live unto ourselves alone.

As I go across this country, I find it very reassuring that most Americans recognize that a return to isolationism would surrender most of the rest of the world to Russia and endanger our own survival as a free nation. Still we all know that the sands of public opinion frequently shift. We know that the immediate economic well-being of the American people is bound to have a very important effect on their opinion in respect to any proposal involving American foreign policy. If serious economic restrictions should come to characterize our economy within the next few years, those with an isolationist point of view would be able to exercise a much greater influence on American public opinion than they are able to do at the present moment. That is why I believe that the greatest defense weapon America has is a sound domestic economy.

The greatest answer we have to communism is to demonstrate the superiority of a capitalistic economy over the totalitarianism of a Russian state economy, or for that matter any other form of a state economy. That is why I say that a balanced budget, substantial annual payments on our national debt, a revision of our tax structure aimed at eliminating the gross equities which are now in it, the adoption of legislative policies which will carry out the constitutional intent of promoting the general welfare of our people within the framework of the checks and balances of our Constitution are just as much essential elements of a sound defense program for America as are the necessary military defenses.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, I have no hesitancy in telling you that at this critical hour there can be no let-down in America's defense program, but among the many things we must do in building that program is to take the steps necessary to stabilize our economy and demonstrate to the world that the economic freedom which characterizes our capitalistic economy can be a disciplined freedom of a united people devoted to promoting the common good. It is with kindness, but with frankness, that I say that American schools and colleges can and should do a much better job of educating the American people to a clearer understanding of the direct relationship between their political freedoms and their economic freedoms.

I'm afraid that too many people have forgotten that our economic system and our political system are inseparable. We cannot have individual rights and liberties as set out in our Constitution under any form of state economy. We cannot maintain the political freedoms guaranteed the individuals by our democratic government as we start down the road of a state economy. Political democracy and economic democracy are inseparable. They constitute what we mean by our American system of self-government.

Although the foundation principle of democratic government to which I refer appears to many people to be an abstract one, I would caution you to remember that it is an exceedingly concrete one measured in terms of your rights.

This country of ours was founded primarily upon the basic democratic principle that the spiritual value of the individual citizen is the very core of self-government. One cannot read the Constitution nor the Declaration of Independence nor the great debates out of which was born this Republic without recognizing the fact that our founding fathers believed that a society of free people must rest upon a devotion to the spiritual value of the individual person. They considered that the primary purpose of a democratic form of government was to protect the dignity of the individual. They realized that the individual human being is the creature of the Almighty and that to exploit and debase the individual person is a sacrilegious offense.

It is very difficult to reconcile in the interest of peace the political philosophies of communism and democracy, but we must try to find some basis on which the two philosophies can live in peace in the world. I say that because if we are going to avoid a war which would result in the killing of millions of human beings living under both Communist and democratic governmental systems today we must face the cold, hard fact that some mutually satisfactory understanding for peaceful relationships must be reached.

I am not one of those who believe that the Russian people are being held in complete subjugation or in involuntary servitude by the Russian leaders. The evidence is very much against such a point of view, although there are those in this country who are trying to convince us that the Russian pepole are entirely out of sympathy with the Communist regime.

It would be rather reassuring and hopeful if one could believe that the Russian people are anti-Communist. The facts, however, point to the contrary. The facts indicate that the Russian leaders have succeeded so well with a program of indoctrination and propaganda since the Russian Revolution that the Russian people generally believe the communistic form of government offers the only hope of survival for them.

We Americans need to remember that the Russian people have been convinced that we intend to make war upon them and that they must proceed as rapidly as possible to prepare for that war, no matter what the personal sacrifice and hardship may be. It appears evident that the Russian people are making tremendous sacrifices and undergoing great hardships in carrying out the propaganda dictates of the Russian politburo.

Part of the Russian strategy is a program of infiltration into the free governments of the world so that in case of another war the Communists will be in a position to do internal damage to those free governments including our own. This tactic of infiltration is characteristic of totalitarian techniques as used by Hitler as well as by the Russians. We cannot ignore the fact that a spread of the communistic philosophy in America is itself a threat to the great spiritual values of our form of government.

Although we must recognize this danger we must be careful at the same time not to become alarmists. We must be careful not to become Red-baiters in the negative sense.

But on the other hand we must not close our minds to evidence and proof of Communist infiltration into our American institutions.

Shortly, in the Senate of the United States we will be debating a proposal to appropriate funds for the extension of the Marshall plan another year. Already the ghosts of isolationism are stalking the corridors of the National Capitol—already some Senators are proposing to stop all Marshall plan appropriations and others are proposing to cut them so drastically that the plan will break down. Statesmanship calls for finding the answer to the question, "How much money is needed to complete the job of economic rehabilitation in Europe and how much of it can America make available this next year consistent with maintaining our own economic strength here at home?"

The evidence is clear that the early success of many phases of the Marshall plan will justify considerable reductions in previous estimates of the amount that will be needed this year. It is also clear that the Marshall-plan countries need to demonstrate a greater willingness to develop economic unity among themselves and eliminate the costly trade barriers within Europe which for so many decades has created a European pattern of economic nationalism.

The schools of America have a job of informing the public in regard to the economic problems involved in operating the Marshall plan. Query—Will they do it? It is part of the job of winning the peace because unless the American people develop a better understanding of the direct relationship between the economic rehabilitation of Europe and the peace of the world, those of us in the Congress who are supporting the Marshall plan will have great difficulty in preventing a scuttling of the economic phases of America's foreign policy.

That leads me to comment upon the direct relationship between the maintaining of a nonpartisan or bipartisan foreign policy and winning the peace. We shall see in our generation the sunset of peace if the American people allow themselves to become disunited over foreign policy. If partisanship replaces nonpartisanship in American foreign policy, every Communist in America and the Russian leaders in the Kremlin in Moscow will rejoice. I am satisfied that part of the infiltration tactics of the Communists is to divide us on questions of foreign policy. Here again the schools of America can function in the front lines of the fight for peace by providing the forums and spreading the truth concerning the facts of foreign affairs.

There is considerable talk these days in Washington, and elsewhere, about having the leaders of our Government, and possibly of one or two other governments, make an approach to the Russian leaders for a settlement of the issue of the atomic bomb and now the hydrogen-bomb control by agreement between them. It would appear that there is some attempt to make a partisan issue of such a demand.

I seriously question the advisability of such an approach to the Russians. I regret the partisanship of the attempt to politically embarrass our President in case he does not agree to such an approach. The United States is a member of the United Nations. I believe that the best hope for peace is to be found through strengthening the United Nations—not circumventing it or weakening it. America's participation in the United Nations, in the first instance was the direct result of a unity of action on a bipartisan basis of the leaders of the two major political parties in this country.

It is a sad fact that there have been many instances in which the spirit of bipartisanship, which characterized the great San Francisco Conference at the time the United Nations was born, has not prevailed in some other international conferences. However, mistakes in applying the principle of bipartisanship do not justify repudiating the principle. There is a growing confusion in America as to what our foreign policy is. The American people seem to be developing feelings of fear, doubt, and almost hysteria concerning our foreign policies and the trends of world affairs.

A world full of people worried by fear, nations feverish with war psychology, national economies spending more for armaments than for human welfare, time races in competitive construction of atomic and hydrogen bombs, spell war—not peace. In my judgment, the time has come for the American people, the Russian people, and the mothers and fathers everywhere on the face of this world to recognize that present world trends, unless changed, will lead to war. We will witness a sunset not only of peace but of human happiness for generations to come unless the leaders of our generation succeed in laying the foundation, as Senator VANDENBERG has put it, of a world order based upon international justice through law.

It is my hope that you will give thoughtful consideration to the view that it is of great importance to the people of the world that the American people maintain a united front in support of a bipartisan foreign policy. That policy must seek to strengthen the forces of freedom in the world by establishing a world order capable of substituting international judicial decrees for hydrogen bombs as a means of settling international disputes.

As Nehru of India declared during his trip to this country, "There can be no doubt that a world government must come—for the only alternative is world suicide."

Yet, as we sit here tonight, we should not ignore the fact that there are forces at work in America seeking to prejudice the thinking of our people into an acceptance of a partisan approach to foreign affairs. They are appealing to the selfish motives of those who would place immediate economic gains for themselves and the Nation above the long-time security of peace. Their isolationist program is directed at the present moment at scuttling a bipartisan foreign policy. They have seized upon imperfections and mistakes in that policy as affording them an opportunity to play politics with the security of our Nation.

Recent statements by prominent Members of the Congress, highly critical of the past, present, and supposed future policy of the United States in China and Europe, raise serious questions as to America's future course in international relations.

Is the United States on the verge of another postwar era of narrow nationalism and isolationism? Is the Republican Party about to abandon the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy which Senator VANDENBERG, one of its main architects, has rightly called our best available insurance for peace?

How strong are the forces that would have America embark on an imperialistic course, characterized by dollar diplomacy and the conditioning of further Marshall-plan aid on the recipient countries adopting different policies in the conduct of their own domestic affairs?

At the Philadelphia convention in 1948, the Republican Party solidly backed the principle of bipartisanship. The platform there adopted, in anticipation of a Republican victory, pledged that the minority party would be invited to join in stopping partisan politics at the water's edge.

The Democrats likewise have repeatedly pledged a bipartisan approach to foreign-policy problems. Those who sneer at the bipartisan program need to be reminded that differences over means of implementing a united American position in international relations do not justify scuttling the principle. Rather, the shortcomings which have developed point out the need for perfecting the mechanics of cooperation.

The reasons for a bipartisan foreign policy are plain enough. Our basic objective is to achieve and maintain international peace and security in a world of free nations devoted to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. To fulfill our obligations as a leader among free nations, we must have a foreign policy that is clear and consistent. Moreover, national security demands that our foreign commitments weather changes in the political direction of our Government.

The necessary conditions for a workable bipartisan foreign policy are not obscure, but perhaps it may be well to restate them in view of the charge that bipartisanship means me-tooism and is no more than a Republican rubber-stamp policy.

With agreement on the desirability of a bipartisan foreign policy, its successful operation necessitates that responsible party leaders achieve an understanding of common readiness to work together, that there be full access to and sharing of information, and that there be timely consultation.

Despite the strains of three election campaigns, bipartisanship has survived. At times, its workings have been far from perfect. But now is no time to stick our heads into the sand of isolationism or refuse to put forth our best efforts toward improving the machinery of bipartisanship so that America may present a united front.

A bipartisan foreign policy carries with it the obligation upon the party in the White House, be it Democratic or Republican, to consult with the leaders of the minority party in advance of entering into international understandings which commit the United States to some definite course of action. It is a two-way street between the White House and Capitol Hill.

It is true that under our Constitution the primary responsibility for determining foreign policy rests with the President of the United States, but it is also true that whenever friction develops between the White House and the Congress over foreign policy questions, our country is greatly embarrassed. This is particularly true whenever the President makes an international commitment or agreement which later requires implementation by the Congress.

Many of the strains and stresses which American foreign policy is undergoing at the present time must be attributed to the fact that in recent years Presidents and Secretaries of State have too often entered into understandings with heads of foreign governments as to which both Democratic and Republican leaders of the Congress were kept in ignorance until a misunderstanding of potentially serious proportions had developed.

It is not wise to discard entirely the use of hindsight when charting a future course of

action. The shortcomings of our bipartisan foreign policy as it has developed in recent years can be seen in a much better perspective by a realistic analysis of some of the serious mistakes which have resulted from the failure of Presidents and Secretaries of States to take into their confidence and to consult with congressional leaders of both parties upon whom the administration must lean, in the last analysis, for congressional support of any international commitments.

The Cairo understanding, the agreements reached at Yalta, the commitments made at Potsdam, the administration's policies in China, during and particularly since the war, are all examples of shortcomings in carrying out the basic spirit of a bipartisan foreign policy. Does anyone think for a moment that the understandings reached by the President with the representatives of foreign powers at Cairo and Yalta would have been acceptable, even at the time they were made, to the bipartisan leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

The Cairo and Yalta commitments involved not only the prosecution of the war but the building of the peace as well. Historians will undoubtedly record that the international conferences of the Roosevelt administration involved in a very real sense an attempt to write peace treaties by the installment plan.

It is difficult to answer the charge, made in good faith by many critics of bipartisan foreign policy, that in those conferences the treaty-making clause of the Constitution was circumvented by the President of the United States. In any case, the conduct of the executive branch was not in keeping with the spirit and intent of a bipartisan foreign policy. Even the Potsdam agreement cannot escape its fair share of criticism on this score.

The administration's handling of our policy in China, particularly since the war, cannot be fitted into a traffic pattern of two-way cooperation between the White House and the Congress. For many months the State Department failed to discuss with the bipartisan leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate its plans and policies in China, if it had any. Warning signals of dissension and criticism were raised in debate in the Senate many times during this period. On one occasion, during the Eightieth Congress, the Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and the man who is perhaps more responsible than any other living American for a willing acceptance on the part of Republicans, and for that matter Americans generally, of the need for national unity in support of a bipartisan foreign policy—admitted under questioning on the floor of the Senate that the State Department had not consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee for many months on any phase of the China problem. He admitted in the course of that debate that the contents of the Wedemeyer report had not been made known to the bipartisan leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee.

At that time, which was the fall of 1947, a serious crack developed in the seams of America's bipartisan foreign policy. It should have been cemented very quickly by a mutual exchange of points of view and information between the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Instead, the misunderstandings and criticism in respect to American policy in China became greater throughout 1947, 1948, and 1949. True, the predominant feeling in the Congress was overwhelmingly in support of any administration proposal offered in the name of a bipartisan policy. Nevertheless, those of us in the Senate who strongly supported the idea of maintaining a bipartisan foreign policy were both grieved and handicapped on many occasions over the failure of the State Department to take the bipartisan leaders of the Congress into its confidence and consultation in respect to Asia.

When the second session of the Eighty-first Congress convened on January 3, the administration faced a serious attack upon some aspects of its foreign policy, particularly those relating to China.

It is not too late to stop the trend toward partisanship in the field of American foreign policy. It is not too late to displace the distrust which some Senators have of the administration's foreign policy with a spirit of confidence and cooperation. If the administration will hasten to give not only the Congress but also the people of the United States the assurance that the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the Congress will be taken into consultation preceding formulation of policy on any major international issue by the State Department and the White House, the breach can be healed before irreparable damage is done.

That is the test of the existence of a bipartisan foreign policy. No other course of action on the part of the administration will ever satisfy those who are questioning not only the existence but the worth of a bipartisan foreign policy. No other kind of cooperation will give the necessary strength to the hand of the great VANDENBERG by placing him in the strong position he deserves to be within the Republican Party when he is faced with laying an administration foreign policy request before the Republicans in the Senate for approval and support on a bipartisan basis.

A bipartisan foreign policy does not mean that Members of the Congress should hesitate to criticize any proposed course of action contemplated by the administration in the name of a bipartisan foreign policy. Rather it is the duty of a Member of the Congress to express criticisms. If in his honest judgment criticisms are due. However, experience shows that mutual cooperation and mutual exchanges of points of view between the administration and the leaders of Congress in advance of international commitment usually remove any basis for fair and just criticism.

What is more, the greatest assurance the administration has of maintaining a united American people behind the foreign policy of our country is to follow a truly cooperative effort in the formulation of a bipartisan foreign policy. The American people can be counted upon to respond in united support of a foreign policy which is the result of the cooperative effort of the leaders of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Whenever a split occurs between those leaders, then division of a serious nature is likely to develop among our people.

Rather than have the head of our Government attempt to negotiate with Stalin outside the framework of the United Nations, I would prefer to have our Government call for an extraordinary meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be participated in by the representatives of all nations, for the purpose of considering not only the international control of atomic and hydrogen bombs, but the control of all armaments as well.

I would have both parties join forces now—this year—in a world-wide appeal through the United Nations for an end to the armament race. It seems perfectly clear to me that the position taken by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Mr. TYDINGS, is unanswerable. He points out that unless the world agrees on some satisfactory machinery for controlling armament, the world will plunge itself into another war.

It is my opinion that the most important step the leaders of our Government could take in the interests of uniting the American people in the cause of winning the peace would be to announce a coalition of Democratic and Republican leaders charged with the responsibility of developing and administering foreign policy at the State Department level. Next, it should assure the American people that it will apply a bipartisan approach to foreign policy at the congressional level by consulting and seeking advice from Democratic and Republican congressional leaders in advance of any major international negotiation. Through such a coalition of Democratic and Republican leaders working together in a spirit of patriotic, nonpartisan statesmanship, we would be able to marshal a united American people behind any program which such a coalition of leaders might present to the United Nations for the international control of atomic and hydrogen bombs and the disarming of the arsenals of the world, whose very existence are bound to be a threat to the peace. Through such a coalition of Democrats and Republicans on the issue of winning the peace, I think our chances in our generation of seeing the sunrise of permanent peace would be greatly improved.

Each of us owes an obligation to our country, as I see it, to support a bipartisan approach to solving the crisis of our generation, which is winning the peace.

It is not going to be won without great national costs and sacrifices. It is not going to be won by making the mistake of ignoring the realities of world facts as they confront us today.

It is well for us to think in terms of the goals and ideals of a world order, based upon a system of international justice through law; but our immediate task is to cooperate with the other freedom-loving people of the world in demonstrating to Russia that we stand united in a determination to defend the peace from any Russian aggression.

However, at the same time, we must demonstrate that we stand ready to join with Russia and the other nations in an effective plan for international control of the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

The hour of our generation may be the dusk and sunset of peace. As we close this day, let it be our prayer that through the cooperative efforts of all freedom-loving people throughout the world, our generation will see the dawn and sunrise of permanent peace.

Eisenhower Leads in Poll—Stassen Second in Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an interesting poll taken in Oregon recently and published in the Portland Oregonian. This poll is of the "scientific sampling" type, and not, as might be indicated, a newspaper clip-and-mail type. This poll is highly respected in our State for its proven accuracy over a period of years.

EISENHOWER LEADS POLL, STASSEN SECOND IN LINE—THE FRONT DOOR BALLOT BOX

(By Dan E. Clark II)

Although the next Presidential election is still far distant, Front Door Ballot Box editors felt that Oregonian readers would be interested in keeping tabs on the popularity of possible candidates in the 1952 elections.

To do this, interviewers asked a scientifically selected cross section of Oregon residents: Which of these men do you feel would

have the best chance of beating Mr. Truman in the 1952 Presidential election—Robert Taft, Dwight Eisenhower, or Harold Stassen?

The Front Door Ballot Box poll reveals that Oregonians give Eisenhower the best chance of beating President Truman in 1952. He leads his nearest rival, Stassen, by more than a 2-to-1 margin, and Senator TAFT of Ohio, frequently mentioned as a candidate for the Republican nomination, trails Eisenhower by a 9-to-1 margin.

Here is how Oregonians rated the potential candidates on their chances of beating President Truman in 1952:

	Percent
Eisenhower	54
Stassen	22
Taft	6
None of these men	14
Undecided	4
Total	100

As one would expect, more Democrats than Republicans thought none of these men mentioned had a chance of beating President Truman.

This is how the chances of potential candidates stand with Democrats and Republicans at this time:

	Eisenhower	Stassen	Taft	None	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Democrat	50	20	6	20	4
Republican	55	27	7	7	4

Where less than half of Portland residents pick Ike Eisenhower for first place, nearly 6 out of 10 upstaters felt Eisenhower had the best chance of beating Truman. There were also nearly three times as many Portlanders as upstaters who were pessimistic about the present chances of any of the men mentioned in opposition to Truman.

Figures below show the split in opinions between upstaters and Portlanders and veterans and nonveterans:

	Eisenhower	Stassen	Taft	None	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Portland	46	21	6	24	3
Up-State	58	23	6	9	4
Veteran	56	23	5	13	3
Nonveteran	51	21	7	16	5

Abolition of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Monday I offered for the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of last Sunday. This editorial favored removing the Federal Government from the management and control of rents. I wish now to offer an editorial from the Washington Star of last night which supports the same point of view. Both of these editorials simply state the obvious when they maintain that a national emergency concerning rents is no longer present. Federal rent controls were employed and justified for the single reason that a national emergency did exist. Now that the national emergency foundation has been done away with it will best serve the welfare of the Nation to eliminate Federal rent controls.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A FEDERAL PROBLEM

In moving to end Federal rent control by June 30, the Senate Appropriations Committee was motivated by the sound conclusion that this has ceased to be a Federal problem.

It is true that the President has asked for another year of Federal control. And it is also true that in some localities there is need for continued regulations of rents. But this need can and should be met by local action.

The 1949 rent control law set out procedures under which the States and their political subdivisions could free themselves from Federal control. Many have done so. Some 350 areas, with about 11,000,000 rental units, still are under Federal control. Some of these areas, as in the case of New York State, have stand-by controls of their own which become effective when Federal control ends. In other areas, where comparable local controls are lacking, the ending of Federal controls can be expected to work some hardship.

But this is not an argument for indefinite continuance of Federal regulation. Rent control was a wartime measure, designed to meet an emergency national need. The war has been over for nearly 5 years, and it is time for the Federal Government to step out of this picture. The yearly demand upon Congress for renewal of rent regulation shows, however, that the Federal Government will not let go of this power until Congress compels it to do so.

The True Meaning of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very fine article from the January 12, 1950, issue of the Wisconsin Lutheran, which is published in Madison, Wis. The subject of this article is The True Meaning of Security. It was reprinted from the National Lutheran, and it shows that security is more than material aid, such as is provided by governmental, private, and church welfare agencies. Security essentially is a thing of the spirit, and if misinterpreted, security can be a negative factor in life rather than a positive factor.

I believe that all spiritually minded Americans will be interested in this very fair article, and I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE MORE SECURITY

Slashed across the headline these days are details of the current drive for pensions, medical benefits, and higher wages. The Social Security Act and its many benefits have been an accepted part of the American way of life. Security and more security is the order of the day.

Ever since the Garden of Eden, man has been forced to struggle against the inexorable forces of nature for life itself; the present efforts toward achieving a greater security are only a part of the age-long struggle.

Welfare agencies and institutions of the church work from day to day with the problems of security in the lives of our people. Foster homes for rejected children, that they may have the feeling of being loved and wanted which is so vital to their well-being; adequate facilities for older people, where their physical, emotional, and spiritual needs may be met so that they, too, can feel loved and wanted; help for unmarried mothers; guidance and counseling in problems of marriage and the family—these are the things our welfare workers do to make more secure the lives of our people.

But what is security? What is this thing we are seeking? Webster and others say that security is "freedom from care, anxiety, or apprehension," "a confidence of safety," or "a feeling of certainty." From what cares, anxieties, and apprehensions do we want freedom? What sort of safety do we want? Of what must we be certain in order to be secure?

At the mention of "security" we almost invariably think of material things: Food, clothing, shelter, a good income, freedom from want in old age, and so on. And in an effort to achieve that security we slave and hoard, denying ourselves this and that, buying more insurance, piling up savings accounts, fearful all the time that the tides of fortune will sweep away overnight our tiny resources. Is that security? What did the Master say about such things? As I remember it, He said, "Lay not up your treasures on earth, where moth and rust do corrupt, and thieves break in and steal." Are we afraid to believe in Him?

Shakespeare, that wise student of human nature, had this to say: "As you all know, security is mortals' chiefest enemy." Security man's enemy? Yes, for security can rob life of its purpose, drain away all desire to achieve, stultify ambition and advancement. We were not made to sit back in soft security, growing fat and slothful; rather, we were made in the image of God to face life and its problems, secure in our faith in the Father and the ultimate triumph of good over evil. For security is not freedom from, but the ability to, the ability to face even with fear and trembling, the unknown of today and tomorrow, knowing all the while that our faith will carry us through.

None of us can deny that we have felt fear and anxiety. Fear and anxiety are natural reactions; they are also very corrosive, eating away at peace of mind. How are we to cope with fear and anxiety? How is the cast-off child to find a home and love and affection? How is the older person to find a safe and happy haven as the sands of life run out? Where does the family in trouble find help?

Lutheran welfare agencies and institutions supply the answer. Through them God brings care to those in need; through them we are used, by means of our contributions and volunteer efforts to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick. And through the social security system and the other governmental efforts in the welfare field comes help to those in need. Truly we are all instruments in the hands of God for the service of our brothers and for His greater glory.

These things are not the whole answer, however. We must look to the Sermon on the Mount, where the Master laid down one of the most vital of all mental health principles when He said, "Therefore I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet for

your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? * * * But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." (Matt. 6: 25, 33.) No government plan ever contemplated this kind of security.

There are those Christians among us who have tried out this promise of the Master, who daily live by this principle; they have found a true security far beyond anything ever contemplated by legislators or social planners. For security of the spirit transcends infinitely a security of body. Seek, then, if you will, the true security and find eternal life.—(S. Ross Pond, the National Lutheran.)

United World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an encouraging letter concerning the hearings we are conducting in the Foreign Relations Committee on the resolutions having to do with amendments to the United Nations Organization and the World Organization.

I ask this, Mr. President, not because I am a sponsor of the World Federalists resolution, since as chairman of the subcommittee it is incumbent upon me that I remain neutral in regard to the various resolutions which are before us, but the educational worth of this letter from Dean Moore will be of interest to all the members of our committee, and that means practically all of them who want to see law under government and government under law extend throughout the whole earth.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., February 23, 1950.
Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: All of us are deeply conscious that the most vitally important problem before the American people and the world generally today is the avoidance of another war and the establishing of a permanent, positive peace—a peace which is much more than the absence of a shooting war. We know that there will be no real victor in the next war—as there was not in World War II—but destruction and death everywhere beyond what most of us are able to imagine.

Recognizing this problem, the questions are, Can we solve it and how best can we solve it? In view of Russia's ideology, world foreign policy, etc., as known to us theoretically and as demonstrated by countless actions these past 4 or 5 years, I am convinced that we cannot expect any constructive cooperation from her presently and that we must try to avert disaster by a strong foreign policy and a show of strength in all directions. But I am equally convinced that peace cannot be achieved permanently through military might, power politics, pacts, and agreements, but only through law under government.

In every sphere of our present political organization—local, State, Federal—we preserve peace and order on this principle; law under government in its legislative, judiciary, and executive branches. The time has come when we must extend this principle to the world. Only in this way can we have international or world law in any strict sense of the term and, without such law under a supranational government, peace and order with justice cannot be established and maintained among nations.

I recognize that there are tremendous difficulties in the way of setting up a world federal government, especially since this government must be representative and constituted on democratic principles which recognize the sacred dignity of the human person and the inviolability of human rights. But these difficulties in my opinion do not excuse us from beginning now to work toward world federal government which alone can solve our most important problem, and perhaps save the world of men from their own destruction.

In this conviction I am a member of United World Federalists whose beliefs, purposes, and policies I endorse. I ask you to support these things, and I am sure that in doing so you will not jeopardize the national life of these United States but do the one most important thing possible to preserve this Nation both in these difficult times and for future generations.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. PHILIP S. MOORE, C. S. C.,
Dean.

It's Only Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "It's Only Money" was published in the Washington News of February 28, 1950. The editorial, which is a very interesting one, discussed the absurdity of the Government's potato-buying program. I hope Senators who raise potatoes, especially my Republican friends, will take a look at that editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S ONLY MONEY

With the absurdity of the Government's potato-buying program spelled out so clearly in the last few weeks, you'd think Congress would be eager to do something about it at the first opportunity.

It's going to cost the Government between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000 to maintain its price supports on the 1949 potato crop.

Eighty million dollars is the amount that will be taken in from the excise tax on luggage, handbags, and wallets this year. If we didn't spend it on useless potatoes, we could reduce or even eliminate this wartime levy now.

Eighty million dollars is the Government's total take from the income taxes of 394,000 married men with two children, each man earning $4,000 a year.

It's only money, of course, but it's your money the Government puts out to accumulate millions of bushels of throw-away potatoes, which you can't eat because the Government is buying them to keep them off the market and hold potato prices up.

Senator LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois) tried to do something about it for you. He's the administration leader in the Senate, but in this case he was bucking the administration and acting on his own.

Senator LUCAS proposed simply that all potato price props be dropped until strict marketing quotas were imposed to cut down those surpluses. He estimated it would save $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 of the taxpayers' money on the 1950 crop. It was one of the few times anyone in Congress has had the courage to fight on the floor for a move that actually would interrupt a farm-crop support program.

But what happened to Mr. LUCAS' proposal? It was defeated last Friday by a combination of farm-State Senators, including many members of the so-called economy bloc of Republicans. It was the old story of farm-subsidy grabbers banding together to head off a measure which might be a foot in the door against the whole costly structure of price supports.

Yesterday the Senate relented to the extent of passing a House-approved acreage bill which will drop potato price props unless marketing curbs are put into effect.

But the measure won't apply until 1951. And it won't save $60,000,000 to $70,00,0000 on the 1950 potato crop.

Appropriations for the United States Coast Guard Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Committees on Appropriations of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are presently giving consideration to a budget request from the Treasury Department for the United States Coast Guard Reserve. I am one of many in the Congress who hope that a reasonable appropriation will be agreed to because it will be impossible to establish a balanced security system for the Nation for as long as the Coast Guard Reserve remains inactive and without a training program. Because the two articles bear directly on a pressing need for approving a Coast Guard Reserve training program, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Seattle Times and an article by George Fielding Eliot be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Times of December 19, 1949]

NEGLECTING SECURITY OF NATION'S SEAPORTS

As a seaport city, Seattle is genuinely concerned over congressional neglect to provide any adequate training program for reservists of the United States Coast Guard. It is that service which is called on in an emergency to shoulder responsibility for the security of port facilities here and in every coastal city. Yet, funds have been withheld by the Eighty-first Congress to hold and train a reserve force sufficient to perform this vital function in case of trouble.

Efforts to obtain appropriations for this purpose, in fact, have failed for the past 3 years. President Truman has requested the comparatively inconsequential sum of $3,500,000 to provide a Coast Guard Reserve training program. The request has been repeatedly denied, and just before Congress adjourned, an item to supply the needed funds was stricken from the third deficiency appropriation bill.

The result is that Coast Guard reservists by the hundreds have flocked to other reserve organizations, and no program whatever has been set up to train those who remain on the reserve list in their port-security functions.

Seattle well remembers the excellent job the Coast Guard port-security detail did here all during the war. Many of its members still are available to be called to active duty in an emergency. The National Defense Establishment regards it as important to keep the reservists of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in trim and prepared for emergency service. It is no less important for the coast guardsmen to retain, and improve, their wartime skills.

It makes little difference whether this training is carried out as part of the Navy Reserve program, since the Coast Guard becomes a part of the Navy in war, or by the Coast Guard itself. The point is that an adequate training program should be set up, and the appropriations needed to put it into effect should be reconsidered when Congress reconvenes.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 12, 1950 (also in St. Louis Times-Dispatch)]

HARBORS CALLED OPEN TO ALIEN SHIPS WITH SMUGGLED A-BOMBS

(By George Fielding Eliot)

NEW YORK, February 11.—If the Russians wanted to send atom bombs, or H-bombs, into New York Harbor on merchant ships and explode them there, they could do it without much trouble. Atom Scientist Harold C. Urey told the Senate so on Wednesday, and he was right.

This reporter has just completed an exhaustive 2-week survey of port security in New York Harbor. Only one conclusion is possible—we're wide open to a sneak A-bomb attack. So are other United States seaports.

This is by no means the fault of the highly efficient customs, immigration, and Coast Guard men who inspect the ships entering our ports. There are simply not enough of these men to do a thorough job. Moreover, wartime port-security measures have been largely relaxed. Present efforts are directed toward preventing the illegal entry of alien persons and evasions of customs laws. The security set-up does these things quite effectively, but it wouldn't be likely to detect A-bombs before they went off.

CARGO NOT EXAMINED

For example: Let's say a ship comes into the harbor with an A-bomb carried as a deckload. It's boxed and it's entered on the manifest as industrial machinery. At quarantine the customs boarding officer goes aboard. He finds the ship's papers in order. He doesn't examine the cargo then and there—he has neither the time nor the facilities to do so. The ship proceeds to an anchorage in the upper bay. Darkness falls. There is no customs patrol in small launches as there used to be during the war—the economy ax has abolished this patrol. The Coast Guard is supposed to patrol the harbor, but it doesn't have the cutters or the men to do a thorough job. So it's perfectly simple for the crew of the A-ship to hoist their bomb over the side and allow it to slip silently into the waters of New York Harbor with a time fuze attached.

Next day the ship unloads her regular—and innocent—cargo, complying with all usual formalities. The cargo is inspected by customs officers when it is unloaded. It is quite in accordance with the manifest. The ship sails away.

Three days later—boom! A huge column of water rises from the harbor—a deadly radioactive mist envelops the city—hundreds of thousands of people die or are incapacitated.

COULD LEAVE BOMB ABOARD

Or take another approach. The ship has the A-bomb either as a deck load, or in her hold just under a cargo hatch. She proceeds to a pier in the heart of Manhattan and ties up, late in the afternoon, too late to unload that day. The members of the crew have their papers—all correct. They go ashore and, presumably get out of town fast. That night the bomb goes off, and D-blasts a vast gaping wound into the center of New York City.

If it were desired to have bombs sent to inland cities as well, it could be done by the simple device of shipping them in bond, thus avoiding customs examination in the port of New York. The time fuze would have to allow ample margin for the period of transit from the New York pier to a railroad freight station, then to a customs warehouse to await application for entry by the consignee, who would, of course, never show up. In this way such cities as St. Louis or Chicago, Pittsburgh, or Detroit could be reached by a sneak A-bomb attack.

Probably the A-ships wouldn't be flying the Soviet flag. In fact, only one Soviet ship entered New York harbor during the whole of 1949. Arrangements would be made with the comrades of some other country to do the job. That would be a simple matter.

MORE PERSONNEL NEEDED

Guarding our seaports against this form of attack is, however, not so simple. We will need cutter patrols, manned by experienced customs and Coast Guard personnel, in every major harbor. We will need to expand the customs searching squads in 10 times their present strength, using experienced men as squad leaders, training others as fast as possible. We will have to exercise the closest watch over the entry of foreign ships and over all activities aboard them; it may be necessary to station guards on board every such ship during its entire stay in harbor. We will have to seek the close and constant cooperation of friendly governments to detect in advance the approach of a ship whose crew includes persons suspected of Communist affiliations. Ships from ports which are behind the iron curtain may have to be excluded altogether, or permitted to unload only at isolated anchorage far from any worth while atomic target.

One unhappy fact is that the reservoir of trained personnel for port security duties—the United States Coast Guard Reserve, with a wartime strength of 144,000 officers and men—exists today only on paper. The last Congress refused to pass a $3,000,000 appropriation for training this reserve. It's a deficiency which must be corrected, for it's the very foundation of security for our great seaports. But this will only be a start toward real security for the coastal cities of the United States, which today are sitting ducks for an A-bomb.

Abduction of Greek Children

REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of Greek children who have been abducted from their homes in Greece, spirited away surreptitiously and hidden behind the iron curtain is one of the most tragic, deplorable, and reprehensible crimes chargeable to the Communist regimes. It is unthinkable that such inhumanities could occur in a civilized world, and it is of utmost importance that our Government persist in its efforts, by moral and economic persuasion, to force the return to Greece of the 28,000 children.

Last Sunday afternoon more than a thousand persons attended a meeting in Cleveland sponsored by 35 societies of Americans of Greek descent urging concerted action on the part of our Government and of the United Nations to restore these children to their homes and parents. Homes must be preserved inviolate. Parents have the God-given right and obligation to rear their own children, and the children likewise should be given the opportunity to live and grow up under the guidance and influence of their own parents, rather than to be reared as abject slaves wholly subject to the atheistic philosophy of a state which considers them as chattels instead of children of God.

I urge the President and our Government to act promptly in this matter.

Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks a telegram containing a resolution adopted by the combined societies of Cleveland, which is as follows:

FOR THE REPATRIATION OF 28,000 ABDUCTED GREEK CHILDREN NOW DETAINED IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 26, 1950.*

Whereas the general assembly of the United Nations has formally announced that 28,000 children were forcibly abducted from their homes in Greece during the recent guerrilla war and are now detained in the various iron-curtain countries of Europe; and

Whereas two resolutions unanimously passed by the United Nations General Assembly seeking the prompt repatriation of these children have proved of no avail due to lack of cooperation on the part of the iron-curtain countries; and

Whereas we believe that the relationship of mother and child is a divine natural instinct above any human control; and that, the right of mother and child to be together and to cherish the love which is inherent in this relationship has been recognized and respected by all civilized peoples throughout the ages: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this assembly of 1,000 citizens of the city of Cleveland and surroundings with Governor Lausche and Mayor Burke, of Cleveland, partaking, raises its voice in protest for the abduction and forcible detention of these innocent children and registers its indignation for such inhuman practices; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly respectfully urges and petitions the President of the United States, the State Department of the United States, and the Congress of the United States and the general assembly of the United Nations to use their good offices and bear pressure upon the respective governments in whose territory these Greek children are detained to the end that these 28,000 unfortunate victims be speedily returned to their motherland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of this assembly to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the United States Congress and to the Members thereof from the State

of Ohio and to the representatives of the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations and to the general secretary thereof.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS B. SELTZER, *Chairman.*
JOHN KRAS, *Secretary.*

Nebraska's Eighty-third Anniversary

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, 83 years ago, on March 1, 1867, the one-time Territory of Nebraska was admitted to the Federal Union of States as a full partner in this Republic.

It has become an established custom for Members of Congress to admire and extol the wisdom, the courage, the farsightedness of the founding fathers whose combined experience wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. That custom is just and reasonable. Yet, there is a single drawback to that custom. It assumes that, after the creation of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the statesmen of this Nation made no further contribution toward true government by the people.

I do not speak for any other State. I do speak for Nebraska. In 1867, the first legislature of the new State of Nebraska accepted a great seal for my State. The motto on that great seal is: "Equality Before the Law."

This statement, to me, was and is one of the most significant of all time.

Why?

Bitterness was rampant in Nebraska 83 years ago. Civil War guns still echoed in many ears. Spiritual wounds had not healed. Boys in blue settled next to the boys in gray. Old feuds broke out. Grievances soon found their way to the courts. To Nebraska courts these disputes were not between the blue and the gray—rather, they were between citizens of the State of Nebraska. They were decided fairly, justly, according to the evidence. There was "equality before the law."

Other antagonisms could well have made the newly established State a dark and bloody ground. The early settlers of some of our counties were of English ancestry. A great wave of Irish migration swept into these counties in the late sixties and early seventies. This could—and did—make for strife. True to Old World tradition, pioneers of German and French origin carried on their battle which began before recorded history. Swedes and Danes clashed. Yet, to Nebraska courts, there were no English nor Irish, no French nor Germans, no Swedes nor Danes. Nebraska courts recognized no national origins. Contestants before the courts were Nebraska citizens. There was "equality before the law."

Perhaps the most serious conflict of all in early Nebraska was between the old-timer and the johnny-come-lately. Nebraska was a new State in 1867, but it had had white settlers since the time of the Revolutionary War and before. The first to come resented the intrusion of the newcomers, regardless of their national origin or their Civil War sympathies. The newcomers resented the know-it-all and own-it-all attitude of the people whom they found living in their new home. Naturally, these resentments ultimately led to the courts. Nebraska courts made no distinction between the old and the new. The cases involved were decided on their legal merits alone. There was "equality before the law."

What kind of equality was this?

I like to think of it as David's kind of equality—the kind of which he sang in the Fifty-fifth Psalm:

> It was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company.

What kind of law was this?

I like to think of it as James' kind of law, the kind of which he spoke in his general epistle:

> But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

Nebraska needed its respected courts to enforce the peace. But, as David said, going to church together was perhaps the greatest single influence of equality our State could afford. German went to the same church with Frenchman. Dane and Swede sang the same hymns. Men who had shot at each other in the Civil War listened to the word of God—together—in Nebraska's new equality.

The wall between old settlers and new settlers was broken down because every Nebraskan had to be, by dire necessity, a "doer of the work." Old-timer gave of his own sparse supplies to newcomer when newcomer's worldly goods were destroyed by a swift prairie fire. Newcomer fought his way through a blinding blizzard to old-timer's sod house, risking his life that old-timer might live. Their women joined together at quiltings. Their men broke barriers at barn raisings. They helped each other bury their dead in common cemeteries after Indian raids. They celebrated together after bumper harvests. They pulled in their belts after the grasshoppers had eaten their land barren.

What began as a reluctant association in "equality before the law" was welded, by living together, into a common bond of one people, one Government, one God.

By unfailing adherence to the "law of liberty," Nebraska has prospered. This—in spite of two world wars which have taken its wealth and its youth. Nebraska has been able to recover from even these crowning catastrophes because it has been conceived in privation and has grown amidst hardship.

Ours is a producing State. Our cement, clay products, and stone are widely used in the American building industry.

In agriculture, Nebraska has made tremendous strides within the past few years. We lead in the production of wild hay over all our 47 competitor States. We are up in the front ranks of the producers of corn, oats, wheat, barley, rye, alfalfa, potatoes, sugar beets, sorghums and soybeans. We are well above other States, greater in size and in population, in producing cattle, swine, and sheep. It is natural that the chief industry of our State is that of food processing. It is natural that Omaha, principal center of the Nebraska food-processing industry, should be first city in the world in butter manufacturing.

Nebraska's progressive people of today—direct heirs of a pioneer past—have exercised a high degree of ingenuity in the development of their inheritance. Of the State's total area of 77,237 square miles, approximately a million acres have been made to produce more and better crops through irrigation. Then, too, Nebraska was one of the first North Central States to put into action a planned program of farm-to-market roads. These well-graded or hard-surfaced roads have enabled Nebraska farmers to get their crops to market, irrespective of the weather, with maximum speed and with minimum spoilage.

Nor has Nebraska's most valuable product—its human product—been neglected. No Nebraska community is without its grammar school and its high school. Many communities have their junior colleges which have been functioning over a considerable span of years. We have a State university and one municipal university. We have two denominational universities. We have 12 denominational colleges and four State teachers colleges. It can truthfully be said that every Nebraskan can receive his complete formal education—from kindergarten to doctor of medicine—without leaving his home State.

Nebraskans are individualists today, as they were 83 years ago. You cannot fence in their thoughts. Our State has seen Populists and Bull Moosers, Democrats and Republicans.

But, individualistic Nebraskans have no peace with pink-tea "liberals" who parrot social and economic phrases and shift their viewpoint with each change in party line—"liberals" who are liberal only in the sense of stealing the savings of others through taxes.

Nebraska individualists have shown themselves to be mid-twentieth century progressives. We have the only unicameral State legislature in the United States. We have an efficient preprimary system of selection of party candidates. All electric power facilities in the State are publicly owned. Yet, never have we flown in the face of the Republic. Never have we flouted the Constitution. Nebraska has the lowest per-capita tax of any State in the Union. We have no bonded indebtedness, and there is a surplus in our State treasury.

On this, the eighty-third anniversary of the admission of Nebraska as a State, I am proud to define the Nebraskan of 1867 and the Nebraskan of 1950—for they both require one and the same definition. A Nebraskan is a forward-looking American, with a long, long memory.

American Foreign Policy and the International Trade Organization (ITO)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address I delivered at the annual dinner of the United States Customs Examiners Association held at the Hotel Statler in New York on February 21, 1950:

The International Trade Organization Charter was adopted at Havana on March 24, 1948, by 54 nations, including the United States, bills to provide United States membership in the Organization have been pending since January 1949, and the President sent the Congress a special message on it in April 1949, yet vigorous action with respect to the approval of the Charter and the acceptance of membership by the United States in the Organization has been singularly lacking. This in spite of the fact that the reestablishment of multilateral trade among the free nations, which is its central purpose, is absolutely essential to world economic recovery and particularly to western Europe if the European recovery program is to have a chance of ending in 1952.

If the administration has been restrained in pushing for United States membership in the ITO out of fear of its opponents, it is time that the issue was faced and that the American people understood that ITO is an essential ingredient for maintaining our own prosperity and for attaining world prosperity.

European production has increased materially over what it was in 1938 and 1939, over 50 percent in an item like cement, yet Europe is still in dire need of American dollar aid, and the spectre of communism is still haunting Europe should such aid end before the dollar gap—still at about $3,000,000,000—is bridged. What is lacking is a system of trade relations among the European nations and between them and the rest of the world to assure the development of regular and continuous international markets making possible the most economical use of Europe's production resources. Europe now has done reasonably well in the battle of production, but she needs markets and it is exactly the purpose of the ITO to facilitate the opening up of markets.

The Communists count heavily on the fear of depression among the free peoples as a means for their infiltration. ITO can do more to answer that fear for the free nations of the world than any other international measure now seriously before us. American efforts to attain economic integration in Europe and elsewhere are negated by the failure of the United States for almost 2 years to acquire membership and thereby to bring into being the ITO which has the greatest capability for establishing the conditions for integration, both in Europe and elsewhere. Charges that the ITO will deprive the United States of tariff bargaining power are baseless, in view of the express provisions in the Charter itself which provide only that members will enter into and carry out negotiations directed toward the substantial reduction of tariffs and the elimination of preferences. This is no more and no less than the United States is already doing under the reciprocal trade agreements program last year extended for an additional period of 3 years, and no more and no less than it is bound to do under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiated by the United States with the 22 other signatories at Geneva on October 30, 1947, and declared in effect for the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, and five other principal commercial nations on January 1, 1948.

Opponents of the ITO are entirely negativist in attacking a constructive world plan developed since 1945 largely at the urging of the United States to facilitate world trade, without offering anything whatever in its place except either chaos, or such trade barriers and trade restrictions as are seriously hampering world trade and world recovery, today. As early as the lend-lease agreements with Great Britain in February 1942 the United States was already insisting that negotiations should be had for the reduction of tariffs, the elimination of tariff preferences, and the removal of other barriers to the expansion of international trade. This policy was continued when the United States came out with practical proposals for this purpose in December 1945 and when these proposals were refined in several international conferences culminating in the conference at Geneva which lasted from April to August 1947 and resulted in the adoption by the 18 principal trading nations of the world, other than the U. S. S. R., of a draft charter for the ITO. This draft became the basis for the charter adopted by 54 nations at the final International Conference on Trade and Employment in Habana, from December 1947 to March 1948.

The establishment and success of ITO is, among all the nations, the most vital to the United States for the United States today is the big exporting nation of the world with much at stake in respect to its own economy in maintaining these exports. Total United States exports for 1949 are estimated at $12,000,000,000, while total imports are estimated at $6,500,000,000, leaving a net export balance of $5,500,000,000. The situation in which the United States found itself before and just after World War I when it feared a flood of cheap imports from European and other countries where lower labor costs prevailed and which resulted in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, is now completely reversed. Other trading nations of the world now fear that their markets will be flooded by our manufacturers and that their resources will be drained away by our goods as soon as they are not longer the subject of aid from us such as is afforded by the ERP. Without an ITO we may expect that these countries would erect even higher tariff barriers against our trade and engage in more discrimination and preferential arrangements than ever, and in view of the prevalence of state trading, they are in a better position than ever to do so. If we retaliated, as indeed we would have to, and so would other nations, it would defeat the effort of western Europe at recovery, would jeopardize our own domestic economy which to a growing extent is dependent on an export market and would materially improve the chances of communism infiltrating Europe.

Freer world trade must also be recognized as absolutely essential by those who contend that there must be an end to programs of American aid overseas, for this can only be achieved through greater imports into the United States and through triangular trade which are being hampered and thwarted by existing trade barriers and trade restrictions. These dangerous facts are borne out by the slipping off already taking place in United States exports, in 1949 $2,500,000,000 below their 1947 peak and estimated in 1950 to be a billion or more dollars under 1949. This export trade, though only a small percentage of our total production, is of the most critical importance to our general economic prosperity. For example, in agricultural products like wheat, cotton, and tobacco we normally export from 20 to 33 percent of the total crop. This is equally true in other merchandise and industrial fields like drugs and automobiles, where we normally export 20 percent of our production; machine tools, where we normally export 40 percent; and farm machinery, where we normally export 20 to 30 percent of our production. Yet while $12,000,000,000 of exports represents only about 6 percent of our current output and something under 10 percent of goods and commodities produced, in key items it represents the difference between profit and loss and success and failure—and the impact of these key items on our whole economic structure and on employment generally in our country is far more vital than the 6 percent figure or the 10 percent indicates. This was very clearly evidenced during the depression when the state of our economic health went down drastically right along with a drop in our import and export figures which hit a low of $1,600,000,000 and $1,300,000,000, respectively, in 1932 and 1933.

We are failing badly in our imports, too. According to our economic history and taking into consideration the over-all increase of about one-third in prices generally since prewar, we should be importing not $6,500,000,000 of goods a year but $9,500,000,000, or more. Imports from South America, from Canada, and from Central America have held up to this level but imports from Europe are about one-half of what they were prewar, and from Asia but a fraction of what they were prewar. As the greatest market in the world, there are many types of goods we ought to get from the world to improve materially our own standard of living. Linens, laces, china, glass, leather goods, and fine cutlery which enhance and beautify life could be acquired by us more plentifully from overseas. Imports of strategic raw materials which we lack, as well as raw materials in which it is advisable for us to husband our own resources, all of which are in long supply elsewhere in the world, should be of the greatest interest to us; these include oil, copper, manganese, industrial diamonds, rubber, and many other items.

The ITO charter proposes to establish rules of trade exactly such as the greatest trading nation on earth would want, and generally of a kind which only narrow nationalism or an iron-curtain ideology should oppose. The charter makes the first international effort to eliminate quantitative restrictions on imports—that is, limitations on the quantity of a certain type of goods which may be imported into a particular country; to eliminate preferential arrangements on imports between two countries which discriminate against other countries; to eliminate discriminations on imports when they enter the stream of internal commerce with regard to excise taxes or sales restrictions; and to regulate subsidization of exports by Government so that it is not used as a weapon in order to capture markets. These are the very practices which were refined into a science by the Nazis who victimized Europe with coercive barter agreements by which the foisted unneeded goods—like harmonicas and aspirins—on peoples who were breaking their backs to produce food, and the ITO charter for the first time proposes to bring under some control these dangerous foreign trade weapons. The charter also makes universal

for members of the organization the most-favored-nation treatment providing for nondiscriminatory opportunity to all to trade and provides also that customs and trade regulations shall not unduly burden or discriminate against imports—as for example to provide standard procedures for determining value for customs purposes. State trading, cartels, and intergovernmental commodity agreements are brought by the charter under some measure of international review in order to see that they are not used as weapons against world trade for selfish purposes, while for the first time on a world political as well as economic level an effort is made to establish in the charter an international code of fair treatment for investors in foreign countries.

The charter, also for the first time on an international basis, seeks to establish some rules for state monopolies of import or export trade, or state trading operations so widely prevalent in the world today, requiring them to operate in accordance with commercial considerations and customary business practices and to allow adequate opportunity for competition to the enterprises of other member countries.

Admittedly the charter has many exceptions, even some exceptions which weaken the charter materially. For example, those regarding the subsidization of exports which are quite general and weak, but these are attributable to the low state of the world's economy, to the grave difficulties created by the ravages of war and to a multitude of traditional trade relationships having a tendency to hamper trade which have grown up through the centuries, and which until ITO, no major effort was made to dispel. Certain of these exceptions were requested by the United States, notably those to protect our farm price stabilization program and to protect our own essential national security. We also insisted on the fundamental exception which we have written into all our reciprocal trade negotiations that tariff concessions may be suspended or withdrawn if increased imports cause or threaten serious injury to our domestic producers. Finally, we effected a great reform in opportunities for our moving-picture industry, the greatest in the world, and as influential in teaching other peoples how Americans live as in furnishing entertainment. The ITO charter eliminates import quotas for movies and substitutes quotas of screen time making for competition instead of restriction.

The major exceptions of which other countries are likely to take advantage relate to quantitative restrictions by countries that are in balance of payments difficulties, new preferences and exceptions to the most-favored-nation rule incidental to the formation of customs unions or required for economic development, and other restrictions on imports may be utilized for the same purpose. However, for the first time in the history of international trade, each nation may not act freely in these respects as it chooses, but is circumscribed by certain criteria which it must meet to obtain either the approval of the International Monetary Fund, or of the ITO itself before engaging in these practices.

The United States, however, or any other member of ITO may withdraw from the organization on 60 days' notice if dissatisfied with a decision of the organization.

The free nations of the world are by now fairly well agreed that hunger and despair are the breeding ground for communism, yet an analysis of world income shows how far we are from decent living standards and how far we have to go to attain what we ought to consider a civilized world. A study of these figures makes us understand why such vast areas of the world and so many millions of people listen to a Communist ideology which is to us puerile, cynical, and degrading. Three-fifths of the people of the world have incomes of less than $100 a year, and living standards accordingly. Even in more highly developed countries, contrasted with United States per capita average income of $1,400 in 1948, France, the United Kingdom, and Argentina show per capita incomes of around $400 a year, and countries like Colombia, Brazil, Guatemala, and Chile show per capita incomes of about $100 a year.

Great vistas of higher standards of living and general well-being can be opened up by us for the teeming millions of the world, and the challenge of communism decisively defeated and driven back from where it has already taken hold, as in the vast area of China. It seems clear that we are most likely to attain these goals for the peoples of the world if world trade can flow fairly and easily. Our acceptance of membership in the ITO will be the signal for acceptance by the other signatories at Havana. Before then they will not sign, for the success of ITO is dependent upon us, by far the biggest trading nation of them all.

The establishment of ITO will confound the Communists who predict that on the issue of economics, the democracies will cut each other's throats. It will demonstrate the ability of the democratic nations to unite on economic principles which are essential to their success. It will decisively refute the claims of the Soviet propagandists that economic cataclysm is on the horizon for the free nations. We have already delayed much too long in organizing for the counter-offensive against communism which is inherent in the ITO. Timidity plays into Communist hands. ITO has been by now so thoroughly discussed and analyzed on record and indeed third thought that we ought to have our national debate on it and act. It will be for our world leadership a departure as vital as ERP from all previous world leadership.

Less Talk, More Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun able editor Julius Gius complains mildly of the catch-all nature of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, and asks for consideration of a "less talk" news item from Norway.

We must work for increased efficiency, but that is not always accomplished through the means suggested by the Norwegian Storting.

With a sad memory of the years when all democracy was blacked out in Norway, I recall with joy that wonderful day in 1945 when I stood with a cheering crowd on the dock at Oslo, Norway, to welcome home from England the free Norwegian Government, which had long been exiled by the totalitarian Nazi.

During all those years of German occupation there was no debate because there was no Storting, as Norway's Congress is called. Totalitarians always have feared not only free debate but all other democratic institutions.

Even with the hope engendered by the Government's return, the fact that a democratic government had not functioned for years in Norway created an atmosphere which contrasted noticeably with that in Sweden where the Riksdag, which I visited only a few days before, was democratically active.

Yes, Editor Gius, there must be a more efficient way to do things than that exemplified by our 16-hour day on the fair employment practices bill last week, but remember that the longest speech during this time was 15 minutes and the great majority of them were made under the 5-minute rule. No matter what our attitude as to this legislation, it was fairly and openly debated.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorial reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that, as the Sun requests, Members of Congress may read this debate and working-hour limitation:

LESS TALK, MORE WORK

That voluminous Washington publication, known as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains a daily Appendix which is filled with letters, speeches that never were delivered, some few that had been, reprints from hither and yon, very bad poetry, and miscellany of every sort.

We'd like to submit to said periodical one very brief paragraph that we've just run across in a Norwegian publication, with our prayer that it, too, be reprinted. Here goes:

"The Norwegian Storting has been considering how to increase its working efficiency. After 5½ hours' debate last week it was decided to limit speeches by party leaders, cabinet members, and chairmen of committees to a maximum of 1 hour, and to limit speeches by others to 20 minutes. It was also decided that the morning meeting of Parliament shall extend from 10 a. m. to 3 p. m. without the 1 hour's break at noon, which has been customary."

We'd hope that some few, at least, of our Senators and Representatives might read the item. We'd even hope that one or two might think the idea laudable and, maybe, try to do something with it.

A Profile of Hon. Jacob K. Javits, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine New Yorker concerning our colleague from New York, Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS:

PROFILES—THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK
(By E. J. Kahn, Jr.)

As the Member of the House of Representatives from the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York, JACOB KOPPEL JAVITS, an energetic, informed, and ambitious lawyer generally addressed by the people whose backs he slaps as Jack, is the spokesman on the national scene for the slightly more than 300,000 inhabitants of the upper west side of Manhattan. JAVITS, who was born on the lower east side of Manhattan, has been in Congress only 3 years, but he has so rapidly adjusted to his environment that he can

now use a phrase like "warp and woof" in ordinary parlor conversation without blinking. He is a stocky man of 45, 5 feet 9 inches in height, with a gleaming bald head and gleaming white teeth. His appearance suggests an erudite version of Jack Benny, with whom, unlike some of his legislative colleagues, he has nothing occupational in common. JAVITS has always been an exceptionally serious-minded man, and he is a serious-minded legislator. He has a high regard for businesslike efficiency and is himself a sturdy example of it. When he first went to Congress, another legislator asked a mutual friend what kind of political machine the newcomer had behind him. "JAVITS doesn't need one" was the answer. "He is a machine." JAVITS has a strong social conscience, an alert and retentive mind, a fluent tongue, a courtly manner, and an air of indomitable self-assurance. He dresses expensively and carefully but without the flashiness of many politicians. During one of the two congressional campaigns in which he has been a candidate, a coworker suggested to him that he enhance his visual appeal to the voters by adopting some gay sartorial symbol. The friend mentioned Al Smith's brown derby and the success that that had enjoyed. JAVITS forthwith bought himself a black fedora, and scarcely took it off his head until election day. There is no reason to believe that it influenced a single vote.

The Twenty-first District, a politically, socially, and intellectually heterogeneous area with no particular feeling one way or another about haberdashery, hugs the bank of the Hudson River from One Hundred Fourteenth Street north through Inwood and extends as far east, here and there, as St. Nicholas Terrace and the Harlem River. It takes in Washington Heights, Marble Hill, Manhattanville, Morningside Heights, and Hamilton Grange. Its main thoroughfares are Broadway and Riverside Drive, and within its boundaries lie Columbia University, the Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center, Lewisohn Stadium, and the tombs of such antithetical celebrities as General Grant and Saint Frances Xavier Cabrini, the first American to be canonized. It is a middle-income district. Substantial blocs of Catholics and Negroes are to be found in it, but it is predominantly Jewish; since the 1930's so many refugees from Germany have sought it out as a haven that it is now occasionally called the Fourth Reich. It was traditionally regarded as a stronghold of Tammany Hall until 1946, when Javits, running on the Republican and Liberal Party tickets, dethroned the Democratic Party there.

A Congressman is, of course, supposed to espouse the views of his constituents, and JAVITS has tried harder than many of his colleagues to ascertain what those views are. During his 1946 campaign, he established a political precedent by engaging Elmo Roper, at a cost of $2,000, to sound out the residents of the district on how they felt about things, and he ordered a similar poll taken in 1948, when he successfully ran for reelection. On both occasions, Roper's operatives collared a thousand people of voting age, presumably a cross-section of the Twenty-first, and questioned them, for JAVITS' edification, about such issues as housing, the cost of living, atomic energy, China, public works, labor relations, the Soviet Union, and the quality of the performance of the Congress of the United States. JAVITS learned, among other things, that his potential constituents were markedly prolabor, and after being elected he dutifully voted against the Taft-Hartley Act, to the anguish of many of his Republican colleagues, who felt, as his party irregularity since then has caused them to continue to feel, that he was being grievously disloyal to their grand old cause.

Roper's 1946 survey disclosed that only 8.8 percent of the thousand constituents could correctly name their Congressman, JAVITS' predecessor; that 6.9 percent thought they could but came up with the wrong name; and that the remaining 84.3 percent, many of them well informed on atomic energy and China, found the question utterly beyond them. In 1948, when the same question was asked and the right answer was, of course, "JAVITS," 33.1 percent gave that name, and only 5.3 percent somebody else's. This was enormously pleasing to JAVITS. A few weeks ago, guided solely by a hunch, he estimated that well over half of his constituents could now, if challenged, name their representative. If that is so, he is, by big-city political standards remarkably well known in his district. His relative renown stems partly from the diligence with which he has looked out for the interests of his flock, and partly from his having demonstrated a nice flair for getting his name publicized not only within the narrow limits of the twenty-first district but also in the outside world, where he has had to compete for attention with the favorite sons of the four hundred and thirty-four other congressional districts. JAVITS works hard to this end. He almost never makes a speech or issues a statement without embodying in it expressions of sentiment that he regards as quotable and without distributing numerous mimeographed copies thereof. When Drew Pearson, who had once described him as "an effective operator," failed to mention him in an item that JAVITS thought he deserved to be counted in on, JAVITS hastily telephoned the columnist, fearful that he had somehow unwittingly hurt his feelings and eager to make amends. Such enterprise has paid off. JAVITS was, for example, the only Congressman to be honored by Forbes Magazine, a while ago, on a page headed "Thoughts on the business of life," in which one of JAVITS' thoughts (it had to do with the responsibility of the United States to the rest of the world) was quoted alongside thoughts of Abraham Lincoln, George Eliot, Irving Berlin, and an anonymous hotel proprietor in Syracuse who had put up a sign on his premises stating that business has never invented a substitute for customer satisfaction. Many of JAVITS' constituents feel that, by gaining recognition of such a high type, their congressman has brought them gratifying recognition, too. "You've put Washington Heights on the map," a pastor of that neighborhood told him a few weeks ago. JAVITS takes a more modest view of his achievements. "I've done a lot for the district," he says, "but the district has done a lot for me, too."

The mere fact of being elected a Congressman does a lot for any man. It generally means, for instance, that his State bureau of motor vehicles grants him a distinguished-looking license plate; JAVIT's current New York number is an eye-catching and cop-stopping JJ 20. Like his colleagues, he is entitled to, among other prerogatives, free medical care in Federal hospitals; Government-printed calling cards proclaiming his eminence; 68 copies of each daily printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and two bound sets of the collected issues of that massive and colorful journal; Government-made ice cubes, in the event that he should care to offer a drink to a constituent or a colleague visiting his office; Government-owned office furniture; and Government-supplied paper clips, towels, soap, brooms, and hothouse plants. The plants are lent to Congressmen to brighten their offices by the United States Botanic Garden, a couple of blocks from the Capitol. When the plants begin to wilt, the Garden obligingly sends a man around to pick them up and substitute fresh ones.

Congressmen otherwise decorate their chambers according to individual taste. One of JAVITS' closest legislative cronies is an ardent collector of ancient paintings and statuary; his office resembles an antique shop. In the realm of fine arts, JAVITS himself, like the majority of his colleagues, prefers to make do with what is readily available—calendar art bestowed upon the Nation's legislators by railroads and air lines, and framed, like any similar decoration, at the cost of the Government, provided that the users supply the glass. JAVITS has elected to deck his legislative headquarters with sparkling vistas of MacArthur Park, in Los Angeles; Old North Church, in Boston; and the lower tip of Manhattan, which is part of the Sixteenth Congressional District. An occasional visitor from the twenty-first may grumble that, geographically speaking, this gallery is hardly suitable, but without departing from his make-do policy JAVITS is powerless to remedy the situation; the travel companies have not as yet seen fit to pay pictorial tribute to Marble Hill, Manhattanville, or Hamilton Grange. JAVITS is assigned a two-room air-conditioned suite in the older of the two House Office Buildings, adjacent to the Capitol. His windows afford a view of an interior courtyard. As his seniority increases he will be entitled to better quarters, and someday, perhaps, will enjoy an outside view from the new House Office Building. On the desk in his private chamber, as befits a man in his job, are a Bible, an elephant, and pictures of his mother, his wife, and his two small children; behind the desk is an American flag, and on the floor next to the desk a spittoon, both furnished all Congressmen by a Government sensitive to legislators' needs. There are bookcases whose contents attest to the catholicity of JAVITS' interests—Science and Farming, the Veteran Comes Back, Poland Struggles Forward, and a 1947 Texas Almanac. Framed on the walls are a replica of the United Nations Charter; a Government pay check for 42 cents earned by JAVITS during part of 1941, when he was a dollar-a-year man; a photograph of the Eightieth Congress taken on January 3, 1947, his first day in office; and a copy of H. R. 3762, a piece of legislation known as the National Heart Act, that went into effect on June 16, 1948, and that is, to date, the only bill introduced by JAVITS (except for one affecting a lone constituent of his) to have become the law of the land. In the same frame with H. R. 3762, which provides for Government-sponsored research into causes of and cures for heart and cardio-vascular diseases, is the pen President Truman signed it with. JAVITS had to pay for this fancy job; the House framing service draws the line at three-dimensional objects.

JAVITS has a staff of six assistants, which is about normal for a legislator who takes his work seriously and has, or contrives to have, a good deal of work to do. His aides are evenly divided between the two poles of his political axis. In New York, he has a personal secretary and two part-time political secretaries, one representing the Republican Party and one the Liberal Party, who act as liaison men between him and his constituents. In Washington, sharing the outer office that leads into JAVITS', are another personal secretary, a press-and-legislative secretary, and a stenographer. None of the six is related to JAVITS, by blood or by marriage. All are on the Federal pay roll, and last year they collectively received $20,170. JAVITS' salary came to $12,500, and he also got a tax-free expense allowance of $2,500. Then there was $800 for stationery, $500 for telegrams and long-distance phone calls (local calls are on the House), and—since each Congressman is granted 20 cents a mile, every session, for the round trip between Washington and his home district—$89.20 for carfare.

JAVITS and the members of his staff take in, among them, more than $35,000 a year, but it costs closer to $50,000 a year to run his legislative office. He is able to make ends meet because, like many other Congressmen, he leads a perfectly honorable double life;

he devotes some time to the law firm, of which he is still a partner, that he was associated with in his pre-legislative days, and he continues to draw an income from it, though a considerably smaller one than he did when he was a single-minded man. JAVITS supplements his aides' pay out of his own pocket; he spends nearly $2,000 twice a year for printing and addressing a letter to 90,000 of his constituents, reporting on his activities; his telegrams and long-distance calls come to much more than he is allotted for them; he keeps up residences in both Washington and New York; and he has to foot a personal transportation bill that all by itself more than eats up his expense allowance. Congressmen whose districts are remote from Washington are rarely able to get back where they came from during a legislative session, but men whose districts are nearby find it not only possible but useful to make frequent trips home.

Many legislators from New York, Philadelphia, and other places reasonably close to Washington habitually attend to local affairs a couple of days a week, and are disparagingly known among their envious brethren from far away as members of the Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday Club, a reference to the prevailing belief that they can be counted on to be present in the House only on those three midweek days, if then. Indeed, in deference to their habits, and to their numbers, the House often waits until the middle of the week to vote on important bills, and its committees hold most of their meetings then. JAVITS is an unusually conscientious legislator and can often be found in Washington on a Monday or a Friday, just as if he hailed from Oregon or Arizona, but in order to be on tap at the Capitol and also to spend what he considers a proper amount of time in New York, he has taken to commuting wildly, and expensively, between the two places. He regularly makes 2 or 3 round trips a week and has been known to make a couple in a day. When he first took office, he often used the Congressional Limited, but he has become more and more pressed for time and now generally flies. Some Thursday afternoons, as Representatives from New York City rush out of the House and wing toward home, JAVITS finds himself on a plane with half a dozen of his colleagues. On one such day last fall, he took a seat next to a stranger, and they got to talking about children. In the course of the conversation, JAVITS, referring to his year-old daughter, said carryingly, "She talks a lot but doesn't make any sense." Two other homebound Congressmen, who had evidently heard all his sentence except the introductory pronoun, turned and glared fiercely at him.

JAVITS talks a lot himself and, operating in an oratorical arena where making sense is not necessarily a qualification for admittance, he is admired by old-timers around the Capitol for the amount of it he makes. Last summer, the House was about to take its final action on a housing measure that after many weeks of wrangling had finally been approved by a joint Senate-House conference committee and was thus, as legislative procedure ordinarily goes, far beyond the stage of protracted debate. Nevertheless, when the conference report came back to the House for formal ratification, a few die-hard Representatives who disapproved of Federal housing rose to urge windily that every hod carrier working on a Government housing project be compelled to file a non-Communist affidavit, and to hint darkly that the House of Representatives itself was infested with Reds, pinks, and other heretics of allied hue. At that point, JAVITS asked for and got the floor. He said, in notably few words, that everyone present who had been against Federal housing all along would probably vote against the conference report and that everyone who had been for it all along would probably vote for it, so why didn't his distinguished colleagues just vote and get it over with? The effect of so rational a suggestion was startling. The debate halted instantly, a vote was taken, and the bill passed, at a saving to the taxpayers of heaven knows how many Congressman-hours.

During the three congressional sessions in which JAVITS has participated—two in the Eightieth Congress and one in the Eighty-first—he has been outstanding for his lack of the reticence that usually characterizes fledgling legislators. It is axiomatic in congressional circles that the best way for a freshman to get along, and to insure his reelection, is to keep his mouth shut. JAVITS was an impressively articulate courtroom lawyer prior to entering politics, and silence is foreign to his nature. He began his first session in Washington by holding himself fairly well in check, remaining officially mute until Congress had been meeting for more than 2 weeks. Then, however, he cut loose with a 20-minute speech. Before the House adjourned that fall, he had recovered so sensationally from his slow start that the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the session showed him to have been more active vocally, than any other Manhattan Congressman. The second session of the Eightieth Congress had been under way only 3 days when JAVITS took the floor, and when the Eighty-first Congress convened, a year ago, he gave tongue, with the confidence of an old hand, the very first day. (This current session, he was mute for a week, but possibly only because he was preoccupied by the birth of a son the day before Congress convened.) Up to now he has demonstrated his versatility on the floor of the House by holding forth on something like a hundred and fifty themes, including James G. Blaine, health conditions in Brazil, CARE packages, Indonesia, the death of Jan Masaryk, Pan-American Day, Herbert Hoover, overtime pay, immigration quotas for the British West Indies, rent control for hotels, segregation in Washington schools, the profits of the General Foods Corp., Wendell Willkie, the United States Employment Service, the United States Information Service, air-mail rates, retirement pay for Army officers, the preservation of the dairy industry, American policy toward Spain, the Russian threat to the Dardanelles, Elihu Root, the character of the German people, wheat, children, wool, the Jackson Hole National Monument, and, it goes without saying, New York City. As a fervent champion of this city JAVITS once collaborated eulogistically with Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, a Manhattan Democrat from the Nineteenth Congressional District, who had felt impelled to pay tribute to his home town and various of its subdivisions—Wall Street, Greenwich Village, Chinatown, Little Italy, the Bowery, and so on. JAVITS, perhaps motivated partly by the fact that KLEIN had inadvertently neglected to mention the lower East Side, where most of KLEIN's constituents live, took up the ball and not only rectified that omission but added Park Avenue and "my own Washington Heights" as a couple of other regions he felt the House, at that particular moment of history, should pause to take cognizance of. "We are really a collection of small towns," he said, "not an amorphous mass of people and masonry. There is as much good will, kindness, hospitality, and consideration per square foot in New York as in any other part of America, town or country. New York's millions of friendly citizens, its rapid transit, its restaurants of many nationalities, its magnificent shops, its unmatched theater and music, the sheer tempo of its movement, are the joy of invention, the passion for freedom, and the drive for progress which is America." Sic rapidly transit JAVITS.

The principal business of a legislator is, theoretically, at least, to legislate. While JAVITS has been in the House, around twenty-three thousand bills or resolutions have been introduced there—about 18 per Representative per session. When legislation presented to one Congress fails to get anywhere, its sponsor (if he is still there) frequently presents it to the next Congress; JAVITS has a 3-year total of 90 pieces of legislation—slightly over par for the course—including 13 that he has proffered hopefully to both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses. Some 20 of his offerings, including 4 repeaters, have been designed to assist individuals. Measures of this sort are known as private bills, and they are traditionally passed without objection once they get to the floor of Congress. The trick is to get them there. Some private bills introduced 10 years ago and reintroduced in each new Congress since then have yet to be reported out of the committees given jurisdiction over them. One of JAVITS' private bills would oblige the Government to pay $500 to a constituent of his who posted a bond in that amount with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1931, as a guaranty for his sister, who was allowed that year to enter the United States as an alien in transit, while on her circuitous way from Habana to Nassau. She didn't leave the country when she was supposed to, and the bond was forfeited. Nobody tried especially hard to deport her, and in 1937 the State Department, letting bygones be bygones, decreed that she might stay here indefinitely. Following that the immigration people said that they would gladly return her brother's $500 but that they would first have to be formally authorized to do so by Congress. JAVITS introduced the appropriate enabling legislation in 1948. It died with the Eightieth Congress and he hasn't got around to reintroducing it yet. JAVITS has had one private bill passed. It related to a merchant seaman who, while ashore at Leghorn, Italy, in 1946, was struck and injured by a military vehicle that he took to be a United States Army truck, and who wants damages from the Government. JAVITS' bill has granted the man the right to have his claim adjudicated by a United States District Court, where the matter may conceivably drag on for a couple more years.

The actual drafting of a bill is not the most onerous of a Congressman's chores. For one thing, the House provides a nonpartisan legislative drafting service, which, given the substance of any bill a man may have in mind, proceeds to dress it up in proper technical language. Then there is the Library of Congress, which stands ready to do whatever research a legislator may require in order to decide what he would like to put into a bill. The first public, or nonprivate bill that JAVITS offered to Congress would, if enacted, have permitted the entry into the United States, without regard to immigration quotas, of certain war orphans under 14. Having thus made his debut on the public-bill level, JAVITS went on spiritedly to propose legislation having to do with juvenile delinquency, meat rationing, public housing, multiple sclerosis, pensions for the widows of Federal justices, fair-employment practices, un-American activities, and the awarding of medals to members of the Army and Air Force Reserves. He has not been especially distressed by the lack of enthusiasm that most of these legislative proposals have evoked. A Congressman's contributions to the general welfare are not always measurable by the number of laws passed with his name on them. Carrying on in a forum where obstructive criticism is the natural order of things, JAVITS has tried to establish himself as a constructive critic of other men's bills, and several amendments he has championed have, to his immense satisfaction,

been formally, even if all but anonymously, enacted into law. Once, he got a letter from a constituent complaining about a postwar statute that allowed alien fiancees of American servicemen to enter the United States irrespective of quotas. Under the terms of this law, all such sweethearts whose romances soured after they got here and who didn't get married were liable to deportation, with the exception of German nationals, who, because the German quota had not been filled, owing to the postwar restrictions on general immigration from that country, could remain here in any event. Inevitably, some Germans had been taking advantage of this loophole and, with the connivance of Americans who were willing to let themselves be called sweethearts for immigration purposes, had been crossing the Atlantic ostensibly to get married but actually just to get resettled. JAVITS was impressed by his constituent's account of this uneven state of affairs, and, noting that an immigration bill of some kind seemed on the point of being passed by the House, he tried to tack an amendment onto it requiring that German fiances be treated the same as other fiancees. The general feeling at the time was that the matter could be dealt with administratively, rather than by new legislation, and the amendment was rejected, by the spectacular vote of 100–1, the sole vote for it being cast by Representative JAVITS (Republican-Liberal, New York). A less determined solon might have let the matter rest there, but JAVITS, nettled by the staggering proportions of his defeat, pleaded his cause earnestly to some Senatorial friends, and convinced them that a law was necessary. They inserted JAVITS amendment into the version of the immigration bill that was later approved by the Senate, and presently he had the pleasure, after this and the House version had been spliced in conference, of observing his fellow-Representatives unanimously approve a measure containing precisely the provision they had so overwhelmingly rejected not long before.

In the Senate, any number of Members may jointly sponsor a single piece of legislation. In the House, if more than one Member wants to sponsor a bill, each must present it as a separate, even if identical, legislative proposal. JAVITS, for instance, was 1 of 96 Representatives who introduced similar bills designed to strengthen the United Nations along lines recommended by the United World Federalists. This system of multiple authorship has at least one advantage; it enables whole flocks of Representatives, when reporting to their constituents, to claim credit—by implication, at any rate—for the same statesmanlike achievement. When popular indignation over the shabby treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty was at its highest, JAVITS was 1 of 13 Representatives who, moved by humanitarianism, introduced resolutions sympathizing with the cardinal's plight and berating his oppressors. So eager was JAVITS to have his views on the matter set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that even after the House, by demonstrating its readiness to accept a colleague's resolution that was much like his own, had begun to take exactly the legislative action he had advocated, he felt it necessary to make one of those little caudal speeches that help to give the RECORD its bulging girth. "I append hereto House Resolution 65," he said, "which I offered to the same effect as the resolution now being adopted, and I am satisfied that the resolution now being adopted accomplishes the same result."

Much of Congress' legislative give-and-take is of a preliminary sort, occurring informally in restaurants, hallways, and cloakrooms, or formally at meetings of committees and subcommittees, to one or more of which every legislator is assigned. JAVITS, at the start of his first term, was tapped by his Republican colleagues for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and he has served on it ever since. The committee's influence on the conduct of foreign affairs used to be modest compared with that of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Recently, however, the House group has been catching up fast, since the Government's foreign affairs and relations have been largely of a monetary nature—the European recovery program being a striking example—and since all appropriations bills originate in the House. JAVITS' good fortune in being assigned to this committee in the era of its ascendancy has been ERP's good fortune, too; he was one of a handful of global-minded Republican Members who, at a time when there was considerable sentiment within the committee for returning to isolationism and the Congress as a whole was dominated by the Republicans, tipped the balance in favor of distributing American largess abroad.

In 1947, JAVITS and three other Representatives concerned with foreign affairs went to Europe on one of those congressional fact-finding expeditions, and while in Warsaw one day, seeking facts about displaced persons, stopped to watch a crowd of men and women shoveling rubble into trucks. One of the legislators, aware of his position as a roving ambassador of American good will, graciously offered a cigarette to an old woman on the work gang. "Cigarette, pah," she said, and thrust a shovel into his hands. JAVITS and his two other colleagues, though a trifle weary from fact-finding at a pace that had them visiting eight countries in 6 weeks, took the hint, grabbed shovels themselves, and together they valiantly filled a whole truck with rubble, thus giving a demonstration of good will possibly never before or since matched by any itinerant delegation of American Congressmen.

The three Representatives who went abroad with JAVITS contributed, as it happened, not only to expediting American foreign relations but to expediting JAVITS' domestic relations. When the four legislators sailed from Manhattan, one of the well-wishers who came aboard to see them off was a personable young lady to whom the gentleman from New York, then unmarried, had for some time been attracted. The sailing was delayed, and so was preceded by several all-visitors-ashore warnings. Each time the bells clanged, JAVITS gave his visitor a conservative peck, and each time his colleagues, taking advantage of the prevailing atmosphere of camaraderie, gave her a resounding kiss. After the third or fourth round, JAVITS cried anxiously, "How about this, boys?" "Congressional courtesy," they explained. Before the boat cleared the harbor, JAVITS had decided that a young lady who so manifestly appealed to other men of stature was in danger of getting away from him if he didn't act fast, so he proposed to her by ship-to-shore telephone. Two months later, when JAVITS and the lady were married, his fellow-members of the Foreign Affairs Committee gave the couple a handsome silver tray with all their names inscribed on it—one of the rare instances of their taking unanimous action on anything.

When in Washington, JAVITS usually gets to his office around 9:30 in the morning. Committee meetings generally begin at 10 and last until noon, when the House convenes. It remains in session until mid- or late afternoon or, toward the end of a congressional year, when there is much unfinished business on hand, until early the following morning. Few Congressmen spend much time on the floor unless a bill in which they are vitally interested is under consideration; some hardly ever go there. To insure their being present at critical moments, as when a close vote on an important matter is imminent, they are, like firemen or young ladies seeing ships off, alerted by bells, which ring commandingly throughout the House office buildings. JAVITS keeps in fairly good shape by, among other things, spending a couple of hours a week playing paddle ball, a refinement of handball, in the House gymnasium, for the privilege of using which he pays $5 a year; when pressed, he can get from his office desk to the House chamber—roughly a quarter-mile stretch, indoors and out—in 4½ minutes without straining. This affords him a wide margin of safety, because the most important kind of vote is an alphabetical roll call, or two-bell vote, and calling the roster of the House twice (as is regularly done, to give stragglers and slowpokes a chance to record their votes) takes nearly three-quarters of an hour.

JAVITS manages to spend a few hours in his office most days when he is in Washington, but nonetheless he has to work late at night at least twice a week, and he practically never gets to any of the cocktail parties that are commonly thought to be as indispensable to the well-being of some Congressmen as paddle ball is to that of others. While JAVITS is in his office, he devotes a good deal of his time to conferring on the telephone about legislative or political matters with his colleagues (he is on a first-name basis with about a hundred of them, including quite a few Democrats); to reading and answering his mail, which rarely comes to fewer than fifty letters a day and sometimes goes well above a hundred; to greeting constituents who drop in to say hello, to ask for passes to the House or Senate gallery, or to nag at him; to preparing speeches or studying bills that are scheduled to come up (many of these are couched in such cloudy language that he has to get his legislative secretary to find out what they mean before sitting down to ponder their merits); and to editing material that is to appear in the RECORD.

When a Congressman says something on the floor it is transcribed, and if he has asked permission to revise and extend his remarks, it is sent to him so he can make any corrections he cares to before it is inserted in the RECORD, a protective device that leads to the excision of many grammatical bobbles and that once enabled a Representative from a dairy State who had absentmindedly spoken favorably of oleomargarine to change a highly embarrassing "for" to a rocklike "against." A Congressman may alter, add, or delete as much as he chooses, and a sentence like "I feel that we will continue to press for action for the middle-income families, which was also provided for in our bill"—the words JAVITS used one day in commenting on another man's housing bill—may come out something the way that one did: "I feel also that we will continue to press for action on housing for the lower middle-income families, which is not contained in his bill, but which was first provided for in the bill introduced by the 10 House Republicans, later joined in by similar bills introduced by 22 Democratic Members." Congressmen become so accustomed to editing anything they put in the RECORD that in the process of inserting an article from the Saturday Review of Literature last summer JAVITS edited that. Despite this careful preparation insertions in the RECORD are still occasionally liable to misinterpretation. During the last session JAVITS submitted for the RECORD's Appendix, in which Congressmen may insert material not spoken from the floor, an item that began with the statement, "This is an invitation to Members from our 26 most populous States to go to the theater." Some Congressmen, who knew that JAVITS had introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a national theater and who had heard through the legislative grapevine that he had just been in telegraphic communication with Oscar Hammerstein II, one of the producers of "South Pacific," read on with high anticipation, only to find that JAVITS' encouraging preamble was followed simply by a listing of the names of more than 250 summer theaters in 26 States that a theatrical acquaintance had asked him to insert as evidence of the ubiq-

uity of the stage. JAVITS had sent a telegram to Hammerstein, all right, but merely to inquire into the possibility of buying a pair of tickets for a Saturday-night performance of "South Pacific."

JAVITS' less provocative contributions to the Appendix have included a letter from a housewife in his district lamenting her inability to find a decent apartment and a letter to the editor signed by J. K. JAVITS and published in the Herald Tribune last year when it was searching for a definition of liberalism. The Tribune has been a supporter of JAVITS, and said editorially of him, after the 1946 elections: "He promises to be a legislator of a new and different nature, and we look forward to hearing more of him." JAVITS was grateful for so warm a send-off—though probably not surprised, inasmuch as the paper's chief editorial writer was one of the men who had urged him to run in the first place.

Some Congressmen cram the Appendix with lofty words they have declaimed at cornerstone layings, barbecues, and husking bees. JAVITS has been remarkably diffident in this respect, and not for want of material, as since taking office he has made an average of two or three speeches a week at functions he has attended. If he were to accept all the invitations that come his way, he could be even more oratorically occupied, but he has chosen to confine himself, in the main, to audiences with national influence, such as the annual convention of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, and to audiences with influence in his home district, such as the Kip's Boy Scout Troop 472, Manhattan. Being one of nine Jews now in the Eighty-first Congress (he was one of seven in the Eightieth) and an outspoken friend of the State of Israel, he is considered an exceptionally attractive drawing card by most of the Jewish organizations in the country; immediately after his election to Congress he visited Israel, at his own expense, to study conditons there, and this later made him a logical choice to christen the S. S. *Haifa*, the first vessel to fly the colors of the American-Israeli Shipping Co.

During a typical 3-month period, JAVITS was invited to such varied functions as the annual strawberry ball and card party of the Republican Club of the seventh assembly district, north; a meeting of the American Association of Former European Jurists; a supper party of the Sisterhood of Congregation Ramath Orah; a dinner of the American League for an Undivided Ireland; the installation of officers of Upper Manhattan Chapter 42 of the Order of Ahepa; commencement exercises of the Western Union Messenger School of New York; a weekend cruise on an aircraft carrier, to observe naval operations; and a ball given by the Columbia University Chinese Students' Association, at which a special award of merit was to be presented to him. All these bids happened to be among the many that JAVITS was obliged to decline, except the one from the Chinese students, and, as things turned out, he might as well have declined that, too. The ball was canceled at the last minute, and he has not yet received his award.

JAVITS has learned that a politician must be patient about such personal disappointments, especially when they occur within his district. Not long ago, he was asked to an evening festival at a neighborhood synagogue, and replied that he had a terribly full schedule already set up for the evening in question but that he would try to drop in if he possibly could. When the date came around, he did have a full evening, with three or four duty calls to make, but he gamely stopped by the synagogue anyway. It was closed and dark, and after pounding respectfully on a few doors and rattling a few knobs he went away. A busy private citizen might have raised a fuss over being thus inconvenienced, but JAVITS took the whole thing with good grace. "Perhaps you had the festival on another evening and forgot to tell me," he wrote to the man who had issued the invitation, and added his expression of good wishes for the fine work he felt sure his elusive host was doing. JAVITS himself tries hard not to disappoint people who are expecting him, but he makes so many engagements that now and then he can't keep up with them. One man, who had been extremely anxious to talk to him and had had a couple of lunch and cocktail dates with him misfire, thought he had licked the problem by asking JAVITS to his home for breakfast at 9 o'clock on a Sunday morning. JAVITS accepted. That Sunday, the host and his wife arose early, got their children fed and out of the way, and sat around hungrily awaiting their honorable guest. JAVITS arrived at 10:30, panting. He was dreadfully sorry to be so late, he said, but a prebreakfast engagement had lasted longer than he had figured.

Marihuana Makes Youthful Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, an alarming number of crimes in various sections of the United States have been committed by young people who have been under the influence of marihuana. Many of these crimes have been committed by teen-age youngsters who, while under the influence of this vicious drug, have committed murder, robbery, and other equally shocking crimes.

Newspaper headlines tell the story every day. The recent hitch-hike robbery and murder of an innocent citizen involving a young 18-year-old girl and her 15-year-old companion, who admitted she was under the influence of marihuana, is but one grim example of the current tendency toward drug addiction by young people.

I am truly amazed at the public apathy which greets this shocking wave of cases. Our law-enforcement agencies are fighting this menace and trying to break up the various crime syndicates which operate these illicit narcotic rings. But the time has come for the American people to rouse themselves and to take stock of the situation.

How can a citizen join the fight? First, by learning through intelligent reading what effect marihuana has on the person. Second, by learning through discussion with local law-enforcement authorities just how unscrupulous habitual criminals circulate marihuana through highly developed crime syndicates.

In this way the citizen can become alert to the present danger of crime under the influence of drugs, and assist actively in support of our law-enforcement agencies.

Report anything that arouses your suspicions to your local police department.

Do not wait for the other fellow to do it; do it yourself and do it now.

In conclusion I would like to suggest that the vast, far-reaching medium of radio be utilized more than ever to drive home to the American public the simple truth that crime does not pay, not by simply dramatizing the activities of private detectives and criminals, but by showing the criminal in his true light—as a coward, a menace to decent citizens, a broken wreck of a human being often a marihuana addict or user of other drugs—and documentarily detailing the never ending war waged by our law-enforcement agencies to bring an end to this evil.

The Man Few People Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the former Governor of Nebraska, the Honorable Samuel R. McKelvie, served as a member of the Federal Farm Board under the administration of President Herbert Hoover. Each year Mr. McKelvie issues a very interesting booklet entitled "By the Way." In this year's issue, Mr. McKelvie has written an inside story about the former President and also a statement regarding surplus farm crops as they existed at that time.

Because we are now perplexed over our farm problems, I feel that the membership should have Mr. McKelvie's story, since the situation in those days regarding farm surpluses was somewhat similar as the conditions appear to be today.

By leave granted me, I include Mr. McKelvie's statement as part of my remarks:

THE MAN FEW PEOPLE KNEW

The most unusual valentine I ever received and the most appreciated was a telephone call February 14, 1929. It was from President-elect Herbert Hoover. I was in Arizona trying to recuperate from a 3-year-old X-ray burn. He was in Miami, Fla., getting in a few spare hours of fishing before taking on the immeasurable responsibilities of the highest office in the land.

He asked me to accept appointment as Secretary of Agriculture in his Cabinet. It is impossible to describe my emotions, not only because it took me so completely by surprise, but that I could not accept. After expressing my deep appreciation of the honor, the most I could say was that on account of my physical condition I could not accept then, but within a day or two would advise with an eminent surgeon from Northwestern University who was then in Phoenix, and report. This I did on February 16.

"MY DEAR SECRETARY HOOVER"—(he was still Secretary of Commerce under President Coolidge). "I have awaited giving you my final answer pending a conference with the best medical authorities. Am able to say to

you now rather definitely that I shall not be able to undertake any responsible work before the 1st of June, or possibly the 1st of July.

"The fine honor you tendered me is one that I could not decline under normal circumstances. I am in sympathy with your program for agriculture, and would welcome the opportunity to take so important a part in developing it.

"I hold myself in readiness to be of service whenever and wherever I can." (Which I did, as will be noted later.)

Fact is I had disavowed any further public office, having just begun to recover financially from my 4-year governorship bout. I was sick of politics.

That was why I wrote Mr. Hoover shortly after his election congratulating him and saying: (He was about to start on a good will voyage to South America.)

"I hasten to express good wishes on the important voyage that you are about to take.

"From copies of letters sent me I am aware that representations are being made to you in my behalf in connection with your official family. I cannot too earnestly assure you that these words of my good friends are wholly unsolicited. I seek nothing politically. My efforts in your behalf were actuated by your fitness for the place, and I would regret very much to have it considered otherwise.

"I am at your command to be helpful in promoting the success of your administration, and my services will be without thought of personal reward." (I tried to help all right, but am not very proud of the results.)

My recuperative stay in Arizona did not yield the desired results. From there I went to Johns Hopkins, had the burn excised, the wound began to heal and Martha hurried me off to our summer retreat in the Black Hills of South Dakota. That was in June. It was not long until I was wandering along the stream snaring an occasional trout, and taking a new lease on life. Then in July came another telephone call. It was from President Hoover in Washington.

The new Congress had enacted the agricultural law that he recommended. It provided for a Federal Farm Board of nine members. Secretary of Agriculture Hyde, who was a member ex officio of the Board, had felt me out from time to time about accepting a place on it. I repeatedly took refuge in my physical inability to serve. But finally the word got to the White House that I was giving them the run-around. That was why Mr. Hoover called.

He asked me to serve as a member in charge of the Grain Division. All of the other members had been appointed, and the Board was functioning. As previously indicated, I declined for reasons other than my health, but that refusal lasted only 1 day. He called again the next day and was so insistent that I accepted for 1 year only, and, on July 24, wired him:

"I will undertake service on Federal Farm Board wtih understanding that I may begin September 1 and retire June 1 next year. If this is agreeable to you I will arrive in Washington next Monday and spend 1 week with the Board. Also, anncuncement should include conditions of my acceptance." All of which was carried out, except that when next June rolled around he prevailed upon me to stay another year.

One of these times I will have more to say about the ill-fated Farm Board and its work. Suffice to say that its acts seemed so revolutionary, and it was so stanchly opposed by private interests that it hung like a millstone around the President's neck. The squawk was made to high heaven that it would break the taxpayer and the Government. Believe it or not, the total appropriation was only $500,000,000.

"One-half billion dollars. My gawd. What was going to become of such spendthrift government. And Mr. Hoover was responsible for it all." Such incidents were the major theme of an unscrupulous opposition that set out early in his administration to misrepresent the facts and defeat him.

Small deficits were run during the last year or two of the Hoover administration. They were in fact trifling compared with what has happened since, but because it had been so long since there had been a deficit it was easy to make mountains of it. Finally, when the next campaign came on in '32 the opposition candidate speaking at Pittsburgh, said:

"We all know that our own family credit depends in large part on the stability of the credit of the United States.

"The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

"But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. * * * Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy. * * *

"I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues. * * * In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business."

How true. And how clearly stated.

Consider, then, what happened. Expenditures in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, were a little less than $5,000,000,000, and the national debt $16,801,000,000. By 1936 expenditures had increased to over $9,000,000,000, and the national debt was $33,779,000,000. More than doubled in 4 years.

Whether Franklin D. Roosevelt ever intend to live up to his promise we will never know. Suffice to say he never did, but it was red-hot campaign stuff at the time.

In my opinion, Mr. Hoover was the greatest economist and statesman of this century, and the poorest politician. One day former Gov. Henry Allen, of Kansas, and I were bemoaning the latter fact when Henry said: "The trouble with the Chief is that he always catches the ball on the second bounce." Meaning that he could not anticipate popular reactions to what he said or did. He sent out no feelers or trial balloons. If he thought a thing should be done he did it; and if he was opposed to a proposal he said so without equivocation.

I retired from the Federal Farm Board in June 1931. At that time the Government owned nearly 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and an equivalent amount of cotton acquired through stabilization purchases of the Federal Farm Board. Little, if any, of it dared be sold because just as soon as that was intimated the speculative trade made capital of it and promptly depressed prices to growers.

What was to be done about it? Well, we tried to peddle it by subterfuge. Some was sold in foreign countries in the form of flour. A few thousand bushels were traded for coffee in Brazil. Some was sold on "tick" to China, and I think never paid for. As I recall much the same was done in Germany, or other foreign countries. But all of those things made not a dent in the tremendous Government holdings.

Before leaving the Board I suggested that by some device, preferably through a charitable agency, it be given away to the needy at home. There were plenty of them. As the months wore on and the unemployed increased it seemed all the more imperative that it be done. So I went to Washington and took it up with several authoritative individuals and agency chiefs, among whom was Mr. Hoover.

The purposes appealed to him, especially on behalf of the needy—there never was a greater humanitarian; but he feared that it would again depress prices to the producer and interfere with the normal sources of distribution. I agreed but still felt that the end justified the means, and added that if he did not recommend and urge it the next Congress would and he would not get the credit. It did not budge him.

As a final clincher I pointed out that we had been giving it away in foreign countries to those far less worthy, and added "the people will appreciate it." With a good deal of vehemence he replied, "Appreciate it! They will not even remember it 6 months hence."

I recommended that 10,000,000 bushels be given away, but I believe nearer 10 times that was distributed through the Red Cross. It went into 85 percent of the counties in the United States. It was appreciated all right; that is, momentarily; but I'll wager there is not 1 in 10,000 who remembers it today. No doubt a good many were influenced by it in the next election, but Mr. Hoover did not get the credit.

Mr. Hoover believed in keeping government close to the people instead of centralizing it in Washington. He urged that the communities and States assume and discharge the responsibilities of taking care of their people. There, again, he was no politician. His successor proved that the easy way is to buy votes out of the National Treasury and let the recipients pay it back in their own money—taxes.

Fact is that in the midst of one of the worst depressions in American history Mr. Hoover could not have been reelected had he been Jesus Christ himself.

As the time for his retirement approached, Mr. Hoover offered his services and cooperation to his successor without prejudice, despite the unfair and in many respects dishonest campaign that had been made against him. His interest was in his Government and his country. To those ends he would make any sacrifice. His offers were ignored completely, and as time went on it was easy to understand why.

According to Raymond Moley, who was a part of the New Deal administration in its early stages, "Roosevelt always had a much more serious opinion of the damage to him of a Hoover come-back than he would publicly admit. I have the evidence that he (Roosevelt) made a bet with me before the 1936 campaign that Hoover would be renominated by his party." He adds, "The real gist of the Democratic appeal in four presidential campaigns has been the wonderful recovery of the country after the defeat of Hoover. The Democratic Party has been running against Hoover for 20 years."

Mr. Hoover's unselfish service to his country is measured in his every act. Never has he taken one penny from the Government in payment for his services, including the years he served as President. In that he stands alone. He never weighed his work in dollars and cents. It was a labor of love and duty. His beliefs were founded upon the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These he sought to preserve, and his emphasis in matters of Government policy always were founded upon them.

To me it seems he was the man few people knew. The greatest economist and statesman to occupy the White House in our time, he knew and gave the answers to good government policy almost before the questions were asked. But in that time of depression and discontent, the answers were not popular. Immediate relief was the want, regardless of cost or final result.

He was a friendly man, and cordial; but not a back slapper, opportunist, or paternalist. Just a plain, hard-headed, straight-thinking businessman, he tried to get results by the short, honest route without realizing that in public life the leader must not be too far in advance of popular knowledge and thinking.

New Deal Measure, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Proves Worth to United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Herald-American of February 6, 1949:

FDIC ONCE MORE PROVES WORTH TO UNITED STATES ECONOMY—ONE BANK'S TROUBLES TODAY ARE NOT DISTURBING

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

Despite a defalcation estimated at $200,000 by its cashier, the First National Bank of Dyer, Ind., is operating as usual.

In the old days, an episode of this sort would have caused an immediate run on the bank and the chances are that very quickly it would have closed its doors. There would have followed other, more moderate runs on nearby banks and the Dyer bank would have gone through the long and costly process of receivership and liquidation.

At best, depositors' money would have been tied up for a long period and business in the whole community would have suffered. At worst, depositors would have received only a gradual and partial return of their funds over a period of years. Stockholders would have been assessed their 100-percent double liability and a substantial amount of the assets would have been eaten up with the fees of receivers, attorneys and what not.

As it was, with deposits insured up to $5,000 by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, there was no fear on the part of small customers of suffering any loss. Consequently, there was no run, no frantic efforts to liquidate under unfavorable circumstances.

LOANS WILL BE GUARANTEED

Instead, plans were made for the bank to be taken over by the Gary National Bank with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation guaranteeing loans up to $1,000,000 and agreeing to assume slow-paying loans at the end of a 6-month period.

This episode recalls the manner in which almost every banker in the country opposed Government guaranty of bank deposits prior to the bank crisis of 1933. Today the bankers recognize this insurance as the greatest blessing that has come to their business. They no longer lie awake nights fearful of runs that sometimes started from rumors that had no basis in fact.

The bankers opposed Government insurance because certain of their leaders told them it would bankrupt the Government, make for bad, reckless banking and be a first step toward complete Government control. The propaganda along this line had been so active and persistent that it was almost universally believed.

Today it would be difficult to find a banker in the country who is not wholeheartedly in favor of Government insurance.

There are other propaganda waves, however, that have swept the country which are just as false, just as injurious as the campaign against insurance of deposits prior to 1933.

ASK FOR CUT IN INSURANCE FEE

Further there is another movement now on foot in connection with the insurance of bank deposits that impresses us as completely unjustified. It is to lower the insurance charge from the present level of one-twelfth of 1 percent of deposits. Those who have been advocating this have a plausible case. Distributions as a result of failure have been very small, the FDIC has paid off completely the funds advanced by the Government for setting it up and its capital funds now exceed a billion dollars.

Superficially, certainly, a lower insurance fee would seem to be adequate. There are important factors, however, that make for an opposite conclusion.

First, deposits have soared since the creation of the FDIC. Liabilities have risen proportionately.

Second, the whole life of the FDIC has been in a period of expanding business. There have been almost no bank failures because there have been few failures of any kind and business has been excellent. What the future may hold, however, nobody knows. The test of the FDIC will come when times get tough.

Third, bank earnings have been very satisfactory. As a result, the banks do not need at this time relief from the insurance charge.

The Extra Bushel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, on February 18, 1950, before the National Farm Institute, at Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am especially glad to have the opportunity of participating with you in this outstanding institute. The National Farm Institute makes an important contribution to our agricultural thinking. It is a healthy and constructive example of democracy at work, encouraging a better understanding of our Nation's farm problems and what can best be done about them.

We have before us for consideration today some serious problems of farm policy, problems which demand an early solution, not alone in the farmer's interest but for the welfare of the entire Nation.

There are, undoubtedly, a number of approaches that would be helpful to general understanding of just what is involved. But I would like to suggest we examine our subject in this way:

We have here on the table a bushel of corn.

If you will assume it is the first extra bushel beyond our assumed domestic needs, beyond export requirements, and beyond even the safe reserves required to protect the Nation against crop failure or other emergency, then it is a symbol of our major national farm problem.

It is an extra bushel. It is the bushel for which a satisfactory market must be found if the man who produced it is to get a fair price and if it is to do anybody any good. Its counterpart is to be found in many other crops.

Yet it is no different from any other bushel of corn. It requires time and effort and money to produce, and it contains the same essential feed values as all the rest of our corn.

Farmers may accidentally produce it in good faith as part of their effort to earn a living for their families and to help feed our Nation adequately and properly. They can produce many like it through more efficient use of their resources—through new and better farm practices, through better care of the soil, through new varieties developed by long and painstaking research, and through mechanization to cut down the man-hours of farm labor required.

What are we going to do with that extra bushel?

There are just two alternatives:

We must either consume it by transforming it into meat, milk, eggs, and poultry—and by getting that extra food eaten—or we'll have to lock up that extra bushel in storage and reduce the next year's production by that amount.

Of course, there are some potential industrial uses for a very small portion of this extra bushel. But the alcohol manufacturer today could not pay the farmer more than 50 cents a bushel for corn and stay in business.

That's just about all the choice we have. And that, in a way, just about sums up our farm problem today. There it is—that extra bushel.

The future course of our Government farm policies will determine what shall happen to that extra bushel—whether we use its potential nutritional values for a better diet for the American people, or whether we must stop producing it—if, indeed, it is possible to stop producing it.

Making use of it will benefit both farmers and the consumers; abandoning its production will mean a sacrifice for both.

Modern farming is geared to abundance. Our present methods of farming are founded upon the use of modern machinery, motor power, and the newest discoveries of science. Practical, far-sighted conservation practices are also aiding farmers to reach new production records.

I do not believe any of us want to call a halt to this progress.

I do not believe either farmers or the rest of the American people are willing to concede that more efficient use of our resources is a waste just because it results in that extra bushel.

I do not believe any of us would willingly give up the know-how for producing that abundance. We want to learn—and must learn—to live with our abundance. That's why I have advocated farm program measures aimed at making use of that abundance rather than shackling it.

There still appears to be some misconception and lack of understanding about these farm program recommendations, and even about my motives for making them. Some of this is the natural result of insufficient information. More of it has been intentionally manufactured by the leadership of a great farm organization.

But whatever the cause, we are here dedicated to objective study.

So, first let's get straight on some basic concepts.

I am for parity. I am for the original concept of parity—a standard of equality for agriculture, a fair share of the national income for the farmers who contribute so greatly to creating that income. I am thinking in terms of people, rather than just commodities. I want parity of opportunity for

the farmer to earn a fair return from his investment of capital, labor, skill, and management ability; not just parity for that bushel of corn. I want parity of living opportunity for the farm family.

I am against regimentation. I am against any form of controls that can be reasonably avoided and any which do not have the affirmative support of a large majority of the producers affected. I am for the widest possible freedom of choice by the farmer himself in the management of his farming enterprise. I am for farm programs that will make the maximum use of our farm production—so that we can avoid the strict controls that will be inevitable if we fail to provide a profitable and useful outlet for that extra bushel.

I am for efficiency of production and for constantly increasing our efficiency. But I do not agree with those who hold that the only path to efficient production is industrialized mass farming. I want to see no collectives taking over the farms of America—whether those collectives be of the Soviet design or the corporation pattern. I believe the family-sized farm can be efficient, and I believe that we should concentrate our efforts for increased efficiency upon the family-sized-farm unit because of the important human values it contributes to our society. I am for encouraging, strengthening, and preserving the family-sized farm as the backbone of American agriculture, not turning our backs upon it and destroying it in the false name of increased efficiency.

I am for Government economy. I am for economy by eliminating the uneconomic practices of present price-support methods that waste good food and penalize the consumer by making him pay the costs twice—first in his tax bill, and second in his food bill. I am for doing everything in our power now to avoid the tremendous cost to the Government of another disastrous depression and to avoid its cost in human misery to the people of our Nation.

I am against the wasteful accumulation of unmanageable surpluses beyond normal safe reserves at a time when much of the Nation's population is still ill-clothed and underfed. I want to see the Nation use that extra bushel of corn, not just lock it up and try to make farmers quit producing it. And I repeat I'm talking today about that extra bushel which is clearly beyond safe reserves, and beyond domestic and export needs. I am not talking about the reserves that we have sealed up in bins, I am talking about the extra bushel beyond prudent reserves.

Your ideas and mine cannot be far apart on these fundamentals.

But just what is our situation today? Are we making progress toward our objective or are we slipping backward? Are we on the right track?

Unfortunately, both farm prices and farm income are headed in the wrong direction. Farm prices have dropped an average of almost one-fourth in less than 2 years. They are still going down. But farmers still have to pay within 5 percent as much for what they buy as they paid 2 years ago. In 1947, farm operators had a net income of nearly $18,000,000,000. Last year, it was down to around $14,000,000,000. The forecast for 1950 is for a net income of under $12,000,000,000. That is a decline of one-third in net farm income at a time when national income is at or near its all-time peak.

Is this the way to parity?

Is this a desirable trend?

The gap between farm and nonfarm incomes is widening, instead of closing.

Even at the peak of agricultural income, total per capita income of persons on farms was only about 60 percent as high as for persons not on farms. In 1949 this income gap widened, and in 1950 is expected to widen still more.

The people on farms constitute nearly one-fifth of the total population, yet they got from their farms less than 10 percent of the national income year before last, and only 7.8 percent last year.

We are headed away, instead of toward, our real concept of parity—equality of opportunity for agriculture.

Should we not be disturbed about this trend? Should we not seek its causes and offer our best effort to retard and reverse it?

Must those in public office whose duty it is to be particularly sensitive to these trends be attacked as stupid, dishonest, or nuts because they speak out about them and seek a remedy?

One of agriculture's best friends in Congress—Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri—frankly faced the facts at a recent Appropriations subcommittee hearing by saying, and I quote:

"Our present support program is not working. It is failing notably in three ways. It is failing to support prices. Hogs are selling today at less than half the price at which they sold at a time when wages, freight rates, and dividends in this country were lower than they are today. The present system is a failure, in the first place, because it fails to bring the farmer a fair wage for his labor and a fair return on the capital he has invested, his fair share of the country's income, or his fair standard of living.

"In the second place, there is a lot of administrative machinery for embracing the system which enrages the consumer and creates sentiment all over the country, in every grocery store and every meat shop, against the farmer and the Government. It is unfair to the farmer, unfair to the Department of Agriculture, and unfair to the Congress.

"In the third place, and not the least important, it denies the American people food they need and ought to have." That is the end of the quotation.

Many people in agriculture and many friends of agriculture would agree with the Congressman. Like him, I am sure, they would defend and maintain our present farm program for the good that is in it against the enemies who would destroy it. But they would also join the realists who see the faults in the program and wish to make improvements. I am sure all of us appreciate the great strides of progress we have made since those dark days of the depression thirties when many Iowa farmers had to burn corn to heat their homes.

We have made progress, even though we are still quite a ways from our goal.

We made that progress by realistically facing our problems and the conditions of our times.

We did it in our struggle upward from the depths of depression before the war, and we did it to meet the challenge of war.

And now we're going to have to do it again, as we squarely face and appraise the great capacity of this Nation to produce food and fiber and adjust ourselves to whatever changes may be necessary to put that extra bushel of corn to use to convert it into food people need and will consume, instead of abandoning its production.

How are we going to do it?

Perhaps one answer can be found in the fact that there is not only room but need for more meat, milk, eggs, and poultry in our Nation's diet. That could mean more consumption of corn, and therefore less need to restrict corn production.

But we aren't likely to get that corn converted into more meat, milk, eggs, and poultry unless the farmer producing those foods has reasonable assurance of fair returns from his finished product. Few of them will find much inducement for converting a commodity with an assured price into one with an uncertain price. We must broaden our support program to provide the incentive the farmer now lacks to produce the foods we need, both to improve our diet and to use up that extra bushel.

But getting that extra bushel converted into protective foods is only the first step. We have to get that extra food eaten. We need adequate consumer purchasing power to encourage increased consumption, and we need to offer the consumers the opportunity to add larger quantities of such protective foods to their diets at reasonable prices.

From our past ups and downs in food consumption we know that the people, given prosperity, will gladly up-grade their diets with meat, milk, eggs, and poultry.

Adequate farm purchasing power contributes to such prosperity, and helps maintain the purchasing power of other consumers. Prosperity in the farm market always means more dollars in real wages in cities and towns.

But if we really intend to serve the Nation's best interest by maintaining the farm purchasing power needed for a full economy, we have learned from experience that we must do more than support the prices of a few commodities. It seems obvious that we must use a realistic farm income objective and extend supports to the products which create a substantial part of that income. It seems equally plain that we must do it by methods that encourage rather than hamper increased consumption.

For example, we must do it by methods that let American potatoes compete for the American market, instead of letting our own potatoes go to costly waste while consumers buy and eat Canadian potatoes because they are cheaper.

I do not think any of us should be satisfied with farm laws that create such a situation as we now have with potatoes. Yet, strangely enough, some of those objecting loudest against the administration's farm proposals appear unconcerned about the costly waste of potatoes. Despite all the fault-finding on other scores by the national leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, it appears satisfied with the present potato situation. Unlike the Department of Agriculture, they never objected to the present law regarding potato price supports, although it appeared in the 1948 act in precisely the same form as in the present 1949 act. On the contrary, they embraced the present law and advised the Department how it should be operated. The Farm Bureau leadership advised me as follows: "We recommend a 1949 program for potatoes at 60 percent of parity and without acreage allotments."

Why aren't we working together toward adapting our farm programs to meet the existing conditions of today? Why do some insist upon blocking any constructive action at all?

What is there that we can't agree upon?

Is the scare cry of "subsidy" the stumbling block? Let's be realistic. All aid to agriculture in any form is a subsidy, just as all Government aid to any other group is a subsidy. There is no point in blinking this fact. Rather, let us stand on principle. To the extent that the agricultural subsidy serves the public welfare, it is not only justified but necessary. By the same token, no subsidy is justified which does not serve the public welfare. And if we stand on that principle, we can be open and aboveboard about it; there is no reason for agricultural aid to be concealed or hidden.

Farmers are the trustees of our basic resource, without which this country cannot remain strong. They must be given a fair opportunity to earn sufficient funds to maintain soil fertility, care for their families, and continue to produce an ample supply for the rest of the Nation.

Is it the question of cost that is keeping some of us apart? There's been a lot of loose talk about costs. Some like to estimate the cost of one program without comparing it

with the cost of any other program. They like to forget that price declines cost somebody whether there's a program or not—and, without a program, that somebody who pays the cost is the farmer.

Let us not forget, either, that the potato program has cost the Government $500,000,000 in recent years—more than three hundred of that in the last 2 years. The administration has recommended a program that would combine for potatoes the use of acreage allotments, marketing quotas, marketing agreements, and production payments. This would most certainly reduce the overproduction of potatoes. The cost would be cut to a fraction of what the program is now costing. I have estimated before, and I say again, that the cost the first year would be less than $25,000,000.

And while we are talking about the cost of farm programs, let's not overlook the potential cost of failing to have an adequate farm program—the terrible cost of depression.

The American Farm Bureau Federation had something to say about that back in 1939, when memories of the depression were perhaps fresher in our minds. In the foreword to its resolutions embodying its farm program recommendations that year, the Farm Bureau declared, and I quote: "We believe that failure to raise agriculture's income to parity is the major cause of the unemployment which has cost the Federal Government billions of dollars in relief appropriations.

"The unsettled condition of the world makes it increasingly imperative that the United States should put its domestic affairs in order without further delay. The cost of accomplishing this by restoring agriculture to complete parity is hardly a drop in the bucket compared to the cost of neglecting to do the one thing which will solve our difficulties. We have temporized with this vital question too long. We must not delay action longer." The statement goes on to say: "It is costing the Government billions because it is not doing the one thing which will solve at once the twin problems of low farm prices and widespread unemployment."

That was written a decade ago, but it's certainly something to keep in mind when we hear the national head of the Farm Bureau repeatedly raise the cry of "cost" to prevent objective consideration of proposals to forestall another economic collapse.

But let's go back to seeing if we can find just what it is that some folks can't seem to agree upon today.

Is it the false cry about danger to free enterprise that causes some to hesitate?

How can they complain about the proposals of the administration and still defend the present system, under which the Government has become a bigger and bigger operator in the food business? We want to encourage free enterprise by taking the Government out of the channels of trade just as far as possible—out of warehousing, processing, shipping, and marketing, permitting dealers and consumers alike to have the benefits of free markets on the perishable products of our farms, as long as we can still make all farmers more secure in their right to a decent and fair reward for their toil.

What about the charge of regimentation? In my opinion, we don't have regimentation as long as farmers themselves decide whether or not to use the controls that are provided by law. Some production adjustments are essential in a country with such a production potential as we are fortunate in having in the United States. But the extent to which painful adjustments have to be made will be determined in large measure by the use we find for the extra bushel. Shall we eat it in the form of livestock products? Or try to stop producing it?

I doubt whether any of these charges we hear are the real differences that have developed in our current farm policy debate. For the most part such misleading attacks are merely smoke screens intended to cloud the real issues—hampering instead of helping all of us to arrive at wise, considered decisions so vital to our future.

Actually, behind all the pros and cons over the methods of our future farm program, the underlying conflict is in the very philosophy of our farm policy itself.

You are confronted with two entirely different ways of thinking about what objectives we should seek for the American farmer.

One group, of which the present administration is a part, believes it is in the best interest of the entire Nation to use price support as a means for providing agriculture the opportunity to earn a fair income. It does not propose to guarantee that income to anyone, but it does propose assuring diligent farmers the opportunity of achieving a level of income that would bring them closer to the goal of equality with other groups.

On the other hand, there are those who preach that the only role of price supports is to protect the farmer against bankruptcy. In other words, they see no reason for stopping price and income declines until the farmer's back is against the wall.

The Farm Bureau's present national leadership is among those adopting that attitude. Its spokesmen advocate stop-loss price supports—whatever those are—sometimes using that terminology and sometimes even less exact language. Sometimes they say they are against only what they call unreasonable price declines.

What do they mean by unreasonable price declines? Farm prices have already dropped 23 percent; how much farther must they fall before they become unreasonable?

Must the farmer almost go broke before he can expect the steadying hand of Government to be extended? And where is that fine line between being almost broke and just plain broke?

The present Farm Bureau leadership has turned its back on that great organization's historic position of the past, when it so often declared, and I quote from its own former statements of policy: "The fight of organized agriculture * * * has been and is now for equal opportunity and parity position with the other great groups."

Why aren't those words still true today?

Because the gentleman now heading the American Farm Bureau is here today, I would like to take the opportunity, for just this once, of addressing him directly in the hope of reaching a better understanding of the attitude of the Farm Bureau's present national leadership.

I would like to ask the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in all seriousness: Does it aid agriculture in any way to say of the administration's proposals: "People who propose such a program to farmers are very dumb or downright dishonest?"

How will such personal attacks protect the price of hogs?

I would like to ask the gentleman: Do you actually expect to halt the decline in farm prices by calling the administration's recommendations a "statement of politico-economic philosophy, not a farm program," a "supreme delusion," or, as you have also done by saying the idea is "nuts"?

I would like to ask the gentleman: Do you think it fair to your own members to be openly favoring still lower price supports for farmers in the harsh hope of forcing some of them out of business, so that farming can be more profitable for those big-scale farmers with larger cash reserves who are able to survive?

I would also like to ask: Do you feel the Farm Bureau is fulfilling a constructive role in behalf of agriculture by having its spokesmen spend their time tearing down the recommendations of others with such abusive remarks as, and again I quote, "It shines and stinks and stinks and shines like the rotten mackerel in the moonlight"?

Let me play back the record of a few more typical comments of the Farm Bureau's spokesmen about administration efforts to improve the price-support program: "Totalitarian collectivism," "written by the CIO labor people," "ulterior motives," "socializing agriculture," "changing our form of government," and, strangest of all, "it could lead to the passage of the President's civil rights legislation."

I ask the gentleman, again in all seriousness, if he really feels such negative abuse contributes anything at all to a fair attitude and the atmosphere of serious, constructive thinking so necessary to the development of wise and practical solutions to our farm problems.

I might venture to suggest that instead of sitting in the seat of the scornful, adopting a tone of antagonism or condescension, or assuming a cocksure attitude that carries its own condemnation, the gentleman might better serve agriculture by recognizing earnest efforts for a better farm program in the making; and that in a constructive spirit he should make contributions toward wise development of its policy.

And by contributing something constructive I certainly do not mean the penny-wise, pound-foolish kind of economy that would sacrifice even the vital progress of our agricultural conservation program. Just this month the American Farm Bureau leadership has advocated a slash of $35,000,000 in the budget authorization for the agricultural conservation program—a slash not only in conservation payments but in the functioning of the farmer-elected committees so capably administering the program.

The national leadership of the Farm Bureau is apparently not even satisfied with trying to block any improvements in our price programs; it is now trying to tear down the conservation program that many of you have worked so long to build.

What aid to agriculture does the leadership of this organization offer? The press quotes the Farm Bureau president as having a twofold objective: Defeat of the administration's farm program and boosting the organization's membership by not quite 100,000.

I ask in all fairness: Are these the goals of American agriculture for which the gentleman professes to speak? Is the leadership of the Farm Bureau Federation blind to what is happening to farm prices and income in this country today?

Is it no longer of concern whether or not the farmer gets a decent and fair return for his investment and toil?

After all, the American farmer has contributed to the welfare of our Nation, after all we have learned about the interdependence of agriculture, industry, and labor, after all the progress we have made toward economic justice, must we now suddenly revert to the narrow idea of the Government keeping its hands off until after the Nation has plunged once more into the disastrous depths of depression?

I don't think so.

But that is your choice, and that is the only real basis of conflict in the current farm-policy debate.

It is the difference between those wanting to push forward, and those turning backward.

On the one hand, we have those with determination to maintain a full, expanding economy; to live in prosperity with the abundance we can produce by properly utilizing it to raise the living standards of all.

On the other hand, we have the stop-lossers, the temporizers, those who are willing to gamble on getting by themselves regardless of what happens to the other fellow. They are willing to risk the entire

Nation's welfare on their own stubborn lack of vision and foresight.

They are the advocates of sliding scale price supports that usually slide only one way—downward. They are—apparently—not much concerned over the present slide of farm income.

They are bound by the fallacious assumption that downward sliding prices provide an acceptable way to adjust production, they are willing to starve farmers into compliance if necessary to obtain that adjustment, instead of doing it the more humane way—by the incentive of fair rewards. They are willing to sacrifice small farmers under the brutal survival-of-the-fittest concept even if it means large numbers of farms and farmers forced out of business at a heavy loss. That's what they mean by so-called natural adjustments.

But are we satisfied with that harsh kind of a solution to our production adjustment problems, even if it would work?

Somehow we don't believe this is a good way. Most of us have thought we had gone beyond the dog-eat-dog law of the jungle. Yet that's what is hidden behind the concept of a downward sliding scale of prices aimed at forcing some farmers to go broke and out of business.

On which side do you want to be counted?

All that I ask—all that the present national administration asks—is constructive consideration, with open minds, of the recommendations we have made for the welfare of the farmer and the welfare of the Nation.

All that we ask is a reasonable balancing of the administration's proposals against the only alternatives before you.

Which way of thinking offers the better hope for using constructively that extra bushel of corn—that extra bushel beyond even safe reserves—instead of just locking it up and trying to quit producing it?

Which way offers the better hope of drawing nearer to the real goal of parity, nearer to a fair share of our national income for the farmer? Which offers a way to reduce our surpluses instead of piling up more? Which offers the better chance of encouraging increased consumption of the abundant food our American farms can produce? Which offers real Government economy, by doing more to avoid the costly and tragic toll of another depression?

Those are the real measuring rods for judging our farm program—weighing it in the balance of public necessity and public good against the only alternatives remaining.

Keep that bushel of corn in mind and I shall have no fear of your ultimate judgment.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the text of an address delivered by Prof. S. Harrison Thomson, of the University of Colorado, on the Justice for Poland radio program conducted by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress.

These weekly programs were inaugurated some time ago by Dr. Karol Smolczynski, president of the branch with headquarters in Chicopee, and have attracted a widening circle of listeners in the central Massachusetts area.

The address of Professor Thomson, who is editor of the Journal of Central European Affairs, follows:

One of the oldest areas of international friction in our modern world is that between the German and the Polish states. And because recent developments have brought the problem into more clear focus, it may be profitable to look into the background of this complex and persistent antagonism.

The primary significant fact is geography. The Poles now inhabit the broad valley of the Vistula from the Carpathian Mountains northward to the Baltic. A thousand years ago and even since then, they reached west of the Oder River and occupied a good 200 miles of the southern Baltic coast. But German so-called crusaders, merchants, and missionaries took most of this coast away from them, and German arms and the will to conquer moved eastward. It's a long and sanguinary story, and doesn't make pleasant reading. One single example will indicate the nature of the story. On a dismal November morning in the year of grace 1308, German knights and men at arms fell on the Polish population of the fishing village of Gdańsk (more commonly known as Danzig) and murdered about 10,000 of them, men, women, and babes in arms. One would be wrong to think the Poles of today do not remember the simple facts of this bit of German missionary activity. A few centuries later, when the Polish state was having some internal difficulties, the German ruler who was looked upon as the most enlightened monarch of his day, Frederick the Great, showed his greatness and his enlightenment by joining with the rulers of Russia and the Hapsburg Empire to slice off parts of the Polish Commonwealth and adding them to their own domains. The Germans took the most prosperous parts.

This partitioning of Poland was planned long ahead, and carried out in order to forestall internal reforms then in progress which would have made Poland the most democratic state in all Europe. Once the territory was in his possession Frederick and his successors proceeded to Germanize it as ruthlessly as they could, bringing in German farmers, townsmen, teachers, soldiers, pastors and priests. One has only to put oneself in the place of the Polish inhabitants of this land to realize the emotions they would experience at seeing foreigners, their sworn enemies, in all positions of power and influence over them, at being forced to use the language of their conqueror in all public places, and in sensing conscious economic and social discrimination at every turn. The term "German" came to mean a perpetual oppressor. But the Poles were then as now a vigorous people, proud and tough. The process of Germanization, carried out by all the typical Prussian efficiency and ruthlessness, wasn't quite the success it was supposed to be. Late in the last century the great Bismarck, himself a native of an area where many people still talked Polish, realized that the Poles were regaining ground and that German influence was waning in the parts of Germany that were formerly a part of the Polish Commonwealth. He raised additional vast sums to buy land and colonize Germans in the eastern parts of the Reich. But this failed too—and election and school statistics showed the Polish population of the German Reich growing and the German population and influence decreasing. By the outbreak of the First World War the handwriting on the wall was clear. In 1918 Poland was reconstituted as a free state, and her boundaries with Germany were fixed approximately according to language frontiers. East Prussia, a coastal area blocking Poland's access to the sea for a part of the Baltic, was left to Germany. Prussia was an economic liability to Germany, as it hadn't been self-supporting for well over a century. Every Pole knew how the Germans regarded East Prussia—as a military outpost which could be used against Poland or as a springboard for further German expansion eastward.

During the subsequent 20 years of uncertain peace, 1918–39, every Pole sensed that the western frontier of the country was in danger. He knew the German well enough to know that Germany would not willingly give up control of so fertile a land as western Poland and so hard-working a people as the Poles. But France and Great Britain, and to a lesser degree perhaps, America, made concessions to Germany, forgave her war debts, and loaned her vast sums of money with which she rebuilt her heavy industry, and by the Locarno Pact of 1925 left the way open for Germany to revise her frontiers with Poland. Every Pole knew that to the Germans revision meant simply taking over Polish territory. Who is now in a position to blame Poland for being cynical about the bland work of western statesmen who proclaimed that they had achieved peace by agreement and proper concessions? On at least two known occasions Polish Marshal Pilsudski told the diplomatic representatives of the western powers that Poland was willing to fight to force Germany to live up to the conditions of the Versailles Treaty. The western powers were unwilling. Germany had promised to be good. The Poles again can hardly be blamed for judging the western powers bankrupt. They were that a good 15 years before the outbreak of hostilities in 1939. The Poles knew it. The records are clear in this matter.

Came the war in 1939 and Germany and Soviet Russia again partitioned Poland. The Polish Nation underwent cold-blooded butchery by Germans which no nation of comparable size has ever undergone in recorded history. She lost from bombing, concentration camps, and before German firing squads about 6,000,000 of her people. This would correspond in the case of America to a loss of 30,000,000. Her cities were burned into rubble, her treasure stolen, her forests and national resources ravished by the Germans. The Germans were defeated finally and pushed back beyond the Oder. The territory given to Poland in the west, labeled "compensation," by the Tehran and Yalta agreements in which the United States participated, for Polish land in the east taken by Russia with American consent, had been inhabited largely by Germans for many centuries. Yet, though this new land and its industries look to be worth more than the territory they lost, the Poles know that the Germans, whether in west Germany or eastern and Soviet-controlled Germany, will never rest content until it is again in German hands. They have worked heroically to resettle this land, without regard to their feeling about the present puppet government in Warsaw, but every Pole, peasant, factory worker, or intellectual, deep in his heart dreads the day when Germany is again strong and armed and will reach out and grasp in traditional German fashion for someone else's property. At this moment the Poles are making the best they can out of their present situation. So long as it suits Soviet purposes Poland may be assured that she can keep this western land. But when Russia wants or thinks she needs German support, she will promise these former German lands to Germany as a bribe, and Poland will be partitioned again. This is an eventuality every Pole sees as almost certain. So long as territory of somebody else can be swapped around to satisfy a greedy ally, this condition of fear and hatred between neighboring peoples in Europe will persist. It is certainly nothing that an American can blandly put aside as none of his business. We are as responsible, by our dealing at Tehran and Yalta, as anybody for the grim future the people in this part of Europe face. We will

do well to pay close attention to present and future relations between Poland and Germany, and remember that 10 centuries of German aggression against a weaker neighbor cannot and will not be forgotten in one or two generations. We will also have to be sure that we do not contribute to worsening these relations by heedless ignorance of deeplying political realities.

Pass the Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial by Robert Ingalls of the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times on the Brannan plan:

PASS THE POTATOES

In his speech the other evening at the $100-a-plate banquet Comrade Truman endorsed the Brannan farm plan and justified the huge potato surplus. Apparently he had not read the records of the National Grange convention held recently in Sacramento, Calif. The National Grange, one of the two biggest farm organizations in the country, came out unqualifiedly against the Brannan plan, which would seek to play both ends against the middle at the expense of the taxpayer. That denunciation of the Brannan plan was most scathing and it came after a general discussion participated in by delegates from 37 States and after Secretary Brannan had appeared in person before the convention urging endorsement of his silly method of throwing away the taxpayers' money.

The resolutions adopted assail the plan as an effort of the Government at Washington to solve farm price difficulties by subsidy and characterized it as "an internal cancer that eventually would destroy our free-enterprise system," and "at best a temporary device which will serve only to postpone the time when a sound solution of the farm problem must be reached. The resolution stated that the Brannan proposal would "make farmers beggars for a fair income." Clearly under such a system that party which would promise to voters the largest bonus out of the Treasury would garner many votes not obtainable on the basis of an honest, sound platform. It would then become a race to see which party would promise most."

In addition to the Grange the officials of the American Farm Bureau, one of the two largest organized farm groups, have come out against the Brannan plan. Only the National Farmers Union, which one editor has characterized a sort of agricultural CIO has come out for the plan. This does not mean, however, that the Brannan plan will not be an important issue in the campaign next year. Some local farmer groups which have not yet been able to see beneath the surface favor the plan and in some few States even the organizations of the conservative Grange have come out in favor of the Brannan plan.

However, what assures the Brannan plan a prominent place in the campaign next year is that it is the brain child of the CIO and its Political Action Committee. And the Democratic Party and the national administration as now constituted are captives of these two organizations. The administration, of course, wants all the farm votes it can get and hopes to garner many through the Brannan plan. But it realizes, too, that if it lost the support of the CIO and the left-wing organizations in the cities and industrial districts, all the farm votes it would be able to gather would do it little good. The left-wingers have now taken over in the Democratic organization and despite all camouflage, they will continue to be in charge. Make no mistake about that. So we can expect the Brannan plan to be prominently featured next year by the New Dealers, the Fair Dealers and the Fabian Socialists of various hues.

The reason why the CIO and its PAC are pushing the Brannan plan designed to "help the farmers" is easy to understand. Workers in the city are beginning to tire of high prices, even if their wages have risen accordingly. What they naturally want is cheap meat, cheap bread, and high wages. The present system of Government loans keeps prices high. So the CIO'ers have designed a plan where prices will be allowed to reach the market level and the farmers will be paid subsidies by the Government to make up for the loss of crop loans. The workers—so the Brannan planners believe—will get cheap food and the farmers will get high prices. Only the taxpayers will suffer. At least that is what they think. Here is why the radical labor leaders favor the Brannan plan to help the farmers. They want to get off their necks the irate consumers who don't like high food prices.

Chinese Reds Seek Yanks To Fly Gift Air Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clyde Farnsworth and also an editorial from the Washington Daily News:

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

CHINESE REDS SEEK YANKS TO FLY GIFT AIR LINE—CHENNAULT FILES APPEAL FROM HONG KONG COURT AWARD OF PLANES TO COMMUNISTS

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, February 27.—Having acquired a ready-made air transport system, largely founded on the wartime bounty of American taxpayers, Red China now is shopping around for American know-how to help handle its $100,000,000 prize.

That is what it would have cost the Chinese Communists, by authoritative estimate, to amass the aviation assets to which they have now fallen heir—through bashfulness of the United States State Department and the good offices of the British in reallocating other people's property.

A reliable official source, who disapproves of last week's decision of the Hong Kong Supreme Court conferring two former Nationalist air lines on the Chinese Reds, said he believed Communist talent scouts were trying here, in Bangkok, Rangoon, and possibly the United States to hire American air technicians.

He also supposed that British concerns in Hong Kong were preparing to handle Communist requirements for spare parts and fuel; and he wondered how this would fit into the proposed $35,000,000 American aid appropriation to Britain for aircraft parts.

So far as he knew, Red agents thus far failed to sign any American pilots for the 71 planes Peiping won in the Hong Kong court. But he knew of three American technicians, and possibly three besides, who had agreed to work for the Reds.

HAD WANTED RECEIVER

Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault and Whitting Willauer, interim purchasers of the air-lines assets, wanted a receiver appointed pending a full-dress court trial for determination of title.

But the Hong Kong court ruled that as of January 6, when Britain recognized the Peiping regime, agents of that government (actually the turncoat employees of the air lines) were in physical possession of the assets and the Red government and the air-lines assets therefore enjoyed "sovereign immunity."

APPEAL FILED

Chennault has initiated an appeal to the same court and intends to go next to the British Privy Council. Lodgment of the appeal in Hong Kong requires 14 days. Meanwhile, under heavy police guard and with antiaircraft batteries ready for action at Kaitak airfield, just in case some Chinese Nationalist air fighters should take active issue with the British decision, equipment and spare parts already are being moved out by ship.

How soon the Communists will be ready to try flying the 71 planes into Red China no one could say. Flight crews are a particular problem—the Communists may need foreign pilots to ferry their loot out.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950]

HOW CAN WE WIN?

Now that the United States and Britain have recognized the French-sponsored Bao Dai regime in Indochina, French military circles are asking for a common western policy in the Far East, as well as immediate military aid.

A list of the equipment wanted, including light tanks, jeeps, reconnaissance cars, and small-arms ammunition, has been given to our Government, with an additional request for a $100,000,000 economic rehabilitation loan.

Since we are here being asked to buy into a war, it will be well to get all the facts on the table. We ought to know what we're getting into, and just what chance, if any, we have to win. From this distance, the chance looks dim.

The French, having had an army of 160,000 men in the field for 3 years, have inflicted no serious injury on Ho Chi-minh's Communist forces. Now, according to a Paris report to the New York Times, an effective blockade of Communist China is regarded as one of the essentials if victory is to be achieved.

The idea of a blockade of Communist China can be discarded, now that the British court in Hong Kong has awarded the Red Government at Peiping 70 transport and passenger planes which Major General Chennault had purchased from the Chinese Nationalists. That decision probably spells the doom of Formosa, as well as killing any prospect of saving Indochina from the Reds.

Some heads should be examined in the State Department and the British foreign office. Britain recognized the Chinese Reds and now has given them the planes they need to continue their campaign of aggression. The United States has recognized the Bao Dai forces in Indochina, and now is asked to put up the money and the arms to defeat the forces of Ho Chi-minh, which are said to have the active support of the Chinese Reds. Russia, of course, is backing both Red forces.

How can the west hope to win under this kind of leadership?

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, from the New York News of yesterday:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 27.—Ohio's Representative CLIFF CLEVENGER—who used to run a dry-goods store before he came to Congress in 1939 and so knows the headaches of keeping a business out of the red—felt like a lot of other American taxpayers the other day when the State Department asked for $76,000,000 just to pay the salaries of the distinguished Dean Acheson and his brother diplomats for the next fiscal year.

It was one of those behind-closed-doors sessions of the House Appropriations Committee and one after another of the State Department's bigwigs had asked for additional millions. For hours Department spokesmen had droned on on the same familiar theme: We need more cash to carry on our great work in global diplomacy.

At the end of the session (this was on February 2) CLEVENGER leaned back in his chair and let fly with these off-the-cuff remarks, which we have a hunch many fellow-taxpayers have been making to themselves about the Truman-Acheson diplomatic regime:

"I've been feeling that certain numbness which also runs through the American people regarding this spending and our tax situation. I've kept quiet but I did a little arithmetic—tried to break this thing down for the people who were losing sleep because of the pressure of food and housing, taxes, etc.

"I worked it out this way: With 151,000,000 people in the United States, the cost of Government had become $8 per week per head. It was broken down in round figures to about $6 National and $2 a week State and local. This is a lot of money when it gets to $32 a week out of every average family.

"The debt that we are talking about, $258,000,000,000, simply leaves any intellect numb."

But the spenders in the State Department had not felt that numbness of the average American taxpayer shared his worries. They were now asking for $76,000,000, just for salaries for 1 year.

CLEVENGER continued:

"This amount of money, gentlemen, is just for personnel in this one Department, which has now grown so that every month you in the State Department spend more than you did in a year when I came to Congress. This is for personnel alone. It is twice the cost of the legislative operation of the United States Government. Counting the operation of the Capitol; the Printing Office—half of that at least is charged to it—the Library of Congress, which is only in a small part an agent of the Congress; and the operation of both of the office buildings and all of our staffs, that is only about half as much as these personnel sheets for the State Department's operation."

IN EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

With the Treasury showing a deficit of $40,000,000 a day, CLEVENGER roughly observed that the point had been reached where we had to drop something, and he was for dropping the State Department's "day-dreaming; these gigantic operations of pamphlets and books and moving pictures which (reveal) that there is no place in the world where we are not busy taking care of everybody's business. * * * We have the greatest facility for getting our nose into everybody's business that was created since time began."

He then turned his attention to the heavy tab we have to pick up to run the United Nations set-up in New York. CLEVENGER wound up with this final salvo:

"I am hoping they will provide some way to peace, but it does not seem that we are finding it. But we are finding ourselves involved in almost every domestic spat everywhere in the world. Our people are simply bombarded with endless propaganda for foreign interference.

"We have developed millions of psychopathic people in the United States, from pressure of the economic cost of living, everyday living, that is driving people out of their minds. And, so far as I am concerned, I just want to serve notice that I hope some of you will sharpen up your pencils and stand along with me to try to reduce this thing to some sensible size.

"Now, with that, I am done on the State Department, so far as I know. It is one of the greatest offenders in our Government for scattering our money, for involving us in all the difficulties of the world, and for one I am ready to try to cut it down to size and try to restore some sanity to our people and to our Government."

World War III: Is It Closer Than We Think?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times of Thursday, February 23, 1950:

WORLD WAR III: IS IT CLOSER THAN WE THINK?

One September not so long ago we turned in our sleep and then decided it was the telephone ringing.

"The Associated Press calling," said the operator, and then the message, "Hitler's armies have marched into Poland."

What did it mean?

War! War in Europe. With all the sword rattling that had gone on, it still didn't seem possible.

Not many months later the news of Pearl Harbor came upon us like a bolt of lightning. War! Not just for Europe but us.

Today, people who are extremely well informed believe that we may any day experience the Pearl Harbor of world war III. It is not denied that a special meeting of the Cabinet was called recently to consider the very danger of a sudden and catastrophic attack by Russia upon this country.

Certain it is that Russia has taken a new and bolder turn. She has pushed us out of Bulgaria. Her pressure upon Tito indicates that Yugoslavia may any day face actual invasion by the Russian armies. Her demands upon Finland assume unreasonable character and impossible proportions. Her swallowing of China goes unchallenged.

Let us not indulge the wishful thought that there may be an insurrection by the people of Russia. True, the Voice of America, our own short-wave radio, is being heard inside Russia and has some influence upon the people. But the Russians have never lived under a decent government; the czars were about as bad as the present dictatorship, and people don't usually rebel unless they have known something better.

Our best hope is in the practicality of the Russian mind. It is possible that they intend to go as far as they can without facing a full-scale war with the United States, but in that event it still takes complete war preparations for us to stop them.

We are obviously not prepared for a war that may come to us overnight. One thing is sure, it will come with a suddenness and devastation that will outdo Pearl Harbor.

After that impact in 1941 we were driven from the Pacific and we depended upon England to hold out for us in Europe and the Atlantic. It took us 2 years to retool our industry for war production, raise armies and train them, and get ready to fight our enemy.

This time there isn't going to be 2 years, there may not be 2 months or 2 weeks to get ready. The devastation of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and germ warfare, to say nothing of new devices for mass killing that are still locked up, mean that the country that has to get ready after the fighting starts is going to lose.

At the present time our railroads and industries are almost out of coal, leaving us in a weakened and vulnerable position as the result of a strike. For our national safety, that ought never to happen again.

Perhaps it is our sense of what is important that has led us to our unpreparedness, for we are unprepared both militarily and spiritually.

The nations of history who have fallen to a conqueror were almost invariably wealthy and bent on their own comfort. Rome with all its culture fell before the invading hordes of vandals and other tribes. France was serving pastries from the kitchens of the Maginot line almost up to the time the German fifth column took over.

We are now the wealthy of the world—all of us in America—for by world standards, any person who drives a car is among the wealthy. Further and worse, we have put an importance upon our comfort and well being that may be our undoing. We speak of a standard of living as though that were the goal of life. We are all the time talking about shorter hours and more pay; getting more and giving less, and it won't do; it softens and weakens us and leads to our destruction as a people. Nor need anybody get the idea that we are throwing stones at labor, all of us are guilty.

The fact is that while we meditate upon our standard of living, coyly preserve our sovereignty, and notify other countries that Marshall plan aid will soon stop and they'll be on their own, Russia overruns the world. She already has gone farther and taken more territory and more people than Germany had done when we were drawn into the war.

Czechoslovakia, China, Poland, Bulgaria, and half of Germany already have been swallowed. Yugoslavia, Malaya, Finland, and Formosa are almost within the bear's paws. How far does it go until we are next?

Our world situation overshadows every other consideration in our lives today in importance, and yet our actions are weak and inadequate. We need a bold program of action, equal to the task and up with the times:

1. We need to purge the country of Communists, not just from key positions in Government offices. The plea of freedom of speech for Communists is nonsense; they intend the overthrow of the Government, and that is treason. We might as well permit murder because the Constitution guarantees the right of people to be secure in their persons.

2. We need to double our world propaganda activities, such as Voice of America, to carry the story of freedom to all peoples. That would not approach the propaganda activities of Russia on behalf of communism.

3. We need to retool industry for war production as we would if we knew war were only a few months away.

4. We need to integrate our economy and our very lives with the other free peoples of the world. This alone can really make us and the world of free peoples strong against the world of Communist dictatorship and enslavement. There are those who smugly will say our interests are affected. Perhaps. Would it be better to preserve these interests and lose our necks?

5. We need to find other solutions to our economic problems than bickering and loss of production. It not only reduces the standard of living, but weakens us as a nation and makes us vulnerable to attack. We have got to find a way to work together.

We need a rebirth of the spirit of our fathers who founded this country: their courage, their common sense, and their concern for the common good of decent peoples.

Let us go forward together, with the conviction of free people, the courage of our fathers, and the spirit of humanity, to meet the challenge that Communist dictatorship now makes against our religion, our freedom, and our very lives.

Hog Price Supports for Next Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of February 27, 1950. In this editorial Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is quoted as having said that he would continue to support the price of hogs after March 31.

HOG PRICE SUPPORTS FOR NEXT YEAR

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan departed from his prepared text at the National Farm Institute to announce: "I'll let you in on a secret," that he would continue to support the price of hogs after March 31.

Hog prices are now guaranteed at 90 percent of parity. Under the new farm price law the Secretary can support hogs at any level up to 90 percent of parity. Farmers have not been in much doubt that hog prices would be supported at some level next year. What they are eager to learn is, how high?

It is getting pretty late to alter production plans for sows which have been bred for early spring farrow. However, farmers who have sows due to farrow in late April or May could still change their plans. And hog men still have the question of summer pigs to decide. It would be enormously helpful if the Secretary would announce what level of price support could be counted upon during the next 12 months—better still, for the period up to June 1951.

The new parity calculation raises the parity price of hogs. For example, in January the old parity placed hogs at $17.50. The new parity for that month would have been $18.70. So a continuation of 90 percent supports actually would mean a substantial rise in the dollar level.

Price support in the last year was not too high to cause trouble, since the Government never had to buy pork and lard to make it effective. The margin got fairly close at a time or two last fall, however, and in January the Department of Agriculture went so far as to call for bids on sales of pork.

In a time of booming general business conditions, strong demand for meat and high farm income, it would be ridiculous for the Government to interfere in the market for hogs—no matter what the parity formula happened to show. Besides, the present law does not permit the use of direct payments as a means of implementing price support. So the Government would have to buy and store pork and lard, which would be a nuisance and run the grave danger of an unmanageable surplus, as with potatoes.

Therefore, it would seem wise for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce a new hog support level safe enough to prevent Government buying next year. Such a level would provide farmers with a minimum yardstick to shoot at—without guaranteeing them a sure profit. But it's not as simple as that.

The Secretary cannot afford to put the hog support figure so low as to discourage feeding corn to hogs next year. That would intensify the corn surplus problem. Since corn supports are mandatory at 90 percent of parity, this partly ties the Secretary's hands. And it provides an illustration of the difficulties in individual commodity price support as a means of protecting farm income.

No matter what Mr. Brannan decides, we hope he does it soon so Iowa farmers can make their plans with assurance.

Tax on Theater Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, urging repeal of excise tax on theater admissions:

I am grateful to the members of the Ways and Means Committee for the opportunity to express my views on the question of exempting admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions. On February 8, 1950, I introduced a bill for this purpose, and I strongly urge that this and other wartime excise taxes be repealed at once.

The original Admissions Tax Act was passed as a war revenue measure in 1917. It was never repealed but during the interwar period some measure of relief was granted by the setting of certain minima under which the tax did not apply. During the 1920's when admission costs were somewhat lower than they are now, the minimum rate to which the tax was applicable was frankly aimed at the luxury class, for it was for some time $3. Subsequent revenue acts, particularly during the 1930's gradually lowered the minimum, until, just before the war, by an amendment of 1940, effective in 1941, it was down to 21 cents. The Revenue Act of 1943 put the effective rate at 20 percent, reaching down, with a few exceptions in favor of certain classes of persons, to levy a tax of 1 cent for each 5 cents or fraction thereof of the admission price. And, despite an express clause, covering their automatic repeal 6 months after the conclusion of the war, we have kept them at full effective war-tax rate.

It is interesting to know how they got that high in the first place. When World War II came along, we lumped all these admission tickets in with such items as luggage and jewelry. The tax on luggage was devised to prevent too great a demand for leather that was needed for war purposes; jewelry, too, was made of hard-to-get materials. But what is our excuse for admissions? Luxury taxes? Well, maybe the first-run movie houses, or the big-time legitimate theaters are a luxury, but we certainly overreached ourselves when we went beyond them. We struck at the ordinary recreation of the low-income factory worker, and deprive thousands of our lowest- and middle-income earners of this vital and often only means of relaxation and recreation.

If any luxury taxes are to be repealed, wartime excise taxes on admissions, I feel, should be given the first consideration. For so far as movies are concerned this so-called luxury tax reaches down, not only to the ordinary recreation of the lower-income class, but it also adversely affects hundreds of small businesses, in an industry that is not only competitive within itself but is just entering upon a difficult period of readjustment to the competition of tax-free television.

Insofar as the motion picture industry is concerned, let's take a look at these forms of entertainment, and the industries which produce them, and see if, after viewing the record, we are justified in continuing these admission taxes. The motion picture industry during the war, the stars, the big studios, the theaters across the Nation, small and large, the hundreds of employees who work in them, built up an enviable record of assistance in the selling of war bonds. Their efforts in this task resulted in the sale of over a billion dollars worth of E bonds. Their generosity to the Government in aiding in this work cannot be questioned. No one can accuse the motion picture industry of failing in its responsibility to the American public in our hours of greatest need. Nor have they ever shirked an effort to aid the public. We know how helpful they have been in the "march of dimes" campaign, the heart fund, community chest advertising, Damon Runyon cancer fund and others.

Let's look at the industry itself. The admissions tax brings in the fourth largest amount of revenue of all the excise taxes, surpassed only by the taxes on alcohol, tobacco, and gasoline. Last year the movie box-office take was $1,400,000,000 of which $234,000,000 represented the tax. This last constitutes 60 percent of the total admissions tax revenue of $335,000,000 for the year 1949.

A billion dollar business sounds like a lot of money, and it is difficult to be against a good revenue producer, but a break-down shows that the larger part of this money stays right in the home town for local services, and so instead of taxing a large-scale concentrated industry which can balance off deficits of one unit against profits of another, we are levying this tax on a conglomeration of units which can ill-afford to bear it.

The distribution of these receipts is as follows:

Sixty-eight percent are for local payments which cover the following items:

	Percent
(a) Salaries of theater employees	16
(b) Rent or equivalent	15
(c) Operating expenses	20
(d) Taxes	6
(e) Net profit	11

Thirty-two percent goes for film rental which covers both (a) distribution costs, 12 percent; (b) studio production costs, 20 percent.

This 32 percent which is given to the major studios is broken down in an average budget as follows:

	Percent
1. Story costs	5
2. Production and direction costs	5
3. Sets and other physical property	35
4. Stars and cast	20
5. Studio overhead	20
6. Income taxes	5
7. Net profit after taxes	10

Thus the money Hollywood takes in goes not just to the big-name stars and the stockholders of the company, but to the thousands of working people who compose the industry. If the industry fails, an important segment of low-income working people will be affected.

A survey of the motion-picture industry since the end of the war shows the same factors affecting it, as affect many another business. It no longer is in a seller's market. In its peak year in 1946, attendance rose to approximately 98,000,000 a week; in 1947, it was 90,000,000; in 1948, it was 88,000,000; and in 1949, it was approximately 85,000,000.

For years the movies have been admitted to be the greatest exponent of American culture abroad. This foreign market is dwindling alarmingly, not because of lack of desire on the part of foreign nations for the pictures, but because of international exchange difficulties. Back in 1940, not more than 4 or 5 out of 10 pictures recouped their production costs at home. The others turned to the foreign market to obtain sufficient revenues to save them from a loss on that production. Now the dwindling domestic market prevents more than 1 out of 10 from recovering production costs at home, and the movie industry is faced with a serious problem.

For despite economies, production costs as such have not decreased; it is only through the use of fewer extras, and tightening on other items of the production budget that the economies have been effected. The relief from the amortization charges will soon run out, and consumer resistance continues, and will continue if prices continue to rise, for the drop in attendance is attributed to tightened family purse strings. If increased attendance is not brought about, this great industry will be hampered if not destroyed. Domestic demand must be kept elastic, or we shall be destroying at the same time low priced American recreation, and the best voice of American life and living that foreigners ever heard.

Hardest hit, even worse than the studios which are concerned about where to get the money to produce the pictures, are the low-priced theaters that show them, the neighborhood theaters that are compelled to charge 50 cents for a show these days. It is from these little fellows that the real push for repeal is coming. They operate over 20,000 theaters with 12,000,000 seats in all the towns, and hamlets across the land. They state plainly that the 20 percent tax is hurting their business. The Theater Owners of America which has joined forces with the Council of Motion Picture Organizations points out that nearly 60 percent of the land's theaters gross an average of less than $600 per week, and that for small scale businesses such as these, the tax is an oppressive burden. The small time operators, united in the Council of Motion Picture Organizations, announced through the chairman of their tax committee, Abraham F. Myers, an all-out campaign to convince the American public that this Congress which represents the American public of the inequity of the tax.

"Our first job," Mr. Myers said, "is to secure repeal of the existing taxes on admissions. Then we—that is, our successors—will have to remain ever alert to see that such taxes are never again imposed. We have got to sell the Congress * * * the legislators of several States, and local authorities everywhere that it is wrong to impose special taxes on the motion picture business which are not imposed on other enterprises. * * *

"It is imperative that the public in general and public officials in particular, be made to understand that the admission tax is not a tax on Hollywood—that it does not reach to those fabulous salaries which until recently were blazoned in the headlines. Those salaries, I have been told are being readjusted to conform to changed economic conditions; but however that may be, the Government lays violent hands on Hollywood salaries by means of the income tax, just as it reaches into our meager purses at stated intervals. The admission tax has nothing whatever to do with those salaries."

Beyond the economic effects of the tax, there is one other major consideration to be borne in mind. The Hutchins Committee on Freedom of the Press in its study in 1948 classed the motion picture with newspapers, radio, and magazines in its obligation to live up to its responsibilities as a conduit of mass communication. Mr. Myers, speaking on behalf of the Council of Motion Picture Organizations, stated it this way:

"We cannot conceive of your advocating a special tax on newspapers, magazines, and books. As a lawyer you might ponder whether such a tax would abridge the freedom of the press; and as a statesman you would certainly say that such a tax was contrary to public policy.

"We feel, on reason and authority, that motion pictures are an important part of the communications industry and as such are entitled to the same consideration accorded by the Federal Government and the States to the press."

I believe there should be sweeping action by the Congress aimed at all excise taxes, and especially the 20-percent tax on motion-picture-theater admissions. As I have already pointed out, this popular type of recreation affects practically every family: When this movie tax was imposed as a wartime measure, it was accepted in good spirit. There were sound reasons for it and the other excise taxes. But I am convinced there is no longer any justification for continuing it, and I strongly urge the immediate repeal of the excise tax on movie admissions. Thank you very much.

Rayburn's Big Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Banner News, of Magnolia, Ark., for July 21, 1949:

RAYBURN'S BIG CHANCE

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended that the Southwestern Power Administration dovetail its power-delivery operations with those of the private utilities in the area. The committee also recommended that the appropriation as approved by the House be reduced. This appears to us to be sound recommendation which has as its objective the saving of millions of dollars which otherwise will be spent by the SPA in building power lines which duplicate those of the private utilities.

The Senate committee apparently took its cue from the recent agreement worked out between the SPA and the Texas Power & Light Co. It is no secret that Speaker SAM RAYBURN was in large measure responsible for bringing the private utility and the SPA together on this compromise agreement which will enable the Government to do what it seeks to do in the power field without driving the private companies out of business.

It is almost certain that the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee will be followed by the Senate as a whole when the matter comes up for consideration, probably this week. The issue will then go to a House-Senate conference committee. Surely the House committee and the House will see the wisdom of concurring with the Senate action.

It is our hope that Speaker RAYBURN will use his influence to promote the SPA-Texas Power & Light agreement as a national policy. If he does, he will have rendered a great service to his Government and to the cause of private enterprise.

It's a Long Time From Mr. Abbitt to Mr. Zablocki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. NOLAND
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Collier's for March 4, 1950:

IT'S A LONG TIME FROM MR. ABBITT TO MR. ZABLOCKI

(By James C. Derieux)

CONGRESS WASTES A MONTH EACH SESSION TAKING ROLL CALLS, THOUGH A MACHINE WOULD TALLY ALL 435 VOTES IN SECONDS

During its last, long session, the Eighty-first Congress spent approximately 1 month of its time calling the roll, and that's about par for the chore. In the Senate there were 413 quorum calls and 226 calls for the yeas and nays, requiring from 10 to 15 minutes each. The House droned through 115 quorum calls of perhaps 20 to 25 minutes each, and 121 yeas and nays that used up about 40 minutes each.

Do a little multiplying and dividing, figure 5 days a week and 5 hours a day as normal time spent on legislative floors, and you will come up with the surprising fact that Congress could cut its sessions by 3, 4, or even 5 weeks if it did not have to go through with those slow-motion roll calls by clerks.

And it doesn't have to go through with them. It could use electric roll-call machines that would reduce minutes to seconds. It could do this without the loss of a single filibuster, without eliminating or shortening a single speech, without damage to the Constitution or to any other bulwark of freedom, without peril to this great Nation established by our fathers, and without impairment of the right of any Member to view with alarm or point with pride.

The cost of installing electric roll callers in both Houses probably would be between $300,000 and $400,000, which is not even piggy-bank change in these days of billions.

Directly, the saving of money by use of electric roll calls would not be great, because Members of Congress and their clerks are paid by the year, not by legislative piecework. But saving money is not the main point in favor of electric voting. The impression Congress makes on the public is the big consideration.

Liberty resides in representative lawmaking assemblies. Any serious disrespect for Congress is a threat to our system of liberty. The fact, therefore, imposes on the public the obligation to be intelligent in its appraisal of Congress, and on Congress the obligation to transact its business—which is your business—in the most effective and impressive manner compatible with freedom of deliberation.

A legislature cannot be efficient in the narrow sense. It should not make instantane-

ous decisions. It needs all the time it can get for its deliberations. There must be study and debate and consultation and, often, compromises. One way to do this is to speed the roll calls.

Tens of thousands of American citizens, including school children, visit the legislative galleries in Washington every year, and too many of them go home disappointed. To them the Congress seems a casual, dull body that drones along in nasal tones. This impression is due partly to the fact that legislative procedures are not thrilling. Even when there is political intrigue, it usually is obvious and seedy. Adventure stories are not written around the behind-the-scenes work of committees. But visible and instantaneous results in roll calls, instead of the drugging effect of oral calls, would do something to create the impression that Congress moves alertly, and lives and has its being in the twentieth century, not in the nineteenth.

Seventeen State legislatures use the electric roll call in one or in both houses. They are Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. The earliest of these installations was made in 1916, others were made in the 1920's and onward. The machines have been progressively improved. No State that has tried this modern technique has thrown it out, nd in none of the using States have the people, so far as is known, lost any liberty because of the device.

Here is how the device works: Each member would have a regular seat, which is true in the United States Senate now, but not in the House. At each seat there would be an electric switch box, to which the Member would have a key. When voting time came, he would insert his key—no other key would work his switch—and throw the lever to record his vote. On an illuminated roll board up front, which would display the number of the bill being voted on, a light beside his name would show how he voted—if he voted.

The result would be totaled and shown immediately on the board, and a perforated card would come out giving the printed record of who voted, and how. Corrections would be easy if errors should be made. The Presiding Officer, who faces the legislators, would have a miniature of the big board in front of him on his desk, so that he could see what happened without turning around.

In addition to this main service of taking and recording a roll call in from 10 to 20 seconds, the big board could be used to call pages. Of course, it would still be necessary, before a vote to give Members perhaps 10 minutes to get to the floor. Warning bells, as now, could do this. There are some political disadvantages to simultaneous and instantaneous voting, but they are not wholly respectable. The Member who waits to learn how the vote is going before throwing in his yea or nay would be discomfited. Also, the Member who likes to avoid putting his vote on record except on selected bills would suffer political pains for, if the machine is used on all calls, he could not count on the anonymity of the unrecorded voice vote.

Under present procedure, many bills are passed without recording the actual votes. If the machine reduced this practice, representative government would be the winner. The more recorded roll calls, the better we can judge our Representatives.

Some object to mechanical voting on the ground that it would displace worthy employees. That is not a valid argument. Everybody who knows anything about Washington knows that a public employee who loses one job generally shows up somewhere else in Government in another and perhaps better one. That is the history of Washington reforms and consolidations.

In his book, A Twentieth Century Congress, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, speaking of the oral roll call now in use, says: "Of all the antiquated procedures on Capitol Hill, this one undoubtedly pulls down the efficiency of Congress more than any other single practice."

Senator KEFAUVER, Representatives JAMES E. NOLAND, Democrat, Indiana, CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, Florida, and GLENN R. DAVIS, Republican, Wisconsin, teamed up to do something about this at the last session, but without sensational results so far. However, sentiment for electric voting in the House seems to be overcoming some of the inevitable resistance to change, often strongly developed in senior public figures.

The electric voting machines would not be revolutionary in their results. In public affairs nothing is ever so beneficial as its friends claim it will be, or so damaging as its opponents predict. Even so, electric voting would help raise congressional efficiency a desirable notch or two.

The last session actually was one of tremendous actions. The North Atlantic military alliance was ratified, and more than $1,000,000,000 was appropriated to arm foreign countries. The Marshall plan and reciprocal trade agreements were extended, the military establishment was reorganized, a public housing program was started, the minimum-wage level was lifted, and there were numerous other legislative acts significantly affecting life in the United States and elsewhere. The Senate, in session 928 hours, passed 926 bills, resolutions, etc. The House passed things at an even swifter rate in the course of the 1949 session that lasted from January 3 to October 19.

Yet the session had a poor press, especially as it dragged cut through the hot and humid summer; and remarks in the galleries and elsewhere suggested that the public was not satisfied. Quick, visible voting instead of the slow call from Mr. ABBITT to Mr. ZABLOCKI (first and final House names) would have done at least a little to dispel the impression that the session fumbled and stumbled and wasted time.

A Substitute for the Lodge-Gossett Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Arthur Krock entitled "A Substitute for the Lodge-Gossett Plan," which appeared in the New York Times of February 9, 1950. Mr. Krock, with his customary felicity summarizes House Joint Resolution 414, introduced by me as an alternative to the Lodge-Gossett Resolution. The alternative resolution provides for election of members of the electoral college in precisely the same manner as are elected Members of Congress, to wit, one to be elected from each congressional district and two to be elected at large from each State.

Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., a Princeton scholar advocating the district system, concluded that—

This, I repeat, is the mode which was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted. It is also the mode which was advocated after some experience with the Constitution by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others.

Mr. Krock's article is as follows:

IN THE NATION—A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE LODGE-GOSSETT PLAN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—The strength of the bipartisan support in the Senate for the Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution—it prescribes dividing Presidential electors hereafter in proportion to the popular vote in each State—has been taken as assurance that the House will also yield the two-thirds majority, which the proposal requires for submission to the State legislatures. Nevertheless, Representative COUDERT, of New York City, intends to press a substitute that has much to commend it.

Mr. COUDERT'S joint resolution, introduced this week, provides for reversion to the original method of choosing electors to select the President and the Vice President. This was done by districts within the States, a majority or plurality of the voters in each district being sufficient to designate one presidential elector. Each State chose two others at large.

DESCRIBED BY MADISON

This method, according to Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, who has surveyed the whole subject, in a very able and informing article, was described by Madison as the one "mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted." But it was exchanged for the system of submitting State-wide tickets of electors to the people. This became general in Jackson's time and now prevails. On the way to this present arrangement the choosing of presidential electors by legislatures was practiced and then abandoned.

Most of Mr. Wilmerding's solutions are incorporated in the Coudert proposal. It provides that each State shall have the same number of electors as the total of its Representatives in Congress plus its two Senators. The voters in each Congressional district are to choose an elector from that district and all the voters in the State are to choose the two others. If no candidate for President or Vice President shall have a majority of the whole number of electors chosen throughout the Nation, then from the three leading candidates Congress, voting as one body, with each Senator and Representative entitled to a single vote, shall make the choice. Three-fourths of Congress must be present on such an occasion, and the office will go to the candidate receiving "the greatest number of votes."

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES

This proposed amendment to the Constitution departs from the plan sponsored by Senator LODGE and Representative GOSSETT in three important respects. It does not provide for proportional allotment of electors on a State-wide voting basis. It requires as at present an electoral majority—not a minimum plurality of 40 percent—for popular choice of a President or Vice President. And it provides for congressional selection if a majority is not forthcoming. These differences, together with the reversion to the district voting plan, make Mr. COUDERT'S resolution a very different measure.

In his memorandum Mr. Wilmerding makes these points:

1. "The intention of the Constitution was to give to each mass of persons, entitled to one elector, the power of giving that electoral vote to any candidate they preferred" (a quotation from Senator Benton, of Missouri, in 1824).

2. "The late assembly (of Virginia, which in 1800 changed from the district method to the State-wide—has separated us from our fellow-citizens of the Union and compels us

to speak the voice of Virginia only". (A quotation from the Federalist legislative minority of that year).

THE DISTRICT SYSTEM

3. The district system is preferable to proportional voting because it maintains the geographical constituencies and gives an equal voice to equal units of population rather than to equal aggregations of actual voters. This is because each district contributes an elector, no matter how many in it go to the polls. Under the proportional-representation-voting system the weight of the equal district groups would vary with the local turnout. Bad weather would retain for urban communities the same advantage over the rural they have at present. Or some acute local issue would enable one district to exercise disproportionate voting weight.

THE EXAMPLE OF 1892

4. The two extra electoral votes to which each State is entitled, and are reflected in the two Senators granted to each, might either go to the candidate who carried the State as a whole, or the State might be divided into two superdistricts for the purpose. This was done as late as 1892 in Michigan, where each congressional district also chose a presidential elector.

5. But a preferable method (to Mr. COUDERT'S proposal that present congressional districts, or as legislatures may rearrange them in the future, be the voting units) is to add a provision to the suggested amendment. This would require Congress to create, for national election uses only, "compact and contiguous districts containing, as nearly as practicable, an equal number of inhabitants."

With these slight deviations, Mr. Wilmerding is on Mr. COUDERT'S team, and his pioneer labors in this field of electoral reform plainly influenced the New York City Representative in working out his substitute for the Lodge-Gossett amendment. Few forecasters of Capitol action would give it much of a chance when the House, in a week or so, takes up the resolution passed by the Senate. But then everyone was surprised when the Senate approved any electoral change at all.

No Partisan Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 26, 1950:

NO PARTISAN MATTER

The Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution, under which the electoral vote in Presidential elections would proportionately reflect the popular vote by States, has passed the Senate and is now awaiting action by the House.

It is interesting that the amendment has aroused opposition both from the Taft school of Republicans and from some liberal Democrats on grounds of its practical political effect. Mr. TAFT seems to fear that the Republicans would be unable to make sufficient inroads, in the foreseeable future, on the popular vote of the Democratic South to offset the loss of electoral votes in the industrial States of the North (Ohio, for example) which under the present system have often swung en bloc into the Republican column. On the other hand, those liberal Democrats who are fighting the amendment fear that industrial Northern States would tend to lose their present political influence just because their popular (and therefore electoral) vote is so evenly divided. They fear that the South shedding its one-party character only by slow degrees, would meanwhile regain its former prestige in Democratic councils precisely because of the large blocs of electoral votes it, alone, would be able to produce. Furthermore, they fear that the Republicans, hoping to make inroads on the South, would tend to move more to the right, thus lessening still further the influence of labor and minority groups in the North.

We believe that the Lodge amendment can and should stand on its own merits as a genuine and democratic improvement in our method of electing the President and Vice President. Whether it would benefit the Republicans in the South or the Democrats in the North, whether it would give an advantage to this or that political group, is basically immaterial. It ought to be locked at not as a weapon for partisan advantage but as a proposal to bring our constitutional structure more in line with modern conditions and as a means for eventually breaking the one-party system where it exists.

Gleam of Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald:

GLEAM OF SANITY

Emerging from the fog of the Government's potato-price-support mess comes a ray of light that should be noted.

As the result of considerable pressure exerted by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, the Department of Agriculture has decided to make surplus potatoes, eggs, and milk available to needy Rochester and vicinity families through the Monroe County public-welfare department.

Representative KEATING has been one of the foremost critics of the Government's price-support program, with its inevitable surpluses; and it is no secret that a storm of protest against the proposed dumping of from 25 to 50 million bushels of surplus potatoes on the farms on which they were grown, after the grower had been paid for them with the taxpayer's money, of course—had arisen in many sections of the country.

As a result, increasing pressure has been brought to bear on Secretary Brannan's Department of Agriculture to find some way by which at least a portion of the surplus foods could be utilized.

As Representative KEATING declared, "with people hungry and in need of such supplies it seems little short of criminal to follow a policy of destroying perfectly good food."

That, undoubtedly, is the sentiment of the vast majority of our people; but they are also becoming sick and tired of being stuck for the money with which the Government buys up these surplus products, only to see that Government turn around and dump them.

Potatoes, Representative KEATING announces, will be made available directly to both private and public welfare agencies in Monroe County, but dried milk and dried eggs will be handled only by the county welfare department. Private welfare organizations will be able to obtain such commodities for needy cases from this source.

Jesse B. Hannan, director of Monroe County Public Welfare Department, has been empowered to act as clearing agent for certification that particular families in Rochester and other Monroe County communities need potatoes, dried milk and dried eggs.

Transportation charges for the surplus food will be paid by the recipient welfare agency.

Presumably, if these foods can be made available for Monroe County, they can be furnished to welfare agencies in other counties; and the result may be that valuable help will be provided to families that need it, and a considerable portion of the surplus foods now on the Government's hands will be disposed of to advantage rather than destroyed.

Administration of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from C. T. Zinsmeister:

UNITED ENGINEERING & FOUNDRY CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 22, 1950.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Member of Congress,
Federal Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR JIM: From time to time I read of the confusion among our representatives in Congress regarding the economic and political need of ECA and, of course, I am in no position to judge the existence of ECA from this standpoint.

However, for your guidance, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that in regard to the administration of the affairs of ECA, we have had a large amount of dealing with the various heads of departments within ECA, and I must admit that of all the tremendous volume of dealings we have had with various agencies of our Government, our dealings with the ECA have been by far the most prompt and intelligent. We realize all Government agencies are controlled by rules and regulations, which, of course, makes it a little more complicated at times than our transactions in private industry; however, the control and administration of ECA is as close to perfect as is possible.

Our particular dealings and those with others that I know of in the Pittsburgh district have been particularly with Mr. George Knutson, chairman of the Projects Committee, and Mr. F. B. Appelbee, attached to the controller's office. We have never dealt with any persons in Washington who have performed their assigned functions and duties, and yet had some sympathy for the problems of industry, as the above-mentioned men.

In your consideration of whether or not we should have an ECA and as to the amount of ECA assistance to be given, I trust you will advise some of your friends in Congress as to my humble opinion of the above particular phase of ECA.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

C. T. ZINSMEISTER,
Secretary.

Representative Abraham A. Ribicoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Stewart Alsop that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, February 26, 1950, concerning my colleague and friend, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut:

CONNECTICUT'S ASTONISHING RIBICOFF—STEWART ALSOP APPLAUDS CANDID REPRESENTATIVE

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—It is a rare experience these days—and, therefore, a rather moving one—to come upon honesty, intelligence, and real courage anywhere in Washington. It is perhaps particularly rare to come upon these qualities in the United States House of Representatives, on the whole not the most inspiring branch of American Government. Yet all three of these qualities are to be found in the person of a certain obscure freshman Representative, ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF.

There is no special distinction in RIBICOFF'S appearance or manner. He looks like what he is—a rising young lawyer-politician, intelligent, ambitious, personable, complete with neatly tailored double-breasted blue suit and a city-bred pallor. His manner reflects the rather automatic affability which most politicians instinctively adopt early in their careers as a kind of protective coloration.

Yet, RIBICOFF has written three communications for the edification of his constituents which a well-qualified observer has called "the ablest, the most courageous, and the most literate public statements I have seen from any Member of Congress in 10 years."

RIBICOFF'S personal history is a first-generation American success story in a minor key. The Jewish-Polish immigrants who settled in a small Connecticut manufacturing town; the ambitious son working his way through law school; the successful law practice in Hartford; the wife, the neat house in the suburbs, the regulation two children; a peculiarly American story so familiar it hardly needs repeating. Nor is there anything unusual about the RIBICOFF political career—a 4-year term in the Connecticut State Legislature, followed by 4 years as a police court judge, and finally by his election to the Eighty-first Congress on the Democratic ticket in a close race.

Dozens of RIBICOFF'S colleagues could duplicate all this. Yet the fact remains that ABRAHAM RIBICOFF is full of surprises. For one thing, this freshman Congressman has embarked on a quite astonishing political experiment. The nature of this experiment, which began after he toured Europe this summer as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is very simple. It is to tell the voters in his district the unpalatable truth.

On his return RIBICOFF made speeches throughout his district, and wrote numerous articles for Connecticut papers about the real position of the United States in the world. He has now written a summing-up article called Europe and Illusion, which, unlike almost anything else to emerge from Congress, deserves to be read in full. For one thing, RIBICOFF is found to write (and he employs no ghosts) a simple but remarkably effective English prose.

"There are no breathing spaces ahead," he writes, "for this country to enjoy while the balance of power serves as a buffer between us and the world's problems." He spells out the meaning of this conclusion: It is a dangerous illusion to suppose that we can withdraw from our world responsibilities in 1952, or soon thereafter, sharply reduce taxes and live happily ever after.

On the contrary, he writes, "It looks to me more like a task of 10 more years calling for an additional outlay of $25,000,000,000. * * * The present planning of foreign aid is premising a scope that is too little and an ending that is too soon. * * * We must look upon the cost of keeping Europe free as a cost of keeping ourselves in business. If we pull out at any time in the unforeseeable future, we leave a vacuum which can only be filled by the Soviet Union."

This is strong stuff in an election year. But in two other communications to the voters of his district RIBICOFF really drives the point home—that American responsibilities are neither cheap nor painless. Virtually the entire farm vote of his district consists of shade tobacco growers. At their request he has introduced an amendment to the farm bill including shade tobacco under the farm parity program. At the same time he has bluntly served notice on his farmer constituents that he will vote against the whole program, including his own amendment, simply because he considers it extravagant nonsense in these times.

He has also, astonishingly, opposed the building of a federally financed $132,000,000 dam in his own district. "We have fixed charges which must be met before we can even begin to discuss appropriations for such projects," he briskly informs the voters. "The security of our Nation, as represented in military and foreign aid commitments, is now primary."

By all the accepted rules, putting national security before the pork barrel should spell curtains for RIBICOFF. Yet there is a final surprise in his strange tale. He is now so unchallengeably strong in his district that the Republicans are talking of nominating him on their ticket.

Despite all the evidence to the contrary, the RIBICOFF story seems to suggest that to treat the voters in this democracy like adults is actually good politics. At least a good many people more powerful and conspicuous than the freshman Congressman might do well to ponder the meaning of ABRAHAM RIBICOFF'S experiment.

Letter to the Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert copy of a letter which I have sent to Secretary of State Acheson. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1950.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ACHESON: I should appreciate it very much if you would find it possible to make me conversant with the Government's views relative to the rearmament of the Arab States by Great Britain.

My attention has been called by interested citizens of Massachusetts, whose views I respect, that the peace of the Near East is being threatened and that the war against Israel by the neighboring Arab states may be renewed as a result of the acquisition by the Arab States, particularly Egypt, of large quantities of modern arms of all kinds, including jet planes, Spitfire planes, Sherman tanks, submarines, and battleships. These arms are being supplied, as you know, by the Government of Great Britain. It is asserted that the destruction of the balance of armament, as between the State of Israel and its Arab neighbors, constitutes a source of encouragement to the Arab governments. They have, by reason thereof, assumed an intransigent attitude toward Israel's efforts to negotiate treaties of peace.

Moreover, the responsible Arab leaders, as well as the Arab press and radio, so it is said, make no secret of their intentions to renew the war against Israel. They speak constantly and publicly of a "second round." The inflammable utterances of the Arab official spokesmen, no doubt, give weight to Israel's apprehension and it may well endanger the peace in the Middle East area—"a region the security of which is of great importance to the West," as you well state in your letter of January 12, 1950, to Representative JAVITS. As a direct result of the unprecedented delivery of arms by Great Britain to Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Transjordan, and Lebanon, an armament race between Israel and its Arab neighbors is now in full swing which, in itself, is bound to create an explosive situation—the very thing which our Government is endeavoring to avoid.

Indeed, no one is in a position to guarantee that the warlike statements by the Arab leadership and the provocative pronouncements on the radio and in the press calling for a war of revenge against Israel are merely intended for domestic consumption. Should the Arabs carry out their threats and the war be resumed against Israel, then it would be too late for anyone to extinguish the conflagration, which is capable of spreading into other sections of the world. Hence Israel has reason to be jittery. Therefore it is compelled, as a matter of self-defense, to strengthen itself militarily and thus consume its financial resources for the protection of its security. These resources would otherwise have been employed for sound economic and constructive objectives for the purpose of rehabilitating the hundreds of thousands of the DP's who came to Israel in search for peace and security.

In the aforesaid letter to Representative JAVITS you state:

"Arms shipments to the Arab states and Israel should be limited to those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order by the government concerned in the legitimate exercse of constituted authority, and for the purpose of providing for reasonable requirements of self-defense."

Both the amount of arms as well as the kind of arms that are being shipped to the Arab states cannot be said to be limited to the maintenance of law and order internally. If the policy of your Department with reference to the rearmament of the Arabs is to be dictated by the security of the Middle East area, which might be attacked by a third power, then Israel, say many interested citizens of Massachusetts, is entitled to be the beneficiary of that policy and receive similar arms. By the delivery of arms to Israel in similar quantity and kind, the balance of armament between it and the neighboring Arab states would be maintained.

I am persuaded that, in the event of any aggressive act by a third power in the Middle East, Israel may well be counted as a faithful ally, and it is, therefore, worthy of no less consideration than the Arab peoples.

As you well know, American citizens of Jewish faith are contributing vast sums of money to Israel for the immigration, settlement, and rehabilitation of hundreds of thousands of the Jewish DP's of Europe and other parts of the world. They are deeply concerned about the security of Israel.

I would appreciate your reply to the contentions of my constituents.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

A Blow at the Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the feeling in opposition to the Lodge formula for dividing each State's electoral votes in exact proportion to the popular vote is causing great apprehension among the citizens of New York State. It is a proposal, of course, to surrender the affairs of the Nation to a one-party system. It will make a few of the large States the tax-paying slaves of a party which is now dominated by a group of reckless spenders and wastrels.

I am taking the liberty of inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, two editorials from the Buffalo Evening News, one dated February 20, 1950, and the other February 25, 1950:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of February 25, 1950]

WHY NOT A DIRECT POPULAR VOTE?

When applied to past presidential elections, the so-called Lodge formula for dividing up each State's electoral votes in exact proportion to the popular vote produces some mighty queer arithmetic.

For example, the 16 States carried by Governor Dewey in 1948 gave him a total of 189 electoral votes under the present system. But under the proposed Lodge amendment—already approved by the Senate and now pending before the House—Mr. Dewey's total margin over President Truman in all these 16 States combined would have amounted to 6.9 electoral votes. Yet the Truman margin over Dewey in Texas alone would have amounted to 9.4 electoral votes. The one-party State of Texas, in other words, was more than enough to offset the combined Dewey margin in all the States he carried.

Yet in the face of such incongruities as this, the Lodge amendment is put forth on the contention that it would practically give us a direct popular vote for President—wholly ignoring the fact that every New York vote would have about one-sixth the weight of a Nevada vote.

We agree with many of the Lodge amendment's supporters that the President of the United States, being a national officer responsible to all the people, should be elected directly by the people. But we cannot agree that the devious Lodge formula would give us such a system, or even move in that direction. The Ohio Congressman who dubbed it "a fine racket for southern Democrats" is much too close to the truth for comfort.

If a popular vote is wanted, why not provide it in a straightforward way? The only possible justification for this clumsy alternative is expediency: since the small States already have a disproportionate weight of electoral votes, it is not thought likely that they would ratify an amendment which deprived them of it.

What this overlooks, however, is that this supposed advantage of the small States is in reality a disadvantage. So long as elections depend on carrying the "key" States, the small States can be sure their favorite sons and favorite issues will get little play by either party. A direct popular vote, far from disadvantaging them, would extend Presidential "availability" in every part of the country and make one State's voters just as important as any other.

Electoral reform is long overdue. But if Congress is at last on the verge of proposing one, why not make it a real reform—a direct Nation-wide popular vote for President and Vice President? That kind of proposition could stand on its merits before every legislature, and its ratification would give us in fact the "people's choice" for President—which is much more than can be said for the Lodge amendment.

[From Buffalo Evening News of February 20, 1950]

QUIRKS IN THE LODGE FORMULA

In seeking to improve our constitutional system of electing Presidents, Congress is trying to meet at least three distinct objections to the present method. First, the electoral college is an anachronism and ought to be abolished. Second, the present system of throwing any election to the House of Representatives when no candidate has a majority of electoral votes presents the constant danger of a serious constitutional crisis. Third, the electoral vote system is not a true measure of national sentiment and ought to be modified in the direction of an out-and-out popular vote.

The so-called Lodge amendment, which recently passed the Senate and now is pending before the House, tries to meet all three objections in a single cure-all formula. We heartily concur in its objectives, but confess to serious misgivings about the formula chosen for attaining them.

As to abolishing the electoral college, the easiest way to do that is simply to abolish it, by letting everyone vote directly for President instead of indirectly for a presidential elector. Each State could still cast all its electoral votes for the successful candidates, but the Lodge plan would change this to have the electoral votes split in proportion to the popular vote.

As to the danger of a constitutional crisis under the present system, this is real and serious. If no candidate gets an electoral majority, the House (with each State delegation having a single vote) must choose from among the top three. Unless a majority of the State delegations can agree by January 20 (when the presidential term begins), the Vice President-elect (chosen by the Senate) would fill the vacancy. The whole system is an invitation to chicanery, corruption, or worse.

But that, too, could be corrected easily enough, through an afterthought clause in the Lodge amendment. It provides for congressional interference only when the leading candidate has less than 40 percent of the total electoral vote. In that case, the whole membership of Congress (House and Senate) would choose between the two highest candidates. In this respect, the Lodge amendment is a distinct improvement over the present system.

As for moving in the direction of a straight-out popular vote, however, it is hard to see how the Lodge plan offers much improvement at all. It purports to do this by splitting each State's electoral votes instead of giving them all to the candidate who carries that particular State. The reason for this cumbersome alternative to a direct popular vote is obvious, an amendment needs to be ratified by 36 States, and this one is frankly a compromise to lure the small States.

But if so, why are the big ones supporting it? That is something a number of Senators, including TAFT, of Ohio, simply couldn't understand. For the Lodge plan not only would deprive the large States of their special prominence in presidential elections, but it would greatly amplify the voice of the one-party States. New York would have no importance at all, since the two parties' normal vote here would very nearly cancel out. But a single one-party State like Georgia or Vermont might yield an electoral margin bigger than either party could hope to offset in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio combined. And since most one-party States are in the Democratic South, the Lodge system would put the Republicans at a substantial disadvantage right off the bat.

The proposed plan, in short, would not give us a direct popular vote, but would simply shift the emphasis from one extreme to the other—from the key States where the parties are in close balance, to the one-party States, mainly in the solid South. The United States News and World Report has calculated that four Republican Presidents—Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, and McKinley—would have lost out under the Lodge plan because of this factor.

Before submitting any such amendment to the States, therefore, it would seem particularly incumbent on the Congressmen from the big States—especially the Republicans—to be very sure they know what they're doing to themselves. Senator TAFT has flashed a warning that should put them on guard: "I cannot understand Republicans voting for a system which is unsound in theory and fatal to the hopes of Republican success in any close election."

Educating Poland's Youth for Russian Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Prof. Donald E. Super, of Columbia University, on the subject of educating Poland's youth for Russian expansion:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF ATTORNEY STEPHEN S. SOJA

Ladies and gentlemen, our speaker has chosen for his topic Educating Poland's Youth for Russian Expansion. He presents a detailed description of what is happening to Polish youth under Communist indoctrination and what it means to the future not only of Poland, but the rest of Europe and the west.

Our speaker was born in Honolulu, Hawaii, in 1910. He received his elementary education in New York, attended secondary schools in Poland and Switzerland, and was graduated from Oxford University with bachelor's and master's degrees. Columbia University bestowed upon him the degree of doctor of philosophy. During the last war he served as an aviation psychologist, leaving the Air Corps with the rank of major. He taught for 4 years at Clark University and in summer schools throughout the country includ-

ing Harvard. At present he is professor of educational psychology at Columbia University. As a psychologist he is regarded as among the leaders in this country.

I consider it an honor to present to you a recorded address by Prof. Donald E. Super, of Columbia University.

EDUCATING POLAND'S YOUTH FOR RUSSIAN EXPANSION

To graduate from high school in Poland today a boy or girl must pass an examination in which his social and political views are appraised by representatives of the Government-controlled political parties and trade-unions. This means that unless he has, or skillfully makes believe that he has, accepted the Communist doctrines prescribed by the Soviet-controlled Government, he cannot graduate from high school. And it goes without saying that, if he cannot graduate from high school, most training and positions which might lead to executive or professional employment are closed to him. In one district, that of Katowice, 2 years ago 30 percent of the candidates for the matura or high school diploma were failed because of "social unpreparedness," high-sounding name for lack of sympathy with communism and Soviet Russia.

How can such things happen in Poland, with her traditions of intellectual freedom? The answer is clear, for in May 1947 Minister of Education Skrzeszewski (a Russian-trained Communist), said: "Reforms are needed to allot Marxism a more worthy place among the sciences." Accordingly a great many different steps are being taken to insure "a more worthy place," that is a monopoly, for Marxism.

For example: in the ancient Jagiellonian University of Cracow three new chairs have been established, one in Marxian economics, one in Poland and the modern world from the Marxian viewpoint, and one in the history of social movements and revolutions. While the shortage of safely indoctrinated and docile professors has made it necessary to appoint one man, a Professor Sieradzki, to two of these chairs, their creation is an indication of the Communist Party's determination to indoctrinate at every level. There is evidence, too, that the shortage of Communist and fellow-traveling professors may not last too long, as there has been an influx of academically unprepared and intellectually unqualified, but Communist-led young men and women into the universities. They have been sent there by the party in response to demands for more students willing to learn what the party feels they should learn. One bit of evidence: university enrollment in the 28 institutions of prewar Poland equalled 48,000 students per year, whereas today, with fewer students in the academic and technical secondary schools, there are twice as many students (102,000) in twice as many universities (60).

Another bit of evidence: according to the official newspaper last summer, the examinations for admission to the universities are not difficult, but it is necessary that candidates supply certificates from local authorities concerning their social background and work in Communist organizations in order that they be eligible to take the exams. To pass the examinations, one must show further evidence of "class-consciousness and economic maturity, and of understanding of the role of the Soviet Union in the fight for the liberation of nations from the capitalist yoke." This is another way of saying that in order to get into the universities one need only be a pro-Russian Communist. Thus the Soviet-controlled government insures instruction of the proper doctrines, by properly indoctrinated professors, to properly receptive students.

But these are by no means the only steps being taken to bring Polish education in line with Russian. A great variety of special events are planned and staged with great fanfare. Last November included a Pavlov Week, in which a delegation of Soviet biologists toured Poland to lecture at the universities and educational centers on the currently approved biological concepts. So-called festivals of Soviet film, plays, and the like are staged, featuring Russian productions in theaters, schools, and even in the streets, in order to carry indoctrination to the school child and to the man in the street. World Student Week provided an occasion when university and technical institute students had publicly to demonstrate their unity with the Communist students of the world, or risk dismissal from the universities because of "social unpreparedness."

The campaign for thought control has, as case of Hitlerite Germany, reached the textbooks used at all educational levels. Although 3 years ago a member of Parliament dared to protest that the textbook revision then going on was handicapping the schools by forcing them to operate without books, they underwent still another revision last year in order to bring them in line with further changes in doctrine and interpretation—this has been true especially of history and biology. Thus the 6 year plan for communizing Polish thought moves ahead.

With the universities training Communists to be future teachers, with textbooks rewritten to conform to current ideology, there are still the presently employed teachers to consider: they, too, must be Communists or, failing a sufficient supply of these, fellow travelers. Last summer several thousand school teachers, compelled to take special vacation courses in Marxian ideology, were told that they must prove their allegiance to it during the current year in order to be reappointed next year. With children trained to think that spying on elders is a praiseworthy activity, checking up on the teachers is easy.

But sole reliance is not being placed on an older generation of basically non-Communist teachers in the public schools while waiting for a new generation of teachers to be trained, the so-called Society of Children's Friends has at its disposal large sums of money which are being spent on atheistic schools and on summer camps, staffed by trusted teachers, in the apparent hope that they will produce a less-adulterated crop of young Communists than the regular schools.

This does not mean that the public schools have less pressure on them to indoctrinate. Quite the contrary. On Stalin's birthday, for example, surprisingly similar messages from Polish children were read in chorus in the public schools and at meetings, hailing Stalin as "the culture and joy of youth * * * the leader and teacher and friend of all the suffering and oppressed," like the crocodile in Kipling's Jungle Book who was flatteringly called the protector of the poor by all the weaker animals who feared he would eat them. School children were forced to write letters to Stalin, uniformly beginning with "I, a child of democratic Poland, on the day of your seventieth birthday, want to express, in my humble letter, my gratitude to you." But then the so-called spontaneous demonstration organized from Moscow is an old story in the history of communism.

The number of nursery schools and kindergartens, for example, has increased threefold, their enrollments have quadrupled, since prewar days. That figure, taken at face value, sounds splendid—until one examines what is back of it. We should remember that it is the early years which are the most formative, and that there has been a steady drive for the employment of young women in construction work: if the children are in kindergarten they can be indoctrinated and the mothers can work. Declines in enrollment in elementary schools and in high schools confirm the interpretation by showing that the Communist government is not interested in a truly educated populace. The fact that enrollment in so-called vocational schools, which are now in effect mere apprentice-training institutions, is five times the prewar level, shows that what the party wants is not thinkers but producers: modern cannon-fodder.

But education, the Communists well know, is not something that takes place solely in schools. Accordingly all youth organizations have been taken over, some primarily for indoctrination purposes, and some primarily as a means of recruiting free labor, but all partly with both of these objectives in mind. The Scouts, the YMCA, and such organizations have been taken over and merged with the so-called Association of Polish Youth (the equivalent of the Russian Komsomol) and the Service for Poland (a semimilitary organization). Political and atheistic training, anti-American indoctrination, spying on elders, and construction work are their principal activities.

The Soviet-controlled government recognizes too that education is not all formal or organized. Therefore, the Christmas toys of a year ago were criticized as reactionary and capitalistic, and this Christmas was one of toys in which dwarfs worked for the 6-year plan, games came with pictures of Stalin and Bierut, and picture books dealt with subjects such as world revolution.

The rapid rate of change, and the many fronts on which it is being pushed by a country with limited resources, make it clear that Soviet Russia and her satellites consider youth the principal objective of communization; if they are adequately indoctrinated, their countries will soon be safe tools for Soviet Russia. It is in the indoctrination of youth that Russia is consolidating her territorial gains in World War II. It is only obvious, then, that if we in America do not want to stand by and see Russia turn a substantial part of the world against us, we must show an active concern for what is happening to youth in the satellite countries, and in particular to the youth of a country such as Poland, which was the first and last to resist Soviet-Russian aggression. That young Poland still reaches out to us for help despite the disillusionment of Yalta and of the wars and uprising is made amply clear by the fact that courses in English are much more popular in Poland today than are the all-but-compulsory courses in Russian; at the University of Warsaw last fall, for instance, 114 enrolled for the study of English while only 11 signed up for Russian. What a straw to grasp at, courses in English, when what is desired is normal intellectual and social intercourse with the free western world; grammar, when what is needed is a way of life; words, when their very meaning is being changed and "democracy" has become a synonym for totalitarianism.

Address of Hon. Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 21, our colleague, the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, delivered a very able and timely address to the North Carolina Democratic Club, of Washington, and I take great pleasure in presenting this well-prepared speech, and I hope very much

that it will be read and appreciated fully.

From the vantage point of the vice chairmanship of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, our colleague has discussed with gravity and wise understanding the perils we face in this atomic age. He has pointed out the inevitability of an atomic warfare race in view of the adamant attitude of the Kremlin in not being willing to assume the obligations which UN control, ownership, and inspection of world atomic installations would require. Our colleague has indicated the tragedy of the possible deprivation to our people of the marvelous possibilities of peacetime utilization of our rapidly growing atomic knowledge, if we are forced to concentrate wholly on atomic weapons of war. The honorable Member frankly concludes that the only way out of the atomic dilemma is to induce the Kremlin to agree to international control, and until such agreement is reached, he realistically admits that in planning our atomic energy program we must look first to our military defenses, at the same time continuing our untiring efforts to persuade Russia to see the light. Our colleague insists that we cannot permit a lag in development of atomic energy for peacetime applications. The program, he states, must go forward on this twofold basis.

There is no note of hysteria in our colleague's discussion, nor is there manifest any spirit of defeatism. He says, and I quote, "We must calmly but resolutely guard our ramparts and keep our powder dry."

The honorable Member warns against erecting barriers of secrecy between our people and the atomic-energy program. Rather, he believes, we should concentrate on positive achievement. We must not stifle the spirit of investigation and scientific inquiry and erect an iron curtain of our own. Our colleague is a trained scientist, and he knows the dangers of stifling scientific investigation and the free spirit of scientific research.

Throughout his calm and judicious statement runs a thread of approval of the steps taken by our President, Harry S. Truman, upon whom has devolved the stupendous task of the atomic decisions from Hiroshima to the H-bomb. Our colleague believes our President has made wise and inevitable decisions in the face of circumstances, and he describes the President's most recent responsibility in arriving at the decision to proceed with the hydrogen bomb.

In my opinion, our colleague has made an excellent and inspirational statement on a matter of the gravest import to the American people, and I know that every Member will profit by its perusal.

Mr. Chairman, speaking to you tonight as Democrats, being members of a political party that has set our policy continuously since 1933, I desire to point out to you during the first half of this twentieth century, the Democratic Party has been charged with the responsibility for more than 24 years—8 years under Woodrow Wilson, 12 years under Franklin Roosevelt, and more than 4 years under President Harry Truman. This period has produced surprise upon surprise, and now presently the atomic age. We as a party have received dose after dose of tension with monotonous repetition. So it is necessary that we guard ourselves of not becoming overexcitable. The Democratic Party has had to take over every crisis in the first half of this century. Now it becomes necessary that we make the people of the world aware of our genuineness of what we are doing. The duration of the Democratic Party has been long and honorable, but the duration is not so important as the donations that we make as a political party. We are seeking today a peaceful world, but we are not seeking peace without honor and we never will. There is no doubt that Russia is building a formidable military machine in the hands of an absolute small group of men who would destroy us if opportunity offered, and for that reason our present leader, President Truman, has deemed it imperative to build a strong defense.

The pressure which is building up for a conference of some sort with the Soviet Union, in my opinion, is dangerous. It would immediately place us in a position of despair and defeatism.

When, in mid-1945, atomic bombs fell upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and brought the Pacific war to an abrupt close, most Americans thought the ultimate in instruments of destruction had arrived. Men talked of the absolute weapon; it seemed that nothing could surpass the power of the atomic bomb.

Now matters appear different, and still more startling.

Four weeks ago the President gave the go-ahead signal on the hydrogen bomb. There is good reason to think that a single such bomb could destroy any city in the world. The scientists are confident that it can be built. And if we can make one, we must assume the Soviet Union can, too. The Russians broke our atomic monopoly only 4 short years after Hiroshima.

I can assure you that the President said "Yes" to the hydrogen bomb only with the greatest reluctance, and because he could not afford to say "No." Picture, if you will, the dilemma that confronted him. To say "Yes" to the super bomb was to authorize development of a weapon which, if uncontrolled, may ultimately destroy civilization. But to say "No" was to invite the possible destruction of both America and all those nations now joined with us in seeking a world of freedom and abundance. Nothing in the record of the Kremlin suggests either inability to make the hydrogen bomb, or reluctance to use it if a tempting opportunity were offered.

Therefore, the President's decision was correct—and, under today's circumstances, it was inevitable.

But why was the President faced with such a cruel choice? We must turn to Moscow for the answer. Mr. Acheson, speaking for the President, is right, in my opinion, in his theory that he must keep himself in a strong situation for future negotiations, and I point out to you press conferences where President Truman and our State Department plainly made it known that we have not closed the door as many columnists and other people would have you believe.

Over 3½ years ago, the United States offered the world a plan that would harness the atom for man's good. Bernard Baruch, as representative for our President, stood before the United Nations and announced that we were willing to give up our atomic monopoly, to share our secrets, to admit UN inspectors to our installations, to put our plants under UN ownership and control. In return, we asked only freedom from the fear of atomic attack—we asked only that the Soviet Union and every other country undertake similar obligations. All the free world agreed to our offer being generous and sound. Only Russia and her satellites opposed it—as they still do today.

President Truman, at his weekly press conference on February 16, said, with great emphasis, that this country is wide open to any peaceful overtures, including the international control of atomic energy, through all its embassies and the machinery of the United Nations. On February 13, Mr. John D. Hickerson, Assistant Secretary of State, also said the United States is willing at any time to sit down and talk with Russia in the United Nations on international control of atomic energy, and you recall that Russia has offered no control proposal since June 1947. Mr. Hickerson said in his press conference that the Soviet Government alone is blocking plans for world control of atomic energy. Mr. Jacob H. Malik, Soviet delegate to the United Nations, issued a statement on February 12, after his walk out of the six-power consultative body of the UNAEC, and gave as his excuse the unwillingness of the West to oust National China. Our State Department at that time made it known that regardless of the Chinese matter, we were prepared to continue negotiations and talks on internaitonal control of atomic energy. Mr. Hickerson said what this country wanted is an agreement on atomic energy but Russia has continued to use every excuse to block negotiations on some type of control of this dreadful weapon.

Now we find ourselves facing the prospect of an atomic armaments race.

But such a prospect represents only half of the tragedy. The other half lies in this: Moscow's refusal to accept a just control scheme deprives mankind of the untold benefits that might follow if all the genius and treasure now being expended on atomic weapons for self-defense were turned instead to harnessing the atom for man's well-being.

As you know, our Atomic Energy Commission is constantly developing the peacetime applications of atomic energy. Of course, we should not be Utopian in our hopes. The day when an "atomic pill" will heat your house for a year, or send your auto across the country is not in sight.

But much progress has been recorded, and even more is to be anticipated. In medicine, for instance, the use of radioactive "tracers" brings closer the date when cancer will be conquered. In agriculture, atomic research offers the prospect of greatly increased crop yields and resistance to plant diseases. In industry, experiments now being conducted with new types of power-generating plants hold out the possibility of driving turbines and dynamos through atomic energy. Furthermore, the time is not too far distant when the split atom will propel ocean-going ships.

Now suppose that instead of being forced, in self-defense, to build atomic and hydrogen bombs we could go all-out in developing the medical, agricultural, and industrial uses of atomic energy. Such a program might change and immeasurably improve the patterns of our existence.

That we cannot now go all-out in exploiting the atom for peace represents not only America's tragedy but the world's. The impoverished Russian people, the starving and disease-ridden millions of Asia and Africa—their loss is at least as great as ours.

What is the way out of this atomic dilemma? If we are to be frank and realistic, we must conclude that there is only one way out—inducing the men of the Kremlin to agree to an effective international control plan. Until such an agreement is reached, our very existence as a nation demands that in planning our atomic energy program we look first of all to our military defenses.

I confess that I see no easy method of persuading the Kremlin to accept a plan which it has consistently rejected for almost 4 years. Yet we must keep trying. We must continue to explore every avenue that may lead to a dependable and worth-while agreement.

It also disturbs me to read newspaper statements—some of them issued by scientists—suggesting that we retreat from realism and pin our hopes to some scheme or other that could succeed only if all men, and particularly the Communists, were completely enlightened and unselfish. The scientists have been instrumental in creating the difficult situation in which we find ourselves today. I think they should call upon the same realism and objectivity that guides them in the laboratory to help us find a workable solution to our political problems—rather than confusing the issue, as a few of them do, with impractical ideas and proposals that lead, not to a better world, but to greater danger for the free countries of the world.

While we are striving for atomic peace, along the path that our President has rightly taken ever since Hiroshima, we must calmly but resolutely guard our ramparts and keep our powder dry. We must keep our defenses in such a state of readiness that no aggressor will be offered the prospect of a quick and easy victory. We must work to maintain our lead in both the peacetime and military application of atomic energy.

This lead, of course, is not assured us merely by allotting a given number of dollars to our atomic program. We must choose between alternatives, and allocate our resources of brain power, money, and materials, so as to secure the greatest return on our investment. This often involves real problems of choice. How, for example, should we ration our scientific economy—our supply of available scientific experts—so as to press ahead not only with improved atomic bombs, not only with hydrogen bombs, but also with atom-powered ships and atom-powered industry? Can we pursue all these programs at full speed with the technical talent at hand? If not, which programs should take priority?

We must also be sure that in our understandable eagerness to reap immediate benefits we do not neglect pure research. We must not, that is, allow the well of fundamental knowledge to run dry. Here I think especially of our university students—our young biologists, chemists, and physicists. Let us remember that our real security and prosperity derive not so much from our natural resources—although for these we may be thankful—as from the skills and knowledge and imagination of free Americans.

We are in a race to develop brains as well as the race to develop bombs and reactors. Your representatives, and all those working on atomic energy, are very much aware of these problems. They are also aware that no small group of men—no matter how diligent or how dedicated to our national welfare—can determine by itself how atomic energy can best be used to promote our twin objectives of security and prosperity. They are further aware of the imperative need for the criticism and cooperation of an informed citizenry.

That is why we must exercise the greatest caution in erecting barriers of secrecy between the people and their atomic energy program.

Of course, we cannot afford to forget about Klaus Fuchs, the British scientist now on trial for divulging atomic secrets to the Soviet Union. Of course, we want to guard against future leaks, and we want to improve our security measures if impartial examination finds them wanting. But let us not be stampeded by the Fuchs revelations into a disastrous effort to achieve security more through secrecy than through positive achievement. Not only would this imperil our democratic institutions: it would gravely jeopardize our atomic program for military purposes. The continuing success of that program depends on the greatest possible interchange of ideas and information between our scientists.

Science does not take congenially to compartments or boundaries. The iron curtain hinders Russian scientists from participating in that intellectual cross-fertilization on which the growth of scentific knowledge depends. The Soviet iron curtain is a tragedy both for the Russian people and for the world. We must not compound this tragedy by needlessly erecting curtains of our own.

Let us always keep first things first in our minds. Let us realize that the liberation of the latent power of the scientific mind awaits the end of bombs and the beginning of world cooperation through an effective control plan. Keeping our atomic defenses in order can only buy us time. We must use that time to work and struggle for the day when international control enables us to realize the true promise of the atom.

Is There Room in the Poorhouse for 149,000,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsford (N. Y.) Post of February 2, 1950:

IS THERE ROOM IN THE POORHOUSE FOR 149,000,000 PEOPLE?

In 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any Government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Those words, important 17 years ago, have even greater significance today. Why? Because in every year since 1932 (with the exception of the two fiscal years immediately following the war) our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

In 1932, our Federal Government spent $4,500,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1950, it is estimated that our Federal Government will spend ten times that amount—$45,000,000,000.

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year of 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today as it was in 1932 that "a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse"?

Just what are you doing to end excessive spending by our Federal Government? Have you written your Congressman? Have you discussed the problem with your business associates, your friends, your employees?

Let's make sure our Representatives in Government know how we at home feel about the continuance of a habit that means the poorhouse.

The time for action is now.

—*Automotive News.*

When Good Intentions Are Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Longmont (Colo.) Times-Call of Wednesday, January 11, 1950:

WHEN GOOD INTENTIONS ARE BAD

All of us have heard that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, but who ever wrote it failed to say where those go who paved it.

It would be interesting to know whether the well-meaning perverter of truth, the betrayer of those whom he loves, and the destroyer of that which he seeks to build are judged by their intentions or by the results of their actions—when the Great Judge renders his final verdict.

We need not answer that question here, but it is important to know that motives, no matter how good, cannot prevent operation of the law of cause and effect.

The doctor who mistakenly prescribes arsenic to cure heart trouble does not thereby prevent the poison from killing his patient, no matter how earnest his hopes that the patient get well.

The architect does not prevent destruction of the house he builds if he ignores the laws of physics in trying to save money for his client.

The teacher who loves his students does not thereby change the laws of psychology which wreck the boy who is mistakenly taught to rely entirely upon others.

So with the political and economic policies of a nation. We know that the Communist wants to destroy capitalism and thereby tear down the prosperous economic structure which we have built in the United States. He wants to set up government control over our lives and subjugate the individual to the state. He sees Jesus of Nazareth with his gospel of love as the mortal enemy of Karl Marx with his doctrine of class hate.

But the Communist is too wise to attack in the open with clear avowal of his real purpose. He makes the attack in the name of democracy and humanitarianism, seeking to enlist for his fell purposes the aid of the very elements he seeks to destroy.

And so, many a devout church member, or worker for good, accepts the extravagant spending and accumulation of public debt as means to foster the welfare of individuals less fortunate than himself, and to provide easy help for the projects he would serve. He does this out of love for his fellow men, to establish the reign of plenty for all men on earth.

But, whether the purpose behind the extravagant spending, subsidies, Government control and piling up of debts be to wreck the capitalistic system quickly, as is the aim of the Communist and his Socialistic pals—or whether it be in the name of democracy

to promote humanitarian purposes, as is the hope of the devout and the good—the end result is the same in either case. It brings destruction to our traditional American freedom and self-reliance, the setting up of bureaucratic controls which ultimately enslave the individual, lower his standard of living, and ultimately destroy the church itself.

So the devout church member can become fellow traveler to the Communist without realizing it, and neither the purity nor the nobility of his motives prevents him from serving as ally to the destroyers of his country and its basic freedoms. His methods defeat his purpose.

Sheer love for humanity does not save humanity when those who love it use the methods that ultimately destroy the objects of their love. It then becomes loving betrayal.

Sir Harry Lauder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, Monday, February 28, 1950:

THE SCOTTISH MINSTREL

Sir Harry Lauder made the world hum. He led it to sing. "Singing makes you cheery," he said, and he taught the world a score of lilting songs that made it deliciously gay. The dialect was no obstacle. It came home to the dense population of Chinese as readily as to the scattered settlers of Australia. He was the first Scots comedian to capture London. The demand was so great for his appearance that he was billed in three theaters at one time.

Gifted with a rich baritone voce, Sir Harry was as happy in a sentimental song as he was in a comic number. This quality the public little knew. It was overshadowed by his irresistible humor. He was not an imitator of the Scots. He was a caricaturist. He exaggerated types he knew, had seen on street corners, had rubbed elbows with on the Clyde. He strengthened his characterizations, and gave them dramatic values of which the originals were bereft. His catchy verses—many written by himself—caught all the romance of the Clyde in the gloaming.

Where Burns and Scott left off in literature, Sir Harry carried the torch in song. An artist to the fingertips, he gaged his audience by its response, his devoted wife always helping in the early days by relaying comments made by departing listeners when the show was over.

Sir Harry knew how to get his songs across the footlights. He was meticulous in makeup, artful in dance steps, lilting in style. He worked hard, lived when possible close to the theater, and rehearsed an hour before the show. He left nothing to chance. The step that missed a beat was as carefully engineered as the wag of the kilt when he turned a corner. He had a keen sense of stage art, and capitalized on the value of taking the audience into his confidence.

Once in a while he would prompt his listeners to tell him what song they would like him to sing. When a dozen voices shouted a dozen different favorites, he would silence his hearers bluntly: "You don't know what you want, so I'll sing Keep Right On to the End of the Road." This was the favorite song of the "Scottish minstrel." It was his philosophy, too.

Hong Kong Court Gives Reds Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Burton Crane, from the New York Times:

HONG KONG COURT GIVES REDS PLANES—DENIES RECEIVERSHIP PLEA OF UNITED STATES CONCERN FOR 93 FORMER CHINESE NATIONALIST CRAFT—INJUNCTIONS ARE LIFTED—SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY CITED BY BENCH—ONLY REGISTRY BARS SHIPS' FLIGHT TO PEIPING

(By Burton Crane)

HONG KONG, February 23.—Under Hong Kong Supreme Court decision today, 93 planes, paid for largely by United States taxpayers, are being turned over to the Chinese Communist Government.

Despite the decision, which denied a receivership application and vacated two injunctions granted last autumn, the Chinese Communists are unable at present to fly the planes to their territory. They are not registered under Hong Kong laws Thus, some time remains for possible action from Washington or elsewhere.

[According to the Associated Press, a spokesman for one of the air lines involved, said the planes would be flown to Peiping, seat of the Chinese Communist Government, probably within a week.]

The case concerned three corporations. The largest was the China National Aviation Corp., a prewar subsidiary of Pan American Airways. It was reincorporated in 1946, with the Chinese Nationalist Government taking 80 percent of the stock by virtue of its contribution of planes and equipment it received from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Economic Cooperation Administration, lend lease, and other forms of United States aid.

The second concern, the Central Air Transport Corp., was owned 100 percent by the Nationalist Government's Communications Ministry.

When the Communists began to overrun China both companies removed their planes to the Kaitak airport in Hong Kong. Eighty percent of the Chinese employees of both air lines defected to the Communists last November 9 and flew away several planes.

The two corporations asked the protection of the British Government, which then still recognized the Chinese Nationalist regime. The corporations were told they would get protection if they first applied for an injunction, according to Richard Heppner, one of the lawyers representing Nationalist and United States interests in the case. Mr. Heppner was wartime head of the Office of Strategic Services in China and a law partner of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, retired, overall head of the OSS.

The two Nationalist Government air lines asked and got an injunction forbidding the defecting employees to touch the planes, which include four Skymasters and six Convairs. Shortly thereafter the Communists got an injunction preventing Nationalists sympathizers from going near the equipment.

Mr. Heppner declared tonight that the Americans and the Chinese Nationalists involved in the case had objected strongly because only the second injunction was ever enforced. Communists were permitted to work on the planes and service them, he said, and the British refused to withdraw the airfield passes issued to the Communists as employees even though they had announced they were no longer connected with the two concerns.

Early last November, the Nationalist Government attempted to extricate itself from this dilemma by selling all planes of both airlines to Civil Air Transport, Inc., a Delaware concern formed for that purpose by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault and his associate, Whiting Willauer, Civil Air Transport declared in court that it had paid $3,900,000 for the planes of the first two companies.

On January 6 Britain recognized the Chinese Communist Government shortly after inspectors from the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority appeared with an announcement that the former Central Air Transport and China National Aviation planes had been registered by Civil Air Transport with the United States Government. They said they wished to inspect the planes and place United States markings on them. British authorities refused to allow them to tamper with the planes.

Civil Air Transport then filed applications with the Hong Kong courts for the appointment of receivers for both companies.

Today, Sir Leslie Gibson, Hong Kong's Chief Justice, handed down a decision declaring that the "doctrine of sovereign immunity operates to prevent the court from entertaining an application to appoint a receiver." He also declared that all proper parties were not before the court and that the plaintiff corporation had not established a sufficiently strong case.

"I have held that the assets are in possession of the Central People's Government (Communists)," he said. "If I am wrong in this then, in my opinion, they are clearly in possession of the corporation—China National Aviation. Neither the Central People's Government nor the corporation is a party to these proceedings or has consented to the appointment of a receiver."

The chief justice dismissed the American contention that the Communist Government had got possession only through infringing the November injunction and declined to admit the validity of the minutes of China National Aviation of December 31, approving the sale to Civil Air Transport. The court ordered the plaintiffs to pay $8,000 as costs.

According to the Nationalists' intelligence, possession of the planes will triple the Communist air force.

The Viewpoint of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., Monday, February 27, 1950:

SIN IS NEWS

There are many folks who charge that newspapers print too much about crime.

From the viewpoint of the news editor's desk, anything that is unusual, out of the ordinary run of things, is news.

Good living is expected. It takes place with unexciting regularity.

Crime is news. A wrongdoing clergyman is news, just as railway accident or a plane mishap is news.

No editor would give even a paragraph to a railway journey that ended without accident.

Suppose it were not so. Suppose that sin were the usual thing and goodness the exception. Then if anybody did a good deed the reporters would rush to the scene to write up the story. We should have such headlines as these in huge type:

"Great sensation. Wild excitement. The honesty of a Chicago bank cashier found out by accident. Facts incredible. Whole city shocked."

"Startling revelations in New York City. An affectionate, faithful mother discovered. Astonishing. Report unfortunately confirmed."

"Strange reports from Philadelphia. A well-known business firm actually meets all its obligations. An investigation demanded."

"Amazing happenings in Columbus, Ohio. A married couple living happily together. No reason given. Most extraordinary. Unheard of in this region."

"A patriotic politician unmasked in St. Louis. No graft found, no chiseling; all records straight. A tough case for the FBI."

"Washington City baffled. A church full of people listening to a gospel sermon right under the nose of the Government. Entire city stirred."

Yet if we actually read such headlines, we should think that the editor had gone off his head. Love, fidelity, honesty are the rule, and the daily paper proves it. Sin is news.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 24, 1950.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the County Hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 14th day of February A. D., 1950, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas on May 23, 1947, January 20, 1948, and on various occasions over a period of years prior thereto, this board of supervisors has recorded itself in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

"Whereas the Public Works Committee of the United States Congress is preparing for a hearing on the St. Lawrence project, to be held during the month of February 1950; and

"Whereas it is still self-evident that the proposed seaway, if completed, would threaten the economy of the entire State of New York, and particularly the Niagara frontier; and

"Whereas the people of this State have invested large sums of money to provide water transportation from Lake Erie to the port of New York; and

"Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would cause a serious diversion of transportation from the Erie Canal, and particularly the port of Buffalo, such diversion resulting in direct loss of revenues to this locality, and further resulting in the eventual loss of employment to many of our citizens; and

"Whereas the people of Erie County would be called upon through additional Federal taxation to meet the staggering cost of the contemplated project; and

"Whereas such a project is unsound, unwarranted, and unnecessary: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this board of supervisors again voice its opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress and to the Public Works Committee of Congress."

Attest:

ALFORD J. FARLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Fortieth Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Rev. Rowland F. Nye, rector of St. Thomas's Episcopal Church, Lyndhurst, N. J., on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, February 12, 1950:

A man named George Orwell wrote a book last year about the strange world of 1984. It was a frightening picture of the cruel fate of man in a regimented left-wing police state which controls his mind and soul.

In the world of 1984 the true meaning of words had become so utterly distorted that they had come to mean their opposite. Every citizen had it continually dinned into him that war is peace; freedom is slavery; ignorance is strength." The appalling fact is that our world seems to be tending in that lamentable direction.

Mr. Orwell's book is available at our free public library, and I commend it to adults. It is not enjoyable reading, but we live in a world of increasing tensions between democracy and despotism, and we gain nothing by shutting out unpleasant truths which will eventually find us and force the choice of freedom or slavery.

Possibly you boys wonder what all this has to do with you in 1950, as you celebrate the fortieth anniversary of Scouting in America and the birthday anniversaries of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. It has a great deal to do with you, because your elders are making day-to-day decisions which determine the kind of world you shall inherit as adults; whether the dismal preview of Mr. Orwell will become actuality or whether the American dream of democracy with its basic and fundamental belief in the worth, dignity, and significance of each individual shall be the shape of your future.

There is a familiar word which I shall examine this morning, a word which is already so abused that it may well be added to the absurd affirmation that war is peace; freedom is slavery; ignorance is strength. I refer to the word "tolerance." If we do not understand its true meaning we may come to believe the falsity that tolerance is acceptance.

Before we recall Washington's and Lincoln's decisions to reject evils which many urged be tolerated, let us examine what tolerance truly means and how it is becoming distorted to mean something very different.

Tolerance implies both a freedom from bigotry and a liberal attitude to opinions other than one's own. It applies especially to religious and political doctrines. It forbids severity in judging others who hold such opinions or doctrines or the imposition of any restrictions upon their freedom to think as they will.

This is the 36-inch measure of tolerance and the one and only one which must measure every individual or group in society. It is the basic test for any who demand tolerance: that they grant to others what they demand for themselves. But we know that it doesn't always work like that. For the past 36 years particularly, slight-of-hand propaganda has purposely confused tolerance with acceptance, and this confusion has subtly permeated the public mind of western civilization to the extent that the good 36-inch measure of tolerance has been shortened to something less than 12.

Every totalitarian group which challenges the democratic belief in the worth, dignity, and significance of each individual demands that its program for restrictions upon freedom must be permitted in the name of tolerance. Those who challenge this travesty of tolerance are branded intolerant. Tolerance, it is told us, is the acceptance of absolute truth, the one and only system of social justice, the millennium of heaven on earth—each and all masking their plan to destroy democracy. Any society which falls for this double talk is ripe for the loss of its worth, its dignity, and its freedom.

Tolerance has also come to connote failure to resist through indifference or sometimes through a desire for peace and harmony. Tolerance thus becomes appeasement on the installment plan, whose final payment is loss of freedom.

No man in colonial America more devoutly desired peace and harmony than Col. George Washington; he possessed wealth, a magnificent estate; but he risked the hangman's noose by his intolerance of the imposition of unjust restrictions upon the colonists. He knew that ties of acquaintance and bonds of friendship would strain or break in the struggle, yet he pledged his life, his fortune and his sacred honor.

Abraham Lincoln, a man of charity and compassion, grew in political stature as he sharpened the national debate between feudalistic slavery and a Federal Union of men equal in worth, dignity and significance. Lincoln said in 1858: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy."

And so Lincoln quietly, but firmly, resisted those who urged that the erring sister States be allowed to secede in peace, "the tolerance of acceptance," and when Sumter's flag was fired upon he issued a call to arms to preserve the Union. True, Lincoln was intolerant of the southern pretension of sovereignty, but the Union was saved and we honor him today.

That Union is now in a state of cold war with a vast and ambitious totalitarian despotism whose language is double talk, a language which has misled many. It debases the word democracy until it is turned inside out and means nothing of the worth, dignity, and significance of each individual. Soviet democracy is the 1950 preview of 1984, in which war is peace; freedom is slavery; ignorance is strength, and tolerance is acceptance. The forces of subversion play upon our devotion to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and try persuasively to make them strands of the rope with which they would hang us. Pleading the protection of civil rights they seek under that same protection to engineer the destruction of all civil rights.

Can it be that we shall allow such a distorted and false tolerance to become the means of our destruction? It is time that we clarified our thinking and made it unmistakable that we shall be intolerant of any group or program which seeks to subvert the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which would make democracy the instrument of its own death.

In conclusion: let us practice true tolerance, keeping ourselves free from the bigotry which claims exclusive copyright on all truth and grant to others the same worth, dignity, and freedom we demand for ourselves; let us beware of that false tolerance which permits freedom to destroy freedom; let us guard against the tolerance, misnamed broadmindedness, which is the refusal to face the deep and challenging conflicts of life.

It is my hope that this generation of adults will so meet the physical dangers threatening our Nation, and so successfully debunk the insidious propaganda which would make white black and black white, that the Boy Scouts of America may inherit in their manhood free and democratic institutions; enjoying the blessings of a Constitution unbreached and triumphant, and established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

It is your duty and mine to love our country; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Name of Veterans' Hospital in Erie County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 24, 1950.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the County Hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 14th day of February A. D., 1950, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas this committee realizes that the veterans' hospital in Buffalo is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and that the naming of this hospital is subject to the decision of the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the recommendation of the Erie County Board of Supervisors that the name suggested by the Joint Veterans Council of Erie County, namely, Veterans Memorial Hospital, be adopted and that wings or sections of said hospitals be named in honor of individual distinguished servicemen of this area; further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the above resolution be forwarded to the three United States Representatives from this area, the two United States Senators from New York State, and the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee."

Attest:

[SEAL] ALFORD J. FARLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

Commercial Air Transportation

REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, ever since I became a Member of Congress I have had a real interest in our commercial air transportation system. I have had that interest because of its very real value to our foreign and domestic commerce and because I believed it to be—and it has proved itself to be—an essential element of our national defense. But like many of you, I have been concerned at the mounting cost in the form of mail pay which annually is paid out to the certificated scheduled air carriers. Particularly is this true when there are so many demands on each taxpayer dollar.

Commercial air transportation is no longer in the experimental or developmental stage. It has now reached a point, except perhaps in the foreign field, where it should think about becoming self-sustaining. I subscribe to the proposition set forth in the President's budget message that the subsidy element of payment for the transportation of mail should be separated from the compensation paid the air carriers for the service they perform in carrying the mail.

Last week I was pleased to note in the American Aviation Daily for February 15, 1950, that the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board appeared before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of legislation providing for separation of air-mail pay and subsidy. I also was impressed by the Board's statement of its economic program for 1949, wherein it recognized the cost of uneconomic competition on various air routes and undertook corrective action, at the same time committing itself to encourage the development of air transportation along efficient and economical lines.

Such action by the Board is constructive. It can and should stimulate and encourage those who believe in free enterprise, who believe that initiative and hard work will pay higher dividends than Government subsidy.

There is a striking example in my own district of the results of adherence to this belief. Pacific Overseas Airlines Corp. is a small company based at the International Airport in Ontario, Calif. Its employees are its stockholders. It has never received one penny of Government subsidy and it has never engaged in the subterfuge of the so-called charter operations to operate scheduled services. Nevertheless, in the 4 years since the war, when some of the certificated carriers were in the shadow of bankruptcy courts and payments for the carriage of mail were higher than ever before, Pacific Overseas, by contrast, in industriously seeking out contract business and winning the confidence of its customers, has increased its net worth 500 percent, and at the same time given a respectable living to its stockholder employees.

During the war the men who own this company flew over 30,000,000 statute miles between the west coast and points in the Pacific—the Hawaiian Islands, Australasia, and the Philippines—under contract to the Air Force. Their record for efficiency, economy, and safety was not excelled by any of the air carriers working for the Air Transport Command. Since the war this small company has flown over 15,000,000 miles in the performance of contracts to Hawaii, Japan, and China, without injury to a single passenger or crew member. They have proved their ability to operate a successful air line service.

Ever since 1940, Pan American Airways has had authority to operate between Los Angeles and Honolulu; it also has authority to fly between San Francisco and Honolulu. In 1946, United Air Lines was also authorized to operate between San Francisco and Honolulu, and by making a stop at San Francisco, it can render service between Los Angeles and Honolulu. Recently the Civil Aeronautics Board authorized two carriers to operate between Seattle-Tacoma and Portland and Hawaii. Los Angeles, the largest city in the West, a city that has a greater population than San Francisco, Oakland, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle combined, and one of the greatest air travel centers of the world is the only city which has only one carrier offering direct service to the islands. It ought to have two carriers flying this direct service and the economy of the Hawaiian Islands demands it as a means of increasing its tourist market, so vital to the Territorial economy.

Early last summer the matter of additional air service between Los Angeles and Honolulu was heard by one of the examiners of the Board. Only two applicants sought the route, United and Pacific Overseas, opposed by Pan American which seeks to preserve its monopolistic position. United's case was predicated on the operation of a service which was an exact duplication of the luxury service now provided by Pan American; the same aircraft, the same speed, the same fares, and catering to the same deluxe market—everything the same except the name on the outside of the airplanes. And the cost to the Government of this duplicating service would be mail payments of $3,000,000 annually. Pacific Overseas, on the other hand, proposed to provide a coach or tourist type service with an emphasis on air transportation, operating at slower speeds in less comfortable seats, without multiple course hot meals and cocktails, at a fare reduction of $50; $110 instead of $160 one-way, and directed toward an entirely new travel market. But most significant, Pacific Overseas proposed to provide this service without authority to carry mail, without a dime of Government subsidy. The men who own and work for this company have said:

We do not demand $3,000,000 a year from the taxpayer to provide a duplicating serv-

ice such as that proposed by United. We believe competition means more than that. It is supposed to bring some public benefit. We will provide that benefit by making air transportation available to thousands who cannot now afford it. We will do it at the risk of the dollars we have put into this company and we will show that air transportation can be made self-sustaining. All we ask is that Pacific Overseas be given an 8 by 11 sheet of paper which authorizes us to fly.

This case is now before the Board for its decision. It is an important case because in deciding it the Board must determine whether the additional service between Los Angeles and Honolulu will continue to be avaliable only to those who can afford a 6-cents-a-mile fare with an additional charge of $3,000,000 per year from the Public Treasury, or whether the travel market will be broadened by the introduction of a 4-cents-a-mile fare without cost to the taxpayer. The Department of the Interior, charged with the responsibility for the welfare and development of our Territories, is strongly on record in favor of the tourist-class service. It knows the economic situation in Hawaii, that defense spending is down, that the sugar and pineapple markets cannot be expanded, that surface transportation has been disrupted and for prolonged periods, and it recognizes that the development of an expanded tourist market is the only means of assuring the islands' economy. The Department has made it clear that carriers who are engaged in the operation of deluxe services over extensive foreign or domestic systems cannot be expected to offer a tourist service designed primarily for the islands. Because travel between the mainland and Hawaii is largely of a local or regional character, the Department of the Interior has also said the operation should be conducted by a carrier whose primary interests are directed to this market and who can take advantage of its knowledge of local conditions.

Pacific Overseas and its partner, Trans-Pacific Airlines, which is owned by citizens of Hawaii and operates a local service between the islands, meets these standards as no other applicant can, and it has but one objective—serving the local need for transportation between Honolulu and Los Angeles. It can make a real contribution to the development of our air transportation system by penetrating the mass transportation market lying below the level of luxury air transportation.

The certification of this new carrier is also important from the standpoint of national defense. Award to United of the right to fly directly between Los Angeles and Honolulu adds nothing to our defense potential—no new ground facilities, no more trained personnel, no additional airplanes. This country receives nothing except an annual bill of $3,000,000. I have already referred to the unexcelled job which the men who own and operate Pacific Overseas did during the war. Perhaps it is not very important, but it is illustrative to tell you that they checked out United's pilots in order that they could qualify for trans-Pacific operations, and they provided the maintenance in Australia for the aircraft which United operated for the Air Transport Command. The men who constitute Pacific Overseas have stuck together for almost 8 years; they have invested their savings, and theirs only, in this enterprise; they have assembled a virile, efficient, trained organization with splendid ground facilities, located at Ontario, Calif., about 30 miles east of Los Angeles, for the maintenance and overhaul of four-engine aircraft, and they have made money. They have done all this in anticipation that some day they should be authorized to conduct regular commercial operations in the Pacific. If they are not certificated, this highly trained and qualified group of pilots and mechanics will be lost, their organization ultimately will devote itself to other activities or be dissolved, and their usefulness as a potential resource in the event of national emergency will be totally dissipated.

Authorizing them to operate this route will have a further value to the national defense. It will provide additional and new facilities in the Hawaiian Islands for the maintenance of large four-engine air craft which could quickly be converted to military projects in an hour of need. It would provide additional qualified crews and transport-type aircraft. These very real advantages to our national defense cannot and should not be overlooked.

It is my view that the development of this new-type service proposed by Pacific Overseas Airlines is within the policy directive given the Board by this Congress when we adopted the Civil Aeronautics Act. It will contribute to our air transportation system and be a valuable adjunct to our national defense. I believe it is within the purview of the Board's own pronouncement of its economic policy for 1949—which we can hope will also be its policy for 1950. We should await its decision in this case with interest, for from it we may find signposts to guide us in matters of legislative policy with respect to commercial air transportation.

A Practical Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Banner-News of Magnolia, Ark., for July 25, 1949:

A PRACTICAL POLICY

In recommending that an appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) be reduced to about $1,000,000 (the House had voted it $9,000,000) a Senate committee urged last week that the SPA accept an offer of electric companies that would eliminate needless waste of tax funds on duplicating power lines.

This appears to be a practical policy for Congress to adopt. In the Senate, Arkansas' JOHN MCCLELLAN has won much praise for his attempts to economize on Government spending.

If the Senate as a whole will adopt the committee report, it would be doing just what Senator MCCLELLAN is urging—economizing.

It seems utterly ridiculous for a Government bureau—whether it be SPA or any other—to waste tax money on duplicating power lines. What the electric companies offered to do was transmit power from Government dams over their lines for the SPA. When they do this there is no need for the SPA to build transmission lines.

Taxes are heavy enough now without keeping them higher with expenditures on such needless projects as unnecessary power lines.

Hydrogen Bomb Should Stir Peace Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland News:

HYDROGEN BOMB SHOULD STIR PEACE DRIVE

As President Truman says, his will be the final responsibility for decision on whether the United States shall take the fateful step of attempting to build a hydrogen bomb.

The President is getting, and will get, all sorts of advice. But when the day of decision comes he must stand alone. It is a heavier responsibility, even, than President Roosevelt met with his approval of atomic bomb research.

The potentialities of the hydrogen bomb are frightening almost beyond conception. Prof. Harold C. Urey, one of the Nation's top atomic scientists, says that it has been reported that, if such bombs were dropped off the Pacific coast, the prevailing winds would carry the radioactivity over this country and would result in the extinction of all forms of life.

Professor Urey does not vouch for the accuracy of the statement, but the fact that he quotes it is a measure of the terms in which scientists are thinking of the hydrogen bomb.

Yet Professor Urey is for development of the bomb on the single ground that if this country does not beat the Russians to it, the United States will have lost the armaments race with all the consequences that implies.

To lose the race, says Professor Urey, will be to lose our liberties, and "it is more important that this spirit of liberty continue to exist than that I or any group should continue this mortal existence for a few years more."

Surely there is no question but what the United States is in an armaments race, and that it cannot afford to fall behind. If a hydrogen bomb can be built, this is the country which ought to have it first.

But while the decision is being debated there is all the more impelling reason for a vitalizing of the hunt for new paths to insure world peace. We are thinking in terms of support for such organizations as the United World Federalists and others aiming at the same fundamental objective.

It is not necessary that one agree completely with the precise program suggested by the Federalists to give their project backing.

It is enough to know that here is a group of private citizens striving most earnestly and devotedly to promote a world order which has the strength and authority to preserve peace and prevent aggression.

We are not sure at the moment that theirs is the most practical approach, since it involves a hope that it will be possible to draw Russia back into the orbit of cooperation in good faith.

But with the hydrogen bomb looming in the future no chance to bring that about should be left untried.

A Real Chance to Economize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Phillips County (Ark.) Herald:

A REAL CHANCE TO ECONOMIZE

News items of recent weeks—items that have attracted considerable attention—have followed the headlines in reporting that Congress seems to be giving a lot of thought these days to economies in government.

That sounds almost too good to be true. Let us hope that Congress does more about it than just talk, thereby preventing a duplication of effort that is bound to cause repercussions which would throw additional burdens on an already heavily taxed taxpayer.

Arkansas' senior Senator, JOHN MCCLELLAN, is making a great fight to cut Government spending and he is getting some Senate support. Of course all economies are reflected in how much taxes we pay.

Only a few days ago a Senate committee voted to reduce an appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) to about one and one-half million dollars.

The House had previously voted to give the bureau (SPA) about nine million.

However, the practical Senate committee, thinking of the unnecessary payment of taxes on duplicate endeavor—in preventing the utilization of two carts for a single horse—went even further in ordering the SPA to abandon its ambitious program of duplicating power lines and to accept the offer of power companies to carry SPA power over their lines.

It is expected and hoped that the full Senate will carry out the recommendations of its committee. Here is a real opportunity for economizing. If the SPA's purpose is—as it is purported to be—to furnish the most power for the least possible cost, both to the user and the taxpayer, then it will, of its own volition, see fit to use prevailing power lines to transport its power.

It stands to reason that money not spent on needless duplicating power lines could be spent on greatly needed development of our rivers and our harbors.

Since most of the people in Arkansas, and the residents of Phillips, Lee, and Monroe Counties in their entirety are definitely interested in additional funds for rivers and harbors, it behooves them to contact their Senators and Congressmen and air their views on the matter.

The people of Arkansas, will be watching with a great deal of interest how Senator FULBRIGHT votes on this plan of practical economy.

H. R. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I have always been greatly helped by the active cooperative assistance of members of all of the clerks' groups in the various post offices of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California.

Whenever I have asked them to give me facts and concrete evidence proving their claims that they were either under or not adequately paid; that they were justified in their request for increase in salary, and so forth, they have uniformly come up with prompt, helpful, and clear evidence that their representations made to me were well founded in fact.

So, in connection with my consideration of the merits of H. R. 87, I asked the Post Office Clerks Union, in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., to make and to send to me a brief analysis, based upon actual cases, of the earnings of the average veteran in the group, who was married and had a family. Under recent date I received this data, and I feel that it is so informative that every Member of Congress would be helped in understanding the worthy objectives of H. R. 87 by observing the facts as set forth in the communication to me herewith presented, to wit:

LONG BEACH POST OFFICE
CLERKS UNION,
Long Beach, Calif., January 30, 1950.

Subject: Questionnaire, H. R. 87, Veterans.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: In an endeavor to furnish your office with some authentic concrete facts concerning the economic status of the World War II clerks in this office who would benefit by enactment of the veterans credit bill, a questionnaire was circulated and compiled.

It is believed that the facts presented below will show that the average veteran here is a mature, married man with a family and earning $2,870 per year postal salary. He is forced to seek other part-time employment to augment his salary. This is his third year in the postal service and he served 3 years in the military during the war. He is working alongside clerks who came into the post office at the same time he went to war and who are drawing $700 per year more in salary.

Permission is granted to use these facts and figures as you see fit.

Out of a total of 295 clerks in the office there are 120, or 40 percent, who would come under H. R. 87 and who received questionnaires.

Number of returns received, 100 out of 120, or 83 percent.

Average age, 32.

Average salary, $2,870 (includes recent raise of $120 under H. R. 4495).

Eighty-four are married with an average of three in the family.

There are 19 whose wives are working.

Thirty-one clerks have other part-time jobs.

Five hundred and ten dollars is average debt of 94 clerks who answered this one.

Seventy-seven have cars whose average model year is 1940 and 21 have no cars.

Average rent being paid, before decontrol, $44.50 per month.

Average length of military service during the war, slightly over 3 years.

The 120 veterans here are looking to Congress with hope for enactment of this meritorious legislation. It was good news to hear that the powerful House Rules Committee granted a special rule on January 27. Please press for adoption of the special rule and passage of H. R. 87 as reported by the House Post Office Committee in July 1949 which includes four additional grades upon being promoted to regular clerk.

Your efforts on behalf of the veteran are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ADAM JASO, *President.*

The Case for ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 22, 1950, entiled "The Case for ECA":

THE CASE FOR ECA

In presenting its case yesterday for continued Marshall plan aid the administration gave Congress a grim picture of the present world situation. Appearing before a joint session of the Senate and House foreign-policy committees, Secretary Acheson accused Soviet Russia not merely of blocking agreements, or even of aggressive expansion, as heretofore, but bluntly charged Moscow with pursuing, amid "signs of increasing boldness," a deliberate "design for world dominion." Economic Cooperation Administrator Hoffman was equally plain-spoken when he described the Marshall plan as an indispensable weapon for the preservation of peace and freedom.

This estimate of the present situation was submitted to Congress in support of the administration's request for new appropriations of $2,950,000,000 for the third Marshall plan year, and as an answer to those Congressmen who would use the technique of the meat ax to slash this sum by $1,000,000,000 or even $2,000,000,000. The testimony of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman is supported by the whole record of Soviet policy since the war. In fact, recent Soviet successes, which Mr. Acheson acknowledges, not only permit of no relaxation of our counter efforts but raise the question whether our present counter efforts are adequate.

As Mr. Acheson says, there are now two antithetical concepts of foreign relations. One is the concept of the Soviet world, which demands of all Communist states complete subservience to the Kremlin and denounces any act of peaceful cooperation among non-Communist states to defend their own interests and to solve their own problems as a plot of war mongers. The other concept is that of a free world, in which nations, in return for respect of their own rights, respect the rights of other states and ask only that conflicts of interest be resolved by peaceful means. Between these two concepts the best present hope is the possibility of some modus vivendi. This is a far cry from the one-world concept which we

cherished during the war, but as long as the Soviet concept prevails and is backed by Russian might, there is no other alternative.

However, as Mr. Acheson likewise points out, to attain even this limited goal the free world must first meet a threat to its existence, and that threat must be met both defensively and constructively. "The first test of any society is its ability to defend itself," he said, and we are now reorganizing both our defenses and those of our allies within the framework of the North Atlantic Pact. But defense alone is not enough. It must be matched by the creation of a successfully functioning political and economic society of free nations, which is the purpose of the Marshall plan. To cripple that plan, or even destroy it, before its goal has been attained would be not only poor economy but a direct threat to both our own security and to the whole free world.

It is from such considerations, primarily, that the administration urges approval of the third-year funds which it now seeks as the absolute minimum necessary to keep the Marshall plan going. Mr. Acheson acknowledges, of course, that Europe would have grave economic problems even without the threat of Soviet aggression, as it did after the First World War. And he puts the American Government squarely behind Mr. Hoffman's demands for both European integration (for which purpose ECA is earmarking a special fund of $600,000,000 for the European payments union) and for a readjustment of our own economy, to permit larger imports as one means of closing the remaining dollar gap. But above all economic and practical considerations or difficulties stand the primary necessities of survival of both ourselves and a sufficiently large free world to enable us to live and breathe. We are confident that after weighing the administration's arguments the American people and Congress will rally to its support.

Status of Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the other day I made some remarks about the status of the calendar and the progress that the Democratic majority had been making this year. Today I am inserting this statement with reference to it.

I hold in my hand the current calendar. The back page indicates that only one bill has been passed up to date, and that an urgent deficiency bill. So that there may be no confusion about it, I checked the record of the Eightieth Congress, which the President continues to belabor. At that time they had already passed the independent offices appropriation bill, a large bill; the civil functions bill; an urgent deficiency bill; and a major bill, the income-tax reduction bill. By March 15 we had passed eight of the major appropriation bills. Now the House Appropriations Committee has not completed hearings on the one bill which we are told will be taken up by March 15. Think of it. The Congress has been in session almost 2 months and the Senate has not passed a single bill worthy of mention on the calendar. The House has only passed a deficiency appropriation bill in addition to the bill passed today. It is a disgraceful record, and proves the complete inability of the Democratic leadership to operate the Government effectively.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at Boise, Idaho, on February 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow Democrats, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the compliment implied in your invitation for me to address this fine gathering in Idaho and I am happy that my schedule in the West permitted me to accept it.

We rejoice that the Democrats have an annual opportunity of meeting and expressing their admiration for two great Americans who have contributed not only to the welfare of their country but have given life, purpose, and vitality to the Democratic Party—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Only a few nights ago I attended the great outpouring of Democrats from all over the United States gathered in Washington to pay honor to these outstanding men. It was a glamorous occasion—5,300 people assembled in the greatest dinner in the history of the world. They poured nearly a half million dollars into the treasury of the Democratic Party, which is of some importance to all of us as we look forward to the elections next November. Particularly is it important in such a State as this where two Senate seats are at stake this fall.

I don't know which annoyed the Republicans more—the mass of people there to express their loyalty and devotion to the Party and its leaders, or the dollars they dropped into the till. The Republicans saw all that money rolling in at a hundred dollars a plate and all they called us was "Socialists."

I want to talk briefly tonight about Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. But before I do that I want to talk to you as a Westerner interested in reclamation, anxious to see the West continue its great onward sweep, determined to help you as you seek to achieve your great destiny. There may not be much politics in a great deal of what I say tonight. It may sound like a chamber of commerce speech in spots, but that may be because when I first entered the Congress of the United States I went in as a Member of the House of Representatives. There were only a handful of us from all the Rocky Mountain States and even when we added together all those from the reclamation States, we still had only a few. We found we had to bind ourselves together, both Republicans and Democrats, to achieve the development of the West. From the standpoint of politics all I need say now is that I know how alert the present administration is to the needs of the West, how anxious it is that our soil shall not be washed away, that the waters that pour down from the mountains may be held in place by great dams and mighty lakes, that multiple-purpose projects may enrich our communities, that our mines shall be encouraged to produce and our forests may be conserved. In a word, this administration by its works shows its faith in the expanding economy of the Nation and tries to guarantee that future generations may enjoy the blessings which a kind providence has showered throughout this area.

Early in February the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which I am privileged to be a member began consideration of certain phases of the Columbia Valley program of the Department of the Interior. This arose out of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which carried authorizations of $250,000,000 for the Columbia River Basin to be utilized by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Senate Interior Committee amendment would add another $200,000,000 for reclamation works. The matter has been tied up for weeks to permit the Interior Committee to study and express its opinion on the reclamation features of the omnibus bill. We must move cautiously on any item of a quarter billion dollars, but I could not help but think what this great program for the development of the Columbia Basin means to your State of Idaho and to all your neighboring States.

Here you will have the world's greatest single power and irrigation development. You people of Idaho remember that irrigation in this area probably started at Lapwai, near Lewiston, Idaho, in 1837. A missionary came out into these lands and while he was trying to serve his mission to the Nez Perce Indians his group constructed a ditch to irrigate fields in the river bottom to supply grain and vegetables. You know far better than I the long hard work that has followed in building the Boise, Twin Falls, Minidoka, and other projects in southern Idaho—your own Boise project just now coming into final completion by the construction of Anderson Dam at a cost over $30,000,000 of Federal funds, and how in the early days of the administration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt he agreed to a low power dam at Grand Coulee constructed so that it might be raised at a later date but also supported the Bonneville Dam on the lower Columbia River which was actually constructed first.

In the testimony now being given before the Senate committee, engineers point to the McNary and the Hungry Horse Dams. One of the Senators casually read into the record the names of a dozen projects soon to be built all over this part of your inland empire.

I have tried to visualize what the citizens out here feel. I live in an area where we are struggling for water. Every acre of my farm has to be irrigated, but the narrow valley of the middle Rio Grande, pinched between high mesa lands, can never hope to irrigate much more than 100,000 acres. Where I farm the valley is a couple of miles in width and the supply of water which comes from the headwaters of the Rio Grande in Colorado is uncertain and sometimes rather disappointing.

I have tried to think how you must feel as you see the great Grand Coulee Dam, the Anderson, Arrowrock, Lucky Peak, and American Falls Dams pouring out their power and visualize that when all the dams and reclamation enterprises in 240,000 square miles have been authorized, engineered, and constructed, you will have 12 multiple-purpose dams, 86 major power dams which are now functioning, and hundreds more which will

come into being when all the vast resources of your area are fully utilized.

My State sought recently to acquire a project of the Army Air Corps for the construction of a giant wind tunnel. Many of us thought that geographically we presented an almost perfect location, and many technical advisers to the Air Force agreed, but we lacked water and we lacked power. I wonder what it must feel like to live here in a basin where 2,715,000 kilowatts are now being delivered by existing power plants and where new plants now under construction or authorized will add 3,307,000 kilowatts to that tremendous figure.

It is hard for me, living in a narrow valley, to broaden my horizon and think that in the whole Columbia Basin area when fully developed you will have 5,000,000 acres under irrigation.

You can protest that many of these acres and the great proportion of these dams will be in other States, but I remind you that when the Creator was laying out the Northwest, mapping the paths for its rivers and smoothing the lands for its valleys, He had very little knowledge of later-day geography and a very imperfect idea of where State lines would fall. He built you an inland empire and you people of Idaho are a part of it, a rich and potentially richer part of it as the years roll by. That is why you people are interested in the hearing which our committee has been conducting. You are interested in the discussions of a Columbia Valley authority and the proposals for the complete utilization of the water developed in the great Northwest.

Although you are producing huge quantities of potatoes, sugar beets, seeds, and dairy products, you do not depend on irrigation for all your agriculture. I was reading a short time ago the 1950 Progress edition of the Spokesman-Review, published at Spokane, and in its part 6 I saw a story of the forests of the inland empire. It caught my eye because as Secretary of Agriculture I had flown over a great deal of the forested area in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. I had driven through great stretches of the forests of Idaho, and I know intimately thousands of acres in the forest lands of my own State. Probably the greatest cause of contention during the period that I was a member of the President's Cabinet was my admiration for and continued support of officials in the United States Forest Service. There are few people in the Congress of the United States who have a greater interest in forests or will have for them than I have. That's why I was so pleased by what I read about your forests.

I was happy to read that the period when we stripped the land and passed it by had ended, that lumbering had come of age in this part of the world, and that you had learned the value of timber cropping, both on public and private lands. I read with interest the announcement of a $12,500,000 pulp and paper mill to be built at Lewiston by people who already operate there the largest white-pine lumber mill in the world. You are proud of your white-pine belt. You are pleased, I know, in the great production of Ponderosa pine, for each year your State turns out 350,000,000 board feet of lumber. But you can be equally proud of your determination to handle this crop in such a fashion that there will not be ghost towns where once you have had active lumber camps but that you will harvest this crop on a sustained-yield basis that guarantees the long life and perpetual prosperity of these communities in your State.

As if irrigated farm lands and forests were not enough, Providence has been kind to you in the deposit of minerals within your mountains. We have been struggling in Washington with the problem of assisting the mining industry in this Nation. I don't know what will come of its final working, but we want the Couer d'Alenes to continue to have dozens of successful small mining companies and as many large ones as you can keep going. Senator O'MAHONEY, with his bill, S. 2105, as well as Senator MURRAY and Congressman ENGLE, with their bill, H. R. 976, have been trying to insure the long life of the mining industry in the United States.

Few States have more interest in the perpetuation and gradual development of that industry than has Idaho. Frankly, I don't know what the new smelter at Stibnite, Idaho, is designed to do. I hear it is going to produce antimony metal, and if the demand for that product fails, it can turn to straight gold or silver ores. Antimony sounds so much like the principal product of Nevada that most married men would leave it alone, but if it brings you money we're happy to find you prosperous because of it. Idaho has the largest phosphate reserves in the world. You already have a large fertilizer plant at Pocatello, an extremely important new basic phosphorous plant. I find it easier to understand the production of alumina from the aluminum clays of the inland empire, and I commend your State University for the work it is doing in an effort to guarantee the future of the Northwest in the production of light metals.

Recently there has been an announcement of a new atomic-energy activity in your State at Arco. When there is any announcement of atomic-energy activity it runs into huge sums, and so $20,000,000 will be the starter on your project. We, in New Mexico, have been greatly benefited from the work done in our State and we welcome you into that happy family.

I am reviewing some of these things because I am glad to find Idaho so prosperous under this Democratic administration. I mention that because I hope that all the people of Idaho when they enjoy the prosperity that will come from this great Northwest, as they see their cities grow and their businesses grow, will not turn their backs on the party that has tried to keep this an expanding economy, a progressive and prosperous Nation.

In my private life, I own an insurance business and am president of a small insurance company. On the back page of part 3 of the newspaper to which I referred a moment ago, its issue of January 22, 1950, there is a page ad dealing with an Idaho compensation insurance company. It started in 1939 with premiums of $37,000 and assets of $157,000. In 10 years it has grown to where its premiums exceed $2,000,000 and its assets exceed $2,500,000. If I have time I would like to learn if the officials of that company worry about the financial competence of the Democratic Party. That's the way business grows when the Democrats are in.

I would like to have time to visit individually with the farmers of your State. I would like to ask them how they've been coming out under Democratic administrations. I know what the story is over the country. I have made up a table that doesn't just deal with the total gross income of the American farmer. That is quite a story in itself—how the net income to persons on farms from farming rose from $2,285,000,000 in 1932 to $19,529,000,000 in 1948. I have noticed how the gross farm income went from $6,406,000,000 in 1932 to $35,299,000,000 in 1948.

But there is another yardstick which I insist should be used. Farmers have been wanting parity. They want equality in income with other parts of the population and it isn't enough just to measure how much they have because other costs may have gone up in proportion and their actual relative income be no better and so I have been interested in what they have done. I have had calculated what parity income should have been in every year from the very beginning of the period we use in calculating parity, starting with the year 1910, through and including 1948, and as figures become available, I can shortly carry my calculations through 1949. I find that in the 15 years that the Republicans were in power, namely, 1910 through 1912 and 1921 through 1932, the actual income to persons from farming was $76,619,000,000 whereas if the farmer had had parity it would have been $89,102,000,000. In other words, the net amount by which the farmer failed to attain parity in the years the Republicans were in power was $12,483,000,000.

But what is the Democratic story? In the 24 years since 1910 that the Democratic Party has been in power, namely, 1913 through 1920 and 1933 through 1948, the income has been $208,748,000,000 against an estimated parity which should have been only $160,538,000,000. In other words, under the Democrats, farmers have received $48,000,000,000 more than parity. Thank heaven the Democrats get in power once in a while to make up for the deficits that the farmer sustains when the Republicans are in power.

What is the source of this great drive within a party to bring prosperity to a land and all the people who live upon it? Why is it that the Democratic Party has fought so hard for the rights of the workingman and of the farmer and has incessantly struggled to make sure that the banks and the small businesses all over the Nation thrive and prosper?

I can sketch but briefly a few moments in the history of our party. We need to go back to that period in American life in the early nineteenth century when the United States was just a small group of States clustered along the Atlantic seaboard. We had only a tiny Republic, sneered at by much of the world, expected to collapse like a home built of cards with the first gust of wind. But there was in the White House Thomas Jefferson, a strong advocate of the Constitution, but a President who realized that the Constitution without a Bill of Rights could become a Sword of Damocles hanging over all of our people and threatening their very liberties. He proposed that we should have a government which recognized the right of the people to rule, where there was equality in the courts, where there was a free press, where there was the right of petition for redress of grievances, of religious freedom and all those fundamental rights which are guaranteed by the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. We are greatly indebted to Jefferson for the part he played in securing those rights.

But he expanded not only the spirit but the substance of the Nation. He completed the Louisiana Purchase by which the Nation acquired a huge tract stretching from the Mississippi to the Rockies and the Gulf to Canada. He laid the foundations of the Democratic Party.

After Jefferson we had Andrew Jackson to whom we owe the strengthening of our belief in human equality. With him no man was king and none was servant. He is known to history as the first people's President.

When he came into power he found a strong enemy against him—the Bank of the United States. He took on that enemy in one of the great conflicts that has characterized the Presidency of these United States. The bank fought him with every resource at its command. Jackson fought back with every weapon he could find and the result was that

the people, sensing that he was truly a people's President, swarmed from the farms and the fields and the factories and made their presence known at the polls. It was, I assume, like the outpouring of 1948 which confounded even the greatest of the political experts.

I cast my first vote for Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States. He was and has remained through the years almost an idol to me—that scholarly, gentleman who suffered as President the agony of a people whom he loved but must lead through a world war.

How suddenly political conditions can change. It was Woodrow Wilson who said to us, "The great tides in human affairs do not give notice of their intention to rise and run. They rise in their own power and irresistible might and those who stand in the way are overwhelmed."

Yes, we had been seeing great tides running in human affairs, seeing the tides that swept in Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland. Now we saw it in the victory of Woodrow Wilson where after these elections the progressive tide really began to flow in earnest. Let me list some of the accomplishments of his administration:

The Federal Reserve System was organized.

Labor was specifically and legally declared not a commodity.

Farm loan banks were organized to meet the need of farmers for loans at reasonable rates of interest.

Women were given the vote, Nation-wide.

The income-tax amendment was adopted.

For the first time, Members of the Senate of the United States were elected by popular vote.

Do you know anyone who today would urge repeal of any of these progressive programs? Think for a moment how large these reforms bulk in your lives—you women who vote—you men and women who can elect your Senators—you farmers who can obtain credit—you workers whose rights as human beings are safeguarded—you business and professional people who benefit from a sound banking system. Would you give these up without a fight?

And now we come to another period, an era when the tide of progressivism came in with a roar and literally swept aside all who stood in its way, just as Wilson had said it would.

The first hundred days of that era were among the most dynamic hundred days in American history. I believe historians of the future will agree that in that short period we traveled as with seven-league boots farther along the road of social progress than in all the Republican administrations since the time of Abraham Lincoln.

May I refresh your minds about those days?

Think back with me. It is March 3, 1933. In Wall Street and the Loop of Chicago howling mobs surge around the pillars of closed banks while the police struggle to hold them back.

There is a sickening sensation in everyone's heart as we watch the financial life of the country come to a dead stop.

And then suddenly a day later there is hope again—hope surging through the vitals of this Nation as a great leader—though he was a man who could not even walk unaided—comes to the microphone and tells you and me that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

Never will the Nation forget that day. Never will it forget those first 100 days that followed.

On Sunday, the day after inauguration, the President uses a lingering power from World War I to declare a 4-day bank holiday.

On Monday a conference of governors meets at the White House.

On Thursday Congress convenes, an emergency banking bill passes both Houses, and is signed by the President.

Six days later the economy bill becomes law.

The day after this farm-relief legislation is sent to Congress.

In the next 3 months—what a stream of legislation. Sound banking act, agricultural adjustment, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Home Owners Loan Act, the Federal deposit insurance program, the Securities Act, the Wagner Employment Exchange Act—all rolled into 100 days of the most rapid legislative progress the country has ever known, 100 days in which the progressive spirit of a people rises triumphant over their fear or despair.

You have heard Republicans curse the New Deal. Well, in the Eightieth Congress they had control of both Senate and House of Representatives. Did they repeal any of the acts I have mentioned? They didn't dare. I'm not going to compete with President Truman in the job he does of lambasting the "do nothing" Eightieth Congress. He'll be at it again this fall and the people of the country will welcome him at every whistle stop. So I'll leave the record of the Eightieth Congress to him.

I hope you all heard the President in his Jefferson-Jackson Day address. He was in rare form and the great crowd roared its approval. To those of us in that immense throng, watching him and listening to his every word, it was apparent that he enjoyed picking up the old statements from the Republicans in 1933, 1934, 1936, 1940, 1944, and even in the last campaign because he could thereby remind the people of this Nation that the Republicans have tried to scare us again and again. He reminded us that their 1936 platform cried out, "America is in peril," that the New Deal has bred fear in commerce and industry, thus discouraging new enterprises. President Truman could bat that down because he knew that, instead of discouraging new enterprises, the Democratic administration had lifted us up until our national output was over $250,000,000,000 a year and until our people were enjoying the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

All over this land there are Republicans who hope that the Democrats will adopt a more cautious approach. They plead with us to join with them in some sort of bipartisan move to avoid what they think is a drive toward socialism.

The Republicans have been viewing with alarm in five straight Presidential elections and they have lost every one of them. Surely they do not expect the Democrats now to adopt the route that they have found so ruinous.

All over this land people rose up in the last days of the last campaign and turned to the support of President Truman because you still can't beat something with nothing. If the Republicans believe that the people of this country want housing, and social security, and reclamation in the West, and things for which President Truman has been contending, then they'd better tell the people of this country that they do, that they, too, have a program and that their program will give America its abundance, its comforts, its opportunities, for poor and rich alike in greater measure than the Truman program.

If, on the other hand, they believe that the people of this country are more concerned about potential threats to our economy and just where every dollar is coming from and just how high a tax burden can get before it becomes oppressive, and, therefore, if they believe that all of the good things in the Truman program must be set aside for a more propitious moment, then let them take a position of flat-footed opposition and carry that issue honestly to the people.

I say to you that there is not much hope for a Republican Party that is divided, one which stands in a sort of twilight zone, unable to determine whether it wants to face the dawn or the dusk. As a great newspaper said recently, the Republican Party "can offer something better than the President offers or it can meet him in head-on opposition. But as long as it hovers in between, Mr. Truman will continue to hold the political aces."

And so, my fellow Democrats, I bring you glad tidings from the battlefield. We Democrats in Washington are neither in doubt or in dismay. We know where we are going. We are fighting for a program which Harry Truman carried to the people of this country and which we, in our respective States, proclaimed from a hundred platforms prior to the 1948 elections. That program measures up to the great traditions of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, and we will not fail while we fight for it.

Address of Hon. George D. Aiken, of Vermont, Before Eastern States Farmers' Exchange Annual Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, during the past few days, debate in the Senate has shown what a complete contradictory and fallacious set of policies the Democratic administration has been following in its farm program. Certainly, the staggering surpluses in potatoes, eggs, and butter are a clear indication that the vote-getting, rigid parity scheme is well on its way toward ruining the Nation's farm economy.

The administration now contends it has an answer. I refer to the so-called Brannan plan, which has been put forth as an ultimate panacea of Government planning and control.

Mr. President, I am equally opposed to the rigid set of high 90 percent parities which prevail in the country today and to the political promises implicit in the Brannan plan. On the affirmative side, I have always favored a reasonable and moderate flexible program of price supports, which has an intelligent relation to the law of supply and demand and yet protects the American farmer against depression prices.

My good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], was the author of a flexible price support farm program in the Eightieth Congress. Unfortunately, the 1948 election intervened and this flexible program was supplanted by the law of 1949, which continued rigid high supports.

On February 28, the Senator from Vermont made as fine a speech on the general subject of American agriculture as I have ever seen. In speaking to the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange in Springfield, Mass., he said, among other things:

What rouses me and what rouses others is the promises of the Administration, which never could keep those promises, to pay farmers a satisfactory income in return for the surrender to the Government of the right to run their own farms and to improve their condition under their own initiative.

In other words, farmers are to stop thinking for themselves, stop planning their own farm work, stop raising above a certain amount per farm and in return they get what—a promise of 100 percent "income support standard," which is one way of saying parity in three words.

He further summarized the economic fallacies of the Brannan plan by saying:

But there you have the three main points of the Brannan plan—first, promises of a satisfactory income to farmers which can never be fulfilled; second, limitation of production per farm, taking away production from the efficient farmer and giving more to the submarginal or uneconomic producer; and third, compliance with soil conservation practices as approved by the Secretary.

Those are the main points of the Brannan plan which are never mentioned by administration spokesmen today.

Then he went on with his own affirmative program of moderate and flexible price supports, which would take into consideration the supply of a commodity which is being supported. On this side of the ledger, he spoke in part as follows:

We should put the support level for various commodities on an equitable basis which we cannot do so long as grain is supported at 90 percent of parity and poultry and dairy products at 75 percent, thus throwing our agricultural economy out of balance.

This should be done in the interest of the grain producers themselves, inasmuch as the greatest opportunity they have to broaden their own market is by marketing grain in the form of animal products.

Support levels should be high enough to protect the farmer and the country against economic collapse, but not so high as to destroy either the market for farm commodities or the initiative of the farmer himself in seeking new markets and new uses. Our first aim should be good prices on a free market, cushioned by Government supports only when needed.

I point out that this latter point raised by Senator AIKEN is of vital concern to New England poultry and dairy men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech of the Senator from Vermont which he delivered at Springfield, Mass., on February 28. I further point out that the flexible price support program which he advocates, and of which I am a sincere supporter, is strongly endorsed by the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a welcome relief to get away from Washington, where it seems as if everybody is trying to do something for or to the farmer, and meet with you members of the Eastern States Farmers' Exchange who still believe in the ability of the farmer to do something for himself and run his own business.

If I really thought that the American farmer is the destitute and decrepit being that some of his self-appointed spokesmen make him out to be, or if I thought that he is the greedy ogre depicted by the metropolitan press, then I would abandon all hope for the future of American agriculture.

It so happens that I know from first-hand experience that the farmer is not a slender reed leaning on the arm of the professional politician for support, nor does he desire to exact the last ounce of blood from the consumer upon whom he knows full well he depends for his income.

Farmers built our Nation. They defended it in several wars. They have sent their sons and daughters to our cities to develop the greatest economic and industrial era the world has ever known.

They have not descended from this proud position to one of dependency and subservience overnight.

For the most part, their spirit is unchanged—yet day after day all over this country the public is being conditioned, through the most elaborate propaganda system we have ever seen, to believe that the farmer should now become a ward of the Government.

Why has this all come about? Why is the American taxpayer being mulcted for an elaborate and extravagant propaganda program of this nature?

I will tell you why right now. I don't like to talk rough—but time is running out. I have done all I can to help the administration give good government but my patience has played out. We have this propaganda program because we have in Government today men who are so determined to retain and expand their powers over the United States that they would humble what George Washington called the noblest profession on earth in order to realize their ambitions.

If they control the food supply of the Nation they know full well that they will gain control over all segments of our economy.

I have confidence in the greatness of my country, but I would not minimize any danger to it from within or without.

I know that our Nation will not meet the crisis which confronts it now—an emergency greater than it was only a few years ago—as it has met crisis after crisis since it was founded.

The thing that challenges us now is nothing new.

Since history began, ambitious men have sought to control nations and people and the pattern which has been used all through the centuries is the same.

They seek to gain control through promises and then to maintain it by force if necessary.

If I were not so everlastingly proud of the record which American farmers have made I might be more apathetic to what is going on today, but having been a farmer all my life, I do not intend that we shall now lose our independence or the pride that goes with being the greatest agricultural nation in the world, without a last-ditch stand.

Let us now consider in more detail just what these things are that have aroused so many American farmers to a fighting pitch.

It is not the proposal to maintain a farm-price-support program. It certainly is not the work of the extension service, soil-improvement agencies, or any endeavor on the part of government now, or in the past, to make farming an even more secure and profitable occupation.

What rouses me and what rouses others is the promises of the administration, which never could keep those promises, to pay farmers a satisfactory income in return for the surrender to the Government of the right to run their own farms and to improve their condition under their own initiative.

In other words, farmers are to stop thinking for themselves, stop planning their own farm work, stop raising above a certain amount per farm, and in return they get what—a promise of 100-percent income-support standard, which is one way of saying parity in three words.

What would a deal like that mean to our farmers?

Last year the average per capita farm income in America was something less than $800, while the average price received for farm commodities was a little over 100 percent of parity.

Are the farmers of America going to be fooled by a promise of an $800 annual income?

It is claimed that such a program will benefit the small farmer, the so-called family farm.

I maintain that the promise of an $800-a-year average income is not going to incite a great deal of enthusiasm when the farmers find out what it means.

A 100-percent support guaranty definitely will not assure farm prosperity, and definitely will result in lower farm incomes in the long run.

But, the administration says, "We will limit the production of the big farmers so that the small farmers can produce more."

"We will restrict production to a base of $20,000 a year per farm and adjust that figure from year to year according to the purchasing value of the farmer's dollar."

Well, that amounts to about $25,000 at the present time.

So let's go on the premise that production per farm will be restricted to a maximum of $25,000.

Where does that leave the New England dairyman who spends half his income for grain and other supplies? He gets support, not on $2,000, but only on that part produced by his own effort.

Where does it leave our orchardists and our potato growers who have to have such a huge investment in facilities and equipment before they can consider any production at all and, lastly, but not least, where does it leave our consumers?

Certainly breaking up the large farms, and I admit that many of them are too large today, could only result in higher production costs and definitely higher prices to the consuming public.

The fact is that out of 6,000,000 families living on farms today only about half of them are commercial producers and even their numbers are being reduced.

The efficient use of machinery and equipment has resulted in fewer but larger sized farms.

Most of them cannot be broken up into smaller units and operated as efficiently as they are today.

They could be taken over by Government, operated by Government, worked on by men compelled to work by Government and perhaps be handled efficiently.

I don't think the people of America want their farms run that way.

Right now there are complaints that the high cost of the potato-support program is due to the fact that farmers raised so many potatoes to the acre. There is no question but what the increased yield per acre added to the cost of a poorly handled potato program.

Potatoes were not alone in this respect, however.

Last year the peanut acreage was cut and the peanut growers increased their yield per acre approximately 6 percent in a single year.

Tobacco growers have increased their yield as enforcement of quota laws reduced their acreage.

I see no crime in a farmer raising the best crop possible on his land, or getting the highest possible milk production from his cows. If we accept the proposal of those who would redistribute the right to produce and limit the amount which can be produced by a single farmer, however, we will destroy that initiative which enabled the American farmer to increase his production 35 percent during the war years in spite of shortages of labor, new machinery, and other supplies.

When any nation succeeds in stifling the initiative of its people, it cannot long endure.

The next proposal of the administration is that each farmer shall be required to comply with minimum and sound soil conservation practices—not as prescribed by his State department of agriculture; not as prescribed by the soil conservation services; not as prescribed by his State PMA, but as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

That means concentration of power over American farms in the hands of one man who can tell farmers where to plant, when to plant, how much to plant, and what part of their income must be spent on improving their farms.

My guess is that there isn't a farmer in this meeting but what knows better how to run his own farm than the Secretary of Agriculture does.

But there you have the three main points of the Brannan plan—first, promises of a satisfactory income to farmers which can never be fulfilled; second, limitation of production per farm, taking away production from the efficient farmer and giving more to the submarginal or uneconomic producer; and third, compliance with soil conservation practices as approved by the Secretary.

These are the main points of the Brannan plan which are never mentioned by administration spokesmen today.

All they talk about is the great benefits resulting to the consumer and the high prices which will be received by the farmers if they can only get a law permitting compensatory payments on the statutes.

In the mildest language which I can think of right now, I term this proposal the acme of political hypocrisy.

The terrible Eightieth Republican Congress, after 7 months of intensive study, enacted a long-range agricultural law which, if it had been permitted to take effect unamended, would have kept American agriculture out of the complete mess it is in today.

One provision of that law gave the Department of Agriculture the right to make compensatory payments in a price-support program.

This meant that in the case of certain commodities the crop could be permitted to find its own level in the market, and the farmer then reimbursed for the difference between the average selling price and the support level.

If this provision of the law were used wisely, it is possible that at times both farmer and consumer could benefit. I emphasize "if it were used wisely."

A year ago, however, we saw indications that the Secretary of Agriculture might use this provision of the law to promote a general consumer-subsidy program, costing billions of dollars annually, and charge the cost of that subsidy up to the farmers.

As an example, it is estimated by the best agricultural economists that if the Brannan plan were in effect now, the cost of the potato program would not be a possible $80,000,000 but somewhere between $250,000,000 and $400,000,000 with only a minimum of compensatory benefits to the consumer. However, we don't have that provision for compensatory payments in the law now.

The Eighty-first Congress enacted a new agricultural law and one of its provisions was the repeal of that part of the 1948 law which permitted compensatory payments.

The Secretary of Agriculture never at any time protested the repeal of this provision.

The President never protested its repeal, and on October 31, 1949, the President signed the bill which repealed the compensatory payments provision which otherwise would have taken effect on January 1, 1950.

On January 4, 1950, President Truman came before the joint session of Congress and pleaded for the compensatory payment plan which was repealed by his signature October 31 as if the life of the Nation depended on it.

Are the farmers of America pinning their faith on this type of political operating or are they going to pin some faith on themselves and those people in our State and Federal departments of agriculture and the farm organizations that have done everything that has been done during the past century to put American agriculture in such an enviable position?

I mention farm organizations particularly because at the time the 1948 law was enacted it was supported not only by the United States Department of Agriculture, but by every major farm organization in the United States. Even the Farmers Union, which has since changed its position, at that time vigorously endorsed the flexible support provisions and the revised parity formula of the so-called Aiken bill.

What is the situation today? Any farm leader, and particularly the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, are subject to attack by the propaganda service of the United States Government if they dare to venture an opinion contrary to that voiced by the administration.

Of all major farm organizations, only the Farmers Union supports the administration farm plan today. The others are constantly under attack through a most extensive and expensive propaganda program.

I say expensive—expensive to the taxpayers of this country because much of the material used is furnished and distributed through Department of Agriculture channels.

Every time material is sent to the 95,000 PMA directors scattered over this Nation, it is sent at public expense.

Ninety-eight percent of the material sent to these directors is factually correct, but running through it is a vein of innuendo and promotion which is either incorrect or misleading.

Fortunately throughout New England and a good share of the country our local committeemen are able to see through this.

I hope the time will come when the United States Department of Agriculture can again devote its entire services to the purpose for which it was created.

Having now expressed my opinion of the manner in which the administration and the Secretary of Agriculture are operating, I want to make some suggestions myself as to what should constitute a well-rounded program for agriculture.

There is no easy way out of our difficulties now.

We are already in some trouble and will be in worse trouble within a year or two unless steps are taken to correct existing conditions.

The continuation of the high wartime incentive prices for the crop year 1949 has resulted in the accumulation of unwanted surpluses which are depressing the market for some commodities. An example of this is eggs.

When the 90-percent support for eggs was continued through 1949, it was the signal for an increase in laying flocks all over this country, particularly through the Midwest.

Production ran far ahead of demand.

Government invested some $75,000,000 last year in supporting the price of unwanted eggs. The weight of the surplus production eventually broke the market resulting in heavy losses to thousands of poultry producers who were unable to get even the support price.

Fortunately, some of the men in the Department of Agriculture have had the foresight to reduce the support price for eggs this year to 75 percent of parity as permitted by the provisions of the 1948 law which were continued in the Anderson Act of 1949.

The egg market will probably right itself in a few months, but, in the meantime, many people are going to be hurt.

We should profit from this experience with eggs and put into effect promptly a flexible support-price program which will take into consideration the supply of the commodity which is being supported.

We should put the support level for various commodities on an equitable basis which we cannot do so long as grain is supported at 90 percent of parity and poultry and dairy products at 75 percent, thus throwing our agricultural economy out of balance.

This should be done in the interest of the grain producers themselves, inasmuch as the greatest opportunity they have to broaden their own market is by marketing grain in the form of animal products.

Support levels should be high enough to protect the farmer and the country against economic collapse, but not so high as to destroy either the market for farm commodities or the initiative of the farmer himself in seeking new markets and new uses. Our first aim should be good prices on a free market, cushioned by Government supports only when needed.

We should continue to emphasize our research work in production and marketing methods with a view to increasing efficiency and decreasing costs in both these fields.

Improvement of our soil resources which has made such remarkable progress during recent years should be continued mainly under the direction of the local soil conservation districts and local and State farmer committees.

Public participation in soil conservation programs is a good investment and entirely proper.

The welfare of all people and the security of the Nation depends upon maintenance and improvement of our soil resources.

The public participated in despoiling these resources. A moderate participation in their restoration is only fair.

I said at the beginning of this talk that the farmer realizes that he is dependent upon the American consumer for his income.

Unless the consumer has the means to purchase food and clothing, however, he cannot contribute to farm prosperity.

Therefore, let us always remember that full employment with adequate income for city people is a proper farm objective.

There are, however, many million people, possibly as many as 40,000,000, in this country who do not and cannot have an income adequate to enable them to buy the kind of food they need.

For many years I have urged a complete study of this field with a view to enacting legislation which will make it possible for our low-income people to have enough to eat.

Call it a consumer subsidy if you like, but if the result is a higher standard of living for all people and the elimination of the farm surplus problem, it will be a subsidy well spent and result in a stronger nation.

I would handle this subject more carefully, even experimentally at first, broadening it as experience proves such broadening to be advisable.

Next, we should pay more attention to the development of foreign markets for our agricultural commodities.

There is a wide opportunity in this field.

We must not approach this matter of international trade in the light of how much we can give away, but with the purpose of developing a permanent trade with every nation in the world which produces commodities that we can use in exchange.

International trade is at low ebb now and will continue to be so long as it functions on a give-away basis.

World trade between nations must be restored and failure to do so will inevitably result in war.

Finally, if our farmers are to successfully fight off economic monopolies on the one hand and political domination on the other, they must keep themselves strong—strong, not only as individuals, but strong as organizations representing the best interests of agriculture.

Our farm cooperatives must be protected and strengthened at all costs.

They stand between us and Government controls.

They stand between us and economic and business monopoly.

They stand for the right of the farmer to enjoy a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by other groups.

Farm cooperatives are under continual attack by short-sighted business and industrial interests.

These attacks must and will be beaten back but not if we relax our guard.

Would-be monopolists don't want to just double tax cooperatives. They want to kill them.

The Eastern States Farmers' Exchange is a living and shining example of what farmers can do for themselves.

It is up to us to defend this example and show the world that self-reliance and cooperation can do for agriculture what Government controls and dependency can never hope to do.

The Crusade Against Gambling in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of combating the influence of interstate gambling and racketeering in our country. This statement has particular reference to the notorious racketeer, Frank Costello. In it, I urge the Department of Justice to report promptly on a request which has been made for a review of Costello's status as a citizen, in view of certain charges the truth of which he has admitted.

In the event that Costello's citizenship is revoked, I personally will urge that he be deported as a harmful influence in this country which gave him the privilege of citizenship, which he apparently proceeded to abuse.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, REQUESTS DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO REPORT PROMPTLY ON PROPOSED REVOCATION OF CITIZENSHIP OF GAMBLER FRANK COSTELLO; URGES PROMPT APPROVAL OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION RESOLUTION

Mr. President, every citizen of the United States is aware that gambling and racketeering existing throughout our country is making a mockery of Federal and State laws. On the tax angle, alone, we are all aware that literally billions of dollars in taxes are lost every year because there is illicit income from gambling, racketeering, and related activities which is never reported to the States and to Uncle Sam.

TAX EVASION

Last year, a report was submitted to the Federation of Tax Administrators in Chicago, which showed that, according to Business Week magazine, in an article of May 14, 1949:

"Commercial gambling is the only billion-dollar business in the United States that does not take a licking from the tax collector. Except for legalized parimutuel betting at race tracks, only a small part of the shill game's annual take (estimated as high as $15,000,000,000 last year) ever winds up in Government treasuries. Gambling has generally stayed immune to the rash of post-war excise taxes, in spite of its obvious luxury label and features that make it easy prey for the tax man."

GAMBLING INVESTIGATION ESSENTIAL

My colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee have clearly recognized the necessity for a thorough investigation of the interstate implications of crime, racketeering and gambling, and have taken prompt action on the legislation introduced by our able associate, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I earnestly trust, therefore that Senate Resolution 202 will be promptly enacted by the Senate. May I point out a quotation from an article in Collier's magazine of April 19, 1947:

"It is likely that only a full-scale congressional investigation could trace the ramifications of America's underworld empire and its relations with politicians and elected officials, or arrive at a correct estimate of the enormous sums of money involved."

THE ALLEGED KINGPIN OF RACKETEERING

Literally dozens of newspaper and magazine articles and radio statements have been read and heard by all of us to the effect that the kingpin or at least one of the kingpins of a multi-billion-dollar gambling syndicate in America is apparently Frank Costello. This notorious individual who has been publicly denounced as a racketeer and with practically every adverse adjective and noun in the books (and who has apparently not dared to file suit against anyone making such charges) is a citizen of the United States by virtue of a privilege granted to him as a former alien.

However, we have evidence by Costello's own words that for the 5-year period prior to his being granted citizenship, he was engaged in activities which by all normal standards would have rendered him unfit for citizenship rights.

Now, this whole citizenship question is being raised by Mr. Robert Montgomery in a formal request for review that he has raised with the United States Department of Justice and with an affidavit for investigation served upon the Federal district attorney for the southern district of New York. I congratulate Mr. Montgomery for his activities in bringing this whole question again before the American people. His request to the United States attorney is incidentally, I believe, the first such initiation of legal activities for revocation of Costello's citizenship.

I personally will insist that the Department of Justice respond quickly on this matter because the facts are comparatively well known and were brought to light many years ago. The only thing that is not well known is why the Justice Department has been so shy and quiet on this whole situation for so long. It is only natural that many citizens suspect political influences of Tammany Hall at work on behalf of Costello.

PREVIOUS CHARACTERIZATIONS OF COSTELLO

Let me cite the words of Mayor de Lesseps Morrison, of New Orleans, president of the American Municipal Association (which represents the governments of 9,500 cities and towns in the United States). He stated that at the head of the multi-billion-dollar crime syndicate is Frank Costello, "one of the most pernicious and dangerous influences in America today and probably one of the 10 most powerful men in the country."

According to News Week magazine of the November 21, 1949, issue, the late Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, is said to have called Frank Costello the world's biggest and most corrupt gambler.

Thomas E. Dewey says "He is a gangster."

Virgil W. Peterson, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission, has described him as "the lord of the underworld of the entire United States."

News Week went on to say that the California commission on organized crime reported to Gov. Earl Warren that Costello was the present head of the great underworld organization with headquarters in New York which is called by its own members "the combination." The so-called "Murder, Inc.," the commission said, is the enforcement branch of this organization.

WHERE THERE IS SMOKE THERE IS FIRE

Mr. President, we are familiar with the old expression, "where there is smoke there must be fire." It is no mere accident that for many years now, newspaper columnists, editorial writers, magazine writers, and other folks have thus written up Frank Costello, calling him such names as "prime minister of the underworld," and so on. Costello's only answer has been to proclaim piously that he is being persecuted and is merely an honest, upstanding businessman.

I should like to point out, however, Mr. President, that Frank Costello, within a period of 3 months, was charged with influencing politics in New York, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and New Orleans. Official crime commissions have speculated about his connections with gambling houses, night clubs, race wires, narcotics smuggling, jewelry theft, and other assorted crimes. Undoubtedly there is some exaggeration in this guesswork.

In spite of all these charges, in spite of all the magazine write-ups, Costello has thus far had but a single accusation stick against him, and that is the charge of illegal possession of a pistol 'way back in 1915.

The various magazine articles to which I have referred have pointed out the fact that rackets in America today are a big business, and that the old-time trigger-happy hoodlums had largely become a thing of the past, giving way to supersharpsters developing immense cartels of interrelated rackets. Shall America's youngsters grow up with awe and admiration of these crooked big shots who escape the law?

MR. MONTGOMERY'S DOCUMENTATION

I have in my hand several of the scripts which Robert Montgomery has broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co. network in the last 3 months on Frank Costello. Mr.

Montgomery cited chapter and verse of Costello's testimony in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, appellate division, first department, on October 25, 1943. At that time Costello admitted that between 1919 and 1932 he made no tax payments to the Federal Government or the State government, and that during those years he was engaged in the bootlegging business. Yet Costello was granted citizenship on September 10, 1925, and in order to obtain such citizenship, he had to state under oath and by signature that he was attached to the principles of the Constitution. The Naturalization Code of the United States states explicitly that those persons applying for citizenship must be of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States. How could Costello, who petitioned for citizenship on May 11, 1925, and who later admitted smuggling whisky during that entire period, be of good moral character, attached to the principles of our Constitution, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of our country?

These are questions which must be answered, and the person to answer them is primarily our former colleague, the able Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath.

WE RECOGNIZE CITIZENSHIP AS PRICELESS PRIVILEGE

Mr. President, citizenship is a priceless privilege both to our native born and to those who were formally citizens of other countries and who now receive its blessings. If the United States Government law enforcement authorities lightly allow any single individual who does not deserve the privilege of citizenship to continue to enjoy that privilege—such action or inaction makes American law a travesty.

I have no doubt that high-priced lawyers retained by Mr. Costello will fight any action which civic-minded citizens take against this racketeer. However, we in the Congress appropriate enough millions of dollars to the Department of Justice to get expert legal services, and there is no reason for dilly-dallying on this issue.

IF COSTELLO'S CITIZENSHIP IS REVOKED, I WILL SEEK DEPORTATION OF HIM

If Costello's citizenship is revoked—and that naturally could only happen after due process of law in a true American fashion—then I, for one, will insist that he be promptly deported in order that every American will note that the people of the United States are on guard to protect the morality of our citizens, particularly our young people. The proposed deportation of Frank Costello would not, of course, of itself solve or begin to solve the crime and gambling problem; however, it would make unmistakably clear to every hoodlum, every mobster, as well as to millionaire crooks living in their penthouses and sitting smugly behind the barrier of legal experts—it would make unmistakably clear to them that crime does not pay.

Mr. President, the crusade against crime must be a continuous affair. When one hoodlum is disposed of, others try to take his place. The answer to the underworld must come, as I have previously indicated in the Senate on February 20, from an aroused citizenry cooperating with local, State, and Federal enforcement officers, with our great FBI, and with all those who believe in decency and honesty in human affairs.

CONCLUSION

Too many big shots are living in the lap of luxury, because they have plucked pennies from the poor, nabbed nickels with the numbers racket, slot machines, etc.—pennies and nickels that should have gone for food, shelter, clothing, care of youngsters. We must eradicate this cancer of crime. We must put the thugs in the jug.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Senior Class of Confluence High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered before the senior class of the Confluence High School, Confluence, Pa., on Monday afternoon, February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure to address a high-school class. I consider it a real honor to be invited to visit with you and to discuss briefly the part you can plan in shaping the future of your community, your State and the Nation.

First let me tell you that I appreciate so much the interest you are taking in the American system of government and how it operates.

It is an important part of good citizenship to have an understanding of the three levels of government—local, State, and Federal.

Your interest is most encouraging because the kind of country we are to have in the years ahead will depend upon the kind of citizenship that is developed among the boys and girls now in high school.

Therefore I want to discuss with you the importance of the work you will soon be called upon to undertake in your communities and in your Government.

It will not be long before you young men and young women will be in the driver's seat. You will control and operate the farms, the factories, the mills, the mines and all the business establishments.

You will have the responsibility for our churches, our schools, and our Government.

That's a big job. It will be your job.

To handle it successfully will take honest, courageous and vigorous leadership. It will take intelligent cooperation and willingness to work for the common good.

It will take sincere appreciation of the American way of life and the American plan of freedom of the individual.

Above all it will take loyalty and devotion to the principles of American patriotism, placing love of country above selfish interest or personal advantage.

The Government of the United States was founded upon the proposition that freedom of the individual is the greatest blessing bestowed by God upon mankind.

The founding fathers found inspiration in the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount. Since the world began there has never been a better guide to human conduct.

Patriotism, religion, and high moral standards are fundamental qualities without which no nation can go forward. Regardless of its form of government, regardless of the laws placed upon its books, no nation can rise above the moral and spiritual standards of its people.

In the growth and development of our country there have been many changes. But the principles upon which it was founded are fixed and unchanging. They must live forever in the hearts and minds of our people.

The real meaning of America must be taught in every classroom from the one-room country school to the greatest university.

We must tell over and over again the story of America's rise to greatness unparalleled among the nations of the earth.

Other nations had greater land area, greater population, and even richer natural resources.

What quality does America possess that enabled our country, in the short span of less than 200 years, to create more wealth, greater spiritual and cultural progress, and a higher standard of living than the world has ever known?

It is the God-given freedom of the individual. It is the right of every citizen to carve out his own destiny to work, to save, to invest, to prosper, according to his own ability, energy, and initiative.

Freedom is our most precious possession. It holds out a golden promise of opportunity for every boy and girl in America to reach a high place in business, in industry, the learned professions, the church, and in Government.

No matter what calling you may choose, I hope that everyone of you will adopt as one of your real objectives the preservation of the God-given rights that have come down to us through generations of toil, blood, and sacrifice.

In my political career and in my public life, covering more than 40 years, I have been guided by certain principles in reaching decisions on questions involving the welfare of our country.

I have always sought the answers to four questions:

First. Is it right? Nothing can be politically right if it is morally wrong.

Second. Will it work? Sometimes proposals that seem very attractive turn out to be impractical and unworkable.

Third. Is it for the good of all the people? Too often projects are advanced for selfish reasons that would benefit only a special section or group to the disadvantage of the country as a whole.

Fourth. Can we afford it? All government is paid for by taxes taken from the earnings of the people. There is grave danger in government grown too big or too expensive.

If these four questions can be answered in the affirmative with respect to legislation, I will support it. Otherwise, I will fight against the proposal.

As a United States Senator representing Pennsylvania, I have a duty to all the people of our Commonwealth. But also, I am entrusted with a part in legislating for the whole United States. I proceed on the theory that what is good for the whole country is good for Pennsylvania.

In closing, I would like to make some suggestions for your guidance growing out of my long and varied experience as a soldier and as a public official.

1. Cherish within your own heart and mind loyal and devout adherence to American ideals and principles. These ideals and principles should be your constant goal.

2. Respect and support your church. A republic cannot live without the spiritual strength of the church. There should be tolerance in religion—but everyone should strongly support his church.

3. We should all support and respect the law. If everyone would obey our laws, what a wonderful country we would have.

4. In order to become better citizens and to make better communities you should assist in public-spirited movements.

5. Let us all take an active interest in the government of our local communities, our counties, our State, and the Nation. A free republic cannot exist where there is indifference and neglect by the electorate.

6. Let us keep uppermost in our minds that America has no more precious assets than

freedom and opportunity. So long as these blessings are preserved and maintained, the youth of our land will go forward to new heights of achievement for America and the world.

7. Let us all practice the fundamentals of good citizenship, work, thrift, self-reliance, fair play, tolerance, respect for the rights of others, and the love of God.

Remember always it is your country and your government. It will be what you make it.

The share you take in community betterment, the interest you take in local, State, and national affairs, is the measure of your citizenship.

To help build a better America of the future you must always be ready to face the problems of the day, confident and unafraid, sustained by faith in American freedom and faith in God.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire, Before Women's Republican Club, Claremont, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix an address I made in commemoration of Lincoln's Birthday, at Claremont, N. H., on Monday, February 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For many years it has been the custom for Republican groups all over the Nation to gather together in observance of the anniversary of the birth of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, our first Republican President and our greatest. The purpose of these gatherings is not only to do honor to Lincoln's memory but, even more fundamental, to consider on his life and his example. It is well, therefore, for us tonight to apply introspection, to see whether our party policies today are consistent with his precepts, and then to appraise our position for the voters of our country in a heart-searching effort to determine whether we are worthy and well qualified.

So, all over the country during this week our party members are gathering together to observe the anniversary of the birth of him whom many regard as the strongest character the Nation has produced, Abraham Lincoln. The very name has become a symbol for justice and humanity.

No writer of fiction, however able, could produce a figure of more humble origin, of more remarkable growth, whose influence on his generation and those yet unborn, would be more profound, or whose death could be more tragic than that of Lincoln.

What were the attributes of this man that have so endeared him to every American born since his passing?

His great size, his ungainliness, his rugged simplicity, these were obvious, but deeper than such external charasteristics was the great heart that actuated him in his passion for justice, his devotion to principle, his love for his fellow men, and his profound faith in the common people.

Many of you have visited the impressive memorial to him in Washington. To me, it is always an inspiration to look upon that heroic figure and read again the quotations from his words which are carved on the walls. As I have stood there I have looked upon the faces of those who, like myself, came to pay their tribute to him. People of all types, especially plain people, those whom some refer to as the common men, many of foreign birth, but each holding Lincoln's memory in loving regard.

Today his name is revered and loved even to the uttermost parts of the world, and so long as this Nation of ours shall endure his life will be our inspiration and his name will be written on our hearts. In his love for humanity, his forebearance, his charity he followed the teachings of the Master of Men.

Of his passing, Lowell said, "Multitudes shed tears for the death of one they had never seen, as if a friendly presence had been taken from their lives. Our common manhood had lost a kinsman."

While we cannot bring him back to again lead our Nation in these days of great national crises, yet he can and will live again, if you and I and our fellow men reflect in our lives his great attributes of common sense, rugged honesty, his passion for humanity and his faith in the divine power.

We turn then to you tonight, Mr. Lincoln, for we are troubled on many sides. No generation of men ever had more complex problems to solve. In the years you led the Nation you, too, had to meet grave problems. You met these courageously, without compromise, often standing alone.

So talk with us tonight, Mr. Lincoln, on principles and problems which you faced in your days and which confront our Nation in these our days.

Since you were President, Mr. Lincoln, labor has made great progress in improving its working conditions, in wages and in a recognition of labor's dignity and worth. You expressed yourself on labor several times. How did you feel in this important matter?

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration.

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy subject of any good government."

Mr. Lincoln, those views of yours square with those of many men today, and our party has done much for labor's advancement and progress since you were here.

No problem we face today is more pregnant with possibilities for good or ill than the foreign problem. It constitutes a crisis of first magnitude. Certain aspects of it justify fears of the extinction of our human society, if not wisely met. Can you help our thought in this, Mr. Lincoln?

"In our intercourse with other nations, it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why, then, let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long and threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best."

That is sound advice today, Mr. Lincoln, and in recent years we have joined with other nations in setting up an organization called the United Nations. It is a league of sovereign states, not a world government, and, therefore, cannot by law prevent armed conflict between nations and establish justice and security. Nevertheless, it is the greatest step yet taken by mankind toward world peace. Since the charter provides for amendments, every effort should be made to transform the United Nations into an organization with larger powers.

Science has given to the world some instruments of terror and destruction that in your day the world never dreamed of. We have used one of these, namely, the atom bomb, with terrible deadly effects on civilian people, and now this atom bomb has been superseded by a so-called hydrogen bomb, many times more powerful than the most powerful atom bomb. We are told that it could annihilate a large part of any country by explosion, and used in quantities could annihilate civilization.

We have decided to produce this dreadful weapon for self-defense.

In the aftermath of this tremendous decision, we have to think anew and act anew, as you said so truly years ago.

This United Nations, which we had a large part in bringing into being as presently constituted, is too weak to cope with the great crisis and many believe the Charter must be amended to implement the United Nations in a larger degree.

It is a trite thing to say that civilization is at the crossroads. The fate of the world is at a crossroads unprecedented in human history because the mind of man has produced weapons which stagger the imagination and could wipe out great portions of the human race, almost instantly. As the New York Times said, "The atomic bomb is here to stay." The question is, "Are we?"

Today we often hear the term "welfare state" referred to. Some men quote the constitutional phrase, "To provide for the general welfare," in attempting to justify the Government's taking over more and more of the care and sustenance of the people.

Here is an observation from Lincoln's life, which is told by a recent writer in the following words:

"The teaching of Lincoln's life which this generation needs most to take to heart is that a sheltered, easy life is not an unmixed blessing; that toil and privation are better masters than luxury and ease; that life is a drama not staged merely for our pleasure but in which we are cast for parts we must play ill or well. The doctrine seems to be very generally preached and accepted today that labor, sacrifice, and self-denial are evils to be shunned as pestilential rather than necessary means of developing capacity and character. For one to gain a livelihood or a fortune without working to pay for it more than is absolutely necessary is a desire increasingly prevalent among rich and poor. The things which made Lincoln great—toiling until it hurts, dependence for mental and spiritual growth upon self, amid commonplace surroundings and associations—these are in little favor in an age craving to be amused, to be excited, to be supported, even by the state or by society.

"The unused hand withers. The unused brain ceases to function. The unused heart hardens. Where there are no calls for courage, for sacrifice, for stoicism, the nobler qualities of human kind—these do not come forth. The chief thought even of those sincerely seeking a better social order today seems to be that of putting props under people. Altruism is good, humanitarianism is good, charity is good; but a state which becomes the universal provider, policeman, and employer necessarily becomes also the breeding ground of weaklings and of slaves. Individualism produces the sanity and strength of a Lincoln; the paternal state breeds exotic dreamers, who think humanity is dead clay for the potter rather than a

spiritual creation which 'makes and unmakes systems and system makers'."

I personally have seen no conclusive definition of the oft-heard phrase, the "welfare state," and it doubtless has varied connotations with different people.

If, however, its implications mean a state in which the citizenship looks to the state to meet all human needs, then all thoughful people should oppose it, as I do.

We should stop the centralization of all power in Washington, return the administration of much legislation enacted in Congress, to the States. That is one reason why I strongly oppose the so-called compulsory socialized medicine plan.

The Government can wisely help people to help themselves, but for the Government to direct all the movements of its citizens, and to undertake to supply all their needs is far removed from the spirit of America, as I understand it, and is a subtle threat to the real happiness and well-being of our Nation.

Therefore, I lift up my voice to warn against the dangers of a state where every possible contingency is to be cared for by the Federal Government. It would completely destroy the self-reliance of the people, and in so doing it would destroy their character.

Freedom to work, to carry out individual initiative, beyond the mere providing of sufficient food and clothing for the day is the incentive which should be the desire and the objective and the heritage of all citizens, and will maintain the ideals and standards under which our country has grown from an infant to its position of commanding leadership in the world today.

Give us your thoughts on Government aid to people, Mr. Lincoln.

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate or individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

Since you trod this earth, Mr. Lincoln, life has become more complex, and our population has grown tremendously. While these problems we are naming tonight are not on all fours with those you faced, yet they are very similar.

Today men call for free enterprise, as against too much centralized controls and regimentation. You touched upon this when you said, and I quote you, Mr. Lincoln:

"Our greatest strength lies in our ability to give a vigorous demonstration that our private property competitive incentive system of free workmen can continue to provide more benefits for more people than any system in the world."

And Mr. Lincoln, many years after you had left the earth, a great author here wrote a play called Valley Forge. It told of the campaign of Washington on the Delaware, and referring to Washington, the author said:

"There are some men, who lift the level of the age they inhabit, until all men stand on higher ground, in that lifetime."

That was true of Washington, and fully as true of your life and sacrifice for us. May we so live in these our days, that after we have passed on, men may truly say that of us.

Mr. Lincoln, in these our days, there is a lessened respect for law on many sides. We suffer from a moral let-down, manifest in disregard of law and order, even in widespread outbreak of juvenile delinquency. Give counsel to a troubled Nation on this weakness, Mr. Lincoln:

"Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap, let it be taught in the schools, in the seminaries, and in the colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice.

* * * * *

"Reason—cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason—must furnish all the materials for our future support and defense. Let those materials be molded into general intelligence, sound morality, and in particular, a reverence for the Constitution and laws."

In harmony with that statement, Mr. Lincoln, we have an epigram carved over the portals of one of our great temples of justice, which reads, "Obedience to the laws is liberty."

You, Mr. Lincoln, have expressed a similar profound truth.

Fellow Republicans, one cannot make an inventory or survey of our national strength today without becoming depressed at the lack of common honesty and integrity which exist in Government.

So many of the rank and file of our citizens have lost faith in men in Government, and have come to the conclusion that many in Government care little for the people except to get their votes at election time. There is justification for that conclusion.

A disillusioned electorate is a very serious thing. It takes a long time to reestablish confidence. If some special infrared ray could be used by the people to apply to halls of government and to some of the offices of those supposed to be the people's representatives, the Nation would stand aghast at the deceit, and the chicanery that exists today.

This feeling may have been one of the main reasons why only half the registered voters across the Nation exercised their privilege of voting in the 1948 national election. It is a shocking thing when men elected to high office sell their influence for money, and when in a lust for money, men surrender their independence. Such faithless public servants should be ostracized and barred from future public service.

In the face of such faithlessness, I ask you, Mr. Lincoln, what have you to say?

"If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time, you can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time."

Truly said, Mr. Lincoln, and the people are aroused over this danger and the increasing degree of discernment of the American people is something to be reckoned with.

Finally, Mr. Lincoln, when you walked amongst us, and came to the high office of President, you were reviled and smeared, you suffered misrepresentations as your high purposes and aims were attacked, yet, like the Christ, when you were reviled, you reviled not again. (Some of us, Mr. Lincoln, know the tragedy of bearing such crosses.) What did you say to such?

"Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dangers to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

And then I treasure your conclusive answer to all those who falsely attacked you, when you said:

"If I were to try to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out alright, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

In truth then, fellow Republicans, Lincoln being dead, yet speaks to us, and tonight, as we have met together to consider on the life and principles of our martyred President and apply them to our days, think we cannot do better than to close our remarks by joining together in a remarkable and beautiful prayer by the late Reverend Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States, made in the Senate on the anniversary of Lincoln's birth. Our Chaplain led us in this prayer, and that night he died. And Dr. Marshall prayed:

"We do pray that something of the spirit that was in Lincoln may indwell in our leaders now that they may see, as he saw clearly, that only right makes might, that only as we are on the side of God can we hope that our cause will prosper. We pray that Thou wilt raise up among us now, other men to walk as he walked, to talk as he talked, to rise above the undercurrents of politics, so that they may see the country as a whole, and not be governed by pressure from this group or that, but may seek the common good and the will of God."

Statement by Robert M. Searls in Opposition to Extension of Social Security Insurance To Cover Mine Block Leasers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and illuminating statement by Mr. Robert M. Searls, in opposition to certain sections of House bill 6000. Mr. Searls is one of the outstanding lawyers, particularly one of the outstanding mining lawyers, in America, and his observations on this subject will be most informative and worth while for consideration by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. SEARLS IN OPPOSITION TO CERTAIN SECTIONS OF H. R. 6000

My name is Robert M. Searls. I am an attorney at law, practicing in San Francisco, Calif., where I reside. I am appearing in behalf of the American Mining Congress, and particularly the California chapter of the American Mining Congress, in support of the position taken by these organizations in opposition to the extension of social-security insurance cover mine-block leasers. The opposition of the American Mining Congress was evidenced by resolution unanimously adopted at the convention held in Spokane, Wash., last September, copies of which have been furnished to each Member of Congress.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL TO WHICH EXCEPTION IS TAKEN

The mining industry, expressing its views through its industrial association, the American Mining Congress, takes specific exception to the proposals in H. R. 6000, which provide for the reclassification as employees of self-employed mine leasers, who hold independent-contract relationships with the mine owners. For reasons which will appear in this statement the industry is opposed to the imposition of social-security taxes on the mine owners covering these independent leasers as newly defined employees of mine

owners in whose properties their leases are held. By the terms of the bill mine-block leasers would be included in the latter category under the specific definition contained in sections 210 (K) (3) (F) and 206 (d) (3) (F) of the bill, pages 50, lines 4 to 7, and 151, lines 6 to 9, and they would probably be included in the category of employees under the vague and shadowy standard prescribed for the determination of employment in sections 210 (K) (4) on page 51, lines 4 to 16, and 206 (4) (2) on page 152 of the bill. This latter section classifies as employee "(4) any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has, with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss."

I am aware that the language just quoted is a codification of certain language used by courts in classifying workers in individual cases involving application of social-security laws, and that one main purpose of the Gearhart resolution passed by the 1948 Congress was to clarify these definitions. I am not here to either attack or defend the Gearhart resolution. The mining industry does object, however, to the legislative enactment of vague and indefinite language such as that above quoted might have the effect of reversing previous adjudications that mine leasers are independent workers and are not employees. Our objection goes both to the specific and to the general inclusion of mine-block leasers, as employees under the language of the bill above referred to, and I will submit to the committee with this statement a suggestion of the specific amendments to the bill which would overcome our objections.

It seems very significant to us that the Advisory Council to the Senate Finance Committee appointed to study needed Social Security Act revision did not recommend enactment of any of the sections of the bill to which our objections are made. (Hearings report, p. 6, item M.) The Advisory Council would have left the present law unchanged.

REASONS FOR OBJECTIONS

The reasons for the objections which the mining industry has to the bill in question are as follows:

1. Mine block leasing has been judicially determined not to be employment within the meaning of the Social Security Act by both the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and by the Supreme Court of the State of California. The former determination was in the case of *Anglim* v. *Empire Star Mines Company, Limited,* (129 Fed. (2) 914) involving directly the application of social security taxes to leasers; and the determination with respect to the State unemployment tax on these same leasers; was made by the Supreme Court of California in *Empire Star Mines Company, Limited* v. *California Employment Commission* (28 Cal. (2d) 33; 168 Pac. (2d) 686). Both of these cases held that block leasers at the Empire Star Mine were independent contractors not subject to social security or unemployment taxes. This determination was made some time prior to the adoption of the Gearhart resolution and has been accepted up to the present time by the Social Security Administrator as an adjudication of the leasers' independent status. His office is now seeking by congressional legislation to again saddle the mine owners and mine leasers with this tax burden.

2. Mine leasers are in fact independent contractors: I believe it will be helpful to the committee if I briefly outline the basis of this contention. Mine leasing in western United States had its origin in the customs of the old Cornish miners who came over as emigrants in the early days of California gold mines. They had been accustomed to work in the tin mines of Cornwall under a system known as "pitch and tribute" under which they mined ore and received a portion of the ore which they took out as their share of the operation, the balance going to the owner of the property. Leasing became a common method of mine operation in California, in the Cripple Creek District in Colorado, and in the Utah mines. It was also carried on in lead mines and barite mines in the tristate districts of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. I am most familiar with the system as worked in California, and roughly summarize the sworn testimony of the witnesses in the tax cases above referred to (in which I represented the company as counsel) in order to illustrate how the system works.

3. Practice in the Empire Star properties in California: In 1929 the Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd., took over and consolidated the Empire, Pennsylvania, and North Star gold mines at Grass Valley, Calif. These three mines occupied a block of ground, approximately three miles long, two miles wide and a mile deep. They have been operated for almost a century, and there are over 300 miles of underground workings extending throughout the territory. There were large areas in the old North Star Mine, accessible only from the incline shaft, that were reputed to have good ore in them. They were at some distance from the shaft—from a half mile to a mile—and the veins, although usually quite rich, were very small. These areas were so far away from the portions of the mine where the company was conducting its mine operations that it saw no way by which its own company bosses could look after and supervise work there. It would not have been, and is not now, commercially practicable or profitable for the company to work these areas with is own crews. This is due partly to the fact that the use of its own crews involves greatly increased overhead expense for bosses, foremen, superintendents, etc., together with the burden of social security taxes which goes with employment, and partly to the fact that miners do not work with the same care or incentive when they are working for wages as they do when they are working for themselves and do not take as great pains to separate ore from waste, limit the size of working places, and, in other words, keep down cost. The company believed that there were various skilled miners in the district and in California who from long experience in prospecting and underground work in the Grass Valley District knew how to mine these narrow high-grade veins, keep the ore clean, and follow the vein with a skilled miner's nose for ore, for their own profit.

A number of these miners were glad to have the opportunity to work cubical blocks of ground, using the company's shafts and means of access, but driving their own development drifts and mining and stoping their own ore, with the privilege of keeping 50 percent of what they took out. This was the essence of the deal. Written leases were made, usually for a 6-months' period under which specifically described blocks of ground were allotted to each head leaser for his group. He selected his own partners and they made their own arrangements for division of the proceeds. The company received a royalty of 50 percent of the value of the bullion and concentrates extracted, furnishing as part of the consideration for this 50 percent the use of its shaft and workings, hoisting services, fresh-air supply, and keeping the underground workings unwatered with the mine pumps. It also furnished the service of skilled mill operators to handle the leaser's ore; when it was reduced to bullion shipped it to the mint for the leaser's account; and delivered to the head leaser of each leaser group its share of the proceeds. The leasers were authorized, but not required, to buy their powder, fuze, electric exploders, and personal equipment from the company at the company's actual cost, and a further charge was made, at cost, for sharpening drill steel and milling the ore and reducing it to bullion. Milling of leaser's ore in lessor's mill was at leaser's option, and not a lease requirement, but it was to his financial advantage to have it milled there because of lower costs than he could obtain elsewhere. Each lease group's ore production was kept separate, handled separately through the chutes, hoisting cars, mill machinery, and emerged finally in the form of a bullion bar bearing the leaser group's separate number, or, as in the case of concentrates, was paid for on the basis of continuous sampling of the particular leaser's batch of concentrates being run through the mill. The company had no bosses, foremen, or superintendent supervising the leaser's operations. Each leaser worked in his own leased territory and conducted his operations in such manner as he saw fit. It was solely the leaser's profit incentive that induced him to use careful, accurate mining methods, thus obtaining the highest grade of ore for milling and avoiding the uneconomical cost of unnecessary handling of waste rock. These written leases were renewed from time to time and the practice became so popular with miners that there are now 28 leaser groups operating on the Empire property. In more recent years the Idaho Maryland Mine followed suit with its own leasing arrangements with workers, quite similar to those of the Empire. Some nine groups hold leases in Idaho Maryland properties. It is my understanding that the leasing practices in Utah and Colorado are not greatly dissimilar except that the production of nonferrous metals necessarily requires different milling and sampling practices than in the case of the California gold mines. All of these practices were commenced long prior to enactment of the social-security-tax laws.

4. The leasers' average annual income: In view of the fact that the company does not supervise the accounting of the leasers as between each other for their share of the value of concentrates or gold recovered, it does not know accurately what the leasers average. We do know, however, from occasional information that many of them have made as much as $5,000 a year. Eleven thousand is the maximum individual leaser's annual income of which the company has any information. In general they average more than a miner's day's pay would have yielded had they been employed on a wage basis; otherwise the incentive for taking leases would of course be lost.

5. Reduction of these independent workers to employee status is impracticable. In the first place, unless the method of operation is entirely changed the company would have no means of telling what the inncome of individual leasers was as a basis for social-security taxation. The company simply delivers each leaser group's share of mint returns from bullion produced from gold shipped to the mint for them, or the value of concentrates assayed and purchased from them, to the head leaser of the group and division is made by each group according to its own rules. Sometimes the groups themselves hire men on a day's pay basis to get certain development work done. They impose penalties on each other for failure to join in the operation or for certain classes of absences or for violation of the safety laws. There is therefore no basis on which the company could compute and return social-security taxes on the individual leasers. For all practical purposes it would have to

reduce the leasers to employee status to meet the requirements of this bill.

6. Conversion of leases to employment arrangements would wreck many companies' operations: It is undoubtedly not news to this committee that the gold mines of the United States have not been prospering under present labor costs and gold price conditions. Labor cost is a very large percentage of the total cost of underground mine operation. This is also true in nonferrous metal mines. If the leasers are made employees by the definition of this act, the companies believe that the mutual advantages of the leaser relationship, for all effective purposes, will be lost to both parties. If Congress makes the leasers employees for social security taxes, the Wage and Hour Administrator will want to call them employees. The National Labor Relations Board will want to call them employees. The companies will be faced with supervisory obligations, with labor relations problems, and worst of all, with operating problems in mining clean ore which it does not now have under the leasing system. The managements believe that the increased expenses would so far destroy the margin of profit as to render the operations in question nonremunerative. This in turn would necessitate closing down large sections of several mines and allowing them to cave or fill with water. Several hundred leasers would be deprived of their means of livelihood and the disaster to the already slender economy of these mining communities is not hard to predict.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF OUR SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

I believe the committee will be interested in considering the other side of the picture. What will be the effect on the leasers' welfare if the amendments to the bill requested here are adopted? They will remain as they have been, independent operators. Familiar as most of them are with the traditions and practices of the prospectors and early miners who found, prospected, and developed in the initial stages the great gold mines and oil fields of California—these leasers will continue to use their skill, initiative, and ability to follow the veins in accumulating a modest competence for their retiring years. The groups carry their own compensation insurance with the State of California so that injuries are taken care of. It is obviously a matter of little concern to the owners whether or not the leasers are taxed as self-employed. Their earnings should enable them to make provision for their later years out of their savings. However, the leasers will speak for themselves on this subject. I only wish to make it clear to the committee that the position which the mine owners are taking through the American Mining Congress in this matter conforms with the position of their lessees, and that if the amendments which we ask are made, Congress will not be deciding in favor of one side or against the other. The effect on the social-security funds in the National Treasury from the loss of contributions from the few hundred leasers now engaged in mining in the United States would certainly be negligible. The situation is one which does not require the intervention of the Federal Government in the interest of security or protection for groups of individual citizens who are perfectly able to take care of themselves and their wants. On the other hand, the insertion and retention of the amendments which the industry requests will conform with present judicial decisions as to the independent status of the leasers, and it will greatly help in enabling the mining industry to meet, without expense to the Government, some of the major financial and economic problems with which it is confronted.

In behalf of the gold-mining industry and of the nonferrous metal mining industry of the United States I most respectfully urge your committee to adopt the amendments we propose which would strike out the specific classification of leasers as employees and would eliminate the generalized uncertain language from sections 206 (d) (4) and 210 (K) (4) of the act under which no operator or person holding contractual relations with him could know for certain whether that person occupied an employee's status or not.

I thank your committee for your time and attention.

EXHIBIT

SPECIFIC AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 6000 SUGGESTED TO THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS AND REASONS THEREFOR

I. On page 151 amend section 206 (d) (3) by striking out clause (3) (F), page 151, lines 6 to 9, of the bill, reading as follows: "(F) as a lessee or licensee of space within a mine when substantially all of the product of such services is required to be sold or turned over to the lessor or licensor;"

II. On page 50, lines 4 to 7, strike out clause (K) (3) (F) of the bill.

The effect of these two amendments will be to automatically eliminate block leasers in mines from the definition of the term "employee" as used in the bill.

III. Strike out the parenthetical statements in lines 17 and 18, page 50, and in lines 19 and 20, page 151, reading as follows: "(other than the services described in subparagraph (F))." This language becomes unnecessary if paragraph (F) is stricken.

IV. Strike out sections 210 (K) (4) on page 51, and section 206 (d) (4) on page 152 of the bill, both sections reading as follows:

"(4) any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has, with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss."

The reason for this exclusion is to prevent the classification as "employees" under the act of persons who are not and have not been considered as employees under accepted common law definitions so that mine leasers and similar classes of independent workers could not be classified as "employees" under the act merely because their leases may continue for a long period of time or they may perform the work under the leases with regularity and frequency or because the production of ore under the leases is usually an identical type of business to that in which the leaser is engaged, and because a mine block lessee does not normally have a large investment in facilities for work, most of which are owned by the lessor and furnished to the leaser either as a part of the fixtures covered by his lease or as facilities necessary to his use in operating under the same.

V. Insert in the list of exceptions from the definition of employment on page 35 of the bill, following section 210 (a) (1), and on page 137 of the bill, following section 205 (b) (1), the following:

"(2) A lessee or licensee of space within a mine where such space is held under a written lease or license for a period of not less than 6 months and where no control over lessee's operations is exercised by the mine owner; provided, that furnishing access, supplies, transportation, and ore storage and milling facilities by the lessor, as well as standard lease requirements for operation in a minerlike manner and observance of law and safety regulations, shall not be considered as an exercise of control over lessee's operations sufficient to constitute him an employee."

The purpose of this amendment is to specifically exclude mine leasers, along with agricultural labor, certain types of domestic servants and other services excluded from classification as employment under sections 205 and 210.

VI. Renumber the subsections of sections 210 (a) and 205 (b) following subsection (1) to conform with the above insertions.

Eyewitness Report on Communist-Occupied Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested and impressed by an eyewitness report which I have received from a young South Dakota GI who has recently returned to his home in Mound City, S. Dak., after spending several post-war years in Germany. I take this means of calling to the attention of Congress and the country the following report and recommendations.

At the conclusion of the letter I received from Mr. Kundert will be found an English translation of the program referred to in the letter and which was held as part of the cleverly staged Stalin birthday celebration.

I hope other Senators will share with me the conviction that the moral we Americans should draw from all of this is that we should sharply expand, step up, and make more realistic and forceful our Voice of America publicity program in Germany and in eastern Europe generally.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1950.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Thank you for your very kind letter of February 1, 1950.

I am sending along the program of the Stalin birthday celebration, plus a photo of Stalin. The photos and programs and copies of the Freie Deutsche Jugent (Free German Youth—a newspaper printed in the Soviet zone of Germany) were sold at the ceremony. This is only one of the many methods employed by the Communist Party to raise funds for their activities in western Germany.

As you know, the currency reform of 1948 struck the German Communist Party in the western zones a vital blow, and they have been desperately trying to devise other methods of raising revenue in the western Deutsche mark.

For example, the Communists have set up printing firms (who, by the way, gain a lot of innocent, unsuspecting western business) which are run by agents from the Soviet zone, and which do their work with printing presses smuggled across the zonal borders.

When the zonal borders were reopened (after our counterblockade had been in effect for some time) the Soviets had built up large stores of textiles and other Soviet-zone goods which they promptly rushed across the borders to merchants in the western zones. In this manner they were able again to raise western Deutsche marks to carry on their nefarious activities in our zones of Germany. The textiles were sold to otherwise non-Communist German dealers in the west who leaped at the chance to buy their goods at prices lower than those in the western zones. Thus, by underselling western textile manufacturers, the Communists were again able to raise funds in western marks.

I shall leave further comment on this subject for another time. I do want to give you my comments (as you requested them) on the effect of Russian propaganda and activities on the German people.

I must say quite frankly that I was shocked at the reaction of the German public at the Stalin birthday celebration. To begin with, the auditorium was jammed to the rafters. I do not know how many people were there out of curiosity as I was, but I doubt that many were because their terrific enthusiasm at the unveiling of the Stalin portrait and their wild singing of the Internationale (the text of which appears at the back of the program) were sufficient indication to me that most of the audience were carried away by the greatness of the moment.

I had with me a cousin who was born and raised in the city of Odessa, in Russia. He knows the Red paradise from the inside, and he and my Russian teacher (a lady who was a professor at the University of Leningrad for many years and who worked in the anti-Cominform (can give you more details on this later if you like), gave me many ugly pictures of life in Utopia. The speech by Max Reimann (as you know, he is the leading German Communist in western Germany) was violent, clever, and caustic. He quoted Harry Truman by name and then proceeded to rip him to shreds. He made much of the fact that Truman once stated (during the war and while he was Vice President—believe it was a New York paper he quoted) that Germany and Russia should be permitted to bleed themselves to death and then the United States and other nations should step in and direct matters from that point on. Reimann pointed out to a cheering audience that this was the same Truman with whom they were still dealing and that the leopard hasn't changed his spots.

After Reimann's speech, the red curtains parted and a huge portrait of Stalin was revealed, whereupon the audience went stark, staring mad, leaped to its feet, and began yelling (and I do mean "yelling") the Internationale. Such a commotion you have never heard. I must confess that the man who had painted the portrait was a genius. He had combined the loving father with the stern man of destiny and the kindly elder brother so well that I was confounded. The portrait artist could have made Gargantua look like St. Cecelia.

My cousin and I did not rise—we wanted to see what would happen if we didn't (and the day has not yet come when I am forced to rise in tribute to Stalin). Aside from a few cold—or should I say hot—stares, nothing happened. But as we drove out of the auditorium grounds, the Communist youth chorus blocked our way by forming a chain across the road (my American car was easily recognizable—in fact, it was the only American car there). I simply stepped on the gas and charged them and they scattered like South Dakota pheasants by the roadside. It would have given me great pleasure to maim a Communist, particularly since this group came from the University of Frankfurt (a university which we have helped to rebuild—obviously merely in order to furnish a breeding place for vermin).

From my conversation with hundreds of Germans from the Soviet zone and certainly thousands from the United States zone, (I have spent 4 years in Germany), I feel that that are two classes of Germans who are fertile territory for the Russian propaganda. These are:

1. Those Germans who had the Communist tendencies in them (many prior to the war), and

2. Those young Germans (and oddly enough, very old people) who are caught up by the Communist ideal (brotherhood of man, and so forth) without realizing that the present realization of communization in Russia, and the satellites, is a far cry from the Utopian one originally preached by Marx.

I personally am not worried about the effectiveness of the Russian propaganda which tries to influence Germans by promising them Utopia. I am very much worried about that section of Russian propaganda which threatens the Germans with retribution for not supporting the Communists and which tells them they had better get on the Communist bandwagon to avoid punishment when the Russians finally take over Germany and western Europe.

I know personally of many Germans who have joined the Communist party, not because they are Communists or believe in Communist ideals, but because they are insulating themselves against things to come. They feel that joining the party and giving lip service to communism will protect them when the Communists gain the upper hand. Note that I said when, because there are not too many Germans who are firmly convinced that the United States and other democracies are willing to stage a desperate, last ditch, armed fight against communism in Europe. Too many of them believe we will give up the fight in the final analysis. True, they have seen the miraculous airlift, but they consider that only the initial stage of a really bitter fight.

I do not personally know the temper of the people in Berlin, but I do know that when a 2-pfennig levy was put on each 20 pfennig of German postage, there were howls of protest from Germans in the rest of Germany. "Why should we help the Berliners—the Allies are holding Berlin, let them foot the bill"; "The Berlin situation does not concern us, and so forth."

I frankly do not think the German nation dependable enough in character to be trusted very far. As individuals they seem to me very shifty and treacherous, and I see little reason to hope that they will be a strong front against the onslaught of communism from the East. The moral degradation left by the Hitler regime is painfully in evidence in every phase of German private and political life. So, as I said, I am more concerned with the effects of Russian threats to the Germans—causing the Germans to knuckle under out of fear.

For example, while I was stationed in Augsburg, Germany, rumors began circulating about that the Germans need not, or should not, accept their new food ration cards for a period early in 1947 because the Russians would be issuing the food ration cards for Bavaria for that period (ergo, the Russians would already be established in Bavaria). True, these were only rumors, but they were so prevalent that many Germans took them almost at face value, and were certainly afraid and convinced of the possibility of such a turn of affairs.

I think, insofar as the Germans are concerned, we have the duty of letting them see our firm intent to stay in Berlin (this is the place where the whole European issue will be fought out with the Russians, and Lord knows we are in an unhappy position there) and in the rest of Germany. If we lose Berlin, we have lost Germany and Europe.

It is encouraging to note how much news of the outside world seeps into the Soviet zone of Germany, and into the satellite countries. Even the U. S. S. R. is not immune. I want to mention our propaganda to the U. S. S. R., satellite countries, and Soviet zone, though.

From many conversations with deserters from the Russian Army in the Soviet zone, and Russian civilian employees of the Soviet Army, I note that our Voice of America is eagerly heard by those Russians themselves who can hear it. But all of these sources urge that our propaganda coverage (our radio coverage—which is our only coverage) is so pitifully inadequate that it is merely a drop in the ocean.

Many of these sources told us that they believe that a really strong and vigorous and wide coverage of these areas by our Voice of America broadcasts would be our best guaranty of preventing the present cold war from becoming a hot war.

I call to mind, for example, merely our statements on Voice of America that we grant political asylum to persons fleeing the Soviet zone and satellites. The Russians tell us that if we would redouble our efforts on this one point alone, and be direct and vigorous we could prepare the ground for our psychological conquest of the Russian people (a fact which the Germans overlooked much to their painful surprise). I saw the report of the chief of German intelligence for the Russian front, and he recognized that the Germans failed in their physical conquest of the Russians because they had failed in their psychological conquest first.

I think that we had darned well better give a lot of advance thought to our psychological handling of the Russian people, because, should we ever have to fight them (and I for one am firmly convinced that we shall) we will be a lot closer to success if we have properly prepared the ground.

I know, too, that when the Germans marched into Russia, many Russians greeted them as liberators, but when the Germans committed atrocities, and treated the Russians as inferiors and animals, the battle was already lost. The Germans recognized this, and made belated efforts to organize eastern divisions (ost divisionen) but had already lost their golden opportunity by that time. I can go into much more detail on this point if you like.

Sorry, but I really went to seed on this letter. But it will give you an indication of my capacity for going on for hours on the subject. At present I am speaking to high schools, church groups, Rotary clubs, and commercial clubs and am hoping to do my bit to inform our people in the U. S. A. what kind of an enemy they are facing.

Hope the program I am sending will be of interest and help to you. I should like it returned when you are finished with it.

I am coming east sometime in March and may be able to stop and see you in Washington (have never been in that fair city).

Thanks, again, for your letter, and please let me know if I can clear up any points.

Sincerely,

OTTO KUNDERT.

MOUND CITY, S. DAK.

[Translation]

FRIENDSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION

(P. 1)

J. W. Stalin, the guardian of peace, the friend of the German people, will be 70 years old on December 21.

Friendship demonstration in the Franz-Althoff-Building in the zoo on Monday, December 19, at 20 o'clock. Max Reimann will speak.

Admission 1-DM.

This program entitles to admission.

PROGRAM

(Inside page)

1. Coriolan Overture (Beethoven)- Orchestra
2. Recitation---------- Mathilde Danegger
3. From the Soviet Union: Report in picture and sound.
4. Choir----------
5. Speaking Choir---------- Youth Choir
6. Recitation---------- Mathilde Danegger
7. Egmont Overture (Beethoven)- Orchestra
8. Speech---------- Max Reimann
9. The Internationale-- Community singing

Performers

Hessian Philharmonic Orchestra.
A youth choir.
Mathilde Danegger (formerly at the Zurich playhouse).

(P. 3)

THE INTERNATIONALE

Wake up, condemned of this earth,
Whom one still steadily forces to hunger.
Justice, like the glow in the top of a crater,
Forces with might to an eruption.
Settle accounts with the oppressors.
Army of slaves, wake up!
Being nothing is no longer to be borne,
Stream together to become everything.

People, hear the signals!
Up for the last fight!
The Internationale
Wins human right by battle.

No higher being rescues us,
No god, no emperor or court,
Saves us from misery.
Only we ourselves can do it.
Empty word: the rights of the poor!
Empty word: the duty of the rich!
We are called children and knaves.
Endure the shame no longer.

(Same chorus.)

In city and country, you working people,
We are the strongest of the parties.
Shove aside the idlers,
This world must be ours.
Our blood shall no longer be food for the ravens
And the powerful vultures.
When we have driven them away
Then for the first time the sun will shine without ceasing.

(Same chorus.)

(Translated by L. M. Manross, February 28, 1950.)

Company, Seven Unions at Peace for 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in these days when there is so much unrest and misunderstanding between management and organized labor, it is good to know that up in New Hampshire, the Granite State, there is a long-established, successful concern, the Nashua Gummed & Coated Paper Co., which has enjoyed peaceful labor relations for 15 years. This industrial concern has recently received recognition of its wonderful labor relationships made possible by those who work for it and the employers themselves, through a statement put out by an authority, the National Planning Association, entitled "Causes of Industrial Peace Under Collective Bargaining." I sincerely congratulate both workers and management who have made this splendid New England enterprise one of the most successful companies in the Nation. I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of February 17, 1950, entitled "Company, Seven Unions at Peace 15 Years."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPANY, SEVEN UNIONS AT PEACE 15 YEARS—NASHUA PAPER, A. F. OF L. GROUPS WEIGH GRIEVANCES TOGETHER—BOTH SIDES APPROACHABLE

WASHINGTON, February 16.—A management that encourages the expression of grievances and unions that believe the boss wants to be fair are described in a new case study released today by the National Planning Association.

This is the record of the Nashua Gummed & Coated Paper Co., of Nashua, N. H., and seven unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The study is one of a series on the causes of industrial peace under collective bargaining.

An illustration of present top management attitude was this:

"We try to encourage the expression of grievances. You always have them, and if they aren't coming out, you know there must be something wrong. The union people come into my office and raise hell, I encourage this, to get it off their chests, and see what the problem is."

Management characteristics mentioned consistently in interviews with labor leaders were these:

"NO STALLING," UNIONS REPORT

"You can always get to them without any trouble. There is no stalling. They are willing to discuss any problem. They don't just say 'No' without any reason."

The unions are the paper workers, bookbinders, pressmen, stereotypers, photoengravers, operating engineers, and firemen and oilers.

The on-the-spot investigation was made by Dr. Charles A. Myers and Dr. George P. Schultz, professor and assistant professor of industrial relations of Masachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Myers also is executive director of MIT's industrial relations section.

Conclusions of the authors are highlighted in a statement with the report signed by all 29 of the experts on labor relations who make up the NPA committee on the causes of industrial peace. The committee's chairman is Clinton S. Golden, who inspired the study series. The work is financed by John Hay Whitney.

RELATIONSHIP COVERS 15 YEARS

The major conclusion of the study is that this 15-year, no-strike, no-lockout relationship is based on patience rather than pressure; on hard work and good will, day in and day out, not just during annual negotiations.

The seven unions and the company look upon force as a last resort, because each party to the bargaining understands and accepts the needs of the other for security and growth, for economic gains and profits.

Neither party has argued for the inflexible application of broad principles such as management's prerogatives or union's rights.

There is no sharp distinction between making and administering contracts. When need arises, issues are negotiated and changes in the contracts are frequent. Only two arbitration cases have occurred during this history of collective bargaining.

The company produces a diversified line in a highly competitive industry. Profits, operations, and the number of employees have shown a steady growth since the company's incorporation in 1904. The expansion has continued since the first union was recognized in 1935, and employee productivity has been high.

There have been no costly interruptions of production in this company where profits depend heavily on ability to maintain a high volume of production and sales.

Ann Pamela Cunningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present within an address prepared for delivery over the radio in my home city of Greenville, S. C., in the observance of the two hundred and seventeenth birthday of our First President, Gen. George Washington. The program was sponsored by the Nathaniel Green Chapter of the South Carolina Daughters of the American Revolution and Mrs. Jessie Reed Burnett as chairman. Since Congress was considering one of the most controversial issues on February 22, I could not leave Washington. My son, William J. Bryson, Esq., read the message for me, the text of which is as follows:

As Mrs. Burnett has so well stated, we cannot properly understand or appreciate our priceless heritage, without some knowledge of the lives and sacrifices of those who have established and maintained it for us. Hence, the members of the Nathaniel Greene Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution and of other chapters are to be commended for their ceasless efforts toward bringing about such understanding and appreciation. They are to be especially commended for their efforts on this day to inform or remind us of the tremendous debt of gratitude which we owe to George Washington and to those persons who in some way are connected with his memory.

I have been asked to present briefly a biographical sketch of a South Carolinian, who, though she did not live during the times of our War for Independence or ever met George Washington, made of her life a challenging example for us to follow, and who is as much a benefactor of our democratic way of life as are her kinsmen and contemporaries who fought on the battlefields or in the legislative halls during the early years of our Nation's history.

That patriot and benefactor is Ann Pamela Cunningham.

On the banks of the muddy Saluda River near the community of Waterloo in Laurens County may be seen today the faint lines of what was once a skillfully cultivated ornamental garden and park. Here and there may be seen various types of roses, evergreens, and boxwoods growing wildly and intermingled with weeds. At the end of what appears to have once been an avenue of roses stands a crumbling chimney. This scene of abandonment is what remains of one of the most famous of South Carolina's upcountry plantations known as Rosemont. This was the home of Ann Pamela Cunningham.

Today on the banks of the Potomac River in the State of Virginia, not far from our Nation's Capital, may be seen in full glory

gardens and parks similar to those which once existed at Rosemont. In the center of these gardens and parks, on the river bank, there stands a mansion in all its majestic simplicity similar to that which once stood on the banks of the Saluda. That building and those gardens and parks are known to us as Mount Vernon, the home of our first President, George Washington. It stands today just as it stood during his lifetime.

Authorities estimate that today, George Washington's Birthday, some 25,000 persons will visit Mount Vernon. During the past century millions of people have visited there. Every President of this country has visited Mount Vernon at some time or another, and it may safely be assumed that none who visits Mount Vernon comes away without a keener sense of our heritage and the responsibility which rests upon us to preserve it. That historic spot is indeed a place of reverence and inspiration.

You may wonder why I have linked the desolate, decayed homestead of Ann Pamela Cunningham with the well-kept and often visited homestead of George Washington, Mount Vernon. The reason why I have done so is also the reason why the life of Ann Pamela Cunningham is important to us if we are to properly appreciate our rich heritage as American citizens. In fact, the reason is the life of Ann Pamela Cunnningham.

Miss Cunningham was born on April 15, 1816, the daughter of Robert and Louisa Bird Cunningham. She was born at her father's plantation, Rosemont, which was located in what was then known as Laurens District, S. C. Her grandfather, Patrick Cunningham, migrated to that district from Virginia and her maternal forebears came from Pennsylvania.

Miss Cunningham received her formal education through a governess and at a select school for girls near Columbia. Upon the completion of her studies she returned to Rosemont and entered into the social life of the community. The clearest picture of her at that time is found in the diary of one of Greenville's most prominent citizens, who in 1835 was a promising young bachelor lawyer, Benjamin F. Perry. Mr. Perry states that Miss Cunningham was "pretty, very intelligent, and exceeding graceful and dignified in her manner."

Shortly after Miss Cunningham returned from school she suffered an accident which changed the course of her life. She was thrown from her horse and sustained injuries from which she never recovered. This misfortune, however, is mainly responsible for the present existence of Mount Vernon, for it was upon returning from a trip to doctors in Philadelphia that Miss Cunningham's mother brought to her attention the fact that the home of our first President was lacking proper maintenance and in need of repair.

Struck by the neglect of Mount Vernon, Miss Cunningham had published in the Charleston Mercury, on December 2, 1853, a letter addressed to the women of the South calling upon them to raise funds to save Washington's homestead. As it was improper for a lady's name to appear in the press at that time, she signed her name as "a southern matron," which name followed her throughout her life.

This first appeal, which was also published by other newspapers of that day, brought little result except in her local community. There the ladies of the Liberty Springs Presbyterian Church met and established the first chapter of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. This was on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1854. A small amount of money was subscribed on that occasion for the purpose of preserving Mount Vernon and plans were formulated for a campaign to raise additional funds. From there support of the movement spread to Camden, Spartanburg, Hamburg, and other parts of this State.

By July 1854 the movement gained popular support throughout five Southern States and the goal of $200,000 with which to purchase Mount Vernon from John Augustine Washington was in sight. During this period, although an invalid, Miss Cunningham worked tirelessly, writing additional letters and carrying her campaign to the northern States.

Two years later in 1856 due to an increasing amount of disapproval on the part of men citizens and to the unwillingness of the owner to sell Mount Vernon, the efforts of Miss Cunningham and her associates seemed doomed to failure.

In June of that year, at the point of death, Miss Cunningham made a final attempt by visiting Mount Vernon and Mr. Washington. During that visit she secured Mr. Washington's consent to the purchase and the contract was signed on April 6, 1858. It was not, however, until 1860 that the Mount Vernon Ladies Association took possession of Mount Vernon.

The ladies of the association began at once to repair Washington's homestead and to return it to its former splendor. Since that time Miss Cunningham and her successors have maintained this national shrine for us without cost to the public. While their efforts have often faced disaster, as they did during the Civil War, Mount Vernon stands today as it did when George Washington was President.

In June 1874 Miss Cunningham resigned from her position as regent of the association and returned to her home, Rosemont, where she died on May 1, 1875.

On a headstone in the churchyard of the First Presbyterian Church in Columbia is the name of Ann Pamela Cunningham.

On the walls of the senate chamber of the State capitol in Columbia hangs a portrait of Miss Cunningham, the only woman to be so honored.

On the banks of the muddy Saluda River, as it flows through Laurens County, are the deserted, wild remains of a once well-cultivated ornamental garden and the crumbling chimney of a once lively home.

On the banks of the Potomac River are the magnificent gardens and buildings of Mount Vernon, a national shrine.

Thus, it is that a frail, invalid women from the clay slopes of Laurens County sacrificed her life and health to preserve for us the historic home of George Washington. She did so in order that we, the generations that have come after her, might be reminded by its existence of the life of the Father of our Country and thereby gain strength in our attempt to maintain and improve our heritage.

I am sure that Ann Pamela Cunningham never thought that we would also gain such strength by remembering her life and sacrifice.

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose a copy of the resolutions adopted by the delegates of District 8, Essex County, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, at a regular monthly meeting convened at Beever-Wilmot Post, No. 309, Salisbury, Mass., on Sunday, February 19, 1950:

Whereas while we are in favor of efficiency and economy in services rendered to veterans by governmental agencies: Be it

Resolved, That we feel that the dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration Agency into several different agencies as outlined by the Hoover Commission Report recommendations will cause increased expense, great confusion, and delay in rendering service to the veterans; and

Whereas we believe that the veteran who gave of his time, at the risk of life and limb, and who in many cases has paid with the same, we feel that he is entitled to favorable consideration by a grateful Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That District 8 (Essex County), Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, be opposed to any legislation in the future that will result in the dismemberment, or that will take away, deny, or limit the preferences, that are now received by veterans in any manner whatsoever; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen of the respective districts, and that a copy be forwarded to the Massachusetts Department, the American Legion.

Address of Dr. Dirk Uipko Stikker, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by His Excellency Dr. Dirk Uipko Stikker, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and special representative of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

Dr. Stikker's address was a dinner speech at the Mayflower Hotel on Wednesday evening, March 1, 1950. The dinner was given by the Honorable Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, honoring Dr. Stikker.

This address is an excellent report on the progress of European integration and is historic in the fact that a representative of one European country is speaking for the 18 countries, which are members of the OEEC.

I hope my colleagues in Congress and the American people will carefully read this friendly, sincere, and sound report.

The address follows:

After this excellent dinner I have no intention of boring you with a lot of figures, statistics and details of the operation of the Marshall plan in western Europe. This, I feel, is neither the time nor the place to go into technicalities. Instead, I should like to give you a broad, general outline of the establishment of western European unity and of the main difficulties and obstacles we find on our way.

But before I embark on this subject, I should like to raise a question. How is it that right at this moment a single man can

speak in your midst on behalf of western Europe? I have not been endowed with supranational powers. In fact, I much preferred my task and powers to remain vague, because the question of supranational authority would inevitably have raised the issue of sovereignty. Still, the fact remains that, for the first time in history, all the different countries of western Europe have asked the representative of one to be spokesman for all of them. The conclusion is obvious: here is political progress of the first importance.

This brings me to my main theme, Western European Unity. The problem of Europe is neither new nor of local importance. It is the familiar question of how an advanced, very thickly populated and highly developed part of the world, having suffered the ravages of two world wars in 20 years, can regain its balance and prosperity, and thereby safeguard its all-important democratic traditions and institutions, before the evil forces of disruption, destruction, and dictatorship which thrive on postwar turbulence can get a firm grip on the situation. Nor is it a local problem, because what happens in one major part of the free world must of needs have the most far-reaching effect in another. The problem of Europe is not only Europe's problem, it is also America's.

That this was, and is, persistently realized in this country was illustrated in the first place by the approval of the lend-lease principles without which the war would have been lost, and in the second place by the acceptance of the plan voiced by a great American when he was Secretary of State, General Marshall.

Now the American people have been told on many occasions how grateful the peoples of western Europe are to them for their extensive and generous assistance on the road to recovery. I can only testify to their gratitude once more. Recently the American people have also heard that the first object of the Marshall plan has been achieved, and that from the point of view of recovery and staving off economic collapse it can already be qualified as a great success. It seems natural, therefore, that they should wonder sometimes why it proves so difficult to attain the second important objective: the integration of the western European economies and the removal of the various obstacles to free trading.

I should like to emphasize here that also in this field progress is being made all the time. There is, however, one additional difficulty here. Whereas the first objective of the Marshall plan could be reached by economic means chiefly on a national basis, the participating countries have, comparatively recently, found—not without some prodding on your side—that the more progress they make toward the economic integration of western Europe, the more likely they were to run into complications of a political nature. To the Governments of Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands this did not come unexpectedly. They had had the same experience while concentrating their efforts on the establishment of the Benelux Economic Union. I should like to recall that this relatively small-scale development took fully 6 years of truly hard work to mature.

Small wonder therefore that a similar project for the whole of western Europe should run into much more formidable difficulties.

In the first place we should always bear in mind that we are dealing with an age-old historically grown system of independent states. To persuade all of them to abolish protective economic measures is not an easy job. But I feel sure that it can be done and that it will be done, just like the Benelux Union has become a living reality through the perseverance of the participants.

The second difficulty we should not underestimate is the special position of Great Britain. On the one hand Britain has strong historical, cultural, economic, and geographical ties with the continent of western Europe which makes her anxious to occupy her rightful place in the European community, but on the other hand she has equally strong affinities outside Europe which render new commitments, especially when these may have far-reaching consequences, a matter for very serious consideration. It should be remembered that Britain's currency serves approximately 40 percent of world trade. There is, however—and I should like to stress this point—no question of a deadlock here either. Certain recent statements in the press tried to convince us that western European integration had reached an impasse because of the duality I just desscribed, but I would remind anyone who has serious fears in this respect that the absence of spectacular and rapid success by no means implies failure. I, for one, have good reason to be optimistic; a few weeks in my present capacity have shown me progress, sometimes slow progress but at the same time—and this makes it encouraging—willingness to cooperate toward an acceptable solution. I feel particularly gratified at this development, because I have a strong feeling that an overall agreement would be the only satisfactory solution. An integration of European economies without including the United Kingdom can, in my mind, not constitute our final aim.

The third difficulty we have to contend with is the problem of the German balance of payments. I realize that here I touch upon a technical aspect of our problems and that this is hardly the place to go into technicalities. But I may be permitted to draw the attention to the general importance of the position of Germany in western Europe. In my opinion it would be impossible to establish a sound European economic system if Germany were not part of it. German economy has historically played an important role in Europe. It seems unsound to me to ignore this in trying to build up an economically healthy Europe.

The fourth difficulty we encountered is the existence of various trade and payment barriers in Europe. These barriers are being maintained, not because these governments are so fond of protective measures, but simply because economic recovery in individual countries has not yet reached such a stage as to enable them to remove all these barriers without serious repercussions. I need not cite to you as legislators the extent of political pressures which come from vested interests which are opposed to the removal of protective barriers in any country, including the United States. I am sure that you experience them in the American Congress in any effort to lower your own tariffs despite the fact that from the over-all economic standpoint a more liberal policy on imports would surely appear to be in the interest of America, as a great creditor Nation, as well as in the interest of Europe.

Having pointed out four of the main factors which have recently proved to stand in the way of immediate and spectacular successes in our efforts to achieve western European unity, I should now like to turn to the other side of the question. There is in western Europe a most gratifying and promising tendency to foster European cooperation and to attain the integration we are looking forward to. Last year this tendency was crystallized in the establishment of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg. The importance of this organization and the effect it will undoubtedly have on the course of European events should not be underestimated. In the Council of Europe we see both the legislatures and the executive branches of most of the western European nations getting together to (and I quote from the Council's statute) "achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realizing the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress."

Through one of its organs the Council has already taken up contact with the OEEC. This contact is likely to become more intensive, whether it is formal or informal. What the effect of any future exchange of ideas will be I shall not venture to guess. But I feel certain that the obvious desire of both governmental and parliamentary representatives to bring about a feasible and sound form of unity cannot fail to yield beneficial results. A strong, unprecedented movement for unity as arisen in Europe—and Marshall aid has given it considerable impetus—which it would be impossible to stem.

Compared with America, Europe is an old continent, but old as it may be, Europe has not lost its vigor. Western Europe will use all its resources to achieve our common end, but in spite of the proverb which says: "Where there is a will there's a way," the will on the part of western Europe will not be enough. We need material assistance to tide us over the difficulties lying ahead in the next 2 years.

Four years ago, the present Netherlands Ambassador in Washington, Mr. van Kleffens, discussed in a speech in New York the commanding position occupied by the United States after the war and the consequences deriving from that position in the economic field. He then said that the outside world often looks with a certain apprehension toward your gigantic country, hoping and trusting that no measure will be taken there which, with the best of intentions and without any desire to harm other countries, might nevertheless result in damage to them by a certain lack of awareness of their economic position and legitimate interests.

Today, after the Marshall plan has been in operation for almost 2 years, we in western Europe know how seriously the people, the Congress and the Government of the United States have taken this responsibility. Under the inspired guidance of President Truman, former Secretary of State Marshall, eminent members of the executive branch of the Government, leaders of Congress such as Senator CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG, Representative KEY and Representative EATON, and many others—too many to mention—the United States, by the bold and timely action of its Congress, has shown unsurpassed generosity to those who for a number of years lacked the physical means to help themselves. We have already done much, and, with confidence in the future, we want to give expression to our gratitude and to pledge ourselves to spare no efforts to reach our goal. But I am certain that one day—and I hope it won't be long from now—we shall be able to show our American friends that their vast contributions have not been in vain.

Then Europe will show the United States and the rest of the world that investment in liberty and in democracy, liberally but judiciously made, does neither mean political subjugation, as has been contended so often in eastern Europe, nor a waste of valuable taxpayers' money, as has been feared by some here. This investment will prove to serve the cause of prosperity, of economic well-being, consequently of peace.

The part which the United States Congress is playing in this historical undertaking is a difficult one: every year during the operation of the Marshall plan the Congress has to consider and harmonize its two responsibilities, the one toward the American people as a guardian over their financial and other interests and the other toward the

democratic world as a whole from the point of view of safeguarding world peace and prosperity.

This year the United States Congress will once more be asked to appropriate a large sum of money for foreign aid. We in western Europe feel convinced that it will not be denied us, because we cannot believe that an American would help build a bridge only halfway across a stream.

We, on our part, are contributing our share toward the same goal. Western Europe realizes fully that the unity envisaged by the Marshall plan will be beneficial to all of us. We feel that America and Europe, linked together by that highway of traffic, the Atlantic Ocean, have more in common with each other than either of them with any other part of the world. The various parts they play in the Atlantic civilization demonstrate how inseparably they are united in the world of today. We gladly acknowledge the generous contribution you have made in recent years but we want to assure you that western Europe is doing and will continue to do all within its power to be a worthy partner of America in the Atlantic community of nations.

We are conscious that your aid would be wasted, if we did not create unity between democratic countries, and a free, good, and just society. These are the stakes, worthy of the supreme effort of free men.

Modern Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Dr. J. C. Roper, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Clover, S. C., entitled "Modern Trends," including trend in state. The editorial is from the Clover Herald of February 23, 1950:

MODERN TRENDS

(By Dr. J. C. Roper)

Some days ago the writer was in a business office and saw a calendar on the wall with a picture of a man standing on a ship looking through his glasses taking his reckoning. Underneath were these words: "It is not where you are but where you are going."

TREND IN STATE

From the unimpressive Government over which George Washington presided to the one over which President Truman holds sway is a chasm as great as an ocean. This Nation is the last bulkwark of civilization; it is crumbling now with the weight of bureaus, lobbyists, appeasing politicians, whose chief thought in every act would seem to be with a view to reelection. Not all, to be sure, are for sale. Too many find the road of least resistance. The sequel: The new bonds to redeem some coming due will net the lender around 1 percent. Who is paying off the multibillion debt? Those who have stored up savings against old age. Taxed, on capital, on income derived interest, when will wealth give out?

Did not the Socialist Government of Britain declare only 250 taxpayers received more than 14,000—as against several times that number when it took over? When one gets more than $14,000—who will pay that remaining mortgage on that island that once ruled the world?

Yielding to every pressure group, the dollar has been losing its value, its purchasing power. This writer bought 2,000,000 German marks for $2.80. They are not worth a nickel. Yet, 30 minutes ago the man who used a bad word about a South Carolina statesman, according to Edward R. Murrell, is appealing for a moral battle against gambling and crime.

The moral, the educational, the religious, the national are intertwined. If these trends are not upward, where do they take us? What will the end be? England is a spot from which our planes can depart, if we are able to hold her. The treaty with China means, this once potential friend is committed to an enemy that can neither be appeased nor trusted with any promise, pledge, or treaty.

A citizen of Clover stated to this writer that his history teacher in college told his class that "taxes were the downfall of nations." Undoubtedly the debts of France aided the coming of the great French Revolution. Some have said the loss of coin by attrition, or otherwise, brought on the Dark Ages.

Gone With the Wind was the title of a fast-moving book. Going with the wind might express what is taking place under our noses and we are too blind to see it.

A horse trough for a foot-tub, a blue-back speller for a curriculum, a family altar for devotion, an intelligent minister with sense (not too much learning) but full of the Holy Ghost, and sanction from on high, encugh to eat and not too much spare time, helped a lot. Punch buttons, fine soap, smelling powders, silk underclothes, lascivious literature, soft living, may add to earthly joy—at a heavenly discount.

Gravity, trends, gravity, going with the wind.

Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants.

Oil and Gas Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Ways and Means Committee on February 28, 1950:

The Ways and Means Committee has heard a wide range of testimony from State officials, Members of Congress, and representatives of the oil-producing industry on the proposal to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowance. I think the case for rejection of the Tresaury Department's proposal was ably and honestly presented. The witnesses spoke out of earnest conviction which was based on long experience.

Over a considerable number of years I have lived in close association with a class of oil producers of whom you have heard a great deal. That is the operators of the stripper wells.

The oil industry began in my district a little more than 90 years ago. There are wells still producing in the area which are nearly that old. Yet, it is probable, according to laboratory examinations of theoretically depleted oil sands, that underlying such wells there is 75 percent or more of the original volume of oil which was there when the wells were drilled.

In that far-off time little was known about oil. Producers were dealing with a substance which they did not understand. Such fundamentals as the conservation of pressure and protection of the oil sand from water were unknowns then. Consequently, the amount of oil produced from one of the fields in Venango and other counties which were the original oil country, has been large in number of barrels but small in percentage of the total content of the sand.

The stripper well reserves of the United States are estimated to be about 8,000,000,000 barrels, recoverable by ordinary pumping and by what are known as secondary recovery methods.

These methods include the restoration of pressure to an oil sand by means of water, compressed air, and compressed gas. Others are in the experimental stage. Some form of mining may be not far off. Experiments have been made in my district and in other parts of the United States in which shafts were dug to the oil sand and tunnels extended laterally through the sand, greatly enlarging the area drained. Oil producers are constantly at work to overcome the damage done when the industry was new and technical guidance was lacking, as well as to operate newly found fields in a way that will recover through primary methods a far greater percentage of the oil in the reservoir.

How does this relate to the depletion allowance? Simply that secondary recovery work will come to an end without the allowance in at least the present percentage, according to oil producers in whom I have full confidence. Because a portion of their income is exempt from taxation some of the income is available for the improvement of producing methods. When the operator finances the large investment necessary for the application of secondary recovery methods, he counts on the depletion allowance heavily to insure his return of capital. That is so basic in the financing that without it, secondary recovery work would not be possible.

There are about 300,000 stripper wells in the United States. Without the stimulus of secondary recovery, they continue to decline in production. Their owners expect wherever the methods of restoring reservoir pressure are feasible, and when market and credit conditions warrant, to apply such methods. This work proceeds at a rate consistent with the conditions named. If such a vital factor as the depletion allowance should be reduced, it would mean the abandonment of a large portion of our known reserves within a short time.

The effects of stripper-well maintenance and secondary recovery methods on the national oil supply have been great. In the Pennsylvania oil-producing region owners of small wells have gone ahead steadily for many years learning more and more about methods of increasing the recovery of oil. To this end they have financed research work in various ways, jointly and individually. The results have been most encouraging to all who look to the United States as the primary source of petroleum supply for peaceful pursuits, as well as for national defense. The Bradford field of Pennsylvania, for example, has produced as much oil since 1920 as it had in the preceding 45 years, although in 1920 it was chiefly a stripper-well field. Operators there used the profits from secondary recovery to go into other parts of the United States—some to acquire stripper-well properties and apply the methods which had been so successful in Pennsylvania and New York fields; others to explore in untested territory and find new fields which added materially to the Nation's reserves.

I feel certain, based upon my observation of the oil industry in Pennsylvania, that none of these results would have been possible without the depletion allowance which has enabled the industry to retain sufficient income to find the new supply of oil to replace that which is consumed.

The application of secondary recovery methods is as truly a finding of new supply as is the discovery of a hitherto-unknown field by the drilling of a wildcat well.

There are several thousand stripper wells in my district. They are a part of the other thousands which account for the daily production of 50,000 to 60,000 barrels per day of the superior lubricating-base crude oil known as Pennsylvania grade. In my district there are a number of refineries which rely entirely on the production of the stripper wells and the properties which have become secondary recovery projects. The depletion allowance is of vital importance to the region, to the substantial industry located there, and to the consumers of the Nation who use the products which are made from Pennsylvania grade oil.

The term "risk capital" is used in connection with the oil industry's discovery and development operations. It must not be assumed that there is no risk in the stripper well phase of the industry. A substantial amount of drilling is carried on to keep production at the point where operations return a profit and many of the holes are dry. The Oil and Gas Journal reported that in 1949 there were 67 wildcat wells drilled in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio—three States which are wholly stripper well and secondary recovery oil regions. Of the total wildcats, only 7 found oil. In total drilling in these 3 States and in New York, of the 4,400 wells drilled last year, 526 were dry. The number includes all drilling, wildcat, development, and the 1,173 which are classed as service wells. The latter are the kind which produce no oil or gas but are used solely for the injection of water, gas, or compressed air into the sand to increase production.

This committee has much testimony before it as to the role of the depletion allowance in stimulating the discovery of new oil and gas fields. I respectfully ask that consideration be given also to the effect on approximately 300,000 stripper wells and the 2,500,000 acres which they occupy. This is, incidentally, about half the total oil-producing acreage in the United States. About 15 percent of the national daily production came from this class of wells in the year 1947, the latest figures available.

An increase in the producer's tax, as proposed by the Treasury Department in its recommendation for a reduction in the depletion allowance, will destroy a substantial part of the Nations' oil reserves. To leave the depletion allowance unchanged will be an important contribution toward the maintenance of these reserves and the continued operation of the stripper fields.

In conclusion I might say that to penalize all small independent marginal producers in the stripper fields at this time would be the most devastating blow that has ever been struck at the owners and producers in the stripper fields such as exist in Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, and Ohio and other parts of the country. The depletion allowance permits him to carry on research and make this effort. To take away this incentive to keep these fields alive means their abandonment and loss to the economy of the Nation.

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 23, 1950]

DEPLETION LAW MUST REMAIN

Should anyone seek to hatch a plot to strangle the oil industry and render it impotent in any program for the Nation's future security, no quicker or surer method could be found than the proposal by the Treasury Department, backed by President Truman, to cut the present depletion allowance.

For depletion allowance is the very heart from which pulses the lifeblood of the industry, keeps it alive and virile, and provides it with the stimulus necessary to replenish the reserves so vitally needed for the health and stability of the Nation's economy and safety.

Depletion allowance is as old as the income tax law itself. When the income levy first was enacted it was recognized that special provision should be made for oil and other minerals where production income, unlike any other business, is derived solely from liquidation of capital.

The oil producer's invested capital in any particular property is represented by the amount of oil in place in that property. Every barrel of oil taken from the ground and converted into cash is a liquidation of that capital. When the supply of crude is exhausted from a particular property, the producer has nothing left and to remain in business he must constantly acquire and develop additional prospective oil acreage.

This continuing search for new reserves is an extremely costly nad hazardous venture and has stamped the oil industry as the greatest gamble of them all. Last year the industry completed 7,250 wildcat or test wells drilled in new or unproved regions and of this number 82 percent were dry. Only 15 percent found oil and 3 percent were gas wells. The industry's investment in drilling these wildcats was in excess of $350,000,000. Since only one out of five were producers, the average cost of each productive wildcat well was appoximately $250,000.

Even in territory where oil already has been found, drilling remains a big and costly gamble. In these areas last year, 25 percent of all wells drilled were dry, 66 percent produced oil, and 9 percent were gas wells.

Congress, in enacting the first income-tax law, recognized these peculiar and vital problems of the oil industry: First, that the income tax is just what the name indicates, a levy on earnings or gain, and that it would be improper to tax capital assets which would be the case if the entire proceeds from a barrel of oil, less the operating expenses in producing that oil, were subject to tax; and, secondly, the necessity of returning to the producer, tax free, the capital expended in the search for new sources of oil.

Depletion allowance was Congress' answer to the problem. At first the provision provided a 5-percent allowance on the gross value of the oil at the well. It soon was realized that this allowance, in many cases, was inadequate and inequitable and it was supplanted in 1918 by the unit per barrel allowance. This method of figuring depletion gave a much higher rate to the producer but it was found too involved and indefinite and in many instances did not fulfill the purpose for which depletion was allowed.

Finally, in order to set up a fair and simple depletion law, the Government authorized a survey of oil-production operations during the years from 1918 to 1925. This survey showed that the annual average depletion of capital invested by producers in finding and producing oil was between 32 and 33 percent of the gross income from production. Using this survey as a basis, the House in 1926 passed a bill providing a percentage depletion allowance on gross income from a producing property of 30 percent in figuring taxes. A Senate measure set the figure at 25 percent, then in conference the present depletion allowance of 27½ percent on gross income (but in no event more than 50 percent of the net income from a property) was decided upon and enacted into law.

The fairness and the necessity of the present depletion allowance has been consistently recognized by Congress since that time and that enlightened body has repulsed repeated attempts by the Treasury Department to trim that percentage. Any reduction now would undoubtedly prove a death blow to the large independent segment of the industry which already is struggling for survival against enormous cost increases and lower crude prices. Ten to fifteen years ago wells of 3,000 to 4,000 feet were considered deep wells. Now drilling at 6, 10, and 12 thousand feet are the main sources of new production. And the cost of these wells is tremendous.

Producers themselves are only part of the great number of persons who would be affected by elimination of the depletion law. The oil industry, always progressive, gives employment to a very large number of persons who would be thrown out of jobs should producers be forced out of business. Farmers and merchants in all lines would suffer as the oil industry pays annually millions of dollars in oil royalties, lease rentals, and bonuses.

The Government, too, would be forced to absorb a tax loss that undoubtedly would be far greater than any revenue gain which it might hope to acquire through ending the depletion allowance. For the oil industry, in its various ramifications with other industries, shoulders a large part of Federal and State taxes.

A glance back at the performance of the oil industry in the last two great wars should provide a final clinching argument against any Government action that would imperil an industry so vital to the welfare and security of the Nation. It was largely through the herculean efforts of the oil men of America in meeting the demands of the Nation's mechanized armies that these wars were won. And this great effort was actuated by patriotic motives without the incentive of profit. For the increase in the price per barrel of crude received by producers caused by the war demand was very small in comparison with the increased price of other materials.

The depletion law has provided the incentive for the continuing search for new reserves without which the oil industry could not have attained its present vital role in the life of America. The proposal to eliminate that incentive holds a dire threat to the entire oil industry.

Congress should heed no pleas for action that would destroy, but rather should do everything within its power to foster this industry which stands as a bulwark for the future progress and security of the Nation.

That Unofficial Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the February 9, 1950, edition of the Christian Advocate entitled "That Unofficial Federation." This is in reply to an article in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest by Stanley High.

The editorial follows:

THAT UNOFFICIAL FEDERATION

In the current issue of Reader's Digest, Stanley High, who was once a probationer for a Methodist Annual Conference but was never admitted into membership, and who

ran, unsuccessfully, for the editorship of the Epworth Herald, official youth publication of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has written an article titled, "Methodism's Pink Fringe." It is clever and half-convincing—only half-convincing to careful readers because the facts are fractional facts.

Throughout the article Dr. High descends to the level of the kind of reporting we have done in the first sentence of this editorial. There we have set down two unpleasant and uncomplimentary facts about Dr. High's relationships with the Methodists, among whom his father was a distinguished minister. We might have enumerated many complimentary facts, and we hereby apologize to Dr. High for following, for the moment, the bad example he has set throughout Methodism's Pink Fringe. We would do this personally but Dr. High has just left for Australia.

That piece of writing, in which he has been so scrupulously selective in his choice of facts to support his thesis, concerns the sinning and sinned-against Methodist Federation for Social Action. The article is only the most recent of a series of attacks that began in 1907, when the organization started as the Methodist Federation for Social Service, then as now an unofficial critic of political, economic, and social ideas and actions. Because its leaders have never cared much for safety and security, it has been an embarrassment to many Methodists, and it has been attacked as persistently inside as outside the church.

"Communist" is only the last of the bad names that have been hurled against the federation. It has been called "modernist" and "pacifist" and "socialist" and much else that cannot be printed in the Christian Advocate. But name-calling, cheapest trick in the propagandist's bag, has never cowed the federation. Rightly or wrongly—and the reader ought not to judge without examining the federation's principles in their entirety, and not Dr. High's excerpt—this group has gone on, championing the rights of the workers when Stalin was still the Czar's exile in Siberia, opposing the oriental exclusion act when Chiang Kai-shek's party was still in league with the Russian Communists, calling for an embargo on scrap-iron shipments to Japan before Pearl Harbor, demanding a like embargo on Russia for its attack on Finland while the men of Berlin and Moscow were still allies. The federation even opposed certain New Deal policies when Dr. High was still on the White House staff, writing publicity for the Roosevelt administration.

Understandably, Dr. High has made no effort to compile a history of the federation, which the Methodist General Conference of 1944 called a history of achievement. He has made no attempt to describe the federation's work. He has taken a few fractional facts and, after the manner of the astute debater he is, has based his argument on them. On several occasions the Christian Advocate has been at variance with the policies and programs of the federation, but we think that Dr. High is a long way from proving his case.

For instance, there is the much-debated Kansas City meeting of 1947 on the topic, "The Christian Church and Present-Day Tensions." General Feng Yu-hsiang spoke there, as he had spoken a few days previously before the Methodist board of missions and as he spoke before other groups, inside and outside the churches. Jerome Davis, author of Behind Soviet Power, also spoke; and his book was sent to all Methodist ministers, but not by the federation. Carl Marzani, whom Dr. High singles out of a score of resource persons, was also present.

These are facts, but they are not the definitive facts about the meeting. The keynote address was not that of General Feng or Dr. Davis, but of Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, past president of the federation, who warned against the totalitarians—both Fascists and Communists. The opening worship message was given by a staff member of the board of evangelism. The list of invited speakers included President Louie D. Newton of the Southern Baptist Convention; Rev. Edgar Wahlberg, whose community work was highly praised in Reader's Digest, and who served with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in China and Greece; Dr. L. N. Palar, chief of the Indonesian delegation to the United Nations; and many others.

Only a small portion of time was given to the speakers. Most of the schedule was devoted to the delegates themselves—and the list included several lawyers, an editor, a shoe manufacturer, a clothing manufacturer, and others from the commercial and industrial world—who discussed the relationship of the church to American-Soviet affairs, colonization and the Far East, Europe, labor, agriculture, community, and civil liberties. Mr. Marzani was a resource person in this last-named group, but so was Arthur Garfield Hays, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union.

Except for Dr. Davis' statement, no speaker actually dealt with the Soviet Union, and there was no praise for its policies. Nor was there any praise of Russia in any resolution adopted, including that on Soviet-American relations. Rev. Jack McMichael, federation secretary, who receives a considerable budget of space in Dr. High's article, said at Kansas City: "The Soviet Union has not only made mistakes in its history but has committed sins. The Soviet Union is by no means a Utopia. And the United States has certainly made many and great contributions to the peoples of the world. But both of these great nations are human and sinful; both have potentialities for evil, but also for good. Neither has a monopoly of virtue and neither a monopoly of sin."

Of course, this Kansas City meeting was about as badly reported as any in recent years. The New York World-Telegram headlined: "Minority Sings Red Hymns." All were from the Methodist Hymnal and included "Faith of Our Fathers" and "In Christ There Is No East or West." But Dr. High is a responsible journalist, who ought not to be willing to take newspaper accounts of a conference which one newspaperman condemned in advance, before a speech was made or a discussion held or a report heard, as a national sounding board for Communists and fellow travelers to expound the gospel of the Communist line.

Furthermore, Dr. High ought to know Methodists well enough to realize that they have the maturity to consider other points of view besides their own. When Board of Missions officials sent out Dr. Davis' book, Behind Soviet Power, they did urge that it be read. They also sent with it opposing statements from the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the suggestion that these be read, too. If Methodists are to be missionaries against secularism, materialism, and militarism in communism and other false religions, they need to know what they are fighting. Dr. Davis' book is a clear, if easily challenged statement. The Christian Advocate would be interested in having Dr. High, or anyone else, cite the name of one Methodist who was converted to communism by the study mentioned.

Despite all that has been written here, and much more that might be written on the weaknesses in Dr. High's case, the Christian Advocate maintains that there should be an end to the anomalous situation in which any group, no matter what its principles or purposes, can make unofficial pronouncements and take unofficial actions that are regarded as official. Only the general conference has the right to speak for Methodism; but non-Methodists, and many Methodists, do not know that. Because many of us do not agree with the positions taken by the Methodist Federation for Social Action, that group ought, voluntarily, to drop the word "Methodist" from its name.

Furthermore, we believe that the general conference of 1952 should set up a board of social action that would be responsible for studies and activities in this area of interest that has always been close to the heart of a reforming church. We made this suggestion before the general conference of 1948. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam made it 20 years before that, in 1928. We believe that it is an idea whose time has come.

But, whether or not Methodists have an official social-action body, with duties outlined in the discipline and officers responsible to the general conference, we hope that there will always be room in the fellowship of the church for persons and groups who disagree with most of us on political and economic, as well as ecclesiastical doctrine. No church has a more complete plan for bringing both ministers and laymen to trial, if they are guilty of conduct that is un-Methodistic. But we Methodists have never taken the position that disagreement means disunion, or dissent signifies disloyalty.

Dr. High has not proved that any Methodist is a Communist; he has not even said it. Furthermore, we doubt that he will or can.

Oil and Gas Depletion Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following transcript of the testimony given by me in opposition to the reduction of the oil and gas depletion allowance before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, February 14, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the record my name is CHARLES W. VURSELL, from Salem, Ill.

My State ranks sixth in the production of oil, out of the 22 in the Nation.

Our situation is a little different from what we would find in the great producing oil wells of the Southwest, that is, in the fact that most of our wells, while some of them come in as very good producers, are small oil wells. This depletion allowance, if it is tampered with, would strike a terrific blow at the present production and at the possibilities of future exploration.

I might say that the Texas Co., only a few miles out of my town of Salem, brought in the heaviest production in southern Illinois, beginning in 1937, and has found that those wells have gone down in production to the point where they have decided to do a major-scale repressuring to bring out more oil.

One of the high men in the Texas Co. for the past 2 years has been giving all of his time in organizing that field and getting ready for this repressuring.

Mr. REED. That is a secondary operation?

Mr. VURSELL. That is what you call a secondary operation. Now, this big company is interested in this work. I bring out this point, which you men probably are not familiar with. They say that notwithstanding the great production that has come out of that field, that has enriched our country, that has contributed millions to the Treasury, that with this secondary recovery process at an expense of millions of dollars, they expect to

bring more oil out of this field than has heretofore been brought out of it. I raise this point because the officials of this great company who well understand financial set-ups, would not undertake nor would they go through with such an expensive repressuring effort were it not for this 27½ percent depletion allowance.

All of this valuable power-giving product would be left in the ground. The Treasury would not get the extra revenue that it will get.

That is just one phase of the effect the 27½-percent depletion allowance, if seriously reduced, will have on the economy of the oil business and on the economy of the Nation.

Repressuring is going on in different States, and it will continue to expand; and in addition, the small stripper wells, if they are left without this 27½-percent depletion, will leave billions of dollars' worth of oil in the ground that will never be brought out, and the Treasury will not get the revenue therefrom.

There are over 3,000 wells in my county. There are over 20,000 wells in Illinois. They have made a great contribution to the economy of the country, to southern Illinois, and to the Government. And the oil men tell me, 90 percent of them independents—the little wildcatter that is still going out and discovering oil in these small fields—that they will be driven out of business if this depletion allowance is reduced from 27½ percent to 15 percent. And so it will go throughout the Nation. And they will be compelled to sell to the only purchasers, the gigantic corporations that may come into being, or to the great major oil companies that already are operating in the United States. Removal of this 27½-percent depletion is a gigantic move toward monopoly in the oil business.

I want to display to this committee a map of less than one small county in my district, and show you something of the financial hazards of going out and exploring for and producing oil.

This first map represents a small part of Gallatin County and the red dots indicate the dry holes. There are a few black dots. These dry holes are 94 in number, and cost over $1,316,000 of venture capital-and-loss capital, by the little independents and wildcatters that seek to develop the resources of southern Illinois.

I have another map representing a part of Edwards County in my district, which had 78 dry holes at a cost of over $1,092,000. This is a tribute to the pioneer spirit. Yes, and it is a tribute to a people who live in a government of freedom under the free-enterprise system, that are willing to risk in order to better the welfare of themselves and their families, and in order to help make this contribution to our State and to our Nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question, as you members of the committee well know, this question of depletion has been before the Congress and this committee time and again in the past. After a thorough research of trial and experience, it was agreed by the Treasury Department and by this committee and the Congress, that the 27½-percent depletion allowance policy is the nearest equitable solution possible to arrive at, as between the Government and those engaged in the great oil industry.

This depletion allowance has been the constant main spring incentive for the past 25 years in the exploration and development of our great oil industry and its contribution to the entire economy of our Nation.

This depletion incentive made possible the accumulation of power that has helped us win two world wars on land, sea, and in the air. In the last World War it was absolutely vital to national defense. With the chaotic condition of the world at the present time, it is more imperative than ever that this depletion allowance be not reduced to any degree. The reduction of this depletion allowance by this Congress would be a risk and gamble against national defense that we dare not take.

The economic structure of the oil industry is built around this depletion provision. If it is seriously reduced, or if completely repealed, it will drive practically all of the little independents of the Nation out of business, because under such a condition they cannot raise the risk capita necessary to continue exploration.

Mr. Chairman, this depletion allowance is particularly necessary if we are to keep hundreds of thousands of small wells producing. Without it, they would be closed down with possibly billions of dollars worth of oil that never would be brought to the surface. It would be lost forever. The Federal Government would lose the tax revenue it would bring into the Treasury.

We have over 20,000 oil wells in Illinois—several thousand of them located in the congressional district I have the responsibility to represent. From my close contact with the operators in Illinois, and from my knowledge of the Illinois fields, I know the destruction it would bring to my section of the State, because most of the wells are small producers.

To seriously tamper with the depletion provision would largely stop further exploration and development and would close down thousands of wells that are now profitably producing and would deprive the people of my section of the State and the Federal Government of a great amount of much-needed revenue.

Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department has testified that to reduce depletion from 27½ percent to 15 percent would gain the Government in taxes $200,000,000 a year.

A successful tax structure must be one that will encourage the expansion of business and the increase of the national income against which taxes are levied. This proposed tax legislation does not follow such a policy. It is just the reverse.

It tends to contract and reduce business. It makes the goal sought impossible. It will come nearer reducing by a half billion to a billion dollars the amount of tax money finding its way into the Federal Treasury than it will increasing the amount by $200,000,000. It is a gamble that this committee and this Congress, in my judgment, cannot afford to take.

When you consider the thousands of oil rigs that will be stacked in the yards and no longer used if this legislation is passed, with a million or more men formerly employed in the oil fields and in the oil business no longer employed, from which the Government, when employed, was checking off a high income tax, with billions of former oil income lost and no longer taxable; it is no rash statement when I say—

That the Treasury has asked this Congress to pass a bill that, on the one hand, may bring in $200,000,000 additional income in the coming fiscal year; but, on the other hand, the result of this legislation will most likely lower the national income to the point where the Treasury thereby will lose and fail to be able to collect from $500,000,000 to a billion dollars for the same fiscal year.

Worse than that, this terrific loss in tax revenue will continue in the future each year if the present depletion exemption is repealed.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all realize that the Congress and the Chief Executive has laid the heavy hand of taxation on all business almost to the limit of its endurance. We must not tax to the point of diminishing returns. We are at the point on this legislation where, in my judgment, if we pass it, we will demonstrate to the people of this Nation what Thomas Jefferson meant when he said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Mr. Chairman, I know the great Jeffersonian Democrats on this committee and the great Republican Members of Congress on this committee—all of whom believe in the truth of that statement—will not want to demonstrate to the American people the logic of Jefferson's wisdom expressed over 150 years ago by becoming a party to destroying the great independent oil interests of this country through taxation.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go further in my defense of the thousands of little oil operators in southern Illinois and throughout the Nation. I believe we have proved our case.

I understand I am to be followed by Mr. Alan K. Swann, who has followed the oil trail for a lifetime from the Texas Panhandle to southern Illinois, and who is now located in Evansville, Ind., specializing for a lifetime as an oil lawyer and in oil development.

Among the independent producers I know of no man who can bring to this committee more definite facts in discussing this prospective legislation. He will speak for the Tri-State oil group, representing Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky. I know you will hear him with interest and with profit.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the courtesy extended to me, your colleague.

Mr. REED. I just want to congratulate the gentleman on the very logical and convincing way in which he has presented this case for his constituents out in Illinois.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I heartily concur in the remarks made by my colleague.

Mr. VURSELL. Thank you very kindly, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. VURSELL, for the information you have given the committee.

To Balance the Budget Takes Skill, Courage; but It Is Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Blair Moody from the Detroit News of January 15, 1950:

TO BALANCE THE BUDGET TAKES SKILL, COURAGE; BUT IT IS POSSIBLE

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—By getting down to the real crux of the issue, Congress can balance the budget this year, vote a moderate reduction in excise or income taxes, and leave a small surplus to cut the national debt.

It will not be an easy task and cannot be done by a routine "more of the same" on Capitol Hill. It will require, if it is done, real political courage in standing up to pressure groups, the imagination and boldness needed to install a modern system of budget making based on standard corporate practice, and extensive changes in certain laws which now serve as open spigots, pouring out tax dollars.

But the opportunity is within grasp. And it can be done, as this article will attempt to demonstrate, without wrecking President Truman's international peace program—the customary target of some blunderbuss economizers on Capitol Hill—and without undermining either the activities of the Government which help to sustain prosperity, or

the military strength which is the free world's protection against aggressive communism.

BLANKET SLASHES NOT A CURE

To end the days of peacetime red ink on the Potomac, a program must have these three things:

1. A vigorous will to economize intelligently.

A vague impulse against deficit spending, if not accompanied by hard-boiled analysis of hidden subsidies, usually results in political demands for impractical "blanket" slashes after Congress itself has approved a long list of appropriations, some of which are unnecessary or plain waste. Possible specific cuts are listed below.

2. Recognition of the fact that not only the budget itself but the laws lying beneath it require revision.

Some of these laws establish specifications under which money is to be paid out, but set no limit on the height to which such mandatory payments can climb.

It is under such a law that $263,000,000 is being poured out in 2 years for potatoes which are being destroyed. Such a law required the Secretary of Agriculture to pay out $65,000,000 for eggs, while grocery prices were 85 cents a dozen, and bury millions in caves in the Midwest.

DOOR LEFT OPEN FOR SUBSIDIES

Another mandatory open-end appropriation has ballooned to $990,000,000 in a single year the cost of mortgages on new homes bought for cash by a single Federal agency. The subsidy for building and operating our merchant fleet has jumped out of control from eighteen to eighty-one millions in a single year. The cost of veterans' education was $500,000,000 above estimates.

These open-end laws are one reason Congress cannot conscientiously order the President, as one group tried to do in 1949, to make enough cuts to balance the budget. The President has no legal way to check some expenditures running into billions.

Nor does it do any good for Congress to go through the motions of reducing a presidential item, like its $400,000,000 cut in the veterans' fund last year, when this merely means it now must vote a "supplemental" appropriation of $700,000,000 to carry out its own law. In 1947 Congress reduced by $800,000,000 the item for tax refunds which taxpayers had coming to them by law. Of course, this "economy" had to be canceled later, plus.

WHERE SPENDING IS ORDERED

It would be impossible for Congress to set exact amounts for some programs which are thoroughly justified, because the cost varies with economic conditions. But it is important to realize that a big segment of the budget is written, not by the appropriating committees, but by those who write the phrases into these open-end laws.

3. Remove from the list of items which are to be paid for out of taxes the cost of loans or improvements which is actually to be met by payments from a second source.

In the new budget there are about $4,000,000,000 of such items. Under the present system they are being charged to the taxpayers, cash on the barrel head.

They include such items as home mortgages being bought outright. These will be liquidated by the people paying off the mortgages. If experience serves, the losses will be small. The whole transaction will wash itself out as a huge revolving fund. But this is counted as much an expenditure as a machine gun or a clerk's salary.

They include cash loans on huge reserves of corn, wheat, and cotton, which, come a lean year, will be sold. But the taxpayer pays cash now. They include loans for installation of rural electric lines and telephones, which pay for themselves. They include well-secured foreign loans made by the Export-Import Bank, money loaned to States and cities for public works planning, and investments in the vast reclamation projects which invariably return the Government's money 100 cents on the dollar.

THE TAXPAYER PAYS

But the taxpayer is asked to put up all the money for all of those returnable items this year, and if Congress does not think such heavy taxes are good for the country, then he is told Uncle Sam is running in red ink, the country is "deficit spending," and higher taxes seem to be called for.

Would a private corporation run its affairs on such a basis? Where would General Motors get if it built and equipped a new Chevrolet plant and then charged the full cost into the selling price of its cars in a single year?

The Government is using its credit to back the buying of homes by GI's, which, if such direct Government credit is sound at all, could properly become a revolving fund in the Federal Reserve System. Instead, the taxpayers pay cash for the homes, now, and get their money back over a period of years.

OUR REAL LOSSES

There is another angle to this lack of a capital budget in Federal finance. Millions of tons of topsoil are flowing down our rivers to the sea each year. They cannot be recovered. Billions of kilowatts of potential power are flowing to waste in undeveloped rivers. Hundreds of thousands of acres are still unfertile desert for lack of irrigation projects which would pay for themselves.

Why aren't they developed? Because the money for their capital improvements would be charged this year to the taxpayers. Therefore, we can't afford it. Therefore, vast resources become a net loss. Completion of the great self-liquidating Central Valley project in California and many others will take many years longer to develop than would be possible if the Government had a corporate system of bookkeeping.

This policy would be like Chrysler deciding how much it could charge to prices each year for a new plant, and then building only that much of the plant in that year, instead of getting the benefit of the plant at once and making the charge-off over a suitable period of years.

It would be like Detroit lumping the whole cost of its new $30,000,000 sewer system on the tax rolls in 1 year—or else not building the sewers.

CLOSE CHECK NEEDED

The deficit in the budget sent to Congress by President Truman was $5,100,000,000. By cutting expenditures where they can be cut without damage to the country, and by creating a reserve revolving fund, with a proper percentage set aside against losses, within RFC or preferably Federal Reserve, to finance all loans and programs which after hard-boiled appraisal qualify as self-liquidation, a minimum of $6,000,000,000 can be cut from the tax budget.

Close check should also be kept on the total outgo and total income in relations between the people and the Government. This flow of cash represents the impact of Government activity on the economy and must be measured against current conditions to guide the President and Congress in timing the size of Government programs from the angle of inflation, deflation, prices, and employment.

But the central issue posed by the annual budget made by the President is whether taxes are sufficient to cover expenditures.

POSSIBLE ECONOMIES

Even the shift to a capital budget would not balance the tax budget. Real economy is also necessary. Here is one way to do it:

1. An average over-all cut in Federal personnel of 8 percent, as recommended by Senator DOUGLAS (Democrat), Illinois. Some smaller agencies would be crippled by such a cut, but larger ones could absorb around 10 percent providing many of them are reorganized at the same time, as recommended by the Hoover Commission. Secretary Johnson says the Defense Department will operate more efficiently after 149,000 discharges than before. Saving in this area—$550,000,000.

2. Hidden subsidies buried in the theoretically inviolable interest on the public debt account. The average cost of Government borrowing is 2.2 percent, but the Treasury pays 3 percent to the two billion trust fund of the railway retirement account, a net subsidy of $16,000,000 paid by the general taxpayers.

The veterans' insurance accounts gets 3½ percent for its World War I trust and 3 percent for World War II trust, a net subsidy to this eight-billion-plus trust fund of $75,000,000. Saving—$91,000,000.

3. President Truman has frozen the contract authority for $306,000,000 worth of veterans' hospitals Congress has voted. Of the 1,800,000 veterans to be sent to school and college in the coming year at a cost of $2,400,000,000, more than half are in below-college-grade schools, some of which recruit students, collect tuition fees but do not provide adequate training, according to the President.

Budget experts estimate $500,000,000 to $700,000,000 can be saved in this area alone, with one big "if." If Congress changes the terms of the law so the Administration can get at the near racketeers.

NONSERVICE AILMENTS

Two-thirds of the veterans in hospitals have non-service-connected ailments. Their proportionate cost of hospital expenses—$314,000,000. They are admitted only if there is spare room in the VA hospitals, theoretically, but Congress authorized a building program topping $1,000,000,000.

The President says the Government should provide only for the needs arising out of military service. Experts estimate the potential saving at $200,000,000 if only those who really need the subsidy were admitted.

If administrative costs of the veterans' insurance trust funds were charged to its income, that would be another $44,000,000. Economy—roughly $1,000,000,000.

4. The budget includes $500,000,000 as subsidy to States and cities for roads. In theory, this is uncuttable, since under the hangover system it is always authorized, and some contracts are let, before the money is voted.

However, State representatives could be called in, told Uncle Sam cannot afford so great a road subsidy this year, and asked to cooperate, always realizing that cooperation with Santa Claus pays in the long run. Potential saving—$250,000,000

PERSONNEL REDUCTION

5. Knocking down the overgenerous vacation leave from 26 days to 20. If done during the general shake-up which Hoover recommends this could reduce personnel sufficiently to save (DOUGLAS' estimate)—$100,000,000.

6. Reduction of subsidies on silver, and on potatoes and other agricultural commodities—$100,000,000. This is DOUGLAS' estimate. It is a variable because it depends on Congress changing the price-support laws.

If Congress would change the agricultural price-support scheme to a combination of the best features of the Aiken and Brannan plans, the saving could be much greater and everyone would be better off, he believes.

7. Slowing down the rate of construction in river and harbor projects. Saving (DOUGLAS' estimate), $300,000,000.

8. Reduction of maritime and other transportation subsidies; merger of Army engineers in Department of the Interior as Hoover recommended. Saving (DOUGLAS' estimate), $200,000,000.

These savings would total $2,500,000,000. They are, of course, very rough estimates. Nor do they include all savings that could be

made. But they give a measure of what might be done.

CAPITAL ACCOUNT ITEMS

Now for the capital assets that could be shifted into a capital account, to be financed through a revolving fund, to be considered in their impact on the economy, but not to be charged against the tax account. They could include:

Loans

RFC loans to industry and financial institutions, $194,000,000.

Rural electrification and telephone loans, $408,000,000.

Mortgages financed by Federal National Mortgage Association, $990,000,000.

Loans to States and cities for public-works planning, to be returned to Government when projects are actually financed and built by local communities, $241,000,000.

Export-Import Bank loans to foreign nations (these considered better secured than loans granted by ECA), $98,000,000.

Commodities

Grain, cotton, and other crops held by Commodity Credit Corporation, $621,000,000.

Stock piling of scarce and strategic materials, $650,000,000.

Physical assets

Self-liquidating reclamation projects, $354,000,000.

Tennessee Valley Authority extension, $118,000,000.

In total, the taxpayers are being asked to pay in cash this year for $3,674,000,000 worth of assets which will pay out. (The President's 4,000,000,000 figure included some items that are invaluable assets, like atomic-energy plants, but are not yet surely self-liquidating. He did not favor the capital budget.)

GET MORE FOR LESS

This analysis indicates that something over $6,000,000,000 could be clipped from the tax budget without altering the President's figures for either international aid or defense or halting such social projects as the proposed Federal aid to education.

Secretary Johnson has already made savings in the Defense Department officially estimated at $1,500,000,000 a year. But the purchase of equipment, especially airplanes, previously authorized by Congress will raise military spending to a point slightly higher than a year ago, even though the request for new authority to contract is less.

We are getting more defense for less money. If the additional $500,000,000 Senator DOUGLAS believes can be clipped from defense is feasible, it should be devoted to more equipment. The Air Force still warns it does not have what it needs to defend the United States and strike back if a sneak attack comes.

There is no need to cripple the vital programs for peace and higher living standards by cutting the budget. It can be balanced without that. This analysis does not intend to imply there are not other spots at which the budget could be cut. There undoubtedly are. But here are enough to do the job.

The Crisis the President Couldn't See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of February 24, 1950, entitled "The Crisis the President Couldn't See":

THE CRISIS THE PRESIDENT COULDN'T SEE

As this was was written, Illinois schools were closed to more than 43,000 boys and girls. The buildings were without heat because of the coal strike.

Hospitals are keeping a watchful eye on their coal reserves. Householders who burn coal guard every lump and use it with the greatest economy. The State welfare department, with thousands of persons housed in its institutions, is scrambling in the open market for scarce coal and seeking other sources of heat, should the coal supply utterly fail. It seems likely at this time that a State-wide dim-out will be imposed in order that producers of electricity may conserve coal. The anticipated 25-percent power cut will be felt by many businesses.

Meanwhile scarcity has been producing its inevitable family of evils. Panic prices are being paid for coal. It is reported that at some small mines still operating, coal is sold to the highest bidders. Eugene A. Tetzlaff, chairman of the Peoria citizens coal committee, telegraphed to Governor Stevenson and to Illinois Congressmen Wednesday that there is virtually no coal in Peoria and that "suffering is imminent."

This is the crisis that was foreseen as inevitable 6 weeks ago. Every detail of it was predictable. We watched it fearfuly as it drew nearer, day by day.

The one man who denied it until even he could no longer refuse to face facts was President Truman.

No one can predict today how or when the coal strike will be settled. But we can say with certainty that the settlement would have come earlier if the emergency had been recognized earlier by the President.

We owe our present crisis largely to President Truman's reluctance, for political reasons, to use the Taft-Hartley law.

Amending the Tariff Act of 1930

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following text of a bill introduced by me February 27 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, together with a brief explanation of the bill and a statement of the need therefor:

H. R. 7447

A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new proviso: *"Provided further*, That on photographic or magnetic film, tape, wire, or other material of any kind on which sound has been recorded abroad by photography, magnetism, or any means whatsoever, and which is suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture exhibits (not including any of the foregoing which is photographic film on which pictures have been recorded, or any of the foregoing which is provided for in paragraph 1726 of this act, as amended), the duty shall be 1 cent per linear foot."

SEC. 2. That paragraph 1726 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting, after the word "reel", the following: "photographic or magnetic film, tape, wire, or other material of any kind on which sound has been recorded abroad by photography, magnetism, or any means whatsoever, and which is suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture news reels."

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

SECTION 1

This section extends the coverage of paragraph 1551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to include photographic or magnetic film, tape, wire, or other material of any kind on which sound has been recorded abroad by photography, magnetism, or any other means, and which is suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture exhibits. It imposes a duty at the rate of 1 cent per linear foot on such materials. It excludes photographic film on which pictures have been recorded and undeveloped negative moving-picture film for use in connection with silent or sound news reels. Both of the latter are now covered by existing law. The language of this section is broad in scope and is designed to permit its application to such new materials or methods of sound recording as may be developed in the future.

SECTION 2

This section amends paragraph 1726 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by including in the free list sound-recording film, tape, or other material on which sound has been recorded abroad and imported for use in connection with moving-picture news reels. Undeveloped negative moving-picture film exposed abroad for silent or sound news reel is now on the free list.

NEED FOR THE BILL

When the Tariff Act of 1930 was enacted, the art of producing sound moving pictures was in its infancy. With the advancement of the art and the development of improved techniques for recording sound, new problems have arisen that point up the need today for enlarging the scope of the act's coverage.

In making sound moving pictures abroad, the accepted practice for years of American motion-picture companies is to photograph the moving picture on one piece of film and the accompanying sound on a separate piece of film. The separate films are returned to the United States and duty is paid on each at the rates provided for in paragraph 1551 of the above act, as follows:

Exposed and developed negative, 3 cents per linear foot.

Exposed but not developed negative, 2 cents per linear foot.

Photographic-film positives, 1 cent per linear foot.

By virtue of the most-favored-nation clause provision in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement with Mexico, January 30, 1943, the above rates of duties were reduced to 1½ cents, 1 cent, and ½ cent, respectively. Such rates are currently in effect.

Present-day plans of American motion-picture studios making moving pictures abroad call for the original production sound recording to be done by magnetic methods, using either magnetic film or magnetic tape. Magnetic film describes a film base, having standard sprocket holes, with a red or black magnetic oxide applied to the base in much the same manner as a photographic emulsion is applied. This film is driven in exactly the same manner as photographic sound film. Uniformity of speed and accuracy of synchronism with the picture are maintained by means of the sprocket holes.

Magnetic tape describes a tapelike material having paper, acetate, or other flexible base. Applied to this base, or impregnated in it, is either a red or black magnetic oxide, which is the recording material. This tape

has no sprocket holes, is approximately one-quarter inch wide, and the equipment for using it drives the tape with some form of friction drive. Magnetic tape is essentially a nonsynchronous material.

Since neither of the foregoing methods involves the use of photographic film, the sound track produced by magnetism is held to be dutiable on an ad valorem or cost-of-production basis rather than on the linear-foot basis provided for photographic film in paragraph 1551 of the tariff act.

Determining the cost of production of the sound track by itself is a cumbersome procedure. It involves an estimate of the cost of the entire production, moving picture and sound, and an approximation of the sound cost in relation to total production cost. In some instances, a few days' or a week's sound recording will be rushed to the United States. It is difficult, if not impossible, to fix a proper valuation on such limited recordings. On the other hand, the photographic film negative on which pictures are recorded, and to which the sound relates, may be similarly shipped and entry permitted on the payment of the linear-foot duty. Except in extremely unusual cases, the sound recording would represent only a minute part of the total capital expenditure for the production. Therefore, from the viewpoint of the development of a fair and consistent customs policy, as well as simplicity of administrative enforcement, the extension of the linear-foot measurement of duty on photographic film to sound-recording film, tape, etc., offers a practical and efficient means of determining the import duty that is fair to both the Government and the producer.

The proposed duty rate of 1 cent per linear foot, provided in section 1 of the bill, is a fair and reasonable rate in respect to the major element to which it relates—the film on which the moving pictures are recorded. Such duty rate is also the same as the duty rate currently in effect on exposed, but not developed, photographic-film negatives, a category as to which the exposed sound track has some resemblance.

Excise Tax Repeal and Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Committee on Ways and Means February 14, 1950, on the repeal of wartime excise taxes and retention of the depletion allowance for oil as existed for almost a quarter of a century. I invite the attention of all Members of the House to this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and members of this great and important committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity of coming before this distinguished committee on the question of percentage depletion on oil and gas.

I do not want to appear presumptuous but I have given a lot of study to this and the other problems of the oil industry for some time. As a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have been privileged to serve on the oil special committee for 8 years. I am honored and privileged to be the chairman of that important committee now. I, therefore, believe that having the opportunity during these years to study all phases of the oil industry very closely in time of war and peace, I know something about the problems of the industry and I am glad to give you the benefit of what information I can on this question of depletion.

I am fully aware of the tremendous responsibility of this committee. No one wants their taxes raised and I know you seek most sincerely to adjust certain burdensome wartime excise taxes and justifiedly so. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I say in all candidness that such wartime excise taxes should be repealed. They were adopted as a war emergency. It was understood then, I believe, that following the war such burdensome taxes would be terminated. We provided in the act imposing such taxes that they should be automatically terminated within 6 months following Presidential proclamation ending the national emergency. Such proclamation was made in 1947 but the Congress in its enthusiasm to reduce taxes in 1948 unwisely made such excise taxes permanent. It might be recalled the President at that time recommended that they be continued for only 1 year.

In view of the original intent and this history, I am quite confident this committee will report a bill that will include the repeal or adjustment of these excise taxes which will be in the interest of the public. At the same time, I recognize the difficult task of this committee in its efforts to provide additional revenues to make up the losses as well as to try to bring increased revenues in an effort to close the gap in our deficit spending.

However, Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that to follow the recommendation of the Treasury Department in reducing the depletion allowance on oil and gas would have a tremendous adverse effect on the future of this important industry. I firmly believe it would ultimately affect not only the economy of this country but the jobs of thousands and thousands of people. I firmly believe that it would ultimately and in a few years affect the available productive capacity and seriously endanger the future security of our country.

I do not want to be repetitious and I know you have heard the history and many phases of this question but I do want to give you briefly what I think are good and sound reasons supporting the statement of importance to our country and our future security. I want to present to you facts and specific instances not theoretical or assumptions, but how it actually works.

THE PURPOSE OF THE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

In the first place, why did the Congress provide depletion allowance? What was its purpose? What was the objective?

As far back as 1918, it was recognized that the future of this country in a large measure would depend among other things on a sufficient oil supply.

Therefore, the primary purpose of Congress in adopting the depletion allowance was to enable the oil industry to provide our Nation with an adequate supply of oil in both peace and in war. Before tampering with this provision of our tax laws, it behooves the Congress to weigh most carefully the effects any changes would have upon the primary objective sought—that is, a sufficient oil supply.

The Congress, since the Revenue Act of 1913, has recognized the need for some means of returning invested capital to an industry, such as oil, of irreplaceable mineral assets. It was not until 1918, after experience under the earlier laws, that Congress recognized the need to provide further incentive so the oil industry could obtain the funds required to engage in the peculiarly hazardous and costly task of discovering and developing oil reserves.

The percentage depletion allowance, in its present form, has been in our laws since 1926. It was designed as a method of determining what part of an oil producer's gross income is properly taxable income, thereby providing him with sufficient capital to encourage him to go out and look for another oil field. It is an incentive that has worked—that has done the job Congress intended. On numerous occasions Congress has reviewed this tax provision and continued it without change.

The risk in the oil industry is great. It is a hazardous business. To find an oil field a producer may drill four or five dry holes, and sometimes more, before he finds a producing well. Even after an oil field is discovered there are many dry wells drilled in the development of that field. During the past 25 years the record shows that of all wells drilled—both exploratory and development—more than 25 percent were dry holes. This percentage of failures for the year 1949 increased to 36 percent. The tax provisions, including both the depletion allowance and the option to expense intangible drilling costs, have made this very highly risk-taking activity possible.

The Treasury Department now proposes that the Congress take action which would involve a gamble on destroying the ability of an industry, essential in a greater degree than any other to the national security, to continue an outstanding record of performance over a long period of time. It is unnecessary to speculate on what has been accomplished under these provisions. Under the present tax provisions during the past 25 years, the petroleum industry discovered and developed 48,000,000,000 barrels—more than one and a half times the quantity used by the consuming public.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE HAS WORKED SUCCESSFULLY

Since the primary purpose of the Congress adopting the policy of depletion allowance is to provide the Nation with an adequate supply of oil, the question naturally follows—has it been successful—has it worked? That is a question you must consider and ponder well before making drastic changes as recommended by the Treasury.

In other words, through the years since World War I, has the depletion allowance provided the margin of encouragement that has meant the difference between having enough oil and in facing enemies with insufficient oil to fuel our war machines?

If so, Mr. Chairman, the Congress then cannot afford at this time to take any action that would discourage the discovery and development of domestic oil resources.

During World War II our Nation was called upon to fuel the greatest war in history by supplying six-sevenths of all the oil used by the United States and all of her allies. Had it not been for the wise course of action adopted by Congress immediately following World War I, by recognizing the need to encourage the oil industry by means of an incentive depletion allowance, the oil industry would not have been able to supply the oil we needed. Our oil supplies here at home meant the difference between victory and defeat.

Today the industry has recovered from the burdens and restrictions imposed upon it during the years of World War II and fortunately once again the domestic industry is able to provide all of our domestic demands and in addition, a reserve producing capacity above current demands. This is a reserve that we must have so as to be prepared for any emergency. In fact, our military authorities urge that this reserve capacity be increased.

The uncontradicted facts prove that it has worked and we have had a sufficient supply of oil. Even though the demands have sharply increased, the discovery of proven reserves have kept ahead of demands. We now have greater proven reserves than ever before. We have added over 1,000,000,000 barrels last year, 1949, from drilling. We drilled a total of more than 39,000 wells.

Consequently, the present tax provisions for oil and gas have proved to be effective, practical to administer, and equitable to the taxpayer. They have assured an adequate supply of oil which is essential to the Nation's prosperity on which income-tax revenues are based. This is even more vital to national security according to our military authorities.

OIL INDUSTRY PROFITS

There has been a great deal said about the profits of the oil industry and particularly with reference to the rate of income paid in dividends as compared with other industries. I am sure some erroneous impressions have been obtained from various reports singling out specific instances.

For example, the April 1949 monthly letter published by the National City Bank of New York, indicates that oil companies in 1947 and 1948 made a relatively high rate of profit as compared with other industries. The pertinent figures appearing in this publication are as follows:

Industrial group	Number of companies	Percent rate on net assets	
		1947	1948
Petroleum products:			
Integrated companies	44	15.7	22.1
Oil and gas producers	44	24.1	35.9
Total manufacturing	1,680	17.1	18.9
All industries	3,262	12.3	14.0

The above figures would seem to indicate that the oil companies, and particularly the group of oil-producing companies, made a relatively high rate of profit in 1947 and 1948. These figures are misleading and do not reflect actual conditions in the petroleum industry.

First, the above figures represent an extremely small sample of the petroleum industry. This is obvious from the fact that the 44 oil- and gas-producing corporations represent less than 1.5 percent of the 3,696 oil and gas corporations that filed income-tax returns with the Federal Government in 1946. In addition to these 3,696 corporations, there are many times that number of individual producers and partnerships for which this information is not available. The sample used by the National City Bank, therefore, cannot be considered as reflecting average conditions in the entire petroleum industry.

More important than the inadequacy of the sample, however, is the fact that the peculiarities of the oil-producing industry, as contrasted with other industries, result in a serious overstatement of real profits during 1947 and 1948. This comes about because the petroleum industry is engaged in the sale of capital assets found and developed in previous years whereas other industries in general are producing, buying, and selling goods acquired on a current basis. This means that the oil industry in 1947 and 1948 was producing and selling oil most of which was found several years ago when the cost of drilling and development was far below the 1947 and 1948 cost of replacing this oil. There is ample evidence that the cost of finding and developing oil reserves has been increasing steadily during the past decade. If the financial statements of oil-producing companies fully reflected the current cost of finding and developing, instead of the low cost in previous years, the book profits shown in the financial statements would be sharply reduced. This fact is well recognized in the oil industry and most financial statements contain an observation with reference to this situation.

A study will show that the oil industry normally has not made higher profits than other industries. For example, over the period from 1923 through 1948, 24 of the largest and presumably among the most profitable of the oil companies consistently earned an average rate of return lower than the average of manufacturing industries.

A further comment that is of interest in connection with this subject is the fact that the statistics of the Treasury Department show that the oil- and gas-producing corporations paid a larger share of their total income as Federal income taxes in 1946 (the latest year for which complete statistics are available) than the average of all industrial corporations. The 3,696 oil- and gas-producing corporations in 1946 paid 4.1 percent of their gross income as Federal taxes whereas the average of all industrial corporations was 3.1 percent.

In addition to paying its fair share of the Federal taxes, industry statistics indicate that during the past 15 years dividends paid to stockholders have reached 5 percent of net worth in only 2 years. The industry has found it necessary to devote an increasing share of its income to the discovery and development of new oil reserves. Industry figures show that a constantly declining percent of net earnings has been paid to the stockholders, or owners, in the petroleum industry.

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT'S HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE OF THE EFFECT OF REDUCING DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FROM 27.5 TO 15 PERCENT

Now I want to refer to the testimony of the Treasury Department wherein a hypothetical example was given which is a complete misrepresentation of the facts. I want to give you a clear picture of an actual experience which is typical of the oil industry to show that this is not a hypothetical or theoretical problem but an actuality.

According to the Treasury Department, the hypothetical example was given as follows:

"This situation might be called the story of how to make profits in the oil business without paying an income tax. The following example illustrates the method of avoiding tax liability:

"Gross income, oil and gas sales	$1,000,000
Costs:	
Operating costs	250,000
Development costs	200,000
Total	450,000
Net income before depletion	550,000
Depletion at 27½ percent of gross income	275,000
Capital cost of drilling six additional test wells at $50,000 per well for intangible drilling costs	300,000
Net loss from total operations	25,000

"The proposed tax revision would decrease the rate of percentage depletion but would continue to allow the deduction of development costs. In the example above the result of the proposed decrease in percentage depletion would be as follows:

"Gross income, oil and gas sales	$1,000,000
Costs:	
Operating costs	250,000
Development costs	200,000
Total	450,000
Net income before depletion	550,000
Depletion 15 percent of $800,000 ($1,000,000 minus $200,000)	120,000
Net income after depletion	430,000
Capital development cost of six additional wells at $50,000	300,000
Net income from total operations	130,000"

The Treasury Department misrepresents the facts in this hypothetical case as a method of "avoiding tax liability." In doing this the Department implies that this taxpayer has evaded the payment of a proper tax. This is completely erroneous. The taxpayer has complied fully with all the laws established by Congress and the regulations of the Treasury Department. In no manner has he evaded any law or the payment of any proper tax.

Congress adopted the present tax provisions for the specific purpose of encouraging producers to spend money in the exploration for new oil fields. In this hypothetical case the producer at the end of the year was not liable for any tax only because he had spent $300,000 drilling six new wells. The fact that a decrease in percentage depletion from 27½ to 15 percent would subject this operator to paying income tax only proves that the Treasury Department's proposal would increase his taxes and thereby reduce his ability and incentive to engage in exploration development.

The ultimate effect of the change proposed can only be determined over a period of several years, not on the basis of 1 year. The tax revenue that the Treasury Department may expect to receive from the oil industry in the future, will depend upon the number of successful oil wells that the producers will drill. The income which will be subject to taxation in years to come depends upon the ability of the industry to spend money in finding and developing new oil reserves. The more exploratory efforts that are encouraged now will mean more production and more income subject to tax in future years. The proposed change shown in the above case, therefore, would merely mean a larger tax during the year shown, but less incentive for drilling and an ultimate decline in oil production and tax revenues to the Federal Government.

Now I want to refer to the testimony of the Treasury Department wherein a hypothetical example was given which is a complete misrepresentation of the facts. I want to give you a clear picture of an actual experience which is typical in the oil industry.

A FACTUAL TYPICAL OPERATION

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see how this actually works in practice as totally different from the hypothetical case.

As I have just said, it requires a number of years to determine the actual return to the Government. Let me give you a typical case and approximate figures.

A producer in the early development of his properties in 1945, had a gross income of approximately $65,000. He had extensive development costs, which with other operating costs and expenses showed a total loss for him that year of a little over $100,000.

In 1946, having fairly good success, along with his extensive development operations, he had an income of approximately $700,000. Even so, with continued development and operating costs, depletion allowance, and other expenses, he again showed a net loss of over $300,000. But in 1947, in the development of these properties, the income went up and he had a net income after all development costs, operating costs, etc., of over $600,000 on which he paid Federal income tax. His income still increased extensively in 1948, but his development costs decreased. He began to show a substantial return of the tremendous risks and after all allowances, he pays to the Federal Government on a net income-tax return of more than $2,500,000.

In 1949, it was even more in income and tax payment. He received and pays income taxes on a net income of more than $3,000,000, and substantially more than 50 percent of his gross income that year.

In other words, over the period of 5 years and the development of these leases, even though the first 2 years showed a loss, you

can see in the 5-year period, the taxes the Government gets from this operation, and since it is being operated on a long time conservation basis, the Government will continue each year to receive a tremendous sum of taxes from these producers.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be safe to say, that had it not been for the incentive of the depletion provision, this operation as many other such operations, would very likely not have developed.

EFFECT OF REDUCING OIL AND GAS DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Then what would be the result or effect of reducing oil and gas depletion allowances as proposed by the Treasury? That is the question you must consider. What would happen in the future in relation to consumer interest as well as our security? To change or reduce the long established tax provisions relating to oil and gas, I think, would certainly endanger the Nation's oil supply. Every dollar of increased taxes means one less dollar available for exploring for new oil fields. Congress cannot afford in this time of international uncertainty, to adopt a program that inevitably will result in a discouragement of the search for oil.

For some time the domestic oil industry has been facing some rather difficult and serious problems. Before this proposal by the Treasury Department there were other serious developments which were already discouraging and having its effect on our domestic industry.

It is continuously faced with the contention of shortages which have been disproved over a period of 25 years by new discoveries and increased known reserves beyond the yearly demands.

In addition to this continuing problem, imports of foreign oil have been rapidly increasing, crowding the domestic oil producer out of his own markets. Excessive imports have the same effect as would this proposal, by depressing the domestic producers' income and activities.

Last year, 1949, imports reached an all-time peak and has seriously hurt the domestic producer. The Interior Department reports that the 1949 income of the domestic oil producing industry was $500,000,000 less than in 1948. This was not all due to imports but they were cited by the Department as one of the specific causes of this reduced income.

In addition, we are faced with another serious situation, as a result of the recent British embargo, on oil shipments by American companies into sterling areas. This threatens to further depress our domestic industry by diverting large quantities of oil produced in foreign countries by American companies into the American market.

I have made a serious effort to appraise the specific results of the proposed tax increase. I have made inquiries among the oil producers in my own State of Arkansas. A typical response was the comment of one independent operator who told me that he did not know what the result of the Treasury Department's proposals might be for the entire industry but he did know the effect on his own business. He stated that he had seven drilling rigs and five of them are now shut down and inactive. In his own words: "I am not going to do any more drilling until I am sure that excessive imports and increased taxes will not make it impossible for me to take the chance of getting five or six dry holes before I get a producing well from which I can recover my investment."

In my State of Arkansas, the oil producers drilled 322 wells in 1949 of which 147, or 46 percent were dry holes and a complete loss. This is a higher rate of failure than the national average of 36 percent dry holes during 1949. By drilling these wells, producers in my State were barely able to replace the oil produced by newly discovered and developed reserves. Arkansas produced almost 30,000,000 barrels of oil last year. Under the existing tax provisions, exploration and development was encouraged so that about 30,000,000 additional barrels were found and developed to replace our production. As a result, the State still has about 300,000,000 barrels of proved reserves from which it can make its contribution toward meeting this country's oil needs of the future. There is no doubt in my mind that we would have fallen behind in our reserve position without the present tax provisions.

Only a few days ago another wild-cat discovery was made in our State. This is highly significant in connection with this program. This well was drilled to a depth of over 9,000 feet. It costs more than $120,000 but yet it is a discovery of a new pool of oil. In fact, it is a success from two depths—two formations. One of these unusual cases known as a dual producer.

The important thing is that had it not been for this depletion allowance, this important discovery would perhaps not have been made. You have got to provide this industry with the proper incentive to find oil.

Another example is the Scurry County Field in Texas, the biggest single discovery made recently.

The reason, I say, my colleagues, that these discoveries would not have been made is because these leases have been owned for years and many of them lapsed, hope was given up, yet others in the industry come in and were challenged to find oil where their competitors failed.

You are having now the greatest hunt in Colorado, all around Denver are companies conducting a wildcat campaign that stands yet to give to the Nation a lot more reserves of oil.

What is the alternative? Cut out this provision and you will see these efforts to discover oil subside. The reserves go down and you know what the result will be.

Look at our neighbor to the south. Very little discovery has been made in Mexico since the Government expropriated the private oil interests.

Furthermore you talk about revenues to the Treasury. Without a sufficient and adequate supply of oil, you will be called upon to appropriate millions and millions of dollars for synthetic fuel plants. For the last two Congresses, legislation has been presented here for the Government to provide $350,000,000 in a commercial synthetic-fuel-development program.

Yes, looking at the over-all situation from a national point of view, I am equally disturbed as to the probable results of this tax proposal. I recall the war period when the Office of Price Administration froze the price of oil at a depressed level. This denied the oil producers the necessary funds and incentive just as the proposed increase in tax would do. All of us remember the effect of this price freeze. The reserve capacity was used up in fueling World War II, and, because of the restrictions on money and materials, oil-development activities failed to keep pace with demand. By the winter of 1947–48 our oil supplies were close to the danger point and consumers in our eastern seaboard States were faced with temporary but serious shortages. That situation has been overcome but it seems to me that it provides a lesson that the Congress should not forget. The Government has already experimented in discouraging industry through price controls that limit or remove the profit incentives. The Treasury Department is now proposing the same policy through increased taxes. The Nation cannot afford another threat of shortages of oil which would inevitably result.

How Frightened Can We Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1950, entitled "How Frightened Can We Get?":

HOW FRIGHTENED CAN WE GET?

There is nothing essentially new in what Hans Bethe, Frederick Seitz, Harrison Brown, and Leo Szilard have just had to say in their round-table observations on the prospective hydrogen bomb. As four of the Nation's outstanding atomic scientists, they have merely confirmed, with special authority and fresh detail, a fact that has been stated many times before—namely, that it is at least theoretically conceivable that the super-super-killer, when and if it is produced, will place within the reach of man the ability to destroy all life on this bewitched and bewildered planet.

As explained by the four experts, something like 500 tons of heavy hydrogen—exploded in just the right way in combination with certain common elements—might be enough to do the job. At any rate, the theory of the thing supports the possibility that such an explosion, in addition to causing an almost unimaginable abomination of death and destruction by means of blast effect, pressure wave, and uncontrollable fire within the general target area, would let loose a vast and all-pervasive cloud of radioactive particles. These particles, in turn, would play the role of a "suicide dust" poisoning the atmosphere everywhere and inflicting total death on mankind, thus leaving the earth lifeless in space—like the moon—except possibly for a few hardy bugs.

In any case, even if the hydrogen bomb never achieves its full theoretical potential as an absolute annihilator, today's actual and prospective instruments of mass destruction are—to put it mildly—terrible enough. Thus, according to the four scientists, a war with A-weapons, or with H-weapons not quite so frightful as the one these men have in mind, would create virtually insoluble problems of civilian defense. For example, over a period of 10 years or so, in anticipation of such a catastrophe, we might disperse about half our population and decentralize our major coastal cities at a total cost of hundreds of billions of dollars. But what good would that do? How could such a program be carried out without wrecking our free-enterprise economy and destroying the political and social fabric of our democracy? And why bother to undertake it when we know that our inland urban areas would be equally vulnerable and that there could be no real hiding place against radioactive clouds?

Actually, the more one thinks about the problem, the less sense can be found in proposals to establish an alternate National Capital or to embark on elaborate projects aimed at making life safe for civilians. The truth of the matter seems to be that the large-scale pursuit of such safety—by means of decentralization, dispersal, and things like holes in the ground—would be impractical to the point of impossibility. The fact everybody must face—both here and abroad—is that in an all-out, sustained atomic war, home-front populations would share the common threat of annihilation.

This is perhaps the most important single reality of our time, and by its very nature it is an incitement to fear. Yet, even though scientists and others are talking more and more luridly about it, the average individual appears to be admirably calm. As human beings with an inborn desire to enjoy life, most of us tend to resist being forever frightened by dismal possibilities. The Cassandras, of course, may be completely right. Still, it does not seem unwholesome to be reasonably optimistic and prayerfully hopeful that the terrifying destructiveness of modern weapons will in itself help mightily to prevent war.

In the last analysis, after all, everybody has to leave this earth sooner or later, in one way or another. There is therefore much to be said for the philosophical view that even if the worst happens and suicide dust engulfs us, the experience may in fact be less painful than such commonplace forms of extinction as being hit by a streetcar. In any event, if life is to be bearable, it must be keyed to something much better than a spirit of constant fear.

The Social Security Act Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article appearing on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune on February 28, 1950, written by Elinore Morehouse Herrick entitled "The Social Security Act Under Fire":

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT UNDER FIRE—CRITICS CALL LAW A FLOP AND A FRAUD UPON THE WORKERS

(By Elinore Morehouse Herrick)

I

A swelling chorus of criticism of the administration's old-age and survivors insurance program demonstrates the imperative need for a thorough overhauling of the system. A Senate committee is now holding hearings on H. R. 6000, which presents a modified version of the administration program. Criticism comes not from opponents of a Federal social-security system, but from proponents, including some who led the fight for adoption of such a system.

Their indictment is: (1) That it benefits too few of the workers aged 65 and over; (2) that it has become subordinate to a vast Federal relief system which is morally, socially, and individually demoralizing; (3) that the complex benefit formula presents too many hurdles to applicants and falsely portrays it as a contributory system; (4) that the administration program perpetuates the unsound and undesirable Federal relief system; (5) that it is impossible to predict the future costs and that in any event the whole plan prevents development of a sound program. It is disturbing that those in the best position to evaluate the unsound and inequitable nature of the existing program should be advocating its continuance—namely, those who are administering the program, receiving their own salaries from taxes.

Who are some of the critics and what do they have to say about the existing law and the proposed changes? Right Rev. John O'Grady of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, testifying before the Senate Committee on Finance, said: "As a pioneer in social security I now have grave questions about its future. * * * What is the picture after 13 years? About a quarter of the aged who have actually retired are receiving benefits under old age and survivors insurance, amounting to $800,000,000 a year, while almost twice that number are receiving old-age assistance involving an expenditure of approximately a billion and a quarter a year. And, not only is old-age insurance competing with old-age assistance, it is also competing with aid to dependent children. What puzzles us at the present time is that at the most critical moment in the history of social security the Federal Security Agency is recommending an enormous expansion in public assistance and aid to dependent children."

Monsignor O'Grady points out that because payments are more liberal under the assistance program than under the "insurance" program there is an invitation to fraud. He cites cases "in which mothers have entered into collusion with fathers about their disappearing from the home. Many times the husband was in the same city earning good wages, but the mother was receiving aid to dependent children funds, nevertheless, on the grounds of desertion * * * or a family in which the father was earning $100 a week * * * while the mother was getting about $150 a month under A. D. C. * * * The situation is most demoralizing to the family life of our people." No one knows how much of this sort of chiseling is going on.

William Rulon Williamson, an experienced actuary who left an insurance company to join the staff of the Social Security Board in 1936 and remained until 1947, bluntly terms old-age insurance "a flop." We have millions of unpaid beneficiaries among the aged and orphans. * * * H. R. 6000 sets out to make this system even more intolerable. Nothing could justify its passage. * * * With varied assistance administration, in lots of places old folks give away their property to their children to qualify, others are reticent about their resources, some seem to remember an earlier birthday. The attitude toward easily-come-by Federal funds on the part of State administrators is the logical development of the handout complex. * * * Three Federal recognitions of the aged exist, overlapping. Two of them, insurance and tax exemption, give more to those who have more. The third tempts the honest and thrifty to lose self-sufficiency, become dole receivers and demoralize both the recipients and the nonrecipients. * * * We should not burden today's society with 'adequacy' for all needs and fancied needs, but in simple justice we should not give $300 a year to one group for a purely token 'tax,' called a 'contribution,' to another more than $500 as charity, on the basis of needs tests that are frequently farcical, and nothing to the rest."

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, who in 1937 wrote the economic brief supporting the Social Security Act before the Supreme Court and has had 17 years of experience with Federal and State agencies in this field, reminded the Senate committee that in 1935 when the Works Progress Administration was being liquidated Harry Hopkins said the Federal Government was going out of the relief business, but it has failed to do so. It has simply changed the names of the various types of public aid. In 1932 the Federal Government spent a little over $4,000,000 on social welfare. Three years later it spent $2,000,000,000. The country was then in the depth of a depression. We thought of the expenditures as a temporary expedient. But now, 15 years later, during years of great national prosperity, years when national income is high and unemployment low, the Federal Government is spending close to $10,000,000,000 a year on health and welfare services. This is about 4 times as much as was spent in each of the depression years of 1934, 1935, and 1936 and 2,500 times as much as was spent in 1932. * * * Had it not been for the Social Security Act which crystallized and made permanent a vast system of Federal public aid, we might reasonably have expected the demand for such aid to subside as unemployment receded and national income rose. But the Social Security Act saddled the country with a more all-embracing system of public charity than we had in the depression. * * * Public charity is being accepted as a way of life by millions of our people. An artificial distinction has been drawn between social insurance and social assistance. The former is supposed to be due to certain workers and their dependents as a right; social assistance, on the other hand, is given to other persons and their dependents as pauper's aid. In reality there is small choice between the two since both forms of cash payments are made from tax funds. * * * The various public-aid programs which now cost the people of this country about $1,000,000,000 a month * * * are all similar in character * * * they are simply tax-supported benefits for favored segments of the population. * * * Social insurance is a cruel hoax. Workers are not buying insurance; they are not paying premiums; they are paying an ordinary income tax. They do not have a contractual agreement that for such and such a premium they will be entitled to a certain annuity at age 65. * * * In reality they will not get anything unless they stop work at 65. * * * What they will get, if they get it, is a small wage-loss retirement annuity which will come to them as a gift from the Government, that is, from other taxpayers. These facts should be explained to the people so that we may have an end to all this talk about benefits as rights. The fact to be borne in mind is that millions of workers are destined to be fooled.

Both Mr. Williamson and Dr. Shearon point out the impossibility of predicting the future costs of the present system. Monsignor O'Grady joins them in demanding a fundamental change-over in the present system to one of social budgeting which all three term truly a pay-as-you-go policy.

Mr. Williamson says: "We cannot find out all the facts about today. * * * Way out yonder in the year 2000 * * * we are not very clear how things will be. We do not know how many old people there will be. We do not know at what age people will seem old. We do not know what effect this dwelling on personal retirement for decades in advance will have in taking retirement. We do not know what the marriage mores will be in the year 2000. We do not know whether the costs will be $9,000,000,000, $14,000,000,000, or $20,000,000,000. * * * Social budgeting is pay-as-you go. * * * We should forget the misused words 'insurance,' 'contribution,' 'adequacy,' 'as a right,' and should think about compensation for the robbery of the aged by inflationary procedures, a social dividend for our inherited plant, of the generosity that is spelled out in imposed and paid taxes. * * * If we pay for social budgeting we must earn the funds. * * * Let us have no more tampering with an intrinsically bad law until a thorough study outlines the logic of a sound program. Such study should be conducted by competent, qualified persons. They should not be directed from the social security bureaucracy."

From a Republican Congressman, CARL T. CURTIS, comes one of the best and most thoughtful discussions of the present social security system. He, too, ends up with recommending social budgeting as the best way to meet the ever-changing problem of the

elderly and dependency. Mr. CURTIS' findings and suggestions will be considered in another article. All thoughtful citizens are aware of the mounting pressure for a proper social-security system. The drive for private pension plans is a dominant factor in labor relations today and serves sharply to underline the failure of the Federal system. Private plans have the overshadowing weakness that their continuance depends upon the financial success of the particular business, not just now but for years to come. They tend to tie the worker to his job—which is individually and socially undesirable. Also, they militate against the employment of the older worker, whose unemployment will add seriously to the burden of the taxpayers. On the other hand, a Federal system will be assured of continuity as long as the Government itself lasts.

Assuredly, this is the time to make fundamental changes in a system which in 13 years has shown increasing weakness, which has worked so inequitably and which is costing so much.

The Social Security Act Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1950, a second article written by Elinore Morehouse Herrick entitled, "The Social Security Act Under Fire," appeared on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that article, as follows:

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT UNDER FIRE—PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES INCLUDE LESS BOOKKEEPING AND PAYMENTS WITHOUT NEEDS TEST

(By Elinore Morehouse Herrick)

II

The break-down of the Nation's social-security system is so clearly evident that its very break-down affords us an unparalleled opportunity to restudy the entire program and come out with a far better one. Fortunately, a growing number of people in and out of Congress recognize the need to reappraise the program. One of these critics is Representative CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, who characterizes the old-age and survivors' insurance program as a "grossly unsound and ineffective tool." He calls for objective reexamination rather than a mere extension of its coverage or a mere numerical revision of its benefit formula, as the administration is urging. There must be a drastic overhauling of the program, even though it proves necessary to abandon completely those concepts upon which the current program rests. The discouraging factor is that those charged with administrative responsibility seemingly are unwilling to face the realities and the consequences of their program.

Mr. CURTIS criticizes the grandiose promises of the administration though relatively few of the aged can qualify for benefits under the insurance program. He points out that the old-age assistance program which makes more generous payments has led some people to conceal their assets while old people of the most deserving type have remained in need rather than face the stigma of a needs test, still others have become a burden upon their conscientious but poor children. In short, the artificiality of the line between covered and uncovered employments has put a large group of people who have worked hard all their lives to the necessity of pleading poverty in their old age.

The inequities of the present system can be seen in a few examples. A man whose salary is over $250 a month and who has been under social security since it started, and his wife, who is the same age, are drawing $67.86 a month. Yet this man paid into the trust fund a total of $390, or less than the amount he and his wife draw out in 6 months. H. R. 6000 would give a worker who has been steadily employed at an average of $250 a month $16 a month more than the benefits of a worker steadily employed at $100 a month. In short, the higher-paid man has paid for only $2.47 more in benefits but receives $16 more in benefits. This inequitable situation arises from the law's theory of compensating for the higher wage-loss suffered by the higher-paid worker upon his retirement although he has had more opportunity to save than has the lower-paid worker.

Mr. CURTIS attacks the method by which H. R. 6000 proposes to adjust the benefits of the insurance program to meet the change in living costs since the benefit formula was adopted. The remedy is not a satisfactory one, and the very problem is evidence of the program's basic unsoundness. * * * In view of the constantly changing levels of prices and wages, the revision could only be a temporary expedient. If wage and price levels fall substantially in future years, the ratio of benefits to wages could be disastrously high, both socially and economically. The more probable long-term trend, however, is upward, and not many years may elapse before this trend will give rise to a demand for further adjustment. * * * This continual need for revision of the benefit formula * * * points clearly to the absurdity of basing benefits on wage histories.

Representative CURTIS, like Dr. Marjorie Shearon, a former economic consultant to the Social Security Board, calls attention to the wastefulness of the wage-histories system. Elaborate records are kept, although the benefits paid bear no real relation to the amounts paid in—as in the case where the total sum paid would purchase a monthly benefit of $14.10 on an actuarial basis, yet the beneficiary would draw $47.95 a month under present law. "Even though the most modern labor-saving devices have been applied in the operation of the wage-record system, the cost is substantial, due to the inherent waste." Millions of wage records must be kept. For women, for example, who are only intermittently members of the labor force and who may never qualify for benefits, records nevertheless must be kept from the time they are first employed until death. "Or take the case of a man who starts to work, and works continuously, the keeping of his wage record by the Government is expensive. It is very likely that several times before he dies the cost of living and prices generally will change to the extent that the benefits he is to receive have to be changed, thereby rendering these past wage records entirely useless. We must also not forget that many fine citizens, who lead productive lives and make their contribution to society, never have a wage record. It is exceedingly difficult and in some cases almost impossible to apply the present program to these citizens."

Dr. Shearon describes in graphic detail the enormity of the wage-record system. "The Government is now paying more than $1,000,000 annually to rent IBM machines to keep the records in Baltimore. During the fiscal year 1949 wage records were posted to over 50,000,000 accounts. During the 1948 accounting year nearly 190,000,000 wage items were received. As of June 24, 1949, there were over 115,000,000 names in the employment index. Over 2,500,000 employers were annoyed with the necessity—and cost—of making out quarterly reports. As of June 30, 1949, the number of accounts which had been established was 93,356,137. The Social Security Administration is trying to persuade Congress to authorize an appropriation of $12,000,000 for a new building to house twice as many records. How many buildings do you suppose would be required during the next 50 years if the wage items kept pouring in at the rate of 190,000,000 a year? In 10 years there would be 1,900,000,000, in 50 years well over 9,500,000,000. The scheme is utterly fantastic and incredibly expensive."

Mr. CURTIS proposes that benefits be extended without a needs test to the millions of old people who cannot qualify under a wage-record insurance program on the grounds that they have worked just as faithfully as the more fortunate few who can now qualify. Broad universal coverage of the aged without the present law's restrictions upon the amount they may earn to supplement their benefits is economically feasible if we change our whole approach. Mr. CURTIS argues that "since social-security funds are necessarily limited in amount because they depend upon the amount of economic productivity in the Nation, the possibility of drawing off a portion of this productivity for social-security purposes is not too large to injure the Nation's economic health." In times of high employment the older worker would be able to continue contributing to national productivity and the amount drawn off for old-age benefits would be a relatively small portion of the national income.

A program of modest benefit amounts, one that could be borne by a present tax rate not much greater in total effect than the cost of Federal grants for public assistance plus the combined amounts of employer and employee contributions at present, is advocated by Mr. CURTIS. This tax should be in the form of an addition to the current normal income tax rates and the costly wage-record system abandoned. If the tax for social security were handled like an addition to the income tax there would be an immediate saving on the wage-history records. Approximately 8,000 of the 15,000 employees engaged in the administration of the present program are directly concerned either with the enforcement of the pay-roll tax or the processing of the quarterly employer reports and the maintenance of the many millions of wage accounts. Practically all these operations and some of the remaining operations could be dispensed with, if benefits were independent of these wage records. Administration of the old-age and survivors' insurance cost now in the neighborhood of $50,000,000 with about $45,000,000 for administration of the old-age-assistance program. The elaborate and costly network of regional offices would be unnecessary and other administrative economies would substantially reduce the present administrative costs if payments to the fund were handled as a simple income tax.

The nonpartisan, nonpolitical Brookings Institution has also studied the present law and the administration's proposed changes. They, too, recommend drastic changes: Immediate assumption of full load, payment of benefits no greater than are necessary to give full protection against need, and financing through a universal flat-rate personal income tax earmarked for social security appears the best system to use in these uncertain times. Brought face to face with full-load costs to be met annually, the people will be in a better position than

they are now to determine whether individuals with personal income sufficient to protect them from need should be paid a benefit equaling that given to individuals who without the benefit would be in need. Decisions on such vital matters should be arrived at with full knowledge of the size of the true load and the real costs of the system.

"The American people and the Congress have at present an opportunity to reconsider the fundamentals of the social-insurance systems that may not come again. Because of the upward spiraling of wages and prices that has occurred since 1939 the money benefits now being paid under the most costly part of the program—old-age and survivors' insurance—are comparatively small. They are small enough so that at present the existing system could without great difficulty be converted into one designed primarily to insure against the dangers of want, and that will to a high degree preserve the freedom of the individual to determine what use he will make of his earnings. Such a system will leave a wide field open for the voluntary savings that have been a source of capital, particularly venture capital."

What too few people seem to realize is that social benefits granted by whatever formula possible must be paid for out of our national productivity. Pay-roll taxes become a part of the labor costs and hence part of the price the consumer pays—and thus are passed on both to the worker who will ultimately benefit from the social-security program and to those now excluded from that program. Thus the very basis on which we now collect the social-security funds contributes to the high prices which make the benefits shrink. Congress has a great opportunity and duty now to reexamine the entire fabric and philosophy of our Social Security Act.

The Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star:

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

"There is no right to strike against the public safety by anyone, anywhere, any time."

So telegrapned Calvin Coolidge, then Governor of Massachusetts, to Samuel Gompers on the occasion of the Boston police strike.

Public response all over the country was so favorable that Coolidge may be said to have established a national policy. It is thought that this declaration had much to do with his later elevation to the Presidency.

The Taft-Hartley law was a reaffirmation of the Coolidge declaration. It was passed after a winter of disastrous strikes had fanned smoldering public resentment to flames of anger. The Congress that was elected in 1946 was generally considered to carry a mandate from the voters that legislation be passed to prevent strikes against the public safety.

President Truman has played shameless politics, with the Taft-Hartley Act. He is now reaping the harvest of the demagoguery he sowed in the campaign of 1948. The people now suffer because there is a major strike against the public safety and the Nation's Chief Executive, reluctant for political reasons to use the law which he condemned, waited too long to do something in behalf of the people.

Labor has no weapon but the strike. That labor is entitled to this weapon is also public policy in the United States. But that labor is entitled to use it without limit is not true. The people said so emphatically in the 1946 election. They are saying so now, as schools close, transportation slows down, and householders frantically strive to make a few bushels of coal last through the emergency.

We do not know how coal may be produced, if miners will not work, even though they are commanded to under the law of the land. But we do know that the people believe today, as they did in 1919 when Calvin Coolidge was Governor of Massachusetts, and as they did in 1946 after a winter of industry-wide strikes, that no one, anywhere at any time, has the right to strike against the public safety.

President Truman has failed in this crisis. We hope that better leadership will emerge from it. The 1950 elections cannot fail to reflect the public resentment over being the victims of the current coal strike.

The people of the United States believe that the right to strike does not include the right to strike against the public safety. They have said so through their Congress. They must say so again with such emphasis that the Federal executive department will respond to their wishes.

Are Local Chambers of Commerce Abandoning Their Fight for Local Industry?—Seventy-six Economists of American Economics Association Oppose Basing-Point Bill Because Against Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that over 3,000 local chambers of commerce will permit the parent organization here in Washington, the United States Chamber of Commerce, to vote them against their own interests. That is exactly what is being done in the basing-point matter. The old Pittsburgh-plus is rearing its ugly head again. This time monopolistic interests are not trying to conceal the fact that they want the power to destroy any local industry anywhere in the United States.

S. 1008 is a bill to perpetuate concentration of industry in a few areas around Pittsburgh, Pa. The Supreme Court outlawed the basing point when used for the purposes that these monopolies want to use it for now, on April 26, 1948. If the basing point is legalized, it means no decentralization of industry. Without the basing point every locality in the United States on water transportation is a potential site for a steel mill. With the basing point legalized it is not a potential site for a steel mill. If the basing point remains outlawed in every section where there is iron ore, there is a potential site for a steel mill, but if the basing point is legalized, such a site will not be considered. In practically every county in the United States there is limestone that can be used for making of cement. With the basing point outlawed there is no reason why a lot of cement plants should not be built. In fact, a large number have been built since the basing point was outlawed in 1948. If the basing point is legalized, there will be very few, if any more, cement mills constructed. The railroads strongly favor the basing point on account of the cross hauling that is caused thereby. This is very uneconomic, costing the consumers enormous amounts in excess of what should be paid, but it means dollars to the railroads.

I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune concerning the stand of the 76 economists on the basing-point bill. It is as follows:

A TEST JUST AHEAD

Seventy-six economists of the American Economics Association have just joined in a letter to the United States Senate asking it to defeat the basing point bill.

It is a measure designed to facilitate the use of basing-point or freight-equalization systems of pricing which were knocked out in the case of cement and steel by recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

The letter is a studied argument winding up with the idea that businessmen as well as Socialists can destroy free enterprise by engaging in national planning. According to John T. Flynn, author of The Road Ahead, the test of socialism is whether or not one believes in national planning.

It may be costlier for a time to stick to the traditional American policy of maintaining a free and competitive economy, but we ought to do it, the economists declare. To approve price fixing under the guise of clarifying the law, which they say is happening in this instance, would weaken the antitrust laws and hinder their enforcement, establish two systems of pricing, since only a few industries heretofore used the basing-point method, emasculate the Robinson-Patman Act, and be a blow to freedom by restraining competition.

The letter will be an irritation to those segments of business that believe sincerely there is nothing wrong but something very fair with uniform prices arrived at through manipulation of freight charges. Admittedly it complicates affairs for the large firms in such lines as cement and steel to have to sell at dock prices plus freight. It might even force them to such uneconomic ends as opening new plants in sections they have heretofore subsidized by absorbing most of the freight rate from the central plant. It might cost the people of the undeveloped portions of the country more for their heavy goods until enterprise comes along to open plants closer to them than Pittsburgh or St. Louis. And there is no indication that Congress is going to pay any heed to the letter.

But when the history of the country is written later the letter may have a place there, among the other warnings that it was a bad action to trespass onto the field of free competitive enterprise, whether the trespasser has a pink beard or a Van Dyke.

Trading on Bomb Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Arkansas Gazette on February 14, entitled "Trading on Bomb Control."

This editorial supports the movement for world government that has been spearheaded in the House by my very able colleague, BROOKS HAYS. Under his effective leadership, this movement has gathered a momentum and a degree of support that would never have been dreamed of a year ago. This editorial is one example of the way in which the opinion of this country's leaders is rapidly being brought to realize that world government offers the best ultimate solution to the troubles that presently beset the world. It follows:

TRADING ON BOMB CONTROL

On the same day that Albert Einstein in America was warning that, if the hydrogen bomb is developed, it will bring the annihilation of life on earth within the range of possibility, a dispatch from the Soviet capital reported that possibilities of achieving world-wide atomic control have been revived by Moscow's diplomatic circles. But any idea that the Kremlin leaders may have been moved by a desire to avoid a hydrogen bomb cataclysm was destroyed by the Moscow dispatch's statement that Soviet UN delegate Jacob Malik had hinted that Russia would be ready to continue atomic control talks in the United Nations if China were represented by a Communist delegation instead of a Nationalist one.

It seems likely that the question of Communist representation for China in the UN is only one of timing. Sooner or later it will come. But the Soviet Union is not contributing to progress on atomic control by putting a price tag on its willingess to cooperate. Even if Communist China were represented in the United Nations, this would not change the balance of power. The West would still have a superiority in voting strength and Russia would still have its veto.

The atomic control question cannot be settled by the obsolete methods of political horsetrading. As Professor Einstein observes, it will require the creation of new supra national governmental machinery. The Russians have shown no awareness of this necessity. And Americans, although they have demonstrated an appreciation of the need for political pioneering, have not taken positive steps in this direction. Only when we have put ourselves squarely behind a policy such as that enunciated in Congressman BROOKS HAYS' world federation resolution, can we feel that we have explored the path which Professor Einstein is talking about. Meanwhile, we can hope that the Russians will be able to realize that Einstein is speaking for them too when he warns of the possibility of annihilation.

People Eager To Hear About Ways To Preserve Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Ogden Standard Examiner, Ogden, Utah, under date of February 5, 1950.

It is a brief but timely editorial on the subject of peace. As one of the sponsors of the world federation resolution I commend it to you for your reading.

The editorial follows:

PEOPLE EAGER TO HEAR ABOUT WAYS TO PRESERVE PEACE

If any man in Congress knows the number of billions required to prepare a nation to take part in an atomic-bomb war and the size of the catastrophe to befall the combatants and innocent bystanders alike if nations begin dropping that kind of bombs on each other, it is Senator BRIEN MCMAHON (Democrat, Connecticut), for he is the chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee.

Gripped by the strong emotions his knowledge inspired, the Senator last week called upon the Nation to move heaven and earth to stop the atomic armament race. The Senator proposed the spending of as much money as a tiny war would cost to provide financial aid to Russia and other countries in the hope that economic aid would reduce the spirit of aggression.

The Senator's speech touched off lively discussion, probably to his surprise, because he confessed that his proposal would be viewed by some critics as wild and impractical, as indeed it is so viewed by some, but the general opinion is that it was time that somebody spoke up as dramatically as MCMAHON did for the good it will do in mobilizing public opinion against the defeatist notion that nothing can be done to stop the drift toward war.

Congress is even now considering in committee the famous Resolution 64, which says: *"Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring,* That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be the fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

The number of Americans, including Members of Congress, who believe that action in harmony with the foregoing will be effective in preserving peace, is far larger than the number who will go along with MCMAHON on his peace program. Yet the world federalists, despite their number and influence, never have gained the Nation's dramatic attention with their program as the Connecticut Senator has done with his.

The lesson MCMAHON taught is that the country, and probably the world, is eager to hear, for a change, some strong and emotional instructions as to how we can be switched from the war path.

Letter From Edward Francis Baker, of Mount Morris, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for the benefit of the Members of the House of Representatives a letter from a young man from northwestern Illinois.

During my many years as a Member of Congress I have never received a more unselfish nor a more logical letter. It convinces me that as long as we have young men such as he, with such American ideals, those who desire to shoulder America with foreign ideologies are going to have trouble in saddling the American people with un-American panaceas and schemes.

The letter follows:

MOUNT MORRIS, ILL., *February 14, 1950.*

Congressman LEO E. ALLEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I'm a young farmer (age 29), just getting started farming. I've been farming with my father for 10 years. This is my second year on a full-share basis. I'm married, with two children—a girl 4, and a boy 3.

Just getting started on my own, I'm naturally interested in making farming a paying proposition. I've voted a Republican ticket since I became 21. I'm in almost full agreement with everything the party has done in this period.

I (being an employer) believe Congress should keep the Taft-Hartley Act. There should be some protection against the loss of free enterprise, and no union has the right to tell an employer how his business should be run and what he has to pay. I'm also against the Brannan plan. I favor the sliding parity support plan. In case of an oversupply, let the price drop a little. The consumer has a tendency to feel bitter against the farmer on this direct payment. The potato situation is just a forerunner of what will happen if we continue to keep our support prices too high. I believe in letting supply and demand be the main factors in determining the prices we receive. A little Government control on marketing protection is about all I think we need. That is against speculators and large companies or syndicates trying to regulate the market channels. I think that with our present means of getting information out to the farmers (radio, farm meetings, etc.) we should be able to pretty well figure out just what is needed in production and how we can meet certain situations. I think emphasis should be placed on conservation of our soil and the Government agencies carrying on this work should not be cut out in any way. We don't quite need all we can produce now, but in another 50 years I think we may.

Getting back to my thought on our Government. I'm certainly against the socialized state. It has helped England to reach bankruptcy at a much faster pace than I think she might ordinarily have. I think it is exactly the opposite view from what our forefathers had in mind when they came to America. Let's give each American a little

incentive to work and not tax him to death, and I think our country will stay free and prosperous. If everyone is desirous of a Government job rather than one of his own, it won't be long until the people will be working for the State instead of the State for the people. I think we are at the crossroads today.

My whole thought on the matter is about like this. Let's keep every American an individual and not one of the masses. I love my work and I do it because I don't have someone telling me how to do it. I'm still my own boss, and I wouldn't trade this fact for all the promised security of some other system in the world.

Sincerely,

EDWARD FRANCIS BAKER.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD BREEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BREEN. Mr. Speaker, statehood for Alaska is a must, both for the people of the United States and for the people of Alaska.

Full development of Alaska is of vital importance to the United States from the standpoint of national defense.

Alaska has an area of about 586,000 square miles, about one-fifth the size of the United States, a little more than twice as large as the State of Texas. Only 56 miles of water, in the Bering Strait, separates Alaska from Russia. Out in the Bering Strait are two islands, Little Diomede, on the east, belongs to the United States; Big Diomede, to the west, belongs to Russia. They are only 2½ miles apart.

Alaska was the only part of the American continent to be invaded during World War II. Alaska is on the Great Circle route to Asia; the air route from San Francisco to Japan via the Aleutians is about 1,700 miles shorter than the route via Hawaii.

Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, has recently stated that Alaska is "wholly vulnerable" and that it "could be taken tomorrow by a minor-scale air-borne invasion from Siberia, either across Bering Strait or over the Pole." In the opinion of the Governor, statehood for Alaska and adequate defenses are inseparably linked, and one is dependent upon the other. Economic development calls for defense, and statehood will bring economic development. As long as Alaska remains undeveloped and militarily weak, the national safety is imperiled.

We are forcibly reminded of Gen. Billy Mitchell's statement that "He who holds Alaska holds the world." Any and all parts of the United States could be attacked from enemy-held airfields in Alaska.

While Alaska remains economically undeveloped, and what could be very strong military defenses are neglected, there is evidence that there is considerable economic activity across the Bering Straits. We are informed that permanent farm populations are being established to support industrial, mining, and military activities; and also that all kinds of experiments in agriculture are being carried on to determine how far north and under how adverse conditions foodstuffs can be grown; and that new kinds of crops and grains have been developed which prosper in the soil and climatic conditions there. In the meantime, I have been advised that little or nothing has been done in Alaska. Large expenditures have been made in Europe and elsewhere in the interests of security and for the containment of communism, and by contrast the importance of an area so near at hand and the one point at which the United States itself impinges almost directly upon the Russian homeland, has been neglected.

It must be pointed out also that Alaska and the United States are separated only by our friendly neighbor, Canada. The Canadian and American borders are the friendliest in the world and are the result of years and years of solid and genuine friendship and cooperation.

The time to concentrate upon building up Alaska in every respect, militarily and industrially, has come, and indeed such attention is long overdue. We cannot and should not be satisfied until we have a strong Alaska until Alaska's potentialities as a bulwark of defense and a source of valuable resources are realized to the utmost. I sincerely believe that the best way to accomplish this is to take the first step in the direction of statehood, and Alaska must have statehood now.

Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter and certain tables relating to our fiscal situation, the material having been prepared by Mr. Paul O. Peters, research consultant, Washington, D. C.:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1950.*

Mr. DANIEL A. REED,
Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: A study of the economic reports issued by the President's Council of Economic Advisers indicates that the Federal Government now should embark upon a program designed to drastically cut Federal expenditures at all levels where they make no counted contribution to the gross national product.

At page 626 of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948, it is shown that approximately $19,700,000,000 of the $36,300,000,000 in Federal expenditures do not involve purchases of production and might well be carefully scrutinized by the Appropriations Committee of both Houses and drastically trimmed.

An economy that depends upon deficit financing in time of peace is an economy headed for disaster. The Federal spending is providing a pattern for deficit spending at State and local levels, and the only way to put the Nation's financial house in order is to start now to balance the budget and begin the liquidation of the public debt.

This can be done only by cutting down on expenditures which make no counted contribution to the gross national product and indirectly to our national income and security.

From the testimony of several of the witnesses who have so far appeared before the Ways and Means Committee I find but little attention has been given to the matter here presented.

For your information and use there is submitted herewith several compilations which show better than words in this letter how the substance of our people is being sapped for the benefit of people other than "we the people of the United States."

Also, in view of the fact that the purchasing power of our dollar has now dropped to approximately 58 cents, it is suggested that the committee review the present exemptions for single and married persons with dependents and place the exemptions on a realistic basis, say $750 for a single person and $1,500 for a married couple, with an extra $500 for each dependent. The hidden excise taxes, tied in with State and local taxes, put a heavy burden on every person's income, leaving nothing with which many are able to provide security for the hazards of life, including old age.

Respectfully,

PAUL O. PETERS.

Summary of postwar foreign credits, grants, loans, and capital investments of the United States Government for the period July 1, 1945, through Jan. 31, 1950

Capital investments:	
Paid to International bank	$635,000,000
Paid to International Monetary Fund	2,750,000,000
Grants and credits utilized:	
Lend-lease	2,553,000,000
Civilian supplies	4,211,600,044
European recovery program	6,353,693,213
UNRRA and post UNRRA	2,877,099,803
Interim aid	577,000,000
Chinese stabilization and aid	399,173,438
Greek-Turkish assistance	584,429,758
Philippine rehabilitation	346,000,000
Korean aid	11,000,000
Refugee assistance	153,000,000
International Children's Emergency Fund	65,196,904
Inter-American aid	29,000,000
American Red Cross	10,000,000
Surplus property credits	1,341,000,000
Other items	340,019,047
Export-import bank, loans and guaranties	2,455,000,000
British loan	3,750,000,000
Utilized total commitments	29,441,212,207

Compiled from Foreign Transactions of the United States Government, issued October 1949, and from Daily Treasury Statement for February 15, 1950.

This compilation does not include amounts expended for memberships in or contributions to international organizations, which costs were $144,629,262 for the fiscal year 1949, according to S. Rept. No. 1274, 81st Cong. 2d sess., issued February 14, 1950.

THE LOAN PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND OTHER ITEMS AFFECTING THE GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

In computing the gross national product, the Treasury Department deducts from Federal budget expenditures items not involving purchase of production. Such items include expenditures for interest, veterans' pensions and benefits, tax refunds, grants-in-aid to State and local governments, loans to foreign governments, loans by Government-owned corporations, and such items and grants to foreign nations under programs like ECA.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1948, at page 626, shows that of budget expenditures of $36,300,000, items in the total amount of $19,700,000, representing expenditures not involving purchases of production were deducted leaving the contribution to the gross national product from Federal expenditures but $16,600,000,000.

The compilation following is submitted as an indication of the total of Federal expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 which make no counted contribution to the gross national product of the United States:

[All figures are in millions]

	1950	1951
Interest on the public debt	$5,725	$5,625
Tax refunds	2,177	2,151
Grants-in-aid [1]	1,803	3,265
Export-Import Bank loans	71	48
Veterans' pensions, etc.:		
Pensions and compensation	2,243	2,237
Insurance	518	39
Loan guaranties	61	68
Readjustment benefits, etc	2,871	2,542
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:		
Loans to cooperatives	10	30
Loans to prefabricators, etc	52	45
Business loans and guaranties	153	155
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Loans to middle-income cooperatives	-------	50
Agriculture:		
Loans to low-income farmers for housing	20	45
Farmers Home Administration, loans	26	26
Commodity Credit Corporation, loans	1,533	952
Rural Electrification Adminstration	362	436
European Cooperative Administration: Loans, grants, credits, etc	4,040	3,250
Deductible totals	21,665	20,964

[1] Actual expenditure 1949; estimate for fiscal 1951.

The table is an indicator of the trend in Government spending. Just how the Government, operating at a deficit, is able to carry on loan and other programs which make only a negligible contribution to the gross national product is the growing problem which the Congress must some day wrestle with. Eventually—why not now?

FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1, 1949, TO JANUARY 31, 1950

From July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1949, the foreign transactions of the United States consisting of grants, loans, and credits to the people of other countries totaled over $26,725,000,000. For the first 7 months of fiscal 1950 additional foreign spending was as follows:

Agriculture:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	−$4,471.24
China Aid Act of 1948	1,275,665.00
Foreign Aid Act of 1947	−9,561.08
Relief to people of countries devastated by war	−260.00
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads: Assistance to Greece and Turkey	118,784.53
Army:	
Military functions:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	$55,745,024.91
China Aid Act of 1948	88,130.27
Foreign Aid Act of 1947	28,711.20
Civil functions:	
Government and relief in occupied areas	551,600,044.68
Navy:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	9,949,122.79
Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	889.90
Federal Security Agency:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	3,843.79
Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	1,099.98
General Services Administration:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	106,849.55
China Aid Act of 1948	4,014,538.22
Foreign Aid Act of 1947	−103.46
Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	−593.22
Maritime Commision: Payments for UN relief and rehabilitation	−1,592.80
State Department:	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	−166,451.64
China Aid Act of 1948	446,826.39
International Children's Emergency Fund	7,196,904.05
Relief to people of countries devastated by war	−4,377.68
Economic Cooperation Administration:	
Disbursements by ECA	$1,710,144,423.18
Agriculture Department	235,451,515.84
Commerce Department	3,039,822.63
Defense Department:	
Army	38,774,272.15
Navy	−68,413.18
Export-Import Bank of Washington	71,868,285.08
Federal Security Agency	83,994.79
General Services Administration	1,091,846.77
Labor Department	15,489.07
Post Office Department	8,988,029.00
Assistance to Greece and Turkey	1,687,058.40
China Aid Act of 1948	−10,651,721.23
State Department	188,432.26
Foreign Relief Act of 1947	−580,713.07
Relief to people of countries devastated by war	−3,688.76
Other	17,351,638.46
Total, net expenditures July 1, 1949, to Jan. 31, 1950	2,707,769,295.52

Appropriations for international activities of the State Department other than the Foreign Service, for the fiscal years 1945 through 1950, both inclusive

Activity	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Participation in international organizations	$1,431,087	$9,008,156	$14,616,414	$90,961,118	$100,966,490	$99,663,558
Construction loan to United Nations	----------	----------	----------	----------	65,000,000	----------
International contingencies	1,500,000	4,250,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,600,000	3,300,000
Cooperation with American Republics	3,450,000	4,098,370	5,375,000	3,900,000	4,100,000	----------
Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation	----------	----------	47,918,000	42,500,000	21,499,000	17,166,398
Mexican Boundary and Water Commission	430,000	1,636,200	10,130,000	4,950,000	2,514,428	2,020,000
Rio Grande emergency flood protection	100,000	----------	100,000	25,000	100	15,000
Informational and educational activities	----------	----------	----------	3,000,000	27,000,000	47,300,000
Expenses and salaries, international commissions	197,000	232,910	318,100	415,417	469,130	500,000
Cultural relations with China, Near East, etc	----------	1,390,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Liquidation, informational and cultural program	----------	----------	----------	1,430,000	----------	----------
Payment to Government of Finland	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	5,574,740
Payment to Government of Switzerland	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	14,600,000
Intergovermental Committee on Refugees	----------	4,500,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Other miscellaneous expenditures	135,000	355,000	90,000	----------	----------	125,000
Transfers from war agencies:						
Salaries and expenses, foreign economic functions, State	----------	3,747,454	----------	----------	----------	----------
Office of International Information	----------	24,934,134	----------	----------	----------	----------
Inter-American Affairs functions	----------	5,819,414	----------	----------	----------	----------
Strategic Services functions	----------	2,500,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Surplus-property disposal, Army	----------	325,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Salaries and expenses, War Assets Administration, special	----------	3,516,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Yearly total	7,246,087	66,312,638	81,547,515	151,181,535	225,149,148	190,264,696

Taconite—The Need for Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, northern Minnesota is an area rich in natural resources and one which offers great opportunities for future development. In the past our great forests have been an important source of timber for the Nation—the high-grade iron ore of the Mesabi Range has been the backbone of the American steel industry for over half a century. But these resources are not unlimited. Our virgin forests are gone, and it is estimated that the high-grade iron ore of Mesabi will be depleted in another 20 years at the present rate of production. For this reason

we must give our attention to the development of other natural resources which are available in great quantities. We have enough low-grade ore and taconite to supply America's steel needs for a thousand years if such resources are developed. Northern Minnesota needs a reforestation program to restore our forests and rehabilitate the timber industry.

Northern Minnesota also has enormous deposits of peat—over half of all United States peat deposits are located in northern Minnesota—and the development of this peat offers this country a new and almost unlimited source of cheap power and fuel. For this reason it was most encouraging to note that the gentleman from Minnesota's Sixth District and my very good friend, Mr. MARSHALL, has recently introduced H. R. 7330, a bill to provide $1,000,000 in Federal funds for research in peat, and another $1,500,000 in loan authorizations to small business for peat production. This is an excellent proposal, and I want to go on record as being in full support of the measure. Congressman MARSHALL has my unqualified and active support in his efforts to secure passage of H. R. 7330.

I will now discuss briefly the question of taconite and the need for its development. Northern Minnesota is fortunate in having unlimited amounts of taconite, and this taconite contains the iron ore upon which our economy depends. For this reason it is proper that it should be discussed at this time.

A prosperous industrial economy and national security require, above almost all else, a continuous, adequate, sure, and safe flow of increasing supplies of iron ores to the country's iron- and steel-making facilities.

Without prejudice to the progress made to date, or to the sanguine hopes of the future, for the ultimate development of foreign sources of iron-ore supplies, one cannot avoid recognizing that the full success of such plans depends greatly upon an almost universal peacetime atmosphere. This condition certainly does not prevail in the cold war of today or appear on a nearby horizon.

The new set of realistic economic criteria used by Congress today in guiding it in its decisions should soon be brought to bear on this subject and be clearly passed on to industry, so that they can be applied mutually in endeavoring to assure adequate iron-ore supplies for the country. Violation of these guides, not yet fully recognized by many in industry, will surely endanger both our industrial health and security. We recognize that it has been necessary in the development of our decisions to adjust former peacetime economic criteria to the realities of our present era and responsibilities. Today we are fighting a cold war by unorthodox methods and unprecedented expenditures for national security and defense. Hence, determinations surrounding the supplies for production of and the marketing of industrial products must be kept in harmony under economic rules which realistically take into consideration the conditions of our present circumstances and the possibilities of a hot war.

Through two world wars the upper Great Lakes area has successfully supplied most of the required volume of iron ores without protective demands upon our military services. Today the same area still stands ready and capable of providing practically unlimited supplies of iron ores without the strain of military protection for its transportation routes such as are necessary in foreign fields or on open international sea lanes.

In addition to the types of iron ores supplied the country during the last two World Wars, the upper lake area has an abundant reserve of iron ores described as taconite. These are the types of ores upon which, in keeping with our American tradition of progress, we should begin to depend in larger measure. They represent a grade of ore in abundant supply within our own national boundary.

A large degree of national dependence upon foreign imported iron ores has many pitfalls adverse to both peacetime industrial health and wartime defense. It calls for a radical shift of plant location to certain coastal areas tending toward densifying population centers and increasing the strategic disadvantage of already critical target areas. Also importation of foreign iron ores tends toward delaying the necessity for an overdue advancement in iron- and steel-making techniques such as are known to be practiced on the European Continent and understood to be an important part of the Soviet program.

Sufficient progress has already been made in the beneficiation of taconite ores to point the way toward possible over-all economies by the broad utilization of these ores. These advantages are especially with regard to more efficient material-handling methods and adjustment of heat requirements. This beneficiation can be done locally near the ore bodies through the use of electric power and heat obtained from nearby reserves of heat.

These are only a few of the reasons why I have proposed that the Congress provide ways and means for prompt research and development of taconite for metallurgical purposes and heat for power and related purposes.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. DAVIES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments and observations concerning the piece of legislation which passed this House last Thursday, February 23. That measure, originally called the FEPC bill, as we all know was so completely hacked to bits by the McConnell and other crippling amendments that it bore almost no kinship, either in scope or purpose, to the original bill. It was so unrecognizable, in fact, that the father of the FEPC bill, Mr. POWELL, refused to vote for the version which finally passed this House.

All of us know why the original bill had its heart cut out by the McConnell amendment. A bipartisan coalition rallied enough votes to pass the amendment. It was a foregone conclusion that no Member who represents a district below the Mason and Dixon's line would vote for the bill in its original form. But most people believed that the members of the Republican Party who sit in this body would cease playing politics as far as this measure was concerned. After all, did not the Republican platform of 1948 contain a civil rights plank?

Ah, but we who believed this, were wrong. We were hopelessly naive in the ways of politics. For even on a matter dealing with fundamental rights for millions of our citizens, many Republicans would not uphold the side of human freedom.

Our Declaration of Independence states that one of the inalienable rights with which our Creator endows us is the pursuit of happiness. Certainly, in modern society the pursuit of happiness includes the right to work in a free economy according to one's talents, regardless of religion or race.

In all justice I will admit that a few of the Members from the North who voted for the McConnell amendment did so sincerely, because they believe that racial and religious intolerance cannot be cured by legislation, but by education. In the final analysis it is true, education is the answer, but the original FEPC bill was a step toward that educational goal. It is true that we cannot legislate men's minds. But the Nation, during its tumultuous history, has been governed by many laws which, when passed, were shocking and revolutionary but within a few years were part of our national thought and philosophy.

But aside from this group, there was a much larger group of Republicans who teamed with southerners to emasculate the FEPC bill. I submit that these men voted for the McConnell amendment solely because the original FEPC bill was endorsed by the administration.

We Democrats admit that we are split wide open on the civil-rights question. But what happened to the supposed solidarity of the Republicans? For political expediency, many of them voted for the McConnell amendment so that they could cripple the administration-backed bill and get credit for the final product. Many strong civil-rights advocates voted for the final product, but only because, though it was worth while, it was better than nothing.

If those Republicans want credit for what finally passed this House, I say let them have it. It is certainly nothing to be proud of and I seriously doubt whether many citizens, regardless of their political affiliation, are proud of those Representatives who voted to cripple the original FEPC bill.

I only hope that the voters whom those men represent come to the polls next November and show them that human rights are a matter above the level of partisan politics.

A National Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional rights of the people to life, liberty, and property have been brought to a very low ebb by the failure of the President of the United States to take immediate action in the coal strike still continuing, notwithstanding the belated injunction and contempt procedure. Millions of people, old young, sick, crippled, and those who are institutionalized for one cause or another, are made to suffer because of the stubbornness of our Chief Executive. I wonder if his failure to act in this great crisis at a time when he should have acted, notwithstanding the suffering his dereliction will cause, is a result of his desire to curry political favor with John L. Lewis and his followers.

Right now in the North the weather is extremely cold and from time to time snowstorms are sweeping over my congressional district, where there is actual suffering, and unless coal is made available without further delay the consequences to human health and life will be tragic. I am in a minority in Congress; therefore, I am not in sympathy with the socialization of our coal industries by having the Government take over the mines. This would be one of the steps in the program of both the Communists and Socialists whose voices seem to be the only ones heard by the administration.

This strike in the coal mines clearly indicates that the control of only a few industries by a political-minded administration can quickly deprive the people of their rights to life, liberty, and property, which is in violation of our Federal Constitution.

With the coal mines under the control and domination of one man, aided and abetted by a political administration, a large percentage of the industries essential to life, liberty, and property, can be ruined.

I deplore that in a supposedly free country one man should be able to inflict such consequences upon millions of people.

To suffer and permit the industries of this country to be closed will obviously inflict a cruel blow upon the employees of these industries and unless relief from the coal shortage is forthcoming it will mean in many cases loss of homes, evictions, untold suffering, deaths, and consequences that are immeasurable.

I have called upon one of the many industrial cities in my district for facts pertaining to the effect of the present coal strike. I have received a telegram this day, March 2, 1950, in reply to my request, which under leave heretofore granted I am inserting as a part of my remarks. I believe that this report from the industrial city of Jamestown, N. Y., will fairly represent the perilous plight of cities and villages throughout the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York. The wire reads as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. Y., *March 2, 1950.*
Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Member of Congress:

Coal situation this industrial community desperate. Note following facts:

1. Municipal light and power plant, which also furnishes heat to city hospital, has scant 10 days' supply.
2. Fifty percent of industries facing shutdown by March 7 or 8.
3. Furniture plants burning waste consume more coal when not operating and therefore will freeze when shut down.
4. Dim-out already in effect.
5. Prices for inadequate supply of poor coal now about double pre-strike price of good coal f. o. b. mines.
6. No profiteering by coal dealers.
7. Trickle of coal mined comes from stripping (surface operations) which are uncertain due to weather and roving bands of pickets.
8. Closing of industry means heavy loss of workers even though they receive unemployment benefits, plus suffering among those who can least withstand it.

Unless mining of bituminous coal is resumed at once, permanent loss will be serious.

JAMESTOWN INDUSTRIES, INC.,
H. G. KING, *General Manager,*
Division of the Manufacturers
Association of Jamestown, N. Y.

Treachery Is Protected by Statute of Limitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD George E. Sokolsky's column of February 14, 1950, in which it is pointed out that an act of treachery against the United States is protected by the statute of limitations:

THESE DAYS

TREACHERY IS PROTECTED BY STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

A point to note is that a fellow can commit an act of treachery against the United States, wait 3 years, announce his crimes, and nothing can be done about it. The statute of limitations shall have run and he is safe. This is the open season for ex-spies announcing their crimes. There is even money in such confessions.

That is why former spies like Whittaker Chambers, Henry Julian Wadleigh, and Mrs. Hede Massing can tell their stories in safety. That is why Alger Hiss could only be held for perjury. That is why some of them are only held in contempt of a congressional committee. The statute of limitations gives them a wonderful blanket protection for the crimes they actually committed.

The Hiss case, as important as it is, must reopen the question of the statute of limitations in such crimes. Actually, there ought to be no statute of limitations in crimes involving treason, espionage, treachery. There is no statute of limitations for murder; and while a murder may involve only one person, such treachery as the theft of the A-bomb involves all of us.

I want to quote from A Factual Review of the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss Controversy, by William Marshall Bullitt, a distinguished lawyer and a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of which Alger Hiss was president.

"On or about August 29, 1939, Chambers and (Isaac Don) Levine dined with Mr. (A. A.) Berle at the latter's Washington residence. Chambers revealed to Berle his whole story of the Communist underground in Washington, and particularly mentioned the names of Alger Hiss, Donald Hiss, Nathan Witt, and Lee Pressman.

"Mr. Berle was both worried and disturbed, because he believed that Chambers was telling the truth as he saw it. Berle at once took the following precautionary steps: (I) Established very close relations between the State Department and the FBI; (II) organized a special section in the State Department to follow any Communist activities; (III) arranged to have a weekly liaison meeting with the FBI for the exchange of information; (IV) worked with the Department of Justice in passing needed legislation for the Government's protection; and (V) twice checked with Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, who had Alger Hiss as his executive assistant; and Acheson vouched for both the Hisses absolutely.

"Sometime later, Levine conveyed the Chambers revelations to William C. Bullitt, then Ambassador to France, and to Lloyd (he must mean Loy—G. E. S.) Henderson, in charge of the Russian section of the State Department. Since then, the State Department has removed 134 members of the State Department, for disloyalty reasons. (The pamphlet was prepared in December 1948—G. E. S.)

"In 1943, and again in 1945, Chambers reported the facts about Hiss to the FBI."

In a word, as far back as August 29, 1939, the State Department and the Department of Justice had a lead to the Harold Ware Communist cell and its members. The FBI knew about Alger Hiss and must have followed the lead as a routine matter. On August 29, 1939, Soviet Russia was not our ally; in fact, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were in alliance and had signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact to divide the world by war. The nonaggression pact, as it is formally called, was signed on August 23, 1939. Actually, the war eventuated 9 days later by the invasion of Poland simultaneously by Russia and Germany, in accordance with the Stalin-Hitler alliance.

From August 23, 1939, until June 21, 1941, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany were in alliance and the United States was fearful of the implications of the war they had made. Actually, it took us into a disastrous war. Yet, these high officials, A. A. Berle, Dean Acheson, William C. Bullitt, Loy Henderson, to say nothing of the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, and the Attorney General, Frank Murphy, did nothing about the information which Whittaker Chambers gave them, and which now has been proved true in two trials before an American jury.

Many say today that Hiss and his associates should be forgiven because they operated in the wartime pro-Russian atmosphere. The truth is they were brought to the attention of our officials during the Stalin-Hitler alliance.

The issue raised here is one of responsibility. Who was ultimately responsible?

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of the book entitled, "The Road Ahead." This condensation of the book by John T. Flynn was published in the February 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest. I wish to say that the condensation of the book exceeds what may be printed in the RECORD without an estimate. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer of $348.50 as the cost of printing the matter in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator what the matter is?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is the condensation published in the Reader's Digest of the book entitled, "The Road Ahead," by John T. Flynn.

Mr. LUCAS. Its printing will exceed the number of pages permitted to be printed in the RECORD without an estimate being furnished, and the Senator says the cost will be $348?

Mr. BREWSTER. And 50 cents. I am sure the Senator will feel it is worth that amount, if he has the opportunity to read it.

Mr. LUCAS. I have read the book and I do not agree with the Senator that it is worth it. I do not think the Reader's Digest article is worth $348 of the taxpayers' money. If the economy-minded Senator from Maine wants to spend that amount of money, I am not going to object.

Mr. BREWSTER. I very much appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD AHEAD—AMERICA'S CREEPING REVOLUTION

(By John T. Flynn)

Most people in this country believe that the American Communist Party and its dupes are the chief internal enemy of our economic system and our form of government. This is a serious mistake. The Communists are a traitorous bloc in our midst, but if every Communist in America were rounded up and liquidated, the greatest menace to our form of social organization would be still among us.

This most dangerous enemy is the American counterpart of the British Fabian Socialist, who denies that he is a Socialist and operates behind a mask which he calls National planning. These Socialist planners are enticing us down the dark road that has led so many European nations to their doom. Unless they are recognized for what they are, and are stopped, they will destroy this country.

Our people have been so far from the European scene that they have not observed closely the forces which in the last 30 years have been eating away the foundations of European civilization. The same forces that ruined Germany, Italy, France, and Britain are repeating their work of destruction upon our economic and political organisms.

Of the countries in Europe which have moved into the Socialist camp, the two which concern us most are Russia and Great Britain. Each adopted socialism by a different route; each organized its Socialist society upon a different model. But both are Socialist. Russia was conquered overnight by a sudden, violent revolutionary convulsion. Great Britain moved into socialism a little at a time, without bloodshed, in a journey that took almost 40 years.

We are following in the footsteps of Great Britain. We are much further along the road than we suspect. If we do not clearly recognize that fact and abandon that fatal road, we shall inevitably, perhaps in less than a decade, be in the condition the British now find themselves in.

In Great Britain we have a perfect case history of the infection and progress of the Socialist disease and, while this book is about America, we should briefly review the carefully concerted Socialist plan by which that once great country—the home of modern capitalism and modern free government—was led stealthily to her present state.

The Socialist government in Britain did not come into power by accident. In 1883 a small group of Socialists organized what they called the Fabian Society. Among its members were such eminent persons as Sidney and Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw, and Ramsay MacDonald. This group realized that if socialism were to make any headway against the solid rock of British opinion it would have to proceed gradually, by political methods. They adopted the policy and the name of the Roman general, Quintus Fabius, who held that the only way to conquer his principal enemy was to lure him to battle in small sectors and defeat him bit by bit.

They began by advocating not a Socialist state but a welfare state. Deciding against state ownership of land and industry, they simply proposed state ownership of such basic sectors of the nation's economy as credit, electric power, transportation, and coal. The rest of the economic system would be left in private hands but operated under plans made by the state.

They knew they must capture the mind of the working class and must take over the apparatus of the labor unions, so they formed a political arm which later became the British Labor Party. They would begin by cooperating with the Liberal Party, which corresponded to our Democratic Party, until their own Labor Party acquired strength enough to displace it.

They agreed they must penetrate and capture the instruments and leaders of public opinion and information—writers, churchmen, and schools.

This plan's central aim was to bring on socialism without mentioning that odious word—to offer to the voters one small part of the Socialist program at a time without the Socialist label on it. Thus they would smuggle socialism into the social fabric without arousing the suspicions of the people.

The small coterie of Socialist doctrinaries, which never had more than 4,000 members, got into action about 1905. Thirteen years later their party had pushed the old Liberal party aside. In 5 more years their leader, Ramsay MacDonald, was Prime Minister of England. At that time MacDonald did not remain long in power, but the Socialists continued to push through social-welfare measures which eventually accustomed the citizens to look to the State for the correction of all their ills. The climax of this creeping revolution came in 1945.

The First World War had hit Britain a smashing blow from which she never recovered. The Second World War struck her with such epic violence that her empire withered away. Her foreign trade disappeared and her economic system lay in ruins. No capitalist government had anything to offer other than sweat and short rations for a decade at least. Only the Socialist had his radiant rainbow ready, his promises of the good life, jobs for all, security for all from the cradle to the grave. And so in the general election of 1945 the inevitable happened: the Conservatives were swept out and a Socialist government came to supreme power in Great Britain. The Fabians' plan had succeeded.

For 4 years now the Socialist prophets of abundance and security have been in power. Finally it has dawned upon the British people that the realities of the Socialist paradise does not correspond with the rosy dream. The dream has turned into a nightmare.

Socialist propagandists from Britain are fond of claiming that they have socialized only about 25 percent of the economic system and that 75 percent remains under capitalism. This is a distortion of the facts. Britain has nationalized about 25 percent of her economic processes, but she has socialized almost the entire economic system.

The government has nationalized the following: the Bank of England (credit); cables and wireless (the overseas communications system); civil aviation; railways, bus transport and inland waterways; coal mines; electricity; the gas industry; medical services.

The rest of the economy has been socialized by a method under which the state makes the plans for all forms of business—farms, factories, shops. Government bureaus decide on production quotas for an industry as a whole and in many cases for the individual units. They fix the quotas, priorities, and prices on raw materials; fix wages; determine who shall get credit at the banks and who shall not. In sum, the state generally makes the blueprints upon the basis of which all business operations are carried on and polices those operations to insure faithful obedience to the state's plans.

If the British Socialist experiment were successful one would suppose that it would have produced more goods at lower prices, and workers would be better off than under the old capitalist regime; that the security of the Nation would be advanced in every way.

But these promised benefits have not appeared. On the contrary, by every economic, physical, and moral test, socialism has been a tragic failure. It is already falling apart. The people cry out against impossible prices, against scarcities, oppressive taxation, and bureaucratic oppressors.

Britain's foreign trade—the foundation of her economic existence—is being washed away. Even with the aid of billions of dollars from capitalist America she cannot settle her foreign debts except by the gradual extinction of her gold reserves.

Her people have seen withering away those great freedoms for which Britons have fought through the centuries—freedom from seizures and searches without warrants, freedom to work where and at what they choose, freedom to engage in business and to own property, freedom to work their privately owned farms as they choose.

Let us look at the black record. The Socialist government has operated at a loss the basic industries and services which it took over. At the end of 1948 it was producing coal at the rate of 7,000,000 tons a year less than the mines under private ownership produced before the war, notwithstanding the expenditure by the Socialist government of over $170,000,000 on mechanization to increase output. The national coal board lost about $95,000,000 in 1947. By raising the price of coal it managed to cover costs in 1948, but it is still in the red about $90,000,000 since it began operations.

The miners, despite the fiction that they are now the owners of the mines, will not

produce as much for themselves as they produced before the war for private owners. Around 84,000 miners a day fail to show up for work.

The Government owns and has operated the overseas air-transport industry in the Atlantic area at a loss of $244 on every passenger carried.

The railroads have been run at a considerable deficit.

Of course, every loss sustained by the Government on its enterprises must be paid through taxes taken from the people. There are no longer enough rich individuals to soak with any appreciable results. In fact, there are only 45 persons in England whose incomes after taxes exceed $24,000 a year, and only 35,000 with incomes between $8,000 and $16,000. Hence, to pay the losses of Britain's nationalized industries, everybody must be soaked, including the workers.

We have heard a great deal about Britain's achievement in providing homes for its workers. Actually, despite the Government's free-handed spending on housing, it has provided only about 230,000 houses a year compared with 364,000 in each of the two prewar years.

Britain's exports have fallen off disastrously. She can fix the prices her own people must pay, but she canont fix the prices to her foreign customers. In foreign markets she must meet the prices of her competitors. She cannot sell abroad goods whose prices must include the enormous taxes of the Socialist government.

This Socialist regime may be able to drag on as long as it receives free billions in aid from private-enterprise America. When that ceases—as it must—Britain will have to face the grim realities. If there is one prayer British Socialists should send up nightly it is that God will save America from drifting into socialism.

The bait held out by the Socialists to the workers was the vision of a softer and more abundant life. But poverty has not been abolished; it has simply been distributed. A small minority have been benefited a little; the great majority have been greviously brought down.

John Strachey, Minister of Food, boasted that the British people "are getting enough money to buy all the food they ought to have." Here is the permitted ration: 1 egg and a half a week, 3 ounces of butter, 6 ounces of margarine, 1 ounce of lard, 1 ounce of cheese, 1 ounce of bacon, 8 ounces of sugar, 6 ounces of meat, 2 ounces of corned beef. This is Socialist abundance 4 years after the war ended.

The Socialists' great boast concerns the social services they provide from the cradle to the grave. These begin before birth with prenatal care and cover medical care, hospitalization, old-age retirement payments, unemployment insurance, allowances for widows and for families in need. The allowances, however, are meager. But thin as they are, these social services, along with the losses on the nationalized industries and the cost of the bulging bureaucracy, are wrecking Britain's enervated economic structure.

Workers were led to believe that socialism would end wage slavery. But in fact the worker has now merely exchanged the old boss for a new one—a bureaucrat. The old boss might have been a tough fellow, but he usually was also a fairly decent human being. The boss now is a cold, impersonal, remote bureau.

No decision can be made on the job without an immense amount of paper work that begins at the local office and moves snail-like through various local boards, subcouncils, regional boards, and other bureaucratic nests up to London, and finally back through the same succession of petty bureaus.

Added to all this are the controls which are worse than they were during the war. Regulations and amended regulations pour from the presses daily so voluminously that neither shopkeeper nor housewife can keep up with them. There were 30,000 prosecutions for infractions of the regulations in a single year.

The Socialist leaders declared fervently they would never interfere with the right of British workingmen to choose their occupations. But adequate supplies of labor and full effort by workmen have not been forthcoming in the industries the government wishes to stimulate, so the government had to enact a law which says that no man between the ages of 18 and 50, or woman between the ages of 18 and 40, can change occupations at will. The Minister of Labor has the power to direct workers to the employment he considers best for the national interest. This power has been exercised upon occasion, and men have been put in jail for resisting it.

This ruthlessness extends to the farm. Over the farmer's head hangs a threat perhaps more serious than that applied to the industrial worker. Farmers are paid large subsidies to produce what the government wants them to raise, but there is a regular inspection of every farm and a record kept of its produce. If the farmer falls short of what is expected of him the government can put a price upon his property, pay him for it, and put him off the farm, which then passes into the hands of a government manager.

The British Socialist planners who have done these things are not wicked men; they simply believe they know how to run the economy of an entire nation. They have now discovered that this cannot be done without applying compulsions to labor and farmers as well as to owners of industries.

One of the curses of this system is that nothing is called by an honest name. Words are used to deceive. Hateful practices, abhorred for ages by a free people, are now identified by luminous words, while praiseworthy practices are ticketed with odious names. The man who works in a privately owned factory is a wage slave. Socialism itself is never called socialism—it is national planning. Thrift is a vice until the Government asks you to save and lend it money; then it becomes a virtue.

Socialists say that the most diabolical crime against society is profit. Private industry runs at a profit and uses that profit to expand its producing capacity. Government industry runs at a loss and taxes the substance of the people to pay for its inefficiencies. Which is the greater crime against society?

The British Socialists have been destroying freedom. This was inevitable. Years ago it was prophesied that the Socialist state, uniting the functions of political ruler, landlord and employer of the population, would result in tyranny. This is what happened in Russia.

Today the British Socialist, faced with the problem of compelling citizens to comply with his plans, has turned to compulsions. The Government has plenty of machinery for this, since it now possesses credit, electric power, transportation, and fuel—without which no man can operate a business—and can grant or withhold these.

The citizen's right to spend his income as he chooses is almost permanently abolished, since the government takes so much of it in taxes that most people have only enough left to cover the bare necessities of life.

It would be possible to fill a book with accounts, amusing and terrifying, of the blunders of men who assume that they know how to plan the economy of an entire nation. In 1947 Emanuel Shinwell, then Minister of Fuel and Power, ordered all electricity used for power shut off in the extensive industrial areas of London and the Midlands. This shut down 75 percent of British industry. The reason given was the shortage of coal. It would last, said the Minister, only 2 or 3 days. But it actually lasted 3 weeks, threw 2,000,000 people out of work and lost over $800,000,000 in desperately needed export trade.

Many predictions of the coal shortage had been made public. Why was no provision made against it by the Minister?

In 1946 Shinwell had foreseen there would be a coal shortage that year, so he suggested to Alfred Barnes, Minister of Transport, that 1,200 locomotives be converted to oil to effect a saving in coal. (Oil, being imported, is far more expensive than coal, and if 1,200 locomotives had been converted this policy would have cost about $16,000,000 a year more for fuel.)

Barnes converted 93 locomotives to oil at a cost of $6,000,000. Then he inquired about getting oil—and discovered there was none to be had for this purpose. The British Transport Commission reversed the plan. Barnes and Shinwell now had on their hands 93 locomotives for which there was no oil, so the 93 were converted back to coal.

In January 1947 the great housing plan was proclaimed: the Government would build 250,000 houses that year. Brick, cement, plumbing, nails, plaster, and other materials were ordered, and factories went to work to produce them. All this was well along when it was discovered that lumber could not be supplied for more than 60,000 houses, and that there was not nearly enough labor for the program. In the meantime, all the other materials were being furiously produced; mountains of bricks lay in brickyards, innumerable materials were piling up.

The great plan fell short by 190,000 houses.

These are just a few samples. We can match such blunders among our American planners. When they occur, the critics point to the stupidity of the planners. But the fault lies rather in the fact that no one man or small group of men, no matter how brilliant, can ever hope to comprehend the vast amount of data and the innumerable conditions which would have to be grasped in order to make effective plans for a large industrial nation. It simply cannot be done.

In taking over the railroads, the coal industry and others, the Socialists bought the properties outright from the corporations and stockholders who owned them. They paid for them with British bonds paying 3 percent interest. With each new industry it takes over, the Government adds another heavy obligation to its already crushing national debt. The folly of this lies in the fact that under the old order the stockholders had no claim for any return on their investment if the industry made no profit. But these bonds are now a fixed charge upon the Government, and it must pay interest on them whether the industry makes a profit or not.

England is being taxed to death. For instance, a clerk with an income of $2,800 a year gets one deduction of $560, an additional deduction of $720 for his wife, and $480 for his two children. Total deductions: $1,760. This leaves $1,040 of his income subject to visible taxation.

On the first $200 he pays 15 percent	$30
On the next $800 he pays 30 percent	240
On the next $40 he pays 45 percent	18
Total tax	288

A man with the same family and salary in the United States would pay $26 in visible taxes.

If a worker goes to the pub for a glass of beer to forget his troubles, he pays a tax of 16 cents on the pint. Half of the 80 cents paid for a ticket to a movie goes to the Government.

The dark realities of the condition created by this floundering Socialist regime have

brought more than one Socialist up with a jerk. Alfred Edwards, formerly a Socialist member of Parliament, declared: "I have spent years discoursing on the defects of the capitalist system. But we have seen the two systems side by side. The man who would still argue for socialism as the means of ridding our society of the defects of capitalism is blind indeed. Socialism just does not work." (Naturally he was promptly expelled from the party.)

In 1949 Lord Milverton, Labor whip in the House of Lords, renounced his party affiliation during the debate on steel. In a speech on the floor he declared, to quote the London Times, that "he had certain ideals and had thought the Labor Party could deliver the goods. He was now appalled at the type of goods which were being delivered. He thought he was participating in a crusade but found himself a camp-follower in a rake's progress. The road on which they were traveling led to a precipice at the foot of which clearly emerged the totalitarian state."

This is the system of socialism we in the United States are being asked to imitate.

We have seen what socialism means in Britain and the plan by which it was brought into effect and the consequences visited upon the British people. Do we have in America any movement comparable to the Fabian Socialist movement in Britain? And if so, what is it doing, how is it progressing and what are its chances of success here?

The answer is that we have precisely such a movement here; that it is making rapid strides; and that, unless it is soon arrested, nothing can prevent its extension here on the British model.

Do not confuse the present Socialist movement in America with what we have known for so long as the Socialist Party. This party has reached a low estate in numbers and in growth. I am referring to an entirely different movement led by entirely different men and under wholly different banners.

There are some persons who brand as socialism almost any intervention by the state into the economic system. Many imagine that socialism means confiscation by the state of the whole economic apparatus of the Nation. These concepts are incorrect.

As we have seen in Britain, modern socialism means the assumption by the state of the responsibility and authority for the control of the entire economic system. This does not mean that the state will take over every farm, mine, shop and factory. It will operate the great basic functions of credit, power, fuel, transportation and insurance. The rest of the economic system may be kept in private hands but must be operated according to plans made by the state and carried out under the supervision and compulsions of government bureaus.

This is the type of socialism with which America is now threatened. And just as it fastened itself on Britain by a movement that avoided calling itself Socialist, so it is being promoted in America by persons and organizations, that never use the word socialism. They call their system the planned economy. What that cunning label means is precisely the same thing that is now in operation in Britain.

The advocates of planning believe that the economic system must cease to be a free system and that the state, which under our system was forbidden to intervene in the management of industry, should be established as the master of industry with the power to make the plans for the whole economic system.

Who are these mysterious American Fabians? What is their organization and who are their leaders?

The crash of 1933 and the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt brought into Washington swarms of men and women with blueprints for the reconstruction of civilization upon every conceivable model. Such a miscellaneous menagerie of social philosophers had never before been gathered together.

Because of the presence in positions of power of men like Wallace, Frankfurter, and Tugwell, streams of out-of-work or low-salaried Socialist professors and instructors, young lawyers, and economists flowed into nearly all the bureaus in Washington. As the bureaus increased in number, fresh hordes of Socialist doctrinaires, ranging from dark-red revolutionaries to mild-mannered pink reformers, multiplied in the Government. In time, the left-wingers floated to the top.

The crack-up of 1938 and the rise in unemployment created the opportunity for a new type of radical who called himself an economic planner. This new form of hooded socialism gained immense ground. A man could espouse it without confessing himself a Socialist. Actually a great many of the men who were arguing for the planned economy declared their purpose was to save capitalism.

The theory of economic planning which Stuart Chase, George Soule, and others had been preaching for years rose into respectability. This philosophy, newly equipped with glorious spending theories and magical proposals for practically endless Government borrowing, brought the school of planning into official favor.

The first attempt to provide this idea with an organized propaganda machine was the formation of the CIO Political Action Committee by labor leader Sidney Hillman in the 1944 presidential campaign. In this committee Socialists of every description—planners and Communists by the thousands—were collected together. To reach various elements outside of labor Hillman formed the National Citizens Political Action Committee. Intellectuals were formed into the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which included professors, writers, dramatists, actors, movie stars, lawyers, doctors, and editors.

The Americans for Democratic Action was formed in January 1947. This organization has now become the spearhead and the central planning and propaganda machine of the national Socialist economic planners in this country. The basis of their program is in their statement of policy on March 2, 1948. It states that there are areas of the economy which cannot be controlled while in private hands. These may be dealt with in two ways. One is to have them taken over by cooperatives operating under one of the Government agencies—the Rural Electrification Administration, for instance. The other is complete public ownership. The rest of the economic system they will subject to national economic planning.

They propose first a vigorous use of the power to tax and spend, in order to shape and control the economic system. They advocate what they call "balanced production targets for the whole economy," and say there must be "price, allocation, inventory, and credit controls." Those and other trade phrases are actually a costume of words for socialism. What the planners intend to bring here is precisely what the Fabians brought to England.

Americans for Democratic Action have brought together many of the most powerful figures in the three great labor groups; there, too, will be found most of the old New Deal planners.

The ADA announces that it "is not a political party," that "it works through established parties," and that "its tools are education and political action." It declares its intention of "telling the people the facts and what they can do about them; working in party primaries to nominate liberal candidates; campaigning for their election." It has spread through 48 States, with over 75 full-fledged chapters and 100 student groups.

Of course, it will offer, as in England, personal benefits to various groups. At the moment it is putting its power behind a very important drive: socialized medicine. But it will never use the word socialism. That word will not emerge until the country is carried so far along the road that it can no longer be disguised from even the most ignorant.

At every stage of this subject the Communist issue arises to confuse us. The Communist Party in the United States is a political organization, but is not a party in the sense in which we understand that term. It is a secret, conspiratorial brotherhood, engaged in wrecking the American system as a prelude to making this country into a Socialist nation. (It is also the agent of a foreign power in carrying out the objectives of the Russian Government in this country, and to this extent it is organized treason.)

In a left-wing gathering it would be difficult to determine whether a given person is a Communist or a Socialist. They all believe that the capitalist system must go. They are agreed that socialism in one form or another we must have, and on this plane all of them—Communists and Socialist planners—must be grouped together as enemies of our traditional American system.

Communist Party members favor anything which will tend to wreck our private-enterprise system. For instance, they know that nothing will wreck it more quickly and more surely than extravagant spending and the accumulation of public debt. They are, therefore, for any program that will pile new tons of debt on the Nation. Our less-intelligent Socialist reformers, who know little about economics and despise its lessons, support public spending because the effects are immediately pleasant and because they have been persuaded by a new school of so-called economists that it is a sound policy.

The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities has compiled a list of 1,160 organizations and movements brought into existence by the American Communist Party to promote all sorts of seemingly laudable social objectives. Until the war ended, you would find in these "front" organizations the names of most of those men and women who have been prominent in Socialist activities.

My point is that there is no need to make a fine point of the distinction between Communists and Socialist planners. They have been good soldiers together, marching in the cause of wrecking the American capitalist society in favor of socialism. They have penetrated labor unions, professional groups, teacher organizations, political bodies, religious bodies, racial groups. They are doing a job together upon the minds of the American people, creating in us a mood of frustration and despair about our traditional way of life. They paint a vicious picture of America which makes this country seem rotten with poverty and injustice. They proclaim that there is no prospect before us except to follow the "democracies" of Europe and throw ourselves into the arms of the planners.

Since the war ended and the terrible truth about Communist Russia has been revealed, it has become the fashion to be anti-Communist. But behind that anti-Communist label you can be a Socialist planner. As we look around for the real enemy who must be kept constantly in sight and kept ruthlessly out of positions of power where he can do his work of destruction, we need be in no doubt about that enemy. He is the Socialist planner.

In 1936 John L. Lewis, Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky, in a deal with President Roosevelt, put their unions and the CIO

into politics and gave Roosevelt $500,000 for his campaign fund in return for certain pledges from him.[1] One of the byproducts of this deal was the delivery of the unions into the hands of the radical labor politicians, who wanted control of the officers, funds, and educational machinery of the unions. This propaganda apparatus they proceeded to use upon their own members.

They have brought to bear upon the minds of the rank and file vigorous propaganda pressure for all sorts of blessings which are to come from a benevolent Government—guaranties of perpetual employment, endless prosperity, and Government responsibility for the welfare of every worker. These are what might be called the first steps in a Socialist program, after which follow such things as socialized medicine and endless Government spending to provide employment at constantly rising wages and prices.

The immense, powerful, well-financed propaganda apparatus of the unions is now at the service of the Socialist planner.

The Democratic Party is at the Socialist planners' mercy in precisely the way the British Liberal Party became the prisoner of the British Labor Party. Through third parties in New York State the Socialist planners have the margin of votes which can spell victory or defeat for the Democrats; therefore, that party must subscribe to their demands. The next problem is to crack the Democratic South, and the planners now have elaborate plans for this job. Meantime, they propagandize through the schools, the press, the theater, the movies, and strangest of all, through the churches.

I have tried to make it clear that our American system is being destroyed by groups united in the design of luring this country into a Socialist system on the British model. The Communist would like to ruin the American system by clubbing it over the head. The Socialist planner does it by slow poison. Both types of assassin are at work here now, but the latter is by far the more dangerous. And their campaign is succeeding.

Just how far have the planners advanced their program for socializing this country?

For one thing, our Government now has almost as large a control over our private banking system as England has over its banks. It has not yet the power to decide what types of loans may be made to private industry, but is geared now to assume that power with only a slight alteration in the set-up. It would then possess the power of life and death over every industry.

The Government itself has moved into the business of banking, including money lending, upon an astonishing scale, through a large number of major lending agencies whose loans and investments total $6,575,000,000, while the private banking system is at the Government's mercy because the Government is now the bank's biggest borrower and most powerful customer.

Next to credit, the most important key economic weapon is electric power. Our Federal Government's authority to engage in flood and navigation control has been seized on as a pretext for engaging in the manufacture of electrical power. The public has little conception of the extent to which our Government has penetrated that industry.

Up to now the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) has been the largest entry into that field. But President Truman has sent to Congress a demand for an extensive project on the Columbia River which would embrace river systems draining Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana. There are 16 other similar power projects. This is just the beginning of a program which is intended to cover America, take the power industry out of private hands and put it into the hands of the Government.

While Government power systems are to a great degree free of taxes and of interest charges on investment, amounting to countless millions a year, and are permitted bookkeeping practices which would land a private utility official in jail, the privately owned power companies are weighed down by every form of Government shackles. Private power systems must run at a profit or die. The Federal power systems run at losses while loudly claiming fictitious profits.

The Socialist planners believe they have the private power systems on the run. The total capacity of the private systems now is 45,000,000 kilowatts. Present Government plans call for Government plants generating 41,000,000 kilowatts. It is all being done in the name of reclamation and flood control. Little will be said about power, but the drive is to socialize the power industry.

Another project now heavily pressed by the Socialist planners is socialized medicine. It is called health insurance. The plan, which ostensibly came from Oscar R. Ewing, head of the Federal Security Agency, calls for an increase, with Federal aid, of the number of hospitals, doctors and nurses, and dentists, along with what he calls compulsory health insurance. This plan is similar to Britain's. Under it, all employers and their employees would be taxed at the pay-roll window for medical care.

The proponents of this scheme had the effrontery to call it free medical care. Of course it is not. It will be paid for by taxes from everyone's pocket.

It is important to remember that, while each of these proposals—Federal invasion of banking, Federal invasion of electrical power and socialized medicine—is promoted as if it were just a single reform unrelated to all the others, the fact is that each is intended to liquidate some sector of the private-enterprise system and expand the area of socialism.

The President has announced his wish to have authority from Congress to build additional steel mills because he believed the private steel industry was not producing enough steel. He was egged on to this by his Socialist labor-leader supporters, who are eager for the Government to get started on this course.

Congressman BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, has proposed a law called the Spence Act which would authorize the Government to use vast powers under certain conditions. These powers are stated in such broad terms that the President can use them whenever it suits his purposes, and under the plan he is to be the sole judge of whether or not the conditions exist.

If this act becomes law the President can decide how much ought to be produced of any essential commodity, and make up a national production budget which industry will be directed to meet under Government plans and compulsions. He can order new factories constructed. He may set up priorities and allocations of materials.

Manufacturers would have to get permission to buy materials, and a bureau would decide in what order and in what quantity each would get it. Here is the power of life and death over industrial enterprise. He can establish maximum prices on materials or facilities. Here is the beginning of the end of the price system without which a private-enterprise economy cannot possibly exist. And he may make such inspection of the books, records, and premises or property of any person and make such investigations as may be necessary to the enforcement or administration of this act. Here is the power of seizure and search upon a hitherto unimagined scale.

This is the planned economy so far as industry is concerned. If this law were enacted, our country would be further along the road to the Socialist-planned economy than Britain was 3 years ago.

What appears in this Spence Act, of course, is only one part of the scheme. Another Federal administration approach to the planned economy is the Brannan plan, sponsored by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan.

The Government has been pegging prices of some crops to provide high prices for farmers, but the harassed housewife has been crying out in anguish. To meet this situation the Government has invented an incredible scheme.

There would be no more Government pegging of farm prices. The farmer is to sell his produce in the open market at whatever prices he can get. This gives the housewife the benefit of a low price. The other prong of the scheme is to give the farmer his same old high prices by a subterfuge. A price level for produce will be fixed; then the Government will pay the farmer the difference between the price at which he sells his crop and the price which the Government guarantees him.

For instance, if the guaranteed price on his crop were fixed at $2,000 and it brought in the open market only $1,500, the Government would pay him the remaining $500. The farmer would thus be paid for one part of his crop by the consumer and for the other part by the Government. But, of course, the consumer would really pay it all, and the part paid indirectly to the farmer through the Government in taxes would bear the additional charge of the salaries of bureaucrats needed to run this show.

Secretary Brannan has thus far refused to estimate the cost of his scheme, but others have indicated it might run from five to ten billion dollars a year in additional taxes.

From these Spence and Brannan proposals we may form a picture of the society into which we are being tempted by the bait of Government planning and spending. These are not schemes which may at some distant day appear as a program of government. They are the program of the present Government, and have been announced as such.

From it all emerges the spectacle of a society in which the Government makes itself responsible for the security of every citizen from the cradle to the grave, and for the operation of the entire machinery of business and farming. The ultimate aim, of course, is to control banks, transportation, power, coal, iron and steel, and the entire business of insurance. The rest of the system will be operated by private owners, following plans made by the Government under broad powers and a multitude of planning and enforcement bureaus. This corresponds in every essential respect to the system which is now wrecking Great Britain. And this is what we will have here if the men now in power in our Government are permitted to have their way.

This, then, is the road we are traveling. It is the road to socialism. And we will continue to travel it until Americans realize this and take vigorous measures to halt the journey and to reverse it.

One of the first things those opposed to this socialistic program must do is to rid themselves of the moral intimidation which

[1] In his new book, John L. Lewis, An Unauthorized Biography, Saul Alinsky quotes Mr. Lewis as saying this to him personally:

"The United Mine Workers and the CIO paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation we have gotten. It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the $500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money."

has been imposed on their minds. In the debate around this problem, the American system has been painted as something wicked, bungling, even brutal, while the planned new world of the future will be filled with sweetness, light, and plenty. The very word "profit" has been endowed with the most sinister implications.

But it is not a choice between a perfect system called socialism and an imperfect system called capitalism. It is a choice between two human systems both of which will inevitably have their imperfections because they are human. But the Socialist planners do not concede this. Capitalism they present to us only in terms of its defects. But socialism is painted only in terms of the wonderful things it is going to do someday.

But we do not have to rely on the promises any longer. Socialism in various forms has had plenty of trial. Russia is a Socialist country, though the Socialists would like to escape that fact. The old Socialists who first lifted the torch in Russia talked of the perfect day of the free life which they would bring. No one arraigned tyranny more vigorously than Lenin. But when they set their ideal into motion it rushed along to its inevitable end—tyranny, the most terrible tyranny in history.

The old Socialists, with their luminous dreams, got power in Germany after World War I and operated a society not greatly different from that now in effect in England—partially nationalized and partially planned. It ended in fascism and Hitler, for the line between fascism and Fabian socialism is very thin. Fabian socialism is the dream. Fascism is socialism plus the inevitable dictator.

In Italy, Socialists of various schools dominated the political life with the same results as in Germany, and that, too, ended in fascism and Mussolini.

Now Britain makes the experiment, blown-up with promises of freedom. But already she has got around to the ways of the tyrant. She asserts over the worker the right to say where he shall or shall not work. She asserts the right to throw the farmer who does not meet her directives off his farm. And this British experiment would collapse tomorrow if the strong arm of American capitalism were withdrawn from its support. Indeed it is collapsing now even with that powerful arm around it.

On the other hand, the greatest and most efficient producing machine in the world is in this country. This did not happen by accident. It is the result of the soil of freedom in which it grew.

The road we are traveling is sufficiently clear. We cannot delude ourselves with the expectation that we may go a little way further and then stop in the belief that we can combine socialism and capitalism and preserve the best features of each. The very first hard and cold fact we must face is that these two systems cannot live together in the same society.

If we keep on the way we are going, nothing can save the capitalist sector of our economy from extinction, because it will inevitably be called upon to pay the cost of operating its own sector and the greater portion, if not all, of the cost of operating the Socialist sector. In the United States the few Government-operated industries we have are operated at a loss. Private industry must produce the income out of which the losses of these Government industries are paid, and the attendant costs of Government as well.

We must arrest the course of the social disease that is destroying us and set our hands to the hard task of lifting up and revivifying our shattered system of free enterprise. If we do not, we shall go on stumbling down the path along which Europe has slipped.

It is not possible to lay down a program in detail for checking and reversing our direction. And it is not necessary. What is necessary is to see clearly the general principles which must govern our effort. These I shall now attempt to enumerate as briefly as possible.

We must put human freedom as the first of our demands. There can be no security in a nation without freedom. Let us work to make our country a more bountiful home for all to live in, but the first and indispensable test of every plan must be whether it will impair our freedom. A better life for all, yes—but not at the expense of our liberties.

We must stop apologizing for our capitalist society. It has made us strong, and has provided us the highest standard of living in world history.

Not one more step into socialism. There is, of course, much to be done to repair all the damage already done to our system by the advocates of socialistic measures, but the first militant maneuver must be to hold the line for the American way.

Get rid of compromising leaders. Let us put a mark upon every man in public life who is willing to surrender further.

We must recognize that we are in a social war, and that we must fight it as such. Our enemies have managed to capture many of the instrumentalities of the classroom, the platform, the pulpit, the movies, and the radio upon an amazing scale, and to use them not for their traditional purposes but to carry on an attack upon the minds of the American people.

We must put an end to the orgy of spending that is rapidly bankrupting the Nation. Among the most critical conditions that menace us are the fantastic commitments for spending countless billions and the crushing weight of our national debt upon our economic system. From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949—President Truman's years in power—he spent $184,000,000,000. This is $30,000,000,000 more than was spent by this Government in all the 147 years of its existence from George Washington to the end of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first administration. We must not permit one more cent for any purpose beyond our present commitments.

We must stop planning for socialism and begin planning to make our free system of private enterprise operate at its fullest capacity. Since 1933 the Government has waged relentless war upon the capitalist system, at first ignorantly, but recently with a definite design to cripple and destroy it. The man who runs a business has been pilloried as a criminal, and the Government has taken measures to prevent him from accumulating those savings which make expansion possible. It has held him up to public scorn and hatred. It has taxed away his savings, and it has so choked the streams through which savings flow into investment that our system is wilting away.

Our system is in an appaling mess now, what with the public debt, the confiscatory taxes which draw the blood from its very veins, Government intrusions, and the threats of ultimate extinction that are taking ever more terrifying shape. The task calls for patriotism and courage; it must not be delayed another day.

We must set about rebuilding in its integrity our republican system of government. We cannot depend on any political party to save us. We must build a mass organization outside the parties so powerful that all parties will be compelled to yield to its demands. Our forefathers gave to the world the subiime example of statesmen who cast off the tyrant state and built up the sovereign people, unleashing the energies of free men. It was this historic experiment which set off the astonishing surge of human energy that created here such abundance and freedom as the world has never known.

The task before us is clear. For our principles of action we must go back to our Constitution, to our Declaration of Independence, to our history and to the example set by our national fathers. We must begin now to dismantle the tyrant state in America and to build up once again the energies of a free people.

Address of Hon. Knox T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Knox T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, a Tennessee farmer, made at a luncheon meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., today.

I am particularly happy to have the opportunity to submit this talk through the courtesy of Mr. Hutchinson and Representative PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee. This talk in my home city, which I am honored to represent in Congress, brings to mind that my constituency is composed partly of five rural counties made up of agriculture and agricultural communities, and Minneapolis made up largely of industrial workers.

These people are the very heart of America and it is for them that the program laid down by Mr. Hutchinson is timely.

The address is as follows:

LET'S TALK FACTS

I feel honored, indeed, to have a part in this program.

The influence of the Farm Forum has widened year by year until it is now a most valuable source of information and mutual understanding. I congratulate the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and all the other organizations and individuals responsible for setting up this annual event and keeping it going.

It's a healthy thing when representatives of the important branches of our economy get together, talk together, and arrive at a better appreciation of the fact that the only way we can go forward is to go forward together. So I appreciate this opportunity to come out here to talk facts about agriculture.

And I'm going to do just that—talk facts.

It seems to me that this year's meeting is of special moment. Highly desirable as fact-facing is at all times, it becomes absolutely vital in such a situation as we now face.

Can anyone look with complacency upon the world today?

Was there ever greater need for world peace than now?

We have seen what block-buster bombs can do. We have had a glimpse of what primitive atom bombs can destroy. But we can only imagine the horrors that might accompany the unleashing of the H-bomb.

Was there ever greater need for national prosperity than now?

We have seen what depression can do. We have seen how depression can focus our eyes upon ourselves and make us blind to growing

dangers from abroad. But we can only imagine the cost and chaos and the threat to our very civilization that might follow from depression now.

The recent course of world history reminds me of those tube-shaped toys that one can look into and see a pattern of colored glass; and whenever you turn the tube the glass pieces at the bottom are rearranged and form a new pattern.

Throughout human history the world has been like one of those tubes. But whereas in other ages the tube of world events turned slowly, now it spins rapidly—and always more rapidly.

It took human ingenuity all the ages of man's existence until about three-quarters of a century ago to make an electric light; now there are billions of them.

It took all the ages of human existence until 57 years ago to make an auto; last year this Nation alone produced them by the millions.

It took all the ages of existence until 1903 to make and fly a mechanical airplane; now scientists make plans concerning flying by rocket to the moon.

Never have the processes of change been as breath-takingly quick as now.

How long has man inhabited the earth? The most conservative estimate says thousands of years. Others say millions. Whether the answer is actually thousands or millions, in all the history of his existence until this past century the top speed at which man could travel was no faster than a horse could gallop—something less than 40 miles an hour even for a Man o' War. There was safety in distance in those days.

But in less than one century man has stepped up his speed of movement to 500, 600, 700 miles an hour—faster even than sound itself. There is no longer safety in distance. That is one reason for the emergency today.

Change! It is rapid change that creates emergencies—and the world is changing now as never before. We are more interdependent now than ever before. We are less able to live our own lives or mind our own businesses. We are all tied together by the complexity of modern life—and that is why this kind of meeting with the understanding of our mutual interdependence that it promotes is so immensely valuable.

We cannot face the future with confidence unless we understand the issues and are prepared to make the continual adjustments demanded by the fantastic pace of world change.

Other nations have looked to our democracy with faith in our ability to meet our changing international responsibilities and to solve our changing domestic problems. We dare not permit that faith to be uprooted.

The old idea that there's plenty of time to make adjustments tomorrow contains the germ of our own destruction.

Tomorrow might not be time enough to do all that needs to be done to preserve our national strength.

That is why the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing his best to impress upon the people our grave need for an improved farm program—not tomorrow but now.

That is the real reason I am here today.

To face the future we need a strong economy. But we cannot have a strong economy without a strong agriculture. Our farms supply the basic raw materials for industries that produce one-third of all our manufactured products. Roughly half the money the American people spend for commodities and services goes for products that originate on farms. And approximately two out of five working persons in the United States are employed either in agriculture, or in handling and selling agricultural products, or in producing and selling goods and services to farm people. Again and again the economic history of our Nation demonstrates the importance of farmer buying power to national prosperity.

To face the future we must be a strong people. But we shall not be a strong people without a strong agriculture. The health and vigor of any people depend largely upon an adequate well-balanced diet. In the 1930's when agriculture was weak and our whole economy was struggling out of depression, it was estimated that only one city family in four had a good diet. Many of the American people were existing on a bread and potato diet. They could not afford enough meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. And farmers couldn't afford to produce enough of these foods.

The Nation paid for that in the number of young men rejected for military service. It paid in absenteeism and lessened efficiency in the factories and mines.

In recent years diets have improved greatly. As the people found more food money in their pockets, they could afford to buy more meat, milk, and other protective foods. And farmers could afford to produce more of these foods—and they did.

To face the future we need a strong defense. But in the long run we cannot have a stronge defense without a strong agriculture. This is more than ever true in an age wherein wars are waged and won by the nation with the better machinery.

If a strong agriculture is so vital to our economy, our defense, and the health and vigor of our people, we should be foolish indeed if we did not ask ourselves: What is the condition of our agriculture? Wherein is it strong, and wherein weak?

American agriculture is stronger than ever before in its ability to produce.

A century and a quarter ago, one person engaged in farming was able to provide for himself and three and a half other persons. Today the person engaged in agriculture provides, on the average, for himself and 13½ other persons. That's a long-range measure of our agricultural progress.

But we have ample evidence of increasing farm productivity in the short range, also. In the past 10 years, American farmers have set six new all-time production records. In 1948, despite some 9 percent fewer farm workers, our agriculture turned out about 40 percent more food and fiber than before the war. Last year, the all-time record of 1948 was equalled.

We have profited immensely by long years of research. Hybrid seed, improved varieties, electric power, and tractors and other equipment have made it possible for farmers to take advantage of a break in bad weather to put in and harvest big crops where 15 years ago crop failures would have resulted.

Pest-control chemicals—DDT and 2,4-D for example—and the increased use of fertilizer have remarkably stepped up yields of some crops.

Improved methods of breeding and feeding livestock, better soil management, and the ever-widening use of machines and electric power have given farmers a new control over production.

Many agricultural scientists say that we are only at the beginning of progress, and that, in the field of hybrid vigor, for example, we have only penetrated the fringe of things to come.

Obviously, then, so far as ability to produce for the needs of our people and our economy is concerned, agriculture is strong and healthy. I cite that as a plain fact.

In a free economy, however, ability to produce is not enough. Farmers have to be able to market what they produce, or eventually they will find themselves burning their corn for fuel as they did in 1932.

Farm capacity to produce is outrunning population. Production is up 40 percent since prewar, but population has increased approximately 15 percent.

For a time, it appeared that the gap would be made up by increased per capita consumption. In 1946 our people consumed 19 percent more food per person than they had in 1935–39. But consumption has fallen off since 1946 and last year it was only 11 percent above the prewar average.

Partly as the result of this decline in per capita consumption, farmers are running into sharp price and income difficulties. Feed grains and hay have dropped almost one-half; food grains and meat animals about a third. Prices received by farmers have dropped nearly 25 percent from their postwar peak. The prices farmers pay, however, have come down only 5 percent.

Even though agriculture is producing at a record level, farm net income has been greatly lowered by falling farm prices. In 1947, farm net income totaled nearly $18,000,000,000. This year it may fall below twelve billion—a drop of one-third in 3 years.

Economically, therefore, agriculture is extremely vulnerable. I cite that as another plain fact.

We must all realize that farming is unlike most other industries. Some people try to compare agriculture with the auto industry, or the steel industry, and they cannot see why farmers are unable to protect themselves against economic pressure as many businessmen are able to do.

But even if farmers could adjust their production and prices with their eyes on the largest possible amount of profits, would the people want them to do so? Could we, under these circumstances, depend upon abundant production of food and fiber—when the events of our economic history plainly show that farmers get a considerably better return from producing a little less than enough to meet demand than they do for producing a little more than enough?

Do we want to take a chance on too little food? Suppose farmers had been able to cut back their production to 12 percent of capacity as the steel industry did in the early thirties? Suppose farmers in 1932 had cut their output down to about one-quarter of the 1929 level—as auto manufacturers did when they reduced the number of cars produced from about 5,500,000 in 1929 to less than 1,500,000 in 1932? We can get along for quite a while on old steel and old cars—but we can't get very far without a continual supply of food.

In actual fact, the individual farmer has almost no control over the price of his products. He competes for a market against nearly six million other farmers. He cannot by himself adjust production to demand, because his production is a drop in the bucket. Moreover, once his crop is in, how big it will be depends upon the rain and the sun—so that he cannot even control his own production. He sells in the market for what he can get—unless he has the backing of some kind of national farm program to give him a little of the protection and freedom of choice that other business people are able to provide for themselves because of the control they exercise over output and prices.

If agriculture is to achieve economic stability, it requires an effective national farm program. I cite that as another fact.

In much of the agricultural legislation that has been enacted in the past two decades you will find this basic idea that programs are needed to make agriculture economically more stable.

This was a basic element in the agricultural adjustment programs of 1933 and after.

It was basic in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

It was a reason for the Steagall amendment which guaranteed price supports on many farm commodities during the war and for a period afterwards.

I believe it is fairly obvious now that the American people have accepted the philos-

ophy that if agriculture produces abundantly for the needs of the Nation, farmers should not be left completely to the mercy of the market place.

Agriculture deserves—and the Nation needs—a farm program. Most of us agree on that. The question is: What kind of farm program will best serve farmers and all our people?

For almost a year this question has been hotly debated. The debate began when Secretary Brannan, at the request of Congress, presented to the agriculture committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, certain recommendations for improving the national farm price support structure.

Nothing in recent years that has been proposed for agriculture has created so much discussion—and I might add, so much heat.

What did the Secretary propose that caused all this furore?

Some new and radical departure from traditional American procedure? No, there is nothing new in his recommendations. They are on the contrary, the logical development of the price support programs that began in the thirties. He sought only to apply farm price supports to the needs of producers and consumers in our present postwar economy.

There are four principal points in the proposals which Secretary Brannan recommended on behalf of the administration.

1. We start from the premise that farm buying power must be maintained at a reasonable level or the entire economy will suffer. We seek as an objective such prices as will return to farmers as much buying power as they had in a recent, movable 10-year period.

2. Instead of supporting the prices of only the so-called basic commodities—cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, peanuts, and rice which bring in only about one-fourth of all farm income—we would support (besides cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco) milk, eggs, chickens, beef cattle, hogs, and lambs. This would provide support on about three-quarters of all farm income.

3. To present methods of support, which work well for storable crops, we would add the method of direct payments to producers when supporting such nonstorable crops as milk, meat, and poultry products. Instead of keeping the prices of perishables at an artificially high level through Government purchases, we would let perishables seek a supply-and-demand price. Consumers would then have the benefit of the entire supplies of meat, milk, and poultry products—and at a market price that would encourage consumption. Instead of buying nonstorable commodities and withdrawing them from the market—instead of being forced to get rid of these nonstorables in uneconomic ways as we are now doing with potatoes—we would use this purchase money to make payments directly to producers. The amount of the payment would be the difference between the average market price and the support level.

4. Price support would be subject to certain conditions. Wherever possible, observance of good land-use and conservation practices would be required. If supplies of a commodity made marketing quotas necessary, the support program for the commodity would depend upon acceptance of the quotas.

Finally, we feel that price supports should provide financial encouragement for operators of family-size farms, but not for the continued development of extremely large-scale, industrialized farming which concentrates farm land in fewer and fewer hands. Therefore it has been proposed that supports be limited to about that amount of production which is available for sale from our largest family farms.

Those are the proposals.

There is nothing new, nothing shocking, nothing without precedent in any one of them.

For many years farm leaders and farm organizations have claimed that they stand for a fair share of the national income for farmers.

Farmers surely do not have a fair share of the national income now. In 1948 the total per capita income of people on farms was only about 60 percent as large as the per capita income of nonfarm persons. In 1949 the per capita income of persons on farms—and this includes income from all sources, mind you—was only $763 per person, compared with $1,555, more than twice as much, for nonfarm persons.

If the 1949 trend of farm and nonfarm income continues, farm people this year will have less than $40 of income for every $100 that nonfarm persons have.

When we restrict our consideration to income from farm sources alone, the picture is even worse. Farmers and their families constitute nearly one-fifth of the population. This year it is estimated that their farm income may be less than one-fourteenth of the national income.

This is not a theory. This is the hard fact of what is now taking place under present price-support legislation.

I mentioned before that farm prices have already fallen to a point one-fourth below their postwar peak—and they are still going down. Prices of feed grains and hay are down 47 percent. Farm net income this year is expected to be about one-third below the income of 3 years ago.

I repeat these facts because they show so clearly that present price-support legislation is not adequately supporting.

If we accept the objective of an equitable share of the national income for agriculture, let's be consistent when we come up against facts.

The administration takes the position that farmers are entitled to a fair return and that price supports are a positive mechanism to help them attain it. From the Secretary's viewpoint, price supports are not merely a system of protection against bankruptcy. They are not a stop-loss mechanism. We are not seeking merely to assure agriculture 60 or 75 percent of the parity price of a few commodities.

We are working toward a fair share of the national income for agriculture, because that is vital to the Nation in the emergency situation it faces today.

Let's see what kind of protection the present legislation provides. For some commodities the lower level of support is 60 percent of parity. For most commodities assured of support, the lower level would eventually become 75 percent of parity. But some of the most important commodities—meat and eggs, for example—are not assured of support at all.

Is 60 percent of parity adequate protection against unreasonable price declines? Is 75 percent adequate protection?

In 1932 all farm prices averaged 59 percent of parity, as it is figured today.

From 1930 to 1934, farm prices averaged 69 percent of parity—and as Secretary Brannan pointed out recently, three-fourths of a million farmers lost their farms. In 1939, farm prices averaged 80 percent of parity. And still every major farm organization in the country felt that 80 percent of parity was not enough.

Let's face the facts. The scale of support provided in the present legislation just does not do the job of protecting agriculture's right to a fair income.

In view of this obvious fact, why do some farm spokesmen cling so tenaciously to the present law? Why do they advance such emotional arguments against the administration's recommendations for improvement?

I want to say that it makes me more sad than angry when I see the cuttlefish approach that some of those who oppose the administration proposals are using.

It makes me wonder about their sincerity when I hear wild assertions that these proposals threaten the independence and integrity of the American farmer.

I have more confidence in the American farmer.

I know how jealous he is of his freedom, and I know also that he is far too intelligent to be fooled by this obvious smoke screen.

There is not one bit more regimentation asked or implied in the administration recommendations than is already existing in the present legislation—or than has been on the books for the past 12 years. That's another plain fact.

As for the squeamishness which some people profess about accepting a subsidy, what is this but another instance of the cuttlefish approach? Price supports under any guise are a subsidy. Let's face it. But is it wrong for the farmer to accept a price-support subsidy for producing the most essential product of all—food—and right for the manufacturer to accept the subsidy of a protective tariff—or the air-line company to accept the subsidy of a Government air-mail contract—or the publisher to accept the subsidy of postage concessions.

Let's have more honest argument and less appeal to the emotions.

We hear a great deal about the possible cost of the administration's proposals, and some critics let themselves be carried away by the fervor of their opposition. I read one estimate of costs the other day that would have the Government paying farmers some 15 percent more than the total gross income of American agriculture has ever been in its all-time peak year. According to this absurd estimate, farmers would not only give away for absolutely nothing all that they produce, but they would even pay nonfarmers for taking the agricultural produce off their hands.

But though we hear a great deal of nonsense about the possible cost of the administration's recommendations, we hear very little from the opposition about the cost of the present program. It seems to me that American citizens are paying a pretty penny now for something that satisfies neither farmers nor consumers. Our operations on 1949 potatoes alone may run to $80,000,000. The over-all cost of potato supports since the end of the war is approaching a half billion dollars. The American people have been paying artificial prices for the spuds they eat, and besides they've been paying tax dollars for the spuds fed to hogs or diverted to other uneconomic uses.

No wonder the people are getting fed up with such a senseless procedure.

The administration recommendations would actually lower the cost of supporting some commodities, and would also do a far better job of placing nonstorable commodities in the hands of consumers, where they are useful and where they belong.

On this question of cost, I should like to quote Secretary Brannan's recent statement. "By maintaining farm income at the level of average farm purchasing power in a recent 10-year period," the Secretary said, "we should be moving effectively to prevent the onset of depression. The 'stop-loss' and 'protection against unreasonable decline' theory on the other hand would leave us, I'm afraid, in the position of calling the fire department after the house had burned half way down. Which is cheaper: Fire prevention or fire-fighting?"

Although I have devoted much of my time to the price-support question, I want to make it plain that the administration's proposals are not regarded as a complete farm program. The main reason why the Secretary has hammered on this issue is that price and income considerations are the core—the heart—of an over-all program.

The reason is not obscure. The reason is that all other elements of a well-rounded

farm program inevitably are affected by, and are largely dependent on, farm income and farm prices. How can a farmer be expected to give his land the care it requires, if he is forced to farm it to the limit to keep possession?

How can we expect a farmer to take advantage of rural power lines, unless he has income enough to pay for installation of electricity? Obviously, this is one reason why a larger proportion of farms are electrified in relatively good-income States than in low-income States.

How can we expect a farmer to take advantage of credit facilities, if lack of income makes him a bad risk?

But though we have fought long and hard for adequate price supports—and make no mistake, the fight will go on—there is no responsible Department representative who is not anxious to get on to the other elements of a sound agricultural structure.

We have made immense progress in conservation. But we still have far to go. Let us settle this price question, and get on faster with conservation.

We have made great strides in electrification—four out of five farms are now electrified, whereas only about 1 out of 10 had electricity 15 years ago. But well over a million farms are still without power lines. Let's settle this price question and get on faster with electrification.

We've made advances in the level of rural living. But millions of farm homes are wretched structures. Millions are without running water, telephones, and other necessities. Millions of farm families are still denied adequate educational opportunities, hospital care, medical and dental attention, and recreational facilities.

One-fourth of all farm families had total incomes in 1948 of less than a thousand dollars. The answer to the problems of these families is not prices so much as it is production. They need, above all, the opportunity to produce enough for a better living.

Let's settle this price question and get on with building better production opportunities and better rural communities. For it is from the rural communities that much of our future population is coming—much of our manpower—and a lot of our genius and leadership. Nearly half the Nation's children are the product of rural families.

We need to develop that potential manpower—that genius—that leadership. It is a real emergency we face today.

We need, as never before, a strong and economically secure agriculture.

The strength of our farms has served us well in peace and in war. We must not dissipate that strength—for that would be a betrayal of freedom and a great service to the enemies of democracy.

We have built well in the past 17 years. But we must not stop building now. It is our privilege tt move forward for larger abundance and more complete security in the interests of the whole Nation.

It is the job not of farmers alone, nor of farm organizations, nor of Government to build that sound and secure agriculture.

It's a job for all of us.

If we have not already learned that every right-thinking man is indeed his brother's keeper, we had better learn it fast.

If we have not already recognized that we must all seek not only our own selfish desires, but the common good of all, we had better take a long, serious look at the world we live in.

It's a changing world—a terrifically fast-changing world.

No longer are empires, as in ancient times, slowly built and slow to disintegrate. Adolf Hitler rose and fell in only 12 years. In only 31 years the Comintern of Russia has achieved domination over perhaps a third of all the world's people.

We must try to keep peace among all nations—for wars between major powers can no longer be kept in quarantine. They speedily become global—and total—struggles.

We must try to maintain prosperity for all groups in our land—for depression is a communicable economic disease, and it quickly spreads, paralyzing all industries, affecting all groups.

We need a strong agriculture. We need it to maintain prosperity. We need it because it is basic to our national defense. We need it because it is the indispensable requirement of a healthy, vigorous, free people.

Let's start building the kind of agriculture we need—an agriculture of abundance—an agriculture with economic stability—by providing an adequate, realistic, and efficient program of price and income support.

Let's start now.

England's Public Medicine: The Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, everyone has an opinion on the experiment in national medicine now going on in Britain, but very few people know the facts about it. I was delighted to find an article on the subject by Dr. James Howard Means. Dr. Means who is Jackson professor of clinical medicine in the Harvard Medical School and chief of the medical services at Massachusetts General Hospital, is a recent past president of the American Association of Physicians, one of the most distinguished professional organizations which admits only outstanding doctors. He is the author of many books and over 150 articles on medical subjects.

Dr. Means article, which appears in the Atlantic Monthly for March, gives a simple factual report of his observations of the system in England. His standing in his profession gives us all complete confidence that his findings are fact, not opinion prejudiced one way or the other. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert this article in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGLAND'S PUBLIC MEDICINE: THE FACTS

(By James Howard Means, M. D.)

I

I hold no brief either for or against the British National Health Service, but I firmly believe that information about its success or failure will ultimately prove to be of great value to us in our own country. We have problems in this field to solve ourselves. We can be aided by the experience of others.

Americans either hold up the British Health Service as a horrible warning or use it as a talking point in favor of compulsory health insurance for the United States. Neither of these positions can be regarded as objective or realistic. What is needed is less recrimination and more investigation, and the first question to be put is, How is the system serving Britain? On my visit to England and Scotland last year I chatted with many people, both medical and nonmedical, I visited clinics, and I read a variety of British newspapers and journals. Some of the people I talked with were friends of many years' standing, the value of whose opinions I am sure I know accurately. Others were new, and some were chance acquaintances. Since returning home I have kept up a brisk correspondence on the subject.

I started off with the steward and stewardess aboard ship going over: both are English; both live in Liverpool. The steward was strongly in favor of the health service; the stewardess was against it. Both were working people, but one belonged to the Labor Party, the other to the Tory. This even split, it soon became evident, was no accurate indication of how the British people as a whole view the health service. There can be no doubt whatever that, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, the vast majority of the people are for it.

The attitude of the doctors, however, is very different. Among them there is undoubtedly much discontent. This runs all the way from trifling dissatisfaction to something approaching actual hostility. A very small number are enthusiastic proponents of the service. Organized medicine in Britain, represented by the British Medical Association, fought certain provisions of the National Health Service Act vigorously, but did not oppose its basic principles in any such uncompromising fashion as the American Medical Association has resisted any and all proposed legislation for a national health program here at home.

In Britain at the present time, the health service being a fait accompli, I found it to be practically the unanimous opinion of all with whom I talked, doctor and layman alike, that it is there to stay, regardless of the outcome of February's general election. The problem is how to improve it to the point where it is for everyone, fit to live with.

The actual direction which the development of Britain's National Health Service has taken was conditioned to a considerable degree by the war. When, in 1940, invasion of Britain became imminent and aerial bombardment certain, an integrated emergency medical service (EMS) for the entire realm, to take care of military and civilian wounded and sick, was rapidly set up under the wartime powers of the Government. The system devised made use of all hospital and professional services in the United Kingdom. Each individual, each unit, was assigned an area of responsibility—a particular function in relation to the whole. First aid, dispensary service, and hospitalization were systematized and services distributed so as to become universally available. Channels for the evacuation of sick and wounded were established. Though set up hurriedly, the EMS worked with great smoothness and success. Forced upon Britain by the war, it set the pattern for, and accelerated the tempo of, the socialization of medicine.

The main intent of the act which brought the national health service into existence on July 5, 1948, is to provide complete medical care for all people, to promote health, and to prevent disease. The training of professional personnel and the conduct of research are both recognized as essential to the success of the plan, and although these are primarily still in the hands of the universities, there is extensive interlocking with the health service at the level of the teaching hospitals. In a Socialist state it becomes an obligation of government to insure the production of a sufficient number of optimally trained physicians and surgeons and other professional personnel; also to see that medical knowledge is advanced to the greatest possible extent through research. In our more conservative democracy these functions have been left to a considerable degree to private enterprise. With us, the Federal or the State Governments take some, but by no means complete, responsibility for them.

Although intended to provide medical care for all people—even aliens temporarily in the country—the health service is not compulsory; any person or any doctor can remain out of it. Doctors may serve under it and also engage in private practice, if they can

find any. Medical care in Britain today is on a basis analogous to that of primary and high school education with us. All are entitled to it without direct payment but are not compelled to take it. As we may send our children to private schools, so Britons may go to private practitioners of medicine if they wish, and can afford to do so. But as we pay for education in this country through taxes, whether we send our children to private or public schools, so do British citizens pay for the health service through taxes[1] whether they use it or not. Harley Steet in London and its equivalents in provincial cities seem as full of doctors' offices as ever, and a considerable volume of private practice is going on in them. However, the doctors with whom I talked were convinced that it would slowly diminish until it might reach the vanishing point.

II

Final responsibility for the administration of the entire health service rests with the Minister of Health, a cabinet officer appointed by the Prime Minister, and therefore likely, as with us, to be replaced with each change in the government. The present Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan—one of Winston Churchill's pet antipathies—while by no means the originator of the concept of a unified national health service, was nonetheless to a considerable extent the architect of the present act. Of it in 1946 he said, "We have just passed through Parliament the greatest single health measure of our history. We are facing, at this moment, the monumental task of putting it into operation. We are trying to secure that in future the medical and health resources of the country are available to everybody in a rational and organized way, irrespective of personal means. But the availability of the health services is not our only object: we are also aiming at their improvement and expansion. This will not be achieved in a moment; it will require a great deal of hard work, and it will require the intelligent cooperation of the public."

He might have added "and of the medical profession," but he didn't, and there, I gather, lies a considerable portion of the rub. The majority of doctors with whom I talked had the feeling that Bevan had consulted the profession inadequately in drawing up his plans. This has embittered them rather extensively. It is not health acts in general to which they are opposed, but this particular one, which they think was set up in a bungling manner.

From the Minister of Health extend three main ramifications of administrative responsibility—namely, those of hospitals, general practice, and local health authority. The classification of hospitals and doctors under the act needs elucidation. Hospitals in Britain, as with us, prior to the inauguration of the National Health Service, fell into three major categories: voluntary hospitals, municipal hospitals, and private or commercial hospitals—generally called "nursing homes." The so-called voluntary hospitals, such as Guy's or St. Bartholomew's in London, are the equivalent of our privately endowed charity hospitals, such as the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, the Presbyterian in New York, or the Barnes Hospital in St. Louis. The voluntary hospitals are the ancient hospitals of Britain; originally run by the church, they later became secular charitable enterprises. It is in them for the most part that medical education has been conducted.

For the administration of the government-owned hospitals, England and Wales have been divided into 14 hospital regions, each based on a university medical school. In Scotland, which has an independent but similar national health service, there are six regions. The administrative control of the Scottish system lies in the Secretary of State for Scotland. Each region has a regional hospital board appointed by the minister to govern hospital affairs.

On July 5, 1948, the ownership of all voluntary and municipal hospitals was transferred to the Minister of Health. The nursing homes were left out, I have no doubt with the expectation that they will gradually wither on the vine.

It must be remembered that at the end of the war the voluntary hospitals were close to bankruptcy. Something had to be done about them, and done fast. The hospitals and the doctors at the head of them were swept along in the process of socialization then taking place in Britain.

The doctors of Britain under the Health Act are classified into four categories: (1) general practitioners, (2) a large and diverse group of hospital doctors, consultants, and specialists, (3) full-time clinical teachers, and (4) medical officers of health and their associates in the local health authorities.

In the promotion of health and the attack upon disease, the general practitioners are the front-line troops. Each general practitioner has a list of persons in his area who have joined the Health Service, who have chosen him to be their doctor. Such a practitioner is paid by the government so much a head per year for every name on his panel. He is allowed to take up to 4,000 persons. In our country this number would usually be considered excessive. To them he must render complete general practitioner service. The patients under this system are entitled to free medicine, which they can get on the doctor's prescription only.

Does the patient have any choice of physician? Yes, to a certain extent. So far as possible he is allowed to choose among the doctors in his area, but obviously in any area ultimately the total number of patients must be assigned among the available doctors in some reasonable proportion. The doctor is not obliged to receive any patient on his panel that he doesn't want, nor is the patient compelled to remain with a doctor he does not like. No troublesome obstacles are placed in the way of patients wishing to change doctors. General practitioners also are allowed to take on as private patients any persons not enrolled on their panels and charge them fees for service.

When the general practitioner encounters something he cannot handle, he transfers the patient via a hospital to one of the doctors of the class which I have numbered 2. This class includes the great group of practitioners who under the previous regime were on the staffs of voluntary or municipal hospitals. They made their living in whole or in part in private practice, chiefly of a specialist or consulting character—they were the Harley Street type of doctor. Under the National Health Service they function much as before, but they are paid by the government for everything they do for the service. They are based on hospitals and see their public patients as arranged by the hospital administration. This duty may be in ward or dispensary (out-patient department); or when necessary, arrangements can be made through the hospital for the consultant to see a patient with a general practitioner in the patient's home, and this type of domiciliary service is proving very helpful for a class of society to which it was not formerly available.

Payment of the consultant-specialist class of doctors is not on a panel system; it is on a time basis. The word "session" has been employed as the unit of work for doctors of this class. A session is half a day's work once a week per year. It may consist of any kind of professional work which this type of doctor is called upon to do—consulting, operating, or teaching.

Doctors are free to choose how many sessions they will serve, up to a total of 11, and for each they receive a flat rate per annum. A doctor taking nine and a half sessions or more is considered to have an adequate wage without the necessity of supplementing it with private practice. There are a few doctors who have stayed out of the health service altogether and still succeed in making a living on the old private-practice basis, but they are excluded from all the nationalized hospitals—which is, from the point of view of keeping educated, a great handicap. There are a larger number who fall between these extremes, and carry on some public and some private practice.

A very significant item in the over-all administration plan of the health service is that those hospitals which have been designated as teaching hospitals have been put in a special category. In England and Wales they are not directly under the regional hospital boards (in Scotland they are), but instead have their own boards of governors, which are appointed by joint action of the university concerned, the hospital staff, and the regional board.

This arrangement is to be interpreted as a consciousness on the part of the drafters of the plan of the fundamental necessity of preserving a measure of academic freedom in medical education, and of protecting it against any kind of political influence. My observations would indicate that this objective so far has been attained. It is through the teaching hospitals that the universities and the National Health Service find themselves engaged in a joint enterprise. The universities beyond this are not related to the minister of health. They as yet have not been nationalized.

Research is done chiefly in the university medical schools and the teaching hospitals as with us, although the Health Act gives every regional hospital board and every hospital management committee the power to initiate research and through a separate amenity fund to spend money on research.

It is interesting, however, that the most important research organization in the country, the Medical Research Council, is not under the minister of health at all. It is administered through the privy council, a separate department of the government. The Medical Research Council was set up in this way during the First World War, and was not changed when the Health Service came into being after the second.

III

The Health Service is working—that much is fact—but how well? Fairly well, but far from perfectly would be my judgment. Its success or lack of success, for want of an adequate frame of reference or control, cannot be measured quantitatively. One can only attempt to find out whether the British people are getting good, bad, or indifferent medical care under the National Health Service, or whether postwar Britons are getting as good service out of their medical system as prewar Britons did out of theirs. One cannot expect to discover whether, as things are now in Britain, the service provided under the National Health Act is better or worse than that which might be provided under some other type of system.

I have had opportunities occasionally to observe the work in the great British hospitals over a period extending back to 1913, and what I saw this past summer gives me the impression that there has been no important change, certainly no deterioriation in the quality of care provided. At no time in Britain, in the United States, or in any other country has the practice of medicine been as uniformly good as the medical knowledge of the time would permit it to be. There is always abundant room for improvement. To those tub thumpers of organized medicine in the United States who rant about our having the best medical service in the

[1] A small fraction of the expense of the health service is met through pay-roll deductions in the case of employed persons, and from compulsory contributions by employers.

world, I would say, "Possibly, but how many people get it?" Not many, I am sure. In both countries either now or in the past, there is, or has been, good, bad, and chiefly indifferent medicine. To evaluate a national medical system we need to know the overall standard of medical practice provided under it. I am unable to assert that the general standard is higher in Britain under the national health act than it was before that went into effect; but, on the other hand, I have encountered no convincing evidence that it is lower, and certainly more people get it.

There are many "bugs" to be gotten out of the health service—after all it has been going for only 19 months. Doubtless in time they will be gotten out, and the service will improve accordingly. Right now an amending bill is on its way through Parliament which will correct a number of the faults already found in the act. One of the most crying needs is to improve the lot of the general practitioner. He is today unquestionably overworked, underpaid, and insufficiently related to hospitals. But these abuses are correctable. One of the sorest points is that dentists are making about double what the general practitioners of medicine are. This is partly due to the fact that dentists are paid by the job, whereas general practitioners of medicine are paid on a capitation basis.

Abuse by patients of their privilege to see the doctor is another difficulty. Since it costs them nothing, they go, it is claimed, oftener than is necessary. There is reason to believe that this situation will be rectified. A token fee for each visit might be imposed, sufficient to put on a slight brake without vitiating significantly the principle of free care. Recently a charge of 1 shilling, not for visits to the doctor but for prescriptions written by him, has been imposed. Whether this will serve a useful purpose is not yet clearly discernible.

A great clamor has been made about free eyeglasses, free dentures, and even, in certain cases, free wigs, provided by the health service. Certainly there has been a colossal demand for these props to health. But is that fact a just criticism of the health service? All it would seem to mean, when viewed dispassionately, is that under the previous system there were great numbers of people who needed these prosthetic appliances and could not afford to get them. The stories of abuses of these privileges I am convinced are exaggerations, and I am assured that steps are being taken to eliminate such abuse as does exist.

One of the important elements of the program is the development throughout the country of local health centers. These will be primarily to implement and facilitate the work of general practitioners. They will even provide them in many instances with office space.

The difficulty is that the health centers have not yet really got going. The London County council's first large health center, I am told on good authority, will be in full operation in 1950, and three or four others in 1951. But for the most part the health centers are still largely in the blueprint stage.

The two most serious criticisms of this system that I encountered were that it is costing more than the country can afford, and that it is undermining the incentive to doctors to do good work.

Certainly the Health Service is costing much more than was anticipated. Whether it is more than the country can afford is a question inextricably bound up with that of the whole economy of Britain. I am a physician, not an economist, and cannot possibly throw any light on it.

The undermining of incentive to excel would be a serious defect. It is difficult to determine to what extent, if any, it actually prevails. One English prophet of doom, Lord Horder, who talked to American doctors at Atlantic City last June, can see nothing but deterioration ahead for British medicine under government control, but I did not find such a totally pessimistic view to be, by any means, universal among British doctors. It should be remembered that hardly anything but opinion is available at present. Only experience will answer the question, and 19 months' experience with the Health Service is not enough time by which to judge it accurately.

My feeling is that Britain is trying a momentous experiment in the nationalization of medicine. Since we too have great problems before us in our own country regarding the promotion of health and the provision of good medical care to all who need it in the community, it behooves us to watch closely and objectively the progress and outcome of Britain's project. Our observations will deepen our insight and may lead us to make wiser decisions concerning our own problems, which admittedly are different in many ways from those of Britain. We should be grateful to Britain for making this venture.

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material, I include a letter I have received from a Washington State constituent who is temporarily in California.

The writer of this letter is a successful businessman, who is an authority on wildlife and who is familiar with the game problems of Alaska. His information, I am sure, is accurate and his viewpoint constructive and convincing.

His letter to me follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *February 24, 1950.*
Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: I trust you will bear with me while I point out the importance of an adequate appropriation for the Alaska Game Commission. Last year $100,000 was appro] riated for the purpose of securing some measure of predator control and the apprehension and punishment of game law violators in the Territory. While some good has been achieved the amount is not enough to do the job as it must be done if the once vast herds of Alaska's wild game is to be saved from complete extermination.

The amount to be devoted to this purpose should be not less than $300,000. Up to now, wild game has constituted the major source from which the natives have obtained their food, clothing, and in no small measure their shelter. If this source is destroyed or seriously depleted this burden will fall on the Federal Treasury. It will be called upon to feed, clothe, and house something over 40,000 natives in the Territory. This will also be true of perhaps 50 percent of the white population.

The seriousness of the situation can be realized when the amazing depletion of the game herds during the past 15 to 25 years is pointed out. Here are a few figures. Twenty years ago the number of reindeer in northern Alaska was estimated at 600,000. Today there are less than 50,000. Twenty-five years ago there were one and one-half to two and one-half million caribou in the Territory. Today the most reliable estimates place the numbers at not to exceed 100,000. In the late twenties there was an enormous population of the white—or Dall—sheep in the Territory. Today these animals face complete extermination. For instance, in the late twenties the number of wild sheep in McKinley Park were estimated at fifteen to twenty-five thousand. Today, by actual count, there are less than 500.

Everyone familiar with the situation agrees that the big Arctic wolf is the worst offender. The slaughter by these savage killers is devastating. While the kills for food are considerable the major damage results from kills in teaching the young to fend for themselves, kills to satisfy an insatiable lust for blood letting and deaths from starvation because of the presence of these animals on the winter feeding grounds of wild game. Because of deep snows and subzero temperatures these areas are limited. The presence of a few wolves can prevent game from obtaining the nourishing food essential to survival. As a result mass starvation ensues. These combined with the depredations of game hogs and law violators account for most of the slaughter.

It may surprise you to learn that the coyote, commonly called the prairie wolf, entered Alaska some 20 or 30 years ago and is now found throughout the Territory in considerable abundance. These in conjunction with the wolves have invaded the nesting grounds of migratory waterfowl on the vast northern tundras and are literally destroying the eggs and the young by the millions. Since these areas provide the major source for birds that traverse the Central and Pacific flyways the effect naturally drastically cuts the numbers that visit these areas. Obviously control of these two mammal predators would have the effect of increasing the waterfowl in the Western States and assure better shooting for the thousands of scatter gun addicts resident therein.

The remedy is to be found in an adequate corps of trained patrolmen. Today but 10 men are provided to patrol a rugged roadless area almost as large as the United States east of the Mississippi River. Three to five times that number are needed. Surely three or even five hundred thousand is a small price to pay for the conservation of Alaska's once abundant wildlife.

You can help mightily toward securing adequate funds for the Alaska Game Commission. The need is so vital and the amount asked for is so small compared with other appropriations. I trust you can see your way clear to give this proposition your wholehearted support.

Sincerely,

I. P. CALLISON.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, February 16, was officially designated as Republic of Lithuania Day in Pennsylvania. At this time I place in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Honorable James H. Duff, Governor of

Pennsylvania, an editorial from the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald, and a resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian descent assembled on February 19 at Girardville, Pa.

The text of Governor Duff's proclamation is as follows:

In conformity with the doctrine of the right of self-determination guaranteed by democratic freedom-loving peoples, the Council of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, formally declared Lithuania to be free and independent.

Twenty-two years later, the Republic of Lithuania was absorbed by a neighboring state, and today no longer exists as a free nation. Thus, it is that Americans of Lithuanian descent will celebrate the Republic of Lithuania Day with the hope that their homeland will some day be restored to her rightful free and independent place among the nations of the earth.

Pennsylvania is proud of its many citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, and join with them in the celebration of their anniversary of independence.

Therefore, I, James H. Duff, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1950, as Republic of Lithuania Day.

Furthermore, I call upon the citizens of Pennsylvania to give proper recognition to this important anniversary and to join in such exercises as may be appropriate for its observance.

JAMES H. DUFF, *Governor.*

[From the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Herald]

A HOLIDAY OF HOPE

Last December, on the occasion of Stalin's seventieth birthday, State-owned printing presses flooded the Soviet domain with tributes, special editions, and biographies of the dictator.

One sample: "Joseph Stalin is the leader and teacher and friend of all the suffering and oppressed."

It is not difficult to picture the grim feelings of Lithuanians as they scanned this propaganda at the time. And it requires little or no imagination to visualize the attitude of these same people today—the thirty-second anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

It was on February 16, 1918, after some 160 years of domination under the Russian czarist rule, that Lithuania proudly proclaimed to the world that it was free and independent. The long enduring chains of oppression were finally severed.

All of the powers recognized the Republic of Lithuania, including the United States of America. For that matter, officially we continue to recognize her independence. The Soviet Union, too, acknowledged the existence of this free state, but that gesture was not to continue for any appreciable period.

The black clouds gathered and finally broke in June 1940, when the Soviet moved in its troops—a direct violation of the treaty of 1926. The Communist octopus snaked its tentacles around the people of Lithuania and also those comprising Latvia and Estonia. The economic blood-sucking started it. It shows no signs of abatement even to this day.

Midnight descents by the secret police and constant spying no longer surprise or shock the Lithuanian people. It is a part of their daily life. Religious worship as these oppressed people once knew it simply is no more. A national culture is in the throes of plotted elimination. Education consists of an evil process to twist facts and figures to suit the nefarious purposes of the U. S. S. R.

As for the shocking toll of atrocities, the evidence is clear and unmistakable. The firing squads deal out their volleys of death to all attempting to shake off the bonds of tyranny.

But any regime built on a foundation of murder, pillage and general misery for innocent peoples cannot long endure. All of the past examples of world history prove this.

In Lithuania today, February 16 conveys a hollow ring to those who remember the era of the Republic. They know, however, they have the full sympathy of all liberty-loving Americans and many other nationalities in different parts of the globe.

Theirs is a matter of fortitude until Lithuania is once more saluted and honored as a restored free republic. Meanwhile, their courage will see them through this trying period, the end of which is not yet in sight. Time has a singular way of balancing accounts.

LITHUANIAN DAY ASSEMBLY

Americans of Lithuanian descent assembled this February 19, 1950, in St. Vincent's Hall, Girardville, Pa., to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation, have unanimously declared that—

(a) The ethnic, cultural, linguistic individuality and political tradition of the Lithuanian people;

(b) The Ancient Lithuanian statehood dating back to the year 1200 A. D., its splendid historical record of tolerance, of individual, racial linguistic, and cultural liberty;

(c) The long unceasing, and determined struggle of the Lithuanian people against the foreign Muscovite domination and oppression;

(d) The heroic sacrifices of each succeeding generation of the Lithuanian people in the great mass insurrections of 1794–95, 1812, 1863–64, 1905, 1918–20, and the epic Lithuanian fight for basic human rights, for human dignity, for the freedom of the press and of the printed Lithuanian word during the 40-year suppression of all Lithuanian literary activities, 1864–1904;

(e) The imposition by the Soviet Union—by threat of superior force and in connivance with Nazi German war criminals—of a mutual assistance pact on October 10, 1939, whereby Lithuania granted and leased to the Soviet Union military bases in the strategic centers of Lithuania in exchange for a solemn Russian guaranty of the independence of Lithuania and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, political, social, and economic order of the country;

(f) The Soviet invasion of Lithuania, June 15, 1940, violating all treaties—the peace pact, the nonaggression pact, and the mutual-assistance pact with a guaranty of the political independence and noninterference in domestic affairs—then and now in force between the Soviet Union and the sovereign Republic of Lithuania;

(g) The Atlantic Charter declaration holding out a promise of the restoration of sovereignty to the peoples forcibly deprived of same, and the subsequent embodiment of the Atlantic Charter as a part of the declaration by the United Nations, including the Soviet Union, on January 1, 1942;

(h) The effective Lithuanian underground liberation struggle during the 8 years of German occupation and continuing to this date, directed against Soviet attempts to annihilate Lithuania as a sovereign nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, To call on the Congress of the United States to create conditions enabling—

(a) The formation of broadly representative interim governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The repatriation of Baltic deportees from Siberia and northern Russian exile, under the supervision of the United Nations;

(c) The evacuation of the Russian troops, police and Communist Party apparatus from the territories of the Republicans of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia helping the sovereign peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to restore their democratic self-governments after the harrowing experiences of three successive hostile occupations; and

(d) The initiation of a move for an immediate admission of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, still full-fledged members of the League of Nations, into the United Nations Organization; be it also

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be printed and mailed to the President, Secretary of State, to Foreign Affairs Commission and Members of both Houses of Congress.

LITHUANIAN DAY ASSEMBLY,
FRANK P. MAJIKAS, *President.*
ALBERT J. VILLINSKY, *Secretary.*

Wisconsin Spends What It Has and No More—Uncle Sam Should Do Likewise

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin will not go broke nor will it pile up a huge debt for future generations to pay. Under our State law there can be no deficit spending. The money must be in the State treasury before it can be disbursed. The law thus protects the State employee and it also assures the taxpayer that he can expect economy and prudent management in fiscal affairs.

John Wyngaard, a prominent State columnist, in his daily report from Madison, tells the story and I am including it as part of my remarks:

STATE GOING BROKE? IT CAN'T; IT SPENDS ONLY WHAT IT HAS AND CANNOT BORROW FURTHER

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—State administration spokesmen are scouting the impression, assiduously cultivated by the Democratic opposition that the State is going broke. A combination of high spending during the last session of the legislature, uncertainty at budget time a year ago about biennial tax trends, the habit of caution among State fiscal managers, and the campaign activities of the Democratic opposition to distract attention from the Truman deficit budget in Washington, have served to create the idea that the State is confronted with a severe financial crisis.

Actually, in the fairest analysis, it is far from a crisis or prospective crisis. The State government will be required to pull up its belt after the flush years of the war and immediate postwar period. But State employees are in no danger of missing pay days, and municipalities need not fear that their State aids will not be paid on the dates due.

THE FACTS

As other commentators have pointed out, it is inaccurate and misleading to talk about a deficit in State government terms. The State can't have a deficit. If it doesn't have the money, it can't spend it. The State cannot borrow.

In that lies an important distinction from the national budget. President Truman has

presented a budget to Congress that deliberately plans a deficit. The difference between the year's income and the year's outgo, under his program, will be made up by borrowing and an increase in the national debt. That can't happen here. The State does not borrow. It spends only as it collects.

Nor will there be a deficit in the sense that there will be a shortage of money. When the present budget was worked out last year, it was based upon a conservative estimate of receipts during the biennium, including the new revenue measures and the use of the wartime surplus that had been saved precisely for the purpose of financing postwar improvements.

Moreover, that cautious financial program was planned to have a cushion of some $7,000,000 for contingencies, as a working fund in the treasury.

A YEAR LATER

State officials now know they were unduly conservative. (They must be, because of the prohibition against borrowing.) Tax receipts have been higher than they dared to hope.

Moreover, the next State budget will very likely be smaller than the current program. The present appropriation laws contain items that will not recur, presumably. The big institutional capital authorizations are an example.

There also is the prospect of sizable lapsed balances—appropriations made and now representing claims against State revenues, but unlikely to be executed. The big veterans' housing appropriation illustrates here. Individual applications are coming in slowly, and not a single request for aid from a municipal housing authority has yet been filed. There is every indication that much of that money will remain to be available for other budget purposes in future years. Altogether, therefore, there is no chance for a State deficit in the strict meaning of the word, and the State's over-all financial situation is much better than was forecast a year ago.

In Greece There Is No Children's Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the kidnapping of 28,000 children by Communist guerrillas during the recent Greek civil warfare has understandably shocked the conscience of our civilized world. Appended is a pointed editorial on this subject from one of America's outstanding Greek-American journals, the Atlantis of New York, Solon G. Vlasto, publisher, from its issue of Sunday, February 26:

AN APPEAL TO THE WORLD

The appeal of the Greek Church to the world public opinion in behalf of Greece's abducted children is answered in the United States by a touching and wide interest of the American people in the fate of these unfortunate Greek children. It is natural that this atrocious crime is decried generally in our country.

By the hateful and deliberate practice of the Communist forces, many thousands of Greek children have been abducted from their homes, their villages, and their country, to an unknown fate. The abduction of 28,000 Greek children by the Communist-supported bandits represents one of today's greatest crimes against humanity, and if there is any conscience left in the world, some means must be found to return these children to their parents.

Cruelty reaches its depths when children are torn from their fathers and mothers leaving the parents in the agony of suspense, not only from the separation itself, but also as to how their children are being treated, or if they will ever see them again.

Representatives of the Soviet and satellite countries made a great point at the last meeting of the United Nations General Assembly of the fact that criminals were being convicted and punished through the due process of law. Yet these representatives of countries which do not even hold trials, or whose trials are travesties of justice, had bleeding hearts for those convicted in Greece for offenses against the state and their own people. How these representatives can justify the great crime of abducting 28,000 Greek children and making 18,000 additional homeless in Greece is impossible for a free man to understand.

Humanity and civilization have shown their keen interest in the fate of these tragic children. But world opinion must be aroused to the point of forcing the Communist countries to atone for this crime and return these children to their suffering parents at once. To hold these children any longer is but further proof of the criminal intent of their abductors. The appeal of the Archbishop of Athens and Primate of all Greece is an appeal to the whole civilized world and on the basis of human rights.

What Do Past Elections Disclose?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much these days about the swing to socialism at home and abroad. England is pointed out every day as the horrible present-day example of socialism. A terribly devastating war and all of its aftermath of privation and suffering, of course, had nothing to do with England's present plight according to some present-day nonreasoning people. The doctors scream about England's socialized medicine, and every other selfish group points out that we are heading for the same fate which Britain has now arrived at. All of these comparisons are so ridiculous that it should not be necessary to discuss them at all.

Is England's Government really socialistic? If it is then socialism has surely taken on a most strange window dressing. Just imagine a dangerous socialistic government with a king, and a royal family, and all of the estates, and castles, and social tomfoolery that a king and his court and his royal retinue requires and demands. No; every person in England, after the last war was over, needed to be put under guardianship, and there being no proper guardians available they all joined hands, community style, until they could recover sufficiently from their physical and mental shock and incidentally remove the great want and privation which stalked their land. They are a limited monarchy now and most probably will continue so to be in the future. When their government recovers the old tory classes will take the helm again and liberalism will find its same old poverty hole again also.

England pulled together both before and after World War II, and at intervals pulled great aid out of us also. On the contrary we people of the United States pulled together during the war and did a great job, but after the war the selfish gougers of our Nation combined to restore to themselves again their golden empire, but unlike England, in this Republic the people will not let the days of old come back again. The extreme right-wingers had better take heed because the ballots of the thinking man and woman are theirs no longer for the asking, or the forcing, or the buying.

A lot has been said about the people of the Republic, swinging to the right again, but I think that the people are too wise to thus knock themselves out of all of their gains and advancements by their own ballot-box punch.

I wish to submit, in conclusion, the following timely article published in the Christian Science Monitor on February 28, last, which gives us food for thought:

BRITAIN SWINGS RIGHT—BUT NOT FAR

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—As in the case of the New Zealand and Australian elections, the British elections prove that the political tide can swing from a leftward to a rightward direction.

In other words, it is now well established by three postwar elections in English-speaking countries that the cause of conservatism has not been foreclosed by events of the past decade. Governments of the left can be thrown out of office, as they were in the first two countries. A government of the left can be so nearly defeated as to nullify its plans for more leftward legislation, as in Britain.

From this fact men of the right and center may take comfort, as they are.

But before they take too much comfort, or relapse into an easy confidence that because it happened in three other places it will automatically happen here, too, they had best note two aspects of the matter which have been somewhat overlooked in the original enthusiasm.

The first is that the pattern of the past lends almost no support to the theory that British and American electorates tend to follow each other. On the contrary, it would almost seem as though the two electorates were perversely determined to move as frequently as possible in opposite directions.

For example, when the United States had Herbert Hoover—a man of the political right—the British swung left to Ramsay MacDonald. Then when American voters swung left under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the British soon turned right under Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain.

Following the war, Britain turned abruptly left under its Labor government. But the first American postwar election was a swing to the right—the Republicans capturing both Houses of Congress. There was a resumption of a leftward trend in America in the 1948 election, but now the inclination in Britain is rightward, even though not quite far enough to overthrow the government. Judging from the past, there is certainly no reason to assume that the American electorate will turn rightward just because the British have. Over the past half century the political cycles in Britain and the United States more frequently conflict than coincide.

The second aspect of the matter is that the British conservatism which did better than expected in last week's elections is a very different thing from the conservatism of

the presently dominant group in the American Republican Party.

The British voter may or may not have consciously repudiated nationalization of industry by his votes. But the British voter has made it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the British Labor government to proceed with much more nationalization. However, if we judge what a Conservative government would do from its campaign record one must conclude that the British voter has most definitely not repudiated the idea of the welfare state.

The Conservative Parties which won in Australia and New Zealand, and nearly won in Britain, are all pro-welfare-state parties in the broad sense of the term. That is to say, if you are to draft a formula for a Conservative platform from the experiences of the three British Commonwealth elections your formula would be built on accepting the welfare state just as firmly as on rejecting the nationalized state. That has been the winning combination twice, and the nearly winning combination once.

It remains possible, of course, that a Conservative Party can win someday by being against both nationalization and the welfare state. But there is no basis in any of the three British elections for such an assumption. Those elections prove only one thing—that the combination of the welfare state with private capitalism is appealing to the voters of New Zealand, Australia, and Britain. It does not prove that any other combination will be appealing to voters anywhere. Nor, of course, does it disprove it.

Representative Lovre's Long-Range Plan for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] has spent a good deal of time working on a long-range plan for agriculture. Recently he announced the objectives of his plan, which drew Nation-wide comment, most of it favorable. I would not attempt to comment on the merit of the proposal without a long and thorough study of its details, but, having great respect for Mr. LOVRE's knowledge of farm problems and confidence in his judgment, I believe that his suggestions deserve the careful study of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. Our long-range farm policy is the most vital domestic problem before the American people, and our decision in regard to it may well determine whether we are to take the road to regimentation and socialism or to a free and expanding economy. Therefore, every suggestion should receive our conscientious consideration.

For this reason I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic of Wednesday, February 22, discussing Mr. LOVRE's plan. W. R. Ronald, author of the article and publisher and editor of the paper, has spent many years studying problems affecting agriculture. His observations are worthy of note.

CAN ATTAIN LOVRE FARM PLAN'S GOALS BY ONE MAJOR CHANGE IN PRESENT LAW

(By W. R. Ronald)

When Representative HAROLD LOVRE of the First South Dakota District, announced yesterday in Washington the provisions of the grass roots bill he will introduce, it was the culmination of 17 years of experience and effort by farmers administering the AAA and PMA measures.

This South Dakota Representative had already broken with the National Republican Committee because of its inane, one-sentence proposal for agriculture. He said he would present legislation to set up a farm products price support program.

He had found in 32 meetings, held after he had sent 85,000 post cards to farmers in his district to tell him what they wanted, that 90 percent, of course, asked for:

Full parity price on normal domestic consumption.

A completely self-financing program.

A two-level price system under which the surplus would be segregated.

Administration by county, State and national committees or boards made up of farmers, either nominated or elected by the farmers.

Tuesday Representative LOVRE announced the provisions of the bill he will introduce, which would:

1. Provide full parity price at all times for all normal domestic consumption of any of the farm products upon which the law would be operative.

2. Be fully self-financed, thus ending the use of taxpayers' money for subsidies for farmers.

3. By a simple device segregate surplus so that the farmer will receive only what it brings when sold.

4. By using market devices only, terminate all efforts to control production by the Government, but insuring that the farmers would themselves reduce production when the amount received by them for surplus becomes low enough.

5. By calling loans or selling surplus, make the parity price also the ceiling, thus protecting consumers.

6. Make it possible for the Government to get back probably most of the fourteen billion it now has invested in surplus foodstuffs.

7. By recovering this amount and adding at least the $2,000,000,000 of income which Secretary of Agriculture Brannan says is the amount by which farm income has already been reduced below what farmers should receive, go far toward balancing the Federal budget.

8. Providing a system under which, by adding a few cents to parity and then collecting it from farmers, it could provide insurance of crops against any and all loss, without any expense to the Government.

9. Make the application of the law voluntary, by using the same provision in present marketing laws, namely, a referendum in which two-thirds or more of the farmers must vote for its use before it goes into operation.

10. Set up a system of marketing under which the cost of depreciation of farm plants and of restoring the fertility of depleted soil, could be financed by adding the necessary amount to be the parity price, to be retained by the farmer only if used for those purposes, thus making possible the most extensive soil-conservation program ever put into operation in the United States.

11. Make it possible to control exports of surplus at less than parity within any policy established by Congress and without breaking down agriculture in other countries.

12. Establish administration of the law by farmers. This would be accomplished by the election of county committees of farmers, as under the AAA and the PMA; nomination of farmers for the State committee by the county committees, the Secretary of Agriculture making his appointments from this list; and nomination of farmers for the national committee or board by the State committees, the Secretary making his appointments from this list.

ONLY ONE MAJOR CHANGE NEEDED

All of this would be accomplished by only one major change in present law. Congress, a number of years ago, passed marketing quota laws to keep surpluses from breaking prices. Under this or any other such laws, the farmer is given a quota under which he may market only his share of the normal total domestic consumption of the commodity as to which the law is in operation.

By adding one amendment, namely, to require the farmer to purchase any additional marketing quotas for the sale of any surplus, the Federal Government would thus have the funds with which to provide food stamps for low-income families, aid new uses of food and through export to move any surplus it acquires, either by purchase or loans, always at parity.

"I was surprised by the unanimity of the farmers on the program they want to assure them decent prices," Mr. LOVRE told me about the meetings he held in October, November, and December. "I was astonished at the number who responded to my post card invitations. I would say that about 90 percent want full parity under a self-financing program, with a two-level price to them. By a two-level price, they mean full parity on their share of normal domestic consumption and whatever is realized on any surplus they may market by buying additional marketing quotas. I know this measure is what they desire and I am going to give it everything I have got."

FARMERS IN OTHER STATES WANT THIS LAW

I can say that Mr. LOVRE, through his meeting, found exactly what the Daily Republic was given, in meetings with farmers in eight States, North and South.

Politically, Mr. LOVRE has shown the way by which the Republicans can surely win the 1950 elections in the Farm Belt. If they are smart, they will get behind the Lovre bill.

Readers should appreciate what Mr. LOVRE did by issuing his statement when he did. The policy, or program, outlined by Chairman Gabrielson of the Republican National Committee, referred to agriculture in general terms.

Mr. LOVRE, to his great credit, immediately declared that this Gabrielson statement on agriculture did not go far enough, and announced his intention to introduce the grass-roots bill. It is unusual for an officeholder to break so quickly and so frankly with the head of his party's organization. Obviously Mr. LOVRE was influenced by his knowledge of what the farmers of his district want, obtained by his 32 meetings with them. That, in turn, presages an aggressive effort by the Congressman to put over his measure.

So, by summoning all the farmers of his district to a frank, nonpartisan statement of what they want, Mr. LOVRE not only did a smart thing, but gave an exemplary example of democracy at its best.

I think I know why Mr. LOVRE found a response that surprised him. This was manifested in the number who came to his meetings.

ELECTION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Not only office holders and politicians, but also news writers, have failed to appreciate what it has done to the farmers to have held 17 annual elections of county AAA and PMA committees, beginning with 1933. The Secretary of Agriculture has named the State committees and has dictated what they should say and do; the county committees

have not only not been invited to make suggestions, but when they have tried it, have been rebuffed.

Anyone should imagine the resentment that has been accumulating with the farmers, as, year after year they have held their elections of county committees, only to find that these county committeemen are not permitted any voice in forming a farm program. It has been election without representation. And, since this is contrary both to the theory and practice of democracy in the United States, the farmers not only do not like it, but properly resent it. That is why they will insist on State and National committees or boards made up from lists of farmers they nominate for any permanent farm plan. Moreover, it would insure the interest and activity that would handle the details of any program correctly and with understanding and dispatch.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

How the plan would work may be illustrated by a farmer who had been given a marketing quota on corn at a time well in advance of planting. We will say this is for 5,000 bushels. But, because of unusual favorable weather, he produces 6,000 bushels of corn. He could dispose of the 5,000 bushels, either for cash or by feeding.

If under his alloted quota he should desire to market also the 1,000 bushels of surplus corn he had produced, he could do so, but only by purchasing a certificate for surplus marketing of 1,000 bushels from his county committee.

If parity on corn were $1.50, he probably would be charged at least 75 cents a bushel for this surplus certificate. He would sell at full parity, and the $750 he had paid to be allowed to market the 1,000 surplus bushels would go to the Federal Treasury.

The Federal board or committee administering the law would at any time purchase at parity, or make full parity loans, on any amount of corn necessary to maintain the parity price of $1.50 per bushel.

This national committee or board would store surplus up to the amount of carry-over desired in order to provide a reserve against a shortage through crop failure or increased demand.

But if the national board should acquire more than the amount desired for reserve, it could and would move it at whatever reduction in price is necessary. Food stamps for any such surplus would be issued to low-income families.

The national board would determine the value of the stamps, whether for 20 or 30 or whatever cents per pound of foodstuffs. And it would also determine the number to be issued. In any event, they would be discontinued when the market for the commodity no longer needed support. (No doubt the board would be authorized also to sell at a discount to firms experimenting with new uses for corn; and also to export at a price below parity, as may be in keeping with the policy of Congress or any agreement such as the Marshall plan.)

The cost of moving any and all surplus in those ways would be met by the amounts paid by farmers for surplus marketing certificates.

BALANCES DUE FARMERS

At the end of the year, the national board would have a record of the average amount received for any surplus corn, for example, it had disposed of. Thus it would know the average realized per bushel. Let it be supposed that this amount was $1 per bushel. Farmers selling surplus had paid 75 cents per bushel for these surplus quotas and received $1.50 (parity), and so would have obtained a net of 75 cents per bushel. They would have 25 cents per bushel coming to them from the Federal board, because it had netted $1 per bushel on surplus. This would be collected by the farmers from the county committee by presenting the surplus marketing certificates they had purchased.

So, the two-level price system would work out this way. Each farmer would receive full parity for his share of the total normal consumption, and the amount realized on the sale of any surplus by the national committee or board administering the program.

This is the private-enterprise system. It is what every merchant does: sell the bulk of his stock at full price and then dispose of his surplus at reduced prices. The farmer must have the Federal Government act as his agent to handle his output in the same way, because he himself has nothing to say about the price he receives.

QUOTAS CORRECTED ANNUALLY

Each year the Secretary of Agriculture would estimate the normal domestic consumption, at the same time making a correction on the estimate for the preceding year or years as compared with the actual.

If farmers were to continue producing large surpluses, the national board would charge more and more for surplus marketing certificates in order to have funds to pay for a larger amount of food stamps or other discounts. So the farmer might have to pay $1 or even $1.25. (If in any year it is found the charge is too low, it could be immediately increased.) The farmer would receive less and less, net, for his surplus. And presently he would voluntarily reduce his production, on that account.

Under a one-price system, the more the price drops the more units the farmer tries to produce, to keep up his gross income. Only when he is obliged to take a lower price on the surplus, and the surplus takes all of the beating on price, so that it would pay him less and less, will he find he is money ahead if he reduces his plantings.

In order to reach the sale of any feed crop in the form of byproducts, namely, livestock, dairy and poultry products, all grains and probably soybeans and sorghums and hay and livestock, dairy and poultry products would be treated as one commodity. Thus, upon any of these products of which the national board acquires a surplus that should or must be marketed, food stamps would be issued whether it be eggs or butter or beef or pork or grains.

COST OF CONVERSION KNOWN

Not only the Department of Agriculture and State agricultural colleges but many farmers know how many bushels of each kind of feed is required to produce 100 pounds of meat or a gross of eggs or 100 pounds of chickens and the surplus marketing certificates bought by the farmer would be valued accordingly. That is why, if the law should be approved by this Congress, and a referendum were to be put into operation on grains and their byproducts, the Government could get its money out of any surplus of any of these products it now holds. As it is now, it cannot at the same time buy and sell on the public market without breaking the price. That's why it is destroying foodstuffs and unnecessarily losing millions, and if this practice is continued, billions.

In this respect the Government is in the very same quandary as was the Hoover farm board. It will be recalled that the more it bought of wheat the lower it went. When it began operations wheat was selling for $1.25; when it stopped wheat was bringing 40 cents.

ONLY WAY TO SAVE BILLIONS

Thus Representative LOVRE is offering the one way by which the Government can get out of the mess in which it finds itself by continued purchase of farm products to support the market, with no way to dispose of its holdings without lowering the price, to support which the purchases were made. As it is, the Department of Agriculture doesn't know what to do except to keep on buying. That is why Secretary Brannan a few days ago asked for another $2,000,000,000 for that purpose. If that were given to him, and he spent it, the Lovre bill could save six instead of four billions.

Since any addition to farm income adds seven times as much to national income, and even Secretary Brannan admits the farmers this year will get $2,000,000,000 less than they should (which is less than parity), and their returns are increased only by that amount, it would add fourteen billion to the annual income of the whole country and that in turn would increase the return from income taxes.

So the Lovre bill not only is the one and only method proposed by anyone that could balance the budget, but in all probability would do that very thing if the Eighty-first Congress passes the measure.

Hidden Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, hidden taxes have lulled the taxpayer into a fool's paradise. He does not know what his tax bill is nor does he seem interested. In some way he must be aroused. At this point I include a timely editorial that appeared in the Evansville (Wis.) Review:

In an editorial called Those Hidden Taxes, the New York Herald Tribune observes, "The citizen who grins and bears it each week when he takes note of deductions from his take-home pay, or who gulps when he makes the quarterly payment on his income tax, has perhaps mercifully been spared a consciousness of the hidden taxes which fall upon him every day. * * * The problem of tax reform, however, requires knowledge on that part of the citizens. It is to the advantage of the individual that he sees through the tax smoke screen which the experts have laid down, that he feel the pain of what has been devised to be painless."

The Herald-Tribune ran a series of factual articles, by Robert S. Bird, dealing with the impact of hidden taxes on the ordinary taxpayer. It is a sure bet that not 1 citizen in 10,000 has any accurate idea of how deep these taxes cut into his earnings. For instance, on a $10,000 house it was found that no less than 639 hidden taxes were involved in the construction, development of site, and purchase financing. These taxes, Mr. Bird says, were collected by the Federal and State governments from the architect, builder, banks, agents, insurance companies, contractor, manufacturers, jobbers, and others.

Hidden taxes are not confined to big purchases like a house. The tax foundation found that 151 taxes applied to a loaf of bread. A woman's hat carried 150 taxes. A man's suit came in for 116. A humble egg accounted for 100. Mr. Bird writes: "In none of these studies were local taxes taken into account, nor the Federal and State levies on the various steps behind the supply and manufacturing point. As an example of how complex the tax-shifting devices work, the economists found that even the length of

time an article remains in stock sometimes determines who bears the weight of a particular tax."

No one knows the actual total of hidden taxes. Estimates indicate they may run as high as $700 per family per year. And, of course, they come on top of all direct taxes. The magnitude of the latter is shown by the fact that in 1949 the average taxpayer worked 1 month for the Federal Government to pay the Federal income tax alone.

The Federal Government is the biggest tax eater by far. It takes 71 cents of each tax dollar, while the states take 15 cents and local units 14 cents. By contrast, in 1932, the Federal Government took but 22 percent and in 1939, 39 percent.

What to do about this tremendous problem is a tough question. The Herald Tribune says, "The overlapping of tax jurisdictions, the continuance of taxes which have outlived their original purpose, the crushing proportions of the tax burden as a whole, require the most careful * * *. But the first step is to know, and the second is to be aroused."

Depositors Who Remember GOP Era of Bank Failures Appreciate New Deal Protection of Their Life Savings Through FDIC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Thank God for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation," which appeared in the Daily Times-Democrat of Pryor, Okla.:

THANK GOD FOR THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

People who lived during the past depression and happened to be residing in a community where there was a bank failure, can appreciate the beneficent and glorious service the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is rendering to this community at this hour.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation started work quickly upon discovery by the bank examiners of the condition of the bank. For their promptness this community will be forever grateful.

Moreover, the people of this community should be grateful for the fact that we have living in our community men with determination and financial means to assist in building the financial structure of even a larger bank than the old one. And also we should be pleased that our community has attracted Charles H. Fawks, president of the new bank, to come here with his talents and means.

This is the hour when due credit should be acknowledged and this community will be grateful forever for the ultimate and satisfactory relief from this financial crisis.

Under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, deposits are guaranteed up to $5,000. However, in the case of the Pryor bank, a new bank having been organized, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will make a purchase of the assets of the old bank and all depositors will be paid in full.

The National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful, analytical, and constructive speech of our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], which was delivered at the breakfast of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, N. J., on February 28, 1950. Those of us who have served both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate with the Senator from Texas know that he always thinks through the problems confronting our Nation and that he courageously stands for what he believes to be in the public interest. These characteristics are shown in the address I asked to have printed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thirteen years ago, a majority of my neighbors and childhood friends in central Texas concluded that the State of Texas would best be served if I were sent away to Washington. Except for that, I might well be one of you this morning.

My earliest ambitions, after graduating from teachers college at San Marcos and entering the education field, were toward the work of school administration. At that time, Texas had an unusually large number of able and inspiring public-school administrators. The honor of the work was high, but the honorariums were low.

Today the honor is still high—and the honorariums are no longer so low. I hope both will increase in future years.

It was not my purpose in coming here from Washington to talk with you about school administration. You know that field—and you are doing a wonderful job.

Instead, I propose to talk with you about our national security.

My first committee assignment as a member of the House of Representatives in 1937 was the Naval Affairs Committee. From that year to the present, I have had the rare opportunity and the great responsibility for participating in a continuing study of this Nation's defense and security.

I do not pretend that this service qualifies me as any rare expert, either in matters of defense or in matters of our international relations.

I know that I do not possess any great store of startling and secret information, and I will not seek to stimulate those who may have an appetite for the sensational by pretending that I do.

From my years of service, I am sure of only one thing:

Modern politics and modern science have made it impossible for any nation to be certain that its defenses are adequate.

Remember that. We may appropriate and appropriate, build and build, plan and plan for our defense, but we can never be sure we have done enough.

This is a fundamental fact, a simple and obvious reality of our world.

We may as well accept it; we cannot escape it.

I emphasize this for a purpose.

A NEW ROLE

Within the past 6 months, two events have forced upon us a new role in the defense of freedom.

First, well ahead of schedule, communism has come into possession of the atomic bomb.

Second, communism has sealed the back entrance to Soviet Russia through the conquest of China.

What do these events mean?

For one thing, international communism has, for practical purposes, accomplished many of its major goals nearly everywhere except in the United States and in those nations allied with the United States through the Atlantic Pact.

Whatever advantages we may have held because of the Kremlin's diversion to other interests are now dissolving.

Furthermore, the Soviet atomic bomb changes the balance of the physical strength of communism and freedom.

We know that we no longer possess an explosive force mightier than the Soviet; we can only hope ours is not weaker.

Stated bluntly, this may be alarming.

Certainly it is disturbing.

What we have lost, thus far, is time.

Worse, however, we are losing both time and our relative strength every day.

In 1945, year one of the atomic age, scientists told us that we might have 10 years of monopoly on the atomic bomb.

The predictions were too optimistic.

Instead of 10 years we had barely 3 or 4 years.

The world of 1955 has now arrived ahead of schedule, and free men have found themselves running late.

OUR POLICY OF CONTAINMENT

For a few years we had a policy of appeasement, and then we adhered to a policy of containment. With our military resources and with our money we have attempted to hold in check the imperialism of communism. As a legislator, I have supported the policy and I have looked forward to its successes.

In those places where the policy has succeeded, it has succeeded, as Churchill pointed out, only because we held the advantage of the atomic bomb. In other places, it has not succeeded at all.

Force can only be countered by superior force.

We no longer possess a superior force. In addition to the world's largest underseas fleet, the largest land army, and one of the largest air forces, Russia has an atomic bomb. We are building an H-bomb—there was no choice other than to build it. But only the naive, only the hopelessly innocent or ignorant, would bother to contend that the H-bomb is an American monopoly.

We should now admit to ourselves that peace does not come in bombs.

Whatever bomb free men build, slave men can build also.

If slave men ever use their bombs, free men must use theirs also—that is, of course, if the first attack of the aggressor is not fatal.

Because of Russia's bomb, and because of our bomb, I believe our people need to look thoroughly into our whole policy of containment for Communist imperialism.

If all of us adhere stubbornly to a policy born in a different day and age, we may easily succeed only in containing ourselves. In other words, we may find we have fenced ourselves in, instead of fencing in communism.

What results such a review might produce I do not know. I do not think there is profit or worthy purpose in proposing reviews merely to announce what the outcome should be.

This I do sincerely hope: That not all suggestions for review or reexamination of our policies will be dismissed by any free people with the reply to that change—or suggestion of change—would be interpreted by the Communists as a sign of weakness.

We should not freeze our vision or destroy the strength that hope gives by accepting this answer.

CHANGE IS OUR STRENGTH

It has long been my belief that the greatest strength of free peoples in the struggle with communism is their unique ability and their traditional willingness to change, to adapt themselves to changing situations, to find new answers to old problems.

That is what distinguishes democratic systems from totalitarian systems.

Our freedom, of which we speak so much, is actually the right and the ability to change.

If we want to lose our freedom and lose our strength, we can do so by permitting communism to frighten us away from change.

I am not one who agrees that the active quest for peace is indicative of weakness. Only those who are strong, and who are confident of their strength, can effectively seek peace. Peacemaking should not be only the business of the weak.

I believe this Nation must remain sufficiently strong to sit at the conference table with Russian representatives and seek the answer to the survival of two worlds.

In our foreign policy, we can have the combination of hardheaded realism and dynamic imagination of our forefathers—and, perhaps, more of the audacity of such bold strokes as the Monroe Doctrine, the Louisiana Purchase, and the purchase of Alaska.

Those ventures kept democracy's enemies on the defensive.

We must not leave today's problem—our greatest problem—to be answered by a static, negative policy of containment.

My point is this:

So long as we held a monopoly on the bomb, our policy was successful. Now, the monopoly has ended, and our policy's continued success may be ending.

What we seek is a policy that will continue to be successful. We can—and we will—shape such a policy. That is the reason for the present public discussion of our policy, we are not attempting to find a graceful way to surrender, as some seem to believe; we are attempting to find a policy that will be even stronger and more effective.

MOSCOW MUST UNDERSTAND

I believe it is as imperative that Moscow understand our policy and our purposes as it is for us to develop and maintain effective policy and determined purpose.

Twice before, once in 1917 and again in 1939, foreign dictators failed to comprehend the depths of our determination. The Kaiser misunderstood us, Hitler misunderstood us.

The cause of peace will be served now, I believe, if our President or our Secretary of State will make clear our willingness to outline American intentions frankly and openly to the Soviet. Men such as President Truman, Chief Justice Vinson, General Eisenhower, General Clay or General Bedell Smith could, I am sure, impress upon the Soviet leaders the firmness of our purpose and the clear outlines of our policy.

Free men do not desire to dictate the course of allied governments or to attempt to overthrow the chosen governments of other independent nations.

Free men cannot easily guard the secrets of their strength from the eyes of enemy powers, unless they prize the secrets more highly than their freedom.

Finally, free men cannot keep their freedom—nor guarantee their security—if they attempt to keep pace in an armaments race with a totalitarian nation.

We may be entering the final stages of the cold war. Indian summer is over.

We know that we are not bluffing. We can presume no longer that Russia is bluffing.

FACTS OF OUR STRENGTH

The facts are these:

In terms of superexplosives, we are ahead in production, which may not last long, but we now know we have no monopoly on any type of superbomb.

In the air, Russia is considerably stronger today than is the United States.

On the sea, Russia is much stronger in effective submarine strength.

On land, Russia is the strongest nation in the world.

What does this mean? What should be our reaction to these facts?

Shall we pretend to equalize these odds by ignoring them? Shall we attempt to intimidate the Soviet by displaying 160,000,000 stiff upper lips?

Shall we take another course some suggest and arm ourselves more heavily than the Soviet?

Again, I say no.

If we should enter an armaments race with Russia, we would very likely destroy ourselves attempting to win. A nation cannot dedicate its full resources to munitions production and still retain freedom for its citizens.

We do not have the population to compete with Russia in an arms race.

We do not have the fiscal resources to compete.

We do not have the time to compete.

THE MINDS OF FREE MEN

What shall our course be?

If communism and freedom are to be equal in terms of superbombs and explosive power, we must find salvation for our world in the greater achievements of the minds of free men.

Freedom's great basic advantage over communism is that free men have the opportunity to think.

We must—and we can—out think the Communists in the field of foreign policy.

I am convinced that we can—and must—out think the Communists in the field of our military defense.

For 5 years, since the end of the war in Europe and in the Pacific, we have—perhaps unwittingly—fallen into the routine of a sort of false-front armaments race with the Soviet. Instead of holding our own, we have lost ground.

At the first hint of Russian aggression, we nervously lowered our vision from the distant future to the immediate present. We began to assemble our armed forces on a day-to-day, hour-to-hour basis of urgency and need.

Our purpose has not been realized. Russia has greatly increased the size of its forces in relation to ours. And we have suffered the casualty of lost imagination, lost invention, lost planning.

A look at the defense budget will explain what I mean. This year we are spending $14,000,000,000 on our National Military Establishment. We are asked to spend $13,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

This is the largest item in our Federal budget—it will take 32 percent of your taxes.

THE DIVISION OF DEFENSE FUNDS

What interests me and what I hope challenges you is the division of funds and division of emphasis which we are making.

Of our total defense budget for 1951, less than 5 percent will be devoted to research and development of new weapons for future wars.

Less than 5 percent for the future.

What we have in our arsenal is impressive and it is tested; but, we know that much of it will be outmoded at the time any future war starts.

I say that helpfully, not critically, I believe it is true.

Recently, I had opportunity to look into one specific phase of our defense development—the field of guided missiles.

It was disturbing to me to find that, to the best of our knowledge, Russia probably is 2 years ahead of us in some missile research.

Our services are conducting research—on a limited scale and on a limited budget. Less than 1 percent of the total defense budget is going for these weapons which may be vital to our defense in any future conflict.

Despite this limited operation and despite the great need to acquire workable weapons in this field, there is duplication, triplication, and, in one instance, quintuplication of effort.

We do not have the time—and we do not have the brains—to condone such a squandering of talent and effort.

Imagine the chaos if, for example, there had been three Eisenhowers trying to invade the Continent of Europe. We might have been working till yet if our brain power had been misused so flagrantly.

The time has come for free men to recognize their greatest resource—free minds—and put those minds to use.

MAKE UNIFICATION WORK

For the armed forces, unification was originally conceived to economize on talent and time. It was meant to make all three services richer in terms of effectiveness, not poorer in terms of money.

The time has come to make unification work toward greater effectiveness.

Research, new methods, new inventions—that is the area in which free men can win and hold supremacy over the dead hand of totalitarian systems.

I believe we can defend ourselves with a $13,000,000,000 budget. We can do it if the services work as one, not as three. We can do it if we make sure that no brain power, no talent is being wasted.

There is fat in the Defense Establishment—physical fat and mental fat. I am most anxious that we fry out the mental fat.

SEEK FULL USE OF OUR TALENTS

With statements and counter statements now appearing in the press regarding the condition of this country's strength, I believe the time is near when the proper authorities must determine the facts concerning the strength of our Military Establishment. This should be done, not in a spirit of bias or a spirit of petty revenge, but in the hope of making full use of this Nation's scientific and technological resources.

In addition, I think we should look into our stock-piling program, so that we can avoid the great hazard of being caught short in essential strategic materials.

Also, we must look thoroughly into the conditions of our military housing and other factors relating to personnel so that the morale of our forces will not be lowered and their efficiency reduced at this period when the utmost is demanded from all of us, individually and as a team.

We have the advantage of a long history of free public education, which has given us the world's greatest reservoir of enlightened manpower. We have the further advantage of freedom, which permits the full use of the minds and learning of our citizens.

This is our great source of strength. We must put that strength to use in the military as in all other areas of our Government.

For 5 years, we Americans perhaps have to some extent isolated ourselves behind the security of an atomic monopoly. We did not extend ourselves mentally or physically. We were tired from the exertion of war, weary of crisis. We concentrated our national energy and our national talent on our own comfort more than on our security.

This is true in the formulation of our foreign policy, true in the formulation of our domestic policies, and true of the broad conduct of our Military Establishment.

That isolation is ended.

CHALLENGE OURSELVES

We can no longer indulge laziness or sluggishness.

We must challenge ourselves—and in that challenge we will find the salvation of the world.

I have spoken of these things to you because I think it important that you, as leaders in your community, carry back to Texas the realization that these times demand the best in us—and pray that the best in us is adequate for the challenge.

We will profit nothing if we succumb to hysteria, to panic, or to demands that we try to match Russia plane for plane, submarine for submarine, bomb for bomb.

We will profit nothing if we mistake change for weakness. When we talk of new policies, new ideas, new approaches, we mean more effective policies, better ideas, more successful approaches—we are talking of strength, not surrender.

You can serve a most valuable purpose if you will admonish your neighbors and friends against hysteria and panic, against fear that this Nation is to be overwhelmed by the military forces of communism.

The facts are grim, but we must face them. Only by facing facts squarely we can and will find the answers to our problem of survival.

This is not the darkest hour in our national history. If the challenge of the moment stirs our imagination and our capacity for invention, we may see the brightest hour of civilization.

There is hope for us and for the world—so long as we keep hope alive.

Lincoln Day Address By Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address by my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], before the Portland Lincoln Club, in Portland, Maine, February 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last year at the Lincoln Day dinner in Washington, I addressed the attending Republicans as "fellow mourners." That dinner was more like a wake at which we were making post mortems on why we had lost the Presidency for the fifth straight time. We talked about the mistakes that the Republican Party had made.

But this year is different. This year I address you as "fellow fighters" because something happened in Washington this week that convinces me that the underdog Republican Party has started on the comeback trail and has started fighting.

Monday in Washington we had the kick-off Lincoln Day dinner. It was a dollar box-lunch affair—a common man's affair, not a $100-a-plate rich man's affair like the Democrats have in building up their campaign war chest. There were those who said it would be a flop—that it was fantastic to try to get a crowd of any size in the Democratic jobholder city of Washington.

But it wasn't a flop. A record, roaring crowd of 12,000 cheering people jammed the Uline Arena. There was hardly breathing space and there were 3,000 people outside who couldn't get in because there just wasn't room for them. I have never seen so much enthusiasm in a crowd.

Yes, I think the Republican Party was resurrected this past Monday night.

Monday, the Republicans issued a 2,500-word restatement of principles. Eloquent as it might be, I think that it could have been stated in less than 100 words—and in common, everyday words of the average man in the street—the man whose vote we have to get to win in 1950 and 1952. My boiled-down version of the Republican restatement of principles is not only a mere 89 words of Republican Party position but also an indictment of the Democratic Party on 10 counts for the Democratic Party has not only failed miserably on each of these points but also has made it clear that it opposes each of these points. My concept of what the Republican Party stands for and what the Democratic Party is against is: (1) Reducing taxes; (2) balancing the budget; (3) fighting deficit spending and Government waste; (4) fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it; (5) making foreign policy truly bi-partisan instead of merely rubber-stamped; (6) fighting and exposing something-for-nothing deception, whether it be socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes; (7) preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public; (8) maintaining an adequate social-security system that does not limit opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving; (9) opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits; (10) smashing the filibuster on civil rights.

No other political party can make that statement—much less the Democratic Party. Only 89 simple words to show the basic issues between the Republicans and the Democrats—to tell the difference between the two parties.

I was elected to the Senate in 1948 on the slogan of "Don't Trade a Record for a Promise." That is equally applicable for 1950 and 1952. The Republicans promise changes if they are put into power. The voters can rightfully ask, "Do you have a record to back up your promises?" And the Republican Party can confidently say, "I'm glad you asked that question. The answer is unqualifiedly 'Yes.' Here is the record."

1. The only tax reduction that has been given to the American people in a generation was by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the only Republican controlled Congress in the last 20 years;

2. The only time that the budget has been balanced during the last 20 years was in 1947 and 1948 by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress;

3. The only real fight that has been made against deficit spending and Government waste is the fight made by the Republicans;

4. The only real fight to expose and purge Communists and their fellow travelers from key posts in our Government so that they could not send our vital secrets to Russia has been that made by the Republicans in Congress;

5. Republicans have made our foreign policy bipartisan. But the Democratic administration is now excluding Republicans from a voice on policy formulation. The Democratic administration has turned what was once a cooperative two-way street into their own secretive, one-way back alley where only the Democrats make the decisions and then try diplomatic blackmail under the guise of unity to make Republicans mere spineless, rubber stamps.

6. The only effective efforts to expose the something for nothing fraud and deception practiced upon the American people by the Democratic administration under the policies of socialized medicine, socialized farming and hidden taxes, have been the efforts of the Republican Party to warn the people that they were in danger of trading away their individual freedom without realizing it for the mental opiate of a false sense of security;

7. It was the Republican Eightieth Congress that passed the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public. Republicans created the Department of Labor. One of labor's greatest champions, Senator George Norris, was a Republican;

8. As far as social security is concerned, it was Republicans that first adopted a valid old-age assistance program in Montana 12 years before the Federal Social Security Act;

9. As far as veterans are concerned, the Republican Eightieth Congress was the champion of them all, passing more favorable legislation for veterans and reservists than any other Congress in history;

10. As far as the opposition to civil rights is concerned, everyone knows that it is the Democrats who are blocking it with filibusters. The Republicans are constantly trying to break those filibusters. And does anyone dare deny that Abraham Lincoln, greatest of all Republicans, was the father of civil rights?

If any of you are still unconvinced, try this for size. The Republican Party created the Department of Agriculture. It is the original trust-busting, antimonopoly party that gave us the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Republican Party is the party that gave women the right to vote—the party that got Alaska from Russia for only $7,000,000, the party in power when we acquired Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, Midway, and the Panama Canal.

The Republican Party is the party that stopped a Democratic President from packing the Supreme Court and from destroying the independence of our judicial branch. It is the party that discarded the spoils system and set up the civil-service system on Government jobs by merit and qualification instead of by the political patronage standard of whether you voted for the winning party.

Now what has the Democratic Party given the American people? Time permits me to mention only one thing—and I have chosen that which you are most aware of now—taxes. The Democrats have given you the highest taxes in the history of the country and the Democratic administration has asked that those heavy taxes be made even higher and heavier. You realize that now by merely looking at your income-tax return. But what most of us don't realize is what we pay that doesn't meet the eye—in hidden taxes. Were it not for hidden taxes, the quart of milk you pay 21 cents for you could get for 14 cents because now you pay 7 cents in hidden taxes on that 21-cent quart of

milk—were it not for hidden taxes, you could get that 47-cent can of baby powder for only 29 cents, that $2,100 car for only $1,400, that $10,000 house for only $7,000, that 10-cent candy bar for only 7 cents (look back in Republican days, full-size candy bars were only 5 cents), that 15-cent loaf of bread for only 10 cents, that 25-cent gallon of gas for only 14 cents, that 50-cent movie for only 30 cents.

Our Democratic President campaigned successfully in 1948 on the slogan of "Telling the people the facts of life." We Republicans can well take a cue from the opposition and start "Telling the people the tax facts of life." I could go on for hours talking about the tax facts of life on examples of hidden taxes on specific products and services that most of us don't realize, but let me conclude with one of the best of all examples on hidden taxes—you even pay a tax on the air in the tires of your car.

These are the facts that the party of Abraham Lincoln—the most human, the greatest representative of the common man ever to be President—must bring home to the American people if our free way of life is to be recaptured and preserved, if we are to remain loyal to the principles of Lincoln.

The Republican Party now has the fighting spirit of the under dog. It has the most admirable of causes to fight for. It has the ammunition to fight with—a past record of positive accomplishments—and the stumbling, fumbling errors and deliberate deceptions of the Democratic administrations for the past 18 years.

We can and we will win with our undeniable cause and record, if we just keep fighting to tell the people the facts of life that the Democratic administration is trying to keep from them. Let's lift the iron curtain set up here in America by the Democratic administration between the people and the Government. In that way, we can return the American people to the most basic of all freedoms—the freedom to be let alone.

The Home Owner and Honest Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1950, the junior Senator from Washington enjoyed fulfilling an invitation to address the annual convention of the National Association of Home Builders in Chicago. The address which was offered under the subject of The Home Owner and Honest Money has aroused considerable interest and some controversy. In order to satisfy requests for copies I ask unanimous consent that the speech he printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOME OWNER AND HONEST MONEY

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, I feel deeply that I would rather be in your company this afternoon than in that of any other group in all of America. Many among your membership are close and personal friends of mine. I respect what you stand for and I have willingly enjoyed fighting for what I conceive to be your rights as American citizens and as the home building industry of the United States. In a word I respect what you have accomplished for the good of our Nation and have high hopes for the contributions you will make to all men and women in the future.

It has been a long time since I have read a written speech. I now intend to read a statement in order that I may adhere to your time schedule and because I want to think that what I want to say will be reprinted and read by other Americans everywhere.

In very simple but positive language I want to tell you a story which is typical, which you can uncover for yourselves by looking in any direction you will and which is deeply tragic. This story characterizes the road on which most American families find themselves these days. After this story has been related, I wish to offer a recommendation for your consideration and whatever action you think it proper to give.

No group in this country has a better interest in the future of America than you men and women. You are gathered here to consider the problems of home construction, home financing, and home ownership. The happiness, the pride, the future of the family, depend in a special sense upon its ability to acquire and own a home. It is your business and professional task to promote this deep-seated instinct of the human race. I do not claim originality when I say that a nation of home owners is a nation with stable institutions and a bright prospect.

Home ownership, however, serves a much deeper purpose than the immediate happiness of the family group. I do not mean to disparage that happiness. The individual is the focal point of community interest. Those of us who have not been swept off our feet by the nostrums and gold brick promises of the welfare state appreciate this.

Every schoolboy has been taught that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This means individuals. It means families. It does not mean some vague abstraction. It does not mean a blank check for dictatorial power. It does not mean paternalism and spoon-fed pap for those who do not have the energy, the courage, and the self-respect to struggle for their own rewards.

While the happiness of its citizens is the proper goal of every government, this does not mean, in my opinion, a bib and a bottle for every citizen. It means, on the contrary, the maintenance of conditions under which each American can work for his own living with the right and the duty to provide for his own needs. Let us reserve charity for those unfortunates who need help and not force it on all, under the guise of social welfare.

I spoke a moment ago of home ownership and its deeper meaning. It is a meaning which must be defined in economic, in political, and in social terms. Economically, a high ratio of home owners means stable local business. Politically, it means a greater interest in local government. The government of a home-owning community is much less susceptible to machine politics. Socially, a community of home owners assures a healthy atmosphere with a minimum of agitators and crackpots.

Last year we added more than a million units to our total of homes. It was a good year for construction generally and for residential building in particular. A fair estimate at the end of 1949 shows that this country has 47,000,000 homes. More than half of these were owned by the occupants. Among the nations of the world America ranks high as a nation of home owners.

This means much more than a desire on the part of people to live under their own roofs. It means that those who struggle and save and work for the right to call their homes their own have faith in themselves. Still more important—it means that they have faith in their Government.

When a young couple assumes the grave responsibility of owning a home, with the heavy financial obligations which such ownership entails, it means that they have not only confidence in their own future but also faith in Uncle Sam. Faith that he will not change the rules of the game. Faith that he will maintain the terms of financial contracts so that in the future those terms will not become burdensome to the owner on the one hand or defraud the lender on the other.

The ownership of a home, with its usual lien on the future earning power of the owner, is a tangible, concrete pledge of confidence in the Government. It strongly implies a conviction on the part of that owner that Uncle Sam will not tamper with the currency, that he will not limit the freedom of the owner to find the best job he can fill; that Government will not tax him so heavily that he cannot meet his obligations. If the commitment to buy a home is a personal hostage for industry and thrift on the part of the home owner, it is also—and I wish to emphasize this in the most solemn terms—an unmistakable mandate to Government to keep faith with the individual.

Let me be more specific. G. I. Jones is a typical American. He is a war veteran, married, has one youngster and hopes to have more. He is a garage mechanic in a medium-sized city in the Middle West and earns $75 a week. He works for an intelligent and successful employer who helps him set up a personal old-age pension system. It will enable Jones at the age of 65 to retire with a monthly income, counting social security, of $125. The boss pays half the cost.

By the time Jones has paid his income taxes and met the charges for social security and old-age pension, his weekly pay envelope has shrunk to $66. I am using approximate dollar figures.

Being a prudent family man, he carries a modest life-insurance policy which nicks his weekly pay for another $3. As a practical person, Jones knows that illness and accident might touch him or his family. It would be well to carry a personal reserve for contingencies in the form of a savings account. This takes another $3 a week. By the time all these charges, prudent and necessary in the mind of Jones, are made against his pay he has $60 left from his week's earnings.

This man and his wife now decide to buy a home. He has saved his veteran's bonus, some bonds he bought out of his Army pay as a sergeant, and his insurance refund. This adds up to a tidy down payment on the home and leaves a mortgage of $6,000. Its amortization over a 20-year period, plus taxes and insurance, involves a further charge of $13 against his weekly earnings. This leaves approximately $47 for all other living expenses.

Now Jones realizes that he is taking a risk. However, this is constructive risk-taking. It is a form of personal venture which is characteristic of all Americans. It is a kind of risk which millions of Americans have cheerfully assumed in the past. The willingness to take such risks has made this country outstanding among the nations of the world.

Jones and his wife did not make this commitment for a home without a great deal of careful thinking. Both are high school graduates. They read the local paper, a weekly magazine of current events, and listen to the radio. Jones is not an economist. He is not a financial expert. He uses plain, homespun common sense in getting at conclusions.

He knows that the future on which he is now wagering, with so many claims against his income, is subject to two major risks.

The first deals with his job. This does not worry him too much. He is a good mechanic and knows it. He is willing to work hard, and as long as people drive cars they will have to use him.

The second major risk involves the kind of money in which he will be paid and which, in turn, he will have to use to meet his own obligations. Will he continue to be paid in the same kind of dollars that he is getting today, or will they be different dollars? How will this affect his position as a wage earner, a home owner, a bank depositor, an insurance policyholder?

Jones sometimes reads the speeches of the President. He recently read a speech in which Mr. Truman predicted a total national production of one thousand billion dollars by the year 2000. What this meant was quite beyond Jones. It is indeed beyond a lot of people who have advantages of education which Jones does not have. Was the President discussing the future or discoursing upon the hereafter? Jones hasn't the slightest idea what the President really meant, and I share his bewilderment.

The President also spoke of an average family income of $12,000 a year. Here was a figure that was down to earth. It sounded more like personal income than astronomy. Jones knew some men who were already making that much. Yet it was about three times as much as Jones was now making and he wondered how anything the Government could do could raise his pay 200 percent.

To be sure, with all the faith that he had in himself he knew that someday he might become foreman of the shop or have his own garage. This might give him a higher income; maybe as much as the $12,000 in question.

What bothered Jones was his failure to find anything in the President's speech which dealt with the kind of money in which this future $12,000-a-year family income was to be paid. He knew that the dollars which he received for pay today were only about half as good as the dollars which he earned before the war. Could it be that the President had in mind some other kind of a dollar—a dollar which was worth only a third as much as the present dollar?

Jones had seen the result of inflation in France. He had been told by some older Frenchmen that it now took a hundred francs to buy as much as 1 franc bought in 1914. After his outfit had crossed the Rhine he had a chance to talk to some Germans. They described the great inflation in Germany after the First World War.

One German told him that his father had bought a 30-year insurance policy in 1892 with a maturity value of 50,000 marks. He explained that this was roughly the equivalent of $12,500 in American money. When the policy came due in 1922, after 30 years of frugal savings, the insurance company sent his father a single postage stamp. That was all the 50,000 marks would buy.

Jones had just read a newspaper story about Formosa. The correspondent had paid a taxi driver $7,000,000 and given him a tip of a million dollars. Did the President, in promising a future family income of $12,000 a year, have this kind of goldbricking in mind? What was being done to protect him, G. I. Jones and his family, from this kind of chiseling and cheating.

Although he was no Ph. D. in economics, he knew that inflation was the result of financial monkey business and that the Government was usually responsible for it. He could find nothing in the President's speech which assured him that the value of the dollar would be protected.

Jones tried in his limited way to get at the bottom of this problem. He tried to find out what caused money to go on the skids as it did in France, in Germany, and in China. He thought he made two discoveries.

Money becomes worth less and less when the Government issues more and more of it. It's like wheat. When there is too much of it, it drops in value. "Now," Jones asked, "what causes too much money to be around?"

One cause, it seemed to him, was the failure of the Government to live within its income. When he, a garage mechanic, spent more than he earned, he quickly got into a jam. Uncle Sam, he found, could do something which he, a worker, could not do. Uncle Sam could print money and pay his bills.

To be sure, this meant that the dollars which other people had, dollars which were honestly acquired as the result of work, would lose their value. It meant, in other words, that Uncle Sam could go on a financial spree while the people who had honestly earned dollars would pay the cost by losing some of the value stored in their money. It was a form of subtle filching.

It was odd that he could find no mention of this in the President's speech. In fact, what disturbed him most was to find in the President's speech a statement which seemed to say that the Government should spend more than its income, that this was a good thing.

Could it be that the President had in mind phony dollars when he was talking about a thousand billion national product and a $12,000 family income? Did he mean a $12,000 income in dollars that had lost so much of their value through inflation that the $12,000 was actually worth less than the amount he was now making? The ugly thought occurred to Jones that the rosy future painted by the President was paved with Chinese dollars. The same thought has occurred to many other citizens.

In his inexpert and nonprofessional probing for the truth in this problem, Jones made his second discovery. As long as money could be printed there was no limit to the total amount which the Government could get to pay its bills. If this continued long enough, the dollar would be worth no more than the paper on which it was printed. It could reach the point where it would be cheaper to light a cigarette with a dollar bill than to scratch a match.

Since this was the case, the only way to limit the supply of money, the only way to be sure that its value would not go the way of the German mark or the Chinese dollar, was to use something for money which could not be multiplied by a printing press.

It suddenly dawned on our mechanic that gold was the answer. He knew that the total amount of gold in the world was limited, that the amount added each year was a small percentage of the existing supply.

If the number of dollars in the country was limited by the supply of gold, then Uncle Sam could not spend more money each year than he collected in taxes. He would have to live within his income in precisely the same way as Jones himself had to live within his income.

If Uncle Sam had to live within his income, he might be less likely to buy potatoes at $16 a ton to be sold at a penny a ton. Uncle Sam might be less interested in raising the living standards of Zulus or building dams on the Euphrates. With the supply of money limited by gold, Uncle Sam might pay a little more attention to his problems at home and a little less attention to Fair Deals in other parts of the world.

This horse-sense thinking of our ex-G. I. is down to earth. We have explored his reasoning and weighed his position. While some of the responsibility for the failure to protect the buying power of the dollar properly falls upon the Government, I do not wish to leave the impression that all the blame should be placed there.

If the Government has operated in the red for 17 of the last 19 years, if it has disregarded the solemn duty to preserve the integrity of our money, the blame for this must be shared by the public.

In particular, it must be shared by those institutions which solicit confidence of the citizen and assume obligations toward that citizen payable in the future. I refer particularly to our banks and great insurance companies.

There are more than 14,000 banks in this country. They have more than 104,000,000 individual deposit accounts. These banks are the debtors and the depositors are the creditors. The depositors give the banks money today which must be paid back at some time in the future. In legal terms the banks discharge their legal responsibility if they return to their depositors the same number of dollars which they originally accepted.

However, if, in the interval, the buying power, or the real value of the dollar is cut in half, the depositor in the end of the period finds himself the loser. This is obviously not fraud in any premeditated sense but the effect is unfortunately though precisely the same. Too many of our Nation's banks, in their preoccupation with the narrow terms of the agreement between themselves and their depositors, have had an eye almost solely for the legal discharge of their obligations. They have been, too many of them, completely indifferent to the real substance of their obligations.

I say "completely indifferent" advisedly and only after carefully weighing my words. Ten years of my life were spent in the private American banking system when I was employed by an outstanding commercial and trust institution. This experience provided me with respect for what our banking system has contributed to the growth and development of America, and a real hope for what its leadership can contribute to the stability and health of our future. I am, therefore, not an enemy but a friend of our banking fraternity. I simply want it to live up to its potential rather than to continue to drag its feet and remain quiet when the prevailing national need for its leadership and council is so imperatively pressing. I have now been a Member of the upper House in your Congress for several months more than 3 years. In that time, and bear in mind what has happened in that period to the real value of our currency, I state as a simple fact that not a single banker has ever come to me and urged the need for protecting the integrity of the dollar because he, the banker, feels any deep sense of responsibility for the depositor.

I know of no State banking association which has appealed to Congress to protect the dollar in order that its members might, in real terms, discharge fairly and fully the obligations to their depositors.

Probably the primary responsibility for urging honest money rests upon the American Bankers Association. This body has consistently, so far as I know, remained silent on the great issue of currency. I have never seen the association become indignant or express any articulate opposition to what is happening to our American dollar. In my view their silence implies a bypassing of their moral responsibility to the millions of Americans who are their average depositors.

Here is a body whose members presumably understand money. They know full well what the ultimate, inevitable effect of paper currency with no bond to gold must be.

The American Bankers Association has besieged Congress with appeals to reduce their FDIC assessments. It has urged us in the House and in the Senate to restrain and curtail the competition of Government credit agencies.

These requests are legitimate and possessed of merit. But the point I make is that a great association is callously indifferent over the discharge of their own obligations to depositors. All banks, is seems to me, have a moral duty to insure the value content of the dollars they repay. This they have strikingly failed to recognize and in their failure they reveal a disappointing lack of stature which fortunately they can regain if they only will and must do.

Actually, the American Bankers Association at its last annual meeting at San Francisco extended the courtesy of its platform and the great prestige of the occasion to a noted guest who lectured them on the virtues of a managed currency. This is the kind of currency that England has today. It is the kind that France has and China, and Russia.

Instead of coming to the Congress and urging us to restore gold on some practical basis the American Bankers Association entertains and flatters a planner who would leave the currency to the loose limitations of the printing press and the discretion of so-called "competent and responsible men." As an American, as a Senator, and as one who learned about thrift and honesty and consumer purchasing power from his years in the banking system, I can only say that I have been looking for greater perception and more courageous leadership among bankers of this day. I am sorely grieved to say that I have been sadly disappointed.

What I have said sincerely and consideredly about the bankers goes with equal force and conviction for the great life-insurance companies of America. They carry 191,000,000 insurance policies aggregating more than $213,000,000,000. They collect money today in the form of premiums at the annual rate of $6,800,000,000. This they will return to their policyholders at some time in the future.

Again, as in the case of the bankers, there is a narrow concern over the details of dollar obligations and a disquieting complacence regarding the substance of the ultimate payments to their policyholders. The managers of these great aggregates of capital are concerned too much with the literal letter of their obligations and consistently, flagrantly ignore the meat.

It is small wonder that capitalism is under furious assault by the forces of chaos and disorder. The men who should be fighting to preserve all that is good and useful in capitalism are silent in the face of mortal danger. Every well-trained Communist, getting his instructions from the Kremlin, knows that the easiest way to destroy and wreck and undermine capitalism is to debauch the currency. In the face of this truism I want you to point out to me the prominent or leading bankers or insurance presidents who have publicly urged your Congress to return our currency to gold.

If we in the Congress are to take any constructive action on this most fundamental and vital issue, it is necessary for us to have substantial support—particularly from men and institutions dealing with money.

Rightly or wrongly, the public presumption is that the leadership of our banking and insurance fields understand the subject. Their failure to speak up implies approval of a paper currency completely unhinged from gold. I can understand their reluctance to stand up and be counted but I can't condone it. They are doing only what their counterparts did in Italy and Germany in the decades of the 1930's. In a big way all of them grew to be frightened of their Government. They didn't and don't want to rock the boat. They lulled themselves into a sense of false security by assuming that everything will somehow come out all right in the end. They are afraid that if they speak their minds, reprisals or higher tax rates will be imposed or taken against them. They want to avoid being made a "whipping boy" of the administration. As their reluctance to be themselves, within the confines of their vast accumulation of knowledge, brought gigantic ruin to Germany and Italy the present-day disposition of the banking and insurance fraternities of our Nation to let the administration have its own way in money matters will bring the same sort of tragedy and ruin to all of us in due time.

Leadership is a demanding taskmaster. It calls for conviction and self-sacrifice and placing the future good of the country above self. A leader must take some risks. He must expect some abuse and even venomous attack and criticism. The country looks for leadership to those who are authorities in different fields of endeavor. America has a right to expect that the acknowledged authorities about money, the banking and life-insurance leaders, will publicly present and offer their views about sound money and fight for their adoption.

If our Nation continues down the foolhardy and evil path of inflation, the responsibility must be laid partly on the doorstep of the administration but partly on the consciences of our financial leaders who are guilty too because they remain mute while the cause of honest money cries out of the pain of agony for American defenders.

There are men and women in Congress willing and able to take up the cudgels for real money. I am among those who believe that the return to a gold standard is a reasonable, early, and practicable possibility.

There are three approaches.

The first is a return to the fictitious base established by Treasury regulations under authority of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. They call for a dollar defined as one thirty-fifth of an ounce of pure gold. This base has been a monetary fiction and has never been tested.

There is much evidence, persuasive to me, that any return to gold on the basis of an ounce of gold for $35 would result in a run on our gold stocks and invite their early dissipation. This might prove a fatal blow to gold as a standard.

A price for gold must be established which, in the light of prevailing conditions, constitutes a fair, a tenable equation between gold and goods. That price must be set at a level which will not expose our gold reserve to the danger of dissipation.

What is such a price for gold? How can it be determined?

The technicians within our official monetary and financial agencies—I mean the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, and the International Monetary Fund—hold that any change in the price of gold must be made by Executive decision. In other words, they want the right to change the base for our currency. They mean well. They have the faith in their own infallibility which is the hallmark of all planners and all dictators. Without in any sense reflecting on their capacity or probity, I do not trust them.

There is a better way. We have passed through the ordeal of a great war. Our economy has suffered unprecedented distortions. Not the least of these is the great increase in the public debt and the prodigious growth in our money supply. These cannot be restored to prewar levels without deflationary pressures so rigorous as to undermine our economy. The operation could be successful but the patient in the process might also die. It is not necessary to run this risk.

Let gold for a period of time be traded freely in an open market. Let buyers and sellers from all parts of the world match values. Over a period of time a price for gold will emerge which has stood the test of market action. Let Congress take such a price for gold and use it to reestablish the dollar on a firm base of gold.

We must keep faith with GI Jones. He represents America. He is the real strength and hope of America. His home-building instinct, his industry, his willingness to take a calculated risk, his wary concern for the future—these are qualities that have made this country great.

If his financial leaders, both in and out of government, and by their silence, have defaulted on their solemn, moral obligations, it is by no means too late to compensate for this failure. The Congress, I am sure, with or without White House cooperation, is ready and willing to play its part. But I must, and want to, warn you that the high lord of monetary justice and economic stability will help only those who help themselves. Your Congress is an instrument through which our American way can be restored and preserved or dissipated and destroyed. Your Congress looks to America for advice and assistance concerning what you want done. If you want money which is hard, reliable, and honest I would urge you to give your very lives if necessary to attain it. If you are satisfied to let things and dollars drift and slide aimlessly as they have done for years, there is nothing my kind of people can do about it.

Sound American homes and sound American dollars are inseparable. If you lose one you are certain to lose the other. I came along this afternoon in hopes that together we might work and fight a little harder to save them both.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] which was recently delivered on the Justice for Poland program, a program which is sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, western Massachusetts branch, the president of which is Dr. Karol Smolczynski, of Chicopee, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH FREEDOM

Much has been written and much has been said of the Polish people's long and glorious struggle to establish and preserve an independent Polish nation. Perhaps, however, insufficient credit has been given to an equally lustrous aspect of Polish history—the age-old and honorable fight waged by the Polish people for the recognition of the dignity of the individual and his God-given right to live and work and die a free man.

The record of the Poles' passionate attachment to the human freedoms is an ancient and enviable one. Long before our forefathers founded the United States of America and dedicated it to the proposition that all men are created equal, there was flourishing

in Poland a strong tradition of democracy and social justice.

This democratic tradition found early and eloquent expression in 1543, when Frye-Modrzewski, protesting the general practice of forbidding the peasant to move from the soil he tilled, dared to voice the radical thought that before God all men are equal.

Far ahead of their time, the words of Frye-Modrzewski went largely unheeded in his day. But his cry echoed down through the decades of Polish history to be raised again and again, in different forms, by other great Polish liberals. The pages of Polish history are bright with the famous names of these pioneers of political democracy who demanded social and economic reforms and compassion for the exploited masses of Poland.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this early Polish tradition of liberalism and democracy was inspired largely by religious motives. What had been primarily a religious and humanitarian movement was transformed into a political force by the impact of the revolutionary ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity which in the eighteenth century swept the breadth of the continent of Europe and shook society to its very core.

Spearheading this force in Poland was the redoubtable Stanislas Staszic, the great Polish patriot who has been called the patriarch of Polish democracy. Staszic tirelessly and selflessly devoted his life to the service of the Polish people and the cause of Polish democracy. For 40 years he strove ceaselessly and magnificently to abolish serfdom, to secure private rights, and to establish the principle of the freedom of movement for the peasant.

The writing and preachings of Staszic, and other renovators of Polish political thought were shortly translated into concrete political action designed to advance the democratization of Poland.

Aroused by the tragedy of the first partition in 1772, the Polish people launched a 20-year program of sweeping social and political reforms which culminated in 1791, in the constitution of the 3d of May—that great, independent product of Polish democracy-in-action which evoked the spontaneous acclaim of humanitarians everywhere.

Ranked among such peerless documents in the history of human progress as the Magna Carta and the American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the 3d of May nevertheless precipitated the extinction of Poland as a political entity. For this magnificent milestone in the march of democracy raised so high the torch of human liberty and enlightened liberalism that the tyrannical monarchs of Poland's neighbors, alarmed at this latest menace to the perpetuation of their own despotic rule, were impelled to dismember Poland in the partitions of 1793 and 1795. It is, however, to the everlasting glory of the Poles that Poland fell, not because she could not live, but because, inspired and strengthened by her democratic ideals, she chose to live only as a nation in which her citizens would be free.

Although Poland was no longer to be found on the map of Europe by 1800, the flames of democracy and liberalism which had consumed her political independence continued to burn brightly in the hearts of her people. Events in Poland's history from the last decade of the eighteenth century to the restoration of Poland as an independent European state after World War I provide ample evidence that, far from losing their faith in democracy, the Polish people cherished and were sustained by that faith in the long years of the fearful ordeal of foreign rule.

The nineteenth century witnessed many heroic attempts by the Polish people to win their liberation—the insurrection of 1830, the rebellions of 1846 and 1848, the rising of 1863, and others. All of these failed and were cruelly disappointing. But out of the bitterness of defeat two facts emerged with crystal clarity.

The first of these was that, in the debates in the Diet, in the columns of the press, in the thousands of political pamphlets which were flooding the country, there was reflected a new and invincible force in Poland life—general and genuine concern for the destiny of the common man. The Poles knew by now what human rights were; they were prepared to defend these rights with their lives, if necessary.

The other fact now apparent was that, in the defense of these basic human rights, the Polish people for the first time were acting together. Irrespective of class interests, they were working in partnership in a common cause—the essence of democracy at its best.

The result was inevitable. When World War I ended and the long-awaited restoration of an independent Poland was finally achieved, it was as a democracy that the Polish state was reconstituted. And, although soon surrounded by the totalitarian ideologies of communism and nazism, it was as a democracy—a free and proud and resolute democracy—that Poland lived until the infamous Stalin-Hitler aggression of 1939.

The years since 1939 have been a tragic and trying period for Poland. But it is one of the strongest characteristics of the Polish people that they are at their noblest in times of adversity. The great Stanislas Staszic once uttered these challenging and immortal words: "Even a great nation may fall, but only a worthless one can perish." Poland, as a free nation, has fallen now. But, recalling these words of Staszic, I am supremely confident that a free Polish nation will rise again.

And when that happy time comes, Poland, true to her time-honored tradition of honoring the inviolability of the freedom of the individual, once more will be a democracy, a free and proud and resolute democracy.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Dinner of Somerset County Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the annual dinner of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce at Somerset, Pa., on February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall always have the highest admiration for the fine people of Somerset County. Here in your beautiful hills and valleys, you have built a solid structure of real Americanism.

You are the inheritors of a rich and historic tradition. The story of Somerset is an inspiring record of courage, self-reliance, patriotism, and love of liberty.

Across the soil of Somerset passed the first pioneer and military trails to the West.

George Washington, Gen. John Forbes, and Col. Henry Bouquet are outstanding among the leaders who made history in the wilderness of Somerset.

Their heroic exploits pushed forward the western frontier for peaceful settlement and advancing civilization.

The memory of Somerset's first permanent settler, Harmon Husband, is honored as a pioneer of America's struggle for independence.

He and others who followed him came here in order that they might enjoy political and religious liberty. They had a great part in the building of America.

With its magnificent historic background and its splendid progress, Somerset is an appropriate place to discuss Americanism and the problems confronting our Nation.

The course taken by government in recent years has brought us to a time when we must take our bearings as a Nation and as a people.

We have reached a time when we must again evaluate the principles which have guided our Nation to greatness in the past.

We have reached a time when we must ask ourselves whether we are to adhere to those time-honored and time-tested principles or whether we are to follow the socialistic philosophy to which so many of our people have been attracted.

The decisions we reach and the direction we take—now—will shape the course of the United States and the world for generations to come.

I do not hesitate to say that the survival of America as a land of liberty and opportunity depends upon how we meet the grave problems now confronting us.

The paramount issue before us is this:

Shall we fight for the principles which have made America the last remaining hope of freedom in the world or shall we be led into a socialistic pattern of government which has brought disaster to every nation where it gained control?

That issue has been forced upon us by policies and programs of the administration at Washington. They invite national bankruptcy.

The most powerful business corporation in the United States would go broke within a year if it were so wretchedly managed as our Federal Government is being managed today.

We are asked to accept the alien teaching that the concentration of all government power and authority in a gigantic Federal bureaucracy will provide security and prosperity for all the people.

We are told that the more we spend the better off we will be, even though the people are shouldered with taxes that grow more oppressive year after year, with an ever-increasing burden of debt and with inflated prices for food, clothing, housing, and all the other necessities of life.

We are told by President Truman that he must have a budget for the next fiscal year of forty-two and a half billion dollars and that we must go $5,100,000,000 in the red just to pay the cost of government.

When we consider that we are burdened with a national debt in excess of a quarter of a trillion dollars it is not surprising that more and more people are becoming alarmed.

It is not surprising that more and more people are asking how long can we keep it up and retain our solvency as a Nation.

But that's not all. President Truman proposes that we place education under Federal control; that we socialize the practice of medicine and place agriculture under political dictatorship through the Brannan plan.

No one has been able to estimate how much these dangerous proposals would cost. But we do know that they would add billions of dollars to the already swollen cost of government. They would place an additional back-breaking burden upon every home, every worker, every farmer, every businessman, and every other taxpayer.

My fellow Americans, that philosophy of government is the economic road to socialistic ruin and the destruction of American liberty.

To be free we must be solvent. To remain solvent we must be free.

To me it is immoral and dishonest for a President of the United States to assure the people of this country that it is perfectly all right for the National Government to go into debt year after year, even in the years of record-breaking national income.

And how did the President justify his action? Well, he said that, if we followed his policy of bigger spending and bigger debt, the Nation would become so prosperous some time in the future that the Government would then be able to balance its books.

But I would like to make a suggestion for the solvency of our Nation. It is this: Instead of gambling upon the unpredictable events of the future, I suggest that we start balancing our budget now—today.

I suggest that the only way to balance the budget is to cut down the high cost of government. By spending less than we take in there would be a surplus to be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

That may not be as romantic and colorful as waiting to see what the year 2000 will bring.

But, my friends, we know that this old-fashioned, traditionally American formula will work.

Down in Washington the administration defends its actions by declaring that 70 percent of the spending goes for wars of the past, national defense, interest on the public debt, foreign aid, and care of the veterans.

The administration says these items cannot be cut by an inflationary nickel, and that anyone who says otherwise is unpatriotic and a reactionary.

Well, I don't have to defend my patriotism. I'll let the record speak for itself. If a firm belief that my country will be stronger to face the perils of communism by living within its means is a sign of reaction, then I must plead guilty.

But the same charge could be made against George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and a host of other Americans whose words and deeds and principles I have faithfully tried to follow.

It is not true that the 70 percent of the budget cannot be cut. National defense spending has already been cut deeply and many are of the opinion that it can be cut again without danger to the national security.

Foreign aid can be cut through more economical administration. I voted for this aid to get the nations of western Europe back to a stable economy. But I want to see it used the way we were promised it would be used. I want the countries of western Europe to keep their promise to work together and to help each other.

Let's turn to something else in the budget—public works. There is another big item of expense the administration makes no effort to curb.

Public works should be expanded when there is deflation and unemployment. They should be curtailed when business and agriculture are enjoying good times. No public works projects should be undertaken now except those that add to the national wealth.

Nevertheless, last year recorded an all-time high for public works, despite the peak business. This year the administration went out and broke last year's record.

Might I suggest that in a sincere program of economy this is one place where deep cuts can be made

And I assure you there are many other places where the knife of economy can cut expenses without in any way impairing the efficiency of the Government to serve the people.

I cannot take your time to discuss the extent to which spending taxes and debt have been increased by the other levels of Government. But the figures show that the infection has spread from the Federal level to State and local governments.

We've seen some tragic examples in Europe of the fool's gold that waits at the end of the false rainbow we have been following.

In Germany, the philosophy called itself national socialism. The all-powerful supergovernment grew into Nazi tyranny. It forced the whole world into the hell fire of war and ended by dragging its own country down to disastrous defeat.

In Russia, there is another kind of socialism—Red socialism. This government calls itself a dictatorship of the proletariat, the common people. But it enslaves the poor and humble just as it does everyone else in the country. In fact, Soviet communism has dragged all the Russian people down to the poverty level.

And in Britain today there is a third kind of socialism. It is a kind of middle-class socialism. At least it started out that way, but gradually it is becoming a socialism of the poor, because it is making all the English people poor.

One thing they all have in common. The people have lost their independence. They have lost initiative and all incentive. They lean on their government. Their lives are controlled by the bureaucrats.

My friends, I don't want to see those things happen in the United States. I want our country to follow the path which carried it upward in a little over 150 years from a newly born nation on the edge of a wilderness to the greatest, richest, most powerful Nation in world history.

I want us to follow the path of independence, not the path of dependence.

In our own country dependence upon the Government has spread to an alarming degree.

At a meeting in New York in December of last year, I made the statement that 19,000,000 Americans are now receiving regular checks from government of some kind.

A short time later the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, declared that there were 23,000,000 receiving such checks. This caused us to compare our figures and we now feel that almost 25,000,000 Americans are receiving checks of some kind from government.

This includes, of course, all the employees of local and State governments in addition to the Federal Government. It also includes those getting retirement payments and those getting checks for subsidies of various kinds.

There are 37,000,000 families in the United States. Of course, there may be some families in which two people are receiving checks, or one person may receive more than one check. It does mean, however, that more than half of the families of America are receiving regular payments from government.

This cannot continue much longer or there will be no one on the paying side of the fence. We then must become a completely socialized government.

Now, let me turn to another great issue, that of loyalty, undivided loyalty, from all on the Federal pay roll.

All of you remember how the President sneered "red herring" back in 1948 when we tried to tell the people that the administration was riddled with Communists—that disloyal men entrusted with our country's innermost secrets were traitors and spies for a foreign country—Red Russia.

Across the Nation; in thousands of villages and towns, clean, decent Americans found those charges hard to believe. Because the administration sneered at our warnings many people felt that it just could not be true.

But unless the administration leaders were deaf, dumb, and blind, they could not help knowing what so many in Washington knew. The stories of Communists in many departments and agencies were no secret in official Washington circles. They were talked about freely. Information was turned over to the departments. The facts were there, but they were locked up in secret files and the President issued an order refusing to open the records to congressional investigating committees. The administration ignored Congress and the American people completely and answered, "red herring."

Finally the President was forced by public clamor to order a security probe by the FBI. The people who supported the battle against communism at that time forced the administration to order an investigation.

You know what happened. Scores of Federal workers quit rather than have their records looked into. Most of them were Communists. Some others were quietly forced out. To have made too much fuss about it would have discredited the "red herring" cries which still came from the administration.

And then, thanks to the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Republican Eightieth Congress, the story of Alger Hiss and of many other Reds in high places became known. Those disclosures have been fully confirmed in the Federal court. I believe that most of the Reds have been ousted.

But when I study some of our foreign policies, including the tragic failure in China, I wonder whether they are all gone. I wonder whether some of these men or their fellow-travelers are not still in key places, influencing the thinking and decisions of our top officials.

And I think it is the duty of every American to make his voice heard on the issue of loyalty. We must let the Government know that we want policy made and directed by men with a single loyalty—loyalty to this land, our free institutions, and to the political system that made our country the mighty power it is today.

We hear a great deal about the cold war in which we are now engaged. But here on the home front another great conflict is in progress. The outcome will decide whether we are to continue as a Nation of individual freedom and self-reliance or whether American liberty is to be destroyed by the evils of socialism.

The opposing forces in this struggle represent two widely separated philosophies. One proclaims that America can achieve greater progress through an all-powerful Government supported by high taxes and the unlimited expenditure of public funds.

The other army is composed of those who advocate prudent and economical government within the framework of the Constitution.

The battlefield is the political arena.

As Americans and as leaders in your community, your place is in the front line. Your manifest duty is to protect and safeguard freedom of the individual and all that has been built up through generations of toil, thrift, and sacrifice.

The United States was established on a dream of liberty. Let us fight against turning that dream into a nightmare of socialistic slavery.

Cooperative Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on February 3, 1950, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], referred to a public statement made by Herman T. Stichman, the New

York State Commissioner of Housing, in which Mr. Stichman criticized certain provisions of S. 2246.

The junior Senator from New York then inserted in the RECORD a communication addressed by him to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, commenting upon the New York State Housing Commissioner's remarks.

In view of the foregoing facts, I believe it might be of interest to the Members of the Congress to have before them a release from the Division of Housing, State of New York, by Commissioner Herman T. Stichman, dated March 2, 1950, commenting upon the criticism of the junior Senator from New York of the commissioner's address at the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami Beach, Fla.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Commissioner Stichman to which I refer.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, March 2, 1950.—New York State Housing Commissioner Herman T. Stichman asserted today that United States Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S criticisms of the commissioner's recent address at the meeting of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami Beach, in which Commissioner Stichman pointed out deficiencies in the Maybank-Sparkman cooperative housing bills pending in Congress, must have been music to the ears of speculative builders.

"These Federal bills will milk cooperators out of almost a double amount of interest and prove to be a $2,000,000,000 boon to some speculative builders who have been responsible for the $25 to $35 per room and more monthly rentals demanded in new housing, rather than a benefit to lower middle income families. They are the forgotten families with incomes just too high for public housing and too low to be able to afford the demands of speculative builders current since the end of hostilities. Any Federal cooperative housing program should be made into an open laboratory to determine true building costs, with inefficiencies and the excessive demands of speculative builders eliminated and profits held to a fair and reasonable amount, just as the State of New York has done in its nonpromotion cooperative housing program," Commissioner Stichman stated.

Commissioner Stichman said the Maybank-Sparkman cooperative housing bills have no effective provisions for determining what true building costs should be and for limiting excessive speculative demands, in contrast with the cooperative housing program of the State of New York, which requires efficient building methods and limits builders' profits to a fair amount, 5½ percent to 7½ percent. New York State's program, the Commissioner stated, is providing cooperative home ownership with carrying charges of a little over $14 per room monthly, and down payments of about $240 per room, and will provide rental housing at less than $15 per room monthly. This will help to stabilize the home building economy, since the people can afford housing at such costs even in so-called lean times.

"Instead of following our leadership in eliminating inefficiency and waste in building methods, and preventing excessive demands," Commissioner Stichman pointed out, "the Federal bills seek to reduce carrying charges by providing for the lending of mortgage money by the Federal Government through the device of a Federal guarantee, with an anual interest rate which it appears may be 2½ or 3 percent, and lengthening the mortgage period to 50 years, or in the event of refinancing, to 60 years, with provisions for extending these periods three more years. This will not cut total actual costs; it will make them still higher so far as the man paying the bill is concerned.

"Increasing the mortgage period from 34½ years to 60 years, which would undoubtedly be availed of under the refinancing provisions of the Maybank-Sparkman bills, would increase total interest payments by 90.9 percent, almost double; i. e., by $5,510.62 on a loan in the principal amount of $10,000 at a 3 percent interest rate, and would effect only a 22.8 percent reduction in the amount of carrying charges. Total interest payments over a 60-year period on such a loan would amount to $11,574.21, so that the borrower would be paying $21,574.21 to pay off a $10,000 loan. Whom would that help? Is that cutting costs? Increasing the mortgage period to 50 years would increase the aggregate of interest payments by 53.7 percent, i e., by $3,255.07 on a similar loan, and reduce monthly carrying charges only 17 percent.

"There is room for Federal aid in this essential field of cooperative housing and reducing home buildings costs, but the present Federal bills give no real help; they do not cut costs. Instead, they would increase the aggregate of carrying charges and merely spread the heavier burden over a longer period of years. So far as supposed savings are concerned, there is shadow through the device of a Government guarantee, which would bring a lower annual interest rate but would carry with it greater aggregate outlay, and obvious inflationary possibilities today. But there is no substance. There is no effort to cut real costs by spurring technological advances, encouraging efficient building practices and definitely and specifically limiting builders' profits, in return for the benefits, which would aid builders, of the low interest rate and Government guarantee. This would eliminate a continuation of the unfair and excessive speculative builders' demands which we have witnessed in the FHA and VA housing programs.

"It is as though the clothing or the radio, television, or automobile industries, instead of introducing efficient mass-production methods to lower true costs and meet competition, had asked that the Government provide purchasers with direct long-term Government loans or long-term Government-guaranteed loans at a similarly devised lower interest rate to enable such consumers to buy their products, and then offered the result as an example of cost savings. The price would not be cut; the monthly payments would be lowered, but the purchaser would be paying more in the long run because of the higher aggregate of interest over a longer period of years. That would be a subsidization of inefficient methods, just as the present Federal bills would subsidize present-day builders' inefficiencies and excessive demands. They are equally fallacious.

"The Federal bills would demonstrate nothing to the country at large; the only people who would receive the 'benefits,' questionable as they are in view of the increase in total carrying charges, would be those living in housing built under the Federal program. What we need instead is an open laboratory, just as we have in New York, to demonstrate how all building costs can be reduced—whether built with Federal financing or private financing, unless it is proposed to have the Federal Government finance all the housing needed now and in the future.

"New York State's cooperative housing program does demonstrate how efficient building methods can reduce building costs; it proves that the responsibility for present-day high costs has been that of certain speculative builders and not that of labor, because at Bell Park Gardens, our first pilot project for 800 veterans' families now completed in the Borough of Queens, we have used the same workingmen, the same materials, paid the same prices for land, and used the same private lenders, but we have been watchful and efficient and limited the profits to a reasonable amount.

"The bankers have been so enthusiastic about our laboratory housing program and the hope it offers of stabilizing the home-building economy that they reduced the interest rate to 3½ percent. So productive was labor at Bell Park Gardens, and so efficient the contractors, that there will be a dividend of about $400,000, which we have provided will go to the cooperators, in connection with building construction of about $7,500,000. This is equivalent to a reduction of about $100 in individual down payments per room, reducing them to about $140 per room, or to an appreciable reduction in monthly carrying charges. Those monthly carrying charges leading to mutual home ownership are now only a little over $14 per room, including amortization of the mortgage, interest, heat, repairs, and maintenance. That is housing that the forgotten family can really afford. The contractors are making a good but reasonable profit, and are sufficiently satisfied that they are looking for more business.

"Under the Maybank-Sparkman bills, which Senator LEHMAN approves, the contractors would get the additional $400,000 which has been saved under our plan, instead of the cooperators, and the cooperators would have the privilege of paying almost double the amount of interest for 60 years, the remainder of their lives, that is, if they came from long-lived families.

"We have found that most builders are willing to accept limitations of their profits to reasonable figures, under our program, because of the hope it offers of stabilizing the home-building industry and eliminating booms and busts. They are anxious to participate.

"Senator LEHMAN would do well to espouse a program similar to that of New York. We would then have a true laboratory of home-building costs in every State of the Union."

Under the State's plan the new housing, but not the land, is exempt from municipal taxes for about 30 years. Commissioner Stichman said that such tax exemption will be sought only for a limited number of pilot projects in the State's program to demonstrate true building costs, and that all those who need homes would benefit by proof that rentals and prices for new housing demanded since the end of hostilities have been excessive.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Middle Income Group Housing Help Decried," written by George Ericson, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE-INCOME GROUP HOUSING HELP DECRIED

(By George Ericson, editor of the financial pages of the Christian Science Monitor)

Are more laws needed to bring adequate housing to the American people? The administration thinks so. Two weeks ago it introduced the Maybank and Spence bills, designed to provide new aids to cooperative housing and to extend the FHA mortgage loan insurance authority. This week the Senate Banking Committee reported out the middle-income bill, setting up a new Federal lending agency with authority to use $1,000,000,000 in low interest rate loans to housing cooperatives. With an obeisance toward moderation, the Senators cut the $2,000,000,000 sought by President Truman in half and reduced the $2,750,000,000 requested by the administration for additional lending power of the Federal Housing Administration to $1,750,000,000.

It is not surprising that various features of this proposed legislation have excited controversy. There is considerable basis for the charge that it is another rather thinly disguised subsidy, calculated to elicit support from that large portion of the electorate which is held to be the backbone of the economy, the middle-income group. The question naturally arises why this group, which may be presumed to earn between $4,000 and $8,000 a year, and which pays such a heavy proportion of the taxes, should get what amounts to a subsidy paid for largely by themselves.

MEASURE SEEN AS CARRYING SPECIAL FAVORS

Let us see what is the basis for the charge that the administration is offering another subsidy. First of all, it is not a public-housing program in the true meaning of the word. It is not aimed to remedy a serious shortage of housing, or to aid those incapable of providing their own housing, or to do away with slums. Rather, it lays itself open to the characterization of this legislation as offering special favors to the veteran groups and labor organizations which are supporting the bill.

No one probably is better qualified to evaluate the financial implications of this measure than Thomas B. McCabe, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, who condemned the cheap-money provisions of the bill. His criticism is all the more pertinent since he has long been an administration supporter.

That advancing loans to various nonprofit groups at extremely low rates would have a marked effect on private credit is hardly to be denied. The new agency would float its own bonds to get the capital at 3 to 3½ percent, with the loans to run for half a century or more. "We know of no mortgage credit currently available in this country on amortization terms of 50 to 60 years or at interest rates such as are contemplated here," Mr. McCabe told the Senate committee.

M'CABE OFFERS FOUR REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

The Reserve Board Chairman criticized the bill as inflationary, as a factor in boosting the volume of public debt, as a measure that would add to the Federal budget deficit and as a likely overstimulus to building which might contribute later to deflation in the housing industry. Mr. McCabe held strictly to the economic factors involved but he might also have asked why cooperatives should get terms so much better than other home owners. These groups would not only get money at rates only slightly above those paid by the Federal Government on its borrowings and would be able to get a 10-year extension beyond the original 50-year loan, but would be allowed to put off payment for 8 years during the life of the loan on both principal and interest.

FHA loans by contrast cost 4½ percent over a 30-year period.

The only limitation on the help to be offered by this National Mortgage Corporation of Housing Cooperative (NMCHC) is that it is to go to moderate-income families. The general interpretation of the foregoing phrase or that of a middle-class group gives it an earning power of from $4,000 to $8,000. The middle-income group comprises persons earning up to $6,000 a year, according to the Internal Revenue Bureau. This looks to private building organizations like a step toward socialism. A free-enterprise system, they assert, has no obligation to house its citizens.

Opponents of the legislation are asking whether there is now a housing shortage which demands further participation of Government in this field. The building industry in 1949 broke all records in the erection of new houses, making available over 1,000,000 additional homes—houses and flats—compared with the previous peak of 937,000 in 1925. This high pace is continuing in 1950 with January starts 60 percent above the 1949 month.

IS THE HOUSING SHORTAGE ENDED?

The builders are concentrating on low-price homes, largely below the $8,000 figure and embodying many cost-saving features.

The fact that apartments-to-let signs are to be seen in some new developments, that the Federal Housing Expediter has decontrolled a number of areas, that many rent increases have been permitted raises the thought that the housing shortage is coming to an end. Those who doubt the necessity for calling forth a flood of cheap money may, therefore, be forgiven if they question the wisdom of the program and see in it the fostering of a political issue useful in the coming presidential campaign.

It is evident that though building is steadily catching up with minimum demand, the administration is unwilling to let the competitive element determine what is fair and reasonable in prices and rents. The sponsors of cheap money and other privileges for cooperatives say that lack of experience with housing co-ops makes lenders reluctant to put up capital. However, it should be noted that such co-ops, which are generally heavily mortgaged, have their troubles in bad times. Private builders point out that more than 75 percent of these co-ops in New York and Chicago went insolvent in the 1930's. The Senate committee reporting the Sparkman bill last year nevertheless said the Federal Government should advance the funds needed where private financing is not available.

Of course, the new bill would be a help to the private building of rental housing, which is to lose one prop when section 608 of the National Housing Act expires on March 1. That section allowed a mortgage up to 90 percent of estimated cost. The new bill would raise insurance limits to 90 percent of value on projects costing $7,000 or less per apartment, after which insurance would be 60 percent of the next $3,000. But as Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, says: Why give loans to a middle-class cooperative at 3 percent when GI programs must pay 4 to 4½ percent?

Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bigger Hole," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, February 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIGGER HOLE

Senator THOMAS, who is chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has remarked that "the Republicans have got us Democrats in a hole on this surplus-potato mess."

Now politics being what it is, there's no surprise in the fact that a Democrat should be worried that the spectacle of rotting spuds in Government storage might prove a painful political weapon. Nor will we be surprised if the Republicans—the brighter ones, anyway—make use of this weapon.

But it does seem to us that Senator THOMAS doesn't realize how big this hole is. It isn't just the Democratic politicians who are in it. The taxpayers who foot the bill for this mess are in it much deeper. And that includes just about everybody.

Douglass Burnett, of Sparks, Baltimore County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the Towson (Md.) Jeffersonian of February 24, 1950, there appeared an article about a very fine and well-known citizen of Maryland who has recently been elected president of the Edison Pioneers. I refer to Mr. Douglass Burnett, of Sparks, Md., whose interesting career is outlined in the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER OF OUTSIDE ILLUMINATED CHRISTMAS TREE CHOSEN PRESIDENT OF EDISON PIONEERS—SPARKS MAN CREDITED WITH TAKING ELECTRIC LIGHT FROM LUXURY BRACKET

Members of one of the Nation's most exclusive organizations, the men who knew Thomas Alva Edison intimately and were associated with him in his scientific work, have elected Douglass Burnett, a Baltimore countian, as their president for the coming year.

There are only a handful left of these original Edison Pioneers, as the group is called. Thomas A. Edison would have been more than 100 if alive today and his son, Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey, is in his sixties.

Mr. Burnett retired in 1939 after some 45 years of utilities work during which he became recognized as one of the country's leading engineers in the fields of gas and electricity.

He is also known as the father of a Christmas practice now almost as familiar as the carols and holly, lighting Christmas trees on lawns. Mr. Burnett has lived about 7 years in Sparks and earlier lived more than 20 years at Cockeysville and Riderwood.

Probably more than anyone in Maryland, Mr. Burnett is responsible for the general household use of electricity today. Much of his long career was spent in work to take electricity out of the luxury bracket and

make electric lights a convenience now taken for granted by nearly everyone.

A native of Brooklyn, N. Y., where his father, Samuel Oliver Burnett, was in the hardware and household furnishings business, Mr. Burnett obtained his bachelor of science degree at the Brooklyn Polytechnic and Collegiate Institute in 1899.

After some postgraduate work and teaching at the same institution, he taught for 5 years at Brooklyn's Pratt Institute as professor of applied physics. When not teaching in the daytime, he was busy at night making apparatus to be used in the classroom.

Through his scientific studies he became interested in Edison's work, which was beginning to receive wider attention, and about 1895 he convinced New York Edison Co. officials they should give him a job.

One of his first assignments was to sell electric lights to the New York Times, which didn't have them and didn't much want them. Mr. Burnett used some of his most persuasive argument.

"You've got to take them," he told the business managers of the Nation's best-known newspaper. "If you do, everyone will, because they say the Times is never wrong." He got the contract.

He also was given the job of reorganizing the New York Edison Co.'s applications for electric service. These records he later described as confusion, confounded by confusion. Many of the largest users of electric power had no meters, and many of the meters in use weren't working.

He began restoring order to the system, and eventually had seen to it that meters were installed everywhere and that every meter in the system had been carefully inspected.

Mr. Burnett superintended the annual surveys for the New York Edison Co. He was responsible for so much of the extension of the system that a great deal of the present system in the Borough of Manhattan was originally established under his supervision.

His work also resulted in the development of electric elevator service which speeded the construction of New York's skyscrapers instead of the four- or five-story buildings previously in use.

As new business came in, Mr. Burnett's salary and prestige increased, but he felt there was much yet to be done. Electricity still was a rare service, used mainly by the wealthy, and he believed it could be within the reach of all.

He started a house-to-house canvass, explaining electrical benefits, and then went to work on the New York Electric Show held about the turn of the century, where tens of thousands of persons for the first time became aware of what electricity was doing to revolutionize living.

One of the most convincing exhibits, Mr. Burnett has said, was demonstrated by a young woman named Miss Jane Elting Young, who went to the show and, using an electric stove, baked thousands of cookies which were distributed free to the public.

In 1903 Miss Young became Mrs. Burnett.

For the 1914 Christmas holiday, 10 years after they had come from New York to Maryland, Mrs. Burnett got her husband to decorate two trees in front of their home on Falls Road Terrace with electric lights.

The idea was such a quick and great success that the old United Railways ran three special cars each night just to take people on a sightseeing trip past the Burnett home. Mrs. Burnett died in 1939, a few weeks after her husband's retirement as manager of rate structures for the gas and electric company, where he had served 35 years.

When Mr. Burnett came to Baltimore to take an executive position with the firm then named the United Electric & Power Co., he found conditions in many ways the same as when he had started out with the New York firm.

Along Charles Street the only lights in business establishments were the small bulbs hanging over the safe. "A good way to show a burglar how to get in," Mr. Burnett used to say.

He had only time to get an impression of the volume of work ahead when the downtown section of the city was wiped out by the great fire of 1904. Mr. Burnett had been in town about a week.

Immediately, he directed the printing and mailing of penny postcards to all customers announcing the company would be ready to serve them at 8 a. m. the following day at new offices on South Eutaw Street.

As the city began to rebuild, Mr. Burnett helped install many reforms in the power set-up, and in the field of customer relations began to convince businessmen of the advertising value of the electric light. Lights came into the windows of the establishments along Charles Street and nighttime window shopping began and has never stopped.

The electric company merged with the Consolidated Gas Co. and Mr. Burnett helped establish the differentials in rates for domestic and industrial services, another phase of utilities management in which he pioneered.

Because of his early work with household gas heating, it was possible to pipe manufactured gas into many homes in this area years before it was done in many other parts of the country.

One of his principal contributions was made soon after he came to Maryland. He brought about the national standardization of lamp voltage at 3 instead of the previous 32. This made possible, among other things, the manufacture and sale of a higher quality incandescent lamp.

The rapid extension of electric service in rural areas of Baltimore County and the nearby county areas was one of the main factors that led to the establishment of the national rural electrification project. Mr. Burnett served as chairman for Maryland.

He was always interested in young men who wanted a better education and was greatly disturbed by the fact that many had no chance here for advanced technical study.

He happened one day to meet Dr. Frank J. Goodnow, who had been elected president of the Johns Hopkins University, and thought here was the chance he had been waiting for. He broached the subject of night engineering and technical courses to Dr. Goodnow. The latter was favorable to the project but said it would have to be underwritten for about $10,000.

Fortunately, a businessman friend of Mr. Burnett believed in the idea strongly. He pledged he would guarantee the $10,000 and the school was going within a few months. Later, Mr. Burnett is glad to say, the underwriters only needed to contribute $237. That was all they ever had to pay.

Mr. Burnett also was instrumental in moving the Baltimore Manual Training School from the old Carroll Mansion on Lombard Street to Howard and Centre Streets, former location of the Baltimore City College, where it became the city's first real vocational school.

For many years Mr. Burnett has been active in civic affairs. In New York he was vice president of the New York Electrical Society. Since becoming a Marylander he has served as chairman of the Baltimore section of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers and as president of the Engineers Club of Baltimore, the St. Andrews Society, and the Rotary Club of Baltimore. He has also been an active supporter of the Maryland Academy of Sciences and the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra.

He has three sons, Douglass Burnett, Jr., of Philadelphia; Robert Elting Burnett, of Schenectady, N. Y., and Thomas Douglass Burnett, the eldest, with whom he lives at Sparks. There are four grandchildren. All are grandsons except 11-year-old Happy Burnett, of Sparks, who is Mr. Burnett's shadow and, in his opinion, can do little wrong. Happy is the only girl born in the immediate family in three generations.

Mr. Burnett has been an enthusiastic motorist since the early days of automobiles and was one of the first persons in the East known to have taken his family on a vacation trip by car. It was a 2-week junket to Long Island, played up by newspapers of several States with both stories and pictures.

For about 50 years now Mr. Burnett has spent his summer vacations in New England—at Nantucket, where he is among the oldest summer residents and, in fact, is pictured on a resort souvenir postcard.

Since he retired in 1939 he has adopted a gentle masquerade that is peculiarly appropriate to the Nantucket background. He grew a set of white chin whiskers and acquired a sou'wester cap which together give him the appearance of a typical New England sea captain who might have just stepped off a whaling ship. His whiskers and cap were at first vacation items, and mostly a joke, but he had so much fun about them he decided to make them permanent. He gets a big kick when an old acquaintance sees him in the new guise and doesn't even recognize him.

It's not a 100-percent joke, however. The sea is in the Burnett family blood. His grandfather and other members of the family followed it.

Except for the summer vacations, Mr. Burnett spends most of his time quietly in the country, reading scientific books and amusing and instructing his granddaughter. But he always makes at least one expedition of some distance a year.

The Job Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at the annual dinner, National Small Businessmen's Association, March 2, 1950, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., by Franklyn B. Snyder, president emeritus, Northwestern University, and president, the Presbyterian Hospital of city of Chicago:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and an honor for me to be here this evening. This association, completely nonpolitical, national in its scope, and concerned with the welfare of the country, has already accomplished much of which it can be proud. The future will see it doing even more to bring happiness to the citizens of the United States, and through them to the people of many lands. It is an association which anyone should be proud to join. I thank you for letting me be with you on this occasion.

I have never been a businessman, but I have spent my life enjoying the fruits of that freedom of opportunity and action in which you as businessmen believe. I have lived many years on the campus of a privately endowed and controlled university. I am today happily busy in a great American hospital, also privately controlled and endowed. These two notable products of our American way of life, the private university and the voluntary hospital, are dedicated to public service, to the welfare of men and women without regard to race,

creed, or color. They receive generous support from those who realize that freedom has its obligations as well as its privileges. They give back to the public many times the value of what they receive, and illustrate perhaps the finest flowering of the free-enterprise system operating in the service of humanity.

You, as businessmen, believe in what we call the profit motive, but you know well enough that your fellow citizens, as well as your stockholders, must profit from your activities. You know too that only under a political and economic system which recognizes the validity of this motive can you find happiness for yourselves or extend it to others. The private university and the voluntary hospital, though they never operate for profit, also believe in the profit motive as a stimulus to intelligent and successful business activity. Hence we have much in common—you of the business world, and we of the educational and philanthropic world.

I have read with care your four legislative recommendations for the Eighty-first Congress, and wish they might be laid before all the voters in the land. I join you in the hope that the Congress will act promptly and vigorously to check the rising tide of national debt. I hope the Congress will institute drastic economies here at home, and will sharply reduce the amount of money being given to foreign countries. I have no fear that slavery can ever be imposed upon this Nation by outside force; but I am not at all sure we may not enslave ourselves in the shackles of an ever-mounting national debt. To check this tendency, to balance the Federal budget, and to retire some billions of our outstanding bonds—what a tonic effect such action would have upon our national life.

Apropos of debt, I am glad to recognize the debt which private universities and voluntary hospitals owe to American business. Businessmen have founded many of our most distinguished universities, investing their capital in the future welfare of young Americans. They have given generously to support our hospitals and our universities, for they know that these privately controlled institutions make larger contributions to human welfare per dollar received than Government institutions have yet been able to make. Businessmen serve as trustees and curators of private institutions and foundations dedicated to public welfare. For all these services we of the universities and hospitals are grateful—sincerely grateful—to you of the business world.

There are many things, ladies and gentlemen, which American business and American education have done together in the past, and which I hope they will continue to do together in the future. And just at present they have one great task in common; a task so important and so difficult that all minor obligations are insignificant. That task is to combat the insidious but steady encroachments of socialism upon our national life. That is the job ahead; to preserve freedom in the United States.

Socialism is like old age: it creeps upon one unawares. Old age never overtook a man overnight. Quite the contrary, his powers fail, but only little by little, and painlessly at first. Slowly his arteries harden, his eyesight grows dim, his hearing is impaired. If he recognizes the symptoms and consults his physician early enough a good deal can be done to postpone the final decay. But if he waits too long his case is hopeless, for no physician can cure old age, once it has really taken hold of a man.

Socialism lays its chilling hand on a nation the way old age overtakes us human beings. No nation, so far as I know, ever said "Go to now; after next Thursday we will all be Socialists." No, the affliction comes gradually, and usually without discomfort in the early stages. But the ultimate result is unhappiness, national destitution, and slavery. The only way to fend it off is to be alert to the symptoms, and take proper measures to eliminate them. In this way socialism can be kept at bay, for though old age is inevitable, socialism is not.

I say socialism works slowly, and by doing so lulls its victims into apathy. It took two or three centuries for the poison to destroy Rome. At first the citizens merely allowed their rulers to keep themselves in power through gifts of cheap food and of treasure. Then the vicious idea that "the government will do it" gradually poisoned the thinking of the hardiest race that Europe had yet produced. Little by little integrity and thrift and industry gave place to corruption and waste and indolence. Before long, and probably without realizing it, the people had bartered their ancient heritage of freedom for the specious ease and false security offered them by politicians. And then Rome fell, not because it was beaten down by superior physical force, but because it had collapsed spiritually. The Roman new deal, which was to have made every man happy, sold the nation into slavery.

Many centuries later another nation was to have a similar experience. It was suffering from the aftermath of war, with all that that implies, and came under the leadership of a self-confident idealist. He was intolerant of criticism, willing to manipulate facts to suit his own purposes, but smart enough to limit his early activities to combatting a financial depression. He regulated business, established new rules to govern commerce and finance, and dismissed from the government men who did not approve of the new ideas.

The new leader saw that under the old system of free enterprise merchants and landlords could make money. So he levied new taxes to take away their profits and destroy what he called the monopoly of capital. To please the laborers, he controlled prices but not wages. To win the favor of the farmers he gave them loans and subsidies, which worked first to their advantage, but ultimately to their ruin. And when the national debt mounted alarmingly, he pooh-poohed his critics by saying that earlier leaders had not understood government finance.

That is the story of China under Su Tungpo in the eleventh century as told by the distinguished present-day historian Lin Yutang. Ultimately, of course, this experiment collapsed miserably and brought the nation to financial ruin—with the loss of the rich northern provinces. The attempt to establish state socialism, though made by a very clever man, all but ruined the country.

If eleventh-century China seems too far away to be significant, look at contemporary England. When the British, too worn by their sacrifices during the war to be able even to think clearly, turned the government over to the Socialists, they took a long step toward disaster. The nationalization of one industry after another, with the resulting inefficiency of management and steady increase in costs, was bad enough, in all conscience. But far worse was the concentration of power in a central government which blundered more often than it succeeded.

Fortunately for England, and for the cause of freedom everywhere, the recent election proved that there is still hope of a change—yes, there is now the certainty of a change. Despite their disheartenment, their regimentation, their willingness to stand patiently in queues, the English have not lost their belief that liberty is worth all that it costs, or their willingness to fight for that in which they believe. Before long they will be free again.

Anthony Eden put the case against socialism well when he said last summer, "The Socialist Party is far too much given to control for the love of control. * * * In restricting liberty in small matters, they are playing into the hands of those who would suppress liberty in the greater things of life. The more we are conditioned to control, the weaker becomes that sense of personal responsibility that in the past has been our strength as a nation."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the real tragedy of socialism, of the all-powerful state, no matter what you call it or where you find it; that is the real reason we should oppose it. Not that it is wasteful and stupid and inefficient; not that it attracts third-rate men to its councils; not that it blunders tragically in its attempts to plan your lives and mine; but that it undermines the sense of personal responsibility and destroys normal, laudable, human ambition. Of course it attacks my pocketbook; but—far worse—it also poisons my soul. Ultimately its victims cease struggling. "Why worry" they say, "we can't do anything about it. The government controls us—we no longer control the government—to hell with it."

"But," you say, "this is the United States; we are still free; let's not worry about what happened in England." I agree that worry is of no use whatever. But I add that unless we resolutely and promptly do something vigorous about it, we may well find ourselves where England was before the election. And that, as I said not long ago, is the job ahead—to check the development here in the United States of the socialized state.

Already too many Americans are working to bring it into being. Honest but stupid visionaries, undercover friends of communism, and some who merely lust for power for its own sake, are actively busy promoting the destruction of free enterprise. Certain religious and political groups are openly advocating the elimination of the profit-motive from our national life, and the establishment in its place of a total planned economy.

No one can object when these radicals air their opinions. They are merely exercising the right of free speech. But I wish that intelligent conservatives would exercise the same right. I wish they would proclaim from the housetops that a program of Nation-wide planned economy, carried to its logical conclusion, is really a program of national slavery. We of the center and the right, ladies and gentlemen, are far too complacent, too lethargic. Our opponents never sleep.

A second indication of the trend of the times is the alarming growth of the administrative departments of the Federal Government, in size and in power. Well intrenched Federal bureaucracies are dictating the rules of the game in many phases of our national life, and are ceaselessly alert for more worlds to conquer. Even if the bureaucrats were skillful managers and planners, their increasing numbers and authority would be a menace to our national freedom. But they are not skillful; they are bunglers. See what they have done with potatoes and eggs, or think for a moment about that monstrous thing called the Brannan plan.

Few people who advocate—or acquiesce in—increasing the power of the Federal Government realize that in doing so they are working for socialism. But they are. For the submergence of the individual in the state is the very heart and soul of socialism. So long as we are free to protest, to assert our own independence, to enjoy our liberties as Americans, there will be no Socialist state. But once we are shackled by debt and taxes and hemmed in by administrative regulations we lose the power of effective resistance; ultimately we lose the will to resist. And then the whole battle is lost.

As we all know, the Constitution provides for a tripartite Government: executive, legislative and judicial branches all performing their proper functions, and acting as checks and balances on one another. During the past 20 years we have seen the execu-

tive department usurp many of the powers of the legislative, and attempt, through a "packing" process, to bring the judicial to heel. From this situation it is no long step to government by a single party, a single bureau, or perhaps by a single individual. The bare mention of such a possibility is repulsive. But that is no reason for burying our heads in the sand.

The bait offered us by those who favor an all-powerful socialistic state is attractive. For example, we are all interested in the education of our children and in their health. When either of these matters is mentioned, we become sentimental. Of course we want better schools, better hospitals, better medical service in small towns. And since we are already taxed to exhaustion we agree to "let the Government do it"—forgetting that the Government can pay the bills only out of our own depleted pocketbooks. We also forget that as soon as it is paying the bills it will inevitably control, no matter what safeguards may be attempted.

What about Federal aid to education; do we really think that in the long run it would be good for the country? I for one do not. Our American educational system, imperfect, but still the best in the world, has been built on the basic principles of local autonomy and local responsibility. There is no emergency which can possibly justify abandoning these time-tested principles. If my State of Illinois really wants better schools it can have better schools, by eliminating waste in the administration, or by increasing State taxes on liquor and cosmetics. We will gain nothing by sending our money to Washington to have half of it returned to us for our educational budget.

But, you say, not all States are as wealthy as Illinois. Should not the Federal Government help those who cannot help themselves? Mr. Frank Holman, president of the American Bar Association in 1949, recently discussed this question. He pointed out that the State most commonly cited as in need of such aid had increased teachers' salaries 156 percent in 8 years, had a surplus in its treasury greater than its total debt, and through the process of investing this surplus in United States bonds was actually lending money to the Federal Government. The same situation would probably be found in other places, if the real facts were brought to light. I say again no educational emergency exists which can justify abandoning our well-established principles of local autonomy and local responsibility, and allowing our schools, through subsidization, to come under the control of the Federal Government.

An even more attractive lure dangled before us is the promise of free medical and hospital care through a system of compulsory health insurance paid for out of Federal money.

It is commonly stated that millions of low-income families are without competent medical care; that the profession is unable or unwilling to give them this care; that hospital and nursing costs are prohibitive, and that the only way to solve this problem is to turn it over to the Federal Government.

No intelligent person doubts that illness sometimes lays a heavy burden on persons with middle-range incomes, that the United States needs more physicians than it has, or that the distribution of these physicians leaves many areas inadequately cared for. The war interrupted the work of our medical schools, stripped them of their youngest and most vigorous teachers, filled their classrooms with poorly prepared students, and sent into uniform hurriedly graduated medical officers who had had about half the training we expect our physicians to receive. Our medical schools and teaching hospitals are only now slowly recovering from this devastating experience.

But even so American medicine is doing a notable job in the cause of private and public health. There are few cities in America where virtually free medical care is not available to anyone who really requires it; few hospitals which ever close their doors to charity patients. In the city I know best no one is ever more than an hour's ride by streetcar from a clinic where the highest type of medical aid is available without cost to the patient. And for the middle-income group voluntary hospital and health insurance—the Blue Cross, Blue Shield plans, and many offered by insurance companies—spreads the cost of any illness over some 60,000,000 participants, and greatly lessens the danger that illness will have catastrophic financial results.

That I believe to be the American way and the best way of solving this problem—by voluntary cooperation between the medical profession and the people that profession serves; by voluntary and local support of hospitals and clinics; by efficient administration of these institutions; by generous private assistance to medical schools.

I am glad this Congress has laid aside the bills for compulsory health insurance; I hope they will not be resurrected. I say this, not because they would give the country socialized medicine, but because they would almost certainly give it poor medicine; not because they would be costly—the voluntary system we all believe in is costly—but because they would inevitably be inefficient; not because they would put the physician on the Federal pay roll, but because sooner or later they would enslave him.

Even more alluring than the proposal for compulsory health insurance is the administration's recommendation of a greatly extended social-security program. House Resolution 2893, and its somewhat more moderate substitute, House Resolution 6000, are intended to establish such a system of old-age, survivor, and disability payments as will give generous aid to virtually everyone over age 65, and to many younger persons.

The complexity of the program is so bewildering that I do not pretend to understand it in detail. But, of three things I am sure: First, the program would be a powerful deterrent to any gainful activity by a person over 65, and would make drones out of many who are now happily employed. Second, the cost, as estimated by the Social Security Administration itself, would be fantastic; not less than $4,500,000,000 in 1960, and rising in 4 decades to a possible $20,500,000,000. Third, a vast new army of Government employees would be required to administer the program. Their salaries have not been included in the figures I have just quoted; nor can their possible political influence be estimated.

In each of these three respects the program seems to many people to be contrary to good public policy.

These objectors to the administration's proposals believe that we should encourage our older citizens to work instead of to loaf, and point out that medical science has made retirement at 65 a luxury and not in any sense a necessity. They believe that we should reduce and not increase Federal expenditure, and should fight shy of any plan which promises to become increasingly costly as the years pass. They believe we should lessen and not increase the number of Federal employees, and I add that if either of these resolutions should become law, this country would at one step have gone far towards a completely socialized State. I hope this proposal, like that of compulsory health insurance, will be definitely laid aside by the Congress.

I said a few minutes ago that, unlike old age, socialism is not inevitable. Whether or not it is to overwhelm us depends in large measure on people like ourselves, who believe that freedom is essential to the happiness of the individual as well as of the Nation. The battle has just been joined, ladies and gentlemen, and if you and I and all the other right-thinking Americans do our part, the victory will be ours.

What can we do? First—and I cannot say this too emphatically—educate young America; tell the students in high schools and colleges what this capitalistic system of ours really does to keep the national standard of living higher than that of any other nation; to make America the land to which the unfortunate of every other nation would gladly come if they could. These young people are alert, intelligent, trustworthy. They will be in control of things before long. It is important that they know the truth before they take over the driver's seat. The radical, who would overthrow the present order of things, is constantly busy on college campuses. The conservative should be busy, too.

Second, can we not make it quite clear to our Representatives in Congress that the needless harassment of business, big or little, can do only harm to the country; that thrift is a national as well as a personal virtue; that the organizing and administrative skill which distinguishes American industry should be used to make our Federal Government more efficient and less costly; that the States are quite competent to handle their own educational and medical problems; and, above all, that we wish less rather than more power in the hands of the Federal Government.

Is there anything hopelessly reactionary about these suggestions? I think not. I am merely asking Congress to preserve for our children the basic freedoms and opportunities which we have enjoyed. Is there anything narrowly partisan? I think not. Neither Democrat nor Republican wishes the individual to be submerged in the State, or hopes by his action to bring socialism into power. Is there anything in these suggestions to which you as businessmen should object? Again, I think not. You have already advocated them, directly or by implication, in your published platform. If you and your friends will really work to implement your own proposals, we of the educational world will gladly help, as we can, and between us we shall banish the spectre of socialism from our land.

Heroes of Iwo Jima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is so eloquent that any words by me can only spoil it. I give it to you exactly as it appeared on February 23, 1950, in newspapers throughout the country and in the Journal American in New York City:

HEROES OF IWO JIMA

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

It was 5 years ago today that United States Marines stormed Mount Suribachi on the tiny Pacific island of Iwo Jima, during which five of their number planted the American flag in its volcanic dust.

What a soul-stirring spectacle. What a soul-stirring story.

Like rolling billows it swept across the pulsating heart of the Nation.

The marines who raised our flag symbolized the unsurpassed gallantry of all our fighting

men. The marines who raised our flag epitomized the sacrifice of all our fighting forces.

Yes, she's up there—Old Glory. How bright the stars beam. And the stripes like red signals of liberty gleam.

We have stormed the darkness of night. We have set in the darkness a light.

It is the flag of Trenton, Gettysburg, Chateau Thierry, and Iwo Jima.

They hold deeds that shine like stars above our blessed shrines.

Behold our flag—it was born of the sun, the stars, and the sky.

It was baptized by American patriots. It was dedicated in freedom's holy light.

Its stripes are as red as a patriot's blood could paint them; as white as a mother's tears could wash them. Its field of heaven's own arch that bends o'er us and set with a galaxy of 48 brilliant stars glittering together for the glory of God's country.

It is the flag of our Nation. It is the flag of liberation. It is the flag of humanity. It is the flag of destiny.

Wherever it has been unfurled to the breeze, its noble and inspiring message has been: Here men shall be free.

On this day dedicated to the glory of Iwo Jima—let us honor those who died under the flag to keep it free. Let us weave a wreath of prayers. Let us weave a bouquet of spiritual flowers, whose sweet fragrance will be carried to the throne of God in memory of our heroic souls.

Because of them our lives are free. Because of them our Nation lives. Because of them our civilization is blessed.

Let us pause today in tribute to the heroes of Iwo Jima. All is quiet on the hill—but in the distance we can see the snow-white crosses covering the ground like morning dew, for there sleeps the flower of our American youth.

The Stars and Stripes flutter leisurely. Not a sound is heard—except a silent sentinel keeping vigil on the sacred soil.

Yet One walks there among the crosses. He lifts His holy voice in benevolent benediction: "My peace I give unto you. Well done, good and faithful servants."

So shall they rest in peace.

The Chinese Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Newsweek says that Mr. Trygve Lie, Director-General of the United Nations, is carrying on secret maneuverings and negotiations designed to get the majority of the members of that organization to withdraw recognition from the legitimate government of China, thus opening the way for installing in its place in the United Nations the Communist regime now established in Peiping which calls itself by the attractive name, Peoples Republic, but officially describes itself as a "peoples democratic dictatorship."

Mr. Speaker, I hope this report is not true and that Mr. Trygve Lie will disavow it. The United Nations is badly shaken already as far as public confidence is concerned and if it turns out that it is being used or can be used as an agency for carrying on maneuverings and manipulations on behalf of the Soviet Union and its satellites, that would be almost a fatal blow to the United Nations, and perhaps to man's best hope for peace.

Veterans' Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the papers carried a story this morning and the service organizations have been talking with me about the Veterans' Administration dismissal of 7,800 employees because they do not have enough money to pay them. Approximately 3,000 employees in hospitals and 4,800 other employees are included, the Veterans' Administration says. Hospital beds will be taken away as a result. Already there is a shortage of 1,600 beds for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that with the closing of the Army and the Navy hospitals, and the Veterans' Administration hospitals, this administration is not mindful of illness or disability, particularly of our disabled veterans. It seems to be there is more interest in potatoes and things like that than there is in disabled men. It is like the old Japan that drowned weak people they did not want, or let suffer and die.

That should not be the American way. It is not America.

The following article by Jerry Kluttz appeared in the Washington Post today:

VA To Lay Off 7,500 by April 10

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Veterans' Administration is rushing plans to fire between 7,500 and 8,000 of its employees by April 10, the Washington Post learned last night.

Several hundred VA employees here and nearby will get the ax in the major shake-up.

VA Administrator Carl Gray disclosed plans for the big reduction in messages sent yesterday to key agency employees here and in the field. He instructed them to give out 30-day discharge notices a week from today to become effective on April 10.

VA's department of medicine and surgery will be hard hit by the pending lay-off, the first it has had to take. It has been ordered to fire 3,000 hospital employees, from attendants to doctors, and 1,800 employees from the medical sections in the regional offices.

A total of 4,800 employees would have to be fired from the medical program. But the program has 117,000 of the 187,000 VA employees, and percentagewise the claims, insurance, and other administrative sections would suffer.

ADMINISTRATIVE FORCE HIT

Approximately 3,000 employees would be laid off from the 70,000-man administrative force.

Among the employees here to be fired will be most of the remaining temporary staff that was recruited to pay the GI insurance dividends as well as cuts "here and there" among the regular employees at headquarters, the regional office, and Mount Alto Hospital. Officials explained it would be another week before the exact number to be cut here would be known.

The reduction was ordered, officials pointed out, for a combination of reasons but it all added up to lack of funds to maintain the present staff.

"We must get in line now," an official explained, "with our 1951 budget. The longer we wait the more people we must fire."

MISCALCULATION IS HINTED

There was also a hint that VA officials had miscalculated 1950 operating costs a year ago in preparing the budget. It was recalled that Congress, the day before it adjourned last fall, okayed a deficiency appropriation for VA—money which was intended to prevent the firing of about 8,000 employees at that time.

Although no definite decision has been made, officials confided that they expected the sharp cutback to result in the closing of from 300 to 400 contact offices throughout the country, and the closing and merger of half a dozen regional offices.

In addition, the eventual closing of some hospital beds is a clear possibility. A VA spokesman explained that additional hospitals were being constructed and several thousand additional beds would become available within the next year.

The Case for Home Rule for Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today a memorandum on "the case for home rule for Washington." It begins with a quote from James Madison that appeared in the Federalist paper:

The inhabitants of the Federal District will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them.

And he assured them that—

A municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrage, will, of course, be allowed them.

The memorandum traces the history of local self-government in the District. I urge you to read it.

The petition to discharge the Kefauver bill from the Committee on the District of Columbia now has over 165 signatures. We need more. I hope that those Members who have not yet taken action on the petition will sign it.

The memorandum follows:

THE CASE FOR HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

1. The founding fathers promised local self-government.

(a) In one of his Federalist essays, James Madison wrote that "the inhabitants of the Federal district will have had their voice in the election of the Government which is to exercise authority over them," and he assured them that "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

2. Washington had local self-government from 1802 to 1874.

(a) Elected mayors and town councils from 1802 to 1871.

(b) Elected House of Delegates (25) and Delegate in Congress from 1871 to 1874.

3. The people of Washington are capable of local self-government.

(a) They have an occupational acquaintance with public affairs.

(b) District residents are the best educated of any American city.

4. Taxation without representation is incompatible with our traditions.

(a) District residents pay local income, property, and sales taxes amounting to almost $100,000,000 a year, but they have no control over how their tax money is spent.

5. The people of Washington want home rule.

(a) They voted 8 to 1 for local suffrage in 1938.

(b) They voted 7 to 3 for it in 1946.

(c) Seventy percent favored home rule in Washington Post poll in May 1948.

6. The Nation wants the District to have home rule.

(a) A Gallup poll in 1948 showed that 77 percent of the country favored it.

(b) Many leading American newspapers have supported it editorially.

7. President Truman endorsed the Kefauver bill and urged its passage in a letter to the Speaker of the House on July 25, 1949.

8. Home rule would relieve Congress of an onerous councilmanic burden.

(a) All District legislation must now pass through both Houses of Congress.

(b) There are 28 stages in the passage of a bill through Congress.

(c) Elsewhere local policies are made by single act of city council.

(d) It takes an act of Congress to change street names, establish daylight-saving time, destroy starlings, cut weeds, etc., in Washington.

(e) It isn't fair to Congress; it isn't fair to Washington; our needs are neglected.

9. Both political parties have promised suffrage rights to the people of the District of Columbia.

(a) Since 1892 Democratic platforms have contained District of Columbia home rule planks.

(b) The 1948 Democratic platform states: "We favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia."

(c) The 1948 Republican platform contained a similar plank.

10. The constitutionality of home rule has been upheld by the Attorney General of the United States; House and Senate Legislative Counsel; several eminent constitutional lawyers.

(a) Exercise of rights of local self-government from 1802 to 1874 was a practical construction of the Constitution.

11. All other cities in the United States enjoy local self-government.

12. All other capital cities in the world outside of the iron curtain have it except Canberra.

13. Lack of local self-government in capital city of world's greatest democracy embarrasses conduct of our foreign relations.

(a) Washington should have a model system of self-government.

14. Under present form of government here, we have no control over acts of city officials.

(a) If school facilities are inadequate—if crime rate is high—if municipal services are unsatisfactory—we cannot dismiss the responsible officials.

15. Lack of home rule dulls the edge of democracy—weakens the citizen's sense of civic responsibility—atrophies our political faculties for sheer lack of expression.

16. With home rule, the administrative structure of our local government would long since have been modernized.

(a) It has just growed like Topsy since 1878 and is a tangled jungle of overlapping, duplicating, and uncoordinated agencies set up through years in piecemeal response to local needs.

17. Under present system, Washington has nine bosses: District Commissioners; Bureau of the Budget; House Appropriations Commitee, 45 members; Senate Appropriations Committee, 21 members; House District Committee, 25 members; Senate District Committee, 13 members; conference committees on District of Columbia appropriation bills; Congress; President of the United States.

18. Under the Auchincloss-Kefauver bill, it would have one boss—a city manager—who would be responsible to an elected District Council which would be the governing body of the city.

19. Federal interests would be safeguarded under home rule:

(a) Via constant oversight of District affairs by the District committees.

(b) Via the power of Congress to disapprove District legislation.

(c) Via the power of the President to veto District legislation.

(d) Via the right of Congress to amend or annul the charter at any time.

20. The home-rule charter would become effective only after approval by a majority of District voters in a popular referendum.

21. Voting rights of District residents in their native States would not be jeopardized—100,000 local residents maintain legal domicile in the States.

22. The proposed qualifications for voting in District elections are the same as those which prevail throughout the country: citizenship, age, residence.

23. Nonpartisan local elections will prevent any national political organization from capturing control of the local government.

24. Home rule will restore local self-government here after lapse of 75 years.

25. The Auchincloss-Kefauver bill is not perfect, but it grants as much home rule as the Constitution permits.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The overwhelming majority of the people of the District of Columbia do not want this so-called home rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Resolution on Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the House to the following resolution on genocide, adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, on February 3, 1950, at its Miami, Fla., session. I sincerely hope that our colleagues in the other body of this Congress will lose no time in ratifying the Genocide Convention of the United Nations.

RESOLUTION ON GENOCIDE ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE A. F. OF L.

The crime of genocide, which is the intentional destruction of national, racial, and religious groups, is a blot on our civilization and a serious threat to social security and international peace. It not only destroys life, but it also prevents life. Further toleration of this crime is a grave threat to our civilization.

The American Federation of Labor realizes that because of the required two-thirds majority in the United Nations Assembly it was impossible to include the destruction of political groups in the convention. However, the text of the convention as it now stands does not limit the scope of motivations on the part of the offender and, even if the crime were committed for political or economic reasons, it would be punishable under the convention.

International treaties are a result of negotiations, and, therefore, this treaty can be considered as a necessary instrument for establishing standards of human decency in the world. Article II of the convention, which speaks of the creation of conditions of life calculated to destroy national, racial, and religious groups, covers the problems of enslavement of members of these groups in concentration and slave-labor camps. In these camps labor has been transformed into an instrumentality of death. The American Federation of Labor, which took the initiative in placing the slave-labor problem before the United Nations, considers this convention as an important first step toward providing international sanctions against the destruction of life through slave labor.

Though the crime of genocide has in recent years been most gruesomely perpetrated by the Nazis, it is not limited to any particular country or nation. It is a criminal menace of world-wide implications. It has been committed in the mountains of Greece, in the Balkans, in Siberia, and in the Baltic lands. More recently mankind has witnessed a new form of this monstrous crime. We are now face to face with tragic extension and a frightening innovation in this crime of mass murder. This development only puts into painful relief the growing menace to humanity and the extreme urgency to take effective action against it.

Behind the iron curtain—and particularly in Soviet Russia—governmental authorities have developed a fiendish plan based on cultural grounds and have launched a terrific compaign to wipe out entire groups of their population. The new drive to make impossible the continued existence of Jews in Russia and in its satellite areas is going on under the flag of a savage war against so-called cosmopolitanism. Their crime is that they have, or might develop, a culture different from the ultranationalist and imperialist brand supported by the ruling party, by the totalitarian dictatorship, in Russia.

A vicious campaign is afoot to chase out all Jews from employment in occupations entailing contact with the mass of people in the U. S. S. R. or with the people of other countries. All citizens of Jewish origin have been eliminated from the Soviet occupation administration in Austria and Germany. Jews are no longer permitted to be members of Soviet delegations and foreign missions or to undergo training for diplomatic service. The door to employment in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade has been slammed hard in the face of Russia's Jews—on cultural grounds. The same process of elimination of Jews continues ruthlessly in the ranks of the ruling Communist Party and its government apparatus.

We must keep in mind that in countries where one party has a monopoly of all political power and where the government dictatorship is the sole employer, such cultural pogroms against intellectuals and their followers mean virtually the sentencing of these individual human beings to death—by enforcing conditions which make life impossible, by ostracizing them and depriving them of all means of livelihood.

Here is terrifying confirmation of the fact that prompt international action to check the spread and stop the perpetration of this heinous crime is most urgent. Otherwise, humanity is likely to be confronted by still

more new manifestations and variants of genocide in various parts of the world.

In the light of the above tragic developments and urgent considerations, the American Federation of Labor appeals to the United States Senate to ratify promptly the Genocide Convention.

The Congress and the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at the legislative conference of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S HEALTH—HEALTH LEGISLATION IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

I should like to take this opportunity to tell you about what's going on in Washington with respect to the one thing that is more important to you than anything else in the world—your health and that of your family, of your neighbors, and of your community.

It's a subject as big as it is important. But, fortunately for your patience and my very well known dislike of speaking at length, there are a few short cuts we can take.

For one thing, I know I need not spend much time talking about why the Federal Government is active in the field of health. Some 20 years ago, perhaps, there would have been people insisting that it was entirely the business of the States and of local communities. Today, Republicans as well as Democrats—even Dixiecrats—are agreed that the Nation's health is very much the business of our Nation's Government.

We have learned that we Americans are a highly mobile people. With no iron curtains or immigration bars between the States, our people by the hundreds of thousands move from place to place throughout the country each year hunting better jobs, seeking greater opportunity, carrying on their business or just looking for rest and relaxation.

We have learned, too, that just as our people move about freely and in great numbers, so too, does disease disregard community borders and State boundaries. We know that the great cities of the country draw their people from the farms and rural areas of the Nation. We know that the health of city workers in large measure determines their ability to earn enough to buy the products of our farms. We know that the Nation's wealth depends on its people's health—that, in fact, our health is the basic source of all our wealth.

We know these things and we've learned, that, while the job of protecting our health must be carried out at the local level—in the States and in the local community—the States and their local governments cannot themselves finance necessary health measures. Their taxing powers are far too limited. Not even in the case of very wealthy States, can they effectively carry on separate and uncoordinated programs.

We know, that just as disease recognizes no boundaries, recognizes neither State lines nor differences between rich and poor, so too must the battle against illness and disease and against the wrecked hopes and broken homes they leave in their wake, be national in scope. Our country's strength is in the health of our people.

We are all agreed that the Congress should concern itself with health problems. The fact that today such conservative Republican stalwarts as TAFT, of Ohio, and DONNELL, of Missouri, as well as the so-called liberal Republicans like MORSE, of Oregon, and AIKEN, of Vermont, all sponsor national health bills proves the point. It's true that, as usual, they were some 10 years behind the Democrats in learning about the country's needs. But I'm glad they have learned, glad that now we have bipartisan recognition of the fact that we have health problems, that these problems are national in scope, that they call for action on the national level.

To a great extent, we are also agreed as to what those problems are. Briefly put, they involve problems of preventing disease as well as curing it. Problems of getting enough doctors and dentists and nurses and other health personnel to meet the needs of our people. Problems of having the hospitals and clinics in the places where they're needed. And, given enough doctors, nurses, hospitals, and clinics, the great big problem of seeing to it that people are able to use them—are able to afford their services. Those are the problems. Throughout the Nation and in the Congress there's pretty general agreement on them.

But after we've stated the problems, we've got to agree on solutions for them; we've got to do something about them. And it's at this point that you'd expect to find the Congress torn by conflict and argument—much talk and very little action.

Well—let me surprise you—and I'm sure I will surprise you: insofar as I've seen newspapers and magazines writing about the Eighty-first Congress and health legislation, it's been in terms of conflict. There have been headlines and full-page spreads telling about how Republicans have damned the Truman health program as socialized medicine. There have been others about how Democrats label the Taft health bill, charity medical care, and state medicine on the Russian model. And those headlines have been true.

But have you seen any headlines telling you that the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress has worked a miracle when it comes to health legislation? Do you know that four parts of the seven-point Truman health program have already passed the Senate? Have you been told that in one session of this Democratic Eighty-first Congress we have passed not one but five major health bills?

I'm sure you haven't. In earlier Congresses, any one of these bills would have meant impassioned argument and much oratory. Its passage would have been looked upon as a major accomplishment. In the Eighty-first Congress not only did we pass five bills of major importance to the health of the Nation, but each one passed the Senate unanimously, without a single dissenting vote.

That's what should have been in the headlines. Those bills, if they pass the House of Representatives, are going to mean the difference between life and death to tens of thousands of Americans. Because they are important in themselves; because the manner in which we reached agreement on them has an important bearing on the argument over health insurance, and because I am very proud of the fact that I had something to do with the passage by the Senate of those five bills, I want to tell you about them—about what they are, what they can mean to America, and about what they will cost.

One of these bills—the school health services bill—will make it possible for every State to assure all needed health services to its school children. A second bill—the Public Health Units Act—makes possible public health services everywhere in the Nation. The third bill extends the Hospital Construction Act for 5 years and doubles its funds so that every community in need of hospital facilities can have them built if it can support them. The fourth bill creates two great institutes of research into the causes of and cures for arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, multiple sclerosis, palsy, and epilepsy. It is based on the fact that spending millions year after year to halt the spread of disease, to care for its victims and to provide relief for stricken families, without at the same time trying to find out what causes these diseases and how they can be cured, is completely illogical. Yet that is just what we as a Nation have been doing. Arthritis and rheumatism alone cost our people $100,000,000 a year for medical care, $120,000,000 a year for relief, and about $500,000,000 a year in wages lost. Yet we have been spending less than 3 cents per case of illness to find its cause and cure. That's why we want to add these institutes of research to those now operating in the fields of polio and cancer and mental illness.

The fifth bill we passed—and again I remind you that each of them passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote—was for urgently needed financial aid to medical, dental, public health, and nursing schools. A bill which, after the most thorough investigation, the Senate found was essential if we are to keep in existence the schools on which the entire Nation relies to provide us with the skilled men and women to whom we turn for aid in times of illness.

What do these five bills already passed by the Senate in the Democratically controlled Eighty-first Congress mean? Taken together and assuming that they will be passed by the House of Representatives, these bills can mean an America none of whose children need grow into adult life with physical or mental defects which could have been prevented or corrected. They can mean that every community in the land can have those protective and preventive public health services which have wiped out some diseases, halted the spread of others, and added years to the span of life. They can mean that people in rural areas and people living in the less wealthy sections of the country can have available that same network of related hospital services which in wealthier places has often meant the difference between life and death. These bills can mean an end to the financial disaster now threatening to overtake many of the schools on which we rely to turn out physicians and surgeons, dentists and nurses for the country—a danger which is nonetheless real even though few people now know about it. Finally, these bills can mean the establishment by the Congress of a definite and badly needed policy in the field of health; a policy under which we shall no longer think our work done when we provide relief and medical care and makeshift jobs for the millions maimed by blindness and palsy, by sclerosis, epilepsy, arthritis, rheumatism and other diseases; a policy under which, while we continue to care for those struck down, we shall also do that which is much more important—we shall mobilize the best brains in the country, provide them with the laboratories and the clinics they need, and put them to work to find the causes and cures for these dread diseases.

WHAT WILL THEY COST?

Those are the things the five major health bills we've passed in the Senate can mean to you and me and this country of ours.

But what will they cost? That's not a question which will be asked by anyone suffering from the diseases I've mentioned. It won't be asked by a mother whose child has died because there wasn't an adequate hos-

pital nearby. Nor will it be asked by a young husband whose wife has been taken from him and from their children because doctors didn't know what caused her disease or how to cure it. Those people won't ask what this kind of legislation costs—and don't forget that sooner or later you and you and you and I will be one of those who will want the hospital, need the doctors, and pray that they have the answers. We won't worry about the cost either then.

But right now some people want to know—particularly one of our Minnesota editors who gets great pleasure out of adding up the total costs of the bills HUBERT HUMPHREY sponsors and implying that I'm out to bankrupt the country.

Well, in all seriousness, it's a good question. It's an honest one and one that calls for an answer. What will it cost to provide the health services in these five bills which the Senate has unanimously decided the Nation needs and can afford?

As a serious answer to a serious question I'm going to give you an answer that may sound contradictory at first. But it's not. And you'll see why. Those five bills will call for an expenditure of slightly over $300,000,000 a year, but I'm convinced that they won't cost us a penny.

Our editor friend would say they will cost $300,000,000 a year. In his terms he's right and $300,000,000 is a figure not to be taken lightly—even though it breaks down to $2 for each of us.

But these are millions we cannot afford not to spend. We have spent and we are planning to spend billions—billions not millions—to create one single instrument of death and destruction to be used in a war which we hope will not come. These health millions—millions not billions—are needed to fight a war which is already upon us—a war against disease and illness which is regularly killing and maiming millions of our people.

Now let's talk about costs in my terms rather than the editor's. When I put out a dollar and get back two—which doesn't happen very often—I don't say the transaction costs me a dollar. I say I've made a dollar. Similarly I say that these health bills won't cost us a cent—that if we spend two dollars apiece on them we'll be making money.

The spread of hospital services and of preventive medicine, the presence of doctors and nurses when and where they are needed, the emphasis on prevention rather than treatment of illness means lives saved. And that means greater productivity. It means we can cut down some of the 600,000,000 man-days lost to industry every year through illness. And that means greater wealth. It means thousands and thousands of families remaining sturdy, productive, wealth-making units of our economy instead of becoming relief-receiving burdens on local taxpayers for many years. It means saving, Mr. Editor, not spending—saving dollars if that's your concern—but saving lives and families and human happiness as well—and that's my concern. After all that's what this Government was set up for, "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," Mr. Editor—not the pursuit of the almighty dollar.

Well, now you've heard what we've done about health legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. And I know you're interested in what's been left undone—in the unfinished business before the Senate—particularly in what's supposed to be the great battle over national health insurance. Certainly the doctors of Minnesota are interested. But there really isn't any great battle. Republicans and Democrats aren't really at each other's throats. They're not really spending all their time in the Senate shouting socialized medicine at one another. Let me tell you how the Senate passed these other important health bills unanimously; how it happened that Senators TAFT of Ohio and HUMPHREY of Minnesota who disagree completely on so many other things were both able to put their names on these five bills along with such other political enemies as Republican Senators DONNELL, SMITH, MORSE, and AIKEN and Democratic Senators THOMAS of Utah, MURRAY, PEPPER, HILL, WITHERS, and DOUGLAS. Those are the Senators all of whose names appear as joint sponsors of the five health bills. That is the entire membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate—the committee which handles health legislation.

You've all been taught that when the lion and the lamb lie down together the millenium will have arrived. Well, let me tell you, that when Senator TAFT is found lying down in the same legislative bed as Senator HUMPHREY and Senator MURRAY, it is not one whit less significant.

In effect what this means is that health legislation which used to be highly controversial in every aspect has in large measure been lifted out of the realm of politics. Credit for this achievement belongs for the most part to the voters of America. They have made it very clear that they regard health as a very important subject and they have in no uncertain terms insisted that something be done about it. Even the Republican elephant with one ear tuned to Wall Street and the other to Colonel McCormick and the Chicago Tribune could not remain deaf. And when that happens in a particular field, statesmanship eventually replaces politics. But the American people must give a great deal of credit for expediting the process to Senator THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to Senator MURRAY of Montana, chairman of its subcommittee on health, and to all those older members of the committee who laid aside their profound differences of opinion on other matters when they took up health legislation. These men devoted long hours, day after day for many months to working out the details of these bills even though they knew that by working together on a bipartisan basis, their work would lack the glamor and spice which means headlines and political prominence. After they had heard representatives of the public and of the professions, they closed the doors to newspapermen, called in professional and technical experts and buckled down to work. By keeping at it and by keeping their initial differences of opinion out of the papers, they found that those differences represented either misunderstandings which disappeared of themselves or minor differences which in an atmosphere of mutual respect could easily be compromised. The result was that each of these health bills was brought out on the floor of the Senate and when it was seen that they were sponsored by every member of the committee, Senators knew that each bill represented a real need for action, that it was soundly drawn and economically planned, and that it would work well in action. Consequently, each bill passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote.

That's the way your Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has worked in the last year. That's the way it's working now, and that is the way we intend to keep on working on the problems of the Nation's health. It doesn't make for headlines but it does mean lives.

Now I've said all those fine things about that particular committee even though I'm a member of it myself and it could be embarrassing. I said it partly because you and I know that I'm a new member and that, while I'm proud to be on that team and to have helped write and pass those bills, the credit goes primarily to those Senators who, because of their seniority, made the decisions as to how it would work. I said it mostly because when we talk about the big unsolved problems of medical care it's very important that the doctors of Minnesota and of the Nation realize how far along we've come and the atmosphere in which we're working. Now let's turn our attention to those unsolved problems.

When the Eighty-first Congress got under way there were eight fields of health which presented serious problems. In five of these the Senate can consider its work done and done well. But there are three other fields in which action should be taken if we are to round out our program for the Nation's health. One of these is in the field of rural health. It's true, of course, that the bills we've already talked about are going to mean a great deal to farming communities. But conditions in rural areas are such that special action must be taken to make it possible for doctors to make a good living in isolated areas and for farming communities to afford the kinds of medical centers and laboratory facilities that modern medicine demands. That's another one of the seven points in the Truman health program—one of the seven titles in the administration's health bill and one on which I've introduced a separate bill worked out with our Minnesota cooperatives and designed to help them create the farmer's health cooperatives which we think may solve the problem. Since in this field, too, members of the committee are working in harmony, there is an excellent chance that we will have worked out and sent to the Senate before the close of this session a rural health bill on which we can all agree.

Another field on which we anticipate action involves special programs for maternal and child care. We don't like the fact that three times as many mothers die in childbirth in some States as in others. We don't like the fact that 60 percent of the doctors specially trained to take care of infants and children live in places where only 4 percent of the children are found. We don't think the American people like these things either and we hope to find a way to do something about them.

PAYING FOR MEDICAL CARE

The last and the greatest of the problems in health legislation on which the Senate has still to act is the one that is probably of greatest interest to everyone here—the problem of paying for medical care. It is around this point that all the sound and fury has centered—around this question that the argument over health insurance has raged for years. But as I said before and as I now repeat, in Washington the great battle over national health insurance is all over. The battle has been won. The American people have won. The Democratic Party has won. There is no longer any question as to whether or not we're going to have a national health insurance program in these United States. We are going to. The only questions that remain involve details as to how far we should go, how fast we shall go, and along what lines we shall proceed.

Let me explain by briefly reviewing the history of the battle which I insist is now over.

To all intents and purposes the battle began when the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care brought out its report back in the early 1930's. That committee composed of distinguished leaders in American life and headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur—a former president of the American Medical Association and Secretary of Commerce in President Hoover's Cabinet—studied the problem for some 5 years. It found that while American medical care was among the best in the world, most Americans could not afford it. It found that doctors quite naturally concentrated in areas of greatest wealth while sick people naturally were somewhere else. It found that whereas the wealthy got the greatest amount of medical care, the middle classes and the poor needed it most. It found that the root of the problem lay in the facts that with each advance

in the science of medicine medical care grew more expensive and that since sickness was unpredictable none but the wealthiest families could budget the cost of illness. And having proved what the average family had always known, it recommended health insurance as the answer. Not compulsory health insurance, not national health insurance. Just local voluntary health insurance plans.

The storm broke immediately. Dr. Fishbein, speaking for the American Medical Association, denounced the idea. He insisted that it would lower the quality of medical care, that it would regiment the doctors, and he proclaimed that advocacy of voluntary health insurance was—I quote—"communistic, socialistic, and inciting to revolution."

The AMA's Bureau of Medical Economics actually studied the problem instead of frothing at the mouth. It concluded that it did not want either voluntary or compulsory health insurance. But it said that if we were to have either we might as well avoid the mistakes European countries had made in trying voluntary plans and establish a compulsory system immediately. Here's what the AMA's Bureau said of voluntary plans—again I quote—"without some sort of compulsion, voluntary insurance fails of its objective. The young and healthy will not join and the aged and sickly, if accepted, will raise the cost to a prohibitive point and, if rejected, remove protection from those most in need"—unquote.

Well, despite the AMA, facts were facts. With hospital beds going empty and hospital treasuries going broke while lots of people needed their services, the hospitals risked inciting to revolution and set up the Blue Cross system.

The results proved that the AMA was mostly wrong and partly right. Dr. Fishbein was completely wrong. The quality of hospital care was improved rather than lessened. Instead of being regimented, doctors had greater freedom than before—for any patient who had Blue Cross insurance the doctor was free to prescribe hospitalization when it was needed instead of having his treatment regimented by the size of the patient's pocketbook. And I don't think even Dr. Fishbein any longer believes that the men who run our Blue Cross plans are Communists or Socialists.

But the AMA's bureau of economics was partly right. In order to stay on a sound financial basis, to keep from being swamped with poor risks the voluntary plans had to protect themselves. The old and the sick could join—if at all—only if they were members of large and healthy groups, contracts had to be limited and charges had to be high enough to pay the bills. Perhaps the greatest drawback was and is the fact that they have to charge all members at the same rate. If it costs a $100 a year for a family to belong to a fairly comprehensive voluntary plan that means that a family with $5,000 pays 2 percent of its income, but a family with only $1,000 has to pay 10 percent; just the opposite of what the doctors, the hospitals and the people want.

As a result of all these factors our voluntary hospital plans while they have done an excellent job within their limitations, cost too much and can give too little. Our Blue Cross plans which are excellently managed and run still reach only 40,000,000 people—over a 100,000,000 Americans do not have or cannot afford Blue Cross protection even though it is sold at cost and only covers about 20 percent of the average family's medical care bill. And the great bulk of those members are concentrated in a few industrial States. The Blue Shield plans for physicians' care set up by medical societies after they got religion, are far more limited both in the services they offer and in the number of people they reach. In fact all the figures available in Washington show that no more than 3,500,000 of our people are enrolled in the kind of comprehensive health insurance plans that pay for almost all of their care and that includes the preventive medical care which aims at keeping people well instead of treating them only after they are seriously ill. In this connection I wonder how many of my doctor friends have ever asked themselves why it is that the plans which are run by lay, cooperative groups like Group Health in Washington or by industrialists like Henry Kaiser give really comprehensive care and keep a check on the quality of service rendered while the plans run by medical societies offer very limited service and no controls whatever of the quality of the care rendered?

In our own State of Minnesota which is far from being one of the poorer States of the Nation, our Blue Cross plan is one of the best in the country—both in terms of the service it offers and in terms of efficient operation. Even here, however, while it does not pay the entire bill for hospital services and does not permit people over 65 to enroll it costs a family $48 a year for its best coverage and according to the latest figures I have available hasn't yet enrolled 35 percent of our people.

Those are the highlights of the health-insurance picture as it has developed here in America. You'll notice that somewhere along the line the big fight by the AMA against voluntary health-insurance plans disappeared. The AMA suddenly decided that they were not communistic, but were fine things—so long as they were completely controlled by the medical societies, of course. You won't be surprised when I tell you that the AMA's change of heart coincided with the introduction of a national health bill in the Congress in 1939.

It was Senator Wagner who took the lead. Strangely enough his first bill was very similar to the one now being urged by Senator TAFT—but then the Republican elephant usually lurches along more than 10 years behind the times. In 1943, the first Wagner-Murary-Dingell bill calling for a national health-insurance plan was introduced and the fight really grew hot. The AMA and the Republican Party insisted that everything was fine; that all Americans could get all they needed; that if anything at all should be done it should be done by the States. But the American people recognized that stalling tactic. It's 40 years since workmen's compensation got under way in this country and we still don't have it in all 48 States. Year after year public hearings on national health insurance were held and testimony taken from people in all walks of life. The AMA continued its opposition, refused to cooperate in framing acceptable legislation, and persuaded doctors to contribute millions to a viciously un-American outfit called the National Physicians' Committee, run by a couple of high-powered press agents whose tactics were so low that the AMA itself was finally forced to repudiate them. But the people whose health and whose money was at stake, made themselves heard. Bill Green, speaking for the AFL's 7,000,000 members, insisted on national health insurance as the answer and suggested improvements in the bill. Jim Carey spoke for the CIO's more than 6,000,000 and their 18,000,000 dependents. Great capitalists like Albert Lasker—one of America's richest men and a director of many corporations argued for it is the democratic way and as a barrier against communism. So too did the president of the Radio Corporation of America and Gerald Swope of General Electric Co.

Jim Patton argued for the Farmers Union and our own Cooperative Health Federation of America testified.

After each set of hearings, the bill was improved and the tide of public support swelled even further. Then when Senator TAFT, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, introduced his own National Health Act—even though it was a sorry substitute and was opposed by every single lay citizen's organization testifying—it became obvious that the fight was all but won. Even Senator TAFT and his colleagues, Republican Senators DONNELL and SMITH, had finally agreed that as regards paying for medical care (1) it is a real problem; (2) it is national in scope; and, (3) it demands action by the Federal Government.

Finally, when Harry Truman was reelected and the Eighty-first Congress met, the rush to put national health bills into the hopper proved that the fight was all over—the battle has been won.

(Incidentally, even the AMA now favors compulsory insurance, something which it always claimed was un-American. The AMA has agreed with us that when a group believes something is necessary for its welfare but that something is too expensive for one member to bear the burden and voluntary participation doesn't bring in enough funds, participation should be made compulsory. Therefore the AMA has made it compulsory that all members pay a premium of $25 a year into an insurance fund out of which it will pay $100,000 a year to two high-pressure salesmen and give them $3,000,000 to spend in fighting these health bills. The AMA advocates compulsory insurance to fight compulsory health insurance. And I want it understood that I think they have a perfect right to do so. I suggest though that if the principle is all right for the AMA, it's O. K. for the American people too, and I don't expect to hear the AMA ever again say that it isn't.)

We now have five national health bills before us in the Senate; there are still others in the House. All five of the Republican members of the committee which is responsible for health legislation are sponsors of one or another bill. Two other Republicans—FLANDERS of Vermont and IVES of New York—are sponsoring a bill. Seven of the eight Democrats on the committee are sponsoring national health bills and the eighth is busy drafting his own. Moreover, just within the last few weeks Senator HUNT, of Wyoming, a conservative Democrat and a dentist himself, has publicly stated that the Federal Government must do something to enable the American people to cope with the costs of medical care and has introduced his own national health insurance bill.

To all but the willfully blind these developments mean but one thing, we are—and in a very short time—going to have a national health program. And since every one of these bills looks upon health insurance as the answer to the problem, we are going to have a national health insurance program of one sort or another. That's not prophecy, it's fact, and it's a very important fact to my many friends in the medical profession who are here today.

What sort of program? That does call for prophecy. We have five bills before us in the Senate. At one end of the line there's the Taft bill. Very briefly put, it would give grants from the Federal Treasury to the States to provide care for all who cannot themselves pay in full for their care. I find it completely unacceptable and so did all the representatives of the public. First, because it pretends to solve a problem affecting 80 percent of our people but provides only enough for about 10 percent. Secondly, because it depends entirely on funds from the Treasury and permits the exclusive use of State employed doctors in State clinics.

I could give many other objections, but my third is conclusive enough for me—the Taft bill would help solve the problems only of those American families so desperate that they would be willing to publicly ask for charity. Charity is one of the heavenly virtues, it is true, but to ask 80 percent of the American people to depend on public charity

as a solution to their problems is as repugnant to them as it is to me.

A second bill—S. 1456—is sponsored by three Republicans and three Democrats. It is much better than the first but follows the same lines and puts no limit on the amount of tax funds which might be used. Moreover, it would turn public funds over to private, professionally controlled, monopolistic groups to the exclusion of other groups.

A third bill—the so-called Flanders-Ives bill—represents a long step forward. It would use voluntary plans and supplement them by using Federal funds to make up the difference between what they cost and what participants can afford to pay. It rejects the charity principle and accepts the insurance principle of the President's plan. It rightly insists that no local plan would be eligible unless control was vested in the hands of the public. But while this bill does represent a long step forward, I do not believe it goes far enough to solve the problem, and, in addition, it contains several very serious flaws which, if unchanged, would make its operation very risky.

The fourth bill—Senator HUNT'S—has been introduced too recently for extended comment. All I can say about it now is that it is the only one of the five which seems to make no provision for the continuance of voluntary plans and that it is written in such general terms that I am not at all clear on how it is supposed to work.

The fifth bill is, of course, the administration's national health insurance bill. It is, as you know, S. 1679, and it contains seven titles, four of which have already passed the Senate. Since to my mind it goes much further toward meeting our national problem and does it in such a way as to advance the interests of all concerned, I am proud to have had the opportunity to join in sponsoring it. I am sure that most of you here know its provisions at least in general terms, and since it is not my purpose tonight to debate these bills I shall not attempt to review it.

What I want to do is to ask your help—particularly that of the professional people who are here—and if the rest of my friends will bear with me, I should like for the next few minutes to talk directly to the physicians and the dentists and the nurses of Minnesota.

I want to say again that the Congress of the United States is going to pass a national health plan in the near future. We have five bills before us now and I've tried to explain what that means. I've told you how the members of our committee have worked together on other bills and I want you to know that we are now working in the same way on these bills. We know the people want an answer and we are determined to make it as sound an answer as possible. Right now, in Washington, our staff is studying all the voluntary health plans in the Nation. We want to find out if they should play a role in a national health program; and if so, what kind of plans and to what extent. We want the answers to this and a host of other problems in order that we may draft a bill which means as much to you as to the people who seek your services. We've had the advice and assistance of farm organizations, of cooperatives, of labor groups of social workers, statisticians, and public-health people. They've consulted with us and we know they will again. But from the organizations of professional people who have so much at stake in this legislation we have received nothing constructive at all—nothing but opposition. I learned in Washington that early in 1946 Senator MURRAY had written the AMA—had asked its representatives to come to Washington, to go over his bill, and to point out anything in it that could possibly do damage to you, either professionally, politically, or economically. He had not asked support—only for constructive criticism. I cannot tell you how shocked I was to learn that your officers did not even have the courtesy to reply. They waited until the election of 1946 showed a Republican Congress elected and decided that the medical-care problems of the American people had disappeared and that even courtesy was no longer necessary.

I want to tell you that the time for that sort of blindness is past. The American people need and want, and are going to have, a national health program. If when that program goes into effect there is anything in it which hurts you in any way, it will be because of criminal negligence on the part of your organizations. It will not be the fault of the American people or of the men who draft the law. We do not believe we can have a sound health program unless it is as sound for you as it is for us.

I believe the American people want a plan that will enable them to purchase health care on a decent, self-respecting, pay-as-you-go basis. They want a plan that will enable them to use your services when and as needed—at your discretion. They want to pay in proportion to their incomes and they want the Government to add enough so that you get paid well and with plenty of incentive. They're thinking of you as well as of themselves because they and we, your representatives in Congress, know that we want the best medical care possible and that we can get it only from people who are free and happy in their professions.

Without your help we have tried painstakingly to protect your interests in drafting the administration's bill. We've not only guaranteed the patient complete freedom to choose or change his doctor but we've guaranteed you complete freedom too. It's spelled out in the bill. You are free to enter the plan or not, or to enter it on a part-time basis if you so choose. If you do enter you are free to accept or reject patients just as now. In each community doctors can decide for themselves on what basis they would like to be paid. You can engage in group or solo practice as you will. You are represented on all local plans and at the State and National level by men of your own choosing. And the bill guarantees that professional matters shall be decided upon only by professional men.

Without your assistance we have tried to give you every just and equitable assurance. But we should have your help. I don't mean the sponsors of S. 1679 alone and I don't mean help in passing a bill. I do mean that since one of the bills before us or a variation of one is going to pass, your officers owe an obligation to you and to the Nation to see to it that should a bill pass even over their objections, it protects your interests as well as is humanly possible.

I am asking you—pleading with you—to recognize your obligations to the future of your professions and of the Nation of which you are citizens. As individuals I know you do, but when your organizations speak for you, they do not—and they are your organizations.

The American people have granted you your licenses to practice.

The American people have said that no one shall compete with you.

The American people have invested $40,000 of their money for every one of you doctors in order that you might have hospitals in which to work without cost to you.

The American people have invested thousands more in the professional training each of you receive.

Having done these things and more, the American people with all their respect for you as men and women of science and as friends, are not going to permit your organizations to tell them that they have nothing to say about the manner in which they shall pay your bills.

That's why I am asking that before it's too late you stop listening to those venal men who make their fortunes by urging you to fight every proposal and charging you for the privilege of carrying on the fight. Forget the scare words like "socialism" and "welfare state." Use the same scientific approach to economic and political problems as you would in investigating a purportedly new remedy for disease. This Government which the firm of Whitaker & Baxter and the AMA want you always to fight—which they want you to fear—is your Government. It belongs to and is run by you and your neighbors. It's the Government of the United States of America and of its people. That's the Government the Journal of the AMA is talking about when it says the Government wants to regiment you, to destroy your livelihood, to ruin your profession. That sort of talk is nonsense and right now for you it's dangerous nonsense.

Those of us who serve your Government in the Congress are not ogres. We're elected by you and your neighbors. We want to work for and with you—not against you. And in the field of health this is particularly true. The people tell us what their needs are—we should have your help in getting it for them.

Read the health bills in the Congress. Don't let anyone tell you glibly what they would mean or do to you. Read them. Put your finger on any line or lines you think bad or harmful. Call them to our attention. Either we can explain why they are there and how they are good, rather than bad, or we'll change them. No one of the sponsors of the national health insurance bill thinks he has a perfect bill. Not a single Senator sponsoring any of the other bills thinks his is perfect—I know I can speak for them all.

We do think that American medical care is among the best in the world. But we know that too many Americans can't afford it under our present system of payment. We want to change not the practice of medicine, but only the way in which we pay for it. The people of this country are demanding a change and, with or without your help, we're going to give it to them. Without your help we won't do as well and you may inadvertently and unnecessarily suffer. With your help we should have no problem reaching a solution satisfactory to all.

For myself, for the Congress, and for the people of your country, I ask that help. I can pledge you our good faith—completely. Will you extend to us a little?

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a resolution endorsing House Resolution 463, to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, which I have introduced and which is receiving widespread support from many Americans.

NEW YORK SOCIETY FOR THE
CITY OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, February 28, 1950.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At a duly organized regular meeting of the New York Society for the

City of New York, Inc., held at the Hotel Edison, Floral Room, on February 14, 1950, a short business session was held to provide time for our featured guest speaker, Hon. John J. Fitzsimmons, chairman of our board of governors, who gave to the body a minute description of his recent trip to Ireland, which must have left on his memory a lasting impression, since no notes were in evidence.

Also read to the body was a copy of the resolution, House Resolution 463, Eighty-first Congress, second session, as presented in the House of Representatives by Congressman JAVITS, February 7, 1950, and referred to Committee on Foreign Affairs, a resolution to encourage a peaceful, prosperous and united Ireland, but without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people.

On motion duly seconded the body resolved to adopt unanimously, and endorse said resolution as part of its minutes and incorporate same therein. Further resolved that a copy of this endorsement be filed with the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. FLANAGAN, *Secretary.*

Blind Legal Stupidity Rides to a Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the days pass by many reports are being made of acute coal shortages in different parts of the Nation. One segment of reactionaries seek to blame President Truman because the miners and mine owners cannot agree upon a settlement of their wage disputes, while another segment of the same political brood put the blame upon John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers Union. Never once have I heard the mine owners and operators and their organizations and other hand and glove cohorts of this type of big business blamed in the slightest for the present shortage of coal.

Those who speak out so boldly in the Congress against our President and his administration, and John L. Lewis and the coal miners, in their loud and demanding way, for the putting into execution of the Taft-Hartley law, whether that law can be presently applied or not, have reached almost the fanatical stage.

Today a United States district court judge, Richmond B. Keech, in Washington, by his decision brought forth a very self-evident legal truth known to everyone but these reactionaries, that the fact that you have the Taft-Hartley law is not all that you need to get the desired results, but you also need evidence to support the charge brought under that law. To start either a civil or a criminal action without sufficient evidence is about as unavailing as the irresponsible conversation of these clamorers reduced to writing and presented to a court to take action upon.

As soon as the decision of this court became known today a stunning silence came over these lusty critics, but they were quick on the recovery and in an effort to save face blamed the Department of Justice for not getting the necessary evidence, and presenting it to the court. May I ask these men what evidence do they know of which was not presented? Their perplexed ingenuity may prompt them to furnish an answer to the question which neither they nor anyone else could or should believe.

President Truman was right that this was a case which required that the Government should proceed with caution, and be sure of its ground and not go off prematurely or half-cocked like these men always seem to me to do. Nothing hurts a cause worse than to end up on the losing side, and that generally is what always happens when you have the short end of the stick.

When you shoot at a mark and miss it, do not blame the mark but blame yourself. My father stated it correctly when he said that he never heard of a poor shoveler having a good shovel. These poor shovelers think that the public will believe their ill-conceived excuse, but the public just is not that gullible yet.

What kind of a case could the prosecution present? Just a case based solely on circumstantial evidence. The high lights of that proof were these: The men who refused to work belonged to a union. John L. Lewis was the head of that union. Heretofore these men had always refused to work without a contract, but for months in an effort to settle their differences they did work without a contract. When all of their efforts to secure a contract seemed to be futile they worked 3 days a week for quite a long time. The individual tempers of John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers became so aroused that they ceased all work. The squeeze was upon the public. The President was forced to consent to court action and two restraining orders issued. John L. Lewis gave the greatest circulation to two telegrams and one letter urging the men for their sake and the sake of their union to obey the restraining orders and go back to work. These individually infuriated men refused to obey their leader and their union. A grave legal question arises as to whether or not men acting spontaneously and individually can be forced into involuntary servitude in the light of our Constitution and its pertinent amendments, and the legal law of the land, but there was no need of a court to decide that question if the evidence presented was insufficient.

It is a very well established rule of law in our country and that rule of law applies to civil as well as criminal cases, that proof made by circumstantial evidence alone in order to be legally sufficient must be so strong, clear and convincing as to exclude every reasonable hypothesis other than guilt. In a proper case circumstantial evidence may be just as good evidence as direct testimony but it must be so strong, clear, and convincing that every reasonable theory other than that sought to be proved by the prosecution must have been eliminated.

No the case was dangerously weak and its trial has done much harm. It will encourage rather than discourage the miners to stop digging coal. The blame for the situation with which we are confronted today rests squarely upon the legally awkward shoulders of men who can make loud noisy demands for action when a working brain would bide the time until a case could be proved legally in court.

The only thing left for the Congress to do now is to pass legislation to seize the coal mines, and to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, and put in its place a law which will be fair to both labor and management—a law which will make today's cruel and smug management bargain in good faith again collectively with labor. I know of no greater way to drive this country into communism than to have these selfish, cruel, extreme right wingers sit ala Taft-Hartley-like across the table from the real producers of the Nation. They have had their day, and their day is over, and they had better realize it now before it is too late for them, and for all of us who believe in the Golden Rule instead of the Rule of Gold.

Everyone I am sure is anxious to know the real condition over the United States as far as coal shortage is concerned. As to conditions in Nebraska I submit the following United Press news item which appeared in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, on Tuesday, February 28, last:

NO REAL COAL EMERGENCY YET IN STATE

Nebraska scraped the bottom of the coal bin Monday, but a survey of principal cities showed no real emergency yet.

State officials said the situation was critical. They urged Nebraskans to economize on use of coal.

Spot checks around the State Monday morning indicated many cities and towns had only a few days' supply on hand.

Dealers, city and State officials believe the State will "get by" if the weather continues mild and nonunion coal mines in the South and West maintain the present "trickle of coal."

Substitution of gas and oil during the last few years for heating and industrial purposes staved off emergencies in many communities.

At Norfolk, the fuel dealers association secretary, Clarence Isaacson, reported dealers "don't know what they are going to do." He said conditions there were "critical."

At Alliance, city officials said they had just over a 2-week supply on hand and were considering a "brown-out" to relieve the critical situation at industrial plants.

Numerous cites reported a "hand-to-mouth" situation with dealers trading coal and consumers buying in basket quantities.

Here is a city-by-city report at 10 a. m. Monday:

Lincoln: Situation getting "rougher by the day" but no emergency. Stoker coal nonexistent. Some coal coming in from Oklahoma and Missouri mines.

Omaha: Dealer supplies very low but still adequate to take care of demand on limited scale. With favorable weather, city can get by if small shipments continue.

McCook: Coal almost gone; schools and other large buildings have converted to gas. Dealers report only small nut-type coal for small stoves in stock. Sustained cold weather would cause residence hardships.

Grand Island: Half city schools use coal and report enough for few days' operation. Cold snap could deplete school supply as well as many home supplies. Industries switching to gas.

Norfolk: School officials report 2 weeks' supply on hand if weather mild. Few cars of coal arrive every week from western mines

but only a drop in the bucket compared to need.

Hastings: Dealer supply ranges from few days to few weeks; many businesses and residents converted to gas past year. Most schools using gas.

Nebraska City: Not serious; most homes heat with gas. One dealer completely out of coal, others' small supplies believed sufficient for winter. The State blind school has a 2-week supply, public schools 1-month supply.

Falls City: "A week of cold weather and there's going to be some real suffering in Falls City," said the City Fuel Co. owner, Jake Norris. "If I let people have all they wanted, supply would go out in 3 or 4 days." Situation very serious, with school supply about 1 week, city generally, week or two.

Kearney: Serious, but heavy shift to gas since 1947 keeps major industries from being affected seriously. City schools and Kearney State College using gas; dealers cracking lump coal by hand for stoker use. Best estimate of city supply, 1 week.

Fairbury: Dealers able to supply emergency demand, but stocks running low and using stand-by supplies of stoker coal at city power plant.

Broken Bow: Natural and bottled gas available keeping situation from becoming serious. Two-week supply coal reported on hand by one dealer, others very short.

Alliance: City officials report 15-day supply on hand, "much shorter than our supply should be." One more week of shortage might force brown-out. City schools have less than week supply.

York: A York College spokesman said the school had only 3 or 4 days' supply of coal on hand with no immediate prospects of further deliveries.

Beatrice: Dealers report stocks 50 percent normal, stoker coal unavailable but otherwise city in pretty good shape, if mild weather continues. Schools use stoker coal and have little bit on hand.

Columbus: Situation not serious here. City schools received carload Friday and mild weather preserving school and community stocks.

Fremont: Utility officials estimate enough coal to last about 20 days if mild weather continues. The power company has turned over 250 tons to local dealers. One dealer has been bringing coal from Omaha, but reports he can get no more there. He reported Fremont could carry on normally about week or 10 days.

RFC Mining Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, prior to the Eightieth Congress there was in the RFC Act the so-called Mine Loan Section. In their haste to shrink the RFC and cover large amounts of its funds into the Treasury a number of changes were made in the act. One of the most ill-advised, to my way of thinking, was the repeal of section 14 which was done, I am sorry to say, with the collusion and consent of Mr. John Goodloe, then Chairman of the RFC.

Prior to 1940, section 14 covered only loans to producers of gold, silver, and tin. Realizing the trend of the times, Congress in 1940 expanded the loaning authority of all strategic and critical minerals and metals and this bit of foresight, Mr. Speaker, proved to be of incalculable value to the war effort. Millions of pounds of vital metals and minerals were made available to our country because of these mine loans and some important mines are still working which would never otherwise have been developed. Even though some of these loans could not be entirely repayed, the over-all net gain to the country must show a substantial profit from the operations so financed. This was realized by former Senator Charles B. Henderson, who for a long time headed the RFC. A Nevadan with a true feeling for mining, and especially for the small miner, he encouraged his mine loan divison to extend every possible help under the law and even resorted to the general wartime loan authority to expand the mine-loan activities.

Since the chairmanship of Mr. Henderson, the Corporation has looked with disfavor upon mine loans and curtailed its activities in every possible way. After successfully getting section 14 repealed on the assurance of RFC officials that mine loans could just as readily be granted under the regular business loan authority—that is, since 1948, mining men have found that assurance to have been a snare and a delusion. A few loans to coal mines have been granted and two or three to metal mines where hundreds used to be in process all the time. Practically no applications are received as mining men have found it a waste of time even to fill out the forms.

Before section 14 was repealed, there were several bills introduced to amend the language to liberalize the law and make the section more workable for post-war loans. I am reliably informed that strong representations were made by several Democratic Senators to the Republican chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that was handling RFC legislation in an attempt to get section 14 strengthened rather than repealed. In the face of hostile—perhaps the word is too strong, Mr. Speaker, and I should say in the face of an unsympathetic atmosphere in the RFC itself, the committee left out section 14 or any substitute therefor when it reported the committee bill and the mining industry has suffered ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time to tabulate here all the metals and minerals produced under RFC loans, but I do want to mention a few, covering the period from January 1, 1942, to March 31, 1949. Copper produced by development loan and general mining loan borrowers during the stated period reached the incredible figure of approximately 88,000,000 pounds, of which a million and a half pounds was produced in my State of Nevada. Lead amounted to nearly 83,000,000 pounds of which 2,500,000 pounds was produced in Nevada and zinc production under these loans was 150,500,000 pounds of which about 6,000,000 pounds came from Nevada. A score of other minerals participated in the program.

Mr. Speaker, much of this metal never would have seen the light of day had Congress not been foresighted enough to provide this program and had the RFC not been under a Chairman wise enough to see that it was properly implemented. Under the present set-up there still is a remnant of the old Mine Loan Section personnel supervising the liquidation of past loans and waiting hopefully for a new application to study. I understand that the gentlemen who service the RFC business loans confer with these mining men when there is occasion to do so, but the final decision is now in the hands of those who make the usual business loans under the general loan authority of the RFC.

Mining is a highly specialized business. It is too much to expect that the average man will be sympathetically inclined to mining loans, as the men who are used to examining the ordinary business-loan application simply do not understand and fit the miner into a strait-jacket of impossible terms and demands. That is why special legislation was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the administration continually is voicing the necessity for expanding our mineral resources, although it frowns upon every attempt of the Congress to aid private enterprise to do this very thing. As a western Democrat from a natural resource State, this, I must admit, puzzles me no end. I cannot understand why, for example, the RFC is not enthusiastic about the several mine-loan bills such as S. 497, which rest in the Banking and Currency Committees and gather dust there along with the adverse reports from the RFC, written by lawyers who know nothing about the problems involved, and signed by a chairman who has been beguiled into blindly following the precedent set by Goodloe. I would introduce a bill to amend the RFC Act to authorize mining loans, Mr. Speaker, but for two things—the bill would fall into the hands of the Banking and Currency Committee and be clipped to those already moldering there and it might put the Corporation to the trouble of thinking up still another excuse to recommend no action when I gather from the daily press their excuse is their department is already overworked in other directions.

I may, before long, ask the Mining Subcommittee of Public Lands, of which I have the honor to be a member, to look into this RFC mine-loan situation in some detail. At the very least I can request any committee which we may empower to investigate the RFC to make this one of their points of investigation. My mining people need encouragement, Mr. Speaker, as do miners all over this country. The Eighty-first Congress should repair the damage done by the Republican Eightieth Congress when it revised the RFC Act, and the chairman of that Corporation should make himself personally familiar with the situation instead of blindly following advisors who still are tainted with the prejudices of departed, but not forgotten predecessors.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious, I will persist in driving home

to my esteemed colleagues here that the national security, as well as the preservation of the economic balance of our country, demands that steps be taken to preserve, expand, and reinvigorate our domestic mining industry. The resumption of RFC loans to strategic and critical metal and mineral producers should be one of these steps.

Loan Value on Gum Naval Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution passed by the Senate of the State of Georgia in which it is asked that the loan value on gum naval stores be raised to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible under existing law for the Commodity Credit Corporation to support naval stores at 90 percent of parity. It is possible, however, for the support to be raised from its present 60-percent figure to 71 percent. A large group of Members of the House and Senate has met with the Secretary of Agriculture and other members of the Commodity Credit Corporation and asked that 71 percent of parity be announced as the loan-guaranty figure. As yet we have been unsuccessful in getting this done.

The following resolution accurately describes the situation existing in the naval stores belt:

Whereas the State of Georgia produces 65 percent of all gum naval-stores products of the entire world; and

Whereas the gum naval-stores workers and farmers of Georgia are facing bankruptcy and ruin because of action of the United States Department of Agriculture, which has set Government support of gum naval stores at 60 percent of parity for the year 1950; and

Whereas such action is unreasonable and arbitrary for the reason that in 1947 and 1948 Government support of gum naval stores was set at 90 percent of parity and during 1949 the same was set at 80 percent of parity; and

Whereas during the year 1950 the cost of production of gum naval stores will be from 20 to 35 percent higher than during the years 1947, 1948, and 1949; and

Whereas the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress, and Congressmen from the naval-stores belt arranged a meeting some weeks ago with the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, for the purpose of protesting the action of the United States Department of Agriculture, which set the Government's support of gum naval stores at 60 percent of parity, and to urge upon him the grave necessity for overruling this disastrous decision, and to fix the percentage of parity at 90 where it rightfully belongs; and

Whereas the turpentine farmers of this State and of the naval-stores belt will be unable to operate their business at the 60 percent of parity and compete with the increase in minimum wages recently put into effect, and continue to produce gum naval stores, which is vital to the defense of this country, and such a condition will cause hundreds of thousands of workers in this grave and vital industry to be thrown out of employment; and

Whereas such condition will seriously reduce the value of timberlands in this State and in the naval-stores belt and bring chaos to general business throughout this area, from which it will take years to recover; and

Whereas the continued well being of the gum naval-stores business is vital, not only to the workers and property owners of our own great State, but to the people and government of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, is hereby urgently requested to take such action as will alleviate an intolerable condition now faced by a large percentage of the people of Georgia and the naval-stores belt, and that he exercise the discretionary powers granted him by the Congress of the United States and fix Government support of gum naval stores at 90 percent of parity for the year 1950; be it further

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, is hereby urgently requested to immediately fix this percentage of parity for gum naval stores, so as to save the taxpayers of the United States approximately $8,000,000, and at the same time build up the stock pile of vital and strategic war materials for any emergency which may face this country, and which will save the turpentine farmers of Georgia and the naval-stores belt from releasing hundreds of thousands of workers and suffering great loss in the value of timberlands; and be it further

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress immediately exert their utmost efforts in bringing this pending condition to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and urging his immediate acceptance and approval of this matter which is of such grave importance to the people of this State, and other States in the naval-stores belt; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Georgia delegation in Congress, and to Hon. Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of the Senate.

John C. Calhoun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on John C. Calhoun, which was written by Miss Margaret L. Coit, West Newbury, Mass., and reviewed by Claude M. Fuess, retired headmaster of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. This article appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on Tuesday, February 28, 1950.

JOHN C. CALHOUN—SLAVERY WAS HIS CONTRADICTION

Miss Margaret L. Coit, now resident in West Newbury, has written what is certain to be one of the outstanding biographies of 1950—John C. Calhoun, American Portrait, published today by Houghton Mifflin Co.

Almost exactly 100 years ago Senator John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, worn out by "that long diseases, my life," died at the age of 68 in a pitifully bare room in Hill's boarding house, on the site of the present Supreme Court Building, in Washington. On March 4, 1850, he had dragged himself across the park to the Capitol and taken his place in the Senate Chamber while Senator Mason, of Virginia, read Calhoun's carefully prepared valedictory, described by Miss Coit as "the most powerful warning delivered by a southern leader before the Civil War." He was carried to his seat 3 days later to listen to Webster's magnificent Seventh of March Speech, which probably postponed the conflict by 10 years, thus ensuring the success of the North. Calhoun felt that the effect of Webster's words would be only temporary, and with this conviction he died early on the morning of Sunday, March 31, 1850, his eyes retaining their brightness till his last breath.

Miss Coit's biography is thus a very timely book, culminating in the debate over the omnibus bill of just a century ago. Furthermore, she has accomplished an amazing feat of revivification by presenting Calhoun as a human being. The earlier lives of the South Carolina statesman had treated him almost as an abstraction, a political philosopher without blood or vital organs, the embodiment of an idea to which everything else was sacrificed. Von Holst, writing in 1882, said of Calhoun: "We hear that he was a just and kind master to his slaves, that he was possessed of an uncommon conversational talent, and that he exercised an especial fascination upon young men. This is about all." Miss Coit, who is a literary artist, has removed this misconception. Now at last we feel that he was not a mummy but a man, as full of vitality and perversity as Andrew Jackson or Daniel Webster.

Calhoun married at 29 his cousin, Floride, 10 years younger, who brought him a modest fortune. "From almost her wedding night," says Miss Coit, "she was pregnant," and she bore her husband nine children. Unfortunately he was often away from home; indeed, of their 39 years of marriage he spent nearly 15 separated from his wife. While he was in Monroe's Cabinet, from 1817 to 1824, and later as Vice President he lived with her in Washington on the famous estate of Dumbarton Oaks, entertaining on a lavish scale. Later, however, he found himself in financial difficulties and was obliged to leave Floride on their plantation, Fort Hill, where she was lonely and dissatisfied.

Says Miss Coit, "with the one exception of Mary Todd Lincoln, there is no more baffling or stormy figure among all the historical American wives than Floride Calhoun." With a woman's perception and intuition, Miss Coit has explained how the rift widened between husband and wife. The reader will enjoy her analysis of Floride Calhoun and her feminine psychology.

When we have finished this book, we know the little things which help to elucidate a man's personality—what he ate, how he dressed, his habits of work, his moods and vanities, the obscure motives which often actuated his changes of opinion. Introspective, repressed, self-disciplined, living in a state of intellectual solitude, he was very different from the southern plantation owner of tradition. He was really a Puritan in temperament, just as Webster, the Yankee, was in many respects a cavalier.

The volume is a fine example of the best modern biographical technique. So far as I

can see, Miss Coit has explored every available source of information. She has consulted the important private papers preserved at Clemson College; she has studied the proceedings of the State legislature; she has talked with members of the Calhoun family, including the last grandson. She has used newspapers effectively by excerpting brief, salient passages for quotation. She has neglected none of the existing diaries and journals, and has even found little known manuscript reminiscences, like those of Crallé and Anna Maria Clemson. But she has been the mistress, not the slave, of her material. She has known how to separate the essential from the irrelevant, the picturesque from the commonplace. For this reason alone her book is far superior to any previous biography of Calhoun, and it is unlikely that it will be superseded.

With all its readability, this is no fictionized biography, padded with imaginary conversations of the type which has been the bane of seekers for historical truth. Miss Coit is a genuine scholar, as thorough as Nevins or Schlesinger, with a passion for accuracy; but she has not thought it necessary to be dull in order to be authoritative. Moreover she has not been content with uncritical eulogy. Although she has given Calhoun fair play, she has not attempted to extenuate his blunders or to use him to support a thesis, as some other writers on the period have done. Calhoun has been, and will always be, a highly controversial subject, but Miss Coit has appraised him without malice or prejudice. I have seldom read a book dealing with political issues which is so free from partisanship.

Calhoun's career as Congressman, Secretary of War, Vice President, United States Senator, Secretary of State, and then Senator again is familiar to students of American history. He entered national politics in 1811 as one of the Warhawks, who followed Henry Clay and has been described as "the young Hercules who carried the war with England on his shoulders." He was then a Unionist and was soon to be a supporter of the protective tariff. As the efficient Secretary of War in Monroe's Cabinet, he gained influence rapidly, and in 1824, only a little over 40 years old, he was the young men's candidate for the Presidency, supported by the great Daniel Webster, who was his exact contemporary. During this campaign he was the victim of scurrilous attacks and when he failed to gain the support of Pennsylvania, he left the field. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives, where John Quincy Adams was chosen President, with Calhoun as Vice President. In 1828, he espoused the cause of Jackson and was again elected Vice President, with every expectation that he would be Old Hickory's successor in the White House after the latter had served his two terms. So far his rise had been quick and not too much obstructed.

It was Andrew Jackson, the turbulent, obstinate, and unforgiving autocrat, who was Calhoun's nemesis. At the inaugural ball in 1829 the aristocratic Floride Calhoun ignored "Peggy" O'Neil Eaton, the former barmaid who had married Secretary of War Eaton and whose social ostracism had evoked all Jackson's frontier chivalry. According to Calhoun family tradition, the President told the South Carolina Senator that his wife must return Mrs. Eaton's call. When Calhoun refused to intervene, Jackson called on Mrs. Calhoun and laid down the law. Floride listened to his tongue lashing and then, calling the butler said, "Show this gentleman to the door."

Whether or not this incident really happened, Martin Van Buren, the bachelor in the Cabinet, had no scruples about calling on "Peggy," thus earning Jackson's gratitude. The President's resentment against Calhoun was aggravated when William H. Crawford betrayed the fact that, as Secretary of War in 1818, Calhoun had censured Jackson's seizure of Florida territory. The testy old general, who made every issue personal, turned against Calhoun. Meanwhile the latter had made himself politically vulnerable by opposing "the tariff abominations" and writing for the South Carolina Legislature his notorious exposition, outlining the doctrine which was to become known as nullification.

At the Jefferson Day dinner in 1830, President Jackson repudiated nullification in his toast. "Our Union—it must be preserved." The Vice President, in a scene which nobody has described more vividly than Miss Coit, slowly drank his wine and then white-faced, his eyes blazing, rose and uttered the words, "The Union. Next to our liberties, most dear." "That night," comments Miss Coit, "in that room the lines of Appomattox had been drawn."

The breach was now complete, and from that moment Calhoun was a tortured man, his ambition thwarted. It is unnecessary to tell again here how South Carolina in 1832, under Calhoun's leadership, passed a formal ordinance of nullification, how the administration responded with the force bill, and how Henry Clay, the Great Compromiser, finally succeeded in modifying the tariff measure, thus averting disaster. The crisis was over for the moment, but Calhoun was no longer a Nationalist but the spokesman for the isolated South. He resigned as Vice President to become Senator, and from his seat reiterated his protests against the rising dominance of the North. For the remainder of his career he was a tragic figure, disappointed and disillusioned.

As the years went on, Calhoun became the symbol of a lost cause—a cause which was lost almost from the beginning. All the finespun logic of his speeches could not alter the inexorable course of events. Northern industry flourished; southern agriculture languished. Immigrants poured in at northern ports from Ireland and Germany. The discrepancy in population and wealth between the two sections widened, and Calhoun could do nothing to stop the trend. He was driven finally to the point where he became the bigot who defended human slavery. As Miss Coit puts it, "To rest the cause of the South upon the crumbling foundation of human slavery was the tragic contradiction of Calhoun's career." His error brought ruin to his political aspirations and disaster to the South.

For a brief period Calhoun was again in a position of power, as Secretary of State under President Tyler. He accepted the office primarily to secure the annexation of Texas; and when a treaty for that purpose failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate, he resorted to the device of a congressional joint resolution. A day before the Tyler administration ended, he sent off a dispatch inviting Texas to enter the Union. It was his last triumph as a statesman. He had hoped to be the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1844 and even was the principal author of a campaign autobiography of himself, published anonymously. But his views were too radical for all except southern extremists and the dark horse, James K. Polk, was preferred.

Miss Coit reproduces the daguerreotype of Calhoun taken by Matthew Brady in 1849, showing him with all the appearance of great age but proud, defiant, unbroken, his cloak swept dramatically about him, the shaggy hair hanging loose about his bent shoulders, a tortured prophet, who sees nothing in the future but the defeat of all he fights for and holds dear. When Clay and Webster, the other two of the great triumvirate in the Senate, tried to save the Union in 1850 through the omnibus bill, Calhoun was too feeble to help very much. He was buried in the cemetery of St. Philip's church in Charleston, under a huge slab of white marble on which is cut the one word, Calhoun. Miss Coit tells the story of the bitter Yankee soldier, standing triumphantly in the churchyard in April 1865, in the midst of Charleston's shattered ruins, and saying, "The whole South is the grave of Calhoun."

Through her enthusiasm and skill Miss Coit has made John C. Calhoun seem almost a contemporary personage, as real as if he belonged in a present-day news magazine. Swept along by her narrative, we live ourselves through the controversy over nullification, the quarrels over abolitionist petitions, the disputes over Texas and Oregon, and the drama of the Compromise of 1850. She has written a first-rate book, one which holds the attention and provokes thought. In my judgment it will stand comparison with any political biography of recent years.

Pope Pius XII, Living Symbol of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial entitled "Pope Pius XII, Living Symbol of Peace," by Harry H. Schlacht, which was published in the New York Journal-American of March 2, 1950:

POPE PIUS XII, LIVING SYMBOL OF PEACE
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

O, Father, grant us the blessings of Thy peace.

Today America salutes Pope Pius XII on the anniversary of his seventy-fourth birthday.

Many, many happy returns of this blessed day.

Today pilgrims are welcomed to Rome to worship at the shrine of the Catholic Church.

It is a true incentive to piety.

It is a spiritual banquet.

The pilgrims will unite in commemoration of the three glorious and blessed celebrations.

His Holiness' fiftieth year as priest. His Holiness' twentieth year as cardinal. His Holiness' tenth year as Pope.

He is the vicar of the church of Christ. He is the apostle of peace. He is the living symbol of peace.

He is a simple man of God.

He is praying that God will come to the world's salvation, will quicken men with charity and faith, will inspire men with truth and justice.

He is armed with God's grace and a martyr's will. He is standing at the ramparts of man's battle for liberty.

His armaments are the weapons of wisdom. His armies are God's loving people everywhere.

His Holiness stands ready to shed his heart's blood to become the seed for the rebirth of enslaved nations.

Pope Pius XII is one of the great statesmen of our times. He is the best equipped personage in the world to lead us in the blessed cause of peace.

He is a man of his time.

No nation is strong except in the strength of God.

No power on earth can equal the power of God's truth. No dictator on earth can control man's thought.

God's truths have their roots in the policy of humble folks whose minds no tyrant can reach, and whose hearts no bond of servitude can fetter.

The arm of the Lord is gloriously made bare for the overthrow of communism, for the upbuilding of righteousness.

God's truths will pierce the iron curtain.

Before His power the forces of tyranny must tremble. Their mortal coils will be shaken off. Their governments will collapse. Their empires will dissolve. Their despotisms will sink into dust.

The church came forth from the dark catacombs, and upon the ruins of paganism there arose the glory that is the Roman Catholic Church.

It has endured through every persecution. It has endured through every revolution. It has endured through every century.

It is immortal in its nature. It is standing firm. It will endure forever.

So on this blessed day of his holiness' birthday, let God-loving people everywhere unite in this heavenly prayer.

May the Holy Father ever stand forth as a champion of oppressed humanity.

May the Holy Father ever stand forth as a protector of the godly in mankind.

May he persevere for many years in the faith of goodness, in the faith of justice, in the faith of peace.

God grant us this prayer.

Abraham Lincoln, Great Friend of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by R. K. Bliss:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—GREAT FRIEND OF AGRICULTURE

On Sunday, February 12, we commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. As the years pass the stature of Lincoln grows on us. He is now with common accord considered the greatest exponent of individual liberty and democracy of the nineteenth century.

We think of him as the leader who preserved the Union of the States that Washington and his associates created. We think of him as the great statesman, the emancipator of the slaves, the friend of humanity, and the foe of intolerance.

These were the great achievements of his career with which all are familiar. But there was another side of Lincoln's services that is not so well known and understood. It is of this other side that I wish to speak of principally today.

During the stress of the Civil War Lincoln signed three legislative acts into law, two of which have had a tremendous influence on the internal development of the United States. One of these was the Land Grant College Act providing for a Federal- and State-supported institution of higher learning in each State.

Prior to this time higher education had been principally for doctors, lawyers, and clergymen. It reached only a few people. Henceforth higher education was also to be for those who made their living principally through manual labor, management, and the sciences.

The passage of the Land Grant College Act was one of the results of a long continued effort to raise the status of agriculture and give greater opportunity to farm people. The Federal law as passed, however, also provided for the mechanic arts and laid the basis for our great colleges in engineering.

A somewhat similar land grant bill had been passed by the Congress preceding Lincoln's administration, but was vetoed by President Buchanan. One of the principal advocates of the Land Grant Act was Professor Turner, of Illinois. Turner was a friend of Lincoln's and Lincoln was certainly familiar with his arguments for the land grant bill. He and Lincoln were discussing the Buchanan veto at the time Lincoln was a candidate for President when Lincoln remarked, "Turner, get me elected President. Then put your bill through Congress and I will sign it."

The passage of the Land Grant College Act virtually democratized higher education. Almost anyone with grit and determination can go to college. Out of it has come as a new feature of education our Statewide cooperative extension services, designed to carry the immediately usable phases of higher education and experimentation to all farmers. This special effort to make agricultural science available to all is the distinguishing difference between agricultural colleges in this and other countries, and accounts in no small degree for the agricultural progress made in the United States.

Lincoln also signed the bill creating the United States Department of Agriculture, which now reaches into every community and farm home in the country. The Department of Agriculture also safeguards the quality of the food supply, and thus serves city homes as well. The two laws creating the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, which also included the development of engineering and science, have had a profound constructive influence on the agricultural and industrial development of this country.

Another act signed by Lincoln was the Homestead Act. The purpose of this act was to divide the public domain into homesteads large enough to support a farm family. The purpose of the act, too, was to remove public land from speculation. It opened the land to actual farmers. Lincoln's name is, therefore, associated with important fundamental steps in the internal development of this country. These acts alone raise his administration to a high place in our industrial and agricultural development. No other President has his name attached to more important and constructive internal legislation.

Abraham Lincoln was truly a pioneer, both in his creative thinking, and in his upbringing. He was truly a product of the American pioneer tradition and environment. Because of this fact, the life of Lincoln is a fascinating story. Born of pioneer parents in poverty, on what we would call a subsistence farm, Lincoln's opportunities in the world were anything but bright. His father was, according to all accounts, a good man but not much interested in progress, who took life easy and was something of a ne'er-do-well. He complained about his son, Abe, trying to get so much book "larnin" and considered it a waste of time.

But, if Lincoln's father was something of a failure as a provider for the family, he at least showed remarkably good judgment in selecting Lincoln's mother and stepmother. Nancy Hanks, the mother of Lincoln, must have been a very intelligent person. Brought up in a community without schools, she nevertheless learned to read. She was religious, and read much to Abe out of the Bible. She encouraged him to go to school. He had to walk 4 miles to his first school, and 9 miles to school in southern Indiana. Lincoln's mother died when he was 8 years old, in an epidemic that swept southern Indiana. Lincoln always had a profound reverence and respect for his mother, and once said "All that I am and all that I ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Lincoln's father's second wife brought love, affection, help, and encouragement to young Lincoln. There could scarcely have been a better choice for him. She championed his efforts to get an education and gave him encouragement when his father objected and grumbled. To the credit of his father it must be recorded that he gave in to his wife on this point.

There was one thing in Lincoln's upbringing that seems perfectly clear. He had the help, love, sympathy, and support of two unschooled but remarkably intelligent women. A home of poverty with one or two rooms and no conveniences where love and intelligent understanding holds sway is better for child development, I am convinced, than a palace where indifference prevails.

It would seem that Abraham Lincoln's physical comforts were pretty well cared for, too. He must have had plenty to eat for he had a wide reputation as a rail splitter and wrestling champion, both of which require great strength.

He must have been highly thought of. While still a boy of 19 he was sent in charge of a raft loaded with produce down the Mississippi to New Orleans. This was no small undertaking. It was on this trip that he got his first impressions of slavery. Some years later he made a second trip. These were great opportunities for an observing and reflective youth. He undoubtedly had much more travel and responsibility than other boys of that day.

Lincoln had an insatiable desire for knowledge and information. He would walk miles to get a book and read it, if necessary, by the light of a pine knot after the day's work was done.

Lincoln was unschooled but not uneducated. Without formal training in grammar, rhetoric, and literature he came to use some of the best English and sentence construction that can be found in the English language. Much of his writings and sayings are immortal in the sense that they will never grow old. They will last as long as men cherish freedom and individual liberty.

A good way to commemorate Lincoln's birthday would be to again read some of his addresses. I suggest the Gettysburg Address as one of the best on democracy of any literature in any country. In this address he expresses the hope that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." These words are especially important in the light of present world events.

The second inaugural was a masterly objective statement made in the midst of war which concludes with the admonition that "with malice toward none, with charity toward all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in." In view of the name calling and bickering that goes on in high places between nations these days, it would be refreshing to have someone now express such noble sentiments.

If you want to study magnificent logic, reasoning and good use of the English language read Lincoln's Cooper Union speech in New York where the unschooled but not uneducated frontier lawyer from Illinois spoke to the highly trained intelligentsia of that great intellectual center and won them over to his way of thinking. This speech helped to make him President.

Of if you want to read a perfect letter of compassion and sympathy, read the one to Mrs. Bixby who had lost five sons on the field of battle.

Lincoln's sayings were unique, interesting, and easily remembered. He is credited as saying, "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Lincoln's logical mind was evident in a conversation with a group of ministers who came to see him during the war. As they were leaving they expressed the hope that the Lord was on his side. Lincoln surprised them by saying he was not so much concerned about whether the Lord was on his side but he was deeply concerned that he should always be on the Lord's side.

The work and teachings of Abraham Lincoln have special significance and value in these present days when dictatorship with its attendant slavery of thought and mind threatens democracy and the freedom of the individual. All who value freedom can draw much inspiration and courage from the life and acts of the great commoner.

Records Management Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for a Records Management Service in the Federal Government. The proposed legislation is to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by inserting a new title therein, for the purpose of defining the duties and functions of the Administrator of General Services and the Archivist of the United States with respect to records management.

A Federal Records Service is to be established and implemented by law as a constituent unit of the General Services Administration to serve the twofold purpose of planning and developing, in cooperation with the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, a records-management program, and of exercising custody and care of the existing records of the Federal Government, its several branches, departments, and agencies.

The Hoover Commission report made clear, perhaps, for the first time, the enormous proportions of the records management job in the Federal Government. The task-force report showed that—

With regard to staff and salaries:

In 1940, an estimate was made of 340,000 employees, with annual salaries of $680,000,000, engaged in handling records then accumulated or being created at that time. A much greater figure would apply were employees engaged primarily in record making added to these in record keeping. No actual count being available, an estimate of over $1,000,000,000 is justifiable. Salaries of no other housekeeping or service function including Government accounting or personnel management remotely approaches this figure.

With regard to space requirements:

Approximately 18,500,000 cubic feet of Federal records occupy more than 18,000,000 square feet of Federal space. This is equivalent to six Pentagons. Space costs are not less than $27,000,000 annually. Actual surveys and official estimates carry this volume of records up to 17,000,000; 18,500,000 cubic feet is a weighted current estimate for the purposes of the task-force study.

With regard to operation and maintenance:

Space occupied by records is operated and maintained consistently at a cost close to the actual rental paid. Annual expenditures for this purpose are not less than $20,000,000.

With regard to equipment:

Records in such a quantity are equivalent to 3,080,000 standard four-drawer filing cabinets costing $154,000,000 at current prices.

The major problems involved in the area are both economic and administrative. The economic problem is obviously one of costs; which, in view of the size of the record-keeping operations of the Government, is considerable. Exactly how much can be saved, it is difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy, but the amount should be sizable. By exercising some restraining influence over the creation of new records, by encouraging proper disposition of records no longer needed, and by the use of the most suitable and economical methods with regard to those records which are to be retained on a more or less permanent basis, it is obvious that substantial amounts that would otherwise be spent can be saved.

Administratively, the present situation is chaotic. The National Archives has fairly clearly defined duties with regard to the custody of records, their preservation and use by the public, but little else. It is important that there be developed under competent professional leadership, Government-wide policies with regard to the size of records, methods of filing and storage, the creation of records centers, and many other problems in this field.

The legislation which is now proposed has been drafted with very great care and in close cooperation with the executive agencies concerned. Its provisions represent a sincere attempt to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission; they are submitted at this time, not only in response to a vital need for some action by the Congress in this important field, but also in accord with the previously expressed intentions of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization to proceed at an early date to round out the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by the inclusion of new titles on this and other related subjects. I hasten to add that the size of this bill is due not to a great quantity of new statutory provisions but to the assembling under this title of all existing and scattered pieces of legislation relating to this subject. All of these earlier enactments would be repealed to be superseded by the provisions of this act, which, when enacted, will in effect provide a code in the field of records management.

In short, I believe that the provisions of this bill are in accord with the principles of good management as practiced in many large private organizations, and as recommended in the report of the Hoover Commission. It will register the intent of the Congress in a field which has suffered from the lack of any clearly defined over-all policy, and from a multiplicity of scattered bits of legislation relating to portions of the field. Its enactment will do much to clarify and unify legislation on records management to make possible improved administration, and to effect substantial savings.

Industrial Development in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 18, this year, I spoke at length to the House on the subject, The South Attracts Industry. Some unbelievable facts were revealed at that time regarding unprecedented industrial development all through the South; particularly in South Carolina and more especially in the Fourth Congressional District.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert herewith two articles from the Christian Science Monitor, Monday, February 27, 1950, pointing out further facts regarding industrial, agricultural, and livestock development in the South:

WAVE OF INDUSTRIALIZATION SWEEPS SOUTH—LIVESTOCK SHOWS NEW PROMISE—NEW ERA HAILED

(By Henry Lesesne)

COLUMBIA, S. C.—Probably no other period in the South's history compares with 1945–49 for industrialization—not even the 1880's, when so many little towns in the Piedmont with available water power began organizing cotton mills as community affairs, the shares being paid for by the people on the installment plan.

At present, there seems no end to the trend in sight. The industrial expansion in the South has been a part of the general industrial expansion which has been going on all over the country. Economists say the new factories in the South largely represent a net addition to the Nation's industrial system.

With the industrial change and expansion have come, too, great changes in the region's agricultural economy. Through the Cotton Belt it is much the same story—smaller cotton fields, more grain, more hogs, more cattle, more poultry. Many areas of the South are concentrating on quality production of cotton.

COTTON MOVES WESTWARD

The culture of cotton has been moving westward to an extent not generally realized. Counting Texas as the West, production has so increased in the stretch from Louisiana to the Pacific coast that, this year, almost half the cotton crop is claimed by that area.

Mechanization has been a great factor in enabling California cotton planters to pick the biggest income crop in the State in the last 3 years. Of course, great cotton-growing areas of the South like the Mississippi Delta

are mechanizing on a large scale, too; but for much of the hilly South, mechanization is hardly adaptable as yet, if ever.

Thanks to research, the South in the last two decades has been able to produce about the same amount of cotton on half the acreage as formerly. At the same time, some parts of the South have turned dramatically to a new type of agriculture, or industry, putting cotton into the background.

PEACHES IN SPARTANBURG

For instance, Spartanburg County, S. C., is a great textile manufacturing county. Twenty years ago, cotton was the main—one might say the only—cash crop. But in the short time since, the county has become the Nation's biggest peach producer. Peach growing is the foremost agricultural pursuit.

Nearly every part of the South has its own dramatic story to tell, whether it be agricultural or industrial. Peculiar to a rather small area in north Georgia, for instance, is the chenille bedspread industry, which began as the hobby of a Georgia farm girl and soon developed into a $120,000,000-a-year business.

In about the same time, a great pulp and paper industry has arisen in the coastal plains, until southern production now accounts for about half the national total. A number of large new pulp and paper mills have gone up in the South in recent years. The region, too, is becoming more conscious of developing and conserving its woodlands, a serious problem.

MORE PURCHASING POWER

But the main thing is that industry, generally, has expanded and become more diversified in the South. The explanation, according to Dr. B. U. Ratchford, professor of economics at Duke University, lies in growing purchasing power, an ample labor supply, plus vast material resources.

Dr. Ratchford is a former Marshall plan adviser and was coauthor with Dr. C. B. Hoover, also of Duke, of the recent report by the National Planning Association's committee on the South, which analyzed the southern economy from the standpoint of the impact of Federal policies.

According to Dr. Ratchford, the rapid rise in southern purchasing power has created an expanding southern market, especially in the purchase of manufactured goods. And, as sales have risen, manufacturers have established plants or factories to make such goods in the South to supply the demands of the region.

INCOME INCREASES

Per capita income in the South has jumped 236 percent since 1939, compared with an increase of 183 percent for the rest of the country. Industry has raised income. So have high farm prices and a shift to a more diversified agriculture. Fifteen percent of southern income today comes from manufacturing, compared with 12½ percent in 1929.

Another factor is that the South pays less than 20 percent of all Federal taxes, and gets back nearly 30 percent of all Federal disbursements. Dr. Ratchford considers abundance of southern resources, especially an abundant supply of water, as second only to the South's increased purchasing power as a cause of the southern industrial boom.

The third most important factor, he says, is that the labor supply is being increased by a growing population and the greatly accelerated mechanization of farms. He says that inducements, such as land gifts and tax exemptions have had little influence upon location of industry in the South.

RURAL POPULATION

North Carolina, probably the most industrial of all southern States, has never had tax exemptions for new industry. Though relatively highly industrialized, North Carolina, like the rest of the South, is a State of many small towns and few cities. Nearly 70 percent of its population is rural. As elsewhere in the South, many families combine the advantages of industrial employment with the security of small farm ownership.

In the postwar years there has been a great expansion and modernization of the textile industry, which has brought supplier industries, such as the synthetic fiber industry. The South's textile industry in recent years has also become greatly diversified, with expansion in finer yarns, in finishing, and in the woolen and worsted branches. Scores of new mills and finishing plants have been built, and others are in the blueprint stage.

MILLS MODERNIZED

These plants are windowless, air-conditioned, and architecturally stimulating to the southern scene. While they may not appear as much out of this world as the new multimillion-dollar plants going up, the existing southern mills have modernized, both in building and equipment, to an extent which was hardly considered within the realm of possibility a decade ago. The mills, often termed a "prince or pauper industry," have plowed back a large part of postwar earnings into equipment and machinery to improve their competitive position.

Some of the most spectacular postwar industrialization in the South has occurred in South Carolina. A new $40,000,000 Celanese Corporation of America plant near Rock Hill has revitalized that college town. The historic resort town of Camden is booming because du Pont is building a big plant near there to make the new synthetic fiber, orlon.

PENDLETON EXPERIMENT WATCHED

PENDLETON, S. C.—Volumes could be written to tell of the amazing changes in the South's economy, industry, and agriculture in the postwar period. The National Planning Association's Committee on the South has dug up a barrel of facts and studies which tend to show many things, not the least of which is that the great number of industrial plants the region has gained represents a net addition to the country's industrial system rather than capacity which has been taken from other regions.

Essentially, the southern story today is one of industrial and agricultural growth, and of industrial and agricultural diversification. The New South—a term more significant today than ever before—is full of exciting scenes, and each part of the region has its own story to tell. But one might look a long time and never find a picture more symbolic of the changing South than can be seen near this little South Carolina up-country town.

Pendleton is a comparatively old town at the foothills of the Blue Ridge, and it hadn't changed a great deal until recent years. It is a historic town; a farmer's society organized in 1815 is still in existence, and the town boasts the oldest farmer's hall in the United States.

NEW PENDLETON VISITOR

Today you can take a main highway out of Pendleton and, on the edge of town, even if it's a bleak winter day, see something like 160 white-faced Hereford steers grazing in the lush front yard of an ultramodern, windowless, air-conditioned rayon twisting and weaving mill. The grass on that immense lawn or pasture, green the year round, which is amazingly high in protein content and reseeds itself, is all that the steers eat and grow fat upon.

This is a relatively new scene in the South even agriculturally; but it's not nearly all of the farm part of the story. But let's consider the industrial side. The mill in the center of the many acres of meadow, the Gerrish-Milliken rayon plant, is one of the scores of new textile mills and finishing plants which have been, and are being, built in the textile South in the postwar period. They are windowless, totally enclosed, air-conditioned buildings of the most modern design, glazed tile interiors, and newest machinery with straight-line continuous production.

PROMISING EXPERIMENT

The project, known as the Deering-Milliken farm operation, is in the nature of an experiment, an experiment which agronomists believe will make a great contribution to the livestock industry of the rolling Piedmont, a part of the Old South that is hardly adaptable to the mechanized culture of cotton. The great green lawn, kept "mowed" by the steers, is a contribution of alta fescue grass, providing year-round grazing, and Ladino clover, which provides grazing plus legumes.

This combination, developed by the Department of Agriculture, has been tried out in other parts of the country—in Oregon and in Pennsylvania—but nowhere has it seemed to thrive better than in the rolling hills of the Carolina Piedmont.

ECONOMICAL CROPS

The South is undoing the damage of generations of a one-crop system. Thousands of acres are being planted in winter pasturage. Kudzu, a deep-rooted, leguminous vine from Japan which has a prodigious summer growth, not only checks erosion but furnishes pasture and forage. In much of the South, agronomists say, year-round pasturage would eliminate the investment in barns and equipment to house livestock and store forage.

Let's Mine Some Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of March 1, 1950:

THE COAL EMERGENCY—AN IMPASSE

Detroit's plight in the current coal emergency is no worse than that of many other communities in the United States, but it will serve as an example of how close to catastrophe we are approaching.

Public resentment is high, as indeed it should be, at the callous disregard for the general welfare which the coal miners and the operators are showing.

The thought of cold, heatless homes has gone beyond the scare stage and become reality. Schools in this city are to be closed unless relief, not now anticipated, is forthcoming within the next few hours.

Conditions have progressed by now to such a point that no relief can be expected for 2 or 3 weeks, even if the dispute were to be settled as this is written.

It is no exaggeration to say that the full responsibility for this deplorable and inexcusable situation lies full on the doorstep of President Harry S. Truman.

He played politics with the individual health and security of the people of the United States until matters deteriorated beyond his powers to control them.

Seldom if ever in the history of this Nation have we witnessed as callous and stubborn disregard for the rights of the people by a Chief Executive.

Ample warning was given him, and the means of averting disaster were in his hands.

He refused to use them, because Congress failed to give him his way and abolish the Taft-Hartley law so that he could win votes as the champion of labor.

Had he acted when the impending crisis became apparent, it is more than possible that the coal dispute would have been settled by this time.

Now it is too late for him to apply either his legal powers, or the implied powers which he so blithely claimed as one of his prerogatives.

The outcome of the legal action against the United Mine Workers holds no promise that the union members will go back to work.

If they choose to remain idle in the face of a Federal court order, who is to force them, as individuals, to comply?

There are nearly 400,000 strikers, and not enough jail cells to hold them all.

What if the Government seizes the mines? Who will dig the coal if the miners refuse to do so? Neither the Army, the Navy, nor the Marine Corps can do it.

The only thing now is an appeal to the patriotism and conscience of the miners.

Speaking in Atlantic City, Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW (CIO) declared that both labor and management have a responsibility to the public that is above the interests of their special economic groups.

Those words ought to be shown to both the miners and the mine operators.

Only by an acceptance of that precept, based on the understanding that by their actions they are forcing millions of Americans toward cruel hardships, possible disease and economic distress, can the coal emergency quickly be resolved.

Whether the coal miners and the operators are beyond an appeal to patriotic duty remains to be seen.

But Mr. Truman at least should make the gesture of trying.

There is no other discernible immediate hope.

Representative John B. Sullivan and Federal Gas Rates Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 24, 1950, which calls attention to a small but important part of the fine work my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable JOHN B. SULLIVAN, has been doing to protect the interests of his constituents:

KERR'S HELPING HAND

When a special-interest group sets out through Congress to relieve the consumer of some of his money, it's customary to offer a high-sounding explanation. Senator KERR, wealthy Oklahoma oil man, has done this for a bill which passed the House and is before the Senate. He explains that his bill would help the independent natural-gas producer.

The Kerr bill would help independent producers, all right. It would help them to millions of dollars by exempting them from rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission. As for their independence, all that means is that these producers don't own gas pipe lines. Most of them are big oil companies and they represent about 70 percent of the gas industry.

For years the gas lobby has been busy in Congress. They have made a case at least for clarification of Federal powers. But if the Federal Power Commission were forbidden to figure gas production prices into a rate formula, the producers would have utilities and consumers virtually at their mercy.

Representative SULLIVAN has pointed out what Federal rate supervision means to St. Louis. Before the Commission stepped in, a southwestern company that indirectly supplied gas for this city charged $8.31 per 1,000 cubic feet. Rate regulation brought that down to $4.66. This benefited local consumers and still left the producer with a good profit.

Supporters of the Kerr bill offer one other happy thought for bilking consumers. That is States' rights. They say the States should regulate gas prices. But when gas is produced in Texas and sold in Missouri, how would regulation by Texas help St. Louis?

The gas industry has grown to the position of an interstate utility, whatever its component parts may be. Millions of Americans and much of their industry depend on it now, and more are turning to gas because of the coal situation. If the Kerr bill passes, these millions will have to pay for it.

Eat, Drink, and Be American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial of the Washington Times-Herald of March 2, 1950, which bears the above title.

The article accurately points out that in the United States we now make some very excellent wine. It happens that I represent a district that contains two very famous wine districts—the Napa Valley and the Lodi District. There are many other areas in California which also manufacture good wine. For some reason, some people have the impression that to obtain good wine one must buy wine which has been made abroad. I do not criticize the wine from foreign countries. But I do say emphatically that if one knows how to select the proper brands and types of wine made in the United States he can be assured that it will be equal to the quality of any similar types made in foreign countries. In California we have been engaged in the making of wines for almost a century. During that time, through scientific research, both public and private, and by the combined efforts of the wine industry represented by the Wine Institute, we are continually and have continually improved the quality of our wine. When one realizes that the production of wine in the United States is 140,000,000 gallons annually one can realize that the wine industry is no small industry. Furthermore, in California we produce 2,857,000 tons of grapes per year. There are probably over a hundred different varieties of these grapes. This insures that we have a great diversity in the type and taste of our wine. California manufactures approximately 90 percent of the total wine production of the United States.

I commend to the reading of my colleagues the article referred to which reads as follows:

EAT, DRINK, AND BE AMERICAN

Maj. Philip Harrison, who supervised management of wine cellars in occupied Rome and who is an expert on matters wine-y, made a good little speech in Balitimore the other day. Harrison said we should all drink more wine—which seems sensible; the Bible says "Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake"—and he further said that we should all drink more American wine.

HOME PRODUCT JUST AS GOOD

"I am sick and tired," said the good major, "of the poseurs and pretenders who delude people on the subject of wine * * * label-snobs who buy wines for the sake of the names on the bottles. Good wines are made in the United States as well as abroad," he said.

How right you are, Major? Our American wines, particularly those California and New York varieties, are every bit as good as the average bit of juice you can get from the sunny slopes of France, and they are improving all the time.

A man isn't only kidding himself when he spends $6.95 for a reed-wrapped cobwebby jug of Old d'Artagnan S'il Vous Plait Extraordinaire from A Bas Le Tourniquet just so he can murmur, "Aaaah—1928—the only good French vintage, y'know," to his friends—he is also wasteful. For that $6.95 he can get a jug and a half of much better American champagne and a box of crackers to boot.

An Honest Deal To Replace the "Raw Deal" on Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 weeks I have received from an aroused constituency in my home district roughly 15,000 signed statements of protest against the 20-percent Federal amusement tax. The larger part of these protests have come from the average American citizen—the fellow who after pay deductions of income tax, social security tax, insurance, and union dues, has very little left for entertainment. Yes, and these protests bring to mind the numerous cases of those average people who must cut corners and save all week in order to take their wives and families to the movies on Saturday night.

The unfortunate thing about these cases is not so much the fact that the average person has to scrimp and save in order to have enough for a little entertainment, but rather the cold, hard fact that the Federal Government, while purporting to give the low-wage earner a break, taxes him to the extent of 20 percent on every amusement admission ticket he buys whether it be the movies, the circus, a rodeo, or sporting event. And these are only a few of the "open taxes" masquerading under the name of "luxury taxes." We still have a 20-percent excise or luxury tax on light

bulbs, jewelry, cosmetics, toilet preparations, luggage, fur coats, and even certain baby necessities.

Figures available for the last complete fiscal year show that the American people paid in excise taxes alone a total of $7,500,000,000. On the basis of 150,000,000 population this breaks down to around $50 per person or $200 for a family of four.

According to the January report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Federal Government in the coming fiscal year will extract from the American taxpayer in the form of excise taxes approximately $6,000,000,000. Besides paying the various tobacco, liquor, stamp, and miscellaneous excise taxes included in the foregoing figures, the consumer will eventually be required to pay more than $1,500,000,000 in manufacturer's excise taxes, passed along to him on any number of household goods he buys during the course of the year.

There is no way to escape paying these taxes either, for, when you try to get away, you pay a 15 percent tax on train, plane, and steamship fares, an average of 6 cents on every gallon of gas consumed by your automobile and another 15 to 25 percent tax on any telegrams sent or phone calls made.

There seems to be no end to the taxes we are required to pay. The darkness below the surface of American economic life is alive with hidden taxes too. They teem and multiply. They mean increased costs for virtually every item of living.

The American people today have every right in the world to grumble and express their anger over the excessive tax burden they are asked to bear. The average American is becoming more and more tax conscious and is fast learning to realize the full implications of the Federal Government's present chronic tax program based on the ill-conceived New Deal and Fair Deal theories of deficit financing.

I firmly believe that the majority of the American people at this point are fed up with the "raw deals" foisted upon them by the New Deal and Fair Deal and want simply an honest deal.

This "honest deal" can be given to the people, in part, by repealing excise taxes outright, lowering taxes generally, and then operating the Federal Government within the confines of a "pared down" budget geared to a peacetime economy.

"How," you may ask, "can we do this and still live up to the obligations to which we have already committed ourselves?"

This question can best be answered by comparing the records of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress and this Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress.

In the fiscal year 1948, during the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, total expenditures amounted to $33,800,000,000 and the Treasury's balance sheet showed a surplus of revenues over expenditures in excess of $8,000,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1949, during the first session of this Democratic-controlled Congress, total expenditures amounted to more than $40,000,000,000 and the Treasury's balance sheet showed a deficit of nearly $2,000,000,000.

One need only compare these two figures of total expenditures and ask himself this question: "What additional services or benefits have I received from this $6,300,000,000 increase in Government expenditures?" I dare say the average citizen hasn't received one thing more than was given him by the Eightieth Congress for $6,300,000,000 less money. In fact it took that Republican-controlled Congress to lower everybody's individual income tax from the confiscatory wartime rate to the one presently in effect.

This year the President has asked for expenditures totaling some $42,000,000,000 and latest figures indicate that a deficit of $5,000,000,000 will be written in red come June 30.

The Republican Party has proved that it can set a peacetime budget, live within it, give the Treasury a surplus, and still give the people all the services ordinarily expected of a government that claims to be one "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The Democratic Party, on the other hand, has during every 1 of its last 16 years in power operated in the red.

With that record in mind, I am becoming more firmly convinced that as long as the present administration is in power the only way we can ever cut the gigantic cost of government is to cut the taxes first and then see to it that the Federal Government lives within its income, just as you and I must do.

Repeal of all excise taxes at this time would be a boon to the little fellow who could enrich his living with the many items now taxed beyond his reach. The removal of all these taxes would certainly give business a "shot in the arm." While their removal would cost the Treasury a loss of an estimated $6,000,000,000 in revenue for the next fiscal year, many believe more than half this loss would be made up in an increase of corporation-tax revenue resulting from a greatly increased volume of business.

There is no reason why we, as representatives of the people, should not start the ball rolling now on a tax-reduction program as I have outlined. These more than 15,000 signed protests received from the Eighteenth District of Illinois clearly indicate to me that the American public is fed up with the administration's grandiose schemes that purport to give them something for nothing. These clear-thinking individuals are not interested in "fandangled" legislation that in the end will take even more money out of their pockets than is now being taken in every conceivable kind of tax.

They want simply relief from the excessive tax burden which they have had to bear for the last 10 years. The entire Congress would do well to take note of this public opinion poll which I feel certain will make itself felt this coming November.

Omnibus Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has written an interesting article for the Tax Review on the purposes of the omnibus appropriation bill, which this body will consider after the middle of April. I think this excellent article is of great importance to Members of Congress and the general public, and, under leave to extend my remarks I include the article here:

A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY—IMPROVED FISCAL CONTROL THROUGH OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

(By Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States House of Representatives)

For the first time since the early days of the Republic, the Congress of the United States and the tax-paying public this year will be offered a unique opportunity to understand the entire financial program of the Federal Government.

With the demands of a cold war falling upon a Government whose fiscal situation is worse than ever before in its peacetime history—with Federal spending totaling almost 20 percent of the Nation's entire national product and exerting a tremendous influence on the operation of the national economy—with the war-created deficit at hitherto unbelievable heights—now more than ever it is necessary for the Congress to exercise its important power of the purse with care and wisdom.

The opportunity that is being afforded this year for effective and intelligent fiscal management lies in the consolidated appropriation bill procedure, a technique that is new to the Congress although it has been tried and proven in France, England, Sweden, and other countries from the inception of parliamentary government. The objective of the new procedure is simple; instead of nine or more appropriation bills being considered individually over a period of 6 or more months, without relation to each other, to the total of appropriations, or to the total of Government receipts from which the obligations must be met, the House Appropriations Committee will consolidate all appropriations into one omnibus bill and will report the consolidated bill to the House, together with an estimate of Government receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year to which the appropriations apply.

This simple technique is the culmination of many years of legislative efforts to keep pace with the increasingly large and complicated Federal fiscal structure. Starting in 1796, when a Committee on Ways and Means was first appointed in the House of Representatives, the need for effective congressional fiscal control has become more apparent and more urgent as the size and scope of Federal programs has mushroomed through the years. In the last three decades particularly, the history of fiscal legislation has been marked by an insistent demand from the country, and by a consistent effort on the part of the Congress, to perfect a more efficient and effective system of handling the annual appropriation bills.

In the years preceding 1920 the appropriating functions of Congress were exercised by many committees, which at various times reported appropriations with little or no relation to any definite centralized plan or system. For some years Congress worked intermittently but assiduously in an effort to devise a plan under which we could consolidate and coordinate the appropriation functions, thereby achieving a more scientific and economical handling of national finances.

Finally, in 1921, Congress enacted the Budget and Accounting Act, under which for the first time we were able to segregate the funds for each department and agency of the Government in one place, in the same bill. It was a decided step forward.

NEED FOR EXPENDITURE CEILING

However, it became immediately apparent that there was a further defect in the system in the lack of a ceiling or other means of correlating expenditure with revenues—of adjusting outgo to income. Many men in these intervening years, including Swagar Shirley, of Kentucky, John Fitzgerald, of New York, and Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, with the able cooperation of talented career men like Marc Shield and John Pugh, have sought the philosophers' stone in a correlated consolidated budget submitted to the Congress simultaneously with authoritative estimates on the national income, but were thwarted largely by an obsolete and antiquated organization of the subcommittees.

Eventually, after long study, the Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, including section 138, which provided for a legislative budget under which a joint committee of the two Houses was required to submit not later than February 15 of each year a legislative budget, including a ceiling of expenditure and estimated over-all Federal receipts for the next year. It was hoped at that time that this provision would solve the problem, that it would bring into such strong relief the outgo and the income of the Federal Government as to retrench the amount of money appropriated and bring it into a reasonable relation with the national income.

But from the beginning the plan was singularly unsuccessful. The requirement that a ceiling of expenditure be fixed before hearings could be held rendered it wholly impracticable. It was in effect a requirement for a court verdict before witnesses could be examined and testimony submitted. On the other hand, if desired until after hearings had been completed and bills reported, its application came too late to affect the totals.

Section 138 of the Reorganization Act of 1946 is now a dead letter. But the need which it sought to serve, the problem which gave rise to its enactment are still with us and growing more insistent with the increasing size and complexity of national finance. Some practical method had to be found of presenting in one proposal the entire expenditure program for the fiscal year in connection with an authoritative forecast of the national income for that period.

We believe we have now developed such a method. Through a reorganization of its subcommittees, restricting each member to one subcommittee and each subcommittee to one annual supply bill, and through a corresponding readjustment of our committee staff and reporting system, permitting all subcommittees to sit simultaneously, the House Committee on Appropriations during the first session of this Congress reported to the House and sent to the Senate for the first time in the history of the Congress all annual appropriation bills within approximately 10 weeks from the beginning of the hearings. This was the first step. We had to wait until its practicability could be demonstrated.

During the present second session of the Eighty-first Congress the Committee on Appropriations will discontinue the practice which has been in effect since the earliest days of the Congress of reporting appropriations piecemeal in separate, unconnected and uncorrelated individual bills, and will submit the annual appropriations in one consolidated omnibus appropriation bill.

EFFECT OF CONSOLIDATED BILL

The bill will be reported not later than April 15 of each year. By that time an authoritative forecast of the national income will be available. The prime question before the House when the appropriation bill comes to a vote will be whether to hold expenditures within the national income or vote to exceed the national income and increase the already stupendous national debt.

In the fierce light of publicity which will be concentrated on that final vote there will be no escape from responsibility. A clear unequivocal record must be made. And public opinion will do the rest. The embodiment of all annual expenditures in one compact bill, with all duplications and conflicts eliminated and with its impact on national credit clearly outlined, will serve to offset the pleas of pressure groups and high-powered lobbies and should save vast sums of money and reduce waste and prodigality to a minimum.

The advantages of the one-package bill are obvious. Appropriations will be more carefully processed; duplications, overlapping and conflicts will be reconciled; legislative items will be eliminated; logrolling will be impracticable as all the cards will be on the table at one time and any attempted trades will be too apparent to withstand the light of publicity; the entire expenditures for the year will be submitted in one figure simultaneously with an authoritative estimate of the national income; deficit financing will be discouraged, as a last opportunity will be afforded for reconsideration in the subcommittees of the entire bill with a view of bringing annual expenditures within the annual revenues of the Government; the bill will have been passed and all annual appropriations enacted before the end of the fiscal year, obviating the need for the usual continuing resolutions and permitting adjournment of Congress much earlier than heretofore.

HOW CONSOLIDATION WORKS

No special enactments or changes in the rules are necesary in order to provide for the consolidated budget or its consideration in either House. The House Committee on Appropriations is authorized to determine, without conference, the number and form and jurisdiction of the annual appropriation bills.

For example, at the beginning of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress two subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations had for many years been reporting the military appropriation bill and the naval appropriation bill respectively. Under the authority vested in the committee we combined the two subcommittees which now report out one bill, the armed services appropriation bill. Likewise at the beginning of the last session we combined the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and the Subcommittee on Government Corporations. From the consolidation of four bills into two bills it is only a step to the consolidation of all bills into one general bill.

The mechanics of drafting the omnibus appropriation bill will center on an executive committee within the House Appropriations Committee. The executive committee, whose five majority and three minority members will be rotated each session, will receive and hold the reports of the subcommittees assigned to particular chapters of the appropriation bill. If revision or amendment is deemed warranted, the chapter is returned to the subcommittee for further consideration. Each subcommittee report will be accompanied by a statement of total expenditures projected in the budget for the particular chapter, plus an itemized report of any changes in the expenditure total that would ensue from subcommittee action. When all reports have reached the executive committee and been approved, all chapters and reports will be submitted to the whole Appropriations Committee simultaneously, and will then be reported to the House in an omnibus measure.

OMNIBUS BILL NO CURE-ALL

Of course, the omnibus bill of itself will not be a panacea for all of the ills which prompt its inauguration. There is no substitute for laborious and searching inquiries for analyses and studies, by members of the Appropriation Committees of the two Houses, or for selfless interest and courage exercised by them and other members of the two bodies when the bill is before them for consideration or when legislative bills are under consideration, whether in committee or on the floor, which would impose new and additional drafts upon the Federal Treasury. These are requisites to the attainment of proper and effective congressional budgeting, and their importance cannot be too heavily stressed. We cannot have economy in Government under any system without patriotic interest and courage on the part of those charged with the duties of raising and spending revenue in providing for the support of the Government.

In this regard, it is necessary to remember that one of the many untoward effects of any war, and to an unprecedented degree in the last war, is the development in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government of an expenditure complex, a spending psychology. In the stress of war and the imminent necessity of providing for adequate national defense at all costs, we appropriate and spend with little regard for the sources of income or the possibility of securing results at less expense.

Now that the war is over it is difficult to get back to normal conditions and the exercise of prudent economy. It is hard to begin thinking again in terms of prewar expenditures and to drop from billions down to millions and from millions down to thousands—from dollars down to pennies. And in the present emergency in which we find ourselves, with a national debt which approximates a very substantial percentage of our national wealth, and with increasing budget estimates and decreasing revenues, we must begin to count even the pennies. Under present circumstances no economy is so small as to be disregarded.

INCENTIVE TO RETRENCHMENT

The consolidated bill considered in juxtaposition with the available incomes offers an incentive to retrenchment. As a matter of fact, it is the only practical method available at this time that offers hope for a reduction of appropriations to the smallest amounts consistent with sound business and good government.

Attainment of that goal will not be easy. The national defense situation is such as to require consideration of major policy matters which must be permitted—to some extent at least—to outweigh cold budgetary requirements. That is, there must be some consideration other than merely the number of dollars on hand at the particular time to determine the amount of national defense we will purchase. On the other hand there is no occasion to so close our eyes to budgetary restrictions as to purchase national defense on a basis which will in a few years result in our having nothing left to defend,

by reason of having exhausted our resources so completely in an all-out defense effort as to have destroyed our economy.

Veterans' benefits cannot be reduced by the Committee on Appropriations materially as such benefits are provided by law and whatever amounts are due must be paid. If any change is to be made in this area it will have to be made by the legislative committee.

In the foreign field we have certain commitments which must be honored in order to maintain our standing among nations. Regardless of how any member may feel about the policy or about whether we should originally have made commitments, the fact remains that we are committed and, whatever the cost, we must pay. Of course the committee will scrutinize such requests carefully to be certain no more is provided than is necessary to meet obligations incurred and to insure continuation of those programs, which have so far proven effective in maintaining the peace of the world and in preventing the spread of ideologies which have for their purpose the destruction of democratic principles.

However, in view of these facts, this is no time to talk about new charges against the general revenues. Before we embark on new programs we must go back and survey the old ones and find what we can do about eliminating those which have outlived their usefulness and reducing the cost of others. Presentation of all proposed expenditures simultaneously in one bill will contribute materially to that end.

Thus, the initial use of the consolidated appropriation bill procedure during the present session of the Eighty-first Congress will achieve two major ends: First, it will provide the Congress with a new and much-needed tool to be used in the construction of the Federal fiscal structure; and second, it will magnify the responsibility of each Member of the Congress to achieve the sound national economy on which America's growth must be based.

Democracy Beats Communism Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 11, 1949, entitled "The Gladewater Plan—Democracy Beats Communism Week." It was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH. It includes the statement that the idea for Democracy Beats Communism Week was originated by John Ben Shepperd, former president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and that it was conducted at Gladewater the week of March 20 to 26, 1949.

I recall participating in Democracy Beats Communism Week in Kansas City, Mo., during the week of September 20 to 26, 1948, when it was sponsored and carried out by the Kansas City Junior Chamber of Commerce. The idea was, in fact, originated by my friend, Clint W. Kanaga, Jr., a prominent young Kansas City insurance executive, who offered the plan to the Executive Committee of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for adoption for national action in January 1949, after it had been so successfully carried on and splendidly received the previous September in Kansas City.

The Kansas City Jaycees sent speakers before countless civic, church, labor, veterans' and other groups, as well as to almost every school in the community. The people of Kansas City were privileged to hear these men in earnest discussion of the fundamental issues between our way of life and that under the world's harshest dictatorship. The subject was not approached from the point of view of bitter denunciation on one side and flag-waving on the other. Instead, the Jaycees, who had spent many hours in study, presented hard facts of a historical, economic, social, and political nature and tried to give their audiences all the facts on both sides. It was seldom necessary to draw conclusions for the listeners. The Jaycees knew that when both sides of this question are clearly and dispassionately presented, Democracy invariably wins out. The whole community profited from this project and similar plans were subsequently undertaken in other communities.

I believe that the Kansas City Junior Chamber of Commerce deserves high credit for being the first to organize Democracy Beats Communism Week and for having one of its members as the originator of this plan.

Train Radio Might Have Helped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial of the St. Louis Star-Times of February 20, 1950, entitled "Train Radio Might Have Helped," which discusses the recent shocking collision of two trains of the Long Island Railroad, resulting in a great loss of life and injuries to passengers.

While the railroad unions and some Members of Congress are supporting a bill, H. R. 378, to provide greater safety for passengers and employees, in the face of blind opposition, it is worth noting that the Long Island Railroad, after 29 or 30 passengers have been killed and more than 100 seriously injured, has announced the installation of "trippers" which would automatically halt trains on that particular section of a double track where trains running in opposite directions could not pass. The railroad announces that the "trippers" would be in operation within 24 hours, showing how easily they could have been installed. Why must the railroads delay installation of obvious and existing safety devices until disasters overtake them or legislation forces safety measures? The editorial entitled "Train Radio Might Have Helped" from the St. Louis Star-Times follows:

TRAIN RADIO MIGHT HAVE HELPED

Apparently the grisly collision of 2 trains on Long Island, in which 29 were killed and 100 hurt, was caused by a simple human failure. The tracks are normally double but were temporarily overlapped. It seems that one of the engineers, forgetting about the makeshift arrangement, was not watching the signals. He ran through a stop light. The right side of the west-bound train and the left side of the east-bound sheered each other open.

No gadgets in the world will ever erase the possibility of human error. But the techniques of science can make human error less likely. In this situation the Long Island Railroad was using old-fashioned signal equipment.

Here was a tragedy that radio communications between trains and between trains and stations might have averted. A radioed warning might have reminded the inattentive motorman of the overlapping stretch. The averting of a single tragedy such as this one would justify the relatively slight cost of installing the newest type of safety systems in the railroads that are lagging behind.

John H. Geisse Receives Deserved Award for Outstanding Contribution to Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a copy of a citation accompanying the gold medal presented by the Department of Commerce to John H. Geisse, who is a consultant with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for his outstanding contribution to aviation in developing the cross-wind landing gear. The citation, which indicates the importance of this contribution to aviation, is as follows:

Mr. Geisse receives the Department's gold medal for his outstanding contributions to civil aviation, including the development of the famed cross-wind landing gear. Over a period of 25 years Mr. Geisse has labored constantly and tirelessly to bring the personal aircraft to the point where it would appeal to a wide segment of the American public. From his efforts to develop a personal plane have come the first nonspinning airplane, the safety airplane with tricycle undercarriage, and the proof that cheaper power plants and accessories for aircraft are possible.

His most recent success is the development of the cross-wind landing gear, which contributes materially to safety and economy in flying. Millions of dollars will be saved in airport construction on the basis of a recently announced CAA policy to build only one strip or runway on existing or improved class I airports, and to build no intersecting runways on larger airports. This policy was made possible only through the cross-wind landing gear, and Mr. Geisse was the prime mover in its development and adoption. Records already are available showing that both skilled and unskilled pilots have

avoided accidents resulting in possible injury or death because their planes were equipped with the castered gear, thus indicating that it represents a major contribution to the technology of flying.

John Geisse has been a crusader in the aviation field. It is with considerable satisfaction, therefore, that the Department has awarded its exceptional service medal to him on this occasion.

Potato Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of February 28, 1950:

POTATO PROBLEM

The importance of the potato problem is that it offers perfect illustration of the economic absurdity of subsidy without control. To its lesson we might pay close heed, lest we find ourselves shortly immersed in the quicksand of our own good intentions, up to our fiscal neck.

Basically the problem is simple. We grow more potatoes than we can use. In 1909 we consumed 193 pounds per year per person. Today we use only about 100 pounds. Yet farmers each year raise more potatoes; for although acreage has been cut by about 25 percent in the last 4 years, new insecticides and modern fertilizers cause 10 potatoes to grow where 1 grew previously.

Left to find their own level in an open market, potatoes today would sell at not much more than 60 cents a bushel, a price that would bankrupt producers. To avoid such a contingency, the Government has established price supports that have cost the taxpayers of this country just $495,169,000 in the last 7 years.

This price support has been available only in those areas where the farmers have agreed to voluntary acreage reduction. In Aroostook County in Maine, for instance, this reduction has cut plantings from 220,000 acres in 1946 to around 140,000 in 1949. But, obviously, a still further Nation-wide restriction is needed, and it was to this purpose that Senator LUCAS sought last week to amend a House bill with a provision that would suspend all price support for potatoes until some form of production control could be established by Congress.

The Senator's proposal was killed, however, by a coalition of 28 Republicans and 15 Democrats. In its place the Senate approved a plan which would continue price support as at present in all areas where growers agree to go along with marketing orders.

This plan admittedly will not cure the potato surplus. It was defended on the score that growers had already bought seed and fertilizer for the coming planting season under a gentleman's agreement with the Government that the price this year would be supported, which is true enough, and by the less tenable argument that in the present uncomfortable situation the growers themselves are without blame.

This is not to say that the potato farmers have been more eager of subsidy than others, or that they have not been cooperative. Indeed, it was the Maine farmers themselves who, taking the lead in efforts to cure the situation, first urged that the support price be lowered from 90 percent of parity to its present ratio of 60 percent. They have cut acreage heavily, switching to other crops, particularly dairy farming; as between 1947 and 1949, for instance, there was an increase of 10 percent in the number of farmers shiping milk to the Boston market from the State of Maine.

Furthermore, under our present agrarian policy, potato growers are entitled to protection against the ruin that awaits them in a free market under the laws of supply and demand. But they are hardly entitled to such protection through means that have already proved their inequity by saddling the taxpayers with a $500,000,000 expense in this one crop in 7 years.

No one likes Government controls such as the Lucas proposal envisaged, and the opposition of the potato farmers is understandable. Yet the fact remains that to guarantee price without at the same time controlling production, is to flirt with economic disaster by encouraging ever-increasing production.

As of today the Government has $3,600,000,000 tied up in crop surpluses. The figure might easily pass $6,000,000,000 in another year.

Under such conditions to insist that voluntary acreage reduction and marketing controls are sufficient, is like insisting on the pleasantness of the weather in the teeth of a northeast gale.

Potatoes at present occupy the news spotlight, but other crops press forward: the grain crops, cotton, pork, wool, eggs, butter, peanuts, and linseed oil. Are these products to follow in the way of the potato?

Are we to continue to give tight support to prices, while insisting on only the loosest of production controls?

If so, our entire farm program faces eventual collapse.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Fear of Semisocialism Here Factor in Concern Over Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan and an editorial, both appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune:

FEAR OF SEMISOCIALISM HERE FACTOR IN CONCERN OVER BRITAIN—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS REMEDY FOR UNEASINESS AT HOME LIES IN ELECTION NEXT NOVEMBER

(By Mark Sullivan)

The effect of the recent British election on relations between that country and ourselves will not be clear until we learn what course the Labor government is going to attempt in the light of its extremely reduced strength. The government's program is expected to become known when the House of Commons meets next week with the Labor Party's majority reduced to almost nothing. Soon thereafter one aspect of our relations with Britain will come up in our own Congress, when that body considers further aid to Britain (and other European countries) under the Marshall plan. On every occasion when aid to Britain has been discussed in Congress some Members have raised the point that our aid was helping a Socialist government remain in power.

The point is true, and the many implications of it that have been raised are true or tenable. It is a fact that our aid to Britain has enabled the Socialist government to remain in power. In a phrase of Winston Churchill's, Britain has lived "from day to day and hand to mouth" on help from the United States: cessation of our aid would have been followed by economic collapse that would have unseated the party in power. And the existence of a Socialist government in Britain has been a detriment and threat to the United States, for if a country so important in world trade as Britain should become completely and permanently Socialist it would be difficult for us to continue as a country practicing free enterprise.

HANDICAP TO AID POLICY

These and other points raised by Americans who have questioned our aid to Britain are valid. They have been a handicap to the Truman administration's Marshall plan policy, and especially to Republicans who have supported the policy in a bi-partisan spirit. While votes in Congress for Marshall plan aid have always been overwhelming, uneasiness in that body has been larger than vocal expression of it. Members have been silent for the sake of maintaining a united front for a vital foreign policy. And feeling among the people has been more extensive than public expression of it. Spokesmen of public thought have practiced restraint, in the spirit of amity toward Britain and mutuality between the two peoples. Public feeling, however, has tended to grow, and public expression of it may be appropriate and less harmful at a time when apparently the British people are receding from socialism.

The queries raised about aid to Britain are true or tenable. But another thing is true, and is paramount absolutely. We are engaged in, and are the spearheads of, world resistance to communism. In that resistance, Britain is our partner. The British resistance to communism is as wholehearted as our own—in the recent election no Communist candidate was successful, and the total vote for all Communist candidates in the country was a minute fraction of the whole.

Britain's partnership with us in world resistance to communism has been imperatively indispensable. If at any time during the past 5 years the British Government in power should have fallen, whatever party it belonged to, or economic system it practiced, the effect on world resistance to communism would have been an extreme calamity. We have been abundantly justified in giving aid to Britain to keep its economy working and its Government stable.

What we have here is not infrequent in many situations, public and private. We are under an imperative necessity to help Britain for a purpose paramount above everything else. At the same time this necessity is accompanied by an awkward condition. If for the sake of the necessity we do not take account of the awkward condition, there is no reason for not recognizing it intellectually.

PART OF CAUSE DOMESTIC

In the present world chaos are three ideologies—communism, practiced by Russia, socialism, practiced by Britain, free enterprise and capitalism, practiced by the United States. While Socialist Britain and capitalist United States are united against Communist Russia, there is a subordinate and latent difference between them.

The uneasiness we feel about this difference may not be caused solely by the fact that Britain is Socialist; part of the cause may be domestic. It may arise obscurely from the feeling of many that the administration in power in our own country is not as wholeheartedly free enterprise and capitalist as the

British Government is wholeheartedly Socialist. Our uneasiness may arise not exclusively from socialism in England, but partly from apprehension about semisocialism in the United States. The remedy for our own condition is not an election in Britain, but an election in the United States, such as will take place next November.

THE LAST WEAPON

Whatever the legal basis for Judge Keech's refusal to find the United Mine Workers guilty of contempt, however closely it may fit into or widely diverge from the precedents established by Judge Goldsborough and the courts which have reviewed his opinions, the hard fact remains that the miners have found a means of nullifying the injunctive proceedings established by the Taft-Hartley law—for the time being. And since time is of the essence in this national emergency, this victory for the miners, however temporary it may prove to be, has confronted the American people with extremely grave alternatives.

The union and the operators offer no hope of a settlement. The American economy is being strangled at an accelerating pace by continuance of the strike. Mr. Henry Ford has predicted that a mass shut-down of industry would be precipitated in 2 weeks unless coal supplies are forthcoming. To sit idly by while the Nation rushes toward catastrophe is unthinkable.

The last weapon remaining in the Government's hands is that of seizing and operating the mines. It is of uncertain value; in itself, it settles nothing, and may not even bring the men back to the pits. It places a heavy strain upon the American system by injecting the Government into the position of assuming the responsibility for the functioning of a vast field of private enterprise, and raises many questions, both of principle and detail. Some have advocated that the Government employ the opportunity afforded by seizure to force a contract upon the parties, or arbitration of the dispute. Others have urged that any profits from the operation of the mines be impounded during the seizure. If the Government is to act impartially under the circumstances—indeed, if it is to act at all—it will be plagued by many similar demands. The miners, the operators, the administration, the public must all regard seizure as a confession of common failure, a last resort.

Yet the prospect must be faced. The attitude of the administration toward the Taft-Hartley Act, consistently undermining its moral basis, refusing to invoke its provisions until time had nearly run out, affords almost no opportunity for further negotiation, or exploration of other legal remedies. The sole hope of averting the need for this expedient lies in a last-minute change of atmosphere around the bargaining table. Hitherto public pressure and legal pressure to that end has been unavailing; possibly the imminence of Government operation can still bring the bargainers to agreement. But the decision must come immediately, or the Government must step in.

Republican and Democratic Dinners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter from a friend and constituent of mine:

GOSHEN, N. Y., *March 2, 1950.*
Hon. KATHARINE B. ST. GEORGE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I have just read your News Letter No. 56 and see that you mentioned the Republican box supper and also the Democratic Jefferson-day dinner.

To demonstrate the ethics of the party in power in Washington, I submit that it might be mentioned in one of your news letters that the Republicans had 12,000 diners at $1 each and paid the regular Federal admission tax of 20 percent on each admission, or a total of $240. In contrast, the Jefferson Day dinner had 5,300 diners at $100 each, upon which they paid toward the unusually heavy expenses of running the Government—nothing. They evaded the regular 20-percent Federal tax of $106,000 on these admissions by adopting the subterfuge of accepting contributions and then issuing complimentary passes to that dinner. No doubt it is a state of mind, but it certainly does not inspire confidence among the people.

The source of this is Time, February 27, 1950, page 20.

Yours sincerely,
JOSEPH W. R. DALLY.

Serious Unemployment Conditions in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter which stresses the fact that unemployment in Lawrence, Mass., is still in a very serious condition with thousands of the unemployed unable to collect benefits, due to the fact that their payments are exhausted. I sincerely hope that some relief will be accorded to these unfortunates by the Federal Government.

CITY OF LAWRENCE, MASS.,
City Clerk's Office, March 1, 1950.
Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: It has come to the attention of the City Council of Lawrence that Mr. Arthur W. Brown, area director of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, recently wrote to you and to Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL, requesting you to take such action as you could to have an immediate survey undertaken of the unemployment situation in our city with a view of providing work relief to assist our unemployed workers in their present plight. Our city council desires to give this request its strongest support and to add its voice to that of Mr. Brown to urge the necessity for positive action to relieve unemployment conditions in our city.

As Mr. Brown has told you, conditions in our city today are worse in some respects and are causing more hardship than they were a year ago when unemployment reached its peak here with more than 20,000 unemployed at that time. At present there are probably still 17,000 to 18,000 unemployed but conditions are worse because more than 13,000 have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits and are receiving no income today, while last year they were still eligible and were receiving unemployment benefits. Consequently the present plight of thousands of our workers is worse than it was a year ago.

This condition has been reflected in a most revealing manner in the demands upon our municipal welfare departments for assistance. During the month of January, 1950 our city disbursed more than $30,000 in direct welfare relief and an additional $20,000 for veterans' benefits, making a total disbursement of more than $50,000 in one month, or at the rate of more than $600,000 per year. By comparison, the total amount disbursed for public welfare and veterans' benefits in 1949 was $324,000 so that the demands for assistance have doubled in the past few months with every prospect of reaching higher levels unless employment in our mills increases or a relief program is provided.

We feel that conditions brought about by unemployment in Lawrence are more serious than ever before and that every effort should be made by the Federal Government to alleviate this situation either by channeling Government orders for textiles to our mills as we suggested a year ago, or by a direct work relief program.

The people of our city and the members of our city council believe that if only a small part of the billions of dollars being expended by our Government to rehabilitate western Europe and to subsidize farmers so as to maintain their income at the highest wartime levels were spent to purchase textiles from our mills, it would go far to relieve the distress which is so prevalent among our unemployed workers.

We know that you expressed keen interest in our unemployment problem last year and we trust that you will continue to do all in your power to have our Federal Government take effective and immediate action to relieve prevailing conditions in Lawrence and other textile centers of Massachusetts.

Most sincerely yours,
GORDON E. GAFFNEY,
City Clerk.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Has Succeeded Because of Sound Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, January 19, 1950:

DEPOSIT INSURANCE

The joint Senate-House committee which recently reported on its study of Federal credit, monetary and fiscal policies, included an informative discussion of Federal deposit insurance.

Under present law the FDIC insures bank deposits up to a maximum of $5,000. This covers 96 percent of all accounts, but 54 percent of the total volume of deposits remain uncovered.

In case of a bank failure the deposits uncovered would seriously cripple a community. The large depositors are generally those establishments which have large pay rolls

which a failure would render them incapable of meeting.

However, the $5,000 limit has been almost purely academic and actually all deposits have been protected. This happens because the FDIC instead of waiting for banks to fail has anticipated matters and in case of a weak bank has brought about a merger with another institution. In doing that it has committed itself to financially supporting the merged institution to some extent but this has proved cheaper than the cumbersome process of receivership.

It is conceivable, of course, that if anything like the banking experience of the early thirties were to be repeated such operations would be beyond the capacity of the FDIC. If so, the $5,000 maximum would be the limit of the Corporation's power to pay off depositors. Then the disturbance to business life, resulting from the loss to larger depositors, would have its serious effect.

The committee suggests that Congress study thoroughly the advantages and disadvantages of increasing the coverage of deposits insurance and that no change be made in deposit insurance rates until after that study is completed. In brief the committee seems to raise the question as to whether it is better to lower the rates, a move often suggested, or raise the coverage.

We suggest that the amount covered by insurance will not be the determining factor in establishing the continued success of Federal insurance of bank deposits. That will be determined by the administration of the act.

When deposit insurance was suggested in 1933, there were many opponents, including the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. William Woodin. That opposition was based on the disastrous experience of State experiments in insurance of deposits.

After a decade and a half none of the bad consequences that the opponents foresaw have come to pass. But the reason they have not is that FDIC was soundly administered. It has not let weak situations accumulate but has taken care of them as they arose.

The earlier State insurance schemes failed because the administrators imagined there was some magic in the word insurance; that just insuring something was a guaranty against loss. The Federal administrators have realized that you cannot make a strong situation by lumping together a lot of weak units; that the strength of the whole structure depended on cleaning up weakness or on preventing it from developing.

The continued success of deposit insurance depends on the continuance of sound management. Changing the figure for covered deposits will not do much for it either way.

Clarification of the Purpose of House Joint Resolution 419—Alternate Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in his atomic-energy message to Congress October 3, 1945, said: "The release of atomic energy constitutes a new force too revolutionary to consider in the framework of old ideas."

It is in the spirit and meaning of the President's statement that I have tried to consider the problem of continuity of Federal leadership in the face of possible catastrophic obliteration of our National Capital by an atomic blitz.

The nerve center of Federal leadership is concentrated in Washington, D. C., or immediately adjacent to its boundaries. There is no doubt in my mind that Washington, D. C., would be target No. 1 for enemy attack. Paralysis of the nerve center for directing military and civilian movement in times of crisis is possible at the present moment on the basis of two undeniable facts·

(a) Concentration of the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of the Federal Government in one small area.

(b) Possession by a potential enemy nation of scientific weapons of mass destruction capable of destroying the Capital area.

I believe that it is imperative that Congress take cognizance of the problem which could be posed by possible enemy action. This is the problem: How can continuity of Federal leadership be guaranteed in the face of possible catastrophic obliteration of Capital facilities and key Federal personnel in the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of Government?

I am confident that calm consideration of the problem will produce a practical and workable solution.

I am also confident that the proper way to find the solution is to establish a commission composed of qualified Members to study the problem thoroughly and make suitable recommendations to the President and the Congress.

On February 20 I introduced a resolution—House Joint Resolution 419—proposing that a commission be created to investigate the measures which can be taken to insure the continuous operation of the United States Government in the event of attack by a foreign power. The commission would have two main fields of inquiry:

First. The feasibility of an alternate seat for the Government; and

Second. Appropriate procedures for selecting the successor of any President, Vice President, or Member of Congress who might become unable to perform his duties as the result of attack.

This resolution is receiving serious and careful attention by the departments and agencies of Government vested with responsibilities for the defense and security of the country. Many letters have come to me from persons who are thinking about the future of our country in the age of atomic science and the hydrogen bomb. Outstanding citizens within and outside the Government have responded favorably to the resolution. Newspaper editorial writers and radio commentators on the whole have been fair and intelligent in their analysis of the problems within the purview of the proposal I have made.

Understandably there have arisen a few misconceptions regarding this matter. Therefore, I lend my voice to those who plead for common sense and calm reasoning in these troublous times. I am not one who panders to panic. Nothing is more ill gotten than the publicity that plays on unreasoning fear.

My resolution does not contemplate removal of the Nation's Capital from its present site.

It does not advocate the relocation and dispersion of industry.

I am not suggesting that key executives and Members of Congress take flight from Washington, D. C., anymore than I am suggesting that the populace take flight from reason.

The burden of my resolution is a precautionary one. What measures are necessary to make sure that the machinery of government will not be paralyzed by a single knock-out blow? I propose that a small commission of responsible and informed citizens investigate and recommend to the President and the Congress the precautionary measures that must be taken.

An alternative seat of government to be used in the event of attack by a foreign power does not mean giving up our present Capital; it means simply that we must be prepared to carry on the operations of government from another place or other places in the event of sudden and drastic emergency.

To me it appears the essence of wisdom to take such preparatory steps. Unless we are genuinely concerned about the ways and means of maintaining continuity in the process of government, at some dark moment in the future we may be faced with complete and utter breakdown, our leaders gone, and our people panicked. Democracy then would disappear in the rubble. The greatest challenge of our times is the preservation of democratic government and institutions amid the awful and demanding pressures of the atomic age.

From a purely military standpoint, no doubt, the near-perfect defense would be the wholesale dispersion of industry and population, remaking the face of America on strategic defense lines without regard to the staggering economic costs involved or the devastating impact upon the lives and fortunes of its inhabitants. That is not the practical way, in fact, we would have to adopt the methods of dictatorship to attain this objective. For one thing is certain above all else; namely, that no foolproof defense can be devised against attack by the offensive weapons of our age. The most sensible thing we can do is to take vigorous defensive measures within the limits of our resources and our democratic institutions.

In stressing these limitations on defense, I do not for a moment imply that our case is hopeless; neither have I lost faith in the ultimate value of international organization for permanent peace.

What I do wish to convey—and this is the thought behind my resolution—is that we cannot shut our eyes to hard and dangerous facts; we must take the realistic measures for safeguarding the machinery of democratic government in the event of attack, even as we bend every effort to rendering such attack unlikely.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. Paul J. Larsen became director of the Nation's civil-defense program. In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter written by Mr. Edward I. Farley, of New York, a former naval officer, to the editor of the New York Times. Mr. Farley was at Pearl Harbor and was one of the very first Americans to fire a shot in World War II. An officer, he raced to an antiaircraft battery on his destroyer and fired at attacking Japanese bombers. There are many unsung war heroes. Mr. Farley is one of them.

The letter follows:

LACK OF CIVIL DEFENSE—EFFECTIVE PROGRAM FOR DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY CONSIDERED VITAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There is a serious—perhaps critical—gap in our national defense program. It is the absence of an adequate stand-by civil defense and internal security program. It is possible that a $7,000,000,000 military expenditure combined with an effective civil-defense plan could give us greater national security than we have now with an appropriation twice that size. Tragically little is being done to organize our civilian resources to meet the crisis that would result from surprise attack by Russia.

The Russians could deliver us, under the present circumstances of our civilian unpreparedness, a series of quick, paralyzing, and perhaps decisive body blows. They know that we are not prepared to meet such an attack and that it would be tremendously successful. This unnecessary exposure may not only someday induce Russian attack, but it aborts the security our national defense program is supposed to purchase.

Without proper civil defense, surprise attack would critically impair our ability to mobilize in time to help our allies. With the United States neutralized for even a few months, Russia would gain and consolidate her military objectives in Europe and Asia, with enormously enhanced chances of success. Our ability or our failure to weather succesfully the initial shock of surprise attack may easily be a decisive factor in the next war.

TIME FOR ORGANIZATION

Then why do we not have an effective civil-defense program? It is apparently felt in Washington that Russia does not want war and that we are not now in danger. Therefore, it is also apparently reasoned, civil defense is not necessary. Yet it would probably take 3 years to organize a civil-defense program to meet the kind of attack that Russia is now capable of delivering.

Many of our military leaders feel that civil defense is a civilian responsibility; many of our political and civilian leaders feel that it is a military responsibility. Obviously, effective civil defense must be the shared responsibility of our military and civilian authorities. The present administrative responsibility lies in the National Security Resources Board. This Board is responsible to the President, and for political reasons has long been without a chairman. The Board has only a small civil-defense staff and has not been able to adequately provide the civil-defense leadership nor to assume the responsibility in this matter that belongs to it.

Failure to give civil defense the part it should have in the over-all defense program is clearly largely the President's fault. He has ignored the one comprehensive study made on this subject, the so-called Hopley report prepared by a staff of experts under the late Russel J. Hopley, of the Office of Civil Defense Planning in the Secretary of Defense's office in 1948. He also ignored Bernard M. Baruch's suggested stand-by civil and industrial mobilization plan. Mr. Truman's views on civil defense are probably based on the hope that our $14,000,000,000 defense program will deter Russia from attacking us, and the view that civil defense does not make good political grist.

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP

A few States, such as California, New Jersey, New York, and Maine, are taking measures to provide civil-defense programs. However, an effective program requires that leadership originate and flow from Washington because of the required uniformity, flexibility, and coordination. The actual implementation and administration of the over-all specifications can and should be accomplished by the individual States.

The larger problem is how to awaken the President and the other responsible Washington authorities to the fact that we are wide open, and inviting trouble. As we now go, we are certainly not fooling Russia. We must not take false refuge in our inflated military budget, atomic bomb, B–36, guided missile, and all. We must recognize in our thinking and planning that the civilian and his family, the factory and its workers—the Nation itself—are exposed to direct and furious attack. Therefore, to deter Russia from war, to give us a better chance of winning if war should come, to get value received for every dollar spent on national defense—these things require without further delay an effective civil defense and internal-security program. It could be much later than any of us realize.

EDWARD I. FARLEY.

NEW YORK, *January 5, 1950.*

Danger in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, a terrible danger to world peace is boiling and bubbling in the Middle East. The Arab states, particularly Egypt, spurred on by serious misjudgments by the British Government, devoted to humanity at home and to the exploitation of humanity abroad, are showing every sign of preparing to renew their war of annihilation against the Republic of Israel, while the cold war in Europe engages the attention of most Americans.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD, first, an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune dated February 28, 1950, headed "Arms and the Middle East"; second, a letter addressed to me by Mr. Elihu D. Stone, national vice president, Zionist Organization of America; and third, a résumé of reports on the supply of arms by Great Britain to Arab states. In another place will be found the full text of the memorandum referred to by Mr. Stone.

I ask your particular attention, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Stone's assertion that, indirectly, the United States is supplying arms to the Arab states.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1950]

ARMS AND THE NEAR EAST

The latest Israeli request for permission for export of arms from the United States and Great Britain illuminates the stark fact that there is no peace in the Near East. Britain, under her old treaties, has resumed the shipment of weapons to the Arab states; the United States has lifted its embargo on such exports in accordance with the UN decision, and has licensed some sales to Israel. An arms race is on in the wake of the Palestine war.

But as in all similar situations it is not the arms that constitute the real danger of war—rather it is the will to use them. Peace certainly would not be insured by continuing British military aid to the Arabs, while the Israelis were debarred from obtaining weapons from the west. It would not be forwarded if the United States and Great Britain were to enter into a competition to see which nation could supply the greatest amount of arms to the contending parties. Even a new embargo by the western powers, although it might reduce some of the tension in the Palestine region, would not necessarily remove the fundamental threat. Both sides would seek other sources of supply, and if they found them in the Communist bloc of states the situation would be worsened all around.

The real answer to the problem does not lie in any juggling of arms shipments but in the conclusion of peace treaties among the nations involved in the Palestine imbroglio. The present armistice must be replaced by a genuine agreement which will permit the necessarily slow growth of mutual trust and cooperation. A workable solution of the question of Jerusalem must be found, and the United Nations as a body, the United States and Great Britain as interested powers, must exert their influence to bring the parties to terms.

The armistice agreements give a practical basis for a settlement; there have been substantial advances toward resolving disputes over boundaries, the refugees, and the like. Both Israel and the Arab states have domestic problems which clamor for undivided attention, and make heavy demands upon all the resources of skill, energy, and wealth that are available. Neither side can hope to obtain more, in terms of national prosperity and stability, from war than it would achieve by peaceful methods; indeed, war promises only disaster. If peace, a real peace, were made the first objective on the agenda of Israel, the Arab states, the United States and Britain, the arms race would be relegated to a subsidiary importance, and would die away of inanition.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I beg to be allowed the privilege of soliciting the exercise of your kind offices with reference to a problem in which American Jewry is deeply concerned—a problem of maintaining peace in the Near East—on behalf of the American Zionist Council, which consists of all Zionist parties and groups. The council includes the Zionist Organization of America, the Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America,

the Labor Zionist Organization of America, and the Mizrachi Organization of America (Orthodox).

Through the United Jewish Appeal, of which the Honorable Henry J. Morgenthau, Jr., is general chairman, American citizens of the Jewish faith are contributing millions of dollars to the Jewish Agency in Israel for the work of immigration and rehabilitation of tens of thousands of homeless Jews from Europe, known as the DP's, and from other countries.

However, it is distressing to learn from authoritative and reliable sources that peace in that part of the world is being threatened by the unprecedented rearmament of the Arab nations, particularly Egypt and Iraq, and that the source of the supply of arms is Great Britain.

I am enclosing herewith a memorandum which recites reliable facts relative to the Arab rearmament and the part played in it by England, as well as its accompanying threat of war based on authentic information coming from official and semiofficial Arab sources.

A study of the memorandum reveals warlike intentions of the neighboring Arab states against the State of Israel. They are energetically preparing themselves for what the Arab press describes as a second round. The tremendous military appropriations in their budgets conclusively establishes extravagant military preparations on the part of the Arabs for action, and that action is intended against Israel, a fact which the Arabs do not conceal. The volume and the kind of arms purchased by the Arabs from England and other European nations cannot be said by any stretch of the imagination to be merely for the purpose of maintaining internal domestic tranquillity.

Our own country, the United States of America, is deeply concerned in the maintenance of peace throughout the world, including the Near East. It is recognized that peace is indivisible; an aggressive military act anywhere is a disturbance of the peace everywhere.

The United States, under the Atlantic Pact, is supplying arms and ammunition to the western European nations, including England, which constitutes, in effect, a replacement of the arms shipped by England to the Arab nations. In fact, we have reason to believe that a part of the surplus of American arms left in England is today in the possession of Egypt and other Arab states. Thus, in effect, the arms are being paid for by the American taxpayer and, indirectly, the United States is contributing toward the rearmament of the Arab nations. As a direct result, Israel is compelled to divert a large part of its financial resources for armaments in order to meet the terrible threat of war. Thus, an armament race between Israel and the Arab countries is in full swing.

I sincerely hope that, consistent with your official position, you will deem it proper to communicate with the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, to the end that this terrible armament race of the Near East, which broods no good for mankind, shall be stopped, and that you will be good enough to insert your statement to the Secretary of State in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Indeed, the Department of State is possessed of the appropriate means for the purpose of impressing England, and the other countries in western Europe, with the evil consequences of the delivering of arms to the Arab countries whose warlike designs against Israel are a matter of public record.

If it is the policy of the Department of State, for reason of security resulting from the cold war, to rearm the countries of the Middle East, then certainly Israel should be included. Indeed, Israel may well be regarded as a faithful and cooperative ally of the west. Surely, Israel is no less worthy of confidence than its neighboring Arab countries, whose record in World War II is a rather dubious one. Israel is the bastion of democracy in the Near East. The establishment of a balance of armaments between Israel and the neighboring Arab states would eliminate fear and restlessness, and help to bring about the execution of peace treaties between Israel and its Arab neighbors, as a substitution for the present armistice treaties.

Perhaps you may be interested in a speech which Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN delivered on the subject of the rearmament of the Arab States, in the Senate, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1950. You may also be interested to know that William Green, president of the AFL, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, recently visited the President of the United States, protesting against the rearmament of the Arabs and requesting that Israel be supplied with arms so that it be placed on a par with the Arab States, who are being supplied with arms by England.

I respectfully suggest the advisability of making a statement on the floor of the House, in addition to the insertion of any communication that you may deem proper to forward to the Secretary of State, in accordance with your judgment.

We would be grateful to you if you will be kind enough to send us a copy of your communication to the Department of State.

I would be glad to come to see you personally if you find it necessary and if you let me hear from you.

Please accept our deep appreciation for your kind cooperation.

Respectfully,

ELIHU D. STONE,
National Vice President,
Zionist Organization of America.

REPORTS ON SUPPLY OF ARMS BY GREAT BRITAIN TO ARAB STATES

1. On June 9, 1949, a United Press dispatch stated that England had decided to lift the embargo on the supply of arms to the Arab countries.

2. Manchester Guardian wrote on June 18, 1949: "The decision of the British Government to renew her supply of arms to the Arab countries, while Lausanne talks are carried out, sounds like a threat."

3. Beirut broadcasting station (Lebanon) announced on September 4, 1949: "During the Palestinian War an arrangement had been made to purchase several warships. The embargo detained the sending of the ships. Now, the embargo being lifted, the ships are due in Egypt. One ship is harbored in Malta and is ready to leave for Egypt. Three other ships are still in British ports and will be leaving for Egypt soon."

4. Reuters quotes the Lebanese Defense Minister, Emir Arselan, as saying on September 6, 1949, that Lebanon has recently received from England 5 to 10 training planes. Another shipment is expected by the end of the month.

5. The Middle East broadcasting station announced on October 6, 1949: "The Syrian Government is contacting British aircraft manufacturers in order to buy airplanes from them. The Syrian Government also intends to send to England Syrian pilots to learn to pilot the jet airplanes."

6. El Misri (Cairo newspaper) correspondent in London wrote on October 17, 1949: "A British source indicates the arms purchase of Egypt in Britain to be worth the sum of £15,000,000."

7. The Daily Telegraph on October 27, 1949, said: "It was announced here today that the Egyptian Government has approved the purchase from Britain of 61 military aircraft. This total is stated to comprise 40 Spitfire models, 9 Halifaxes, and 12 DH–113 night fighters which were regarded here as a new type and hardly considered yet in the production stage. Egypt has a military mission at present in Britain. Spitfires are already in extensive use in the Egyptian Air Force which is cooperating today with the RAF in a major exercise for the defense of the Suez Canal. The prospective purchases from Britain are part of a plan approved in May to spend about £53,000,000 sterling on military equipment, including an armored division and an auxiliary air force. The Egyptian Government's intention to establish a factory in Egypt for the manufacture of 'fighter or Spitfire' planes and the agreement for this having been reached with a foreign government were announced in the senate here in July by the Minister of War and Marine Haydar Pasha. The proportion of the cost of the aircraft from Britain that may be assigned against Egypt's sterling balances is not mentioned."

8. The New York Times correspondent in London wrote on November 15, 1949: "The Egyptian Delegate in England has ordered a big order of jet planes of the latest types. The aircraft will be purchased from the DeHavilland Co. with the agreement of the British Government."

Retirement of Timothy W. Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent years about the problem of juvenile delinquency. So often we label a young lad delinquent because he gives the normal response to an abnormal situation. Then he is thrown into a reformatory which is probably the most abnormal of all abnormal situations in the world and, while there, he learns to perfect his technique of giving natural responses to abnormal conditions. Then we wonder why it is so difficult for him to readjust himself to a new and different society after his release.

What needs to undergo reforming is not the boy, but the social, spiritual, and physical environment in which he finds himself. In my opinion, it is the parents who oftentimes need reforming.

On March 1, in my home town of Buffalo, Timothy W. Regan retired as deputy director of the City Court Division of the Erie County Probation Department.

He has been one of Buffalo's outstanding citizens and has rendered almost 40 years of service to his community and his country. He was among the first in Buffalo to realize that the best and cheapest way to cure juvenile delinquency is not to let it happen. He knew that by providing a wide variety of proper group experiences in wholesome circumstances and under proper supervision much of the so-called "juvenile delinquency" could be prevented. He was a pioneer in establishing youth organizations to provide wholesome recreation for the youth of our town.

He knew that the cure for juvenile delinquency lay in individual diagnosis and treatment, and in the thousands of cases that passed through his hands in

his everyday work he used that individual approach, and found it highly successful. He knew that unless properly handled, a boy's natural reactions may be the forerunner of a serious behavior pattern.

It has been a real pleasure and privilege to have known and been associated with Timothy Regan, and I hope that, even though age has forced him to retire from active duty, he will be kept on an advisory basis because his knowledge and experience would indeed be a great loss to our community.

I want to take this opportunity to extend to him my heartiest congratulations on his seventieth birthday and my very best wishes for his continued success and good health.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith including an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express in this connection:

REGAN RETIRING MARCH 1 FROM PROBATION POST—COUNSELOR OF 150,000 IN 36-YEAR CAREER

(By Wes Johns)

A man who has counseled an estimated 150,000 persons in their hour of need during the last 36 years will retire March 1 from public life.

He is Timothy W. Regan, deputy director of the City Court Division of the Erie County Probation Department, who reached his seventieth birthday February 12. Regan's long experience as a humanitarian and probation officer has earned him the title of "Buffalo's trouble shooter."

Casting a retrospective eye over the past during an interview yesterday, the veteran probation chief drew a comparison between the problems facing youth today and 3 decades ago. He also cited what he believed to be the four most important factors contributing to crime among the younger element today.

INFLUENCES TO CRIME

There, he asserted, are:

1. Environment: America has undergone great changes in 50 years, in many cases for the worse. Careless fathers and mothers who allow their children to roam the streets at night, broken homes and overindulgent parents contribute to crime.

2. Bad companions: This is an outside the home influence which may contribute to crime. Under bad companions may be listed both persons and books.

3. Neglect of religion: This may be followed by a total disregard for other sacred things and for the law. I have found the boy or girl who observes God's law is seldom charged with disobeying man-made law.

4. A general indifference by the community to the welfare of young persons: Members of the community will sit by and see questionable resorts spring up and not question them. Failure to wipe out vicious entertainment and failure to provide proper recreational facilities. We might better spend $5,000 for a playground than many times that sum for reform institutions.

NO CHANGE IN PREVENTIVES

In drawing a comparison between crime today and 36 years ago, Regan observed that most law breakers three decades ago were full-grown men of 21 and over.

Now conditions have changed so that it is not uncommon to see youths from 16 to 22 years old involved in felonies and serious crimes. While the age has lowered, there has been no change in the main preventive feature in crime.

"Proper parental supervision is the arch of youthful character for which no substitute has ever been found," Regan observed.

Boys and girls today, however, are pretty much the same as several decades ago, Regan believes.

During retirement, Regan plans to live an active life, in which fishing, walking, gardening and travel will be the principal ingredients.

"I'll see America first, then Europe," he said.

One of the city's wittiest and most polished speakers, Regan also will continue to make platform appearances.

INTERESTED IN SPORTS

Regan also expects to continue his interest in sports, which began when he pulled an oar on the 1914 West Side Rowing Club crew.

Regan was appointed probation officer November 14, 1913. By the unanimous choice of ten city court judges, he was made deputy chief probation officer December 20, 1927. He was appointed chief probation officer on the death of his predecessor, William E. Wiley, March 9, 1928.

Regan was the first Italian-speaking probation officer appointed here, and for 15 years he worked with the Italian people of the city.

Regan instituted many reforms including a prevention clinic. This has now become a fixed feature and the clinic, largely through Regan's effort, has been a means of saving many young folks from crime. It has also been the means of settling family disputes and keeping homes intact.

Regan has always emphasized that unclean literature has been a great factor in wrongdoing by young persons.

SERVES MANY ASSOCIATIONS

In 1944, Regan was voted a frontiersman by the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce. He has also been an honorary citizen of Boys Town for more than 20 years, also a sponsor of the Catholic Youth Organization of the Buffalo diocese, and a member of the Buffalo Boy Scout Council and Advancement Committee and his parish committee of the Nativity, Albany and Herkimer.

During the time Regan has been the head of the City Court Probation Division, approximately 97,000 persons have passed through his department, and $10,000,000 nas been collected in fines, restitution and nonsupport.

The Medical Treatment Supplied by the Veterans' Administration for Veterans of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in these remarks, I desire to discuss the medical, dental, and hospital services presently being furnished to Alabama veterans by the Veterans' Administration. My emphasis will be on these services as they relate to veterans living in Blount, Cullman, Fayette, Franklin, Lamar, Marion, Pickens, Walker, and Winston Counties which make up the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

There are presently three veterans' hospitals in Alabama, located at Tuscaloosa, Montgomery, and Tuskegee. A fourth Veterans' Administration hospital is under construction at Birmingham.

The hospital at Tuscaloosa, Ala., is primarily for neuropsychiatric cases but has an allotment of beds for general medical cases.

The hospital at Montgomery is for general medical cases only, but will in real emergencies accept other types of cases.

The hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., is maintained altogether for colored veterans. It accepts general medical cases and neuropsychiatric cases as well.

APPLICATIONS FOR HOSPITALIZATION

A. ROUTINE CASES

In a routine case—where an emergency does not exist—an application for hospitalization should be sent to the regional office, of the Veterans' Administration at Montgomery, Ala. There, the eligibility of the applicant for hospitalization will be determined, and his application sent to the proper one of the three hospitals. When a bed is available the hospital notifies the veteran to report.

B. EMERGENCY CASES

In an emergency case the veteran or his representative should telephone the hospital nearest to him. This may be done by the veteran himself, by his doctor, or by a service organization representative such as the representative of the State Department of Veterans' Affairs, the American Red Cross, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, and others. If possible, it is highly desirable that a doctor call the hospital so that he may professionally explain to the admitting officer of the hospital the nature of the emergency condition of the veteran.

OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration may authorize out-patient treatment for a veteran if:

First. The veteran has a condition which carries a service-connected rating. This condition does not have to be one that the veteran necessarily receives compensation for. The condition must be service-connected, but it may be a condition that has been rated as not disabling to a compensable degree.

Second. The veteran has a condition which may tend to aggravate a service-connected condition.

Third. The veteran is enrolled in training under the provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, and has a condition that would cause his training to be interrupted.

APPLICATIONS FOR OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL TREATMENT

The Veterans' Administration through its Montgomery, Ala., regional office, maintains suboffices at Decatur, Birmingham, and Montgomery. Veterans desiring out-patient treatment should contact the chief medical officer of the office serving his area. If the veteran lives in Franklin or Cullman Counties he would contact the Decatur, Ala., office. If he lives in Pickens County, he would

contact the Montgomery, Ala., office. If he lives in Marion, Walker, Winston, Blount, Fayette, or Lamar Counties he would contact the Birmingham office.

WHO GIVES OUT-PATIENT MEDICAL OR DENTAL TREATMENT

When a veteran has been approved for out-patient treatment he will be treated by either:

First. One of the subregional offices at Decatur, Birmingham, or Montgomery, each of which has medical and administrative personnel with which to handle out-patient treatments.

Second. Fee-basis doctors or dentists. Any doctor or dentist licensed to practice in Alabama may get his or her name on the approved list of fee-basis doctors and dentists by making application to the Veterans' Administration.

Third. Other doctors. If the veteran who is approved for out-patient treatment prefers that his treatment be given him by his family or home-town physician or dentist, he should make such request to the chief medical officer of the subregional Veterans' Administration office—at Decatur, Birmingham, or Montgomery—serving his area.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks a list of the fee-basis physicians and dentists living in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama who have heretofore made application and been appointed as fee-basis physicians and dentists of the Veterans' Administration:

FEE-BASIS PHYSICIANS

Blount County: Dr. Vernon E. Whitehead, Blountsville, Ala.; Dr. J. S. Wittemeir, Cleveland, Ala.; Dr. M. Denton, Oneonta, Ala.

Cullman County: Dr. E. B. Barnes, Dr. Thomas D. Beatty, Dr. J. C. Chambliss, Dr. R. B. Dodson, Dr. C. E. Herrin, Dr. V. P. Hughes, Dr. Frank C. Stitt, Dr. Roy W. Williams, Dr. Robert F. Williford, all located in Cullman, Ala.; Dr. George T. Rowe, Hanceville, Ala.

Fayette County: Dr. B. W. McNease, Dr. J. Banks Robertson, Fayette, Ala.; Dr. J. D. Scrivner, Berry, Ala.

Franklin County: Dr. J. D. Burns, Dr. Clarence D. Prichard, Dr. J. S. Snoddy, Dr. Wm. H. Spruell, Dr. W. E. Wilson, all in Russellville, Ala.; Dr. Zadoc L. Weatherford, Red Bay, Ala.

Lamar County: Dr. Charles A. Davis, Kennedy, Ala.; Dr. John M. Robert, Vernon, Ala.

Marion County: Dr. J. O. Brooks, Hamilton, Ala.; Dr. Robert L. Hill, Dr. M. C. Hollis, Winfield, Ala.; Dr. M. S. White, Hamilton, Ala.

Pickens County: Dr. V. L. Ashcraft, Reform, Ala.; Dr. Lewis C. Davis, Gordo, Ala.; Dr. Hugh W. Hill, Carrollton, Ala.; Dr. Robert K. Wilson, Aliceville, Ala.

Walker County: Dr. James Andrew, Cordova, Ala.; Dr. Frank Blanton, Saragossa, Ala.; Dr. J. C. Gladney, Jasper, Ala.; Dr. Clarke E. Ginther, Gorgas, Ala.; Dr. A. C. Jackson, Jasper, Ala.; Dr. Bruce Johnson, Flat Creek, Ala.; Dr. Giles W. Jones, Parrish, Ala.; Dr. Giles W. Jones, Goodsprings, Ala.; Dr. Gaines W. Keith, Carbon Hill, Ala.; Dr. Karl E. Maneval, Parrish, Ala.; Dr. T. J. Payne, Jr., Jasper, Ala.; Dr. H. J. Sankey, Nauvoo, Ala.; Dr. John T. Simmons, Dr. William T. Snoddy, Dr. J. K. Taggert, Dr. L. M. Walker, Jasper, Ala.; Dr. H. S. Watkins, Oakman, Ala.

Winston County: Dr. Robert F. Blake, Dr. W. M. Godsey, Dr. R. Lee Hill, Dr. W. E. Howell, Dr. Hobson Manasco, Dr. Charles A. Oliver, Dr. William K. Wilson, all in Haleyville, Ala.

FEE BASIS DENTISTS

Blount County: Dr. John P. Brittain, Dr. Robert E. Brittain, Oneonta, Ala.

Cullman County: Dr. George W. Bledsoe, Dr. Leroy C. Bledsoe, Dr. Sidney H. Morrow, Dr. Elmer G. Plunkett, all in Cullman, Ala.

Fayette County: Dr. Horace E. Berry, Fayette, Ala.

Franklin County: Dr. Julius Y. Blake, Dr. Thomas S. Jones, Jr., Dr. Alonzo L. Owens, all in Russellville, Ala.

Lamar County: Dr. John L. Davis, Sulligent, Ala.

Marion County: Dr. Franklin M. Shirey, Winfield, Ala.; Dr. Henry H. Sizemore, Guin, Ala.

Pickens County: Dr. Lon Alexander, Gordo, Ala.; Dr. William H. Comerford, Reform, Ala.; Dr. James V. Sullivan, Aliceville, Ala.

Walker County: Dr. Doyce G. Briscoe, Dr. Dan M. Christopher, Dr. Malvern B. Cooper, Dr. Thomas D. Rice, Dr. Orland L. Rice, all in Jasper, Ala.; Dr. Samuel E. Knox, Carbon Hill, Ala.

Winston County: Dr. W. Stewart Brock, Dr. Fred Robinson, Dr. John W. Robinson, all in Haleyville, Ala.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR RATING PURPOSES

All examinations for rating purposes are conducted either at a Veterans' Administration office, by a Veterans' Administration physician, or by doctors selected by the Veterans' Administration from the approved fee-basis list. The veteran is not allowed to select the doctor who examines him for rating purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I insert at this point a letter from Hon. Harley A. Smith, manager, the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Montgomery, Ala., which deals exclusively with the subject matter of these remarks:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
REGIONAL OFFICE,
Montgomery, Ala., January 26, 1950.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: I have delayed a few days in replying to your letter of January 18, but believe that I now have the information that you want.

In this letter I shall explain first the set-up for handling out-patient treatment and examination, and in the second portion a few comments about the VA hospital set-up within the State. Under both sections of the letter I shall refer principally to your congressional district, but will also give you a picture of the organization for the entire State.

I am sending along with this letter a map that shows the location of the Montgomery regional office and three VA offices under the jurisdiction of this office. In each of these VA offices we have a chief medical officer and other professional and administrative personnel to handle out-patient treatment and examinations for rating purposes and examinations to determine the need for hospitalization. The footnotes on this map explain the routing of requests for emergency medical treatment, as well as requests for hospitalization. I note that your congressional district falls into three different areas as far as out-patient medical service is concerned. The chief medical officers located at Decatur, Birmingham, and Montgomery will give prompt attention to requests received from any areas of the State. For purposes of administration and control, however, it is desirable to contact the chief medical officer serving counties within each subarea. For example, veterans living in Franklin and Cullman Counties will contact the Decatur office; those in Pickens County, the Montgomery office, and the remainder of the counties in your area will contact the Birmingham office.

It might be well to point out in this letter that out-patient treatment can be authorized only under certain circumstances. These circumstances are as follows:

(a) Treatment of any condition which carries a service-connected rating—whether it be a compensable rating or not.

(b) Any condition that may tend to aggravate a service-connected condition.

(c) For veterans who are enrolled in training under the provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, treatment may be authorized for any condition that would cause the veteran's training to be interrupted.

The coverage for handling out-patient treatment includes fee-basis and home-town doctors as well as VA medical offices located on the map. I shall explain briefly the set-up on fee-basis doctors and treatment by hometown doctors who are not on the approved list of fee-basis physicians.

(a) Fee-basis doctors: Any doctor or dentist who is licensed to practice in the State of Alabama is approved as far as the VA is concerned. To be on the approved list of fee-basis doctors and dentists, however, it is necessary that the doctors make application to the VA and be appointed as a fee-basis doctor. I am sending along with this letter a list of fee-basis doctors and dentists located in your congressional district. This list contains only the names of doctors who have made application and been appointed on a fee-basis.

(b) Other doctors: Doctors other than those listed on the fee-basis list may render out-patient treatment on request of the veteran concerned. If a veteran is eligible for treatment he may indicate to the VA that he desires the treatments to be rendered by his family or hometown physician. These requests should be made to the chief medical officers of the respective VA offices. The chief medical officer will then authorize treatments to be rendered.

In your letter you did not refer to medical examinations for rating purposes, but I would like to point out that a veteran may not select the doctor to perform this type medical examination. All examinations for rating purposes are conducted either at a VA office, by a VA physician, or by doctors selected from the approved fee-basis list.

With regard to the hospital set-up, there are three VA hospitals in the State. They are located at Tuscaloosa, Montgomery, and Tuskegee. The hospital at Tuscaloosa is primarily for NP cases, but has a certain allotment of beds for general medical cases. The Montgomery hospital is for general medical cases only, except, in real emergencies, other types of cases will be accepted. The hospital at Tuskegee is entirely for colored veterans—both general medical and NP-type cases.

Applications for hospitalization in routine cases where an emergency does not exist, should be sent to the VA regional office in Montgomery. At the regional office eligibility is determined and the application routed to the appropriate hospital. When a bed is available, the hospital then advises the veteran to report. In cases where an emergency medical condition exists, the nearest VA hospital should be contacted. The veteran himself, local doctors, or service organization representatives may call the hospital. It is more desirable, however, that a doctor call so that the nature of the emergency condition can be professionally described to the admitting officer at the hospital.

It is a pleasure to pass this information along to you. If I have failed to mention anything in this letter that you had in mind, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY A. SMITH,
Manager.

Revision of the Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the House Committee on Ways and Means to urge favorable consideration of the proposal that certain wartime excise taxes should be completely removed or drastically reduced.

The excise taxes on such articles as ladies' handbags, luggage, cosmetics, baby oil, electric light blubs, electric and gas cooking appliances and water heaters, photographic equipment, furs, jewelry, and on such services as local and long distance telephone calls, telegrams, passenger travel, freight shipments and movie admission tickets were imposed as a wartime emergency measure to raise revenue and discourage sales to civilians of scarce articles and the civilian use of over-burdened public services, such as telephones, telegraph and railroads. It was not the intent of Congress at the time these war taxes were imposed that they be made permanent taxes on the American people. They were special emergency taxes for these two special purposes.

Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) would have expired 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities of the war.

I think it should be mentioned that our people would not now be burdened with these taxes had it not been for the action of the Eightieth Congress which passed H. R. 1030, a bill to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates. This bill passed the House of Representatives on January 29, 1947, as is recorded on page 727 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

H. R. 1030, passed by the Eightieth Congress, amended section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to war-tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes, by striking out the provision that such taxes would expire 6 months after the date of termination of hostilities, thus continuing these taxes indefinitely.

Likewise, H. R. 1030 amended section 1654, the retail tax on luggage, etc., and section 1659, relating to the tax on billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys. This bill also amended section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on transportation of persons).

Because of the action of the Eightieth Congress in continuing these wartime excise taxes on a permanent basis, it is necessary that we take action at this time to repeal them. They bear most heavily on that portion of our population least able to pay heavy taxes. These taxes have an adverse effect on retail business. They discourage sales of many important commodities and are imposed on many items that are necessities, not luxuries. I should like to point out the great injustice of levying a 20-percent tax on electric-light bulbs, on baby oil, and on movie tickets, to mention only three of the many unjust taxes that were continued by the Eightieth Congress.

There is another phase of this tax problem that I would like to discuss briefly—the tax on charity funds of fraternal orders. If you will pardon a personal reference, the Elks Lodge, of which I am a member, each year holds a charity ball to raise funds solely for the purpose of relieving distress and furnishing Christmas baskets to some of the less fortunate families of the community. I believe the present tax on charity funds is not in the public interest and should be repealed. I strongly urge your committee to relieve fraternal orders from this unjust burden of taxation.

In conclusion, I want to tell you that I shall support this committee's efforts in carrying out the President's recommendations and suggestions concerning the elimination of the tax loopholes which now permit some groups to escape their fair share of taxation. I fully agree with the President's statement that "The continued escape of privileged groups from taxation violates the fundamental democratic principle of fair treatment for all, and undermines public confidence in the tax system."

I hope you will succeed in your endeavor to plug all these loopholes.

Protect Those Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, there is pending legislation before both Houses of the Congress which, if enacted into law, would continue to have the alarming effect that is stressed in an editorial from the Bridgeport, Conn., Post of February 28. I am one of those who is completely in accord with the provision of necessary protection to the industrial workers of Connecticut and New England whose jobs might be jeopardized because of the fact that our money sent abroad put into manufacture of products like those produced in our great Northeast could be sold in the United States at a much lesser price. This lesser price would be possible because the goods could be manufactured at a greatly reduced cost and imported into our markets with little limitation on the volume since our reciprocal trade agreements include no peril clauses; devalued currency in the foreign countries further lessens the cost of production as compared with our costs of manufacture.

Under leave to extend my remarks to include this editorial, I also take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his stand in this matter, and I trust that he and many others will continue to be on the alert for statements of administrators and proponents of legislation in which they reveal the actual intent of the proposals which, unchallenged, would be the authorized purpose of appropriations when they became approved acts, and, as such, a detriment to jobs that presently have some semblance of security. The editorial follows:

PROTECT THOSE JOBS

Workers in New England factories have some cause to be grateful, we think, to Senator CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts—brother of Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Fairfield County—for the prompt and decisive manner in which he challenged the statement of ECA Director Hoffman that we must import floods of European-manufactured articles into this country to enable the nations of Europe to repay us some of the millions which we are pouring across the Atlantic.

Senator LODGE pointed out at once that this meant a sharp loss of jobs in our own country. If the European articles to be imported are similar to the ones which we make ourselves, their importation means an equal decline in the sale of American-made goods with a consequent loss of jobs in American factories. We all know what has happened already to the watch industry of Waltham, Mass., because of the flood of Swiss watches pouring into this country.

Instead of being refuted, Senator LODGE's charge was practically admitted by those on the other side of the debate when they suggested that the situation might be met by special provision for unemployment insurance on jobs lost because of imports and also for a Government plan to retrain the jobless for other lines of work. The Senator from Massachusetts at once retorted that our workers want jobs not doles.

As for retraining them now, why should they alone be forced to bear this dislocation? For that matter, why should the cost of financing Europe be borne, indirectly through loss of jobs and business, by one section of the United States—the industrial section? Perhaps the agricultural South and West are not particularly concerned, but they ought to be. A loss of purchasing power in New England would mean a loss of the market for other American products from other sections of the country.

It is encouraging to note from the tone of the debate which followed Senator LODGE'S declaration, that his point sank home. Members of Congress as a group are not ready to sacrifice employment here for the sake of carrying out these world-wide schemes which always seem to begin by robbing American taxpayers, to pour their money all over the globe.

A Rational Approach to a Difficult Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication I have received from Mr. Raymond M. Hilliard, chairman of the mayor's advisory committee on Puerto Rican affairs in New York City. I include the covering letter to me only to make clear the main part of the communication, which is a copy of a letter addressed to Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin by Mr. Hilliard. To save space, I am omitting the list of members of the mayor's committee, except that I wish to mention that Mr. Manuel Cabranes, Director of the New York Office of Government of Puerto Rico Department of Labor, Employment and Migration Bureau, 1881 Broadway, is vice chairman; the membership is widely representative of New York's responsible public leaders.

To those of us who believe in an open door immigration policy, it is profoundly disturbing to be forced to advocate any kind of restrictions; and I present this

communication to the House as an example of a rational approach, devoid of hysteria and emotion, toward a most difficult problem of readjustment of underprivileged American citizens.

CITY OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE,
New York, N. Y., February 23, 1950.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: The undersigned Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs was appointed by Mayor William O'Dwyer to advise him on all matters affecting the integration of Puerto Rican immigrants in New York City.

In matters requiring Federal legislative or administrative consideration, it is our intention to inform you, from time to time, of the findings and recommendations of this committee. A list of the membership of the committee is enclosed for your information.

At the present time we wish to call your attention to the enclosed letter to Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin. In this letter we have set forth a strong representation to the Secretary on the Department of Labor's policies for the admission of migrant agricultural workers from foreign countries.

We are especially concerned that the Department's policies shall be modified to exclude workers from the British West Indies, unless it can be definitely established that no American citizens are available for this kind of employment.

We hope that you will agree with us on this matter which so vitally affects the interests of the people of New York City and Puerto Rico and that you will take appropriate action to support our position on it.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND M. HILLIARD,
Chairman, Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City.

CITY OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1950.

The Honorable MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY TOBIN: The undersigned committee has been appointed by Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, to look into the problems of the city occasioned by the concentration of Puerto Rican migrants, past and prospective.

In connection with our work, we have learned that large numbers of British subjects from the British West Indies have been admitted to this country for the past several years to perform seasonal agricultural work. Among the unemployed in New York are many Puerto Ricans and probably others who have had prior agricultural experience and who are readily available for the work performed by these British subjects. In addition, we are advised that unemployed agricultural workers in Puerto Rico are also available for this work. Aside from constituting a constant drain on Puerto Rico's economy, these unemployed United States citizens are the prospective migrants most of whom, if they decide to migrate, will settle in New York City.

The city of New York is not in any way attempting to discourage the free migration of American citizens. Those who desire to come will be welcome, as were their predecessors. But it is senseless to foster such migration by perpetuating a continued state of unemployment in Puerto Rico. This unemployment results from affording to foreign workers work which could be performed by capable and willing Americans.

We understand that you, as Secretary of Labor, have the ultimate determination of whether foreign workers are permitted to enter the country. You have publicly stated your position to be:

"The labor requirements of the agricultural industry are of such complex nature that it is not possible at this time to end our present arrangements for the use of foreign agricultural workers. This is not possible because it is necessary, as a part of our national economy, to have the necessary manpower available where and when it is needed to handle agricultural products."

Insofar as the above statement applies to Mexican and Canadian citizens, there may be special governing considerations. We strenuously urge that you reconsider your position concerning the British West Indians and, until it is affirmatively established that American citizens are unavailable in sufficient numbers to do the work required, we urge that British subjects be excluded.

The fact that 90 percent of migrating Puerto Ricans locate in the city of New York compels our interest in this matter.

We are communicating our point of view to all New York City Congressmen.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND M. HILLIARD,
Chairman, Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City.

Operators Used Taft-Hartley Club To Prolong Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by Hon. James O. Monroe, which appeared in the Collinsville (Ill.) Herald, of which he is the publisher, on February 10, 1950:

HUNGER MAY FORCE THE MINERS BACK TO WORK, BUT THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW WILL NEVER DO IT

For the first time in the history of the infamous Taft-Hartley law, a show-down on its power to compel men to work against their will is near—and it will fail.

On Monday, after months of unsuccessful negotiations with coal mine operators for a new contract embodying new demands, more than 400,000 soft coal miners of the United Mine Workers quit work, saying they would not return until a new contract was signed. Hunger may force them back to the pits, but the Taft-Hartley law never will do it.

President Truman reluctantly invoked the hated law Monday by appointing a board of inquiry, which is to report back to him within a week. The report may afford the basis for the President to ask a court injunction as provided in the Taft-Hartley law. The law was invoked against the miners nearly two years ago, and Federal Judge Goldsborough fined both the union and its president, John L. Lewis, heavily. Lewis ordered the men back to work, and they complied with the order. I predict that Lewis will not again order the men to return to work, and should he do so, I predict they will not heed the order. The die, I repeat, is cast for a show-down as to the force of the law, and the miners, I am convinced, will not heed it so long as there is a crumb of bread in the cupboard.

While Lewis can be fined, or jailed, and while the union treasury can be stripped bare under a Federal court order, there is no penalty in the law for the men who refuse to respect either the order of the court or the order of the union officials. Therein lies its fatal weakness. The law, as I have said before, amounts only to intimidation, not to coercion. Congressmen who framed the law, being more bent on breaking the unions than in the public welfare, had not the courage to put penalties upon the men who dig the coal, and even if they had imposed penalties, no coal would have been mined. Coal miners are rugged, and, while they might endure prison, they will not be slaves.

I discussed this eventuality in some detail—and prophetically—in the statement I made to the House Labor Committee in Washington last March.

"I do not want to be taken as an inciter to strikes or to defiance of the Government," I told the committee, "but I predict that under the present law there will be strikes where the men will not follow the orders of the officials who give them under court injunction."

"And," I added, "I suggest to you that in such event you will have left the Nation helpless."

A few minutes previously, I had said to the committee:

"The practical question, it seems to me, is whether or not members of a union are under any responsibility to, and therefore will respect, the orders of the union, particularly when the union orders are in contravention of the union's policy and are, moreover, delivered under duress of a court order. Neither the union laws, nor the statute, nor the court order suggests any such eventuality. So far as I can discern any inhibition in the law, the men can strike as quickly and as long as they please. And no matter how crippling a court order may be to the union, nothing is achieved for industrial resumption unless the men go back to work. One may say that the men have some responsibility to obey the orders of the officers, but the law does not say so, and Judge Goldsborough did not say so, and even if both said so, there is no penalty on the men if they refuse—which makes the law well nigh a nullity."

When I put this proposition to Senator C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, a Taft-Hartley champion, at a breakfast at Alton in October 1948 he admitted that I was correct, and when I said to him that the law which he had been touting to the voters was mostly bluff he did not dissent.

The miners appear prepared to call the Taft-Hartley bluff. They called Brooks' bluff in November 1948.

I lament as much as anyone else the distress of the Nation which will be created by this strike, but I applaud the courage of the coal miners in demonstrating the futility of the vaunted Taft-Hartley law.

Coal-mine operators last Thursday walked out of a final conference with the UMWA officials in Washington, hoping that this break-down of negotiations over the contract issues would lead the President to invoke the Taft-Hartley law 80-day "waiting period." This, if the men had respected it, would have given the operators the advantage of having the men continue to work for nearly 3 months more under the conditions of the old contract which has expired. That is the fundamental wrong of the Taft-Hartley law, that it continues the status quo which suits the operators and ignores the demands of the workers.

In my address to the House Committee I made a suggestion on this score, which the Taft-Hartley law supporters did not heed, but which now may get some attention. The suggestion was this:

"If you should be so enamored of the waiting-period idea, and whether you enforce it by injunction or by explicit statute, this suggestion comes to me as being worth tendering to you: It would be extremely soothing to men who have to work under threat of a penalty against their union for refusing,

if you would provide that whatever benefits they may eventually secure, through the negotiations which may ensue during the waiting period or after it, should be retroactive to the date on which the coerced period began. That matter of simple justice would appeal to the men, would allay their feeling of injustice and would, I think, facilitate settlement of disputes."

The coal miners by their strike are not likely to create any immediate sentiment for just treatment, either by the coal operators or by the Congress. Rather, they will be blamed entirely for the distress which a prolonged strike is bound to cause. Nobody ever seems to think of suggesting some coercion upon the operators, who only have to stand pat and let the miners take all the blame.

But the miners are willing to endure this censure, along with their personal distress. The only question now is whether their cash in hand or their credit at the neighborhood grocery will last as long as the Nation's coal piles.

Out of all the suffering, I think, will come a realization that industrial peace cannot be achieved by court orders. At least it will be seen that the present law, harsh as it is, is no stay against industrial paralysis. And the Nation then will face the choice of adopting Government controls which will encompass both employers and employees—the only controls that can be either effective or fair—or of undertaking to achieve conciliation with retroactive benefit provisions to make the settlement efforts more sincere.

Proposed Cuts in the Veterans' Administration Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandums sent out by the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion regarding proposed cuts in the Veterans' Administration budget:

1951 VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Submitted herewith is copy of a release being put out by the Veterans' Administration today announcing drastic personnel reductions throughout the VA system. This comes as a sudden blow since the VA budget request for 1951 as submitted to Congress does not reveal the necessity for such action. Apparently negotiations for additional funds have been going on which probably ended with a disapproval by the Budget Bureau. We interpret that the effect of this reduction will be the creation of examination backlogs in the regional offices and reduction in the scope of services rendered in hospitals. Another effect will be a demoralizing one upon the VA personnel; with consequent impairment of quality and output of work:

"VA today announced that a reduction in force of approximately 7,800 jobs will be made primarily in order to bring personnel within the provisions of the VA budget as submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1951. The reduction in force also is prompted at this time to offset in part a shortage in salary funds for the balance of fiscal year 1950.

"The reduction will be Nation-wide and will include all activities of the VA. Some 3,000 employees in hospitals and homes, and 4,000 in other activities will be included.

"Managers of VA field stations Monday will be notified of their new personnel ceilings and notices of separation will be in the hands of employees by March 10, 1950, which will permit customary 30-day notice of separation. The reduction in force will be made under civil-service regulations.

"The VA explained that immediate action must be taken. Otherwise employment levels during the early months of fiscal year 1951, which begins July 1, 1950, would be above those for which funds would be available on an annual basis. Unless this step is taken now, more drastic curtailment would be necessary during fiscal year 1951.

"This reduction will not affect the VA new hospital construction program or plans for staffing these hospitals."

It will be recalled that 2 years ago a similar situation occurred which alerted the American Legion to go into action before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Later the legislative and rehabilitation directors were heard by a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. A deficiency appropriation was eventually approved which permitted a more gradual reduction and less impairment of services to veterans and less hardship in making necessary adjustments.

This office will appreciate getting full information about the effect of this drastic cut-back on the essential services to veterans in both regional offices and hospitals. The national commander has been notified and everything possible will be done to see that these essential services are maintained at a level traditionally supported by this organization.

T. O. KRAABEL,
National Director.

Here is text of statement being released by VA today with reference to personnel reduction. It is worse than we thought last night when I sent you the preliminary report:

"VA today announced that a reduction in force of approximately 7,800 jobs will be made primarily in order to bring personnel within the provisions of the VA budget as submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1951. The reduction in force also is prompted at this time to offset in part a shortage in salary funds for the balance of fiscal year 1950.

"The reduction will be Nation-wide and will include all activities of the VA. Some 3,000 employees in hospitals and homes, and 4,000 in other activities will be included.

"Managers of VA field stations Monday will be notified of their new personnel ceilings and notices of separation will be in the hands of employees by March 10, 1950, which will permit customary 30-day notice of separation. The reduction in force will be made under civil-service regulations.

"The VA explained that immediate action must be taken. Otherwise employment levels during the early months of fiscal year 1951, which begins July 1, 1950, would be above those for which funds would be available on an annual basis. Unless this step is taken now more drastic curtailment would be necessary during fiscal year 1951.

"This reduction will not affect the VA new hospital-construction program or plans for staffing these hospitals."

In my best judgment this should become an objective of primary importance with the American Legion, especially after we have received reports from coworkers in the field as to the effect of these reductions upon the essential services to veterans.

We are preparing a bulletin which is being sent out to our regular mailing list asking them to keep us advised of the consequences they observe in the regional offices and hospitals in their respective areas. Another factor we have to look forward to is the demoralizing effect upon the employees with a consequent lowering of both the quality and quantity of work. We can definitely look forward to mounting backlogs of examinations, claims adjudication, waiting lists and even a shrinkage in the coverage of medical and hospital care, especially in the outpatient services.

T. O. KRAABEL.

A Cry of Despair From China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a cry of despair from a desolate group of refugees from Nazi horror, now faced with Communist terror, huddled forsaken in Shanghai.

These are people who fled from central Europe, from one hell to another, hungry, bedraggled, but clinging to their faith in God and man, more than a decade ago, and still have found no haven—except for those who have found the final haven of death.

This message, presented in the quaint language of the original, was sent to the World Jewish Congress by the Migration Committee of Central European DP's in Shanghai, a last despairing cry for help.

If the undersigned committee hereby takes the liberty to approach you, it is primarily because we have learned from many a public utterance and action of yours in which high-minded way you have repeatedly taken concern in the needs and worries of your fellowmen.

We represent a group of approximately 900 central European refugees, all of which are eligible for UN-IRO assistance, that now here, due to circumstances, have gotten into severe economical as well as physical difficulties—if they are not indeed in great danger.

For years these people have had only one desire: To find a new home in the United States of America. They have so far failed in doing so, mainly on account of the quota system. For example, not a single Rumanian, Hungarian quota has been allocated to this refugee center and for the last 2 years not one person under the Czechoslovakian and Austrian quota has been processed.

During the Pacific war interned by the Japanese into a ghetto, their existences, hardly just and so painstakingly build up only, were destroyed again. Throughout this period actually the only hope that kept them up was the possibility to be given a chance at the end of the war for resettlement and rehabilitation in the land of their longing, the United States of America.

However, it was to come differently. Tragedies that can hardly be described resulted out of this quota system. Parents from their children, married couples, relatives, friends were separated or, after many years of separation, still are unable to achieve reuniting. But the law had to be abided by "Summum ius, summa iniuria."

American policy and law-making parties realized the cruelty of this system, and in a special DP bill in 1948 it was attempted

to eliminate its hardness. How abyssmal was our consternation, however, when we found out that our emigration center here had not been given any consideration whatsoever by said bill.

New hope arose, when we learned that a new bill (H. R. 4567), by an amendment, was to be extended, thereby also to become applicable to us, the forgotten ones here. There hardly are words suitable enough to describe our disappointment, when we realized a few weeks ago that the Eighty-first Congress again during its last session had deferred passing of the bill and that perhaps a decision would only be met during the next one. And this just at a time, when prospects to reach the United States of America by following the already above described—so difficult a routine procedure—had become still more remote inasmuch as the United States Consulate here discontinued to consider and deal with our applications for immigration visas, except for a very few special cases.

We fail to understand, just why this our small remnant group of approximately 900 people here, should deserve so severe a fate, especially so since this group in its composition in no respect is better or worse than those more fortunate ones that already found a new home in your country. Under halfway favorable and peaceful economic conditions, they would be able to support themselves, and the more so if their relatives and friends could lend them helping hands, as only parents, children, relatives, and best friends can do, who already got firmly settled in the United States of America.

The desire of our people here, to go to the United States of America, is however not only based upon ties of kin—and friendship, but on that security which is the natural result of such ties is making emigration to the United States of America so very desirable. We already branch out into the United States of America, and only there we shall be able to deeply root again, last not least also in ideological respect.

Considering general conditions here, our problem of emigration to the United States of America has now become more urgent. As a matter of fact, conditions, under which we now have to live, should justify special treatment of our group. Our people here, on account of prevailing economic conditions, are losing ground daily.

In this desolate situation, help only can come to us, if the United States consulate here would be instructed to further resume consideration of applications for immigration and processing of immigration visa cases. However, if furthermore sufficient quota numbers according to registration requirements could be made available for us, the whole problem could be solved easily and entirely, even without the earlier quoted bill and its amendments. Should our suggestion not be feasible it would be necessary that the State Department should instruct the consulate here to process our cases most expeditiously.

It is the time factor now, which is of such great importance for us. We are much afraid that the bill in question will only be brought up again toward the end of the coming session of the Senate, whereby we would have to wait for another indefinite period; and this waiting may be deadly.

We do not know to what extent you will be kind enough to help us with the many possibilities at your disposal. Please do consider this letter, in which we have rather elaborately outlined our situation, as an outcry for help. It is indeed much like a very last S O S of a shipwrecked crew, as we cannot believe that the Coast Guard would disregard any S O S just because its sender is not lawfully eligible to the Coast Guard's help. We can and will not believe that you and the American people will be unwilling to help us to reach the goal of our hopes for so many years and therewith be saved. On the contrary, believing in the high doctrines of America and in humanity and human rights, we have dared to write to you asking you for your so influential and valuable assistance.

In anticipation permit us to express our most heartfelt gratitude and to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

MIGRATION COMMITTEE OF CENTRAL EUROPEAN DP'S IN SHANGHAI-HONGKEW,
Dr. GEORG LOWENSTEIN, *Chairman.*

The Crusade for Peace Will Achieve World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a radio address which I prepared for broadcast over radio station WCAU in Philadelphia on March 4, entitled "The Crusade for Peace Will Achieve World Government." The address follows:

The common people of the world, and of this country, today are banding together, some consciously, some unknowingly, in a crusade for peace. With every report of new and more horrible weapons of war, bigger and more devastating bombs, deadlier methods of destruction, the longing for peace grows stronger in the hearts of people everywhere. A striking indication of this was given last week in Britain, where political analysts credit a large portion of the high vote achieved by Winston Churchill's Conservatives to Mr. Churchill's proposal for new talks with the Russians, in a new bid for accord between the East and the West.

In this country Senators MCMAHON, of Connecticut, and TYDINGS, of Maryland, rejected the defeatist attitude that war is inevitable. Senator MCMAHON'S proposal, which aroused a great response, was relatively simple. He suggests a world-wide Marshall plan, with Russia included, in return for an atomic disarmament agreement. The Congress of the United States has been giving serious consideration at committee level to various proposals for strengthening the United Nations and creating an effective limited world government.

It is this last phase which I want to discuss at this time. Recently 105 or more members of the House of Representatives and a proportionately large number of Senators joined in introducing to the Congress a resolution which has become known as the world government resolution and which expresses as the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

I joined in sponsoring this resolution because I believe world government would be a practical solution to the outstanding problems facing the world today. World government is practical because people have formed governments and federations of governments before and can do it again. To say, as opponents of the idea of world government have been saying with increasing frequency, that nations must learn to get along together before we try world government, is not practical. If peoples or nations could get along together voluntarily, there would be no need for government. Government provides the vehicle, the laws and their enforcement, that enables people to get along together. As I see it, the nations of the world are faced with the necessity of banding together or being destroyed or at least witnessing the collapse of the remains of democracy or free enterprise.

Extreme opponents of the idea of world federation contend that a world union must ultimately result in the abandonment of national sovereignty. This of course is not true, except in a very limited sense. In a world government each nation would retain complete control over its own internal institutions, governments, and policies. Only those things affecting the international relations of the federation would be subjected to international control. In other words, a little sovereignty would be sacrificed for a great deal of freedom—primarily, the freedom from fear. This would be achieved by laws to enable the world federation to deal effectively with the control of arms and aggression, and the enforcement of international law in these fields by a world court and a world police force, and no more.

Efforts have been made on the part of neo-Fascists and supernationalists to insinuate that the world government movement is composed of leftists who are bent on the destruction of the United States. The strongest rebuttal to this ridiculous charge is found in the names of the sponsors of the world government movement. Besides the Members of Congress who sponsored the world government resolution, which includes men of both parties and various degrees of conservatism and liberalism—excluding the extreme left—the theory of world government has been espoused by the American Legion, Kiwanis International, the Young Republican National Federation, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Grange, and the legislatures of many States, to mention but a few.

Among the false charges which have been leveled at the world government movement are these: It would result in the reduction of American standards of living, curtailment of the liberties of our people, destruction of our free institutions, scrapping of the Constitution, abolishing the Army and the Navy, world taxation, free immigration and common currency. All of these charges are deliberately, or at best carelessly, false, with perhaps the exception of the contention that our Army and Navy would

be abolished. While they would not be abolished, they would eventually be reduced to a small force, adequate to deal with internal policing and similar problems. The prime purpose of world government is to promote international peace and harmony, and the only practical means of achieving this is by a central organization backed up by an international police force and a world court.

With the progress the world has made in the science of destruction, the peoples of the world are faced with this terrible alternative—amalgamation on a limited basis or annihilation. I, for one, favor at least a serious effort toward building the United Nations into a world federation.

Secretary Louis Johnson Reports That Without Impairing Our Defense He Has Already Reduced Civilian Employees by 151,542 Instead of the 135,000 Promised—He Now Advises That We Shall Soon See 100,000 Less Men in Uniform and Yet More in Combat Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, with such a record already established, the Members of this Congress—Democrats as well as Republicans—can well understand why the National Committee on President Hoover's Report on Reorganization of the Departments of Government has bestowed an award of merit and honorable citation upon Secretary Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Steelman, assistant to the President of the United States, as well as the Honorable Lamar Caudle, United States Assistant Attorney General, both told me of a great speech made by Louis Johnson during a recent conference in the Department of Justice attended by the United States district attorneys. Both of these distinguished gentlemen were of one mind in stating that they had never witnessed an audience of lawyers more greatly impressed by any talk than was the group addressed by our great Secretary of Defense.

Lamar Caudle said Louis Johnson's talk moved him so deeply that, immediately upon returning to his desk he addressed a note of appreciation to the Secretary.

In his discussion with me he said: "Frank, please do not think me fanciful or extravagant in the use of language when I say that I shall remember that talk by Louis Johnson until the day I die."

Mr. Speaker, Lamar Caudle's remarks warmed my heart for I hold that America has no greater citizen, patriot, or public official than Louis Johnson.

Because of the esteem in which I hold him, I determined to get that talk and to read it to learn even more about my good friend and I want to tell you, the Members of this House, that it was an address that was not tongued but rather a talk that came right out of the heart of a great man.

I told my colleagues in this House about a year ago that there was no rabbit blood in Louis Johnson. I further stated that so long as the blood of life was in him he would fight for what he deemed was right and do so in the light that God gave him to see the right.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Johnson's first allegiance is to his country and then to his own conscience. Self-made, vigorous, it is inherent in him never to compromise—his opinions, yes—the principles of a life, never.

On many occasions when my good wife and myself sit alone in the evening reading of the day's happenings in the press, we have come upon things that have caused us to speak of the merits of our good friend.

More than once we have discussed the barrage of unfair criticism that has been directed at him because in his economy drive to attain a dollar's worth of value for every dollar expended it is well known to all that he has stepped upon the toes of certain self-seeking men who, without thought of the Nation's benefit, are concerned solely with their own personal preferment and well-being.

The multiplicity of caustic comments in the press has sometimes caused me to think that his critics have concluded they could obtain their objectives merely by creating a great product of repetition and of emphasis.

I often ponder on just what I would do were I to find wave after wave of attrition and vituperation hurled against me in an endeavor to turn me from what I held in my heart and conscience to be my bounden duty.

I remember only too well the manner in which Louis Johnson, as Assistant Secretary of War, fought with his back to the wall to mobilize the industries of this Nation against the day of inevitable attack from the gathering thunder of the Nazi hordes being mobilized for the conquest of Europe, if not the world.

The God in heaven alone knows how many American lives and billions of dollars were saved in World War II because of the action programs for preparedness that were launched and brought to fruition by Louis Johnson personally and unfortunately oftentimes fighting alone—for a preparedness program.

I was one among that great circle of friends the day he took his oath of office in the courtyard of that huge Pentagon. I remember that he that day pledged himself and the American people that when he assumed his office he would not alone achieve the unification of the armed services, strengthen the national defenses, but annually save a billion dollars by a more provident and judicious expenditure of the tax moneys entrusted to his spending.

Mr. Speaker, devotion to public trust and to public office will never die in these United States as long as men like Louis Johnson live and serve this Nation.

The talk that was made by the Secretary of Defense to the assembly of United States district attorneys was a great talk—homely, simple, truthful.

The world has enough men who are skilled in oratory and in rhetoric. It needs more men like Louis Johnson and his Army, Navy, and Air Force teammates—of innate character and abilities—simple men who have the courage of their convictions, the guts to do their duty as they see it, and who speak the truth.

Every promise of Louis Johnson to the American people has been more than fulfilled. Knowing of his growth in popularity among the common and the little people of this Nation, his critics in the future will not be unmindful of the fact that what Louis Johnson promises to accomplish, will be accomplished by him, and on time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues to insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter sent to my good friend, the great Secretary of Defense by the Honorable Lamar Caudle on the occasion of his recent talk to the conference of United States district attorneys, together with Secretary Johnson's address on that occasion.

Secretary Johnson's speech was as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Attorney General, distinguished guests, members of the Federal bar, and particularly you United States district attorneys, all of whom I understand are present, I am a little overcome by the kind words spoken by my friend the Attorney General. There was one thing I surely wanted to talk about today, and that was to tell you who work with him in the Department of Justice—the men who carry the burden for justice in the field—what I thought of Howard McGrath.

Won't you discount, more than just a little, the kind things he said about me because he's my friend and looks at me through rose-colored glasses? He looks at me with memory of the days from September 15 to November 2, last year, when the two of us worked closely together as men seldom ever do at what first seemed a hopeless and impossible task. But when I thought of the strength of the man in the White House and the courage of Howard McGrath, I myself acquired the courage and the strength to go ahead and do my part in that great campaign.

I know of no man for whom I have a deeper affection than for Howard McGrath. I know no man who is a better American. I thank God for what Howard McGrath accomplished as national chairman of the Democratic Party. I thank God that he now sits as the Attorney General, and I even forgive him for serving us a Republican box lunch here today instead of the meal I expected. I'm hoping that the people in the gallery weren't omitted on the box luncheons, as I understand some were at a recent one served here in Washington.

I should particularly like to talk to you lawyers about some phase of the law, but that's not what you expect of me here today.

I think I should first tell you that the defenses of the United States, as of today, are, in the opinion of the President of the United States, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of myself, sufficient unto the needs of the hour.

May I take a little liberty with Shakespeare, the kind of liberty the New York Times takes on a quotation and say that "Time is out of joint. Oh cursed spite, that we are untimely born to set it right." I have had that sort of a feeling at times about the job of Secretary of Defense.

As the Attorney General indicated, criticism has been rough. I think the book, all the books, not alone the lawbooks, have been thrown at me since I have had this job. If there are any charges that could have been brought, false as they all have been, that haven't been brought, I don't know what they could be.

I see a number of you I've known a long time. I think to you in this room I can say that those charges, those investigations and those trials and tribulations haven't caused us to lose a single stride in the job which we were sworn to do on March 28 of last year. They might have but for one thing: and that is my experience in the period of 1937 to 1940 when I was serving as the Assistant Secretary of War. I was then charged by statute—with responsibility for current procurement and for industrial mobilization of the Ground and Air Forces. In my efforts to create an air force, and in my efforts to prepare the country for what I then thought was inevitable war, there were some real book-throwers and some real name-callers around. I lost sleep. I worried. Time, however, showed that we were not too far wrong in trying to build an air force, and in fighting for industrial mobilization.

In that period of 1937 to 1940, Howard McGrath, John Steelman, and I got vaccinated or inoculated, or something of the sort. Criticism has therefore not interfered with our doing the job some 16 or 18 hours a day and to the best of our ability. Moreover, we propose to continue to do so regardless of charges or criticism.

I want to report to you today—and the time is limited—as I said a minute ago, that we are ready to defend America.

I stated in a speech made in New York, I believe on December 7, that the first attack by the United States would be a counterattack. Someone else would have to commit the first attack upon us. That was said because you and I as Americans feel that way, because we seek no foreign soil or acquisitions and we want to make the maximum contribution to the peace of the world.

My title is that of Secretary of Defense. When George Washington asked for the first appropriation for the militia of the United States in his message to Congress, he said he wanted to create not a War Department or Defense Department; he said he wanted to create a peace establishment. So while we of the Defense Department talk about war preparation and readiness for war and defense, through it all we seek a plan to secure the peace—the peace of this country and the peace of the world.

In this seeking we know how certain of the world's nations feel about us. They do not seem to pull any punches in what they say in their unfriendly attitude to us and our way of life. Even if such countries had the will to make war upon these United States, I feel that today they do not have the capacity to do so.

Nevertheless, it is our job in the Defense Department to be so ready to return the first possible blow, if a blow must come to America in the form of aggression, that it will serve to make him who delivers it stop and look, think twice and not move.

In other words, our establishment of defense must first be so strong—in the conception of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and myself—that it will deter anyone who wants to start trouble in this world; and second, it must be so strong that if somebody does start trouble, there will be no question about America being the victor in the final outcome of that fracas. I want to put in the record of this distinguished gathering that the plans for the defense of America are so drawn and they have the unanimous approval of the President, the Chairman and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries, and of myself.

We read in the paper that that isn't so, but it is, and as a matter of record, I declare it to be so.

Moreover, I want to say to you it is a balanced plan. It isn't a plan drawn by the Army, or a plan drawn by the Navy, or a plan drawn by the Air Force; it is a plan drawn by all three services which are ready to go at 5 o'clock in the morning.

May I say that the scale of that plan is one of defense, the defense of America, and further say to the assistant to the President of the United States, my long-time friend, you, John Steelman, that if the program of America were one of offense and conquest—we would need a larger Military Establishment than we need for defense and security.

Let us now turn to unification. I heard from about half of you, it seemed to me, in the unification fight before Congress last fall. Now let me tell you why you and I must have unification.

First, Pearl Harbor could never have happened if there had been unification. Unity of command and unity of purpose are needed for defense.

Second, we need unification to gain time. We have had months, a year and a half or two years before each of the preceding wars in which to work out our fighting plans and our joint programs. The would-be aggressor of the world would not be deterred one moment if he thought it would take America 3 months, 6 months, or a year after it struck for us to work out unification. There could be no readiness of the Defense Establishment if the three services were not united and agreed upon one plan ready for action at 5 o'clock or at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Third, we need unification to get greater value out of every defense dollar. A year ago in drawing the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the three services, after whittling each of their respective separate budgets down to what they thought was the minimum, asked for thirty billions of dollars for the defense establishment. For the fiscal year 1951 that starts July 1 the figures of the three services, when they came up to me, were for something over twenty billions of dollars. And those figures came up despite the fact that the three services were given but fifteen billion this year. Those figures had to be carefully scrutinized.

We of the defense establishment are convinced it does not do any good to have the best defense and the most efficient defense establishment in the world if in its building we use so much money as to wreck the economy and make fertile soil for the Communists to move in without fighting.

That is a basic reason why there must be unification.

Frank Pace, as Director of the Budget, knows that of about $15,000,000,000 over-all allotted to us this year, that we shall finish this year spending, I believe, in the neighborhood of a hundred million less than thirteen billion dollars, and because of that fact, for the year beginning July 1 we have asked for but $13,000,000,000.

Although we have talked extensively of economy, as I did myself but a moment ago, although the newspapers have made much reference to economy, I want to assure you that in our operations economy is of secondary import in the Defense Department. The first thing—the controlling thing—the impelling thing—is the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

Secondary to these comes economy.

When we made an announcement that we were going to let out a hundred and thirty-five thousand civilians—whom we did not need, the newspapers, some of them in your districts, said it was political—it would never be done.

As I came into the hall today, shortly after I left the White House, I received from my office the figures sent to me from the Pentagon on the number of civilians let out since this economy drive started. Instead of the 135,000 we promised, I am happy to tell you this morning that without injustice to anyone, without vacating a place where a man was needed for a job, we have, as of January 31 * * * let out 157,542 civilians, and the end has not yet been reached.

I want you to believe I hate to fire a man. I hate to see a man put out of a job. The defense of the United States is supposed to be ready and alert and those not needed for defense are of no help. We have found that in units where we have cut out 30 or 50 percent of the civilian employees, that unit now is doing more work and better work.

We have taken soldiers away from desks and put them in regiments with fighting troops where they belong.

For the fiscal year 1950–51 we plan to have 100,000 less men in uniform in our armed forces. We are able to effect such a reduction by improving our organization and our operations under unification. But here is the most significant feature. Despite these reductions we will have more men in combat units than we had before we decided we could lop off 100,000 without hurting defense.

Let me explain that to you—and while I have talked 25 minutes, may I not take 5 more?

I believe you would want me to talk frankly about this situation. Let me tell you really what the shooting is all about. The shooting doesn't worry us. We don't like it, but it doesn't worry us. We have but one potential enemy and I want to concentrate on our readiness to deal with him if we have to.

Let the newspapers say of whom they are speaking when they quote my remarks. I mention no names, but you all know of whom I speak.

Before unification each of the services would get dollars to do with what it pleased, even if they did exactly the same thing. In that way there was a surplus of some items and a shortage of others. The planning in one service was not made with reference to the other nor in reference to the potential enemy.

Long before I became the Secretary of Defense—under the wise guidance of my friend, Jim Forrestal, it was decided that we should measure the enemy, the one who might cause trouble, and then look at the defense of the United States in the light of that potential enemy and not on the basis of a scatter-gun defense everywhere against every country in the world.

In explaining what we discovered, imagine that well over there to the left divided into three panels.

Let me say, the first panel represents what you have to do at 4 o'clock in the morning if that enemy starts anything. That was something unanimously agreed upon long before I came to the Defense Establishment.

The second panel, and logically, you lawyers will agree, depicts what it would take to do it. That, too, was unanimously agreed upon, in one of the celebrated conferences, long before I came to the Defense Establishment.

Now we have two panels: (1) What you have to do; and, (2) what it takes to do it.

The thing depicted on the third panel down there was all but agreed upon when I came. Mr. Forrestal, who was to leave on May 1 instead of March 28, had hoped to stay to see that panel finished. Health, however, did not permit. That panel depicted who does it. That third panel was likewise unanimously agreed upon and signed up while Jim Forrestal was yet alive. I had the pleasure of reporting to him in the hospital that it was

agreed upon as he wanted, and I know that made it happier for him in his latter days.

That I submit to you as leaders of opinion throughout America, constitutes the intelligent defense of America. I submit to you, Mr. Budget Director, the observation that all of the money for national defense ought to go into the planning exhibited and depicted within these three panels.

We now have three panels: (1) What you have to do; (2) what it takes to do it; (3) who does it.

First General Eisenhower and then General Bradley, as acting chairman, and now chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, contributed mightily to those conclusions, and both approve of them completely.

I get into trouble when I get over on the other side of the wall to a still fourth panel. It is so big that it might be said to cover the whole side of the wall.

That fourth panel includes things like we discovered at Sandy Hook—thousands of acres of land which we will never use again, together with coastal defenses. In that panel are depicted the forts of revolutionary days now in the hearts of big cities where they contribute neither to defense nor the tax rolls of the country.

In that panel are depicted two ranges in the West, one consisting of three or four thousand acres—both off the tax books. Either one of the ranges could satisfy the needs of both services operating them, and the other range with all of its personnel, could and should be eliminated.

Panel four further discloses two or three billions of dollars a year of cost that does not contribute one nickel to the defense of America.

My fellow lawyers, before you all, I renew my pledge—bring what it will, in criticism or in health, first to tend alertly and fully to the defenses of America; and, second, though it takes my dying breath, we are going to whittle out this wastage, this fat, this throwing away of the taxpayer's money, so that the defense of America will be obtained with simon-pure dollars.

In doing that, I serve my country. I serve my conscience, and no man, save the President, is going to stop that work and he won't because it has his approval.

Included in that fourth panel are the 18 hospitals that we closed or shut down in part at the beginning of last week. We are told that that saves twenty-five million. Actually, it is much more. How much more, I cannot tell you, but I will tell you why parenthetically: I asked for a report when I first went into the defense establishment as to the cost of the medical services and hospitals. I have it now in writing that they cost $126,000,000 a year.

With the present performance budget, Senator McCARRAN—which with the help of Herbert Hoover and Frank Pace—we got through the Congress (as part of the unification law), we now know that that figure isn't a hundred and twenty-six million— it's nearly five hundred million. Cutting out the 18 hospitals we do not need still leaves us 50 percent more beds than we need. (We will continue taking care of veterans—and adequately.)

At the same time it relieves between 450 and 500 doctors to take care of our shortage in doctors elsewhere in the armed services. I am looking at this staff of mine over here who are now wiggling around, and I want to say that in addition thereto, and they don't want me to say it; it lets out 11,000 more civilians, nurses, and other personnel that America needs and we don't need in the Military Establishment.

This is the sort of a job we are in and but a few illustrations of the many things we are doing in one element of this fourth panel.

Mr. Attorney General, there are those who say that America has reached its meridian. I am one of those that believe that with public servants like you and Frank Pace, and may I include myself somewhere in the rear guard of the group, that America is not at the meridian but, as Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "We are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star."

I think the getting rid of the wastage and the throwing away of defense dollars will long postpone our reaching that meridian.

I believe that America is but in its infancy. I believe that America, the greatest country in the world, has the responsibility which we are assuming in the Atlantic Pact, the military assistance, and what not, and for all those calculated risks we stand, but we stand also with adequate defense with simon pure defense dollars.

Please do not regard this as a speech. It is merely a talk to lawyers out of the heart of a harassed lawyer, but by one who here declares he is determined to do a good job. With the backing of the President, with the help of the Cabinet, the help of Frank Pace, the help of Congress and the support of the American people, I pledge anew that job is going to be done.

God bless you everyone.

Mr. Speaker, what follows is the letter from United States Assistant District Attorney Lamar Caudle, to the Secretary of Defense:

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LOUIS: I cannot resist the urge to tell you how much I enjoyed the talk you finished but a few minutes ago. What the Attorney General spoke about you, I feel is reflected in the minds and hearts of a great preponderance of the American people.

Your equally splendid response clarifying so many important accomplishments already achieved in the Department of Defense—exhibits the splendid record that is being established in unifying the armed services of our country—coupled with an economy program never before equaled in Government administration.

It seems to me that the general consensus of opinion of those I have met from over the country is that President Truman could not have picked a finer, more capable, and determined citizen—to carry out the declared policies of the President and our Congress—than your own good self.

The common weal has tremendous confidence in your ability to secure the peace and security of our country.

The task now being finally nailed down has been a colossal undertaking.

I just wanted to pass these thoughts along to you. They have been in my heart for a long, long time. I do so in the belief that such things should be made known to one's friends because it adds encouragement as well as appreciation of work well done.

Good luck, and with fondest wishes always.

Sincerely and affectionately your friend,

LAMAR.

ECA Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, while we are monkeying around with socialistic schemes in this country and getting ready to vote more of the taxpayers' money for ECA spending in support of Britain's socialistic government, it is well to note what Winston Churchill said about that government just before the recent election. He stated:

They seek the dollars, they beg the dollars, they bluster for the dollars, they gobble the dollars, but in the whole of their 8,000-word manifesto (election platform) they cannot say "thank you" for the dollars. All of them said there would be anything up to 2,000,000 unemployed if it had not been for the American loan. Fancy the Socialist Government in England keeping itself alive economically and politically by those large, annual dollops of dollars from capitalistic America.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and fancy the international "do-gooders" over here still persisting that we continue these "dollops of dollars" to keep socialism going over there.

Recently a letter came to my attention which, I believe, should have the consideration of all my congressional colleagues in connection with further ECA appropriations. It was written shortly before the British election by a Conservative member of Parliament to a taxpayer in this country. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote an extract from the letter herewith:

LONDON, *January 13, 1950.*

I am contesting the Southampton test constituency, part of Southampton which has been divided since the election of 1945 into two constituencies; you will remember I represented the whole of Southampton in Parliament for 14 years. The chances I do not regard as being very hopeful for this reason: In spite of what Sir Stafford Cripps says, the financial position of this country is not improving. Last week he had a good deal to say about the gold and dollar reserves, but I see no chance whatsoever of these reaching what is regarded as the minimum reserve for safety between now and when Marshall aid ends—which I pray to God will not be renewed, as I blame America for financing socialism as it has done. Had it not been for this we would have had two million unemployed, and it is the opinion of many people that such a situation must arise before the country as a whole is brought to its senses.

Quite apart from the financial position, some of the principal unions—and, quite rightly so—are refusing to fall into line on the proposal for freezing wages, and I think this decision of the unions which was made this week, has been the deciding factor in having an early election. The Socialists want to get this over before the apex of the crisis comes upon them, which may not be until about June, and if the election took place then there would be no doubt that the Socialists would be heavily defeated but, coming on February 23, I am afraid the Socialists will be returned with a small majority—quite unworkable—and another election will follow in about 12 months' time. However, they can do an awful lot of damage in 12 months if they proceed with their further threats of nationalization.

America's generosity, which is unquestioned and undoubted, is going to prove to be a boomerang. I have always disapproved of American foreign policy, and it is now possible within the foreseeable future to appreciate the serious consequences of this and I cannot perceive any hope of a change or an escape from these so long as the Truman regime exists. You will remember that I said in more than one speech that it was necessary for America to take off her coat, roll up her sleeves and fight socialism now, not waiting until it had got a greater hold on the life of

the American people. Yet, little appears to have been done other than a spate of literature recently put into circulation. I would say that this anti-Socialist propaganda is at least 6 months too late.

I advised a meeting of bankers, financiers and economists that private enterprise would have to reorganize itself to meet the new world threat. Nothing seems to be being done in this connection. After all, what does the workingman want? He wants security and a decent standard of living which gives him a sufficient surplus to enjoy himself in quite a modest way, and if only private enterprise had appreciated its responsibility there was no reason why they could not have met these, what I regard as quite justifiable, demands and strengthened the capitalist free enterprise system. But no, someone is afraid of moving. Who is it? The money interests are strong, all powerful, but a united private enterprise effort I am certain could defeat this master control.

Relationships throughout the world are such that conditions now are worse than they were when Britain issued an ultimatum to Germany in September 1939—and the only reason that I attribute to there not having been several further ultimatums is providence. We are being given time to endeavor to realize our weaknesses but, instead of doing something about it, the diplomats' activities are, in my opinion, worsening conditions: Providence will not stand by us indefinitely.

Cold Wars Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stewart Alsop:

[From the Washington Post of March 3, 1950]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

COLD WARS CAN BE WON

At this dark turning point in the cold war, a sense of defeatism and impotence is spreading like a fungus throughout the Government, the Congress, and the country. Yet this is the richest and most powerful Nation on earth, standing at the head of a confederation of free and brave peoples. We need not be impotent, if we choose to use our strength.

George Kennan, the brilliant State Department planner, has written that, as a basic requirement for peace, we must create "a situation of fact" which will cause the Kremlin to reverse its policy and abandon its dream of world domination. It is absolutely clear that this "situation of fact" is not now being created. If it is to be created, how must our strength be used? To what ends must our efforts be directed? How much of our resources must be mobilized? The answers to these questions lie in the following program, which represents in rough dollar terms a sort of crude, simplified consensus of those experts who must now remain publicly silent.

The first essential is to meet the challenge of Soviet rearmament. The defeatists would have it that the military problem is insoluble. It is not.

In November 1948 the late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal presented to the President a military budget of $16,900,000,000. In the judgment of Forrestal, whose wisdom becomes more apparent with every passing day of folly, this sum was sufficient to give reasonable security to the United States. A further sum will be needed to help give our Allies that "sense of their own military security" which Kennan also postulates as essential to continued resistance to Soviet pressure. Over-all, in dollar terms, what is necessary is an increase in the annual military budget of five to seven billion dollars, tapering off as our Allies are rearmed.

The doctrine that this will lead to war is demonstrable folly. What will invite Soviet aggression—what has already invited Soviet aggression wherever it has existed—is weakness. This outlay will not provide the western confederation with aggressive strength, nor will it begin to match the military effort of the Soviet Union, whose whole economy is now dedicated to preparing for war.

Yet the aggressor, by one of the oldest and best military rules, requires a ratio of strength of 3 to 1, and the proposed outlay should thus be enough decisively to deter any aggressive Soviet adventures. Less than this, surely, the wealthiest, the most populous, the most productive nations on earth, cannot do.

In the political and economic sphere, the western confederation is quite as directly threatened as in the sphere of strategy and simple power. The economic insecurity of the British Commonwealth; the resulting British reluctance to participate in the organization of Europe; the consequent impossibility of building a structure into which Germany can be safely fitted—all these are problems as acute as they are vast.

Yet again, these problems can be dealt with. In the case of Britain, for example, it will cost this country 10 to 16 billion dollars annually to fill the power vacuum that will be created, if economic crisis forces Britain to go out of business as a world power. We have not got this capability. Yet the annual deficiency which is driving Britain toward this disaster for the whole confederation of the west amounts to no more than $1,000,000,000.

The contrast speaks for itself. But the essential point is that dealing with all these problems will mean, at least temporarily, further drafts on American resources. The time for half measures is past. The whole job, of building a solid structure in the west and dealing with Soviet expansion in Asia, must now be done, even if it adds a further burden of $2,000,000,000 or a little more per year, which is about the outside figure.

These measures, both military and economic, are essentially defensive. If Kennan's situation of fact is to be created, it is also necessary for us to take the offensive in the cold war, as the Soviet Union has consistently done since before the last war ended. The way to take the offensive is by a massive propaganda effort, combined with those clandestine methods which the Soviets are already using on a gigantic scale. If we enter this field of effort with energy governed by prudence, gradual but vital changes may be confidently expected in many different and crucial situations all over the world. For this purpose, something like $500,000,000 should suffice.

Stated in rough dollar terms, such is the hard program which the wisest of the experts privately but unanimously agree is required if we are to make a serious effort to win the cold war and thus secure a dependable settlement with the Soviet Union. If economies are not made elsewhere, as they certainly should be, the total effort would increase the budgetary imbalance between 8 and 10 billion dollars. But cold wars, like hot wars, cannot be successfully waged with one eye on the budget.

During the last war, the budget was unbalanced by $50,000,000,000 annually, yet we ended the war with our national income tripled, and our wealth increased. This is the correct perspective in which to see the problem. And just to make the perspective a little clearer, it may also be remembered that the penalty for losing the cold war will be slavery or death.

Outstanding Mining Leader, Harry Sears, Speaks on Gold as a Commodity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered at the annual convention of the Colorado Mining Association in Denver on February 2.

The speaker, Harry Sears, of Angels Camp, Calif., is director of the California Gold Committee and president and general manager of Calaveras Central Gold Mining Co., Ltd. He is a recognized leader among mining men and is actively working to assist the gold-mining industry which has suffered greatly at the hands of our Government.

GOLD IS A COMMODITY

In opening this discussion of gold, we should first define what gold producers talk about. Gold, to us, is a commodity, just as wheat or corn or wool are commodities.

Gold did not grow valuable because it was a currency base; it became the backing for currency because it was valuable.

Because of its former use in coinage, and its present use as a reserve behind paper currency, great confusion has arisen as to the rights and powers of the Government with regard to gold, also as to the rights and privileges of gold producers. It has been the practice of the Government to broaden such rights as they had, and through opportunism and propaganda, to build up belief in the minds of economists, bankers, the general public, and even gold producers themselves, that the price and sale of their gold was limited by the absolute power of the Government, as expressed in the gold regulations of the Treasury Department.

Many economists, sympathetic to the present Treasury viewpoint, try to forget that gold is basically a commodity, with a continuous and expanding use in private enterprise. They also forget that all gold deposits are limited in commercial content. Once exhausted, the mine is permanently out of business.

The Government jealously guards its custom to supply this gold to industry at a prewar commodity price. Statistics on this use in industry are published in the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury.

In the 11 years 1919 to 1930 we find the industrial use of gold in the United States was 131 percent of the total United States gold production. During the years 1941 to 1949 we find that the industrial use of gold in the United States was 139 percent of the total United States gold production.

There is a statement in the report for 1930 which says:

"Gold produced from mines in the United States, unless exported or consumed in the

industrial arts, obviously adds to the gold monetary stock of the country."

Therefore, on the official admission of the Secretary of the Treasury, no gold produced in this country during these 20 years was added to the monetary stock.

There is, therefore, no question as to the status of gold as a commodity. What, then, about its price?

I attended the meetings of the International Monetary Fund, in Washington, last September, together with J. C. Kempvanee and George Nugent, of the California gold committee, we were present when Hon. N. C. Havenga, Finance Minister of South Africa, addressed his fellow governors. He stressed the importance of gold as a commodity. He was talking the same language which must be stressed by gold producers in this country. Our position is identical with his. He said:

"I do not think anybody can deny that gold is today the cheapest commodity in world trade. One searches in vain for one other commodity entering prominently into world trade which can still be purchased at prewar prices. The bulk of the world trade in gold is carried on in 1939 prices. * * * South Africa cannot continue to be the bargain basement of the world in order to maintain exchange stability for the benefit of all."

That statement reflects the position held by the gold producers in the United States.

GOLD PRODUCERS VICTIMS OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL TREASURY REGULATIONS

In an address here in Denver last January I presented some facts with regard to newly mined gold. We can better appreciate further development on the subject if I repeat several passages from that address:

"Gold producers are hampered by regulations dating back to that era when Congress was told to pass laws in spite of doubts as to their validity or constitutionality. If the law did not give the New Deal planners the desired freedom of action, this was achieved by a Department order, rule or practice, under pretense of authority.

"There is a vast legal difference between newly mined gold, a commodity, and government gold stocks for monetary use. Gold mines are held by their owners by direct grants from the government. Whether as claim location or as patented ground these grants are valid contracts, specifically conveying the gold, and they are property. Rights acquired against the United States, arising out of a contract with it, are protected by the fifth amendment of the Constitution which holds that no person—shall be deprived of property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

GOLD IS PRIVATE PROPERTY

"All gold mines contain gold in its natural state: that is the condition in which the Government granted it to the owners, and that is the condition in which the gold producers find it. In or out of the ground it still remains the private property of the owners. Some gold may be retained in its natural state but usually gold must be processed to insure its recovery and avoid losses.

"When a producer is compelled to yield up any of this processed gold at a price fixed by the government, and is denied the right to seek another purchaser and receive a higher price, it is clearly a violation of his property rights guaranteed under the fifth amendment.

"There is now a steadily increasing market in this country for newly mined gold in its natural state. So far as the industry as a whole is concerned this is little direct help, for only a small part of the total gold production is in this form."

When gold producers are denied access to this market for their processed gold, because of arbitrary Treasury regulations, they are forced to take less money on their production. It is this loss which will now permit a gold producer to bring an action against the Government to collect and to change the gold regulations.

Consider the Gold Act of 1934 and its regulations. We are told that they are the rules under which we must operate today, but the validity of any law or statute must be determined not only from its words and phrases, but also from the intent of those who made it and likewise upon the basis of their legal power to write the law.

It, therefore, becomes important to review what happened in that period between the Presidential gold embargo, on April 20, 1933, and January 30, 1934, when the present Gold Reserve Act was approved.

When the embargo was first made there was a storm of protest from the mining industry, for here was an order to sell their product to the Mint at $20.67 an ounce when there were higher prices for gold in world markets abroad.

A BANKING, NOT A MINING ORDER

In construing the word "gold," in the first Executive order of 1933, the Attorney General held that this meant "gold coin," "gold bullion," and "gold certificates." It was, therefore, a banking and not a mining order.

On August 2 new regulations were made permitting sale and shipment abroad of "gold in its natural state."

Then on August 28 the President issued an order making it an offense with $10,000 fine or 10 years' imprisonment for exporting, hoarding, melting gold coin, bullion, or currency, all of which had to be turned into the Treasury at $20.67 an ounce.

But on August 29, the President issued an order that the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to receive gold recovered from natural deposits in the United States, on consignment for sale, and that "such sales shall be made at a price which the Secretary shall determine to be equal to the best price obtainable in the free gold markets of the world."

As this was issued after the criminal order of August 28, it clearly shows that transactions in gold from natural deposits were recognized as private property, entitling gold producers to "just compensation" and a fair price.

On October 25, the President issued another order substituting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as buyer. There was an opinion on October 22, by the Attorney General approving this, in which he said:

"Whereas there is no free market in the United States for gold newly mined in the United States; and

"Whereas it will aid in the creation of such a market if such gold be purchased in the United States; and

"Whereas it will further aid such market if gold, whether newly mined or not, be purchased abroad; and

"Whereas the public problem arising from the absence of a free market in the United States for gold newly mined therein, warrant action."

This was the status therefore, up to January of 1934, when there was some debate on the Gold Reserve Act in the Senate, practically all of which was on the subject of the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund and its control by Secretary Morgenthau. There was no mention of mines or newly mined gold except references made to the special and privileged position of this newly mined gold, which was then being sold at world market prices, while the Government demanded that all other gold be surrendered at $20.67 an ounce.

In view of present higher prices for gold in other parts of the world and because of the growing market here for gold in its natural state, it seemed most logical that producers could get relief from the pressure of high production costs, which prevents most of them from operating, and that the Government would act, if these facts were brought before them.

During the months since that last Denver meeting there was earnest effort on behalf of gold producers and responsible banking and business leaders, devoted to presenting the case for a free market for newly mined gold before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. These hearings developed the opposition and brought it out into the open. It was expected that the Treasury would oppose the bills, also the State Department and the Federal Reserve Board. But there was an almost hysterical attack upon the bills and gold producers by a group of misguided economists and businessmen who are seeking to have paper money made convertible into gold at the present $35 price.

Members of this group still harp on the old threadbare formula that gold producers were granted a great gift of extra profits when the price of gold was set at $35. They have completely ignored the fact that the gold-producing industry, at that time, was in the doldrums because the old price had failed to keep pace with rising costs.

Let us examine the gold price in light of historical statistics. There seems to be little doubt that in a century the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped 77 percent. Assuming, therefore, that in 1850, its purchasing power was 100, the figure now is 23. In plain words the dollar today is worth 23 cents in terms of the 1850 dollar.

THE PRICE OF GOLD IN SHRIVELED DOLLARS

The price of gold was fixed at $20.67 in 1834. If the same dollar shrinkage existed before 1850, as afterwards, it had depreciated quite a bit by 1850, but assuming that it was 100 then, we find that gold which in terms of dollar value was $20.67 in 1850 had shrunk to $17.52 per ounce in 1870, that it was $14.37 an ounce in 1890, that in 1910 it was $11.22 and that by 1934 it had dropped to $7.47 and if the old gold price had continued it would have been $4.75 per ounce by 1950.

However, 1934 was the great year for gold producers, according to the crackpot economists. Gold went to $35 per ounce, although in purchasing power of depreciated dollars, it really only went to $12.64 and by 1950 that new price has become $8.04.

It's a strange thing that in discussing gold many people only think of its price and completely ignore its cost.

Let's go back along the line and look at some costs, gold mining labor in 1890 was $2.50 per day, for a 10-hour shift, in 1934 it was $4 to $5 for an 8-hour shift and today it is $10 to $12. Supplies now are generally 100 percent to 200 percent higher than they were in 1934, transportation costs are up almost 300 percent, necessary clerical work is up 500 percent and taxes have been raised 7,600 percent in the past 50 years.

To speak of convertibility of gold for paper money today, at $35 gold is a waste of words. A study of the basic thinking of our money masters in Government should show anyone supplied with normal intelligence, that this would be the last thing that they would consent to. They have sought to control gold for the purpose of centralizing their power and if the pressure for conversion gets too heavy it will certainly be at a higher dollar parity or a higher gold price.

GOVERNMENT DETERMINED TO HAVE MANAGED CURRENCY

At the recent convention of the American Banking Association in San Francisco, Allen Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, stood on a platform backed by a large mural depicting the early California pioneers, boasted of being a native San Franciscan and of it

being the one hundredth anniversary of the discovery of gold in California, then proceeded to castigate gold money as something inferior to the brand of managed currency now forced on the public by the Government and the Federal Reserve. Sproul put emphasis on his complete determination that the people must have managed currency and that they were not to be trusted with gold. He spoke frequently of laws without apparent realization that his conception of the gold question was completely lawless. He calmly supported confiscation of gold.

The next exhibit in our collection of horrors is a statement by Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. He recently replied to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report and said as to gold; "Proposals have been freely forthcoming from world gold-producing interests to raise the dollar price of gold. The dollar price of gold, however, is still higher relative to the general level of commodity prices, than it was in the 1920's and gold production remains above the level of that period."

Mr. McCabe's statement is false. In the 1920's the commodity level of gold was lower than other commodities, by comparison of the time its price was fixed, it had been static since 1834. As to present gold production in the United States, it is only 72 percent of the 1920's instead of being above the level of that period.

I believe the latest pronouncement from the Government on this subject is the report of this Joint Committee on the Economic Report, issued in Washington on January 23. In this they have adopted one of Mr. McCabe's statements, swallowing it hook, line, and sinker. They definitely turn thumbs down on gold convertibility but the words used are not an evidence of strength but of weakness. I will quote them:

"An overriding reason against making gold coin freely available is that no government should make promises to its citizens and to the world which it would not be able to keep if the demand should arise. * * * Return to the gold-coin standard would clearly expose the economy to the risk of a drastic and undesirable deflation at times of high speculative demand for gold for hoarding, or else the government would have to withdraw its promise of gold convertibility."

In short, they admit that they could not face a public accounting of their money stewardship.

These points illustrate the spirit of our money managers toward gold and the interests of gold producers. It would be idle to expect any help or justice from them. They have appropriated our private property for their own use and nothing but force will dislodge their grip on gold.

Fortunately for us, gold producers have that force available, and if we will demonstrate a percentage of the old-time guts which formed the background of this industry, we should get out of this mess. Our industry has been completely socialized. We were the guinea pigs and what happened to us yesterday may happen to any other industry tomorrow.

We are producers and wholesalers of a valuable commodity, at present being forcefully taken at an inadequate price. We have the right to seek protection against the unlawful seizure of this private property.

NO BASIS FOR TREASURY POWER OVER NEWLY MINED GOLD

It is a long established legal principle that neither Congress nor any agency of Government has the right or the power to fix the price at which the Government buys. Maintenance of this principle is fundamental to our free economy.

The gold regulations are a product of the Treasury Department and express the manner in which they wish to have things done. They have no legal force or effect if they overstep the power conveyed by the Gold Reserve Act.

The regulations fix the price and they also fix the compulsion to sell to the Government. They deny gold producers the right to sell their gold, processed in its extraction, to anyone but a mint, or one of their licensed buyers which makes him merely a branch of the mint for the purposes of a compulsory sale.

The fixing of the price plus the compulsion to sell amounts to the taking of property without just compensation. A definite violation of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

The fixing of a proper price, at which the Government may purchase, is a judicial function and cannot be legally accomplished by Congress, which is the legislative branch, or by the Treasury, which is only an administrative branch. Neither of these possesses judicial power for such price fixing.

If we compare the basic world conditions now and as they were in 1933, there are both parallels and contrasts. World currencies are again devalued ahead of ours. The price of gold abroad is higher than in this country, but the rights of gold producers to receive world prices are not now conceded by the Government. In fact they are violently denied to us and such slight freedom as we have in the markets for gold in its natural state is clouded by Treasury propaganda and threats to change these regulations at any time.

JUSTICE FOR GOLD PRODUCERS

There are two solutions to our problem.

Step 1: Proceed against the Government in the courts, with several distinct cases each having a different set of circumstances. We would thus seek a clear-cut decision defining the property rights of gold producers to mine and sell their product. The precise questions we are raising have never been before the courts. There are no legal decisions against the gold mining industry. We have accepted the power of Government without question, like a lot of sheep. How much longer will we submit to this?

Step 2: Cooperate, under a new and honest set of regulations with the Treasury Department, and sell our product to them provided they pay us the current world price. They could do this now, at any time. They have ample authority under section 3700 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. With the approval of the President the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase gold in any amounts, at home or abroad * * * at such rates and upon such terms as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest * * * any provisions of law as to parity, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

The Government did this in 1933 under the Presidential order of August 29 and their legal right to do this was confirmed by the opinion of the Attorney General which I have quoted.

The Government may not yet be ready to grant us the benefit of step 2, but they may be willing to do so if we proceed diligently under step 1.

The California Gold Committee is a group representing diverse gold producers' interests. Its functions are to coordinate the efforts of the industry so that they may be more effective through group action than by the efforts of a single producer.

We charge no fees, we are not a membership organization in competition with other groups. We seek no profits.

We have made research regarding the soundness of our program, have provided competent legal counsel in Washington and we have developed avenues for practical relief for the gold mining industry, along two lines.

The first being to get redress through court action against the Government for the loss and damages caused by the closing down of gold mines under L208, an illegal order, which was a studied crime against gold producers.

Two claims have already been filed in the Court of Claims of the United States, under this heading and others are being processed.

The committee would be glad to have inquiries and suggestions from those interested in this subject. Gold producers who have suffered money or property losses are invited to submit an outline of their cases to us. We would thus be able to give advice as to the most effective procedure.

Our address is, California Gold Committee, Auburn, Calif.

Gold mining has had a particularly raw deal but it is not the only branch of the mining industry that is in trouble. Seventy-three percent of all metal mines operating in 11 Western States in 1940, are now closed down. This shut-down is due to world and sectional politics. Much of this could have been avoided if mining people had been more alert but we have been too much engaged in the details of our own affairs and have been inclined to avoid politics.

That must be changed. Whether we like it or not, we must get into politics and the thousands of people in our communities must be enlisted to support us. Likewise, the thousands of stockholders in our enterprises, who now suffer with us, must be alerted to the end that we become articulate.

We must recognize and support our friends and root out of office those politicians in whom we trusted, but who have helped or permitted the mining industry to be brought down to the desperate level it now holds.

Education for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior and junior Senators from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. DARBY], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Education for Freedom," delivered by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of the Pennsylvania State College, at the forty-first annual dinner meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, in Philadelphia, on February 28, 1950.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this manuscript is estimated to make approximately two and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $205. Owing to the importance of the address, it being a discussion of the objectives of a liberal arts college, I believe the Members of the Senate will be very much interested in reading it. It is for this reason that I am asking that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM

I am deeply grateful for the honor you do me tonight, and for this demonstration of the friendly spirit of Pennsylvania. It is

more reassuring to me than perhaps you envisaged when you invited me here.

The Kansas from which I come retains many of the attitudes and characteristics of the frontier. I've grown accustomed there to a candor and a relaxed friendliness which might easily be lacking in an older society with deeply rooted traditions. If I had any misgivings about moving from Kansas to Pennsylvania they were that I might, temporarily at least, feel a stranger to the more formal atmosphere and conservative demeanor of this great Commonwealth.

You have convinced me of my error. You have done so not only by the cordiality of your welcome but by the fact that, tonight, you are proving yourselves to be as casually irreverent of tradition as any western pioneer could desire.

For you are shattering one of the most cherished traditions of American higher education. A newly elected college president is supposed to slip quietly into office and spend several months in seclusion on the campus, after which he is formally inaugurated with pomp and ceremony. Only then does he announce his educational philosophy and aims. What you are doing tonight is so lacking in precedent that I'm hard put to find a name for it. Certainly this occasion is not an inaugural; that, I suppose, will occur for me a good many months hence. Perhaps it can best be characterized as a preinaugural, similar to the orientation and testing program to which we modern educators subject freshmen before we permit them to enroll.

However it is classified, I must say that it is a pleasant experience, and I shall respond to your pioneering generosity by doing a little pioneering of my own. I, too, shall ignore tradition by stating, as frankly as I can, and before I have had an opportunity to become acquainted with my forthcoming responsibilities, my views on the responsibility higher education has for protecting, developing, and spreading the blessings of democracy.

Now, education is not a cloistered enterprise, comfortably removed from the turbulent streams of our social, physical, and spiritual life. It is an essential part of that life. For whatever glorious triumphs we of the United States have achieved, education must be given part of the credit, and for whatever failures we have experienced, education must be assigned part of the blame. Education deals with the life of the mind, and a free society rises or falls by the quality of thinking of all its participants.

This means that education must be adaptable to changing social conditions. Ideally, sound developments in education should precede social change. Ideally, we should, as a society, think before we act, using that rationality which education is concerned to develop as the driving force of progress. But this has not always been so. It has not been so, I think, in our own time. Most of us in American education are acutely aware that it has lagged behind social adjustments caused by an advancing technology—which is to say that these adjustments have been, quite often, irrationally made. They've been made, and are now being made, without sufficiently clear conceptions of the goals we wish to achieve, the values we wish to preserve or create. It is our awareness of this fact which has sparked the revolution now under way in most of our institutions of higher learning, from Maine to California, from Montana to Louisiana.

This is the second major revolution in American higher education.

The first occurred during the Civil War. That was a revolt against the restricted classical concept of higher learning, based on Greek and Latin and designed for the cultivation of a privileged class. We imported this type of education from Europe and maintained it here for many years despite the fact that it not only failed to contribute vitally to democratic development but actually, in many ways, hindered that development.

Our democratic system sprang directly from basic moral conceptions. Great ideals of human dignity, mutuality in human relations, and individual liberty motivated a social system in which social power was shared by all the people. The people were to employ this shared power to promote the common good as well as the individual good. It was a system requiring an intelligent, well-informed citizenry, each of whom realized that he was, in his capacity of free citizen, both governed and governor.

It was, perhaps, easier to meet this requirement in the early days of America than it is now. Our democracy began in a simple agrarian environment. There was a minimum of economic interdependence. True, there was a lower level of popular education; but social problems were also simpler, for no man's problems and outlook were greatly different from those of his neighbors. The average citizen mind could encompass most of the factors which must be considered in the determination of public action.

Yes; democracy was easier in those days—and it was Thomas Jefferson's realization that industrialization would make democracy more difficult which determined his initial hostility to the encouragement of manufactures. In 1787 he contended that popular government would survive in the United States "as long as agriculture is our principal object," a statement indicating at least a latent despair of democracy should industrialization proceed too fast and too far. Later, however, he modified his views. He came to regard increasing industrialization as a challenge which democracy could meet successfully, providing people generally achieved an ever-higher level of education and understanding. It must be, he saw, an education which encouraged a profound commitment to freedom while developing the skills of creative compromise.

Convinced that education is the greatest single guaranty of freedom, Jefferson helped establish the University of Virginia, whose charter declared that education must—

(a) Expound a sound spirit of legislation which leaves the individual free to do whatever does not violate the equal rights of another;

(b) Harmonize and promote the interests of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce;

(c) Develop the reasoning faculties of youth, enlarge their minds, and instill into them the precepts of virtue and order; and

(d) Form them to habits of reflection, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves.

Unfortunately, these goals for education were not widely adopted in Jefferson's time. Particularly were the first two goals neglected. Obviously, these goals implied widespread popular education and an education related to the vocational interests of the masses of the people. Yet higher education continued to be the prerogative of the few; it continued to be focused on Greek and Latin and pointed primarily to the learned professions of law, medicine, and theology. The masses of the people remained unenlightened, and distrusted the educated few.

Meanwhile the American environment was being vastly changed. An industrial democracy was developing. The percentage of people engaged in farming was decreasing while that engaged in manufacturing, trade, transportation, personal services, and professions was steadily increasing. Economic self-sufficiency was beginning to disappear. Men began to specialize, and to encounter wholly new physical and social problems, for which few seemed to have answers. A rapidly increasing population was not attaining the level of education and understanding which onrushing events made essential. Certainly a purely classical education for a relative few did not suffice. Education was failing, and failing desperately, to contribute to democratic development.

It became increasingly clear that college education must be popularized; it must be placed within the reach of large numbers of men and women; it must concern itself with their vocational interests and needs; it must help find the answers to perplexing physical problems, such as that of a rapidly declining soil productivity. The price of failure to develop this kind of education seemed, to many serious thinkers, the ultimate collapse of the democratic system.

Accordingly there developed, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, a new charter for American education. It was the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the land-grant college system of which Kansas State College and the Pennsylvania State College are a part. Through it a major step was taken toward the realization of at least a part of Jefferson's charter. The land-grant colleges did breathe forth a spirit of democratic legislation, laying great stress on individual enterprise and individual liberty. They did strive—and with remarkable success—to promote the interest of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. Gradually, in research, resident instruction, and extension, they helped solve vexing problems and provided the answers to vast numbers of people in all the States.

At that time, with interest focused on physical development, the other goals in Jefferson's charter did not seem as important as they do today, especially the goals of developing reflective thinking and harmonizing the interests of specialized groups. But I shall return to this point shortly.

The establishment of the land-grant colleges initiated a chain reaction. The new concept of higher education rapidly overcame the contempt of the classicists who, to begin with, had felt that science was not worthy of a place in universities and that it was not quite respectable to be, say, an engineer. The new colleges made science a partner of the farm and the industrial classes, and demonstrated that higher education could contribute directly to man's economic advancement. No longer did the college student look only to law, medicine, or the ministry as proper vocations. More than 3,000 occupations were now open to him. And from the land-grant schools, the new concepts spread to other colleges and universities and to secondary schools as well.

This was truly a successful revolution in education. The triumph of the concept of popular education is evident in the fact that today some 10,000,000 young men and women are enrolled in American high schools, colleges, and universities. The triumph of the concept of scientific and vocational education is evident in the curriculums of nearly every college in the land. Indeed, the triumph of this latter concept was so complete as seemingly to blind us for a long time to other educational values which now are recognized as being crucially important.

Let me explain why I say this:

Beginning in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and rapidly gaining momentum in this century, our colleges contributed immensely to our scientific and technological progress, not only by turning out highly skilled scientists and technicians, but also through research conducted in their own laboratories. For several thousand years, it seemed, physical progress had languished, like the quiet waters behind a great dam. Now the dam was burst, and industrialization with its concomitant specialization flowed forth like turbulent flood waters. Industrial and agricultural productivity increased phenomenally, releasing manpower for new professions and trades. Men applied their creative powers with feverish vigor to physical and biological mysteries and came forth with machines and treatment beyond the dreams of Jules Verne.

Happy with success, and responding to the need for men of greater and greater degrees of specialization, higher education now specialized with a vengeance. Whether in the basic or applied sciences, or even in the many disciplines within the social sciences and humanities, students were encouraged to probe deeper and deeper into narrower and narrower fields. Our colleges developed more and more highly specialized minds, tremendously competent within the confines of their specialties but uninformed and often dogmatic about everything else. The tendency, at least, was to train a biological chemist who was a stranger to the social world in which he lived; or a language specialist who literally feared the physical world, for he had no understanding of it; or an engineer who knew little about the economic forces determining the very field in which he worked.

This was a tragedy of monumental proportions.

Intense specialization in every avenue of life has brought about conditions and social problems profoundly different from those of our early agrarian days. One is an exacting economic interdependence. And interdependence calls constantly for broad understanding and tolerance. But a too-exclusive specialization, either in work or education, makes for intellectual narrowness. It creates partial minds, whereas interdependence desperately demands whole minds.

If a man does only one thing, day after day—whether it be research in a laboratory, or livestock production on a western ranch, or riveting in a shipyard, he naturally—unless he has trained himself to do otherwise—judges social affairs almost exclusively in terms of their effect on the business of research, or livestock raising, or riveting. Partial minds very naturally cluster around their special vocational and economic interests, and thus are created scores of human pressure streams, running head-on into each other.

Today there is greater community of interest among similar specialists of Seattle, San Francisco, and New York, than there is between different specialists in a single geographic locality. Each interest group, each vertical part of our society, experiencing only a fraction of the whole, thinks primarily of its own welfare. These pressure streams bear upon State capitols and the National Capitol so constantly and relentlessly that if legislation promotes the general welfare it is almost coincidental.

Specialization and interdependence have induced social changes of such bewildering speed that the citizen mind can scarcely comprehend. Hence we frequently devise social action within an obsolete factual framework. When such action doesn't get good results, we become confused and frustrated, grow critical, and look for a whipping boy.

For example, our change from a debtor to a creditor status brought wholly new economic situations which, even after more than 30 years, seem not to be generally understood, especially in the Midwest, and it is not surprising, therefore, that appropriate corrective action is difficult to take. But by far the most awesome example of cultural lag is our complete ignorance of the proposed hydrogen bomb—itself a climax of research and social organization which can literally destroy the very developments that brought it into being. To scramble my examples, I may say that we should not be arguing the economics of our debtor years at a time when a single agency of destruction could well make all argument fruitless or impossible. One of the foremost problems for all the people is to gain at least a minimal understanding of today's forces and circumstances that may determine our destiny. The facts of 25, or 5, or even 2 years ago will not do. Action devised within an obsolete factual framework is a guaranty of dismal failure.

Still other far-reaching consequences flow from extreme specialization. The complexity created by it, and the tempo of working and living that accompanies it, seemingly cause us to subordinate those very spiritual values, those very ethical concepts, which are at once the foundation and the binding cement of our free society. All life is competitive, and there is great virtue in that, provided we retain a unifying compulsion which, at all critical times, is more important to us than our individual or group interests and differences. That unifying compulsion is made up of devotion to human dignity, fairness in human relations, and the protection of interdependent freedoms—political freedom, personal freedom, economic freedom. It seems to me that in this post-war period, with foreign dangers keeping our nerves taut, and with internal problems fraying our minds, we tend not only to forget unifying spiritual values but also to accentuate philosophic differences. These differences today are deeper than ever before, save in the Civil War period. Certainly they grow daily more bitter.

Now, if our modern situation requires anything from the educated man and woman, it requires a mind that is broad, trained in critical thinking, tolerant in judgment, skilled in creative compromise, and dedicated to democratc principles.

Others may state the problem differently, but what I have just said is, I think, a self-evident truth. It is the cardinal fact that is now causing the second revolution in American higher education. Everywhere, teachers, trustees, educational administrators, and students are struggling with the problem of developing and maintaining an educational experience that will help build minds capable of contributing constructively to the solution of problems caused by modern interdependence.

Success in this task requires, I think, that we focus our attention on all the goals of Jefferson's charter for higher education—not on just some of them.

You will forgive me, I trust, if in recounting specifically how education is trying to meet its new task, I become somewhat more personal. I can, you will realize, speak with authority only about Kansas State College—about how we there during the past 7 years have tried to meet these new obligations, as we see them.

We've sought to keep always before us the obvious but important fact that most students spend only 4 years or less in college. Whatever values are to be gained from college must be gained in that brief period. It is a critical period. Most students are in college at a time when they are maturing—physically, intellectually, spiritually—and we've learned that no one of these phases of maturity can be neglected without badly affecting the other two.

We have had to remind ourselves almost daily that all the values of a college experience cannot be obtained exclusively in the classroom or laboratory. How a student lives, how he participates in constructive extra-curricular activities, whether he is given opportunity to learn through experience the democratic lessons of discussion and decision—these and dozens of other circumstances have a direct bearing upon the maturing process of a student.

Specifically, we at Kansas State College have been gradually adjusting our educational program in ways which will help each student achieve five definite goals.

The first continues to be specialized training for the making of a living, or of a home. Specialization is not to be condemned merely because it has presented us with complex social problems. Indeed, specialization is an urgent necessity in modern society, and it is a necessity which education must help to satisfy. Without it, our economic prosperity would be drastically reduced, human misery vastly increased. And democracy itself requires the high productivity yielded by specialization, for a democratic society will be sustained only in an atmosphere of abundance. At least it must be said that totalitarianism spreads only in an environment of human misery.

So of course we must train competent engineers, economists, physicists, and do so with increasing skill in view of the growing intricacies of each area of specialization. But we must do more than this—which brings me to the second of the five goals we've been aiming at for Kansas State.

The second goal is to help each student achieve an understanding of all the broad fields of knowledge—the physical sciences, the biological sciences, the social sciences, the humanities. Of course, no one mind, in four brief years, can achieve specialized training in a single field and at the same time gain detailed knowledge in other fields. He can, however, achieve a general introduction to other fields which, if properly made, will not only enable him to educate himself in them throughout his life, but will also stimulate his desire to do so. Only if they achieve the foundations of self-education, will most individuals leading a specialized life be able to keep themselves broadly and accurately informed as modern democratic society demands of the responsible citizen.

As first steps toward this second goal, we at Kansas State have introduced what we call comprehensive courses in the several fields of knowledge, each built around an integrating theme—courses entitled "Man's Physical World," "Man and the Cultural World," "Man and the Biological World," "Man and the Social World." Students take those comprehensives which are outside their own fields of specialization. We're trying to build courses aimed at broad understanding, while avoiding mere compendiums of unrelated items of information.

A third goal toward which we are aiming at Kansas State is the development of the skills of communication. So many of us in America these days don't really know how to read, or write, or speak, or listen. I often think of what a great surge forward we could have in our society if all individuals and groups attained logic and clarity in communication. Every individual is dependent on others in a multitude of ways, and his true success or failure—as a producer and as a citizen—depends vitally on his ability to analyze and assess what he hears or reads, and to state logically and clearly what he knows, thinks, or wishes to ask. A fairly low level of proficiency in communication is one of the present handicaps to the successful functioning of our free society. At Kansas State, as in most other institutions, we are trying to lift the level of achievement in this field.

This brings me to the fourth goal toward which we're aiming: the fostering of wisdom, or the development of the capacity for sound judgments. Here, how students are taught is as important as what they are taught. Or, more accurately, how students learn, is as important as what they learn. Perhaps the greatest achievement a student can attain is to learn how to learn. Involved in this is learning how to select knowledge relevant to a problem. Involved in it is the exercise of critical thinking about alternative solutions. And involved in it is sensitivity—the deeper intuitions whence arise moral or spiritual values.

Precisely because this goal of wisdom is all-inclusive, it must permeate the entire college program. It cannot be developed through a single device of course. It is as important to develop the habit of critical thinking in a course in history as it is in mathematics, in philosophy as in chemical engineering. And the all-college environment must make its contribution, too. Is the school, with all its fun, really dedicated in class and out to the serious purpose of education? Are students, in class and out, given

opportunity and encouragement to formulate judgments, express them, and test them against objective facts and judgments of others? Unless the answer to these questions is "Yes," the college is not, I fear, working satisfactorily toward this fourth goal.

And this brings me to the fifth, and last of our goals.

At Kansas State we are determined that every student should gain from his total experience in college an abiding commitment to the democratic way of life—a commitment based, not upon indoctrination, but upon genuine understanding. We want this commitment to be so firm that each student will become an effective, participating citizen in all the democratic procedures open to him—working constantly and effectively for the protection and development of our interdependent freedoms.

I may be quite blunt about this: We have established and supported in this country a Nation-wide system of education designed primarily to lift the level of understanding of all the people so that the maintenance of democracy may be assured. Every citizen has a right to expect that our educational institutions will contribute directly and effectively to the democratic system which maintains them.

But I'm afraid a great many people do not realize that good results in this regard do not derive merely from preachments. A mere emotional commitment to freedom and democracy is not enough. A student who has only an emotional attachment to democracy is easy prey to contrary arguments, both here and abroad.

A genuine, abiding commitment can be achieved only if the student really understands the basic theories and practices of democracy, as well as the basic theories and practices of other systems and ideologies—in all the forms they have taken throughout history. The glory of it is that democracy, with all its shortcomings, is the best social system ever devised by man. It is the only one that is compatible in practice with man's innermost spiritual or religious convictions. It is the only one that permits man to release the springs of his own greatness. Hence, the free democratic system can stand comparison successfully with all other systems, ancient and modern. Out of comparison and the development of his own value-judgments, each student is certain to develop the kind of commitment needed in the effective free citizen.

To help along the process of commitment to democracy, both at the secondary and higher levels of education, we established a few years ago at Kansas State under a grant of $200,000 from the Volker Foundation, an Institute of Citizenship It is working with students on the campus, with adults throughout the State, and with teachers in cooperating high schools. It is constantly experimenting with both the processes and subject-matter of citizenship education. The results of these experiments—and some of them have been highly successful—are soon to be published in a series of bulletins which a few of you may wish to read.

Well this, gentlemen, is my view of the responsibility of higher education in a free society. Perhaps I can sum it all up by saying that what each student should get out of college is himself—himself as a mature personality with capacities and incentive for continued growth, himself as an informed and effective citizen in a free society, himself as a deeply moral creature of God.

If he is soundly trained in a field of specialization, has sufficient understanding of other fields of knowledge to be self-educative, has developed habits of critical thinking, can communicate with logic and clarity, and is committed, on the basis of his own value-judgments, to the democratic way, he will inevitably be a priceless asset to America. He will insist upon the maintenance and extension of liberty, regardless of what changes the waves of event may bring. He will insist upon shared power in political democracy, mutuality in human relations in personal democracy, and competition and a wide diffusion of responsibility in economic democracy. He will help to promote and harmonize the interests of agriculture, industry, labor, and commerce.

If there are enough of him—and we must see to it that there are enough—he will, in the words of Washington, "so develop the blessings of democracy as to recommend it to the applause, the affection, and the adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it."

Purchasing Value of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table showing the purchasing value of the dollar as measured by the consumers' price index. The table has been prepared by the Institute of Life Insurance.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Purchasing value of the dollar as measured by the Consumers' Price Index

[The January 1939 dollar=100 cents]

	Index
1820	214.6
1821	224.7
1822	219.3
1823	229.9
1824	248.1
1825	242.1
1826	255.1
1827	245.1
1828	248.1
1829	242.1
1830	261.8
1831	251.3
1832	245.1
1833	251.3
1834	273.2
1835	233.1
1836	204.9
1837	194.6
1838	196.5
1839	196.5
1840	235.8
1841	234.7
1842	255.8
1843	273.2
1844	271.0
1845	261.1
1946	242.1
1847	242.1
1848	261.1
1849	276.2
1850	258.4
1851	233.6
1852	235.3
1853	219.3
1854	219.3
1855	211.0
1856	205.3
1857	202.0
1858	203.7
1859	223.7
1860	230.4
1861	220.8
1862	196.5
1863	165.0
1864	135.7
1865	128.9
1866	130.2
1867	136.4
1868	137.4
1869	143.1
1870	147.3
1871	154.6
1872	155.8
1873	159.0
1874	162.3
1875	166.4
1876	171.5
1877	174.5
1878	180.0
1879	182.8
1880	180.0
1881	173.3
1882	167.2
1883	177.6
1884	186.6
1885	191.6
1886	189.0
1887	189.0
1888	184.2
1889	184.2
1890	184.2
1891	189.0
1892	186.6
1893	191.6
1894	196.9
1895	196.9
1896	194.2
1897	191.6
1898	191.6
1899	186.6
1900	179.9
1901	175.4
1902	171.2
1903	163.4
1904	165.3
1905	165.3
1906	159.7
1907	151.3
1908	158.0
1909	158.0
1910	149.7
1911	149.7
1912	141.0
1913	143.7
1914	141.0
1915	139.7
1916	130.7
1917	110.6
1918	94.6
1919	82.2
1920	70.8
1921	82.4
1922	86.6
1923	84.2
1924	83.3
1925	81.2
1926	80.6
1927	82.4
1928	83.5
1929	83.9
1930	86.9
1931	96.6
1932	108.1
1933	112.5
1934	106.3
1935	102.7
1936	100.5
1937	96.3
1938	98.9
1939	100.2
1940	99.4
1941	94.5
1942	85.4
1943	80.8
1944	79.7
1945	78.5
1946	73.5
1947	65.0
1948	61.1
1949	[1] 59.1

[1] Based on 11 months' data

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics: Federal Reserve Bank of New York; National Industrial Conference Board; Institute of Life Insurance

Unemployment in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are very much concerned in the Pacific Northwest about the growing unemployment problem. The Oregon delegation in Congress has received a communication from one of the representatives of CIO labor in the Pacific Northwest dealing with this problem and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
Portland, Oreg., February 24, 1950.

Members Oregon Delegation in Congress, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: An unemployment survey conducted by my office indicates that on February 1, 19 percent of the State's labor force was unemployed. Statistics obtained from maritime unions, including my own, reflect up to a one-third drop-off in work since 1947.

Since longshore and offshore employment in this State is closely related to our principal cargo item—lumber—my union has made a detailed inquiry into the situation in lumber at this time. We find:

1. British Columbia is cutting deeply into our Atlantic coast and California markets. The following table is revealing:

British Columbia shipments to California (in board feet):	
1947	None.
1948	7,879,611
1949	6,885,679
British Columbia shipments to east coast (in board feet):	
1947	None.
1948	96,071,921
1949	303,525,459

By the end of 1949, British Columbia had taken over one-third of our markets on the east coast. The shipments, during the first 8 months of the year, amounted to 24.77 percent of the province's total lumber production. (Bureau of Dominion figures.)

When unemployment in west coast lumber and maritime industries is considered in the light, not only of the above but of the total volume of Canadian lumber exports to the United States in 1949, the outlook for 1950 is dark indeed.

Last year, Canada, according to the Commercial Bulletin of Boston (issue of Saturday, February 18), exported 1,627,500,000 board feet to the United States. That is a lot of lumber, and is roughly equivalent to the total shipments, both domestic and foreign, for the year from Oregon and Washington. It is also equivalent to 31 percent of Canada's total lumber production.

In job terms for Oregon-Washington workers, the British Columbia shipments to our east coast alone, in 1949, were equivalent to some 3,600,000 man-hours for woodworkers and 30,352 gang-hours (14 men to a gang)—work Oregon and Washington loggers and sawmill workers and Puget Sound, Portland, Astoria, Coos Bay, Longview, and St. Helens dockers did not get.

This represents something like a $1,000,000 wage loss for ILWU members—money they did not have to spend at the corner store.

Much of the lumber shipped by Canada to this country found its way into FHA building channels.

2. We find that some $4,000,000 in ECA funds were recently allotted Great Britain for the purchase of lumber. But out of the 87,000,000 board foot order which resulted, only 5,000,000 board feet went to our mills. Canadian mills got 82,000,000 board feet.

3. We find that Great Britain has just been issued an additional procurement order for $10,000,000 to cover purchase of some 132,000,000 board feet.

If Great Britain is permitted to spend this money in Canada, our west coast woodworkers will lose some 1,584,000 man-hours and our longshoremen will lose between 14,000 and 16,000 gang-hours.

We have information showing that the British, in considering bids on ECA allotment purchases, discriminate against certain American ports. For instance, they refuse to consider bids from Eureka, Newport, and, in some instances, from Coos Bay, although American ships and vessels in the Pacific Coast European Conference place no restrictions against those ports. Since we have locals in all three ports, this matter is of direct concern to us.

4. We find that within the next 2 months, some 29 ships are slated to load lumber in British Columbia for our east coast, in addition to 14 ships so loading between November 3 and December 31.

Apparently not a single ship chartered for the recent British timber purchase was an American ship, although ECA regulations specify that 50 percent of the cargoes must be carried in American bottoms.

The loss of California and east coast markets to Canada is reflected in figures obtained from the Pacific American Steamship Association in San Francisco on intercoastal and coastwise vessels operating out of west coast ports. Of 150 dry cargo vessels operating in the intercoastal trade before the war, there are today only one-third that number. Coastwise carriers have declined from 30 to 12.

5. We find, also, that our markets in Japan, China, and the Philippines are a total loss.

In 1931 Oregon and Washington shipped 325,764,561 board feet to Japan; 314,475,322 board feet to China; and 2,120,870 board feet to the Philippine Islands.

Last year, only 5,941,936 board feet went to Japan (of which only 22,875 was from Oregon); no lumber at all went to the Philippines; and, after March, no lumber to China.

The employment loss for woodworkers and longshoremen, as reflected in the above figures, is some 7,704,000 man-hours for woodworkers and more than 60,000 gang-hours for longshoremen.

Were we exporting lumber to the Orient in the quantity in which it was shipped in 1931, Oregon and Washington longshoremen this year would be richer by more than $2,000,000.

You know, of course, that the United States Bureau of Employment Security notes that when the unemployment is 12 percent and over, the situation is sufficiently serious to warrant consideration and remedial efforts at local, State, and possibly Federal levels.

It would appear that unemployment in many Oregon counties has reached the danger point, while American diplomats fail to deal realistically with the Chinese situation and while American tax dollars are used to boycott Northwest cargo items and to subsidize a foreign merchant marine.

The end effect of such a situation can only be to force down our American living standards, cause widespread labor unrest, force many businesses to the wall, and throw heavier and heavier burdens on the relief agencies.

In conclusion, I am urging you to (1) start a congressional probe into the ECA lumber deals; (2) move to restrict ECA lumber purchases to American mills; (3) sponsor an FHA requirement that all lumber used in FHA-financed houses be manufactured in the United States; (4) act to wall up the loophole in the ECA Act which permits cargoes in excess of the act to be carried in foreign ships; (5) urge removal of trade barriers with China; (6) extend credit to China, Japan, and the Philippines to purchase the products of our country.

Respectfully yours,
MATT MEEHAN,
International Representative.

Excise-Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington enjoys talking each week by radio with his constituents at home. The subject of war-created excise taxes was the subject of his talk on Monday, February 27. Because a good many citizens have requested copies of the remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the radio statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is HARRY CAIN in Washington, D. C., in your Nation's Capital.

On the 19th of January of this year it so happened that I was the Senator who offered a motion that the Senate ought to consider the merits of an excise tax reduction bill which has been quietly slumbering on the Senate Calendar since last June. This motion was vigorously debated but when the question came to a vote the motion was defeated strictly on party lines. The administration leaders, including the majority leader, Mr. LUCAS, and the Senate Finance Chairman, Mr. GEORGE, said they were sympathetic to repealing some excise taxes and reducing others but that it wasn't yet time to tackle the question. Since the motion was defeated a good many of us have been watching those who speak for the administration to determine when the time is right to get rid of taxes which are burdensome to you and which have outlived their justification and usefulness.

Last week Senator GEORGE, a very distinguished and influential Member of the Senate, spoke his piece in no uncertain terms. In doing so he spoke in opposition to what the White House wants done. Mr. GEORGE was simply speaking for himself but his voice is a big one and many Democrats and Republicans are hopeful that his recommendations will be followed, and quite soon.

Senator GEORGE came out flatfootedly for outright repeal of the wartime excise taxes, excepting only those now levied on alcohol, gasoline and tobacco. He estimated it would cost the Government about $2,250,000,000 in immediate tax revenue losses but he predicted that about half of that gigantic sum would be recaptured by the Treasury as a direct result of the incentive given the businesses affected. The remaining loss, he

thought, could be made up by cutting Government spending. It is good to have a responsible Democrat reflect on this possibility isn't it, and by going all out to plug tax loopholes. Senator GEORGE appears to be strongly opposed to the administration's proposal to make selective cuts of around $600,000,000 in these wartime levies and to increase other taxes by any war excise tax loss. Senator GEORGE maintains that this would be nothing short of a careless approach to a pressing and important problem and in his words "it would simply postpone a job we ought to do now."

The Senator stated publicly that the 1941, 1942, and 1943 increases were imposed chiefly to check consumer purchases of war-scarce commodities and services. That need passed after the war but the excises stayed on. Nearly all of them have a present-day repressive effect on business. The Senator thinks that these taxes can't be handled selectively and that the Congress ought to be wise enough and bold enough to make the cuts now. Whenever the good Senator gives the word—for either he or Senator LUCAS controls the green-light go-ahead signal—I can think of 42 Senators on the opposition, or Republican, side of the aisle who will cry "hooray" and vote to eliminate the taxes.

For the next few minutes I want to talk with everybody about these taxes and about what they are doing to our economy and to your happiness and education. Everybody must be interested in the subject because the taxes in question are of basic concern to housewives, industrialists, members of labor unions, farmers, little-business men, big-business men, landlords, tenants, veterans, nonveterans, and in fact every man, woman, and child in America.

Many of these taxes were in existence long before the war, but were raised substantially as a wartime measure. The war has been over for nearly 5 years, and the promise your Government made to you to repeal these taxes at the war's end was and has been broken. We are still paying a 20-percent admission tax on amusements, 20 percent on furs, 20 percent on jewelry, 20 percent on luggage, purses, toilet cases and handbags; 20 percent on cosmetics; 15 percent on transportation; and 25 percent on telephone and toll messages, telegraph, cable, or radio messages.

As an example of the regressive effect, which means holding back, of these taxes on business, the fur industry in Washington State is suffering badly. Those contemplating the purchase of fur coats are waiting in the hope that in the near future the tax will be repealed. As a result, business is falling off; many employees, both of the manufacturers and retailers of furs, are being reduced to a part-time work basis, if they have not been laid off entirely. Obviously, this goes far deeper than forcing the ladies, or their husbands, to pay an additional 20 percent on the retail price for furs. By depriving the industry of its normal expectancy of business, it radically imperils the industry itself as well as the income of its employees.

Strong pressure, which certainly I approve, is now being exerted on the Congress to repeal the amusement taxes, especially those affecting that great segment of the American public, rich and poor, who rely on the movies as a wholesome type of entertainment which the family can enjoy together. A 20-percent tax on a single admission is one thing for an adult; it is quite another if it is a youngster who strives to save his pennies for a Saturday movie. It is also a serious thing to the parents of large families, especially in the light of what is left of the father's take-home pay, after deductions.

Taxing the movies and circuses, the only form of relaxation many people in rural areas have, the levy is against the poor man's entertainment and the pleasure of children. It is, in part, responsible for the decline of theater attendance. In failing to distinguish between low-priced suburban or country movies and the big, high-priced, first-run city theaters, an injustice is worked on the masses, the laboring people, the women, and the children.

The levy of taxes also on admissions to agriculture fairs, again hits the great mass of the people, both rural and urban, and in addition indirectly puts a tax on the education of farmers who use this medium for the exchange of ideas and for an opportunity to learn progressive methods of operation and procedures, from one another, and from the industrial exhibits of new farm implements and machinery.

As applied to the legitimate theater, musical concerts, and operas, the tax on admissions places the United States in a position of taxing an industry that other nations have traditionally considered a proper subject of state assistance. In this country, our great symphony orchestras, large and small, are made available to more people who love music, because they are subsidized by civic-minded private citizens in the various communities, otherwise, the price of admission would of necessity be beyond the pocketbooks of a large majority of the people. There is not one symphony orchestra in this country today which does not owe its existence to the loyal financial support of those who have the heart and the money to furnish private subsidy to orchestras in order that those on limited incomes may enjoy fine music. The 20-percent admission tax which every ticket buyer must pay, only adds to his burden as well as to that of the many others who not only give generous sums each year in support of symphony and philharmonic orchestras over the land, but buy their admission tickets as well.

The admission tax was established under the Revenue Act of 1917. It was uniformly set at 1 cent for each 10 cents, until it was raised to 1 cent on each 5 cents by the Revenue Act of 1943. Previously there had been some exemptions, which ranged as high as $[illegible] between 1928 and 1932. There are no such exemptions now.

For the fiscal year 1948 the tax on general admissions alone brought in a revenue of $383,626,814. Added to that exacted on leases of boxes or seats, ticket broker sales, admissions to cabarets and roof gardens, and similar forms of entertainment, and club and initiation fees, $464,127,037 flowed in an unending stream into the Treasury of the United States in 1948 from your pockets.

The excise tax of 20 percent on leather goods, trunks, handbags, suitcases, etc., was a wartime tax adopted in 1943 as a wartime conservation measure. It puts all leather goods in the category of luxuries. I do not argue with the stand that some of the expensive ones are, but the average shopping bag, woman's purse, school bag, or suitcase is an essential.

They can in no way be considered articles of adornment, as is jewelry, for instance. It has never been made clear why these articles should be taxed when women's gloves and hats have escaped. There has been a tremendous protest both from the consumer and the industry against what both claim to be unjust and unjustified. Certainly the effect on the industry as a whole is regressive and repressive, cutting production sales and employment.

The excise tax on the transportation of persons was clearly a wartime measure designed partly to help dissuade civilians from further burdening the already overcrowded public carriers engaged in the movement of troops or other personnel essential to the wartime effort. The levy is now a sales tax upon an essential service that is not a luxury and has to be used repeatedly by a large segment of the population. It is also discriminatory against certain sections of the country far removed from the large centers of the population. Especially does this apply to us in the far West. It discriminates against us because persons in the East who under normal circumstances would be willing to pay the increased fare to say the Northwest, as compared to that of the Northeast, cannot meet the added expense of the tax which increases proportionately with the fare—a sufficiently added burden to cause the traveler to choose the Northeast instead for his vacation and travels.

The increased excise tax on telephone, telegraph, and radio messages was also a wartime measure. The most inexplainable thing about this tax is the rate. If one goes to a night club or buys a piece of jewelry, he pays a 20-percent tax. If he uses public transportation on a vacation, he pays a 15-percent tax, but if he makes a long-distance call, business telephone call, or sends a telegram, he pays a 25-percent tax. This is a tax imposed on business and social necessity, and is based on no sound principle nor has it a justification in peacetime. Certainly these cannot be considered luxuries. They discriminate against businesses which have to make frequent use of our communication services. Like the transportation tax, it also discriminates against sections of the country far removed from the centers of the population, again, included in the far West.

As to the tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations, I am sure there isn't a woman listening to me tonight who won't agree with me that they have been articles of everyday use, and by custom a virtual necessity. Certainly they are to any woman who wants to hold her job and, shall we say, her man.

One last comment; the administration will oppose the "bold and wise" and immediate tax cuts which Senator GEORGE has so honestly recommended. The reason is simple: war excise taxes are easy to administer, they are collected automatically, and they provide large sums which the insatiable spending appetite of the administration demands.

This reason won't prevail once the question is debated by the Congress. The taxes will go at the first voting chance. A promising prediction, isn't it? Your job then is to continue to needle your Congress to do what a majority of its Members want to do for you.

Until next week at the same time this is HARRY CAIN saying good night and good luck.

Danger From Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. John Temple Graves, a leading southerner, orator, and writer, before the National Automobile Dealers Association, in Atlantic City on February 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our danger at home isn't the march of communism, it is the creep of socialism. Into our schools and colleges, conditioning minds like those of Alger Hiss, Judy Coplon, Elizabeth Bentley. Into our government, telling it to play God. Into our literature

and the philosophies of our men of good will. Into our American spirit, persuading us to play safe and ask a security that is gone with the bomb. Into our morals, saying right and wrong are subject to change without notice. Into our churches, telling us the angels in heaven have left wings only.

The soft under belly of America for Communist attack is this creeping socialism.

A Socialist is a Communist who doesn't know the facts of life. He thinks you can be sweet and nice about it, pass around the civil liberties, be law abiding, let the people rule, and all that. But you can't. Russia knows and Britain is learning. You can't play God and be subject to the whims of a legislature and periodical votes of the people. Sooner or later, as a practical matter, you have to do it the Russian way, with a dictator and policemen.

There are many kinds of socialism now. In Europe there are national socialism, Christian socialism, democratic socialism, Soviet socialism. In this country we have the regular Socialist Party and the Socialist Labor Party. And lately, for the first time on a national scale, we have developed what may be called tax-spend-elect, or Pendergastian socialism.

The Pendergastian Socialist is cynical. He doesn't care for socialism, but he doesn't mind. He brings it about in course of handing things out. He gets his name from a political machine which flourished once in Kansas City. Some of the people in that machine are dead, some are in jail, and some have moved to Washington.

Tax, spend, elect, works. We have seen that, and are seeing it now. Only three things can stop it. One is bankruptcy. One is the full socialism to which it leads. The third is visibility of taxes. When taxes become visible as a burden, people begin to complain. The golden goose begins to squawk. They are complaining this year. A $5,000,000,000 deficit is a pretty visible thing. No wonder our tax-spend-elect Socialists want to reduce excise taxes and up taxes on business. The public can't see business taxes. Not right away.

A party line for America, it seems to me, is a line in two parts. A part against too much government and a part against government too far from the governed. Antistatism and State's rights—they are two faces of the same coin.

We need a lot of government these days, far more than 50 years ago, or, perhaps, even 15 years ago. Few dispute it now. The true issue is whether you recognize a danger point in too much government or whether you "pooh-pooh" the idea, call it a red herring out of selfish interests and say, What is statism, anyhow? Whether we have passed the danger point yet is something on which we may honestly disagree. But I don't see how anyone who believes in the free way with which we made this Nation and have lately won two wars at once on two sides of a planet can refuse the fact that there is a point in government controlling, spending, and taxing beyond which you can't go and have (1) democracy, (2) solvency, (3) incentive to work, or (4) incentive to enterprise and invest.

Democracy and too much government are incompatible. So are democracy and government too far from home. We knew that when we threw King George's tea in the water at Boston, government too far from the people governed is government that doesn't understand, government that doesn't have the sympathy of those governed, and, therefore, government that must operate more and more through force bills and police.

We talk of civil liberties, and it is precious talk. In my part of the country we need to talk and practice it more, and we are learning. But the most civil of all our civil liberties is the liberty to be governed at home on problems peculiar to us at home. Some call this home rule, some local self-government, some cross-roads democracy. In the South we use the quaint name of States' rights.

God is not mocked by our God-players of today. Still He confuses their tongues as in days of Babel, whether they play through a big government, a big business, or a big labor union. In big government we call the confusion bureaucracy. It isn't in my Bible, and my preacher didn't tell me, but I suspect that when the children of Israel had built the Tower of Babel so high that it began to invade heaven and play God, and when the Lord had decided to topple the tower over and had already confused the tongues of the builders so that they were making noises like many a one that has come out of Washington these 18 years, I suspect that at that very moment they found on top of the Tower of Babel a little fellow with horn-rim glasses and a Harvard accent, shooting rules and regulations at all of heaven's stars and bombarding all creation with questionnaires, each to be answered in triplicate. He was the first bureaucrat, on top of the first thing that got to be too big and tried to play God. His tribe has increased.

They are the two freedoms of 1950. Freedom from too much government. Freedom from government too far from home. Enough Americans believe in them to make a majority, if those who believe can be put together, and put to work. Already they make a political party. It is a party without a name and without an identified leadership, but its roots are in all the grasses of this green land, and sooner or later it is going to express itself not only in the Congress but in great realinement under our two-party set-up.

Totalism is incompatible with our American set-up no matter who runs it. Total government, total business, and, especially now, total organized labor. Wisely we have passed laws against combinations in restraint of trade, but never in our history have there been such combinations in such restraint of so much trade as those over which John Lewis and several other labor leaders are presiding over. We exempt labor from the law because we say labor is not a commodity, and it isn't. That is a core principle of American being. But it begins to be a question whether we, the rest of the people, are a commodity, to have our economy crushed like a crate of eggs at the bat of a bushy eyebrow. The only solution is the simple solution. It is to include these Nation-wide totally organized unions in key industries in the operation of our antitrust laws, as Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, is proposing.

Not by votes alone, or speeches alone, or even by understanding, is our American philosophy of freedom to be saved now, it seems to me. It depends at last on American character, individual character. Our free enterprise depends on Americans who, in character, are fit for their freedom and full of the enterprise. You don't have to have character to be a Communist. You just memorize the party line, and take care not to deviate lest you liquidate. You don't have to have character to be a Fascist. You just march along in ranks, singing your song, wearing your silly feather or cap or button or Ku Klux Klan regalia, overcome by somebody else's false emotions. But you do have to have character to be free and self-governing in the most intricate and dangerous world that ever was, with Russia and the split atom to be lived with.

I believe our people are seeing it. I believe they are looking to a great renaissance of individual character, in public life and private. I believe, for example, that they are going to reelect Senator TAFT in Ohio next November not because he is a Republican, not because of the Taft-Hartley law or his foreign policy, but because they are bewitched at the spectacle of this not at all bewitching gentleman who nevertheless, has the courage and honesty to ask election for what he thinks is good for his country, rather than with wanton promises to put together a winning combination of pressure groups.

The character to be honest and brave and to resist hand-outs and to assume responsibility and, most of all, the character to be insecure. Roosevelt told us in 1933 that all we had to fear was fear itself. I think that was true in 1933. But it seems to me that what we have to fear in 1950 is unwillingness to live fearfully, to take chances, to accept a life of profit and loss, ups and downs, danger and change.

We can live fearfully like this, I think, only if somehow we have the balances and assurances and serenities of a faith in things eternal. Such a faith is suggested now, not challenged, by physical science. The splitting and fusing of atoms takes us to the limits of the physical world. It takes us to a dim edge where there is some other world. It takes us to a place where physics turns to metaphysics—and mathematics touches God.

1949 Progress in the Tennessee Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James P. Pope, director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Athens Kiwanis Club at Athens, Tenn., on February 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1949 PROGRESS IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY

The chairman of your program committee has requested that I talk to you about TVA today. Since this is a rather large subject, as you know, I think it would be well for me to limit it to the progress of the Tennessee Valley during the last year. Progress has continued on all fronts and in some respects it has been very rapid as, for instance, in the field of rural electrification. The construction and installation of new generating facilities by TVA have also gone forward rapidly during the year.

Private enterprise has prospered and advanced throughout the region. Production has increased generally, both in agriculture and in industry. Interest and activity in the location of new industries have grown during the year. And some major developments, such as the proposed Oak Ridge expansion and the Air Engineering Development Center near Tullahoma, have been assured. TVA construction has included rapid progress on the New Johnsonville steam plant. And an announcement has recently been made of the location of another large steam-plant site at Widow's Creek in northern Alabama.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine has been an important year in the development of the valley along all lines—not only in those just mentioned but in navigation, flood control, and conservation. During the year there was celebrated the planting of the two hundred millionth tree as well as the furnishing of power to the millionth customer.

The records disclose that there was substantial progress in traffic on the Tennessee River, with 470,000,000 ton-miles being carried. This was an over-all increase of 6 percent in ton-miles of traffic over 1948. The increase in 1949 was more than 40,000,000 ton-miles over the volume of river traffic in 1948. And the 1949 traffic volume was over 212,000,000 ton-miles more, or over 80 percent greater than 1945, the first full year of operations in the completed river channel.

These traffic increases apply to all commodities, with the principal exception of coal, during the year. The decrease in coal shipments was due to strikes and to the fact that TVA used less coal last year because of heavy rainfall and a good supply of water in the river. As to some important commodities the increase is remarkable. Steel shipments, for instance, increased 1350 percent over 1948. Petroleum products increased 10 percent, grain 75 percent, coke 88 percent, and automobiles 36 percent. Savings to shippers on last year's river traffic, although final calculations have not yet been made, are expected to be substantially larger than those in 1948, which were about $4,000,000.

As to flood prevention during the year the record is good. There was no flood damage of consequence either on the Tennessee, the lower Ohio, or the lower Mississippi Rivers. While there were no major floods during 1949 comparable to those in the three preceding years, the holding back of waters in the two lesser floods in the valley saved Chattanooga about $860,000 in damage. And the reduction of flood crests on the Ohio saved an estimated damage of some $200,000. These savings of over a million dollars in 1949 are worthy of mention, although not comparable to savings in past years which have totaled over $40,000,000 at Chattanooga alone.

It is of current interest that the crests of the recent floods on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers were so reduced as to make it unnecssary to blast open the fuse plug levee of the Birds Point-New Madrid floodway in southern Missouri—according to the joint statement of the United States Army engineers and TVA. The Kentucky Reservoir held back large quantities of floodwaters in accomplishing this result. This saved millions of dollars in flood damages in the floodway where 12,000 people live.

It requires no argument to convince the people along the Tennessee, and the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers of the tremendous value of flood control on the Tennessee. They know its great value. They also know the large value of the all-year-round navigation on the Tennessee River. And yet one still hears in other parts of the country from those who serve the interests opposed to TVA that navigation and flood control provided by TVA are of little value—that they are really camouflages for the power development.

The fact that these contentions were made by the private power companies in numerous suits testing the constitutionality of the TVA Act, and that the courts held them invalid does not seem to deter the same interests from repeating the arguments outside the valley region. The contention is still made that TVA is primarily a power agency. But the fact is that the generation of hydropower is subject to the use of the river for navigation and flood control. The navigation channel must be maintained at a 9-foot depth and floods must be dealt with as they come. If it becomes necessary to spill water to serve these purposes, it is done regardless of the effect it has upon the production of power. Large amounts of water are sometimes spilled as has been the case within the last few weeks. Flood conditions may, and generally do, cut down the amount of water that can be used for generation of power.

In spite of these conditions, however, TVA has become the largest integrated power producer in America. It produced last year over 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours which was 11 percent increase over 1948. Its installed capacity was increased during the year by 258,000 kilowatts, and its transmission lines were increased by about 300 miles. Its gross revenue from sale of power was increased by $9,200,000 and its net income by several million dollars.

The most striking advance was made in the field of rural electrification. Of the 127,000 new customers served, 92,000 of them were rural consumers. Most of the 17,000 miles of new distribution lines were rural. The percentage of electrified farms increased from about 55 percent in 1948 to 70 percent in 1949. Now about 300,000 of the 425,000 farms in the TVA area are electrified and rapid progress is being made in reaching other farms. The estimated savings on power bills of the million TVA customers were about $33,000,000 last year compared with average rates on the Nation.

This progress is very well illustrated by last year's record of operations of your city of Athens. This system built 28 miles of new rural lines, increased the number of customers served 27 percent and the amount of electricity furnished them 34 percent. The number of urban customers was increased 6 percent and the amount of electricity used in the city was increased 19 percent. This is a fine record and your power management deserves commendation.

In the field of farm and forest conservation steady progress was made during the year. Research has gone forward at the Muscle Shoals laboratory and plant principally with reference to new fertilizers. Various combinations of fertilizer ingredients are being tried out. For instance, pilot plant studies during the year were successful in producing dicalcium nitrophosphate containing both nitrogen and phosphate. Tests and demonstrations of new fertilizers are being made on actual farms. The increase of cover crops and decrease in row crops are continuing. More and more winter cover crops are being planted. About a million acres of land have been shifted in the last 15 years from row crops. The valley is greener this winter than it was last winter.

No better illustration of what is going on in soil conservation and farm management can be found than that of Mr. Rex Moses here in McMinn County. Since 1940 Mr. Moses has been a TVA-Extension Service test-demonstration farmer on his 162 acres of land. In 1940 he had a dairy herd of 6 cows and 7 other cattle. By 1948 he had a dairy herd of about 24 milkers and 25 heifers and other cattle. With diversification on the land, with application of fertilizers, and with good management, Mr. Moses has built up his land, his production, and his standard of living. He has built a new home with modern electrical conveniences, a new garage and smokehouse, a tool shed and workshop, a modern dairy barn, and other new buildings and improvements. Every year this farm is improving; it was better in 1949 than in 1948.

The work in forestry conservation is going forward. About 15,000,000 new trees were planted last year, reaching the two hundred millionth from TVA nurseries since the program began. Most of these were planted on private lands by the owners. Thousands more acres of timberlands were brought under adequate fire protection and more forestry demonstration tracts were added last year. Again we have an example of such progress here in McMinn County. Almost 100,000 new seedlings were put out on the lands in the county last year. The total that has been set out in the county since the beginning of the program is almost 5,000,000.

Malaria control has gone ahead rapidly. Fifteen years ago, when the program began, about 30 percent of the people in the malarial sections were infected. Now less than one-tenth of 1 percent are infected in the areas along the reservoirs. Preventive measures of all sorts have proceeded during the year.

Recreation developments, particularly along the shores of the lakes, have gone forward rapidly during the year. Investments along the shore line have increased about $3,000,000. Gross incomes from business enterprises on the lake fronts increased during the year something like $200,000. Incomes from commercial fishing jumped about $50,000 last year. It is estimated that the total tourist income for the Tennessee Valley area was about $175,000,000 in 1949.

Industrial development of the area stands high in the record of valley development. In addition to the Oak Ridge expansion and the Tullahoma project, supplies of natural gas are being provided; the research project at the Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala., is assured; the Reynolds Metals Co. at Sheffield is making a large expansion; an important paper industry by du Pont is being established at Pisgah, N. C.; two large, new companies have located plants at Elizabethton; a Quaker Oats plant is being located at Chattanooga; and other large industries are planning or investigating locations in the region. The Redstone Arsenal project is being moved from Fort Bliss, Tex., and will employ about 1,100 scientists. These are some of the larger industrial developments and projects. Many smaller private enterprises are similarly interested.

These are some of the reasons why we can call 1949 a banner year in the history of the Tennessee Valley development. And this is attracting the attention of people all over the world. The number of visitors to the TVA projects last year increased 1,100,000—from 5,000,000 to over 6,000,000. They came from almost every nation in the world, as well as all the States in this Union. Hundreds of them are distinguished visitors, ranging from technical men to the chiefs of states. Many of them report to us that they are planning similar developments in their own countries and in some of them such developments have already begun. Interest in the Tennessee Valley and its progress is world-wide.

A Frank Review of the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Frank Review of the Hoover Report," delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, before the New York Press Association at Syracuse, N. Y., on February 10, 1950. It is a timely discussion of the Hoover report. Coming from Mr. Farley, with his long experience in government, I think the address is well worth reading by every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This country is composed of two kinds of people. One group believes that the Government can support all the citizens. The other wonders whether all the citizens can support the Government. I feel certain that all of us here tonight belong to the second group.

In an address early in January, President Truman said that on the basis of the growth of this country over the past 50 years we would in another 50 years have a national income of a trillion dollars. I have no doubt about his figures nor his expectations, but we can reach some frightening conclusions when we take the past 50 years as a measure of the increase of the next 50 years.

One of those conclusions is that if we take the cost of Government for 1900 and compare it with the cost of Government for 1950 and then figure the same rate of increase for the next 50 years, our Government would cost $6,000,000,000,000, or six times as much as the whole national income. On that basis, we would also have working for the Federal Government alone 20,000,000 men and women. The lesson of these simple figures is that unless we find some way of reducing the cost of Government it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but everything that we have all saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us.

This is a very sobering situation. And I think it is to the interest of every citizen to impress upon those whom he has elected to office the necessity that this increase in the burden of Government be checked, or we shall find ourselves living under a form of Government which is utterly different from that in which we were born and under which our forefathers built a great country.

This problem is not a political issue. It is an American issue, and every true American, regardless of party, owes it to himself to study it, understand it, and do something about it. It comes down to two questions. First, has our Government the capacity to control its own growth? Second, are those who are elected to office or who are running for office going to be able to tell the people the truth about what Government can do for them and what it cannot do for them?

The first part of my remarks will be about what is called the administration of government as it is. The second part will concern the broader question of what we ought or ought not to expect government to do. The first part deals with what was generally covered in the studies and the report of the great Hoover Commission which completed its work almost exactly a year ago. The second goes beyond that to the broad American question of what a government should be expected to do in our American civilization.

The Hoover Commission was created by Congress and appointments were made by both the Congress and the Executive. Its title was "The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government." It was composed of distinguished Americans, headed by our only ex-President. Herbert Hoover deserves the respect and gratitude of all Americans for this great undertaking. While some of us may have disagreed with him when he was President, and while we may disagree with some of his views, none of us can question his sincerity, his patriotism, and his vast knowledge of Government and public policies. He undertook this job at an age when most of us will be thinking of quiet retirement and when a great many of us will be passed from this earth. The job entailed as arduous a task as has ever been laid upon an American.

In the first place, the field that the Commission had to cover involved a study of public expenditures amounting to $40,000,000,000 a year. It reached into every corner of our vast governmental establishment. Mr. Hoover's part in it, moreover, involved the reconciling of the views of the 11 men who shared with him membership in the Commission. It meant a minute examination of thousands of pages of task-force reports on dozens and dozens of technical aspects of government. It involved questions of finance, military affairs, engineering, medicine, banking, agriculture, business, labor, science, personnel, and administration generally. It involved road building, electric power, hospital care, and foreign trade. It involved the relations of our country to many foreign governments, each of which presented a special problem of need and responsibility. It involved the conduct of our foreign affairs, with all of the vast world-wide ramifications that are covered by that service. Never, I venture to say, has any commission been invested with responsibility of covering so many subjects in such detail within the limit of time that was imposed upon this task.

All of this Mr. Hoover and his patriotic associates in this Commission took as a serious responsibility. They have given us in this report the distilled wisdom not only of their own knowledge and experience, but of the hundreds of people who assisted them. It is the solemn duty of every American citizen to take this report with the utmost seriousness and to cooperate, as the years pass, in bringing about the adoption of its helpful and excellent recommendations.

This Commission started with the premise that in Government, as in business, the heart of administration is control. If Government is to control as much of our lives as it does, then there must be some means by which we can control Government. It is also essential that if Government is to control us then Government must have the means to control itself.

One of the most startling things in this report is the fact that it proves pretty conclusively, I believe, that Government as now constituted has grown so fast, so great, with such haphazard methods, that it is actually out of control of the very people who are conducting its affairs. That means that, with things as they are, Congress lacks the real means of controlling its own expenditures, and the President himself lacks the means of controlling the very departments over which he has the constitutional responsibility of direction.

In discussing this question I cannot within the time assigned to me do very much except to touch on some highlights. It is a very long report and it covers a vast multitude of subjects. But a few of the subjects selected with care will illustrate what I mean by the lack of administrative control. Let us first look at two departments of Government that were created as a means of direction and control of expenditures. First is the Bureau of the Budget, and second is the General Accounting Office. I take these two because one is responsible to the President and the other is, technically at least, responsible to the Congress.

The Budget of the United States, as you all know, is a very large and complex document. It is supposed to be a means by which the President, through his Bureau, reviews of the needs and requirements of every department of government, and, after careful counting and pruning, presents to the Congress the requirements of government for the next fiscal year. With this before the proper committees of the Congress, it should theoretically be possible for the legislative branch of the Government, which, after all, is the spending and taxing authority under our Constitution—to decide for itself whether it will grant or whether it will deny these Executive requests. However, the budget over the years has grown so large that it is almost impossible by an examination of this printed document to determine with any degree of accuracy the real necessities of government and to eliminate those which, in the wisdom of Congress, can be dispensed with.

With reference to this budget and to the Bureau of the Budget, which creates it, the Hoover Commission had some very critical things to say. These criticisms were seriously regarded by the President, and to his credit it must be said that the budget presented last month represents a great improvement over the budget presented a year ago. It shows for the first time the cost of the various projects, set up in such a way as to indicate their total cost. Previously, the costs of projects were scattered under so many classifications that it was impossible to view any one as a whole and to measure its cost against its probable benefits. This is a step in the right direction, and the Hoover Commission can be credited with at least the beginning of a reformed budget.

The other great agency of control is the General Accounting Office, at the head of which is the Comptroller General of the United States. The Hoover Commission had some rather critical things to say about this agency of government. It pointed out that in its efforts to scrutinize enormously detailed expenditures of government it had loaded upon itself such a burden that it was almost impossible to fulfill other responsibilities which had been placed upon it by law. To express it briefly, the Comptroller General, in checking over every voucher and expenditure and in determining whether those expenditures were within the law, had in substance taken away from the executive department a responsibility which in every business must rest with the executive of that business. In an American business like the one with which I am associated, the general policies are vested in a board of directors. That board of directors then employs a president and other officers. In turn, the board of directors is elected by and responsible to the stockholders.

Under the operation of such a business, the executives—the president and his associates—set up a system of accounting which at all times provides for them a picture of what is going on in the business. The board of directors, in order to have a completely unbiased and impartial picture of the business over which it presides, employs an auditor, who goes over the books of the business from time to time and reports back to the board of directors. Thus, there is in business a distinction between accounting and auditing.

In our national system, the Congress can roughly be called the board of directors of our national business. The President and the executive departments are the officers, and the stockholders are all of us. Unlike ordinary businesses, however, in Government the functions of auditing and accounting are confused. The Hoover Commission proposed that they be separated, with the Comptroller General conducting auditing business for Congress and an Accountant General in the Treasury Department conducting the accounting for the President. It will take a long time to accomplish this change, but it is one of those essential necessities of control that we shall need, if we are to bring Government clearly within the pattern set by our own modern business methods of administration.

Another thing that business does—and if it doesn't do it, it soon goes broke—is to require a real accounting of property that it

owns. Such an accounting of Government property is not present in our Government, which owns something like $27,000,000,000 worth of personal property.

I have always believed in the principle of civil service. The intent was good when it was created, some 67 years ago. As it has grown, however, it has become to some degree a hindrance, rather than a help to good and efficient administration. It is too difficult in Government now to enlist the best sort of personnel, and it is too difficult to get rid of incompetent employees. The Hoover Commission proposes that the responsibility of selecting employees be decentralized and that the Civil Service Commission limit its activities to determining the standards under which Government employment shall be carried on by the departments.

One of the reports of the Hoover Commission tells an amazing story about the records that the Government keeps. It points out that the actual paper records of the Government, if all brought together in one place, would fill six Pentagon buildings. Under a more efficient method of record-keeping, about a third of this paper stuff could be thrown away and a lot of the rest could be moved out of Washington into less expensive quarters.

As all of you know, the Government has become one of the biggest bankers in the history of the world. It has innumerable lending agencies—the best known of which, of course, is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Hoover Commission makes some very clear-cut recommendations concerning these agencies. Their operations should be concentrated, and in many instances should be eliminated. Many of these lending agencies could very well be put into deep freeze and kept ready in case another depression comes along for a resumption of their operations. There is altogether too great a temptation, when Government money is being lent so readily and so broadly, to lend more than is necessary and to take from the private banks and insurance companies their responsibilities in this matter.

The Hoover Commission goes on farther and recommends a unification of Government hospitals, public health and medical research. It points out as an indication of great waste that at the time of its investigation there were in our Federal hospitals beds for 225,000 patients and that only 155,000 were occupied. Despite this fact that there was a surplus of 70,000 beds, Congress proceeded to make additional appropriations for 50,000 additional beds, at a cost of $1,300,000,000. President Truman canceled out $300,000,000 of this program. That was some help.

The Hoover Commission made a very elaborate study of what we are doing in the way of conserving our water and our water power. It was found that there was a great deal of duplication there. A great rivalry exists between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Service, which has never been a particularly economical conflict. The Hoover Commission recommended the unifications of these services, which would involve a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars.

One of the most serious tendencies in our Federal system is the extent to which the Federal Government, through grants-in-aid, is absorbing the obligations and responsibilities of our State governments. Three years before I entered the Federal service—that is, in 1930—the total of Federal grants-in-aid to the States was about $100,000,000. When I left the Government service this had risen to almost $700,000,000. I do not want to suggest to you gentlemen or anyone else that I had anything to do with this great increase. I was kept pretty busy with the Post Office Department during that time.

These grants did not increase during the 5 years of war and preparation for war. But after the war and over the past 5 years they have begun to go up at a much more rapid rate. The figure has more than doubled and, according to some estimates, will reach something like $2,000,000,000. These grants, of course, are not made in accordance with the amount of money taken out of the States. The Federal Government takes five times as much out of the State of New York as it gives back. We are a great State, and we are proud of our productive wealth. But we can hardly afford a continuation of this trend over a period of years. Nor can, in fact, many of the other States.

It may be true that the Federal Government has a proper responsibility to see that States that are unable to offer the essential services to their people should be helped by Federal grants. I am not sure, however, that these grants are disbursed on any such principle. The trouble under this system is that some States are getting more than they should and other States are giving more than they should.

The most vital part of this Federal-State relationship is that, if this thing goes on, the States will gradually give up all of their responsibilities and the Federal Government will absorb them. The result will be, not a Federal system such as was set up under our Constitution, but a centralized unitary government which can never fit the 48 individual requirements and special conditions of a country as broad as this one. The way to stop this trend is to restore to the States some of the sources of taxation that the Federal Government has taken over. Here again the Hoover Commission has some very constructive and important recommendations.

The danger in the extension of the personal income-tax system is that it becomes so easy to raise money through the Federal income tax that many other proper sources of revenue are overlooked and neglected. We must establish in this country equality of taxation. And that taxation ought to be distributed so that individual initiative and wholesome business growth will not be stifled by unwise methods of taxation.

I have been talking, so far, about the essential recommendations of the Hoover report, with a few examples. Now, as we all know, it is one thing to believe in good things and to recommend them, and another to get the recommendations accepted. Congress is under so many demands for the expenditure of funds that it finds it almost impossible to resist them. What is needed is that Americans be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend. A start toward this has been taken since the Hoover report was issued. There has been established a national citizen's committee, the purpose of which is to support the recommendations of the Hoover report and to get them enacted by Congress and by the administration. State and local subcommittees have been created to assist in this in the various States of the Union. The efforts of this great national committee and of its subcommittees should be supported by all of us.

Up to this time I have been talking about administration, with particular reference to the recommendations of the Hoover report. I wish to make it clear that this was a nonpartisan, nonpolitical report and that its function was not to suggest the wisdom or the unwisdom of any of the activities carried on by the Federal Government. The determination of such questions becomes a matter of national policy over which Congress has final control. In short, the Hoover Commission takes things as they are and suggests, through methods of reorganization, the more efficient disbursing of existing services and a consequent lower cost. If all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were adopted the saving would be considerable—perhaps more than $3,000,000,000. If some of the long-term recommendations were adopted, this sum might be increased over the years because of greater efficiency. All this, of course, would lighten our tax burden and help us to reduce the cost of Government and the danger of too much government.

I wish to note, however, that even if all these recommendations were adopted in the present year, we would still be running a deficit of $2,000,000,000 or more. This is not the way that a wise and thrifty country ought to be running its affairs. In time of prosperity we should be balancing the budget. A few dollars saved here and there are not going to do it, and we are not going to do it even if we adopted the most efficient principles of administration.

What we must do is to make a decision as to what should come first in the way of Government expenditures and then stop the increase.

I realize that, as President Truman pointed out, a vast amount of the present budget of more than $40,000,000,000 is required to pay the cost of past wars and the expenses of the present cold war. But, nevertheless, there can be savings in what is expended over and above military and foreign aid. I am not at all sure, moreover, that we cannot save on our military expenses and at the same time have adequate defense. I am not at all certain, moreover, that we cannot reduce our foreign aid to more reasonable proportions.

Beyond that, we are ignoring expenditures in the civil side of Government that should be carefully scrutinized by Congress. We must find some means of keeping our agriculture prosperous without involving a constantly increasing Government expenditure to pay for crops that should not be raised. I realize that such supports cannot immediately be taken away, but I think we all ought to find a means by which over a few years we can reduce the present staggering sum that we are giving for the support of one segment of our economy at the expense of other segments.

Before we undertake new and vast experiments in social services of various sorts, we ought to consider putting first things first.

These are matters that are not partisan. I have had enough experience in the National Government to know that in the scramble for congressional appropriations we cannot distinguish the energy of a Republican from that of a Democrat. The National Congress is a great body and I can count in its membership scores of warm, personal friends and fine patriots, but I sincerely feel that there ought to be much more of a spirit of national security, rather than of local urgency, in its activities. We have got to have men in Congress who look to the need for a sound national economy with a balanced budget, and a little less concern for what certain communities and particular departments are demanding. This is a national cause and it requires a national point of view.

For, as I said a moment ago, we cannot, if we expect to remain a great and growing Nation, indulge in an extension of the practice of deficit spending in times of great prosperity such as these. Our tax burden now is about all that we can support. An increase in our income taxes would probably yield less, rather than more, revenue. We must reduce our cost of Government, and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process.

It will not profit any of us to be members of a Nation which is pursuing unattainable objectives and is employing unsound methods. The public welfare is the welfare of all of us, not necessarily each one of us. The public welfare is the welfare of our Nation. And in the face of that, our individual concerns should be subordinate. It is my hope that this principle may more and more occupy the serious attention of everyone faced with the responsibility of public office.

Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune discussing the attack made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE DUCHESS SAID—

The Tribune must confess that it is more flabbergasted than convinced by Senator HUMPHREY'S sudden entrance into the arena of Government economy. It is hard to believe that HUMPHREY really wants to slay the brute of Federal extravagance. One wonders, as he advances menacingly toward Ferdinand, if he will not ultimately sit down and sniff the pretty spending flowers with him.

The Senator wants to abolish the joint congressional committee on reduction of nonessential expenditures in the name of economy. He thinks the committee has been spending too much money, and that it serves no useful purpose. It occurs to HUMPHREY that the interests of Federal economy could be excellently served by liquidating an agency which has been vigorous and constant in promoting the interests of Federal economy. To us this is a good deal like recalling the fire department because it has been using too much water putting out the fire.

The joint committee which HUMPHREY wants to scuttle is headed by Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia. BYRD is the foremost spokesman for economy in the upper House. Year in and year out, he has kept up a steady assault on Federal waste and extravagance. Far from being an irresponsible and superficial spokesman, he is always careful to buttress his case with facts and figures. Thus we recall one report of BYRD'S joint committee which cited more than 900 cases of overlapping and duplication in the Federal Government.

This committee preceded the Hoover commission on reorganization, and its efforts have been devoted to much the same good end. Considering its cost (HUMPHREY indicates total expenditures of around $350,000 to date) it is about as cheap a fiscal watchdog as can be imagined. If the Byrd group were to be dissolved tomorrow, the whole cause of Government economy would suffer. It would be about as dreary a piece of penny-wisdom and pound-foolishness as Congress could devise.

When HUMPHREY attacks the Byrd committee for extravagance, we think that Minnesotans are entitled to a few polite snickers. A comparable absurdity would be Senator BYRD rapping HUMPHREY for being too niggardly with Federal funds, or Mr. Truman demanding the abolition of the Democratic National Committee because it was pro-Truman. The logic is awry; the pieces do not fit together; the part that HUMPHREY plays is strangely out of keeping with many of the scenes that went before.

If Minnesota's junior Senator wanted to end the life of the Byrd committee—period—we could understand it. There would be no mystery at all in that, for HUMPHREY would then be reaffirming a familiar theme, to wit, that Government spending is the lifeblood of the Nation, and that economy is a sort of measle-like rash upon the body politic.

But when HUMPHREY wants to scuttle the Byrd committee on nonessential expenditures for the sake of economy, we are completely bewildered. The mystery, though, may be dissolved in time. As the Duchess sagely remarked in Alice in Wonderland, "Tut, tut, child, everything's got a moral if only you can find it."

Communists in Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix a portion of a radio broadcast made over the American Broadcasting Co. network last evening, March 2, by the radio commentator, Mr. Jack Beall.

This distinguished veteran newspaper writer and radio commentator, substituting for Mr. Elmer Davis on this program, is known as a fact-getting reporter and news analyst. His observations in this excellent analysis of one of the most controversial subjects of the day should be of interest to every citizen of this country. I respectfully commend it to the attention of every Member of the Senate and the House.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Truman's conference yielded more news today. He came out with a statement which backs down a bit from his previous declarations about the McCarthy probe of the State Department Communist situation. Previously Mr. Truman indicated he would resist the effort of the Senate subcommittee in seeing the files. Today he said he is perfectly willing to cooperate with the subcommittee in furnishing information. Mr. Truman patted himself on the back for being the only one in the Government who has taken any concrete action against the Communists—a thing which would seem astonishing to anyone who remembers his repeated statements of "red herring" when congressional committees, and even the Department of Justice, were conducting hearings and trials of Communists or their sympathizers. But the swing-about today, in attitude, would indicate that the President had taken sage counsel from his supporters in Congress, who do not wish to have any clear-cut political issue develop on the subject of administration softness toward the Communists, who may still be in the Government.

It was extremely interesting to learn today that the State Department has acknowledged to Senator KNOWLAND, of California, that 257 loyalty review cases had been pending in the Department for more than a year. It was explained that one of the reasons for the delay was that the FBI had asked for more information and clearer fingerprints on some, and that many of these cases were overseas.

In these days of State Department pouches going by plane and when no spot on the earth is supposed to be more than 72 hours away by air, the delay of a year on loyalty cases concerning people abroad representing our Government would appear to be very dilatory. With those still in this country the excuse is less, both from the standpoint of the individual and of the Government, in keeping them for more than a year on the suspect list. It would tend to bear out Senator MCCARTHY'S claim that not too good a job has been done of cleaning out the State Department.

If there is one thing that should be settled doctrine by now, it is that no Communists or Communist sympathizers have any right to employment by the very Government they are striving to overthrow and defeat. They may have a right to other jobs, but not to Government jobs, and particularly not to Government jobs in a sensitive agency like the State Department.

Federal Union for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Time Has Come," published in a recent issue of the Nashville Tennessean. The editorial relates to the proposed Atlantic union. Editorials such as this one will do much to convince the public that, truly, the time has come.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME HAS COME

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will open hearings next week on Senator KEFAUVER'S bold proposal of last year that the signatories of the Atlantic Pact, along with other acceptable democratic nations, seek to form a federal union for world peace along the pattern set by the union of the Thirteen Colonies into the United States of America.

This idea has lost nothing of its force since the Senator placed it before Congress. It has, in fact, gained significant support. Nearly 30 Senators and Representatives have signed the bill.

The objective is world peace, a peace by law rather than precariously balanced power and variable sentiment.

Since Russia's conduct has blocked the realization of the one-world vision inspired by World War II, Senator KEFAUVER wants to work at least for one free world, for federation of democratic and like-thinking nations.

The Senator's bill does not call for such a union. It merely authorizes the President to name delegates and call an exploratory conference with delegates of other nations to see how close they can come to agreement on the legal and governmental machinery of permanent peace.

Just as Bretton Woods explored the economic phases of international agreement as a necessary prelude to San Francisco, so would the Senator's conference explore all possibilities of this new and closer concept of federal union.

The Senator's proposal will not commit the country. It will cost us nothing but the trouble of learning where we stand and what our chances are of achieving the nucleus of peace.

Without ignoring the difficulties or advocating the creation of such an international union, the Nashville Tennessean thinks the trend of world events has made Senator KEFAUVER's concept sufficiently important to warrant prompt authorization of the exploratory conference by Congress.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most active and well-informed groups of air-minded individuals in the Midwest area is the organization known as the Flying Farmers of Prairie Farmer Land. It has been my pleasure to be identified with the Illinois wing of this organization, and I have found the members not only interested in aviation personally but gravely concerned over matters of national defense as well. At their State meeting, held on February 9 and 10, 1950, at the University of Illinois, in Champaign-Urbana, they endorsed unanimously a statement of policy on national defense worthy of consideration. For that reason I take the opportunity granted by the House to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include the text of their resolution, which is as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas we are now living in one of two diametrically opposed worlds, and

Whereas ours could be the weaker of the two if a serious mistake is made in our defense planning, and

Whereas such a mistake might bring national disaster, even to the point of subjugation by a Communist power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Flying Farmers of Illinois, do in regular convention assembled urge the Congress of the United States to take the following steps:

I

Amend the Armed Services Unification Act by adding a fourth member to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with said member representing the United States Marine Corps.

II

Empower the Navy to proceed immediately with the construction of a prototype aircraft carrier commonly known as a flush-deck carrier.

III

Establish once and for all the right of Congress to question either in closed or open hearing members of the armed services, and to guarantee to those questioned freedom from reprisals or punitive measures.

IV

Amend the National Defense Act so that it will clearly establish the right of each of the armed services to develop its own prototype weapon without fear of veto by the heads of the other two services.

V

Be it further resolved, That the United States Navy be urged to decommission the battleship *U. S. S. Missouri* and to use the funds thus saved to bring out of moth balls and recommission *Essex*-type aircraft carriers so badly needed in our defense setup.

Whereas it is important that Members of Congress be apprised of the thinking of their constituents: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That our executive secretary be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to each and every Illinois Congressman and our two United States Senators, and to such others as may be necessary to the end that the Congress, the military, and the executive branch of our Government may be fully apprised of our wishes.

BILL RENSHAW,
Executive Secretary, Indianapolis, Ind.
HARLAN WALKER,
De Kalb, Ill., Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

Specifications for a Republican Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly magazine an article entitled "Modernize the GOP—Specifications for a Republican Program," written by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It has occurred to me that this article, being both interesting and thought provoking, might well be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am sure all Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, will be interested in reading the article if they have not done so already.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERNIZE THE GOP—SPECIFICATIONS FOR A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

(By HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.)

(A Yankee born at Nahant on July 5, 1902, HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., was educated at Middlesex School and at Harvard. He began as a journalist in the Washington bureau and then on the editorial staff of the New York Herald Tribune. After two terms in the General Court of Massachusetts, he was the only Republican to replace a Democrat in the U. S. Senate in 1936, defeating ex-Mayor Curley by a plurality of 142,000. He was reelected in 1942; went to Africa in the first detachment of American tanks with the British Eighth Army; then resigned his Senate seat to serve in Italy, southern France, and Germany. He was elected to the Senate for the third time in 1946, where his record stamps him as one of the strongest younger men in the party.)

The American political party, whether it be Republican or Democratic, is not an end in itself; it is significant only as a part of our two-party system. I believe the continuance of this system is absolutely essential to the United States, and that the system is in danger only when one party appears to be losing its hold. There is talk today of the realinement of the American parties, and in this talk the Republicans are too often labeled as conservatives and reactionaries. Some of them want to be, as is evidenced by the following letter published in the Wall Street Journal after the 1948 election:

"We have in this country two major political parties whose philosophies of government are becoming more and more identical with each succeeding campaign. * * * If the two-party system is to remain virile and effective, the Republican Party must * * * return to a position of unmistakable conservatism, dedicating itself to a determination not to compromise with New Dealism."

This opinion, in my view, is anchored to a dead past. It expresses a philosophy with which the overwhelming mass of Republicans disagree. It denies the spirit which gave birth to the Republican Party, and if this opinion prevails it will condemn the party to certain defeat.

We must have a program which is obviously good for the country, a program which can be stated in specific terms and which will put us back on a competitive basis with the Democrats. Such a program does not mean "me-too"; neither does it mean mere negation. Instead of scolding the darkness, let us light a lamp.

I propose to confine this article to a domestic program and shall begin with taxes—always a sensitive subject in March.

TAXES

We should inaugurate a form of tax reduction which will encourage the growth of new economic activity and will therefore, in the larger sense, be most advantageous to the Government finances.

SPECIFICATIONS

1. Republicans should support a change in the law relative to the taxation of corporations doing a business of less than $1,000,000 so that they could file their returns as a partnership. Practically all the activities of venture capital start as small businesses. This would provide a powerful lift to the little man with a bright idea who is fundamentally the source of new jobs and new wealth.

2. Penetrating analysis—on a more purposeful and optimistic basis than has ever been undertaken before—should be given to the revision of our tax laws so as to reward those businesses which lower prices, increase production, stabilize employment, and keep their people at work even though they are old. A method should be worked out to ease the taxes on young people who are starting new business ventures. There has been a defeatist attitude about this type of incentive taxation—as distinguished from punitive taxation—which should cease.

CIVIL RIGHTS

To be true to our traditions we should embark on a realistic civil-rights program. This is a field in which the Democrats will always be weak, faltering, apologetic, and divided. It is a field in which we can be vigorous, effective, and bold. We can no longer tolerate the idea of having second-class citizens in this country, and the Republican Party must be the party to bring this truth home. To do so would be in the clearest possible Republican tradition. We were born as the antislavery party and the party of civil rights at the time of the Civil War, and it would be foolish and grossly negligent for us not to seize this issue again.

SPECIFICATIONS

In our legislation for civil rights we Republicans work to:

1. Eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting for Federal officials.

2. Make lynching a Federal offense.

3. Extend the right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life to all citizens, irrespective of race, religion, color, or country of origin.

4. Insist on administrative action which would end racial segregation in the armed services as rapidly as possible.

5. Eliminate segregation in housing projects or in educational aid projects which are financed by the Federal Government. In both these fields the present administration opposed legislation which would have effectively blocked such discrimination.

These are moderate demands which are essentially public and civic. They do not impinge on private life. They are the minimum to keep modern government in harmony with the statement in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal," and with the mandate of the Constitution "to establish justice."

SOCIAL LEGISLATION

In the field of social legislation we must not try to outbid the Democrats, who, let it be noted, have not achieved satisfactory results despite all their talk and 18 years in office. There are unquestionably problems in housing, health, agriculture, and social security. We must accept the challenge of producing the best solution.

The men who fought in World War II have been impressed by the fact that, when war broke out, the Government took off its coat, rolled up its sleeves, and proceeded to do whatever needed to be done regardless of the conventional theories about too much government. Many of the veterans reason today, therefore, that if Government was such a useful servant in time of war, it had better be equally useful in time of peace.

This statement is all right as far as it goes. But it is not complete wthout stating that the reason for our great performance in World War II was the competitive system, which in peace had developed incomparable efficiency enabling it to produce wartime munitions at an accelerated pace. Even if we admit the premise that we must use the power of Government whenever it can be used efficiently, we must never carry it to the point where we destroy the free system which is the source of peacetime prosperity, the trump card of our national defense, and the foundation of political liberty.

We need to draw a line between what is good and bad in the field of social legislation.

Republicans should approach such legislation believing that the American competitive economic system is the greatest possible producer of material welfare but that, excellent though it be, it is not perfect. There are some chinks which it does not fill. If nothing is done about filling those chinks, discontent will grow until it endangers the whole system. I, therefore, favor social legislation to fill in the chinks, both as a matter of decency and humanity and in order to maintain enthusiasm for the competitive system.

This is a very different type of social welfare program from that which the Democrat Party has undertaken. The difference between the two parties would be as broad as the difference between what is wasteful and what is well managed, between what is controlled locally by public-spirited citizens or controlled centrally by political bureaucrats, between something which really serves the people and something which appears to serve the people but in effect aggrandizes the State. There are two aspects of social legislation which come close to the heart of every family: health and security for old age.

HEALTH

Here is an issue which the Republicans must meet in such a way that the sick will receive good medical care without lowering the standards of the medical profession, without depriving the patient of the choice of his doctor, and without creating a system which is so overwhelmed by goldbrickers and malingerers that the really sick cannot get proper attention. The specific problem, of course, is to ease the financial burden of medical care for the individual citizen who is neither a millionaire nor a charity case.

The administration would approach this problem by putting the doctor into a compulsory system and so forcing the community to run the risk of socializing the medical profession. This is dangerous. We can obtain the desired results if in our program we aim for these objectives:

SPECIFICATIONS

1. Take action which will increase the number of high-quality young doctors; with inducements so that they will practice in places where they are most needed.

2. Lower the cost of the hospital bill—such an important item in medical expenditures—by using public funds for hospital construction and for the maintenance of such hospital services as the care of the indigent on welfare rolls; the education of residents, interns, and nurses; accident rooms; ambulances—services which are now often rendered at much less than cost.

3. Provide free diagnostic clinics, including X-ray service, so as to catch the disease before it gets established.

4. Furnish periodic health examinations for all school children.

5. Provide expensive medicines and appliances free of charge.

6. Provide funds for research and experimentation in the field of voluntary health insurance. We need to determine the utmost possibilities of such private insurance schemes as Blue Cross and Blue Shield. Extensive study should particularly be given to schemes such as that suggested in the Ives-Javits bill, which is a clearly superior approach to that of the administration. Sixty-one million people are already covered by voluntary insurance and the number is growing. Private schemes have a much lower overhead than that which would exist if the Government were to operate them; in them the individual would receive more for his money. People who have chronic heart disease or other ills which are not insurable by orthodox insurance methods would be cared for by issuing to them Blue Cross or Blue Shield cards, entitling them to exactly the same benefits as regular subscribers to Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

These proposals are not only radically different from that which the administration is sponsoring; they are more sound and truly generous. We should work out procedures along these lines and then the amount of dollars to be appropriated for these purposes would be separately decided in the light of the need and of the state of the budget.

OLD AGE

Never before have we had so many vigorous old people in this country. Many of them are well and could be productive; none of them want to be a burden on their children. The fact that people live longer than they used to has resulted in a large group tragically described in the phrase "too old to work and too young to die." To react to this fact by saying that men over 45 are too old for industry—as some have done—is clearly inhuman and absurd. The majority party, judged by actual legislation, does not meet the issue broadly.

SPECIFICATIONS

1. The Republican Party should insist that the Government increase the coverage and amount of old-age and survivors' insurance. The bill which passed the House at the first session of the Eighty-first Congress does not go far enough. We have the word of the Secretary of Labor that today "social security gives an old couple only $41." This is obviously far too low to support even a frugal living standard in our cities where the cost of living for a couple is estimated at from $120 to $150 per month. It actually compels about one-tenth of all persons receiving old-age insurance benefits to get public assistance as well—to which, of course, they have never contributed. It constrains many persons to stay at work when they are not really fit to do so, thus defeating a prime purpose of old-age security. I propose an increase to be financed if necessary by raising the pay-roll tax by not more than 1 percent, so that an old couple would receive an average benefit of between $90 and $100 instead of the average of $40 in the present law and of $80 in the House bill. This change could give a couple who were credited with an average monthly wage of $300 a benefit of about $150.

2. We should also insist on making the coverage as broad as possible, particularly so as to cover the more than 6,000,000 farmers and farm workers who today are ineligible for social-security benefits. This should result in a more intelligent and truly constructive type of farm legislation and should ease public-assistance costs in rural areas where they are highest. I contend that the wider the coverage the better for the country.

3. Every individual should be entitled to tax exemptions up to a stated portion of his income for the purpose of investing in a bona fide annuity plan. This would encourage both individuals and employers to provide for supplementary pensions or annuities, chiefly through tax concessions. This is a point which is not covered by the House bill. Our tax system should be revamped so as to give corporations a wider latitude in the framing of pension plans to suit their particular needs.

4. The House bill does not sufficiently liberalize the eligibility requirements for the aged. If relief costs are to go down in the future, the eligibility requirements for old-age insurance should be reduced along the lines suggested by the advisory council of the Senate Finance Committee to the Eightieth Congress. Under the House bill, a man 65 years of age would have to work a minimum of 5 years before he could retire. Only workers aged 69 or over could retire in less than 5 years. Yet these are the very people who will keep relief costs up because their earning power is so low. The advisory council suggested that persons aged 62 or over be qualified for benefits after 1½ years of coverage and contributions, thus shortening the time they are on relief. Such a provision would be a vast improvement over the administration bill and would really—and not merely hopefully—help to decrease relief costs in the near future.

These changes are defensible on humanitarian grounds; they would also promote economy in Government—Federal, State, and local.

PRIVATE RESPONSIBILITY

The arrangements regarding old-age pensions which were agreed to last November by Steel are all but one on a noncontributory basis, which means that the worker has no personal rights in his pension.

The worker loses his pension if he moves away from his job. This is obviously bad for the worker, bad for business, unsatisfactory for the community, and a potential danger in case of war, when workers would be wanted for transfer to defense industries. Moreover, the agreement by the large industries to pay direct pensions outside of the Social Security System naturally creates a demand to have small businesses do the same thing, and many small businesses simply cannot afford to do so. Clearly, the progress of the pension movement should not become one more discouragement and one more obstacle to the prosperity of small business. On the other hand, pension benefits received from the Government-operated social security fund are on a contributory basis.

Worker contributions along with the contributions of industry have built up this fund on a share-and-share-alike basis. The recipient has a vested right in his pension and carries that right with him even when he changes his job.

The agreements that were reached with the big steel companies provided that industry should underwrite a guaranteed pension payment of $100 per month on the understanding that whatever amount the Government provided out of social-security payments would be deducted from the amount which industry has to pay. To the extent, therefore, that Government social-security payments are increased, the burden of industry is reduced.

This is not in conflict with the idea that the more that industry, working through labor and management, assists in developing the security of the citizen, the better. Industries which, for example, can progress toward an annual wage to their employees, or industries which will agree to keep their older employees on the job, are perhaps the most powerful forces working toward the enhancement of our private competitive economy. The more our private enterprise carries the load, the less the demand on the State and the more we enhance the private enterprise system. Wider coverage and larger amounts under social security make the citizen more mobile; his potential for production is increased. Under a system based on a contribution by the worker, taken out of his own production, the result actually is that private enterprise bears a larger share of the cost even though the payments are made in the name of the Government. The worker, too, is, in the most literal and truthful sense of the word, private enterprise.

SPECIFICATION

Republicans should start legislation which would, all other things being equal, give preference, so far as Government contracts are concerned, to industries which guarantee an annual wage to their employees. This will be an effective denial to the rather helpless reaction of the majority party that the only solution to all problems is the indefinite extension of government.

These recommendations taken together would mean a much reduced burden of old-age assistance (or relief) locally, which cost $250,000,000 more in 1949 than in 1948. There would be a consequent reduction in local and State taxation, since social security would be financed out of earnings. Instead of throwing people on charity, either private or public, when they were old, we would now insure that they would have a modicum of existence as a matter of right.

Writing in the New York Times for December 26, 1949, A. H. Raskin said that one out of every four Americans past the age of 65 is currently on relief and the cost of assistance is running nearly nine times as high as it did in 1936. This is clearly not the best way to handle this problem.

We Republicans should say to the voter: We offer you social legislation without socialism, a welfare society without a welfare state; we offer you a self-executing, self-liquidating plan. We think the desire for security is normal and human and good, in war and in peace, and that we can have it without red tape, without bureaucracy, without governmental stupidity, without sacrifice of opportunity, and without loss of personal liberty. We Americans have done harder things than that in our history.

THE FARMER

Problems of the farm involve another type of social legislation, and, to be fair, the majority party must be judged by its latest agricultural bill, which became law on October 31, 1949. This bill will not promote the best long-range interests of either the producer or the consumer because it is not soundly based on the premise that the farm must be related to human food, which is produced either directly for human consumption or indirectly as feed for animals. Without such a relationship the consumer is taxed twice—once when he pays his Federal tax, and again when he buys his food. This current agricultural act is also bad for the producer because obviously he cannot have the prosperity to which he is entitled without the existence of a prosperous market. It appears all too likely that this farm law, with its rigid price-support provisions, will have the end result of increasing agricultural surpluses which may rot before they can be eaten. It will add more speculative elements to the whole structure of agricultural economics and, by inflating the price of animal feed, will increase the cost of raising cattle so much that the average consumer will be even less able to buy meat, dairy products, and eggs than he is now. As this is written, complaints are arriving in Washington from farmers confirming the worst fears of those who opposed the administration's farm law. They charge that the so-called big-factory farms, raising speculative crops, are subsidized by Washington but that the small family farm, raising food for people to eat, is out in the cold.

Surely, this is not the only approach to the farm problem. The Republicans should, here too, offer a program which is radically different, sounder, and in the end more generous. We should say that the farm must be related to food; that we think of agriculture not in terms of Henry Wallace's "ever-normal granary," but in terms of the "ever-normal refrigerator;" that we think of the farm as a place which grows the things that people put in their refrigerators because they are the things which are good to eat—milk, cream, butter, cheese, eggs, lamb, pork, and steak. No bill has passed Congress in the lifetime of anyone reading this article which has done anything to make steak more plentiful or cheaper for the consumer, or to make the production of steak more attractive to the farmer.

SPECIFICATIONS

1. A first step would be legislation ending the discrimination against the family-type farmer who raises hogs, poultry, and cattle—human food; discrimination which is in the present law. We cannot end the system abruptly, but we can and should eliminate its flagrant defects and move gradually toward the new objective of farm for food.

2. Legislation giving automatic protection against the kind of market collapses which ruin food producers could inaugurate this farm-food relationship and be of immense benefit to producers and consumers alike. But Congress must not only start thinking of the farm in terms of food; the parliamentary alliances between food and fiber growers must also cease. Were such an approach made, the voter would be given the choice between a system which piles up unwieldy surpluses, wastes the consumer's substance, and defrauds the farmer; and one which, on the other hand, being soundly based on the mutuality of interest of the farmer and the consumer, produces a better diet for the American people and a richer market for the farmer. There must indeed be no pitchfork stuck in the back of the farmer—or the consumer. The solution I propose sticks no pitchfork in anybody's back.

3. Congress, as I have argued, should extend social security to cover farmers.

4. Help should be extended to the farmer to assist him in the procurement of capital equipment, and it would be sound policy to extend direct aid for maintenance and improvement of the quality of the soil.

5. Republicans should subscribe to the idea that a good agricultural program must be designed primarily to protect those who need protection when they need it; not those who do not need it. Above all, it must protect the national economy. If anyone is going to be favored by this type of social legislation, it is the small farmer—not only for his benefit but for the good of the whole.

6. Out of our surpluses we must see that food will get to those consumers who particularly need it, through school lunches and food-stamp programs.

7. New uses for farm products such as those being developed through chemurgy should be encouraged.

All these procedures and objectives would in time put farm legislation on a new, sounder, and eventually more economical basis than exists today. The size of appropriations would have to be determined in the light of the need and the state of the budget each year.

LABOR

Here Republicans should favor specific and prompt corrections of those clearly proven defects of the Taft-Hartley law which are causing immediate hardships and inequities. For example, a labor leader came to me the other day and said that in certain parts of the watch industry new assembly-line procedures are currently eliminating the jobs of certain craftsmen. But because of a quirk in the law the union cannot use strike action for the retention of these men on one of the new assembly-line jobs, should such action be deemed necessary by the union. Correction of such manifest imperfections may perhaps incur the displeasure both of those who wish to retain Taft-Hartley without change and of those who are satisfied with nothing short of total repeal.

In fact, the watch worker's problem may seem to be a minor matter, of consequence only to the watch worker. But the solution of his problem by specific legislation opens a way for intelligent legislative treatment of the whole labor problem.

Up to now this has been dealt with by the "omnibus" approach, which forces a vote on a single legislative package, containing many and divergent legislative proposals, some good, some bad, and labeled "all or nothing." This has resulted in the rank and file of labor and the public becoming the unhappy victims of extremists in the Democratic Party, in the Republican Party, in management, and in the labor movement. The watch worker's problem is also important because it illustrates how a group of workingmen can be compelled to wait unnecessarily, perhaps for a whole year, before "omnibus" legislation can be finally agreed to, pending which their particular and essentially simple problem cannot be solved. They, therefore, symbolize the many other groups who for no good reason are suffering from an "all or nothing" political approach to labor legislation. (Let it also be emphasized that the vital interests of the rank and file of labor are not nowadays exclusively centered in laws affecting unions, but are strongly affected by all things which pertain to economic security.)

SPECIFICATIONS

1. Republicans, accordingly, should favor a bill removing the present legal prohibition against negotiations on matters in which technological changes are involved so that the situation in the watch industry described above will be subject to the same type of labor action as applies in industry as a whole.

2. To the best of my judgment there are at least two dozen other specific defects, many of which would be corrected by Congress if they could be brought up in individual—not "omnibus"—bills. These should be acted on quickly and new defects should be corrected as fast as they come to light.

3. The rank and file of labor would also be directly benefited by specifications previously described in this article which aim to improve the worker's diet, foster his health, make secure his old age, and which, by stimulating progress toward guaranteed annual wages, would stabilize his employment.

These then are a few specifications for a modern republicanism. There are necessarily omissions, such as conservation, military affairs, and foreign policy, all of which may become issues between the parties, but have not yet done so. The specifications proposed in this paper are neither negative nor imitative and I believe that, regardless of party fortunes, they are good for the United States. With them, of course, goes the vital duty of the minority to act as a check on the majority by constant scrutiny and investigation.

Underlying the entire program is the urgent need for a balanced budget and its corollary, a stable currency. A dollar of constant value has always been necessary to the successful transaction of business; to the millions receiving checks from the Government the constancy of the dollar is a matter of economic life and death. Republicans should work faithfully and enthusiastically toward making possible a balanced budget by a definite date, following a dependable timetable. This would be based in part on putting into effect measures of the type recommended by the Hoover Commission for the elimination of overlapping and duplication in the Government—a job which we should be able to do better than the Democrats because we have no political machine to protect. It would be achieved in part by the tapering off of Marshall plan and similar expenses which has already been announced and virtually accepted by both parties.

No man can say that this program alone will elect a Republican administration. Such an achievement may well be beyond the power of any program. Also, the full Presidential program comes with the national convention in June of 1952. Success at that time will depend on the candidate and his traits as much as it will on a program. Success also depends on the extent of the desire to throw out those in power. Luck and the irresistible forces of circumstances also play a part.

When we consider the Democratic reaction to this program, we come up against the predictions of many seasoned Washington journalists that there will be no legislation of consequence at this session of Congress and that it is part of the smart politics strategy which is currently dominating national affairs not to legislate, but to keep all the glittering legislative goals intact so that the party in power will reap a harvest of votes at the 1950 election in anticipation of favors to come. Those who remember the vigorous efforts of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt to get Congress to act will note this difference and, perhaps, wonder at it. Clearly, the lack of constructive achievement in 1949 in such fields as civil rights, agriculture, and public health lends color to this journalistic opinion, however much we may deplore it.

If these observers are right, an issue arises between the parties which is in addition to the challenge which these clear and constructive specifications propose. The strategy of smart politics paints a picture of an administration making a cynical offer of political bait and thus raises the naked issue of sincerity, of responsibility, of achievement. This is an issue on which many a political campaign has been won in the past. But Republicans should not depend on administration shortcomings for success. We must press our own program—bold, different, practical, and constructive. Inspired by the beginnings of the Republican Party in the fight for human rights, we should press this program. We should do so because we believe that it will create a political climate in which the strength and self-reliance of the individual human being will grow and flourish. On this ground we will gain the victory because we deserve to win.

Hot and Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, an old-time Hit Parade tune contains this refrain, "The song is ended but the melody lingers on." Now that the coal strike has been settled, President Truman, when he improvises at the piano, might well play that tune but change the refrain to "The coal strike is ended but my malodorous action lingers on."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorial from the Washington Times-Herald which sets forth why President Truman might well paraphrase this refrain as suggested:

HOT AND COAL

Announcement that John L. Lewis and the northern coal operators have reached a virtual agreement is the big news today.

However, the failure to convict the United Mine Workers of contempt is one of the worst miscarriages of justice that has ever occurred in our courts.

KEECH IS BLAMELESS

And the blame for it rests completely on President Truman and his Department of Justice. The not guilty verdict returned by Justice Richmond Keech was the only one he could have found on the basis of the evidence presented to him by the Government lawyers.

But there was plenty of other evidence that could have been produced by the Government which would undoubtedly have given the judge something on which to make an effective decision.

Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, coauthor of the law under which Truman belatedly and lamely has attempted to halt the coal strike, too late, has pointed out that the Government did not show the judge the 60 affidavits furnished it supporting the contention that the back-to-work order of John L. Lewis didn't mean what it said.

These affidavits state that presidents of various locals told the men the orders didn't mean what they said; that it was decided at local meetings that the members would not go back, disproving the claim that the strike is the result of individual action.

Anyhow, common sense tells anybody the violence and threats used to keep a number of miners from working were evidence that some central authority was directing the whole thing.

TRUMAN IS AT FAULT

Why weren't those affidavits used? Why didn't the Government attorneys carry on a more vigorous prosecution? There's only one answer that fits the pattern drawn by Truman.

Truman hates the Taft-Hartley law. He's tried to get it repealed and failed. So he's going to do everything he can to smear it. By failing to ask for an injunction months ago, he attempted to rig a claim that Taft-Hartley is ineffective. The mock prosecution was clearly part of the same plan.

After he had his not-guilty verdict he asked Congress to give him power to throw Taft-Hartley aside and seize the mines. And right on the heels of that request came the announcement last night that an agreement on basic principles had been reached.

Why didn't Truman direct his Justice Department attorneys to file a new charge of contempt against Lewis and his union and prove their guilt with the evidence at hand? Is he so mulish or timid that he cannot admit he was wrong?

It would do no good for the Justice Department to appeal the case they have made before Keech. They made no case on which an appeal could be based.

Industry has been closing down all over the country because of the lack of coal. Hundreds of thousands of persons are suffering from cold and loss of work. All because Truman has been ducking his sworn duty to uphold the law of the land.

He has no moral or legal right to cast aside a law because somebody doesn't want to obey it. It's up to him to see all the laws are obeyed. And he cannot make exception because he doesn't like a law. Congress should insist he enforce the law at hand before they give him any more power.

Planned Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert therein the following article by Victor Riesel, which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror. It gives a graphic description of life in the Soviet paradise:

PLANNED SLAVERY

(By Victor Riesel)

Our Government has just received detailed information from a former highly placed Russian, who slipped into the American zone of Berlin recently, which discloses for the first time the exact manner in which the MVD (Soviet secret police) operates more as a slave manpower overseer than as an internal counter-espionage corps.

The information supplied during weeks of conversations between this Russian refugee and United States officials in Germany has been made available exclusively to this column and will be used shortly by the western democracies in a public fight within the United Nations councils.

Without the exploitation of 20,000,000 people in MVD slave labor camps the economy of the Soviet Union and its vast armament program would collapse, according to the Russian, who was a top echelon official of GOSPLAN, the U. S. S. R.'s highest planning agency.

SLAVE LABOR BATTALIONS

In fact, this former Gosplan executive, now under secure guard in Western Germany, reveals that the Soviet secret police was the main construction agency of the U. S. S. R. just before the German invasion, with a great part of its work devoted to building the Russian aviation industry. It still is.

Here, then, is the first accurate picture of the Soviet security police, not as an internal spy force, but as builders of special projects ordered by the Kremlin. These details were assembled and interpreted by the Commission of Inquiry Into Forced Labor, directed by a minister, Albert Herling.

The secret police's slave labor battalions build everything from children's nurseries to housing projects, from mining facilities to logging camps, from defense areas to paved roads of national importance, from camp facilities to railroad lines running through vast isolated regions.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF FORCED LABOR

Its prisoners mine uranium, gold, coal, chrome and iron ore, cut down huge forests for timber and dig for oil. The MVD even uses its concentration camp corps to make furniture and kitchenware. The refugee Gosplaner disclosed that a year or so ago this secret police division was ordered to turn out: One-eighth of the total production in the timber industry; 10 percent of all furniture and kitchenware production; 25 percent of the total U. S. S. R. freight towage and over 40 percent of total Soviet chrome production.

This was only a small part of its assignment that year.

The refugee revealed that since 1938 the MVD has provided "slaves" to produce 75 percent of all gold production and had large quotas for machinery, cement and the operation of oil fields in the Komi area near Ukhta.

The point is that the Russians long ago abandoned arrests for suspicious political activity and now simply seize thousands on short notice from their official manpower division just to provide enough forced labor battalions to produce on the Soviet's timetable.

PLANNED HUNGER AND FEAR

For example, when the secret police chief, Lazrenti Beria, was called in and told that the Germans had captured the Donbas coal fields and new sources were needed, he merely ordered the arrest of thousands of workers on suspicion of enmity to the state and threw them into construction of a railway line across hundreds of miles of tundra to the Pechora River basin to tap the coal supplies there.

Just as recently as last June, word came that labor battalions were needed in central Asia. Some 30,000 persons of Greek, Turkish and Jewish origins were given 3 hours' notice to be ready to leave their homes and shipped en masse to the Orient. So were entire peoples, like the Crimean Tartars and the Chechens in north Caucasus, for special projects.

According to the United States Government's Russian informant, the principal force which moves the political prisoners is hunger—not violence, not wages. The amount of work performed by the MVD prisoners in corrective labor camps determines how much they will eat. Those who weaken or refuse to work are hustled into solitary confinement, receive just subsistence rations and then are left to die if they rebel for long. When the forces are depleted, a new call goes out, and other groups suddenly find themselves suspicious characters.

Another type of forced labor not yet revealed here is performed by persons too valuable to ship across the tundra. They work under police guard at their normal jobs, but for reduced wages.

The Russian refugee said that fully half the political sentences in the Soviet Union cover this sort of arrest—intended just to freeze specialists into their jobs.

So, for many a Russian the secret MVD is with him literally from the cradle to the grave, for he is born in the secret police's hospitals, raised in its nurseries and dies in its labor camps.

Expressions of Views by Service Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Can't a General Speak to a Senator, Even in the Strictest Confidence?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN'T A GENERAL SPEAK TO A SENATOR, EVEN IN THE STRICTEST CONFIDENCE?

During the Formosa controversy, Walter Lippmann thought it necessary to remind General MacArthur that soldiers should confine expression of their views to superiors, and that they had "no right to conduct a public agitation, using the press and politicians as their mouthpiece, to challenge and discredit the policies of their government."

Of course, it is perfectly true that a soldier in uniform cannot appropriately enter public controversy. However, as we understand it, this is not what General MacArthur is supposed to have done. The assumption has been that, when he was asked certain specific questions by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, the far eastern commander gave them his opinion as to the importance of Formosa in the defense of the Pacific area against the further spread of Communist power. Was that improper? If it was, the question arises how, in existing circumstances, the views of military authorities on a military problem are to be ascertained at all.

As a matter of practical fact, the reluctance of military and naval officers to express their views has contributed considerably to the present situation. At Yalta, we now know, a high military officer did his best to communicate to the American delegation the view of the armed services that it was unnecessary and dangerous to bribe Russia to enter the war against Japan. The officer expressed his views solely through "official channels," in which they were sunk without a trace—official channels being what they were. Had there been a couple of big-eared Senators about, to hear the story, who can say how different history might have been!

A little more indiscretion on the part of military men at international conferences might have held up the deal on the Kurile Islands or even the forced treaty by which China surrendered substantial rights in Manchuria to the Reds. But the leaks would have had to be directed outside official channels, which were so clogged with Services, Davieses and Hisses as to be all but impassable to the quaint notions of the men who have to rig up an American defense in spite of what the statesmen and their befogged experts do.

Maybe General MacArthur should have taken off his uniform and resigned his command before speaking quietly to Senators. But it is a hunch at least that the American people would support the idea that the general in the field should have some way of getting his views across.

Nebraska Is 83 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, I took the floor to give the membership some information about Nebraska as a Territory and Nebraska as a State. Sterling H. McCaw, editor of the Norfolk Daily News, of Norfolk, Nebr., on that same day wrote an editorial giving a more detailed and more interesting story about Nebraska. I include this editorial with my remarks:

On March 1, 1867, this State came into the Union by proclamation of President Andrew Johnson, but through no favor of his. President Johnson had twice tried to block the admission of the State, for partisan political purposes. Once he succeeded, the second time he was frustrated by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress.

A lot of history was made between the time the first attempts were made to organize Nebraska into a Territory, and the day 13 years later when it took its place as a member of the family of States.

The signing of the territorial bill on May 30, 1854, by President Pierce, according to our office encyclopedia reopened the fierce sectional conflict between north and south. The conflict split the Democratic Party, destroyed the Whig Party, led to the organization of the new Republican Party and to the series of events leading to the Civil War.

Quite an accomplishment for a Territory soon to be inhabited by a peaceful and industrious people. It might also have been said that the bill had brought back into politics one Abraham Lincoln, who was to play an important part in the events of the succeeding decade. Lincoln had retired from politics, but when the Nebraska bill was reported out he put on his fighting clothes and slugged it out with Stephen A. Douglas, sponsor of the bill, and though beaten in the early rounds, won the final victory in his election to the Presidency.

The reason for the turbulence, of course, was slavery. The bill contained a provision that the people of the Territory might decide whether it should come into the Union free or slave. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 had provided that the new States should come in as free States. The free soilers looked upon this as a betrayal.

The battle gave the United States Senate what has been called its most turbulent session. But on March 5, 1854, after an all-night session, the Senate passed the territorial bill. The House followed in a couple of months and Nebraska became a Territory.

Originally Nebraska included all the territory extending from what is now the southern border of Kansas to Canada and west to the summits of the Rocky Mountains. But luckily this vast territory was divided at the fortieth parallel of latitude, and the area below that was made Kansas Territory.

That act saved Nebraska a lot of turbulence and bloodshed, for Kansas was the fighting ground of slavery and antislavery factions for several years. Beeche's bibles, as rifles sent from the East were called, were smuggled into the Territory and used with good effect.

But this is only incidental to Nebraska's birthday story. The State legislature on January 4, 1860, passed an act looking to the admission of the State, but the people were not ready for it, and it was defeated at the polls by a vote of 2,094 for it, to 2,372 against.

A new constitution was presented on June 2, 1866, and was adopted by a majority of exactly 100, the vote being 3,938 to 3,838. It was the soldiers' vote that saved the day. The members of the First Nebraska Cavalry gave the constitution the 100 majority, breaking what otherwise would have been a tie. The soldiers' count was 134 for and 34 against.

The fight had been a bitter one. The Republicans favored statehood in order to give their slim majority in Congress two more Senators and one Representative. The Democrats opposed it because they had formed a coalition with President Johnson's liberals and had hoped to organize the new Congress.

So when Congress, just before adjournment, passed the bill admitting Nebraska as a State, President Johnson gave it a pocket veto. The President pointed out that the constitution limited suffrage to white citizens. The Republicans saw the point and repassed the bill with a provision that the State legislature must eliminate color as a qualification for voting. President Johnson vetoed that bill, but the two Houses repassed it over his objections.

But the conditions that Congress had attached to the measure almost wrecked statehood. When the color provision came before the legislature it required seven votes to carry it through the senate. Seven senators favored accepting it, all Republicans, but one was sick. It looked dark for statehood until Isaac S. Hascall, of Douglas County, a Democrat, broke away from his party and cast the deciding vote for statehood.

"The air," according to C. H. Gere's account, "was blue with Democratic expletives at that time, but if the genius of that venerable organization haunted the chamber of the offender at the solemn midnight hour, and, fixing him with his glittering eye, said, like Othello to Cassio, 'No more be officer of mine,' 10 to 1 the tough and wiry Isaac hung out no signal of distress, and the ghost retired abashed."

Thus, painfully and precariously, Nebraska was born 83 years ago tomorrow. And at 83 it is full of vigor and of faith that the best days of its life are ahead of it.

Judge Keech Decision Seen Putting Truman in a Terrible Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of March 3, 1950:

JUDGE KEECH DECISION SEEN PUTTING TRUMAN IN A TERRIBLE SPOT—GOP HAS BEEN HANDED MAJOR ISSUE ON LACK OF RESTRAINING LAWS

(By David Lawrence)

Judge Keech, through his decision acquitting the miners' union of contempt, has put President Truman in a terrible spot, politically and otherwise. But he had a right to reject conjecture and insist on evidence of collusion by the leaders with the striking miners.

Whether the Justice Department was overconfident and presented what it believed was an adequate case based on the precedents created when Judge Goldsborough uttered his now famous "wink and nod" doctrine or whether Judge Keech, who was a former White House assistant, leaned over backward to pronounce judgment on the basis of lack of proof will be debated for a long time to come.

Certainly the Republicans have been handed a major issue on a platter. This would tend to refute any idea that the case was not pressed in good faith. For today, instead of a Taft-Hartley law that is "oppressive," especially in its injunction feature, the country suddenly discovers that its labor-management laws are not strong enough.

OPPORTUNITY FOR SPEAKERS

Plainly nobody in the Democratic administration has wanted to see such a contingency arise, for it affords an opportunity for Republican stump speakers to put further blame on the Democratic Party.

Most important is the blunt fact now dramatized beyond any doubt that there is no law on the statute books that restrains an economic group bent on causing suffering and impairing the national health and safety.

Obviously, the mine workers union could have gotten the workers back on the job if it wished to do so. There is no lack of discipline in a closed-shop type of union. Undoubtedly also the strategy to circumvent the injunction if it came was worked out in great detail long before the strike occurred. It is a question whether anyone can be tried for a conspiracy to take steps to circumvent an injunction before it is issued.

But, on the other hand, there can be little doubt that the Government, by using the resources of the FBI and serving restraining orders on every officer of local unions, could secure the necessary evidence of a concerted refusal to go back to work. As Judge Goldsborough said, many hundreds of thousands of men in a union do not operate as individuals but in unison when they disregard plainly worded orders to go back to work. If, in truth, there has been such a collapse of discipline, then the right of a national union to conduct an industry-wide negotiation can also be questioned. So can the effectiveness of any signatures that may be affixed to a contract by union officers who have lost control of their men.

WON'T RESOLVE ISSUE

Seizure of the mines will not resolve the larger issue that has arisen—the arbitrary manner in which the public interest has been damaged. Nor will any one-sided seizure bill get through Congress. If profits are held up, so probably would wage rates and working conditions be frozen until such time as both sides agree on a settlement.

Demand for a general revision of the labor-management laws will be pressed, too, and Congress may find itself taking up the Taft-Hartley amendments which have been pigeonholed by the Democratic Party at the behest of the union leaders.

The American people now are face to face with the fact that economic groups have arisen which are apparently more powerful than the Government and which can make a mockery of court orders and the whole collective-bargaining process. It certainly calls for a leadership which thus far neither party in Congress has been willing to assert.

Is Socialism a Scare Word?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial in the Evening Observer is timely and to the point; therefore under leave to extend heretofore granted I am inserting the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONLY A SCARE WORD

President Truman thinks socialism is just a scare word. He said so. He said, "Their (the Republicans) current scare word is socialism."

Perhaps socialism is just a scare word to many Americans, but this light treatment of it makes it all the more a frightening fact rather than just a word.

Socialism is not just a word to Russia, to Czechoslovakia, to the troublesome minorities of Italy and France, to Cardinal Mindszenty, to Alger Hiss, to the Communists convicted of treason in fair American courts, to Chiang Kai-shek, to the Koreans, to Hungary, to Tito, to Poland, to east Berlin, to the British, to the Finns.

"For the Republicans to drag out the same old moth-eaten scarecrow of socialism again in 1950 * * * is an insult to the intelligence of the American people," says President Truman.

How remote can a President get from the facts of life? Were it not for socialism today the American military budget could be cut by two-thirds, the foreign-aid program could be diminished by a like percentage, taxes could be reduced, and the budget be cut by from one-quarter to one-half. Were it not for socialism there would have been no announcement of an H-bomb, no threat of a chain reaction which might destroy the planet. Were it not for socialism the United Nations would be moving smoothly and effectively, not stalemated by veto power.

Of course the President was speaking in a domestic sense, but in so doing he seemed unaware of the subtle movements by which a nation abandons free enterprise and develops socialism. That condition which is only a scare word to the President can be approached by both revolutionary and evolutionary processes. In the end it is the same socialism which can be and usually is a far worse tyranny than any which the founding fathers resisted in the creation of our Republic.

Surely the President's eyes cannot be closed to modern history, to contemporary history. How can he believe socialism to be a red herring, a scare word? The greatest, the most deadly, and the most insidious doctrine and way of life in the world today impresses the President as no more than a political bogey man. And that, we fear, reflects the smug attitude of too many Americans.

Politics by the Bushel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report from Republican State headquarters at Des Moines, Iowa:

POLITICS BY THE BUSHEL

Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan tossed the farm program right smack into the middle of partisan politics when he appeared at the National Farm Institute. If there was any doubt that Brannan planned to make farm legislation a political football it disappeared in the smoke of what was billed as a "discussion of farm policy" but could be more accurately described as Pendergast political harangue.

Brannan took more than an hour to lambast farm organizations and their leaders and it wasn't until after he had delivered his blistering attack and promised to stump the country for his plan that he attempted to explain.

After listening to the Secretary for more than 80 minutes—during which there was no explanation of the plan—the panel chairman asked the Cabinet member to explain it in simple terms. But Brannan the politician didn't do it. He did devote 15 minutes to generalities, skirting the subject at every

turn. He failed to give an adequate explanation of the plan—something hundreds of persons in the audience had come to hear—and many went away as a dirt farmer in southwestern Iowa put it "more confused than ever before."

The Secretary apparently thinks he's going to have a tough time selling his plan. He attacked farm organizations and their leaders in an effort to discredit their position without stressing the merits of his own plan. Even on his plan the Secretary was confused. At one point he said there was nothing new or revolutionary in it and that most of it was lifted from the Agricultural Act of 1948. A few minutes later he said 125 employees of the Agriculture Department worked night and day for 6 months drafting the plan.

Brannan didn't get around to explaining his plan. But he did make it clear that he intended to stump the country to elect Representatives who will support it. He reminded the audience that he toured the country blaming the Eightieth Congress during the 1948 campaign. But this year he's going to blame, not the Eighty-first Congress, because it is controlled by his own party, but "selfish groups in the Eighty-first Congress."

He spent a great deal of time playing potato politics. He blamed the potato and egg situation on everyone but the Department of Agriculture.

As Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, told the Senate recently: "Secretary Brannan now has ample authority under existing laws to handle the surplus-potato situation. He has been dramatizing potato supports and trying to make Congress look bad."

The crowd roared with laughter when Brannan said: "I am for Government economy." That really sounded funny in light of the Hoover Commission Report, which pointed out that the Department of Agriculture has mushroomed from 18,000 to more than 80,000 employees in 20 years, and its share of the national budget from less than seventeen million in 1912 to a high of $2,500,000,000.

Brannan also said we don't have regimentation. But a look at the so-called farm bill which bears his name belies that fact.

The following provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the Brannan-plan farm bill:

"Farmers engaged in the production of any agricultural commodity shall furnish proof as to their acreage, production yield, storage, and marketing of the commodity in the form of records, marketing cards, reports, storage, or sales receipts or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe as necessary for the administration of this title.

"Any person failing to make such a report or keep any record as required by this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 and any such person making a false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

That language, which the Secretary didn't take time to explain, sounds very much like regimentation.

The Los Angeles Examiner, commenting on the vote bait being used by the Truman administration, said: "Of course, the Brannan plan is modeled to catch votes among workers as well as farmers * * * this scheme resembles the current British Socialist Labor Government farm plan. The gold brick element of the Brannan plan inheres in the fact that the city dweller in reality will pay twice for food—once to the store and again to the tax collector."

Brannan apparently let his feelings of vehemence against a farm organization cloud his vision and instead of discussing "the extra bushel" he tossed out bushels of politics.

United Nations Must Be Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the United Nations Charter must be amended in the light of our experience and in view of the change of world conditions since the United Nations was founded.

I believe the changes necessary include: The elimination or drastic revision of the present veto provision, and the tightening of joint procedures of the democracies in cases of aggression or threatened aggression. Certainly a new definition of aggression should be made in the light of the Soviet refusal to cooperate with the great majority of the United Nations signatories plan for atomic-energy control, which must include internal inspection of all nations' facilities.

Under unanimous consent, I include with these remarks a statement which I made on October 12, 1949, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. My statement was in support of a resolution to achieve this purpose.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have never believed that a preventive war against the Soviet Union presented even a last-ditch alternative to a peaceful solution of the world crisis. I have never believed that our sole possession of the secret of the atomic bomb gave us anything more than a fleeting moment of time in which to develop a policy which might lead to a peaceful solution. I have never believed that a peaceful solution could be found through purely negative means—that is to say, through a policy which aimed merely at stopping Soviet or Communist expansion.

Given the existence of the Soviet menace, I have gone along with the various means improvised to contain that menace, in the effort to make western Europe as a whole impervious to subversion or military conquest. I have accepted the necessity of maintaining our own military strength at a level which should make it clear to the men in the Kremlin that aggression would involve the Soviet Union in a war in which it would meet overwhelming military strength.

Nevertheless, I have felt that these negative, precautionary steps were not enough—that our policy lacked an affirmative constructive approach to the making and preserving of a lasting peace. I have felt that, while defensive preparation has been essential to the Nation as a preventive to war, defensive preparation alone could not lay the foundations of lasting peace. Moreover, it has been apparent for some time that defensive preparation to prevent war, if carried far enough, would eventually lead to war; that a sterile arms race would preempt the resources needed for building the peace; that a way must be found to halt the vicious circle of mutual distrust and provocation.

I am convinced that the only way to halt the arms race is to do the one thing which makes disarmament possible, namely, to establish world law and world law enforcement. This, I know, cannot be done overnight. But what we can do overnight is to make the establishment of world law and world law enforcement the avowed aim of American foreign policy. Once we do this, all our defensive actions will fall into an entirely different context. Once we do this, we shall give a constructive purpose, a clearly understandable constructive purpose, to our at-present disjointed efforts to promote economic health and political stability.

The fact that Russia has broken our monopoly on atomic weapons merely confirms a thing which has been apparent for a long time: There can be no way out of our present difficulties through war. It follows that the United States must take the lead in turning its back upon reliance on armaments and start working toward the establishment of peace machinery which will make such devices unnecessary. The resolution before us is merely the first step in this direction. The road to the development of the United Nations into a world federation is long and arduous. Many obstacles stand in our path. But, irrespective of these obstacles, we shall have failed in our mission as a Nation if we do not now, at this moment, make up our minds to start along this road to overcome the obstacles by patient effort and to lead the world at last into the tranquil harbor of a secure and enduring peace.

A Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter, I am inserting a letter which I have received with reference to a tax problem which is disturbing business. I am also enclosing an article by Raymond Moley entitled "A Tax Against Safety and Progress."

FEBRUARY 28, 1950.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Thank you for sending us a copy of H. R. 6563 and of your statement on the introduction of the bill in the House on January 3.

We think that your bill and your comments thereon represent one of the most constructive approaches to the tax problem that we have seen.

We have particularly noted your proposed revision of section 102. Your proposal is, of course, in the right direction and represents, we assume, your realistic appraisal of the extent to which the Congress might be persuaded to go in alleviating this menace to the sound economic growth of our country.

We urge you, however, to consider whether in view of the increasing realization that section 102 as applied to active business corporations is fundamentally unsound, the Congress might not recognize the need of more drastic revision. For example, it might be provided that no company shall be deemed to have accumulated surplus beyond the reasonable needs of its business if its total capital and surplus at the end of the tax year is not in excess of its expenditures for pay roll and purchase of materials during the year plus investments in fixed assets, or is not more than double the expenditures for pay roll and materials exclusive of fixed assets. Another possibility would be to provide that section 102 is not applicable to any corporation where 90 percent of the

shareholders own less than 50 percent of the voting stock, because in such instances the minority stockholders themselves have recourse through the State courts to prevent any undue accumulation of earnings.

Enclosed is a copy of a reprint of an article by Raymond Moley in the February 6 issue of News Week, which you may have seen. You will note that he has suggested that section 102 should either be repealed or amended to make it clear that it does not apply to companies employing a given amount of labor or realizing a given turnover of goods in relation to the amount of capital invested.

Your efforts in the direction of sound tax laws are sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully yours.

A TAX AGAINST SAFETY AND PROGRESS

(By Raymond Moley)

If Congress really wants to increase national wealth, guard us against depressions, and protect the jobs of workers, a good place to begin is with section 102 of the Internal Revenue Act. This section was innocently written in 1913 and ignored for 25 years. It was rediscovered in 1938.

In 1935 President Roosevelt shocked and angered Congress by proposing his notorious share-the-wealth tax program. He did it because he was at the moment afraid of Huey Long, who intended to run in 1936. One of the proposals then recommended was a tax on corporation surpluses, designed to force the paying out of profits in dividends. This idea was enacted into law in 1936. In 1938, against the President's vigorous opposition, it was substantially repealed. Roosevelt then turned to the sleeping section 102.

Under this law, the Treasury, not the business concerned, decides how much a company should withhold from stockholders and keep as a reserve against future needs and emergencies. The people who make this decision are not the people who have made and live with the business, but are revenue officers without business experience generally and altogether without knowledge of the specific business involved. The section has been an unjust burden and a sinister threat, particularly to small business.

There has been a stepping up of this threat since President Truman assumed office. In the 1946 tax-return forms the Treasury inserted a warning which meant to most companies that they should dissipate their earnings or else. This was later omitted. Meanwhile, the Department of Commerce was encouraging companies to invest more and more of their surplus funds in Government bonds, substantiating this suggestion by a reference to section 102.

The fallacy of this policy is that it implies that a business surplus is an unnecessary economic precaution. The fact is that a surplus constitutes basic purchasing power. It represents the ability to pay labor, buy raw materials, restore machinery and equipment, and provide security for business credit. It becomes the central power plant which supplies jobs, purchasing power, improved products, and a better standard of living for all.

To build up strong and productive companies means more income for normal taxation and larger revenues for Government. But to compel this security to be dissipated in dividends produces an insignificant amount of tax revenue. The wide scattering of share holdings, in which 80 percent of stocks are in the hands of relatively small taxpayers, provides a very limited tax source. Thus, the drastic enforcement of section 102 decreases tax revenues.

This law was originally intended to prevent abuses through incorporated pocketbooks. That purpose is already accomplished through the personal holding company tax.

Section 102 should either be repealed or it should be amended.

One part of an amendment should be to make it clear that it does not apply to companies employing a given amount of labor or realizing a given turn-over of goods in relation to the amount of capital invested.

Further, the burden of proof should be placed upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to show both the unreasonableness of the accumulated surplus and the existence of a real tax-avoidance purpose. In addition, it should be provided by law that long-term capital gains should be excluded from section 102 net income.

And corporate reserves set up out of profits already taxed, which reflect higher costs of replacing plant and equipment, should be excluded from section 102 net income.

Finally, there is a problem that has grown as the Government has, more and more, placed its heavy hand on business enterprise. That is the problem of unreviewable administrative decisions. The Supreme Court has refused to review cases brought under this law. As a result, the only law available to taxpayers and advisers has been the law as interpreted by the Treasury. The result is that business has been the helpless victim of administrative caprice.

Lewis Defends His Tactics, Asks Dealing With Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of Friday, March 3, 1950:

LEWIS DEFENDS HIS TACTICS, ASKS DEALING WITH OWNERS—INSISTS IN INTERVIEW PUBLIC IS IN NO DANGER—STOCKS HELD SUFFICIENT IF DISTRIBUTED—HE ASSERTS PROFITS BACK HIS CAUSE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—John Llewellyn Lewis, whose leadership of the coal miners of the United States has for years alternately paralyzed the flow of this essential fuel into commerce or released it to turn the wheels of ever-expanding industry, in an interview authorized for publication today answered seven questions that ranged from the source of his power to the most effective methods of preventing and settling disputes between labor and management.

Although Mr. Lewis is the target of more bitter criticism from the public than he ever experienced except during the wartime strikes of the United Mine Workers in 1943 and 1945, he submitted to the questions and agreed to let his answers be published.

Publication of Mr. Lewis' comments on the situation in the coal industry was deferred while the Government's civil and criminal contempt charges against his union, the United Mine Workers, were on trial before Federal Judge Richmond B. Keech here. Today Judge Keech dismissed as unproved these charges—that the union, though not Mr. Lewis, connived to keep the miners from returning to work in defiance of the judge's order.

In his answers the president of the UMW made these statements:

"No strike in the coal fields, including this one, has ever imperiled public health or safety.

"Enough coal is on hand, if fairly distributed, to last out the time we shall require to adjust the current dispute fairly."

His current wage and other demands on the operators are justified by statistics of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Interior which demonstrate to him that the profits of the coal industry (before taxes) rose from $34 per miner per annum employed in 1939 to $733 per miner per annum employed in 1948.

The power attributed to him has its source only in the degree to which the coal miners will follow his leadership, and this they do only when he is right.

His control of the selection of some officials in the union mine districts is exercised only where and because the miners, left to themselves, would make choices against their true interests.

The sole proper way to settle disputes where public health and safety are concerned is through collective bargaining in good faith, and in the current dispute the industry has never wanted that, being convinced that delay would bring into operation the Taft-Hartley Act. The procedures of the Railway Labor Act merely defer a strike, not settle it or its causes.

If he could bargain always with the real owners of the mines instead of their employees it would produce prompt and fair settlements.

As substitutes for the Taft-Hartley and the Wagner Acts he favors a simple law which would guarantee collective bargaining in good faith and establish a few unspecified, unfair practices for both management and labor.

He is not enthusiastic over Government mediation, but at times it can be useful.

The coal industry deserves the epithets of "cruel" and "conscienceless" which he at times has launched against it, as its cessation of welfare payments recently demonstrted.

A PRIVATE PERSONALITY NOTED

After Mr. Lewis answered the seven questions, this correspondent asked him to clarify and expand three of his replies and submit to two more. These are listed at the end of this dispatch.

Mr. Lewis said he did not have the time at hand to deal argumentatively with these. This is regrettable, though understandable in his current circumstances, because this material, whether or not to the satisfaction of his critics, would fill out or clarify what they are certain to point to as omissions and evasions.

Mr. Lewis' responses to the seven questions were written down by this correspondent from memory, but soon after he made them. In authorizing the language as his own, the union leader said:

"Naturally you have not written it the way I would write it, but 't will do."

In a personal conversation of this character Mr. Lewis gives a very different impression of his personality than the one he projects to the public. His tone is devoid of wrath, his words carry no trace of that purple bombast which is so familiar to readers of his public prose. His diction is clear and extensive, and he finds the mot juste without visible effort. His speech reflects deep reading, and is both simple and cultivated. The barking polysyllables which he employs for propaganda and personal attack are wholly absent.

The impression one gets is that Mr. Lewis, like most effective dealers in the marketplace of politics and social economy, puts on that make-up and assumes that dramatic role, as an actor does, which he has decided are best suited to create the impression he feels will serve his purpose best.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The questions and Mr. Lewis' answers follow:

"Question. Do you think you have too much power for one citizen?

"Answer. What is my power? As a union leader I have no more special privilege under

the law than any other, and much less scope under the Taft-Hartley Act than I had under the Wagner Act. The mine workers in the coal fields have usually followed and supported me because they believe that their cause is mine.

"If I had the power suggested by your question, would they not have returned to work the other day when I urged them to do so for the protection of their welfare and that of the union? When they think I am right they follow me, and that is the extent of it.

"I know it is said that between the local officers and members and myself there is a set of secret signals, that I phrase such urgings as the above in a way which they will understand to mean the contrary. But how could there be such signals? And if there were, why has no one in the industry, with spies all about, been able to detect and expose them? It is nonsense.

"Tomorrow a psychological wave might pass through the minds of the mine workers and wash away whatever influence over their actions I have as an individual and as president of the UMW. That isn't power in the sense the word is generally employed about me.

"The President has power which no psychological change can take away from him while he holds his office. Other officials have the same. Industrialists have the power conferred by financial resources on which labor depends for its bread. That is real power, of which I have none.

"Question. Do you think that labor's sense of responsibility has caught up with its present power?

"Answer. I believe that in the unions as elsewhere a sense of responsibility always catches up with increased economic strength. I think that is the situation in labor today.

"Question. I understand that in some areas miners do not elect their own union officers. If this is so, why?

"Answer. In perhaps a dozen districts the miners do not choose their district president and secretary. That is because these districts showed a tendency to make poor choices and the national organization decided its interest required that these officers be selected for them until their choices could be more relied on. But in these districts as well as in all the others each miner has a vote on the national officers and the decisions of each convention.

"I have heard it said that I have the power to expel a union member for any reason I may wish. The truth is that not for years has any attempt to expel been ratified by the controlling committee.

"Question. How should a labor dispute be settled where public health and safety are imperiled, as in this one in the coal industry? Would the Railway Labor Act procedures help? Would labor and management be better off if both the Taft-Hartley and the Wagner Acts were repealed and nothing substituted?

"If you and the operators do not present demands when negotiations begin how can there be prompt bargaining? Would it be helpful if both sides were required by law to state their demands in writing at the outset?"

GOOD FAITH AS ONLY WAY

"Answer. Collective bargaining in truly good faith is the only way to settle any labor dispute. And no strike in the coal fields has ever imperiled public health or safety, this one included. When has the Nation been really imperiled by one? There is enough coal on hand, if it were fairly distributed, to last out the time we shall require to adjust the current dispute fairly. The outcries are coming in part from those who did not stock up as they should have in view of the end of the contract period last June. Others did, some in remarkably large quantities.

"As you travel through Indiana and Pennsylvania these days you will see reserve piles of coal for the steel industry, piles so high that they obscure the big plants. And the TVA has a reserve of 650,000 tons. It should be simple to send around a few carloads to hardship cases in that region.

"Now for the Railway Labor Act. This has become weaker and weaker in practice, and in full operating strength it merely delays a strike; it does not prevent one. The present strike in the coal fields was delayed without such procedure, and the next time you are on a train if you will talk to any railroad employees you will find they no longer take stock in this act.

"The delay in this current coal strike came because the union did everything possible to avert it—witness the 3-day week—and continued to hope that management would sincerely sit down to real collective bargaining. Until that disposition was made manifest I could not protect the miners and at the same time state my requests either verbally or in writing. It was clear that the operators were anxious to drag out negotiations—if they could be called that—to the point where Taft-Hartley would be invoked. Had that law not been on the statute books I believe we would have had an agreement long ago. The operators want to weaken the mine union and they know that Taft-Hartley is the means to do that.

"I am for its repeal, as I have made plain, but I would not want to surrender all the protections of the Wagner Act. What I propose is the substitution of both acts with a simple statute, giving labor the protective guaranty of collective bargaining and adding a proscription of certain unfair practices on the part of labor and management alike. That, with supplemental laws like Norris-La Guardia, Wages-and-Hours, etc., would be all the labor legislation needed to maintain a steady economy."

MEDIATION SERVICES AN AID

"Question. What part should State or Federal mediation services play in labor disputes? Have they been helpful in the terms of your own experience? If not, how could they be made so?

"Answer. In my experience, these services have been somewhat helpful but not more. It is useful occasionally for labor or management to have solutions suggested by official conciliators that, for tactical reasons, cannot be proposed by either party to the controversy. In this way settlements have been forwarded now and then.

"Question. Nearly always you and the coal operators accuse each other of failure to bargain in good faith. You represent some of them as conscienceless, cruel men. What is the solution of these attitudes?

"Answer. Here are some figures showing the consequence to disabled miners, their widows, their children—some of them orphans—of the stoppage of welfare-fund contributions by management in the coal business. [These listed thousands without this means of subsistence.] This is what I have in mind when I sometimes represent the operators as cruel, conscienceless men. Even now, when the court says the old contract is temporarily in force, many of them have not resumed payments to the welfare fund. Yet Government statistics reveal that the coal industry, which made a profit of $34 per miner in 1939, made a profit of $733 per miner in 1948.

"I don't know how to melt the hearts of such men. But a step toward a solution of what you call these attitudes would be for the coal industry to send its real owners to the bargaining table. I speak for the union. But on the other side of the table I find only employees who have no authority to come to terms which I have the authority to offer. If the industry will send its owners to the table, we can come quickly to fair agreements, as was demonstrated when Myron Taylor and I made the first contract in the steel industry. Instead of George Love and the others I deal with, the industry should send Ben Fairless, G. M. Humphrey, R. R. Young, and James D. Francis, as examples."

LABOR AS POLITICAL ENTITY

"Question. With the British example in mind, do you still oppose the formation of American labor into a political party? And what do you think of statements that your methods are taking coal out of the competitive fuel market and costing the miners large sums of take-home pay every year?

"Answer: Let us begin with the case of Great Britain. The population there is sitting on a coal deposit which, if taken from the earth by modern methods, would solve the economic problem of the British. But first British management made the mistake of letting obsolescence weaken the industry. And then British labor made the mistake of becoming a political party and using the political instead of the economic approach to national problems. The result is what you see. In 1948 American miners took out approximately 600,000,000 tons, British miners took out less than 200,000,000 tons. And in this country the mining force was 404,000 and in Britain it was 736,000. The UMW has been greatly responsible for the methods employed in the industry and its modern equipment. This should be remembered when the dead cats and brickbats are flying around the heads of coal union leaders.

"However, I read editorials which say that my methods have advanced the use of competitive fuels and doomed coal to become a drug on the market. When the miners read that they laugh. They laugh because they know that any housewife whose husband can find the money will put in gas for fuel; it is clean and requires no hand labor. They also know that industry will use coal over other fuels because its lower cost appeals to industry."

LOST PAY VERSUS STRIKE GAINS

"I also read editorials which say that the pay I cost miners who go out on strike represents much more in any year than any wage gains I procure for them. When the miners read that they laugh, too. They laugh because they know these things: That about 200 work-days per year is maximum in the industry and that the time spent in strikes would be idle time, anyhow. That is history, and it will be the same in 1949–50 when this strike is settled.

"The trouble with the editorial writers and many others is that you have to know coal miners before you can write about their affairs and their leadership. Mining is the only labor which is done underground. It is performed amid hazards, in foul air and is backbreaking. To choose to be a coal miner means that you are a certain type of man. These I know well, their needs, their interests and their psychology. For many generations members of my family have been miners or operators, and I well know labor in the depths of a mine."

The answers Mr. Lewis was asked to amplify were as follows:

"Question. In 1948 you did deal with the tricts where this is the arrangement? Are the elections of members to the international executive board also barred to these workers? Is it true, as has been stated, that the last opposition candidate for president of the UMW was taken off the ballot and out of the convention by something resembling force? How much beating up of the opposition is the practice?

"Question 6. What is there in the industry contention that they suspended welfare payments partly because you were spending the money faster than it was coming in?

"Question. In 1948 you did deal with the real owners, Messrs. Fairless and Humphrey, and got the able and willing clause from them, over the protest of Charles O'Neill. Do

you think that proves or damages your argument in this respect, from the public viewpoint?"

The additional questions submitted but not answered were:

"What are the arguments for a wage increase at this time beyond the profit per miner figures you gave me? What is there in the belief that your strategy all along has had the objective of Government seizure?"

STATISTICAL DATA CITED

For statistical data supporting his answer No. 6, Mr. Lewis offered the following:

"Office memo to Mr. Lewis:

"We have just completed a thorough analysis of the bituminous-coal industry profits per employee for the 10-year period 1939–1948, based on Department of Commerce national-income figures and United States Bureau of Labor Statistics employment figures. This shows:

"1. Profits—before taxes—per miner employed, increased from $34 per miner in 1939 to $733 per miner employed in 1948.

"Rate:

1939	$34
1941	182
1942	225
1945	313
1947	577
1948	733

"2. A wage increase of 95 cents per day, and a royalty increase of 15 cents per ton could be given, on the basis of 1948 figures, without any price increase and with a 22 cents per ton profit to the industry.

"The 1948 figures show 404,000 employees and profits of $296,000,000; per employee, $733, or approximately 50 cents per ton.

"Applying the wage and royalty increase to this 1948 data, profits would be $130,088,000; per employee $322, or approximately 22 cents per ton.

"Sources of profit data: from table 17—Corporate Profits Before Federal and State Income and Excess Profits Taxes, by Industry, in United States Department of Commerce's National Income Supplement to Survey of Current Business; years 1939, 1941, and 1942, page 30, July 1947 issue; years 1945, 1947, and 1948, page 16, July 1949 issue.

"Sources of employment data: from table A–6—estimated number of employees and indexes of weekly pay rolls in selected nonmanufacturing industries, in United States Department of Labor's Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1947 for years 1939, 1941, 1942, 1945, and 1947, page 24. Year 1948 from United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Bulletin C. M. 1 No. 12, page 11, table 5—average number of men, days active, man-days, man-hours, and production in bituminous coal and anthracite mines during January-December 1948."

Statement of George J. Burger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., February 15, 1950:

My name is George J. Burger. I am vice president and a member of the board of directors of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., head office, San Mateo, Calif., a national nonprofit organization organized under the laws of the State of California, which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the Nation. I am also in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., located in the Bond Building, Washington, D. C. We also maintain offices in Chicago, Cincinnati, and New York City.

I want to take this time to thank the chairman, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, for the privilege extended to me in behalf of the federation and its membership to appear here today and present our views on this major legislative proposition. In the first instance, it has been the keystone of the objectives of the federation to protect our free enterprise system and through this the people we represent, independent business, through the all-out enforcement of antitrust laws. Our position in this matter was stated in plain and understandable words in the privilege extended to us in our appearance before the platform committees of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions held in the city of Philadelphia in the summer of 1948. At this time I want to have it on the record that we received the most courteous and interested attention of both committees to the federation's position on antitrust law enforcement. Our position then was, and it is now, and I quote:

"First and foremost, members of the federation desire that a consistent, vigorous, effective antimonopoly campaign be waged by Government. To this end, federation members have repeatedly urged their Congressmen to vote adequate appropriations to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. To this end, officers and directors of the federation have constantly contacted Congress and congressional committees, including the congressional Joint Committee of the Economic Report, suggesting that both these agencies be freed to voluntarily inform congressional Committees on Appropriations whenever, and the extent to which, their budget requests have been cut by the Bureau of the Budget.

"In this connection, federation members have consistently demanded that Congress strengthen our antitrust laws wherever needed and have urged Congress and Government to refrain from all actions designed to weaken these laws. Recognizing the fact that present antitrust-law-violation penalties are really insignificant and ineffectual, they have repeatedly asked Congress to legislate stiffer penalties for violators of these laws. And, in recognition of the fact that antitrust-law litigation is many times subjected to suffocating delay, it has been requested that Congress act to provide some means of speeding action on this type of litigation.

"You may wonder at the stress that federation members lay on this phase of Government activity. The fact is that the tendency in our economy is toward more rapid and more certain concentration of power in the hands of a relatively few business giants, both in private hands and in the hands of cooperative-type organizations. Pacing this trend toward concentration is an increasing disregard for the rights of independent business, which is mirroring itself in increasingly serious curtailment of economic freedom of opportunity. Our members see as one of their main bulwarks the antitrust laws of the Nation, and they demand that these laws be used for that purpose."

It must be understood, Mr. Chairman, that no officer or group of officers sets the position of the federation, but our position is set exclusively by the registered vote of the Nation-wide membership of the federation through its official publication, the Mandate, and in the Mandate itself a ballot is affixed on which the member votes his views and the ballot is returned by him to the district chairman, an independent businessman, and the ballots are then forwarded by the district chairman direct to the respective Members of Congress. The federation's position then is controlled exclusively by the expressed vote of its members. Such a procedure has been consistently followed by the federation's members in their use of the ballot through the Mandate, and I attach herewith as a matter of record, which I would like to have included in the record, Mandate Nos. 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162 which contain questions on antitrust enforcement.

On November 17, 1948, I was requested to appear and give testimony before the subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee To Investigate Monopolistic Practices. In my testimony I said in part:

"In my visits in the respective cities it would appear that antitrust violations are becoming more rampant than ever before in the history of our Nation. It has reached an exceptionally low level. In most States there are laws for protection where violations are taking place, but it is my opinion that many States are deficient in carrying out the laws and the public is being gouged through such practices. More important, small business is being misled and the free-enterprise system is falling by the wayside.

"In my own industry, rubber tires, with which I have been connected for close to 40 years, I do know that many of the suggested and recommended ideas for violations of either State or national laws originate in the minds and thinking of the big monopolists of that industry. I say this without fear of contradiction, and apparently if such conditions exist in that industry, possibly the same pattern is being followed in other industries controlled by monopolies. Again, small independents are being misled and free enterprise is being destroyed, and regimentation is coming from the dictates of those who desire to protect the monopoly in their respective field, and not from the Government as monopoly would have us believe.

"Encouragement should be given to the youth of this Nation to go into the various trades so that the services of sufficient and adequate numbers in their own businesses will be available to the American public.

"It must also be understood that we take no position that merely condemns big business because it is big, for such is not the case, but we do condemn big business where, by its own action, it prevents the free-enterprise system from functioning, and the public is the victim."

It is our opinion that the committee should thoroughly explore the public hearings Senate document titled "Officers and employees of the Federal Government, hearings before the Committee on Civil Service, United States Senate, Eightieth Congress, first session, on Senate Resolution 41, a resolution to investigate certain matters relating to officers and employees of the Federal Government, part 3, February 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 18, 1947." The committee will be particularly interested in that part of the testimony relating to the Hon. Wendell Berge, where the matter of the application of fines and jail sentences was thoroughly

explored by the members of the committee present during Mr. Berge's testimony before them.

We are particularly interested in the statements from committee members or by the witness as to the application of fines levied by the courts where convictions took place, that is, as to their value as a deterrent to continual violations, irrespective of what the fine might be.

It is interesting to quote some of Mr. Berge's testimony. He said:

"We can get convictions in price-fixing cases, and we generally get them, and I would point out the amount of fines we collect annually in the criminal cases is very substantial, but my point, Senator, is this, if your defendant is a large corporation, and they generally are, the financial penalty is not a big item to them and they'll spend hundreds of thousands of dollars—I know of a case where they spent $2,000,000 in attorney fees—to fight a fine liability at most of a few hundreds of thousands of dollars."

It is interesting to note during the same hearing, an exchange between Mr. Vogel of the committee and Mr. Berge, and I quote:

"Mr. VOGEL. Did you ever think of the question that your penalties have not been sufficient to do the job? That is, the penalty of $5,000 was not a deterrent and possibly a jail sentence might produce something that had not been produced in 57 years.

"Mr. BERGE. Of course, we have considered it. But as I told you, and for whatever my judgment is worth—I may be wrong—but I am sure if we are given a mandate that Congress wants jail sentences, we will go out and try to get them. We had not understood that was what was wanted. It has been our judgment that was not."

Later in his testimony Mr. Berge made the following statement:

"My experience, and I would be less candid if I did not bring to your attention, is that the courts are very loath to impose even the maximum fines we have now because there is some feeling, which I do not share, but nevertheless there is something about a Sherman Act violation that is a little nicer than the ordinary kind of crime, and we cannot be tough with the kind of a defendant we have in Sherman Act cases."

He continues:

"No; how do we get around that and have an effective penalty? It is not because the court is afraid to extract money from the average corporate defendant. He knows that they can afford to pay it and knows that the lawyers before him are drawing more in a single day than the maximum fine he could impose. So when he decides to make it $2,000 instead of $5,000, it is not because he does not want to impose the burden but because there is a feeling in the minds of many people, including judges, that criminal fines are not quite the kind of punishment that defendants ought to have. I say that as a fact that you cannot ignore."

In view of the above authority, the then Assistant Attorney General, a career man in the Department of Justice, it is our opinion that the fine provisions in antitrust law violations will not be a deterrent to continual violations of the antitrust laws. It goes without saying that the fine penalty would be a deterrent to independent businesses where they are found in violation of antitrust laws and convicted, and in most cases our opinion would be that fines could really put independent business out of business, but in the higher brackets in our business economy, where big business functions in high gear, we hold to the view that fines would be no deterrent, irrespective of the amount of the fine involved. For example, during the World War II emergency, where rubber tires were an essential commodity for our war efforts, and at which time the Government laid down specific regulations and laws where violations took place, we find that when the Government moved in to correct the violation of a small firm and the penalty was inflicted, in most cases it resulted in the fact that the small fellow's right to do business was suspended for a term, which action put them out of business. But, on the other hand, when a larger member of that industry deliberately, Nation-wide, violated the law in a similar manner, by some manner or means he was able to get away with it. Or would we put it this way, Mr. Chairman, "Don't do it again," which is the line with the comments referred to above as made by members of the Senate Civil Service Committee during the examination of Mr. Berge, the then Assistant Attorney General on antitrust enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, it would be in order, in our opinion, to amend H. R. 6679, and to add thereto the provisions outlined in H. R. 4402, as follows:

"That any person convicted of any offense under the antitrust laws shall, as part of the punishment for such offense, be barred, for not less than 2 nor more than 5 years, from serving, directly or indirectly, in the capacity of officer, director, executive, legal counsel, adviser, and any similar capacity, with any corporation or corporations convicted in the same proceedings, and from directly or indirectly receiving any compensation, remuneration, or other consideration therefor, or by way of indemnification for being so barred. If he shall have been connected with any such convicted corporation in any such capacity during the commission of the criminal acts for which he has been convicted, he shall be so barred from such corporation for not less than 3 years, instead of 2 years as provided above. If he is a second offender by reason of prior conviction under the antitrust laws, he shall be barred for not less than 10 years, instead of the time provided for above; if a third offender, he shall be permanently barred, and the bar shall extend to serving with all corporations engaged in commerce."

Finally, as we see the situation, speaking solely in the interest of independent business of this Nation, we come to the conclusion that increasing fine penalties would not arrest the continual violations of antitrust laws, but, on the other hand, if the penalties for removal of officers were added thereto, and the Congress would vote such legislation, it would result in a watchful step by many corporations and their executive officers before they would chance losing their jobs through their own actions, either for a time or permanently.

We also believe there is immediate need for Congress to vote such recommended legislation in view of the fact that such action should be taken before any attempt is made for financial aid for independent business, as the above legislation would provide real protection for long-term capital loans.

It is our hope that your committee will take under advisement the suggested amendment to the bill under consideration and report out the amended bill at the earliest possible moment as such action would be in keeping with the expressed platform promises to independent business for more vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws and the strengthening of the laws by both the Democratic and Republican platform committees. This would be keeping their pledge to independent business of this Nation whom we believe number 3,000,000 or more. We believe for the good of our Nation's welfare that stronger antitrust laws must be enacted immediately, and the penalties for violations being more severe, if our free-enterprise system is to remain and function as independent business of this Nation understands the words "free enterprise."

Hospitalization of Mental Patients by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing herewith a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Georgia which I think will be of interest to the Members of this House who may have such conditions as described in the resolution existing in their States.

Mr. Speaker, in line with the resolution referred to above, I have introduced H. R. 7534, a bill to amend veterans' regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service. I commend this bill to the attention of the membership of this House and hope that we may secure speedy passage of same so that many deserving veterans may be taken from county jails and placed in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it has been forcefully called to the attention of the several members of this house of representatives by the State department of veterans service that hospitalization for mental patients by the Federal Veterans' Administration has become so critical as to be almost unobtainable; and

Whereas we are informed by the Veterans' Administration that this crisis is due to the lack of bed facilities in the various Veterans' Administration hospitals in the vicinity of our State; and

Whereas there are Georgia veterans suffering with mental disabilities languishing and suffering in Georgia jails because of the inability to secure beds for them in Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas there are many of our young veterans that can be cured of these mental conditions if adequate treatment is received without delay; and

Whereas there are 130 Georgia veterans entitled to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities who are hospitalized in the State Hospital for the Insane, Milledgeville, Ga., because the Veterans' Administration was unable to hospitalize them because of the lack of bed facilities; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration hospital at Augusta, Ga., will admit only veterans suffering with mental disabilities incurred as a result of service in the armed forces of the United States of America; and

Whereas the laws of the United States of America provide for hospitalization of veterans irrespective of their service-connected status and since these laws do not discriminate as to the type of disability and since there appears to be discrimination by the Veterans' Administration against mental patients resulting in the aforementioned deplorable condition of our mental patients; and

Whereas it is felt that the Congress of the United States of America did not intend nor does it now desire that the men and women who fought for the preservation of our way of living against the enemies of

our country be thus abandoned to the tortures of mental derangement in jails, inadequate homes and wherever else they may be because the Veterans' Administration will not accept them, and until beds can be made available at the already overcrowded State hospital: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Georgia herein assembled strongly deplore the treatment received by Georgia veterans suffering mental disabilities at the hands of the Federal Veterans' Administration by refusing hospitalization for non-service-connected mental cases, thereby necessitating their prolonged incarceration in the jails of the various counties of this State without treatment and adequate care; and be it further

Resolved, That this critical condition be made known to the Georgia delegation of the Congress of the United States now in session so that they may do all within their power to relieve this critical situation by securing more beds and adequate medical personnel to staff the Veterans' Administration hospitals whereby effective treatment may be rendered and these veterans removed from the pitiful conditions now existing; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the House and that copies be sent to the United States Senators and Representatives in the Congress from this State.

In house, read and adopted February 9, 1950.

J. BOONE,
Clerk of the House.

Visit to the United States by Delegation From World Congress of Partisans of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a State Department release relative to the proposed visit to the United States by a delegation from the World Congress of Partisans of Peace.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY DELEGATION FROM WORLD CONGRESS OF PARTISANS OF PEACE

The World Congress of Partisans of Peace, the leading over-all Communist-front organization in the world, has announced that it is sending a delegation of 12 Europeans to the United States on March 3. The announced purpose of the delegation's visit is to present a petition to the Congress of the United States for (1) cessation of the armaments race by immediate reduction of war budgets and military effectives; and (2) prohibition of atomic weapons.

Members of the delegation have applied for visas to come to the United States. The 12 delegates, on the basis of available information, are either known Communists or fellow travelers and are therefore subject to exclusion from the United States under the immigration laws.

The Department of State, because of the avowed intention of the group to present a petition to Congress, has consulted with majority and minority leadership in both Houses. On March 1, the majority leader of the House, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, addressed the House on the subject. Mr. MCCORMACK said in part:

"Heretofore, the function of this Soviet front-organization has been manipulation of the peace symbol in ways calculated to exploit for selfish Soviet purposes the sincere longing for peace of hundreds of millions of souls throughout the world. It has shown little genuine concern for peace as that term is understood in the free world but abundant zeal for the establishment of conditions favorable to extension of Soviet powers.

* * *

"It is singularly presumptuous of this Soviet-front organization and its sponsors to assume that the legislative branch of this Government would, for a single moment entertain any fraudulent appeals calling on this body in effect to abandon its principles and disregard its solemn responsibilities to the American people and their allies for the security of the United States and the preservation of democratic institutions throughout the free world.

"I am sure the State Department recognizes the situation and will govern itself accordingly in the proper way."

At the close of Mr. MCCORMACK's remarks, the minority leader, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., requested permission to make the following statement:

"I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and I hope the State Department will take the proper action and not permit the visit to be made."

On March 2 Senators TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; SCOTT LUCAS, majority leader; and KENNETH WHERRY all spoke in opposition to the granting of visas to the delegation. Similar opposition was expressed in the House by Congressmen JOHN KEE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and JAMES G. FULTON.

The Department of State, in full concurrence with the congressional expressions above stated, is therefore refusing to grant entry to the proposed delegation.

ANNOUNCEMENT AND SPONSORSHIP OF THE PROPOSED VISIT

The first public announcement of the membership of the delegation to the United States was contained in the February 18, 1950, issuance of the Paris Communist newspaper Humanite. The same source, on February 10, had reported on a February 9 meeting of the Paris Secretariat of the movement at which the decision was made to send delegations to various countries including the United States.

On February 23 a welcoming committee for the World Peace Delegation, with its headquarters in New York, extended an invitation to the delegation to come to the United States. The American group is headed by O. John Rogge and reportedly includes Bishop Moulton, Dr. Linus Pauling, and others who were associated with the so-called Cultural and Scientific Conference on World Peace which met at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, March 25–27, 1949.

BACKGROUND OF PARTISANS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

The partisans-for-peace movement was organized at Communist-line meetings held in Paris and Prague, April 20–25, 1949. It stemmed from an earlier international peace congress at Wroclaw, Poland, held in August 1948. The World Congress of Peace Partisans at Paris established a permanent world peace committee as the central unit in the peace movement. The committee consists of representatives from 54 countries and includes key leaders from such Communist-front organizations as the World Federation of Trade Unions. It has a smaller executive bureau headed by the French atomic scientist, the Communist, Frederic Joliot-Curie.

The peace congresses held in various countries under the auspices of this organization have uniformly followed a Communist line. They have centered their attack on "United States warmongers" and have been most sympathetic to the U. S. S. R. and Soviet foreign policy. The organizational pattern has been to use as spokesmen prominent intellectuals, some of whom are consistent fellow travelers and some of whom are independent leftists, while the direction and machinery remained firmly in Communist hands. Rarely have non-Communist viewpoints been expressed at these congresses. When presented they were quickly blanketed by orthodox Stalinism.

PROGRAM OF THE PARTISANS FOR PEACE

As a major Soviet instrumentality for propaganda and political pressure, the partisans-for-peace movement encompasses virtually all important front organizations through which Communists are appealing for support to labor, women, youth, and other peace-loving people. Leaders of the movement have stated recently that the movement has completed its basic organizational stage and that the time has come for it to undertake concrete tasks.

A series of campaigns, seeking such concrete results, is under way at the present time. A striking aspect of this stage of developments is its open connection with the Cominform and the world Communist movement. Thus, the best summary of the Partisans of Peace program is to be found in the leading editorial of the Cominform organ for February 10, 1950, which claims that the world-wide struggle for peace is entering a new phase of concrete patriotic action against war in which declarations and pacifist phrase-mongering are not enough. The Cominform, therefore, states that the tasks of the Partisans of Peace include a campaign to secure refusal by the workers to produce weapons of death; a campaign among western European transport workers to obtain their refusal to handle American arms, agitation for the withdrawal of French troops in French Indochina, the replacement of the present reactionary governments in France and Italy in order that their parliaments will stop the arms race and annul the North Atlantic pact, and the active support of Soviet proposals to prohibit atomic weapons and to conclude a peace pact among the big powers.

Although the Partisans of Peace are participating in each of the campaigns mentioned by the Cominform, the most important work is being done with reference to two of these. The most spectacular campaign is directed toward closing European ports to American shipments under the mutual defense assistance program. The effort to do this centers largely around a strike campaign coordinated by the World Federation of Trade Unions, an affiliate of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace. The various local and national committees of the Partisans of Peace movement in Europe and actively assisting in this strike campaign by attempting to mobilize mass support through demonstrations, other propaganda methods, and the collection of funds, and by providing a propaganda cover to the strike campaign, which is justified in the name of peace.

In the second of the important Partisans of Peace campaigns, an effort is being made to mobilize world public opinion behind a series of peace proposals which coincide with those presented by the U. S. S. R. delegation to the United Nations—a connection that is mentioned in the official journal of the Partisans of Peace.

A variety of methods is being used by the Partisans of Peace in their effort to mobilize what they will claim to be world public opinion in support of these proposals. These include the collection in a number of countries of millions of signatures for peace ballots, torchlight processions, and other demonstrations, and the petitioning of thousands of municipal councilors and members of parliaments. In this country there is now underway a drive to collect a million signatures in protest against H-bomb diplomacy to be presented to President Truman on April 12, the anniversary of President Roosevelt's death.

The most important aspects of the Partisans of Peace campaign in support of the Soviet peace proposals centers around the effort to secure their formal ratification by the various national assemblies of the world (of which the proposed delegation to the United States is one example). This is being done in two ways: First, the Partisans of Peace organizations in each country are petitioning their own parliaments to ratify these proposals. (A number of satellite parliaments, including Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, have already responded to such appeals.) Second, the World Congress of Partisans of Peace is now planning to send a number of international delegations to appeal to the parliaments of such countries as Belgium, Holland, Italy, France, Mexico, the Soviet Union, and the United States.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE DELEGATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Pablo Picasso: World-famous Spanish painter. A member of the French Communist Party since 1944, he has been a leading figure in various Communist-front organizations, including the International Committee of the World Partisans of Peace.

Rev. Hewlett Johnson: Dean of Canterbury. Member of the editorial board of the Daily Worker. Delegate to several conferences of the Partisans of Peace and British member of the World Peace Committee.

Iver Montagu: British film producer, director and scenarist, and active in many phases of motion-picture production. He has been a Communist Party member since 1932 and is a member of the Daily Worker editorial staff.

Dr. Max Cosyns: Belgium's foremost atomic scientist and associate of Professor Piccard since 1932. An avowed Communist sympathizer, Cosyns has been playing a vigorous role in various front organizations.

Eugene Aubel: Professor of chemistry and biology, University of Paris. A member of the French Communist Party. Active in Communist-front organizations. Delegate, World Congress of Intellectuals, Wroclaw, Poland, 1948, and a member, National Council Combattants de la Liberte et de la Paix (Fighters for Liberty and Peace).

Hans Erni: Well-known Swiss modernist painter. An ardent fellow traveler, he is a leader of the Swiss-Soviet Friendship Association.

Jean Lurcat: Artist, reportedly a member of the French Communist Party and an active member in numerous Communist-front organizations.

Luigi Cacciatore: A parliamentary deputy, Cacciatore is an active leader of the Italian Socialist Party which cooperates with the Italian Communist Party. He was Minister of Posts and Telecommunications in the De Gasperi cabinet in 1947.

Dr. Mario Montesi: Communal councilor of Rome since the liberation. He was at one time active in the Christian Democratic Party but later joined the pro-Communist Christian Movement for Peace.

Giuseppina (Pina) Palumbo: A socialist senator and former social worker, she was the first woman given a post in the Italian Government after liberation. She is now active in leftist women's groups.

Prof. Oliviero Mario Olivo: Highly regarded Italian specialist in anatomy and histology and one-time Rockefeller fellow in the United States. He took part in the leftist-sponsored Congress of Italian Culture in 1948.

Furio Diaz: Communist mayor of Leghorn since the liberation. Thirty-three years old, law graduate; formerly taught at University of Pisa. Member of the Italian Communist Party and its organ, the Friends of Unita.

Not Fooled by President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press of Pontiac, Mich., dated March 2, 1950.

The President may think that he can fool all of the people all of the time. This outstanding newspaper has pointed out in its editorial that the one person to blame for the present coal famine is President Truman, himself.

Many telegrams have reached my desk, urging that impeachment proceedings be instituted against the President.

As long ago as October 27, I wired the President, urging action in the coal crisis. That appeal has been repeated by me to him since that time. Such appeals have been entirely ignored.

Whatever credit the President may take for settling the coal strike is entirely unjustified. The people of the country should know that for political purposes and for political purposes only, he neglected to do his duty to the American people.

The editorial follows:

THE TRUMAN COAL FAMINE

Is your coal bin empty?

If it is or so nearly so that you are alarmed by the threat to your family's health, do you know who is to blame?

The easiest answer to that question would be John L. Lewis and the mine operators. But it wouldn't be the right one.

Mr. Lewis and his United Mine Workers certainly must accept great responsibility for the catastrophe now gripping the Nation. Neither are the mine owners guiltless. But the major weight of blame belongs to one man.

He is President Harry S. Truman.

His dilly-dallying brought on the crisis.

It explains why Pontiac is one of the forty-six Michigan communities forced to the last ditch resort of coal rationing and sharing.

His refusal to take a firm and early hand in this dispute idled nearly 200,000 employees of coal-using industries, besides the 370,000 miners still on strike in defiance of two court injunctions.

At every stage of this slowly developed national emergency the President has procrastinated. Perhaps, as has been suggested, he desired to show the weakness of the Taft-Hartley Act as a means of settling disputes endangering the national welfare.

Instead he has proved his own weakness. And the people are left in the middle.

They are being squeezed between the two ruthless forces of a big labor monopoly and a socialistic Democratic-Labor administration.

The United Mine Workers Union belatedly has been brought into court on a charge of contempt. But there is no certainty that even a heavy fine will persuade the miners to resume work.

Sentiment in Congress is growing for legislation authorizing the President to seize and operate the mines.

We hope this can be avoided.

It is objectionable on two counts.

For one thing it would put Government into a business which should be privately operated. Second, it would enable the administration to make a contract with the UMW the union never could hope to win from the operators.

Past experience shows that the result would be higher coal prices and no greater probability of uninterrupted production in this sick industry. An administration banking heavily on rank-and-file labor votes can't be expected to handle contract negotiations without those votes in mind.

This very step apparently has been the goal of John L. Lewis ever since he cut the workweek to 3 days with the definite intention of bringing on a critical situation. All the way through many months in which the national situation grew steadily worse, President Truman sat quietly by, replying to frequent questions merely that there was no crisis.

The American people should know by now where the major blame lies. They know that votes put the man mainly responsible in the White House. If they don't like the way he has acted, they should remember that votes also can take him out of it.

Transit Radio's Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some agitation about the pros and cons of radio broadcast to trolley cars and busses here in the District of Columbia.

Transit Radio, Inc., is a concern of high reputation and its operations are participated in by some of the best daily newspapers in various sections of the United States. Perhaps music makes some people nervous but this article points out in an honest manner that, contrary to recent agitation, the broadcasts are welcomed by most car and bus riders and, of course, they are not used for anything but legitimate commercial purposes as are any other lawful broadcasting companies. In order that the people of the country will not be deluged by hysteria on the subject I am presenting the following article, reprinted from Broadcasting-Telecasting, a trade publication, issue of February 6:

(By C. L. (Chet) Thomas, president, Transit Radio, Inc., general manager, KXOX-AM-FM, St. Louis)

The case for Transit Radio has never been fully made. It is impressive. The main arguments in favor of Transit Radio are:

The riders of public transportation like Transit Radio.

They like its music. It is good music—popular in the best sense, neither heavily

classical nor radically "jive." It is the type of music that, according to psychologists and experts in industrial relations, soothes people and reduces tension. Without cost the riders of public transportation are given the same kind of service with which many businesses at considerable cost provide their customers and employees. Without cost the riders of public transportation receive the very best radio service available to the riders of private automobiles. Without cost they hear this service reproduced with a fidelity equal to that of the most expensive receiving sets in private automobiles. The riders of public transportation receive this excellent transmission of this excellent program during what is to most of them the most tedious parts of their day.

CITES LISTENER APPEAL

The riders of public transportation like the nonmusic services provided by Transit Radio also. They like the brief newscasts and weather reports. Most of them like the advertising because it acquaints them with available goods and services.

We know the riders of public transportation like Transit Radio because we have checked it. Here is the summary of the results of five surveys made in St. Louis, Washington, D. C., Baltimore, and Kansas City by Edward G. Doody & Co. during 1948–49:

"Eight out of 10 riders favor Transit Radio as a part of regular service. Less than 1 out of 10 object. The rest don't care or are undecided. However, even among those who say they object, there is a substantial group which would not object, if the majority favored permanent installations. Thus, only a fractional group of active objectors remains opposed even against majority will."

Transit Radio helps the transit companies provide sound, efficient, and economical service.

Insofar as Transit Radio provides public-transit companies with a source of income in addition to their fares, it is helping to make possible good public transportation at minimum cost.

Transit Radio makes it possible for the drivers of busses and streetcars to meet emergencies.

In this regard Transit Radio has already shown its capabilities. Because of newscasts received over Transit Radio, bus and streetcar drivers in Washington, D. C., and St. Louis have known how to avoid areas blocked off by fires. Because of newscasts over Transit Radio, drivers in Houston, Tex., did their jobs better during a hurricane. These instances are portents of vastly more important uses.

The American people are just beginning to look full in the face the job of reducing their vulnerability to atomic attack. The need was underscored once when the United States developed the atomic bomb. It was underscored a second time when the Soviet Union did likewise. It is being underscored a third time by debate over the forthcoming development of a hydrogen bomb, potentially 1,000 times more powerful than the A-bomb. One of the obvious and essential requirements of civil defense will be a means by which the public transportation systems can be mobilized to move great numbers of people out of threatened areas and to move civil defenders to their posts of duty. The means, of course, is FM radio, which was used by tanks, artillery, planes, infantry, etc., during World War II.

Thanks to Transit Radio, the busses and streetcars of 19 American cities are already equipped with radio which in the event of an emergency could be used for guidance. This is done without cost to the taxpayers, the riders, or the public transit companies. It is being done while giving the riders the best radio service available. It is being done while giving that same service to the entire community. Arrangements are under way to provide Transit Radio to 25 or 30 other American cities.

Against this imposing array of advantages, only one argument has been advanced by its critics. "It violates the rider's right not to listen," they say. "In this way it violates his right to privacy and assails the freedom of his mind."

First, how many riders of public transportation do not like Transit Radio? Take the 8 out of 10 riders who like Transit Radio. Add those who are undecided. Add those who do not care. Add those who do not like it but who withdraw their objections in deference to the majority preference. As the Edward G. Doody Co. says, "only a fractional group of active objectors remains." This fractional group ranges from 1.2 percent to 5.3 percent.

But the critics brush these figures aside. "It isn't a question of percentages," they say. "It is a question of the rights of the minority however small. The offensive thing about Transit Radio is that it holds its audience captive."

Is advertising over Transit Radio really different from advertising generally? The answer is no. All advertising tries to hold the attention of its audience.

Take the ads in newspapers and magazines. Can a person escape seeing them? Not if he wants to read the paper or magazine. The periphery of his vision takes them in, willy-nilly.

HIGHWAY SIGNS

Take advertising on aural radio or TV. Can a person in his home escape hearing and seeing the "plugs?" Not if he wants to listen and watch. Of course, he could switch the program off or turn it down during the commercial. But he doesn't. And to do so would require a greater attention and a greater exertion than not doing so.

Take advertising signs along the highway, particularly those head on at curves. Can a driver escape seeing them? Not if he wants to keep the car on the road.

This list could be expanded—the show windows of stores, the card advertising in busses and streetcars, the posters on subway pillars, etc.

In each case the individual who does not want to hole up like a hermit is exposed to advertising.

But he certainly is not a captive. He frees himself by controlling his attention, either consciously or, more often, unconsciously. The stream of stimuli assailing the senses is limitless and unending, even on a desert island. The mind selects those it wants to use and of necessity ignores the others. This is elementary psychology. Everybody does this every minute of every day, even when asleep. One does it so naturally that one isn't aware of doing it. Nobody, on a bus or streetcar who doesn't like transit radio need pay attention to it. One can bring to bear the same habits by which one is able to ignore other things one wants to exclude.

People who ride public transportation systems are already prepared to "tune out" transit radio if they want to. They have been trained to do so by the noises that inevitably attend public transportation, the sound of the motor, the clash of gears, the jolts and jars, the horn, etc.

Privacy on a bus? The same kind of privacy that there is in Madison Square Garden: The privacy of concentration. If a rider doesn't want to listen to the conversations of his fellow passengers, he doesn't have to. ("This morning when I got up I didn't feel well. I wasn't really sick. Just butterflies in the stomach, you know.") If he wants to, he can pay attention. ("And I told my husband, if you want to keep your little girl friend, you can, but you can't keep me.") In the same way the rider can tune transit radio in or out at will.

Minority rights are not at stake. But the rights of the majority are at stake—the rights of the 8 out of 10 riders, who want transit radio. These the competitors of transit radio would deprive. They would deprive them of the radio service they like. They would deprive them of an agency that may some day save millions of lives.

The real reason for most of the opposition to transit radio is not ideological at all. It is mercenary self-interest.

Transit radio is able to do effectively what all advertising tries to do. It reaches a mass audience. It can tell its clients precisely how big. It reaches special kinds of audiences. It can tell its clients precisely what kinds and the precise times when they can be reached. It provides these services to the advertisers in the best tradition of advertising—while providing a public service that the people need and like.

Competition for the pieces of the pie of the advertiser's dollar has always been keen. It has never before been so keen as it is today. Established media have always tried to block newer competitors. AM radio was opposed. FM radio was opposed. Car-card advertising was opposed. Billboard advertising was opposed. And so on. Now, and for the same reasons, transit radio is being opposed. The only differences are two: The opponents of transit radio are hiding their commercial motives behind a facade a bit more fancy than usual. And the opponents of transit radio are resorting to tactics of unprecedented viciousness and desperation.

The Future of the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a special bipartisan commission, appointed in the same manner as the Hoover Commission on Organization of Government, to study the coal industry and report back to the Congress in January 1951. The commission would recommend a long-range program to put the industry on a sound economic basis and prevent the recurrence of the constant crises in the industry which in recent years have so seriously threatened our country's economic stability.

Two excellent articles in the Christian Science Monitor for March 2 present data which show the need for such a study. Both are written by the able journalist, Harlan Trott.

I include these articles, entitled "Coal's Smoky Future" and "Coal Faces Dark Technological Future," in the RECORD and commend them to the serious attention of my colleagues:

COAL'S SMOKY FUTURE

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Just because the Nation is in the throes of a national crisis over the miners' refusal to dig coal is no sign that management in the coal industry is without its blind spots.

The big commercial operators do not seem alarmed unduly over the fact that their market is shrinking at the rate of several million tons a year due to switchovers to oil and gas, not just by householders, but by big industrial users as well.

One hears little about these shrinking markets except during coal strikes, at which time comments on John L. Lewis' ability as a gas and oil salesman are in order.

Coal operators take the view that the future of coal is secure because of its essential tie-in with the electric power industry. The latest bituminous coal annual has this to say: "If this be the 'age of electricity,' consider that bituminous coal is the foremost fuel for producing electric power and lighting, and it is basic to the expansive prospects. The electric utilities in 1949 became bituminous coal's largest single market, and will probably continue so."

Lately, however, several big electric power companies have switched from coal to oil, and some of the big coal companies along the eastern seaboard have gone into the business of selling oil to industrial customers who have converted to oil.

Conversions of steam-generated electric plants from coal to natural gas are increasing, too. Gas pipe lines are spreading their steel tentacles all over the map. Right now, Texas natural gas is worming its way to Bangor, Maine.

One wonders whether coal operators are not being unduly optimistic about their security in the age of electricity. Opponents of public service monopolies would have us believe that the linked power systems they call the electric power trust still epitomizes the danger of bigness.

But how about oil?

Actually, the electric power industry does not begin to compare in size with the business of supplying fuel for the Nation's millions of automobiles.

Private electric power companies own about 100,000,000 horsepower of combined installed generating capacity. But the automotive industry manufactures 100,000,000 horsepower of new automobile engines every 2½ months. That means that five times a year the branch of private enterprise which technologists call the "oil-power trust" duplicates the electric power industry's entire installed capacity.

In order to fuel this vast market, big oil companies have acquired control of crossroad corner lots and staked out their claim with shiny motor pumps. These oil-power dispensaries are known in our motorized folklore as gas stations. Their slogan is "Fill 'er up!"

In thinking about coal, the country seems to have fallen into a kind of mass fatalism whereby we write off any future for coal on the theory that, as President William Green of the AFL told Congress last week, it is a "sick" industry. Calling a thing sick never healed it.

For a long time coal technologists have been trying to tell us that there's nothing sick but the industry's thinking. They have been demanding that the industry dust off its data and widen the horizons of its research in order to perfect and apply the processes of converting coal into oil.

If the coal industry's faith in the electric power industry's shaky dependence on it is not enough to save it, perhaps oil will. Many years ago State universities and Federal research agencies learned how to run automobiles on gasoline distilled from coal.

Officials in the United States Bureau of Mines have said on numerous occasions that the bulk of the Nation's vast coal deposits contain upward of 20 to 30 gallons of good refinery oil per ton of coal.

This is another way of saying that the Nation wasted in excess of 300,000,000 barrels of oil last year in the 600,000,000 tons of raw coal that Mr. Lewis' men poured into the market.

Bureau of Mines officials will tell you that the smoke that goes up the chimney is more than a blot on the landscape. It's writing on the sky, a warning against squandering the earth's wealth, an appeal to make this a richer and more beautiful America.

Barely a fortnight ago the Standard Oil Co. announced the closing of its oil-from-coal experimental plant at Library, Pa., due to unstable labor conditions. Given the vigorous, perceptive leadership of a union leader like Walter Reuther, the miners would not have let this happen.

Here certainly is the underlying challenge that emerges from this current crisis in coal. Put technology to work, and there will be work enough for the men who dig coal.

COAL FACES DARK TECHNOLOGICAL FUTURE

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—"There is no technology in sight to save the coal industry."

This is the opinion voiced by the Government's second-ranking expert on synthetic fuels. He is Dr. W. C. Schroeder, Chief of the Office of Synthetic Liquid Fuels in the Fuels and Explosives Service of the Bureau of Mines.

Dr. Schroeder's views carry special impact, coming at a time when the Nation is in the grip of its worst coal crisis in history.

Behind the unwillingness of John L. Lewis' 400,000 members of the United Mine Workers to dig coal without a contract is the economic fact that competition from natural gas and oil has cut into the coal market so badly that full-time employment for most of the coal miners appears to be a thing of the past.

ATOMIC PLANT CONVERTED

A series of postwar coal strikes has forced many large industrial coal users as well as householders to turn to other fuels, which are not only more convenient than coal but the supply will not be interrupted by strikes.

Uncertain coal supplies resulting from labor unrest in the mines was directly responsible for the Atomic Energy Commission's decision to convert its huge Oak Ridge project from coal to natural gas.

When the Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Co. and the Standard Oil Co. opened their joint coal gasification pilot plant at Library, Pa., a couple of years ago, it appeared that industry leaders were determined to try to save the coal business by converting the Nation's vast, latently oil-rich coal deposits into synthetic liquid fuels by this German-pioneered approach to oil-from-coal technology.

Such an undertaking held big implications for the men who dig coal. Mr. Lewis was invited to the formal opening of the pilot plant. Bowing to George Love, president of Pittsburgh Consolidation, the miners' chieftain told the gathering: "The great financial efforts of the company to increase not only its own earnings, but those of its employees, augurs well for the future stability and strength of America."

No such fanfare marked the closing of this project last January 6, while the Nation was suffering for want of enough of the 2,000-year supply of coal that lies underground.

Mr. Love blamed the failure of the project on the miners.

"Things are so bad from an economic standpoint," he declared, "that we see no reason to carry on this particular work further at this time. To be successful, a plant of the type we had planned would have to have cheap coal and complete assurance of a regular coal supply. Under present circumstances the labor relations in the industry are so bad that none of these things are possible. No sane person would dream of investing great sums of money in a venture which was tied to coal as a raw material when the future cost is so indefinite and the supply of coal so unreliable."

Standard Oil took a different tack.

LONG-RANGE VIEW

"With the return of a more nearly normal increase in oil demand and with greatly increased world petroleum supplies," the company said, "it now appears that the need for converting coal to oil is not pressing."

Dr. Schroeder discounted the explanation given out by Mr. Love. He said he thought Standard Oil had "got all the data out of it they were going to get."

Some observers are wondering how the coal miners feel about this oil-company view of the miners' dismal long-range prospects for steady employment.

A prominent coal technologist recently told Mr. Lewis that now is the time to begin making a coal and shale supply the base load of the Nation's oil requirements.

At the same time, he was asked to throw his weight behind the idea of having the country's diminishing petroleum take care of seasonal peaks or national emergencies. He was told that the miners should have a say in the best use of the Nation's fuel reserves.

Mr. Lewis was told that this was labor's opportunity to create new, steady, full-time employment, and to help develop low-cost power for the farmers, who now use 10 times more oil-consuming automotive power than industry.

Ye Were Afraid To Live, and So Ye Perished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Hal Boyle:

YE WERE AFRAID TO LIVE, AND SO YE PERISHED

(By Hal Boyle)

There came a time when the earth was divided into two hemispheres, the east and the west.

Great was the contention between them, and each charged the other with seeking to rule the world. And the hemispheres became armed camps.

There were then 4,000,000,000 people in the world. No man's mouth was free to speak his yearning, and all men bent under the burden of readying their hemisphere against the enemy.

Nine-tenths of every drop of sweat, every yard of cloth, every pound of gold, every ton of steel was spent to safeguard the peace. This was true everywhere upon the globe. The people groaned in their tatters, but the engines of war were gleaming and fed.

It chanced that on a warm and moonless night in April the Island of Bermuda disappeared, with a titanic crash, beneath the surface of the sea. Two passing air liners saw it go down in a dim tower of foam. They radioed an alarm.

Three hours later a 50-square-mile area of forestland in Siberia erupted in broken greenery from the impact of a gigantic force.

The chancelleries of the world held hurried conference and agreed: Counterattack.

And the engines of war were unleashed. Each side sent up huge guided missiles, carrying hydrogen bombs in their warheads. The slender missiles passed in midair over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, leaving a murmurous sigh in their wake.

Where they landed, cities or landscapes disappeared—and so did radio stations, and cows, and violins, and old books, and the paintings of Rembrandt, and the lives of millions of people.

"Victory or death," cried the eastern leader.

"Win or perish," cried the western leader.

And the bombs mushroomed by the hundreds, then by the thousands. And great winds arose and carried the dust of death over every land. In 6 weeks every man,

woman, and child, every bird, every beast, was gone. The trees gave up their leaves, the moss turned white, and no ant crawled.

The last thing on earth to die was a worm 4 miles south of Oak Ridge, Tenn. It was washed out of the soil by a radioactive rain—and collapsed.

Then the spectral spirits of earth's 4,000,000,000 people flew in a vast host to the gold bar of Heaven. Through the gates they could see green grass and rainbow flowers. And the gates opened, and the souls of all the slain children skipped into Heaven.

And the parents surged after them, but a mighty voice called:

"Wait." And they waited.

"Why did ye this unto Me?" said the voice.

"They started it," cried the leader of the East.

"No, you started it," cried the leader of the West.

So, the celestial bookkeeper was called, and he said:

"On a night in April a small island in the Atlantic was struck by a large meteor. Three hours later—hmmm, very unusual—another meteor landed in a Siberian forest. Then everyone on earth just seemed to lose his mind."

"Why?" said the mighty voice.

"Because we were afraid," said the leader of the West.

"Yes, because we were afraid," said the leader of the East.

"Ye were afraid to live—therefore ye died," said the voice. "Look at the Eden I gave ye."

The great host turned and looked across the fields of space. They saw the dear familiar earth, the hills of home, spinning in gray ruin under a silent sky.

And as they watched the gates of Heaven closed noiselessly behind them.

The Fearless, Able Work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Ability of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI To Ferret Out the Truth and Their Courage To Make It Known Made Possible the Exposure and Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the persistent, able, patriotic, and fearless efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the work of J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI forces, the ablest fact-finding organization in the world, brought to light the treasonable acts of Alger Hiss in stealing secret documents from the files of the State Department and turning them over to a Russian spy ring. There would have been no exposure of Hiss and he would not have been indicted, tried, and convicted for perjury in denying his treasonable conduct but for the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI.

Always, as a Member of the House, I have supported both the Committee on Un-American Activities and J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which appeared in the United States Investor under date of February 18, 1950. This Corporation protects more than 100,000,000 depositors in our banks, and it is the major stabilizing influence for the entire banking structure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FDIC ITSELF—TWO PHASES NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRESENT MOVEMENT TOWARD REDUCTION OF ASSESSMENTS HAS MADE OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

In all this discussion, now current at Washington, as to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and its assessments, two phases can easily be overlooked. One is that the Corporation has made other definite contributions to the uplift of American banking besides the protection of depositors from loss. Our banks of State charter operate on a definitely higher level now than in the days before this Corporation came into being and no small degree of credit for the improvement must be given to the Corporation and to the very capable men who have served at its head.

MEMBERSHIP COST THUS FAR

The other is the fact—and we are prepared to defend this statement against those who cling to an opposite view—that the cost represented by the annual assessments paid by banks into the Corporation has not been exorbitant. We do not mean by this that the present movement for reduction of these assessments is out of order or even badly timed. We do wish that the banks of some of our States were blessed with greater capital funds than they have thus far accumulated. A ratio of capital funds to deposits of no better than 1 to 20, existing now in several major States, is not so large a first defense against bad banking or economic upheaval as it should be. But with the American Bankers Association on record as believing that the funds saved through reduced assessments may well go to the building up of capital account, the case for reduction at the present time is strong. Hitherto, the money accruing to the Corporation from the assessments has represented no more than a reasonable outlay by the American banking system for the protection of its depositors.

THE PROBLEM OF STATE EXAMINATIONS

Let's talk a bit further about each of these phases of the problem. First, about the uplift to American banking which the Corporation has very definitely helped to bring about. It was no secret, in the days prior to 1933 that bank examinations varied in quality as between national banks and State banks in a good many parts of this country. Of course, in a State like New York or Connecticut or Massachusetts, there had been a determined purpose to bring the examinations of State banks and trust companies up to the level of national-bank examinations and for the most part this result had been accomplished. Even in those States, however, there were occasional lapses from the avowed high purpose. Some less worthy person, pushed forward on political considerations, would obtain the office of superintendent or commissioner of banks and a let-down in quality of bank supervision would almost inevitably follow. On the whole, however, you could count on the State bank examinations of part of our States.

Unfortunately, there were plenty of other States where examinations of State-chartered institutions were way below the level of examinations of national banks. It became something of an axiom among people moving their businesses from one State to another that if they wished to play safe with their bank accounts they would better lodge these with a national bank. The quality of national-bank examinations was good and had a tendency to become even better. For a number of years before 1933 the office of Comptroller of the Currency was held by a series of strong men and they instilled the quality of strength in the bank examining force. In the States, there was much less attention given by Governors to the quality of commissioners whom they appointed and these in turn set mediocre standards or worse for the work of their examiners.

CORPORATION HAS ACCOMPLISHED MUCH

Indeed, when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation first became a reality, there were plenty of critics to declare that it would certainly flounder upon the reefs created by poor State bank examinations. One of the greatest tributes one can pay to the splendid record which Leo T. Crowley made as the first chairman of the corporation is to say that he sensed quite clearly the challenge presented to him by the then character of State bank examinations. One of his first undertakings was to lift such examinations to a level comparable with that of national-bank examinations. Under chairman Harl this same high purpose has been continued.

At times, this undertaking on Mr. Crowley's part called for a considerable measure of diplomatic skill. State bank examiners have never been noted for their enthusiasm over suggestions from Federal authorities. To make matters more complex, there was a considerable disposition among the State banks themselves to look askance at the new bank examining force which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was creating and to complain that this meant duplication of examinations of State banks and a lot of annoyance, therefore, to bank operating men. But patience and diplomacy on the part of the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation won out in the end. Not only is there a fine spirit of amity today between State bank examiners and the examiners of the corporation, but there is a genuine purpose that examinations shall be of a distinctly high order.

LESS OF POLITICS NOW

The commissioner of strong political antecedents and present political activity is a rare creature among our State banking systems today. It is literally true that in some of our States where political rivalry is very much in evidence, all of the factions seem to have come to the common belief that politics has no place in the office of the Commissioner of Banks. One State of the South comes very much to mind in this connection, where three groups are savagely contending for mastery of State affairs and where in ordinary matters no holds are barred. Yet in that State, the bank commissioner's office has been kept quite out of the struggle and examinations of banks are worthy of the standards which the most enlightened States are setting. A large degree of credit for this goes to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which has set high standards of examination for itself and by its example has

done much to create high standards among each State's own examiners. As a matter of fact, the men who operate State banks would probably make their voices heard if State examinations were to drop below the Federal level.

ITS OWN EXAMINING FORCE

All along, of course, the corporation has sensed the grave need of keeping its own examining force up to a high level of quality. The Corporation has an exceptionally heavy assignment. It must keep itself so strong financially that it will never fail to indemnify the bank depositors of this country against loss. It has a substantial trust fund committed to its care for this purpose, and it must protect that fund to the extent of its ability from erosion. Big as $1,200,000,000 of capital and surplus sounds, to the ears of most of us, it is really a tiny accumulation when compared with the hundreds of billions of deposits which it undertakes to insure against loss. The Corporation really has no choice but to keep capable and wide-awake examiners on the job if it is to make that modest insurance fund do the work. There is no room for political appointees in that examining force. There is room only for the best examiners that the means of the Corporation will permit it to employ.

Now how does it go about the selection of men for this force? It selects them by two kinds of examinations. There is first the written examination, common to all people nowadays who wish to enter the civil service of the Federal Government. As everybody knows, however, written examinations can turn up some bewildering results. Your man whose marks are high is not always adapted to the work of examining a bank. He has to have personal qualities in keeping with this particular kind of work. Besides the ability to go over books of account and wring from them the story they have to tell, and perhaps the secrets they are withholding, the examiner must know how to get along with people, how to cooperate with his fellow examiners and how to make the people of the bank respect the work he does and the things he says.

So each person who passes the written examination appears before a committee for judgment of his personal aptness. There are representatives of the Civil Service Commission, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and of the banks on this committee. The man who emerges from this test ought to make a good assistant examiner, the grade to which he is assigned at first.

THE TRAINING IS CONTINUED

Don't you believe, however, that the efforts of the corporation to keep its examining force up to a high order stop with this set of examinations. It has a vigorous educational program which all the assistant examiners must take. As of a comparatively recent date, over 300 members of the examining force of the corporation were taking courses through the various chapters of the American Institute of Banking. They are expected, you see, to train themselves for evermore skillful work. The force already contains a great number of AIB graduates.

Then a picked group who have advanced from assistant examiners to examiners and have shown particular aptitude for the work are given courses at the expense of the Corporation either in the Graduate School of Banking conducted under the auspices of the American Bankers Association at Rutgers University, or at the corresponding school in Wisconsin and on the Pacific coast. Something like a dozen men, we believe, were enrolled at Rutgers as of a recent date, and several others enrolled at the two other institutions.

Quite a far cry, isn't it, from the kind of bank examiners which this plan aims to create, and we think does create, and the kind of examiners of other years who not infrequently owed their appointments to the endorsement of some man high in political life or to the proneness of some bank commissioner for favoring his political henchmen? While it has been lifting the quality of State bank examinations generally, the Corporation has devoted earnest effort to equipping itself with a dependable and capable examining force. Through these it is conducting the examinations of 6,600 banks or nearly half the whole number of insured banks in this country.

THOSE OUTLAYS FOR INTEREST

Now for our second assertion, namely, that the cost of deposit insurance up till now has not been exorbitant. When we say that, we must naturally produce a yardstick for measuring the accuracy of our statement. We can do it. Prior to the banking troubles of the early 1930's, one extravagant expenditure had taken deep root among the banks of this country, that of paying interest on demand deposits. Somehow the banking profession could not get rid of this evil, no matter how much the more thoughtful bank men were inclined to deplore it. Competition among banks had brought the unfortunate practice into being and that same competition was too keen to permit discontinuance of the practice. Some fine old banks stood out against it but they succumbed in the end for fear of losing deposits to the banks which were paying interest. This one outlay constituted a drain upon bank income which was considerable, and we are firmly of the belief that it contributed in some measure to the banking debacle of 1933.

Along with this unhappy practice was another mischievous arrangement, the effort on the part of banks to pay rates of interest on time deposits which earnings did not warrant. The practice reached its worst phases in areas where joint stock banks, National or State, attempted to pay the same rates as mutual savings banks were paying. The latter could very comfortably pay 4 percent and sometimes paid 5 percent. And commercial banks competing with them tried to keep up with this pace that the mutual savings banks were setting. As they look back now, they know that they cut an absurd figure by any such antics as these. The savings banks had abundant surplus funds on which they had no interest to pay, whereas the commercial banks were quite without this happy feature.

So here were two drains upon the commercial banks in the 1920's and early 1930's, interest on demand deposits and excessive payments of interest on time deposits. Not until the Government itself stepped into the situation and brought order out of chaos was anything done to cure this evil. The Government decreed that no interest whatever should be paid on demand deposits and it put control over interest on time deposits in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

MAKES COST OF INSURANCE LOOK SMALL

Now we have no figures as to the whole amount of money that was being wasted each year through these two drains. We have some figures from the national banks as to how much they paid out each year in interest on demand deposits. In 1928 the amount was $186,287,000, in 1929 was $173,204,000, in 1930 was $170,838,000, and in 1931 was $152,383,000. Remember, these outlays were for interest on demand deposits alone. What the national banks paid by way of excessive interest on time deposits is a figure not available. Furthermore, we have no figures for the payment of interest in these same years by State-chartered banks on either demand deposits or by way of excess payments on time deposits. So it is safe to say that the amount wasted in 1928 was several times $186,287,000 and was likewise several times the amount given above for the succeeding years.

Well, here is our yardstick for measuring what has been the actual cost of Federal deposit insurance to the banks of this country in each of the years from 1945 through 1948. The total assessments paid by the banks in 1945 were only $93,662,000. That, you see, is just about one-half the amount paid by the national banks alone in 1928 for interest on demand deposits. The whole amount of the assessments paid by the banks of this country for deposit insurance in 1946 was $107,033,000. In 1947 it was $114,429,000; in 1948 it was $119,227,000. How modest is each of these figures compared with what national banks alone were paying out prior to the act of 1933 for interest on demand deposits alone, and how positively tiny it must be in comparison with what National banks and State banks together were paying by way of interest on demand deposits and excessive interest payments on time deposits. So it cannot very well be argued that deposit insurance has been a luxurious outlay for our banks, taking them as a whole, when this outlay is so much less than they were paying in the 1920's as a penalty for certain evils of competition which they could not eradicate.

PURGED OF WEAKNESSES

The story of Federal deposit insurance is a record of splendid achievement. It confounds those of us who were inclined to look askance at the whole idea at the time of its inception and to question whether it had one chance in many of success or even of survival. Part of this success, of course, is due to the fact that both National and State banking systems had been pretty thoroughly purged of weak situations before the Corporation came into being. But the Corporation, by diligent attention to its own bank examinations, on the one hand, and to those of the State bank commissioners, on the other, has done much to keep State bank systems purged in the years that have followed. One may fairly say that, thus far, Federal insurance of deposits has been worth all it has cost.

Hon. Walter F. George, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senator WALTER GEORGE," under the caption "Did you happen to see," written by John White, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE

SENATOR WALTER GEORGE

Here is the rock of Capitol Hill, the great moderate, the immovable moderate, the man who believes that the country's future depends on careful, thoughtful, slowly wrought change, the long-term optimist who will not be discouraged by sudden jerks which threaten to upset the governmental struc-

ture, nor falsely encouraged by the appearance of quick illusory blessings.

Like a rock in stormy seas, he seems occasionally lost in the winds and waves which roar over Capitol Hill—but when the storm subsides, there he is, unshaken. He goes on and on. Not overly concerned with present fame or blame, he concerns himself always with the future.

President Roosevelt found that out in 1938. F. D. R., because GEORGE had opposed the Supreme Court packing plan, tried to purge him from the Senate. GEORGE, the long-term optimist, showed a thorough mastery of short-term politics—he campaigned himself to a thumping victory—but the first thing he did when he returned triumphantly to Washington was appeal for peace in the Democratic Party.

He, like TAFT of the Republicans, displays the rarest of qualities of modern statesmanship, a profound and fixed regard for important issues and their ultimate effects.

WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE was born some 3 miles from Preston, county seat of Webster County, Ga., on January 29, 1878, and in 1889 moved to Cordele, where he went to school. He also went to school in the musically named town of Arabi. For 2 years he taught school, then in the fall of 1897 he entered Mercer University, emerging in 1900 with a bachelor of science degree. Mercer has since honored him with an honorary doctor of laws degree and has named its law school after him.

He was admitted to the bar in 1901, practiced in Vienna, pronounced Vi-anna, Ga., became a solicitor general, a judge, and finally an associate justice of the State supreme court.

In 1922 he was elected to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Thomas Watson, and he has been reelected faithfully ever since. In 1928 he was his State's choice for the presidential nomination.

His main interest has always been finance, although for a while he had to divide his time between chairmaning the Finance Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, and in his 28 Senate years he has taken part in some of the most important tax legislation ever passed in this country.

Now he is particularly anxious to broaden social-security coverage and increase benefits, abolish wartime excise taxes on necessities, and in general revise our tax-law structure.

GEORGE is a serious, direct man, who has watched with great concern the drift of Government toward expansion, more power, and more bureaucracy. He does not like this drift. But he believes it is inevitable, and he believes the solution depends not upon laws, but men, "selection of good men by the executive branch—good American citizens of broad vision and devotion to the economic and political system we have built up, men who regard administration of the laws as a sacred trust."

Men, that is to say, like himself.

JOHN WHITE.

Corporate Profits, Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Corporate Profits, Taxes," published in the Evening Star-News of Culver City, Calif., on Monday, February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE PROFITS, TAXES

A Department of Commerce report shows corporate profits, one of the big sources of taxes to support the Government, turned upward in the third quarter of 1949, but will be considerably less for the year than for 1948. In 1948 corporate profits before taxes amounted to $34,800,000,000 compared with an estimated $28,900,000,000 last year.

But after taxes corporate profits retained for dividends and reserves for improvements were reduced last year from $21,200,000,000 in 1948 to an estimated $17,500,000,000. This is a little less than 8 percent of the total national income of $223,400,000,000 or a little over 12 percent of the compensation of all employees amounting to $142,200,000,000.

While profits for corporations were down last year, compared with 1948, compensation of employees was up and amounted to nearly 65 percent of the national income. Corporate taxes to be paid this year on last year's earnings will amount to $11,400,000,000, only $5,400,000,000 less than the pay rolls of Government civilian workers last year, which amounted to $16,800,000,000 or almost 15 percent of all the wages paid to all the workers in private industry.

Corporation profits are very much overestimated by many uninformed voters who do not realize that wages, interest, proprietors' business, professional, farm, and rental income last year accounted for nearly 86 percent of the national income. Corporation taxes, therefore, are a heavy burden placed on less than 15 percent of the national income.

Yet corporate profits after taxes are only a little more than the wages of all the civilian workers in the Government service. The Government workers produce nothing and, therefore, their wages and salaries add that much to inflation and increased prices on goods produced outside the Government and taxed to support Government bureaucracy.

Corporation taxes like all other taxes must be added to production costs. Therefore, the greater the cost of Government the greater the cost of living to those at work outside and inside Government bureaucracy. And, added to the high prices of goods and services because of high taxes, we are now faced with further inflation in the cost of living by deficit financing at Washington that will increase the public debt and still further increase the cost of living for this and perhaps future generations.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Taxes!" which appeared in the Cavalier Chronicle, published at Cavalier, N. Dak., on the 12th of January 1950. I particularly recommend this to all Senators who have been voting in favor of sending American money across the ocean.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES

Although the weather has been cold for the past some time in our good country, there is one subject that may not warm the atmosphere too much but it does bring up the blood pressure so a person can get warm under the collar regardless of what the thermometer says outside.

When groups of individuals (two or more) are in a huddle and having a discussion you can bet that they are all talking about the same thing. The writer is not too sure that many are not only talking over this subject but it is constantly on their minds while they sleep as well.

Well, it may be that people have become aroused, and many have become angry over this subject that seems to be first in the minds of the folks today.

Readers, it is not the atomic bomb, it is not the China question, it is not the price of wheat, spuds, or any other farm products. Neither is it John Lewis, Truman, or the Governor. All these seem to be in the background now.

The big question today is taxes.

Since the tax notices have been sent out a person hears nothing else discussed.

For the benefit of those who are not interested in decreasing taxes the writer wishes to inform them that the people are not only talking about the situation, but they will see that something is done about it. They will not stand idly by and see this situation continue.

Like everyone else, this writer has no idea where or how to start. That is the $64 question. But there is a way and if the people continue in the spirit they now have you can bet they will find a way to decrease the tax burden as it is today.

This big increase in taxes is not piled onto any particular group or class of people, according to reports that have reached the ears of this writer. The farmer, the businessman, the home owner, and the owner of personal property have all been hit and hit hard. Some received a stiffer rap than others because of unjust valuation of property, but generally speaking everyone has been hit and, believe me, hard too.

Let me point out the seriousness of this situation and the writer hopes some definite action will be taken before it is too late. If it continues we are in for times much harder than can now be realized.

How will we be able to continually pay this heavy tax burden if our income continues to go down?

Remember those taxes must be paid. They are not an income tax and your ability to pay is not based on your income, but you must pay them. Income tax is paid on the basis of your income. Property tax of any kind must be paid regardless of whether you have made the money to pay them or not.

According to law, if you do not pay property taxes, in time you will lose your property. That is what must be prevented, not when it is too late.

It is well known that income to almost everyone in Pembina County and over the Nation has decreased. Cost of production continues to rise, whether you are engaged in farming or in business, and in case of an employee his cost of living shows no signs of going down.

With production cost continually rising and income or business volume decreasing it is obvious that something must happen. What it will be no one knows or when; no one knows—except Truman—who can see big things in year 2000.

The writer believes it is best for us not to wait 50 years or take much stock in Truman's predictions that in 50 years all will be rosy. Something has to be done now to prevent, as one farmer stated, "death by taxation."

One good, honest, reliable man, who does not have the reputation of being a complainer, stated to the writer this morning that "you can bet there will be nothing done in Washington this session to reduce taxes." That looks like the picture.

It is the belief of many that economy should start in Washington, and start this session, not after they are elected this year.

Personally I read several newspapers and looked them over closely, but I do not find many in Washington today thinking along the lines of economy. It seems they have a tendency to increase our taxes rather than save.

We as taxpayers—that means all of us—should show the politicians, regardless of what party they are associated with, that we want economy and want it now.

No doubt there will be action if the temperament of the people today is an indication of what is to come. People cannot and should not be expected to have such a tax burden placed upon them. There must be a way to find cuts, and no doubt organizations will be formed that will look into the question and make a drive for economy.

Voters, this is your year to put the ax to spendthrifts. Don't let politicians make promises and break them. Let them know we want economy and will accept no substitute.

We realize the opinions of this newspaper will not change the tax deal, but we wish to tell those responsible for such tremendous increases that no one likes it, and it will not be taken lying down by the people of Pembina County.

They will not allow anyone to tax them out of their homes, off their farms, out of business, or take their personal belongings by taxation.

They will rise up and fight this thing until economy gets into the heads of the powers to be.

If taxpayers will sit down and write Messrs. LANGER, YOUNG, BURDICK, and LEMKE and tell them in no uncertain terms how they feel about economy, they, at least, know what the people want from Pembina County. What they will do to help cut expenses is another question but they at least will know what is expected of them at this session.

These discussions bring out different opinions as how to cut taxes. and there are many. The writer cannot answer that question, but he is sure things will have to change some way to get the tax bill down to where it is sensible.

If we do not fight this now from all angles, it will continue to be a burden to us, and at present it does not look like those in the driver's seat are looking for economy.

It is up to us—so let's make ourselves heard and get action.

Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message from Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the Legislature of the State of New York, dated March 3, 1950, in which he points out certain inequities and undesirable features in the present administration of unemployment insurance as a part of Federal policy under existing law. Governor Dewey does not criticize the Federal Government, however. He calls rather for the enactment of new Federal legislation to take care of this inequitable condition which is causing great trouble in States like New York in the direct administration of their respective unemployment insurance laws.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N. Y., March 3, 1950.

To the Legislature:

For many years the people of the State of New York and of all other States have been the victims of the tangled Federal law relating to the administration of unemployment insurance. In the hope that a joint resolution adopted by your honorable bodies might increase the likelihood of improved Federal legislation, I urge such action.

The Federal Government levies on employers a pay-roll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent for administration. By appropriation it decides how much of the money so collected shall be returned to the States. The Secretary of Labor then apportions this money among the respective States.

During the operation of the unemployment insurance law the employers of New York have paid to the Federal Government through this tax for administrative costs $150,000,000 more than the State has received back for the administration of the system. Each year for the past 12 years the amount allowed to the State of New York has been grossly inadequate. So unscientific has been the planning of the Federal Government that the Division of Placement and Unemployment Insurance has been faced regularly with the complete exhaustion of funds before the end of succeeding fiscal years. Many employees have been released only to be rehired or replaced a few months later.

With such instability of employment and such a sense of insecurity among the employees, it is a miracle the law works at all.

Lack of funds and personnel makes exceedingly difficult the detection of improper and fraudulent benefit claims. It impedes and periodically suspends all efforts to cope with tax evasions. It makes impossible effective policing of the placement and unemployment insurance program. These facts have been repeatedly made known to the Federal Social Security Board and its successor in function, the Secretary of Labor. No relief has been forthcoming.

The Federal Government has been regularly siphoning money collected for unemployment administration into its general funds for use in its general purposes. The general revenues of the Federal Government have profited by over $1,000,000,000 from diversion of these taxes. Conceding that the tax collections of the States for administrative purposes should be pooled to permit wealthier States to contribute to the administrative costs of smaller States, there is no justification whatever for diversion of moneys so collected into general Federal revenues.

If we are to improve the administration of placement service and unemployment insurance in this State, there must be a fundamental overhauling of the system which controls the allocation of necessary funds. The rise in the number of persons unemployed makes such a change imperative.

Legislation is presently pending before Congress which would earmark all taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and provide for their return to the States in an equitable and sensible fashion. The objects of this legislation are most desirable. They are:

1. Earmark all taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for use in connection with the unemployment insurance and employment service programs.

2. Permit Congress to continue to restrict the total amount which it deems necessary for efficient basic State administration.

3. After making provision for the amounts granted to all States, return to the States the excess of taxes collected within each, for additional administration expenditures or to meet benefit claims.

Properly administered unemployment insurance is a program of inestimable value. Improperly administered, it is an open invitation to waste and indolence. In times of decreased employment such as we have had during the past year, it has kept families from need and sustained business generally. The enormous size of the system administered in this State is little realized. It will distribute in benefits this year some $400,000,000—more than is spent for State purposes by the entire State government.

Like any insurance venture of such size, there is great danger of fraud. Such fraud is a danger not only because of the immediate loss it causes or the dishonesty which it encourages, but also because it brings the entire system into disrepute and encourages movements to curtail its benefits and to embarrass the people who through years of hard work have become entitled to benefits during periods when they are unemployed through no fault of their own.

Bungling, unscientific administration is a hazard to any program. Unemployment insurance is one of the great accomplishments of recent years. In the next few years when our systems may be called upon to make full use of this benefit, we must be assured of competent administration. To this end I urge the action of your honorable bodies.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

The Coal Strike

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it requires either courage or judgment or leadership to let the Nation sweat out a crisis. I hope this House and the Senate will take action to provide legislation which will at least be ready and available when needed in the inevitable recurrence of the present crisis. I do not know whether the policy makers of this Nation's Government realize it or not, but a lot of people get hurt on every occurrence of crisis such as the one which now confronts us. Domestic economy and national security are threatened. I think it is part of our job to help provide the machinery to prevent its recurrence and to provide it now. We, the Congress, and the administration, have a responsibility to the American people. We can, at least, discharge ours.

The Oklahoma Leopard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Sad Story of the Leopard Stirs Philosophic Musings," by John M. Cummings, a political columnist of the Philadelphia Inquirer, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Friday morning, March 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAD STORY OF THE LEOPARD STIRS PHILOSOPHIC MUSINGS

(By John M. Cummings)

If pressed for an opinion we should say the happiest leopard in Oklahoma is the one that died the other day, victim of poisoned bait planted by the most intelligent and at the same time the cruelest critter that walks the face of the earth—man.

Life had been anything but happy for this particular leopard during the 60 days that elapsed from the time of its capture in an India jungle to the moment of its demise in a cage at the Oklahoma City Zoo.

Perhaps the leopard did get some sort of cattish satisfaction from the excitement—and the fear—of the countryside for miles around during the 61 hours it was at large. Man, intelligent man, trembled and quaked at the thought of this 175 pounds of sleek and sinewy jungle cat, its savage nature intensified by hunger, roaming a region where untold wealth gushed from the earth in the form of oil.

This was strange country to the leopard. In its jungle habitat the problem of survival, tough as it is for all wildlife, would be easy compared to the handicaps it faced in a wilderness of oil derricks. Trained hunters stalked the big cat, even the Marines were called out to help capture an animal which made an 18-foot leap from a "safety" pit to gain its freedom.

The urge to live is great. Of no less importance is the urge of a species to perpetuate itself. When to these are added the driving force of hunger you can understand why the Oklahoma leopard, having avoided the hunters, the marines, and the dogs placed on its trail, returned to the point of departure. There it would find food, there it would find its mate.

The leopard found food, all right. But it was poisoned food, food loaded with dope. It was not the intention of intelligent man to kill the leopard with poisoned meat. The idea was to give it enough of a powerful sedative to put it to sleep—in fact, an Oklahoma veterinarian now says excitement and overexertion killed the beast. Rendered helpless it could then be safely returned to its cage. But this was a hungry leopard just returned from 60 hours of liberty. It ate a lot of the meat and consequently got a lot of dope. In 17 hours it was dead.

Freedom is a precious thing. It is difficult to realize how precious it is until it is lost. The easiest way of life is the surest way of losing your liberty. In its India jungle home the leopard saw a piece of meat—a hand-out. It went for it because it offered a meal without effort. In seizing the meat it sprang a trap. Its liberty was gone. Sixty days later it was in an Oklahoma zoo.

To the leopard, as to some men, the loss of liberty proved unendurable. The leopard took a chance and got away. But it was in a wrong environment. Hunger sent it back to its jail—hunger and a female.

There is a lesson for intelligent man in the life and death of the Oklahoma leopard. The hand-out of today may mean prison, poisoned meat, and death tomorrow.

Torture of Offenders Against Communist Regimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, recent reports of shocking tortures to which alleged offenders against the Communist regimes in eastern Europe have been subjected were tragically confirmed in the official statement and affidavit just made public by the State Department regarding Soviet methods in this field.

The State Department release, which includes the verbatim affidavit which 38-year-old Michael Shipkov, a Bulgarian, wrote in the American Legation at Sofia, after he had been grilled for 32 hours by the secret police there, presents to the world first-hand factual confirmation of the methods reportedly used by Communist officials to extort confessions such as were made use of in the trials of Cardinal Mindszenty at Budapest, of the 15 Protestant clergymen at Sofia, and on other occasions.

It is a horrible record of Soviet brutality thus documented—one that should be given fullest publicity in order that the people of the entire world may know and appreciate the brutal and inhuman lengths to which Communist leadership will go to justify their own actions and to prejudge the unfortunate victims of their hatred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SHIPKOV ON HIS INTERROGATION IN BULGARIA

(Following are the text of a statement by the State Department on an affidavit by Michael Shipkov, Bulgarian, who was employed in the United States Legation in Sofia and is under indictment for espionage, and excerpts from his affidavit, which was released in full by the State Department.)

UNITED STATES STATEMENT

As a result of the publication on February 21, 1950, of the Bulgarian public prosecutor's indictment of Michael Shipkov, the American Legation learned with regret that this innocent employee has fallen once again into the hands of the Bulgarian security militia. Accordingly, the Department of State is honoring the request of Michael Shipkov to publish his sworn affidavit, which he concluded by writing:

"I want the Legation to bring to the knowledge of the militia that any attempt of theirs to make use of that statement of mine [i. e., his forced confession] will be countered by exposure of this. * * * I furthermore request that this statement here be made public and used to justify the good name of the Legation and my name in case the militia attempts to make use of the confession they drew out of me."

Like Cardinal Mindszenty, the Bulgarian evangelical pastors, and recently the American citizen, Robert Vogeler, Michael Shipkov was forcibly persuaded in August 1949 to sign a false confession. At the end of his ordeal he had written and signed a seven-page confession and an agreement to return to the Legation as a spy informer for the militia. Among other things, he confessed that, under orders, he had organized intelligence contacts to submit economic, political, and military information to the American Legation; that these orders came from the American Minister and other officers of the Legation; that he had willfully and "venemously" exaggerated, distorted, and misinterpreted events in Bulgaria to discredit his country and its Government in the eyes of the outside world; and that in this manner he had hoped to be instrumental in encouraging foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria.

A familiar pattern

The pattern of Mr. Shipkov's confession has become tragically familiar, whereas the method of how such confessions are extorted has remained a mysterious enigma. For the first time, however, a victim of this apparently hypnotic process has had the spiritual fortitude and courage painfully to piece together again the shattered pieces of his moral character and to reveal in detail how a man of integrity can be completely broken and forced to describe in his own words a fantastic story of imaginary crimes of espionage and treason.

In reading Michael Shipkov's affidavit, it is essential that the reader first have a clear understanding of his mental condition at the time he wrote it. In addition to his own personal ordeal, he still had fresh in his memory the recent death of his colleague, Ivan Secoulov, who had met death 3 days following his arrest by the militia.

Mr. Shipkov's affidavit is being released exactly as he wrote it, untouched and without a comma or word removed. The story he tells is not an orderly one. It represents a series of thoughts written as they came to him as he struggled to search his memory and recall every minute item of his interrogation that might be of value as throwing light upon the methods used by the secret police to force confessions from innocent people. His affidavit must be read carefully for its full significance to be appreciated. Otherwise it is difficult to separate and place in the right perspective the factual and interpretative material which is interwoven without distinction throughout his statement.

The reader will see that in many sections of his statement Michael Shipkov is relating how he was compelled to build out of his own imagination details of meetings with Americans and other officials and other acts, which in reality never took place, but which would meet the militia's conception of espionage and treason.

Under months of pressure

It is important to realize that Michael Shipkov was not broken down by the 32-hour interrogation alone. For months prior to his arrest, as he explains near the end of his statement, he was afflicted with a feeling of oppression, fear, and resignation, owing to the steady pressures exerted by the militia on his sisters, his brother, and his colleagues in the American Legation, particularly Ivan Secoulov, who had just died.

Michael Shipkov's affidavit exposes, as he had hoped it would, the complete falsity of

the charges made against him, the American Minister, and against members of the Legation staff in the indictment published on February 21, 1950, by the Bulgarian Government. This indictment was built up on imaginary evidence which Shipkov proved was extracted from him by force in August 1949, following his arrest and 32-hour interrogation.

Not only has Shipkov destroyed the validity of the evidence contained in the indictment against him, but as important a Communist authority in Bulgaria as the Foreign Minister, Vladimir Poptomov, who is now also a Vice Premier and member of the Politburo, confirmed officially to Minister Heath his conviction that Michael Shipkov was innocent.

During the prolonged negotiations which Mr. Heath conducted with the Foreign Office for the issuance of passports and exit visas to Mr. Shipkov and his family, during which time Mr. Shipkov resided in the American Legation, Mr. Poptomov personally assured Mr. Heath on October 11, 1949, that the maltreatment of Shipkov was absolutely against the policy of his Government. He went so far as to inform Mr. Heath that he had personally recommended to the Interior Minister that passports and exit visas should be granted to the Shipkovs.

Michael Shipkov knew when he returned to the Legation and requested that he be permitted to remain there that he was already a doomed man as far as the militia was concerned. If he failed to leave Bulgaria and fell again into the hands of the Bulgarian militia, he knew that his fate was determined. It was to provide for this eventuality and to fight back at the militia and all it stands for through the only means available that he provided the Legation with his detailed statement.

His tangible bequest

Another compelling reason for providing the Legation with his statement was Mr. Shipkov's desire to salvage his good name and moral character. In a real sense, Shipkov's affidavit represents the only tangible item he felt he could bequeath to his survivors.

Michael Shipkov was not a spy. He was not an intelligence agent of the United States. Michael Shipkov was not a traitor. He was an employee of the American Legation who performed the routine, legitimate, and nonconfidential duties of a translator. However, Michael Shipkov was an intelligent, honest Bulgarian citizen who nourished not only a deep-seated devotion to his Christian ideals, but also a concern for the welfare of his country.

As a private citizen he did not conceal his nonadherence to Communist dogma, nor his opposition to certain policies of the present Government. The pursuit of this freedom of expression and conscience, guaranteed to him and to all Bulgarian citizens by the treaty of peace and the Bulgarian Constitution, did not, in his eyes nor, according to the standards of any civilized democratic country, constitute a crime or treason.

However, in the words of the public prosecutor, his family background, his act of seeking employment with the American Legation and the expression of his opposition to the Communist creed and to some of the Government's policies, constituted treason, for which the prosecutor concluded in his indictment of February 21, 1950, that Michael Shipkov was turned over to the Sofia County Court to be tried, to be found guilty, and punished.

SHIPKOV'S STATEMENT

(In opening his statement, Shipkov told how he was picked up by a plainclothes policeman on Saturday, August 20, 1949, as he was bicycling home from his job at the American Legation in Sofia. He was taken to the National Assembly Building, where he was forced by guards to enter an automobile that took him to police—or state security militia—headquarters. There he was escorted into a small office.)

On entering, I was made to stand left of the door, in the corner, facing the window. In front of me was a desk, two chairs on either side, and a metal cabinet on the right of the window. On the wall to my left was a picture of Lenin, on the opposite wall a frame with the phrase, "Merciless fight against foreign agents."

I was taken up by a team of two agents of the State Security, age between 25 and 30, stern, serious, and incredibly earnest. I was ordered to empty out my pockets on the desk, which I did. I had been previously asked whether I carried any arms on me. I was not made to take off my watch.

I was then asked whether I was aware of where I had been taken, and the reasons for my detention. I replied that I was in the building of the militia—they corrected that to state security militia. I told them that I was perfectly aware and that I had been expecting for many months, that any employment at the legation would end in trouble with them.

First, presumably until the arrival of a superior functionary, I was made to answer the questions contained in militia form No. 10–T, which I had filled out on two previous occasions when I had been trying to obtain a passport. * * * I noticed that they were writing down my replies in perfunctory manner, which confirmed my belief that that was to give time to the actual investigator to arrive.

Effort of resignation

My state of mind at that stage: I was trying very hard to reconcile myself with what I had long considered inevitable and to impress into my mind the necessary fortitude and resignation. Already I had been faced with the difficulty of maintaining any continuous line of thought within me, while having constantly to correspond to their moves and give them the replies or indications requested.

In about 30 minutes another functionary arrived, presumably of superior standing, as the chair at the desk was ceded to him. After a whispered conference, he began to direct the interrogation. There always was a great play of locking and double locking the door whenever anybody came in or out of the room.

I was immediately faced with the accusation, no, with the statement, that I had been a spy, a traitor, and a saboteur of my country; an enemy. I was told with a fair display of solemnity that I had been arrested on express authorization of the chief prosecutor, on the strength of undeniable proof, and that now I was to complete their knowledge by a full confession and repentance of my guilt. * * *

While this lasted, I had made the acquaintance of all the seven functionaries who dealt with me throughout my stay in the building. There were two relays of lesser agents, working in teams of two, one of which was always on hand. Then there were two higher ranking fuctionaries, aged between 30 and 40, who conducted the interrogation proper—the lesser ones merely ranking man, head of section, department, etc. * * *

I maintained a show of resistance, without a semblance of defiance, up till some time late in the evening—9–10 o'clock. Tempers had been rising in the meantime, I had been often warned not to exhaust their patience, not to force them to turn the other leaf. I was told that this had been the behavior of all the numerous spies and traitors who had passed through their hands in this very room and they mentioned Dimitrov, Peev, Hadji Christov, my brother, Cheshme, Nikola Petkov, the Protestant pastors. And they stressed that any such obstinacy on my part would only worsen my future, without any real inconvenience to them. They also stressed and to which I sincerely agreed, that I could not really hope for aid from the Legation.

I had been so long prepared for this that I agreed sincerely and told them I was quite resigned to accept their judgment and penalty. Already there appears in the mind of the person arrested a desire to be told the extent of one's punishment, and to begin serving it, if only to be gone from the pressure and fear of their presence. Before the investigations passed from one to another, the outgoing one would come near, bluster, slap me in the face: one of the middle category ordered me to turn around and face the wall and then hit me on several occasions with the thick of his palm, I imagine, in the back of the neck. I recall that this treatment was not particularly painful nor frightening, nor that I was so afraid of its recurrence.

The head of the team

Before I had broken down, I saw the head of the team in the room for half an hour—a short, stout, pasty-faced individual of evident superior rank to all the others. Yellowish tinge, thinning hair, carelessly and slovenly dress, no culture, great energy, very sharp and cunning, very high-strung and tense, very self-assured, I suspect, very self-satisfied. He professed and indicated more knowledge of me than even myself. * * *

It was he who gloated—there is no other word—on the quixotic mental attitude of my brother, who had refused in a very romantic way to translate for the English and inform the security militia at the same time. And the familiar way in which he used my brother's first name, and recalled the further unhappiness which had befallen him, made me think it had been him who had ordered my brother to be beaten up into insensibility in the street, to pay him for his gallantry. He lingered long on the subject of my private family life, accepting the theory that I had nothing any more in common with my wife, that I had engaged in picking up mistresses here and there, and that I had not cared if my wife did the same—mentioning persons of the tennis club.

It was again he that suggested the parallel between my espionage and that of the Protestant ministers—and that was ruthlessly taken up later by his subordinates, until they had got me to tell them exactly the words that fitted their theory—that the British were the master minds in all the systems of espionage, and that this espionage, this loyalty they exacted from their agents, included espionage on the American employees to the benefit of the English. * * *

I was ordered to stand facing the wall upright at a distance which allowed me to touch the wall with two fingers of my outstretched arms. Then to step back some twelve inches, keep my heels touching the floor, and maintain balance only with the contact of one finger on each hand. And while standing so, the interrogation continued—nor was I allowed to collect my thoughts.

This posture does not appear unduly painful, nor did it particularly impress me in the beginning. And yet, combined with the mental strain, with the continuous pressure to talk, with the utter hopelessness and the longing to go through the thing and be sent down into silence and peace—it is a very effective manner of breaking down all resistance. I recall that the muscles on my legs and shoulders began to get cramped and to tremble, that my two fingers began to bend down under the pressure, to get red all over and to ache. I remember that I was drenched with sweat and that I began to faint, although I had not exerted myself in any way.

If I would try to substitute the forefinger to the big finger, I would be instantly called to order and the same if I tried to bolster my middle finger by placing the forefinger over it. No attention is paid to the suffering, nor is there any place for hope that they would take pity on you. And when the trembling increases up to the point when I collapsed, they made me sit and speak. I did get several minutes respite, catching my breath and wiping my face, but when I had uttered again that I was innocent, it was the wall again.

Final breaking down

And after a time of this, I broke down. I told them I was willing and eager to tell them all they wanted. The main appeal is to end the pain, to stop needless, futile resistance, and to come nearer to the moment when they would let me in peace. * * *

At this moment I believe that I had covered the worst and that I would tell them I am a spy and a traitor and that I would be sent below into a cell to await or serve my punishment. And that did not appear very grim at the moment.

It is a very painful surprise to realize the error I was in. The interrogation took on again, unrelaxed. Here I want to describe their method of interrogation. You are a spy and a traitor, tell us what tasks you were given to do, who gave them to you, in what manner and with whose help you achieved them and to whom and in what manner did you report? No further indication and no generalities, no over-all statements of guilt accepted. And this went on, hour after hour, throughout the night, throughout the day, without respite or end.

How can I best explain? The only straw for which I could reach is the impression that I had, in my emptied, vacant thoughts, of some sentence that had pleased them, or that had conformed with the pattern I had so often seen in the newspapers. And if I were to stop and plead fatigue, or poor memory, or ask to rest—the wall again and again, and the slaps, and the blows in the nape. And I remembered I would come up gasping and talk and talk and feel utterly broken.

It began with my prewar origin—the well-to-do bourgeois family, the American school, the attraction of English prestige and power. September 9—I am a class enemy, if only my antecedents have made me into a natural class enemy. Then, turn this class enemy into active resistance—then come the British—hasten to place myself in their service.

(At this point Mr. Shipkov related in great detail how the police gradually forced him with hours of questioning to construct a story of espionage involving him falsely with British and American officials in Sofia. Those thus brought in included a General Oxley, head of the British section of the Allied Control Commission for Bulgaria at the end of the war; Maynard Barnes, who had been United States political representative there; Milton C. Rewinkel, a United States Foreign Service officer during the armistice period; Robert C. Strong, another Foreign Service officer; a Mr. Weitzel, former Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. representative in Bulgaria; John E. Horner, a United States Legation secretary; Raymond F. Courtney, also a Legation secretary; the American Minister, Donald R. Heath, and others.

(Mr. Shipkov also referred to many Bulgarians in his statement—acquaintances and friends, but the State Department said it could not identify them.)

The forced confession

How about your personal letter to Maynard Barnes, asking for intervention? First, I refused having ever written MBB, later confessed. How about your mistresses, who are they, when did you meet, how often, in whose apartments? And there comes a time when I found myself in such unbearable depths of degradation and misery that I would gladly have ended it all at once. You plead with them not to force you to incriminate innocent persons, persons whom you have never engaged in any such activity—no response. Speak on, tell us more.

Out of the jumbled memories, some impressions stand out vivid. One: They are not overinterested in what you tell them. It would appear that the ultimate purpose of this treatment is to break you down completely, and deprive you of any will power or private thought or self esteem, which they achieve remarkably quickly. And they seem to pursue a classic confession, well rounded off in the phraseology, explaining why you were induced by environment and education to enter the service of the enemies of communism, how you placed your capacities in their service, what ultimate goal did you pursue—the overthrow of the People's Government through foreign intervention.

And they appear to place importance on the parallel appearance of repentance and self-condemnation that come up with the breaking down of their prisoner.

Second: I rarely could perceive any personal hatred or enmity for me—contempt certainly but sooner an academic detached dealing with an annoying problem in order to achieve the goal, and a fanatic, rabid obsession of devotion to communism and hatred for Anglo-American resistance to them—all the newspaper talk is to them gospel truth.

And in this respect they are to be taken as disciples and fervent followers of the dogma. Not much imagination, nor quick brains nor much intellectual baggage nor sensitivity—but enormous stores of character, undeviating loyalty to their creed, fanatic belief in their own cause, fanatic hatred and mistrust of anything else. No possible contact with them on any intermediary grounds. No fear of possible retribution, not within the ranks that I met. No conscience, unless that of their duty to their creed.

Toward the evening of Sunday, I had given them satisfaction. They gave me a glass of water, a bit of bread which I could not eat, and altered their bearing. I had been taken to urinate in a nearby toilet. And I was given a cigarette, and time to relax and control my trembling—hands, feet, teeth, so that I could write down what I had told them. It was then—just before I sat down to write, visited by the chief who seemed satisfied and mentioned, or sooner alluded to, my nearly freedom in exchange for perfect frankness and sincerity, and I remember him mentioning my daughter and that it was worth while looking up to seeing her again.

Writing out a statement

I wrote six lined pages, beginning with my unfortunate origin and education, my formation into a class enemy, then a description of my espionage with stress on each individual task—who had entrusted me with it, when, how I had achieved it, whom I had enrolled to help, how I had handed in my report. At the end, a plain statement of the purpose I had been pursuing—the destruction of the regime through foreign intervention. Signature after that—and although my deposition was controlled and checked paragraph by paragraph by the two lesser persons on duty, one of the superiors insisted that I add specific information as to my secret preference for the British and on my spying for them on the Americans.

When that was completed I was allowed a cigarette and some rest and I remember dozing off straightaway. Then one of the superiors went into a lengthy preparation of my future, on my youth, my daughter, on the necessity to reform and be an honest Bulgarian—on my acceptance to collaborate secretly with the State security and report to them everything I see, hear, or learn of the attempts of foreign spy centrals to undermine the people in Bulgaria. He dictated the thing to me in most solemn manner, and I wrote and signed. * * *

(Shipkov was then released.)

In the morning I overslept. * * *

In the Legation, my first obsession was to clear my conscience of the sense of guilt I had for all the people I had incriminated. I wrote a brief statement in the morning, intending to enlarge on it in the afternoon. I could not do as I wished as I felt observed and attended all the time by other Bulgarian employees. * * * On Tuesday, I tried first through Wallace and then through Burke to get Courtney to call me in the ordinary way. When he did not, I sent up the two statements through Burke and when that was done I knew that the militia no longer had any power to use me and to use my words against other people.

(Frank E. Wallace was a guard in the Legation; Timothy J. Burke was vice consul.)

I would like to make a few points very clear. I have been officially connected, first with the British Military Mission, and then with the American Legation, from the end of 1944 up to now. And from the very beginning, I have even more clearly understood and borne the mistrust, suspicion, and hatred of the regime for anybody who is in any way connected with the British or Americans.

This feeling of oppression and fear has grown steadily, first because of the chain of unhappiness and hardship which have descended on my friends and relatives—my two sisters expelled from their homes with their families and deported to the province; my brother, first beaten into insensibility in the street, with a cowed spirit afterwards, later packed off to a concentration camp; my closest friends arrested, obviously subjected to some similar method of intimidation, and then, one of them has disappeared, the other doing his second stretch in a concentration camp; the succession of other Bulgarian Legation employees who are arrested and either disappear from view or are reported hanged.

Building up of fear

This is in parallel to the other instances of fear, those that are featured in the newspapers and which I have had to translate—a translation which has been more and more personally depressing with time. This depression is augmented by a feeling of helplessness and despair, no possibility of evasion, no issue, no real hope for assistance or protection by the legation, not while the militia alone has force on its side. Resignation is achieved to a certain extent never enough to keep off the fear of the day when it will arrive on me. And the last instance, that of Secoulov, was very difficult to resign myself to.

(Ivan Secoulov, another Legation employee, had died in police hands.)

Therefore when I had been resisting them in the first day I had long since been prepared to accept my lot—prison, concentration camp, without any hope for reprieve. From that it is easy to decide to end the struggle, accept their accusation, give them satisfaction, and be allowed to relax my mind. And this breaking in is immediately followed by the realization that it is not the end but the beginning of an even more painful period, much more degrading, because before I believed I would draw upon myself their penalty by agreeing to their accusations and the thought of prison or camp for myself only is not so awful as that moment.

However, with the first acceptance my power of resistance grew weaker and I slipped steadily lower and lower, not only drawing punishment but time and time again speaking of others—friends and relatives of mine, involving them in deeds or thoughts utterly untrue, unfounded, slanderous. And then the feeling of resistance is wholly broken;

and I remember going deeper and deeper in this awful disloyalty, feeling utterly degraded and wretched, and yet powerless to protest and deny. Indeed, the only things I did not tell them were things they never thought of leading me into describing. At the end, when I wrote down the confession of guilt and repentance, I remember that the whole thing appeared fantastic and ridiculous, but it seemed to give them complete satisfaction.

News Letters by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of my biweekly news letters for January 12, February 9, and February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Don't be fooled by the FEPC and excise-tax riders on the oleo bill. They aren't intended to lift the wartime luxury taxes, or to give us a Fair Employment Practices Act. Both riders are aimed at killing the oleo tax repeal—and nothing more.

A stalemate would occur in the House if the Senate were to adopt either rider. The reasons are technical, but essential to full understanding. These facts are important:

The Senate and House must agree down to the last comma before any measure may be sent to the President for signature.

Oleo, excise taxes, and FEPC are unrelated issues—and each is handled by a different legislative committee of the House: oleo by the Agriculture Committee, excise taxes by Ways and Means, FEPC by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Only the oleo bill has been passed by the House—an FEPC bill is out of committee and on the House Calendar— and the House Ways and Means Committee has not completed its work on excise-tax legislation.

So, though I support FEPC and reduction of excise taxes, I oppose both riders because they're improperly intended here to cause confusion and block oleo tax repeal.

Both the Senate and House are scheduled to debate FEPC within the next few weeks. Our experience with the Fair Employment Practices Commission that guarded against employee discrimination by firms handling Government war contracts was extremely successful and I intend to fight vigorously for the adoption of FEPC legislation this year.

Excise taxes will be reduced by Congress this session. These are the wartime taxes on so-called luxury items—fur coats, ladies' handbags, luggage, cosmetics, theaters, and others—and the heavy taxes put on travel and telegrams to discourage excessive use of wires and unnecessary travel.

President Truman and leaders of both parties recommend changes in excise-tax laws. The reasons for these war measures have changed. The House of Representatives, which, as required by the Constitution, must originate all tax bills, will act promptly to aid consumers and stimulate business by relieving the excise-tax burden.

And as a member of the Senate Finance Committee (which has Senate jurisdiction over tax matters) I'm confident we will act speedily when the House sends the excise-tax bill to us for consideration.

New social security legislation is now the big job before the Senate Finance Committee. In the closing days of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the House passed the bill, after lengthy consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee. The bill makes numerous liberalizing amendments to the old social security law, amendments which will afford much more adequate protection to widows, orphaned children, the disabled, and the retired.

I plan to summarize the social security amendments in a subsequent News Letter after Senate hearings give us a better picture of the changes we may wish to make in the bill.

Housing legislation for middle- and lower-income families will be considered shortly by the Senate. The pending bill aims at encouraging investment and construction of private housing for families now more or less priced out of the housing market. The proposed legislation is a comprehensive companion for the Public Housing Act of 1949, and in a later News Letter, I will outline the major provisions of the new housing bill.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

FEBRUARY 9, 1950.

What are your plans for retirement? Your future—and that of your family—will be influenced by the kind of social-security law Congress passes this year, and thus it's essential that you understand the proposals now before the Senate.

You—or your family—may be eligible now, or later, for insurance benefits resulting from retirement, disability, or death.

As a taxpayer—possibly as a recipient—you'll be affected by the Federal grants-in-aid to States for public assistance in the form of money or emergency medical care for the needy blind, the aged, the disabled, or the dependent children.

And Federal assistance to States for Child Welfare Services plays an important role in the development of healthy, responsible citizens.

A Nation-wide, self-supporting insurance program is the ultimate social-security goal. Adequate insurance protection can do away with distress resulting when families lose their income because of death, retirement, or injuries which make future employment impossible.

Thirty-five million of the sixty million working Americans now contribute to social security. Seven to eleven million would be added by provisions now being considered. These new groups include the self-employed small businessman (grocers, barbers, etc.), nurses, social workers and others employed by nonprofit charitable, religious or social organizations, some cab drivers, some domestic workers, contract loggers, mushroom pickers, poultry workers, many salesmen, perhaps others.

Farmers and farm workers weren't included in the Social Security bill as it passed the House last year—although more and more farmers want to be covered because one-fourth of them have contributed to social security while working at seasonal jobs or in war plants.

All employees of local and State governments—teachers, clerks, police, others—will become eligible for social security for the first time. This is primarily to help thousands of these employees who today have no pension coverage, but those now covered by their own pension systems may add the Federal program to their present benefits if groups of them decide by referendum to do so. However, I am submitting an amendment to safeguard the benefits now enjoyed against possible reduction as a result of this provision.

Insurance benefits would be doubled for the 3,000,000 now drawing social-security payments if the House provisions are adopted. This would not run social security into the red because the Federal insurance program is now more than self-supporting. Another new feature would permit insurance benefits to the permanently disabled, whatever their age.

Present grants to States would be increased. These are Federal contributions to the public-assistance programs operated by each State to meet urgent needs of millions of older people, dependent children, and the blind who are without insurance protection or income from other sources. Public assistance payments are now inadequate, and large State and Federal funds must be spent to help our needy until more people have insurance coverage.

Old-age assistance payments in Pennsylvania are small * * * averaging only $39.57 monthly * * * $4 below the national average. Thirty-one States make larger old-age grants * * * and four States gives 50 percent more than Pennsylvania. The proposed bill would add $19,000,000 next year in Federal money to Pennsylvania for all public assistance. Both the Federal share and old-age payments would be larger if Pennsylvania were willing to increase its old-age contributions.

Direct public assistance grants can be decreased as more people are permitted to pay for retirement and disability insurance. This is a strong argument for social-security insurance because it is a self-supporting, self-respecting means of providing for the future without depending upon tax-supported public-assistance grants.

America is growing security conscious. More and more people are planning ahead by combining social-security benefits with private retirement policies. And this thoughtful looking ahead has developed tremendously since the first social-security law in 1935.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

Good health is everybody's business. Health protection costs us at least $10,000,000 a year. Our 150,000,000 people spend about $8,000,000,000 for treatment and drugs. State and local governments spend another $1,250,000,000—and the Federal Government, $750,000,000.

But our health protection is inadequate. These facts aren't contested:

As a Nation, we go to the doctor too late. Troubles that could have been detected in a periodic check-up are often neglected until they cost much more to correct, or are allowed to become completely incurable.

Though our doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, research facilities and medical schools are the world's best, few people get the best available.

Health protection is expensive. It takes years of training and thousands of dollars to become a doctor. Research is costly, but must go on. And the best in scientific, technical equipment and hospitals is expensive.

Prolonged illness, usually unexpected, can wipe out savings and drive families far into debt.

Our rural areas need help desperately. The Hoover Commission said "for practically every category of service, the rural population receives services smaller in quantity and lower in quality than urban, and far less adequate than would be warranted by the burden of illness and impairment it bears."

All levels of Government are working to provide more people with better care. These activities are carried out largely by local and

State health and welfare officials, usually assisted by Federal funds and technical advice and training from Federal agencies. Here are some of the United States Government grants that went to Pennsylvania in 1949:

Children's Health and Welfare: $342,598 for aid to crippled children—$148,815 for delinquent, homeless or neglected children, $448,967 to aid Pennsylvania with its maternal and child care program. In addition, the Federal Dental Health Service has helped 32 Pennsylvania communities provide fluorine treatment for protection of children's teeth.

Hospital Construction: Over $4,500,000 in Federal grants went to Pennsylvania communities for building public and nonprofit hospitals in 1949—mostly in smaller towns and rural area. Last session, the Eighty-first Congress doubled this program, and Pennsylvania will get $9,241,058 yearly.

Cancer Research: $151,036 for research and aid to Pennsylvania doctors for special training in treatment and control of cancer.

Tuberculosis: $265,639 for detection, prevention and cure of TB.

General Health Assistance: $739,708 to be used by the State as it saw fit for such things as health education, industrial hygiene, research.

Pennsylvania engages in most Federal health programs, though our State (and Wyoming) has not entered the United States Mental Health program, and we've lost $200,000 yearly since 1947.

Meeting doctor and hospital bills still remains the big problem for most families. Some form of health insurance is the only solution. The American Medical Association, once opposed to any health insurance, now supports voluntary group insurance as its answer to proposals for Government health insurance that would provide protection for everyone.

Voluntary health plans should be encouraged in every way. In the past 15 years, 3 million of our 39 million families have become regular members of some health insurance program. The Senate, recognizing that the success of voluntary plans depends upon enlarging all medical facilities, passed and sent to the House a bill providing medical scholarships and Federal grants to enlarge medical schools—as well as a bill establishing clinics for school children. Research funds for ruthless killers, polio, heart disease and cancer—and direct grants for rural health facilities—are essential. Government help through such programs as these is imperative if voluntary health insurance is to be the way our people provide themselves with the best that modern science and skilled training can offer.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Republican Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "More Advice to the Republican Party," from the current issue of the Exeter (N. H.) News Letter. The article is by Dr. Henry Phillips, of the faculty of Exeter Academy, and refers largely to an article written by our colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly, discussing the Republican Party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL WEEK—MORE ADVICE TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

One of the results of the recent parliamentary election in Great Britain, in which the voters demonstrated a swing to the right, is said to be renewed hope that this country too may turn to the more conservative Republican Party in the 1950 congressional elections. This overlooks the fact that trends in the two countries have, more often than not, been in opposite directions. For example the swing here away from Republicanism in 1932 was matched in England by a return to conservatism under Stanley Baldwin and then Neville Chamberlain.

However, this may be, it does no harm to seek trends where they may be found and judge them for what they may be worth. Trends are worth no more than the forces which cause them, and among these may be numbered luck, personalities, and good management.

Good management includes giving the voters some notion as to what a party stands for, and we have taken occasion twice within the last 2 months to comment on statements of Republican Party principles. The first was a reference to Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, who, at his inauguration, expressed support for reforms proposed by the Hoover Commission, certain economies and improvements in State government, and above all economy at the level of the Federal Government.

The statement issued by the Republican National Committee early in February stated the issue between the parties as "liberty against socialism." It, too, saw extravagant spending by the Federal Government, with its powers of taxation, as one of the critical dangers of our time. It also pointed to the danger inherent in the increasing tendency to look to the Federal Government for solution of all problems.

Now Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., writing in the Atlantic Monthly, offers some suggestions toward modernizing the Republican Party in order that it may fulfill its function in a strong two-party system, provide the country with an attractive alternative to the policies of the present administration, and possibly win elections.

Senator LODGE'S program is limited to domestic policies and does not cover all the possible fields of opposition to the Democrats. He favors tax reductions, especially in favor of corporations doing under a million dollars worth of business a year, and of businesses which help to stabilize general production with low prices, increased production, steady employment and use of older employees.

On civil rights the Senator is more specific than the statement of policy of the national committee. He favors elimination of the poll tax in elections for Federal officials, making lynching a Federal offense, enacting fair employment legislation, doing away with segregation in the armed forces, and in Government housing projects.

Health legislation can be enacted by the Republican Party which will be superior to the proposal for socialized medicine by the administration. His aim would be to increase the supply of young doctors and get them to the places in which they are needed; lower the costs of medical care through financing the building of hospitals, educating nurses and interns; and expand the possibilities of the voluntary hospital and medical associations which already have a membership, it is claimed, of 60,000,000.

The problem of the aged should be tackled more realistically than by a program which allows an aged couple $41 a month—the present social-security figure. Tax exemption on income toward a voluntary annuity plan is one suggestion for bringing up old-age assistance to $150 monthly. Also tax assistance to industries which provide benefits, keep employment steady by annual wage plans and agree to provide jobs for older employees, is one of the strongest guaranties of the strong competitive economy which is the key to the country's greatness.

Senator LODGE'S proposals in agriculture center around the need to favor food farming against speculative farming. That is, present legislation discriminates against the small food-growing farmer, and in favor of the large factory farms which pile up huge surpluses and waste the taxpayers' money in support programs.

Finally, on labor the need seems to be for remedial legislation to cover individual problems in the labor front, rather than package legislation which lumps all labor problems together. Labor will also benefit from other items of legislation previously referred to: health, social security, old-age assistance.

No constructive program, however, will succeed unless it rests on sound finances. A balanced Government budget and stable currency are prime considerations.

EXONIAN.

Bipartisan Approach to the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pillsbury Raps Food in Politics; Urges Bipartisan Approach to Farm Problem," from the Minneapolis Star-Journal. The article is very thought-provoking, and I think it would be well to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all may read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PILLSBURY RAPS FOOD IN POLITICS—URGES BIPARTISAN APPROACH TO FARM PROBLEM

Phillip W. Pillsbury, president of Pillsbury Mills, Inc., proposed a bipartisan food commission today "to put an end to the folly of using food as a political football."

Speaking as general chairman of the annual Minneapolis farm forum at Nicollet Hotel, he said:

"Politicians are outpromising each other for votes with food issues as bait. Half the world is hungry. This country's mechanized farms are producing surplus after surplus.

"Food is too important to too many people—and to world peace—to be in politics any longer."

With a Bernard Baruch or a Herbert Hoover as chairman—Pillsbury proposed:

"The same bipartisan approach to a solution of the food and farm problems as the Hoover Commission brought to reorganization of the Government or as the Republican and Democratic Parties brought to our foreign policy."

Pillsbury's plan urged establishing at once "a bipartisan food commission, staffed to

develop an intelligent, efficient program for economical use of our abundant food."

"There is not, nor never was, a food surplus," he declared. "Let's once and for all get the best thinking of the Nation at work selling the food we produce."

Pillsbury said he decided to call for the bipartisan food commission at the outset of the farm forum to lift its program beyond the realm of party politics.

He desired, he said, to explore the commission plan with such farm leaders as Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Knox T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and D. W. Chapman, president of the Montana Farmers Union, who were to speak at the forum session on national farm problems.

"It's not just a United States farm problem we are up against," he declared. "It is a world-wide food program we need—a food plank for peace.

"If our experts can make an H-bomb that will work, we ought to have men who can make a food plan work—and for peace, at home and abroad."

Wire Tapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Clarification Needed on Wire Tapping," which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times on the 18th of January.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARIFICATION NEEDED ON WIRE TAPPING

The present Federal law concerning wire tapping is entirely inadequate. It provides that no person, not being authorized by the sender, shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance * * * or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

Two interpretations have been put upon this provision. One, by a succession of Attorneys General over the past 16 years, holds that it is not illegal to intercept provided there is no divulgence or publication. If this is correct, then anybody may tap any wire without punishment provided he does not divulge what he learns. This situation would be intolerable.

The other interpretation, by such persons as James L. Fly, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, holds that all wire tapping, even by the Federal Government in situations of extreme danger to the national security, is illegal. If this is correct, an important gap in the Nation's security legislation needs to be filled.

A situation where in the use of wires the enemies of society would be protected and the protectors of society would be hampered would not make sense. It would not be respected by those responsible for the defense of the country. It is quixotic to expect that in the fight against spies and saboteurs military intelligence and the FBI are going to be bound by Marquis of Queensberry rules. They haven't been. They won't be. Even Frank Murphy, a stanch disciple of civil rights, permitted wire tapping to be used when he was Attorney General.

Why should wires alone be held sacrosant? A man's home, under proper procedure, may be searched. A man's papers, under proper procedure, may be subpenaed. Under proper procedure, wire tapping should be permitted.

Wire tapping is everything it has been called. It is dirty business. It is sneaky. It is revolting. But so is spying. So is sabotage. So is kidnaping. So is extortion.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated the difficulty. How to balance the needs of law-enforcement agents for use of a method they consider essential in certain types of cases with the need for protecting citizens against the abuse of such power, he said, raises the most delicate problem in the field of democratic statesmanship.

This is a delicate problem, but it is not new. The solution is suggested by the ways other dirty businesses, like the search of a man's home and the seizure of his papers, have been dealt with.

The Federal law should permit the FBI to tap wires in a few specifically defined kinds of cases. Espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion have been suggested. The procedure should be spelled out, requiring a description of the persons suspected, the purpose of the tapping, setting a time limit, and being granted only on specific written authorization of the Attorney General.

The evidence obtained by legal wire tapping should be admissible in trials the same way evidence obtained after use of a search warrant is admissible.

Stiff penalties for wire tapping by unauthorized persons, including members of the FBI, should be set and enforced.

All courts should be instructed not to admit evidence obtained by illegal wire tapping.

Provisions such as these would at the same time give society the use of wire tapping where it is necessary and give the members of society protection against its abuse.

If, as some charge, the FBI is using wire tapping indiscriminately. this should be found out and stopped. But the investigation should be just one part of a new and searching inquiry into the subject. The best way to avoid the abuse of a power that cannot be neglected is to define precisely its permissible use.

Plan for Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Gould Lincoln appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 21 on the subject of proposed electoral reform:

THE POLITICAL MILL—COUDERT PUSHES PLAN FOR ELECTORAL REFORM—SYSTEM SEEN GIVING GOP BETTER CHANCE

(By Gould Lincoln)

As a substitute for the Lodge-Gossett constitutional amendment to do away with the electoral college for the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents, Representative COUDERT, Republican, of New York, will press an amendment to the Constitution to "reform" the electoral college.

Under the present system, Presidential electors are chosen in each State by a plurality vote in a State-wide contest. Mr. COUDERT proposes to choose the Presidential electors just as Members are elected to Congress, one for each Member of the House in each congressional district, and two from each State at large as Senators are elected. To be elected President a candidate must have a majority of the total electoral vote, or the election would be thrown into a joint session of the House and Senate.

The Lodge-Gossett constitutional amendment has already passed the Senate by the necessary two-thirds vote. It awaits action by the Rules Committee of the House. Its proponents are hopeful. This amendment not only does away with the electoral college, but provides that the electoral votes of a State be divided among the Presidential candidates in proportion to the number of popular votes cast for these candidates.

SYSTEM HELD FAIRER

It provides, too, under the so-called Lucas amendment which Mr. LODGE accepted in the Senate, that unless one of the candidates receives at least 40 percent of the total electoral vote, the election shall be thrown into Congress, with all Members of the House and Senate participating and each Member having one vote. It is Senator LODGE's contention that the system he proposes, with Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, is much fairer and more representative of the popular will than the present manner of electing Presidents.

Mr. COUDERT, for his part, fears the Lodge-Gossett amendment might be "appalling in practice." It could, he insists (as does Senator TAFT, of Ohio) be a decisive step in the establishment of one-party government, because its immediate effect would be to increase the weight of the one-party, Democratic States of the South.

Senator LODGE's contention is that, under his plan, Republican voting in the South would increase greatly, breaking down to a considerable extent the one-party system prevailing in that section. This, Mr. COUDERT replies, is to build a dangerous illusion.

BETTER CHANCE FOR GOP

Mr. COUDERT, like Senator LODGE, desires to get away from the system under which the entire electoral vote of a State shall be given to a Presidential candidate, even though he has only a bare majority or a plurality of the total vote cast in that State. Under his proposal, he contends, a Republican would have a far better chance of winning a Presidential race than under the Lodge plan.

Senator LODGE, however, argues that the Coudert plan fails to do away with the electoral college and would take the election of a President even farther away from the popular vote. Senator TAFT is inclined to support the Coudert plan, but insists that there should be further study. He points out that since the State legislatures fix the boundaries of the congressional districts—and frequently resort to gerrymander tactics to strengthen one particular party—and frequently do not change for years—disproportionate results might still be obtained.

The Constitution leaves to the State legislatures the manner in which Presidential electors are to be appointed. No uniform plan existed in early elections. The three most usual methods, however, were: (1) election by legislatures, (2) election by the people in districts, (3) election by the people on a general or State-wide ticket. Only the third is now practiced. The second plan is the Coudert method and presumbaly the States could adopt it without a constitutional amendment, but would not. The Coudert amendment would make it mandatory on the States to do so.

Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include several resolutions adopted by the stockholders of the Midwest Creameries, Inc., at their seventeenth annual meeting at South Bend, Ind., February 24, 1950. The resolutions, in part, follow:

Federal support of dairy products: We oppose the present method employed by the Government in support of dairy product prices by purchasing butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids on an f. o. b. plant basis without consideration of transportation costs and distance from terminal markets. Such methods of purchase are not conducive to the orderly marketing of these products and disrupt the domestic distribution of these products resulting in the Government purchasing greater amounts of these products than is necessary. We urge that the Department of Agriculture abandon its current methods of purchase and reinstate the methods used so successfully in former years by the Dairy Products Marketing Association and the Commodity Credit Corporation. Since DPMA can operate readily on the exchanges, we urge the Secretary of Agriculture to permit it to assist in the conduct of the purchase program.

Farmers cooperative income tax exemption: We again urge that nothing be done to impair the right to income-tax exemption of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations that are operated on a true cooperative basis.

To this end we oppose any change in section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code, the regulations promulgated under that section of the interpretations of those regulations that have been made by the Treasury Department.

American Dairy Association: We again urge support of the American Dairy Association and its program to promote and expand the sale and consumption of dairy products, and recommend that the cost of collection of funds be kept to a minimum in order to provide the highest percentage of moneys collected for direct use in advertising and promotion of dairy products.

We favor extending the check-off period for advertising purposes to cover at least 3 months instead of the usual 30-day period.

Filled dairy products: We oppose the substitution of other fats and oils for milkfat in dairy products. We also oppose the production and offering for sale of any imitation product made in semblance of, or which purports to be a dairy product.

The consuming public and the dairy industry alike must be protected from fraudulent and deceptive practices which undermine the public health and the welfare of the Nation.

Chain-store discrimination: We urge producers of dairy products to voice their opposition to proposed governmental restrictions on types of food distribution such as represented by the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which in the past have increased consumption of food especially butter and other dairy products. Anything that is done to hinder such types of distribution will only result in less dairy products and butter being consumed.

Contagious bovine diseases: We support joint Federal-State programs for the control and eradication of Bang's disease and bovine tuberculosis, and we favor adequate appropriations to carry out these programs. The slaughter program carried out in the fight against Bang's disease has not proven entirely adequate. We have found that calfhood vaccination under proper Federal-State supervision has reduced the incidence of Bang's disease.

There is great need for information. Extensive research is paramount in controlling Bang's disease and mastitis. We therefore favor the allocation of adequate funds under the Hope-Flannigan Act for research to reduce and, if possible, to eliminate these bovine diseases.

Transportation tax: We believe that the 3 percent special excise tax on transportation which bears heavily on perishable food and particularly on the movement of milk from farm to processor can no longer be justified. We urge our member creameries and officers to press vigorously for its early repeal.

Improvement of quality: The butter industry is faced with a serious decline in the demand for butter, due in part to loss of our markets during the war when the production of butter was deliberately discouraged by the Government, and partly by the inroads of imitation dairy products. We endorse all voluntary programs to improve the quality of butter, and urge our dairy farmer members to aid in this project by the continued improvement of quality and production techniques.

Lower Mississippi Valley Flood-Control Projects Near Completion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an article entitled "Lower Mississippi Valley Flood-Control Projects Near Completion," by Brig. Gen. P. A. Feringa, of the Corps of Engineers, president of the Mississippi River Valley Commission, delivered before the Waterways Division, ASCE annual meeting, in January 1950, at New York. I think the subject matter included in this article is of general interest to all believers of flood control in the United States. It reads as follows:

LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS NEAR COMPLETION—WORK OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION SUMMARIZED

(By P. A. Feringa, M. ASCE, brigadier general, U. S. Corps of Engineers; President, Mississippi River Commission, Vicksburg, Miss.)

Functions of the Mississippi River Commission, as created by the act of Congress of June 28, 1879, were to consider and mature a plan to correct, permanently locate, and deepen the channel and protect the banks of the Mississippi River, improve it for navigation, prevent destructive floods, promote and facilitate commerce, trade, and the postal service.

The act provided that the Commission should consist of seven members: Three from the Corps of Engineers, of whom one would serve as President; one from the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and three from civil life, two of whom must be civil engineers. All members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The present membership consists of Col. Ernest Graves; Col. Clark Kittrell; Rear Adm. Leo O. Colbert, Coast and Geodetic Survey; Edward Flad and DeWitt L. Pyburn, civil engineers; Albert L. Culbertson, and the writer. With the exception of Mr. Culbertson, who is not an engineer, all are members of ASCE.

WORK DEALS WITH LOWER MISSISSIPPI

Major problems to be solved were those of the river below Cairo, and while the surveys required by the act were duly completed from Lake Itasca to the Gulf, the plans and operations of the Commission, with comparatively minor exceptions, have dealt with the lower Mississippi and its alluvial valley. The actual construction work is handled in the same way as in an ordinary Corps of Engineers division. There are three districts set up within the boundaries of the Commission—Memphis, Vicksburg, and New Orleans.

The alluvial valley extends from Cape Girardeau, just above the mouth of the Ohio, to the Gulf of Mexico. It averages approximately 40 miles in width and contains approximately 20,000,000 acres, much of which represents some of the most fertile land in the Nation. The distance by river from Cairo, at the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi, to the Gulf, is roughly 1,000 miles.

FIVE TYPES OF FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

The flood-control problem which confronts the Commission is to take care of a design flood estimated at 2,450,000 cubic feet per second between the mouth of the Ohio and the mouth of the Arkansas and at 3,000,000 cubic feet per second below that point. The design flood was deduced by determining the most severe combination of synchronous floods of the tributaries of the Mississippi that could be expected under logically assumable hydrologic conditions. The drainage area involved includes 41 percent of the United States, or 1,240,000 square miles. The problem of flood control is met by five types of work.

1. Overbank floodways to carry flows in excess of the safe capacity of the leveed river channel. The New Madrid floodway, in Missouri, is complete and was used in 1937. The other floodways are in the State of Louisiana. The design flood, at the latitude of Angola, is 3,000,000 cubic feet per second. Design floods at various sections of the river are shown in figure 1. The safe capacity of the Mississippi River at New Orleans is 1,250,000 cubic feet per second. The Bonnet Carre floodway above New Orleans has been designed to take care of 250,000 cubic feet per second, discharging directly into Lake Pontchartrain. Thus the Mississippi River, plus the Bonnet Carre floodway, will take care of one-half of the design flood. The remainder must find its way to the Gulf of Mexico by means of the Atchafalaya Basin, including the West Atchafalaya floodway (250,000 cubic feet per second), the Atchafalaya River (650,000 cubic feet per second), and the Morganza floodway (600,000 cubic feet per second).

Bonnet Carre floodway is complete and has been used successfully on two occasions, in 1937 and in 1945. The West Atchafalaya floodway is complete and can be used if needed. The capacity of the Atchafalaya River is sufficient to take care of its share, and the Morganza floodway is under construction. It is expected that the entire Atchafalaya floodway—including the Morganza structure, the greater levees confining the flood flows, and the work below Morgan City—will be completed early in the calendar year 1953.

2. Levees, which have been and are being built to a height and cross section which will enable the Mississippi River to carry the design flood. There are 1,581 miles of Mississippi River levees. The levees will be 73 percent complete by June 1950.

3. Bank revetment, installed to hold the river in place and to prevent it from wandering as it has done in the past. Continued meander would destroy levees, with resultant need for setbacks, and would regain some of the length taken away when the cut-offs were made. A total of 425 miles of revetment will be needed, of which 199 miles will be in place by the end of the 1950 fiscal year.

4. Reservoirs, which are constructed beyond the limits of the alluvial valley on tributary river systems, such as the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the White, the Arkansas, the Ouachita, the Red, and within the alluvial valley itself, on the St. Francis and the Yazoo. The design flood at Cairo was adjusted to reflect the effects of reservoirs above that point.

5. Cut-offs, designed to shorten the course of the river and increase its slope and discharge capacity, are complete.

Black-Eyed Peas or Black-Eyed Beans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information in regard to black-eyed peas:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, November 23, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of November 16, 1949, in which you quote from a letter addressed to you alleging billing of black-eyed peas shipped from California as black-eyed beans, which billing is claimed to result in lower rates to the advantage of California growers over Texas shippers of black-eyed peas, describing them as such and paying a higher rate.

Your informant does not state the points of shipments of black-eyed peas from Texas or the destination points of the California shipments competitive to the Texas shipments. I find that the applicable tariff rates on dried beans from California to Kansas City, Mo., St. Louis, Mo., and Chicago, Ill., as representative points, are the same as the rates on dried peas. Likewise the rates on dried beans from Marlin, Tex., to those three destination points are the same as the rates on dried peas. Therefore, it is suggested that you secure further information from your constituent with respect to the specific origin and destination points of both Texas shipments and California shipments of black-eyed peas. I shall then be able to determine whether there is any difference in the rates applicable to transportation of the shipments with which he is concerned.

For such bearing as it may have on the question, it may be added that I have received advice from a representative of the Department of Agriculture to the effect that so-called black-eyed peas are classified by the Department of Agriculture as beans. Upon receipt of the information requested above I shall make further inquiry into the matter in accordance with your request.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES D. MAHAFFIE,
Chairman.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, December 16, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of December 12, 1949, with which you enclosed a letter addressed to you by George S. Buchanan, Marlin, Tex.

Mr. Buchanan discusses the description and labeling of black-eyed peas as black-eyed beans sometime in the past and suggests that the action may have been employed either to secure a lower freight rate or to have obtained more favorable consideration as to rationing or ceiling prices established under orders of the Office of Price Administration. In response to your inquiry as to whether there was an advantage enjoyed in the OPA days on freight rates, it may be said that since June 30, 1941, there has been no difference in the rail carrier rates on peas and beans destined to Middle West points and originating either in California or Texas.

In accordance with your request, Mr. Buchanan's letter is returned to you.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES D. MAHAFFIE,
Chairman.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 5, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am returning the copy of letter addressed to you by former Chairman Mahaffie, dated December 16, 1949, on which you have noted a request as of December 30, 1949, for information as to any differences on freight rates applicable to shipments of black-eyed peas and black-eyed beans before June 30, 1941.

I have had a further check made of tariffs in effect from 1930 to the present time. That check reveals that during the entire period there was no difference in the rates applicable to shipments of dried black-eyed peas and dried beans destined to Middle West points and originating either in California or Texas.

Although your previous inquiries apparently have dealt with domestic shipments, as a matter of possible interest I may add that prior to October 26, 1943, in the case of export traffic on shipments originating in California points the rate on dried peas was 10 cents per 100 pounds higher than the rate on dried beans shipped by rail to Texas ports for export. During that period there was no difference between the rates on dried peas and dried beans from Texas origin points to Texas ports. By tariff effective October 26, 1943, the rates on dried peas and dried beans from California points to Texas ports for export were equalized and have continued to be the same.

Cordially yours,
J. M. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of November 16 quoting from a communication sent you by a constituent dealing with black-eyed peas.

Under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a standard of identity for the canned product has been promulgated and this requires that the article be labeled as "black-eyed peas" or "black-eye peas." While we are aware that there are some sections of the country which have referred to the raw product as a bean, the information available to us is that consumers generally think of the product as a type of pea, and the product was standardized under its common or usual name.

We are not familiar with any differences in freight rates depending upon their classification for shipping purposes as peas or beans.

Sincerely yours,
L. D. ELLIOTT,
Associate Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of November 16, 1949, addressed to the Secretary of the Army, which has been transmitted to this Department for a reply. You quote from a letter from one of your constituents relative to the practice of shipping black eyes from California classified as beans, whereas the black eyes produced in Texas are called peas.

Black eyes are classified as beans under the official United States standards for beans and have been so considered by this agency since the promulgation of the bean standards. They are, therefore, not mislabeled when shipped from California and marketed as black-eyed beans.

Sincerely yours,
F. K. WOOLLEY,
Acting Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1949.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This letter makes reference to your communication of recent date in which you ask whether the Department of the Army advertises for black-eyed peas or black-eyed beans when procurement is initiated for Army consumption.

I have been able to determine that when the advertisement for bids is extended, the nomenclature used is as follows: Beans, dry, type E. In accordance with Federal specifications, type E is listed as black-eyed beans. When shipment is effected, the above nomenclature is used.

I am glad to be able to secure this information for you. If I can be of further service please do not hesitate to call upon me at any time.

Sincerely yours,
C. G. BLAKENEY,
Colonel, General Staff Corps.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1950.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum dated December 15, 1949, relative to the fact that black-eyed peas are also called black-eyed beans.

The current Federal specification shows them as black-eyed beans. However, this specification is under revision, and the new issue will show them as "Class 4, black-eyed peas (black-eyed beans)." The Navy cookbook has recipes for black-eyed peas.

These peas have been used in Navy general messes for many years, and personnel are familiar with the fact that they are sometimes called black-eyed beans. It is considered highly unlikely that bids submitted for

black-eyed peas would have been rejected because of the reference to peas.

Your interest in the Navy subsistence program is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. FOX,
Rear Admiral (SC) United States Navy, Chief of Bureau.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 4, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of December 19 regarding the classification of black eyes.

Dry black-eyes are classified as beans under the United States bean standards. Many of the black eyes produced in Texas are marketed in the fresh state rather than in the dry or ripe state. Fresh or green black-eyes are generally considered as peas in the trade and do not come under the bean standards, since they only apply to dry beans. Their handling is comparable to that of other fresh vegetables, whereas the handling of black eyes in the dry state is comparable to that of other dry edible legumes.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Taxes and Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many innovations are being proposed in the sound Government policies that have been followed by the Congress in safeguarding the liberty and advancing the welfare of the individual citizen since the Nation was established. Under our Government and its legislative policies great advancement has been made in almost every line of human endeavor, notably in the science of medicine. Today we find that medical science has conquered the dread enemy of childhood, diphtheria. Our doctors have made our shores impregnable to the invasion of yellow fever and have searched out and destroyed the yellow fever germ-carrying mosquitoes. Our medical men are fast conquering dreaded tuberculosis; they have overcome in a large measure the ravages of the incurable scourge, leprosy. The magnitude of the victories of medical science is beyond the comprehension of the average layman. When we consider the advances that have been made in medicine as applied by our physicians few can fail to be impressed with the able and conclusive presentation on the subject made by that veteran statesman and great American leader, Hon. James F. Byrnes, in a recent article appearing in the March 4 issue of Collier's magazine from which I quote:

To pay his Federal taxes, the average worker today puts in about 47 days a year—close to 1 day a week. But new programs are proposed, such as the construction of plants to produce materials determined by some official to be in short supply, when such official decides private enterprise will not furnish adequate production; socialized medicine, which is certainly ultimately to cost billions; Federal aid to education; the bold plan to help the backward people throughout the world; the Columbia River Authority, and the Missouri River Authority, etc.

If all these new programs go into effect with the minimum expenditures proposed, the average worker will then have to give the pay from 67 days of his work to pay Federal taxes of all kinds. When he does this, he is saying, by implication, to the Federal Government: "Here, you take my money and buy me something with it. You know better than I do what I want." Such dependence will lead to pernicious political anemia.

What is the need for the Federal Government doing so much more than is now being done? What is the hurry? There is no crisis. Let us examine just one field in which there is a great push to expand Government activities, the field of public health. Proposals for some kind of socialization in this field are put forward as a "must"—a word that is an insult to the Congress though, unfortunately, many of its Members do not seem to realize it. How bad is the health situation at present? What are the terrible conditions that demand radical steps?

Perhaps we can get the story from news releases put out by the Federal Security Agency, of which public health is a part. Here's one that tells us, "A greater proportion of births in the United States were delivered in hospitals or institutions in 1947 than in any previous year on record. * * * Since 1935, the first year that data of this kind became available, the percentage of total births delivered in hospitals has more than doubled—rising to 84.8 percent."

And here is another release: "Maternal mortality decreased to a new low in the United States." Still another: "The infant mortality rate in 1947 was the lowest on record." And again: "Latest available figures show that the average length of life of the people of the United States is nearly 2 years above the level reached in the 3 years just before the war." And finally: "The death rate for the United States in 1948 was the lowest in the history of the country."

All of these releases appeared in 1949, giving presumably the latest figures and showing plainly—if I can read figures—that the general health conditions in the United States are excellent, and improving rapidly, I cannot think of one compelling reason to change from a health system that is giving us progressive and sensationally good results to one that is doubtful and experimental. Those who argue that conditions demand a change in our health system should argue also, if they wish to be logical, that Notre Dame should change its football system.

Regardless of how much money is appropriated for a Government bureau, you cannot get medical treatment for more people unless you have more doctors. But you cannot secure a doctor by legislation—he must be trained. Medical colleges are already working on their own to increase their faculties and their students. If the politicians will let the doctors alone, the Government will be able to continue its boasts about improved health conditions.

Some advocates of socialized medicine, who apparently doubt the strength of their own proposal, seek support by calling it a New Deal proposal. It was not President Roosevelt's proposal. Five days before the election in 1940, when Willkie was a candidate for President, I was in Indianapolis. Senator Champ Clark—now Judge Clark—telephoned me that some doctors in Chicago were charging that Roosevelt had promised to support a program of socialized medicine. When I asked the President about it, he said it was not true and he would correct the impression in a radio speech on the following day at Bethesda, Md.

F. D. R. STATES HIS POSITION

In that speech on October 31, 1940, among other things, President Roosevelt said: "Neither the American people nor their Government intend to socialize medical practice any more than they plan to socialize industry. In American life the family doctor, the general practitioner, performs a service which we rely upon and trust, as a Nation." He made the statement deliberately to reassure the voters who then, as now, feared socialized medicine and socialized industry.

So far as I know, he did not thereafter change his views.

When the present Congress closed its first session, there was a flood of appraisals of what it had done and left undone. Among those stories I saw a disturbing number of times the declaration that the Congress had failed dismally to carry out the President's program, and there followed lambasting and belittlements.

Just what do people who say things like that think the Congress is supposed to do? What is their idea of our form of government? In their minds, checks and balances appear to be harmful. If Congress must carry out whatever a President wants, why not abolish Congress? What these people seem to want is a powerful Executive, and an obedient Congress. Whatever that might give us at the start, it would end in dictatorship, in tyranny, the condition the founding fathers feared most.

If the Congress should obey, what about the courts? Shall we have a system under which the executive branch of the Government is supreme? Only men who do not like our system of government, or silly men who do not pause to think, would say that a Congress must be obedient to the President if it is to serve our country. Under the Constitution the Congress is supposed to be an equal and independent branch of Government, not a me-too adjunct of the Executive.

Full Employment—In Exchange for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following enlightening article on the subject of full employment by Dr. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics at New York University:

FULL EMPLOYMENT—IN EXCHANGE FOR WHAT?

(By Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University)

Should the full-employment bill become law, the people of the United States apparently will find that something of far greater importance has happened to them than they now seem to suspect.

Although several competent analyses have been made of this bill, their net effect may be extremely limited. The sponsors of the proposal have the means by which they can smother such analyses while, at the same time, they can give wide dissemination to glittering statements and plausible propaganda in favor of the proposed program. A far-reaching propaganda machine is in operation, and it is steadily gaining momentum.

Furthermore, the proposals in the bill are presented in a manner that will tend to win approval more or less automatically and to disarm those who may not read between the lines or grasp any dangerous implications which the plan may contain. The principal device employed to accomplish this aim is the incorporation in the bill of a lengthy declaration of supposedly admirable purposes. Such material is in the nature of a preamble; and this is not law, despite the fact that it follows the enacting clause. "Legislating by preamble," a device that has been employed extensively in Washington in recent years, cannot be defended in legislative law; and it is dangerous because it is used to mislead a trusting public.

It is this preamble type of material that enters chiefly into the popular discussion of this bill and is utilized, because of its emotional appeal, in the organized propaganda now being brought to bear upon the general public and Members of Congress by certain administrative, congressional, and various other pressure groups.

But the major defects or virtues of this bill are not found in the announced purposes. They are in the mechanism designed to provide full employment. And since this mechanism involves complex questions regarding statistical measurements and intricate causal relationships in the economic world, many economists and others opposed to the socialization of our economy fear that the general public may not be in a position to weigh the factual evidence which reveals the merits or dangers in this program. Regarding many, if not most, of the basic assumptions made in the bill, some of our most experienced and reputable economists are entering vigorous denials as to their accuracy or practicability.

The bill provides for a national production and employment budget, shortened to national budget—a budget which far exceeds in complexity of concept our large and complicated Federal budget. It is to include the estimated size of the labor force and the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditures by private enterprises, consumers, and State, local, and Federal Governments supposedly required to produce the gross national product deemed necessary, at expected prices, to provide full employment opportunities. It is also to contain estimates of the contemplated investment and expenditures of these groups, apart from the national budget program, including such foreign investments and expenditures for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

The President is required to transmit such a budget to Congress at the beginning of each regular session. The budget is to be applicable to the ensuing fiscal year or such longer period as he may deem appropriate. If the estimated volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or longer is less than the estimated volume required to assure full employment, the national budget shall provide for correction of the deficiency. The President is to set forth ways of encouraging non-Federal investment and expenditure to increase employment and, to the extent that these are thought likely to prove insufficient, he is to provide a program of Federal investment and expenditure. His recommendations are to favor the utilization of private enterprise "except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law."

If, conversely, the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure is more than is supposed to be required to assure full employment, the President is required to present a program designed to contract this volume.

He is also authorized to submit supplemental or revised estimates, or programs, or legislative recommendations to Congress "from time to time." He is required to review all Federal investment and expenditure quarterly to ascertain any changes supposedly needed in the volume of Federal investment and expenditure, and the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment.

This National budget is to be prepared in the Office of the President in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments. In addition, there is to be a joint committee on the national budget composed of 15 Members of the Senate and 15 Members of the House who are supposed to study the budget and to report to Congress by March 1 of each year.

The bill provides that nothing in it shall be construed as calling for or authorizing the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government, or the use of compulsory measures in the distribution of manpower, or any change in existing procedures on appropriations; or the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by some law other than this bill.

The arguments that have been offered in behalf of this program are essentially those set forth in the bill's declaration of purposes. The significant considerations for the people of the United States are those raised by analysts who have studied the bill carefully and are in a position to appraise its implications with accuracy. In general, their queries and observations, thus far, follow closely the following summarization.

Serious questions arise concerning the concept of the national budget. Its reliability and value, quite apart from matters of purpose and practicability of administration, rest upon other concepts such as those of gross national product, the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure, regular and full-time employment, and so on, regarding which our statistical data are inadequate and of a questionable character. Most of these concepts are matters of dispute among economists both as to definition and as to the possibility of accurate measurement.

What, for instance, is regular and full-time employment—how many days per week must one work, how many hours per day, how many adult members of the family must work, how many holidays may there be, at what age may one begin work, and at what age may or must one retire? How can the notion of continuing full employment be applied to seasonal workers, specialized workers, migratory workers, apprentices, incompetents who are discharged, and those changing jobs? Is not the need for full employment greatest when the living standard of people is lowest, and least when their standard is highest? Does not the idea of full employment dissociate wages from productivity? Are not prosperity and productivity, rather than full employment, the major considerations?

Some of the other concepts mentioned, such as that of gross national product, involve, probably, even more difficult questions.

This bill directs the President to proceed as though our statistical data on the basic elements involved were complete and reliable or can be made available when needed. It directs him to make predictions on the basis of data known to be incomplete and unreliable. It proceeds upon an assumption that a deficit in what is supposed to be the proper amount of spending and investment can be stated with accuracy, and that this deficit can be related in a definite manner to the unemployment which has prevailed or may be predicted.

Indeed, the bill is essentially a series of assertions cut loose from realities. It states how governmental policies are to promote private enterprise, how they are to bring about the desired activity on the part of business, how they will assure full employment, how consumers' expenditures will be increased or decreased as desired, how capital outlays of business will be increased or decreased as needed, and so on, just as though assertions of this type in a law can effect the ends desired.

The bill incorporates what has come to be known as a compensatory economy program, the soundness of which has been challenged repeatedly by many of our most responsible economists. Provision is made for Government spending to take care of the deficits in the national budget. No consideration is given to the effects of taxation or borrowing on the private economy. Insofar as the theories in this bill go, taxation and borrowing might be exceedingly heavy and disturbing. No consideration is given to the possible size of the Federal debt nor to other unfortunate disturbances which the proposed Government policies and actions probably would cause. Under this plan we could have a series of deficits until the public credit collapses.

The bill, like the general run of comments on it by its proponents, seems to reveal no clear understanding of the net effects of similar Government policies in the past, as, for example, during the 1930's. When a policy, much like the one proposed, was tried in this country during those years, the economy was so disturbed that unemployment remained at a high level despite the heavy governmental expenditures. The flow of capital into new enterprises declined to a mere trickle. The velocity of bank deposits, which in general reflects people's optimism or pessimism, declined to the lowest level on record up to the time we embarked upon our armament program—to a point below that reached at the depth of the depression in July 1932. Facts of this type are ignored by the proponents of this bill. Moreover, its sponsors offer none that would warrant support for the theories on which it rests. They are asking the people of the United States to accept the bill on faith—on the basis of assertions and the declaration of purposes.

Another important consideration is whether a government can really do the things which this bill takes for granted. There are qualified persons who maintain that it is more reasonable to assume, in the light of the evidence that is available, that governments will make serious mistakes and cause maladjustments than it is to assume that they will always act with wisdom and proper foresight.

The bill takes for granted that even though a nation has been plunged into a severe war, with all the attendant serious and radical adjustments that are involved, the central government, if it will only take appropriate measures, can effect a smooth transition to a peace economy and enable the country to escape a severe postwar reaction. Many economists doubt that there is any basis in economics, or in economic history, for such an assumption. They insist that much of our thinking in the late 1920's was of this type. We thought then, they say, that if we could maintain a stable price level and continue certain other enlightened policies,

which our Government was supposed to be pursuing, we could escape a secondary and severe postwar reaction. We were soon taught the foolishness of those notions. Today we are seeing essentially similar assumptions made. The importance o a stable price level is being stressed just as in the late 1920's.

There is nothing in the proposed plan that would indicate how much Government spending is necessary to put a certain number of people to work. For instance, during the days prior to the pump-priming program of the 1930's, when the Federal budget was approximately $5,000,000,000, what was the relationship of this budget to the number of people employed? According to fairly conservative estimates, the best we can expect in the way of a normal-time postwar budget is one of, say $25,000,000,000. With a budget of five times the pre-pump-priming budgets, what would be the relationship of this extra 20 billions of Federal expenditures to the number of people that would and would not be employed?

The plan fails to recognize what qualified economists know to be the difficulties in solving the problem of unemployment by Government action: A government is a cumbersome machine and slow in launching public works. It is difficult to start these in the areas of unemployment and, therefore, labor often must be moved to distant points and perhaps be provided with special housing and other facilities. Projects, once started, are rarely stopped when the need for such employment disappears, partly because of the waste involved in the incompleted enterprises. There is the question of how to utilize the products or services for which there may be little or no demand. The supervisory bureaucracy is wasteful, expensive, politically minded, and tends to perpetuate itself and to expand its undertakings. There is a tendency to compete unfairly with private enterprises and to cause it to shrink or die, which, in turn, provides the excuse for still further expansion of Government employment activities.

Despite provision for advisory and other committees, the proposed national budget would be in control of a small group of statisticians who would devise programs of national expenditures based upon their statistical estimates. It is hardly reasonable to suppose that the 30 otherwise busy members of the joint committee of Congress would go behind the reports of the statisticians and obtain a genuine understanding of the nature and shortcomings of the raw material used in such estimates. What one can count on is that this committee and other advisory groups, Congress, and the President would take what this small group of managerial statisticians gave them, and that both Congress and the President would act upon such estimates. Otherwise, they would be defeating the chief purpose of the program. The probable consequence would be the discovery that, through the passage of this bill, we had instituted in large degree a federally managed economy with the management actually in the hands of a small group of statisticians.

Another serious question involved in the program is whether security in the form of assurance of "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" can be given to individuals by any government without at the same time sacrificing, to an undesirable degree, the freedoms which individuals must have if they are to go forward in the best possible manner. The bill does not face the fact that an individual cannot have freedom without, at the same time, incurring risks. It assumes that the people of the United States have reached a stage in which they are willing to sacrifice their guaranties of freedom to obtain what is in fact a spurious guaranty of employment. It embodies the doctrine that every person is entitled to obtain a living from the Government regardless of whether he has the ability or the willingness to produce enough to justify the pay which it is proposed that he shall have.

Just how does the Federal Government propose to see to it that the person who desires "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" is to get it? Who will decide whether the job is "useful" and what is "remunerative"? Will rates of pay differ or will they be uniform? What is a "regular" and a "full-time" job, and how is one to get it if there are no openings in the fields where one's qualifications lie? The net meaning of all these vague words—"useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment"—can be nothing but Government regimentation of those people who may be so unfortunate as to become the victims of the system which the bill, by its nature, apparently will institute.

The fact is that if an attempt is to be made by the Government to provide employment in accordance with the vaguely worded promises in this bill, the Government, of necessity, must determine when, where, and under what conditions the seekers of employment may work. This fact is not altered by the statement in the bill that nothing in the plan may be construed as calling for or authorizing the use of compulsory measures of any type whatever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower. The existence of a painful amount of unemployment will supply all the compulsion that is necessary. This bill opens the way to far-reaching Government action to insure such employment as it may see fit to provide. The Government could, and probably would, enter many fields of activity that are not proper functions of Government—if we are to maintain the system of private enterprise.

Although the declaration of purposes is not law, but rather a psychological trick, the statement that one of the purposes of the plan is to contribute to the full utilization of our national resources is symptomatic of the unhealthy nature of this bill. No well-informed person could possibly expect to have or to want full utilization of our national resources. Such utilization would mean the end of all conservation and would leave little or nothing for future generations.

Despite the great concern repeatedly expressed in the bill over the preservation and fostering of free, competitive, private enterprise, the program in its essence is a monument to a striking lack of faith in the virtues and strength of private enterprise. The faith of the sponsors of this bill lies in the so-called welfare state, a fact adequately demonstrated by the declaration of purposes. And the true nature of the welfare state is a matter of grave concern to those who wish to maintain private enterprise in this country. "The slave state," says the British economist, Hayek, "always starts out as a welfare state. It promises freedom from worry, want—as many freedoms as you wish, except freedom from the state itself." This bill provides for much less, not more, freedom from the state. Indeed, some careful critics regard this program as probably the boldest attempt yet made in this country by Government planners to usher in a federally controlled peacetime economy.

Continuing full employment cannot be assured in a free society. If this bill should become law, the probable effect would be to discourage rather than encourage private enterprise and to decrease rather than increase nongovernment employment. The Federal Government will have assumed an explicit responsibility for full employment and for unemployment in this country. Presumably the best administration would be the one that would employ the most people. This could easily lead to huge Federal spending, huge bureaucracy and patronage, and finally, to national bankruptcy.

Although the bill expresses again and again an aim to encourage and to utilize private enterprise in carrying out the proposed program, escape clauses are invariably provided which would enable the President, with the cooperation of a majority in Congress, to do practically anything he pleases. In addition, there are various broad and vague provisions under which those responsible for the proposed policies could attempt almost anything in the way of instituting a federally managed economy.

The alternative to this bill does not involve doing nothing to combat unemployment—a matter of great concern to all enlightened people. There is, as qualified economists well know, an alternative that can be helpful and at the same time actually preserve and strengthen private enterprise and foster a healthy economy.

In brief, if our Government officials really desire to preserve and to encourage private enterprise and private capitalism, they should give more attention to what makes it function best and what causes the maladjustments that result in unemployment. Then they should endeavor to create the atmosphere favorable to the best functioning of the system.

Specifically, they should foster free and fair competition. They should not compete unfairly with private enterprise. They should provide the Nation with currency and fiscal systems in which the people have confidence and which facilitate rather than disturb the operation of the system of private enterprise. They should protect the weak from the strong and give careful consideration to ways to aid the needy aged and helpless without undermining their self-reliance and self-respect. They should see to it that those who handle other people's money adhere to the highest standards of ethics. They should encourage science, invention, and learning, and seek to broaden rather than to narrow the scope of individual freedom. They should regulate in the interests of peaceful settlement of disputes rather than to endeavor to produce and to direct. They should narrow rather than enlarge Government activities. They should encourage hard work, prudence, saving, and self-reliance. They should cease to cultivate the enervating notions that self-reliance is no longer a virtue, that the Government owes all citizens a job and a living, that there are distinct limits to the penalties that may attach to lack of prudence, and that there can be too much saving and that "oversaving" is a bad thing.

They should do other things of a similar nature. Some public works, if they are needed and if they can be properly conceived and executed in times of unsual unemployment, might accomplish some small benefits; but there is no basis for supposing that the benefits can ever be comparable to those assumed in this bill. Such works, when designed primarily to provide employment, besides being too expensive, rarely produce anything that leads to continuing employment. At their best, their accomplishments compare poorly with those resulting from a small fillip in the private enterprise system.

It is in these directions, rather than in more national planning of the type proposed in this bill, that our non-Socialist economists of repute believe the road to higher standards of living, greater individual freedom, and greater national well-being is to be found.

A basic question presented to the people of the United States by the full-employment bill is whether their thinking and activities are to continue in the direction of preserving and enlarging the freedom of the individual or whether they are to follow those of Socialist-Communist-authoritarian Europe.

America's Tradition of Asylum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the HIAS in New York on March 5, 1950:

AMERICA'S TRADITION OF ASYLUM

In the face of all we know—in the face of history—how can anyone sit back, smug and complacent, and deny that one of the greatest sources of American strength is in its tradition of asylum? But I think it is one of the bitterest commentaries of our time that men of good will are forced again and again to take the position of defending the immigrant, that men of good will again and again are forced to repeat the facts, to deny the slanders and review the history of immigration in our country. As far back as 1813, the same hue and cry was set forth against the immigrants. Almost 150 years ago men were making political capital of talking about closed frontiers, limitation of opportunity, and displacement of the American worker. These were men of little faith, restricted in imagination with tight, little minds who understood neither the era in which they lived nor the era to come. This is as true today.

The United States Congress had made provision when the struggle began in 1924 to restrict immigration, for the admission of 153,000 yearly. That law stands today. For almost a decade under that law just prior to and during the chaotic war years only a fraction of that number came in. Even under the now accepted restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, thousands upon thousands—almost one million and a half—seeking asylum could have entered without a dissenting murmur had the law provided that each year's unused quota would not lapse. Had these thousands been able to come in under the law, nobody would have talked of the displacement of American workers. Nobody would have talked about housing, etc., etc. It would have been taken for granted. Mind you, I make no brief for this act, which is based on eligibility of admission rising out of national origin. If 153,000 people are to be admitted yearly, what difference does it make if they are Poles, or French, or British, or Germans? This business of racial emphasis is an evil one. It translates prejudices into law and gives official sanction to the baseless concept of racial superiors. I cannot help but face this issue honestly, but I must likewise admit that the temper of the times is such that any attempt at repeal of such concept would meet with defeat—a defeat so complete that it must surely injure such attempts when made at a more propitious time. But I pledge myself to work unceasably to eradicate racialism from our lives. I shall not rest secure until any immigration law, based upon so-called racial superiority, is wiped clean off our statute books.

To go back to the law as it exists today with the possible admission of 153,000 yearly and with the lapse of over a million and a half quota numbers in the last decade—think what sound and what fury accompanied the discussion of a displaced-persons program in the United States. The displaced-persons program, of course, is a problem apart from our general immigration problems, but it is intimately related because of the prejudices and distortions which accompanied the enactment of a law in 1948—a law which reiterated the intolerance that made its first appearance in the law with the Immigration Act of 1924.

I think it is a fair question to ask what would the United States have been without the enrichment and vitality brought to it by the immigrant. We have a vigorous and dynamic society because we have utilized and amalgamated numerous cultures, numerous skills, numerous philosophies, and the product of that amalgamation, of that fusing together, is unmistakably and characteristically now a merit. Just as families inbred through years of highly selective marriage finally disintegrate, like the royal families of Spain and the Hapsburg Empires, so a nation stops growing when refinement of blood is its only goal. This is historically true and has been demonstrated again and again through the course of mankind. For example, it has been clearly shown that the years of greatest prosperity coincided with the years of the greatest immigration waves. It has been demonstrated that the States with the largest immigration population are most prosperous, spending more per capita for education, for road construction, for health, and for other general-welfare projects than those States barren of immigration blood. James G. McDonald, former High Commissioner of Refugees under the League of Nations, described the exiles from Germany, whom we admitted as being among the political and intellectual leaders under the German Republic—Democrats, moderate Socialists, pacifists, liberal professors, journalists, Catholic priests, and Protestant pastors. So selective was the emigration that Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and Franco's Spain became practically intellectual deserts. As a further indication of the outstanding quality of the group that sought asylum amongst us in the 10 years 1932 to 1942 alone, it should be noted that 12 were Nobel Prize winners and that at least 103 of them have attained the distinction of being listed in Who's Who in America and 220 in American Men of Science, despite the short time they have been here. The number so listed is twice as large as would be expected if the same ratio to general population characteristic of Americans were to be applied to them.

Literally hundreds of refugee scientists made substantial contributions to the success of the Allied arms. Prof. Karl Sollner, a refugee scientist at the University of Minnesota, was a coinventor of a portable device to enable shipwrecked sailors and airmen to convert sea water into drinking water. A Polish engineer, T. Janiszewski, invented a new type of portable demountable V-type deck bridge which became standard United States Army equipment. An Austrian, Alfred Schwarz, research director for an optical company, designed a synchronized shutter used by Air Force and Signal Corps photographers. Czech specialists in the glass industry brought in a number of secret processes that were utilized in plane manufacture and in plastics. Iron and steel men from the Skoda Works contributed special knowledge and skill to the manufacture of munitions. These are just typical examples of the extensive contribution made by refugees to the war effort.

Most dramatic of the new discoveries was the development of the atomic bomb, which turned into a race between German and Allied scientists. Ironically enough, Germany started the experiments, but we finished them. In this we were aided by refugee scientists, a number of whom had been expelled by the Nazis because they were Jews. Among them were Albert Einstein, who provided the mathematical equation which showed just what the relation of matter to energy is and how one can be converted into the other, and whose letter to President Roosevelt resulted in the appointment of the Advisory Committee on Uranium. Dr. Lise Meitner, who discovered with Prof. Otto Hahn the important clue to the release of atom energy, fled to Denmark where she communicated her results to Dr. O. Frisch, a physicist likewise driven from Germany, and worked with Dr. Neils Bohr, a Nobel prize winner, until the German occupation in April 1940, when she escaped to Sweden and continued her research work, the results of which were sent to the United States; Dr. Bohr, formulator of the theory on which the atomic bomb is based, who was whisked from the grasp of the Nazis in his occupied homeland, went to England and also came to the United States where he assisted in developing the atomic bomb; Prof. Rudulf Peierls and Dr. Franz Eugen Simon, two German physicists who fled to England where they participated in the British part of the program; Dr. Enrico Fermi, Italy's foremost physicist and a Nobel prize winner, a refugee to the United States, who discovered how easily a slow neutron can slip into an atom to burst its nucleus and release terrific energy and who also did much to show how the chain reaction could be controlled; and numerous refugees of other nationalities who assisted in bringing the A-bomb to perfection. As the New York Times of August 8, 1945, remarked editorially: "Though the credit for having forestalled Germany must go to the air forces that bombed German research laboratories where secret weapons were developed, we have some reason to thank Hitler and Mussolini for handicapping themselves. The Fuehrer's irrational glorification of Nordics and Il Duce's acceptance of the Nuremberg policy had the result of presenting us with some of the best physicists of Germany and Italy and of occupied countries. There must be scores of others who were not mentioned in the official announcements—engineers, technicians, chemists, physicists of distinction, all gifts of Hitler and Mussolini."

Many alien baiters and xenophobes, in the most arrogant fashion, proclaim their superiority. They alone, for example, are responsible for winning the war, so they say. They have a monopoly on patriotism. They forget the contributions of immigrants and sons of immigrants in World Wars I and II. They forget such heroes as Abe Krotoshinsky, of the famous Lost Battalion; General Rose, son of a rabbi; Don Gentile, famous flying ace, son of Italian immigrants; Meyer Levin, of Polish descent; and Colin Kelly, of Irish descent. Of the six servicemen who participated in the historic flag raising at Iwo Jima, three of the men were aliens, one a Swede, one a French Canadian, and one a Carpatho-Russian, born in Czechoslovakia. The fourth was a full-blooded Pima Indian. In 1854, Lincoln rejected the proposed endorsement of the Whigs and Know Nothings, who were the alien baiters of his day. At the time he said: "Who are native Americans? Do they not wear the breech-clout and carry the tomahawk? We pushed them (Indians) from their homes and now turn upon others not fortunate enough to come over as early as we or our forefathers. Gentlemen, your party is wrong in principle." Then he told this story.

"I had an Irishman named Patrick cultivating my garden. One morning I went over to see him and asked how he was getting along. 'Mr. Lincoln, what do you think of these Know Nothings?' he asked. I explained what they were trying to do and asked Pat why he had not been born in America. 'Faith,' he replied, 'I wanted to but my mother wouldn't let me.' "

Let me again, in the interest of clarification, make this clear. I do not hold the premise that immigrants are better than other people. Neither are they worse. They are, in short, human beings with all the failings and with all the virtues that go to make up people. But I do make the premise that the intermingling of cultures and that the applications of alien skills in a country enrich it, serving both the nation

and the immigrant. I do hold the premise that a country which bars immigrants, which holds fears of aliens, which embraces chauvinism, will bring on self-destruction. I don't mean that the country will die out. I mean self-destruction in terms of growth and progress in its economy, in its arts and sciences; in short, a country which bars its immigrants has dried up the bed of its life-giving waters.

Let us look for a moment at our displaced-persons program which goes so far to demonstrate these truths. True, the present law contains restrictions and limitations which have proved detrimental to the entire program. The displaced-persons programs of the other countries, with the exception of Israel, have been on the basis of mass "labor recruitment," with selection by the governments of these countries. These countries have the widest latitude under their respective laws and regulations providing for the selection of immigration of displaced persons. Only in the United States has the program been rigidly circumscribed by a law which includes restrictions, limitations, preferences, and priorities upon all displaced persons who seek entrance into our country. It must be remembered that these special requirements are placed on top of all other requirements which our customary immigration law provides. We require individual assurances for jobs and housing which will not displace citizens; we find a 40-percent preference for those of Baltic origin and a 30-percent preference for agricultural workers. The 40 percent allotted to nationals of the Baltic States and the 30 percent allotted to agricultural workers comprise less than 19 percent of the displaced persons in the camp and this 19 percent arbitrarily receives 40 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of all visas issued. The Displaced Persons Commission is thus placed in an impossible position where it has to withhold the granting of visas until nationals of Baltic States and agricultural workers are found to meet these percentages. And they cannot be found.

Factually, there are not enough of these two groups to meet the 40- and 30-percent categories. Those who have job and housing assurances who are neither Balts nor agricultural workers must, perforce, sit back and wait. This has made the administration of the present law a most intricate and dismaying business.

In the early days of its operation under the 1948 act, the Displaced Persons Commission tried religiously to adhere to the prescribed percentages. When it became obvious that this policy slowed down the progress of a 2-year program of admission, the Commission informed the Congress in March of 1949 that in order to comply with the requests of American sponsors filing assurances it would temporarily pay less attention to the Baltic and agricultural percentages in order to expedite the flow of displaced persons under the 1948 act. The fact that the House of Representatives had as far back as June 2, 1949, passed the Celler bill eliminating the arbitrary and discriminatory preference percentages constituted an encouragement for the Commission to continue this sound policy. A much faster and more expeditious flow of displaced persons to the United States ensued. Many of the camps in Europe were emptied; many of them were closed and other countries such as Israel, Australia, and Canada, encouraged by the progress of our program, have greatly increased the number of displaced persons they have decided to admit. The outlook for complete and final dissipation of the displaced-persons problem was excellent.

But it is now obvious that the application of these restrictions, the unworkability of which has been predicted repeatedly, is preventing the fulfillment of the intent of Congress. It may well be because of these percentage preferences that the pathetically low figure of 205,000 will not be reached with the result that the displaced person problems will continue to be with us.

Even if there were a way found to make the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 workable, there would still remain 180,000 displaced persons in Europe by the end of the year.

The solution is an obvious and simple one. The Celler bill, which, as stated above, passed the House and is now awaiting action in our Senate, increases the number of eligible displaced persons to 339,000 and removes the unworkable percentage limitations. Out of 360,000 now remaining, 260,000 have already been listed for resettlement in other countries.

Thus the passage of my bill would insure a resettlement program fully complete except for the hard core of displaced persons which contained the disabled and the sick. This hard core would then necessarily fall within a mercy program which some countries have already undertaken. All reasonable people agree that every sound reason exists for the enactment of my bill.

The increases under the present law have created no additional housing problem; they have constituted only one-three hundredth of 1 percent of the labor force; 25 percent have been placed on farms, according to the statement of the Department of Agriculture; they have created no criminal problem, according to the statement of the Department of Justice; and their social integration has been excellent, according to the Federal Security Agency Administrator. The voluntary relief organizations, which have concerned themselves with their resettlement, report that there have been no instances where it has been found necesary to place any one of them on relief rolls, nor has their resettlement been concentrated in already crowded cities. Twenty-five percent as noted have gone to rural areas, and that percentage is increasing at a rapid rate. They have brought with them occupational skills which have been in short supply. All the orphans under 16 years of age attend school full time. None of the children under 16 work. Of the immigrants admitted under the act approximately 25 percent were under the age of 18, and 84 percent of all displaced persons who arrived were under 45 years of age. Seventy-six percent of the displaced persons were in family groups.

Questionnaires concerning the resettlement program were sent out by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to the appropriate executive departments, to the 48 governors of the various States, to labor organizations, and to social welfare agencies. More than two-thirds of these various groups replied, and in no one reply was there expressed any dissatisfaction with the displaced persons. Twenty-seven governors have already replied to date, and two-thirds of them state that they could use more displaced persons. Replies coming from the midwest and southern regions of the country have asked for more displaced persons with professional skills. The National Catholic Welfare Conference in its reply states:

"Of the total number of displaced persons sponsored through War Relief Services—NCWC, 40,592, not one person is either receiving relief or is unemployed. Opportunities for more displaced persons come into this office at the rate of about 700 a week; the program's success may be judged by the continuous stream of new assurances for displaced persons. The displaced persons who have resettled in the United States have sold the program to the American people by their willingness, honesty, and devotion. The few whose resettlement has not immediately been successful are forgotten when the program is viewed as a whole."

The United Service for New Americans, Inc., reports:

"It is our feeling that the program of resettlement of displaced persons in the United States has been a real success to date and is an augury of the satisfactory integration of the entire 205,000 people who are eligible to enter the United States under the DP Act of 1948."

The Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society states:

"The new arrivals apparently have adjusted themselves because, to our knowledge, no DP's have had to turn to welfare authorities for financial aid. Socially, they have been law abiding—none has thus far run afoul of the law; many have become leaders of religious congregations; some have entered the artistic fields; and still others have excelled in scientific studies. The DP, generally speaking, is a conscientious, reverent, and energetic person, who wants to make good and is willing to start at the bottom. We have seen men of letters accept jobs as menials, in a spirit of tolerance and profound appreciation for the immigration opportunities afforded to them."

I cannot leave off without stating how strongly I feel about the Senate Judiciary Committee amendments to the Celler bill. These amendments were the brain child of Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada. What he has done is to take my bill and under the guise of liberalizing it, has perverted it to the use of German expellees. It is cleverly written to leave the impression that it accepts the principles of an increase in the admission of displaced persons in this country, but nothing is further from the truth.

The Celler bill is designed to deal specifically with the problem of the displaced persons camps—to look toward their quick dissolution, and to relieve the taxpayer of their burden of support for these camps. All facts point to the conclusion that the passage of my bill will achieve that result. The changes proposed by the Senate committee, despite their appearance to the contrary, would do no such thing. They leave untouched the central problem which is the elimination of the displaced persons camps. The Senate committee bill does that primarily by including in its definition of the displaced person "persons of German ethnic origin" * * * "who are expressly excluded under the constitution of the International Refugee Organization." That provision coupled with its other restrictive provision that 30 percent of the authorized visas shall be issued to persons who have been for at least 2 years at some previous time or times engaged principally in agricultural pursuits practically bars entry to those in the DP camps. The Displaced Persons Commission has testified that the agricultural restriction in and of itself has made the present act unworkable because of the difficulty in finding so high a percentage of eligible agricultural workers. There will be no difficulty in finding agricultural workers among the persons of German ethnic origin, but where does that leave the displaced person?

In addition thereto the proposed changes strengthen the provision that 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia, or areas under the control of any such countries.

Thus we see in effect a bill not for the persons in the displaced persons' camp, but for persons of German ethnic origin. In other words, the persons in the DP camps will have to compete with a heavy and overwhelming advantage in the law on the side of Germans for admission to the United States. This spells out a studied attempt to close our doors to the persons in the DP camps. It means that the American taxpayer will have

to continue maintaining these camps for an indefinite period; it means that the DP problem will remain with us to be rehashed and rehashed over and over again; and it means that the hopes of dissolving the IRO on March 31, 1951, to which the United States is so heavy a contributor, will be dashed.

In addition to the expenses borne by the United States in maintaining these camps and in contributions to the IRO, the United States will be called upon to pay for all transportation costs of those persons of German ethnic origin since these persons do not come within the jurisdiction of the IRO. The constitution of the IRO forbids the organization from paying transportation costs for persons so excluded. Let me point out that the IRO bears the costs of transportation of displaced persons within their own definition. It will be noted, of course, that the Senate Judiciary Committee has changed the definition of a displaced person which heretofore has been the definition used by the international organization. Acceptance of these provisions will mean a denial of our international obligations as well and a rift in the direction of international harmony.

I note, too, that the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to include the word "Marxist" in addition to the word "Communist" already included in the Celler bill in its definition is many things to many men. What is a "Marxist" and who is a "Marxist" is far from being settled, and to use so vague a term legislatively is a grave error. Does a "Marxist" mean George Bernard Shaw, Clement Attlee, or Tito, or Molotov, or any or all of them?

The Celler bill at best was a compromise bill, but it does have the merit of dealing directly and centrally with the problem of the displaced person.

Let us all fervently hope that that day never dawns when we set aside forever America's great tradition of asylum.

Improving Our Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate:

IMPROVING OUR ELECTIONS

Cartoonists have long depicted our ancient electoral college system as hoary and outmoded. By and large, they have correctly popularized the notion that reforms in our Presidential elections were badly needed. The Senate last week responded to the popular appeal by voting the necessary two-thirds majority for the amendment offered by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts.

The plan provides that the electors shall be able to reflect popular preference for a candidate by casting their ballots for a minority candidate. In other words, instead of the winner-take-all theory that has led to lop-sided electoral counts in the past, the outcome will allow candidates in a Presidential election to retain their votes in proportion to the popular ballots. In 1948, when the election was still in doubt, the Dixiecrats might have held the balance of power had one of the large States gone the other way.

Such perversions of the popular will would be obviated in the future, under the Lodge amendment. The act must still be voted and approved by two-thirds of the House and from there must be approved by 36 of the States. There is a good possibility that the twelfth amendment will be revised and the reform incorporated into our Constitution.

The plan is not the pure democratic process whereby a President would be elected by popular vote alone. But it is a good compromise. The amendment offered by Senator LUCAS, providing that no candidate can win without 40 percent of the popular vote, adds to the attractiveness of the reform. In the absence of such a plurality, the entire Congress, not just the House, elects the President. The improved electoral revision deserves the support of the House and the Connecticut Legislature, as well as all others interested in fair and equitable elections.

Mao Returns to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 4, 1950:

MAO RETURNS TO CHINA

Mao Tze-tung, chieftain of the Chinese Communists, is now back in his native land after his extended pilgrimage to Moscow. Because of the fact that he went there to negotiate a treaty most of the emphasis upon his return has been placed, so far, on the question: What did he come back with? It is equally pertinent to ask: What did he come back to?

It is not so easy to make an appraisal of the exact situation, but plainly Mao comes back to an inflation of the same sort as that which undermined the Nationalist Government of China. The promise of $60,000,000 a year for 5 years that he received from the Russians won't help much to halt the already downward spiral of Communist currency. Apparently the policy of forced loans was not enough. The tactics used in forced rice collections and return of these loans to get moral credit apparently won't work when it comes to money.

A factor in the deteriorating economy, of course, is Nationalist bombardment and blockade. Whatever its cost in other respects, it is apparently proving to be more effective in the economic field than many persons had supposed it could have been. Chiang, who was upbraided for the lack of will to resist on the part of his armies, is showing more than a little ability to resist and to do real damage with his navy and his air force. At the moment he is forcing the Communists to lose ground economically.

This is a curious and fateful reversal of roles. It is easy to see that the effectiveness of the Chinese Communist movement derived to a very considerable extent from the fact that its attack over a long period was not on the field forces of the Nationalist Army but on the basic economy of the Government of China itself. The Communists boasted that when that viable economy had been sufficiently undermined the resistance of the Government would fall of its own weight, and events justified their boast. The situation has now swung around and it is the Communists who must try to establish and sustain a working economy for China. Their present outlook is not bright.

At the same time the character of Nationalist resistance has improved. Chiang, in resuming the presidency, is simply responding to the logic of forces and events. He has rehabilitated resistance on both Hainan and Formosa. He has at last put the real liberals and reformers into key positions. In place of some of the liberal followers of Li Tsung-jen, who came into office on the theory that it was possible to make an honorable peace with the Communists and wound up in Peiping, he has put authority into the hands of such acknowledged leaders as Wang Shih-chieh, K. C. Wu, George Yeh, C. K. Yen, and O. K. Yu. In the military field he has the services of skilled and imaginative commanders such as Chen Cheng, Hsueh Yueh, and Sun Li-jen.

Mao's return, in this light, must be viewed as something short of triumphal. He has won some of his battles in China. He may or may not have won his battle in Moscow. He still has an economic and political and military war on his hands.

Sunny and the Devil's Capsules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Al McCready, from the American Weekly for March 5, 1950:

SUNNY AND THE DEVIL'S CAPSULES
(By Al McCready)

A spotlight picked her out, and Sunny Burnett danced, and when she was done the theater audience whistled and cheered. It happened in big cities and small ones, from one coast to the other, and people who saw that dazzling sprite in those days, in the late twenties and early thirties, still brighten up when her name comes to mind.

Other people, in the dim back rooms of drug stores and in hospital wards, remember her, too, and when they hear her name they grow abruptly silent. They knew her when her dancing days were over.

Sunny was a foundling. She was adopted by a foster mother in an Oregon town near Portland. She was such a happy little girl that soon she was "Sunny" to everyone, and she kept the name for good.

By the time she walked, she seemed to want to dance; before she was 4, she was learning ballet and tap steps in a dancing school; at 6, she was a professional, and on the stage.

Vaudeville houses dotted the country then, and when she was still in her early teens, Sunny made the 1-night stands and the longer ones of the Pantages and Orpheum circuits.

After that, there was a tour of Europe, and then, because she was really dedicated to ballet, she put aside money-making dancing for more study. She practiced several hours a day and in that period finished high school.

When the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo visited Portland, Oreg., she danced with it in the Civic Auditorium; and she kept on afterward with the hard grind of practice; and in 1938 she starred in a musical production in the Portland Civic Theater.

"How about a cup of coffee?" a young man asked her one night after a performance. That was the way she met Ray Ward, the young foreman of a cleaning and dyeing plant. She had coffee with him in a nearby restaurant, and within the year they were married.

She had everything to live for then, she said; a husband she loved, security, and her

goal ahead, the time when she would be a ballerina.

When she fell ill of appendicitis she wasn't worried. An operation at a Portland hospital would set her right. But after the surgery she found she couldn't sleep.

She began at night to take what she thought was a harmless pill, and soon she was taking two a night, and then three or four.

Before either she or her husband realized it she became one of those unfortunates who find that sleeping pills are habit forming.

She tried to keep on dancing, she tried to keep regular hours and lead a normal life, and the efforts were pitiful. She had to have more pills. She couldn't be without them.

"I sent her to a rehabilitation hospital where they try to cure people of the dope habit," Ray Ward said recently in an interview with a representative of the American Weekly. "It was the beginning of a 10-year nightmare."

Five days after she came out of the hospital "cured" her husband found her lying in a stupor on the floor of their apartment. A partly filled bottle of sleeping pills stood on a bathroom table.

"I sent her back to the hospital," Ward said. "She was 'cured' again, and went back still again. Each time the same thing happened."

Sunny tried to free herself of the habit. She suffered, Ward said. But she couldn't force her steps past one door or another where, if she turned in, she could get a fresh supply.

Her husband began to make a round of doctors and druggists, pleading with them not to let her have any more of the barbiturates. Some agreed willingly. He said he was shocked to find others callously indifferent.

One druggist, he said, in a 2-week period filled 18 prescriptions given to Sunny by 18 different doctors.

Some doctors, he said, were not above taking advantage of the fact that she seemed to be a sleeping-pill addict. One of them, not in Portland, sent her pills by mail, c. o. d., and the price was high.

A State law restricted the sale of the pills but Sunny—as her dancing days waned and her stupors grew deeper and more frequent—managed to stay adequately supplied.

She went to one hospital after another, one clinic after another, throughout the Pacific Northwest. She was hospitalized 28 times and Ward paid out $15,000 in fees, trying to have her really cured.

It wasn't any use. There was no reason any more to call her "Sunny." She was never herself.

One day in 1944, groggy from barbiturates, she fell from the balcony of her room in a hospital and fractured her skull and spine. Surgeons took a piece of her shin bone to repair the spinal break, but she never danced again. The old hope of fame as a ballerina vanished. Sleeping pills took its place.

Twice, falling asleep in the daytime, she set fire to furniture. Once, in the night, Ward awoke to find her lying beside him, her hair aflame from a cigarette, and her pillow burning.

They talked it over, later. They agreed on a divorce. They parted friends and he paid her $150 a month. That was in 1947. Later he increased the payments and he paid hospital bills.

One evening in December 1949, after he had remarried, he met her on the street, gaunt and haggard, and he asked her how she was.

"O. K.," she said, and she walked on quickly.

A week later, Portland police headquarters reported:

"Sunny Burnet, 35, was found dead in bed in her apartment Wednesday night. The coroner's office attributes death to an overdose of sleeping pills."

Excise Taxes and Hotel Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed the Michigan Hotel Owners Association at Kalamazoo, Mich. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of that address:

Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss some problems that I believe are of particular interest to you who are in the hotel business.

You know, it was not so many years ago—most of us here can remember it—when the things that would be of interest to one group in one State were not so important, or of such great interest, to the same kind of group in another State. Our problems once were almost wholly local problems. But due to the changing times—to factors our people might have controlled, if they had wished, and to other factors that were beyond the control of any of us, in a real sense—we find that similar groups in every State are interested in similar problems.

One of the big reasons for this similarity of problems—among all business groups—has been the steady, undiminished, unparalleled growth of Federal power.

The situation has changed so rapidly in recent years that many persons, formerly alert and informed of trends in existence, find that they have overlooked important and vital factors by not being fully informed every day.

Twenty years ago decisions made in Washington were not nearly so important to your business. You innkeepers kept a few traveling Federal agents. I can remember when everybody in town would talk about it when a Federal man came through. He might have been an inspector for the post office, a Treasury agent, or a representative of the Tariff Commission. The local editor would interview every one of these Government officers, if he could get them to say anything, and record the interview in his local paper.

But today, I dare say, the owner of the smallest hotel of the smallest town represented here keeps not one or two but dozens of Federal agents every week. They do not represent just this or that agency but hundreds of Federal agencies. There are a good deal more than 2,500 different departments, establishments, agencies, bureaus, and subbureaus, with more than 2,000,000 employees. They are busy, attending to the enormous duties and responsibilities pitched into the lap of the Federal Government by an unwary people.

The problems which face us now are incomparably more complex than they have ever been before—at least those with reference to our Government. Once, an innkeeper was not, in effect, a collector of taxes for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. But that is exactly what you are now. If you don't know it, let me prove it to you.

If your hotel sells liquor or tobacco, you collect excise taxes for Uncle Sam. If your hotel has a cabaret, or a dine-and-dance place of any kind, however small, you have to collect taxes for Uncle Sam. If you put on any kind of amusements, or allow these to be put on in your hotel, you either have to collect the amusement tax, or be certain that it is collected correctly and sent to Uncle Sam.

In an unofficial capacity, you see to it that the Government collects a lot of other taxes. You are unofficial greeter for persons who have paid an excise tax on the goods that have been hauled to them through private transportation facilities, or who have paid an excise tax or their air line, bus, or railway fares. You, yourself, pay an excise tax on every light bulb your hotel uses, every match you or your employees use, all the food-warming or refrigeration equipment you have to buy for your kitchen or coffee shop, and on a wide variety of other goods and services, such as telephones in your rooms and the telegrams you send.

I often have remarked to myself that I suspect no other group of businessmen suffered so directly as did hotel men when wartime excises were imposed. But even before that, your industry was paying excises on a wide variety of commodities.

I am particularly happy to bring you a light ray of hope to lighten some of the business clouds. Congress is going to repeal some of these wartime taxes and revise others downward. I believe the House of Representatives will act first, probably in February or March, and that the Senate will drag along as usual, but will act on excises before the session is over. Senator SCOTT LUCAS (Democrat, Illinois) the majority leader, already publicly has promised the Senate that it will have a chance to vote on excise tax revisions before the session is over.

You men of the hotel industry, I believe, have one of the most graphic stories to tell Congressmen and the public of how you have been wronged through the workings of the wartime excise taxes.

Take the story of the excise tax on goods and services sold in cabarets, or dine-and-dance places maintained at many leading hotels. The Bureau of Internal Revenue collected $6,357,000 on this tax in October 1946. That indicated pretty good business, just as the war had been over for a year.

Then, the injustices of this excise tax began to become apparent.

By October 1947 receipts of the Treasury from this source fell more than $1,000,000. To be exact, receipts fell to $5,193,000. In another year, by October 1948, receipts fell off to $4,218,000. By last October 1949 receipts from this source were down to $3,565,083 and were still trending downward.

In other words, over a 3-year period, Treasury receipts from the excise taxes on cabarets were cut virtually in two. The figures show that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, Uncle Sam took in $72,076,800 from this source, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, he took in only $48,856,000.

I am proud that I was among the first to agitate for removal of this—and other wartime excise taxes. I could see that these excises would act as a brake on business and would penalize the groups affected far out of proportion to what they, or any group, deserved to be penalized in peacetime. As early as 1947, I introduced legislation to repeal the excise tax on cabarets and on a wide variety of other goods and services.

I know that I reveal no secret when I say that the Republican Eightieth Congress had it on the agenda to repeal these excises, but the leadership put it over until January, 1949, in the thought that it would be easier to accomplish thoroughgoing repeal with a Republican President in the White House. This isn't the first time the Republican leadership has been overly optimistic, but I hope it proves to be the last.

At any rate, when we came back into session a year ago, the Fair Dealers were in the saddle. JOE MARTIN, the minority leader, and I decided to try for excise tax repeal, even though there had been a change in the congressional personnel. JOE MARTIN prepared a discharge petition—and my name was the first name under his on it—to force excise revision legislation on to the floor for a vote. We had 61 signers in just a few hours, but the Democrats did not want to help us. They played politics with the issue and, in fact, got two other men to start two other petitions. If all the persons who signed all the petitions had signed the Martin petition,

the House of Representatives would have acted on excise tax reforms last year.

Be all this as it may, on this particular issue, I am proud to be able to repeat my prediction that the future looks bright to you.

If I may be allowed to become a pessimist for a little while, however, I should like to draw your attention to some of the darker aspects of life. President Truman said in his opening message to Congress that the state of the Nation is good, that we are in the midst of a great prosperity, that all of us should be happy. It is true that more money is circulating around than ever. But any man who is optimistic about our Nation today, or about the future, has to be blind to certain facts of life.

As businessmen, you know that you cannot operate your establishments on a deficit basis for year after year without inviting serious consequences. You will understand me when I say, then, that we as a people must be apprehensive about our future in this Fair Deal heaven that Truman is planning.

For 20 years, except for 2, the Federal Government has been running a deficit. The deficit in this fiscal year ending June 30 will be more than $5,000,000,000, while the deficit for next year, if the President's new budget is followed, will be $5,000,000,000 more. In other words, while you get excise-tax relief this year, the long-range outlook is either for election of a Congress that will cut Federal expenses to the bone or for you to get ready to pay more taxes. There is no escaping the consequences of an economic act. We as individuals might dodge the consequences here or there by inheriting money, finding some in a cave, or otherwise having a stroke of luck. But as a people, we all must pay for the mistakes we all make.

Inevitably, an unbalanced budget has meant higher taxes. It will mean that again, and again, and again, unless somewhere along the line our people can be awakened to the dangers of our present course.

President Truman hinted that everybody should be happy. But the cold facts of his own statisticians disprove this. One-fourth of the wage earners now take in less than $2,000 a year, due to reasons of health, age, or other causes. These are family people. They are suffering more and more because of inflationary policies. They are not customers of yours because they cannot be. You can't afford to lower your prices because of policies of the Federal Government. The vicious circle is upon us. Poor people can't buy at high prices. The Government encourages high prices by high taxes. Yet, the Government pretends to be wanting to help the poor. By its methods of helping the poor, it not only hurts the poor, but it also hurts the more healthy, productive citizens. It taxes them to death.

I should like to be able to tell you that prices would come down. But I cannot in all honesty say it to anyone, rich, poor, or in-between. For years, I have been warning the people of my district to prepare for higher costs, higher prices, more of the vicious kind of inflation that men and women are bewildered when they face. Now, that kind of inflation is on you. It will get worse. It is due, of course, to the crazy-quilt financial pattern the New Deal and the Fair Deal have been following. We have been seeing our money spent by the billions in Europe, under the guise of stopping communism, while watching the Communists gobble up huge areas in Asia. Every acre of ground lost to freedom is another acre we some day may have to regain at the bloodiest kind of cost, and I can't help but believe there has been treachery in high places.

Somehow or other, you and I are going to have to get to our friends, neighbors and customers with a message of how we can restore some financial soundness to our Government operations at home and abroad. As you undoubtedly realize, I am greatly interested in seeing the Hoover Commission reforms put into effect. But I have to admit that if every one of these reforms were passed, as long as we have our present bungling administrators in the Federal Government, the money would be wasted efficiently instead of inefficiently. Trying to stop Government waste after the Fair Dealers have caused it, by voting huge appropriations in Congress, is a lot like trying to stop the Mississippi River from flooding by building a dam at New Orleans.

If we want to stop a flood on the Mississippi River, we have to stop the flow of water way up in Minnesota, Illinois, and all around by building up heavily forested areas and the dams by the hundreds, such as the Corps of Engineers has done through the years. Then, and only then, can the flood be minimized. Likewise, if we are going to stop huge Federal waste, we are going to have to get the people back in the cities and towns to quit demanding, and to quit voting for, projects that will push the total of Federal expenses far above the amount we can reasonably collect in taxes.

The job of informing and helping to educate the people in simple economics is a good job for every intelligent citizen, and most particularly for hotel men. I commend it to you.

We have tremendous problems at home and in the field of foreign affairs. Our foreign policy has been bad, terribly and tragically bad, in the past several years. Its fruits are becoming apparent to everyone. Five years ago, Stalin ruled 190,000,000 persons. Today, he rules more than 680,000,000—at least one-third of all the people on earth. If he ever gets them organized and can equip them, the disunited other two-thirds of the earth will be easy prey to him. We must begin to build now ever firmer frontiers against onrushing communism. We have waited too long and it is almost too late.

If we can get just a few of the people to see what we must do to save this country, there is still a great chance that we can move forward into a better life. Instead of more poverty through less production, we could have more prosperity through more production. Instead of creating new frictions through more taxes and higher and higher Government expenses, we could build firmly and efficiently.

I am not by nature a pessimist. I have been an optimist most of my life and hope to be again. But, as I say, the only way a man can be real optimistic today is by blinding his eyes to the cold facts of life. There is another fact that gives us hope, however; it is the fact of our still-continuing freedom of speech. As long as we can inform the people, they can awaken and we can go forward again. As long as we keep open and unhampered the communications to our friends throughout the world, outside the iron curtain, we can count on spiritual, moral, and material support. As long as man can think freely and talk freely, we can have visions of a better tomorrow.

There are many who charge us Republicans with looking back. I do not fit into that pattern. I am looking ahead. And if our people will but just see a few of the economic and political facts of life, we all can have a bigger and better and finer America, in every respect. I know that you join with me in the hope and in the prayer that that America will come to pass Let us, as individuals, do our part to see that it does come to pass.

Nothing Funny About Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include therein a radio address delivered by me over WJR, the Good Will Station of Detroit, Mich., on Friday, March 3, 1950, on the subject of taxes:

There is nothing funny about taxes. The power to tax is the power to destroy; all of us know that.

As one of your Representatives in Congress, I have voted consistently against Federal tax increases, and against Government projects when in my opinion they added needlessly to the public debt. Even when public money was requested in behalf of my own district, I made sure that the expenditure was imperative and would return benefits in excess of the amount expended.

With this policy, I feel free to criticize and to offer suggestions concerning the tax policies pursued by the Truman administration and supported by the Democratic majority in Congress.

Indeed, those policies remind me of the story published a few days ago in a national magazine about the taxpayer who admitted to his Congressman that nothing is certain except death and taxes, but who nevertheless pointed out that death does not get worse every time Congress meets. He might have added that any further increase in taxes would make departure from this life somewhat more attractive. But, as I remarked before, there is nothing really humorous about taxes.

Because of extensive publicity by press and radio, all of us are aware that President Truman has asked Congress for about $42,500,000,000 to defray the cost of Federal Government during the fiscal year beginning next July 1. For the same reason, all of us know that the United States Treasury estimates Federal tax income—the only income the Government has—at about $37,300,000,000 for the same period. Thus deficit spending by the Federal Government next year cannot be less than $5,200,000,000. The $5,200,000,000 will be added to the present public debt of $258,400,000,000.

But this is not all. There is a whole lot more, which is being deliberately concealed from the taxpayers and the public at large. This consists of about $9,200,000,000, carried in the 1951 budget as contract authorizations. By the phrase—contract authorizations—is meant that various Government agencies, notably the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineer Corps, would be authorized to make contracts, calling for total outlay of $9,200,000,000, for irrigation and electric power projects, flood control, and rivers and harbors improvements, in advance of appropriation by Congress.

If these contract authorizations are approved by Congress, then the total of Federal Government expenditures for the 1951 fiscal year will be $51,700,000,000, instead of $42,500,000,000. True, the money would not be paid out until some later date, when Congress would have to appropriate whatever sums had been obligated, but the money would be spent next year—spent in exactly the same way anyone spends when he signs a purchase contract, and installment notes, for a new automobile or anything else.

From what I have said, it becomes apparent that President Truman wants to spend, not $5,200,000,000 more than the Government will take in next year, but actually $14,400,000,000 more. Thus instead of adding $5,200,000,000 to the public debt, he would add $14,400,000,000. This would make the debt $272,800,000,000, or $3,400,000,000 more than ever before, even at the end of the most costly war ever fought in the history of the world.

President Truman has said that the 1951 budget was pared to the bone before it was sent to Congress. If this be so, then why does the budget provide for adding 24,583 new civilian employees in 37 Government departments and agencies which are not connected with national defense? Government civilian employment already is close to the wartime peak. Administration talk of efforts toward Government economy is nonsense, and a fraud upon our people.

The President and his supporters in Congress know that the Hoover Commission called for a drastic reduction in Government personnel. They know that by putting into effect even a part of the Hoover recommendations next year's Federal deficit could be wiped out. And by carrying out most of them a tax reduction equal to that made by the Republican Eightieth Congress would be made possible. But instead, the President sends to Congress a budget which would add the equivalent of an army corps to the Government's civilian payroll. At the same time, the President demands higher taxes to pay for what he calls unavoidable Government expense.

Recently the President cast the blame for this year's deficit of more than $5,000,000,000, and the prospective deficit of anywhere from $5,200,000,000 to $14,400,000,000, on the Republicans for reducing income taxes by something over $4,000,000,000 annually in 1947. Incidentally, this reduction took more than seven million low-income taxpayers off the tax rolls entirely.

But the President forgot, or ignored, the fact that the 1947 tax reduction was made at a time when a 1948 surplus of $8,500,000,000 had become a certainty. He conveniently forgot, too, that in 1947 he advanced his own tax reduction program. It would have reduced each individual's tax bill by $40, and would have made up the $3,200,000,000 revenue loss by increasing income taxes on corporations. This program would not have taken low income people off the tax rolls. Furthermore, those who saved $40 in direct tax would have paid out the same money in higher prices for everything. Higher prices because corporations, like individuals, have to pass tax costs on to the consumer if they hope to stay in business.

The most important thing forgotten, or ignored, by President Truman was that the amount of tax income increased after the income tax was reduced by the Republicans in 1947, just as it did after the $6,000,000,000 cut in excess-profits taxes on corporations was made effective in 1945. Federal tax income increased in each instance, of course, because tax relief stimulated business. Both corporations and individuals had larger incomes on which to pay taxes.

Public opinion now demands elimination, or at least drastic reduction, of wartime excise taxes on such things as freight charges, passenger fares, telegrams and telephone messages, and theater tickets—to say nothing of cosmetics, women's handbags, luggage, baby powder, and many other things of daily necessity. As a result, the administration, because of its wild and reckless spending, is engaged in a frantic search for other tax income to make up for the loss it fears with respect to this source.

Anyone would concede that the elimination of hidden taxes on these things would stimulate business sufficiently that Government tax income from other sources would more than offset the loss. Excise taxes of all kinds make up 18 cents of every tax dollar collected by the Federal Government.

Excise taxes are not the only hidden taxes with which the American people are burdened. The hidden tax burden has become heavier than that of direct income taxes. For example, the wife's new Easter bonnet will have 150 taxes on it. You paid 206 hidden taxes on your new automobile. The egg you ate for breakfast had 100 invisible taxes in its cost to you. You paid 11½ cents in hidden taxes on the package of cigarettes you bought today.

When your wife bought a 21-cent quart of milk yesterday at the grocery store 13 cents was for milk, 8 cents for taxes; she paid 25 cents in taxes on a 75-cent pound of meat. When you last bought a ton of coal—if you could get it—$5 of the price was for taxes. If you bought a Ford automobile this year, $700 of the price was for taxes. Everything you buy is loaded with hidden taxes.

In view of this situation, the President once more insists—publicly, at least—that excise tax cuts must be followed by corporate tax increases. But according to some sources within the Ways and Means Committee—the committee which writes the tax laws—the White House last week let it be understood that possibly present taxes on corporate enterprise should be reduced slightly instead of increased. This because many large industrial companies have laid aside expansion plans, and even have delayed replacements, owing to excessive tax costs and lessening demand for their products and falling prices in the buyers' market. The result, of course, is increasing unemployment.

All of these things lead to but one conclusion. Government spending at every level, except that of national defense, must be cut drastically—and now. The Hoover economy measures generally must be carried out—and now, not later. The reckless Fair Deal administration must be curbed—their worldwide WPA projects for nations which use our ECA funds and goods for political purposes instead of rehabilitating their economies, must end.

The people must rise against the Fair Deal further loading Government pay rolls for political purposes. The Communist traitors and their Socialist allies in our Government must be cleaned out and removed from the pay rolls. The Fair Deal must be prevented from establishing its welfare state program and spending this country into bankruptcy, thereby destroying our precious liberties.

With the help of public opinion, the Congress of the United States can do these things. The Congress now has an opportunity to adopt a 1951 budget of only $36,000,000,000; an alternative to the President's budget of more than $42,500,000,000. Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, its originator, points out that it would provide for none of the Fair Deal socialistic proposals, but would provide for every essential Government service and for adequate national defense. He ought to know, because he undoubtedly is the Nation's outstanding expert on Government finance. By adopting this budget, or one closely resembling it, the Congress can, and should, remove the pressure for higher and ever higher taxes; and indeed, make possible some substantial tax relief for the people.

As an American citizen, as a Member of Congress, as a Republican, I am for the lowest possible budget. I shall do all in my power to help bring about its adoption, as a step toward the ultimate preservation of the Republic.

Segregation in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to an article in the New York Herald Tribune of February 19, 1950, by Mr. Walter White, lauding the Justice Department for the work it is doing in defense of civil rights. I, too, wish to add my word of commendation.

The article follows:

SEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS—LAUDS JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FOR AIDING SOUTHERN NEGROES' SUIT

(By Walter White)

If the amicus curiae brief which has just been filed by the Justice Department is heeded by the Supreme Court the good which for more than half a century has been "interred with the bones" of the late Justice Harlan will come to life again.

Mr. Harlan, of Kentucky, was the lone dissenter against seven colleagues when he said, "We boast of the freedom enjoyed by our people above all other peoples. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law which, practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law. The thin disguise of 'equal' accommodations * * * will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done."

The Solicitor General of the United States, Philip B. Perlman, and the Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Philip Elman, are asking the Supreme Court to put into practice the incontrovertible logic of Justice Harlan. The cases in which they intervene as friends of the Court on behalf of the Government are those of G. W. McLaurin, a graduate student preparing for a doctor's degree in education at the University of Oklahoma, and Heman Marion Sweatt, who wants to study law in Texas.

"McLaurin and Sweatt are Negroes," the brief states. "For that reason alone they have been subjected under the laws of the States in which they live to various educational restrictions not imposed on white students. McLaurin * * * is required to sit at a special desk set aside for him in the doorway of the classroom; he may use the library, but only if he takes his books to a designated desk on the mezzanine floor; he may eat in the school cafeteria, where he is served the same food as other students, but only at a different time and at a table specially set apart for his use."

As for Sweatt, of Texas, he has been barred altogether from the law school and offered instruction at a "separate" school which Texas hastily tried to set up for Negroes to escape the wrath of the courts. The United States Government has gone unequivocally on record in the present brief as saying and believing that "the fact of racial segregation is itself a manifestation of inequality and discrimination," which, if allowed to continue, will mean that "the ideals embodied in our Bill of Rights would be ridiculed as empty words, devoid of any real substance."

Those who have a vested interest for political, economic, or racial reasons in perpetuating educational segregation are already protesting lustily the action of the Justice Department in joining the fight for justice.

But the majority of students and faculty members in southern schools have demonstrated over and over again that they want the farce ended.

Heavily burdened taxpayers are waking up to the fact that it is as expesive as it is absurd to pay for two law schools, two medical schools, two dental schools, two engineering schools, two forestry schools, two graduate schools of education and two of every other kind of professional and graduate school. All this is obeisance to white supremacy. This rapidly growing awakening to the absurdity of such duplication was trenchantly expressed by the president of one of the South's largest State universities when he said recently, "We can't build a cyclotron for a single student."

Among the road blocks to the success of the efforts to preserve the status quo in the South are the swiftly expanding industrialization with new moneys for development and new and younger personnel, a growing resistance to the financing of hate movements by northern industrialists (who formerly made suckers of southerners by their divide-and-rule practices), and the phenomenal growth of the Negro and labor votes.

Consider Florida: In 1948 Governor Warren won by the narrow margin of 23,000 votes in an election in which a half million Floridans voted. In 1944 Senator CLAUDE PEPPER squeaked through by a mere 9,700 ballots. Today there are slightly more than 100,000 registered Negro voters in Florida, and other Negroes are registering at so much more active a pace than others it is conservatively estimated that no less than 125,000 Negroes will vote in the May 2 primary. To a greater or lesser degree the same trend is seen in every southern State, including Mississippi and South Carolina.

Beaten back on every front—judicial, political, economical and moral—white supremacy advocates still assert loudly and belligerently that the South will never tolerate interference with the southern pattern of segregation. Only 2 years ago they shouted the same moth-eaten threats when the Supreme Court was considering legal cases involving the so-called white Democratic primary. Today Negroes—and a considerably larger percentage of younger and more intelligent whites—are voting in all but the Klan-ridden rural areas of the South. Everyone except the most bigoted and timorous southerners believes that the same extension of true democracy will come about in graduate and professional tax-supported schools in the South.

Time marches on—even in Dixie.

Resolution of Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in part a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange at Carbondale, Ill., February 28, 1950. And I want to commend the splendid citizens of my State for their clear thinking in expressing their opposition to the action of the Department of Justice in the case of the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., their expressed opposition to the Brannan plan, and their recommendation that wartime excise taxes be eliminated.

The resolution follows:

1. *Be it resolved,* That the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange in this annual meeting, express our opposition to the action of the Department of Justice in the case of the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co. and its similar actions pending or already started against other large firms, when based on the same principles as that taken against the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co.

2. *Be it resolved,* That the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange express its opposition to the Brannan plan and that the proper authorities be so informed.

3. *Be it resolved,* That the Illinois Fruit Growers Exchange support the Illinois fruit promotional efforts of the Illinois Fruit Council.

Connecticut State Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Waterbury (Conn.) American, of March 2, 1950:

STATE HOUSING PLAN NO HELP TO THIS EX-GI

To the EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN:

In December 1949, I heard about the Connecticut State housing. It all sounded wonderful. It was for us moderate income earners. I earn $2,000 yearly on a 4-day week, and I've got a 4-month-old son. Interest would only be at 1½ percent. It just sounded too good to be true. Seeing that we live in a small three-room rent, and pay $45 monthly, this own-your-own-home plan initiated by our Governor, was just the thing.

Incidentally us GI's were required to put down only a very small down payment. So I immediately applied for this and, in about 2 months I received my certificate of eligibility. This meant I could either buy or build a home at a 1½-percent mortgage.

Along with this certificate I was sent a book. In this book it showed that on a $7,500 home $193 was required for a down payment; on an $8,000 home, a fraction higher, etc.

It also showed that taxes on any of these homes were $8 per month. I still don't know how the State arrived at this figure, but I have been told that this is an average of all cities and towns in Connecticut. Anyway, suffice it to say that this figure is at least 50 percent wrong; $16 per month would be closer, here in Waterbury.

So, armed with all this information, I went to the State's local correspondent. I immediately was told that there were no $7,500 $8,000, or $8,500 homes. Prices started at $9,000 and up. Well, making only $2,000 yearly, one can readily see that these homes were out of my means.

I asked them, what about the $7,500 homes? Their reply was that the State had no idea about what it cost to build a house.

Well, since I couldn't buy a reasonable home, I thought I would build. After a week of getting estimates, I submit the figures below for your approval:

Lumber	$2,400
Carpenter	1,200
Mason	1,775
Plumbing and heating	1,800
Electrician	300
Painter	500
Lot	800
Building permit, surveying, etc	100
Total	$8,875

Well, I can buy for $9,000 or build for $8,875. The only thing that is stopping me is that I can't afford it.

Why?

Because I am a moderate income earner.

Well, now, what is a moderate income earner?

This is answered by the State housing authority itself.

They state that to qualify for this program, you have to earn less than $2,500 yearly, plus $600 for each dependent, and you must have less than $3,000 cash.

Well, since I received a certificate of eligibility, I guess I qualified.

Well, getting back to my owning a home, I found myself stymied. I read in the papers that a representative of the State Housing Authority was coming to Waterbury on Monday, February 27. So I went there, with the intention of finding out my next move. Incidentally, I wrote a letter to Governor Bowles and told him how I couldn't buy or build a home under his program. I have yet to receive an answer.

As I was saying above, I went to this meeting of the representative of the State housing. I told him of my problem. As for $7,500 homes, he said, you take that up with the local State correspondents. The $8 taxes per month was a round figure.

When I said that taxes here were twice that much, he seemed to be preoccupied with someone else.

Well, about this time I waved my certificate of eligibility at him and asked him what I should do with it. He then went on to say that I shouldn't act like this when our good Governor is trying to do something good for us.

I then reminded him that on my $2,000 yearly earnings, I was unable to take advantage of our good Governor's generosity.

To this our State representative added, "Why don't you get a part-time job? He went on to say how he did at one time. Apparently our friend is optimistic. Otherwise he would realize how conditions are in Waterbury.

But that is neither here nor there.

I have a certificate of eligibility.

What shall I do with it?

It can't buy me a house. Did our good Governor say this program was for moderate-income earners?

S. C. G.

WATERBURY, *February 28, 1950.*

The Next Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing this Congress and this country is the recurrence of the coal strikes periodically, as and when the contract between the

operators and the United Mine Workers expires. The Washington Post, in its Sunday issue of March 5, 1950, has written an excellent editorial which should be read by all Members of Congress. It appears to me that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to begin to work upon and enact legislation to prevent recurring strikes in the coal industry and to save the public from the hardship and suffering that generally results when coal cannot be produced in sufficient quantity for the welfare, health, and safety of the people of this Nation.

John L. Lewis should not be permitted to profit from collective bargaining and at the same time repudiate and shirk union responsibility in getting the union members back to work, as has just recently been done. Union responsibility should match bargaining power. I include herewith the editorial entitled "The Next Coal Crisis":

THE NEXT COAL CRISIS

The apparent agreement between the coal operators and the United Mine Workers has relieved Congress of the necessity of passing an emergency seizure bill, as requested by President Truman, and there is a strong tendency to sit back with a sigh of relief and say, "Thank goodness it is over." But that is precisely what the country has been doing for many years, with the result of encouraging new crises. If we have any capacity to learn from experience, now is the time to press for long-range legislation. For the strategy that John L. Lewis has employed so successfully is certain to be used again, and the only machinery the Government had for dealing with such crises has been left a shambles. To slump into complacency because the immediate emergency has been eased would be to invite a worse ordeal when the new contract expires.

In addition to asking for seizure powers, the President recommended that Congress set up a commission to make a thorough study of the coal industry in terms of economic, social and national security objectives. This is a step of the greatest importance. We have often pointed out that interruptions in coal output will continue until the industry finds means of stabilizing production, eliminating high-cost mines and providing steady work at wages that will not drive coal out of competition with other fuels. The industry has proved utterly incapable of diagnosing and curing its own ills. Since a steady flow of coal is vital to both economic well-being and national security, the Government is under the strongest sort of obligation to try to bring order out of the present chaos.

If the mines are to remain in private operation, moreover, some means will have to be found of averting these periodic holdups of coal consumers. Thoughtful observers have always recognized that the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were a weak reed on which to rely. Senator Taft himself pushed through the Senate last year a bill to permit seizure of struck plants or mines for 60 days as well as to restrain strikes by court order while efforts to settle disputes threatening the national health and safety are being made. Judge Keech's ruling that the UMW was not guilty of contempt has now made reexamination of this issue imperative.

Not much fault has been found with the court's ruling because of the weakness of the case the Department of Justice presented. Apparently the department took it for granted, because the United Mine Workers had twice before been punished for similar offenses, that the continuance of the strike itself would be sufficient to establish contempt. There is much sympathy with Judge Keech's rejection of this easy assumption. Yet if a union is able to escape all responsibility for a strike that it initiates and then fails to stop when the point of a national disaster is reached, the result will be a mockery of all law and order.

Either a union is responsible for the concerted action of its members or it is not. Logic would have demanded that if the miners were in rebellion against Mr. Lewis, as his case presented to the court indicated, he should not have represented the union in collective bargaining efforts. Instead, it is unmistakably plain that he continued to wield the power of the UMW in all matters except calling off the strike. Incidentally, he candidly recognized the strike as such in his talks with newspapermen and assumed that it would continue during "the time that we shall require to adjust the current dispute fairly." In other words, the union leaders took full advantage of the strike while washing their hands of responsibility for its continuance. No union official resigned because of repudiation of his leadership. No defiant local union was disciplined. Regardless of what the requirements for proving contempt may be, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the UMW won a notable victory by hoodwinking tactics.

Congress will have to meet this problem. If unions are not responsible enough to halt a threatened disaster which they have set in motion, Congress may have to forbid industry-wide bargaining. Mr. Lewis cannot eat his cake and have it too. It is possible, of course, that this fatal weakness in the law would not have developed if the Department of Justice had shaken the lead out of its shoes and given the courts an accurate picture of the goon squads and other union pressures that prevented the miners from going back to work. But one thing is certain: If union responsibility cannot be expanded to match bargaining power, bargaining power will have to be shrunk to match union responsibility.

Time To Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Fred R. Zimmer edits and publishes at Hartington, Nebr., the widely read Cedar County News. Hartington is a progressive county-seat town. Cedar County, one of 24 counties of the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, is a first-rate agricultural county by any comparison. The people of Cedar County are industrious, thrifty, patriotic Americans that love their country and take an alert interest in affairs of government. In this environment and with this inspiration, Mr. Zimmer has written an editorial, Time To Wake Up, that, because of its timeliness and perception, is included in these remarks:

TIME TO WAKE UP

It is time for all Americans to wake up. It is time for all of us to do some thinking and working for ourselves. This applies to every American citizen, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican.

Do you know where the Fair Deal is taking us? Do you know what the welfare state will lead to? If you do not already know, it is time to wake up and look at the sign posts along this road down which we seem to be traveling so easily.

It is not entirely the fault of the Government in Washington. They are giving us what the vocal majority seems to be asking for. Namely, something for nothing, security without work, payments, aid, and relief.

What is all of this Government aid costing us as individuals? First of all we are paying in taxes the money which is returned to us in the form of Government aid and subsidy. Secondly, for our cradle-to-the-grave security we are giving up increasing amounts of our freedom and independence, which in years gone by the American people have prized so highly.

People have been prone to take the easy road. They have asked the Government for this and that. The Government has granted the requests, but in return they have taken more and more tax dollars, and infringed more and more upon private enterprise. The higher taxes are placing a greater burden upon individual business each year. Each year private business is faced with more and more competition from Government. Government business pays no taxes, nor does it have to operate at a profit, because the taxpayer makes up the losses. Private business cannot continue to function for long under such a program.

The ultimate result is socialism. The Government will operate everything. They will set our standard of living, and they will harness us with controls, until like the horse, we will have to obey the commands of the one holding the reins. That is not the way Americans like to live, but that is what they are heading for if they do not wake up soon and put an end to the present trend.

The Federal Government has grown more and more powerful. Today it is squeezing out the State and local governments as well as the individual. Our National Government takes such a big share of the individual income that States and local governments can no longer collect the taxes they need to carry on their functions. So, they are forced to trade some of their rights to the Federal Government for grants-in-aid to help build roads, airports, and hospitals and to help care for the poor and needy.

This puts the local and State government under the thumb of the Federal Government, just like the individual. What is even more harmful is the waste of money in the Federal-aid program. The State could get the same things done with less expense. When the Federal Government handles your tax money before they hand it back in aid they deduct the cost of handling. Handling charges for bureaucratic control come high. The red tape takes more than time; it takes money.

We must call a halt. We must stop this idea that anything we can get from the Federal Government is free. We must get away from these demands for Government aid, assistance, and security. We must get away from Government in business. We must put Government back in the business of government, and allow the people to carry on under the system of free enterprise that made America great.

It is not going to be easy getting back where we were in the twenties when Government was just "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," but if we want to continue the American way of life we must take the road back. We must break the give-me habit. We must put our shoulder to the wheel in place of holding our hand out with our eyes on Washington.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Union Leader, Buffalo, N. Y.:

COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON COURIER EDITORIAL

Whereas the Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council in following the principles and policies laid down by our national CIO constitution, support, completely the program of Brotherhood Week, which is 1 week set aside for all citizens of the United States to practice the holy and laudable phrase, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." We call upon our members throughout the Niagara Frontier to advocate and carry out this principle during this important week, and we also call upon all the citizens of our community to censor those who either by tongue or pen, engage in or advocate hate because of a person's race, creed, color, nationality, or station in life; and

Whereas the Buffalo Courier-Express in its leading editorial in this morning's paper, under the heading of "It's his own fault," launches a vicious and biased attack against the working people of this community and Nation and the coal miners in particular, by proposing their own program called, "Hang John Lewis Week," when their editorials should be carrying and advocating the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God; and

Whereas this newspaper, operating under the sanctity of freedom of the press, allows itself through either ignorance or otherwise, on the part of its owner and editors, or through editorials, to sink into a quagmire which brands it a provocateur of violence and a purveyor and peddler of hate by its advocacy of a slogan which calls jestingly for the hanging of an individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the CIO who have been attacked in this editorial, carrying out the principles of Brotherhood Week, simply state "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," and we hereby call upon all of our members and the citizens of this community to set aside each day for the balance of this week, a time in the morning and in the evening, to pray to our Father in Heaven, asking him forgiveness for the sins which these owners and editors of this paper have committed, and we pray our Lord also, that He may lift up the minds, the hearts, and the hands of the owners and operators of this paper, out of the quagmire of hate and intolerance in which they find themselves, and we, the members of the CIO, ask the Courier-Express to impose upon itself, a penance for this sinful act which has been committed in this editorial, and that they print for the remainder of the week as their leading editorials, the Beatitudes from the Sermon on the Mount, and further, that they apprise the reading public of this community with the fact that the mine operators and managers of industry are not free from sin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this be sent to the Courier-Express, enclosing a copy of the Beatitudes, in the hope that this newspaper will never again desecrate the sanctity and holiness of such a laudable program as the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God, by attacks upon the workers of the Nation.

We Jaywalk as the Juggernaut of Doom Bears Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

WE JAYWALK AS THE JUGGERNAUT OF DOOM BEARS DOWN

(By Edward J. Meeman)

A man walks leisurely across the street in the middle of the block. He looks neither to the right nor the left.

He walks as men walked before the mighty locomotives we call automobiles were invented.

He does not notice, seems not to care, that one of these engines of destruction is bearing down upon him.

The automobile swerves—and the man escapes being crushed.

That is modern man.

He goes his way as if the destruction of atomic war were not bearing down upon him.

MAYBE IT WILL PASS—MAYBE

Yes, this destruction may be deflected. Stalin may pass, and his empire may be broken up by strife among those who would succeed him. Stalin himself may stop short of unloosing mutual destruction of east and west.

Maybe, only maybe.

We dare not count on getting a lucky break.

We need to do things we would never have dared to do if this awful danger did not confront us.

We have done things somewhat daring. We have made considerable military preparations with the idea of deterring the Red dictator from attacking. We have made a mutual defense pact among the Atlantic nations.

So far so good.

But not far enough. Not good enough.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

We need to strengthen the United Nations to unite the nonaggressive nations against the aggressor. Within the United Nations we need to federate the free democracies in a permanent great union, in order to get the fullest benefit of their potential power.

Some say it is impossible, that there are too many diverse interests, diverse views among the free nations.

Impossible? Look what a handful of men have done. They have welded together almost half the world, many nations of diverse languages and ancient hates, into an empire so unified that we know it is a terrible menace to us. They have done it by compulsion and propaganda.

Shall we say that the citizens of the free world cannot do as much, cannot do better, by voluntary action and by reason?

WHAT REASON TELLS US

Reason tells us that we face destruction unless chance intervenes. Will the same reason let us dare trust to chance?

To survive, we must compose the differences in the free world. What we must do, we can.

We cannot afford the easy ways of earlier, carefree days.

We cannot afford the luxury of bitter recrimination and internecine strife between labor and management, between Democrat and Republican, between white and colored, between Socialist and free enterpriser.

DARE NOT STOP TO TAUNT

We free enterprisers dare not taunt our Socialist friends, who now comprise much of our free world, with the reckless statement that "socialism is the same as communism." It isn't true. If it is true, as we liberals believe, that there is danger that socialism may eventually lead to the police state and communism, it is a danger that is remote. It will not threaten us beyond repair before the imminent danger of the physical destruction of the free world either passes by rare good luck or is averted by our intelligent and purposeful action. After the great immediate danger is over, freemen can settle—with vigorous contention if they please—the question whether freedom can stand socialism, and, if so, how much.

You can move away from socialism in a democracy, as the recent elections in New Zealand and Australia have shown.

A people once gripped by Communist tyranny can't move away from it. A civilization destroyed by atomic war cannot be revived.

IF AND WHEN IT FALLS

A man who sees a hydrogen bomb descending from the skies above his city will not, in that last moment, think that he could not have done more.

I may be that man. You may be that man.

We can summon the pure reason that lies under the layers of prejudice, self-interest, and sloth that cover our minds. We can summon the will to do what reason says must be done to save ourselves.

We do not have to jaywalk to our doom.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the argument was made during the course of the Alaska statehood debate last week by some of those opposed to the measure that Alaska's population is too small to entitle it to statehood. No better reply to that argument could have been made than was given by the New York Times editorially yesterday:

STATEHOOD AND POPULATION

In attacking the bill providing for Alaska's statehood, which the House of Representatives wisely passed, some Representatives of more populous States objected to the fact that Alaska, with a population of about 100,000, would have the same Senatorial representation as New York or California, with populations exceeding 10,000,000. This argument is unsound and the House was right in disregarding it.

In our Federal form of government the representation in our bicameral Congress was designed precisely to meet the question of disparity of population in the federating units. In the lower House representation is on a population basis. In the upper House it is on a unit basis. Several States have been admitted to the Union when they had populations smaller than that of Alaska and when the disparity between their populations and other States was as great or greater.

Raising Second-Class Mail Will Reduce Volume and Revenue and Will Increase the Deficit of the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the postal increase bill, H. R. 2945, I tried to point out to the membership that the proposed increases on second-class mail would likely result in decreased revenues and increased deficits instead of increased revenues and decreased deficits as claimed by the proponents of the bill and the administration.

Just yesterday, an editorial was called to my attention which bears out my contentions and supports my views. The editorial is entitled "Revenue That Isn't There." It was published in the Minneapolis Star for February 20.

I have asked permission to include this editorial in my remarks for the benefit of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

REVENUE THAT ISN'T THERE

Fellow called us on the phone Saturday afternoon. "I've been thinking about that House of Representatives bill to raise postal rates," he said. So have we, we said, referring him to an editorial, Costly postal service, February 11.

"I read that," he said, "but you didn't point out all the inconsistencies in the legislation." For instance, we said.

"Well, take second-class mail—magazines, newspapers, and such." You could tell by the way he talked he had it all figured out. "The Congressmen sponsoring the House bill want to raise the rate on second-class mail so the post office will take in $15,000,000 more for handling it. Those Congressmen claim that's going to mean $15,000,000 more revenue for the Federal Government.

"They're dead wrong. It's going to work this way:

"Say a magazine or a newspaper company is supposed to pay $60,000 more for mailing its publication under the proposed new rates. The company's just going to add that $60,000 to its operating expenses and deduct that much more from the profits it has to pay taxes on. So the Government's going to get less in corporation taxes from that company and every other outfit in the publishing business that is hit by the new mail rate.

"Now there's no telling exactly how much this will amount to in the publishing business, but it's plain to see the Government's going to net a good deal less than the $15,000,000 some Congressmen think they're going to get by raising the mail rates.

"On the other hand," our caller went on, "if the Post Office Department saves $140,000,000 by cutting expenses—as the Hoover Commission showed it could do—that's a clear gain. It's like money from home."

And you know, he's dead right in everything he said.

The Hoover Proposals—Pro and Con

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Disabled American Veterans' National Commander David M. Brown, as printed in the Vet-Times, February 25, 1950:

THE HOOVER PROPOSALS—PRO AND CON

National directors of the Disabled American Veterans have recently completed an intensive study of Hoover Commission proposals for Government reorganization which would affect veterans. Results of this study conclusively prove that if such proposals were enacted into law the over-all administrative cost of the veterans' program would be greater while, at the same time, the standard of service would be lowered.

We of the DAV certainly realize that a greater number of shortcomings exist in the present program under the Veterans' Administration. However, administrative economies can be made effectively within the framework of the VA itself. When a house leaks the sensible thing to do is repair the roof, not to tear the house down.

Our directors divided the study into five parts, covering each veteran service which would be affected by the Hoover Commission proposals. These include medical activities, hospital construction, veteran preference in civil service, Government insurance, and GI loans.

The main points which are clarified by the study are listed below under the various veteran services to be affected.

REGARDING MEDICAL ACTIVITIES

1. The proposed consolidation of Government hospitals would impede the efficient handling of veterans' claims for compensation, pension, insurance, and other benefits where a physical examination is necessary. Major benefit programs are so dependent and integrated with the medical, hospital, and domiciliary care programs as to preclude their separation from the Veterans' Administration without disastrous effects on the efficient administration of veterans' benefits.

2. Hoover Commission proposals state that the present VA hospital building program serves no purpose except to make beds available for non-service-connected cases. Thousands in this category are actually service-connected but have failed to file a claim or their claim has not yet been adjudicated. Many have service-connected disabilities but are suffering from conditions where service connection is denied. Failure to treat these cases often results in the veteran becoming totally disabled and eligible for a non-service-connected pension which is far more costly than prompt treatment.

3. Approximately 55 percent of VA hospitalized patients are suffering from mental disorders and 13 percent have tuberculosis. They are indigent or will become so in the future and must be cared for by the taxpayer, whether service-connected or not.

4. Hoover Commission proposals are based on two major assumptions: (1) an armed forces draft of doctors would be necessary to replace young physicians leaving service and (2) an alarming lack of medical and surgical specialists in the armed forces. The draft of doctors has not materialized as predicted. Rather than suffering from a lack of specialists, the armed forces are confronted with the necessity of adjusting their training program because of a developing excess of specialists in most fields.

5. Hoover Commission proposals state that the Commission's recommended medical program will reduce the drain of doctors away from private practices. The present VA hospital program has brought about the greatest economy in medical manpower of any Government branch furnishing hospitalization, according to Dr. Paul R. Hawley, former chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration and member of the Hoover Commission Task Force.

6. Past bitter experiences, when veteran hospitalization was under the Public Health Service and claim records were handled by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, clearly prove that the same inefficiency would result if the VA handled the files and the proposed medical administration handled examinations and hospitalization.

7. It is an elementary principle of the theory of administration that every change involves additional costs, because the prevailing pattern must be disrupted.

8. Last, but far from least, the proposed merger represents a vigorous stride in the direction of socialized medicine. Full utilization of all Government hospital facilities can easily be accomplished by closer cooperation and a system of liaison between agencies concerned, rather than by the drastic change recommended by the Hoover Commission.

REGARDING HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

1. Hoover Commission proposals recommend the transfer of hospital construction activities from the VA to the Department of the Interior. By such transfer of authority there would not be the close working relationship required between those who construct and those who design to meet the necessary medical requirements.

2. Over a period of 20 years the VA has developed highly qualified architect engineers who have, by long experience and intimate knowledge of the program, become experts in the design and supervision of new hospitals to meet the needs peculiar to the care of veteran patients. Actual construction contracts have always been awarded on the basis of competitive bidding by private concerns, with the lowest bidder receiving the contract.

3. Division of the two functions of medical care and construction of hospitals between two agencies would breed delays and render impossible the placing of responsibility.

4. The Commission's report indicates that the VA would still be required to maintain an engineering and architectural staff, while the Interior Department maintained a full staff to perform similar functions. Needless to say, this would not lead to economy nor efficiency.

5. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, Army, who assists in VA hospital construction, said, "It would be neither economical nor efficient to equip a new agency to perform the service the Corps of Engineers is now performing."

REGARDING VETERAN PREFERENCE IN CIVIL SERVICE

1. The Hoover Commission proposals recommend that the Civil Service Commission decentralize its examining and recruiting process. This would mean that every one of the more than 140 Government agencies conduct its own recruiting and examining programs. Instead of one central examining board doing the job, with a single staff, each

department and agency would be required to maintain a full-time staff to conduct examinations. This method would require some 2,700 additional boards and an estimated increase in cost of operation of $40,000,000 annually.

2. The Civil Service Commission would be completely destroyed as a recruiting agency. By decentralizing hiring and doing away with numerical rating of examinations, the way would be wide open for favoritism, political pressure and return to the spoils system.

3. The section of the Commission's report dealing with reduction-in-force is so filled with generalities that expert authorities in the Civil Service Commission themselves have been unable to figure out just how the plan would work. The rating process for reduction-in-force, proposed to be handled by a Committee of Examiners, would be entirely inadequate as numerical ratings would also be absent in this field. Such a system would breed jealousy, distrust, and ill-will among employees and supervisors alike.

4. Such recommendations, if put into effect, would require the virtual repeal of the Veterans Preference Act, thus rendering as impotent all protection in Federal employment now rightfully enjoyed by veterans and their dependents. Veterans would be given mere lip service since there would be no yardstick for rating examinations or setting up categories.

REGARDING GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

1. Hoover proposals which recommend transfer of insurance administration to a new Government Insurance Corporation fail to mention the tremendous cost of supplying the new corporation with a staff for related services such as legal, personnel, supply, finance, and indexing. In the present set-up, these services are furnished by units serving all of the benefit programs of the VA.

2. Adoption of this recommendation would mean the creating of a gigantic autonomous agency of the Federal Government. It would mean increased overhead and a gradual absorption of further fields. In fact, it may well be called progress in the direction of a Nation-wide socialized insurance program.

3. In all probability premium rates would be increased as insurance trust funds become burdened with costs due to deaths resulting from the extra hazards of war service. Under present legislation, Congress annually appropriates funds to cover such deaths. There is no guaranty that this will continue in the proposed program.

REGARDING GI HOME LOANS

1. Adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendation to relocate veterans' home loan guaranties in the Housing and Home Finance Agency would further divide responsibility for such administration as the VA would continue to certify the eligibility of a veteran but would not actually grant the guaranty. Such a division of an integrated operation is against all principles of sound business practices. The Hoover Commission was strangely silent regarding business loans.

2. Although the Hoover Commission states that the Veterans' Administration is inexperienced in the lending field, recent statistics reveal that veterans of World War II have purchased more than 1,694,000 homes with financing guaranties provided by the VA of $4,566,232,866. Claims paid by the VA under the guarantee for defaulted loans amounted to less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the total guaranteed. This splendid record certainly does not indicate a lack of experience in the lending field.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the same people who objected to woman suffrage have reappeared, even with that same old argument about the protections that women would lose when they got the vote. And above all, the lack of respect that they would receive at the hands of the chivalrous males, who, when this argument came up then, as it comes up today, seem to be a strange mixture of Sir Galahad and Sir Walter Raleigh.

Well, I get on perfectly well with the men of my family and acquaintance and I do not expect or want them to put me on a pedestal and tell me, as Galahad did, that "my strength is like the strength of 10, because my heart is pure." I have always thought that a rather priggish remark and it also gives me a great feeling of inferiority that such a supremely noble creature should look upon me with veneration because circumstances over which I have no control make it possible for me to be a mother while he is by a like set of uncontrollable fates precluded from being one.

I am also not at all anxious for any gentleman of my acquaintance to put his best coat down on the muddy ground because I have forgotten to wear my rubbers. I would also like to point out that the great Sir Walter only did this once, and there is no record that he ever did it for any woman but his Queen.

This is the great trouble with this much-vaunted protective legislation; it applies to a few women, not to the mass of women.

When we are giving women full legal rights under the Constitution we are not taking anything away from them; we are simply making them first-class citizens.

One very distinguished Senator made the startling statement that men and women are different.

There is nothing shattering in this discovery; a lot of us knew it already and are quite well pleased that it is so.

Old men are different from young men, and we have legislation that protects them, if you will, but they still have equal rights under our Constitution. There is a difference between black men and white men, but they are still equal before the law under our Constitution. There is a difference between veterans and nonveterans, and veterans get plenty of legislation that is completely protective and highly preferential, but they still are equal with their fellowmen under the Constitution.

Under the United Nations, and in many countries where universal suffrage prevails, the words occur that there shall be complete equality under the law for all persons regardless of race, creed, color, or sex. This is notably true in Soviet Russia. There is no question that if the Constitution were being written today this wording—race, creed, color, or sex—would be included.

Our Constitution was written long before woman's suffrage. It also was written when slavery still flourished and was accepted as a part of our civilization.

It is very interesting to note that the State of Georgia, before the Civil War, had some very fine protective laws to ensure the proper care and treatment of slaves and I have heard of many persons at the time of the emancipation who told heart-rending, and no doubt perfectly true, stories about old and devoted slaves who did not want their freedom and begged to be kept in the families they loved and be protected as they were in the past.

But the majority of the slaves did not feel that way and today those who wanted protection are well-nigh forgotten in the march of progress. This same thing will happen after the equal-rights amendment has been written into the Constitution. We will smile at the arguments for protection that the favored few who are protected, advance. We will laugh a little at the talk about the great biological difference and the weakness of women. Look at your insurance charts if you are worried about "the lass with the delicate air." Count up the widows of your acquaintance and you will find that the female of the species is far deadlier than the male, and also huskier.

Granted, she has not the muscular strength, but we are not living in an age of muscle. No, even Galahad with his broadsword and his strength like unto the strength of 10 could not do much against a woman holding an atom bomb.

All this amendment does is to state this very simple proposition:

SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification.

The equal rights amendment has been a plank in the Republican platform since 1940 and in the Democratic since 1944. In 1948 it was in the platforms of the Republican, Democratic, and Progressive Parties.

It is, therefore, a matter that is entirely outside and above party politics and it seems rather cynical not to say plain dishonest, that after all these professions of policy and planks in the platforms, nothing has been done until very recently about carrying out these solemn promises.

I would like to quote from the speech of a woman attorney, Helen Elizabeth Brown, before the Lawyers Civic Association of Maryland, because she answers specifically the question that is always brought up by the opponents of the

amendment: In what way are women, under the law, inferior to men?

Men, aliens, and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country: American women are not.

It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not.

Now all the nonsense about seats in factories for women and maternity benefits are so much eye wash.

There is no more reason why women should not have seats if they need them than that the GI's should not have special educational advantages that are not open to ordinary civilians. There is no reason why a woman should not have maternity benefits, any more than that a veteran should not have a bonus. She is doing just as much for her country as the soldier, and in both instances they are each doing something the other could not do.

If women have the right to vote they certainly have the right to be considered equal under the Constitution.

The fight for suffrage was more intense and vehement than this one, but this amendment will be written into the Constitution in time. It is the last step on the long road of freedom for women in the United States. We want equality, not protection. We want justice, not privilege.

We are the descendants of the pioneers just as much as our men are and we want to stand beside them in the modern world as equals, ready to make our contribution to the development and prosperity of this good land which is our heritage.

Popular Support Behind Maritime Commissioner McKeough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for 8 years the Second Congressional District which now I have the honor to represent was brilliantly represented in this body by the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough, who as representative and the nominee of his party for United States Senator carried the torch in Illinois for democracy and progressive advance in the critical years when, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, America was being pulled from the wreck that years of Republican reactionary government had brought about.

Our former colleague, Mr. McKeough, has continued his outstanding public service as a member of the Maritime Commission, and I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 1, 1950, as reflective of the high regard in which he is held by the country and the stout support in public opinion which he enjoys in his contentions with other members of the Maritime Commission:

MARITIME SHIFT

As reports continue that the President may abolish the Maritime Commission and reconstitute it in the Department of Commerce, it is important to look at the real source of trouble in the Commission. That trouble is, purely and simply, a reluctance to administer the law as it is written. The commission majority has convinced itself that bigger shipping subsidies are desirable, and it has contrived devious ways to grant them—over the consistent objections of one commissioner, Raymond S. McKeough, and against the biting criticism of the House Executive Expenditures Committee and the Comptroller General.

We sympathize fully with the President's efforts both to hold down subsidies, and to bring them out in the open, and we support the idea of an over-all subsidy study. Once Congress has set a subsidy policy, however, the job of a regulatory body is to administer it fairly. Here it becomes apparent that the fault is not so much with the Maritime Commission structure as with the attitude of the members carrying out policy.

Unless the President is prepared to recommend the consolidation of all transportation-promotion functions in a single agency, it is hard to justify the singling out of a single commission for reorganization. That would merely serve to increase the hodgepodge in which regulatory bodies operate. Whatever may be said for a Federal department of transportation, much could be accomplished under existing law by the promulgation of a unified set of objectives for transportation agencies in a national transportation policy. Specifically, with respect to the Maritime Commission, improvement could be made by the simple means of replacing present commissioners, when their terms expire, with men whose first dedication is to the public interest.

Should There Be an Extension of Federal Standards Over State Employment Compensation Insurance Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio interview in the American Forum of the Air over the National Broadcasting Co. system:

Chairman GRANIK. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

In his state of the Union message and in his Economic Report President Truman urged legislation improving the operation of our unemployment-compensation system and increasing its coverage and benefits. The President indicated that he sought an extension of Federal standards over State unemployment insurance laws. This has brought protests from some quarters that the President apparently feels that the States are not equal to the task of dealing with their own problem and that the Federal Government must step in.

Now, Mr. Secretary, you stated recently that you have in mind, not federalization, but merely the fixing of levels beneath which no State would be allowed to fall. What are those levels, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary TOBIN. We feel that there should be an approach toward the objective that was common at the time the act was passed by Congress in 1935—to give an unemployed worker approximately 50 percent of his wage. At the start when the bill first went into effect in the respective States it averaged about 44 percent, but there has been a gradual decline with the increase in the cost of living until today the average worker receives between 35 and 37 percent of his basic wage. There is also the feeling that unemployment compensation should be paid over a period of 23 weeks, because of the fact that some States have as low as 12 weeks, because of the fact that better than 1,500,000 workers during the year 1949 exhausted their benefit payments in respective States and then had no source of income at the termination.

Then another one of the objectives is to increase to cover all workers. At the present time the Federal law calls for compulsory insurance for all employers with eight employees or more. Many of the States have gone down to one, and ranging up to eight, but we believe that every worker in the country should be covered.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BRICKER, what do you think about it?

Senator BRICKER. In my opinion, Mr. Granik and Secretary Tobin, the States have done an excellent job in this program which was an integral part of the social security law of 1935. This was one program that was left to the States, along with the old-age assistance program which was partly financed by the Federal Government, the Federal Government taking over the survivors and old-age benefits program with an assessment equally upon labor and management. The total cost of this program is paid by management in the various States. There are various rates of pay. There are various rates of allowances to unemployed workers. In my judgment the States have done an excellent job up to the present time. They have assumed the responsibility fully, have met local conditions which are diverse from one section of the country to another according to the industrial situation, according to the character of labor, and as to the degree of centralization of working forces.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Secretary?

Secretary TOBIN. If left to the States, we would have no unemployment compensation insurance law on the books today. In 1935, in order to get unemployment compensation on the books, it was necessary for the Federal Government to pass a law requiring a 1-percent payroll tax on every employer in the country on all wages up to $3,000. In the event that a State failed to pass an unemployment compensation law within a period of 2 years, that money was to flow into the Federal Treasury without benefit to either the employer or the workers in the respective States. Under this compulsion, the 48 States of the Union did pass unemployment compensation laws. So there was your very first standard. On the basis of Senator BRICKER's argument, were

he a Member of the Senate at the time, on the basis of States' rights, to be consistent he would have had to vote against the unemployment compensation law of 1935. Fortunately, all of the States did pass laws, and we now have a great protection for the unemployed worker, and I think everyone will agree that we do not want to go back to the days of WPA, back to the days when we had millions of unemployed people in the country, dependent upon the charity and the bounty of the Federal Government, the States, and local governments. I think an insurance system is far better, and if it is worth while, it should be a good one, it should be adequate to protect the average worker and adequate to protect and to buttress the economy by placing purchasing power in the hands of the American workers during unemployment.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BRICKER.

Senator BRICKER. Secretary Tobin assumes an unfounded presumption that there would not be any unemployment compensation in the country. Some of the States had unemployment compensation, just as they had old-age assistance and pensions prior to the time of the enactment of the Social-Security law in 1935. I think Wisconsin was the first State——

Secretary TOBIN. Wisconsin was the only State, and they passed it just prior to the enactment of the Federal law.

Senator BRICKER. Legislation was introduced and being considered at the very time in various States. I want to say that in the very beginning this was a violation of the Federal relationship in the country. Federal relationship assumes that the States still have some responsibilities to their people and to their local communities. It was a compulsory, arbitrary national enactment with which I do not disagree at this time because it has worked successfully up to the present time. Even the President in his state of the Union message said that this was one of the laws which had helped in the unemployment shock of 1939.

Chairman GRANIK. He said it served to support the demand for goods in his economic review.

Senator BRICKER. He has commended it many times, and it is worthy of commendation because the States have done a good job. The State funds are not bankrupt at the present time.

Let me refer to the Labor Information Bulletin of October of this past year. After the experience that the President talked about wherein this program had been successful under State operation, this says:

"In that year there were 22 States in which benefits exceeded collections and interest, in a few States by a wide margin. However, while generalization is difficult because of the tremendous variation between the States in benefit costs, size of present reserves and tax income, very few States need to be concerned about their ability to weather even a substantial economic recession."

Let me say to you that the only two States at the present time that are in any danger at all—that they are not in any substantial danger—are the State wherein our distinguished colleague here today. Secretary Tobin, was Governor, that is, Massachusetts and the State of Rhode Island, which is of course in much worse shape than Massachusetts.

Chairman GRANIK. That is where the Attorney General is from.

Senator BRICKER. The States are in very good shape, and even last year in the unemployment crisis, they were able to increase their reserve funds, which now total about $7,000,000,000.

Secretary TOBIN. Total amount is close to $7,500,000,000 in the reserve fund of the country.

I would like to say in connection with the statement that has been made by Senator BRICKER that if unemployment compensation has made a contribution to the stabilization of the economy—and I am going to quote from Business Week in just a moment—we should have a good system. Senator, we have one State in the Union that in 1936, when it passed its law, established a $15 maximum payment. They have let that maximum payment remain for 14 years. That gives to the average worker, to the worker who is unemployed getting the maximum payment in the State, a purchasing power equal to $8.22 based on 1939 costs. I feel that we should have Federal standards, Nation-wide standards from one end to the other, minimum standards below which no State can go. We first have always required federally that all of the States in the Union have an unemployment-compensation law. Secondly, we have required that employers of eight or more have insurance coverage for their workers, and I think it is reasonable to establish minimums below which no State can go.

Let me just cite from Business Week.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's go to the Senator and then come back to you. Go ahead, Senator.

Senator BRICKER. I might say in comment upon what the Secretary has just said that in 1940 the average weekly benefit payments were $10.50; in 1949, $21.01.

Let us turn to this federalization operation that the Secretary desires in this program, and that is what it amounts to. Maybe it is not a federalization program. It is more in the nature of a nationalization program which would completely ultimately wipe out the State's position in the unemployment-compensation field.

Let us turn, though, to the old-age and survivors insurance program which is administered by the Federal Government. That in 1940 paid an average of $22; in 1948, $25. There is a 12-percent increase, while there was a 100-percent increase in the amounts paid under unemployment compensation. That 12-percent increase took place under the operation of the Federal Government when costs of living was rising practically 70 percent.

Let us turn also to the old-age pension program which has increased about 100 percent. True, the Federal Government does contribute 50 percent of that, but it is still under the complete operation of the States, subject to State law in every respect.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Secretary, did you want to comment on Business Week?

Secretary TOBIN. This is a copy of Business Week dated May 7, 1949. Here is the picture of the conditions in the city of Lawrence, one of the hardest-hit cities in the United States. Business Week has this to say:

"It takes a lot more to make a depression in 1949 than it did in the early 1930's."

It then goes on and says:

"But despite this, business conditions were about the same for the country as a whole."

In other words, there are 23,000 workers, according to the report, unemployed out of 57,000 workers in Lawrence.

"Unemployment compensation has proved to be an effective cushion for business as well as workers against the impact of unemployment."

Since unemployment compensation has made this contribution, not alone to the workers of America, but to the business of America, I think that we should have standards in this country—and incidentally I do not believe in federalization. I believe in a perpetuation of the Federal-State program. The one guaranty we are going to have for the preservation of the State program is to have it effective and to meet the needs of America's economy at the present time. I do not think it proper or fair to have workers in the United States receiving as low as 20 percent of their weekly wage, and that is true in altogether too many States of the Union. With the establishment of the Federal standards and an approach toward the objective of 1935 of a 50-percent payment of the loss of wage, we can be sure that there is going to be an adequate income for the average unemployed worker, and there will be a buttress to the economy that will carry us through and prevent future depressions in the United States of America.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator BRICKER?

Senator BRICKER. Secretary Tobin merely emphasizes the fight, which is 15 years old, in regard to unemployment compensation. The philosophy of the law that is to be presented is nothing new. There has been a constant battle between those who believe in the rights of the States in this field and those who want to completely nationalize the program. The proposition that is made so far is a result of a circular that was sent to the State unemployment bureaus on the 29th day of November by Mr. Goodwin, who is the head of the Unemployment Security Section in the Department of Labor. The State employment directors were asked by the 5th day of December to submit a complete report as to whether or not they approved or disapproved the suggestions that were made. I would like to know the results of that poll, and I hope that the Secretary of Labor can give them to us before this program is concluded. I do know what they did in my State. They are absolutely opposed. The director—I am advised—and I am sure correctly advised—that the Governor supports him in his position—is opposed to the Federalization, so-called, or nationalization program, because it absolutely makes a minimum of the present maximums of payments, of duration of payments, and of the qualifying requirements, and almost completely relieves all restrictions on employment. Furthermore, it emphasizes the fact that this is not a relief measure. It was originally passed for the purpose of absorbing the shock of unemployment. If it is to be a relief measure, the handing out of a dole dependent upon needs, there are other departments of both the Federal Government and the State governments that are thoroughly adequate and are at the present time charged with the responsibility of taking care of those programs.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Secretary, do you care to comment on that?

Secretary TOBIN. Yes, I would like to comment on it. Back in the thirties under the days of WPA, PWA, and the like, the State of Ohio received $1,100,000,000 in direct grants from the Federal Government of the United States. We don't want to see those days in America again, so I say that it is sound to have a sound insurance system that will take care of the unemployed in this Nation for a period of 26 weeks, and I further contend that we would not have had unemployment compensation in the United States if it had not been for the Federal law that practically compelled the States to enact such laws.

There was only one State in the Union in 1935 that had unemployment compensation, and that was the State of Wisconsin. It was because of the Federal standards requiring the States to establish these laws that we have them on the books today and that Business Week is able to write the wonderful story about the city of Lawrence. In the city of Lawrence workers are paid for a period of 23 weeks. They are paid a maximum of $25 a week. If we did not have unemployment compensation, certainly the merchants of Lawrence would not be as prosperous as they are today, and the retail sales in the city would not have been staying practically abreast of the rest of the United States of America.

So if unemployment compensation is a sound system for America, then let us have standards that will make it genuinely sound and let us work toward meeting the objectives that were set in 1935 of giving an un-

employed worker approximately 50 percent of his earning wage.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that level, Senator?

Senator BRICKER. I can't help but call attention to the fact of the conditions existing under State administration in the location that was cited by the Secretary and that the same conditions didn't exist in all the States. While the funds in one State were being depleted, the funds in other States were being built up at a terrific rate. We should not let the conditions of one State control a national program that has been successful up to the present time and which has, in the very words of the Secretary himself, worked so successfully.

I mentioned a moment ago that this was to be submitted to the Security Council by Mr. Goodwin, a report made on it, and subsequent legislation to be introduced as a result of that. That is the only group that I know of, the group in the Department of Labor, that are advocating anything like this. I hold in my hand the Federal-State Relations Report of the Council of State Governments, which definitely says, on page 237, that this should be left as it is, as a responsibility of the States. Thorough study was given to that. I remember the consideration that was given to it at the time. We had a committee of the Congress, the Council of State Governments, and the governors of the States. Fifteen governors, I think 10 Congressmen, and 6 Senators, met in Chicago and spent 2 days on this subject 2 years ago. That report is in Senate Document 1054, and it definitely says that:

"The Federal Government should relinquish to the States the Federal tax on employers levied to cover the administrative expenses of the State employment security programs. The States will assume the responsibility for the administration of the unemployment compensation and employment service programs."

Chairman GRANIK. What is your comment?

Senator BRICKER. I have a couple more here, after the Secretary comments on those.

Secretary TOBIN. Let him go ahead. I will comment on all of them when he finishes.

Chairman GRANIK. We have just a minute, before questions, if you want to comment here.

Secretary TOBIN. There is naturally opposition on the part of certain people to Federal standards. The selfsame arguments were offered in 1935 against the establishment of unemployment compensation as a result of a Federal law that compelled the 48 States to enact those laws. The same arguments are being advanced by Senator BRICKER now and would be logical if it is an infringement on States rights to establish minimum standards. Remember, the minimum standards are to approach 50 percent of an earner's wage up to $30 a week. In other words, if a worker earns over $60 he will not get better than 50 percent of his $60, or $30. So it is my contention that if it was sound in 1935 to write the basic law, it is sound after 14 years of experience and after giving the States an opportunity for 14 years to approach those standards, to have the Federal Government establish minimum standards for the protection of the economy and for the protection of individual workers.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, let's take some questions from our studio audience. I see Miss Penuel has a lady with a question.

Question. I should like to know why the United States Employment Service is using public funds for advertising in the newspapers and on the radio for applicants for jobs in direct competition with private employment agencies.

Secretary TOBIN. In direct competition with private employment agencies?

Question. Yes.

Secretary TOBIN. For the purpose of rendering a service to the American people. I am certain one American who feels that any government owes it to the people to help them procure jobs without the payment of a fee; and when we save individual workers from paying a week's pay or 2 weeks' pay for the purpose of procuring a job, I think we are rendering the kind of service that the Government of the United States should render to their citizens.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Senator?

Senator BRICKER. I would like to comment on that because of the attitude of the Federal Government in the administration of this law all along. I would just like to quote from one of the administrators of the unemployment-compensation fund in the States as to the attitude of the Federal Government. I don't want to get into personal recollections of the matter, because Mr. Goodwin and I had this out in Ohio years ago as far as civil service is concerned, long before you were in it, Mr. Tobin. Herschel Atkinson, who was administrator of this program in Ohio, has this to say about the relation of this program to the Federal Government and to the State governments, which is still part of our system, talking about this very thing of Federal administration and action.

"One of the most amazing statements to me when I was administrator was when a representative of Federal Security came out to Ohio and said, and I quote: 'This money is for velocity spending. This is to get spending power out in the hands of the people. We will never audit you on the payments made. If a man walks in and signs a slip, pay it to him. What do you care? We will never audit you. Get the money out. This is a spending velocity law.' Believe you me, that pressure was put on me repeatedly."

A recent article called, "Rainy Day Money, or Give It Away Show," referred to this article, the statement of Mr. Atkinson, and had this further to say:

"I have heard the same statement from administrators still in harness. They say the States which accede to such demands get more money to administer their programs, while those who do not are continually on or near a deficit spending basis."

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to answer that?

Senator BRICKER. Let me accentuate that with one thing.

Secretary TOBIN. The Senator quoted Mr. Goodwin, who now heads the Unemployment Service. He was Regional Director of Federal Security at the time when Senator BRICKER was Governor. I asked Mr. Goodwin who is present in the audience, if he ever heard it. He was the representative in the State of Ohio. He never said it to Mr. Atkinson, and he knows no man who ever did say it.

Further than that, I have a letter from Mr. Teets, who is the president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies of the United States, denying that statement by Atkinson, and he says he has checked with his executive board and he has checked with the other State directors, and not one of them knows of a single instance in which a Federal official ever talked that way to them.

I think it is a false indictment that is without foundation. Mr. Goodwin is right here in the audience. He was the regional director at the time, and he will contend that it never happened.

Senator BRICKER. Let me say further that the Federal administration—I have had some experience in this field, Mr. Tobin—fined the State of Ohio $1,250,000 at one time because of a quarrel between Harry Hopkins and Mr. Altmeyer and my predecessor, Governor Davey, whom I do not intend to defend here today, as I never have. As a result of that, showing the power of the Federal Government, their callous disregard of the right of workers, they withdrew from Ohio, $1,250,000 of administrative expense money, and we had to dig down in the State general revenue after I become Governor to pay it back.

That is the attitude of the Federal Government, and that is the reason that the Governors Conference, when you were a member of the Governors Conference, Secretary Tobin, in 1944 passed a resolution against federalizing and for leaving this as it is, in the hands of the States. That was reiterated at the Governors Conference in 1947 by a unanimous vote, because they don't pass any other kind of resolutions.

Secretary TOBIN. This program is not a federalization program. It leaves it still as a Federal-State program in the hands of the States, with additional standards comparable to the standards that were passed in 1935. It is not a federalized program at all.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take another question? Go ahead, sir.

Secretary TOBIN. I do want to say this in that connection. In the year 1939 the State of Ohio was perfectly willing, during the period of time that you were Governor, to accept WPA money for the feeding of the people of the State of Ohio, when a special session would not be called for the purpose of feeding them and the Government of the United States had to do it.

Senator BRICKER. We also appropriated money by the State legislature. That fight was solely on a local political basis as to whether the State would furnish all of it or the cities a part of it.

Chairman GRANIK. Let me squeeze in a question here.

Question. I would like to ask Senator BRICKER if he recalls the 1948 position of the Republican Party on the matter of unemployment compensation.

Senator BRICKER. I haven't checked the vote at all. I certainly was in favor of it at the time. We supported it in Ohio during my administration and made it work effectively.

Question. I was wondering if there were any new ideas the party would like to put on the statute books at the present time.

Senator BRICKER. New ideas have virtue only if they are constructive. There is no merit in itself in having something new. In fact, the Constitution of the United States has stood for over 150 years, and I think the people of Ohio, because it is old, have a high appraisal of their constitutional structure that provides for a Federal system of government. This isn't a federalization program at all; it is a nationalization program which takes the maximums at the present time and makes them compulsory as minimums upon every state in the Union. That is taking over; that is not cooperation. The Federal system recognizes the rights of the States, and this program doesn't in any way give the States any position, practically, except as administrative units of the Federal Government.

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, we must have your summaries now. Mr. Secretary, will you summarize briefly, please?

Secretary TOBIN. Yes.

National City Bank of New York praises unemployment compensation as a contributing factor to the stabilization of our economy and the avoidance of a depression. Business Week does the same in this article in reference to the city of Lawrence. Since it is accepted as a sound principle and a help to our private-enterprise economy, then I say we should make it equally effective with minimum standards—remember, minimum standards—in the 48 States of the Union and eliminate the possibility of individual States leaving their law unchanged, taking no recognition of the increased cost of living that has occurred since this law was originally written. I say that if it was sound for the Government of the United States in 1935 to compel the States to write the law, it is sound in the year 1950 to have minimum

standards that will make it equally effective in all sections of the United States.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Senator BRICKER, your summary, please.

Senator BRICKER. Mr. Granik, I have presented here evidence in support of the Labor Information Bulletin; of two governor conferences, of one of which the distinguished Secretary of Labor was a member; of the Social Security Advisory Council to the Senate Finance Committee, which was chairmaned by the late Edward R. Stettinius, who was then chancelor of the University of Virginia; and of Sumner Slichter, who is professor of economics at Harvard University.

I have presented support for the present State-administered program from the legislative council of the council of state governments.

I have found yet no one who supports the forcing onto the States of these minimum standards which are at the present time the maximum standards of the various States of the Union. It has worked well, according to the testimony of the President and of Mr. Tobin himself, and we should not disturb a program which has met increasing costs by increasing the allowances 100 percent when the old-age and survivors insurance program under his Department has increased only about 12 percent at the same time.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference has again been exposed as a front for selfish interest. In an editorial, Seaway and Selfishness, published in the distinguished independent newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, March 4, the conference is revealed as a front for corporations who have their own reasons for fighting the much-needed seaway project. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the editorial:

SEAWAY AND "SELFISHNESS"

The National St. Lawrence Project Conference has a pretty high-sounding and dignified name for an organization that confers only on ways and means to bury the proposed St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway and power project.

But the conference has more than a high-sounding name—it has a shotgun that is not only double-barreled but shoots in two directions.

In recent days the conference has been burdening the post office and editorial desks with antiseaway propaganda that attempts to establish these two diverse themes:

First, the seaway is pushed by iron and steel firms for the "private benefit of ore exploiters or shippers or iron and steel companies." This is an indication of selfish private interest.

Second, the seaway is being pushed by "economic planners" who are interested in promoting the welfare state and who will, one day, take over the selfish private interests that now seek an "immediate but temporary advantage."

This picture of "selfish" private enterprise and the "welfare state" advocates fighting side by side to despoil the Nation is intriguing—and a perfect example of the kinds of arguments the real selfish interests can use when facts aren't strong enough to support their stand.

The new ore discoveries in Labrador and Quebec and Venezuela are not the main arguments for the seaway—merely additional arguments. The seaway looked like a good bet long before anyone started mouthing the words "welfare state"—and was so considered by such Presidents as Hoover and Coolidge, who could hardly be called "welfare staters."

One thing must be said for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, however. For a fight against "selfish interests" and "for the people" the organization certainly picked the right officers. As representatives of the Nebraska Stock Growers' Association, the American Mining Congress, and the Republic Coal & Coke Co., of New York, they know a "selfish interest" when they see one.

The Importance of the American School Teacher to Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come in the present session of the Eighty-first Congress for all Members who are deeply concerned about the present and future welfare of America to begin to consider the teaching profession.

For many years the American teachers, inspired by a great desire to improve the youth of this great land of ours, have continued in their profession at low and inadequate salaries. No other group in this broad land of ours is as underpaid as the teaching profession. This has approached almost a national calamity. If our best teachers are forced by poverty to abandon their profession the onward and upward march of America will be reversed and we will turn our faces back toward the Dark Ages.

The teachers in every school in America—rural, village, city, and township—can and do inspire their pupils with all the power that they possess. They teach them while they are in their youth, and in a receptive state of mind how to work and play and how to share with others. They can and do inspire them with the great freedoms of America that has enabled this Nation to reach the pinnacle of power and happiness in the history of the world. They put in the minds and hearts of their pupils ambitions to accomplish much in this world. If we properly support our school teachers in this divine undertaking of theirs, we can build a greater America out of the future generations that pass through their hands daily.

All great uplifting movements start in the little school units of the United States. Each school teacher has his share in building the soul, mind and power of America. It is literally true that they hold the future destiny of this great Nation in the hollow of their hands. All other professions stem from the product of the teaching profession.

These patriotic men and women, who have molded the lives of our young people, if we will wake up in America and pay them adequately, will do more to prepare the following generations of American citizenship to take their part in the world and to bless all mankind than any other profession. They have worked for generations on disgracefully low salaries mostly without complaint but they cannot do the impossible. Living standards have greatly increased as well as the cost of living and there is no other group in America that has been so consistently underpaid.

Most of them have remained in this great profession because they love it. Tens of thousands of them are looking to the men selected by the people of America to pass adequate laws so they they can be properly paid. All good citizens should resolve that this shall be done and we should devote enough of our national wealth to support them adequately in their great endeavor. It is within the power of the teaching profession of America to bring up our young men and women possessed with the qualifications to solve our national problems and the problems of our States, counties, and cities.

In the dawn of this great scientific age, if we improve equally over the United States the educational opportunities of every American child, America will continue to grow and be a blessing to all mankind. These teachers can develop not only industrial skills of their pupils but they can sow the seeds in the minds, hearts and souls of young America the finer qualities of life so that in addition to being able to create great wealth, our people in the future can grasp the great beauties and happiness that is the divine purpose of mankind.

Today and for years past millions of American children, with sturdy bodies and bright and capable minds, have been allowed to remain in ignorance and have never been able to exercise and enjoy their latent powers and abilities that their creator endowed them with.

One is reminded of Gray's Elegy in a Country Churchyard, when this great poet sat silently gazing upon the little headstones and footstones at the graves of the country people and when he said:

Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

We no longer want the youth of America to be wasted. We should form a national standpoint as well as a State and local standpoint, burst asunder the bonds of ignorance. We should adequately and generously support our teachers and pay them well, and we should build and equip our schools knowing that they are the ground sills of the American way of life.

When Jesus Christ was on this earth He had three great professions. He was a minister, He was a physician, and He was a teacher. When He choose his 12 apostles, He trained them and sent them forth to teach the peoples of the world. Throughout 20 centuries His teachings and the teachings of His chosen teachers have rung down the centuries to uplift and bless all mankind.

The teachers of America are in need of our support and while we serve the great people of our land, let us give to them the full measure of what they deserve.

For the practical businessmen of our Nation, who know that we must keep this Nation solvent, let me say this:

Three hundred million dollars for Federal aid to public schools will all be spent here at home. Salaries of teachers have been so low for so many years that this supplemental and increased pay will immediately be placed in the current money circulation almost 100 percent. Each monthly salary check to the teachers will be spent for food, clothing, household furniture, books, and every other kind of daily necessities of life and will pass along from one businessman to another in commerce and turn over many times each year.

Millions of pupils who will acquire better education through this supplemental fund will become larger earners to create more wealth here in the United States. Thousands of these pupils who would otherwise remain ignorant and become charges upon society, not earning and contributing enough to pay their own way in our American way of society will be moved up across the productive profit line where they can pay their own way and beneath which line many of them have lived for so long.

Our national income will be substantially and permanently increased. More taxes will be paid into the Federal Treasury all along the line. It will be a good investment, it will pay immediate economic dividends to the entire United States and to all of its individual citizens. This Federal aid-to-public-school bill will also add substantially to our cultural, spiritual, and educational uplift.

For all these foregoing reasons I urge my colleagues to enact into law a good bill providing for Federal aid to our public schools.

Sermon on Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the time of the House for a few minutes in order to preach a short sermon on the subject of manganese.

As the president of the American Manganese Producers Association told the Public Lands Committee not long ago, manganese is the "starch" which stiffens steel—no adequate substitute has been found for it and none is immediately in prospect. Without manganese, no matter how much steel we have the capacity to produce, we cannot make munitions.

In the last issue of that eminent trade paper, The Engineering and Mining Journal, Mr. Norwood B. Melcher of the United States Bureau of Mines, states:

The critical shortage of manganese ore evident at the close of 1948 was intensified in the first quarter of 1949 by a virtual embargo on exports of manganese ore to the United States.

Yet I understand, Mr. Speaker, that if and when the O'Mahoney bill, S. 2105, comes to this floor, there may be made on the part of the Government agencies an attempt to amend it to prevent manganese producers from benefiting from its provisions. This is just a rumor which has reached me, but if true, how serious are its implications may be seen from the following quotations from the same article by Mr. Melcher:

Speaking of the plans of the Government to attain a satisfactory balance between total domestic requirements and supplies, most of the programs begun in 1949 will not be effective for several years, but some that were already under way January 1, 1949, showed substantial results by the second half.

Completion of a program begun in 1948 to supply railroad cars to the Union of South Africa resulted in a substantial increase in exports to the United States in 1949. Shipments were expected to exceed 300,000 short tons compared with only 217,000 tons in 1948. Similary shipments from India are expected to nearly double the 1948 total of 216,000 short tons. India was the largest single supplier to the United States in 1949, furnishing 27 percent in the first 10 months. Exports from the Gold Coast also increased in 1949, reaching 330,000 short tons of ore. In addition, imports of ferromanganese made from the Gold Coast ore were received from Norway and Canada equivalent to about 120,000 tons of ore. Thus, in terms of ore equivalent, Gold Coast was the largest source in 1949, furnishing about 450,000 short tons.

Inadequate transportation facilities in Brazil held the 1949 shipments of ore to about the 1948 level of 144,000 tons. Cuba and Mexico each shipped about 4 percent of the 1949 total, and small shipments (3 percent in all) were made from Angola, Belgian Congo, Chile, France, French Morocco, the Philippines, Portuguese Asia (Goa), United Kingdom, and Liberia. Imports of manganese ore during the first 10 months totaled 1,201,240 short tons; of this 61,319 tons was battery grade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is all well and good, and I am delighted that we are getting all possible manganese from all possible sources. I do not think the total imports come anywhere near our requirements if you take into consideration stock piling as well. But note, after the detailed information on foreign supply, that the domestic situation is dismissed with these words:

Domestic production of manganese ore in 1949 dropped off slightly from that of the previous year, due largely to mechanical problems, and is estimated at 115,000 short tons.

Is it mechanical problems, or price, that really is the difficulty, Mr. Speaker? I hear of no programs to supply railroad cars, or anything else, to manganese producers in Nevada or elsewhere in the United States. I introduced a bill some time ago which would have authorized the payment of up to 50 percent over the foreign price under stock-piling contracts, but that bill reposes in the Armed Services Committee unheard. As a matter of fact, I believe the Bureau of Federal Supply has sufficient authority to pay almost any price for domestic manganese for stock piling. Let them announce that a sufficient price will be paid and I dare say the increase in domestic production would surprise them. If, instead of applying all possible stimulation, there really is a scheme afoot to remove manganese from S. 2105, it is altogether a shameful thing and I shall resist such a move as far as it may be within my power to do so.

The moral of this sermon, Mr. Speaker, is, paraphrasing the old saw about charity beginning at home, that manganese production should begin at home where neither the wind, waves, shortage of shipping, snorkel submarines, or enemy seizure of foreign sources of supply can cut our supply lines. The quicker we realize this elementary truth about manganese and other strategic and critcal minerals the better prepared we shall be should the misfortune of another war develop. I should be most unhappy, Mr. Speaker, were I to think that future historians might look back at these United States as we do at the Roman Empire and say, "sic transit gloria mundi." Let us not speculate with our future; let us be prudent now, rather than sorry later.

Henry McLemore's Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Henry McLemore, newspaper columnist, in the Washington Star of February 28, 1950:

McLEMORE CALLS ON NATION TO WAKE UP

(By Henry McLemore)

To read the newspapers and listen to the radio is to wonder why the United States of America is called the United States of America.

At the moment the States seem to be about as united as Ingrid and Dr. Lindstrom. A much better name, for the time being, at least, would be the Disunited States of America.

Just read the headlines and subheads, and listen to the radio announcers who, truth to tell, do little more than read the headlines and the subheads out loud.

"Miners Stiffen as Coal Famine Brings Show-down.

"Dixie Battle Plans Drawn Against FEPC.

"New Block Hit in Talk on Phone Strikes.

"GOP Blocks Plan for Spy Ring Inquiry.

"Probers Told Reds Control Progressives."

SO WHAT TO DO?

What sort of reading is that for a country which is faced with destruction by an enemy which makes no bones about what it would like to do? Russia, I'm talking about. If Russia lets us know how much it hates us in public, just how much more do you figure Russia hates us in private? About ten-thousandfold, I'd say.

So what do the so-called United States do? Fight night and day among each other, group against group, bloc against bloc, majority against minority, party against party, statesman against statesman, politician against politician, neighbor against neighbor.

It seems to me, silly as I am, that now is the time, if there ever was a time, for this country to pull together. If a coal strike affects steel and steel affects the building of the materials of preparedness against war, then there should be no coal strikes. The same goes for all the other strikes and for all the other hold-outs against unity.

LET US WAKE UP

I have said this before but I want to say it again. There seems to be a widespread belief in this country that there is a relatively small group of men willing and anxious to die for their country; a group who, as doughfoots, wants to freeze and shiver and get slugs in their bellies; a group who, as flyers, wants to streak to death or injury in the skies; a group who, as sailors, wants to freeze in the oceans of the earth.

There are no such men. Even the wildest-eyed kid finds war a little too much to stand and prays to get home. But unless this country starts working as a unit, faces the common danger with a united front, a few million poor devils are going to have to pay the price for the selfishness or stupidity or both of millions and millions of others. The next Pearl Harbor will be a dilly. Most of the major brains in the country have prophesied that. It won't be a handful of bombers coming over, but a terrific, all-out thrust that will make front-line combatants of even babes in their cribs.

The Taft-Hartley Act Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article which appeared in the Collinsville Herald, Collinsville, Ill., on Friday, March 3, 1950:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW IS DEAD—JUDGE KEECH FINDS UMWA NOT GUILTY OF VIOLATING ORDER BECAUSE MINERS REFUSED TO WORK

Adopting the legal theory developed by James O. Monroe, publisher of the Collinsville Herald, in an address to the House Labor Committee in Washington a year ago, Judge Richmond B. Keech in the Federal district court in Washington Thursday afternoon held that the United Mine Workers Union was not guilty of contempt of his no-strike injunction order because of the refusal of the coal miners to return to work at the direction of the union officials.

Monroe in his address to the Congressmen had predicted that at some future time there would be a strike where the dissatisfied men would refuse to follow the orders of their officials who would be acting under duress of a court injunction. That was what happened following Judge Keech's order of 10 days ago to the UMW officials. Union President John L. Lewis issued an order to the men to return to work, but they failed to do so.

Judge Keech's finding that the union is not guilty of contempt because of the failure of the miners to resume work ends the court proceeding. It demonstrates what Monroe has said from the beginning, that the injunctive process would be unavailing to prevent or to end a strike. It means that the Taft-Hartley law is virtually dead. Monroe predicted Thursday that the law now would be either repealed or radically revised.

Following is the portion of Monroe's statement to the House Labor Committee discussing the futility of the Taft-Hartley law as a strike-breaking measure:

"The greatest error on the part of those who framed the Taft-Hartley law was that they acted as if they regarded the union and its officers as being the controlling agents over the union members, a doctrine specifically stated by Judge Goldsborough, saying, 'as long as a union is functioning as a union, it must be held responsible for the mass action of its members.'

"Union officials are regarded by the members as leaders and not as dictators nor as being empowered to determine policies and to bind the men to them. In the Typographical Union, to which I belong, no action can be taken, including the election of officers, without a referendum of the membership, both in the locals and in the International, and strikes are entered upon only by a vote of the membership affected. I understand that this is true in the Mine Workers, who are the largest industrial group in my city, and in most other unions. Labor unions are not corporations, which elect directors and officers who manage the business for a year or some other stated period and who during that period can commit the stockholders to policies and obligations. 'Labor czars' are no more potent than 'political bosses.'

"This fallacious thinking, which Judge Goldsborough first expressed, is at the bottom, so it seems to me, of the provisions in the present law which seek to prevent strikes by court injunctions against only the union and its officials, and which seek to direct union activity by requiring officials to take a non-Communist oath. And this thinking, and the legislation which it fostered, leads inevitably to the practical difficulties of establishing industrial peace by them. For men who recognize their officials as leaders, and not as dictators, cannot be expected to respect and accept and follow a law, first, which affronts their instincts, second, which thwarts established practices in the settling of disputes with management, and third and most important, which lays its impact solely on the union and its officials and which suggests no coercion and imposes no penalties upon the men themselves, either as individual citizens in the commonwealth or as members of the union.

"The more practical question, it seems to me, is, regardless of the theoretical responsibility of the union, whether or not members are under any responsibility too, and therefore will respect the orders of the union, particularly when the union orders are in contravention of the union's policy and are, moreover, delivered under duress of a court order. Neither the union laws nor the statute nor the court order suggests any such eventuality. So far as I can discern any inhibition in the law, the men can strike as quickly and as long as they please. And, again being practical, no matter how crippling a court order may be to the union, nothing is achieved for industrial resumption unless the men go back to work. One may say that the men have some responsibility to obey the orders of the officers, but the law does not say so, and Judge Goldsborough did not say so; and even if both said so, there is no penalty on the men if they refuse—which makes the law well nigh a nullity.

"As yet there has been no real test of the capacity of the injunction against unions to stop a paralyzing strike. I know that it will be said at once that John L. Lewis called off the miners' strike last April. But it must be remembered also that at the same time he got what he wanted in the welfare fund which was at issue. The longshoremen's strike last November on the two coasts was not ended by the order to the men to go back to work, but by the settlement, while they were still idle, of the disputed matters. I do not want to be taken as an inciter to strikes or to defiance of the Government by workers, but I predict that under the present law there will be strikes where the men will not follow the orders of the officials who give them under injunction. And I suggest to you that in such event you will have left the Nation helpless."

Democratic Party Responsibility for the Rise of Russia—John B. Chapple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have had thousands of Lincoln Day and Washington Day speeches throughout the Nation. Most of them sounded silly and missed the boat completely. The most outstanding speech in the Nation in my opinion was delivered by a small-town editor, John B. Chapple, of Ashland, Wis. I might add that this is the same John B. Chapple who won the Republican nomination for United States Senator in 1932. He won that nomination on a platform of anticommunism—the first public figure in America to see the light in 1932 as he sees it now in 1950.

Americans will take pride in reading this speech. That is why I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD so that 70,000 copies will go all over the Nation.

His address follows:

[From the Ashland (Wis.) Daily Press of February 25, 1950]

Friends of Ontonagon, we have been pioneers, your ancestors and mine, from the days when the first white man came to this Lake Superior shore, on to the time that our Nation was founded with a Declaration of Independence proclaiming human rights and human dignity to all the world, and on down to the time of our First World War.

That period of the First World War proved to be one of the great turning points in world history.

While we of America were busy in a war which we hoped would end war, in a war to make the world safe for democracy, a philosophy that was the exact opposite of what we were fighting for, the exact opposite of ours, a poisonous philosophy that had been spawned in Germany, gained support in Russia during the revolutions in which first the Czar and then representative government were overthrown—and there was let loose upon the world a philosophy of government the exact opposite of everything we believe in—a philosophy that denied God, that denied the sacredness of the human family, that denied honor and honesty and everything that America for 300 years has stood for—yes, a philosophy that denied, and still does deny, everything that the Ten Commandments have stood for down through the ages, and stand for today.

For a few brief years after World War I, this Communist philosophy of the denial of God and the denial of human rights, this overturning of the philosophy of human brotherhood for a philosophy of hate and treachery, was held at bay by America.

Then, in the confusion and paralysis of the depression that was the aftermath of that First World War, there came into power in

America a man and a party that gave the official recognition of the United States to a philosophy that is the deadliest enemy that America ever had or ever could have—not only gave official recognition to the Communist power of Soviet Russia, but has aided and abetted it until it is sweeping over much of the world and has actually become the world's greatest power, relegating America to second place.

Those who did this knew what they were doing when they did it.

They knew that for 15 years since the Communist revolution in Russia its leaders had flaunted the words of Karl Marx in the faces of the world that "religion is the opium of the people."

They knew the words of Lenin, predecessor of Stalin, that "children must be taught to hate their parents if they are not Communists. If they are, then the child need not respect them; need no longer worry about them."

They knew Lenin's advice to his Communists to "practice trickery, employ cunning, to sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth" in carrying on their work.

They knew the words of Mejinsky who had said, "As long as there are idiots to take our signature seriously, and to put their trust in it, we must promise everything that is being asked, and as much as one likes, if we can only get something tangible in exchange."

They were acquainted with the words of Lenin when he said: "Down with love of one's neighbors. What we need is hatred. We must know how to hate; only thus shall we conquer the universe."

They knew all these things; everyone in America knew them. They knew it when they did it.

And in the short space of 18 years since the Democratic Party went into power in America and made the deal with Soviet Russian communism which has finally produced today's world crisis in which every heart is secretly filled with terror about the future, the Democratic Party has written the blackest and most tragic chapter in American history.

The story of Nero fiddling while Rome burned has a ghastly parallel today in President Truman's bewilderment as Russia takes away from us control of the world.

This is Brotherhood Week, and from the White House President Truman issued the following splendid statement. I quote:

"Respect for human dignity is the central issue in the world struggle today.

"America is dedicated to the conviction that all people are entitled by the gift of God to equal rights and freedoms even though they may differ in religious persuasion, in social and political views or in racial origin. Our greatness is and will be measured by the degree of our recognition of this fundamental truth.

"Millions of people in our world are living in slavery. They are subject to the iron rule of despots who make the state supreme and who constantly violate God-given human rights. Free people everywhere are horrified to witness the subjugation of their fellow human beings by the totalitarian states. No group is being spared. Protestants, Jews, Catholics, Orthodox, are being crushed into submission. Statesmen of democratic spirit, and writers, teachers, and scientists of independent mind are being destroyed. The conscience of the free world is appalled by their shocking martyrdom."

That is the end of the quotation.

Ladies, and gentlemen, President Truman wrote the truth when he wrote these words. But what he failed to add is this:

If America is done for in the days to come, it is because the Democratic Party got control in 1932, and in the unbelievably short space of 18 years, nurtured and supported with billions of dollars of our own heart's blood a country whose leaders are the sworn enemies of human rights and freedom, and everything we believe in, and who are succeeding at their task of taking the world away from America, and away from those who believe that the Ten Commandments are the foundation of civilization.

In the incredibly short period of 12 years, the Russian empire has increased its population from 180,000,000 to 800,000,000 people.

Here is what Soviet Russia has been able to incorporate into its empire in that time:

Eastern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Karelia (part of Finland). This brings the Russian empire in Europe to the Elbe River on the west; to the Adriatic Sea on the southwest; close to the Aegean, with only a narrow strip of Greece, as a barrier, on the south. The present position of the Russian empire in Europe makes the Scandinavian peninsula indefensible.

This embraces 800,000,000 human beings, one-third of the total population of the earth.

In January 1945 Moscow ruled 190,000,000 human beings.

In June 1948 Moscow ruled 450,000,000 human beings.

By November 1949 Moscow ruled over 800,000,000 human beings.

The total human population of the earth is about 2,500,000,000.

Moscow rules one-third of the human race.

And here is the latest chapter:

At 10:18 this morning, over the United Press leased wire in the Daily Press office, came this bulletin:

"WASHINGTON.—The State Department announced it has broken diplomatic relations with Bulgaria. The Bulgarian delegation was ordered from Washington. Bulgaria accused the United States Minister at Sofia of conspiring against the so-called People's Republic of Bulgaria—the front name for Soviet Russia."

The Democratic Party over the past 18 years has built up this enemy of America, and now the situation is desperate.

I need scarcely remind you how every evil force in America was concentrated behind the Democratic Party in 1932. All the millions of dollars of the whiskey trust were dumped into that campaign. Every evil political power of the big cities was turned loose. The shell-shocked people of America, struggling through a depression caused by World War I, cracked under the strain and turned the reins of government over to what turned out to be the world forces of evil. Proof of this came in the quick recognition of Communist Russia.

An evil force took control in America at that time that reversed the direction of our Government and sent us spinning down hill.

A blind, stupid foreign policy failed to give any encouragement to the Republican postwar government of Germany that was struggling to get onto its feet after World War I, and by this lack of support actually helped Hitler rise to power.

Instead of doing something to help stabilize postwar Germany and keep a maniac named Hitler out of power, the Democratic Party of the United States turned its attention to Soviet Russia, which it officially recognized in 1933, creating an even greater peril to America than Hitler, as time has proved.

Out of the Democratic Party's blindness, Hitler, who had already proclaimed his attack upon the Jews, was actually allowed to rise to power.

And in that same fateful year of 1933, right after taking power in America, the Democratic Party officially recognized Communist Russia and put that nation on its feet later with billions of dollars of American money, and Communist Russia's agents, spies, and criminals were brought into this country with the encouragement and connivance of the Democratic Party until the whole bloodstream of our Government was poisoned with enemies not only of our Nation but of every ideal of decency that we believe in. The Democratic Party and the Democratic Party alone is guilty of this act which historians of the future will doubtless classify as treason to our country.

President Truman's statement Thursday that he is standing on his order not to release the secret loyalty files in the present investigation into Communist influences within the State Department speaks for itself.

This same Democratic Party let loose in the labor relations of our country the same venom and hatred that the Communists proclaim openly is their weapon. Who gave birth and political preferment and untold power to John L. Lewis, who sponsored him and nurtured him in the belief that he has the right to bring hunger and suffering upon millions of innocent people instead of seeking to settle labor controversies with the assistance of sane government and civilized mediation of differences, of which human beings who are made in the image of God are capable? Who is responsible for stirring up and encouraging in human hearts every evil trait—suspicion of their fellow men, envy, malice, violence? This must be laid squarely at the door of the Democratic Party.

Who has tried for political reasons to break the spirit of the American people, to make pioneers like our fathers and ourselves dependent upon Government, regimented under Government regulations so that we begin to feel like helpless pawns of Government?

Who created this world power of Communist Russia that is spilling over Europe today, that is taking over China, that is at bay with us over Germany, that greedily eyes India and Africa, and that eventually plans to strangle us and crush the life out of the kind of an America that we know and have fought and worked for? Who has sold America out to Russia? The Democratic Party must take the full and complete responsibility.

Today the release of George Sokolsky, the columnist, for February 21 came to my desk. Sokolsky is the son of an American rabbi. He edited a newspaper in Russia and later worked in China and is a man of world-wide vision and in my opinion the greatest columnist in America today.

Under the title, "Let's Face It," he wrote these words that throw the situation sharply into focus. He writes:

"I was sitting in a train in conversation with a man. Our conversation grew increasingly gloomier. He hoped that everything I said was untrue, unfounded, nonsense. And the reason? He did not want his grandchildren to have to live in the kind of world that seemed inevitable from our conversation.

"Of course, he and I are not designing the next historic period. It was designed for us at Yalta. We have to get that into our heads. It was designed principally at Yalta, with side arrangements at Quebec, Tehran, Moscow and other places. There three men formed a design—an historical design of tremendous dimensions. If these men thought badly, as they undoubtedly did, we shall spend many decades getting out of their arrangements. The chain process that is started by an historic mistake is rarely arrested except by war or revolution.

"The point is that history deals with people—not with lands or boundaries or treaties, but with living, working, hoping, aspiring people. Politicians often forget that. They shove 50,000,000 souls here and 100,000,000 there. They smash a system of government and substitute another. They end a war and start another. They waste productivity and starve a hitherto productive race.

And when they have done their work and die, the heritage they leave may be, for a century, little more than blood and sweat and tears.

"It is important for us in this decade to understand precisely where we are. In 1938, we were annoyed with the Japanese and we were very angry with Hitler and Mussolini. Then came the European war, which should have been localized but was not. It became, instead, world-wide, involved us to the extent that we took it over, became the leader of one side, defeated the enemy, and found a changed world, in which the smaller of our two principal allies came out the victor and simultaneously our enemy.

"It took us a long time to understand what had happened. Could it be that those smart men who knew everything—Roosevelt, Churchill, Harry Hopkins, Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, George Marshall, Henry Morgenthau, Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore—could it be that they were all wrong?

"The answer of history is clearly that they were wrong. That has nothing to do with whether you like them or not; whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, a Liberal or a Conservative. None of this makes any difference, because the historic fact is that World War II was won by the Russians, and we lost it. The Russians got the spoils, and we got the expenses. They moved into first position.

"So now we have to get out of that. And as Americans we face some very tough problems.

"This is what we face:

"1. The possibility of direct attack on our soil;

"2. The possibility of economic and political isolation;

"3. The danger that the cost of safeguarding ourselves from 1 and 2 may so damage our national economy as to imperil the life which has made us the great Nation that we are;

"4. The preservation, in spite of 1, 2, and 3, of the liberties of our people, without which it hardly matters whether we succeed at all. In a word, we must not lose our freedoms no matter what else we have to do.

"So that is what World War II has produced for us. And it would not be so difficult if we did not have among us pro-Russians, pro-Britishers, internationalists, and just plain ostriches who refuse to face up with the brutal facts of history. Maybe if we could deal with this strictly as Americans, we could do something vital about it."

That is the end of the George Sokolsky quotation.

Let me repeat part of his final sentence:

"If we could only deal with this situation as Americans," he writes.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is only one party in America today that can deal with this suitation as Americans.

Here we stand—at bay with the forces of evil. Twenty years ago none of us thought these forces would ever gain the power they hold today. They hold that power because of the most ghastly conspiracy against the welfare of America that can be found in our American history.

And all the Democratic Party can do in this situation is to try to cover up.

Anything goes in America today, under the guidance of these Democratic misleaders. It is the bread and circuses period of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, all over again, only this time we in America are the victims. Our whole social structure is falling to pieces under the misrule of the Democratic Party and its evil philosophers. They have even talked of giving the atom bomb and the H-bomb to Russia to complete our destruction.

I don't propose to allow any administration or any party to protect the forces destroying the ideals of my children, mislead them, and then send them off to war to pay with their blood once more for Democratic Party folly in world affairs.

Men and women of Ontonagon, the sands of time for the Democratic Party are running out. They have built up the only enemy that America ever had in all its history that has become actually stronger than America itself. They have committed the unpardonable sin—sin against their mother country—yes, that conceivably may even mean the death of our Nation and the ideals we have known since the founding of America.

In this situation, it is a question of do or die. The Republican leadership in America must tear the control of our Nation out of the hands of its present evil Democratic leadership, or die with it.

In the words of Washington, we must once again raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. As he said in that earlier crisis, the event is in the hands of God—and the Democratic Party and its alliance with godlessness over the world are stacked against us.

In this crisis we have a terrific responsibility.

As we move forward in this crisis, let us tell the American people in clear words what it is that we as Republicans seek for all Americans.

Not the freedom of the anarchist, where anything goes, but the freedom of a life in which human beings may respect themselves and have reasonable hope for their children.

Not the freedom of the enemies of God and of the moral foundations of family life to destroy our civilization, but the exalted freedom of a government that protects family life, that recognizes the family as the foundation stone of human society, that protects the ideal of marriage, that protects motherhood, that protects children, that protects each family in its right to adequate food and housing, and its right to be safeguarded from such degrading influences as the commercialization of the Ingrid Bergman-Rosselini affair. We must tell the people of America that in time of stress and strain our ideal is that the American family not only is most certainly entitled to protection from hunger and want by the Nation, but that our higher goal is the freedom to work our own destiny under a system that gives the family a chance to survive as a family, and is not choked and strangled by a government that is riding the Nation to death until our economy cannot produce what people need. We must assure the people that we demand the constant improvement in the distribution of what we all produce, so that we need not resort to the criminal democratic practice of destroying food or hiring people not to produce it while other people are still hungry.

We must make clear to the American people that if a thing is good and sound and wholesome for the welfare of the American family, then the Republican Party is for it and will fight for it, and that it is the only truly American party today.

The Republican Party does not go along with or protect any power based on a philosophy that religion is the opium of the people, or that children should hate their parents if they are not Communists, or that we should practice trickery, employ cunning, and sometimes even overlook or conceal the truth, or that as long as there are idiots to take signatures seriously, to promise everything that is asked, or a philosophy that says, "Down with love of one's neighbors—what we need is hatred."

We have an appointment with destiny right now to rescue the American people from terror and despair.

It is indeed time, as Washington so clearly phrased it in that earlier crisis, to raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. Once again, as he said, the event is in the hands of God.

Automotive Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following from Mr. Lou Hosking, general manager, Minnesota Motor Transport Association, 2453 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Hosking is an outstanding authority on all phases of motortruck transportation. He has carefully and earnestly considered the automotive excise taxes from every viewpoint and their ultimate effect not only on the motor-transport owner and operator but likewise on businesses and the consuming public.

In order that the Members of the House may have the benefit of the Minnesota Motor Transport Association views as presented by Mr. Hosking, under leave previously granted, I am inserting the letter herewith:

MINNESOTA MOTOR
TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 23, 1950.

Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEN: The proposed repeal of certain excise taxes, now before Congress, is of vital importance to Minnesota truck operators; and, in ultimate effect, to the thousands of businesses in our State which they serve.

I would like to enlist your vigorous support in equalizing this burden which far outweighs any monetary gains which may accrue to the Government from its continuance.

Specifically, we urge the outright repeal of the 3-percent tax on the transportation of freight and a cut-back of additional highway-use taxes to prewar levels. Even a prewar level on these taxes is not justified but your problem and that of Congress in sustaining a reasonable tax level cannot be disregarded. We are fully cognizant of it.

I firmly believe that the present 3-percent freight-transportation tax is a depressing assessment which indirectly hits the pocketbook of every man, woman, and child buying any commodity, and I further believe that a cut-back to prewar levels of other highway-use taxes would boost, rather than harm, our economic well-being. The percentage of all income paid for transportation charges on all commodities is very high—more than most people realize—and if lowering of these highway-user taxes will in effect encourage lower transportation rates, or sustain a stronger transportation system to render dollar-saving transportation, then the loss in revenue to the Federal Government will more than be offset by additional net dollars to every constituent of yours in Minnesota.

We ask that the 5-percent tax on new trucks and trailers be cut back to the 2½-percent level which prevailed before the war; that the tax on truck parts and accessories be cut back to the 2½-percent which prevailed before the war; that the tax on tires and tubes be cut by 50 percent, thus restoring prewar levels; that the tax on lubricating oil be cut by 25 percent which would restore them to the levels prevailing before the war.

We further recommend that the present Federal tax on gasoline be cut from 1½ cents to the 1-cent level which prevailed before the war.

Our association members are in highway-freight transportation. They are direct servants of the people. The freight they handle is in their possession only temporarily. Any corrective measure which will facilitate their operations is of direct and immediate benefit to the consumer.

In this connection, I must state that no other form of transportation pays the excise taxes that our members do. These motor-freight carriers are subject to corporate taxes, income taxes, and all of the other types of taxes that business or individuals in general are subject to. Yet, in addition, they must pay a special levy on their equipment, maintenance parts, and many of their major items of operating expense such as gasoline, lubricating oil, and tires. It is unfair.

There is no pretense in the excise tax that the proceeds are for highway purposes. To that extent it is a penalty to truck transportation. No other forms of freight transportation are subject to such excise taxes. They thus are placed in a privileged category and enjoy an unearned advantage.

Since the ultimate benefactors to repeal of the 3 percent transportation tax, and, to an equal extent, a cut-back on other highway-user excise taxes are your constituents and our customers, it behooves us to fight for this enactment of excise-tax repeals. We do not speak of luxuries, of items which one can do without. These taxes are on services and items which are a vital key to one's economic well-being.

I would like very much, dear Congressman, to have you actively work for this program, and would like to know if it would be possible for you personally to appear before the House committee which is considering the reductions and present our views. It will be difficult, if not impossible, for us to make this appearance in Washington. We would be very happy to hear from you.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

LOU HOSKING,
General Manager.

Address of Very Rev. Vincent J. Flynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Very Rev. Vincent J. Flynn, president of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., and president of the Association of American Colleges, Cincinnati, Ohio, January 10, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure and an honor to speak to you as president of the Association of American Colleges. I am proud of the association; I am proud to have been its president during the past year.

First of all, I am proud of being president of the association for a personal reason. Quite naturally it is gratifying to me to feel that I have the esteem and friendship of my colleagues. It is naturally a matter of some satisfaction, that, after having been on the board for 3 years, my fellow college presidents would ask me to be their president. But apart from this personal satisfaction, which I, being human, have no desire to suppress, there is another consideration involved of far greater importance.

I take pleasure in being a member of this organization because to me it seems to furnish an example of the unity and harmony so badly lacking in our Nation, and in the world at large. In our deliberations, there are, of course, differences of opinion, but I know of no similar organization where there is less friction and more fundamental good will than our own; and I think it a tribute to the fair-mindedness of the membership of the association, which is predominantly Protestant, that they should have chosen for their president a priest of the Catholic Church.

Man is by nature one. That is the teaching of any theology that I know of, and sociology, as well; that is to say, human beings are essentially the same. This does not mean, of course, that all are alike in every respect; in fact, it is part of the mystery and fascination of life that no two human beings are alike in all respects. But when we say that all men were created equal, we mean that men in their very essence are the same, regardless of race, color, or creed. Christianity teaches that we were all created by the same Father, all redeemed by His Son, and that we all have a common destiny.

Until recent years, this concept of the oneness of man, although admitted speculatively, had not been brought into the realm of practical political thinking. A little over a century ago, Tennyson, dipping into the future, saw a vision of "the Parliament of man, the federation of the world." The first faint realization of his dream was, of course, the League of Nations. Today, with the extraordinarily rapid development of transportation and communication, as well as the discovery of new means of destruction, there is a more urgent clamor than ever before for world unification of some sort. We have our United Nations organization, struggling bravely to maintain its existence, in the face of enormous difficulties; we have the World Federalists, who wish to go a step further; because of our recognition of the mutual interdependence of nations, we in the United States are trying to help Europe get back on its feet. It is becoming increasingly clear that the problems of one nation are the problems of all; that, in fact, we are our brothers' keepers.

To achieve world unity is, of course, a colossal task. The difficulties are all too obvious. But this is no excuse for abandoning the attempt.

If world unity is a good thing, obviously unity within a nation is a good thing, and likewise within the separate political and social units of the nation—the various States or Territories, the counties, the cities, the families. Anything which sets a man's heart against his brother is wrong; anything that binds him to his brother in charity is good; and because I believe that the Association of American Colleges falls into the second category, I think that it is good.

Now it would be, indeed, an extremely optimistic person who would expect perfect harmony among all men for any length of time. But that does not lessen, in my opinion, the moral obligation of mankind to strive for this goal. And there is always the possibility of a certain amount of success. Even the most pessimistic would admit that.

If we are to have any success in achieving unity and harmony among men, we shall need first to discover what it is that divides and separates them. To me it seems that the answer lies in the very nature of man as he exists today. Briefly, man, as we know him, is an imperfect creature both in his intellect and in his will. Men disagree because in many matters the truth is by no means immediately evident; its discovery is often a long, tedious process. Men differ in intellectual powers, as well as in the cultivation of those powers. Only God is all-wise; only He comprehends truth in its fullness. And men disagree because of an exaggerated selfishness in their hearts. Most of us, according to Aristotle, follow our senses rather than our reason in competing for "wealth, honors, and bodily pleasures." It is the exceptional man, says Aristotle, who is truly a lover of self, in desiring that he should always "act justly, temperately, or in accordance with any of the other virtues," and in general in trying "to secure for himself the honorable course." And from the imperfect understanding of an issue by an imperfect intellect, and from an inclination toward an irrational selfishness, come the deforming passions of fear, of anger, of hatred, of the desire for revenge.

These are the things, in my opinion, which divide and separate man from man.

The next question is, what kind of unity do we want, and how can we achieve it?

I think that we may as well face the fact that we are not likely soon to get the whole race, or our whole Nation, or our whole city, to agree on anything. Ideally, of course, if we accept the theistic position, we should all have the same faith. But actually we live in a world filled with Buddhists, Mohammedans, Shintoists, Jews, and so forth, not to speak of the various Christian bodies. All believe in some sort of Supreme Being, all have some sort of moral code. If we are ever to have one world, or anything like it, we must, I think, first accept the fact of diversity, and secondly, we must tackle the problem with charity as our basic attitude. We shall need, to be sure, our experts in politics, economics, and sociology, but all of our technicians will avail us nothing unless we work together in a spirit of mutual love. Let me explain what I mean.

When I use the word "charity" or "love" as existing between man and man, I mean that one has a desire for the total good of the other. Life, as someone has said, consists in a series of relationships with other persons. The relationships are not between ideas; they are between human beings. Now, it is quite possible for me to love a man while hating his ideas. According to the precept of Christ, we must therefore love even our enemies, and do good to those that hate us. We need not agree with the ideas of our enemies, or with the things that they do. But we must wish their well-being in time and in eternity, and be willing to do anything within reason to help them attain it. And the reason for this is the unity of the race—we are all children of the one Father. Until the leaven of this idea somehow permeates the mass of men, or at least their leaders, international unity will have, I fear, very little chance.

The same is true, I believe, with regard to national unity, State unity, civic unity, and even family unity. You may begin at the top or the bottom of the scale, but you will find no real unity in a body of men without charity. Differences and disagreements will exist, even in the best of families. But I appeal to your experience: where love is present, agreement can usually be reached—at least in the field of action, if not in that of opinion. Where love is not present, no unity is likely. There may be uniformity, or conformity, enforced by the police. Totalitarian states try to reach unity through this method. But is it a method repugnant to all that we Americans cherish.

Since ours is a national organization, let us look for a moment at the present state of our Nation, from the point of view of national unity. We find here in America persons of the most widely diverse ancestry, representing all, I daresay, of the races of men, and holding various political and religious beliefs. Whether we wish it or not, this diversity is going to continue for a

long time. Can there be any harmony in this pentecostal population?

I think that there can be. During the war, Americans exhibited a high degree of unity indeed. The political parties got together on a bi-partisan program; labor and capital buried their differences; Army and Navy chaplains of different faiths worked side by side, and there was comparative peace between their various coreligionists. But now that the emergency—that particular emergency, the threat of utter destruction—has passed, we are demonstrating to the world that as a people we can quarrel among ourselves as lustily as the next.

While I deplore any unseemly disputes, of course, in the realms of politics and economics, I am not nearly so troubled by them as I am by those in the realm of religion. And here the situation is none too good. In recent years there has been a resurgence of bad feeling between Protestants and Catholics in the United States. Without attempting to fix the blame, we can all agree, I am sure, that the fact is highly regrettable. It is regrettable because, as I have already said, anything that sets brother against brother is regrettable; and it is especially regrettable because it gives scandal to the unbeliever, who like ourselves—according to Christian teaching—has been made to the image and likeness of God. But is he likely to abandon his unbelief and join our ranks when he sees us quarreling like heathens? Woe to him by whom scandal cometh. Which Christianity? is the question the puzzled pagan asks when we invite him to accept the faith of Christ. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another.

Now what can we possibly do to keep the peace between persons of different religious faiths? Shall we fight it out with firearms? Few, I hope, wish that solution. Shall we send missionaries to each other? In a sense, we are always doing precisely that. By our lives (God forgive us) as well as by our words, we are trying to persuade others of the correctness of our views. But what if we cannot? Must we then accuse each other of bad faith? Hardly. The Christian believes that it is only God Himself who can scrutinize the secrets of the human heart; for that matter, any man of sense will agree that he cannot with certainty know the motives of another.

What program then shall we recommend? The program that men of good will have always followed; the program that even civilized pagans have followed, at least to a degree. We shall not go about picking quarrels about doctrinal differences, but we shall try to cooperate with each other in matters that affect the common good. I do not mean that doctrinal differences are unimportant. They are important, unless truth is unimportant. But we must accept the fact that, for the present at least, we must live in a world of many religious faiths. The question is, How can we live and work together without compromising our integrity?

One answer is that we are already doing it, both in America and abroad. For years it has been common to see Catholics and Protestants working side by side in matters of civic and community concern—the Red Cross, the Community Chests, school boards, city improvement committees, and so forth. Similarly we find both banded together for their common good in labor unions, in the National Association of Manufacturers, in business houses, in the various associations of professional men. For centuries, this has been true among men devoted to the fine arts, and for almost as long, I should say, among scholars.

Let me give you an instance from my own experience. Some years ago I had the privilege of spending 15 months in various libraries in England, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Belgium. At Oxford, Cambridge, and the British Museum, I was treated with the same courtesy as I found at the Vatican library. And similarly in the libraries of France, Germany, Belgium, and Austria, when I seldom knew whether I was speaking to a devout Catholic, a devout Protestant, a Jew, a free-thinking agnostic, or a professed atheist. And when I was at the Vatican I learned that the building had recently been repaired by the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace, because the members of the foundation had regarded the library as promoting peace—scholars from all lands use it—and that money from the same source was being provided to pay for a new card catalog. And this fact is also instructive: when I was about to leave London for Rome, I was given a letter of introduction to an official in the Vatican library by a Jewish scholar from the University of Heidelberg, who happened to be working in the British Museum at the time, and no one, either at the museum or at the Vatican, thought it odd. Of course I could probably have got into the Vatican library through other channels; but the point is that my friend in London had a friend at the Vatican, and he wished me to receive special attention. Furthermore, when I mentioned to the officials at the Vatican the names of two of my friends at the University of Chicago (where I received my degree), Prof. Charles H. Beeson and B. L. Ullman, I was treated with added respect: Mr. Ullman had been for years a correspondent of the then Pope, Pius XI, when the latter was librarian at Milan, and later in the Vatican; Mr. Beeson, under whom I had studied, was recognized abroad as one of the two or three leading paleographers in America.

But, it may be pointed out, our present-day religious quarrels are due, not so much to doctrinal differences, as to the feeling of one body that its interests are being threatened by another, or a fear that they may be threatened in the future. To be specific, some Protestants in the United States fear that if Catholics ever became strong enough to do so, they would deny freedom of worship to persons of other religious faiths. And some Catholics have a paralyzing fear of certain Protestant organizations.

Now there is historical reason for fear, I admit, in both instances. For various reasons, civil liberties have not developed throughout the world as they have in the United States. But, to my mind, the important question is this: Are we in this country likely to follow exactly the same pattern in human relations as that which has been followed elsewhere?

Personally, I do not think so. I believe that most of the Protestants I know have no desire to curb my freedom of worship. And I trust that most of the Catholics I know are equally fair.

American history, I believe, supports the view that we are, in truth, a freedom-loving people, and that we are steadily making advances in the domain of human rights. Our forefathers came to this country, not to think alike in political and religious matters, but to live peaceably with their own convictions. No matter what has happened elsewhere, I believe that we in America have developed, and that we can in the future further develop, so strongly our understanding of the rights of the individual conscience that no fear in this regard need be felt by anyone. I feel that we Americans can learn to live together in peace. If we are to look at the matter realistically, the cross-currents of interest—political, economic, and social—are so diverse in America that people here are not, in the main, arrayed for or against each other chiefly on religious grounds. And I doubt, too, whether, in the foreseeable future, any responsible religious body would wish to enslave another. For that would mean that the majority of Americans would be reversing their thinking completely; and it takes a long time indeed for people to make such a shift. And the mere fact that we Americans are gradually getting to know each other better helps the situation enormously: it is usually the stranger whom we dislike and mistrust.

Another reason for optimism in this matter, I think, is the development in some quarters of a new approach to the question of religious differences. Whereas some persons have begun the discussion by declaring that error had no rights, others have been pointing out that rights inhere in persons, not in abstractions; and that all persons, even those in error in their thinking, have rights; and that, furthermore, we must be extremely careful of the rights of the individual conscience even when it is in error. Reduced to practical terms, this means that for every person his conscience is the guide which he must follow, even though he be objectively in error. For example, if a college instructor's conscience tells him—however erroneously—that he must liquidate the president of the institution, then he is morally bound to do so. Certain inconveniences, to be sure, result from this doctrine; but it is still sound, according to my theological friends. The doctrine of the rights of the erroneous conscience is, of course, recognized in the prevalent attitude toward conscientious objectors to military service; most people regard the position of the objectors as erroneous, but still respect their right to act according to their own convictions. The same doctrine underlies the legislation in some churches, among them my own, which forbids members to baptize a person against his will, even though these churches regard the person in objective error if he does not wish to be baptized.

There are, to be sure, people in this country who would impose an artificial harmony upon us by trying to make us all agree upon everything. As a step toward this idealistic condition, they would do away with the private educational institutions. They would say, for example, that it is wrong for the Lutherans, the Baptists, the Catholics, and other religious denominations to have their own colleges; they hold that such a condition makes for division among our people. But if I understand my history correctly, the early settlers came to America so that they might believe as they saw fit, in matters political, economic, religious, and otherwise. And since they themselves founded church colleges, I think that they would most heartily applaud our having colleges today maintained by the different denominations.

Why do I speak about these matters to college administrators? Because I think that they are relatively free from the prejudices which militate against our national unity; because I think that they have been foremost in the fight for a true unity, a unity based on understanding and sympathy, not force; because I think that by virtue of their position they can do more than any body of men of like size to promote this idea of unity; because I think that they have given an admirable example, in this association especially, of the patient forbearance and of the Christian charity which must underlie all our efforts to effect peace and harmony among Americans and among all the peoples of the earth.

Nero Was a Piker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD, I include therein a very thought-provoking editorial from the February 24 issue of the Dayton Press, of Dayton, Ohio:

NERO WAS A PIKER

Deep in the wilderness of Siberia some fifty-odd miles from the village of Aleksandrovskoe, buried far down in the bowels of the earth behind masonry walls 30 feet thick, thousands of scientists labor diligently to build up their stock pile of uranium bombs—which they were not supposed to know how to make for another 5 years. And they are not far afield in the processing of the hydrogen bomb, in the mastery of guided missiles, in the art of making war by bacteriology. Already these grim men of death have given Stalin formidable fleets of long-range submarines armed with apparatus for lobbing A-bombs into our coastal cities from spots far below the horizon.

The men of the Politburo are realists. They hold in their hands the fate of two billion human beings. They would risk anything—even the complete destruction of the world—to gain their ends.

On the other side of the world from them the leader of a great nation pushes away his $100 dinner plate, climbs slowly to his feet and launches into his old tirade against special interests. He twists the opposition party for having no platform and with the cocky assurance born of smug victories predicts the overwhelming defeat of the enemy at the 1950 election, and the eventual passage of his hand-out program which would make all of his people wards of the Government. And the next day the men in the Kremlin applaud, for they know that as long as minds are occupied with trivia there is nothing to fear.

Nero was a piker.

Half the world goes hungry to bed. Children whimper in their sleep and strong men stare vacantly into darkness in the direction of that other land across the seas where millions of bushels of potatoes rot in storage bins or are shoveled to hogs too fat to grunt their thanks; where billions of dried eggs and oceans of powdered milk distract Government men from their plans to grant renewed subsidies to bring greater production of potatoes and eggs and milk.

Hungry children, of course, know no better, and even strong men may be forgiven if they cannot understand the ultimate sin of wasting food while millions are hungry, or the spectacle of a strong Nation dissipating its good will.

Nero was a piker.

War threatens and there is no peace at home. Half a million coal miners are in open rebellion against their Government, for they flout the orders of the high courts and thumb their noses at executives who by their inept handling of the emergency have given encouragement to anarchy. A Nation-wide telephone strike is at hand and one of the great unions of the country is making plans to sabotage communications by "jamming" the switchboards of the Nation.

With criminal disregard of facts, the Secretary of the National Defense blurts out that if this country were attacked at 4 a. m. it would be fighting back at 5 a. m. Without coal, Mr. Secretary, and telephones? A few well-planted A-bombs would paralyze the Nation. There would be no time to get the miners back under ground, to haul fuel to the far stretches of the country, to make the weapons of war we should have to have. It would be a short war.

Congress indulges in an oratorical binge; the President furrows his brow over the details of his socialistic program. The people must have their beer and their television and their movie scandals. And nobody has told them their ship is without a competent helmsman, that bureaucracy is a bloodsucker, that statism, socialism, and communism are one and the same.

Nero was, indeed, a piker.

A Proposed Law To Destroy Small Business—S. 1008

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, on March 1 this body voted to appoint new conferees for S. 1008. The House also voted to table the Carroll amendments which a year ago it had voted to make a vital part of S. 1008, if enacted into law. If this measure is finally passed by the Congress without the Carroll amendments it will become, in my opinion, one of the most destructive measures ever passed by Congress. It will give big business a free hand to destroy small business through the method of price discrimination which the Robinson-Patman Act sought to prevent. It will also give big business, whose plants are largely concentrated in the northeastern part of the United States with an overflow into the Middle West, a free hand to destroy the industrial development of the South and West which occurred during the late war. Finally it will put monopolists beyond reach of existing antitrust laws—give them a legal green light in the future to finish their efforts of three-quarters of a century to monopolize industry.

I cannot understand how anyone who believes that small business is entitled to fair play in markets, who believes in the right of the South and West to grow industrially, who is opposed to monopoly in trade could have voted to table the Carroll amendments. Yet I am sure that a good many of my colleagues voted that way last Tuesday because they did not understand the real purposes of this bill. In the debate which preceded the vote of the tabling of the Carroll amendments I listened to many inaccurate statements made about this bill by those advocating its passage minus the Carroll amendments. I think such misstatements were an important factor in obtaining the votes necessary to table those amendments—and today I feel it imperative to point some of them out. I call your attention to the inaccurate representations of my colleague from Pennsylvania. Because of the great popularity and prestige of the gentleman in our body his misstatements undoubtedly influenced many members who otherwise might have voted differently. I like the gentleman and admire him, too, but on a measure as crucial as S. 1008 I feel it my duty to challenge them.

From its inception S. 1008 has been represented as simply a measure to clarify existing antitrust laws, so as to make it clear that individual sellers acting independently can quote or sell at delivered prices and can absorb freight. It has been claimed that the necessity for such clarification was caused by the obiter dicta remarks of one Justice of the United State Supreme Court when this Court convicted the cement industry of using a basing-point system to eliminate competition among producers of cement in violation of existing antitrust laws.

This was the beginning of the smoke screen behind which the true purposes of S. 1008 were skillfully hidden. The obiter dicta remarks of the Justice—and I have read them carefully—do not say that sellers cannot absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices. All the Justice said was that the issue of whether a seller acting independently could or could not abosorb freight had not been determined by the Court in the Cement case. But the proponents of S. 1008 seized upon this obiter dicta, claiming either that the highest Court in the Cement case had actually declared that freight absorption under the existing antitrust laws by sellers acting independently was illegal or that it left the whole matter in a state of confusion. Obviously the Court had not declared freight absorption illegal where sellers acted independently. It had only ruled freight absorption out where sellers, as in the cement industry, had acted in concert to use freight absorption so as to eliminate competition in the industry. The cry, that the obiter dicta remarks of the Justice had left uncertain the whole status of whether sellers acting independently could absorb freight under existing antitrust laws, was calculated and without substance.

The Federal Trade Commission had brought the suit against the cement industry. Its former chairman, Robert E. Freer, testified before a Senate committee that, in his opinion, the existing antitrust laws did not prohibit freight absorption by sellers acting independently. Mr. Walter Wooden, associate general counsel of the Commission and the Commission's prosecuting attorney in the Cement case, also testified before a congressional committee that this was also his opinion—that the Commission had never brought a case against sellers who were acting independently in absorbing freight. Mr. Everett McIntyre, Chief of the Commission's Division of Monopoly Trials, who assisted Mr. Wooden in the prosecution of the Cement case, also testified before a congressional committee that this was his opinion, too. In response to questions put to it by counsel for the interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, the Federal Trade Commission itself on February 10, 1949, stated to the committee its opinion that freight absorption by sellers acting independently was not illegal under existing antitrust laws. It reaffirmed this position in a letter to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate on March 1, 1949. It further affirmed the same position in a letter to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER as late as January 18, 1950. Now the Federal Trade Commission is charged with the enforcement of the antitrust laws by Congress and it had given businessmen ample assurance that sellers acting independently would not be prosecuted if they absorbed freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices. In the face of the Commission's repeated assurances, there was no confusion about the whole matter. Yet the proponents of S. 1008 have gone on claiming that there is, and that clarification of existing antitrust law is necessary.

But in his remarks to the House on March 1, the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated to this body that the obiter dicta remarks of the Supreme Court Justice had been picked up by the district court judge in the Rigid Steel Conduit case of the Federal Trade Commission and cited as the law, and that because of this, S. 1008 was necessary. The plain inference was that the District Court had interpreted the obiter dicta of the Supreme Court Justice in the Cement case to mean that sellers acting independently could not absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices—a situation which, if true, would have justified a bill to give sellers acting independently the legal right, under the antitrust laws, to absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices.

I am first surprised that my learned friend from Pennsylvania should not know that the Rigid Steel Conduit case was never heard in any district court of the land. Cases of the Federal Trade Commission go directly to a circuit court of appeals, and it was the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit which passed upon the Rigid Steel Conduit case. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to bring in the judges' opinion in that case and show this body any such construction of the obiter dicta remarks referred to. The fact is that the Judges did not cite the obiter dicta remarks of the Supreme Court Justice in the Cement case as law. At no time in the trial of the Rigid Steel Conduit case did either the Federal Trade Commission or the judges contend that freight absorption by sellers acting independently was illegal under the existing antitrust laws. When the Federal Trade Commission wrote the order in this case, the defendants petitioned the Commission to amend the order so that the right of sellers acting independently to absorb freight would be spelled out. The Commission rejected the petition stating that the order as drawn did not prohibit such action and went on record again that the Commission considered that existing antitrust law allowed this right.

My esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania also on March 1 sought to convey to the Members of this body that extensive hearings had been held on S. 1008 and that, when the bill was considered by the full Committee on the Judiciary of the House, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN was accorded the privilege of testifying on it.

We who are opposed to S. 1008 have insisted that on this bill no adequate public hearings have ever been held—and we are absolutely correct in that claim. On the Senate side, it is true that extensive hearings were held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a bill by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, in the Eightieth Congress. It is also true that in the Eighty-first Congress, this Senate Committee held hearings on a bill by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. There were thus public hearings on both the Capehart bill and the Johnson bill. But S. 1008 is neither the Capehart bill nor the Johnson bill, differing in essential details from both. On the Senate side, S. 1008 was submitted as a substitute for the Johnson bill on the floor of the Senate. The bill was passed without any public hearings whatsoever on it. On the House side there were no adequate public hearings on this measure.

The subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held an open hearing in the sense that the witnesses could be heard by the public. But the fact is that they permitted only two witnesses to appear. Both of these witnesses were representatives of Government and favored passage of the bill. They refused to permit representatives of small business organizations and farm groups to testify at this hearing in opposition to the bill. From the standpoint of an adequate public hearing on this bill, the hearing of the subcommittee on it was a farce. When the subcommittee reported the bill to the full Judiciary Committee the chairman held executive sessions and also refused to allow representatives of small-business organizations and farm groups to appear in opposition to the measure. On the House side, therefore, small business was completely denied an opportunity to be heard at any hearing held on this bill, though small business claims that the bill is designed to destroy small business.

During the executive sessions of the full House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that Mr. PATMAN testified. Even if Mr. PATMAN had testified, both the hearings of the subcommittee and the full committee on this bill would have been ridiculously inadequate. But when he says Mr. PATMAN testified, I am informed by the gentleman from Texas that this is not an accurate statement. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says he appeared before the full committee in executive session to protest the inadequacy of the hearings held on the bill on the House side and to urge that adequate public hearings be held before reporting the measure to the House. While Mr. PATMAN was there the committee asked him some questions about the bill and Mr. PATMAN naturally replied. But had Mr. PATMAN been testifying, he would have come prepared to make a full statement on the measure and not simply to reply impromptu to questions asked him. In my opinion the gentleman from Pennsylvania misled the House when he sought to convey the impression that adequate public hearings had been held on S. 1008 and that Mr. PATMAN had testified before the House Judiciary Committee on it.

No, gentlemen, the argument of those advocating S. 1008 that it is needed to clarify existing antitrust law so that sellers will be in no doubt that they can legally absorb freight in quoting or selling at delivered prices is shabby subterfuge. It is clear to me that the repeated statements of the Federal Trade Commission ought to be enough to convince any seller that he already has such a right under existing law. But if the proponents of S. 1008 were really sincere about it being necessary to clarify existing law they could have submitted a bill containing only one sentence to accomplish that objective. The truth is that the clarification argument is only a smoke screen to hide the real and destructive purposes of the bill.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is correct when he told the House that S. 1008 does not seek to make basing point pricing systems legal in defiance of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Cement case. But he did not tell the House that the bill provides another pricing system which is made unreachable by the antitrust laws and which can be used fully as effectively as basing-point systems to suppress price competition in business—the single zone pricing system.

Nor did the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania disclose to the House that the bill would in effect wipe the Robinson-Patman Act off the statute books. To the contrary he strove also to confuse and becloud this ominous issue. He told the House that the Kefauver amendments—later strengthened by the Carroll amendments—were intended to legislate the rule of the circuit court of appeals in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. Nothing could be further from the facts.

Under the old Clayton law passed in 1914 price discrimination was forbidden in trade. But this prohibition could not be enforced because of another provision in the Clayton Act. This provision tolerated price discrimination where businessmen were meeting competition. The result of this second provision was that the first was reduced to an empty gesture. The Robinson-Patman Act in 1937 sought to close this fatal loophole in the old Clayton Act. It provided that discriminatory prices could not be defended on the ground of meeting competition if there was an injury to competition from such prices. In the Standard Oil case referred to, the FTC charged the oil company with giving discriminatory prices to certain of its buyers. The company defended on the ground that it was only meeting competition. The court ruled that this defense was no longer admissible under the Robinson-Patman Act and since the discriminatory prices given had injured competition the company was guilty. Now the Kefauver amendments were put into S. 1008 to prevent the bill from undoing by legislation the decision of the circuit court of appeals. Without such amendments the plain purpose of the bill was to restore the fatal loophole in the Clayton law which permitted price discriminators to get by with such discriminations on the ground that they were meeting competition irrespective of whether competition had in fact been injured. The Kefauver amendments consequently sought only to preserve existing antitrust law—and not as said to "legislate the rule of the circuit court of appeals in the Standard Oil of Indiana case."

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will take account of the inaccurate statements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania made in this body on March 1, so that when S. 1008 comes back to the floor from the conferees they will then either vote it down or restore to it the Carroll amendments.

Message of Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, to the Seventeenth Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the message delivered by Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, to the seventeenth legislature, on February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN, GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO, TO THE SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATURE AT ITS SECOND REGULAR SESSION

Members of the Legislature:

In my message of last year I spoke to you of the sense of proportion and scale of priorities which should be kept in mind when considering the great and difficult task in which the people and the government are engaged. We have all made a great effort to act according to those norms in the year which has just come to an end. It is such a decisive matter for Puerto Rico that we act each day with greater precision on the basis of this understanding, that I believe it worth while to examine the subject more closely at this time.

The economic goal of Puerto Rico is to increase production as effectively as possible so that the greater number of Puerto Ricans that there are each year will have fewer days of unemployment, a higher standard of living, and depend less and less each day on aid and privileges which are not the result of their own productive activities. It goes without saying that this economic objective is not only desirable in itself but is also a basis and means for a more tangible justice among men and a broader possibility for the enjoyment of cultural and spiritual values. However just is the justice accomplished with insufficient means, it still falls desperately short in its practical results. The human spirit, besieged by the claims of material existence, is not as free as it should be.

The aim of production must also be to bring about a balance between importation and exportation. During the war Puerto Rico accumulated a favorable liquid balance of $260,000,000 because its exports to the continental United States exceeded in this amount its imports from the continent, which were greatly reduced due to wartime restrictions. When the war ended, and normal shipping conditions were reestablished, and emergency restrictions eliminated, Puerto Rico began to import more than it exported. Nevertheless, many millions of dollars come into Puerto Rico in other forms than that resulting from export trade, such as for example, the payments to veterans, the expenditures of the Army and Navy and civil Federal agencies, Federal aid for highways, public health, and vocational education. These forms of income compensate in great measure for the lack of balance in trade, but do not eliminate it. In 1948, for example, imports amounted to $170,000,000 more than exports, but since $128,000,000 came into the island from the noncommercial sources above mentioned, the unfavorable trade balance that year was only forty-two million. After substracting the $42,000,000, a favorable accumulated balance of $191,000,000 remained. For 1949 it is calculated that the discrepancy amounted to $22,000,000, leaving an accumulated balance of one hundred and sixty-nine million. Nevertheless, this debt of the economy of the United States to the economy of Puerto Rico is gradually being reduced, and if the unfavorable balance of trade is not corrected within a certain number of years, the debt will disappear completely and a real unfavorable balance will accumulate against Puerto Rico. This situation may be aggravated by the fact that the expenditures of the Army and Navy are being reduced, and that the rights to various types of payments to veterans are being exhausted. An increase in production is necessary to counteract this situation as well as to reduce unemployment, and to continue raising the standard of living and to support the many thousands of new inhabitants in Puerto Rico every year. It is necessary, furthermore, in order to make Puerto Rico less and less in need of Federal aid and Federal expenditures which do not depend on our efforts or our will. It is to achieve all these objectives that we must continue up the steep road along which we have begun to climb.

The struggle to achieve this economic objective we have called the battle of production. This is a battle which is being fought not only by a government responsible to the people but by the people themselves of all economic classes, who are those who gave the Government the order to fight.

To fight this battle and win it, it is not enough to have the will to win which the people of Puerto Rico have so patently developed, and which has given so much sympathy and prestige to their efforts in the eyes of those on the outside who observe and aid us. Nor does the forward march of technical development suffice, nor the skills of the workers, nor the know-how in all branches of production and marketing: even if we had all these things, and we do have some of them and are acquiring others, still one thing would be lacking. This is the stern and unflinching willingness to sustain a clear concept of priorities in regard to all the things we want to do and which have to be done to improve the living conditions of the people. A great deal of clear thinking is necessary if we are to make a conscientious choice among a thousand important things, which cannot be done at the same time, either with the funds at our disposal during 1 year or over a period of years, and to decide which of these important things ought to occupy first place on the priority list, and which of these important things must unhappily be left in the thousandth place.

We have striven toward this goal, but we must strive harder with every passing day.

Naturally, in a country with abundant natural resources, with a population which is sufficient, but not extreme in proportion to its resources, where it is necessary merely to maintain a situation which has already been achieved, the force with which this concept of priority must be applied may be much less than it has been in a community like Puerto Rico, where the natural resources are scarce, where the density of the population constitutes a problem, and where a great many matters must be attended to before we reach, after a stiff uphill climb, the plateau on which we may devote ourselves to the mere maintainance of a favorable situation already achieved.

The basic dilemma of priorities is that it involves choosing between great services which the people greatly need, and the great productive effort which the people greatly need, in order to develop and maintain those same services, and all the other aspects of a better life. Out of increased production come the means for giving better service to the people, while only a few services may result indirectly in an aid to greater production, and others, worth while in themselves from a humanitarian standpoint, result in no aid whatever to production.

Our tendency, as men who have been deeply identified with the great suffering stoically borne by the masses of our people, is to extend to them the services they need and which they so nobly deserve until we have spent the last cent available for such services. But if we allow ourselves to be carried away on the tide of this very human and decent tendency, we shall never be able truly and permanently to save our people from those same sufferings that so deeply move the heart, and will run the risk that our sentiments will tell us to employ all of our means on temporary relief, only to find ourselves powerless later on to effect a complete and permanent cure. The poverty-stricken farmer must exercise great will power not to assuage the hunger of his children with the grain he has with which to sow his fields. If he does not exercise his will power, greater still and more irreparable will be his hunger later on, but if he does exercise it, the crop he reaps will reward his sacrifice.

The fundamental decision which the people of Puerto Rico have to make, and on which will depend multiple minor details, in harmony with that decision is how to divide their present income between the amounts which are to be devoted, on the one hand, to consumption—by private citizens—and to services—by the Government—and, on the other hand, the amounts which are going to be devoted to improving and encouraging, and cooperating with, the increase in production.

That is to say, the dilemma lies between investing and spending. The more that is spent, the less there is to invest. The less that is invested, the less there is to spend later on. The more that is invested, the more there is to spend later on. Spending is the easier alternative, and furthermore, the results of spending, though more temporary, are more immediately visible. Therefore we must exercise our will power in order to invest as much as possible and spend as little as possible, since this is the way to put an end to the present situation, to enable our people to free themselves from want as quickly as possible, and achieve a modest degree of prosperity and security.

In pointing out the priority which investing should have over spending, I refer not only to the fundamental policies of the Government, but also to policies which ought to take root in the whole community of Puerto Rico. At the most humble level, some grain for the furrow, not all for the loaf. On a higher level, fewer useless luxuries, more concentration of capital in the furrow of dynamic production. Naturally it is true that at the lowest level there is sometimes not a single grain for the furrow which is not needed for the minimum diet, while on the higher levels there is a considerable amount spent on all kinds of luxury items, which might be converted into productive investment.

The work of government, as far as priorities are concerned, is divided in three parts: First, the creation of production, or direct inducements of production; second, services which contribute indirectly but basically to production; and third, services of unquestionable human value which nevertheless do not contribute, except very indirectly, to production. Among those services which, without being production or direct encouragement of production, are nevertheless necessary to productivity, are education, health, especially preventive medicine, pure water supplies, highways, and industrial, commercial, and agricultural research and experimentation. It is evident that an industrial civilization cannot reach a high point of efficiency and competitive opportunity in a community which bears a heavy

burden of illiteracy, deficient general and technical education, and bad health. Such services are therefore desirable, not only for the human values implicit in them, but also be ause they form an essential part of the economic development toward which we are struggling in the battle of production. Of course, if one wishes to stretch the interpretation, there will always be arguments to prove that almost any service should have priority because it is connected in some remote way with production. But not to artfully search for such far-fetched interpretations is part of the self-discipline that the situation requires.

This brings us to a great dilemma as to what our taxing policy should be in regard to (1) stimulating prior investments in industries and crops necessary for winning the battle of production, and (2) providing those public services which are not only humanly desirable but which form an inseparable part of the productive efficiency of the country. The greatest inducement to private investment in production is a tax rate which in general is low, and for this reason attractive to industries. I realize that this is better than a high rate with total exemption for certain new industries. We are trying to find a way to establish such a system, at the same time honoring all legal obligations contracted with new industries which have been established under the tax-exemption law. But it is not easy to find, in the case of Puerto Rico, a system which, in addition to being attractive to investors, will produce sufficient income to enable the Government to pay for such public services as education, health, experimentation, and research, without which the industrialization resulting from the investments would not be really effective.

We are struggling with this difficult problem, and in examining it closely we see the possibility of a system of taxation which, without special exemptions, would fall lightly on those who increase production, and which would give us the funds necessary for the services inherent to production by imposing heavier tax burdens on those activities which are not closely allied to boosting production. The treasurer of Puerto Rico has made some recommendations in this respect, but we are still not in possession of sufficient knowledge of the problem to attack it at its roots.

I know that the people of Puerto Rico have made up their minds to free themselves from extreme poverty and insecurity. I know also that they are willing to make the sacrifice that this implies. I know that we are willing to tighten our belts during these first years of our economic development, if we can see clearly that this is leading us, slowly but surely, to overcome once and for all the difficult situation of our people. I also wish to point out that if the spirit of sacrifice is to be found in all, even in those for whom their poverty makes it more burdensome, the example must be set by those who, because of their superior economic position, find the sacrifice less difficult. I am also fully aware of the responsibility which this places on our shoulders—yours, legislators, and mine. It is up to us to see that this sacrifice is not in vain. Every dollar invested, instead of spent, represents a renunciation of human needs for pursuit of a hope. It is for us to defend that hope so that its fulfillment will not come to naught.

At this point I must inform you that although the economy of Puerto Rico is saving and investing between thirty-five and fifty million dollars a year, this investment is much less than we need. Our studies reveal that no less than $80,000,000, probably $100,000,000, is what the Puerto Rican economy, private as well as public, ought to save and invest each year if our expansion is to carry us to the goal within a period of time that is not too long for even the most robust stoicism and the most vigorous hope. Our economy must eliminate that difference on the basis of greater investments, and we should count not only on those which may come in from outside, but also on those which are the fruits of a sober understanding of the situation of an attitude of the people based on that understanding, and of legislation which gives courageous recognition to these realities and takes the necessary steps to deal with them.

The Government of Puerto Rico has contracted an obligation with the people who have entrusted it with the struggle to solve their difficult problem of existence. This implies that we carefully examine the balance between what it is necessary to invest and what must be spent, in the light of our fundamental obligation to increase the productivity of Puerto Rico. This obligation which the Government has in regard to expenditures of public funds, should similarly be a matter of conscience and foresightedness for private citizens in making expenditures on their own initiative.

In striking a just balance between what the Government should invest in increasing production, directly or indirectly, and what it should spend on giving services which do not in themselves increase production, let us carry forward each day in greater harmony our established practice whereby both the executive and legislative branches are at the same time motor and brakes, rather than dividing the functions so that one branch will be the motor and the other the brakes. In other words, I should not be the one to propose an attractive but secondary baseball park, and you the ones who have to remind me that the productivity effort comes first. Nor should the roles be reversed; rather should we both feel the responsibility of creative risk and conscientious sacrifice, although we may come to different conclusions. Both you and I, all of us, must realize what it means to think in terms of a government of the poor and for the poor.

A government of the poor and for the poor is not a government which invests little or spends little on legitimate services. That might be perhaps a government of the rich for the rich, who, because they were rich, would be unwilling to contribute of what they had, and would not need to have others contribute to what they had. A government of the poor for the poor is a government which should use all its economic powers, without haggling, but within a strict and careful system of priorities, to raise the country's level of production as rapidly as possible to the point at which extreme poverty and insecurity will disappear from the life of man.

The idea which I wish to drive home to you and to the people of Puerto Rico is that of emphasis, of point of view, of what must be attended to first, of priorities of action. Each one must collaborate, thinking independently, to make clearer in the minds of all what the true priorities are in each case, in consonance with the common goal. What I ask of you is that we strive together and that together we keep vigil so that in deciding on each expenditure or public investment, and on the encouragement to be given to private investment, we conscientiously apply the criterion of what will help most to end—to end once and for all, and not just mitigate in part—the extreme poverty of our people.

Fellow citizens of the legislature: my most hearfelt recognition for the noble collaboration I have received from you during our first year of government, both in the attention with which you have received my recommendations, and in the criticisms and improvements of them by means of which you have so effectively contributed to the good work of our government.

Respectfully submitted,

LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN,
Governor.

LA FORTALEZA, *February 23, 1950.*

Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorial and news comments about the so-called Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the broadcast of February 25, 1950, by Mr. Albert L. Warner, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., dealing with the recent proposal of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to abolish the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. This broadcast analyzes the very splendid achievements of the Byrd committee, and concludes that the spendthrifts will have a difficult time to abolish the small counterweight of one committee which sturdily stands up to emphasize economy and efficiency and that Senator BYRD is not likely to be silenced that easily, nor will he be alone in the fight.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON

(Broadcast by Albert L. Warner over ABC February 25)

This week President Truman and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the Virginia Democrat, continued their battle over Federal expenditures. The Senator said the President was the principle obstacle to budget balancing. The President said the Senator's statement was all political.

There is a lively suspicion at the Capitol that this feuding led a supporter of the White House, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, to aim a blow of his own at his stalwart conservative colleague from Virginia.

Senator HUMPHREY took the Senate floor to demand that the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Government Expenditures be abolished. Senator BYRD is the chairman of that committee. "It serves no useful purpose," said Senator HUMPHREY, "it is used only as a publicity medium. It deals only in generalities and wastes public funds rather than conserving them."

Senator HUMPHREY said the Byrd committee had spent over $100,000 in appropriated funds, plus $250,000 worth of time and effort of the executive branch of the Government

in compiling data, plus undetermined money for printing.

Now, when you go to the record for the facts about the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, you find it has been in existence 9 years. During two of those years it did not get a cent of appropriations.

Senator BYRD's own staff contributed their time, keeping it going. But over the 9 years the committee has received appropriations totaling $127,000. That's at the rate of about $14,000 a year—as inexpensive a committee as could be found anywhere in Congress or the Nation's Capital.

The committee was set up to put Federal revenue and expenditures in perspective and to work for efficiency and economy. It has held hearings on 35 subjects, issued 25 formal reports, and made 53 major recommendations. The committee calculates that these have resulted in savings of $1,000,000 for every $17.50 spent by the committee.

A year ago the Byrd committee centered attention on the top-heavy number of civilian employees in the Military Establishment. The charge must have had merit even in the eyes of the Truman administration, because Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has been reducing the number ever since and declaring that the reduction is of no harm to his department and has even increased efficiency.

A regular monthly release from the Byrd committee gives the number of employees in each department and agency compared with preceding months.

The committee put into effect and required a system of accurate reporting on this subject by the executive agencies. But how this compilation of data could be considered an unnecessary expense is almost beyond comprehension. If there were no Byrd committee in existence the head of any department ought to be insisting that he have figures on his desk to show how many people are working for him at the end of every month.

Maybe there's a broader question at stake. Congress is weighted toward the spending side. Every congressional district has local projects to advance. Even chambers of commerce which often verbally cry for economy are behind those projects. In every district group pressures for this and that program involving expenditures are forceful and constant. The administrative agencies have the staffs to make out strong cases for the expansion of their activities.

It may be that many of the large Federal expenditures are good and that large executive staffs are necessary to carry out the functions voted by Congress, although Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has said that you don't have to be a spendthrift to be a liberal.

But with all these dominant influences already operating on one side of Congress, it is now proposed to abolish the small counterweight of one committee which sturdily stands up to emphasize economy and efficiency. Senator BYRD is not likely to be silenced that easily, nor will he be alone in the fight.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I next ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Valuable Publicity Medium," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, February 27, 1950.

This editorial strongly defends the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and points out how the committee has had a restraining effect on Federal departments and agencies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VALUABLE "PUBLICITY MEDIUM"

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, wants to abolish the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the ground that it is "used only as a publicity medium." But a lot of people who are more worried about Federal spending than Senator HUMPHREY seems to be will contend that the committee's publicity activities are a very good reason for continuing it in existence.

It is true that Senator BYRD and his colleagues of the joint group have publicized freely and often the inefficiencies and extravagances of the Government. The committee has kept the spotlight focused on the growing size of the executive establishment, a trend that is all the more disturbing in view of the fact that the war emergency ended nearly 5 years ago. It is hard to measure the benefits of this publicity in specific terms. There is good cause to believe, however, that the watchdog role of the Byrd committee has had a restraining effect not only on the departments and independent agencies but on Congress as well.

To those who regard governmental retrenchment and thrift as old-fashioned and unnecessary, the joint committee's frequent reports on Federal expansion and spending are understandably irritating. That, in itself, is as good an argument as any for making certain that the committee keeps up the good work. The relatively small cost of maintaining this congressional "publicity medium" is a profitable investment, the returns on which, in terms of administrative savings, can be large indeed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Never Say Senator HUMPHREY Is Opposed to All Retrenchment," from a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVER SAY SENATOR HUMPHREY IS OPPOSED TO ALL RETRENCHMENT

Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, a standout even among the left-wing democracy as a talker and a spender, is mad at Senator BYRD. What troubles him particularly is the Byrd Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. And guess what Senator HUMPHREY objects to in the joint committee? Its expenditures in 9 years of $100,000 for expenses. This, says the junior gentleman from Minnesota, is the "No. 1 example of waste and extravagance."

In other words, Senator HUMPHREY stands for one retrenchment: He wants to economize on devices aimed at economy.

Pennsylvania Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony I gave before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on behalf of Pennsylvania flood control and rivers and harbors projects.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have always enjoyed these appearances I've made, through the years before your committee to ask for sufficient appropriations to carry on flood control and rivers and harbors projects in Pennsylvania and nearby States effectively.

These flood control and rivers and harbors projects represent gains which may prove themselves at any time, perhaps tomorrow if the spring rains begin. They represent positive increases in the amount of revenue gained from our income-tax laws. They forestall what has always been, in my mind, Government expenditure which should have been avoided—appropriation of emergency funds for the relief of flood-stricken area. These emergency expenditures offer no long-range relief—no steps which could prevent another flood tomorrow, or next week, or next year.

We have heard a great deal of debate in the Senate these past few weeks on conditions brought about by lack of water in the far West—and possible remedies. And not too long ago newspapers throughout the country headlined the story of the water shortage in the metropolitan New York area and those chaveless Thursdays.

But the water problem is an old story to those of us in Pennsylvania. Our problem, throughout the history of the Keystone State—so important to the industrial production of this country—has been to control the waters we do have. We have too much water—or at least too much water in the wrong places. As I have previously told this committee, there's hardly an area of Pennsylvania whose residents are not acutely aware of problems arising from our waterways. We have several outstanding ports and harbors in Pennsylvania, and the economy of the entire State rests upon continued efficient operation of those ports. At the same time, Pennsylvania has many areas which are extremely vulnerable to floods which cause severe hardship and dislocation as well as a substantial amount of real suffering and even loss of life.

Your committee has a long history of recognizing the importance of those projects in Pennsylvania. I have always felt, after completing such testimony as I am giving today, that the people in Pennsylvania are indeed fortunate that the men who are on the Appropriations Committee have shown a real understanding of the worth-whileness of flood-control and rivers and harbors projects. One could easily understand the temptation felt by your committee to make these projects the "whipping boy" and to thereby present to Congress and to the people of the country a more economy-minded budget. But as I have said so many times in the past, such economy is false economy. It represents saving $1 today and throwing away $2 tomorrow. Consistently, your committee has rejected this temptation. Consistently, you have provided at least minimum funds, have overcome attempts to cut to a foolhardy sum the amount appropriated for civil functions projects. Let me say at this time the people of Pennsylvania are sincerely grateful for these past actions. The volume of mail I receive asking me to thank you for such affirmative and responsible actions is just one indication of their gratitude.

The Corps of Army Engineers have done in the past—and shall, I know, continue to do—a remarkable job in giving our country the

maximum in flood-control protection and rivers and harbors improvement at the minimum cost. They want to accomplish the most possible for all the country.

That's why I am convinced the amounts recommended by the engineers and adjusted by the Bureau of the Budget should be completely appropriated, with no cuts. These recommendations are not the result of guesswork; they are based on the studied judgment of men especially trained in this highly technical, complex work. Careful consideration was given to fiscal requirements of the projects now under way. The estimates provide for a minimum rate of progress consistent with logical construction programing and timing of the various features of the individual projects.

And, of course, any proposed figures of the engineers were subjected to the careful scrutiny of the Budget Bureau. No, the amounts finally listed in the budget are not high—far from it. It would probably be much more accurate to say that in many cases they represent the very barest minimum needs.

I honestly feel that any reduction in the estimates before you will inevitably result in increased costs to the Federal Government. The engineers have pointed out that such increased costs might be direct and tangible—such as those associated with the closing down of a contract due to insufficient funds. Intangible increased costs are also involved. Consider the increased contingency factors in future Government contracts to protect the contractor against losses resulting from the necessity of operating major equipment at a rate below that necessary for efficient operation.

At this point, what Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Engineers, told the House committee considering these same appropriations bears repeating. He pointed out that "Longer construction periods require additional costs for inspection and supervision over the extended construction period." Eventually, we must do the job anyway. And to stretch out and delay work from year to year only succeeds in pyramiding the eventual costs involved. That, obviously, is not economy. It is the worst type of short-sightedness.

I would now like to go into just a little detail on the various projects which most directly affect Pennsylvania. First let me discuss flood-control projects.

1. Conemaugh Reservoir: The total cost of this project is $44,200,000. Of this amount, $26,715,000 has already been appropriated. The 1951 budget calls for $9,000,000, which will put the project within about a year of completion.

The importance of this Pittsburgh area in the industrial production picture of our country hardly need be emphasized at this time. Any cut-off in production in this area because of flood conditions is bound to have an immediate effect throughout the 48 States. Perhaps the fact that the Pittsburgh district alone outproduces each of 36 States will present a more graphic picture of what I'm saying here.

Unfortunately, such a flood is more than a it-could-happen-here affair. It has happened here, many times, with the St. Patrick's Day flood of 1936 the most disastrous one in recent years. That flood alone caused $120,000,000 worth of damages in just the Pittsburgh area.

That flood, let me point out, did not merely hit the pocketbook of the individual factory owners, or factory workers, or businessmen in this area. That flood also resulted in greatly decreased revenue for our Government. Western Pennsylvania alone paid more income tax to the United States Treasury in 1949 than 40 States.

This reservoir is on the stream which caused the great damage in 1936. It is the key dam in the whole flood-control project around the Pittsburgh district, and will do as much for Pittsburgh and the whole Ohio Valley in providing defense against future floods as all of the existing reservoirs combined now accomplish in flood protection for that area.

2. Sunbury: The total estimated Federal cost of the Sunbury diking system is $7,300,000. Of this, $5,856,000 has been appropriated to date, and the Engineers are asking for $1,200,000 to make their work 96 percent complete. The money will be used for flood walls, pumping stations and interceptor sewers. I know it is always particularly satisfying to me—and it must be to you also—to see that a project has finally been completed. Incomplete protection, no matter what amount has been expended, just does not do the job if and when a community finds itself facing flood waters.

3. East Branch Clarion Reservoir: The total estimated Federal cost of this reservoir is $9,612,000. To date, $5,388,600 has been appropriated, and this year's budget calls for an additional $2,000,000. This dam is one of the major protections against floods for Johnsonburg, Ridgeway, and the upper Clarion Valley.

Work on this reservoir has reached the point where any interruption, even for a year, would prove very costly. The closure is to be effected shortly. And unless work is continued, the portion of the dam already constructed will have to be protected—this is an earth dam and such dams must be completed once they are started.

4. York: The $90,100 requested for fiscal year 1951 will complete this $5,100,000 project. There was no appropriation for construction in 1950. This modest sum will be used to rebuild a local wall built by local interests.

5. Williamsport: The total estimated Federal cost of this project is $17,000,000. Of this, $9,344,000 has been appropriated, and this year's budget provides for an additional $1,200,000. This project illustrates perfectly what I mean by saying flood control projects can prove their value in dollars and cents. The Williamsport flood-protection program was first authorized by Congress in 1936. Since that time—only 14 years—Williamsport has had two floods—one in March 1946, and another in May 1946—which caused damages totaling more than the total cost of this project.

And the Williamsport story, too, indicates the weakness in the argument of those who would have us go ahead with construction at a slow rate to drag out the costs of the projects. Ten years after the project was authorized, the partial construction that had been accomplished did not help in the least to hold back the flood waters.

Fortunately for the people of Williamsport, the engineers have made considerable progress on the project since 1946 and by November of last year, the work had approached the stage of providing the proposed degree of protection for the central portion of Williamsport, bounded by Lycoming Creek, the west branch of Susquehanna and Miller's Run.

The congressional action authorizing the Williamsport project provided that the works should be maintained and operated upon completion by a local cooperating agency in accordance with Army regulations. The city government has already taken preliminary steps to handle this responsibility.

We must not assume that just because one section of the Williamsport project is completed, we can let the other portions go for a few years. As I told this committee last year, the flood wall around Williamsport proper could well divert stream flow in high water into the Newberry section and wash out railroad lines and threaten a great many residences.

These then are the budget amounts for construction work of flood-control projects in Pennsylvania. They should, in my opinion, all be approved.

MAINTENANCE

In addition to appropriations for construction work in flood controls, the engineers have asked for funds to maintain the projects already in operation. I do not see how anyone can oppose these appropriations—nothing would be more ridiculous than to appropriate millions of dollars to build these projects and then to refuse to appropriate the funds to maintain them. I therefore ask this committee to approve the $60,000 requested for the Tionesta Reservoir; $60,000 for the Crooked Creek Reservoir; $33,500 for the Mahoning Creek Reservoir; $40,000 for the Loyalhanna Reservoir; $60,000 for the Youghiogheny Reservoir; $15,000 for the Johnstown project; $8,000 for the Punxsutawney project completed this year; and $18,000 for the York project, which includes the care of 180 flood gates.

PLANNING

There's still another phase to the engineers' work in flood control. That, of course, is the planning work that must be done for projects already authorized by Congress. As you know, people who live in areas constantly threatened by floods find it difficult to understand why it takes so long for actual work to begin, even after a project has been authorized. They have the right to expect that Congress will appropriate enough funds to permit the engineers to go ahead drawing up plans, plans which when translated into actual construction will mean great savings in property damages and even in loss of lives.

The following amounts have been requested by the engineers for planning funds in Pennsylvania—$30,000 for the Allegheny River Reservoir; $50,000 for the Allentown project; $50,000 for the Bear Creek Reservoir; $10,000 for Johnsonburg; $25,000 for Prompton Reservoir; $50,000 for Shenango River; $30,000 for Swoyersville and Forty Fort, and $40,000 for Uniontown. I urge the committee to appropriate the full budget amount and give the people in areas affected by these projects the assurance they are not being forgotten.

RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

At this point, I would like to take up certain rivers and harbors projects. Unfortunately, it is always a bit more difficult to get people enthusiastic about this type of work. News of a flood can always make the headlines, but discovery that a harbor vitally important to the economic welfare of our country is rapidly filling up and may soon become useless can only get into one of the back pages.

The fact of the matter is—those projects do have an intimate tie-up with the economic well-being of our country. Reduction in funds for navigation improvements and maintenance can seriously affect our industrial and commercial state of health.

1. Morgantown lock and dam, Monongahela River: This project involved a total estimated Federal cost of $8,850,000. Of this amount $5,800,000 has already been appropriated and this year's budget calls for $2,000,000, which will make the project 88 percent complete.

Though located in West Virginia, this project is of great importance to Pittsburgh and to the steel and coal industries of western Pennsylvania. The new construction will replace two older, hand-operated locks which are no longer adequate to handle the volume of business activity in the Morgantown area, greatly expanded during the war years.

2. Schuylkill River, above Fairmount Dam: The engineers justify this $52,000,000 project—only $17,000,000 of which is to come

from the Federal Government, with the remainder from State and local interests—on the basis of savings to Government in maintenance dredging of navigation channels in Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, reduction of flood hazards, and betterment of quality of water for domestic and industrial uses. As a life-long Philadelphian, who has been greatly concerned over the tremendous waste of water potential because of the filthy condition of the Schuylkill, and as a Member of Congress who has watched the Federal Government expend thousands of dollars in dredging navigation channels of these rivers, I can personally testify to the accuracy of the engineers' claims. That's why I so welcomed the opportunity of sponsoring the original enabling legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Already we can begin to see the results of work on this project. In one section the stream is now carrying less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the solid matter it carried 2 years ago.

Of the $4,000,000 asked for this year $215,000 will be used for completion of disposal areas for Plymouth and Flat Rock pools, $1,000,000 for dredging Plymouth pool and partially dredging Flat Rock pool, and $2,785,000 for the Darby Creek disposal area and partial dredging of the Fairmount pool.

If waste material is allowed to remain on the bottom of the stream—as has been the case all those many years—any agitation of the stream during floods moves it down into existing channels below dams, where it has to be dredged out.

3. Ohio River lock and dam construction: Of total estimated Federal cost of this all-important project, $111,621,000 has already been appropriated. This year's budget calls for an additional $500,000, the money to be used to extend guide walls on two of the locks.

As you undoubtedly know, the Ohio River is probably the heaviest-used river in the United States. The two locks in question are ones where tows of considerable size come loaded out of Pittsburgh with heavy, bulky iron products and the like. The construction work has been scheduled because of the considerable difficulty encountered here in recent years.

4. Ohio River, open-channel work: This project involves a total Federal expenditure of $21,114,000. To date, $15,589,600 has been appropriated and this year's budget sets aside an additional $250,250. There is no overlapping between the Ohio River lock and dam construction and this open-channel work. Here the engineers are concerned with channel dredging between the locks and dams and in the pools—with dredging and widening channels in constricted areas, with lengthening turns and with taking out bars. Though the work done is similar in character to regular maintenance work on the Ohio, the engineers will operate here in previously untouched areas.

In regard to both of these Ohio River projects, let me reemphasize that the Ohio River might well be the most important waterway in our country. It moves through highly populated cities like Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, Wheeling—cities which are really the heart of this country's industrial production.

The barge traffic alone on the Ohio last year totaled 6,600,000,000 ton-miles. When we compare this with the annual average of 3,000,000,000 ton-miles during the 5 years preceding the war, we can see clearly why locks and dams 40 or more years old could not handle the increased traffic unless we complete the job of making the Ohio River a modern waterway.

5. Lock 2, Monongahela River: The total estimated Federal cost of this project is $15,090,000. The $3,780,000 requested this year will make the project 73 percent completed.

The lock involved in this construction work is practically within the city limits of Pittsburgh. With this money, the riverward lock will be completed and the landward lock initiated. The old lock being replaced is completely inadequate to do the job.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

This completes the list of new construction work on rivers and harbors in Pennsylvania. As for the money requested for maintenance and operation of such projects, what I've just said about such appropriations for flood-control projects is equally true for these projects. There is simply no point in permitting a harbor to fill up after we've spent much clearing it out.

I, therefore, request the full budget amount for the Monongahela River—$89,300 for maintenance dredging in the pools formed by the dams and $1,011,500 for operation and care of existing locks and dams; Allegheny River—$33,500 for maintenance dredging and $343,700 for operation and care of locks and dams; Youghiogheny River—$20,000 for maintenance dredging in the 9-foot channel between the mouth of the river and McKeesport; Ohio River lock and dam construction and open-channel work—$8,835,700 for maintenance; Schuylkill River—$1,000,000 to maintain dredging necessary to provide adequate facilities for the large commerce, amounting in 1948 to about 15,000,000 tons; Erie Harbor—$67,000 for dredging to maintain the 25- and 26-foot depths in channel entrances and the harbor itself, ranging in depth from 18 to 23 feet.

I would like to go into a bit more detail on the maintenance funds for the Delaware River, particularly that portion between Philadelphia and the sea. The budget amount for this portion is $3,248,000. There seems to be considerable doubt whether even this amount will do the trick in dredging this important harbor to its authorized 40-foot depth, and the engineers are now preparing a report for me on the present situation. We are faced here with the problem of a harbor allowed to shoal up, during the war years, to a depth considerably less than its authorized one.

I also recommend that the engineers be appropriated the $200,000 needed to maintain dredging in that section of the Delaware between Philadelphia and Trenton.

PRELIMINARY SURVEYS

The engineers should also be allowed $2,000,000 requested for examinations and surveys—surveys so essential if we are to have an up-to-date assessment of conditions of our waterways.

SPECIAL REQUESTS

The Senate as yet has had no opportunity to vote on the omnibus civil-functions bill which has been delayed in committee for so long. But chances now seem good for a vote on these projects in the near future.

In view of this, I would like to request that the Appropriations Committee authorize planning funds for certain of these projects. If such action is not taken now, these projects—all of them really needed—will face another year of postponement.

Dyberry Reservoir for the Lackawaxen River is one such project, and $50,000 in planning funds are needed. This is the companion reservoir to the Prompton Reservoir for which Congress appropriated planning funds last year. Originally the two reservoirs were slated to be constructed simultaneously, but the House cut Dyberry out of its 1948 omnibus bill.

The Bradford flood-control project, also in the Senate omnibus bill now pending, has a long history of delays. Right after a preliminary survey was completed by the engineers in 1947, a flood hit Bradford, a major one. And 1948 brought still another flood. Because of these floods, the engineers were forced to resurvey the area, and the project could not be included in any authorization bill until this present one. Surely, though, these two floods in this important crude-oil production area are the best sort of proof that Congress must act now. Furthermore, the State which is to contribute a substantial sum to the project cannot act until Congress actually appropriates money. About $50,000 is needed for planning funds for the Bradford project.

I further request that $100,000 be appropriated for planning funds to make further improvements in the Monongahela. Though the work involved here would be done in West Virginia, it would have an important beneficial effect on the entire steel-producing section, of which Pittsburgh is the heart.

A few last words. We in Congress know the long legislative road these projects must travel from the time their need is first acutely felt until they are completed. There's the investigating by the Representative and Senator before he decides to introduce the necessary bill, the preliminary survey by the engineers, the congressional authorization, the detailed planning by the engineers, and finally the appropriations which must be fought for over a period of years. I remain convinced that any project which could not prove itself, in terms of saving of lives, or of property, or as a necessary defense or industrial measure, simply would not be a topic of conversation this morning. These projects are needed, and needed now.

Rabbi Nachum David Herman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the observance of the sixty-seventh anniversary of the Hebron Yeshivah and its National Youth Rehabilitation Center of Jerusalem. This anniversary is being celebrated this month by all freedom-loving people who believe that the foundation of democracy is allegiance to God.

This morning, at the opening of the session, Rabbi Nachum David Herman, American chairman of the anniversary committee, delivered the invocation. May I say a few words about my distinguished friend and spiritual leader. Rabbi Herman was born and bred in New York City. He graduated from Hebron Yeshivah in Jerusalem, and thereafter did postgraduate work at the Fountain of the Great in Jerusalem. He is presently rabbi of the Congregation Tifereth Israel, Bedford Avenue and Clymer Street, Brooklyn, the largest orthodox synagogue in America.

Rabbi Herman was appointed by the chief rabbi of Israel, Dr. Isaac Herzog, as chairman of the anniversary committee, and in conjunction with this hign

honor bestowed upon him, Rabbi Herman is now preparing a manuscript depicting 20 centuries of Jewish history evolving around the study of the Torah and religious observance which sustained the Jews in every corner of the world, despite the tidal waves of anti-Semitism which uprooted them, stymied civilization and cast a blot upon our generation, a blot that has yet to be erased before the supreme bench of justice.

Our democracy under God is an amalgamation of minorities, each contributing its share of culture, making our Nation truly representative of harmonious living and a challenge to bigots and rabble rousers who would want us divided.

Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor Supports Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is a declaration on point 4 adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at its recent meeting and transmitted to me by Chairman Matthew Woll of the International Labor Relations Committee, A. F. of L. It is an eloquent statement of labor's determination to give all-out support in the struggle for free institutions and individual liberty now going on in the world:

DECLARATION ON POINT 4 ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, A. F. OF L.

After giving careful consideration to the report of Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorp on point 4, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor declares:

1. We reaffirm our support of the guiding lines and policies elaborated in the comprehensive resolution adopted by our sixty-eighth convention held at St. Paul in October 1949 dealing with President Truman's point 4 program.

2. In view of the disaster which has befallen the great Chinese people through the overrunning of their country by the Russian-directed military forces and fifth column operating under the orders of the Cominform, the executive council underscores the great urgency of speeding up the application of point-4 policies in the non-Communist areas and countries of Asia.

3. In line with our convention declaration, we urge our Government to aid the Republic of India in overcoming its immediate food difficulties, in developing public education, and in the improvement of her public health. We also urge American initiative in the World Bank for a loan to speed the development of an agricultural extension service in India. Vigorous and generous application of point 4 in Formosa, where encouraging economic achievements have already been obtained through the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, will not only further improve the economic and social conditions on this very important island of resistance to Communist totalitarianism in China. It will also dramatize to the people of occupied China and to freedom-loving people everywhere that America has not turned its back on the struggle for liberty and national independence in this vast Asiatic country with which our Nation has always had the friendliest relations.

4. We canont reaffirm too strongly our convention resolution which emphasizes that labor must have adequate representation in the formulation and application of specific plans and policies and that technical aid to underdeveloped areas in Asia and elsewhere should include provisions for the transmission of bona fide free-trade union, cooperative, and farmers' know-how which will enable the workers and peasants of Asia to build effective, democratic unions and self-help organizations. This will permit the toiling folks of Asia not only to secure their material betterment but also to enhance their appreciation of their dignity as human beings on a basis of equality with all other races and peoples on other continents. American aid to such moral and spiritual enhancement will far outweigh in importance and lasting value the generous dollar aid we have been providing for the conquest of poverty and tyranny and for overcoming the threat of war.

5. The successes attained to date through the ERP, in raising the levels of production in the countries aided, only underline the necessity of preparing now for the time when the Marshall plan as such will end. It is clear that in the interest of developing a sound and balanced economy in the free part of the world, the democratic nations must lose no time in combining the various measures taken under ERP and point 4. There can be no effective integration of the economy of democratic Europe unless its economic life becomes more closely related with that of Africa, the Western Hemisphere, and the democratic countries and areas of Asia. More and more western Europe should be able to find markets for its manufactured products in the under-developed countries. Given this common outlet, the various European national economies, which are competitive in many respects, would tend to integrate more easily. In return, these underdeveloped areas could provide western Europe with the raw materials which it needs for its manufacturing industries. By following such a policy, we would be able to eliminate any attempts to expand business relations with Russian-dominated areas and thus to prevent the feeling of appeasement generated by business-as-usual tactics. This business-as-usual attitude might prove catastrophic to the democratic cause in the event of German heavy industry producing for the Chinese market. The present Russian baby blockade of Berlin and the Communists' accelerated national unity campaign in Germany are no doubt part of the Kremlin's over-all strategy for wearing out and drawing Germany into Moscow's military economic orbit. Thereby, Russia hopes to conquer Europe and Asia.

6. The urgency of gradually combining the basic features of ERP and point 4 is made all the more imperative by the fact that the increased productive capacities of Europe and America are operating in a much-reduced trade area. Totalitarian communism has torn out of the world market nearly half the population and about one-quarter of the area of the entire globe. Because Russia and its satellites in Europe and Asia have militarized their economies and are gearing themselves solely for aggressive warfare, very little trade in the normal and peaceful sense of the word is possible for them.

7. In view of this critical situation, all efforts and energies of the democratic world should be bent toward raising the productive capacities of the free peoples and toward increasing the possibilities for mass consumption by improving their purchasing power and living standards. There is no other way of counteracting the effects of Russia's disruption of the world market. There is no better way of demonstrating the moral and material superiority, and assuring the triumph, of the democratic over the totalitarian Communist world than by our creating and expanding those conditions of life and labor which will enable many additional millions of people to attain more liberty, greater material well-being, and spiritual happiness.

Civil Liberties and the "War Bride" Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House an editorial in the New York Times of last Saturday, March 4. This distinguished newspaper has done a notable public service in emphasizing the grave questions of civil liberties in the present procedure by which the Attorney General may exclude arriving aliens without a hearing. Two other outstanding newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York Post, have done an equally fine job of alerting the Government and the public about this issue.

Naturally, I can have no informed opinion about the merits of the case of Ellen Knauff. My concern in this matter is with the civil-liberties problem, which I believe is serious and immediate. I may say that the American Civil Liberties Union and the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers share this view. The bill referred to in the New York Times editorial which follows is H. R. 7476, to provide that aliens who have arrived in the United States shall not be excluded without a hearing:

THE CASE OF THE WAR BRIDE

The still-current case of the war bride who was denied admission to this country without a hearing may yet serve a notable purpose. It may yet result in bringing about a change in one remarkably un-American aspect of our immigration procedures.

The right—if one can call it that—of the Department of Justice to exercise the formidable power of barring aliens without explaining why stems from wartime regulations still in force. But we believe—and we are confident that most Americans believe—that irrespective of a man's citizenship as well as of his race, creed, or color, he should be informed of charges against him and should have the opportunity of answering them. In fact, denial of this simple proposition comes perilously close to falling into a pattern of thought characteristic of the police state.

This whole issue has been dramatized in recent weeks by the case of Mrs. Ellen Knauff. A few weeks ago the Supreme Court held that even though she was the war bride of an American citizen, she could be permanently barred from the United States without a hearing. But in an eloquent dissent, on which we commented at the time, Justice Jackson noted that not even a court can find out why the girl is excluded. She may or may not have been the victim of the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt. So far as the official record goes, neither she nor anyone outside

the Justice Department can know. About to be deported, she was actually aboard ship this week when a last-minute habeas corpus proceeding gave her a respite at least until Monday.

Meanwhile, Representative F. D. ROOSEVELT has introduced legislation—since the Justice Department has shown strange reluctance to modify its own procedure—that would guarantee to aliens the right of every free man, i. e., the right to have a hearing, even if a secret one. We think it most important that the record of the United States be set straight on this issue, and that there be reaffirmed without equivocation the fundamental American belief in fair play—especially toward the weakest and the most defenseless.

Farm Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think enough publicity has been given to the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 which relate to farm housing. The fact that farm housing was included in the Housing Act proves that the Eighty-first Congress has the interests of farmers at heart. I think more people should realize what this act does.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include here a brief summary of the farm housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, as explained in a supplemental report of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

The title authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to extend through the Farmers' Home Administration three types of financial assistance to owners of farms to enable them to construct or repair dwellings and other buildings on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, share croppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions and adequate farm buildings:

1. Loans up to 33 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest. The loans would not require a first mortgage on the farm property and could be secured by the farmer's equity in the farm.

2. Similiar loans, supplemented by annual contributions applied as a partial credit on interest and principal payments, to the owners of farms which are not presently self-sustaining but which, through a satisfactory program of enlargement, improvement, or adjusted farm practices, can be made self-sustaining within a period of not to exceed 10 years. The annual contributions could not be made available to a farm owner after the farm is made self-sustaining or, in any event, for more than 10 years.

3. Loans and grants for minor improvements and minimum repairs to farm dwellings and other farm buildings on farms which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, cannot be made self-sustaining. The amount available in such cases would be limited to $1,000 for any one farm or dwelling or building owned by one individual, and not in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one dwelling or building could not exceed $500.

Loans are to be refinanced through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever feasible.

Relation Between the Transportation Industry and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on March 3, 1950, on the invitation of Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, president of the New York chapter, National Defense Transportation Association and commanding general of the New York port of embarkation, to speak before their group at the Statler Hotel, New York City, on the relation between the transportation industry and national defense. Under leave to extend my remarks, I append herewith my speech:

At the outset, I wish to thank General Yount for the kind invitation he, as president of the New York chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association, has extended to me to speak before this fine gathering of men and women who are keenly interested in the transportation industry and its relation to national defense. It is indeed an honor and a privilege, which I very deeply appreciate.

The Elder Count von Moltke, as most of the distinguished military gentlemen present here this evening will undoubtedly agree, was considered one of the greatest strategists of the latter half of the nineteenth century, and was proclaimed the creator of the modern method of directing armies in the field.

Even in his day, as it was in the time of Caesar, and as it is in ours, the question of properly expending the moneys allotted for his war machine was a perplexing one.

When the question was put to von Moltke as to how an allocated sum of money should be expended, he stated quite firmly and clearly, that he would rather have another railway than all the fortifications in the world. Thus, the father of modern strategy made it evident that transportation plays a paramount and vital role to be reckoned with when one considers national defense. And in these days, that subject—national defense—must be carefully considered.

However, to sing the praises of the importance of transportation to this assemblage is, I am sure, as superfluous as informing a young mother that she has an exceptionally beautiful and intelligent child. She knows it, just as you members of the National Defense Transportation Association are convinced that transportation, whether it be by sea, by land, or by air, is as important to the commerce of war as it is to the commerce of peace. And you know it—otherwise you would not be here—that your work and development now is essential to success in any future emergency.

The problems of transportation are basically similar, and the underlying principles are omnipresent whenever the law of supply and demand operates. Though the press of traffic is always greater in war than in any preceding period of peace, the fundamental principles established by democratic competition in time of peace are put to enthusiastic utility by the military in time of war.

It is in these days of cold, uneasy peace that we prepare, not only in the obvious manner of training reserve manpower, or intensifying mobilization plans for industry, but in the not so obvious method whereby vigorous and free peacetime competition tests the ingenuity of our people and develops tremendously effective operational and economic techniques.

Take an example which you all know, in the field of motor transport. By the interchangeability of truck bodies, a 1½-ton chassis can be paired with the standard cargo truck body, or a dump truck body, whichever is needed most. Another example of a highly developed peacetime technique exploited to great advantage by our Military Establishment in the past conflict was the development and the simplification in numbering of interchangeable spare parts.

It is in the countless numbers of such prosaic but businesslike methods that there was developed so many wonderous and amazing instruments of destruction, as if by magic, in the time that followed Pearl Harbor.

Since, as I have said, the problems of transportation are basically similar in war and peace, and the underlying principles are the same, it behooves us all to encourage, protect, and foster the needs for the transportation industry.

Since a healthy, well-nourished, and thriving transportation industry, as of right now, is a most important must to a strong and adequate transportation system in time of hostilities, you well may ask, "What, then, is being done by your Congress in the field of transportation legislation?" I am glad to report that much is being done. So much, in fact, that one could easily say that the subject of transportation with all of its wide ramifications—though perhaps not such a spectacular subject as, say, atomic development, is certainly of such importance as to occupy a great deal of the time of those who help guide the destiny of this Nation, as your elected Representatives.

I propose this evening to present the evidence of the awareness of Congress of the fundamental tie-up between the transportation industry and national defense. Presently on the agenda are bills covering each of the three major fields of transportation: Air, land, and water. I would like to discuss some pending developments in all three fields and highlight those that I consider extremely significant.

From the air viewpoint, analysis of some seven proposed items of legislation reveals that the bill entitled "The Air Merchant Marine Act of 1949" is of a far-reaching importance as the title would indicate. This act is patterned, as one would suspect, on the tried and tested Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Its purpose is to insure a number of cargo aircraft adequate to meet the potential commercial requirements of our Nation and to integrate that need with a number equal to meet our military reserve requirements.

This will be accomplished by the creation of the Aircraft Development Corporation, within the Department of the Air Force, which will be administered by that agency but which will exercise its function independently of the Secretary of the Air Force. It is proposed that this Corporation be initially capitalized at $100,000,000. Its function will be to survey, study, and report to the Congress the potential commercial and military reserve requirements for cargo aircraft. So long as the number of cargo aircraft is inadequate to meet the needs of commercial cargo requirements and the military reserve, it will be the duty of the Corporation to purchase from manufacturers within the United States the number of cargo aircraft necessary to meet these needs. The planes so purchased will be leased by the Corporation to citizens engaged in the transportation of commodities in air commerce, provided, among other things, that 75 percent of the personnel employed by the lessee in connection with operation of leased cargo aircraft shall be members of the Reserve components of the armed forces. Quite naturally, such organizations will be susceptible to instant assimilation within the Air Force in time of emergency. So much for air.

In the field of water transportation, before discussing the aspects of pending legislation, I'd like first to make a distinction: the national policy on inland waterways and coastwise shipping is as much a matter of national defense as is our policy with respect to our interocean water shipping. However, in the case of the former, our problem is mainly one of integration, whereas with the latter, our problem is one of competition with foreign-flag shipping.

One might say that the difference which lies between our inland waterway policy and our ocean policy is like that difference existing between tactics and strategy; one is a problem of detail, and is local; the other is a problem of large scale, and is of world-wide scope.

But we cannot overlook the importance of the domestic scene in favor of the immediate international distractions. I well remember when opponents of the program to modernize the New York State Barge Canal (historically known as the Erie Canal), stated that putting money into such an enterprise was about as useful a project as building an ice house in the Arctic Circle. However, in the trying days of the war just past, it more than proved its worth; an unceasing 24-hour train of barges, tankers, tugs, and supply craft of all varieties moved on that modernized canal.

That lesson, I hope, has been well taught. Our inland waterways cannot be forgotten. They are necessary adjuncts of our national defense. At the present time there is pending a bill pertaining to the Inland Waterways Corporation which will carry out the announced congressional policy to continue the transportation services of the Corporation until, among other provisions, "there shall have been completed in the rivers where the Corporation operates, navigable channels as authorized by Congress, adequate for reasonably dependable and regular transportation service" * * * and * * * "terminal facilities shall have been provided on such rivers reasonably adequate for joint rail and water service."

So today, insofar as the national defense picture is concerned, there is certainly not found lacking consideration of the practicability of exploiting the natural assistance of our inland waters.

But now how about shipping on the high seas and our transportation policies in relation to our ships which ply the oceans engaged in world commerce? What is being done to strengthen national defense in this connection? A bill has been introduced which is of sweeping importance to industry as well as to the national defense concept, which would amend the Merchant Marine Act. This bill proposes to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine. It is of such sweeping significance it might be well to consider it rather fully.

As you know, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was the basis for the development of our merchant marine, privately owned and operated by our citizens, but available as auxiliary to the armed forces in time of national emergency.

The establishment of such a merchant marine assists immeasurably in the development and advancement of the know-how necessary for the construction of modern ships and provide for their operation so that there might always be available an auxiliary force in the event of an emergency such as has arisen twice in the past generation.

Under our system of free enterprise constant effort is made to avoid Government subsidy to specific industries. The need for an adequate and well-balanced merchant marine has always been well recognized, and in these troubled times it has been essential and desirable to foster and bolster such a merchant marine with Government aid when necessary. Due to existing economic conditions in the other maritime nations, it is essential to provide some form of Government assistance which will aid in offsetting the unequal advantage held by competitor nations with their lower standards.

Our military leaders have repeatedly attested to the necessity for the continued development of the merchant marine. Therefore, in order to avoid wasteful expenditure of colossal sums and to conserve precious time in a future emergency, it is clearer now than ever that we should foster as strong a merchant-marine development policy as we do for the other branches of the Government concerned with national defense and security.

Without going into all the intricate details of the proposed amendment to our Merchant Marine Act, I would like to point out one or two phases of it. First, let us touch on the subject of "construction-differential subsidy," with which the act is principally concerned. First, the term itself. What does the term "construction-differential subsidy" mean? We've all noticed that term in the newspapers, and of late, since discussion of the proposed amendment, its use has become increasingly prevalent, and rightly so, since around that phrase is the nub of contention.

Well, we all know that subsidy means to aid or promote a private enterprise with public money. What about this "construction differential"? It can best be explained by illustration. For example, the X Steamship Co. wants to build a ship. The lowest bid for construction is twenty million. But they won't have to pay that twenty million, for the Maritime Commission has ascertained and determined that the vessel would cost only fifteen million if built in a foreign port. Therefore, that's all the X Steamship Co. pays. The Government pays the difference. That is an illustration of how "construction-differential subsidy" works. In my opinion this is a small price to pay for insurance for the future. In case of another emergency, when we need the ship, it will be there, and this may well serve to prevent future Bataans or Corregidors.

Now the old act (that is the one presently in effect) provides for the granting of the "construction-differential subsidy" upon operation of the vessel so aided, on specific essential services, routes, or lines in the foreign commerce of the United States. The new bill proposes to maintain the subsidy, but to eliminate the restriction by extending such provisions to vessels to be constructed for the inland waterways and intercoastal trades, and removing the requirement that vessels receiving "construction-differential subsidies" be operated on certain essential trade routes. This will serve to encourage the creation of liner services to many places not presently served with correspondingly beneficial effect on foreign commerce to those places, as well as to ourselves.

This amendment will eliminate the provision which prohibits operating differential subsidy contractors, or any of their affiliates, subsidiaries, or associated firms from engaging in the domestic, intercoastal or coastwise service without the written permission of the Maritime Commission.

As I mentioned previously, there are other details. However, the expansion of the subsidies for the shipping industry is the most significant aspect of the proposed amendment to the Merchant Marine Act, and the controversy over its execution has created a great deal of congressional interest. So far, it appears that the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget have signaled their opposition to it. It is endorsed by the Maritime Commission, and the Departments of Defense and Navy are expected to back up the Commission.

Thus far I have discussed piecemeal and in a fragmentary way certain items of pending legislation pertaining to the transportation industry which concerns national defense.

But in my mind, the most momentous item of legislation pertaining to national defense and transportation, I have yet left untouched. In prefacing this subject, I would like to quote to you a paragraph from Edward Hungerford's excellent book, Transport for War. In his discussion of the men in the transportation industry, whom we know as the many-numbered brethren of Casey Jones, Mr. Hungerford says, "in the last analysis, a railroad is a far-flung army, a well-organized and long-standing army of men and locomotives and trains, all working in unison. Its men long since were trained in discipline and in organized effort just as are the soldiers of any well-trained army. They are on an unceasing lookout for emergency or disaster: flood, holocaust, washed-out bridge. Any of these things can come to pass in a day's work. The railroaders are trained to meet them. In the present emergency (he was referring to World War II, of course) the armed forces of the United States found this railroad army already trained and seasoned, quite ready to do their bidding and work side by side with them." My point in quoting this to you is not only to indicate my agreement with every word of it, but to go further and state that it is not only the men of the railways, but those of the highways, the airways, and the shipping lanes as well who, in the last analysis, are a far-flung complement, an organized and long-standing army of men, working in unison, men long since trained in discipline and in organized effort just as are the soldiers of any well-trained army.

And what's more, I have cited this passage and added my comments to emphasize the fact that factually and psychologically, there is a great natural unity and affinity between the industry of transportation and the problem of national defense.

I would like to quote again, this time from an equally excellent and scholarly source, the fine joint achievement of Professors Johnson, Huebner, and Wilson, in their comprehensive work on the subject of transportation. "It is a mistake," they say, "to consider the various types of transportation and carriers as separate and isolated business enterprises. They are not * * * They may serve international, national, sectional, or local areas. Essentially, however, they are parts of a transportation system, the integration and coordination of which constitutes one of the most important economic problems of recent times."

Again I agree with the learned authors, and again I would like to go further and state that not only is the integration and coordination of transportation one of the most important economic problems—it is one of the most important problems from the standpoint of national defense. Accordingly, there has been presented before the Senate and House identical bills for the establishment of a Department of Transportation. This proposes a Secretary of Transportation who will have the following already established governmental agencies assigned to his department:

The Interstate Commerce Commission.

The United States Maritime Commission.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the Weather Bureau, the Inland Waterways Corporation; and most important, the Office of Defense Transportation.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you see at long last the development of a focal point—a long needed heart and soul—for the transportation industry: One general, high-level administrative authority for the coordination of the national transportation system, and the establishment of a national transportation policy which will be, as it must be, a bulwark to our national defense.

Of course, with the possible establishment of this Department of Transportation, there will be by no means an infringement upon

the continuance of private ownership and operation.

Today, the keynote in Government is the same as it was in 1787—unification. It is nothing new. The Latin phrase, "E Pluribus Unum"—"One out of many"—is as basically sound as the coins upon which that phrase is engraved.

Unity is the keynote; for in unity there is strength. Besides, there is a diminishing distinction between the civilian and the soldier, and there is a necessity not only for unification of the Military Establishment for the purpose of national defense, but a unification of the armed forces with industry, including the transportation industry, for that same purpose.

It is foolish to keep up the nineteenth century distinctions between the soldier and the civilian when we live in a world which is manufacturing missiles of destruction that do not know, and are incapable of knowing, any such difference. These weapons are cold bloodedly indifferent as to who, or what, is to be its victim.

And whether we like it or not, we must face the cold fact, that in the case of another conflict, it will not be some far-off beachhead with a foreign-sounding name which will be the target for the night. There will be no strange, fantastic name like Biak, Morotai, Wadke. There will be names of places familiar to our ears, like Seattle, like Chicago, like New York.

Gentlemen, you have a responsibility when you walk out of this fine hotel this evening and breathe the free, fresh air. For it is up to you, in or out of the armed forces, as someone connected with the dynamic transportation industry through which, and by which, the lifeblood of the Nation flows in either tranquil or contentious times.

As that individual it is not only your patriotic duty, it is your very personal, moral duty to the principles which you carry within yourself, to think and act to integrate and affiliate your particular transportation endeavor with national defense.

And you can do it, gentlemen, whether it be in the crating of boxes for domestic shipment or in the planning for the sailing of a fleet to the far-flung reaches of the earth. If you think your task is really too insignificant I'd like to remind you of a fable we all learned in childhood which we are now too prone to forget:

"Because of the nail, the shoe was lost,
"Because of the shoe, the horse was lost,
"Because of the horse, the rider was lost,
"Because of the rider, the cause was lost."

I want to thank you for your kind indulgence, and to publicly acknowledge a debt of gratitude to my dear friend, Col. Norman Gold, who is responsible for stimulating my interest in the problems of transportation. Up to a few months ago my love was social legislation. I'm afraid from now on I may be accused of being a little fickle.

Highways and Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association, March 6, 1950, at Cincinnati, Ohio, to wit:

HIGHWAYS AND CIVILIZATION

Civilizations have always advanced as highways have been constructed. A country or a community without roads is a country or a community which has never developed. Highways and progress have always gone hand in hand.

MOST IMPORTANT ROAD

The highest road in the world is in the Peruvian Andes. The longest is the old Silk Road in central Asia. The finest is the Appian Way. The most heavily traveled is between New York and Philadelphia. But the most important road in all the world is the road that passes by one's own door.

ANCIENT ROADS

There are records of the existence of roads in Europe, Asia, and Africa as early as 3000 B. C. At first they were used for the transportation of precious stones and spices. They were also used for policing and collecting taxes from subject peoples.

The Amber roads, as the name suggests, were first used for the transportation of amber and metals, and later on for furs and tin. These roads extended north and south as well as east and west in Europe.

The Lapis Lazuli road led from the Lapis mines in northeastern Afghanistan across south Persia and then northward to the Mediterranean ports. Lapis lazuli were precious stones used by the ancients for decoration.

One of the great Silk roads led from China to the Mediterranean ports. Another of the Silk roads led from east central China across Burma into India. It was over these routes that the products of China were first introduced to Europe.

The famous Tin Road led from Cornwall in England to the shore where tin was carried by ships to Denmark. The Tin Road then followed the amber roads to the Mediterranean area.

ROMAN ROADS

The earliest roads about which definite construction facts are known are those of ancient Rome. The oldest and most celebrated Roman road for the grandeur of its work was the Appian Way and it was built in 312 B. C. Roman roads are outstanding in engineering and construction. Many of them still remain to form the foundation of modern roads. They were the arteries by which the culture of that day was introduced to the barbarian lands of France, Spain, and England. Between 300 B. C. and 400 A. D. approximately 50,000 miles of Roman roads were constructed. Ethlyn Miller Hardwick, in these lines, tells of the greatness of Roman roads:

"Great roads the Romans built that men might meet
And walls to keep strong men apart, secure,
Now centuries are gone, and in defeat
The walls are fallen, but the roads endure."

FRENCH ROADS

France started a national system of roads in 1597. Adequate drainage was provided. These roads were surfaced with broken rock.

ENGLISH ROADS

John L. MacAdam, the distinguished Englishman, in the eighteenth century utilized scientific principles in the construction of roads. MacAdam emphasized surfacing and drainage. Macadamized roads are named for him.

AMERICAN ROADS

The roads of the United States are most significant to us. They are responsible for the development of the motor vehicle and for the industrial and agricultural progress of our country. Thomas Jefferson early recognized the importance of roads. He stated that it was much more rational to spend public money for roads than for waging war. George Washington, in 1785, in a letter to Patrick Henry, said that the convenience of the country required that roads leading from one public place to another should be straightened and established by law.

WILDERNESS ROAD

The development of the United States west of the Alleghenies did not begin until the Wilderness Road was opened in 1795. Prior to that time there was no road westward to accommodate vehicles. With the opening of the Wilderness Road mountains were crossed and exploration westward began. Pioneers opened the trails. The Army followed close behind constructing forts to protect against Indian raids.

GREAT TRAILS OF THE WEST

The great trails of the West provided for the explorations which began early in the nineteenth century. The travels of the pioneers are among the most thrilling annals in American history. They followed the Santa Fe, the Overland, and the Oregon Trails. They settled for the United States the great domains of the West. These trails were remarkable. They were the principal routes of travel. One of them—the Oregon Trail—has been described as the most remarkable route known to history. No transit located a foot of it. No level established its grades. No engineer built any bridges or surveyed the mountain passes. The general quality of the 2,000 miles of the Oregon Trail was most remarkable.

THE GALLATIN PLAN

As the United States expanded from the Atlantic seaboard across the Alleghenies, the need for roads was emphasized. In 1808, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, formulated a comprehensive plan in which he recommended the construction of a continuous turnpike to provide for travel from Maine to Georgia which would unite the major seaports along the Atlantic coast. He also recommended roads across the Alleghenies between the Atlantic Ocean and the great western rivers. The plan was never adopted because of sectional differences and on account of its alleged unconstitutionality.

CUMBERLAND OR NATIONAL ROAD

In response to the need for transportation in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Congress appropriated funds for a number of road projects. As early as 1806 appropriations were made for the Cumberland, or National Road. Maintenance of the road depended upon the collection of tolls, but there was violent opposition to tolls then as now. In 1822 President Monroe vetoed a bill to provide for the collection of tolls to maintain the Cumberland Road. The road extended to Wheeling and then across Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, to St. Louis.

TOLLS THEN AND NOW

The veto message of President Monroe in which he refused to approve the collection of tolls on a road for which Congress had made appropriations inaugurated the policy against the collection of tolls on Federal roads for which Federal aid is provided. The Cumberland Road was also known as the National Road. For some 40 years Congress made appropriations from time to time for the Cumberland Road, and in a few instances, for other roads for military and mail purposes. Travel was by coach, by canal, and by boat. With the advent of the railroad prior to the War Between the States, and with the expansion of railroads following that war, appropriations for Federal roads were discontinued.

Then followed the era in which the railroads were constructed. The stage coach was supplanted by the passenger coach. Finally the steamboat was also supplanted by the passenger train. River traffic disappeared with the beginning of the twentieth century.

The early roads of the United States were the roads of hope. They led the pioneers to

new lands. They were the means of opening up new lands and extending civilization.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS

For almost 100 years there was no Federal participation in road construction or maintenance. The highways were built and maintained by States and counties, and the streets were constructed by municipalities.

With the advent of the automobile, at the beginning of the twentieth century, better roads became imperative. Appropriations for experiments were made, and in 1912 Congress made a modest appropriation to construct a few roads as examples for State and local road building. Federal appropriations for roads, which were only small for 25 years and disappeared for more than 75 years, became a necessity when the motor vehicle was perfected. As Herbert Spencer well said: "Progress, therefore, is not an accident, but a necessity." Good roads became imperative. The United States was growing and developing. As Whittier said:

"And, step by step, since time began
I see the steady gain of man."

FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT OF 1916

The Federal Aid Act of 1916 was the beginning of the present system of Federal aid. It was amended in 1921. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1921 made provision for Federal aid for primary roads. It was the beginning of the Federal-aid primary system. The States designated a highway system and a definite formula was adopted for the allocation of Federal aid. Construction costs were on a 50-50 basis. Authorizations have been passed for 2-year periods since.

EXPANSION

In 1934 and in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1936 the policy of Federal aid was expanded and extended to embrace secondary roads. States were required to match Federal funds. Provision was made for the elimination of railway grade crossings. As the production of motor cars increased highway construction increased. It was stepped up materially in the 1930's and particularly during the depression of that decade.

During World War II, except in aid of the war effort, construction was materially reduced. In many cases it was delayed.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1944

Before the end of hostilities, in 1944, Congress made provision for the expansion of Federal aid for highways. The act of 1944 was the most constructive highway act ever passed by the Congress. It continued aid for primary roads. It extended aid for secondary roads. It provided for the elimination of railway grade crossings. It extended aid to urban areas. It set the pace, not only for Federal aid, but for State and local construction. For the first time authorizations were provided for 3 years.

DELAY

On account of the increased cost of construction and the scarcity of material construction was delayed. The act was amended to extend the time in which States could match Federal funds.

The 1944 act provided for annual appropriations of $500,000,000 and provided also for on interstate system of approximately 40,000 miles.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1948

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 authorized appropriations of $450,000,000 for each of the two fiscal years, 1950 and 1951.

AUTHORIZATION BILL

The House Committee on Public Works is conducting hearings on an Authorization Act for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. It is well to keep in mind the needs and the problems for highway construction, as in all human endeavors, we will go backward if we do not go forward.

THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

There are in the United States today over 3,300,000 miles of highway, roads, and streets. Three million miles are in the rural areas. Over 300,000 miles are in the urban areas. Federal aid is being extended to 636,037 miles of roads today. The primary system in rural areas is 219,588 miles. The secondary system is 398,488 miles. Urban roads total 18,000 miles. The interstate highway system is included in the primary and urban roads. It embraces 37,800 miles.

In the State system of highways there are 349,929 miles. The city streets contain 316,537 miles. Since 1921, 95,793 miles of the Federal-aid highway system have been reconstructed and improvements have been made on the entire system since 1921 aggregating 237,025 miles. In addition to the various Federal-aid systems there are 72,000 miles of roads under Government control in the national parks, forests, and reservations.

OBSOLESCENCE

The average life of a Federal-aid road is 30 years. Obsolescence is multiplying. Twelve thousand miles of primary roads must be reconstructed annually and 30,000 miles of secondary roads must be reconstructed annually. Roads wear out.

REGISTRATIONS

For 1949 the estimated registrations of automobiles, busses, and trucks aggregate 43,800,000 vehicles, an increase of more than 35 percent since 1940. The vehicle miles of traffic in 1949 aggregated 418,800,000,000 miles, an increase of more than 38 percent since 1940.

LOADS AND SIZES

The average load carried by trucks in 1948 was 38 percent higher than in 1941 and 73 percent higher than in 1936. Actual loads of 18,000 pounds were found on an average of 13 out of every 1,000 vehicles in 1936 and on 93 out of every 1,000 vehicles in 1948, a 615-percent increase. There has been a tenfold increase in larger loads of 22,000 pounds and more since 1936. Not only are the loads larger but many of the trucks resemble boxcars and many of the trailers look like pullmans. Roads are being destroyed and a danger is being promoted on the highways.

RURAL AND URBAN AREAS

One-half of the traffic is in the rural areas and one-half in the urban areas. More and better streets, as well as more and better roads, are needed.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

There were 20,000 miles of new construction in highways in 1948, but the production in that year of automobiles, busses, and trucks, placed bumper to bumper, aggregated 20,000 miles.

INCREASED COSTS

There has been an increase in the costs of construction from 1940 to 1949 of approximately 123½ percent. The increase since 1945 has been 48 percent. At the same time, there was an increase of approximately 3,000 miles in new construction in 1949 over 1948. However, the work done in 1949 just about equals the work done in 1936 because the dollar buys less due to increased costs, although the authorizations are larger.

INTERSTATE IMPROVEMENTS

The interstate system improvements for the fiscal year 1949 account for 30 percent of the total amounts programed for primary and urban roads. Twenty-three percent of the primary funds and 46 percent of the urban funds were for interstate improvements.

TRAFFIC AND POPULATION

The population is increasing and the traffic is multiplying. If I were asked the most important problem confronting the United States today I would answer that there must be more highways. The roads must be wider and straight. Safety must be promoted.

SAFETY

I am gratified to report that safety has been promoted, and while deaths and injuries are still entirely too numerous there were fewer in 1949 than in 1948.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS ARE SELF-LIQUIDATING

For the fiscal year 1949 the Government collected $1,326,054,091 in highway-user taxes, of which $503,648,471 were derived from the 1½-cent Federal gasoline tax. The policy of Federal aid for highways is self-liquidating.

STATE FUNDS

State and local revenues available for road construction have not kept pace with the increased costs of construction in the past 10 years. Funds are being diverted. Highway police and administration, as well as highway maintenance, take a large percentage of State funds. It is imperative that the States make provision for matching Federal funds.

STATE AND COUNTY DISTRIBUTION

There is need for better farm-to-market roads. It is well to keep in mind, however, that in many States a disproportionate part of funds for roads are spent in the construction of local roads. The cost has been shifted to the highway users. In Ohio, for instance, rural road agencies received in 1946 $30,850,000 from the State and spent $35,953,000 for the construction and maintenance of local roads. This means that in Ohio the State provided the equivalent of almost 86 percent of the local-road expenditures. In Michigan the ratio is 96 percent. The States generally are providing for local roads, for these roads are State and local problems.

BETTER ROAD EQUIPMENT

While the costs of construction have increased, a better type of road is being built. The country is indebted to American road builders for a revolution in road construction. The improvements in road building enabled the United States to do many things in World War II that never had been dreamed of. As a result of improved machinery airfields were constructed, army and navy bases located and roads opened more speedily than ever before.

THE PACE

While Federal aid contributes to the construction of approximately 15 percent of all highways, roads, and streets annually, it sets the pace for construction. Improvements are being made as a result of the experiments carried on in the laboratory of the Bureau of Public Roads. Foundations are being stabilized. Soil studies are contributing to a better type of road. The experiments are resulting in a more economical local road. The Bureau of Public Roads is taking the lead for better road construction.

THE FUTURE

There is a $250,000,000,000 economy in the United States today. Production is essential to the progress of the Nation. The Federal Government is profoundly interested in highway construction. Employment is provided for millions. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report estimates that the cost of correcting the present deficiencies of roads, streets, and highways in the United States amounts to over $41,000,000,000. The largest single need is $23,000,000,000 for modernizing State highway systems and their urban extensions. The remainder of the $41,000,000,000 reflects the need of city and village streets and local roads. For the expanding population and for the progress of the Nation production must be increased and production without transportation is impossible.

NEXT STEPS

The authorizations for Federal-aid highways must be increased over previous au-

thorizations for the next two fiscal years. The program must be expanded. There are many steps to take. I mention but a few:

1. There should be an increase in the Federal contribution to the interstate system. The increase should be fixed and definite for all of the States. The Federal contribution can well be increased from 50 to 75 percent as the national defense is involved in the interstate system.

2. The Federal contribution should be increased as soon as practicable for four-lane divided highways with controlled access extending for 10 miles from all larger urban areas. Those who use the roads pay for them. One-half of the traffic is in the cities. Four-lane highways are in the interest of the public.

3. While it may be difficult for the Federal Government at present to provide a larger amount for rural roads, I believe that the next step in solving the rural road problem is for the United States to assist in providing adequate engineering administration of local roads. There is need to get the farmers out of the mud, but there is also a great need to protect the revenues of the taxpayers. We cannot protect our revenues without adequate engineering talent.

4. Express highways and adequate arterial roads in the cities are imperative. Traffic is being impeded. Progress is being delayed.

5. Many of the State laws for acquiring rights-of-way are antiquated. The statutes were passed for horse-and-buggy days. They are outmoded and outdated. Rights-of-way are expensive and additional assistance must be provided.

6. I cannot overlook in the sixth place the need for express highways in populous areas. New Jersey and New York are taking the lead in the construction of such highways. Their lead must be followed by other States. The Federal Government must cooperate.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 should not only set the pace for the highway needs of the present but provide for the highway needs of the future as well. The policy of Federal aid has been tested. It should be continued and expanded to provide for the multiplying needs of a $250,000,000,000 national economy.

BUILDING CIVILIZATION

I have stressed the building of roads and I have mentioned the improved machinery for better road construction. I began by saying that highways and civilizations have always gone hand in hand. We cannot build roads unless we build men. We cannot grow and prosper as a government unless men grow. An enlightened citizenship will mean a better civilization. Science and invention are important, but the progress of humanity, after all, is based upon the moral law. The material is important, but the spiritual is more important. An enduring civilization is based upon faith, justice, and righteousness.

COMPLACENCY

After the sacrifice of war we are prone to become complacent. We are inclined to be soft. We turn from the sacrifices of war to the pleasures of an uncertain peace. We are prone to substitute complacency for sacrifice. The men and women who have left their impress on human history have been those who gave in sacrifice and in unselfishness.

STRONG AMERICA

Our civilization cannot advance unless America is strong. The strength of America is not in the atom bomb nor in the hydrogen bomb, but the strength of America is in the spirit of the people of the United States. We must profit by the lessons of history. It would be most unfortunate for the United States to place its confidence in any bomb or in any power. Civilization would not advance for men would not grow. Our plans must be sound. Our Government must be stable. Our faith must be abiding in man, country, and God. If we placed our dependence upon any weapon we would relax, we would not be vigilant, we would lose our liberty.

We must not substitute selfishness for service. In the frontier days the greedy merchants could not resist the lush prices offered by Indians for guns and ammunition and often they sold their personal guns and belts to the Indians and when they did they sold their own scalps as well.

I repeat, we must profit by history. The French placed their confidence in the Maginot line rather than in the strengthening of their Government, and France lost. She was easily overrun and conquered in World War II.

Science is essential to the advancement of civilization but morality is more essential. The spirit is more important. I do not underestimate the effect of the atom bomb but I recall that at the conclusion of the First World War poisonous gases were being brought into play and it was announced that their use in the next war would mean the destruction of civilization. But the scientists who compounded the poisonous gases were confined to no one country and at the beginning of World War II all nations had supplies of poisonous gases but not one country made use of them.

Already the Russians have split the atom. The scientists who invented the atom can discover and perfect a defense against the atom.

OPPORTUNITY

As the most powerful Nation, and as the wealthiest people, with unparalleled natural resources and with undeveloped scientific frontiers, there has come to the United States the greatest opportunity for growth and development of our civilization that was ever enjoyed by any Nation in history. If we utilize inventions, discoveries, science, and knowledge for building and not destroying civilization, the people of the United States in the next 25 years will not only maintain, but will extend and expand, the highest standard of living that was ever before enjoyed by man.

OUR GENERATION

I would like for our generation to be constructive. The individual, like the Government, that does not grow will die. Democracy is not only a growing but it is a dynamic faith. We are concerned in these uncertain days of peace about national security. If we build our civilization on a solid foundation the future is secure. The great men and women of history have not sought an easy place. They have not been satified with personal security. They have taken the risk. They have sacrificed. We must be patriotic. We must be prepared to sacrifice for our ideals and for our country if our civilization is to endure and to advance. We must walk upright, with our feet on the ground, with our eyes toward the stars. We must be "guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship."

On the walls of the magnificent building of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in the city of Washington are carved the thoughts of Daniel Webster, uttered by him more than 100 years ago, which our generation should adopt, as we build and improve our civilization:

"Let us develop the resources of the land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, to see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Development of Peat Resources

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 7330 to encourage the development of our peat resources. I think it is imperative that the Members of the House be informed on the progress made in the utilization of peat; particularly in Russia and Great Britain.

I think the following translations of Russian newspaper accounts and government reports on peat development merit our attention. With our great untapped peat resources, this progress is open to us in the interest of our national economy, national defense, and national security.

[From Pravda of July 6, 1947]

Moscow, Leningrad, Gorki, Yaroslavl, Ivanovo, and a number of other industrial centers met their needs for electric power to a large degree from stations operating on peat as a fuel. Peat is also used for municipal heating, and the textile industry has heavy demands for it. The season for peat extraction is half over. The production plan is being fulfilled but the process of peat drying is not being carried out satisfactorily. Poorly dried peat cannot be used. Several electric power stations met difficulties at the beginning of this year due to lack of fuel in spite of the fact that hundreds of tousands of tons of peat lay in the fields not far away, but was not in condition to be used.

[From Pravda of April 23, 1948]

THE TEMPOS OF PEAT PROCUREMENT MUST BE SPEEDED

During the * * * months it will be necessary to stockpile millions of tons of peat for the national economy of our country. The chief consumers of peat are our power plants. The Soviet Union occupies the first place in the world in regard to the amount of power generated by plants run on peat. Besides being used by power plants peat is also largely utilized by the textile, light, glass, and other branches of industry. The municipalities of many of our cities are using peat to heat hospitals, schools, and homes.

The Soviet Government is paying great attention to the peat industry, its technical servicing, the mechanization of its labor processes, and to the betterment of the housing and living conditions of workers employed by the peat industry, and it demands a similar attitude toward this matter on the part of local organizations * * *.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who believed in the great importance of the peat industry as a foundation for electrification, was the initiator of its mechanization. This branch of industry is utilizing at present the latest technical means. In particular, peat is obtained by the hydraulic method. This year much machinery of new design is going to be utilized, * * * excavators, and others.

Last year's plan was not fulfilled, and this year's plan likewise is endangered. Work of monumental proportions remains to be done this year, such as building 55,000 square meters of new living space for the peat industry workers.

The seasonal character of the peat industry demands a planned approach to actual

mass propaganda work. Every man and woman worker of the industry must be made to understand how important to the state is the work they perform.

A new method of handling peat, developed this season in the Ural peat fields, U. S. S. R., utilizes a combination of dredge and electric spreading machine. The foreign press describes each unit as being composed of one four-row, multiscoop excavator and two electric spreading machines. The peat moss is processed by the dredge after which the electrical machines form it into briquettes and spread them over the field.

The unit, designed by the Institute of Mechanization of Peat Production, has a reported capacity of 200 cubic meters of peat moss an hour, which is 10 to 12 times the capacity of the dredges alone. The new method requires only about one-third of the electric power and one-fifth the manpower used in the elevator system of peat excavation and an improved quality of product is claimed.

Eleven of these machines have been built by Sverdlovsk Glavenergozapchasti and 19 by a special workshop of the Monetny peat enterprise. During the peat season this year, 45 dredges and 26 electrical spreading machines have been in operation on the peat fields on the Sverdlovsk oblast.

Production of a peat sucking portable crane is being started by the Works Collective of the Ivanovo Peat Machinery building plant which planned in the third quarter of 1945 to build three of these machines each weighing 27 tons. In addition to beginning the production of the new peat sucking portable crane and a universal peat excavator, this plant's pledge for 1945 was to treble the 1944 output of peat equipment, including cranes, peat loaders, peat suction pumps, and spare parts.

(Based on items in Trud, October 11; Izvestia, July 27; and Pravda, July 28, 1945.)

[From Trud, September 12, 1946]

A newly built plant in the city of Sverdlovsk, the Urals, is now producing electric-powered combines for the Soviet peat industry. These combines press peat mixture into briquettes and spread the briquettes over the field to dry. The capacity of the combines is 200 cubic meters of peat pulp per hour.

The plant will build 40 of these combines a year.

[From U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin of July 30, 1947]

Workers of the Peat Institute of the Byelorussian Academy of Sciences, under the direction of Professor Klimov and Engineer Chudnovsky, have developed a method for the complex utilization of peat as fuel for power stations and as raw material for synthetic gasoline.

In the new process the peat is treated chemically and transformed into gaseous form before being sent to the power station. The power station thus receives excellent gaseous fuel, and what remains of the peat after gasification is used to make synthetic gasoline.

The process of complex utilization of peat reduces the cost of synthetic-gasoline production by 18 percent and reduces the peat consumption in power stations by 30 to 35 percent.

UTILIZATION OF PEAT—ACTUAL AND POSSIBLE

Fuel: Lump peat, peat briquettes, powdered peat, peat fuel oils, gas, gasoline, kerosene.

Chemicals: Ammonia, paraffin, wax, methyl alcohol, acetic acid, asphalt, phenol, peat tar, cresols, lysol, furfural.

Agriculture: Fertilizers (composts, peat ashes), litter (moss) mulch, food yeast.

Medicine: Surgical dressings (sphagnum).

Metallurgy: For smelting pig iron in blast furnace and cupolas.

Paper industry: Peat used in the manufacture of paper.

Construction: Base for artificial wood (torfite), bricks, or as a filler for clay bricks, for insulation.

Miscellaneous: Lubricating oils, in the manufacture of varnishes and dyes, in cosmetics, benzine, antiscale solution for boilers, textile and building industries.

Experiments showed that in the processing of peat by artificial dehydration, the following byproducts can be obtained for every ton of finished peat product:

Ethyl alcohol of 94.5 percent, 6–10 liters.
Fodder yeast (pressed), 25–35 kilograms.
Dry ice (carbon dioxide), 20–30 kilograms.
Furfurol, 1.5–3.0 kilograms.
Methyl alcohol, 0.8–1.0 kilogram.
Acetic acid, 1.0–1.1 kilograms.

Because of the fact that the above chemicals represent byproducts of the processing of peat, their cost of manufacture is less than that involved in regular production.

The manufacturing processes for ethyl alcohol and yeast have been developed and checked in practice; the processes for the manufacture of dry ice, furfurol, etc., have undergone only laboratory experimentation.

Alcohol is obtained by the following process:

The liquid obtained during the steaming of the peat flows into a container. It is then pumped into a sediment tank where it is freed of all peat particles. This is followed by neutralization with peat ash or lime while, after this, it is filtered in "Prokska" filters and heated (or cooled) to 30 degrees centigrade.

Yeast for the fermentation of the liquid obtained from peat in the autoclaves is made in the Linder apparatus, in a mother-liquor vat, and in a fermenting tank. Fermentation of the liquid is done by repeated use of the ferment (20 times). After fermentation, the liquid is distilled and rectified in a distillation apparatus with cooling coils. The alcohol produced in this manner is 94.5 percent by weight.

In addition to alcohol, the distilling wash and liquid from steamed peat can yield fodder yeast by a process similar to the manufacture of alcohol. However, a special culture of yeast produces pressed yeast with high sugar content.

As can be seen from the foregoing, the processes of manufacturing alcohol and yeast are similar to the usual alcohol and yeast production processes.

It has been determined that the capital investment in one liter of alcohol amounts to 4 rubles and the production cost is 1 ruble, 50 kopecks. The investment in one kilogram of pressed yeast amounts to 40 kopecks and the estimated production cost is 30 kopecks. (M. I. Sarmatov, V. Y. Patsulo, and G. N. Sizov, the Floating Peat Plant, Peat Industry, No. 4, July–August 1945.)

Water gas can be obtained from peat semicoke. Composition of the water gas obtained from peat semicoke is as follows:

Ammonia also can be obtained from peat. According to the Soviet newspaper For Industrialization of October 11, 1946, there were in the U. S. S. R. "in process of construction a number of peat-chemical plants in which a large number of products were to be made, including ammonia." (S. A. Tsurupov, The Peat Institute and Its Problems in 1946. The Peat Industry, No. 2, 1946 (summary)).

The institute has at present 1,400 students, which is more than before the war. Beginning with 1945, 400 students will be accepted annually and at least 200 to 250 engineers will graduate. In the next 3 to 4 years the number of students in the institute is expected to rise to at least 2,000. For more than 2 years the institute has had a preparatory section.

The U. S. S. R. has two-thirds of the world's peat preserves, the industrial reserves of peat in the country occupy the second place among other combustible mined fuel. In electric stations it forms 50 and sometimes almost 100 percent of the fuel supply, yet the country has only 700 to 800 engineers specializing in peat. This naturally impedes technical progress in that branch of industry.

The institute has now been granted the right to educate engineers for the peat industry in six specialties and from 1945 on has commenced educating engineers in three faculties—technological, mechanical, and building faculties. The institute can, therefore, henceforth provide the peat industry with specialists in all the main branches necessary for its development. It remains to organize faculties for the chemical and thermic treatment of peat. A chemistry section has already been organized with prominent specialists in the gasifying and chemical treatment of peat, but a special faculty for the education of engineers specializing in these branches will be opened later in the year.

As regards scientific work, the institute has been working mainly on theoretic problems connected with the development of the peat industry and new technological schemes and methods.

(These reports are taken from the legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress TP 360 on Peat Industry of the Soviet Union.)

[From the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research report, The Winning, Harvesting, and Utilization of Peat, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office 1948]

UTILIZATION OF PEAT

The principal uses for peat at the present time in Great Britain are as a fuel for domestic purposes, as peat-moss litter in agriculture, and as a soil ameliorant in horticulture. In other countries peat has found use industrially as a fuel for power generation by burning under steam boilers or gasification in producers. It has also been used industrially for the production of peat coke which was used as a producer fuel and for metallurgical purposes. Various other methods for the utilization of peat, e. g., as a heat-insulating and packing material, in the manufacture of paper and textiles, for coal-gas purification, for the production of alcohol, etc., have been exploited commercially.

Peat is a very free-burning fuel which requires only a very low draught to maintain a satisfactory rate of combustion. In a modern well-type, open-hearth fireplace this can frequently be arranged by keeping closed the regulator admitting air under the fire, but it is sometimes necessary in addition to cover partially the bottom of the grate by means of a sheet of metal or tiles. There are now on the market in Eire a number of appliances which will burn peat satisfactorily.

USE AS INDUSTRIAL FUEL FOR STEAM GENERATION

There are two main methods in which peat can be used industrially for steam-raising purposes. These are:

(a) Burning to complete combustion under boilers, either in the form of air-dried blocks or coarse powder (milled peat) or as a dried pulverized fuel.

(b) Complete gasification in producers, with or without recovery of by-products, followed by combustion of the gas in gas-fired steam boilers.

The use of peat fuel for steam raising at electricity generating stations has been developed on a large scale in the U. S. S. R. with

apparently a considerable degree of success. The peat is obtained partly by the hydropeat process. In the northern and central districts of the U. S. S. R. where climatic conditions are not favorable for this process, the use of milled peat as a fuel has been developed. In 1933 approximately 30 percent of the power stations in operation in the U. S. S. R. were burning peat fuel, these stations having a capacity of over 1,000,000 kilowatts. Under the second 5-year plan it was proposed to increase this capacity to nearly 4,000,000 kilowatts. Larger power stations, each having a capacity of between 100,000 and 200,000 kilowatts, have been built at Shatura (Moscow), Dubrovka (near Leningrad and at Balakna in the Gorki (Gorgres station). At these stations hydropeat or machine-formed air-dried peat is burned under water-tube boilers fitted with a special type of grate, known as the Makarev shaft-chain grate. This grate is a combination of gas producer and chain grate. The peat is fed from bunkers into a shaft through which preheated air is passed. The more volatile constituents of the peat pass through suitable openings into the main combustion chamber, and peat reaching the bottom of the shaft discharges onto the chain grate. The most satisfactory results have been obtained in this system when using peat containing about 30 percent of moisture.

An alternative method by which peat can be used in solid form for steam-raising purposes is to burn it in a pulverized fuel system. In Sweden pulverized peat from a works at Vislanda has been used for locomotive firing on certain sections of the state railway. The results of tests have been published and indicate that the method adopted was satisfactory. Using peat having a calorific value of 7,740 B. t. u. per pound, 4.7 pounds of steam per pound of peat were produced.

Utilization of peat for purposes other than as a fuel: Agricultural and horticultural uses, extraction of wax from peat, production of alcohol from peat, other uses for peat.

Peat has been used for a large variety of other purposes, but these have been on a very small scale only and are not likely to be extended.

Fibrous, cotton-grass peat has been used in the manufacture of building materials, paper, millboard, and textiles.

Raw milled peat has been successfully used as an absorbent in filter beds and sewage beds, and it has found application in the manufacture of filters for reducing the hardness of water. The absorbent power of peat has also been utilized in medicine, the peat being used as a filling for surgical dressing.

Estimates made indicate that approximately 1,000,000,000 tons of air-dried peat could be made available by the development of peat reserves in this country.

Owing to the shortage of coal in Eire, especially during the war years, the production of peat has been stimulated. Information received indicates that about 5,000,000 tons of air-dried peat are now won anually, mainly by hand-winning methods.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Mines, Minerals Yearbook of 1948, Florida, New Jersey, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Georgia, Indiana, Colorado, Alabama, Texas, Maine, Washington, and Massachusetts have rather large deposits of peat.

We have to ask the question why it was needed that "imports of moss peat continued to increase totaling 91,073 short tons in 1948, an increase of 16 percent over the 1939 prewar figure?"

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD No. 21 in the biweekly series of broadcasts I am making.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MARCH 3–5, INCLUSIVE

(No. 21 in biweekly series)

The potato, which in the years since the war has grown hotter and hotter, finally got dumped on the Senate floor 10 days or so ago, and for a few days a regular battle royal ensued.

It was the decision to destroy some $50,000,000 worth of the 1949 potato crop purchased by the Government under our price-support program that really got the potato talk going recently. Most of the talk has been confined to the absurdity of using 50,000,000 tax dollars for unjustifiable destruction—and as a result, we haven't heard much about the events leading up to the potato surplus.

So, for a bit, I want to give you some potato history, as it were, because I don't believe that by and large many people are aware of the basic problem which the potato surplus reflects.

Back during the war period, our farmers had a tremendous job thrown at them—the job of feeding not only our own people and our fighting men—but in addition, our farmers undertook the task of feeding millions of others all over the world.

It was in the war period also that the tremendous quantities of cotton, wool, wheat, and a number of other storable agricultural commodities which the Government had previously purchased and put in storage really came in handy. The Government, as you may recall, had bought and stored these commodities to help our farmers keep their incomes from sagging badly in years that our production exceeded our national demand.

As I've already indicated, these stored surpluses came in handy during the war, and, as a matter of fact, the Government was able to sell its stored wheat, cotton, wool, and so forth, at a profit and we emerged from the war with our entire price-support program over the previous years having not only paid for itself, but, in fact, the Government actually made money through having bought and stored surpluses in bumper-crop years and selling them later when we weren't producing enough to meet demand.

But, as you can appreciate, not every farm product can be stored without spoiling, and when we were faced with the job of feeding people in the war areas, we just didn't have a sufficient supply of perishable foods such as vegetables, butter, and so on. Faced with this difficult problem, the Congress came up with a program designed to encourage farmers in increasing their production of these commodities, and potatoes happened to be one of the foods that we were short on. So that's how the problem started.

That wartime potato baby has grown up to be a giant. Potatoes can't be stored, and despite the fact that commercial alcohol can be obtained from a potato, we simply don't have a sufficient demand for industrial alcohol to use all our potato surplus for this purpose. I might add here that the Russians use the potato for a concoction known as vodka, though, as yet, I haven't heard anyone suggest seriously that we put our potato surplus to that kind of use.

Now in the farm bill, adopted by the Congress last fall, a provision was made which permitted the distribution of surplus perishable foods owned by the Government to charitable and welfare agencies, free of charge. The bill, however, did not provide that the Government would pay the freight on these surpluses from the point of storage to the welfare groups who needed them. Fortunately, some of our present surpluses are stored close enough to communities that need the food for relief purposes, but the truth of the matter is that our surplus of potatoes is far larger than needed for welfare purposes. I might add that some surplus powdered milk and dried eggs have also been distributed to charitable organizations as a consequence of the so-called welfare section of last year's farm bill.

But the free distribution of perishable surpluses is a far cry from a real solution to the problem. The fundamental difficulty is the fact that potato production is now far too large to meet any conceivable needs, and the only real answer is to be found through cutting back our production until it is again within reasonable limits. As matters now stand, this can't be done by reducing the number of acres we are planting. This was actually done with the crop in 1949, and yet we turned out more potatoes than ever, simply because many farmers moved the rows closer together, and thus got higher yields per acre. Practices of this sort are disastrous, because they result literally in mining the land—in robbing it of its productive value—and ultimately, of course, in destroying the power of the land to grow food.

Now there are basically two ways to handle the potato problem: first, to withdraw price supports altogether; and secondly, to withdraw potato supports unless farmers agree to cut back on their production.

The first possibility must be rejected. Both the Democratic and Republican parties have adopted as part of their national platforms the promise that price supports of some kind are necessary to help stabilize farm income * * * and for some time it has been part of our Nation's policy to support the foundations of our farm economy against the calamities it has suffered in the past.

Those of us who can remember back into the twenties and early thirties recall with painful clarity that the stock-market crash of 1929 was not the first danger signal which warned us the depression was on the way. From the middle twenties on, the bottom had dropped steadily out from under farm income, and the farmer's situation was desperate long before the Wall Street bubble burst. Mortgage foreclosures on farms were a commonplace by 1929, and most of our farmers had virtually ceased to be consumers of the industrial goods they had previously purchased. Naturally, as farm income dropped, this had a serious effect on our banks, particularly those in rural areas, and it had a big influence on our factory output because industry after industry lost important segments of its market.

The tide that swept in ever-worsening depression conditions on our farms was not reversed until the first of our basic farm laws put in an appearance in 1933. Since 1933, the farmer has been able to improve his position steadily. Today Federal conservation programs play an essential role in saving our valuable topsoil and enriching the food we

eat. Programs developed under the Farmers Home Administration and its parent agencies created in the middle thirties have been of enormous assistance in helping farmers to obtain long-term loans for making needed repairs on their farm buildings and other improvements necessary to get farms on a paying basis. Other Nation-wide programs, enacted by the Congress over the past 16 or 17 years have, taken together, performed yeoman service in making it possible for the farmer to get back on his feet as a self-sustaining and independent businessman and producer * * * and these national programs depend heavily for their success upon the basic principle of farm-income support.

So we cannot afford, as a matter of national policy, to throw the farmer to the wolves and pitch ourselves once more into the national calamity of a withering farm income by abandoning the farmer altogether.

On the other hand, we cannot afford to underwrite, through Government purchase, limitless and wholly unusable over-production.

About 10 days ago, just as the first of the 1950 crop of potatoes was being planted, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, the majority leader of the Senate, came up with an amendment which would have solved the potato problem. His amendment—which I supported and which was backed by other administration leaders in the Senate—would have cut back the size of the 1950 potato crop to fit our needs by proposing to withdraw price supports for potatoes on the coming crop unless farmers would accept production-quota control.

Quota controls would simply mean that the Secretary of Agriculture would be called upon to establish a potato production goal for 1950 on which the Government would support prices at a reasonable level. This production goal would represent our total foreseeable needs for potatoes in the coming year. Thereafter, when the farmers voted to accept quota controls, a fair share of the potato production would be allocated among them, and once the production target had been established and agreed to by the farmers, a fine would be levied on any farmers who refused to cooperate and insisted upon marketing potatoes grown in excess of the production quota.

The administration amendment to solve the potato problem was overthrown in the Senate by a Republican-led revolt, in which some Democratic Senators joined, which insisted that we should continue our present potato policy for at least another year. The net result is simply that this time next year we will have another bumper crop of potatoes bought up by the Government—and once more, in all likelihood, we will be forced to destroy a large share of the quantity we buy.

So a small majority of the Senate refused to settle the potato problem in terms of the 1950 crop—though the Senate later agreed to apply the Lucas amendment to the 1951 crop. In short, the Senate was willing to accept the Lucas proposal as workable a year from now, but would not apply it to the 1950 crop.

I don't get this kind of thinking at all. If the Lucas amendment is the answer—as the Senate seems to agree that it is—it should be used now, and I did everything I could to get it adopted for this year. I feel that the Senate made a disastrous mistake in rejecting the administration proposal—and I feel that the entire health and well-being of our farm economy is seriously threatened by this failure to handle the hot potato.

We had another explosion in the Senate on Saturday, February 25, when the Senate Appropriations Committee voted against authorizing funds needed to administer the Rent Control Act between now and the time the present law is due to expire on the 1st of July of this year.

You'll recall that the Eighty-first Congress made some repairs last spring in the rent-control law adopted by the Eightieth Congress, and we extended the law for 15 months—or until July 1, 1950. It was estimated that $21,000,000 would be needed to administer the law during the fiscal year which began last July, but the Congress last session voted only $17,500,000 of this amount with the understanding that the balance of $3,500,000 would be approved early in 1950. It was this $3,500,000 which the Appropriations Committee refused to approve a week ago.

The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee is not final, however, and very shortly I expect to see the matter brought before the Senate. I feel we must go through with the promise made by the Congress last year in agreeing to continue rent control until July 1. We expect a big fight on this in the Senate, but I intend to do everything I can to see that the needed $3,500,000 are made available to carry out the law for the next 4 months. I don't believe it is proper to kill off a law through the expedient of refusing funds needed to administer a law the Congress has already declared to be national policy.

I also feel strongly that it will be necessary to extend rent controls for at least another year. As I've said repeatedly in the past, rent control is messy business, and it is utterly impossible to have any kind of rent-control law that doesn't put some limitations on somebody, somewhere. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that critical housing shortages continue to exist in many localities in Pennsylvania.

I think this can be proved by the fact that most communities and States have not decontrolled their rents, although the Federal law adopted last year permitted local decontrol when people in any area felt controls were no longer needed.

And from the experience of communities that have prematurely voted to decontrol rents before the shortage was licked, we have seen that there are still landlords—not many, but a few landlords who ruin things for everyone—who will indulge in rent gouging when they know their tenants can find no other place to live.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee will hold extensive hearings on the subject of continuing rent control beyond July 1 of this year to determine if it is still necessary in view of changes that may take place before the present law runs out.

I do believe that these congressional hearing on extending rent control for another year will produce facts which will show clearly that the controls must go on for a time longer. And if the facts do show conclusively that rent control must be continued, you may be sure that I shall do everything in my power to see that the law is extended.

Statement of Army and Navy Union, United States of America, on Armed Preparedness

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have all been very much interested in having our civilian population instructed as to what can be done to cope with the atomic bomb for the protection of the civilian population and also what can be done against communism.

I am including as part of my remarks a release from the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, dated March 5, at their request. It reads as follows:

Whereas the President's Own Garrison, No. 104, Army and Navy Union, United States of America, is vitally interested in national civil defense and in being heard in connection with the various phases thereof; and

Whereas the possibility of an enemy attack upon our cities with the terrible devastation that would result therefrom, is now fully realized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the civil defense planning against such attack upon our cities, both from within and without, be accelerated; be it further

Resolved, That the vital part to be played by all means of communication in the control of the civil population in the event of such emergency or attack be recognized; and that the civil defense planning recognize the great value of radio broadcasting through warnings and instructions to the civil population of our cities by established broadcasting stations and through the use of transportation broadcasting such as in use on trains, buses and streetcars; be it further

Resolved, That it be recommended to United States Attorney George Morris Fay that his office investigate the actions and motives behind the actions of any who would interfere with communications systems essential to the national defense, since such interference might endanger thousands of lives in the event of an attack on cities of our Nation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Department of Defense, the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Members of Congress and the press; be it further

Resolved, That our national headquarters, departments and other posts be informed of the adoption of this resolution and that such headquarters, departments and posts be requested to adopt this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That the New York Journal American be congratulated for its special story of February 27 portraying effects of atomic attacks upon our cities.

The above resolution was passed at the regular meeting of the President's Own Garrison, No. 104, Army and Navy Union, United States of America, held Monday evening, February 27, 1950, and distributed for the Sunday press of March 5, 1950.

By order of Commander Bladen.

Trade and Tariff Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address of

King George VI to the British House of Parliament, as it appeared in last night's Star. I call particular attention to the point in the address where the King said:

You will be asked to approve orders making certain changes in the customs tariff arising from agreements which my government concluded last summer at the meeting at Annecy, at which the governments of the Commonwealth were represented.

It is evident that in Great Britain, as in most other countries, the legislative body approves trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch. I believe the United States is one of the very few countries in which the legislative branch has no say whatever in approving or disapproving these trade agreements.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF KING'S ADDRESS

My Lords and members of the House of Commons, I am proud to recognize that my people, by a sustained endeavor, have increased industrial and agricultural production, and thereby helped our country forward to greater prosperity. In this task they have been greatly assisted by the help and cooperation of the governments and peoples of other parts of the Commonwealth.

The world shortage of dollars, in which this country has shared, has again been eased by generous help from the United States of America and Canada. Renewed efforts will, however, be required to secure a balance in the country's overseas trade and, in particular, to increase earnings in North America.

My government will maintain their wholehearted support of the organization for European Economic Cooperation, through which it is hoped to work out a new European payments scheme.

PLEASED BY COLOMBO PARLEY

I look forward with great pleasure to the visit of the President of the French Republic and Mme. Auriol.

My government in the United Kingdom warmly welcomed the opportunity provided by the recent meeting of Commonwealth Ministers in Colombo for a valuable exchange of views on foreign affairs.

In accordance with the recommendations of the meeting, my ministers look forward to cooperating with other Commonwealth governments in south and southeast Asia.

My government welcomes the inauguration of the 27th of December last of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia as an independent sovereign state, with whom diplomatic relations have been established.

On the 6th January my government accorded recognition to the central people's government of the People's Republic of China.

On the 7th of February my government granted recognition to the States of Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia, as associate states within the French Union.

SUPPORT PLEDGED TO UN

My government will continue to give full support to the United Nations, for it is only through an effective system of security that world peace can be assured. In particular, they will use their utmost endeavors, through the United Nations, to assist in finding a durable solution to the tremendous problem of atomic energy so that international agreement for adequate control and supervision of the production of atomic energy may be secured.

My government will do their utmost to insure the success of the Council of Europe.

The formation of a federal German government has made possible a progressive transfer of responsibility from the western Allies to the Germans. As a result my government has been able to make substantial reductions in the cost of their administration of Germany.

My ministers will maintain the closest relations with the other powers signatory to the North Atlantic and Brussells Treaties, and play their due part, in collaboration with the other powers, in strengthening common means of defense. My government will continue to take all necessary steps to insure that my armed forces are ready to meet their responsibilities in all parts of the world and the new Organization of Civil Defense will be developed.

COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT

My government is actively promoting the economic and social development of the colonial territories, and the Colonial Development Corp. is proving a useful instrument to this end.

Members of the House of Commons, the estimates for the public services will be laid before you in due course.

You will be asked to approve orders making certain changes in the customs tariff arising from agreements which my government concluded last summer at the meeting at Annecy, at which the governments of the Commonwealth were represented.

My lords and members of the House of Commons, the economic difficulties of this country have emphasized the need for renewed effort to expand the production of food from our own soil, and my government will continue to take all practical steps to encourage our agricultural population to increase output by every efficient means and to make better use of marginal land. The improvement of water supplies, particularly in rural areas, will continue to occupy the attention of my ministers and preparatory steps will be taken with a view to the introduction of legislation as soon as circumstances permit.

LIMITED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

In view of the restricted time available and the heavy volume of financial business to be transacted, my government propose only a limited program of legislation for the present session. Nevertheless, should other measures prove in their view to be immediately necessary for the maintenance of full employment and the national well-being, my minister will not hesitate to submit them to Parliament, even though they may seem likely to prove contentious.

A bill will be laid before you to amend the law relating to allotments in England and Wales and in Scotland.

A bill will be laid before you to amend the medical acts so as to raise the standard of medicinal education and to modify the constitution and disciplinary procedure of the general medical council. Legislation will also be introduced to vary the constitution of the central midwives boards and to make other alterations in the law relating to midwives.

A measure will be laid before you to provide a uniform code for regulating the breaking-up of streets by public utility undertakings; also a measure to empower highway authorities to place and maintain cattle grids in highways.

You will be invited to pass a bill to regulate and improve the living conditions of the crews of fishing trawlers.

You will be asked to approve legislation giving further encouragement to the transfer of industrial undertakings to the development areas.

The Senate and the Displaced-Persons Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Senate and the Displaced-Persons Bill—The Truth Behind America's Shame," by Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, of Chicago. The speech has been edited in accordance with the rules of the United States Senate, because, in my personal judgment, in its original form it contained certain comments which I thought violated the rules of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE AND THE DP BILL—THE TRUTH BEHIND AMERICA'S SHAME

Text: "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Leviticus 19: 33–34.)

Last Saturday night the United States Senate, eager to finish its busy calendar and get home to mend political fences, permitted a horrible travesty of American idealism to be perpetrated by a handful of obstructionist Senators. By a vote of 36–30 it decided to return the DP bill (known officially as H. R. 4567) to the Senate Judiciary Committee for further consideration, which was a polite way of killing it for this session.

There is a story behind this shameful and unworthy act of the Senate that ought to be made known. This morning I propose to tell something about the present law of the land known as the DP Act of 1943, how it came to be law, why it isn't working as well as it ought; what happened to the DP bill, who opposed it, what their tactics were, and why the bill failed. I am deeply aroused over this because I believe we Americans have a duty to perform and a responsibility to discharge.

Furthermore, I speak to this question this morning because religion must always be concerned with kindness, generosity, and humanitarianism, with "one law for the stranger and the home-born," and when these are thwarted, as they were this week, the pulpit must speak out with its eternal message—before it is too late.

I

To find some clues for understanding the whole problem let's go back into a little American history. This country's traditional immigration policy has clearly established the principle of offering asylum for the oppressed. That has always been one of our most cherished political doctrines. Leaders of all parties and all periods have consistently supported it. By virtue of that doctrine America has become synonymous with freedom, with opportunity for pioneer men and women to share with their sturdy children in the development of a great continent.

All of us are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Only the Indians are true natives. And to the Indians, the Pilgrims in their day seemed like undesirable aliens. We are a nation of immigrants, as Louis Adamic has described us. Thirty-five million newcomers have spilled themselves over

a new continent; they grubbed and lugged and heaved and dug, until this modern democratic Republic was created.

The history of immigration to the United States of America can be divided into four periods: (1) The colonial period, from the initial white settlement to 1783, was a period when immigration was considered essential to the future development of the Colonies. Lord Baltimore and William Penn engaged in gigantic real-estate operations. They needed manpower. They brought over all the immigrants they could—with bounties, prizes, and inducements. (2) There followed a period of "free immigration" from 1783 to 1830, when the entry of people was totally unregulated. (3) From 1830 to 1882, the States controlled their own immigration policies, each according to its own interests and views. States' rights ruled supreme. (4) From 1882 to the present time, during which Federal controls of immigration have operated.

In 1921 the United States drastically changed its immigration policy. Until then almost any person in good physical and mental health and of sound moral character could enter. After World War I widespread demand for restriction of mass migrations set in. It was a time of narrow isolationism: we abandoned the League of Nations, we tolerated KKK, we listened to Henry Ford. In 1924 the Johnston Act was passed which became our basic immigration statute: the number of immigrants who could enter the United States in any year was limited by quota to 153,000. The quota system became law.

What are the arguments of the narrow nationalists who oppose any liberalizing of our immigration restrictions? Mostly they appeal to fear; fear of the foreigner, fear of his manners and customs, fear of job competition, fear of his political ideology, fear of contamination from aliens, fear of letting down the bars recently set up. * * *

I read through hundreds of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week. Over and over again in long-winded speeches, Senators said the same thing. What an insight one gets into our legislative process by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The truth is that immigrants do not merely take jobs; they creat jobs for others. They don't merely receive wages; they spend wages and increase the demand for goods and services. They stimulate rather than drag upon the economic life of the country. They start new enterprises, develop new markets, introduce new processes. Immigrants become new buyers, new consumers. They often bring skills in critically needed categories, like tailors, doctors, nurses, carpenters, shoemakers.

The other great fear of little men who oppose bringing DP's to America is that they bring with them subversive doctrines that will infect this country with communism. But the law is clear on this point, and no one advocates its change: the law stipulates that "aliens entertaining or advocating views inimical to organized government or who are anarchists will not be admitted." Let the law be enforced. No one is pleading for special privileges for the Communists. Let the FBI do its job. Let the courts do their job. Liberals ask only for justice, decency, and humanitarianism for the stranger.

Some reactionary special interests who have not quite gotten over their prewar isolationism take the position that until homes are found for all Americans, until our unemployment problem is solved, until the foreigners legally and illegally here are assimilated, until we are sure those already here do not imperil our way of life and our national security, there should be no further immigration permitted. But they forget that we have not finished the war against Hitler until we have provided homes and hope for the first and most pitiful victims of Hitler. The war is not over and neither is the peace won. We have only an armistice, an armed truce. The cold war now being waged with the Soviet Union is largely a battle of power politics and propaganda. How can we gain allies among different nations of the world if we cannot show them that democracy is superior to communism? How can we give other countries this assurance when we preach one thing and practice another?

II

Then we come to the pitiful plight of the war's aftermath—the DP's—those 800,000 Poles, Lithuanian, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainian Yugoslavs and stateless people who still languish in concentration camps, fed and maintained by the International Refugee Organization which incidentally is supported chiefly from American taxes.

The question is: What is to become of them?

Three alternatives must be dismissed at once. They cannot be repatriated to their homes behind the iron curtain. They cannot be sent to Germany, a country still nazified and now being renazified under the very noses of the Allies. They cannot be maintained indefinitely in the assembly centers with no hope of a future. A fourth alternative is inescapable: they must be resettled in free countries where they can strike new roots and build new productive lives for themselves and their children.

Nearly 30 countries began accepting DP's before our Congress passed the DP Act of 1948. When that bill finally came to the White House, President Truman saw at once that it was poorly drawn and discriminated against the very people whom he wanted to see helped: the DP's themselves. He reluctantly signed the bill because the Eightieth Congress had already adjourned; to veto the bill would have meant no law at all. Its provisions were unfair, discriminatory, and un-American.

It was no surprise then that the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is not operating as a success. To show you how poorly the Displaced Persons Act has been working, just look at the statistics for its first year of operation.

Under the terms of the law, 100,000 might have entered the United States in its first year of operation which ended June 30, 1949. Actually only 39,734 entered. Of these 20,182 were dependents—over half the number; 9,470 were wives and 10,712 were children. In a nation of 60,000,000 jobs, some Senators are worried about less than 20,000 wage-earners upsetting the whole American economy!

Why, you may ask, has the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 not worked out more successfully? Why must it be amended?

In the first place, the "cut-off" date is too early. By the "cut-off" date is meant the date after which displaced persons are not eligible for the benefits of the act. The "cut-off" date was set as December 22, 1945, but many DP's fled from behind the iron curtain into Allied zones after December 22, 1945. Consequently, they could not qualify for visas under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

In the second place, the act stipulated that 30 percent had to be agriculturalists. If that figure was not met, the entire number of visas issued had to be lowered proportionately. But most DP's are not farm folk. They are artisans and workmen, professional people, or just wives and children. This has caused another bottleneck, slowing down the processing of DP's.

In the third place, 40 percent had to come from territories annexed by Soviet Union—Eastern Poland and Baltic countries. But when a man is torn from his roots and roams about Europe, his citizenship papers, his birth certificate, his personal records, are frequently lost or destroyed. This stipulation has been another bottleneck thwarting the administration of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 requiring amendment.

Congressman CELLER, of New York, introduced a bill which immediately became known as the DP bill (H. R. 4567). This bill proposed that the date of eligibility for DP's be changed from the discriminatory date of December 22, 1945—the date which arbitrarily excluded all deserving DP's who had fled into Allied zones after that date to a new date, January 1, 1949. The new date would give opportunity to recent political refugees—especially Catholics and Jews—who had fled from Poland, Hungary, and other iron-curtain countries.

Secondly, the bill would increase the number of DP's to be admitted to the United States from 204,000 in 2 years to 339,000 in 3 years—an increase of 134,000.

Thirdly, the bill eliminates the discriminatory features of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 in that 30 percent had to be agriculturalists, and 40 percent had to come from territories recently annexed by the Soviet Union. These two features have been the principal bottlenecks of the present act.

And fourthly, the bill provides for special screening to be sure that Communists and Fascists are barred from coming to the United States.

Actually then, H. R. 4567 is merely a bill to liberalize an existing statute—an amendment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, so that the bottlenecks and administrative headaches might be removed and the law made more workable.

In the course of debate, Senator IVES, Republican, of New York, declared:

"Somehow many people seem to have acquired the erroneous idea that the United States already has taken a large share of the DP's in Europe. Nothing could be further from the truth. Actually, this country has accepted only about 15 percent of all the DP's. * * * Of the 604,000 DP's resettled, the United States has accepted only 84,000, of whom 44,000 had been admitted * * * prior to the enactment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. * * * Compare these figures to the 123,000 persons taken by war-torn little Israel * * * and the 99,000 persons taken in by bombed-out Britain, herself in the throes of serious domestic problems." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., October 15, 1949, p. 14676.)

Two Senators were careful to note the moral obligation of the United States in the course of the debate. Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, declared:

"It is my desire to see the United States fully live up to its responsibility as the greatest power in the world today. Helping in times of distress is a great characteristic of our Nation. The displaced persons are the aftermath of war. Other countries have helped to a far greater degree in proportion to their ability than have we to find them homes." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., October 15, 1949, p. 14677.)

And Senator MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, went on to say:

"We are dealing here with a great moral obligation. * * * It (the bill) asks the United States to take only a fair share of these people, on the basis of terms and conditions which are reasonable. * * * By the passage of this bill, I think we shall give great reassurance to the peoples all over this world that we do practice our ideals. * * * Once again America has a tendency to talk in terms of personal liberty and freedom and protecting the dignity of the individual, but frequently (she) falls short of putting those ideals into practice. * * * The passage of this bill will be an irrefutable answer to those who are seeking to spread that sort of propaganda against my country." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 81st Cong., 1st sess., October 14, 1949, p. 14547.)

IV

Late Saturday night—October 15, 1949—the final vote came: 36 Senators voted to recommit the bill to the Judiciary Committee

with orders to report back on the bill by January 25, 1950; 30 Senators voted against this "no-action this session" way of killing the bill; 30 Senators did not vote at all. They were absent at the time of voting.

When you analyze the Senate voting record, one fact immediately strikes you in the face. It was the absentees who beat the DP's.

Senator McCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the immigration subcommittee had refused to let the bill come to the Senate floor. Only a bi-partisan motion to force the bill out of committee, led by Senator LUCAS, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator TAFT, Republican of Ohio, both great friends of the DP bill, brought the measure to the floor of the Senate for debate. But by then it was too late. The Senate was anxious to go home—impatient with long sessions. The bill would have passed with a clear majority had it been scheduled earlier in the session.

Senator McCARRAN waited until the end of the session before deciding to go to Europe. He cabled the Senate he had made a great discovery. Some DP's did not have bona fide passports. Now isn't that a terrible thing? What did the distinguished Senator from Nevada think those poor devils have been doing for passports all these years, waiting for his little inspection trip? They had passports all right. They were passports to nowhere.

So Senator McCARRAN asked the Senate to wait for his return before voting. But the Senate wanted to go home. They wanted to settle up their unfinished business. So a "gentleman's agreement" developed to force a vote when many Senators had left town for the weekend, because they thought a filibuster was on and there would be no vote until Monday. Late in the session Saturday night, with 30 Senators off the floor, a vote was called. The result, 36 voted for recommitment, 30 against it. That means: 36 Senators voted against the DP's, 30 for them. DP's must languish in concentration camps still longer before the American Senate finds it convenient to voting them life, liberty, and a chance to pursue happiness.

Passing or defeating this bill is not going to make much difference in the American economy. But it is going to make a great deal of difference to the thousands of Nazi and Communist victims in Europe. Even more important, it is going to make a great deal of difference to the honor and conscience of the United States, which of all countries in the world can best afford to provide a haven for those who have suffered religious and political persecutions * * * for the very kind of people who have done so much to help make this country the great nation that it is. (New York Times, October 14, 1949.)

A moral duty was missed, said the New York Times, "a moral disaster in which the convenience of absent Senators has been permitted to outweigh the misery and the heartbreaks of thousands of refugees in Europe to whom the bill meant new life and hope." (October 18, 1949.)

V

The decision of the Senate is not final—just postponed. There is something for each of us to do.

What, then, can each of us do?

1. Tell Senator LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who are now home from Washington, that we citizens of Illinois are proud of the gallant fight which they put up for decency and humanitarianism. Encourage them to go on fighting for an American principle. It is awfully easy for a Senator to get the idea that the folks back home do not appreciate the abuse he takes when he fights for a great cause. People take for granted the fine things a Senator does. But when he makes a single mistake he hears plenty. So tell Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Senator SCOTT LUCAS that the people support the stand they have taken.

2. If you have never been a letter writer before, start writing a letter right now, as soon as you get home from Temple, to the editors of each of our four metropolitan newspapers. The "letters to the editor" printed on the editorial page represent a cross-section of the people's opinions; sometimes they even influence the thinking of editorial writers. Write and tell our local papers in a short, simple way just what I have been saying this morning—that it is scandalous for the Senate to desert those DP's; that America has a responsibility to show peoples of the world that we practice the humanitarianism we prescribe for others.

3. Have any convention you attend or business organization you belong to pass a resolution and send it to all 96 Members of the Senate.

4. Support the effort of the Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons, 303 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., led by Earl G. Harrison, former United States Commissioner of Immigration. This is the organization that is working night and day to mobilize public support for the forgotten DP's.

All this must be done now. The Senate has adjourned until January. The Judiciary Committee, to which the displaced persons bill was remanded, was ordered to report back on the bill by January 25. Let the members of that committee know that we, the people, demand justice and decency for those whom a few Senators have talked to death.

VI

One final thing I want to make clear. Most of the 800,000 DP's in Europe are not Jews. Only a small proportion, less than 20 percent, are Jews. And among the so-called hard-core category of DP's—the old, the sick, the infirm, the handicapped—less than 5 percent are Jews.

But Jews know what it means to have no home. Our own tragic experience in the thirties and forties has taught our people a profound sympathy for any human being who is displaced from his home and from those he loves. Our religion has taught us for 3,000 years to pour out our hearts and our treasure to the stranger * * * to treat him as our very own.

I raise my voice as a rabbi, not alone for the fractional proportion who are my people, but for all the DP's—Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, even those who have lost their faith. They are human beings. They are children of God. They are my brethren, and I must be my brother's keeper. Judaism teaches me that. "One law shall there be for the stranger and the home-born; thou shalt love him as thyself * * * for once ye were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Leviticus 19: 33–34.)

It is a terrible responsibility to be an American these days. The traditions of the United States as a land of opportunity and sanctuary for the oppressed have not been forgotten by those thousands of DP's who look desperately to America. We are the only country with the resources, the space, the traditions, the potentialities.

What is more, we will live much more comfortably with ourselves if we bestir ourselves to do something for others. Let us at least keep our self-respect by striving to prove worthy of the inscription guarding the entrance to New York Harbor. Let all America reverberate with Emma Lazarus' motto on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse to your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Evidence of Contempt," from the Washington Post of March 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVIDENCE OF CONTEMPT

Though the coal strike is over, the basic question that it raised is far from being settled. That question is whether the Government can compel a union which is endangering the national health and safety to end its strike. We had supposed that this issue was settled by the rulings of the higher courts in similar cases. But Judge Keech found the miners not to be in contempt. The Department of Justice, he said, had not proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the union was responsible for continuation of the strike. This caused us to believe that the Department had been negligent in not submitting the kind of evidence that would have been convincing, for the fact of contempt seemed to be indisputable.

We had felt, specifically, that the case could have been buttressed by evidence of goon squads at work to keep men out of the mines and various other acts in defiance of the court's order. It has been brought to our attention, however, that evidence of this type might have confirmed the UMW's contention that continuation of the strike was due wholly to the action of individual miners, and there was no evidence of secret communication between the UMW and the locals counteracting Mr. Lewis' return-to-work order. In these circumstances the Government felt—and on reconsideration we now feel—that the most convincing evidence of contempt was to be found in the fact that 370,000 miners continued their strike and the UMW continued to take advantage of that strike in bargaining with the operators. Certainly if the courts are going to disregard such evidence and rely upon verbal instructions by union headquarters, which obviously do not convey the real wishes of the union officials, protection of the national health and safety by means of injunction may well prove impossible.

For this reason it is of the utmost importance that this legal issue be settled. The Department of Justice has appealed Judge Keech's ruling to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. We hope that the court will find it feasible to rule on the law involved in spite of the wind-up of the strike; for it the present state of confusion were left unresolved, Congress and the courts would be at a great disadvantage in dealing with any similar national emergencies that might arise.

There is some reason for believing that Judge Keech misunderstood the ruling of the court of appeals in the case that grew out of the 1948 strike. In that instance Mr. Lewis had failed to order the miners back to work on April 5 when the temporary restraining order was served on the union. He gave no instructions to the miners until April 12, when the dispute concerning the welfare fund was settled. The Court of Appeals did

say, in upholding the conviction for contempt, that "if Lewis had sent on April 5 telegrams of a directory or advisory nature, similar to those he sent on April 12, neither he nor the union would have been guilty of contempt of the court's order." But this has to be read in the light of the fact that Mr. Lewis' order of April 12 had the effect of sending the miners back to their jobs. In the present instance Mr. Lewis went through the motions of ordering the men back and the miners, knowing he was under compulsion, respected his wishes instead of his word. Certainly this relieved Mr. Lewis from any charge of contempt; but should it free the union from contempt when the totality of its membership was openly defying the court's order?

In the previous case the court of appeals noted: "The evidence is overwhelming that the walk-out was concerted." The evidence of concerted action was even more overwhelming last week. Should the courts decide to ignore such evidence and rely upon some overt act of contempt upon the part of union officials, they would be issuing a general invitation to lawlessness and irresponsibility on the part of big national unions. It is difficult to believe that the last word from the courts will be so out of keeping with the realities of present-day union practices.

L'Affaire Coca-Cola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "L'Affaire Coca-Cola" from last night's Evening Star. It is apparent from this editorial that the French are not at all anxious to reciprocate the many favors the United States has done for their nation. On this particular occasion the proposal to ban Coca-Cola did not quite succeed; but we have no assurance, of course, that the proposed ban will not be made after our gifts under the Marshall plan have come to an end.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L'AFFAIRE COCA-COLA

The old adage that politics makes strange bedfellows has just been vividly illustrated by an action of the French National Assembly. There, an oddly matched bloc of conservative Popular Republicans and Communists, hitherto unable to agree on anything, united to bar Coca-Cola from France.

As may be imagined, the reasons behind this singular combine are very different. The Popular Republicans responded to pressure from the great French wine-growing interests, which are among their most powerful backers. It would seem that far too many Frenchmen are neglecting the traditional vin ordinaire. So the wine growers are up in arms. Their propaganda attracted the attention of the Communist high command, which saw a golden opportunity to use the issue as another stick to belabor Uncle Sam. So France is deluged with Communist warnings against the "coca-colonization of France," denounced as a pernicious economic invasion of the country and as a vehicle of United States imperialism. The French consumer is pictured as soon to be made "coca-colique," with the aid of lurid advertising techniques. All this, despite the fact that sales of Coca-Cola involve no loss of dollar credits to France, since the concentrate is made at a factory in French Morocco, while distribution is entirely in French hands.

Nevertheless, the measure as passed by the Assembly would effectively ban the beverage from France. Ostensibly this rests on grounds of health, albeit it is not specifically mentioned in the bill, for that would openly violate trade agreements by discriminating against an established United States product.

Problems of the United States in the Present War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. William J. Donovan on the occasion of the presentation to him of the Alexander Hamilton award by Columbia University on February 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Soviet Union has completed the conquest of China and this has been given formal approval by the 30-year peace treaty.

Throughout the Far East this marks a defeat for the United States.

This victory now makes Russia the dominant power in Asia as well as in Europe.

There may be disagreement whether this breach of the former balance of power in Asia has already gone so far that it threatens our security. But there can be no difference of opinion that the balance of power on which formal peace depends will be hopelessly upset if the Russians carry out their projected extension of the Chinese conquest to Indochina, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma. This was the path by which the Japanese before them got all the way to India.

I visited all these countries, except Burma and Korea, and also visited Japan. During my trip the Russians boldly announced that they were going to try for just such an extension of their continental conquest. They made that announcement by recognizing the Communist revolutionary parties as the government of French Indochina. Within a week the Western Powers had to accept the challenge. The British, the French, and ourselves recognized the opposition government of Bao Dai. In Asia it is completely appreciated that the Russians have declared a subversive war on the rest of non-Communist Asia and ourselves. I wonder if the significance of that choosing up of sides has really come home to us here in the United States.

In the face of this Russian declaration of further conquest beyond China, with the Russians having demonstrated that they do know how to wage this kind of war, the non-Communist Asiatics wonder if the poet Shelley does describe us, if we indeed are "An ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain."

They want to be on our side if we're safe to be with, if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad.

What is there we can do to justify their reliance upon us? What are the elements in that area that we can pull together for the sake of the people there as well as for our peace and security? As a line of departure I accept the statement of the Secretary of State that "It is hardly necessary for me to say that an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States, but I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack." Let us see how, even at this late day, this defense could be accomplished.

Southeast Asia stretches from the subcontinent of India to the Australia subcontinent. In the center of this great south Asian triangle lies the spreading culture of southeast Asia—on the Indochinese peninsula, on Burma, Siam, and Malaya. On the triangle at its base are the archipelagoes of Indonesia and the Philippines.

Within this triangle live almost 600,000,000 people or about 25 percent of humanity.

The first thing we have to do is to recognize that the theater is one theater—Burma, India, Siam, Indochina, Manila, Malaya, Formosa, Korea, Japan.

That it is all one in spite of the differences that lie between. That it is one in which victories won, time gained, or material salvaged, in Indochina or Formosa may greatly help in an intelligent defense of the Philippines or in the reconstruction of Burma or Indonesia.

When we look at our map and wipe out of our minds the wartime artificial separation into theaters of operation, we see that the western Pacific is a strategic unit of which the Philippines are an integral part.

There is disorder to the point of chaos in Burma. Yet it is the bulwark before India and only speedy political and economic reform can save it from Soviet exploitation. In Indochina the Soviet has picked Ho Chi-Minh, to do there what they used Mao to do in China proper. In Malaya the British are contending against a campaign of ambush and assassination by the Malayan Communist Party.

Japan and its associated islands 1,600 miles from the Philippines give it protection from the north and Formosa almost halfway between must be denied to enemy occupation by National China until next June at least.

Indonesia is the master key for the defense of the Philippines because with Malaya it forms a protective shield against the south and that shield is given depth by Australia only 300 miles south of it. Strategically, southeast Asia is of more than local interest. Whoever controls the Straits of Malacca and Singapore dominates a sea route comparable in importance with the Panama Canal. Indonesia is an island gate between the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. In 1942 Japan took the islands and broke out of the Pacific to extend its operations as far west as Ceylon. The Indian Ocean may well be the warm water target that Russia has always sought.

The American naval and air bases in the Philippines are only a thousand miles from Saigon in French Indochina.

Indonesia is the most important of the southeast Asian countries that have emerged from colonial status into nationhood. An archipelago stretching nearly 4,000 miles, or one-seventh of the way around the earth, and having some 750,000 square miles of land area and a population of 75,000,000.

It is probably the most westernized of the far-eastern countries. Its economic, financial, and even its transport system are based upon western models. It is even by modern standards rich in resources, and is fully able to repay any loans advanced to it for reconstruction and capital expenditures.

Its top leadership is anti-Communist by conviction. Although on lower levels, there is needed experience in organization and administration, the Government in control is about the best that could be obtained. The four or five leading men are competent and honest. They seek United States technical advice both of an industrial and military nature. If we could meet this request for aid as well as counsel, our position would gain strength from the fact that for the last 2 years we have carried out a policy there, consistent, definite, and to a degree successful.

In addition our ambassadors in the vital countries of India, Siam, and Indonesia are men of training, experience, and understanding. They already have the respect and friendship of those countries to which they are accredited.

There is general agreement among those whose opinion should be given weight that Russia has a program in southeast Asia and that the timetable for that program has been stepped up in an endeavor to take full advantage of the momentum from their speedy victories in China.

The urgency requires leadership now. It requires a leader, whether you call him a supreme commander or a high commissioner with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems. He should be vested with the discretion to deal with those problems on the spot and should be located in the theater close enough to see it at first hand, yet not so close as to lose his perspective.

The cooperation of the British, the French, and the Dutch would be eagerly given, and they know our leadership is needed. The establishment of such leadership would be welcomed by the people of the countries concerned and would allay their present fear that we would abandon them.

We must make clear to them that having picked our friends we will stay with them to the finish whatever the consequence.

We have a precedent for this action.

In June 1948 Russia, in the Berlin blockade, employed a menacing and dangerous tactic to test the will of the western Allies and to stop the European recovery program at the outset.

General Clay met the challenge with boldness and resolution. The dramatic success of Operation Vittles, which maintained Berlin's food supply despite the seizure of the city, caught the Soviets flatfooted with surprise.

General Clay saw that, if the Soviets intended war, war could not be avoided by a retreat from Berlin. On the contrary, it would mean that we would be driven progressively to weaker positions. He saw, too, that if Russia was bluffing, that the moment had come to call the bluff or to surrender the initiative he had won.

The courageous and common-sense action of General Clay in that crisis is a guide and an example for us all.

We have shown our great desire for peace with Russia and our willingness to settle differences. But we have learned that up to now, at least, agreement with the Russians is a hopeless illusion.

We now see that what happens in Berlin or in Peking has its repercussions in every area of the world where our country and the Soviet Union face each other. It is a war of subversion on a global scale, in which Russia is trying to whipsaw us from one side of the world to the other.

We must win now the war in which we find ourselves. It is a war which on many fronts Russia has been waging and winning. A war that we can lose without a shot being fired. A war that if we win may make impossible a shooting war. We can neither buy our way out nor appease our way out. Our strength must be found in ourselves—in our decision and in our resolution.

The Government Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Farm Program Must Be Rewritten," by George Minot, which was published in the Boston Herald on March 5, 1950. This is one of the most timely articles of its kind that I have seen, and it should interest the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FARM PROGRAM MUST BE REWRITTEN—$6,000,000,000 WILL BE TIED UP IN SURPLUSES A YEAR FROM NOW

(By George Minot)

It is about time the American farmer was taken off the political auction block. And it is long past the time when the American taxpayer should demand that the whole vast program of private supports be reviewed. The Irish potato, on which we have spent upward of half a billion dollars in 5 years of price support, is only a tiny part of a terrific mess.

Secretary Brannan has been talking about dumping the potatoes or selling them for a penny a bag as if that would solve the whole matter. Pretty soon he will try the same tactics with 200,000,000 dozen dried eggs and $27,000,000 worth of dried milk. Senator LUCAS wants to remove all price supports from potatoes unless the Maine farmers accept rigid production control. Somebody should ask him how he feels about a similar program for corn and wheat that are raised in his State of Illinois. He sings a different tune on that.

Right now the Department of Agriculture has more than three and a half billion dollars' worth of surplus commodities it cannot get rid of. It is little wonder that there is overwhelming resentment against the farm program. It hits the public's pocketbook in two ways. It takes tax dollars to buy up and dump unneeded surpluses. In doing this it holds consumer prices higher than their natural levels.

SUPPORT PROGRAM CAN'T BE STOPPED

The farmers will tell you, on the other hand, and they are upheld by economists, that if the support program is abandoned or trimmed too sharply, it will result in a depression that will engulf the Nation. That's probably correct.

Let's look at some of the surpluses on hand the value of which adds up to $3,345,129,317:

Tobacco	pounds	367,258,290
Cotton	bales	6,036,588
Wheat	bushels	465,226,944
Linseed oil	pounds	394,827,620
Flaxseed	bushels	13,943,222
Corn	do	510,654,685
Dried eggs	dozen	210,000,000
Butter	pounds	96,260,088
Wool	do	69,403,900
Dry beans	hundredweight	4,850,795
Barley	bushels	24,626,019
Dried milk	pounds	215,799,300
Cheese	do	22,900,000

Other items in the surplus list have a value of $314,000,000.

It doesn't end there, because the perishables have to be stored in commercial cold storage and dry storage warehouses all through the dairy farm belt from New York to Minnesota. The Government—that is you—has to pay the storage costs, and they are not inconsiderable.

For instance, for butter it is 35 cents per 100 pounds for the first month, and 15 cents per hundred every month thereafter. What it amounts to here is that the price of the butter is advancing about a cent a pound for the first 6 months, and a little less than a cent more for every 6 months thereafter.

EASTERNERS HURT

The day is fast approaching when the Department of Agriculture is going to be faced with proposals for the wholesale destruction of much of the $3,500,000,000 worth of commodities listed above.

To complicate the situation, the House passed a bill the other day to add from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 acres to this year's cotton crop and added an unspecified number of acres to this year's peanut crop. The cotton and peanut farmers were helped in this action by representatives of the wheat and corn areas, with the implied understanding that their request for increased acreage on both wheat and corn will be supported by the cotton and peanut representatives.

The Senate followed suit by adding acreage to cotton, wheat, and peanuts.

These are the people in Congress who really are murdering the eastern farmer. Take the poultryman. He is going to be forced out of business or into bankruptcy because he cannot possibly pay the artifically high costs for commercial feeds resulting directly from the Government's high support program.

The eastern dairy farmer is just beginning to feel the pinch. His situation is going to be exactly like the poultryman's unless something is done to rectify the inequalities under the support law as it now exists.

FARM PICTURE BLACK

There are a couple of other items that make the farm picture look black.

First, Americans are not eating as much as they used to. They have cut down their appetites significantly in the last couple of years. The answer is supposed to be that they have so many other things on which to spend their money nowadays—automobiles, television sets, refrigerators, and homes—that they just are not spending as much as they used to for the things they eat.

Secondly, the value of the food commodities we ship overseas is expected to drop between half a billion and a billion dollars this year.

Export, principally under the ECA programs, has provided a big outlet for three main money crops raised by United States farmers—wheat, cotton, and tobacco. During the 1948–49 crop year we shipped out half a billion bushels of wheat, almost as many pounds of tobacco and 4,750,000 bales of cotton. Each of these will drop significantly this year, primarily because of good weather and big crops overseas.

In the ECA countries alone, it is said, farm production is now at 90 percent of the prewar level. And on a long-range basis, these European countries are devoting a constantly larger part of their manufacturing capacity to the production of fertilizers and trucks and farm machinery. This means they will need less and less from us.

SPUD SURPLUS

At home, it seems obvious that there will be another surplus of potatoes. In fact, the Government already is buying early-grown 1950 crop spuds to carry out price guaranties.

Then it is obvious that although the Government has more than $100,000,000 worth of surplus eggs and dried milk, which it is

trying to give away for relief use, even larger purchases of these items, as well as of butter, will be necessary this year.

There is also the probability that the Government will have to buy large quantities of pork this year to support hog prices. This would be taking supplies of meat away from consumers—with their own tax money—at a time when the Government is trying to get more and more meat onto the market.

Finally, in the darkening farm outlook there is almost certain to be an accumulation of additional surpluses on this year's crops of cotton, wheat, corn, and peanuts, which the Government will be obliged under the law to buy up and take off the market.

A MILE APART

The Associated Press estimates that the Government may have more than $6,000,000,000 tied up in surpluses a year from now, and that its postwar losses on perishable products may total upward of a billion dollars.

Thus when you take into account such developments as a rising public debt, Mr. Truman's pleadings for higher taxes and heavy expenditures for national defense, it becomes obvious that something must be done about the billions we are spending on the farmers. But almost everybody is a mile apart when they start to talk about what should be done.

For a starter, a good-sized slash in the cost of Government and a reduction in taxes would be the best kind of Federal aid the American farmer could get.

Control of Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the very fine organizations of which I am proud to be a member is the Wisconsin Grange—a vital element of the National Grange movement. In the March 1950 issue of the National Grange Monthly there is a splendid editorial comment by the distinguished master of the National Grange, Mr. Albert S. Goss. The theme of his comment is "Control of Monopoly"—a matter of crucial historic significance in the background of the early Grange movement and a matter of interest to every farmer, every laboring man, every businessman, every housewife, in the United States.

Albert Goss is one of the finest spokesman in our Nation on matters affecting the national welfare and particularly American agriculture. The members of the Grange, as well as the members of other vital farm organizations look to him as one of the real statesmen in American life, and Members of the Congress respect his wise counsel and judgment.

Time after time he has testified, with other distinguished farm leaders, on crucial issues affecting agriculture, and his suggestions have been of invaluable aid in the actual writing of farm bills.

He has commented on this crucial issue of monopoly. He wisely points out that monopolistic control in any hands—whether it is the hands of labor or of business or of Government—is harmful. Through the years I, too, have commented on this issue, for the fight against monopoly is a never ending fight.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this splendid editorial from the National Grange Monthly be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY CONTROL

Twenty years ago in 1929 agriculture employed 10,500,000 persons. By 1949 employment had shrunk to 8,000,000 persons, but the physical volume of agriculture output had increased 42 percent.

This tremendous increase in agricultural production efficiency is due principally to mechanization, improved seed and breeding stock, improved insecticide and fungicides, and improved farm practices generally.

Who benefits from such increased efficiency? The answer is that in a free economy, everyone benefits, if we define a free economy as one in which the government protects its citizens from both physical and economic aggression (Guide Post No. 3), so that they are free to develop their own talents in their own way, so long as they do not impose on others.

If someone held a monopoly in the automobile industry, or any other major industry so he could charge whatever the public would pay, the economic wealth created in a few major industries would soon be concentrated in a few hands. In such circumstances the benefits of technological improvements would result in a concentration of wealth and poverty such as America has never known. The farmers were the first to detect this danger with the rapid expansion of industry during the early days of the Grange, and to call for control of monopoly. It became the great issue around which the Grange was built three generations ago, and resulted in the enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, the only such law among the major nations of the whole world. Effective competition resulted in the advantages of invention, discovery, and technological improvement being gradually but steadily passed on to all our people, through a constant lowering of production costs and selling prices and a consequent rise in the standard of living. The results are many and noteworthy. Four only are noted: (1) In a few brief generations America has jumped from a third- or fourth-rate power to the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth; (2) among the great nations America has the largest middle-class group of any nation on earth; (3) Americans enjoy a better living standard than any other nation on earth; (4) Americans spend a smaller percent of their income for food than any other nation on earth, and eat better.

Turn anywhere else in all the world and we find that control of many of the essential sources of wealth lie in the hands of a comparatively few. There is a wide income gap between the working people and a small property-owning group. In most countries few of the workers are ever able to bridge that gap. They had no automobiles, electric refrigerators, telephones, or many of the conveniences which we commonly own and class as necessities, and very little hope of ever getting any. With a limited property-owning group, protected by varying degrees of perfectly legal monopolies and cartels, it is little wonder that they turn to socialism and communism as a means of bettering their position. They have never had experience with the American way and know nothing about it. The strange thing is that so many people in this country, where we have kept reasonable control over the abuse of monopoly, should turn to the remedies which so many European countries have tried to apply to their monopolistic abuses rather than applying more of our own remedy which has produced such good results.

Although the results of monopoly control have been good here in America, there is still room for much improvement. In time of the recent shortage of supplies, competition broke down in many instances and the public paid through the nose. We have not yet learned to apply voluntary controls effectively in such circumstances, and our efforts at Government price control in many instances only served to aggravate a bad situation. Also, in an effort to grant labor equality in bargaining position, we have set up the possibility of labor monopolies quite as threatening as industrial monopoly.

Despite these shortcomings, we are way ahead of the rest of the world in dealing with this problem, and very clearly the answer is not to abandon the course we have chosen in favor of Government monopoly, but rather to search out and remedy the shortcomings in our method so that the benefits of our great productive capacity will redound to all in lower costs and continually improved living standards from the bottom up.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Capital Press, of Salem, Oreg., written by the editor thereof, Mr. Henry M. Hanzen. The editorials deal with the problem of excise taxes, and the editor takes the position which the junior Senator from Oregon has taken for some years in the Senate, namely, that wartime excise taxes should be repealed.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLDS TOP HAND

(By Henry M. Hanzen)

Canada is booming.

So declares a high Canadian official.

He attributes the boom to Canada's repeal of a number of wartime excise taxes and the slashing of others.

Said this official:

"This tax program has already given the people more money to spend.

"Business is booming.

"From every side we get reports of increased business—increased income.

"We have avoided the business slump and the increase in unemployment the United States experienced recently.

"We are tremendously optimistic.

"We are sure now that the revenue flowing from the increase in business and our national income will more than offset the immediate loss of revenue from the tax cuts."

Canada has repealed the tax on transportation, amusements, telegraph and telephone messages.

It has cut the tax on jewelry, cosmetics, furs, luggage, handbags, fountain pens, cigarette lighters, and similar commodities.

Americans are still paying these wartime excise taxes.

They pay a tax of 15 percent on transportation, 20 percent on amusements, 20 percent on jewelry, 20 percent on cosmetics, 20 percent on luggage, handbags, fountain pens, cigarette lighters, and similar commodities.

In his message to Congress President Truman recommends that these excise taxes be reduced.

He declared the most serious inequities exist in these taxes, adding that were they cut it would help business.

But in his message the President made the cut in these excise taxes contingent on Congress increasing corporation, gift, and estate taxes to recoup the loss in revenue.

The President also took occasion to denounce tax loopholes which allow some groups to escape paying their fair share of the tax burden.

He cited the oil operators as one group and the moving-picture operators as another, pronouncing the tax evasions of both as shocking.

He demanded that these loopholes be closed by Congress and other tax reforms be made.

While Congress generally is agreeable to slashing excise taxes, the Republicans and Dixiecrats are balking on any increase in corporation, gift, and estate taxes.

Consequently the message will likely precipitate a tug of war between the Executive and the conservative Members of Congress.

The President, however, would appear to hold the top hand.

He has the veto power, and there are probably enough administration men to sustain it.

With this veto power he may be able to force through his tax program.

All the excise taxes the President recommends be cut were imposed during the war.

Primarily their purpose was to discourage civilian buying and save raw materials and labor for war work.

The war ended several years ago, and it is time now that the consumers were given a break.

CARNIVAL OF TAXES

(By Henry M. Hanzen)

The Tax Foundation, a private research organization, has been probing into hidden taxes.

It found plenty.

It found 151 taxes hidden in a loaf of bread, and 100 inside the shell of an egg.

It found similar taxes hidden in everything else we eat—every bite of food.

That is the principal reason why food prices are so high.

The Tax Foundation further found 116 taxes woven into a suit of clothes—found them woven to a greater or less extent into everything else a man wears, everything a woman wears, everything children wear.

That is the principal reason why wearing apparel is so high.

The Tax Foundation further found that Uncle Sam collects $210,688,165 annually on jewelry, $33,969,241 on cosmetics and toilet articles, $82,607,133 on luggage, $61,946,247 on furs.

That is the principal reason why so-called luxury articles for women are so high.

The Tax Foundation further found that there are between 700 and 1,000 hidden taxes in a new house.

That is the principal reason why the dream houses of GI couples are so high.

The Tax Foundation further found that Uncle Sam collects annually $2,247,000,000 in taxes on liquor.

That single item is larger than the total revenue for the Federal Government for the year 1933.

We pay hidden taxes on everything we eat, everything we drink, everything we wear, everything we use, every business transaction.

Altogether these hidden taxes total annually the giant sum of $7,600,000,000.

Combined with direct taxes these taxes comprise the Federal budget for this fiscal year, $42,400,000,000.

It is estimated that this budget represents $1 in taxes out of every $6 earned in the country.

Yet the Government will be $5,100,000,000 short.

How is all this money spent?

It is spent for foreign aid, defense, aid to veterans, social programs, development of natural resources, aid to farmers, public works, housing, education, labor programs, general government, interest on the public debt.

How much of it is wasted?

Billions.

The nonpartisan Hoover Commission, whose recommendations for the overhauling of the Federal Government has the blessing of President Truman, estimates the waste at a minimum of three billions.

Every State, county and municipal government is also permeated with waste.

We are living in a carnival of taxes, and waste of public funds.

It is time to call a halt on this colossal waste of the money of the taxpayers.

How Propaganda Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "KERR Denies His Gas Plan To Bring Increase," from the Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla., March 2, 1950. The article is a factual news story which gives some interesting background on the techniques employed to influence public opinion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR DENIES HIS GAS PLAN TO BRING INCREASE

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The battle over natural-gas regulation continued to rage on the national scene today, following a radio interview in which Senator ROBERT S. KERR denied that his pending legislation would bring increased gas rates to the American consumer.

On a radio program here with Columnist Marquis Childs, Senator KERR pointed out that Southwest independents are selling gas under long-term contracts already fixed for years to come. His legislation "assuring independents continued freedom from Federal regulation does not disturb a single contract," according to KERR.

"All of the present supply was secured by the consuming market without the independent producer ever having been regulated by the Federal Government," KERR said.

"The best interests of the consumer in the future will be served as it has in the past by the independent producers being free to sell to them without regulation or restriction. The amendments do not change in any way the jurisdiction or power of the Commission."

The frontal attack against the Kerr legislation is being led by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, with various other interested forces joining in the fray. The institute passed a resolution opposing the legislation at its convention in Kansas City last December, but officials here said City Attorney Bob Davidson, of Tulsa, voted against that resolution.

Individual members of the National Conference of Mayors are getting in their licks, but the organization as yet has taken no formal stand. Paul V. Betters, executive secretary, while not acting formally in the absence of an organization resolution, is assisting members in getting the opposition information.

The American Municipal Association, the general organization for all city officials, met last fall, but its publicity spokesman here said no resolution on the subject was even presented.

Charles H. Rhyne, Washington representative of the institute, spokesman for the critics of the Kerr bill, is getting convenient data from experts he doesn't identify. Rhyne, himself, appears unfamiliar with the subject. He did not know about the activities of State corporation commissions. He could offer no substantiation for his contention that the Kerr legislation would mean a 5-cent increase per 1,000 cubic feet, but said the estimate came from experts in certain cities.

The opposition to the legislation is faring well enough in the public battle of words, partly because handy generalizations are easy to make and technical legislation hard to get across to the public.

Name-calling, personal attacks, such as Rhyne launched on Kerr, always attract more attention and are difficult to combat when an issue is painted as a battle against the vested interests. That alone lures certain politicians into the fray. They see themselves riding as knights in shining armor in defense of the American consumer—and to political glory. The controversy over the gas legislation is snowballing on the national scene, and the climax will be reached when it is fought out on the floor of the Senate probably next week.

Proposed Peace Conference Between the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Door Is Still Open," published in the Portland Oregonian for February 15, 1950. The editorial was sent to me by Joseph R. McCready, of Forest Grove, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOOR IS STILL OPEN

Scarcely have the statements of Secretary of State Acheson and President Truman ceased from reverberation—to the effect that it is useless to direct a peace appeal to the Kremlin—than the State Department issues an invitation to the Russians to resume discussions of atomic energy at a hearing in the United Nations.

The sticking point remains, we assume, with Russia pinheadedly blocking the American and UN proposal of international control and inspection. But the situation is too potentially cataclysmic for impatient treatment. The surly suspicion of the Kremlin must be reduced, if humanly possible, by attrition through reassurance and reason. Mankind isn't gaming for marbles, but for survival. One hopes, and prayerfully, that the Russians will agree to a resumption of the talks.

It must occur to any logical analyst that Russians may in truth be as worried about the atomic energy dilemma as we are, and to mask their dread are resorting to brag and bluster. They are fools if they aren't scared out of their best felt boots. We are admittedly frightened, not of the potential enemy alone, but of the hideous choice we might have to make. That is why we grasp eagerly at the straw—if such it is—of resuming discussions. And that is why we read with intense gratification that favorable talk is current in Russia.

Said the attorney general of Great Britain, Sir Hartley Shawcross, of the deadlock that must be broken, if it is breakable, "I do not believe war is inevitable; I believe statesmanship can still avoid it." For our conduct in the promotion of peace we are accountable to ourselves, as the Kremlin is for its own. We must not weary of endeavor, through appealing to the Russians by every moral means, lest civilization should blunder into radioactive oblivion, dragging all life with it. The theoretical prospect beggars the fancy of Dante. If sustained patience is any insurance against it, let us cultivate the virtue as never before, for humanity's sake.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article relative to the settlement of the coal strike, written by Mr. Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—A great many people, including some of the strongest party supporters of President Truman's program as well as its Republican and Democratic opponents in Congress, apparently are united in the conviction that he mishandled the crisis over the Nation's soft-coal supply in a manner which was certain to lead to his request for power to seize the mines, and an intervening or ultimate settlement largely in the miners' favor. Many competent observers have been saying all along that this was John L. Lewis' objective from the end of the miners' contract period last July.

Hence, the President is under fire on three serious charges: (1) He delayed coming to grips with the plain threat in the coal fields to national health and safety until it was a reality; (2) he refrained so long from making use of the Taft-Hartley injunction procedures that the miners took this as encouragement to flout the law for which Mr. Truman showed such obvious distaste, which he had attacked as a slave labor act and sought to repeal; and (3) his tactics not only made inevitable his request for Government seizure, and the ultimate triumph of Mr. Lewis, but forced another national step toward nationalization (in this instance of the mines), which is a basic tenet of socialism.

RECALL TRUMAN STATEMENT

And his critics go on to say this drift and this result were the work of a President who said only recently that he "hasn't a drop of Marxist or Socialist blood" in him.

There is documentation for these harsh charges, though to prove them to the popular majority and make them endure as a political liability of Mr. Truman and his administration is the task which will first confront his critics in the congressional campaign of 1950. By the time the voters come to decision on Democratic candidates he favors for election in November, events may have blunted some or all of the accusations or the topic may be submerged in far graver ones.

Nevertheless, it is already plain that Mr. Truman and his administration are to be made the general issue in the 1950 elections—he, his Democratic opponents and the Republicans agree on that—and his handling of the coal situation in 1949–50 is certain to be a part of the issue. Among its facets these will appear:

1. The President has long denounced the Taft-Hartley Act as a slave-labor law, designed to put workers into involuntary servitude, and has constantly striven to repeal it, as he promised the voters in 1948 he would do. Insofar as this could undermine public acceptance of a law Mr. Truman was sworn to enforce, it has done so.

LAW PROVED TO BE WEAK

2. But when the President finally brought himself to invoke the law in an effort to suspend the coal strike, the virtually unanimous refusal of the miners to respect its enforcement by the courts showed that, instead of being an instrument of enslavement, it is too weak. Also, the miners' disregard of this and of the court injunction which grew out of the corollary effort to suspend the strike that was made by the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board calls for reconsideration by Congress of the bans it declined to legislate against industry-wide bargaining and against strikes at the sources of essential national supplies.

3. In every respect, therefore, the President was wrong about the kind of labor legislation which is needed and dilatory in making use of what there is.

At this writing, it seems that there will be powerful arguments against the President, his administration, and those Democrats who have supported and will defend them. If the items do not add up to a major political liability which could be liquidated by the election of another Congress opposed to the Fair Deal, then the President's opposition will have missed the boat again, or subsequent events will minimize what now appears to be the political peril of the administration, or the popular majority will show itself still disposed to support Mr. Truman on balance.

Administration Democrats who have been shying away from strong defense of the President's course, were beginning to take heart today, however, with the claim that the seizure message forced the operators to make a "fair" settlement. But numerous Democrats will not take that line—its accuracy is open to doubt. And most Republicans are seizing on the issue with avidity.

The President, in his message to Congress Friday asking for power to seize the mines temporarily, suggested the outline of the campaign answer he will make to the accusations. It is in general a declaration of faith in collective bargaining as the proper means to settle industrial disputes without Government intervention and in the propriety of his course first in delaying and then in using seizure as a settlement club. In detail, it makes the point that the coal industry is sick from causes which no administrative acts or policies can eradicate until a commission of inquiry can find the root of the trouble and a "solution of the basic difficulties."

SEEMING BASIS OF MESSAGE

In other words, the message seemed to be saying this:

"No law now existing or proposed, and no men entrusted with law enforcement, are capable of solving the problems of the coal industry as they now are or as they have been evaluated. Until the trouble is found and the remedy prescribed and taken, the only thing to do is to try to make collective bargaining work and assume that it will up to the twelfth hour and beyond."

The question is, Will that be an effective shield from the political attacks?

Importance of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wake Up America," by Melvin O. Steen, of the Missouri Conservation Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

(By Melvin O. Steen, Missouri Conservation Commission)

If you would know the true story of Americans, their wildlife and their land, look first to history. On its pages you will find that story revealed in the critical light of historical fact. To better understand this story, however, it is necessary to first scan the history of other men and their land. It is necessary to look at yesterday as well as at today.

Look at history, and you will see nation after nation march across its pages, to rise and flourish on the rape of a fertile land, and to pass on into national decay or oblivion with the depletion of that fertility. Look at history, America. When you do, you will see that civilized man has always misused the land. You will see many unproductive scars on old Mother Earth, lands that once housed and fed great nations. Look at the history of any nation that has ever tilled the soil, and you will see that man is not worthy of his stewardship of the land. He always despoils the land, and the degree of his destruction can be measured in terms of his tenure plus his so-called civilization.

When the source of man's sustenance and material glory will no longer sustain his way of life, he does one of two things: He sinks into individual and national decay, or he takes, by force of arms, more fertile land from some other nation. That is history.

Van Loon defines history in this short but tremendously significant sentence: "History is the story of a hungry animal in search of food." But man is not possessed of physical hunger alone. His hunger engulfs the whole array of human desire, and he uses the land to satiate that hunger without much regard for the future. Man's philosophy with respect to the land is "rip it off the hills; gouge it out of the soil; get it into the bank in one

generation if possible." His slogan is, "To hell with tomorrow, I want mine today."

These are searing words, but they are not my words. I only quote from history. These are not my words; these words are written on the sands of time; they are scrawled across the pages of history, that "story of a hungry animal in search of food."

So much for yesterday; now let us look at today.

You are young and you are strong, America. You are progressive, you are wise. Your way of life is different; your ideals are high; you will not do these things, you say. Let us look at the record, at your history.

You are young, America. This land has been under your control some 300 years, more or less. For about 100 years you have used it intensively. Tonnage yields to feed the world has been your goal. You have produced, but at a price. You have produced, but you have also ruined, partially or completely, more than half the fertile topsoil you possessed. It took the Chinese 10 times as long to do as much to China.

You are strong, America. But may I remind you that your way of life, your institutions, and your society are builded on, sustained by, and no better than the land on which you live. I remind you that adequate nutrition requires more than mere bulk, that nutrition is a qualitative as well as a quantitative thing. I remind you that your hillbilly is a hillbilly because he grows his food on hillbilly land. In the light of present-day knowledge there can be little doubt that the true hillbilly is what he is because of malnutrition; qualitative malnutrition that dulls his mind, saps his strength, and smothers his ambition. This American is already in the process of degeneration. Do you not see him rave, and burn, and hack, and gouge the impoverished soil on which he lives, further depleting its ability to sustain and nourish him? Can you not see the vicious circle in which he lives, a circle that moves relentlessly around and around, a circle from which but few escape. Must I remind you that there are other groups within our society which suffer a like fate? What are your "Tobacco Road" and "Grapes of Wrath" if they are not symbols of this truth.

These are searing words, America, but they are taken from history—your history.

You are progressive, America. When your land fails to produce the tonnage you desire you fix things up with chemical fertilizers. But you pay no attention to the warnings of scientists whose long experience in tilling the soil leads them to say that chemical fertilization is only a delusion, a stop-gap, a tonnage producer that does not restore essential, life-giving elements inherent in a fertile soil.

You are wise, America. When your overworked corn lands lost much of their fertility and their ability to produce, you came forth with hybrid corn. Your corn yields skyrocketed, and you are still congratulating yourself on your ingenuity. But you fail to take note of one significant thing. You overlook that fact that history will record hybrid corn as being that corn which had the ability to take fertility out of the soil twice as fast as any corn that man had ever grown before.

The truth is that your own land-use history records you as the greatest spendthrift of all time. You have developed bigger, better, and faster ways of using up soil fertility than has any nation in all the world. You are the champion playboy of all history, and your extravagance is exceeded only by your disregard of the consequences.

"And what," you may well ask, "has all this to do with wildlife?" Simply this, that nature makes no distinction between wild and tame life insofar as soil fertility is concerned. In Old Mother Nature's book nutrition is nutrition, and life is life. It makes no difference whether that life be wild or tame.

It is true, however, that misuse of the land is a two-edged sword insofar as wildlife is concerned. It reduces protective cover as well as fertility. Adequate protective cover and adequate nutrition are the two big essentials of wildlife production, and both these essentials are impaired by misuse of the land.

At the present time prices of farm products are very high and the economic incentitive to squeeze every last pound of production out of the land is great. The immediate effect is to increase erosion and reduce wildlife, but the long time effect is to reduce land fertility; and hence, all production.

The simple truth is that man cannot reduce soil fertility without all life suffering the consequences. That truth is supported by evidence which grows steadily in volume and significance. This evidence puts the emphasis on qualitative rather than quantitative nutrition. Soil fertility determines the quality and contents of foodstuffs, and the quality and contents of foodstuffs affects all life. The evidence is overwhelming. When insane men are made sane through the avenue of nutrition alone, one can no longer doubt that quality counts. Some day foodstuffs will be valued on the basis of quality, not quantity. When that day comes we may have the economic incentive that will save our soil. Until we do, we must save the land by any means we can.

The simple truth is that the growth, vigor, survival, and reproduction of all life is wedded to the land by unbreakable bonds. The truth is that America should maintain, without impairment, the fertility of all her lands. To do otherwise is unthinkable, and must eventually lead to disaster. It is not wildlife alone that hangs in this balance. It is America herself that is at stake.

If this be true, what are we doing to maintain the fertility of our land? Let us look at the record. Let us look at history—today's history.

As individuals we are doing relatively little. Here and there an individual has learned that he can maintain the fertility of his farm and make more money in the long run than if he misused his land. But that individual is relatively rare. The masses know nothing of this. In fact, the masses, including the vast majority of those who till the land, know little or nothing of the true significance of land fertility and the real dangers of land abuse.

As a Nation, we have done very little to save our agricultural lands. Our most effective governmental actions have been the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service, and the initiation of benefit payments to American farmers for soil-conserving practices. But neither of these came by any united design or desire of the American people. The first came into being largely because of the inspired leadership and dogged persistence of a single American citizen. The second does not have even that background. Benefit payments for soil-conserving practices in America came into being by chance—they were initiated because the Supreme Court of the United States said we could not pay public money to American farmers for plowing under crops and killing little pigs. Thus was born America's national efforts to save her soil.

If this is not enough to convince you that America does not know the score, look to the seat of your government, look to Washington. There you will see your government appropriating $45,000,000 to the Soil Conservation Service to finance their work of holding America's water where it falls and her soil where it lies, and, at the same time appropriating $185,000,000 to the War Department with which to make down payments on dams designed to stop the water that doesn't linger where it falls and the soil that doesn't stay where it lies.

Forty-five million dollars to the doctors who feverishly strive to sew up your severed and gushing arteries, America—and frankly admit that they are waging a losing fight—$45,000,000 to the doctors who feverishly strive to suture your severed and gushing arteries, and four times that sum to the tinsmiths who beat out buckets with which you propose to preserve your life's blood.

That is not—as some may assume—an indictment of tinsmiths. It is an indictment of you, America, you, who entertains and tolerates such a twisted, distorted, cockeyed concept of national values and national needs.

If you are not yet convinced that America doesn't know the truth, look again to Washington. There you will see many of your leaders and representatives sponsoring a movement to slash, by one-third, the appropriation for soil conservation benefit payments. You will see the scalpels poised and ready to cut the heart and backbone out of America's effort to save her land. These men contend that you cannot afford to pay for saving the soil, that you have other and better things to do with public money. You can afford, it seems, $11,000,000,000 plus for national defense, but you cannot afford $300,000,000 to save the very thing you propose to defend. You can afford to subsidize navigation, aviation, hydroelectric development, flood control, and other special interest groups, but you cannot afford to subsidize the saving of the land, in which every living American has a stake, as do all the generations yet unborn.

You can afford to mobilize American manhood into armies that you count by the millions, to equip them with implements of destruction that stagger the imagination, you can afford navies that swarm the seven seas, you can afford aircraft that figuratively—and literally—blot out the sun, you can afford $200,000,000,000 in the prosecution of a single war, you can afford barrels—nay, rivers, of American blood; all this, and more, you can afford to save America from danger from without, but a little lip service, and a token gesture here and there is all you can afford to save America from disaster within.

America, you go the way all men have gone. You are a living symbol of the truth, that history repeats itself. ("A hungry animal in search of food.") You are not young, you are not strong, you are not wise, you only dream these things. You live an old, deceitful dream, that blinds your eyes against the truth, that leads you down disaster's road. You have one chance and only one. Wake up. Shake off this dream. Wake up. Shake off this spell, that you may see that you may take a better road.

Let's Stop Wallowing in Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Stop Wallowing in Fear," which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., on March 4, 1950.

Today we have too many prophets of doom and too few prophets of peace; too many who arise each morning to predict a day of fear and too few who arise to look for the road to peace.

These are difficult days, but we should recognize that we cannot find a way to solve our problems by wringing our hands and crying, "There is no hope."

There is hope—if only we have sense enough to recognize it. I commend the editorial, and urge all Members of Congress to read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP WALLOWING IN FEAR

The other day, in his new role of private citizen, David E. Lilienthal had some decidedly sensible things to say about the foolishness of constantly harping on the frightful possibilities of A-bombs and H-bombs. The possibilities undoubtedly are terrible, and they need to be kept in mind, but he has taken the very sound view that the calamity howlers are not rendering a real service either to the Nation or the world when they keep on howling as if they wanted to give everybody a nervous break-down.

Of course, as the recently retired Chairman of our Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lilienthal has more than enough grim information to persuade him to concede that today's actual and potential weapons of mass destruction make the annihilation of mankind at least theoretically conceivable. He is willing to concede, too, that the subject demands a great deal of public study and discussion. But what he does not concede is that the study and discussion should be dominated by end of the worlders who seem to take a morbid delight in the extravagant and sensational picturing of the horrors of atom warfare.

In other words, what Mr. Lilienthal is against, what he is fed up with, is the more flamboyant of the scare-the-dopes school of experts who feel that the people (the "dopes") can be alerted to the dangerous nature of our time only if they are ceaselessly bombarded with all sorts of frightening talk—such as talk about how 500 tons of heavy hydrogen might be used to wipe out all life on this planet, or about how the seat of our National Government should be established in some city other than Washington, or about how 60,000,000 Americans should be dispersed from our urban centers. As Mr. Lilienthal has put it, speculation about the end of man adds up to a kind of neurotic wallowing in the hazards of atomic warfare, and suggestions for the drastic decentralization of our cities, or for a gigantic dispersal of our population, amount to nothing but a lot of high intellectual nonsense, because the thing can't be done and it won't be done.

More than that, as Mr. Lilienthal has rightly declared, such talk, far from alerting people, can have the opposite effect. For the average human being has the altogether healthy trait of not wanting to be afraid. He ceases to be agitated by the cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" when it is repeated too often, and he tends to grow more and more bored these days by the endless succession of lurid doomsday speeches. He refuses to crawl in under the covers and quiver in his bed. He wants his life to be reasonably enjoyable. The frightening words begin to pall on him, the tocsin ringers and the atomic Paul Reveres become increasingly tiresome, and he gets progressively less and less interested in them until he forgets about the whole business and turns his attention away from the calamitous to the pleasant.

Thus, instead of awakening the American people, the "scare-the-dopes school," by overdoing things, bids fair to bore them to the point of indifference or fill them with the feeling that the atom leaves them pretty much helpless and hopeless. Quite obviously, that is a poor way to promote national security or sound public thinking. Nothing could be more sterile. In Mr. Lilienthal's words, "To face the dangers of a very tough world, what we need is not to be overwhelmed by them but to understand them, and then with courage and resolution and patience face up to them and see them through."

It is good to have this said by a man like Mr. Lilienthal. Within recent weeks, the Cassandras have been filling the American atmosphere with just too many high thin cries of woe. We need to get back to our traditional language of hope, self-confidence, and affirr tion. The atomic speech makers—scientists, legislators, and all others vocal on the subject—would do well to stop shouting about the end of the world and take a calmer, more level-headed view of the immediate realities. We have had too much wallowing in fear. It is a spectacle that can win no respect for us in Russia or anywhere else.

No Victory for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 24, 1950:

NO VICTORY FOR FEPC

Under existing circumstances, passage of a fair-employment-practices bill by the House yesterday represents no real victory for those who sincerely desire fair-employment-practices legislation. The original administration bill has been so diluted that very little is left of it but an expression of good intentions. Thus, almost exactly 5 years after FEPC first emerged from a House committee, after conventions of both parties had endorsed it in principle, but after every parliamentary device known to man had been employed to scuttle it, the net result is that virtually no advance has been made toward establishing FEPC as an effective arm of the Federal Government.

If circumstances had been different, something might have been said in favor of the basic provisions of the bill that the House finally did approve. In essence, it establishes a Fair Employment Practices Commission to assist State and local agencies to combat job discrimination against minorities, but the assistance would be through investigation, recommendation, and persuasion without power of enforcement. In view of Southern feelings, this might not have been a bad way, as a starter, to bring the Federal Government into the picture. It would have clearly established Federal policy on discrimination, and this approach to an admittedly touchy subject might have been a wise first step.

But such legislation cannot be looked at as if it were in a vacuum. The unhappy fact is that the opposition to FEPC has shown that it will not compromise; it will not retreat an inch; on this issue it will not pay any attention either to the party platforms or, for that matter, to the spirit of the American democracy. It has engaged in a long and bitter parliamentary struggle to prevent any action at all on an FEPC bill; and when these tactics failed, it cynically supported a toothless measure that, in view of all that has gone before, no one now expects to be taken seriously. The whole affair has become a mockery of responsible legislative practice; and the prospective filibuster awaiting FEPC in the Senate only adds to the hollowness of the entire procedure.

Community Development in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What This Town Needs," by Norman Kuhne, published in the Nation's Business for February 1950, which is an excellent article on community development in the State of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THIS TOWN NEEDS

(By Norman Kuhne)

Scarcely a day goes by in any community without some resident telling anyone willing to listen something like this:

"Now what our town needs is * * *."

"The trouble with this town is * * *."

"We're never going to get anywhere in this town until * * *."

Forget the chronic complainers. Usually such statements preface constructive suggestions by citizens eager to make their home towns better places to live.

Civic leaders everywhere have sought to translate this latent desire for progress into ways to build better communities. A plan which does just that marks its second anniversary in Arkansas this month. It's a joint enterprise of private industry, business associations, and State government called the community development clinic program. Working hand in hand to build better home towns in the Wonder State are the Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce, the Arkansas Power & Light Co., the State government's resources and development commission, and some 100 local chambers of commerce.

In numerous towns and cities people have learned what they can accomplish by accepting the responsibility of good citizenship. The community clinic program promises to become a vital force in other places, with several States, cities, and even foreign countries having investigated the plan with a view to adopting it.

The Arkansas program has aroused such interest because it can be adapted to meet the needs of the most, as well as the least, advanced community. Such clinics can stimulate multi-million-dollar projects like airports and public buildings or modest improvements like neighborhood playgrounds. They can insure the developed area against civic complacency and the underdeveloped against stagnation.

Fort Smith, a bustling city of 50,000 in western Arkansas, for years had been pursuing an active development program through its chamber of commerce and other organizations. But this community, like many others, had come to depend on a small group of old reliables willing to work. And businessmen never were sure the projects they sponsored were those with widest popular support.

A community clinic transfused new blood into the Fort Smith program. It disclosed the names of several hundred persons willing to work, many of them already active on various committees. What's more, civic leaders know their present program includes projects considered most important, which makes it truly a community undertaking.

Fort Smith's clinic high lighted the need for new streets. Many older thoroughfares,

paved with brick, were breaking up. After the clinic, a group of citizens persuaded the city council to adopt ordinances permitting the formation of street-improvement districts. A delegation called on the county judge who controls State-aid highway funds. He agreed to release $115,000 provided the city would raise $57,000. Householders whose properties are on the streets to be repaved will put up the balance. Eight street improvement districts are being created and work will begin this spring.

Favorable action on a $650,000 bond issue for school improvements also is credited to the clinic by Arthur Murphy, Fort Smith chamber manager, as are a dozen other projects.

Throughout Arkansas, cities and towns are erecting public buildings, beautifying highway approaches, establishing parks and playgrounds, constructing youth centers, building farm-to-market roads, providing off-street parking facilities, extending water and sewer mains and doing numerous other things toward a higher standard of living and greater human comfort.

In many communities local residents say they've moved ahead faster in the 2 years the clinic program has been operating than in any previous decade. And the accomplishments have been things the home-town folks considered of first importance.

To see how a community clinic works, let's examine one I attended at Dardanelle, a town of 2,000 in west central Arkansas.

At 9 a. m. 56 Dardanelle businessmen, farmers, housewives, and workingmen met in the American Legion club room on the town's main thoroughfare. They were greeted by Warren McGuire, a grocer and president of the local chamber of commerce, who explained the purpose of the meeting. Then McGuire introduced I. J. Steed, chief planning officer of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission, to lead discussion.

Steed explained the basic needs of any community. His was no high-flown lecture. It was the conversation of a man reared on an Arkansas farm, just like many of his listeners.

He discussed practical industries, up-to-date stores and service establishments, market facilities for farmers, accommodations and attractions for tourists. He stressed the social factors: schools, libraries, churches, recreational facilities, art and music. Then there were the physical factors: condition of streets and sidewalks, municipal services, appearance of public buildings and grounds, look of private homes, vacant lots, and highway approaches.

By talking about things that apply to any town, Steed established a yardstick for Dardanelle—one with which the townspeople themselves could measure the standing of their own community.

He distributed 5- by 8-inch cards on which was space for the writer to jot down the things he thought Dardanelle needed. Each person was asked to sign his name and address and signify if he were willing to work on a committee that might be created to carry out the projects in which he was most interested.

The meeting lasted a little more than an hour and, at 10:30, a second group arrived for a similar session. This group, too, represented a cross section of community interests. In the course of a 2-day clinic, Steed held 14 meetings with groups ranging in size from 30 to 60, including one with the high school senior class and another with a delegation of colored citizens who account for about 20 percent of the local population.

In all, 487 townspeople filled out cards. About half said they would work for the projects suggested. Such suggestions ranged from street and sidewalk paving, which would entail a sizable bond issue, to cleaning up a river-bank dump which would require an afternoon's work by volunteers. There were lofty proposals like one calling for the construction of a local library to supplement the county bookmobile service. There were homely ones like that advocating "wet toilets" in the outlying sections.

His brief case full of suggestions, Steed returned to Little Rock to prepare a report. The cards were tabulated and the project most frequently suggested became No. 1, and on down the line.

After listing desired improvements in tabular form, the report took up what the people said they wanted. One man mentioned the need of a traffic light at a highway intersection. The report noted the specific corner. Another man proposed repaving an intersection on a back street and the report listed that. An appendix named those attending the clinic, their chief interest, their willingness to work on a committee.

Mimeographed copies of the report were returned to the Dardanelle chamber's board of directors for action. At this writing it's still too early to tell how the community will follow through on the proposed program but, if experience elsewhere is any guide, results will show.

The fact that large numbers of people turn out to discuss local problems and suggest their own course of action has awakened a civic consciousness that formerly lay dormant in many Arkansas communities. In a dozen towns I visited, business leaders said that their clinic had generated enough interest in local projects to insure favorable action on bond issues that otherwise might have failed.

Typical was a $165,000 sewage-disposal plant and sewer-main extension project in Bentonville, a city of 3,500 in the northwest corner of the State. The issue had been hanging fire for several years and was coming up for a vote, with the outlook none too favorable. But after a community clinic, held a week before the election in April 1948, the picture changed.

People began to talk it up. Businessmen like Arthur Smith, president of the bank; Clayton Little, deputy prosecuting attorney; Terry Peel, realtor; Roy Stewart, steel fabricator; and J. C. Knott got on the phone and kept their lines busy telling associates to get out and vote. Others made a block-by-block canvass.

When the ballots were counted, the bond issue carried by a vote of 368 to 227. According to Bruce Williams, manager of the Bentonville Chamber of Commerce, the vote would have been adverse but for the civic enthusiasm generated by the clinic.

Other communities, too, credit the clinic with providing the margin between success and failure of local projects. Trumann businessmen say there is no doubt but that their clinic assured approval of a $100,000 bond issue for school improvement and was a material factor in raising $70,000 by public subscription for the same purpose.

In Arkadelphia the clinic indicated great interest in sewer improvement, resulting in a city-wide vote to spend $200,000 on the project. Perhaps it was action like this which prompted George S. Dews, manager of the Arkadelphia Chamber of Commerce, to say:

"In 17 years' service in this office I have never known as much interest or as many people at one time being interested in civic improvement to the extent that they will say what they want and then work unselfishly to see that it is well done."

Wesley Gordon, Fayetteville chamber manager, says a clinic gave the needed impetus for a $1,000,000 waterworks for that city.

Fayetteville is an example of how a chamber of commerce uses its clinic report. Copies went to all civic groups and their cooperation was enlisted. One contemplated project was a better park. A park committee composed of representatives of various civic organizations was established. With an ante of $400 contributed by members, the chamber raised $1,500 by public subscriptions to provide park rest rooms. The Rotary Club, Lions Club, American Legion post, and Women's Civic Club each financed the construction of a concrete tennis court. In all, civic groups contributed $15,000 for park improvements and persuaded the city council to put up $20,000 for a swimming pool.

Elsewhere the story is similar. In Montecello, the clinic disclosed the need for more street markers. The Veterans of Foreign Wars donated them. At Mount Ida, the P. T. A. contributed $700 to modernize school rest rooms. In Newport, a private citizen donated a library building. In Warren, the Junior Guild equipped an office for the health department. At England, the Heritage Club installed new traffic lights.

Some suggestions made at clinics require action by private industry—and industry has acted. At the De Queen Clinic, several people spoke about a rough railroad grade crossing. A railroad employee was in the audience. Within 48 hours a repair crew was at work. At Osceola, several persons suggested a more convenient location for the bus station. The bus company met their desire. Bentonville people disliked the way an unsightly junk yard at one approach to the city impressed visitors. After the clinic, a city beautification committee was established with the junk yard proprietor as a member. Shortly an attractive showroom for new cars replaced the junk yard.

Through the stimulus of these clinics people are coming more and more to grips with such fundamental issues as: How can we balance our economy, diversify our agriculture, extend our trade area, stabilize employment, improve local government, get away from dependence on Washington? By starting a search for answers to questions like these, the program can produce far-reaching results.

The community-clinic program is a postwar development in Arkansas that owes its existence in part to chance and part to design. When the war ended, C. Hamilton Moses, president of the Arkansas Power & Light Co., and some of his staff went to New York to get financing for an expansion program. In a meeting with a committee of underwriters, their credit standing was questioned, principally because they did business in Arkansas—considered by some a backward State.

Meanwhile several Arkansas cities were trying to woo industries. More than one chamber secretary was told by an industrial prospect to make another call after his city had better schools, more paved streets, greater fire protection, and the like.

These frank statements did much to awaken State business leaders to the need for greater civic improvement. Moses called a meeting of the Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce which he headed. What to do about a program that would help cities and towns to progress?

As an experiment, several community planning experts were called in from other States to survey various cities and make recommendations. They did a competent job but when they pointed the finger of scorn at local conditions, townspeople got their backs up. It became clear that any future program must originate within the community itself.

Group meetings were decided to get people thinking about local development projects. A man familiar with community problems generally would lead discussions. As long as he was from Arkansas he would be accepted. As a nonresident of the community where the clinic was held, he couldn't be charged with playing up his own pet project at the expense of some other. The resources and development commission and the economic council each had a man and the power company had two who filled the bill. They were loaned to the new program.

Cards for recording suggestions were printed. A written report embodying the wishes of the people would become the basis for action.

A number of businessmen from Pine Bluff, a city of 35,000, had taken part in the initial planning. They were interested in revitalizing their own chamber of commerce by giving it specific jobs to tackle. Pine Bluff was selected as the guinea pig.

The clinic produced immediate action. The discussion made it possible to separate the practical from the financially impossible projects. A projected municipal auditorium was sidetracked in favor of a new sewage-disposal system. Four neighborhood playgrounds were established, a new school built, an industrial foundation revitalized, and a fund-raising campaign for a $25,000 youth center was stimulated.

Since that trial run in Pine Bluff in February 1948, more than 100 clinics have been held in communities ranging in population from Fort Smith's 50,000 to villages like Mount Ida which boasts 900 "during school hours."

Trial and error perfected the technique. Experience showed early that a series of small group meetings produced more results than one or two mass sessions. Discussion leader and participants profited by the informality of small meetings. They aroused more interest, provoked more questions.

Detailed discussion of local wants proved more satisfactory than general summarization. During the clinic at Paris a student suggested beautification of highway approaches by planting redbud trees. When the report spelled out that suggestion, local garden clubs went to work and planted 5,000 redbuds. A similar suggestion from another clinic, lumped in as one more tally for "city beautification" was lost.

Simply holding a clinic won't solve all a community's ills. Follow-up on work programs still is weak in some places. Lack of revenue has stymied other ambitious projects in small villages. But the village with a surplus of ingenuity can overcome a shortage of dollars.

Folks in Waldron, a town of 2,000 in the Ouachita Mountains area, were loyal followers of their winning high-school football team. They thought nothing of driving 100 miles to attend one of its games.

But when visitors came to Waldron, residents were always a little shame-faced about the home athletic field.

After a clinic in February 1949, the school board was persuaded to buy an 8-acre tract near the city limits for $2,500. That left the treasury low, so 1 acre fronting on a main road was sold to the county for $1,500 to provide space for a highway-equipment garage. Then Waldron had 7 acres of raw land, a far cry from the athletic field it wanted.

But townspeople turned to. Volunteers graded and sodded the site. Others erected a fence, put up bleachers, installed lights for night games.

The mayor swung a shovel, the banker a hammer, the merchant wielded a paint brush. Now there's a gridiron, baseball diamond, rodeo arena, shower, and locker rooms. The athletic field still is no Yale Bowl, but it's one that would do credit to any community of 2,000.

In larger communities the program has brought coordinated action by local organizations. In Hot Springs nearly every civic group was promoting a municipal auditorium, yet each unaware of the others' progress. After the clinic, a central committee was established and now much of the work preliminary to construction has been completed.

Many projects suggested involve engineering, legal, financial, or other complicated problems. When that's the case, the community can call on any one of the three State-wide sponsoring agencies for technical assistance and get it. A fair association needed a landscape architect to lay out its cattle show grounds. A city needed an engineer to help on a water-supply project. Another needed help on a revenue problem. According to Hamilton Moses, there are about 1,000 industry members in the economic council whose personnel are available to help communities work out their local problems. Also on tap are experts of the State government and the power company. Between them they've been able to handle every request for assistance.

Arkansas leaders believe their plan can be adapted to meet the requirements of other States and communities. What if there's no State development agency? The extension services of many colleges and universities are prepared to help with development programs and so are State chambers of commerce. What if the power company doesn't cooperate? Try the industrial department of a railroad. In any State there is some business group that will help the community that wants to help itself.

Now and then you'll meet a man who labels the clinic program "something the power company cooked up" or "just a chamber of commerce stunt." There's no denying that a rising standard of living and rising sales of electric power go hand in hand or that chambers of commerce are eager for local development. But it's also a fact that the sponsoring agencies have shown the same interest in communities served by other utilities—in farm communities served by rural electrification cooperatives as those on A. P. & L. lines—and in communities where there is no local chamber, clinics have been held under the auspices of organizations such as the American Legion Auxiliary, the town's planning association, the junior chamber of commerce, and the Rotary Club, as well as various other civic-minded groups.

The community clinic program literally is changing the face of Arkansas. Around the town squares and along main streets men and women are talking about ways of equalizing property assessment so that local tax yields can be increased. The question one hears is: "How can we do it ourselves?" and not "Whom can we get to do it for us?" New attitudes on governmental relationships are being developed. There's more to it than reaffirmation of the doctrine of State's rights. It's also a practical matter of dollars and cents.

The city of Siloam Springs found by financing the construction of a new hospital locally it got a better job for $82,500 less than it could have by participating in a Federal-grant project.

Perhaps the lesson that Arkansas is learning from the program is best summed up by the statement of W. L. Fulmer, past president of the chamber of commerce at Booneville, who said:

"A development from within is more to be desired than an invasion from without. The benefits are more lasting and of greater value in the long pull."

The people down in Arkansas are thinking of the long pull.

Tribute to Ernest L. Kurth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on December 14, 1949, at Lufkin, Tex., there was given by the citizens of Lufkin and Angelina County a testimonial in honor of their most prominent citizen, Ernest L. Kurth.

Theretofore, Mr. Kurth had been officially proclaimed "Man of the South" by the magazine Dixie Business. He was selected over a number of other eminent and distinguished personages as the man of greatest achievement in the South for 1949.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Man of the South for 1949," which was printed in the magazine Dixie Business, describing the testimonial to Mr. Kurth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF THE SOUTH FOR 1949

(By Col. Hubert F. Lee, Stone Mountain, Ga.)

The longest and most impressive testimonial ever held for a living American took place in the piney woods of east Texas at Lufkin, on December 14, when Ernest L. Kurth was officially proclaimed Man of the South of the Year 1949 by the editor of Dixie Business.

Many of the 5,000 who voted him the top honor in the annual Dixie business advisory poll were on hand to pay personal tribute to the man of greatest achievement in all the South for 1949.

Letters and telegrams from most of the South's 50 foremost business leaders named this summer by Dixie Business were among the hundreds received by Ernest Kurth in a genuine demonstration of sportsmanship that is one of the fine characteristics of the leaders of the South. Ernest Kurth was one of the South's foremost 50 and was named for the top honor when he received the greatest number of votes in letters, cards, and telegrams ever read by the edior of Dixie Business since the annual "South's hall of fame for the living" movement began.

And every man and woman who took part in the great Kurth day celebration had their own reasons for wanting to honor Ernest Kurth.

Newspaper publishers of the South saw in him the man who made their dreams come true when he became the first to mass-produce newsprint at his Southland Paper Mills in January 1940.

His friends in the lumber industry honored him for the years of leadership as head of the Angelina County Lumber Co., and his pioneering in perpetual reforestation.

The people of Lufkin and Angelina County, who put on the great event, hailed him as the man who transformed a small lumber town into the fifth largest industrial stronghold in the biggest State in the Nation.

* * * * *

For years there have been loud cries of the need for conservation of the trees of the South and Ernest Kurth has been a "tree-farmer" since he learned the art following his father through the piney woods from which they farmed timber for use in the great Angelina County Lumber Co. mill.

The Memorial Hospital at Lufkin is the first built for workers of a community by its industrial leaders and Ernest Kurth was first in making this possible.

* * * * *

The Kurth Day celebration was sponsored by the Angelina County Chamber of Commerce and in some way or other it seemed that everyone in Lufkin, Herty, Keltys, and Angelina County had some sort of part.

* * * * *

"Ernest L. Kurth accepted his honors Wednesday night before more than 900

southerners who came here to tell him why he was chosen.

Newspaper publishers, businessmen, Government, and civic leaders were in the crowd that heard Kurth described as a leader among the men who had the vision to bring industry to the South, as a great businessman who carved an east Texas career that reaches far outside the State.

Kurth appeared on the verge of tears.

He called Kurth Day one of the greatest markers of my life. But he said the honors really were bestowed upon every man and woman in Angelina County.

Time magazine devoted a column and a half in the December 26 issue in Business and Finance department:

"Mr. East Texas"

"In Lufkin, Tex.—population 22,500—one cold night last week, 900 citizens jammed into the high school gymnasium. There, over a roast beef dinner, they listened to some famed Texans—including United States Senators TOM CONNALLY and LYNDON JOHNSON—praise a fellow Texan in terms extravagant even for the Lone Star State. Said ex-Governor William P. Hobby; 'He is the kingfish of free enterprise.' Added Governor Allan Shivers: 'He is Mr. East Texas.'

"The 'Kingfish' is big—6 feet, 200 pounds—shy, pink-cheeked Ernest L. Kurth, 64, a jack of all trades—lumber, insurance, banking, theaters, construction, utilities, machinery—and master of them all as well. Kurth's dozen-odd enterprises employ 3,250, indirectly support 50 percent of Lufkin's population. But the Kurth achievement that most east Texans boast about, and the one that is of prime importance to the southern economy, is newsprint. Set up only 9 years ago as the South's first newsprint producer, Kurth's $18,000,000 Southland Paper Mills, Inc., last week was rolling out enough newsprint—132,718 tons last year—to supply some 70 percent of southern newspapers, and was grossing $15,000,000 a year."

A score of newspaper correspondents covered the Kurth Day celebration and as many news photographers. Paramount News had a cameraman. Television equipment was set up.

To Texans it was the top news story of 1949.

Isthmian Canals and Atomic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, recommending the construction of a new Panama Canal at sea level was transmitted to the Congress by the President on December 1, 1947, without comment or recommendation.

The plan urged in the Governor's report contemplates changing the physical form of the present canal from the eminently successful high-level lake-lock type to a sea-level lock design, a project of great magnitude, whose primary premises of security and national defense, as well as estimates of cost, have been challenged by eminent authorities. Extensive discussions about many of the vital issues may be found in the sources given in the bibliographical list on the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, in an extension of remarks by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, chairman of the special subcommittee now investigating the matter of financial operation of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress.

Among the most outstanding papers listed in this bibliography is the authoritative presentation by former Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, second session, April 22, 1948, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2449. This contribution by Captain Bradley—perhaps the most comprehensive statement on its subject in congressional history—affords a deep insight into the basic facts of the current discussions as to the future of the Panama Canal—from the viewpoints of both ship-transit operations and national defense. He emphasizes the overwhelming opinion of leading atomic experts that no canal—regardless of location or type—can withstand an actual atomic attack.

In my studies of the national defense and national security aspects of the proposed sea-level project I have observed that among its principal advocates have been certain members of the Corps of Engineers of the Army who have urged it as being mandatory because of the atomic bomb. It is noteworthy, therefore, that some of the authors of the very able articles on the atomic bomb—upon which both Captain Bradley and I have based our opinions—are also members of the Corps.

A recent contribution with respect to atomic defense, published in the November–December 1949 issue of the Military Engineer, volume XLI, No. 284, page 417, is a technical paper by Lt. Col. Richard D. Wolfe, also of the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

Colonel Wolfe, in his presentation of the subject, does not specifically mention the Panama Canal, or interoceanic waterways; but he does supply a most constructive approach to the problem of atomic defense, with special attention to the bomb as a radioactive contamination weapon. His statements thus add to our understanding of the Isthmian defense problems, and tend to produce sounder thinking and planning for a more effective national security.

Thus, support is further given the previous deductions I have unfailingly derived from the writings of many atomic-warfare authorities, namely, that the defense of any type of canal—at Panama, or elsewhere—like the defense of the ports, highways, rivers, railroads, locks, dams, reservoirs, and public utilities and vital production plants in the United States, is an over-all governmental responsibility. This defense depends on the combination of our industrial capacity and the active might of our armed forces, equipped with the most powerful modern weapons and protective devices, rather than merely on passive defense features which may be embodied in the designs of canal construction, and which would constitute, in effect, another Maginot line.

It is obvious, therefore, that the expenditure of vast sums and the utilization of great stores of strategic resources in the construction of projects—such as the so-called sea-level canal at Panama, with the virtual scrapping of the existing Canal; or the building of a canal at another site—would divert funds from other more urgently needed defense projects, situated in the United States, thereby affecting, in a most serious and adverse way, our "national security."

The Isthmian Canal question most certainly is one which must not be taken lightly by the Congress; but it should receive the most careful consideration, with the advice of the best-informed technical authorities, of wholly independent character.

The utter fallacy of the contention that a sea-level canal will prove invulnerable to atomic attack is completely shattered in that the H—or hydrogen—bomb, now to be made by our Government, is declared by scientists to be infinitely more powerful and devastating than the existing A-bomb—perhaps a thousand times more so. In my former discussions of this subject I have sought to call attention to the fact that the atomic bomb was yet in its infancy—though powerful enough to destroy any type of canal, if permitted to strike—and that soon scientific development will leave it far behind. Such is the case already. The official proponents of the sea-level project were, therefore, either wholly lacking in vision in failing to realize that the atomic bomb was only in its initial stage—though deadly enough, at that—or, else, they undertook, through the avowal of a false premise, to mislead the American Congress and people, and to frighten them into acceptance—in the name of security and protection—of a vast "boondoggling" enterprise of astronomical costs and uncertain value—a veritable Tower of Babel in reverse. Thus it has come to pass that the H-bomb—before it is actually made—has destroyed the sea-level canal—before it is built. Indeed, a paradox; but a very gratifying one for the American taxpayer and shipowner.

All of which, as I believe, emphasizes the urgent need for the enactment of legislation providing for the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission, of independent and broad-gauged membership—and charged with the duty of making a full and complete study of all the problems involved in the various proposals urged—both at Panama and elsewhere—and the submission of a comprehensive report in the premises. In addition to the all-important engineering features to be determined, there are very grave treaty questions to be considered, and such a body could make a comprehensive study of every factor that must be taken into final account; and make a report, thus grounded, for the information and guidance of the President and Congress.

To make Colonel Wolfe's timely discussion more readily available in the technical literature that is now accumulating, under leave granted, I am ex-

tending my remarks by inclusion therewith of the full text of his paper:

ATOMIC DEFENSE—A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH

(By Richard D. Wolfe, lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers)

Since the advent of the atomic bomb, many articles have appeared in the public press and elsewhere concerning the terrifying after-effects of the radioactive contamination produced by the explosion. Unfortunately, much of this writing has been in thoroughly alarmist vein, implying or stating in so many words that nothing can be done immediately to minimize the effects of this contamination or subsequently to remove it. These exaggerated "scare-head" statements have frequently been in error as to fact. More important, in best Sunday supplement style, they have often presented ideas by implication and facts by conjecture, all of which are calculated to produce the impression that the radioactive after-effects of atomic explosion are always present, always horrible beyond imagination, and impossible to do anything about.

This is a negative attitude which is completely inconsistent with our national character as a vigorous people who can tackle a practical, finite problem, however complex, with ingenuity and with improvisation if necessary, to arrive at a workable solution. The correction of the unfortunate impression which the "nothing-can-be-done" school of thought has attempted to create in the public mind is the subject at present of an educational campaign sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project, and other agencies.

THE BOMB AS A BLAST WEAPON

No attempt is here made to minimize the immediate blast effect of the bomb as an explosive weapon. But as pointed out in a recent issue [1] the bomb is a finite weapon which differs in intensity but not essentially in quality from other weapons. Its immediate effect as an explosion on matériel and personnel in the worst case could be reproduced by high explosives; high explosives used in conjunction with chemical warfare agents could in turn reproduce the contamination effect if numbers of casualties rather than type of injuries are used as a criterion of effectiveness. The defense against the explosive effects lies in dispersion, in placing a few key installations underground, and in preventing the enemy from delivering the weapon in one's own neighborhood.[2] If it be argued that this constitutes no real defense, then equally there is no defense against mass strategic bombing as practiced by this country and its allies in the war just concluded.

Considering the bomb as essentially a large-scale blast producer (in which role it utilizes its destructive power most efficiently), it creates maximum physical damage when exploded in the air fairly high over the target, as was done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In this case, in which it acts predominantly as a high explosive, any direct radioactive effects are practically instantaneous with the explosion and cause not more than 10 to 15 percent of personnel injuries. The radioactive byproducts of the explosion boil up immediately in the cloud of hot gases and are dissipated to infinite dilution in the upper atmosphere. Residual contamination on the ground is minimal or nonexistent.

THE BOMB AS A CONTAMINATION WEAPON

When the bomb is exploded beneath the surface of water or earth, it does become in some measure a new weapon.[3] In this case the only practical evidence we have to go on is the Baker test (underwater explosion) at Bikini. From the data of this test and by analogy to underwater or underground conventional explosions, the surface damage produced will be much less than in the case of the air burst. There will also be damage from the subsurface shock wave to ships and utilities in an area roughly equal to that damaged by an air burst. The additional new aspect is that the water or earth thrown up by the explosion contains a fair proportion of the radioactive byproducts of the explosion and will probably be distributed over an area approximately equal to that suffering maximum damage in the case of the air burst. The comparison between the air burst and the subsurface burst reveals the following facts: (a) The air burst produces immediate destruction or damage to matériel and, in the absence of forewarning, to personnel in an area, say, 3 miles in diameter. (b) The subsurface burst produces immediate destruction or damage in a smaller area (say, 1 mile in diameter) and, in addition, covers the 3-mile-diameter area with radioactive contamination which does no material damage but which is potentially dangerous or lethal to animal life.

It is evident, therefore, that the only new feature of the bomb as a contamination weapon is that it differs in quality from the bomb as a blast weapon. The extent of physical damage to structures in the subsurface explosion is less, whereas the number of personnel casualties in the area in the worst case is probably no more than with the air burst. Herein lies the fallacy in the claim that the underwater or underground burst is a more dangerous and destructive weapon than the air burst; on the one hand, the damage done by the air burst inside the 3-mile diameter is immediate and is effective in destroying both material things and living creatures; on the other hand, the immediate damage from the subsurface burst is much smaller in area and the potential danger from contamination which extends to the 3-mile diameter applies only to living things, is not instantaneous, and therefore permits action to be taken in mitigation of the hazard.

Three factors permit reduction of casualties in this doughnut-shaped area lying outside the radius of the heavy physical damage and inside the radius of radioactive contamination. The first is the fact that the contamination falls from the air in the form of rain or dust, or both, in a matter of say 5 minutes after the explosion occurs, and thus is restricted initially to external surfaces of buildings and to ground areas. Now the dangerous radiations emitted from the contamination are dissipated by distance, and by the shielding afforded by any solid material such as earth, or the walls or roof of a building. Thus, if the populace can be trained to remain indoors in the center portions of structures, as far from outer walls and roof as the building permits (preferably in basements), being careful to wash off any contamination which they may have acquired by contact with the outdoors, casualties can be considerably reduced. The populace must be further convinced that it must remain in such protective isolation, whatever the inconvenience, for at least 4 days, as explained below.

The second factor, which in reality makes the first effective as a measure of protection, is the fact that the radioactivity in the contamination dies out quite rapidly as an inverse exponential function of time following the explosion, such that within approximately 4 days movement can be permitted in the area by properly equipped working parties for limited periods of time. This permits the third defensive phase to become active, that is, evacuation of personnel, together with decontamination.

DECONTAMINATION

The statement has frequently been made (often by supposed authorities on the subject) that decontamination is impossible, or at best impracticable.[3,4] This echoes the negative do-nothing approach mentioned above. The statement is untrue both in fact and in implication. Much has been learned concerning practical methods of decontamination, and research now in progress at the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory and elsewhere gives promise of even better methods than are now known.

However effective these methods may become, it should be realized at the outset that they will always be expensive in manhours and materials; sufficiently so as to preclude anything approaching complete decontamination of areas and structures immediately following an underwater or underground burst. Initially, decontamination efforts will probably be limited to those predetermined approach ways, areas, and structures whose reoccupation and continued use are vital to prosecution of the war effort. After evacuation of personnel, other areas must be blocked off and isolated for the time being. Later on, the decision can be made whether it is cheaper to decontaminate, to replace the structures and facilities in a new area, or to delay for a period of months until reduction of radioactivity by decay has reduced both the personnel hazard and the difficulty of decontamination.

Practical field decontamination to date has largely been concerned with the decontamination of ships following the atomic bomb tests at Bikini in 1946. The methods used are successful in removing contamination, although they are considered to be inordinately time-consuming and expensive. Ships have nevertheless been completely cleared for normal usage as a result of decontamination performed by the San Francisco Naval Shipyard in conjunction with the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory. In general, the results indicate that any ship, no matter how badly contaminated, can be successfully decontaminated by present methods provided the ship itself is sufficiently valuable to warrant the time and expense involved, together with replacement of such equipment as cordage, wooden decking, et cetera.

RESEARCH FOR ATOMIC DEFENSE

Much of the work done by the agencies of the Manhattan Engineer District and later by the Atomic Energy Commission has contributed valuable information toward defensive measures. However, since their aims have been primarily toward development of offensive nuclear weapons and the development of nuclear power, none of these agencies has pursued an integrated program aimed at the defensive aspects of the problem. In fact, the only agency in the Nation, service or civilian, which is actively prosecuting a broad research and development program pointed toward defense against the various forms of radiological warfare is the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory (NRDL) at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

* * * * *

The present research program of the laboratory embraces four principal fields of endeavor: (1) Studies on the contamination and decontamination of land installations, ships, and aircraft; (2) Evaluation, test, and development of radiation detecting instruments including portable and semiportable

[1] Industrial Vulnerability to Bombing, Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, the Military Engineer, January-February 1949.

[2] Nuclear Weapons, Lt. Col. A. W. Betts, the Military Engineer, March-April 1949

[3] No Place To Hide, Dr. David Bradley; Little, Brown & Co.

[4] Civil Defense for National Security, page 78, Report of the Office of Civil Defense Planning. United States Government Printing Office.

survey instruments and such laboratory-type instruments as are necessary in prosecuting the work; (3) Investigation of individual and collective protective devices to determine their ability to safeguard personnel against inhalation and ingestion of radioactive material; (4) Investigations in the medical and biological field with a view to determining the nature of radiation sickness and the means of early diagnosis of radiation damage, together with prognosis as to probable effects on the efficiency of the individual and his life expectancy.

Put in another way, the first job of the NRDL and of the National Military Establishment to implement radiological defense is to provide for the immediate and continuing safety of personnel. This involves determining allowable limits for each type of radiation under varying operational situations. Following that, instruments must be provided to indicate what kind of radiation is present and how much there is. The next step is to provide diagnostic procedures to determine the imminence of radiation damage, to establish criteria for its detection and estimation of its seriousness either in the immediate postirradiation period or distant future. A very important auxiliary job related to the latter is the one of working toward an understanding of the mechanisms of radiation damage, so that treatment of it can be provided on a more rational basis than is now possible.

The second principal task is the discovery and development of expeditious and economical means of removal and disposal of radioactive contamination, meanwhile providing protection for personnel engaged in this operation to insure that they are not overexposed in the process.

* * * * *

As stated earlier, one of the principal efforts of the laboratory is the field of decontamination studies, for which the burden of research falls on the chemistry branch and its chief, and also on the engineering applications branch. The mission of the chemistry branch and, in part, of the engineering applications branch is to find a practical means of decontaminating structures, ships, or aircraft which have become contaminated by radioactive materials as a result of some form of radiological warfare, and to investigate practical means for eliminating or minimizing initial contamination.

Depending on the time intervals after the blast (assuming an atomic bomb detonation), the contamination may consist of a mixture of part or all of some 50 elements which have been rendered radioactive by the explosion, plus unexploded material from the bomb itself. This contamination is deposited initially on surfaces by "falling-out" from the radioactive cloud, or is contained in water or earth thrown up by an underwater burst. In general, the contamination is found to be associated almost entirely with the external surface of the area on which it lands. Thus, there are three general methods toward decontamination, or toward preventing contamination. The first consists of surface removal methods. In this category are the successful methods used to date in decontamination of ships. In crudest form they include paint removal by caustic solutions, and such brute-force methods as sandblasting and scraping to remove paint and part of the surface of the material. The second approach is that of decontamination without affecting character or quality of the surface; this method includes the use of chemical solutions to dissolve the contaminants and to carry them away. The third method involves the means of preventing contamination, including such devices as the interposition of a water film on the surface, which mechanically impedes the attachment of contamination to the surface itself. Obviously, there is great variation in the relative contaminability of various surfaces. Naturally, rough or porous materials will tend to hold contamination to a much greater degree than hard smooth surfaces.

PLANNING, ORGANIZATION, TRAINING

As with all research, progress tends to be slow and laborious. Nevertheless it is hoped that within approximately 1 year practical, expeditious, and relatively economical means of decontaminating structures and areas will have been reached. This time limit applies to the fundamental technique as developed in the laboratory. Following this step, engineering development must take place and procurement must be instituted in order to make the benefits of these discoveries available for practical use by services in the field. In addition, personnel must be trained in the techniques of such decontamination work and in the use of the equipment developed. Organization must, therefore, be set up within the current organizations of Naval, Army, and Air Force units, all in coordination with similar plans for civil defense.

It is obvious that a great deal of thought and action must go into the job of preparing the military services and the civilian population to act both as organizations and as individuals, according to precepts outlined earlier, in order to minimize casualties as a result of radiological warfare. A start has been made in this direction, both by the military services and by the Office of Civil Defense Planning. The scope of the task is broad, however; probably it will be of the same magnitude as the effort expended in producing the atomic bomb itself. It will not be solved by shoestring operations, splinter efforts, or by the part-time consideration of planning staffs, whether civilian or military. It requires an energetic, coordinated, integrated effort which has the support of an educated populace as well as of governmental and military agencies, backed by sufficient funds to implement a firm program. Such a program of organization, procurement of equipment, and training in its use will not be accomplished overnight nor in a period of a few weeks or months. The program will require vigorous prosecution if it is to be done in 1 or 2 years.

But the problem is finite, and far from impossible of execution. It is probably no more difficult of solution than the tremendously complex planning and training which was performed in preparation for any of the large amphibious operations of World War II, or in preparing the very effective organization of the British citizenry to cope with the air attacks in the blitz of 1940 and after. Finally, it is a job which must be done, and the earlier the better for our peace of mind and protection as a nation—at least until international control of atomic energy becomes a reality and the threat of war is much less than it appears to be at present.

Big Government Is in Your County, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Country Gentleman for March, 1950:

BIG GOVERNMENT IS IN YOUR COUNTY, TOO

(By John Strohm)

Twenty-five of the best farmers in De Kalb County, Ill., were asked this question: "What would be your rough guess as to the number of Federal farm agency employees—either part or full time—in De Kalb County in 1949?"

Their average guess was 56 Federal hired hands in their midst. And 21 of the 25 farmers went on to say this was too many.

They were flabbergasted when told the right answer was more than three times their guess. For 178 men and women were working for the Federal Government in De Kalb County last year—just to tell farmers what they should do, what they can do, and, in some instances, what they cannot do.

These 178 persons put in part or full time and were paid from $8 a day up to $5,350 a year. They worked only on the various Federal farm service programs inside that one county. One hundred and twenty-three of them actually live right in the county; 55 of them live outside the county but regularly visit as part of their duties. Jobholders in State, regional, and national bureaus who influence but never see De Kalb County were not counted.

Uncle Sam spent $86,065.60 in tax money to bring their services to the county's 2,500 farmers. This does not include the Federal portion of salaries received by the 55 workers who live outside the county and made occasional visits.

"This 'free advice' is costing too much!" exploded one amazed farmer when shown these figures.

It took 65 De Kalb men and 5 girls a total of 590 days to sign up, check performance, figure up results, and pay out $35.01 apiece to farmers who cooperated in the Government's PMA program. These farmers were paid to spread limestone, spray weeds and plow under clover—practices that 96 percent of those surveyed said they'd done anyway.

The Soil Conservation Service's bill was $14,040 for offering technical advice to 95 farmers—3.8 percent of those in the county. That's a cost of about $147.68 each. One "cooperator" admitted: "Oh, I just signed up to get their soil map—I'm not following the rotation they set up for my farm."

Farmers get free advice on crop rotation from at least three different Government agencies, in some instances five, and yet more than 100 De Kalb County farmers have put up $40 apiece to hire their own farm-management consultant.

Youth leaders, paid in part with Federal funds, head up 4-H Club work and Future Farmers—overlapping youth groups whose members frequently belong to both. Yet, two-thirds of the farm boys and girls are reached by neither. Two 4-H leaders receive a total of $2,940 Federal funds, while 23 teachers, who spend a portion of their time leading Future Farmers and Future Homemaker groups, get $14,780 of their pay from the Federal Government.

De Kalb County farmers have been increasingly worried about big Government. Many of them have heard about the Hoover Report and how the cost of Federal Government has skyrocketed from 4 to 40 billion dollars in the last 20 years—how we used to hire 600,000 Federal workers, and now have 2,100,000 on the pay roll—how the average American works about 65 days a year to pay Federal taxes alone.

But few realize big Government is not all in Washington. Few had stopped to analyze the numbers of Federal-hired farm hands under their very noses at the county level.

"I've been disturbed by this growing feeling to let Government do it—but this is worse than anything I ever dreamed of," was

the shocked comment of a prominent cattle feeder who saw this report. "No matter how good a job these agencies are doing for us, someday, if this continues, we'll wake up and find our freedom gone."

"Never even knew my township PMA committeemen got $8 a day," exclaimed one surprised farmer. "Maybe we should have just one for a township instead of three."

"Why should we get paid at all?" asked Fred Willrett, township committeeman for many years. "School board members don't get paid. We'd better think before it's too late—we've got to have the guts to cut down some of these Government programs."

"And what bothers me," said E. E. Houghtby, "is that we collect these taxes, send them to Washington, but only get a few dollars back. It's like a De Kalb County farmer giving himself a blood transfusion from one arm into the other—and spilling a couple of quarts of blood in the process."

De Kalb farmers have a practical stake in the Federal tax dollar. Most of them paid an income tax last year of between $800 and $3,000 in this unusually good county in northern Illinois. They recognize the merits of many of the farm education and action programs, but are beginning to question the conflicts and duplications as well as the costs.

The Production and Marketing Administration ("That's the old AAA dressed up" explained the county chairman) will pay farmers $1.30 a ton for spreading limestone within certain limits—no soil test required. "I've had to tell some farmers they were spreading too much limestone—that they would probably be doing more harm than good," recalls W. C. Mummert, former De Kalb County farm adviser, or county agent.

"The PMA will pay for plowing down clover or sweetclover, but not alfalfa. I've rotated with alfalfa since 1901 and I know this crop is worth much more to De Kalb County than clover," reports Henry Parke, pioneer farm and livestock leader. "It doesn't make sense that we can't adapt ourselves to local conditions, but Washington told them they can't do it, so our State and local PMA committees are helpless."

De Kalb County, a fertile, level prairie, got $53,700 from PMA for soil-building practices in 1948. Morgan County, Ill., with 14 percent of its land too eroded for crops, 7 percent so eroded it can be used only in grassland, and 32 percent needing terraces and contouring—Morgan County got only $38,000.

"The PMA is geared to 15 years ago when they had to bribe farmers a bit to get them started on conservation practices," asserted a veteran farm leader. Harney King, county PMA committeeman, admitted that lots of farmers would follow soil-building practices without payment, so the program really was a device to give a farmer extra income.

"But why have a big organization to give away $35 to a farmer?" asked a big-fisted, ruddy-cheeked grain farmer. "I have to drive 17 miles to De Kalb to sign up for the program. I come into the county office in the winter with receipted bills for fertilizer. If I've done some contour farming, an $8-a-day Government hired hand comes over to inspect the job. The girls in the AAA office fuss over my report (in between reading their magazines and talking about what they did on their dates the night before). The reports are sent to Decatur, where some more job holders check them during their busy 5-day week. And I finally get a check—and I understand it costs our Government $5 just to write a check. Sounds like a pretty expensive way to hand out $35."

Farmers are uneasy about the big corn surplus. The realize something must be done. They're not sure PMA's current acreage reduction will do it. "Why, the last time we had corn-acreage controls, the AAA field man himself showed us how we could substitute Atlas sorgo, which takes more out of the soil than corn, and which gave us more forage than corn," said one brow-furrowed veteran of those threadbare thirties. Nine out of ten farmers interviewed thought they could raise almost as much corn with their 1950 acreage cut by planting thicker, adding more fertilizer, using their best ground.

Congress says the Extension Service shall carry out all educational programs in farming. Yet in De Kalb County, the Soil Conservation Service is primarily educational and spends three times as much as Extension. Two full-time men with salaries totaling $7,760, plus 6 others who work part-time in De Kalb County, and drive 5 Government cars, offer farmer cooperators soil maps which most farmers want, plus advice, mainly on rotation, which many do not follow.

Although technical help on laying out contours, strip cropping, and terraces is included in their program, the SCS admittedly soft-pedals these because a few farmers want to do them. Yet, leave out such things, leave out the map, and you have much the same program which the Extension Service has been preaching for 30 years.

"We show farmers how turning under the third crop of alfalfa-brome will put $100 worth of soil nutrients into the soil," said the SCS soils man. But the PMA in the office downstairs has not been able to pay farmers for turning under alfalfa—just clover, sweetclover, and rye.

Fred Willrett, speaking as a director of the De Kalb County soil conservation district, believes the SCS is doing an extremely valuable job, but frets at the slow pace. "We have only 95 plans in operation after 3 years—and we have 250 applications we haven't been able to get to."

"We really need another man to follow up the plans we've already laid out," asserted the SCS conservationist's aid.

There are three lending agencies in De Kalb County using interest-free Federal funds. Farmers get Commodity Credit Corporation price-support loans, administered by PMA, through the local banks or PCA. The local Production Credit Association lent 125 farmers about $1,350,000 in 1948. Although it has set its goal to be a completely farmer-owned credit agency, it still has $90,000 Federal money which it can keep as long as it wants to without paying interest. For each $100 a farmer borrows, he gets $95 cash and a $5 share of stock which makes the interest rate really higher than the current 5½ percent. Local banks now charge from 4 to 5 percent for cattle-feeding loans. Farmers generally feel that the PCA has brought lower rates from private banks.

"Yes, farmers can now borrow money for less at the private banks," admitted Ben McNeely, cattle feeder. "But Production Credit will give you a bigger and longer loan on a bunch of feeder cattle. I could get a $10,000 loan on a $10,000 bunch of cattle by giving a chattel mortgage on them and a crib of corn—the bank won't do that."

De Kalb County bankers quickly say: "We won't, because the same Government that says PCA can, tells us we can't."

PCA boosters say they have the confidence of the farmer—a sort of across-the-backfence way of doing business which the farmer likes. "Another thing which makes our position attractive—we catch all the traffic that goes into the PMA and Farm Bureau offices," said Martin Donnelly, PCA fieldman. (Their office is right inside the front door of the building that houses most of the Government agencies.)

The catch-all for the risky loan business is the Farmers' Home Administration, which 24 out of 25 De Kalb County farmers surveyed said was not needed. It makes loans which the Government forbids other loan agencies to make. Robert Becker, supervisor from outside the county, looks over the six tenant-purchase farms in De Kalb set up by the Farm Security Administration. He handles distress loans to producers, and has the new job of sifting applications for the Public Farm Housing Loans to farmers who want to build a home, put in a bathroom, or build a hog house, and who can't get credit elsewhere. A fifth of his time, and of his office help, takes $1,612 in Federal money.

The 11 vocational agriculture teachers in De Kalb County are paid an average of $4,225.33 each, about one-fourth of which comes from Federal funds. The 12 home economics teachers get about $2,600 each, of which a fourth comes from Federal funds. The agriculture teachers lead Future Farmer clubs; the home-economics teachers, Future Homemakers clubs. In aims and purposes, they are not unlike the 4–H Clubs.

"About 90 percent of our Future Farmers were also 4–H Club members," said W. C. Mummert, who was an agriculture teacher for 7 years, a farm adviser for 6 in De Kalb County. "But we were constantly warned from the State and Federal offices when I was an agriculture teacher to get out of leading 4–H Clubs—to emphasize to the boy with a beef calf that while it could be used in both FFA and 4–H work, the calf definitely was a Future Farmer project being used as a 4–H project and not a 4–H project being used as a Future Farmer project."

The Future Farmers have a district fair. The 4–H Club members have a county fair—mostly the same boys and girls, same animals, same projects.

Yet, there are 2,000 farm boys and girls between 10 and 20 in De Kalb County who are members of neither organization. Better organization between Government-paid youth leaders would permit us to reach more of them, believes Mummert. He used to have regular meetings with the vocational-agriculture teachers when he was in extension work. We have so much in common and could do so much more if we'd have one coordinated program. There's wasted opportunity here for furthering agriculture.

Training veterans how to farm is costing the Government 50 percent more than its 11 agriculture teachers and 12 home-economics teachers. The United States Veterans' Administration poured $20,118.04 into the county to train 111 boys. In addition to the agriculture teachers who get an additional $55 a month for teaching a veterans' class, seven extra instructors were hired at $65 a month to teach one night class a week—three self-employed veterans make up one class.

Extension activities in De Kalb County cost the Federal Government $7,660. About $5,000 of this pays part of the salary of the farm adviser (county agent), his assistant, home adviser and her assistant, while the balance is for the part-time services of 48 university extension specialists who visited the county for 1 day or more during the course of the year. The county itself contributes $6,922, and the State $3,922 toward the farm and home advisers' wages.

The statistics show the farm adviser spent 173 days in the office, 126 in the field, had 9,226 phone calls, wrote 7,554 letters, visited 107 farms, had 98 night meetings and 6,000 office visits. The home adviser and her assistant worked 241 days with adults, 240½ with 4-H Clubs and older youth. They made 113 home visits, had 1,234 office calls, 1,599 telephone calls. They have 678 home-bureau members, 308 girl 4-H Club members, and 75 rural youth. "This is one group we really overwork," one farmer commented when he saw these statistics.

A former extension director of De Kalb County feels there can be improvement here. "We have extension specialists come up from the university for a 1-day stand, and maybe 16 to 30 farmers show up for the meeting. And they're the same farmers who come meeting after meeting. We should have the information from the specialists in a form

that would get it out to all 2,500 farmers in De Kalb County."

In a nearby county, a health extension specialist (salary: $5,000) came from the State college, 165 miles away (expenses: $25) to talk to a meeting on health. Her audience: six women. The cost: $10 each.

The Production and Marketing Administration paid 83 men and women for working on the farm program in De Kalb County—committeemen, office girls, crib inspectors, auditors, field men. The bill for 1949 will be an estimated $31,746.57. This does not include any conservation payments, crop loans, or the $64,082 to set up cribs and seal corn.

"The farm program is run by the farmers," the PMA chairman said. "But elections for PMA committeemen are getting to be pretty much of a joke," said one farmer. This past year only 180 out of 2,500 farmers voted. The three township committeemen and their two alternates, voting for themselves in each township, could have swung the elections throughout the county. In two townships, only four men showed up to cast ballots.

"I'm afraid that when a farmer is elected to the PMA committee he becomes biased in spite of himself," believes Henry Parks. "And once we set up a temporary Government bureau, it quickly becomes permanent."

"If you think PMA has a big staff now," cracked one former official, "wait till we get corn and wheat quotas and maybe soybean-acreage control—brother, you'll see the PMA grow and grow."

With all of these facts and statistics, De Kalb County is a most unusual county:

1. It has fewer Federal employees than most counties of similar size. It has no REA, Crop Insurance Corporation, Forestry Service, Reclamation Service, or half a dozen other Government agencies that have been set up to help the farmers farm in many counties.

2. Its employees, prodded by intelligent farm boards, do a better-than-average job. Example: The local PMA committee spent only 9 percent of the total soil-conservation payments for administration, while the State average was nearly 14 percent and some counties spent almost 20 percent—just to figure up and send out the checks.

3. Cooperation between Government bureaus is as high as in any county I've visited. "Sometimes I think the Extension Service, the PMA, and PCA have to have so many meetings to keep their wires straight, they waste time when they should be working," smiled E. E. Houghtby.

4. There is a strong desire by De Kalb County farmers to stand on their own feet. Through their County Farm Bureau—2,900 members at $15 each in a county of 2,500 farms—they have spent $8,200 on youth and extension activities. They have hired a livestock marketing expert for $4,000. One feeder said he made $1,900 when Lee Moser advised him to reject a country bid and ship his cattle to Chicago. Another afternoon, he visited four different farms, and those farmers by following his advice on shipping, made an extra $3,600. Last year he gave advice to 900 livestock men. "That's the kind of advice we can't get from Washington for any price," says the County Farm Bureau president, George Bark.

Last year, worried about high taxes, they hired a tax expert for $4,192. "We get our tax bills, bellyache and then forget them," says Bark. "We wanted our citizens to know where their tax money goes, so we can get the most for our tax dollar."

They invested $2,800 in a soil-testing laboratory. They test soil free, and will pick up soil samples for 10 cents an acre.

De Kalb County farmers know they can do things at the county level—they also feel that they can do more of their own thinking there.

"In forty-two years of farming, Uncle Sam looked to us to keep him going. Now it seems everyone is looking to Uncle Sam to keep them. Let's look after ourselves. Farmers at the grass-roots level are just as smart as they are at the State or Federal level," declared Frank Schweitzer. "We're petted too much politically."

County PMA Chairman Terwilliger had something to say on that too: "We can stand on our own feet. We're able to think for ourselves. We don't want dictation from the State offices. We don't have to take guff from anyone outside the county. Give the farmers the right to decide what they want."

De Kalb County farmers, appreciating the need of some kind of farm program, nevertheless want it kept simple. They don't like to see Big Government get bigger, and controls get more rigid.

Daniel Webster's Speech 100 Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is another anniversary that will live long in the history of America. One hundred years ago today Daniel Webster made his famous Seventh of March speech.

That speech contains some colloquy between him and John C. Calhoun. Present that day was Jefferson Davis, later President of the Confederacy, and also Senator Cass, of Michigan, who I believe was at one time the Democratic candidate for President.

Daniel Webster made more enemies in the North with that speech than any other speech he ever made, for the simple reason he was trying to avert an internal conflict, the War Between the States.

It came after he passed away and his son, probably his only son, Fletcher Webster, was killed in the first battle, the Battle of Bull Run.

As I look back over that history I wonder if it would not be good for the Members of the House to reread that speech and reread the colloquy between him and Mr. Calhoun and to get back on the beam, if you please, and take the advice of Calvin Coolidge.

On one occasion I attended an American Legion convention in Boston. I saw two Presidents of the United States on the same platform, a former President and the then President of the United States. It was the only time I have ever seen that situation. The only man in this House who was present, if I remember correctly, was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. The boys were all singing "We've paid our debt to Lafayette; who the hell do we owe now?" They were clamoring for Mr. Coolidge to make a speech. Mr. Hoover at that time was President and was on the platform with him.

Finally the pressure got so strong that Mr. Coolidge rose and made one of the best speeches I have ever heard a man make in one sentence. He said, "We have paid our debt to Lafayette; now let us pay our debt to ourselves," and sat down.

It is time for us to take that sage advice and save America for Americans—for our children and our children's children to the remotest generation.

The speech made by Daniel Webster 100 years ago today is as follows:

SPEECH IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 7, 1850

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Kentucky were made the special order of the day at 12 o'clock. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Walker] has the floor.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. President, this vast audience has not assembled to hear me; and there is but one man, in my opinion, who can assemble such an audience. They expect to hear him, and I feel it to be my duty, as it is my pleasure, to give the floor, therefore, to the Senator from Massachusetts. I understand it is immaterial to him upon which of these questions he speaks, and therefore I will not move to postpone the special order.

Mr. WEBSTER. I beg to express my obligations to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. Walker], as well as to my friend from New York [Mr. Seward], for their courtesy in allowing me to address the Senate this morning.

Mr. President, I wish to speak today, not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a Northern man, but as an American, and a Member of the Senate of the United States. It is fortunate that there is a Senate of the United States; a body, not yet moved from its propriety, not lost to a just sense of its own dignity, and its own high responsibilities, and a body to which the country looks, with confidence, for wise, moderate, patriotic, and healing counsels. It is not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitations, and are surrounded by very considerable dangers to our institutions and government. The imprisoned winds are let loose. The East, the North, and the stormy South, combine to throw the whole ocean into commotion, to toss its billows to the skies, and disclose its profoundest depths. I do not affect to regard myself, Mr. President, as holding, or as fit to hold, the helm in this combat with the political elements; but I have a duty to perform, and I mean to perform it with fidelity, not without a sense of existing dangers, but not without hope. I have a part to act, not for my own security or safety, for I am looking out for no fragment upon which to float away from the wreck, if wreck there must be, but for the good of the whole, and the preservation of all; and there is that which will keep me to my duty during this struggle, whether the sun and the stars shall appear, or shall not appear, for many days. I speak today for the preservation of the Union. "Hear me for my cause." I speak, today, out of a solicitous and anxious heart, for the restoration to the country of that quiet and that harmony which make the blessings of this Union so rich and so dear to us all. These are the topics that I propose to myself to discuss; these are the motives, and the sole motives, that influence me in the wish to communicate my opinions to the Senate and the country; and if I can do anything, however little, for the promotion of these ends, I shall have accomplished all that I expect.

Mr. President, it may not be amiss to refer very briefly to the events which, equally sudden and extraordinary, have brought the political condition of the country to what it now is. In May 1846 the United States declared war against Mexico. Our armies, then on the frontiers, entered the provinces of that Republic, met and defeated all her

troops, penetrated her mountain passes, and occupied her capital. The Marine force of the United States took possession of her forts and her towns, on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. In less than 2 years, a treaty was negotiated, by which Mexico ceded to the United States a vast territory, extending seven or eight hundred miles along the shores of the Pacific, and reaching back over the mountains, and across the desert, until it joins the frontier of the State of Texas. It so happened, in the distracted and feeble state of the Mexican Government, that, before the declaration of war by the United States against Mexico had become known in California, the people of California, under the lead of American officers, overthrew the existing provincial government of California, the Mexican authorities, and ran up an independent flag. When the news arrived at San Francisco that war had been declared by the United States against Mexico, this independent flag was pulled down, and the Stars and Stripes of this Union hoisted in its stead. So, sir, before the war was over, the forces of the United States, military and naval, had possession of San Francisco and upper California, and a great rush of emigrants from various parts of the world took place into California in 1846 and 1847. But now, behold another wonder.

In January of 1848, the Mormons, or some of them, made a discovery of an extraordinarily rich mine of gold, or, rather, of a very great quantity of gold, hardly fit to be called a mine, for it was spread near the surface, on the lower part of the south, or American, branch of the Sacramento. They seem to have attempted to conceal their discovery for some time; but soon another discovery, perhaps of greater importance, was made of gold, in another part of the American branch of the Sacramento, and near Sutter's Fort, as it is called. The fame of these discoveries spread far and wide. They inflamed more and more the spirit of emigration toward California, which had already been excited; and persons crowded in hundreds, and flocked toward the Bay of San Francisco. This, as I have said, took place in the winter and spring of 1848. The digging commenced in the spring of that year, and from that time to this the work of searching for gold has been prosecuted with a success not heretofore known in the history of this globe. We all know, sir, how incredulous the American public was at the accounts which reached us, at first, of these discoveries; but we all know, now, that these accounts received, and continue to receive, daily confirmation, and down to the present moment I suppose the assurances are as strong, after the experience of these several months, of mines of gold apparently inexhaustible in the regions near San Francisco, in California, as they were at any period of the earlier dates of the accounts. It so happened, sir, that, although after the return of peace, it became a very important subject for legislative consideration and legislative decision, to provide a proper territorial government for California, yet differences of opinion in the counsels of the Government prevented the establishment of any such territorial government, at the last session of Congress. Under this state of things, the inhabitants of San Francisco and California, then amounting to a great number of people, in the summer of last year, thought it to be their duty to establish a local government. Under the proclamation of General Riley, the people chose delegates to a convention; that convention met at Monterey. They formed a constitution for the State of California, and it was adopted by the people of California in their primary assemblages. Desirous of immediate connection with the United States, its Senators were appointed and Representatives were chosen, who have come hither, bringing with them the authentic constitution of the State of California; and they now present themselves, asking, in behalf of their State, that it may be admitted into this Union as one of the United States. This constitution, sir, contains an express prohibition against slavery, or involuntary servitude, in the State of California. It is said, and I suppose truly, that of the members who composed that convention some 16 were natives of, and had been residents in, the slaveholding States, about 22 were from the nonslaveholding States, and the remaining 10 members were either native Californians or old settlers in that country. This prohibition against slavery, it is said, was inserted with entire unanimity.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator give way until order is restored?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will see that order is restored, and no more persons admitted to the floor.

Mr. CASS. I trust the scene of the other day will not be repeated. The sergeant-at-arms must display more energy in suppressing this disorder.

Mr. HALE. The noise is outside of the door.

Mr. WEBSTER. And it is this circumstance, sir, the prohibition of slavery by that convention, which has contributed to raise, I do not say it has wholly raised, the dispute as to the propriety of the admission of California into the Union under this Constitution. It is not to be denied, Mr. President, nobody thinks of denying, that, whatever reasons were assigned at the commencement of the late war with Mexico, it was prosecuted for the purpose of the acquisition of territory, and under the alleged argument that the cession of territory was the only form in which proper compensation could be made to the United States by Mexico, for the various claims and demands which the people of this country had against that government. At any rate, it will be found that President Polk's message, at the commencement of the session of December 1847 avowed that the war was to be prosecuted until some acquisition of territory should be made. And, as the acquisition was to be south of the line of the United States, in warm climates and countries, it was naturally, I suppose, expected by the South, that whatever acquisitions were made in that region would be added to the slaveholding portion of the United States. Very little of accurate information was possessed of the real physical character, either of California or New Mexico; and events have turned out as was not expected; both California and New Mexico are likely to come in as free; and therefore some degree of disappointment and surprise has resulted. In other words, it is obvious that the question which has so long harassed the country, and at some times very seriously alarmed the minds of wise and good men, has come upon us for a fresh discussion; the question of slavery in these United States.

Now, sir, I propose, perhaps at the expense of some detail and consequent detention of the Senate, to review historically this question, which, partly in consequence of its own importance, and partly, perhaps mostly, in consequence of the manner in which it has been discussed in one and the other portion of the country, has been a source of so much alienation and unkind feeling.

We all know, sir, that slavery has existed in the world from time immemorial. There was slavery, in the earliest periods of history, in the oriental nations. There was slavery among the Jews; the theocratic government of that people ordained no injunction against it. There was slavery among the Greeks; and the ingenious philosophy of the Greeks found, or sought to find, a justification for it exactly upon the grounds which have been assumed for such a justification in this country; that is, a natural and original difference among the races of mankind, and the inferiority of the black or colored race to the white. The Greeks justified their system of slavery upon that idea, precisely. They held the African, and in some parts the Asiatic, tribes to be inferior to the white race; but they did not show, I think, by any close process of logic, that, if this were true, the more intelligent and the stronger had therefore a right to subjugate the weaker.

The more manly philosophy and jurisprudence of the Romans placed the justification of slavery on entirely different grounds.

The Roman jurists, from the first and down to the fall of the empire, admitted that slavery was against the natural law, by which, as they maintained, all men of whatsoever clime, color, or capacity were equal; but they justified slavery, first, upon the ground and authority of the law of nations, arguing, and arguing truly, that at that day the conventional law of nations admitted that captives in war, whose lives, according to the notions of the times, were at the absolute disposal of the captors, might, in exchange for exemption from death, be made slaves for life, and that such servitude might descend to their posterity. The jurists of Rome also maintained that by the civil law there might be servitude or slavery, personal and hereditary; first, by the voluntary act of an individual who might sell himself into slavery; secondly, by his being received into a state of slavery by his creditors in satisfaction of his debts; and, thirdly, by being placed in a state of servitude or slavery for crime. At the introduction of Christianity, the Roman world was full of slaves, and I suppose there is to be found no injunction against that relation between man and man, in the teachings of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or of any of his apostles. The object of the instruction imparted to mankind by the founder of Christianity was to touch the heart, purify the soul, and improve the lives of individual men. That object went directly to the first fountain of all political and all social relations of the human race, as well as of all true religious feeling, the individual heart and mind of man.

Now, sir, upon the general nature, and character, and influence of slavery, there exists a wide difference between the northern portion of this country and the southern. It is said on the one side that, if not the subject of any injunction or direct prohibition in the New Testament, slavery is a wrong; that it is founded merely in the right of the strongest; and that it is an oppression, like unjust wars, like all those conflicts by which a mighty nation subjects a weaker nation to its will; and that slavery, in its nature, whatever may be said of it in the modifications which have taken place, is not in fact according to the meek spirit of the Gospel. It is not "kindly affectioned"; it does not "seek another's, and not its own"; it does not "let the oppressed go free." These are sentiments that are cherished, and recently with greatly augmented force, among the people of the Northern States. They have taken hold of the religious sentiment of that part of the country, as they have more or less taken hold of the religious feelings of a considerable portion of mankind. The South, upon the other side, having been accustomed to this relation between the two races all their lives, from their birth; having been taught, in general, to treat the subjects of this bondage with care and kindness, and I believe, in general, feeling for them great care and kindness, have not taken the view of the subject which I have mentioned. There are thousands of religious men, with consciences as tender as any of their brethren at the North, who do not see the unlawfulness of slavery; and there are more thousands, perhaps, that, whatsoever they may think of it in its origin, and as a matter depending upon natural right, yet take things as they are, and, finding slavery to be an established relation of the society in which they live, can see no way in which, let their opinions on the abstract question be what they may, it is in the power of the

present generation to relieve themselves from this relation. And, in this respect, candor obliges me to say, that I believe they are just as conscientious, many of them, and the religious people, all of them, as they are in the North who hold different opinions.

Why, sir, the honorable Senator from South Carolina, the other day, alluded to the separation of that great religious community, the Methodist Episcopal Church. That separation was brought about by differences of opinion upon this particular subject of slavery. I felt great concern, as that dispute went on, about the result; and I was in hopes that the difference of opinion might be adjusted, because I looked upon that religious denomination as one of the great props of religion and morals, throughout the whole country, from Maine to Georgia, and westward, to our utmost western boundary. The result was against my wishes and against my hopes. I have read all their proceedings, and all their arguments; but I have never yet been able to come to the conclusion that there was any real ground for that separation; in other words, that any good could be produced by that separation. I must say I think there was some want of candor and charity. Sir, when a question of this kind seizes on the religious sentiments of mankind, and comes to be discussed in religious assemblies of the clergy and laity, there is always to be expected, or always to be feared, a great degree of excitement. It is in the nature of man, manifested by his whole history, that religious disputes are apt to become warm, as men's strength of conviction is proportionate to their views of the magnitude of the questions. In all such disputes, there will sometimes men be found with whom everything is absolute, absolutely wrong, or absolutely right. They see the right clearly; they think others ought so to see it, and they are disposed to establish a broad line of distinction between what is right, and what is wrong. And they are not seldom willing to establish that line upon their own convictions of truth and justice; and are ready to mark and guard it, by placing along it a series of dogmas, as lines of boundary on the earth's surface are marked by posts and stones. There are men who, with clear perceptions, as they think, of their own duty, do not see how too hot a pursuit of one duty may involve them in the violation of others, or how too warm an embracement of one truth may lead to a disregard of other truths equally important. As I heard it stated strongly, not many days ago, these persons are disposed to mount upon some particular duty as upon a war horse, and to drive, furiously on and upon, and over, all other duties that may stand in the way. There are men who, in times of that sort, and in disputes of that sort, are of opinion that human duties may be ascertained with the exactness of mathematics. They deal with morals as with mathematics; and they think what is right may be distinguished from what is wrong, with the precision of an algebraic equation. They have, therefore, none too much charity toward others who differ from them. They are apt, too, to think that nothing is good but what is perfect, and that there are no compromises or modifications to be made in submission to difference of opinion, or in deference to other men's judgment. If their perspicacious vision enables them to detect a spot on the face of the sun, they think that a good reason why the sun should be struck down from heaven. They prefer the chance of running into utter darkness, to living in heavenly light, if that heavenly light be not absolutely without any imperfection. There are impatient men, too impatient always to give heed to the admonition of St. Paul, "that we are not to do evil that good may come;" too impatient to wait for the slow progress of moral causes in the improvement of mankind. They do not remember that the doctrines and the miracles of Jesus Christ have, in 1,800 years, converted only a small portion of the human race; and among the nations that are converted to Christianity, they forget how many vices and crimes, public and private, still prevail, and that many of them, public crimes especially, which are so clearly offenses against the Christian religion, pass without exciting particular indignation. Thus wars are waged, and unjust wars. I do not deny that there may be just wars. There certainly are; but it was the remark of an eminent person, not many years ago, on the other side of the Atlantic, that it was one of the greatest reproaches to human nature, that wars were sometimes just. The defense of nations sometimes causes a just war against the injustice of other nations.

Now, sir, in this state of sentiment upon the general nature of slavery lies the cause of a great part of those unhappy divisions, exasperations, and reproaches, which find vent and support in different parts of the Union. Slavery does exist in the United States. It did exist in the States before the adoption of this Constitution, and at that time.

And now let us consider, sir, for a moment, what was the state of sentiment, North and South, in regard to slavery, at the time this Constitution was adopted. A remarkable change has taken place since; but what did the wise and great men of all parts of the country think of slavery, then? In what estimation did they hold it at the time when this Constitution was adopted? Now, it will be found, sir, if we will carry ourselves by historical research back to that day, and ascertain men's opinions by authentic records still existing among us, that there was no great diversity of opinion between the North and the South, upon the subject of slavery. And it will be found that both parts of the country held it equally an evil, a moral and political evil. It will not be found that, either at the North or at the South, there was much, though there was some, invective against slavery as inhuman and cruel. The great ground of objection to it was political; that it weakened the social fabric; that, taking the place of free labor, society became less strong and labor was less productive; and, therefore, we find from all the eminent men of the time the clearest expression of their opinion that slavery was an evil. And they ascribed its existence here, not without truth, and not without some acerbity of temper and force of language, to the injurious policy of the mother country, who, to favor the navigator, had entailed these evils upon the colonies. I need hardly refer, sir, particularly to the publications of the day. They are matters of history on the record. The eminent men, the most eminent men, and nearly all the conspicuous politicians of the South, held the same sentiments; that slavery was an evil, a blight, a blast, a mildew, a scourge, and a curse. There are no terms of reprobation of slavery so vehement in the North of that day as in the South. The North was not so much excited against it as the South; and the reason is, I suppose, because there was much less of it at the North, and the people did not see, or think they saw, the evils so prominently as they were seen, or thought to be seen, at the South.

Then, sir, when this Constitution was framed, this was the light in which the Convention viewed it: The Convention reflected the judgment and sentiments of the great men of the South. A Member of the other House, whom I have not the honor to know, in a recent speech, has collected extracts from these public documents. They prove the truth of what I am saying, and the question then was how to deal with it, and how to deal with it as an evil. Well, they came to this general result: They thought that slavery could not be continued in the country if the importation of slaves were made to cease, and therefore they provided that after a certain period the importation might be prevented by the act of the new Government. Twenty years was proposed by some gentleman, a northern gentleman, I think, and many of the southern gentlemen opposed it as being too long. Mr. Madison especially was melting warm against it. He said it would bring too much of this mischief into the country to allow the importation of slaves for such a period. Because we must take along with us, in the whole of this discussion, when we are considering the sentiments and opinions in which the constitutional provision originated, that the conviction of all men was that if the importation of slaves ceased the white race would multiply faster than the black race, and that slavery would therefore gradually wear out and expire. It may not be improper here to allude to that, I had almost said, celebrated opinion of Mr. Madison. You observe, sir, that the term "slave," or "slavery," is not used in the Constitution. The Constitution does not require that "fugitive slaves" shall be delivered up. It requires that "persons bound to service in one State and escaping into another shall be delivered up." Mr. Madison opposed the introduction of the term "slave," or "slavery," into the Constitution, for he said that he did not wish to see it recognized by the Constitution of the United States of America that there could be property in men. Now, sir, all this took place at the Convention in 1787; but connected with this, concurrent and cotemporaneous, is another important transaction not sufficiently attended to. The Convention for framing this Constitution assembled in Philadelphia in May and sat until September 1787. During all that time the Congress of the United States was in session at New York. It was a matter of design, as we know, that the Convention should not assemble in the same city where Congress was holding its sessions. Almost all the public men of the country, therefore, of distinction and eminence were in one or the other of these two assemblies, and I think it happened, in some instances, that the same gentlemen were members of both. If I mistake not, such was the case of Mr. Rufus King, then a Member of Congress from Massachusetts and at the same time a member of the Convention to frame the Constitution. Now, it was in the summer of 1787, the very time when the Convention in Philadelphia was framing this Constitution, that the Congress in New York was framing the ordinance of 1787. They passed that ordinance on the 13th of July 1787 at New York, the very month, perhaps the very day, on which these questions about the importation of slaves and the character of slavery were debated in the Convention at Philadelphia. And, so far as we can now learn, there was a perfect concurrence of opinion between these respective bodies, and it resulted in this ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery as to all the territory over which the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction, and that was all the territory northwest of the Ohio. Three years before Virginia and other States had made a cession of that great territory to the United States, and a most magnificent act it was. I never reflect upon it without a disposition to do honor and justice, and justice would be the highest honor, to Virginia for the cession of her northwestern territory. I will say, sir, it is one of her fairest claims to the respect and gratitude of the United States, and that, perhaps, it is only second to that other claim which attaches to her—that from her counsels and from the intelligence and patriotism of her leading statesmen proceeded the first idea put into practice of the formation of a general Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the ordinance of 1787 was applied thus

to the whole territory over which the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction. It was adopted 2 years before the Constitution of the United States went into operation, because the ordinance took effect immediately on its passage, while the Constitution of the United States, having been framed, was to be sent to the States to be adopted by their conventions, and then a government was to be organized under it. This ordinance, then, was in operation and force when the Constitution was adopted and the Government put in motion, in April 1789.

Mr. President, three things are quite clear as historical truths. One is, that there was an expectation that, on the ceasing of the importation of slaves from Africa slavery would begin to run out here. That was hoped and expected. Another is, that, as far as there was any power in Congress to prevent the spread of slavery in the United States, that power was executed in the most absolute manner, and to the fullest extent. An honorable Member, whose health does not allow him to be here today——

A SENATOR. He is here. (Referring to Mr. Calhoun.)

Mr. WEBSTER. I am very happy to hear that he is; may he long be here, and in the enjoyment of health to serve his country! The honorable Member said, the other day, that he considered this ordinance as the first, in the series of measures, calculated to enfeeble the South, and deprive them of their just participation in the benefits and privileges of this Government. He says very properly that it was enacted under the old confederation and before this Constitution went into effect; but my present purpose is only to say, Mr. President, that it was established with the entire and unanimous concurrence of the whole South. Why, there it stands! The vote of every State in the Union was unanimous in favor of the ordinance, with the exception of a single individual vote, and that individual vote was given by a northern man. But, sir, the ordinance abolishing, or rather prohibiting slavery northwest of the Ohio, has the hand and seal of every southern Member in Congress. So this ordinance was no aggression of the North on the South.

The other and third clear historical truth is, that the Convention meant to leave slavery in the States, as they found it, entirely under the authority and control of the States themselves.

This was the state of things, sir, and this the state of opinion, under which those very important matters were arranged, and those three important things done; that is, the establishment of the Constitution with a recognition of slavery as it existed in the States; the establishment of the ordinance prohibiting to the full extent of all territory owned by the United States, the introduction of slavery into that territory, while leaving to the States all power over slavery in their own limits; and creating a power, in the new government, to put an end to the importation of slaves, after a limited period. And here, sir, we may pause. We may reflect for a moment upon the entire coincidence and concurrence of sentiment, between the North and the South, upon all these questions, at the period of the adoption of the Constitution. But opinions, sir, have changed, greatly changed, changed North, and changed South. Slavery is not regarded in the South now as it was then. I see an honorable Member of this body paying me the honor of listening to my remarks (Mr. Mason); he brings to me, sir, freshly and vividly, what I have learned of his great ancestor, so much distinguished in his day and generation, so worthy to be succeeded by so worthy a grandson, with all the sentiments he expressed in the Convention in Philadelphia.

Here we may pause. There was, if not an entire unanimity, a general concurrence of sentiment, running through the whole community, and especially entertained by the eminent men of all parts of the country. But soon a change began, at the North and the South, and a severance of opinion showed itself; the North growing much more warm and strong against slavery, and the South growing much more warm and strong in its support. Sir, there is no generation of mankind whose opinions are not subject to be influenced by what appears to them to be their present, emergent, and exigent interests. I impute to the South no particularly selfish view in the change which has come over her. I impute to her certainly no dishonest view. All that has happened has been natural. It has followed those causes which always influence the human mind and operate upon it. What, then, have been the causes which have created so new a feeling in favor of slavery in the South, which have changed the whole nomenclature of the South on that subject, so that, from being thought and described in the terms I have mentioned and will not repeat, it has now become an institution, a cherished institution in that quarter; no evil, no scourge, but a great religious, social, and moral blessing, as I think I have heard it latterly spoken of? I suppose this, sir, is owing to the sudden uprising and rapid growth of the cotton plantations of the South. So far as any motive consistent with honor, justice, and general judgment could act, it was the cotton interest that gave a new desire to promote slavery, to spread it, and to use its labor. I again say that that was produced by causes which we must always expect to produce like effects; the whole interest of the South became connected, more or less, with it. If we look back to the history of the commerce of this country at the early years of this Government, what were our exports? Cotton was hardly, or but to a very limited extent, known. The tables will show that the exports of cotton for the years 1790–91 were not more than $40,000 or $50,000 a year. It has gone on increasing rapidly, until the whole crop may now, perhaps, in a season of great product and high prices, amount to a hundred millions of dollars. In the years I have mentioned, there was more of wax, more of indigo, more of rice, more of almost every article of export from the South, than of cotton. I think it is true when Mr. Jay negotiated the treaty of 1794 with England, that he did not know that cotton was exported at all from the United States; and I have heard it said, also, that the customhouse in London refused to admit cotton, upon an allegation that it could not be an American production, there being, as they supposed, no cotton raised in America. They would hardly think so now.

Well, sir, we know what followed. The age of cotton become the golden age of our southern brethren. It gratified their desire for improvement and accumulation at the same time that it excited it. The desire grew by what it fed upon and there soon came to be an eagerness for other territory—a new area or new areas—for the cultivation of the cotton crop, and measures leading to this result were brought about rapidly, one after another, under the lead of southern men at the head of the Government, they having a majority in both branches to accomplish their ends. The honorable Member from South Carolina observed that there has been a majority all along in favor of the North. If that be true, sir, the North has acted either very liberally and kindly or very weakly, for they never exercised that majority efficiently five times in the history of the Government when a division or trial of strength arose—never. Whether they were outgeneraled or whether it was owing to other causes, I shall not stop to consider, but no man acquainted with the history of the country can deny that the general lead in the politics of the country for three-fourths of the period that has elapsed since the adoption of the Constitution has been a southern lead. In 1802, in pursuit of the idea of opening a new cotton region, the United States obtained a cession from Georgia of the whole of her western territory, now embracing the rich and growing State of Alabama. In 1803 Louisiana was purchased from France, out of which the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri have been framed as slaveholding States. In 1819 the cession of Florida was made, bringing in another region of slaveholding property and territory. Sir, the honorable Member from South Carolina thought he saw in certain operations of the Government, such as the manner of collecting the revenue, and the tendency of measures calculated to promote emigration into the country, what accounts for the more rapid growth of the North than the South. He ascribes that more rapid growth not to the operation of time but to system of government and administration established under this Constitution.

That is matter of opinion. To a certain extent it may be true; but it does seem to me that if any operation of the Government could be shown in any degree to have promoted the population, and growth, and wealth of the North, it is much more sure that there are sundry important and distinct operations of the Government, about which no man can doubt, tending to promote, and which absolutely have promoted, the increase of the slave interest and the slave territory of the South. Allow me to say that it was not time that brought in Louisiana; it was the act of men. It was not time that brought in Florida; it was the act of men. And lastly, sir, to complete those acts of men which have contributed so much to enlarge the area and the sphere of the institution of slavery, Texas, great and vast and illimitable Texas, was added to the Union as a slave State in 1845; and that, sir, pretty much closed the whole chapter, and settled the whole account. That closed the whole chapter, that settled the whole account, because the annexation of Texas, upon the conditions and under the guaranties upon which she was admitted, did not leave within the control of this Government an acre of land, capable of being cultivated by slave labor, between this Capitol and the Rio Grande or the Nueces, or whatever is the proper boundary of Texas, not an acre. From that moment, the whole country, from this place to the western boundary of Texas, was fixed, pledged, fastened, decided, to be slave territory forever, by the solemn guaranties of law. And I now say, sir, as the proposition upon which I stand this day, and upon the truth and firmness of which I intend to act until it is overthrown, that there is not at this moment within the United States, or any Territory of the United States, a single foot of land, the character of which, in regard to its being free-soil territory or slave territory, is not fixed by some law, and some irrepealable law, beyond the power of the action of the Government. Now, is it not so with respect to Texas? Why it is most manifestly so. The honorable Member from South Carolina, at the time of the admission of Texas, held an important post in the executive department of the Government; he was Secretary of State. Another eminent person of great activity and adroitness in affairs, I mean the late Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Walker, was a conspicuous member of this body, and took the lead in the business of annexation, in cooperation with the Secretary of State; and I must say that they did their business faithfully and thoroughly; there was no botch left in it. They rounded it off, and made as close joiner work as ever was exhibited. Resolutions of annexation were brought into Congress, fitly joined together, compact, firm, efficient, conclusive upon the great object which they had in view, and those resolutions passed.

Allow me to read a part of these resolutions. It is the third clause of the second section of the resolution of the 1st March

1845, for the admission of Texas, which applies to this part of the case. That clause reads in these words:

"New States, of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36°30' north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire; and in such State or States as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri Compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited."

Now what is here stipulated, enacted, secured? It is, that all Texas south of 36°30', which is nearly the whole of it, shall be admitted into the Union as a slave State. It was a slave State, and therefore came in as a slave State; and the guaranty is, that new States shall be made out of it, and that such States as are formed out of that portion of Texas lying south of 36°30' may come in as slave States to the number of four, in addition to the State then in existence, and admitted at that time by these resolutions. I know no form of legislation which can strengthen this. I know no mode of recognition that can add a tittle of weight to it. I listened respectfully to the resolutions of my honorable friend from Tennessee, Mr. Bell. He proposed to recognize that stipulation with Texas. But any additional recognition would weaken the force of it; because it stands here on the ground of a contract, a thing done for a consideration. It is a law founded on a contract with Texas, and designed to carry that contract into effect. A recognition now, founded not on any consideration or any contract, would not be so strong as it now stands on the face of the resolution. Now I know no way, I candidly confess, in which this Government, acting in good faith, as I trust it always will, can relieve itself from that stipulation and pledge, by any honest course of legislation whatever. And, therefore, I say again that, so far as Texas is concerned, in the whole of Texas south of 36°30', which, I suppose, embraces all the territory capable of slave cultivation, there is no land, not an acre, the character of which is not established by law, a law which cannot be repealed without the violation of a contract, and plain disregard of the public faith.

I hope, sir, it is now apparent that my proposition, so far as it respects Texas, has been maintained; and that the provision in this article is clear and absolute—and it has been well suggested by my friend from Rhode Island that that part of Texas which lies north of 34° of north latitude and which may be formed into free States, is dependent, in like manner, upon the consent of Texas, herself a slave State.

Well, now, sir, how came this? How came it to pass, that within these walls, where it is said by the honorable Member from South Carolina that the free States have always had a majority, this resolution of annexation, such as I have described it, found a majority in both Houses of Congress? Why, sir, it found that majority by the great number of northern votes added to the entire southern vote, or at least nearly the whole of the southern votes. The aggregate was made up of northern and southern votes. In the House of Representatives it stood, I think, about 80 southern votes for the admission of Texas, and about 50 northern votes for the admission of Texas. In the Senate, the vote stood for the admission of Texas 27, and 25 against it; and of those 27 votes, constituting a majority for the admission of Texas in this body, no less than 13 came from the free States, and 4 of them were from New England. The whole of these 13 Senators, constituting, within a fraction, you see, one-half of all the votes in this body for the admission of Texas, with its immeasurable extent of slave territory, were sent here by free States.

Sir, there is not so remarkable a chapter in our history of political events, political parties, and political men, as is afforded by this measure for the admission of Texas, with this immense territory, that a bird cannot fly over in a week. [Laughter.] Sir, New England, with some of her own votes, supported this measure. Three-fourths of the votes of liberty-loving Connecticut were given for it, in the other House; and one-half here. There was one vote for it in Maine, but I am happy to say not the vote of the honorable member who addressed the Senate the day before yesterday [Mr. HAMLIN], and who was then a Representative from Maine in the House of Representatives: but there was a vote or two from Maine, aye, and there was one vote for it from Massachusetts, given by a gentleman then representing, and now living in, the district in which the prevalence to some extent of free-soil sentiment for a couple of years or so has defeated the choice of any member to represent it in Congress. Sir, that body of northern and eastern men, who gave those votes at that time, are now seen taking upon themselves, in the nomenclature of politics, the appellation of the northern Democracy. They undertook to wield the destinies of this empire, if I may call a republic an empire, and their policy was, and they persisted in it, to bring into this country, and under this Government, all the territory they could. They did it under pledges, absolute pledges to the slave interest in the case of Texas, and afterward they lent their aid in bringing in these new conquests to take their chance for slavery or freedom. My honorable friend from Georgia, in March 1847, moved the Senate to declare that the war ought not to be prosecuted for acquisition, for conquest, for the dismemberment of Mexico. The same northern Democracy entirely voted against it. He did not get a vote from them. It suited the views, the patriotism, the elevated sentiments of the northern Democracy to bring in a world here, among the mountains and valleys of California and New Mexico, or any other part of Mexico, and then quarrel about it; to bring it in, and then endeavor to put upon it the saving grace of the Wilmot Proviso. There were two eminent and highly respectable gentlemen from the North and East, then leading gentlemen in the Senate—I refer, and I do so with entire respect, for I entertain for both of those gentlemen, in general, high regard, to Mr. Dix, of New York, and Mr. Niles, of Connecticut—who both voted for the admission of Texas. They would not have that vote any other way than as it stood; and they would have it as it did stand. I speak of the vote upon the annexation of Texas. Those two gentlemen would have the resolution of annexation just as it is, and they voted for it just as it is, and their eyes were all open to its true character. The honorable Member who addressed us the other day from South Carolina, was then Secretary of State. His correspondence with Mr. Murphy, the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States in Texas, had been published. That correspondence was all before those gentlemen, and the Secretary had the boldness and candor to avow in that correspondence that the great object sought by the annexation of Texas was to strengthen the slave interest of the South. Why, sir, he said so, in so many words——

Mr. CALHOUN. Will the honorable Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. WEBSTER. Certainly.

Mr. CALHOUN. I am very reluctant to interrupt the honorable gentleman; but, upon a point of so much importance, I deem it right to put myself in rectus in curia. I did not put it upon the ground assumed by the Senator. I put it upon this ground: that Great Britain had announced to this country, in so many words, that her object was to abolish slavery in Texas, and through Texas to accomplish the abolishment of slavery in the United States and the world. The ground I put it on was, that it would make an exposed frontier, and, if Great Britain succeeded in her object, it would be impossible that the frontier could be secured against the aggressions of the abolitionists; and that this Government was bound, under the guaranties of the Constitution, to protect us against such a state of things.

Mr. WEBSTER. That comes, I suppose, sir, to exactly the same thing. It was, that Texas must be obtained for the security of the slave interest of the South.

Mr. CALHOUN. Another view is very distinctly given.

Mr. WEBSTER. That was the object set forth in the correspondence of a worthy gentleman not now living, who preceded the honorable Member from South Carolina in the Department of State. There repose on the files of the Department of State, as I have occasion to know, strong letters from Mr. Upshur to the United States minister in England, and I believe there are some to the same minister from the honorable Senator himself, asserting to this effect the sentiments of this Government, viz: that Great Britain was expected not to interfere to take Texas out of the hands of its then existing government, and make it a free country. But my argument, my suggestion is this; that those gentlemen who composed the northern democracy when Texas was brought into the Union, saw, with all their eyes, that it was brought in as a slave country, and brought in for the purpose of being maintained as slave territory to the Greek Kalends. I rather think the honorable gentleman who was then Secretary of State might, in some of his correspondence with Mr. Murphy, have suggested that it was not expedient to say too much about this object, lest it should create some alarm. At any rate, Mr. Murphy wrote to him, that England was anxious to get rid of the constitution of Texas, because it was a constitution establishing slavery; and that what the United States had to do, was to aid the people of Texas in upholding their constitution; but that nothing should be said, which should offend the fanatical men of the North. But, sir, the honorable member did avow this object himself, openly, boldly, and manfully; he did not disguise his conduct, or his motives.

Mr. CALHOUN. Never, never.

Mr. WEBSTER. What he means he is very apt to say.

Mr. CALHOUN. Always, always.

Mr. WEBSTER. And I honor him for it. This admission of Texas was in 1845. Then, in 1847, flagrante bello between the United States and Mexico, the proposition I have mentioned was brought forward by my friend from Georgia, and the northern democracy voted straight ahead against it. Their remedy was to apply to the acquisitions, after they should come in, the Wilmot proviso. What follows? These two gentlemen, worthy and honorable and influential men, and if they had not been they could not have carried the measure, these two gentlemen, Members of this body, brought in Texas, and by their votes they also prevented the passage of the resolution of the honorable Member from Georgia, and then they went home and took the lead in the Free Soil Party. And there they stand, sir. They leave us here, bound in honor and conscience by the resolutions of annexation; they leave us here, to take the odium of fulfilling the obligations in favor of slavery,

which they voted us into, or else the greater odium of violating those obligations, while they are at home making capital and rousing speeches for free soil and no slavery. [Laughter.] And, therefore, I say, sir, that there is not a chapter in our history, respecting public measures and public men, more full of what should create surprise, more full of what does create, in my mind, extreme mortification, than that of the conduct of this northern democracy.

Mr. President, sometimes, when a man is found in a new relation to things around him and to other men, he says the world has changed, and that he has not changed, I believe, sir, that our self-respect leads us often to make this declaration in regard to ourselves, when it is not exactly true. An individual is more apt to change, perhaps, than all the world around him. But, under the present circumstances, and under the responsibility which I know I incur by what I am now stating here, I feel at liberty to recur to the various expressions and statements, made at various times, of my own opinions and resolutions respecting the admission of Texas, and all that has followed. Sir, as early as 1836, or in the early part of 1837, there was conversation and correspondence between myself and some private friends, on this project of annexing Texas to the United States; and an honorable gentleman with whom I have had a long acquaintance, a friend of mine, now perhaps in this Chamber, I mean General Hamilton, of South Carolina, was knowing to that correspondence. I had voted for the recognition of Texan independence, because I believed it was an existing fact, surprising and astonishing as it was, and I wished well to the new Republic: but I manifested from the first utter opposition to bringing her, with her slave territory, into the Union. I happened, in 1837, to meet friends in New York, on some political occasion, and I then stated my sentiments upon the subject. It was the first time that I had occasion to advert to it; and I will ask a friend near me to do me the favor to read an extract from the speech, for the Senate may find it rather tedious to listen to the whole of it. It was delivered in Niblo's Garden, in 1837.

(Mr. Greene then read the following extract from the speech of Mr. Webster, to which he referred:)

"Gentlemen, we all see that, by whomsoever possessed, Texas is likely to be a slaveholding country; and I frankly avow my entire unwillingness to do anything which shall extend the slavery of the African race on this continent, or add other slaveholding States to the Union.

"When I say that I regard slavery in itself as a great moral, social, and political evil, I only use language which has been adopted by distinguished men, themselves citizens of slaveholding States.

"I shall do nothing therefore, to favor or encourage its further extension. We have slavery already among us. The Constitution found it among us; it recognized it, and gave it solemn guaranties.

"To the full extent of these guaranties, we are all bound in honor, in justice, and by the Constitution. All the stipulations contained in the Constitution in favor of the slaveholding States, which are already in the Union, ought to be fulfilled, and, so far as depends on me, shall be fulfilled in the fulness of their spirit, and to the exactness of their letter. Slavery, as it exists in the States, is beyond the reach of Congress. It is a concern of the States themselves. They have never submitted it to Congress, and Congress has no rightful power over it.

"I shall concur, therefore, in no act, no measure, no menace, no indication of purpose, which shall interfere or threaten to interfere with the exclusive authority of the several States over the subject of slavery, as it exists within their respective limits. All this appears to me to be matter of plain and imperative duty.

"But when we come to speak of admitting new States, the subject assumes an entirely different aspect. Our rights and our duties are then both different. * * *

"I see, therefore, no political necessity for the annexation of Texas to the Union—no advantage to be derived from it; and objections to it of a strong, and, in my judgment, of a decisive character."

Mr. WEBSTER. I have nothing, sir, to add to, nor to take from, those sentiments. That speech, the Senate will perceive, was in 1837. The purpose of immediately annexing Texas at that time was abandoned or postponed; and it was not revived with any vigor for some years. In the meantime it had so happened that I had become a member of the Executive Administration, and was for a short period in the Department of State. The annexation of Texas was a subject of conversation, not confidential, with the President and heads of departments, as well as with other public men. No serious attempt was then made, however, to bring it about. I left the Department of State in May 1843, and shortly after I learned, though by means which were no way connected with official information, that a design had been taken up of bringing Texas, with her slave territory and population, into this Union. I was in Washington at the time, and persons are now here who will remember that we had an arranged meeting for conversation upon it. I went home to Massachusetts and proclaimed the existence of that purpose, but I could get no audience, and but little attention. Some did not believe it, and some were too much engaged in their own pursuits to give it any heed. They had gone to their farms, or to their merchandise, and it was impossible to arouse any sentiments in New England or in Massachusetts, that should combine the two great political parties aganist this annexation; and indeed there was no hope of bringing the northern democracy into that view, for their leaning was all the other way. But, sir, even with Whigs, and leading Whigs, I am ashamed to say, there was a great indifference towards the admission of Texas, with slave territory into this Union. The project went on. I was then out of Congress. The annexation resolutions passed the 1st of March 1845; the Legislature of Texas complied with the conditions and accepted the guaranties; for the phraseology of the language of the resolution is, that Texas is to come in "upon the conditions and under the guaranties herein prescribed." I happened to be returned to the Senate in March 1845, and was here in December 1845, when the acceptance by Texas of the conditions proposed by Congress was communicated to us by the President, and an act for the consummation of the connection was laid before the two Houses. The connection was then not completed. A final law doing the deed of annexation, ultimately, had not been passed; and when it was put upon its final passage here, I expressed my opposition to it, and recorded my vote in the negative; and there that vote stands, with the observations that I made upon that occasion. It has happened that between 1837 and this time, on various occasions and opportunities, I have expressed my entire opposition to the admission of slave States, or the acquisition of new slave territories, to be added to the United States. I know, sir, no change in my own sentiments, or my own purposes, in that respect. I will now again ask my friend from Rhode Island to read another extract from a speech of mine made at a Whig Convention in Springfield, Mass., in the month of September 1847.

Mr. Greene here read the following extract:

"We hear much just now of a panacea for the dangers and evils of slavery and slave annexation, which they call the 'Wilmot proviso.' That certainly is a just sentiment, but it is not a sentiment to found any new party upon. It is not a sentiment on which Massachusetts Whigs differ. There is not a man in this hall who holds to it more firmly than I do, nor one who adheres to it more than another.

"I feel some little interest in this matter, sir. Did not I commit myself in 1837 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permitted to say that I cannot quite consent that more recent discoverers should claim the merit and take out a patent.

"I deny the priority of their invention. Allow me to say, sir, it is not their thunder. * * *

"We are to use the first and last and every occasion which offers to oppose the extension of slave power.

"But I speak of it here, as in Congress, as a political question, a question for statesmen to act upon. We must so regard it. I certainly do not mean to say that it is less important in a moral point of view, that it is not more important in many other points of view; but, as a legislator, or in any official capacity, I must look at it, consider it, and decide it as a matter of political action."

Mr. WEBSTER. On other occasions, in debates here, I have expressed my determination to vote for no acquisition, or cession, or annexation, North or South, East or West. My opinion has been, that we have territory enough, and that we should follow the Spartan maxim, "Improve, adorn what you have, seek no further." I think that it was in some observations that I made on the three-million loan bill, that I avowed that sentiment. In short, sir, the sentiment has been avowed quite as often, in as many places, and before as many assemblies, as any humble sentiments of mine ought to be avowed.

But now, that, under certain conditions, Texas is in, with all her territory, as a slave State, with a solemn pledge, also, that if she shall be divided into many States, those States may come in as slave States south of 36° 30', how are we to deal with this subject? I know no way of honest legislation, when the proper time comes for the enactment, but to carry into effect all that we have stipulated to do. I do not entirely agree with my honorable friend from Tennessee [Mr. Bell], that, as soon as the time comes when she is entitled to another Representative, we should create a new State. The rule in regard to it I take to be this: that, when we have created new States out of Territories, we have generally gone upon the idea that when there is population enough to form a State, 60,000 or some such thing, we would create a State; but it is quite a different thing when a State is divided, and two or more States made out of it. It does not follow, in such a case, that the same rule of apportionment should be applied. That, however, is a matter for the consideration of Congress, when the proper time arrives. I may not then be here. I may have no vote to give on the occasion, but I wish it to be distinctly understood, today, that, according to my view of the matter, this Government is solemnly pledged, by law and contract, to create new States out of Texas, with her consent, when her population shall justify and call for such a proceeding, and so far as such States are formed out of Texan territory lying south of 36° 30', to let them come in as slave States. That is the meaning of the resolution which our friends, the northern democracy, have left us to fulfill; and I, for one, mean to fulfill it, because I will not violate the faith of the Government. What I mean to say is, that the time for the admission of new States formed out of Texas, the number of such States, their boundaries, and the requisite amounts of population, and other things connected with the admission, are in the free discretion of Congress, except this.

to wit, that when new States, formed out of Texas, are to be admitted, they have a right, by legal stipulation and contract, to come in as slave States.

Now, as to California and New Mexico, I hold slavery to be excluded from those Territories by a law, even superior to that which admits and sanctions it in Texas. I mean the law of nature, of physical geography, the law of the formation of the earth. That law settles forever, with a strength beyond all terms of human enactment, that slavery cannot exist in California or New Mexico. Understand me, sir; I mean slavery as we regard it; slaves in gross, of the colored race, transferable by sale and delivery, like other property. I shall not discuss the point, but leave it to the learned gentlemen who have undertaken to discuss it; but I suppose there is no slave of that description in California now. I understand that peonism, a sort of penal servitude, exists there, or rather a sort of voluntary sale of a man and his offspring for debt, as it is arranged and exists in some parts of California and some Provinces of Mexico. But what I mean to say is, that African slavery, as we see it among us, is as utterly impossible to find itself, or to be found in California and New Mexico, as any other natural impossibility. California and New Mexico are Asiatic in their formation and scenery. They are composed of vast ridges of mountains of enormous height, with broken ridges and deep valleys. The sides of these mountains are barren, entirely barren; their tops capped by perennial snow. There may be in California, now made free by its constitution, and no doubt there are, some tracts of valuable land. But it is not so in New Mexico. Pray, what is the evidence which every gentleman must have obtained on this subject, from information sought by himself or communicated by others? I have inquired and read all I could find, in order to acquire information on this important question. What is there in New Mexico that could, by any possibility, induce anybody to go there with slaves? There are some narrow strips of tillable land on the borders of the rivers; but the rivers themselves dry up, before midsummer is gone. All that the people can do in that region is to raise some little articles, some little wheat for their tortillas, and all that by irrigation. And who expects to see a hundred black men cultivating tobacco, corn, cotton, rice, or anything else, on lands in New Mexico, made fertile only by irrigation? I look upon it, therefore, as a fixed fact, to use an expression current at this day, that both California and New Mexico are destined to be free, so far as they are settled at all, which I believe, especially in regard to New Mexico, will be very little for a great length of time; free by the arrangement of things by the power above us. I have therefore to say, in this respect also, that this country is fixed for freedom, to as many persons as shall ever live in it, by as irrepealable and more irrepealable law, than the law that attaches to the right of holding slaves in Texas; and I will say further that if a resolution, or a law, were now before us to provide a Territorial government for New Mexico, I would not vote to put any prohibition into it whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle, as it respects any effect it would have upon the Territory; and I would not take pains uselessly to reaffirm an ordinance of nature, nor to reenact the will of God. And I would put in no Wilmot proviso for the mere purpose of a taunt or a reproach. I would put into it no evidence of the votes of superior power, for no purpose but to wound the pride, even whether a just pride, a rational pride, or an irrational pride, to wound the pride of the gentlemen who belong to Southern States. I have no such object, no such purpose. They would think it a taunt, an indignty; they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard a proper equality of privilege; and whether they expect to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it at least a plain theoretic wrong; that something more or less derogatory to their character and their rights had taken place. I propose to inflict no such wound upon anybody, unless something essentially important to the country, and efficient to the preservation of liberty and freedom, is to be effected. Therefore, I repeat, sir, and I repeat it because I wish it to be understood, that I do not propose to address the Senate often on this subject. I desire to pour out all my heart in as plain a manner as possible; and I say, again, therefore, that if a proposition were now here for a government for New Mexico, and it was moved to insert a provision for a prohibition of slavery, I would not vote for it.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I proposed to go into any line of observation to establish, the proposition with which I set out, and upon which I propose to stand or fall; and that is, that the whole territory of the States in the United States, or in the newly acquired territory of the United States, has a fixed and settled character, now fixed and settled by law, which cannot be repealed; in the case of Texas without a violation of public faith, and by no human power in regard to California or New Mexico; that, therefore, under one or other of these laws, every foot of land in the States or in the Territories has already received a fixed and decided character.

Sir, if we were now making a government for New Mexico, and anybody should propose a Wilmot proviso, I should treat it exactly as Mr. Polk treated that provision for excluding slavery from Oregon. Mr. Polk was known to be in opinion decidedly averse to the Wilmot proviso; but he felt the necessity of establishing a government for the Territory of Oregon, and, though the proviso was in it, he knew it would be entirely nugatory; and, since it must be entirely nugatory, since it took away no right, no describable, no estimable, no weighable, or tangible right of the South, he said he would sign the bill for the sake of enacting a law to form a government in that Territory, and let that entirely useless, and, in that connection entirely senseless, proviso remain. Sir, we hear much of the annexation of Canada; and if there be any man, any of the Northern Democracy, or any one of the Free-Soil Party, who supposes it necessary to insert a Wilmot proviso in a territorial government for New Mexico, that man will of course be of opinion that it is necessary to protect the everlasting snows of Canada from the foot of slavery by the same overspreading wing of an act of Congress. Sir, wherever there is a substantive good to be done; wherever there is a foot of land to be staid back from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges; but I will not do a thing unnecessarily that wounds the feelings of others, or that does disgrace to my own understanding.

Mr. President, in the excited times in which we live, there is found to exist a state of crimination and recrimination between the North and South. There are lists of grievances produced by each; and those grievances, real or supposed, alienate the minds of one portion of the country from the other, exasperate the feelings, and subdue the sense of fraternal affection, patriotic love, and mutual regard. I shall bestow a little attention, sir, upon these various grievances produced on the one side, and on the other. I begin with complaints of the South. I will not answer, further than I have, the general statements of the honorable Senator from South Carolina, that the North has grown upon the South in consequence of the manner of administering this Government, in the collecting of its revenues, and so forth. These are disputed topics, and I have no inclination to enter into them. But I will state these complaints, especially one complaint of the South, which has in my opinion just foundation; and that is, that there has been found at the North, among individuals and among legislators, a disinclination to perform, fully, their constitutional duties in regard to the return of persons bound to service who have escaped into the free States. In that respect, it is my judgment that the South is right, and the North is wrong. Every member of every northern legislature is bound by oath, like every other officer in the country, to support the Constitution of the United States; and this article of the Constitution, which says to these States, that they shall deliver up fugitives from service, is as binding in honor and conscience as any other article.

No man fulfills his duty in any legislature who sets himself to find excuses, evasions, escapes from this constitutional obligation. I have always thought that the Constitution addressed itself to the legislatures of the States or to the States themselves. It says that those persons escaping to other States shall be delivered up, and I confess I have always been of the opinion that it was an injunction upon the States themselves. When it is said that a person escaping into another State, and becoming therefore within the jurisdiction of that State, shall be delivered up, it seems to me the import of the passage is, that the State itself, in obedience to the Constitution, shall cause him to be delivered up. That is my judgment. I have always entertained that opinion, and I entertain it now. But when the subject, some years ago, was before the Supreme Court of the United States, the majority of the judges held, that the power to cause fugitives from service to be delivered up was a power to be exercised under the authority of this Government. I do not know, on the whole, that it may not have been a fortunate decision. My habit is to respect the result of judicial deliberations, and the solemnity of judicial decisions. But, as it now stands, the business of seeing that these fugitives are delivered up resides in the power of Congress and the national judicature, and my friend at the head of the Judiciary Committee has a bill on the subject now before the Senate, with some amendments to it, which I propose to support, with all its provisions, to the fullest extent. And I desire to call the attention of all sober-minded men, of all conscientious men, in the North, of all men who are not carried away by any fanatical idea or by any false idea whatever, to their constitutional obligations. I put it to all the sober and sound minds at the North as a question of morals, and a question of conscience. What right have they, in their legislative capacity, or any other capacity, to endeavor to get round this Constitution, to embarrass the free exercise of the rights secured by the Constitution to the persons whose slaves escape from them? None at all; none at all. Neither in the forum of conscience, nor before the face of the Constitution, are they justified, in my opinion. Of course, it is a matter for their consideration. They probably, in the turmoil of the times, have not stopped to consider of this; they have followed what seemed to be the current of thought and of motives as the occasion arose, and they neglected to investigate fully the real question, and to consider their constitutional obligations; as I am sure, if they did consider, they would fulfill them with alacrity. Therefore, I repeat, sir, that here is a ground of complaint against the North well founded, which ought to be removed, which it is now in the power of the different departments of this Government to remove; which calls for the enactment of proper laws authorizing the judicature of this Government, in the several States, to do all that is necessary for the

recapture of fugitive slaves, and for the restoration of them to those who claim them. Wherever I go, and whenever I speak on the subject, and when I speak here I desire to speak to the whole North, I say that the South has been injured in this respect, and has a right to complain; and the North has been too careless of what I think the Constitution peremptorily and emphatically enjoins upon her as a duty.

Complaint has been made against certain resolutions that emanate from legislatures at the North, and are sent here to us, not only on the subject of slavery in this District, but sometimes recommending Congress to consider the means of abolishing slavery in the States. I should be sorry to be called upon to present any resolutions here which could not be referable to any committee, or any power in Congress; and, therefore, I should be unwilling to receive from the Legislature of Massachusetts any instructions to present resolutions expressive of any opinion whatever on the subject of slavery, as it exists at the present moment in the States, for two reasons: Because, first, I do not consider that the Legislature of Massachusetts has anything to do with it; and next, I do not consider that I, as her representative here, have anything to do with it. Sir, it has become, in my opinion, quite too common, and if the legislatures of the States do not like that opinion, they have a great deal more power to put it down than I have to uphold it; it has become, in my opinion, quite too common a practice for the State legislatures to present resolutions here on all subjects, and to instruct us on all subjects. There is no public man that requires instruction more than I do, or who requires information more than I do, or desires it more heartily; but I do not like to have it come in too imperative a shape. I took notice, with pleasure, of some remarks upon this subject made the other day in the Senate of Massachusetts, by a young man of talent and character, of whom the best hopes may be entertained. I mean Mr. Hillard. He told the Senate of Massachusetts that he would vote for no instructions whatever to be forwarded to Members of Congress, nor for any resolutions to be offered expressive of the sense of Massachusetts as to what her Members of Congress ought to do. He said that he saw no propriety in one set of public servants giving instructions and reading lectures to another set of public servants. To their own master all of them must stand or fall, and that master is their constituents. I wish these sentiments could become more common, a great deal more common. I have never entered into the question, and never shall, about the binding force of instructions. I will, however, simply say this: If there be any matter pending in this body, while I am a Member of it, in which Massachusetts has an interest of her own not adverse to the general interests of the country, I shall pursue her instructions with gladness of heart and with all the efficiency which I can bring to the occasion. But if the question be one which affects her interest, and at the same time equally affects the interests of all the other States, I shall no more regard her particular wishes or instructions than I should regard the wishes of a man who might appoint me an arbitrator, or referee, to decide some question of important private right between him and his neighbor, and then instruct me to decide in his favor. If ever there was a government upon earth, it is this Government; if ever there was a body upon earth, it is this body which should consider itself as composed by agreement of all, each Member appointed by some, but organized by the general consent of all, sitting here under the solemn obligations of oath and conscience to do that which they think to be best for the good of the whole.

Then, sir, there are the abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last 20 years have produced nothing good or valuable. At the same time, I know thousands of their members to be honest and good men; perfectly well-meaning men. They have excited feelings; they think they must do something for the cause of liberty, and in their sphere of action they do not see what else they can do, than to contribute to an abolition press, or an abolition society, or to pay an abolition lecturer. I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these societies, but I am not blind to the consequences of their proceedings. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to every man? Let any gentleman who doubts of that, recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition made by Mr. Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery was discussed in that body. Every one spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignominous and disparaging names and epithets were applied to it. The debates in the House of Delegates on that occasion, I believe, were all published. They were read by every colored man who could read, and to those who could not read, those debates were read by others. At that time Virginia was not unwilling nor afraid to discuss this question, and to let that part of her population know as much of the discussion as they could learn. That was in 1832. As has been said by the honorable Member from South Carolina, these abolition societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said, I do not know how true it may be, that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any event, they attempted to arouse and did arouse, a very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against Southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bonds of the slaves were bound more firmly than before; their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery, and was opening out for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether anybody in Virginia can, now, talk as Mr. Randolph, Governor McDowell, and others talked, openly, and sent their remarks to the press, in 1832? We all know the fact, and we all know the cause; and everything that this agitating people have done has been, not to enlarge, but to restrain, not to set free, but to bind faster the slave population of the South. That is my judgment. Sir, as I have said, I know many abolitionists in my own neighborhood, very honest, good people, misled, as I think, by strange enthusiasm; but they wish to do something, and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last 20 years as much money has been collected and paid to the abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers, as would purchase the freedom of every slave, man, woman, and child, in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. [Laughter.]

Again, sir, the violence of the press is complained of. The press violent. Why, sir, the press is violent everywhere. There are outrageous reproaches in the North against the South, and there are reproaches no better in the South against the North. Sir, the extremists of both parts of this country are violent; they mistake loud and violent talk for eloquence and for reason. They think that he who talks loudest reasons best. And this we must expect, when the press is free, as it is here, and I trust always will be; for, with all its licentiousness, and all its evil, the entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of government on the basis of a free constitution. Wherever it exists, there will be foolish paragraphs and violent paragraphs in the press, as there are, I am sorry to say, foolish speeches and violent speeches in both Houses of Congress. In truth, sir, I must say that, in my opinion, the vernacular tongue of the country has become greatly vitiated, depraved, and corrupted by the style of our congressional debates. [Laughter.] And if it were possible for those debates to vitiate the principles of the people, as much as they have depraved their taste, I should cry out "God save the Republic."

Well, in all this I see no solid grievance, no grievance presented by the South, within the redress of the Government, but the single one to which I have referred; and that is, the want of a proper regard to the injunction of the Constitution for the delivery of fugitive slaves.

There are also complaints of the North against the South. I need not go over them particularly. The first and gravest is, that the North adopted the Constitution, recognizing the existence of slavery in the States, and recognizing the right, to a certain extent, of representation of the slaves in Congress, under a state of sentiment and expectation, which do not now exist; and that, by events, by circumstances, by the eagerness of the South to acquire territory and extend her slave population, the North finds itself, in regard to the relative influence of the South and the North, of the free States and the slave States, where it never did expect to find itself when they agreed to the compact of the Constitution. They complain, therefore, that, instead of slavery being regarded as an evil, as it was then, an evil which all hoped would be extinguished gradually, it is now regarded by the South as an institution to be cherished, and preserved, and extended; an institution which the South has already extended to the utmost of her power by the acquisition of new territory.

Well, then, passing from that, everybody in the North reads; and everybody reads whatsoever the newspapers contain; and the newspapers, some of them, especially those presses to which I have alluded, are careful to spread about among the people every reproachful sentiment uttered by any southern man bearing at all against the North; everything that is calculated to exasperate, to alienate; and there are many such things, as everybody will admit, from the South, or some portion of it, which are disseminated among the reading people; and they do exasperate, and alienate, and produce a most mischievous effect upon the public mind at the North. Sir, I would not notice things of this sort appearing in obscure quarters; but one thing has occurred in this debate which struck me very forcibly. An honorable member from Louisiana addressed us the other day on this subject. I suppose there is not a more amiable and worthy gentlemen in this Chamber, or a gentleman who would be more slow to give offense to anybody, and he did not mean in his remarks to give offense. But what did he say? Why, sir, he took pains to run a contrast between the slaves of the South and the laboring people of the North, giving the preference in all points of condition, and comfort, and happiness, to the slaves of the South. The honorable Member, doubtless, did not suppose that he gave any offense, or did any injustice. He was merely expressing his opinion. But does he know how remarks of that sort will be received by the laboring people of the North? Why, who are the laboring people of the North? They are the North. They are the people who cultivate their own farms with their own hands; freeholders, educated men, independent men. Let me say, sir, that five-sixths of the whole property of the North is in the hands of the

laborers of the North; they cultivate their farms, they educate their children, they provide the means of independence; if they are not freeholders, they earn wages; these wages accumulate, are turned into capital, into new freeholds, and small capitalists are created. That is the case, and such the course of things among the industrious and frugal. And what can these people think when so respectable and worthy a gentleman as the member from Louisiana undertakes to prove that the absolute ignorance and the abject slavery of the South are more in conformity with the high purposes and destiny of immortal, rational, human beings, than the educated, the independent, free labor of the North?

There is a more tangible and irritating cause of grievance at the North. Free blacks are constantly employed in the vessels of the North, generally as cooks or stewards. When the vessel arrives at a southern port, these free colored men are taken on shore, by the police or municipal authority, imprisoned, and kept in prison, till the vessel is again ready to sale. This is not only irritating, but exceedingly unjustifiable and oppressive. Mr. Hoar's mission, some time ago, to South Carolina, was a well-intended effort to remove this cause of complaint. The North thinks such imprisonments illegal and unconstitutional; and as the cases occur constantly, and frequently, they regard it as a great grievance.

Now, sir, so far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law, they can be redressed, and ought to be redressed; and so far as they have their foundation in matters of opinion, in sentiment, in mutual crimination and recrimination, all that we can do is to endeavor to allay the agitation, and cultivate a better feeling and more fraternal sentiments between the South and the North.

Mr. President, I should much prefer to have heard from every Member on this floor declarations of opinion that this Union could never be dissolved, than the declaration of opinion by anybody that, in any case, under the pressure of any circumstances, such a dissolution was possible. I hear with pain, and anguish, and distress, the word "secession," especially when it falls from the lips of those who are patriotic, and known to the country, and known all over the world, for their political services. Secession! Peaceable succession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. The dismemberment of this vast country without convulsion! The breaking up of the fountains of the great deep, without ruffling the surface! Who is so foolish, I beg everybody's pardon, as to expect to see any such thing? Sir, he who sees these States, now revolving in harmony around a common center, and expects to see them quit their places and fly off without convulsion, may look the next hour to see the heavenly bodies rush from their spheres, and jostle against each other in the realms of space, without causing the crush of the universe. There can be no such thing as a peaceable secession. Peaceable secession is an utter impossibility. Is the great Constitution under which we live, covering this whole country, is it to be thawed and melted away by secession, as the snows on the mountain melt under the influence of a vernal sun? disappear almost unobserved, and run off? No, sir! No, sir! I will not state what might produce the disruption of the Union; but, sir, I see as plainly as I see the sun in heaven, what that disruption itself must produce; I see that it must produce war, and such a war as I will not describe, in its twofold character.

Peaceable secession. Peaceable secession. The concurrent agreement of all the members of this great Republic to separate. A voluntary separation, with alimony on one side and on the other. Why what would be the result? Where is the line to be drawn? What States are to secede? What is to remain American? What am I to be? An American no longer? Am I to become a sectional man, a local man, a separatist, with no country in common with the gentlemen who sit around me here, or who fill the other House of Congress? Heaven forbid. Where is the flag of the Republic to remain? Where is the eagle still to tower? Or is he to cower, and shrink, and fall to the ground? Why, sir, our ancestors, our fathers and our grandfathers, those of them that are yet living amongst us with prolonged lives, would rebuke and reproach us; and our children and our grandchildren would cry out shame upon us, if we of this generation should dishonor these ensigns of the power of the Government and the harmony of that Union which is every day felt among us with so much joy and gratitude. What is to become of the Army? What is to become of the Navy? What is to become of the public lands? How is each of the 30 States to defend itself? I know, although the idea has not been stated distinctly, there is to be, or it is supposed possible that there should be, a Southern Confederacy. I do not mean, when I allude to this statement, that anyone seriously contemplates such a state of things. I do not mean to say that it is true, but I have heard it suggested elsewhere, that that idea has originated a design to separate. I am sorry, sir, that it has ever been thought of, talked of, or dreamed of, in the wildest flights of human imagination. But the idea, so far as it exists, must be of a separation, assigning the slave States to one side and the free States to the other. Sir, there is not, I may express myself too strongly, perhaps, but some things, some moral things, are almost as impossible as other natural or physical things; and I hold the idea of a separation of these States, those that are free to form one government, and those that are slave-holding to form another, as a moral impossibility. We could not separate the States by any such line, if we were to draw it. We could not sit down here today and draw a line of separation that would satisfy any five men in the country. There are natural causes that would keep and tie us together, and there are social and domestic relations which we could not break if we would and which we should not if we could. Sir, nobody can look over the face of this country at the present moment, nobody can see where its population is the most dense and growing, without being ready to admit, and compelled to admit, that ere long America will be in the valley of the Mississippi.

Well, now, sir, I beg to inquire what the wildest enthusiast has to say on the possibility of cutting that river in two, and leaving free States at its source, and its branches, and slave States down near its mouth, each forming a separate government? Pray, sir, pray, sir, let me say to the people of this country that these things are worthy of their pondering and of their consideration. Here, sir, are five millions of freemen in the free States north of the River Ohio: Can anybody suppose that this population can be severed, by a line that divides them from the territory of a foreign and an alien government, down somewhere, the Lord knows where, upon the lower banks of the Mississippi? What would become of Missouri? Will she join the arrondissement of the slave States? Shall the man from the Yellowstone and the Platte be connected, in the new Republic, with the man who lives on the southern extremity of the Cape of Florida? Sir, I am ashamed to pursue this line of remark. I dislike it, I have an utter disgust for it. I would rather hear of natural blasts and mildews, war, pestilence, and famine than to hear gentlemen talk of secession. To break up, to break up this great Government, to dismember this glorious country, to astonish Europe with an act of folly such as Europe for two centuries has never beheld in any government or any people. No, sir; no, sir. There will be no secession. Gentlemen are not serious when they talk of secession.

Sir, I hear there is to be a convention held at Nashville. I am bound to believe that if worthy gentlemen meet at Nashville in convention their object will be to adopt counsels conciliatory, to advise the South to forbearance and moderation, and to advise the North to forbearance and moderation; and to inculcate principles of brotherly love and affection, and attachment to the Constitution of the country as it now is. I believe, if the convention meets at all, it will be for this purpose; for certainly, if they meet for any purpose hostile to the Union, they have been singularly inappropriate in their selection of a place. I remember, sir, that when the treaty was concluded between France and England, at the peace of Amiens, a stern old Englishman and an orator, who regarded the conditions of the peace as ignominious to England, said in the House of Commons, that if King William could know the terms of that treaty he would turn in his coffin. Let me commend this saying of Mr. Windham, in all its emphasis and in all its force, to any persons, who shall meet at Nashville for the purpose of concerting measures for the overthrow of this Union, over the bones of Andrew Jackson.

Sir, I wish now to make two remarks, and hasten to a conclusion. I wish to say, in regard to Texas, that if it should be, hereafter, at any time, the pleasure of the Government of Texas to cede to the United States a portion, larger or smaller, of her territory which lies adjacent to New Mexico, and north of 34 degrees of north latitude, to be formed into free States, for a fair equivalent in money or in the payment of her debt, I think it an object well worthy the consideration of Congress, and I shall be happy to concur in it myself, if I should be in the public counsels of the country at that time.

I have one other remark to make. In my observations upon slavery as it has existed in the country, and as it now exists, I have expressed no opinion of the mode of its extinguishment or melioration. I will say, however, though I have nothing to propose, because I do not deem myself so competent as other gentlemen to take any lead, that if any gentleman from the South shall propose a scheme of colonization, to be carried on by this Government upon a large scale, for the transportation of free colored people to any colony or any place in the world, I should be quite disposed to incur almost any degree of expense to accomplish that object. Nay, sir, following an example set here more than 20 years ago by a great man, then a Senator from New York, I would return to Virginia, and through her for the benefit of the whole South, the money received from the lands and territories ceded by her to this Government, for any such purpose as to relieve, in whole or in part, or in any way to diminish or deal beneficially with, the free colored population of the Southern States. I have said that I honor Virginia for her cession of this territory. There have been received into the Treasury of the United States $80,000,000, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands ceded by her. If the residue should be sold at the same rate, the whole aggregate will exceed $200,000,000. If Virginia and the South see fit to adopt any proposition to relieve themselves from the free people of color among them, or such as may be made free, they have my free consent that the Government shall pay them any sum of money out of its proceeds, which may be adequate to the purpose.

And now, Mr. President, I draw these observations to a close. I have spoken freely, and I meant to do so. I have sought to make no display; I have sought to enliven the occasion by no animated discussion, nor have I attempted any train of elaborate argument. I have wished only to speak my sentiments, fully and at large, being desirous, once and

for all, to let the Senate know, and to let the country know, the opinions and sentiments which I entertain on all these subjects. These opinions are not likely to be suddenly changed. If there be any future service that I can render to the country, consistently with these sentiments and opinions, I shall cheerfully render it. If there be not, I shall still be glad to have had an opportunity to disburden my conscience from the bottom of my heart, and to make known every political sentiment that therein exists.

And now, Mr. President, instead of speaking of the possibility or utility of secession, instead of dwelling in these caverns of darkness, instead of groping with those ideas so full of all that is horrid and horrible, let us come out into the light of day; let us enjoy the fresh air of liberty and union; let us cherish those hopes which belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our consideration and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that devolve upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, our aspirations as high as its certain destiny; let us not be pigmies in a case that calls for men. Never did there devolve on any generation of men higher trusts than now devolve upon us, for the preservation of this Constitution, and the harmony and peace of all who are destined to live under it. Let us make our generation one of the strongest and brightest links in that golden chain, which is destined, I fondly believe, to grapple the people of all the States to this Constitution, for ages to come. We have a great, popular, constitutional Government, guarded by law, and by judicature, and defended by the whole affections of the people. No monarchial throne presses these States together; no iron chain of military power encircles them; they live and stand upon a Government popular in its form, representative in its character, founded upon principles of equality, and so constructed, we hope, as to last forever. In all its history it has been beneficent; it has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no State. Its daily respiration is liberty and patriotism; its yet youthful veins are full of enterprise, courage, and honorable love of glory and renown. Large before, the country has now, by recent events, become vastly larger. This Republic now extends, with a vast breadth, across the whole continent. The two great seas of the world wash the one and the other shore. We realize, on a mighty scale, the beautiful description of the ornamental edging of the buckler of Achilles —

"Now the broad shield complete, the artist crown'd
With his last hand, and poured the ocean round;
In living silver seem'd the waves to roll,
And beat the buckler's verge, and bound the whole."

Agricultural Services by the Federal Government

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, an obscure headline in one of the Washington newspapers yesterday caught my eye and as I considered the implications contained in the statement of fact, or perhaps the predictions contained in that headline, I received a letter from one of my constituents in southeast Missouri which further impressed me with the fact that our people are becoming more conscious of the need for greater efficiency and more economy in the operation of our Government. The headline, "Few Federal agencies can expect increase in funds by House group," headed an article which stated in part that—

Representative WHITTEN, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee, reminded Agriculture officials of the big Federal deficit in a closed meeting and he added: "We will be fortunate if we can go along at the same rate that we have in the past, much less increase appropriations. * * * We have reached a point where we have to be selective."

The Agriculture budget as recommended by the President would add funds for 2,600 new jobs.

Coming as I do from one of the richest and most productive agricultural districts and representing a constituency which includes as progressive a group of farmers as will be found anywhere, I believe I am thoroughly conscious of and deeply appreciative of the many fine services which are being rendered by the several agencies in the Department of Agriculture.

For some time, however, I have been deeply concerned over the apparent conflicting interest and the overlapping functions of some of these services. For many years I have been a member of the farm bureau in my home county which sponsors the county agent's office, and I am familiar with the many accomplishments of the Extension Service in that area. I am always impressed when I read the annual report which sets out the activities in which the county agent and the home demonstration agent are engaged.

I have witnessed the development of the PMA organization throughout my district and I know that this program has made a most valuable contribution and has provided the machinery for implementing the farm program which has been responsible for many farmers enjoying a prosperity which was unknown prior to the early thirties.

More recently, farmers in three of the counties in my district, recognizing the benefits which are possible through a soil-conservation program, have organized soil-conservation districts. Despite the fact that these districts have been operating only a short time, the results which have been obtained are doing much to create interest in this program throughout the other counties of the district.

Unfortunately, despite the valuable contributions which are being made by each of these agencies, I have been conscious of the fact for some time that there is an overlapping of their functions, and while this in itself might not be a sufficient ground to demand that some action be taken to bring about a unification or an integration which would prevent a duplication of their efforts, since only a comparatively small percentage of the farmer taxpayers are being reached by either or all of the agencies. The fact that there is an apparent lack of coordination, which at times has resulted even in a conflict which has brought about contradictory policies, leads me to believe that it is time for a comprehensive study to be made of this situation.

In the letter above referred to, my constituent in reporting a meeting which was held in one of the counties of my district for the purpose of discussing the possibilities of establishing a soil-conservation district, reports that "farmers at the meeting agreed that there are far too many overlapping duties and services offered by the many Federal agencies interested in agriculture. It has reached the point where the various agencies are 'sniping' at each other in public to the detriment of themselves and certainly to the farmers."

The writer who is a former teacher of vocational agriculture and who has since been employed in the Missouri Department of Education as director of veterans' education, in which capacity he had the opportunity to work with and through many other Federal agencies, but who is now in business for himself, makes this further comment:

No doubt all of the agencies render a certain amount of good service to the farmer. It may be that all of the services now being rendered—and proposed—are necessary. It is a shame, however, that these services cannot be offered by a coordinated branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, thereby eliminating the confusing contradictory advice now given the farmer and certainly eliminating the costly overlapping now existing.

While this writer does not propose to have the answer and as he states:

This letter is not for the purpose of condemning any particular agency, I hope you can use it as a fair reflection of the thinking of at least some farmers in your district in your efforts to improve agricultural services to the farmers by the Federal Government.

At the meeting to which he referred in his letter, he pointed out that there was some discussion and quotations made from a recent article in the Country Gentleman, March 1950 issue, entitled "Big Government Is in Your County, Too." In this same issue is also an editorial by Dean Rusk of the Illinois College of Agriculture which bears out the theme of the article. I have read this article and also the editorial and I believe it does present in an interesting and informative manner the problem which has been causing me some concern, in that a similar condition exists not only in the 10 counties of my district but also in hundreds of other counties throughout the agricultural section of this Nation.

I think that we have a situation in the Department of Agriculture which can be compared to the Department of Defense. Just as no one would suggest doing away with the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, neither am I suggesting that we abolish the Soil Conservation Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, or the Extension Service, yet I do believe that there is a need for unification and an integration of the services within the United States Department of Agriculture, and I believe

that there is an opportunity for the same type of economy to be effected within the Department of Agriculture which is being brought about in the Department of Defense.

I am today extending my remarks in the Appendix, in two instances, including the article, Big Government Is in Your County, Too, and an editorial, A Cure for Big Government Ills, which appeared in the March 1950 issue of the Country Gentleman.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said for and against the proposal to admit Hawaii to statehood; a proposal to create an additional State in our Union.

I have had the honor to work closely with the Delegate from Hawaii and I have had the honor to second the motion to report the Hawaii proposal.

I desire to record my sincere thanks to the Delegate from Hawaii, Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, for the careful, considerate, and learned manner in which he made available to my committee and myself the many considerations contained in this proposal. I believe this gentleman is entitled to great credit from this Congress for his untiring work, to the end that our work was made as light as possible under all the circumstances.

H. R. 49, the Hawaii bill, provides for the addition as a State of a Territory as large as Connecticut and Rhode Island. It contains a population of one-half million people.

Hawaii offered to exchange her independent sovereignty for annexation to our country 53 years ago, and by that independent act and the continuous demonstration of unquestioned loyalty, has sufficiently shown a planned intention of being one of us. We accepted that annexation 52 years ago, and "Pearl Harbor" and the consequent conduct of the people of Hawaii is proof of the wisdom of that annexation.

The desire for statehood has been brought to the attention of Congress 15 times since annexation. That indicates readiness for peaceful democratic action. It is a model of peaceful planning on the part of Hawaii; and is critically indicative of the slowness of the democratic processes upon the part of the other—the Congress.

Statehood will increase immeasurably the prestige of America throughout the Orient, at a time when it is badly needed.

The National Military Establishment and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior have made favorable reports in behalf of this proposal.

I urge my colleagues to prompt and favorable action upon this proposal.

Liberalism in the Present Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House believe that we are true liberals in the full sense of the word, but at times it is difficult to give an exact definition of the word or a clear connotation of the concept of liberalism. We are living in a time of confusion. Terms pertaining to political concepts and ideologies that were so readily understood by all only yesterday, have been twisted and misrepresented to the point where we are not certain what they stand for today.

I believe the Members of this House, whether they consider themselves liberal or not, will enjoy reading the following article, published in the New Republic, March 6, 1950:

LIBERAL CACHEXIA: ITS CAUSE AND CURE
(By David Goldknopf)

Lately I have been sitting up with my favorite sick friend, the liberal. You say that liberal doesn't mean anything any more and yet you know perfectly well what it means. You know that my friend used to be a New Dealer, that he is now a Fair Dealer, that he is not progressive. He does not believe that private enterprise is ever strictly private, and he does believe that in large and important areas where its services have been somewhat less than adequate—health, housing, education—government ought to do something. In other words, he isn't afraid of the Government meddling in his life as long as he feels that it's his government. He likes Eleanor Roosevelt and Chester Bowles, Walter Reuther and Estes Kefauver, David Lilienthal and the Douglasses of both Senate and Supreme Court (not to mention Helen Gahagan). You can continue this sort of documentation almost endlessly. You can predict how my sick friend will feel—if he is well enough to feel anything—about nine-tenths of the bills to come before the next Congress. How can you call any word meaningless that tells you so much?

No, the trouble with "liberal" is not lack of meaning; it is lack of motion. My friend is suffering from cachexia: (ka-kek'si-a), a condition of ill health with malnutrition and wasting of the body, due to some chronic constitutional affection, as tuberculosis or cancer (Webster). His limbs are lax, his eyes dull, his movements random and ineffectual. Bright lights disturb him (and so, for that matter, does dim light). He cannot stand loud noises, whether from the left or the right. Occasionally a hollow groan escapes him, as if in the memory of an unpardonable and irremediable error. And there are times when, out of the depths of his ineffable despondency, he feels compelled to repeat his dismal story—

"I am a liberal. I abhor communism. But in my abhorrence of communism I find myself allied to those very elements of society that I have always distrusted and often despised. This is my incubus. I raise my voice against the abuse of a minority, and the Communist raises his voice, too. And somehow he can always raise his voice higher than mine. I whirl upon him snarling, 'How many slave laborers are there in Siberia!' 'That's telling 'em!' yipe my ancient enemies of the right. 'Vile Francophiles!' I shout at them. 'Don't you call me comrade!' 'Double in spades!' crows the Commie. Back to my left! 'Stay away from me,' I cry menacingly. 'I'll tito you!' 'Let him have it!' the Hearst press yodels. 'I'll hold his hands!' Back to my right! 'Union-buster!' 'Fascist scum!' and the Commie hisses. 'Mad-dog reactionary!' Left! Right! And another left! And another right! I fall back against the ropes A left, another left; I'm slipping down; the count, three, four; I—what happened?"

Tears come to his eyes. And to mine, too, for I remember him so strong and indomitable—the tilt of his chin in the old May Day parades, his picket-line stamina. I turn my head so that I cannot see his pain, so that he cannot see my grief.

I am a liberal. I abhor smallpox. But in my abhorrence of smallpox I find myself allied to those very elements of society that I have always distrusted and often despised.

Nobody ever says that. It's creviced with all kinds of fallacies.

1. I am a liberal. I abhor smallpox. In this case juxtaposition certainly implies connection: Abhorrence of smallpox is an attribute of liberalism. But we know that it isn't so, that there is no connection between liberalism and the abhorrence of smallpox.

2. I abhor smallpox. Who doesn't? But why make a point of it? Why this obsessive need to put yourself on record? And how much time can you afford to devote to the abhorrence of smallpox? Even if you spent as little as a half-hour a day on it, wouldn't your life be seriously distorted?

3. But in my abhorrence of smallpox I find myself allied to those very elements. This is sheer nonsense. Alliances aren't fortuitous; they are expressions of intent. You don't "find" yourself allied any more than you "find" yourself married. It may be a mistake, but it's not an accident.

Then what ails my friend? If his self-styled incubus can be disposed of with a casual sweep of the logical broom, how does one account for his lamentable condition? Obviously his troubles do not lie within the luminous boundaries of reason. For example, he seems to have been terribly worried about maintaining his identity, his "position." But why haven't his adversaries of the right and left been similarly preoccupied? In a recent congressional vote on a foreign issue (it doesn't matter what issue; that's exactly the point) three New York City Representatives voted "nay." One was a Democrat who has, however, always enjoyed American Labor Party support. Another has followed every twist and turn of the Communist Party line with contortionist dexterity. The third was an unregenerate conservative who made his political reputation, such as it is, by conducting a shameless prewar witch hunt in the colleges of New York—a witch hunt that did put a Communist instructor in jail for perjury, but completely ignored an outspokenly Fascist college professor who was, in fact, to broadcast for Hitler during the war. All three Representatives voted the same way on an important policy bill—without embarrassment. They were not afraid that they would be compromised by their association. They did not consider themselves associated.

Only the liberal is dismayed by oppositions of this sort. Why? The Communist changes his "position" as casually as a trapeze artist. Reactionaries can be just as mercurial. The imperialist of yesterday becomes the isolationist of today without any noticeable "sturm und drang." The apologists of free enterprise vote gaudy subsidies for Maine's potato farmers. Nor can these paradoxes be marked off as political hypocrisies. Both on the left and on the right there are profound convictions that are never violated. But these convictions, being profound, have nothing to do with the relative

superficialities of "program" or "position." They are, in fact, not at all political. They deal with the nature of man and how much say he has in his destiny.

The Communist, we know, believes that man has very little say in his destiny. He redefines freedom as submission—submission to the dialectical current of history—"the recognition of necessity." The Communist believes in economic determinism. He believes in the supremacy of class interests.

On the face of it, the conservative has an altogether different view of things. Man has an immense, an almost unqualified control over his destiny. Success is universally attainable; anyone can make good if socialistic government doesn't mess up the American way. But what is success? Success is—ah—well—success, the ranch house in the suburbs, the good car, the devoted wife, getting what you want out of life. And what's more (this, far more confidently), the only reason a man will work is to achieve success. To get what he wants, to keep what he has got.

Somehow or other, success is never defined in terms of—oh—the Golden Rule or the Brotherhood of Man, or any of the other ideals to which the conservative sincerely and often actively subscribes. In fact, the conservative seems merely to have substituted personal for class interest. Whether he realizes it or not, he believes in the inherent, intransigent, and apparently limitless selfishness of man. Sometimes that selfishness is enlightened; that is to say, a man may forego a small bone today for a larger, juicier one tomorrow. And there are rules in the dog fight we call life—rules that must be obeyed if you don't want to go to jail, or to hell, or to both. But those are limitations upon the expression of selfishness, not upon its influence or applicability. Success is a personal, never a social achievement. A man may slave for his children; it is because they are his, and let other men slave for theirs. Man being man, that is the way it has got to be, and any tampering with this primordial condition can lead only to socialistic chaos.

You might say, then, that the Communist takes a mechanical view of life and the conservative takes a biological, or more specifically, Darwinian, view. Or—Communist thinks that man is pushed to his destiny, and the conservative thinks that he is pulled. But is there really a great deal of difference between the electric goad under the tail and the carrot in front of the nose? A mule is a mule.

Doesn't the liberal believe that man is pushed? Certainly. Slums, disease, poverty predispose thousands to delinquency, for example, and we ought to get rid of those evils. (But the relationship between, let us say, poverty and crime is a statistical one; you cannot attribute the brutalization of any one person to his environment.) Is man pulled? Sure. We'd never get anything done without incentives. (But these incentives vary widely, and the fact that they are incentives does not necessarily make them ungenerous. The altruist receives satisfaction from his altruism, the hero from his heroism; it does not follow that self-satisfaction is the motive for altruism or heroism.) Pushed or pulled, says the liberal, man nevertheless keeps his feet and walks forward under his own power and by his own volition. And he does not walk alone.

Therein lies the difference between the liberal and his adversaries of the right and left. It is not a difference in program, and the liberal who predicates his difference on program is bound to be confounded as conservatives and Communists veer temporarily toward him. The liberal is different in that he believes in at least a limited freedom of choice—and that means choice of ends as well as means. He believes in altruism. He believes that the human race is a community, if not yet a fraternity. He respects man.

The Communist does not. He has some respect for the capitalist, none at all for the workingman. The worker is a dupe, a pawn, who must be led every inch of the dialectical way—"educated." Actually, you can't blame the Communists for feeling as they do. Respect implies responsibility. If a man is, as the solacing phrase goes, a "product of his environment," you can no more respect him than you can iron ingots. (Properly speaking, you cannot hate him either, and it is a fact that in the early days of the Russian revolution Lenin cautioned his followers against hating the people they were forced to murder. But this particular discipline seems to have been relaxed over the years.)

On the other hand, it isn't easy to respect the conservative ideal either—the man who has made good. Even the conservative senses this. It isn't enough to make good; you must use power and wealth usefully. The conservative ideal is a man who has spent 60 years of his life accumulating his pile, and the rest of his years dispensing it philanthropically. During his last years he completely reverses his field. And he knows it. But all he can do is grunt in that gruff old way which fools no one—the old rascal—"Well, you can't take it with you." A number of movies have been built around this situation. You can expect a great many more. (As a matter of fact, a pretty good case could be made for the thesis that Scrooge is the conservative ideal.) But no movie is going to solve the most serious conflict in the conservative philosophy: the conflict between make-good and do-good.

The liberal respects man. He believes in man. He believes in him not as a dialectical pawn, nor as a refugee from the jungle. He believes in him as a distinguishably human being. He believes in society. He believes in it not as an instrument of suppression or of progress, nor as a device for controlling or arbitrating the beastliness of man. Nor as a convenience. Nor as an invention. He believes in society as an aspect of man's humanity—source and outgrowth, flower and root.

What makes man that way? One might as well ask, "Why mind?" "Why life?" "Why matter?" "Why motion?" Strictly speaking, none of these Sunday-sermon topics is legitimate. That is the way things have happened. And altruism is no more incredible than breathing, breathing than gravitation. Nothing explains anything. Matter does not explain mind; sex does not explain love; biology does not explain society.

In fact, biology explains a lot less than we've been brought up to think. It is true that sight has great survival value, but once a man has eyes he can use them for anything he pleases. He can paint pictures that have no survival value—in any sense of the phrase. More important, the sighted person is not a blind man plus sight. He is an altogether different person. Similarly, the social being is not an individual in society; that is the definition of the unsocial being. If anything, the social being is society in the individual. This may be the contributive insight of our century. Just as the eighteenth was the mechanical century and the nineteenth the biological century, so the twentieth may be the social century. If that's the case—and we've still got half a century to go—there'll be some changes made. You can expect even so monumental a nineteenth-century achievement as psychoanalysis—Darwinism extended to the mind—to undergo eclipse or profound modification. You may expect the current childish and undignified quest for private religious salvation to run its course. You may expect liberalism to become increasingly confident and expressive.

Diversity of human goals, freedom of choice, altruism, the social nature of man: for the liberal they are facts, not hypotheses or utopian aspirations. Considered collectively, they make up the distinguishing character of liberalism. The liberal who remains true to them need never fear the contamination of the left or right.

Will this prescription bring the sick liberal instantly to his feet? Probably not. His present disorders are, fortunately, symptomatic rather than essential, but a symptom can be almost as noxious as the disease itself. Alcoholism is a system of deep psychic disorders, but before the alcoholic can be cured he must stop drinking. Similarly, the liberal's preoccupation with communism cannot be airily dismissed. The burden of disavowal has become too onerous, the repudiation of past associations too demanding. The history of this preoccupation has a certain clinical charm. But so far as treatment goes, the future is more important than the past. And most important of all is the present.

It is a tragic blunder for the liberal to be mouse-trapped into an anti-Communist position. It is a tragic blunder for him to be mouse-trapped into an antianything position. The premises of liberalism—consider them again—are all positive. The conservative and the Communist are both at their best as a member of the minority opposition. In fact, both can be very useful to the liberal in that role. Put either of them into power, and the result is ruinous. But the genius of liberalism is best expressed when the liberal is in power. To allow himself therefore, to be cast in the role of opposition is a sure route to self-annihilation. The primary tactical principle of the Communists has always been dominate or destroy. Negative domination is a highly efficient technique of destruction. That is why the Communist will go to great extremes to alienate the liberal, to force a fight. In a political dog fight he can't lose. The role of underdog is immensely gratifying to him, ideologically, tactically, and psychologically. Ideologically, because it bears out Marxist predictions; tactically, because martyrdom is his greatest asset; psychologically, because it vindicates all the bitterness, sadism, and insecurity that predispose him to communism in the first place. But the liberal is a friendly person. He does not enjoy rancor. He wants to work with people. He wanted to work with the Communists before the war, during the war, and immediately after the war. He is a trusting person. He believes in sincerity and good intentions. He is a sanguine person. Antagonisms make him bilious. My friend is very bilious.

All of which leads to several categorical conclusions. When Communists hold a cultural conference, liberals do not hold a countercultural conference. When Communists march down Eighth Avenue on May day liberals do not march down Fifth Avenue. When the Communists commission Paul Robeson to sing for civil liberties, liberals have no part in any protest demonstration. Liberals do not carry on in this infantile way. They do not rise to the Communist bait. In the words of the sidewalk psychologist, "They do not give them that satisfaction."

The liberal spends his time and energy doing what comes naturally—beating the drum for liberalism. He believes in at least limited freedom of will and he tries to extend its limits. He believes in the diversity of human goals and arbitrary restrictions in this respect meet with his sharpest disapproval. He believes in altruism and he believes that man should be sufficiently liberated from his biological obligations to be able to practice it. He believes in the sodality of the human race, but he notes, regretfully,

that a great many of its details remain to be worked out.

In other words, he has a full-time, self-perpetuating job on his hands. And the next time the Reds and the reactionaries start swinging at each other I hope he has sense enough not to step in between them. We lose more damn liberals that way.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said for and against the proposal to admit Alaska to statehood; proposal to create an additional State in our Union.

I have had the honor to work closely with the Delegate from Alaska and I have had the honor to make the motion to report out the Alaska proposal.

I desire to record my sincere thanks to Delegate, the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, for the careful, considerate, and learned manner in which he made available to my committee and myself the many considerations contained in this proposal. I believe this gentleman is entitled to great credit from this Congress for his untiring work, to the end that our work was made as light as possible under all the circumstances.

H. R. 331, the Alaska bill, provides for the addition to the Union as a State our "last frontier." It adds a State that is a vast storehouse of undeveloped resources which our people will need. It is larger than 12 other States, in population, at the time of their admission as States.

The tradition of self-government is a strong American tradition, and today fulfills the obligation of the United States under the United Nations Charter "to develop self-government."

During the last year alone 138 corporations were authorized to do business in Alaska. This indicates a large new reservoir of business and trade for our Nation. Two national forests of 21,000,000 acres give our country a huge reserve of timber products. That is all in compliance with our historical and economical planning.

Commodity Credit Corporation

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan was awarded a gold medallion for outstanding service to agriculture at a convention of the so-called Farmers Union in Denver, Colo., yesterday. Most of us from the Middle West understand Mr. Brannan's service to the American farmer only too well.

For example, several days ago he came before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, to request $2,000,000,000 additional borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation. When he took office 20 months ago, the corporation had, unimpaired, its full borrowing authority of $4,750,000,000. On February 14, 1950, the balance of its borrowing authority had shrunk to one and one-third billions under Mr. Brannan's administration. And, remember, appropriations for the Department of Agriculture are not included in the three and one-half billion CCC dollars he has spent in a little more than a year and a half.

But perhaps we should quote Mr. Brannan himself on his strange service to agriculture. Here is what he testified before the committee last Wedesday:

> In 2 years, gross farm income has dropped more than two billion dollars, and cash expenses have gone up by more than one billion. After paying cash expenses, farm operators last year had 17 percent less money than in 1948 and about 22 percent less than in 1947. The purchasing power of farm families in terms of 1947 dollars dropped about two billion dollars in 1948, another two billion dollars in 1949, and could drop still another two billion dollars in 1950 if farm prices do not strengthen.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Brannan has compiled quite a record of service to American farmers. I wonder, though, how many farmers will appreciate his service in reducing their income tax liability by slashing their incomes so drastically.

Then there are other services to agriculture in which Mr. Brannan has had sterling assistance from other executive departments of the Truman Administration. An outstanding example is the program of shrinking our exports and encouraging increased imports of foodstuffs which we have in surplus supply—such as potatoes, beans, and pork. To permit this continued importation of surplus foods is to betray the American farmer. No saving is reflected to the consumer because the Commodity Credit Corp. buys, stores, and eventually sacrifices at a substantial loss any surpluses that are accumulated. In short, Mr. Brannan's service on this score results in subjecting the American farmer to unwarranted criticism, and in saddling the American taxpayer with senseless expenditures that benefit neither the producer nor the consumer.

In addition, Mr. Brannan has performed no small service in his 1950 acreage-allotment program which will save our farmers the trouble of cropping more than 30,000,000 fertile acres that were under the plow last year. There will be even more idle land in 1951 unless he stops killing American agriculture with his special brand of service, and starts distributing intelligently the surpluses he has accumulated.

Mr. Brannan's greatest service to agriculture, however, lies in his continued attempts to sabotage the efforts of the Congress and the responsible farm organizations to work out a sound, long-range program for American agriculture—a program based on price supports sufficiently flexible to insure profitable farming operations with a minimum of Government controls and at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, if the present Secretary of Agriculture really wants to earn the gold medallion that has been given him for alleged service to our farming population, he can do so very easily—by simply submitting his resignation to the President.

Veterans' Credit Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, BRANCH NO. 377,
Evansville, Ind., March 4, 1950.

Hon. WINFIELD K. DENTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENTON: I have been informed that H. R. 87, the veterans credit bill, will probably be called up in the House Tuesday, March 7. Efforts will be made to kill this bill with "kindness" by various amendments which would increase the cost to such a figure that H. R. 87 would fail of enactment.

One of these so-called liberal amendments would extend the benefits of H. R. 87 to veterans in every department of the Government. As postal employees we have no objection to veterans in other departments receiving a salary commensurate with the position they occupy, however I would like for you, Mr. DENTON, to point out that when the reclassification act of 1945 was passed these employees received an increase of $360 per annum and said increase was added to the entrance salary. As a result every employee who has come into these other Government agencies since 1945 has received the benefit of that increase.

This is not the case in the postal service. When the reclassification act was passed July 1, 1945, every regular employee received an increase of $400 per annum and every substitute carrier and clerk received this $400 when they advanced to a regular position, but the entrance salary was left at $1,700 and every veteran coming into the postal service since July 1, 1945, has been short this $400 that was given to all those employees who were fortunate enough to remain at home during the last war. Obviously this is very unfair and penalizes a man for being away in the defense of his country. I trust that you can agree that the veterans who entered other Government positions have already received $360 per annum that our boys in the postal service are still striving for.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has voted to instruct Chairman TOM MURRAY to offer an amendment to H. R. 87 substituting S. 689 as passed by the Senate last August. I hope that you will be present to support the committee amendment and to vote against all amendments that would increase the cost of this legislation to a figure that would prevent it becoming law.

If the veterans in the other agencies are entitled to still more than those in the postal service there is a bill pending in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee granting them credit for their military service. If it is the desire of Congress to give this credit it should be passed on its own merit and not be tacked on to our bill that we have worked for so many months.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD W. KERNEY,
President.

P. S.—I will appreciate very much having this in the RECORD.

Ethiopian Government Protests Appointment of Fascist Gen. Guglielmo Nasi as Administrator in Somaliland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and memorandum:

ETHIOPIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1950.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Ethiopian Embassy wishes to enclose herewith a memorandum made by the Imperial Ethiopian Government registering their objection to the proposed appointment of the Fascist Gen. Guglielmo Nasi to run the administration of former Italian Somaliland under the United Nations trusteeship.

With best wishes and regards of the Ethiopian Embassy,

Sincerely yours,

MESFIN BEGASHET.

ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT PROTESTS APPOINTMENT OF FASCIST GEN. GUGLIELMO NASI AS ADMINISTRATOR IN SOMALILAND

It has come to the attention of the Imperial Ethiopian Government that Italy proposes to appoint as its administrator of former Italian Somaliland, under the United Nations trusteeship, the Fascist General Nasi.

We wish to protest this appointment with all the vehemence at our command, for the reasons here set forth:

1. General Nasi was an active participant in the Italo-Ethiopian War. He played an important part in the invasion and occupation of Ethiopia, and has, therefore, been listed as a war criminal by the Allied War Crimes Commission.

2. He is one of the senior Italian officers who, together with General Graziani waged the unprovoked 1935–36 campaign against Ethiopia. His return to east Africa, where he took part in the initiation, planning, and launching of the aggressive war against Ethiopia from within Somaliland, is considered a menace to the security of our country. We must point out in this connection, that during the occupation, he was at one time Governor of Harar Province in Ethiopia, and subsequently became vice Governor General of Ethiopia under the Duke of Asota. Consequently the Imperial Ethiopian Government views with serious concern his proposed appointment as Administrator of Somaliland, where, under the Fascist regime, he once served as Governor of Harar and Somaliland combined.

3. The Imperial Ethiopian Government is in possession of ample documentary proof of the educational policies fostered by General Nasi during the occupation, a policy of ever maintaining the status quo of illiterate people. We have, therefore, no doubt that no one is less fitted than General Nasi to guide the destinies of the very people whom, under the United Nations mandate, Italy is expected to prepare for independence within 10 years.

In view of our intimate experience with General Nasi, the Imperial Ethiopian Government trusts that the United Nations will not let this proposed appointment, which we consider most undesirable, go unnoticed.

We trust, too, that members of all peace-loving nations will take our view seriously and support the rejection of this appointment.

South Carolina Pioneer in Patents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Mayflower Hotel on Monday, March 6, 1950, under the auspices of the American Patent Law Association:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Patent Law Association, distinguished guests, as evidence of my gratitude for sharing your dinner tonight I intend to be brief enough to justify your inviting me again. After these several years of expert indoctrination in patent law at the hands of many of your skilled colleagues, I am beginning to feel that I now am only semi-illiterate in this important subject, but I am yet far from constituting a competitive threat to even the lowliest of those present. While that apprenticeship does not qualify me as an authority on our patent system, it has at least given me a constant and growing awareness of its profound importance to our American way of life and of its sensitivity to change. What started out as a perfunctory legislative assignment for me has become a considerable interest by choice.

In a way, the patent system is part of my inheritance as a South Carolinian, and perhaps that accounts for the more than random interest I had even prior to coming across the facts that I am now about to relate:

These facts concern the vital role played by my State in the early history of the patent and copyright laws.

It is a strange coincidence that South Carolina had a patent law of its own, even before the adoption of the Constitution. Most of the independent States had their own copyright laws, but South Carolina alone had her individual patent law.

On March 26, 1784, the General Assembly of South Carolina enacted a law "for the encouragement of arts and sciences." This law related to both copyrights and patents, and provided for securing exclusive rights to authors and inventors. Of course, this law was rather simple in its terms, but it does show an appreciation of the desirability of a patent law on the part of South Carolina. As I have indicated, none of the other States had any similar statute.

This is not all. The Constitutional Convention, which met 3 years later, found South Carolinians foremost in the introduction of patent and copyright clauses to the Constitution.

It was our brilliant young Charles Pinckney who on August 18, 1787, as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, introduced a resolution that the legislature of the Government they were framing be given the power: "To grant patents for useful inventions," and "To secure to authors exclusive rights for certain times." Though Pinckney was the youngest man in the Convention, more of his ideas were written into our organic law than of any other delegate.

John Rutledge, another South Carolina delegate, headed the Committee on Detail to which the various resolutions were referred. In their report, the said committee included the clause relating to patents and copyrights which was unanimously adopted by the Convention as a part of our Constitution. I need not repeat its familiar language to you, but wish to point out the similarity between the objective specified in the Constitution—promoting the progress of science and the useful arts—and that specified in the title of the South Carolina statute of 1784—encouraging arts and sciences.

Finally, the bills which became our first patent and copyright laws were presented on April 10, 1790, to Congress by Representative Aedamus Burke, of South Carolina as chairman of a special committee on patents and copyrights.

So you see that in my present capacity as chairman of a congressional subcommittee responsible for patent legislation I am only doing what comes naturally.

The patent laws, born as they were of wisdom and fortified through the years by the genius of our people, justly merit our pride and our constant effort toward their preservation and strengthening. It is a tribute to the authors that the major structure of those laws, as they were enacted in the 1830's remain largely unchanged in principle today and have accommodated themselves with astonishing ease to the revolutionary advances in technology through the intervening years. The twentieth century in particular, with its overwhelming progress in science and in business strategies, has subjected the patent laws to great tests.

The evidences of this wear and tear are nowhere demonstrated so effectively as in the record of legislation which has been proposed and considered during the past two decades in Congress. In my brief tenure we have been confronted with patent proposals of the most complex nature, difficult for the lay mind to comprehend, and even more difficult, once understood, to determine. If you learned gentlemen feel disposed to question the diligence of your legislators in considering your patent problems, lay it not to our lack of interest but rather to your own talented disagreement.

By this time you have all probably received preliminary drafts of a proposal to revise and amend the patents title of the United States Code. I am heartened by the manner in which the organized patent bar has come forward in a commendable and constructive fashion to help Congress in undertaking this formidable assignment. Your instantaneous cooperation has been one of the most dramatic evidences of the democratic process that I have had the pleasure of witnessing. With the attitude you have adopted I am confident that we shall perform a painstaking, objective study of the subject that will ultimately produce a body of laws which will serve our future as well as the present ones have served our past.

May I assure you again that the draft which you have received is merely a starting point. The committee has given it neither prolonged study nor endorsement, and its sole purpose is to serve as a target. We believe it is a workmanlike, professional document, entailing skill, knowledge, and patience on the part of its authors. It em-

bodies many similar suggestions, many borrowed from other sources, and some novel in themselves. This will be your opportunity, gentlemen, to help mold the future of our great patent system.

May your restless, inquiring, inventive minds continue to search and thus harness even the elements of nature and alleviate pain and suffering among all mankind everywhere so that lightning and light, frost and flame, and all the secret subtle powers of the earth and sky may be made subservient to man's will under God.

A Cure for "Big Government" Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Country Gentleman:

A CURE FOR "BIG GOVERNMENT" ILLS

(By Dean Henry P. Rusk)

What is wrong with the USDA? No one can read John Strohm's article on page 21 of this issue without realizing that something is seriously wrong.

Over the years, the Department has enjoyed the confidence of a vast majority of our citizens—farmers and nonfarmers alike. Probably it has rated higher in the minds of more people than any other department of the executive branch of the Government. In such an atmosphere the Department of Agriculture, with the support of the State experiment stations and the Cooperative Extension Service, came to be recognized as an important servant of our whole economy.

Public confidence in the Department as a source of sound information on an ever-widening range of problems has brought increased demands for service and forced expansion of activities. The evolution of the Department has been characterized not only by tremendous growth, but also by the addition of functions that may have conflicting implications.

From a beginning devoted to the increase of production, it has in later years received legislative mandate to control production.

From a beginning dedicated to the expansion of opportunities, it has come to have responsibility for the security of those with limited opportunities.

From a beginning directed to greater use of our natural resources, it has come to place major emphasis on conservation.

The original functions remain, and the newer responsibilities, or as is often the case, increased emphasis on separate phases of old responsibilities, have been undertaken by more or less independent administrative units. The agricultural task force of the Hoover Commission found that this type of development has resulted in a loose confederation of autonomous bureaus and agencies with strong tendencies to develop independent, overlapping, and duplicating programs.

John Strohm has pin-pointed the problems as he found them at the grass-roots level. Among the farmers of one outstanding agricultural county, he finds confusion and misunderstanding regarding the functions, services, and jurisdiction of various agencies operating in the area. And among the agencies themselves, he found overlapping of programs and duplication of effort.

The normal reaction after reading Mr. Strohm's article is to ask, "Whose fault is it? Who is to blame for this situation?" No individual is to blame and certainly not Secretary Brannan. He is just a new tenant in an old house, to which new additions have been built year after year by preceding generations; and the house, though often altered, has never been thoroughly remodeled and modernized. Secretary Brannan is not responsible for this, but an aroused public should hold him jointly responsible with Congress for a thorough remodeling job.

Strohm's criticism is directed at the local level. To correct the most obvious faults at this level, the task force recommended consolidation of field services where possible, administration of action programs by departmental employees through offices based on the States as units, and the establishment of State and county councils of elected farmers whose major responsibility would be to represent the farmers rather than the action agencies. These council members would receive no pay, but would be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses.

But the basic faults in the organization and procedures of the USDA are at the top. The rapidity of the Department's growth can be partially measured by the increase from 18,000 to more than 80,000 employees in 20 years. Its share of the national budget increased from less than $17,000,000 in 1912 to a high of approximately 2½ billion, including restoration of 1½ billion of CCC capital, in 1947. This rapid growth has been accompanied by diffusion of authority, failure to develop clear lines of authority, and failure to clearly designate delegated authority. Some 20 different offices report to the Secretary.

The Hoover Commission's task force on agriculture sought to remedy the major faults of the present organization by grouping the functions of the Department into logical administrative units, later called services. Those recommended by the task force are: (1) Research Service, (2) Extension Service, (3) Agricultural Resources Conservation Service, (4) Commodity Adjustment Service, (5) Regulatory Service, (6) Agricultural Credit Service.

The task force believed that the Rural Electrification Administration was essentially a Government credit agency and that its services to borrowers' cooperatives could be handled most effectively through the reorganized Agricultural Credit Service. It believed that the REA's research and information programs should be handled through the Research Service and the Extension Service.

Apparently the Commission believed that the record of the REA had been so good and public opinion was so favorable that it was not feasible at this time to incorporate REA into the more logical functional pattern recommended by the task force, for in its final report the Commission lists a seventh Service—the Rural Electrification Service.

In this connection it may be pointed out that the record of the cooperative agricultural credit agencies has been just as good as that of REA. The Federal land banks have rendered an outstanding service, repaid the United States Treasury for all borrowed capital, and become wholly owned by the borrowers. The leading editorial in the January issue of Country Gentleman reports that the 36 production credit associations of Texas are paying off the last dollar of capital advanced by the Government. They, then, like the land banks, will be wholly owned and controlled by the borrowers. This record of handling credit like credit rather than like subsidies speaks well for contributions of the whole cooperative credit system to the support of American free enterprise. The more nearly all Government lending to agriculture can fit this pattern, the better off we will all be.

An example of some of the absurdities in organization and procedures found by the agriculture task force is the dual set-up for the management of a large body of public forest land in Oregon and California, where the USDA and the Department of the Interior administer alternate sections in each township. The confusion resulting from paralleling and overlapping functions, policies, and programs of these two independent and unrelated Government agencies is obvious. The task force on agricultural activities recognized the serious need for better coordination and integration of Government programs for management and conservation of our natural resources. It viewed them properly as a community of interests, which could be most successfully administered by a single agency in one department.

Its recommendations were largely followed by the Commission, which proposed that all major soil, range and forest conservation agencies should be brought together in an Agricultural Resources Conservation Service.

Adoption of the basic features of the Hoover Commission report is not seriously jeopardized by differences in the opinions of those honestly endeavoring to secure the most efficient and economical organization of our governmental procedures. The real danger comes from those who want to maintain status quo. Most of those who violently resist change are among the hundreds of thousands of Government employees. Every proposed change for any department affects the status of some employees. They know where and how to make their complaints, influence administrators and Members of Congress.

Public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of the Commission report, but it is not so vocal as the opposition. If the public allows this type of opposition to defeat our country's major effort to improve the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government, we shall have to admit that there is some ground for the fear of some that we are tending away from "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," toward a government by bureaucracy in the interest of its employees.

Former Secretary CLINTON P. ANDERSON, who has had experience in attempts to reorganize the Department of Agriculture and knows all the difficulties involved, in a recent public address said:

"If we approach every proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture with the condition that no employee is to be separated from his task, that no responsibility is to be lessened, that no services are to be regrouped, then no progress will be made either toward increased efficiency or reduced costs. It is only when there is determination that simplification must and will be achieved regardless of who is involved or how many positions are abolished that there can be any effective result. * * *

"Therefore, I suggest that we start by agreeing that reorganization is possible and should be undertaken. The plan proposed by the Hoover Commission may not be the only one that could be developed. It is, however, available and specific. It deals directly with conditions as they now exist. In the absence of a current and better proposal, it deserves a trial."

Resolutions of Ottumwa, Iowa, Federated Home Culture Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a

set of resolutions adopted by the Ottumwa (Iowa) Federated Home Culture Club expressing its united opposition to any proposals for socialized medicine:

Be it resolved, That the Ottumwa (Iowa) Federated Home Culture Club does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

We are against socialized medicine because of the following:

Whereas the American family has received the finest quality of medical care available in any country in the world, developed under our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards, and facilities, to the detriment of family welfare; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has taken away the family's right to choosing its own family physician; and,

Whereas invasion of family privacy and violation of the sanctity of the patient-physician relationship have proved to be one of the most objectionable features of compulsory health insurance, wherever tried; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would result immediately in a tax of 3 percent on the income of the American workingman, rising within a few years to 6 percent and higher, creating a new tax burden which would reduce household budgets and bring down family standards of living; and

Whereas Government control of medical services, by gradually undermining free enterprise and establishing heavy new tax burdens and unprecedented national deficits, would threaten national bankruptcy and encourage the spread of socialism, which would endanger the rights of our children to the individual freedoms which have been the American heritage.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

IMPERIAL COURT, DAUGHTERS OF ISIS,
New York, January 21, 1950.

In re FEPC bill.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: The 5,000 members of the Imperial Court, Daughters of Isis, Auxiliary to the Imperial Council Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of North and South America and Its Jurisdictions, Inc. (Prince Hall Affiliation), stand firmly behind you in your battle to secure passage of H. R. 4453, the FEPC bill.

Our several subordinate courts throughout the country devote themselves to charitable work. A true Daughter of Isis must, like a true physician, serve her needy fellow men without thought of recompense. Like physicians and other practitioners of the Golden Rule, we would welcome the opportunity to have abolished that particular need for our existence.

The physician may earn his income by treating our sick but his constant aim is to abolish sickness. Likewise, the Daughters of Isis exist to administer charity to the needy; but we hope, pray, work, and fight for elimination of such need.

Time and time again, experts have testified to the economic results of discrimination. Billions of dollars are poured annually down the drain as the exaction of bigotry. As a byproduct, millions of citizens—members of so-called minority groups, are pushed aside from the main stream of American life and forced into economically depressed ghettos. From among these ghetto dwellers come the most constant calls for our charitable ministrations.

The President's civil-rights program, by removing the dollar leak of discrimination, would go far toward eliminating the economic ghetto and improving the whole American economy. FEPC stands foremost of all the items formulating the civil-rights program.

We urge you to be firm in your battle to enact this legislation. Lift up the depressed by breaking down the walls of bullion. Give all citizens an equal opportunity through gainful employment. Enact FEPC—by so doing, the greatest work of all will be accomplished; that of striking at the causes which create applicants for charity.

Wishing you every success, we remain,
Fraternally yours,
ERCELLE HARMON MOORE,
Imperial Commandress,
Imperial Court, Daughters of Isis.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Following its recent action on Alaska, the House of Representatives now takes up the question of statehood for Hawaii. The same strong and fundamental argument for favorable action applies in this case as in the other: namely, the fact that the people of these islands, like the people of Alaska, ask to be represented in the Government which taxes them and makes their laws. We on the mainland cannot reject this appeal without repudiating a basic principle of our own democracy.

En route to a decision, the House will meet two counter arguments which were raised in the debate over Alaska: That the Hawaiian Islands, though American soil, are not contiguous to continental United States and lie at a great distance from it, and that their population is too small to rate representation by two Members in the Senate. So far as the first point is concerned, other noncontiguous bits of land (Manhattan Island comes to mind) are and always have been represented in Congress, while the argument of distance has vanished with the air age. As for the second point: Hawaii outranks seven continental States (one of them an original member of the Union) in respect to population.

An additional counter argument (not heard in the case of Alaska) is that the Islands have a mixed population. So have we all, as individual States. And if it is further objected that Hawaii's mixed population includes many orientals, with an implied query as to how loyal a State so constituted would be, the answer is that all groups of the Hawaiian people gave a convincing demonstration of their loyalty and fortitude under the severe tests of a war that began with an attack upon Hawaiian soil.

Before the present session of Congress ends we hope that the stars of the new States will have been added to the flag.

Somerset County Maple Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, each year in Somerset County, Pa., the citizens of Meyersdale conduct the Somerset County Maple Festival. This year it is expected that this festival will be bigger and better than ever, and because of its national importance, it is a pleasure for me to extend an invitation to all of my colleagues to attend this great occasion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an invitation from Mr. M. Frank Beamer, Jr., chairman, Somerset County Maple Festival, his personal invitation to each and every Member in both Houses:

SOMERSET COUNTY MAPLE FESTIVAL,
Meyersdale, Pa., March 6, 1950.

Mr. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAVALCANTE: We again extend to you as our esteemed Representative in the Congress of the United States, a very cordial and hearty invitation to be with us during the Somerset County Maple Festival, to be held in Meyersdale, March 24 and 25.

We also request that, in behalf of the maple festival committee, you extend to those distinguished gentlemen in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, our invitation to accompany you to the hills of Somerset County and be in Meyersdale on March 24 and 25 for this great festival.

Meyersdale is located in the famous Allegheny Mountains, near the summit of Mount Davis, the highest point in the State of Pennsylvania. The days are warm, the nights are cool, and the fair breezes blow making the sweet waters flow from the heart of the maple, thus enabling the aborigines to produce the finest, purest, and sweetest maple sirup in the world. For years Vermont sirup processors have been bragging about their wonderful blended maple sirups, yet, few people realize that it takes the 100 percent pure maple sirup from Somerset County, Pa., to make the Vermont sirup good.

Also tell them that here they will see one of Somerset County's fairest young ladies crowned as queen to reign over the festival, in a colorful, elaborate coronation ceremony. There will also be served buckwheat cakes smothered in butter and in this finest and purest of all maple sirups. A pageant depicting the maple-sirup industry will be presented and in it they will see a historical picture of Somerset County when it was a part of the great Cumberland County. There will be a mammoth parade with hundreds of marching units from surrounding States, and dancing at the queen's ball with music by a nationally known band. Tours of well-known sugar camps in the area will be conducted to see how this sweetest and purest maple sirup is produced and processed. All activities will be broadcast via national net-

works and completely covered by news agencies.

As James Whitcomb Riley so aptly wrote in his poem, " 'Mongst the Hills of Somerset"—

'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset—
Wisht I was a-roamin' yet!
My feet won't get used to
These lowlands I'm trampin' through.
Wisht I could go back there, and
Stroke the long grass with my hand,
Like my schoolboy sweetheart's hair,
Smoothed out underneath it there.
Wisht I could set eyes once more
On our shadders, on before,
Climbin' in the airly dawn,
Up the slopes 'at love growed on,
Natcheral as the violet
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset.

How 't 'u'd rest a man like me
Jes' fer 'bout an hour to be
Up there where the mornin' air
Could reach out and catch me there!—
Snatch my breath away, and then
Rinse and give it back again,
Fresh as dew, and smellin' of
The old pink I us't to love;
And a-flavorin' ev'ry breeze
With mixed hints o' mulberries
An' may-apples, from the thick
Bottom lands along the crick,
Where the fish bit, dry or wet,
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset!

Like a livin' pictur' things
All come back; the bluebirds sings
In the maple, tongue and bill
Thrillin' glory fit to kill!
In the orchard jay and bee
Ripen the first pears to me;
And the "Prince's harvest," they
Tumble to me where I lay
In the clover, provin' still
"A boy's will is the wind's will,"
Clean forgot is time, and care,
And think hearin', and gray hair;—
But there's nothin' I forget
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset.

Middle-aged—to be egzact,
Very middle-aged, in fact—
Yet a-thinkin' back to them,
I'm the same wild boy again.
There's the dear old home once more,
And there's mother at the door—
Dead, I know, for thirty year,
Yet she's singin', and I hear;
And there's Joe and Mary Jane,
And Pap, comin' up the lane.
Dusk's a-fallin', and the dew
'Pears like it's a-fallin' too—
Dreamin' we're all livin' yet—
'Mongst the Hills o' Somerset.

Once again, please accept and extend to the Members of Congress of the United States our most cordial and sincere invitation to be with us during the festival.

Sincerely yours,

M. F. BEAVER, JR.,
Chairman, Somerset County Maple Festival.

More Light on the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of March 2, 1950:

MORE LIGHT ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The following is a quote from an Associated Press story out of Washington, dated February 28, dealing with testimony about the State Department given before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee:

"The Hiss matter came up after Department Undersecretary of State John E. Peurifoy had testified that in the last 2 years the Department has rid itself of 202 employees who were under security investigation.

"He said 91 of the 202 were homosexual cases, explaining that such persons are rated bad risks because they might be blackmailed by spies."

We confess that we were more startled by that casual statement than by any other revelation that has come out of Washington in many months.

The Department of State is a good-sized agency, with 21,203 employees at last count. Whatever the number, it is shocking that 202 employees of the Department had to be dismissed because their loyalty was doubtful, and that 91 of these doubtful cases were found to be homosexuals.

Add to favorite swish occupations: A career in the United States State Department.

Now at last we know why American foreign policy in the Orient has been so confused. While the more manly Reds and fellow travelers argued in favor of embracing the Chinese Communists, the representatives of the third sex wanted to give everybody a good slap on the wrist.

Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Time magazine for March 6, 1950:

HONG KONG
WITH HIS MAJESTY'S COMPLIMENTS

In Hong Kong last week a British colonial court decided that 71 United States-made planes, formerly the property of Nationalist China, now belong to the Chinese Communists. With the aircraft (including DC–3s, five Convairs and five four-engined Skymasters) went 20,000 tons of maintenance equipment; altogether the property was worth $30,000,000.

The planes had been operated by Nationalist China's Government-owned CNAC and CATC. As Communist armies overran the mainland, the lines retreated to Hong Kong's Kai Tak Airfield. There, last November, most of their Chinese personnel declared allegiance to the Communist (Time, November 21) and shooed off Nationalist officials.

To get the planes out of Communist hands, the Nationalist Government sold the property to a United States corporation headed by its good friend of Flying Tiger fame, Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, who operated Nationalist China's other air line (CAT). But when Chennault tried to take possession, Hong Kong authorities blocked him. There were reports of Communist threats to British business interests; one story was that the Communists threatened to confiscate one British business in Shanghai for every plane that went into Chennault's hands.

Meanwhile, there was an unexplained delay in a final court hearing. Then, in January, His Majesty's Government recognized Communist China. In last week's decision, Chief Justice Sir Leslie Gibson ruled that British recognition established Red ownership of the disputed planes. "Any question as to sovereignty * * * of a foreign state," he said, "is a question on which the court must be guided by the attitude of His Majesty's Government * * *. Our state cannot speak with two voices on such a matter, the judiciary saying one thing and the executive another."

At Kai Tak Airfield, exultant Chinese Communist mechanics painted Red flags on 71 fuselages.

Doctor Assails Dollar Chasing by Colleagues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of March 7, 1950:

DOCTOR ASSAILS DOLLAR CHASING BY COLLEAGUES

Dr. R. J. Wilkinson, president of the Southern Surgical Congress, last night ascribed greed and selfishness to members of the medical profession and demanded a medical program which will give good treatment to all people at a price they can pay.

Dr. Wilkinson's remarks were part of the presidential address delivered at the end of the first day of the congress' 4-day convention in the Shoreham Hotel.

CALLS FOR LEADERSHIP

Charging a menace of being "manhandled by forces that are ruthless and have neither the doctor's nor the patient's welfare at heart," Wilkinson called for "fearless leadership to awaken the doctors to their responsibilities.

"Most of our young doctors, upon completion of college work, are pseudo scientists instead of well-trained practitioners of medicine," he said.

"In most instances," he continued, "the young graduate's patient must be hospitalized because the doctor has been taught to depend largely on hospital facilities for both diagnosis and treatment.

"Is it any great wonder,"' he asked, "that we are unable to supply doctors for our rural areas or for them to condescend to answer many night calls?"

SLAPS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

With an oblique slap at the American Medical Association, Wilkinson said the association's ironclad rules, ultraconservativeness, and lack of fearless leadership are responsible for the present plight of the doctor.

Wilkinson cited the rapid growth of the Nation's population compared with the failure of medical schools to keep pace by providing a corresponding number of graduates.

He said there were 600 more young doctors graduated in 1909 than in 1949. With the Government (VA) absorbing many of them and the annual doctor death rate of 3,500 remaining constant, the plight of the patient grows serious, he added.

HITS EDUCATIONAL SET-UP

The doctor decried the present educational requirements, established by the AMA which compel medical students to go to school for 10 or 11 years, then finish as men who consider themselves specialists and charge high prices for services they are not yet qualified to give.

The diminishing of ordinary general practitioners in this country, Wilkinson said, may be accounted for by these long years of required study and by the inroads made by the Government's "baited hook."

EFFECTS OF VA ASSAILED

Referring to the Veterans' Administration practice of paying a flat $50 for a few hours of a specialist's time, Wilkinson said this can be considered "hush money" and accounts for the medical profession's hands-off policy in the matter of attacking regimented VA medical methods.

"Today," he said, "many of our young physicians are seeking employment with the VA, not for the high-type training offered, but because of the promise of a life of ease and retirement after 20 years' service."

"Some undoubtedly are afraid of complete regimentation and are seeking this protection in the hope of immunity when and if the fatal day arrives. I am afraid these boys will be disillusioned regarding their status if the day comes."

Wilkinson concluded with a demand for more State aid of medical schools, shortened educational requirements without sacrificing rigidity, condemnation of VA's socialistic methods, and an increased volume of medical students.

HESS RAPS DOLLAR CHASE

Dr. Elmer Hess, vice chairman of the council on medical service, AMA, told the group that current differences between physicians and hospitals, primarily based on financial matters, can be resolved if both sides stop thinking about the almighty dollar and become more interested in the public good.

Dr. Hess echoed Wilkinson's words by charging the Veterans' Administration with opening the doors to all ex-servicemen who become ill, although those hospitals were originally established to care only for service-connected disabilities.

The convention is represented by doctors from 12 States and the District of Columbia. The greater part of the session, which ends Thursday afternoon, will be taken up with reading medical treatises, with discussion periods following each reading.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EAST END CIVIC LEAGUE,
Little Rock, Ark., February 21, 1950.
CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMAN: The news has reached us through our local paper (Arkansas Gazette) that the one Dr. J. M. Robinson, president of the Arkansas Negro Democratic Association of which we are a part, stated that the Negro in the South is not ready for civil rights; such statements we do flatly denounce.

Dr. J. M. Robinson also stated in his letter that the South is not ready for full participation in civil rights. It is our thinking that we are one Nation indivisible. He also stated, "I believe that reform of this kind should take place by gradual integration and not by overnight legislation." In question of power, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Let no more be heard of confidence in man but bind him down by the chain of the Constitution" (legislation).

We further believe that the citizens of each State should be entitled to equal privileges and protection regardless of skin color, hair texture or religious faith. We are asking only for protection in the things God has given us; for out of one blood God has made all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth, not as chattel, but as men.

Again, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "All men are born equal." This document has been carefully investigated and after much deliberation by our organization we thought to send a copy to each of the above-named persons. We would have you know that it is the offspring of our thinking, uninfluenced by any political party.

Now, therefore, we pray you upon your sacred honor that you will exert your every effort to see that this civil-rights bill be passed immediately. You have our confidence. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

J. L. HAWKINS, *President.*
MRS. M. JACHSON, *Secretary.*
ASHLEY BYNUM,
JESSE BAKER,
AMOS NICKERSON,
S. SCOTT,
J. L. HAWKINS,
Committee.

The Mopac Turns to Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am proud to call attention to the fact that the Missouri Pacific Railroad and the M. K. & T., which serve Missouri and St. Louis, are pioneering the use of radio. They have found it helpful and are extending its use. The timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 21, which follows, discusses this subject:

To those of us who are supporting H. R. 378, and working for railway safety in the face of blind and obstinate opposition of those who oppose the use of radio or any other safety device, it is refreshing to know that the Missouri Pacific and the Katy, which are so large a part of our everyday life, are showing the way.

THE MOPAC TURNS TO RADIO

Included in the Missouri Pacific's $5,399,000 improvement program is $164,000 for train radio. This is a small but important item of the total bill, because radio is largely neglected as an aid to railroad safety. In this region, the Katy is the only other line to make much use of radio for any purposes.

Actually, safety is not the principal reason for the Mopac's action. It is installing the radio equipment on 53 freight trains, largely for cab-to-caboose communication in switching work. This will help operating efficiency more than safety. Still, some accidents have developed from slowness in getting freights onto sidings. Here, the cab-to-caboose system can help.

Passenger trains, however, should have first call on train radio, and it should be intertrain radio. The use of radiophone between trains could have helped prevent many accidents. One was the Otterville collision on New Year's day 1948, when one Mopac train ran into the rear of another and 14 persons were killed.

Most railroads have opposed efforts to make them adopt train radio on grounds that it is too experimental. Though neither the Mopac nor the Katy are making anywhere near full use of radio for safety reasons, they have gone far enough to dispose of the argument that train radio is impractical.

Public Works for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Post of March 7, 1950, on the subject of unemployment:

IDLE NOW TOTAL 4,684,000, HIGHEST POINT SINCE AUGUST 1941

Unemployment figures rose to 4,684,000 in February, highest since August 1941.

The figure, reported by the Commerce Department yesterday, is an increase of 204,000 over January.

The total does not count those idle because of strikes.

In the Government's statistics, strikers are counted as employed since they have a regular job, even though they are not working at it while on strike.

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said in a statement:

"The slight rise in unemployment between January and February appears to be due mainly to a seasonal increase in the labor force and not to any cutbacks in employment.

"Nonfarm employment seems to be holding steady this year in contrast to last year."

The Census Bureau, which prepared the figures, observed that between January and February last year there was a 500,000 increase in the number of jobless, "with nonseasonal cutbacks in employment an important factor in the rise."

The 204,000 rise in unemployment from January to February this year resulted from the fact that 210,000 persons, including midyear school graduates, entered the labor force—and only 6,000 new jobs were available immediately.

The 6,000 new jobs raised the total of those with regular work to 56,953,000.

The 4,684,000 total of unemployed compares with 5,620,000 in August 1941.

In this connection, I wish to refer to H. R. 5010 which I introduced on June 6, 1949 and which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, which reads as follows:

A bill to authorize the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 through the Federal Works Agency to provide for needed public improvements and to promote full employment

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that within the provisions of this authorization and through the organization of the

Federal Works Agency measures be taken to restore full employment within the United States and to construct projects in cooperation with the local communities in order to provide needed public improvements.

SEC. 2. Work on all projects shall be paid for at the hourly rates of wages equal to those prevailing for similar work in private industry in the locality or to the union scale of wages obtained for such work in such locality.

SEC. 3. No worker shall be denied employment because of sex, race, color, religion, length of residence within a community, political opinion, or membership in any economic, political, or religious organization, excepting persons who are members of organizations advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence.

SEC. 4. The Administrator of the Federal Works Agency is hereby directed to distribute equitably between the States the various projects with a view especially to meeting the unemployment situations as they may exist.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency the sum of $5,000,000,000 for the purposes named.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that the current unemployment of 4,684,000 does not include persons who are idle because of strikes. Such persons, in the computation of the Commerce Department, are considered as having jobs. It is also to be noted that the current figure represents the highest number of unemployed since August 1941. Hence it is apparent that good reasons exist for taking immediate action on such legislation as H. R. 5010.

Public works in this country have been retarded during the period of the war and its aftermath. Modern and adequate road construction for highways and through cities are needed or else the production of automobiles in this country will be interfered with. The construction of needed post offices, other Federal buildings and schools would benefit communities with improvements that are overdue and would put men to work and would reverse this trend of growing unemployment.

I am requesting the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives to commence hearings on such legislation.

American Planes in Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to call attention to the speeches made on March 1 by Mr. LODGE, of Connecticut, and Mr. LARCADE, of Louisiana, about the American planes in Hong Kong. The State Department should take effective action to prevent these planes from falling into the hands of the Chinese Communists. Our consul general in Hong Kong, Karl Rankin is known to me as a man of exceptional abilities but he cannot be expected to act effectively unless his superiors in the State Department will give him appropriate instructions and back them up. The British are our allies in the Far East but they are endangering the foundations of this alliance with consequences so serious as to outweigh any temporary advantage they may reap from what amounts to paying "squeeze" to the Communists with American property. That in my opinion is not the way for the British to save Hong Hong.

I append an article by Clyde Farnsworth appearing in the Washington News of February 28 last and a dispatch from London appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of February 28:

[From the Washington News of February 28, 1950]

PROTEST OVER PLANES LACKS REAL PUNCH

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, February 28.—Whatever Secretary of State Dean Acheson may have said about the vigor of American conversations with the British over their gift of 71 American-registered transport planes and other aviation assets to the Chinese Reds, the State Department has been pulling its punches.

The State Department has been using strong language but not strong enough to make the British back up on a deal that was cooking for 3 months as part of Britain's recognition of Red China.

United States Consul General Karl Rankin has been going as far as his instructions permit in voicing official American disapproval. But he said today there had been no actual protest over last week's ruling of the Hong Kong Supreme Court.

Representations to Hong Kong haven't been elevated to the plane of formal notes. An official said the State Department had gone no further than to say that if a fair trial was not granted by the British to determine title to the airlines' assets, the United States would view that shortcoming as an unfriendly act.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 28, 1950]

HONG KONG RULING TO STAND

LONDON, February 27.—The British Government cannot and will not interfere with a Hong Kong Supreme Court decision handing over 90 Chinese air-line planes to the Communist Government of China, a Foreign Office spokesman said today.

He confirmed that representations against the ruling have been made to Great Britain by the United States, which contends the planes passed into the hands of an American company through purchase. But, he added, the court ruling in the British colony is something over which the British Government has no control.

The VA Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES P. NELSON
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many of us in the House who are sincerely interested in economy to whom the proposed cut in Veterans' Administration personnel poses a problem. We would all like to know why and where those cuts are to be made and just whom they will affect. No such cut could be justified if it materially affects the treatment of veterans with service-connected disabilities and especially those veterans who now live and may always live in the psycho wards of our hospitals because of the horrors of war. To us then the statement of the council of the American Psychiatric Association is most disturbing. I am informed that this association represents 5,500 psychiatrists throughout this country. I believe that statement should be spread in the RECORD for our information.

On Friday, March 10, 1950, 8,000 employees of the United States Veterans' Administration will be notified of their dismissal if immediate action by Congress is not taken. Government procedures prevent Veterans' Administration officials from telling Congressmen directly of the disastrous results which will follow. Contemplated reduction in personnel will result in immediate deterioration of medical care to veterans and discourage remaining personnel in the performance of their duties.

This kind of false economy always results in less effective treatment which ultimately means greater expense to taxpayers.

The American Psychiatric Association strongly maintains that unless this action is prevented, medical care of nervous and mentally disabled veterans will deteriorate below accepted adequate standards.

The President's Vacation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the President is going down to Key West next Sunday for another vacation. The White House explains that he is tired and needs a rest. Very likely the President is tired because of two things. It must have been an extreme exertion for the President to insist over and over again that the coal strike was not a national emergency, that the people were not suffering from the severe winter weather and that the Nation's economy was not upset despite the fact that the strike idled 600,000 workingmen.

Secondly, the President certainly must be exhausted over the labor of devising ways and means to spend the people's money and just how to continue his plans to spend us into false prosperity.

We can expect developments on the spending front during the Key West vacation. Remember the last time he went down to the sands of Florida, it was from there that his Budget Director announced that the 1950 budget couldn't possibly be balanced without a tax increase.

It was also at Key West last November that the Democratic National Chairman solemnly said that the people would gladly accept any tax increase the President might request in 1950.

So, Mr. Speaker, we should keep attuned to the pronouncements coming from Key West during the next few weeks. I am certain they will affect the whole Nation.

Along this line, under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer which everybody in the country should read. It certainly hits the nail right on the head.

THIS IS NOT FICTION

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions, having been through it.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $25,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year," says he.

"Hmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious, too?

But the banker gives allowance for unforeseen circumstances. So he asks Mr. Truman, "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see, I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "he's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year, will they?"

"No, but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel apiece, but I give them an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $2 for each one they sell. Besides my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below income seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaimng his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

World Peace Threatened by the Arms Race in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, knowing that many of my colleagues are as perturbed as I am over the arms race in the Middle East, and the lack of action on the part of our State Department to stop it, I am including in the RECORD my letter to the Secretary of State, so that Members of the House may know what I have requested of him.

MARCH 7, 1950.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The purpose of this communication is not merely to express alarm and concern over the great arms race in progress in the Middle East, but to call upon you, as countless others have, to use all the power vested in you, to stop it.

Authoritative reports—admitted by all the nations involved—prove that the Arab nations, Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, and Syria, are rearming for war. They have recently purchased and contracted for, large numbers of jet fighters, heavy bombers, artillery, and mobile units, as well as modern and heavily gunned destroyers, corvettes, and submarines. In November 1949, we learned that the Egyptian Purchasing Mission was placing orders for $45,000,000 worth of artillery, jet aircraft, infantry equipment, and sea torpedo craft. She will soon have a total of six new warships. It is not necessary for me to lay facts and figures before you. As our Secretary of State you have access to much more material and information than do our regular news sources.

That the greatest arms race in the history of the Middle East is on, is acknowledged. We also know that the equipment involved has come from Britain, and that she is also appropriating huge sums in her budget for the rearming of the Arab states. At the same time, the United States is supplying money, arms, and ammunition to Britain, and we are told that surplus American arms which we left in England, are today in the possession of Egypt and other Arab states. Therefore, unwittingly, the United States is contributing toward the rearmament of the Arab nations, and increasing the threat to Israel. Yet, the position of the United States has been that export of arms to that area of the world should be strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements.

The British insist on their freedom to ship arms overseas, claiming that such shipments are necessary to establish the morale of the Arab states as a buffer against further Communist expansion. We know that the shipments are not necessary, nor are they being made for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order, and for the purpose of self-defense. All this dates back to an agreement that Great Britain made after the end of World War I, when she was entrusted with the Mandate of Palestine. At that time (1920) Transjordan was considered a part of Palestine. Two years later, the British Government declared "the exclusion of Transjordan from the article of the mandate relative to the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine." Then the Emir of Transjordan organized a regular armed force. This force, known as the Arab Legion, was commanded by Col. F. G. Peake Pasha, a Britisher. In 1938, Colonel Peake was replaced by Col. Glubb Pasha, another Britisher. Under these two British officers the Arab Legion came to be the most effective fighting force in the entire Arab world.

At the end of World War II, Britain signed a treaty with Transjordan, recognizing it as a fully independent state and agreeing to give military aid to each other as a result of an armed attack by a third party; she also agreed to afford financial assistance in meeting the cost of the military units of Transjordan as well as to provide British officers for training in all fields of military and aeronautical instruction, including such arms, ammunition, equipment, aircraft, and other materials as may be necessary. In view of the terms of this treaty, England found herself bound by her word and believed that from the spring of 1946 she was obliged to render financial and military assistance to Transjordan. Although the treaty did not specify a definite sum of money, it was later agreed that the sum would not exceed two and one-half million pounds sterling annually (about $10,000,000 at that time). In the 1949-50 budget, this annual payment was raised to three and one-half million pounds sterling. As soon as the UN Security Council lifted the arms embargo on August 7, 1949, Britain started to send arms to the Arab nations.

The extravagant military preparations on the part of the Arabs points to only one thing—war. Any other conclusion is only wishful thinking. The volume and kind of arms being purchased by the Arabs from England and other European nations are far in excess of what are needed for ordinary defense in peacetime. And who is the potential victim? Israel. The Arabs have threatened a "second round" against Israel. Statements by their military and government officials as well as a hostile press, all point to a renewal of hostilities against Israel.

There is at present no peace between Israel and the Arab states. There is merely a cessation of hostilities. But we had all hoped that Israel and the Arab states would soon agree upon final and lasting peace treaties. To encourage and assist them in an armaments race at this time is cruel, and the results will be disastrous.

Our Government has maintained that it is dedicated to helping people of all democratic nations so that they may live in peace, free from the threat of aggression. Yet, by giving military and financial aid to Britain, we are helping her to undermine the safety and security of Israel. Britain contends that by sending arms to the Arab states, she is not violating her agreement with us under the mutual defense program. I maintain that if it is no direct violation, then it is such a circumvention of the pact that our aims are destroyed. The fact is that in helping Britain, we make it possible for her to arm aggressor nations in the Middle East. These nations have Israel as their target, and have sworn to conquer her.

A short time ago, we welcomed Israel into the world's family of democracies. She has emerged triumphant after years of bloodshed, untold hardships, and struggle. Although faced with all the economic and governmental problems of a new nation, she undertook at the same time to receive 150,000 displaced persons and to resettle and assimilate them as well as 200,000 more of the

homeless and disinherited human beings who looked to her for shelter.

It is a stark tragedy that at this crucial point in Israel's history, she is forced to divert her manpower, energies, depleted finances, and efforts, to defense activities instead of being assisted along the path of peace, security, and freedom for which she has fought so desperately. Furthermore, it is a sad commentary upon the leading nations of the world, that we are to a great extent, responsible for her plight.

Mr. Secretary, you have remained very calm in the face of these developments. Your attitude has been that we should wait and see what happens. Surely, you know what happens when potential enemies are geared for war and when one of them is boasting that it will conquer the other. Surely, I need not point out to you that war in any part of the world today, threatens every other nation in the world. There must be no renewal of the Palestine conflict.

What is tantamount to a violation of protocol occurred in Washington last week. The State Department let out a story about an Israeli request to purchase arms from the United States. Normally, the applicant publishes such a request, if he so wishes, but the recipient of the application rarely does so. The statement given by the State Department failed to place accurate emphasis on the Israeli request. Israel's communication protested arms shipments to the Arab states, hoped America would take steps to prevent such a race, and added, in conclusion, that as a means of prevention Israel wished to purchase arms in America.

By not revealing the background against which the Israeli request was transmitted, the State Department created the impression of an outright arms request. Thus, it might be interpreted that Israel's past protests against arms shipments to the Arab states were merely a blind or smoke screen preparatory to Israel's own arms request.

Again let me emphasize—Israel wants peace, not conflict. You, as a powerful Cabinet officer, our Secretary of State, have at your command the means to avoid such a conflict. You can insist that the British Government stop the shipments of arms to the Arab nations until the United Nations has had a chance to investigate the entire situation in the Middle East. The United States should stop all aid to Britain as long as she persists in arming aggressor nations.

The United States has assumed a leading role in the world. This being so, let us aim for the respect of nations by upholding the cause of peace, and have the courage to insist upon the right. Any other attitude on our part will bring shame upon us and the derision of our enemies. To continue to close our eyes to the impending shooting war in the Middle East is to violate our commitments to the world.

Mr. Secretary, what are you going to do?

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Billions for Arizona Landholders but Not One Cent for a Crippled Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona, which is now asking the Congress for a $1,500,000,000 reclamation gift, has just announced a new policy that reveals the great "humanitarian instincts" in the hearts of the Arizona people.

That policy is: No crippled Indian child shall be helped.

The Public Welfare Board of Arizona, which favors the proposed central Arizona project, recently voted to refuse their annual Federal grant of $100,000 for crippled children rather than include Indian crippled children.

All other States provide treatment for crippled Indian children on the same basis as for other crippled children.

Not Arizona.

Arizona is now asking that the Federal Treasury hand out one and a half billion dollars for a project to bring Colorado River water to a few thousand acres of land which is owned by a few large growers and speculators.

This is to be a gift to rich white Arizonians by the American taxpayers.

But what will these rich Arizonians do for the crippled children of their State? Rather than let Indian crippled children be helped, they have refused their annual Federal grant. Thus, they have not only deprived the crippled Indian children, but have deprived the white Arizona crippled children as well.

Regarding this matter, Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, chief of the Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, is quoted as follows:

> The Children's Bureau did not voluntarily or arbitrarily withdraw funds for crippled children in Arizona. The decision was that of the Arizona State Board of Public Welfare. Over 2 years ago the Children's Bureau advised the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare that the exclusion of Indian crippled children from the treatment services was contrary to the intent of the Social Security Act.

What has Arizona been doing with the Federal money it received each year for aid of crippled children? The Indian Rights Association states that for years Arizona has been taking this Federal money on the basis of including Indian children, but has refused to help Indian crippled children.

> The victims of this devious and reprehensible practice are physically handicapped Indian children—

Declares the association.

Another indication of how little regard Arizona has for Indians, crippled or not, is the fact that the proposed central Arizona project would flood an Indian reservation, destroying the farms and homes of these Indians, and repay them nothing. The project would, however, make scores of white millionaires at the expense of taxpayers of other States.

In December 1949 the Children's Bureau proposed that Arizona accept Indian crippled children in need of treatment on an equitable basis with non-Indian children, the cost not to exceed 15 percent of the total expenditures in the State for this program. Indian children make up about 15 percent of the child population in Arizona. The State of Arizona rejected the Bureau's proposal.

Miss Lenroot stated:

> Because of this discriminatory action on the part of the Arizona Welfare Board and its refusal to accept any Indian children for treatment, other crippled children in the State are deprived of the care which could have been purchased with the $100,000 of Federal crippled childrens' funds allocable to Arizona each year.

But even this was not enough for the generous Arizona officials. They had to strike another blow at Indians. The welfare board also decided to discontinue all State funds for children with rheumatic fever who received care from the board of public health. The reason for this action? The public-health program of care included Indian mothers and Indian children.

As stated further by the Indian Association, this unjust action of Arizona fits into a pattern of State discrimination which has for years denied the Indian aged, blind, and dependent children the social-security benefits extended to all other Arizona citizens, including the big landholders who are trying to raid the Treasury for more than a billion dollars.

Under the Social Security Act, Federal aid is granted to all States for the care and treatment of crippled children on the basis of the total number of all children, not just on the basis of non-Indian children.

Apparently this is Arizona's policy:

Free millions for each white landholder, but not one cent for a crippled Indian child.

The United States and the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the recent past—notably on February 20 and 28—I drew the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that a general rearmament race is now taking place in the Near East which is bound, sooner or later, to lead to a renewal of warfare in that part of the world and to the most dire consequences for the peoples of the Near East and the peace of the world.

The United States is vitally interested in maintaining peace throughout the world, including the Near East. It is quite clear and readily understood today by the people of this country that an act of aggression anywhere in the world is a disturbance of the peace everywhere.

There is reason to believe that some of the surplus American arms and military equipment from the recent war, as well as some of the arms which we are shipping to England and other western European countries to bolster their defense, is finding its way to Egypt and the other Arab states. Thus, indirectly, our country is a partner to Britain's rearmament of the Arabs. By our support and tacit approval of Britain's action we are condoning such deeds and encouraging Arab aggression against Israel.

The upshot of this has been that Israel was compelled to divert a substantial

part of its resources for armaments in order to face realistically the terrible threat of war. Instead of devoting its full attention to solving its economic problems and to the absorption of the many homeless Jews who have found a place of refuge and a new home in Israel, the young Jewish state is forced to turn its attention to armament in order to secure its future existence and that of its people.

If, for reasons of security, our country finds it necessary to rearm the Near East, then such policy of rearmament should apply to all countries, including Israel. I have been to Israel twice in the past year and a half and I can assure the Members of this House that the United States has a most loyal and devoted friend in the Jewish state, where there is a deep understanding and appreciation of our way of thinking, our mode of life, and our civilization. Israel is a true bastion of democracy in the Near East.

Now Israel has approached the United States with the request that it be permitted to purchase the necessary arms in this country. I would much prefer that the United States use its good offices and its most convincing arguments to persuade Britain to abandon her dangerous policy of arming the Arab States as the best way to prevent the outbreak of hostilities in the Near East.

If, however, this is impossible at the present time, then our country should make available arms to Israel in order to balance the rearmament program in the Near East and in this way eliminate the restlessness and fear which is rampant among the peoples of that area. By so doing, we shall also hasten the attainment of genuine peace treaties between Israel and its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to read an editorial entitled "For Middle East Peace," from the Jewish Advocate, Boston, Mass., of March 2, 1950, as follows:

FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE

The disclosure that Israel's Ambassador to Washintgon, Eliahu Elath, had requested the State Department to permit the sale of arms to the new state was neither surprising nor unwarranted.

The Arabs have long been receiving heavy arms from Britain, and our own Secretary of State has defended London's policy on the ground that shipments were made under long-standing treaties aimed at enabling the Arab countries to maintain internal security. The fact that the shipments were of so heavy and abundant a nature as to preclude the conclusion that they were meant solely for internal-security purposes did not deter Mr. Acheson from displaying irritation when pushed against the wall. In fact, shortly after Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, called on the State Department to protest against the heavy shipments of British arms to Egypt, Mr. Acheson found it necessary to stress at his press conference that he had not changed his mind about the issue.

Now, if Washington and London are so concerned about internal security in the Arab lands, the corollary follows that they should be equally concerned about Israel's ability to maintain internal security. And if the Arab countries get tanks, destroyers, submarines, and jet planes—as Drew Pearson told the UJA national conference at Miami Beach last week end—for the preservation of internal order, there is no reason to assume that Israel doesn't need them.

But the truth of the matter is that a dangerous cold war is being conducted in the Middle East against Israel and that the shipping of heavy arms to those countries foreshadows the possibility of a second Arab round against Israel and its people. If that is the motive behind Britain's heavy sale of arms, it is simple logic that American sale of arms to Israel would prevent another war in that segment of the world. The argument that the arming of the Arabs is part of the world picture, a sort of precaution against an aggressive Soviet move, is too specious a contention to merit serious consideration. The realists in Washington and in London know full well that if they must count on the Arabs to hold back the march of the hammer and sickle in that area they might just as well write off the Middle East.

If it is peace in the Middle East that is really the concern of our policy makers, they have only one course—either have Britain abandon her dangerous policy or else offset that evil by permitting Israel to secure arms in the United States.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown in the Washington Times-Herald of January 20, 1950:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

President Truman, with a cynical effrontery without precedent in American history, has now openly and brazenly asserted the mastery of the executive power over the legislative branch of the Government.

This is the sinister significance of this week's show-down battle in the House of Representatives over a resolution to restore the power of the rules committee.

"I am doing everything possible," said the President in a direct quotation, "to have that motion beaten when it comes up for consideration on the floor of the House."

Those shocking words, hitherto unfamiliar to American ears, represent the most flagrant and unconstitutional attempt at executive usurpation of power since the adoption of the organic law of the Republic.

They mean that the President of the United States has viciously undertaken to dictate to the House of Representatives the making of its own rules.

No President in this country ever before thus publicly claimed a royal prerogative which went out of fashion in the English-speaking world with the overthrow of the Stuart kings and the Declaration of Independence.

The Constitution of the United States provides that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

The form of government it provides is strictly one of separate and independent branches, legislative, executive, and judicial.

A President of the United States has no more authority to tell the House of Representatives or the Senate what rules it may or may not adopt, than he has to tell the United States Supreme Court what decision to hand down in a pending case in which, as President, he might be interested.

As a matter of fact the rules of House and Senate are carefully designed to preserve the constitutional functions and independence of those bodies and to prevent any attempt at executive encroachment.

The President's impudent interference in the vital question now agitating and dividing the membership of the House is a deliberate and premeditated infringement upon congressional liberty of action under the Constitution.

It is a challenge to the high estate of the House and its freedom from all Executive penetration, and is enough in itself alone to inspire the House to repudiate this attempted invasion of one of its most sacred rights, by ignoring the President's pressure—and it is plenty—and restoring its powers to the Rules Committee.

The President's intemperate attack upon the constitutional integrity of the House of Representatives was made before a so-called civil-rights group that has been meeting in Washington.

This outfit made a great show of excluding all Communists who clamored for admission, but with transparent insincerity it has swallowed nearly the whole of what the Communists stand for.

But there is more than FEPC or civil rights involved in the revolt of conservative Members of both parties in the House against Executive domination.

Notwithstanding it was deprived of its traffic control of pending legislation on January 3, 1949, the Rules Committee, controlled by a bipartisan conservative majority, has been bottling up since the adjournment of the last session of Congress a prospective welfare-state-treasury raid involving eventually upward of $15,000,000,000. Some estimates are much higher.

The continued solvency of the United States is hanging in the balance in the Rules Committee at this very moment.

If the floodgates of squandermania are opened this country is sunk.

Thus far the Rules Committee has been keeping back the threatening tide of unconscionable spending that could only end in national bankruptcy.

But in its present condition of limited power it cannot hold back this impending flood of red ink indefinitely.

Mr. Truman knows that if the conservative coalition in the House can rehabilitate the Rules Committee the scheme to socialize America cannot be carried any further this year.

From his point of view his design to browbeat the House into submission to his will is perfectly understandable.

Aided by the powerful labor dictators who are deluging Members with their demands and orders, the President is pouring it on.

Will the Republican minority play Truman's game?

It is up to them.

The Coal Industry Wanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I reproduce the editorial taken from the Shreveport Times of February 26, 1950, entitled "The Coal Industry Wanes." This editorial is as follows:

THE COAL INDUSTRY WANES

Ten years ago a month-long strike in the coal industry was enough to bring the economic life of this country to a dead stop. Times have changed. The mines have been

shut down two-thirds of the working time for the past 8 months. A dead stop is not in the picture.

During 1949 coal production in this country dropped 170,000,000 tons below the level of 1948 because of strikes and the short workweek. But this low level of production fell only 10,000,000 tons short of meeting the full demand for coal in the United States market.

This down slide of the coal industry as a factor in meeting the total fuel demand is at the bottom of the labor-management strife in the industry, and the important thing is that the situation for the industry seems certain to become worse, much worse, in the months and years ahead.

Among the one-time giant consumers of coal which have turned to other fuels at a fast clip in recent years is the railroad industry. A generation ago 90 percent of all fuel used by the railroads was coal. Two years ago coal constituted 68 percent of all rail fuel. But today, because of the rapid change to Diesel oil, only 26 percent of all passenger mileage is being regularly provided by steam-powered locomotives and only 46 percent of all freight mileage. These figures are based on normal operations, not on operations curtailed because of the coal strike.

Many other industries are abandoning, or have abandoned, coal as fuel. The steel industry is still a large user, primarily because no effective substitute for coal has been found in steel making. But the research experts of the major steel companies are at work seeking new processes which will permit abandonment of coal. If a process is found—and it is likely one will be found—the demand for coal will take a fresh skid.

The prospect is then that many of the mines now being operated skip-stop fashion because of labor difficulties will close down entirely before many years have passed. The mine owners and miners alike have been trapped by a sweeping change in fuel use, and the closing of the trap has been accelerated by labor wrangling, higher production costs, uncertainties as to supplies.

One characteristic of our highly industrialized economic life is that it is unfriendly to high costs wherever they may be. The coal industry for too long harbored the conviction that the country cannot get along without coal. And now the country is well on the way toward doing it. Any philosophy of production or of management or of marketing which is premised on the belief that the consuming public must have a certain commodity or service or production method is resting on a flimsy foundation in these days of rapid research development and sharp industrial competition.

CARE Book Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

CARE BOOK BILL

When at war's end, Selective Service Director General Hershey strongly recommended that the wages earned by the conscientious objectors and paid into the Treasury should be appropriated for a welfare fund for these men and their families, the conscientious objectors themselves rejected the proposal. They voted instead that the money, which amounts to $1,327,641.67, be turned over to CARE for furtherance of its program of restocking the war-ravaged libraries of the world with the latest and best in scientific and technical books and journals. The crying need for such intellectual nourishment in countries which suffered an almost 10-year blackout of medical, scientific, and professional information need hardly be labored here. Nor does it seem necessary to point out that the advantages of making self-help available to professional men in other countries are mutual.

Yet, this humanitarian gesture was slapped down in the House on Wednesday. The measure was defeated amid a chorus of unworthy fulminations about economy, isolationism, and drearily familiar money-down-the-rathole formulas. Since the fund does not come out of tax money, the economy talk is not convincing. The contention that the program duplicates the work of the State Department library service was not well made, since CARE seeks only to provide books for already established national institutions, while the State Department must house, equip, and staff its libraries. The objections voiced to the conscientious objectors themselves were simply irrelevant. These men contributed a total of 8,237,866 man-days of labor during the national emergency. They have, as Representative JUDD, sponsor of the bill, points out, a moral equity in the funds paid to those among them who were assigned to private employers. They have chosen a worthy purpose for their disposition.

Freedom on the Baltic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to speak at Webster Hall, in New York, to a considerable gathering of American citizens, or prospective citizens, of Lithuanian birth or derivation. The occasion was the meeting, on February 19, of the Luthuanian-American Council of Societies, to celebrate the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania—a date revered in their hearts, though Nazi terror and Soviet might have eclipsed the reality.

A resolution was adopted at that meeting which, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD at the request of the council, that the dream of liberation may not die:

Citizens of New York meeting under the auspices of the Greater New York Lithuanian-American Council of Societies, on the 19th day of February 1950, at Webster Hall in New York City, for the purpose of fittingly commemorating the occasion of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania; after deliberating upon the present-day political situation as it affects Europe and particularly Lithuania and its neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, make note thereof herein and the following resolutions thereon, to wit:

Whereas after military victory over Nazi Germany, the promise of freedom, happiness and justice to the enslaved peoples in Europe has thus far been denied due to the Soviet Russian aggression and the peoples of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors are subjected to systematic mass extinction and deportations to Arctic Russia and Siberia; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter and four freedoms gave promise of freedom to the enslaved peoples of Europe; that the great powers of the world would not seek territorial aggrandizement and that the Atlantic Charter was a proposed basis for a just peace for which we fought and bled; and

Whereas the peoples of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors Latvia and Estonia have been subjected to mass extinction and deportations of their peoples, fathers separated from their wives and children and families systematically broken and disrupted and it is noted that more than 800,000 persons had disappeared from the country under Soviet auspices prior to 1948 and some 200,000 vanished in the self-same year, and these practices fall within the definition of genocide which is described as the willful destruction, in whole or in part, of a national, ethnical, racial or religious group; and

Whereas the question of the ratification of the Genocide Convention is now before the United States Senate, and it appearing that several of the members of the United Nations have already approved same, and it appearing that genocide is a most horrible crime which must be prevented and punished: It is therefore unanimously

Resolved, That the President of the United States of America and the Secretary of State be requested—

1. That the United States of America in any peace settlement negotiations with Soviet Russia respecting Germany and the countries contiguous thereto, require the preliminary and immediate withdrawal of Russian occupation armies—MVD police and Communist Party forces, from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to give aid to the peoples of the Baltic states, if so requested, in restoring the political sovereignty and interim regimes of those countries.

2. That the Baltic states in any such negotiations should be fully represented by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and the respective Latvian and Estonian representatives directing the liberation services.

3. That we urge most vigorously that the United States Senate ratify the Genocide Convention since it represents the first international legislation designed to effectuate the program initiated in the United Nations to abolish barbarous practices of mass killings and deportation of peoples as having no moral or legal sanction in this mid-twentieth century.

That copies of these resolutions be directed to be sent to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

JOSEPH P. GINKUS,
Chairman.
DANIEL J. AVERKA,
Secretary.

The Tough Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a very interesting editorial taken from the February 1950 issue of the Louisiana Farm Bureau News. It re-

lates to cotton production and new legislation, and is as follows:

THE TOUGH JOB

Just about the toughest job Congress has to face in writing a cotton-acreage bill that will remove certain injustices in the present law is to steer a middle course between the proposals of some folks who have odd ideas about successful farming and other successful business operations and the proposals of other folks who may not understand the situation and who might make it worse by what could be described as unwise generosity.

The present law is unjust to the many growers who would have to make unfairly drastic cut-backs in their cotton acreage. This part of the law should be corrected. But it might be dangerous if the correction went so far as to make the whole acreage-allotment and marketing-quota program ineffective. Cotton growers know that better than anyone else.

Whatever their troubles, cotton growers aren't asking for a free ride on the gravy train. Neither the cotton grower nor any other farm group expects the Government price-support program to take care of unlimited production, or even of production so large that vast surpluses continue to pile up. As a matter of self-interest, it should not be necessary to point out that such a development might endanger the entire price-support program for cotton and even the rest of the farm program.

The Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

NELSON CO.,
Detroit, Mich., February 23, 1950.

The Honorable FRANCIS P. WALTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALTER: I have been very much disturbed because certain Members of Congress opposed to S. 1008 have made emphatic statements that this bill is dangerous to and is opposed by the small-business man.

We operate a small local business, employing between 100 and 120 people. The elimination of the basing-point system has already caused us financial losses, and it is apparent to us that unless S. 1008 is made into law our pipe-distribution activity will be destroyed.

I wish, therefore, to present to you, as a member of the conference committee on this bill, the facts as we see them.

I trust that you will take time to read the attached paper and that it will give you some new and additional viewpoints on this legislation.

Yours sincerely,
H. R. DUSENDORF,
Purchasing Agent, Nelson Co.

The opponents of the basing point (or more properly, the freight-absorption) pricing system claim that it (1) is harmful to the small-business man; (2) constitutes an unfair method of competition; (3) results in price discrimination; (4) creates monopolies; (5) is in the interests of big business and (6) that legislation to reinstate that or a similar system will destroy present antitrust laws and the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is apparent that, if these claims were correct, this company, composed of loyal Americans operating a small business, would likewise be opposed but our experience with and without basing-point pricing on steel pipe indicates that the evils mentioned above exist only under the nonbasing-point system.

1. Freight-absorption legislation will preserve, not harm, small business.

The steel-pipe mill nearest to Detroit is at Lorain, Ohio. Under the basing-point system, all Detroit steel-pipe distributors bought at the Lorain base, meaning that even though their pipe came from farther away, they paid freight only from Lorain to Detroit. Under nonbasing-point pricing, distributors who buy from the Lorain mill pay, because of varying freight charges, $1.20 per ton less than those who buy from Youngstown, Ohio, and $2.80 per ton less than those who buy from Pittsburgh, the two next nearest sources.

In a competitive economy, in a free-enterprise system, a commodity like steel pipe cannot be sold by one distributor at a higher price than his competitors. The distributor buying from the Lorain mill establishes his selling price based on mill costs plus freight from Lorain. Detroit distributors who buy from Youngstown or Pittsburgh must sell at that same price. It is apparent that a distributor whose supply of pipe comes from Pittsburgh at an extra cost of $2.80 per ton, would, on an annual volume of 1,000 tons (which is not unusual) suffer a loss of $2,800 without in any way affecting the corporate big business condemned by the opponents of the freight-absorption pricing system. Small businesses—local distributors of steel pipe—all over America have suffered such and much greater losses since the basing-point pricing system was dropped—and nobody has gained. It is contended that steel mills can absorb these extra freight charges providing they do not do it in collusion. The steel mills, however, claim that such absorption under existing legislation is in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

2. Lack of freight-absorption pricing destroys free competition: It is apparent from the above that certain distributors have a cost advantage over others and, therefore, the latter group has no competitive opportunity. Theoretically, competition would be restored if all distributors purchased from the nearest mill but this is impossible under today's conditions because the nearest mill is unable to take on any more distributors in this area. This likewise applies to other mills in other areas. If all pipe distributors in each area bought from one mill it would establish a regional monopoly which would be entirely in control of prices and competition in each area.

3. Lack of freight-absorption pricing causes price discrimination: From the above example, it is apparent that price discrimination is not a fault of the freight-absorption pricing system but is caused by the lack of such system.

4. Lack of freight-absorption pricing will create monopolies:

In the absence of freight-absorption pricing, all distributors of steel pipe will eventually be compelled, so far as is possible, to make their purchases from the closest source of supply or go out of the pipe distribution business. Under these circumstances, each steel pipe producer will have a monopoly in the area in which he has a freight advantage. This condition does not exist at present because some mills do not have sufficient capacity to supply everyone in their monopoly area, while other mills are able to produce a great deal more than their monopoly area can consume. As some mills increase their production while others reduce theirs, the eventual consequence will be that each mill will have only sufficient capacity, manpower, and machines to supply their own monopoly area.

For example, many steel pipe distributors on the eastern coast who previously purchased their pipe elsewhere now buy it from a mill at Sparrows Point, Md., because of freight losses if purchased from their previous source. When the lines are finally drawn and each mill is producing only the pipe they can sell in their own monopoly area, a shutdown of the Sparrows Point mill because of labor difficulties, fire, an act of God or any other cause would mean that the entire east coast would have no source of supply. This same condition would apply to all monopoly areas.

5. Lack of freight-absorption pricing benefits Big Steel, hurts Little Steel.

The first effect of the banning of basing-point pricing was the voluntary and involuntary discontinuance of sales by steel mills to customers in areas where freight cost difference would compel these customers to seek a nearer source of supply when steel shortages no longer exist. Thus, large steel corporations with multiple-plants have an advantage over smaller one-plant producers.

The second effect was an endeavor, successful in many cases, to persuade steel-consuming manufacturers to move their plants or build new ones near to existing steel mills. This can be accomplished by guaranteeing a supply of steel to consuming-manufacturers nearest the mill.

Smaller one-plant steel corporations supplying distant customers cannot, without freight-absorption pricing, compete with large multiple-plant producers having a plant nearer the customer and must, therefore, seek customers nearer home or go out of business.

It is the contention of opponents of freight-absorption pricing that new steel mills will be built in various parts of the country to supply high-consumption areas. There is nothing to stop such construction under freight-absorption pricing as witnessed by the steel mills in Detroit and elsewhere which were built during the basing-point pricing era.

Under a non-freight-absorption pricing system, however, the restriction of sales in monopoly areas, the transportation cost of raw materials and several other important factors would legislate against the construction of new mills in many if not all areas where mills do not now exist. It is very probable, too, that if such mills were constructed they would be built by the larger steel corporations, thus further stifling small steel. Steel mills cannot be constructed as cheaply nor as quickly as other manufacturing plants and, therefore, it is to the interests of Big Steel to persuade steel-consuming industry to come to steel rather than steel to go to them. The old saying, "It is easier to sweep the little to the lot than the lot to the little" aptly expresses this condition.

6. Lack of freight-absorption pricing may centralize industry: Inasmuch as it is improbable that steel mills will be built all over the country and inasmuch as steel-consuming industry has already begun to move nearer existing steel mills, it is very possible that the final result will be a centralization of industry that could be very disastrous to our country if war should occur.

7. Lack of freight-absorption pricing restrict freedom of choice:

When the inevitable happens and all pipe distributors in each area are purchasing, as a matter of survival, their supply of pipe from the one pipe mill most advantageously situated to serve their area, neither they nor the ultimate consumer will have any choice as to which brand of pipe they may buy.

For example, recently a steel consumer wishes to buy two carloads of pipe made of a special steel needed for a specific purpose. They first approached the nearest mill because pipe from there would cost them less. The pipe was needed within 60 days and the nearest mill could not make delivery of all items within that time. The next nearest mill (still operating in the Detroit area only because the nearest mill cannot take care of

all demands for standard pipe) agreed to supply those items of pipe which the nearest mill could not furnish.

When, as is inevitable under a non-freight-absorption pricing system, all pipe mills have adjusted their production capacity to take care of only their monopoly area, such freedom of choice will be impossible and the consumer will be compelled to wait until the monopoly-area mill can take care of his needs.

8. Freight-absorption legislation need not affect anti-trust legislation nor the Robinson-Patman Act:

The Robinson-Patman Act, as well as all antitrust legislation, was designed to protect the American people from those who might have the power to destroy the opportunity for free competion on which this country was built. The lack of freight-absorption pricing on commodities destroys that opportunity and, therefore, legislation to keep that opportunity in existence is in line with such laws rather than opposed to them.

9. Effects of regional monopolies created by lack of freight-absorption pricing: Consider some of the effects of regional monopolies in the manufacture of steel pipe. Assume that all of the steel pipe needed for gas, water, steam, oil, air, and thousands of industrial uses in any manufacturing area came from one producer, that which could deliver pipe to that area at the lowest price and asume, too, that some unavoidable circumstance forces that mill to suspend operation. Where, then, would the people of that area get steel pipe? All other mills would be operating at full capacity to supply the requirements of their own monopoly area and would not be capable of nor interested in taking on the requirements of an area which will not need them when the monopoly mill resumes operation. What would happen under those circumstances if our country should suddenly be thrown into war as it was on December 8, 1941? If the Detroit area was the one affected, how would war-matériel plants be able to do their part? If it was an oil-producing area, what then? And even in peacetime, how would the emergency problems in plumbing, heating, manufacturing, gasoline refining and distribution and the thousands of other places where steel pipe is a necessity be solved?

This presentation is based almost entirely on one steel product, pipe, but practically everything which has been said about it applies as well to all steel products. Regional monopolies will restrict the production of all manufacturers, will prevent the starting of new enterprises, will stifle the need for industrial research, thus depriving the American people of new and improved products and will seriously damage if not destroy the American system of competition and the most important guaranty of the American Constitution, the freedom of opportunity.

Thoughts About War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bruce Barton from the Washington Sunday Star of March 5, 1950:

THOUGHTS ABOUT WAR
(By Bruce Barton)

We Americans romanticize too much—about everything from love to hot dogs. But one thing we should be coldly realistic about is war.

To bring our history into better focus, we might begin by remembering our wars. What we call World Wars I and II really were III and IV.

World War I was Europe's Seven Years' War, England and Prussia were allies against France, Austria, Russia, Sweden, and Spain. Over here it was the French and Indian War. Our ancestors teamed up with the British (George Washington was a young officer in the English forces) and tossed out the French.

World War II (a continuation of I) we call our American Revolution. Our ancestors teamed up with the French and threw out the British.

Both these wars were fought for splendid principles, but they also were very profitable.

The last profitable wars that ever will be waged were our Mexican War and England's war in South Africa. By our peace treaty we got from Mexico, for a paltry $15,000,000, Utah, Nevada, California, and large parts of New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado. The British got the South African gold and diamond mines.

Our war with Spain grew out of what the great historian, Charles A. Beard, called the devil theory of war. There are in the world good people—ourselves—and bad people—devils. When the devils do what we good people think they shouldn't do, it is our duty to shoot them.

The Spaniards were doing wrong to the Cubans. We fought them in an inexpensive, badly managed war, and promptly were victorious. We wound up with Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and a sort of general mortgage on Cuba—all rich islands.

What we didn't realize until later was that these islands had masses of poor people, for whom we had made ourselves responsible. We have paid billions for that easy victory and still are paying.

World wars III and IV almost could be called the wars that nobody won. The English and Germans and French now know that, while they were shooting enemies, they were shooting customers. They lost their wealth, their plants, and their markets. For our part, we are paying through the nose to support both our allies and our enemies.

World war V, if it comes, will complete the destruction of Great Britain and Europe, throw Russia back into barbarism, wipe out our entire wealth, and destroy all the progress we have made in our 150 years as a nation.

These thoughts are unpopular. It is popular to talk about our moral obligation to prepare to defend freedom all over the world. I prefer to talk about a war that we somehow ought to be smart enough to avoid, since it is perfectly certain, that while we won't lose, we cannot possibly win.

Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding persons in the country who has devoted a lifetime of study to the problem of congressional reapportionment is Dr. Walter F. Willcox, formerly of Cornell University, now living at 3 South Avenue, Ithaca, N. Y. A summary of the results of his studies has been published in a recent issue of the Cornell Law Quarterly. However, Dr. Willcox has written to me his own summarization of the conclusions reached as the result of his studies, which I am taking the liberty of inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reference by any future students of this problem, as well as for the assistance of appropriate committees of the Congress and the Congress itself in dealing with the question of congressional reapportionment.

Because of Dr. Willcox's outstanding position in this field, I feel certain that his views, conclusions, and recommendations will merit and receive the careful consideration and attention of the Congress.

ITHACA, N. Y., *February 17, 1950.*

Hon. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: After nearly 50 years of work on the apportionment problem I have reached results which are explained and defended in an article in the forthcoming number of the Cornell Law Quarterly, two preprints of which go to you under another cover. A summary of the conclusions follows:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The number of methods of apportionment which satisfy the mathematical conditions of the problem is indefinitely large.

There is no mathematical reason for preferring one method of apportionment to another.

When these different methods are applied to the 1940 figures, nineteen different results are reached. Under the 1950 figures the number is not likely to be less.

These results differ only in the number and the allotment of what might be called transferable seats, that is, seats which would go by one extreme method to a State with more and by the other extreme method to a State with less than the average population.

Between these extreme methods a series of intermediate methods can be constructed so that each method would transfer one, and only one, seat from a large State to a small one, or vice versa, as compared with the methods on either side of it in the series.

The proper basis for preferring one set of results to another is to be found not in mathematical or political considerations but in deciding how to interpret the ambiguous phrase of the Constitution, "shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers."

The method which was used before 1840 apportioned all transferable seats to large States, although there is no evidence that Congress intended this or realized that it was the inevitable result of the method.

The debates and votes since 1840 indicate that Congress now aims at equalizing the district population in the two groups of large and small States.

Every method used or proposed for a century has divided the transferable seats almost evenly between large and small States.

These methods differ in the weight given to fractional remainders. The one used before 1840 rejected all such remainders. The intermediate methods which succeeded it give additional seats to remainders larger than about one-half but differ among themselves in where they place the critical fractions separating those large ones which are given weight from those smaller ones which are rejected. The smaller the critical fraction, the more transferable seats are apportioned to small States.

Among this group of intermediate methods the method of major fractions, under which the critical fraction is one-half, makes the district population of the two groups of large and small States most nearly equal.

Under 1940 figures the present method of equal proportions requires a critical fraction of .45 instead of .50. Whenever its results differ from those of the method of major fractions, that is because it adopts a critical fraction somewhat less than .50.

If Congress should decide that the conflict of interests between large and small States, so crucial in the constitutional convention, a conflict which points to the method of major fractions, is no longer important and that in consequence to aim at equalizing the district population of the 48 States individually is better than to aim at equalizing the district population of the two groups as units, that decision would point toward the method of included fractions.

The realization since 1900 that Congress must start apportionment, not from scratch, but with a body of 48 Representatives, one for each State, prescribed by the Constitution tells also in favor of the method of included fractions.

Under that method Representatives are apportioned one after another, beginning with No. 49, to whatever State has at that point the largest district population.

The results of the method of included fractions differ from those of the method of equal proportions and all other methds by reducing the difference between the largest and the smallest of the 48 district populations and also reducing their average to the lowest point possible.

W. F. WILLCOX.

Actual Farmers Headed for Trouble in the Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to sound this note of warning to the Members of Congress who represent the actual farmers of this country. Acreage allotments are based on the 4-year average preceding the year for which the allotment is determined. For example in 1952, the allotment will be based on the acreage of 1948, '49, '50, and '51.

Individuals and incorporated concerns, who are not actual farmers and have no interest in a home on the land, are busy in western Kansas and Colorado breaking up thousands and thousands of acres of land with high-powered machinery. To show just how fast these acres are being brought in by big operators, I will say that there were 7,000 acres brought in 1942 and 177,000 in 1949.

In 1949 a contractor broke up 63 sections of land in Colorado, and that process is quite general in those two States. By 1952 there will be 8,000,000 acres of additional wheat acreage, hence if this acreage is spread over the years 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951, those 8,000,000 acres will be eligible for allotment. Since the allotment program is based on acreage, these 8,000,000 acres will compete with those who have made and are making farming a business. Those farmers will have to share the allotment acreage with those bringing in these huge acres, and in North Dakota alone, by 1952, it will mean that the farmers will be cut a 1,000,000 acres.

On the small farms, where farmers live and operate on a family-sized farm, the acreage allowed will be so curtailed that the small farmer will be unable to plant enough wheat to supply his family, pay for his expenses, taxes, and machine equipment. In fact, that situation is already here in a small way, and many farmers who operate small units are objecting vehemently to the acreage cuts for 1950.

Another cause for great alarm among small farms is the fact that in figuring the acreage base, not only the actual land planted to wheat, but the summer-tilled acreage all goes in as cropped land and swells the historic base.

Unless the members of the Agriculture Committees of the Senate and House are alert and understand what this wholesale production of new acres means, the whole farm belt will be up against such a severe cut in acreage that many small farmers will be put out of business.

Not much harm has yet been done, but looking ahead just a year or two it is easy to see the disaster awaiting.

Isthmian Canals and Atomic Bomb Defense Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in previous extensions of remarks I have commented at length with respect to the basic fallacy in the presentations of the promoters who urge the building of a new Panama Canal at sea level on the alleged ground that such construction is dictated by the atomic bomb and new weapon dangers.

In my extensions I have unfailingly emphasized the view that the security of any type of canal depends not upon passive defense features that may be embodied in the designs of construction, but upon the active might of our armed forces supported by our industrial capacity and the traditional American spirit.

It is most fitting, therefore, to include in the RECORD an enlightening statement of Dr. Vannevar Bush, the eminent authority on modern weapons, on the general subject of defense against atomic bombs and the projected hydrogen bomb, made before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on February 9, 1950, and published in the Associated Press dispatches on that date.

The full text of the Associated Press story follows:

A-BOMB DEFENSE PLANS BASED ON OLD METHODS—DR. BUSH SAYS NO TRICK WAY HAS BEEN FOUND TO DEFEND UNITED STATES FROM ATOMIC ATTACK

WASHINGTON, February 9.—Dr. Vannevar Bush, atomic scientist, said today there was no trick way to defend the United States against attack by A-bombs or the projected hydrogen superbomb.

"There is no defense against a bomb, as such," Dr. Bush told newsmen after he had testified at a secret 2-hour session before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

By that he said he meant no method had yet been worked out by American scientists to detonate atomic weapons carried by enemy planes before the bombs have been dropped.

Dr. Bush quickly hedged, however, by saying defenses against any new weapons developed so quickly it is dangerous to forecast what may emerge from defense laboratories in the future.

ONLY TWO WAYS OF DEFENSE

But at present, he said, the only way to defend against an atomic bomb is to "stop the airplane or other carrier before it gets to the target—bomb the place that is manufacturing the bombs."

Dr. Bush was one of the Nation's top scientists advising military leaders during World War II. He served as Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and as adviser to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Behind closed doors Dr. Bush talked at length with members of the Armed Services Committee, drawing a broad picture of what can be expected in future warfare.

Senators were close-mouthed about his testimony, but Chairman TYDINGS, Democrat of Maryland, later told newsmen Dr. Bush said there was no "complete defense" against atomic or hydrogen bombs. "Dr. Bush gave us a very concise account of modern warfare and what has been and is being done," TYDINGS said.

The Maryland Senator said Dr. Bush urged "more research and development" toward building up national defense, but TYDINGS gave no details.

Coincidentally, Senator BRICKER, Republican of Ohio, dropped a hint that United States scientists possibly have been working on the H-bomb far longer than generally supposed. It was a week ago Tuesday that President Truman gave the go-ahead order for development of the so-called hell bomb.

But BRICKER, a member of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, commented to newsmen:

"Dr. Bush told us about the hydrogen bomb 3 years ago—about as much as has been made public recently."

Estimates on how long it would take to build the H-bomb have ranged from 1 to 4 or 5 years. Scientists say it would be 8 to 1,000 times more devastating than the wartime A-bomb and theoretically would have no limit to its destructive fury.

Froelich's Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the February 28, 1950, issue of the Development Bulletin published by the Iowa Development Commission contains the little-known but dramatic story of the invention of the tractor by John Froelich, of Froelich, Iowa, in my district.

Modern farming on the scale which it is practiced in the United States would be impossible without the tractor. Its invention initiated the rise of the American farmer as the greatest food pro-

ducer in the history of mankind. The name of the inventor, John Froelich, should be as familiar to every schoolboy as the names Eli Whitney, Cyrus McCormick, and Luther Burbank. Unfortunately, Froelich's name is relatively unknown.

It is important that we revere the memories of these great inventive geniuses, not merely because of their marvelous contributions to the advancement of civilization, but also because they symbolize what freemen can accomplish under a free-enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article referred to:

IOWAN INVENTED TRACTOR

About the time the cry of "Gold" rocked a growing nation, another cry was heard out on the prairie land of Iowa, made by a baby boy who was destined to invent a machine which would revolutionize farm work.

The machine he was to invent in Iowa alone helps cultivate the fields which annually produce more wealth than all the gold mines in the world.

Today, that machine—the tractor—is the flagship of the farm, with more than 2,000,000 in operation on farms in the United States. About 213,000 are in Iowa.

The inventor, John Froelich, is little known.

John Froelich was born November 24, 1849, in Giard, Iowa, but was living in nearby Froelich (named after his father) when he began dreaming of plans for the tractor.

From youth he had shown an inventive turn of mind. Among his inventions were a washing machine and a corn picker. But, like his father, he was also a businessman and operated an elevator and feed mill at Froelich in the 1880's.

He made good side money with a well-digging outfit and for 4 years took his threshing rig on "runs" in Iowa and South Dakota. It was during the time Froelich operated his two outfits that he realized the impracticality of the big steam engines which made modern farming at that time.

Then in 1890 John Froelich started hinting around about a mechanical power machine he had in mind. Most folks around the community were amused. They admitted he was a good businessman, but after all John wouldn't see 40 again, and he knew better than to go around saying that some day traction engines would do the work of horses on farms. And as for his talk about a smaller traction engine that would run on gasoline—had he been out in the sun too much?

John Froelich heard these snide remarks, but went about his work. In 1892 he went to Cincinnati where he bought a large vertical one-cylinder gasoline-powered engine which he shipped back home. It had a 14-inch stroke and bore. He placed the engine on wooden beams mounted on the running gear of a steam traction engine.

The two parts didn't fit together too well. In fact, in many respects, they didn't fit at all, and Froelich and his helper, William Mann, had to borrow, design, and recast many new parts.

It took time, but gradually in John Froelich's little blacksmith shop there took form a hybrid contraption that made folks smile. But the day came when the machine was assembled and ready for trial.

Froelich tugged at the massive flywheel. The machine wouldn't start.

No matter how hard Froelich and Mann yanked on the flywheel, the machine simply would not start; and somewhere, among the spectators, there was a snickered "I thought so."

Then Mann had an idea.

He twisted the bullet from a rifle cartridge, wedged the cartridge in the priming cup, hit it with a hammer.

That did it.

With a cough and a roar, the engine came to life and the flywheel began to spin. The closest spectator jumped back, horses reared and tried to pull loose from the nearby hitching rail. "Good boy, John," shouted the spectator who a few minutes before had scoffed.

Froelich, on the driving platform, nimbly eased his invention into gear. It lurched forward. "Back 'er up, John," someone called. He tried the reverse. The machine clanked backwards.

Out on the road he went, and to a farm where a neighbor was threshing grain. His machine was substituted for the steam engine. It did the job.

That was a summer day in 1892 when the first self-propelled gasoline-powered traction engine, capable of forward and reverse motions, chugged along at the snail's pace of 2 miles per hour.

A few weeks later, Froelich and a crew took the new invention and a new threshing machine to South Dakota where they harvested 72,000 bushels of grain.

Success seemed a cinch. But success was still 20 years away, and John Froelich was to be separated from his invention which went on to fame and became the product of a whole new industry.

After successful field tests, a group of businessmen at Waterloo organized the Waterloo Gasoline Traction Engine Co. John Froelich was president. The company built two tractors, but both were returned. Somehow all efforts to manufacture a practical tractor failed.

But John Froelich believed in his machine and experimentation went on. Then, in 1895, after the company had decided to make stationary gasoline engines to secure income to offset experimentation costs, the company was reorganized as the Waterloo Gasoline Engine Co. But John Froelich, whose interest was in tractors not in engines, withdrew from the company. Later he moved to St. Paul, Minn., where he died May 23, 1933.

In 1913 the company offered a successful model—a two-cylinder opposed engine on a four-wheel chassis. Twenty tractors were sold. The tide had turned.

The upsurge has gone on, and in its wake great plants have arisen throughout the Nation, some of them in Iowa, which make the tractors that came from the brain of John Froelich, of Giard, Iowa.

He has been almost forgotten down the roll call of years. Even after the value of his contribution to agriculture was established, the world gave him little recognition. But Froelich, Iowa, the town where his dream started, remembered him. In 1939 the little community dedicated a historical marker to his memory. Part of the marker reads:

"In this village, John Froelich built the first gasoline tractor that propelled itself backward as well as forward. Far reaching in its effect on modern agricultural history, it moved out of this village and into the world in 1892."

Reform of Electoral College System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter sent to me by J. Harvie Williams, a constituent of mine, who is a student of political science. Mr. Williams has made a careful analysis of the present electoral college system, the Lodge-Gossett proposal, and my resolution, House Joint Resolution 414, which is an alternative reform proposal of the present electoral college system.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 22, 1950.*

Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COUDERT: As you requested, I have made a comprehensive study of the comparative effect of the electoral reforms proposed in Lodge-Gossett amendment and in the amendment which you introduced on February 6 in House Joint Resolution 414.

To Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, must go the bulk of the credit for bringing the need of electoral reform to the fore in the public mind. And to Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, N. J., must go the credit for the most scholarly and complete study of the subject that I have seen, published as the leading article in Political Science Quarterly for March 1949. These gentlemen have forced the cause to its present vantage point in public thought. They have pointed out some of the weaknesses of our present electoral system. Senator LODGE has won the acclaim of all friends of electoral reform by his remarkable achievement in winning more than a two-thirds majority (64 to 27) in the Senate for his electoral reform plan, although many able and thoughtful men question the principle on which it is founded and doubt seriously that it would solve the problem in view.

Before the House of Representatives comes to act on the measure, most careful consideration should be given to these questions regarding it:

1. Does the Lodge-Gossett amendment conform to the established structure of American government?

2. Does it bring into closer balance the electoral power and the congressional power of the political parties in the States and therefore in the Nation?

3. Does it reduce or eliminate the present basis of ideological conflict between the President and the Congress—the greatest weakness of the present system?

The whole case for the electoral college is set forth in a single paragraph in George Bancroft's History of the United States, VI (pp. 339–349):

"And now the whole line of march to the mode of the election of the President can be surveyed. The Convention at first reluctantly conferred that office on the National Legislature; and to prevent the possibility of failure by a negative vote of one House or the other, to the Legislature voting in joint ballot. To escape from the danger of cabal and corruption, it next transferred the full and final power of choice to an electoral college that should be the exact counterpart of the joint convention of the two Houses in the representation of the States as units as well as population of the States, and should meet at the seat of Government. Then fearing that so large a number of men would not travel to the seat of government for that single purpose, or might be hindered on the way, they most reluctantly went back to the choice of the two Houses in joint convention. At this moment the thought arose that the electors might cast their votes in their own States, and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government. Accordingly, the work of electing a President was divided; the Convention removed the act of voting from the joint session of the two Houses to

electoral colleges in the several States, the act of voting to be followed by the transmission of authenticated certificates of the votes to a branch of the General Legislature at the seat of government; and then it restored to the two Houses in the presence of each other the same office of counting the collected certificates which they would have performed had the choice remained with the two Houses of the Legislature.

Thus it is clear that the founding fathers regarded the electoral college as a counterpart body of the whole Congress. It was necessary then—and still is necessary now—to articulate the Federal and national features of our Government in the election of a President as they are articulated in the two Houses of Congress, the Senate being a Federal body with equal representation for the States as units and the House of Representatives being a national body with representation based on the population of the States. Too, the electoral college was and is necessary to maintain the separation of executive and legislative power, an essential element in the structure of our National Government. This articulation of Federal and national principles in our Constitution, while the result of a political compromise in the Convention, is the root of our greatest contribution to the knowledge and practice of statecraft and government—the eminent and successful principle of dual sovereignty.

To each State the founding fathers gave electoral power equal to its congressional power, and so it remains today. But the concept of the electoral college as the counterpart of Congress in the articulation of Federal and national electoral power was destroyed by political leaders of the larger party in each of the States. To win all of the electoral power in a State these political leaders had things rearranged so that all presidential electors ran for election on general State-wide tickets. This is the arrangement that permits the entire electoral vote of a State to go to the presidential candidate of one party by as little as one vote plurality. This practice is the source of the complaints against our present electoral system. This is the situation sought to be corrected. I don't believe there are very many among the American people who want to change violently the structure of our Government, and I am certain that the sponsors of the Lodge-Gossett amendment are not among that number.

I am equally certain that the Coudert electoral reform plan embodied in House Joint Resolution 414, will make the electoral college the exact counterpart of a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives. It provides:

"SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner as its Senators and Representatives are chosen * * *."

The effect of this provision would be to put an end to the prevailing practice in the States of choosing all of their presidential electors by the general State-wide ticket system. Rather, only the two Federal electors, corresponding to each State's two Senators, would be elected on a State-wide basis, unless, as in some States, some of the Representatives are elected at large; and the national electors, corresponding to the Representatives in Congress, would be elected in congressional districts, or at large in a few cases.

Adoption of the Coudert amendment would have these important political effects:

1. Divide each State's electoral power among the parties on the same basis that its congressional power is divided among them. Thus national parties would have electoral power commensurate with their congressional power—an ideal situation.

2. Give the Presidency to any party that won a bare majority (218) of the seats in the House, and won a bare majority of the States (25) with two electors each, for a total of 268 electoral votes, or won more congressional districts and carried fewer States.

3. The President and the whole Congress would have exactly the same constituency cast up in the same form. Pressure groups of all kinds would have the same weight in electing the President that they have in electing the whole membership of the House and Senate. There would be no basis for an ideological conflict between the President and the Congress when both were of such close political complexion.

4. Both large and small States would have their political weight properly divided among the parties in the election of the President.

5. States having large blocs of doubtful electoral votes would no longer be the exclusive sources of party candidates for President, although they would continue to have the largest delegations at the nominating conventions.

6. New York's 47 doubtful electoral votes under the present system would be reduced to a doubtful 12 under the Coudert amendment, since only 10 of its 45 House seats (43 before 1932) have changed their party representation since 1920. The two Federal electors would always be doubtful. New York would continue to be a dominant State, but its dominance would not be overwhelming. The same would be true of other large States like Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California.

It is clear, then, that the Coudert amendment conforms squarely with the established structure of our National Government, that it would almost exactly balance the electoral and congressional power of the political parties, and thus would eliminate the basis of the present ideological coflict between the President and the Congress—a conflict that will doom our form of government if it is not soon ended.

It should be noted that the Coudert amendment maintains the requirement of a majority of the electoral vote for the election of the President; and it should be emphasized that the majority requirement is the primary basis of our two-party political system. Under the Coudert amendment, when no candidate for President or Vice President received a majority of the electoral vote the final choices would be made by a joint session of Congress voting as a single body, from among the persons having the three highest numbers of votes on the lists of those voted for for each office. Three-fourths of the combined membership of the Senate and the House would be required as a quorum.

On the other hand, by introducing a new and novel application of the principle of proportional representation for the division of each State's electoral vote proportionally among the candidates for President, and allowing the election of a President by a plurality of only 40 percent of the electoral vote, the Lodge-Gossett amendment would violate the established structure of our National Government and remove the foundation of the two-party system. By abolishing the electoral college entirely the Lodge-Gossett amendment attempts to remove the Federal feature from our form of government, insofar as it is possible politically to do so. It denies the validity of dual-sovereignty.

Conceivably in 25 years, once the proportional principle has been dignified with constitutional authority, several of our larger States will be electing their Representatives in Congress by some system of proportional representation; and, conceivably, several new minor parties will be electing, together, a bloc of 25 to 35 Representatives who will be a continuing balance of power in the Congress of the United States. It should be remembered that the proportional principle is the source of the multiparty systems that have paralyzed European governments and brought up dictators to relieve the paralysis. Both Hitler and Mussolini had their political origins in the conditions created by proportional representation.

Based on previous elections, which can only be guides, for under either, electoral reform plan campaigns would have been conducted differently, the Lodge-Gossett amendment would have violently shifted the parties' source of electoral power. The Republicans in 1948 would have won from the Democrats 32.4 additional electoral votes. But, 30.2 of them would have come from the 11 Southern States and 13.9 of them would have come from the five border States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Oklahoma, for a total of 44.1 electoral votes. A Republican loss of 11.7 electoral votes in the 32 Northern States brings the net gain down to 32.4 electoral votes. To match this gain of 44.1 votes in electoral power in the Southern States and the border States the Republicans have only 5 House seats of congressional power and carried only the State of Maryland by a plurality.

A comprehensive study of the prospective shifts of electoral power under the Lodge-Gossett amendment reveals that Republican gains are consistently in the southern and border States and the Republican losses are, of course, in the North. Both parties would lose electoral power where they would have congressional power, and would gain electoral power where they have little or no chance of gaining congressional power. Thus, the Lodge-Gossett amendment would produce as great a disparity between the sources of the parties' electoral and congressional power as exists under the present system, with a growing basis for the continuance of the ideological conflict between the President and the Congress.

There is enclosed a table showing the net electoral vote advantage by the sectional political divisions of the country for the parties in terms of the Coudert plan over the Lodge plan, for the 1948, 1944, and 1940 elections.

You will note that the Coudert plan is consistently better for Republicans in the 32 Northern States—both in the 8 largest States and in the other 24—and is equally advantageous for the Democrats in the border and Southern States. Except in 1940 when some odd parties elected Representatives in some of the Western States, other parties are consistent net losers in all sections under the Coudert plan. Vice versa, the other parties would be consistent gainers in all sections under the Lodge-Gossett plan.

Sincerely,

J. HARVIE WILLIAMS.

Red Victim Bares Confession Agony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle by Edward V. Roberts entitled "Red Victim Bares Confession Agony":

RED VICTIM BARES CONFESSION AGONY

(By Edward V. Roberts)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—A man who may now be dead has given the free world its

first detailed picture of Communist secret police methods used to obtain confessions in Soviet-type political trials.

The State Department said today the story—a tragic tale of the utter break-down of a man's will to resist—is the first time the civilized world has been told how the Soviets force men to swear publicly to crimes they did not commit.

The Department released a sworn statement by Michael Shipkov, former employee of the United States Legation in Bulgaria, describing how he confessed espionage and treason after 32 hours of questioning and torture by the Bulgarian State Security Militia last August.

After confessing he agreed to return to the Legation and serve as an informer for the police. Instead, he immediately wrote the details of his experience in an affidavit which he gave to American officials. Then he remained hidden in the Legation for 6 months.

He finally left February 11, was recaptured, and promptly indicted for treason.

HIS FATE STILL A MYSTERY

Inasmuch as such trials frequently are carried out in secret, there is no way of knowing whether he has yet been tried. The penalty for treason in Bulgaria is death.

The State Department suggested that Shipkov's affidavit shed light on how confessions were obtained from Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, imprisoned for treason in Hungary; Robert A. Vogeler, American businessman, imprisoned for espionage in Hungary; and 15 Protestant pastors convicted of spying for the United States last year in Bulgaria.

Shipkov's story was told in an 8,000-word affidavit, written in longhand. He told how his confession was extracted from him and how he was made to implicate others. The confession, he said, was "dragged out of me against my will, against any knowledge of actual truth, under duress."

Shipkov said he was questioned by seven militiamen, working in teams. The interrogation began on a Saturday afternoon and continued until Sunday night. The only interruptions, he said, came during his periodic collapses from exhaustion.

During most of the questioning Shipkov was forced to stand facing a wall, bent forward, with one finger of each hand pressing against the wall. When his answers were unsatisfactory he was slapped or struck on the back of the neck.

"This posture does not appear unduly painful, nor did it particularly impress me in the beginning. And yet, combined with the mental strain, with the continuous pressure to talk, with the utter hopelessness and the longing to go through the thing and be sent down into silence and peace—it is a very effective manner of breaking down all resistance," Shipkov wrote.

"And after a time of this I broke down. I told them I was willing and eager to tell them all they wanted. The main appeal is to end the pain, to stop needless, futile resistance, and to come nearer to the moment when they would let me in peace."

Shipkov thought the worst was over then. They let him sit down, gave him a cigarette, "even lit it for me."

But he was wrong. The interrogation was only beginning. The inquisitors wanted details.

"And this went on, hour after hour, throughout the night, throughout the day, without respite or end.

"How can I best explain?" he wrote. "The only straw for which I could reach is the impression that I had, in my emptied, vacant thoughts, of some sentence that had pleased them, or that had conformed with the pattern I had so often seen in the [Communist] newspapers.

"And if I were to stop and plead fatigue, or poor memory, or ask to rest—the wall again and again, and the slaps and the blows in the nape. And I remembered I would come up gasping and talk and talk and feel utterly broken."

CONFESSION WRUNG BIT BY BIT

Bit by bit, he said, he made the "confession" they wanted, naming people they seemed to want named, inventing details they wanted; yes, he had spied for the British and for the Americans, and on the Americans for the British; yes, he had distorted events in Bulgaria "to provoke hatred and cause foreign intervention"; and so on, for hours and hours.

Out of his agonies Shipkov's mind retained two vivid impressions which he wrote down:

"1. They are not overinterested in what you tell them. It would appear that the ultimate purpose of this treatment is to break you down completely and deprive you of any will power or private thought or self-esteem, which they achieve remarkably quickly.

"2. I rarely could perceive any personal hatred or enmity for me—contempt certainly, but sooner an academic detachment dealing with an annoying problem * * * and a fanatic, rabid devotion to communism and hatred for Anglo-American resistance to them."

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, Statehood for Alaska, lead editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for March 7, makes such a compelling argument for Alaska statehood that it answers every objection which has been raised against the statehood bill which was approved by this House last week. I do not see how anyone could fail to be swayed by the persuasive language of the Herald Tribune editorial which is quoted here in full text:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

At a time when Russia frowns across the Bering Strait at the northernmost frontier of the United States, it is of supreme importance that Alaska be a strong point of American defense. This is not exclusively, nor even most importantly, a matter of physical armament. It requires, rather, that Alaska be sound and vigorous, militarily, economically and politically; that it share in the main currents of American life. In the cold war, the best garrisons are not those who wear uniforms; they are citizens with the full rights of citizenship, promoting the prosperity of their communities and aware of their responsibilities. Such rights as Alaskans have enjoyed under the Territorial government are, to be sure, far superior to those which any subject of a Soviet dictatorship is granted by his masters. But American freedom should not be exemplified in a crucial region, by half measures. As an example of the intrinsic dynamism of the American way, if for no other reason, Alaska should be admitted to statehood.

Such a decision—which has already been approved by the House of Representatives—will have other practical benefits. As a State, represented in Congress and able to vote for Presidents, Alaska could attract a larger population, work more freely to develop the riches of its huge area, help to dispel the ignorance which has hampered its growth. Too many Americans are still only vaguely aware of the potentialities of Alaska; its semidependent status has fostered an impression of wild wastelands, romantic but exotic. To bring Alaska into the familiar political pattern of the American States will adjust this viewpoint, allow a more realistic appraisal of Alaska's value and encourage the investment of capital, skills, and human hopes.

Yesterday the House gave a voice vote for statehood for Hawaii as well. There is no necessary connection between the two; Hawaii must be considered on its own merits, which are strong. But the Alaskan case is, in our judgment, overwhelming. Virtually all of the opposition in the House to Alaska's entry has been based on political considerations—the fact that as a State it would have two Senators, like all the rest, despite the disparity between its present population and that of New York, for example, or California. But if statehood will increase Alaska's citizenry, it would be a mistake to hamper the growth of an important portion of America because of a situation which may well be temporary and which, in any case, was expressly provided in the Constitution to balance the political power of large and small States. Shifts in population have before this made many of the arguments used against the acquisition of Territories by the United States ludicrous—it used to be said, for example, that Oregon was worthless because of the "1,500 miles of unredeemed and invincible sterility, with a backbone of snow-covered and (for most of their length) impassable mountains" separating that region from the East. Time proved the folly of this judgment; given courage and imagination in Congress, time can do the same for Alaska.

The Challenge of Atheism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge of Atheism," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, an officer of the Mystic Shrine, before the joint meeting of the Central States and Midwest Shrine Associations, Sioux City, Iowa, on February 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF ATHEISM

There is a Godless ideology in this troubled world of ours that is spreading like a prairie fire. Loyal and God-fearing Americans cannot read their newspapers or listen to their radios without recoiling emotionally at the thought that we have in our country an organization whose leaders brazenly tell us that in time of war, if that war were with the Soviet Union, they would follow the Red flag instead of the Stars and Stripes. That, I submit, is a plea of guilty of treason in advance of the act.

We face a more formidable enemy today than ever before in the history of this Republic. We face an enemy who can and who will destroy us if we permit him to divide us, as he is well on the way to do. In 1939 he was an enemy of 170,000,000 people. In 1945 he was an enemy of 345,000,000

people. In 1950 he is an enemy of 800,000,000 people. In 1939 he lay east of Poland. In 1950 he is on the River Elbe with nothing between him and the English Channel but weak, divided, and disorganized people whom his agents have infiltrated. In 1950 he is controlling the whole western Pacific, from Vladivostok to the Hainan Islands. This enemy is a power stronger than we, and the sooner we recognize this fact the less chance there will be of our being absorbed by Communist Russia.

While the hour is late, it isn't too late yet for us to save ourselves from that Godless ideology, but we cannot temporize with it much longer and remain freemen. The Communists are infiltrating all departments of our Government—the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and the executive department. David Demarest Lloyd, who admitted joining the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, and who for an appreciable period of time was a member of the National Lawyers' Guild, which has been listed as a Communist front by the House Un-American Activities Committee, is now one of President Truman's speech writers. It was Lloyd who wrote the President's Oklahoma speech in which the President defended his stand insofar as Reds in our Government are concerned. Since resigning from the Washington Cooperative Bookshop and the National Lawyers' Guild, Lloyd has written complimentary articles on Alger Hiss, who was recently convicted for lying about his giving state secrets to the then Communist courier, Whittaker Chambers.

Inasmuch as membership in Masonry is a prerequisite for membership in the Shrine, the future of our organization is contingent upon the health and growth of Masonry. That's why I shall emphasize what the Communists in our Republic are doing to destroy Masonry and, indirectly, the Shrine of North America. Lest you think I am an alarmist, I shall read brief excerpts from the 1949 annual report of the Grand Master of Masons from one of our Southern States.

"I learned early in the grand lodge year," said the grand master in his report to the grand lodge, "through conference with a sister jurisdiction that there existed an organized Communist campaign to destroy the effectiveness of Freemasonry through infiltration and boring from within. My investigations showed that in many subordinate lodges the investigation of petitions was ineffectual and inadequate. Radical changes were made in our form of petition and procedure of investigation for the purpose of keeping Communists out of our fraternity."

We know that Communists have infiltrated some of our lodges and we know what they are doing to keep the best type of citizens out of blue lodges by the exercise of the ballot.

Our form of government was virtually born in Masonic lodges. The Masons, as you know, engineered the Boston Tea Party and, on the occasion of his midnight ride, Paul Revere was an officer of his lodge. A large majority of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were Masons. Masons, in my opinion, have a greater responsibility to keep America American and thus preserve our way of life than any other segment of our human family. There are said to be 3,500,000 Masons in the United States, most of whom would, if organized and energized, become Paul Reveres, in which event, we would need have no fear for the safety of our country.

The founders of our way of life placed their belief in the existence of the Supreme Being. You cannot read the Constitution of the United States or the Declaration of Independence: you cannot read the constitutional debates, out of which our Republic was born, without realizing that our founding fathers recognized that a government of freemen must necessarily rest upon spiritual values. Was it not Paul who said, "Where the spirit of God exists, there will be found freedom." The Communists deny the existence of a Supreme Being and brazenly proclaim that the spirit of Christianity—belief in God—must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere. No greater indictment could be drawn of any movement than to say it cannot exist in a religious atmosphere.

Kill the spirit of God in America and our liberties will evaporate almost overnight. The Communists know this and that's why they are infiltrating our churches; yes, I said our churches, and all other organizations whose structures are founded upon a belief in God.

We are engaged in an atheistic war which is sapping our financial strength. This war is called a cold war yet it is proving to be as expensive as a hot war from a monetary standpoint. It was Lenin, that patron saint of communism, who said many years ago that sooner or later the Communists hope to force America to spend her way to destruction. In a measure, that's what is being done in our country today. The war in which we are engaged is a perilous one, more perilous than the hot war with the Germans and the Japs. We have lost virtually all of the preliminary battles. It takes a courageous people to face that fact, but I submit that if we don't have the courage to face it honestly we will certainly be destroyed.

We must divorce our minds from the things that are trivial and concentrate upon the great problem of saving our civilization from atheism and communism, which go hand in hand. We can save our way of life if we have the courage and the character to follow the advice of our Masonic forefathers who did so much to make our way of life possible and if we are worthy of our heritage, we must put forth the same kind of effort which they put forth.

Nothing pleases the Communists more or advances their interests more rapidly than the wasting of human effort through strikes and unrest, the dissipation of our mineral resources and fertility of our soil which we are doing by various forms of subsidies and governmental extravagance which pyramid our national debt. In his Farewell Address George Washington, one of our Masonic forefathers, admonished us to, "Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt." This, among other things, we have failed to do. Our Masonic forefathers gave us a way of life which has produced a greater degree of liberty and a higher living standard than ever experienced before in the history of civilization. If we Masons fight for its preservation and encourage others to emulate our efforts, we shall not fail.

What Is the Sixteenth Amendment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Charles Coburn, the eighth generation of Coburns born in America, has never alined himself with politics. An actor of stage and screen, therefore a servant of the people, his interests politically have been in the preservation of the Constitution and the American way of life, rather than in party politics.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Coburn:

WHAT IS THE SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT?

(By Charles Coburn)

Ask the first 100 people you meet the question, "What is the sixteenth amendment?" and you will be amazed to find not more than one can give you the answer.

The Constitution of the United States is a contract of agreement between the "people" as party of the first part, and the "servant of the people" (the Government) as party of the second part.

All contracts are based upon "intent," "purpose," and "consideration"; consequently, any proposed change in or any added clause to the agreement should be in keeping with the original intent, purpose, and consideration upon which the contract is based.

It is my belief that the sixteenth amendment is directly opposed and antagonistic to the Constitution of the United States and repugnant to the intent upon which the contract is based.

In the Declaration of Independence our forefathers stated very clearly that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Among the charges made against the dictatorship of King George III were:

"For imposing taxes on us without our consent.

"For abolishing the free system of English laws and establishing an arbitrary government."

The fear expressed by our forefathers of leaving any possible loophole whereby our Government might ever become a political dictatorship was emphasized by Benjamin Franklin who said:

"We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution now no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states all round Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances."

The main intent of our system of checks and balances—that is, of having three departments of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—was to prevent any arbitrary power being given to any one department of government.

The purpose of the contract is expressed in the preamble of the Constitution:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

All the articles and amendments in and to the Constitution, up to the sixteenth amendment, are in support and full accord with the intention expressed in the preamble.

George Washington in his Farewell Address warned his fellow citizens "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence * * * since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

It is obvious that our form of government was never intended to countenance fascism, communism, socialism, or welfare statism, or any other form of dictatorship destructive to our system of free enterprise and to the liberty and independence of a free people.

The insidious seed of dissolution was injected into the Constitution against the warning of Benjamin Franklin and George Washington, and "we the people" were sold down the river when through stupidity or cupidity our trusted representatives of 42 State legislatures ratified the sixteenth amendment granting dictatorial powers to Congress.

The sixteenth amendment is worded as follows:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Up to and including 1932, the figure for living expenses was arbitrarily set at $2,500 for a single person and $3,500 for a married couple. Today the figure is arbitrarily set at $600 for a single person and $1,200 for a married couple. And this is done at a time when living expenses are perhaps three or four times as much as they were in 1932. So with one fell swoop the Government takes out of each taxpayer's income $1,900 for a single person and $2,300 for a married couple. In other words, this law puts arbitrary power into the hands of a branch of the Government to take a man's life without a hearing, for, as Shakespeare says:

"You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house; you take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

Through the present brutally unfair and viciously discretionary system of taxation our National Government has added bureaucrat to bureaucrat and subsidy to subsidy and there are now more than 19,000,000 persons living in whole or in part on the National Government, supported by the workers and salaried people of the country.

Chief Justice Marshall was right in saying: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Not only has the sixteenth amendment nullified most of the clauses of the Constitution which protected our system of free enterprise, but it is a whip in the hands of a political machine rapidly driving us into socialism or welfare statism and pauperism.

For who can live on $600 a year at the present high cost of living which is due to our present system of taxation. It is obviously an admission of dishonest thinking for the Government to allow a hard-working taxpayer only $600 a year for his living expenses and then appeal to Congress for $1,200 a year for old-age security. Though I am in favor of $1,200 for old-age security, this kind of reasoning is illogical to say the least.

"We the people" are fast becoming the slaves of a bureaucratic Government, for no matter what we earn by the sweat of our brow we may keep only as much or as little as the czars of taxation are pleased to allow us. In these circumstances how can a man provide for himself and his family and set aside anything for the future? This is certainly not the intent of the contract which definitely promises the people "the right to be secure in their persons" * * * "Justice" * * * "domestic tranquility" * * * and the "blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity."

The political slogan of "soak the rich" for the purpose of getting votes has been exploded by the arbitrary power to tax—and the socialistic practices of England have already proven there is no such thing possible as an even distribution of wealth—any more than it is possible to have an even distribution of brains or intelligence. The only thing which can be and is distributed evenly is poverty—and America is headed in that direction under the present practice of deficit spending by the Government.

If the Supreme Court of the United States can find any legal technicality for not declaring the sixteenth amendment unconstitutional, or if Congress cannot find ways and means of taking the teeth out of this amendment and compel the administration to eliminate wasteful expenditures, then it is the duty of every loyal American, regardless of his political affiliation, unless he is in favor of having a socialist government, to insist upon the repeal of the sixteenth amendment, which is unquestionably un-American in spirit and repugnant to the original Constitution of these United States.

Who is here so base that would be a slave? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so vile that would not love his country? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so stupid that would destroy our Constitution? If any, speak; for him have I offended. I pause for a reply.

Nomination of William Crawford Gorgas in the Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise my remarks, I include a letter I have written to Dr. Sockman, director of the Hall of Fame, in behalf of the memory of Gen. William Crawford Gorgas:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1950.

Dr. RALPH W. SOCKMAN,
Director, New York University Hall of Fame, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SOCKMAN: I wish to add my endorsement to the many you are receiving in behalf of the nomination of William Crawford Gorgas to the Hall of Fame.

The Dictionary of American Biography has called Dr. Gorgas the man who made possible the construction of the Panama Canal. This alone is an eminent achievement. But Dr. Gorgas did more. It was his conquering of disease in Habana and later in Panama which made possible the eradication of yellow fever in the Western Hemisphere.

Historians agree that one of the chief causes of French failure to build the Panama Canal at the end of the nineteenth century was the twin scourge of yellow fever and malaria. Records show that during their 9 years on the isthmus, the French lost nearly 23,000 workers. At all times at least one-third of their labor force was sick. Panama had earned the name "White Man's Grave."

It was to this veritable pest hole that Dr. Gorgas came, fresh from his successful sanitation campaign in Habana where both yellow fever and malaria was brought under control for the first time. In due time, according to Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., "Gorgas so improved the sanitary conditions of this death-laden region that it became more healthful and showed a lower death rate than any community in the United States." This public-health miracle wrought by Dr. Gorgas made possible the building of the Panama Canal with little loss of life.

Modern American communities have been rendered almost immune to mass epidemics of plague proportions because of the amazing advance of preventive medicine and public-health techniques. Most Americans find it difficult to visualize the horror of the plagues that devastated the Old World and America too until comparatively recent times. As late as 1873 my home town of Birmingham, then 2 years old, was almost wiped off the map by a cholera epidemic. Having heard tales from our grandparents of that terrible experience, we can more readily picture the desolation visited upon a community by such a scourge—the frenzied exodus of all able-bodied citizens, leaving the sick behind without care, the almost complete paralysis of business and all normal life.

In 1878, shortly before Gorgas began his yellow-fever work in Habana, the United States had more than 100,000 cases of yellow fever and more than 20,000 deaths. Today the disease is almost unheard of. But the significant fact to be borne in mind is that the brilliant pioneering of one man in preventive medicine and sanitary engineering freed the modern world of this dread disease. If it were not for Dr. Gorgas our statistics might still be heavy with deaths from yellow fever.

Therefore it is not only as one of the architects of the mighty Panama Canal that we revere the memory of William Crawford Gorgas, though this accomplishment in itself adds permanent luster to his name. It is because of the effect of his life and work upon the health and welfare of all mankind that we feel he belongs beside the other great immortals in the Hall of Fame. In the words of Maj. Gen. Robert E. Noble, United States Army, Dr. Gorgas "was a soldier, a doctor, a humanitarian. The good he did will live to bless the peoples of the world in generations yet unborn."

For these reasons, then, I respectfully request your earnest consideration of the nomination of Alabama's Dr. William Crawford Gorgas to the New York University Hall of Fame.

Sincerely yours,

LAURIE C. BATTLE.

Statement by Henry Ford II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important announcement from Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co. It deals with that company's organization of a fund in an attempt to discharge obligations as an industrial citizen in the fields of charity, education, public and private health and hospitalization, civic and community development. In my opinion, it is an outstanding example of industrial citizenship.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Henry Ford II, president of Ford Motor Co., made the following statement today (March 6):

"We wish to announce the formation, under Michigan charter, of Ford Motor Co. Fund, a charitable, nonprofit corporation.

"The purpose of Ford Motor Co. Fund will be the alleviation of want and human suffering and the betterment and improvement of mankind through the making of contributions to organizations operating exclusively for charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes.

"The fund will be financed principally by contributions from Ford Motor Co.

"This action is an attempt to organize ourselves to discharge to the best of our ability our obligations as an industrial citizen in the fields of charity, education, public and private health and hospitalization, civic and community development in Dearborn, Detroit, and elsewhere.

"It is our observation that traditional sources of financial support of private institutions operating in these fields are tending to disappear. We do not like the consequences inherent in the alternative facing such private institutions—that of having to turn to government for much-needed financial aid. In our opinion, this situation places an increasing responsibility upon American businesses in their role of industrial citizens.

"Ford Motor Co. Fund headquarters will be located in Dearborn.

"The board of trustees of the fund are Henry Ford II, Ernest R. Breech, L. D. Crusoe, John R. Davis, Benson Ford, William T. Gossett, D. S. Harder, and T. O. Yntema.

"Henry Ford II is president of the fund, Ernest R. Breech is executive vice president, Allen W. Merrell is vice president and chairman of the administration committee, L. E. Briggs is vice president and treasurer, and Fred A. Thomson is secretary."

Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD, for the consideration of the Members of the House, a letter I have received from Mr. John E. Hughes, attorney at law, of Chicago, Ill. He presents a very interesting comment on the proposed change in existing law with respect to depletion allowance.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 1, 1950.*

Hon RALPH E. CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH: The President, in his tax message, said one man had an income of $1,000,000 a year for the 5 years 1943–47 and by using it to drill for oil escaped income taxes on it and now has properties yielding $5,000,000 a year.

It is too bad for the revenue there are not more such men because these properties must be worth $25,000,000, and when he dies the Federal estate tax thereon at present rates will be about $16,600,000, and also if he now has income from the property of $5,000,000 a year he pays an annual income tax of 77 percent on half of his income, or almost $2,000,000, unless he has a wife who survives him and to whom he leaves half his property, in which case his estate will be half that but her estate must pay on the balance when she dies.

If he had not drilled for oil the Treasury would have collected only about $4,000,000 in income tax from him for 1943 to 1947, inclusive. Thus, instead of losing money by the provisions the President attacks the Treasury gains as above-stated. Also, the example failed to note that oil drillers were in high-tax brackets and the $1,000,000 spent in development did not escape tax because they paid tax on a considerable portion of it at high rates.

Furthermore, if the depletion allowance is modified, then oil producers should have the same treatment now afforded timber operators who only pay 25-percent tax on timber sold under section 117 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code. Oil, unlike timber, is irreplaceable.

I am writing you on my own behalf as an oil operator.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN E. HUGHES.

The American Taxpayers Are on the Sucker Lists of Arizona Landholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the lesson for today will be on the subject of men making fortunes at the expense of our National Treasury. The particular example I shall use involves a gigantic reclamation project for the State of Arizona. This proposed development—the central Arizona project—would cost the Nation's taxpayers an initial billion and a half dollars.

The Arizona landholders who would benefit the most from this fantastic project do not propose to pay any of its original cost. The whole thing would be a gift to them from the people of the United States. Yet, these same Arizona landholders would make untold millions of dollars if the Congress should approve this incredible scheme.

How could such a thing happen? I shall tell you.

Under somewhat unusual circumstances, of which the Arizona promoters are well aware, the big landholders would operate beyond the control of reclamation laws. They would be excess owners, yet the 160-acre limitation law could not be applied to them.

Let us consider the evidence.

The Bureau of Reclamation report on the central Arizona project states, on page R–9, that about 628,000 acres in the project area have a history of irrigation.

The report continues:

About 32 percent of the land with a history of irrigation is held in excess ownership.

Thirty-two percent of 628,000 acres is 200,960 acres.

Excess ownership means land held by individuals in excess of the 160-acre limitation law for projects constructed with Federal money.

The excess-ownership estimate of the Bureau of Reclamation is not only incorrect but is deceptive. Hidden in the Bureau's own report are figures which show the excess ownership to be much greater.

On page R–12 is this statement:

An estimated 7 percent of the farms are 500 acres or larger in total acreage and contain an estimated 55 percent of the irrigated land.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau says approximately 628,000 acres in the project area have a history of irrigation. Some simple arithmetic reveals that 55 percent of 628,000 acres is 345,400 acres.

Therefore, the Bureau's excess-ownership estimate of 200,960 acres is completely untrue. The fact is that more than half of the irrigated land in the project area, 345,300 acres, is held in excess ownership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ordinary irrigated farm land in the project area is worth about $300 an acre. Therefore, if the proposed project were approved, the 345,400 acres held in excess ownership could be sold for $103,620,000.

That is a tidy sum. But wait. Who would get it?

The Bureau report says there are about 6,000 farms in the project area. Seven percent of these farms contain 55 percent of the irrigated land. Seven percent of 6,000 is 420.

Therefore, we have the startling disclosure that under the project 420 large landowners in the project area would be in a position to sell their holdings for $103,620,000.

Let us take some specific examples to prove the case.

It so happened that in Pinal County, Ariz., between 1939 and 1947, about 193 excess ownerships were created by using water pumped from natural underground storage basins. This pumping was done in the face of dire warnings that there was not adequate water for such operations. But the speculators wantonly continued their plundering, and there was no law to stop them.

These 193 excess ownerships in Pinal County alone contain more than 137,000 acres. Using the basic value of $300 an acre, the 193 excess ownerships under pumped water in Pinal County would have a selling value of at least $41,000,000 if the proposed project were approved.

Yet, these 193 excess ownerships would pay none of the cost of the project. They could get this high figure for their excess land because under the project there would be an assured water supply, which costs them nothing.

In due course I shall name the 193 excess owners in the Pinal area.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain this underground water gimmick, which makes the proposed project the greatest Christmas present in reclamation history.

The plan of the proposed project is to bring water on the surface from the Colorado River to the project area. Enormous amounts of this water will flow into the underground basins.

The Federal 160-acre limitation law applies only to water carried to the project. Now what about this water after it goes down into the underground basins?

There is the gimmick.

I have shown that there are in one part of Pinal County alone at least 193 excess ownerships, created between 1939 and 1947, which use only underground water. Under the project these excess ownerships would be given free a dependable source of water, a gift from the Federal Government.

Why? Because there is no way to apply the 160-acre limitation law to underground water.

These 193 excess ownerships could remain in excess, and there would be nothing the Government could do to bring them under the limitation law. They could take all the water they needed from the underground basins. Therefore, they would receive all the benefits of the project without paying 1 cent of its cost.

There are, of course, many more such excess ownerships in other sections of the project area which would receive similar Christmas presents.

It is a rosy prospect, indeed, especially for the large landowner in the project area, and Arizona's own statements support this contention.

Let us look at the record for a moment. In the last session, hearings were held on the Arizona project before the House Public Lands Committee. Mr. V. E. Larson, an engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified that the 160-acre limitation law would be applied to the proposed Arizona project, and that "some of the larger areas or farms would have to be broken down to fall within the limitation."

Mr. Larson was careful to use the word "some," for the large farms using underground water exclusively would not have to be broken down at all. These pump farms would go right on taking what water they needed, and no one could stop them. I am sure that Mr. Larson and the Reclamation Bureau is very much aware of this fact.

In the same public lands hearing, the distinguished Congressman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], questioned a witness, Mr. Charles A. Carson, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Carson, if this legislation should be enacted, will not this project be a Federal reclamation project?

Mr. CARSON. Yes, of course.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will not the 160-acre limitation law apply as elsewhere?

Mr. CARSON. Yes.

Now, Mr. Carson is a leading water attorney for the State of Arizona. He is a fervent advocate of the proposed Arizona project. In the hearings he was questioned at length, and I should like to read a short excerpt from the record when he was being questioned by my colleague, Mr. ENGLE of California:

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Carson, I notice that on page R-12 of the Bureau of Reclamation report that it states that the largest individual farm, in terms of irrigated acreages, averaged * * * 10,430 acres under irrigation during the period 1940 to 1944. * * * Do you mean to say that these farms with an average irrigated acreage of 10,430 acres under irrigation are going to be all reduced to 160 acres?

Mr. CARSON. Yes, sir. Most of those now are not dependent upon surface diversion. They are pumped areas, Mr. ENGLE, and not under any Federal reclamation project. They are under no regulation by the Government nor anybody else. They are outside the boundaries of all the irrigation districts that are established in Arizona, or that share in the Federal reclamation project water. If this project goes through and is authorized, it is my understanding that this would all be Federal reclamation project and that those ownerships would be broken down.

Mr. ENGLE. Do you know of any practical way to apply the 160-acre limitation to underground water?

Mr. CARSON. No.

Mr. ENGLE. I do not, either.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it cannot be done. These Arizona landholders using pumped water from the underground pools cannot be controlled, or forced under the 160-acre limitation law. They could, under this project, go right ahead using the underground water, and no one could stop them. That is what Mr. Carson, Arizona's leading spokesman, himself, said. And in this instance, I agree with Arizona.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who are the 193 excess owners in Pinal County? Here are their names, and the amount of acreage registered to them on local Government records between the years 1939 to 1947:

	Acreage
P. H. Ethington	6,807
Arizona Farm Products Corp	5,814
C. A. Owen	4,232
T. Decker	2,945
P. Bianco	2,720
J. N. Harber	2,691
E. H. Smith	2,550
J. F. Nutt	2,236
R. H. Hawn	2,080
J. D. Singh	1,919
Murphy et al	1,760
I. H. Wallace	1,542
Pretzer et al	1,492
F. W. Shedd	1,472
H. Wasner	1,357
E. K. Porter	1,343
General Farms Co	1,320
Table Top Ranch Corp	1,306
California Cotton Oil Co	1,281
E. B. Miller	1,280
G. H. Shay	1,280
L. A. Osa	1,280
N. Rasmussen	1,279
Clemens Bros	1,275
Fuqua et al	1,245
Park & Guy Gilbert	1,175
W. H. Horchheimer	1,116
H. Galloway	1,060
J. L. Rogers	960
Hildebrand	960
D. Harmon	960
C. F. Cherry	960
J. O. Amburger	960
R. C. Smith	960
G. E. Schaefer & J. Zwans	960
J. H. Zellweger & Pete Grubb	954
L. T. Russel	940
D. A. & F. O. Trekell	919
W. A. & A. Thomassen	880
O. W. Rugg	879
C. & J. H. England	839
Sunshine Valley Ranch	803
McCarthy	800
Hough Murphy Ranch	800
J. Nichols	800
A. J. Miller	790
W. E. Shoemaker	724
J. A. Roberts	720
M. E. Clark & J. G. Oldman	720
J. Poonian	680
V. W. Chandler	660
E. E. Smith	657
R. H. Chattin	643
F. L. Kennedy	641
J. H. Payne	640
H. C. Tiffany	640
W. H. Weast	640
M. A. Anderson	640
C. B. Anderson	640
H. E. Kleck	640
R. B. Howk	640
R. S. Phillips	640
R. and A. Self	640
T. B. Wheelis	640
H. Davison, Jr	640
J. D. Dickey	640
M. K. Sellers	640
R. J. Self	640
E. A. Watson	640
H. A. Nafiziger	640
Kelly et al	640
Eloy Ranches, Inc	640
J. W. White	640
Santa Cruz Farms	640
J. D. Goree	640
S. Peterson	639
F. Wuertz	637
W. M. Hauser	634
R. Delange	634
J. D. Johnson	632
L. and G. Effinger	620
H. Wacker	617
R. D. Bechtel	611
L. S. Steen	610
L. C. Barlow	608
A. Peters	600
R. W. Kenworthy	596
A. Kenworthy	590
H. H. Cake	560
J. J. Tweedy and A. A. Ball	556
M. Jones	549
J. W. Blake	545
P. B. Hannah	507
P. E. Hartman	480
Anderson et al	480
F. Early	480
N. S. Cooper	480
G. B. Steward and P. W. Venses	480
N. Beggs	480
M. H. Hanson	480
W. D. Boswell and H. L. Brown	480
Vensel & Steward	480
H. Davison	480
Dunn et al	480
Wiggins et al	480
D. C. and D. H. Maud	475
E. E. Thode	471
H. S. McKinney	471
G. Van Horn	440
C. P. and L. C. Honeycutt	405
W. L. and W. W. Isom	400
G. Ziegler	400
Woodruff et al	400
L. L. Johnson	400
S. J. Norman	400
L. Buntz	400
C. Summerfield	400
Avita Hogue	400
C. V. and K. Hanna	385
B. and V. Scott	360
L. W. Morrill	346
J. D. and P. M. Brophy	344
F. E. and F. W. Sutterlee	321
L. R. Holbrook	321
Saunders Bros., Inc	321
J. C. Milligan	320
A. Rogers	320
C. P. Austin	320
E. Lane	320
C. Brooks	320
J. G. Johnson	320
H. L. Early	320
E. V. Hooper	320
C. K. Raber	320
H. F. Kruse	320
H. L. Holland	320
P. Ulmer	320
K. J. Wadsworth	320
N. S. Stephenson	320
S. C. Kleck	320
W. Vander Hart	320
S. C. McFarland	320
L. E. Weddle	320
Western Cotton Oil Co	320
D. E. Wallace	320
A. Hodgman	320
E. L. Bayless	320
I. McCown	320
J. Pretzer	320
J. D. Waugh	320
A. B. Houser	320
F. L. Zook	320
L. B. Tuttle	320

	Acreage
R. W. Dickey	320
M. Hotts	320
J. T. Crowley	320
T. Willmoth	319
G. Kinne	319
J. W. Brooks	318
D. Bolan	316
L. Douglas	315
M. C. Montgomery	315
L. A. Peterson	314
R. H. Pottsbaum	314
G. W. Kuhlman	313
L. Ward	310
H. J. Belford	310
J. B. Strickland	310
C. B. Shiflet	310
P. H. Davies	302
H. A. Odam	297
A. L. Bartlet	295
W. R. Sikes	285
H. R. Baker	285
L. Mayfield	280
M. H. Montgomery	280
Beth Jones	280
C. W. Lane	278
C. K. Kennedy	250
L. A. McIntyre	240
A. M. Ward	240
G. Hartzig	240
T. M. Carlton	240
N. Moore	240
A. E. Carter	240
Ten Ten Ranch Co	240
O. E. Jordan	240
A. B. Houser	240
A. H. Gobea	240
W. H. Steele	232
O. Wytcherly	200
R. D. McCain	190
G. M. Marsh	181

So, Mr. Speaker, we have the situation where the excess landholders and speculators in Arizona would get all the benefits from this incredible proposed project and would have to pay none of the costs.

I can see why the Arizona landholders want this project, but I cannot conceive of the Congress authorizing it.

This Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of March 6, 1950:

THIS FREEDOM

While we're talking so much about freedom in this country, all of us should get down to brass tacks and check up on our freedom.

Do we have as much as we once had? Is our freedom gradually disappearing? From the standpoint of the individual, is our Government a good Government. Or, under the American interpretation, is it becoming a bad Government?

It is necessary in a large sense to regard freedom from an economic, as well as a political standpoint. If a people are treading a road to economic serfdom, it must be reasonable to suppose that they have lost their freedom.

Now, examine the American scene from that vantage point. A good government will guide a people, will help them to help themselves, offer unity, and give them economic freedom by permitting them opportunity, and the privilege of retaining as much of the money they earn as possible.

On the other hand, a government that does anything less is a bad government, as Americans regard freedom and opportunity, political as well as economic.

February 11, in this column, we discussed the subject, Was Lincoln a Reactionary? Some of the quotations attributed to Lincoln were taken from quoted sources, in the belief they were Lincoln's. Mr. Walter Winchell, the radio commentator, a few days later, took us, and others to task, for using these quotations as attributed to Lincoln.

Mr. Winchell, a friend of long standing of the New Deal, said they were mere propaganda from Republican sources.

However, if his purpose was defense of the New Deal, it would appear he was quibbling over the issue. For, Lincoln did express sentiments opposing the kind of ruinously spendthrift Government we now have.

Here is another quotation from Lincoln, which even Mr. Winchell must acknowledge as authentic. It is entirely to the point we wish to make:

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things ought to belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others have enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue.

"To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor as nearly as possible is a worthy object of any good government."

It needs only a glance at American taxation today to realize that under this definition of good government, we do not have it.

Earned income is taxed by the Government up to 90 percent. Federal taxation penalizes economic growth, it curbs improvement of living standards, and actually threatens national security.

Our economic strength is our greatest defense asset. Gen. Paul von Hindenburg, after World War I, said, "Germany's armies were not defeated in the field. Germany was vanquished by the overwhelming weight of American production."

That same production which provided the metal sinews of war from Stalingrad to the South Pacific was a major factor in the victory in World War II.

Yet, America now is laboring under a Federal tax policy which interferes, actually retards, the long-range growth and expansion needed to keep America strong.

The majority of all corporate equity investment is financed through profits. But, the administration has been leading a campaign in recent years to make profits look like stealing candy from a baby. To back up this attitude, it has imposed severe corporate taxes that drain off in large measure the funds that otherwise would go for plant expansion, and creation of new plants.

The postwar record shows that industry has saved a smaller amount of the funds needed to finance physical growth than ever before in a time of good business.

High individual income taxes add to the problem. They have drained off what used to be the risk capital that created new industry. These taxes reduce both the capacity and the willingness of the public to save and invest in business and industry.

We have created a Government that is taking an average of 25 to 30 percent of individual income in taxes.

It is a policy that is crushing the system that gave the world the greatest war production it ever had seen, and gave the allies the strength needed for victory.

We are going to need that strength again, if not to win a war, certainly, to win the peace.

Labor Is Opposed to Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in recent years I introduced bills and submitted statements to the House Ways and Means Committee urging the repeal of wartime excise taxes, especially the retail tax on furs, jewelry, luggage, and cosmetics. I pointed out how continuation of these taxes is stifling business activity in the country and affecting employment.

I have before me a copy of a statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Jack Wieselberg, president of the International Handbag, Luggage, Belt, and Novelty Workers Union, A. F. of L., urging repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on luggage, handbags, and other leather goods.

Let me call the attention of the membership of the House to the very interesting fact brought out by the president of this union, representing industries in which are employed over 100,000 workers, to the effect that "during the past year there was a curtailment of from 30 to 40 percent in production in the plants in which our members are employed." Mr. Wieselberg's statement to the committee follows:

STATEMENT OF JACK WIESELBERG, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL HANDBAG, LUGGAGE, BELT AND NOVELTY WORKERS UNION, A. F. OF L.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, in behalf of the many, many thousands of members of the International Handbag, Luggage, Belt and Novelty Workers Union, A. F. of L., and their families, in every part of this country from coast to coast, I urge the outright repeal of war-imposed excise taxes on handbags, luggage, traveling bags, and personal leather goods.

Firstly, I call to your attention that the Congress is morally obligated to honor its original commitment that this excise tax should have been removed 6 months after the termination of hostilities.

Secondly, the original purpose of the excise tax to help raise required funds for the successful prosecution of the war and in order to conserve vital war materials has long since ceased to exist. Hostilities were victoriously completed and the raw material going into the manufacture of our products now exists in a superabundance.

Thirdly, by no stretch of the imagination can our products be labeled a "luxury." Consequently the continued 20-percent excise tax of handbags, luggage, and personal leather goods is inequitable and unconscionable. Yet, it continues to exist without any justification whatsoever. The fact that milady's handbag is as necessary and essential to the feminine portion of our population as the pockets of a man's suit or coat is so obvious as to require no further comment. It is utterly fantastic and unrealistic for anyone to label this item a luxury and to make it subject to a luxury tax. And you, the members of this committee, who must carry back and forth with you to Congress and back to your homes items such as luggage, traveling bags, briefcases, and wallets—are these items luxuries? How could you function as legislators if you were deprived of any one of these items? Could

you, by any stretch of the imagination, be charged with indulging in a luxury because of the practical necessity to own and use these items? The traveling salesman, the technician, the professional man, all of whom could not conduct their business or make a living without these items—are they indulging in carrying about and lugging about luxuries? These items are as much the tools of the trade for the people who need them as the mechanic's and laborer's equipment.

There is still another, more important and more persuasive reason for the immediate and complete elimination of the wartime "luxury" 20-percent excise tax upon handbags, luggage, traveling bags and personal leather goods. At our recent international convention held in Atlantic City the 240 delegates representing 80 locals from every part of our country went on record unanimously demanding the complete elimination of this unconscionable and inequitable tax. Why? For the very vital reason that this tax is not only inequitable and unconscionable but because it is ruinous and demoralizing to the very industries in which our members are employed, and upon which their families depend for a livelihood. Our survey and report shows that during the past year there was a curtailment of from 30 to 40 percent in production in the plants in which our members are employed. Consequently, there was a resultant enforced idleness experienced by a corresponding lay-off of large numbers of workers. There was a reduced income for those fortunate enough to work part time.

It is for the foregoing reason that our delegates to the convention unanimously demanded the immediate repeal of this unconscionable tax. It is for such reason that the American Federation of Labor supports this demand for the elimination of this "luxury" tax.

Our industries have been hit harder than any other—although there was less justification for imposing this tax on our industries than on any other one.

Let us face this problem with realism. Let us not make this problem a political football. How long can a 20-percent wartime "luxury" excise tax be maintained on admittedly essential commodities? How long can this condition be continued when it causes irrevocable loss and threatens the very existence of American industries which employ more than 100,000 workers—and affect the hundreds of thousands who are members of their families and who depend upon the continued existence of these industries for their very livelihood? Every survey conducted by us, and yes, by independent impartial agencies, report that there is buyer resistance because of this unconscionable and inequitable tax. The thousands of small-business people who retail these items to the general public report that they are constantly asked "When are these taxes going off?" There is no satisfactory answer and the public doesn't buy. How many tens of thousands of small-business people are being ruined by such shortsighted policy can be understood by any person willing to face the facts. The demoralization of the industries manufacturing these basic necessities has been permitted to a point that cries out for speedy and immediate relief. The consequent unemployment in those industries has reached a point of crisis.

Be assured, gentlemen, that our Government is losing money because of the continued imposition of this inequitable tax. Not only have many manufacturers gone out of business during the past year, and others ceased operation for 6, 7, or 8 months, but those that have operated have done so on a part-time basis. Consequently there has not only been an economic loss to the industry and its workers but the Government has lost in taxes and will continue to lose in taxes on incomes, business, etc., far more than the ruinous 20 percent excise tax will or can bring in henceforth. So far as the Government is concerned this is bad business procedure. I haven't even mentioned the cost to Government in paying out relief, unemployment insurance, etc., all of which is directly traceable to the curtailment of manufacture due to the 20 percent tax.

In conclusion permit me to point out to you that the American public does not consider basic necessities such as handbags, luggage, traveling bags, briefcases, personal leather goods, etc., as luxuries. In fact, Congress never classified these items as luxuries. The continued levy of this tax upon these products is burdensome and ruinous. It is a suicidal tax policy which literally kills "the goose that lays the golden egg."

The imposition of an excise tax on the production of essential goods has no place in a peacetime tax structure. This is particularly true when the items subjected to the excise tax are necessities and not luxuries. Such taxation constitutes an obstacle which cannot be hurdled in the path of an expanding economy. It is absolutely ruinous to industries manufacturing essential goods which have already been demoralized and seriously crippled because of this burdensome tax.

To save our industries, to revive and stimulate employment, and to promote the growth and welfare of American industries manufacturing essential items such as handbags, luggage, traveling bags, and personal leather goods requires the immediate repeal of the 20-percent luxury excise tax upon these items.

Who Is an Indian?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting statement by Paul L. Fickinger, Area Director of United States Indian Service, Billings, Mont., made before the Rotary Club, Billings, Mont., February 20, 1950:

I am pleased with the privilege of discussing briefly some phases of Indian administration. Some of the things I will say today may not completely represent the thinking and views of the Department and therefore I take full responsibility for my remarks.

Why is there a Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs?

The Federal Government first got into the Indian welfare business through the regulation of trade. Benjamin Franklin had reported to the Albany Congress of 1754 that "many quarrels and wars have arisen between the Colonies and the Indian nations through the bad conduct of traders who cheat the Indians after making them drunk."

In the Federal Constitution the States delegated to the National Government the duty of regulating commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes. By Jefferson's time we began to take thought as to how the Indians might be accommodated to the life which was rapidly engulfing them. Jefferson himself wrote: "Encourage them to abandon hunting, to apply themselves to the raising of stock, to agriculture, and domestic manufacture. * * * The ultimate point of rest and happiness for them, is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people."

Two decisions of Congress had the effect of moving the Federal Government from the limited responsibility of regulating trade to a wider one in the field of welfare—in the direction, indeed of carrying out the objective stated by Jefferson.

The first of these was the passage of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 which resulted in the physical removal of some 30 tribes from east of the Mississippi to an all-defined Indian Territory west of the river. These removals involved the United States in expenditures for the costs of removal including the cost of land improvements owned by the Indians, and for tools, equipment, and assistance in establishing themselves in the new country.

The second of these decisions was the adoption of language in the Appropriation Act of 1871 declaring that "Hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent tribe or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty." The decision had the effect of bringing the Indian people under the legislative control of Congress to an extent not previously attempted. Prior to 1871 a total of 374 treaties were entered into by the United States Government with the several Indian tribes. Since 1871 nearly 5,000 laws having to do with Indians have been placed on the statute books.

Originally jurisdiction over Indian matters was in the military branch. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created in 1824 and was placed in the War Department. When the Department of the Interior was created in 1849 the Indian Bureau was transferred to it and came under civilian administration. However, there were constant calls upon the military branch all through the succeeding generation and many Indian agencies were supervised by military men on loan to the civilian branch.

We have long since moved away from military measures in our handling of Indian affairs but there has remained the attitude that Indians are a people apart and that the Indian Service deals with matters which are not of general concern. Legislation providing privileges or benefits for the general population is still being written in a manner to exclude Indians from the application of the legislation. It is necessary to pass special legislation if they are to benefit. There is no reason for this; welfare laws of general application should extend to Indians.

Let us now define a few terms.

1. What is an Indian? This one is easy. An Indian is a human being, even as you and I are pleased to consider ourselves.

2. The next one, Who is an Indian? is not so easy to define. For some purposes an Indian is one who is of one-half or more degree of Indian blood. In other circumstances an Indian is one who is of one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood and in still other instances an individual is considered an Indian if he has one-eighth, one-sixteenth, one-thirty-second, one-sixty-fourth, or one one-hundred-twenty-eighth, etc., degree of Indian blood and is an enrolled member of some tribe. Quite confusing.

There is real need for a declaration by the Congress of the United States as to just who is an Indian. The matter of clarifying this item has been approached many times by many authorities but the complications of old treaties, tribal rights, conflict of individual interests, and various statutes have, to date, made it impossible to have a meeting of minds on the subject.

In my opinion, our Congress will have to settle the matter by an arbitrary blood quantum, or some other equally arbitrary definition.

3. The third definition, What or who is a ward Indian? is likewise a simple one even

though the term "ward" is universally misunderstood and loosely used when applied to Indians. There are no ward Indians except a small handful who have been declared by the courts as non compos mentis, or insane. Indians are no longer prisoners of war. They are full citizens of the United States of America and of the States in which they reside. The so-called reservations on which some of them live are not prison areas; they are the homes of a segment of our population free to go and come as they please.

The term "reservation" derives its name from the fact that the land within a given area was reserved by the Indians for themselves when they gave, sold, or had taken from them, the vast holdings they once owned. We could just as easily apply the term "reservation" to Billings because we have defined an area known as the city of Billings which you and I have reserved, through purchase, as a home for ourselves.

True, most of the remaining land of our Indian reservations is held in trust by the Federal Government for the Indians and as such there are certain restrictions against its alienation. A discussion of that matter would involve more time than is available to me today. There also is the fact that so long as the land remains in this trust status it is nontaxable. This tax-free status of the land, however, was a part of the compensation awarded the Indians for the vast bodies of land they ceded to the Government of the United States, which in turn was made available to our forefathers for homestead entry, and certain sections in each township to the States for school purposes.

The fact of Federal restrictions on trust property and an unfortunate simile made use of by the great John Marshall form the thread upon which has grown the popular concept of Federal wardship and the discriminations practiced in some States and communities against the alleged wards.

Holding of lands in trust constitutes wardship for the Indian no more than for the pioneer homesteader. Yet, our great State has by recent legislative enactment placed a statute on the books defining a ward Indian as anyone whose name appears on a tribal membership roll and as such denies to him certain privileges accorded other citizens of the State—this in spite of the fact that many Indians do not live within the boundary of a reservation. (Others own property in fee title and as such pay taxes.)

If this can be done for one group of our citizens, what is to prevent similar legislation to deny rights and privileges to other segments of our citizenry? Those whose names appear on the roll of Rotary International, for example. Obviously, such legislation is unconstitutional and should never have been enacted.

What is the nature of the Indian problem?

The general picture of the Indians today is one of poverty and of limited opportunity. Land constitutes the economic base for the world population, and so it is with the Indian, yet today one-third of the Indian population is totally landless and for at least another one-third their land holdings are in such a state of divided interests as to be practically useless to them. Even with this situation the picture might not be so dark if the land still in Indian ownership were more equally distributed or it lay in more favorable climatic belts but neither of those conditions prevail and the living standard of those Indians suffers in consequence.

The principal causes of the present land situation stems from the General Allotment Act of 1887 which, though beneficially intended, had the effect of forcing the alienation of large areas of Indian land. Under this act, each Indian whose name appeared on the tribal roll was allotted a given acreage of land from the tribal holdings, ranging in size generally from 40 acres of irrigated land to 640 acres of western grazing land, generally also with little thought being given to the adequacy of the allotment as an economic unit.

The individual allottees were then authorized to obtain fee title and to dispose of their holdings. Between 1887 and 1934, by reason of this legalized alienation, Indian lands decreased from 138,000,000 acres to approximately 52,000,000 acres. During this same period the Indian population increased by approximately 100,000. The area lost was with few exceptions the most desirable and productive land. Some lands have since been restored to Indian ownership to bring the total to its present 56,000,000 acres.

Let us look now briefly at the problem in Montana. We have within the State seven Indian reservations, and an Indian population of some 20,000. Indian lands total in round figures 6,500,000 acres of which roughly 1 percent is irrigated, 6 percent dry farm, 71 percent open grazing, 15 percent forest and woodland, 3 percent other types, and 4 percent are barren and waste.

A great many of the allotments are so involved in heirship, frequently with heirs through three generations and so numerous, that partitioning or division between heirs is economically impossible. The usual practice then is for the land to be leased, sometimes to an Indian, but more frequently to a non-Indian, because few of the Indians are economically able to finance such a venture. The lease rentals are divided between the heirs in accordance with their undivided heirship interest in the land. It is not uncommon for an heir's share to amount to only a few cents. This causes a tremendous administrative problem—one that is increasing day by day.

Another problem lies in the fact that the original allotments were not economic units to begin with. One 640-acre grazing allotment might have water but 10 others lying adjacent to it would not have, and as such were useless by themselves. The result—the whole is leased as a unit, sometimes to an Indian but more frequently to a non-Indian.

Other contributing factors against a greater use of existing resources include a lack of know-how of our American economy—an economy quite foreign to the early life and tradition of the Indians—lack of adequate credit with which to get a start and unquestionably in some instances a lack of interest, and finally the continued pressure of outside forces to gain possession of Indian land.

I am constantly besieged with requests from Indians wanting a patent in fee to their land so that they can sell it to a non-Indian. In some instances these are legitimate requests but by far the greater number come from Indians who have lived all their life on the reservation and will continue to live there. In many instances the bulk of their income comes from lease money on the very land they wish to sell. Its sale offers immediate possession of a few hundred or thousand dollars which would soon be gone and they would then be wholly dependent on someone for a living. In many such instances the holding is not adequate for use by itself, and the rental income is small.

The situation presents a serious problem. What would you do about it?

True, not all Indians want to farm or raise stock even if there were adequate, usable land for them all. That, too, poses a problem of what to do, proper training in skills, acceptance in a community, and adjustment.

I do not mean to imply that all of the Indians in Montana are faced with this kind of a problem. There are many who, through trades and purchases, have built themselves an economic unit and through Indian Service assistance from a meager credit fund have gotten a start and are successful farmers or ranch operators. Others are working in towns and cities, have adjusted, and are substantial citizens of their communities. Their number is far too small in comparison to those still remaining. They have done this, too, in the face of terrific odds.

The lack of resources, lack of training, and health deficiencies combine to make it difficult for Indians either to survive in their home environments or to establish themselves in communities where opportunity is richer.

This by no means exhausts the list of Indian problems in Montana, but let us consider for a moment some solutions.

The problem of the Indian must be worked out in terms of developing to the utmost such of their resources as are capable of development and their proper use by the Indians. As a coordinate of this program, there must be an intensification of the training of Indians, secure them in good health, and establish them in communities where they can support themselves, when such support cannot be obtained in the reservation area.

Some of the requirements for implementing such a program involve:

1. Regrouping of land holdings into proper economic units—a stupendous job.
2. Further development of the available resources—extension of irrigation facilities, conservation, etc.
3. Development of sound individual farm and ranch plans.
4. Availability of adequate credit facilities.
5. Intensification of training in skills for those desiring work in industrial fields and for whom a land base is not available.
6. Facilities for relocating and establishing families in a permanent economy in communities.
7. A vehicle whereby Federal responsibility to rehabilitated families may be terminated.
8. Repeal of the Federal Indian liquor law.
9. An outlawing of the use of peyote.
10. Passage of a law of uniform descent to eliminate further complicated inheritance tangles.
11. Development of a social structure.

This will cost money, but by far the greater amount would be in the form of credit, and thus recoverable, but, in my thinking, a greater expenditure now to clean up the situation will be a good investment and eliminate future expenditures such as will be required if we continue on our present piecemeal course.

The ultimate purpose of Indian policy is to attain that objective stated by Jefferson "to intermix and become one people." Personally, I am impatient with the slowness of attainment. The process must be speeded up.

I have been an employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for nearly 18 years and it has never been my thought that the Indian problem is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government and the Indian Service. That responsibility must be shared by every citizen of Montana—by every citizen of the United States, Indian and non-Indian alike.

Until that principle is accepted and activated we will fail miserably in the stated objective. There is no room in the program for emotionalism or sentimentalism. We must work on the basis of cold hard facts and realism tempered with firm but sympathetic understanding. There is no place in this program for political maneuvering.

As the Indian achieves certain privileges, such as handling his own leasing, property, etc., he must likewise accept and discharge the responsibilities that go with such privileges. We hear the oft repeated cry from a small irresponsible group "We want to be like other people," "Abolish the Indian Bureau," "Turn us loose." What many of them mean is that they want all trust restrictions on their money and property removed but not have to assume the related responsibilities.

Several months ago we issued from my office an opinion and directive to our superintendents to the effect that automobiles owned by Indians (unless title to the automobile was in the United States Government in trust for the Indian, and few if any are in that status) were subject to property tax even though purchased with funds derived from leases or other income from trust land. Prior to this opinion most Indians and county authorities had assumed they were nontaxable. Pursuant to our opinion, the State attorney general issued a similar opinion to county officials. A vocal few of the Indians are protesting the opinion and attempting to enlist the aid of attorneys, congressional delegations, etc., to break the opinion. They want title to such automobiles in their own name so that they can do as they please with them, sell, mortgage, etc., but they do not want to accept the responsibility of taxes that goes with that privilege.

In fairness to the great majority of the Indians, I must say they are paying their tax and accepting the responsibility.

This leads me to the point, however, that such cooperation cannot all be one-sided. Today Indians are paying taxes as you and I do on most of their property except their trust land.

We other citizens of the State of Montana must accord to them the same privileges we enjoy. Such things as the order from the State welfare board in January reducing ADC grants to Indians but to no one else can only retard the ultimate goal. If the State is running short of money and a reduction must be made, that reduction should apply to all ADC recipients, not just Indians. I am glad to say that order has been rescinded.

Other forms of discrimination must be eliminated and avoided. Signs in hotel lobbies and cafe windows reading "Indians not welcome," "Indians and dogs not allowed," and advice from citizens to Indians who are trying to establish themselves in a community "Go back to the reservation," only complicate and retard the program.

Such episodes as occurred this winter in the northern part of the State with the emotional and hysterical stories of starving Blackfoot Indians destroy years of constructive work. The weather and snow were severe, maybe more so than usual, but Blackfoot Indians were not starving. There was an orderly relief program in effect, and had been, long before the stories broke. The effect of the emotional display was to completely disrupt this orderly relief program so that many Indians not actually in need received relief.

The matter of snow removal was something different. We needed help on the reservations as did the counties and State, to break open the roads. However, we were delivering supplies and fuel to isolated Indian families and bringing any seriously sick in to the hospital by a weasel that we secured from the Army 3 years ago during that severe winter. The point I am making is that winter comes to this north country every year. We and everyone else know it. Residents should prepare for it. Fuel and food supplies should be laid in during the summer.

In my opinion relief assistance should not be provided to any employable Indian or non-Indian without the performance of some useful and constructive work. Every time this is not done you weaken the moral fiber of those people. You destroy initiative and the acceptance of responsibility to do things for themselves and this will call for greater and greater appropriations for relief purposes. The constructive answer to such a problem of course is an economy that provides work opportunity for such employables, and I do not refer to the temporary economy of a WPA program.

Now to sum this up in a few words let me say to you that unless we all work together and solve these various problems, instead of spending $50,000,000 a year on Indian matters, in time we will be spending $150,000,000, $200,000,000, $300,000,000 a year and still be no farther along. In fact, in my opinion, we will be farther from a constructive solution than ever. When I say we will be spending, I mean you and I, for it is our tax dollar that is being used.

At any rate, when we have assisted the Indians to a sound economic status and to intermix and become one people then and only then can we reduce or eliminate Federal expenditures on their behalf and abolish the Bureau of Indian Affairs. From a humanitarian as well as a financial standpoint, may we, with God's help, speed that day.

The British Socialists Take Over Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, George Sokolsky in his broadcast of February 26 points out that the British Socialists—the Labor Party—started out to nationalize business on a modest scale but it has now reached a considerable development. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including part of his broadcast:

The Socialists in Great Britain set out to build a welfare state, but slowly. They proposed to limit their nationalization of the means of production and distribution and the welfare of the people to 20 percent. But the nature of modern life is such that if 20 percent is nationalized, it affects the whole of life. Fabian socialism is a slow step to the totalitarianism of communism.

This is what the Socialists have done:

March 1, 1946: The Bank of England was nationalized.

August 1, 1946: Civil aviation was nationalized.

January 1, 1947: Coal mining industry was nationalized.

January 1, 1947: Telecommunications were nationalized.

January 1, 1948: Inland transportation was nationalized.

April 1, 1948: Electrical utilities industry was nationalized.

July 5, 1948: Health services were nationalized.

May 1, 1949: Gas industry was nationalized.

November 24, 1949: Bill enacted to nationalize iron and steel.

The Socialists could only accomplish that program if the United States made up the deficits, if the United States paid part of the bills. And the United States has been paying part of the bills—a huge part. They are our very expensive cousins.

And while we have been paying part of the bills, the labor government has been making separate arrangements with the Communist states, with Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, and maybe with others, to our detriment.

And now there are several proposals before our Government to make a great contribution to Great Britain—another contribution in billions of dollars. Among the most fantastic is the proposal to let goods come into this country which is to undersell American-manufactured goods. Then when the Americans go broke, the United States Government will pay the owners of the company a subsidy, and labor a dole, to make up for the loss. This nonsense must be given full debate, for it can wreck our economy.

At any rate, the British people have turned down socialism and the welfare state, as New Zealand and Australia have voted against socialism and the welfare state. Ernest Bevin said last July that the United States was, "As much a welfare state as we are, only it is in a different form."

But now Great Britain has repudiated socialism—definitely and unmistakably. The effects of the repudiation are naturally not yet clear, but as the weeks unfold the picture, it will become clearer—the full effects of this election will be clearer.

Obviously, the Attlee government is stymied. It cannot do much in continuance of its Socialist program. It cannot propose new legislation to nationalize more of British life. It must stand still.

On the other hand, the British are an extraordinarily patriotic people. It is inconceivable to believe that Winston Churchill would do anything to imperil his country. No matter how ambitious an Englishman may be, he never risks his country. He never puts self above King, as he would say it. Therefore Winston Churchill and Clement Attlee, no matter what their differences, will watch closely that whatever they do, England will not be at a disadvantage.

The right of a people to choose and to change its own government is one of the most essential of human rights. It correctly makes government the servant not the master of the people.

Different peoples devise different methods to achieve this result and to preserve this right.

The British have from earliest times, from Alfred the Great to this last election, worked at representative government as has no other people in history. They have achieved a method that is more representative than our own.

And even more, they have achieved a maturity of responsibility among public servants that can be the envy of all peoples. And it still works.

Congratulations to Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle honoring a distinguished gentleman of Brooklyn, N. Y., Mr. Max Abelman:

Our congratulations to Max Abelman, secretary of the board of Jewish Hospital, who was the guest of honor at a birthday luncheon the other day at which a large group of his friends presented him with a plaque dedicated to his 40 years of community service. We join in the tribute to Mr. Abelman because we know the story of his unselfish devotion to Brooklyn, his never-failing eagerness to participate in activities which reflect credit on the borough. It is our hope that he enjoy many more years of service to others, as we know full well that out of this he gets his greatest joy in life.

Passing of Daniel Frisch Is a Great Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Frisch, president of the Zionist Organization of America, died March 7, 1950, at the Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia Medical Center, after a serious operation. He was 52 years old.

He is survived by his widow, Tillie; a daughter, Mrs. Marvin Bacaner, of Boston, Mass.; and a son, Lazar, a student in the University of California.

Funeral services held in New York were attended by men and women from every walk of life and of every religious denomination. His body was then taken to Indianapolis for interment. The body was escorted by a prominent ZOA delegation. Despite serious illness, Mr. Frisch carried on with his presidential duties in directing the affairs of the Zionist Organization of America until he was taken to the hospital. He was the first president in the 53-year history of the organization to die in office.

Mr. Frisch's election to the presidency of the organization at the fifty-second annual convention held on May 27–29, 1949, at the Hotel Statler, New York, climaxed a career of more than 30 years of active association with and participation in the American Zionist movement. Born in Palestine, Mr. Frisch was taken by his parents to Rumania at the age of 1 year and immigrated to the United States in 1921 and settled in Indianapolis, Ind.

From the very day he immigrated to this country, Mr. Frisch was active in the work for the Zionist cause and for the welfare of the Jewish community in general. Combining idealism with practical approach, Mr. Frisch soon was accorded recognition for his organizational abilities and for the indomitable spirit to which he applied himself to the task of furthering the cause of Zion reborn. Despite the pressure of a successful business, Mr. Frisch devoted most of his time and energies to the cause of Zion and to the community.

While Mr. Frisch attended the Yeshiva —rabbinical seminary—abroad and a scion of famed rabbis in Rumania (his father and grandfather were rabbis in Rumania), he assumed the title of layman as a byline in his extensive writings. A writer and speaker of note, his articles on the philosophy and organizational problems of the Zionist movement have attracted international attention.

Before taking up his residence in New York some 5 years ago, Mr. Frisch during his domicile in Indianapolis was elected the delegate of that community to the American Jewish Conference and was subsequently named the outstanding Jewish citizen of the State. For a number of years he was chairman of the board of education of the Jewish Education Society of Indianapolis and was president of the Beth El Zedeck Temple there. He was a founder of the Indianapolis Zionist district and later was elected president of the Ohio Valley Zionist region.

Mr. Frisch attended most of the World Zionist Congresses during the last 2 decades and also was a delegate to the London Zionist Conference held before the end of the war. In 1934 he was elected a member of the national ZOA administrative council and later he became its chairman. He was also a member of the national ZOA executive for many years and until his election to the presidency in May 1949 he served as vice president of the ZOA and vice chairman of its inner committee.

Although only 9 months in office, Mr. Frisch left an indelible mark on the American Zionist movement by the inauguration of several major constructive projects embodied in his program for action for work in Israel and for cultural survival on the American Jewish scene, which was unanimously adopted by the national administrative council and national executive committee of the ZOA.

Immediately after the convention, Mr. Frisch left for Israel on a mission of close cooperation with the Israel Government and to lay the groundwork for the launching of ZOA projects embracing aid to the middleman, or the forgotten men as Mr. Frisch termed them, and for the erection of a ZOA house in Tel Aviv which is to serve as a center of information for American tourists, Jewish and non-Jewish, as well as to provide information on the American Jewish community to the Israelis.

Mr. Frisch again visited Israel last month, and together with Mr. Fred Monosson of Boston, chairman of the ZOA house building committee, he broke ground for the erection of the house. The ceremonies were attended by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion, United States Ambassador James McDonald, members of the Israel Cabinet, and members of the Knesset (Parliament). During this visit to Israel, Mr. Frisch made arrangements with the colonization department of the Jewish Agency for Palestine for the settlement of American pioneers on two ZOA colonies which are to be established under an agreement signed by Mr. Frisch in November with the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the World Confederation of General Zionists. He returned to this country an ill man.

Mr. Frisch's widely acclaimed program also called for a drastic revision in Hebrew education and the presentation of a comprehensive plan for the democratization of the Jewish communities.

In all his actions and writings, Mr. Frisch assumed a militant stand on major questions affecting the future of Zionist movement. He was frank, outspoken and minced no words in voicing his convictions.

The national ZOA office today released the text of a letter which Mr. Frisch dictated from his hospital bed on the eve of the operation. In this letter, which was addressed to the officers of the ZOA regions and 800 branches throughout the country, Mr. Frisch said:

You might find it rather strange that one who, like myself, is facing an unavoidable major operation, should dictate from his hospital bed a letter to his friends—but strange things do happen in life.

I trust you will believe me when, standing at the crossroads of life in more than one sense, I tell you that I am convinced that a strong ZOA and a vigorous general zionism (not zionism in general), are as indispensable today to the welfare and growth of Israel, both as a state and as a people, as they have been.

During the 9 months of my presidency, I have given the ZOA and the Zionist movement my very all. I have tried to manage the affairs of the ZOA without regard to past politics or any attempt to settle old accounts. I have tried to do my very best; I think I have earned the right to call on others to do theirs.

We are now facing the next convention. Believe me that, as I lie here, I have nothing on my mind concerning personalities that may compete for one position or another. All I am concerned about is that the dignity and the power and usefulness of the ZOA should be reflected in the next convention. We must come to the convention with a treasury capable of carrying us through the lean summer months and with a membership as large, if not larger, than that of a year ago. For the ZOA cannot maintain its influence and creativity without funds and a large membership.

May I appeal to you to help me and the ZOA by doing your very utmost within the next 60 days, from March 15 to May 15—our two mobilization months—so that we may exceed by far last year's membership and the proceeds of the American Zionist Fund, without which the ZOA cannot function?

I shall be thinking of you, looking forward to your help.

May life be kind to you always.

Cordially yours,

DANIEL FRISCH, *President.*

As the world joins us in mourning our loss, we in ZOA pledge ourselves to fulfill his last request.

More Debt and More Taxes Is Not the Cure for Excessive Debt and High Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful and prominent citizens are deeply concerned with the present trend of Government spending and its final result.

Recently there was received a copy of a letter on Government spending addressed to the President by a former schoolmate and now a prominent businessman of Spokane, Wash., which is inserted here for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

His Excellency HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Don't you think, Mr. President, that it is about time we got our house in order? At the present moment we are Russia's No. 1 enemy and the No. 1 enemy of China. Russia would strike in a moment if she believed she was strong

enough or we were weak enough. We are becoming weaker internally each day, and we cannot continue to spend our substances without one day becoming too weak to resist a strong aggressor nation. In 1926 Lenin is reported to have said, "Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

You must know, Mr. President, that an individual or a nation can't spend more than they take in without having disastrous results. We could probably cut $7,000,000,000 from our budget and our people would be better off and national defense would not be reduced nor necessary foreign spending impaired. It would take courage, of course, but the welfare of this Nation is far more important than the welfare of any individual or group of individuals in it.

You may ask, Where can we save $7,000,000,000? And I suggest the following savings:

Veterans' program	$2,000,000,000
Housing	1,000,000,000
CCC and reclamation	675,000,000
Rural electrification	218,000,000
Army engineers	200,000,000
School aid	290,000,000
Stock piling	350,000,000
Hoover economies	2,700,000,000

These savings will total over $7,000,000,000.

Russia, Mr. President, is getting stronger and we are getting weaker. We are becoming encircled by Russia, and some day, unless we change our ways and become strong internally and externally, it will be too late. Again, we cannot dissipate our substances and remain strong. There'll be no Marshall plan to help us.

One of our principal troubles is excessive debt and taxes, and we cannot cure these by more debt and more taxes. In spite of suggestions to the contrary, we cannot buy friendship or peace. Only strength and character will guarantee that.

Yours very truly,

SETH RICHARDS.

Hydrogen Bombs Versus Human Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an address by my friend, Mr. L. T. Merrill, of Beloit, Wis. His subject was The Handwriting on the Wall. I commend it to every Member of this body, because it is timely and points out dangers for the future that we must avoid:

THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

(By L. T. Merrill, pastor, Shopiere Congregational Church)

"I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."—Deuteronomy 30: 19.

As at Balshazzar's feast, we see ominous handwriting on the wall confronting humanity with fateful choices. Looming into our consciousness are the gigantic letters, HB, written twice. It is the same combination of letters, but one HB has suggestions of benevolence and a power for the healing of the nations. The other has a portent that is terrible and sinister: "Choose ye this day," Joshua told the children of Israel. Which HB will we choose: Human brotherhood or the hydrogen bomb?

The fateful juxtaposition of the two alternatives confronts us paradoxically when churches and schools are called upon to observe this as Brotherhood Week and the President calls us to live by the Sermon on the Mount, but at the same time exercising what he says is his sole prerogative of decision in a democracy of 140,000,000 persons, he orders full speed ahead on attempted production of an H-bomb, which Winston Churchill this week said may be a thousandfold more terrible than the atomic bomb. If used, it will make a murderous mockery of the word brotherhood and a travesty of the international pact we are being urged to adopt against genocide or mass slaughter.

Newspapers lately carried report of an eastern professor who played the suicidal game of Russian roulette, in which the player stakes his life on a 1-to-5 chance. He puts a single cartridge into one chamber of a revolver, points the weapon at his head, whirls the chambers, and pulls the trigger. Twice this young man twirled the chambers and pulled the trigger and nothing happened. He gambled the third time and blew out his brains. We say, "What folly in the individual!" But how much greater and more tragic the folly of a civilization proceeding to point an H-bomb at its own head and letting brass hats and confused and fear-driven politicians get their quivery fingers near the trigger for blasts that may blow our civilization to bits!

Twice in a generation we let them pull the trigger with devastating but not wholly fatal consequences. Give them their third gambler's chance. What then? Vividly a modern thinker phrases the question: "Will some angel," he writes, "flying through the vault of Heaven look down upon the blackened cinder that was our earth and say: 'Here once dwelt a race of men and women made in the image of God, but they rebelled against His divine law and used the forces given them for their own extinction.'"

The anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth that ushered in Brotherhood Week calls to mind his qualities of leadership lifting him above the littler men fumblingly wielding power today. We long for the statesmanship of a Lincoln—with all his political abilities, his shrewdness, his acumen, his adroitness, his clever manipulation of men on the checkerboard of politics and diplomacy. Lincoln would not have come down to us so cherished and enshrined in the Nation's memory if he had not had besides, in consummate degree, that human quality of kindliness, that welling capacity for compassion, for sympathy, for mercy, and for understanding the hopes and dreams of the common man.

Where is the spirit of Lincoln today? We need another Lincoln, because not merely a nation but a world has been torn asunder, because its wounds are deeper, the devastation is more terrible, the spread of human woe wrought by war is more widespread than in any previous martial upheaval in the world's history. And that freedom from fear, one of the precious four freedoms that the war statesmen promised us, has not come; instead a rule of international fear gripping the minds of politicians and military men who shape our policies for us and who have at their command means of unexampled power to lead the world from fear to destruction—fear and the power of annihilation in dreadful combination.

Where is the hope of salvation for our human brothers here or around the world in these thunderbolts of cataclysmic destruction? "When wilt Thou save the people, O, God of mercy, when?" runs the opening line of an expressive brotherhood hymn. But God is not responsible for men's folly. God has a right to expect the people whom he has endowed with free will and with the ability to search out some of the deeper secrets of His power, which they have found in atomic energy, God has a right to expect that His human children will be less foolish than some of their leaders.

Dr. Harold Urey, atomic scientist, testifying before a Senate subcommittee last week, said if a hydrogen bomb is developed to its maximum efficiency there will be no place to hide. If two nations have H-bombs, Dr. Urey stated he didn't know what the result would be. "Perhaps in the end there isn't any solution," he said. "It may be hopeless."

Are the people of the world content with continuing in a course that leads down that blind alley of moral nihilism to annihilation? After 19½ centuries of Christendom's upward striving toward a better hope, must we accept that sort of suicidal solution in this Brotherhood Week in the year of our Lord 1950? "No!" the voice of Lincoln would be telling us. "No!" the voice of Christ is telling us. "No!" we are saying in our hearts if we believe in the universal Father, the God of love who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth" (Acts 17: 26).

A single individual's expression may seem pretty futile. Yet a mass prayer to God should go up and a mass petition to our scientists and to our political leaders, who in a democracy are our servants, not our masters, imploring them to explore further the possibilities of human understanding and brotherly reconciliation before it is too late, before we build up international hate, suspicion, and fear to a point from which there will be no returning. Winston Churchill wisely suggested such further exploration of these possibilities in an election speech in Britain this week. His counsel should be heeded in the White House, in Congress, and in the Kremlin, when he says, "I feel that Christian men should not close the door on any hope of finding a new foundation for the life of the self-tormented human race."

We read in the Scripture, "He that hateth his brother is in the darkness and walketh in darkness and knoweth not whither he goeth. * * * Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer" (First John 2: 9; 3: 15).

"A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another," said Jesus, who is the Lord of life rather than the Lord of death (John 13: 34).

The formula of Lincoln's second inaugural address for the reconciliation of the people after our throes of civil war was as old, as humane, and as Christian as the Golden Rule, and as the rule of brotherhood that the Master preached. But he was taken from us by an assassin's bullet and vindictive littler men frustrated his purposes, prolonging the bloody and hateful era of reconstruction.

The world for which Lincoln died, and for which Jesus died must apply their spirit and teachings in a more sincere, more purposeful, more far-reaching effort for the reconciliation of peoples and the healing of the nations; otherwise we shall be voices crying in a wilderness laid waste by diabolically directed science, "Peace, peace, but there is no peace."

"Love suffereth long and is kind. Love hopeth all things. Love never faileth" (First Corinthians 13: 4, 7–8). Paul meant that it would not fail if we really tried it, and the world must make another try at it or the consequences of failure in this atomic age are too terrible to contemplate.

"Thus saith the Lord, behold I set before you the way of life and the way of death" (Jeremiah 21: 8). It is a fateful choice. As we view the handwriting on the wall, which HB will we choose—the hydrogen bomb or human brotherhood?

Fair Employment Practices Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the February 25, 1950, issue of Business Week, pages 114 through 117, presents a national survey on fair employment practices legislation. This article is entitled "Does State FEPC Hamper You?" In light of the fact that we shall soon be debating the issue of fair employment practices legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have this article reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES STATE FEPC HAMPER YOU?

How much of a headache—if any—have State fair employment laws proved to employers? With FEPC coming up on Capitol Hill, and more antibias bills coming out of State legislatures in the next year or so, management has been pressing that question.

To get an answer, Business Week did some asking of its own. It queried a group of employers on just how State FEPC laws were affecting them. To get a fuller picture, it also queried State commissions.

Briefly, the answers boil down to this:

Employers agree that FEPC laws haven't caused near the fuss that opponents predicted. Disgruntled job-seekers haven't swamped commissions with complaints. Personal friction hasn't been at all serious. Some employers still think there's no need for a law. But even those who opposed an FEPC aren't actively hostile now.

Commissions say that the laws have created no new problems for either a business or a community. They haven't interfered with any employer's basic right to choose the most competent man for a job, the commissions say. And the unanimous view is that minority groups are finding openings in places barred to them before.

1. THE STATE LAWS

Eight States have adopted enforceable FEPC laws since 1945. Two others have laws calling for employers to stop job bias on a voluntary basis. And laws have been proposed, so far, in 14 other States.

Enforceable laws are on the statute books in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Washington, Oregon, and New Mexico.

Nonenforceable laws are in effect in Indiana and Wisconsin.

Proposed laws are before the legislatures of Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana (to add teeth to the present law), Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Utah.

In addition, four cities—Chicago, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis—have enforceable local ordinances barring job bias.

What the laws do

FEPC laws in the eight States with enforceable statutes are all modeled after the wartime Executive order that terminated in 1945, and on the pioneering New York law (Business Week, June 30, 1945, p. 94). They have been through a pretty thorough shakedown period. But they have come through with only a few changes.

Broadly, these laws bear directly on an employer in three ways: (1) They bar him from refusing to hire, from discharging, or discriminating in advancement, because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; (2) they prohibit discriminatory job advertising; and (3) they ban questioning job applicants about their race or creed.

In all, the laws provide more or less tight job protection for so-called minority-group members: Catholics, Negroes, foreign-born residents, Jews, Mexicans, and Spanish-speaking residents.

II. THE COMMISSIONS' REPORT

Here's what State commissions had to say about the operation of their laws:

Connecticut: During the 1948–49 reporting period the commission handled 65 formal complaints of job discrimination—58 against employers, 5 against employment agencies, 2 against unions. It also investigated 40 cases that did not lead to formal complaints.

Half the charges involved manufacturing establishments; most alleged discrimination in hiring. Two-thirds were valid complaints, necessitating adjustment. All but one were settled without court action.

Generally, the commission reports no unfavorable comments from anyone.

Oregon: Most of the commission's work thus far has been devoted to disseminating information about the law. It has had four formal complaints of job bias—all from Negroes. One was dismissed for lack of evidence; one was substantiated and settled in conference with the prospective employer, who hired the complainant; two are still pending.

New Mexico: The commission has had six or eight complaints, of which three weren't justified. The others are in the process of investigation or conciliation.

Massachusetts: In 1948 (last year for which there is a final report) the commission handled 142 complaints and settled 135 after investigation and conference, without a single formal hearing or [having] a matter settled through conference brought into a court of law for further consideration. The other complaints were still pending when the commission reported.

The Massachusetts FEPC reports scores of job opportunities opened up for members of minority groups—including Negroes hired for the first time as retail store sales clerks. It said that a survey of settled cases indicated there had been no burden upon employers with respect to either management-employee relationships or employer-customer relationships.

New Jersey: The commission disposed of 423 formal, 195 informal, and 131 miscellaneous complaints in 1948–49. Of the formal complaints, 74 percent charged discrimination in hiring practices, and 13 percent alleged discriminatory dismissals.

The commission reports it closed 40 percent of the cases amicably, through conference; it dismissed 40 percent for lack of evidence of job bias; and the complainant withdrew in 20 percent of the cases.

The commission said that a check of 79 major New Jersey employers indicated: (1) No new difficulties or problems in business policy; (2) no interference with their basic right to select the most competent workers for [their] operations; and (3) as far as we know, the law has been fairly and effectually administered. The commission had had no complaints of FEPC-bred racial tensions or of anyone's refusing or vacating a job because of minority-group employment.

New York: The New York board has been functioning smoothly for almost 5 years. As a result, says its general counsel, Henry Spitz, minority groups have had broader employment opportunities. They're accepted today in places where they were never accepted before. The most noticeable spots, department stores and restaurants.

There's still resistance to job equality—and a great deal of discrimination. The commission is attacking these through educational efforts.

III. WHAT EMPLOYERS SAY

Reports were received from companies operating in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, and from Aluminum Co. of America—which has plants in six FEPC States.

Some of the comments:

Alcoa: FEPC laws have made very little difference in personnel policies, although the company has made minor changes in application forms to comply with technicalities of the various laws.

The laws have not increased the labor supply—as FEPC proponents promised they would. Alcoa said its labor market is substantially the same now as it would have been had these laws not been passed.

There have been a few cases in which we have been accused of discrimination by an applicant, where actually no discrimination existed. So Alcoa has had to adopt more precise methods of evaluating the ability of workers and more elaborate records as a potential defense in the event of future charges of discrimination.

Posting notices of compliance with the laws tended to irritate * * * employees who do not favor FEPC laws. So the company suggests more educational work among these groups.

Prudential Insurance Co.: The company has its home offices in Newark, where it employs a large white-collar work force. It feels that the job-bias ban has neither helped nor hurt—nor has it interfered with management's hiring prerogatives. Prudential has run into no opposition from employees to an antibias policy, and has had no discipline and grievance problems.

Elizabeth (N. J.) Iron Works: Management's normal rights have not been subjected to any serious pressures, and the New Jersey law hasn't created any new problems. There have been no adverse comments from employees.

Bridgeport (Conn.) Brass Co.: In Connecticut, none of the disastrous results anticipated by FEPC opponents * * * have come to pass—such as mass walkouts of employees forced to work with minority groups, loss of patronage by mercantile establishments, etc. Instead, the law is getting voluntary acceptance * * * by the vast majority of employers, employment agencies, and unions.

It has eliminated entirely a large and growing Communist campaign being waged * * * among the large urban Negro groups. It has widened job opportunities for minority-group members; but without interfering in the prerogatives of management so far as we have yet noted.

The law has had no injurious effects on the company's personnel relations, has caused no grievance or disciplinary problems. It has been ably administered—with a determined effort to get acceptance of the law through education rather than persecution.

Hat Corp. of America: The Connecticut law "has in no way interfered with our employment practices," this South Norwalk company reports. It has created no problems whatever.

Allen Manufacturing Co.: This Hartford, Conn., metalworking company has had no difficulties, is much impressed with the Connecticut law.

Pitney-Bowes, Inc.: The Stamford, Conn., postage-meter company "started a Negro integration program * * * before the enactment of the Connecticut [FEPC] act. Many of the problems which we encountered would have been much less difficult had we the support of [the] legislation." Pitney-Bowes believes the Connecticut act is "functioning very successfully."

Western Electric Co.: Plants under New York and New Jersey laws "have not had any difficulty in meeting the requirements of these laws," and the laws have not "entailed any undue hardship on employers who are trying to do a conscientious job in employee relations." The laws "have been accepted generally by our employees."

New York Shipbuilding Corp.: The Camden, N. J., firm reports no "interference with our right to select the most competent workers" and "no added problems or difficulties."

New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.: No serious difficulties have arisen under the New Jersey law, and there has been no interference with hiring on a basis of competence.

Lea Fabrics, Inc.: This Newark textile company was charged with discrimination shortly after the New Jersey law went into effect. On investigation, the company was cleared. After that first experience, the company has had "no new difficulties" in complying with the law, or in selecting the most competent workers.

St. Regis Paper Co. (Panelyte division): A few cases requiring State investigation have arisen at its Trenton, N. J., plant, but the company reports "very little difficulty" with the State act. And it reports: "No problems that have not previously been with us have been raised since the inception of the law, nor has it interfered with our hiring procedure."

Health Insurance Is Next

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who advocate a comprehensive national health program welcome a significant article in the March issue of Fortune magazine titled "Health Insurance Is Next." The article was written for the Henry Luce publication by Russell W. Davenport.

The article is an important contribution to greater understanding of the need for a national health program. While we do not agree with many of Mr. Davenport's conclusions about voluntary programs, his facts about the urgent need for some kind of national program are impressive.

There is nothing radical about the author. His most prominent political activity was managing Wendell Willkie's presidential campaign in 1940. He is a Republican. What can be said about Mr. Davenport should also be said about Henry Luce, the publisher of Fortune. He is a Republican whose wife, Clare Boothe Luce, served as a Republican of considerable prominence in the House of Representatives.

This article marks a great forward step in our understanding of the state of the Nation's health. We now have groups in both political parties who realize that this serious problem is beyond political boundaries. They differ as to method, but there is no real difference of opinion that something must be done by Government action.

Mr. Davenport is very definite in declaring that the American Medical Association is doing itself and the American people a real disservice in its propaganda designed to prove there is no problem. He makes it finally and eminently clear that more than half of the American people do not get adequate medical care.

From that point of agreement, I think the legislative process can work to solve the problem. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present the Fortune article:

HEALTH INSURANCE IS NEXT

(By Russell W. Davenport)

It is now certain that one of the big questions before the American people during the next few years will be public health. Already seven major bills have been introduced into Congress, with several others on the way. Prospective candidates are sizing up the question and feeling for their positions. All signs point to a good, old-fashioned political debate.

The issues involved in the debate are momentous. There is first of all the issue of whether a nation whose health and health services rank among the best in the world needs any major legislation at all. But secondly, even if it is granted that major legislation is needed, the controversial question arises of the kind of legislation desired. Here the inquiring citizen runs straight into the so-called welfare issue, but on a scale larger than anything he is likely to have encountered thus far. The attempt to solve the problem of health by Government initiative—as the administration proposes—would constitute a more advanced step in the direction of state socialism than the American people have yet been willing to take.

Now of all the proposals made thus far, only two approach this issue in a thoroughgoing manner on a national scale. One is the administration proposal (S. 1679 and H. R. 4312 and 4313), which has as its keystone the principle of compulsory insurance administered through governmental agencies. The other is the remarkable proposal (S. 1970 and H. R. 4919) of a group of progressive Republican Senators and Congressmen, based upon the voluntary principle. (The sponsors: Senators FLANDERS (Vermont) and IVES (New York); Representatives AUCHINCLOSS and CASE (New Jersey), FULTON (Pennsylvania), HALE (Maine), HERTER (Massachusetts), JAVITS (New York), MORTON (Kentucky), and NIXON (California).) This principle, of course, has been used in many plans, notably in the Hunt bill, which is comprehensive in scope, but vague as to its provisions and costs. More typically, however, as in the Taft bill and the Hill bill, voluntary plans are partial plans, aimed at alleviating some portion of the medical problem. But the progressive Republican plan defines a method of implementation (which the Hunt bill lacks) whereby the voluntary principle can be applied effectively on a national scale. This bill, therefore, which has had remarkably little publicity, ought to be better known, inasmuch as it seeks the achievement of an important social goal in a uniquely American manner.

An examination of all legislation dealing with health would be a lengthy process. Inasmuch as the two bills in question are the only ones that set forth a complete national health policy, with practical proposals for implementation, we shall do best to confine our inquiry to them.

Now there is a strong body of opinion, hitherto led by the American Medical Association, that there is no need for any such basic legislation as either of these bills proposes. This position rests on the record of United States medicine thus far. Since 1900, for example, life expectancy has increased from an average of 49 years to 68 years; while the population has doubled, the number of old people has nearly quadrupled; enormous strides have been made in combating pneumonia and communicable diseases; infant mortality is the lowest in the world (except in Sweden); and so forth.

Moreover, the United States is relatively very well supplied with physicians and medical facilities. There are almost 160,000 active and available licensed physicians, or, in round numbers, 1 for every 1,000 persons. We spend privately about $7,400,000,000 on medical care, $2,000,000,000 publicly, and $80,000,000 on medical research—a total of about $9,500,000,000 a year. There are about 6,000 hospitals with a total of 1,500,000 beds, which, during 1946, took care of 1 out of every 10 persons in the population. Moreover, this vast health system is bolstered in many ways. Some 18,000 local political units provide medical services of various kinds; United States industry has shown a good deal of initiative in setting up services for its employees; and there are about 500 voluntary health-insurance organizations that give some form of medical protection to 65,000,000 people. In short, says the AMA and its followers, while it may be necessary to make better provision for underprivileged groups, there is no need for comprehensive legislation.

But unfortunately these rosy statistics are neither complete nor realistic. The truth is that some portion of the American people—no one knows exactly the number—can and do get the best medical care in the world. But another portion get this kind of care only when they are lucky, or if they make a tremendous financial sacrifice; while still a third portion do not get it at all. And the disconcerting fact seems to be that the second and third groups, added together, constitute more than half of the population. The AMA itself observed in 1939 that families with incomes under $3,000 a year could not afford to pay the costs of a major or chronic illness. If this figure were adjusted for the rise in the cost of living it would today be close to $5,000 a year and would apply to about 80 percent of the population.

The illusory quality of the over-all statistics arises chiefly from the bad distribution of doctors and of medical facilities. The State of New York, for example, has 1 doctor for every 500 persons, but Mississippi has only 1 for every 1,500. In many counties of the United States there is no resident physician at all. In California there is 1 dentist for every 1,300 persons; in South Carolina 1 for every 5,000. In Connecticut there is 1 nurse for every 200 persons; in Arkansas 1 for every 2,100. In one-third of the 3,000 counties of the United States there is not a single full-time health nurse. And in specialist fields, such as pediatrics, it is found that out of a total of 3,500 pediatricians, only 4 percent are practicing in small towns or rural areas, where 60 percent of the children live. The same uneven distribution characterizes medical facilities. Forty percent of the counties in the United States have no acceptable general hospital, and not a single State has enough general hospital beds to meet the standard established by the National Health Assembly (4.5 per 1,000 of population).

Generally speaking, therefore, it can be said that the medical services of the United States, while adequate, or nearly so, in certain wealthy areas of the country, fall in other areas far below any standard that an American could conscientiously defend.

THE COST OF MEDICAL CARE

These considerations enable us greatly to clarify the debate. Almost everybody, including the AMA, agrees that direct Government aid is desirable for the expansion of medical facilities, especially hospitals; for

increasing the capacity of the medical schools; for special aid to backward areas, etc. Both the administration bill and the Republican bill provide for such aid about equally, but the amount cannot be determined until actual appropriations are made. Aid to hospitals has already been started under the revised Hospital Construction Act, which provides $150,000,000 of Federal funds annually for construction purposes.

Yet the expansion of facilities and services is by no means the whole problem. The biggest part of the problem, and the most difficult to solve, has to do with the cost of medical care; and it is here that the political debate begins in earnest. On one side there are those who contend that Government should not concern itself with this problem at all. Then there are those, such as Senator TAFT, who say that some aid must be given to cover costs, but only to those who are unable to pay. And finally, there are those who maintain that the question of costs can be met only through a national system of insurance. This is the position taken by the framers of the two bills under discussion.

It is a powerful position that will certainly win the backing of the people in the long run. For the threat of medical costs looms over the average American family in a truly sinister way. The threat does not lie in the average cost but in the fact that a serious illness may drive the cost for a particular family up into the thousands of dollars. Hence the doctor is avoided, symptoms are concealed, and diseases that might have been prevented had they been detected at the outset are permitted to develop into irreparable human tragedies. Only if these fears are disposed of by a system of insurance, it is argued, will the American people begin to approach the problem of their own health intelligently.

Of course, as already stated, about 65,000,000 people (40 to 45 percent of the population) are already covered by some form of voluntary medical insurance. But the coverage of almost all of these policies is very inadequate. Virtually all of these people are covered for hospital benefits of some kind, though often meagerly. Only about half are covered for surgery. And a pitiable 5 percent (about 3,500,000 people) are covered by relatively comprehensive plans. The Blue Cross and Blue Shield give hospitalization and some medical and surgical benefits, but their premiums, levied as flat rates, are beyond the reach of lower income groups. Moreover, 60 percent of the Blue Cross members live in six industrial States, only 17 percent in the South and West, and less than 3 percent in the rural districts. This same uneven distribution probably characterizes commercial insurance plans, employee-benefit associations, union plans, etc., etc.

In a survey recently released by the Henry Street Settlement of Manhattan it was shown that out of 200 families with incomes under $3,000 a year, there were 151 who had medical bills in 1949 ranging up to $1,000 per family. On top of these relatively tremendous costs, in many cases, a job was at stake. One woman, whose husband earned $55 a week, had to have a hysterectomy at a cost of $1,000 (doctor $400, hospital $600). In addition she paid $100 for dental care for her four children and $50 for dental care for her husband. Another woman with a chronic heart condition had not been to the doctor for 6 months because she cou'dn't afford to go (her husband earns $35 a week). She had a prescription for some pills, but they cost $1.90, and she had not called for them at the drugstore because she could not pay for them.

The majority of these people go to free clinics, but they dislike them intensely. The great complaint is that they have to sit around the waiting rooms sometimes as long as 6 hours, often for 3, before the doctor can get to them—women with children and household cares, men with jobs. Such people are torn between their dread of the clinics and their fear of being unable to pay the doctor. As a result, the practice has grown up of calling an ambulance, no matter what the sickness is. The ambulance has to come (with two attendants), and the person goes to the hospital, where he is properly diagnosed—all at the expense of the city. In rural areas, where there is rarely an ambulance to call, the chief problem is often to find any medical care whatever.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

The conclusion to be drawn from such consideration is that most Americans are financially unable to care for themselves medically. If this is true, then something much more profound is involved than the AMA has admitted. With reference to the first article of this series, The Greatest Opportunity on Earth (Fortune, October 1949), it is apparent that nothing less is involved than the right of life.

As that article sought to make clear, this right, when originally framed in the Declaration of Independence, may have had a somewhat restricted meaning. But to insist on what may have been its original construction, without taking account of the evolution of the society, is in effect to discard the right. If we are to maintain the right we must endow it with contemporary meaning. And the evolutionary fact that we must take into account in the present instance is the growth of modern medicine, which gives to those who can pay for it enormous advantages over those who cannot. If we are to take the right to life seriously in our time we cannot rest our medical service upon clinics that the people dread, doctors whom they avoid, and costs capable of ruining them. We must find out how to deliver reasonably adequate medical care at a cost that anyone can afford.

And it is precisely here that all those plans fail which, like the Taft bill, propose to solve the problem by taking care only of those who are unable to pay, i. e., the indigent. A man earning $50 a week is not ordinarily described as "indigent." Yet if his wife needs a hysterectomy—not to mention a host of other hazards, some less, some more expensive—he becomes at once medically indigent. On this basis, as already pointed out, 80 percent of the American people are medically indigent, or are in danger of becoming so. The medical problem, in short, is national in scope.

This brings us face to face with the question of method. In last October's article it was pointed out that there are in general two ways to reach the social goals that have become necessities of our time. One is to permit the government to take the initiative—in which event, it was maintained, there can be no final solution except that of state socialism. The other is to encourage the voluntary initiative of private parties, whether these be business concerns, individuals, or fraternal or benevolent organizations. Insofar as such private initiative is able to implement the necessary social goals, the proper role of government remains restricted; insofar as it fails in this, the role of government is of necessity expanded.

The two medical plans presented here pose this most profound issue of our time with a precision rarely found in politics. The administration plan gives the initiative to the Government; the Republican plan, while providing Government aid, gives it to the people themselves.

THE ADMINISTRATION BILL

The chief and unique feature of the administration bill, as already indicated, is compulsory national health insurance. This is to be financed by a 3-percent pay-roll tax, which will total $4,200,000,000 a year. The basic financing of the plan is similar to Federal old-age insurance but with complications that involve considerable sums from general taxation. The bill provides for the prior appropriation of an amount equal to 1 percent of all wages (about $1,400,000,000) as a reserve fund, half of which has already been recommended in the President's budget message, with the further recommendation that it be raised by a special pay-roll tax. In addition, the bill provides for an appropriation, specifically from general taxation, equal to one-half of 1 percent of all wages about $700,000,000) for dental services and other expenses for each of the first 3 years—and 1 percent annually (about $1,400,000,000, assuming the total for wages remains the same) for the second 3 years. The total cost of this insurance from all sources, based on the administration's estimate that 80 percent of the population will be covered, therefore, would be about $6,300,000,000 the first year (including the reserve), $4,900,000,000 the second and third years, and $5,600,000,000 a year for the second 3 years.

Two points regarding these figures are worth noting. In the first place, in the British experience, the actual cost of their national health program during the first year turned out to be about double the original estimate, according to Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan. The administration proponents claim that this cannot happen to their estimates, owing to the calculating methods used; but the difficulty of forecasting the rate of increase in medical and hospital services is almost insuperable, and it is a safe guess that the present estimates would have to be revised upward.

Secondly, however, it cannot be said that costs of this order of magnitude are out of line with the task that has to be done. The aim of any national health-insurance program is to provide better medical care for more people; hence it will of necessity result in the expenditure of something more than the $9,500,000,000 that the people are now spending in the health field. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the Federal expenditures would not all represent new spending: a very large portion of them (just how much would be difficult to determine) would go to pay medical bills that the people are now paying for themselves.

Perhaps the most serious defect of the administration bill is its failure to face the result of suddenly dumping such a huge load on existing medical facilities. In this connection administration supporters are not always candid. They contend that the load would not be unduly large, and they cite the experience of Britain.

It is true that statistics can be cited to show that the increased load on British medicine, caused by the national health plan, has not been unduly large. Yet it is a well-known fact in the medical profession that British doctors, with panels ranging up to 4,000 patients, and with a mass of paper work to finish every day, are carrying an enormous burden. This is made clear in the excellent report, the National Health Service of Great Britain, by Willard C. Rappleye, and in other documents. A nation's medical capacity, though impossible to measure accurately, is a real, not an imaginary factor. An effort to exceed that capacity through government compulsion can have only one result: the substitution of mass techniques for individual techniques. And while there may be much room for the development of mass techniques in American medicine, the attempt to push this too far too suddenly is bound to result in a lowering of standards, from which it would be difficult for the profession to recover.

Administration enthusiasts are inclined to make a virtue of this defect. Said the bill's father, Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing, in his 1948 report to the President, "Facilities and manpower expand in response to effective demand and demand depends on

total group purchasing power. * * * It is acknowledged that there is a shortage. * * * [But] the plan as outlined here * * * will provide the funds and generate the steady and increased demand which will assure us enough medical manpower and facilities in the foreseeable future."

Yet this reasoning fails to meet the realities. It is quite true that a demand creates a supply. But it is necessary to ask, "A supply of what?" We are not in this case talking about a supply of bobby pins. We are talking about a supply of medical care, and this means—if it is to mean anything honest—a supply of personal attention. As Winslow Carlton, a medical-care consultant, has put it, "The rapid processing of patients in a clinic can provide effective screening for gross diseases, but the mesh is far too coarse for the majority of ills that cause suffering and cut off life. * * * The science of medicine has greatly advanced, but * * * most medical care is still an art * * *."

It is true that millions of Americans desperately need medical care. It is true also that for these people care of some sort, even if the standard is lower, would be better than nothing. Still, the administration bill is in danger of promising the American people something that it cannot deliver. Should the bill succeed in its stated objective of reaching 80 percent of the people, within (let us say) 5 years, not only would the care of the lower-income groups be second rate, but a medical inflation would result, complete with black-market fees. People who could afford to do so would pay private fees for special attention. The inequitable distribution of good medical care would thus become even more pronounced. And the experience of our time teaches us what the remedy for this scarcity situation would surely be: more government controls.

The administration plan, in short, can succeed only insofar as it fails, within the first several years, to reach its objective of service to 80 percent of the people. A promise of medical care commensurate with American medical standards can only be honestly fulfilled if time is provided for orderly growth.

THE PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN BILL

This bill starts from the proposition that any group of Americans can set up an insurance plan adapted to their needs. Such groups might include those already in existence, such as Blue Shield and Blue Cross, employer plans, union plans, benefit-association plans, or entirely new plans worked out by responsible citizens. State and regional boards must approve the plans, but they would not initiate them.

The major requirements laid upon the voluntary programs, if they are to participate in Government aid, are (1) that they be nonprofit; (2) that their governing boards shall be composed of a majority of laymen; and (3) that their subscriptions shall be determined as a percentage of the subscriber's income (up to incomes of $5,000 a year and with a minimum charge of $6 a year). This latter feature is unique. Almost all the voluntary plans now in existence charge flat rates, whatever the subscriber's income, and they are therefore usually beyond the reach of lower income groups. This fact should be remembered when it is claimed that, according to past experience, voluntary insurance provides insufficient coverage. By requiring that rates be based upon a percentage of income the Republican proposal makes such plans more available than they have ever been.

Thus in a 3-percent plan, a family with an income of $5,000 a year would pay $150 a year, or $12.50 a month; one with $3,800 would pay $114 a year, or $9.50 a month; one with $1,500 a year would pay $45 a year, or $3.75 a month. They would all get the same services. It is estimated that the $3,800 family would just about pay its way on an actuarial basis. Smaller incomes would be subsidized, mostly by public funds, but partly also by the higher-income people in the plan. It is worth noting that this partial subsidization of the lower income groups by the higher ones is just what happens now, a rough and unsatisfactory way, through the scaling of charges by the doctors and the hospitals. Persons with incomes over $5,000 could join a plan, and would undoubtedly choose to do so; but in most plans they would probably be paid fixed sums (called indemnity benefits) rather than the complete costs of their care (called service benefits).

The amount of Government aid that any particular plan would receive would be determined by a formula that sounds rather complicated but is mathematically simple. To begin with, there is set up in the bill itself a yardstick plan, based on a charge of 3 percent of a subscriber's income, and providing certain specified benefits (doctors, both general and specialist; visiting nurses; hospitalization for 30 days; ambulance service; and rehabilitation). A regional board estimates the cost of providing these benefits in its region, and this estimate (if accepted by the State) is called the "cost norm" for that region. Let us suppose it to be $50 per capita. Each plan in the region is then assigned an allowed cost, depending on the number of services it offers. Manifestly, if it offers the yardstick services its allowed cost will be the cost norm of its region. If it covers lower-income groups, however, its charge of 3 percent of subscribers' incomes will result in something less than this allowed cost—let us say $37.50 per subscriber. The amount of Government aid owing to a plan will be the difference between actual subscribers' payments and the allowed cost—in this case the difference between $37.50 and $50, or $12.50 per subscriber.

An interesting feature of this formula is that if a plan is heavily loaded with lower-income groups, and has consequently a lower gross income, Government aid will be greater. Conversely, if the income groups served by the plan are relatively high, Government aid will be less. It is estimated that on the average the Government's contribution (State and Federal) will be about a quarter of the allowed cost.

A plan does not have to adhere to the yardstick, however. It may provide fewer services, in which case its allowed cost will be correspondingly less than the cost norm and it will charge less to its subscribers (say 2 percent). It will still get Government aid to cover the difference between the allowed cost of its services and the payments from subscribers. Or it may (with State approval) offer more than the yardstick and charge more than 3 percent.

By the use of this formula a maximum of freedom is assured for all concerned. Not only may patients, doctors, and hospitals stay out of all plans, but, if they want to come in, they will have a variety of plans to choose from. In fact, it is anticipated that the system will lead to a good deal of healthy competition. Some plans may devise means (for instance, by the installation of a first-rate system of group insurance) to provide more service than the yardstick, though charging only 3 percent. They would not get more Government aid than other 3 percent plans, but their popularity with subscribers would exert a competitive pressure upon less efficient plans.

It is exceedingly difficult to estimate the cost of this proposal because it is not known how fast the plans would grow. The framers of the bill have made the assumption for working purposes that in 4 years the voluntary plans could build up to a volume of about $3,000,000,000, to which the Government contribution (part State, part Federal) would be an additional $1,000,000,000. This bill, then, contemplates a somewhat smaller expenditure than the administration bill, although the two plans are set up so differently that an exact comparison is almost impossible. Since the long-range objective of both is complete national coverage, it may be assumed that their ultimate costs will be of the same order.

THE OBJECTIONS

Since only 1 day's hearings have been held on the Republican bill, it has not yet received much criticism. One objection is that it subsidizes the high costs of voluntary plans, which, besides ordinary administrative expenses, include substantial items for collection and sales promotion. Yet this objection fails to take account of a number of factors. In the first place, Government bureaus themselves are not ordinarily conspicuous for economical operation. The FSA has given a good account of itself administratively, but the administration of the health bill would be infinitely more complex than that, of say, of OASI. It would involve not merely the administration of funds but the administration of services. Secondly, competition between the voluntary plans should foster economical operation. And finally, while sales promotion would still be necessary, this would constitute a form of medical education—which is very much needed if any kind of national insurance is to be a success. In such matters the cheapest way is not always the best. Americans encourage small enterprises, for example, even though in innumerable instances these are demonstrably less efficient than very big ones. As a supporter of the Republican bill has remarked, "The additional cost of voluntary programs, if any, represents the cost of free choice."

Some people object to the plan's complexity. It is admittedly difficult to understand at first, but this is partly because it embodies some really original thinking. So far as the yardstick formula is concerned, it entails very little actuarial work that is not already done to set up any voluntary medical plan. This work will be done by actuaries and statisticians, not by the subscriber. From the latter's point of view the proposal is simple enough: Government aid to voluntary plans will enable you to insure yourself medically at a great bargain. Your concern, therefore, is to choose that plan which will give you the best service for your money.

Another and more serious objection concerns the States. The Republican plan makes Federal aid contingent on State aid, according to a formula that gives the poorer States an advantage. Thus, in order for the plans to start, States must undertake to make substantial outlays. In addition, a great many States will have to change their laws (a) to allow consumer-sponsored plans and (b) to provide for the fixing of charges on the basis of a percentage of income. These difficulties are real, but surely not insuperable. They arise partly from the fact that the States are given a real choice, whereas by the administration plan they are compelled.

The fundamental objection to the Republican proposal has to do with voluntary plans in general. Administration proponents assert that their growth has been inadequate, their costs high, and their coverage scanty. They declare flatly that the lower income groups will never subscribe to such plans. Moreover, how is the necessary capital for starting a plan to be raised? Private funds for such purposes are becoming increasingly difficult to get. In short, many an administration advocate will declare that he would prefer the voluntary system in principle; but he will add, flatly, that it won't work.

In answer to the objection about the difficulty of raising the original capital funds, the advocates of the Republican bill admit that this exists. Nevertheless, they think that the administration people exaggerate it. It is true that some voluntary plans have required very large capital funds: the health

insurance plan of Greater New York cost $250,000 to start, and the New York Group Health Assurance cost $500,000. But these plans were faced with special problems. Group-health plans in Washington, D. C., Minnesota, and Seattle cost respectively $30,000, $16,000, and $15,000 to start; and even the large Associated Hospital Service in New York City cost only $30,000. The Republican bill, moreover, provides that the Federal Government may advance non-interest-bearing loans to an approved plan up to 50 percent of the total of the starting capital.

The answer of the Republicans to the categorical objection to voluntary plans in general is made difficult by the fact that their bill is in effect proposing something entirely new. It is the contention of its sponsors that a voluntary system has never really been tried. It is true that many voluntary plans exist. But a concerted effort—promoted, possibly, by communities and civic organizations—has never been made to educate the people to the virtue of such plans, offered at below cost through Government aid. The Republicans point out that the American people have been able to educate themselves on many other matters (life insurance, for example); that vast facilities exist for the purpose; and that if community leadership were aroused throughout the country, with the help of the right kind of legislation, an entirely different atmosphere could be created that would make past experience obsolete. They feel that the administration supporters are failing to make allowance for the potentialities of the American people.

The advocates of the Republican bill believe that if universal health insurance is ever to be achieved in this country, without sacrificing the qualitative excellence of American medicine, a fairly long evolution lies ahead. The compulsory system advocated by the administration contemplates forcing this evolution. A voluntary system would stimulate it as much as possible, but never in excess of the ability of the medical profession to grow in an orderly way. The Republican plan contemplates starting with a nucleus of about 65,000,000 people who are already educated, through voluntary plans, to the idea of some medical insurance. It would not be too difficult, the Republicans think, to educate these people to the idea of complete medical insurance. From this nucleus it is no far cry to the coverage of everyone on a pay roll, where the device can conveniently be used of periodical deductions—undoubtedly with the employer sharing in the contributions. And at the same time, everyone on relief would be joining the plans, for the simple reason that most States would subscribe for them.

Such a growth of demand, the Republicans believe, would develop great pressures, not only for more medical services, but for better ones. The necessary expansion has already started in the Hospital Construction Act, and would be carried further by various provisions for direct aid to medical schools, backward areas, etc., proposed in their bill. At the end of 5 or 6 years some of this expansion would have taken place, and it would then be possible to push on toward complete national coverage. If special legislation is needed for this final step, we would then know what kind of legislation it ought to be. But to attempt to take the final step before the necessary preliminaries have been achieved seems to the Republicans both foolhardy and unnecessary.

DEMOCRATIC INTANGIBLES

Underlying all the arguments regarding these plans there are a number of important intangibles, not the least of which is the question of how far the power of government is to be extended.

The framers of the administration bill have made a sincere effort to reduce Federal powers to a minimum. The functions of the National Health Board, the top medical authority for the plan, would be essentially threefold: (1) To account for the funds; (2) to distribute the funds; and (3) to set standards. All other administrative tasks would be passed down to the States, and thence to regional boards. These powers sound innocent enough. Yet they are, after all, the ultimate powers so far as the plan is concerned; and since the whole plan is by Federal law compulsory, the Board is bound to prevail wherever its duties lead it into conflict with local interests.

But even assuming that the States would have a good deal of working power under the administration bill, we should not forget that a State is also a government. And the question is whether any government, Federal or State, ought to be drawn into such decisions as the administration bill requires some government to make. Merely to guarantee doctors control over professional matters is not enough. Doctors will be put in the position of contracting with the State concerning their fees, for example. Hospitals will also be in this position. The determination of what is adequate, what constitutes incentive, what constitutes undue profit—all this, and the paper work pertaining to it, becomes the concern of government.

The danger of this can be illustrated by a single example from the British experience. Before they installed their compulsory health-insurance system the British had a partial plan designed especially to help lower-income groups. Under this earlier plan the Government set certain rates for filling teeth, and another rate for extractions. The rate for extractions, however, turned out to be too high; the temptation for every dentist was to take a bad tooth out rather than to try to save it. This seemed to the Ministry a bad policy, and when the full-fledged compulsory-insurance plan was installed, the rates were altered, giving relatively better rates for fillings. The effect of this was to encourage dentists to save teeth; indeed, where a dentist was very busy (and almost all of them were) it became difficult to obtain an appointment for an extraction, unless one was willing to pay the dentist a private fee.

Very likely the policy of saving teeth is a wise one. But the real question is whether it is wise to implicate government, whether Federal or State, in decisions having professional repercussions that are completely unforeseeable.

Soft-Socialist planners cannot avoid this kind of thing no matter how hard they may try. For it is their invariable practice to start their planning at the wrong end of the social organism. If you start with an entity called government and work downward, there is no real way to limit its power, because nobody has more power. True limitation of government power can come only by working from the people upward. This is perhaps the most basic concept of American politics, and we shall overlook it at our peril.

The chief virtue of the progressive Republican plan is that it proceeds in exactly that manner. It is true that in order to provide for full national coverage, and especially for the lower-income groups, the Republican bill gives the Federal Government a lot of power. It has the power, that is, to approve a State's plans, and above all, to pass upon the propriety and accuracy of a State's claims for Federal aid with reference to the yardstick. Even at that, the Republican proposal gives the Federal Government far less direct power than the administration plan does: Government has nothing whatever to say, for example, about medical fees, which are wholly determined by the doctors in their contracts with the voluntary plans. Yet all that is really secondary. The great advantage of the Republican proposal lies in the fact that the initiative must come from the people and not from any government, whether Federal or State. The people and the local communities retain the power, because theirs is the decision whether to act and how to act. If the Government yardstick is not realistic they will refuse to act. The power of Government is thereby checked and balanced by the people themselves.

The ultimate question, therefore, is whether the American people have got the initiative and the intelligence to subscribe to voluntary health plans. The administration supporters do not think so. The Republicans, on the other hand, do not declare flatly that they have. They merely say that nobody knows—because nobody has really tried.

It may well be that Americans are not what we like to think they are—individuals capable of making intelligent decisions regarding their own affairs. But if this is the case, then it would seem that socialism in some form, and especially the principle of State compulsion, is unavoidable. The progressive Republicans merely maintain that this conclusion cannot be reached a priori. They say that the voluntary method should be tried first, to see how far it will go. They suggest that it will perhaps go so far that the problem of including everyone can be solved by much simpler means than those that the administration now proposes—for example, many States today require automobile drivers to carry some form of insurance, though this may be (and usually is) private insurance. The progressive Republicans believe that the hope of freedom lies in the intelligence of the millions of individuals of which our society is composed. They desire to test this proposition before surrendering it. And they maintain that the medical issue, which now faces the Nation, provides almost a perfect test.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—TWO PLANS

There are seven major health bills now before Congress. Of these, the Taft bill and the Hill bill are both chiefly concerned with providing aid to the lowest-income groups on a basis of Federal charity. The Keating bill seeks to stimulate voluntary health insurance by providing for income-tax deductibility. The Bosone bill provides for compulsory health insurance financed by a pay-roll tax, which would pay medical bills over $50, dental bills over $25—the catastrophe type of insurance. The Hunt bill is an amorphous plan for voluntary insurance, with the Federal Government in the role of insurance company. The two bills outlined herewith are the most complete. They embody two different political philosophies, each liberal in character, which are bound to clash in coming months.

Administration plan

How it works: If an employee or self-employed, you are subject to a Federal tax, which entitles you to medical insurance. You choose your own doctor. If he has joined the plan and if he accepts you—he doesn't have to do either—he will care for you and send the bill to a Government insurance agency—either State of local—which will pay him according to the system chosen by himself or a majority of doctors in his area—salary, fee per service, or flat fee per patient on his list. The amount of his fee will be determined by a contract between him and the State or local agency, based on existing income standards in the State or area. The bill instructs that "regard shall be had for * * * annual income," and that fees should be calculated to insure "professional and financial incentives."

Regional role: The local committee or officer administers the plan in the region; publishes names of doctors, hospitals, etc., participating in the plan; disseminates information; receives and adjusts complaints; cooperates with medical profession, hospitals, etc.

State role: The State agency makes a survey to determine resources and needs of the

State; then develops a program and sets up local health service areas. It enters into agreements with all legally qualified furnishers of service—including voluntary prepayment plans—specifying what services are to be provided and what fees are to be paid. It reports all this to the National Board.

Federal role: The bill sets up a National Health Insurance Board of five, together with an Advisory Council. The Board allocates the funds to the States, taking account of population eligible for services, medical facilities, number of doctors, etc., in accordance with its own and State estimates of "the cost of reasonable and equitable compensation." It determines the extent—beyond the guaranteed minimum—of the hospital services to be rendered by the plan. It can limit dental, home-nursing, and auxiliary services. It sets the standards for specialists. It has power of approval over all State plans, and if a State fails to submit a program it must step in and administer the plan in that State.

How financed: Federal pay-roll tax of 3 percent of salaries or net income up to $4,800 per year—probably half from employers, half from employees—plus, from general or pay-roll taxes, $1,400,000,000 before the plan starts, as a reserve; plus, from general taxes, $700,000,000 a year for first 3 years, $1,400,000,000 a year for next 3 years.

Benefits: Medical, surgical, and hospital; plus home nursing, auxiliary, and dental, if available.

Hospitals: Free to join or stay out. Participating hospitals contract with the State or local agency for payments for services, based on "reasonable costs of hospitalization" and on "least expensive multiple-bed accommodations available in hospital," but National Board can set maximum payments. Plan guarantees 60 days with nursing.

Professional personnel: Doctors as individuals or groups contract with State, not with private parties. They are, however, guaranteed control of professional matters, are represented on general advisory committees, and form sole membership of special professional committees.

Republican plan

How it works: Voluntary nonprofit health-insurance plans are started in your community (with help of Federal loans). The cost of joining one will be a certain percentage of your income every year ($6 a year minimum). Your plan, if approved, will get Federal and State aid, enabling it to provide services at less than cost. The amount of aid is determined by reference to a Federal yardstick plan, which specifies certain services to be rendered for a charge of 3 percent of subscriber's income (up to $5,000). On the average, Government will contribute about a quarter of a plan's gross income. Most plans will probably follow the yardstick, but they don't have to; some may offer fewer services and charge less, others (with State approval) more services and charge more. There will thus be a variety of services. The plans will make contracts with doctors and hospitals, leaving all free to choose without Government interference.

Regional role: A regional health authority approves cooperating plans. It estimates the normal costs in its region of the yardstick services, from which, with State approval, it determines the amount of Government aid due to that particular plan.

State role: A State that decides to join the plan (it doesn't have to) divides its area into health regions and districts, authorizes any group of persons in good faith to establish a voluntary plan, and sets up a State health council. The council approves the voluntary plans. It also approves the normal cost estimates of the regional authorities, from which the amount of Government aid is calculated. The State allots such funds to the different plans, supervises their operation, and pays the subscription charge of persons on relief or unemployed.

Federal role: The Surgeon General, advised by the Health Council (11 members, all laymen), certifies State plans. He allocates funds to the States according to the formula provided by the yardstick, and also according to a formula based on per capita income of the States, which would give poorer States relatively more aid than richer ones. His role is thus chiefly one of applying formulas. He has no administrative or professional authority over the voluntary plans.

How financed: By voluntary subscriptions based on a percentage of subscribers' incomes (up to $5,000), which, according to estimates, would total about $3,000,000,000 by the fourth year, plus Federal-State aid equal to about 30 percent of the total, or $1,000,000,000 by the fourth year.

Benefit: A plan can give any benefits it wants, subject to State approval. The yardstick benefits include complete medical, surgical, hospital, and visiting-nurse services.

Hospital: Free to join or stay out. The hospitals contract directly with the voluntary plans. Government has nothing to say about it.

Professional personnel: Doctors contract with voluntary plans; Government has no say in their arrangements. Plans must be administered at all levels by a majority of laymen.

Idaho Potatoes and the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, much is being written and said about potatoes and the Government potato price-support program.

Potatoes are one of our most important and useful farm crops, and besides their use for food, potatoes can be manufactured into many valuable commercial products such as starch, alcohol, and potato flour.

Potatoes that are perishable in their natural state can be turned into a staple product by being dehydrated in wholesale quantities that can be packaged and preserved over the years, as they were during the war in many dehydrating plants of large capacity now idle in Idaho, Maine, and elsewhere.

Dehydrated potatoes fell into disfavor during the war due to improper cooking and serving in the Army and Navy mess. With proper preparation and cooking, dehydrated potatoes are as palatable and nourishing as cooked fresh potatoes.

It appears our Government is overlooking a big opportunity to turn a perishable farm commodity into a staple product and salvage its potato investment. For the information and consideration of the Members of the Congress, there is inserted herewith a letter, memorandum, and resolution received from the Idaho Potato Producers Association:

IDAHO POTATO PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Idaho Falls, Idaho, February 23, 1950.
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed are resolutions passed by the Idaho Potato Producers' Association.

I have attended meetings all up and down this upper valley the last 2 weeks; in every meeting they voted to discontinue support on potatoes if the rest of the States would do the same.

On February 1 Idaho had sold to the Government for support 69 sacks of No. 1 potatoes. These were the last of an early grower that had no other market at the time. All the propaganda now coming out of Washington has pushed our market into a slump. I am sure all our potatoes this year in Idaho would have found a ready market at no expense to the Government if this front-page publicity had not have happened. I am hoping these resolutions will help you in forming some program this year. We do not want a compulsory support program with quotas on a bushelage basis.

The Bingham County Farm Bureau, representing over 1,400 members and the second largest potato-producing county in the Nation, has approved these resolutions.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST ESCOTT,
Chairman, Resolutions and Legislative Committee.

IDAHO POTATO INDUSTRY THREATENED

If present legislation now being written in Washington goes into law, Idaho may be forced to grow a potato similar to other States that will yield in comparison to Maine and North Carolina. Idaho has the know-how and can raise a potato that will yield 400 to 500 bushels to the acre. Our only market for this kind of a potato, however, would be the Government as our freight rates to consuming markets make it impossible to ship this kind of a potato.

The Idaho Russet or Netted Gem is a low-yielding, high-quality potato compared to other varieties. PMA committeemen are now only allowing support on the famous Idaho potato in the larger Idaho producing counties.

It has been proven in the past that the grading and sacking process is costly to our Government and serves no useful purpose. Freight and processing has cost the Government more than the grower received for the product in many cases.

RESOLUTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE IDAHO POTATO PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION

Whereas the potato producers of Idaho are becoming increasingly alarmed at mounting potato surpluses, with consequent waste of Government funds; and

Whereas we believe all potato-producing States should be interested primarily in producing and marketing a quality potato through regular trade channels, and that consumer preference be recognized; and

Whereas the present subsidy program is encouraging some producing areas to grow a low quality, high-yielding potato for sale to the support program; and

Whereas we believe that the place to curtail the high cost of the subsidy program is at the source, or in the area where surpluses are created, and where heavy sales are being made to Government support; and

Whereas we are drifting toward the situation, wherein the Government, in order to strengthen their position further, and to cut the cost of potato subsidy, will harness the potato growers with still more stringent and intolerable controls and regimentation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the potato producers of Idaho, recommend to the Congress—

1. That a flexible support price be continued on the potato industry.

2. That only No. 1 potatoes 2 inches minimum be protected at full support.

3. That B grade and No. 2 potatoes be eliminated from support.

4. That certified seed growers be supported for their full crop at No. 1 support level.

5. That State potato acreages be cut in direct proportion to the surpluses that they sell to the support program, even as much as 25 percent of this surplus each year, until a proper and natural balance between production and regular consumer markets are obtained.

6. That State PMA committeemen be chosen by county PMA officials and various organizations affected.

7. That Idaho potato producers oppose the importation of Canadian potatoes under the present program.

8. That future potato programs be based on bulk delivery at the farmer's storage or point of processing.

Russian Plans for World Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal lately about peace missions to Moscow and renewed efforts by our Government and leaders to persuade Stalin to sit down with our representatives and discuss peace. It seems to me that we certainly have been patient with the Russians these past few years and have given them numerous opportunities to meet us half way. Yet we continually hear pleas for "one more chance" or "one more peace conference."

The American people do not want war. I believe the Russian people do not want war either—if only they had the opportunity to speak their mind freely. But if war nevertheless engulfs this world, it will be due to the insatiable lust for power on the part of the present rulers of Soviet Russia.

The noted political commentator, Heptisax, has written a fine analysis of the situation in which he points up the futility of a peace conference with Stalin and why a conference of this kind must necessarily be worthless. His analysis was published in the New York Herald Tribune, March 5, 1950, under the title "Russian Plans for World Empire," and is as follows:

RUSSIAN PLANS FOR WORLD EMPIRE—A DISCUSSION OF THE FUTILITY OF A PEACE CONFERENCE WITH STALIN

(By Heptisax)

A few months ago a great deal was being said, particularly by the Communists and other progressives, about the hysterical temper of the witch hunt. Actually there was no widespread popular hysteria. A few extravagances were perpetrated, mostly by officialdom in Washington. A few laws were passed that we could have done without, mostly by State legislatures. And there were a few incidents to deplore, mostly provoked by the Communists. But if the witch hunt, so-called, had been pursued with anything like popular hysteria, there would have been a multiplication of incidents far more deplorable than the Peekskill affair, there would have been mob action against Communist offices and meetings, no known Communist could have moved safely in the streets, and the legislative reaction to hysteria would not only have driven the Stalinists underground but would have imposed many foolish regulations on all of us.

If one wants to see hysteria developing, the quarters in which to look for it are not those in which the bitterest anti-Stalinists assemble, but those in which the emotionalists feed their imaginations on the possible horrors of a hypothetical "hell-bomb" war, and then shriek themselves hoarse about peace. To hear this clamor or to read the appeals which individuals address to their Congressmen, and which long lists of notables, as the Communist publications call them, address to the White House, one would think that no effort had ever been made to negotiate real peace with Soviet Russia and that Stalin was standing with arms outstretched and tears in his eyes, begging for peace, while the leaders of all the non-Communist peoples exchanged cynical grins and ignored him.

These emotionalists listen eagerly to assurance from those who know Russia, and from those who think they do, that the Soviet Union does not want war. Certainly the Kremlin does not want war with this country and its allies if it can get what it wants without the risk of war.

While the Stalinists hope that they can ruin the capitalist world without head-on conflict with the West, and then simply walk into possession of the world, they have every reason to hope that there will be no war. The major device they are employing now was prescribed by Lenin in 1924, not long before his death. He advised his following to abandon the thought of a direct attack on Europe; but to go east and come back through Asia on a bankrupt and demoralized Europe. That is being done, and the prospects of making Asia worthless to Europe are so excellent that the plans for doing the same in Africa are openly discussed. Then would come South America. Great Britain and Europe cannot live without overseas markets and sources of raw materials, unless they live on us. This they couldn't do forever, but they might do it long enough to impoverish and demoralize this country. Then would come the push over in Europe and the United States—with the help, of course, of the fifth columns which would be doing their best all along with both material and moral sabotage.

Now, no one who reads Stalinist literature can have any doubt at all that that is the great plan. No one but a very simple soul can believe that the Kremlin can be persuaded to abandon that plan through suasion, cajolery, bribery, or an appeal to Stalin's finer instincts, as one letter writer who was gasping about the H-bomb recently suggested.

For these various reasons I feel that bringing popular pressure on the administration to go to Stalin begging for peace or the worthless lip service to peace which would be the result of such an effort, is wholly wrong headed. The Russians have had all the opportunities, time, and means of expression they need to demonstrate that they want live-and-let-live relations with the non-Stalinist world.

So far they have demonstrated in a hundred ways—including clear enough statements of their objectives—that that is what they do not want. The proponents of peace by incantation say that we should give them another chance, because it is possible that fear and suspicion of us account for their unfriendly and aggressive manners. I don't believe that. I think that they are moved to no small degree by fear; but what they fear is their own people and the peoples of their victim states. They feel that they cannot be secure in their despotic powers while capitalism, and the democratic institutions and freedoms associated with it, survive in this world and can be advertised to their enslaved populations as an attractive alternative to state capitalism and their ruthlessly exploited wage slavery.

Another conference, another pilgrimage of the high and mighty to a meeting place of Stalin's choice, would give the Stalin regime "face" at home and would be a depressing spectacle to such resistance forces as there are behind the iron curtain. If such a conference won us some worthless promises, it would probably be because we had left more friends in the lurch and were pledged on our part to lower our guard. If it won us nothing and had to be proclaimed a failure, the Communists would advertise the world over that it had failed because of our recalcitrance, because our war-mongering bankers and generals had no use for peace; and against their highly organized mendacity our protests would carry little weight.

The sad end to all this line of thought is that there is not going to be any peace until the sins of the Stalinist regime against the Russian and other neighboring peoples catch up with them and a tide of counterrevolution washes the rotten foundations from under the massive Red edifice. That day may come tomorrow or it may be many years away; but it is the only possible solution to the toughest problem that humanity has ever faced. But we don't hasten that day by running from the imaginary horror of H-bomb extermination into the real horror of a phony peace at Stalin's price.

The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Belle Zeller, of Brooklyn College:

THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

(By Belle Zeller, Brooklyn College)

Although the need for such action had long been apparent in Washington, it was not until 1946 that a Federal statute was enacted for the regulation of general lobbying activities. Prior to that year Congress had, on a number of occasions, investigated lobbying practices, and as a result had enacted measures which reached a limited number of groups engaged in them. The Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, the congressional act in 1936 affecting the shipping interests, and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 were important regulatory measures, but they reached only a few of the groups exerting direct and continuous influence in Washington. The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of August 2, 1946, is more general in its coverage, and it has been in force long enough for its effectiveness to be tested.

In this article it is my purpose (1) to supply a brief historical background for the measure referred to; (2) to examine the statute's provisions; (3) to appraise the objections raised to it; (4) to examine the actual administration of the act and point out the difficulties of enforcement, particularly during its first year; and (5) to offer recommendations for strengthening the law.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Bills to regulate lobbying appeared in Congress as early as 1907 and were introduced from time to time thereafter. In 1928 Senator Thaddeus H. Caraway, of Arkansas, intro-

duced a bill which only the Senate passed.[1] In defending his measure, the Senator pointed out that there were between 300 and 400 "alleged associations" listed in the Washington telephone directory, "90 percent of which * * * are fake associations organized for the sole purpose of profit for those who are at Washington, [and] are engaged in obtaining money from those who live away from Washington under the belief that they are promoting some theory of government in which they are interested, or protecting or advancing the interests of some business in which they are engaged. Ninety-five dollars out of every hundred that the public pays to these alleged associations go into the pockets of the promoters of these fake associations. It might be safely said outside of a dozen there is not a penny paid to these associations that is not worse than wasted. * * *"[2]

In 1935 the excesses of the utility lobbies attracted Nation-wide attention. Of their activities, the House Rules Committee said on February 27, 1936: "The campaign to influence utility holding company legislation was probably as comprehensive, as well managed, as persistent, and as well financed as any in the history of the country.[3] As a result of this publicity, bills to regulate lobbying poured into the Seventy-fourth Congress. Senate bill 2512, sponsored by Hugo L. Black, of Alabama, and H. R. 11663, introduced by HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, passed their respective Houses, but their wide divergence, although bridged by the conferees, did not meet with congressional approval, and they failed to become law.[4]

However, Congress was determined that the utilities should not escape regulation, irrespective of the fate of the general lobbying bill. It therefore wrote into the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, not only the provision that utilities should not contribute to party campaign funds, but the additional stipulation making it "unlawful for any person employed or retained by any registered holding company, or any subsidiary company thereof, to present, advocate, or oppose any matter affecting any registered holding company or any subsidiary company thereof, before the Congress or any member of committee thereof, or before the Commission (Securities and Exchange) or Federal Power Commission, or any member, officer, or employee of either such Commission, unless such person shall file with the Commission in such form and detail and at such time as the Commission shall, by rules and regulations or order prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors or consumers, a statement of the subject-matter in respect of which such person is retained or employed, the nature and character of such retainer or employment, and the amount of compensation received or to be received by such person, directly or indirectly, in connection therewith."[5] The law further requires that financial statements be filed with the Commission "within 10 days after the close of each calendar month during such retainer or employment."[5]

Encouraged by its success in passing this legislation concerning the public utility holding companies, Congress turned its attention the following year to the lobbies of the shipbuilders and ship operators; and in 1936 a statute similarly regulated these pressure interests through registration with the United States Maritime Commission.[6]

With war clouds hanging over Europe, and activity of foreign agents on the propaganda front intensified, Congress took a protective step in 1938 by passing the first Foreign Agents Registration Act (amended in 1942), requiring that every person who is an agent of a foreign principal shall file with the Secretary of State a statement describing in detail the nature of his activities. The law provided also that political propaganda disseminated by such agents shall be so labeled and copies of such matter filed with the Librarian of Congress and the Attorney-General. Under an Executive order, effective June 1, 1942, President Roosevelt transferred to the Department of Justice the administration of registering foreign agents. Registration statements, open to public inspection, had thereafter to be filed with the Attorney General every 6 months, and a copy of each registration statement had to be furnished the Secretary of State. It should be particularly noted that the Attorney General was required also to make reports from time to time to Congress concerning the administration of the act.[7]

In reporting the special areas of lobbying activity upon which Congress has acted, it is perhaps well to include the amendment to the Criminal Code in 1940. This forbade anyone to endeavor "corruptly or by threats of force, or by any threatening letter or communication, to influence, intimidate, or impede any witness, in connection with any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress of the United States" or by such methods to attempt to interfere with the proper administration of law or proceedings of inquiries. The above language appears sufficiently broad to cover the influence exerted by lobbyists upon Congress.[8]

In studying the problem of lobbying regulation at the Federal level, much can be learned from the experience of the States, 35 of which regulate lobbying in some way.[9] Of the 35, 25 now provide for the registration of legislative agents and legislative counsel employed in such capacity for compensation. The secretary of state is the officer with whom the statements are customarily filed. The required information usually includes the name and address of such agents, by whom employed, date of employment, duration of employment if it can be determined, and the special subject of legislation to which the employment relates. Seventeen of the twenty-five States also require the filing of statements of all expenses paid, incurred, or promised in connection with the promotion of legislation; thirteen require that these expense statements be filed within 30 days after the adjournment of the legislature, and two within 2 months after. In 1945, both Nebraska and Wisconsin amended their statutes to provide for the filing of expense statements during the legislative session.

These State lobbying provisions have at least established the principle that the public has a right to know who are the paid lobbyists and what is the source of their funds. It must be said, however, that the record of lobby control in most States reveals that it has not been as effective as it should be, because faulty definition has failed to include the pressure groups as well as their paid agents, and because of inadequate enforcement.

The year 1946 seemed propitious for the enactment of a general Federal lobbying law. For one thing, the first year after the cessation of the war witnessed an unprecedented amount of lobbying in connection with many controversial questions before Congress—particularly veterans' housing, price control, public-power projects, and strikes. President Truman inserted in the prepared text of his Jackson Day address on March 23, 1946, a declaration that "my friends in Congress have got to make up their minds whether they're for the veterans' rights or whether they are going to bow to the real-estate lobby."[10] Senator MURRAY, of Montana, called attention to a small ruling clique in the American Medical Association which is trying to defeat the administration plan for congressional health insurance.[11]

Earlier, on March 11, 1946, Speaker RAYBURN had called attention to lobbying activity in another area, when he stated from the floor of the House that this town, for the past 6 months, has been seething with lobbyists out to kill rural electrification and public-owned power in general.[12] The next day Chairman SABATH, of the Rules Committee, offered a resolution proposing that a special committee be established to investigate any and all groups which have or are engaged in present propaganda campaigns or lobby to defeat legislative measures for the relief of the acute housing shortage * * * to abolish or weaken price control; all groups which have or are engaged in the power lobby. This resolution was revised by the Rules Committee, directing that the investigation be made by the Rules Committee itself and that lobbying activities by Federal agencies and employees as well as by private groups be covered.[13]

Even before these and other attacks upon lobbying activities in 1946, the Special Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was giving its attention to the need for a congressional lobbying law. In fact, the committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, under the chairmanship of Dr. George B. Galloway, who later was named research staff director of the joint congressional committee, had recommended in 1945 that all groups, representatives of which appear before congressional committes, should register and make full disclosure of their membership, finances, etc.[14]

---

[1] S. 1095, 70th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] S. Rept. 342, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, pp. 2, 3.

[3] H. Rept. 2081, 74th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3. An earlier investigation of lobbying practices in which the National Association of Manufacturers figured prominently occurred in 1913. Cf. H. Rept. 113, 63d Cong., 2d sess.

[4] H. Rept. 2925, June 2, 1936.

[5] U. S. Code, 1940, title 15, ch. 2C, secs. 79 (h) and 79 (l). See also Forms U-12 (1)—A and B of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

[6] See U. S. Code, title 46, sec. 1225; U. S. Maritime Commission General Order No. 9, July 13, 1937; and Forms 807-1 and 807-2, together with accompanying instructions for such forms.

[7] U. S. Code, title 22, secs. 611-621; Executive Order No. 9176, Federal Register, vol. 7, June 1942, p. 4127. See Report of Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 as amended for the period from June 28, 1942, to December 31, 1944 (June 1945). Also Karl E. Ettinger, Foreign Propaganda in America, Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 10 (fall, 1946), pp. 329-342.

[8] U. S. Code, title 18, sec. 241a, approved January 13, 1940.

[9] A fuller story of the State lobby laws has been told elsewhere. See especially E. B. Logan, Lobbying, Supplement to the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July 1929; Belle Zeller, State Regulations of Lobbying, in the Book of the States, 1948-49, pp. 124-130; Belle Zeller, Pressure Politics in New York (1937), pp. 251-262, for detailed examination of the administration of the New York State lobbying law.

[10] New York Times, March 24, 1946.

[11] F. M. Brewer, Congressional Lobbying, Editorial Research Reports, vol. 1, No. 18 (May 8, 1946), p. 320.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, p. 2156.

[13] This resolution, H. Res. 557, and another similar in purpose, H. Res. 416, introduced earlier by Representative SMITH of Maine, did not pass.

[14] The Reorganization of Congress; a report of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association (1945), p. 80.

Many complaints of the attempts of organized pressure groups to influence the decisions of Congress were heard during the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, although extensive evidence on the need for lobbying legislation was not given at these hearings.[15] In its report to Congress on March 4, 1946, the joint committee recommended "that Congress enact legislation providing for the registration of organized groups and their agents who seek to influence legislation, and that such legislation include quarterly statements of expenditures made for this purpose."[16] On August 2, 1946, the President signed the Legislative Reorganization Act, title III of which is the Regulation of Lobbying Act.[17]

II. PROVISIONS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE LOBBYING TITLE

Provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act are set down in sections 302–311, inclusive. Section 307 is designed to define the application of the title and includes any person (defined as an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons), "who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes: (a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States; (b) to influence, directly, or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Section 305 states that every person receiving any contributions or expenditures for the purposes designated in (a) or (b) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives only, between the first and the tenth day of each calendar quarter, a statement containing the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more, and the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure of $10 or more has been made, with the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure. The Clerk of the House supplies Form A for the information required under this section.

In section 308, the act requires any person who engages himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation to register both with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate before doing anything in furtherance of such object. The registrant must state his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to have for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Form B is supplied by the Clerk and the Secretary for this information.

Each person who registers in accordance with section 308 between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, must also file with the Clerk and the Secretary, so long as his activities continue, a detailed report of all money received and expended by him during the preceding quarter calendar in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purpose; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials; and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. Successive reports within a calendar year must be cumulative. This information is filed on Form C. All reports and statements under the Lobbying Act must be made under oath (sec. 309).

All information required to be filed under the provisions of section 308 is to be compiled by the Clerk and the Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statements required by the title are to be preserved for a period of 2 years, and to be open to public inspection during this interval (sec. 306). Any person who violates the provisions of this title, upon conviction, is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 12 months. Such convicted person is also debarred for a period of 3 years from influencing, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of legislation. Debarred lobbyists who continue their activities are guilty of a felony (sec. 310).

In section 308, the act further specifically exempts from its application (1) any person who merely appears before a committee of Congress in support of or opposition to legislation; (2) any public official acting in his official capacity; (3) any owner, publisher, or employee of a newspaper or other regularly published periodical acting in the regular course of business. Nor does the act apply to party committees or to practices and activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act (sections 307 and 311). The report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress adds further that the lobbying title does not apply in any manner to persons who appear voluntarily without compensation, and concludes the category of exempt groups by stating that the law "does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed."[18] An examination of the remarks of Representative HOWARD W. SMITH on the floor of Congress, June 17, 1936, indicates that the joint committee took over the Congressman's exact words in noting this last exception.[19]

Many organizations have turned to this last statement in the committee's report for clarification of legislative intent, and for an explanation of the words "principally" and "principal" in section 307. Their failure to comply with the provisions of sections 305 and 307 is based largely upon defining "principal" as "primary" or "major." There is little doubt that a literal reading of the provisions of the lobbying title presents a mass of contradictions and ambiguities. As a criminal statute, it is technically defective because such statutes are construed strictly and must define prohibited acts with certainty.[20]

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress stated that section 307 defines the application of the title.[21] Section 307, then, may be construed as conflicting with sections 305 and 308. As noted above, section 307 refers to anyone who solicits, collects, or receives money; section 305, however, is not limited merely to those who receive contributions, but includes persons who expend money for such purposes. Does this mean, if section 307 controls, that that part of section 305 dealing with expenditures is superfluous? There are organizations which hold that they do not solicit or receive funds for the principal purpose of lobbying, but who nevertheless expend money in hiring professional lobbyists. The implementation of the act, during the first year, clearly demonstrated that many organizations are holding section 307 the key to the coverage of the act, thus exempting from the strongest provisions of the act organizations whose legislative activities are not their principal concern, and who are careful not to accept funds earmarked for lobbying.

The relationship of sections 307 and 308 is ambiguous. By its terms, section 308 appears to exclude the definitions of section 307. Section 308 covers engagements "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation." Many persons who have registered under this section call attention to the minor proportions of their time devoted to influencing legislation. In so doing, they are undoubtedly following the interpretation that section 308 does not stand alone, that section 307 qualifies this section as well, and that influencing legislation must be their "principal" activity before registration is required. However, section 308 should be construed as bringing within its scope persons paid for performing services if any part of that job—no matter how infinitesimal—is concerned with influential legislation. To support this position, it is not necessary to go further than to point out that section 308 exempts from registration public officials acting in their official capacity. Except for a very small group of legislative representatives of public agencies, no reasonable interpretation could consider public officials as principally engaged in influencing legislation.[22]

The legislative history of the bill does not establish beyond any doubt the intention or the aim of Congress. Representative Dirksen, a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, stated on the floor of the House when the lobbying section was under debate:

"The question has been raised as to whether or not an organization that pays a man to be vigilant upon legislation here would have to schedule all of their assets and all of their receipts, and probably file a very long administrative record with the Clerk of the House. That is certainly not the intention of the committee. There are some clarifying sections and some exclusions which you will find in section 308. * * * What we are trying to do here is to reach those whose principal purpose, not incidental purpose, but whose principal purpose is to come here and endeavor to influence the passage of legislation either by bringing about its defeat or its enactment."[23]

---

[15] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, four parts, 79th Cong., 1st sess., March 13, 1945, to June 29, 1945. See especially helpful comments of George H. E. Smith, research assistant to the Senate minority leader at page 411 of these hearings. After the close of the hearings, the writer submitted to the joint committee upon request, a memorandum on the subject of Federal Regulation of Lobbies. For the text of this memorandum, see print of Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, June 1946, pp. 65–69, and George B. Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads (1946), pp. 302–307.

[16] Senate report 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 27.

[17] Public Law 601 (Senate bill 2177), 79th Cong., 2d sess.

[18] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., May 31, 1946, p. 27.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, p. 9751.

[20] *Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91, at p. 136): "It is axiomatic, of course, that a criminal statute must give a clear and unmistakable warning as to the acts which will subject one to criminal punishment. And courts are without power to supply that which Congress has left vague."

[21] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 28.

[22] For an examination and interpretation of the provisions of the Federal Lobbying Act see the brief filed on January 28, 1948, by the National Association of Manufacturers in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. See also Columbia Law Review, vol. 47, January 1947, pp. 98–109; Yale Law Journal, vol. 56, January 1947, pp. 304–332.

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, July 25, 1946, p. 10138; on June 17, 1936, Representative SMITH said: "It [the lobbying bill] does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed." (Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, p. 9751.)

However, a wider purpose of the legislation was understood by Senator La Follette, chairman of the committee, as seen in his discussion with Senator Hawkes on the floor of the Senate, the day after Representative Dirksen made his comments:

"Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin give me his opinion on one subject which has been brought to my attention by some of the finest organizations in the United States? They are somewhat concerned lest the provision in the reorganization plan against lobbying might be construed to apply to institutions such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, for instance, which was organized at the request of the President of the United States to assemble information and make it available for ready reference for members of his Cabinet and the various governmental agencies. I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin express his opinion whether it affects these fine institutions which are a part of our business and industrial system in the United States.

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as any organizations or individuals are concerned, * * * it will depend on the type and character of activity they undertake. * * *

"Mr. HAWKES. Just a moment, Mr. President. Would not the Senator from Wisconsin be willing to express an opinion regarding such organizations of years and years standing?

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot tell the Senator whether they will come under the act. It will depend on the type of activity in which they engage, so far as legislation is concerned.

"Mr. HAWKES. Does not the bill contain language to the effect 'if they are organized to do a business of lobbying principally'? And does not that mean something to the Senator, who knows, of course, that there is not a business organization or chamber of commerce in the United States whose representatives do not come to see Senators and Representatives and interview them regarding legislation?

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It will all depend on the type of activity that is carried on. I cannot give the Senator a blanket interpretation." [24]

[24] Contrast this language with that of Representative SMITH, who sponsored lobbying legislation 10 years earlier: "The amendment proposes to change that language by striking out the words 'in whole or in part' and by inserting the word 'principally.' The reason for that amendment is, it was brought to my attention, and I think to the attention of other members of the committee, that there were many organizations of national scope who have large memberships of thousands and some of millions of members organized principally for other purposes than affecting legislation, but many of those organizations do from time to time become interested in legislation, and they undertake to do something about it. It was not thought necessary or proper that that class of organization, because a minor part of its funds were devoted to purposes of influencing legislation, should be required to report all of the dues of their hundreds of thousands of members, and for that reason this amendment is proposed so that it would not apply except where the money is collected for the principal purpose of undertaking to influence legislation or the election of Federal officers." (Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, March 27, 1936, p. 4535.)

Unlike the bills sponsored by Senator Caraway in the 70th Cong. and Senator Black in the 74th Cong., the Lobbying Act of 1946 does not specifically define lobbying. It may, of course, be construed that the acts and practices under the statutes that require the filing of statements may be called lobbying. In Senate bill 1095 of the 70th Cong.: "A lobbyist, within the meaning of this act, is one who shall engage, for pay, to attempt to influence legislation, or to prevent legislation, by the National Congress." In Senate bill 2512 of the 74th Cong.: "Lobbying * * * shall consist of any effort to influence the action of Congress upon any matter coming before it, whether it be by distributing literature, appearing before committees of Congress, or interviewing or seeking to interview individual Members of either House of Representatives or the Senate."

These definitions were patterned after the broader one in the House report of 1913, which defined lobbying as the "activities of a person or a body of persons seeking to influence Congress in any way whatever." (Cf. H. Rept. 113, 63d Cong., 2d sess., 1913, p. 15.)

It certainly would appear that the Joint Committee in 1946 was thinking of a broad application of the legislation, when in its report it listed the following three distinct classes to which the lobbying title applied chiefly:

"First. Those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of letters and telegrams, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons and organizations will be required under the title, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

"Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful influence over Members of Congress. These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence. The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

"Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment." [25]

As an additional example of its broad intention, the Joint Committee, in its two reports on the legislative reorganization bill, stressed pressure groups rather than the individuals employed by them.

"Mass means of communication and the art of public relations have so increased the pressures upon Congress as to distort and confuse the normal expressions of public opinion. * * * In order to enable Congress better to evaluate and determine evidence, data, or communications from organized groups seeking to influence legislative action, we recommend the adoption of legislation requiring the registration of all groups engaged and individuals employed in such activity." [26]

And again, the committee stated:

"A pressure-group economy gives rise to government by whirlpools of special-interest groups in which the national welfare is often neglected. * * * Without impairing in any way the right of petition or freedom of expression, Senate 2177 provides for the registration of organized groups and their agents who seek to influence legislation. * * * Full information regarding the membership, source of contributions, and expenditures of organized groups would prove helpful to Congress in evaluating their representations and weighing their worth. Publicity is a mild step forward in protecting government under pressure and in promoting the democratization of pressure groups." [27]

Still another fact to note in defense of the broader intent of Congress in 1946 is that the lobbying title is part of an omnibus bill dealing with the improvement of the organization and operation of Congress, and did not come as a demand to check the predatory pressures upon that body.

Almost immediately after the lobbying title became effective, many organizations called upon their counsel for advice concerning the applicability of the statute. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in its long memorandum of interpretation, reasoned that it did not fall within the purview of sections 305 and 307, and consequently did not file under Form A. The memorandum added: "It should be noted, however, that even though the organization does not have lobbying as its principal activity, an employee or other person paid by the organization who has lobbying as his principal activity may be subject to the act." [28] Was the chamber of commerce playing safe when two of its representatives filed under Form B prepared for the information required in section 308—one of whom stated in his report that his salary was $15,000 per annum, "although not more than one-fourth is paid for the principal purpose of influencing legislation as defined in section 307"? [29]

Some tax-exempt organizations were even more cautious, and filed no information under any of the forms for fear of jeopardizing their exemption under the Internal Revenue Code. For example, this is the legal advice given to one such organization:

"Since the principal purpose of the Anti-Defamation League is not to influence legislation, the mere publication of the Legislative Information Bulletin, even if it may be considered a publication which directly or indirectly affects Federal legislation, the ADL will not be compelled to register or file. The answer should be the same even in contemplation of the added factor of a Washington representative whose incidental purpose may be to influence Federal legislation. Section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that a tax-exempt organization loses its tax-exempt status if a substantial part of the activity of such organization is the influencing of legislation. Such a provision may be important if the legislative activity of a tax-exempt organization, or its Washington representative, becomes greater than that of merely incidental activity." [30]

On the other hand, counsel for the American Farm Bureau Federation recommended that the federation and its employees, substantially active in influencing legislation, register under the forms supplied by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. "While considerable uncertainty exists as to the meaning and scope of the Lobbying Act, I am of the view that the only safe course which your organization can pursue is to register under the act." He argued that section 307 is "made decisive as

[25] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., May 31, 1946, p. 27.

[26] S. Rept. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., Mar. 4, 1946, pp. 26–27.

[27] S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5.

[28] Memorandum dated August 28, 1946, p. 6.

[29] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947, p. 52.

[30] However, subsequently Paul Richman filed under Form B and stated that he was employed by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and that he "devotes less than 5 percent of his time, if any, to activity within the terms of the statute." Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, May 12, 1947, p. 5210.

to what persons or organizations must register under section 305. Unfortunately, section 307 is ungrammatical almost to the point of being unintelligible. * * *"[31]

III. OBJECTIONS DIRECTED AT THE ACT

The lobbying title shows poor draftsmanship in other respects. The sections do not constitute an integrated whole. There is every indication that the drafting was done hurriedly, with little fresh thinking on the problem. An examination indicates heavy dependence upon the bills introduced by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH and Senator Hugo L. Black in the Seventy-fourth Congress, 10 years earlier, and the lobbying title of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is only a slightly modified version of these earlier bills.[32] Occasionally words are used loosely; for example, a broad definition is given of a "person" in the introductory section of the title, and yet in sections 304 and 308 "individual" is used where "person" would appear to be more accurate. Furthermore, it would be difficult to understand how an association under this broad definition of "person" could be punished by imprisonment, unless individual members of the group were held responsible, in which event a serious question of deprivation of constitutional rights could be raised. There are unclear, and what appear to be contradictory, references to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act in sections 307 and 311. Section 307 exempts from the provision of the lobbying title, "duly organized State or local committees of a political party." Section 311 states that "this title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act." If any reference at all to the Corrupt Practices Act is necessary here, it should be a simple statement exempting the political committees of all legally recognized parties from the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Others may be required to file under the Lobbying and Corrupt Practices Acts, depending upon their activities.

The President received the bill at the fag end of the session and signed it without detecting a typographical error that had slipped into the bill while it was being engrossed. In section 304, the word "rendered" was used instead of "render." The clear intention was that every person who receives contributions of $500 or more for the purpose stated in the law, "shall within 5 days after the receipt thereof render to the person or organization for which such contribution was received a detailed account thereof. * * *"[33] Unimportant as this error was, it received considerable unfriendly newspaper notice. In fact, on two occasions, two newspapers dealt with it exclusively. The Boston Globe[34] stated: "In any event, an act of Congress will be required to correct the mistake, and lobbyists subject to registration may take advantage of the situation and delay signing up." The Buffalo News[35] concluded its remarks on the matter this way: "You can never tell when a tense situation will be rendered past, present, or future on Capitol Hill."

Vigorous opposition was directed against section 308 of the statute because it exempts from its purview "any public official acting in his official capacity." This opposition to the exempting of "tax-paid lobbyists" was voiced by a number of organizations at the time they filed their own reports under protest, or while questioning the applicability of the law to their particular organizations. On October 9, 1946, the representative of the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service wrote to the clerk:

"The proponents of the legislation in question have indulged in every form of propaganda and publicity they have been able to devise, including the most venomous and unfair attacks, in the leftist press and otherwise, on the National Physicians Committee and its personnel. This propaganda has, in the main, originated in and stemmed from certain branches of our Federal Government where there are long-established and well-entrenched groups of professional bureaucrats, with distinctly collectivist leanings, who are completely committed to the cause of socialized medicine and all that it entails.

"These propagandists, with the resources of the United States Treasury behind them, can and do flood the magazines and newspapers with press releases, in addition to the millions of Government bulletins and publications that are constantly going out to the general public, all at public expense. But, by the express terms of the Lobbying Act, these bureaucrats are not "lobbyists"; they need make no reports and are subject to no penalties regardless of the millions of dollars of Uncle Sam's money they see fit to spend, or however they spend it."[36]

In its memorandum on the lobbying law, the Committee on Constitutional Government, a private organization, said:

"If Congress were properly concerned about lobbying, it might and should long ago have dealt with lobbying by the bureaus set up by the President and itself. For it was shown by Representative Gross, of Pennsylvania (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 10, page A1501) that 'the worst and most persistent lobbying comes from the various bureaus within the Government in their effort to perpetuate themselves.' As one of the several illustrations, he mentioned that when Secretary Ickes appeared before the Insular Affairs Committee he was surrounded by 19 lieutenants * * *. We just recently saw the spectacle of the OPA whipping Congress to a standstill and dictating to the President. During the debate, Senator TAFT exhibited (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 7, page 8450) the OPA as the worst of all lobbyists, using the radio and propagandizing in a highly organized manner, even reaching into the schools. The bureaucrats were so impudent that they burnt TAFT in effigy in Ohio three times."[37]

There is, of course, ample precedent, in States with lobbying legislation, for exemptions of public officials who, in their official capacity, attempt to influence legislation. Furthermore, the purpose of lobbying legislation is to identify the many private organizations and their agents who are engaged in promoting or opposing legislation. Surely the Congress has other effective means at its disposal—for example, the power of the purse—to discipline such representatives of the Federal agencies who, with too much zeal, or in other objectionable ways, go about the business of influencing the legislation they are expected to administer. It would seem that appropriate local government agencies, not to mention the constituents of elected local officials, could adequately discipline State and local officials who use objectionable methods in influencing Federal legislation. It would seem reasonable, however, to withhold exemption of the provisions of the lobbying title from associations of public officials, supported in whole or in part, from private sources.

It has been charged also that the lobbying law is unconstitutional because it violates amendments I and IV of the Constitution of the United States—that the act is in contravention of the specific constitutional requirements that freedom of speech and the right to petition the Government shall not be abridged. One organization further claimed:

"The requirements of this lobbying act * * * make a system of search of the books, records, and papers of the citizen without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, in violation of the fourth amendment. The records which the act prescribes to be kept by the citizen are to be used against him when occasion offers. * * * In the courts of the States, as well as in the Federal courts, the constitutional provisions protecting the citizen against unreasonable searches are liberally construed in favor of the man. * * * Wherever there is a lack of jurisdictional oath, or of absolute clarity as to 'the place to be searched, and the persons * * * or things to seized,' the man wins."[38]

This is a grave charge, and it seems difficult to substantiate it. It may be in order to question the relevancy of injecting the fourth amendment into the discussion, and of the reasoning on the part of those who try to make out a case against this Federal law by citing a series of Supreme Court decisions involving that amendment but bearing questionable relation to this problem.[39] Twenty-five States now require lobbyists to register, and 17 of these also require the filing of expense statements. Are pressure groups so influential in these States as to be largely responsible for the lax enforcement of these laws, and hence find it unnecessary to raise objections to them on constitutional grounds or any other?

Surely the regulation of the lobby does not interfere with the constitutional right of free speech, or free press, or the right of petition. It denies to no one the high right of appeal to Congress or to the public for

[31] F. E. Lee to Donald Kirkpatrick, November 26, 1946. The American Farm Bureau Federation filed quarterly A reports in 1947, and four individuals, including the president, filed B reports, indicating annual salaries totaling $37,000. Each of these four representatives also filed quarterly expense statements under Form C.

[32] H. R. 11223 and H. R. 11663 and S. 2512, all 74th Cong. See H. Repts. 2081 and 2925, 74th Cong., 2d sess., and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 80, p. 4535.

[33] The term "render" appeared in the bill read to the House of Representatives. Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1946, p. 10137. "Render" also appears in section 3 of H. R. 11223 (74th Cong.) and H. R. 11663 (74th Cong.).

[34] August 10, 1946.

[35] August 13, 1946.

[36] See also New York Times, October 18, 1946, and Philadelphia Inquirer, October 21, 1946. E. H. Cary, chairman of the National Physicians Committee, testified on April 19, 1946, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor that his group had spent $905,359 on various forms of educational work during the last 5 years. The committee reported expenditures of $200,541.63 for the first 9 months of 1947 under the Federal Lobbying Act.

[37] First memorandum on Regulation of Lobbying Act, p. 3, probably late August 1946. The Committee for Constitutional Government reported under the Lobbying Act expenditures of $465,080.97 for the period August 2, 1946, through June 30, 1947, but gave no information on contributors.

[38] Memoranda on Regulations of Lobbying Act of the Committee on Constitutional Government, p. 3 of the first memorandum, and p. 4 of the second.

[39] Cases cited in the two memorandums prepared for the Committee for Constitutional Government include *Boyd* v. *United States* ((1886), 116 U. S. 616); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (1881), 103 U. S. 163); *Sinclair* v. *United States* ((1929), 279 U. S. 263); *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Brimson* ((1894), 154 U. S. 447); *Federal Trade Commission* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (1924), 264 U. S. 298); *Hale* v. *Henkel* ((1906), 201 U. S. 43); *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* ((1927), 273 U. S. 135); *Jones* v. *Securities and Exchange Commission* ((1936), 298 U. S. 1.) The brief filed by the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States Federal court in Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1948, also holds that the lobbying title is in conflict with the Constitution.

the purpose of influencing legislation.[40] Penalties are provided for those who fail to comply. Of course, one of the objectives of the law is to put the whole game of pernicious lobbying out of existence and the bad pressure boys out of work. This legislation may be regarded as a curb against abuse of petition, as laws of libel and slander are in the case of freedom of speech and of press. It seems doubtful that section 310 (b) debarring a convicted person from engaging in lobbying for a period of 3 years would be considered unconstitutional either as a bill of attainder or as violative of due process. However, it is difficult to see how this penalty can be applied to associations as "persons." No constitutional question has been raised in those seven States that have similar provisions for debarment.[41]

A further complaint is made that the Lobbying Act does not go far enough. For example, the American Legion and its legislative representatives, who filed promptly under all three forms, complain (1) that the names and addresses of contributors of $499 or lesser amounts do not need to be reported; (2) that many "witnesses" who appear before committees are "lobbyists" and "should be required to state under oath on whose authority they are testifying and also to state in detail whether they received any travel expenses or other gratuities for their testimony, with the amounts thereof," (3) that all lobbyists who claim to represent organizations submit sworn statements as to their membership and by what authority they speak for such membership.

In connection with the first point, while some abuses may be practiced in the collection of contributions under $500, it would appear inadvisable to change this figure. The listing of names and addresses of thousands of persons whose contributions may really be dues paid by members of legitimate associations should not be required or encouraged. In respect to the second recommendation of the American Legion concerning witnesses before committees, rules of the two Houses can adequately meet this desirable suggestion. The Legion's third suggestion can be met by amending the statute to require such information to be furnished preferably by the organizations, rather than by their paid legislative agents. It is evident that the lobbying title stresses the financial background of lobbyists rather than the representative character of the organization, or the processes by which its decisions are reached.[42]

Lastly, another complaint directed against the act is that it goes too far—that it is built on the unwarranted assumption that all persons who collect money for the purpose of lobbying may use it in degradation of public policy, and that, therefore, all persons should be treated as potential wrongdoers. It would be difficult to produce rational evidence supporting this charge. The lobbying title does not draw a distinction between good and bad lobbying. Its aim is to stress the public character of those who participate in influencing legislation.

Wide coverage was given to the Legislative Reorganization Act by the newspapers of the country after the President affixed his signature to the bill. On the whole, the press, in both its news and editorial columns, received Congress' attempt to regulate the lobby favorably. The Cleveland Plain Dealer commented editorially on August 2, 1946: "Since most legislation is sought or opposed by special interests, it is well to have these special interests identified, and it is better to have the representatives of the special interests conduct their activities in the open rather than in secret and sometimes mysteriously. Thus, it appears that Congress has not only reorganized itself but has brought about a reorganization of the lobbyists." On the following day the Journal of Atlanta, Ga., said that "the requirement that lobbyists register and disclose the source of their funds will curb, though not eliminate, an ancient American disgrace." The Washington Post, in an editorial entitled "Goldfish-Bowl Lobbying," noted that "legislators will be able to distinguish more clearly than ever before the plea of organized money from that of individual citizens."[43] On the other hand, a number of newspapers, through feature stories, high lighted the vague terminology in the legislation under headlines that read: "New lobby law spreads confusion";[44] "Lobbying law stirs confusion in Washington—Many puzzled groups ask lawyers if they must register under new act";[45] "Lobbying law goes into effect, but exact meaning is not clear";[46] "Lobbyists slow to register";[47] "What's a lobbyist?"[48]

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

How has the lobbying title in the Legislative Reorganization Act been administered, particularly during the first year after it took effect on August 2, 1946?[49] With the Seventy-ninth Congress already adjourned on this date, and after numerous inquiries, the Clerk of the House of Representatives announced that the lobbying title would take effect at once.[50] To aid in both the interpretation of and compliance with the act, the Clerk's office, in consultation with the Secretary of the Senate, promptly prepared the three forms, A, B, and C, on which the information was to be set forth.[51]

Replies in the negative were given by the Clerk and the Secretary for administrative rulings or opinions relating to the interpretation and enforcement of the act. An early conference after the title became law between the Clerk and the Attorney General resulted in no official interpretation by the Justice Department.[52] It was deemed advisable to let the new statute take its course, permitting the courts to render decision, should a test be made.[53]

The following reply is typical of the Clerk's interpretation:

"The provisions of this act appear to be quite clear as to its interpretation. There remains only the possession of detailed knowledge as to the activities of a person * * * in order to apply the test very specifically set forth in the act. It is the opinion of this office that such a determination should be made by the person who believes he may come within the provision of this law, and that the Clerk of the House should not make a decision for him. For your complete information, additional copies of the forms developed by this office to assist persons in complying with the provisions are herewith. These forms by their very nature tend to simplify the process of understanding the application of this law."[54]

---

[40] Senator McCLELLAN, who preferred a lobbying bill limited to professional lobbyists, viewed the lobbying title before passage as a possible violation of civil liberties: "I should not be willing to pursue that purpose so far as to prevent the president of the Federal Farm Bureau, or the president of the CIO, or the president of the A. F. of L., or the president of the Farmers Union, or the secretary of the chamber of commerce, * * * from coming to Washington and conferring with their congressional delegation unless they agreed to register and to report as professional lobbyists. I do not think the legislation should go that far * * * I think it is probably an abridgment of the civil rights of our citizens and our constituents, when and if the law does go that far * * * I do not think we have a right to say to any citizen of our State that, as a citizen of the State, he cannot, without becoming a criminal because of violation of this proposed law, contact his Senator or his Representative in Congress and discuss with him legislation in which he or his organization is interested, unless he registers and acknowledges himself to be a lobbyist" (cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, June 10, 1946, p. 6678).

[41] Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wisconsin. See Belle Zeller, State Regulation of Lobbying, The Book of the States, 1948–49, pp. 129, 130.

[42] That the latter was also the intention of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress may be seen from its report, (S. Rept. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

[43] August 26, 1946.

[44] New York Times, August 10, 1946.

[45] New York Herald Tribune, August 24, 1946.

[46] St. Louis Post Dispatch, September 22, 1946.

[47] Journal Gazette, Fort Wayne, Ind., October 10, 1946.

[48] Chicago Times, September 13, 1946.

[49] The writer has had opportunity to examine, periodically, the reports filed under the provisions of the lobbying title with the clerk of the House of Representatives and the secretary of the Senate, to talk directly with persons in these offices and with those responsible for the drafting of the legislation, to examine the memorandums of interpretation and advice prepared by counsel for a number of organizations affected by the legislation, to communicate by telephone and letter with some of the counsel and with a larger number of the Washington lobbyists themselves, to examine the press coverage from coast to coast on this lobbying title, and in some instances to talk directly with the Washington press correspondents.

[50] New York Times, August 10, 1946. Unlike other titles in the Legislative Reorganization Act, title III provided no specific date on which it was to take effect.

[51] In this connection, counsel for the American Farm Bureau Federation commented: "The simplification which the Secretary and the Clerk have thus undertaken is advantageous to persons required to register under the act, except that Form A, which is for use by organizations, states that it is filed under section 307, thus implying that any organization filing it is engaged principally in lobbying." Cf. letter of F. P. Lee to Donald Kirkpatrick, November 26, 1946.

[52] Interview with H. Newlin Megill, Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives, December 6, 1946; United States News, vol. 31, September 6, 1947, p. 70.

[53] It was disclosed on December 25, 1947, that the United States Attorney General had earlier appointed Irving R. Kaufman as his special assistant to conduct an investigation of lobbying activities. Cf. New York Times, December 26, 1947, and interview with Irving R. Kaufman, January 2, 1948. On January 14 the Attorney General announced that he had given Mr. Kaufman written authorization to appear before a grand jury in cases warranting prosecuting; and on March 23 it was disclosed that a grand jury in Washington, D. C., had started receiving evidence from the Department of Justice on alleged violations of the Lobbying Act. Cf. New York Herald Tribune, March 24, 1948. On March 30, 1948, this grand jury indicted the United States Savings and Loan League. Cf. New York Times, March 31, 1948. On January 28, 1948, the National Association of Manufacturers followed what appears an unusual course when it appealed to the Federal district court in a civil action for an injunction to enjoin enforcement of the Federal Lobbying Act, which is a criminal statute.

[54] Clerk to Edward A. Rumely, of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., October 10, 1946. The same advice was repeated subsequently by the Clerk to officers of the organization. On July 8, 1947, Mr. Rumely wrote the Clerk, "* * * I protest that I am not under any legal obligation to file reports under said act, and again request a ruling on this question for future guidance."

On another occasion the Clerk returned a registration on Form A with the advice "that it should perhaps properly be filed in the name of the organization and sworn to by you as the agent thereof." And again a Form A was returned because it reflected no information. "It would appear," said the Clerk, "that such a form should be filed by the person * * * with whom you are associated, if they are receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 307. * * * In such a case, a statement by an organization should reflect some type of receipt or some type of expenditure or some information." [55] However, this procedure was soon changed. The clerk now files all reports, regardless of the nature of their contents.

The Clerk made the following reply to the request of the representative of the People's Lobby for postponement in filing his financial statement: "I note that your basis for this request is your present illness. There is no authority that lodges with the Clerk of the House in the administration of this act that would permit him to vary the requirement of this statute."

One barometer for measuring compliance is the number of registrations under the lobbying title during its first year. A total of 216 different organizations filed a total of 450 entries with the Clerk of the House under Form A.[56] These quarterly reports ranged from one to four for each organization, and, unlike the data filed on Forms B and C, are not published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Furthemore, the data supplied on Form A pertaining to the first three questions on amount and sources of contributions are meager indeed. Fuller information is supplied in answer to the last three questions concerned with the expenditures of the associations. On the other hand, too many among the 216 organizations that filed at least once during the year on Form A gave no information at all—"none" or blank spaces appearing in answer to all six questions.[57]

Many itemized expenditures, even of less than $10, appear on separately attached sheets. These statements should, and most of them do, include the expenses incurred by the lobbyists employed by the association. However, if the lobbyists' expenses are included on Form A, this does not absolve the lobbyists from registering under B and C.[58]

Among the organizations that indicated in detail not only all expenditures, but also the contributors with their names, addresses, and the amounts given, was the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. The chief concern of this organization, which employed 27 registered lobbyists, was to procure passage of the Stratton bill (H. R. 2910). The committee reported on Form A that during the first 6 months of 1947 it received contributions amounting to $236,753.25 and disbursed $185,431.45.

The following list gives a representative sampling of the amounts reported to have been spent by associations during the first 6 months of 1947:

American Federation of Labor (in campaign to defeat Taft-Hartley bill)	$819,648.18
Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.	248.505.58
Townsend National Recovery Plan and Weekly	236,599.42
National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service	135,367.86
National Association of Electric Companies	126,039.75
National Home and Property Owners' Foundation	77,333.82
Southern States Industrial Council	51,686.95
Southern Pine Industry Committee	34,988.23
American Legion	29,788.22
Unemployment Benefit Advisors	25,157.79
American Farm Bureau Federation	23,097.12
Sea Air Legislative Committee	21,326.20
National Association of Cooperatives	21,119.35
National St. Lawrence Association	20,381.05
Central Valley Project Association	18,306.38
American Medical Association	15,174.11
Christian Amendment Movement	9,875.40
American Library Association	7,990.17
National Conference of Railroad Investors	7,525.83
The People's Lobby	6,694.10
National Federation of Post Office Clerks	6,283.66
North Dakota Resources Board	4,978.21
Western Defense Housing Co.	4,848.08
American Parents Association	3,372.59
Federation of American Scientists	3,007.67
Irrigation Districts Association of California	2,576.22
American Veterans of World War II	494.20
National Committee for Strengthening Congress	248.20
Legislative Bureau of the Communist Party, United States of America	34.95

Twenty-two organizations that filed under Form A had no record of having hired legislative agents. This, of course, is entirely possible under the Lobbying Act, as the following statement, attached to the Form A of the Committee for United States Information Abroad indicates: "This is a volunteer committee composed of prominent individuals who are publicly supporting legislation to continue a United States information program abroad. It has no paid employees other than the office staff listed in the enclosed Form A: therefore, we are returning the blank forms B and C."

Even among the organizations that filed under A are a number which registered under protest or with reservations. For example, the American Library Association filed Form A with a statement that although this association "* * * is of the opinion that the provisions of this act do not apply to its activities, we feel that the purpose of the act merits the cooperation of every association in the United States and is, therefore, complying with the requirements as a matter of policy." [59]

The National Association of Electric Companies stated that it was very unwillingly filing forms A, B, and C. "* * * for the information of the Congress of the United States under title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but seriously questions whether and to what extent that act applies to this association. The scope of that title is not clearly stated, and the forms have been prepared without the benefit of official interpretation."

However, it is the information required under Form A rather than B and C that throws important light upon the organizations that influence legislation—although occasionally the registrant under B gratuitously gives information about the association employing him. The data required in Form A emphasize what the State lobbying laws disregard, namely, that it is more important to know something of the structure, finances, and policy-making machinery of the organization than of the activities of the lobbyist employed by the pressure group.

Thus a cardinal weakness in the administration of the lobbying title must be judged by the failure of organizations to file under Form A (some of the most powerful and influential associations are in this category); and, secondly, by observing that in many cases very meager information was supplied by organizations that did file.

On Form B, 845 different registrants recorded 677 "persons" as their employers.[60] If a liberal interpretation had been given to the word "principal" in section 307, the correlation would have been higher between those who filed under Form A in accordance with sections 305 and 307 and the employers of Form B registrants reporting under section 308.[61] These 677 organizations employed a total of 1,058 legislative agents. Included among this latter figure were 74 who recorded that they were employed by more than one person. In fact, these 74 represented 287 organizations and individuals. The record is held by Walter F. Woodul, who represented 24 railroads in Texas, Missouri, and California, and the Imperial Sugar Co. of Texas. James E. Curry, representative of 18 Indian tribes, is promised 10 percent of all recovery in claims plus "reasonable fees for other work." Stephen Walter represents 14 different power companies.[62]

The registration figures also disclose that a number of associations have in their employ at the same time more than one person who is responsible for the group's legislative work. The record is held by the Townsend National Recovery Plan. Thirty-four different individuals for twenty-five States filed under Form B and indicated the Townsend National Recovery Plan as the organization in whose interest they were working. While some of the Townsend registrants indicated they were paid a flat salary of $50 or $75 a week, 18 others indicated that they received as commissions from 25 to 50 percent of the financial contributions or dues of members in their respective States. The employees at the national headquarters in Cleveland listed salaries ranging from $4,000 to $7,800 and additional expense allowances.[63] The Citi-

---

[55] South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives, to Charles E. Sands, November 20, 1946.

[56] By January 31, 1948, an additional 21 "persons" filed under Form A.

[57] Among such organizations were the National Farmers Union, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, and the United Health League.

[58] For example, J. Byron Wilson, chairman of the legislative committee of the National Wool Growers Association, filed no B or C statements. He is reported to be one of the best-known lobbyists on the Hill. The National Wool Growers Association, however, did report on its Form A, filed on July 9, 1947, that Mr. Wilson spent a total of $2,457.22 during the first two quarters of 1947, but made no mention of his annual salary. His colleague, J. M. Jones, secretary of the association, did file under B and C.

[59] However, the American Library Association listed its expenditures but not its contributions on its four quarterly Forms A. Letter of Carl H. Milam, executive secretary, to Leslie F. Biffle, Secretary of the Senate, October 10, 1946.

[60] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947; February 5, 1947; May 12, 1947; August 15, 1947.

[61] Although by January 1948 a thousand lobbyists had registered, they represented a total of about 750 employer organizations and individuals. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, November 17, 1947; vol. 94, January 29, 1948.

[62] It is possible that among these 74 registrants are some who terminated their services with one organization before being employed by another. This may apply to those who filed at different times under Form B. A specific statement of termination of employment should be required on Form C.

[63] On Form A the Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., reported for 1946 contributions of $216,146.34 and expenditures of $584,833.47.

zens Committee on Displaced Persons followed the policy of having all of their 27 employees, including office and field workers, file individual registrations on Form B, and thus a total pay roll of $165,000 annually was recorded. It seems unnecessary to add that the number of lobbyists employed by any one organization does not indicate its strength or influence. Congress has not adopted the program advocated by the Townsend plan, nor did the Stratton bill, urged by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, become law in 1947.

Significantly, former Government employees were registered as lobbyists, but not to the extent that one would expect after reading the statements of the late Senator Caraway.[64] The statements filed under the lobbying statute during its first year disclosed that eight former Members of Congress were registered, and several former officials of the Federal administrative branch.[65]

Sixty-five women are numbered among the 845 individuals who registered as lobbyists. It has been estimated that their total salary is about $170,000 per year in a field of employment that is reputed to draw down in salaries four or five million dollars annually. The highest salary reported for a woman lobbyist was $7,000 per annum, and the next highest was $6,400.[66] The majority of the women lobbyists, however, draw annual salaries ranging from $3,000 to $4,000. Three make less than $1,500 a year, while a number of the women are volunteer workers drawing no salary, but only necessary expenses. The largest number of women registered for a single organization is the 10 employed by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons.[67]

The highest salary on record is $65,000 paid to Purcell L. Smith by the National Association of Electric Companies, who stated: "On the basis of the activities of the association to date, I estimate that not over 25 percent my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of the act." [68] The runner-up is Stephen M. Walter with an annual salary of $52,000, while Ernest W. Greene is paid $45,180 per annum as agent for the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association.[69] Top labor leaders, as William Green and Philip Murray, have not registered as lobbyists for their respective organizations. However, three legislative agents for the American Federation of Labor registered, each with $7,280 per annum salary, and two for the CIO at salaries of $6,000 and $4,320. It is perhaps superfluous to note that some salaries are very low indeed, one registrant recording $5 a year from the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs. There are also a number of volunteers, even among the male representatives who have registered, although a reading of section 308 of the lobbying title would appear to exempt agents not employed for compensation.[70]

Approximately 400 of the nearly 700 employers of registered legislative agents came from various categories of business, whereas about 75 were labor and government employee associations. Agricultural, veteran, professional, civic, and miscellaneous groups made up the remainder.

A check of the addresses of "persons" employing lobbyists indicated that all but seven States of the Union were represented, as well as the following Territories: Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. In addition, organizations with addresses in Mexico, the Netherlands, Egypt, Cuba, and the Canal Zone employed registered lobbyists. About 172 organizations have Washington, D. C., addresses; 107, New York addresses; Illinois comes next with 43; then California and Texas with 35 each. It has been estimated that there are about 3,000 lawyers in Washington, D. C., more per capita than in any other city in the country. A large number of the lawyers with District addresses represent, as registered lobbyists, not only organizations located in the District, but also organizations with addresses elsewhere in the country, in the territories, and in foreign countries.

Sixteen legislative agents during the first year requested that their registrations be canceled. Undoubtedly several more of the 845 registered lobbyists terminated their services without specifically notifying the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate. In these cases one could assume that the failure to file the quarterly financial report would indicate that their services as lobbyists were at an end. The Clerk so ruled in reply to the request of Samuel Rosenman to "withdraw" his registration because his activities in connection with the specific legislation for which he represented the Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers had come to an end with its enactment. In reply, the Clerk stated: "The act requires persons registered to file quarterly reports as long as they are engaged in the activity, and therefore failure to file such quarterly reports is a notice of withdrawal of registration pursuant to the act." [71]

In answer to the question on Form B, "the duration of such employment," either a fixed termination date was stated, or, more frequently such replies as "indefinite," "at will," "undetermined," "permanent," were recorded. One of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor, in answer to this question, said: "Until fired, resigned, retired, or dead." [72] A Rev. James C. Olden recorded that he was working for the American Negro "until the problem is solved," and that he was supported in these labors by "free will offerings of churches and interested individuals."[73]

The number of reports on Form C listing the quarterly expenditures of individual lobbyists has increased with each quarterly compilation. For example, 149 filed for the first quarter, 198 for the second, 539 for the third, 631 for the fourth, making a total of 1,517 who filed Form C during this first year.[74]

Most of the lobbyists have complied with the filing of their quarterly financial statement, although some statements came in slowly. In a number of cases, statements have been filed for two quarters at the same time. Furthermore, in a few cases, legislative agents have erroneously used Form A instead of C for their personal filing records. This confusion undoubtedly was caused by the use of the word "person," which normally means an individual rather than an association.[75] Financial statements are not required for any quarter in which the lobbyist did no lobbying. However, a few lobbyists prefer to file the C form and state, for example: "No participation in lobbying during second quarter, and I shall not be lobbying on labor legislation as set forth in first-quarter report." [76]

The statute recognizes the importance of publications in promoting legislation. Form C therefore asks for "the name of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials." In the overwhelming number of cases, either "none" was recorded, or no reply at all was given. However, there are examples in which some registered agents listed newspapers and periodicals to which news releases and articles had been mailed, or in which they had been published.[77] More often, a single specific publication is mentioned, and that is usually the organ of the association employing the lobbyist, e. g., "None other than weekly newsletter published by employer."

In answer to the last question of Form C, "The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose," the replies take different forms. Agents for the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons mentioned H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act (Stratton bill). In another case there appears a series of specific bills. The representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation replied: "In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions, adopted by the federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed." [78] More often some such general

---

[64] H. J. Res. 227, 70th Cong., undertook to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in the practice of lobbying, but the resolution did not pass.

[65] Former Congressmen were Albert E. Carter, employed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at $12,000 per annum; John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., at $25,000 per year; Wesley E. Disney, of Oklahoma, National Gas Association of America, at $10,000 per year plus legal fees from other groups; Winder R. Harris, of Virginia, Shipbuilders Council of America, at $15,000 per annum; Fritz G. Lanham, of Texas, National Patent Council, State Rights Association, and others, at a total of $16,000 per year; Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, Air Transport Association of America, at $25,000 per year; H. Jerry Voorhis, of California, Cooperative League of the United States of America, at $7,500 per year; Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia, American Plant Food Council, Inc., at $36,000 per annum.

Prominent among the other former public officials were Samuel Rosenman, employed by the Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers, Inc., at $40,000 per year; and William P. MacCracken, Jr., employed by Remington Rand, Inc., at $12,000 per year, while his services to the American Optometric Association are paid for from time to time, the amount depending upon the nature of the work and the time involved.

[66] These salaries are paid, respectively, to Margaret K. Taylor by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation and Hilda W. Smith by the Committee for the Extension of Labor Legislation.

[67] In addition to the list published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, see New York Herald Tribune, May 15, 1947.

[68] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947, p. 54.

[69] Representatives of the Association of American Railroads and the United States Beet Sugar Association are each paid annual salaries of $40,000.

[70] One Jostus R. Moll recorded that he received "no money or other valuable consideration" from the Frisco System Board of Adjustment, except the payment of his annual dues, and he even paid his own expenses. He added: "In addition to said consideration, I hope to receive as other consideration mentioned in the statute, the continued loyalty and gratitude of the membership of Frisco System Board of Adjustment (or any other bona fide labor union) in return for my efforts."

[71] April 8, 1947. It is evident that it would be well if some provision were made on form C specifically called for a statement of resignation or cancellation.

[72] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, January 3, 1947, p. 49.

[73] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, May 12, 1947, p. 5209.

[74] The last two quarters covered the first 6 months of the 80th Cong. By the end of January 1948, 2,592 filed on form C.

[75] For example, this was done by Charles E. Saltzman, who represented the New York Stock Exchange until he resigned in July 1947 to become Assistant Secretary of State.

[76] Entries for Herman M. Booth, Jr., in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, May 12, 1947, p. 5216, and August 15, 1947, p. A4468.

[77] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, August 15, 1947, p. A4492.

[78] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, August 15, 1947, p. A4493.

characterization is given as "any margarine legislation," "measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate," "legislation affecting credit union," "matters affecting the mortgage-banking industry," "supporting legislation for the unemployed," "all legislation of interest to business such as bills on taxes, budget control, portal-to-portal pay suits, general labor, claims, etc.," "legislation for workers."

It has been observed that 677 persons were listed as employers on Form B. In addition, there were 22 associations that filed under A, but did not employ lobbyists, according to the Form B records on file. A break-down of this total figure of 699 indicates that 498 were associations or member organizations, while 201 were individuals or individual companies and corporations. How many organizations are really active in the area of national legislation? Samuel H. Tower stated in the New York Times that "lobbying has reached, if possible, a new pitch of activity in the present session of Congress." [79]

Joseph and Stewart Alsop reported that "in the presence of lobbyists, the Eightieth Congress of the United States has behaved like a blowzy chorus girl just starting on her second pint of rye. * * * At this session something very like the beginning of a lobbyists' carnival has been plainly discernible * * * the power lobby is the most active, and most conspicuously well-heeled, in Washington. Its grand panjandrum, the high-powered P. L. Smith, representative of the National Association of Electrical Companies, gets a salary in the Hollywood class—$65,000 annually, with an ample expense account. But even the prosperous Smith is less important than the numerous officials of the large utilities companies. These converge on the Capitol at frequent intervals to make the boys on the Hill see the power question in the old free-enterprise way. And behind these large operators, there is a whole network of lawyers with retainers from the utilities, bankers with deposits from them, and other influential figures. These speak from the voting districts to Washington with voices of authority. Besides stirring up the sordid attack on David E. Lilienthal, the power people have scored major successes at this session with the Appropriations Committees." [80]

In vetoing the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, President Truman stated:

"One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real estate lobby. Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective. They have constantly sought to weaken rent control and to do away with necessary aids to housing. * * * It is intolerable that this lobby should be permitted by its brazen operations to block programs so essential to the needs of our citizens. Nothing could be more clearly subversive of representative government. * * *" [81]

And again, Ned Brooks, Washington correspondent wrote:

"The real-estate lobby's series of successes in Congress has soothed the sting of President Truman's rebuke to it. * * * They have won all major objectives in the current session. * * * Six weeks before the session began, Boyd Bernard, then president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, told members to 'wait for the new Congress on the Capitol steps with a proposal for a cushioned decontrol of rents.'

On May 12, after the House had passed the bill opening the way for rent increases and repealing most of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, the association notified members: 'We won the first round of rents through the passage of the Wolcott bill. This embodies substantially the program we wanted.'

At the same time the association was soliciting its membership for $5 contributions to conduct 'legislative and research work' here in Washington. Officials ridiculed statements that it had a $10,000,000 fund available for putting over its program, saying its goal of voluntary subscription was only $59,000.[82]

The six leading organizations which constitute the real-estate lobby in Washington are: Association of Real Estate Boards, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, National Association of Home Builders, Buildings Products Institute, United States Savings and Loan League, and National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. According to statements on file in the Clerk's and Secretary's offices, their 14 agents receive salaries totalling $81,450 per annum. Only two of these organizations during the first year filed under Form A. The National Association of Real Estate Boards reported expenditures of $39,355.72 in 1946, and the National Home and Property Owners Foundation recorded, for a 7-month period in 1946, expenditures of $232,132.08.[83]

In the New Republic, Helen Fuller refers to the "Eightieth Congress * * * [as] a demonstration of government by lobby and steamroller." She indicts, among others, the Association of American Railroads for its lobbying budget of nearly $5,000,000 per year, which got the Reed-Bulwinkle bill (exempting railroads from the antitrust laws) through the Senate; and the sugar interests, which put through "a sweet deal in the Sugar Act of 1948"; and the "big business' biggest guns, the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce, concentrated on labor first, taxes second." [84]

On the other hand, organized labor, with the assistance of consumer and other civic organizations, was far from quiescent. The registrations under the lobbying title record about 75 organizations affiliated with the A. F. of L. and CIO., as well as unaffiliated groups. Unprecedented sums of money were spent in legislative battles, particularly over the elimination of price controls in general, rent controls, the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, and the reorganization of the Labor Department. As never before, in enterprising and novel ways, radio and newspaper advertisements were used to carry labor's message to millions of people.

On June 23, 1947, Representative ARENDS, of Illinois, on the floor of the House, said:

"Last week, during the discussion of the President's veto message on labor, some 800 lobbyists were reported to have come to Washington in an automobile veto caravan. They came here for the purpose of influencing the President to veto the Labor Act and to exert their influence on Members of Congress to sustain such veto.

"Who paid their expenses? Have they registered as lobbyists?

"There have been reports that labor organizations have spent more than $1,000,000 in lobbying against the Labor Act and for sustaining the veto. Have those expenses been reported as lobbying costs?

"Phil Murray, president of the CIO, was interviewed on a radio program Friday night called Meet the Press. In that radio interview Mr. Murray said that he had talked to various Members of Congress about the act. Mr. Murray was asked if he thought that would come under the head of lobbying. He replied that he did not believe so. Many Members had called him asking about the act, he replied. Is that lobbying and is Mr. Murray registered as a lobbyist? [85]

The American Federation of Labor filed under Form A for the first time on July 11, 1947, a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements for the period from April 23, 1947, through June 30, 1947. It showed that the Federation had received for its fight on the Taft-Hartley bill contributions aggregating $992,452.30 from 102 of its national and international unions and from its local trade and Federal unions, and had spent $819,648.18.[86] The largest items in its expenses were: for newspaper advertising, $423,821.58; for radio advertising, $322,839.26; for radio entertainment, $61,673.54; and for telegrams, $3,641.33. The three unions making the largest contributions were: United Mine Workers of America, $90,000; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, $90,000; and International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, $93,750. Judging from these figures of the American Federation of Labor, it can be concluded that all of organized labor must have spent millions of dollars in its unsuccessful campaign to keep the Taft-Hartley bill from the statute book.

It is, of course, difficult to estimate with accuracy the number of pressure groups that are active in the area of national legislation. It is undoubtedly an understatement that, even with a strict interpretation of the lobbying law, more than the 699 employers that can now be found in the files should have registered under the lobbying title. According to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, more than 3,000 national trade and professional associations are represented at the capital in some manner.[87] The report of the Temporary National Committee on "Economic Power and Political Pressures," prepared by Donald C. Blaisdell in 1941, listed 391 national organizations with permanent representatives in Washington.[88] Many of the associations recorded under the lobbying law during its first year are not, of course, national organizations, and undoubtedly do

[79] New York Times, June 1, 1947.

[80] Washington Post, July 25, 1947, reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, July 25, 1947, p. A4067.

[81] New York Times, July 1, 1947.

[82] Washington Daily News, July 21, 1947, reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, July 25, 1947, p. 10353.

[83] On March 30, 1948, the Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., indicted the United States Savings and Loan League for its failure to file under form A of the lobbying law. Three of its legislative representatives did file under form B. When a Federal grand jury brought an indictment against the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the Washington Real Estate Board on grounds of conspiring to fix commission rates for real-estate dealers, the president of the national association saw in this action a reprisal for disagreement with the administration on housing. Cf. New York Times, August 29, 1947.

[84] August 4, 1947.

[85] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, June 23, 1947, p. 7716. Neither Mr. Murray nor Mr. Green has registered under the lobbying act.

[86] For the period April 23, 1947, through December 31, 1947, receipts were $1,046,478.03 and expenditures $834,565.38.

[87] C. J. Judkins, Trade and Professional Associations of the United States (Washington, D. C., 1942), U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The associations are broken down as follows: 1,900 trade associations (business competitors in one industry); 300 other "business associations" (not trade associations, but composed largely of businessmen); 600 other organizations (the activities of these are of special interest to business, such as the American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Medical Association); 300 additional associations. The National Association of Manufacturers states that there are about 1,500 national or regional trade associations of commercial or industrial enterprises.

[88] TNEC Rept. No. 26, pp. 197–201.

not all have permanent representatives in Washington. Eighty-two organizations in this 1941 list registered in some form under the lobbying law in 1946–47.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THE ACT

During its first year, the Federal lobbying law has been of limited effectiveness. However, a sufficient number of registrants have complied in one way or another to justify an early revision. Soon after the law became effective, an Omaha newspaper reported: "A cynical alliance stands as a new threat to the La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act. The World Herald's Jack Jarrell reports from Washington that some of the Nation's top lobbyists have joined forces with the unofficial Congressional Old-Timer's Club in a drive to undercut the bill." [89] Whether or not the Omaha correspondent was correct, the Federal Department of Justice may force the hand of Congress, and revision of the lobbying law may be seriously undertaken.[90]

Unlike the original title, all proposed amendments should be subjected to careful scrutiny by committee members, following full public hearings.[91] The value of carefully planned hearings cannot be overestimated. On this point, Prof. Joseph P. Chamberlain, of Columbia University, told the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress:

"I think, in my experience, it is enormously important in order to get good legislation to have careful committee consideration. I have drafted a good many bills in my time for private organizations, for State departments and bureaus, and I have never felt any satisfaction about any measure to which I might have given a great deal of time and consideration unless it had had a careful hearing before a committee—and I knew that the common sense of that committee had been expended on that bill." [92]

Methods employed to influence legislation are no longer restricted largely to buttonholing Members of Congress in the Nation's Capitol or at home. Mass channels of communication and the art of public relations have increased the pressures upon Congress and other Government agencies, and thus have drastically changed modern pressure techniques. It is recommended that:

1. The lobbying title of the Legislative Reorganization Act be completely redrafted and its various sections considered as an integrated whole, in order to avoid contradictions and ambiguities.

2. The words "principally" and "principal" now appearing in section 307 be deleted, and the Lobbying Act be made applicable to all organizations that now expend a specific sum (for example, at least $1,000 for any one quarter of the year) in influencing public opinion or the agencies of Government, directly or indirectly, in the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. While it cannot be denied that organizations such as labor, chambers of commerce, trade associations, farm groups, etc., do perform major services not directly related to influencing legislation, such legislative activity as they do engage in, even for limited periods, may be of vital importance to the existence of these organizations. It is difficult, even at times impossible, to separate the so-called nonlegislative from the legislative expenses of any organization.[93] Therefore, the act should require a statement of the total budget of these organizations, broken down into broad categories of expenditures with a listing specifically of all items of expenditure labeled legislative. The names and addresses of contributors of $500 or more in any one quarter should appear in the statements filed under the lobbying title, whether specifically earmarked for legislative purposes or not.

3. A statement of the bona fide total membership of organizations should be required. It would also be effective if each organization were required to state how its legislative policy is determined and to indicate the responsibility of the lobbyist in conveying these views on behalf of the membership of the organization. It would then be a simple matter to expect chairmen of standing and special committees to require of a witness appearing at hearings a sworn statement as to whom he represents, the membership of his organization, and the internal structure of such organization, indicating how the position taken by the witness was arrived at. This might prove a great step in the direction of making pressure groups more representative of their actual and potential membership, and more democratic in their procedures.

4. It should be the responsibility of a specially designated agency to enforce the Lobbying Act. This agent should be the Attorney General of the United States. It would be his responsibility to see that complete information is supplied in accordance with the terms of the act and that such information is given the fullest publicity. Publicity is the key to effective enforcement of lobbying legislation. The compilation of the data for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is only a first step. The Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, now responsible for the compilation of the data on Forms B and C, lack police power. The information on all forms, to be prepared by the Attorney General in the first place, should be published at quarterly intervals in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. One copy should be filed with the enforcement agency and one with the Clerk of the House. It is further recommended that the compilation of the data be furnished either by the enforcement agency or by the Clerk of the House to the Press, Radio, and Periodical Press Galleries at stated intervals, in sufficient number to permit distribution to each accredited member of the galleries.[94] Copies of the compiled lobbying data should also be sent at weekly intervals while Congress is in session to the presiding officers of each House in sufficient number to permit distribution to each Member of Congress.

Furthermore, the Attorney General should be specifically required to evaluate in his annual report to Congress the working of the lobbying act during the past year, to interpret the information yielded under the act, and to suggest improvements through administrative or legislative action. It would be highly advisable for the appropriate congressional committees annually to evaluate the act, as provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act.

5. The act should be revised to require the the filing of statements and registration of persons who exert influence upon any Federal bureau, agency, or Government official. The Congress having taken the first step in requiring registration of persons exerting influence upon the legislative body, the extension of its provisions to the administrative agencies would be a simple matter. It would be further recogntion of the fact that the pressure upon the administrative division is considerable.[95]

6. The act should specifically prohibit the employment of any person to promote or oppose legislation when compensation is contingent in whole or in part upon the passage or defeat of legislative matters.[96]

7. The exemption granted in section 308 to newspapers or other regularly published periodicals should be extended to radio.

8. The contradictions in sections 307 and 311, as affecting the Corrupt Practices Act, should be resolved, making it clear that only duly organized State and local party committees are exempted from the provisions of the lobbying act and that others may be required to file under the lobbying and corrupt practices laws, depending on their activities.

If the foregoing suggestions were adopted, many organizations now enjoying tax exemption status under the Federal Internal Revenue Code might lose this status if they complied with the lobbying statute so amended. This is undoubtedly one of the chief reasons why many organizations have not filed under the ambiguous terms of the present law. It would seem, then, that Congress might be required to amend the Internal Revenue Code if it wished these organizations to continue as tax-exempt groups.[97]

No one doubts that it is a nuisance to require such full information from private organizations. Yet the time is opportune to insist upon it. These groups have grown accustomed in the past two decades to furnishing more and more information to the Government. Teeth should be put into the lobbying title at the earliest practicable moment. It is far better for Congress to clarify its position than for the courts to do so. Groups engaged in the legitimate activity of helping the people's representatives formulate public policy are in a sense clothed with a public interest. A democracy is entitled to

---

[89] Omaha World-Herald, October 9, 1946.

[90] See footnote 53 above. The Justice Department holds that the phrase "principal purpose" in sec. 307 means any purpose which is not incidental to the activities of the "person" in question, that any other interpretation would be meaningless and would clearly defeat the expressed intention of Congress. See testimony of Irving R. Kaufman, before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, February 17, 1948. See footnotes 53 and 83 above.

[91] The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has already held such hearings, in which the writer participated on February 17, 1948, New York Times, February 18, 1948.

[92] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 4, p. 1007.

[93] For example, the chairman of the National Legislative Committee of the American Federation of Labor, in order to support his statement "that the legislative expenses of our organization is a very minute proportion of its activities," points to the annual report of the Federation for the year ending August 31, 1946, in which the total expenditures of the federation were given at more than two and a half million dollars and legislative salaries and expenses amounted to $16,441.57. Cf. letter of W. C. Husking, December 6, 1946, and report of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, 1946, pp. 2–3. For the year ending August 31, 1947, although the total expenditures of the federation exceeded $5,000,000, legislative salaries and expenses were $22,474. These figures do not include the sums spent in the federation's campaign to defeat the Taft-Hartley bill.

[94] For membership of the Press, Radio, and Periodical Press Galleries, see Congressional Directory, January 1948, pp. 731–763.

[95] Senate bill 2512, 74th Cong., introduced by Senator Black, made such provision.

[96] This prohibition is found in many of the State lobbying laws. Contingent payments may tend to encourage questionable practices. A registrant, in answering question 4 on form B, "how much he is paid and is to receive," stated: "$10,000 per annum as a retainer as Washington counsel on all matters affecting the economic and legal welfare of the [fur] industry, plus a fee of $15,000 in the event excise tax on furs is cut from 20 percent to 10 percent, plus an additional fee of $25,000 in the event the entire excise tax on furs is repealed on or before July 1, 1948." Cf. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, January 29, 1948, p. 741.

[97] See U. S. Code, title 26, sec. 101 (6), 1938.

the fullest information from all the sources that constitute its functioning parts—and who would deny that pressure groups play a valuable and indispensable part in the dynamics of government?

However, regulatory legislation by itself, no matter how carefully drawn or vigorously enforced, will not eliminate the predatory lobby or discourage the use of questionable or illegitimate practices by pressure groups. Significantly, the lobbying title is part of the Legislative Reorganization Act which aimed to improve and modernize the organization and operations of the Congress. For example, by placing greater professional expert and clerical assistance at the disposal of legislative committees and Members, Congress has made itself less dependent on unofficial sources of information than ever before. Strengthening the ability of Government to formulate legislative policy will go a long way toward providing effective regulation of pressure groups.

The Myth of the "Untouchable" 71 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a bulletin entitled, "The Myth of the 'Untouchable' 71 Percent," published by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, signed by Alvin A. Burger, research director.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYTH OF THE "UNTOUCHABLE" 71 PERCENT

Spenders in and out of Congress have been utilizing what has proved to be an effective device for countering demands from folks back home for reduced Federal spending and a balanced budget. The device works this way: Pointing a frosty index finger at the complaining taxpayer, a prospending Senator (for example) will say, "Do you know that 71 percent of the proposed 1951 Federal budget goes to pay for past wars and to prevent future wars? National defense takes $13,500,000,000; services and benefits to veterans, $6,100,000,000; foreign aid, $4,700,000,000; and interest on the Federal debt, $5,600,000,000; $29,900,000,000 all told, or 71 percent of the total expenditure. Now, Mr. Public, do you want to cut down on national defense? Do you want to abolish services to our veterans? Do you want Europe to be overrun by Communists? Do you want to default on the interest on the debt? No? Well, then, that leaves only 29 percent of the budget that can be cut, and that includes outlays for health, social welfare, agriculture, labor, natural resources, and so on. Are you prepared to say where and by how much these items should be reduced?"

The average citizen is taken aback by such an assault. He has no pat answer to the phony assumption that 71 percent of the budget is immune to pruning. Left with the remaining 29 percent to ponder upon, he finds himself frustrated and silenced.

What he realizes in due time, of course, is that he has been the victim of a percentageal "con" game at which the spenders in Washington have long been adept. The scheme is to get the public to believe that 71 percent of the budget is untouchable (last year it was 76 percent), and that in any event the opportunities for substantial expense-paring are negligible.

Now what are the facts? Briefly, here they are:

1. Of the $42,400,000,000 of estimated spending in the proposed 1951 budget, only $9,4[illegible]0,000,000, or 22 percent, represents fixed charges not subject to reduction by Congress. The largest item in this sum is interest on the debt, estimated at $5,600,000,000.

2. Of the remaining $33,000,000,000, $14,600,000,000 is subject to outright reduction by the appropriation process, while the rest, amounting to $18,400,000,000, can be reduced somewhat by the appropriation process and substantially by amending existing laws authorizing the expenditures involved. In this latter category are programs involving Federal grants, subsidies, payments to individuals, home-mortgage purchases, etc.[1]

3. Expenditures for the Military Establishment and for veterans' services and benefits, far from being untouchable, offer abundant opportunities for spending reduction without impairing our national defense or curtailing reasonable services to veterans. Reports of the Hoover Commission and recent statements by Defense Secretary Johnson and Veterans' Administrator Gray support this.

4. Foreign aid and military-assistance expenditures are certainly subject to control by congressional appropriation except for certain obligated balances carried over from previous appropriations.

5. Ordinary domestic peacetime expenditures of the Government—those not related to past or future wars—have risen from $6,700,000,000 in 1948 to an estimated $12,300,000,000 in fiscal 1951, an increase of 84 percent.

6. The President's 1951 budget provides $953,000,000 to initiate 34 new spending programs. If Congress refuses to approve them, $953,000,000 will be saved. If Congress approves them, not only will this sum be spent, but the continuing programs will require much larger annual outlays in the years to come.

7. Despite recent improvements in many agencies of the Government, the 1951 budget still covers up much of the waste, duplication, payroll padding and inefficiencies exposed by the Hoover Commission, Byrd Committee and other survey agencies in their numerous reports. These add up to billions of dollars of possible savings.

REDUCING MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The 1951 expenditure estimate for national defense is $13,545,000,000. This huge sum nearly equals the total amo nt of taxes collected last year for the support of all our State governments, all our municipal and county governments and all our school systems combined. Now we all want a strong system of national defense in these days of cold war. The question is, can we, in striving for a balanced budget, achieve a cut in military spending and at the same time maintain an adequate system of defense? Senator HARRY F. BYRD maintains that we can. So. does Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Both have proposed that substantial cuts be made. But most encouraging of all is the attitude of Defense Secretary Louis Johnson himself, who, although a strong advocate of armed security, has shown himself to be no respecter of the sanctity of military budgets. Although he has said that military spending would probably continue at a $13,000,000,000 level until 1952, he has undertaken economy measures under the Unification Act which he estimates should result in $1,000,000,000 of savings by August 10 next. Greater combat effectiveness can be achieved as a result of these savings because of reduced excessive overhead and waste.

[1] The figures used in 1 and 2 are taken from Budget Bureau testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, January 18, 1950.

But Secretary Johnson's commendable economy efforts are encountering opposition from five principal sources. These are:

1. Certain military, naval, and Air Force brass to whom budgets are incomprehensible and the thought of conserving tax resources is repugnant;

2. Certain short-sighted industrial pressure groups having a vested interest in military spending;

3. Certain local interests that are more eager to retain unessential military installations within their boundaries than to see the Nation's budget balanced;

4. Certain employee groups which oppose reductions in the huge civilian pay rolls of the armed services; and

5. Certain Members of Congress who speak for the various interests here listed.

There is little doubt but that these interests are setting up costly obstacles in the path of true unification of the armed services. Failure to defeat them will result not only in costing the taxpayers large sums of unnecessary taxes, but also in weakening our system of national defense through foolish dissipation of its resources of manpower, materials, and money.

SAVINGS IN VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

The estimated expenditure for veterans' services and benefits in the President's 1951 budget amounts to $6,080,000,000. The overlapping, duplication, and waste prevailing in these activities have been given full public airing through the findings of the Hoover Commission. The Commission's recommendations call for a business-like overhauling and streamlining of all veterans' services, particularly the hospital and insurance programs. If adopted, these proposals would not only save hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, but would provide more effective services for deserving veterans.

But the chief cause of much of the waste found in the Government's outlays for veterans lies in ill-advised legislation passed by Congress from time to time. A glaring example is found in certain provisions of measures providing education and training benefits for World War II veterans. Expenditures for these benefits in 1951 are estimated at $2,700,000,000.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was passed to assist the returning veteran in making his readjustment to civilian life after separation from active service. Among other things, the act set up a sound system of education and in-service training benefits for veterans whose education had been delayed or impeded by war. But as time went on, Congress passed liberalizing measures which have made a large part of this program a costly farce. Abuses include:

1. The setting up of thousands of poorly qualified training schools which bid for veteran enrollments and derive exorbitant profits from tuition fees paid by the Government.

2. The enrollment of veterans for the primary purposes of income from the Government.

3. The enrollment of veterans who are temporarily unemployed or on strike.

4. The wholesale changing of courses by veterans (1,117,000 individual veterans had changed courses up to July 1949, thousands of them as many as 3 or 4 times).

5. The enrollment of veterans in courses wholly unrelated to their present or intended means of livelihood.

It is clear that the terrific waste incurred in this program stems not from faulty administration so much as from very bad laws. Responsibility for plugging up the bulk of this waste obviously rests with Congress.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

The President's 1951 budget sets aside $4,700,000,000 for foreign aid and other international finance programs. Of this amount

$3,300,000,000 is for ECA and $645,000,000 is for the military assistance pact entered into last year. None of these programs is a "sacred cow" insofar as the power of Congress to reduce or modify appropriations is concerned.

One of the serious questions which a Member of Congress must ask himself in voting foreign aid funds is whether he is serving the best interests of a friendly foreign nation by approving sums which throw our own budget out of balance, thus weakening the economy of the Nation on which the free world depends for aid. May we not be serving that neighbor better when we provide him fewer dollars but keep the source of those dollars solvent and sound?

IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

The plain truth is that Congress has all the power it needs to reduce Federal spending sufficiently to balance the 1951 budget.

It is Congress which appropriates funds for the executive branch to spend. It is Congress which legislates new spending programs. It is Congress—not the executive branch—which has the power to modify and repeal all such spending legislation.

The executive branch cannot spend what Congress does not appropriate. The executive branch cannot initiate spending activities which Congress does not authorize.

It is, therefore, the height of effrontery for any Member of Congress to characterize as arrant nonsense proposals that the budget be balanced through spending reduction.

The Government would quickly descend upon any taxpayer who might say, "I can't—or won't—balance my household budget. Therefore I can't pay my Federal income tax this year."

That is what the President and Congress tell us when they say, in effect, "We want to spend $5,000,000,000 in excess of our expected income next year. So if you don't mind, we'll put it on the cuff."

ALVIN A. BURGER,
Research Director, Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

Taxes! Taxes! Taxes!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I include for the RECORD an article on taxes written by Mr. Edward F. Hutton in the Palm Beach (Fla.) Daily News of February 23, 1950. The fundamental truths he stresses and the simplicity of his presentation should invite the attention and consideration of all of the Members of this House.

Mr. Hutton's article follows:

TAXES! TAXES! TAXES!—WHO LIKES THEM?
(By Edward F. Hutton)

They are not liked because the take is too big.

Everyone should know, including Government that the dollars which are withdrawn from industry are taxes for big Government and the tax dollars are lost to production.

Government produces no wealth and that is the only source which can yield taxes. The more money we, the people, have left, after taxes, goes into productivity as venture capital risk, which creates and increases jobs.

The correct doctrine was that taxation should be held down as low as possible consistent with: "provide for the common defense"; "maintain law and order"; "insure domestic tranquility"; "provide public service"; after which the more money which was left in the hands of we, the people, could be applied to fertilize the growth of new endeavors to create jobs.

But the climate has changed. The redistribution of wealth does not take the crude form of sharing the dollars and wealth, but, in effect, by taking from the people too much of that which they earn by their labor. This is being done by subsidies and so-called free service.

The method of confiscatory taxation obviously destroys the incentive to earn anything more than a modest income. Authorities must know how powerful the present income tax operates to restrict effort.

Human nature is what it is. So who is going to strive by hard work to double his income, only to incur heavier taxes?

Why exercise one's talents?

PENALTY ON SUCCESS

Why try to climb the ladder of success, if no rewards are to be granted?

Why penalize success?

Why penalize human ambitions?

Why destroy character and courage and initiative?

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. When that is accomplished, government becomes the wage payer. Ponder this:

What will then be the worker's hours of labor—will your pay check be more or less? How much more will be deducted from the pay envelope? And what about your life-insurance policies?

The growth of business should not be slowed down because of size. When that happens, Government stops prosperity by man-made laws. But the wheel has turned, and taxation is regarded by some as a prime instrument in achieving a socialized change in our form of government.

The ambition to attain by hard work the legitimate rewards of success is one of the most powerful motives which goes to the preservation of family life. If man be realistic, high principled, and earnest in his belief that the preservation of human dignity is a manifestation of God on earth, then government must admit also that it is possible only where all people have freedom. The Government should preserve such freedom.

THREAT TO GOVERNMENT

Government cannot continue to be strong by destroying the people's initiative and independence. The history of every business is literally a pattern of the human ambitions of all living under liberty. We are not a perfect people. Our profit-and-loss and competitive system is not perfect. Unionism is not perfect. The bar association, the church, the Government, the academy of medicine are not perfect. Nothing is, nor ever will be perfect 20,000 years hence. But the profit-and-loss and competitive system is better than any other system on God's green earth.

Show us where on the face of this earth has there been a country or form of government by which socialism, collectivism, or any other ism has given us more comforts, luxuries, and happiness than the American system?

Show us, not by arguments, dreams, blueprints, or imaginary figures, but with facts.

Show us, where is, or was, that other country that gave as much to its people as America has always given to us.

Show us; give us concrete evidence. Prove it by example. Prove that any other system is better than ours—prove that the system, founded on our Constitution and Bill of Rights gives less life, less liberty, less opportunity, and less freedom than any other system.

Show us whether the dictates of a socialized state are more important than constitutional liberty and freedom.

There are many people in this country, in and out of Government today, who are attempting to change the entire concept of liberty in America by socialistic legislation, which is the next step to communism.

There is no better way of life on the face of this earth than that which we have. To most people, America is a foretaste of heaven. We still have a system that works best for the greatest good of the people.

It is time all foreign isms be exposed for exactly what they are, and what they will do to the people, and not for the people. It was the individual know-how—individual planning and financing in free markets, regulated, but not controlled, which made America the leading industrial power. Bureaucracy—political management—by governmental direction, should not invade the fields of competitive enterprise and compete with business, which they are now doing with the taxpayers' money. Governments never have produced, nor can they produce wealth. That is not their function or duty. They should police the laws, but not control the functions of business. The only money Government has, or can get, is through taxing the people, and when it cannot get enough in taxes—directly—it hides them. The hidden taxes are deceptive and immoral. So these foreign isms mean the denial of the rights and capacity of the people to manage themselves and the things they own. Management should explain that to the people. Management is paid its salary by those whose moneys are at work in the business—so-called shareholders. They expect a return—a so-called dividend—for the use of their moneys. The expectation is a reasonable assumption. There is nothing morally or ethically wrong about that. When you destroy the incentive for a return on invested money, you destroy productivity, which is made possible by venture capital risk. It is like taking feed away from the cow, and still expecting milk.

The reverse is, Government takes the money from the people to compete against business activities without the know-how to return some rent—interest—for the taxpayers' money.

In other words, governmental take of the moneys the people earn, by confiscatory taxation, means the complete denial of the rights and capacity of the people to manage themselves and the things they own; and if these conditions continue, it means America will become a fourth-rate nation because productivity by the people, and for the people, will cease to create capital venture risk, which provides employment and increases jobs.

God created man for His purpose, to be free, and to be of service to his fellow man; not to any state.

Socialism is the "system of society in which individual ownership would be abolished and all capital and means of production would become the property of the state." And that is not God's purpose.

The present trends toward Government authority and less individual responsibility are more vicious precisely because they are hidden revolutionary acts, and hence imperceptible to the average citizen. The greater the number who profit from governmental benevolence, the lesser the public vigilance and the greater the public complacency. These are the erosive processes that wear down the rock of liberty, and then suddenly the rock is not there any more. In its place is the quicksand—political "authority," and that soon hardens into concrete bands—"the ball and chain." Always remember, power, once usurped, is never

voluntarily surrendered. Real power rests in the hands of the people, if they will only use it; and so our countries are in a race between education and catastrophe. We cannot expect the people to defend that which they do not understand. The people of our country can do anything if they are only told why, but they must be told; otherwise they will accept some foreign ism. A person's judgment is no better than his information. Business should expose these trends.

By continuous wasteful Government spending—so-called deficit financing—and increasing bureaucracy, the Nation's business is being taxed into weakness. These man-made trends, unless checked and reversed, will make business subject to political dictation.

The strength of our Government is the productivity of the people. When these foreign isms provide man's security by doing for him that which he could, and should, do for himself, it assails his best work, and destroys human ambitions. We would become a Nation subject to governmental dictation. That ends liberty—period.

Wildlife and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the State of South Dakota has long been known as a splendid area in which to hunt game, notably the Chinese ringnecked pheasant, deer and elk, grouse and ducks. However, the people and their governmental representatives are also conscious of the need for conservation and restoration.

In that connection I wish to include here a statement from the office of the Honorable George T. Mickelson, Governor of South Dakota:

Governor Mickelson today proclaimed the week of March 19–25 as Wildlife Restoration Week in South Dakota. The Governor said the week was being sponsored nationally by the National Wildlife Federation.

Governor Mickelson said the purpose of the observance is to focus attention of South Dakota people on the urgent need for wildlife conservation and its importance upon their daily life.

State, county, and local groups were urged to hold meetings, at which time public discussions might be held with regard to better management of the State's natural resources, including water, soil, trees and all other plants, as well as animal life.

No Longer the Watchdog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Capital Journal of Salem, Oreg., on the recent action of the Armed Services Committee in the Denfeld-Matthews controversy:

NO LONGER THE WATCHDOG

A slap on the wrist is all that Secretary of Defense Johnson and Navy Secretary Matthews got for firing Admiral Denfeld last fall.

The House Armed Services Committee did no more than describe Denfeld's removal as Chief of Naval Operations as a reprisal for his frank and honest criticism. A minority group on the House committee wanted to go further. The minority urged the Attorney General to consider charges against Secretary Matthews. Such charges would be brought under a 1948 law which forbids the influencing or intimidating of congressional witnesses.

As will be recalled, Denfeld testified at the request of the committee on how unification of the armed forces was working. He was told to be frank. His views would be protected by the committee. So Denfeld told his version of how the Navy was being submerged to the detriment of the Nation. Johnson and Matthews retaliated by dumping him, an officer to whom they already had offered a new tour of duty as Chief of Naval Operations.

Johnson was praised in some quarters for preserving civilian control of the military. But that was not the point at issue in this case. It was a matter of the top naval officer being questioned by Congress as to the condition of the branch of the service he commanded. Because bull-headed Johnson didn't like the testimony, he gave Denfeld the boot.

The House Armed Services Committee didn't have the nerve to tell Johnson to stay in his own bailiwick and not overshadow the legislative branch of the Government. From now on out, Johnson will know he can get away with his control of the military—and congressional committee.

The House committee is no longer the watchdog of the country on the armed services. It is Johnson's obedient pet, waiting in fear of what its master, the Defense Secretary, will think of it. The protection it promised Denfeld amounted to no protection at all.

The Little Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANK WILSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 7, 1950:

THE LITTLE FELLOWS

This country's long-suffering patience with strikes is rooted in our natural sympathy for the little fellow in any argument. We would all like to see little Elon College lick Notre Dame, story-book fashion. The striker shines as the little fellow and the company is the massive mastodon.

It seems to this newspaper that it is time we reexamined the question, Who is the little fellow? Who is striking against whom?

We presently have a case in which several hundred thousand coal miners have struck against a handful of coal companies, a clear case, it would seem, of the interests of the many against the interests of the few. The other little fellows involved are forgotten.

There is first of all the little fellow who heats his home with coal. A prolonged strike means real hardship for him, and if the coal miners by their concerted action win their will, it means this little fellow will pay more for every lump of coal. Further, the price of coal affects in one way or another—through higher shipping and manufacturing costs—the price of nearly everything this little fellow buys with his wages. The price of all these things too will go up, and all the little fellows will pay.

We also have presently threatened a strike in the telephone industry. In this case, about 100,000 installers and repairmen plan to walk out. The telephone company is one of the largest companies we have; this would seem a perfect example of the little men battling the Goliath. Perhaps; but whom else are they striking against?

There is again the little fellow who uses the product, and in this instance it includes just about everybody in the country. A really successful telephone strike would create an unimaginable chaos and, if won, the winnings would be paid for by everybody who uses the telephone.

But disregarding that, what of the malefactors of great wealth who own this "octopus," this telephone company? Why should we waste any sympathy on them?

Well, if that is a true picture we must have an awful lot of malefactors. Some 940,000 people jointly own the telephone company, most of whom are little people with little savings. More than one-third of the owners have less than five shares. And, curiously, among the owners are 175,000 employees of the company. Now whom are the employees striking against?

None of this is an argument against higher wages for coal miners or telephone workers. Considering the value received from a telephone and from a ton of coal it could be that the producers of these things are worthy of greater hire, that is, that all of us should pay more for their products. What we are here urging is simply more thought about the nature of these strikes.

The unions that have monopolies over whole industries are the new Goliaths. They can coerce the little fellows in their own membership—what man, however badly he wants to work, dare defy a picket line? They can coerce the rest of us—where will you get coal, or steel, or phone service, if the unions say you shan't? You have become the little fellow.

Developing an honest and fair labor policy is never going to be an easy task, but we shall not even approach it until we realize that in all these strikes there is another little fellow who has been almost forgotten.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Alaska statehood debate in this House last week which revolved partly around the proposition of population, I desire to submit a letter written by Mr. Paul H. Whitney, of Flushing, N. Y., which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for March 7:

ALASKA STATEHOOD—OTHER TERRITORIES ADMITTED WITH LESS POPULATION

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The specious reasoning of several of our Congressmen in their attack on the Alaska

statehood bill should be questioned. They cry with alarm that the two Senators from Alaska, representing only 100,000 population, could nullify the votes of Senators from the more densely populated States. Exactly! It was for this express purpose that the founding fathers, after months, even years, of bitter quarreling, finally agreed that there should be equal representation in the upper House of the Congress.

It was a bitter pill that Virginia (population 747,610) swallowed when she at last agreed to stand on a parity in the Senate with Delaware (population 59,096). Pennsylvania was not happy that her 434,373 citizens might be voted down by Rhode Island's 68,825. North Carolina, with a population greater than the State of New York when the Nation was formed, recognized sparsely settled Vermont as her equal in the Senate. That fight was fought and decided more than 160 years ago, but the gentlemen from California, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan appear to have forgotten their history lesson.

No precedent is being established in giving Alaska two Senators as Representative LEROY JOHNSON, of California, should know, for his State had only 92,597 population when admitted to the Union. Representative EDGAR A. JONAS should be reminded that Illinois could count only 12,282 heads when she was admitted. For the benefit of Representative ALBERT J. ENGLE, of Michigan, let it be recorded that his State had the smallest population of any that has ever been taken into the United States—a scant 4,762 according to the official Federal census. Yet that little colony of Wolverines could have nullified the votes of the Senators from Virginia or New York, either of which had a population of close to a million. Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, stands on very firm ground in fighting Alaska's plea for statehood because his State had a population of 130,945 when it first sent two Senators to Washington. Of course, he wouldn't remember that at that time New York had a population of 2,500,000.

Not counting any of the first 13 States, there have been 21 States admitted to the Union at a time when they had a population considerably less than Alaska has now.

If Alaska is to be kept out of the Union because she has only 100,000 citizens, then, by the same strange reasoning Nevada, Delaware, Vermont, and Wyoming should be evicted. Any State having fewer citizens than the "big five" should have a Senator taken away from them and any having less population than the 10 next most populous States shouldn't be allowed to have a Senator at all. How much fairer it would be to deprive of all representation in Congress such States as elect to Congress men who reason as do the Messrs. JOHNSON, JONAS, ENGLE, and KEEFE.

PAUL H. WHITNEY.

FLUSHING, N. Y., *March 3, 1950.*

Fertilizing Influence Fast Becoming a Serious Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on October 10, 1949, I drew the attention of the Congress to the fact that eight Members of the United States Senate had protested against the monopolistic practices of the fertilizer industry, and had asked for an investigation; and that the distinguished Representative from Wisconsin, the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, and the distinguished Representative from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, had each offered resolutions requesting the appointment of a special committee to make a full and complete investigation of the fertilizer industry, and to find the facts in connection with the statements recently made by competent judges that present methods of fertilizer manufacture are not only responsible for unnecessarily increasing the amount of the farmer's national fertilizer bill $250,000,000, but are also the cause of the extensive spread of destructive plant diseases, and of the increased incidence of vascular diseases and degenerative diseases.

There are serious matters, Mr. Speaker, but the most serious phase of this matter is the fact that Federal court records show that a large number of fertilizer companies were indicted and fined for having exerted an illegal influence on State lawmakers, and that while this influence was being exerted, the State laws were so amended as to allow the manufacturers to lower the quality of fertilizer by using excessive proportions of the cheap, soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done.

A letter dated February 25, 1950, written by Mr. William G. Holman, a well-known citizen of Virginia, to Mr. Osborne B. Bond, publisher of Liberty magazine, Chicago, Ill., contains some statements far more shocking and serious in their implications than any that have heretofore been brought to the attention of the Congress in connection with this matter. I ask that Mr. Holman's letter be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to inquire into the charges of collusion, and to take such steps as are necessary to free the fertilizer industry from monopolistic control which is proving to be a detriment to the health and welfare of the people, and obviously a detriment to the morals of public officials. To do otherwise would sound the death knell to popular government in this country, and all of us know that popular government throughout the world was never in greater peril than it is today.

The letter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1950.*

Mr. OSBORNE B. BOND,
Publisher, Liberty Magazine,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. BOND: I have just read a letter you wrote to a Congressman, in which you asked the question: "Isn't it time that something be done to keep America together?" and then that: "As a Nation we're spending billions to impress other peoples with the importance of free enterprise and what we know as the American way of life, but how about our own people at home?"

Yes, how about our own people at home, and how about the importance of, and necessity for, something that you and I know deep down in our hearts we don't have today—free enterprise?

If we really had free enterprise, would it be possible for "one-eighth of 1 percent of all the corporations in America to acquire 51 percent of the Nation's assets," and would it have been possible for 3 percent of the farmers in America to own 41 percent of the farm land?

If we really believed in free enterprise would we shrug away and do nothing about the criminal exploitation of the farmers by the Fertilizer Trust, and fertilizer practices that endanger the health of the people?

Would we condone the leasing of public lands to a few corporations on which are found the principal potash deposits in this country which enabled these corporations to obtain a monopolistic control of such an essential fertilizer ingredient as potash and to use this control to the harm and injury of the farmers?

Would we meekly submit to the encouragement given to a few fertilizer manufacturers though an Act of Congress (Webb-Pomerene Act) to acquire a monopolistic control of such essential fertilizer ingredients as phosphate rock and acid phosphate, and to the use of this control to force the smaller manufacturers to lower the quality of fertilizers, and thus impose upon the farmers and endanger the health of the people?

If we knew that collusion existed between the fertilizer industry and the Bureau of Plant Industry, and that gifts of money to this agency of the Federal Government by the fertilizer industry had blinded the eyes of these Government officials to fertilizer practices that were harmful to the health and welfare of the people, and we shrugged away the shocking implications of such a situation, wouldn't that amount to an admission that monopoly was in the saddle and free enterprise was a thing of the past? If you want the facts, open the columns of your publication to your humble servant and I will present the unvarnished facts.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. HOLMAN.

Promotion of Veterans of World War II in Field Service of Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to reaffirm my support of H. R. 87. I was one of the original supporters of this necessary remedial legislation. My testimony is included in the hearings and this statement is reprinted in the August issue of the Union Postal Clerk.

It is regrettable that a number of amendments are to be offered which will have the effect of killing the bill. This bill as modified by the substitute should be approved and I intend to support it.

I would like to review the situation in a particular community, namely, Grand Rapids, Mich., my home town. As this committee knows, all civil-service examinations for the post office were frozen during World War II. In the period between 1941 and 1946 the Department used many temporary employees but none in this group achieved permanent status because no qualifying examinations were given.

The first examinations for post office employees were held in September 1946.

The veterans of World War II who initially entered the postal service after the late war took this examination at the first opportunity, along with those who had been temporary employees during the war. I think we can validly assume that many veterans would have become post office employees during the period between 1941 and 1945 if military service had not intervened. A number of veterans passed this examination along with a few temporary employees. Those temporaries who passed examinations and became classified employees upon appointment as regulars received an automatic increase of $400 per year. This gave them a period of only 6 years in which to reach top-grade salary. Veterans of World War II have to work 10 years to reach top-salary grade.

In my estimation, under the present law an unfair discrimination presently exists as far as World War II veterans are concerned because the former temporary employees get the benefit of a $400 increase in salary while the veteran when he becomes a regular employee does not derive the same financial benefits even though his forced absence from the postal service was no fault of his. I have no desire to penalize the temporary employee who worked diligently during the war for the Post Office Department, but I certainly think we should give the veteran credit for his war service once he enters the postal service as a permanent career employee.

A failure to remedy this situation will be harmful to employee morale. This is best illustrated by a specific example. Rather than use names, I will refer to employee A, a veteran who took and passed a civil-service examination given in September 1946. A was appointed January 1, 1947, as a regular because of his high rating on the examination. Employee B, a nonveteran, took the same examination but he had been hired on May 1, 1945. B did not get his regular appointment after the September 1946 examination until April 1, 1948.

What is the situation today? B is now making $3,350 per year while A earns only $2,750 annually. There is this differential even though A has 15 months additional seniority as a regular or permanent employee. Furthermore A has been graded "outstanding" while B has only a "satisfactory" rating. Both these men do the same job, they work side by side. Employee B, the nonveteran, now earns approximately $11.54 more each week than his veteran coworker, despite A's better qualifications, both on the examination and on the periodic grading system. This is only one of many such cases but it well illustrates the inequities which must be rectified.

For the committee's examination I include a table showing the precise situation in the Grand Rapids post office. It will be seen that the veterans of World War II, who make up a substantial portion of the postal employees, are being penalized and the morale of the entire service will unquestionably suffer if this legislation is not approved.

In closing, let me emphasize the need for this legislation. Veterans of World War I have received credit for time spent in military service, even those who were not employed in the postal service prior to their entry into the armed forces. Veterans of World War II who worked for the Post Office Department previous to entry into the armed service in the last war have received credit for their military service under present pay schedules.

I therefore strongly recommend favorable consideration of H. R. 87 by this committee in order that richly deserved benefits will accrue to those veterans who direly need financial assistance at this time and in the years to come.

Classification	Regulars	Classified substitutes	Total of both	Number who are veterans of World War II	Number of World War II veterans who are eligible for Vursell Act benefits
Supervisors	37	0	37	3	0
Clerks	182	31	213	107	73
Carriers	205	35	240	118	81
Mail handlers	12	2	14	7	7
Motor-vehicle service	30	5	35	5	3
Special delivery	9	2	11	3	2
Custodial	19	[1] 1	20	3	2
Rural carriers	5	[2] 0	5	2	1
Total	499	76	575	248	169

[1] Charwoman.
[2] Substitutes for rural carriers are not carried either as regular or classified employees.

Summary

Total employees—Regular and classified substitutes	575
Total World War II veterans	248
Total World War II veterans who would be eligible for Vursell Act benefits	169

British Import Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill designed to help prevent discrimination against American-owned and controlled companies in foreign commerce. Particularly, it is designed to bring Presidential powers under the customs laws of the United States up to date and to provide against new types of discrimination which are threatening to grow up in postwar practices in world trade.

The British Government has recently placed severe limitations on the amount of petroleum products that can be shipped into the United Kingdom by American-controlled companies.

This loss of more than 150,000 barrels of our foreign market a day is complicating and making more severe the problem domestic oil producers are having with importations of off-shore oil. The flood of imported oil is increasing to such proportions that it is endangering the stability of our domestic market. The British ban against oil from American-controlled companies, applying both to foreign and domestic production, is certain to make more difficult this problem of imports.

These severe limitations are not applied to conserve the Empire's dollar reserves, nor to protect local oil production in the Dominions. They apply against all oil coming from what the British have defined as "American-controlled companies." This definition provides that such companies which are substantially owned, directly or indirectly, by American citizens, regardless of the laws under which such companies might be incorporated are under the ban.

Thus, any such company, even if incorporated under the British flag and complying with all British laws—and even if offering their oil on exactly the same terms and for exactly the same currency as British, they are off-limits and are subjected to these severe limitations for importation into the United Kingdom.

As a result, a British-controlled company, incorporated under the British flag, may ship oil from its Middle East wells and refineries into Britain and sell it for sterling, without restriction. An American-controlled company, incorporated under American, British, or third country flag, offering oil produced or refined in the identical Middle East area, and willing to accept the identical sterling in payment, is subject to the ban.

American investments are thus clearly discriminated against by this British action in an unreasonable manner. Our State Department regards this British action as discriminatory and has so advised the British Government. Our State Department is on record that the proposed discriminatory action is not reasonably necessary to solve any current British currency shortage and that corrective measures should be taken.

Present discussions, looking toward a modification of the British action are now under way between our Government and the British Government, and directly between the oil companies concerned and the British Treasury. While everyone hopes that these discussions will result in a withdrawal of this discrimination it is likely under present circumstances that they will fail.

One important reason why the current negotiations may fail is that our Government lacks the power under present law to take effective action if the British refuse to modify their position of discrimination against American-controlled companies.

Under present law, the President may, if he finds a foreign country is discriminating against American commerce, act in three ways:

First. He may impose additional United States customs duties on the products of such country; or

Second. Withdraw tariff concessions previously granted to such country under a reciprocal-trade agreement; or

Third. Where the President finds a foreign country has placed any burden upon the commerce of the United States by discriminatory regulations, conditions, restrictions, or prohibitions the President can offset this burden by imposing additional rates of duty, not to

exceed 50 percent ad valorem on any products of the foreign country.

The British Government knows that these present methods of combating discrimination do not fit the newer designs of trade barriers.

Most of us are familiar with the now famous Nairobi letter of December 17, 1949, in which the British Government's Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs advised his subordinates of the new discriminations imposed by the British Government on American controlled companies, and stated that the Americans have, as expected, not gone beyond expressing regret at the action taken.

The only effective way of meeting discrimination against American investments is by treatment in kind. Our customs laws have embodied this principle for many years. The methods outlined above were designed to correct examples that had previously occurred but do not cover today's commodity wide discriminations against American-controlled companies.

They do not clearly authorize the President to retaliate in kind against the new types of discrimination that have been devised in recent years, such as the recent British ban on oil imports from American-controlled companies.

The bill I introduced today adds a new subsection to the tariff code. It authorizes the President to retaliate in kind against any foreign discriminatory action effecting American commerce. If the President should find, for example, that the British Government has placed improper restrictions upon imports by American-controlled companies into the United Kingdom, to retaliate by placing equivalent restrictions upon imports by British-controlled companies into the United States.

It is my earnest hope that the power granted by my proposed amendment would never have to be used. I am in full accord with the administration's policy of tearing down trade barriers and removing as many restrictions as possible to encourage multilateral world trade.

Unfortunately, unrestricted world trade is going to be difficult to achieve so long as foreign nations are free to discriminate against American commerce without fear of any retaliation of any kind. My bill would serve merely as a notice to the world that any foreign nation which hits American commerce below the belt can expect to be hit back. In my opinion, the mere existence of such a law on our statute books will discourage discriminatory measures abroad and make its use unnecessary.

CO's Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 7, 1950:

CO's GESTURE

Although the United States has prided itself that it respected liberty of conscience even during wartime, the House has cheapened the value of the work done by conscientious objectors. The relatively small number of men conscripted for "work of national importance" as an alternative to military service received no Government compensation or family allowances, and when they were hired out to private employers most of their wages was paid into a frozen fund held by the Treasury. Now the House has turned down the Judd bill which embodies a request of the CO's themselves that the money be given to CARE to provide scientific and professional publications for depleted libraries abroad.

The hunger for additional technical reading matter is most apparent in countries such as Germany, where the war interrupted normal contacts with the outside, and in the new independent states, such as India. The furnishing of such material under the auspices of CARE would have complemented existing programs and would have been one of the best ways of promoting friendship and understanding. Perhaps the poorest of all excuses for the House action is the one that seemingly received most attention—that the Treasury cannot afford the expenditure. The $1,300,000 involved is not Government money; it is money legally earned by the CO's themselves, who have renounced all claims to it. There could be no better use for it. One may suspect that the real explanation for the defeat was a hidden effort further to punish the conscientious objectors and to kill their gesture.

Speak Up for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio speech I made to the constituents of my district:

Friends of the radio audience, this is your Congressman, WILLIAM S. HILL, speaking to you from Washington, D. C. Today I wish to speak on world peace.

If we are to continue at peace with the world, the people of the United States must speak up. Either we redouble our efforts for maintaining the peace we won at such a horrible price in lives, blood and treasure, or we continue a headlong plunge into world war III.

Dangers of the peace are increasing. The tip of the scale one way or the other, might touch off another war—a war more terrible and destructive than the last. It could be the war to end all wars. It could wipe out our civilization. The very thought is horrifying. Our finite minds are incapable of visualizing the consequences of an A-bomb or an H-bomb dropped on this country.

But the purpose of this warning isn't to scare you out of your wits. It is to awaken you to the idea that now is the time to speak up. Those of us who want peace must be heard. Our voices must ring out with an appealing force to halt the mad dash for superbombs and superduper death-dealing weapons of mass destruction.

Part of the guilt for the armament race is on our consciences. President Truman authorized the dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan. The late President Roosevelt initiated the scientific experiments and provided the finances for construction of the A-bomb during World War II. Now the President has given the green light for the building of the hydrogen bomb. We are out in front in the rearmament race, but it isn't, to my way of thinking, a thing to be proud of. We should be in the forefront of those in the world who want to maintain peace. Our leadership should be for moral and spiritual rearmament rather than military force.

In the world court of opinion, we have left our sincerity and high purposes open to question? The hopes and aspirations of the people, who overwhelmingly desire peace, must be brought out into the light for the world to see. Our diplomatic maneuvers and our military activities have cast a false reflection on the basic motives of this Nation. We are a peace-loving Nation; the majority of our people are most anxious and eager to spread to the four corners of the earth their expression of good will. But somehow this opinion becomes distorted and twisted by the actions of our political and military leaders.

It is time for a constructive call of the great political powers of the world to settle the problems of the cold war. Our leaders have attempted to assuage our conscience by rationalizing the use of the A-bomb and the H-bomb. Perhaps, they are entirely right in their assumptions. But, we should, with equal vigor and honesty to ourselves encourage a policy of world disarmament. All of our efforts politically, economically and otherwise have the single objective of stopping the Red tide of atheistic communism from engulfing the world. Russia is our enemy, now; in the war she was our ally. What caused Russia to change her attitude toward us? Admiral Leahy, who was President Roosevelt's adviser at the Big Five conferences, until the late President's death, attributed the difficulty last week in an article, as arising out of differences between Stalin and Roosevelt. But it was 5 years later before the people were advised of these conditions through Admiral Leahy's magazine disclosure. Why weren't we informed long ago?

Former Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain has thrown another light on American entry into World War II as a result of Pearl Harbor, in his current writings in Life magazine and the New York Times. He established the fact that for a year and a half before Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, he had pressed President Roosevelt to come into the war on Great Britain's side. At the Atlantic conference in August 1941, he said he informed Roosevelt's party and I quote—"that I would rather have an American declaration of war now and no supplies for 6 months than double the supplies and no declaration."

Churchill said that he related this incident to General Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, stating—and I quote again—"We must not underrate his (Roosevelt's) constitutional difficulties. He may take action as Chief Executive, but only Congress can declare war. He went so far as to say to me—this is Roosevelt speaking—'I may never declare war; I may make war. If I were to ask Congress to declare war they might argue about it for 3 months.'"

It will be remembered that the attack on the fleet at Hawaii was presented to the American people, who knew nothing at the time of our American economic sanctions, our unyielding diplomacy with Japan, and our other secret maneuvering, came as a shocking surprise—an act of treachery on—and I quote President Roosevelt—"a date which will live in infamy."

Churchill had this to say with reference to Pearl Harbor. And I quote him again: "I do not intend in these pages to attempt to pronounce judgment upon this tremendous episode in American history. We know that all of the great Americans round the President and in his confidence felt, as acutely as I did, the awful danger that Japan would attack British or Dutch possessions in the Far East and would carefully avoid the United States, and that in consequence Congress would not sanction an American declaration of war.

Quoting Churchill further, he said: "Roosevelt, Hull, Stimson, Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and, as a link between them all, Harry Hopkins had but one mind. A Japanese attack upon the United States was a vast simplification of their problems and their duty. How can we wonder that they regarded the actual form of the attack, or even its scale, as incomparably less important than the fact that the whole American Nation would be united for its own safety. Moreover, they knew, earlier than we in Britain could know, the full and immediate purpose of their enemy."

The armed power of the world is again divided into two camps. Is there a war party in this Nation, as there is in the Kremlin? Communist dictatorship is not only designed for a surprise attack with all the arms it has, but the Kremlin can violate any agreement it signs to gain advantage and abrogate at will the agreements it makes.

But our free people have greater productive and moral powers. We can unite our strength, unless it is undermined and weakened by secret action of our political leaders.

We must make our stand for peace through the United Nations. We must declare our intentions and desires. We have no assurance from available public reports that Russia would cooperate in an effort at disarmament in the strengthening of the objectives of peace, but that should not stand in our way. We should look into every avenue for a way to lasting peace. If our sincerity is clear, our reasons and examples steadfast, then before the eyes of the world we have made our case.

WE CAN DO NO LESS

Are we going to let someone push us into world war III? Is fear of the A-bomb or H-bomb going to deter us from striving for what we know is right, and what the peoples of the world all believe in—peace? Regardless of the actions of their leaders—and this includes Russia, too—I believe that all peoples of the world want peace. But they must speak up; they must be heard before powerful influences get us so involved in political and economic circumstances that resulting action winds up in war.

At present the United Nations is the only world organization in operation. Through it let us urge the representaives of the United States to work for peace. The adoption of certain measures would augment the efforts of the people in presenting our case to the peoples of the world. In the past Russia has overshadowed the rest of the nations participating in the UN and have effectively used it as a propaganda agency. If necessary, let the United States assume the Christian responsibility for guiding the UN into discussions of big-power politics in controlling the A- and H-bombs; renewing the forces of religious and spiritual leadership toward a new birth of moral indignation into the depravity of a superarmament program. Men must learn to live together. War is not the economic savior of broken and decadent political philosophies. This fact must be impressed on those who seek to fasten its chains upon the people.

Unless there is a quick turn in the course of events, the intensity of the cold war will surely increase. It is time for us to unite and demand that every effort be exhausted to maintain the peace. The hour is late.

The expenditure of huge sums for defense weapons or for the purpose of winning friends abroad is not the answer. The answer will come from the deep-rooted desire of all peoples to live together in friendship. Exploitation by political leaders for momentary advantage will not assure a period of international tranquillity. But the earnestness and sincerity of the good peoples of the earth can bring about what selfishness, greed, and political chicanery cannot achieve. Until we have placed this country in the position of exhausting every possibility of peace so that our sincerity and honesty stand crystal clear before the rest of the world, let us not resign ourselves to the cynical attitude that the only solution to our problem is to arm ourselves to the teeth and develop an arms race which in the end can only mean the ultimate destruction of our civilization.

Repealing the Taxes on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the approval of this conference report will write the final chapter in the long controversy between the small dairy farmers of America and the oleomargarine monopoly. A clever and highly financed oleomargarine lobby has done a good job of propagandizing the country. Some 28 oleomargarine manufacturers are now completely in the saddle and the liquidation of many small dairy herds will begin. The dairy farmers will most certainly lose their market if oleomargarine takes over the major portion of the demand for a spread. Some say that cannot happen here, but the fact remains that during the past several years per capita butter consumption has gone down and oleomargarine consumption has gradually been on the increase. The natural result will be that many of the 2½ million dairy farmers will eventually be forced out of business. Now for the first time the oleomargarine interests will be permitted to appropriate unto themselves the historical butter color of golden yellow. This can only mean the perpetration of great frauds upon the consumers of this country, in spite of the so-called protective provisions in the bill. The conference report should be rejected.

Who Won?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis Times of March 5, 1950:

WHO WON?

The coal strike that wasn't a strike is over.

The miners who wouldn't go back to work when John Lewis told them to, went back to work when John Lewis told them to.

The bitter battle that disrupted the whole industry for 8 months has ended—for a year.

Who won?

Not the coal miners.

Their pay goes up 70 cents a day. At that rate it will take 1,714 working days for a miner to get back what he lost in wages in the strike. In just a few days less than 7 years the man who never misses a day's work in the mines may break even on this pay raise. The contract is actually for 1 year, but might be stretched to 2 years.

Who won?

Not the folks on mine pensions and welfare.

The welfare royalty goes up 10 cents a ton, to a total of 30 cents. At the old rate it took three whole years to collect enough money to pay pensions and welfare for 14 months. At the new rate all the royalties collected over the next 3 years might possibly be enough to pay pensions and welfare for 18 months. And the spending of the fund is placed again in the same hands that recklessly squandered it before.

Who won?

Not the mine owners.

Their losses in the past 8 months of hit-or-miss operation already have been staggering. But they have barely begun. Millions of homes, thousands of industries have quit using coal because of this very battle. Every oil furnace that's gone into a home means at least 1 day's work a year a coal miner won't have. A good many thousands of coal miners have struck themselves permanently out of a job. There won't, in their lifetimes, again be work in the coal mines for all the men who were working there when this strike began. A big chunk of the market for coal is gone forever.

Who won?

Not the people who use coal.

They'll pay every dime of the increased wages and the increased pension royalties, added right on the price of every ton of coal they buy.

Who won?

Not the workers in other industries.

The thousands laid off from their jobs because there was no coal haven't even a pay increase to get them back part of the wages they lost in a dispute they weren't in. They do, though, have a higher cost in the factories where they work, which will make it harder for them to get pay increases themselves, in future.

Who won?

Not the general public, which suffered in the cold.

Not the school children, whose education was halted.

Not the Government of the United States, which was too weak to act when the crisis threatened national security.

Not, surely, the six women and children who died in Indianapolis trying to keep warm with makeshift fuel as a direct result of this mine strike.

Who won?

Not even John L. Lewis.

Clearly he lost what he called the strike to get—monopoly control of the whole coal supply of the whole Nation. He didn't get it. He had to give up the willing-and-able-to-work gimmick he's been using to regulate coal output and sign a contract that is a genuine contract, as the old one was not. The gains he got were no more than unconvincing face-saving, that substantially

could have been had for the asking before the strike even began.

Then who did win the coal strike?

Nobody won it.

Everybody lost: the miners, the mine owners, the school children, the union boss, the employers, and the workers in other industries, all the people of the United States.

There must be a better way to settle such things.

In fact there is a better way.

This Nation long ago learned what to do when business monopoly threatened to get bigger than the Government of the United States.

Now, maybe, we've learned that there is no real difference between a business monopoly and a labor monopoly.

John Crown's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Howard A. Rusk, M. D., which appeared in the New York Times on March 5, 1950, entitled "John Crown's Legacy":

JOHN CROWN'S LEGACY—VETERAN LEAVES AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND A PLEA THAT LOVE SUPPLANT GREED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

(In 1946 a letter was published in this column from a young veteran in Halloran Hospital, a letter created by suffering, anguish, and bewilderment. Last week, after 4 years of struggle, the writer, John Crown, died. His legacy to the world was an example of courage and a philosophy of life which, in these troubled and uncertain days, plead even more eloquently for the necessity of understanding than the day on which his letter was written. In this era of precocious technology, hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and all the additions to the horrors of war that have caused an epidemic of anxiety and tension throughout the world, this pain-wracked boy's prescription for peace among men merits thoughtful rereading.)

My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I do no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles, Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profit, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, Junior wants more spending money. To these, I say, is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains?

Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the nation and of the world.

As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops hogging the road with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world. If man wishes peace again, he must return to the great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God."

Suppression of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., March 6, 1950:

FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

Proposals for some kind of Federal action against crime organizations are rapidly gaining adherents, both in Washington and in many cities and State capitals. A study of laws by a committee of municipal, State, and Federal officials is to be one result of a conference on crime held recently by the Federal attorney general, and the Senate Judiciary Committee has on foot an inquiry into gambling which could well produce recommendations for new Federal criminal laws.

There are many possibilities for real help by Federal authorities in the suppression of crime. At the same time there also are inherent political dangers against which careful safeguards must always be maintained. The larger a Federal police force becomes, the greater are the potential misuses of it by the unscrupulous. Every new Federal police control over citizens is a potential check on the individual's independence of action. A fine balance is needed between the safeguarding of individual rights and sufficient police power to control the underworld. The experience of some cities with crime syndicates indicates that we do not have the correct balance at the present time.

Another point which must be kept constantly in mind is that neither local responsibility nor local authority should be abdicated to Federal crime busters. It is the responsibility of local government to enforce municipal and State laws, and in the great majority of cases if this is done well and energetically even crime syndicates with powerful intercity and interstate connections will find themselves unable to operate. Local government should never welcome the intervention of higher government in dealing with local problems until after the utmost effort has been made to employ local authority against them.

Secretary Brannan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that Brannan and company are out to ruin the economy of our country in general and the economy of our farmers in particular. The following article is from the Sunday Times-Herald:

SECRETARY BRANNAN AND THE POST PLOT "SMEAR"

(By Philip Warden)

Agriculture Secretary Brannan has joined in a plot with Eugene Meyer's Washington Post, sole administration newspaper here, to smear successful Corn Belt farmers and making them the "whipping boy" for blocking congressional acceptance of the Brannan plan.

The conspiracy was exposed yesterday when copies of a letter sent by the Agriculture Department to its Extension Service agents accidentally fell into hands of newspaper reporters covering the Department.

DATA SOUGHT FROM AGENTS

The letter ordered the extension agents to send the Department at once the names and activities of the biggest farmers in their community for a Post series by reporter John Ball "to show how some farming is really big business." Ball has been Brannan's principal medium for circularizing Brannan-plan propaganda to Members of Congress regularly of late.

Big farms are ineligible for "benefits" promised in the Brannan farm price support plan. Brannan has emphasized that his plan is aimed at encouraging the break-up of big farming enterprises into family-size farms.

The material Brannan has directed the extension agents to send the Department for Ball on the biggest farmers could provide just the material he needs to make Congress believe the Brannan plan is opposed only by big business although the large farm groups have publicly expressed their opposition, congressional sources reported.

BALL LETTER SENT OUT

Brannan made an unusual exception to Department policy by using the Department's free mailing privileges to send a copy of a letter written by Ball to all the State extension agents. The wide circulation of the letter is best illustrated by Brannan's estimate this week that the extension agents contacted 6,500,000 farm families in 1949.

The Ball letter was enclosed in a packet which accompanied the weekly letter from Lester A. Schlup, chief of extension information at the Department, to State extension editors. Of the Ball letter, Schlup wrote the editors:

"John says he wants to show that farming is really big business. He is particularly interested in what the biggest farmers do that makes them successful, how well they follow the recommendations of the Department and State experiment stations, and so on."

GOVERNMENT STATIONERY USED

"John has syndicated a number of stories lately about the farm program. He hopes the stories he writes, based on tips from you, will have much wider circulation than in the Washington Post, although the Post reaches a large, important audience here."

The Ball letter, addressed to Schlup but mimeographed by the Department on Government stationery, said he wanted to get a list of the Nation's biggest farmers—either individual or corporative.

"For instance, I had in mind," Ball wrote, "the biggest corn planters in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Nebraska, and other States in the Corn Belt. Also the biggest wheat raisers in the biggest wheat States, Kansas, Nebraska, etc."

BALL OUTLINES PLAN

"I think I'd like to cover them in this order: 1. Those farming the biggest areas in each of the important States, in aggregate crops; 2. The biggest growers of cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, soybeans, potatoes (I have

the figures for Maine), citrus fruit, sheep, cattle, and hogs. Also, in certain States such as California, the largest honey growers.

"I know this is a large order. I have in mind a series on the biggest in their lines to show how some farming is really big business. Maybe I'm asking too much."

The letter was signed "John Ball."

At the end of Schlup's letter under the words "actions requested" (printed in heavy black type) was a reminder that John Ball of the Washington Post wants tips for stories on large-scale successful farming.

Brooklyn's Woman of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very proud to call attention to an article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on February 19, 1950, by Jeanne Toomey, honoring Brooklyn's "Woman of the Week," Elizabeth Goodman, general chairman of Brooklyn Week for the Blind, 523 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

BROOKLYN'S WOMAN OF THE WEEK; BLIND HAVE A REAL FRIEND AND SHE PROVES IT DAILY

(By Jeanne Toomey)

Boss of a man's business that most men would find quite technical, Elizabeth Goodman, general chairman of Brooklyn Week for the Blind, has made the plight of the sightless her own because, as she says, "I enjoy beautiful sights and love to read."

"Blindness has always struck me as a great handicap because I appreciate how much of our comfort and safety depends on good sight," Miss Goodman said the other day in her office at 523 Atlantic Avenue, where she spends 6 days a week from 9 to 6 as owner of the Safety Gas Main Stopper Co.

Since her brother, Francis, died in September 1938, she has headed the privately owned business started by her late father, Patrick, who invented the gadget manufactured by the concern.

The only survivor of seven children, Miss Goodman, who lives at 652 East Eighteenth Street, learned the details of the business early. As a child of 10 she typed her father's special letters, and has even invented new devices in connection with the product she describes as a "safety tool used to shut off gas in mains during repairs and alterations."

A blue-eyed, white-haired woman who holds her master's degree in philosophy from Columbia University, she started out with the intention of becoming a high-school teacher. She abandoned that purpose gradually and regrets it only when those long school vacations roll around.

IRELAND PREFERRED

However, she has managed to make four trips to Europe. Although she rode over the Alps in an open car, visited Venice, Rome, Monte Cassino, Scotland, England, and France, she remembers Ireland, home of her parents, as the country she most enjoyed visiting.

Each trip included a long stop-over on the Emerald Isle and she is now beginning to plan another trip there.

"It rests the spirit," she said. "It has a special atmosphere."

As an example of the friendliness of the Irish people, she recalls a stop made at a crossroads general store in Bally St. David, to ask for information about the road before her party attempted to drive over the mountain with a fog coming down.

"The owner of the store asked us in for tea because his wife had scones ready," she recalled. "He turned out to be a classical scholar who read Greek and Latin."

She particularly recommends a visit to the Blackwater in County Waterford in the south of Ireland where the dusk lasts until 10:30 at night.

A patriotic American, Miss Goodman is quick to point out that she toured her own country many times before visiting the land of her ancestors. The family came to Brooklyn from upper Manhattan and joined the parish of Our Lady of Refuge Roman Catholic Church, Ocean and Foster Avenues.

WORKED WITH MOTHER

Miss Goodman's mother, who died last August at 89, brought flowers from her garden to make into boutonnieres for the men during the first observance of the week for the blind. Mother and daughter were charter members of the board of directors of Anthonian Hall, a nonsectarian home for blind women under Catholic auspices, located at 107 Greene Avenue.

This enterprise is termed "my most beloved project" by Miss Goodman, whose workmen know the folks at the home by name since they frequently paint and do other work there. One of the workmen, Beni Lione, has been making Goodman stoppers for 42 years.

Ask Lione about the firm and he'll tell you: "I couldn't stay so long if I wasn't happy here. This is my whole life. I was 19 when I joined the firm, then located in the Bronx, and I'm 63 now."

Canvas, leather, felt, army duck, rubber, and steel are a few of the materials used in making the gas-main stoppers, which range in diameter from 3 to 48 inches.

In Miss Goodman's very feminine office are two framed certificates honoring her father for inventing the stopper. In 1904, at the Universal Exposition at St. Louis, he received a silver medal, while in 1915, at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco, he was awarded a gold medal.

VERY UNLADYLIKE

Although Miss Goodman says of her work that it is a very unladylike business, she proudly points out that it is a good, constructive, and necessary little enterprise, the oldest in its field.

Present goal of the drive for the blind, which has already opened although the special week will be in May, is $100,000. The Brooklyn Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor and the Brooklyn Bureau of Social Services are sponsoring the benefit campaign.

At their offices, at 401 State Street and 285 Schermerhorn Street, respectively, pillow cases, towels, aprons, ironing-board covers, woven floor mats, and all kinds of mops, as well as stuffed toys, and leather, and woven belts are now on sale. These articles are made by the blind and their sale insures the independence sightless persons desire.

Jewish temples and sisterhoods, Protestant churches, and Catholic parishes are all joining to make the drive a success. A total of 75,000 volunteer workers are giving their time to the project.

During the official Week for the Blind, May 9, will be Catholic Day; May 10, Protestant Day; and May 11, Jewish Day. All proceeds will be donated to the two sponsoring agencies that train and employ the blind.

Of the efforts of these agencies to make people who cannot see self-supporting, the general chairman of the drive says:

"The ability to work is very important and we feel that getting jobs for blind persons comes first so that they can earn their own money and feel that they are holding their own place in society.

"They want to feel they're contributing something for what they get."

The Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, March 7, 1950:

STEADY IS THE WORD

We have never seen a time—not even after Pearl Harbor—when American thinking was more in need of calm steadfastness. Multitudes have been jumping not merely to atomic conclusions but into an abyss of H-bomb extinction. A most potent antidote for this fever is the article by George F. Kennan in the current Reader's Digest, reprinted in this newspaper March 2.

Mr. Kennan, who has been head of the State Department's policy planning, believes any early war with Russia is unlikely. He offers reasons that deserve attention. One is the Communists' confidence in their own doctrine, which leads them to expect capitalist countries to crumble without military attack. The Soviet is having more trouble than is commonly realized in chewing up what it has bitten off since the war. Another reason is the fear that retaliation would wreak damage which could not be hidden and might upset the Kremlin regime.

Moscow might by miscalculation or in desperation resort to war, Mr. Kennan says, but so far it sees pressures and propaganda as cheaper and safer. At the same time he offers no hope of early settlement with Russia, and declares an agreement would have only the value of the power required to support it. He is convinced that the situation will improve if the United States maintains its own strength, proves its own free system, and wisely supports other peoples who show themselves ready to fight for freedom.

Americans will do these things more effectively if they can keep free alike from atomic apathy and hydrogen hysteria. Those seeking assurance that war will not break out tomorrow need not depend wholly on Mr. Kennan's reasoning. Military experts believe several weeks of preparation would be required—preparation which could not be hid from American intelligence agents. Beyond all such material factors, many persons will find assurance in the power of prayer. And in this situation multitudes are ready to trust it.

Evolution in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

a statement entitled "Evolution in Aviation," prepared for me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVOLUTION IN AVIATION

Our Government has recognized the need for a national system of airports for economic and security reasons. However, it appears that our civil aviation industry is now in a very unfavorable position to render the services upon which it may be called, in case of a national emergency, due to economic conditions forced upon it after the last war and to other conditions, which, if further aggravated, will close many of the Nation's smaller airports and bases of operations and thereby place our civil aviation industry in a chaotic struggle for survival.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has recently named a 12-man committee to study and make recommendations regarding this and many other problems facing the Government relative to the establishment of a national system of airports contemplated by the Federal Airport Act of 1946. Their report represents the consensus of opinion of the cross section of aviation leaders in both industry and Government. Every segment of the aviation industry has responded with its carefully considered opinion and the result will be found consistent in principle with the many previous studies and treatments of the subject upon which very little or no action has been taken. It is the expressed opinion of both industry and Government that now it is time for more action and less words, and it is with this sincere hope that the following recommendations are submitted for your consideration and prompt action.

The airports of the Nation are divided in classes 1 through 6 and larger. For the sake of this report, we will not consider class 4 nor larger airports, inasmuch as they are usually located in metropolitan areas which have established good general aviation policies and programs which suit the particular need and their airport is financially sound and reflecting a satisfactory operating balance sheet, with very few exceptions which can be corrected. The No. 1 problem of this system of airports is the accelerated rate of airport closures in the more average-size communities throughout the Nation, and it would seem timely to direct our efforts toward the solution of this basic problem.

The specific causes of this serious problem are many and varied. A few of the airport closures are the result of overdevelopment, poor design, and bad location; however, these will be found to be the exception rather than the rule. The main underlying cause for abandonment of airports lies in the inability of the industry to have made a satisfied aviation customer of the general public and should be broken down into the psychological and functional factors involved. It is conceded that the aviation industry is a service industry and that good, safe, economical service must be made available before it can have public confidence and acceptance. Considering that aviation is now 46 years old and that it has been accepted partially by only 5 percent of the public is sufficient reason to warrant investigation and corrective action, and, though the Government has assumed the responsibility for development of aviation, the aviation industry must cooperate more fully and place its unified and complete support with its Government if the problems are to be corrected in the near future.

The psychological factors revolve around three distinct groups of people:

1. The people comprising the aviation industry proper whose principal interest, like that of any other free enterprise in this country, is evolved around the possibilities of rendering service for financial gain.

2. The local State and Federal Government agencies who have found the need for providing the general public with airport facilities in order that it may participate in the advantages of air commerce.

3. The general public in whom must be created a desire to use aviation, having been shown its convenience, economy, and other advantages.

Intraindustry relations have been consistently weak, inasmuch as the services of aviation are made available to the general public through the medium of an airport or fixed base operator who has his operation usually located upon an airport provided for by a governmental agency and inasmuch as the airport operator is generally conceded to be the liaison man between the aviation industry and the general public, his state of mind and psychology of aviation should be the keystone of this situation. Except in a very few isolated cases the airport operator has labored under the delusion that everyone was against him—that the airport manager was against the operator, the Government was against him as well as the general public when they would not buy his products or services. This state of mind and versus philosophy of aviation has not helped the cause of aviation.

It is recognized that certain segments of civil aviation have grown and prospered to an amazing degree in comparison to others. For example, our scheduled air carriers have given the United States the finest system of transportation known to the world. Its powers were ably demonstrated in the execution of the last war and its routes of commerce now extend all over the world. Likewise, our aircraft-manufacturing industry has adapted itself to the know-how methods of mass production and is capable of designing and building any number of any type of aircraft that our country may require. These examples would indicate that our system of Government assistance in the development of aviation could and has been successful. And of these developments, the entire industry as well as the general public, can be rightfully proud. However, the airport operator has not done so well as the scheduled air carrier or manufacturer. He, of course, is not strongly organized and although 6,000 in number his voice individually is very weak in places. The airport operator most certainly would have the most to gain by discarding his versus philosophy of aviation and making a sincere effort to understand better and to cooperate with the other segments of aviation. He should furnish the initiative in improving these relationships.

It is common for the local airport operator to attribute his failure to the lack of local support in his community. This, of course, is usually traced back to his reluctance to cooperate with the administration to assist them in the problems of airport design, construction, management, or operation. The average airport operator has usually done very little to help create or improve the civic interest in the local airport; nor has he offered to cooperate in studying the local problems with the other operators in, for example, an airport-users conference in which all users of the local airport make a serious study of the cost and revenue formulas for the apportionment of the various funds applicable to the certain areas of the airport. It is generally conceded that a properly designed and properly managed airport should break even from its aviation sources of revenue and reflect a profit from the nonaviation sources of revenue. It should be the airport operator's spirit which helps establish this policy in his community, for any airport rendering a service and which is not a financial burden to the community can and should have the civic interest and pride which will afford the airport operator the local support so necessary to his existence. It must also be recognized, however, that just the mere ability to fly, build, or repair an airplane does not necessarily qualify any person to have the proper training, experience, and abilities of an aggressive businessman. However, his attitude and active interest in civic matters, particularly those pertaining to the airport, will do much to overshadow any shortcomings the operator may possess.

Public relations constitute a basic factor in practically every business operation today. The conduct of an airport operation is a business. Public relations properly conducted can and will aid the operator in an exact ratio to the time and effort expended. The average airport operator or manager grossly underestimates the importance of his position as the focal point of the aviation world in the eyes of the general public, who get their first impression of aviation from his operations. This attitude relative to public relations has been caused in part by the flight training programs, CPT and WTS, and more recently the VA program which have encouraged an influx of new airport operators into the field and has created the illusion that there was much easy money to be made quick in aviation. Inasmuch as the airport operator is in direct contact with the public and therefore the first recipient of any gains in improved relationships, he should voluntarily assume the responsibilities for passing on any unsatisfactory service or product to his customers and is therefore in the most logical position to create the greatest improvement or to be responsible for the greatest damage.

The American traveling public all want to conserve more traveltime in order to do more business, have more recreation or more fully enjoy life. An equal effort should be concentrated on both the nonflying and the flying groups of the public. The nonflying groups have as their chief reasons for not using aviation that it is too dangerous, the cost is too high, and there is a decided lack of dependability and convenience. These reasons, of course, do not apply to the air lines, but are partially justified in the personal flying category who could well afford to follow the pattern of the scheduled air carriers in minimizing this public objection to their services and at the same time proceed to diligently find and remove the cause for these criticisms.

Another objection voiced by the public is its dissatisfaction with the general appearance, attitude, and service rendered by the airport operator, whose position is quite comparable to that of the operator of the early-day automobile garage and service station when faced with the same lack of public acceptance of his product and service joined with his manufacturer, the oil companies, the local public officials and others and greatly improved not only the utility of the automobile, but the service stations, garages, roads, and every other facility upon which the public depended for convenient automotive transportation. This was accomplished in a very few short years and with the proper attitude and effort this method appears to be the most logical procedure for cleaning up the civil-aviation industry which forcefully indicates the value and possibilities of a unified civil-aviation structure.

The aviation industry of this country cannot grow and develop in a piecemeal manner. Each segment thereof depends to some extent upon the others. Not unlike the development and growth of a tree, aviation also has its system of roots, branches, trunk, leaves, fruit, etc., each of which must discharge its functional responsibilities or, in its failure, will retard the normal over-all development and growth. There is no disagreement regarding the present unhealthy condition of

the airport operator's segment of civil aviation, which if not remedied will all too soon spread like a disease and affect the remaining healthy segments of our aviation structure and, if necessary, our every means and resource should be utilized to restore this segment of aviation to a position where it will be self-sustaining and ably discharge its responsibilities to the industry as a whole.

It is recommended that—

The Civil Aeronautics Administration continue the leadership in bringing together each of the several segments of civil aviation and to effect the coordination of a national policy and program for civil aviation.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration institute a program to indoctrinate and direct their agents to more adequately serve the industry in matters relating to public relations including the press and radio programs; civic responsibility improving the spirit and activity of the airport operator; adult and public school air age educational programs; general knowledge and promotion of good airport management and operational practices; and proper sales, safety, and accounting procedures, stressing the educational instead of regulatory methods of development.

A revision of our present concepts of pilot training be instituted taking full advantage of the existing utility in the present personal aircraft, concentrating upon the practical problems involved in cross-country flying thereby reflecting better training and pilot ability. It is most desirable that the present VHF radio facilities be revised to include voice identification and all procedures should be simplified as much as possible.

The utility of the personal type airplane must be programed by gradual improvement rather than by revolution and should include a procedure for assisting the manufacturer to make practical application of the research and technical developments of aeronautical engineering; it is important to increase the operating range of the present aircraft as much as possible with the greater emphasis being placed upon the stall and landing speed end of this range; automatic navigational and landing devices must be made applicable to the personal type airplane operated by the amateur pilot; aircraft engineering and production should incorporate to the final degree every combination of methods which will make the airplane extremely easy to operate to the extent that it will fly hands off in a straight level attitude for at least 15 minutes; the present marginal rate of climb requirements should be substantially increased and spiral instability characteristics should be eliminated in the interest of safety.

A concerted industry-wide national program should be activated to accomplish the following results:

(a) Improve domestic postal service by handling of more first-class mail by air.

(b) Improve domestic transportation system by certification of additional small feeder air lines.

(c) Improve the stature of the aviation industry with general public relation program adapted to national, State, and local levels.

Centenary of Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first president of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, issued by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA

In this most critical moment of international tension over the menace of the new terrible weapons of war which is engendering deadly fear among all peace-loving peoples and threatens to involve the world in a new catastrophy, we declare for sincere exploring of all decent means and ways which might lead toward lessening of the tension and achievement of a real international understanding.

While ardently hoping and praying for peace we believe that a lasting and durable peace may be obtained only if it be based on righteousness and justice.

No matter how desirable might be achievement of some modus vivendi which might be negotiated between the western and eastern powers, it would bring about new tension, new uncertainty and would lead to another misunderstanding if it would be based on legalization of injustices and exploits of aggression in the past.

Without proper guaranties, any modus vivendi between east and west cannot be trusted to fulfill what mankind expects from it.

We believe that the first guaranty of good faith on the side of the Soviet Union should be the fulfillment of promises given the peoples behind so-called iron curtain in wartime agreements among the big powers, that they would be accorded the right to freely decide their fate for themselves.

Only free elections under the control of the United Nations offer fulfillment of those promises.

We firmly believe, with the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, as he declared in his speech on Washington Day, on February 22, in Alexandria, Va., that, in the long run world's hopes for peace do lie primarily "in the growth and expansion of freedom and self-government."

On the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of birth of Thomas G. Masaryk of Czechoslovakia, great fighter for self-determination of nations and civil liberties guaranteed by the governments, we appeal to our American Government, to the United Nations, to all western powers and to the conscience of all civilized world to take or aid measures leading toward restitution of the right for self-determination to Masaryk's people. We demand that Czechoslovakian people be accorded the right to hold free elections under the control of the United Nations with proper guaranties of the freedom of expression during the election campaign and with elimination of any outside pressure or coercion.

We demand the same right for other peoples behind the iron curtain knowing that they desire nothing more than to become a peaceful neutral link between east and west instead of being a bone of contention among the big powers.

We also appeal to the Government and the peoples of the Soviet Union to demonstrate their good will, sincerity of intent by favoring this most peaceful solution of the great problem and thus enable us, as well as themselves, to use the new marvelous sources of energy and miraculous advances in science for the good of mankind instead of its destruction.

Story of Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews and the Late Henry Monsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the story of the Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews and the late Henry Monsky, written by Bill Schofield and published in the Boston Traveler of March 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE YOU HEARD
(By Bill Schofield)

It could happen only in America, that a Jew and a Catholic could live such parallel lives, win such similar honors and gain so many mutual friends.

It's the story of Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews and the late Henry Monsky. It's proof of the fact that there still exists in the world at least one nation where a man's success depends upon what he is—not upon his religious beliefs, his forebears' homeland, or the way he spells his name.

And 1 week from tonight, on March 14, it will add one more stitch to its pattern of similarity, for that's when Secretary Matthews will be principal speaker at a veterans' night dinner given by the Brotherhood of Temple Ohabei Shalom in Brookline. Monsky, you see, was a speaker there, too, shortly before he died 3 years ago come May.

The story of these two men goes back more than threescore years to the State of Nebraska. There, in the town of Albion, Matthews was born on March 15, 1887. And there, in the nearby city of Omaha, Monsky was born on February 4, 1890.

To gain an education, each headed for the halls of Creighton University at Omaha. Matthews picked up his college diploma with the class of 1910. Two years later, Monsky left with a sheepskin in his hands.

Each man had his heart set on becoming a lawyer. Thus, in 1912, Monsky was admitted to the Nebraska bar, with Matthews following 1 year later. Their weddings came along within 6 months of each other, that of Matthews in November 1914 and that of Monsky in May the following year.

Then they began to climb, and the way their paths followed parallel ascending stairways might well have stamped them as identical twins, except that one went regularly to mass while the other worshiped in a synagogue.

They were among the first to recognize the great value of Father Flanagan's Boys' Town. It's been said that Monsky gave the priest his first $1,000 for that project, and it's recorded in Who's Who that Matthews and Monsky frequently sat together on the board of trustees. They were together on other groups as well, for each served on the board of governors for the Omaha Community Chest and each in turn put in a term as president of that organization.

They climbed high and they climbed fast. Being a Jew, Monsky joined the Omaha Lodge of B'nai B'rith and rose to be president of the Supreme Lodge by 1938. Being a Catholic, Matthews joined the Knights of Columbus and reached the office of Supreme Knight by 1939.

Meanwhile, their names could be found among the workers wherever there was a

welfare job to be done, whether the recipients might be Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish. The unswerving formula they followed was to help a man first and inquire about his background later, if at all.

The Catholic Church sent some of the highest lay awards of the Vatican for Matthews' acceptance. Jewish organizations wrote the name of Monsky on their most important boards. Their paths curved into national affairs, and Monsky worked with the first United Nations Conference in San Francisco while Matthews tramped the ragged roads of European towns to help war victims mend their broken world.

Then they were together one night in Monsky's home at Omaha, when Col. Elliott A. Niles of Boston was present as a guest. And stemming from that meeting, Matthews as Secretary of the Navy will be here next week to address the brotherhood to which Niles belongs, from the platform where Monsky once spoke.

This simple group, so capably guided by President Robert R. Gordon, has listened to other men of national prominence. But few have come here with a closer tie of sympathy than the friend of the late Henry Monsky.

Viewed from this point, it promises to be a colorful night. Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will be the guest of honor. Rabbi Dudley Weinberg, national chaplain of AMVETS, will receive a citation. There's a long list of familiar names scheduled to attend—men like Rear Admiral Hewlett Thebaud, Commandant of the First Naval District; Brig. Gen. A. Robert Ginsburgh, representing Defense Secretary Louis Johnson; Maj. Gen. Frank A. Keating, commanding general New England Military District; Rabbi Joshua Goldberg of the Third Naval District; Judge John E. Swift, supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus; Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, and others of rank and office.

The head table guests will get together for a reception at the Niles home in Brookline shortly before the dinner. And in the evening, the Navy band will show what it can do with Jewish music.

But through it all, for anyone who stops to think, there'll be a theme of human brotherhood that's too swiftly disappearing from the earth.

It will be the theme that made such warm friends of a Jew named Monsky and a Catholic named Matthews.

They proved the thing can work.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby on Friday evening, February 10, before the Alabama Press Association. Mrs. Hobby is executive vice president of the Houston Post, and is the first woman president of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association. She served with me as a member of the United States delegation, of which I was chairman, at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, at Geneva, Switzerland, in April and May of 1948—a conference to which she refers in her most admirable paper. Her inspiring and constructive address will be most interesting, I believe, to the Congress, as well as to publishers and editors throughout the country. I, of course, deeply share her belief that the traditional freedom of the American press has a historic mission.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hamlet's bemused "To be or not to be?" echoes today through many newspaper offices.

The New Yorker observes that "The first duty of a newspaper is to stay alive. And the most important single fact about any newspaper is that it differs from the next newspaper and is owned by a different man or group of men. This fact (the fact of difference) transcends a newspaper's greatness, a newspaper's honesty, a newspaper's liveliness, or any other quality.

"The health of the country deteriorates every time a newspaper dies of strangulation or is wiped out in a mercy killing. The solemn fact about the absorption of the Sun by Scripps-Howard is not that we lose a conservative paper, or an ancient paper, or an honest paper, or a funny paper, but that we lose a paper—one voice in the choir."

The mortality rate of daily and weekly newspapers in the past decade suggests the necessity for more self-analysis on the part of publishers, editors, reporters, craftsmen, and the entire personnel of a newspaper establishment. Examinations have always seemed preferable to autopsies.

Admitting, then, that our hardest battle today is simply to be, to continue to exist, how can we win that battle? I believe the only way is by being genuinely excellent. Excellent in daily journalism, in editorial policy, in management, and in our business operations.

The newspaper world around us is changing constantly. It has always changed, but never so much as in the past decade. Because the daily and hourly notation of change is our life work, we in the profession sometimes find ourselves too absorbed with the pace to take heed of the direction, the technique, or the quality of our product. It is only at meetings such as this one that we can stop, review the local and world community which we serve, and analyze our quality of service.

For example, how good are we in daily journalism? The role of the daily and weekly newspaper has never before been so important as it is today; the press in all its expressions is the eyes and ears of the world. How well do we live up to this responsibility, especially in our reporting of world events?

The lawyer, the cook, the college student, the mayor of a town—none can go to Europe and study the economic conferences of the Benelux nations. None can inspect the operation of Allied occupation in Japan. None can stay at the United Nations to keep informed on its progress, its set-backs, and its achievements. They know only what they read in the newspapers, in news magazines, or what they hear in brief comments on the radio.

Because of the expert work done by news magazines, by the newsreels and the network commentators, editors sometimes feel that they can relegate the greater part of the national and international picture to others. Every paper has so many demands for its column space. Businessmen want more stock quotations, farmers more agricultural news. Women's clubs want pictures and feature stories. The PTA units want individual stories for each school, the better to pad the scrapbooks which they exhibit at State conventions. And, of course, the city desk has its own pet newsruns.

But today's newspapers have a duty to inform their people on world events, because in today's world, the citizens of Wetumpka or Selma or Talladega or Fort Payne may be called on to decide whether or not to continue the Marshall plan, or whether or not to relinquish Formosa; or he may even have some influence for world peace through his demands on his governmental representatives.

An Alabama Congressman once made this statement in Washington: "My people," he said, "never subscribe to Time, or Collier's or the New York Times. A lot of them don't even see the Birmingham News. They do see their home town dailies or weeklies and it is from these sources they must obtain their information. All they know about what's going on in the world comes from their home town papers."

If the American people are to be informed on world events, our newspapers, dailies and weeklies must do it. And it is also our job to make world events seem as real as those of our individual towns and counties. If the laundryman shoots the corner florist, that is something real and immediate and enormously interesting to everyone who has ever walked into the florist's shop or had his clothes picked up by the laundryman. Perhaps the United Nations daily schedule will not boost circulation quite so much as the town shooting—and I should be the last to ask any newspaper to strip itself of circulation—but somewhere there is a happy and intelligent blend of news which readers want to read and news which they should read. By skillful writing and presentation, even the most foreign and esoteric of articles can be made readable. That, I think, is part of our task. We must learn to evaluate the news we present in terms of its relative importance to the individual, as well as in terms of its relative interest.

An equally important question in this self-analysis is: How good are we in editorial policy—in our choice of causes to champion and community goals to be emphasized? Do we set objectives or do we, like Scarlet O'Hara, say, "I'll think of it all tomorrow." "After all, tomorrow is another day."

Conditions differ in different communities, and each publisher must answer this question according to his own judgment. There are questions on all levels from the local to the international confronting us. A newspaper attempting constructive leadership of the community will feel obliged to comment upon these questions in its editorial columns. In our town of Houston, for instance, the Houston Post is particularly interested in health and sanitation—a crucial problem because of our sudden growth. It is one which your city or town may have already solved.

In our State of Texas, the Houston Post is giving emphasis to the care of the aged. The State is rich in potentials, but this burden of care is one not easily solved. To solve it properly, we face the unpalatable accompaniment of deficit financing; we must decide whether or not we shall let ourselves in for a bonded indebtedness. We have done so only once before—during the depression. Shall we do so again?

On the national level, the Post considers that the Hoover Commission recommendations merit substantial coverage. The Federal Government is a bit like Humpty-Dumpty—a Humpty-Dumpty who has grown so corpulent and ungainly that he has lost his original agility. If he falls off his perch, all the king's horses and all the king's men cannot put him together again. It is nationally important—and therefore important to every citizen of Texas—that we reduce Humpty-Dumpty and put him back into efficient trim before he runs any danger of falling.

In the international field, the Houston Post is asking that we consider an Atlantic Union of the Free. A resolution to that effect is now before Congress. It proposes that the President of the United States call a conference of the Atlantic Pact democracies to

explore the possibilities of a Federal Union among them. We have already taken the dangerous step of military unity. Under an Atlantic Union, we would gain the economic benefits which we in America badly need and will need even more badly as the years of international spending continue.

These are some of the special points of the Houston Post's editorial policy. There are, of course, others; but all of them boil down I think, to a general question which should be that of every publisher: Is my paper first and foremost a witness for a free people, a true conscience for democracy?

We often hear about freedom of the press, sometimes almost as if it were a privilege given us for our special enjoyment. It is, rather, a sword for the protection of freedom of the people, and we have an obligation to use it as such. Of what use would a life preserver be in the hands of a sailor too lazy to throw it to a drowning man? What good is freedom of the press if we see injustice done and remain silent? Not only remain silent, but condone the injustice?

These are not just rhetorical questions. I am thinking, for example, of the case of Dr. Condon. A respected scientist and a public servant, he was labeled "one of the weakest links in our atomic security" in a report released to the press by J. Parnell Thomas, then chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Though Dr. Condon repeatedly demanded the right to a public hearing and official denial, he was not granted his right. The American press should have demanded the right for him. Worse—we gave three and four times the amount of space to the charges than we gave to statements relating to his innocence. In other words, we have given equal display to unsubstantiated charges made against Dr. Condon, a distinguished scientist and an American citizen, as we have given to Dr. Fuchs, a German-born citizen and a naturalized British citizen, against whom formal charges were filed, and who was arrested, and who will be tried shortly for espionage.

There was a time when every citizen was adjudged innocent of a crime until legally proved guilty in court. This was a precedent we inherited from English common law. Now almost suddenly, in midtwentieth century, this long established protection of the ordinary citizen against possible injustice is being nullified. When sensational charges are made against anyone—not by a jury, not by a district attorney, but sometimes by vacant-minded or hysterical people—the charges are broadcast from coast to coast; and the public instinct is to accept charges as proof.

I realize these are pains that go along with democracy but it is a frightening tendency, to which the American press is contributing. We must resist it. We must set it in true perspective with a question mark. In the case of accusations such as those against Dr. Condon, we must incessantly ask, "What is your proof? Have you legal and unmistakable evidence that this is true?"

I sometimes think that the greatest single failure of the American press is its willingness to forget the question mark. If I could, I should like to build and endow a memorial to the question mark—of course with many people I have wished I could endow the period—but surely it is the duty of the press to question.

We—with all our fellow-Americans of the twentieth century—have lapsed into a dangerous tendency to accept things: To accept almost any statement as true once it has been printed; to accept any columnist as a good one; to accept institutions as things of virtue until a public charge is made against them; to accept minority government for the United States because the majority is either politically illiterate or refuses to accept responsibilities of citizenship.

Instead, we should question everything—good as well as evil. Under question, the good only stands forth more clearly revealed for what it is, and evil is bared for all to see.

Most specially, we newspaper publishers should question what goes into our own columns.

We who print our newspapers far from the scenes of Federal Government or internal crisis cannot cover major national or overseas events with our own staff, and so we draw on columnists and the news agencies. As was pointed out recently in the Economist, the good columnists—Walter Lippmann, the Alsop brothers, Marquis Childs, Doris Fleeson, and Thomas Stokes, to mention a few, have great value in a country where distance prevents any newspaper from getting more than a local—or at most a regional following. For a few dollars a day, an editor in a small town can get material he could not afford in any other way. "But there are also bad columnists," the Economist reminds, "and ignorant ones."

How true. All of us in this tremendous country have a tendency to respect as being authoritative anyone who writes from the source. We read and believe the Washington columnists and correspondents because they are in Washington and should know. We think they must be good, or they wouldn't be writing up there where the competition is stiff.

But if any of you read Our Armchair Correspondents, written by one of them, you will know how pitiful are our illusions.

Let us therefore form the habit of questioning the caliber and performance of all writers whose work comes to us from the outside, as we question those on our own staffs.

Finally, let us question ourselves. I believe that the newspaperman—be he publisher or cub—should take stock of himself every year, or even every month. In honest self-analysis, he should try to clear out fuzzy thinking, should try to outline his own principles or philosophy of Government and of living, should try to review his own store of information, and discern which is prejudice.

He should try to be very sure that he knows exactly what words mean before he uses them. For example, there is a great difference between socialism and communism. There is a greater difference between democratic socialism and political communism. But how clearly do we define and distinguish the differences for our readers? Have we fallen into the fuzzy-minded habit of labeling all Communists, Socialists, and Liberals together as "left wing," thereby implying that the United States is "right wing," reactionary, hide-bound, controlled? This kind of thing is playing directly into Russia's hands. As a matter of fact, the United States is the most liberal—in the true sense of the word—the most progressive, and the most un-hide-bound country in the world. False labels create false ideas, and we who are the American font of ideas should know their propaganda value and be more careful how we use them.

The American press is not bad. I never realized how good it is until I saw all the world's press represented at the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information and the Press at Geneva. Not even our fellow democracies can equal us. The British press is crippled by newsprint shortages. The French press suffers from lack of advertising and from subsidy by political parties. And, of course, the Russian press is simply the voice of the Soviet Government.

If we are to serve our tradition and our function in a free government, we must grow in excellence. Nothing has ever stood still—except the sun that day—and we shall either merit a continued existence or we shall negate our historic guaranty, freedom of the press.

Ours is a terrifying responsibility for the happiness of the individual and the welfare of the country. We must remain in constant, hourly awareness of how important what we say is to little people and big ones too.

If we decide that our historic freedom of the press has a historic mission, then every one of us must judge for himself whether or not, at the end of 1950, he can say "objective sighted," or "mission accomplished."

Encouragement of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on encouragement of science delivered by the distinguished scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton University, at the Science Talent Search Award banquet, held in Washington, D. C., on March 6. I believe the address is particularly relevant to national-science legislation now pending in Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here tonight to honor you and to celebrate the high promise of your future as scientists. We are happy to be with you. We think of that future with respect and curiosity. We think of the discoveries which you will make. We think of the questions to which we today have no answer, and to which you will come to know an answer. Even more, we think of the answers that we have today, and of the new questions that you will put to those answers. We think of how altered and how deepened our knowledge of the world will be before you are through with it. My first wish to you is that you may make and that you may share in the making of great and beautiful discoveries which enrich our knowledge of the world of nature and of man. I have a second wish for you; but that must come at the end of my talk.

I do not propose to talk to you of such topics of the day as the hydrogen bomb and the statutory provisions of the National Science Foundation. If these matters are not in a very different state when you shall have come to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship, you will have reason to reproach you elders for your inheritance.

Science has profoundly altered the conditions of man's life. During the last centuries, the discoveries in science, and their applications to practice, have changed the material conditions of life. They have changed as well many matters of the spirit. They have changed the form in which practical problems of right and wrong come before us; they have changed the focus of moral issues, both for the individual and for governments. They have given us new methods for defining the meaning of problems that face us, and for judging whether or not our solutions are just.

The most manifest of the changes are the material ones. Yet even here it takes a certain perspective to see their true extent. Advances in the study of man and other

living forms have extended our life span by decades. Discoveries in physical science have immeasurably lightened our toil, and enriched our lives. They have given leisure to an ever-widening group of men. They have made a reasonable education not a special privilege, but a common right. They have made the world, in its physical dimensions, a small place, and established the means by which people in remote parts of the earth can communicate with each other, can get to know each other, and can learn to work together. They have put at the disposal of everyone the resources of physical power, of ease and of knowledge that were in the past reserved for the few.

Not all of the changes in material well-being that science offers are realities. Yet the very fact that they are possibilities has changed the nature of the responsibility which we bear, both as individuals and as a community of men and women banded together in government. In the Greek cities, political democracy, and civilization itself, appeared possible only on the basis of a slave economy. Technology, born of science, has altered that; it has enabled mankind, as it has forced mankind, to deal with the issues of slavery as a moral issue. Poverty has always been an ugly thing, and in its extremes a desperate one. Today, it is an evil, in the sense that it lies within human hands and human hearts to abate it. Science can provide us, for the first time in history, with the means of abating hunger for everyone on earth.

Perhaps nowhere has the impact of science more clearly altered the specific terms of a great political issue than in the effects of scientific development on warfare. This is a can of worms with which I have myself unhappily been engaged for some years. It would not be honest to say—as it would be folly not to hope—that the very terror of modern weapons would in itself put an end to war; it would not even be honest to say that because of this terror the abolition of war and the maintenance of peace have become the one absolute, final objective of all political decisions. There are other things in man's life: his freedom, his decency, and his sense of right and wrong, that cannot so lightly be subjected to a single end. But what we need to remember is that war today has become, and is increasingly becoming, something very different from what it was a century ago or a millennium ago. We need to recognize the new situation as new; we need to come to it with something of the same spirit as the scientist's, when he has conducted an experiment and finds that the results are totally other than those that he had anticipated.

Four months before Hiroshima, in the last days of his life, President Roosevelt's thoughts turned to these questions. In the last words that he wrote, in words he did not live to speak, the President looked to the future, to the atomic age. He looked to the past, to the days of the founding of the Republic. He wrote:

"Thomas Jefferson, himself a distinguished scientist, once spoke of the 'brotherly spirit of science, which unites into one family all its votaries of whatever grade, and however widely dispersed throughout the different quarters of the globe.'

"Today science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate them one from another.

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace."

Science has greatly extended the range of questions in which man has a choice; it has extended man's freedom to make significant decisions. Is there anything in the methods of science itself, or in the spirit of science, which can help in the making of these decisions? To what extent is there a play on the word "science" which can mislead us and take us up false roads when we speak of this science of human relationships? Is there anything we can learn from the relevance of science to politics?

If we are to answer these questions, and answer them honestly, we must recognize important and basic differences between problems of science, and problems of action, as they arise in personal or in political life. If we fail to recognize these differences, we shall be seeking magic solutions and not real ones. We shall delude ourselves into laying aside responsibility, which it is an essential part of man's life to bear.

In most scientific study, questions of good and evil, or right and wrong play at most a minor and secondary part. For practical decisions of policy, they are basic. Without them, political action would be meaningless. Practical decisions, and, above all, political decisions can never quite be freed from the conflicting claims of special interest. These, too, are part of the meaning of a decision and, of course, of action, and they must be an essential part of the force of its implementation.

Political decisions are unique acts. In politics there is little that can correspond to the scientist's repetition of an experiment. An experiment that fails in its purpose may be good or better than one that succeeds, because it may well be more instructive. A political decision cannot be taken twice. All the factors that are relevant to it will conjoin only once. The analogies of history can provide a guide, but only a very partial one.

These are formidable differences between the problems of science and those of practice. They show that the method of science cannot be directly adapted to the solution of problems in politics and in man's spiritual life. Yet there is relevance of a more subtle, but by no means trivial, kind.

In trying more fully to explore this relevance, I should like to start with a text. This text is a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to a young man who had inquired of him as to the usefulness of his studies of science. I am indebted to Dr. Julian Boyd, of Princeton University, for the copy of this hitherto unpublished letter. It was written in the middle of the year 1799, the year in which Napoleon abolished the directory and began to assume dictatorial power in France, the year before Thomas Jefferson was elected for the first time as President of the United States. Jefferson and the diverse brave and hopeful men who with him laid the foundations of our own Government had learned much from the peoples of other nations. Many of their highest political ideals and their most powerful political instruments were built on the experience, the insight and wisdom of European scientists and philosophers. Even today we need to remember that this was so, and that there may be much that we can learn from others, and that we should be glad to learn, as in turn by example, we should be glad to teach.

Jefferson's letter starts with a survey of the subjects in science which he believes young Munford ought to pursue. I will quote one characteristic passage which may strike a familiar and homely note for you:

"The science of calculation also is indispensable as far as the extraction of the square and cube roots; algebra as far as the quadratic equation and the use of logarithms are often of value in ordinary cases; but all beyond these is but a luxury; a delicious luxury, indeed; but not to be indulged in by one who is to have a profession to follow for his subsistence."

But that is not really the part of Jefferson's letter which I commend to you. Here it is:

"I am among those who think well of the human character generally. I consider man as formed for society, and endowed by nature with those dispositions which fit him for society. I believe also, with Condorcet, as mentioned in your letter, that his mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot as yet form any conception. It is impossible for a man who takes a survey of what is already known, not to see what an immensity in every branch of science yet remains to be discovered, and that, too, of articles to which our faculties seem adequate."

And later, in the same letter, still more explicitly:

"And it is still more certain that in the other branches of science great fields are yet to be explored to which our faculties are equal, and that to an extent of which we cannot fix the limits. I join you, therefore, in branding as cowardly the idea that the human mind is incapable of further advances. This is precisely the doctrine which the present despots of the earth are inculcating, and their friends here reechoing, and applying especially to religion and politics: 'that it is not probable that anything better will be discovered than what was known to our fathers.' We are to look backwards, then, and not forwards for the improvement of science and to find it amidst feudal barbarisms and the fires of Spitalfields. But thank heaven the American mind is already too much opened to listen to these impostures; and while the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind, then, and freedom of the press, every spirit would be ready to devote itself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will and speak as we think the condition of man will proceed in improvement. The generation which is going off the stage has deserved well of mankind for the struggles it has made and for having arrested that course of despotism which had overwhelmed the world for thousands and thousands of years. If there seems to be danger that the ground they have gained will be lost again, that danger comes from the generation of your contemporary. But that the enthusiasm which characterizes youth should lift its parracide hands against freedom and science would be such a monstrous phenomenon as I cannot place among possible things in this age and this country."

To me there are two striking impressions which this letter of Jefferson's makes, even beyond its eloquence and its beauty. The first is that the letter is pervaded with the idea of progress, that ideal that owes so much to the development of science and that in turn has provided the great enriching human faith in which scientific discovery and invention has flourished. Jefferson is confident that an increased understanding of the world will lead to progress; he is convinced that the barbarisms of the past cannot stand up against inquiry and understanding and enlightenment; he is confident in man and sure that as men know more they will act more wisely and live better. In our contemporary expressions of hope that catastrophe could be averted and civilization yet be saved, that confidence has lost much of its robustness.

The second point is that for Jefferson there is something in the ways of science that is relevant to political life. Even in religion and politics he holds that it is probable that better things will be discovered than what was known to our fathers. This conviction that new knowledge is possible and that not all the answers are known is, of course, the stuff of the day-to-day life of the scientist. Science itself does progress; new knowledge is possible; and new knowledge, because it does not destroy or ignore the old, can only increase our understanding. The very idea of the development of science is an example of progress, and of progress which in no true sense can ever be reversed. But this is only part of the story. It is true, as Jefferson knew, that in the large, science has flourished in conditions of human freedom, and that

its growth is parallel to the growth of democratic institutions. Today, looking back on more than a century and a half of further history, we can be even more sure of this. We have seen not only the inspiriting example of science and democracy flourishing together, but the tragic examples of their foundering together. We express the hope that of this tragedy we shall soon have seen the end.

What are these lessons that the spirit of science teaches us for our practical affairs? Basic to them all is that there may be no barriers to freedom of enquiry. Basic to them all is the ideal of open-mindedness with regard to new knowledge, new experience, and new truth. Science is not based on authority. It owes its acceptance and its universality to an appeal to intelligible, communicable evidence that any interested man can evaluate.

There is no place for dogma in science. The scientist is free to ask any question, to doubt any assertion, to seek for any evidence, to correct any error. Where science has been used in the past to erect a new dogmatism, that dogmatism has found itself incompatible with the progress of science; and in the end, the dogma has yielded, or science and freedom have perished together.

Our own political life is predicated on openness. We do not believe any group of men adequate enough or wise enough to operate without scrutiny or without criticism. We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it, that the only way to detect it is to be free to enquire. We know that the wages of secrecy are corruption. We know that in secrecy error, undetected, will flourish and subvert.

Let me be clear. Science is not skepticism. It is not the practice of science to look for things to doubt. It was not by a deliberate attempt of skepticism that physicists were led to doubt the absolute nature of simultaneity, or to recognize that the ideas of strict causality embodied in classical physics could not be applied to the domain of atomic phenomena. There is probably no group of men who take more for granted in their daily work than the scientists. Common sense, and all that flows from it, are their principal basis for what they do in the laboratory and for what they make of it on paper. But for scientists it is not only honorable to doubt, it is mandatory to do that when there appears to be evidence in support of the doubt. In place of authority in science, we have and we need to have only the consensus of informed opinion, only the guide of example. No scientist needs to order his colleagues to use a new technique of experiment or to enter a new field of discovery. If he has done this, it will be an invitation to his fellows to follow.

These then are some of the attitudes of mind, these are some of the disciplines of spirit which grow naturally in the scientist's world. They have grown there in part as a result of a humane and liberal tradition in political life, and in part as a cause of that. The open mind, the reliance on example and persuasion, rather than on authority, these are the heritage of the centuries in which science has altered the face of the earth. Science can help in diverse ways in preserving and extending this heritage. Its very universality speaks across frontiers to make truth manifest in lands otherwise darkened; its material applications create the preconditions—in leisure, in education, in means of communication—for the converse of men with each other. Science provides the material and the intellectual basis for a world in which example and understanding can help all men to improve their lot and fulfill their hopes. Today we need to remember that our country, founded on these practices, and grown strong by their exercise, owes its strength to them. In this time of crisis, we need to cherish that strength.

And this brings me to my second wish for you. I wish you not only the joy of great discovery, I wish for you a world of confidence in man and man's humanity, a world of confidence in reason, so that as you work you may be inspired by the hope that what you find will make men freer and better—in which, working as specialists in what may be recondite parts of the intellectual life of the time, you are nevertheless contributing in a direct and basic way to the welfare of mankind.

Illusion or Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in my hand I hold a document which, for a change, brings good news from western Germany where the future of democracy hangs in the balance. In that arena true democracy as we know it here is pitted against the godless materialism of the left and a resurgent materialism of the right.

The constructive forces in the new German Republic are being aided by a world-wide ideological movement known as moral rearmament, initiated by an American, Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, of Pennsylvania. In a way that we had hoped might happen, and yet feared would never happen, this movement is creating industrial teamwork as an answer to class war. It has achieved the seemingly impossible by winning over some of the top Communist leaders of western Germany. These men who have for years been spreading their false ideology among the miners and workers of the Ruhr came last summer to the World Assembly of Moral Rearmament at Caux, Switzerland, to which this House sent an official committee. The Communists found there what they described as an ideology superior to that for which we have fought.

On their return to Germany they not only resigned from the Communist Party but devoted their militant energies to spreading this new ideology among their former comrades—with such effectiveness that they too have left the party in large numbers.

In Altenessen the chairman of the Communist Party, who had founded the party there 25 years ago, said that he so now believed in moral rearmament as the answering and uniting world ideology that if the Communist Party did not accept this ideology, he would take a third of the Communist Party of Altenessen, which has a membership of 10,000, out of the party with him in support of moral rearmament. He said "Caux is where we belong."

In fact, only a few weeks ago the executive of the Communist Party in western Germany were summoned to a special conference at which they stated they were going to reorganize the entire executive and secretariat because it had become tainted with an ideology inimical to the party.

The extent of the success of this movement and the strength of its opposition is illustrated by an editorial published in a Bremen newspaper. It was sent me by my son, Harold, who is over there learning at firsthand how to have a part in this strategic work of bringing a democratic ideology to Germany.

This ideology has taken hold and is assisting in the development of democratic processes in Europe, and this is clearly shown by an editorial entitled "Illusion or Reality," which appeared in the Bremen Weser-Kurier of Monday, February 6, 1950.

I thought it would be of interest to the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

An English version of the editorial is as follows:

ILLUSION OR REALITY

The presence of the cast of the movement of moral rearmament in Bremen, and the performances of the industrial play Der Vergessene Faktor, have found an echo in all the vital intellects of our city, that has by far exceeded the expectations of the skeptics. So what has happened in other cities has been repeated in Bremen. Whatever your point of view, negative or positive, no doubt can be left that through the moral rearmament movement the people have been touched by something for which they have long been waiting.

There is in the millions a latent readiness to devote themselves to a great uplifting idea; to direct their good will for an aim; to give their life and work a meaning without which they cannot carry on their existence. These millions are looking for something. They know also that mortal danger hovers over them, and that trying to meet the danger by material means alone is very questionable.

The people of Caux understand this situation. The danger that threatens Christian culture and thus Europe and all countries whose spiritual origin is in Europe, is not primarily dependent upon the means of power mobilized by the Communists, nor upon tanks, planes, and atom bombs, but upon people who have themselves subscribed to the Communist ideology. Neither are those who have been forced into the Communist sphere of influence by pressure and terrorism the dangerous ones, but the idealists who are deeply convinced of communism; not those who seek fame and power, but those who are willing to sacrifice and who have committed themselves body and soul. Indeed, the latter as idealists have a claim to the respect even of those who think otherwise.

Because millions know this danger, or in any case feel it unconsciously, they are not wholly reassured nor given a feeling of inner security by the might of the Western democracies and those peoples whose life is based on a God-inspired culture, even though this might is so immense as to lend a sense of outward security.

Why does not the power of the West reassure or, when it does, only partially? Because the inner foundation of real power is lacking—the ideology to which material power is subordinate; the ideology that in extreme emergency even gives the use of force a moral justification.

I am fully aware of the dangers of this last statement. The president of the Bremen KPD faction in a letter to the Kurier which

we published recently said: "They do not notice that President Truman and others are using them to rearm morally for new wars." In other words, that the movement of moral rearmament is an attempt of the war-hungry capitalists to find a moral facade for their offensive aims.

Now there is always the risk that idealists will be used by unsavory materialists. It would be foolish to deny such a possibility, especially in our time when Communist leaders are misusing the idealism of millions in a way that has alarmed the whole civilized world. But no one who knows or has understood the spirit and the people of Caux can really believe that impure elements could ever succeed in misusing their idealism.

We have said that millions of people today lack something, since democracy without an ideological basis loses itself in outward mechanics which cannot satisfy man, nor free him from fear, nor give him the capacity for sacrifice. The movement of Moral Re-Armament supplies this lack by giving the democratic system a moral foundation.

The head of the Parliamentary Communist faction, Mr. Rafoth, is quite right when he says that this idea was already born 1,950 years ago, but he is not right when he belittles as futile this world-spanning attempt to remake man from within. He and his ideological friends in the Kremlin know that in spite of all battles, in spite of all the progress and regress of Christianity and Christian culture, the edvelopment of the West and the New World has been determined by it, and that this ideology is still today the bulwark against the world victory of communism. Caux has set itself to the task of filling the Christian teaching with new lifeblood; of plunging into the middle of the problems of our time, saying to man that the changing of men and systems must always begin with man himself; that we must free ourselves from hatred and mistrust; that the road to reconciliation between the millions starts not with putting a moral challenge to your neighbor but with putting it to yourself, because only by your own personal example can you decisively affect the world around you.

Beliefs that come from inner conviction do not lose their value when someone rejects them as old. On the contrary, their age proves their indestructibility. The Bremen Communist Party does not say in its statement that the aim of Caux should be rejected, but that its realization is an illusion.

The people of MRA do not try to answer this argument by theoretical discussion. They prove the durability of their ideology by living it. Their world influence can be traced far beyond the expectations of so-called realist politicians, and it is this that gives them the happy inner certainty of being on the right road. Innumerable men and women who know the danger that threatens Christendom from the dedicated fanatics of the Communist ideology—far more than from their weapons—will follow on this road, because today the durability of the Caux movement is no longer an illusion but a reality.

FELIX VON ECKARDT.

A Reply to Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and member of Senate Finance and Armed Services Committees:

The President of the United States recently gave Mr. Arthur Krock an exclusive interview of universal interest. Mr. Krock is a brilliant journalist whose dispatches are meticulously accurate. The President has confirmed the accuracy of the report.

My name was mentioned in that part of the interview relating to the Federal fiscal situation. Under the circumstances, in the interest of both accuracy and clarity, I am compelled to comment on certain of the President's statements with respect to deficit spending, taxes, and reduction of Federal expenditures.

DEFICIT SPENDING

The President told Mr. Krock that in no sense does he tolerate deficit spending. He said he hates deficit spending as much as HARRY BYRD ever could, and it is only a temporary condition brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any genius of statecraft known or available to him.

In the five fiscal years President Truman has been in office the budget has been balanced twice and both of these occasions were during the Eightieth Congress. In 1947 there was a surplus of nearly $1,000,000,000. In 1948 there was a surplus of $8,500,000,000. For the coming year, beginning July 1, he does not even go through the formality of proposing a balanced budget, with or without additional taxes. In fact—in his budget message, in his economic report, and in his tax message—the President has advised Congress three times since January 1 against balancing his 1951 budget. From his record it would appear that he not only tolerates deficit spending but, in effect, he also recommends it.

If the President regards chronic deficit spending during peak prosperity as a fatal menace to our form of Government and free enterprise, as I do, the Federal budget would be balanced now with the full influence and prestige of his Office brought constantly to bear on this objective.

The President today is the chief obstacle to balancing the budget. I feel justified in saying this because he is now urging upon Congress the adoption of a budget more than $8,000,000,000 in excess of actual expenditures in 1948. This he calls a "tight" budget and he is resisting any reductions by Congress. In our fiscal affairs the President is taking the easy course of procrastination waiting for some unspecified time in the future to do what he should and can do now.

How many times have we heard that before? President Roosevelt used to say we'll balance the budget when we get out of depression and into prosperity. Now President Truman says we'll balance the budget when prosperity is greater.

If the Federal budget can't be balanced in years such as this when income and employment are at or near their peak, when there are no domestic emergencies, and when the need for economic assistance abroad is supposed to be diminishing, when can we balance it?

How long is "only a temporary condition" mentioned by the President in refering to deficit spending? If we follow the President's recommendations, a whole generation within the coming year will have reached its majority under a deficit-financed government. We have been on a deficit basis in all but 2 years since 1930 and the President proposes it again for the coming year. If Congress, at the insistence of the President, authorizes the expenditure of billions more than the revenue during the year beginning July 1 it is probable that the budget never will be balanced again until we go over the precipice of financial disaster.

How long can we pile new deficits on a postwar debt of more than a quarter of a trillion dollars and expect democracy and free enterprise to stand the burden? Neither can exist in insolvency.

Two years ago the Federal Government spent $34,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1948. We balanced the budget, and there was a surplus. In that year, which ended only 19 months ago, when we spent $8,000,000,000 less than the $42,400,000,000 expenditure budget the President is requesting now, our economy did not disintegrate, our national defense was not impaired, and we were spending more for foreign assistance than the President now proposes. In the field of foreign spending the President in his pending budget proposes to spend $4,700,000,000 as compared to $4,800,000,000 in 1948 when total spending was $8,250,000,000 less than he now recommends.

Of the $8,250,000,000 difference between these two budgets $5,300,000,000 is for increased domestic-civilian projects, excluding foreign assistance, excluding national defense, excluding interest on the debt, and excluding the cost of veterans programs. The President now proposes to spend $12,200,000,000 for domestic-civilian projects, with all of the exclusions just mentioned, as compared with $6,900,000,000 for domestic-civilian projects in 1948.

These figures show that domestic-civilian expenditure increases total more than the $5,100,000,000 deficit for the coming year as estimated by the President. It follows that the deficit may be attributed largely to increases in expenditures for activities and programs which are not related to past wars or future defense. Compilation of increases in the domestic-civilian categories explodes the President's contention that the budget cannot be cut because of fixed charges resulting from previous wars and the requirements of our defense in the future.

TAXES

The President told Mr. Krock that "there wouldn't be any (deficit) if the Republicans had not cut the incomes taxes in the Eightieth Congress." He said tax changes should not be made piecemeal at any time, but they should conform to a general plan. He told Mr. Krock "this was equally true when he approved the repeal of the excess-profits taxes, and he wishes he had not done this." But, he said, he was "new at the job."

In his February 16 speech the President repeated his reference to the Republican tax cut and said "much of our present financial difficulty is the result of it."

This is not the first time the President has said deficits this year and next are attributable to tax reductions by the Eightieth Congress. He has also said the same thing about the deficit last year. This is another red herring of which he has made frequent use.

What are the facts?

He admits his own indorsement of a $6,000,000,000 reduction in excess-profits taxes on corporations enacted in 1945 when there was a $20,000,000,000 deficit, but he blames all recent, current, and future deficits on the Eightieth Congress, which followed up his corporation-tax reduction with a $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 reduction in individual income taxes made effective in fiscal year 1948 when there was a surplus of $8,500,000,000.

As in his February 16 speech, the President now says the 1948 income-tax reduction was "ill-timed and irresponsible," but in his state of the Union message dated January 7, 1948, he justified a 1948 income-tax reduction proposal of his own as follows: "During this period in which the high cost

of living is bearing down on so many of our families tax adjustments should be made to adjust their burden." No tax proposal could be more piecemeal or conform less to a general tax plan than his scheme to reduce each individual's income-tax bill by $40, with its $3,200,000,000 loss in revenue to be compensated by an increase in corporate profits taxes.

This proposal urged by the President instead of the 1948 tax bill, which he criticizes so bitterly did not have a single advocate on the Senate Finance Committee and it never mustered sufficient appeal to be presented in the Senate as an amendment or otherwise.

Let us recapitulate the President's tax policy.

What tax proposals by the President have not been piecemeal? What tax proposals by the President constitute a general plan to which we may conform?

With respect to corporation taxes: In 1945 he endorsed the $6,000,000,000 reduction in corporation excess-profits taxes. In 1948 he proposed to restore $3,200,000,000 by increased taxes on corporate profits. In 1949 he proposed in the winter to increase corporate taxes by $4,000,000,000. In the summer he withdrew the proposal. By autumn he was talking again about increasing them. Now in the winter of 1950 he proposes to increase corporation taxes by half the amount he proposed a year ago.

With respect to individual income taxes: In 1948 the President proposed his own reduction of $40 per taxpayer, opposed the formula which was approved by both the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, ignored the community-property amendment which had the support of both parties in Congress, and vetoed the 1948 tax bill, as passed, including the community-property-tax provision.

With respect to social security pay-roll taxes on individuals as well as business: he proposed last year to increase them by $2,000,000,000, and this year he is proposing an increase of $1,750,000,000. In neither case would the pay-roll taxes requested for socialized medicine even begin to finance the program he proposes.

As to excise taxes, he now proposes to withdraw some, but not all, of the wartime levies.

How can private enterprise plan its expansion under such inconsistent and constantly changing tax proposals by the President of the United States? How can investors calculate their risks? How can heads of families assure their security? How can the Government keep its fiscal affairs in order?

Is it logical for the President to excuse his own approval of a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction in a deficit year and at the same time blame past, present, and future deficits on the Eightieth Congress, which reduced individual taxes by a lesser amount in a surplus year?

It would seem by the record that, if throughout future years we are to blame Federal deficits on the tax reductions in some prior year, the President must assume much of this responsibility.

EXPENDITURES

The President told Mr. Krock: Senators GEORGE and BYRD "call for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget. They know it can't be done." He said he is an old hand at budget making. He told Mr. Krock "he has cut" the budget for fiscal year 1951 "as much as can be done in consideration of the basic needs of the foreign program and the dynamic domestic economy he seeks to create and maintain."

It is gratifying to learn that the President knows "the economizers have a blueprint" for the budget. For years he has been saying no one would tell him where to cut it. Now the platitude is changed to say Senator GEORGE and I know our proposals can't be accomplished. As a former Senator the President knows how difficult it is for Congress to reduce Federal expenditures without at least a sympathetic attitude by the President, and he knows it is practically impossible against open opposition by the President such as he has voiced three times this year since he sent in his new budget. Perhaps the President had this fact in mind when he said Senator GEORGE and I know it can't be done.

To the contrary I am confident that a majority of Congress believes the budget can and should be reduced to a balance now and the fact that he is the principal obstacle will not deter determined efforts in Congress to bring this about.

I have suggested how it can be done in a budget outline detailing expenditures totaling $36,000,000,000. This reduction would be at least $6,000,000,000 under the President's requests. Senator GEORGE, a hand of nearly 30 years' experience at Federal budget making, has announced his support for such a reduction.

A $36,000,000,000 budget would be $2,000,000,000 more than the budget of 1948, which was balanced by the Eightieth Congress, whereas in comparison with 1948 figures the President proposes to increase expenditures by over $8,000,000,000, more than half of which—I repeat for emphasis—would be in domestic-civilian expenditures unrelated in all respects to wars or rumors of wars. In this period of less than 2 years what has developed on the home-front horizon to justify an increase in domestic-civilian expenditures of near 100 percent?

It is not enough to say these expenditures are less in proportion to the national income than they were 10 years ago. The fact that the Federal tax-take alone out of the national income has increased 500 percent in the same 10 years is only one of the many factors which must be considered along with such a statement.

The record shows that as such programs as foreign assistance begin to expire more domestic-civilian programs are added.

The prosperity we have is suspended dangerously from the unpredictable economics of a Federal debt already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars. The President proposes that we increase the debt at the rate of nearly a half billion dollars a month. Under such a policy how long can we expect to maintain the domestic economy, the private-enterprise system or our form of government?

Democracy and freedom here and throughout the world depends upon the preservation of our solvency which is being jeopardized by growing debt and chronic deficits.

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress, in tabular form with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (which ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (which will end next June 30), estimated, Jan. 9, 1950, revision	Fiscal year 1951 (which begins next July 1)	
			Byrd 36-billion dollar budget	President's Jan. 9 proposal
I. Domestic civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	6.9	11.4	8.9	12.2
Social welfare, health, and security	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.7	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.1	1.8	1.2	2.2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.2	.1	.2
Labor	.2	.2	.2	.2
General government	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3
II. National defense	11.0	13.1	11.3	13.5
III. Veterans	6.6	6.9	5.3	6.1
IV. Foreign	4.8	6.0	4.8	4.7
V. Interest on the Federal debt	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.6
Grand total expenditure budget [1]	34.2	43.3	36.0	42.4
Revenue [1]	42.2	[2] 37.5	[2] 37.5	[2] 37.5
Deficit/surplus	+8.0	[3] −5.5	[3] +2.0	[3] −5.1

[1] Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.
[2] Maximum estimate.
[3] Minimum estimate.

What the taxpayers of each of the 48 States would save by the adoption of the $36,000,000,000 Byrd budget for the fiscal year 1951 as compared with the cost to each State of President Truman's proposed $42,400,000,000 budget

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State [1]	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
United States total	100.00	$42,439,000,000	$36,000,000,000	$6,439,000,000
Alabama	1.17	496,536,300	421,200,000	75,336,300
Arizona	.37	157,024,300	133,200,000	23,824,300
Arkansas	.72	305,560,800	259,200,000	46,360,800
California	8.32	3,530,924,800	2,995,200,000	535,724,800
Colorado	.80	339,512,000	288,000,000	51,512,000
Connecticut	1.67	708,731,300	601,200,000	107,531,300
Delaware	.40	169,756,000	144,000,000	25,756,000
Florida	1.29	547,463,100	464,400,000	83,063,100
Georgia	1.40	594,146,000	504,000,000	90,146,000
Idaho	.32	135,804,800	115,200,000	20,604,800
Illinois	7.59	3,221,120,100	2,732,400,000	488,720,100
Indiana	2.29	971,853,100	824,400,000	147,453,100

[1] The formula used in estimating each State's share of Federal expenditures consists of 3 factors: (1) The percent of individual income taxes collected from each State; (2) the proportion of corporate income taxes borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of the national income; and (3) the proportion of excise and miscellaneous taxes (excluding social-security taxes), borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of total population. Thus we get a picture of Federal taxes borne by rather than collected from, each State, which we believe more nearly reflects the true distribution of the Federal tax burden. Each of the 3 factors is weighted according to the percent each tax bears of the total Federal tax revenue (1949 figures); individual income taxes, 47.52 percent; corporation taxes, 30.42 percent; and excise and miscellaneous taxes, 22.06 percent; total, 100 percent.

What the taxpayers of each of the 48 States would save by the adoption of the $36,000,000,000 Byrd budget for the fiscal year 1951 as compared with the cost to each State of President Truman's proposed $42,400,000,000 budget—Continued

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State [1]	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
Iowa	1.58	$670,536,200	$568,800,000	$101,736,200
Kansas	1.15	488,048,500	414,000,000	74,048,500
Kentucky	1.20	509,268,000	432,000,000	77,268,000
Louisiana	1.22	517,755,800	439,200,000	78,555,800
Maine	.44	186,731,600	158,400,000	28,331,600
Maryland	1.68	712,975,200	604,800,000	108,175,200
Massachusetts	3.40	1,442,926,000	1,224,000,000	218,926,000
Michigan	4.71	1,998,876,900	1,695,600,000	303,276,900
Minnesota	1.86	789,365,400	669,600,000	119,765,400
Mississippi	.71	301,316,900	255,600,000	45,716,900
Missouri	2.53	1,073,706,700	910,800,000	162,906,700
Montana	.35	148,536,500	126,000,000	22,536,500
Nebraska	.86	364,975,400	309,600,000	55,375,400
Nevada	.13	55,170,700	46,800,000	8,370,700
New Hampshire	.29	123,073,100	104,400,000	18,673,100
New Jersey	3.29	1,396,243,100	1,184,400,000	211,843,100
New Mexico	.28	118,829,200	100,800,000	18,029,200
New York	14.67	6,225,801,300	5,281,200,000	944,601,300
North Carolina	1.59	674,780,100	572,400,000	102,380,100
North Dakota	.34	144,292,600	122,400,000	21,892,600
Ohio	5.78	2,452,974,200	2,080,800,000	372,174,200
Oklahoma	1.17	496,536,300	421,200,000	75,336,300
Oregon	1.04	441,365,600	374,400,000	66,965,600
Pennsylvania	7.62	3,233,851,800	2,743,200,000	490,651,800
Rhode Island	.56	237,658,400	201,600,000	36,058,400
South Carolina	.76	322,536,400	273,600,000	48,936,400
South Dakota	.36	152,780,400	129,600,000	23,180,400
Tennessee	1.37	581,414,300	493,200,000	88,214,300
Texas	4.38	1,858,828,200	1,576,800,000	282,028,200
Utah	.34	144,292,600	122,400,000	21,892,600
Vermont	.18	76,390,200	64,800,000	11,590,200
Virginia	1.49	632,341,100	536,400,000	95,941,100
Washington	1.65	700,243,500	594,000,000	106,243,500
West Virginia	.92	390,438,800	331,200,000	59,238,800
Wisconsin	2.10	891,219,000	756,000,000	135,219,000
Wyoming	.18	76,390,200	64,800,000	11,590,200
District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska	1.48	628,097,200	532,800,000	95,297,200

Source: Federal Spending Facts, prepared and published by Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Jan. 24, 1950.

How Rent Control Operates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from an intimate friend of mine from Stockton, Calif. This man was one time an elected official of the State of California, voluntarily retiring from the office to devote his entire time to the practice of law. He is an able and respected member of the bar of California and a gentleman who is fair and equitable in all his dealings with his fellow men.

This letter shows what rent control does in specific cases, which probably could be multiplied by the hundreds of thousands in the United States.

During the war I believe that rent control was essential and for sometime thereafter I believed in rent control during the readjustment period due to the extreme shortage of houses, especially in my home State of California.

But that time has passed and we should now give those who have invested their life savings in real property and improvements thereon the same chance to obtain a return on their investments that other segments of our economy have. My experiences with the Rent Control Bureau have never been very satisfactory. I dealt with many specific cases, especially those of old people who had invested their life savings in rental property try to get adjustments but in practically every case were refused any adjustment. When the rent-control law went into effect they were renting their apartments and their flats at reasonable rentals. These figures remained in practically every case that I know about throughout the war and for some time thereafter, although the cost to the landlord in taxes kept getting higher and other things climbed higher. The instances cited in the enclosed letter illustrate the distortions that are practiced and can be practiced under rent control. For obvious reasons, I do not wish to disclose the name of the individual who wrote it—the main reason being that I have not received his permission.

I hope that everyone interested in rent control will read the letter, which is as follows:

Hon. J. LEROY JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROY: You haven't heard from me for some time, have you? I want to urge on you not to vote for any more rent control when the present act expires. The thing has never been fair, as it has practically frozen all rents on the 1942 level, during which time not only expenses of operation; taxes, etc., have risen, but the ability of the tenants to pay rent in terms of dollars has doubled. Oh, yes, in occasional instances, by fighting the tenants at the rent office the landlord is able to get at most a 15-percent increase, as compared with a hundred-percent increase in almost everything else in the same period, including the tenant's income. We could put up with all that unfairness for a while, as long as there seemed to be a great scarcity of rental units. That scarcity, however, has ceased, except in isolated spots. In others there is an apparent scarcity, because of families spreading out in large houses which they can get for low rent, and one or two people occupy places which would easily accommodate five or six, without crowding. I have a tenant, who, when rent control went into effect, was occupying a seven-room house, with a family of three or four children. She was paying $20 per month. Upon my petition, the rent has gone up to $27.50 per month. Her children are grown up and gone. She can't rent a single room with kitchenette at that low a rent, so she continues to occupy the seven rooms all by herself, and I can't get her out as long as she pays the rent.

Another illustration: We bought a house in Carmel for a summer home. With the furnishings, it cost $20,000. In order to get some income from it during the times we did not intend to use it, we proposed to rent it. We had the rent director look over the property, and he gave us a figure of $175 per month as maximum rental. It had never been rented before. A tenant was not secured until last November. At that time the rental period was pretty well past. We secured a particularly desirable couple, and, because of the lateness of the season, and the fact that they appeared to be very fine people, and would take good care of the place, and only wanted it for a few months, we let them have it for $125 per month. We were then required to register the maximum rental for the place at $125 per month, because that is the rent we allowed this couple to pay. We are told now that, in order to increase it from $125 to $175, which the director himself admits it is worth, we will have to file a petition showing hardship, etc. We are further told that, having once rented it by the month, we can never rent it by the week to summer vacationists at anything more than a pro rata of the low wintertime rental. The result of all this regulation is that, when we get that house back, we intend to take it off the rental market completely; thus, rent control helps create a scarcity of housing.

A client just came in. Through an estate he acquired a house which had never been rented before. He offered it for rent fully furnished. A real-estate firm advised him that $95 was a fair rental. They secured a tenant who was willing to pay that amount and signed a written lease for a year, agreeing to pay it. The tenant was represented as having a family consisting of his wife and a small baby only. The tenant took possession, moving in himself, his wife, his wife's mother, a grown son, and three children. Shortly thereafter, he filed a petition to decrease the rental from the $95, which he freely and voluntarily agreed to pay, to $52.50. It is probable that petition will be granted. That kind of fraud is perpetrated on the owners and countenanced by the rent office constantly. Under this law a tenant cannot be held for the most palpable fraud, but the landlord can be assessed triple damages for some technical violation.

You may place no value on my personal opinion in this matter, but you can't get around what happens in actual cases. I have heard that once a Government bureau gets its tentacles on the public, it never lets loose. I hope this is one bureaucracy which you can help abolish.

With best regards, I am
Yours very truly.

Union Hiring Halls in the Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, already there are signs of the undermining effect of the Taft-Hartley law on American industry. The recent action of the United States Supreme Court, sustaining a lower court ruling of the maritime union hiring hall as illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act, brings closer to realization the disruptive influence of this ill-conceived piece of legislation.

In the maritime industry, more than anywhere else the Taft-Hartley ban on the closed shop poses a problem that must be reckoned with immediately. Otherwise a virtual break-down of the industry's ever-increasing efficiency of operations looms large. For the Taft-Hartley closed-shop ban not only strikes at the heart of the seafaring unions, but it is an immediate threat to the stability of the industry of which they are a part.

Management, as well as labor, stands to lose if the outlawing of the hiring hall is not rescinded.

Undoubtedly that was not the intention of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nevertheless that is exactly what the closed-shop ban is on the verge of accomplishing in the maritime industry at least.

Any objective study of the maritime unions' hiring halls will demonstrate the value to all concerned of the continued use of this method of employment. These hiring halls are at the very core of the industry's operations. Arbitrarily to knock them out would inevitably upset the entire pattern of operations and invite a return to chaos, confusion, and even corruption.

I have observed the hiring halls, as maintained by the seafaring unions, in action. As a result of these observations I am unqualifiedly in favor of giving them legal status—for the simple reason that they have accomplished much in behalf of the American seamen and the American shipowner, with consequent advantage to our Nation.

On a recent stopover in New York, I visited the headquarters of the Atlantic and Gulf district of the Seafarers International Union, A. F. of L., for the purpose of establishing in my mind how the hiring hall principle was applied.

In the seafarers' hiring halls the seamen obtain employment through what is called the rotary system of shipping. A man who comes in for a job is registered and is given a shipping card. His name is then placed at the bottom of the shipping list, and as jobs are called out they are offered to the men at the top of the list.

The men at the top of the list may accept the jobs or reject them—without affecting their prior claim when another job is called. In this way the list rotates. In other words, jobs are distributed on a first-come-first-served basis. No other consideration enters the picture. The only qualification is the required competence for the job, and all eligible applicants have certificates of endorsement issued by the United States Coast Guard.

The rotary system is democratic in principle, and at the seafarers hall I witnessed it as democratic in practice.

This, then, is the method of employment which the SIU and other maritime unions are defending in their fight against the Taft-Hartley ban. And they are morally justified in doing so.

Anyone even slightly familiar with the sordid hiring practices in the maritime industry prior to the advent of the union hiring hall will readily admit the justification for the unions' stand.

In the preunion hiring hall days ships' complements were filled by the most odious means. Men were drugged and hustled aboard ships by unscrupulous characters who received fees for their piracy. A detestable breed of parasites known as crimps sunk seamen deep into debt, then forced them to take jobs aboard vessels under any kind of conditions as a means of releasing them from financial indebtedness.

A man who went after a job on his own was subjected to discourtesies and abuses which he had to bear lest he jeopardize his chance for employment. Seamen were stripped of every vestige of dignity. Understandably, the merchant marine could not be expected to operate efficiently in the midst of such medieval treatment of the men handling their vessels.

Merchant seamen like those in the SIU are determined to keep the present democratic method of job distribution, which, they maintain, is only possible through the medium of their union.

But the clincher in the argument for immediate action to return the union hiring halls to their pro-Taft-Hartley status is the fact that the shipowners themselves have indicated their desire to continue present hiring methods. From management's standpoint, dispatching men to ships from the union halls has proved to be decidedly economical.

Under the present hiring-hall system the shipowners know that their ships will arrive and leave on time. They know that their ships are in the hands of responsible, competent seamen who are demonstrating an ever-increasing responsibility.

In the light of conditions in the maritime industry today, the Taft-Hartley Act's ban is a mistake. It should be recognized as such. To sit by and do nothing to ward off the damage it could reek would simply be compounding the error.

A frank, objective approach indicates that remedial legislation is essential to correct the injustice of the Taft-Hartley ban on the hiring hall to the American seamen, the American shipowners, and to the Nation.

The Case Against Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Case Against Mr. Truman," published in the March 9, 1950, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST MR. TRUMAN

The outcome of the coal strike confronts the Truman administration with serious charges, of which it is bound to hear much in the future. Seldom has a government engaged in a series of concerted moves more calculated to undermine the authority not only of a particular law but of law in general. Mr. Truman may congratulate himself upon what he assumes to be the break-down of the Taft-Hartley Act. But he shall find, in the long run, that he, and not the law, is called to account.

The political campaign which Mr. Truman has waged against Taft-Hartley, echoing the empty cry of "slave law," could not have been better devised to induce the miners into disobedience. Did they not have every reason to suppose that a law which was thus attacked by the Chief Executive would be enforced, if at all, in a half-hearted way? Mr. Truman's repeated denunciations might have been excused had they been part of a sincere attempt to have the law improved. Yet he blocked amendment deliberately. He might have had written into the law a plan for seizure, giving him in advance the weapon he sought desperately at the last moment; he might have had written into it a provision for fact-finding boards empowered to make recommendations. These amendments, as well as many others, were approved by Senator TAFT and would have been enacted except that Mr. Truman preferred to keep alive what he supposed to be a profitable political issue. To have continued his slurs upon the Taft-Hartley Act was, in these circumstances, a course of utter irresponsibility.

Having thus weakened the law's authority, the President proceeded to delay invoking it until the last possible moment. An Executive whose freedom from partisan motivation was entirely assured might have been given the benefit of the doubt in choosing his own moment to ask for an injunction. But the tardiness, coming on top of Mr. Truman's previous behavior, could only be interpreted as one more indication that he did not take the law seriously. It had the additional result of bringing the country so close to a severe catastrophe that time was not available for bringing the necessary legal processes to their end. An earlier resort to the Taft-Hartley injunction would have made possible an appeal from Judge Keech's decision, which might have left the legal situation entirely different from what it is now.

To crown all this, the Government's prosecution of the contempt case against the union was notably lacking in vigor. It will be observed that Judge Keech held it to be entirely conceivable that the strike in the face of the injunction had been ordered, encouraged, recommended, instructed, induced, or in some wise permitted by means not appear-

ing in the record. The gist of his decision was simply that, evidence of this kind not having been presented, he could not convict on conjecture. But why was it not presented? Senator TAFT and others claim evidence to show that union officials recommended disobedience of the back-to-work order and that organized goon squads kept union members from the mines. It would certainly seem possible for the Government, where so clear an indication of union responsibility existed, to document the case effectively. Why was this not done? Or if it was done, why was the evidence not put in the record?

A persistent attitude and a long train of acts show the Truman administration to lie under the charge of having subverted the Nation's laws in the hope of gaining political advantage. That is as heavy a charge as can be made against a Chief Executive. It is inconceivable that a people conscious of the duties and the supreme responsibility of their President should soon forget it.

ITO Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky dealing with ITO agreements, and with the effect such agreements are having on industry, especially the pottery and chinaware industry, particularly in the State of Ohio.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

While the State Department is pushing its multiple trade agreements and the internationalists are pressing for the adoption of the ITO agreements, another American industry is being squeezed to death by cheap-wage competition and dumping by dollar-anxious governments.

The item is chinaware and pottery.

This American industry is widely scattered and is held by comparatively small businesses. There is a concentration of pottery and chinaware manufacturing in the vicinity of Zanesville and East Liverpool, Ohio, but this is an unusual industry not only because it is widely scattered but also because there remain in it one- and two-man plants.

It is therefore difficult for chinaware manufacturers to exert great political pressures.

According to the Vitrified China Association, the wage scale of workers in this industry in 1948 was: the United States, $1.30 per hour; England, 43 cents an hour; Belgium, 31 cents; Germany, 30 cents; France, 26 cents; Italy, 25 cents; Czechoslovakia, 22 cents; Japan, 9 cents. And in this country, wages have gone up since then.

As labor costs are the biggest item in the production of this commodity, American labor cannot compete with low-scale wages, particularly when the tariff is manipulated to favor the foreign product.

I am told that over 100 small one- and two-man plants around Los Angeles have been driven out of business since the war, due to dumping from Japan.

Medium-grade chinaware is in competition with chinaware from Czechoslovakia. Considerable so-called Dresdenware is coming into this country marked Meissen, Czechoslovakia. But Meissen is not in Czechoslovakia; it is in Saxony, in east Germany, which is in the Russian zone.

In a word, our customs officials permit the Russians to fake a label. As there is no American consul in Meissen, the manifests are handled from our consulate in Prague as though it were Czechoslovakian goods.

Perhaps it really makes no difference, but there are Americans who would not buy Russian-made or controlled goods at any cost. Such persons are being fooled into buying this stuff on the assumption that it is Czechoslovakian and not Russian-zone goods, if it makes any difference.

Imports are on the constant rise. Although the total dollar volume of this generally low-priced commodity is not high, the effect of the imports on our industry is important and, in some places, disastrous.

An astonishing callousness toward American producers of chinaware was recently noted by Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, who called attention to the fact that American embassies use German (that is, Russian) chinaware in preference to the American-made. This was done without a bid, without advertising, without giving the American manufacturers a chance.

Allen (Allyn?) Donaldson of the State Department is reported to have explained this unusual attitude toward American goods as follows:

"The reason why we didn't advertise this thing was because we didn't want commission men to come down here from New York."

It probably would inconvenience Mr. Donaldson—take his time and that sort of thing.

The British have some regard for their own manufacturers. Senator BUTLER'S report includes this letter, which to me makes sense:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, November 8, 1949.

Mr. ROBERT F. MARTIN,
Vitrified China Association, Inc.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 31st of October, and would point out that, as the United Kingdom is itself the manufacturer of some of the finest chinaware in the world, we are not in the market for china manufactured elsewhere; nor do I think that any of the other embassies in the British Commonwealth would be interested in your proposal.

Yours very truly,

F. A. DE MOLEYNS.

After what happened to the Waltham Watch Co. in competition with Swiss watches, American producers of articles which compete with European and Asiatic goods ought to study the various measures which the internationalists have cooked up against us.

They cry that those who need dollars should be permitted to dump their goods into this country. It is even being suggested that if our industries go broke, the owners of companies are to be given a subsidy and American laborers a dole on condition that they do not produce American goods.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Revere City Council under date of March 6, 1950, at Revere, Mass.:

Resolution memorializing Congress relative to Public Law 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944

Whereas Public Law 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, more generally known as the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans, approved June 22, 1944, and specifically that portion which relates to readjustment allowances payable to honorably discharged veterans with 90 days or more of service, after September 16, 1940, was intended primarily to assist veterans to readjust themselves to civilian life by granting of security payments during the process of transition, up to a maximum of 52 weeks, with payment rates of $20 weekly; and

Whereas many veterans did not avail themselves of the benefits of said law because not in need during its life; and

Whereas many veterans are now in need, and whereupon others shall be in need in the future for like assistance as prevailed while the law was in force: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized that the provisions of said law be therefore revived and extended, such as to offer equal opportunity to those veterans who have not hitherto availed themselves of its provisions.

Proposed Benefits to Government Employees Who Retired Prior to April 1, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 6, 1950, addressed to me by George Cutler, president, Second Division, National Postal Transport Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT
ASSOCIATION, SECOND DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It has been with considerable regret and misgivings that I

have been following the slow progress of S. 878, a bill designed to give those employees who retired prior to April 1, 1948, certain deserved benefits which were unfortunately denied them under Public Law 426, Eightieth Congress.

All Federal civil-service employees are fully aware of the major role that you played in the enactment of the legislation best known to us as the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Retirement Act, and appreciate that many of its most favorable features would not have been incorporated therein but for your efforts.

We are also cognizant of the fact that you felt, as we did, that Public Law 426, despite your best efforts, contained a glaring inequity toward those employees that retired prior to the effective date of the act. These men, after a lifetime of faithful and efficient service, trying to exist on completely inadequate annuities in a period of runaway inflation, were offered the unfair choice of either a $300 annual increase in their annuities or a provision for a widow's annuity should they predecease their wives.

We can well appreciate the dilemma of these men, forced to choose between the $300 they needed so desperately to make ends meet and the protection that their lifetime helpmates were entitled to have in the event of the annuitant's prior death. Surely this was a terrible choice to inflict upon a faithful employee after a lifetime of service. It should not be forgotten also that these men contributed to the retirement fund during all of their service in dollars worth 100 cents while their annuities were being paid in dollars worth less than 60 cents in terms of relative purchasing power.

This inequity has now persisted almost 2 years and should be corrected without further delay and we are certain that you will do all in your power to secure enactment of S. 878 in the interests of justice and equity.

In common with all postal employees, let me again take this opportunity to express our appreciation for your constant efforts in our behalf and to assure you of our sincere gratitude for your interest in our problems.

Sincerely,

GEORGE CUTLER,
President, Second Division, National Postal Transport Association (Formerly the Railway Mail Association).

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed "Sam Citizen," which appears in the February issue of the Swift News, published by Swift & Co. I believe the sentiments therein expressed are shared by millions of Americans. I am indebted to Joseph M. Nolan, a member of the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., for calling attention to this excellent little article.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYTOWN, U. S. A., *1950.*

UNCLE SAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR UNCLE: Let's talk this thing over. Somehow I have had the idea you were working for me—that I gave you your job by my vote.

It looks now like the shoe is on the other foot. You've got me working for you. I don't quite know how it happened, but here are the figures:

	Days each year
To pay our debts for former wars I work	11
For defense and the cold war I work	24
For other Federal expenses, I work	12
Total	47

Now you're talking about spending more. If you put these bills across, they will cost me another 20 days per year. In addition, I have to work for State and local government expenses 14 days.

That is a total of 81 days. There are only 252 working days in a year. So, you and others are putting the bite on me in taxes for almost a third of everything I earn. And it hurts.

President Truman appointed a bunch of pretty smart people to study the problem of Government economy a while back. Their outfit was named the Hoover Commission. I'd like to see you follow their recommendations.

Now I know, Uncle, that I've asked you to do a lot of things for me. Too many, I guess, considering how much they all cost. If I depend on you to put aside more money for my old age and to meet my bills when I'm sick, somebody will have to pay. And if you're going to pay me whether I work or not, build me a house, and send my kids to college, there's just one thing that's certain. Your hand will be in my pocket all the time instead of just about one-third of the time, or else you'll be bankrupt. Credit is a great thing, but you can stretch yours too far just like I can mine.

So, what am I going to do about it? Well, Uncle, I'm going to let my Congressman know what I think we taxpayers can afford and what we can't pay for. And I'm going to tell him, too, that he has to limit spending to absolute necessities.

Yours truly,

SAM CITIZEN.

British Columbia—Forty-ninth State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is not my habit to insert personal letters in the RECORD, but I received yesterday one which I think contains an original suggestion with reference to proposed statehood bills, and I should like to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZION, ILL., *March 6, 1950.*

United States Senator BUTLER,
Member, Interior and Insular Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our local paper, the Waukegan News Sun, recently had an article referring to your stand on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The Chicago Herald American has been pushing this idea for weeks.

I believe definitely in your stand on blocking this action until we can use a more sane and realistic approach to our national safety.

My idea in writing to you is this. We Americans care nothing for the political angles, but what is best for all of us for our betterment as a whole and national safety problems. I have read many times of Canadians wanting to join us. Provinces or certain districts.

Why not start negotiations to see if British Columbia would vote to join us and make Columbia our forty-ninth State? Then Alaska would become the fiftieth State.

This is the best method to keep our borders contiguous and realistic in adding new States. Otherwise, to make far-away places or islands, States, is laughable.

This would make it possible to better build up our coast defenses of the west in radar and landing fields.

Hope this sounds sensible and await your kind consideration to your fellow Members. I am

Respectfully yours,

CHESTER G. ROSS.

The Real Damage Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1950:

LAW SEEN DAMAGED MORE THAN ECONOMY BY LEWIS' VICTORY—SYSTEM OF ENFORCEMENT AND LABOR REGULATION LOST BY COURT RULING

(By David Lawrence)

A survey of the wreckage strewn by John L. Lewis and the mine workers' union shows much more serious damage to the fabric of law and order than to the Nation's economy.

What was lost in dollars and cents by the mine owners and by the miners and the disinterested public is not as great as the injury done to the whole system of law enforcement as well as to the field of labor-management regulation by law.

For from now on all union officers have a precedent encouraging them to defy court injunctions and court orders merely by claiming that the individual members act spontaneously and not by concerted decisions.

John Lewis readily gave up the clause in the contract declaring that his members would mine coal only when "able and willing." This clause became superfluous the moment Judge Keech's decision was rendered. Wildcat strikes and so-called unauthorized work stoppages now can be undertaken apparently without fear of the orders of a court which heretofore would have been expected to secure compliance with its orders to desist from violation of contract law or the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

EVIDENCE SUPPRESSED

What is worse is the way the administration here, unchecked thus far by Congress, has suppressed evidence showing how the court's injunction was flouted by a conspiracy inside the miners' union. Thousands of words of affidavits told the Justice Department attorneys plainly how the mine unions held local meetings throughout the coal fields several days in advance of the expected issuance of a court injunction and how, by word-of-mouth arrangements, the plan was engineered to disregard the telegrams sent by their own officers at the behest of the court.

Now John L. Lewis boasts in the newsreels shown in the moving-picture theaters throughout the Nation this week that his union "discredited the Taft-Hartley abomination"—by which he means, of course, the injunction provisions that constitute its teeth. He is right—the union has discredited not only the law but the whole system of enforcement of the orders of the Federal courts of America.

The State courts have also been damaged in prestige. Although many suits have been filed alleging a violation of laws governing restraint of trade by means of the 3-day week and other controls over production, the operators, as a condition toward getting the Lewis signature on the contract, were compelled to agree to drop all such suits and in effect, withhold from the State authorities any evidence to prove law violations. Thus is economic duress used to break down the proper functioning of State courts.

GAINS NEW INFLUENCE

Most important is the new influence which Mr. Lewis gains over the whole labor movement. Though not in the AFL or CIO, he has begun to dominate them both. He offers $1,000,000 to Walter Reuther's auto workers, sends back the $500,000 which Philip Murray's steelworkers sent him and revives his idea of a mutual-aid pact for defense whereby the hundreds of millions of dollars amassed from workers' dues shall be used to buy legislation and influence the election of those who will do the bidding of union groups. Mr. Lewis frankly admits, in a recently published biography, that he paid $500,000 to the Roosevelt administration to buy the passage of the Wagner labor-relations law.

Mr. Lewis also has led the way to something else—far more significant. He is the first labor leader to achieve for his union a 2-to-1 control of the trustees of a big pension fund and involving shortly about $300,000,000 of money. Other union leaders will demand the same thing now.

Mr. Lewis bids fair by his challenges to make a last supreme effort to bring about a dictatorship by means of a working alliance among the big unions. The other leaders may be jealous of him, but he has demonstrated to the rank and file that he is bigger than Presidents or Congresses—they become putty in his hands.

The abuse of the public interest in the coal controversy brings nearer the day when an exhausted and desperate public will demand some form of Government control of both unions and industry.

Labor Curbs in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Labor Curbs in Britain," and an editorial dealing with the same subject, published in the Wall Street Journal of March 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR CURBS IN BRITAIN

(The following report on the extent and use of labor controls by the British Government was written by Allan Flanders, formerly an official of the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain. It is condensed from Labor and Industry in Great Britain, a quarterly review, published by the British Government. For a discussion of this report, see the editorial "Never? Well, Hardly Ever" in today's review and outlook columns.)

In discussing the controls over Britain's economy, there is usually very great misunderstanding over the extent to which labor is controlled.

It is true that Britain has retained in the years since World War II some statutory controls over the movement of labor from one occupation to another. Unfortunately, however, the purpose, nature, and extent of these controls are not always understood or even correctly reported, with the result that sometimes strange and unrecognizable pictures are formed of the industrial life of Britain's workers.

Let us first glance, however, at the reasons why it has been necessary in postwar Britain for the government—with the full support of the trade unions—to exert any influence on the movement of labor. Basically this is due to the maintenance of full employment. As long as the fear of unemployment forced most workers to keep to whatever jobs they could find, no industries were seriously bothered with the problem of a labor shortage. Full employment has given to the workers a new industrial freedom.

THE UNDERMANNED INDUSTRIES

According to their qualifications they can choose a job to their liking, one in which the wages and working conditions taken together seem likely to provide them with the maximum satisfaction. During a transition period this new freedom was bound to lead to the existence of undermanned industries. In the long run a relative improvement in the wages and conditions in these industries—which has already taken place to some considerable extent in agriculture, coal mining, and textiles—is likely to overcome their labor shortage. But this takes time and the rate of improvement is limited by many other considerations. In the meantime there is an urgent need to match full employment with full production and to ensure that essential work is not held up by the lack of essential workers.

The control-of-engagement order, introduced in October 1947, has been the main legal instrument employed for this purpose. Under this order workers within certain categories of employment (excluding most salaried occupations) and within age limits (18 to 41 for women and 18 to 51 for men) have to report to an employment exchange when they are out of work. Subject to the important qualification that it should be suited to their industrial qualifications, they are offered work in the essential industries, from a list of first-preference vacancies. They are not, however, compelled to accept any of these vacancies providing they look for some form of essential work.

Very often the employment exchanges receive applications from workers to take jobs which they have found for themselves, or from employers to engage particular workers. Although they may seek to persuade the workers concerned to accept first-preference vacancies, the exchanges are not allowed to use the order to prevent workers from taking employment of their own choice providing it is essential.

THE VALUE OF PERSUASION

The value of persuasion can be illustrated by the fact that in 1948 the total manpower employed in the principal first-preference industries increased by 3 percent (in textiles it was as high as 6 percent) as compared with 1.1 percent in other industries and services. The results since April 1949, however, have been less striking, partly because the requirements of many first-preference industries for additional manpower have become smaller, more specialized, and harder to fill.

It is true that the wartime powers of direction of labor are still retained by Britain's Government, but these powers have been used almost exclusively to prevent workers from leaving coal mining and agriculture. Since October 1947 in all 473 mine workers and 159 agricultural workers have been refused permission to leave their industries, but this particular control has now been withdrawn. Otherwise direction has been used in only 29 cases out of some 9,500,000 vacancies filled by the Ministry of Labor since the introduction of the control-of-engagement order.

The problem of the undermanned industries has been eased a good deal in the past 2 years, partly because of the influx of foreign workers into civilian employment in Britain. But some industries—notably textiles—are still short of manpower. Moreover, there is an immediate need following devaluation of sterling for measures which would help to secure some redistribution of labor in favor of the dollar-earning and dollar-saving industries.

NEW METHODS OF EASING LABOR MOBILITY

The National Joint Advisory Council to the Minister of Labor, on which the British Employers' Confederation, Britain's Trade Union Congress, and the nationalized industries are represented, has, in fact, been considering whether there should not be some overhaul of the present procedure under the control of engagement order. As yet no decisions have been announced, but it is most unlikely that there will be any attempt to use the powers of direction.

A tightening up of the administration of the Control of Engagement Order has also been considered. This may take the form of limiting the range of jobs offered to workers by employment exchanges to less than four or more alternatives usually provided at present. A shorter list of priority industries may be drawn up and employment exchange managers may be encouraged to consider the merits of individual firms in their districts in regard to dollar earning or saving.

In short, Britain is still confronted with the problem of moving workers to essential work, but encouraged by her past experience she continues her efforts to solve the problem without using the equally undesirable compulsions of outright direction or unemployment.

NEVER? WELL, HARDLY EVER

No government in history, Sir Stafford Cripps once remarked, has ever succeeded in managing an economy without using compulsion on labor.

But the British Socialist government, he added, was going to prove it could be done, that a free people could have a planned economy without compulsory labor. Britons never, never, shall be slaves.

In an adjacent column this morning we print a report on the compulsions used on British labor by the Socialist government to support its planned economy. This report is intended as a defense of the Government's labor policy; it was written by a former official of Britain's Trades Union Congress and a friend of the Labor government, and it was published by the official British Information Service.

This report speaks unintended volumes.

The Socialist government, says Mr. Flanders proudly, has used compulsion against British workingmen in a total of only 661 cases. These have been almost exclusively to prevent workers from leaving coal mining or agriculture; otherwise, compulsion has been used in only 29 cases. Furthermore, workers have never been compelled to accept a specific job provided they would look for some form of essential work, i. e., work the Government considered essential.

Now, this is a fine tribute to the moderation of the Socialist government. In all Britain only 661 persons have had to be put to forced labor to fit the plans, doubtless a matter of great comfort to the coal miners who could not leave the coal mines and to the farm hands who could not leave the land.

Once, it is true, there was an ugly name for the practice of chaining a man to a job. It was called serfdom. But now it is called "a new industrial freedom."

In this new industrial freedom the powers of compulsion are not used promiscuously or by whim. They are invoked only because it is at times "necessary to secure some redistribution of labor" and only when the Government's plans are "confronted with the problem of moving workers to essential work." The planners are proud that this is hardly ever.

It is most unlikely, says Mr. Flanders, that there will be any greater attempts to use the powers of direction in an absolute sense. The most that is now being considered is a limitation of the range of jobs offered to workers to less than four, the number usually provided a man at present. The worker can take any job he likes so long as he likes one of the two or three approved by the Government. The Socialist planners, encouraged by their past experiece, will continue their efforts to plan for greater freedom without using undesirable compulsions.

No government in history, Sir Stafford Cripps once remarked, has ever succeeded in managing an economy without using compulsion on labor.

Veterans' Hospital for South Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that while the battle wages and the sacrifices of our patriots are fresh memories in the hearts of our countrymen, the soldier and veteran need not worry about the American Government doing its utmost to compensate him for his sacrifices; but that as war, with all its tragedies, becomes more distant in our memories, the Government tends to forget its responsibilities to these men.

A true example of this can be cited in the plight of the veterans in south Texas. They recently received an order from the Government eliminating 125 contract beds awarded to the Veterans' Administration for treatment of service-connected and emergency cases in the south Texas area. This is an area comprised of 30,000 square miles and having within its perimeter well over 170,000 veterans.

This is a new country and a rapidly growing country in which civilian hospitals have not been able to keep pace with the increase in population. Throughout south Texas all civilian hospitals are filled to capacity. A check of these hospitals in the area shows that they have no surplus beds that might be used for veterans even if reimbursement from the Veterans' Administration were possible.

The only facilities for treatment of veterans in south Texas are Brooke General Army Hospital in San Antonio and the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Houston. These two hospitals are approximately 400 miles from the valley and it is obviously hazardous for acutely ill patients to travel such long distances. In the case of mental patients who are often violent, they have to be confined in local jails until arrangements can be made to transport them over these vast distances to a veterans hospital that can accommodate them—a tragic reward for a man who has donned his country's uniform and through his sacrifices has become mentally or physically ill.

The hospital at Corpus Christi, although not in my district, is adjacent to it and the 125 beds therein which were designated for veterans use have been of considerable assistance in helping us meet part of our problem. The Veterans' Administration states that throughout the country we have an average of 1 bed available for every 423 veterans. Compare this with the veterans of our area who have over 170,000 veterans within a 30,000 square mile area and not one bed available for either service-connected or emergency cases.

The hospital at Corpus Christi was placed in operation on July 1, 1941. It is well constructed and could not be duplicated for twice the original cost of prewar construction. It has excellent planning, each ward having a glass-enclosed room for the nurse with every bed in sight at all times.

I have been told that the elimination of these 125 contract beds was for the purpose of economy, but I cannot believe that a careful study was made or the result would have been otherwise. A check of the daily food cost per patient shows an average of $1.08, which is an unusually low food cost. At present the daily patient cost is $13.53, and if the 125 contract beds are denied and it is reduced to 100 beds for naval personnel only the cost will rise to $20 a day or approximately 50 percent above the present cost of hospitalization. The hospital is now adequately staffed, but some specialists will still be required in various categories to serve the 100-men hospital. A reduction of over 50 percent in the beds will result in a reduction of only 4 doctors, 10 nurses, and 30 corpsmen. At the present time the hospital has a manager and medical assistant, 1 psychiatrist, 1 chief surgeon, 1 chief medical service, 1 EENT specialist, each having an assistant; 1 urologist, 1 laboratory specialist, 3 obstetricians, 1 dental officer, and 1 administrative assistant, a total of 23 medical specialists. There are 23 nurses and 124 corpsmen on duty.

At the present time there are 111 war veterans in this Navy hospital. A survey shows that 30 percent have service-connected disabilities and this is considerably above the national average. Eighty-one veteran patients are nonservice connected but were admitted as emergency cases. Of these 81 patients none could afford to pay for private hospitals.

One patient interviewed by the American Legion field representative is a Legion post commander from Bay City, Tex. He states that he was unconscious when admitted for pneumonia and came to while under an oxygen tent. He said he would have died if emergency hospitalization had not been possible.

Once more it appears that too often our Government departments look to the veterans first when they must economize in the Government. We have been told that the best prophet is a man with a good memory. We have but to remember the attack on veterans' services following the First World War to realize where this present trend is headed. The economy proposed in this measure is, indeed, a false economy, for a study of the facts shows that if these veterans are transferred to other hospitals, as is set out in the order, the cost to the Veterans' Administration will be considerably more. In turn, the taxpayer will suffer because of this ill-advised, so-called economy move. The total per diem cost for treating patients in VA hospitals throughout the United States averaged $15.41 as compared to the daily cost of $10.75 for VA patients in the Navy hospital. If the order is carried out, it will be an additional cost to the taxpayer of $4.66 per patient, or $552.50 a day more than would be expended in the present hospital at Corpus Christi. This amounts to $201,662.52 per year. The argument that this is an economy move just does not make sense in view of the figures shown. In addition to this, it will result in not only an inconvenience to the veterans of this area but the possible loss of life due to a lack of facilities for emergency treatment in the distance to hospitals that can take care of the patient. In addition to the increased cost to the Veterans' Administration for taking care of these patients at other points, the Navy, too, will bear an increased cost of $6.94 per patient, or $263,155 a year.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee in asking that this order, along with similar curtailments of hospital facilities, be delayed until a congressional

investigation of the matter can be made. I have been told by members of that committee that a subcommittee will personally investigate the proposed reduction at Corpus Christi and will visit the base hospital this month. In the name of the veteran and the taxpayer, I ask revocation of this unwarranted and ill-advised order for reduction of VA hospital beds at Corpus Christi.

Depletion Allowance Vital to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of February 24, 1950:

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE VITAL TO DEFENSE

An oil well is not like a factory. Except for normal wear and tear on buildings and equipment, a manufacturing plant can be expected to go on producing at approximately the same rate year after year without losing its productive capacity, and with only periodic need for new large-scale capital investment. But every time an oil well produces a barrel of oil it is that much nearer to exhaustion. Every barrel of oil brought to the surface drains away part of its capital assets and diminishes the value of the property.

So the oil producer, if he wants to maintain his producing level, must be constantly engaged in the search for new oil. That is roughly analogous to the problem that would face a manufacturing concern if it had to build a new plant, or add substantially to its present plant, each year. The cost of searching for new oil, with wells now being drilled deeper and deeper, is high. And, as anyone with even the most casual knowledge of the oil industry can testify, it is an extremely hazardous and uncertain business.

That, in substance, is the picture painted by L. F. McCollum, president of Continental Oil Co., in a Fort Worth speech before seventh district members of the Texas Bankers Association to show why the administration's effort to abolish or drastically reduce the present tax allowance for depletion of oil wells is unwarranted and dangerous. The theory of this allowance is that the oil industry should be given special tax consideration if the new capital required to seek out and develop new sources of oil is to continue to be available.

This depletion allowance of 27½ percent of the gross income of each oil-producing property is in no sense a loophole in the tax laws but a percentage fixed by Congress in 1926 as a result of actual experience in the rate of exhaustion of oil fields. It is entirely in accord with the principle that capital should not be taxed but only the income from capital. It is recognition also of the the high risks involved—risks which make it possible that the producer has sunk much money into drilling dry holes before he brought in the well on which he is allowed to recover his capital tax-free.

Even in proven oil territory, as Mr. McCollum pointed out, one out of every five wells drilled turns out to be a dry hole. For purely exploratory drilling, this percentage of failures naturally is much higher. In 1949, 82 percent of the wildcat wells drilled in the United States were dry. Of all the wells drilled in this country last year—wildcats and development wells (those drilled in supposedly proven areas)—more than one of three was a dry hole.

Money invested in such operations is risk capital indeed, and if the tax incentive is wiped out or substantially reduced there may be few who will be willing to take the gamble. The ultimate results of a sharp lessening of the effort to find new oil reserves are not difficult to see: Less domestic oil available, dependence of the United States upon foreign oil which could be cut off in the case of war and price-manipulation in time of peace, shrinking incomes of oil producers and the many businesses dependent upon the petroleum industry, lower State revenues which would have to be made up from other sources. These unwelcome prospects bear out Mr. McCollum's statement that not only would all the public be made to suffer from a change in the tax allowance, but the national security might be seriously menaced.

As Mr. McCollum also pointed out, the attack on the tax status of the oil industry comes at a time when it is harassed from other directions. The postwar demand for crude oil has slackened its rate of rise just at a time the industry has completed a $1,750,000,000 program to increase its productive capacity. A flood of foreign oil began to pour into the United States just at a time when domestic demand was dropping behind domestic supplies, and these imports show no sign of slackening. The British announced a policy which freezes American dollar oil out of much of the world market, thereby bringing the prospect of release of even more American-produced foreign oil into the United States.

All this, plus the threat of drastic revision of the tax law, falls with especial harshness upon the independent producers—the little fellows of the oil industry. They are the men who, according to Mr. McCollum's figures, in 1948 put down 78 percent of all the development wells drilled in the United States and who are responsible for most of the wildcat oil discoveries.

Texas, as producer of 40 percent of the Nation's oil, already has seen the effect of sharp production cut-backs upon its State finances. The $26,000,000 State deficit in prospect at the end of the current fiscal year is directly due to the tax loss resulting from lowered oil production. Further discouragement of production would deal a heavy blow to a tax structure which is already wobbly.

Mr. McCollum calls it a fantastic paradox that the Government on one hand is trying to curtail future oil production ability in order to increase tax revenues, and on the other is proposing to spend millions of dollars to develop means for producing synthetic fuels. Quantity production of such substitute fuels is still years in the future. Meantime the oil industry, if not hamstrung by a penalizing tax policy, is capable not only of producing to meet the Nation's peacetime needs but of building up the capacity which would be vital in the case of emergency.

If the ill-advised policies now being advocated in Washington had been in effect before World War I the United States could easily have lost that conflict instead of winning it. And if those policies had been put into effect prior to World War II the United States could not have won that war either.

It has been said many times that the ability of this country to produce enormous quantities of oil from reserves already located and proven spelled the difference between victory and defeat. Are we foolishly to close our eyes to the lessons of the past?

To adopt an unrealistic tax program that would discourage oil exploration, or to smother the domestic petroleum industry by unrestricted imports of foreign oil would be to trifle inexcusably with our national economy and the Nation's defense.

Address of Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, March 8, 1950:

It would have been easier for the American people if the mantle of world leadership had fallen across their shoulders in a time of peace and international harmony. Circumstances, however, have willed it otherwise. The economic, political, spiritual, and military leadership of the Western World has devolved upon us in the midst of a cold war of economic distress, political insecurity, and international tension.

For 4 years after World War II, Americans thought more about reconstruction than defense, more about peace than about war. In the background lurked the ominous shadow of the atomic bomb. But we alone held the atomic weapon.

However, in the past 6 months since the President's announcement of an atomic explosion in the Soviet Union, the American public has given more thought to the possibility of war. There has been increasing doubt about our own security, and continued preoccupation with Russian capabilities of aggression.

This international tension has fostered national confusion. If we allow this confusion to persist, we can only expect a future period of national frustration. In our bafflement, we could make errors in judgment and action that would do us irreparable harm.

American leaders, with the full support and understanding of the American people, can dispel the present confusion by thinking sensibly, calmly, and clearly about national security.

On the foreign policy of our Government, and its supporting military strength, rests the confidence of all friendly nations.

If Americans intend to pursue a course leading to an increasing security, it is essential that they give more attention to long-range plans for defense. This Nation has adopted a long-range policy of international peace, and international collective security. This policy needs the support of a sound, long-range military policy that cannot be bent by each shift in the wind, tempered, or softened from day to day.

If the military preparations behind the iron curtain become the barometer for our national policies, then the likelihood of peace becomes as unpredictable as the March weather.

The headline phrasing of the question for 1950 is this: Are the United States defenses adequate? This question may be an oversimplified statement of the confusion on defense matters.

If we believe that war is to be thrust upon us in the near future, a $13,000,000,000 budget fails to provide the air power, the naval power, and the ground units essential to waging it by ourselves.

But our question can no longer be applied only to United States defense. For in the studied opinion of any aggressor, the industrial, commercial, and cultural prize of the world is western Europe.

Our defense needs, and our appraisal of adequacy, must include all of the friendly nations of the North Atlantic Treaty organization, as well as those other nations in

Europe whose security is tied in with our own.

As we study the problem of our own security, we must realize that our first goal is the prevention of war. The program for gaining this objective is the responsibility of the President, the Congress, and the President's Cabinet advisers, among whom the most important is the Secretary of State.

At the same time, however, it is the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense and his military advisers to assist in the programs for peace. The Department of Defense must provide the military backing for these national policies.

Several hundred thousand men and women of the National Military Establishment are overseas engaged in such activities for the Nation. Our occupation forces in the Far East, and in Europe, and all the supporting naval and air forces, are engaged in carrying out national commitments which are a sequel to World War II, and a preface to the world peace which we hope to attain.

It is obvious that a great portion of the defense budget is expended in this role of the Defense Department. The Joint Chiefs of Staff devote a great part of their thought and effort to the support of these programs. Many of the papers handled by the Joint Chiefs of Staff from day to day are for these specific purposes, in order that we can advise the President, through the Secretary of Defense, on the military implications of the plans, programs, and actions involving national policy.

If these programs and policies of the peace offensive at any time falter or break down, then we are charged with the protection of the United States by armed force, and the ultimate protection of any nation or group of nations whom the American people acknowledge as allies.

Our basic military structure consists of two main elements—the forces in being, and the mobilization base. Because the United States will not make war of its own volition, a fact as apparent to any aggressor as it is to us, our forces in being are maintained at a strength which can prevent disaster in the event we are attacked, and which can strike a retaliatory blow that will be strong enough to slow down the aggressor while we mobilize. It would be economically foolhardy and politically inconsistent for us to maintain forces in being sufficient to win a major war.

Our mobilization base must provide the educational, training, and logistical facilities that will assure us of a quick expansion of the armed forces in order that we can eventually bring the full might of this Nation, in conjunction with allied nations, to bear upon the enemy.

The forces in being must be maintained at sufficient strength, and with sufficient weapons, to protect the United States and to hold the bases which we would need in case of war. The Navy must have the capacity of keeping the sea lanes open to these bases, and to our allies. At present, the greatest threat to this ability is the modern submarine. Admiral Sherman's submarine program and his antisubmarine program must go along as fast as our research and development facilities will permit. We must not stint on any well-conceived and coordinated plan for solving the submarine menace. I am glad to be able to tell you, from my personal observation, that we are progressing rapidly in this field.

The Army has managed to effect the savings demanded in the present budget and still provide 10 divisions of ground forces, plus additional regiment combat teams, with their essential combat-support and supply units.

The Air Force program at present is building toward 48 groups, which, in many respects, are larger and stronger than similar groups that were in existence 2 years ago.

The present forces cannot give the United States an absolute guaranty against a disastrous blow. But these balanced forces are a part of the longer-range plan to provide an optimum chance of withstanding an attack, to be followed immediately by mobilization.

Our stock pile of atomic bombs, and our ability to deliver them, affords us an immediate but inconclusive blow of retaliation. Our research and development program, not only in bombs and missiles, but in other weapons and techniques, if properly maintained and supported, should continue to improve the position of the United States and its friends.

Our mobilization base, which includes our industrial mobilization program, demands constant and careful evaluation. When budget economy cuts out an Army division, or a Navy ship, or an Air Force squadron, it is quickly apparent. But when a budget economy cuts sharply into the mobilization base, its effect is not so readily apparent. It is in this field that reductions may do us great harm for the long pull, and yet it is in this field that cut-backs can be most readily applied.

During the past year, the Department of Defense has reported a continuing program of economy to the people of the United States, and there have been publicly expressed grave doubts as to whether these economies had adversely affected our security. It is unfortunately true that no matter how hard we try, in many instances real savings can only be made by cutting down the funds allowed. To cut out the fat and build the muscle, you frequently have to cut out the rich diet. Wartime habits of operation in a hurry, at a greater expense, are hard to break, but once broken, improved efficiency with real savings is the result.

In some measure, this present $13,000,000,000 budget cuts the pocketbook for economy's sake, and, we hope, for improved efficiency in the next fiscal year. There are real evidences that duplications and extra expenses have been curtailed. For that reason, I went along with the present budget reduction, feeling sure that in the long run we could improve our security.

At the conclusion of World War II, with this Nation feeling sure that further combat was not required, the fighting units were demobilized faster than the service units and the shore stations. As we have moved further from World War II, and have taken care of as much property that was left over from the war as we could, having disposed of some and stored some, we can now cut back on service and shore establishments.

At present, I feel that the economies in our defense structure have not cut too deeply into our mobilization base. On the other hand, I also feel that further economies in some of the mobilization programs, including industrial preparedness, should not be effected without very careful consideration of what it may mean to the United States security in 5 or 10 years. Secretary Johnson and I agree on the importance of the mobilization base.

One of the most important duties assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the recommended allocation of funds to the three services. In this area, the defense plans come face to face with dollars, and with the basic question of whether or not we are providing adequate security. However, in the preparation of this budget for fiscal year 1951, cognizance has been taken of the fact that the size and expense of our armed forces must not be allowed to destroy the economy of this country. It is frankly acknowledged that this latter consideration is not within the purview of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor the Secretary of Defense.

In regard to our budget, I must refer once more to the concern of the American people with Russian military capabilities. Over a long period of peacetime, the United States should not expect to match the Soviet Union plane for plane, ship for ship, division for division without lowering its standard of living.

It is truly understood that forces in being, including ground, air, and Navy are not sufficient now to fight a major war. Nor would they be sufficient for such a calamity by the end of the fiscal year of 1951.

But I feel that we are going to achieve the necessary forces to prevent a disastrous attack from crippling this Nation. I also believe that our forces in being, and our mobilization base, will be sufficient, together with the forces and potential of friendly nations, to win a war if it comes.

Whenever we count up our armed forces, we must include the dependable forces of the friendly nations who are allied with us toward a common goal of prolonged peace and collective security. Even now, if we take account of our total planes, and ships, and of the ground combat units, the relative position is not as insecure as indicated at first glance. As time goes on, we will be able to count even more effective units in the air force, navy, and army units of friendly nations, if we continue present programs of mutual assistance and collective strategic planning.

If it is the desire of the American people to assemble forces that will statistically give the United States a preponderance of military power next year, then we shall have to become an armed camp. We will have to lower the American standard of living, and I am sure, permanently adopt large peacetime conscription. Eventually, such forces will be a drain, not only on the economy but on democracy and its many freedoms.

I have stated many times that, in my opinion, we may be able to work out a solution to this international conflict without a war; that I hope we can work out a solution for permanent peace; that we can combine our military potential and our peaceful intention in a strategy for peace.

These statements are based on the assumption that we, the American people, are always going to insist on remaining strong—economically, politically, and militarily. If we do not maintain this strength—and especially if we become confused to the point of disarmament—we will sacrifice any possibility that this Nation may finally forge a lasting peace.

In summary, I believe that: We are building toward sufficient forces in being to avert disaster and to retaliate vigorously in case we are attacked. We have a mobilization potential which will insure victory in the end; and we must combine with friendly nations for collective security.

Study of Monopoly Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I am including herein a copy of a letter and enclosures which I addressed to the Federal Trade Commission and to the Attorney General of the United States as a result of recent hearings con-

ducted by the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power:

MARCH 9, 1950.

Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
The Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: A case meriting investigation by the Department of Justice has come to my attention. I refer to the testimony adduced during the recent hearings on a proposed bill to amend the Webb-Pomerene Act when a representative of the Typewriter Manufacturers Export Association testified before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power. I have personal doubts as to the legality of the operations of the members of this association both in the export and domestic markets.

Although the Webb-Pomerene Act confines exemption from the antitrust laws to an export association "entered into for the sole purpose of engaging in export trade and actually engaged solely in such export trade * * *," this association, according to testimony, "has concerned itself primarily with agreements relating to trade practices and the gathering and dissemination of statistical information relating to typewriter exports," while "each of the members has continued to do its own selling as before." Has this been organized as a paper corporation seeking to obtain the benefits of the Webb-Pomerene Act while refraining from engaging in export trade as defined by that act?

What has been the attitude of the Department of Justice toward this corporate structure? Here are the words of the association's own representative:

"Before our association was organized we submitted a memorandum with respect to its purposes and a copy of its proposed bylaws to the Department of Justice, and they made certain suggestions as to certain changes that they thought were desirable, and those changes were incorporated, and they said they had no objection to it."

What has been the attitude of the Federal Trade Commission? The association's representative claims that the "Federal Trade Commission over the years has interpreted the statute as permitting associations of the type such as ours." It was also testified to that the Commission has never set foot within the association's office to examine its records or to subject it to close administrative surveillance.

The members of this Export Association have apparently not been content to take advantage of the deficiencies in interpretation and enforcement of the Webb-Pomerene law, as a glance at their behavior in the domestic market will reveal. The four members of this association, Underwood Corp., Remington Rand, Inc., Royal Typewriter Co., Inc., and L. C. Smith and Corona Typewriters, Inc., manufacture over 90 percent of the typewriters produced in this country. This Big Four was indicted by the United States on July 28, 1939, for engaging in many reprehensible practices, among them price-fixing. A civil complaint was likewise filed against them and a consent-decree entered perpetually enjoining them from fixing or determining the prices to be charged in the sale of typewriters. But almost 10 years after the entering of that decree, prices quoted by these concerns to the United States Government (1948–49 less tax) for a standard 11-inch keyboard machine were as follows:

Underwood	$107.52
L. C. Smith	107.52
Remington	109.17
Royal	109.02

The domestic consumer has apparently fared little better. Lowest prices to other than the Government in the domestic market for standard 11-inch keyboard models were the following:

Underwood	$121.10
Royal	121.13
Remington	121.30
L. C. Smith	119.48

The enclosed tabulation of these and other figures belies the existence of competition in the typewriter industry.

The profits of these monopoly partners have also swelled the tills of these corporations as a reading of the net profits of these four typewriter companies for several selected years, which I am including herein, will show.

I believe that the foregoing facts warrant prompt and thorough investigation by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission into the corporate structure of the Typewriter Manufacturers Export Association and a reexamination of the practices of its members in the domestic market with special reference to the provisions of the consent decree already entered against them.

Yours very truly,
EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

Typewriter prices, July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949

	Manufacturers' list price	Lowest price to other than Government [1]	Tax	Total	Government price	Tax	Total
Underwood, 11	$149.50	$121.10	$8.97	$130.67	$107.52	$8.97	$116.49
(Best non-Government) 12	155.00	125.55	9.30	134.85	112.62	9.30	121.92
Remington, 11	149.75	121.30	8.99	130.27	109.17	8.99	118.16
(Best non-Government) 13	156.00	126.36	9.36	135.72	113.72	9.36	123.08
Royal, 11	142.50	121.13	8.55	129.68	109.02	9.55	117.57
(Best non-Government) 12	148.50	126.23	8.91	135.14	113.61	8.91	122.52
L. C. Smith, 11	147.50	119.48	8.85	128.33	107.52	8.85	116.37
(Best non-Government) 12	154.50	125.15	9.27	134.42	112.63	9.27	121.90
Woodstock, 11	142.50	103.88	8.55	112.43	93.49	8.55	102.04
(Best non-Government) 12	148.50	108.26	8.91	117.17	97.43	8.91	106.34
Ralph C. Coxhead, model DA 11 [2]	490.00	490.00	31.85	521.85	441.00	31.85	472.85
Varityper, model D 16 [2]	385.00	385.00	25.03	410.03	346.50	25.03	371.53
I. B. M. model 111–12 [2]	335.00	335.00	20.10	355.10	301.50	20.10	321.60
(Electric) model 112–16 [2]	360.00	360.00	21.60	381.60	324.00	21.60	345.60

[1] This does not include prices on typewriters for educational purposes, which is exempted by Public Law 640.
[2] Special writing machines.

Return on invested capital—4 manufacturers of typewriters

[Percent of net income to net worth]

	1941	1946	1947	1948
L. C. Smith & Corona Typewriters, Inc.	13.93	9.86	18.04	16.01
Underwood Corp.	17.69	8.16	21.73	19.29
Royal Typewriter Co., Inc.	22.39	4.26	26.55	30.25
Remington Rand, Inc.	20.59	22.48	37.26	28.59

Source: Moody's Manual of Investments, Industrial Securities, 1948 and 1949 edition.

British Shipment of Arms to the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Secretary of State:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have the honor to address you on behalf of my constituents, and, I believe, on behalf of the overwhelming majority of American citizens, in regard to the attitude of the Department of State concerning the continued and increasing British shipment of arms to the Arab states.

As the sound of gunfire after the last great war died away, the nations of the world began to examine their national economic wounds. Our closest ally, Great Britain, was in dire straits indeed. It became rapidly apparent that this nation must receive immediate economic therapy in the interest of our own security. This was begun in 1946 by granting to the British Government a loan of $3,750,000,000 at only a nominal rate of interest. In 1948, after huge loans and other forms of assistance to the various nations of Europe, we initiated the Marshall plan for aiding European economic recovery. This plan was necessary to stave off complete ruin for Europe and all of the horrible economic consequences that would have been entailed for us too. We wisely foresaw that the best way to resist the pressures of communism was to avoid the economic and political vacuum which this nefarious ideology so eagerly attempts to fill.

The cost of the Marshall plan to the American taxpayer has been tremendous. In 1948 we expended $5,055,000,000 for the ERP. In 1949 we paid out $4,702,380,000 in ERP assistance. The estimates of the ERP cost to us in 1950 reach almost $8,000,000,000. Great Britain receives the lion's share of this huge aid program. And to the extent that the economic recovery of Britain is consistent with the aims of the program this is not to be criticized. But let us examine the two major aims of this costly program and see if Britain's behavior in the political and military world has been consistent.

First of all, the Marshall plan aimed for European economic recovery on a healthy, productive basis. We have met with some limited success here, but we are hampered by the dissipation of Britain's production potential in the face of her own increasing economic precariousness. Secondly, the aim of the Marshall plan was to create, by, and along with, such economic recovery, conditions which would make for a peaceful world.

However, the behavior of Britain has been diametrically at variance with such an aim.

The new and progressive State of Israel signed the last of several armistices with the attacking Arab States in July of 1949. At that time the Security Council of the United Nations lifted the arms embargo to the middle eastern nations. However, in the debates concerning such action the spokesmen for several of the Security Council members, including, ironically, Great Britain, pointed to the great moral obligation to keep armament shipments to these nations at the minimum level consistent with national defense needs. But Britain, instead of honoring such moral obligation, has continued to supply heavy, offensive-type weapons to the Arab States at an ever-increasing rate. This fact is attested to by reliable observers and not denied by the British Foreign Office.

Thus it is that Britain dissipates her now-limited production capacities while unabashedly taking, almost demanding, more and more of our dwindling financial resources. Certainly this is no way to speed economic recovery.

It must also be apparent to all that this policy of fostering a Middle East armaments race runs counter to the aim of promoting world peace. Moreover, it contributes in large measure to the general instability of the Middle East and so works into the plans of the Communists. It would not be an unhappy situation for world communism if the Middle East, which should be devoting its energies to social and economic progress, were again torn by a disastrous war, which might this time so politically bankrupt the area that communism could easily usurp control in the best traditions of that ideology.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I urge that in the name of our Government you protest most vigorously any further shipment of arms which Britain makes to any of the Arab States. I further urge that you warn Great Britain immediately of the strong feeling of our citizenry in this regard, and indicate that the cessation of Marshall-plan aid to that country will certainly be the unfortunate but logical outcome of continued violations of her moral obligations.

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

Our Sick Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, coal represents 95 percent of our supply of mineral fuels, or sources of energy. Gas and petroleum reserves constitute the other 5 percent. Other things being equal, therefore, coal should be supplying 95 percent of our energy and heat requirements. Coal today, however, supplies only 56 percent of those needs; petroleum, 25 percent; and natural gas, 7 percent. During the last 20 years the use of coal has been reduced by one-third, while the use of both petroleum and natural gas has increased by 500 percent. Why? Because "coal has been priced out of the market."

What about the wages paid to the coal miners as compared to wages paid in all manufacturing plants? In 1939 the average weekly wage in all manufacturing plants was $23.86 and the coal miner was getting an average weekly wage of $22.88. In 1949 the average weekly wage in all manufacturing had advanced to $54.41, but the coal miner received $76.84 as a weekly wage in 1949—a 128 percent increase in factory wages, and a 200 percent increase in coal mining wages.

What about the danger incurred in coal mines as compared to factory work or railroad work? Government figures, taken from the Bureau of Mines and the Interstate Commerce Commission, show that injuries in the coal mines are far less per man-hours worked than either in manufacturing or in the railroad industry. Accidents in the coal mines have been reduced 50 percent in the last decade; accidents in industry have been reduced 10 percent; while accidents in the railroad industry have increased by 50 percent. On the basis of Government reports, therefore, work in the transportation field is three times as hazardous as in the coal mines, and work in coal mining is only half as hazardous as in manufacturing.

Taking all these facts into consideration, the coal industry is a sick industry largely because first, coal has been priced out of the market, and second, the great inconvenience caused the public through coal shortages, artificially created by the ruthless exercise of dictatorial powers by one man, John L. Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, as a further explanation of the coal situation, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial, Poststrike Inventory, taken from the Christian Science Monitor, of Tuesday, March 7, 1950:

POSTSTRIKE INVENTORY

Where does the coal settlement leave the Taft-Hartley Act?

John L. Lewis is quoted to the effect that had there been no Taft-Hartley Act there would have been no emergency—the operators would have settled long ago. Which makes exactly the same sense as remarks by some employers about strikes a few years ago: That had there been no Wagner Act there would have been no trouble—the strikes would soon have been broken.

Probably many Americans, not trade-unionists, are entertaining a troubled feeling that the law, somehow, failed.

While we are on record as favoring a number of changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, we would point out that had it not been for this law no court action whatsoever could have been taken against the mine shut-down until after a long trial. Furthermore, because of this law, the willing and able, and the unlimited memorial holiday clauses—both sources of difficulty—do not appear in the new contract.

But it is arguable that had the law permitted a fact-finding board with power to make recommendations, considerably more pressure could have been brought against both sides to make a settlement.

The application of the law by the administration and its interpretation by the courts are quite something else, however. And we would censure one and question the other.

Had President Truman invoked the injunctive procedures of the act before the Bureau of Mines warned that the emergency had come, he would have been interfering in behalf of one side of what was still an economic wrestling match between private parties. But once melting coal piles made the public interest paramount, he should have acted with speed and decision. He did not.

No one knows whether either a court order or Government seizure a month ago would have got coal mined. But action then would have put greater pressures at the Government's disposal and given the Nation a wider margin against calamity. It was the President's duty to try, at least.

Judge Keech's acquitting the union of contempt concerns less the Taft-Hartley than "judge law" as laid down by Judge Goldsborough and affirmed by the Supreme Court. Can a functioning union which is offering to contract for delivery of the collective labor of its members be absolved from all responsibility for failure to control its members in the face of a national emergency? Judge Keech so absolved the United Mine Workers, and we doubt that his decision will stand the test of future industrial strife. It still should be appealed, if for no other reason than to clarify the issue.

Where does the settlement leave the industry?

In a still poorer competitive position against other fuels. But also where it can hardly justify this time any boost in the price of coal beyond the 25 cents a ton added by the new wage and welfare costs.

Where does the end of the strike leave the miners?

Very well paid indeed, by the day. But we doubt any better paid by the year, because they are pricing more and more coal out of more and more markets—and there are too many miners. There is hope in the confidence expressed by operator-spokesman George H. Love—perhaps the industry is learning at last that unless it works to stabilize employment John L. Lewis will. And hope in the Senate's welcome to Mr. Truman's proposal for a thorough legislative study of the industry's problems.

Where does all this leave the public?

A bit baffled, we fear—baffled that no sure answer has been found to the anarchy of battles between giants in an essential industry.

An Educator's Viewpoint on the Smith Amendment to the National Science Foundation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from Cyril Stanley Smith, director of the Institute for the Study of Metals, University of Chicago, and whose eminence as a scientist is attested by his service on the most important and respected engineering and scientific committees of national scope, I have received a letter on the subject of the Smith amendment to the National Science Foundation bill. Mr. Smith sets forth in such clarifying manner the sound objections of the scientists and educators of the Nation to this amendment that I think it should be brought to the attention of the House and receive thoughtful consideration of the Members thereof. The letter follows:

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF METALS,
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1950.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have noticed with interest and approval the increased public

awareness of the importance of science to national welfare, and have been anxiously awaiting the establishment of a National Science Foundation which would permit the Federal support of scientific education and research on a less restrictive basis than is possible through the use of funds appropriated for the military services. I am therefore greatly distressed at the passage by the House of the bill carrying the Smith amendment requiring FBI investigation and clearance of all employees and recipients of funds of the Science Foundation. It must be obvious by now that anything short of an extremely detailed, painstaking, and expensive investigation will fail to detect an occasional person of Communist sympathies. I believe that the use of public funds to pay for the training or research of an occasional person of leftist tendencies is a very small price to pay for freedom, particularly when contrasted with the alternative, which is to introduce police-state paraphernalia and suspicion into the educational system of this country.

It must be remembered that the Science Foundation is not concerned with secret science, but aims to provide fellowships and scholarships to assist training in nonsecret fields and to support research in the fundamental sciences on which technological and military developments eventually depend. This will not be helped by the setting up of an elaborate mechanism to exclude all Communists. I believe that FBI investigation of college students and research men is exceedingly harmful and should be invoked only for those scientists engaged on secret military work. It will inevitably introduce an attitude of suspicion, breed spiteful informers, and tend to prevent the expression of diverse points of view and the free search for truth that it is the duty of the universities and of scientists to encourage.

It must be realized that an open and inquiring mind is an essential characteristic of a good scientist, and nothing is gained by demarking a whole field into which a young man cannot even inquire. I am personally convinced that the best answer to communism is the exposure of its fallacies by free discussion throughout the country, not the setting up of an environment wherein any man who expects to work in science or other domains of public service is afraid ever to mention the word in conversation and campus "bull" sessions.

FBI investigations do not seem to have prevented the presence of an occasional Communist agent even in high Government circles. The dilution of its efforts caused by making the Bureau examine the intimate associations and opinions of every young man who leans toward a scientific career will render it still less able to devote time to critically important security problems.

I believe most strongly that the atmosphere of suspicion and the restraint of free discussion that will inevitably result from the requirement of FBI clearance for a scientific career will discourage a large fraction of young men who otherwise would go in this direction, and is bound to have the effect of lowering the caliber of men remaining in science, and thus of weakening this country's competitive position in both industrial and military fields.

I am writing this letter as a private citizen. My opinion, however, is reinforced by my experience as Director of this Institute and by service on a number of engineering and scientific committees of national scope, for example the executive committee of the Institute of Metals Division of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the Metallurgical Advisory Committee to the United States Bureau of Standards, the Materials Subcommitttee of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and last but not least the Presidentially appointed General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The amendment tends to nullify the very purpose for which the foundation was proposed. If you wish a strong science on which to base future industrial and military advances, I sincerely hope that you will urge the committee to eliminate the restrictive amendment.

Very truly yours,

CYRIL STANLEY SMITH.

Chicago Will Hold First World Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Chicago Journal of Commerce on February 28, 1950, entitled "Exhibition To Contribute to Prosperity and Peace."

This International Trade Fair is to be held in the city of Chicago, from August 7 to August 20, 1950.

After many months of planning by the leading manufacturers of this Nation and the nations of the world, Chicago was selected because it is the strategic geographic center of all the Nation's communications system and can be reached easily from every part of the country, and also because it is a buying center for the Nation's greatest industrial and merchandizing organizations. Chicago being the hub of the Nation, has held more trade shows and expositions than any other city in the world.

To illustrate the magnitude of this International Trade Fair, I would like to call to the attention of Congress, the fact that representatives of the Organization of European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) will participate and that already, Frederic Berbigier, Commissioner General of the Trade Fair Board of the OEEC, has met with Chicago's great mayor, the Honorable Martin H. Kennelly and Mr. I. S. Anoff, president of the First United States International Trade Fair. In addition, President Truman has indorsed the fair as being of significant help in improving economic and political relationship throughout the world and thereby contributing to the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting the copy of President Truman's letter commenting on this fair.

EXHIBITION TO CONTRIBUTE TO PROSPERITY AND PEACE

(By I. S. Anoff, president, First United States International Trade Fair)

Size notwithstanding, there's still plenty of the old pioneer spirit in Chicago.

The city that has always had a reputation for gettings things done quickly and directly has tackled the problem of world trade in its traditional quick and direct manner.

Chicago—not Detroit, Atlantic City, Philadelphia, or New York, all of which announced plans to hold a fair—is staging the First United States International Trade Fair in 1950.

Chicago, not these other cities, is establishing a reputation in every part of the globe as the market center for the entire world.

More than $15,000,000 will be spent by visitors and exhibitors in the fair in Chicago.

MAKING UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION

And with all of the benefits to the city and to its business, Chicago's First United States International Trade Fair will make a signal contribution to world trade, world prosperity—and we hope and pray—world peace.

The idea of an international trade fair naturally would appeal to Chicagoans, because they long have been familiar with the value of a giant market place where buyer and seller can meet and do business.

Chicago is the home of many commercial markets, which in the American economic tradition—unlike the August world trade fair—are vertical markets. But they are great markets and the merchandise mart, the largest building of its kind in the United States, and the furniture mart, one of the great commercial centers in the Nation, are evidences of Chicago's status as the market place, as one of the greatest buying centers for America's great industrial and merchandising organizations.

These are facts that everyone knows, but when Detroit and the other cities made their bid for the fair, they pointed out that Chicago was an isolationist city, unfamiliar with foreign trade.

INTEREST IN EVIDENCE

As a matter of fact, there is considerable evidence in Chicago already of an interest to build healthy trade with the world. It is the only city in the United States with its own import-promotion organization, and only 2 weeks ago, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry published an import directory that listed 487 importers in the city. At least 100 more could be added to the list. From January 28 to February 3, more than 30,000 persons visited the French travel and trade exhibit, where more than 100 potentially new importers were developed.

Chicago, therefore, has all of the natural advantages of the best geographical location, of being a market center, of being the world's greatest transportation center—and, in addition, it has already evidenced an interest in the problem of foreign trade.

These are the reasons why it was natural that Chicago—the commercial, industrial, and transportation center of the United States—should be the first host to the producers of the world's goods at the First United States International Trade Fair.

OTHERS PLAN FAIRS

Other cities—Detroit, Philadelphia, and Atlantic City—already have announced plans to hold fairs in 1951, and we in Chicago welcome their participation in the same manner as the government sponsors of the Canadian Fair in Toronto welcome our fair. Like the Canadians, we recognize that a number of fairs in all parts of the United States will enable foreign businessmen to make sort of a grand circuit of fairs and do a better job of penetrating more markets.

At the same time, by virtue of Chicago's exclusive advantages, and the fact that it is host for the first fair of this kind in the United States, we are confident that the Chicago World Trade Fair will be established as the one outstanding annual trade event around which all of the others revolve.

Chicago can anticipate a business boom as a result of the fair. Approximately $15,000,000 will be spent locally for incidental expenses, such as hotel rooms, food, entertainment, and local transportation, by the visitors and exhibitors to the fair.

The combination this summer of the First United States International Trade Fair and the great Chicago Fair of 1950 will do much to stamp Chicago as the dynamic city for spectacular worth-while expositions. The two fairs are certain to complement each other and to go down in history along with the Columbian Exposition of 1893, a Century of Progress in 1933 and 1934, and the recent Railroad Fair of 1948 and 1949.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 23, 1949.

I welcome the decision of Chicago's forward-looking businessmen to establish an International Trade Fair in their city next year. The interchange of goods among nations is an important means of improving political and economic relationships throughout the world. The Chicago Fair should be of significant help to this end—and the end, therefore, of establishing a firm peace in the world.

I know that the businessmen of the world will find Chicago a gracious and warm-hearted host.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Great Britain Fights United States Oil Industry With American Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and the other esteemed Members of this House have read many news items in recent months about the conferences on oil and the dollar-sterling relationship which have been held between representatives of Great Britain and the United States.

I believe that it is high time that the Congress of the United States concern itself with this subject.

The Persian Gulf area contains almost unlimited quantities of oil which can sustain industrial development and raise the standard of living not only of the United States but of the entire world. However, I wish to invite your attention to the ownership or control of the oil-producing countries of that area.

The Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which is 56-percent owned by the British Government, 22 percent by the Burma Oil Co., and 22 percent by individual stockholders, has the concession for the known oil-producing area of the country of Iraq.

The Iraq Petroleum Co.—which is owned 23¾ percent American, 23¾ percent Dutch-English, 23¾ percent French, 23¾ percent British, and 5 percent individual—has the concession for Iraq, Iran, Transjordan, most of Syria, two Trucial Sheikdoms, Oman, Hadhramut, and Dhofar.

The Bahrein Petroleum Co., which is United States owned but incorporated in Canada, owns the concession on the island of Bahrein.

The concession for Kuwait is 50-percent owned by the Gulf Oil Co. and 50-percent by the British-controlled Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. In the neutral zone of Kuwait both Pacific Western and American Independent have concession interests.

All of the above concessions are either owned or controlled by British companies, are incorporated under British or Dominion laws or the British have political control of the country in which the concession is located.

The sole company in that area which is United States-owned and incorporated outside of Great Britain or her Dominions is the Arabian-American Oil Co. which is owned 30 percent by SONJ, 30 percent by SOCAL, 30 percent by Texas Co., and 10 percent by Socony Vacuum Oil Co.

For the last 3 weeks the New York Times has published a number of interesting articles in its financial section on this subject in which it has been reported that the future and, in fact, the very existence of our oil interests outside of the United States are being threatened. They are as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 17, 1950]

UNITED STATES, BRITISH PACT ON OIL IS UNLIKELY—AVAILABILITY OF DOLLARS AFTER END OF MARSHALL PLAN HELD THE DECIDING FACTOR—MATTER VITAL TO BRITAIN—LIFE AND DEATH TO STERLING AREA, ONLY DIVIDENDS TO US, HER DEFENDERS SAY

(By J. H. Carmical)

Any long-range agreement with the British over the sale of oil by United States concerns in the United Kingdom and the sterling area appears virtually impossible at this time.

The position of the British Government is that it cannot now determine the number of dollars that will be available to pay for oil from United States companies when the Marshall plan expires in 1952.

A British Government source last week said that when the Marshall plan expired it would be necessary to review the entire field of international trade and particularly that between the dollar and the sterling areas. The policy then adopted with respect to oil and other imports, he said, would involve how much the United States bought from the sterling area, how much it invested there, how much it lends, and how much it gives away.

The latest proposal by the British Government on oil imports applies only so long as the Marshall plan is in effect. During that period the British agree to impose no further restrictions on oil sales by United States companies in the sterling area. This, however, will cost the British no dollars, since virtually the entire cost of such oil sales will be paid by the United States Government.

LACK OF DOLLARS SEEN

With the expiration of the Marshall plan, a British Government source said, it may be jolly difficult to get hold of dollars. He emphasized that the United States was the only creditor nation and that it virtually was self-sufficient, needing to purchase relatively little from foreign sources. Thus, he said, it would be most difficult to obtain enough dollars in the regular commercial way to buy essentials necessary to the industrial activity of Britain.

Oil is the largest single item calling for dollar payments in the sterling area. It is estimated that there is a dollar deficit of $600,000,000 a year from oil operations in the area. With the dollar deficit for the entire sterling area placed at $1,500,000,000 a year, oil alone accounts for nearly 40 percent of the total.

A large part of the expense incurred by the British and the British-Dutch oil companies in their operations must be met in dollars. Of the estimated 80,000,000 tons of oil these companies now are selling each year in the sterling area, there is a dollar cost of $275,000,000 for which exchange must be provided.

The cost in dollars of oil supplied by the British companies to the sterling area is said to be about one-fourth that for the United States companies. In view of the lower dollar cost to the British companies, it is pointed out that, with a dollar deficit, it would be folly for the British Government not to use oil produced by its own nationals to satisfy the needs of the sterling area. However, it was said, there would be no objection to the United States companies competing for this business if it could be done on a basis where it would cost no more in dollars than the oil produced by the British companies.

LIMIT TO SALES LIKELY

The whole question of the sale of oil by United States companies in the sterling area primarily is one of dollar exchange, it is maintained. Unless some device is arranged after the expiration of the Marshall plan to supply these dollars outside the regular commercial way, it is believed there will be no recourse other than to limit drastically the sale of oil from dollar sources in the sterling area.

In this connection it is argued that the sale of oil by United States companies in the sterling area is only a matter of dividends, but that it is a case of life or death to Britain, including the entire sterling area.

To the United States oil companies, however, more is involved than profits. For years the United States oil companies have been operating abroad and have huge investments, many of them made at the suggestion of the United States Government. These foreign oil properties are needed not only as a supplement to domestic oil operations but are considered vital for national defense.

Further, the royalty payments on the oil produced in foreign countries by United States concerns go a long way toward paying the cost of local governments. If the United States companies expect to hold their concessions abroad they must operate them at a reasonably high level and they can do this only by having a market for their product.

On an equal basis with the British companies, United States companies maintain that they would have no difficulty in meeting competition and holding their share of the world markets. However, through exchange controls and unilateral trade agreements made by the British, they maintain that they are being squeezed out of markets outside the sterling area.

There are some indications that the British may be easing their drive on markets outside the sterling group. One of these is Argentina, where the British more than a year ago negotiated an agreement through which a large amount of oil was exchanged for meat and other foodstuffs. One of the reasons for the possible change in attitude is understood to be the realization that, with the expiration of the Marshall plan, the British companies would not have sufficient oil to supply entirely the markets outside the sterling area.

With the British maintaining that they must have the oil markets in the sterling area if the economy of that group of nations is to be aided, it is becoming evident that the United States companies will have to depend on areas outside the sterling bloc for an outlet for their oil.

BRITISH OIL OFFER TIED TO WIDE RULE—AMERICAN EXECUTIVES SAY CALL TO ASSIGN CONTROL MEANS LOSS OF FOREIGN FIELD—RETURN FAVORS REBUFFED—STERLING RESTRICTION, DIVIDEND LIMIT, AND 50-PERCENT TAX ON NET CITED AGAINST PROPOSAL

(By J. H. Carmical)

The British Government's proposal last week that American oil companies operating abroad assign their concessions to British

corporations and submit to British control and taxes would result eventually in bringing international oil trade under the domination of the British, according to oil executives here.

For some time it had been rumored that the British would make such a suggestion. In fact, if such a proposal were accepted, the British Government said, it would relax its cartel operation, cease making barter agreements, stop the freezing of sterling exchange, and also refuse to recognize any nation that previously had not been recognized by the United States Government.

The British proposals, which generally are considered harsh and unreasonable are not likely to be accepted by United States companies holding oil concessions abroad. It is contended that the only thing they would receive in return was the promise that, so long as the Marshall plan continued, Britain would not impose restrictions on dollar oil beyond those previously proposed. Under this, it is said, about 65,000,000 barrels a year of dollar oil could be sold in the United Kingdom.

MAIN POINTS OF PROPOSAL

Generally, the British proposal would permit the sale of oil for sterling anywhere in the world only through corporations managed and controlled by Britishers and with ownership clear back to the oil source. In addition, the new British companies are to be subject to the British tax laws, which means a levy of a little more than 50 percent from net income.

The new companies may convert their sterling earnings into dollars only to the extent necessary to meet dollar expenses and to pay dividends at a rate prescribed by the British Government but not to exceed 6 percent on investments. The balance of the sterling earnings may be used only to pay labor costs and to buy items needed by the companies in their own operations. Any sterling not so used apparently would be "frozen" indefinitely.

In the oil industry here it is said that the British Government fully realizes the necessity that the American companies have virtually free access to the international oil markets if they expect to hold their foreign concessions. Some oil executive from the start have sensed that the imposition of exchange controls by the British was to get hold of concessions held abroad by the American companies.

DIFFERENCES IN DOLLAR COST

In its regulations the British Government arbitrarily has classified as sterling oil all petroleum produced or marketed by companies of beneficial British-Dutch ownership regardless of the dollars it might cost to produce or acquire the sterling oil.

There is a dollar cost in most oil whether produced by American or British companies. In some instances the dollar cost is greater when oil is produced by a British company rather than a United States concern. For example, it is estimated that the British company operating in Venezuela has an estimated dollar cost of around $1.50 for every barrel of oil produced. On the other hand, a United States company operating in the Middle East has a dollar cost of only 50 to 60 cents a barrel.

The discriminatory feature of the exchange control scheme is emphasized when the British company operating in Venezuela is provided a market in the sterling area for all the oil it may produce, while the United States company operating in the Middle East may not sell its oil for sterling, even though its dollar cost is only about one-third that of the British company in Venezuela.

The result of this action by the British has been not only to reduce exports from this country but also to increase imports here from foreign concessions held by the United States companies. This has greatly reduced the portion of the home market formerly held by domestic producers.

Last year, it is estimated that the domestic producers could have brought to the surface an average of 832,000 barrels daily more oil than was produced without overproducing the wells. The estimated shut-in domestic production now is in excess of 1,000,000 barrels a day.

So far, Texas has borne the main burden in restricting production so as not to upset the petroleum markets. However, there is some doubt as to how long the Texas Railroad Commission, the regulatory authority in the State, can continue "holding the umbrella" over the domestic petroleum industry.

If the commission should be successfully challenged, it is feared that the domestic industry might become demoralized. However, the importing companies are aware of the danger and recently have been reducing their schedule of imports.

The seat of the trouble appears to be a series of moves which have been made by the British as a part of a program to correct their unfavorable dollar balances. We in this country have been very much aware of Britain's dollar problem and through the fine work of ECA have made a considerable contribution toward rectifying the situation. But it must be obvious to all that it is unwise to single out the petroleum industry to bear the brunt of Britain's efforts to save dollars—particularly when the effect of that action may well be to deprive the United States of foreign-oil concessions which are, because of our mutual interest, vital to the security of both countries.

Britain's recent unilateral action in restricting the importation of United States oil into the United Kingdom has brought matters to a head. The British have informed the United States-controlled companies that their fuel-oil imports to the United Kingdom and certain other sterling-area countries are prohibited and their motor-gasoline imports reduced one-third. The only way these United States-controlled companies can continue to meet their marketing requirements in these areas is to purchase so-called sterling products from British-controlled companies. These sterling products have a considerable dollar-cost component that in some cases is higher than the dollar-cost component in so-called dollar oil. The logical conclusion is therefore that under the guise of saving dollars, the British are to gain commercial advantages for the British oil companies at the expense of United States-controlled oil companies.

This was followed almost immediately with similar restrictions imposed at the suggestion of the British Government by India, Australia, and the British Crown Colony of Kenya. Considerable publicity has recently been given to the letter ascribed to sources within the British Government, and never disavowed, which instructed the British colonial possessions to disregard all United States protests as, apparently, they were not seriously intended.

The British have struck another heavy blow at United States oil companies by means of a series of bilateral trade agreements made with Argentina, Sweden, and Egypt and there are further agreements in prospect with Denmark, Spain, and Portugal. These agreements are essentially barter arrangements. In each case it must be recognized that United States oil is being displaced by British oil with the direct assistance of the British Government.

It appears that Great Britain may be attempting to restrict American oil companies business by imposition of currency controls. For example Arabian-American Oil Co.'s production of 530,000 barrels per day a year ago is now down to below 450,000 barrels per day. Largely as result of British exchange controls and bilateral trade agreements with other countries that result in United States controlled oil companies not only losing business in the British Empire but also in such countries as Argentina, Sweden, and so forth. The British by means of operation of exchange control are even trying to get the business of United States-controlled oil companies in Japan.

It is not my purpose today to attempt an evaluation of the markets for United States oil which have been lost and will be lost in the future as a result of British encroachments. There are people in the State Department who are far better qualified for that purpose than I. It is apparent, however, that repercussions will be felt in the form of lost United States oil production in South America, the Middle East, and the Far East as well. The Government of Venezuela has already shown serious concern over the possibility of a reduction in the oil royalties which are so important a part of its total revenues.

In the last war this country needed every bit of oil it was able to get from South America, the Middle East, and elsewhere in order to supplement our own overburdened production in the United States. Frequently, our ability to obtain oil supplies in various parts of the world was valuable purely as a matter of logistics—permitting the saving of much valuable shipping space as the war emphasis shifted from one theater to another. If we ever become involved in another war, you may be certain that we will be tapping all available foreign oil reserves probably more heavily than ever before since new techniques of warfare require ever-increasing quantities of petroleum supplies.

I do not mean for a moment to overlook the importance of our domestic production to us. It is a matter of first importance that we maintain a high level of productibility in this country. There have been recent reports to the effect that the United States currently has a shut-in production of between 800,000 and 1,000,000 barrels of oil a day. This is as it should be. For our military security we need a shut-in production of at least that amount. We had a margin of 1,000,000 barrels per day when the last war started and it barely saw us through.

For 10 years I have been a member of the Naval Affairs and House Armed Services Committees and have often been concerned with the armed services petroleum supply. At present I have been reliably informed that Arabian-American Oil Co.'s crude is the source of at least 12,000,000 barrels of fuel oil,

5,700,000 barrels of Diesel oil and 2,000,000 barrels of gasoline supplied every year to the armed services of the United States. The price paid for fuel oil in particular is much less than going market prices and I want to see that continued.

But my people at home are also concerned over the cost of oil, gasoline, and oil products. I do not believe in the unlimited import of oil produced outside the United States but neither do I believe we should shut out all such oil and thereby force up or maintain an artificially high price at home.

Coal is important to us industrially but I remind this body that today when our mines are being operated, we mine and use approximately the same amount of coal we mined 30 years ago. Our ability to increase our industrial output and our standard of living over the past 30 years has been based on an oil and gas economy.

I consider that the retention of the United States oil concessions in the Persian Gulf area are of the utmost importance to us nationally. If through any means or for any reason, we lose control of our small part of the total oil available in the Persian Gulf area we will have lost a priceless asset and future generations of Americans can, in that case, say we have failed our country and them miserably and have been unfaithful to the trust placed in us.

Mercedes Didn't Get the Handbag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

MARCH 4, 1950.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: Mercedes did not get the handbag.

Mercedes is a special friend of mine—going on three—who talks to me in Spanish, but sings Happy Birthday to You in English, kisses me when she sees me and otherwise brings sunshine to a gloomy world. So, when I was in the dime store this morning and saw that dashing red handbag for 50 cents I immediately knew that it would brighten the life of Mercedes. However, there was a 20-percent excise tax and a 3½-percent local sales tax, which brought the item out of bounds and so Mercedes did not get the handbag.

I wouldn't go so far as to say that because Mercedes did not get this handbag she will later become a problem child, a juvenile delinquent, a suicide, or anything else so gruesome; but I do say that the immediate result of that excise tax and others like them is pretty bad. True, the loss of one 50-cent sale will not make or break the dime store, but multiplied by similar instances throughout the country, it can result in such a drop in sales of handbags, for instance, that the manufacturer becomes overstocked and finally closes down for a period—or for keeps. That means folks out of employment—out of buying power—reduction in sales of other items—more lay-offs—more people looking for jobs—fewer jobs available—but you take it from there.

Mr. HINSHAW, the best thing Congress could do for the country today is to cut down on taxes. Suppose Harry does have to pass up some of his grandiose schemes. Let him. After all, he brags that he went bankrupt. Is that any reason why he should bankrupt everyone else? I don't think so, but he'll do it if Congress doesn't take a hand in it and limit his spending.

If we can keep what we earn—can have a personal exemption for income-tax purposes of not less than $1,500 each (you can't live on less in this country) and have taxes scaled so that no matter how much we earn we can keep two-thirds of it—individuals, corporations, and all—you'll be surprised how much better off the Nation will be. Right now we are headed for bankruptcy and when that happens, where will the money for all the free schemes come from? The golden goose may not be dead yet, but it's pretty sick.

There is no branch of Government today—no department or what have you—that cannot get along on less money. For instance, as you probably have read, Los Angeles has put on a sales tax on alcoholic beverages. My license is for a letter shop—not a grog shop—yet I get notice to collect the tax. Undoubtedly mine is not an isolated instance caused by misfunctioning of the sorting machine at city hall, so you can estimate the amount of wasted effort in mailing notices to the thousands of licensees who do not sell alcoholic beverages, plus the printing and postage required. Is it any wonder that taxes are mounting when such nonsense goes on.

This waste is not isolated. It is not peculiar to Los Angeles City or Los Angeles County. It happens in Sacramento, in Washington, in every Government office and department in the country, and the pity of it is that necessary and useful functions of Government was impeded by such waste.

Another thing, why can't you make it possible for us business people not to have to be tax collectors without compensation. Get this, I don't want to be compensated—all I want is to be relieved of the burden so that I can pay my help what they earn each week and not have to keep a lot of records for some grim-visaged, otherwise gruesome auditor to examine a couple years from now and become more grim-visaged and gruesome especially if he finds the records in shape and no fines applicable. Why should I have to collect taxes from a man and at the end of the year have part or all of it returned by the Government. It doesn't make sense.

Back in early 1941 I bought a good used car for personal and business use. Came the war. My work necessitated that I use the car. OPA kept my prices down, but my other expenses increased. Came the end of the war and my expenses sky-rocketed. Taxes remained at wartime levels, eating into my capital, as has been the case with many and many a small-business man. My car wore out last fall. Under a proper Government set-up and view of taxes, etc., I could have put aside enough to have replaced it. So far, I have not been able to do so. I really feel very bitter about that, Mr. HINSHAW, for I have worked very hard since 1941 and could have and should have had a new car long ago. But the money that I earn is being taken from me and spent by persons who never operated a business in their lives. Or, if they did, they went broke and think that qualifies them for mangement of the Nation's affairs.

I need a car in my business. In fact, I am losing business right now by not having it. Furthermore, I have earned the price of that car, and in 1 year have paid in income tax a very substantial down payment on a car, and since the war ended my income tax payments could have easily bought me a very good car. It's not because I have earned so much that I pay so much income tax, it is the insane manner in which it is figured and the quaint idea that I can live on $600 a year. It is not taxation any more—it is confiscation.

Anyhow, Mercedes didn't get the handbag.

Yours very truly,

HELEN LEE.

Report on Grazing Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years I have endeavored to assemble and bring before the Congress and the people an annual report on the extent to which our Federal Government is taking care of and improving the grazing lands upon which we depend greatly for livestock feed and soil conservation. At the conclusion of these remarks, I want to include a table comparing the acreage held by the nine Federal agencies controlling range lands, their revenue therefrom, and the amount spent on research and improvements on these lands for the last 3 years.

We have made some fine improvements recently and the estimates for 1950 indicate that we finally have awakened some Federal agencies to their responsibilities to care for the lands under their control, even though grazing may be of secondary importance on those lands. The Army and Navy, particularly, are investing greater portions of their grazing receipts in improvements of their gunnery ranges and other lands which are rented out for stock feeding. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority spent less in 1949 for improvements than in 1947, the latter primarily because of reduced acreage. The Bureau of Reclamation and National Park Service, neither of which collects substantial grazing fees, spend nothing for improvements.

Research on grazing problems is handled by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, chiefly the latter, with the total amount spent in 1949 being 20 percent higher than in 1947. Information gained is disseminated to other Federal agencies but there is no over-all policy requiring those agencies to adopt new practices recommended as a result of the research.

Over-all receipts on the Federal range lands were $1,385,263 greater in 1949 than 2 years before, totaling $7,876,761.42. At the same time, total acreage was reduced from 303,964,126 to 298,057,159 acres. Of this amount, the Army lost more than 2,000,000 acres and the Forest Service more than 4,000,000 acres, while the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, and Fish and Wildlife Service substantially increased their holdings.

Seven of the nine agencies increased their revenue from grazing last year. The Army and TVA receipts dropped due to reduced acreage. Most agencies

raised their grazing-fee rates during the last 2 years.

The total amount spent in 1949 for improvements and research on grazing lands was approximately one-third of the total revenue received. This is almost exactly the same ratio as was indicated by the 1947 report. Results of the research, of course, are also made available to holders of privately owned range lands.

The tabulation follows:

United States grazing lands

[Compiled by Hon. Walt Horan, 5th District, Washington]

Department and bureau	1947		1948		1949		1950 anticipated gross revenue
	Number of acres	Gross revenue	Number of acres	Gross revenue	Number of acres	Gross revenue	
Interior:							
National Park Service	1,705,780.00	$13,776.67	1,718,880.00	$20,300.43	1,678,780.00	$14,779.69	Same
Indian Affairs [1]	44,311,000.00	1,438,000.00	43,933,000.00	1,525,000.00	45,203,000.00	1,710,000.00	[2]
Bureau of Land Management [3]	163,784,000.00	1,058,827.00	163,784,000.00	1,419,113.00	163,784,000.00	1,332,485.00	$1,413,000.00
Bureau of Reclamation	492,791.32	[4] 56,890.58	455,763.28	[4] 92,109.96	[5] 657,911.66	[4] [5] 119,319.43	Same
Fish and Wildlife Service	853,207.00	112,140.20	897,431.00	123,600.00	980,029.00	145,382.30	Same
Defense:							
Army	3,017,427.00	1,069,135.00	1,698,993.00	610,512.00	927,319.00	501,745.00	558,000.00
Navy	100,287.00	69,578.00	130,000.00	76,830.00	166,000.00	93,574.00	Same
Agriculture:							
Forest Service	83,165,918.00	2,293,773.00	81,073,463.00	2,898,315.00	78,176,865.00	3,275,964.00	3,000,000
Soil Conservation	6,493,893.00	335,000.00	6,436,135.00	585,000.00	6,454,353.00	[6] 640,000.00	[6] 640,000
TVA [9]	39,823.00	44,378.00	33,247.00	43,744.00	28,900.00	43,512.00	([10])
Total	303,964,126.32	6,491,498.45	300,160,912.28	7,394,521.39	298,057,159.66	7,876,761.42	

Department and bureau	1947		1948		1949	
	Expended for research	Expended for improvements	Expended for research	Expended for improvements	Expended for research	Expended for improvements
Interior:						
National Park Service	None	None	None	None	None	None
Indian Affairs [2]	None	$146,000	None	$180,000	None	$230,000
Bureau of Land Management [3]	$15,540	794,350	$25,000	736,000	$25,000	1,123,000
Bureau of Reclamation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Fish and Wildlife Service	Incidental	40,000	Slight	50,000	None	25,800
Defense:						
Army	Nominal	Nominal	None	25,000	None	35,000
Navy	Nominal	Nominal	Nominal	Nominal	Nominal	4,500
Agriculture:						
Forest Service	330,000	535,000	365,000	521,875	[6] 390,000	[7] 436,040
Soil Conservation	None	550,000	None	480,000	None	487,625
TVA [9]	None	30,000	None	20,000	None	4,526
Total	345,540	2,095,350	390,000	2,012,875	415,000	2,346,491

[1] 342,000 acres of Army Department aerial gunnery range lands within the exterior boundary of the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota, placed under the supervision of Bureau of Indian Affairs for grazing purposes pursuant to 25 CFR 73. Fiscal year 1949 receipts approximately $32,000; estimated receipts for fiscal year 1950, $32,000.

[2] Slightly higher.

[3] Exclusive of Alaska.

[4] Calendar year.

[5] 213,430.48 acres is acquired land; $35,283.01 gross revenue from acquired land.

[6] This amount applies to range research expenditures largely applicable to Federal range lands, national forest, and other; results of this research apply also to comparable range lands in private ownership.

[7] Exclusive of range reseeding expenditure of $730,828.

[8] Estimated revenue from grazing fees only on fiscal year basis.

[9] TVA does not administer any range lands as such. However, in developing the Tennessee River and its tributaries for navigation, flood control, and power, TVA has acquired some acreage along the margins of its reservoirs. On this land TVA has encouraged a variety of uses, including pasturing, raising hay, and row cropping according to standards advocated by agricultural agencies in the region. Such use of the reservoir land is, of course, subsidiary to the primary purposes of navigation, flood control, and power. Methods of administering these properties are probably quite different from situations where extensive land holdings are not subject to the needs of navigation, flood control, and power. For example, much of the land listed in (1) (number acres) consists of acreage which lies within reservoir flowage zones, and is not available for year-round pasture.

[10] Approximately 20-percent less.

NOTES.—Estimated improvements for fiscal year 1950: Bureau of Indian Affairs, $420,000; Bureau of Land Management, $1,190,000; Army, $35,000; Forest Service, $470,000; Soil Conservation Service, $527,900; Fish and Wild Life Service, Navy and TVA, all same as for fiscal year 1949. Total estimated improvements, $2,677,726.

(All information obtained from Federal sources.)

Our Constitution Needs Another Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1950 issue of Inn Dixie, a magazine published monthly by the Dinkler Hotels, there appears an editorial by Editor William G. Hastings, entitled "Our Constitution Needs Another Amendment."

Under leave previously granted, I insert this article herewith:

OUR CONSTITUTION NEEDS ANOTHER AMENDMENT

A fine service was rendered in 1933 by the passage of the twentieth, or lame-duck amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This changed the expiration dates of the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress from March back to January.

Formerly those selected for such places in the November elections did not take office until the following March, which left Congress disorganized for months. This method has been in operation since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787.

It is time now for Congress to go a step further towards increasing the value to the country of our public officials.

This can be done by extending the term of office of a Representative from 2 years to 4 years. Senators are elected for 6 years but a Member of the House is limited to 2 years. This may have served in 1787, though we doubt it; certainly it does not serve well today.

Under a 2-year term a Member of the House of Representatives has to begin campaigning for reelection almost before he assumes his office. This forces him into commitments which many would not make if their terms were long enough for the value of their views to be determined. Partly because of this pressure groups practically control our country today. Most, if not all of them have no interest in the general welfare of the country. This self-interest is their only concern. They will oppose the greatest statesman in Congress if he should vote against any of their programs, regardless of his value to the Nation as a whole.

As a rule the people of a republic can be depended upon to form sage judgments on national issues. But not always. Mass hysteria and self-interest sometimes dull the judgment of the wisest and most honest. They are two things that are not amenable to reason at the time; time alone may rectify such false judgments.

In 1786, the year before the Constitution was adopted, the great democrat Jefferson said, "The animosities of sovereigns are temporary and may be allayed, but those which seize the whole body of a people (and a people, too, who dictate their own measures) produce calamities of long duration."

The bad judgment of the public was illustrated years ago in the matter of woman

suffrage. This was so ridiculed by the "hemen" of the time that some good officials found themselves in mighty hot water and were defeated for espousing it. If any Member of Congress proposed to rescind it today he surely would be unseated at the next election. This is just one case where the majority changed, but it took time for them to recognize their mistake. Whether the "hemen" opponents of woman suffrage were convinced by the reasoning of their wives, or by their rolling pins, is not known, but we do know that their minds did change.

Give Congressmen a term long enough for the public to properly evaluate their votes in Congress, and we will have infinitely more independence of thought and more independence of action than ever will be possible under 2-year terms.

Formosa—Another Munich?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the fear that Formosa may become another Munich, unless proper aid is given that anti-Communist island, is graphically told in the column of Eddie Zeltner, Over the River, of the New York Mirror.

Under the leave given me, I include a portion of Eddie Zeltner's column highlighting the present over-all situation as related to him by Elliott H. Simpson, an American of over 30 years of intimate contact with the Orient.

The article follows:

OVER THE RIVER
(By Edward Zeltner)
ORIENT-ATION

To one Brooklynite, China means more than a midnight snack of egg rolls and chicken chow mein. He's Eliott H. Simpson, rubber and commodities broker, with 30 years of probing the Orient behind him.

Eliott is one of our close pals. For years he has wowed us with tales from his storybook career. No one we know has a better insight on happenings in the Far East.

In the last war, Elliott beat it out of Singapore a half-step ahead of the Japs. A civilian with a couple of thousand Nippon yen on his handsome skull, he came back with worthy intelligence.

Now he has returned once more, after nearly a year of roaming through the necklace of territorial trouble which strings around the throat of the South China Sea from Hong Kong, Indochina, Singapore, the Straits Settlements and deep into Indonesia.

We sought an intimate view on what's happening in the heart of the world's No. 1 sore spot.

Right off, Elliott said that the United States, in by-passing aid to the Nationalists on Formosa, is bartering for another Munich. "We ought to send Chiang Kai-shek money, ammunition and food," he said. "MacArthur is strong for fortifying Formosa."

He though a moment, then added:

"All this talk about the Generalissimo being a wrong guy. That's rot. He was the victim of a sell-out by exploiters in his cabinet. He took the rap for a bunch of rich Chinese and carried too much responsibility on his own shoulders.

"No one believes we have to send soldiers to stop the Red movement which is rapidly strangling not only China, but Indochina, the Malay States and the East Indies," he continued. "But we must give arms now, or you'll have a third world war before the E bonds of the last one mature."

How do the Chinese look upon America now? we queried.

"The masses in China have an expression, 'that glorious flag' meaning the Stars and Stripes. They will have an affection for Americans. Only the younger student element is intent on causing a rupture. Of course, they're guided by an outside influence," he added.

"The Communists can never live up to their promises. In fact, they are nothing but a band of pirates, these war lords who now control China. I look for them to soon begin bedeviling the people worse than the misery dished out when the banking houses of the Kungs, and Soongs controlled the Chinese Republic."

He said the British hastened to recognize the Communist regime to protect Hong Kong, adding: "I fear that's another Munich too."

Elliott warns that Burma and Siam are being squeezed by the Communists. He takes a dim view of the rampant Reds being kept off the back of the Philippines. There's not a thing to stop them except a guy named MacArthur. He may be engulfed one day too, if we let Formosa go by the board," he warned.

"Take Singapore," Simpson explained. "Labor now controls this area and the leaning is toward communism. In Indonesia, the infant republic is not yet in position to govern itself. This would be a push-over too for the red-flagged legions in their drive eastward. It's so bad there that occidentals have moved into the cities from their inland estates, fearing murder."

As the only non-Chinese to be admitted to a club in New York's Chinatown, Elliott is sure where the sympathies of the local Chinese lie.

"There are one or two student groups who outwardly profess fealty to the Reds, downtown, but the FBI has them pretty well watched, even if they ever got away from the domination of their patriotic elders."

Public Opinion Poll Reveals Present-Day View of Residents of Central Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the cooperation of the daily and weekly newspapers in my congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties in central Pennsylvania, a public-opinion poll was conducted during January and February for a period of 4 weeks.

Nearly 2,000 persons participated in the poll. A break-down of the vote by counties is as follows: Blair County, 768; Centre County, 570; and Clearfield County, 530.

The tabulation of the vote on the various issues is as follows:

Tabulation of the 14 questions representing the views of 1,876 residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties

1. Should the Taft-Hartley Act be—
   (A) Repealed 232
   (B) Amended 372
   (C) Left alone 1,226

	Yes	No
2. Do you favor reenactment of the Wagner Labor Act?	358	1,200
3. Do you favor extending rent control?	856	932
4. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	684	1,084
5. Do you favor compulsory socialized medicine?	192	1,612
6. Do you favor voluntary health insurance?	1,258	458
7. Do you favor universal military training?	788	968
8. Do you favor 70-group Air Force?	1,170	408
9. Do you favor price control?	322	1,468
10. Do you favor an increase in personal income taxes?	196	1,598
11. Should wartime excise taxes be repealed?	1,398	490
12. Do you favor liberalization of the Social Security Act?	962	720
13. Do you favor the outlawing of the Communist Party?	1,358	440
14. Do you favor the so-called Brannan plan?	326	1,026

NOTE.—Many participants did not answer all questions giving as their reason that they lacked sufficient information on the subject to vote intelligently.

ANALYSIS OF POLL BY OCCUPATION

White collar	840
Housewife	276
Farmer	130
Labor	630

More than half of the questionnaires were accompanied by explanatory letters discussing many issues of national importance not covered in the newspaper questionnaire.

In connection with the vote on outlawing the Communist Party the 440 who voted in the negative qualified their votes by stating they were not in favor of the Communist Party, but believed it unwise to drive the Communists underground.

Every community in the three counties participated in the poll. In many cases the participants stated that this was the first time they had ever contacted their Representative in Congress.

Hazardous Treasury Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, of Wednesday, March 8, 1950:

HAZARDOUS TREASURY DEMAND

Our oil industry's major problem is the maintenance of production and reserves at nationally adequate levels. As oil wells in one field play out, new fields must be found and developed. With the new uses and constantly growing demands for oil and its products, the exploration for new supplies grows more urgent. It involves heavy financial risks, for many more wells come in dry than productive.

To meet this situation, Congress in 1918 set up percentage-depletion allowances for oil, gas, and related industries. Its purpose—to provide funds for discovery of "new reserves of vital natural resources which are being used up"—justified the experiment. With respect to oil and gas, the depletion allowances have justified themselves fully by practical results. Reexamined by Congress in the middle 1920's and in 1940, its reapprovals made them a part of the Nation's settled tax policy.

Now the Treasury Department demands their drastic reduction, to increase the Federal tax take and the present administration's spending money. If there is other and sounder reason, it does not appear. Wrote Representative Boggs of the House Ways and Means Committee, in a recent letter to this newspaper, "I cross-examined the representatives of the Department at great length to ascertain whether or not studies had been made which justified the arbitrary reduction of the allowance. * * * No evidence could be presented along this line. I also questioned the effect the reduction would have on the continued expansion of the oil and gas industry. This matter too had not been studied."

Spokesmen for the oil industry warn that the Treasury demanded cut of the depletion allowance "will decrease the incentive necessary to the development of adequate productive capacity and reserves. That service is rendered chiefly by independents, called wildcatters. Its cost to them has been multiplied since the present depletion allowance was fixed. The loss risks are correspondingly grown. Of 6,728 wells drilled during 1948 in the search for new oil, 5,480—or 81.5 percent—were dry, and 78 percent were drilled by the wildcatters. The one think that has made it possible for this group to live or die by their own efforts, testified one authority, is the application of the percentage depletion as we know it.

Whether or not the Treasury Department is interested in long-run results, the defense services show both interest and concern in the maintenance of adequate oil production and reserves here in our own land. Slackened search for new fields would diminish the defense reserves also, and the margin of national safety. Not only so; a slump in oil discoveries eventually would bring a slump in oil production and thus diminish the Federal tax take from the industry, making the Nation's next position—financial, economic, industrial and defensive—worse than its present one.

Congress, responsible guardian of the Nation's welfare, must take all these things into its reckoning. As the case stands, the Treasury's demand for destructive alteration of a national tax policy vindicated by more than 30 years' practical experience should in our judgment be rejected both as unfair and harmful to a key industry and hazardous to the Nation's domestic economy and safety.

Congressional Committee Bares Facts on Alleged Di Giorgio Ranch Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, a matter of great importance to many Members of the House has just occurred.

After the adjournment of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, entitled Subcommittee No. 1, investigated alleged agricultural labor disturbances at the Di Giorgio Ranch, in Kern County, Calif. The ranch belongs to the Di Giorgio Fruit Corp.

The committee's interest and the interest of this House was aroused by the release of a movie film and narrations which depicted deplorable conditions and physical disabilities of men purporting to result from the unconscionable actions of the employer, Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. The film was shown to the Committee on Education and Labor during hearings on pertinent labor legislation.

I recommend as the majority report of the subcommittee, signed by three members thereof, to all Members of this House who have any doubt about the libelous nature of the film as narrated by Mr. Harry W. Flannery. This majority report is conclusive proof that for 30 pieces of silver, more or less, Mr. Harry W. Flannery and his associates deliberately fabricated falsehoods. The officers of the National Farm Labor Union then admittedly used the fabrication to collect hundreds of thousands of dollars from workingmen throughout the country to finance a purported strike that did not exist. The majority report is another disclosure of corrupt men deliberately bearing false witness to do untold damage to employers and employees, as well as disservice to the legitimate American Labor movement, for a pittance by way of gain for themselves.

I am, therefore, including herein a copy of the majority report which has been signed by three members of the five-man Subcommittee No. 1.

My purpose in offering it today is that the Di Giorgio Ranch, referred to in the report, lies entirely within the Tenth District of California, which I represent. Public opinion in the area of the Di Giorgio Ranch is incensed over the falsehoods embraced in the said moving picture and narration and the fraud that has been perpetrated to the advantage of a handful of men. That area is desirous of immediately correcting the unfavorable publicity resulting from the libelous action. I am including the report in the RECORD today inasmuch as it may be several weeks before it is distributed in printed form by the subcommittee. It follows:

AGRICULTURAL LABOR AT DI GIORGIO FARMS, CALIFORNIA

Special Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, was constituted by the following authority:

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and pursuant to House Resolution 75 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, I hereby appoint you as chairman of Special Investigating Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on Education and Labor. Other members of the subcommittee will be the Honorable LEONARD IRVING of Missouri, the Honorable TOM STEED of Oklahoma, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON of California, and the Honorable THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON of Kentucky.

You are hereby authorized and directed to investigate conditions to provide for the education of children residing on certain nonsupporting federally owned property and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area and for other purposes as outlined in H. R. 4115.

You are further authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation of labor-management relations at the Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation known as the Di Giorgio Farms, in Di Giorgio, Calif.

You are further directed to hold such public or executive sessions as you may deem advisable, and you are hereby authorized and designated by me to issue and have served such subpenas as may be necessary in this investigation.

Upon completion of your study and investigation you are directed to prepare a report to the Congress with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as in the judgment of your subcommittee the facts warrant.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Pursuant to the authorization and direction of the whole committee, the subcommittee met on November 12–13, 1949, at Bakersfield, Calif. It heard sworn testimony from witnesses called by the National Farm Labor Union, the subcommittee, and the Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. It also viewed two motion pictures, one submitted by the union and one by the fruit corporation; and it visited the Di Giorgio Farms, Di Giorgio, Calif., and the surrounding area.

The hearing at Bakersfield and the visit to Di Giorgio Farms were for the purpose of inquiring into the background of a labor disturbance which occurred on October 1, 1947, at Di Giorgio Farms and thereafter. At least theoretically, it continues to the present day. There was a large volume of testimony on the part of the union concerning conditions of living and working on farms owned by corporations in general; and in a brief filed with the subcommittee the union took the position that such testimony was germane to the Di Giorgio Farms disturbance. There was also some testimony concerning conditions prevailing at Di Giorgio Farms in the past, going as far back as 1934. The subcommittee has been compelled, in order to report upon the issues involved in its investigation, to separate all such extraneous matter from that relevant to the question involved.

The subcommittee's view is that its authority and instructions were to investigate: (1) The hours, wages, working conditions and living conditions of the employees of Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. at Di Giorgio Farms during the period relevant to the labor disturbance there, i. e. roughly the period from June 1, 1947, to date; (2) the nature and history of the dispute; (3) consideration of proposed legislative changes suggested in connection with the foregoing.

I. THE DI GIORGIO FRUIT CORPORATION AND ITS DI GIORGIO FARMS

Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. is a Delaware corporation, with its principal office in San Francisco, Calif. Its business is the production and marketing of fruits and vegetables, and the activities incidental to that business. In 1946 its total assets were somewhat over $19,500,000, its total revenue over $18,000,000. Its founder and principal stockholder is Joseph Di Giorgio, who owns 43.9 percent of the class A common stock, 39.8

percent of the class B common stock, and 31.4 percent of the cumulative preferred stock. The remainder of the stock is owned by some 5,000 stockholders.

The corporation owns 11 orchards and one farm in Florida, and 8 orchards and vineyards in California. It also owns some interests in 3 fruit auction markets on the eastern seaboard, a box company and a wine company.

Joseph Di Giorgio is chairman of the board of directors of the corporation; his address is Di Giorgio, Calif. The president of the corporation is Philip Di Giorgio of New York City. One of the vice presidents, J. A. Di Giorgio, resides on Di Giorgio Farms. The other officers of the corporation reside either at New York or San Francisco; the directors in New York, San Francisco, Southern California, or Florida, and one in Cuba.

Di Giorgio Farms is a tract of almost 11,000 acres, or 18 square miles, in the San Joaquin Valley, about 15 miles southeast of Bakersfield, in Kern County, Calif. The development of the land to its present condition began with the purchase in 1919 of 2,000 acres of Kern County land by the fruit corporation's predecessor. At that time there was no significant agricultural production in Kern County; the land was dry and barren. Joseph Di Giorgio was active in the management of the company and the development of Di Giorgio Farms. By drilling deep wells for irrigation and experimenting with suitable crops, the land was brought to production and presently bears grapes, plums, potatoes, and asparagus, in order of importance.

Selection of crops by the fruit corporation has depended on two factors: (1) Individual crops which were suitable for the soil and weather of the area; (2) a combination of crops which would enable it to employ a relatively stable permanent labor force throughout the year. Employment ranges from approximately 1,200 permanent employees to 2,500 at harvest season; other growers in the area may have a temporary-permanent employment ratio of as much as 15 to 1.

II. THE DISPUTE OF THE FRUIT CORPORATION WITH THE NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION

Early in 1947 the National Farm Labor Union sent Hank Hasiwar to Kern County as its western representative, to organize the farm workers there. He established Kern County Farm Union Local 218 and proceeded to organize some Di Giorgio Farms employees. In September of 1947 he requested the fruit corporation to recognize the local as the exclusive bargaining agent of its employees, claiming to represent a majority of them. The fruit corporation declined recognition, contending that local 218 did not represent its employees or any substantial number of them. Thereupon, on October 1, 1947, local 218 established a picket line at Di Giorgio Farms.

The evidence before the subcommittee, including the testimony of the secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, establishes that the sole issue in this dispute is recognition. Members of the union testified to various grievances concerning wages, hours, working conditions, and living conditions, but all of these were obviously afterthoughts and makeweights. This strike was solely one for the purpose of organization.

The National Farm Labor Union does not hold any collective bargaining contracts in the State of California. Yet it has maintained a picket line against a single employer for over 2 years, and its representatives and others have testified that the wages, hours, working conditions, and living conditions on that employer's farm are not inferior to those elsewhere; the subcommittee finds that they are, for the most part, superior. Wages, hours, working conditions, and living conditions have never been a real issue in the Di Giorgio strike.

III. WAGES AND WORKING CONDITIONS AT DI GIORGIO FARMS

Although these issues are not actually present in the dispute between the fruit corporation and the union, there is much testimony in the record concerning them, and the subcommittee deems it desirable to report on wages, working conditions, and living conditions at Di Giorgio Farms. The union presented its film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, which is designed to represent living and working conditions at Di Giorgio Farms. The fruit corporation presented its film, The Di Giorgio Story, relating to the same matters.

The union film was also shown to the committee during its hearings on H. R. 2032 in Washington on March 16, 1949. The committee has been seriously imposed upon by the union by the presentation of the film Poverty in the Valley of Plenty at that time. The film itself, and the president of the union in presenting it, represented to the committee that the conditions depicted in the film existed on Di Giorgio Farms and led up to a strike there. The committee's belief in the truth of these statements induced it to authorize and instruct this subcommittee to investigate the facts. The union's president now takes the position that the film relates, not to Di Giorgio Farms but to corporate farms in general. The educational director and the western representative of the union insist that the film is a true picture of the Di Giorgio Farms. The subcommittee finds that, insofar as it purports to represent conditions existing on Di Giorgio Farms, the film Poverty in the Valley of Plenty was made and was presented to the committee in disregard of the truth.

The film purports to relate the facts surrounding the wages, working conditions, and living conditions of employees of the fruit corporation at Di Giorgio Farms. The subcommittee finds the facts to be as follows:

Wages: The lowest wage paid at Di Giorgio Farms is 80 cents per hour for field work. The highest is $1.10 per hour for loaders. These wage levels are, if not the highest, at least as high as any in the area. Neighboring farmers testified that the fruit corporation had always been the leader in the matter of raising wage scales, which the other farmers followed in order to keep their employees. There is testimony in the record by a union witness to show that wages at Di Giorgio Farms rose from a depression-born low during the midthirties by steady progression to their present levels.

Wages are not a grievance or a strike issue.

Working conditions: Individual members of the union testified to various grievances over a 15-year period. One of these was that persons often came to Di Giorgio Farms seeking employment, and if not hired were not paid. There was no evidence that the fruit corporation ever called in a worker and failed to hire or pay him. Another grievance was that foremen were given the power to discharge field workers; another that foremen and supervisors were extended privileges not extended to field workers; that drinking water in the fields was not iced; that workers in refrigerating rooms were not given extra pay; that foremen had to supervise too large groups of employees.

Insofar as the afore-mentioned grievances are concerned, the subcommittee found that in some instances they were not supported by the evidence, in others they were inconsequential and that in no event did they constitute an issue in the strike.

In its motion-picture film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, the union said that the fruit corporation required its irrigators to work 12 hours, but paid them for only 11. This statement was wholly false, as witnesses both for the fruit corporation and the union agreed.

Living conditions: The union film also represents that living conditions on Di Giorgio Farms consist of disreputable, filthy shacks, and that the living habits of the occupants are substandard and squalid.

The film contains unmistakable innuendos that the houses pictured in it are on Di Giorgio Farms. None of the houses shown is fit for human beings to live in. They are in varying states of disrepair, unpainted and sordid. They are surrounded with junk and with undernourished children and dogs. Near one is a shower, said to be used by 25 or 30 families, lacking in hot water, and situated next to a cow pen. The film charges that the fruit corporation rents washing machines to employees for 50 cents per hour, and that women are compelled to heat water over open fires. No one could doubt that these charges are leveled straight at the corporation.

All of these representations are false. The shacks portrayed, said to exist on Di Giorgio Farms, are not on the farm. It is inferred that the fruit corporation charges its employees $26 per month for such housing; all the witnesses agreed that $3 per month is the maximum ever charged; and that at present all company housing is rent-free.

In fact, the National Farm Labor Union film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, insofar as it purports to represent conditions existing on Di Giorgio Farms, is a shocking collection of falsehoods, almost wholly unrelieved by any regard whatever for the truth and the facts. The subcommittee believes that responsible labor leadership will join with it in decrying the attempt of the National Farm Labor Union's organizers to win their case by dishonest presentation. The cause of organized labor is not aided when one group of union organizers are willing to besmirch the public reputation of labor as a whole, in order to advance their own interests.

The evidence and the subcommittee's visit to the premises demonstrated that the housing conditions at Di Giorgio Farms are at least as good as any to be found on similar properties in agriculture. The fruit corporation maintains several types of housing: cottages for supervisory personnel; smaller houses (2–4 rooms) for field and shed workers; apartments; and dormitories for single men. The houses are respectable, though not pretentious, enjoy modern facilities, including electricity, and in addition have garbage disposal service and fire protection at company expense. Separate facilities are maintained for workers whose backgrounds give them different dietary tastes, and they are provided with food which is acceptable to them. All the union witnesses agreed that the food furnished by the company is better than average.

Recreational, educational, and religious facilities: The union represented to the committee that Di Giorgio workers were deprived of all recreational, educational, and religious opportunities. The evidence shows that the fruit corporation provides swimming pools and tennis courts for all employees. It does not maintain any schools or churches. However, there are ample, modern well-equipped schools in the vicinity, including a new high school in Arvin. A new grammar school building near the farm was made possible by a gift of 40 acres of land and $150,000 cash by the fruit corporation. The fruit corporation supports these schools by payment of 64 percent of the taxes of Di Giorgio school district; and it has contributed land or cash or both to the churches in the area.

Welfare provisions: The union in its film represented that Di Giorgio workers were without any protection in case of accidental injury, and depicted a maimed worker in the fields who, it said, would receive no

compensation for his injuries from the Di Giorgio Farms. The evidence shows that this individual was not injured on the Di Giorgio Farms and that in fact the fruit corporation has always maintained full workmen's compensation insurance protection for all of its employees, though not required to by law. Such statements have convinced the subcommittee that the union did not make a fair and truthful presentation.

An official of the fruit corporation testified that the company did not provide unemployment insurance for its workers; had no pension plan; provided no old-age insurance. However, the fruit corporation offers employees of 1 year's standing a group life insurance policy, on which the company pays 60 percent of the premiums.

Mexican labor: The union in its film Poverty in the Valley of Plenty insinuated that the fruit corporation engaged in a program of smuggling Mexican aliens, wetbacks, across the border to work in its fields. At the hearing it did not charge smuggling but did complain at length of the hiring of Mexican nationals by the fruit corporation.

The fruit corporation had participated in the program instituted by the Federal Government during the war of hiring Mexican nationals to supplement the Nation's farm labor force. One hundred thirty of these nationals remained at Di Giorgio Farms when the union set up its picket line on October 1, 1947. After the situation was explained to them by a representative of the Department of Agriculture, they unanimously signified their desire to continue to work, and did so. The fruit corporation contends that the farm labor union brought pressure to bear on the State Department and, in violation of the Government's contract, these nationals were removed from Di Giorgio Farms.

Illegal aliens have from time to time been found on Di Giorgio Farms, just as they have been found on almost every farm in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and southern California. There is no evidence that the fruit corporation ever smuggled any alien into the United States, or hired an illegal alien knowing his status. The union's charges in this respect appear to be completely unfounded. In any event they throw no light whatever on the issues involved in the labor disturbances, and have no real place here.

IV. THE LABOR DISPUTE AT DI GIORGIO AND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

After the picket line was set up at Di Giorgio Farms the work of growing, harvesting, and shipping the produce of the farm continued. A majority of the employees of the fruit corporation continued to work, or returned to work within a few weeks. There were allegations of a few isolated cases of violence by both sides in the early months of the strike; but the picket line may be regarded as a relatively peaceful one, and the subcommittee finds that the union made it its policy to discourage violence.

Since the picket line failed to affect the operations of the fruit corporation or to accomplish the organization of its employees, the union embarked upon a series of secondary activities. In this it had the aid of a few of the members of a winery local at Di Giorgio Winery, and of some other trade unions. The farm labor union picketed the winery; it picketed another distant winery, owned by a wholly separate company; it placed a mass picket line across the tracks of the railroads which serve Di Giorgio Farms, and it boycotted the produce of Di Giorgio Farms in southern California cities by picketing distributors in that area.

After an investigation of complaint, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board sued out an injunction against this conduct, which was granted by the United States District Court for the Southern District of California against the unions involved, including the farm labor union and other unions acting in concert with it, under section 10 (j) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The fruit corporation thereafter filed unfair labor practice charges with the Board against the same unions under section 8 (b) (1) (A) and 8 (b) (4) (A) of the act. The trial examiner found that all the factual charges in the complaint were true. He exonerated all the respondents under section 8 (b) (1) (A). He recommended that the Board's order issue under section 8 (b) (1) (A) against all the unions except the farm union and a teamsters' local, both of which purported to represent, for the purpose of the proceedings, agricultural workers only. The theory of the trial examiner was that the Board could not impose sanctions upon the farm union, since, he said, the act does not extend its benefits to the farm union. The fruit corporation and the general counsel of the Board filed exceptions to the trial examiner's report, and the matter has been submitted to the Board.

The farm union takes the position in its brief before the subcommittee that it is inconceivable that any group could be subjected to the sanctions provided by the act, unless it were extended privileges and benefits under the act. Counsel for the fruit corporation, in a statement to the subcommittee, said that the position of the fruit corporation is that Congress "need not purchase compliance with the laws of the United States at the price of benefits and privileges."

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION GROWING OUT OF THE DI GIORGIO LABOR DISTURBANCE

The law, the strike issues, and the investigation: The hearing and investigation at Bakersfield and DiGiorgio Farms were held at the request of the National Farm Labor Union. The reason stated for this request was that a situation existed on Di Giorgio Farms which called for immediate action in order to prevent further unfair and ill treatment of agricultural workers at Di Giorgio Farms. The committee was told that legislation was required in order to correct the abuses of corporation farmers and their lobbies.

Relying on this request and these representations, the subcommittee came to Bakersfield and visited Di Giorgio Farms. Witnesses were called by both sides, and the subpena power of the subcommittee was made available to the union and the fruit corporation. The union called no pickets to testify; and there was no picket line at the farm when the subcommittee went there. No employee of Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. was called by the union to testify to his wish to become a member of the farm labor union, and to the fruit corporation's thwarting of his wish. The subcommittee interviewed Di Giorgio employees and no one of them signified a desire to become a member of the union or his acquaintaince with any other employee who held such a desire. No witness called by the union testified to anything which represented a substantial strike issue, or even approximated the charges depicted in the union's film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty.

The contrast between that film, with the testimony accompanying it in Washington last March, and the case made by the union at the Bakersfield hearing and investigation, is most striking. The way in which the union presented its evidence shows that this committee has been induced to spend its time and the taxpayers' money to publicize the leadership of a labor organization which has no contracts, no grievances, no strike, no pickets, and only a handful of members; its only apparent reason for existence is its voluble leaders.

The processes of the Congress of the United States have been perverted and misused by the National Farm Labor Union in order to furnish a soundingboard for its claims. The committee should certainly not be without power to prevent the recurrence of this kind of abuse of its functions and impositions upon its energies.

Workmen's compensation: The question of workmen's compensation is not relevant here since, contrary to the charges of the union, the fruit corporation has always provided full compensation-insurance protection for all its employees, including agricultural workers of every description.

Fair-labor standards: This matter likewise has no bearing on the present issues. The undisputed evidence shows that the fruit corporation had a minimum-wage level of 80 cents per hour long before the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended to provide even 75 cents.

Old-age and unemployment insurance: The fruit corporation has not provided benefits of this character. However, the question whether its employees should be covered has been repeatedly considered by the Congress, and the Congress has repeatedly found that they should not be. Lack of coverage is the result of exemptions in the law, and not the action of the fruit corporation. The fruit corporation does provide low-cost life insurance as a measure of welfare protection.

The National Farm Labor Union recommends removal of the exemptions of agricultural labor from labor legislation. Agricultural labor has been exempted from all labor relations legislation ever written. The evidence before the subcommittee shows that it would be harmful to the public interest and to all responsible labor unions to legislate otherwise. The evidence shows that a strike of any serious proportions in agriculture would choke off interstate commerce in necessary foodstuffs, would cause incalculable harm to the public, and would antagonize public opinion to the cause of tradeunionism. It would not only result in temporary distress of a character more serious than has ever been experienced, it would result in permanent loss of farm employment and permanent loss to the public of farm production, and, of course, permanent ruin to the farmers of the Nation.

The union has suggested that the fruit corporation is of such a size and character that it should be differentiated from other farm producers. The union did not, however, suggest any valid basis for differentiation of small farmers from large ones, or of corporate farms from farms owned by individuals or other forms of business organization. In fact, the union disclaims taking the position that the mere bigness of the fruit corporation is a vice. This must be apparent to anyone who has seen Di Giorgio Farms. It is perfectly obvious that, were this acreage distributed to its permanent workers, none of the 1,200 could make a living on his 9 acres. If Di Giorgio Farms had not been developed and operated by a corporation, or some individual or organization possessing comparable capital, it could never have been developed or operated at all.

Mere size is not a sound basis for differentiating between farmers. It is evident that any condition imposed by law upon a large farmer, automatically becomes a condition under which every farmer, however small, must operate. It is idle to contend that 1 or 2 or 10 farms in Kern County may be subjected to congressionally imposed standards, without subjecting their neighbors to the same standards.

The subcommittee finds that the exemption of agricultural labor from the Labor Management Relations Act is sound, being based upon facts which clearly differentiate agriculture from industry in this regard.

Other legislative recommendations: The fruit corporation contended that the exemption of labor organizations from the antitrust laws resulted in serious abuses which

required repeal of the exemption. The evidence before the subcommittee showed that the farm union possesses no collective bargaining contracts, at least in California, and has created no labor disturbance except at Di Giorgio Farms. The only conduct of the union which violates the antitrust laws is its secondary boycott activity, and in this regard the exemption is created by Supreme Court decisions construing the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Since the secondary boycott is already made unlawful by the Labor Management Relations Act, as discussed above, no recommendation is here made with respect to this contention of the fruit corporation.

The union made certain recommendations for State legislation which the subcommittee does not deem it appropriate to discuss.

It also recommended certain Federal legislation, most of which is discussed above. The evidence shows that all of the union recommendations not previously discussed have no application to the facts at Di Giorgio Farms, and the subcommittee therefore considers them irrelevant.

RICHARD NIXON.
THRUSTON B. MORTON.
TOM STEED.

Michigan Alumni in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith an extension of remarks covering a recent item in the Michigan Alumnus of January 14, 1950:

TWENTY-TWO ALUMNI ARE SEATED IN CONGRESS

From the earliest days of the university, Michigan's alumni body has produced many men and women who have contributed distinguished public service to their communities and to their countries. In years past, a significant number of former university students have become Members of the Congress of the United States.

It is doubtful if any information agency has ever attempted to tabulate a complete listing of all Michigan alumni who have been elected to the Senate and the House of Represenatives, although Ira A. Campbell, 1900, '02*l*, in contributing a chapter to Michigan and the Cleveland Era (University of Michigan Press, 1948), presents an excellent summary of the former students who gained membership during two specific periods—the two Presidential terms of Grover Cleveland.

At times, alumni of the university have constituted 5 percent of the entire membership of the National Legislature. During the Cleveland era, which spanned the Forty-Ninth and Fiftieth Congresses (1885 to 1889) and the Fifty-Third and Fifty-Fourth Congresses (1893 to 1897), many Michigan alumni served in Congress.

Of the 76 Senators and 325 Representatives in the Forty-ninth Congress, the University was represented by one Senator and by 10 Representatives. The succeeding Congress again had one Senator who had received his education at the university, while the number of Representatives increased to 16. In the Fifty-third Congress, there were two Senators and 16 alumni representatives, and in the Fifty-fourth the representation again increased to 4 Senators and 18 Representatives.

Today, the membership rolls of the Eighty-first Congress of the United States list the names of 22 alumni of the university. Some of the legislators completed all of their higher education on the Michigan campus, while others took credit courses at Michigan as well as at other educational institutions. Two of the men attained alumni status although they did not pursue any degree work in Ann Arbor. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas was a recipient of an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the 1948 commencement, while Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan's Ninth District, in 1937, was unanimously elected by the board of regents as an honorary alumnus.

A total of seven United States Senators are alumni of the university. The State of Michigan is represented by ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, *l*'01–'02, A. M. (Hon.) '25, LL. D. (Hon.) '47, of Grand Rapids, and HOMER FERGUSON, '13*l*, of Detroit. The other Senators are CLINTON P. ANDERSON, '15–'16, LL. D. (Hon.) '46, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, '07*l*, of Laguna Beach, Calif.; LISTER HILL, *ss*'14, of Montgomery, Ala.; ALEXANDER WILEY, *l*'04–'06, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., and Senator FULBRIGHT.

Senators VANDENBERG and HILL have both served their constituents for more than two decades. In 1928 Senator VANDENBERG was appointed to that body by Gov. Fred W. Green, '98*l*, to fill the remainder of the term left vacant by the death of Woodbridge N. Ferris, *m*'73–'74. In the fall of 1928, Senator VANDENBERG was elected to the post which he has held ever since. Senator HILL, who studied in the university's law school during the summer of 1914 following his graduation from the University of Alabama, first went to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives. He served in eight successive Congresses, from 1923 until 1939, when he resigned to become a Senator.

Youngest of the alumni Senators, in point of service, is Senator ANDERSON, whose term began with the Eighty-first Congress, following the elections of November 1948. Prior to running for this office, however, Senator ANDERSON had a distinguished career in many responsible Government posts, including the Cabinet position of Secretary of Agriculture. Senators DOWNEY, FERGUSON, and WILEY are serving their second terms.

Last year Albert P. Blaustein, '41, New York attorney, wrote a series of articles for the American Bar Association Journal which required research on the legal background of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress. He found that there were 64 lawyers included in the 96 men comprising the Senate. In addition there were 15 ex-judges and 31 former city, county, State, and Federal attorneys. These men attended 99 different universities, Harvard topping the list with 9 alumni. Columbia contributed 7 of its former students; University of Alabama, 5; Yale, 4; Georgetown, 3; 2 alumni each from 15 more universities; and 1 each of the remainder.

As noted, 5 of the Michigan alumni Senators took courses in the university law school. Blaustein's report notes that the membership of the Senate represents 40 different law schools. In addition to the men who studied law in Ann Arbor, 6 men went to Harvard; 5 to Columbia; 3 each to Yale, Alabama, and Georgetown; 2 each to the universities of Virginia, Maryland, Temple, and West Virginia; and 1 each to the remainder of the 40 institutions.

Similar data was compiled for the membership of the House of Representatives. Of the 435 Members, 25[illegible] were lawyers. The 435 Members attended 208 colleges and universities and, in addition, the 254 lawyers attended 74 law schools. In both of these categories, the total of university alumni in the House of Representatives ranked near the top behind leading Harvard University.

Fifteen Members of the House have taken academic work at Michigan. Two of them, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, '14, '15*l*, of Des Moines, Iowa, and ALVIN F. WEICHEL, '22, '24*l*, of Sandusky, Ohio, gained both their bachelor's and law degrees from the university. Four more came to Michigan to complete their preparation for legal careers: WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, 12*l*, Flint, Mich.; JAMES S. GOLDEN, '16*l*, Pineville, Ky.; FRANK B. KEEFE, '10*l*, Oshkosh, Wis.; and ROLLA C. MCMILLEN, '06*l*, Decator, Ill.

Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., '35, Grand Rapids, Mich., played varsity football while completing his undergraduate work, and Representative RALPH E. CHURCH, '07, *l*'07–08, Evanston, Ill., attended law school for 1 year following his graduation from the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts. Other alumni now in Congress, all of whom received a portion of their education at Michigan, are: LEO E. ALLEN, '19–'21, *l*'21–'22, Galena, Ill.; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Saginaw, Mich., who studied political economy for 3 years, 1925–27, through the extension service; J. CARL HINSHAW, *g*'16–'17, Pasadena, Calif., who took graduate work; EARL C. MICHENER, *l*'00–'01, Adrian, Mich.; PAUL W. SHAFER, Battle Creek, Mich., who received some of his legal training through Michigan extension courses; and GEORGE H. WILSON, *l*'26–'27, Enid, Okla.

Of all the Michigan alumni now holding membership in the Eighty-first Congress, Representative MICHENER has been in office for the longest period. With the exception of one 2-year term, he has represented the Second Congressional District of Michigan—which includes the city of Ann Arbor—continuously since 1919.

Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article in the March 9 issue of the Washington Post on the Brannan plan.

I feel that it is an interesting article and points up some of the areas of thought and discussion that should be valuable to us in the present controversy over "What farm program shall we have."

Definitely it can now be established that Secretary Brannan would have been on better ground had he proposed his so-called Brannan plan for perishables alone and have allowed more time for a proper disposition of the War Board price support program on nonperishable and storable commodities.

THE BIGGEST TROUBLE, THOUGH A SUBTLE ONE, WITH ALL PROGRAMS IS THAT IT PUTS THE GOVERNMENT BETWEEN THE PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS

It is because of my own introduction of this observation that I am pleased to herewith include the article by Ysabel and Robert Rennie:

BRANNAN PLAN MAY BE TRIED IF PRICE SUPPORT MESS GOES ON

(By Ysable and Robert Rennie)

If present farm supports continue to get out of hand, as they have been doing in the case of potatoes, Congress may yet give the Brannan plan a try.

Last year it was opposed by every major farm organization except the National Farm-

ers' Union, and Congress turned it down. Today farmers as well as Congressmen are beginning to wonder whether anything might not be better than the present mess.

Secretary Brannan's farm-support program is aimed primarily at the perishables which account for 75 percent of farm income. These are commodities which will spoil in storage—things like milk, poultry, eggs, meat, fruits, and vegetables.

Today we buy up nonperishable crops to keep prices at high support levels. But for perishables like potatoes the solution will not work.

Secretary Brannan would sell these products on the open market for whatever they would bring. If the market prices were below support levels, the Government would make up the difference in production payments to the farmer. The consumer would get the benefit of low food prices, the farmer of high incomes.

WOULD MAINTAIN BUYING POWER

Support prices would be set to guarantee that a bushel of potatoes or a box of oranges would have the same purchasing power as in the base period, whatever happened to the price of the things the farmer must buy. The base would not be an obsolete period like 1910–14, but rather the first 10 of the preceding 12 years. Each year the base would move forward.

The Brannan plan would put a brake on the farm prices during downswings. It would also prevent the violent year-to-year fluctuations which have characterized farm income in the past.

After all, the prices of things the farmer buys—cars, tractors, furniture—change very little from one year to another. But farm prices have risen and fallen with the sickening speed of a small boat in a heavy sea.

There is one other feature of the Brannan plan which should be mentioned. It would limit support payments to the maximum output of a family-size farm—at 1949 prices, about $25,000 worth of produce. Under present law, some farmers received hundreds of thousands of dollars in subsidy payments and at least one farmer received several millions.

OTHER POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

There are other points in which this program differs from the present Agricultural Act.

For one thing, the Government would not, on most foods, buy commodities to keep their prices up. Not only would food prices drop to free-market levels, they might actually drop below them. This is because high support prices encourage larger output, and the greater the production, the lower the market price.

To prevent a glut of food and a collapse in market prices, the Brannan plan would have to rely on direct controls like marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This is a feature farmers do not like.

If every wheat farmer was ordered to cut acreage by 20 percent, farmers with high-yield land would be forced to take much of it out of production. At the same time, the marginal farmer would be encouraged to sow on poor land. This is no way to raise farm productivity. It has quite the opposite effect.

Limiting benefits to the average output of large family farms would have the same result. Family farms are not as efficient as the larger industrialized ones.

By penalizing efficiency, we are confusing social and economic objectives. It may be socially desirable to keep the small-family farm as a way of life, but we should understand that the policy has its economic costs.

FARM SUBSIDY COSTS HIDDEN

Would the Brannan plan cost more than our price-support program? This is the question that bothers Congress. At present the cost of farm subsidies is pretty well hidden. Much of it is paid by the consumer at the grocery store. Only the minor portion shows up on his tax bill.

Under the Brannan plan, almost the whole bill would be paid by congressional appropriation. The amount probably would be higher than the present cost, in taxes and food prices, of the farm program. There are two reasons for this: the support level would be higher, and it would cover many products which are not now supported.

On the other hand, the average family would eat better because food prices would be much lower. For the same reason our agricultural exports would once more become competitive in the world market.

Secretary Brannan calls his plan an income-support program. It is, of course, nothing of the kind. No price subsidies can raise farm income where it is lowest, on the small-family farms which raise little more than what they consume.

Out of the 1,589,706 farms harvesting cotton in 1939, almost 80 percent reported less than eight bales. Obviously, neither the Brannan plan nor the present support law would solve their problem.

Price supports, however clever the formula, can only guarantee a higher living standard to the farmer who already has a reasonably high one.

Harry Outen Cole, Interoceanic Ship-Canal Engineer and Builder of the Pacific End of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1950, West Virginia lost one of her most illustrious sons, Harry Outen Cole, of Morgantown, who died at his home in the early morning of that day, ending a life of extraordinary distinction.

As an engineer of the highest order of ability his career transcended the confines of normal experience in that his constructive contributions covered a wide range of projects and interests and were international in scope. His greatest achievement was, as resident engineer in charge, the responsible supervision of the construction of the entire Pacific end of the Panama Canal south of Culebra Cut, 1908–14. This work included the two Pacific locks and the Pacific sea-level section of the Canal with the accessory features.

Though his activities carried him to distant lands on a variety of major undertakings, he always thought of his canal work as being the high point in his experiences, and he became a lifelong student of that tropical waterway, ever solicitous of its integrity and interested in its rational improvement.

When, in 1947, the old 1906 issue as to the form of the future Panama Canal, known in canal literature as the "Battle of the Levels," was resurrected under the guise of "conversion" by the recommendations in a report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Mr. Cole was deeply interested.

After studying the available new data he became seriously concerned about the recommendations of the Governor and undertook to enlighten the American people on the subject—to reveal what he considered the principal fallacies upon which the proposed sea-level project was developed and to outline what he felt was the best solution.

In that effort he was forthright and fearless in his approach. After a careful study he recognized the operational inadequacy of the present Pacific lock system, and the serious navigational hazards in the lock and channel arrangements which would have been produced by the third locks project. He instinctively recognized and accepted the terminal lake plan for the future Panama Canal as offering the soundest and most economical means for the modernization of the Panama Canal from every point of view, especially from that of the vessels which transit the canal. He did this in spite of the fact that—as he fully realized—such work would require the reconstruction of the Pacific locks whose building he had supervised. Hence it is clear that his judgment as an engineer was not clouded by any considerations of sentiment.

With respect to the sea-level proposal he was an implacable foe. His writings are replete with exposures of the unwarranted assumptions upon which that plan was promoted in 1947. He often expressed the opinion that the sea-level plan, as proposed, would be less satisfactory operationally and vastly more costly to construct and maintain than the canal it would replace, and that it is entirely unjustified from every point of view, especially national security and national defense.

In a moving address delivered on May 8, 1948, in Washington, D. C., before the Panama Canal Societies of the United States in tribute to the late Sydney B. Williamson, who from 1908 to 1912 was his superior at Panama, Mr. Cole declared in words which reflected his heartfelt sincerity:

> Were Colonel Williamson with us today he would join with the late C. A. McIlvaine in saying, "The Panama Canal was the great love of my life, the one thing I have encountered worth devoting my life to." That is the way all the men and women who built the Canal feel.
>
> I want you to know that some of us who had the unparalleled engineering experience of building the Canal and know at first hand about its serious problems and dangers have some very definite ideas in the recent recommendations for the conversion of the present Canal to sea level, and we know that the public is not being as adequately informed on this question as it should be. At the right time we shall be heard. It is your duty to write your views to your Representatives and Senators on the subject.
>
> Many eminent engineers have from time to time expressed themselves in strong opposition to a sea-level canal at Panama for reasons based upon definite knowledge and experience. Among these statements the most eloquent, the most forceful, and the one most historically based was made by the former Chief Engineer, John F. Stevens, on July 13, 1927, before the American Society of Civil Engineers. When discussing the sea-level controversy of 1906 and the decision of Congress to build the high-lake-type canal, he stated: "I have been privileged to be of

some little service to my country, and the greatest service I ever gave to it was the part I took in preventing foreign votes from foisting a nameless, useless, sea-level canal (as proposed by the majority of the consulting board) upon a too-credulous American people."

These words of Stevens are just as true today as they were when he said them. We are now in another critical period for the Panama Canal.

I feel it my duty to warn you and the American people that, if this so-called sea-level conversion project is undertaken, it may prove to be the practical destruction of the Panama Canal and disruption of the world's maritime shipping for an indefinite period of time, to say nothing of the futile and wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars and the blot on the reputation of the American engineering profession that could never be erased. (Hon. Chapman Revercomb, Tribute to the Late Sydney B. Williamson. (Extension of Remarks. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 2d sess., May 21, 1948, vol. 94, part 11, Appendix, p. A3191.))

Other recent writings of Mr. Cole of technical nature have been published in extensions of remarks by Members of Congress and are now listed as matters of historical interest:

Hon. Melvin C. Snyder, What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal? CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, second session, May 4, 1948, volume 94, part 10, Appendix, page A2743.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Panama Canal—the Sea-Level Project, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eighty-first Congress, first session, February 9, 1949, volume 95, part 12, Appendix, page A662.

Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, Waterway Improvements, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 14, 1949, volume 95, part 12, Appendix, page A760.

These papers set forth his views on the canal question in words of power. Together they form an important part of the technical record which restored national thinking concerning this grave subject to a sound basis. I am happy that I was privileged to include one of his writings in an extension of my remarks. The death of Harry Cole—especially at this time—is, indeed, a national loss; but, fortunately, his ideas are recorded in permanent form. They will remain vital and serve as an important beacon in the stream of future events.

A Practical Step Toward Better Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal for March 4, 1950:

A PRACTICAL STEP TOWARD BETTER EDUCATION

By a senate resolution, Kentucky has taken the first step to enter the plan of cooperation among Southern States for college education. It is natural that this will revive the debate over racial separation. Many see the plan to be an effort to evade the Constitution and the Supreme Court and to perpetuate segregation.

This newspaper believes, however, that if every State in the South broke down tomorrow all laws and customs on segregation, the regional college plan would still be a good and desirable one. The issue of segregation and the issue of better education and better opportunities for all are two different things.

It may be admitted that the cooperative plan was first thought up as a way of keeping segregation by building first-rate colleges, mutually supported and used, to which Negro students would be sent. In the early narrow contemplation this would comply with the Court's mandate of equal facilities for all and still avoid a supposed touchy situation. But the idea has gone far beyond that.

Today the aim is to pool resources to build strong professional schools in which all States may share. In many fields of education, no Southern State has been doing a good job. Money is notoriously lacking in a region of low resources. Southern educators long have seen that they could not hope to set up all the facilities needed on a State-by-State basis. At this rate, each State duplicating the schools of the others, no school would be really good.

The idea grew that if instead of 11 schools for teaching, say, veterinary medicine, one institution, or three or four institutions could be maintained, it would be better all around. The original idea was left behind. The broader idea was explained by Millard Caldwell, former Governor of Florida and chairman of the board of control for Southern Regional Education. "The plan is not intended," he writes in an analysis of the legal points involved, "to relieve the States of any responsibility under the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution; nor could it, for that matter."

In other words, if segregation were wiped out and jealous tradition laid aside, the result would apply to regional schools as well as State schools.

Negroes and white groups opposed to segregation in colleges are not opposed to the plan of regional education in itself. Their attitude was set forth in an editorial in the Journal of Negro Education last year, which said:

"Why are Negroes opposed to segregated regional graduate and professional work? The answer briefly is that they are opposed only to the segregated aspects of it. They have no objection to and see considerable advantage in regional services which are based upon a principle which looks forward to a greater educational future for the South, rather than backward to a decade or more ago."

As matters stand now, it is a fact that citizens of several States, white and colored alike, cannot get at home certain professional training. Segregation has no place in their situation. Florida and West Virginia, for example, have no medical schools. To remedy this situation would cost upward of 10 to 20 million dollars for buildings and equipment, and large sums for operation. The problem is solved for them under the regional plan. The regional compact, which 10 States already signed, opens to their citizens medical schools at Vanderbilt, Tennessee, Tulane, Louisiana State, Meharry (the Negro college at Nashville), Duke, and Emory. The States pay $1,500 a year a student. John I. Ivey and William McGlothlin, directors of the system, make it plain:

"A State shares the school it has in one field and buys use of a school elsewhere in a field in which it is deficient. The system adds up to a more efficient use of facilities and a practical application of the regional philosophy. It permits the region to put its combined strength into the development of a school that, through location and present growth, holds greatest promise for service to the region."

Package Freight Trade on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include statement of Mr. Harry C. Brockel, Milwaukee, Wis., before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Maritime Matters of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, February 11, 1950.

The problem of restoring our Great Lakes package freight trade is of major import and worthy of serious study on the part of the Congress of the United States. I hope every Member of Congress will read Mr. Brockel's very complete statement on the need for revitalizing package freight and passenger service on the Great Lakes. This is additional proof for the necessity of amending the Ship Sales Act of 1946 as provided for in bills introduced in this body by 28 Members, including myself and Congressman BLATNIK.

STATEMENT OF HARRY C. BROCKEL, MILWAUKEE, WIS., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND MARITIME MATTERS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 11, 1950

I appear before your honorable committee as a public witness in behalf of the maritime interests of the Great Lakes region. I am municipal port director of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, and appear here as representative of that city.

I am also secretary of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, which represents some 25 to 30 Great Lakes ports, large and small, and my statement represents the views of that organization also. Further to qualify myself, may I say that I am immediate past president of the American Association of Port Authorities, which is vitally interested in the rehabilitation of domestic shipping, coastwise, intercoastal, and Great Lakes. I also represent the Great Lakes on the Joint Committee for the American Merchant Marine.

The net effect of World War II, insofar as our seagoing merchant marine is concerned, was to modernize our ocean fleets and to expand our off-shore fleet tremendously. In direct contrast, World War II had the effect of completely destroying some very vital segments of Great Lakes shipping. The recent war, in some respects a blessing to our ocean merchant marine, was directly the opposite insofar as the Great Lakes is concerned.

The Great Lakes are one of America's major transportation arteries. They serve an area which is one of the most highly productive regions of the globe, with a population of 50,000,000 people. No other nation or continent has been favored by inland seas of such magnitude and importance nor with such volume and value of commerce.

Although the Great Lakes serve an immense water-borne commerce, certain segments of Great Lakes water transportation have been seriously affected by competitive factors, and there has been considerable displacement of vessels as a result of World War II. The unfavorable conditions which confront the domestic merchant marine gen-

erally have been felt on the Great Lakes as well as in the intercoastal and coastwise trades. The problems which beset the domestic merchant marine are much the same on the Great Lakes as on salt water, and an adequate solution of the domestic merchant marine problem must take cognizance of the lake situation as well as the oceans.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Unlimited space could be devoted to an historical discussion outlining the rise and fall of the Great Lakes package freight trade. To summarize briefly the competitive and commercial conditions which led to the progressive decline in the volume of package freight handled on the Great Lakes, mention several important factors. These include the prewar competitive attitude of the rail carriers, which permitted package freight services a mere existence and over a period of years progressively reduced the number of commodities available for water carriage; the new competition of truck carriers, which drove out of existence the so-called alongshore vessel services operating port-to-port services of regional importance; the gradual rise in operating costs even prior to World War II, accompanied by a parallel decline in revenues; and finally, the necessities of war, which resulted in the United States and Canadian Governments requisitioning of scores of lake ships for ocean service, thus forcing the suspension of all general cargo services available at the outbreak of the war.

Thus a trade which 25 years ago employed a large fleet of vessels and gave productive employment and profitable activity to seamen, stevedores, warehouses, terminals, shipyards, and other phases of the marine industry, gradually declined from its earlier importance and was barely existing when World War II placed the final quietus on these historical services these trades are dormant today, as steamship operators have either been unable or unwilling to reenter the trade, and there has been no constructive action by Government agencies looking toward restoration of these services.

ECONOMIC VALUE TO THE LAKE REGION AND TO LAKE PORTS

The Great Lakes were discovered, explored, and colonized by water transportation. The whole economy of the region is traditionally a water-transportation economy. The displacement of a large segment of the Great Lakes merchant marine is a distinct loss to shippers and to the economic structure of the entire Middle West. The Great Lakes package freight services offered transportation services at appreciable savings under all-rail freight costs; gave shippers the benefit of alternate routes during periods of railroad congestion, and maintained a competitive relationship between rail and water rates.

While the preponderance of lake shipping is devoted to the so-called bulk trades (coal, ore, stone, grain, and petroleum) which move tonnage in tremendous quantity, it is significant that comparatively few shippers can use this type of service to advantage; i. e., those industries which by their very nature can deal in cargo lots and which have the capital resources necessary to permit of full utilization of bulk shipping facilities by way of investment in docks, handling apparatus, large stock piles, and the ships themselves. On the other hand, the balance of the lake commerce available for movement by package freighters, passenger and freight vessels, and unscheduled steamers is of interest to an infinitely larger number of enterprises, numbering literally thousands, ranging all the way from small town merchants and manufacturers up to great national industries.

From the standpoint of port interest, important lake terminal facilities whose operations are predicated upon these commercial movements, may find economic survival difficult. Major port facilities require large initial investments and have substantial maintenance and overhead costs which cannot be supported unless they earn regular revenues. The disappearance of normal shipping services and of commodity movements, upon which these terminals depended for revenues, presents a serious question to public and private terminal operators. The entire economy of the Great Lakes area is affected by this situation.

In the event of any substantial business recession, the repercussions would be serious from the standpoint of employment. The removal of approximately a hundred ships from the American fleet as constituted prewar means that there are a hundred fewer staffs of officers and seamen employed on the lakes. Thousands of stevedores have had to find other occupations. In Milwaukee, for example, before 1942, we had a force of 500 stevedores continuously employed in handling general cargo. As of today, we find it difficult to maintain employment for 50 stevedores. The same condition prevails in the whole pattern of economic activity that springs from an active merchant marine.

RAILROAD COMPETITION

The present situation of the domestic merchant marine is due to abuses of long standing. For many years past, domestic water transportation has been progressively undermined by ruthless railroad competitive practices. This is not a mere accusation but a condition which has been recognized in official reports of the Maritime Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and other authoritative agencies.

The Transportation Act of 1940 vests in the Interstate Commerce Commission the duty of regulating both rail and water carriers so as "to preserve the inherent advantages of each * * * without unfair or destructive competition." It was hoped that this act would provide a solution to the rail-water competitive problem, but after 9 years of operation under this act, the situation has deteriorated steadily, and, in fact, has reached the point of crisis.

While the Maritime Commission has taken some encouraging steps to initiate a complete investigation of rail-water rate structures in the intercoastal and coastwise trades, this proceeding has lagged and thus far there is no indication as to when a final conclusion by the Interstate Commerce Commission may be forthcoming.

No study of the domestic merchant marine can be complete without full recognition of the rail-water competitive situation and the demonstrated determination of the railroads to capture Great Lakes, coastwise, and intercoastal traffic even though on noncompensatory rates. Unless the Interstate Commerce Commission takes appropriate action to terminate these ruthless competitive practices and to restore a reasonable balance between rail and water services in accordance with the several congressional declarations of policy, it will be necessary to seek congressional consideration of the problem and to secure a legislative mandate of a character which will permit the domestic merchant marine to exist. It can neither operate nor exist under present conditions. Depressed rail rates are an effective barrier to the increase of water rates, and the water carriers are thus unable to recapture the added cost of operation under present inflated conditions. The railroads, through the maintenance of depressed rates, have made it impossible for water lines to operate on a compensatory rate basis. As long as this situation continues, domestic water lines are in a hopeless condition.

EFFECTS OF WORLD WAR II

The following table showing the status of the United States Great Lakes fleet as of 1939–46, shows graphically the decline in the Great Lakes merchant fleet as a result of World War II:

United States Great Lakes fleet (over 500 tons registry)

Type	1939		1946	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
Bulk freighters	414	2,170,486	350	2,103,402
Package freighters	24	87,169	0	0
Car ferries	32	80,782	27	74,543
Passenger steamers	19	70,557	12	42,564
Total dry cargo	489	2,408,994	389	2,220,509
Oil tankers	28	58,245	26	65,370
Total dry cargo and tankers	517	2,467,239	415	2,285,879

Percentage 1946 of 1939:	*Percent*
Number of vessels	80.3
Registered tonnage	92.6

Between 1939 and 1946, the United States Great Lakes fleet of more than 500-ton registry declined from 517 ships to 415 ships, a decrease of 102 vessels. In numbers of vessels, the fleet declined approximately 20 percent and in registered tonnage, it declined approximately 7 percent as shown by the table. The Canadian Great Lakes fleet declined from 274 ships in 1939 to 212 ships in 1946.

Of the 102 vessels removed from the Great Lakes fleet during this period, a few were lost by disaster or retirement. However, the vast preponderance of the reduction is represented by ships taken from the Great Lakes for war service, which have in no manner been replaced.

The entire fleets of the principal package freight services were ordered into ocean service upon the outbreak of World War II. Whereas 24 package freighters were operated in 1939, none are in postwar operation. Two of the largest passenger ships on the Lakes were converted into aircraft carriers for naval aviation training, while other passenger ships were taken from the Lakes for use as transports or for conversion into freight carriers. Motorship services which formerly operated between the Atlantic seaboard and the Great Lakes were forced to discontinue cargo service to lake ports. Automobile carrying vessels were converted into bulk carriers to meet wartime demands.

The Maritime Commission, during World War II, built 16 large modern ore vessels for the Great Lakes trade. As a condition of the construction and acquisition of these ships, lake shipping companies were forced to surrender 36 moderate-size Great Lakes bulk freighters, of obsolescent types, which immediately after the war, were sold for scrapping. The 16 large ore carriers added to the Great Lakes fleet are of such dimensions that they can be safely and economically operated only into a few of the principal Great Lakes ports, primarily the ore ports. The Great Lakes fleet thus gained 16 large ships whose usefulness is limited to a few ports and lost 36 ships of moderate size which were capable of operating into practically any lake port. As a result of this transaction, lake shipping lost much of its flexibility and while the ore trade may be well served, many of the

smaller ports are now at a disadvantage in securing vessel space.

The demands of World War II thus caused the removal from the Great Lakes of nearly 100 ships of all types, including passenger ships, bulk carriers, motorships, tankers and other useful vessels, large and small, which furnished a flexible transportation service adaptable to most lake ports. The removal of these ships by the Federal Government has automatically terminated the movement of many commodities economically important to the Great Lakes region and has caused great injury to the commerce of the Great Lakes.

After the First World War, the Great Lakes area was fortunate in securing the services of small salt-water ships built on the Great Lakes for ocean service. After World War I, many of these so-called lakers came back into the Great Lakes and were an important transportation asset between the two world wars. During World War II, the shipbuilding program concentrated on vessels of dimensions too large to enter the Great Lakes unless and until the St. Lawrence seaway is developed. Few if any small cargo ships suitable for Great Lakes operation were built during World War II, and the result is that the pool of Great Lakes shipping is considerably smaller after World War II than before the war. This condition is in striking contrast to the wealth of tonnage now available for foreign service.

To summarize the present status of the Great Lakes fleet, it is admirably served from the standpoint of bulk commodities but is totally lacking in vessels suitable for general cargo trade and in small flexible types of bulk carriers adapted to various trades and to serving the smaller ports. The lake fleet is much less flexible than before World War II, and its tonnage is now largely concentrated in the bulk trades (coal, ore, and grain) leaving great deficiencies in other aspects of Great Lakes commerce.

To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, we on the Great Lakes have had exactly two acquisitions in the way of vessels out of World War II. Those are two LST's one of which is hauling pulpwood from Canada to a Wisconsin paper mill and the other is carrying new automobiles across Lake Michigan. These two LST's represent our net replacement for the 100 or more ships lost to the area during World War II, as a result of Government action.

MARITIME COMMISSION POLICY

The Great Lakes situation was forcefully called to the attention of the Maritime Commission by the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners as early as September 1943, as the radical effect of the war upon lake shipping already was fully manifest. The Milwaukee presentation received wide support throughout the Great Lakes area.

Admirals Land and Vickery, formerly Chairman and Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, both verbally and in writing committed the Maritime Commission to the rehabilitation and restoration of Great Lakes shipping. Continued negotiation between lake interests and the Maritime Commission over a 7-year period has, however, produced nothing substantial and not a single vessel of the entire vast surplus fleet has been assigned to the Great Lakes by the Commission.

Admiral W. W. Smith, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, on March 24, 1947, addressed a letter to the Honorable John R. Steelman, Assistant to President Truman, discussing in some detail the domestic merchant marine crisis. He said in part, "The problem of reestablishing domestic water carrier services, which before the war played a vital part in the distribution and marketing of commodities in interstate commerce, is the direct concern of Government agencies responsible for orderly reconversion to peacetime economy. Moreover, there has been an indisputable obligation upon the Government since it disrupted the business of these steamship lines by requisitioning their ships for war uses, to do its best to help them recapture their position in the transportation industry."

This is an admirable statement of policy and an admirable recognition of the Government's moral obligation to the domestic carriers. However, 5 years have elapsed since the end of the war without a single substantial forward step having been taken either by private enterprise or Government agency to restore the hundred ships diverted from the Great Lakes to the war effort. In the meantime, vast numbers of surplus American vessels have been disposed of to foreign purchasers under preferential terms, and the American merchant marine languishes while foreign flag fleets rapidly rehabilitate themselves.

Canadian shipping enterprise is moving to provide modern vessels and expanded service on the Great Lakes and in the St. Lawrence River. Unless American enterprise keeps pace with Canada, the inevitable result will be foreign domination of many segments of the Great Lakes trade, bolstered by modern and efficient vessels, in contrast to an aging American fleet, marked by great gaps in our shipping services as a result of wartime requisitioning.

Comprehensive reports on the Great Lakes problem have been presented to the United States Maritime Commission, to the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, and more recently to the Merchant Marine Committee of the House. We are most appreciative of the interest which the House and Senate committees are demonstrating with regard to the Great Lakes problem and are grateful to General Fleming, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, who, at the request of Great Lakes interests, initiated a complete study of the Great Lakes shipping problem, which we understand is nearing completion. Some of the specific measures recommended to the Maritime Commission include the following:

1. The initiation of studies looking toward development of one or more vessel types designed for the special conditions of the Great Lakes package-freight trade, with special reference to low cargo-handling costs, fast turnaround, lowest fuel costs consistent with reasonable speed, and minimum crew requirements.

2 Pending design and construction of vessels dedicated specifically to the Great Lakes trade, it was recommended and requested that the Commission allocate to Great Lakes service suitable types of vessels in sufficient numbers to permit reestablishment of the Great Lakes package-freight and miscellaneous freight services, upon favorable terms consistent with Government policy, recognizing the public interest involved in the restoration of these important services.

3. It was requested and recommended that the Maritime Commission aggressively support legislative and rate policies which will permit the operation of Great Lakes package freight and general cargo carriers on a sound, healthy, and economical basis. The rate history of these trades indicates that Great Lakes package freight and general cargo operations have not had the support of the Federal Government and that there has been a progressive decline in these trades over a period of years through encroachment by rail and truck carriers.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted at a time when the greatest danger to the American merchant marine was its inability to compete with foreign operators. Construction and operating subsidies were provided by Congress to overcome these handicaps and to assure that the American flag would continue to fly the seas. The economic dislocations caused by World War II have entirely reversed the situation. The foreign trades now enjoy an improved position as compared to its prewar status, and the domestic trades are now in demand of public attention and assistance.

GREAT LAKES SHIPBUILDING

Closely allied to these questions is the problem of an adequate Great Lakes shipbuilding resource. During the war, approximately 20 shipyards on the shores of the Great Lakes built ships under Maritime Commission, Army, and Navy contracts. Some of these yards did not exist before the war and most of them have since gone out of existence. Prior to the emergency, Great Lakes shipbuilding was in the doldrums, with little activity in the way of new vessel construction.

The national interest requires that Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities not be allowed to fall into a state of disuse and disrepair. Policies should be formulated for development of Great Lakes, coastwise, and inland waterway transportation, which will utilize these shipbuilding resources on a regular and consistent basis, to insure their continued operation and maintenance. In time of peace, the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry, so maintained and supported, would constitute an economic asset of great value to the Great Lakes area and to the Nation at large; and in the event of future wars, would be able to produce ships speedily and efficiently for the national defense. When the St. Lawrence seaway becomes available, Great Lakes shipyards will be able to build and deliver ships of much greater capacity than at present, up to and including vessels of 10,000 tons in size; but in any event, these resources should be utilized consistently and maintained in working condition.

Most of the materials required for modern vessel construction are to be found on or near the shores of the Great Lakes, in close proximity to the industrial machinery and the skilled labor required for vessel production. In this sense, the Great Lakes shipyards are probably in a position to deliver ships at cost equal to or lower than other shipbuilding areas because of their central location, which minimizes transportation requirements in the way of materials and machinery and tends to eliminate cross hauling of materials and equipment.

The maintenance of lake shipbuilding on a sound and healthy basis should be closely integrated with programs for restoration, rehabilitation, and expansion of Great Lakes shipping and commerce. To the maximum extent possible, ships intended for lake service should be built in Great Lakes yards, thus tying together the entire shipbuilding, ship-operation, and ship-repair economy of the region.

We recommend and request, therefore, that your committee, in the course of its studies looking toward rehabilitation and modernization of Great Lakes shipping, give consideration to the suggested liaison and integration of Great Lakes shipbuilding and Great Lakes shipping services.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is self-evident that an adequate domestic merchant marine is essential to our national defense. There can be no quibbling on this point in the light of the record of the domestic fleet in World War II. The intercoastal, coastwise, and Great Lakes fleet bore the first brunt of the war and provided this country with shipping capacity at a time when our national security hung in the balance. The ships were readily available, were manned by experienced crews, and furnished our first line of defense, until the wartime shipbuilding program swung into action and began producing tonnage in quantity a year or more after the outbreak of World War II.

One may well ask what the situation of the United States would have been after

Pearl Harbor has there been no intercoastal, coastwise, and Great Lakes fleet. The answer is obviously that national disaster might have ensued. Yet, in the face of this record, there are those who would gamble with our national security by arguing that domestic shipping has served its role in our national development, that the railroads need the traffic, and that domestic shipping must go the way of the horse and buggy.

In 1937, 517 merchant ships plied the Great Lakes under the American flag. Four hundred and fifteen ships were in this trade as of 1946. The disappearance of 102 ships from the Great Lakes fleet means more than the loss of actual bottoms. It means that 102 fewer skilled crews of seamen and 102 fewer sets of capable officers will be on call during the next emergency. If these ships and their commerce are not restored it means a proportionate reduction in seamen, stevedores, marine personnel, and terminal facilities generally. These vital facilities will be found lacking in some future national emergency.

The national defense demands the restoration of these ships not only as a matter of actual bottoms but in the matter of maintaining a pool of trained officers, seamen, and port facilities. It has been repeatedly stated by our top military authorities that an adequate merchant marine is essential to our national defense, that the Navy cannot function without it, and that the Army cannot convey expeditionary forces to distant battlefronts without it. No detailed discussion on this point should be necessary. Similarly, little discussion should be needed to emphasize the vital role of the domestic merchant marine in this over-all picture.

CONCLUSION

The vessels of the Great Lakes and the thousands of skilled officers and seamen manning these ships form a vital part of the American merchant marine—although the limited recognition extended to lake shipping thus far by the Congress, regulatory commissions, and ocean shipping interests raises the question as to whether the Great Lakes are so recognized.

Great Lakes shipping has been largely self-sufficient during the past century, which is probably the best reason for its lack of prominence in congressional consideration of merchant-marine matters. The Merchant Marine Shipping Act of 1936, the basic law prescribing the functions of the Maritime Commission and establishing our national merchant-marine policy, makes only passing reference to "domestic" and "inland waterway" transportation. The phrase "Great Lakes" occurs only two or three times in 30 pages of fine print in this act. The foreign-trade policies prescribed by the act refer specifically to offshore shipping. A considerable degree of legislative indifference to the Great Lakes is apparent in this act, which is the fundamental merchant-marine law of the land.

The American people have a tremendous stake in Great Lakes commerce and in its ports and harbors. The Nation has no greater avenue of water transportation and no cheaper form of transportation. Its contribution to the national welfare and economy both in war and in peace cannot be challenged. A great public investment has been made in navigation and harbor improvements on the Great Lakes, the full benefit of which cannot be realized unless lake shipping is fully restored.

Maintaining the strength and vitality of Great Lakes commerce is just as important to the citizens of the Middle West and to the entire Nation as is the development and promotion of seaboard and foreign commerce. All phases of the Nation's commerce are as deserving of aid and recognition as our foreign commerce.

The Maritime Commission has a vast fleet of 5,500 vessels to dispose of, in accordance with congressional policy for the fostering and promotion of both our foreign and domestic trade. Thus far the Commission has not seen fit to assign so much as one ship of this vast fleet to the Great Lakes as even a token replacement of the many vessels sacrificed by the Great Lakes toward victory in World War II.

The Great Lakes area has traditionally supported the establishment of ocean shipping on a sound and healthy basis. It earnestly feels, however, that the Great Lakes problem as well as salt-water shipping problems should have responsive and liberal treatment by the Federal Government. While the distressed condition of Great Lakes shipping is only one of the major problems confronting the Federal Government, we submit that it is a problem requiring the best thought, and much more speedy and aggressive action than it has received heretofore.

In your consideration of national merchant marine policy, we sincerely hope that the Great Lakes situation will receive your earnest consideration. We hope that this report will in some measure assist you in your deliberations. The restoration of Great Lakes commerce is one of the most vital problems confronting the Middle West and the entire Nation.

In connection with your hearings relative to ship sales and charters and the extension of the Ship Sales Act of 1946, Great Lakes vessel operators will make certain legislative recommendations to your honorable committee, which we hope will have your serious and careful consideration. We hope sincerely and devoutly that from the deliberations of your committee will come a realistic program for restoration of common carrier shipping services on the Great Lakes, a vital but overlooked segment of the American merchant marine.

The Great Lakes region is interested in recognition as part of the American merchant marine. Sound and useful shipping opportunities will again be offered by the Great Lakes. Lakes shipbuilding, ignored in peacetime and suddenly valued under the stress of war, should receive greater recognition. With 8,000 miles of shore line and scores of fine harbors, with great natural resources and a reservoir of skilled labor, the Great Lakes were allowed about 3 percent participation in the wartime shipbuilding program, in terms of tonnage.

A fleet of 500 vessels, manned and officered by tens of thousands of competent seamen capable of moving more than 200,000,000 tons of freight in an 8-month season cannot be ignored in surveying the national landscape. The Lakes demand recognition of these shipping and human resources which together constitute a great national asset.

States' Rights and Lefts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the shocking conduct of Philip B. Perlman, employed by the people of the United States as their solicitor general but, who, in fact, obviously represents other interests and not the people who employ him, was the subject of a recent column by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States.

To be more accurate I might say that Mr. Perlman's actions became the subject of Mr. Fitzpatrick's column after Mr. Perlman had become the subject of the American Bar Association. I make this distinction in order to point out that Mr. Perlman also became the subject of the American Bar Association after he, Mr. Perlman, had become the subject of most serious discussion and action on the part of the Judiciary Committee of this body.

Let me fill you in.

As Solicitor General, it is Mr. Perlman's job to act as the trial attorney for the people of the United States and the various agencies of the Government.

When the chips were down in an important case, however, Mr. Perlman unblushingly declared himself on the opposite side of the people from whom he draws his salary.

So unparalleled was his action that the Judiciary Committee of this body took unparalleled action and by a majority vote of the majority and minority sides of the committees denounced Mr. Perlman's action and said, in effect, that since Mr. Perlman had abandoned his client and had deserted to the other side it was time that the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, have somebody to speak for them. One of this body's most distinguished Members, SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, the ranking majority member of the House Judiciary Committee, was selected to represent the Congress and the people since Mr. Perlman had taken a run-out powder on his client.

It is almost unbelievable but it is a fact.

Such action on the part of any run-of-the-mill lawyer would have brought down immediate action by the ethics committee of any bar association in any State.

Of course Mr. Perlman's action was no surprise to Members of Congress who were familiar with his previous action in New York where he read into the housing legislation certain rules, regulations, and restrictions which the Congress on several occasions had specifically rejected.

This is the gentleman who is the subject of Mr. Fitzpatrick's column in the New Orleans States and New Orleans Times-Picayune.

Now Mr. Fitzpatrick himself is no ordinary run-of-the-mill, fly-by-night editor. He is editor of a newspaper which long ago established its integrity and its right to be heard. On two occasions the New Orleans States has been nationally recognized by being awarded the Theta Delta Chi medal for distinguished service and courage in journalism. This newspaper has every right to be proud of these two awards.

In view of the high standing in the community of the New Orleans States and recognition of the fact that the New Orleans States is not a propaganda sheet or an apologist claptrap, nor a carrier of imported and foreign ideas, Mr. Fitzpatrick's article on Mr. Perlman is of more than passing moment.

STATES' RIGHTS AND LEFTS

(By W. H. Fitzpatrick, editor, New Orleans States)

The papers last week revealed that some of our lawyers are upset about the way a Washington lawbooks named Philip B. Perlman has been carrying on, and so there will

be no misunderstanding at the outset, they are right as rain.

Perlman is one of these hot-eyed zealots who wants to reform—according to his own chosen ideas of what reformation means—the whole structure of the Federal courts, the ethical concepts of the American Bar Association, and the mores of a people.

I have had pieces before about how intolerant upper-case Liberals really are. If you can't see things their way, brother, you're lucky you're not living with them in Salem in the seventeenth century.

All of this was a bit too much for Cuthbert Baldwin of New Orleans and Le Doux Provosty of Alexandria. They have asked the bar group to cool Perlman down.

They charge Perlman with maligning Federal judges of the fifth circuit court and with abandoning clients, and if the committee on grievances and ethics finds him guilty, the board of governors can kick him out.

This gentleman under discussion isn't just a night court lawyer—he's the Solicitor General of the United States. As such, he filed before the United States Supreme Court petitions for writs of certiorari last October alleging that the Court of Appeals of the United States Fifth Circuit was following a pattern of denial in cases before it involving the National Labor Relations Board.

Along with these petitions he filed a chart showing how many NLRB cases the fifth circuit had enforced, how many it had modified, set aside or remanded, and compared its record and results with other circuit court decisions. This formed his pattern. In Perlman's book, the fifth circuit is an also ran.

But even to a layman like me, there is a certain respect for evidence and facts. I say nuts to his patterns. What was the evidence in each of the cases he complains about? That's what I want to know and that's what every lawyer ought to want to know, including the bookish boys on the Supreme Court.

For this fearsome scatter shot, which has left the judges of the fifth circuit visibly unimpressed, the American Bar Association is going to decide whether or not Perlman has violated its ethics through a pursuit of "unjust criticism and clamor."

This isn't the only charge resting against the honorable Solicitor General. There is the little matter of abandoning a client, too.

This latter criticism of Perlman arises from a suit filed against the Interstate Commerce Commission by Elmer W. Henderson, attacking an ICC ruling setting up separate but equal dining facilities for whites and Negroes on railroads. Perlman, who ought to be defending the ICC, his Government client, hopped the fence and filed a brief supporting Henderson's position.

For this, the bar association's committee on ethics is studying the charges of Messrs. Baldwin and Provosty that Perlman has "abandoned its (the ICC's) defense and espoused the cause of its alleged adversary."

These are not the first evidences of the attempts of Perlman, through his office, to centralize control in the executive branch of the Government for purposes of his own and to run roughshod over the judicial and legislative. In those cited above he has tried to break down the lower courts in the NLRB cases and nullify Supreme Court and ICC rulings upholding segregation in the Henderson case.

There was the time on December 4 last, when in New York, for political purposes, he made a speech in which he said that the Federal Housing Authority would no longer lend funds to projects which sought to enforce racial restrictions.

This was in direct contravention to the wishes of Congress which has refused, each time Federal Housing has come before it, to adopt similar restrictions. The Congress is wise enough to know that local law and local customs ought to determine whether segregation should be enforced.

This is the record of Mr. Perlman. It comprises disregard of the Congress, disregard of Supreme Court and ICC rulings, charges of abandonment of clients and unjust criticism of Federal courts and violation of the basic ethics of his profession for his own designs.

Maybe from this evidence you can follow the pattern being woven by this ideological ambulance chaser now holding the high office of Solicitor General of the United States.

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit some additional comment on the conference report on H. R. 2023, the bill to repeal the taxes on oleomargarine, and on the statement of the managers on the part of the House which accompanied that report.

The oleomargarine bill as amended carries a provision designed to make clear the intent of Congress that the raw oils destined for human consumption in the form of oleomargarine shall be required by the Food and Drug Administration to measure up to the same sanitary standards applied to the milk and cream used in the manufacture of butter. The statement of the managers on the part of the House states that this provision adds nothing to section 402 (a) (3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as that act has been interpreted and construed by the administrative officials charged with its enforcement.

I think it would be well for the record to show what that interpretation is. An official of the Food and Drug Administration has assured the conferees that under sectior 402 (a) (3) the raw oils intended for use in oleomargarine could and would be subjected to the same sanitary standards presently applied to the milk and cream used in the manufacture of butter and also that the plants extracting oils for use in oleomargarine could and would be required to meet the same sanitary standards applied to creameries handling milk and cream to be manufactured into butter.

The amendment therefore serves as a ratification or approval of that interpretation and as a directive to the Food and Drug Administration to bring about this equality of standards in actual operation. The amendment does not increase the standards for butter, milk, or cream, or for oleomargarine or the refined oils used therein, as such, but merely requires that the raw oils intended for human consumption in the form of oleomargarine shall be kept clean and sanitary from the time of the original extracting of the oils to the same extent that milk or cream is required to be kept clean and sanitary from the time it reaches the creamery until it is used in the manufacture of butter.

Another amendment in the bill prohibits advertisements which represent or suggest that oleomargarine is a dairy product.

This amendment is intended to put an end to the use in oleomargarine advertisements of grade labeling similar to the grade labeling authorized by law or regulation for butter. Specifically it is intended to reach at the present time the use of grade designations in oleomargarine advertisements such as grade AA, grade A, grade B, and so forth, or the use of grade designations which are similar to the score system of grading butter, such as 92 score, and so forth. This amendment would also prevent the use in oleomargarine ads of dairy scenes or dairy terms, such as pictures of cows or dairy farms or equipment, or such terms as dairy breed names, churned, and so forth. The amendment would also prevent the grouping of oleomargarine with dairy products in advertisements, particularly where such grouping occurs in a box or under a heading entitled "Dairy Products," or suggesting that the products so grouped are dairy products.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill I introduced yesterday, I would like to include a statement of my position on social security:

I believe in the right of all people to a good and decent life when they are no longer able to work because of age, disability, or responsibility for young children.

I believe this right is most secure under a social-insurance program in which a person unable to support himself receives benefits as a matter of equity right because he and his employer have contributed during his working years. This is the self-respecting American way.

I have always been a supporter of the Social Security Act, great pioneering measure of the Roosevelt New Deal, which established that right in our law.

I have supported every recommendation of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and the Democratic platform for making this program more adequate to the needs of all people.

I voted for H. R. 6000, the social-security amendments passed by the House last year, which extended this program to 11,000,000 more workers, greatly increased its benefits, and added insurance against permanent disability. This bill was a great forward step as far as it went but it didn't go nearly far enough.

I, therefore, have urged a further liberalization and extension of the Social Security Act to make security, on an adequate level, a reality for every person who works or has retired. I have introduced a bill for this purpose, H. R. 7617, which would add to the steps already taken, these further provisions.

My bill extends social-insurance protection to everyone who works, whether for himself or another, whether in agriculture or industry, whether in a big enterprise or small. All working people not covered under other Federal systems would, through their own and their employer's contribution, be entitled to benefits as a matter of absolute right without any means test, when they retired.

My bill further increases the social-insurance benefit level. It sets as a minimum monthly payment the $75 which we in California decided at the polls was the least on which any individual could maintain a decent life. Above this basic amount the person retiring would receive 15 percent of his average monthly earnings up to a maximum of $400 of earnings, plus 1 percent for each year he worked in covered employment. His wife would receive the $75 monthly minimum. Thus a worker and his wife retiring after 20 years of covered employment with average earnings of $300 a month would receive a monthly benefit payment of $219.

Men would be entitled to retirement benefits at 65, women at 60. But if a worker became permanently disabled before that time he would be immediately entitled to his retirement benefit. If he should die, his widow and children would receive proportionate monthly payments.

My bill recognizes the justice of the plea for similar treatment from those who have already retired by granting them insured status at the minimum level of $75 a month. All men over 65, all women over 60, and all those permanently and totally disabled would receive the minimum social insurance benefit of $75 a month if they had retired. The Government would purchase this insurance for them as a part of the transitional cost of launching this universal program.

It is no fault of this retired group that they were not able to make pay-roll contributions during their working years. It is the accident of their birth date that has deprived them of the protection of a dignified social insurance program and forced them to submit to the indignity of the public assistance means test.

I believe that the contribution they made to the economy, to the building up of our young and still growing state, entitles them to social insurance on at least this minimum basis. To recognize the just claim of this group will strengthen the social insurance system and thus help to protect the equity of the younger workers.

I do not believe that security is an end in itself. It is the means to all other values. Who can fulfill the creative and spiritual promise that lies within every man when he is obsessed by the uncertainty of how he and his family will live when he can no longer work? Fear is the enemy that corrodes human dignity; insecurity engulfs the human spirit. We who are rich in resources must make ourselves equally rich in the human values which can only fulfill themselves when we have banished fear and insecurity.

I am committed to that battle.

Society of Friends Endorses United States Participation in International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the secure economic base necessary for world cooperation to achieve peace, and the need for fair rules in international trade as a precedent for the permanent and sure settlement of international differences in other endeavors, the Friends' General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends has recommended approval of the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization. Appended hereto is the statement issued by this religious body whose roots are deep in American history and culture supporting the ITO and giving reasons why the United States should accept the charter:

THE HABANA CHARTER FOR AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The Friends' General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends wishes to record with the Committee on Foreign Affairs its recommendation that the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization be approved by the committee and reported favorably to the House of Representatives.

Until an organization is established to deal with the many difficult problems that arise in the field of trade relationships, the structure of cooperation for the peaceful settlement of international differences will be incomplete. The Habana charter would establish such an organization. It is a product of protracted negotiations. It affords a basis upon which the nations of the world can now agree.

The charter embodies the principle that nations, instead of taking action in their own interest without regard to the harm that may be done to others, must first enter into consultation in an effort to achieve a solution that will be in the interest of all. It would create an instrument for the promotion of mutual understanding and the reconciliation of conflicting purposes. By inaugurating a process of continuous accommodation, it would hold in check the ever-present temptation to resort to the weapons of economic warfare.

The creation of an international trade organization was first proposed by the United States. The charter that is now before you is a product of American initiative. If our country were now to turn its back upon it, it would appear to all the world to be abandoning the principles of peace and freedom that it has long espoused. American leadership is desperately needed in the troubled times in which we live. But if it is to be respected, it cannot afford to falter. It must be steady, sure, and strong.

As a practical and constructive contribution toward the organization of a peaceful world, the Habana charter should be approved.

Eighth National Banquet a Significant Occasion—Declaration of American Citizens of Hellenic Descent—Constitution of the Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of March 7, 1950, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., Mrs. Doyle and I were among several hundred other guests on the occasion of the eighth national banquet of the Order of Ahepa.

We were guests of the chapter of this order consisting entirely of American citizens of Hellenic descent of my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

It was announced that the Order of Ahepa holds such national banquets here in the Nation's Capital every other year.

Following is the text of their constitution, to wit:

CONSTITUTION OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

PREAMBLE

We, American citizens of Hellenic descent, desiring to form, institute, and perpetuate a fraternal order and promote its objects and principles; to effect a perfect and harmonious understanding between ourselves and others; to inculcate loyalty and patriotism to and for the country in which we live; to stimulate the spirit of good fellowship and cooperation; and to aid in the solution of social and civic problems, do hereby establish and ordain this constitution.

OBJECTS

The order of Ahepa, and every member thereof, shall always strive to teach, exemplify, and achieve the following objects, principles, and ideals:

To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America; allegiance to its flag; support to its Constitution; obedience to its laws and reverence for its history and traditions;

To instruct its members, by precepts and examples, in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind;

To instill in every one of its members a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship, and the sacred duties attendant therewith; and to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor, and always to strive for the betterment of society;

To awaken in every member an abhorrence of all political corruption—the destroyer of free institutions—and pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out from this country every trace and influence of this evil;

To arouse mankind to the realization that tyranny, wherever it may exercise its baneful power, is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor, and integrity of every nation; and that the preservation of our liberties can be assured, only as this country becomes the champion of liberty and the defender and protector of all oppressed and downtrodden peoples;

To promote throughout the world, and especially in the United States of America, a better and more comprehensive understanding of the Hellenic peoples and nation, and to revive, cultivate, enrich, and marshal into active service for humanity the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism;

To labor in every manner possible, and to utilize every means available for the perfection of the moral sense in its members; to promote good fellowship among them; to endow them with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness; and to point out to them, in unmistakable methods, the advantages of education, the beauties of sacrifice and the deformities of selfishness;

To champion the cause of education; to support the American system of public schools and keep them free from religious prejudice; to promote and augment the educational advantages of this country; and to open, establish, and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning; and

To resist, by lawful means and methods, any tendency toward a union between the civil government and any church or religion, and to repel the interference of any religion in governmental affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the beautiful and appropriate printed program set forth the supreme lodge of the Order of Ahepa as follows:

The supreme lodge: John G. Thevos, supreme president; Constantine G. Economou, supreme vice president; Peter N. Derzis, supreme secretary; Charles Preketes, supreme treasurer; Peter L. Bell, supreme counselor; Pantelis Lambros, supreme governor; Constantine Verinis, supreme governor; Nick Strattin, supreme governor; Peter Grammar, supreme governor; Arthur H. Lalos, executive secretary.

The district governors: Speros Zepatos, Peter V. Paulus, George J. Margoles, John Priggooris, George Kapetanakis, Steve E. Pepps, Chris A. Politz, Gus Rakus, C. G. Morgan, James Argyros, John Rusomanis, John Kras, George M. Paradise, Gus Callas, Leo G. Athans, Paul Destun, Bill Simopoulos, Leon J. Marketos, William Genimatas, George A. Speros, V. C. Beskas, Gus Marinos, Stephen Berdalis, Constantine Vlassie.

The mother lodge, Order of Ahepa, is as follows: John Angelopoulos, Harry Angelopoulos, George Campbell, James Campbell, Nicholas D. Chotas, George A. Polos, Spiros Stamos, James Vlass.

The committee for this significant and happy occasion was as follows:

Basil Anargyros Thomas, chairman; Peter C. Charuhas, vice chairman; Andrew D. Vozeolos, vice chairman.

Arrangements: Luke Carmen, Spiros Gianaris, Anthony Raptis, Charles Charuhas, Caleroy Panos, Dr. Harry S. Sembekos, Arthur H. Lalos, executive secretary.

The program for the evening was one of enriching information and inspiration, and was as follows:

Presiding chairman: Basil Anargyros Thomas.

National anthem: The Star-Spangled Banner.

Ode to Liberty—National Anthem of Greece.

Invocation: The Most Reverend Michael, archbishop of the Hellenic Orthodox Church.

Toastmaster: V. I. Chebithes, past supreme president, Order of Ahepa.

Speakers: Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor; Senator Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Senator Brien McMahon, Connecticut; John G. Thevos; supreme president, Order of Ahepa.

Benediction.

Dinner music by Jack Morton.

Mr. Speaker, in the Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California, these American citizens of Hellenic descent, are the most stable, industrious, active, particular and practicable citizens of our State, and contribute substantially to the progress of the State and the Nation. They contribute substantially and vigorously to the perpetuation of the America we all love. You will note that paragraph 2 of their constitution states that one of their objects is "to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America; allegiance to its flag; support to its Constitution; obedience to its laws, and reverence for its history and traditions."

Live for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under and by virtue of permission heretofore granted, I extend my remarks which I made by letter Tuesday last, town meeting day in Vermont, as of my annual custom, heretofore followed, to the people of my home town assembled in town meeting at Northfield. That convocation is really the savior and the fortress of every American and of the constitutional liberties which, so expanded, we do now enjoy, as well as the guarantor of the perpetuity of those liberties we, of the blood of our ancestors, all propose to protect and to defend against all comers from within or from without.

So I said:

DEAR MR. MODERATOR AND NORTHFIELD FRIENDS: Of necessity, my annual letter must be brief. I am a member of the subcommittee of five men to whom is entrusted the responsibility of undertaking, originally, to say just how much of dollars and cents of the taxpayers' money shall be appropriated to defend this country to maintain the armed services both against attack and for necessary defense. The figure presented to us was $13,500,000,000, which is some money even in Northfield. I am very busy.

"When I was young and in my prime," as some of those who are listening to me will recall I once was when we sang that song while I was ringing Northfield fire alarms and church bells, in celebration of Hallowe'en or Fourth of July (in those days of quite some long ago) I never thought I would come to this.

That should be a threat as well as possibly an inspiration to every single boy born in Vermont, particularly Northfield.

I am never unmindful of the fact, nor am I ever ungrateful, as I recall that beastly cold day of the latter part of December some years ago when 900 and more of you sent me to Congress; without regard to partisan political affiliation. I shall never forget it. I hope I have never made any of you who supported me sorry for what they did.

So I presume to say to you that these really are desperate days in which we are permitted to live and to play a part.

The burden is on us to undertake to transmit to those who follow us, not a burden, nevertheless a responsibility, and better, an opportunity such as no people ever had the chance to enjoy since the world began.

I am much concerned to do my part to see to it that the United States adopts a stabilized program free from and not disrupted by those who call themselves Free Thinkers, Liberals, Progressives, or those, too cowardly to brand themselves as registered Communists, or who undertake to avoid the fact that they are Socialists, as subversively together they have been undertaking to socialize Vermont and in effect to reduce it to the situation similar to that in which Great Britain finds herself today.

I am proud of the fact that I am said to be as reactionary as the Ten Commandments. Call me what you've a mind to. I still thank whatever Gods there be for the enemies I have made amongst those groups to whom I refer which undertake, subversively, cowardly and under a blanket supported and publicly endorsed by the Communists and the anarchists and the Socialists and the leftists, to destroy this America of mine and my State.

Five civilizations have been buried by people in Mexico and elsewhere under exactly such theories as are today advocated by those who would undertake to tell you in Vermont that I am a reactionary. That is a part of their program.

Some of my very best friends are being misled. They do not appreciate nor realize the end which these folks seek to attain, nor see the method they employ. My friends should put every ounce of effort back of the United Nations in an endeavor to see and to insist that it shall be given the police power to enforce its edicts, without which it will be as powerless as was the League of Nations. It is time to realize that fact. The fact is obvious there can be no world federation so long as Russia undertakes to maintain and still insist, as it does, upon its position. So why waste effort?

The American ideal which has been idolized and idealized is not only an ideology but a fact. Privileges greater than ever before in the history of the world have been offered to the average person in America to make a living and to live a life in these United States such as none ever enjoyed heretofore, yet there are those in the groups to which I have referred who would undertake, subversively and persuasively, to destroy the very sources which would deprive you, as individuals, of every chance and of every right which you now enjoy.

Unless we, you and I, wake up and shake off and deny and defy those with fallacious and subversive theories offered as incentives to get an easy living off us which would destroy all individualism, all industry, all enterprise you and I are going to be held responsible for burying not only a possibility for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but the greatest Republic God ever gave man an opportunity to create, in the first place; in the second place, to develop; in the third place to continue; the last of which opportunties is the burden of your responsibility. This is a country of free people so long and only so long as we maintain that right to be free. See to it that you keep it free. That's your job. It is the job of nobody else. It is time that you recognize that fact before it is altogether too late, if it is not already and altogether too late. It is later than you think.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Member of Congress.

New Worcester Diocese Proudly Installs First Bishop, Most Rev. John J. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I should like to include an article, by staff members T. J. Sweeney and P. J. Cogswell, which appeared in the March 7 issue of our newspaper, the Evening Gazette, describing the color and ceremony attendant upon the installation of Bishop John J. Wright as the first ecclesiastical head of the

newly created Roman Catholic diocese of Worcester, Mass.

Citizens of every faith and creed joined with church dignitaries, national leaders, and community officials in welcoming this distinguished prelate to his papal assignment in the heart of the Commonwealth.

At the age of 40, Bishop Wright comes to us as one of the youngest residential bishops in the entire country. His diocese now comprises 95 parishes with 365 priests. Within his jurisdiction will be 8 orphanages, 2 colleges, 1 hospital, 15 high schools, 48 grammar schools, and 12 missions.

A brief history of John Wright as layman and priest will reveal the justification of his choice for such uncommon responsibilities at an age when most of his contemporaries are being entrusted with their initial mature duties.

John Joseph Wright was born in the Dorchester section of Boston on Sunday, July 18, 1909, as the first of six children.

When old enough to go to school, he attended the Trescott School in Hyde Park, Mass., and subsequently entered Boston Public Latin School. At Boston Latin this young man began to show his real prowess. He excelled in his studies, in debating and in public speaking. He was graduated with honors in 1947.

After high school he attended Boston College, where he was awarded the Fulton medal for oratory, and in his senior year was elected as the one who had done most for Boston College during his studies there.

Following graduation from Boston College, feeling called to serve God in the holy priesthood, a call now gloriously confirmed in his elevation to the Episcopate, John Wright enrolled in the department of senior philosophy at St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass. Following his course at Brighton, he attended the Gregorian University in Rome, where he was graduated with high honor at that most advanced Jesuit institution in the world.

Upon his return to this country, Father Wright taught in the philosophy department of St. John's Seminary at Brighton, Mass.

At this time, also, Dr. Wright inaugurated the English course in the new minor seminary, St. Clement's Hall. In his spare time he conducted the Italian Academy, wrote innumerable articles and pamphlets, gave a great number of sermons and addresses, and served as retreat master in various houses of recollection.

In 1943 Cardinal O'Connell appointed Father Wright his secretary. Following the death of His Eminence in April 1944, Auxiliary Bishop Cushing was named archbishop. His first official appointment was that of Father Wright as his secretary. In December 1944, Father Wright was named a papal chamberlain, and in May 1946 elevated by His Holiness to the rank of domestic prelate. In May of 1947 Monsignor Wright was named as auxiliary bishop of the Boston archdiocese. Bishop Wright's elevation to the hierarchy made little change in his routine except to add to it the extra duties which a bishop may perform and by which an auxiliary bishop can assist his superior. He became widely known throughout the country, especially for his eloquence and remarkably diversified learning.

No greater testimony to Bishop Wright's promise can be given than to quote directly from Archbishop Cushing's sermon on the occasion of the elevation of Bishop Wright at the Cathedral of St. Paul, in Worcester, on Tuesday morning, March 7, 1950:

Bishop Wright's love for God and for his neighbor will not be left on any abstract level, nor find its expression in empty platitudes or unfruitful principles. I can promise the people of Worcester County, Catholics and their neighbors alike, that their new bishop is a doer of the law, not a hearer and a preacher only His love for God and neighbor alike will be made manifest in good works, kind deeds, generous self-dedication. He will eloquently preach God's love and will lift his voice in constant teaching of the need for love among men. But he will ever be mindful of the wisdom taught by his patron and name-sake among the Apostles: "Let us not love in word alone nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth" (1 John 3: 18).

Resonare Christum, to be the echo of Christ, is the motto under which the first bishop of Worcester takes up his work in central Massachusetts. Fulfilling the Scripture eulogy—"in a short time he has accomplished much," a happy augury for the conduct of his new responsibilities in the church. As Archbishop Cushing said in his address, "May the Lord preserve him, and grant him length of days and give him every grace, and never deliver him into the hands of enemies. Amen."

The article by the Messrs. Sweeney and Cogswell follows:

(By Thomas J. Sweeney and Philip J. Cogswell)

Bishop John J. Wright today was enthroned as first ruler of the new-born Roman Catholic Diocese of Worcester.

The ceremonies, at St. Paul's Cathedral, fused ecclesiastical elegance and high humility in a gripping pageant governed by ancient formulas still intact.

Officially, Bishop Wright, 40, became the spiritual leader of 225,000 Catholics of the diocese at that precise moment of the ceremonies when, while he was seated on his oaken throne, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, presented him with a crozier.

This shepherd's staff, symbolic of the authority vested in him by Pope Pius XII, indicated he had acquired formal jurisdiction as the youngest diocesan head in the United States.

The cathedral proper bulged with 1,400 witnesses to the ceremonies. Their number included prelates and parish priests, nuns and dignitaries from all walks of life, political, business, civic and educational, and the bishop's parents, brothers and sisters.

CLERGY OF NEW DIOCESE

At the right of the church, their eyes fixed on their new spiritual leader, to whom later, one by one, they pledged their loyalty, sat the clergy of the new diocese.

Nearly a thousand other persons, attracted by the historical and religious significance of the occasion, filled the lower church of the cathedral, where they followed the ceremonies as transmitted by loud speakers by the narrator, Rev. David E. Sherin, of St. Ann's Church.

Hardier persons huddled outside the cathedral, on High, Chatham, and Main Streets, in reverent silence to listen.

A description of the ceremonies came to them, too, by loud speakers.

Muted by the solemnity of the services, they heard Bishop Wright chant the pontifical blessing and they heard Archbishop Cushing, in his sermon, extol the virtues of Worcester's new spiritual leader.

They heard, also, the liturgical prayers, linking the past with the present, sung even as they were sung centuries ago.

Handfuls of spectators were drawn to the scene of the ceremonies as early as 8 a. m. and despite chilly temperature, they remained to be joined by increasing thousands of others.

CHIMES PEAL FIRST TIME

The procession, with an estimated 900 in line, started at 9:40 as the cathedral chimes pealed for the first time. By this time the onlookers were numbered in the thousands.

Piety and pomp were blended in perfect proportions in the procession as it began to wend its way in quiet dignity from the rectory and school to the cathedral.

But when Bishop Wright, toward the rear of the line, came into view, a burst of handclapping shattered the stillness.

He was vested in white mitre and robes, setting off his dark features.

Again, when Archbishop Cushing, preceded by the bearer of the metropolitan cross and wearing his cappa magna, symbols of his rank as chief of the bishops of New England province, drew near the cathedral, applause sounded.

The bishop and archbishop, who brought up the rear of the procession, nodded and smiled to acquaintances among the spectators.

Several women rushed forward to kiss the episcopal ring of Archbishop Cushing.

RICH, COLORFUL SIGHT

The procession offered rich contrast between the parish priest, most of them bareheaded and wearing white surplices over their black robes, monsignori and bishops in their purple raiment, and Trappist Fathers from Cumberland, R. I., in their flowing white garments, their close-cropped hair focusing attention on them.

Two eastern rite prelates also were in the procession. They wore large black headpieces.

Only four nuns were in line. But hundreds of others—somber-robed in black, brown, and gray—occupied seats in the cathedral.

BISHOP MOVED BY CEREMONY

Bishop Wright was visibly affected on his entrance into the vestibule of the cathedral. His face paled.

Together with his attendants, he withdrew to the left of the vestibule, while Archbishop Cushing knelt and prayed at a small desk covered with a green drape.

Bishop Wright stood with hands cupped. His eyes alternately swept upward and downward.

Archbishop Cushing accepted from Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Phelan, temporary administrator of the diocese and pastor of Blessed Sacrament Church, who had awaited his, and Bishop Wright's arrival in the vestibule, an aspergil, or holy water sprinkler. He made the sign of the cross.

He extended it to Bishop Wright to touch. The archbishop then sprinkled nearby attendants.

Monsignor Phelan offered incense to Archbishop Cushing to complete the ceremonial entrance to the cathedral without so much as a word spoken.

SEMINARY CHOIR HAILS LEADER

As Bishop Wright and Archbishop Cushing entered the cathedral proper and walked toward the altar, the St. John's Seminary choir sang the joyous notes of Ecce Sacerdos Magnus in acclaim of the new spiritual head.

All in the cathedral stood.

After they paid homage to the Blessed Sacrament, Bishop Wright was seated on a faldstool, or small chair, at the foot of the main altar and Archbishop Cushing was seated on his throne on the Epistle side of the sanctuary.

They retained their seats during the reading, first in Latin and then in English, by Rev. John F. Gannon, of Leominster, notary, of the papal documents decreeing the erection of the new See of Worcester and appointment of Bishop Wright as first head of the Diocese of Worcester.

The bishop knelt at the faldstool before the altar after conclusion of the reading. Monsignor Phelan approached the altar and chanted a prayer for the bishop, with the choir making responses.

After the choir sang in honor of St. Paul, titular saint of the cathedral, Bishop Wright ascended the steps, kissed the altar reverently, and chanted the prayer of St. Paul.

The prayer completed, Bishop Wright descended from the altar, was clasped by the hand by Archbishop Cushing and Monsignor Phelan, who led him to his throne, where he was seated.

ACCEPTS CROZIER, SYMBOL OF OFFICE

The archbishop placed in his left hand the crozier, symbol of pastoral office.

Bishop Wright held it with both hands.

He now had been formally installed as first bishop of Worcester.

He rose and gave his first solemn blessing in that capacity.

Then the archbishop intoned the first words of the hymn, Te Deum, and the choir and clergy joined in. As the music swelled through the cathedral, priests under Bishop Wright's new jurisdiction made their formal act of obedience to him.

First the officials on the altar, then the priests of the diocese filed slowly across the sanctuary, kneeled before the episcopal throne, grasped the bishop's right hand, and kissed the ceremonial ring.

It was half a handshake and half an obeisance. To each the bishop spoke a few words of greeting.

One priest, who walked across the sanctuary with a decided limp, prepared to kneel before his superior. But the bishop raised his hand so the priest would not have to bend over in what obviously would have been a painful effort.

PROCESSION OF PRIESTS TO ALTAR

The Te Deum ended, but still the procession of priests to the altar continued. It was nearly 20 minutes before all the clergy had fulfilled their obligations.

Through it all, Archbishop Cushing stood, hands folded on his breast, easily the tallest and most imposing figure on the altar.

The altar itself was simply decorated with six vases of red roses contrasting with the gleaming marble. A single altar cloth of white lace was the only other decoration.

The ceremony of obedience indicates the promise of the clergy to obey and revere Bishop Wright and his successors in the See of Worcester. Its completion marked the end of the installation ceremony proper.

Bishop Wright then prepared to resume celebration of the mass for the first time in his cathedral church. While seated on his throne, his assistants went through the ages-old ceremony of vesting the priest for the mass.

The glittering white and gold cope was removed and the bishop donned white buskins, or shoes, and long white stockings. Then he put on the heavily encrusted gold and white chasuble, or outer garment, which was worn by the late William Cardinal O'Connell at his first pontifical mass in Rome in 1906.

WHITE AND GOLD FOR JOY

Vestments of the assistant priests, the deacon and subdeacon were all white and gold, symbolic of the joyousness of the occasion. The day marks the feast of St. Thomas, a doctor of the church.

Midway through the mass, after recitation of the Gospel, Archbishop Cushing moved to a reading stand at the center of the altar rail to deliver his sermon.

His powerful voice and clipped diction carried his voice to the high-vaulted corners of the cathedral. The archbishop read from a manuscript, his hands placed quietly on the reading stand, depending for emphasis only on his inflection.

CALLS FOR PRAYER FOR NEW BISHOP

For the most part his voice boomed loudly but he spoke softly at one solemn moment. That was when he called on the Catholics of Worcester to pray for their new bishop.

"A mitre can be a crown of thorns," he said. "A crozier can be a sorry support to weary limbs. A cappa magna can conceal a broken heart."

After Archbishop Cushing's sermon Bishop Wright continued the mass. The Gospel was sung by the deacon, Very Rev. John A. O'Brien, S. J., president of Holy Cross College, and the Epistle by the subdeacon, Very Rev. Henry J. Moquin, A. A., president of Assumption College.

The seminarians of St. John's choir sang the responses to Bishop Wright's prayers. Included was a chant for the well-being of the new bishop.

"Let us pray for John, our bishop. May the Lord watch over him and grant him length of days and happiness upon this earth, and deliver him not into the power of his enemies."

CEREMONIAL KISS EXCHANGED

After the solemn moment of the consecration all the clergy in the cathedral exchanged the pax, or ceremonial kiss of peace. One by one, bishops, monsignori, abbotts, and priests turned to their neighbors, embraced, and said, "Pax tecum," or "Peace be with you."

At the end of the mass the bishop left the altar and returned to his throne where he removed the mass vestments and donned for the first time the cappa magna.

The length of the scarlet train necessitated a train bearer to help the bishop move unencumbered. It is trimmed over the shoulders with a white ermine cape.

The cappa magna is the symbol of the bishop's authority in his diocese.

From the lectern at the center of the altar rail, the new bishop of Worcester then spoke his first words in his cathedral.

"Let our first words this day be words of gratitude," the prelate said. He asked for divine guidance and strength for his task as spiritual leader of the diocese, and called on church and saints to second our earnest petition to God that faith in these parts will never fail.

Then he expressed his thanks to Pope Pius XII who appointed him bishop of Worcester, to the apostolic delegate, Archbishop Cicognani, of Washington, D. C., to the visiting prelates, to the civic officials present, and to those of the Catholic faith and those not of it who have made him welcome.

Finally he declared he could not forget those blessed dead who gave so much of themselves for the establishment of the church here.

He cited the French, Irish, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Syrian, and faithful of all the other national origins "out of whose work this diocese has been born. We are prayerfully conscious of our debt to them."

At the end of the bishop's talk, the line of clergy re-formed and the recessional began.

GIVES BLESSING TO FAITHFUL

As Bishop Wright left the altar he gave his blessing with upraised hand to those on either side of the center aisle.

As he passed his parents, on his left side, he gave them his blessing but did not pause.

The archbishop brought up the rear of the procession.

As the new head of the diocese left the center door of the church and walked slowly toward the rectory, the throng of spectators who had waited patiently since the beginning of the long ceremony, broke into cheers and pressed forward.

The bishop raised his hand and gave his blessing to those surrounding him. The crush of onlookers was to great, many seeking to kiss the episcopal ring, others to snap his picture, that it took him nearly 20 minutes to reach the quiet of the rectory.

Act Now or It Will Be Too Late—Millions of Dollars of Perishable Surplus Commodities Will Be Lost Unless Quick Action Is Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, I submit an article by John W. Ball, Post reporter, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 5, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1950, I introduced H. R. 7134 authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of surplus potatoes and eggs, gratuitously to the people of the United States, and no action was taken.

On March 1, 1950, learning that there was also 100,736,962 pounds of butter that also was in surplus and about to spoil, I introduced House Joint Resolution 430 to include butter and all other surplus commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture could not otherwise dispose of under the existing law, and the method and arrangement was fully outlined in the said resolution.

From the article which I am quoting below, it is my opinion that the cost to the Government to distribute these precious commodities to the States of the Union for the use of the people, on a basis of population, would be negligible in comparison with the amount that the Government is paying for the storage of these commodities, many of which will spoil and be lost unless they are utilized quickly.

Mr. Speaker, while some of those in Washington may not know—the fact is that there are literally millions of our people who are in need of these foods and are unable to purchase same, and I sincerely believe that the same should be distributed to the people rather than pay these millions of dollars for storage and be lost by spoilage.

The article referred to is titled "Four Billion Dollar Pantry" and is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 5, 1950]

FOUR BILLION DOLLAR PANTRY—STORAGE OF FARM SURPLUS COSTS UNCLE SAM $25,000 AN HOUR OR $200,000,000 A YEAR

(By John W. Ball)

America's surplus of farm commodities—the things that food, clothing, and shelter

come from—is so great that it is costing from $25,000 to $30,000 an hour, 24 hours a day, just to store it.

In other words, the storage costs of the $4,000,000,000 worth of commodities Uncle Sam has taken off the market in order to keep their prices high, runs to a staggering $550,000 to $600,000 a day or about $200,000,000 a year. If interest charges and deterioration are computed, the total cost would run at a rate of about $1,000 a minute.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles the Government's vast price-fixing program, revealed the $4,000,000,000 storage total last week. Commodities in storage under price supports amount in value to about $30 for every man, woman, and child in the country. For an average family of four, that means there is about $120 worth of stuff in Uncle Sam's pantry.

There is enough wheat to meet all our domestic needs without raising a single grain this year—and another crop is growing in the winter wheat belt now. There is enough cotton to carry the country through a full year if necessary. Other things are in abundance in varying degrees.

In addition to the storage costs there is the tremendous charge for interest.

Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan testified this week that CCC pays the Treasury 1¼ percent for the money with which it operates.

That adds up to $50,000,000 a year for the $4,000,000,000. That is almost four and a quarter million a month, or about $150,000 a day.

On top of that is piled the loss through deterioration. Actual loss, charged off in the last 7 months was $96,000,000—about $450,000 a day.

CCC officials freely admit that doesn't in any degree cover the loss. Most of this year's tremendous $100,000,000 anticipated loss in potatoes has not yet been realized. Also, deterioration would run to another immense sum. A lot of dried eggs and dried skim milk—together they total one hundred and thirty-three millions—is getting to an age where it soon won't be of great value.

Thus storage costs, interest, and deterioration is running at a daily rate of above a million and a quarter dollars a day—or more than $50,000 an hour. In other words, roughly around $1,000 a minute.

The tremendous growth of the price program is best realized when compared with a year ago. In 12 months the total more than doubled. A year ago it was only $1,873,000,000.

In fact, this increase points out eloquently the need for the additional $2,000,000,000 that CCC recently asked of Congress. Last week several Congressmen suggested adding riders to this CCC measure, such as "trial runs" for the Brannan plan, and limitations on individual benefits from price supports. Each time Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan urged them not to do anything that might delay action.

At the present rate of increase in the Government's investment in price supports, CCC is in danger of running out of funds before this calendar year is out. Even the two billion additional now asked may not last more than a year.

The Government's far-flung storage bins contain an amazing assortment of more than 30 commodities. Its investments range from $84,000 in flax fiber—the kind from which linen is made—to more than a billion dollars in each of two items, wheat, our chief bread grain, and cotton, our chief source of clothing. We have an enormous $880,000,000 tied up in corn, with the season far from over.

Although the fiber flax is a small item, the total flax program is tremendous. Uncle Sam has almost a quarter of a billion dollars invested in flaxseed and linseed oil that comes from it.

Few taxpayers realize that a lot of tax money has been put up to maintain a high price for ship's stores—rosin and turpentine. CCC has $30,000,000 in rosin and almost two and one-half million in turpentine, both agricultural products.

If, as now appears likely, a support program for hogs becomes effective. Government's total storage cost will go up much higher proportionately.

List of surplus commodities

Commodity		Quantity	Value
Cotton, long staple	bales	3,008	$877,043
Cotton	do	6,459,499	1,012,663,736
Cottonseed	tons	118,922	5,970,611
Flax	pounds	178,145	84,158
Butter	do	100,736,962	62,434,199
Cheese	do	25,307,469	8,517,929
Milk	do	274,723,846	35,024,654
Linseed oil	do	411,943,603	116,649,787
Peanuts	do	246,974,902	24,723,257
Peanuts, shelled	do	14,669,287	2,154,588
Fruits, dried	do	57,651,595	5,718,089
Potato starch	do	10,172,827	607,814
Potatoes	100 pounds	11,480,547	8,074,723
Barley	bushels	52,998,083	66,191,832
Beans	100 pounds	11,823,913	90,937,950
Corn	bushels	627,480,162	880,651,070
Flaxseed	do	22,237,676	117,671,046
Grain sorghums	100 pounds	42,376,230	105,217,906
Oats	bushels	41,698,990	30,019,468
Peas	100 pounds	558,421	1,721,510
Rice	do	1,681,208	7,247,314
Rye	bushels	1,563,618	2,416,819
Seeds (pasture)	pounds	725,422	146,515
Soybeans	bushels	13,102,695	28,770,499
Wheat	do	475,034,491	1,011,791,572
Wool	pounds	51,378,140	40,140,430
Eggs, dried	do	75,918,088	98,116,167
Turkeys	do	1,017,105	421,748
Rosin	do	391,164,467	29,422,550
Turpentine	gallons	5,107,213	2,343,452
Tobacco	pounds	373,868,064	150,695,354
Total			3,947,423,790

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Secretary of the Air Force W. Stuart Symington made an address before the Yale Alumni Association at Yale University on February 22, 1950, appraising the national defenses.

While the junior Senator from Nebraska does not now pass upon Secretary Symington's conclusions, he believes the address is of timely interest.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion of Secretary Symington's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to President Seymour for asking me here today. Memories of 4 years at Yale are among the happiest of my life. In fact a little envy was mixed with the pleasure of seeing my two sons this morning, both members of the class of 1950.

A famous American once said:

"There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Those words sound as if they were stated recently. Actually they were spoken 172 years ago by the man whose birthday we observe today.

In other words, at the beginning of our existence as a nation, George Washington warned that the price of peace is adequate preparedness—that weakness invites aggression.

Today the price of peace remains the same—preparedness. But this air-atomic age no longer allows us the luxury of building up defenses over a period of time, after either we or our Allies have been attacked.

The United States is a peaceful democratic nation. Hence our military plans do not embrace the thought of being an aggressor. But our policies for national security must emphasize what America will do if and when attacked by the only nation that now has the power to launch such an attack.

The more one studies this critical problem, the more one becomes convinced that the greatest defense America can create for its protection is capacity for instant and sustained devastating retaliation against any aggressor. This is true because under modern methods of warfare there can be no sure defense.

Picture the change in this situation even since the last war. In 1941, the British were confident that if they could destroy appreciably more than 5 percent of the attacking Nazi bombers on each raid, the latter could not continue their air offensive against England; and after the RAF did knock down some 10 percent on the night of May 10, 1941, for several years thereafter the Nazis never seriously bothered England from the air; only starting again in 1944 after they had developed the V–1 pilotless missile.

Today, however, in this air-atomic era, if America was successful in knocking out 25 percent of the first surprise raid, or even 50 percent, where will our cities be when the other 50 percent get through?

The practical urgency for full recognition of this problem was brought home to every American at the time the President announced last September that an atomic explosion had occurred in Russia.

It is not significant to realize that the atomic explosion occurred in the land of a dictatorship which has reiterated many times, both to its own people and to the rest of the world, that it is conducting the modern equivalent of a holy war against all who do not believe in the Godless faith of communism.

In every issue of Communist dogma, under the title "Problems of Leninism," published over the signature of Stalin, appears this basic Communist tenet:

"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

That statement of Communist policy has been repeated by Stalin since the close of World War II in 1945.

All this is self-evident in current Russian policy, a policy which so far has frustrated every effort of the United Nations to eliminate war—particularly the use of atomic weapons—as an instrument of settling disputes among nations. This blockade of peace has been successful despite America's conviction that the only war which can be won is the war that never starts.

These words of the leaders of the Communists speak for themselves; but their actions speak even louder than their words.

As illustration, since World War II Russia has engaged in an armament building program which overshadows the combined programs of all the Alantic Pact nations put together.

That country, Russia, today maintains a ground army greater in numbers than the combined armies of the United States and its allies.

Following World War II Russia demobilized to some 30 percent of its peak wartime strength. In contrast, the United Kingdom demobilized from 39 army divisions to their present strength of about four divisions; and the United States demobilized from 90 war strength divisions to a 10 division peacetime structure.

Today Russia has the world's largest submarine fleet, several times larger than the number Hitler possessed when he started World War II.

In terms of air strength, the situation is comparable. Today Russia has an air force whose strength, in nearly all categories, is the largest in the world, and growing relatively larger month by month. Since World War II, Russia has produced far more combat aircraft than have the United States and all other Atlantic Pact nations combined.

As part of its program for air supremacy Russia is steadily increasing the strength of its long-range strategic-bombing force—a type of plane it did not have in World War II.

The Communists do not need long-range strategic bombers in order to conquer Eurasia. Should we not ask ourselves therefore, why are they being built?

Those are the simple truths about the world in which we live; and they should be correlated with the revelation of that atomic explosion.

As our President so ably pointed out in his recent state of the Union message, we have now come to a crucial point in world history. In statesmanlike words he said:

"The human race has reached a turning point. Man has opened the secrets of nature and mastered new powers. If he uses them wisely, he can reach new heights of civilization. If he uses them foolishly, they may destroy him. * * * The swift pace of events promises to make the next 50 years decisive in the history of man on this planet."

The President was referring in part to developments in the field of atomic energy. In that connection, this Nation is fortunate in having at the head of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy your distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, BRIEN MCMAHON, whose awareness of the magnitude of this atomic problem, and whose capacity to deal with it, have been so clearly demonstrated.

Based on the above facts, it is not difficult to reach the following conclusions:

1. As the result of recent developments, real security can be assured only by the elimination of war itself.

2. If all our efforts to prevent war fail, then the United States must win. Defeat means slavery.

3. Victory now requires we not lose the first battle—in that a surprise atomic offensive might inflict a mortal wound from which no nation could completely recover, no matter how long and how desperate the ensuing struggle.

4 In all defense preparations for modern total war, the United States must live within its means—must not destroy its economy and its way of life. To do otherwise would invite defeat from within, nearly as fatal as defeat from without.

As to the latter point however, namely, the necessity of building armed strength this Nation can afford—both the President, in his latest state of the Union message, and the Secretary of Defense in repeated statements, have emphasized that security must come ahead of economy.

But Secretary Johnson also rightly insists that "our armed forces must be organized so as to give the maximum degree of security we can get for the money we have to spend. There can be no luxuries. We cannot afford anything we do not need."

With the premise we must have that economy of efficiency, the great and relatively growing military strength of Russia must be recognized by those who clamor for a balanced budget. Such balance is both logical and desirable. But surely these critics should realize that during this current year 50 cents of their tax dollar goes for security, 34 cents to the Pentagon and 16 cents for foreign aid; and that, despite this vast expenditure, Russian military strength meanwhile grows relatively greater as against the strength of the United States.

Russia's economic problems are negligible, because the coin of their realm is the order of the dictator. Nor do they have a labor problem, because their military and political prisoners, in fact all their citizens, are but slaves to their state.

So when critics of the administration demand that we balance or further slash our budget, we should ask them to seriously consider the need for that calculated military strength provided for in the President's budget, which strength is so essential to the preservation of our freedom, our Nation, and ourselves.

In a democracy it is important that everyone know the truth. The people of this country have demonstrated many times that, given the truth, they will meet the problem.

Keeping Alive the Spiritual Ideals of Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 40 years ago a group of progressive educators, recognizing that American girls wanted and needed an organization of their own, dedicated to their special interests and desires, helped establish Camp Fire Girls.

Since that time more than 2,500,000 girls have passed through the experience and training and association of Camp Fire Girls. Each of them profited, I am sure, from the belief of the group's first national president, Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick, that girls learn best by doing.

Today, more girls than ever before—more than 360,000 of all ages from 7 to 18, and of all races and religions—are enjoying the fun, friendship, and high ideals of Camp Fire.

Camp Fire Girls' program is both practical and inspirational. The leisure-time training supplements wisely the training of home, church, and school. Camp Fire Girls learn the arts of homemaking, of baby and child care, of outdoor living, of furthering friendships through pen-pal letters and gifts. All the work is in the spirit of Camp Fire's two purposes: "To perpetuate the spiritual ideals of the home," and "To aid in the formation of habits making for health and character."

Camp Fire Girls, a nonprofit, nongovernmental group, is doing a great work for all of us, the adults of America, and for our Nation. It is instilling in the hearts and minds of our girls a sense of the meaning of democratic ideals and it is equipping them for greater service by keeping alive the spiritual ideals of home.

We in Texas are especially proud that a charming and gracious Texas lady, Mrs. Richard W. Blalock, of Marshall, is national president of Camp Fire Girls, in this fortieth anniversary year. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD three letters of greeting to Camp Fire Girls from the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

All Members, I am sure, will want to join in extending to Camp Fire Girls, past and present, congratulations in this fortieth birthday week, March 12 through March 18. We wish for the organization many more years of useful service.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 8, 1950.

MRS. RICHARD W. BLALOCK,
President, Camp Fire Girls, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. BLALOCK: Please convey my congratulations and best wishes to the Camp Fire Girls as they celebrate their fortieth anniversary.

Since their founding, the Camp Fire Girls have given some two and a half million girls the opportunity to make the most of their leisure time, to perpetuate the spiritual ideals of the home, and to aid in the formation of habits that make for health and character. Civic organizations know that they can always count on the Camp Fire Girls to give generously of their time and efforts in working for deserving community projects. Even international organizations such as UNESCO and the International Children's Emergency Fund have enjoyed the support of the Camp Fire Girls, who have done their part to promote friendship with children of other countries through donating gifts and exchanging letters.

The task of fostering the well-being of our citizens and stimulating international good will does not fall to adults alone. The vigor and inspiration of young people who will face tomorrow's problems are also required. The Camp Fire Girls not only espouse our American ideals—they put them into practice. I urge all who wish to encourage young people in promoting the American way of life to continue to insure the success of the Camp Fire Girls through their active support.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, March 2, 1950.

MRS. RICHARD BLALOCK,
President, Camp Fire Girls, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. BLALOCK: I am particularly happy to have the opportunity of extending greetings to the Camp Fire Girls on the occasion of their fortieth anniversary, not only because of the fine work being done by that organization, but because of the excellency of the leadership which the organization enjoys.

Those of us, who are concerned daily with the current problems which face our country, are cognizant of the fact that the future of this Nation rests upon the young people who will some day occupy positions of responsibility. Today, as never before, it is essential that these young women have an opportunity to learn through their daily activities their responsibility of citizenship and service.

The Camp Fire Girls for four decades have sought not only to provide a means of worthy recreation and training for girls between the ages of 7 and 18, but at the same time be instrumental in putting them into

contact with the more serious aspects of the society which we have sought to maintain.

Reaching as it does into the lives of girls in every station of life and every type of background, the Camp Fire Girls organization has a unique opportunity to build friendship throughout our country and among the youth of other lands in promoting democratic principles.

Sincerely yours,

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Mrs. RICHARD BLALOCK,
Marshall, Tex.

DEAR MRS. BLALOCK: It is a pleasure to extend my hearty congratulations to you and through you to the hundreds of thousands of girls who are fortunate enough to constitute the membership of the Camp Fire Girls of America on the fortieth anniversary of that splendid organization.

It is well known that millions of our finest women today have benefited from the fun and the training and the experience that they enjoyed as members of the organization during their younger days. You and your coworkers are entitled to the thanks of our entire people for the unselfish service of love which you are giving to these young people and for the contributions which you are thus making to future America. Each of the 360,000 girls who presently are members are to be congratulated upon the opportunity which the organization is now giving them to build character and to prepare for a more useful life while enjoying the play and the friendship of their girlhood days.

With cordial good wishes to you and to your organization, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

Food and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Food and Politics," from the Minneapolis Star of Monday, March 6, 1950. In my opinion, this is a very good editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD AND POLITICS

Two of the best talks at the Minneapolis Farm Forum last week urged a nonpolitical or bipartisan approach to agricultural problems.

Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the forum, suggested a food organization of the stature of the Hoover Commission to develop an intelligent program. Food is too important to too many people—and to world peace—to be in politics any longer.

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, would abolish much of the power of the Secretary of Agriculture over price supports and instead let a bipartisan 12-man board run the program.

At the present time Democrats and Republicans are growing hoarse trying to outbid each other for the farm vote. Their chief offering is an easier approach to the Public Treasury.

In a sense, bipartisanship is working along these lines. It went into action very effectively in the Senate the other day. Senator LUCAS, majority leader, had proposed that price supports for potatoes be cut off unless growers abided by severe acreage and marketing controls. The Nation has spent more than $400,00,000 since the war to bolster potato prices.

Republicans and Democrats defeated the plan for those rigid restrictions in 1950. But in order to win their point, the potato State Senators had to vote for increased acreage for cotton, peanuts, and wheat, all of which are in surplus. The Government already has more than $600,000,000 tied up in cotton and our high support level has priced us out of world markets.

That sort of bipartisanship is dangerous to the economy and, in the long run, to the farmers. The kind that is needed would reconcile the various farm-program suggestions without new unwarranted raids upon the Treasury.

Pillsbury's plea to lift the Farm Forum beyond the realm of party politics was scarcely heeded, and maybe the sessions were more interesting because so many controversial issues were raised. But his suggestion of a national food commission, headed by a Bernard Baruch or a Herbert Hoover, should not die.

The best thinking of the Nation needs to be employed so that the question doesn't lick us.

The Fuchs Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Got Tipped on Fuchs in 1946," published in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES GOT TIPPED ON FUCHS IN 1946, BUT NOTHING WAS DONE, MAGAZINE SAYS

Dr. Klaus Fuchs, it was stated today by the Canadian news weekly, the Ensign, was suspected of being a spy by the Canadian Government in 1946, and this suspicion was passed on to both the British and United States Governments.

Nevertheless, nothing was done about him, and Dr. Fuchs was allowed to work in the highest branches of atomic research in Britain and to have access to top United States and British atomic secrets. Dr. Fuchs confessed his spying activities and was sentenced on February 28 to 14 years in jail by a London judge.

The Ensign is a national news weekly published in Montreal. It is a Catholic paper but is not an official publication of the church. Its lead story date lined Ottawa and published today stated:

"Positive proof that the Canadian Royal Commission on espionage had ample reason to suspect that Dr. Klaus Fuchs was involved in the Russian spy ring, and that these suspicions were passed on to the United States and British authorities in 1946, was disclosed to the Ensign last week."

WARNINGS IGNORED

Despite these clear warnings, Fuchs was permitted to continue working for 4 years in atomic research. It was during this period that he passed most of the atomic information to Russia for which he was sentenced.

Until last week, all that was publicly known, apart from Fuchs' trial confession, was that his name had appeared in a notebook belonging to one of the men accused in the Canadian spy trials of 1946.

A United Press cable from London that a Russian agent's notebook containing Fuchs' name and the word "Nash" (Russian for "ours") was found in Canada last year was inaccurate.

This notebook, belonging to Col. Vasily M. Rogov, Soviet Embassy Director of Atomic Espionage, was shown to Igor Gouzenko, Soviet Embassy cipher clerk, who broke the spy ring, and its contents reported to the Royal Commission 4 years ago.

SPY ROLE REVEALED

Last week the Ensign learned that the Royal Commission knew in 1946 that Colonel Rogov revealed Fuchs' spy role to Igor Gouzenko. Both Fuchs and Dr. Allan Nunn May were considered for assignment to Canada to collect and report atomic secrets. Dr. May was selected but Fuchs was held in reserve. Then Fuchs was sent to the United States in 1943.

These facts were passed to United States and British authorities in 1946. The Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States wanted to make further investigation of Fuchs, and a number of other suspects, but was not permitted to investigate atomic espionage until 1947. Actually, they have been working on the Fuchs' case for less than a year.

Why British authorities did not inquire into Fuchs' activity in 1946 and prevent him from passing atomic secrets to Russia during the last 4 years remains a mystery. MI (War Office counterespionage branch) knew that Fuchs had fled Germany in 1933 as a self-confessed Communist.

They had the reports from the Canadian Royal Commission in 1946.

VISITED EMBASSY

They knew also that Fuchs openly visited the Russian Embassy in London, a curious practice for an atomic scientist.

Other evidences of grave weaknesses in Britain's security system alarmed the United States last year and undermined British efforts to persuade the United States to share more of its atomic secrets. The Fuchs' case merely confirmed earlier fears.

In Ottawa, one indignant official told the Ensign: "Unless the authorities in Canada, the United States, and Britain quickly realize that every Communist and every fellow traveler is a suspect, our security measures will not give us much protection. The least we can do is to clean them out of places of authority and trust."

Sesquicentennial of Establishment of the Capital in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by State Senator P. H. McEachin, of Florence, S. C., at the Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., on March 9, representing South Carolina at the exercises celebrating the sesquicentennial of the establishment of the Capital at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the people of South Carolina I want to express our deep appreciation for the honor bestowed upon us by the dedication of these sequicentennial exercises to our State, of whose record we are so proud and to which we are so ardently devoted.

South Carolina's importance in the making of the new Nation over which this Federal Capital was to preside can hardly be said to have been excelled by that of any other. For more than a hundred years befor Washington was established South Carolina had borne the principal burdens of defending the southern frontier against the encroachments of Spain and France, thus holding a vast territory that later became part of the United States. In the movement leading to the separation of the Thirteen Colonies from England, South Carolina was the first to embody the new principles of self-government in a thorough and complete Constitution. In the long war that followed no other State was called upon to make greater sacrifices of life and property. The very mention of such names as Rutledge, Gadsden, Hayne, Laurens, Jasper, Moultrie, Sumter, and Marion, bears witness to the extent and worth of these sacrifices.

South Carolina was no less interested in the new Federal system than she had been in the war that made the union possible. To the Federal Convention of 1787 they sent John Rutledge, Pierce Butler, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, and Charles Pinckney. Each contributed in some important way to the drafting of the Constitution. It is now admitted, after much controversy, that Charles Pinckney laid before that convention a plan which anticipated a greater number of the provisions of the finished Constitution than did any other. I cannot resist calling attention to one of these provisions, which concerned the establishment of the Federal Capital. It was Charles Pinckney, I am proud to say, who first proposed article I, section 8, paragraph 17 of the Constitution which is now the basic law of the District of Columbia, and the city of Washington.

I think Pinckney was influenced in this by the fact that South Carolina, a few months before, had decided to transfer its capital from Charleston to a spot near the center of the State. In the procedure the State followed, there are striking similarities to the procedure used in arrangements for the Federal Capital. In both cases, the site selected was in open country, not in a populous town. In both cases, the name of Washington was proposed for the new city. South Carolina did not choose that name, but it is interesting to note that the name it did choose, Columbia, was later given to the Federal district around Washington. Finally, I should also point out that the architect who designed the South Carolina state house, James Hoban, later drew plans for the White House and other buildings in Washington.

Such were the ties between the State of South Carolina and the early history of the Federal Capital. They were surface ties, it is true, but they were indicative of the deeper bonds of devotion to the great dream of a federal republic in which men could be equal and free under a system of government the world had never known before.

End the Secret Snatching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my pleasure to deliver by transcription a radio address over the great prairie farmer voice, Station WLS, Chicago, a message on the subject of the staggering cost of hidden taxes. I emphasized the importance of the American public being made aware of the huge amount of taxes which they are paying and which most of them do not realize are snatching pennies, nickels, dimes, and dollars from their purses. On a single loaf of bread there are 151 hidden taxes, all along the line from the wheat in the farmer's field to the time the bread is placed on the family kitchen table.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this radio address over Station WLS be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END THE SECRET SNATCHING—A REPORT ON ENDING HIDDEN TAXES

Wise old Benjamin Franklin told us Americans that "Nothing is certain but death and taxes."

Well, folks, at this time of the year, Ben Franklin's comment seems particularly appropriate. Every March 15 or thereabouts, over 45,000,000 American taxpayers make out their returns for Uncle Sam.

It is not an easy thing, of course, to part with the dollars which you have earned by the sweat of your brow, to part with savings which a man or woman wants to use for his or her own enjoyment, or for the children, or for putting away for a rainy day.

WE ARE GLAD TO PAY OUR WAY

Nevertheless, we are glad, as patriotic American citizens, to meet our responsibilities and to carry our share of the Government burden. We recognize that America, in these times, has many responsibilities to her own people and abroad. This necessarily involves a lot of money.

Our total budget, as you probably know, is around $43,000,000,000. Around 70 percent of that sum is devoted to the payments for past wars or preparations against (God forbid) future wars—for interest on the national debt, for aid to veterans, for defense, and so on.

WE MUST CONCENTRATE ON DEFENSE

Now, folks, these vital budget needs must be met. We dare not leave our country undefended, because we might have squandered our budget money for other extravagant trifles—for unnecessary items.

Just look abroad at this dangerous world situation, the menace of world communism, at the Soviet Union, which already controls a major proportion of the world's peoples. We note that Russia has 157 divisions, and we have but 10. Russia has 14,000 first-line planes. We have less than 2,000. To guard our own shores right now—to guard 150,000,000 Americans—we only have only about four divisions. Why? Because the rest are overseas or are noncombat troops. Those are important facts, serious facts, my friends. These facts emphasize that the greatest responsibility of the Federal Government is to preserve the Union, to protect it from would-be aggressors, to prevent another Pearl Harbor.

Yet, you and I know that the Federal Government, instead of concentrating on that one main problem, seems is going haywire. It wants to expand its field into just about every other insignificant problem under the sun.

CONGRESS MUST NARROW ITS FIELD

You know, folks, Congress has over 10,000 bills. Some of those bills are 100 or 200 pages long. It stands to reason that your Senators and Representatives cannot possibly handle all 10,000 bills adequately. The result is that many important items are considered in too brief a time, while piddling matters—mere trifles—often take up too much of Congress' time.

And, so we see, my friends, that instead of asking the Congress to expand Uncle Sam's field of operations, instead of asking the Congress to have Uncle Sam poke his nose into the field of medicine or poke his nose into purely intrastate matters, we—you and I—ought to be taking Uncle Sam's nose out of those affairs. We ought to have Uncle Sam devote his major attention to the crucial problems of the atomic age—defense, self-preservation.

But there's another major reason why we ought to decentralize Federal operations, so to speak, and return them to the States and localities. And that reason is what we might call secret snatching. By that I mean that your pennies and your nickels, and your dimes and dollars are being snatched in secret without your knowing it. You are paying a fantastic burden of secret taxes. Now, friends, if some racketeer or hoodlum were to snatch your money openly or in secret, you'd call a policeman, and you'd call him fast, because you have a right to protect your money against theft. But how can you protect your income from hundreds of hidden taxes on everything from diapers to tombstones; yes, taxes, from the "womb to the tomb."

When you go to buy a bottle of milk which costs, let us say, 21 cents, the milk cost is only about 13 cents; whereas, taxes, all along the line from the farmer to the man who picks up the milk, to the milk processor, the truck hauler, the retailer, and so on, account for 8 cents. If you buy a pack of cigarettes for 19 cents, 11 cents of that is for hidden taxes. If you buy baby powder for 29 cents, the hidden tax bite—that is, additional taxes—account for 18 cents. Just imagine that, my friends—18 cents for hidden taxes and 29 cents for the baby powder.

Your telephone bill is taxed, your home is taxed, your electric light bulb, your refrigerator, your wife's hosiery, your alarm clock, your auto and auto equipment in particular are taxed. That is what I mean by secret snatching—hidden taxes which cut your purchasing power. I'm referring principally to Federal taxes of course. Well, I say Uncle Sam must cease soaking the taxpayer.

WE MUST ENACT TAX REPEAL BILLS

For that reason, I have introduced a considerable amount of tax-repeal legislation. I have previously discussed with you over the microphone of WLS this question of repealing nuisance taxes. I mean the direct taxes on photo equipment, on furs, jewelry, theater admissions, cosmetics, and hundreds of other items like that.

SOME PEOPLE THINK THEY GET SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

But we've got to attack this whole idea of secret snatching. I can think of no more insidious danger to our American way of

life than these hidden taxes. Why? Well, the reason is obvious. So long as some people think they're getting something for nothing they'll continue the ruinous policy of demanding more Federal aid without realizing that in the long run, they themselves will be paying through the nose for them.

The Federal Government can't give you anything, unless it first takes something away from you. Namely, your money, and, in fact, your liberty.

SUMMARY

Now, friends, let me sum up the various points thus far:

1. The major business of the Federal Government is to look out after our national defense. Remember, experts have warned us that if a surprise atomic attack should come, 50,000,000 people in American cities could be destroyed in a matter of minutes. We must be calm, cool, and eternally vigilant.

2. In order to concentrate on problems of national defense, on problems of decentralization, Uncle Sam must get rid of those State and local functions which he took over during the war and depression emergencies.

3. If Uncle Sam does succeed in turning back some of these functions to the States and localities, then, he'll be able to cut your taxes. Not only cut your direct taxes, but most important of all, cut hidden taxes.

4. Now, fourth, we note that the whole history of taxation reveals the fact that once a tax is imposed, instead of being repealed, it is usually increased.

In other words, it's going to be a hard job to cut taxes. What we need, therefore, are specific techniques to end this secret snatching. We need a specific program. And that is what I should like to suggest now.

SET UP A LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

1. Right now, there is pending before the Senate, legislation to set up a little Hoover Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations. The purpose of this legislation is to end the overlapping and duplication between Federal, State, and local authorities by setting up a commission which would analyze the problem of Federal, State, and local powers and taxes. This Commission could do as wonderful a job in this field as the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization has done.

2. Congress should immediately proceed to act. Every single committee of the Senate and House of Representatives should confer with the Federal agencies under its jurisdiction and direct those agencies to prepare a program for getting rid of certain of their less important functions and returning them to the States and localities.

It is not going to be an easy job to get them to do this. These agencies will probably try to sabotage this decentralization program; but if you, the American citizens insist on it, you can accomplish this purpose.

BUSINESSMEN SHOULD PRINT HIDDEN TAX COSTS ON PRODUCTS

3. Now, third, I suggest that manufacturers of various business products voluntarily try to compute, for example, the cost of hidden baby-powder taxes, the cost of hidden soap taxes, and bread taxes, and so on. Then, if possible, those tax figures should be printed on the product that you buy. The American public should be informed about this secret snatching. If, for example, a woman buys a purse for $10, she should be aware of the fact that hidden taxes on that purse are going to cost an additional $5. Now, obviously, the cost of those taxes can't be printed on the purse itself. But it wouldn't take very much effort to attach a little label to state that the cost is going to be increased by $5 because of the secret snatching.

Newspapers and radio stations can voluntarily cooperate by emphasizing the significance of those hidden taxes, the harmful effect of this secret snatching on business and on consumers.

Some years ago, we had a tremendous problem of kidnaping. There was secret snatching of youngsters that horrified the Nation. We ended that crime by the efficient action of the FBI. Well, today, fortunately, our children are not being kidnaped, but our money is being kidnaped—not illegally, but legally by some so-called public servants. I say it is time that these public servants begin to cut down on this secret snatching—on the kidnaping of your income.

CONCLUSION

Well, ladies and gentlemen, if you agree (or for that matter, if you disagree) with the ideas I have expressed, I hope that you'll drop a note to me in Washington, D. C., care of the Senate Office Building. Just write a penny post card to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. But more important, write to your own Representatives in the Halls of Congress, or write to other Senators. Let them know how you feel. Let them know, as I believe you want them to know, that Uncle Sam must cut down on spending, must cut down on unnecessary functions, and most of all, must cut down on ruinous direct and hidden taxes.

Thanks for your kind attention, and good luck to you all.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the House has passed a bill to grant statehood to the great Territory of Alaska, and it now comes before the Senate committee. So that Senators may be informed regarding the salient facts, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, entitled "Bright New Star From the North," and an article from the Los Angeles Examiner, entitled "More Oil Than Arabia, 'Glacier Priest' Says."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer]

BRIGHT NEW STAR FROM THE NORTH

Heeding the aspirations of a vigorous young American Commonwealth, and echoing the desires of the American people as a whole, the House of Representatives has voted to admit Alaska to the Union.

Now the long-awaited dawn of the forty-ninth star needs only the approval of the Senate to become fact.

What has been acknowledged a necessity long ago, solemnly promised by the platforms of both Republican and Democratic Parties and by the formal avowals of their leaders, is thus at last near fulfillment.

Nevertheless, there are forces and influences at work in the Senate that would deny, and will strenuously attempt to frustrate, the legitimate ambition of Alaska for statehood and the great benefits it would present to the safety and economy of the entire country.

These denials, evasions, and objections must immediately give way to the just demands of the national interest.

It is only too clear and urgent why admission to the Union of Alaska now, and Hawaii as soon as possible thereafter, is of vital importance to the Nation.

Alaska is, beyond question, the most valuable strategic position on the globe today. It needs adequate representation in Congress to achieve full development as a frontal bastion of our defense.

Alaska is potentially one of the richest areas on earth. Statehood would stimulate growth of population, increase investment, strengthen industry, and enlarge commerce. These are historically the results of newly won State rank.

Obviously these tangible values would accrue as much in proportion to the 48 States as to the forty-ninth.

There is besides an intangible factor of inestimable importance.

Alaska is an American land, explored, settled, and civilized by Americans. It is as patriotic and progressive, as full of zeal to create and build as were every one of the once pioneering States that are now principal partners of the federation.

To deny the title and rights of full American citizenship, to withhold rightful representation, to maintain this critically situated and richly promising part of America in the status of a ward, is to deny every principle of our democratic doctrine.

In the light of these incontrovertible reasons for Alaskan statehood, technical objections whose very technicality is highly questionable, promise to make the debate in the Senate acrid and prolonged.

They are already foreseen in the coming hearings of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which must precede senatorial vote.

Whether in committee or on the floor, the carping objections must be overridden, so that the broad and glowing certainties of the future can stand out in the full light of reality.

As Alaska Delegate BARTLETT said to the House:

"Give us statehood and we will give you before long a mighty State whose population will grow constantly, whose business and industry will develop in harmony with the resources upon which they are based. * * * Statehood should enable the pioneer hands in Alaska and those who will go there to carve a mighty new State for this Union from our most western frontier."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Examiner]

MORE OIL THAN ARABIA, "GLACIER PRIEST" SAYS—FARMS BETTER THAN DENMARK AWAIT SETTLER, HE DECLARES

Statehood for Alaska will throw open a vast frontier of tremendous resources to a new surge of colonization and development.

Statehood will facilitate defense of America's key bastion of the north, which lies in Communist Asia's back yard.

It will grant a basic right of democracy—representation—to fellow Americans who are now denied it in Congress.

So believes the famed "glacier priest," Father Bernard R. Hubbard, one of the world's foremost authorities on Alaska.

In an interview at Loyola University yesterday, Father Hubbard drew upon a quarter century of knowledge of that land.

PROSPERITY

"Alaska," he declared, "has everything any State could have for tremendous prosperity.

"The oil resources alone of the Alaska-Canada arc are greater than Saudi Arabia's.

"There are great regions of arable land, comparable to central Europe or Denmark, awaiting farming and dairying.

"I believe statehood will speed up its development.

"Settlers will be attracted first, and industry will follow. I know plenty of capital is waiting to come in with proper assurances of local protection for private investment."

Such expansion and civilization will facilitate defense, too, he said.

"Alaska is of paramount strategic importance. From bases there, B-36's could fly over the polar-ice pack by the shortest routes, to let any nation in the world feel our weight and power."

Alaskans themselves want statehood, he said, because it will give them elected representatives, responsible to them, instead of laying their problems to "voteless Delegates" in a Capital 4,000 miles away.

Ultimately, he said, successful statehood will be bound up with more cordial trade relations with Canada.

With the State of Alaska, Canada, and other United States working closely together, he said, "We will truly have a glorious North America."

Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Greater Peril Than Bombs," from the Indianapolis Star of a recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREATER PERIL THAN BOMBS

Indiana Democrats sat back from their $25-a-plate feast Saturday night and heard Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, voice his grave concern about a problem which the head of the Democratic Party pretends is nonexistent.

Governor Stevenson warned fellow Democrats that they must devote more of their attention to balancing the national budget. "If we can't balance our budget now, when will we?" he asked. He called the problem of balancing the budget while living sanely and making the required total effort in the cold war as urgent a question as this country has ever faced.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower expressed similar concern Sunday night in a New York address. He counseled Americans to worry more about averting national bankruptcy and less about the hydrogen bomb. "We can do something about the possibility of bankruptcy," he said.

Mr. Truman's attitude is in alarming contrast to that of Governor Stevenson, General Eisenhower, and numerous other influential Americans, many of them leaders of Mr. Truman's party. These Americans see the dark peril of continued deficit spending. The President, however, remains blithely indifferent to his projected $8,000,000,000 deficit. Instead, he continues to demand social programs which would greatly increase the deficit.

Atomic warfare, as General Eisenhower implied, is a threat over which we do not have full control. A part of the initiative here belongs to the Russians. But national bankruptcy is a peril which Americans can control fully through their elected representatives. Atomic warfare is still in the if-and-when stage.

That is why General Eisenhower urged us to worry more about bankruptcy and less about bombs. That is why Governor Stevenson injected what might be called a sour note into a happy gathering of Democrats here in Indianapolis. If he succeeded in denting the complacency of some of his fellow party leaders, the result will be worth $25 a plate for every man, woman, and child in Indiana.

"He Made Me Think"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Fine Addresses," from the Delphi (Ind.) Journal of February 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO FINE ADDRESSES

HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Indiana Senator, made an appearance in Carroll County last week and gave two addresses—one to a group of avowed Republicans at their annual Lincoln Day banquet and the other to a gathering of Delphi Rotarians and their farmer guests.

In those two talks Senator CAPEHART left more food for thought in Carroll County than has many a speaker in many a month.

Speaking with the earnestness of a man who has been in the shadow of death itself, CAPEHART left more people wondering about our American form of government than had probably even considered the matter in the past year.

A young man said later, "He really made me think about some things that I had passed over lightly before." The young man has a young daughter and he added that he wants his youngster to grow up in America—America as he knew it before and while he was helping fight a world war.

Senator CAPEHART laid English socialism out for inspection and then showed how dangerously close the United States has drawn to that same situation.

Make no mistake, Democrats who heard the Senator's address at Rotary-Farmer meeting were impressed and have something to ponder. It's not a political question where capitalism, socialism, and communism are concerned. It is a question of self-preservation, of individual freedoms and the right to own a home, a business, a farm, and the opportunity to manage them in the way one sees fit.

If you didn't hear the Senator, you missed hearing one of the best food-for-thought addresses given in these parts recently. A second best would be to take a suggestion made a week ago and read the popular Road Ahead, a wonderful condensation of which appeared in the February issue of Reader's Digest.

Report to the Second District of Illinois on the FEPC Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is proper that from time to time we who serve as the Representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States should report to those who sent us here in what manner we have used our influence and our votes to advance the sort of legislation in which our constituents are interested.

Furthermore I think such reports to our constituents should be made publicly in this Chamber that our distinguished colleagues, whether of our party and our own convictions or contrariwise, should the better understand our sincerity and the fidelity with which we seek to represent the public sentiment of the voters in our respective districts.

In the Second District of Illinois there prevails a strong dislike of anything in the nature of discrimination because of differences in race, color, creed, or station. We believe that equality in opportunity is as essential to a functioning democracy as impartiality in the administration of justice.

In the Second District of Illinois men and women of all religions and all denominations, of all racial groups and of all stations of life, believe that they and all other men and women should have equal opportunity in the obtaining and the holding of employment. To say to a worker that he cannot apply for employment on his own qualifications and his own character and on an equal footing with all other qualified applicants to the people of the Second District of Illinois is abhorrent. To say that he cannot be considered and subjected impartially to the same tests because of his religion, his color, or even his race, to us in the Second District of Illinois is to question democracy itself. We feel that in a real democracy there must be among citizens, united with the common purpose of making that democracy function, a sense of cooperating brotherhood at least to the extent of according to all an equality of opportunity.

EXPERIENCES OF THE MELTING POT

Why do we feel as strongly as we do on the matter of the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act? A few of our distinguished colleagues from the South have said in the debates in this Chamber that our motivation was one of political interest and not of conviction. How little they know us. How scant is their understanding of the experiences of life in a great melting pot from which peoples of all races and of all religions have come to contribute by hard work and loyalty their part to the strength and the greatness of the land of liberty.

Fair and equal opportunity for employment has not always been accorded the Irish immigrant, the Jewish immi-

grant, the Scandinavian immigrant, the Italian, the Polish, the Lithuanian, the Croatian—I could go on down the call of the nations and the races and I could not omit the Anglo-Saxon because against some of the later immigrants from the British possessions has there been directed by some employers that which amounted to discrimination.

If we are opposed, uncompromisingly opposed, to signs in factories and on the walls of offices reading, "No Negroes may apply," one reason may be found in the experiences that are a part of our background.

"Jews not wanted"—there have been such signs to bring tears to the eyes of honest men and women, and of children.

"No Irish need apply"—is it not understandable by our southern colleagues that one in whose veins Irish blood does course would ever wish on men and women of any race the doors of employment to be shut?

"No Polish workers wanted"—yes, in our Chicago, the greatest of the inland cities of America, the metropolis carved in the very center of the American melting pot, we have known that affront to be thrown into the faces of good and God-fearing people who came to America to work and ask only for the chance.

"No Italians wanted," "No Scandinavians hired here"—on down the list of immigrants who came to make their homes with us and to join with us in making our city and our land a place of happiness for all.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in Chicago we learned our brotherhood in the experiences of our own kind. Even those who were born in America, but came from the farms, and were inexperienced in the ways and manners of urban life, had, too, at the beginning some measure of discrimination to combat.

MOST DEMOCRATIC OF CITIES

Chicago never would have become the great city that she is, perhaps the most democratic large city in the world, if from the very first our people had not seen to it that whenever discrimination showed itself, and upon whomsoever visited, that discrimination was crushed under an avalanche of populous disapproval. We of all racial groups and of all religions have worked together as a team in tolerance and in mutual understanding to bring to our Chicago, and all the people who dwell therein, the greatest possible measure of human contentment.

We apologize to no one for placing the quality of character ahead of the circumstances of birth. I suppose that you might call us a religious people, judging from the many churches and synagogues, always filled during the hours of worship. The point that I wish to emphasize here is that in our daily lives in Chicago we seek to give a practical expression in our contracts with our fellow men to the teachings of our religions. To us in Chicago the brotherhood of man is something more than a bit of vocabulary.

I may say to my distinguished colleagues from the South, and especially to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], who in the debate on FEPC raised the cry of hypocrisy against Members from a North that he does not know, from an East that he does not know, from a West that he does not know, that long before the wounds of an intersectional war were healed in the South there came to Chicago and to Illinois many fine southern men and women, who by us were received with open arms as friends and neighbors to work with us, without prejudice or discrimination because but recently the States from which they came were at war with us. We do not believe in discrimination. You cannot live long in the democratic atmosphere of Chicago until this passion for recognition of human rights, and their enjoyment by all without any taint of discrimination anywhere, becomes a part and parcel of your being.

I do not think any of the fine southern men and women who were the first to join our Chicago family after the close of hostilities in the sixties would have had it in their hearts to charge us with hypocrisy because we neither believed in nor practiced discrimination.

SINCERITY OF SOUTHERNERS

I should add, in all fairness, that the great majority of our colleagues from the South, who debated with us on FEPC, refrained from the charge of hypocrisy. They joined with the great majority of the advocates of FEPC in keeping the debate on a high level of logical argument advanced in a spirit of mutual respect. The fact that the delegations from the 12 southern States, including Members ordinarily of liberal trends of thought and many Members of lofty and spiritual character, voted as a unit against FEPC we from the North, East and West could not leave unnoticed. It was not so much a matter of geography—because, Mr. Speaker, we are all one people and we in this chamber find in commingling together that there is little fundamental difference among us—rather, I would say, the explanation for the division along sectional lines lay in the fact that our democracy in such a city as Chicago has longer been under the refining tests of personal experiences. They have been the experiences of the great melting pot into which have come one wave of immigrants after another, each perhaps with its own nationalistic customs and usually under the handicap of learning a new language and the habits of new ways. We have found from our personal experiences, and those of our own kind before us, in the great melting pot in which we became as one team the goal of which was the contentment of all, that human hearts and human minds are pretty much alike, and that race and color and religion and station cannot divide when there is brotherly desire to understand and a sincere willingness to accord to others that exact equality in opportunity expected and demanded for oneself.

Meanwhile, as we were going through the cycle of these experiences, which reached, as I have said, into the "groupal" backgrounds of all of us, the Southern States, emerging from the difficult problems of reconstruction years, continued under a social order only slightly altered. Toward those of a race not too long ago released from the status of slaves there remained an attitude of protection, guardianship, and undoubtedly what was deemed helpfulness. But in the melting pot of many races we had found that you can give all of these—protection, guardianship, helpfulness—and if you have omitted recognition of the dignity of man you have given nothing. It is that recognition of the dignity of man, which all human nature craves and which is of the very spirit of religion, that brings out the finest attributes in the individual and spurs each race to develop within its members those graces of manners and qualities of character that best recommend them in the society of the members of other races and of other groups.

Suffice to say, Mr. Speaker, that in return for the recognition of our sincerity, which most of our southern colleagues generously accorded us in the FEPC debates, we gave to them with equal generosity and in equal measure recognition of their sincerity.

A new order is supplanting an old order, and neither the advocates of a new that is destined to prevail nor the defenders of an old that cannot continue in a modern world can serve any good purpose, either in advocacy or in opposition, by raising a question of sincerity.

DISCRIMINATION IS A POISON

To all in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, to the men and women, and even the children who in their generation will carry the torch for democracy, humanity, and brotherhood, do I make this report of how, with humbleness of spirit, but I hope with that driving force which sincerity gives to our words, I have tried in the halls of Congress to make my voice the sounding board of their voices and my vote truly expressive of the universal sentiment of tolerance, understanding, and brotherhood prevailing among the people I represent in the Second District of Illinois.

On July 1, 1949, I said in the House of Representatives:

> I abhor discrimination of any kind being directed against law-abiding men and women who walk in the image of their God, doing the share of the work of the world that is given them to do. All my adult life, actively expended in championing the causes of ordinary men and women who too often have too few to speak for them, I have fought discrimination wherever I have found its ugly head.
>
> On coming to this Congress, a new Member and at an age where there could be no ambition except to be true to myself and the philosophy by which I had lived my life, I made to myself the pledge that wherever I found discrimination my vote would be withheld and wherever I found that which in sound legislation would eradicate in some measure some form of discrimination there would my vote be and there would it be counted.
>
> Discrimination, Mr. Speaker, in a democracy such as ours is the poison that destroys; slow-working poison, it is true, and for that reason the more insidious and to be guarded against.

USE OF RADIO IN FEPC FIGHT

As a Member of the Congress, active in the fight for FEPC legislation and eager that behind us in that fight should be the strength of an aroused public interest, I appeared frequently on radio programs, both local and national. On January 8,

1950, over Station WWDC in Washington, I said:

Should Congress enact a Federal fair employment practices act? You couldn't expect me to answer that except in the affirmative. The platform of my party, which in all good conscience is binding upon me, declared in no uncertain terms for such an enactment.

If I had been defeated in November of 1948 and my Republican opponent had been elected to represent the people of the Second District of Illinois, I do not see how he could have answered the question except in the affirmative. The platform of the Republican Party, which, in all good conscience, should be binding upon the Republican members of the Congress, declared in no uncertain terms for the enactment of a Federal fair employment practices act.

Who am I to say, or who else has the right in the presumption of wisdom above his fellow men to say that both the Democrats and the Republicans were talking nonsense in their respective platform pledges and that the American people, having declared their overwhelming approval of legislation to end discrimination in the opportunity for employment, should be put in their place by the Members of Congress they thought they had elected to be their representatives and not their masters?

I cannot lose sight of the fact that this is a representative Democracy, that its proper functioning rests upon party responsibility and that, in the absence of a conflict with individual conscience or preelection pronouncement to the contrary, the men and women sent as Senators and Representatives to the Congress are morally and in all decency and honesty obligated to vote in the Congress according to the directions of the voters as expressed in party platform.

There are probably some in the Eighty-first Congress who are honestly fearful of democracy itself just as there were those among the early Americans who were fearful of extending the right of suffrage to those who owned no property and who possessed no superior education. They would have discriminated against men of their own color, of their own religion, of their own national origin, even to the extent of depriving them of a vote and a voice, and only because they were poor and the circumstances of their early lives deprived them of educational opportunities.

There have always been those who were afraid of the competition of equality in opportunity. They have preferred the comfortable cushions of a convenient status quo to the exertion of rolling up their sleeves and meeting their fellows on an equal footing.

They have always been a negligible minority in these United States of America. Their number in the Eighty-first Congress—I mean those who honestly find in their consciences something revolting and terrifying in the concept of equality in the opportunity of employment—is so piteously negligible that as a bloc it would not dent a pat of butter.

Equality in opportunity for employment in a democracy is so essential that where it does not exist there is no democracy. To deny equal opportunity in getting and holding available jobs is nothing less than holding to the discarded concept of master and servant, of classes determined by circumstances of birth, of superior races and of superior religions.

CHURCHES JOIN THE BATTLE

In the extension of my remarks I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1950, my reply to the request of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago that I support the FEPC bill and also sign the discharge petition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. My reply as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1950, to this great federation of all the Protestant churches in the metropolitan Chicago area follows:

DEAR SIRS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your form letter concerning H. R. 4453. I am happy to note the position taken by the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago in support of legislation aimed at removing discrimination in the opportunity to obtain and hold employment.

Such legislation, reflecting as it does the Christian concept of brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, could not fail to inspire deep sympathetic interest among the men and women whose spiritual strength is maintained and augmented by attendance and worship at the many Protestant churches of all denominations comprising the membership of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

It is heartening that your board of trustees has responded to this universal sentiment among Christian people in our community by officially declaring the support of H. R. 4453 by your federation, truly representative of and the spokesman for the United Protestant Churches of Greater Chicago.

You request me to sign discharge petition 20. I am happy to inform you that I was one of the first to sign this petition and that I also signed discharge petition 21, which is of a similar nature. Discharge petition 20 was filed by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT and discharge petition 21 by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. It is significant to note as indicating no division among those supporting FEPC that ROOSEVELT signed POWELL'S petition, as well as his own, and POWELL signed both his own and ROOSEVELT'S petitions.

As the 1948 national platforms of both major parties pledged support of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act, I see no good reason why any individual Member of the House should not feel free to sign any or all discharge petitions the objection of which is to bring an early vote on proposed legislation redeeming the pledge of both parties. Certainly, if each individual Member applied to his own actions the test of fidelity to campaign pledges of his own party it is inconceivable that a discharge petition for H. R. 4453 would fail of the required 218 signatures.

Regardless of the fate of the discharge petitions now on the Clerk's desk, I can assure you with the utmost confidence that H. R. 4453 will reach the floor of the House early in this session and be passed by a substantial majority. The sincerity and determination of the President and of the House leadership is beyond question, and I am sure there is equal sincerity and determination that the FEPC bill shall be passed among sufficient numbers of the opposition party.

The action of the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has been a stimulating contribution, of real value, to a good fight for the good cause of a functioning democracy geared to the conception of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

VOTED AGAINST ALL AMENDMENTS

I remained on the floor during all of the 15 hours and more of that historic February 22, 1950, the anniversary of Washington's birthday when the good, the long, the gruelling fight was made for recognition of the human rights of all our people. I opposed and voted against all the amendments that were offered. I wanted not only the principle adopted but also the enforcement provisions that would make the principle respected in its application as intended.

You will find on page 2200 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, 1950, my reply to the contention of a southern Member that there is a distinction between civil rights and human rights. My remarks in the Halls of Congress on the occasion of that great debate, I quote:

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SIMS], whose sympathy with many liberal viewpoints has won him the friendship of liberals from the North, has sought in his presentment of the southern viewpoint on the pending bill to make a distinction between civil rights and human rights. His opposition to that bill he bases upon his conclusion that its effects would place civil rights in priority to human rights.

I am afraid I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman. That which for convenience in reference we call a bill for civil rights stems from the human right of all men and women to live. Men and women in a complex industrial society, unless born of families of means, cannot live unless they have gainful employment. Shelter, food, clothing, everything necessary to keep body and soul together, must come from the proceeds of that employment.

This bill aims at affording all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States an equal opportunity in obtaining and holding such employment without any discrimination based upon racial and religious prejudices.

I fail to see where there could be any human right more fundamental than the right to live, and it is to establish that right to live on the part of millions of our countrymen now discriminated against that this proposed legislation has been presented. I don't care what you call it—civil rights, as is the easy term in the vocabulary of its proponents, or something sought to be forced upon us in priority of human rights, as the gentleman from South Carolina says. I do not think the good men and women in the galleries above us are interested in labels. No matter what you call it, this is a bill to give human beings the right to live and to enjoy equal opportunities in employment when possessed of equal qualifications.

I can conceive of a situation when a period of great unemployment, such as was visited upon us in the early thirties when the policies of a reactionary government brought us to a wreck, those men and women in the groups discriminated against, being the first to be dismissed and the last to be reemployed, would be doomed as individuals and as a group to unwarranted privations, and in many instances to actual starvation.

No, Mr. Chairman, the right to live of all human beings, without regard to color or race or religion, can never be inferior to any of the rights of a more fortunate and numerous group. I know of nothing in the Constitution of the United States, certainly nothing in the law of God, that establishes the right to discriminate against one's brother in priority to the brother's right to live.

Mr. Chairman, this day in this Chamber, where so many great battles have been fought and won for human rights, will long be remembered. Today an old and passing order made its last stand.

The galleries in this Chamber have been filled for the many hours that we have been here. Until the general debate began, 5 hours after we convened at noon, there was little of excitement to command the interest of those packed galleries. The monotonous calling of the hundreds of names on one roll call after another was all that we, the representatives of the people in what has been termed the greatest deliberative body in the world had to offer.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, those galleries have remained packed hour after hour, and they will be packed, I venture to say, all night and all day tomorrow if it takes that time to bring this bill to a vote.

I ask my colleagues to look upward at the faces of the men and women looking down on us. There is nothing of idle curiosity in those faces. I have never seen reflected in the faces of any gathering more sincerity of feel-

ing, more intensity of emotion, the greater marked because restrained. With rapt attention from the galleries above they look upon everything which is transpiring.

If I read aright the expression in their faces it is one reflective of their joy that on this day and in this Chamber the good fight has been made and is on its way to triumph—the good fight to end discrimination in the opportunity to get and hold a job—the good fight for the human right to live of everyone, even those of other races, creeds, and color.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that in the Second District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, the sentiment for the passage of this bill is overwhelming. In Chicago we do not like any sort of discrimination.

I HAVE REPRESENTED MY DISTRICT

I have the faith that the people I represent, the great Republican rank and file as well as the Democratic, men and women of all religions and creeds and of all races and nationalistic derivations, will approve of what I have done. I repeat, we in the Second District of Illinois do not like discrimination. We like all men to stand on their own feet, to enjoy equal opportunity and to measure up in the esteem of their neighbors by the quality of their individual characters without seeking an unfair advantage in the circumstances of birth.

Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, several weeks ago, in commenting on certain matters under discussion on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to the fact that there appeared in the galleries at that time a group of young people from overseas representing 12 or 15 countries. I also made the statement that the Chaplain of the Senate had written several fine editorials in the Washington Sunday Star, which I understood had been incorporated in the RECORD. I find that I was mistaken in that respect. I therefore ask at this time that the two editorials one entitled "A Rainbow Over the Alps" and the other entitled "At the End of the Rainbow," written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—A RAINBOW OVER THE ALPS—MORAL REARMAMENT IDEAL SEEN AS A WAY TO WORK NECESSARY CHANGE IN HUMAN CHARACTER

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

Spanning the sky like a radiant scarf of blended colors, I saw a rainbow overarching the majestic peaks of the Alps. Under that sign in the heavens lay a little town perched on the mountainside 3,000 feet above the city of Montreux and that liquid-blue gem which is Lake Geneva. As a blazing star once hung over Bethlehem of Judea so a rainbow hangs over a little town in another small land, lovely Switzerland.

That spot, high and lifted up, is a modern Mecca which, as a magnet, has been drawing to its spacious Mountain House pilgrims from all parts of this fear-haunted earth. For during these crucial months, when it is later than we think, the paths of peacemakers who are to be called the children of God have led to Caux, pronounced in our English tongue Co.

All for which Caux has become an inspiring symbol fits in perfectly with that opulent word, "cooperation." Here is an enchanted mount where the Sermon on the Mount is being put into practical operation in this very year of crisis and chaos. That mountainside has been called by a distinguished Member of the United States Congress "the brightest spot in the dark picture of Europe." In many aspects that somber picture is dismal indeed. One of the world's most profound thinkers, whose frank telling of unpleasant truth has earned him the title of the "Gloomy Dean," Dr. Inge, of St. Paul's, London, has just emerged from retirement after much brooding over the present ominous world situation with this startling warning: "Either the nations must surrender some fraction of their independence to a supernational authority which will have the power to settle disputes peaceably or peace will be restored as in the Roman Empire by a knockout blow by the strongest power. This last looks painfully like a Tartar domination of Europe and Asia. Shall we have the sense to choose the former alternative?" But the fatal trouble is that the "former alternative," namely, just adjustments of the differences dividing mankind cannot be chosen unless men and nations change. Above political, diplomatic, and economic levels, earnest men and women weary of frustrated mechanical shuffling of the same old cards of fate, are frankly facing the fundamental necessity—change, changed hearts, changed desires, changed attitudes, changed motives, changed objectives.

A Burmese leader at Caux, speaking for the teeming east, declares: "We need money. We need about everything. But we need most of all changed people, a change which will enable us to trust one another."

Communism is out on a world-wide scale to liquidate one class and put another unchanged class at the top of the heap. Socialism, often sincere enough in its attempts to eliminate exploitation in order to bring the good things of life to all people, is still dealing with unchecked selfishness which can wreck any social scheme. Even in a chastened capitalism, management and labor confront each other with belligerent bitterness and suspicion in a constant tug-of-war. With legislative bricks, a sorry attempt doomed to futility is being made to build an altruistic edifice on the sinking sands of an unchanged society. It is self-evident that the utopian plan will not work without the utopian man.

The only escape from catastrophe is to change human nature. That diagnosis is as old as the Matchless Figure who enunciated the Sermon on the Mount and who insisted, as He fronted the deepest needs of the individual and of society, "You must be changed." "Born again," He called it. That is the working gospel of Caux—change, not in some sweet by-and-by, but in the here and now. That is the rainbow over the Alps. Here men and women by the thousand, representing all walks of life, from more than half a hundred nations, are finding the secret of actually practicing the presence of God—the God who did not cease to guide and to speak when some holy book was closed centuries ago, but who is speaking now to those who will but listen. Here at Caux, in a hostile world longing for peace but preparing for war, is an arsenal of the spirit where the invincible instruments of moral rearmament are being put into the hands of eager crusaders who are marching forth with the old cry which once rang through the embattled hosts of Europe, "God wills it." Here is the laboratory proof that human relationships, individual and social, dull, defeated, and divided, may be changed to relationships radiant, victorious, and united. Seeing that rainbow, parliamentarians, diplomats, legislators, cabinet members, labor leaders, capitalists, Communists, miners, and ministers—Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Moslems—are climbing the path to Caux, to carry back with shining faces the answer.

Next week the Spires of the Spirit will point to the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—AT THE END OF THE RAINBOW—MORAL REARMAMENT CONFERENCE AT CAUX REGARDED AS A SIGN OF HOPE FOR THE WORLD

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

High up in the Alps at Caux inspired men and women, having been shown the pattern in the mount for a new world, are going out with the leaven which must leaven the whole earth, unless a new Dark Age is to emerge, with the split atom as its nemesis. The fight whose strategy Caux plans is not a war against something. It is primarily a fight for something, for a master ideology which is superior and supreme. After a visit to Caux, a United States Congressman exclaimed: "The unmatched ideology here offered to a frustrated world is undoubtedly the Gibraltar of hope to which we must all cling."

The creed of Caux is: An evil idea can be stopped with only one weapon, a better idea. The basis of its ideology is to build a quartet of virtues and values into every human relationship—purity, honesty, unselfishness, and love. That combination in action is irresistible. In the struggle between class and class, and race and race, it offers the healing balm of an understanding and a mutual trust which bridges all gulfs. It is all happening now at Caux, for Marxists and capitalists, for captains of labor and of management, for men from the Orient and the Occident, for white and black and brown. With old hates and hurts forgotten, clenched fists have changed to clasped hands.

Under the spell of Caux once rabid Communists have utterly renounced the Marxian gospel of hate. One who had followed the party line for 30 years testified: "I see now that Marxists carry in their minds a great deal of rubbish." And so do Socialists and capitalists. They all need to be changed.

A labor leader, heading unions influencing over 200,000 members, beholding selfishness change to altruism, competition to cooperation, conflict to concord, ownership to stewardship, in that human laboratory in the Alps, declared: "They have the spiritual atom bomb. Here is the secret for building the new world that we Socialists have always wished for."

Yes, it is no illusion. There is a rainbow over the Alps. It speaks of one more chance for men to turn pending catastrophe into a flowering renaissance which will bring a new Eden for all.

Twelve thousand from 50 nations, reaching Caux by land, sea, and air, have found there the headquarters of the hope of the world. Our own Department of Justice, speaking for America which backs the Marshall plan and all other bulwarks against the threatened flood of communism, noting this rainbow in the sky, has issued this statement: "Moral rearmament is a world force, and its objectives are recognized by the Department as worthy and helpful in the strengthening of democratic forces throughout the world."

No wonder our Congress sent at Government expense this summer a delegation, who left its busy session to fly to Caux and see for themselves this great thing that has come to

pass. One high official speaks for all in reporting what they saw and how they felt, as he testifies: "No man could attend the conference in Caux and watch the emotions of a new hope light the faces of the people and not come away convinced that the organized forces of good in this world can defeat the organized forces of evil."

As we left that mount of transfiguration, far down beneath us lay the city, emblem of the busy haunts and restless hearts of men. Peering earthward from our eerie balcony, naught could be seen below but billowy clouds shutting out all sign of the valley. But we could see plainly that the blue sky was the truth, for we were above the clouds. They seemed only symbols of the suspicions and misunderstandings which hide the vision splendid from the men of the valley.

But, descending to the lake level and looking up to the everlasting hills, lo, at that moment the sun broke through and, like a vast searchlight, poured its glory on Caux. And from the dizzy heights of Mountain House the turrets flashed and flamed like a bouquet of diamonds. And then, across the Alps arched as brilliant a rainbow as our eyes ever had beheld. And the pot of gold at the end of that promise flung across the heavens is beauty in blended unity.

Yes, there was a rainbow across the Alps. And above this world which lieth in darkness there is a rainbow of hope.

Continuation of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made last week in connection with the deficiency appropriation for the Office of the Housing Expediter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT, URGING THE CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROLS

There is growing alarm among tenants throughout the country over the possibility that Federal protection for the ceiling price of their shelter rent may soon be suspended.

The national policy regarding this basic element in the cost of living for millions of our citizens is being determined in a manner which is equally alarming.

Last year the Congress passed an extension of rent control until June 30 of this year. The Senate Appropriations Committee has now denied additional operating funds to the Office of the Housing Expediter for the balance of the current fiscal year. The result is that the country faces a premature termination of this whole program.

This is an unsound procedure. I do not believe that the appropriation process should be used to thwart the expressed intention of the Congress. The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee is an indirect method of rendering the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 inoperable and ineffectual. It takes the teeth out of a law which was designed to give fair and equitable treatment to tenant and landlord alike.

Failure to restore these operating funds in the deficiency bill now before the Senate means the end of effective rent protection for tenants of 12,000,000 rental housing units throughout the United States.

Law enforcement is jeopardized in 74 American cities with populations of 100,000 or more which have deliberately elected to enjoy the benefits of Federal rent control. Public service to both landlords and tenants will soon be suspended or drastically curtailed in 1,000 United States communities where rent ceilings are now being maintained.

The stage will thus be set for a sudden and ill-considered disruption of landlord-tenant relations in 43 of the 48 States. Even before the Congress has fully considered the grave implications in the expiration of rent controls on June 30 next, this serious change in national policy will be accelerated in a reckless and irresponsible way.

This prospect is before us at a time in my own State when a shortage of over 70,000 homes still persists and when over 50,000 workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Only last month, for example, the Board of Aldermen of the City of Waterbury, a key Connecticut industrial center, sent me a resolution requesting the extension of Federal rent control "for at least 1 year", because "there still exists a serious shortage of housing adequate to the needs of our citizens." Rent advisory boards in Hartford, New Britain, New London, and Middlesex and Tolland Counties have voted against rent decontrol in any part of these areas at this time. An acute shortage of low-rent housing is indicated by waiting lists in New Haven and Bridgeport.

Gov. Chester Bowles has unequivocally stated that the lapse of Federal rent control poses the most serious consequences for the economic stability of the entire State of Connecticut.

I concur in these misgivings, not only as they involve Connecticut but for the Nation at large.

I see no element of reasonable doubt to the statement that an acute shortage of moderate-priced rental housing continues to exist. There is every reason to believe that the elimination of rent controls will result in a lower standard of living for those who can least afford further strain on the family budget. I am not at all persuaded that the rental emergency is over, or that the Congress can lightly cast aside its obligations to face up to that emergency.

British Health Seen Slipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, my attention was called this morning to an article in the Washington Times-Herald entitled "British Health Seen Slipping." The article is date lined London, March 12. It points out that a recent national survey shows a 7-percent increase in sickness and an 8-percent increase in visits to doctors and hospitals among persons between the ages of 16 and 64, compared with last year. For persons over 64 years of age sickness rose 20 percent. I do not know just how the increases are related to the present socialized medical system in England, but I believe that the appropriate committees of Congress which are considering socialized medicine and so-called compulsory health legislation might follow through on the information contained in this article and ascertain what the cause for the increase is. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH HEALTH SEEN SLIPPING

LONDON, March 12.—A striking increase in sickness among Britons of working age, apparently indicating the health of the nation is declining, is disclosed in the latest survey by the Ministry of Health, published today.

A Conservative Member of Parliament, R. S. Russell, will ask Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, in the House of Commons what steps he intends to take to deal with the "serious trend disclosed by the official figures."

The survey shows a 7-percent increase in sickness and an 8-percent increase in visits to doctors and hospitals among persons between the ages of 16 and 64, compared with last year. For persons over 64 sickness rose 20 percent.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent well-thought-out editorial from the New York Journal-American, on the subject of statehood for Alaska.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDEEM THE PROMISE

The power to strengthen this Nation immeasurably against the greatest potential enemy in its history rests with 13 men in the United States Senate.

As members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, theirs is the power to report out of committee, for a full Senate vote, the Alaska statehood bill.

The bill was passed by the House March 3. There is a strong reason to believe that the Senate, if given a chance to vote, would pass it by a substantial nonpartisan majority.

Alaska wants statehood with the fervor men and women give to a transcendent cause. An overwhelming number of men and women voters in the United States want statehood for Alaska. This Nation needs Alaskan statehood to advance her defense, sustain her security, and discharge her deep moral obligation.

The 13 Senators should not delay.

There should be no delay for the reason that delay weakens our Pacific security by permitting Soviet Russia to strengthen her Siberian redoubts while also influencing the native population of western Alaska and of the strategic islands of the Bering Strait.

Published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 4 was a revealing article by Sally Carrighar.

This informed writer told what is going on.

The Russians have fortified adjacent Siberia with heavy guns and other coastal

equipment to guard their airfields—airfields from which they may seize our air bases at Anchorage and Fairbanks, establishing themselves to bomb our Pacific areas and our internal centers as far east as Detroit.

The Russians have set up an Eskimo espionage system.

The Russians are suborning the Eskimo settlements in Alaska by collectivizing the primitive industry of their Siberian neighbors and kinsmen—giving them doles while making them state chattels—and by using them as emissaries of Communist paternalism.

If, through neglect or indecision or timid partisan considerations, we withhold statehood from Alaska we shall have dealt a devastating blow to the morale of Alaska's white population.

We shall have injured immensely our world prestige.

We shall have assisted communism in its enticement propaganda designed to win the support of the Eskimos.

We shall have reneged shamefully on our long-promised rights of statehood to one of our most valuable possessions.

We shall have weakened our defenses possibly beyond repair.

For these reasons the 13 Senators in a very real sense hold the fate of Alaska—a fate joined inseparably with the security of this Nation—in their hands, and hold also a tremendous responsibility.

Let us hope fervently that they discharge it well.

Tribute to Wilton E. Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Augusta Herald of March 2, 1950, paying a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Wilton E. Hall, of Anderson, S. C., the publisher of the Independent and Daily Mail.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DISTINGUISHED CAROLINIAN SPEAKS TO WORLD EDITORS

A fine recognition, and one well deserved, came to Wilton E. Hall, of Anderson, S. C., a few days ago, when he was invited to address the opening session of the Columbia University Journalism Seminar in New York City.

While his newspapers are not published in the largest city in his State, Mr. Hall's papers are among the best known in the country, having been cited by many outstanding organizations for their signal services to the city of Anderson and to the State of South Carolina.

Mr. Hall has been publisher of the Independent (morning) and the Daily Mail (evening) for a number of years. He has served his country as United States Senator, but his most conspicuous services have been in the field of journalism.

Augusta civic leaders were given yeoman assistance by Mr. Hall in the development of the Clark Hill project, and today he is sparking the movement to bring about a similar development on the Savannah River near Hartwell, Ga.

Mr. Hall knows and understands the South as probably no other person and his address and round-table discussion at Columbia University was no doubt most illuminating.

Another southern man spoke in New York about the same time. He was Judge J. Waites Waring of the United States court of Charleston, who is temporarily sojourning in the big city.

Judge Waring and Mrs. Waring are vying for public attention at the moment by belittling their own people and their own race.

These people have already had more publicity than they deserve, but since the judge, in New York, was moved to tell a Negro audience that, "The white people of my part of the country are sick mentally, obsessed with the false doctrine of white supremacy," we cannot resist the opportunity for writing about a really distinguished South Carolinian, Wilton E. Hall, who is not mentally ill and who holds none of the views being espoused by the Charleston judge.

It was a Scotsman, we believe, who said something about feeling that everybody is crazy "except thee and me and sometimes I fear that thou art a bit queer."

If everybody is mentally ill down this way save the judge and his wife, what is to hinder us feeling that they, too, are a bit queer?

Public Library Service Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this library demonstration bill. First, it sets up another unnecessary bureau in Washington and starts by appropriating $150,000 to the Federal Security Agency to handle the initial cost of administration necessary in this Department.

Secondly, it offers to appropriate out of the Federal Government $40,000 a year to each State on a matching basis. That is the first plan.

The second plan in this bill would permit the Federal Government to appropriate the difference between $40,000 and a hundred thousand dollars a year to States which would match that amount. The bill is supposed to run for 5 years and could cost the Federal Government in 5 years under the plan $40,000,000.

Not a person in my district has written me asking me to support this bill, and probably not 20 people in my district know that the Federal Government is trying to force this bill on to the States. If we pass this legislation, we are assuming that the people out in the various States are not sufficiently interested in education and libraries to manage their own business; that we of the Congress and the bureaucrats in Washington know better what the States and the people should have than they know themselves.

I am against this legislation because to enact it would be a waste of the taxpayers' money that should be left with him to spend for books and periodicals for his children as he so desires.

When this Congress opened I made up my mind I would not support any new legislation that would add additional expense to the Government unless I was convinced it was absolutely necessary. I know this legislation is not necessary in any way, and a majority of the Members of this Congress must feel the same way about it. For that reason I ask you to join with me in defeating this legislation that would add more millions to the cost of government. I ask you to help defeat this legislation because all of the 48 States are in good shape financially and are more able to pay any educational expense at the present time than is the Federal Government.

The Members of this Congress know, and the people should know, that you cannot cut the cost of government, you cannot stop deficit financing; yes, you cannot prevent bankrupting the Federal Treasury unless the Congress has the courage to stop voting to spend money that we do not have, but will have to borrow from the people.

This legislation is unnecessary. Let us do our duty and defeat it in the interest of all the people.

Long-Range Housing Research Will Strengthen America and the American Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am keenly interested, as I know also are many of our colleagues, in the research work in home construction for which we provided in the public housing bill of the first session. The goal of a decent roof over every American family, and within the means of that family, can be reached. It is not something only to dream of and to talk about. Until we have attained that goal we have not assured the permanent security of our country from the chaos and the ills that attend discontent. Those who are homeless, or are forced to shift about from place to place to find shelter they can afford, often finding it in atmospheres not conducive to healthy family existence, cannot be expected to furnish that stout foundation in a contented citizenry upon which any State must rest.

There is only so much that we in the Eighty-first Congress can do, constructively, to meet the problem of residential structures being priced too high for most people. We made a fine start in providing for public housing and slum clearance. We shortly will have before us the middle-income housing bill, and if we pass that, which I hope we will, we will have made another real contribution to the solution of the problem. But the real solution is in research. In research we will find new and better ways

of construction, new and better materials, new and easier ways of financing.

Because this is a subject in which all of us are so much interested I am inserting in the Appendix a most informative and constructive letter which I have received from James Prestini of the Armour Research Foundation of Illinois Institute of Technology, Technology Center, Chicago. The letter follows:

MARCH 6, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your support of a vigorous Federal housing research program is needed. I realize that Federal housing is a relatively new concept in this country which has come about only because of the dire needs which exist. Your support and the support of everyone to this effort assumes more than normal importance in that what is done will set the pattern for several years to come.

There are few if any matters more urgent, more involved, or nothing more varied than the housing problem. To solve this problem the United States must set up a Nation-wide, long-range comprehensive program of research which is concerned with fundamental knowledge of the technical and design factor as well as the social and economic factors of housing research and which is comparable to the research work done by the Department of Agriculture. This much needed comprehensive housing research program should not be bypassed by substituting a small technical program which struggles from year to year to survive and produces immediate results of little long-term value.

Sound technical research ultimately develops new materials, new structural systems, and leads to reduced construction costs. Research gives data whereby we can anticipate the loadings and the deteriorating influences which building materials must withstand, establish useful properties of construction materials, and develop efficient assembly methods. Greater emphasis must be placed on developing mass-production techniques as related to housing construction. Only through extensive research can this be achieved and reduced building costs assured. The following serves as a sample of some of the technical research problems to be solved:

Development and improvement of methods of testing materials, structures, and components. Design and development of equipment for the conduct of tests.

Design and development of instruments for measurement.

Development of standards for evaluating performance.

Development of materials, structures, and structural design.

Design and development of building equipment.

Establishment of criteria for building and safety codes.

Establishment of specifications for purchases.

Studies in the problems of maintenance.

Development and improvement of techniques to increase production. Some of the design research problems are:

An approach to the problem in its town-planning aspect, in order to determine the most economical and rational type of local settlement for any given population.

Architectural design to determine the best type of plan and form of house.

A study of human conduct is probably the most difficult phase of housing research. Because of its complexity, it has been avoided for the most part. Exhaustive studies need to be made on the human physical and psychological relations to fatigue and comfort of such physical environmental factors as acoustics; illumination; forms; space and size; heating and ventilation; materials, finishes and surfaces. Research techniques need to be developed which will measure and determine conclusively consumer tastes, attitudes and behavior in terms of housing.

Research in economics would include studies in costs of financing home building. There is need for simplification of procedures relative to the transfer of property. The variety of provision of State laws which control foreclosures and registration of titles creates unnecessary confusion and cost. The creation of national systems of mortgage guarantees and supervision of local lending agencies bring out the need for clarification and simplification.

These parts of the technical and design factor as well as social and economic factors of housing research which are mentioned are not intended to be complete but rather a sample of what is meant by the problem being urgent, involved and varied. Setting forth these parts serves to emphasize the belief that only a government agency, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, could coordinate a nation-wide basic research program in housing.

It is obvious that the building industry has not been able and is not able to coordinate a nation-wide housing research program of a long-term value. To a degree the building industry has itself to blame for this inability. The industry is impeded by thinking and construction methods which grew out of a craft type of industry. The resulting house has not produced savings commensurate to those in other industries which have integrated twentieth century research, mass production methods, and mass distribution. The very nature of basic research does not produce immediate returns and this discourages the building industry from financing such a program. Research must be based on new systems and not on the old which merely mitigate and perpetuate the shortcomings of the current building industry.

The Government's position is one of supplementing—not sublimating—the efforts of private enterprise. Since the over-all housing research field is such an immense and complicated problem it is reasonable to believe that no one individual, no one organization, neither the building industry nor the Government alone, can completely solve it. The problem is of such magnitude that the help of all is needed for a solution. To fit our system of private enterprise a Government program of research under the able leadership of Dr. Richard J. Ratcliff, director of research, Housing and Home Finance Agency, could do much to foster a coordinated program for basic research in housing by universities, independent research groups, and other existing not-for-profit organizations. This agency could furnish the incentive and crystallization which are necessary. It should be authorized to undertake such a program to correlate the results of both public and private research and to disseminate the results in such a way as to encourage a modernization of the building industry. Such a research program would supplement rather than duplicate private research efforts. Though it should be undertaken in cooperation with all segments of the home-building industry, basic research should be an independent operation to be assured of the best and unrestricted results. By using the existing and established facilities to carry out the work, we would be assured the fastest, most efficient and most economical solution and at the same time hold to a minimum the criticism of Government participation. Another advantage is that the universities could develop personnel through a teaching program which would integrate theory and first-hand experience. In fact, utilizing the existing established facilities would lessen the amount of criticism, and might be the necessary margin of difference to make an extensive research program possible.

The financing of a program of research of the nature which has been briefly reviewed here will require extensive funds. The Federal request for $3,300,000, most of which will be used for current operations is insignificant. It is not in keeping with the billions in Federal commitments for current housing insurance, guarantees, and subsidies. Large amounts are needed if we are to have a real, broad focusing of the research effort on the manifold aspects of housing.

I hope that through this letter I have made a little clearer the magnitude of the housing-research problem to justify your active support for extensive appropriations and to assure that the program will get the favorable hearing it deserves.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES PRESTINI.

Statehood for Alaska Is Declared Vital for West Coast Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article on Statehood for Alaska, written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Star of March 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA IS DECLARED VITAL FOR WEST COAST DEFENSE—MANY IN AREA BELIEVE UNITED STATES CONSIDERS TERRITORY "EXPENDABLE" WITH WAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Several months have elapsed since an article by Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, in the United States News and World Report, attracted wide attention by its unfavorable report of Alaskan defenses.

So absent-minded are our citizens about Alaska that not long ago a distinguished journalist after visiting northeast Norway described the area as "the only frontier of the Atlantic powers on the Soviet Union," forgetting the frontier on this continent, separated from Soviet Siberia only by a narrow strait.

Recently, in Seattle, an energetic visiting Alaskan told me that many Alaskans believe the United States considers Alaska "expendable" in case of war.

Alaskans are acutely aware that the Territory once belonged to the Russian Empire, whose widest limits Stalin has showed himself determined to restore regardless of how the territories were originally acquired or by what agreements they were subsequently relinquished.

SEMICOLONIAL STATUS

These factors, and others, demand the entrance of the great northern Territory as a full-fledged State into the Union. It is absurd for the United States to support anticolonialism everywhere while retaining a semicolonial status for integral parts of American Territory.

The opposition to Alaskan statehood has come, in the first line, from grasping economic interests who want the Territory as a

privileged market, but not as a producer even for its own needs. It comes, in the second place, from Members of Congress representing populous States who protest against two Senators for a State with only 100,000 inhabitants.

In a letter to the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Paul H. Whitney reminded such congressional critics that some of them represent States which entered the Union with much smaller populations than Alaska's, among them the great States of California, Illinois, and Michigan, and that, all together—apart from the original 13—21 States have been admitted with under 100,000 population.

Senators are United States Senators, and in our history small States have often furnished superior statesmanship. The United States of America is represented in UN by a former Senator from Vermont, whose entire population does not exceed that of a middle-sized city. The present Vermont Senators—GEORGE D. AIKEN and RALPH E. FLANDERS—are among the most respected members of the higher legislative body.

RAPIDLY GROWING AREA

It by no means follows that a community of a million will produce 10 times as many men of brains and virtue as a community of 100,000. Athens produced immortal sages when its population was, in present-day terms, that of a large village. Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and Franklin appeared when the largest American State was a tenth the size of present-day Greater New York City. And if there are now any of their like about, we could certainly use them.

The population of Alaska will stagnate as long as Alaskans have only second-rate citizenship—despite the fact that the Northwest States are the most rapidly growing part of the Union, and the Northwest Passage probably the most important global air route. During the war, the heaviest air traffic was through Edmonton in Canada's Alberta.

But Americans have not been northminded. Many conceive of Alaska as an icebound waste. Alaskan experts, however, insist that it could absorb and support at least 2,000,000 people in areas where the climate is as favorable as in several well-settled States of the Union and Canada.

The neglect of the north may cost us dearly one day. Such neglect is not shared by the Soviets, who rank first in Arctic science. Eskimos, who often have family ties on both sides of the Strait and pass back and forth, have reported greatly increased activity on the Siberian side, near and beyond the frontier.

Finally, it is practically a natural law that no nation, in the long run, holds territory it fails to colonize and develop. Russia became the vast power she is largely by colonization, in which she has had no historical rival. And with growing population pressures, this law is not likely, in the next generations, to fail to operate.

Surplus Potatoes Defeat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, everybody is hearing a lot of talk about the communistic activities in this country and very rarely is any credit given to the American public for their constant vigilance against this terrible menace. During the recent work stoppage in the soft coal mining areas, various communistic-inspired outfits attempted to worm their way into favor of the coal miners. They lost sight of the fact that Americans of the best stock come from the coal-mining areas and I am pleased to report the Commies were unsuccessful in their attempts.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from my secretary in Somerset County, Pa., Mr. Gerald N. Zeigler, pointing out one of the unsuccessful Communist missions in the mining regions of his county. The contents of this letter are self-explanatory and should be read by every Member in this House so that he can see how constant is the vigil of the real American.

WINDBER, PA., *March 5, 1950.*

Hon. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This past week we had a contact with what we believe is a Communist-inspired outfit.

The United Electrical Radio and Machinist Workers Local, No. 418, of East Rutherford, N. J., contacted the local United Mine Workers saying they wished to help the plight of the miners with some financial assistance. The local secretary wrote back and in comes a check for $207.26 to the Eureka Stores to furnish food to the miners.

The letter from local 418 was signed by William Steinman, secretary, and that part of the letterhead which previously showed the CIO label was scratched off.

When the local boys saw what was brewing, they asked the Eureka Stores to return the check as not wanted.

Mr. Finko, the Democratic central committeeman, tells me that some food baskets have come into Central City from the Communist outfit in Pittsburgh. You can readily see the merits of the surplus potato distribution which took the pressure off hungry families and made it unnecessary for them to accept food relief from any of the Communist outfits. Mr. Finko also said he thought there were about 50 Commies in Central City. Mr. Zahurak says that in the Windber local he knows of two.

Mr. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, deserves the gratitude of the American people for his foresight and his American way of combating communism.

As your secretary in Somerset County, I forward you this matter in accordance with your instructions to report all visible communistic activities in this county.

Yours very truly,

G. N. ZEIGLER.

Award to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 11, 1950, the Sidney Hillman Foundation tendered a luncheon to the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, at the Commodore Hotel in New York City. The purpose of the luncheon was to present to Mr. Ewing the foundation's annual award for meritorious public service.

The function was presided over by Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, who is also president of the foundation. His remarks on that occasion, in presenting the award on behalf of the Foundation to Mr. Ewing, were as follows:

Mr. Ewing, honored guest, ladies and gentlemen, once a year, in my capacity as president of the Sidney Hillman Foundation, it becomes my happy duty to introduce to a distinguished audience and to the American people generally, the recipient of the annual Hillman Award for meritorious public service.

A year ago it was my pleasure and honor to introduce the first recipient of this award, Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM, the distinguished United States Senator from North Carolina.

The trustees and directors of the Sidney Hillman Foundation believe that we set a high standard, indeed, by naming Senator GRAHAM as the first to receive our award. The man we name today has also lived and worked in the highest and best tradition of human welfare. I am sure that Sidney Hillman, were he alive today, would approve our choice of Oscar R. Ewing—a fighting liberal.

As you know, the Sidney Hillman Foundation was established, among other purposes, to recognize Americans consecrated to the public welfare. Sidney Hillman's whole life was so dedicated, and the founders of the Hillman awards were determined to carry on in his spirit and to recognize those men and women who felt as he felt concerning the plain people of America—workers, farmers—the professions, and others who have contributed to the greatness of our beloved country.

Sidney Hillman was especially interested, during his public life, in creating opportunities for the dispossessed and disinherited. He was concerned about racial discrimination and the denial of minority rights. He fought for an ever-increasing standard of living and for genuine industrial political democracy. He fought for world peace.

Those of us who were privileged to live and work with Sidney Hillman knew his passionate concern that no man, woman, or child be denied his birthright as a human being.

In honoring Oscar Ewing today with the Hillman award, we acknowledge the acts of a great public servant. As Federal Security Administrator, and before, Mr. Ewing has fought for the underdog. Perhaps, even beyond the call of duty, he has fought for civil rights and FEPC.

He has opposed discrimination in all its forms. He has fought for an adequate housing program and Federal aid to education. He has opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. He is a fearless crusader for the common man.

He has made a determined campaign to extend old-age and survivors insurance to millions of persons not now covered. He has fought for increases in social benefits. He is making a fight to aid unfortunate Americans who do not presently qualify for insurance benefits. Most Americans are in debt to this great public servant for his fight in behalf of comprehensive welfare programs, including public assistance and family welfare services to safeguard mothers and children.

But most of all Oscar Ewing has earned the gratitude of millions of Americans because of his stand in support of national health insurance. Though staunchly supported by millions of neglected Americans suffering from inadequate medical care, he has been the object of bitter, unscrupulous

attacks by organized professional and big-business interests. He has been the principal target of their attacks. He has won, in our eyes, the highest accolade when called by his enemies, the American Medical Association, "Mr. Socialized Medicine" himself.

Of course, it is not socialized medicine. It is nothing of the kind. It is national health insurance, paid for, just as social security is paid for. It destroys the curse of charity and would bring to millions of Americans, not now adequately protected, the latest and best medical aid known to science.

It is for these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, that we honor Oscar Ewing today. He is a public servant in the very best and noblest sense. He has set aside considerations of personal gain. He has devoted his heart and his talents to the greatest good of the greatest number. He is the kind of man we are proud to call an American and a true liberal.

And, so, in recognition of your faithful service to the citizenry of our great country, I present you, Oscar, with the Oscar of the Sidney Hillman Foundation, with our sincere good wishes for your continued good health, and for the ultimate victory of your crusade.

I hand you this medal drawn by a great artist, Mr. Rustolo and this citation which reads:

"The Sidney Hillman Foundation has the honor to present its 1950 award for meritorious public service to the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator. His courageous fight for the Nation's health in the face of powerful opposition; his concern for the widows, the orphans, the sick, the disabled, and the aged; his warm and lively interest in those who toil and make our country great; his enlightened stand on Government's responsibility to its citizens, place Oscar R. Ewing in the forefront of our great public servants and have earned for him the esteem and affection of millions of his countrymen."

From One Great American to Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Sidney Hillman public-service award was presented to a great American and a great Democrat, the Honorable Oscar Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Administration.

A popular magazine recently referred to Mr. Ewing as "Mr. Welfare State himself"; but it is no exaggeration to say that without the profound influence of Sidney Hillman, Oscar Ewing might not, in his lifetime, have had the opportunity of wearing that nomination.

It is certainly fair to say that this award came from one great American to another, from one great democrat to another, and here I use the small "d," for both Sidney Hillman and Oscar Ewing have been noted for democratic qualities which transcend party lines.

Mr. Ewing is the second recipient of this award which was created to perpetuate the memory of Sidney Hillman's achievements and contribution to America; it would be hard to imagine a more perfect choice.

It is my pleasure to insert, under leave, Mr. Ewing's address in receiving the award:

ADDRESS BY OSCAR R. EWING, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

An award for meritorious public service, presented in the name of a great American, Sidney Hillman, is a very rare and precious honor. I am proud to have been chosen to receive this award, and I accept it with genuine emotion.

Every liberal-minded person in this country has, in one way or another, felt the influence of Sidney Hillman's leadership, his idealism, and his intelligent realism. In making this award to me, you are in a sense touching me with the torch of his intense liberalism. You are handing me, not a diploma for past behavior, but a spur to future action—not a compliment but a challenge.

Sidney Hillman himself put this challenge into words. He died less than 4 years ago, in the summer when the infamous Eightieth Congress was playfully engaged in ripping apart the fabric of American progress. But Hillman was not among the weak-kneed. He had not lost faith in the future of America, or in the wisdom of our people. A few weeks before his death, at the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, he said:

"We want a better America, an America that will give its citizens, first of all, a higher and higher standard of living so that no child will cry for food in the midst of plenty.

"We want an America where the inventions of science will be at the disposal of every American family, not merely for the few who can afford them—where it will be possible for all groups, regardless of race, creed, or color, to live in friendship and be real neighbors—an America that will carry forward its great mission of helping other countries to help themselves, not thinking in terms of exploitation, but of creating plenty for all everywhere."

That was the kind of America that Sidney Hillman wanted. It is the kind of America I want. And the only way to approach this ideal is to fight for what we believe in.

It is the fate of the American liberal to be a scrapper. He cannot sit back and say that things are wonderful, so let's go to sleep. Instead, he is spurred by the desire to change things that are bad so as to make them good; to keep pace with the progress of ideas and science; to move forward. Hillman was a great and patriotic American; that is precisely why he wanted America not to stay just as it was at some distant point in past history but to be a better America. Hillman knew that our standard of living was higher than anywhere in the world, but he also knew that some among us were not enjoying the fruits of that high standard. He knew that we had made giant strides in scientific research and development, but he also saw that many among us could not afford to make use of the great inventions of our time. He was familiar with the magnificent American tradition of liberty and equality, but he could not overlook the fact that this tradition has not always been applied to all our citizens, regardless of their color or their faith or their origin.

Sidney Hillman, as a liberal, could not help but be a scrapper. He fought for something real—for the advancement of the workingman, in his own trade and throughout the country; for the emergence of a mature labor movement that would accept its responsibilities for statesmanship in the pattern of our national life; and for the betterment of all America.

These are reasonable goals. But they demand eternal vigilance if they are to be approached; and every one of us who believes in the expanding future of the free world is engaged in the struggle for their achievement. We are in the front lines of politics—as we were in the past under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as we are today under the leadership of Harry S. Truman, as we shall continue to be so long as there is room for improvement in the human condition.

When I accepted the President's invitation to serve as Federal Security Administrator, I knew that I was walking into an exposed salient of the political front line. The Federal Security Agency is the one portion of the executive branch of our Government which deals with people as people—with their health, their education, their social security, their children, their capacity to go into a grocery store or a drug store and feel that what they buy will not harm them. Inevitably, our task is controversial. That is because the well-being of the people is always controversial. I am not afraid of controversy. I like it. It does something to my glands—so long as I am sure I am on the right side of the controversy. My glands have been thriving during the past 2½ years.

There are two kinds of battle lines in America today. One is the line drawn between those who are by inclination and judgment liberals and those who are by inclination and judgment conservatives. It is possible to be a sincere conservative; although as a career it has little to be said for it. Between the honest liberal and the honest conservative there can be worthwhile debate, to the everlasting benefit of the people as a whole. Since 1932, the majority of our people have shown that, when they know the facts, they choose the liberal position.

But they do not always know the facts, because on the second battle line we are confronted, not by facts, but by distortions and half-truths and phoney appeals to emotions. A few weeks ago, the Republicans rallied in Washington, in an attempt to show that they were just plain folks, after all. After great labor, they announced to the country that their issue in 1950 would be "Liberty or Socialism." They would have done better to leave this nonsense in their lunch boxes and to have concentrated on the cold chicken.

What kind of a political slogan is that—"Liberty or Socialism"? Do they mean that only a Republican is dedicated to liberty in America? Do they dare to say that American liberals, who have produced men like Roosevelt and Truman and Hillman, do not know the value of individual liberty, of human dignity, of American freedom?

And as for socialism—at a time when American industry is a hundred times healthier than at any point during the last years of the last Republican administration, these lackwit leaders of reaction presume to raise the scarecrow of socialism.

I do not often give advice to opponents. But, in a spirit of generosity, I urge them to look for something more imaginative, something more positive, something more honest, than so empty a slogan.

Do not misunderstand me. I believe in the clash of ideas. I believe in politics. I think it is a noble profession, and a healthy one. But I believe in the kind of politics that deals in honest ideas. I think we have a right to suspect those who shy away from honest facts and ideas, and resort instead to the strategy of error.

Let me give you an example of what I mean. The American Medical Association is spending $3,000,000 this year to fight the President's plan for national health insurance. The plan itself is a simple one, designed for the sole purpose of removing the financial barrier to adequate medical care in the United States. It would collect a small wage deduction from the earnings of all employed people, which would be matched by an equal contribution from employers—under a system very much like social security. Out of this money would be paid the bills

for medical, hospital, and other care. What it does, in brief, is to make sure that no American would be confronted with bankruptcy if he became seriously ill—because his bills would be paid out of the fund which he himself had helped to create. That is what it does, and that is all it does.

Now, the trade association of the doctors does not like this idea. I am not sure I understand its true reasons for opposing national health insurance, because its expressed reasons make very little sense. I have in my hand an expensively printed little pamphlet, in several colors, which puts the AMA's case. It starts off, "If you value your health—and if you value your liberty—help keep politics out of medicine." Underneath is a full-color reproduction of the well-known painting, The Doctor, by Sir Luke Fildes. It shows a little child lying ill on a bed made from two chairs, in a small and obviously impoverished home. Near the window, the child's mother sits at a table, her head cradled in her arms. Behind stands her husband, with one hand on her shoulder, looking distractedly at his child. Next to the bed sits the doctor. He is leaning forward, with his chin resting on his hand, looking fixedly at his little patient.

When Sir Luke painted this picture, I am certain that he intended to give us the impression of the good family doctor, in the old tradition, whose single concern was to bring the child back to health. But the AMA has put a different interpretation on the painting. In a little box in the upper left-hand corner, like the balloon in the comic strip, the AMA has inserted a slogan—"Keep politics out of this picture." And as a result of the AMA's recent action, most of us are now given the distinct feeling that our good country doctor is not thinking about what he must do to cure his patient, but rather about how he must word his next letter to his Congressman.

In the pamphlet itself I find at least 19 misstatements or misrepresentations. If the doctor in Sir Luke's picture were to practice medicine with the same disregard for painstaking accuracy that the doctor's lobby uses in practicing publicity, the little child would have small chance for survival.

I think it is important, on occasions like this one today to shove to one side the distortions, inaccuracies, lies, and sensationalism, and to return to the bedrock of honest principle. We have no need to be on the defensive. We are proud of our concept of America's destiny.

In our concept, the key to our future lies in the protection and extension of equal opportunity for all our people—opportunity to live, to advance, to think, to achieve. We do not want to hand life on a silver platter to every newborn child in America. Nobody can do that, and it would not be a good thing if it could be done. But we do want to make sure that every person in the United States is given a fair chance: a fair chance at education; a fair chance at health; a fair chance to enjoy his declining years; a fair chance to keep his home together in times of economic distress.

Freedom is meaningless, in our time, unless we can provide this kind of equal opportunity. What you or I may make of these fair chances must depend on ourselves—on our ability, our talent, and our initiative. But what good is ability to the child whose home town is too poor to provide him with adequate schooling? What good is talent if it is smothered by the oppressive burden of paying off debts incurred because of an unexpected serious illness? What good is initiative if it is overwhelmed by fear of an impoverished old age?

These are our new frontiers today. They lie in the human person. This is our new responsibility—to the individual. I believe in the human being. I believe in his infinite capacity to improve, to grow and prosper. I believe that, if he has the equal opportunity to a decent job at a fair wage, to as much education as his ability and his desire may warrant, to adequate medical care when he is sick, to minimum protection against the hazards of old age or economic distress—I believe that if he has these opportunities he will make for himself a greater freedom than has ever before existed. I believe this because I have faith in mankind.

And I will tell you what is wrong with our conservative opponents. The trouble with them is that they do not trust the individual American. They are afraid to provide America with the fruits of the American tradition. They cannot understand that we must use the community machinery which we call government if today we are to guarantee equality of opportunity to all in our complex society. They measure a Federal budget—or a State budget—in terms only of dollars, and they overlook the most important items of all, the items marked humanity and fredom.

Their idea of a better America is that of a left-over America from the last century, before there were corporations and automobiles and atomic piles and any of the vast interconnecting networks of our American economy. They hear the child cry for food, and they say, give him charity—but never, no, never give him the opportunity to enjoy in self-respect the equal opportunity to our country's high standard of living. They wonder at the inventions of science, but they are willing for these inventions to be at the disposal only of the relative few who can afford them. They pay lip service to the concept of American neighborliness and equality, but too often they are ready to team up with the forces that stand for unfair unemployment, discrimination, and segregation.

Why? Because they are afraid. They are afraid of the present, and they are even more afraid of the future.

This is a time when all of us on this planet have good reason to be concerned about the future. We live under the threat of war from an aggressive Communist imperialism. We know that today weapons exist which can annihilate hundreds of thousands in one sudden explosion. We have accepted leadership in a free world where many nations are not yet able to provide their people with the minimum demands of human life anywhere. These are heavy burdens for all of us, and we cannot afford to consider our domestic progress as being separate from them. You and I know that the only protection that makes sense today is what Sidney Hillman stood for.

You and I know—as Sidney Hillman knew—that only those who believe in their fellowmen are equipped to cope with these problems and to fulfill the promise of America. Hillman had unyielding faith in the people of the United States. He lived by that faith, and died by it. You who are gathered here today share that faith. It is my faith as well. And I am proud to accept this award as your challenge to me to help perpetuate the ideals for which a great American lived and died.

Price Supports for Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1950, 18 Members of the House of Representatives addressed a joint letter to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan urging that the support level on hogs after March 31, 1950, be announced at once. Copy of that letter was printed on page 2500 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1950. Under date of March 7, 1950, the Secretary replied to said letter and thereupon 32 Members of the House of Representatives, including those who signed the original letter, dispatched a further communication to Mr. Brannan under date of March 11, 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks, both of these letters are submitted herewith, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: This is in reply to the recent public letter to me which was signed by you and 17 other Congressmen, each of whom will receive a copy of this answer. I disagree with you as to there being confusion among hog producers by reason of the fact that we have not announced a support program for hogs after March 31 of this year. I have assured farmers by public statements that price supports will be continued, even though hogs are no longer in the mandatory category.

However, I concur with your view that the announcement as to level of support should be reached at an early date, and you may rest assured that such a decision will be made as soon as circumstances will permit.

In the meantime, if you have any recommendations as to whether there should be hog-price supports for the coming year or portion thereof and the level of support, either in parity terms or in dollars, I would be happy to receive them.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

MARCH 11, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have at hand your letter of March 7, 1950, in reply to a letter addressed to you on February 24 by 18 Congressmen requesting an early announcement of the support-price level for hogs after termination of the present program on March 31.

Your reply amounted to little more than a proposal that if we "have any recommendations" on the support program you would be happy to receive them.

This attitude on the part of responsible Government officials charged with administering the programs enacted into law by the Congress is becoming increasingly open to question. In your own case, you have repeatedly attempted to pass the buck to Congress on problems which you were appointed by the President of the United States to meet and which the Department of Agriculture is adequately staffed to handle.

The fixing of the support-price level for hogs should not be a matter of guess, hunch, or wishful political thinking. It should be based on information and data gathered from experts in the field with regard to the whole economy.

The Agriculture Department which you head enjoys the following:

A. An appropriation for the current fiscal year of $2,671,000,000.

B. A full-time staff of 59,556 employees and 12,274 part-time employees, or a total of 71,830 people to assist you in arriving at decisions. In addition, there are 137,037 people serving as State and county committeemen either on a per diem basis or at no salary at all, to supply the Department with information. Thus, in all there are 208,867 persons

channeling information into your office on various agricultural problems.

It would appear that you, as Secretary of Agriculture, with a budget of $2,671,000,000, and a staff and field force of 208,867 persons, should be equipped to arrive at decisions on vital agricultural matters promptly, fairly, and without delays that depress the market or otherwise injure agriculture, and without employing the device of pleading helplessness in asking Members of Congress for their recommendations.

Members of Congress are elected to enact laws which members of the executive department, including you as Secretary of Agriculture, are supposed to administer. A member of Congress does well to have an average of three people employed in his office. A member of Congress naturally has many sources of information, but the staff of the entire Congress is no more than a fraction of the staff that you have at your disposal.

Naturally there should be close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, but under the policy of passing the buck to Congress which you are following, the line between "cooperation" and "buck-passing" is becoming far too thin in Government today.

You have attempted to dump the potato problem and the grain storage question in the lap of Congress when you have had ample authority under laws enacted by Congress and under appropriations made by Congress to proceed at all times. Therefore, it would appear desirable in the instance of the support price level for hogs, that you move at the earliest possible moment to make an announcement without further effort to shift responsibility which is yours.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Eighth District of Iowa; ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; KARL M. LECOMPTE, Iowa; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Iowa; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; CHARLES H. ELSTON, Ohio; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; ALBERT M. COLE, Kansas; A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin; GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; THOMAS H. WERDEL, California; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois.

Peat Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the Members of the House of Representatives voted to admit Alaska into the Union as a sovereign State of the United States. For this, the citizens of Alaska are most grateful and we all sincerely hope that the other body of this Congress will not hesitate to uphold this vote. It will mean the achievement of a goal that our Delegates have brought before Congress since 1916 and which the people of Alaska have had in their hearts since Alaska became a Territory of the United States.

During the debate on this bill, many of my friends continually emphasized the importance of Alaska's strategic location as our last frontier and most forward outpost in the North Pacific. But military considerations alone do not make Alaska important to the United States. Of equal importance are our vast expanses of valuable undeveloped natural resources. Neither in agriculture nor in industry have we begun to tap the wealth of resources that wait only to be put to productive use.

As Alaska's political institutions have progressed toward statehood under the tutelage of the United States, so the development of its resources under the tutelage of industrial and agricultural research will make it a State economically secure and prosperous.

Its varied climatic conditions, soils, and land forms have accounted for numberless resources, among them large deposits of various types of peat peculiar to the different regions of Alaska. For this reason, I was happy to see that my friend the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. FRED MARSHALL, has introduced H. R. 7330 to stimulate research and development of peat production and its industrial and agricultural by-products.

Research into the effective and economical production of peat products can mean much to the economic growth of Alaska and to the national security of the United States. Preliminary research has convinced scientists that new products and technological methods can even be of benefit to the fishing and canning industries of Alaska, as well as the establishment of new industries. The development of all of Alaska's resources to their fullest extent will be in the interests of the United States as a whole.

Some research made with Alaska peats by Dr. A. P. Dachnowski-Stokes, Dr. Leopold Pistner, and Dr. Derso Shybekay, registered professional engineers, indicates even in their preliminary surveys that proper utilization of these peat deposits will be a valuable asset to our agriculture and growing commerce. New industries will mean new employment opportunities and an increase of permanent inhabitants in Alaska who will contribute economically, socially, and politically to the growth of their new state.

Only a program of thorough and directed research will show us the number of products that can be derived from our peat. As the members from Minnesota have already pointed out to the House, other countries have outstripped the United States in the utilization of peat and some with remarkable success. Russia, with the world's largest peat resources, has found it not only a source of low-cost fuel but industrial chemicals, building materials, insulations, and fertilizers. And in the United States, it has been used in the production of heat-insulation packing materials and fertilizers.

What other chemicals or uses can be found for the various peat deposits of Alaska, can be determined through further research. Many of the processes which have already undergone laboratory experimentation can be turned into manufacturing practice.

Particularly since I know first-hand the importance of a sound program of developing natural resources in building the economic strength of a Territory or a State, I hope every Member will give serious thought to the proposals made by my colleague in the Committee on Public Lands. I am sure that he will welcome the advice and assistance of all who are concerned with making the best use of every natural resource for the citizens of the United States.

Commercial Natural Gas in Marion County, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to announce that natural gas, in commercial quantities has been found in Marion County, Ala., in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent here.

This discovery was made by Mr. Harry L. Cullet, on a location which he calls No. 1–A Lewis on the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 23, township 11 south, range 14 west, of Huntsville Meridian. It was what is commonly known as a wildcat venture.

The initial gage of the well showed a flow of 620,000 cubic feet of gas per day, through a 20 by 64 inch choke.

According to press reports, Dr. Walter B. Jones, State geologist of Alabama, has stated that this Marion County gas well is the first high quality commercial gas producing well to be completed in Alabama since 1914.

This new gas well is located within a few miles of the enterprising towns of Hamilton, Guin, and Winfield. It is near United States Highways 43 and 78, and Alabama State Highways 118 and 167.

Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that this new commercial gas well is the forerunner of widespread exploration, drilling, and development of the gas resources of Marion County. These resources, when developed, will contribute greatly to the industrial development of the county.

This new gas well is a real addition to the resources of Marion County, which already include wonderful climate, a 50-inch annual rainfall, large deposits of coal, fine farming lands, good hard working people, large timber resources, an excellent highway system, commercial clays and chalks, and large groups of far-sighted people, scattered all over the county who are interested in bringing new industry and enterprise to the county. Interest in better housing, more

paved roads, better schools, and rural telephones is high.

The opening of a new gas field in Marion County will help the county to attain the fine objectives that its citizens have set for it.

Abduction of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 it was my pleasure and honor to attend the eighth national banquet given by the Order of Ahepa here in the city of Washington. This organization is composed of American citizens of Hellenic descent, its purposes being to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America, support of its Constitution, obedience to its laws, and reverence for its history and traditions; to instill in every one of its members a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship and the sacred duties attendant therewith; and to encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields of human endeavor and always to strive for the betterment of society.

The order has many other worthy objects, but from those quoted above we can see that this great organization serves a most useful and worth-while purpose.

The American citizens of Hellenic descent have proven their good citizenship and have contributed much to the intellectual, social, religious, and business life of this Nation. They have set an example that others might well emulate.

The heart of America goes out to the Greek Nation; that brave nation which made such an heroic stand against the Fascists and Nazis and, since the war, against the Communist guerrillas. In this connection I hope that all of you will read a letter written by Mr. Chris Katechis, president, Greek Orthodox Community of Montgomery, and published in the Mongomery Advertiser, Tuesday, February 28, 1950:

EDITOR, THE ADVERTISER:

As president of the Greek Orthodox Community of Montgomery, Ala., and citizen of the United States of America and Montgomery for 30 years, I am constrained to comment on the subject of the kidnaped children.

Thousands of Greek children have been forcibly abducted from their homes. They are being detained in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany.

I visited Greece in 1946, and remained there for a period of 6 months. I saw the situation as it then existed and it has not been remedied. I know from first-hand observation the sorrow and anguish which these Greek mothers and fathers have suffered and endured. Some 28,000 children snatched from their homes and held as hostages by the Soviet Government and its satellites, to be trained, so the Communists hope, to be the fifth columnists of tomorrow.

Why haven't these children been returned to their homes? The answer is: Russia will not give her consent for them to be returned.

If heartaches and tears would bring them back they, long ago, could have returned on a river made navigable by the tears of Greek mothers and fathers. However, grief and sorrow, tears and heartaches, loneliness and homesickness, have little appeal to Russia and her communistic satellite countries.

I appeal to my friends in Montgomery, of every race, creed, and color—Greek, Jew, Catholic, and Protestant—everyone in whose breast beats a heart filled with the love of humanity, of justice, of righteousness, of home, country, and family. I appeal to all my friends everywhere who are appalled at so heinous a crime as that which has been perpetrated on the Greek people, many of whom are kinspeople of Greek-Americans, some of whom live in Montgomery, by Russia and her satellite countries in the kidnaping of these Greek children.

I say to you, friends, please join with me in sending a message to the President of the United States of America—the greatest, most wonderful, and most powerful country in the world today—urging him, as President, to call upon the United Nations to insist on the resolutions which requested the prompt repatriation of these children, and to urge the International Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies to continue their noble efforts toward implementation of the United Nations resolutions pertaining to the return of these Greek children.

The people of Greece cannot stop these crimes. They are powerless to do so; they are suffering the aftermath of an awful war. They must look to humanity in general and especially to Christian America for help in stopping these heinous acts which are so revolting to humanity. They have been loyal to America in the past and will be in the future. Their cup of appreciation would run over if America and the United Nations would say to the Soviet Union and her satellite countries: "Stop those crimes and return those children and we don't mean maybe."

That is the language even a bully understands.

Wire or write the President about this matter, please.

CHRIS KATECHIS,
President, Greek Orthodox Community of Montgomery.

I am sure that the Members of Congress join with Mr. Katechis in demanding that these children be returned to their homeland. We cannot, as a Christian Nation, further tolerate such atrocities.

Poage Answers Star-Telegram Intimation That REA-Financed Cooperatives Are a Drain on Federal Treasury and Pay No Local Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication of the Bob Poage steam plant, which has been erected by the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, Inc., between Temple and Belton in my district. On that occasion, among other things, I said:

I look upon this plant as far more than simply a rather ugly building with some large and strange machinery. I look upon it as far more than just a power plant—more indeed than the source of essential power to light the homes and lighten the work of thousands of men and women throughout central Texas. I look upon it as a concrete emblem of our American way of life. This plant does not represent the Russian idea of state ownership. The Government does not own this plant, nor does it own the great system of transmission lines with which it is connected. The farmers of Texas own those lines and they own this plant. True, they could not have owned them had it not been for the enlightened policy of our Government which seeks to help our people help themselves rather than doing the job itself. The Government provided a source of credit open to power cooperatives and private power companies alike. A source of credit where all who will provide service for rural areas can go and borrow money at the same low interest rates just as banks and railroads can borrow from the RFC.

This has been branded as socialism. I want to believe that those who so brand it are simply uninformed as to our rural electric program. Actually this program is the very antithesis of socialism. This program makes it possible to maintain basic competition in the electric field. I don't mean competition as to who will serve an individual house. I don't mean the kind of competition that involves two sets of wires down every road. I mean basic competition. The kind of competition that makes each producer and distributor know that he must give a satisfactory service at a fair price or see someone else give it. I mean the kind of competition that enables the consumer to always receive the benefits of all technical advancement. I mean the kind of competition that makes monopoly impossible.

The existence of this kind of competition is the distinguishing mark of our American economy. More than any other one thing competition distinguishes our American free enterprise from the foreign type of controlled enterprise where favored instrumentalities, cartels, and outright government monopolies are not only tolerated but even encouraged.

Monopoly inevitably follows the lack of competition. Monopoly characterizes both the communistic and the fascistic systems. Under fascism private interests monopolize industries vital to the welfare of the nation. Under communism the government itself operates similar monopolies. I consider monopoly a dangerous evil in either public or private hands. A generation ago our country approached perilously close to fascism. The great trusts led by the old Standard Oil sought and were fast securing monopolistic control of many of our vital industries. Both our State and our Federal Government acted vigorously. We recognized the truth of and applied the provision of our Texas Constitution which declares that "monopolies are contrary to the genius of a free people and are hereby prohibited."

Our approach in the trust-busting days of Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and R. V. Davidson was essentially negative. We pretty well broke up the threats of 40 years ago, but we did not always assure service for the people. Today the people of the United States demand service in every line. If private industry does not supply it, and at reasonable prices, there is certain to arise a ground swell of public opinion which few legislators could or would resist, demanding that the Government itself provide the desired facilities. Of course, if the Government does provide the services we are, in fact,

traveling down the same road which our British cousins have followed so far with such disappointing results, and we will, in fact, be headed to the same destruction to which the Russian people traveled some years ago. I want to avoid such a course as I know it can only lead to ruin.

On the other hand, when the private power companies said 15 years ago that they had already served practically all the rural customers who were worthy of service; when the private telephone companies said just a year ago that they were adequately meeting the need of rural people for telephones, in spite of the fact that there were less rural phones in the United States in 1940 than there had been 20 years before; when I see and hear of such situations I realize that the only alternative for public ownership and ultimate socialism is to foster and strengthen competition. The American people will never again submit to private monopoly. I don't want to see them simply exchange the ruthlessness of private monopoly for the inefficiency of public monopoly. I consider public monopoly equally as dangerous as the private variety, but I know it is inevitable unless we can offer our people a way of making free enterprise meet their legitimate needs.

This steam plant is a symbol of the determination of our people to follow the road of free enterprise rather than the road to socialism. This steam plant, together with the hydroelectric plants with which it is connected, and with the transmission lines which connect them all, make it possible for the rural people of central and north Texas to supply their own electric needs regardless of the attitude of the private power companies. They make it possible to do this without creating a monopoly of any kind. I therefore look on this plant as of tremendous significance in shaping the course of our economic policies. I look on it as a bulwark for the protection of both the private power interests against nationalization of their industry, and of the public against exploitation at the hands of monopolisitc private interests.

The effect of competition as a factor has been amply illustrated by the expansion of private power companies into rural areas as soon as a competitive agency came into being. Just as the power companies are today serving nearly 2,000,000 rural homes which they had said were unprofitable, so the private telephone companies are daily extending service to thousands of rural homes, even though the first rural telephone loan was just approved last Friday.

Nor need there be any ill feeling between the older private companies and the more recently organized REA-financed cooperatives. Just last week the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op signed a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. for a mutual interchange of power which I believe will work to the decided advantage of both parties. The cooperative happens to need firm power. That is power that they can use at any time any day in the year. The power company has this kind of power but it needs "peaking power"—that is power for a few minutes or a few hours during the peak of demand each day or season. This type of power is especially valuable to the company because if it has to fire an entire steam unit to provide for its power needs for only a 30-minute peak, that power is tremendously expensive. The water at the Morris Sheppard Dam can be turned on and power is immediately available. By using this power the company saves money. By using power from the company's great steam plants around the clock the transmission cooperative saves money. By using each other's transmission lines both systems save money and in the long run the public benefits. This is the basis of the contract recently signed between the cooperative and the company. I think the officials of both are to be congratulated on putting away any feelings of jealousy and working for their mutual benefit and the benefit of the rural people of this great area. I am encouraged to believe that we are seeing the sunrise of a new and better day in industry relations.

Some days later the Fort Worth Star-Telegram published an editorial referring to my speech as follows:

POWER COMPETITION

Congressman W. R. POAGE, of Waco, was the honor guest and principal speaker the other day at the dedication of a new rural electrification power plant on the Leon River between Temple and Belton.

Mr. POAGE was technically correct when he stated that the new plant belongs to the farmers who own the 19 rural-electrification cooperatives which make up the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative. But it is hardly the private-business enterprise which Mr. POAGE's statement might lead some to think it is.

The transmission cooperative did build the plant, but with money supplied by all the taxpaying citizens of the United States through the United States Treasury and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. POAGE also was technically correct when he said power plants such as this provide the kind of competition which makes monopoly impossible and distinguishes American free enterprise from the foreign type of controlled enterprise. Mr. POAGE failed to mention that Government-financed plants such as this also provide the kind of competition that is rather unfair to privately owned power plants which carry their full share of the local, State and national tax burden.

By coincidence the news item carrying Mr. POAGE's remarks at the dedication of the Leon River plant appeared in some editions of the Star-Telegram adjacent to an item about the Texas Electric Service Co.'s annual report having been filed with the city of Fort Worth and the secretary of state at Austin. Among other things the report showed that during 1949 TESCO's city, county, school district, State, and Federal tax bill totaled $4,218,263.

Plants like the one the Waco Congressman helped dedicate provide the kind of competition that makes it difficult for privately owned companies such as TESCO to continue making such tax payments.

I feel that this editorial shows a lack of understanding as to the taxpaying status of all REA financed cooperatives and a similar lack of understanding of the fact that these cooperatives are neither Government owned, nor Government subsidized. On March 8, I addressed the following letter to the editor of the Star-Telegram:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1950.

HON. JAMES M. NORTH,
Editor, Fort Worth Star-Telegram,
Fort Worth, Tex.

DEAR MR. NORTH: A friend has just sent me your recent editorial entitled "Power Competition," but inasmuch as the date of the paper was not shown, I cannot refer to the specific issue. In this editorial you stated that I "failed to mention that Government-financed plants such as this (the Brazos River transmission electric cooperative plant near Belton) also provide the kind of competition that is rather unfair to privately owned power plants which carry their full share of the local, State, and national tax burden."

You did not in so many words state that this plant would not pay its full share of local, State, or national taxes, but I think you will agree that that was the plain implication of the article, particularly in view of the fact that you referred to the tax bill of the Texas Electric Service Co.

I have long been at a loss to understand some of the criticism and attacks that have been made on these farmer-owned, REA-financed, cooperatives. I do not intend any offense, but I have been forced to the conclusion that many of our editors throughout the country are not familiar with the fact that these electric cooperatives do pay taxes on exactly the same basis that the private power companies pay. It is, of course, perfectly true that very few of these cooperatives have reached a point where they have any net income because the very reason for their existence is that they are selling their product and rendering their service at as near cost as it is possible to do.

I recognize, therefore, that you will be able to substantiate the intimation that little, if any, Federal income tax is paid, but certainly little, if any, income tax would be paid by a privately owned industry that was operated on the same profit principle. When it comes to State and local taxes, these cooperatives are subject to exactly the same taxes that any private power company pays.

True, the valuations on their property are fixed by the county commissioners of each county. That is also true of the valuations on the profit-making plants. Some counties have doubtless given their own cooperatives an advantage in the matter of valuations just as many counties give local merchants an advantage in valuations as compared with out-of-town firms, but leaving aside the personal equation which is present in the matter of fixing valuations on all property in every county in the State of Texas, these REA-financed, farmer-owned cooperatives pay exactly the same rate on the valuation of their property to the cities, counties, school districts, and the State as do privately owned profit-making concerns of the same type in the same area.

I think that there have been abuses of the cooperative method of doing business. I think some people have used it to escape proper taxation, but I am afraid that these "shot-gun" attacks on all cooperatives with the intimation that these farmer-owned organizations are escaping local taxes that are being paid by stock companies can only result in extending unwarranted protection to those who have abused the cooperative system. My plea to you, therefore, is the same as I have made to business organizations and to cooperative associations; that we try to determine just where the cooperative form of organization is being abused and to correct the abuses, but at the same time that we carefully avoid any blanket condemnation that might stigmatize the cooperatives that were not guilty of any abuse or special privilege.

Another misunderstanding of equal importance arises from your statement that "The Transmission Cooperative did build the plant but with money supplied by all the tax-paying citizens of the United States through the United States Treasury and the Rural Electrification Administration." Nowhere did you suggest that this money was made available in the form of a loan and that these loans are being repaid with interest and that the record of repayment is far better than any bank in Fort Worth can cite over a comparable period.

Actually, as of December 31, 1949, REA had loaned $1,999,279,707. Of this, $203,346,158.58 had become due and payable. Only $88,872.94 or about two-fifths of 1 percent was delinquent as much as 30 days; $20,714,203.49 of principal and interest, or about 10 percent, had been paid in advance of maturity.

I submit that with such a record of repayments, it is hardly fair to give your readers the impression that the United States Government is footing the bill for the construction of the power plant on the Leon River or for any other farmer-owned cooperative in the United States.

You suggested that this plant helps provide the competition that makes it difficult for privately owned companies. Undoubtedly such plants have made it difficult for privately owned companies to maintain their previously established rate schedule. In fact, when the first steps were taken to organize the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative, Inc., the rural wholesale rate to all the electric cooperatives in north and central Texas was 15 mills. Today it is slightly more than one-third of that amount. Of course, no comparable reduction in rates has occurred in Fort Worth or any other city in this area because the competition that these rural plants and distributing systems have provided is effective in rural areas only.

On the other hand, there were 12,000 rural homes electrified in Texas at the time the Bartlett Rural Electric Cooperative was energized 15 years ago whereas today there are approximately 301,746 rural homes enjoying this service. Most of the power used for these homes is sold either directly or through a local distributing cooperative by the privately owned power companies of Texas. These cooperatives that you condemn as destructive of the privately owned corporations have developed a tremendous market for these very companies.

I think that this record completely justified my statement that these REA-financed cooperatives have provided competition which has been helpful not only to the rural people of Texas, but to the privately owned power companies themselves.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

A Lesson From Chickens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by my good friend, Robert L. Kincaid, president of Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn., appearing in the October 1949 issue of the Lincoln Herald, a publication issued by that fine institution.

This article can be read with profit. It contains a lesson to us of this day and generation when the Government attempts to provide for people who come to believe that Government owes them a living—people who believe that they can get something for nothing.

In this editorial, chickens provide us with a healthy example of the fallacy of indolence. I commend it to the reading of every Member of the House.

CHICKENS THAT SCRATCH
(By Robert L. Kincaid)

Not long ago I was talking with a farm woman about her chickens. She said she was getting about 24 dozen eggs a week from her hens. At 55 cents a dozen, that made a tidy little income without too much outlay of cash for feed. I asked her if she used an incubator to hatch her young chickens, of if she bought them from hatcheries. "Neither," she replied emphatically. She said that chickens raised in brooders were lazy and shiftless, and would wait around all day to be fed.

"But when a hen raises a brood of chickens, she takes them out each morning and teaches them to shift for themselves. She weans them in about 6 weeks, and then they are on their own. You ought to see how these young chickens shift for themselves. After I feed them in the morning they scatter in all directions. They hustle out to the fields and the little patches of woods about the place, and are busy all day long, scratching and rustling. When I call them in the late afternoon they come running. The young pullets grow up into fine healthy hens and make good layers. No, I would not have any of these incubator chicks. They are too lazy and depend too much upon me for their feed."

I came away from my visit with my farm friend deeply impressed. She had learned a valuable lesson. Life can be made too easy even for a chicken.

We hear much these days about the welfare state in which every citizen is guaranteed security from the cradle to the grave. We in America are being lured by such promises of a life of ease and prosperity, regardless of our own efforts. Many of our political leaders seem to think all we need to do to achieve such a Utopia is to set up bureaus in Washington and to dip into the Federal Treasury to equalize benefits for all. It is a laudable goal, but the great danger is that in creating such a welfare state we will destroy the initiative and self-reliance so vitally necessary to a strong nation.

Wealth is created by production. Production comes only from hard work. Every citizen should give an honest day's labor for an honest day's reward. True security can come only to those who work for it and exercise thrift. Too much dependence upon a benevolent government will destroy the very thing which makes us strong. What our country needs is less promise of absolute security without work and more of an overwhelming resurgence of the spirit of self-reliance and personal effort. Only those willing and able who "scratch for a living" can be assured of a decent, comfortable security and the blessings of a happy and contented life.

Our young people have grown up in this universal atmosphere of more favors for less work. Our colleges and universities face a grave problem in training leaders for the next generation. We must reverse the trend, and teach them the dignity of honest labor, and quicken within them the ambition to become producers rather than dependents. That is the primary objective of Lincoln Memorial University.

S. 1411 and H. R. 3942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Wichita Pediatric Society, of Wichita, Kans., is the source of a number of errors of fact with respect to past and projected Government maternal- and infant-care programs. They can be found in a widely circulated appeal for letters to Congress against S. 1411 and H. R. 3942.

I want to take this occasion to correct the errors in this paragraph from that appeal:

A similar measure called emergency maternal infant care that was enacted as a war-emergency measure for the care of the younger children of servicemen only, cost the taxpayers of this country approximately $175,000,000 in the year 1945 alone. Of this sum approximately 60 percent went for administrative purposes only. How does this compare with a business anywhere?

First. The program was not for the children exclusively. Under the program a total of 1,223,000 wives as well as 231,000 sick infants were cared for. They were the wives and children of servicemen in the four lower-pay grades and aviation cadets.

Second. The total cost of the program to taxpayers was $127,000,000, not for 1945 alone, but for the entire period of the program, in effect from April 1943 to June 1949.

Third. The cost for 1945, the year in which the circular claims $175,000,000 was spent, was only $46,000,000. That was the program's peak year. Over-all, the average cost of maternity cases was $92 and sick-infant cases $64.

Fourth. The administrative expenses amounted to 2.3 percent of total expenditures rather than 60 percent. The remaining 97.7 percent was paid by State health departments to hospitals, physicians, and other professionals rendering services to servicemen's wives and infants.

How, I might ask, do these figures compare with business anywhere—if business is what interests you when the health of women and children is involved.

On that subject, I might point out that in 1942, before the EMIC program was in effect, the maternal mortality rate among the group treated was 25.9 per 10,000 live births. By 1948 this had been reduced to 11.7. The infant mortality rate in 1942 was 41.2 per 1,000 live births. By 1948 this had been reduced to 32. Figures are not available for 1949.

All these figures are authentic, compiled by the American Parents Committee, a nonprofit, public-service association. They may be checked in the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency by anyone with the time and interest to do so.

This may seem an isolated example of a bona fide medical group acting on misinformation without checking its sources. Actually, it is just one flagrant incident in a whole series. The advertising hatchet men of the American Medical Association have discarded the fact and logic as weapons belonging to the advocates of better health programs. Bald misstatements of this kind are getting more frequent by the day. This is by way of putting Congressmen on their guard against them.

This happened to be contained in an assault on the school-health program. The others may touch on aid to medical education or research bills or even the social security bill now that the AMA has expressed its opposition to portions of that legislation.

I serve notice that these errors will be brought to the attention of the House whenever and wherever they may be discovered.

S. 1008 Analyzed by Hon. Robert Elliott Freer, Former Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission—This Impartial Analysis Worthy of the Attention of Every Member of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert Elliott Freer, of Ohio, former Chairman and Republican member of the Federal Trade Commission, has made a very fine analysis of S. 1008, as it will come before the House on Tuesday, March 14. A careful reading of this analysis by my colleagues should resolve any doubts they may have as to the deleterious effects S. 1008 will have on our antitrust laws should it be enacted. Mr. Freer's statement, made at the request of the president of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, has, I understand, been mailed to each Member of the House. I trust it will be given careful consideration.. The statement in full follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 8, 1950.*
Re second conference committee report on S. 1008.
Mr. RANKIN P. PECK,
President, National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. PECK: In response to your request, the following brief analysis is submitted of the provisions and probable effects of S. 1008 in the form in which the second conference committee will report it,[1] as indicated by an announcement[2] of the conferees' agreement published in the Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1950:

SECTION 1

Intended apparently to be a legislative declaration of that which the Federal Trade Commission states the present law to be, section 1 would amend section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to legislatively declare the right of sellers to absorb freight in the absence of conspiracy or collusive agreement. The question is whether such legislative declaration is necessary. No decision of the Commission challenges that right, nor can freight absorption, competitively employed, logically be challenged as an unfair method of competition under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. In denying a motion to modify count II of the order in the Rigid Steel Conduit case (D, 4452), the Commission, on July 12, 1949, specifically stated that that order did not prohibit independent as distinguished from collusive use of freight absorption.

While sections 2, 3 and 4 of S. 1008 would amend the Clayton (Robinson-Patman) Act, their inclusion in S. 1008, along with section 1 which would amend the FTC Act, might tend to add to rather than to dissipate any confusion existing as to the status of freight absorption under the latter act.

Additional construction of the new law by FTC and the Court's would be required before the Commission could speak with the assurance it did in its previous statements, as to the legality of individual use of freight absorption under the FTC Act and the illegality thereunder of industry-wide employment of freight absorption (or other geographic system) as a means of matching delivered prices to all customers at any given destination.

SECTION 2

Section 2A would exempt from possible challenge under the Clayton Act the limited-zone method of delivered pricing as well as the one-zone or so-called postage-stamp method.

Dicta in the late Chief Justice Stone's opinion in the *Staley case* (324 U. S. at p. 751) indicates that the postage-stamp method may be exempt without necessity of this amendment.

The test applied by FTC under the Robinson-Patman Act to geographic pricing is injury to competition. In the *Cement case* (333 U. S. 683) it was destruction of competition between sellers; in the *Staley case* (324 U. S. 746) the injury was to those buyers paying phantom freight charges. Section 2B would exempt from challenge under the Clayton Act, freight absorption employed to meet the equally low price of a competitor. What has been said about section 1 and section 2A is applicable here also. If freight absorption is neither collusively employed as a device for eliminating price competition among sellers, nor systematically used to the injury of mill-side purchasers in competition with their more distant competitors, it is not subject to challenge under the Robinson-Patman Act.

SECTION 3

Section 3 apparently would legislatively reverse not only the decision of the United States court of appeals in the *Standard Oil of Indiana case* (173 Fed. (2d) 210), but also the considered judgment of the Seventy-fourth Congress regarding the effect of meeting competition in good faith as a defense to a charge of discrimination injuring competition. In the Standard Oil case, if Standard had only reduced its price in good faith to meet the equally low price of another major oil company the result would have been competition. Standard, however, gave unjustified quantity discounts to four customers and not to several hundred other competing customers. The defense was that other oil companies either had offered to meet or would have met the demands of these four favored customers for a jobber classification and a lower price. The good faith of such a meeting of a lower price might have been a defense, despite the resulting injurious discrimination, under the good-faith proviso of old section 2 of the Clayton Act prior to the 1936 Robinson-Patman amendments; Congress, however, deliberately changed that proviso's status to a procedural status by the Robinson-Patman Act.

Section 2B did not provide that such good-faith lower price would justify an injurious discrimination only that it might serve to rebut the prima facie case made by a mere showing of price differences. Section 3, despite the Carroll amendment, not only might restore this defect in enforcement of the old section 2, but also might add even more difficulties of enforcement than existed in the administration of old section 2. For example, predatory price cutting, a tool of monopoly rather than that of healthy competition, is presently hard to reach because it is defended as a defensive meeting of local competition; under section 3, it might become almost impossible.

SECTION 4

Sections 4A, B, and C provide definitions of some but not all of the new terms employed in sections 1, 2, and 3, and are of importance in appraising the changes wrought in the law by use, in those sections, of the terms which are here defined.

Section 4D provides a definition meriting somewhat greater consideration since it would reverse the United States Supreme Court's decision in the *Morton Salt case* (334 U. S. 37) which interpreted the phrase "effect may be" in the act as meaning "a reasonable possibility." Section 4D's definition is that this phrase shall mean "reasonable probability" of the specified effect.

In practice, the FTC has neither employed the "reasonable possibility" interpretation nor indicated any disposition to do so. Adoption of section 4D, therefore, appears to be a matter of legislative discretion, depending on whether Congress deems it necessary to take positive steps to prevent "possible" rather than "probable" FTC implementation of this Supreme Court interpretation of the term "effect may be."

To fully appraise the changes in substantive law which S. 1008 would produce there is submitted the following brief recitation of the decisions which led to its introduction:

GEOGRAPHICAL PRICING

Uniform delivered pricing systems: In any industry where transportation charges are of real importance, some systematic method of equalizing transportation costs must be employed in determining the laid-down cost of the product to the customer so as to enable each seller to be able to match exactly his delivered-price quotation to a distant customer with those of all his competitors. The key to this geographic-price-matching problem under the FTC Act is collusion. Various systems found to have been collusively used are: (1) Single basing point, involving both phantom-freight and systematic-freight absorption, for example, the *U. S. Steel* (Pittsburgh plus) (U. S. Court of Appeals (3d) Oct. 5, 1948 and *Rigid Steel Conduit* (168 Fed. (2d) 175) cases; (2) multiple-basing point, likewise involving both phantom-freight and systematic-freight absorption, for example, *The Cement Case* (33 U. S. 683); (3) freight equalization, involving systematic-freight absorption and similar to the multiple-basing point except that technically no phantom freight is involved, since every mill is a base, for example, *Milk and Ice Cream Can* (152 Fed. (2d) 478) and *Bond Crown & Cork Cases* (176 Fed. (2d) 974); (4) zone pricing, another variation of the multiple-basing point used to obviate any natural advantage of location from price determination, for example, *Fort Howard Paper* (156 Fed. (2d) 899) (crepe paper) case.

In all of these cases the evidence before FTC has been held by the courts to have established collusion in the maintenance of such geographic-pricing systems contrary to section 5 of the FTC Act. None of the cases forbids individual or competitive employment of freight absorption. It is the fixing of prices by collusion which is held to be

[1] A comprehensive analysis of S. 1008 as reported by the first conference committee (and still applicable except as to sec. 4D) is found at pp. 609–615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1950.

[2] The announcement reads as follows:

"PRICING PRACTICES

"In late session yesterday the conferees on S. 1008 to define application of Federal Trade Commission Act and Clayton Act to certain pricing practices, legalizing the basing-point system in the absence of conspiracy to lessen competition, agreed to file a second conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill, the first conference report having been recommitted by the Senate on January 20, 1950. The second conference report, as approved by conferees last night, reaffirms the action of the first conference committee except in the case of House amendment No. 4, an amendment to section 4 (d) of the bill, to which the Senate conferees receded, accepting the House amendment. The report is not expected to come up in the House until after March 13, with the House acting on the report first."

per se illegal, not the means (system) employed in the particular case, despite intimations in some of the cases that those particular systems were so complex as to warrant a doubt that they could have been employed at all in the absence of the established collusion among the sellers.

The Robinson-Patman Act has sometimes been used by FTC along with section 5 of the FTC Act in basing-point cases. Geographic pricing under the various basing-point systems generally means that customers in different localities are charged different prices which are systematically related to the distance from the controlling base but which bear no relation to the distance from the seller's mill. If these price differences are not shown to injure competition, they do not violate the Robinson-Patman Act. If they do injure competition they are illegal unless justified by the seller. And here it is that the perverse relationship which his price differences bear to his freight costs militates against the seller's successfully claiming that these price differences are not illegal discriminations because justified by differences in cost of delivery (one of the statutory justifications).

PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Just as collusion is the key to the problem under the FTC Act, injury to competition is the key to the price discrimination problem under the Robinson-Patman Act.

Section 2a of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act provides, in pertinent part, "That it shall be unlawful for any person * * * to discriminate in price between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality * * * where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition * * *", excepting, however, by its proviso, "* * * differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery." This condemns price differences not justified by cost differences where the effect is to suppress competition among sellers or to injure competition among competing customers of the discriminating seller. Section 2b recites that a prima facie case is made by the mere showing of a "discrimination in price," but, in its proviso, states that a seller may rebut such a prima facie case "by showing that his lower price * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor. * * *" In several cases, the Commission has found against this defense on the facts. In the Cement case, for example, collusion to avoid competition negatived the good faith of the multiple basing point system of matched prices as a meeting of competition (333 U. S. 683). In the Staley case, the matching of single basing point prices also failed to meet the good faith test (324 U. S. 746, 757). In Standard Oil of Indiana, however, the proof of injury to several hundred retailers of Standard's Red Crown gasoline resulting from Standard's subsidized discrimination practiced through its four so-called wholesalers (all of whom sold Standard's Red Crown gasoline at retail in competition, not with Standard, but with Standard's several hundred other retailers), was considered to counterbalance Standard's defense of good faith meeting competition of other sellers. Section 2b being held to be merely procedural, and not to provide a substantive defense, served only to offset the Commission's prima facie case; and since it did not outweigh the proof of injury to competition, no finding of either good faith or lack of it was found necessary in the case.

As stated by Representative Utterback, "a discrimination is more than a mere difference * * * some relationship * * * between the parties to the discrimination * * * entitles them to equal treatment * * *." The FTC, therefore, proceeds against a sellers' difference in price as an illegal discrimination only where its investigation indicates competition between his buyers or their customers and a "reasonable possibility" of injury thereto, or where, as in count II in the Cement case, it finds the discrimination to be of collusive origin and to result in injury to competition among sellers. Under FTC policy as a practical matter there must be more than a "reasonable possibility" of injury to some level of competition before the Commission will take action.

CONCLUSION

Instead of clarifying the law, enactment of S. 1008 may have the opposite effect. Price fixing is seldom accomplished by formal agreement signed and sealed in the blood. The agreement usually is shown to have existed by reasonable inferences drawn from all the surrounding facts and circumstances, rather than by the introduction in evidence of a written agreement to fix prices. The nub of the controversy over the recent court decisions appears to be whether FTC and the Federal courts should continue to be able to draw a reasonable inference of the collusive agreement to fix prices from the other facts established by direct evidence, such as, for example, the collective efforts of the industry to maintain its price structure. In the Cement case these were summarized by the Supreme Court at page 710 of its opinion, to include "* * * boycotts; discharge of uncooperative employees; organized opposition to * * * new cement plants; selling cement in a recalcitrant price cutter's sales territory at a price so low that the recalcitrant was forced to adhere to the established basing-point prices; discouraging the shipment of cement by truck or barge; and preparing and distributing freight-rate books which provided respondents with similar figures to use as actual or phantom freight factors, thus guaranteeing that their delivered prices (base prices plus freight factors) would be identical on all sales whether made to individual purchasers under open bids or to governmental agencies under sealed bids. * * *"

The Federal Trade Commission has not issued orders against anyone solely or even primarily on the basis of his individually quoting or selling at a price identical to or matched with that of a competitor. In cases where orders have issued they ran against matched prices maintained by collusion and generally were based on some direct evidence of the collusion as well as upon reasonable inferences drawn from the collective efforts of the industry members to effectuate certain programs such as those cited by the Supreme Court in the Cement case.

Whatever the feeling of businessmen generally may be as to whether collusion may continue to be inferred from direct evidence of such collective activities, a part of the business community do not urge S. 1008 on that ground, but on the ground that its enactment would legalize the kind of basing-point selling found illegal as collusive price fixing and in which the injuriously discriminatory geographic prices had the effect of suppressing price competition among sellers.

No case holds freight absorption illegal under the FTC Act in the absence of collusion. Nor can any hold it illegal under the Robinson-Patman Act in the absence of a showing of unjustified injury to competition. Section 1 of S. 1008, in legislatively declaring the legality of freight absorption, attempts to safeguard against a return of the Cement case type of freight absorption maintained by conspiracy.

As pointed out earlier, the results of litigation to test the adequacy or inadequacy of the section 1 safeguard would have to be predicted to appraise the real effectiveness of this effort to safeguard the public against a return of collusive geographic pricing. Delay and uncertainty in the interim, which is predictable, would handicap FTC in enforcement of its orders against continued use of geographic pricing involving freight absorption, previously found to have been maintained by collusion contrary to section 5 and/or to have resulted in unjustified discriminations destructive of competition contrary to the Robinson-Patman Act.

S. 1008 would legislatively reverse not only several decisions of the United States Supreme Court and other Federal courts, but also, insofar as its amendment of section 2B—"good faith"—proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act is concerned, the considered judgment and deliberate action of the Seventy-fourth Congress, taken after full hearings in both Houses, held following submission to the Congress of FTC's chain-store investigation (S. Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess.), showing the destructive effect on competition of price discrimination in favor of large buyers. Such a legislative reversal should be based on a showing of real need for the change rather than the showing of confusion regarding what new pricing methods may legally be substituted for those collusive and injurious geographic systems held illegal in the cases evoking the bill.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT ELLIOTT FREER.

Uncle Sam Refuses To Protect His People Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the conduct of our foreign affairs is so weak and inept that our citizens abroad remain unprotected against detention by the Communists it is time that Secretary Acheson resign his position. This is an act long overdue.

As part of my remarks, I am including an article by United Press which should compel every loyal citizen to hang his head in acknowledgment of a great wrong being committed against fellow citizens abroad. It will take more than feeble whisperings on the part of Mr. Acheson to correct this deplorable situation.

REDS DETAIN UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN CHINA—BUSINESSMEN VIRTUAL HOSTAGES

Chinese Communists are detaining a group of American businessmen as virtual hostages, it was reported today.

The Americans are safe in Shanghai but cannot leave because the Communists will not issue exit visas.

Authoritative sources here said the Communists were detaining the Americans to make sure that American-owned enterprises in China would continue to function.

Americans refused permission to leave were said to include responsible officers of the Shanghai Power Co., the Shanghai Telephone Co., Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., Caltex Oil Co., the Chase National Bank, and the National City Bank of New York.

On previous occasions, China's Communists have detained Americans until they completed payment of dismissal pay to Chinese employees. Under Chinese law, dismissal pay ranges up to 3 months' salary.

Authorities here believed the problem this time was more serious.

The Communists, it was said, want to make sure the American-owned utilities and basic business enterprises keep operating, at least until trained henchmen of the Communists can take over.

ONE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED WANT OUT

About 300 Americans now in Shanghai are trying to leave the Communist-occupied city. Another 1,000 foreigners also asked United States officials to try to arrange transportation for them from Red-held areas.

United States Consul General W. P. McConoughy, Montevalla, Ala., is trying to help all the foreigners he can. But he was described as far from optimistic about getting exit visas for the American businessmen.

The American President Lines, through an arrangement with the State Department, plans to send three or four LST's into Shanghai to evacuate foreigners. Bigger ships cannot be used because Nationalists have mined the major water approaches to Shanghai.

ACHESON PROTESTS

The Nationalists' attempts to blockade Communist-held China have brought United States-Nationalist relations to a dangerous low.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson disclosed yesterday he once again has protested Nationalist attacks on blockade-running American freighters and has received no reply.

Salary and Privileges of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, a survey into the resources and the privileges of President Truman discloses that in addition to being one of the best, if not the best paid man in the world today, he also enjoys services undreamed of by his predecessors.

After taxes of $40,000 are paid on his original $100,000 salary, the President then receives $50,000 which is tax-free. How many other men today have a take-home pay of $110,000 a year?

The President has 42 facilities at his disposal for traveling, vacationing, and entertaining. These include his planes, the *Independence* and the *Sacred Cow*, the yacht *Williamsburg*, naval escort destroyers, a private pullman car, 35 White House automobiles, the Blair House, his vacation house at Key West, Fla., and Shangri-La, the woodland retreat in the Catoctin Mountains of Maryland.

It is estimated that it takes 665 persons to operate these facilities, either full or part time. These include ship crews, plane crews, maintenance forces, pullman staff, Shangri-La staff, White House servants, secret service, police, and auto drivers.

It is also estimated that the salaries of these 665 persons come to $1,491,540 a year. The original cost of the President's facilities—yacht, planes, private car, automobiles, and so forth—is placed at $30,433,000.

The White House travel bill for 1949 was $33,896, and $40,000 has been appropriated for 1950. Airplane travel cost is not included in this bill. It is charged to the Air Force, which maintains the planes.

The yacht *Williamsburg* has a crew of 100 men paid by the Navy. The yacht is also maintained by the Navy. It is estimated that if the *Williamsburg* was owned by a private citizen, it would take $225,000 a year to operate it. The crew costs alone are $190,000 annually.

The President's personal plane, the *Independence*, was built in 1947 at a cost of $1,133,000. It is a de luxe DC–6. It is operated by the Air Force and all its costs are assumed by the Air Force. The *Independence* has a crew of 8, drawing more than $3,000 a month in salaries and allowances. Four enlisted men draw $75 to $165 a month, plus allowances to keep the plane under a 24-hour guard. It is one of a few planes cared for by a maintenance crew of 56 men. Every hour in the air requires 3 man-hours of maintenance. Total crew costs are about $120,000 a year.

The President's other plane, the *Sacred Cow*, is a C–54, and has all the conveniences of the newer *Independence*—kitchen, refrigerator, sleeping quarters, and a built-in elevator. On long flights over water a crew of 8 is required, a crew of 4 for land flights.

Construction cost of the President's private railroad car is placed between $250,000 and $350,000. It is equipped with radio, telephone, private bedrooms, kitchen, dining room, and shower. A steward and two mess boys from the *Williamsburg* man the dining room and provide other services.

There is another White House railroad car which is attached to the Pullman on Presidential train trips. This is a specially built radio car, equipped by the Signal Corps with all the latest communication facilities.

When the President cruises in the *Williamsburg*, a Navy destroyer accompanies the White House yacht. The Navy says the average destroyer costs $876,000 a year to operate and has a crew of 10 officers and 247 men.

Twenty-five secret-service men protect the President. Their salary is $109,200 a year. In addition there is a special force of 107 White House police at a cost of $350,000 annually.

At Key West, the President occupies what once was the residence of the admiral in charge of the wartime facilities at that post. The *Williamsburg* is also used to house White House guests and personnel when the President is in Florida.

Shangri-La, the Maryland retreat, is a hide-out 70 miles from Washington and is guarded, when the President is in residence, by the Marines, 4 officers and 57 men who are on call for duty there. Shangri-La is maintained and administered by the White House.

When the President visits Shangri-La, cooks, waiters, and mess boys from the *Williamsburg* provide the servant staff.

At the White House itself there are 61 employees costing $150,000 a year. These include 6 engineers, 6 carpenters, a painter, 4 electricians, 8 gardeners, 3 plumbers, 3 laborers, a storekeeper, messengers, a housekeeper, 5 butlers, 7 cooks, 4 doormen, 7 housemen, and 4 maids.

The White House is getting a fleet of 10 new cars, including the specially built limousine, which can be entered while wearing a top hat, and which has gold plated doorhandles, vanities, and perfume cases.

In addition to the 10-car luxury fleet, there are between 20 and 25 other White House cars with 30 chauffers to drive them. Drivers salaries run to $90,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, on top of all this, President Truman has the biggest and best paid staff of any Chief Executive. Mr. Truman's staff consists of about 225 persons and the White House salary list is $998,254 a year.

By comparison, President Roosevelt, in 1945, had a staff of 53, costing $256,431, and President Hoover's staff totaled 37 at a salary bill of $127,200.

The President has three top secretaries, a special counsel, five administrative assistants, and three high-ranking armed service aides, and a personal physician, an Army general.

The secretaries to the Presidents once walked to work, but they now arrive in White House cars. And their role and function has changed over the years. Originally occupied with clerical duties they now have turned to policy making.

A private citizen, to match the standard of living now enjoyed by the President, would need an income of between $3,000,000 and $3,500,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should agree that economy in every walk of life is a most admirable thing. In these days of wild-eyed and reckless public spending for almost every conceivable thing, good or bad, it is my opinion that those in high office should be the first to set an example for the people throughout the country. The above facts disclose beyond peradventure that economy has become a lost art in the highest office of the land.

Labor Leaders and Politicians Pay Lip Service to FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Negro Labor News of February 25, 1950, of Houston, Tex., calls the turn on the racketeers who have been exploiting the Negro vote in this country. I am including this front page editorial by Mr. C. W. Rice at this point in the RECORD.

AS I SEE IT—LIP SERVICE TO FEPC—LABOR LEADERS AND POLITICIANS GIVING LIP SERVICE TO FEPC TO HOLD NEGRO MEMBERS AND GET THEIR VOTES

(By C. W. Rice)

As I see it, one of the most notorious deceptions ever worked on the Negro race since the carpet-bagger era, when the northern politicians promised every Negro exslave 40 acres of land and a mule, is being pulled now

by politicians and union-labor leaders who make the Negro believe they want and are working to get the fair employment practice law enacted.

Any student of organized labor can readily see that it will be paradoxical for labor unions to go all out for a law that would transfer the hiring hall from the labor unions to government control in Washington.

For the past 18 years, labor unions have fought to control the government rather than to have the government control them. They dictated to the government and private industries as to whom to hire and fire during the dark and dismal days of the World War. During this time, we had every type of a strike to force labor's demand—the sit-down strike, the lay-down strike, strike to make employers collect dues, the strike over what tools to use, and even a strike over whether a worker should drink milk out of a glass or bottle, and yet, there was not a single strike to my knowledge called by labor unions to force the employment of Negroes where they were not employed.

The unions did not call a strike to force any industries to up-grade Negro workers. There is, however, a record of labor unions in Houston taking a strike vote which resulted in a vote of 8–2 to call a strike if the company would comply to a wartime FEPC directive order to upgrade Negroes from ditch diggers and other common laborers to truck drivers.

As I see it, Negro leaders who are leading the fight for the passage of an FEPC and at the same time, campaigning for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, are either uninformed or playing politics at the expense of the Negro working classes.

The greatest handicap of Negroes in getting fair employment on the basis of skill and ability, has come from organized labor itself, which either by written or unwritten laws and labor-union customs or traditions, barred Negroes from both the labor union and the job.

Despite the 18 years of New Deal and Fair Deal talk at Washington, with labor unions riding high, wide, and handsome, there are still reported to be 26 national and international labor unions that bar Negroes from the unions that control the best-paying jobs in America. This practice, on the part of labor unions operating in the North and South, has been more destructive and discouraging to the progress of the Negro worker than any other evils practiced in the country on account of race.

As I see it, the Taft-Hartley law which has so many Negro leaders, labor-union officials, and professional politicians squawking for its repeal provides for the right to work. Under this law, no longer can a worker be discharged for not joining a union. The anti-closed-shop provision of the Taft-Hartley law guarantees every person his God-given right to work and make an honest living regardless of race, creed, or color.

It is obvious that this provision of the Taft-Hartley law offers the Negro worker stronger protection as a group than the proposed FEPC, while the FEPC seeks to protect minority groups. The unions generally single out the Negro for discrimination.

What the union politicians claim to be asking the Government to do in the FEPC can be done in convention assembly. A weak FEPC as now operating in New York and Chicago offers little or no job security to Negro workers.

As I see it, the Senate should consider the right to work amendment to the FEPC bill now being proposed by Senator McCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas.

Senator McCLELLAN said he is working on an amendment that would also make it illegal to discriminate "because of membership or nonmembership in a labor union."

S. 1008 Threat to Robinson-Patman Act Cited by Original Sponsors—Spokesman for United States Wholesale Grocers' Association Warns Against Weakening Effect of S. 1008—Claims S. 1008 Is a Subterfuge "To Gloss or Conceal the Lethal Stabbing of Antitrust Laws"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association was one of the original sponsors and supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act. This group of small-business men worked day and night to throw back the forces which would have perpetuated cutthroat pricing, price discrimination, and restraints of trade by the giant chain-store systems of our country.

This group of small-business men has been in the forefront of the fight to prevent the passage of S. 1008. At the convention recently held in Cincinnati, this fight was continued. An article by Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce on March 10, points up many of the dangers which will confront small business if S. 1008 is enacted into law. I commend to the Members of the House a careful reading of Mr. Smith's article, which follows in full:

WHOLESALERS' GROUP SEEKS CLOSER PROCESSOR ACCORDS

(By Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive vice president, United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.)

Wholesaler-manufacturer conferences will be an increasing important part of the annual conventions and mid-year meetings sponsored by the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.

Working as a team, wholesalers and manufacturers will put into operation programs to aid retail grocers in better merchandising.

It is timely that we think soberly and act wisely—but get in there and pitch.

These are momentous times for all factors in the food and grocery trade.

Wartime scarcities and the sellers' market have given way to abundant supplies and even surpluses in many items.

TO FIGHT CHISELING

The past 14 years, under the Robinson-Patman Act, has placed the emphasis on efficient operations and good merchandising rather than chiseling in buying. As an association, we will continue our fight to keep it that way, strive to strengthen the law and oppose emasculating amendments.

The past is not where we are going to live. It is the responsibility of USWGA to help independent wholesale grocers and their retail grocery customers improve their position in their markets, assuring a stable future for the trade.

It is the responsibility of every member of the trade to support the efforts of USWGA in maintaining the American way of free enterprise. We must make certain that the protecting antimonopoly laws are not rendered ineffective since that would only lead us to a choice between private monopoly and Government monopoly.

UNITED APPROACH URGED

There will always be some difference of views, no matter how small a group may be. But, we believe that a united approach to the problems with manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, working together with confidence and integrity is the answer and will develop the aristocracy of service.

We have a great responsibility in that the biggest part of the family budget goes for food and other grocery items.

Before the Robinson-Patman Act large buying groups, such as national chains, sprang up and flourished on the tremendous extras they were able to wring out of their suppliers through their coercive pressure tactics. They also developed improved techniques of warehousing and merchandising.

Today, there are outstanding examples, among independent wholesale grocers, of the awakening in the trade.

Many big operators view with alarm their rapidly dwindling advantages when they realize the full meaning of wholesale grocers like Charlie Ragland, Tom Harrison, Bob Goff, Clem Kreckler, Van Salley, and a host of others.

How can the octopus organization hire enough top-flight warehouse executive personnel and retail store management to effectively compete with wide-awake owner-operated wholesale and retail grocery firms? The answer is plainly, they cannot compete with wide-awake independent wholesale grocers and retail grocers so long as the antitrust laws are strong enough to outlaw chiseling in buying. Therefore, they seek to drive a wedge into the antitrust laws or wreck the Robinson-Patman Act with the hope of personal advantage.

LEGAL SAFEGUARDS

Thrown into high light during the past year is the life or death necessity of the wholesaler and retailer maintaining unimpaired, the legal safeguards against price and other discrimination in favor of the big mass-buying organizations—safeguards that they attained at great expenditure of time, thought, and effort.

Insidious attacks have been made on the Robinson-Patman Act by forces which, to serve their own interests, would break down the prohibitions against unfair practices and restraints of trade.

Independent business, to too large an extent, has not realized the seriousness of these threats to its welfare. Seemingly, there has been forgetfulness of the conditions that prevailed prior to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act—a time when one large chain system alone was receiving concessions amounting annually to $8,000,000 ($6,000,000 in extra quantity discounts and advertising allowances and $2,000,000 in brokerage fees)—concessions that the independent operator received not at all, or in very minor amounts.

MONOPOLY THREAT

Had the Robinson-Patman Act not stopped this racket run wild of advantages, exacted from manufacturers by concentrated purchasing power, grocery distribution would today be in the hands of a comparatively few large concerns, which might not include some independents who are now disposed to quibble over the dangers represented by S. 1008, the basing-point bill, and S. 2190, the brokerage raiding bill, and who delude themselves with thinking a few crumbs of benefit will come to them from enactment of these measures. They might indeed get the crumbs, but the chains and other big buyers would get the cake and the topping, too.

Truly no amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act, and the other antitrust laws, should be considered or approved which does not strengthen those statutes, and any amendment that weakens or confuses the language, provisions, or enforcement of those laws should be flatly and definitely rejected. No plea or subterfuge of clarification should be allowed to gloss or conceal the lethal stabbing of these protective measures. Obtaining the Robinson-Patman Act was hard bought. Any slicing of its effectiveness should be hard fought.

Red Professors in Our Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Communists have mysterious ways their wonders to perform. One of those ways is to subsidize college professors throughout the United States to spread their communistic doctrines through the student bodies of America.

Several days ago, I pointed out that one Harlow Shapley, a Red professor in Harvard University, is going to try to dictate the appointments of members of the so-called Science Foundation in the event it is created. At this point, I am inserting a statement I received from the Committee on Un-American Activities showing the Communist-front organizations with which "Dr." Harlow Shapley has been affiliated.

The matter referred to follows:

[Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U. S. House of Representatives]

MARCH 1, 1950.

For: Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN.
Subject: Harlow Shapley.

A search of the public records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has revealed the following information concerning Harlow Shapley:

A letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated September 22, 1939, lists the name of Harlow Shapley as a member of the national committee of that organization. He signed the organization's open letter, setting forth a five-point program to aid refugees, which was sent to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. (See Daily Worker, July 25, 1940, p. 2.) Letterheads of the organization dated January 17, 1940, and May 26, 1940, list him as a member of the executive committee.

In 1942 the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found that "in recent years no other organization has been more clearly stamped as a Communist front" as the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. (Report of the special committee, dated June 25, 1942, p. 13.) Again, in 1944, the special committee cited the organization as a Communist front which has defended Communist teachers. (Rept. 1311 of the special committee, dated March 29, 1944.)

A folder of the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder, issued in 1942, names Harlow Shapley as one of the prominent Americans who favored Presidential clemency for the release of Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States. "When Earl Browder was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder." (Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, p. 6.) The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder had previously been cited as a Communist organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.)

Harlow Shapley has been affiliated with the Council for Pan American Democracy as one of those who signed the open letter which that organization prepared and sent to the President of Brazil to save Luis Carlos Prestes, Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International. The list of signers appeared in the December 3, 1940, issue of New Masses (p. 29). The Council for Pan American Democracy, also known as the Conference for Pan American Democracy, has been cited as a Communist front in two reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Report of June 25, 1942, p. 18; and report of March 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164.)

The Council (or Conference) for Pan American Democracy has also been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See press release of June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948.)

The affiliation of Harlow Shapley with the League of American Writers is shown in the Daily Worker of July 31, 1940 (p. 7), which reveals that he was one of those who signed the League's open letter to Secretary of State Hull and the Pan-American Conference. The League of American Writers was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle found that the league was "founded under Communist auspices in 1945. The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686.) The League of American Writers has also been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See press releases of the United States Civil Service Commission dated June 1, and September 21, 1948.)

Harlow Shapley was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, as shown on a letterhead of that organization dated February 15, 1940. The Daily Worker of May 13, 1940 (pp. 1 and 5), disclosed that he was one of those who signed an open letter issued by that organization in support of one of its policies. The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102).

According to the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 3), Harlow Shapley was one of the signers of a statement issued by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which hailed the War Department order on Commissions for Communists. This organization was cited as a Communist-front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of June 25, 1942 (p. 20), and again in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50). Attorney General Biddle characterized the organization as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has also been cited as "subversive and Communist" by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See press releases of the United States Civil Service Commission dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.)

Harlow Shapley was one of those who signed the New Masses letter to the President, as shown in the April 2, 1940, issue of New Masses (p. 21). Both the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and Attorney General Francis Biddle have cited New Masses as the weekly organ of the Communist Party. (See committee reports of June 25, 1942, p. 4, and March 29, 1944, p. 48; and Attorney General Biddle's citation which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942, p. 7688.)

A telegram which was prepared by the New York Conference on Inalienable Rights and sent to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers' Union, defendants, was signed by Harlow Shapley. (See Daily Worker of September 17, 1940, p. 1). The New York Conference for Inalienable Rights was named as a Communist-front organization in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149).

A letterhead of the Spanish refugee appeal of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee, dated February 26, 1946, lists the name of Harlow Shapley as one of the national sponsors of that organization. An invitation to a dinner in New York City, March 31, 1948, listed Harlow Shapley as cochairman of the national reception committee for Mme. Irene Joliet-Curie, in this country for the purpose of making a speaking tour under the auspices of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee. A letterhead of the organization dated April 28, 1949, still carried the name of Harlow Shapley as a sponsor.

The joint anti-Fascist refugee committee was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174). The organization was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. (See lists released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). On March 29, 1946, the chairman of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee, and on April 16, 1946, members of the executive board of the organization, were cited for contempt of Congress for refusal to testify and produce records subpenaed by a congressional committee. All were convicted in the District of Columbia courts on June 27, 1947.

Harlow Shapley spoke at a meeting of the Brooklyn Chapter of the Congress of American Women, as shown in the Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker) for September 28, 1947, Attorney General Tom Clark cited the Congress of American Women as subversive and Communist on lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948.) The Congress was the subject of a special report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 23, 1949, in which it was stated that "the Congress of American Women is an affiliate of the Women's International Democratic Federation, which was founded and supported at all times by the international Communist movement. The purpose of these organizations is not to deal primarily with women's problems, as such, but rather to serve as a specialized arm of Soviet political warfare in the current peace campaign to disarm and demobilize the United States and democratic nations generally, in order to render them helpless in the face of the Communist drive for world conquest." (Report on the Congress of American Women, Committee on Un-American Activities, October 23, 1949, p. 1).

Harlow Shapley was one of those who signed a statement in defense of Gerhart

Eisler, which statement was printed in the Communist Daily Worker of June 28, 1947 (p. 6). On February 6, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities held public hearings concerning Gerhart Eisler, at which time Eisler was revealed to be an international Communist agent directing Communist activities in this country.

The Worker of April 13, 1947 (p. 3M), reprinted a speech which had been delivered by Harlow Shapley. The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Communist Party's official organ, the Daily Worker.

Harlow Shapley was one of the sponsors of the Bill of Rights Conference of the Civil Rights Congress, held in New York City July 16–17, 1949 (see Call to the Conference, p. 4; and Daily Worker June 17, 1949, p. 5).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); it is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it." (Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19.) Attorney Gen. Tom Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist on lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.)

Harlow Shapley was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, held in New York City March 25–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. (See Conference Program, p. 13; and Conference Call); he was chairman of the program committee of the conference (Conference Program, p. 3); and also chairman of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (letterhead received January 1949.)

"Parading under the imposing title of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, the gathering at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations." (From a Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released by the Committee on Un-American Activities April 19, 1949, p. 1.)

An interview with Dr. Harlow Shapley by Abraham Chapman was reported in the March (1949) issue of Fraternal Outlook. Mr. Chapman relates that "no gathering of artists and scientists has aroused as much interest as this conference (Cultural and Scientific Conference * * *). The United States State Department issued a statement criticizing the conference in advance of its deliberations. Most American newspapers featured a wide assortment of attacks on the conference. To ascertain the true character, scope, and purpose of this unprecedented gathering, I interviewed Professor Shapley (chairman) * * * on the eve of the conference. * * * Professor Shapley personifies the highest achievements of American science. Born in Missouri and educated at the University of Missouri and Princeton University, he rose rapidly in his field, attaining degrees and honorary degrees from many universities here and abroad. From 1914 to 1921 he was astronomer at the Mount Wilson Observatory in California, and in 1921, while still a young man in his thirties, he was appointed director of the Harvard Observatory, a post he holds with distinction. He is a past president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and has won awards and honorary degrees for his research and scientific work from universities and scientific bodies all over the world. He is without question one of the world's top-ranking scientists."

Fraternal Outlook is the official publication of the International Workers Order, "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). The organization has also been cited several times by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports of January 3, 1939, March 29, 1944, January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942); it was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark (see press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to permit this spread of communism through our educational institutions to continue, then God save America.

American Give-Away Mania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a very excellent article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, which appears in the current issue of Newsweek. I commend it to all Members as it relates to the ECA bill which will soon be under consideration by the House. It is time that some common sense be used in the further expenditure of taxpayers' dollars that we do not have. Reckless spending is the order of the day under Truman's New Deal "Fair Deal" program. This "Deal" is fair to everybody but the American people.

THE AMERICAN GIVE-AWAY MANIA
(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration is now possessed with a mania for "lending" or giving away the American taxpayer's money to any foreign government that it can coax into taking it. This mania grows by what it feeds on. The Marshall plan is only one channel for it. In addition there are the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the International Fund, the arms aid program, and the proposed global catch-all, point 4. Our foreign policy can almost be summed up in four words: "Give 'em more money."

If none of these Government hand-outs had been devised, Europeans would still have had great need for American capital. They would have had to apply for private loans. And they could have got these only by restoring the confidence of American private investors. It is not difficult to specify the reforms they would have had to make to inspire such confidence:

1. They would have had to assure anybody who put money into Europe that he could get it out again. This means that they would have had to make their own currencies freely convertible into dollars. They could have done this simply by dismantling their wartime exchange control.

2. They would have had to assure foreigners holding pounds, francs, or lire that these currencies would not depreciate. This means that they would have had to halt monetary inflation. To do this they would have had to return to balanced budgets.

3. To return to balanced budgets European governments would have had to give up nationalization, which has meant huge deficits in the nationalized industries. They would have had to reduce to manageable dimensions food subsidies and overgrown relief and social-security programs.

4. They would have had to stop threatening still further nationalization, expropriation, and seizure.

5. They would have had to relax or abandon controls over wages, prices, interest rates, and profits.

6. They would have had to reduce excessive taxation.

If Europe had been obliged to attract private capital, such reforms would already have gone far farther than they have. They would have brought not only far more production, but the freer and more balanced trade, the currency convertibility, the multilateralism, and the integration for which our ECA officials have made futile exhortations. The reason for their futility is clear. As long as foreign governments can pick up easy money from our own Government they don't have to make these reforms.

As a result European recovery has not only been slow and precarious, but the recovery that has taken place has been in the wrong direction. Production indexes have gone up; but the added production is not primarily for export, as it should be, but for home consumption. So foreign trade is still unbalanced, and Europe's self-induced dollar shortage remains.

The dilemma of the Marshall plan and of point 4, the dilemma of every government-to-government hand-out, is plain. If our Government imposes no conditions on its hand-out, the money is worse than wasted. If it does impose conditions, they provoke foreign resentment.

Our ECA officials vacillate between the horns of this dilemma. First they say that they won't interfere in the internal affairs of these countries. Then, of course, the European governments getting our aid make in return none of the economic reforms so desperately needed. The British bureaucrats repay us by discriminating against American motion pictures and American oil companies. The French repay us by threatening the sale of Coca-Cola. Then our ECA officials talk of getting tough. But when it comes to a show-down they cannot risk insisting on reforms that would be really effective. So we end by subsidizing foreign-government discrimination against our own industries.

In short, Government loan and gift programs like the Marshall plan and point 4 do not promote world recovery; they retard it. We are subsidizing and prolonging statism and socialism abroad, and imperiling our own free-enterprise system to do it.

Statement of S. Abbot Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Mr. S. Abbot Smith, president of the Thomas Strahan Co., Chelsea, Mass., before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 28, 1950. I believe this statement to be worthy of the serious consideration of the Members of the Congress as he is speaking in behalf of small business.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is S. Abbot Smith. I am president of Thomas Strahan Co., a small company manufacturing fine wallpapers in Chelsea, Mass. I am also a director of the

Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., and a member of their committee on taxation.

The first objective of any tax bill is to raise the revenue needed but how it is done may produce very different results. We might girdle a maple tree when collecting sap in the spring, which would produce a lot of sap once, but never again. We don't girdle it, but tap the tree to obtain the sap and not injure its growth. Likewise with taxes, we want to obtain the revenue but at the same time want to keep business and employment expanding with consequent growth in Treasury revenues.

Taxation is at the root of one of the most important problems of all business, especially small business, namely, the lack of long-term and equity capital financing. Consequently, if we can improve the tax situation we may be able to so help small business that some of the suggested legislative remedies may be unnecessary.

If small businesses were able to retain a larger part of their profits, they would to that extent be able to plow back those earnings, thus lessening the need for that outside financing which is so difficult to obtain for growth and expansion.

With that end in mind, Congressman PHILBIN last April at the request of Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., introduced a bill, H. R. 4431, which would exempt from Federal income tax the first $25,000 of corporate income. This exemption would apply to all corporations but it would of course be of more importance to small businesses than to large ones.

Another provision of this same bill would eliminate the so-called notch rates on corporate income between $25,000 and $50,000. I am glad to see that the Treasury recognizes the injustice of those higher rates and also recommends their elimination.

This bill if passed would enable more small businesses to grow and expand by plowing back earnings, thus creating more jobs, more buying power and so directly increased revenue for the Treasury. Another result would be that as these small companies are thus strengthened it would be easier for them to obtain short-term financing at once. In the long run, too, it is probable that investors would look upon them more favorably when it came to supplying equity capital.

It is also encouraging to see that the Treasury proposes the reduction of certain excise taxes, especially those on transportation of property and persons. Obviously, they are treated as a part of cost by each processor and so pyramid rapidly, raising costs and hence prices to the ultimate consumer way out of proportion to the tax itself.

Small businesses are especially hurt by these taxes. Since many of them were imposed or raised as a war measure to discourage the use of the materials and services, not primarily to raise revenue, they should be eliminated now when the need is to encourage business and the use of those same materials and services, thus creating more jobs and raising incomes.

The Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., has for some time pointed out the injustice of allowing competing businesses to be tax-exempt just because they are owned by educational, charitable, or cooperative institutions. This exemption not only gives them an unfair advantage as competitors but whatever tax burden they escape must be shifted to the shoulders of those who do pay taxes. We believe, therefore, that if the earnings of cooperatives are retained in the business for business purposes they should pay the same taxes as those with whom they are competing. We believe also that businesses run or owned by charitable and educational institutions but not directly connected with their main purposes should likewise pay the same taxes as their competitors.

We applaud the Treasury suggestion of a 5-year carry-over and 1-year carry-back of earnings. Our association has for some time stressed the fact that the income of small businesses fluctuates much more widely from year to year than does that of big companies, so a provision of this kind is essential to iron out somewhat the peaks and valleys.

Believing as we do that the health and prosperity of small business have a major influence on the strength of the economy of the United States and on the revenues of the Treasury, we strongly urge that your committee give consideration to several other points not yet touched on. One is flexible depreciation rates so that businesses may charge off their equipment as best suits their interest and thus stimulate capital expenditures and growth. This would be of especial value to small businesses. No more than 100 percent could be charged off anyway, the companies would have better up-to-date equipment, the Treasury would gain ultimately from healthier businesses, the public from better products and services at lower prices.

We believe, too, that some steps, even though necessarily small now, should be taken toward the reduction and eventual elimination of the double tax on dividends. Only in this way can we start to loosen up the flow of equity capital which alone can keep business expanding and the standard of living constantly rising in our free enterprise economy.

It is perhaps outside our discussion today but I should like to remind you, gentlemen, that our Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., feels strongly it would be most helpful to all business to eliminate the present tax exemptions accorded State and municipal bonds. Not only does being able to borrow so easily encourage unnecessary spending and extravagance but, more important, we feel those bonds are a haven for capital which would otherwise be invested in industry where it would be put to work expanding our whole economy, i. e., those bonds are draining off potential equity capital badly needed by business.

Finally, gentlemen, when writing the new tax bill, please make it as simple and clear as possible and direct the Treasury to make their forms simple and clear also. That alone would be a boon to small business.

I recognize that in this statement, I have outlined several proposals which would at the moment decrease Treasury income, while making only two which would produce an immediate increase. However, we small-business men are hopeful that governmental expenditures can and will be reduced at every possible point by the firm determination of top operating officials like Secretary of Defense Johnson, and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. We read that plugging tax loopholes will also produce more income and better enforcement of present tax laws.

In the final analysis, however, we must all remember that the bulk of our revenue comes from business. Oppressive taxes retard business, may kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. As a practical matter, just as a mountain climber can carry a heavier pack farther and longer if it is well adjusted, so business can pay more to the Treasury if the revenues are raised through a system of taxation carefully devised to hinder its growth and expansion as little as possible. Lower rates with large volume will produce more than high rates and low volume and will provide more jobs, too.

The present tax structure bears too heavily on small business, both directly and indirectly. Did you ever stop to think how many thousand more employees the Treasury would have to hire if we businessmen did not collect so many of their taxes for them—and without recompense? (To be sure, the cost goes into general expense and is charged off before taxes, but what about the company which makes no profit? The expense of collecting those taxes comes right out of that chap's pocket.)

When 1 big company with 2,300 employees is about to shut down, everybody scurries around trying to help it continue in business. On the other hand, if a hundred small companies with 23 employees each were to shut down it would cause scarcely a ripple. Small-business failures are on the increase.

Our tax system must be such as to foster the small businesses upon which almost half of the people of this country are dependent for jobs, which are the mainstay of so many of our communities, which are the seedbed for our big business, the best customers of big business, in short—the backbone of our American economy.

I am sorry it is not possible to open the whole tax structure for review and revision because both are badly needed but we all hope that the new tax bill will at least provide for:

1. Exemption from income tax of the first $25,000 of corporate profits.
2. Elimination of wartime excise taxes.
3. Taxation of charitable, educational, and cooperative organizations on same basis as competing businesses.
4. Five-year carry-over and 1-year carry-back of earnings.
5. Flexible depreciation rates.
6. A start toward elimination of double taxation of dividends.
7. Simplification of tax law and forms.

Thank you, gentlemen, for giving me this opportunity to lay before you these ideas of the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc. which, if adopted, we believe would be of great help to business in general and especially to small business.

Hell-Bent for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include as part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Hell-Bent for What?" which appeared in the Oregon Journal on March 5, 1950:

HELL-BENT FOR WHAT?

Progress report for 1950 A. D.—Lucifer to Satan: "Plans are progressing nicely to blow the world to hell."

Ridiculous? Not at all. This could well be the last generation of so-called civilized men. There's no place to hide our civilization if ever the A-bomb and the H-bomb are released with insane furies behind them. Men, women, and children will die like flies. That is, the lucky ones will die. A few will be unfortunate enough to live.

What if Hitler had possessed a large stock pile of A-bombs and H-bombs and means of getting them all over the world? Do you think he would have hesitated in taking civilization along in his suicide? In his crazed mind he would have thought it a great and heroic joke. There have been other Hitlers in history. There may be another.

Almost 5 years have passed since the fateful day that a special crew of the United States Air Force dropped an atomic bomb over Hiroshima, followed by another bomb in a few days on Nagasaki. Those terrible explosions, utilizing the primary forces of nature, left

in their wake almost 100,000 men, women, and children dead, and about twice that number injured in varying degrees.

NOW A NEW HORROR

Almost 5 years have passed. The atomic bombs have been improved. Tests at Bikini and Eniwetok showed greater destructive power. President Truman has announced Russia has the atomic bomb—and that was expected. President Truman announces the decision to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, many times more powerful and destructive than the atomic bomb.

We talk of the cold war, of civilian defense and start to reorganize that defense; we talk of bombs and atomic spies; we see a mockery made of justice and democracy in the Soviet satellite states. In many mouths there is the continuing assertion that war is inevitable. We see nations again playing the old balance-of-power game, increasing armaments, and using diplomacy as the basis for obtaining advantages against potential enemies.

It is a game as old as history. It is a game that always has led to war.

Are the people of Oregon so mad at the people of Bessarabia that we feel that all of them should be killed off—wiped out, every man, woman, and child? Are the people of Budapest so angry at the people of Montreal that they'd like to put every one of them in an unmarked grave?

Of course not, and it seems absurd even to talk that way. But that's exactly about what will happen in an atomic war—atomic and hydrogen bombs are not discriminating against any flesh, or sex, or age, or nationality.

Why then are the people of the world allowing an atomic arms race, the results of which may well be atomic war and the virtual destruction of world civilization? Before discussing atomic control—its failure to date—we should keep four things in mind:

1. There will be no winners in an atomic war.

2. We, the United States, set the precedent for the use of atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In 1947 former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson asserted that nine men made the decision to use the atomic bomb against Japan as "our least abhorrent choice" to save American lives. But, once there is war, any nation can use that argument.

3. Virtually all nations can make atomic bombs, and possibly hydrogen bombs. It is no secret. As early as March 1946 the Atomic scientists of Chicago told us this: "All large nations, and perhfaps some smaller ones as well, will be able to produce atomic bombs within not more than 10 years, and some will probably be able to do so within less than 5 years. In fact, it is possible that the U. S. S. R., for example, will have atomic bombs within 2 or 3 years, quite independently of any technical disclosures which may be made on our side." (This statement, remember, was made 4 years ago.)

4. We cannot expect to meet on a common moral ground for agreement between Christian nations and Russia. Our morals are based upon the teachings of the Bible and Christ. Soviet Russia's are based upon Marxian materialism. Any agreement reached must be on check and balance based upon mutual healthy suspicion and inspection, for the very simple reason we cannot give an oath of faith before the same God.

Now, with those things in mind, let us look at the record—

Shortly after the Japanese blasts and ending of the war, there was definite world-wide action to try to act like human beings. In London the United Nations Political and Security Commission adopted unanimously the Moscow resolution, previously worked out at Moscow by representatives of Russia, Britain, United States, China, and Canada, for establishment of an Atomic Commission. The resolution stated that "the work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken."

This met with general approval—as a start, at least.

TALK, IDLE TALK

Many significant statements were made in this country in 1946. Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, demanded in the Senate that President Truman immediately call a world disarmament conference to prevent an atomic world war. Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel peace prize winner, urged all nations to surrender the right to make war by putting the atomic bomb and other weapons of mass destruction exclusively in the hands of an international police force.

And thus the talk went. This country, at least, was ready to surrender part of its sovereignty, it was indicated, to make atomic control really work. There were similar expressions from all over the world. Russian dictators remained comparatively quiet except for periodic blasts about warmongers.

In June 1946, elder statesman Bernard Baruch made his proposal for the international control of atomic energy, outlawing bombs, providing for practical inspection to see that outlawed bomb making was not violated.

He asked for a security program not composed merely of pious thoughts but of enforceable sanctions—an international law with teeth in it.

HOPE IN THE UN

Here in the United Nations was the hope. Seven members of the UN Security Council, the Atomic Energy Commission's parent organization, sat listening—The Netherlands, Poland, Russia, the United Kingdom, Australia, China, and France. Also at the table were representatives of the United States, Mexico, Brazil, Canada, and Egypt. Here was the power to institute a practical plan. Here was the hope for a world at peace. Here was the hope of settling the fears generated by the awesome atomic bomb.

Baruch laid down this simple plan:

"When an adequate system for control of atomic energy, including the renunciation of the bomb as a weapon, has been agreed upon and put into effective operation and suitable punishments set up for the violations of the rules of control which are to be stigmatized as international crimes, we propose that—

"1. Manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop.

"2. Existing bombs shall be disposed of pursuant to the terms of the treaty; and

"3. The authority shall be in possession of full information as to the know-how for the production of atomic energy."

He emphasized that the matter of punishment "lies at the very heart of our present security system," and pointed out that such punishment goes directly to the veto power contained in the Charter of the UN.

"There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes," he stated. (Any one of the big five—China, Britain, France, Russia, United States—could veto any punishment action.)

This meant giving up a certain amount of national sovereignty for common world good and security. It was a new and daring plan that met the problem honestly. It was generally applauded.

But as time went on it became apparent that Russia would not give up the veto power; it would not consent to inspections. The plan bogged down in red tape and propaganda contributed largely by the vocal Soviet delegation. Finally, at Lake Success, on March 6, 1947, Andrei Gromyko jolted the hopes of immediate control with the blunt statement that—

1. Russia will not permit UN agents to roam unrestricted through the Soviet in search of illegal atomic activities.

2. Russia will not let an international agency manage its atomic activities.

3. Russia will not give up its power to veto the punishment of a country caught making atomic bombs illegally.

4. Russia will find it "difficult, if not impossible," to agree to any kind of control machinery unless the United States first junks its existing atomic bombs.

"VAGUE INSPECTION"

What plan, then, did Russia have? Its plan was to set up vague inspection and control organs under a commission which would make decisions by majority rules and the veto power would not apply in them. Their work, however, would be subject to review by the Security Council, where there was the veto power. They proposed a conference to outlaw the bomb.

But all knew that a statement to outlaw the bomb without inspection and enforcement meant nothing. And so time went on.

A conference was held in Paris the fall of 1948 between foreign ministers. Atomic control was discussed. Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky delivered bombastic abuse at the United States. Nothing was settled on atomic matters.

The year 1949 saw little, if anything, accomplished on atomic control. Berlin blockades, Communists in China, seething in the Balkans, Tito's mutiny, words and words, more armaments. From time to time someone who could tear himself away from atomic spy scares and international anglings and fulminations would ask that the "big brass" of the major countries get together to solve this atomic control problem.

ARMAMENT RACE

We enter 1950, facing a dismal and frightening picture—bigger and more powerful bombs, bigger armies and air forces, fear and mistrust, a weakened United Nations unable even to settle such a minor international problem as Jerusalem. The A-bomb and the H-bomb swing pendulum-like closer to humanity.

President Truman on February 10 announced he isn't budging from the Baruch plan for international inspection and asserts a little cooperation from Russia is all that is needed to set up effective world atomic controls.

Will that cooperation be forthcoming? It is time, past time, to find out. It is time for meeting at the very highest levels.

It is time to make another attempt to remove the threat of destruction from world civilization. Now we are on the way to create our own hell here on earth.

St. Patrick's Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the St. Patrick's Day greetings of Tom Brawders, of New York City, which I feel are most appropriate this week due to the fact that we celebrate St. Patrick's Day on March 17.

This statement of Mr. Brawders contains some good common-sense advice and is worthy of the serious consideration of every Member of the Congress. I sincerely hope that by the time another

Irish week rolls around in the history of our country that Ireland will be blessed with the abolition of partition.

TOM BRAWDERS' ST. PATRICK'S DAY GREETINGS, 1950

This year I am devoting my annual St. Patrick Day greeting card to my personal friends and public officials, where it might help, throughout the United States. My one desire for 1950 is that partition of Ireland will get the consideration it deserves from those who are in position to help. You and I can help by passing along the truth as to the tyranny that allows this desperate condition to exist.

In the summers of 1946-47-48 and 1949, wherever I was registered throughout the 26-county area, each hotel was packed with English and 6-county guests. The hotelkeepers certainly showed no animosity toward them in any way. It proved to me that the average Irishman, whether he lived within the 6-county or the 26-county area could get along together if there was no official obstruction. I met shipyard workers, bank clerks, civil-service employees, etc., from the Belfast vicinity whom, after meeting at the dining-room table for, say a day or two, you might get in a political question, with practically the same answer. When you would take the liberty to say, "What is wrong between the South, where you come, annually, to enjoy the good wholesome living conditions for your holiday, and the North, that even up to this date is merely getting sufficient rationed subsistence as will keep body and soul together?" The answer, to me, for four consecutive summers, has almost been identical: "What can we do about it, if our government refuses to come into diplomatic agreement with the Dublin government?"

During the past summer I enjoyed my usual annual vacation in Ireland and spent 1 week of my sojourn in and around Belfast. Before World War II, I had often included such lovely spots of interest as Warrenpoint, Glens of Antrim, the unforgettable coast road to the Giants Causeway, Portrush, and Derry. These summers the natives of those lovely six-county resorts are to be found on the various hotel registers at Killarney, Tralee, Rosslare Strand, Kilkee, and Dublin. All happy in the 26 counties—the land of plenty. To me this partition of Irish people, who constantly demonstrate that they could live happily together, is one of the most ridiculous of geographical fantasies.

Our Government, down through the years, has definitely shown sympathy that has materialized into justice. What about these six counties? Take a look at the map on the cover of this folder. It could remind you of the State of Maine remaining aloof, for one reason or another, from the rest of our Union. Under these geographical conditions the six counties have the most violated freedom of elections. These six counties, of course, vote strictly for the Crown; exactly as if the Beacon Hill section of Boston was gerrymandered from the rest of the city; or the Park Avenue section of New York spoke for the rest of the electorate.

Ulster, down through the centuries, contained nine counties, but the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, tossed off Donegal, Monaghan, and Cavan and formed a government consisting of Armagh, Antrim, Tyrone, Londonderry, Down, and Fermanagh.

We here in the good old United States are continually putting pressure on our governmental representatives, pleading for a fair plebiscite in some far-away place. Yet in Ireland, the birthplace of our parents, where there exists the most severe example of gerrymandered elections, we sit by without one word of protest. I know that many of us make governmental appeals; get them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then sit back. That is merely the start—not the finish. Your governmental representative is a busy, poorly paid individual who has so many calls on his time that unless you keep constantly on the subject it will lapse behind the immediate pressure of other important items on his agenda. We, of Irish descent, are definitely looking for someone in Washington powerful enough, politically, to fight and win enough support to be heard in the British Colonial Office in London, saying, "we demand a plebescite of the 32 counties of Ireland"—or even dare them to hold an election in the original nine counties of Ulster.

In Belfast a prominent businessman, sitting at my hotel luncheon table, chock full of conversation and austerity food, came sort of sharp when the partition subject was broached. "How is it, sir," asked my table neighbor, "that you first- and second-generation Irish, in America, hate England so much?

"Only, sir, because we want to see the 32 counties of Ireland enjoying the same mode of life and opportunity that our fathers and mothers, irrespective of their native county, enjoy in America. As for hating England, we will go along with you on that item, too. Name one country that was, or is, a colony that does not feel the same way? The policy of your British Colonial Office down through the centuries from the days of our Thirteen Colonies, down to the present, has never changed. In America, sir, we always say, 'freedom is everybody's business' and that goes for Ireland, too, until her 32 counties are all of one government. Our help will continue to come from across the seas in any way the majority of Irish people ask for it. They are the ones to say in which manner the 6 counties are to come over to the other 26.

"This I will say: That no colony of England, America included, ever got complete severance from your colonial office through any graceful, diplomatic gesture. There is only one medicine that England doesn't like—even though it is her greatest reliance—the bayonet. As we say in America, 'England likes to dish it out—but she can't take it.' In other words, England can hold the six counties only by the enormous number of military personnel that she now has throughout these held counties.

"Should the people of the 26 counties decide to do it 'the Tom Barry way' (remember him?)—America will say, it is the will of the majority of Irish people, and help accordingly. Sir, may I give you my personal opinion, humble as it is, from a first-generation Kilkenny man, who loves Ireland, as to an immediate cure for all partition evils? Take the British soldiers out of the six counties and the question will automatically rectify itself."

Red Termites

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

America is in graver danger from within than she has even been before at any time in her history.

The petted enemies within our gates who are plotting the destruction of our Government are more bold, more aggressive, and more effective than they have ever been before at any time.

Since my extension of remarks in which I included the Communist record of Albert Einstein it has developed that said Einstein was instrumental in getting into this country Klaus Fuchs, one of the most dangerous Communists who ever betrayed this country, as well as Great Britain, and who has just been convicted of treason in the British courts.

It has developed that Einstein was instrumental in getting in this country Gerhart Eisler, who is now leading the Communist forces in Germany.

Turning from faker Einstein to the other enemies within our gates, I want to quote from a part of a broadcast made by the Honorable Henry J. Taylor on February 13, 1950, which every American should read.

The matter referred to follows:

RED TERMITES' PROGRESS

Subject: Have you further information on the Communist spy plot, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. The Red termites have eaten into our Government house so that the pillars of security just are not there any more. Listen, if you will, to the case of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.

Courageous J. Edgar Hoover, who fears no one, and the FBI have a file on this man a mile long. So did the House Un-American Affairs Committee, until that committee was throttled by the present Congress. Now the committee appears ready to come up with one whitewash after another.

HE CLIMBED UP AND UP—ON THE INSIDE

My information about Nathan Gregory Silvermaster goes back nearly 9 years. On my return from trips overseas during the war—especially from Finland and Turkey and from Germany itself—I would report, at the request of the Army, to war agencies on economic affairs affecting the enemy abroad. During that time I saw Nathan Gregory Silvermaster sitting in Washington as head economist of the Board of Economic Warfare, of all places.

He is Russian-born, and a former $10,000-a-year, top-pay Government economist on the public pay roll.

Silvermaster was born in Odessa. He came here in 1915. He sailed into Federal authority, and onto the Government pay roll in 1935—2 years after Alger Hiss.

Starting in the Resettlement Administration, he moved to the Maritime Labor Board as chief economist, then to the Labor Division of the Farm Security Administration, as its director, no less. In short, he climbed up and up, and on the inside, like Alger Hiss.

By 1944 Silvermaster was over in the Treasury Department, and he finally wound up with the RFC. Along the way, just as Alger Hiss sat in on international conferences with the Russians, Silvermaster helped Assistant Secretary of Treasury Harry Dexter White—later named by Whittaker Chambers and other confessed Communists as a source of information for Stalin—to draw up the Bretton Woods international conference agreement for American funds, which involved the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, Silvermaster served as United States Department of Commerce representative on the Inter-Department Committee which decided what American exports, including uranium, could or should not be sent to Russia.

LET'S LOOK AT THE FILES

Now, remember, this is not hearsay. This is firsthand reporting. For here is the official Civil Service Commission finding on Silvermaster—and I quote from the official files:

"Silvermaster has been known and listed in the files of the Seattle Police Department, the Thirteenth Naval District, the San Francisco Police Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a member and leader of the Communist Party."

Accordingly, civil-service investigators recommended—as early as 1942, 8 years ago—and I quote from the official file—that "Silvermaster be declared ineligible for the position of head economist, Board of Economic Warfare" and—at last—proposed to "bar him (from official authority) for the duration of the national emergency."

But the Civil Service and FBI findings didn't mean a thing to Silvermaster. He was able to sail right along. To do so, he admitted, he obtained the aid of Lauchlin Currie, economic adviser to the President inside the White House.

Now, let me turn to the files of United States naval intelligence. They, too, were looking at Silvermaster. The naval intelligence report bluntly called Silvermaster a Communist, not to be trusted in his office. Nevertheless, for four solid years after these security checks had been presented, and overruled from the inside, Silvermaster held important places in the Government of your land and mine.

ALMOST UNBELIEVABLE EFFRONTERY

Now, as I begin to find out more and more about Silvermaster, a known Communist agent described him as in the straight pay of the Soviet secret police, as an NKVD agent in America. He testified before Government authorities that Silvermaster maintained, in his Washington home, photographic and microfilming equipment on which he allegedly photographed and microfilmed Government documents for delivery to Russia.

One confessed agent testified to having actually seen Silvermaster do so, allegedly in cooperation with a Major William Ludwig Ullman, of the United States Army Air Forces in the Pentagon Building. Silvermaster had lived in Washington with Ullman since 1937.

Yet, when Silvermaster was officially questioned on August 4, 1948—over a year and a half ago—he refused even to say whether or not he was a Communist. His grounds, and now I quote Silvermaster himself, were that "any answer I may make to this question may tend to be self-incriminating."

So the outcome is "Step down, brother. That's all." Whereupon Silvermaster lets out a laugh and disappears.

But Silvermaster did not disappear completely. I can tell you that at this moment he is on a little island off the Jersey seacoast. If the newspapers are interested, the name of the island village he has gone to is Harvey Cedars.

A CLEANING-OUT LONG OVERDUE

No, the remarkable thing is not that Stalin has had, and has today, his inside workers here. The remarkable, incredible thing is that anybody in an official position, or of any standing, would for any reason—year after year—call this vicious threat to our country a "red herring" or a "witch hunt" or try to distract the country from the importance of cleaning this place out.

The safety of America is at stake in the face of a barbarically cruel, stealthy, ruthless, and clever Asiatic enemy, and his fifth column in your land and mine.

The Sick Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include the following well considered and thought-producing editorial appearing in the Boston Post of March 6, 1950, entitled "The Sick Industry":

THE SICK INDUSTRY

President Truman may soon have a study authorized by the Congress looking into the economics of the coal industry. It is certain that the Congress will have a committee looking into the deficiencies of the Taft-Hartley law. Both of these add up to the danger of a degree of nationalization of the coal industry, or, at least, stronger Federal controls in the public interest.

Coal is unquestionably a sick industry, but what kind of ailment has not been determined. It all depends upon what doctor looks the patient over. The union will claim that the operators have made the industry sick by inefficient operation and by attempts to exploit the miner. The operators will claim that the union has made the industry ill by excessive wage demands which forced up the price of coal and compelled industry and the railroads to seek some other cheap source of fuel.

None of the doctors seem to have admitted to the clinical history of the sick industry the plain fact that there are too many miners and not enough work for all of them. The United Mine Workers went on a 3-day week from last July until mid-September, and then went into a series of "no day" work weeks until November, when John L. Lewis called a truce and sent the miners back to work. In December the miners' leader put the miners back on a 3-day week.

By January there were spontaneous strikes and on February 8 there was a Nation-wide stoppage in the soft coal fields.

Not until the middle of February were the coal stocks on hand, necessary to industry, depleted to the point where there was alarm and lay-offs of workers in other industries. It is fair to say that for 5 months out of the year the miners produced enough coal on a 3-day workweek to provide the Nation at the height of its productivity with enough coal to operate industry. Plainly there are too many miners, and probably too many mines, or, at the very least, too many inefficient mines.

John L. Lewis has been able to force up wages only by work stoppages that depleted the stocks of coal above ground. It is his sole weapon—and he has used it effectively to collect a total of 79 cents an hour in four rounds of wage and welfare increases for his followers. But, he hasn't raised their living standards by any comparable degree, because their payless periods have eaten up most of their gains.

Truly, coal is a sick industry, and will be as long as there are too many miners and not enough work for all of them. Let it be determined now, however, that the nostrum for the patient is not nationalization in any form. The remedy was tried out in Britain. It very nearly killed the patient.

The Coal Strike—The Winner and the Losers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Racine Journal-Times has made some very pertinent observations on the Lewis coal strike in its issue of March 6, 1950. So that his timely comments may be brought to the attention of the people of this country I shall include it as part of my remarks:

THE WINNER AND THE LOSERS

Once again a coal strike has been settled at the eleventh hour—just short of real disaster, but not soon enough to avert a considerable degree of suffering, much economic paralysis, and interruption of normal life in this Nation.

Once again the miners have successfully defied the Government of the United States.

Once again John L. Lewis has emerged with a measure of victory—not with everything he asked, but with enough to save face adequately, strengthen his hold on the miners, and satisfy his power ego.

Once again the public, innocent victim of hardships imposed by the strike, will pay for its fruits through inevitable further boosts in the price of coal.

The big loser of face in this deal is the Government of the United States, and the Truman administration cannot dodge its share of the blame.

A Federal court ordered the miners to return to their work. They refused. Their union was tried for contempt. Federal Judge Richmond Keech found the union not guilty. His reasoning was that the organization has asked the men to obey the return-to-work order, but they had refused as individuals. Perhaps this was the only conclusion the judge could reach on the basis of pure legality, though there might have been strong suspicion that union officials had issued their work "command" with their tongues in the cheeks hoping that the men wouldn't obey. And certainly the end result of the union members' defiance of the Government was pleasing to United Mine Workers' officials, including the top boss himself. By holding out, the men forced a settlement much in the union's favor.

Here was a case of a union with the power to bargain for the men, but without the power to control them. Common sense would dictate that if a union cannot control its membership, how can it rightfully make contracts for them? If it cannot keep them from disobeying the Government, how can it guarantee that they will observe the terms of a contract?

Some may say that the strike proved the Taft-Hartley law to be ineffective and unworkable. But though we think it demonstrated the need for strengthening that law for protection of the public against too-powerful combines of either industry or labor, it should be obvious to even the most casual observer that the existing law was not given a fair test in this case. It was not applied in time to give such protection and relief as an 80-day stay of the strike might have provided through the cold winter months, when coal is most needed.

And here the fault rests with President Truman himself. Though others saw the emergency coming when the strike started last October, the President refused to recognize it. As late as January 20 he said "the coal situation does not constitute an emergency." Finally he appointed a fact-finding board to work outside the Taft-Hartley law, which he does not like for political reasons. Even when efforts of this board came to naught, Mr. Truman stalled. It wasn't until March 2, with industries crippled, thousands of men laid off, schools closed, and coal bins empty in many homes, that he finally conceded the situation was serious.

No matter what kind of law you have, if those charged with enforcing it don't make the best possible use of it, the law will fail.

Now we're going to have a Government study of the whole industry, including the situation of the operators and the miners. If the resulting report is honest, unbiased,

and without political tinge, it should be helpful. It should give public backing to whatever law is necessary to avert a repetition of what Americans have gone through year after year through closing of the mines upon order of John L. Lewis.

Adenauer's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of March 9, 1950:

ADENAUER'S CHALLENGE—TIME TO JUMP IN AND PUSH

Chancelor Konrad Adenauer, crusty leader of the West German Republic, has thrown down the gauntlet of peace.

He has proposed a complete union between West Germany and France as the basis for a United States of Europe.

In an interview with Kingsbury Smith of International News Service, he has struck at the heart of the matter in devastating fashion.

Do we save Europe or don't we save Europe? That is Adenauer's question. The answer cannot safely wait.

Three years ago the Item urged Congress to press for the speedy realization of a United Europe. In the interim we have frequently discussed the need for a genuine federation on the continent. The subject is not new.

The argument for European union is simple. No one nation standing by itself can enjoy the security necessary to its physical safety and economic development. Banded together, the various states can realize the full potential of their peoples and resources.

Leading statesmen of Europe have conceded the ultimate need for union. Some, like Winston Churchill, have openly urged immediate steps. A consultative assembly has met. Observers on the scene report widespread popular support for a close federation.

These people know just how senseless are the barriers that divide and weaken them. They understand the vicious circle of currency restrictions, quota systems, and other artificial restraints on the free flow of goods. They sense the disaster that might befall them in the event of an attack from the east.

Why, then, are they so reluctant to take the necessary plunge?

The reasons are many. They boil down to the fact that "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." Western Europe was smashed by the war. With our help, she has regained some of her former tone and color. But the strength both to initiate and put through a revolutionary change of pattern is lacking.

The time has come for the United States to jump in and push.

The American people have shown a great willingness to put forward the effort and money needed to secure peace. Their misgivings about ECA stem from the suspicion that it is not enough to do the job. The widespread response to Senator MCMAHON'S $50,000,000,000 "peace crusade" is sufficient proof of a desire to avoid war at whatever monetary cost.

Nothing less than a United States of Europe, we believe, can provide the basis for independent and lasting security. For political, economic, and military reasons, federation is urgent.

The man to pick up Chancelor Adenauer's gauntlet is not France's Premier Bidault, but the President of the United States of America.

We suggest that Mr. Truman prepare a message for delivery before both Houses of Congress pledging this Nation's all-out support for a Union of Europe.

With the sanction of Congress, Mr. Truman should then call on the heads of European governments to meet with him in Paris to discuss the ways and means of bringing federation into being.

For historical impact and statesmanship, this assertion of American leadership would surpass all previous efforts for peace. It is our great opportunity to influence permanently the course of human events.

The High Cost of Low Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 10,000,000 American families are making a futile effort to make ends meet on an annual income of $2,000 or less. This is a matter of public concern, because most of these people are a charge on the public for aid of some kind to supplement their incomes. What is the best way to handle this situation? What conditions cause this poverty? Are they correctable?

These and other questions about our lowest income families are answered by Prof. Sumner Slichter, of Harvard, in an article appearing in the New York Times magazine. I should like to insert this most important article in the RECORD. It is as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF LOW INCOMES
(By Sumner H. Slichter)

In 1948, the most prosperous year in the history of the country, nearly 10,000,000 American families had cash incomes of $2,000 a year or less. The condition of such families concerns the entire country. For one thing, these families contain about 9,000,000 children, and the small income of the family may deprive the children of fair opportunity. Moreover, low incomes are frequently the result of low productivity; if the productivity of these families could be raised the whole country would have more to consume. Apart from these considerations, low-income families contain a high proportion of people hard hit by misfortune, and all humanitarian peoples want to do what they can for the unfortunate.

The situation of the nonfarm low-income group, numbering about 6,300,000 families, is probably more difficult than that of the farm families, so this article will center on impoverished people living in towns and cities. Three principal questions stand out: Who are these families and what are the reasons for their low income? What kind of lives do they lead? What can be done about the problem of low incomes?

Over two-thirds of the low-income families fall into one of three large groups: (1) Families whose head has been disabled by accident or disease; (2) broken families—that is, families headed by women because of widowhood, desertion, or divorce; and (3) families whose head is 65 years of age or more.

The exact size of the first group, headed by persons permanently disabled for long periods, is not precisely known, but it runs numbers well over a million. These are persons of working age who at one time were members of the working force but now are totally disabled for an indefinite period. The second group, headed by women who have lost their husbands, includes 1,500,000 families. More than one-third of these families have no earners. The third group, headed by older persons, includes 1,700,000 families—more than one-fourth of all nonfarm families with incomes of less than $2,000. About half of these families have no income earners among their members.

In addition to these three major groups, there are many other kinds of low-income families. Some families are in the low-income class only temporarily—because they are starting new businesses or have experienced business losses, or because the chief earner has been temporarily disabled. Then, too, the low-income families naturally include many headed by persons who are incompetent, or misfits, or maladjusted, and who have trouble in getting and holding jobs. The misfits include persons with low intelligence who require so much supervision that they are hardly worth employing and persons who suffer from phobias and complexes of various sorts and do not easily fit into an organization.

Included among the misfits are many alcoholics. Information about their numbers is not reliable, but a recent conference on alcoholism in Chicago concluded that about 1,300,000 alcoholics are regularly employed. Of course, not all alcoholics are in the low-income class, but alcoholism frequently results in low income.

What kind of lives do the low-income families lead? Here is the part of the population, of course, where hardship is concentrated. The best measure of this fact is the high proportion of low incomes absorbed by expenditures on food. Nearly three-quarters of the income of nonfarm families receiving less than $1,000 a year and nearly half of the income of families in the $1,000–$2,000 class goes for food—in comparison with about one-third for the average-income nonfarm family.

Nevertheless, many of these families are not so badly off as one might suppose. In the first place, there is a general tendency for people to understate their cash incomes. In the second place, many families have resources apart from cash income, particularly in food and in shelter of their own houses. Also, the low-income families are smaller than the average. In addition, such families tend to be concentrated in the smaller cities and the rural nonfarm areas, where, as a rule, it is easier to live simply and cheaply than in a large city.

In fact, the low-income families have a surprising amount of property. This probably reflects the fact that at some earlier time—before the family head retired or died or was disabled—these families were better off. At any rate, almost half of such families own their own homes, and about three out of four of these homes are owned mortgage-free. Over one-fourth own an automobile—of sorts—and the ownership of United States savings bonds and saving accounts is equally frequent. In 1948, over one out of four of these families purchased such goods as furniture, radios, refrigerators, washing machines, or television sets.

What can and should be done about the problem of low-income families? Since there are many causes of low income and many kinds of families in the low-income group, there is no panacea. Many of those persons who have suffered severe disabilities can learn new work or, in a few cases, new ways of doing their former jobs. In 1948,

53,000 persons were rehabilitated under the joint Federal-State retraining program, but there are about 1,500,000 persons in need of retraining. Great expansion of retraining programs is indicated.

Many disabled persons are prevented by illness from holding jobs and some of them are not able to learn new ones. In nearly all of these cases public or private assistance is needed. The Federal Government now helps the States that provide assistance to the blind and to families having dependent children, and last summer the House of Representatives passed H. R. 6000, which provides for grants to the States for assistance to permanently and totally disabled persons not covered by existing programs. It was estimated that this program would help about 200,000 totally disabled persons.

If there are dependent children in the family of the disabled worker, help may be given under the Federal-State program of aid for dependent children. In July 1949 about 540,000 families were being assisted under the program by an average monthly payment of more than $70. Federal participation in aid to dependent children is not as liberal as Federal participation in old-age assistance or aid to the blind. The Advisory Council on Social Security, appointed by the Senate Finance Committee of the Eightieth Congress, has recommended that this difference in Federal help be eliminated.

A long-range program dealing with the problem of disability should include insurance against the loss of income because of temporary or permanent disability. Under present conditions the problem of temporary disability can be handled best by the States, and New York and several other States already have started such schemes. More important is the insurance against disability of indefinite duration (say 6 months or longer), or so-called permanent disability.

Many insurance experts do not believe that it is practical to write such insurance because the possibility of getting an income for many years, and perhaps for life, creates too powerful a temptation to malinger. Others believe that total and permanent disability is an insurable risk provided it is required that the disability be medically demonstrable.

The Advisory Council on Social Security has recommended that the present old-age and survivors insurance plan be broadened to cover insurance against permanent and total disability, and such insurance is included in the social-security bill passed by the House of Representatives last summer. The insurance would be limited to persons who have been in the labor force for at least 10 years and whose disability can be medically proven.

In nearly two out of three of the broken families, the wife or one of the children is gainfully employed. The proportion of widows or divorced mothers and of children between 14 and 17 years of age who are in the labor force has increased substantially since 1940. Hence, the maintenance of a high demand for labor is particularly helpful to members of broken families. While certain jobs are not good for children, children of 14 and over are likely to be helped by some employment if it does not interfere with education.

In the main, however, the income problem of broken families must be solved in ways other than by employment of the mother or children. Where there are dependent children in the family, the help can be obtained through the Federal-State program of aid to dependent children.

Nearly four out of five broken families have lost their chief breadwinner by death. Hence, a great step would be taken toward reducing destitution if the Federal old-age and survivors insurance plan were extended to the 25,000,000 jobs not now covered. The benefits also need to be made larger and eligibility requirements more liberal. At present the average primary benefit (on which survivors' benefits are based) is only about $26 a month.

Two changes in the law would be particularly helpful to families broken by the death of the chief breadwinner. One would raise the benefit of the first dependent child or of a dependent parent to three-fourths of the primary benefit. The other would permit widows of deceased workers to begin drawing benefits at the age of 60 instead of 65. Widows caring for a minor child of the deceased worker draw benefits now.

The largest class of low-income families comprise those in which the breadwinner is retired. Consequently, measures to meet the needs of these families offer the most promising way of attacking the broad problem of low incomes. Three changes would be particularly useful: (1) Raising the usual retirement age in industry, (2) modifying the so-called work clause in the present Federal pension laws, and (3) providing a more generous Federal pension system.

A large proportion of persons 65 or over are quite capable of continuing their occupations, so the practice of some companies of retiring all employees at the age of 65 is quite unnecessary. Furthermore, it increases the number of low-income families, and thus aggravates the problem of low incomes. Studies of the Social Security Agency show that most retirements occur against the will of the worker. The problem of low-income families would be substantially reduced in importance if the retirement age in industry were made 68 or 70 instead of 65. In addition, the output of industry would be raised, and the standard of living of the country as a whole would be improved.

The present Federal old-age pension law contains a peculiarly vicious work clause. It is designed to prevent persons from drawing pensions who are also receiving income through employment. The law provides that a pension recipient who earns $15 or more a month shall lose his pension so long as his earnings equal or exceed that amount. The obvious effect is to discourage beneficiaries from supplementing their pensions by useful work.

A more sensible arrangement would be to permit pensioners to earn a fairly liberal amount, say $75 a month, without losing their pensions, and to provide that for every dollar above $75 a month earned by the pensioner a dollar would be subtracted from his pension for that month. This would encourage retired workers to help themselves.

The third change—to extend and liberalize the present old-age insurance scheme—is the most promising way of dealing with low incomes among retired workers. As has been pointed out, the plan at present covers only about three out of five jobs. It should be made virtually universal. In addition, the benefit payments should be raised to about 50 percent of a man's earnings before retirement. This would eliminate much of the problem of low-income families. The present pension payments of $26 a month for persons without dependents and $40 for persons with dependents are far below a decent level.

In addition to these direct measures, there are numerous indirect ways to help low-income families, some important, others less so. Since a high proportion of low-income families have their savings in Government savings bonds, one form of help to them (and to many other families as well) would be for the Government to issue a savings bond payable in a fixed amount of purchasing power rather than a fixed number of dollars. Persons who bought Government savings bonds in 1943, 1944, or 1945 have lost a large part of the purchasing power which they put into those bonds. Small-income families wishing to save should not be compelled to gamble on whether the price level will rise or fall.

Another kind of indirect help would be the removal of economic barriers to opportunity. More abundant scholarships to young persons of demonstrated ability would be one way to do this. Setting limits on the initiation fees that men must pay in order to join unions would also help. Fortunately, most unions are opposed to high initiation fees, but a minority charge $100 or more. An amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act should impose a maximum $25 initiation fee for admission to any union which is granted exclusive bargaining rights or which is permitted to establish a union shop.

Still another form of help would be modification of the Government program of supporting the prices of farm products. Because low-income families spend a high proportion of their cash incomes on food, the price-support program, which now includes wheat, corn, pork, butter, eggs, potatoes, cheese, apples, pears, concentrated orange juice, lard, and other commodities, is especially burdensome to nonfarm families with low incomes. The so-called Brannan plan of agricultural aid has grievous faults—in particular, it undertakes to support farmers' incomes at too high a level—but it would have the important merit of letting farm products be sold at free-market prices.

The most important indirect aid of all is encouragement of technological research, because it is from a rise in all incomes that more adequate support can be given the low-income groups. Not only does technological progress raise the incomes of all classes, but it has had the important result of reducing the proportion of unskilled jobs and of increasing the proportion of jobs that require semiskilled or skilled workers. Between 1910 and 1940, for example, common laborers dropped from 36 percent to 26 percent of the labor force. Converting of common-labor jobs into semiskilled or skilled jobs reduces the proportion of workers receiving low pay and helps people rise out of the impoverished class.

These measures—direct and indirect—to aid low-income families are of great importance, not only to the persons immediately concerned but to the Nation as a whole. They would raise the contribution of the low-income families to production, and thus diminish the extent to which these families are supported at the expense of the rest of the country. Broadening and liberalizing social insurance would reduce the dependence of low-income families upon relief, and thus reduce—though not eliminate—the possibility that help for the low-income groups could become a corrupting influence in politics.

Most important of all, good arrangements for meeting the problems of low-income families would raise the esteem in which the American economy is held both here and abroad. Critics of American economic institutions have been forced to admit that these institutions are remarkably efficient and give the country an unmatched standard of living, but they insist that this highly efficient economy neglects human needs.

As a matter of fact, few other countries distribute as large a proportion of income on the basis of need as does the United States. Income distributed on this basis was about $11,000,000,000 in 1949, and was about three times as large relative to all personal incomes as in 1929.

Nevertheless, a rich and successful economy such as that of the United States must be expected to look out for the nonproducers or low producers more adequately than do the less efficient economies. Arrangements for meeting the problem of the needy more generously will show the critics of American institutions that this economy is the most efficient in the world.

Basing Point Aimed at South, West, and New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Members of this body from the South, the West, and New England would like to see steel mills established in their regions. And why should they not have them?

Certainly, in each of these areas the demand for steel is far in excess of the supply. Certainly, each of the regions is either naturally endowed with the necessary raw materials for steel making as is true of the South and the West, or can readily secure them at low cost from nearby sources, as is true of New England, which will be able to use the newly discovered Labrador ores. Certainly each of these areas has the labor force required to operate a steel mill. Certainly, the capital is locally available for the construction of the mills. In other words, the demand, the raw materials, the labor force, the capital—all of the necessary ingredients are present. But will steel mills in these areas be erected?

If S. 1008 is passed, the answer is no. The restoration of the basing-point system spells finis to the hopes of these great areas for a steel industry of their own. Why is this so? Let me answer by recounting what has actually happened to the mills located in one of these areas, the South. The experience of the mills at Birmingham, Ala., provides a vivid illustration of what happened to a mill in an outlying area under the basing-point system.

As is well known, the Birmingham mills are the most efficient in the country. They are the only mills in the land which are located virtually in the midst of the three raw materials required for steel production—iron ore, coking coal, and limestone. Hence, the failure of the Birmingham mills to gain anything more than a relatively small share of the southern market cannot be traced to high costs or inefficiency.

One would think that under normal conditions southern buyers would secure a fairly large proportion of their steel requirements from the Birmingham mills not only because of their lower mill costs but also because of the smaller transportation charges involved.

Actually, under the basing-point system both of these advantages are wiped out, since the delivered price to any given buyer is the same from all mills. The delivered price to the buyer in Birmingham, itself is the same whether he buys from the Birmingham mills, from Pittsburgh, from Chicago, from Sparrows Point, from Cleveland, or from any of the other places where steel is produced. This is the unique feature of the basing-point system—identical delivered prices from all mills to any given destination point.

Therefore, since under the basing-point system there is no advantage to the southern buyers in purchasing their steel from Birmingham, they have bought in large quantities from the distant northern mills. We have always believed this to be true. Now we have the facts to prove it. On February 20, 1950, I put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some very interesting figures, prepared by Dr. George Stocking, of Vanderbilt University, showing the extent to which, under the basing-point system, the Birmingham mills have been deprived of the southern market.

These figures show that during February 1939 the nine Alabama counties surrounding Birmingham obtained no less than 37.4 percent of their structural shapes from distant sources, most of which—27.9 percent—coming from faraway Chicago. Buyers in all other Alabama counties relied to an even smaller extent on Birmingham mills, obtaining nearly half—47.5 percent—of their structural shapes from northern mills.

The neighboring State of Mississippi obtained no less than 72.1 percent of its structural shapes from the remote northern production centers. Georgia secured 33.5 percent of its structural shapes from the northern mills; Tennessee, 45.6 percent; Florida, 36.6 percent; North Carolina, 91.4 percent; Kentucky, 94.7 percent; and Texas, 82 percent.

Obviously, if the basing-point system had not been in existence, there would have been two incentives for southern buyers to purchase from the Birmingham mills: First, the lower costs of the Birmingham mills and, second, lower transportation expenses—which in a heavy product such as steel is an important factor. Thus, if the buyers in the nine Alabama counties surrounding Birmingham had obtained their structural shapes from Birmingham their freight charges would have only been 94 cents a ton as compared to $11 to $15 a ton for shipments from the northern mills. In all of the Southern States the saving in transportation costs as a result of buying from Birmingham rather than from the northern mills would have been substantial. By buying from Birmingham Mississippians would have saved about $11 a ton; Georgians would have saved about $7 a ton; Tennesseans about $5 a ton; Floridians about $5 a ton; Carolinians from $3 to $4 a ton; and Kentuckians from $3 to $10 a ton.

The material prepared by Dr. Stocking shows that the same situation prevails with other steel products such as steel plates, plain drawn wire, hot-rolled strip and hot-rolled sheets, the Birmingham mills obtaining only a small share of the southern market and southern buyers paying delivered prices which contained high-freight costs from northern mills.

There is one other lesson to be learned from these figures. If the delivered price to a southern buyer is the same from Birmingham as from a distant northern mill—as is the case under the basing-point system—then it must follow that the delivered price must necessarily have been established at an extremely high level. Only if the delivered price in the South is fantastically high could northern steel mills ship into the South, absorbing freight charges ranging from $10 to $20 a ton and still make a profit. All of us know that the northern steel mills are not in business for their health. When they ship into the South it is for the purpose of making a profit, but if on such shipments they are absorbing freight charges of from $10 to $20 a ton they would obviously lose money unless the delivered price in the South were set at an extraordinarily high level. This, of course, is exactly what occurs under the basing-point system. As the Supreme Court held in the Cement case, the basing-point system is a handy instrument to bring about elimination of any kind of price competition. In other words through the mechanism of the basing-point system the steel companies have been able to eliminate price competition and set delivered prices at levels so high as to enable the established northern mills to make a profit on sales to practically any area. Without the basing-point system, they will find it extremely difficult to engage in this form of price fixing.

In conclusion let me raise this question: If under the basing-point system the Birmingham mills, with all their advantages, have not been able to secure more than a small share of the southern market, how could it be expected that if the system is restored new mills in the South or the West or New England will fare any better? If the Birmingham mills get only 28 percent of the adjoining Mississippi market, only 12 percent of the Texas market and so on, how could it be expected that under the basing-point system a new mill in the West, in New England, or in the South, for that matter, could do any better? It is most unlikely that the cost of such a mill would be any lower than those of the Birmingham mills. It is unlikely that the excess of demand over supply would be any greater than it has been in the South. It is unlikely that such mills would have available a larger labor force. On what basis then can it be expected that under the basing-point system such mills will succeed in obtaining a reasonably large share of their home market, when the Birmingham mills—the lowest cost mills in the country—have so conspicuously failed?

That, Mr. Speaker, is the question with which every Member of this body from the South, the West, and New England should be immediately concerned.

Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, every student of southern history knows that the expansion of the South has been re-

tarded, more than anything else, by the practices of northern monopoly interests. Perhaps the most well-known of these practices aimed against the South has been the freight-rate discriminations. The facts have conclusively proved that this particular form of discrimination stems from the efforts of northern financial interests to protect their own established investments from any possible competition which might develop from an expanding southern economy.

But while the character and effect of freight-rate discriminations are known to practically all southerners, there is another form of discrimination practiced against the South which has equally injurious effects but which has been surrounded in mystery. I am referring to the regional discrimination inherent in the basing-point system. Under the basing-point system it makes no difference to the buyer what mill he buys from. He receives the same delivered price down to the last ten-thousandths of a cent from all mills. Therefore, he obviously fails to receive the benefit of the lower costs which one mill may have as against other mills.

This characteristic of the basing-point system is peculiarly disadvantageous to the South in that there is located in our region the most efficient, lowest-cost center of steel production in the country. I am referring of course to the mills at Birmingham, Ala. The Birmingham area is unique in its possession of the three raw materials required for steel production—iron ore, coking coal, and limestone. Other mills throughout the country have to obtain one or more of these raw materials from distant areas, involving heavy transportation expenses. But in Birmingham the materials are all at hand. The advantages to the Birmingham mills resulting from this situation were revealed in a study made just before the last war by the Board of Investigation and Research. This Board which was established by Congress to formulate a national transportation policy, issued a report, the Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, which shows the number of ton-miles required to bring together at a steel mill the iron ore, coal, and limestone required in steel production. Only 49 ton-miles were required to assemble these various raw materials for the production of one ton of pig iron at Birmingham—22 ton-miles being required to bring in the iron ore, 24 miles for the coking coal, and 3 miles for the limestone. How does this figure of 49 ton-miles stand up against comparable figures for other steel production centers in the country? It takes no less than 832 ton-miles to assemble the raw materials for the production of one ton of pig iron at Pittsburgh, and the same amount for production at Chicago-Gary; 507 ton-miles are required to assemble raw materials for production at Youngstown; 582 are required for Sparrows Point, Baltimore; with usually greater distances being required for the country in other steel-producing centers.

Because of the fact that practically no transportation charges are involved in bringing together these raw materials, the assembly costs of raw material for iron and steel production are much lower in Birmingham than in other parts of the country. According to this same report, in 1939 the cost of assembling the iron ore, coking coal, and limestone required to produce one ton of pig iron was $2.69. This is to be contrasted to a comparable figure at Pittsburgh of $5.99; at Chicago-Gary of $7.31; at Youngstown of $6.56; and at Sparrows Point of $9.93. In other words, the total cost for assembling the raw materials required to produce pig iron was from two to three times higher in the northern steel mills than at Birmingham.

Similarly the cost of assembling raw materials required to produce one ton of finished steel was only $4 at Birmingham, as compared to $7.36 at Pittsburgh, $10.28 in Chicago-Gary; $8.66 at Youngstown, and $13.86 at Sparrows Point. Again, costs at Birmingham are from 50 to 70 percent lower than in the North.

I believe these figures reveal one of the reasons why the northern steel interests are moving heaven and earth to get S. 1008 passed. They simply want to bring about the restoration of a situation in which it makes no difference to the buyer what mill he buys from. And if it makes no difference to him, why should he buy from the Birmingham mill just because it is the lowest-cost mill?

On the other hand if this bill is not passed, it could be expected that over the long-run the Birmingham mills would obtain the natural advantage of their lower costs. Buyers would be expected to purchase their steel at Birmingham for the simple reason that it can be produced there more cheaply than anywhere else. It could be expected that southern steel consumers would at long last secure their advantage of proximity to this low cost source of steel production. It could be expected that southern steel consumers, by obtaining steel at lower prices made possible by the low costs at Birmingham, would be able to widen the area in which they are able to compete. It could be expected that as a result of this expansion, southern industries would be able to provide more jobs for southern workers, more profits for southern investors, and more expansion and greater well-being for the South generally.

But it should be obvious that these benefits will be denied the South if this bill is passed. The steel companies have clearly indicated their intention to return to the basing-point system immediately upon its enactment. And if this happens, the potential great expansion of the South will be nipped in the bud. This is evident from what has happened to the South under the basing-point system in the past. It is a fact that during the existence of the basing-point system, despite their lower costs, the proportion of the Nation's pig iron capacity held by the Birmingham mills actually declined. In 1925 Alabama mills held 7.1 percent of the Nation's pig iron capacity. By 1938 its proportion had declined to 6.2 percent.

Similarly, the proportion of the Nation's steel capacity held by Birmingham mills remained about constant. In 1925 Alabama mills held 2.7 percent of the Nation's capacity to produce finished hot-rolled steel products; by 1938 the proportion had risen only slightly to 3.2 percent. And this, I repeat, despite assembly costs which were from 50 to 70 percent lower in Birmingham than in the northern mills and despite total costs which were more than 20 percent lower in Birmingham.

In short, we are presented with the paradoxical and fantastic situation that the lowest-cost mills have actually lost ground in pig iron and failed to gain in steel. Yet the relative importance of the higher-cost producers has increased. Only under monopolistic conditions could such a flagrant reversal of all of the laws of economics take place. If S. 1008 is defeated, Birmingham will regain its birthright of efficiency and the normal operation of competition will bring about one of the greatest expansions in southern history. But if the bill is passed, Birmingham mills will be denied the benefit of their natural location, the southern consumers will be denied the advantage of the low costs at Birmingham, and the South in general will once more be placed in the position of paying prices which the northern monopolists set and of producing only what the northern monopolists permit.

Forceful Presentment of the Viewpoint of the Famous Atomic Scientists of the Nation on the Smith Amendment to the National Science Foundation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of March 11, 1950, appeared an article by Clifford Grobstein, vice chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, aptly titled, "Time Bomb in the Science Foundation." This is so clear and poised a presentment of the viewpoint of the scientists and educators of the Nation in the matter of the Smith amendment to the National Science Foundation bill that I think it should and will receive the thoughtful attention of the conferees on the Science Foundation bill when named.

I might explain that the Federation of American Scientists had its beginning during the war in the atomic-energies laboratories. Three years ago the group expanded to admit all scientists, but its primary concern is still with matters of atomic-energy control, both domestic and international. The stated purpose of the organization is to direct the flow of the benefits of science into constructive social fields. The chairman of the Federation is Dr. Hughe C. Wolfe, head of the Department of Physics at Cooper Union. The greatest of living scientists, Albert Einstein, is a member. Included on the advisory panel are Dr. J. Robert

Oppenheimer, head of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, and formerly director of the Los Alamos project, also two of my very distinguished constituents of the second district of Illinois, Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, and Dr. Leo C. Szilard, the outstanding atomic scientist who was the first to present to President Roosevelt the designs for the atomic bomb. Dr. Urey and Dr. Szilard, I am happy to say, are on the faculty of the Institute for Nuclear Study of the University of Chicago, which numbers among its distinguished alumni many members of this body.

The article by Dr. Grobstein follows:

TIME BOMB IN THE SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(By Clifford Grobstein, vice chairman, Federation of American Scientists)

In your editorial of March 3 you refer to the drastic provision for FBI investigation of National Science Foundation employees and fellows contained in the bill passed by the House on March 1. You ask, "Where is this absurdity to stop?" May I suggest that it will not stop so long as democratically minded citizens resign themselves, as you suggest, to the view "that it is better to have the bill with the restriction than not to have it at all."

The Federation of American Scientists has urged the importance of this legislation, as the Washington Post has so splendidly done, but it knows, too, the nature of the time-bomb planted in the legislation by a misguided group in the House. There are at least two good reasons why this legislation, now unfortunately loaded with political dynamite, is not better than none at all.

First, the chances of success of the House proposed NSF are jeopardized at the outset by its violation of a first principle of scientific tradition—freedom from political qualification. Scientists will not strike against legislation. But more and more of them simply will prefer to look elsewhere for their support, or go without it, rather than subject themselves to procedures so unnecessary and repugnant.

Second, the issue raised goes beyond the Science Foundation, indeed almost relegates it to the background. It is not only as scientists, but as citizens concerned for the future of our way of life, that we protest this new height in antidemocratic measures offered to protect democracy.

The loyalty provision of the House version reads as follows: "No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship shall be awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the FBI shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney General, or any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

In light of the fact that this provision is applicable to an agency intended to devote itself primarily to education in the sciences and basic, nonsecret research, it deserves comparison with the provision governing the Atomic Energy Commission, an agency concerned with highly secret research and information: "Except as authorized by the Commission in case of emergency, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual."

The proposed NSF provision is far more drastic than the AEC provision in at least three important respects.

1. Membership in a single organization on the Attorney General's list, of however short duration, demonstrates disloyalty, regardless of other evidence to the contrary. Evaluation is based not on an individual's total record, but on what may have been a single action.

2. Not only present membership, but past membership demonstrates disloyalty. An individual who has performed a single purportedly disloyal action can never again be regarded as loyal. And, according to the language of the NSF provision, this applies ex post facto—an individual is disloyal even though he resigned from an organization before it appeared on the Attorney General's list.

3. The FBI is given not only investigative responsibility to establish facts, but evaluative responsibility as well. Before any person is employed or awarded a scholarship, the FBI must certify that he is loyal. If this provision is accepted, Congress, for the first time, would have declared that the FBI is more than a fact-gathering agency, that it is responsible for judging, and certifying to the loyalty of free citizens. Whether or not this is regarded as a proper function of the FBI, the question certainly should not be decided in legislation to establish a Federal science agency. If we wish the FBI to do this, it should be accomplished in legislation specifically designed for the purpose.

How far this absurdity is to go, to use your apt phrase, depends upon how far we will allow ourselves to be led without more than grumbles and protests for the record. In the opinion of the Federation of American Scientists, loyalty checks of any kind are unnecessary and unwise for scientists not having access to secret information. The Foundation is expected to support very little secret research, and we would prefer, in fact, that it support none at all.

What secret work it may do is adequately protected in both House and Senate versions by the provision that the Foundation, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, "shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified." Under this provision, if necessary, the FBI could be called on to investigate particular individuals in sensitive positions. There is no reason for a blanket provision applying to the great majority of persons associated with the Foundation who will be concerned only with information of completely unrestricted nature.

Under these circumstances, the drastic general loyalty provision is completely inappropriate and must be viewed as a maneuver designed for other purposes. Either the hope is to kill the bill by including a provision completely unacceptable to its supporters or to use the bill to establish a precedent for later legislation involving Federal support, as, for example, to education.

If these tactics are to be beaten, the grave general issue must be recognized and public opinion mobilized to insure deletion of the provision by the Senate-House conference committee which will be appointed shortly. The Senate version of the legislation, written in more temperate days, contains no unnecessary loyalty provisions. Conference committee members may be expected to exercise more reasoned judgment than did the House, particularly if it is made clear that the House version is totally unacceptable, not only to scientists but to all those who are more concerned with free thought than with safe thought.

Statement of A. B. Averill Presented to the Honorable Jamie Whitten, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. B. Averill, of Fremont, Wis., presented the following testimony.

This statement is a grass-roots opinion of a public-spirited constituent that came to Washington, at his own expense, to make constructive suggestions. His opinions on the farm problem is very much in keeping with the expressions of a majority of the farmers of our district.

The statement:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Pat Averill. I reside in Fremont, Wis., a litle village of 437 inhabitants, in Waupaca County, Wis., about in the south central part of the State.

In this village I own a small meat market and grocery store. I also own a small farm on the outskirts of this village where we milk from 25 to 30 cows, have about 100 hogs, and a family-size flock of chickens. We raise practically all of our own feeds, only buying a few concentrates. On this farm we employ help the year around.

I feel that I can speak from a small-town businessman's and a small farmer's point of view.

As we all know, the farmer's income has shrunk considerably within the last couple of years and at the rate it is going it does not paint too bright a picture for a small farmer nor for the small-town businessman. As a businessman we depend upon the greater majority of our business from the farmer and if the farmer does not thrive, the small-town business suffers equally as much.

I recently talked with nearly all of the businessmen up and down the street and they all tell me the same story. For example, your farm implement dealer; a few years ago the farmers were all clamoring for farm machinery. Now it is being stockpiled in the dealer's yards and warehouses and the dealer can find no other cause for it than the small income among farmers.

Our bankers also tell me business is not as good as it was a few years ago. Farmers who had their account paid up are now coming back for new loans.

I feel that every effort must be put forth to maintain stable prices and assure reasonable living conditions for all parties concerned. None of us want to hit the skid row we did back in the thirties.

I realize the fact that the Government has had a triple A program for several years, though now they have changed it to PMA, whatever that means, but to me it is still a triple A program under which we have worked for some time and I firmly believe in a program of that kind. Both as a farmer and businessman, I am thoroughly convinced that this is the proper program for agriculture. Practically all the members on this committee in this program are farmers elected by farmers who know what is best for farmers in their immediate locality. To

me the only thing wrong with the program is—there isn't enough of it.

Before I came here I had a talk with our PMA chairman. I was surprised to learn that 85 percent of the farmers in our county take part in this program. He also told me that in recent years the budget for this program has been cut to a point where it is hard to get some of the small farmers interested in building up their soil. The family-sized farm needs it most of all.

A number of the farmers are hard hit and this is no fault of their own. They may have large families or poor farms, or both. And it is extremely difficult for them to improve their farms without a little more assistance. I am sure they are all grateful for what the program has done for them in the past. It has done a great job in protecting our top soil and I feel it is the only program that is working on a large scale and in order to really accomplish conservation it must work on all farms; at least if we are going to continue to feed the greater part of the world.

I did not come here to ask for more money, but I would like to see you rearrange and earmark some of the money so more of it would get into the hands of the family-sized farmer. The commercial farmer has the knowledge and the finances to investigate these programs from all angles while the small farmer does not see where he can afford the time and money when he gets only a comparatively few dollars a year for his benefits.

And while on the subject, I think it would be of great benefit if there was more of an educational program put on so it could be thoroughly understood by all concerned. I, as a farmer, feel it would be a great benefit to me. By building up the soil one gets good crops and nothing makes the farmer feel happier and more light-hearted than to have good crops even though he doesn't get much for them.

It has been a privilege for me to meet with you and try as best I could to have you understand the situation as it exists in my part of the country.

I am extremely proud to have met you and I want to take this opportunity to thank you for permitting me to express my views.

Springfield High Schools Win Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to tell the Members of Congress that the young people in my district have been winning national honors for school publications. The competition includes every State in the Union and it is described in detail in the accompanying newspaper article.

I know the Members will want to join with me in congratulating the young people from the Second District of Massachusetts who have done such an excellent and outstanding job.

The article from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of Friday, March 10, 1950, follows:

TWO LOCAL SCHOOL PAPERS JUDGED BEST IN COUNTRY—CATHEDRAL AND CLASSICAL IN FIRST PLACE; BUCKINGHAM AND WEST SIDE JUNIOR HIGH ALSO HONORED

Competing with school publications from every State in the Union, the products of two Springfield high schools have won highest honors in their respective groups, it was announced today from Columbia University, where 3,500 school journalists are attending the twenty-sixth annual convention of the Columbia Scholastic Press Association.

First-place honors go to the Cathedral Chronicle in the division for printed newspapers in high schools with enrollments of 1,500 to 2,500, and the Classical Recorder in the same category for schools with enrollments of 750 to 1,000.

Four other schools in this area share in the contest awards. Next highest honors go to the Scribe, put out by students at Easthampton High School, in competition with other duplicated magazines of high schools with 300 students or less.

Suffield High School's Reader's Reflection took second place in the duplicated senior high-school magazine division of 300 to 750 enrollment.

A third-place award was won by the publication of Buckingham Junior High School, the Beacon, in the division for printed newspapers in junior high schools with enrollments of 700 to 1,200.

Another third-place award goes to the Observer, of West Springfield Junior High School, competing with duplicated newspapers of junior high schools with 700 or less students.

In rating the 1,300 entries, the judges considered such factors as make-up, typography, news, and story content.

The awards will be presented tomorrow at a luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, marking the conclusion of the 3-day convention. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Columbia, will address the final session.

A Sell-Out of American Workers by the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. I take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to call to public attention the serious plight facing workers in the rubber-footwear industry. Some of the nonreciprocal trade agreements negotiated by our State Department are resulting in reduced standards of living in this country.

Since 1933 import duties on both waterproof and rubber-soled canvas footwear have been applied on the American selling-price principle. While this did not totally discourage imports, it did afford some measure of protection to the American workingman. Under this system labor costs in this country were a consideration in the amount of duty paid. There is now a movement afoot to abandon this system and to apply duties on invoice value. Not content to strangle the rubber worker economically in only this one regard, the diplomatic "bright boys" are preparing to negotiate the present 25-percent to 35-percent tariff rates downward at a reciprocal-trade conference later this year.

Let me state unequivocally that employees in the rubber-footwear industry and their families will not long tolerate this complete disregard for their welfare. In the town of Naugatuck, Conn., alone more than 3,000 are employed in the manufacture of rubber footwear and allied products. Many thousands more depend upon the continued prosperity of this single facility. Most of the manufacturing plants for rubber footwear are located in the two New England States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Is it not enough that every administration policy seems dedicated to removal of these industries to other sections of the country?

Indignity is heaped upon indignity, and it is now proposed that we relinquish employment and manufacturing opportunities to the Russian satellite, Czechoslovakia. It is proposed that slave labor in a nationalized, Communist industry compete evenly with free Americans paid a decent, living wage.

How, in Heaven's name, can a Congress representing the American people countenance this outright give-away of the birthright of citizens of the United States? All anyone asks, in this instance, is the opportunity to be employed at a task of one's own choosing.

I call upon Congress to reject any proposal which would substitute the principle of invoking tariff duties on invoice or foreign value rather than upon the American selling price principle. This thesis was upheld by two former Presidents, Herbert Hoover in 1933 and Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937.

I submit for inclusion, with these remarks, a letter from the president of the Goodyear Rubber Co., Middletown, Conn., and the Case for Rubber Footwear:

GOODYEAR RUBBER CO.,
Middletown, Conn., March 7, 1950.
The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Once again the American rubber footwear industry is facing a serious threat from foreign imports and from efforts of our Government to encourage further the flow of manufactured goods from abroad. As one of the threatened American manufacturers, we appeal to you to use your good offices to obtain for us the protection we need to continue to operate and provide jobs for our present employees.

At the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Conference in Geneva, 1947, the duty on waterproof rubber footwear was cut virtually in half. Since that time, imports, especially from Czechoslovakia, have increased steadily and have reached dangerous proportions.

Now two new developments are in the making in Washington. The more serious is the attempt to abolish the American selling price principle, under which duties on waterproof and rubber-soled canvas footwear now are applied. This method was invoked by President Hoover in 1933 and sustained in 1937 by President Roosevelt. It is our understanding that the provision to remove the essential protection of the American selling price principle is contained in a bill, now being drafted, to revise procedures of the Bureau of Customs.

From our long experience in competing with goods made abroad with cheap labor, we know that the removal of the protection given under the American selling price principle will have disastrous results on the American footwear industry. Facts and reason supporting our position are give in concise form in the booklet the Case for Rubber Footwear, issued by the Rubber Manufacturers Associaton, Inc., which we are sending with his letter.

The second development which we anticipate is involved in the next conference on reciprocal trade announced for September of this year. It is expected that the American delegates will offer to negotiate the tariff on rubber-soled canvas shoes. We are conscious of the harm a reduction in this duty would do us in particular and the industry generally; and we respectfully urge you to do whatever you can to prevent such a reduction.

At present, the duty is 35 percent based on the American selling price. While this may appear to the uninformed as a high duty, we have evidence that even today rubber-soled canvas footwear is being offered for delivery in New York far below the lowest American price, and far below the point at which American manufacturers can hope to compete successfully for their own domestic market.

Within the past 20 years, the American rubber footwear manufacturers have on two occasions satisfied the proper governmental officials and the President of the United States that it needed tariff protection for its very existence. We respectfully ask you to help us retain this essential protection.

Your interest in this matter is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

THE GOODYEAR RUBBER CO.,
ALBERT A. LAPPIN, *President.*

THE CASE FOR RUBBER FOOTWEAR

The rubber footwear industry is an American enterprise.

It was founded by Americans more than 100 years ago. Although its early history is vague, 1843 is generally accepted as the year of its birth.

It was developed by Americans, and American manufacturers have been foremost in the promotion of design, quality, and efficiency.

The American pioneers in the rubber footwear industry had the entire world for their market.

While foreign competition was developing, American manufacturers maintained their leadership in the world markets for more than three-quarters of a century.

This leadership in the export field was lost in the late twenties to Japan and Czechoslovakia.

United States Department of Commerce statistics tell dramatically how American manufacturers of rubber footwear were driven virtually out of the export field by Japan and Czechoslovakia.

In 1919 American manufacturers accounted for more than half the total world exports of footwear. In 1936 (the last year the Department of Commerce issued its report) the American exports were just over 1 percent.

The decline of the United States and the ascendency of Japan and Czechoslovakia are graphically shown in the following table showing percentages of total world exports of rubber footwear (waterproof and rubber-soled canvas):

1919:	
United States	58.87
Japan	0
Czechoslovakia	0
1924:	
United States	26.31
Japan	2.93
Czechoslovakia	0
1929:	
United States	17.24
Japan	29.15
Czechoslovakia	.26
1934:	
United States	1.35
Japan	63.72
Czechoslovakia	8.23
1936:	
United States	1.11
Japan	62.83
Czechoslovakia	7.80

NOTE.—For the sake of brevity the above table covers the Department of Commerce report in 5-year steps, except for 1936 which was the last year the report was published.

These foreign competitors who swallowed the world markets and moved menacingly into the domestic market contributed nothing new to the development of rubber footwear. They merely copied American designs and American methods.

Their sole advantage was cheap labor which enabled them to undersell American manufacturers in their own markets.

These foreign offerings did not in the slightest expand the domestic market. Each pair of imported rubber footwear sold to American buyers simply took the place of an American pair which either remained unsold on the dealer's shelf or unmade by the higher-paid American workman.

In 1932 the influx of rubber footwear imports was so great the Tariff Commission made an investigation of costs in both the foreign and the domestic industries and reported to President Hoover.

The threat to the American rubber-footwear industry was so serious, that President Hoover issued a proclamation making duties on rubber footwear applicable on the American selling-price basis. The rates of duty (25 percent on waterproof and 35 percent on canvas) remained unchanged, but they applied to the domestic selling price of American-made footwear like or similar to the imported articles. Prior to the Hoover proclamation these rates were assessed generally against the invoice or foreign value of the imports.

This saved the American industry.

In 1937, when the Czechoslovakian Trade Treaty was under consideration, President Roosevelt sustained the action taken by President Hoover and refused to negotiate on rubber footwear.

Shortly after the conclusion of the Czechoslovakian Trade Treaty, the world started on its path to total war and for the next decade there was no import problem. With the end of the war, foreign manufacturers turned their eyes toward the American market.

Czechoslovakian rubber footwear manufacturers—now nationalized—began shipping their products into the United States. American manufacturere were aware of the danger that threatened. They realized that the margin of protection granted by two past Presidents would be ineffectual if the Czechoslovakian Government chose to use its nationalized rubber-footwear industry to obtain dollar credits in the United States.

It was at this time—1947—that the American delegation to the Reciprocal Trade Conference in Geneva granted to Czechoslovakia concessions on waterproof rubber footwear, which, for practical purposes, cut the American duty in half.

The trade treaty became effective in April, 1948.

Czechoslovakia accelerated its exports of rubber footwear to the United States. Receipts up to the present are not large when compared to American production, but they are steadily increasing.

The imports are priced at from 20 percent to 40 percent under the usual American prices. The presence of even a small amount of low-price goods in an industry as seasonable as rubber footwear can be most upsetting to the market. The least damage is the retarding of buying. Inventories are piling up more than usual as American manufacturers build against expectation and store the finished goods in order to provide continuous employment for their workers. While it is normal to build up some inventory in this period of the year, gambling on economic and weather conditions 6 months or more ahead, the industry's hazards are increased this year by the foreign offerings in the market and the threat of unknown future importations under the reduced tariffs.

Unrestrained importation of rubber footwear can lead only to the curtailment of the American industry, and probable failure of some companies.

It will not put more rubber footwear on American feet.

The domestic industry—except during the recent war when it was restricted to the manufacture of military footwear and a limited list of essential civilian items—always has been able to supply the public demand for its goods. Every year in its history its manufacturers have carried over substantial inventories from one season to the next.

Imported rubber footwear, produced by workmen whose wage level is far below American rates, may give the public the questionable benefit of temporary lower prices. Such imports are priced low because they have to be to compete. No guarantee is given that they will remain low if they can oust their competition from the market.

If American manufacturers are forced by such competition to cut prices below what sound business demands, the differences must come out of the manufacturers' pockets or out of their workmen's wages, or both.

Is the American rubber footwear industry worth saving?

There are 13 ccmpanies engaged in the manufacture of standard line rubber footwear. They produce 98 percent of the rubber footwear made in the United States. Several specialties manufacturers account for the remaining 2 percent.

These 13 have given steady employment to more than 20,000 men and women. An unusually high percentage of the industry's costs are for labor. In 1948 factory salaries and wages were 47 percent of total factory costs.

Since the end of the war the industry has produced rubber footwear with an annual average value of well over $100,000,000 at the wholesale level.

During the war the industry made more than 45,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear for the armed forces and at times half its capacity was devoted to military orders.

In addition, allocations of rubber—the most critically short war material—were made to enable the industry to produce a restricted list of civilian footwear which the Government held to be essential to the national health and welfare.

Is the American rubber footwear industry worth saving?

New Gouge for Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article, which appeared in the New Republic of March 13, 1950:

NEW GOUGE FOR CONSUMERS
(By Robert Wallace)

The petroleum interests which monopolize the Nation's natural-gas resources have found a new way to remove billions of dol-

lars from the consumers' pockets and will soon begin doing so if Congress will pass one little law.

This bill, sponsored by Senators ROBERT KERR and ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, and Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, Arkansas, passed the House handily last summer; it is close to passage in the Senate today. If it does become law, the gas bills of 40,000,000 natural-gas consumers will rise by one hundred and thirty to five hundred and fifty million dollars annually, with total extra costs of four to sixteen billion dollars over a period of 30 years. These levies on cooking and on the heating and lighting of our homes will add to the immense fortunes of the Rockefellers, the Mellons, the Pews, the Phillipses, and the other monopoly combines which control the oil-and-gas industry.

The gas bill would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from regulating the prices charged by independent gas producers to the operators who pipe the gas to consumers and allow them to charge what the traffic will bear. Among these independents may be found Standard of New Jersey, Standard of New York, Standard of Indiana, Gulf, Shell, Sinclair, Phillips, Texas, and Cities Service. They are independent because they sell to the pipe-line companies but are not affiliated with them.

Representative ROBERT CROSSER, Democrat, of Ohio, who led the fight against the bill in the House, has named 24 of the gas producers who would profit by this bill. They are all mammoth corporations. Their total assets amounted to $14,000,000,000 in 1948 and their profits averaged 24 percent after taxes; they are hardly distressed companies in need of relief.

The backers of the bill maintain that if it passes, competition among the producers will keep both prices and profits down. They point out that the prices of coal and oil are not regulated by Government. Why not depend on competition to suppress prices in the gas industry as well?

The answer lies in the concentration of ownership in the production of natural gas and the monopolistic control of its distribution.

There are 2,300 gas producers who sell to interstate pipe-line companies. Three percent of them account for 70 percent of the sales. The seven Southwestern States of Arkansas, Kansas, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and New Mexico contain nearly 90 percent of all the gas reserves in the country. There are 600 nontransporting gas producers, but only 12 of these producers sold more than half of all the gas going into interstate pipe lines from the Southwest.

Coal can be transported by truck, barge, or rail, and fuel oil can use these means as well as pipe lines. If prices are unreasonable at any particular coal mine or oil refinery, a buyer can get trucks or railroads to haul from another. For these reasons competition is at least feasible among the producers of coal and oil. But gas does not lend itself to such freedom. If a pipe-line company decides to buy gas from a particular field, it lays its pipe line. But if the producers in that field get together and raise their price, the company must either pay the increase or tear up the pipe line and lay a new one to a field with lower prices. Once a pipe line is laid, the competition of other fields is almost nil.

What about the possibility of competition among the various producers in a given field? Cannot one producer underbid another in the same area? The Federal Power Commission posed this question. It carried out studies of fields with combined reserves of 15.5 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. It found that in each case, one, two, or three companies owned from one-half to all of the natural gas.

Price fixing is, of course, contrary to the Sherman Antitrust Act. That means simply that companies which conspire to fix prices take care not to leave any documentary evidence lying around. Even though the same prices may be charged by all the producers in a single field, proof of conspiracy is hard to obtain.

From 1938, when the Natural Gas Act was passed, to 1947, the price of gas at the well was generally reasonable. Gas reserves, usually discovered during a search for oil, were considered a consolation prize and sometimes a liability. The FPC did not regulate the prices of the nontransporting gas producers during this period. But as the remarkable growth of pipeline companies created an ever-expanding demand for gas in the North, East, and other regions, prices at the wells soon began to skyrocket.

In recent years, gas prices have doubled and sometimes tripled. Speculation has been widespread, and reserves have been held off the market in the expectation of even higher prices. Yet producers had one great apprehension—the possibility that the FPC might move in to protect the public by regulation.

The oil and gas lobby began a campaign during the Eightieth Congress to remove this possibility. Their campaign produced the Moore-Rizley bill, which undertook to prohibit regulation of the nontransporting producers and to permit the pipe-line companies which owned their own gas wells to charge higher prices to the tune of $50,000,000 a year.

The primary emphasis of the Moore-Rizley bill was placed on allowing higher prices for gas produced by pipe-line companies, since, up to that time, no real attempt had been made by the FPC to regulate the nontransporting gas producers. The bill failed. But the campaign of the lobby gained in force.

Early in 1948, the FPC completed a study of the natural-gas industry. It indicated the startling degree to which prices had gone up and the concentration of ownership of gas reserves increased. As a result of this study, Commissioner Leland Olds began his fight for regulation of the prices charged by the nontransporting producers. This effort to protect the public welfare cost Olds his job. Senators from the gas-producing States blocked his confirmation for another term.

The monopolists of the natural-gas industry had good reason to fear Olds. One struggle before the FPC involved the Phillips Petroleum Co. In 1945, the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co. contracted with the Phillips Petroleum Co. for gas at a price of 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. But after pipe-line construction was well under way, the contracts were renegotiated and additional contracts signed which increased the minimum price to 8.5 cents, with some gas going at 10 and 11 cents. Added yearly costs to consumers amounted to $5,000,000 in this case alone. The price had doubled in 4 years.

If the gas bill is defeated, the FPC will probably bring producers' gas prices under regulation and, while allowing a fair return on investment, will protect consumers from excessive charges. But if the Kerr bill passes, the gas industry will aim for the highest profits possible and will charge the limit. Natural-gas prices may well go as high as oil and coal on an equivalent heat-value basis, and perhaps higher, since the cleanliness of gas makes it preferable for domestic use. This is already the case in Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia, where gas costs more than other fuels.

If the price of gas rises in this way, it could ultimately increase as much as 20 cents per 1,000 cubic feet on an average for the whole country, assuming 1947 fuel-oil prices. Based on 1952 consumption, this would mean an ultimate annual increase of more than $500,000,000 in amounts paid by consumers to the big gas companies.

Were gas to increase by the more conservative estimate of 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet—and it has already done so in some areas—consumers would still pay an extra $132,000,000 annually. Additional amounts paid out by the various regions would be approximately as follows:

Middle Atlantic States	$5,200,000
East North Central States	13,400,000
West North Central States	13,400,000
South Atlantic States	5,800,000
East South Central States	4,000,000
West South Central States	21,500,000
Mountain States	3,700,000
Pacific States	2,700,000

The strangest phenomenon shown here is that the consumers in the West-South Central region, containing the four States of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, would suffer more than any other region if the gas bill becomes law, and yet this is largely where pressure for passage of the bill is coming from. While the big gas companies, having wells located in this region, would profit greatly, the consumers in the same region would be hard hit.

The fate of the gas bill will be decided very shortly in the Senate. Senators KERR, of Oklahoma, and JOHNSON of Texas, Democrats, backed by other Senators from gas-producing States, are leading the fight for the bill. Senator FRANCIS MYERS, of Pennsylvania, Democratic whip; Senator JAMES MURRAY, Democrat of Montana, veteran liberal, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, who also helped to lead the fight against the basing-point system, are leading the opposition. Senators AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont; KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, have also indicated a keen interest in fighting the gas bill.

The oil-and-gas lobby is, of course, all out for the bill. Labor and consumer groups as well as municipalities have begun to move into opposition.

Many Senators have not made up their minds on this issue, and the outcome will, to a much greater extent than usual, be decided on the basis of the debates and the mail basket. Rumors about President Truman's attitude continue to fly, but the Budget Bureau has stated that the bill is "not in accord with the President's program." As of this writing, the President has not repudiated this position. In view of his blasts at "special interests," it is difficult to imagine his accepting this bill. It is an outstanding example of the efforts of selfish interests to profit at the expense of the public welfare, against which he successfully campaigned.

Rulers of Red China Call on British To Negotiate Return of Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting an article by Constantine Brown, columnist, which appeared in the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., of date March 12, 1950, with respect to a question which was of the utmost interest to the United States, that is, the recognition of the Red regime in China by the British Government and the abandonment of their, and our former, ally, the Chinese Nationalist Government.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be one instance where British diplomacy will boomerang.

The article referred to is reproduced as follows:

RULERS OF RED CHINA CALL ON BRITISH TO NEGOTIATE RETURN OF HONG KONG

(By Constantine Brown)

The new Chinese People's Republic has told the British representative, with whom it has been negotiating in Peiping, that it cannot accept Britain's recognition unless the British support Chinese Communist entry into the United Nations and are willing to negotiate the return of Hong Kong to China.

The first condition could easily be met by the London Government, since it officially has broken relations with the Nationalist regime. The situation is more difficult with respect to Hong Kong, the preservation of which was one of the main reasons for Britain's haste in recognizing Moscow's newest puppet.

The British administer the crown colony under a charter dated April 5, 1843. In recent years the Chinese have disputed British rights to that territory. At the Cairo conference in 1943 between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek the generalissimo insisted on retrocession of Hong Kong to China, but eventually he yielded when Mr. Churchill reminded him and Mr. Roosevelt that he did not become His Majesty's First Minister in order to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire.

QUESTION GLOSSED OVER

Thus, while Manchuria and Formosa were "returned" to China, the question of Hong Kong was glossed over. Chiang did not press the matter, but Mao Tze-tung and Chou En-lai, the Chinese Communist leaders, pressed it.

They have now informed the British negotiator through a minor official of the Peiping Foreign Office that the question of Hong Kong must be discussed and settled before the Chinese People's Republic can consider the British offer to resume normal diplomatic relations. What the Chinese Communists now are asking is that Britain admit that Hong Kong is a mere leasehold, which they will pledge themselves to evacuate a number of years hence.

The actual time for the British departure is left open for negotiation. But the principle that the crown colony actually is a Chinese territory and eventually is to be returned to China must be settled before the Peiping government will agree to exchange ambassadors with Great Britain.

The new situation may result in reversal of Britain's policy toward the Chinese Communists. There is an outside chance that Mr. Churchill, in agreement with the Government, will raise the question in the House of Commons, require Foreign Secretary Bevin to explain the status of the negotiations, and then force—by a vote of confidence if necessary—withdrawal of the preferred recognition of the Communist regime.

REQUEST OF BIG BUSINESS

Strange as it seems, the Labor government rushed into recognition of the Peiping government at the pressing request of Britain's big business. Banking and export firms which have been making handsome profits in China for the last 150 years pleaded with Mr. Bevin to consider their vital interests rather than political and ethical considerations in dealing with the Moscow puppets.

Unable as they are to make good profits in socialistic Britain, businessmen are trying to revive their old trade with the Far East, where they once reigned supreme.

Since the requests of the business firms did not conflict with the ideology of the Labor Party, the British Government decided to recognize the Communist regime in China about 3 months ago. The Foreign Office and the old "China hands" were taken back, however, when the Communist leaders were less than lukewarm to this offer of recognition.

Because of Britain's past prestige in the Far East, the Government and businessmen believed that Mao Tze-tung and Chou Enlai would accept eagerly the extended hand of British friendship. Instead, both Chinese leaders went for a long stay in Moscow, and the British diplomat assigned to negotiate resumption of relations was left cooling his heels in Hong Kong. He could not get a permit to enter Communist China.

Normally the British would have been indignant at the insult by the Chinese Reds and would have ordered their diplomat back to Britain. Eventually the Foreign Office representative received a visa to go to Peiping. He was received by underlings in the Peiping Foreign Office, who transmitted to him the conditions under which China was willing to consider conversations leading to eventual resumption of normal relations.

From Dear Hearts, Gentle People, a New West Springfield Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the country already knows about the famous Springfield plan which is mentioned in the accompanying newspaper article.

I also want to call the attention of the Members of Congress to another plan in a neighboring community called the West Springfield plan. I hope all the Members will take the time to read the description of it.

FROM DEAR HEARTS, GENTLE PEOPLE, A NEW WEST SPRINGFIELD PLAN

A few years ago much was heard about the so-called Springfield plan, the basis of which was the very simple idea that people of different races and creeds can get along together and work toward common desirable objectives.

The plan caught hold and received national attention. Books were written about it, magazines and newspapers sent special writers to Springfield to see it in action, and the radio used it effectively in programs designed to stimulate neighborliness and fair play.

WORLD-WIDE IMPACT

Indeed, the good that grew out of the Springfield plan cannot be measured, and the spirit it engendered spread throughout the country and, via our soldiers in foreign lands, was known even in far corners of the world.

GI's serving overseas from this area came to be asked about the Springfield plan.

There was a heartening contagion about this idea, as people of good will everywhere sought to uproot prejudice and promote better understanding.

It was and is such a good and effective idea that it is worth a new impetus, and the purpose of this article is to suggest that West Springfield furnish fresh drive for the spirit that created it.

Let's have a West Springfield plan.

Since this is already the Friendly Town, bustling with dear hearts and gentle people, it would be quite in line with our normal outlook to seize hold of this idea of community good will and give it a new fling that it might light other fires of good will in other good hearts.

DIVIDE AND DESTROY

If there is any enemy at work today seeking to destroy America or what America stands for—and there are signs that we have such foe—certainly one of the weapons they are turning loose against us is that which seeks to divide, that we might be the more easily conquered.

Beware the whispered word that seeks to poison our mind against a neighbor!

Tear through the insidious insinuations that seek to lump all those of opposite color or creed in separate camp, that would have us build fences to keep out fellow citizens.

Remember, that whatever our differences, nothing is so vital in the world today as that men of good will should stand together.

Some such slogan might be the basis of a West Springfield plan.

It takes more than writing about it, of course to make such a plan. The community must practice it.

There is ample opportunity in many existing frameworks, which by simple recognition of a West Springfield plan and extension of program could make it a vital force in the community.

ALREADY AT WORK

Already it is a dominating factor in some of our groups, such as the West Springfield neighborhood house, where program and good will cut through all superficial barriers of race and creed.

In our schools, both public and parochial, there is much to encourage the fundamental allegiances that make for a strong democracy and effective brotherhood.

Indeed, in almost every circle within the community there is a force for the West Springfield plan. A consciousness of the objectives could rouse a considerable activity town-wide in impact which could thrust this community into the forefront of a movement world-wide in scope.

There is no lack of good will in West Springfield, but even the most optimistic among us knows full well what opportunity there is for amplifying and insuring the continuity of this good will.

BUT NEEDING LEADER

It requires intelligent program and some effort to promote a plan such as this. The latent materials are at hand. The leadership is needed.

The importance of the work is beyond dispute in this troubled day. The reward is peace.

Atomic Crisis Needs Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting article written by Judge Thomas F. Quinn, of Boston, Mass., and appearing in the Boston Post of March 5, 1950:

ATOMIC CRISIS NEEDS ACTION—KNOWLEDGE OF FISSION GIVES NATIONS TOO POWERFUL WEAPON—CHANGE IN UN CHARTER CAN HELP

(By Judge Thomas F. Quinn)

We have heard much about social security. We recognize and we are concerned with a general insecurity. In a free America these concerns may not be left to a select few.

The aggravated atomic crisis confronting all of us requires more than receptive bravery. It requires an insistent demand by the people for action broad enough to deal with and control this unleashed power.

Social security forever more on this earth depends upon peace between nations. The world-wide knowledge of atomic fission and thermonuclear weapons has placed in the hands of nations and in the control of national political leaders, war weapons sufficient to destroy all life on earth. The Russians may match and outdo us. We may match and outdo the Russians. It appears certain that on such a course we will both undo each other, undo other nations, undo future generations, and social security to boot.

Our national leaders in aid of our defense have done much more than authorize extermination weapons. Confronted by a cruel and tyrannical Soviet expansionism that has marched into Europe, that has crushed peoples as far as the Danube, that has swept over Asia to the Pacific, that has infiltrated its agents of hatred and fury amongst all the peoples on earth, we have moved slowly but inexorably to create a common defense with all people outside the iron curtain.

IN MANY FIELDS

We have moved in the field of international politics, with economic aid to other nations, with economic aid to our own citizens to secure our internal stability, with military arms to those who will stand for freedom and justice and honor. We are participants with nations abroad in Atlantic and Mediterranean defense pacts in which an armed attack on any national signatory is regarded as an attack on all so bound.

We are sharing in the physical protection of the countries of North Africa and southern Asia. We are pouring our wealth into many lands without hope of any return other than a common sustenance. We have encouraged a European economic union. We look with favor upon stability in Europe in a community of nations or through federation. We are aiding upon the rearmament of England and part of the European Continent. We have bolstered the United Nations Organizations with hope for their future. Our national political leaders, our officials, our industrialists, our bankers, have not been idle.

COLD WAR HOT CONTEST

After all these temporizing activities, where do we find ourselves? What of our security? We find ourselves directly or indirectly cheek by jowl with Communist militarism in every corner of the world. We find ourselves engaged in a cold war that is in fact about the hottest contest in the history of mankind, with no normal interchange of goods or services or information with the mass of humanity imprisoned by the Soviet war machine. We find humanity marshaled or joined in two great camps, madly testing great instruments for mass destruction.

There is no earthly security through our present split global arrangements. The mere marshaling of human labor to produce the enormously expensive and burdensome instruments of destruction will corrode a free society, and soon may wipe out any extensive holdings of private industry or any proper individual economic freedom. The two great armed camps are likely to destroy earthly freedom without moving into any explosive action. If they move, they are likely to destroy life on earth. In any event, we, the people, cannot permit the development of destructive power to move on to obliterate our lives or our freedom.

Our political leaders do not like this situation. The Russians could not be so stupid as to be either apathetic or content with their position. None wish to be the Pied Pipers of doom. Where then is the path through the maze? Where are the chains that bar the road to sanity and peace, that we may cut them?

MILITARISTIC CHAINS

We should consider whether the chains that bind all of us are militaristic chains now united with the chains of nationalism. Nationalism is good and proper and necessary for national affairs. The militaristic chains are so monumental now that they have become galling in the common affairs of all mankind. Atomic fission is such a common affair. Mass destruction is such a common affair.

The basic power to cut these chains lies under God with the people of the world. May we use any part of the United Nations to institute the organization of this power of the people? I think so. The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations, placing the source of authority in the peoples of the United Nations, sets forth a determination to live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security."

A proposal for amendment to the Charter might be made in the Assembly in accordance with article 108, so that regulation adequate for survival may be vested in the United Nations free of veto in the Security Council. The ultimate objective would be to activate and implement all the structures of the United Nations to their proper ends, but we are considering initially only a resurgence of the spirit and the will of the peoples of the world for definite and effective controls of armaments.

COULD SPONSOR PROPOSAL

Our Congress, by joint resolution, might direct our representatives in the United Nations to sponsor the initial proposal. This proposal might affirm that the security of the peoples of the world is endangered by weapons for mass destruction, and by the inability of member nations to formulate separate agreements adequate for national defense and for the supervision and control of such weapons.

Then we would sponsor an amendment to chapter V, article 27, by adding after the words "including the concurring votes of the permanent members" the words "excepting votes upon any and all destructive armament the maintenance of which shall be regulated by the Security Council upon principles common to all nations by votes of two-thirds of the members, and for said purposes of regulation, complete and continuous rights of inspection in every part of every member nation are granted to the Security Council." This amendment would be effective upon adoption in accordance with provisions of chapter XVIII, article 108.

It seems to me that such an amendment under present conditions would not impair the right and duty of the Congress to provide for the common defense. International regulation upon principles common to all nations may be the most effective and practical way now to insure our defense. We will be obligated to abide by these common regulations only upon assent by all the permanent members of the Security Council, including the Soviet. We grant none of our sovereignty, nor any part of our domestic responsibility. It is about as far as we may expect other nations to advance now with us.

We must act boldly for the security of all people. If we fail to act we leave ourselves and all the world in serious and imminent danger. If others fail to agree to regulation, world opinion may arise in a more common unity with us to impel common protection.

CAN HAVE NO ILLUSIONS

We should have no illusion that a mere writing of words or a mere agreement in words will keep the peace. International regulation of destructive armaments, including the elimination of certain types of weapons, and the limitation of others, may provide further time for the people to lay the foundations for an enduring peace.

Common inspections will generate common talk at the peoples' level. Common concern to alleviate suffering in most depressed areas should give rise to considerable common action to that end. Reasonable access to the most important natural resources upon fair terms should be facilitated and encouraged. We should study with other peoples the intricate task of developing fair exchanges of all necessary goods and services. In short, we should acquire time to search for peace, and we should use that time to reduce the economic causes of war. We must activate our proclaimed spirit of good will by sacrifices necessary to save humanity.

Some may say that this program means communism for all of us, however good our intentions, and that Red Riding Hood with her market basket will never survive against the wicked revolutionary gutter tactics of the big bad wolf. There is that danger. But why send Red Riding Hood? After all, we are talking about human beings—Russian human beings—with whom we propose to compete and cooperate, depressed human beings that we propose to place on their own two feet, human beings all over the world who react very much as we do.

I think that many of our business leaders may think too narrowly, but for weal or woe we are world leaders and the best that we have, backed up by the most skillful free people on earth will not be afraid to tackle any necessary economic assignment on the face of the earth.

NEED PLANNING AND HELP

We need not lose our right to hold all the private property necessary to our freedom. We do need guidance and planning and governmental help to reconvert haphazard processing for domestic waste to a balanced abundance for domestic and foreign peoples.

If we can find the way to turn our energies away from the destructive armaments now fabricated by our taxes, to useful goods, the distribution of which may be accomplished by similar taxes, we may save the lives of our children. A common survival need not mean stagnation. A common survival need not mean loss of individuality or of any appropriate freedom.

On the path that I indicate lies the hope of survival. We may remember that the path of good will is our only hope of reaching temporal security, and if it lends us hope for fair days hereafter we might try that together, for we are all headed that way.

Federal Officers or Employees Convicted of a Felony in Connection With Their Service Should Be Barred From Annuity Benefits

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, any Federal officer or employee, including a Member of Congress, who commits a felony in connection with the conduct of his office should forfeit any claim he may have to a Federal contribution to retirement benefits. Adjudged faithless to his trust, he should not ask the Government to assist in paying the cost of a retirement annuity appropriately awarded to conscientious and faithful public servants. His only right should be to recover the amount of his own contributions to the retirement fund.

Chapter 15 of title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," contains provisions relating to the conduct of Federal officers and employees, including Members of Congress. I am today introducing a bill to add a new section to this chapter to provide that anyone convicted of a felony committed in connection with his service as an officer or employee of the Government shall receive no award of annuity under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. One so convicted, under this measure, will only be repaid the amount credited to his individual account arising from his own contributions to the fund less any sum which he may already have received on an annuity previously awarded.

Conviction of a felony already carries with it forfeiture of the franchise and frequently disqualification from holding an office of honor or trust in the Government. Certainly when an offense has to do with the performance of one's official duties, conviction should carry with it loss of the benefits designed to reward those who serve with integrity and fidelity. Insofar as pension rights derive from the purse of the American public, they have a right to insist that malefactors in office shall not share in the annuity benefits which they provide.

It may be argued with considerable force that the bill I have offered does not go far enough in that it is limited to a conviction of a felony committed in connection with or related to the service of the Federal officer or employee. It may be considered desirable by the Committee on the Judiciary to extend these punitive provisions to one convicted of any felony whatever. I have endeavored, however, to design a measure which would have the widest possible support. Thinking it might be contended that conviction of a felony provided in some of the States' statutes or arising possibly as the outgrowth of political rivalries should not carry with it this additional penalty, I have limited the applicability of this legislative proposal strictly to malfeasance in office.

The fact that Members of Congress under existing law might profit from their own wrongdoing at the expense of the public makes it imperative that we act and act quickly to indicate our recognition of the need for change in existing law. The preservation of public respect for Federal officials is essential to the successful functioning of our form of government. This is an issue upon which we cannot afford to delay or equivocate.

The Red Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 11, 1950, issue of the New York Journal-American relative to famine in China which is the rest of the Communist conquest of that country:

THE RED FAMINE

In the wake of the Communist conquest of China has come the inevitable tragedy of a helpless and hopeless nation whose bewildered people have been uprooted from their homes and their productive lives.

Infinitely worse than the destruction and devastating Red conquest of China is the ensuing Red famine.

Ten millions of the Chinese people will surely die of starvation in the next few weeks, and ultimately as many as 70,000,000 may perish—a horror of such vast proportions that the annals of human history may be searched in vain for a parallel.

This is happening because the conquering Communist armies have swept through the land like thieves and locusts.

The available supplies of food have been confiscated for the use of the Communists alone, leaving the masses of the people to starve and die.

The people are not planting new crops, because they would only feed those whose ruthless and crushing heel is on the neck of China.

So the great Red famine is stalking throughout the land and spreading like a plague to the uttermost reaches of the enslaved and agonized country.

There is no relief for China in this grim disaster, for only the Communists are in a position to help the people and, of course, it is the Communists who have caused the disaster and are reaping the gruesome profits from it in terms of the power and authority they are now able to wield over the people and at their expense.

The bitter irony in this situation arises from the fact that China has many friends among the nations of the world, but none of them can help her.

None of China's friends are more able and willing to help than America, but Americans too must sit back and watch China die.

Communism has brought this ghastly tragedy to China, as to all other countries that have fallen under its evil spell, even and especially Soviet Russia itself.

It is not a new experience in world history for famine and pestilence and death to descend upon a people, in the wake of conquerors who have laid the land waste by despoiling it.

But it is new for all the rest of the world to be compelled to stand by helplessly while the whole work of horror is wrought, not by the violent acts of nature but by the deliberate designs of evil men.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the one question uppermost in the minds of the American people today is economy in Government. This is especially true now when we are all called upon to pay our Federal income tax and it certainly does not make us any more anxious to pay our taxes when we realize that much of the money paid is wasted in unnecessary and unessential governmental spending.

At the beginning of the present session of Congress, President Truman estimated that the 1951 deficit would be $5,100,000,000. Last year the President estimated that the deficit this year would be $800,000,000. He could, of course, be just as wrong on the 1951 estimate as he was this year, in which event the deficit could be considerably more than the present estimate.

Based on the President's present estimate, the 1951 budget is $8,200,000,000 more than the expenditures in 1948. Under the 1951 budget, domestic civilian expenditures—exclusive of veterans and interest—would total $12,250,000,000 as compared with $6,900,000,000 in 1948, and $11,400,000,000 estimated for 1950. This amount for non-war-connected purposes is far more than the total budget, including defense, foreign, veterans, and interest, in any peacetime year before the war.

In this budget, foreign expenditures are reduced by $1,800,000,000 and domestic expenditures are increased by nearly a billion dollars, indicating that as foreign expenditures and recovery programs are decreased, expenditures are to be increased for domestic programs.

As the budget now stands, the proposed program for the military will cost more than any year since demobilization was completed in 1948—this in spite of the fact that this will be the third year of unifications, which was to materially reduce the cost of the armed services.

Frankly, I am opposed to many of the policies financed in the pending budget, and I think it imperative that we reduce, rather than increase, our governmental expenditures and make a sincere effort to balance the budget. No other big business could long continue deficit spending, and, in my opinion, neither can the Federal Government. It is the responsibility of the Congress alone to appropriate money for Federal expenditures, and I sincerely hope we will make a real effort to reduce Government spending and try to balance the budget.

Too many people are asking the Federal Government to perform the functions of State and municipal governments. Too many people want to lean upon the Government. Too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. Too many people are going to sleep dreaming of economic security guaranteed by the Government, and I fear they will wake up in a nightmare of austerity guaranteed by socialism.

We are today spending more than tax revenue justifies. Without adopting any of the new programs urged by the administration, it is conservatively estimated that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, we will have spent between five and seven billion dollars more than our income, but if we adopt all of those new programs, no one can tell exactly how much we will have to borrow. We do know, however, that deficit financing as a result of spending beyond our revenue is destroying the purchasing power of the dollar, destroying the value of every insurance policy, every deposit, every pension, social security, and so forth.

Today our banks have more money on deposit than ever before in peacetime history. Farmers are reasonably prosperous. Few factories are idle. More men are employed than ever before, and our people are better fed and better clothed. If our Government cannot live within the national income today, what will it do should we have a serious recession in business?

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has submitted a budget to the Senate amounting to $36,000,000,000, a cut in the 1951 budget of $6,000,000,000. I have no doubt the affairs of Government could be efficiently carried on with this amount. We must economize and we must confine our expenditures to conform to our income. If we do not reduce our expenditures, we necessarily will have to increase taxes by more than $7,000,000,000, if we expect to preserve the purchasing power of the dollar. God knows none of us want to raise taxes, because taxes are already so high that they are choking the life out of the incentive to do business.

I am confident that achievement of a sound balanced budget would reaffirm the confidence of the public in prospects of our continued solvency, and strengthen the private-enterprise system which is our basic form of government. This confidence is based upon the conviction that a sound and reasonable budget would—

First. Balance the budget and create a surplus sufficient to justify correction of tax inequalities and injustices which admittedly exist, and this might provide a business stimulus to pave the way for tax reductions.

Second. Break the momentum of deficit financing policies.

Third. Dispel the fear of private enterprise inherent in Government encroachment through public debt and by Federal controls which lead to socialism.

Fourth. Stimulate constructive investment, development, and expansion in industry and agriculture for the production of more of the still tremendous backlog of things people everywhere need and desire at prices they can pay.

Fifth. Put savings to work through private enterprise creating the wealth which is required to lift the great millstone of debt from our backs and leave us erect with the dignity of a sufficient and creative people, free and unregimented in the pursuit of happiness.

Should we accept Senator BYRD's recommendation of a $36,000,000,000 budget, it would result in a saving of $108,000,000 a year for the people of Maryland, which is about one-seventh of the amount of Federal taxes paid in Maryland in a year. I was interested in reading the following editorial in the Baltimore Sun of February 27, 1950:

WHAT FEDERAL BUDGET PRUNING COULD MEAN TO MARYLANDERS

When someone suggests a pruning program for the multi-billion-dollar Federal budget, the average person, if he gives the suggestion any thought, is very likely to push it hurriedly out of his mind with a frustrated "So what?" That is so because the Federal budget is too big and complicated for the average person to be able to translate a pruning program into anything remotely resembling personal pocket-saving terms.

Senator BYRD has now come forward with a statistical table which should be of great help to those who want to know what Federal budget pruning could mean to them. The table shows how much the taxpayers of each State would save if the Byrd plan to cut the Truman budget proposal were to be adopted. The cut would reduce the budget from $42,400,000,000 to $36,000,000,000.

The result in savings to Marylanders would be $108,000,000. What would that mean in terms of reducing the taxpayers' burden in this State? To make a comparable saving in State taxes it would be necessary to slash the State budget by 70 percent. That would then allow the elimination of the State sales tax, income tax, gasoline tax, property tax, alcoholic-beverage taxes, automobile taxes (licenses, titling, etc.) race-track taxes, inheritance taxes and half of the tuitions at the University of Maryland.

There were loud cheers when Governor Lane put forth his plan to reduce the State tax burden by $3,750,000. But that reduction, welcome as it is, is chicken feed in comparison to the saving that would accrue to Maryland taxpayers if Senator Byrd's plan to prune the Federal budget were adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote at every opportunity for a reduction in governmental expenditures, and I firmly believe that if we all try, we can keep the budget within the $36,000,000,000 a year recommended by Senator BYRD.

American Legion Supports Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'BRIEN: The American Legion at its national convention in 1949 unanimously endorsed Senate bill 2246 having to do with housing legislation. The House last year passed part of that legislation in H. R. 6070 and will soon consider H. R. 7402, which includes cooperative housing and other perfecting amendments. The American Legion strongly urges the passage of H. R. 7402.

Prior to our endorsement of the cooperative housing proposal we gave it serious and conscientious study. We consider it to be in keeping with the private-enterprise system and we cannot agree with the objections raised by its opponents.

In passing H. R. 6070 last year the House eliminated the direct loan back-up for veterans. The American Legion respectfully urges that this provision be added as an amendment to H. R. 7402 or that it be agreed to in conference between the Senate and House conferees. The American Legion further urges that no action be taken that would increase the rate of interest under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act beyond 4 percent.

Thanking you for your favorable consideration of the above, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Unions Necessary, But Improvement Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, few familiar with industrial problems object to unions which obey the law, maintain fair play in their own organizations as well as in their disputes with employers.

From the Allegan Gazette of March 6 comes an editorial written in answer to the president of a local union who evidently can see no fault in unions or their practices.

One thing union men apparently forget and that is that as wages to meet the increased cost of living go up, so does the cost of living.

The remedy? You ask. A return to the law of supply and demand. Following that law there is always some injustice, some inequality, but the injustice and inequality are far less when we stick to nature's laws than when man attempts to avoid those laws, run the universe under those he makes.

Prices for everyone sometimes are too high, sometimes too low, but never, so far as I can recall, has there been as much injustice as under the laws which we have recently used in our so-called planned economy. All one needs to do to realize this is to think of the price the grower receives for potatoes, the price the consumer pays, and the subsidy paid by the taxpayers generally. Nor need we confine our argument to potatoes. The same result in greater or less degree has followed every attempt of every Government to fix prices.

The editorial is as follows:

UNIONISM AT ITS WORST

For the past month the people of this country have seen unionism at its worst. During that period, union coal miners in mobs up to as many as 1,000 men have roamed through the coal districts attacking nonunion coal workers and operators, destroying property, and kidnaping workers; all in an attempt to enforce union will upon the people of this country.

To be more specific, a mob dynamited two loading docks at Brockway, Pa., the explosions damaging 30 nearby homes and stores and injuring 3 women living nearby. Damage to the docks was estimated at $9,000 and to private property (homes and stores) at $3,000.

On the same day a mob chased a truck driver to his home at Grafton, W. Va. There this man surrendered to the mob so as not to endanger his family. The mob then took this man to a mine and attempted to question him relative to nonunion activities, telling him when he refused to talk that they would refresh his memory. At the mine, police rescued him from the mob.

Near Murraysville mobs destroyed property and attempted to ignite coal piles by throwing Molotov cocktails.

More recently two nonunion mines were blasted by dynamite northwest of Birmingham, Ala., total damage estimated at $115,000.

Last September at one of these mines, owners and employees defended the mine against an armed attack by 200 pickets and

in the pitched battle one of the pickets was killed by a shotgun blast.

These are just examples of what has been going on in the coal districts for the past month.

According to the Department of Labor, the coal miners for the year 1949 received a pay averaging $76.32 a week.

During this period of violence union mobs have committed arson, assault and battery, kidnaping, malicious destruction of property, and felonies by the score, all under the benevolent pretext of advancing the case of unionism.

Meanwhile, President Truman has done practically nothing to prevent what we believe is civil war.

We predict that the United States Government headed by Truman will in the end take over the coal industry, surrender to the union mobs, and give them whatever it is that they want.

If Mr. Gibson thinks that this is kicking the wrong dog we will publish any reply he chooses to make provided he limits it to a half column and provided it is in answer to this editorial.

Today Russia Is Really a Weakling and Not a Tower of Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a great deal these days about the war might of the U. S. S. R. and perhaps most of us who are not too well informed on the subject anyhow, and have not resorted to individual thinking, are prone to believe implicitly what we have heard and read on the subject.

In the March issue of the National Grange Monthly, beginning at page 12, appears a most enlightening article written by Mr. J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel of the United States Department of Labor, entitled "Russian and American Food Potentials," which is a real eye opener for everyone who will take the time to read it.

The real test of the war might of any nation is not its population, or its soldiery, or its battle armament, but its food and water supply and the efficiency of its networks of transportation facilities.

A great American general once said that an army marches on its soldiers' bellies, and that statement is as true today as it was when it was first spoken. The last war proved that fact when almost invincible forts, such as Corregidor fell, largely for the want of food and water. So also on other theaters of World War II activities, food supply and the ability to move it, if it was available, where needed, were the controlling factors and upon which was spelled out either defeat or victory.

This splendid article, which I recommend to my readers, is as follows:

RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN FOOD POTENTIALS

(J. T. Sanders)

One very important difference between the economic position of Russia and the United States, the difference in costs of food supplies, is often overlooked in comparing the present and future economic strength of the two nations. Despite the popular belief of the contrary, Russia is and will continue to be at a great disadvantage to the United States in abundant and cheap food to feed a rapidly growing population.

Take a look at the simple table on this page and note the present great disadvantage of Soviet Russia compared with the United States. These figures were issued by the United States Department of Labor and reveal that, measured in terms of the unweighted average of the seven basic foods shown, Russia now pays for a composite pound of food 16 times as many minutes of toil and sweat as we do. Part of this great difference is the greater degree of mechanization and efficiency on American farms. How much is due to this we do not hazard a guess. Despite their 30 years of intensive totalitarian efforts to collectivize and mechanize farms it certainly would be humiliating, I should think, for the Communists to admit this, although they must know that their farmers are far behind American farmers in mechanization and efficiency. We are convinced Russia's farmers will never equal ours in this respect; but this is not the main purpose of our discussion. Our main purpose is to show that there are important reasons other than basic inefficiencies in the two kinds of economies, which account for this extraordinary difference in the cost of foods in Russia and the United States. One very significant reason is the unbelievably great handicap of transportation that hangs like a millstone around everything that Russia does. The word "transportation" should be written in bold letters across all Russia's 5-year plans to remind her of handicaps that she must overcome to surpass her hated capitalistic America. Here is surely the physical Achilles' heel of Russia.

If one could accurately measure the physical cost of moving a bale of American cotton from Chickasha, Okla., to Moscow, and a bale from the Russian cotton-growing areas around Tashkent to Moscow, he would find that the shipment of the Oklahoma bale costs considerably less. Shipping a commodity 2,000 miles over a desert most of the way is indeed expensive freight, especially when the railway is mainly supported by a one-way haul.

Minutes of labor required to pay for a pound of various indigenous foods in the United States and U. S. S. R.

[Basic data from Labor Review, November 1949, of U. S. Department of Labor]

	Minutes of labor required to buy a pound of—							
	Flour	Rice	Beef	Butter	Milk	Egg	Sugar	Unweighted average of 7 foods
United States	4	8	29	32	9	27	4	16
U. S. S. R.	52	145	254	542	59	158	141	264
U. S. S. R. as a multiple of United States	13	18	6	17	6	6	35	16

Take a close look at the figures of the different food costs in the table above, and it will be seen that transportation is accountable for an important part of the differences in costs. In Russia, beef, milk, and eggs are consumed near production areas and are not shipped long distances, partly because of poor refrigeration facilities, but also for other economic reasons. Flour, rice, butter, and sugar, on the other hand, are transported over much longer distances. In Russia a pound of the first group is marketed for only six times the amount of labor that this group costs in the United States. The second group, where longer hauls are involved, requires from 13 to 35 times as many minutes of labor to purchase, as is the case in America. This statement does not imply that all this great difference is traceable to transportation.

Let us look at the physical basis for this great influence of transportation, and why there is such a handicap placed on Russian farm production and sale to consumers. The good agricultural lands of Russia are to a large extent in the so-called black and brown earth soils which stretch, with minor interruptions, over 5,000 miles from western Ukraine to eastern Russia at Vladivostock. Almost all Russia's land other than the black and brown earth soils are either too infertile, too rugged, too dry, or too cold for good agriculture. This area of productive farm land averages about 200 to 270 miles across. In other words, it is 20 times as long as it is wide. The area in the United States where the great predominance of the food shown in this table is produced, is a great compact triangular area about 1,200 miles in extent on each side, embracing roughly the Mississippi River drainage area, lying in the heart of America. It stretches from Pittsburgh to the northwest corner of North Dakota, thence to near Austin, Tex., and back to Pittsburgh.

TRANSPORTATION

Thus our food-producing area is located in the very center of the Nation and shipment is from this center to the outer edge. Our food haul probably will average not over one-fifth that of Russia when the latter develops its undeveloped agricultural resources as completely as we have ours. Practically all of the undeveloped agricultural resources of Russia lie in Asiatic Russia where the body of good cropland is 3,000 miles long, averages only a little over 100 miles wide, and is much less in an uninterrupted body of good land than is true in European Russia—that is, the good agricultural land in Asiatic Russia is probably 30 times as long as it is wide. The whole 5,000-mile narrow stretch of productive land is bounded almost every mile on the south by barren deserts and at least all of its 3,000 Asiatic miles to the north by the Siberian frozen wastes. Since European wheat lands in Russia have long been intensively used, future new areas of crops must be developed east of the Ural Mountains in Siberia with longer and longer hauls.

Another important difference to note between Russia's agricultural land and that of the United States is that Russia's good land gets from 10 to 20 inches of rain with an average of not over 15, whereas the great agricultural triangle of the United States gets a rainfall about double that of Russia. As a consequence, per-acre wheat yields in the United States average around 50 percent more than those of Russia. Year to year fluctuation in yield is also about twice as high in Russia as in the United States. In other words, yields of wheat in the United States are and will continue to be 50 percent greater and twice as dependable as those of Russia. Since future expansion of agricultural production in Russia must be in the main toward drier and drier, as well as more distant areas, yields will almost certainly tend to be smaller and less reliable in the future than at present or in the past.

Despite Russia's great effort to conserve moisture and make rain artificially, this great handicap compared with the United States will remain with Russia as long as

time lasts. It will always make food costlier in human toil in Russia than in the United States. Improvement in transportation efficiency will help, but will never eliminate this handicap.

LOW YIELDS—HIGH RISK

Since wheat at present is grown in all parts of the good agricultural lands of Russia, this wheat handicap of low yields and high risk characterizes and indicates the extent of Russian agricultural handicaps for most farm products except possibly barley, rye, potatoes, and some other root crops. Certainly its dairy, pork, and, to a less extent, beef production is similarly handicapped. Russia has not the physical basis for producing great quantities of feed grain that will even remotely compete with our Corn Belt—by far the world's best.

Americans should not view these great unsurmountable handicaps of our present greatest and most bitter antagonist either in a gloating spirit or with complacency. We should get from this knowledge a better perspective of relative economic strength of Russia and America; but we should also recognize that Russia can in part meet this handicap by pitifully low living standards for the great mass of her people. Neither would we appraise the situation honestly if we contend that free enterprise and democracy for her would remove her handicaps, for it would only do so partially.

STANDARD OF LIVING

To maintain even the present comparative lower standard of living of Russia, is certain to require in the future a far greater part of Russia's total labor capacity than we as a Nation will ever require. We will in the foreseeable future be fed much better and cheaper than Russia will, thanks to America's unsurpassed natural agricultural resources. Our implicit faith in the superiority of our democratic and free-enterprise system gives us the added consolation that our farmers' efficiency will for decades to come be unsurpassed and unequalled by that of Russia.

These few simple comparative agricultural facts should give us a perspective that adds to our faith in America. We can only hope that in the not too distant future we can have a relationship with the great Russian people that substitutes friendship for hostility, for only in friendship can the handicap of Russia be softened and reduced. Until that blessed day we can get comfort from a realization of the natural superiority of our position and form of government.

The Dawn Is Breaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the Detroit Free Press, under the guidance of John S. Knight, followed to a certain extent, the New Deal line, praising it and abusing and vilifying Congressmen who, in the beginning recognized the New Deal for what it was.

That Editor Knight is repenting—and I hope his repentance will stick—is evidenced by the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, March 5, 1950:

POINT 4 CALLED A POINT OF NO RETURN

An old-time friend of mine is a retired newspaper editor who used to work for one of those rare specimens, a New Deal publisher in the South.

"Tom," I said one day, "did you always share the views of your liberal, world-saving boss?"

"I'm afraid not, Jack. You see I was never that enlightened."

Editor Tom was reflecting the viewpoint of millions of other Americans who want to see the world progress but are not sufficiently "enlightened" to go into raptures over President Truman's proposed global Fair Deal.

Of course, they may be slightly on the stupid side and lacking in the finer understanding that impels other big and noble-minded people to accept development of the world's backward areas as the primary responsibility of the United States.

But, in their literal, unimaginative way, they can't figure out why the American taxpayer should finance "Backwardarea" when our own Government is running better than $5,000,000,000 in the hole with the highest peacetime taxes in history.

The Truman plan for "Backwardarea" is better known as point 4.

It was first proposed by the President in his inaugural address of January 20, 1949, when he said:

"We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

"We should make available the benefits of our store of technical knowledge and we should foster capital investment in areas needing development. The program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living."

In 1944, Earl Browder, then head of the American branch of the Communist Party, proposed substantially the same program in a book called, Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace.

Comrade Browder maintained that Government-financed giant industrial-development corporations, each in partnership with some other government, or group of governments would become the best investment the American capitalist class had ever made in its whole history.

As Henry Hazlitt points out in an interesting little booklet, Illusions of Point Four, there is nothing new in the belief that sound international investment promotes world production.

What is new is the paternalistic assumption that the process of international investment must not be undertaken, as hitherto in modern times, by private investors at their own risk, to private borrowers who have proved their credit worthiness and responsibility, but must be nursed, spoon-fed, furnished with crutches, and guided at every step by the Government.

Like Browder, President Truman assumes that it is this Nation's duty to raise standards of living in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

This may be a fine humanitarian concept of America's responsibility, but nevertheless the weary United States taxpayer should understand that as the world's standards of living are raised by point 4, his own living standards will have to come down.

For example, if we spend millions for a housing project in Patagonia, less money will be available for housing in Detroit.

The proponents of point 4 would have us believe that the United States can become richer by giving our money away, on the theory that merely by investing capital anywhere in the world, you necessarily add to the wealth of the world.

Actually, nothing of the kind can be accomplished by point 4.

Money taken away from American taxpayers to assist the natives of "Backwardarea" simply means that the "Backwardareans" will have more, and the Americans less.

In addition, when we have accepted the premise that it is our duty to help everyone, everywhere, when and where can we ever call a halt without being threatened that "Backwardarea" will go Communist or Fascist unless we come through with more money pronto?

We have been "blackmailed" in Europe and South America ever since World War II. Every nation with a shaky economy has "communism for sale." Our overseas friends have shrewdly capitalized upon our propensity for believing that dollars will cure anything.

Three years ago, in an editorial opposing the Truman doctrine, I said "that if this policy is carried out to its logical conclussion, it will drain our treasury while destroying any hope that the United States and Russia can ever work together.

"Since virtually everyone concedes that the next war, if it comes, will be fought with atomic weapons and rockets, perhaps some apologist for the Truman program will explain how the expenditure of $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey will 'contain' Russia when she has learned how to manufacture atomic bombs and decides to use them on us."

Three years later, Where do we stand? Is Russia being "contained" by the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan or is she more powerful in every way?

The President's point 4 program is even more fantastic than his earlier visionary schemes. The original cost, thirty-five to forty million dollars a year, seems so small in comparison to other Washington projects that few voices have been raised in protest.

But a principle is involved which, if adopted, would commit us morally to following the recommendations of the Government's technical commissions in underdeveloped areas.

If our experts find that "Backwardarea" needs a hydroelectric plant, the assumption normally follows that the United States Government will put up the money.

By taking on the first obligation, we suggest the second.

Do the American taxpayers want to let themselves in for that kind of a deal?

If, for the sake of argument, we concede (1) that there can be no lasting prosperity in the United States with a world in disorder and (2) that the world is in need of development, why cannot private-venture capital be substituted for Government aid?

If, instead of volunteering to pour the money of American taxpayers into foreign lands, the Government would obtain assurances from these nations that private-risk capital would not be confiscated, nor the profits of the American investor wholly retained in the country where his plant has been built, there would be ample venture money available for foreign investment.

Undertakings of this nature could be negotiated by the State Department with countries seeking development capital. The State Department could be tremendously helpful in showing these nations that it is to their self-interest to encourage the investment of American capital, posssibly with a minority stockholding interest.

Such arrangements would work to the advantage of both the American investor and the nation in need of industrial development.

This thoroughly feasible plan has no chance whatsoever if President Truman's point 4 is given congressional approval.

A bill has already been introduced in Congress which would insure all risks in foreign investment.

This means that an automobile manufacturer who built a plant in Europe or South America could keep his profits but his losses would be taken out of the hides of the United States taxpayers.

Such a cockeyed deal would lead to the eventual nationalization of all foreign investments and the further dilution of our competitive profit-and-loss system.

And have you noticed that Secretary of State Dean Acheson and ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman are proposing some form of direct relief for victims of foreign competition?

In other words, we have been taxed to build up Europe so that the Marshall plan nations can sell their products abroad. Acheson and Hoffman would now tax us again to subsidize American industries suffering from European competition which has been financed with our own dollars.

How nutty can we get?

The President, who professes to be neither a Socialist nor a believer in deficit financing, is constantly flirting with schemes that are socialistic in character and so costly as to make impossible a balanced budget and ultimate reduction of the national debt.

Point 4, the maddest of them all, may appear to him as a cooperative enterprise with other nations of the world, but to the United States citizen who pays the bills, it should more accurately be renamed "the point of no return."

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

National Correct Posture Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, for many years past the first week in May of each year has been designated by the National Chiropractic Association as National Correct Posture Week and observed throughout the United States unofficially, with special educational campaigns conducted through schools, social and fraternal organizations, professional and labor groups, and others.

The huge economic loss due directly or indirectly to the poor posture habits of the American people, measured in lowered efficiency, less production, lost wages, and doctor bills is serious. There can be no doubt that the better posture campaigns of the chiropractors and the remedial treatments have helped to reduce that staggering loss. The National Chiropractic Association and the chiropractic profession have been valiantly performing an invaluable public service.

MARKED BY LOCAL OFFICIALS

As Members know, Mr. Speaker, National Correct Posture Week has been recognized by many State and local officials and legislative bodies. A complete listing of the proclamation or legislative enactments would take too much space; but I can mention that our former colleague, the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., now mayor of Baltimore, has already called on that huge city to observe National Correct Posture Week from May 1 to 7, inclusive, urging all our citizens to give serious thought to the importance of correct posture and to join in the various educational programs being arranged.

The Governors of Minnesota, New Jersey, and Arkansas have issued similar proclamations for 1950, and many more announcements are expected.

It is my sincere hope that my resolution may be acted upon promptly in order that national observance may be made.

GOOD POSTURE CONTRIBUTES TO GOOD HEALTH

The National Chiropractic Association calls Correct Posture Week "a week devoted to reminding all Americans that long life and sound health demand correct posture."

It is hardly necessary to say, Mr. Speaker, that for the content of these remarks I am indebted to the information supplied by the National Chiropractic Association, and especially to its excellent and eye-catching literature on the subject; for I am an attorney by profession, not a practitioner of the healing arts. I am especially indebted to Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D. C., director of public relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

If so much good can be done without official notice from the Federal Government, it seems to me that more good could be done by the official designation, through proclamation by the President, of the first week in May each year as "National Correct Posture Week."

Accordingly, on February 20 I introduced House Joint Resolution 422, the text of which I wish to include at this point in my remarks:

House Joint Resolution 422

Joint resolution designating the period beginning May 1 and ending May 7 of each year as National Correct Posture Week

Whereas clinical and statistic evidence proves conclusively that correct posture in childhood and in maturity has a great and beneficial effect on the health of the individual and thus on the collective health of the Nation; and

Whereas it is self-evident that the general welfare of the people of the United States, both in peace and war, is best served by promoting a general high level of good health in the Nation; and

Whereas it has been adequately demonstrated that habits of correct posture can be readily acquired through self-discipline of the individual when properly instructed; and

Whereas for many years the first week of May has been sponsored by the National Chiropractic Association and observed unofficially as National Correct Posture Week, with special educational campaigns conducted through schools, social and fraternal organizations, professional groups, and other media of information: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the period beginning May 1 and ending May 7 of each year is hereby designated as National Correct Posture Week. The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon schools, social organizations, and professional groups to cooperate in the observance of such week by conducting educational campaigns to provide instruction in the acquisition of habits of correct posture and to demonstrate the beneficial effect of correct posture in health.

GOOD POSTURE IS GOOD SENSE

Good posture is more than standing or sitting straight. It is that position of the body in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort. Good posture is important. The internal organs have plenty of room and nerves are free from pressure at the spine when the body has good posture. Lungs, heart, and digestive organs function better when they have room.

You feel better.

Chiropractors—and for that matter other orthopedists—have traced bad posture, in a majority of instances, to specific causes. Among them are poor diet, lack of rest, poor shoes, soft mattresses and chairs, bad eyesight, too little exercise, and worry.

POSTURE HABITS FORMED EARLY

No child is too small to begin the formation of posture habits which will affect his carriage in later life.

If, from the beginning, the baby is trained and encouraged to stand, walk, sit, and lie correctly, and if those specific causes I have named are removed, his chances are good for growing into maturity without the consequences of bad posture.

With the growth of true sciences of healing, it is recognized that good posture is the foundation of good health. The White House Conference on Child Health stressed this in its recommendations to the Nation.

POOR POSTURE IS EXPENSIVE

The chiropractors of America tell us that poor posture is expensive. Poor posture habits—improper body mechanics if you prefer—are responsible not only for many days of lost time and wages, which means lost productivity and purchasing power, but also for poor response to the needs of a job, or of everyday living, and eventually for a shortened life of top efficiency.

I agree with Dr. Murphy that no greater contribution can be made by the chiropractors of America to the Nation than by improving posture and thus increasing the efficiency of Americans.

Our industrial civilization has encouraged bad-posture habits. Workers are required to remain in unnatural positions, frequently under nervous and emotional strains, for hours on end, while the cry for more and more speed is heard.

BAD POSTURE WIDESPREAD

Studies conducted by the Chiropractic Research Foundation indicate that 35 percent of all children have faulty posture and that 35 percent of all adults have spinal defects likely to lead to organic disease unless corrected.

Good posture and good health go together; conversely, bad posture and bad health seldom part company.

CHIROPRACTORS RECOMMEND

These are the recommendations made by the National Chiropractic Association:

First. Learn to stand tall, sit tall, and walk tall.

Second. Follow a few simple exercises daily to preserve the strength and tone of the ligaments and muscles which support the spinal column.

Third. Learn to relax completely

More About This Socialized-Medicine Scare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association representatives on every possible occasion, and sometimes also when it seems impossible to a clear thinking mind, point to the British health plan as the terrible thing which brought old England on bended knee into the circle of socialistic governments. Of course, almost any child who is not halfwitted, knows that that is not true, but this medical society persistently and closely follows the pattern of other dictators and keeps repeating the lie in the fond hope, I guess, that sheer repetition will in and of itself, cause the people to believe the claim to be the truth, even if the falsely spoken words are not believed by the very praters themselves.

They say they do not want any outsiders to set their fees, but they forget that every compensation and liability insurance company for lo these many years has been doing just that very thing and that the practice-mad doctors of the Nation have been fairly trampling each others shoe-pinched toes off to get the business.

Health and accident insurance companies also set the fees of doctors and the doctors just love it.

The Blue Shield and the Blue Cross set the fees of the doctors and also the hospital charges, and the doctors just love it.

All insurance-company-kept doctors know if they are yet capable of knowing anything for sure, that fee setting by the big and little industries of our country has been the order of the day and the doctors have just loved to get the business.

However, when national health insurance might provide a fee schedule for doctors they throw an intellectual fit which would do credit to any old-time fit maker.

They say that our national health insurance plan is socialized medicine like the British plan is, when that is as false as most any old doctor's United States income tax return, and the hypocrite doctors know it full well.

I guess no greater truth was ever spoken than the words of the poet Milton that hypocrisy is the only evil which walks concealed except to God alone.

Heretofore, I have always been a real friend of doctors in my practice of law. I have protected them and have helped them. I never sued any doctor but one and that was shortly after I was admitted to the bar.

The doctors never had occasion to kick me upstairs politically as they have some other Members of Congress.

I want to tell them here and now that if they ever kick me downstairs they will wish to God that they had left me upstairs.

I do not know what has come over the great bulk of the medical profession which I am acquainted with. They do not seem to have a profession any more at all. It seems now to be a harsh, cruel business. I believe that my friend, Dr. Hart of outstate Nebraska, had the correct answer when he told me that the medical profession was running out of humanity and character; that the storehouse which God had given them containing character and humanity was nearly exhausted through misuse and general neglect and spoilation. Today they seem to have no more character and humanity left to draw out of the great bank and storehouse of good deeds.

Many doctors today, will not face up to simple truths let alone great truths.

When running for office, I sent out letters telling the doctors and other of my district that I was against socialized medicine and that my examination and evaluation of national health-insurance bills, filed as of that time, convinced me that they were not socialized medicine.

After I came to Congress I sent out to doctors and others of my district a pamphlet which analyzed three of the pending bills and accompanied it with a letter stating that I was favorable to a national health-insurance plan. The reactionary Republican doctors of my district then seized upon the thought that I had broken faith with them and had falsified to them in my first letter, when such a claim was far afield from the real facts and was a deliberate falsehood told so as to furnish them with a reason to cudgel me politically.

During the vacation period I tried to convince these golden-calf worshippers, and otherwise evil men again, that I was against socialized medicine and would not support any national health plan but a voluntary one, and I explained that by that I meant that the insured should have the right to say whether or not he wanted national health insurance, and should have a right to personally select his own doctor, and that every doctor should have the right to say whether or not he desired to accept the patient I could have employed my time, however, to better advantage by talking to the monkeys in any old zoo than by talking to them.

All they would carp back was that I advocated socialized medicine. What can one do for such hideously benighted people? You tell me and I shall try it.

Any national health-insurance plan should be voluntary, because many people now have health and accident insurance which is to their liking, and why load them up with additional insurance, and be the cause of their losing insurance which they have carried for a long time, and in which they might have a real investment perhaps. I was loaded up myself on life insurance and lost it all during the depression and I have no insurance now. I know from experience what that means.

No veteran would need national health insurance because he can receive now, medical and hospital attention from the doctors of the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' hospitals. He can also secure dental care. Why load the veteran up with insurance he does not need or perhaps want. Let him say whether he wants national health insurance or not.

Also many persons who have worked years for railroads and industry may have paid into a fund for medical and hospital care. Why load them up with insurance they do not want or need?

It has been said that in a special congressional election held some time ago, the American Medical Association spent in excess of $300,000 to defeat a woman candidate. It is claimed that an exposure of this matter is due very soon.

Is not it just too bad that this organization did not see fit to pour this money back upon the neglected and needy members of our present-day society as a humanitarian gesture to the general public of the Nation upon whose bounty they, the doctors, have lived so long, so splendidly, and so well?

In conclusion, I wish to quote the following article from the March 13, 1950, issue of the CIO News, because it is indeed very enlightening to say the least:

LIGHT, NOT HEAT, ON BRITISH HEALTH PLAN

YOU'RE RIGHT, SOLDIER

A State-wide lobby tie-up in Wisconsin between the American Legion and the American Medical Association to fight the proposed national health insurance bill was exposed recently in the Capital Times, of Madison.

On its front page, the Times reproduced a letter from the president of the State medical society to Legion post commanders urging the posts to adopt resolutions opposing the program as socialized medicine.

One commander sent the letter to the Capital Times with this note scrawled across the top: "I received this as county commander of the American Legion. Alas, we have fallen upon evil days."

(By Hollace Ransdell)

If all the articles and news stories written about the British health system were laid end to end, it would undoubtedly take quite a walk to pace them off. Yet few Americans really know much about the subject and too often what they think they know is inaccurate or entirely untrue.

The American Medical Association can take much of the credit for this. Their $100,000-a-year publicists, Whitaker & Baxter, a husband and wife team, can be criticized harshly for the type of lurid propaganda they turn out, but they can't be accused of laziness. Millions of copies of the pamphlets, leaflets, and other releases they issue in behalf of the AMA's fight against national health insurance circulate throughout the country.

(The AMA tops the list of lobbyists with the whopping total of $1,500,000 spent in 1949, according to figures given in the year-end financial reports filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.)

Britain's health system is a favorite topic in the AMA propaganda, although just what it is or how it works is never explained. Instead of facts or honest analysis, the AMA gives rumors, prejudiced opinions and calls names.

Representative BIEMILLER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, one of the sponsors of a bill for a national health insurance system for the United States, last week called the attention of Congress to the general misconception in this country about the British health plan. Everyone has an opinion on the experiment, he said, "but very few people know the facts about it."

To throw some much needed light on the subject, he asked to have an article by Dr. James Howard Means on England's public medicine inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Means is a professor in the Harvard Medical School and chief of the medical services at Massachusetts General Hospital. He is the author of many books and over 150 articles on medical subjects. The article quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

Dr. Means explains that he holds no brief either for or against the British health service, but believes that information about it will be of great value to Americans. "We can be aided by the experience of others," he says.

The article is of special interest because it not only explains from an unbiased viewpoint how the British system works, but also takes up the objections made against it in this country and Britain, and examines their validity. Dr. Means says his analysis is based on observations extending back to 1913. Last year he spent some time in England and Scotland studying various phases of the present health system.

"Americans either hold up the British health service as a horrible warning," the doctor writes, "or use it as a talking point in favor of compulsory health insurance for the United States," whereas what is needed "is less recrimination and more investigation."

Dr. Means found a practically unanimous opinion in Britain at present that the health service is there to stay. He quoted, however, there was much discontent among British doctors running all the way "from trifling dissatisfaction to something approaching actual hostility."

The direction taken by the present health service was set by the Emergency Medical Service, set up to take care of the military and civilian wounded and sick, he states. Although set up hurriedly, the EMS worked smoothly and efficiently.

The service is not compulsory, he points out, although it is intended to provide medical care for all people, even aliens temporarily in the country. Any doctor or person who wants to can stay out of it. Doctors may serve under it and keep their private practice at the same time.

Here are some of Dr. Means' answers to questions raised about the British plan and to attacks constantly made on it:

How well is the health service working? Fairly well, he says, though, of course, not perfectly. After all it has been in effect only about 19 months. Efforts to improve it and to remove the bugs are continually being made.

Has medical care deteriorated under it? Based on observations extending back to 1913, Dr. Means says he found no important change, and certainly no deterioration in the quality of the care provided. At no time either in Britain or America, he declares, has medical care been as uniformly good "as medical knowledge of our time would permit it to be. * * * There is always abundant room for improvement."

Isn't it true that America has the best medical care in the world? "Possibly, but how many people get it?" replies Dr. Means. "I am unable to assert that the general standard is higher in Britain under the National Health Act than it was before that went into effect, but on the other hand, I have encountered no convincing evidence that it is lower, and certainly more people get it."

Is it undermining the incentive of doctors? Dr. Means admits that this would be a serious defect, if true, but he admonishes prophets of doom to remember that there is nothing available on the subject at present but opinion. "Only experience will answer the question, and 19 months' experience with the health service is not enough time by which to judge it accurately," he says.

What about the complaints that general practioners are overworked? It is true that at present they are overworked, underpaid, and insufficiently related to the hospitals, answers Dr. Means, but amendments to the bill to correct these and other abuses are now before Parliament.

Don't patients abuse their privileges and go to the doctor more often than necessary?

Steps are being considered to remedy this difficulty, possibly by imposing a token fee to put a slight brake on such a tendency, Dr. Means states.

What about this clamor about free eye glasses, dentures, and even free wigs?

All this would seem to mean "when viewed dispassionately," says Dr. Means, "is that under the previous system there were great numbers of people who needed prosthetic appliances and could not afford to get them. The stories of abuses of these privileges I am convinced are exaggerated, and I am assured that steps are being taken to eliminate such abuse as does exist."

In rounding out his analysis of the British system, Dr. Means emphasizes the fact that local health centers are one of the important elements of the program, although so far they are still largely in the blueprint stage. When they get going, they will implement and facilitate the work of general practitioners and even provide them with office space in many instances.

Although our own problems are in many ways different from those of the British, Dr. Means feels that we have much to learn from Britain's momentous experiment.

"We should be grateful to Britain," he concludes, "for making this venture."

New Postage Bill Reduces Revenues and Increases Deficits to the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate on the administration's bill to increase postal rates on first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. Members of the House will recall that I made quite a point of the fact that many of the larger publications throughout the country would set up their own distribution systems if postage rates were increased on second-class mail. I claimed at that time that if the increases were adopted by the Congress, and of course I opposed most of the increases, many users of the mails would adopt other methods of distribution.

It has now been revealed publicly that the larger magazines of the country will do so, and a number of test programs have proven economical and now it is proposed that a plan be expanded to additional magazines and additional areas throughout the country. In other words, because of the threatened increase in rates, magazine publishers in order to keep their subscription rates as low as possible to the public, will now adopt a more economical distribution program for their magazines.

If the Post Office Department still believes that it loses money on magazine second-class mail, they perhaps will at least not oppose the new plans, of the publishers to distribute their publications

The plan has generally proven successful and now it is likely to spread through the publishing industry and especially in the case of the larger publications of the country. As I predicted during the debate on the postal bill, this will increase in less volume to the Post Office Department and no doubt greater deficits. It also will result in decreased jobs for post-office employees. Furthermore, it will set up a situation which will result in eventual poorer service and further curtailment of service to the public.

The plan is outlined in detail by an article published in the Wall Street Journal for March 6, by two writers, Michael J. Saada and J. Howard Rutledge.

The article is as follows:

Magazine publishers are thinking of saying good-by to the postman.

Mail costs of selling and distributing their periodicals to householders are already as high as many publishers can afford—and the possibility of higher postal rates is in the offing. So in Reading, Pa., they're having a first try at doing for themselves the job which now is performed elsewhere by the mailman.

Curtis Publishing Co.—Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, Country Gentleman, Holiday, and Jack and Jill—is currently operating the plan—on its own behalf and for the publishers of eight other top magazines—through a subsidiary, Curtis Circulation Co.

The plan is already slated for extension in April into Columbus, Ohio, and South Bend, Ind.; field men are now studying routes and other details. Other cities to which it may be extended later include Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore. Ultimately, Curtis thinks in terms of putting the program on a Nation-wide basis with additional magazines participating.

THE SIDE-STEP

The scheme for side-stepping the post office is simple enough. It provides for freighting the magazines to a central point in each city. Salaried agents pick these up and distribute them by auto to subscribers' doors. They also take subscriptions and renewal orders, further lightening the pay load of Uncle Sam's carriers, who have been toting publishers' form letters by the millions.

Immediately, it's true, the plan offers no savings over mail delivery. President Walter Fuller, of Curtis Publishing, says the comparable costs in Reading are close. But hanging over publishers' heads is a House-passed postal bill which would raise rates for distributing most magazines and some newspapers by about 50 percent. In addition, it calls for a stiff hike in fees for letters and post cards used by publishers to solicit readers. Passage of this measure by the Senate is regarded in Washington as a 5-5 possibility.

If this happens, says Marvin Pierce, president of McCall Corp., a major publishing house, the Curtis plan might very well work out to be cheaper than postal methods of delivery and subscription of magazines. Even if the bill is sidetracked, as it was at the last congressional session, he favors further experimentation with the new undertaking to make it more economical. Curtis is determined to continue.

PASSENGER LIST

Two of Mr. Pierce's journals—Redbook and McCall's—are included in the Reading delivery-sales plan. Other magazines entered are Better Homes and Gardens, Coronet, Cosmopolitan, Esquire, Good Housekeeping, and Sports Afield.

Three Curtis publications are participating—Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, and Holiday. Omitted as yet are

Country Gentleman, designed for rural readers, and Jack and Jill, which, because it carries no advertising, would be much more lightly afflicted by the postal bill.

Time, Inc. (Life, Time, Fortune, Architectural Forum) is still outside the plan looking in. "We are following the development with great interest," says F. De W. Pratt, circulation director.

Most publishers like the dodge-the-postman plan as a way of distributing magazines, but some firmly opposed any arrangement that would take control of their subscription programs.

DEBATE

One publisher-dissenter says: "We think subscription selling know-how is a big factor in keeping up our circulation; we don't want to entrust this important job to anyone else."

Objects another: "It's bound to work out that an agent selling subscriptions for a group of magazines—as under the Curtis program—would favor some over the others."

Declares a third: "Costs of hiring men to solicit magazine business are at least three times those of doing the job by mail—and I'm putting it mildly."

Curtis President Fuller takes exception. He insists that, far from being more expensive, the door-to-door salesmanship of the Reading magazine squad is achieving savings that pay the major share of expenses for the entire experiment.

And he observes he is quite aware of the fear that agents might show sales favoritism. Some executives of other publishing houses have suggested that if any single national agency is to be soliciting subscriptions for rival journals, it should be a co-op. "My best answer," Mr. Fuller says to this sort of comment, "is that under the Reading operation we are doing very well for other publishers in the sales of subscriptions and in renewals to their magazines."

Actually, subscription field forces for Curtis Publishing and two other big magazine houses—Hearst and Crowell-Collier—have for many years written new subscriptions for one another and for other publishers. Nevertheless, most magazines now make their heavy subscription selling efforts individually—customarily through the mails.

HOW SYSTEM WORKS

Enthusiasm runs high among the Curtis forces in Reading, where the sales-delivery plan has been operating 6 months.

As in other localities to which the experiment will be extended, the city is divided into districts—six in this case. One agent is assigned to each; he gets a salary, a car allowance—and a bonus for writing new subscriptions and renewals in excess of his quota.

Issues of the 11 magazines distributed under the Reading experiment reach town 3 to 5 days in advance of delivery date. "We plan it that way to be sure of deliveries," says Harold J. Bean, vice president and subscription manager of Curtis Circulation Co.

Copies are given to householders without the usual label, the agent merely checks his subscription list as he covers his territory. Since the magazines are shipped into Reading in neatly wrapped bundles, each copy is fresh on receipt and the men are careful to keep them that way.

The group of agents is headed by a local subscription manager, in Reading he's named George Bortz, and he has this to say:

"The most favorable aspect as I see it from the front line is the personal contact with subscribers. It opens wider fields for magazine selling, puts more finesse into the job. Subscribers like the personal touch."

The public tends to think about magazine delivery as an ethical problem, Mr. Bortz has discovered. One woman who recently signed up with this service explained she had never subscribed to any magazine before because she didn't like to burden the poor mailman. Against this, he encounters numerous complaints that we are doing the mailman out of a job, that we are cheating the Government, that it isn't right to bypass the Government's organized postal service.

At such times he patiently explains the new method takes no bread from any postman's mouth, post office hirings and assignments are governed largely by the burden of first-class letter mail.

Governor Dewey's Rent Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of New York, in a recent message to the State legislature, discussed his plan for having the State take over rent control. Upon analyzing the projected GOP law, I contend that the Governor is attempting to perpetrate a fraud upon the people of the State of New York. The proposed rent-control law will not only be another spineless attempt by New York State to regulate the vital matter of rent control, but also will not provide adequate safeguards against increases and evictions.

I recognize the Governor's plan as an attempt to garner votes because of the confusion which now exists regarding rent controls in general. It is attempted by the bill, to sound the death knell of Federal rent control. I predict right now, that after election, rent control in New York State will be ended. Then, the people without any protection whatsoever, will be left to the mercy of the real-estate wolves.

It is of paramount importance that rent control be continued on a Federal basis. We must do everything we can to obtain a strong rent-control bill. However, even a weak Federal rent-control law, inadequately administered, is preferable to none at all, and the New York State bill is none at all.

I am including in the RECORD, a copy of an editorial which appeared in the New York Post of March 10, on this subject, which also points out the necessity for the continuation of Federal rent controls:

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S RENT HOAX

In his special message to the legislature on Wednesday Governor Dewey denounced Democratic failures in rent control and promised that this State's Republicans would show us how it should be done. Not many hours later the GOP State rent-control measure was made public. It is a cynical repudiation of the Governor's pledge and we do not believe that Dewey will be able to get away with it. The detailed, eight-point attack on the bill released by the Democratic leadership is a devastating document and ought to be widely read in this city.

The Democrats admittedly face a tough problem—a problem initially created by the weakness and ineptitude of Federal Housing Expediter Tighe Woods. It was largely as a result of Woods' performance that the city administration was forced to create its own rent commission; it was because of Federal failure that the drive to substitute State for Federal controls in this State gained headway. We have generally supported that move; we have felt that New York—whether under State or city rule—can have stronger rent controls than Woods is able to offer. That has been demonstrated in this city under the rule of the city rent commission. But the Dewey formula is a fraud. It is, we think, another dramatic example of the Governor's fatal tendency to try to play both sides of any public street. He has talked tough and given the realtor lobby an incredible series of concessions. He has offered us a high-toned hoax.

The loopholes in the projected GOP law are big and numerous; each rereading of the draft seems to reveal another thinly disguised joker. Eight major deficiencies were cited by the Democratic spokesmen yesterday as they submitted alternative legislation. They pointed out that the proposed measure did not require a hearing in individual cases as the city rent law does. (After the protests started, the GOP legislators hastily amended the bill to require such hearings, but there is still no provision for a stay of increases pending appeal.) The bill permits increases based on the vague formula of "comparability" as well as hardship—and "comparability" is the open door for large-scale rent boosts. It exempts all housing accommodations produced by conversion since February 1, 1947. It offers far less adequate protection against eviction than residents of this city now possess and places no limit of any kind on evictions where landlords propose to alter or remodel the premises. It proposes a fantastically small appropriation for administration of the law. The GOP measure also contains no provision for rent reduction where services and property have deteriorated.

But the most flagrant give-away clause in the bill is the provision which would, in effect, enable the State rent commissioner to write his own rules after March 1, 1951, regardless of whether they are consistent with the proposed law. In short, the limited protections afforded by the Dewey bill could vanish soon after election day this year. Nice timing. In his message Governor Dewey decried the atmosphere of uncertainty created by bungling in Federal rent rule. The GOP now proposes to enact uncertainty into law.

We still have no nostalgia for retention of Federal control in New York. Belated efforts by Tighe Woods to regain public confidence are unconvincing. In any case, the issue is academic at Albany; the real battle is over the State bill. If we were a Congressman in Washington we would vote to continue the Federal set-up only because some States are unwilling or unable to establish any form of rent regulation; in those areas even Woods' inadequate administration is preferable to none at all. But that isn't the choice for the people of this city.

We have established effective municipal rent control; we are living under it now. If the State won't give us substantially better protection than the Federal Government offers, the city's representatives at Albany must renew the fight for municipal option. In the long run that may be the best solution for this crowded metropolis. At this moment neither Federal control nor the Dewey blueprint offers real safeguards for the inhabitants of our town. Unless public pressure forces a major Republican retreat at Albany, the answer for this city is continuation of local rent control.

California State Works for Veterans' Employment Issues Special Pamphlet of Advice and Information to Help Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, a very valuable booklet has been issued by my native State of California Department of Employment. One good thing about the veterans' employment service is that it has a veterans' advisory committee made up of the commanders of the American Legion, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars. I congratulate my State upon this vigorous, vigilant service being rendered.

I bring it to your attention in anticipation of the fact that no doubt many other States who are not doing substantially the same thing will be glad to have this information.

The following is a copy of the booklet:

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT HANDBOOK

(State of California, Department of Employment, James G. Bryant, director. The Veterans Advisory Committee: commander, American Legion; commander, AMVETS; commander, Disabled American Veterans; commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

INTRODUCTION

The California State Employment Service provides special services to all veterans in accordance with Federal and State laws. Regulations of the Veterans' Placement Service Board further stipulate that disabled veterans shall receive preferential treatment from the local employment office.

In order to provide the best possible assistance to veterans, it is necessary that veterans themselves be familiar with these special services in order that they may cooperate in filling job openings for which they are qualified. The term "qualified" means fitted by vocational experience, training, and education to perform the work described in orders received from employers.

PRIORITIES AND PREFERENCES

(A) A veteran is a person who:

Served in the active service of the armed forces of the United States during any of the following periods and has been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable:

Spanish-American War: April 21, 1898, to August 12, 1898.

Philippine Insurrection: August 13, 1898, to July 4, 1902. (If service in Moro Province, ending date is July 15, 1903.)

Boxer Rebellion: July 20, 1900, to May 12, 1901.

World War I: April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. (If service in Russia, ending date is April 1, 1920.)

World War II: December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1946.

(The determination of eligibility for special services because of veteran status is based on documentary evidence of periods of service and character of separation.)

(B) A disabled or "PT" (preferential treatment) veteran is a veteran who:

1. Is currently rated 10 percent or more disabled by the Veterans' Administration; or

2. Meets the Employment Service definition of a "handicapped applicant" regardless of whether or not the disability is service incurred.

SPECIAL SERVICES AND PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT

Special services to veterans include:

1. Priority in referral to open jobs for which they qualify, except that first priority of referral shall be given qualified disabled (PT) veterans.

2. A job development program through which veterans who have individual vocational problems can be placed in suitable employment.

3. Employment counseling to assist veterans to:

(a) Evaluate their aptitudes, experiences, and training, and job preferences in the light of current and prospective job opportunities.

(b) Determine additional training required to prepare themselves for suitable employment.

(c) Adopt practical plans for obtaining such employment.

4. Information and assistance concerning the training on the job program.

5. Advice regarding services available through other public and private agencies and referral to the appropriate agency.

6. Current labor market information about job openings and employment prospects locally and elsewhere.

Veterans Employment Representatives are on duty in California State Employment Service offices. It is the VER's responsibility to insure that veterans receive the special services created and maintained for them and to see that veterans entitled to preferential treatment, as well as other veterans, are given the best possible assistance and attention.

HOW VETERANS CAN HELP CSES HELP THEM

When a veteran applies for employment to the CSES, he will be asked to submit a record of his past employment, training, education, and provide other necessary information.

It is important that the employment record be completed carefully, since it will represent the veteran to the Employment Service in his absence. Whether he can be referred to a certain job may depend upon his written application.

Veterans are registered on salmon (pink) work records and are issued identification cards of the same color. In addition, the work records and identification cards of veterans who are entitled to preferential treatment are marked with a red "PT."

Incoming job orders are checked against active work records and applicants are called in and referred in accordance with their qualifications and priorities. (To make certain that a work record is in the active file, the veteran must make a personal contact with the employment service at least once each calendar month.)

Applicants are urged to register for work regardless of whether they are claiming unemployment insurance.

Applicants may register in as many CSES offices as they will accept referrals from and maintain active records in, providing they possess qualifications for occupations handled by those offices.

VETERANS ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Through the State veterans advisory committee to the director of the department of employment, and through local veterans advisory committees to local office managers, CSES cooperates closely with veterans' organizations and all other groups with a primary interest in the placement of veterans in employment.

All veterans can participate in the job-development program effectively. The veteran who knows of a job for which he does not qualify, or in which he has no interest, will be of service to other veterans if he will report existence of the job to the employment service immediately; or if he is a member of a veterans' organization, to the employment officer of his post or chapter.

OTHER INFORMATION

The California Department of Employment administers the California Unemployment Insurance Act, including disability insurance provisions of that law. The department also administers title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

More comprehensive information will be found in the booklet, California's Employment Security System, available upon request at local offices of the department of employment.

The California State Employment Service is a public employment service operated by the California Department of Employment with offices located in the principal towns of the State.

Competition Is Coal's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the New York Times of March 12, 1950, printed a pointed and interesting editorial defining the principal problems confronting the Nation's coal industry. Chief among the coal industry's problem, according to the Times editorial, is the ever-growing competition of other fuels and the end of the long monopoly which coal has held in many regions.

This is an editorial all Members of the Senate should read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

The President has asked Congress to set up a commission to study the basic problems of coal. The end of the coal strike, he observes in letters to his congressional leaders, "has in no way diminished the need for a long-range study of the coal industry, with the view of finding * * * the best solutions of its problems from the standpoint of the miners, the operators, and, above all, the national interest."

It was following an earlier strike in the bituminous coal fields that another President proposed an inquiry of this kind. The year was 1922 and the President was Mr. Harding. And strange as it may seem, the basic problem then—or what seemed to be the basic problem—was strikingly similar to that of today. Said Mr. Harding on August 18, 1922:

"In the bituminous coal fields are vastly more mines than are requisite to the country's needs, and there are 200,000 more mine workers than are needed to produce in continuous employment the country's normal requirements. * * * Men divide the working time, and high wages are necessary to meet the cost of the barest living."

Mr. Harding had declared that even then, nearly 30 years ago, the country was "at the mercy of the United Mine Workers." The Commission's report, which emerged 3 years later, found that the principal need of the industry was "constructive leadership to solve its own problems," and urged that the policy of the UMW be shifted "from a purely militant basis to a more constructive one."

Today's sickness in coal stems basically from the difficulty of making the adjust-

ment from the monopoly position which the industry long enjoyed to the competitive role it occupies today. Why has the transition been so difficult? Why has a temporary maladjustment become a chronic ailment? It does not require a four-volume study such as the one produced in 1922–25 to provide the essential answer to that question. The coal industry's problem stems from the fact that it has to dispose of its production in a highly competitive market, while its costs are determined by a dictator who holds a complete monopoly on the labor supply in that industry. Wages, which represent the principal element in the cost of producing coal, are not established through collective bargaining, and they are not established with reference either to the market or to the desirability of providing a maximum number of jobs. The result is constantly mounting costs, a steady shrinkage in the market for coal, and a continual decline in the number of work hours for labor. Efforts are made to shore up the slipping structure by shortening the workweek and providing huge welfare funds to care for the idle and the aged. But both these processes themselves add enormously to the cost of doing business. And since it is more and more difficult to pass such costs along to the public, the net result is to speed up still further the vicious circle of mounting prices and contracting markets.

For anyone who doubts that this is basically what was going on in the bituminous coal industry—and is now going on at an accelerated rate—attention is invited to some pertinent facts presented in this newspaper a few days ago by A. H. Raskin. These show, for example, that even the two major strongholds of demand for soft coal have been crumbling since the war—namely, the railroads and the power companies. It is greatly in the interest of the railroads, as haulers of coal, to encourage the use of that fuel. Yet they are turning away from it more and more as a source of their own power. According to Mr. Raskin, out of a total of 5,083 locomotives delivered to the railroads since the war only 348, or less than 7 percent, have been of the coal-burning type. For those currently on order the figure is about 1 percent. In the cities oil has in many cases completely or largely supplanted coal as the source of municipal power. In Cleveland, for example, oil is used exclusively; Philadelphia uses 70 percent oil; the Public Service Co. of New Jersey is using oil for 90 percent of its power.

It may be desirable to make a fresh study of the ills of the coal industry, but that does not lessen in any way the necessity of dealing realistically with the problem of John L. Lewis. As a matter of fact, we might well find that if we really solve this, the industry's No. 1 problem, we shall have made further study largely redundant.

He Fought for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following talk delivered by Dorothy C. Salisbury during a program on March 6 over radio station WBCC:

HE FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

(By Dorothy Cleaveland Salisbury)

On Pennsylvania Avenue at Thirteenth Street NW., there stands the bronze figure of a cavalry officer wearing the round fur hat and military cape of a European army's uniform. The inscription below the horseman reads: Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Fell in battle at Savannah. Brigadier General of the United States. Marshal General of Poland. Brandywine, Valley Forge, Egg Harbor, Charleston, Savannah, Germantown.

Within these few words are compressed the career of perhaps the greatest military genius of his time and one of the most zealous and indefatigable fighters for freedom of any age.

Day before yesterday, March 4, was the two hundred and second anniversary of the birth of this Polish-American patriot.

In one of his first military engagements after reaching America, Pulaski probably prevented a premature end to the young republic when he warned Washington of a British ambush near Warren's Tavern. Five days after the battle of Brandywine, the American troops under Washington had halted for rest and refreshment at this spot on the Lancaster Road, 23 miles from Philadelphia. Within the tavern Washington was holding a council of war.

Suddenly up dashed Count Pulaski, newly-commissioned brigadier general of cavalry. He demanded of the startled sentry that he be admitted instantly to General Washington. "The general is in council and must not be disturbed," was the reply.

But the excited cavalry officer insisted with vehemence, till the commander in chief himself came to the doorway to demand the cause of the disturbance. To him Pulaski explained in a torrent of French and broken English that while he was on reconnaissance with a detachment of cavalry, he had come upon the whole British Army under General Howe, encircling the American position, and dangerously close. He had delayed only long enough to charge the vanguard and so halt the advance for a time.

Washington, dismayed and at first incredulous, was soon convinced of the truth of the report. Promptly dispatching 300 infantrymen to reinforce Pulaski's cavalry, he quickly withdrew his remaining forces to safety.

Just 202 years ago, on March 4, 1748, Casimir Pulaski was born on an estate in southeastern Poland. His father, Count Joseph Pulaski, was a successful and wealthy lawyer and able magistrate. His sons, Casimir, Francis, and Anthony, spent their boyhood in the saddle. Taught by the armed Cossack retainers on the family estates, the boys became unexcelled riders and crack swordsmen and pistol shots in a land of fighting horsemen.

On February 29, 1768, when Casimir was barely 20, the Pulaskis, father and sons, together with a few close friends, organized the Confederation of Bar, a patriotic movement to drive the encroaching Russians from Poland and restore Polish independence. The next 4 years Casimir spent as a cavalry commander of the confederation. By brilliant marches and dashing cavalry raids, he covered the country—recruiting peasants, enlisting the aid of patriotic nobles, and making his name a terror to the Russian troops sent against him.

But patriotic zeal and military genius were not enough to stand against the overwhelming numbers and resources which the Empress of Russia poured upon the confederates. Casimir's father, military head of the confederation, was treacherously seized and died in a Tartar prison. His brother, Anthony, was taken prisoner by the Russians. Francis was killed, almost at his side, in battle. Yet Casimir, taking his father's place as marshal of the patriot army, fought on with undiminished ardor, scorning the enemy's offers to him to capitulate.

Finally Casimir was persuaded to join in an unsuccessful plot to kidnap the King of Poland. When it failed, Casimir, now Count Pulaski, was outlawed and his estates confiscated. This brought to an end his work in Poland.

For the next years the Count was a wanderer. Finally the exile arrived in France sick, half-starved, in tattered clothes, and without a sou. There he heard of the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, of General Washington and the Declaration of Independence. With the fall of his hopes for a free Poland, he had despaired for the future, but now his courage and his enthusiasm returned. "My country has lost her freedom," he exclaimed, "but let us fight for that of a new people."

On June 13, 1777, when the brig *Massachusetts* slipped out of the harbor of Nantes, Pulaski was aboard her. He landed at Marblehead on July 23 and pushed on immediately to Boston to interview General Heath as to the American situation. These were dark days for the new Republic. General Burgoyne was on his march by Lake Champlain and Lake George to cut the Americans in two. Fort Ticonderoga had already fallen.

From Boston the eager warrior rode nearly 400 miles on horseback to join General Washington at his encampment on the Neshaminy, a few miles north of Philadelphia. While waiting for the Continental Congress to grant him a commission, Pulaski joined Washington's staff as a volunteer. During the battle of Brandywine on September 11, the Polish patriot saw his first active service for his new country. As the battle turned against the Americans, he led Washington's bodyguard in a sudden cavalry sortie which threw back for a time the British advance and gave the Americans a breathing space. Four days later Congress commissioned Count Pulaski "brigadier general in command of the horse," uniting under him, for the first time, all the American cavalry.

Next day came the skirmish at Warren's Tavern.

After the battle of Germantown in October, the Army went into winter quarters at Valley Forge. All that winter the new cavalry general worked incessantly with his command, teaching cavalry riding and military drill and tactics to men little used to discipline.

The count was recognized as the best swordsman in the Army and on horseback he was a veritable centaur. He delighted in practicing on the drill field the stunts he had learned as a boy from the Cossacks. With his horse at full gallop, he would fire his pistol, toss it in the air, and catch it as it fell. Or he would hurl it far ahead, dash up to it, and, leaning with one foot out of the stirrup, would snatch up the weapon and, without slackening speed, regain his seat.

Recruiting, drilling, providing for both men and horses kept the energetic Pole hopeful and exasperated by turns. By many short forays and scouting expeditions in small groups he gave his men experience in the field, and by harassing the British foraging parties he helped to keep General Howe's men closely penned in Philadelphia. And with it all, the cavalry veteran found time to write out his regulations for the cavalry as a separate division of the Army.

But the jealous hostility of some of his subordinate officers who resented serving under a foreigner speaking English brokenly, disheartened him. Only Washington's friendship and confidence kept him from resigning his commission and returning to Europe. He did relinquish command of the cavalry. He then prevailed upon Congress to authorize the formation of an independent mobile unit, the famous Pulaski's Legion.

The first of April 1778, Pulaski opened a recruiting office in Baltimore, Md. For the next 4 months he was busy organizing and training his corps. His officers were largely former officers in the armies of Europe, some of whom had served under him in Poland.

The Legion at full strength consisted of three companies of cavalry armed with lances and three companies of light infantry, three hundred and thirty all told. The commander and his officers soon successfully welded them into a splendid fighting machine. He had the gift of inspiring his men with something of his own ardent spirit.

In place of the motley rags and tatters on most of the American soldiers, Pulaski supplied his Legion with brilliant new uniforms of green coats, red vests, and white buckskin breeches. On the march he rode proudly at their head, his military cloak billowing behind him and the gay cockade on his great bearskin shako dancing. Over their heads floated the crimson banner embroidered for him by the Moravian "single sisters" of Bethlehem, Pa.

By the end of July the Legion was ready for the field, but it was weeks before they were to see active service. Except for a few minor engagements, another winter of inaction followed for the impatient Pulaski. But with the spring came a new campaign and renewed hope and enthusiasm.

Early in 1779 the Legion was ordered to join General Lincoln's army in the southern theater of war. The British had captured Savannah in December, and from there were threatening the rest of Georgia and South Carolina. Leaving Minisink on the Delaware River in February, Pulaski's corps started on its long and strenuous march southward. The infantry was dispatched by the post road through York, Baltimore, and Richmond. The general led the cavalry south through the Shenandoah Valley. Both groups hurried by forced marches to reach the scene of action before it would be too late.

On May 11 the two forces were reunited outside Charleston. Not a moment too soon. As the Legion reached the Cooper River, General Prevost, British commander, crossed the Ashley River and sent a message to the city fathers demanding surrender. With one or two other militant leaders, General Pulaski fairly browbeat the councilmen into defying the British demand. "As an officer of the Continental Army I forbid you to surrender," he stormed at them.

Next day, while enthusiasm still ran high, he led his cavalry in daring charges against the superior British forces, cutting his way back, often without loss. Pulaski's praises were on every tongue. General Prevost gave up his plan to take the city. The British commander, harassed by the Legion Cavalry which hung on his flanks, stinging like botflies, retreated down the sea islands to Savannah.

With Charleston safe, the Americans set about ridding the Carolinas and Georgia of hostile troops. By September the British retained only a toehold at Savannah. Hopes were bright that before winter the entire South would be cleared of the invaders. To add to the feeling of assurance, Admiral d'Estaing with a squadron of the French fleet arrived off Tybee Roads, 20 miles off Savannah. Pulaski spearheaded the American advance, picking off British outposts on his way to make contact with the French. By September 16 the allied blockade of Savannah was complete.

But d'Estaing, impatient with the slowness of seige operations and fearing the autumn storms, urged an assault on the well-fortified city. General Lincoln, in command of the American army, reluctantly consented, and on October 9 the allies attacked. Plans had been carefully made, but a deserter had learned of them and carried them to the enemy. Thus all advantage of surprise and uncertainty was lost to the attackers. The ensuing battle was one of the bloodiest of the war.

One of Pulaski's officers vividly describes the scene. "For half an hour the guns roared and blood flowed abundantly. Seeing an opening between the enemy's works, Pulaski resolved to charge through. Imploring help from the Almighty, Pulaski shouted to his men, 'Forward,' and we, 200 strong, rode at full speed after him, the earth resounding under the hoofs of our chargers. For the first few minutes all went well. We sped like knights into the peril. Just, however, as we passed a gap between the two batteries, a cross fire, like a pouring shower, confused our ranks. I looked around. Oh, sad moment, ever to be remembered. Pulaski lies prostrate on the ground."

The fallen leader was rescued by some of his soldiers in the face of the enemy's fire and carried on board the United States brig *Wasp*, to be taken to Charleston. In spite of the care of French surgeons, he died on board her 2 days later and was buried at sea.

So died, at 31, the first commanding general of the United States cavalry, a gallant but ill-fated fighter for freedom both in his homeland and in the land of his adoption.

Today, more than 200 years after Pulaski's birth in far-off Poland, his spirit lives on in the hearts of his compatriots on both sides of the Atlantic, through whose efforts we may yet see fulfilled the dreams of a free Poland beside a free America in a free world.

Promises Versus Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in Chicago there is a great Negro newspaper known as the Chicago Defender. Most Democrats are familiar with this newspaper, and have had a right to be familiar with it for the last decade and more.

Many of its fine articles have from time to time been honored in many ways by members of the Democratic Party, for reasons of benefit to them. However, on the front page of the Chicago Defender for Saturday, March 4, 1950, there appeared a two-column editorial which has not been properly honored by the Democratic Party.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert this editorial from the Chicago Defender in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all the Members of the Eighty-first Congress will have opportunity to read it, and so that the article may be given due honor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

As we enter the 1950 election campaign, the Democrats, both locally and nationally, should do a little soul searching.

Locally there seems to be a growing conviction on the part of Boss Jack Arvey and company that the Negro vote is in the bag for the Democratic Party. As the song goes, they seem to think that they have the world in a jug and the stopper in their hands.

We would like to remind them of that delightful tune from Porgy and Bess, It Ain't Necessarily So.

The Democrats here have, as we pointed out some weeks ago, ignored the wishes of the people in the First and Fifth Senatorial Districts by putting up hand-picked hacks. They have shown similar stupidity by refusing to give Judge Wendell Green the designation for the superior court.

As a matter of fact, the Democratic Party as a whole seems to be suffering from indigestion. They have apparently been eating too high on the hog, and now they are sleeping on a full stomach. The Democrats in Illinois and in the Nation have been and are now in a position to live up to their promises.

Here are some of the questions in the minds of the voters:

1. When will the people see some leadership in breaking the bottleneck on Mayor Kennelly's housing program?

2. Can Governor Stevenson compare his record to date with past administrations?

3. What happened to the administration's leaders in Congress in the fight for a strong FEPC?

4. How did it happen that Chairman Boyle, of the Democratic National Committee, stated that Congressman DAWSON was vice chairman of the committee and now nobody in Washington is quite sure what position DAWSON has on the committee?

5. Why were the qualified Negro candidates overlooked in the appointment of the new Governor for the Virgin Islands?

The action promised by the Democrats in 1948 caught the imagination of the people. Now, 2 years later, we have more promises and few accomplishments. This lack of action is cause for grave concern among voters who turned the tide in 1948 and who may turn the tide again.

The wishes of the people have been ignored and forgotten for the benefit of a small group of selfish men concerned only in maintaining their own little selfish political interests.

They have forgotten the people, but the people have yet to be heard.

Performances, not promises, will set the course.

United States Losing a Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Losing a Market," which appeared in the Kansas City Star of Kansas City, Mo., under date of March 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LOSING A MARKET—SOUTH AMERICA TURNING TO EUROPE, PUBLISHER REPORTS

LAWRENCE, KANS., March 1.—Dolph Simons, publisher of the Journal-World, said today the United States has temporarily lost its markets in South America to European competitors.

He expressed the opinion the Marshall plan had boomeranged to our disadvantage in 9 out of 10 South American nations.

Simons returned today from a tour of Latin America. He said "our neighbors south of Panama are not asking for big chunks of financial aid, but they can't understand why they don't get a single dime while Uncle Sam is giving away billions in other parts of the world under the Marshall plan."

"Everywhere except in Venezuela," he said, "European countries have been given the green light to fill Latin-American stores with manufactured goods * * * while bans have been clamped on nearly all imports from the United States.

"South Americans largely prefer United States cars, radios, and other goods, but they don't have the dollars necessary to buy them. So they buy from England, France, and other countries which are breathing with new industrial life, thanks to billions of dollars from America."

Equal Rights Proposal Called Two-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EQUAL RIGHTS PROPOSAL CALLED TWO-WAY STREET

TO EDITOR, THE NEWS:

In an editorial on equal rights you have used a clever phrase, "This will be a neat trick if it can be done." I agree. You are referring to Senator HAYDEN's rider to the equal rights amendment. The amendment says "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex." The rider says that this shall not be construed to impair any benefits or exemptions conferred upon the female sex.

The rider tries to freeze laws about seats in factories, hours for day and night work, etc., which it is the job of men in the State assembly to discuss. They make statutory law.

But the amendment, adopted in the Senate on January 25 is to be added to the Bill of Rights, like the principle guaranteeing freedom of the press.

New Jersey State Bar Association made an appeal which resulted in equal rights which resulted in equal rights under the law for women in that State, given by the new constitution adopted 3 years ago: "In spirit women have attained a legal status equal with men, but in fact they are still in a subject class. This is incompatible with the right to vote and with the responsibilities women are assuming." New Jersey is the only State in the Union where women have full citizenship; where they are not treated as adolescent and incompetent by the law.

Strange as it may seem, the word "persons" in our Constitution has been interpreted by the Supreme Court as male, so equal protection of the laws guaranteed in the fourteenth amendment omits women.

Now the equal rights amendment is a two-way street. It does not mention women, or men. If Senator HAYDEN feared it would impair protection for women, why not for men? Are legal safeguards for sailors on the high seas, miners in coal pits, soldiers risking their lives to be thrown overboard, while seats in factories for women are saved? That would be a neat trick—and make of women the most selfish and unlovely of mortals.

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT,
Chairman, Connecticut Committee.
NEW HAVEN.

Seeking Security in Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seeking Security in Prayer," by Mary Hornaday, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEKING SECURITY IN PRAYER—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM NEW YORK

(By Mary Hornaday)

NEW YORK.—Readers of the New York Times have been surprised recently to see among the clothing and housefurnishing advertisements, two large displays—one entitled "God and the Atom," and a second, "Prayer, an Answer to 'God and the Atom.'"

In both cases, names of the persons sponsoring the ads were omitted. The first merely gave the name of an advertising agency for replies; the second was signed by a generally unknown group, "Fellowship in Prayer."

Reporters seeking out Ferris Booth who inserted the original "God and the Atom" ad in the Times on October 3, half expected to find what in the newspaper business is referred to as a "crackpot." Instead they located, in one of New York's swankiest hotel-apartments, a six-foot-four bachelor, son of a former vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co., and former manager of the Columbia University crew, who has been spending much time lately thinking about the big problems of the world.

Mr. Booth belongs to no church but usually attends St. John the Divine, the Episcopal Cathedral. He pointed to a shelf full of books on world problems that he had read before he decided to spend $2,500 on the "God and the Atom" ad. The announcement of the Russian bomb gave him his cue.

"There's no angle at all," he told surprised reporters, "but I always thought it was silly to have fights all the time. We can always get worse weapons but what's the use? The money we are paying out for past and present wars only means bankruptcy for all of us. There has to be some other answer, that's all."

Since Mr. Booth specifically addressed his ad to President Truman as a "sincere and most respectful suggestion," he naturally turned there for the first reaction. But a reporter who asked the President about it at a press conference was brushed aside.

But Mr. Booth said he expected God's help in getting a response to the ad. To date he has received 700 letters. In addition it evoked a second large ad in the Times of December 13, placed by C. A. Evans, retired associate executive secretary of the United Board for Christian Colleges in China, who heads a group of 15 calling themselves the "Fellowship in Prayer."

Mr. Evans sits modestly in what would normally be the public-stenographer's office in a hotel just across from the famous Little Church Around the Corner. After 20 years with Protestant church organizations, Mr. Evans, like Mr. Booth, came to the conclusion that there must be an interdenominational turning to God to meet the threat of communism and other antireligious forces. Thus far, he has received enough money from similarly-minded people to put the ad in the Times.

Mr. Evans calls his ad an answer to Mr. Booth because he does not agree with everything Mr. Booth said. He sees no use in bolstering Confucianism in China, for instance.

Also, he believes that, instead of putting responsibility in President Truman's hands, it should be put upon each individual who believes in God, regardless of his religious affiliation.

"The new approach that is needed," Mr. Evans says, "is simply prayer—prayer which recognizes that all great religions believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; that there are basic truths which apply to all great faiths and which may present a common denominator of attributes for which all people may pray. Truth, justice, mercy, and honesty are fundamentals over which there should be no controversy."

People are already writing to Mr. Evans to ask what they can do to further the spiritual renaissance on which both he and Mr. Booth set to work almost simultaneously. He put some recommendations into his ad: Begin now to pray in your own manner. Do it frequently or at stated times. Talk it over with your family, your neighbors, your friends, your spiritual adviser. If possible, get your local newspaper to copy this article or comment upon it. Fellowship circles could be formed. Do not, however, let it interfere with your regular religious duties—rather combine it with them.

The next step in the God and the atom campaign? "It may sound corny and trite," says Mr. Booth, "but I really believe God will take care of that." Says Mr. Evans, "No elaborate organization is planned. God has so far inspired the various steps of progress and he will direct and lead developments. All we know is we can't let the antireligious forces in the world win."

Many who are already effectively applying religion in their own way to the problems of our day will be interested in these efforts as new evidence of the widespread desire for more active peacemaking through religion.

One Great Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that we are all familiar with the magnificent job that was performed in the 100,000 Christian churches throughout our country 2 days ago, Sunday, March 12, in collecting contributions for world relief.

This was the program known as the initial One Great Hour of Sharing.

Throughout Wisconsin as throughout the Nation, churches of the Protestant and Catholic denominations joined together in this heartwarming application of the principles of the Great Teacher. I have in my hands, Mr. President, an advertisement carried in the Janesville Daily Gazette of March 10, sponsored by the Christian churches of that fine city. This advertisement mentions a series of radio programs on Station WCLO which were designed to spearhead the One Great Hour of Sharing drive. I believe

that the spiritual and layman leaders of the Christian churches throughout our country who initiated and carried through this great drive should indeed be congratulated. It is a magnificent demonstration of American unity in fulfillment of our Christian responsibilities to the suffering, the hungry, the naked, and the diseased. It is indeed an "operation good Samaritan."

I believe that this one advertisement shows perhaps more clearly than a Nation-wide summary exactly how the One Great Hour of Sharing program worked in one city. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this advertisement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Am I my brother's keeper?"—Genesis 4: 9.

ONE GREAT HOUR OF SHARING

Tonight, March 10, from 6:45 to 7 o'clock, and on Saturday evening, March 11, from 6 to 6:15 o'clock, WCLO will broadcast the last two programs in a dramatic series titled "Operation Good Samaritan" as part of the Nation-wide One Great Hour of Sharing overseas relief program to be held in your church on Sunday, March 12. This appeal will take place in more than 100,000 Christian churches throughout America. And we, the churches of Janesville, ask you to listen, attend, and give.

Listen, attend, share. Nearly 25,000,000 members of 19 major Protestant and Catholic denominations are participating in the One Great Hour of Sharing. The success of One Great Hour of Sharing, designed specifically to raise many millions of dollars for world relief in the thousands of churches throughout America, depends entirely on the number of people who give at 11 a. m. on Sunday, March 12, following the broadcasts. It is for this reason that we, the churches of Janesville and America, urge you, the reader, to listen tonight and tomorrow night, and to tell your friends to listen, and then go to church on Sunday and give. The hunger of heart, the nakedness of mind, the sickness of soul of millions of men, women, and children of Europe and Asia need help—your help. Only when all men can hold their heads high will the world be truly on the road to peace.

Sponsored by First Lutheran Church, St. John's Lutheran Church, First Congregational Church, First Baptist Church, First Christian Church, Cargill Memorial Methodist Church, Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, Emerald Grove Congregational Church, First Presbyterian Church, Church of the Nazarene, Evangelical United Brethren Church, St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church. St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Salvation Army, Rock Prairie Presbyterian Church.

The President's Handling of the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Clifford B. Ward, appearing in the Fort Wayne News Sentinel under date of March 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

President Truman's handling of the coal strike is sufficient grounds for his impeachment on a basis both of incompetence and malfeasance.

Obviously, he played the worst kind of cheap partisan politics with a situation more threatening to the general welfare of the United States than any plot, real or fancied, on the part of Communist Russia.

In effect, he violated for many months his oath of office by refusing to recognize a Federal law and by refusing to treat as an emergency something which every schoolboy knew was an emergency. When he did take recourse to the Federal law which covers such a situation he did so in a manner that was contemptuous of that law.

At no time did the President make any serious appeal to the coal miners of this country to go back to work and it is likely that an appeal, made by Truman, as President of the United States to the miners might have worked, if he had shown that he meant it.

WORST TYPE OF ENEMY

John L. Lewis was able to do what any avowed enemy of the United States would wish to do but would not be able to do. He was able to take a country which was headed for an unusually prosperous year of business and knock it back on its heels economically even worse than Communists would have been able to do if given full permission to do so. Today there is not a person in the United States who has not been hurt seriously by Lewis' coal strike.

That the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor act has been shown to be the most silly sort of charge. The Taft-Hartley Act is on the books and a national strike threatening the welfare of all the Nation occurred.

The contempt charges against Lewis were predicated on the basis that Lewis is the union. He is not. The union, even if Lewis did not, ignored the orders of a Federal court to go back to work until a fact-finding board completed its work.

NOT RESPONSIBLE UNITS

If unions are not responsive to court orders, they are not responsible organizations and cannot be so treated by Government or by those who deal with them and sign contracts with them. If union leaders cannot handle wildcat strikes, unauthorized union actions, and if they can't exercise the leadership to get their members to obey court orders, then it is silly to suppose that there is such a thing as union responsibility.

Every human being in this country has certain inalienable rights, but no human being in this country has an inalienable right to use an inalienable right to deprive some other citizen of an inalienable right. One man in defense of his rights cannot seriously threaten the rights of everyone else.

WOULD BE HISSED

If any capitalist were to willfully damage this Nation's economy as Lewis has done, his name would be hissed by every other citizen in this country. If a capitalist were to refuse to feed our army of occupation in Japan until he was promised the best profit on food needed, we would ask him to be tried for something comparable to treason.

Yet, Mr. Lewis, in effect, said that he was willing to hurt every innocent person in the United States, if necessary, to see to it that miners got what they were demanding.

A public official who takes an oath to preserve law and order and carry out the requirements of his oath can be impeached if he does not do his duty. Mr. Truman is such a public official.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some letters I have received about housing:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
PERSONNEL POLICY BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1940.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In contacting the military departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, I found that the information which you requested in your note to me on October 25 was being compiled and sent to you by the Secretary of Defense. Therefore, I waited until that letter was sent to you before responding to your request. I hope that this letter from Mr. Stephen Early, as Acting Secretary, sent you on November 30 supplied the desired data on family housing in Alaska.

Vice Admiral McCrea is sending additional housing figures to you in compliance with your notes on his letter of October 3. This should reach you in a few days.

I have been very happy to furnish you with what information was available because of your deep interest in the welfare of the families of men and women in the service.

My delays, and those of Admiral McCrea's, in answering your inquiries promptly have been occasioned by the fact that the Personnel Policy Board does not normally deal with statistical data on housing. This is the responsibility of the Munitions Board and the Office of the Budget, Office of the Secretary of Defense. Therefore, the information which we gathered for you was second or third handed, coming first from the services and then through these two mentioned agencies. I have a suggestion which is respectfully submitted in case you desire further family housing data. There is now another group within the Department of Defense which is going into the housing business very deeply. I refer to the Department of Defense Housing Commission, which was appointed by Mr. Johnson on November 16, 1949, to study all phases of the family housing problem and to plan for an over-all solution to these problems. The studies and research of this commission should produce more complete and accurate figures than have been available heretofore.

I hope you enjoyed your recess and were able to spend most of the time in your home at Gladewater and in your district. I envy you in this respect because my military service has kept me away from my home in San Antonio for about 6 years now.

For your information, I have recently been assigned from the Personnel Policy Board to the Joint Technical Planning Committee, the group which is responsible for operations in connection with the atomic bomb test scheduled for Eniwetok at a later date. I'm very enthusiastic about the new job because of the background it will give me in the use of this most important weapon.

Again, I repeat, it has been a pleasure to furnish any assistance which I could to you. I am apologetic about the delays in time, and I am sincere when I say that these delays were necessary in order to insure that the data was correct and based on sound facts.

Respectfully,

ROBERT R. GIDEON, Jr.,
Colonel, United States Air Force.

P. S.—Attached please find Air Force magazine with an article about housing. Thought you might be interested in reading it.—R. R. G., Jr.

HEADQUARTERS, BENJAMIN HARRISON AIR FORCE BASE,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter of January 10, 1950, the following information is furnished:

Officers with families at this base	168
Airmen with families at this base	331
Officers with families furnished Government housing by this base	63
Airmen with families furnished Government housing by this base	86

No information on additional housing units needed at this base can be furnished inasmuch as this base will be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army on February 1, 1950, and future plans for this base are not known by this headquarters.

Very truly yours,

ROGER E. LEE,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Three Thousand Three Hundred and Tenth Technical Training Wing and Scott Air Force Base, Ill.]

OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
January 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your inquiry of January 25, 1950, the following information is furnished:

Number of officers with families assigned to the base	908
Number of enlisted men with families assigned to the base	2,534
Number of officers with families occupying Government quarters	205
Number of enlisted men with families occupying Government quarters	213

Additional housing units needed: Officers, 703; enlisted, 2,321.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. MCBLAIN,
Brigadier General, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Ninety-first Strategic Reconnaissance Wing]

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.,
January 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter received at this station January 25, 1950, the following information is offered:

1. Number of officers with families at this base, 1,175.

2. Number of airmen with families at this base, 2,546.

3. Number of officers with families now occupying Government quarters on the base, 106.

4. Number of airmen with families now occupying Government quarters:

(a) On the base, 123.

(b) Barksdale Homes (off the base, but immediately adjacent), 101.

(c) Greentree Homes (22 miles from the base, 115. (Homes are not considered adequate due to the distance from the base and the present condition of the homes.)

5. Additional housing units required at this station for officers with families, 855. (This figure is based on the total married officers, less the number now furnished Government quarters, less 20 percent who would not desire Government quarters.)

6. Additional housing units for airmen with families, 2,322. (This figure includes those airmen presently living at Greentree Homes.)

Your attention is invited to the fact that a total of 1,500 additional housing units was recommended by the Federal Housing Administration, of which 692 have been approved and contract let.

We are pleased to furnish you with this information. If we can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to write us.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE M. WADE,
Colonel, United States Air Force,
Deputy Commander.

HEADQUARTERS FORT BRAGG,
CFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Fort Bragg, N. C., January 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 19, 1950, the following information is furnished:

Number of officers with families at this station	1,531
Number of enlisted men with families at this station	5,903
Number of officers with families furnished Government quarters by this station:	
Permanent	124
Mobilization type	[1] 589
Number of enlisted men furnished Government quarters by this station:	
Permanent	140
Mobilization type	[2] 1,012
Number of additional housing units needed for officers at this station	818
Number of additional housing units needed for enlisted men at this station	[3] 4,751

[1] Converted from mobilization-type buildings.

[2] 475 units (Honeycutt housing area) are located 8 miles from the post. 537 units converted from mobilization-type buildings.

[3] This figure includes 2,550 enlisted men for whom housing on or offpost is desirable.

The requirement for 818 officer units and 4,751 EM units is the current need. To this figure must be added units required for replacement of the converted mobilization-type housing, which has an estimated life of not to exceed 5 years.

The above figures do not include 1,000 units which are to be constructed by civilian contractor under the provisions of the Wherry bill.

Trusting that the above covers desired information, I am

Sincerely yours,

HOMER W. KIEFER,
Brigadier General, General Staff Corps,
Chief of Staff.

[Headquarters, Mitchel Air Force Base (Twenty-five hundredth Air Base Group)]

NEW YORK, *January 30, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 19, 1950, please be advised of the following status of family housing at this station.

(a) There are 642 officers assigned this station with families.

(b) There are 1,525 airmen assigned this station with families.

(c) There are 100 officers assigned Government family quarters at this station; these quarters are in the following categories:

1. Permanent, 59.
2. FPHA, 29.
3. Converted barracks, 12.

(d) There are 307 airmen assigned Government family quarters at this station; these quarters are in the following categories:

1. Permanent, 68.
2. FPHA, 145.
3. Converted barracks, 94.

(e) There are 36 airmen residing in privately owned trailers on Government trailer lots at this station.

(f) Based on availability of housing in the adjacent communities, housing is required for personnel of this station as follows:

1. Officers, 315.
2. Airmen, 315.

Please be assured of our continued cooperation in this and other matters within the confines of existing regulations.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. C. WIMSATT,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Four Thousand Four Hundred and Eighth Air Base Squadron]

LAWSON AIR FORCE BASE,
Fort Benning, Ga., January 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your communication of January 27, 1950, regarding Government housing for military personnel assigned Lawson Air Force Base.

For your information, Lawson Air Force Base is on the military reservation of Fort Benning, Ga., and a pro rata share of housing is available to this station from that headquarters. At present we have 33 officers with families stationed at Lawson Air Force Base, 7 of these presently assigned Government quarters on the Fort Benning Reservation. We have 122 airmen with families assigned this station with 7 being furnished Government housing on Fort Benning. To provide adequate housing for all military personnel at Lawson Air Force Base, we presently would need 26 sets of quarters for officer personnel and 115 sets of quarters for airmen.

For your information, 600 units are presently under contract under the Wherry bill on the Fort Benning Reservation. Also approximately 200 sets of noncommissioned officers' quarters are almost completed. A pro rata share of these quarters will be made available to Lawson Air Force Base upon completion.

Yours truly,

RICHARD O. JOHNSON,
Major, United States Air Force, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Four Thousand One Hundred and Eighth Base Service Squadron]

SMOKY HILL AIR FORCE BASE,
Salina, Kans., January 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference your recent inquiry of January 25 relative to the number of officers and enlisted men with families stationed here, the following information is submitted:

(a) Number of officers with families, 14.

(b) Number of enlisted men with families, 106.

There are no officers or enlisted men occupying Government quarters at this station, and no additional units are required at present, since this station is in process of being deactivated and is scheduled to be placed on a stand-by basis on April 20, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

D. M. JONES,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, FORT DEVENS, MASS.,
February 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: As requested by you, the following housing information is furnished:

Officers with families at this station	226
Enlisted men with families at this station	1,236
Officers with families in Government housing	200
Enlisted men with families in Government housing	531
Additional housing units needed for officers with families at present time	26
Additional housing units needed for enlisted men with families at present time	705

The forecast for the future is more unfavorable, although definite figures are not available at this time. An increase in the permanent garrison is anticipated which will increase the shortage by approximately 500, should current plans, as yet unannounced, materialize.

Sincerely,

R. W. GROW,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP LEE,
Camp Lee, Va., February 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have received your letter of January 27, 1950, in which certain information was requested as to the family housing situation existing at Camp Lee, Va.

The information requested is being compiled and will be submitted through the Legislative and Liaison Division, Department of the Army, for coordination.

Sincerely,

R. C. L. GRAHAM,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, THE INFANTRY CENTER,
Fort Benning, Ga.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In response to your inquiry of January 19, the following information is furnished:

(a) Number of officers with families, 2,005. Of this number there are 133 living in bachelor-type quarters who draw family allowance. Due to nonavailability of Government quarters or reasons of their own, including compassion, the families of these officers have remained in their home communities throughout the United States. There will always be a certain number of officers and enlisted personnel of this category. Practically all of these officers are in non-Regular Army components.

Number of enlisted personnel with families, 3,209. Of this number 239 are in the status of the 133 officers described above. (The figure 3,209 includes enlisted personnel authorized quarters or quarters allowance only. In addition there are 4,232 enlisted personnel of lower grades with families who are authorized neither quarters nor quarters allowance.)

(b) Number of officers with families in Government quarters, 894.

Number of enlisted men with families in Government quarters, 338.

(c) Number of quarters required for officers, 1,111. This figures includes quarters for the 133 officers described in (a) above.

Number of quarters required for enlisted personnel, 2,871. This figure includes quarters for the 239 enlisted personnel described in (a) above.

For your further information, 200 units of $60 to $70 rentals have been built on the Fort Benning Military Reservation under the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 774) (per 10 U. S. C. 1270), that are now occupied. Contracts have been let for 600 housing units with rental value at $70 through $95 to be built on the Fort Benning Military Reservation under the Wherry bill. In addition, 80 housing units (Government quarters for authorized enlisted personnel) are under construction on the main post with target completion date April 1, 1950. For planning purposes these 880 units reduce the requirements in paragraph 1 (c) above.

The foregoing indicated requirements are based on actual existing conditions, whereas requirements used in submission of budget requests are ordinarily based upon projected peacetime strengths utilized for long-range planning. The projected strengths for Fort Benning represent a total peacetime requirement of 5,601 family units for officers and 9,859 family units for noncommissioned officers, resulting in a total family housing requirement of 15,460 units.

Yours very truly,

J. S. BRADLEY,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Westover Air Force Base (One Thousand Six Hundredth Air Transport Wing, ATLD–MATS)]

WESTOVER AIR FORCE BASE, MASS.,
February 2, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Acknowledgement is made of your letter of January 25, 1950, in which you request information regarding housing available and required for officers and airmen at this installation.

In accordance with the provisions of Air Force Regulation 11–7, dated April 25, 1949, your inquiry is being forwarded to the Director of Legislation and Liaison, Headquarters, United States Air Force, for reply. Pertinent information will be furnished you by that office in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. E. BARZYNSKI, Jr.,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

AIR PROVING GROUND,
EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.,
February 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am in receipt of your letter of January 26, 1950, in which you request information relative to the numbers of officers and enlisted men with families who are stationed at this base and the numbers of such personnel who are furnished Government-owned housing.

In answer to your specific questions and to provide you with a comprehensive picture of the current housing requirements at this station, the following table of information is offered:

1. Total personnel strength by categories, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.: Officers, 625; airmen, 5,662.

2. Total personnel strength by categories with families: Officers, 499; airmen, 2,302.

3. Total personnel by categories with families who are furnished Government-owned housing: Officers, 149; airmen, 544.

4. Number of existing Government-owned family units deductible from (2), above: Officers, 149; airmen, 544.

5. Present housing deficiency by categories: Officers, 350; airmen, 1,758.

The above figures, relating to personnel with families, are supplied from a survey recently completed as of December 31, 1949, and will not normally vary over an extended period by more than 5 percent up or down. Any attempt to furnish more current information, as to the numbers of officers and airmen with families, would necessitate an additional survey which could not be completed for approximately 15 days, however, experience shows the percentage of officers and enlisted personnel with families will vary only slightly with any normal turn-over of personnel.

It is anticipated that the figures given herein regarding the present housing deficiency will increase in the near future, consistent with proposed future expansion of Eglin Air Force Base; however, justification for future deficiency cannot be made at this time.

It may be noted that the above table indicates 2,302 enlisted men with families for whom a definite housing requirement is established, however, of that number only 1,419 are within the pay grades for which Government housing is normally furnished under current regulations.

I trust this information will be satisfactory for your use.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. KEPNER,
Major General, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE,
Omaha, Nebr., February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Furnished below is the information requested in your letter of inquiry dated January 26, 1950.

Officers with families at this base	449
Airmen with families at this base	929
Officers having Government housing	37
Airmen having Government housing	27
Additional units needed for officers	412
Additional units needed for airmen	902

Sincerely,

GERALD G. ROBINSON,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Deputy Commander.

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP LEROY JOHNSON,
New Orleans, La., February 3, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In reply to your letter of January 26, 1950, requesting data on the housing situation at this post, the following report is submitted:

Number of officers with families assigned	51
Number of enlisted men with families assigned	390
Officers furnished Government housing	5
Enlisted men furnished Government housing (the above housing is not on the post, but furnished by the Navy Bienville Housing project)	38
Housing units needed for officers	34
Housing units needed for enlisted men	352

Trusting that this information is what you desire, I am,

Yours very truly,

M. C. SHEA,
Colonel, Field Artillery, Commanding.

[Headquarters, Lowry Air Force Base and Three Thousand Four Hundred and Fifteenth Technical Training Wing]

DENVER, COLO., *February 3, 1950.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference your letter of January 23, I regret that I am unable to furnish you the information requested. However, your letter has been referred to the Director of Legislation and Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, and you may expect a reply from him.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. CARTER,
Brigadier General, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS,
THE ARMORED CENTER,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Fort Knox, Ky., February 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of January 19, 1950, regarding housing statistics at this station, and the following information is submitted:

(a) Number of officers with families assigned to this post	1,328
(b) Number of enlisted men (consisting of grades E-5, E-6, and E-7; and grade E-4 with seven or more years of service) with families assigned to this post	2,597
(c) Number of officers with families occupying Government quarters	680
(d) Number of officers with families occupying Government substandard quarters	15
(e) Number of enlisted men with families occupying Government quarters	629
(f) Number of enlisted men with families occupying Government substandard quarters	317
(g) Number of officers with families living in privately owned trailers located on the post	117
(h) Number of enlisted men with families living in privately owned trailers located on the post (all grades)	159
(i) Number of officers with families living on post, totals of subparagraphs (c), (d), and (g)	812
(j) Number of enlisted men with families living on post, totals of subparagraphs (e), (f), and (h)	1,105
(k) Number of additional housing units needed for officers with families at this post	516
(l) Number of additional housing units needed for enlisted men with families at this post	1,492

Under current Army regulations, enlisted personnel of the three highest grades with dependents are assigned quarters if available. Enlisted personnel in the remaining lower grades with dependents may be granted authority to occupy public quarters when such quarters are not required for assignment to personnel of the three highest grades.

At the present time there are additional housing units in process of construction which includes 152 Government units plus 1,000 units by private concern under Government lease (Wherry bill) or a total of 1,152 units.

Upon completion of these new units, the housing shortage at this station will be relieved considerably, and the 856 officers and/or enlisted men—totals of subparagraphs (k) and (l) above 2,008, less new units being constructed 1,152—will be able to find family quarters in communities adjacent to this post due to personnel moving into the new units.

In view of above no justification for additional housing can be foreseen at this time.

I will be very pleased to be of further assistance if you find it desirable to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

WM. G. LIVESAY,
Major General,
United States Army, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS,
FORT WILLIAMS, MAINE,
February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The following information is furnished in response to your inquiry of February 1:

(a) Number of officers, with families, assigned to this command, 22.

(b) Number of enlisted men, with families, assigned to this command, 161.

(c) Number of officers, with families, furnished Government quarters, 19.

(d) Number of enlisted men, with families, furnished Government quarters, 42.

(e) In view of the fact that this station and its satellite stations is scheduled for a drastic reduction in strength and eventual deactivation, no additional housing units are needed for either officers or enlisted men and their families.

L. W. GOEPPERT,
Colonel, Coast Artillery Corps, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS,
WENDOVER AIR FORCE BASE,
Wendover, Utah, February 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference your letter of February 1, 1950, requesting information relative housing of military personnel assigned this station.

Presently there are 2 officers and 23 enlisted men, with families, assigned this station. These personnel are housed in a Government housing project in the adjacent town of Wendover, Utah. There are no quarters available on the station for military personnel.

This station is in the process of inactivation and it is not anticipated that housing units will be required.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. CRUM,
Major, United States Air Force, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP CARSON,
Camp Carson, Colo., February 9, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your communication, dated January 26, 1950 pertaining to housing at this installation, the following information is submitted:

Total officers with families	464
Total enlisted men with families	1,349
	Apartments
Total government housing for officers	136
Total Government housing for enlisted men	266
Additional housing needed for officers	121
Additional housing needed for enlisted men	803

I am sorry to have caused you this delay but the compiling of this information through a thorough screening of our records necessitated more time than contemplated.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. MOORE,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Deputy Commander.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 9, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington 20, D. C., in which you requested housing information.

The following information has been supplied by the Commanding Officer of Andrews Air Force Base:

Officers with families	610
Officers furnished Government quarters	182
Additional housing units needed for officers	428
Airmen with families	1,127
Airmen furnished Government quarters	12
Airmen quarters under construction and nearing completion	120
Additional housing units needed for airmen	995

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS SCHOOLS,
Quantico, Va., February 14, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The information requested in your letter of February 10, 1950, concerning the housing at the Marine Corps Schools is as follows:

(a) Number of married officers, 814.

(b) Number of married enlisted, 1,152.

(c) Number of married officers occupying Government quarters, 322.

Number of married officers occupying Government-controlled rental quarters, 66.

(d) Number of married enlisted occupying Government quarters, 207.

Number of married enlisted occupying Government-controlled rental quarters, 271.

(e) Number of quarters now under construction, none.

(f) 450 units have been requested under the provisions of the Wherry Housing Act.

As you know, the housing situation at the Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va., is one of our major problems at the present time. Your interest in the situation is deeply appreciated.

As you requested, I am returning your letter.

Sincerely yours,

LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, Jr.,
Major General, United States Marine Corps, Commandant, Marine Corps Schools.

HEADQUARTERS,
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE,
Alamogordo, N. Mex., February 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of January 23, 1950, relative to housing at this base, the following information is furnished:

(a) Number of officers with families, 102.

(b) Number of airmen with families, 392.

(c) Number of officers occupying Government quarters, 60.

(d) Number of airmen occupying Government quarters, 240. (These 240 quarters are of the "cracker-box" variety built as temporary housing in 1942. They are substandard, inadequate, and have deteriorated to a point where they cannot be economically maintained.)

(e) Number of quarters now under construction, 82.

(f) Total number of quarters required by both officers and airmen, 350. (This number

has been requested under the Wherry Housing Act.)

Your interest in the housing situation at this station is deeply appreciated and I will gladly furnish any further information that you request.

Sincerely,

CARL B. NELSON,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, Coordinator of Congressional Matters.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
DIRECTORATE OF LEGISLATION AND LIAISON,
Washington, February 15, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 1, 1950, requesting information about the housing at Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.

Information in regard to this matter is being obtained and you will be advised further in the near future.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 10, 1950, addressed to the commanding officer, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, regarding Government housing.

The following information has been supplied by the commanding officer of Kirtland Air Force Base:

Officers with families	338
Enlisted men with families	900
Officers with families having Government housing	25
Enlisted men with families having Government housing	75
Additional housing units needed for:	
Officers with families	313
Airmen with families	600

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 25, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer, Westover Air Force Base, Mass.

The following information has been supplied by the commanding officer of Westover Air Force Base:

Personnel occupying family-type quarters on the base:

Officers	98
Airmen	87
Civilians	2

An estimate of family housing needs as of December 31, 1949, was as follows:

Officers	612
Airmen	1,638
Civilians	338

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
DIRECTORATE OF LEGISLATION AND LIAISON,
Washington, February 21, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in further reference to your letter of January 10, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, requesting housing information.

The following information has been supplied by the commanding officer of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base:

Officers with families stationed at base	1,546
Airmen (enlisted) with families stationed at base	1,042
Officers with families furnished housing on base	343
Airmen (enlisted) with families furnished housing on base	372
Number of additional housing units required for officers' families	1,203
Number of additional housing units required for airmen's families	670

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reference to your letters of January 10 and 14, 1950, addressed to the Commanding Officer of Hamilton Air Force Base, Hamilton, Calif., concerning housing data and black-eyed pea procurement at that base and to your communication of January 31, 1950 on the above matter.

One hundred and forty-four pounds of black-eyed peas were purchased at Hamilton Air Force Base from Tiedemann and McMonan, 65 Berry Street, San Francisco, Calif., at $.0979 per pound. One hundred and ninety-two pounds were purchased from Haas Brothers, Third and Channel Streets, San Francisco, Calif., at $0.1637 per pound.

As of January 1, 1950, there were 607 officers and 1,710 airmen with families at Hamilton Air Force Base of which 108 officers and 268 airmen were assigned public quarters.

Your interest in the Air Force is appreciated.

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

HEADQUARTERS, SEVENTY-EIGHTH FIGHTER WING,
HAMILTON AIR FORCE BASE,
Hamilton, Calif., January 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Please be advised that the information desired of the number of officers with families at Hamilton Air Force Base and other related questions in your letter of January 10, 1950, and the number of black-eyed peas or beans that are purchased annually and the source and price in your letter of January 14, 1950, has been referred to the Director of Legislation and Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, D. C.

The Director of Legislation and Liaison has been requested to furnish to you the pertinent information requested.

If I may be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. USHER,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Commanding.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 27, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is further reference to your letter of February 1, 1950, addressed to the commanding officer, Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz., requesting information concerning housing at that base.

Following is the information relative to the housing accommodations at Williams Air Force Base:

Personnel occupying family-type quarters:	
Officers	54
Enlisted men	64
An estimated need for family housing was—	
Officers	226
Enlisted men	851

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressionl Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 28, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reference to your letter of February 14, 1950, addressed to Mr. Symington, relative to the housing situation at March Air Force Base, Calif.

Following is the information relative to the housing accommodations at March Air Force Base:

Personnel occupying family-type quarters:	
Officers	65
Enlisted men	105
An estimated need for family housing is:	
Officers	217
Enlisted men	807

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. MCCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

HEADQUARTERS, FIFTEENTH AIR FORCE,
March Air Force Base, Calif., February 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter of February 1, 1950, has been forwarded to me by the commanding officer of the caretaking detachment of the air field at Victorville, Calif., for the purpose of answering the questions contained in paragraph 3 of your letter.

Unfortunately, specific answers are not available, as the personnel from March Air Force Base who are to go to Victorville with the First Fighter Wing when it moves to that station have not been definitely selected. It has been estimated, however, that at least 400 units will be required for airmen's housing and 250 units for the officers. These units are presently planned for construction under the provisions of Public Law 211.

Information on the current housing status at Victorville is contained in the enclosed letter from the commanding officer of that station.

It is hoped that the information contained herein is a satisfactory answer to your questions. If additional information is desired, this office will make every effort to provide it.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MCCOY, Jr.,
Colonel, United States Air Force, Liaison for Wherry Housing, Victorville.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 28, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reference to your letter of January 23, 1950, to the commanding officer of Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo., concerning housing data at that base.

There are 99 officer families and 61 families of enlisted men quartered on Lowry Air

Force Base. An additional 326 family quarters would be required to house all married officers and 1,591 additional family quarters would be required to house all married enlisted men at this base.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. F. McCLENDON,
Colonel, United States Air Force,
Chief, Congressional Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Permit me to refer to your recent memoranda to various commanding officers of Army installations, wherein you requested information on family housing requirements.

In accordance with our telephone conversation, complete information relative to the housing requirements at Army installations has been consolidated in a single report and is enclosed herewith. In view of this report, it is assumed that individual replies from commanding officers are not required.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG,
Assistant to the Chief, Legislative Liaison.

Department of the Army housing requirements, Dec. 31, 1949

Post or station	Officers					Enlisted men				
	Number living on post with families	Number being furnished Government quarters			Number additional family units required	Number living on post with families	Number being furnished Government quarters			Number additional family units required
		Permanent-type construction	Temporary-type construction	Total			Permanent-type construction	Temporary-type construction	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md	412	56	39	95	317	573	24	142	166	407
Army Chemical Center, Md	329	116	27	143	186	169	7	146	153	16
Army-Navy General Hospital, Arkansas	51	7	20	27	24	113	10	6	16	97
Army Medical Center, District of Columbia	312	11	46	57	255	269	85	0	85	184
Anniston ordnance depot, Alabama	20	3	12	15	5	0	0	0	0	0
Arlington Hall Station, Virginia	173	3	0	3	170	75	0	0	0	0
Atlanta general depot, Georgia	112	10	27	37	75	295	0	12	12	283
Auburn general depot, Washington	9	0	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Department of Army receiving station, Maryland	2	0	0	0	2	11	0	0	0	11
William Beaumont General Hospital, Texas	78	25	14	39	39	45	11	21	32	13
Fort Belvoir, Va	486	88	195	283	203	1,246	72	152	224	1,022
Benicia Arsenal, Calif	24	6	10	16	8	35	7	13	20	15
Fort Benning, Ga	2,005	435	459	894	1,111	3,209	148	190	338	2,871
Black Hills ordnance depot, South Dakota	12	0	5	5	7	2	0	2	2	0
Fort Bliss, Tex	1,609	157	62	219	1,390	1,849	103	53	156	1,693
Blue Grass ordnance depot, Kentucky	10	5	2	7	3	2	0	1	1	1
Fort Bragg, N. C	1,531	114	590	704	827	3,353	96	912	1,008	2,345
Brooke Medical Center, Tex	438	112	72	184	254	714	70	110	180	534
Camp Carson, Colo	256	0	72	72	184	688	0	270	270	418
Camp Campbell, Ky	660	0	359	359	301	1,101	0	486	486	615
Carlisle Barracks, Pa	165	20	46	66	99	161	28	37	65	96
Charleston small boat wet storage basin, South Carolina	5	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	1
Chicago quartermaster depot, Illinois	66	0	0	0	66	41	0	0	0	41
Columbus General Depot, Ohio	68	31	0	31	37	19	2	0	2	17
Camp Cook, Calif	66	0	8	8	58	289	0	23	23	266
Fort Crockett, Tex	8	8	0	8	0	37	28	1	29	8
Fort Custer, Mich	111	8	16	24	87	262	24	64	88	174
Fort Devens, Mass	226	66	0	66	160	710	45	301	346	364
Camp Detrick, Md	35	16	14	30	5	29	5	12	12	0
Detroit Arsenal, Mich	30	0	0	0	30	6	0	0	0	6
Fort Dix, N. J	803	31	107	138	665	1,931	21	187	208	1,723
Dugway Proving Grounds, Utah	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Erie ordnance depot, Pennsylvania	19	7	12	19	0	13	4	9	13	0
Fort Eustis, Va	570	6	102	108	462	750	0	183	183	567
Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado	205	47	16	63	142	281	38	8	46	235
Frankford, Arsenal, Pa	11	8	2	10	1	13	4	0	4	9
Granite City engineer depot, Illinois	37	28	0	28	9	58	0	8	8	50
Fort Hamilton, N. Y., and New York Port of Embarkation, N. Y	514	42	5	47	467	624	25	8	33	591
Camp Holabird, Md	257	8	9	17	240	310	20	9	29	281
Camp Hood, Tex	964	61	263	324	640	2,366	155	833	988	1,378
Fort Sam Houston, Tex	458	169	6	175	283	824	73	117	190	634
Fort Jay, N. Y	391	148	0	148	243	299	138	46	184	115
Fort Knox, Ky	1,220	123	488	611	609	2,360	293	920	1,213	1,147
Fort Lawton, Wash., and Seattle port of embarkation, Washington (quarters for Seattle port personnel are provided at Fort Lawton)	346	18	0	18	328	328	15	114	119	209
Fort Leavenworth, Kans	759	447	236	683	76	791	106	2	108	683
Camp Lee, Va	660	0	182	182	478	786	0	170	170	616
Letterkenny ordnance depot, Pennsylvania	31	0	15	15	16	21	0	7	7	14
Letterman General Hospital, California	193	9	49	58	135	115	0	9	9	106
Fort Lewis, Wash	1,745	187	326	513	1,232	3,045	141	288	429	2,616
Lexington signal depot, Kentucky	22	0	4	4	18	0	0	0	0	0
Lima ordnance depot, Ohio	10	0	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0
Louisville medical depot, Kentucky	25	2	0	2	23	0	0	0	0	0
Midwest chemical depot, Arkansas, Pine Bluff Arsenal	26	0	25	25	1	63	0	40	40	23
Madigan General Hospital, Washington (these quarters are located at Fort Lewis, Wash.)	106	38	0	38	68	178	48	0	48	130
Marion engineer depot, Ohio	7	0	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Mason, Calif	352	26	4	30	322	161	0	14	14	147
Marietta TC depot, Pennsylvania	17	0	8	8	9	11	0	0	0	11
Fort Meade, Md	858	61	183	244	614	1,241	51	181	232	1,009
Fort McNair, D. C	269	34	0	34	235	98	33	0	33	65
Fort McPherson, Ga	467	135	58	193	274	397	27	60	87	310
Memphis general depot, Tennessee	29	16	3	19	10	1	0	1	1	1
Milan Arsenal, Tenn	11	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Miller Field, N. Y	17	17	0	17	17	10	10	0	10	10
Fort Monmouth, N. J	624	198	37	235	389	695	50	83	133	562
Fort Monroe, Va	290	137	114	251	39	323	63	68	131	192
Mount Rainier ordnance depot, Washington	12	0	12	0	0	8	0	4	0	4
Fort Myer, Va	[1] 2,787	46	237	283	2,504	706	29	175	204	502
Navajo ordnance depot, Arizona	11	0	7	7	4	0	0	0	0	0
New Cumberland general depot and U. S. Disciplinary Barracks, Pa	78	5	31	36	42	293	0	4	4	289
New Orleans port of embarkation, Louisiana (quarters are located at Camp Leroy Johnson, La.)	99	0	99	99	0	104	0	104	104	0
Oakland Army Base, Calif	59	0	0	0	59	280	0	64	64	216
Fort Ord, Calif	580	0	0	0	580	1,320	0	247	247	1,073
Philadelphia quartermaster depot, Pennsylvania	77	0	0	0	77	5	0	0	0	5
Picatinny Arsenal, N. J	21	20	0	20	1	5	3	0	3	2
Fort Preble, Maine	6	6	0	6	0	4	3	1	4	0
Presidio of San Francisco, Calif	725	255	40	295	430	1,138	173	201	374	764

Department of the Army housing requirements, Dec. 31, 1949—Continued

Post or station	Officers					Enlisted men				
	Number living on post with families	Number being furnished Government quarters			Number additional family units required	Number living on post with families	Number being furnished Government quarters			Number additional family units required
		Permanent-type construction	Temporary-type construction	Total			Permanent-type construction	Temporary-type construction	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Presidio of Monterey, Calif.	238	55	0	55	183	123	19	8	27	96
Pueblo ordnance depot, Colorado	11	5	0	5	6	2	0	0	0	2
Raritan Arsenal, N. J.	25	4	6	10	15	8	8	0	8	0
Red River Arsenal, Tex.	30	0	29	29	1	59	0	0	0	59
Ravenna Arsenal, Ohio	13	13	0	13	0	7	2	5	7	0
Redstone Arsenal, Ala.	39	10	0	10	29	87	0	0	0	87
Richmond quartermaster depot, Virginia	24	11	3	14	10	4	0	0	0	4
Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.	13	11	0	11	2	1	0	0	0	1
Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colo.	35	0	7	7	28	31	0	3	3	28
Rossford ordnance depot, Ohio	18	0	0	0	18	13	0	0	0	13
Sacramento signal depot, California	23	13	0	13	10	24	0	6	0	18
Savannah ordnance depot, Illinois	9	6	0	6	3	8	6	0	6	2
Schenectady general depot, New York	58	5	20	25	33	5	0	0	0	5
Sharp general depot, California	39	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Sheridan, Ill., and Headquarters, Fifth Army, Chicago, Ill. (132 sets of quarters at Fort Sheridan are utilized by Headquarters, Fifth Army)	449	67	30	97	352	499	51	85	136	363
Sierra ordnance depot, California	21	0	21	0	0	4	0	3	0	1
Signal Corps Photo Center, New York	62	0	0	0	62	26	0	0	0	26
Fort Sill, Okla.	1,201	221	117	338	863	1,656	152	246	398	1,258
Sioux ordnance depot, Nebraska	9	0	0	0	9	6	5	0	0	1
Springfield Armory, Mass.	12	12	0	12	0	1	1	0	1	0
St. Louis Administration Center, Missouri	161	28	0	28	133	59	0	0	0	59
St. Louis medical depot, Missouri	45	1	0	1	42	32	3	0	3	39
Camp Stoneman, Calif.	258	36	0	36	222	403	0	64	64	339
Tooele ordnance depot, Utah	19	0	5	5	14	23	0	12	12	11
Fort Totten, N. Y.	108	33	8	41	67	118	33	6	39	79
Fort Tilden, N. Y.	5	2	0	2	3	17	6	11	17	0
Two Rock Ranch, California	15	8	3	11	4	72	0	4	4	68
U. S. Disciplinary Barracks, Milwaukee, Wis.	38	13	0	13	25	241	8	2	10	231
United States Military Academy, N. Y.	406	269	14	283	123	394	127	45	172	222
Utah general depot, Utah	45	0	45	45	0	3	0	3	3	0
Umatilla ordnance depot, Oregon	10	5	2	7	3	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.	26	9	0	9	17	85	5	34	39	46
Fort Warden, Wash. (including Fort Casey, Wash.)	194	35	0	35	159	618	52	30	82	536
Watervliet Arsenal, N. Y.	13	10	0	10	1	2	2	0	2	0
Watertown Arsenal, N. Y.	17	17	0	17	0	2	2	0	2	0
Western Chemical Center, Utah	38	0	20	20	18	101	0	32	32	69
White Sands Proving Grounds, N. Mex.	87	47	0	47	40	185	119	0	119	66
Fort Riley, Kans.	756	164	59	223	433	1,692	108	320	428	1,264
Wingate ordnance depot, New Mexico	5	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Worth quartermaster depot, Texas	30	8	0	8	22	9	0	0	0	9
Vint Hill Farms, Va.	40	28	1	29	11	117	0	3	3	114

[1] Includes 2,565 headquarters, Department of Army officers.

Soviet "Freedom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following two items which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, the first on March 9, and the second on March 13, typify the operation of "people's democracy" in Soviet Russia:

UNITED STATES PRIEST FINALLY IN RUSSIA BUT STILL CAN'T HOLD SERVICE—FATHER BRASSARD'S VISA DOES NOT ENTITLE HIM TO SAY MASS, HE LEARNS

(By Joseph Newman)

BERLIN, March 8.—The Reverend John O. A. Brassard, an American priest of Assumption College, Worcester, Mass., waited 10 months for a Soviet visa so he could conduct services for Americans and other foreigners in Moscow.

Finally, when he arrived in Moscow last January, Soviet agents refused to let him hold any services on the ground that he did not have authorization for such activities. Father Brassard is therefore singing in the choir with other members of the foreign colony, according to a private report received today from Moscow.

On the first Sunday after his arrival Father Brassard went to the Church of St. Louis of the French, the only Roman Catholic Church in Moscow, to say mass. He was stopped by a Soviet agent who had taken control of the church some time ago and told that he could not conduct mass.

The reason he was given was that he had not been registered by Soviet authorities either as a resident of Moscow or as a priest. When he protested that he had been given a Soviet visa for the purpose of conducting services, he was told that his visa was to make it possible for him to look after foreigners but not necessarily at the church.

Father Brassard, accompanied by an official of the American Embassy, called at the Foreign Ministry to inquire about the latest twist in the treatment of American clergymen in Moscow. They were told that Soviet authorities would look into the matter. Several weeks passed without any word from the Soviet Foreign Ministry and as far as is known Father Brassard, who is said to have a rich baritone voice, is still singing in the choir in the noon mass held at the church for foreigners every Sunday.

This service is conducted by a French priest, Jean de Matha Thomas, who was permitted to say mass once a week after he surrendered the keys to the church in May 1949. At that time he was told he could no longer be in charge of the church, which was turned over to the Rev. Mr. Adamovitch, who was imported by the Russians for that purpose from Latvia. The Church of St. Louis, established by the French colony many years before the Bolshevik revolution, had always been in the hands of French or American priests.

Soviet actions against American clergymen began early last year when Father Antonio LaBerge, an American priest, previously stationed in Moscow, was denied permission to return from a vacation in the United States. The Russians invalidated a reentry visa which they had previously issued to him. Requests were then made for a visa for another American priest to replace Father LaBerge. After repeated demands by the State Department and the American Embassy in Moscow, a visa was finally issued to Father Brassard.

The Soviet censor refused to permit foreign correspondents to report the treatment accorded Father Brassard. Earlier they had been allowed to report his arrival in Moscow, but when they referred to the Church of St. Louis of the French, where he was expected to conduct services, the censor eliminated the words "of the French." To the censor the abbreviated name "Church of St. Louis" evidently sounded more Russian and less foreign.

JEWISH LABOR GROUP ACCUSES SOVIETS ON JEWS—EXILE TO SIBERIA, SPIRITUAL ANNIHILATION AND PHYSICAL DESTRUCTION ARE ALLEGED

(By Paul Tobenkin)

ASBURY PARK, N. J., March 12.—Jews in Russia and other Communist-dominated countries are facing spiritual annihilation, mass exile to Siberia, complete degradation, and in some cases physical destruction, it was alleged today by the Jewish Labor Committee, an organization representing more than 500,000 American Jewish trade unionists.

The JLC at its convention a year ago made the first public allegation of widespread antisemitism in iron-curtain countries. Today's report, delivered by Jacob Pat, secretary of the organization, to the JLC's national executive committee, outlined the changes that have taken place during the last year.

The 150 delegates, after hearing the report, unanimously adopted a resolution asserting that "this horror-ridden situation can no longer be tolerated" and protesting "the brutal inquisition which has been visited on the surviving population of 2,500,000 Jews behind the iron curtain."

REPORTS ON WEST EUROPE

The report will be transmitted to the State Department, to William Green, AFL president, and Philip Murray, CIO head, in an effort to enlist their support in bringing about a change in conditions described.

In dramatic contrast to the condition of Jews in Russia and her satellite nations, Charles Kreindler, a vice president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL, who has just returned from Europe, reported the condition of western European Jewry has greatly improved economically and culturally during the last year.

The report was prepared by the research staff of the JLC on the basis of information obtained from newspapers, documents, and persons who have escaped from behind the iron curtain. Some of the unions which are part of the JLC have close affiliation with European trade unions.

The report, covering Russia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, differs from last year's report in that for the first time conditions within the Soviet Union itself are described. Last year, while there were indications of what was going on in Russia, the specific information available was too sparse to be included in the report.

Discussing Russia and its incorporated territories of Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, eastern Poland, and Bessarabia, the report stated that of a prewar Jewish population of 5,300,000 only 2,000,000 Jews were left, the rest having been victims of Nazi legions, died in Siberia or been liquidated.

LITERARY FIGURES VANISHED

"During 1949, almost all Yiddish literary figures, even though they were members of the Communist Party, vanished," the report stated. The most outstanding of these were Itzik Feffer, Peretz Markish, David Bergelson, L. Kvitko, S. Alkin, and Nistor. Inquiries by American Jewish organizations at the Soviet Embassy concerning the fate of these Yiddish literary figures have met a stone wall of silence. When the Yiddish literary almanac, the Star, in the Ukraine, was closed, the reason given was that it cultivated Jewish national consciousness.

"Simultaneously," the report said, "a drive started against all Jews who occupied important places in general Soviet life—the struggle against so-called cosmopolitanism. Of all the so-called followers of cosmopolitanism who were liquidated about two-thirds were Jews. The most important of them were active in Soviet literature, science, philosophy, history, the theater, and included even special writers, on sports matters. The Communist line was that Jews are landless, stateless, and are not an integral part of Russia and her people, and that they are devoted to abstract Jewish nationalism, which is basically Jewish chauvinism.

"During the year," the report said, "concrete signs of antisemitism emerged. In a very prominent position among those attacked were persons who had Jewish names, and who for years had been writing under Soviet pseudonyms. In numerous instances the Russian names were followed by the original Jewish names in parentheses."

MASS DEPORTATION CHARGED

"The worst, however, that the Jews had to go through in 1949 was the mass deportation to Siberia of Jews from the Ukraine, eastern Galicia, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and the Baltic states. Some 30,000 Jews were deported from the city of Lemburg alone. Very little information about this forced exodus has reached the outside world. American relatives of some of these victims have given up hope of locating them."

The conclusion drawn in the report about Russia is that today "there is not a shred of Jewish cultural life" remaining; that all contact between Russian and western Jews has been destroyed; that Israel is considered an American-British colony; that emigration is forbidden, and that the Jews left face spiritual annihilation. Birobidjan, which had been set up as a Jewish republic in Russia, was dismissed as a complete failure.

In the discussion of Poland, it was said that the 60,000 or 70,000 Jews in that country in 1949 were subjected to a savage liquidation of their cultural life similar to that in Russia although not quite so intense.

Let's Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to point out briefly the critical situation facing dark-fired tobacco growers in Virginia. When the Government-controlled program for tobacco was inaugurated some years ago, Virginia dark-fired tobacco type 21 was combined into the same program with types 22, 23, and 24, which types are grown in Tennessee and Kentucky and are dark-fired tobacco but of different texture from Virginia type 21.

Historically, Virginia type 21 dark-fired tobacco has brought a better price than the other types, and has different marketing qualities and uses. In the past 10 years, Virginia dark-fired tobacco harvested acreage has been cut from 23,000 in 1939 to 10,600 acres in 1949. The other types of dark-fired tobacco have only been cut from 91,500 acres to 47,700 acres. We will see from this that even though Virginia dark-fired tobacco is in the same farm program with other types of dark-fired tobacco, type 21 has been reduced substantially more in harvested acreage than have the other types of dark-fired tobacco. This is equally true as to poundage.

In 1939 there was a production of type 21 tobacco of 20,900,000 pounds. In 1949, this was reduced to 11,900,000 pounds. Types 22, 23, and 24, in 1939 produced 73,500,000 pounds of tobacco, and, in 1949, had been only reduced to 59,200,000 pounds. This shows on its face that type 21 Virginia dark-fired tobacco has been reduced in acreage approximately 54 percent; whereas, the other types have been reduced approximately 47.9 percent. The difference is even more marked as to the reduction in poundage in type 21 as distinguished from the reduction in the other types.

For the past 8 years, we have, each year, sold and disposed of more Virginia dark-fired tobacco in the normal trade channels than has been produced by our growers, with the exception of 1946; whereas, this is not true of the other types of dark-fired tobacco.

In 1939 stocks of Virginia dark-fired tobacco amounted to 23,400,000 pounds. In 1949 it amounted to only 21,900,000 pounds. The other three types in 1939 had 112,800,000 pounds in stock, and in 1949 had 135,300,000 pounds, an increase of nearly 23,000,000 pounds; whereas, the Virginia dark-fired tobacco stocks have been reduced; particularly has this been true in the last several years.

Production and sale figures for the last several years show conclusively that Virginia dark-fired tobacco planters are not producing an ounce more than the trade can afford. In fact, the production is slightly under the needs of the market. This is not true of the other types of dark-fired tobacco, but, as a matter of fact, they continue to pile up a surplus, which is increasing rather than decreasing year by year.

Auction prices for types 22–23 averaged 28.8 cents per pound for the season's sales through February 28; about 8 percent lower than last season. Virginia fire-cured type 21 auction closed February 16, and prices for the season averaged a record 33.5 cents per pound compared with a previous high of 32.9 cents last season.

When the price, 33.5 cents, received for Virginia fire-cured tobacco is compared with the average price received for types 22–23, 28.8 cents, Virginia fire-cured tobacco sold for 4.7 cents per pound more in 1949–50 than the other dark-fired cured types. If this 4.7 cents is applied to the 12,300,000 pounds sold, a total in excess of $500,000 was paid Virginia growers above Kentucky-Tennessee growers for this amount of tobacco. Surely buyers do not, out of the generosity of their hearts, pay as much as $500,000 more for Virginia fire-cured tobacco than they would for an equal amount of Kentucky-Tennessee fire-cured.

Supplies of type 21 are inadequate in many of the grades necessary for buyers buying to fulfill a brand requirement, therefore necessitating paying higher prices for our type of tobacco. This is not as it should be. We should be permitted to produce 15,000,000 pounds of fire-cured tobacco in order to satisfy the demands of the trade in the number of

the grades necessary for them to fulfill their requirements.

In the face of all this the Virginia dark-fired tobacco growers have been given over a 15-percent cut in their acreage allotments for 1950. This is due to the fact that type 21, the Virginia dark-fired tobacco, is lumped with types 22, 23, and 24 of dark-fired tobacco, which is grown in Tennessee and Kentucky. These are separate and distinct types with different markets from type 21.

Fortunately, the law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to separate the different types of tobacco if a proper case is made out showing the difference in markets, prices, and so forth. I am convinced that the above makes out a case which will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to disassociate type 21 dark-fired tobacco and set it in a program separate and apart so that it can stand on its own merit, thereby permitting the growers of Virginia dark-fired tobacco to produce sufficient poundage to meet the needs and demands of the market. That is all our growers are asking—to be allowed to produce a sufficient quantity and only a sufficient quantity to meet this need.

On behalf of the dark-fired tobacco growers of Virginia I am calling on Secretary Brannan to go into this matter carefully and to make that decision that will carry out the full intent of the law that was passed by this Congress and do justice to those people who till the soils of Virginia, the greatest State of the Nation and the best people on the face of this good earth, who are asking for justice and only justice on the merits of their case.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I was granted permission to include an editorial carried in the Farmville Herald, Farmville, Va., on Friday, March 10, 1950. This editorial was written by Mr. J. Barrye Wall, a distinguished and honored citizen of Farmville, Va., who is known far and wide for his intense interest in his fellow men, for his outstanding contribution toward the development of southside Virginia, and for his sterling character. He has the admiration and respect of our entire section of Virginia, as well as people of other sections who know him. He has worked untiringly for those things that go for the betterment of the community in which he lives. He is an outstanding newspaperman, the owner and publisher of one of the finest newspapers in Virginia, and I heartily commend his editorial.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

The meeting of Virginia growers of dark-fired tobacco Saturday in Farmville to discuss tobacco acreage allotments in this belt is of utmost importance to the future of south-central Virginia. For well over 150 years the economy of this area of 16 counties has been based upon the production of Virginia dark-fired tobacco, known as type 21. In no other place can tobacco with the texture, taste, and tone be grown. This type, Virginia dark-fired, is in a class by itself.

Let's look at the record and see what has happened and what the future outlook is. Since 1922 production has steadily declined from 50,000,000 pounds to 25,000,000 pounds in 1933, 18,000,000 pounds in 1940, and 12,000,000 pounds in 1948. The 1950 acreage allotments further reduce acres to be planted by 15.9 percent, which will be reflected in a corresponding decrease in poundage. The trend is obvious.

Older growers will recall the hectic days of 1933 when tobacco prices and everything else were very low. It was then that Virginia farmers, and rightly so, voted for the Government-control program which placed a floor under prices and a ceiling on acreage. Allotments were made to individual farms according to past records of the farm. Dark-fired tobacco has been under this program since 1934 with exception of the war years of 1943, 1944, and 1945, during which period acres harvested in Virginia declined because of lack of manpower. It is interesting to note that during this period production increased in Tennessee types 22, 23, and 24. Reference will be made to this later.

At the beginning of the Government-control program Virginia type 21 was combined with types 22, 23, and 24, it was said, to facilitate administration of the program. Tobacconists agree that the types are different in character. The difference is further substantiated by the fact that for the past 8 years the production of type 21 has not supplied the demand. In other words, the growers have produced less tobacco than has disappeared through normal trade channels. The mere fact that type 21 fails to meet the market demand is prima facie evidence that it is a different type of dark-fired tobacco from the Tennessee and Kentucky types with which it has been combined under the Government program. This fact needs no further proof—the buyer so decrees.

The case with the other types is exactly opposite. Production has exceeded demand by approximately one-third. This excess production in relation to disappearance in types 22, 23, and 24 has caused an overproduction in the dark-fired types as a whole, and the administrators of the control program have continued to order a reduction in acreage throughout the area. Virginia growers are being penalized by being classified with growers of our sister States. Further inequalities in the allotment program came about when the program was reinstituted in 1946. Future quotas were based on production during the 1943–1945 period, which we have shown decreased in the Virginia belt, but increased in the Kentucky-Tennessee belts. Thus the Virginia base was further reduced, which contributes to the acreage decrease now faced.

But let's look further into what is happening. The best way to understand is to bring it down to specific cases or areas. How does this condition affect the individual grower?

Let's look at the record.

In the belt the average acres allotted to each farm was 3.1 in 1934. It has dropped to 1.4 in 1950.

In Prince Edward County there are 780 dark-fired tobacco growers, of whom 370 have an allotment of less than an acre of tobacco for 1950, and of this number 143 growers will have an allotment of half an acre or less. Tobacco growers agree that it is not economically sound to raise less than an acre of tobacco. Furthermore, at the average yield of 1,125 pounds to an acre sold at the average price of $33 per hundredweight, a half an acre would net a grower $167.14. It is obvious that 143 half-acre growers in Prince Edward are about out of the tobacco growing business, and possibly 227 with an acre or less allotment. The danger is that 370 growers, approximately one-half of the growers in the county will either go out of the business now or relatively soon. Multiply this by 10 and you would have a fair belt average.

The pity of it is that these farmers are less able to adjust their production to other products. Why don't they go into cattle? It takes capital to go into the cattle business, and furthermore these men know how to grow tobacco. There is a demand for the tobacco that they know how to grow. Why shift them into the highly competitive cattle business or perhaps the potato business?

There are many reasons for the decline in production of dark-fired tobacco, among them, the change from chewing tobacco usage to cigarettes; the culture of tobacco in foreign countries, which can be substituted in part for Virginia dark-fired, and others. But there is one thing which can be done, namely, to place Virginia dark-fired tobacco on its own and allot Virginia farmers enough acreage to supply the demand for this type.

In order to bring this situation to the attention of the United States Department of Agriculture officials, a meeting has been arranged in Farmville Saturday, March 12 at 10 o'clock in the Farmville High School auditorium and gymnasium, to discuss the situation.

Mr. Farmer, Mr. Businessman, if you are interested in what is happening to your tobacco industry in central Virginia you should attend this important meeting.

The problem is acute—the remedy urgent. It means dollars in your pocket; it may mean more to you.

Mr. Lie Opposed on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication which appeared in the New York Times of March 14, 1950, relative to the suggested replacement of the authorized representatives of the Government of China:

[From the New York Times of March 14, 1950]

MR. LIE OPPOSED ON CHINA—PROPOSAL TO REPLACE REPRESENTATIVES CALLED STAB IN BACK FOR UN

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Friends of the United Nations are deeply shocked at the suggestion of Trygve Lie, Secretary General of that body, that the authorized representatives of the lawful Government of China, be repudiated and replaced by the designees of a group which through fraud and force of arms has imposed its will for the moment upon a large part, but not all, of the Chinese people and Chinese territory.

International law and order cannot exist unless founded upon elementary morals. Nor can any instrumentality of international law and order long survive the negation of elementary morals. Counsels of expediency wrecked the League of Nations. Trygve Lie's proposal in the name of expediency is a stab in the back of the United Nations.

His argument is simple enough: The United Nations in order to function as intended requires the cooperation of the five great powers. One nation, Soviet Russia, refuses to cooperate unless the existing and lawful Government of one of the five—namely, China—is repudiated and a self-consti-

tuted, usurping Government is accepted in its place. Therefore, says Mr. Lie, repudiate the lawful government, notwithstanding its great contributions to the United Nations, and accept a government which has demonstrated itself to be the very antithesis of international peace and goodwill.

Entirely apart from bad morals which condemn the suggestion on its face, what does Mr. Lie hope to gain as a matter of expediency? Had Russia cooperated in furthering the aims of the United Nations before this issue was raised? Is there any reason to suppose that if the free nations yield despite the resulting injustice any genuine cooperation could be expected from Russia? Having yielded in this case, could the free nations consistently decline to refuse a similar demand when the next country in Asia or elsewhere is partially overrun by Communist aggression?

It would be an incalculable tragedy if the United Nations were to fail the hopes and prayers of the peace-hungry peoples of the world. If that failure should flow from Russian contumacy, Russia will inevitably answer sooner or later for that result. If failure should come because the free nations sacrifice justice and morals to Russian contumacy, the United Nations would still fail, though it might simulate continuance, but only as a symbol of universal cynicism and cruel mockery of mankind's noblest aspirations; and the free nations could not evade responsibility for that result. It was not Italy in Abyssinia or Japan in Manchuria which wrecked the League of Nations. It was the weak-kneed, spineless reluctance of the other powers to take a resolute stand upon the ground of manifest morals and justice.

The indication that the United States of America refrain from defining its opinion of Mr. Lie's proposal until a majority of the Security Council had expressed itself is unworthy of the position of leadership which events have accorded America.

The issue is clear and calls for forthright policy.

There is a lawful constitutional Government of China. In the critical years when our own fate was in the balance that Government faithfully, loyally, and successfully defended the bastion of Asia against our mortal enemy—and Russia's. With our allies we entered into a solemn obligation to defend the integrity of China against aggression.

We have done badly enough in fulfilling that obligation without participating in this final, fatal betrayal suggested by Mr. Lie.

HAROLD RIEGELMAN.

NEW YORK, *March 13, 1950.*

Mr. Hope's Opinion of the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congressman HOPE, of Kansas, is an outstanding member of the House Committee on Agriculture. On March 3 he aired his views on the Brannan plan over the radio of NBC. He scored heavily against the plan and I am including his speech as a part of my remarks. It is a timely answer to those who would fool the farmer and the consumer as well if Mr. Brannan's ideas were to be adopted by this Congress. Here is good campaign material. The address follows:

PRO AND CON

It is now almost a year since the Brannan farm plan was presented to the public. During that time it has been widely discussed. In fact, during a period which has been notable for the happening of many world-shaking events and when some history-making sensation occurs almost every day, the Brannan farm program has continued to be a subject of great interest. This interest is due, in part at least, to two things: First, the plan's unquestionable political appeal, and, second, its questionable economic soundness.

The secret of its political appeal is that it offers something to everybody. From that standpoint, it's a stroke of political genius. On the one hand, its advocates say to the farmers, "The United States Government is going to guarantee you an income at high wartime levels." And to consumers they say, "We are going to give you low-priced food." That comes mighty close to being Utopia. It sounds too good to be true. And, unfortunately, it is—because when you bring the plan down from the stratosphere and look it over to see what makes it tick you find that a lot of ugly, un-Utopian things show up.

You find that this isn't legerdemain, after all, and that if farmers are to get high incomes and consumers are to have cheap food, someone is going to have to pay a bill, and a pretty big bill it's going to be, if the plan is carried out on the scale envisioned by its proponents. How big? Secretary Brannan says he doesn't know. Up to date no advocate of the plan has come along with any figures. They don't like to talk about that part of it.

A good many people have tried to make an estimate. The department of agricultural economics of the University of Illinois has said: "It could easily be as much as the total Federal budget before the war." The same department, taking hogs as an illustration, has estimated that hog supports alone might cost $700,000,000 annually, and hogs represent only one-seventh to one-eighth of the output of our farms. The American Farm Bureau Federation, after a study of the cost of the plan as to milk alone, estimated it would amount to $2,480,000,000 annually.

Other estimates as to the cost of the plan as proposed have ranged from two billions to ten billions per year. Some of the advocates of the plan have compared it to the British food-subsidy program, the cost of which has increased every year, amounting in 1948 to the colassal sum of $2,272,000,000. Our population is three times as large as that of Britain so on the basis of population alone the cost of a similar plan here could run to almost $7,000,000,000. But that doesn't take into account that the British are on an austere diet. If they consumed per capita the food we do in this country their cost would undoubtedly be higher and so we are safe in assuming, I think, that the plan here would cost more than three times as much as the British plan is costing.

To make the plan work someone is going to have to dig up billions of dollars because there's no other way to give the farmer high income and the consumer low prices. And where will the money come from? Well, from Uncle Sam—and the only money Uncle Sam has is what you and I give him. That means that every consumer and every farmer is going to have to dig down in his pockets and fork over the money to carry out this gigantic spending operation, and when you count taxes this cheap food may be pretty high priced food.

But suppose we don't dig up the dollars? Suppose Congress says that with a $5,500,000,000 deficit already existing, we just can't appropriate the additional billions which will be necessary to enable Uncle Sam to pay a part of everybody's grocery bill.

What will happen then? Well, initially at least the farmer will be left holding the sack. He will have done his part. He will have produced all that the Secretary of Agriculture asked him to produce. By reason of this heavy production his prices will have declined just as they always do in a time of heavy production when there are no price supports. The consumer will be getting his cheap food but the Secretary will have to tell the farmer, "It's too bad but Congress didn't appropriate the money." Maybe consumers will think that is a good thing but if they do they will be taking a very short-sighted view because low farm prices and bankrupt farmers in the end mean depression and hard times for everyone. At least that's been the case in the past.

So the Secretary will have to look around for some other means to make good his promise of high incomes for farmers. What can he do? Well, for one thing he can start limiting and controlling the production of farm products on the theory that scarcity will bring high prices. To do that in any effective way will in all probability result in the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. We'll have in this country exactly the same thing they have in England where the Government tells every farmer what he must produce and how much he must produce and if he doesn't carry out the orders in that respect he loses the use of his farm and it is turned over to someone else to operate.

If this sounds farfetched to anyone, I suggest they write their Congressman and get a copy of the bill S. 1971 which puts the Brannan plan into legislative form. This bill was written in the Department of Agriculture and sent to Congress for introduction. It was introduced in the Senate on May 31, 1949. It is 86 pages long. A part of it is a restatement of some of the laws already on the books but much of it is new. Fifteen pages of the eighty-six relate to penalties upon farmers and there are more pages with penalties for those who deal in agricultural products. I think most farmers would be interested in reading the provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the bill.

This section provides that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the Secretary; and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $500. And if they make a false report or record they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned for not more than a year. My prediction is that if this bill ever becomes a law we'll either have to have more farm bookkeepers or bigger jails.

We've never had any experience here with an absolute Government-controlled agriculture so we don't know exactly how it will work out but if the history of other countries in any criterion we know that such control will eventually mean less production and more inefficient production. It will mean higher food prices. So in the end the Brannan plan will be just as much of a gold brick for the consumer who has been led to think he will get cheap food as it is for the farmer who wakes up some morning and finds that he has lost control of his farm. Is all this an exaggeration? Not in the least, if the Brannan plan is actually carried out to the extent necessary for its proponents to make good on the promises which they have been making to both producers and consumers.

I think it should be said in justice to the farmers of this country that the Brannan

plan did not originate with them. They were not consulted. They had no part in formulating it. Rather it originated with the political leaders of organized labor. It is frankly an effort on their part to form a political coalition between farmers and organized labor. They say, in effect, to farmers, "Help us elect Members to Congress who will repeal the Taft-Hartley law and we'll help you get the Brannan plan." The labor politicians can't lose on that one. If successful they get repeal of Taft-Hartley toward which they've been moving heaven and earth, and cheap food temporarily. And I know of no way farmers can win on it because the ultimate result must inevitably be lower farm prices, or in the alternative Government control of all agricultural production and ultimate nationalization of the industry. Politically, what will happen is what has always happened when a farmer-labor coalition has been attempted. The labor politicians take over the organization and the farmer is left out in the cold.

Now let me make it clear that what I have been discussing is the political Brannan plan of something for everybody. That's the basis on which its proponents are trying to sell it and the basis on which it must be judged. I don't think the farmers of this country will fall for this political Brannan plan. They are too smart to be caught that way. The wonder is that anyone who knows farmers would expect them to be for it. I am afraid that the labor politicians who concocted this plan have gotten their idea of a farmer from the funny papers and are laboring under the delusion that he will buy the Brooklyn Bridge if a sufficiently clever line of sales talk is used.

A lot of farmers are wondering why, if the Brannan plan is such a good thing for farmers, it wouldn't be just as good for the manufacturer and the workingman. Why not apply it to the production of automobiles or farm machinery or much-needed housing? Everybody knows the prices of those things should come down. This could be done by reducing wages and cutting other costs. No one would lose. Workers would get a subsidy out of the Treasury to make up the loss of wages. Employers would be given Government payments to make up their losses. And the public would get cheap automobiles and farm machinery and housing and maybe a lot of other things. Something for everybody. Isn't it lovely?

Our Immigration Authorities Are Doing a Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, irresponsible statements have appeared from time to time to the effect that hundreds of thousands of aliens are illegally entering this country annually and that millions of illegal aliens are roaming the United States. All of this is, of course, nothing more than a concerted effort to defeat the current attempt in Congress to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act, which presently contains discriminatory clauses aimed against certain religious groups.

Fantastic stories are spread about 5,000,00 illegal aliens running loose in the country. Today there are only about 3,000,000 aliens in the United States registered pursuant to the Alien Registration Act of 1941. With relatively few exceptions, nearly all of them entered as legal immigrants.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is entrusted with guarding the thousands of miles of our borders and the numerous ports along the Atlantic and Pacific, are doing as good a job as can be expected with their limited appropriations. In 1948 a total of 20,371 persons were deported from the United States, about three-fourths of them on the grounds that they had entered without inspection or by false statements, without proper documents, or overstayed the time granted them.

This shows that our immigration authorities are on their toes. It also shows that the fantastic charges about numerous loopholes in our immigration laws, inadequate immigration surveillance, and refusal of the courts in New York or elsewhere to enforce the immigration laws, are simply not true. It is high time that anti-immigration forces stop trying to fool the American public with such scarecrows. Let us proceed to amend the DP Act in a liberal manner and thereby continue our reputation as the land of asylum for the oppressed and the persecuted.

It's Time To Stop Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, political fearlessness is one of the attributes of public service highly desired but not generally found to a degree commensurate with the requirements of the public interest. Representative WADSWORTH is such a public servant, possessing as he does to an unusual degree the quality of honest forthrightness in performance of his public duties irrespective of the effect upon his personal political fortunes. This has been typical of him for the many, many years of his great career as a public servant and has served as a model for some of his associates to emulate.

Recently he announced his determination to oppose all Federal expenditures for a new purpose no matter how laudable except such as might be absolutely essential to the national interest. This policy will offend many people who taste the sweetness of Federal expenditures in some special plea or another. For this positive position he has been hailed and properly so.

Until such time as the Members of Congress find the courage to turn a deaf ear to the persuasive pleadings of special groups for portions of Federal revenues to support new programs, even though of great merit, the budget will continue to be impaired, deficits will become a permanent part of our structure, public debt will mount in ever greater proportions, taxes will continue stifling, inflation will be fanned, production will be restricted, and bankruptcy inevitable. More power to JIM WADSWORTH and men such as he.

In this connection I am pleased to include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of March 11, 1950, as follows:

IT'S TIME NOW TO STOP SPENDING—LET'S BE OBSTINATE

Representative JIM WADSWORTH told Congress the other day that from here on he is going to vote against every measure that will increase the future financial commitments of the Federal Government.

"Even though I may be called an obstinate old man," he said, "I shall fight against every bill that does so unless I am confronted with some dire crisis in which dollars and cents can't count."

Well, the word obstinate is JIM's word. Maybe we'd have picked another one. But somewhere between headstrong, refractory, intractable, or stubborn we need a word that implies persistent resistance to a wrong course.

And Mr. Webster says obstinate means not yielding, not easily subdued, adhering to an opinion, purpose, or course. So we're for you.

That's what this country needs on new schemes to spend. There are times when obstinacy is the highest virtue. This is one of them.

The Government is the biggest banker, the biggest merchant, the biggest consumer, the biggest employer, the biggest spender on earth.

It is the biggest debtor.

And it's the biggest fall guy for any new scheme for going further into debt.

The maw that devours what you and your neighbors produce by your labor staggers the imagination. This year Government is taking in taxes one and a half times the cost of the First World War. But after spending this, it is going into debt as much as the total cost of Government in any peacetime year up to 1935.

And still the new schemes for spending come. Yet Government has nothing and can have nothing except what all of us produce. There simply isn't anything else.

Isn't it time to stop? Now? Isn't it time to be obstinate?

The Times-Union believes the only way to stop this free-wheeling ride to bankruptcy is to mobilize Nation-wide demand for an end to new Federal outlays. Commitments already on the books will make the burden even harder than it is now.

Below is your certificate of membership in the Legion of Obstinate Men and Women. Oh, sure, the spenders are going to pounce on JIM WADSWORTH's word obstinate and try to have fun with it. They've been doing that for 20 years.

And they've laughed you into a debt of $260,000,000,000 that even your great-grandchildren will be struggling to carry.

Let's laugh last. If they're going to load you with a mule's burden, as they are, let's be as obstinate as a mule about carrying any more.

This isn't a partisan proposition. Democrats and Republicans both carry the same load. Zip out the coupon and send it to your Congressman, and every other Congressman and Senator whose name you know.

Tell them you're obstinately sure you're carrying enough now.

Thomas Jefferson on the Presidential Tenure of Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said of the Presidency that—

The service of 8 years with the power to remove at the end of the first 4 comes more nearly to my principles.

This is the proposal for limiting the term of the President that was submitted to the States by the Eightieth Congress. It is interesting to note that already, less than 2 years after this proposal was sent to the States, 23 of the necessary 36 States have approved this proposed amendment.

This prompt approval by so many States seemingly indicates that the amendment will be approved by the necessary 36 States probably by 1952, in which event the tenure of all future Presidents will be limited to two terms.

States which have so far approved this proposed constitutional amendment are: Maine, March 31, 1947; Michigan, March 31, 1947; Iowa, April 1, 1947; Kansas, April 1, 1947; New Hampshire, April 1, 1947; Delaware, April 2, 1947; Illinois, April 3, 1947; Oregon, April 3, 1947; Colorado, April 12, 1947; California, April 15, 1947; New Jersey, April 15, 1947; Vermont, April 15, 1947; Ohio, April 16, 1947; Wisconsin, April 16, 1947; Pennsylvania, April 29, 1947; Connecticut, May 21, 1947; Missouri, May 22, 1947; Nebraska, May 23, 1947; Virginia, January 28, 1948; Mississippi, February 12, 1948; New York, March 9, 1948; South Dakota, January 21, 1949; North Dakota, February 25, 1949.

Jefferson's views on the President's tenure of office and other matters, are told in the following excellent article by Columnist Guy Allison in the News-Press, of Glendale, Calif.:

BYPATHS OF HISTORY
(By Guy Allison)

What noted American changed his mind with reference to the length of time a President of the United States should serve?

When a man reaches the age of 62 years his judgment should be well seasoned, and particularly should his judgment be reasonably reliable if it concerns the type of work which he has pursued for 40 years of his adult life. If such a position is accepted, then the opinion of Thomas Jefferson is worthy of consideration, for it was when he had reached the above age and had been in political office for 40 years that he gave the following answer to the question, "How long shall a President of the United States be permitted to serve?" Said he, on January 6, 1805:

"My opinion originally was that the President of the United States should be elected for 7 years and be forever ineligible thereafter. I have since become sensible that 7 years is too long to be irremovable, and that there should be a peaceable way of withdrawing a man midway, who is doing wrong.

"The service of 8 years, with the power to remove at the end of the first four comes more nearly to my principles, as corrected by experience, and it is in adherence to that that I have determined to withdraw at the end of my second term. General Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after 8 years and I shall follow it."

In a letter to Gov. Mann Page, of Virginia, Jefferson also said:

"I have always found that rogues would be uppermost. Those who, rising above the multitude, always contrive to nestle themselves into the places of profit and power. These rogues set out with stealing the people's good opinion, and then steal from them the right of withdrawing it, by contriving laws and associations against the power of the people themselves.

"It is the practice of despots to use part of the people to keep the rest in order, and those who have once got the ascendency and possessed themselves of all the resources of the Nation, have immense means of retaining their advantage."

Is it not about time for Americans to do some serious thinking upon a subject against which such a man as Thomas Jefferson warned them?

Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the Washington Post of March 12, 1950, as follows:

HAWAII AND ALASKA

In voting to admit Hawaii and Alaska to statehood, the House recognized the overwhelming logic in the pleas of these two Territories. The situation of the whole free world argues for an extension of the principle of union, and the argument is particularly cogent as respect two American Territories prepared for statehood by tradition and long years of tutelage. In the case of Hawaii the approval repeats similar action by the House nearly 3 years ago. It serves to confirm the fact that full membership in the Union for Hawaii is justified by every criterion. In the case of less populous Alaska, legislators gave weight to her strategic national defense position. Statehood also would open the door to the full economic development that Alaska now lacks.

Although the prospect seems to be for harder going in the Senate, we hope Senators will have no truck with the many irrational and groundless objections to statehood. Communism in Hawaii, for example, is a perpetual red herring. The question has been explored at length, and there is no reason to believe that Hawaii is less competent to cope with it than any State. The contention that Alaska does not have enough population is countered by the fact that some 12 States had smaller populations when admitted to the Union, and that territorial status probably is holding down expansion.

The one argument that does have some merit is that a disproportionate representation in Congress. The argument is far less applicable in the case of Hawaii, which now has more population than half a dozen States, but it is true that Alaska would be on a par in the Senate with several States more than 100 times her size. It is precisely because of such differences, however, that the founding fathers devised the two-House system, with House membership apportioned on the basis of population. Alaska's total representation of three—two Members in the Senate and one in the House—would not give it undue influence. Moreover, the fact that Senators serve for 6 years tends to encourage thinking on a national level, at least after a period of service.

Although there have been no new admissions to the Union for 38 years, it was never intended that the Union should remain static. Indeed, this is a time when the United States ought to be giving an example—and an invitation—to the free world.

World Health Organization Battles Disease on Global Scale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Michael Goldsmith:

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION BATTLES DISEASE ON GLOBAL SCALE—MAIN ATTACK CONCENTRATED ON MALARIA, TUBERCULOSIS, AND SYPHILIS, WHICH TAKE 10,000,000 LIVES YEARLY

(By Michael Goldsmith)

GENEVA.—An aggressive world-wide battle against disease is being waged from Geneva headquarters by the World Health Organization—the United Nations' public-health department of the world.

Disease knows no frontiers. The creation of WHO is the most ambitious attempt thus far to pursue disease across national barriers.

Nearly 70 nations belong to the organization. Their major aim in setting up WHO within the United Nations framework in 1948 was to enable medically advanced countries jointly to aid the less advanced for the benefit of all.

WHO's main attack now is concentrated on three preventable diseases: Malaria, tuberculosis, and syphilis. WHO estimates that these three kill upward of 10,000,000 persons every year, but considers these figures extremely conservative. In many parts of the world health services are so inadequate no one knows how many more millions die without ever seeing a doctor.

Hundreds of thousands more are killed every year by cholera and plague, also high on WHO's priority list. In many areas of India and China these two diseases have claimed their dead every day for centuries. As long as these hard cores of infection remain, the danger of a catastrophic epidemic sweeping through the world continues a permanent menace.

MODERN PROBLEMS

Old-fashioned quarantine methods are no longer effective in the air age. "No country can depend solely on its own protective arrangements," says Maj. Gen. Brock Chisholm, WHO's director general. "Each must be assured of satisfactory controls in all other countries as well. The protection of one country depends on the effectiveness of health administrations in other countries and upon the success of their collective action."

Dr. Chisholm—he has dropped his military title—is a soft-spoken little man with twinkling eyes who is recognized as one of the world's outstanding psychiatrists. He has organized WHO into divisions and area commands on military lines, possibly on the basis of his experience as wartime head of the Canadian Army's medical services.

His organization is one of the most successful of the UN specialized agencies. With an annual budget of $7,500,000, WHO sends medical missions and specialists to a score of countries, maintains a permanent watch against the spread of pestilence, organizes full-scale campaigns in particularly disease-ridden areas, aids and records progress in medical research throughout the world, and assists any member nation in the development of its health services and the training of its doctors.

Dr. Chisholm's pet project is an ambitious malaria-control program to be spread over the next 5 years in test areas of the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. The test was organized by WHO, and the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization under President Truman's "point four" world-development and technical-assistance program.

Malaria, which strikes an estimated 300,000,000 persons every year, can be eliminated in any area by vigorous action against the anopheles mosquito. The three test projects will cost $10,000,000. WHO expects the immense increase in food production in the test areas will repay many times the original expenditure.

MOTHERS COOPERATE

New techniques in malaria control are being employed by a number of small WHO demonstration teams already operating in half a dozen Asiatic countries. Armed with DDT insecticide, these teams penetrate into the jungles of Central India and the mountains of Afghanistan to fight malaria and show medical students and sanitary engineers how to do the job themselves.

WHO has abandoned the old technique of spraying DDT from airplanes as wasteful and unnecessary. The system was widely employed in Greece and Sardinia, but experts now agree that individual indoor spraying of houses is preferable.

The malaria teams run into unexpected difficulties in isolated area. In the Terai district of India a team headed by Dr. Peter Issaris of Athens met with Buxas, a tribe where the head of the family is always a woman. The mothers thought the malaria blood tests were a cunning selection system for the Indian Army and spirited their sons into hiding. Bribed with packets of DDT to kill their lice and small bottles of benzoate against their scabies, the mothers were persuaded to cooperate.

In some areas the antimalaria teams wiped out even more deadly diseases. In Shimoga, India, Paul Bierstein, a WHO sanitary engineer from Shenandoah, Pa., found his DDT campaign also killed fleas carrying plague, eliminating the dreaded disease from that area. In East Bengal Dr. Gabriele Gramiccia from Rome, Italy, fought malaria in an area infested with kala-azar, a deadly tropical disease transmitted by sand flies. Dr. Gramiccia's DDT killed the sand flies, wiping out kala-azar in the district.

WHO'S antimalaria teams operate on an annual budget of $250,000. Teams fighting other diseases in many parts of the world are handicapped by an equally limited budget.

One team made a survey of venereal diseases in the isolated Gunde Valley of north India and found nearly half the population infected wtih syphilis. A handful of WHO specialists showed local volunteers how to diagnose syphilis and to inject penicillin. After 3 months' work, the team reported new infections had ceased.

Syphilis and its related diseases are usually estimated to cause 2,000,000 deaths per year but Dr. Thorstein Guthe of Oslo, Norway, chief venereal disease expert, believes the true death toll is much greater. Millions of babies are born with syphilis every year. Most of them die before they are a year old.

Throughout southeast Asia, the West Indies, Africa, and the Middle East, two forms of syphilis known as yaws and bejel cause untold death and suffering. They are easily transmitted through a handshake or an infected drinking cup. In Europe itself, tens of thousands of Yugoslav Moslems suffer from a local form of syphilis which is also passed from person to person without intercourse.

Fortunately, all the variations of syphilis can be cured with penicillin. WHO experts in many countries are teaching new techniques of treatment. A large-scale project is under way in Haiti and adjacent areas of the Dominican Republic to rid the population of syphilis and yaws.

In fighting venereal disease, WHO experts again found themselves up against ignorance and superstition in many areas. In Ethiopia, which probably has the world's highest venereal-disease rate, Dr. Guthe saw tribal witch doctors prescribing the blood of a black male goat as a cure for syphilis.

THE GREATEST KILLER

In the more highly developed countries, syphilis is concentrated mainly in the big cities and seaports. Important navigable rivers carry the infection far inland. For decades the River Rhine has been renowned as a black stream of venereal infection between Rotterdam and the inland ports all the way up to Switzerland.

A special international commission was set up under WHO auspices to coordinate and improve the treatment of syphilis in Rhine boatmen in all the countries bordering on the river.

The greatest killer of all among the infectious diseases is tuberculosis. More than 5,000,000 people die of it every year, although it has been preventable since Koch discovered the tuberculin bacillus in 1882. The reason, WHO says, is a total lack of doctors and medical equipment in large areas of the world.

Antitubercular BCG vaccine was introduced in 1921, but it was never extensively used until WHO opened a vast anti-TB campaign 2 years ago. In cooperation with the Danish Red Cross and the International Children's Emergency Fund, more than 18 million European children were tested for tuberculosis and half of them vaccinated with BCG. The program is to be extended all over the world this year.

"The intense tuberculosis problem is not in Europe at all," Dr. John B. McDougall, of Edinburgh, Scotland, explained. "The worst areas are in Asia, in the Pacific Islands, and in Latin America. In India alone tuberculosis kills more than one million persons every year."

Dr. McDougall, WHO chief tuberculosis expert, returned recently from a survey in India. "The surprising thing is not that the death and sickness rates are so high," he said, "but that many of these poor people are able to live at all."

Tuberculosis centers to be established by WHO in India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon will combine prevention and treatment with training of personnel, Dr. McDougall said, "so that the whole project will grow snowball fashion." Centers eventually will be set up in areas where no doctor has been seen before.

SOVIET WALKED OUT

On all WHO health maps there is a large blank space—Soviet Russia. The Soviet Union and its satellites originally took an active part. Last year, however, the Russians walked out. Bulgaria followed suit and most of the other satellites have become lukewarm. But even while the Soviet Union was a full member, no information on disease in Russia ever reached the experts in Geneva.

WHO still regards Russia legally a member and regularly sends medical literature and periodicals to the Soviet Ministry of Health and to universities in Russia and the Ukraine. The books are never returned, but neither are they acknowledged.

At WHO's first annual assembly in 1948, Czechoslovakia pressed for the establishment of a regional office in Prague to give special assistance to "war-devastated nations" in eastern Europe. The proposal was turned down, mainly for financial reasons. Now with more funds available WHO would like to set up a European office, but the Czechs are no longer interested.

Although political dissension has stalled progress in Europe, WHO is setting up "health regions" elsewhere to decentralize its war on disease. Regional organizations are already functioning in southeast Asia and the Middle East, while the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau has become its regional organization for the Americas.

The various campaigns eventually will be controlled at regional levels, where cooperation of governments works more smoothly and WHO officials can remain in close touch with their workers in the field.

Creeping Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and pointed article from the February 22, 1950, issue of Human Events:

HOW DEFICITS ARE CAMOUFLAGED

In the political breathing spell, before the 1950 congressional campaigns get fully under way, it is helpful to reflect on the economic message sent to Congress by President Truman on January 6.

The immediate journalistic reaction was that this message signified a turn to the right, designed in advance to counter the "Liberty versus socialism" slogan of the GOP. That analysis is probably correct as far as it goes. But that analysis does not go far enough.

Superficially, the economic message reads like a collection of clichés. But every word was chosen with the utmost care to do the political work assigned to it. It was a significant part of the myth-making by which the greatest Nation in history is being transformed by a handful of men. And it should be studied as such.

According to the myth, our economy is in fine shape. With hardly a ripple we have surmounted the most devastating of all wars. We have solved the elusive problem of stabilizing capitalist production. The only difficulty is a lag in business investment, and the administration will take care of that by enlarging consumer markets. It follows that anyone who is against the administration's program is against progress, and has doubts about the ability of the American people.

To be sure the administration must spend $42,000,000,000 a year (or $50,000,000,000 according to the estimates of Congressman TABER). It will run a deficit of 5 to 10 billions even with onerous wartime tax rates. But this deficit is due to business, Congress, and the enemy.

Of course enlarging consumer markets for business brings us by a new route to very old spending programs—public housing, social security, everything that Hopkins or Wallace ever urged. But they are minor issues now. The major issue is the ever-growing advance of Government to the heartland of the free society, the productive system itself.

II

In the old days, when the New Deal was a militant minority, Tugwell and Corcoran delighted in attacking business, in outraging every accepted economic belief. Now business is not important enough to deserve official denunciation.

One sentence in the message tells why. The Government is to help little business take risks—as if the clipper ships of New England or the first Ford automobiles were built by big business.

Obviously it means that government is going to insure loans for small business. Government is now guaranteeing loans for public housing. The price-support program for farm products like potatoes is now much to the fore. There is a bill in Congress to insure risks in foreign investment. This method can be applied to every segment of private business. But if government is the risk bearer, where is free enterprise? Obviously only the State is either free or enterprising.

This is the end product of economic technology. Economists were once philosophers, men of learning and wisdom. Then we began to train economic experts who knew all the minutiae of their science but had little critical judgment or moral responsibility.

The technicians caused little damage at first, because we had an inherited social framework which held us together. But it was inevitable that the new political leaders would take over the rootless technicians as part of their cultural front and inflate their importance to impress the public. A few very able economists and lawyers were used for another purpose. Their work was to take apart the free capitalist society bit by bit and put it together again according to a totally different pattern, but camouflaged to look unchanged.

They are products of the wartime experience in disintegration by which men learned to look at a landscape, to ignore its true significance, and analyze it into fragments, to discover just which details give the illusion of a park, and then make a synthetic reproduction of these details to conceal a munitions plant.

The purpose of both kinds of camouflage is to deceive. Behind their verbal deceptions the little teams of technicians have advanced like commandos into our agriculture, our industries, our housing, our State and city governments. They have, with their financial tools, disconnected the ties which bound each community to the people who built it. They have put in wires that now connect every community with the master switch in Washington. They have combined all our independent activities into one tightly organized production line, where everyone's work is financially geared to government. They are careful to use the orthodox words and phrases, to give the illusion of familiar security to the whole. But the administration in Washington is now completely master of the economic process.

III

Economics is not a parade of wooden figures. It is a metabolic process, a form of life. The people of a nation take certain substances from their resources, transform them by their work and skill into what they need, and do it with such an economy of energy that there is a margin left for growth.

When this vital process of replenishment and growth breaks down the society, like an individual, is dying. The outer limbs may still be robust, but inwardly the turn is toward decay.

The New Deal mined our capital resources and wasted them in made work, in political strife, and and inflated war costs. It restrained our people to distrust their individual ability to plan, taught them to avoid work, and to trust political promises calculated to deceive.

President Truman could have reversed that trend. He has chosen to complete it, though perhaps his advisers really made the choice. The President's economic message of January 6 was a truly historic document. It sounded the death knell of American economic growth, not less so because Mr. Truman himself may not realize what is happening.

The key argument now is full employment of resources, money, machines and men. Both chattel slavery and feudalism succeeded in providing full employment. The free economy improved on these by seeking the most productive employment of all factors. It put every man and every dollar where it would do the most fruitful work. That is why it had rising income to pay them. No one was put on made work, which produced no income, and so no one worked without pay. That wasn't just dull economics. It was one of the greatest political achievements of all history: the abolition of unpaid work or serfdom. We have let abuses under capitalism blind us to the essential value of the system.

"Full employment of resources" is the deceptive phrase hiding the turn back to a system of employment for capital and labor without compensation. The state can give full employment to men or dollars only by putting them at superfluous work. Of course for a while they can be paid by the confiscation of existing capital, laboriously accumulated by our forebears. But soon payment is made by lowering the income of the majority, calling this process "fair shares," as they do in Socialist Britain. Instead of full-time slavery for part of the people we now have part-time slavery for all—involuntary labor to pay taxes.

The planners know this. But they also know that it is politically feasible to go on looting our national capital fund. They need only spend part of the take for gigantic projects to satisfy the people, like Gov. Willie Stark, or like the model villages built by Potemkin to fool the Empress Catherine. These economic Nuremberg festivals are the promotional cost of the welfare state. They are the phosphorescent glow that hides the decay beneath.

IV

In every country the first stage of the welfare state is political squandering of the nation's capital. The second stage is renewal of the exhausted capital fund by the only means at the disposal of the State—by making everyone work longer hours, at less pay, for the dictators who rule in the name of the people.

The second stage of the welfare state appears in its 5-year plans, meaning assignment of workers to jobs that officials choose for them. That is old stuff in Europe. Now we see that it can happen here.

The economic message introduces the note of austerity into American thinking. Workers must work harder. Businessmen must take more risks. Everyone must pay even heavier taxes. To make it all well-rounded the administration vaguely promises to be economical sometime, somewhere—time and place not specified.

So, in America, we move without reason or foresight into the degeneracy of the welfare state.

Why does no one stop this grim decay? This is not Czarist Russia slowly collapsing in corruption. It is not defeated Germany taken over by the band of Nazi plunderers. It is the United States of America, the last, best hope of earth.

The real trouble is not with the power-seekers or the technicians. It is some weakness in ourselves. Froude tells us of the Indian tribes which suffered so deep a trauma from the rush of Spanish violence, and the incomprehensible spread of slavery to a people who had been free, that they willed their collective death.

The cure is easy, if we have the will. We must take back from the administration its power over our money, which is our work.

Money is only a receipt for work done. Credit is an I O U for work not yet done. Any nation which lets its government operate on credit in peacetime is a nation of indentured servants. It is on its way to becoming a nation of serfs. If we let the state use deficit financing in peacetime, we are agreeing to let it conscript our labor in peacetime.

The point at which to attack the evil is in the budget of the Federal Government. For it is there that clever men are fighting to enslave a people who, by their own indifference, are already half enslaved.

Radio Address of Hon. R. Walter Riehlman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio broadcast delivered by our able colleague, Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Representative of the Thirty-sixth Congressional District of New York, over Station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on March 6, 1950. He evidences the same sound common sense and devotion to the principles which have formed a bulwark of strength in the upbuilding of our country which have always characterized his service in Congress. I commend his views to my colleagues.

The address follows:

I want to talk to you about socialized medicine. In the past 14 years one or more bills have been pending before sessions of Congress proposing that the United States Government participate in the furnishing of compulsory medical care to its citizens. All the socialistic countries of Europe for some years now have had programs of this character. I have been invited to speak on this program to express my views on the subject. I am opposed to Government-furnished medicine in the same degree as I oppose Government-furnished food, goods, or services which by custom in our country have been heretofore reserved to free enterprise.

The bankrupt nations of Europe today which are either participating in or furnishing health services are at the same time depending heavily upon us to furnish them with goods and credit and it seems strange that we, one of the few solvent nations in the world, would be interested in borrowing concepts from those countries. In most European countries liberty and freedom are dying because their systems of government do not reward initiative but instead shackle their people and deprive them of their liberty. The free-enterprise system remains healthy in the United States. However, it is threatened by persons who are attempting

to import foreign ideologies, including socialized medicine, into the United States.

Let's analyze without emotion the administration's socialized-medicine proposal. This legislation would draft the services of doctors, dentists, nurses, and other professional personnel, including technicians, and place them on the Federal pay roll for the purpose of rendering medical services to everybody. Wherever tried this type of medical care has degenerated to a low quality of care. The administration's program would be supported by another pay-roll tax, plus contributions from the Federal Treasury to make up underestimates of the cost. The eventual cost of the program has not been definitely determined by the sponsors of this wholly un-American scheme, but estimates do range from the administration's "guesstimate" of $7,000,000,000 to estimates by reliable authorities of $18,000,000,000 annually.

It is inconceivable that our successful medical system should be substituted by a system which has been inaugurated elsewhere and failed to produce the same high quality of medical care already achieved in the United States. We have the lowest death rate, the highest ratio of physicians to population, and ours is the only system which guarantees a confidential doctor-patient relationship.

The latest administration's health-insurance bill contains 163 pages. Several pages are dedicated to the proposition that the patient will be guaranteed freedom to choose his own physician. However, if the doctor's panel were filled, there would be no opportunity for the patient to select him. This is the scheme which is used everywhere socialized medicine exists and is the only workable arrangement.

It is interesting to know who is seeking to sell socialized medicine to the United States. John T. Flynn, in his recent book, The Road Ahead, advises us that unprincipled politicians seeking perpetuation in office offer this social scheme in the hope of winning votes. Flynn warns that they are imitating the socializers of Great Britain, and we could become victims of a deadly parallel—copying Great Britain and starting down "austerity road" to socialism and an all-powerful state.

Mind you, I am not for a moment blind to the problem that many people have difficulty in obtaining medical care at a cost which they can afford, but I am not willing to accept socialism in any form in trade for hard-fought for and well-earned American freedom. We must not lose sight of the fact that socialism does not mix with free enterprise. We can't have a little socialism—it grows and chokes out free enterprise just as weeds, if not eradicated, take over a garden. There is no more reason to nationalize the medical profession than there is to nationalize farming, the steel industry, the mines, our transportation systems, the lawyers, the butchers, or the bakers. All our industries and professions present difficulties to the economy from time to time, but there have always been found American remedies for such problems—certainly we need not resort to socialism as a cure for American ills.

The biggest fallacy of those who would nationalize and socialize to bring about economic cures lies in the fact that socialism hasn't worked successfully in any country where it has been tried—this type of cure is worse than any of the ills with which we are confronted.

I don't wish to end this discussion in opposition to the administration's medical scheme without leaving with you a suggestion as to how better medical care might be assured for the American people at reasonable costs. Briefly I support recent legislation introduced by the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of the Fortieth District of the State of New York. His bill, H. R. 6819, provides that persons who wish voluntarily to purchase health insurance policies, may deduct the cost of the premium from their Federal income taxes. This will certainly provide an incentive to persons within that bracket of taxes, roughly between $2,500 and $5,000, who today need the protection of insurance against the cost of serious illness. To my mind the words "voluntary and American" blend in a happier union than do the words "compulsion and American." Thank you.

Shipment of Arms to the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter that I have received from the Department of State in response to the protest that I received from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Boston, Mass., with respect to the shipment of arms to the Near East:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 13, 1950.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: I have received your letter of February 21, 1950, and enclosed telegram from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Boston, Mass., concerning the shipment of arms to the Near East. Your courtesy in making the telegram available to the Department for consideration is greatly appreciated.

In view of the termination of hostilities in the Near East, it was determined by the Security Council last August that the embargo on arms shipments to the area was no longer necessary. During the discussions in the Council the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom stated that their respective countries did not wish to see an arms race take place in the Near East. The United States subsequently established a policy for the exportation of military equipment from this country to the Near East under which it has permitted shipment to the Arab States and to Israel of equipment which has been determined to be necessary for the maintenance of internal order and for the reasonable requirements of self-defense.

A renewal of the Arab-Israeli conflict would be a tragic development which must not take place. This Government has been keeping a close watch on developments affecting Palestine and an analysis of available information does not lead to the conclusion that serious measures are being taken in preparation for a renewal of hostilities.

There have most certainly been inflammatory and bellicose statements made in both the Arab and Israeli press concerning a renewal of the fighting. While such an attitude on the part of journalists is deplorable and harmful to the eventual establishment of good relations between Israel and the Arab States, under the circumstances, with bitter fighting only so recently terminated, it would probably be too much to expect that highly aroused passions should quickly cool. Some of the warlike pronouncements of officials of near eastern governments may have been made for the purpose of domestic consumption. The Department does not believe that the remarks of individual radio and press commentators should be taken as a reliable indication of any serious or immediate intent on the part of the respective Governments to resume hostilities.

At the present time, the relations between the Arab states and Israel are governed by valid armistice agreements signed by those states in the early months of 1949. In these agreements, the parties committed themselves to refrain from further acts of hostility, and the execution of the provisions of the agreements is being actively supervised by United Nations personnel on the spot in Palestine. These representatives have reported that the area is tranquil. Should a threat to the peace arise in the Near East, it would be the duty of the United Nations representatives, and the state concerned, to report this development to the Security Council, which remains seized of the question of the maintenance of peace in Palestine.

In considering the export of arms to the Near East from the United States, and from other countries, the Department has constantly kept in mind the danger of enhancing the possibility of a renewal of the Palestine conflict. As stated above, our analysis of all information available to us does not indicate any serious preparations to this end. Should such information be received, the United States Government would be quick to use all of its influence in an attempt to prevent such an eventuality, both within the United Nations and outside.

The telegram enclosed with your letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Excise Taxes on Communication Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under consent heretofore granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD my remarks as follows:

We in America are both proud and justly thankful that we still have a free communications system but we certainly cannot be proud of the fact that our great communication services which are a vital business and social necessity continue to be taxed at a rate deliberately designed to restrict and discourage their use. The present restrictive rates which are the results of successive increases by the Revenue Acts of 1941, 1942 and 1943 are as follows:

	Percent
Telephone toll messages of 25 cents and over	25
Local telephone service and toll messages of 24 cents and under	15
Domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages	25
International telegraph, cable, and radio messages	10
Leased wire services	25
Wire and equipment service	8

These taxes are not a tax on the companies but are imposed directly on the users of the services. The taxes are collected by the communications companies from the people and remitted monthly to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The communications taxes are basically wartime taxes and they have no conceivable place in an economy which depends for its survival on continued growth and expansion. That these taxes are wartime taxes and that the present rates are designed to restrict the use of the services is manifest from their legislative history.

The first tax imposed on communications services was that contained in the Spanish War Act of 1898 at a rate of 1 cent for each telephone or telegraph message for which a charge of 15 cents or over was made. This tax was subsequently repealed but reimposed by the act of October 22, 1914—emergency revenue laws—at the same rate. This act was then repealed by the Revenue Act of 1916 but due to the heavy expenditures incurred in the prosecution of World War I the Revenue Act of 1917 reimposed the tax on the same class of communications services at a rate of 5 cents for each 15-cent message. When the war emergency was carried over into 1918, the rate was increased by the Revenue Act of 1918 to 5 cents on messages ranging from 15 cents to 49 cents and to 10 cents on messages of 50 cents and over. This act added a new tax on leased wire services between local service areas at the rate of 10 percent.

The Revenue Act of 1921, which repealed many of the other World War I excise taxes, merely made a slight change in the brackets subject to the 5-cent and 10-cent rates of tax.

The Revenue Act of 1924 repealed all of the then existing excise taxes on communications services.

In 1932 in order to meet rising Federal expenditures Congress reimposed excise taxes on communications services in the Revenue Act of 1932. Excise taxes on telephone messages were imposed at the rate of 10 cents on messages of 50 cents to 99 cents; 15 cents on messages of $1 to $1.99; and 20 cents on messages of $2 and over. Telegraph messages were taxed at 5 percent and there was a 10-cent tax on each cable or radio message. A tax at the rate of 5 percent was made applicable to amounts paid for leased wires between local service areas. These depression emergency taxes were still in effect in 1941 when the country embarked on its defense program.

In the Revenue Act of 1941 the rates on telephone messages of 25 cents and over were increased to 5 cents for each 50 cents or fraction thereof with telegraph, cable, and radio messages being taxed at 10 percent. The rate on leased wires was increased to 10 percent and made applicable to all leased wires and, for the first time, an excise tax was imposed on wire and equipment services at the rate of 5 percent, and on local service, including toll messages under 25 cents, at the rate of 6 percent.

As the war emergency continued, excise taxes on communications services were further increased, first in the Revenue Act of 1942 and further increased in the Revenue Act of 1943. The rate on telephone toll messages was increased to 20 percent of the charge and then to 25 percent. The rate on domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages was increased to 15 percent of the charge and then to 25 percent. The rate on leased wire services was increased to 15 percent and then to 25 percent. And, the rate on local service, including toll messages under 25 cents, was increased to 10 percent and then to 15 percent.

A tax on our communication services cannot be justified on any sound principle of taxation. Such taxes do violence to the ability to pay principal because they fall with equal impact on all classes and actually discriminate against individuals who have to make frequent use of communication services. Moreover, such taxes are a particular hardship on our farmers and all persons in rural areas and also discriminate against certain sections of the country which are often far removed from the centers of population.

Even those who argue that these taxes should be continued because they are productive of revenue and easily administered cannot on any rational ground defend the present rates. By no stretch of the imagination can communication services be classified as a luxury and yet they are taxed not only at luxury rates, but in the case of telegrams and long-distance telephone calls at a 25-percent rate which is higher than the rate applied to such items as movies, radios, perfume, jewelry, night clubs, cosmetics, and other items.

Sixty-six percent of all our families and almost all of our businesses have telephones and of the approximately 38,205,000 telephones in the United States one out of six, or approximately 6,841,000 are owned and operated by an independent (non-Bell system) telephone company.

In my opinion there is an indispensable place in the Nation's business and social system for a privately operated telegraph system but the continuation of the present tax of 25 percent has already destroyed any competitive possibility and as a result the Western Union Co. has been and is now operating at a considerable deficit. In 1949 the telegraph users paid to the company for its services more than $216,000,000 including the tax, but $36,500,000 of the funds collected by Western Union from the public were remitted to the Internal Revenue Bureau. If the present tax restraint is lifted, it wil be possible for this industry to operate succesfully, and this fact together with the recognition of the wholly illogical and unsound continuation of the present comunication taxes makes this a matter requiring the immediate attention of Congress.

Veterans' Preference in Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely interested in postal legislation since coming to Congress in September 1946, as, prior to my service in World War II, I was a postal employee at College Station, Tex.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, I introduced the first legislation which had as its purpose the granting of military credit to our postal employees for pay purposes. Therefore, I am very glad to support H. R. 87, which was reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Eighty-first Congress, and I urge the Members of this House to favorably consider this bill which will allow World War II veterans in the postal service to be credited with the time spent in the military service.

Those of us who are familiar with postal legislation will know the justification for such a bill as H. R. 87 inasmuch as length of service determines the amount of pay our postal employees receive.

Take, for example, two young men who have finished high school in the early 1940's and both having expressed an interest in entering the postal service, we find that one of them had been drafted early in the war and did not have an opportunity to receive an appointment in the postal service. The other young man, however, was not called by the military until a later date and had already entered as a clerk in the postal service. When the latter is separated from the armed forces, there is legislation providing him with military credit to be applied for pay purposes. The other young man, whom we feel has been done an injustice, enters the postal service after completing his tour of duty in the armed forces, and he is not granted any credit at all for the time spent in the armed forces. This bill would grant him credit and would give him the pay grade that we feel he is entitled to.

I sincerely urge Congress to favorably consider this legislation.

Tolerance Is a Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, stamping out intolerance so that every individual in the United States can fully enjoy the rights guaranteed to him under the Constitution is a challenging job facing all of us.

There recently was brought to my attention an example of the efforts being made by one of the Nation's oldest and most widely respected unions in the task of removing intolerance. That union is the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, chartered in 1897. The article was written by its president, Mr. Earl W. Jimerson, and its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, both of whom have spent the greater part of their life in the trade-union movement.

President Jimerson started working in a packing plant at East St. Louis, Illinois, when he was 16 years of age, earning 7½ cents an hour at the time. He became one of the leading organizers of the union during World War I, rose to the position of vice president in 1921, which he held until 1942, whereupon he became president of the union. He is one of the best known trade unionists in America.

Mr. Gorman has an equally impressive record of accomplishment. He started working in a packing plant at Louisville, Ky., at an early age. While so employed, he earned a law degree at the University of Louisville, and became a business representative of his local, and shortly thereafter was elected vice president of the international union. In 1923, at the age of 28, he became president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, the youngest person ever so honored. He remained president for 20 years, and became secretary-treasurer 8 years ago. In 1948, the American Federation of Labor chose him to be a delegate to the Trade Union Congress held at Margate, England.

For numerous years both of these men have been concerned with the problem of achieving for all Americans equality of opportunity in employment and through numerous speeches and written articles have been leaders in the fight to attain this goal.

Their latest effort in this direction is an article which appears in the March 1950 issue of the official publication of the union, the Butcher Workman. It is reprinted below:

TOLERANCE IS A LIE

If one cannot tolerate a person or a race of people and proclaims it to the world, he is considered on those particular subjects as being intolerant. There are thousands of well respected men and women in all walks of life who are, in their communities, considered to be the very essence of tolerance and who at heart are bigots to the core.

The word tolerance is the largest lie in the English language. It is our most weasel word. If we could only read the minds of so-called tolerant people, we would discover that hate still secretly predominates the true character of millions who for business, social, or political reasons tolerate things they actually hate.

Recently at a health resort in one of our Southern States we met a man who could find nothing wrong with our beautiful hotel except that the Jews have taken possession. When we protested the remark, the usual crawfish act was forthcoming—"Now please don't misunderstand me. I like the Jewish people." He was a pure and simple unadulterated liar. He hated the Jews but back home he secretly tolerated them because he wanted to be a regular guy or something.

It is needless to mention the secret terrific anti-Catholic feeling which predominates in so many sections of our Nation. Oh, yes, in the open the bigot praises the Catholics as being good people. On the surface these intolerant Dr. Jekyls and Mr. Hydes are very tolerant, but let a Catholic aspire for political office in these localities and he is buried beneath an avalanche of votes by those who mark their ballots with their genuine narrow character instead of with their supposedly tolerant reputation.

The Jews and Catholics are well able to take care of themselves but when we come to the Negroes of our Nation the picture is altogether different. The Negro is the personification of tolerance of those things that cut him to the heart. He is making tremendous headway under adverse conditions only because he is learning how to cast his ballot and many of the politicians who are posing as his friends are as secretly intolerant of him as was the man down South who liked our hotel except that the Jews have taken possession.

In Washington, our Nation's Capital, the Federal FEPC bill has been kicked and badgered around in a shameful way. Only a few, including President Truman, are willing to make it a clear-cut issue. Others have their eyes and ears back home to ascertain if the issue will cost or gain them votes. In this such politicians are proving the lie of the word "tolerance" and the Negro with admirable patience tolerates the thumb-twiddling of those who were elected to office with a substantial block of Negro votes.

It is ironical that in our same Nation's Capital the living conditions of the Negro as well as white tolerance of his well-being is little better than the plight of his brothers in the Negro slums of the capital of South Carolina. The most gifted sons of the Negro race are still denied half equal rights in dining rooms, hotels, and the like, when the human debris from skid row would be welcome.

So far as we know, not many of the white friends of the Negro holding senatorial or congressional togas have raised their official voices to bring about reform. It is about time to call a halt on such intolerant political hypocrisy. Let us admit that tolerance in matters of this kind is a contemptible lie. Let us, therefore, have the Federal FEPC law now. Its enactment is long overdue. The time has come when so-called friendly Congressmen and Senators must stand up and be counted. The Negro has been politically double-crossed long enough.

Rt. Rev. Walter S. Carroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 24, 1950, Msgr. Walter S. Carroll, of Pittsburgh, died at Georgetown University Hospital. With his passing his church suffered a most untimely loss. Monsignor Carroll at the time of his death was an official of the Vatican Secretariat of State which post he held since 1940. He was the third American to be honored with an assignment with the secretariat and as vicar delegate to the American armed forces during the past war he rendered countless services to American troops and was entrusted with numerous and important diplomatic missions. He was born in Pittsburgh on June 18, 1908; graduated from Duquesne University in 1930; received his doctorate of philosophy from the University of Fribourg in Switzerland in 1933; his degree of S. T. L. at the Gregorian University in 1936, and his doctorate of canon law from the Pontificate Institute of Canon Law, Rome, in 1939. He was ordained on December 8, 1935, and in a short span of 8 years rose to the rank of monsignor. He was assigned to the Vatican in 1940. His passing at the age of 41 came as a shock to his many friends and admirers in this country and abroad and terminated a career that undoubtedly would have led to many and greater honors. His passing was noted by the celebration of Masses by His Holiness, the Pope, and by the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, apostolic delegate to the United States. To his mother, Mrs. B. Margaret Hogan Carroll, and his two brothers, the Reverend Colman F. Carroll and Msgr. Howard J. Carroll, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, go our heartfelt sympathy on their loss. They will be consoled, I am sure, by the thought that their distinguished son and brother has been called to a higher service.

Organization of a Constitutional Government in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, may I refer to H. R. 7674 which I introduced yesterday. It provides for the organization of a constitutional government in Puerto Rico.

Under the Constitution of the United States there are certain rights and privileges which may not be applicable in a given area. But there are certain rights which are fundamental. American citizens wherever they may live are endowed with them.

The people of Puerto Rico are an organized community of American citizens living in the land of their birth, the island of Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is American territory although unincorporated territory.

The Congress of the United States, since 1900, has provided for the operation of Federal laws in Puerto Rico. It has determined the economic relationships to exist between Puerto Rico and the mainland. It has determined that the people of Puerto Rico are United States citizens. Such legal and economic provisions of our organic act the people of Puerto Rico are not aiming to disturb. Rather, they wish to reaffirm them and expressly register their consent to their application.

The Congress has also provided for the establishment of a local government in Puerto Rico and has progressively expanded the democratic nature of such government. Today, we have responsible government in Puerto Rico. It is served by officials which the people themselves elect or select.

However, the charter upon which this local governmental structure is based, has never been adopted by the people of Puerto Rico. That such charter be substituted by a constitution of the people's adoption is now a fitting and necessary

step in order to perfect the democratic nature of our system of government.

To this effect I have introduced H. R. 7674. In so doing, I am the interpreter and the voice of the people of Puerto Rico in this Congress. As a result of the elections of 1948 the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico on this score are unmistakable.

The bill is a simple one. It declares it to be its purpose to duly recognize the principle of government by consent. Under such principle, the people of Puerto Rico would accept this act. The present Federal provisions of our organic act would be continued. Within such framework the people of Puerto Rico would adopt a constitution, under which they would organize their local government.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations with respect to the Territory or other property belonging to the United States. Under this provision of the Constitution, Congress has, in the course of time, adopted such rules and regulations for Puerto Rico as it has considered needful. Congress has been called upon to do so under the terms of cession of sovereignty under the Treaty of Paris of 1898. The Federal provisions of the present organic act would be reaffirmed under my bill. They are needful regulations for the establishment and maintenance of proper relations between the island and the mainland and the Federal Government. But for a community of American citizens at such stage of organization and democratic development as the people of Puerto Rico have attained, it is not needful to determine how their local government should be organized. They can do it themselves. The time has arrived when such community of citizens be recognized in this desire; in the wish to organize their local government as they see fit.

The bill, therefore, is both a recognition of a fact and the recognition of a principle. The fact is that the people of Puerto Rico wish and are able to provide themselves with a local constitution for the organization of their own local government. The principle is that American citizens are endowed with such privilege and exercise whenever circumstances permit.

The right to organize a local government, the right to live under a government of the people's choice is expressly recognized in the Constitution of the United States. Amendment IX of the Constitution reads:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

There is no question that at the time the Constitution of the United States was adopted the people had and did not relinquish the right to organize their Government. They had already adopted their State constitutions. Later they adopted the Federal Constitution. It is such simple and elementary right the people of Puerto Rico wish now to exercise. They wish to adopt a local constitution and reaffirm their station within this Union.

What then would be the status of Puerto Rico should this bill be passed? Puerto Rico would be a Commonwealth of American citizens, living within the federation, in accordance with such provisions of the Constitution of the United States as are applicable in the case, living under a local government shaped and organized and functioning with the consent of the people of Puerto Rico, within this great federation. This would not make Puerto Rico a State, but it would make of Puerto Rico a community of American citizens living in the American way. We would not participate in national elections nor be represented in Congress any more than we now are, but we would have local government as democratically organized as in a State, and, with few exceptions, Federal laws would apply as in a State.

The point might be raised that never in the past has such procedure been followed. To such consideration I would reply with the following consideration:

Up until 1898 all territories added to the original territory of the original Union were incorporated at the time of acquisition. Such additional territories have been admitted or are in the process of being admitted to statehood as it should be. Since 1898 other areas have come under United States sovereignty. They have remained unincorporated, subject to further determination of Congress concerning their status. In one of these areas, in Puerto Rico, a new form of federative relations have been developing. The form is new, but it follows the fundamental principles of the Constitution. It has developed in a line parallel but not coincident with that followed by the incorporated territories attaining statehood.

Puerto Rico started in 1900 with a government comparable to that of an incorporated territory. By a series of enactments Congress has brought Puerto Rico to a status today which is way beyond a territorial pattern of government. It is much more comparable to that of a State. What my bill proposes to do is to perfect such status for Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico would have a position parallel to that of a State, although it would not have such participation in the Federal Government as the people of a state have. In other words, we are not asking for the right to vote for presidential electors, we are not asking for the right to elect two Senators, we are not asking for the right to elect Members of this House other than a voteless resident commissioner.

We are asking to continue to live under the Constitution of the United States as heretofore. We wish to continue to live under Federal laws as heretofore; but we are asking also that as far as our local governmental organization is concerned, we may proceed to shape it, in accordance with the same principles and in accordance with parallel procedures as the people of any of the States organize their State governments. The fact that there has been no precedent should not deter Congress; such fact did not deter the Eighteenth Congress from authorizing Puerto Rico to elect its governor.

We are developing a new pattern of federation, applicable to our circumstances, which do not permit us at the present, nor in the forseeable future, to develop along the classical lines and the uniform pattern followed by former or present territories in their ascent to statehood.

The Constitution of the United States is not a static document. It is a dynamic instrument of Government. The wisdom of the founding fathers made it so, the wisdom of successive generations, past and present, has made it so. The United States are not composed of residents of the 48 States only. It is composed of all American citizens wherever they may be and wherever they might meet and gather and organize upon American soil. It is only natural, logical, it is inescapable, that they should strive to organize and live in an American way.

I plead with my colleagues in the House that such bill as I have introduced may receive their most considerate attention. I plead with my colleagues in the House that the people of Puerto Rico may be allowed to see their wishes fulfilled. In that region of the Caribbean where we live, we face the whole Spanish Main. Such enormous expanse of land is inhabited by people of an origin similar to ours in Puerto Rico. We are the advanced guard and the exponents of the American way of life in that area. All we want now is to maintain it and to perfect it. We want to show the world that democracy not only in practice, but also in principle, always follows the flag.

Wool Support Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein a resolution adopted by the Iowa Sheep and Wool Growers Cooperative at their annual meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on March 7, 1950. I want especially to emphasize, for the benefit of Members of Congress, the concern of this association that much of the value of the wool support price program likely will be lost because of the present plan to base the 1950 support prices, by grades, on the 1-year price relationship that existed during 1949 rather than to base the support prices, by grades, on the 10-year average price which is the basis for parity. Such action would be a severe blow to the wool producers in the fleece-wool States, such as Iowa, and would tend to further discourage sheep numbers, which are at an all-time low.

Whereas the February 23, 1950, release of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicates that the 1950 purchase price for the

various grades of wool may be based on grade differentials established by market prices during 1949; and

Whereas the 1949 prices on medium fleece wools were abnormally low, both because of slow demand and due to the sale of CCC wool of the medium grades at prices 4 to 5 cents below cost to the CCC, and also because of CCC disposal of medium grade stock piles for previous years; and

Whereas a large percentage of the wool produced in Iowa is medium wool: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Iowa Sheep and Wool Growers Cooperative in annual meeting assembled, representing about 8,000 wool producers, demand that the Production and Marketing Administration give a complete and impartial hearing to association representatives of the fleece-wool States and to the National Wool Marketing Corporation, before establishing any new method of determining wool support prices for 1950.

Letter of John J. Phillips, of Temple City, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John J. Phillips, of Temple City, Calif.; also his outline of a sound labor law mentioned therein:

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF., *February 27, 1950.*
Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
Representative of Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICH: I note by yesterday's press your remarks relative to the study and arguments of other Members of Congress for aiding the middle-income wage-earners, etc., and am writing to commend you for your common-sense remarks and contentions in this matter and offer the following suggestions concerning same:

Our Government is getting in deep water and trouble in capital letters by concerning itself with the private affairs of everyone and attempting to raise the standard of living and provide housing, etc., for people regardless of what efforts the individuals put forth to provide these things for themselves. Even Almighty God does not try to feed and care for people as He did for the pilgrims in the wilderness and lets them know that if they do not get out and hustle and do for themselves, they will suffer or starve.

And what of this dollar income? How can we tell what income anyone should receive when the value of the dollar is fluctuating and cost of labor of organized groups is changed and increased over night by the power-drunk labor leaders and the measuring stick, or value of the rule of measure is changed to suit to the selfish demands of large groups month after month and every year, until now with the cost of living coming down, these powerful groups still demand more than they received during the highest point of inflated prices and can tie up our greatest industries and hold them for ransom until they (these labor groups) are again appeased for a short time.

Our dollar is our most important measure of value, and no one should be permitted to tamper with its purchasing value by force, not even the Government after it is once fixed in value and the people work and sell their labor and save on the basis of such value. Much less to permit little selfish groups to devalue the dollars and savings of all because they want more.

Only acts of God; shortage of production, and the natural laws in their free operation should affect the purchasing value of the dollar. It is to the workers' interest to see that this value is maintained at all times, by giving as much in labor and production for the dollars he earns one day as the next, so that he can rightfully expect that those dollars if saved will purchase as much production and labor at any future time, barring some acts or conditions over which men have no control. Only in this manner can we ever have stability of prices, and a sound economy.

Most of those so concerned for these low-income families do not seem to realize that the high income of the better-paid groups is being paid from borrowed money and we are now and have been for years going deeper and deeper into debt, and everything is done on borrowed money. In the case of housing, the loans run for 20 years and the debt for such building is increasing 19 times faster than it is being repaid. Millions of people have their weekly pay checks mortgaged for as high as 3 years ahead for purchasing of cars and home appliances and even clothing is being sold on time payments and those making the cars and appliances, clothing, etc., will have spent the money they received for their work months and years before the installment debts are paid off and the debts of all kinds now stand at the astronomical figure of about $450,000,000,000 and are increasing by fully $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 annually and interest alone at around $16,000,000,000 annually. If this borrowing were stopped at once, or the payments increased to where we pay back as much as we borrow each year and the debt held at the present level, we would have a depression in 2 weeks, so how can anyone say what income any family is entitled to under such conditions?

Now our country is in a mess and when the President talks about "borrowing and deficit spending in bad times to prevent a depression" while we have so much of every kind of food and commodity that they are now destroying millions of bushels of potatoes, and have so much cotton, and grains, etc., that they cannot find storage space for it. It is difficult to understand what we would call good times or what we would do with more food, and raw materials, etc., if God in His beneficence were to give us more?

The only thing that ever drove the cave man from his underground habitat and sent him out to attack a wild animal of that day was hunger, his stomach getting flat and gnawing at him and human nature has not changed and unless people are told plainly that it is up to them to make their own jobs and sell their labor for what others are willing to pay for it or their production, etc., and then let them run their own race or fall behind, we may as well submit to stateism and socialism and let the Government take over, and with every Government aid and welfare, we will surrender a part of our freedom and finally will have to submit to complete regimentation and control just as the people of Britain were coming to before this recent election. Step by step, regimentation and control will finally rule the daily lives of everyone, and the people will be told where they will work and what standard of living they can have and their whole lives dictated and controlled, despite any denials of the President or anyone else. And we are already far on the road to such control.

The chief cause of our trouble is that our economy has been taken from the hands of trained and experienced businessmen and put into the hands and dictatorial control of the selfish labor groups, who know nothing of sound economics and care nothing for anyone else but their own little groups; dog eat dog, and the devil take the hindmost, and the whole country and economy at the mercy of these little warring gangs who have their agents roaming the country and levying tribute on the pay of every worker they can drive into their grasp.

Since passage of the income tax law, every strike and demand for more and more pay, shorter hours and this benefit and that has been against the public, the brothers and sisters of these workers, who serve and provide the strong organized groups with everything they eat, wear and use and it is getting worse every year. Out here the building trades workers have forced their wages up and up with connivance and collusion of the contractors who get a percentage or commission on every dollar they pay for cost of construction, and they give in year after year to these selfish groups and their wages are now from $18 to $25 per day and some such as plasterers have contracts setting 6 hours as a day at straight time, but call for a full 8 hours of work, the last 2 hours to be paid at double time (not time and a half) and this craft gets $2.50 per hour for 6 hours and $5 per hour for 2 hours or $25 per day to help provide homes for the homeless veterans and others. Now they are out to extend this holdup 6-hour basic day and overtime to all of the other groups and force the home builder to borrow more money and further increase the threat of inflation, as well as pile up more debt and increase the monthly payments of the home buyer and reduce his standard of living which will in turn result in further loss of jobs for those supplying the monthly living food and so forth for these families and so it goes.

I herewith attach an outline of a sound labor law that would stop this raiding of the pantries and food budgets of every family by these organized groups and also stop this criminal waste of time by strikes which are weakening our economy and government in this most serious war with the most deadly sinister force—communism—that the world has ever known and which "cold war," we are losing on all fronts and if these labor groups had any concern for their own freedom and the future of their country, they would stop this bickering and fighting and get down to honest work and build up our economic strength to meet the assault which will be loosed against us from all sides when Russia and the communists get firmly set in China and now have us surrounded on all sides.

This demand for pensions for groups is nothing but a holdup of the rest of the public and will lead to ruin, since there cannot be sound investments for any such amount of money and it will upset and destroy the value of the savings of millions who have been saving and investing for their old age. No average pension can provide a full living standard for anyone, but can only supplement the income from savings put aside by thrift and sober living during one's working years and no matter how little one earns they can save something if they try. Therefore it is wrong and even criminal to permit any organized group to devalue these savings by demanding more pay for the same work and production, and tell every other person that "their dollars are worth but 90 percent or 80 percent or on down to but 50 percent of what they were up to that date," which is plain insanity. Not even the government should devalue the dollar and savings of the people much less every little ignorant and selfish group.

This labor plan would stop all of this, and if the Government can put a floor under wages to stop chiseling by employers, then we can also put a ceiling over the wage that groups can demand of their fellow men, and leave the employers free to negotiate the actual wage within these brackets of the maximum and minimum.

No honest worker should ask or demand that his brothers digging his food from the ground for him should work for a fraction of the pay of these ordinary crafts and trades as has been done in the past. Just plain greed and the power to go out and take it from the rest. This should now be stopped. If the Government does take action to help the low-income families, it will not mean a thing if we still permit these land pirates to go on raiding against all of us, and take still more for the same, or less work. Now we are in a mess and it is now time to stand up and tell these power-drunk groups they will not be permitted to continue such raiding, and piling more and more debt on children unborn to try to keep our economy operating.

What could be more fair for all, Mr. Rich, if all the labor leaders sit down together and work out such a fair wage scale and then hold it firm from year to year, and reestablish a firm price ceiling and value of the dollars of all and the purchasing value of the savings of the workers when they retire as well as all living on pensions, anuities, and income from savings? All would be a thousand times better off than this continuous fighting and devaluing of the savings of all to where many are being forced to turn to the relief agencies for help to maintain a subsistance standard of living. It cannot possibly but end in bankruptcy and ruin for millions, and possibly the loss of our freedom and way of life, and it is much later than most people think.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. PHILLIPS.

NATIONAL LABOR COMMISSION FOR REGULATING LABOR RELATIONS

1. Enact a law repealing all present laws on labor relations and set up a National Labor Commission of five members.

2. Set up labor courts in all populous centers of the country with full power to settle all labor disputes peaceably with rights of appeal to the courts if either party to the dispute desires.

3. Adopt a National Labor Code, spelling out plainly all rights of workers, as to seniority and working conditions, etc., as well as obligations of workers to their employers and the public whose rights are paramount to those of any individual or group. And—

(a) Prohibit all strikes, lock-outs, slowdowns, sit-downs, or willful interference with full regular production, service, and transportation by either employers or employees, where demands of the public require. Only acts of God to be permitted to interrupt production, service, etc.

(b) Prohibit workers from quitting their jobs without first giving due notice of their intention to do so; 1 week, 2 weeks, or a month, according to how paid. Employer to give workers the same notice of dismissal, or an equal severance pay when discharged at once. This to prevent workers quitting in mass and disrupting service and supply to the public.

(c) Require every worker to carry a work book giving place of employment (or last and former employment) in which the employer will be required to state in writing over his stamp and signature, why the worker was discharged, and how he or she performed their work and if they complied with the law requiring notice of leaving the employer. These work books to be renewed each year, and carried at all times and give the Social Security number of the holder. Such books and evidence of former employment would be of great service to police in checking up on anyone arrested or picked up because of crime.

(d) Adopt a national system of apprenticeships setting forth the time a beginner must serve at a subsistence wage before being licensed as a journeyman. The number of apprentices admitted to any craft or trade to be regulated by the officials of the Labor Commission.

(e) Take the prevailing wage for farm labor as fixed by the laws of supply and demand, as the minimum and basis for figuring the wage for all other groups of workers in each district.

(f) Consider each craft and trade on its merits, as to skill required, hazards of the work, and time required in apprenticeship, and fix a maximum wage for each craft, beyond which organization groups will not be permitted to force their wage as long as the basic wage for farm labor remains relatively the same. A representative of the farm workers to sit in on these deliberations and be permitted to state what differential between his wage and that of the skilled crafts he feels is fair, and would not overly attract him or other farm hands to leave their jobs in the fields to try to get into the skilled jobs.

(g) Employer and employees to be left free to negotiate the actual wage, within the brackets of maximum and minimum wage as set forth. This to avoid price or wage fixing. It would be wage limitation for groups the same as we have a minimum wage fixed by law, but not wage fixing.

(h) Leave the employer free to reward good, trustworthy workers with whatever wage he feels such worker is worth to him above the maximum for the group. This to serve as an incentive for workers to give their best efforts and endeavor to improve their skill and production, and so forth.

(i) Wages for groups to be held firm from year to year and never permitted to rise for any whole group, unless all workers are given such increased wage. This to reestablish a firm value of the dollars of all.

(j) Every worker to be required to do an honest day's work, no featherbedding or standby work, and so forth. When production and profits in any business rises to where it is possible, the negotiators for the workers to negotiate a reduction in the price of the product or service which will benefit all workers and the public and retired and not upset this fair wage scale fixed by agreement between representatives of all groups.

(k) No one to be denied work because of his membership in a union or nonmembership. Employer to have full right of disciplining workers, and so forth.

Excise Tax on Theater Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about cutting the excise tax on theater tickets.

One of the most forcible approaches to this subject is an editorial that appeared in the Richmond (Calif.) Independent, under date of February 17. I commend it to my colleagues:

INEQUITABLE

There has been considerable talk, but no action, in Congress on the pros and cons of cutting out or reducing the wartime excise taxes.

And one of those taxes that certainly should be removed or sharply reduced is the 20-percent tax on theater admissions. Here is a tax that hits the little people and their cheapest form of entertainment.

The tax is unfair to the masses who find in the movies an economical means of entertainment and enlightenment. Did you ever hear of a tax burden that increased as the family grew in numbers? The vice of the theater tax is that it increases as the family increases, regardless of any increase in the family income.

The tax is discriminatory. Every theater owner in the United States is already paying all the taxes levied on business enterprises generally, together with special taxes and assessments peculiar to the theater industry.

The workingman and his family, unable to afford high cost entertainments, must depend on the movies for satisfying relaxation.

The admission tax is not a Hollywood tax—it is a tax that is paid directly by the people who purchase admission tickets to the theater. The admission tax does not reach to the fabulous salaries which until recently were blazoned in the headlines. Those salaries not only are being adjusted to meet a changed economic condition, but are reached thorugh a different form of taxation—the income tax.

A good way to make your wishes felt in the matter is to write to your Congressman and ask for his consideration when the matter is brought up for debate on the floors of Congress.

Letter of DeWitt Garrison, of Middletown, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MIDDLETOWN, N. Y., *March 7, 1950.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I have never written a letter to either of my Representatives in Congress before, and why I should vent my feelings on you will have to be categorized as kismet.

It is not my intent that this letter shall depict wrath, because I have no feelings of ill will against you or any Member of the Congress. You, like your cohorts, were elected to office by your constituency which definitely placed upon your shoulders a responsibility to do your best for us at all times. That I expect.

Because I do not know the so-called inside, I cannot clearly express an opinion on any subject. There is always more than the eye can perceive.

But I do know that I am most weary of working to support my family and having the Government, to whom by the token of being born under the Stars and Stripes I owe an allegiance, fleece my hard-earned wages from my pockets when I would much rather see it spent on the welfare of my family. Each day the increase of prices alone makes my problem of living all the more difficult without the continual increasing of my taxes.

I work for a stipulated salary. I cannot go to my employer each time a new union contract is made, and which virtually always carries an increase, either financial, gratuitous, or token, and say to him, "Mr. Boss, this group and that group of workers have just received another increase which will mean

that everything that concerns me will increase my cost of living. Will you please compensate accordingly?" In our American way of living this isn't done, because there are more unorganized individuals than there are organized. I still like the philosophy of live and let live, because the man I am working for has the same costs applicable to himself and his family.

So, these organized minority groups continue to raise the cost of my household unrestricted and without apparent regard for me or my costs, or the hardship they cause me while fighting for that increase.

Then comes the Government. It buys potatoes, eggs, and other essential commodities that I need to feed my family with my taxes. So, I have to pay twice their cost over the counter. I don't think I would object quite so much if these products were put to essential use. What does my Government do? They burn them up, throw them away, or store them in some God-forsaken spot, which is an administrative cost, and 9 out of 10 chances will be constituted as worthless within a short period of time.

What else does my Government do? It taxes me to carry out the cost of the Marshall plan, which in some measure must carry food to feed the war-torn Continent. So we buy more food. We can't ship the potatoes that were destined at the time of planting to be burned or wasted. I had to eat dehydrated potatoes and dehydrated eggs when I was fighting nazism and fascism. I would think it little encugh for these people to do the same for me now.

I have bought eggs for 15 cents a dozen. Now I pay 45 and more, and so the story goes. Can't you realize that I must now resemble a punch-drunk fighter? I feel that way, yet there appears to be no referee to stop the fight.

I have no desire for my Government to maintain or support me or my family, and yet it will not give me the resources to do my wish. I want to point with pride at my home and know that I, through hard work, made it mine. I do not want my Government to interfere with my private life, and yet each day expensive bureaus are created to do this or that for my welfare. I have the right to demand that I look after my own welfare. I do not want my Government as a silent partner in the deal. I do not mind paying for the upkeep of the White House—that is mine, too—but the house at 206 Wisner Avenue, Middletown, N. Y., has DeWitt and Lenore Garrison on the deed, and Uncle Sam is not requested. I would like to see every other red-blooded American have the spirit and the guts to do the same thing, instead of having my taxes build his house for him. This puts me in the sucker class, when my Government talks about going in the contracting business.

If I never saw a democratic government making a bunch of human souls lacking in spirit and initiative, I am seeing it now. May God rest the souls of those who fought at Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill.

My son will be college material in another 8 years. Can't you visualize what a struggle this will be, provided we continue as we are now? I do not construe this for more Federal education. I do not want red tape attached to my son's education. I still would want him to write his father about his marks and not some civil service clerk in Washington in order to determine whether his education would or would not be furthered. However, I must admit that I will be fortunate if I can feed and clothe him in 3 years under our present rate of taxation and increasing prices, brought about mainly by ever-increasing wages, except mine and a few million others like me who do not have high-salaried potentates writing the contract.

I reserve the right to instill in my son initiative and responsibility. If anyone is to spoil him or make a bum out of him, it is my prerogative, not that of his Government. It would be bad to have him despise his father, but a far worse sin to despise his Government, and yet the Government is fast trying to do me out of that, too.

You are one. But I beseech you to flail with any instrument at your command to bring about a general reduction of living costs and Government spending. I do not have to tell you what they are, for they speak for themselves. Now I have spoken and, as I have said before, I expect you through your elective office and your position in the Congress to do your utmost.

All I ask from my country is the right to live as a free man, able to assume responsibility, and activate my initiative. I do not ask that my God-given rights be slowly snatched away from me, and to be humbled by high costs and taxes which take away every opportunity that my forefathers planned for me. This is being done, and I resent it beyond words of expression.

This United States of ours was made great by men with initiative. What they made they could hold, and an all-powerful Government didn't take it away from them.

Sincerely yours,

DEWITT GARRISON.

At Least It's Worth Trying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following front-page editorial statement and a statement of mine published in an Ohio weekly newspaper, Public Opinion, Westerville, Ohio, a nonpartisan newspaper of considerable circulation, whose editor and publisher is A. M. Courtright.

The article is as follows:

IN THIS CORNER

AT LEAST IT'S WORTH TRYING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—During these days of hate between nations; indulged in and fostered mostly by the leaders of the United States and Russia, it is hard to find a high Government official in Washington that does not advocate the chip-on-the-shoulder attitude of dealing with the U. S. S. R. We are convinced that the common man in Russia doesn't want a war with the United States any more than we want a war with him. We also are convinced that there can never be a world-wide peace until the leaders of all nations realize that ordinary people aren't interested in international intrigues and designs of conquest, either physical or financial. The only true world-wide peace will come when an honest effort is made by all sides to foster brotherhood and understanding among the peoples of the world, and we believe that such a policy would succeed for the simple reason that it is hard to hate a man you know. Unfortunately, our present leaders have so blinded themselves by the get-tough policy, that they believe no proposal, no matter what merit it may have, is even worthy of consideration unless it carries us further down the arms-race road to destruction. Therefore, it is good to see the action of our Congressman-at-large, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, who sent us the following article from his office in Washington. We'd like to emphasize Mr. YOUNG'S question to President Truman and his advisers—really, what is wrong with trying to achieve peace between the Russians and ourselves by talking?—at least it couldn't be any more unsuccessful than our present policy. We wish more of our Senators and Congressmen would take up Mr. YOUNG'S suggestion.)

Worth trying

Really, what would be wrong with sending Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, of the United States Supreme Court to the Kremlin, to talk face to face with Joe Stalin and other representatives of the Russian dictatorship? Isn't anything worth trying to bring about permanent peace in this world? The Soviet Union is preparing to wage war against us. Otherwise, why its stupendous army and air force?

After all, Chief Justice Vinson served as a Member of Congress for 14 years, served as Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Federal Loan Administrator and Secretary of the Treasury. He is a skilled and experienced negotiator. If necessary, he could probably drink his share of vodka and still look Stalin in the face with a coldly appraising eye. The tremendous costs of the armament race now being waged and the dread portent of A and H bombings justify all honorable steps to maintain peace. Bear in mind the onset of World War III, if such a war should come, would be so terrible, so devastating, that in retrospect Pearl Harbor in contrast might appear no more serious than Custer's defeat, Bull Run or even a traffic accident.

Veterans' Hospitals in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call attention to a distressing situation in California that is steadily growing worse—that of the lack of hospital beds for veterans.

We made a solemn promise to the GI's that they would have free hospitalization on their return to civilian life. We must fulfill that promise. Each and every GI that needs hospital care must get it—not after a year or two of waiting—but when he or she needs it.

Last fall my distinguished colleagues, CHET HOLIFIELD and CECIL KING, arranged a meeting between the southern California congressional delegation, and representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The purpose was to gather current information on the appalling situation in California, and to coordinate efforts.

The stories they brought back to Washington were no credit to our national honor. As a result of that inquiry, our California congressional delegation has recommended immediate action to permit the Veterans' Administration to take over those Army and Navy facilities that have been closed or are to be closed in southern California.

The reasons behind the recommendation are manyfold, any one of which

would be sufficient in itself to warrant a reconsideration of our policy with respect to veterans' hospital needs in California:

First. California's veterans' needs are based on old population figures. In the 1940 census, California was fifth in national rank, with a population of approximately 6,900,000. After the 1950 census, the Census Bureau estimates that California will be officially second, with a population of approximately 10,700,000.

Second. California's population, particularly southern California's, is being increased by upwards of 10,000 every month. The Disabled American Veterans estimate that over one-third of those who come to California are veterans. Many are in immediate need of hospital treatment—especially tubercular and neuropsychiatric. Many more will have to be cared for later as the need arises, and it most surely will.

Third. The State of California is in no position to cope with an additional burden of veterans in need of hospital care. California cannot cope with those who are already awaiting treatment that is theirs by right and not by largess on our part. According to the Veterans' Administration's own figure, as of December 8, 1949, there were approximately 900 mentally-ill patients and 250–300 TB veterans awaiting admission to hospitals in our State.

In recognition of California's needs, the Veterans' Administration some time ago approved new construction. Today the delays in the completion of approved VA facilities and the canceling of others is deeply disheartening.

Because of our acute needs the Veterans' Administration entered into contracts with the Army and Navy to set aside a certain number of beds in specified service hospitals until sufficient VA facilities were available. Recently two of those service hospitals were closed, and 325 of the beds contracted for by the VA for veterans' care were lost. Another 550 beds are scheduled to be lost to veterans when two more service hospitals are closed in the near future. Their closing has thus far been delayed because of protests and acute need, but the Secretary of Defense has stated that they will definitely be closed. If the armed services no longer have need of such facilities the veterans should be given those facilities, and immediately.

Fourth. California's present unemployment situation is such that any additional financial burden could be borne by the State only with great difficulty, and with injustice to our veterans. In 1948 unemployment in California averaged almost 300,000 persons, or 6.8 percent of the California labor force. This was twice the percentage of unemployment for the Nation as a whole. In 1949, the number of men and women out of work in California increased to an average of about 417,000, or close to 9.4 percent of the California labor force. If the number of unemployed in the United States had risen throughout the country to the same high level in 1949 as it did in California we would have had in 1949 an army of unemployed made up of more than 5,800,000 people. In southern California where the veterans' needs are greatest, the growing burden of unemployment relief is most acute.

The Veterans' Administration and the country must assure our GI's the hospital and medical care that is their due regardless of politics, local economic problems, or reorganization plans.

Hour of Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches of America, which through their interdenominational relief agency, Church World Service, are conducting the campaign called One Great Hour of Sharing, are to be saluted. This is a truly Christian project; it is in keeping with the spirit of democracy; it is in keeping with the spirit of America. No doubt every American, no matter what his faith, will be glad to share in this hour.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Hour of Sharing," which appeared in the Independent Press, Bloomfield, N. J., March 10, 1950:

HOUR OF SHARING

One of the greatest blessings given human beings is the opportunity to share with others what life has to offer. We share with our parents, our sisters and brothers, our schoolmates, our husband or wife, and then in turn, with our own children. True, this is a blessing, but also it is a grave responsibility. Sharing one's joy is a delight—sharing one's sorrow is a burden; but they must go hand in hand.

Today, our brothers in Europe and Asia are undergoing, and have been since the conclusion of the war, a period of deprivation of the bare necessities of life. Not only are they desperately in need of material things; above all, they need to know that somewhere in the world there is someone who cares what happens to them. They are seeking reassurance, and it is up to those of us who are in better circumstances to do what we can to give them this reassurance. When we do this we are not really sharing their burdens, for to do that we would have to know what it is to search for loved ones who have been lost since the war. It would mean going back to see the ruins of what was once a loved home. It means all the heartbreak that war brings in its wake. All we can do is lighten the burden.

It is written in the Scripture: "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." This is little enough to do for those who wander the face of the earth and cannot find one litle niche to call their own; this is little enough to do for one who does not have a loved one with whom to share his misery, for many are alone—the lone survivors of a family.

The Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches of America, through their interdenominational relief agency, Church World Service, are conducting a campaign called one great hour of sharing. On Sunday all these churches will unite in one great effort to do their share in alleviating the desperate need which still exists in Europe and Asia. We ask that you give, and give generously, through your own church. But, above all, we ask that you go to church on Sunday morning and join with your own brethren in prayer. This participation will be magnified a hundredfold, for on that Sunday morning all the churches cooperating in the one great hour of sharing campaign will join together in prayer. Yes; sharing can be a joy, but it is surely a responsibility. How can we, as true Christians, face ourselves if we do not do our share?

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of February 11, 1950]

JIM FARLEY'S SYRACUSE SPEECH

Irrespective of politics, former Postmaster General James A. Farley is one of the country's big men, both in stature and mentality. Hence the people of Syracuse and central New York would be interested at any time in his comments and suggestions on government.

But Jim Farley's remarks before the New York State Press Association at the Hotel Syracuse last night have special interest just now, due to the fact that he is being widely boomed for the Democratic nomination for Governor this year.

What does he think of the present picture? He is disturbed by Government spending, deficit financing, and high taxes. Discussing the Hoover report, he says that the country is composed of two kinds of people—those who believe Government can support all the citizens and those who wonder whether all the citizens can support the Government.

He refers to President Truman's statement that on the basis of national growth over the last 50 years we shall have a national income of a trillion dollars 50 years hence. Yes, says Jim Farley. But if the cost of Government continues to increase at the rate of the last 50 years, the cost 50 years hence will be 6 trillion dollars or 6 times as much as the whole national income.

The lesson is obvious: we can't go on boosting the cost of Government at the 1900–50 rate without national bankruptcy. We've got to learn to control such costs, there's no alternative.

As could be expected, Jim Farley rules out partisan considerations in dealing with this issue. "It is an American issue and every true American, regardless of party, owes it to himself to study it, understand it and do something about it," he says. That is right.

And what does Jim Farley suggest good Americans do about it? He says that Congress is under so many demands for the expenditure of funds that it finds it almost impossible to resist them. What is needed, he asserts, is that Americans be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend.

He recognizes the truth of President Truman's statement that a vast amount of the present $40,000,000,000 budget is required to pay the costs resulting from past wars and the expenses of the present cold war. But he believes that there can be savings in what

is expended over and above military and foreign aid. And he thinks that it is quite possible that something could be saved on military expenses without damaging national defense. He also believes that foreign aid can be reduced to a more reasonable figure.

It hardly seems necessary for this newspaper to comment that Jim Farley's position is sound. We have on numerous occasions emphasized the imperative necessity of a closer check on Government expenditures.

But Jim Farley's Syracuse speech certainly will add noteworthy emphasis to this pertinent subject—emphasis which we hope will serve the broad and timely purpose of directing the attention of the whole American people to one of the urgent necessities of the hour.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of February 12, 1950]

WARNING BY JAMES A. FARLEY

James A. Farley is a leader in a great segment of the Democratic Party that did not accept the New Deal. His protest against reckless spending at Washington is, accordingly, of marked significance.

Speaking to members of the New York Press Association, at Hotel Syracuse Friday night, Mr. Farley said that Federal spending has grown to such vast proportions that it threatens our constitutional form of government.

"Unless we find some way of reducing the cost of Government," he said, "it will grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but also everything that we have saved and ultimately everything that we call property."

The statement would have excited little attention had it come from a Republican, but Mr. Farley still commands widespread respect in the ranks of the Democratic Party. If he feels so strongly on the subject of Federal spending, many other members of the party think the same way.

It is a warning that President Truman and his lieutenants would be wise in heeding. The defection of only a few hundred thousand voters would cost them an election.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram of March 14, 1950]

FARLEY URGES HOOVER REPORT

Speaking to the New York Press Association at Syracuse last week, James A. Farley made an urgent plea to the Empire State editors to get behind the Hoover report for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

It is generally conceded by practically everyone in both major political parties that Mr. Farley's devotion to his country and its welfare supersedes his loyalty to the Democratic Party. The former Postmaster General and national chairman has proved that to the satisfaction and admiration of most people.

Mr. Farley thinks it is the duty of every citizen to become acquainted with at least the generalities of the Hoover report, which can be done by reading the numerous condensed reports which appear in the newspapers. The entire report contains 18 enormous volumes, written after nearly 2 years of exhaustive research into Government operations. The average man won't ever see it, but he can familiarize himself with the essential changes urged by the former President.

Mr. Farley says there are two kinds of people in this country. There are those who believe the Government can support all the citizens. The others, and Mr. Farley is in this group, wonder whether all the citizens can support the Government.

Some of his observations, based on experience and knowledge, are a little frightening. Mr. Truman in January said that on the basis of this country's growth in the last 50 years, we would have a national income of a trillion dollars, 50 years ahead. Mr. Farley has no doubt about the President's figures or expectations, but he looks ahead in another way. If we take the cost of Government in 1900 and compare it with costs in 1950, our Government will cost $6,000,000,000,000. And on that basis we would have 20,000,000 Government employees.

This is only one of numerous dangers ahead, unless we find a way to cut the costs so that the Government will not consume everything that we all earn, everything that we have saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us.

The Hoover report is not political. It seeks to solve an American problem, and Mr. Farley sees the report as the one constructive offering made toward that direction. "What is needed," he told the editors, "is that Americans be organized to put as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend." In this, every American should lend a hand, to get all of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission enacted into law.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 11, 1950]

A REDUCING DIET FOR UNCLE SAM

James A. Farley, who knows a thing or two about the art of getting things done in politics, offered some practical counsel Friday night on both the necessity to reduce the fantastic cost of Government, and the ways and means to achieve it. The occasion was a meeting of the New York Press Association in Syracuse, and his treatment of the subject was nonpartisan: A Frank Review of the Hoover Report. But his advice concerned much more than the excellent recommendations for administrative reform detailed in that report. The gist of it is that if big government is not going to overwhelm us, Americans must be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as the various pressure groups have put on it to spend.

The National Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, with its subcommittees in nearly every State and locality, represents a highly impressive beginning in that direction, Mr. Farley says. But the kind of economy crusade he has in mind can't stop with administrative reform, as does the Hoover report. It was not that Commission's function to pass on the wisdom or unwisdom of any Federal activity, but only to suggest improvements in administration.

If all the Hoover recommendations were adopted at once, as the former Democratic national chairman noted, the savings would come to more than $3,000,000,000. But it is well to remember that this would still have us with a $2,000,000,000 deficit. To check the constant upward trend of spending, something more than administrative reform is needed—specifically: a determination in Congress, based on an unmistakable public demand, to stand firm against nonessential appropriations.

This, Mr. Farley insisted, is a national necessity and there is nothing partisan in it. "I have had enough experience in the National Government," he remarked, "to know that in the scramble for congressional appropriations we cannot distinguish the energy of a Republican from that of a Democrat * * * We have got to have men in Congress who look to the need for a sound national economy * * * and a little less concern for what certain communities and particular departments are demanding." But to achieve that requires an organized, articulate voice of economy that speaks as loudly on all occasions as does the pressure-group voice for spending. "We must reduce our cost of Government," says Mr. Farley, "and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process." Active support for the Hoover Commission's crusade for competence is a good place for responsible citizens to start showing that they mean business in that endeavor.

Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, Senators are carefully watching their mail these days for the little hint that will let them know how their constituents want them to vote on the natural gas bill S. 1498. This bill if passed will increase the gas bills in every major city to people using natural gas to heat their home and to those using this type of fuel for industries. It can mean an increase anywhere from 1 cent to 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

I have voted against this bill H. R. 1758 when it was presented to the House. At that time I stated that the mayor and the Buffalo City Council were opposed to this type of bill.

Under this proposed bill, if Federal regulation were lifted, gas users would be forced to pay millions more for the privilege of using natural gas. This money would be paid by the household users and industries and all these millions would go to the coffers of a group of powerful companies, already recognized for their enormous profits of the past.

This is a struggle between the people and a handful of wealthy oil companies.

From statistics furnished by the Federal Power Commission, New York State consumers, at a 5 cents per 1,000-cubic-foot increase, would pay to these utilities approximately $1,500,000 a year more.

Natural-gas interests want to take from the Federal Power Commission the power to regulate the initial sale of gas from the producer to the pipe-line company. Then all rates could be determined by the prices the big concerns decide to charge in the field.

Twenty-four million consumers used natural gas last year. Thirty-eight companies produced 86 percent of gas over the pipe lines. In casting my vote against this bill I was voting for the interest of 24,000,000 Americans.

The United States Conference of Mayors is fighting this legislation. They know what it will mean to the gas bills of the people in the large cities.

This bill can still be defeated in the Senate and should be for the protection of the people who use gas for heating their homes.

The Mo Pac Moves Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of February 22, 1950, entitled "The Mo Pac Moves Ahead," which discusses the use of radio on the Nation's railroads as a safety measure.

We are proud to note that the Missouri Pacific Railroad, which is the worthy successor to the first railroad west of the Mississippi River, is availing itself of the many advantages of train radio. They have found it practicable and are moving for even greater use of this device

The editorial follows:

THE MO PAC MOVES AHEAD

Progress among the Nation's railroads in availing themselves of the many advantages of train radio comes distressingly slow. But it does come. Now Missouri Pacific Lines trustees reveal they are going in for expanded use of this device.

For 2 years the Mo Pac has been testing train radio on freights running between Alexandria, La., and McGehee, Ark. The experiments have been so successful that the road now proposes to spend more than $164,000 this year in putting the equipment on other freights.

Consistently this has proved to be the experience wherever the equipment has been tried. The benefits in both efficiency of operation and in heightened safety have shown the expense of installation to be well justified. It is difficult to understand why the railroads have been so slow in availing themselves of this aid to progress.

Only Monday, for instance, the Star-Times pointed out that train radio on the Long Island Railroad might have avoided Friday's tragic wreck. Now the road will have to pay much more in replacing equipment and settling damage claims than it would ever have had to pay for the radio.

Somehow, though, resistance to this obvious safety device looms big. Even on the Mo Pac now there are no plans to install radios on passenger trains at present, though the need is every bit as urgent there.

But at least the Missouri Pacific moves in the right direction. It's a direction in which all railroads will have to move if they want to show proper concern for safety. They'd do well to move early rather than late.

Look to Yourself, Dean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune on March 10, 1950, wrote the following interesting editorial on the activities of our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The editorial is as follows:

LOOK TO YOURSELF, DEAN

A call upon American men and women to join with their Government in a concerted effort to defeat Russia's plans for world domination was issued Thursday by Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

This, of course, amounts just to so many words. Perhaps Mr. Acheson means that this country should prepare to fight slavery abroad by instituting it here, through Government regulations. We cannot be sure, from his statement.

He speaks about the dangers of communism, and the threat of Russia. These things the American people know. They appear to be ready to fight communism in the American way.

We are not so sure the State Department and the administration are similarly prepared.

For example, Thursday, upon recommendation of the State Department and the Justice Department, a New York court which had convicted Judith Coplon and Soviet Diplomat Valentin A. Gubitchev, suspended the sentence imposed upon the Russian.

Miss Coplon was sent to prison for 15 years. Gubitchev got the same sentence. Then, because of the State Department's request, the court, with what seemed some reluctance, told Gubitchev he would be freed at once provided he left this country forever.

The State Department spokesman said this country doesn't want to risk prejudicing the situation of Americans now in eastern Europe.

That appears to be a strange situation to adopt, in view of Mr. Acheson's call upon the people for support.

Recently, an American, Mr. Robert Vogeler, was sentenced to 15 years in a Hungarian prison, by a Communist court, on charges of being an American spy. Our official envoys have been forced out of Bulgaria, and Americans have been imprisoned, tortured, and generally persecuted by Communist police and officials in Europe, and in Red China.

Now, for the only Red spy convicted in this country, the State Department asks freedom.

This is the kind of appeasement of which the Russians take full advantage. They have taken advantage of American appeasement ever since the days American armed forces were withheld from Berlin to permit the Russians to enter.

Despite our windy stand against communism at home, and our brainless charges issued by some Congressmen and Senators who toss accusations right and left, our Government has shown a consistent attitude of appeasement toward Russia.

And Russia has been steadily advancing because of it.

The most powerful, the most effective way to fight communism is being ignored by Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman, and by the Congress, for that matter.

Every time Congress and the administration approve laws restricting freedom in America, every time they impose new tax burdens upon this free people they restrict liberty in America, they narrow the range of Americanism, and they weaken the greatest free country in the world.

How can we combat slavery abroad unless we guard our liberty at home?

It is ridiculous to suppose that the Government can tax and regulate Americans into a state of Federal servitude, and then expect effective support in the cold war against Soviet communism.

The greatest help the Communists can get is a short-sighted Government in Washington which drives America $15,000,000 deeper into debt every day, and which forces our people to work from 1 to 2 months a year to pay taxes, which seeks new methods of regulation, which plays favorites to groups which flout the law * * * as in the recent coal strike * * * and which generally ignores the basic strength of America * * * our freedom, our will to work, and to produce.

Mr. Acheson directs his appeal in the wrong direction.

His appeals should go not to the people, but to the White House, the State Department, and the Capitol.

Will Farley Go to Albany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, February 28, 1950:

HEFFERNAN SAYS
WILL FARLEY GO TO ALBANY?

One of the ablest political figures of Brooklyn and this commentator were discussing Jim Farley recently.

Is he a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the governorship, consciously seeking the nomination, or is his astonishing popularity carrying him along to that honor whether he wants it or not?

For there is small doubt that the man who backed the young country squire of Hyde Park and outplayed Al Smith at the game of which Al Smith was a master, has a greater grip on the rank-and-file of voters today than he had when he was the chief dispenser of patronage under the Presidency of Mr. Roosevelt. This has been evidenced at any public gathering of either party where he has been a guest or where his name is mentioned.

"Watch him," said the political leader with whom I was chatting. "He is coming along very rapidly."

"But," I said, "his Syracuse speech was neither an angling for Democratic votes nor a bid for the favor of the Democratic leaders of the Nation and State."

"That's Farley!" said my friend. "He can say with complete frankness what is in his mind and get away with it.

"It would not surprise me at all if the wave of affection and esteem that sweeps every gathering at which he appears would sweep the Democratic State Convention and drop the nomination in Jim Farley's lap, no matter what may be in the minds of Paul Fitzpatrick and other State and local leaders. You have not forgotten, have you, how ALBEN BARKLEY was nominated for the Vice Presidency at Philadelphia?"

That set me thinking. There are several reasons why James F. Byrnes might criticize the administration's fiscal policy and excite the irascibility of President Truman, and Jim Farley could touch on the same topic and leave the President undisturbed. One is the Dixiecrat movement in the South, of which Byrnes is now a leader. Another is that when the northeastern leaders were calling in panic for Eisenhower or Douglas, there were two noted Democratic leaders, and TWO only, in this neck of the woods,

who were for Truman, certain that he could be nominated and certain he could be elected. They were Jim Farley and John Cashmore.

Almost on the heels of his Syracuse address, at the recent Washington Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, Jim Farley said to Mr. Truman, "It isn't wise to hold these in an armory. If you are in with the committee of arrangements, you can get a seat where you can hear and enjoy the speeches. But otherwise you are out in right, left, or center field, and you just have a lot of disorder."

And Mr. Truman replied, "You are perfectly right, Jim. And while I am President, we'll never have another affair like this."

It wouldn't be beyond the possibilities that, with Farley for Governor and LEHMAN for Senator, Mr. Truman, who wants a strong Democratic leadership in this State, would be in Jim Farley's corner.

Postage Requirements on Farmers' Checks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the ruling that dairy plants must pay postage on the returns to farmers has been an issue for many years. I include a letter from a constituent and the answer by the Post Office Department as to the rulings on this question. The request is as follows:

MAPLEWOOD HOTEL,
Green Lake, Wis., February 15, 1950.

The Honorable REID MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REID: You doubtless realize that it is these unimportant things, as a rule, that make people the maddest. A goodly number of your constituents, myself included, are thoroughly "het up" over the following situation.

We are sending our milk to the local creamery. The cream hauler is employed by the creamery and is paid a fixed price per hundred for hauling. I am not perfectly certain of the following but it is substantially correct. The price paid this hauler is 20 cents per 100 pounds. Of this 20 cents, 15 cents is deducted from our milk check and appears on our statement from the creamery as a deduction for hauling. The habit is, and has been for the past 40 years, that twice monthly when our check is due from the creamery, the hauler on the first and fifteenth of the month, when he picks up your milk leaves the creamery check and statement for the money due for previous deliveries. The postal department had an "agent" here, investigated the situation, and compelled the creamery company to put a 3-cent stamp on the letter containing the check and mark it canceled.

As I said in the beginning, this is not an extremely important matter but we can't understand why our employee—or the person whose salary we principally pay—cannot bring us our check from the creamery without paying tribute to the postal department for a service they have not rendered. Any information you can elucidate will be appreciated. So far, all we can get from the post office is, "Them are our orders."

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,

V. S. KUTCHIN.

The answer is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: This will reply to your letter of March 2, 1950, regarding an inquiry of one of your constituents relating to the payment of postage on checks delivered outside the mails.

Your constituent states that he sends milk to a local creamery and it is transported by a hauler employed by the creamery. He further states that the hauler delivers a check from the creamery twice each month and that a postal inspector now requires the creamery to put a 3-cent stamp on the letter containing the check and to mark it "canceled." You ask whether or not it is necessary for the creamery company to pay postage for the delivery of milk checks in this manner.

Your inquiry relates to the private express statutes (title 18, U. S. C. 1694–1697; 39 U. S. C. 500), which confer on the Post Office Department a monopoly in the transportation of letters for others over post roads. Bank checks in their ordinary form containing only the names of the drawer, payee, bank upon which drawn, amount of money and date of issue, are not letters within the meaning of the private express statutes, and may, therefore, be conveyed by contract carriers without violating the private express statutes. On the other hand, checks which show upon their face or by stubs attached to them such information as the weight of milk, quality, price, butterfat content, and test, deductions for hauling, and the like, are considered letters within the meaning of the private express statutes. As a general rule, such letters may not be conveyed by third persons such as contract haulers outside the mails unless the conditions of title 39, U. S. C., section 500, are complied with. That statute requires, as a condition to the transportation of letters outside the mails, among other things the payment of the same postage as would have been paid had the letters been sent through the mails.

Inasmuch as the postal monopoly does not extend to articles other than letters, there is no requirement that postage by paid on butter transported outside the mails.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, just exactly how this ruling squares with the distribution of nonagricultural literature it may be difficult to fathom. It appears to me that the ruling is rather far fetched to say the least.

Address of Hon. P. H. McEachin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting to the House a copy of a speech made by my fellow townsman and friend, Senator P. H. McEachin, of Florence, S. C.

Senator McEachin was selected to represent the State of South Carolina at the sesquicentennial exercises commemorating South Carolina's admittance to the Union. The sesquicentennial is honoring each of the Original Thirteen States as they were admitted to the Union. South Carolina was No. 8 of the Thirteen Original States to enter the Union, and we were delighted to hear Senator McEachin's presentation of some of South Carolina's rich and glorious history.

I sincerely hope that every Member of Congress will take a few minutes to read the brief remarks of Senator McEachin giving valuable information as to the leading part taken by South Carolina in the formation of the Union.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina, I want to express our deep appreciation for the honor bestowed upon us by the dedication of these sesquicentennial exercises to our State, of whose record we are so proud, and to which we are so ardently devoted.

South Carolina's importance in the making of the new Nation over which this Federal Capital was to preside can hardly be said to have been excelled by that of any other. For more than a hundred years before Washington was established South Carolina had borne the principal burdens of defending the southern frontier against the encroachments of Spain and France, thus holding a vast territory that later became part of the United States. In the movement leading to the separation of the Thirteen Colonies from England, South Carolina was the first to embody the new principles of self government in a thorough and complete constitution. In the long war that followed no other State was called upon to make greater sacrifices of life and property. The very mention of such names as Rutledge, Gadsden, Hayne, Laurens, Jasper, Moultrie, Sumter, and Marion bears witness to the extent and worth of these sacrifices.

South Carolina was no less interested in the new Federal system than she had been in the war that made the Union possible. To the Federal Convention of 1787 they sent John Rutledge, Pierce Butler, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, and Charles Pinckney. Each contributed in some important way to the drafting of the Constitution. It is now admitted, after much controversy, that Charles Pinckney laid before that Convention a plan which anticipated a greater number of the provisions of the finished Constitution than did any other. I cannot resist calling attention to one of these provisions, which concerned the establishment of the Federal Capital. It was Charles Pinckney, I am proud to say, who first proposed article I, section 8, paragraph 17, of the Constitution, which is now the basic law of the District of Columbia and the city of Washington.

I think Pinckney was influenced in this by the fact that South Carolina, a few months before, had decided to transfer its capital from Charleston to a spot near the center of the State. In the procedure the State followed there are striking similarities to the procedure used in arrangements for the Federal Capital. In both cases the site selected was in open country, not in a populous town. In both cases the name of Washington was proposed for the new city. South Carolina did not choose that name, but it is interesting to note that the name it did choose, Columbia, was later given to the Federal District around Washington. Finally, I should also point out that the architect who designed the South Carolina State House, James Hoban, later drew plans for the White House and other buildings in Washington.

Such were the ties between the State of South Carolina and the early history of the Federal Capital. They were surface ties, it is true, but they were indicative of the deeper bonds of devotion to the great dream of a Federal republic in which men could be equal and free under a system of government the world had never known before.

Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, on March 7, 1950, published on its editorial page a guest editorial by the Governor of Oregon, the Honorable Douglas McKay, entitled "Good Government." This is a timely and excellent discussion of this most important subject and worthy of wide circulation. I am including the editorial as part of these remarks:

GOOD GOVERNMENT

(By Douglas McKay, Governor of Oregon)

The strength of any country lies not in its treasury statements but in the national character of its people.

It shall profit a man nothing to acquire possessions, knowledge, and power if the barter involves the loss of freedoms in which those gains are rooted. If freedom is to produce security as well as the bountiful life, then its sources must be continuously nourished by sacrifice, devotion, and service.

Democracy is a two-way street, and with its benefits comes the necessity of expending time and effort, intelligently and often unsparingly. Hence, it has been proved many times over that self-government is not a gift on which men may grow fat and indulgent.

Rather, self-government is an instrument by which men can—if they have the wisdom—safeguard their individual liberty and employ that liberty in their quest of happiness and fair regards for their labor, ingenuity, and intellect.

Since self-government is an instrument which demands unceasingly the services, the energies and the participation of those who benefit by it, it is weighted as heavily with obligations as it is with privileges.

Delegation of authority to subordinates is a custom of business, serving, as it does, to facilitate business growth and expansion. But the enthusiasm, alertness, and interest of the high company executive are not delegated along with these segments of authority.

In the matter of self-government, too many of us have, I fear, delegated too much of the responsibility and initiative that are directly our own. Instead of blaming ourselves for some governmental trend not to our liking, we complain to politicians and bureaucrats.

We find an increasing tendency to turn to the Government with our grievances—our economic troubles, especially. There is an alarming tendency to look for security rather than opportunity, and, by importuning the Government, we are encouraging both economic and poltical dangers.

Once we make a crutch of the Government, we are on our way to becoming political cripples. Overdependency on government moves us toward enslavement.

Too many of us are 100-percent Americans by creed but only 10-percent Americans by our daily life, with its neglect and indifference to our duties of citizenship.

There must be a rebirth in the hearts of our citizens—a rekindling of our appreciation of certain mandatory fundamentals. Our basis of free enterprise involves a priceless but really elemental formula which, in 175 years has made America the richest country in the world with the widest distribution of wealth.

This we must recognize. We must recognize, too, that conditions have changed us from a pioneering individualistic people to a highly organized industrial people. And, finally, we must appraise these changes and provide security along with opportunity.

The place to start a resurgence of our allegiance to the precepts that must not fail is right here at home. Oregon has always ranked high in patriotic endeavor. Oregon has become accustomed to good government over a long period of years. Its political climate would be conducive to a revival so sincerely conceived and comprehensively executed as to invite emulation everywhere.

Oregon's government—no government—is so good that it cannot be made better through the citizens' investment of their loyalty and energies in its operation. They should actively engage themselves in insuring the selection of sound individuals to the ranks of the precinct committeewomen and committeemen and to responsible positions with the county and State party organizations. They should see to it that only the very best aspirants become candidates for school-district offices, city councils, and county and State governmental capacities.

Good government obligates us to take an aggressive part in its workings and charges us incessantly to be mindful that freedom is not free.

Miss Ruth Cowan, Noted War Correspondent, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, the Department of the Army awarded a certificate of appreciation to Miss Ruth Cowan, one of the distinguished members of the press and who covers both branches in Congress.

Miss Cowan, who is affiliated with the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press and a noted World War II correspondent, was among a group of three persons who were commended for their objective, factual, and patriotic reporting of matters pertainng to the Department of the Army.

A copy of the certificate of appreciation follows:

CITATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Miss Ruth Cowan, for outstanding patriotic service to the Department of the Army. Through war years while serving as an accredited correspondent with our combat forces in overseas theaters of operations and in the critical postwar years as a news correspondent covering army news developments while assigned to the Military Establishment in the Pentagon Miss Cowan has demonstrated outstanding ability as a journalist and as an American citizen. Her work has been conspicuous by her objective, factual, and patriotic reporting of matters pertaining to the Department of the Army and national security. The American public along with the Army has benefited from her interest, her industry and her devotion to the best interests of our Nation. Her valuable services to the American public, the Associated Press, and to the Army have been in the best traditions of democracy and the inalienable rights of our free press and merits the recognition of her fellow citizens and the thanks and appreciation of the Department of the Army.

Status of Sale of Coal and Asphalt Lands of Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, for the information of the House, I include the following release issued by the Department of the Interior:

Persons now holding coal leases and permits on the 400,000 acres of Oklahoma lands, purchased recently by the Government from the Choctaw-Chickasaw Indian tribes, will be given preference rights in the leasing of deposits, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman announced today. The tribes received $8,500,000 from the Federal Government for the lands.

Applications for a preference right lease with respect to leases or permits expiring by January 1, 1951, must be filed with the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Washington 25, D. C., before that date. In addition, the Secretary's order allows holders of leases expiring after January 1, 1951, to obtain a new lease on these Oklahoma lands noncompetitively if they file within 90 days prior to the expiration of the current leases. The leases will be issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

The transfer of this large area to the Government has raised problems regarding rights and privileges of surface users which probably can be solved only by additional legislation. Persons who have been using the surface legitimately will be permitted to continue such use until some method is worked out to protect their interests. They may continue to occupy the lands on the terms of their present occupancy making payments as heretofore, until further notice, it was said.

Legislative history shows that the Government through this purchase of coal and asphalt-bearing lands in 14 Oklahoma counties is fulfilling a 50-year-ago promise made to the Indian tribes under the Atoka treaty signed in 1898, and providing for the management of these lands by the Federal Government in trust for the Indians. By an act of 1902, ratifying the Atoka agreement, the Government through a commission, agreed to sell certain described coal and asphalt lands, totaling over 400,000 acres. The act expressed the intent that these lands would be sold in 3 years. Apparently no sales were made prior to 1918, and a sale in that year resulted in few bids received. At various times, some 50,000 acres, approximately, were sold. In the meantime discussions were held relative to purchase of the lands by the Federal Government in an effort to settle the claim of the Indians for the Government to fulfill treaty stipulations with respect to selling the coal and asphalt deposits. Appraisals for such purpose were made which ranged from $5,000,000 to $34,000,000.

The Department Appropriation Act of June 28, 1944 contained the authorization for Federal purchase of these lands from the Indians. It provided for disposition of coal and asphalt under lease. Although it specifically mentioned "land," no provision was made for sale, lease, or other disposition of the surface rights to this land. Under this act, a contract was negotiated and signed October 8, 1947. It provided for purchase of "lands and mineral deposits" for a price of $8,500,000. This contract was ratified by members of the two Indian tribes and the

Congress. By the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1949, signed May 24, 1949, funds were appropriated to buy these lands. Actual transfer of title has not yet taken place but will be done so as soon as necessary deeds are prepared.

The coal lands are in LeFlore, Haskell, Latimer, Pittsburg, Atoka, Coal, Muskogee and Sequoyah counties. The asphalt lands lie in Johnson, Pontotoc, Carter, Jefferson, Pushmataha, and Murray counties. About 65,000 people reside in the area.

The lands are in the process of being reconveyed to the Government for administration by the Bureau of Land Management under public land laws.

They extend from the Arkansas line west for more than 100 miles and in a north-south direction for more than 60 miles. Although there are numerous towns located on the lands, there has in the past been no provision for public dedication of rights-of-way for telephone lines, sewer lines, or telegraph lines. Also, there are many town lots for which in the past only permission to use has been granted by the Indian Nations. The problem is further complicated, since leases or permits for occupancy have been given in the past for various types of surface uses including agricultural, grazing, industrial, and other purposes.

One of the first requirements for proper administration will be the examination and classification of the lands to determine their status with regard to outstanding leases, extent and appraisal of trespass damages and the highest use suitability and best management of their surface resources. This will be done as soon as possible after title to the lands has actually been transferred, Director Marion Clawson of the Bureau of Land Management said.

Purchasing Power Is Real Measure of Dollar Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, time and again sincere efforts have been made to demonstrate the incontestable fact that purchasing power and not face value is the proper measure of the real value of our dollar, or any other monetary unit.

Seldom, however, have I seen this fact stated more clearly and in more understandable language than in an article by Mr. Herman A. Lowe captioned "Income of $10,000 by A. D. 2000 may turn out to be a mirage," which appeared in the March 11, 1950, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

It is my hope that this article will be read and given your fullest consideration. Mr. Lowe has pointed out with clarity that the 1949 dollar would not purchase any more goods or services than 59 cents would have bought only 10 years earlier. I especially direct your attention to his statement, "And pity the poor guy trying to live on a fixed pension or an annuity for which he scraped and saved during many years."

All of us should most seriously ponder the question, What will our dollar be worth in purchasing power next year, or in 1960, or in the year 2000, if we permit inflation to go on unchecked?

As an extension of my remarks I include the full text of Mr. Lowe's article, which follows:

INCOME OF $10,000 BY A. D. 2000 MAY TURN OUT TO BE A MIRAGE

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—When President Truman sounded off sometime back about a brave new world in the year 2000, when the average American worker would earn $10,000 a year, the question naturally arose, "What will a dollar buy 50 years hence?"

Today, it is buying less than at any time in our history. Thus, while most people are earning more dollars than before, they often have less genuine purchasing power. The American dollar is the most stable currency in the world but, under the microscope of time, our buck assays part rubber.

A dollar of the year 2000, for example, may very easily be worth only 30 or 35 cents of even the inflation-depreciated 1950 dollar.

The purchasing value of our dollar expands and contracts from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year. It goes up and it comes down; but over the long haul, the trend is downward.

A table recently compiled, and based on Government statistics, shows the picture in black and white. It has set up the dollar of January 1939 as worth 100 percent, or 100 cents. Then it has figured out the consumer purchasing value of the dollar for every year from 1820 through 1949, against the yardstick of that January 1939 basic dollar.

Working from January 1939, when a dollar was worth a full 100 cents, up to the present, the picture is one of steady decline in purchasing value.

In 1940, the dollar could buy 99.4 percent as much. By 1942, despite the wartime freezes and stability program, a dollar could get you only as much as 85.4 cents of that 1939 dollar. In 1945, your dollar would purchase only as much as 78½ cents would have bought in January 1939.

Then the war ended. Controls began to go off. Labor struck for higher wages and industry began to pour out vast quantities of new goods to fill the demands which had been accumulating for 5 years.

But that did not correct anything. Inflation really moved in. The 1946 dollar bought only 73.5 percent as much as the 1939 dollar. The 1948 dollar bought only 61.1 percent as much as the 1939 dollar.

Last year, in 1949, our dollar hit rock bottom as a purchasing unit. You could not buy any more goods with it than you could buy with 59 cents in the year 1939. That, brother, is inflation. The fellow who can pressure his wages higher by strike or other means may be as well off as he was in 1939.

But millions of Americans have not been able to do that. Financially they are much worse off today than they were in 1939, even though they have obtained some increases in their income. And pity the poor guy trying to live on a fixed pension or an annuity for which he scraped and saved during many years.

Now, about that pot of gold at the end of the rainbow in the year 2000 when everybody, according to President Truman, may be taking down $10,000 a year. What has happened to the value of the dollar in the last 50 years?

In 1949, the dollar could buy only 59.1 percent as much as the 1939 dollar.

In 1899, the dollar could buy 186.6 percent as much as the 1939 dollar.

That means that, so far as real buying value is concerned, a 1949 dollar was worth less than one-third of an 1899 dollar.

That is what can happen to money in 50 years.

It is what did happen to our Rock-of-Gibraltar dollar in the past 50 years. Even Mr. Truman does not guarantee that nothing like that will happen in the next 50 years.

Suppose it should happen again, then the technicolor, vote-getting vision of $10,000 in every workman's pay envolope in the year 2000, actually boils down to a little less than $3,300 of even the depreciated 1949 dollars for the average worker.

This then is the bright future held out for the American worker if he will permit his Government to continue its inflationary policy of deficit financing and of gambling that things will get better by and by.

It seems like a pretty thin heritage to leave to one's children for the privilege of being tickled with a gaily colored feather.

Heart Trouble Needn't Get You Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ted McDowell entitled "Heart Trouble Needn't Get You Down," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, February 27, 1950:

HEART TROUBLE NEEDN'T GET YOU DOWN

(By Ted McDowell)

A program is under way to give heart disease sufferers something to do besides lie in bed and take digitalis.

Instead of remaining idle, a cardiac patient can make use of several programs designed, first, to keep his mind occupied and, later on, to train him for a nonstrenuous job.

These programs are what authorities call rehabilitation programs. They include occupational and physical therapy and vocational training. They are conducted by the district rehabilitation service, in cooperation with the Washington Heart Association.

Rehabilitation authorities are trying to let heart patients know about these programs. But they are having difficulties. They say the main trouble is that many doctors prescribe heart regulatory drugs and rest, but forget that inactivity, in itself, can be as harmful as heart trouble.

Officials of the rehabilitation service want doctors to tell patients about the programs. In this way, they say, all heart sufferers could be reached as soon as their ailment is diagnosed.

They are pushing for coordination between physicians and rehabilitation agencies, and have enlisted the aid of several prominent heart specialists and physical therapists here.

Suppose an active man is stricken with a heart attack. He is confined to bed for a number of weeks. Instead of lying idle and feeling sorry for himself, he can contact the Rehabilitation Service, a Federal Security Agency organization. This will set in motion a series of services ranging from massages to training in the making of dental plates.

All these services except physical therapy are automatically free. And if the patient cannot pay for the latter, the Rehabilitation Service will finance that treatment, too.

Throughout the process, the Service assigns a counselor to guide the patient, and the Heart Association provides him with an occupational therapist.

There is an old saying that "an egg gets rotten just sitting around." Activity is needed

for mental and physical well-being. The Rehabilitation Service can provide that necessary activity for a patient. For instance, take the case of the stricken truck driver who is used to heavy physical work.

While in bed, he can occupy his mind by tooling leather wallets, making jewelry and doing other craft work. This is occupational therapy. If physical therapy such as massage is indicated, it can be conducted concurrently.

Later, of course, he will want to get to work again. Truck driving is out. What next? He needs a job that will not tax his heart. This is where vocational training comes in.

The first step is to test him for aptitude. There are many jobs he could train for: X-ray work, perhaps. Tests may show the patient has great manual dexterity; maybe watch repair work is the answer. If the patient agrees, the rehabilitation service will contact a watch repair school, make arrangements for the man's training and pay for it.

After completion of training, the former truck driver has a job which will not tax his heart dangerously. Instead of being a burden on the community, he is gainfully employed. For the financially minded, it should be noted, he will be providing revenue through income taxes instead of living off relief funds.

"No better investment can be made than to put money in this program," Representative Kee, Democrat, of West Virginia, stated during recent congressional hearings on District appropriations.

The objectives of this program are summed up in a statement by David M. Amato, Director of the Bureau of Rehabilitation: "The majority of people suffering from heart ailments have many years of activity ahead of them. Our aim is to fit them for these years."

Labor Is Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to approach labor legislation and rulings on the basis of all labor, I have always tried to obtain the following facts. With this in mind, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Maurice Tobin, Secretary of Labor:

FEBRUARY 13, 1950.

Hon. MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY TOBIN: I noted in the press that under the Walsh-Healey Act you placed a 95-cents-per-hour wage for soap purchased by the United States.

Under the same legislative act, have you the authority to fix a wage rate in the field of agriculture on the same basis? Can you insist on a wage rate in the production and processing of agricultural products purchased by the Federal Government?

Under the Sugar Act a minimum wage has been placed on agricultural labor of as low as 25 cents to 32 cents per hour by the Secretary of Agriculture, although I do not believe by the present Secretary.

I believe you feel that labor is labor and that all labor is entitled to equal or comparable wage protection and would appreciate a letter from you on this important subject.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

On March 2, 1950, I received the following reply:

[Walsh-Healey public contracts, Public, No. 846, 74th Cong. Rulings and Interpretations No. 3]

MARCH 2, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: I have your letter of February 13, 1950, inquiring whether the Secretary of Labor has authority under the Walsh-Healey Act to fix minimum wage rates for the production and processing of agricultural products purchased by the Federal Government.

I am enclosing a copy of Rulings and Interpretations No. 3 issued pursuant to the Walsh-Healey Act, which is printed therein on pages 47–52. This act contains no authorization for the fixing of minimum wages; but section 1 (b) does authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine what actually are the prevailing minimum wages being paid in each industry receiving Government contracts, and this section prohibits payment of less than such wage rates on Government contract work. You will note that section 9 of the act on page 51 contains an exemption for perishables and for agricultural or farm products processed for first sale by the original producers, as well as an exemption for contracts made by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purchase of agricultural commodities or the products thereof. This language is interpreted in considerable detail in sections 9 through 12 of the Rulings and Interpretations on pages 5–9.

Although the growing and harvesting of agricultural products processed for first sale by the original producers are thus exempted by the act, some processing of agricultural commodities or the products thereof is not exempt. The wage determination for the evaporated-milk industry is the only one which has to date been issued for industries processing agricultural commodities or the products thereof. It is my intention to make determinations for all manufacturing industries which receive a considerable amount of Government contracts as soon as our facilities permit, including industries processing agricultural products.

Of course, you are aware that the proposals in H. R. 2033 and in H. R. 3190, as introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, to extend the minimum wage protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees on large industrialized farms were not included in the bill H. R. 3190 as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor for the reasons stated on page 24 of House Report No. 267, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Yours very truly,

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor.

This gives a satisfactory picture of the present situation. The agricultural support program provides some 50 to 60 cents hourly wage return on most agricultural products, though winter wheat has shown in the study a higher labor return. My contention is that the provisions of the Walsh-Healy Act should apply to labor involved in producing agricultural products purchased by the Government.

This position has already been taken in the Government purchase of evaporated milk, and as Mr. Tobin's letter states:

It is my intention to make determinations for all manufacturing industries which receive a considerable amount of Government contracts as soon as our facilities permit, including industries processing agricultural products.

If the Government buys soap on the basis of a minimum wage of 95 cents per hour, why should sugar be purchased by the Government on this basis of a minimum wage of 25 to 32 cents per hour?

New Jersey Scholar Solves Baffling Literary Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the identification of the author of the famous Letters of Junius has been a question that has puzzled the most noted literary scholars of Great Britain and America for more than a century and a half. The authorship of these letters has from time to time been attributed to famous men in the English literary and political world.

Dr. Francesco Cordasco, of West New York, N. J., associate professor of English at Long Island University, is now reputed to have made convincing demonstration of the real author of the letters. And pertinent to this discovery is the appended newspaper article from the Jersey Journal:

PROFESSOR SOLVES IDENTITY OF JUNIUS, OF REVOLUTION

What is considered one of the most important literary discoveries in years and which will change impressions of the American Revolution has been made by Dr. Francesco Cordasco, of 6606 Jackson Street, West New York. Dr. Cordasco, associate professor of English at Long Island University, has solved a mystery that had baffled historians more than 150 years—the identity of the eighteenth-century firebrand, "Junius," whose letters did so much toward inciting the Revolution.

"Junius is now known to have been a Scotsman named Laughlin MacLeane, a one-time regimental surgeon with the British Army who fought here in the French and Indian Wars and who had lived in Philadelphia and New York. His letters on the Revolution, however, were written in Europe and published in the Public Advertiser, a London newspaper, during 1769–71. The letters were of incalculable importance to the American revolutionaries in the late 1760's, according to Dr. Cordasco. They influenced Thomas Payne so much that he signed himself once as "Junius Junior," Dr. Cordasco said, and there is no doubt the letters engendered the spirit of revolt among the American colonists.

FIVE-YEAR SEARCH

Found by Dr. Cordasco last June after a 5-year search, papers identifying the author of the Junius letters were traced to a home in Glasgow, Scotland, where those who had them in their possession were unaware of their significance and importance.

MacLeane also was the private secretary of the Earl of Shelburne, friend of William Pitt. It was this latter connection that led Dr. Cordasco to the discovery.

"The Earl said he would identify Junius before his death," the professor declared, "but he died 3 weeks after making the promise. It was assumed the secret had never

been committed to paper, but I felt sure the Earl had made a note of it somewhere."

The Earl's library was disbanded and sold after the owner's death in 1805, and for 5 years Dr. Cordasco traced it through the British Isles. In the Scottish home where the professor discovered the missing papers on which Shelburne had made his notations, the owners were completely unaware of their significance.

Nestled among a sheaf of the Earl's papers was a note which read "let it be known then, once and for all, that my secretary and associate MacLeane was 'Junius,' and that the secret now is secret no more."

The letters of Junius opposed the policies of the Dukes of Grafton and Bedford in North America which, historians say, led to the Revolution.

Probably the most famous Junius letter was the epistle which openly attacked King George III, warning that "while (the king) plumes himself upon the security of his title to the crown, he should remember that as it was acquired by one revolution, it may be lost by another."

A graduate of Columbia University, Dr. Cordasco is author of "A Junius Bibliography," and coauthor of a series of eighteenth century bibliographical pamphlets published by Long Island University.

A native of Manhattan Dr. Cordasco has lived in West New York 4 years. His wife is the former Miss Edna Vaughn, of South Carolina. The professor has taught at Columbia University and Pratt Institute and now teaches philology at Long Island University. He has 3 books in print and is the author of 35 articles that have appeared in scholarly journals.

1949 Annual Report of Benton County, Ark., Agricultural Conservation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, soil conservation is one of the important projects which confronts the people and the Congress. If we are to sustain our position in world leadership in our quest for peace, we must by all means sustain the productive capacity of our soil.

The people of Benton County in my district are interested in soil conservation. A day or two ago I received from Scott Evans, of Maysville, Ark., the 1949 annual report of the Benton County Agricultural Conservation Association. These people are doing a great work, and, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks this report which Mr. Evans has sent me:

COOPERATION

The 3,029 farmers who cooperated in the 1949 triple-A conservation program are the ones who made it a real success. Each of these farmers carried out one or more approved soil- and water-conservation practices during the year. Participation in 1949 represents a 21-percent increase over 1948.

THE LAND

Their farms include 150,758 acres of cropland, 69,689 acres of noncrop open pasture land, and 5,245 acres of commercial orchard. Seventy-four percent of all cropland and 62 percent of all farmland in the county was included in the 1949 conservation program.

GOOD, SOUND SOIL AND WATER-CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Through the application of 5,345 tons of ground limestone, 8,114,952 pounds of 20-percent superphosphate and 199,800 pounds of potash to pastures, meadows, and cover crops these farmers provided not only a protective but a productive cover for 56,000 acres of land in Benton County.

The hills and valleys of our county were covered with an increased acreage of green pastures as farmers established or improved 30,000 acres of pasture by seeding 512,724 pounds of adapted pasture grasses and legumes during the year.

Controlling the weeds on 42,880 acres of permanent pasture by mowing contributed to an increased production of nutritious pasture plants.

The application of phosphate and lime to 40,000 acres of pastures increased the growth of grasses and legumes and prevented the erosion of our precious top soil.

Eight thousand and five hundred acres of summer and winter cover provided organic matter and nitrogen and retained plant food, as well as protected the soil from the pelting rains.

The construction of 52 farm ponds for livestock water contributed to a better system of grazing and aided in the development of additional acres of permanent pastures.

Legume and grass seed harvested from 1,509 acres helped to provide home-grown seed for the seeding of additional acres of pastures and cover crops.

MATERIALS

The furnishing of conservation materials, in the form of phosphate and lime, played an important part in the 1949 triple-A conservation program. Six million pounds of 20-percent superphosphate and 3,000 tons of agricultural limestone were handled on purchase orders.

MONEY

To assist farmers in carrying out this job of conservation, the Government spent $112,072 in Benton County during 1949. For every dollar thus spent the farmer matched it with $2 of his own money in addition to the labor furnished.

Compared to the total farm income of our county, we are putting back into the soil through taxes, one-half of 1 percent of the value of all crops produced in the county.

PUBLICITY

Side by side with the farmers who have performed this job of conservation on the farm, stand those who have kept the problems of soil conservation ever before the public—editors of the county newspapers and manager of radio station KUOA, Siloam Springs.

To all newspaper editors in the county go our sincere thanks for the space given to this important farm program. To the management of radio station KUOA our greatest appreciation for 17 weeks of radio programs during the year.

FARMER COMMITTEEMEN

Farmers who were directly responsible for the formulation and administration of the 1949 AAA conservation program in Benton County were Scott Evans, C. R. Broadhurst, and Dan B. Blair.

EDUCATION

Working with the county committee in an advisory capacity was P. R. Corley, county extension agent, who kept the committee informed on latest experiment station results as they apply to soil conservation problems and assisted with the educational phase of the program.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN

Seventy farmer committeemen elected by their neighbors advised with the county committee on the conservation needs in their community and made suggestions for improvements in the program. This grassroots approach gave farmers assurance that money appropriated would be used in a way to get the most conservation.

The Little Sisters of the Assumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the fifteenth annual subscription bridge for the benefit of the Little Sisters of the Assumption at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Friday evening, March 10, 1950, on the occasion of his receiving the Humanitarian Scroll of 1950, presented by the Friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption. The mammoth subscription bridge has been conducted for a number of years by the Friends, the moving spirit in which is Mrs. Martin J. Kennedy, whose distinguished husband ably represented New York in the House of Representatives for a number of years, and for many more has been active in all worth while civic and charitable ventures. Many New Yorkers, prominent in business, the professions, and politics, are patrons of the Friends.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FIFTEENTH ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION BRIDGE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE LITTLE SISTERS OF THE ASSUMPTION, HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, FRIDAY EVENING, MARCH 10, 1950

Madam Chairman (Mrs. Martin J. Kennedy), members of the Glee Club of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and all the friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption, I am greatly honored by your selecting me to be the recipient of the Humanitarian Scroll of 1950.

Since 1935, I have followed with close interest the fine work of the nursing Sisters and the nursing centers. This magnificent card party, one of your many activities, has become the annual meeting place of almost 2,000 men and women of good will anxious to advance the cause of humanity through the Christ-like work of the nursing Sisters.

Your attendance, on this occasion, gives moral support to this truly noble cause and your financial aid will make it possible for the nursing Sisters to extend their work, in your name, among the sick poor in New York City. Like the population of our city, the Sisters come from every part of the globe and speak many tongues. Therefore, they are able to minister to any person in need of help, regardless of his language.

Throughout the past 59 years, the professional services of the Sisters have been at the command of any poor sick person. As you know, the rule of this religious community imposes upon each Sister-member the obligation to nurse the poor patient re-

gardless of the nature of his illness, his origin, his race, or his creed. Because of this spirit of genuine sacrifice to the underprivileged, the work of the Little Sisters of the Assumption has a wide appeal to the generosity of our citizens—Jews, Protestants, and Catholics alike.

We find this Order of Sisters working in other cities of the United States and in many foreign countries. During my travels, I had the opportunity to observe, at first hand, the work of the Little Sisters of the Assumption in far-off lands. Their kind advice and hospitality given to our armed forces, to our prisoners of war, and to the men, women, and children, made homeless by the war, won a warm place in my heart and has made me a lifelong friend of the nursing Sisters.

My personal contribution to the subscription bridge is a small token of my appreciation for the maternal guidance that the Sisters gave to the women of America, serving our country, in other lands.

I believe tonight's gathering shall be our greatest success. In addition to the proceeds from the bridge party, attended by such a large number of supporters, the Sisters should gain many new friends to help them carry on their daily tasks. I am proud to be a member of the Friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption and I cordially invite you to become an active worker and to assist in the every-day problems of the nursing centers.

Allow me to pay you my personal tribute for your cooperation in making this bridge party so attractive and enjoyable. I want you to know that the committee and the Sisters are most grateful to you. Our special thanks go to the young ladies and gentlemen who compose the junior committee. At all these parties, their work has been invaluable. Their youth, charm, and gaiety are vital to this festive evening. My friends of the glee club of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick have been loyal to this worth while charity. Their splendid musical program has been the high light of each of our fifteen bridge parties and they have our heartfelt thanks and the prayers of the Sisters.

Participating in this gala bridge party gives assurance that we are desirous of extending the nursing facilities and child-guidance services of the Sisters and the nursing centers. Gathered as we are, representing all creeds, gives encouragement to the hope that the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God, as exemplified by the Little Sisters of the Assumption, shall always prevail in New York City.

Each day we read in the newspapers of heroic rescues and breath-taking services performed by our valiant policemen, firemen, and hospital personnel. Do you realize that the day-in and day-out work of the Sisters, while less spectacular and devoid of publicity, is on that same high level of devotion and professional skill? Tending a mother in her severe illness, supervising and feeding her children, cleaning her home and having dinner ready for her breadwinner is a job that requires the ability of a trained nurse, the tact of a diplomat, and the patience of a saint.

Profoundly grateful, I accept with most sincere appreciation the Humanitarian Scroll of 1950, designed and hand painted by one of the Sisters and awarded, each year, by the friends of the Little Sisters of the Assumption. I am doubly grateful because my name is now the second name on the honor roll. Let me assure you that I shall always cherish the distinction you have conferred upon me and, in the future, I shall consider it a privilege to continue to play my part in the work of your organization and to sing the praises of the real humanitarians—the Little Sisters of the Assumption.

Thank you and good night.

Why New York?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, March 13, entitled "Of Course New York" concerning an article which appeared in the February 11 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, together with a rebuttal—in excerpted form—of the Post article, also carried in the Herald Tribune of the same date, over the signature of Walter Hoving, president, Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I am New York born and bred, and I am glad to join with Mr. Hoving in defense of a truly great home town, which despite its size, has always proved most hospitable toward both its own businessmen and visitors—even from Philadelphia.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1950]

OF COURSE, NEW YORK

Habitual readers of the Saturday Evening Post may recall a recent article, entitled "Why New York?" It was a curious hodgepodge by Mr. Wesley W. Stout, who used to be a New York newspaperman once upon a time, and conveyed the general notion that New York is a dreadfully expensive, inconvenient hole unsuitable to most business or normal human existence. This, of course, is a favorite thesis of Post editors which comes bobbing out of Philadelphia with seasonal regularity. We are used to it.

Now there is not much use arguing with people who are convinced that New York is composed of 8,000,000 neurotics, an evolutionary development of subways, night clubs and the struggle for South Pacific tickets. They like to believe it. Such subjective judgments are hard to dispute or disprove. The truth is that while New Yorkers are largely a devoted lot of homebodies, they do feel passionately that this is a pretty wonderful city. Our assets, virtues, and stimulations are so vast and complex that most of us are puzzled at dissenting reports. And as for asking "Why New York?" the question must be shrugged off as downright ridiculous.

But tolerance can be carried to excess. Misstatements about New York, repeated often enough, may gain just enough acceptance to cause trouble. Fortunately the Commerce and Industry Association of New York has spoken up against Mr. Stout's farrago. On this page appears a detailed rebuttal by Walter Hoving, president of the association, which deserves careful reading. It is a sober statement of facts against loose generality, a point-by-point exposition of what makes New York great in people and culture, business, and industry. Everybody knows that New York is the magnet to America, the center of management for the great corporations, a ferment of creative vigor. And it is excellent that the firm bases of New York's leadership, the reasons why our population and business are constantly growing, are painstakingly presented. Furthermore, if the silly question "Why New York?" is ever asked again, let us slap it down hard and promptly with the facts.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1950]

WHY NEW YORK?

WALTER HOVING, ANSWERING THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, STATES THE FACTS

(A month ago the Saturday Evening Post published an article entitled "Why New York?" The following letter of rebuttal by Walter Hoving, president of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, in excerpted form, is self-explanatory.)

Mr. BEN HIBBS,
Editor, Saturday Evening Post,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: The article by Wesley W. Stout in the February 11 issue of the Saturday Evening Post posed a question: "Why New York?" to which the author responded with a variety of answers based, for the most part, on myth and legend rather than fact.

Most of the answers critical of New York are ascribed by Mr. Stout in his article to a member of a firm which devotes itself to locating sites in other communities for business firms in New York and elsewhere. But before expressing his informant's viewpoint, Mr. Stout, on his own, unequivocally asserts that New York "is the most costly city in all ways in which to live and do business," etc. Let us analyze that one first:

The cost-of-living index for New York City, for December 1949, was 164.9. With the exception of Portland, Maine, and Boston, Mass., this represents the smallest percentage increase, over the base period (1935–39—100), of any of the country's 34 large cities. A projection of the data of the United States Department of Labor on The Annual Budget Required To Maintain an Average Family of Four shows that in December 1949, New York City was in eighth place of the 26 largest cities for which comparable data was available. This budget for a New York family of four would be approximately $3,517, compared with $3,684 for Washington, D. C., the highest, New York City being only 11 percent higher than New Orleans, the lowest city in the group.

The facts that New Yorkers maintain 5,769,065 individual savings accounts totaling $9,908,353,000, an average of $1,544 per account or $1,113 per capita, compared with a per capita average of $362 for the country as a whole, is evidence that New Yorkers do not have to spend all their earnings in order to keep body and soul together.

Mr. Stout continues with an attempt to soften his own most costly city blow by admitting that, despite the alleged disadvantages he outlines, more businesses are moving into the city than are moving out. He then quotes his aforementioned informant as follows:

"New York has one thing only to offer a normal manufacturing business. * * * This is the largest and most varied pool of labor skills. All else is against New York." There follows a list of liabilities.

Here are the facts about these liabilities and other projected by Mr. Stout:

"Wages are the highest." Latest available United States Department of Labor figures show that for November 1949, the average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries in New York City were $55.98, compared with the average for the States of Utah, $66.92, and Washington, $64.45; the cities of San Francisco, $61.68; Los Angeles, $61.53; Buffalo, $61.16; Chicago, $60.45; Milwaukee, $59.43, and St. Paul, $58.62; and a United States average of $54.53.

Nor are clerical salaries exorbitant. According to a recent survey by the National Industrial Conference Board, the average median salary for the principal clerical classifications showed New York no higher than the average median salary rates for

those in the 20 large cities covered in the survey. The average median for New York stenographers is $46. Seven of the 20 cities were higher, with San Francisco topping the list at $54. Similar comparisons occur in other job classifications such as file clerks, senior copy typists, comptometer operators, despite the better type of personnel available to employers in New York City.

"Labor turn-over is the highest." This is pure fiction and hopeful guesswork since the United States Department of Labor states no comparative figures for cities are available.

"Labor efficiency usually is lower for a variety of reasons." No comparative data are available but anyone with an elementary knowledge of labor markets recognizes, and even the article admits, that New York not only has the largest supply, but the best-trained labor force for many skills. That is one of many prime reasons impelling manufacturers to locate here.

"Building and rental costs are the highest." New York is the only major city in the country where commercial and business rents are controlled by law, restraining rates to 15 percent above the 1943–44 levels. According to United States Department of Labor's latest data (October 1949), with the exception of Washington, New York has had the smallest increase in residential rents of 34 large cities. The index, 108.9, shows less than a 9-percent increase above the 1935–39 levels. The average index for the 34 cities is 1215, with Birmingham, 142.7; Jacksonville, 140.7; and Chicago, 139.7.

"State taxes are exceeded per capita only by Rhode Island." According to the latest data (1948), published by the Taxation Foundation on per capita State collections, including unemployment compensation, State taxes per capita for New York were $64.91. Not only was Rhode Island ($66.63), higher, but also eight other States: Washington ($91.07), Arizona ($82.62), California ($84.06), New Mexico ($76.25), Colorado ($72.44), Nevada ($72.32), Michigan ($70.16), and Utah ($66.78).

As for the statement that the over-all tax burden is highest, a reading of the Report on Relative Tax Costs Within Seven Selected Cities for Three Groups of Manufacturing Industries, prepared by Prof. Harley L. Lutz, of Princeton University, will go far in dispelling this myth about heavy New York City business taxes.

"Electricity is the most costly, prohibitively so, for large users. A typical residential electric bill runs $14.22 for 500 kilowatts. The York, Pa., rate for 500 kilowatts is $7.71." The Consolidated Edison Co.'s research department could have furnished accurate, up-to-date data which show that the cost of electric current to New York industrial users is by no means the highest and that the rate quoted for uncontrolled service of 500 kilowatts for York, Pa., is antiquated. This was increased on January 17, 1948, to $11.65, while the New York rate on January 10, 1949, was reduced to $13.10.

New Yorkers relax in their apartments only as a last choice * * * they sleep fewer hours and less soundly. This sage observation might better be expected from a tourist taking notes on a corner at Times Square. New York City is made up of five boroughs, and a majority of the people working in Manhattan live in its four adjacent communities. Most of them, too, have their own homes and little gardens and live as normal a life as any other American city dweller.

Strikes are a more real and immediate peril. A check of the record will show that New York City has less difficulties from strikes than almost any other large industrial center.

Mr. Stout concedes that nearly half of the 100 largest United States corporations and hundreds of lesser national corporations have their headquarters in New York City. But he fails to point out that this city is the management center of the country. These headquarters offices of large concerns furnish a large part of the executive and clerical employment to the citizens of this city.

But let us look at New York business as a whole. According to the latest data, more than 234,540 business firms (including 41,343 manufacturers) are established and doing business in the city. These concerns give employment to more than 2,979,743 persons and have annual pay rolls totaling well over $9,000,000,000. New York City's manufacturing firms alone produced over $12,000,000,000 worth of wares in 1947, according to the census of manufacturers.

New York's retail sales in 1948 reached the staggering total of $7,902,859,000 and its people had an effective buying power (disposable income) in 1948 of $14,236,438,000; according to data supplied by Sales Management magazine.

Surely the heads of these 234,540 businesses wouldn't remain in any city unless they were convinced it offered them the best opportunity to prosper.

Businessmen come to New York and remain here because the city offers them many advantages. To enumerate a few:

1. An abundant supply of skilled labor.
2. Availability of raw materials.
3. Adequate power facilities.
4. Close proximity to a large consumer and industrial market for their products in the New York metropolitan area.

However, New York manufacturers do not have to depend upon the New York City market alone for their business, since the metropolis is the center of the wealthiest and most productive part of the country.

New York City is also the country's largest wholesale buying center. Most of the Nation's department and chain stores maintain their principal buying offices in the city, thus making it convenient for local manufacturers to market their products with a minimum amount of traveling. The markets and raw materials of the world are readily available to New York manufacturers through the thousands of foreign trade brokers who make their headquarters in lower Manhattan. Rapid and efficient transportation by rail, air, truck, and steamship is available to New York manufacturers.

The opportunity for success in New York acts as a magnet for the most aggressive and potentially successful people in the country. The influx of highly skilled, talented personnel continually replenishes and furnishes material for continual expansion of its business concerns.

The city offers the highest standard of living to its citizens of any city of comparable size. Its facilities for better health, education, and recreation are equaled nowhere else in the country.

New York has everything that one could desire, whether he be a business leader, a worker, a housewife, or a growing child. New York is a vigorously expanding city of opportunity for any man or woman who wants to make a place for himself and is willing to work for it.

These are the facts. The Commerce and Industry Association, as the largest service chamber of commerce in the East, can vouch for them. They comprise the real answer to the question, "Why New York?"

Very truly yours,

WALTER HOVING,
President, Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

Citation for Contribution Toward Preserving American Ideals of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from an address by Hon. M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, and president of the All Pennsylvania College Alumni Association, of Washington, D. C., at the second annual dinner of the association February 20, 1950, at the Mayflower Hotel:

We came together for the first time at an All Pennsylvania College Alumni dinner in October of 1948, more or less as a spontaneous growth in connection with the observance of Pennsylvania Week.

What was the common cause that could draw together in Washington the alumni of Pennsylvania's colleges and universities? Something around 30 percent of the alumni in this area are not natives of Pennsylvania.

The common cause was—and is—our common concern in promoting and encouraging an educational system of which not only Pennsylvania but the Nation can be proud.

* * * * *

We are confident that the colleges themselves must benefit in fair measure from this increased activity by their alumni in and near the Nation's Capital.

* * * * *

In the constitution of the association we speak of the freedom, dignity, and integrity of the individual—of a government of laws and not of men—of an enlightened public opinion—of the principles and precepts underlying our American system and the social and economic bases of American life—and of the preservation and extension of the American ideals of education, to assure to the youth of America not only the opportunity to develop their special skills but also the opportunity to become better citizens.

The meaning of such phrases is and always has been quite clear to those who understand and believe in the system of self-government and the way of life which have made America preeminent among nations—a system and a way of life which Longfellow surely knew and loved when he wrote:

"Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

It has become all too popular a pastime in these days of confused thinking to speak disparagingly of the precepts and philosophy which are the very essence of America's greatness.

We are well aware that there are all too many—among Americans as well as aliens—who miss no opportunity to becloud the simple, self-evident truths and to ridicule all that is distinctly American, choosing rather to praise alien ideas which, like wolves in sheeps' clothing, purport to pay homage to the so-called common man when in truth they relegate man to the ignominious place of a ward or chattel if the State, isms, or ideologies which are, in truth, antihumanity, if not anti-God.

There are those who would like nothing better than to see our educational system in America refashioned to the pattern of those alien ideas. Let us not deceive ourselves.

They have been working long and hard toward that end.

Before the ceremonies this evening have been completed the association will have conferred upon an individual a citation for "outstanding contribution toward preserving and extending the American ideals of education."

We have in mind those ideals which, since the early years, even long before the Declaration of Independence, led to the establishment of an educational system adapted to the liberal concept of a government founded on the freedom and dignity of the individual, or, as expressed by George Washington, "the right of free-born men to govern themselves in their own way."

Those ideals have had their firm foundation upon the bedrock of certain principles which, if maintained, will serve as a bulwark and shield against destructive external influences.

The first of those principles is and must be this: The soul of man is our primary concern. A recognition of the spiritual, religious nature of man is the major premise on which the education of a civilized people must be founded.

Each of the State constitutions adopted immediately after the Declaration of Independence established certain principles as fundamental law. A decade later, when our Federal-State system was being charted, those principles were assured continued recognition by the inclusion in the famous Ordinance of 1787, adopted by the Continental Congress, of a declaration reading as follows:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and means for education shall be forever encouraged."

Even in our legislative bodies, in our town meetings; yes, even at a dinner meeting of alumni of Pennsylvania colleges and universities, our first act is to recognize the spiritual nature of man and our oneness with God—through prayer. That is symptomatic of the moral philosophy of our people, as much a part of our way of life as freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The first principle, therefore, is the recognition of the soul of man as our primary concern.

As a corollary principle it is acknowledged that in our American system there are moral limitations on the civil power, the real function of government being perceived as an aid to individual initiative and enterprise and the safeguarding of the family as the keystone of the social structure.

It is the traditional American ideal of education to promote and develop an educational system that will ever make the people conscious of these basic principles.

Pennsylvania's 80 institutions of higher learning have adhered to the highest tenets and the noblest traditions of the American system.

As alumni of those institutions, we are proud (1) to promote a more widespread knowledge of their existence and excellence, and (2) to encourage them to continue the development of an educational system that has contributed immeasurably toward strengthening the moral fiber of the American people.

Do You Want Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Banner, Knightstown, Ind., for March 10, 1950:

DO YOU WANT SOCIALISM?

It is unfortunate that everyone could not have heard Stephen Noland, former editor of the Indianapolis News, when he spoke last Wednesday before the Knightstown Kiwanis Club.

Mr. Noland described the British socialistic system as he saw it during the 2-month period which he spent in England.

No responsible, thinking American could possibly support the further socialization of this Nation if he had heard Mr. Noland.

The socialization of America is well under way, but the unfortunate part about it in this country is that those who desire to socialize the Nation are flying under false banners. Instead of running on the Socialist ticket, they are using one of the major parties as the tent under which they may hide.

Here are some of the facts which Mr. Noland cited, and which Americans may expect if and when the Socialists finally succeed in capturing everything:

1. British labor has lost most of its bargaining rights, since the large segment of labor is now working for the Government.

2. British businessmen are being closed out. Many industries have already been taken over by the Government.

3. A British workingman finds it almost impossible to move from one part of the country to another because of regulations on his working and also on his housing.

4. No real incentive, initiative and effort are evidenced in Great Britain.

5. British medicine has become a routine matter—with the little individual attention being given to patients.

6. The British mother and wife is the big loser. She doesn't know whether her children belong to her or the Government, and Government rationing has prevented her from preparing any kind of decent meals.

7. Under national housing, it's getting so that the Government tells everyone where to live and how to live.

Think over these facts, Americans. Ask yourself whether these are things you want in this country, and whether you are going to be misled by golden promises which can never be fulfilled. Ask yourself if the established American system, despite its shortcomings, isn't just about the best plan.

They Want Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post:

THEY WANT FARLEY

Connecticut friends of James A. Farley—and we wouldn't attempt to count them because they're too numerous—must have been thrilled at recently published stories to the effect that spontaneous "Farley for Governor" booms are springing up in various parts of New York State. Contests for governorships cannot cross State lines, of course, but if they could and Jim Farley were the nominee he'd get a tremendous vote in Connecticut.

As for those Democrats in New York State who are hoping to draft the former Postmaster General and former State and national chairman of their party, they are showing good sense thereby. The present governor of New York is a Republican and the Democrats naturally covet the office. And what better start could they make toward that end than by nominating the man who is undoubtedly the most popular citizen in their commonwealth?

Not that personal popularity alone is a reason for making a man governor or President, but it certainly does help on election day. And in the case of James A. Farley he has already given more than sufficient proof of his ability to handle large affairs with skill and efficiency.

In public life he was a splendid Postmaster General and in private life he is an eminently successful businessman. As a Democrat he believes in party regularity and his record in that respect is without a blemish but at the same time he has never been a New Dealer, fair dealer, a miss dealer, or any other kind of dealer. Just a Democrat with a capital D.

In consequence he is admired and trusted on the other side of the political fence even by those who have no particular use for the Democratic Party as constituted today. He would command a great independent vote and no small amount of Republican support solely on the basis of character, personality, and ability.

As it is, the boom appears entirely spontaneous and it is not at all certain that he would consent to run. He declined the same nomination in 1938 when it was his for the taking, and stepped aside in favor of HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who was elected.

For our part, we hope that the present draft movement will be successful. After all, Connecticut and New York are neighboring States and even if the New York election isn't any of our Yankee business here in Connecticut, most of us would feel happy to know that that habitual good neighbor, Jim Farley, was in the executive office in Albany. We could not then imagine any problems arising between the two States which couldn't be settled in the fairest way and in the easiest and friendliest manner.

Let Americans Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article from the Detroit Times of March 8, 1950.

This article includes a statement made by one Emil Mazey, who is represented as secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO. If such a statement had been made by an irresponsible person, it could be ignored; but this declaration comes from an official of a labor organization.

I am constrained to believe that the philosophy expressed by this man does not represent the thinking of thousands of loyal Americans in that organization itself.

If confiscation is to be the rule in America, then freedom will soon be extinct.

REUTHER AND MAZEY REVEAL 10-YEAR GOAL OF AUTO UNIONS—"ALL WE PRODUCE," IS AIM OF EMIL

(By Jack Crellin)

Chrysler Corp. and the automobile industry were told today what they could expect in the way of demands from the UAW-CIO in the weeks and years ahead.

The double-barreled warning was given by Walter Reuther, UAW president, and Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer.

Speaking at a mass meeting of 20,000 Chrysler workers held in the State Fair Coliseum yesterday, Reuther told the corporation that for every day and week the Chrysler strike, now in its seventh week, is prolonged it will cost Chrysler more for a settlement.

TWO-HUNDRED-DOLLAR PENSIONS

He also revealed that the ultimate goal of the union, perhaps 10 years from now, is a pension of at least $200 a month.

Mazey, an avowed Socialist, was even more explicit when he declared:

"We are only asking for a little of what we produce. One of these days when we are organized politically we are going to ask for everything we produce."

Reuther said he had given Chrysler this ultimatum:

"The longer you drag this strike out the more it is going to cost you."

GOAL IN 10 YEARS

Then referring to goals of the union he declared:

"We are going to build brick by brick up to $200 pensions, where they ought to be. Give us 10 years and by working at the Federal Government level and collective bargaining we will get the $200."

Directing his remarks to K. T. Keller, Chrysler president, and pointing out that the corporation is spending hundreds of thousands for advertisements. Reuther asserted:

"Nobody is being fooled by your propaganda. You had better save your money because you are going to have to pay it to us before this is over."

He said the union will not retreat one inch from its stand that any pension plan at Chrysler must be a funded one created through fixed hourly contributions for each employee by the corporation.

Mazey delivered a financial report which dealt in detail with the cost of the walkout to the international.

He estimated that the international would receive beween $600,000 and $700,000 a week from the assessment of $1 a week on all working members of the union.

He said the international has already paid out $372,258 for prosecution of the strike and is prepared to spend "its last dime if necessary to win."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR INSURANCE

Of this amount, $150,524 has gone to local unions to replenish strike funds, while another $150,000 has been paid in premiums on Blue Cross hospital insurance for Chrysler strikers.

At least 4,000 veterans on strike have received about $100,000 from the State's veterans' trust fund while 10,000 other strikers have obtained emergency community welfare aid amounting to at least $150,000.

Norman Matthews, UAW Chrysler director, described the Chrysler management as "the most vicious in the history of the United States."

He warned: "We are going to fight, and we are going to make sure all of our people get the equity they deserve. We'll stay out till hell freezes over."

Negotiations with Chrysler were resumed today at the Sheraton Hotel.

Establishment of Fees for Special Federal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on the establishment of fees for special Federal services.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES FOR SPECIAL FEDERAL SERVICES

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, stated today that the study now under way by the committee staff, with respect to establishment of fees for special Federal services, is arousing widespread interest both within and without Government circles.

In a press release of March 6, the Senator said, there was made available preliminary findings of the staff based on discussions held with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Communications Commission. In each instance the staff had found not only an active interest in the subject, but also discovered that detailed studies had already been undertaken in the past or were currently under way.

The Federal Communications Commission has been particularly active in the area and has now submitted to the committee a written report, quoted below. Senator MCCLELLAN said that this report exemplifies the types of services in which the committee is interested and appears to point up the practicability of shifting to the recipients and beneficiaries a greater portion of the actual cost incurred by the Government in rendering special services which at the present time are a burden of the taxpayers at large. At the same time, the Senator repeated his assurance that the committee has no thought whatsoever of recommending that charges be made for services of which the beneficiaries are the general public; the study is aimed solely at determining the feasibility of charging for those services which benefit particular individuals, groups, or interests.

To illustrate more specifically the nature of the committee's study, Senator MCCLELLAN directed particular attention to the following excerpt from the Federal Communications Commission's report:

"As to the activities of the Federal Communications Commission for which charges might be made, they may be grouped into the following classes:

"(1) Radio application filings.

"(2) Applications for authorizations under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act.

"(3) Continuing regulatory or servicing activities.

"(4) Inspections.

"(5) Equipment tests and approvals.

"(6) Miscellaneous filings—which would cover such items as petitions, motions, appearances, and similar papers filed chiefly in connection with the conduct of hearings."

With respect to the first item in the above list, radio application filings, the FCC reports that "construction-permit applications constitute the Commission's most important work load" and suggests that "a filing fee could be required to accompany each such application." The Commission states further in regard to this category that "the processing of applications for new stations is the most costly function performed by the Commission."

In clarification of the second item in the above list of FCC activities, Senator MCCLELLAN pointed out that proceedings under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act involve, with respect to common-carrier communications, issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity for the construction of a new line, the extension of any line, or the acquisition or operation of any line. Further, and with certain exceptions, a carrier must obtain FCC approval before discontinuing, reducing, or impairing the service. Under this same legislation, FCC processes applications for the landing and operation of submarine cables. Senator MCCLELLAN pointed out that while these activities clearly work to the benefit of the general public through the providing of essential communications facilities, it also seems obvious that clearance by FCC constitutes undeniable opportunity for financial profit to the licensees.

With regard to the third item of the Commission's functions, continuing regulatory activities, FCC suggests that regulation of rates, services, and accounting for communication common carriers might be equitably financed by turning "toward the plans of various State commissions of requiring reimbursements from the individual companies subject to the regulation for the time and expenses of Commission personnel actually engaged in projects directly connected with such companies." As to FCC radio regulatory functions, the Commission suggests that the "charges might be assessed on a yearly basis or might be required in connection with applications for licenses and renewals of licenses."

Senator MCCLELLAN said that the committee is particularly interested in equipment approval by FCC. The Senator stated that performance characteristics of communications facilities are subjected to tests in the Commission's laboratory and, if specifications are met, an approval number is issued to the manufacturer. The advantage to a manufacturer in the acquisition of such FCC approval is obvious.

In emphasizing the above salient features of the report, Senator MCCLELLAN commended it as complying with the needs of the committee in furthering its study. He stressed the fact that the committee itself has arrived at no conclusions whatsoever and will not do so pending receipt and evaluation of all pertinent data. The nature of agency submissions to the committee thus far would seem to indicate that public hearings would be desirable.

The full report from the Federal Communications Commission follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1950.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This will answer your inquiry of February 20, 1950, relative to the possibility of charging fees to the general public or to special interests for services performed by this Commission.

As to cases where fees are now charged for Commission services there are only two such instances. The first case is in connection with the inspection of the radio installations

aboard certain vessels for which charges are made pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (f) (2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C., sec. 154 (f) (2)). The Commission is required by law to make periodic inspections of this equipment in order to determine whether or not it will perform its primary function which is to provide communication service for the protection of life and property at sea. Because of the nature of the shipping business, vessels are sometimes not accessible to our inspectors during the usual office hours and our people are required to work overtime to perform the inspection. In such a case the ship owner is required to reimburse the Government for the amount of this overtime. The money is not returned to the Commission, but is required by statute to be covered into the Treasury's miscellaneous receipts account.

In the second case, the Commission has authorized the Civil Aeronautics Administration's private pilot examiners to issue the radio telephone operator permit for a fee of not more than $1 per issuance. This fee is retained by the examiner. The same authorization may be obtained free of charge from any of the Commission's field offices if the applicant desires to make application there.

The matter of charging fees in other instances of issuance of licenses and in the rendition of other services by the Commission has been designed as one of the items to be investigated in connection with the President's management improvement program under Executive Order No. 10072. Work now in progress on reorganizing the Commission's staff will take so much time, however, that work upon the problem of charging fees may be delayed considerably.

A concrete proposal relative to the matter was advanced in Congress in 1932 in connection with amendment of the Radio Act of 1927. The proposed amendment would have added a new section 17 to that act setting out a definite schedule of charges to be made in connection with the activities of the (then) Federal Radio Commission. The amendment was withdrawn by its sponsor, Senator DILL, and resubmitted as a separate bill, S. 5201. The latter bill was never reported out of committee. (References: S. Res. 351 (70th Cong.), S. Rept. No. 564, 72d Cong., 1st sess.)

As to the activities of the Federal Communications Commission for which charges might be made, they may be grouped into the following classes:

1. Radio application filings.
2. Applications for authorizations under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act.
3. Continuing regulatory or servicing activities.
4. Inspections.
5. Equipment tests and approvals.
6. Miscellaneous filings—which would cover such items as petitions, motions, appearances, and similar papers filed chiefly in connection with the conduct of hearings.

The considerations as to each of these items are given below:

1. Radio application filings: The major classes of applications filed are: Radio station construction permit; radio station license; renewal of license; authority for assignment of license; and authority for transfer of control over licensee.

Applications for construction permits are required in the case of all new broadcast stations and other stations with the exception of amateur, ship, aircraft, and railroad mobile stations. These construction permit applications constitute the Commission's most important work load. In the case of broadcast stations, many of them—and the number is constantly increasing—must go to a formal hearing, since the granting of one application very often means that one or more other applications must be denied. (The Communications Act requires that applicants be afforded the opportunity of a hearing if the Commission is unable to find, from the application, that it should be granted.) A filing fee could be required to accompany each such application.

After a construction permit has been granted and the station is in satisfactory operating condition, an application for license must be filed. (Where no construction permit is required, a license application is submitted originally.) If a license is granted, operation may be continued for the term thereof (a maximum of 3 years for a broadcast station and 5 years for other stations) without further filings. At the end of the license term an application for renewal of license is submitted. If a licensee desires to assign his license to another party, or if control over the licensee is transferred, prior approval of the Commission must be requested in the proper application. The processing of applications for new stations is the most costly function performed by the Commission. After the granting of a construction permit or initial license the bulk of the Commission's work falls in the continuing regulatory field.

2. Applications for authorizations under title II of the Communications Act and Cable Landing License Act: There are many applications filed by common carriers under title II of the Communications Act, which title has to do with the regulation of common carrier communications. Thus with certain exceptions, a certificate of convenience and necessity must be obtained by a common carrier from the Commission under section 214 of the act for the construction of a new line, or of an extension of any line, or the acquisition or operation of any line. Also, with certain exceptions, a certificate is required under section 214 of the act before a carrier may discontinue, reduce, or impair service to a community or part of a community. Sections 221 and 222 of the act provide for applications to the Commission for authorizations with respect to telephone and telegraph mergers, respectively. In section 203 of the act, provision is made for application to the Commission for authority to make tariff schedules effective on less than 30 days' statutory notice. Section 212 of the act requires authorizations from the Commission for certain interlocking directorate and officer positions. In addition, under Executive Order No. 6779, the Commission processes applications seeking licenses under the Cable Landing License Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 8 and 9) for the landing and operation of submarine cables. In order to give you a partial indication of the volume of these various applications, in the year 1949 there was a total of 1,443 applications filed under sections 214 and 221 of the Communications Act; 178 applications were filed during that year for special permission under section 203 of the act to file tariff schedules on less than statutory notice.

3. Continuing regulatory activities: The major part of the Commission's work in the field of common-carrier regulation is related to continuing regulatory activities as distinguished from the processing of specific applications. In the common-carrier field, the Commission is principally concerned with the regulation of rates, services, and accounting of the communication common carriers furnishing interstate and international services, to the end that such rates, services, and accounting shall be just and reasonable in the public interest. If fees are to be collected with respect to such activities as these, it might be more practical to turn toward the plans of various State commissions of requiring reimbursements from the individual companies subject to the regulation for the time and expenses of Commission personnel actually engaged in projects directly connected with such companies.

As to the Commission's continuing regulatory activities with respect to radio stations, charges could be assessed against going radio stations and used to offset the cost of the Commission's continuing regulatory activities such as service developments, frequency measurements, developments and maintenance of rules and regulations, etc. The charges might be assessed on a yearly basis or might be required in connection with applications for licenses and renewals of licensss.

4. Inspections: The Commission inspects radio stations to determine whether or not equipment is in such condition that it will conform with the rules. In the case of certain classes of ship stations inspection is compulsory under the law and in the case of other stations it is optional. The extent to which it is carried out depends on the availability of personnel to do the work.

5. Equipment approval: Equipment is checked in certain cases to determine whether or not it meets performance specifications and if it does meet such specifications, a type approval number is issued to the manufacturer and is required to be affixed to all subsequently manufactured identical pieces of apparatus. Specifications are particularly rigid in the marine field where safety of life and property may depend upon the proper functioning of such equipment. Testing in the Commission's laboratory is frequently required.

6. Miscellaneous filings: These are chiefly papers of a legal nature such as petitions, motions, etc., which are filed in connection with hearings. They are numerous and constitute a sizable work load.

As statistical data which would indicate the numbers of items for which fees might be charged, there is attached the Commission's latest release on the number of radio authorizations valid and outstanding and it is suggested that you further refer to the Commission's fifteenth annual report, which has been made available to the staff of your committee. This report shows the number of applications handled by the Commission, the number of grants made, the number of hearings held, and also gives financial data which shows revenues, expenses, and other items with respect to radio broadcast stations and common carriers.

I hope that the foregoing will provide you with the data which will assist you in the conduct of your investigation as far as Federal Communications Commission is concerned. Please do not hesitate to call upon me for further information or for clarification of the data furnished you herewith.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE COY, *Chairman.*

Compulsory Licensing of Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me in opposition to "police

state" legislation to establish compulsory licensing of motion-picture industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION TO "POLICE STATE" LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH COMPULSORY LICENSING OF MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. President, I should like to make just a brief statement on the subject of the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday, S. 3237, which would provide for the licensing of motion pictures in interstate commerce. I have a tremendous admiration for my colleague, whose long service in the Senate and whose devotion to his State and Nation are so well known as not to require repetition. It is with surprise and deep regret, therefore, that I read in the RECORD and noted in the newspapers his introduction of this stringent legislation. Let me set forth my views on this point.

I SHARE CONCERN OVER DISINTEGRATION OF MORALS

1. I share absolutely Senator JOHNSON'S fundamental concern over any factor which would disintegrate the morals of the American people. I believe, with him, that motion-picture actors and actresses have a heavy responsibility for righteous self-conduct, in view of the fact that they are held up as ideals by our American citizens, particularly by our young people. I believe that the individuals to whom Senator JOHNSON referred, connected with the picture Stromboli, are to be condemned as any other individuals must be condemned for breaking the moral law, for violating the principles of God and man, for transgressing the code of human decency.

Every American churchgoer, every minister, every righteous-thinking citizen in our land deplores this breaking of the moral code, particularly by individuals who have been held up as ideals. We deplore, too, any action by the motion picture or any other industry which might crudely seek to commercialize on the basis of publicity given to a breaking of the moral law.

WE SHOULD USE FLITGUN, NOT SHOTGUN

2. However, to generalize on the individual, isolated case of Stromboli misconduct and to ask that a whole system of Federal regimentation be set up to prevent such comparatively rare abuses is, I believe, to commit a grave mistake. Why use a 100-barrel shotgun where a flitgun would do? I, for one, therefore, would oppose, as I am sure practically every Member of the Senate would oppose, this bill with its tremendous implications of a European police state—a Soviet-type OGPU.

Senator JOHNSON'S bill would require the setting up of a tremendous bureaucracy which would license every motion-picture actor and actress, every producer, every script in this land. It would vest in the Department of Commerce dictatorial powers which could mean life and death over the entire motion-picture industry.

SUPREME COURT WOULD DECLARE THIS LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL

3. Such powers would obviously be but the beginning of an entire dictatorial train of legislation which could end up by licensing every stage star, every radio and television actor, and the entire entertainment profession. Where it would end, no man could foresee.

The Department of Commerce does not want these dictatorial powers; the Congress would not want to confer such powers; and the American people would not want these powers conferred. Moreover, I believe the Supreme Court would throw this legislation out the window as unconstitutional even if it were passed.

The greatest means by which the American people can assure Hollywood's abiding by the moral law is by their refusal to (a) patronize objectionable pictures and (b) to support objectionable actors or actresses by box-office patronage. I emphasize, however, objectionable pictures, because I believe that Americans will differentiate between objectionable individuals who might participate in pictures and objectionable pictures, as such.

Whenever Hollywood learns that the American people will not patronize any pictures featuring a particular individual, that individual quickly leaves the Hollywood scene.

Right now there are many fine organizations such as the Legion of Decency and other groups which look into the question of the moral content of American motion pictures and which advise our people accordingly. I do not believe that we need any Federal gestapo to supplement their powers.

4. Let me point out, Mr. President, that this picture Stromboli, to which Senator JOHNSON referred, is a foreign-made picture. If there was anything morally objectionable in it, the reel could never have entered our country, because the United States Treasury Department through its Customs Offices possess powers to ban admission of morally objectionable items.

MR. JOHNSTON IS NOT A CZAR

5. I should like to point out, too, that while my colleague referred to Mr. Eric Johnston as a motion-picture czar that this is not an accurate description. Mr. Johnston is president of the Motion Picture Association of America. The MPA can approve or disapprove films, but it does not possess czaristic powers to, let us say, ban a particular individual appearing in a film.

LICENSING IDEA REPEATEDLY REJECTED

6. This is not the first time that licensing suggestions have been made. Through the years many individuals have suggested compulsory licensing in the motion-picture industry, but the Congress has always wisely rejected any such move.

WE DO INDEED NEED OVER-ALL MORAL CRUSADE

7. Let me reiterate that I share the fundamental moral convictions of Senator JOHNSON. Right now, there are many evidences of a great and necessary moral crusade on the part of the American people. More and more we are learning that the real answer to the problems of the atomic age is, today, as it was 2,000 years ago, by fulfilling the principles of the Great Teacher, the Master, whose Sermon on the Mount is the greatest single guide to human conduct.

As Senator JOHNSON himself said "Hollywood for the most part is made up of fine, wholesome, clean, respectable, God-fearing people." I am sure that the good people of Hollywood deplore the transgression of the moral law which occurred in the incident which Senator JOHNSON cited, but we in turn would be transgressing and violating the law of man's God-given freedom if we established a police state gestapo over the motion-picture industry or any other industry.

LET US NOT APE THE RUSSIAN GESTAPO TACTICS

The Soviet Union is the sort of country that believes in compulsory licensing of individuals before they may pursue a given profession. We in this country believe that so long as a profession itself is legal, any individual has the right to participate in it without asking anybody's permission, aside, of course, from such technical standards as are required in the medical profession, the engineering profession, etc.

Mr. President, I have previously brought to the Senate's attention the magnificent record of Hollywood's patriotic contributions in war and peace. But Hollywood needs no defense on my part or anyone else's part. This vast industry should not be judged and condemned on the basis of a few disgusting, isolated instances of moral misconduct or suggestive advertising or crude commercializing.

Let us not destroy the Constitution under the guise of protecting the Constitution. Let us not further the trend toward state socialism. Let S. 3237 be rejected by the Commerce Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that there be appended to this statement the text of a release which was released last night by the Motion Picture Association.

The Motion Picture Association of Americe, today, March 14, 1950, made the following statement:

"Senator JOHNSON of Colorado has not thought through the implications of the motion-picture licensing bill he introduced today in the Senate.

"This is a police-state bill, whether so intended or not. It would subject the American motion picture to the same sort of Government slave-control that exists in all police states.

"If it should ever happen that the motion picture should be made subservient to government, then freedom as we have known it in this country will have vanished. The newspapers, the press associations, magazines, books, radio, television—all mediums of expression—would be the inevitable next victims.

"Senator JOHNSON belittles all Hollywood when he says that 'out of her (Ingrid Bergman's) ashes may come a decent Hollywood.' Hollywood doesn't need a certificate of character from anyone. It has given the world too much in wholesome entertainment that all Americans can view with pride.

"Hollywood, like every other community, has its share—but no more than its share—of people who violate the moral code. The majority of people in Hollywood are the finest types of Americans, devoted and loyal to their families and their country.

"Senator JOHNSON is misinformed as to the way the motion-picture industry operates under its system of self-regulation. Motion-picture producers in 1930 voluntarily adopted a production code to assure decency and good taste in the content of motion pictures. The pictures produced under this code meet its high standards.

"The code applies only to the content of motion pictures themselves and not to the private lives of the actors and actresses.

"Senator JOHNSON'S references to money changers is reminiscent of a hateful ideology that millions of Americans fought to destroy.

"It is a disservice to America for a United States Senator to condemn an industry that has such a fine record of performance and patriotism in war and peace."

The Case of Max Perlow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following letter, article, and statement:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1950.

HON. PAUL M. HERZOG,
Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my attention that there is pending, and has been pending for some time, a settlement in the case of Max Perlow, an alleged Communist, representing the United Furniture Workers of America.

Officials of the Comfort Spring Corp., of Baltimore, Md., indicate that they have no intention of dealing with a man of this caliber and, undoubtedly, every good American citizen will concur in their action.

I am writing this letter to supplement their request that an early decision be made in the case of Max Perlow and to call to your attention the fact that Mr. Perlow is the type of person the citizens of this country are not supporting. In the event that there is question of his attitude, I direct your attention to an article appearing in the New York Times, under date of June 6, 1949, wherein it states that though Mr. Perlow has resigned from the Communist Party in order to retain his post as an elected union officer, he did not intend to renounce his belief in Communist doctrines or to refrain from advocating them.

Attached, for your information, is Mr. Perlow's record as furnished me officially from the files of the Un-American Activities Committee, which speaks for itself.

It was the apparent intention of Congress when the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted that not only persons carrying membership cards of the Communist organization were to be affected but also those individuals who express themselves as believing in the principles of the Communist Party.

It is not my intention to influence the action of the Board in any way but I do feel that you should be thoroughly cognizant with the type of individual with whom you are dealing. Business at present is bedeviled by many regulations and restraints and it seems highly irregular that a man of Mr. Perlow's acknowledged beliefs and reputation should be given credence by your Board.

Your careful consideration and early report in this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1949]

UNION LEADER QUITS REDS TO KEEP POST—OFFICIAL OF FURNITURE WORKERS COMPLIES WITH TAFT LAW BUT HOLDS TO BELIEFS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Compelled to choose between continuance in union office and membership in the Communist Party, Max Perlow, secretary-treasurer of the United Furniture Workers of America, CIO, announced yesterday that he had quit the party.

The choice was made necessary by the decision of the union's international executive board to file non-Communist affidavits under the Taft-Hartley law. Mr. Perlow, who supported the decision to file the affidavits, was the first union officer in the 2 years since the law was passed to announce publicly that he had given up Communist Party membership to comply with the affidavit requirement.

He made it plain that his sole purpose in resigning was to retain his post as an elected union officer and that he did not intend to renounce his belief in Communist doctrines or to refrain from advocating them "through peaceful, constitutional processes."

Whether the qualifications put by Mr. Perlow on his resignation might make his affidavit unacceptable presented a problem last night to officials of the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Justice.

Under the law a union officer must swear that "he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member or supports any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

NO GENERAL RULE LAID DOWN

Robert N. Denham, NLRB general counsel, said in Washington that the Board did not attempt to lay down any general lines of philosophy in accepting affidavits but that a person making reservations publicly might be embarrassed.

In normal course, Mr. Denham observed, the Board took the affidavits at face value but, when it received information indicating that the oath had been signed falsely, the matter was referred to the Justice Department for possible prosecution. Jail sentence and fines are specified as penalties for the filing of fraudulent affidavits.

In other left-wing unions that have filed non-Communist affidavits, officers reputed to have Communist ties have signed the affidavits without any public explanation or have withdrawn as officers and accepted immediate reappointment as paid organizers, administrators, or international representatives.

The only Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate that has avowed Communists as top officers is the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. Irving Potash, 1 of the 11 members of the party's national board now on trial in Federal court, is an international vice president. Ben Gold, the union's president, is also a Communist leader. This union is not complying with the Taft-Hartley law and its officers have not filed affidavits.

In announcing that he had decided to leave the Communist Party, Mr. Perlow said it was no secret to the membership of the furniture union that he had belonged to the party for many years.

"It is because of the teachings of this party," Mr. Perlow said, "that I came to the conclusion that there can be no higher privilege, no greater principle, than to serve the working people in their struggle for a higher standard of living, for higher wages, for job security, for greater and greater guaranties for the workers to live decently and bring up their children as free people without fear to face the future."

He denied that the party advocated overthrow of the Government by force and violence and emphasized his own conviction that communism could be established within the framework of democratic processes under our Constitution.

As a union member for 26 years, he objected to being deprived of the opportunity to continue in union office if he refused to sign a non-Communist oath. He characterized this as a "yellow dog" provision inserted into the the law by "reactionary elements" bent on subjecting the Nation to thought control.

He said that he would stand on his constitutional right to believe that Marxism is the best expression of the hopes and aspirations of mankind to rid himself of the mounting evils which threaten the world today.

Three years ago Morris Muster, who had been president of the United Furniture Workers for 9 years, resigned, charging that the union's executive board was Communist-dominated. He directed particular criticism at Mr. Perlow. The union's secretary-treasurer joined with its other officers in accusing Mr. Muster of seeking to split and weaken the organization. Mr. Perlow did not announce at that time that he was a Communist.

Morris Pizer, who succeeded Mr. Muster as president, recommended in November 1947, that the union officers comply with the Taft-Hartley law, but this recommendation was rejected by the executive board. Last week the board decided to abandon its policy of noncompliance.

A joint statement by Mr. Pizer, Mr. Perlow and Ernest Marsh, director of organization, said the union's inability to take part in NLRB elections had caused it to lose 4,000 members to other unions that had qualified under the law. The statement blamed the Truman administration, the leadership of the CIO and the American Federation of Labor for Congress failure to repeal the law.

MARCH 10, 1950.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For: Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON.
Subject: Max Perlow.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning Max Perlow:

The Communist publication, the Daily Worker of July 18, 1938 (p. 4, ch. 4), identified Max Perlow as a member of the Communist Party. In sworn testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 13, 1938, John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, made the following statement:

"Another individual high in the ranks of this union (United Furniture Workers, CIO), is Max Perlow of New York City, who has been a member of the district committee, district No. 2, of the Communist Party in New York City. Both (Morris) Muster and Perlow were leaders of the Furniture Workers Industrial Union when it was one of the groups working under the jurisdiction of the Trade Union Unity League, which was formed by the Communist Party headed by William Z. Foster." (Vol. 1, p. 99, Public Hearings by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938.)

On May 20–23, 1944, the Communist Party assumed the name of the Communist Political Association for strategic reasons and resumed the name of the Communist Party of the United States on July 26–28, 1945. (Committee on Un-American Activities, Rept. 209, April 1, 1947, p. 29). In the printed proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of the Communist Political Association which was held May 20–22, 1944, the name of Max Perlow is shown as a convention delegate and speaker.

On June 7, 1949 (p. 5), the Daily Worker carried an article to the effect that Max Perlow, international secretary-treasurer of the CIO United Furniture Workers, this week end announced regretfully his resignation from the Communist Party in order to fulfill the requirements of the UFW's general executive board decision to sign Taft-Hartley affidavits. * * * In announcing his resignation, Perlow at the same time defended the party from its attackers, and reaffirmed his conviction that Marxism is the best expression of the hopes and aspirations of mankind to rid itself of the mounting evils which threaten the world today. In the same article Perlow was quoted as saying that "it is no secret to our membership, that I have been a member of the Communist Party for many years. It is because of the teachings of this party that I have decided to devote my entire life to the cause of the workers" and "I am forced to sign the affidavits or give up my work in the service

of the membership of our union, to which I have dedicated my life." The article revealed that Perlow said he was forced to submit his resignation from the Communist Party.

In the past, Max Perlow has sponsored numerous organizations which have been officially cited as Communist and/or Communist fronts. In 1947 and 1948 he was affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress, having been one of the sponsors of the national conference of that group, held in Chicago November 21–23, 1947 (see program Let Freedom Ring and also the Daily Worker of October 21, 1947, p. 5); he signed a statement of that organization, opposing Redbaiting and attacks on Communists as shown in the Daily Worker of May 25, 1947 (p. 9). In 1948, Max Perlow was one of the sponsors of the freedom crusade of the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, December 15, 1948, p. 11); he signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to Congress and urging the defeat of the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852), as shown on a letterhead of the Civil Rights Congress dated May 7, 1948, and also a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 11, 1948 (p. 37).

The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party (Committee on Un-American Activities, Rept. No. 1115, September 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the group as subversive and Communist in reports to the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Max Perlow was named in the fall term (1947) booklet of the School of Jewish Studies as one of the sponsors of that school. He was one of the sponsors of a bazaar held under the auspices of the American Jewish Labor Council (Daily Worker, November 18, 1948, p. 7). He endorsed a demonstration sponsored by the American Council for a Democratic Greece (Daily Worker, February 15, 1949, p. 11); and signed a telegram of the council on behalf of Communist seamen (Daily Worker, November 8, 1949, p. 11). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the School of Jewish Studies as an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party (press release of December 4, 1947); he cited the American Jewish Labor Council as subversive (press release of April 21, 1949); and cited the American Council for a Democratic Greece as a subversive and Communist organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948).

In a pamphlet entitled "The People Versus H. C. L." which was published by the Consumers National Federation (December 11–12, 1937), Max Perlow's name appears as one of the sponsors of the federation. He signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International. Both the Consumers National Federation and the Reichstag Fire Trial * * * were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (pp. 155 and 112, respectively).

The Daily Worker of January 17, 1938 (p. 5) reported that Max Perlow signed a "Call" to the Morning Freiheit Conference; he spoke before the Morning Freiheit Association in New York, as shown in the Daily Worker of September 30, 1944 (p. 2). He signed an open letter to President Truman on Franco Spain, prepared by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (see mimeographed letter attached to a letterhead of the Joint Anti-Fascist, dated April 28, 1949).

Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Morning Freiheit as a Communist Yiddish daily (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686); the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the publication as "the official Communist newspaper published in the Yiddish tongue." In the same report (p. 174), the special committee * * * cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization. Attorney General Tom Clark cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist. (See press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

In report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities the United May Day Conference was cited as being "entirely engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations, (and) numbered Frank R. McGrath as one of its members, along with such outstanding Communist Party leaders as Ben Gold and Max Perlow." Max Perlow signed the call to the United May Day Conference which was held in New York City in 1937 (Daily Worker, March 17, 1937, p. 4); he signed the call to the conference in 1938 (Daily Worker, March 19, 1938, p. 4); he was a member of the United May Day Provisional Committee in New York, as shown in a pamphlet, An American Holiday, May Day 1939 (p. 2); on the call for a United May Day Conference, March 30, 1940, he was listed as secretary-treasurer of the Provisional May Day Committee, New York; he spoke before the committee for May Day 1948, as shown in the official press release of that committee; he was one of the sponsors of the Provisional Committee for a United Labor and People's May Day, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 14, 1949 (p. 8); he spoke at a May Day demonstration in 1949 (Daily Worker, May 2, 1949, p. 9).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited the United May Day Conference and the United May Day Provisional Committee in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944. The report states that "the May Day parade in New York City is an annual mobilization of Communist strength" (Rept. 1311, p. 179; also pp. 124 and 139). Attorney General Tom Clark cited the United May Day Committee as "subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America" (see press release of December 4, 1947).

Records of this committee show that Max Perlow has openly defended Communists and their activities over a period of years, and as late as January 1950. He was a sponsor of the National Free Browder Congress and signed a petition of that group to free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, March 1, 1942, p. 2; Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, p. 2; Daily Worker, January 25, 1942, sec. 2, p. 5). He signed a statement of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, March 11, 1942, p. 5). He attended a meeting of the American Peace Mobilization and signed the organization's petition to free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, p. 2).

The National Free Browder Congress and the Citizen's Committee To Free Earl Browder were both cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944; Attorney General Francis Biddle cited the Citizen's Committee To Free Earl Browder as a Communist organization. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud. The American Peace Mobilization has been cited by Attorney General Tom Clark, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and on three occasions by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Press releases dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684; reports of the Special Committee, dated January 2, 1943, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944; respectively).

Max Perlow was one of the sponsors of the Schappes Defense Committee and signed various petitions and pleas for the pardon of Mr. Schappes. (Pamphlet, In the Case of Morris U. Schappes, p. 9; undated letterhead of the organization; Daily Worker, February 4, 1942, p. 5). The Schappes Defense Committee has been cited as "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York." Morris U. Schappes "was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1936 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

Israel Amter was one of the original American Communists and held many important positions in the Communist Party; he ran for Governor of New York in 1942 on the Communist Party ticket. Max Perlow supported Mr. Amter in the 1942 elections (Daily Worker, October 9, 1942, p. 4); he was a member of a committee which supported Amter (New Masses, November 8, 1948, p. 25); and one of the sponsors of a labor committee supporting Amter (as shown on a leaflet, Vote for Victory).

In 1940 Max Perlow signed a telegram of the Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights, directed to President Roosevelt on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, defendants. (Daily Worker, November 11, 1940, p. 1). Both the Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights and the International Fur and Leather Workers Union were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

Max Perlow supported the French Communist-led strikes in 1947 (Daily Worker, December 4, 1948, p. 2); he issued an individual endorsement of the Civil Rights Congress and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, in defense of 12 Communists who faced deportation (among whom were Irving Potash, Alexander Bittelman, Ferdinand C. Smith, Alex and David Balint, and others). In 1949 he protested (together with Benjamin J. Davis, Communist) against interference with a student strike held at City College, New York. (See Daily Worker, April 12, 1949, p. 3).

The citation of the Civil Rights Congress appears on page 2 of this memorandum. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944). Attorney General Tom Clark called the organization subversive and Communist on lists submitted to the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948.)

In announcing a "defense rally for the freedom of Alexander Bittelman, veteran Jewish leader and member of the national committee of the Communist Party," the Daily Worker of January 20, 1948 (p. 4) quoted a statement issued by Max Perlow, secretary of the CIO's United Furniture Union, as follows: "As a trade-unionist and as a Jew, I recognize this attack as a threat to the American people as a whole."

Max Perlow was one of those who signed a telegram, addressed to Attorney General Tom Clark, on behalf of John Williamson, a Communist (Daily Worker, February 16, 1948, p. 6).

Max Perlow led a picket line, sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress (New York State division), on behalf of the 12 indicted Communist leaders (Daily Worker, September 20, 1948, p. 3). He sponsored the Civil Rights Congress Freedom Crusade, protesting the indictment (Daily Worker, December 31, 1948, p. 3); was a member of a delegation on behalf of the leaders (Daily Worker, July 15, 1949, p. 2); and sponsored groups defending them (Daily Worker, July 18, 1949, p. 2; October 5, 1949, p. 2; and October 11, 1949, p. 3; and a letterhead dated September 9, 1949).

The Daily Worker of January 12, 1950 (p. 2) reported that Max Perlow, secretary-treasurer of the United Furniture Workers, would speak at a meeting of the union on behalf of those who opposed a split in the union if "the Communists aren't expelled."

Social Security and Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOBY MORRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 14, 1950, I made a statement before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, concerning social security, and more especially as to old-age assistance and old-age pensions. I discussed the bill I have heretofore introduced, H. R. 2620.

I went into the matter pretty fully and gave some figures and facts which I believe are important and are worthy of our consideration. I particularly discussed certain features of H. R. 6000 which passed the House last session. My full statement is as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS

STATEMENT OF TOBY MORRIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, OF OKLAHOMA, TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 14, 1950

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am deeply interested in the subject of social security and old-age pensions. It is, therefore, a great pleasure to me to know that your honorable committee is giving time for thorough consideration of this subject. It is also a pleasure to present to you some observations I have made to the House of Representatives and also publicly with regard to this matter generally, and to the matter of better security for our aged citizens particularly.

My interest in this subject goes back even much further than my tenure as a Member of Congress. For many years, the great need for an adequate and dependable income for aged people, and what it would mean to all citizens, has impressed my mind and heart. I am also of the opinion that an adequate, regular, dependable income to our retired elder citizens will constitute a well-distributed buying power in this segment of our population that will be a factor in maintaining our high level of national income which is so important to our national economy. If it is possible for our citizens to retire on a reasonable pension at retirement age, job opportunities will be open to younger people, the responsibility of supporting parents on the part of children will be obviated, and the entire population will benefit.

I am pleased that progress has been made in this field

While our present legislation, in effect, is not adequately meeting the great needs of our people, the provisions that have been made, are truly a great help. Much good has been accomplished. In many cases, dire suffering and want has been alleviated. Perhaps the dollars that the Congress has made available through old-age assistance have gone as far toward meeting dire needs of many helpless and deserving citizens, as any appropriations that have been made. I want to be understood as in no way attacking or decrying the good work that has been accomplished in this field.

There is much more to be done

Our present legislation falls far short of taking care of the great needs for adequate security for our elder citizens. Many who badly need regular incomes, and who are of retirement age, are not included. Neither is it possible for them to qualify under our present laws. Great inequities exist in the operation of our present system. Different and, in fact, greatly varying payments are being made to recipients in our States. Hardly do we find the same payments, month by month, in any two of our States. Moreover, we also find that the payments may vary in different parts of the same State. These inequalities should have our careful consideration. I wonder if Members of the Congress have stopped to consider the actual conditions with regard to the operations of our present system. Let me illustrate.

Under our present Federal laws, and under old-age assistance, as shown by the report of the Federal Security Agency for the month of October 1949, which is the last report that I have before me, I am taking figures for just two of our large States in population, and also two of our smaller States. I am comparing the payments on the following points:

1. Number of beneficiaries.

2. Amount of monthly payment to each beneficiary.

3. Total amount of payments for the month in each State. These comparisons show clearly what I mean by inequalities. Here they are:

State	Number of recipients	Monthly payment	Total amount paid for month
California	264,672	$70.74	$18,723,603
Pennsylvania	90,681	39.94	3,621,989

Does it not seem strange that the number of recipients should be so much greater in the one State than in the other, when the States are not far from equal in population? Again note the average payment to the individual. In one State, it is over $70 while in the other, it is less than $40. Then, look carefully at the total amount received during the month by the recipients. In one State, it is over $18,000,000 while in the other State, it is only over $3,000,000. Certainly these facts deserve careful consideration.

Now, let me look at the figures from two States of small population. Let us look at Virginia as compared with Colorado. Let us remember, also, that Virginia has a population of more than double that of Colorado. Please keep this fact in mind and then study the figures. Here they are:

State	Number of recipients	Average monthly payment	Total amount paid for month
Colorado	48,592	$75.01	$3,644,839
Virginia	18,568	20.77	385,650

When we look at these figures, certain very important facts are inescapable. Virginia, with more than twice the population, has less than half as many beneficiaries. The old folks in Colorado received over $75 per person for the month of October; while in Virginia, they received less than $21. The total benefits in dollars paid to recipients for the month, was almost ten times in Colorado what it was in Virginia, notwithstanding the fact that in population, Virginia is almost twice that of Colorado.

I believe these simple comparisons illustrate clearly what I mean by inequality of our present system among the various States. I shall, however, file with the committee, the entire report showing the figures from all the States, from which these figures are taken. I suggest also, that each Member of Congress might watch these monthly reports and study them carefully as they are issued month by month by the Federal Security Agency.

What should Congress do about it

A bipartisan group in the House of Representatives, led by my colleague, Representative VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, representing the minority, and myself, for the majority, have been giving serious study to this problem. We have united with us, in this effort, now more than 130 Members of the House. We have our individual opinions as to many details concerning remedial legislation, and each Member is, of course, entitled to his own opinion. However, we do find that there is a definite field of agreement, and there are positive points of agreement, on which we seem to be united. Among these points, are the following:

1. We should enact a Federal pension to take the place of "old age assistance" under the Social Security Act.

2. The pension should be paid uniformly in all the States without regard to what the States pay.

3. Eligibility of recipients should be liberalized. A property owner should be considered as well as those who have no property.

4. Many of us believe the amount of the Federal pension should be $100 per month, but the figure on which we have agreed is at least $60 per month.

I introduced a bill in the House, H. R. 2620, embodying these features and will file a copy of it along with my remarks, with the committee. I hope it will have the careful and full consideration of the committee, and that when your report is made to the floor of the Senate, you will have seen fit to recommend a decided improvement in our provisions for those citizens who are now of retirement age.

It is well to legislate for the retirement of our workers

I am deeply interested in the future of America. It shall be my pleasure to give full and complete attention to the future problems of security for those who are now actively engaged in production. I am anxious, insofar as we can, that we shall anticipate the needs of all of our active workers, and plan for their security, once they are old enough to retire. However, as important as this appears, it is not an emergency that must be met at this moment. Young people, those who are the workers of today, will not need retirement until they retire. For this reason, I do trust that we will put first things

first, in this matter. I am thinking first of those who have served so well, in peacetime and in war, and have brought us to the proud place we now occupy as the leading Nation in many ways, in all the world. I am very deeply concerned about those who are now old to the point where there is no hope for them in labor, business, professions, or in industry. They are in need of old-age security now. Young people may be able to wait at least a little while. But, unless we do something for those who are now old, we are missing a vital opportunity.

Postponement or delay is serious

If we fail, Mr. Chairman, to meet our obligation to this important segment of our population—I am speaking of those who are now too old to earn—it will be disastrous. Many of them are in dire need. I certainly see no depression coming but the specter of unemployment is casting its menacing shadow across our land. We are looking for markets to keep our farms, mines, mills, and factories going. We are facing the problem of keeping money in circulation. Let us consider the matter of American old-age pensions, in this light. It will be a very efficient and equitable way to keep money circulating in every section of the land. Should we see that our elder citizens can have just a reasonable cash amount each month, giving the employment they now have to younger people, it should benefit business and strengthen our economy. It will aid in maintaining or increasing our national income. This is very important to our future growth and prosperity. In addition to that, it will perhaps accomplish more in genuine happiness and well being among those deserving security, than any other like amount of money which the Congress will appropriate. Should we fail—then I shall dread to contemplate the position in which we have left the deserving fathers and mothers of our country.

Of these facts, Mr. Chairman, I feel sure:

1. America can well afford a reasonable, uniform pension to all citizens of retirement age.

2. There is a great and crying need for such a pension.

3. The pension money being spent in our markets month by month would go a long way toward compensating our economy for the burden of any added tax.

4. While security for our young people, when they become old, is important, it can well wait until the present crying needs of our deserving elder citizens have been provided for.

I know of no action that this Congress can take short of that which deals with our national security that will yield as much in happiness and general good as to provide a genuine American pension for our deserving retired American citizens. I trust and I pray that this Congress will give the matter full and complete consideration, that we may have such a pension enacted as early as possible this year. Most certainly an old-age pension is better than old-age assistance.

In conclusion, may I say that the bill I introduced, H. R. 2620, provides in substance that every citizen of the United States who is 60 years of age or older, and who does not have an income sufficient to require him or her, as the case might be, to file a Federal income-tax return, and who applies for same, is entitled to a Federal pension at the rate of $60 per month. I think that this is a simple, moderate, and workable plan. It would do away with the present case-worker system and with much of the administrative cost. It would not be necessary to set up any new boards or bureaus, as the question of income tax could be determined under the present law and rules and regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

A number of groups in our society now have retirement benefits, such as coal miners, steel workers, Government officials and employees. Why should not all of our citizens enjoy retirement benefits when they reach the proper age? It is sometimes pointed out that the groups just mentioned pay into their retirement fund. The real truth of the matter is, as I see it, that society generally pays into these funds and not the individual beneficiaries, for the reason that salaries and wages are raised either by fiat of law or by employers so that said groups may have sufficient money to pay into their fund. When salaries and wages are raised, the increased tax and the increased cost of production, such as coal and steel, is passed to the public. So in truth and in fact the public pays the bill. If the public pays the bill for these groups, why shouldn't it pay it for all groups and treat them all alike? I certainly do not complain that the groups mentioned have retirement funds—I am glad that they do have them—but my desire is that all groups have the same or similar privileges to what they have.

If the Congress does not think it wise at this time to replace the old-age-assistance section of the Social Security Act with an old-age-pension program, then I respectfully request that it give consideration to the following formula in the old-age-assistance title of H. R. 6000, to wit: That the Federal Government pay five-sixths of the first $30 of the average payment per recipient, plus one-half the balance up to a maximum on individual monthly payments of $60. In substance, the net effect of this proposal is to provide an additional $10 in Federal funds per month.

I am truly grateful to the committee for having given me this opportunity to present my views in regard to this most important matter.

H. R. 2620

A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Federal Security Administrator (hereinafter called the "Administrator") shall pay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated for such purpose, an old-age pension to qualified individuals at the rate of $60 per month.

(b) For the purposes of this act an individual shall be deemed to be a qualified individual—

(1) if he is 60 years of age or over, is a citizen of the United States, and has been a citizen of the United States for not less than 10 years;

(2) if he resides in the United States and has been a resident of the United States for not less than 10 years;

(3) if his gross income is less than the minimum amount with respect to which a Federal income-tax return is required to be filed; and

(4) if he has made application for the benefits of this act.

(c) Payments to qualified individuals shall be made monthly.

SEC. 2. Any individual making application for the benefits of this act shall furnish such evidence of age, citizenship, and residence as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe. Whether a Federal income tax with respect to the income of any individual were payable for any taxable year shall, for the purposes of this act, be established from records and data in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall upon request furnish to the Administrator any documents, records, or information which he may have relating to whether a Federal income tax were payable for any taxable year with respect to the income of any applicant for the benefits of this act.

SEC. 3. No payment to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be made for any quarter beginning on or after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. As used in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of the first section of this act, the term "United States" means the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on last February 23 the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] under extension of his remarks, inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan," as published in the Kansas City Star on February 17. This was part of an article originally printed in the Providence Journal on February 13, entitled "Greek Student at Bryant Charges Marshall Plan Is Choking Itself."

I have received from Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA, a letter dated March 10, in answer to this newspaper article. Believing that it will be of interest to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete original article and Mr. Hoffman's letter.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK STUDENT AT BRYANT CHARGES MARSHALL PLAN IS CHOKING ITSELF—SAYS GREECE GETS UNNECESSARY THINGS—TERMS ECONOMY STIFLED, PEOPLE MADE LAZY AND DEPENDENT

(By Philip C. Gunion)

The Marshall plan is choking itself to death on nylon stockings, lipsticks, plastic combs, and canned tuna fish, Nicholas Farmakis, a Greek who is a student at Bryant College, charges.

The insistence of the United States in shipping little but finished products—and then things that are unnecessary to life in Greece—is stifling Greek economy and making the people lazy and dependent, Farmakis said.

Raw materials which could be converted by native labor into articles really needed by the Greeks would start up industry in Greece and make it a strong bulwark against the Communists to the north.

But the American idea that what an American thinks is right and all that foreigners think is wrong is causing the Marshall plan to backfire into an agency of dissatisfaction among the people of Europe, Farmakis thinks.

AMERICAN TUNA DUMPED

Tuna is an ideal canned product for America with its vast inland territory, Farmakis admits, but it could help make idle thousands of Greeks who fish for a living, when shipped in large quantities to Greece—if only the Greeks would use it.

But they don't. They prefer the native fresh-caught fish. The American tuna is stored in warehouses until the space is

needed, then it is dumped. But it keeps coming, Farmakis said.

Lipsticks and nylons do a lot for the American girl, said Farmakis, who is a student of more than business administration, but their use among the economic level of persons supposed to be helped by the Marshall plan is slight in Greece.

The tall, 23-year-old student, who hopes to go into politics in Greece when his studies in America are completed, feels that all aid under the Marshall plan should be stopped immediately until the nations involved can meet with the United States and set up a program by which they can get the things they need—and the things that we think they need can be left in this country.

CONCRETE PILES TO GREEKS

Farmakis said that when the Greek Government told the United States that it wanted cement and other building materials to start a construction program, it got machines that went around laying concrete piles that were identified as houses by Americans. They remained piles of concrete to Greeks.

Farmakis' father is president of the Greek Rubber Co., and he wants to import raw rubber to Greece so that it can be manufactured by Greeks into things that Greeks need. But the Greek need for these products is met by Marshall plan administrators in shipments of finished rubber goods.

These fail to benefit the people because the Greek Government imposes import taxes on them to protect the native rubber companies, and other Greeks suffer.

Naturally, Farmakis explained, this creates resentment among the Greeks—instead of the fine feeling of fellowship against communism which is the hard-headed reason behind the Marshall plan.

IT IS VERY BAD

"It is very bad," Farmakis said, "because if Greece collapses to the Russians, the United States won't be far behind. Of course, if the United States went first, Greece would go at the same time."

Farmakis would like to stay in the United States forever, but when he finishes his education at Bryant, he will return to Greece.

"I am in a good position because of my father and I feel that perhaps some other Greek boy, less well situated, could come here in my place and get a chance to succeed," he said.

He lives with four American roommates in an apartment at 71 Hope Street and finds this beneficial to his understanding of this country.

His service in the Greek underground during World War II, he shrugs off—"Everybody was doing it."

He is also modest about his excellent English. "When I can understand a New York taxi driver, I will say that I possess the American language," he said.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is a further reply to your letter of February 17, attaching a newspaper article entitled "Greek Student at Bryant Charges Marshall Plan Is Choking Itself," which we acknowledged in our letter of February 23.

The article contains a number of misleading and erroneous statements and we appreciate your giving us an opportunity to comment on it.

In the first place, it is the policy of ECA not to ship any unnecessary or undesirable commodities to a participating country.

We should like to correct the impression conveyed by the article that ECA financing is allowed for importing into Greece lipsticks, plastic combs, nylon hose, and canned tuna fish. Personal accessories such as lipstick, plastic combs, and nylon hose are included on the list of items which have always been ineligible for ECA financing. This list of prohibited articles was sent by ECA to all participating countries and to United States banks holding ECA letters of commitment some time ago, and in those cases where these items have been purchased, ECA has obtained reimbursement from the participating country. Import licensing procedures in Greece, controlled by the Foreign Trade Administration (a Greek Government agency), and the auditing procedures of the ECA controller assure proper restrictions on the use of ECA funds. Items such as those mentioned above could be brought into Greece through two legal methods. First, many of these items reach the people as gifts sent by relatives and friends, and eventually reach the market. Second, they might be obtained through use of non-ECA funds. However, such items are not eligible for financing by ECA.

Canned tuna fish is considered a luxury item and is not eligible for ECA financing. Tuna is prohibited from purchase by a price restriction incorporated in the procurement authorization, which establishes a maximum value that can be paid for canned fish. This controlled price makes it impossible for any country to procure tuna with ECA funds. In prewar years, even before her fishing fleet was depleted as a result of occupation and World War II, fish was among Greece's chief imports. The 1936–39 yearly average import was approximately 23,000 metric tons. Total imports authorized through use of ECA dollars amount to only about 4,600 tons, and these have been limited mainly to wet salted or dried fish.

The importance of building up the Greek fishing industry was taken into account by the Greek-Turkish aid program under the operation of the United States Department of State and subsequently by ECA. American aid under these two programs has contributed materially to improving the industry and making it more productive. New boats have been provided and marine Diesel engines and refrigeration equipment have been supplied to modernize the existing fleet. Tons of twine and other materials have been sent to Greece for repairing fish nets and making new ones. It is encouraging to note that fresh-fish production in 1949 was about 14 percent above the 1935–38 average.

Procurement of crude rubber has never been financed by ECA. Crude or raw rubber is obtainable from sterling areas and, therefore, is not eligible for dollar financing under ECA. The importation of crude rubber, therefore, is a Greek Government problem. The Greek import program for the current year provides for a limited amount of crude rubber, allied gums, and synthetic rubber. This applies also to raw materials for plastics, from which finished products such as combs are made.

Contrary to the newspaper article, ECA does not prescribe the goods to be shipped to Greece. The programing procedure under ECA requires the Greek Government to prepare its own estimates of import requirements. They alone determine what they wish ECA to finance. The import list is then studied by both the ECA mission in Athens and by ECA in Washington and procurement authorized, if approved. In view of Greece's fiscal situation, careful planning is required in allocating expenditures for essential foodstuffs, fuel, etc.; raw materials for those existing industries whose products contribute most to the Greek economy, and for reconstruction materials.

In the beginning of the ECA operation it was necessary for the Greek Government to bring in a larger portion of manufactured articles and equipment in lieu of raw materials. Many industries had been seriously crippled or destroyed as a result of occupation and World War II. Guerrilla warfare, which subsided recently, further destroyed or disrupted Greek industry. As the guerrillas were pushed northward and defeated, reconstruction began and manufacturing plants are being restored. There has been a proportionate increase in the flow of machinery and industrial equipment for the purpose of rehabilitating manufacturing plants. As a result, more raw materials are being shipped for further processing or fabrication in Greece. This is in line with established ECA policy of improving participating countries' production.

Greece has, accordingly, been increasing the importation of construction tools for the purpose of utilizing local building materials for housing. No materials necessary for housing are imported unless they are not available locally.

We should greatly appreciate having any information Mr. Farmakis might be able to furnish which formed the basis for his statements to the press. Upon receipt of such information, we would be in position to request our ECA mission in Athens to make a complete investigation.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

The President's Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial entitled "Streamlined Boards," from the Washington Post of March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREAMLINED BOARDS

The President's Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 to 13 are an attempt to bring greater efficiency into seven Federal regulatory commissions without destroying their quasi-judicial character. Administrative boards are universally regarded as inefficient. Some reformers have urged that they be stripped of all functions, except the decision of cases. The Hoover Commission did not go that far. It recommended that the chairman of each commission be made primarily responsible for its administrative work and supervision of its staff. Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 to 13, which the President has sent up to Congress, would implement this idea.

Two months ago we pointed out the dangers in the strong-chairman plan. If the chairman is permitted to become a dictator, he can destroy the independence of a board or commission, despite the fact that the only reason for assigning regulatory tasks to boards is to get a well-rounded judgment. This danger has been minimized, if not eliminated, in the plan now devised for such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board. The chairman in each case has been given responsibility for the appointment and direction of personnel and for the conduct of the routine business of the agency. But he would be bound by the general policies adopted by the board. The chairman would prepare the budget, but the commission

could revise it and determine the general distribution of funds. Each commissioner would retain control over personnel in his immediate office, and the agency as a whole would have to approve the men chosen by the chairman to head the various administrative units. Chairmen might abuse this power in some instances, but we suspect that on the whole it would greatly improve the operations of the regulatory bodies.

The most controversial item in this segment of the reorganization program is the elimination of the general counsel of the NLRB. This action lends itself to criticism because Congress so recently gave the general counsel separate status in the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the independence of the general counsel has created more problems than it has solved. The judging and prosecuting functions were separated, but the prosecutor himself became also an administrator and policy maker. The task force of the Hoover Commission concluded that the position is an unstable one and recommended that it be reabsorbed into the Board or into one of the executive departments. The Senate, too, voted to abolish the separate general counsel in passing the Taft bill (S. 249) last year. Since then General Counsel Denham has publicly attacked the NLRB, and the Board has clipped his wings. To avoid a prolonged and costly feud, the office ought to be abolished in favor of a general counsel subordinate to the Board.

The Oleomargarine Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the oleomargarine law, from the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRTH OF A LAW—MARGARINE MEASURE IS VIVID EXAMPLE OF HOW A BILL GETS ON THE BOOKS—WAS BOTTLED UP, DISCHARGED, PIGEONHOLED, FILIBUSTERED, ALLOWED TO DIE, REVIVED—IT'S NOT LIKE THE TEXTBOOK

(By Carl Thompson)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman is about to sign into law a bill repealing the 64-year-old Federal taxes and license fees on oleomargarine. Behind this bit of lawmaking is a little-understood story. It dramatizes what happens to most legislation from the day it's drafted until it winds up on the statute books.

The margarine tax-repeal measure isn't necessarily typical—it had more difficulties than most bills—but the way it got enacted will tell you more about how laws are passed in Congress than you can learn from most textbooks.

This particular legislation was bottled up, discharged, pigeonholed, filibustered, amended, substituted, allowed to die, revived, compromised, and saddled with riders. It split the votes of the usually solid farm bloc. It sent liberals like Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, scurrying to the side of cautious Republicans. It caused some conservative southern Democrats to line up with the CIO.

"DENY I AM THE AUTHOR"

So much happened to the bill that its original author repudiated its final form. The measure bears the number H. R. 2023. That bill was introduced January 31, 1949, by Democratic Representative GRANGER, of Utah. On March 7, 1950, as the House prepared to pass the agreed-on version of H. R. 2023, Mr. GRANGER felt it necessary to "deny that I am the author, or have any right, interest, or title in any word, comma, or period in this bill. I am just opposed to it."

In remaining months of the Eighty-first Congress, what happened to the margarine bill will be repeated, with variations. Your taxes, your social security, the spending of your tax dollars, and the farm programs affecting your grocery bill will all run the same legislative obstacle course.

Take a look at the sketchy textbook version of how laws are made at the United States Capital; then fill it in with what happened to the margarine measure:

A typical textbook starts off, "Any Member of the House or Senate may present a bill."

Actually, thousands of bills get introduced at every session of Congress. Few are passed. In the first 2 months of 1950, a total of 1,501 measures was introduced in the House and Senate. In the same period only 29 bills became law, and only 10 of these were public laws affecting most citizens. The others were private bills granting relief to some individual.

MARGARINE BILLS SINCE 1886

Public bills dealing with margarine have been before Congress since 1886, when the first taxes on the spread were approved. Since then hundreds of bills have been proposed. In the first 2 months of the Eighty-first Congress which convened in January 1949, more than 45 bills were introduced to repeal the margarine levies. For at least 4 years a majority of the House and Senate has favored wiping out the taxes and fees. But only this week did a bill get to the White House. Why the delay?

The repeal measure is a compromise. It isn't quite what the margarine makers wanted. Some Federal regulation over the butter substitute remains. In public places, margarine will either have to wear a special label or be served in what one lawmaker calls "diaper-shaped patties" and what another refers to as "triangular cubes."

The law also is far from what butter interests sought. They wanted to hinder margarine's use of the "golden color of yellow" which they claimed was somehow an exclusive attribute of butter. They hoped to prohibit the sale of yellow margarine in interstate commerce, even after they had become resigned to removal of the Federal taxes. (Many States retain local levies and restrictions on margarine, colored and white.)

THE RIDER: FTC FINES

In the final pulling and hauling, the Senate tacked on an amendment that could affect almost every industry. This provides $5,000-a-day fines for every day a final cease-and-desist order of the Federal Trade Commission is violated. Previously, the limit was $5,000 for each violation. Originally aimed at preventing margarine makers from making misleading claims for margarine, this proviso applies to every company under FTC scrutiny.

So it goes with most laws. A rare few are enacted in about the same form as they're introduced.

Says the textbook: "All the bills are * * * referred to committees. The committees will hear all who want to be heard for or against the bill."

Frequently such hearings turn into protracted battles between two opposing groups. In 1948, at least half a million dollars was poured into the margarine battle, a good chunk of it for lobbying. The National Milk Producers Federation led the fight against repeal; the National Association of Margarine Makers for it. In 1949, another $500,000 was admittedly spent. This time the American Butter Institute chipped in over $46,000 on the side of the dairy people; Best Foods, Inc., spent $36,000 for the margarine tax repeal.

"Information about the merits and defects of a measure is not the only thing that the average Congressman wants to obtain," says the textbook. "What his own voters think about it is important, too."

In an elaborate presentation by the Milk Producers' Federation, this point was bluntly hit. The legend on a booklet read: "The dairy farmers' vote is politically sensitive. Dairy farmers always vote to protect their interests."

A FARM PROBLEM

For decades, proposals to repeal margarine taxes were handled in the House of Representatives as a farm problem, not a revenue measure. The House Agriculture Committee was given the job of considering margarine tax bills. And for decades each new measure was "bottled up" in this committee, dominated by Congressmen whose own voters included large and small dairy farmers.

But House Members can thwart a committee that refuses to clear a bill for action. In March 1947 the Agriculture Committee tabled all bills dealing with margarine taxes. That meant no further action by the committee. Representative MENDEL RIVERS, a Democrat from South Carolina, promoted a discharge petition—a maneuver to force the bill out of committee—signed by a majority of House Members.

By April 1948 Mr. RIVERS' petition brought margarine tax repeal before the House and it passed by the decisive vote of 260 to 106. But the final version of the bill didn't get through Congress for almost 2 years. The measure died with the Eightieth Congress, was revived by the Eighty-first, finally passed both Houses and got to the President's desk this week.

TROUBLE IN THE SENATE

The textbook goes on: After the House acts, "all bills are signed by the Speaker and transmitted to the Senate. * * *."

For the average bill this means more trouble. When the Senate in 1948 got the House-passed margarine bill, the biggest fight centered on this question: Should it go to the Senate Finance Committee, whose members favored the measure, or to the Senate Agriculture Committee, ready to "bottle up" the bill as the House committee had done? The finance group got the bill, approved it, and sent it to the floor.

But 1948 was a hot election year. Opponents threatened a filibuster—a minority talk-fest designed to delay action until a weary majority agrees to postpone action. The threat succeeded.

The 1948 margarine bill died with the end of the Eightieth Congress. All bills not acted on when one Congress completes a 2-year session must start their journey back at the starting line.

In 1949, when the Eighty-first Congress convened, the House Agriculture Committee held long and bitter hearings on 44 oleomargarine bills and finally reported one to the House in March of last year.

The textbook says: "The committee may approve the bill just as it stands * * *."

But a committee often reports a bill favorably with amendment. The amendment may strike out everything after the opening clause, "be it enacted by the Senate and House * * *," and put in a completely new and often different bill.

The House Agriculture Committee did recommend the bill to repeal margarine taxes introduced by Utah's Representative GRANGER. But there was a "joker." It also would have prohibited shipment among States of colored margarine. The dairy-States men figured this would help stifle trade in margarine. Even under tax handicaps mar-

garine production had zoomed from about 300,000,000 pounds in 1939 to over 1,000,000,000 pounds in 1949. Postwar high prices for butter and improved flavoring and coloring techniques for the substitute had brought a switch from butter to margarine among many families.

On the House floor, however, Representative POAGE, of Texas, succeeded in substituting a pro-margarine measure for the committee-approved bill of Representative GRANGER. This passed the House 289 to 87. That was April 1, 1949.

The Senate in 1949 never did get around to acting on the bill. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin led the opposition and threatened a filibuster. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas finally got the Democratic leadership to agree to let him bring up the bill the first thing this year. Opponents couldn't filibuster from January 3 to the very end of the session, he reasoned.

The Senate took up margarine tax repeal on January 4, 1950.

Then came a deluge of delaying amendments—to abolish the Southern poll tax, to enact an antilynching law, to set up a fair employment practices commission, to repeal wartime excise taxes. These were knocked down one by one. But before the bill passed the Senate, 56 to 16, the "rider" strengthening FTC penalty powers had been attached.

TRIANGULAR TRICK

Everything seemed fine for the bill's proponents—except for one little gimmick. The Senate had stuck in a change that required all margarine to be molded and packed "so as to be triangular in shape." That meant the one-pound packages and quarter-pound sticks of margarine all had to be triangles.

Representatives of the margarine industry did some scrambling. This would mean completely junking all existing packaging machines and cutting dies, they screamed. It would cost the industry up to $5,000,000 for new packaging machinery and would take up to 5 years to get the equipment, it was claimed.

When the House and Senate have each passed differing versions of the same bill, the textbook casually says: "The matter goes to a conference committee." The conference committee is made up of members of the committees in each house that originally dealt with the measure. They compromise the measure.

In the case of the margarine bill, the triangle packaging issue almost led to a stalemate. This was finally settled by making it mandatory for restaurants to serve the spread in triangles, or else label it plainly as margarine. Then the compromised bill went back to House and Senate and sailed through with little difficulty, and was sent to the White House for Presidential approval.

The textbook was never so right as when it concluded: "It is only the most robust bills that survive to the end."

Fair Employment Practices Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 this body voted to scuttle H. R. 4453, the Powell FEPC bill, and in its place substituted the McConnell bill, which is practically meaningless insofar as effective elimination of job discrimination is concerned. At that time I and a number of other Members of the House stated that this was a sellout of FEPC and that the passage of the McConnell bill would serve as a signal for intensification of discrimination in employment against minority groups throughout the country, thus destroying one of the basic principles upon which our country was founded, namely, the right of all citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Only a few short weeks after the passage of the McConnell bill we see that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee unanimously reported a bill, H. R. 7185, which has as its purpose the continued denial of skilled jobs to Negroes in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department.

When one reads this bill the impression is gained that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is concerned with increased job opportunities for veterans, but an examination of the actual situation which the bill proposes to correct will reveal that this bill was introduced only after the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission had instructed the Treasury Department to cease discriminating against a group of its Negro employees and give a long-postponed examination for apprentice plate printers.

Further proof that the bill is aimed at continuing the discriminatory practices now in effect at the Bureau of Engraving and not for providing increased job opportunities for veterans is revealed by the fact that at the opening of the hearing on the bill the chairman of the committee requested the Treasury Department to postpone the examination scheduled for March 15, which will make possible for the first time in its history for the Bureau of Engraving to employ Negroes who are qualified as plate printers.

The Fair Employment Board stated in its formal decision:

The Board is gratified to learn that the Department of the Treasury has now rescheduled for March 15, 1950, the promotional examination, the indefinite postponement of which precipitated the appeal in this case. This is an encouraging step in the right direction but is of itself insufficient treatment of the basic problem. The civil-service laws and regulations, the financial resources of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the numerical strength of the plate printer force, and the pattern of work organization around the plate printing press provide ample management flexibility to permit the operation of a recruiting system free from any taint of racial discrimination.

It is the recommendation of this Board that the best corrective of the existing situation will be found in the early initiation and continuous operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of an inservice-training program with respect to the plate printing craft, related numerically to the normal turn-over in that employee classification and to the total Government and private employment in this craft. This program should be open to all qualified employees of the Bureau within these numerical limits, thus effectuating the intent of Executive Order 9980 as implemented by the Department's promotional policy announced in Departmental Order No. 114 of June 1, 1949.

The Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission is not an irresponsible body. It was appointed at the direction of the President to correct the problem of discrimination against minority groups in Government employment. It did not arrive at its decision on the Bureau of Engraving and Printing case without thorough and painstaking investigation of the problem. That Board found that the following conditions exist at the Bureau of Engraving:

The number of plate printers employed throughout the country is relatively small, and the Bureau is by far the largest employer. On January 1, 1950, it had on its employment rolls 492 plate printers, a number which is more than 50 percent of the total number of this craft now in employment. Over the past 20 years the Bureau force, with some fluctuations, has grown from about 400 to nearly 500, despite improvements in equipment and technology which have increased individual production capacity. No Negro is or ever has been employed by the Bureau as a plate printer.

Journeyman plate printer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing must have had 4 years of apprenticeship, or its equivalent in practical experience. * * * No Negro has ever been recruited or employed as an apprentice plate printer in the Bureau.

For at least 20 years prior to 1938 the Bureau met its plate printer personnel recruitment needs through appointment, on certification by the Civil Service Commission, of journeymen who had served an apprenticeship in private industry. The Civil Service Commission requires the full apprenticeship experience of 4 years or, since 1942, its equivalent of practical experience, as a prerequisite to such certification, but the Commission in no way restricts the operating Bureau to this single channel for meeting its need for plate printers. The recruitment of journeymen plate printers solely from private industry had the effect of erecting a barrier against Negroes who might aspire to become plate printers in the Bureau, because in private industry up to this time, Negroes have not had equal opportunity to secure the requisite training.

Over the 13 fiscal years 1938 to 1950 inclusive, the Bureau recruited 75 apprentice plate printers, and it has carried on its rolls an average of 21 such apprentices for each of those years. None has been recruited since April 15, 1946.

Of these 75 apprentices, 61 were chosen from lists of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission from assembled written examinations, advertised and held throughout the United States, and 14 were recruited by such noncompetitive action as transfer, promotion, or reassignment. Negroes competed in the examinations and were certified as eligible, and at the same time qualified Negroes were available for noncompetitive assignment within the Bureau as apprentice plate printers. But none of the 75 apprentices were Negroes. In at least one case a Negro eligible failed of appointment while white eligibles of lower rating on the same certificate were appointed. This Negro eligible was subsequently certified to another Government agency where he served his apprenticeship, and is now employed as a journeyman in another craft.

The cessation of apprentice recruiting in 1946 recreated the recruitment situation which existed prior to 1938. Negroes in considerable numbers, presently employed in the Bureau, and veterans of World War II, aspire to become plate printers. The announcement of the promotional examination in July of 1948 opened the channel for a specified group of Negroes in the Bureau, including the appellants. Continued postponement of the examination restores the exact situation which existed prior to the announcement and closes the only channel by which the

Negro applicants can become plate printers in the Bureau.

Who are the Negro employees at the Bureau of Engraving who fought for and secured this decision on fair employment in their agency? They are all veterans of World War II, many with overseas and combat service, some with four and five battle stars and a few with citations for outstanding heroism in the face of enemy action.

H. R. 7185 is designed to destroy the opportunity of these men to enter into a skilled craft from which members of their race have been barred for the last half century both in government and private employment. I am familiar with the fight of these men, for they and their union came before my subcommittee when it was holding hearings on the recently scuttled FEPC bill, H. R. 4453. I heard their stories and I have had Negro employees by the scores come to me and say this is it.

When the Fair Employment Board decision on the Bureau of Engraving case was issued a new atmosphere of freedom and brotherhood was created in that Government agency. Many of the Negro veterans who were affected by that decision and saw for the first time in their lives an opportunity to enter a hitherto lily-white trade, came to me and said now we are beginning to realize some of the things for which they told us we were fighting in the last world war. They told me that not only did they feel that way but that a number of white veterans of World War II who had been caught in the agency's discriminatory squeeze play also had these feelings.

No; the issue behind H. R. 7185 is not the technical one of giving additional job advantages to veterans. It is just the contrary. The motivation is to take away from these Negro veterans their recently won opportunity to enjoy some of the democracy for which they fought and bled. The issued posed by H. R. 7185 is whether or not fair employment practices in our Government agencies will be maintained and upheld or whether a group of narrow-minded, bigoted racists will have complete control over skilled jobs in the Bureau of Engraving by virtue of the passage of this bill.

In effect, the very dignity of this Fair Employment Board which was appointed by the authority of the President is threatened by this bill. If Congress reverses this decision, the civil rights of Negroes and other minority groups in Government employment will have been done an irreparable harm. This is the stain which H. R. 7185 would place upon the conscience of the Members of this House.

I want to serve warning to all of those who propose to hide behind this bill and to give vent to their prejudice by support of this bill that they will be fought tooth and nail on the issue of civil rights. The fight for FEPC will go on.

To support H. R. 7185 will be to support the most vicious discriminatory legislation this House has seen. It will make a further lie of the Republican and Democratic platforms. It will be a direct insult to every Negro, veteran, and believer in democracy.

Only Tuesday, March 14, 1950, Judge Keech rejected a request for an injunction against this examination. The request for this injunction was made by a lily-white group which seeks to continue the racial exclusion policy in this agency. Judge Keech's refusal in district court yesterday to grant an injunction which would postpone this examination is an indication of the complete illegality of any action to overthrow the fair employment decision.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT BOARD,
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Name of appellants: Earl E. Ashton, Raymond F. Cooke, Paul F. Cooper, John E. Harris, Francis E. Janifer, Thomas M. Keys, Edward L. Mitchell, Edgar Sims, Frederick Wiggins.

Department: Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

BASIS OF APPEAL

The above-named persons appealed individually to the Fair Employment Board under Executive Order 9980 from the decision of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, dated December 29, 1949, that there was no racial discrimination in connection with the postponement of a promotional examination for apprentice plate printer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. All of the appellants had applied for, and were eligible to take the examination. The appeals were consolidated for hearing.

The appellants alleged, in substance, that in the recruitment of apprentice plate printers and plate printers by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing discrimination against Negroes has long prevailed; that the promotional examination for apprentice plate printers announced July 16, 1948 was a practical and very welcome step toward removing this discrimination; and that the indefinite postponement of the promotional examination on November 5, 1948 reerected a barrier which effectively deprives all Negroes of any opportunity to qualify for, or attain employment as, plate printers in that Bureau.

Admittance to the promotion examination was limited to seven classifications of Bureau employees having permanent civil-service status and, within these classifications, to veterans of World War II under 41 years of age. From 100 entrance applications originally accepted, 94 applicants remain. Of these, 47 are Negroes.

The announced reasons for the postponement were: (1) that 20 power plate printing presses of considerably greater potential output than the presses then in use had unexpectedly become available and had been purchased for immediate installation; (2) that a program for modernization of the presses then in use had been developed and adopted; and (3) that if those steps proved successful the plate printers requirements of the Bureau could easily be met with existing personnel, therefore making it unnecessary to appoint apprentice plate printers for an indefinite period of time.

The bulletin postponing the examination held out for the applicants only the prospect that, "If the program fails, obviously it will be necessary to revive consideration of the apprentice program."

HEARING AND INVESTIGATION

The Board held a hearing on January 30, 31, and February 1, 1950, at which the appellants, their representatives, and a representative of the Treasury Department were present. Testimony was adduced from witnesses presented by the appellants or called by the Board itself. In addition to the information secured at this hearing and from a review of the file of the Treasury Department, the Board has obtained supplemental data from the Treasury Department, the Civil Service Commission, and other sources, with particular reference to possible racial discrimination in the recruitment and employment of plate printers and apprentice plate printers in the Government service.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The position of plate printer has been clearly identifiable in the pattern of Federal employment for many decades. It is unqualifiedly subject to civil-service laws and regulations. All citizens, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin, are, therefore, entitled to an open channel toward employment as plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

2. The promotion policy of the Treasury Department, which is the only agency of the Federal Government employing plate printers, provides, in its departmental order No. 114, dated June 1, 1949, that—

"It is the policy of the Treasury Department normally to fill vacant positions above the customary recruiting levels in each bureau, office, and division by the promotion from within of qualified employees whose abilities have been demonstrated and who have the capacity to undertake more advanced work. Promotions will be based solely on merit. There will be no discrimination because of race, color, creed, or for any other reason. Preference will be given to seniority only when other qualifications are equal."

3. The number of plate printers employed throughout the country is relatively small, and the Bureau is by far the largest employer. On January 1, 1950, it had on its employment rolls 492 plate printers, a number which is more than 50 percent of the total number of this craft now in employment. Over the past 20 years the Bureau force, with some fluctuations, has grown from about 400 to nearly 500, despite improvements in equipment and technology which have increased individual-production capacity. No Negro is or ever has been employed by the Bureau as a plate printer.

4. Journeyman plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing must have had 4 years of apprenticeship, or its equivalent in practical experience. At present there are no apprentice plate printers employed in the Bureau, as the last apprentice became a journeyman this year. No Negro has ever been recruited or employed as an apprentice plate printer in the Bureau.

5. For at least 20 years prior to 1938 the Bureau met its plate printer personnel recruitment needs through appointment, on certification by the Civil Service Commission, of journeymen who had served an apprenticeship in private industry. The Civil Service Commission requires the full apprenticeship experience of 4 years or, since 1942, its equivalent of practical experience, as a prerequisite to such certification, but the Commission in no way restricts the operating Bureau to this single channel for meeting its need for plate printers. The recruitment of journeyman plate printers solely from private industry had the effect of erecting a barrier against Negroes who might aspire to become plate printers in the Bureau, because in private industry up to this time, Negroes have not had equal opportunity to secure the requisite training.

6. Since 1938 the number of plate printers appointed in the Bureau has averaged 49, and the number of separations 46 per year. As of January 1, 1950 there were 492 plate printers on duty in the Bureau and 20 vacancies to be filled. The Director of the Bureau expects that, subject to possible fluctuation in demand for currency and stamps, the plate printer force will be stabilized at approximately 500 journeymen after the installa-

tion of new presses and the modernization of old presses have been completed.

7. For several years there has been a shortage of qualified journeyman plate printers. This shortage is reflected in the amount of overtime worked by the plate printers on duty in the Bureau. On November 29, 1949, the Civil Service Commission announced an open continuous examination for plate printer. To date, as a result of this examination, the Commission has not secured a sufficient number of eligibles to fill existing vacancies in the Bureau and to provide for the normal annual turn-over in plate printer personnel. According to the Bureau's own estimate, separations are anticipated as follows: 1950, 36; 1951, 36; 1952, 30; 1953, 34.

8. Over the 13 fiscal years, 1938 to 1950, inclusive, the Bureau has recruited 75 apprentice plate printers, and it has carried on its rolls an average of 21 such apprentices for each of those years. None has been recruited since April 15, 1946.

Of these 75 apprentices, 61 were chosen from lists of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission from assembled written examinations, advertised and held throughout the United States, and 14 were recruited by such noncompetitive action as transfer, promotion, or reassignment. Negroes competed in these examinations and were certified as eligibles, and at the same time qualified Negroes were available for noncompetitive assignment within the Bureau as apprentice plate printers. But none of the 75 apprentices were Negroes. In at least one case a Negro eligible failed of appointment while white eligibles of lower rating on the same certificate were appointed. This Negro eligible was subsequently certified to another Government agency where he served his apprenticeship, and is now employed as a journeyman in another craft.

9. The cessation of apprentice recruiting in 1946 recreated the recruitment situation which existed prior to 1938. Negroes in considerable numbers, presently employed in the Bureau, and veterans of World War II, aspire to become plate printers. The announcement of the promotional examination in July of 1948 opened the channel for a specified group of Negroes in the Bureau, including the appellants. Continued postponement of the examination restores the exact situation which existed prior to the announcement and closes the only channel by which the Negro applicants can become plate printers in the Bureau.

DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The method of recruiting plate printers is clearly the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government and, particularly, of the officers charged with general management of the employing bureau. Generally speaking, these officers must be allowed to determine whether such recruitment shall be accomplished exclusively by recruiting journeymen or in whole or in part through an apprentice program. Such discretionary authority should, however, be exercised within the framework and in the light of the spirit and intent, as well as the letter, of civil-service law and regulations and of Executive and departmental orders. If the exclusive recruitment of journeymen operates, for any reason, to deprive any group of American citizens by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, of opportunity to qualify for the civil-service position of plate printer, the recruitment policy and program should be changed.

The Fair Employment Board recognizes that the postponement of the apprentice plate-printer examination in 1948 was, at the time, an exercise of reasonable business judgment. But it concludes that any continuation of past recruitment methods and procedures as applied to plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing will inevitably involve an element of racial discrimination against Negroes, in that it will perpetuate a system which has operated effectively to bar Negro citizens from the civil-service position of plate printer in the Bureau.

The Board is gratified to learn that the Department of the Treasury has now rescheduled for March 15, 1950, the promotional examination, the indefinite postponement of which precipitated the appeal in this case. This is an encouraging step in the right direction, but is of itself insufficient treatment of the basic problem. The civil-service laws and regulations, the financial resources of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the numerical strength of the plate-printer force, and the pattern of work organization around the plate-printing press provide ample management flexibility to permit the operation of a recruiting system free from any taint of racial discrimination.

It is the recommendation of this Board that the best corrective of the existing situation will be found in the early initiation and continuous operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of an in-service training program with respect to the plate-printing craft, related numerically to the normal turn-over in that employee classification and to the total Government and private employment in this craft. This program should be open to all qualified employees of the Bureau within these numerical limits, thus effectuating the intent of Executive Order 9980 as implemented by the Department's promotional policy announced in Departmental Order No. 114 of June 1, 1949.

By direction of the Board:

JAMES L. HOUGHTELING,
Chairman, Fair Employment Board.

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

A Congressman's Duty

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the News-Palladium of Benton Harbor asks—

What is a Congressman's duty when he must vote on a measure which he dislikes but which is favored by so many of the people of his district that a vote against it might cost him his job? Should he abandon his own beliefs and vote for the measure, thus protecting his popularity at the polls? In doing so he might be the best representative of his district, which after all is what a Congressman is supposed to be. * * *

Or should he stand by his own convictions and attempt to justify himself to his constituents on the ground that he did what he thought was best for the Nation? This course, too, could be right in some cases, where the Congressman might be convinced that the proposed action * * * would be harmful to the Nation as a whole. If it would harm the Nation, it would eventually harm his district also; seeing this, it would be his clear duty to vote for the good of the Nation and try to show his voters that he had done so.

The editorial raises an issue which almost daily confronts every elected legislative officeholder. There is no "yes" or "no" answer. The answer is sometimes "yes"; sometimes "no."

For example, everyone wants more at less cost, but it would be disastrous to enact legislation which would give to everyone, regardless of his need—let us say, a pension of $300 per month. Funds to pay that kind of a pension could only be obtained through taxation which would be ruinous. Certainly, no sound-thinking Congressman with the good of his country at heart would vote for something which he knew would destroy the Nation's economy.

Again, how can a Congressman know what his people actually want? Frequently, minority groups put on the heat, write the most letters, use the most newspaper space, talk the loudest. There is no easy answer to the question, "What do the people of my district want?"

There was a time when the people elected a Congressman because they had confidence in his judgment, trusted him to act for the benefit of the district and the Nation.

More recently, pressure groups have become numerous, well organized, vociferous; threaten their Representative with defeat if he does not vote the way that particular group wants, or thinks it wants. If I actually knew what a majority of my people, after having given consideration to the facts, wanted, I would either vote for the measure as advocated, or at least make my opposition thereto clear, give my reasons for that opposition so that at the next election, they would have an opportunity to select someone whom they thought would more often vote for the measures in which they believed.

A Congressman, unlike an employee in business or industry, is out of a job every 2 years. He must go to the voters to get a job. All things considered, a Congressman who does not truly represent the prevailing sentiment in his District is not re-elected. Inasmuch as it is almost impossible to ascertain in advance of the vote upon any one particular measure whether a majority of the people of the district favor it, a Representative is forced, if he is worth his salt, to vote his honest convictions. If that elected legislative official remains in office one term after another, it is therefore safe to assume that he has not only voted as his judgment and convictions indicated, but that he has also voted as a majority of the people desired. The only exception would appear to be when some wave of hysteria for a particular unsound course of action sweeps the country and the officeholder has not been able to point out the unsoundness of the proposed course of action.

A rapid turn-over in officeholders is usually due either to the pressure of a militant, powerful group representing special interests, or to the failure of the officeholder to make his views clear, to think and to act for the good of the Nation as a whole.

Ordinarily, a Representative who survives more than two terms is one who not only votes his own convictions, but at the same time votes as the real majority of his constituents wish.

Usually a Congressman votes his convictions and his convictions are from a practical standpoint, those of his people.

Tax Reduction

REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a specific suggestion about how to bring about a large boost in the living standard of every American, create more employment and better the general welfare of every American. My suggestion is simple. Cut taxes.

Last year our country's total tax bill was $56,000,000,000. This is considerably higher than our total food bill. If we reduce taxes by, say 20 percent, all of us will be able to eat about 20 percent better. Everyone would be better off—the farmer, the food processor, the retailer, and the customer. Remember the total value of all the farms in America plus all the farm machinery and all the livestock on all the farms is only $44,000,000,000.

This same tax bill of $56,000,000,000 is almost as high as the combined annual cost of all food, housing, all household expense, medical care, and recreation for every person in this country. A 20-percent tax cut could mean about a 20-percent improvement in every one of these items. Think of it—20 percent better housing, 20 percent better furnishings, 20 percent better medical care, and 20 percent better recreation for every person in the country.

Taxes drag down our living standards. Let us reduce taxes and insure a better life for every American.

The Eightieth Republican Congress restored confidence to the people. The 1948 farm income, both gross and net, the laboring man's average annual income, and the businessman's income was the highest in the history of our Nation. Thanks to the good record of the Eightieth Congress.

Here are a few facts about the Republican Eightieth Congress:

Taxes: The people were saved $4,800,000,000 by a tax-cut bill passed over three Presidential vetoes. Low-income groups gained greatest benefit.

Labor relations: Passed Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Relations Act over veto. It liberated workers, cut strikes, stabilized jobs, increased income to workers.

Un-American activities: Revealed Communist spy rings and exposed infiltration of Communists into Government positions with high authority.

National defense: Passed Unification of Armed Forces Act and greatly expanded the Air Forces, thus strengthening the Nation's defenses.

Home building: Freed the people of red tape, rules, regulations, and directives, permitting private initiative to double home building in 2 years.

Aged and blind: Passed a bill over President's veto increasing payments for aged and blind and needy dependent children.

Agriculture: Extended full 90 percent parity-price supports on basic farm crops.

Soil conservation: Appropriated more than $500,000,000 for soil-conservation practices on farm lands.

REA: Approved $800,000,000 for REA loans to provide electricity for nearly twice as many farms as any previous Congress.

Roads: Authorized and provided funds for 1948–49 farm-to-market road-building program five times larger than any previous single year.

Veterans: Increased benefits for needy and disabled veterans, their widows and children, and dependents of deceased veterans.

Health: Provided Federal aid for research into causes and treatment of cancer, heart, and teeth diseases.

Bureaus: Reduced number of useless Government agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions over strenuous Presidential objections.

Foreign affairs: Cooperated in every way to the fullest extent with our United Nations officials in their efforts to negotiate peace.

Foreign aid: Gave relief to numerous foreign nations to help them reestablish themselves and enable them to restrain Communist aggression.

Budget: Balanced the Federal budget for the first time in 16 years.

National debt: Paid $7,000,000,000 on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, above all else, in two crowded years the Republican Eightieth Congress gave new life and new meaning to the fundamental principle of American government, which is that government is the servant and never the master of the people.

Tax Reduction

REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent war, Americans were footing the biggest tax bill in the Nation's history—shouldering the burden along with the other special wartime sacrifices which they were called upon to make. But today—nearly 5 years after the end of hostilities—our annual Federal tax bill is only slightly smaller than it was at its wartime peak in 1945. The astronomical tax figure may be more understandable when we realize that 18 cents of every national income dollar was paid to the Federal Government in some form of tax in the fiscal year 1949. Compare this to 8 cents per dollar of income which represents the tax bill only a decade ago. The farmer—the factory worker—the businessman—feels the heavy hand of Government in his pocket and he is voicing his complaints. The taxpayer is more than a harassed looking little man in a newspaper cartoon; he is a man with a voice who decries the extravagance of Government for which he must pay each time he receives his pay check, buys a train ticket or a package of cigarettes, or goes to a movie. If he is in a low-income group and would enjoy some of these so-called luxuries, he must bear an unfairly large portion of the excise taxes.

There seems to be rose-colored theory at present which says prosperity will last forever. Such a theory is dangerous if it blinds men to economic reality and keeps them from facing squarely the problems at hand. Economists and businessmen are finding warning signals in our economy which would be well to heed—signals which seem to indicate that continued prosperity is not inevitable without some incentives to maintain high levels of production and employment.

One danger signal became evident last year when businesses and individuals showed more reluctance to spend their money. Last year businesses were cutting back plans for expansion—putting less money into new plant and equipment for the first time since the end of the war. It might be interesting to note that the profits left to corporations in 1949, after paying what was owed to the Federal Government, were less than twice the amount of the tax payments themselves. Can this tax policy be called an incentive for business expansion? Industry must be able to offer the investors who make expansion possible a decent return on their money. If we are to have a growing economy, we must not shackle it with tax chains and repress its expansion.

The fuel that keeps the machines of business running is the consumer's dollar. A large and steady flow of dollars from consumers who are willing to buy is the basis for high levels of business activity. But in 1949 another danger signal was flashing for those who would look. For the first time since 1938, the volume of retail sales dipped below the level of the previous year—consumers were more reluctant to buy goods and services. A declining demand for goods necesarily affects the jobs of the people who produce them; in 1949 the number of unemployed persons rose to a monthly average of 3,500,000—the highest level since 1941.

As the postwar boom fed by accumulated wartime demand for goods slackens, any forces which tend to weaken purchasing power become more dangerous. The dollars which consumers have to spend are limited by the large slice of their income taken by the Federal, State, and local governments in the form of taxes. Some of these taxes are paid consciously, but many are hidden in the price which the consumer pays for the goods he buys.

Figures for 1948 show that about 23 cents out of each dollar spent by consumers was taken for taxes, assuming that all dollars spent in the United States share equally in the total tax load. Such excessive taxation only leads to economic deterioration, taking from the productive machine the consumer

dollars which it needs to keep it running smoothly at high levels.

The cry to cut taxes is not the whole answer. Unless Government can live within its income by making appropriate economies, we must face the possibility of being saddled with an even larger public debt.

In these days when it is so important to make our free-enterprise system work and keep our country's economy strong, we must not stand by and watch a repressive tax policy stifle the economic progress of the Nation.

Reorganization Plan No. 12

REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 12, which the President submitted to us last Monday, along with 20 other plans.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 abolishes the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and transfers all its functions to the Board and its Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this plan is an illegal attempt, under the guise of being a Hoover Commission recommendation, to destroy the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act. By this plan President Truman is brazenly attempting to repeal one of the most important features of the Taft-Hartley Act. He is attempting to do by indirection that which he has been unable to do directly.

Again he complies with the demands of certain union leaders, even to the extent of attempting to do that which is expressly prohibited by the Reorganization Act of 1949 and, at the same time, attempting to deceive the American people into believing that the proposal constitutes one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to section 5 of the Reorganization Act, which act gave the President the power to prepare reorganization plans. Section 5 of that act placed certain limitations on the powers. That section expressly states that "no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—" and now I read from subsection (4)—"authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress."

In the light of that definite prohibition in the Reorganization Act itself it would take a great deal of legerdemain reasoning to justify legally the proposal of the President by which the National Labor Relations Board is to be vested with the functions of the Office of General Counsel.

I remind you that the Office of General Counsel was established by Congress in order to separate the prosecuting and the judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board. It was first embodied in the so-called Smith bill which passed the House by overwhelming votes on two occasions, only to die in the Senate Labor Committee. It was incorporated in the Taft-Hartley Act, in a modified form which, as you know, the Congress enacted into law over the President's veto, and which we have consistently refused to repeal.

It is almost too elementary to mention the needed separation of prosecuting and judicial functions, particularly in such an act as that involving labor relations. A man cannot act as an advocate of one side of a controversy and, at the same time, inspire public confidence in his impartiality to decide that very same case in fairness and justice to all sides.

I do not wish to take the time now to discuss the various functions of the Office of General Counsel. There are doubtless certain things that should be done to redefine the functions of that office. That is what the Hoover Commission recommended.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the President would have the American people believe, the Hoover Commission did not recommend that the office be entirely abolished and its functions transferred to the Board and its Chairman.

I call your attention to what the task force report of the Hoover Commission had to say on this specific Office. It recognized—page 139—that the Office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board was somewhat unique, as it serves as a prosecutor, administrator, and a policy maker. To the suggestion that the office should again be placed under the Board, the Hoover Commission task force called attention to the objection to having the prosecuting functions and the hearing of complaints united. It then suggests the following as a solution, and I quote from page 141 of the task force report on regulatory commissions:

> It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 submitted to us by President Truman does not carry out any recommendation of that character. His plan is merely masquerading as a Hoover Commission recommendation. He is using the Hoover Commission, which the people support, as a vehicle to carry out the demands of certain union monopolists, who want no restraints whatever on their power. These union monopolists want the office abolished because the General Counsel has refused to succumb to pressure to ignore violations of the law by labor organizations.

Surely our memories are not so short that we do not recall how our people suffered as a result of the recent coal strike. While the President sat idly by and allowed the coal shortage crisis to grow worse and worse, the General Counsel happily had authority to take some independent action. He obtained from the court an injunction to prohibit the strikers from seeking to make the operators agree to contract provisions which are expressly prohibited by law. His action served to narrow the issues in the coal dispute and served to hasten the coal-strike settlement.

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have urged early action on the Hoover Commission recommendations in order to effectuate some economy. I have been very impatient with the delay on the part of the administration in putting this program into effect, and I have expressed that impatience on the floor of this House.

Last Monday, the day President Truman submitted these plans to us, I rose to express the hope that they would be in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations and that they would not just be some of the administration's pet schemes under the guise of the Commission's proposal.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 is not a Hoover Commission recommendation. It is not even legal. It is a plan expressly prohibited by the Reorganization Act itself. It is another one of the administration's pet schemes. It is another attempt to give the union monopolists whatever they want, the existing law, the Congress of the United States, and the American people to the contrary notwithstanding.

Senseless Taxation

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress assembled January 3, 1947, and ended January 3, 1949. The 1948 tax law was enacted April 2, 1948 and made retroactive to January 1, 1948. The President and his spokesmen constantly claim that this tax law is responsible for his budget deficit difficulties. What are the facts?

In fiscal 1948, which includes 6 months of calendar 1948, during which the new law was effective, personal income tax collections amounted to $20,997,780,699.

In fiscal 1949, a period when business generally had begun to slump, total personal income tax collections showed a drop of $2,272,628,261.

In fiscal 1948, corporate tax receipts were $10,174,409,834. In 1949 they jumped to $11,553,669,234, or an increase of $1,379,259,400.

Business was stimulated by the tax reduction granted the people by the Eightieth Congress, so that corporate profits soared, resulting in a net loss of revenue from corporate and personal income taxes of only $893,368,861. In that same year, a deficit of $1,700,000,000 was incurred. Mr. President, how do you and your supporters still contend that the

tax-reduction law passed by the Eightieth Congress is solely responsible for your budget deficits?

The fact is, we spent only $36,300,000,000 in fiscal 1948 as against expenditures of $43,100,000,000 in fiscal 1949, under complete Democratic control. The reason you are facing deficits is because you are spending too much money. More detailed information will be presented later.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as part of these remarks an editorial appearing in the San Diego Union on Thursday, March 9, entitled "Senseless Taxation":

SENSELESS TAXATION

A lot of people at the seat of the United States Government should be given a course of required reading of the Constitution of the United States. If they read intelligently, they would find this primary provision relating to the taxing powers of Congress:

"The Congress shall have power—

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Thus the taxing power of the Congress is definitely and specifically limited.

There is no authority to levy taxes for the purpose of giving or "lending" money to any foreign nation.

There is no authority to make levies for punitive or political purposes.

There is no authority to levy discriminatory taxes which take up to some three-fourths of the incomes of certain classes.

There is no authority to reach a taxing hand into the pocket of one citizen and hand his taxes over to another citizen.

There is no authority to impose taxes to promote experiments in socialism.

The abuse of the taxing power in recent years has been through invocation of the "welfare" clause. This has been made the excuse for outrageous favoritism and deliberate misinterpretation. There has been a continued and persistent effort to pervert this clause for the benefit of special groups and for donations to foreign nations. The thing which these tax eaters overlook in connection with welfare is one word:

"General."

The "general welfare" means the welfare of all the people—not one favored element or group, but the population as a whole.

It is inconceivable that the authors of the Constitution ever could have sponsored any system of taxation designed to give special benefits to one portion of the people through penalizing other elements.

It is inconceivable that they intended to permit the abuse of the taxing power to levy on the common necessities of life and thus increase the burdens of citizens through higher living costs.

Tables, drawn on authentic information, lately have been published in this newspaper showing what taxes cost the rank and file of people.

Taxes on a 13-cent bottle of milk total 8 cents.

Taxes on a package of cigarettes are 11 cents.

Taxes on a 5-cent bar of soap are 2 cents.

Taxes on a 30-cent can of baby powder are 18 cents.

Taxes on a $1,400 automobile are $700.

Taxes on a gallon of gasoline average 11 cents.

Taxes on a railway, bus, or airplane ticket are 15 percent.

Taxes on a $5 purse are $1.

And so it goes.

These are not all Federal taxes, but Federal imposts that compose the heavier load.

It has long been an axiom of able economists that when taxes take 25 percent or more of the national income, national bankruptcy must be the inevitable sequel. Already we are at that stage.

In the midst of all the pretentious talk about increasing our income as a Nation, Government is doing its best to prevent the increase by tax levies which discourage production and consumer expenditures.

"Taxation without representation" was the slogan of the Revolution which gave us our liberty. We are suffering the same evil now, through levies upon us by nonelected bureaucrats and executive autocrats.

Unless somebody at Washington resurrects the outmoded Constitution and insists on following its precepts the United States of America soon may be on the way out.

Juvenile Delinquency, Comic Books and Strips

REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the wave of juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation in the postwar period has focused attention on what parents and grown-ups are doing to arrest this tendency in child conduct. Faced as we are in this advanced age with the moving picture, the radio, and now the television, supplementing the great advances in the printing art, has given rise to many problems not alone with juveniles but with adults as well. Many serious thinkers have come to believe that the modern programs on the screen, in the air, as well as in comic books and strips, are not only accentuating the child-delinquency problem but are one cause leading to crimes of sex and violence.

The comic book has particularly come under observation by many of our citizens who are seeking answers to these perplexing questions. In fact many States and cities have attempted by the enactment of legislation to solve the problem. The New York State Assembly enacted the Feinberg comic-book censorship. It is reported that 60,000,000 comic books are sold in America every month. Not only did the New York Legislature enact such a law but some 14 other States and many cities have taken similar action. Some of these have aroused opposition, resentment, and the contention that such legislation is a direct threat to the freedom of the press. The book committee of the Child Study Association suggests that comic strips which stimulate sex by showing amorous women or scantily clad maidens struggling in the grip of jungle monsters, aren't suitable for young readers. Who, I pray, would contend that they are?

The Association of Comic Magazine Publishers itself has appointed an advisory committee of distinguished membership to point out ways of so improving the comics that they will become, not a menace to morals and incentive to crime, but an educational force in the mass marketing areas. Too much commendation cannot be given to this association for its attempt to clean house.

Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has recently revised its criminal code which has to do with obscene written matter. This provision makes everyone guilty of an indictable offense and liable to 2 years' imprisonment who makes, prints, publishes, sells or has in possession for any such purpose, any crime comic. The Canadian law specifically provides that the motives of the accused shall in all cases be irrelevant and that ignorance of the nature and presence of the matter shall not be considered a defense.

The great freedom enjoyed by the youth and particularly the children of tender age here in America and the opportunity accorded to the boys and girls of America to see depicted on the screen and over the television circuits and to hear radio programs as well as to read in the daily newspapers and magazines and comic books a multitude of salacious and sexy stories and crime problems arouses an unnatural interest in the children and forms lasting impressions on adolescent minds. It follows that some protective supervision over these media of transmission of thought should be exercised by duly authorized officials in order to protect the morals and well being of modern youth who will be the citizens of the tomorrows. The old saying that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world is still true but today the mother in too many cases has abandoned the safeguards which formerly protected growing youth and has permitted outside influences to have the upper hand which in many cases leads the young mind and heart into devious paths to the detriment of the child.

An inquiry of the legislative bureau of the Congressional Library brings the information that there is no pending legislation in the national Congress seeking to provide some controls over the comics which capitalize on crime and sex for reader interest. There is need for a comprehensive study and appraisal of this whole problem so vital to the welfare of our Nation's youth with the end in view of enacting necessary legislation to meet the problem.

Housing Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *March 10, 1950.*
Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
New House Office Building.

DEAR VICK: I understand that at long last debate will be started on the House floor on the general housing bill. This is good news

to the building industry because, in the most part, this legislation is needed at this time in order that we may continue at our present high level of home production.

However, in my opinion, the amendment known as H. R. 7402 which has to do with cooperative housing carrying with it direct subsidy from the Federal Government would prove to be very dangerous legislation.

According to the testimony given before the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Foley admitted that H. R. 6618, now known as H. R. 7402, was designed to house people in the income brackets from $2,400 to $4,800 per year. For your information, this simply means that the Federal Government would be put in the position of subsidizing home purchasers who are today being approved by FHA on homes selling from $7,200 to $14,400. If a man's credit is good, FHA will approve a loan for him equal to three times his annual income; therefore, a man earning $4,800 per year could buy a home selling for $14,400.

I believe you will find that the official records will show that 68 percent of all the homes FHA insured during the first 6 months of 1949 were sold to people making $4,800 and less per year, and that 47 percent of the homes sold in the high-cost New York City area were sold to people earning less than $4,800 per year.

Little did we think only a few short months ago when the public-housing bill, designed to house the lower one-third of our population, that at this early date certain groups would be attempting to push a bill through Congress that would house the middle one-third of our population and also at the expense of the taxpayers.

I honestly believe that if this bill is passed the results will be (1) highly inflationary because certainly a great number of units would be built. We would have a further scarcity of materials (we have been forced to close our operations down for 2 weeks during the last 90 days because we have not been able to get sheetrock). (2) Discriminatory in that a man earning up to $4,800 can buy or rent shelter for approximately 25 percent less (at the taxpayers' expense) than his neighbor living across the street who bought on our present FHA and VA home-loan plans. (3) It will be one more long and I fear dangerous step for the Federal Government to take in the housing field.

I believe that this is the first time that I have attempted to make my feelings strongly felt to you with reference to any bill being considered on the House floor. I do hope that after you have analyzed this bill and heard the debate by the members of the Banking and Currency Committee that you will concur in my feelings in regard to the possible results of such a bill becoming a law.

With sincere personal regards,

W. P. ATKINSON.

Alaskan and Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, last week the House approved statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. Alaska was acquired from Russia about 1867 and Congress approved an organic act making the people of the Territory citizens of the United States about 1912. When this Territory was thus incorporated into the Union, the people of the United States, acting through the Congress, in substance said to the people of Alaska that in due course when your economy has developed sufficiently and when you have demonstrated your ability to handle your affairs of government, you will then be entitled to become one of the States of the United States of America. This is the historical program which the United States has followed since the inception of its organization and the creation of the Northwest Territory. Many of our present States first became organized Territories and later were accepted into the Union as States. They, too, had a very small population when accepted as States.

The very interesting point about Alaska is that the present Russian Politburo under the leadership of Mr. Stalin takes the position that the Czarist Government had no authority to sell Alaska to the United States of America, and, therefore, the present Russian Government seriously questions the validity of the ownership of Alaska by the United States of America.

In view of Alaska's most important strategic position in connection with the defense of the United States as well as Canada, and in connection with our international program of today, the whole world, outside of Russia and her satellites, have taken the position that the sooner we extend statehood to Alaska the better it will be for all of the people of the United States of America.

HAWAII

We should bear in mind that Hawaii was a self-governing people under a representative form of government at the time they asked for permission to annex themselves to the United States of America. After necessary negotiations the people of the United States and Hawaii agreed to join their resources, their economy, and their forms of government, and Hawaii was likewise incorporated into the Union as an organized Territory. For approximately 52 years the good people of those islands have been preparing for statehood. The Hawaiian Islands are likewise a pivotal defense base in our approach to the Far East.

The Hawaiian people contribute vast sums to the United States Treasury; have a very sound and efficient economy; are extremely loyal to the United States of America. If any organized Territory has ever justified being recognized as a State, we must admit the Hawaiians have qualified.

How soon the Senate will approve statehood for these two Territories is questionable. Some of the more vociferous take the position, first, that the Hawaiian people are not loyal, and, secondly, that due to the small population of Alaska as well as Hawaii, these islands should not be permitted to place two Senators in the United States Senate. Such a protest is indefensible; it is contrary to every principle we have advocated in connection with the last two world wars, which have cost us in dollars alone approximately $700,000,000,000, to say nothing about the dislocation of our economy, the loss of lives, and the troublesome days which still lie ahead for our people.

AMERICAN SAMOA

American Samoa is a group of islands some 900 miles south of the Equator acquired by the United States of America during the period 1889–99 through agreement between Britain, the United States, and Germany. At that time the great Samoan race was split by this agreement without their consent and approval. These three great powers simply made a division of the territory which suited their convenience and ideas. During all of these years American Samoa has made great progress. These people are as magnificent in character and intelligence and loyal and as ambitious as any people you could find in colonial life. In all of the colonial possessions of the earth there could be found no finer people. In stature, in general appearance, cleanliness, and sincerity they are par excellence. In American Samoa you find no poor people, rich, or so-called middle-class people of consequence. The economy of the islands is operated under the "matai" or "chieftan" system, with "high talking chiefs, talking chiefs," and other chiefs. The "matai" and the "chiefs" see that all of their clansmen or tribesmen—the very young, the teen-agers, the middle-aged, and the old—are all properly fed, clothed, and housed. They are ambitious from the standpoint of education and of striving toward obtaining a full and complete life as sought by the American people. The American Samoans and other parts of their race which are now under the control primarily of New Zealand—Germany having lost this territory to New Zealand following World War I—look forward to the day when the machinery of the Trustee Council of the United Nations, together with the Congress of the United States of America, will bring the whole Samoan race back together under the protection of the United States of America. Shortly our Congress will be called upon to consider the approval of an organic act setting up a civilian form of government for American Samoa—they having been under our Navy rule for the past several decades—and this act, when approved, will unquestionably offer American citizenship to the Samoans, giving them a bill of rights and set them up as a possession, but not as an organized territory, subject to becoming a State at some future date. The impact of the collapse of Dutch, British, and French colonial power in the far Southwest Pacific, together with our granting to the Philippines their independence, and the collapse of the Japanese Empire and the sweep of the Communists across China, all impose on the United States an obligation to quickly join together our citizens, our resources, our total strength. Hawaii and Alaska should be made States without further delay.

Address in Honor of Hon. Harris S. Richardson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered in honor of Senator Harris S. Richardson, of the Massachusetts Senate, on March 11, 1950, at Winchester, Mass.:

My friends of Winchester, to all of you I extend warm greetings and I want you to know I am deeply pleased to be here on this occasion. You are very kind to ask me to say a few words this evening and I am delighted to have this opportunity. I am extremely delighted to have this opportunity for two reasons.

First of all, and most important, it gives me tremendous pleasure to participate with all of my friends of Winchester in this meeting to honor two very distinguished citizens of Winchester and Massachusetts. It has been my privilege to know Senator and Mrs. Richardson for many years. We have worked together on many matters beneficial to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Always, I have experienced nothing but complete and generous cooperation. For years, I have considered myself most fortunate to have the assistance of such an able and distinguished gentleman as Senator Richardson. His honesty and sincerity are outstanding. His loyalty to me and my efforts and the work of serving this district in Congress has been a constant inspiration to me. It is my hope that the citizens of Winchester and all of us in Massachusetts will have the benefit of his wise counsel and services for many years to come. I say to you again, I am extremely delighted to be here this evening and to have this opportunity to briefly express in your presence my thanks and appreciation to Senator Richardson for his loyalty and the many fine contributions he has made to the life of our community.

When I was invited to express a few remarks this evening, I was requested to speak on issues relating to the national level. I do not believe this is the moment or the occasion to enter into a detailed discussion of the many problems that confront our Nation today. I am delighted, however, to touch on one important matter, on which I believe there is some incorrect information. It relates to my position regarding the subject of economy in Government. This is the second reason why I am delighted to be here this evening.

Recently, I have received a few letters from members of the League of Women Voters in Winchester inferring I am opposed to economy in government. At this moment I desire to nip that inference before it buds and develops into a springtime bloom. I am completely opposed to the deficit-spending program of the present administration in Washington. I am completely opposed to the socialistic schemes proposed by the administration in Washington. I am completely opposed to the Government control policies of the present administration, which this deficit spending is financing. If my record in Congress is thoroughly examined I think the examiner would find I have consistently fought for lower taxes and for economy of operation of the Federal Government. It is my belief that if this Government proceeds on its present road of deficit spending this road will wind its way to only one end and that is socialism with its many hidden pathways leading to communism. Certainly I do not have to say to an audience of my friends in Winchester how vigorously I have fought against the rise of communism. I have fought for years and I am still fighting to stamp out communism in America. This must be done.

The inference regarding my position on the question of economy in government which I mentioned to you a moment ago, probably has been formed from the views and action I have taken in regard to the treatment of the Nation's disabled war veterans. There are thousands and thousands of disabled men in every State in the Union. Now that the last great war is a few years past it is so easy to forget the obligation and debt this Nation owes to them. If you happen to be so unfortunate as to be a disabled veteran or if one of them happens to be a member of your family, you do not forget. These men are in constant need of medical care and hospitalization. The need for hospital care is increasing rather than decreasing. When these men marched off to war—to defend America—our way of life and our freedom—the Great Government of the United States and the country as a Nation solemnly promised them that if their flesh and limb were torn by the enemy's steel they would be completely cared for at the moment and in the years to come. I know these men—I have talked to thousands of them—I have seen their wounds—I know of their suffering. So long as I am a Member of Congress, yes, as long as I am physically able I shall fight and strive to see to it that our Government and our country keeps that promise. As far as I am concerned, there is no economy involved in the elimination of hospitals, so seriously needed for the care of our disabled.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Congress, of which I am a member, is much closer to the constant and continuing needs of the disabled veteran than the Hoover Commission. The Veterans' Committee is a permanent committee of Congress shouldered with the responsibility of knowing the facts at all times. The Hoover Commission is not organized on a permanent basis and certainly was not and is not in a position to make recommendations based upon changing factual situations. Certainly no committee or commission has the moral right to make recommendations which might interfere with the duty and solemn promises of the Government of the Nation. Where honor is involved there is no compromise.

Often it has been said the public has a short memory. Sometimes I believe there is evidence of truth in this statement. Well do I remember, and so do you, that fateful morning of June 6, 1944, as the dawn broke the blackness of night, when the press and radio announced to the Nation that millions of our men were storming the enemy beaches of the Normandy coast. Many of them fell that morning on the cold, wet sand. About midday the editorial writers of our press, our clergy, and our national leadership called for a silent 5 minutes for the people of this Nation to pray for their safety and for their success. Writers and leaders throughout the Nation expressed in every newspaper and magazine and medium of publication that there was nothing too good now or in the future for these American boys, these American boys who at that moment were driving head-on into the rain of the enemy's fire. With them they carried the prayers and hopes of freemen throughout America and the world. My friends, that was just 6 years ago come this June. In just 6 years of ageless time we hear the hue and cry—eliminate these veterans' hospitals, cut down our military hospitals, these hospitals cost too much money, too much is being given to these disabled veterans. Oh, how easy it is to forget, to forget particularly if you and you and you who are doing the forgetting are safe and secure in your warm comfortable homes and are in no way involved.

Ladies and gentlemen, I repeat to you now, and again say to the American people with all of the sincerity and force at my command, I am opposed to the elimination of these already overcrowded veteran's hospitals, under the cloak and guise of economy. Economy, true economy, is always both an admirable and popular objective. There are some gentlemen in the Government today who would have you believe they are the great master minds, the super minds, sent to us just in the nick of time, to knock heads together and make a saving by putting two disabled veterans into one bed. Whenever such a person attempts to knock the heads together of able intelligent and sincere leaders thoroughly familiar with every detail of their responsibility all such a person reaps is headaches and more headaches. Based upon my knowledge of the facts, I know the elimination of these hospitals and doctors certainly is not economy and those who think about the matter for 1 minute can come to the same conclusion as I do, that it is not economy. When an individual in the community betrays his word or his promise he loses respect among his fellow men. When a nation breaks it's word or it's promise it no longer is worthy of honor and is unworthy of the respect, not only of its citizens but of the rest of the people of the world. This Nation, this America, must keep its promises. It must keep the faith.

In concluding my remarks this evening, I shall leave with you this important consideration. In view of recent developments in warfare, the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and other methods of population annihilation; the most important issue facing all of the people in this great and honorable land is survival. I do not propose to discuss with you all of the elements of this issue. I just want to say to you this: I believe in economy in government just as you do. I believe in the lowest possible tax rate, just as you do. I am in favor of the repeal of the nuisance taxes, and I am in favor of efficiency and common sense in the conduct of government, just as you are. But when our freedom, our free way of life, our very life itself is at stake; it is folly, utter folly, to think and believe that the saving of dollars can save America. If this great and wonderful country, all of us love so dearly, is to live out this twentieth century and the centuries to come; we must be strong, stronger than any potential enemy. Freedom is not cheap. Freedom cannot be maintained at bargain prices. If you want freedom, if you do not want your country ruined, if you still want the sweet life of these lovely, charming, and glorious old towns and villages of America—such as Winchester—you must pay the price.

James R. Tetler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose a fine eulogy on the life of the Honorable James R. Tetler, ex-postmaster of Law-

rence, Mass., which appeared in the editorial column of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on March 14, 1950.

The kind and lovable Bob Tetler died as the result of an automobile accident while carrying on his humane work in assisting one of his neighbors, Mr. Smith, when he became suddenly ill while awaiting a bus.

Mr. Tetler will long be remembered by many of us in Essex County, as an able and capable legislator, an excellent public servant, and widely admired husband and father:

A GOOD CITIZEN PASSES

As a result of a characteristically gracious act of neighborliness, James R. Tetler is dead. Needless to say, his death has occasioned much grief in hearts of the many friends he made throughout a busy lifetime of public service.

One of the stalwarts of the Republican Party here for many years, Mr. Tetler was favorably regarded as a dependable man of quiet strength—a man whose resourcefulness and quick mind made him a desirable ally in a tough situation. His political acumen was widely respected. Many a fledgling in politics benefited by the wisdom he accumulated during long years devoted to the Republican cause. No fanciful theorist, he had a practical approach to the problems of the day. He believed that solid men of affairs, acting intelligently in concert, could deal with anything. Nothing could persuade him that it was necessary to depart from ordinary common sense to get good results at any level—city, county, State, or in Washington.

As a State senator, as postmaster here, as superintendent of Essex County training school, he exemplified what he believed. In the negative sense, he never abandoned the sane principles which repudiated radicalism of any sort. In the positive sense, he brought to every job he tackled a high degree of competence, abounding energy, and the quiet enthusiasm of a man healthily interested in his work, his community, and his fellow man.

Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to analyze the cooperative-housing bill.

THE PROPOSAL

A Government controlled and managed corporation would be set up within the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the purpose of making 50- to 60-year loans to housing cooperatives. The estimated interest rate of 3 percent and the amortization period of twice that obtainable from private sources would permit lower monthly payments.

This Federal-lending corporation would obtain its money by an initial United States Treasury stock purchase of $100,000,000 and by issuing debentures guaranteed by secondary 3-year debentures which are in return guaranteed by the Federal Government. This device is an amendment of the original form of Government-guaranteed debentures in a futile attempt to meet objections made by the Federal Reserve Board that this lending scheme is inflationary. One billion dollars—$2,000,000,000 in House version, H. R. 7402—would thus be obtained, plus twenty-five million United States Treasury dollars for preliminary planning loans. The cash down payment would be 2½ percent on application, 2½ percent on completion, and an additional 5 percent payable over 20 years. There are no limits on construction costs; the loan to the cooperative can be up to 100 percent of costs. The Government mortgage corporation would be tax exempt. The cooperative-housing organizations would enjoy the usual cooperative-tax exemptions under their State laws, and by reason of their nature would pay no Federal income taxes.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

First. It is not necessary. The private home-building industry is already adequately providing for the middle-income group. Proponents of this bill say they seek to shelter the $2,400 to $4,800 income group for a monthly shelter cost of $45 to $73, exclusive of utilities. In 1948, 65 percent of all new for-sale housing insured under FHA was purchased by those earning less than $4,800 per year. The equivalent shelter rent was between $36.21 and $74.45 per month. In the first 6 months of 1949, 68 percent of this new housing went to the under-$4,800-income group. According to Federal Reserve Board figures, 50 percent of nonfarm families with incomes of less than $4,000 now own their homes, of which 75 percent are mortgage-free. The persons for whom this bill is stated to be intended constitute the customers for private building.

Second. The Federal Government would become a mortgage lender. This device of a Government-controlled corporation using $100,000,000 of Government funds plus $1,000,000,000 in Government-guaranteed debentures is a thinly disguised form of direct Government lending. There is no distinction between this and the sale of Treasury bonds, the proceeds of which might be used for Government lending. Further, the tax-exempt status of such a Government agency gives it an uneconomic and unfair competitive advantage over private lending agencies.

Third. It will undermine the present savings and investment system. Its passage would threaten the security and incomes of millions of small depositors in insurance companies, banks, and building-and-loan companies. It will force such companies to reduce the return paid on savings nearly to the vanishing point and thus tend to destroy all incentive for thrift. It is the stated objective of the bill to make loans at 3 percent interest for a term of 50 years—extendible up to 63 years. No private lender can compete with this. The inevitable result will be to channel all lending into this pattern.

Fourth. It is highly discriminatory. The more favorable financing terms available to a selected class of individuals in cooperatives, which likewise enjoy State and Federal tax advantages, discriminate against veterans and nonveterans alike who are paying or who may undertake in the future to pay for their homes at higher rates of interest for shorter terms and paying full taxes. Those not desiring to join a cooperative, or whose incomes are too high or too low, would likewise be discriminated against.

Fifth. It will undermine the present FHA and VA programs in housing. If this scheme is adopted, few people would seek to purchase or to rent homes under the higher interest rate and shorter terms afforded by VA and FHA. This would adversely affect the volume as well as the long-term security of properties the financing of which is now guaranteed or insured by agencies of the Federal Government.

Sixth. It is inflationary. The stimulative effect of low interest, 50- to 60-year financing will serve to drive construction costs upward. An estimated 225,000 units would be constructed under the proposed law, but the authorization would be added from time to time in substantial amounts and numbers as political pressures for more and more easy Government credit would develop. The proposal has been amended from its original form by providing Government guaranty now one step removed from the debentures issued by the mortgage corporation, in an attempt to meet severe criticism by the Federal Reserve Board that the whole device is inflationary. The new form of guaranty does not in any way meet this objection. While an attempt is made by its advocates to compare the guaranty to FHA mortgage insurance, it is completely different in that FHA encourages the use of private financing by private lenders direct to the borrower whereas this scheme collects a pool of capital in the hands of a Government corporation through the sale of Government debentures, relying solely on the Government credit. It diverts and changes the flow of mortgage funds into Government hands rather than stimulating it through private lenders.

Seventh. There is no limit on construction costs. The bill contains no dollar limits on the construction cost of or the maximum mortgage amount which can be loaned to a project either on a room or a unit basis except for general language cautioning against elaborate or extravagant construction. This is in sharp contrast with the limits on mortgage amounts ordinarily contained in FHA insurance on privately built and privately financed rental housing. It should be noted that the same bill which permits 100 percent Government loans to cooperatives without any limit on construction cost, seeks to reduce the mortgage limit upon section 207 FHA insured privately financed operations from the present $8,100 a unit under section 608 to a maximum of $7,200, in the case of smaller apartments, and $8,000 in the case of apartments averaging 4½ rooms or over and valued at

$10,000. Thus, the bill accomplishes the effect of allowing the smallest and most unfavorable mortgage to privately financed rental construction; slightly higher mortgage to those cooperatives financed by FHA insured mortgages under section 213; and, a totally unlimited mortgage—at privately unattainable terms of interest and amortization—to cooperatives receiving financing through this direct lending scheme.

Eighth. Occupancy is not limited, even to middle-income families. There is nothing whatsoever that limits occupancy to the persons for whom it is stated by its proponents to be intended. The bill requires merely that the project be suitable for persons of middle income. Further, even if original occupants are, by voluntary action of the Administrator, limited to middle-income persons, there is no requirement that occupants whose incomes increase in excess of the $4,800 level shall move. (In testimony in favor of the bill, Administrator Foley stated that it was not intended to so require and that such a requirement would be impossible of administration.) It is therefore entirely possible that persons with incomes well over $5,000 could remain in the accommodations produced under this scheme, enjoying extraordinary low rents made possible by Government credit.

Ninth. It will establish a vast additional Federal bureaucracy. In addition to the considerable staff required to handle the issuance of $1,000,000,000 in debentures, to appraise projects and to handle details of loans to the cooperative associations, the bill calls for technical assistance and supervision of their operations. It may be expected that an additional Federal agency, equaling or exceeding in size any of the present housing agencies (FHA, PHA, and HLBB) will be required for administration.

Tenth. Cooperative participants in the scheme are doomed to eventual dissolution. A 50-year 3-percent loan on a level payment basis amortizes at the negligible rate of 72 cents per thousand for its first year. For the first 10 or 15 years of the loan, physical depreciation of the property is considerably more rapid than amortization of the debt. Over this period of time, the cooperator will be carrying a debt considerably in excess of the mortgage value of his unit. During the first 20 years, when the home purchaser would normally have his home almost completely paid for, a cooperator in one of these units will succeed in reducing his outstanding debt practically not at all.

Since his monthly charges must continue at the same level over a period of 50 years or longer (almost a normal lifetime), he will one day find the carrying charges on his unit in competition with lower charges on newly constructed projects. During the 50-year period, if past experience is any guide, construction costs may well drop below present levels. While proponents of this legislation cite an attainable $65 rental (in claimed contrast to present-day $90 rentals), it should be remembered that 10 years ago construction costs were such that rental housing could be profitably produced and rented for $50.

ELIMINATION OF VA SECTION 505 (A)

S. 2246 provides, at page 108, title IV, that on or after 180 days from its enactment into law, no further guaranty shall be granted under section 505 (a), combination FHA–VA loans.

REASONS FOR REJECTIONS

First. Elimination of this section would destroy one of the most prolific sources of private credit and would, by that much, diminish the financing opportunities available to veterans, consequently increase sales of mortgages to FNMA, and ultimately cause demand for direct Government lending; and

Second. Under section 505 (a) a veteran, who by reason of change of work or residence has to purchase another home, can use his GI rights again; under section 501 alone, he cannot.

When the House passed H. R. 6070 last year, unfortunately a similar provision striking this highly useful and desirable section was allowed to remain in the bill. VA reports that, as of the end of 1948, 155,983 such second mortgages had been guaranteed; 93,624 of these were in 1948 alone. Thus the need to continue section 505 (a) is clear.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT HOME MORTGAGE LENDING THROUGH VA

S. 2246, section 512 (a), page 108 title IV, provides for $150,000,000 of direct Federal loans to veterans up to $10,000 at 4-percent interest where it is shown that the veteran is qualified for a GI 501 loan but cannot obtain it.

REASON FOR REJECTION

Direct Government lending, except in the direst emergency, discourages private credit, progressively usurps fields of private activity and has dangerous possibilities of waste and political favoritism. This was rejected by the House last year when it passed H. R. 6070, containing general revisions of FHA and VA mortgage insurance and guaranties.

DISPOSITION OF WAR HOUSING

S. 2246, at page 31, title II, contains the proposal (stricken from H. R. 6070 by the House committee) which deals with authority to dispose of both permanent and temporary Lanham Act war housing. This title of the bill contains 39 pages and completely reverses previously expressed congressional policy with respect to war housing disposition which, under the Lanham Act, was to demolish the temporary housing as soon as possible and to sell the permanent housing to private investors.

REASON FOR REJECTION

Disposition of war housing is a separate subject which has no place in a bill dealing with mortgage financing. It should be considered separately so that it can receive the attention which its importance and detailed length warrant.

The provision in this bill would turn over 43,709 permanent units, plus any others requested within 60 days, to local public housing authorities to become tax-exempt public housing. In addition, 62,800 units of veterans reuse housing and 162,200 units of temporary war housing would similarly be given away to local agencies.

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLAR HHFA LENDING AUTHORIZATION

In the Senate bill, S. 2246 at page 123, title VI, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is given $25,000,000 under a new provision (paralleling that formerly existing in RFC under its section 102 but not including mass production of conventional houses) to make loans to finance the purchase and erection of prefabricated houses or site improvements for prefabricated houses.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

First. Previous authorization to RFC to make loans of this character went almost entirely to Lustron Corp. The experience was, to say the least, not too happy even under RFC's sound and comparatively conservative administration. Certainly experience does not warrant continuation of this device in the hands of HHFA which is completely unfamiliar with lending of this sort.

Second. Enactment of this proposal would carry still further the process of converting HHFA into an operating agency for direct Government lending; instead of preserving its original purpose of over-all policy making.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO REDUCE LOANS, AND SO FORTH

S. 2246—section 606, page 122, title VI—contains a provision, also contained in H. R. 7402 as section 301, which gives the President power to reduce the maximum amount, ratio of loan to value, of maximum maturities of any loan made, insured or guaranteed by any agency of the Government.

REASONS FOR REJECTION

First. This would provide an arbitrary summary power to reduce or completely eliminate effective governmental aids to private finance such as FHA or VA, without any opportunity for the private building industry to be heard. It cannot be doubted that this provision carries possibilities of drastically curtailing private construction, in view of experience to date, in which administration proposals have held private housing mortgage aids to considerably less favorable levels than advocated for cooperatives and granted to public housing.

Second. This device strongly suggests experience in England in which private builders have been permitted to construct only one house for every five built by public housing authorities.

Tons of Skim Milk Available to Agencies—Former Mayor Johnson's Friend Campaigns for Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my

remarks and include clippings from newspapers, I am inserting the following items from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of date March 11 and March 9, 1950:

TONS OF SKIM MILK AVAILABLE TO AGENCIES—CATCH IN UNITED STATES PLAN IS FOR SEEKERS TO PAY HANDLING CHARGES

WASHINGTON.—The Department of Agriculture has 4,601,104 pounds of dried skim milk stored in a warehouse in Hoboken, and available to public welfare agencies which can show a need for it, guarantee its distribution and pay for handling charges.

In addition, there are 866,096 pounds of dried eggs similarly stored in another warehouse in Jersey City.

In the New England States there are millions of bushels of potatoes in Government storage, and throughout the Nation there are millions of tons of other foodstuffs, including butter, beans and even meat.

STORAGE RATE HIGH

It was all bought up as surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in addition to losing its high food value by the hour through decomposition, it is costing the taxpayers about $60,000 a day for storage.

The man who has supervision over the foods stored in New Jersey is James S. King, State supervisor of commodity distribution, whose office is at 520 East State Street, Trenton.

Representative JOHN W. HESELTON, a Massachusetts Republican, is currently receiving congratulatory letters from all over the country for the effort he has been making to get this food into the homes of those who need it, on a paid freight basis.

To date, he has had some success in his own area, because public and private welfare agencies have been alerted and have organized to do the job; but he hasn't been able to do so well in other sections.

The fly in the ointment is that the Department of Agriculture can't release this food to an agency which can't transport and distribute it, and can't pay for all other handling charges.

Private welfare agencies can only get potatoes, and since there are no Government spuds in storage in this State (although there are some in New York City) it wouldn't be practical for such agencies in New Jersey to get into the picture.

The Salvation Army, for instance, did it up in Representative HESELTON'S baliwick, however. The Army found out who needed potatoes, carted them from a warehouse, and saw that they were distributed to eligible families.

Public welfare agencies, city and county, can do with the skim milk and dried eggs stores in New Jersey, precisely what the Salvation Army did with the potatoes in Massachusetts.

They had better get a wiggle on, Representative HESELTON warns because much of the food is going bad, although most of it is still edible and wholesome.

FORMER MAYOR JOHNSON'S FRIEND CAMPAIGNS FOR FOOD DISTRIBUTION

WASHINGTON.—A Massachusetts friend of former Mayor John R. Johnson of Passaic is waging a one-man fight in Congress to force the Department of Agriculture to distribute millions of dollars worth of surplus food to needy persons, free of all charge.

Representative John W. HESELTON, Republican, of Deerfield, Mass., hopes President Truman will bring some pressure to bear in the matter "before the end of this week, when I understand he is going to leave for a vacation in Florida."

The Massachusetts Congressman and the former mayor of Passaic are friends of long standing, and on several occasions have been together in Florida, where Mr. Johnson has spent some winters in recent years.

Weeks ago Representative HESELTON called the attention of Congress to the fact that tremendous surplus stores of potatoes, dried eggs, and other commodities were available in Government warehouses, and demanded that they be distributed to agencies which could turn them over to needy persons.

A hitch in the program developed, however, when the Department of Agriculture declared that recipient agencies would have to pay all handling and transportation charges involved, and would have to foot all bills for whatever packaging might be necessary.

Eligible to receive the food under current regulations are schools which can use it in lunch programs, and State and local public-welfare organizations. Private welfare agencies are eligible to receive potatoes only.

In all cases the recipient groups must pay for transportation and handling from wherever the food is stored to areas in which it will be distributed.

New Jersey is included in the Department of Agriculture's northeast area, embracing Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia. The area office is at 641 Washington Street, New York City.

Waste of Surplus Foods and of Public Funds

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the President has landed safely at Key West, so I sent him another telegram. I should like to read it:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 15, 1950.*

The PRESIDENT,

Yacht "Williamsburg," en route to Florida:

Another $60,000 wasted. Total loss to American taxpayers, $2,460,000. Some 52,000,000 of these taxpayers will have paid their taxes to Federal Government by midnight. All the taxes of 45,555 taxpayers since February 2, the date when H. R. 7137 and 3 companion bills were filed in House, which are going to redeem this inexcusable waste. Regret to report that since your request to Secretary Brannan Saturday that he give my correspondence his careful and appropriate consideration I have heard nothing from him. This inexplicable silence and inexcusable lack of action will not be forgotten or forgiven by the American taxpayers when they finally realize the full facts. Nor will the thousands of needy men, women, and children, who could and would eat this food now, understand the failure to act promptly as I have repeatedly requested. I regret you had such a difficult trip to Key West, but assume you have fully recovered from the effects of it. I now repeat my urgent request that you order specific remedial action immediately.

I also wish to quote here copies of letters I have sent to the President and Secretary Brannan:

MARCH 15, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,

Key West, Fla.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of a page from the RECORD of yesterday for your files, together with confirmation of the day letter I sent you this morning.

Sincerely yours.

MARCH 15, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,

Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For your information I enclose a copy of a day letter I have sent to the President at Key West this morning, and a page of the RECORD of yesterday.

May I ask you also to take the promptest kind of remedial action and see that your approval is sent to the House Committee on Agriculture of H. R. 7135, 7136, 7137, and 7138.

Sincerely yours.

I telephoned the office of the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] to advise him that I intended to discuss his remarks of yesterday and his misunderstanding of the situation now prevailing. I am advised that he has left for an important out-of-the-city engagement, but will be here tomorrow. I shall try to clear this matter up then, but for his ready convenience I am listing the dates and pages of the RECORD when I have discussed this matter: February 2, resolutions introduced; 9th, page 1734; 13th, pages 1768, A1018; 14th, page 1803; 20th, page 1997; 21st, page 2017; 23d, page 2308; 25th, page A1365; March 4th, page 2819; 7th, page 2953; 8th, page 3038; 9th, page 3142; 13th, page 3257; and 14th, page 3311.

Special Favors for a Special Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to an important editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1950:

SPECIAL FAVORS FOR A SPECIAL GROUP

It goes without saying that legislation which purports to help the middle- ($2,700-$4,400) income group to get cheaper housing carries tremendous popular appeal. That is why the administration is backing it to the limit. That is why the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Boyle, is calling all politicians to apply the heat to Senators when they vote tomorrow. But no matter how popular may be the appeal, the legislation is bad and ought to be defeated.

It ought to be defeated because it is discriminatory and unsound. Using tax money contributed by all Americans, it singles out a special group of Americans—those in the middle-income brackets who choose to join a housing cooperative—for special benefits. Under this bill, the American who joins a cooperative can obtain the benefit of low interest—3 percent or under—and pay off his housing loan in 50 or 60 years, a come-on proposition designed to mislead borrowers and perpetuate debt. But the American in the same income bracket who prefers not to join a cooperative housing scheme must pay 4 percent or more and pay off the loan in 25 years. The same Government, indirectly or directly, would be backing both types of loan.

In a system of society based on free enterprise, which we are spending a large part

of our substance to protect throughout the world, cooperative, nonprofit enterprises are as permissible as any others. But like other demonstrations of free enterprise, they should stand on their own feet. The pending bill goes much further, however. It offers hidden Government subsidies in a variety of forms as a mark of special favor to nonprofit cooperatives. If the principle behind this bill is carried to its logical conclusion, and supported with public funds and Government credit to make it work, there will be no room in America for one of the largest of all taxpaying, private-enterprise industries, the private housing industry. It would eventually become an industry supported by Government, with everybody joining a housing cooperative under the supervision of another huge Government bureaucracy.

The bill ought to be defeated on other grounds. It would place private housing, including FHA and veterans' housing, at a serious competitive disadvantage. It would in time weaken the stability of billions of private funds invested in such housing by insurance companies, building and loan companies, and millions of middle-income men and women whose savings have been put into the independent purchase of homes. For when the Government makes cheap money available nobody can beat the Government at offering cheaper money.

The financial aspects of the bill have been opposed by the Federal Reserve Board, and the Board's objections, in the opinion of distinguished members of the Senate's Committee on Banking and Currency, have not been removed by committee amendments. The bill violates rules of risk that private lenders must observe. Its effect on bringing down the cost of housing is challenged. For billions of cheap money would be poured into housing construction at a time when housing construction is already going at top speed. The effect would be more likely to inflate already inflated costs of construction than to bring the costs down. And while ostensibly singling out the middle-income group as the group in special need of help, this bill is singling out a group for which as much if not more housing now is being built than for any other.

Responsible Members of Congress will consider this bill on its merits, and not because the real-estate lobby opposes it or the Democratic National Committee favors it. If so considered, it ought to be defeated by a healthy margin.

Letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

DEAR FRIEND: For reasons best known to themselves, the Oneida Dispatch has started a crusade against your Congressman. Their chief complaint is that Edwin Arthur Hall is "all things to all men".

If that is so, I gladly accept the challenge.

Ever since I have served you in Congress, I have tried to look upon all men with a friendly understanding.

Perhaps I am wrong, but I feel that every American citizen has the right to expect his elected representatives to be for him rather than against him.

Whenever anyone comes to me with a problem, I try to help him, not scoff at him.

Why the Dispatch does not approve of this position, I do not know.

Are they carrying the ball for a handful of petty dictators who feel that I should serve them and not the Madison County people who elected me?

Your Congressman

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Statement of D. C. Greer Before the Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works in the House of Representatives is conducting hearings on a bill entitled "A Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950." Mr. D. C. Greer, State highway engineer of Texas, and also president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, appeared before this committee on March 13, 1950. I wish to include his statement in the RECORD, together with a statement of policy which had been adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials in Chicago in November 1949.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the accomplishments of previous aid highway acts, as this method has proven very successful in providing an integrated highway system for our Nation. However, with millions of additional automobiles on our highways today together with the fact that highway construction was greatly curtailed during the war, we must give serious consideration to an expanded highway program for the next few years.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement made by Mr. D. C. Greer before the Committee on Public Works:

STATEMENT OF D. C. GREER, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER OF TEXAS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the American Association of State Highway Officials is, as its name implies, an association composed of the highway officials of the 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, with the cooperation of the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Approximately 34 years ago, the National Congress passed the basic Federal-aid Highway Act of 1916, which was destined to be the beginning of a policy on road transportation that has proven in the subsequent years to be one of the greatest, if not the greatest, contributions of the national government to the economic welfare of our people. Traditionally, since this original law, it has been the practice of the National Congress to re-enact from time to time the Federal-aid Highway Act, in order to provide continuity of the road improvement program of this country.

The Federal-aid highway program was suspended, of course, during the period of World War II and it was started again with the post-war program authorized by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944, which provided Federal-aid for roads for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. This act was supplemented by the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1948 and furnished Federal aid funds for roads for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951.

The allocation of the last year's funds, as provided in the 1948 act, was made this past October. Therefore, in order for the Federal-aid highway program to continue without interruption, it is essential that the National Congress enact new Federal-aid highway legislation during this, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. Additional allocations under such new legislation would become effective with the fiscal year 1952. It is essential that Federal aid authorizations for highways be enacted well in advance of the actual date of availability of funds, in order that both Federal and State Governments may make the necessary long-range plans well in advance of the actual initiation of the programs of work for which the funds are provided.

As I have previously pointed out, the Federal Government has, in the past, assumed the duty and responsibility of providing the leadership to the States in a well-conceived highway development program. We feel sure that it is your desire to continue this leadership which has proven so profitable in the past. Consequently, it is not our purpose to appear here in an attempt to sell you or to beg a specific road program. We do, however, consider it our duty and responsibility as highway officials, with long experience on the front line of the highway program, to report to you our studied and sincere judgment of the proper methods that might be utilized by you to accomplish the greatest good for this country in the realm of roads during the coming years.

We do not consider it necessary to point out to you that America is literally a Nation on wheels and the world's greatest automotive country, with 42,000,000 motor vehicles registered in the United States last year, which represents a 30 percent increase in the past 10 years. We know that you have a complete knowledge of the value of the present day dollar in buying such things as roads and bridges. We know that you are well acquainted with the fact that the Federal Government is now collecting in taxes approximately $1,300,000,000 per year from the motor vehicle users in this country and we further know that you gentlemen of the Congress are well acquainted with the day-by-day wear and tear on our highway system, in addition to the need of the further expansion of the road system in this country. Consequently, it will be my purpose to discuss briefly with you the possibilities of a program accomplishing the desired objectives on roads, so well known to you.

At this point, gentlemen, I would like to insert in the record an estimate of needs of the Federal-aid systems as of December 31, 1949, prepared under the direction of a special subcommittee of the American Association of State Highway Officials for a study of highway finance problems. In filing this estimate of needs, may I point out that it is based on the best information available to us as highway officials at the present time. Obviously, an estimate of such proportions as this must be varied with changing conditions of traffic and it should be construed as a gage of our needs at this time, based on the knowledge available to us at this time.

The highway officials of the United States and Territories met together last November and discussed for several days the highway problems of the Nation. After carefully analyzing the highway needs and the abilities of the States to carry out the details of a new and expanded highway program, almost unanimous decision was reached by the States and Territories concerning a new highway program and our presentation will be

based upon this agreed decision. I might add that our position is not considered perfect for any one State but, based upon a tolerant, give-and-take attitude, is considered the best balanced program for the entire United States and Territories that could be conceived under present conditions.

With your permission, I would like to insert in the record the complete statement of policy which I have previously referred to as adopted by this association, meeting in Chicago in November 1949. I should also like to insert in the record two tabulations of the apportionment of Federal-aid funds; one, based on the dollar amounts as proposed in the policy statement previously referred to, and one on the dollar amounts as set forth in H. R. 7398.

In our discussion, it will be our purpose to comment concerning the provisions as outlined in H. R. 7398, now pending before this committee.

It is our suggestion that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 contain authorizations for Federal-aid funds on four separate and distinct systems of roads; namely, the interstate, primary, urban, and secondary. This constitutes the addition of one more category of roads; that is, the interstate system, which has not heretofore been provided for in national legislation. These four systems are carefully and properly outlined in H. R. 7398. It is our suggestion that $210,000,000 be allocated annually to the interstate system improvement, $270,000,000 to the primary system improvement, $150,000,000 to the urban system improvement, and $180,000,000 to the secondary system improvement. These figures, as you will note, are somewhat higher than those included in H. R. 7398.

It is our suggestion that Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban allocations be distributed among the States in accordance with the regular formula and matching basis, as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1948. This is exactly as contemplated in H. R. 7398.

It is our suggestion that the interstate funds be apportioned on the basis of the population of the State; that no State receive less than three-quarters of 1 percent, and that the matching ratio be 75 percent Federal funds and 25 percent State funds. This is essentially provided in H. R. 7398.

It is our suggestion that these interstate funds may be utilized at the option of any given State to apply on the principal of bonds on toll-free facilities that may be used by such State for the purpose of improvement of the interstate system of roads. This provision is included in H. R. 7398.

It was our studied opinion that we would suggest to the National Congress several other minor corrections and modernizations of the Federal-Aid Highway Act and we have noted with a great deal of satisfaction that these corrections and modernizations are included in the text of H. R. 7398.

In summation, we desire to state that H. R. 7398, now being considered by your committee, embraces the principles and advancements that we believe to be essential to a modern highway program, but we are hopeful that the Congress may find itself in a financial position to make a more expanded investment in the road system of our country which is so badly needed at the present time.

It will be our purpose to present subsequently at this hearing, members of the executive committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials to discuss the four systems of roads, as outlined in this preliminary discussion, in more detail. We would also like the privilege of introducing several more highway officials to present experiences and needs of a few of the typical States of the Union, in order that you may have an over-all picture of the problem as represented by highly qualified State highway officials.

On behalf of the State highway officials throughout the country, I wish to thank the members of this committee for the consideration shown us on this and on all other occasions. We have noted with the greatest admiration your understanding of the Nation's highway problems and have marveled at your grasp of their details. Please be assured that we are at your service and that we have no other purpose than to serve faithfully the people we represent and to do a highway job in this country that will be a credit to you. We are confident that the present Congress will deal wisely and promptly with this problem.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS,

Washington, D. C., November 28, 1949.

The American Association of State Highway Officials, in special meeting in Chicago, Ill., on November 21, adopted an important and far-reaching statement of national policy on new Federal aid for highways.

The postwar program of highway construction began with the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which provided $500,000,000 per year of Federal aid for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. This act was supplemented by another act known as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, which provided $450,000,000 per year for the fiscal years of 1950 and 1951.

The allocations of the last year's funds, as provided in the 1948 act, were made this past October. Therefore, in order for the Federal-aid program to continue without interruption, it is essential that the Congress enact new Federal-aid legislation during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, beginning in January. New allocations would become effective for the fiscal year of 1952. It is essential that Federal-aid authorizations for highways be enacted well in advance of the actual date of availability of funds, in order that both Federal and State governments may make the necessary long-range plans well in advance of the actual initiation of the program for which the funds are provided. It is under these circumstances, therefore, that the association convened in special session in Chicago on November 21.

Membership of the association is made up of the officials of the 48 State highway departments, the highway departments of the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia Highway Department and the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal Government.

After long and earnest discussion, the association adopted a statement of national policy on the matter and therein advocated an annual program approximating $810,000,000 per year in Federal funds. The new recommendations, for the first time, would provision for work on the interstate system of highways, as such; setting up a special category in the amount of $210,000,000 per year Federal funds, to be matched on a 75–25 basis by State funds. This contrasts with the 50–50 matching basis on the primary, secondary, and urban programs. The interstate funds would also be available on a new formula of population. The complete statement of policy follows:

1. Four authorizations of Federal-aid funds on an annual basis:

System	Proposed	(1948 act)
Interstate	$210,000,000	($0,000,000,000,000)
Primary	270,000,000	(202,500,000)
Secondary	180,000,000	(135,000,000)
Urban	150,000,000	(112,500,000)
Total	810,000,000	(450,000,000)

2. That the Federal-aid primary, secondary and urban allocations be distributed among the States in accordance with the regular formulas and matching basis, as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944 and 1948; that not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State for the primary and secondary systems may be switched from one system to the other, provided the State highway department makes such request and it is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads as being in the public interest.

3. That the interstate funds be apportioned on the basis of population of the States and that no State receive less than three-quarters of 1 percent; that the matching ratio be 75 percent Federal funds and 25 percent State funds.

4. That these interstate funds may be utilized at the option of any given State, to apply on the principal of general obligation bonds on toll-free facilities that may be used by such State for the purpose of expediting the improvement of the interstate system of roads.

5. That the provision in the Federal-Aid Highway Act requiring the withholding of Federal aid from any State failing to properly maintain a Federal-aid project be amended so that in the case of secondary and urban projects where a county or city has accepted responsibility for maintenance, future Federal-aid funds will be withheld from the county or city failing to maintain rather than from the State as a whole.

6. That a section be added to the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act authorizing an amount not to exceed $10,000,000 to be utilized by the Bureau of Public Roads, under specific emergency conditions, for the purpose of cooperating with the State highway departments in highway disaster relief on an area basis when an emergency has been declared by a governor of a State and concurred in by a Commissioner of Public Roads, without limitation as to systems, and on a 50–50 matching basis.

7. That a specific appropriation of $100,000,000 be authorized for the purpose of advancing funds to the State highway departments for the acquisition of rights-of-way to be repaid over an extended period of years.

8. That the present one-third limitation on Federal aid for right-of-way purposes be increased to 50 percent.

It should be understood that the above is a statement of policy of the American Association of State Highway Officials. The recommendations will be submitted to the Congress for its consideration by officials of the association at an early date.

D. C. GREER,
President, American Association of State Highway Officials.

Thirteen Korean Assemblymen Jailed for Red Contacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press dispatch:

THIRTEEN KOREAN ASSEMBLYMEN JAILED FOR RED CONTACTS

SEOUL, KOREA, March 14.—Thirteen members of the Korean National Assembly were sentenced to prison today for terms as long

as 10 years for violating national security by having contacts with Communists.

Assemblyman Ro Il Hwan and Lee Moon Wun were sentenced by presiding Judge Sa Kwang Ook to the longest terms—10 years.

At the long trial from November 17 to February 10 before a three-judge panel without a jury—Ro and Lee were declared to have admitted they had received money from alleged Communists.

Both men testified that purported confessions were taken from them under torture.

Prosecutor Oh Che Do, said beforo the trial all 13 assemblymen had made written confessions. He introduced no others after Ro and Lee testified they were tortured.

Address of Hon. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MONROE M. REDDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, Hon. D. Hiden Ramsey, of Asheville, N. C., delivered an address at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Democratic Club of Washington. Mr. Ramsey is general manager of the Asheville Citizen-Times Co., and is generally recognized as one of the ablest speakers and newspapermen of the South. I believe the Members of Congress will be inspired by his speech, which follows:

I am delighted this evening to join with the members of the North Carolina Democratic Club in doing richly deserved honor to the 14 eminent North Carolinians who represent our State in the National Congress. It is not presumptuous to assert that in what we say and do this evening, we speak and act for an overwhelming majority of the people of the Old North State.

No State of this Republic is more fortunate in the characters and capacities of the men who represent it in the Halls of Congress. Other States may be larger and richer. Some of them may attract more attention—not always flattering attention—by the legislative prima donnas whom they send to Washington. But none can surpass North Carolina in the high level of intelligent and industrious devotion to simple duty and of solid achievement which our delegation sets and maintains.

Viewed as individuals, our 2 Senators and 12 Congressmen are men, good and true, who do their work with competence, energy, and integrity. There isn't a scalawag, a mercenary, a sluggard, a buffoon in the whole 14. With their demeanor and their convictions, they contribute nothing to that disrespect in which so many American citizens—not altogether without excuse—view the National Legislature.

Measured as a group, our Senators and Congressmen are typical of North Carolina in all of its varied richness of resource, of geography, of economic outlook and activity. If we could take the 14 lawgivers and roll them into 1, we would have a perfect lawmaker from the viewpoint of North Carolina. He would be the great common denominator of that dynamic democracy which is the Old North State.

This 14-in-1 lawgiver would have the incredibly easy and captivating eloquence, the tranquil temperament, and the sagacious judgment of Senator HOEY.

This composite lawmaker would have the steadily glowing idealism, the utter selflessness, the richly furnished mind, and the irresistible charm of Senator GRAHAM.

This consolidated Member of the National Congress would possess in full measure the democratic simplicity, the vast experience, and the unfailing common sense of Representative DOUGHTON.

The North Carolina lawgiver would understand full well—and this is the beginning of wisdom for the lawmaker—that laws are necessary but very imperfect instruments for maintaining good order and promoting progress and justice in modern society. For the judicial experience of Representative KERR, once an able trial judge, would be an essential part of the stuff out of which he was compounded.

Our typical Tarheel Member of Congress would speak the language and know the thinking and the needs of those sturdy North Carolinians who live within the sound of the Atlantic Ocean. For Representative BONNER would provide that indispenable understanding. In this 14-ply solon would be much of the clear-eyed, unflinching individualism of those self-sufficient Tarheels who live their lives and do their work along the slopes and in the valleys of our mountain section. For Representative REDDEN, a highlander par excellence, would be their spokesman.

This multiple solon would comprehend both the rights and the duties of an enlightened industrialism for Representative CHATHAM, an able industrialist and a Tarheel to the very marrow of his being, would provide that comprehension.

Our typical lawmaker would recognize the Nation's inescapable obligation to foster and sustain a prosperous agriculture as the very bedrock of our national economy, for available to him and even pressing upon him would be the sound convictions and the vast information of Representative COOLEY.

Our North Carolina lawmaker would agree and insist that the Nation has a vital stake in equalizing and enriching the educational opportunities of its youth. But he would stand steadfastly against any Federal control, in whatever guise, of our public schools. For Representative BARDEN would speak forthrightly for him on this urgent question.

Our composite lawgiver would be plain-spoken and urbane at one and the same time, for with Representative DURHAM'S furnishing no inconsiderable part of his official stature, he could not be otherwise.

The coastal regions of North Carolina melt gradually into the Piedmont, and the Piedmont marches slowly into the mountain section. Two congressional districts lie athwart the State from New Hanover to Wilkes. Their representatives, Representatives CARLYLE and DEAN—gentlemen both of light and leading—serve as the linchpins that tie the State together and emphasize and illustrate the essential oneness of our people.

North Carolina is no longer a State exclusively of small towns and rural sections. We are developing clotted centers of population with their peculiar problems and viewpoints. Representative JONES would bring to our composite lawmaker the experience of one who has seen Charlotte grow from a gangling town into a great metropolis.

One Congressman who has contributed much to the sturdy character, the energy and the sure grasp of national problems which have distinguished our North Carolina delegation is retiring at the end of his present term. But Representative BULWINKLE has written a record of substantial achievement of which all North Carolinians are proud.

This 14-in-1 lawgiver would be a simon pure Tarheel by birth and residence. His ancestral ties with North Carolina would reach back through several generations and across the whole history of our commonwealth.

His age would be about 59. But he would be as vigorous as the youngest and as sage as the oldest.

Virtually every college in the State would have had a hand in his educational upbringing and the mark of both the old field school and the modern public school would be indelibly upon him.

In matters denominational, he would be very representative and very tolerant for he would worship in the Methodist, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal and the Lutheran churches. It must be added, however, that being a typical North Carolinian he would show a slight preference for the Baptist persuasion.

He would have served his Nation in two mighty wars. He would know alike the hardships and the carefree life of the buck private and the authority of the commissioned officer. He would be at one and the same time an infantryman and an artilleryman. In his military experience, he would be at home in the air, on the sea and on land.

He would have pursued farming both as a stern livelihood and as the pleasant avocation of the city dweller.

In his professional life, he would be very much of the lawyer. His wits would have been sharpened in the lively give and take of hotly contested trials. He would have the fluency of speech of the well-trained attorney.

But his mind would not be exclusively the mind of the successful lawyer. He would know from personal experience both the austerities and the exhilarations of the school teacher. He would have operated that great town meeting of our local democracy—a small-town drug store where issues, great and small, are debated by busy men and loafers. He would be a progressive industrialist with a high sense of responsibility for the well-being of his employees. There would even be a faint tinge of printer's ink upon his fingers.

His election to the National Congress would have come after long public service to his State and community. He would have administered justice as a judge. He would have prosecuted criminal cases as a solicitor. He would have served on local school boards and on State commissions and boards. His legislative experience would have covered both houses of our general assembly. He would have been governor—a great governor—of North Carolina. He would have even been the chief keeper of that lighthouse which illumines the life of our State—the University of North Carolina in its triple glory. His apprenticeship in public service would have been long and faithful.

In his political views, this composite North Carolina Member of the National Congress would be both a liberal and a conservative. But what rational man can always be accurately defined as an unvarying liberal or an unvarying conservative? Only unthinking citizens, legislators, and States allow themselves to be taken captive by mere labels which have only the meaning which the individual reads into them. The truly great statesman has the conservative's regard for the past, the liberal's concern for the future, and the wise man's thought of the present. Being a discerning and contemplative person, he lets the very real present determine whether he shall lean to the unreal past or the unreal future on any particular issue.

Of this 14-in-1 Tarheel lawgiver, one thing can be said: He is a Democrat by inheritance and by conviction. He may hail from the East where Republicans are as rare as zero weather. He may come from the West where Republicans are embarrassingly and even infuriatingly numerous. Parenthetically, we have in the West some counties that, reckoned in percentage points, are more hopelessly joined to their Republican idols than even Vermont and Maine are in their more unregenerate moments. Speaking in Bos-

ton in 1889, Henry Woodfin Grady paid a very moving tribute to the steadfast loyalty of the Vermont Democrat who refused to be discouraged or dismayed by the Republican landslides which were his regular biennial visitations. Stancher still in his Democratic faith and voting is the Avery County Democrat. Every 2 years he goes bravely and confidently to the polls, seeking hopefully, even wistfully, the triumph which is never his. May the god of the politically helpless be kind to this stout-hearted follower of the forlorn hope.

Whether the typical North Carolina lawgiver comes from the East or from the West, from the level Piedmont or from the rolling hills of the upper Piedmont, he is a Democrat by profession of faith and by practice.

As an individual, of course, this composite legislator does not exist. It takes 14 North Carolinians with their differing talents to make him exist even in fancy.

But if he did live in the flesh as one individual, he would be the very paragon of lawmaking excellence.

Most important of all, he would be typical and representative of North Carolina—of all North Carolina. His experience would be an accurate cross-section of the experience of our people. His political views, I venture to believe, would be the composite views of North Carolina.

When we appraise our congressional delegation as a whole, when we view our lawmakers from the vantage point of a citizen of the State rather than of a voter of a specific district, we do command the incomparable services of such a composite lawmaker. Our exceedingly good fortune should make us grateful. North Carolina can truthfully say that it is competently and faithfully represented in the National Congress.

Of course, the members of our congressional delegation are not of one mind on every issue. On many legislative matters, they disagree—sometimes with positiveness but always with seemly appreciation of the sincerity of each other. It is well that it is so. We are not sending 14 slavish votes to Congress. In North Carolina we still believe that intellectual integrity and independence are among the hallmarks of good lawmakers.

But when the issue involves essentials of party faith, the members of the North Carolina delegation succeed in achieving unity. When they disagree, it is usually about the peace rather than the goal of progress.

In this regard, the Democratic Party of North Carolina and our Democratic delegation in Congress can point a moral and adorn a tale for the Democratic Party of the Nation.

In his road shows, Gene Autry gets a laugh from his audiences by saying drolly: "I don't belong to any organized political party. I am a Democrat."

There is a hard core of truth in this wisecrack. The Democratic Party has never been a severely disciplined, harshly regimented party. It has been more a way of political life than a case-bound political mechanism. Historically, it has extended the utmost hospitality to all private citizens who accepted its basic principles.

That was the spirit which Thomas Jefferson breathed into the Democratic Party at its birth. That was the spirit which enabled John Quincy Adams, the personal embodiment of New England culture and industrialism, and Andrew Jackson, the very personification of the turbulent frontier, to be Democratic rivals for the Presidency. That was the spirit that made it possible and even logical for Grover Cleveland and William Jennings Bryan, Oscar Underwood, and Woodrow Wilson to have a common party affiliation.

There are those who would drive from the Democratic fold the sincere conservatives. There are those others who would expel the honest radicals. They talk in terms of reprisals and purges.

It will be an ill day for the Democratic Party if it ever seeks to close the door on either its genuine conservatives or its genuine radicals. We need them both. With their clashing viewpoints, they provide that internal discipline which every healthy party requires.

Anything that moves—and the Democratic Party is a thing of movement—needs both a brake and an accelerator. We need the counsel and the correction of the conservative to make certain that we do not act without due regard to the lessons of experience. We need the agitations and the urgings of the honest radicals to keep our eyes from straying too frequently from the beckoning future. Woodrow Wilson once defined himself as "a radical with the brakes on."

The balance weight of the Democratic Party is the middle class which weighs the sober fears of the conservatives and the far-ranging visions of the radicals—and decides.

The Republican Party is all brakes. It has long since discarded its accelerator. It has no room for the La Follettes, the Teddy Roosevelts, the LaGuardias, as it had in its wiser and more spacious days. It has achieved solidarity of a sort but in the process of accomplishing this dreary unity, it has whittled its forces down to impotence.

In North Carolina, we have both conservative and radical fringes in the Democratic Party and we do not believe that either is necessarily traitorous to the party faith. In our North Carolina delegation, we have both conservatives and moderates and liberals and we respect all of them as honest representatives of the party.

About 400 years ago a great German theologian laid down this rule of guidance for the contending factions of the Protestant faith:

"In necessary things, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity."

The Democratic Party has followed that rule rather faithfully in North Carolina with results that are manifest in the membership of our congressional delegation and in the quality of progressive, honest government which the party has given to the State over the past half century. The Democratic Party of the Nation can do no better than to follow this example.

Truly, at this troubled, even anguished juncture in the life of civilization, the National Democratic Party, drawing its strength from its historic past, its challenge from the present and its vision from the future, can follow no wiser course than to embrace and practice the admonition of the preacher of that far-off day to the brawling Lutheran factions:

"In necessary things, unity; in doubtful things, liberty; in all things, charity."

Washington Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of March 15, 1950:

WASHINGTON HOME RULE

The Democratic platform of 1948: "We favor the extension of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia."

The Republican platform of 1948: "We favor self-government for the residents of the Nation's Capital."

Action of the Senate in 1949: Passage by voice vote on May 31 of the Kefauver bill, which would permit the people of the District of Columbia to vote for their own city council, would reorganize the District government and would relieve Congress of the ridiculous chore of acting as a board of aldermen for a city of 900,000 people.

Action of the House in 1949: Pigeon-holing of the home-rule bill in the District of Columbia Committee, from which it has not yet been budged. One of the reasons for committee inaction is undoubtedly the fact that one-third of Washington's population is Negro. The mere statement of this reason for denial of local franchise to Washingtonians is enough—or should be enough—to condemn it.

The one practical way of getting the home-rule bill out of committee at this time seems to be through a discharge petition, which now lacks only 49 of the requisite 218 signatures. Members of the House do not sign a discharge petition lightly—and they are right not to do so—but in view of platform pledges this is one piece of legislation that no committee is justified in withholding from floor consideration.

For obvious reasons, it is a matter of major importance to the citizens of Washington. And it should be a matter of genuine concern to all the other citizens of the United States that the inhabitants of one of the country's great cities are deprived of even the most elementary rights of self-government. Furthermore, the time Congress wastes in settling the minutiae of Washington's municipal affairs—from regulation of District of Columbia barbers to organization of a police force band—could doubtless be put to better use in matters of somewhat wider national interest. The home-rule bill should be brought out to the floor and passed.

A Baby Every Day—Triplets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catahoula News, of March 9, 1950:

DAY BY DAY THE HARDIE FAMILY GROWS AND GROWS AND GROWS—A BABY EVERY DAY—TRIPLETS

Jonesville citizens breathed a sigh of relief Thursday, not only because the flood waters surrounding the town were receding, but also because Mrs. Lester Hardie finally completed a 3-day period of having babies.

Triplets—each with a different birthday—were born to Mrs. Hardie one at a time, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at Nasif's clinic.

Dr. N. G. Nasif, attending physician, has been besieged with calls concerning the most unusual case in his career and, as far as Jonesville people are concerned, in the career of any doctor.

On Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock, Mrs. Hardie had her first baby, a 5-pound boy. On Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock, she had her second, a 6-pound girl, and then on Thursday morning, at 12:15 o'clock, she had her third and last, a 7-pound girl.

There was a total of more than 40 hours elapsed time between the first and third

births. Between the first and second births, 25 hours elapsed. Between the second and third births, 15 hours and 15 minutes elapsed.

Dr. Nasif said the babies were full time, and all were in good condition.

Thursday morning, as townspeople "ohed" and "ahed" about the "believe-it-or-not" births, Mrs. Hardie was asleep, with no visitors allowed. Dr. Nasif was tired, too, but proud of the achievement.

Lester Hardie, the father, was of course, proud, but somewhat worried. There are seven other children in the family besides the new triplets, making a dozen mouths to feed. Times are bad, and so is his health.

Hardie is a commercial fisherman, has been for many years, and since 1937 the family has been living on a houseboat about 3 miles up the Ouachita from Jonesville. Long years on the water in all kinds of weather have aggravated his sinus trouble, and chronic bronchitis. Often when fishing is right, Hardie's health prevents his working, he says. And as everyone knows, fishing isn't right now, during the high water.

"The fish are too scattered now," Hardie explained. "You can't get a very good catch." The Red Cross is now helping the Hardies, as it is many other families of flood-stricken Catahoula.

Mrs. Hardie will be 36 in May, and he will be 35 in June. They have been married since 1933. Five of the other children, Edna Lucille, Anise Clothilde, R. L., Myrtle Geraldine, and Wilburn, are in school. Two, Lester Paul and Shirley Ann, are pre-school age.

There are no names yet for the triplets. Hardie said that he had promised an aunt, Mrs. Lilly Ford Harris, of Quaid, that she could name the babies. She has helped Mrs. Hardie out in previous births, he said, and had asked to be allowed to name the babies.

"But," Hardie explained, "she went home or to Ferriday last night and didn't leave a list of names."

Because of their birthplace where three rivers meet, the names "Tensas," "Ouachita," and "Little" were suggested. Hardie agreed they would be good names but said he had promised Mrs. Harris the naming honor. "I want to let her have her 'rathers' about it," he said.

Mrs. Hardie was formerly Mabel Harris of Columbia. Her parents are dead. Hardie's mother is dead, but his father, Richard Hardie, is still living.

Wednesday night, waiting at Nasif's clinic, he said, "I have lots of grandchildren. So many, I don't get excited about them anymore".

"If you aren't excited about these," he was told, "you are about the only person in town who isn't." "Grandpa" Hardie grinned.

Trying to trace back the "twins" on either side—there were definitely no triplets—"Papa" Hardie said that his wife's mother had had twins, born dead, and that one of his cousins had twins.

Aside from the fact that the triplets have different birthdays, there are other circumstances of the birth that are unusual. Dr. Nasif modestly admits that the case is "probably unique in medical annals." He has never delivered triplets before, he said, and had never heard or read of them arriving one each for three consecutive days.

Twins with different birthdays are fairly common, with such births usually occurring around the midnight hours. Twins have also been born in different years, when one was born on December 31 and one on January 1.

Dr. Nasif said that the birth of the first baby was normal and by spontaneous labor. The second two were breech births by induced labor.

"After the first baby came," he said, "I thought the second would follow soon as a normal procedure. After I saw that it wasn't coming of its own accord, labor was induced. Then when the second came, I expected the third to follow, but it would not, so labor had to be induced again."

The first and third babies are identical twins, Dr. Nasif explained, in that they were contained in the same placenta. The second-born baby was in a separate placenta, and biologically is a "fraternal twin" of the others. But being three, they are triplets.

Hardie was planning to move his houseboat and the remainder of his family down to Jonesville Thursday afternoon, to be nearer his wife, and new babies, who will be hospitalized for a while longer.

How to Ruin a Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star:

HOW TO RUIN A FARM PROGRAM

Two congressional committees took action on Wednesday that threatens to dig the grave of any sensible and popularly supported farm program. The House Banking Committee and Senate Banking Committee approved an increase of $2,000,000,000 in the funds allowed for keeping farm prices high. That would make a total of $6,750,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation could spend buying eggs and potatoes and grain and milk to be stored, allowed to rot or to be plowed under for fertilizer to grow more surpluses to be bought by taxpayers' money.

The total cost of administering the Federal Government 20 years ago was less than $6,750,000. How long does Congress think the big majority of the American people are going to stand for high farm prices in the market and higher taxes to pay these support payments? The people know that the Government has millions of eggs, potatoes, bushels of grain and pounds of dried milk; enough to feed thousands of people for a year. They also know it is now going to waste.

They know that their Government is sending billions of dollars to Europe so people there can buy food while we have food running out of our ears over here. They know that most of that $6,750,000,000 is going to come right out of their pockets in the income taxes they are paying this month. Does Congress think the people like paying these taxes so that they have to pay high food prices and at the same time make the Government the biggest food miser in history?

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan rightly thinks that the people will revolt against these high rigid price supports. But he believes he can sell his plan to pay the farmer a direct cash subsidy, control his production and his income, and at the same time allow market prices to drop way down. Yet his plan will cost at least $6,000,000,000 a year and probably more. The taxpayers will still have to foot the bill while the farmer becomes the hired hand of the Government.

What is more likely to happen, when next year's surplus potatoes and grain and eggs and milk are dumped in the rivers and plowed under for fertilizer and burned in pits, is that the people will decide they have had enough of the whole idea of Government support for farmers. They are quite likely to say to their Congressmen, "throw the whole program out." And that is what Congress might have to do next year or the year after, if the politicians keep bidding for the farm vote with the taxpayers' hard-earned cash.

The Political Issues of the 1950 Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of my colleague from Michigan, Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER, to be delivered over Station WJR:

Thank you, and good evening, friends.

In selecting the topic, The Political Issues of the 1950 Campaign, I am expressing my own views as an individual Member of Congress. To me all indications are that the 1950 campaign will be a most vigorous one. The Democrats will endeavor to hold the gains that they made in the 1948 election, and the Republicans, of course, will endeavor to pick up additional congressional and senatorial seats in order to gain control of the Congress.

It is my personal observation that this 1950 nonpresidential-election campaign will be one where no holds will be barred by either party. In my humble opinion, the 1950 elections are extremely important to every man, woman, and child in this country. There are many collateral issues, but the underlying issue the voters have to decide by November is whether they wish to go on supporting a party that will continue to take them down the road to complete state socialism or whether they wish to support a party which believes that true prosperity can only be had through our free-enterprise system.

I believe the issues of this coming campaign will be clearly defined. The Democratic leadership will have to accept the program of President Truman, and the following are some of the measures which the voters will be asked to either endorse or reject, come November:

National compulsory health insurance is one of the major planks of the Democrat platform. This program is commonly referred to as socialized medicine. The administration believes that this plan has considerable vote appeal. National compulsory health insurance, if enacted, would make it mandatory that every family in this country pay a pay-roll tax ranging from 6 to 8 percent. Then, in case of illness, a family could go to a doctor and receive free medical treatment. This is similar to the medical program in England.

We all realize that we do have certain national health problems. However, as Republicans we believe that these health problems can best be met by the training of more doctors and by providing more and better hospital facilities. We propose that our medical training centers be expanded, in order to double the number of medical students. Our way of life is based on competition, and competition in the medical profession is just as healthy as it is in any other line of endeavor. By the training of more doctors the competition itself will reduce the cost of medical treatment. The Federal Government is now cooperating in a hospital

construction program in conjunction with the States and local communities. This program in a very short time will solve our hospital problem. We encourage the use of voluntary health insurance. Voluntary insurance is much cheaper than paying a compulsory 6- or 8-percent pay-roll tax for national insurance.

Socialized medicine would reduce medical care to its lowest level. We know the experiences we have had in the past in the treatment of welfare cases, where the doctors are paid for their services by the State and other local agencies. In many cases this treatment has not been too satisfactory. National compulsory health insurance would place our medical profession under Government control and regulation and would destroy the initiative to render the most adequate and best possible service to a patient. The doctor would be swamped with Government red tape, which impairs his medical efficiency.

Another major issue of the 1950 campaign will be the so-called Brannan farm plan. The administration has come out wholeheartedly for this plan, sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan. Of course, this plan is nothing new. It was first conceived when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. Henry Wallace did not have the nerve to bring it to the light of day. The administration today, however, has no hesitancy in submitting this plan to the people. We have come quite a ways down the road since Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture.

What does the Brannan plan do? First, it has a very appealing catch-on slogan of promising high prices to the farmer and low prices to the consumer. From the best information that we have to date—and, you know it is difficult to get positive information because the Secretary of Agriculture keeps revising his plans every other day—the Secretary would allot marketing quotas to every farmer; should the Department of Agriculture guess right and so control production, of course, food costs to the consumer would not decrease but rather would increase and the farmer would be assured 100-percent parity for his produce. If, however, the Department of Agriculture should guess wrong, and set marketing quotas for surplus foods, prices would drop from a normal to a subnormal level. This because there then would be no incentive for marketing. Then the difference between the market price and the 100-percent-parity price would be made up to the farmers by direct payments from the Federal Treasury. For example, if the Brannan plan had been in effect last year, it would have cost the taxpayers of this country over $5,000,000,000 in direct subsidy payments. Even with our present farm-support program—which we admit has many bugs in it—the net program loss on operation for the 1949 fiscal year stands at $254,762,000. Of course, the dangerous result of this proposed Brannan plan is that management of the farms of this country would be controlled by the Secretary of Agriculture. No farmer can stay in business unless he agrees to come under the Brannan plan. Once he is under the program, and even though his money is invested in a certain type of farming, the Secretary of Agriculture could tell him to do away with his dairy herd, for example, and raise potatoes.

Experience has taught us that depressions are always led by a decline in farm income. It is necessary to maintain adequate purchasing power in the hands of our farmers. This can be done without restorting to Government farming and by our doing two things. First, finding new markets for, and new means of utilizing, our farm produce. As an example take our present potato fiasco. We have a great surplus of potatoes. The Government has spent thousands of dollars to destroy our surplus potatoes. There is no reason why these potatoes could not be used for the manufacture of alcohol.

Second, we should improve our system of distribution. Of course, the price of farm produce increases 100 percent after reaching the city limits. The cost of the produce over the counter in the city has little relationship to the amount the farmer receives for raising the produce. There is no need in a country such as ours for destroying food of any kind. We all remember when Henry Wallace ordered the killing of little pigs. Soon thereafter we were in want of pork.

It is ironical that this past year when we had a period of farm surpluses the administration imported thousands of pounds of butter, cheese, eggs, wheat, corn—yes; and even potatoes. We must discontinue our policy of permitting the importation of farm produce from foreign nations, of which we have a surplus. This foreign competition is most unfair to our American farmers.

Another issue of the 1950 campaign will be that of our present fiscal policy. The Democrats sponsoring socialized medicine, the Brannan farm plan, and other costly measures, of course, have to accept the responsibility for maintaining a high national budget and high taxes and the continuation of deficit financing. As Republicans, we believe that a Nation is no different than we as individuals and should and must live within its income. I know that when I spend more money than I make and continue doing so, eventually there will come a day of reckoning. I think many in the radio audience have experienced the same thing. We cannot condone a Government which in peacetime spends five to eight billion dollars a year more than it takes in in taxes. We are convinced that we have reached the saturation point as far as taxes are concerned. We Republicans are convinced that our present high tax structure has been a definite deterrent to business.

I believe we can take a lesson from our good neighbor Canada. Since the end of World War II, Canada has materially decreased her income taxes; has repealed her wartime imposed excise taxes; reduced her excess profits tax and even with such tax decreases, Canada's national income has increased each year. Canada has made payments on her national debt and has balanced her budget each year. Certainly the experience Canada has had with her fiscal policy should be a lesson to us that true prosperity cannot be had under a high-tax administration.

Another issue in the coming campaign will be charges made by the Republicans that this Democratic administration has been lax in its efforts to weed subversive employees from the Government pay roll. We all realize that Alger Hiss and Judith Coplon were not alone in their activities. We feel the administration has been reluctant to make a concerted effort to remove disloyal employees from the Government pay roll. The Democrats, of course, will charge that this is political witch hunting and that there are no disloyal employees in Government. We must remember Alger Hiss was considered a good security risk until he was exposed by the House Un-American Activities Committee and finally indicted. It is my personal belief that the loyalty of a Federal employee—whose salary is paid by taxing the public—should be above reproach. I see no reason why the burden of proof to establish loyalty should not rest with the individual, whether he be now employed by the Government or whether he is seeking Federal employment, rather than with the Government.

We know our foreign policy is going to be a bigger issue in this 1950 campaign than it has been for some time. The so-called bipartisan foreign policy is breaking at the seams. For the past several years there has been little of a bipartisan approach to any of our international problems. Foreign policy has been dictated by the Department of State and thrown to Congress to accept. Certainly there is nothing bipartisan, for example, about our lack of policy in China.

During the 1950 campaign, I assume, the administration will charge that the Republicans are scrapping our bipartisan foreign policy and we Republicans will charge that such bipartisan foreign policy does not even exist.

These are but a few of the many issues that will be raised in this coming election campaign. The American people will have clear-cut issues. There will be no attempt to say we stand for the same things, but we would do it better. This is a fork-in-the-road election where the American people must decide which way they want to go—whether they want to continue to copy the British Social Labor Government—which has proven disastrous—or whether they wish to tackle our problems in the American way.

We are most appreciative to WJR for putting on this series of programs. WJR has been, and is, performing a great public service in allowing this time to various Members of Congress in order to inform the people of the important issues of the day.

Statement by R. B. Anderson Before House Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1950, Mr. R. B. Anderson, president of the Texas division of Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to present his testimony on the pending question of reduction of the depletion allowance for oil development. Mr. Anderson has supplemented his original statement by additional testimony in answer to the question as to whether the large producers are using the benefits of the percentage depletion provision in the manner intended by Congress.

I recommend to your reading the following statement by Mr. Anderson, which I wish to insert in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

STATEMENT BY R. B. ANDERSON, SUPPLEMENTING HIS TESTIMONY OF FEBRUARY 14, 1950

In my testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on Tuesday, February 14, 1950, on the question of percentage depletion as it applied to the oil and natural-gas industry, I urged the committee to retain the present depletion and intangible well-drilling cost provisions in the income-tax law without change.

A member of the committee raised a question as to whether the large producers were using the benefits of the percentage depletion provisions in the manner intended by Congress. In response to that question, a detailed survey has just been completed of a group of large oil companies, including all of the so-called major companies in the industry for a 12-year period from 1936 to 1947, inclusive, which is the longest period for which complete and accurate data could be assembled covering their operations. The survey shows that this group of companies spent more in their efforts to find new oil reserves than the total percentage depletion allowed for the same period, or $1,833,000,000 more in their effort to find new oil than the total additional taxes they would have paid

without the percentage depletion provisions in the law. The money spent in the finding effort does not include intangible development costs or the additional monies spent subsequent to discovery in drilling and equipping producing wells and leases.

The total sum expended by this group of companies during the period, including both exploration and development, was $5,541,829,000, or more than twice the total percentage depletion allowed.

The Congress, recognizing the hazards of the oil producing business, enacted the percentage depletion provision and has continued it in the law in order to enable an oil producer to recover his capital value. It is the necessary incentive to the oil and gas producer, whether large or small, to plow back his funds in the search for new and essential reserves. It is also the incentive for new and additional risk capital from outside sources to be expended in the search for new and additional oil reserves.

The facts shown by the survey are conclusive evidence that these provisions have done what they were intended to do and that the larger producers are as dependent upon the percentage depletion provisions as the smaller operator in their continuous search for oil.

The average cost per well for exploratory wells drilled in the United States in the search for new oil reserves has almost tripled in the period 1935 to 1948, having increased from $32,578 per well in 1935 to $87,337 per well in 1948. At the same time the number of such wells required to discover a million barrels of new reserves doubled during the same period. As a result, the average cost of finding a million barrels of new reserves increased during the period by 533 percent.

These sharp increases in the cost of finding oil obviously affect everyone who searches for oil irrespective of size. They seriously affect those of our producers who have sufficient capital to undertake the risk of exploring high cost areas. In many instances, the larger producer makes substantial contributions to the smaller producer in order to enable the latter to drill exploratory wells. Generally, it is only the larger producer who can afford the enormous costs involved in the search for oil in many portions of the Rocky Mountain region, or in the swamp areas along the Gulf of Mexico, or in the submerged lands underlying the open ocean off our shores, or in the many unproven areas of the United States where deep test wells are necessary.

I should like to emphasize that the continued search for oil by those comprising the industry, whether small, medium, or large or whatever degree of size, is dependent upon the continuation of the long established percentage depletion provisions of the law without any change.

House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities Prepares to Open Public Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, on Sunday, March 12, carried an article entitled "Washington Lobbyists Again Under Scrutiny—House Group, After Long Preparation, Is Ready To Open Its Investigation." Written by Mr. John D. Morris of the Times' excellent Washington bureau, this article sets out fairly and objectively, I believe, the thinking among members of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities in seeking to make of this investigation into lobbying and pressure groups a constructive contribution both to public understanding of the place of lobbying in a democracy and to improved procedures and clearer lines of jurisdiction of the Federal regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

As Mr. Morris indicates in this article, an investigation of this sort could easily turn into nothing more constructive than a search for some new headline sensation each day. Or, on the other hand, it could develop the need for and the means of improving our relatively new statute on lobbyist registration and identification and thus do a most worthwhile job.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, I have been impressed by the constructive spirit in which all members of this committee, including Representatives LANHAM, DOYLE, ALBERT, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA of Minnesota, have approached this challenge of making of our investigation a real contribution to wider understanding of a complex subject which is so close to the legislative process.

The New York Times' article, Washington Lobbyists Again Under Scrutiny, follows:

WASHINGTON LOBBYISTS AGAIN UNDER SCRUTINY—HOUSE GROUP, AFTER LONG PREPARATION, IS READY TO OPEN ITS INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, March 11.—After a 5-month wind-up, the Select House Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities is about ready to toss out the opening pitch in an investigation that could produce a sensation a day—or turn into a flop. Public hearings are to start March 27.

Chances are that the inquiry will steer a course somewhere between daily headline-hunting and steady digging into the complex subject of what makes the $8,000,000-a-year lobbying industry tick and how to improve the Federal law, enacted in 1946, that is supposed to regulate it.

A dozen or so investigators, lawyers, clerks, and researchers have been quietly at work since last December in laying the groundwork for public hearings.

The object of the preliminaries, according to Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the special committee, is the compilation of what might be termed "a catalog of basic fact on the theory and practice of lobbying."

AREAS OF INQUIRY

The committee then plans to make a detailed inquiry into four so-called twilight zones where question has arisen as to whether actviities constitute lobbying as defined by the registration act. These areas are listed by Mr. BUCHANAN as follows:

1. The peculiar position of attorneys. For the most part, the lawyers involved contend that they merely represent their clients in the normal attorney-client relationship and are compensated for that service rather than for any incidental lobbying they might perform. The assumption is that many other possible lawyer-lobbyists, believing they are exempt, have failed to register.

2. "The peculiar position of officers of companies and associations." Many of these officials have registered under protest, asserting that their lobbying activities were only an incidental part of their regular duties.

3. "The peculiar position of public relations counselors." Similar arguments are advanced by some public relations units employed by organizations and business concerns. An additional consideration in their case is the extent that publicity prepared for dissemination to the public constitutes indirect lobbying covered by the act.

4. "The peculiar position of legislative reporters." Many organizations employ Washington representatives to keep them abreast of proposed legislation of special interest to them. The reports that these representatives make to their employing organizations, many of them in the form of bulletins and circulars, could be classified as indirect lobbying if they are designed to stir up sentiment for the purpose of influencing legislation.

In the course of examining these borderline areas, the committee expects to produce several examples that might be regarded as typical and explore them in detail. It thus hopes to develop exhaustive information on lobbying methods by questioning those in the business.

Among the lobbies selected for thorough investigation are those that operated in connection with the public housing fight last year. The campaign for repeal of war-time excise taxes, which reached new heights this session, may also be scrutinized. It is emphasized that the activities of lobbies on both sides of the various issues will be explored without bias or prejudice.

Great Danger in Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 14, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Thomas F. Downey, which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on Sunday, March 12, 1950:

PROPAGANDA AIMED AT UNITED STATES CANNOT BE TAKEN LIGHTLY—ARMED FORCES ALERTED TO EFFECTS

(By Thomas F. Downey)

Don't make the mistake of taking the cold war lightly. It is a dangerous situation and it is up to every citizen of this great democracy to be on guard against un-American propaganda.

With the hydrogen-bomb coming to the forefront of the cold front hostilities, psychological warfare has reached its peak in the throbbing and thrilling twentieth century.

Although the great battlewagons are riding at peaceful anchor in the mothball fleet and the cannons of war are muted, top leaders of the military forces of the Nation warn that propaganda can be a powerful force which can be deadlier than a gun, a bomb or any other weapon of war.

REALIZE RESULT

Leaders of the Nation realize that psychological warfare can be worse than a shooting war. They know that when the minds of men are constricted with a paralyzing fear, by intimidation and by persuasion, their bodies can be more easily captured.

Many Americans today give little thought to the cold war which is being waged at top speed throughout the world. The forces of blind obedience to sword rattling Communists are on one side and on the other the democratic nations which believe that all

men have a fair and unhampered chance at freedom, success, and happiness.

NOT TAKING CHANCES

High military officials of the United States are not taking any chances on the effects of the cold and deadly psychological war infiltrating to our stalwart men in uniform. The general public will do well to take a few pages from the warning pamphlets which the armed forces have issued on the cold war.

Members of the armed forces throughout the Nation and those on foreign duty are studying the methods of understanding and combatting psychological warfare. The Office of Secretary of Defense has prepared special information on the dangerous subject for ranking officers to disseminate to the men in their outfits.

This Nation's leaders feel that the informed serviceman is best equipped to guard himself and his Nation against dishonest propaganda. The serviceman of the various branches of the armed forces who has not followed the course of events, both in peace and during war, can become an easy prey to the sinister propagandist.

CAN EXPOSE THEMSELVES

If a man or woman is unable to distinguish between fact and falsehood, between accurate and inaccurate they are liable to expose themselves, their organization, community or Nation to serious dangers.

In a special message to the armed forces issued by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, military authorities stress that a serviceman unarmed against a vicious propaganda attack on the Nation is just as bad as a soldier or sailor who is without proper arms in battle.

MUST STUDY PROPAGANDA

Every American—civilian or member of the armed forces—must develop the ability to analyze propaganda. They must know how to detect subversive propaganda, for this is a personal responsibility of every person who wants to keep this Nation a great, peaceful democracy.

Americans must be able to evaluate each and every item of gossip or information that comes their way. This is not a query, to be easily thrown over one's shoulder. The activities of Red- and Soviet-front groups are more numerous and dexterous than a swarm of bees in a sugarcane field.

If you sit back and analyze the situation, modern warfare is made up of four basic types. These are military, which includes air, sea, and land operations; economic, political, and psychological. The world today is struggling under the latter type of deadly conflict.

WARFARE PSYCHOLOGICAL

Officials of the Office of the Secretary of Defense at Washington stress that in the final analysis all warfare is psychological in that it is waged to influence and swerve or intimidate the mind of the enemy.

Pure psychological warfare is distinct in itself. It has its own system. This is not a system or weapon of the last resort. Under honest and skilled leadership it can save lives on the battlefield and help prevent or shorten a war.

Actually, psychological warfare is the application of the principles of psychology (the study of the mind) to the conduct of war. It has many facets.

NOT MODERN DISCOVERY

Psychological warfare is not a modern discovery, officials of the Armed Forces Information and Education Division stress in a recent special message to the men in uniform.

"The pattern—employed 2,500 years ago by Xerxes, the Persian general, who used rumormongering as a means of waging propaganda war—was successfully imitated by the Nazi government in World War II, they point out.

"Xerxes scared the daylights out of the Greek warriors by circulating rumors that when the Persians shot their arrows they shut out the light of the sun.

"It was the same myth of invincibility which in World War II scared Europe out of its wits and enabled the Nazis to conquer Austria and Czechoslovakia with no more than a few random shots."

Hannibal, the Carthaginian king, was another who used rumors expertly. He planted tales about his Roman enemies, claiming that he had a "secret weapon which could not be stopped, and could not even be pierced." The Roman legions mulled about like frightened youngsters, asking what millions wondered about the Nazis, "How can we resist?" They discovered too late that Hannibal's secret weapon was only a herd of armored elephants.

Horrifying shrieks and war masks of ancient Japanese and the African and South Sea island tribes were psychological weapons. So were the blood-curdling cries of the warring American Indians.

American colonial forces at the famed Battle of Bunker Hill used one of the earliest types of front-line combat propaganda. They circulated leaflets pointing to sharp class distinctions then existing between Britsh officers and enlisted men.

Hitler was the worst propagandist of World War II. His main purpose was "to sow mental confusion, contradiction, indecision, and panic" in the Allied countries and among the Allied governments.

RETURNED BY ALLIES

But Hitler and his lieutenants were not the only experts in the art of organized propaganda. The Axis propaganda swords were parried and the lunges returned by allied counter-propaganda.

In the struggle to influence men's minds, a fundamental difference existed between the propaganda of democracy and that of the Axis powers, our Nation's military leaders are quick to point out.

The Axis blindfolded their own people against the truth as the Russians are doing today. They used distortions and falsehoods. "The greater the lie, the more effective a weapon it is," Hitler wrote.

MET TRADITION

By contrast, Allied propaganda stressed the truth, concentrating on straight news and commentaries. Since the aims and ideals of the western democracies were predicated on international justice and the right of nations to self-government, they did not resort to deception to make a case for themselves.

The strategy of truth which characterized Allied propaganda was in full accord with their democratic traditions. They could not have resorted to organized distortion and suppression of truths without discrediting themselves in the eyes of their own people.

In the long run, honesty and truthful propaganda proved a far more realistic and profitable policy for dealing with their own people, the neutrals and also the enemy.

NOT ALL IS FALSE

Every American in this chaotic era must understand that not all propaganda is bad or untrue. Propaganda is used for good purposes. Worthy welfare agencies, for example, use it to promote their ideas and programs. In these instances propaganda is good publicity or promotional activity, free from selfish interests.

All persons should be on guard, however, against unscrupulous individuals and groups who utilize propaganda to advance their special brand of ideas. In plain language, propaganda can be based on truth or on falsehood; it can be useful or harmful, depending on the purposes for which it is used.

Thus the big question posed for every freedom-loving person is: "How can I do my own thinking and evaluating about national and world issues in order to avoid falling the victim of a dishonest propaganda artist or philosophy?"

PRETTY SUAVE OPERATOR

It must be remembered that the dispenser of dishonest propaganda is often a pretty suave operator—in other words, the proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing. Here are some tips from top military authorities on ways of sifting and analyzing propaganda:

The first thing to do is get the facts. Knowledge is the No. 1 enemy of false propaganda. If somebody tells you something wrong about which you have the correct facts, then it is your duty to set him right and halt the spread of false propaganda.

In the world today fear seems to be the aim of much propaganda. If you have the facts you won't be frightened by malicious or nerve-twitching rumors.

CONSULT AUTHORITY

When you go after information get the full and relevant facts. This means going to competent authority to prove the reliability of the information.

Cultivate a discriminating mind. This don't mean you have to become a 100 percent doubting Thomas. But you should refuse to accept uncritically any information or news that comes your way via an unreliable or doubtful source.

Consider all sides of an issue or bit of information. Don't forget to also consider your own personal leanings. Humans often believe what they want to believe on the basis of their emotions.

DISTINGUISH BRANDS

Be propaganda wise. One sure way to distinguish the honest propagandist from the dishonest is to compare the methods employed. While the honest propagandist bases his appeal on demonstrable facts, the dishonest propagandist spreads falsehood deliberately.

The honest propagandist is fair-minded, but the dishonest propagandist assumes the appearance of being fair-minded. The former appeals most to our intelligence. The latter persistently tries to arouse the emotions.

The honest propagandist does not dodge the pros and cons of an issue. He is willing to change his conclusions on the basis of new evidence and maintains an open-minded attitude. The dishonest propagandist is intolerant of open discussion and conflicting views. His mind is closed to everything but his own selfish goal.

Internal Security of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no matter confronting the Nation today of more importance than strengthening the laws relating to our internal security. Recent happenings both in and out of court have revealed a situation that cannot go unchallenged. The subversive activities of some in high policy-making departments of our Government, as well as by some who are

duly appointed representatives of foreign governments, calls for drastic action. There must be a tightening up of our laws and the adoption of criminal procedures that will make it impossible for traitorous offenders to escape punishment. The bill now before us is a step in the right direction. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill and it should have the support of this House. I am certain that it will have such support. While there may be at times divisions among the membership, yet, in a matter of this kind there has never been, and I am certain there never will be, any division, for this is a patriotic and not a partisan or political matter. Patriotism transcends party affiliation and no one political party has ever had a monopoly on love of country. Thus Democrats and Republicans stand together on matters of this kind with unity and single purpose. This is as it should be.

The bill was originally drafted by and has the support of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, a joint group consisting of representatives of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Department of the Navy, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

The provisions of the bill not only increase the penalties that can be exacted of those found guilty, but, it also increases the scope of offenses. In this latter respect the bill has been drafted on the basis of the experience gained in recent investigations and trials that brought to light the insufficiency of existing laws. It will undoubtedly close loopholes and make criminal prosecutions far more effective than at any previous time.

It is imperative that legislation of this character be adopted. Serious gaps in our present laws permit people, both citizens and aliens alike, opportunities to acquire information vital to our national security and to use that information to the disadvantage and danger of the United States without fear of prosecution in our courts. Numerous cases have come to light in recent years pointing to the weakness of these laws when they are subjected to attack. There now exists in our midst a threat of our form of government and to the liberties guaranteed to all of us by our Constitution. The magnitude and strength of this threat is something new and strange to America. It is a threat which is most difficult to counteract, particularly when our law-enforcement agencies are hampered by lack of effective laws.

This bill may not solve all of the problems of security, but, if experience shows that it does not then amendments can be made that will meet any such contingency. But, it is. certain that as now presented to the House it will be of inestimable assistance to the agencies of the Government charged with responsibility of maintaining our national security.

The bill should be passed and without delay.

The American Citizen and His Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days I have received letters which indicate a great deal of thinking on the part of the American people about the type of Government that we have and enjoy and should endeavor to maintain. Two of these letters in particular are so very worthy of your consideration that I asked they be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first letter is by Mr. J. Elmer Pate, of Bryan, Tex., and the second letter which conveyed the thoughts of Dr. John Ashton, of College Station, Tex., is entitled "A Checkrein on Government Spending." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert these two letters:

The Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The Declaration of Independence was the product of men who struggled against being in bonds; men who dared fight the usurper; men whose courage and vision opened the gate to the highest plane of achievement a nation has ever known. Again we need men: Our prosperity and lack of suffering hardships for liberty has dulled our senses to the stealthy, ominous creeping of other usurpers, with their silken thongs of bondage. What a time for a Washington or a Lincoln. It just doesn't make sense to go back down the hill.

Heretofore I've hesitated to write you about legislation because I feel that, in you, we of this district have a good Representative; one who will give all proposals a conscientious study. But if there ever was a time when good men needed the support, and sorry men the condemnation of their countrymen, it is now. That's why I'm writing you about the Hoover Commission report. It seems to me the theme of the whole report, from the General Management of the Executive Branch to Federal-State Relations, is efficiency. And efficiency in government is the forerunner of economy in government. We need this levee in the path of back-to-bondage spending. To be sure, what's a few billion in our day of squandermania? But our day isn't forever. We may not have many more chances to turn the tide.

And we have children. I have a fine athletic son and two beautiful daughters. A variation of that statement challenges the mind and heart of every parent, and of everyone who can understand the dignity and purpose that, in the beginning, God revealed to man.

It's too bad that man doesn't always live up to his possibilities. In our district we are typical men and American; rural and urban, deep-rooted in the soil. Two generations ago the land was virgin, rich, and covered with native growth. Now, as you know, much of it is barren and scarred with gullies. Why? Greed grabbed, and carelessness and ignorance indulged. It didn't matter. After their generation the kids could "go west." A few terraces would have saved a lot of moving—soil and people. The kids didn't mind it much though; the United States was boundless. For what good reason are we "going west" again; this time, to the land-of-no-return, dissipating our liberties via the hand-out route.

We realize you have grave responsibilities, Congressman TEAGUE. You are our leader; we are behind you, but you'll probably have to save us from ourselves. Don't yield every time we holler "milk." It's time we were weaned. And when you meet the force of power-drunk wastrels, whose chief purpose is to grab more power, and who, in the cloak of human welfare, hope to bury the human soul under a colossal state, don't yield. Throw up some road blocks; build some embankments; hold the fort. Or some day our children, groveling under an intolerable yoke, will curse our memory.

Respectfully yours,

J. ELMER PATE.

A CHECKREIN ON GOVERNMENT SPENDING

(By Dr. John Ashton)

It should be obvious to the average voter who has read the series of articles on the Recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, by H. Mewhinney, reprinted from the Houston Post (copyright 1949), that waste and inefficiency are the two disturbing factors in the normal operation of our Government, as so clearly set forth in the Hoover Commission reports.

Firmly convinced that colossal sums of money could be saved the American taxpayer by the introduction of proper business-like methods and procedure in the various bureaus and departments of the Government, the writer of this letter advocates the creation of a new post, having high or perhaps Cabinet rank, endowed with adequate power to bring about a drastic reform throughout the executive branch of the Government, and to supervise, reorganize, streamline, and put into operation, such methods and plans as would tend to bring about great savings in money and more efficiency in operation.

Such an official should be selected with the utmost care, and he should, moreover, be a man of wide experience and knowledge of modern business methods, besides being possessed of ample resource as an administrative leader—in fact, the type of executive normally expected to bring order out of chaos.

He would be responsible to nobody but the President, and through him to Congress. He should be appointed for sufficient period of time as would permit him to bring about favorable results, and, if mutually agreeable, the office could be extended for a further period. In addition to his many admirable qualities for such a post, the incumbent should be totally free from political bias.

He should have—and his opinion should be considered in the choosing—an assistant of undoubted merits and high administrative capacity, besides several under secretaries or officials of like rank to superintend the staff work and general functioning of a large and important bureau.

He would be given the power to appoint in every important bureau or department of the executive branch of the Government an officer whose duties would be devoted exclusively to curbing waste and promoting efficiency, and such officers would confer frequently with their chiefs and write periodic reports as deemed necessary.

The chief himself would confer whenever convenient with the Chief Executive, and his recommendations and views would be placed before the President on such occasions—all in the interest of greater economy in the operation of the essential work of the Government.

With only the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report to guide him, such an officer, together with his trained aides and actively encouraged by a cooperative

President, could doubtless accomplish wonders in stopping leaks, sweeping aside duplications of effort, simplifying procedures, reducing red-tape, abolishing cumbersome laws and regulations of no use whatever, and in separating the chaff from the grain among the employees in Government offices and bureaus.

Then, and probably only then, will deficit spending be a thing of the past.

God save America!

Our Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of March 13, 1950:

FAR FROM WOODWARD AVENUE—OUR MONEY GOES

Never mind the fine-spun economic theories which even the authors of them cannot understand.

Never mind the sweet dreams of heaven on earth that come from the satin pillows of the cloud kissers.

Never mind the cruelties of practical politics by which these vagaries of the lotus eaters are used to cinch the do-gooder votes.

As an idealist, President Truman reminds us of a gregarious and convivial Elk dressed up as Little Eva for a benefit performance of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Never mind any of these things, because what we most desperately need is the truth. And, as Al Smith used to remark, the only place you can find that is in the record.

So here is a startling example of how Mr. Truman's politically motivated point 4 program will work out.

His plan—he says—is to save the world from communism when he is actually moving us into the lobby of its edifice with his socialistic program. By point 4 he plans to spend billions and billions of American taxpayers' money to make the backward people of the world happy and prosperous.

Now, let us look at what is going on in Indochina.

That's a long way from Detroit's collapsing city hall and our own bread lines, Mr. Taxpayer, but get the spot in focus, because that's where Mr. Truman wants to spend some billions of your money and that of your fellow citizens.

The French never won the friendship of the people of this lush and profitable Indochina colony. After the Japanese, who had moved into it with Vichy connivance, were ousted, the natives rebelled against France.

The most forceful of the Nationalist leaders was, and is, Ho Chi Minh, a Moscow-trained Communist.

As a counterweight to Ho, the French set up Bao Dai, a former Emperor of Annam, who had collaborated with the Japanese and then fled the country.

Viet Nam, as the puppet state he heads is known, was then admitted to the French Union but with strictly limited sovereignty. The French kept control of defense and foreign affairs. That isn't what the Viet Namese want. They want to be as free as India is.

A few weeks ago Mr. Acheson's State Department recognized Bao Dai and promised him economic and other aid.

A special mission is now studying the use of economic assistance to combat communism in Indochina and elsewhere in southeast Asia.

At this point the Governor of North Viet Nam declares that American aid must be given directly to the Bao Dai regime and not through France.

Otherwise it would have a bad effect politically.

"We want full, complete independence. We have had many promises in the past. We now want to see real transfer of power."

The Viet Namese fear that if the French have the disbursement of American aid they will use it to strengthen their hold on Indochina.

The French, for their part, fear that if our aid is given directly to Bao Dai he will use it further to loosen that hold.

We've got to choose in this Achesonian art of making enemies and influencing nobody.

The same choice will have to be made if and when Congress authorizes President Truman's bold new program for developing underdeveloped areas.

The French were frank enough to state that they did not want this aid if American notions of freedom for colonies were attached to it.

The Dutch sought our financial assistance in Indonesia. The Belgians have drawn up a 10-year development plan for the Congo in expectation of point 4 aid.

As our policy in Asia is reduced to trying to save the fringe of that vast continent, and its offshore islands, from communism, we can't afford to buck the national spirit of independence with which the entire area seethes.

So we are confronted today with the three-cornered struggle of European colonial imperialism, expertly trained Communist agitators from Moscow, and the nationalistic, patriotic love of submerged and exploited peoples for their own lands.

Mr. Truman has the mad concept that he can settle all this by spending your money—billions of it.

Pandora's box was a harmless cookie jar compared to what the practical politician, Mr. Truman, is prying loose for us in order to win the support of the panty-waist boys and the Helen Hokinson girls. He has already got the precincts of the political bosses, who think Indochina is a type of chicken favored by poultry breeders.

Reduction in Force of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days I have been in receipt of many pieces of correspondence from members of veterans organizations and other citizens who are interested in the welfare of veterans. They protest vehemently the recent reduction in force in the Veterans' Administration because, in their opinion, it will materially affect the services now being provided to veterans.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter addressed to me from the department commander of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, which merits serious consideration. It presents an intelligent approach to the serious implications of the reduction which has been effected:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, N. J., March 13, 1950.

The Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: This letter is an analysis of the most recent reduction in the forces of the Newark regional office of the Veterans' Administration and the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Lyons, N. J., by direction of the Veterans' Administration general office at Washington, D. C.

It also contains our opinion as to the effect that these reductions will have upon veterans' activities in New Jersey.

In presenting this information to you, it is the official opinion of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey. This letter has been read to the meeting of the Department executive committee held on Saturday, March 11, in Trenton, N. J., and was approved by them.

NEWARK REGIONAL OFFICE

The total reduction of force in the Newark regional office is 156 employees. Of these, 62 are medical personnel, principally doctors and medical technicians and some associated clerical employees. This service is principally clinical and out-patient treatment of veterans.

In order to accomplish the reduction with minimum disruption of the service, the Regional Manager has decided to close the medical and dental clinic and out-patient services in the Camden suboffice. Some reduction will also be made in the Trenton, Newark, and Union City offices.

The effect of this will be to slow up materially the rate at which patients may be treated in the offices where medical personnel is retained. In the Camden office, the clinical and out-patient treatment will probably be placed on a fee basis.

As the increased load develops upon the reduced forces in the Trenton, Newark, and Union City offices to back-log proportions, the method of relief will be to place a portion of this load also on a fee basis.

In considering the economics of this reduction, there will be a direct pay-roll saving of employees who will be separated from the service. As an offset, however, there will be an increase in the fees paid to outside doctors for all types of clinical, dental, and out-patient treatment. It is not practicable at this time to estimate what this cost will be but, in our opinion, it will assume substantial proportions in due course.

Secondly, with regard to the physiotherapy and dental units, which are of the latest type of equipment, it will make idle a substantial capital investment. Furthermore, by reason of the reduced professional personnel, it will be necessary to eliminate certain services in these departments which have been available to veterans one or two nights a week. The point here is that the veteran entitled to this treatment will, of necessity, be required to come to the clinics during the day hours with probably loss in pay from his employment or, in fear of losing his job, will fail to receive the necessary treatment.

Of the afore-mentioned reduction of 156 employees, 36 are in the Adjudication Service. These are employees who consider and determine the disability ratings of claimants and fix the pensions to which they may be entitled. In full effect, this reduction means that a present total of 13 rating boards, the force will be reduced to 10 rating boards. On the face of this situation, this means that the remaining 10 boards will have to assimilate approximately a 25-percent increased

load upon them. As it is our present observation that all of these 13 boards are substantially occupied with the present load, elimination of 3 of the boards and the transfer of the case load to the remaining boards will mean a less deliberative and considerate rating of claims and will, in due course, cause a backlog in the number of cases awaiting determination.

As you know, veterans who are delayed in obtaining their ratings and consequent pensions, become rather vocal if the delay is protracted. Too hasty a determination on the part of rating boards in rating cases leads to errors of omission and commission which invariably become controversial and require rehearings and reviews. This means further increasing the load upon the remaining rating boards.

As a further consideration, it will be necessary for these rating boards, in order to expedite the handling of cases, to thoroughly screen and perhaps deny veterans the right of personal appearances before the rating boards. This always instills in the mind of the veteran the idea that his case is not receiving the personalized attention it deserves. It also means that all veteran organizations, the American Red Cross, and State agencies, having authorized right of appearance before rating boards, will have a material increase in complaints to them by veterans which will result in an increase in the rehearing and reratings of cases upon their representation.

There is a further consideration also to be borne in mind that veterans who are dissatisfied with conditions arising out of these circumstances invariably appeal to you for assistance in their dilemma.

It is our studied judgment that a reduction in the Adjudication Service, while effecting a pay-roll saving, in nowise reduces the case load and can only, in due course, cause an increase in expense should it be necessary to put the remaining rating boards on an overtime basis.

There are also some further reductions in personnel of miscellaneous character which we have not analyzed. Among these are rehabilitation and training personnel having to do with vocational rehabilitation and education benefits.

LYONS HOSPITAL

The Lyons Hospital is, as you know, a neuropsychiatric hospital which has a rated bed capacity of 2,234 beds. This has been supplemented by 288 beds of emergency character which were set up in certain buildings initially intended as administrative buildings. The total available beds therefore are 2,522. As of March 10, the patient population at the Lyons Hospital was 2,465.

This hospital has been continuously, for years, overpopulated and understaffed. The American Legion has registered innumerable complaints concerning the understaffing of this institution.

Under the reduction-in-force program, made effective this week, the total employee force of this institution is reduced from 1,371 employees to 1,302 employees, a pay-roll saving of 69 employees. Without attempting to analyze in detail the various categories of employees to be included in this reduction, the American Legion is most concerned with the reduction in the nursing staff, which is 6 registered nurses and 28 hospital attendants. In addition to this, there is a reduction of two doctors.

Considering the fact that a major portion of the patients at this hospital are of an unstable mind, any reduction in the personnel committed to the direct care of patients has serious implications. It should not be necessary for us to invite your attention to the shocking crimes of violence which have occurred in our own State and neighboring localities committed by persons of unsound mind. Without recourse to hysteria, the American Legion is most concerned with these dangers as they pertain to veterans who may be released from this hospital prematurely or without adequate determination as to their state of sanity, which will permit them to be safely returned to the civilian population.

We estimate that if this reduction in force in the Lyons Hospital prevails, it may be necessary to make at least 300 beds inactive because they cannot be properly staffed. There is danger here in the possibility that some demented veteran may be denied or unduly delayed admittance.

In conclusion, we present these facts to you upon their merits. We have endeavored not to make any exaggerated statements. We feel that our conclusions are tempered with our experience.

We sincerely solicit your personal consideration as to the situation in our State in connection with the Veterans' Administration services here. We fear that the current controversy inspired by discussions of the Hoover report, insofar as it concerns veterans' affairs, may have inspired these gestures of economy.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY V. GROOME,
Department Commander.

The Command Is "Forward"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the National Tribune Stars and Stripes, Washington, D. C., of this week:

THE COMMAND IS "FORWARD"

Thirty-one years ago this week there was born in Paris, France, one of the greatest nonpolitical organizations in our Nation's history. It had its predecessors in organized groups of veterans of previous wars, but none ever reached its size in numbers, in prestige, or in actual accomplishment. We are happy to dedicate this column to the American Legion in honor of its devotion to America and to the men and women who have preserved it against our enemies both at home and abroad, and as an added incentive to Legionnaires to a continuance of their purposes as outlined in the preamble to their constitution.

Some 20 servicemen of World War I conceived the idea of an association of veterans of that conflict on February 16, 1919, at a dinner which followed a staff meeting in Paris. Realizing they had no authority to more than start the ball rolling, these men, led by the son of the soldier President Theodore Roosevelt, issued invitations to a caucus, half enlisted men and half officers in composition, that met in the French capital on March 15 to 17 of that year. A thousand delegates there named an executive group which hit upon the name, the American Legion, and in April it drafted a plan of organization and designated a committee to begin operations at home. Another caucus was held at St. Louis in May. Delegates were present from every State, and plans were adopted for the first national convention in Minneapolis the following November.

It has been related on a multitude of occasions that the Legion was predicated upon selfish motives and that it is a pressure group designed to take care of its own at the expense of the average citizen. Nothing could be further removed from the truth. Democratic in all of its aspects, from the choice of its leadership to its program of mandates, its every action is dictated by convention delegates. Although acknowledging that it has its own political machinery as does every other society of any kind that is closely organized, one need only go back to the 1919 meeting in St. Louis to know about its nonpartisan principles which have been carried forward to the present hour and that have given to the Legion the sinews that have made of it a power with which all must reckon. There, as this country's fighting sons, it took its stand against coddling conscientious objectors. It condemned anarchists and international socialists. It demanded deportation of alien slackers, insisted upon a neutral attitude in industrial strife, endorsed land reclamation and initiated its course relative to securing the rights and privileges of ex-servicemen under the law.

The first national convention, in November 1919, approved these policies. It took a stand in foreign relations, spoke out for the first time against militarism in this land and asked for a system of universal military training in order to give our youth a chance for survival in any future war. There, and in its next convention the following year in Cleveland, it spoke out for adjusted compensation for those who fought in war while others, who remained at home, earned high wages in shipyards and elsewhere. Little by little, but ever with increasing force, the Legion has taken its place in the forefront in seeking solutions to the larger problems of national security, Americanism, child welfare, youth delinquency and foreign affairs. It is anything but selfish in principle even though it is fighting jealously to secure also the happiness of its disabled and aged.

At its thirty-first birthday, the American Legion enjoys a membership in excess of 3,000,000 and has associated with it a million auxiliary women. It boasts over 17,000 separate post units and owns or controls properties valued in the billions. As it has prospered, it has increased its activities and, in the normal course, it has aroused envy among the nonveteran class. Quite naturally, and almost entirely because enthusiasm and patriotism die as we become further removed from war years, it has found strong antagonists among those who are forgetful and whose interest in the almighty dollar supersedes thoughts of proper care for men and women who have borne the battle. The complexion of the Legion itself has undergone a change with the passing of a new world conflict. From a strength of a million members it has tripled in numbers. Young men from new generations compose two-thirds of its ranks, and their ideals, while paralleling closely those of their fathers, are differently expressed. In the normal course of events, leadership has gone over to the younger comrades in arms, and new methods of administration and differing means of approach are reflected in their thinking. It is principally of these things that we would concern ourselves as we compliment the Legion on its thirty-first anniversary.

One of the most heartening demonstrations of solidarity it has ever been our privilege to witness has been the patent desire this year, on the part of the first strictly World War II commander, to work in harmony with the national leaders of brother organizations. George Craig has performed a distinct service to all veterans and their dependents in following the course he has chosen. We know now that some old dyed-in-the-wool Legionnaires did not see eye-to-eye with him in his purpose to cooperate with others for the good of all, but it should be obvious to everybody by this time that Craig's vision was clear, and, unpopular as may have been the decision in the beginning, his judgment has been confirmed by events.

Enemies of the veteran class are on the warpath. There has never before in history

been such a propaganda flow against veterans and their hard-earned privileges, excepting possibly the campaign in 1932-33 which resulted in the loss of many veterans' rights and the repeal of their laws. Instead of fighting back with an impotence born of division within the ranks, Commander Craig had the wisdom to accept a place in a coalition of all of the major recognized veterans' organizations and, with no loss of prerogative or identity, he has the representatives of millions of other war veterans and their kin battling with him. He and they will win their struggle because the right is on their side and because they had the courage and foresight to work together in a common cause.

We of the Tribune would look ahead a little. It is one thing to fight a delaying action and to establish a strong line of defense. Given sufficient strength against a common and well-organized enemy, that might win a battle but it will never win a war. Fuzzy-brained idealists are engaged today in altering the entire course of this country's future conduct among nations. They do it in the name of the peace that all veterans so dearly desire, but they play into the hands of others whose ideals stand in absolute contradiction to the principles upon which America was founded and upon which it has grown to a position of leadership among world powers. The great American Legion and its allied veterans' societies are the hope of the civilized world in halting this trek toward ultimate destruction. Other strong movements, backed by millions of gullible citizens and by the coffers of rich supporters, would deny needed legislation to this country's fighting veterans and their loved ones and would destroy some privileges they already possess. Nobody more than the present Legion leadership knows this, but we fear a tendency to carry on a defensive action rather than an offense that will insure the winning of a cause for which all veterans have organized, the one nearest and dearest to them.

There are proposals in legislative form on Capitol Hill that must be written into law. Many of them carry Legion sponsorship. Some are opposed by the older among the Legion membership who happen to be motivated by that human failing which causes people to think in terms of self rather than to broaden their outlook in the realization that they owe a duty to their less fortunate fellow men. We are certain that if the Legion is to move ahead to greater accomplishment, if it is to do all for which it was created 31 years ago and if it would hold within its ranks many of those who gave it birth and who saw it safely through its formative years, the time has come for it to begin an offensive of as great proportions as the delaying action it has so far fought this year. A little soul searching is in order. The other organizations can be depended upon to carry their part of the load, so let us not forget the disabled and needy in this time of stress. While congratulating the American Legion on the splendor of its past, we look ahead to what can and must be done. The command is "forward."

A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, must reading for Members of Congress and all citizens of the United States—especially veterans—is A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports, written by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This article is particularly timely due to the misconceptions of the Hoover reports. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this excellent statement:

A CALL TO VETERANS

(By Herman W. Steinkraus, veteran of World War I, past national commander of the Legion of Valor; president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States)

DEAR FELLOW VETERAN: I'm addressing this message to you because I feel sure you will want to help in a very worthy cause.

Our Nation is in trouble. Serious trouble. It needs your help again.

The job isn't military, but it takes courage, just the same. I'm asking you to look at some facts and to help clear up some misunderstandings which are spreading among your former buddies and mine.

The facts have to do with your veterans' benefits and the Hoover Commission. I believe if you know the facts you will help to see that others learn the truth, too.

You may have heard it said that the Hoover Commission would deprive veterans of benefits, involve them in lots of red tape, dismember the Veterans' Administration, and take hospital beds away from disabled veterans or even send them to prison hospitals. That is absolutely not true.

Those are some of the false statements which have been made by some careless or misinformed people.

In all fairness to yourself and to our country, I ask you to read through this pamphlet and see just exactly what the truth is.

First, let's recognize that the Government has an obligation to treat the veterans right. But it should also spend the taxpayers' money wisely and not waste it by inefficient methods which do no good for the veterans but weaken the financial strength of our country.

Right now our National Government is costing us citizens $120,000,000 a day.

It is spending $14,000,000 more than it takes in every single day.

The Federal debt already amounts to all the money that the Government can expect to collect in the next 7 years, at present tax rates; and you surely agree that taxes are high enough now.

WASTE HELPS NOBODY

Government waste and higher taxes can threaten your job, your savings, your freedom, and future security, just as surely as the Kaiser or Hitler and Tojo would have done if we had lost the wars.

All this huge Government spending is serious enough, but we have plenty of evidence that it is wasting several million dollars a day because of overlapping, duplication, and unbusinesslike procedures which benefit nobody.

This waste can be stopped, and that's where you come in. Your help is needed in stopping it.

Now let me say a word about the Hoover Commission. This Commission consisted of 12 prominent men picked by the President and the leaders of Congress. Six members were Democrats and six Republicans. See their names on pages 12-15. You will know most of them. Nobody claims that the Commission did a perfect job, but those who really know, including President Truman, have said that it did a good job and a very fair one.

The Hoover Commission's 18 reports to Congress ran about 2,000,000 words. That's a lot of words. Together they make a set of books over a foot thick. Very few people have found the time to read them all. It's not surprising then, is it, that misunderstandings have arisen?

The recommendations affecting veterans alone make up 4 of the 18 Hoover reports, and take a lot of reading before they can be understood. But a trained group of experts of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has spent several months and made a careful study of every individual recommendation. These experts are mostly veterans themselves. They have worked hard to make an impartial report. Their answers are contained in this booklet. For your own good, for the future welfare of your children and our country, I urge you to read it.

The Hoover Commission made the most thorough study of Government operations that we have seen in our lifetimes. Government departments have grown so complicated, and are still growing so rapidly, that if this effort to increase their efficiency fails, there probably will not be another chance like this again. In a few more years government will be so big and so complicated that it will ruin our future. We must not let this happen.

The sections of the Hoover reports dealing with veterans are vitally important to this reorganization program. If they are rejected, the whole project will be severely crippled.

The Hoover reports do not recommend cutting out a single one of your veterans' benefits. Just read exactly what the Hoover Commission did propose and why. See for yourself that these proposals do not take anything away from you or any other veteran. Then give your support to the Hoover Commission proposal and help to put an end to any false statements about them you hear.

THERE ARE 19,000,000 VETERANS

When the Veterans' Administration was first established in 1921 under the name of the Veterans Bureau, there were only four and a half million veterans in the United States. Now there are 19,000,000. It makes sense, doesn't it, that the best and latest methods are needed to handle all those veterans' affairs? While it might have been possible to handle the problems of four and a half million veterans efficiently in 1 compact Federal bureau, it is over 4 times as big a job when we have 19,000,000 veterans to deal with.

Remember, there are only 50,000,000 income-tax payers in the United States, and nearly all the 19,000,000 veterans are taxpayers too. You have a real reason for wanting better, more economical, more efficient government. You, yourself, are a taxpayer as well as a veteran.

You don't want to be coddled, nor do you want to take unfair advantage. You just want what's rightly coming to you as a veteran and as a citizen, and a good chance to make your own way in this country for which you fought. The grateful American people want you to have that chance. They want you to have certain benefits. The people don't want them taken away from you. But they do need your help in furnishing these benefits without wasting money.

This booklet is prepared in the form of questions and answers. If any of your questions aren't answered here, please let me know and I'll get the answer for you. I'm asking you this favor as one veteran to another (and I have a son who is a veteran, too). Read this over carefully; discuss it with others.

Here's another chance for you to serve your country as a patriotic citizen. You fought for it in war and now you can help it in peace to adopt a more effective, speedier, and better plan of handling veterans' affairs.

Yours very sincerely,

HERMAN W. STEINKRAUS.

PART I. THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Question. Who served on the Hoover Commission?

Answer. There were 12 members, as follows:

The chairman was Herbert Hoover, the only living former President of the United States. Mr. Hoover has had a long and distinguished public and private career. During World War I he was United States food administrator. In 1946, at President Truman's request, he undertook the coordination of world food supplies in 38 countries. He headed a mission to study German food problems in 1947. Mr. Hoover's chief business interests have been in mining. He holds 48 honorary degrees and is author of several books on political and economical problems.

The vice chairman was Dean Acheson, now Secretary of State. Mr. Acheson is a World War I Navy veteran. A lawyer by profession, he was Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1933 and served as Assistant Secretary and later as Under Secretary of State from 1941 to 1947.

Other members were:

GEORGE D. AIKEN, United States Senator from Vermont since 1940. He formerly was Governor of Vermont, and before that was a local school director. Senator AIKEN is a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

CLARENCE J. BROWN, Congressman from Ohio since 1939. Representative BROWN had a son in the war. Before going to Congress, he served as Ohio State Senator and later as Lieutenant Governor of Ohio. He is a newspaper publisher.

Arthur S. Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University and former college instructor in government. Mr. Flemming was a member of the United States Civil Service Commission from 1939 to 1948. He also served with the labor division of the Office of Production Management in 1941–42, with the Manpower Survey Board of the Navy in 1943–44, with the Retraining and Reemployment Administration of the Labor Department from 1944 to 1947.

James Forrestal, who was a business executive from 1916 to 1940. His specialty was investment banking. A World War I veteran of the Naval Air Service, Mr. Forrestal was appointed Under Secretary of the Navy in 1940. He later became Secretary of the Navy, and then the first Secretary of Defense upon the unification of the armed forces.

Joseph P. Kennedy, business executive and statesman, who lost a son in World War II. Mr. Kennedy has engaged successfully in shipbuilding, investment banking, and the film businesses. He has served as Chairman of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and as Ambassador to Great Britain.

Carter Manasco, Congressman from Alabama from 1941 to 1948. A lawyer by profession, Mr. Manasco has had a long career of public service.

JOHN H. MCCLELLAN, United States Senator from Arkansas since 1942. Senator MCCLELLAN lost a son in World War II. He himself is a veteran of World War I. In the Senate he serves as chairman of the Expenditures Committee and member of the Appropriations and Public Works Committees. His experience in government dates back to 1926, when he was a prosecuting attorney in Arkansas.

George H. Mead, chairman of the board of directors of the Mead Corp., a pulp and paper firm. Mr. Mead lost a son in World War II. He held the following positions in Government: Member of the Commerce Department's Business Advisory Council, 1933–45; Chairman of the Industrial Advisory Board under the NRA in 1934; member of the President's Committee of Businessmen to advise on war mobilization and reconversion, 1941–44; also, member of the National Defense Mediation Board and of the Federal Price Control Board.

James J. Pollock, professor of political science, University of Michigan. A professor of history and politics since 1921, Mr. Pollock is author of several books on United States and European political problems. He has been a member of the United States Industry Committee of the United States Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division, and special adviser to the United States military government of Germany.

James H. Rowe, Jr., a World War I Navy veteran and assistant to President Roosevelt from 1939 to 1941. Mr. Rowe has had a distinguished career as lawyer and administrator since 1934, when he was secretary to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. He has served in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Labor Department, the Public Works Administration, and the Justice Department. He was technical adviser at the Nuremberg trials, after which he returned to private law practice, although still acting as consultant to the United States Budget Bureau on public administration matters.

Question. Who appointed these men to the Hoover Commission?

Answer. Mr. Acheson, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Forrestal, and Mr. Mead were appointed by President Truman. Senator Aiken, Mr. Kennedy, Senator McClellan, and Mr. Pollock were appointed by Senator ARTHUR S. VANDENBERG, who was then President pro tempore of the Senate. Mr. Hoover, Representative Brown, Representative Manasco, and Mr. Rowe were appointed by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, who was then Speaker of the House of Representatives. The law specified that in each group of four members picked by the President and the two leaders of Congress, not more than two could belong to the same political party.

PART II. FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

Question. What did the Hoover Commission think should be done with veterans' hospitals?

Answer. Briefly, it said that hospitals operated in this country by the Veterans' Administration, the Army, Navy and the Public Health Service should all be combined into one Federal hospital system, named the United Medical Administration. This would be a partnership arrangement. The four agencies, VA, Army, Navy, and PHS would set up a board and would operate the hospitals jointly.

Question. Why?

Answer. Because each of those agencies now operates its own Nation-wide system of hospitals. In some large cities, there are hospitals operated by all four agencies. A VA hospital may be overcrowded, short of doctors and nurses, while half a mile away an Army hospital may have hundreds of empty beds and dozens of idle doctors, and yet, under the present system, a veteran could not be moved to an Army hospital bed. He would have to wait for a vacancy in the VA hospital or go to some VA hospital in another city, possibly far from home.

Hoover Commission investigators found these conditions:

In the San Francisco area, 13 Federal hospitals (not counting the VA's specialized tubercular and neuropsychiatric hospitals) had a capacity of 9,905 beds and had only 4,180 patients on hand. (This situation has improved somewhat since the Commission made its study in 1948.) If 7 of the smaller hospitals had been closed and all 4,180 patients moved into the remaining 6 hospitals, those 6 would still have been filled to only 54 percent of capacity. And yet 3 more Federal hospitals with a total capacity of 3,000 more beds, were being planned in the area at a cost of $70,000,000 of your tax money.

In New Orleans there were 5 Federal hospitals within a 6-mile radius, with a capacity of 1,620 beds and only 913 patients on hand. Two were general hospitals, one operated by the VA and the other by the Public Health Service. Each had a staff of about 100 full-time physicians representing various medical specialties. And while medical equipment and desperately needed medical talent were being duplicated and thus wasted in these two hospitals, the three military hospitals in the city were so poorly staffed and equipped that patients needing specialized treatment had to be sent to larger military hospitals in Texas and Florida.

Those are just two examples of what the Hoover Commission found. There were others.

Question. But the hospitals take care of different groups of people, under different conditions. Isn't it unwise to try to handle veterans, soldiers, sailors, military dependents, and Public Health Service patients all in the same hospital?

Answer. Why should it be? When a doctor looks at a mangled arm, he doesn't ask whether it happened in a shell burst or in a truck accident.

Question. What about the military personnel? They are subject to military regulations in hospitals. What about the morning reports, the sick book, the clothing reports, pay records, and other details that must be looked after? Who would take care of those things in a civilian hospital?

Answer. Military personnel could be assigned to a hospital to do that. It isn't necessary for the military to operate its own hospitals just for that reason.

Question. That's well enough but what about the veteran? Especially the one with service-connected disability? The Government has a special obligation to him. He doesn't want to have to compete with the military and with all the types of civilians the Government cares for when he needs a hospital bed.

Answer. The right of veterans to hospitalization is fixed by law and would in no way be interfered with by adoption of the Hoover reports. There would be plenty of beds to go around, if the hospitals were merged. In fact, there would be a lot more spare beds than there are now in many hospitals. The Hoover Commission's survey showed that as of June 1948, there were 225,000 beds in Government hospitals and only 155,000 were occupied. Of this total, VA hospitals had 127,000 beds and 105,000 patients. All the other agencies together had 128,000 beds and only 50,000 patients. Don't let anyone tell you that the Hoover Commission program would cause battlefield-disabled veterans or any other deserving veterans to be dumped out of beds to make room for sick nonveterans. VA would be required to see that veterans got preferential treatment. Actually, the Hoover recommendations would mean more beds for veterans right away, and closer to home, because veterans would have access to hospitals which are now barred to them.

Question. Well, put it this way: A veteran is used to taking his troubles to the VA. When he needs hospitalization, he doesn't want to have to put himself at the mercy of some big new civilian outfit called a United Medical Administration. What's fair about that?

Answer. The veteran would continue to deal with VA as always. If he required only clinical diagnosis or dispensary care, the VA would still be equipped to provide it. If he needed hospitalization, the VA would be fully responsible for seeing to it that he was placed in the Government hospital and provided with the type of care called for in VA regulations. All hospital certification

of veterans would remain entirely in the hands of VA. But just as in the case of military personnel, it seems hardly necessary for the VA to run its own hospitals just to see that its regulations are carried out, does it?

Question. The Government takes care of prisoners in hospitals, too. Are veterans supposed to be put into beds alongside criminals?

Answer. Most emphatically not. The Hoover Report on Federal Medical Services specifically says that hospitals run by the Bureau of Prisons and the Indian Affairs Bureau should be kept out of the United Medical Administration and continued as they are.

Question. It still doesn't seem logical for the Hoover Commission, which is trying to trim down big government, to come out for the creation of a gigantic new Federal hospital administration. Wouldn't a new outfit like that create thousands of new jobs and make it necessary to train numerous inexperienced new officials?

Answer. Let's think about that one for a minute. What new jobs would it create? It certainly would take fewer, not more, doctors and nurses if these four hospital systems were combined—if, for example, the 13 hospitals in the San Francisco area were reduced to 6. It surely wouldn't be necessary to train any doctors or nurses or hospital technicians. Those who had been treating veterans could treat the same ailments in military personnel without any further instruction, couldn't they? Hospital administration also is much the same, regardless of whose hospital it is. True, there would be more specialized paper work in a combined hospital than in one which admitted only a single category of patients. But the paper work is all being done in the various hospitals now. Some of the officials who are doing it now could move into a combined hospital and do it there. The fact is, under the Hoover Commission proposal more hospitals could specialize in different major ailments and the Government would have medical talent to overcome some of its shortages.

Question. But after all, the veteran would lose the exclusive hospital service which is provided for him now, wouldn't he?

Answer. No. He would have the same rights and the same care he is getting now and the VA would still be represented there, protecting his interests.

Question. Who made the hospital study for the Hoover Commission?

Answer. A task force of 17 members. Eleven were doctors. The others were hospital experts. Seven members were veterans. One of them, Gen. Paul R. Hawley, was formerly director of VA hospitals. The chairman of the task force was Col. Tracy S. Voorhees, a World War II veteran. Rear Admiral Joel T. Boone was secretary.

PART III. CONSTRUCTION

Question. Is it true that the Hoover Commission proposed to strip VA of its control over construction, including the building of VA hospitals?

Answer. What the Commission proposed was that all Government construction be done by the Interior Department, instead of by 12 different departments. Hospital construction would be directed by a medical board and VA would be represented on that board to assist in hospital planning.

Question. But isn't it true that through years of experience, the VA has demonstrated that it has the technical know-how for building and equipping such specialized institutions as it needs?

Answer. Since World War II, Army engineers have handled the construction of virtually all VA hospitals. As recently as January 24, 1950, Army engineers let the contract for a $15,000,000 VA hospital at West Haven, Conn. So except that the Interior Department, instead of the Army engineers, would be letting the contracts, the same situation would prevail under the Hoover Commission program as now.

Question. What purpose would be served by having Interior do the job?

Answer. By centralizing all construction, the Government could put an end to the waste caused by Federal agencies bidding against each other for scarce labor and materials. Money also could be saved by mass purchases.

Question. The Hoover Commission reported that the Interior Department's Reclamation Bureau was guilty of gross underestimation of the cost of some of its jobs. For instance, it estimated that the Hungry Horse project in Montana would cost $3,300,000 and the cost actually was $93,500,000. Wouldn't that argue against letting the Interior Department take over all Federal construction?

Answer. The Hoover Commission proposed many reforms in the Interior Department, too. Remember, this program is not confined to veterans' affairs. If the whole plan is adopted, such underestimation of costs will be stopped.

PART IV. INSURANCE

Question. Is it true that the Hoover Commission wanted to take the veterans' insurance program away from VA and give it to some new Government agency?

Answer. No. The Commission proposed that a corporation be set up within the VA to handle the insurance business. The Veterans Administrator would be president of the corporation and he would appoint all the directors.

Question. What would be the purpose of a corporation?

Answer. To make the service more efficient. At present, the Treasury Department handles VA insurance money and the General Accounting Office audits the insurance accounts. There is an enormous flow of insurance paper work among the three agencies. VA now must get approval from the Treasury and account to the GAO for every insurance expenditure it makes. By incorporating the insurance business, the flow of paper work would be greatly reduced and the veteran would get much quicker service, because Government corporations are allowed to disburse their own money. These corporations, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which makes loans to business, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, which lends to farmers, operate under special laws. They have certain privileges not enjoyed by other Government agencies, and they are subject to certain requirements. For instance, they must adopt certain business procedures. The veteran surely cannot object to that. His VA insurance is a business proposition. He wants the VA to be able to adopt some of the practices that are used successfully by private insurance companies. VA could do so if its insurance operations were incorporated.

Question. Wouldn't the setting up of a big VA insurance corporation be expensive?

Answer. No. It might create more jobs at VA, but by reducing the present paper work at the Treasury and at GAO, it would mean savings in personnel at those two agencies. Another thing, VA automatically would pick the employees of its own insurance corporation, subject to civil-service rules, and it is to be assumed that VA would give veterans the first chance at the new jobs.

Question. Under the present arrangement the cost of handling veterans' insurance is paid out of VA funds. Did the Hoover Commission want the veterans to assume this cost by having it added to their premiums?

Answer. Specifically not. The Commission proposed that the costs of operating the Veterans' Life Insurance Corporation be paid out of funds appropriated by Congress. The only difference would be that the Government would have a clearer picture of what the insurance program costs.

Question. What is the matter with the way veterans' insurance is handled now?

Answer. Here are some of the things the Hoover Commission found wrong: VA had 15,432 employees handling insurance. These persons were for the most part so poorly trained and supervised that they handled an average of 450 policies each, compared to an average of 1,762 policies handled by employees of private companies. VA was posting premium payments by hand when they could have done this by machine. Cases were found where payment of death benefits had been delayed as much as a year, due largely to VA's system of handling death claims separately from insurance operations. Half the VA insurance conversion cases studied had been delayed unnecessarily, and 25 percent appeared to have been mishandled. On converted policies the average time required to process death claims was 80 days, whereas private companies pay 70 percent to 82 percent of claims within 15 days.

Question. What reasons were found for such mishandling and delays?

Answer. The methods used at VA were responsible. The Hoover Commission reported that VA has failed to make adequate use of work measurement standards, or of private inspection services to corroborate claims. Some VA policies were found to have lapsed without the veterans' knowledge, because VA clerks failed to check records or to doublecheck one another's work, as is done in private companies. It is logical to assume that if the VA handled its insurance business the same way that private companies do, then it, too, could pay claims within 2 weeks, and a veteran's widow would not have to wait as much as 3 or 4 months for her money, as many widows are having to do now.

Question. Who made the actual study of veterans' insurance problems for the Hoover Commission?

Answer. This was done by a task force which looked into all VA matters. The task force was headed by Col. Franklin D'Olier, first national commander of the American Legion. Colonel D'Olier was director of the United States strategic bombing survey of Germany and Japan (1944–46) and at one time he was chairman of the board of directors of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America.

PART V. VETERANS' PREFERENCE

Question. Did the Hoover Commission recommend that veterans' preference in the Federal civil service be abolished?

Answer. No. The Commission proposed that disabled veterans continue to have absolute preference in Federal jobs, as they do now. Other veterans would be given additional credit for each 6 months of military service to help them retain their jobs whenever there are reductions in force from the Federal pay roll.

Question. But nondisabled veterans who now have absolute preference retention would lose that advantage, would they not?

Answer. Yes. That is just about the only advantage veterans would lose under the Hoover Commission program. And the Commission offset this by other recommendations which would bring more veterans into Government service.

Question. How would this be done?

Answer. The Commission said that selected Government agencies should establish a positive, comprehensive, Nation-wide program to recruit veterans only, in Federal positions. This program should be conducted for the next 3 or 4 years in principal communities, the Commission said. Since the purpose would be to get competent veterans into Federal service, it would be necessary to remove present incompetent employees so that

jobs would be available. Actually, competent veterans would replace incompetent workers who might or might not be veterans.

Question. What was the chief feature of the Commission's proposals for Government personnel?

Answer. The main recommendation was that the heads of Federal departments and agencies be permitted to do their own hiring, instead of relying on the slow, cumbersome Civil Service Commission procedure.

Question. Would this mean setting up thousands of independent hiring boards to replace the single Civil Service Commission?

Answer. Not at all. It would simply enable the executive of a Federal agency to hire the right man for the right job at the right time. The present system sets up all sorts of barriers against hiring the best man, against promoting the best man, and against firing the worst man. Veterans on the civil-service register for junior professional assistant have found out all too well how slow and uncertain the Civil Service Commission system works.

PART VI. HOME LOANS

Question. Is it true the Hoover Commission suggested that the home-loan program be taken away from VA?

Answer. No. It was proposed that the Federal Housing Authority act as VA's agent in this program, just as Interior would be VA's construction agent. VA would continue to certify veterans for home loans, to control the loan funds, to set the standards for loans. FHA would only make the appraisals and guarantee the loan. It should make no difference to a veteran who guarantees his loan. In fact, VA now guarantees only 50 percent of a loan, up to a $4,000 limit, while FHA guarantees 90 percent of a full loan.

Question. Why take this function away from VA?

Answer. Well, FHA already handles a large part of GI home loans under a joint arrangement with VA. The way the program operates now, VA and FHA make separate and often widely different appraisals of the same property and they charge different interest rates, thus involving the veteran in needless confusion and red tape. VA is not experienced in the lending field and as a result it will be compelled, by foreclosures, to go into real-estate management.

Question. What would be the advantage of letting FHA operate the program?

Answer. Duplication would be eliminated. There would be a saving in personnel. The veteran would not have to get two different kinds of loans on his home. FHA has had more experience than VA with home financing.

PART VII. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Question. Aren't all these recommendations about veterans' hospitals, construction, insurance, and home loans designed, in a sense, to dismember the Veterans' Administration?

Answer. Not at all. The effect would be to leave VA fully responsible for the planning and control of its programs and to turn over actual operation in some cases to highly specialized Federal agencies which are now, or would be, performing the same services for nonveterans anyhow. The Hoover Commission made no recommendations for curtailing any of the services to veterans. It was concerned only with finding ways to get the job done faster and at less cost. The Commission said: "The basic question as to what the Government owes to its veterans and the dependents of members of the armed forces is a policy matter which must be determined by the Congress." The Commission took the view that as long as the service is properly performed, it should not matter to the veteran how that service is rendered.

Question. Assuming that the Hoover Commission suggestions were put into effect, wouldn't the result be that a veteran no longer could go to one agency and inquire about his disability claim, check up on his chances to get vocational training, make application for hospitalization, ask about a GI loan, or, if called in for a physical examination, do it all in one place?

Answer. That is a misconception. The veteran would go to the VA just as he does now in every one of those cases. He would get the answers directly from VA too, because VA would still be in charge of all benefits and would decide whether the veteran is eligible for them. His master record, the C-file, would remain at VA and if FHA, for instance, was guaranteeing his home loan, it could be supplied with carbon copies of whatever documents it needed from his file.

Question. Weren't there other recommendations for changing the whole structure of VA?

Answer. Yes. The Commission recommended a thorough overhauling job. Briefly it proposed that all pension, retirement benefit, disability compensation and guardianship matters be consolidated in a Veterans' Benefit Service, and that all vocational rehabilitation, education and readjustment programs, as well as the certification of veterans for loan guaranties, be combined in a Readjustment Service. But these transfers would be stricly internal. Nothing would be taken away from VA. All it means is that the two new services would be set up to take the place of several scattered operations, so that like functions could be grouped more logically within the VA.

Question. But why such a shake-up? Is VA as disorganized as all that?

Answer. Here are some of the Commission's findings: VA now finds it necessary to use 88 different manuals, 665 varieties of technical bulletins and more than 400 circulars of various kinds to explain all its procedures. In one instance, VA took 994 pages to explain two 8½ page laws on a veteran's eligibility for education and other benefits. Doesn't that look like too much red tape to be tolerated in an agency that spends $6,000,000,000 a year or 30 percent of all Federal nondefense funds? The Hoover Commission estimated that $70,000,000 a year could be saved by improving the internal operations of VA. It said that large reductions in the staff and supervisory personnel could be made if there were better office procedure. It pointed out that conditions are so bad that there is an annual turnover of 34.8 percent in VA employment. In other words, more than a third of the employees quit each year. The Commission found that 3,600 representatives of 24 veterans' organizations have space in VA offices, helping to prepare cases for individual veterans who do business with VA. So many mistakes had been made in VA offices that some veterans had been overpaid $179,000,000 and $50,000,000 of this still had not been received at the time the Hoover commission made its study.

Question. How could such conditions arise? What did the commission say was wrong, generally?

Answer. That VA is top-heavy with staff officers; too many people report to the Administrator; operations are scattered; there are too many supervisors; responsibility is divided; there is no clear line of authority between Washington and the field offices. Those are some of the general findings.

Question. How would these basic troubles be overcome?

Answer. The Commission recommended that the Administrator be given firmer control; that subordinates be stripped of independent authority; that the Administrator himself be responsible for drafting all central office directives; that lines of authority be clearly set out and the number of organizational units and their top personnel be reduced; that research, inspection, and investigation be placed under one head. Those and the establishment of the two main services mentioned earlier were the major recommendations.

Question. Getting back to those two services, wouldn't a reshuffling of the whole benefit program, for instance, lead to all kinds of confusion, at least while the changes were being made?

Answer. No, not necessarily. Pension, retirement, disability, and guardianship services, now costing $2,000,000,000 a year and due to rise to $2,700,000,000 in about 10 years, should never have been scattered in the first place. The Hoover Commission said that records of pension payments and compensation now kept by the Office of Contract and Administrative Services could be transferred at once to a new veterans' benefit service. It proposed that active records kept in branch offices be transferred, during the liquidation of those offices, to the regional offices and kept separately from the readjustment, education, and insurance accounts.

Question. About the proposed new readjustment service which includes education—isn't it true that the Hoover Commission made some critical comments about the education program and that the reorganization would interfere with schooling under the GI bill?

Answer. It is true that the Commission found much wrong with the way the education program has been handled. But it did not recommend that any of the education or training services be reduced. The education program, by the way, cost $2,743,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. The Commission found that VA was paying the highest possible tuition and equipment charges to schools in cases which were hard to justify. It said that only after long delays did VA make any efforts to reduce recreational courses, or to enact standards for on-the-job training, or to discover that "institutional on-farm" training was unsatisfactory.

Question. Just what did the Commission think should be done about education?

Answer. It made several recommendations. One was that VA be given authority to establish a system for certifying schools which are not regularly accredited places of learning. In other words, VA should establish standards which would prevent veterans from wasting their time in so-called fly-by-night schools. About 90 percent of the schools attended by veterans are regularly accredited and would not be affected by this proposal. The other 10 percent are not accredited, and the Commission believed that some standards should be set on the kind of teaching they give veterans. Here are some more of the Commission's recommendations: That VA consider giving grants to States to provide better job and school training; that VA consider cooperating with the Labor Department's apprentice-training program to prevent the lowering of apprentice-training standards through the use of Federal funds; that VA study the justification for paying nonresident tuition fees for veterans living within the State; that a simpler system be worked out for handling subsistence allowances.

That's the real story. The Commission was not trying to reduce the chances for education. It was interested in cutting red tape, in seeing that the veteran got the most for the money, and in reducing the burden on the taxpayers by more economical methods. President Truman shares the view that the rules applying to GI training in irregular educational institutions need to be tightened. He sent a report to Congress February 13, 1950, saying that some of the present abuses are "costly to the veteran, to his family, and to the Nation."

Defeatism in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of March 14, 1950:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
DEFEATISM IN WASHINGTON

Seen from the Arizona desert, and some points in between, the picture of Washington at the moment does not make much if any sense.

For each day there are two series of news stories which recur, as Chesterton once said, with all the monotony of roses in a wallpaper pattern. One series comes from Capitol Hill telling how some Republican Senator has warned the country not to trust the State Department and Mr. Acheson; the Senator is going to prove that they are the dupes of the Communists. The other series comes from the State Department warning the people that they would be the dupes of the Communists if they were so stupidly innocent as to feel "that somehow or other there was an answer to our problem if only we were smart enough to figure it out."

There must be a better way to run a Government, which is supposed to be leading the free peoples of the world, than to announce daily that the Senate does not trust the Secretary of State and that the Secretary of State is afraid the people cannot be trusted. The Republican Senators have got Mr. Acheson in a squeeze where he appears to be spending half his time denying that he is a friend of the Communists and the other half figuring out ways to show how much he dislikes and distrusts the Communists.

And although he has now talked himself into a position which makes Winston Churchill an appeaser and a misguided idealist by comparison, the Secretary of State is treated on Capitol Hill with less courtesy and with smaller regard for the rules of evidence than if he were a convicted horse thief.

In this atmosphere of total distrust it is idle to talk about total diplomacy. There can be nothing total about the actions of a Government which is a house so divided within itself. And of diplomacy there can be virtually none when the Secretary of State feels he must distrust the instinct of the people instead of clarifying, guiding, and rationalizing it.

"We clearly are not focusing" he said the other day, "our total resources on the winning of that struggle." Clearly we are not focusing our total resources, including our resources of brain power and of heart. Why not? Because we have not been given any objective on which to focus. The people and the Congress have supported every measure of any importance which the administration has recommended: the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic security pact, the military-aid program, the annual military appropriations, the unification bill, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, and all the rest. They cannot be expected to focus more resources than their responsible leaders ask them to focus. If the administration thinks that more is needed, then it should say what it is that is needed, and why.

But in fact what we see is that Mr. Acheson has nothing new to propose to the Russians and that he has nothing new to propose to the American people and to our allies. Thus the diplomatic situation is frozen in Washington while the actual situation in Europe and Asia is deteriorating. The State Department has for the time being run out of ideas which evoke energy, offer hope, and create confidence.

This sterility and defeatism is understandable in view of the persecution—that is the right name for it—being carried on by the Republican Senators. But it is also true that the persecution goes on, and will go on and on, because the administration has not had for over a year a single new, interesting, and constructive idea to which the Nation could rally.

Yet, the events of the past year have been momentous. In China, in Japan, in south Asia, in Germany and central Europe, in the race of armaments the situation today is radically different from what it was believed to be a year ago. But except that we have announced our intention to make the hydrogen bomb, our official doctrines and our policies are just what they were.

We are still operating the Marshall plan on the assumption that western Europe can be integrated without a solution in respect to eastern Germany and eastern Europe and the sterling area. We are still operating the North Atlantic Pact and military aid without any public recognition of the new insecurity of Germany, Austria, and Scandinavia after the Soviet achievement of the atomic bomb. We have renounced Chiang and we are still thoroughly entangled with Chiang. No wonder that the American people, and even more poignantly the people abroad, feel that somebody ought to try to be smart enough to figure out some answers to their problems. They do not like to be told that it would be foolish to try.

And in fact they will try. If Washington won't try, then Paris, London, Bonn, Delhi, Tokyo, and the rest will try. For what is happening as a consequence of the freeze-up in Washington is that the leadership we had by virtue of our ideas and our power is rapidly disintegrating. We are losing touch with the peoples of the world—with their fears, their hopes, their needs, their purposes, and their will to survive—and we are talking not to them but to ourselves in a self-induced mood of defeatism and impotence about how much we must distrust one another and our own better instincts and our own capacity to think and to believe.

FEPC and the CIO Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article by Ralph Matthews which appeared in the Washington Afro-American, February 18, 1950:

THIS WEEK
LABOR BEING SOLD SHORT BY MURRAY?—"OPERATION DIXIE" OR HOW OUR RACE IS DOUBLE-CROSSED
(By Ralph Matthews)

Several weeks ago when I first pounced on Messrs. Roy Wilkins, Willard Townsend, and company for their audacity at screening the Americans who would and would not be allowed to attend the recent Civil Rights Mobilization here, I was merely indignant over what I thought was patriotic snobbishness.

At the moment I only abhorred the idea, which has grown too popular here of late, of one group of so-called Americans setting themselves up on a pedestal as the true patriots while denouncing others as traitors and skunks.

Bad medicine for all

This I believe to be very bad medicine, both for the prescribers and for the Nation as a whole, because being a good American means many different things to many different people.

I knew only that my idea of what constituted a good American and RANKIN'S idea were incompatible.

Therefore, when the present leaders of the NAACP, with their CIO cohorts, accepted the Rankin formula and tried to force the rest of us to conform to that mold, I realized that somebody had gotten fouled up somewhere.

Believes he was duped

But now I know what I had only suspected then, that Roy Wilkins had allowed himself to be duped into a big game of power politics in which he was the victim of his own inability to see farther than his nose.

In permitting the mobilization to be used as a sounding board against the so-called leftist CIO unions, Mr. Wilkins turned his back on most of the things the NAACP stands for and made a marriage of convenience with an emaciated skeleton which is but a shadow of the once liberal CIO.

Their only crime

The reason most of the so-called Red-dominated unions have been given the boot and are now castigated by their former associates is not that they adhere to any Moscow line, but that they insist on following the line of interracial liberalism, which the CIO followed itself before it got fat and greedy.

The unions which are being purged and with which Mr. Wilkins refuses to associate are the same unions which refuse to fall in line with the new CIO policy which calls for conformity with America's traditional policy of segregation and Jim Crowism.

It is no strange coincidence that the so-called Red unions all maintain their original interracial composition from the top down, while the so-called loyal unions, the ones Mr. Wilkins prefers to associate with, are not only lily white but are making a desperate effort to break the membership of the purged unions up into Jim Crow segments.

Parent body to blame

This goes even for the parent body of Philip Murray himself, whose United Steelworkers' Union has not one colored member on its 41-man board, in spite of the fact that better than one-third of the membership is colored.

This also goes for the saintly Walter Reuther, whose 22-man board of the United Auto Workers is also lily white.

I wonder whether, when Mr. Wilkins decided to joins forces with the CIO purge, he knew that the new national policy of CIO calls for the organization of Jim Crow unions throughout the South.

I wonder whether he knew that the national CIO, during the last election, threw its support behind John J. Sparkman of Alabama, whose campaign cry was "Vote for me and your mother and sister will not have to work beside a colored person."

But the so-called leftist unions opposed him.

Again leftists disagree

I wonder whether he knew that in Birmingham CIO organizer Cary Haigler supported Bull Conner for police commissioner after he had introduced a bill in the city council setting up ghettos for colored citizens.

But the so-called leftist unions opposed him.

I wonder whether Mr. Wilkins knew that Fred Piper, director of the Louisiana CIO, now engaged in organizing workers in that State into Jim Crow unions, was a delegate to the Dixiecrat convention. He has since been promoted by the national organization.

I wonder whether Mr. Wilkins knows that the CIO union halls in South Carolina have Jim Crow toilet facilities, and that George Baldanzi, chief of "Operations Dixie," refuses to permit colored workers to use the same halls with whites.

Maritime situation critical

I wonder whether he knows that now that the CIO has dropped its liberal ideals that there are separate hiring halls for Maritime workers in Houston, Tex.

I wonder whether Mr. Wilkins knows that after Joe Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, staged a red purge, that he slipped through a resolution which practically freezes all colored seamen in grades below World War II level.

The rule provides that no seaman shall be employed at skills he did not posses prior to World War II. This nullifies all the progress and upgrading made by colored seamen on Liberty ships during the war.

The so-called leftists fought this rule and got purged for their pains.

They only follow orders

Both Willard Townsend and sidekick, George Weaver, who set themselves up as the high priests of the labor movement, are little more than glorified office boys carrying out the work of the real CIO brain trusters.

Proof of this is found in the fact that, right now, Townsend's henchmen are down in Dixie trying to raid the ousted and interracial tobacco union and corral them under the banner of his United Transport Workers.

Just where tobacco and transportation merge is a mystery, but the increased dues collected will be his pay-off for helping to smash the textile union.

All of these facts only prove that, under present conditions in America, one can get away with murder if he can only convince somebody that his victim was a Commie. That makes iniquity too cheap.

New Uses for Farm Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a prosperous United States will buy all the American farmer produces for food. One hundred fifty-one million people demand even an increase in food crop production. What then shall be done about the vast amount of farm produce now in storage and the additional amount which we can anticipate will be in storage in the foreseeable future?

The answer is this: Encourage the manufacture of nonfood products which must utilize farm crops as the basic raw material of manufacture.

The farm products stored under the Commodity Credit Corporation could be sold to these nonfood product makers at a rate low enough to stimulate building and expansion. The regular food-consumer market could absorb the direct-sale products of the farm.

This plan is feasible. It is workable. The opinions of the serious scientists of the Department of Agriculture—not the big-city politician jobholders—bear me out in my thinking.

Let us look at corn.

The CCC has currently in storage 627,480,162 bushels of corn valued at $880,651,070.

Here is what could be done with that corn industrially in the manufacture of nonfood products.

By dry milling, we could get industrial alcohol and acetone. Through this same process "furfural"—an important industrial chemical—could be turned out.

By yeast fermentation, more useful industrial alcohol could be made plus carbon dioxide gas, which has its use in industry, and fusel oil—an increasingly important industrial solvent.

By bacterial fermentation of corn, butyl alcohol is developed as well as acetone. Byproducts of this process help in the production of lacquers, stains, varnish removers, smokeless powder, and other products. Ethyl alcohol is at present only a minor byproduct of this method of fermentation.

Wet milling of corn creates a variety of useful commodities. These include starch, dextrins, dextrose, mixed sugars, glucose sirups; corn oil, corn gluten, zein, and steep liquor. Some of the starch is used industrially for sizing cotton warp yarns and paper, for laundering, and for making nitro starch, an explosive. Dextrins are used in pastes and glues. Corn sugar is used in spinning rayon. Dextrose and glucose sirups are used in tobacco products and for filling sole leather. Steep liquor is used in the production of penicillin by mold fermentation. Zein is used to make an artificial textile fiber which, blended with wool and other fibers, can be made into suits and dresses.

The Bureau of the Census reports that there were more people unemployed in February 1950, than at any other time since August 1941—4,684,000, not including the 600,000 forced into idleness by the coal strike. The development and expansion of the nonfood products manufacture of corn alone would help to put a sizable part of that 4,684,000 Americans back on the job again.

Let us look at wheat.

The CCC has currently in storage 475,034,491 bushels of wheat valued at $1,011,791,572.

Here is what could be done with that wheat industrially in the manufacture of nonfood products. Wheat flour is used in the preparation of pastes for use in paper-hanging and bill-posting. Wheat bran is a "must" in the dressing of furs and the "mold bran" is a valuable substitute for malt in the fermentation industry.

Like those of corn, wheat starches and sirups have basic nonfood uses. One of the most striking instances of such use is the oil which is separated from the wheat germ. This oil is a source of vitamin E for medicines and is also used to keep other vegetable oils from getting rancid.

Wheat as a source for industrial alcohol is well known. During World War II more than 100,000,000 bushels of wheat were used for this single purpose.

For many years, that by-product of wheat—straw—has been used on a large scale for the manufacture of strawboard. It has also been used recently on a small scale for the manufacture of insulating board, and is now coming into use for the manufacture of bleachable pulp for blending with chemical wood pulps in the making of high-grade papers.

And what about rye?

The CCC has currently in storage 1,563,618 bushels of rye valued at $2,416,819.

Although the industrial uses of rye have barely been subjected to even a preliminary exploration, it has already been found that rye pastes can be used in industry even as corn and wheat pastes. A good quality of industrial alcohol is procured from rye. Rye straw is used with wheat straw in the making of strawboard. And rye straw provides an excellent straw braid for making straw hats.

And what about oats?

The CCC has currently in storage 41,698,990 bushels of oats valued at $30,019,468.

Oats present a challenge to the agricultural scientist. At present, they are used only for the manufacture of oatmeal or rolled oats. The oat hulls, the byproduct, can be converted into the valuable industrial chemical, furfural. However, recently, oats have been employed in the manufacture of nylon.

And then, there are the soybeans.

The CCC has currently in storage 13,102,695 bushels of soybeans valued at $28,770,499.

Soybean oil is being processed on a limited scale for use in paints and varnishes and in the making of synthetic resins. Processed soybean meal is gaining momentum in industrial plants designed to turn out molding powders and plywood adhesive.

And what about the potato—the lowly "spud," which Secretary Brannan pleases to cast on the waste heap complete with blue dye?

The CCC has currently in storage 10,172,827 pounds of potato starch, valued at $607,814; and the equivalent of 11,480,547 100-pound sacks of potatoes valued at $8,074,728.

Both Maine and Idaho have potato starch plants. The product of these plants is used, chiefly, in the cotton industry for sizing warp yarns and, to a lesser extent, for making dextrins for use as adhesives.

Less than 10 years ago scarcely any potato alcohol was made in this country. It is sufficient commentary on the change-over to point out that in fiscal 1949 more industrial alcohol was produced in the United States from potatoes than from grains.

I have spoken of only a few farm products. I have cited only a few of the nonfood uses of these products. I have mentioned only a score or so of the industrial uses to which these nonfood farm products are being put today. In other words, I have only scratched the surface of the tremendous possibilities involved in using the food now being menaced with destruction and rot in CCC warehouses for nonfood industrial purposes.

Americans are still a pioneer breed although one American may have landed on these shores only yesterday while his next-door neighbor's ancestors may have come over in the Mayflower. There are still frontiers in this Republic of ours.

Let us accept the challenge of the stored farm crops in the silos and elevators of the CCC. Let us not waste this taxpayer's property. Let us maintain fair farm prices for food crops, but let us also make the CCC accumulation more easily available for those who have the courage, the foresight and the know-how to start new industries in these troubled days.

About all, may we never forget that the farm—producing both food crops and industrial raw materials—is the salvation of America.

Wherever we are, we should take our hats off to the farm man, the farm woman—yes, and the farm children, too—who toil endlessly to make our soil produce. These people—and the land they work—together, form the key to a prosperous, free and happy future for the whole people of the United States.

A Meaningless FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article which appeared in the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Okla., written by Roscoe Dunjee, editor, on March 4, 1950, entitled "A Meaningless FEPC":

A MEANINGLESS FEPC

More and more those who think progressively are beginning to realize the need of a third party in this country. The downright surrender last week by both of the old parties to southern reaction is another positive exposure of this necessity if the Nation is to move forward in social thinking.

It will be recalled we said early in the Truman administration, "No chain is stronger than its weakest link," meaning that irrespective of the good intentions of the President, it would be impossible for him to pull Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia up to his level of judgment. Last week we saw the Dixiecrats pull the liberal element of the Democratic party down into the gutter of shame. As the count stands of the moment, both the Republican and the Democratic parties have utterly repudiated and turned their backs upon the solemn promises made in Philadelphia 2 years ago.

Despite the disappointment suffered by millions at the disgraceful apostasy of a Democratic Congress we want to assess the proper value to the stubbornness of the President in his insistence on the passage of civil rights legislation. Despite the downright treasonable attitude of his associates we believe that continued insistence of the President upon Congress to pass this legislation is doing more to arouse the conscience of America to the hypocrisy sheltered in our institutions than any one single individual who has occupied the Presidency. It should in actuality reverse the thinking of those who have hitherto felt "no good can come out of Nazareth." Truman came from Missouri, a part of the slave South during antebellum days. The southeast tip of Missouri is just across the river from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee, and yet in the White House today we have a man from Missouri who offers a formula for human freedom what would warm the cockles of the heart of William Lloyd Garrison.

The Black Dispatch has always sought to be fair in its evaluation of men and parties, and we say here and now that President Truman, who in every public utterance continues to ding-dong on civil rights, is doing something to the thinking of America that is knifing reaction in an unseemly way. What he is doing will of course not affect the elderly group who are joined to reaction, but the impact of his new philosophy in the realm of social adjustment is bound to bear fruit in the next decade.

The bill as it was passed last week is practically meaningless. It is on the level of many of the efforts of our interracial movements which are always proposing a "survey of facts already the common knowledge of all. The present FEPC legislation sent to the Senate proposes that Congress will have the right to "investigate, educate and recommend." We believe Representative MARCANTONIO properly described the present situation when he said that reaction had cut off the legs and arms of FEPC and handed it back to President Truman. You can realize fully that FEPC as enacted by Congress is utterly helpless when Congressman RANKIN of Mississippi voted for the substitute submitted by Representative MCCONNELL. Negro Republicans should keep in mind that MCCONNELL is a Pennsylvania Republican who maneuvered GOP strategy in an effort to embarrass the President.

No one should falter in his approach to this type of legislation because of this temporary barrier erected in the House. The fight now goes to the Senate where there can be a continued fight to build up moral fiber in the masses of the people. That is what the Truman leadership is doing. Slowly but surely there is coming an open cleavage between right and evil in this Nation on the altar of civil rights. More and more of the dominant group are gathering courage and beginning to speak out. We feel as though the approach Representative HAYS of Arkansas has made to FEPC, while still reactionary, shows a tempering of spirit down in Dixie on the subject, which is noteworthy. While Representative HAYS is opposed to FEPC, he shows willingness to discuss the subject with candor and frankness. This is unquestionably progress, as compared to the rabid ranting of other Southerners who are die-hards on any question dealing with social, economic or political equality for black citizens.

Whites and blacks, minority groups, and all lovers of fair play and justice must resume the fight for FEPC in the Senate. It is perhaps unthinkable that the bill will pass in its present form in the Upper House for the filibuster will be used effectively by those opposed to this legislation, but the larger view proves that continued pressure for social decency will have its proper effect among the masses of the people.

After all, the fight for FEPC is an abbreviation of the broad principle which we feel should be spelled out clearly and imbedded in the Constitution of the United States, and there never will be pure democracy practiced in this Nation until this is done. Several years ago we proposed in an NAACP conference in Chicago that such an amendment be sought. Not only with respect to the economic self of minority groups should the laws be harsh and unrelenting, but embedded in the Constitution there should be provided guaranties for the social, political, and absolute equality of every citizen of this Republic.

The ancient Persians recorded the story of Haman, who was finally hanged on the gallows he had prepared for Mordecai. Somehow we cannot resist belief that reaction in America in this atomic age is making the same sacrifice on the international scene. We suspect that the action of Congress with respect to civil rights last week is today being grotesquely presented as we write these lines to millions of people in Asia who will gather suspicion and fear of western culture and attitude toward dark people.

Perhaps when later we in a crucial hour seek alliances in manpower in other sections of the earth we will feel the true reaction that stems from selfishness and hate. Sometimes in the life of men and nations there come realization "We gather in the harvest what we sow."

"Leave Behind" Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as the number and amounts of withheld deductions from pay rolls have increased, we have heard more and more the term "take-home pay."

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, but that "take-home pay" is the important factor to the Nation's wage earners, for it is that amount only which they are able to spend at their own discretion.

However, the withholding of taxes by employers does have the effect of making wage earners much less conscious of the enormous sums which they earn but never actually receive. Therefore, I was much impressed by an editorial entitled "'Leave Behind' Wages," which appeared in the Friday, March 10, 1950, issue of the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News. I especially call attention to the thought expressed in the editorial that if everyone got paid what was coming to him and then paid back on his own what the Government demanded, wage earnears would be asking much more searching questions concerning what the Federal Government is doing with such large portions of their earnings.

As a part of my remarks, the editorial follows:

"LEAVE BEHIND" WAGES

A friend of ours who had just finished his annual go-around with form 1040 was saying what a relief it was to know that he had an ace in the hole. What he meant was that when the wheels had finished grinding out the figure he owed his Government he knew that withholdings would take care of a good share of it. We couldn't give him an argument because we had just gone through almost identical stages of frustration, worry, and relief ourselves.

But we got to thinking about a man who came into the office the other day. He sold these specially printed salary checks that most firms use and with which most of us are familiar. But his checks had a new pitch. The varying amounts of deductions, for Federal and State taxes, health insurance, and the like, were listed as they are in most checks nowadays. But they were arranged in such a way as to point up graphically how much of a swipe these withholdings

were taking out of one's earnings. On the perforated sheet attached to the check itself the gross amount of your pay jumped out at you. Various deductions were given equal prominence. The effect of the check was to make you say, "Good Lord, look what I would have taken home if—"

There are showier ways of getting the same story across. One Midwest firm we've heard about pays off in cash. The entire amount is paid over, then, in front of the employee, deductions are pulled back. Every employee—debt-ridden or otherwise—is bound to ask: "Is what I leave behind being put to good use? Am I getting my money's worth?"

We wonder. The biggest slice of an employee's "leave behind" wages goes into the Federal Treasury. In fact 19 cents of every dollar the taxpayer earns goes into it. Are we getting our money's worth? Well, we can't help thinking that if everyone got paid what was coming to him, and then paid back on his own what the Government demanded, relieving the employer of the job of tax collector, people would be asking more searching questions.

Chances are they would leap to support such recommendations for better Government as have been proposed by the Hoover Commission. They would be less apt to be drawn into joining groups planning mass Treasury raids.

Look Who's Spending Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial:

LOOK WHO'S SPENDING YOUR MONEY

Income-tax day, next Wednesday, would be a good time for Americans who lay their money on the line for Uncle Sam to do some serious thinking about taxes and Government spending.

The President has presented a budget for the coming fiscal year which aims at spending more than $43,000,000,000. Twenty years ago Federal expenditures for all purposes ran to about $4,000,000,000.

While the war is a partial explanation, it is not the sole answer. The President calculates that 71 percent of the spending goes to pay for national defense, the costs of World War II, and other past wars, and for the promotion of world peace.

That makes spending for purposes other than for wars and defense amount to 29 percent of the total or $12,500,000,000. This is more than three times the total Federal expenditure of 1930 which also took account of the costs imposed by a World War and other past conflicts.

It is common for those who defend the vast range of Federal spending to point to the social-security system as a great public gain. But Federal spending for welfare, $1,282,000,000, amounts to only one-tenth of the nondefense budget.

The most discouraging feature of the budget is that it carries a deficit of five billions. This at a time of general prosperity and wide employment. The President fixes no date for balancing and he opposes attempts to cut spending as short-sighted.

Excessive taxation lowers the power and the motive of business to expand. If we left the money not needed to support the Government in the taxpayers' pocket what would be the result?

Business would feel the traditional impulse to take the initiative. The venturing of risk capital would again spur progress.

Americans who have grown rich in an unfettered economy would feel the old impulse to give generous support to educational cultural and artistic institutions, and to philanthropy. Such private beneficence was a characteristic of the traditional American system.

As for the ordinary citizen, he is perfectly willing to let Washington have all that a free American Government needs to perform its proper functions, but he doesn't want to finance restrictions on his own initiative, liberty and legitimate pursuit of happiness.

Government spending in the last analysis is political spending, and as Calvin Coolidge once said, the proper place for money not absolutely needed to carry on Government is in the taxpayers' pockets.

Wouldn't you rather spend your own money?

"This Is Not Fiction"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Newtown Enterprise of March 2, 1950, as reprinted in the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of March 9.

The confused and ridiculous spending policies of our Federal Government are pictured in terms of ordinary day-to-day problems and actions. No one would plan either his family budget or his business budget along the lines which have been followed in Washington for many years past. When you stop talking in billions and bring the real point out in the understandable figures of everyday life, the faults and failures of the whole policy becomes clear.

"THIS IS NOT FICTION"

(Newtown Enterprise, March 2, 1950)

It is difficult to make facts and figures on Government financing interesting and understandable in a newspaper story. Particularly has the term "deficit financing" found the man in the street scratching his head in confusion.

But here is an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which is an outstanding contribution toward a better understanding of their Government by the average citizen. We print it in full.

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions, having been through it.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $25,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year," says he.

"Hmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious too?

But the banker gives allowances for unforeseen circumstances. So he asks Mr. Truman, "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "He's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year, will they?' '

"No, but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel apiece, but I give them an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $2 for each one they sell. Besides, my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below his income seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

Cooperative Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the pending middle-income cooperative housing bill is grossly unfair because it

discriminates against 7,875,000 middle-income families. Fifty-nine out of 60 families could not benefit even if the bill authorized expenditures of $1,000,000,000.

At an estimated $8,000 cost per unit provided by the bill, $1,000,000,000 would build only 125,000 units.

The proposed bill contained provisions for a $25,000,000 propaganda fund. It is compared to the $250,000 fund that organized builders are attempting to raise nationally to spark a drive to sell home ownership and the accomplishments of the building industry.

The measure we have in mind is intended to supply housing to so-called middle-income groups, and by accepted welfare standards it is a bad piece of legislation.

In the old days the ideal criterion of a good law was that it should apply to everyone impartially, whether poor, rich, or of the middle condition. Under a changing conception of fairness, discrimination between classes has come to seem socially right when it is applied to such things as income-tax rates and aid to the needy. It has never been deemed right, however, to permit discrimination between people in identical categories: even the advanced state welfarist professes to believe that equals should be treated equally.

The proposed middle-income housing legislation actually promises to treat equals unequally. The bills now pending before the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses of Congress would make home-purchase money available at 3-percent interest to citizens in the middle-third income bracket—roughly $2,700–$4,400 a year. In addition to the low interest rate the bill would provide authorization of loans over a 50- or even a 60-year period. But to get this easy money the applicant must first elect to become a member of a Government-financed housing cooperative. This is where the discrimination between equals comes in. For, where a cooperatively minded householder would be getting his money at 3 percent with a lifetime to pay it off, middle-income people who prefer to obtain houses on their own would still have to pay 4 percent or more, even with FHA help. As for the 1,750,000 veterans who are now getting housing money at 4 percent with a 25-year amortization privilege, many of them are in the middle-income brackets. Would they take the sight of other middle-income people getting 60-year amortization money at 3 percent without screaming to high heaven about the very obvious injustice of it all?

If the new middle-income housing bill passes Congress it will, in effect, drive the general mortgage rate down toward 3 percent. Equals will insist on being treated equally. This would undoubtedly serve to stimulate the housing market, but what practical good would such stimulus do as long as the Nation is already in the ecstatic throes of a housing boom? One million new homes are in the works for 1950, and labor, lumber, contracting charges and architects' fees are already sky high. The net effect of cheaper money would not be more homes; it would be costlier labor and more expensive Douglas fir and white pine with resultant hardship on all home builders, rich or poor.

Government has entered the area of housing to stay. But in housing, as in other things, Government will do well to stick to the principle of treating equals equally. Otherwise, even by welfarist standards, Government will become an abhorrent monstrosity.

Distribution of Subversive Literature Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including with my entire approval, copy of a resolution adopted by the Gate City Council No. 5 of the Order of United American Mechanics of the United States concerning the distribution through the mails of subversive literature.

I call upon the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to report legislation promptly that will control such distribution of literature.

Whereas the overburdened United States mails are today being flooded with literature, pictorial displays, and other propaganda material extolling the pretended advantages and virtues of present life in Soviet Russia; and

Whereas this is a link in a series of steps and part of a campaign aimed mainly toward infiltrating into our school libraries and classrooms certain tempting and poisonous appeals by which to corrupt and debauch the minds of American school children in their most impressionable and receptive ages which must eventuate in the destruction of our public-school system; and

Whereas this campaign represents a brazen effort to subvert, and ultimately to overthrow, the sanctity of our traditional institutions of the home, the church, and the school, by setting up revolutionary fallacies and evils to take their place; and

Whereas the distribution of this material, through the United States mails, under the ostensible protection of our Government, is helping to increase the rapidly growing deficit under which our postal establishment is operated, while, at the same time it threatens to weaken, and inevitably to destroy the very structure which makes this great postal facility possible; and

Whereas under the existing postal laws and regulations, there appear to be no means by which these nefarious falsehoods can be excluded from the mails, because of the fact that the same do not actually and distinctly advocate outright overthrow or counsel overt treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to the laws of the United States, as now defined in the existing Criminal Code of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Gate City Council No. 5 of the Order of United American Mechanics of the United States, in regular meeting at Atlanta, Ga., on March 8, 1950, That we urgently recommend to our Senators and Representatives of Congress, that they vigorously press for the immediate adoption of such strengthening amendments to the existing laws and regulations governing our postal establishment, as will bar from the use of the mails any and all such insidious and dangerous propaganda, which has for its primary aim the weakening of the fabric of our institutions, the corruption of our youth and the erection of a hideous vision of intolerance, foreign doctrines and false ideals which will eventually bring about the overthrow of every hallowed and blessed privilege of freedom which form the bulwark of America's priceless heritage.

LOUIS A. BURTON,
BASIL STOCKBRIDGE,
VESTER M. OWNBY,
Special Committee on Resolutions.

Contracts Used To Be Sacred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oceanside Daily-Blade-Tribune, Friday, February 24, 1950:

CONTRACTS USED TO BE SACRED

(By H. B.)

If you will look at the San Diego County tax statement, you will find on it a tax rate of 45 cents for the metropolitan water district and 10 cents for the San Diego County Water Authority per each $100 valuation on your property. That is what the taxpayers of Oceanside are paying to have Colorado River water brought to our water mains. A similar tax is shouldered by taxpayers in every one of the 27 agencies that comprise the great metropolitan water district.

The United States Senate this week ignored the people of southern California who had the vision to go to the Colorado River for a supplementary water supply to insure the growth of their respective communities, and voted for a minimum Federal expenditure of $738,000,000 to develop a few acres of land in Arizona.

The people of California do not have any quarrel with the people of the great State of Arizona, but they do resent the fact that a few powerful politicians in the United States Senate swayed a majority of their fellow Senators—Democrats and Republicans alike—to ignore the fact that the people of southern California have sweated and sacrificed to bring distant water to their own communities at their own expense while a few landowners in another State will have water brought to them at the expense of the taxpayers as a whole. That is double taxation.

Under the cloak of reclamation this incredible project now approved by the Senate and soon to be considered by the House of Representatives would:

1. Spend $738,000,000 of Federal funds to bring Colorado River water to the central portion of Arizona at a cost per acre of $1,858, a cost 1,100 percent greater than the average for all western reclamation projects to date.

2. Use public funds to enrich private landowners, of whom a favored 420 would receive average benefits of $550,000 each.

3. Enable private citizens to profit by this huge expenditure without requiring them to contribute 1 cent to the project's capital cost.

4. Deprive the people of California of water to which they are entitled under existing

Government contracts that are supposed to be sacred, valid contracts.

5. Saddle a new tax obligation upon the taxpayers of all the States, in order to benefit a limited number of people in one single State.

In brief, the Arizona project would provide Colorado River water for 25,000 persons in Arizona, but it would cost nearly a billion dollars in Federal funds to get the water to them. California has a long-standing contract with the Department of the Interior for that same water. It will serve 5,000,000 persons in California and require no Federal subsidies.

The point foremost in our minds is whether this country has reached the point where contracts, entered into by six Western States with the Federal Government, receive no recognition from our United States Senate. Such contracts always have been held a sacred trust between the Government and the States in the past. Some of our foreign dictators of old and of the present surreptitiously ignored agreements. Surely the people of the United States are not going to allow this to go unchallenged here.

California's Senators, SHERIDAN DOWNEY and WILLIAM KNOWLAND waged a gallant fight to protect California's interests. Arizona won its fight because Arizona's Senator HAYDEN is about the most powerful man in the upper Chamber. With 28 years in the Senate, he is chairman of the patronage committee, the Rules Committee, and a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. His friendship and good will proved more valuable to supporting Senators than the best interests of the people of the Nation as a whole.

Surely the House of Representatives, whose membership is closer to the hearts of the people, will not desert the people of America by approving this terrific expenditure for the benefit of just a few.

Surely President Truman will not condone this action of the United States Senate. Many of us recall the pledge he made in 1948 in a speech in San Diego and from a railroad car platform in Oceanside that the future of California depended upon an adequate water supply.

Critical days face this county if this insidious piece of legislation is not decisively defeated.

Necessity for Construction of St. Lawrence Seaway To Meet Critical Iron Ore Situation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement prepared by me relative to the critical iron ore situation facing the country, and the necessity for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway as a measure of relief.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. President, iron ore constitutes one of the most basic sinews of American military and industrial strength. Our Government has, however, virtually ignored this sinew and has allowed a situation to approach whereby this country would find itself behind an ore shortage "eight ball."

MY WARNINGS IN FEBRUARY 1948

Two years ago in February 1948 I brought to the attention of the Senate the very serious national crisis that was developing as a result of the gradual exhaustion of the iron-ore resources in the United States. I did so in connection with the debate then under way on Senate Joint Resolution 111, concerning the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

At that time those who for sectional reasons opposed the seaway project found it necessary to question and to doubt the facts then presented.

Mr. President, grim revelations in the past 2 years have fortified and proved the accuracy of the facts concerning the iron-ore situation. It is now admitted by all the steel companies in the United States that the iron-ore reserves of the Lake Superior region are being depleted and that this country, in the interest of its own stability and national security, must find new sources of iron ore. The only question that seems to be a matter of controversy at the present time is from what source we should get the additional iron-ore supplies and where the steel mills should be located to receive them.

WE MUST BRING ORE TO ESTABLISHED MILLS

Mr. President, it was my contention 2 years ago, and it is still my contention, that if we wish to preserve the steel industry of the great Middle West, that ways and means must be found to bring iron ore to the established mills in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, and other steel-making centers. And since the Mesabi range, which has supplied the major part of the requirements of these mills is being rapidly depleted, the only alternative way of bringing this ore to the Middle West is through the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. President, I predicted 2 years ago that if the St. Lawrence seaway is not authorized and constructed, the depletion of the Lake Superior iron ore resources would lead steel companies to consider seriously the establishment of steel mills on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts in order to receive low-cost, ocean-borne iron ore from offshore sources, and that gradually the steel industry would be weaned away from its present location in the Middle West. Since then we have learned of specific developments which confirm these predictions.

STEEL COMPANIES HAVE ALREADY STARTED ACTION

The United States Steel Corp. has recently announced the acquisition of 3,800 acres of land on the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton for the establishment of an integrated steel mill. At the same time the Bethlehem Steel Corp. has announced the expansion of its Sparrows Point plant in Baltimore. Both of these firms will utilize, according to announcements, newly discovered iron ore reserves in Venezuela, in the Orinoco Basin, which are being extensively and expeditiously developed. It has also been brought to the attention of the Senate through the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that New England is ambitious to establish a steel mill, and there are, in addition, reports that Mobile, Ala., is being considered for a new mill.

MAJOR TRANSFORMATION OF UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION LOOMS

Mr. President, the excuse for all these activities in every instance is the fact that iron ore resources of the Lake Superior region are being exhausted and that substitute sources must be found. We are, therefore, confronted with a major reorganization of our industrial structure—a transformation of a system of industrial production that has been established over the past 75 years as a result of natural factors in the location of iron ore and cheap water transportation in the Great Lakes area. I shudder to think of the terrible consequences—the dislocation that would be caused in my own State of Wisconsin and in her neighbors.

Mr. President, these radical and momentous changes in our industrial set-up, it is my contention, are not in the interest of the United States and of its people. They are not economical and they are not necessary if the Congress of the United States will do its duty by the country and make the necessary authorization for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I say, Mr. President, that it is not in the interest of the people of the United States to transfer large segments of the steel industry from its present location in the Great Lakes area to new locations on the Atlantic coast. It may benefit some real-estate owners and other interests in the new locations at the expense of those who have adjusted their lives and their livelihood to the present industrial structure; but it is not in the interests of the Nation as a whole to see these transfers made against the advice of those concerned with security matters.

ATLANTIC COAST PLANTS COULD EASILY BE ATTACKED

Plants located on the Atlantic coast will be vulnerable to enemy attack in case of national emergency, not only by air, but also by water, and the supply lines of the raw materials being brought in oceangoing bottoms will be subject to submarine attack. It is a well-known fact that of the seven or eight deep-draught, ore-carrying boats that an eastern steel company had in operation between Chile and Baltimore during World War II, three-fourths were sunk during 1942, and the others had to be withdrawn from service. Ore had to be brought to Baltimore expensively and laboriously by rail for 1,500 miles from Minnesota. It is not to the advantage of the country to have a major share of its steel-producing capacity subject to the vicissitudes of enemy attack.

Neither is it to the advantage of the United States, through inaction, to permit the dislocation of economic values and community life that would be forced upon these Middle Western industrial centers when major segments of the steel industry shut down in their present locations and open up in new locations on the east coast.

WHY SENATOR WILEY HAS ADVOCATED SEAWAY

I have advocated the St. Lawrence seaway project because I feel strongly that the supply of raw materials to the existing industries of the Middle West is vital to the economic stability and national security of this country.

LABRADOR ORE OFFERS MAGNIFICENT SUPPLY WITH INTERNAL LINES OF COMMUNICATIONS

It is fortunate that a group of independent steel companies have discovered a new continental source of iron ore located in Labrador, north of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which is accessible to the middle-western steel mills through internal lines of communication not subject to submarine attack. These iron-ore resources will also permit the maintenance of the present scale of operations in the Lake region and thereby encourage the development of low-grade taconite in Minnesota.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to the establishment of new mills in the East if thereby the economic and national-security interests of the United States would be served. There may be conditions under which expansion of the steel-producing capacity of the United States may be best achieved by the establishment of new plants in strategically located areas. I do object, however, to any scheme that will result in the displacement of middle western mills by coastal establishments, because I do not consider that an advantage to the people

of the country and to the security which we seek.

MIDWEST INDUSTRY CONFRONTED WITH STARVATION OF RAW MATERIALS

Our first interest, therefore, must be to consider ways and means of protecting the industry of the Middle West against a starvation of raw materials which is threatening at the present time. I cannot see how such an objective is detrimental to the interests of any section of the country. At a time when we are all concerned about the preservation and improvement of the productive capacity of far-away areas in Europe and Asia in defense of the democratic way of life, it ill behooves any American in or out of Congress to maneuver so as to upset the established productive capacity of this country, which has stood so well by the American way of life.

THIRTY-MILLION-TON SUPPLY FROM NEW SOURCES NECESSARY

Let me point out that we need, under ordinary circumstances, 80,000,000 tons of iron ore to maintain the current operations of the steel industry in the Middle West. We have been getting this supply from the Lake Superior area. To the extent that depletion of open-pit ores makes it impossible to secure this total supply from the same sources as heretofore, we have to find supplementary supplies. It is estimated that in the course of the next 10 to 20 years, even with the development of taconite ore in Minnesota, new supplementary sources in the amount of 30,000,000 tons a year would be required in order to supply the total of 80,000,000 tons needed in the Middle West.

It is imperative, therefore, Mr. President, that the St. Lawrence seaway be authorized to insure a means of transportation for this vitally needed raw material. If we do not construct this waterway, then we must confront the inevitable prospect of seeing one-half of the steel capacity of the Middle West transplanted to new locations with all of the depreciation and obsolescence of plant, community facilities, housing, and human beings that necessarily follow any such major industrial revolution.

CONCLUSION

I am confident, Mr. President, that if the full impact and the significance of this situation is appreciated the regional considerations that seem to befuddle the controversy on the St. Lawrence seaway will be dissolved and that we shall begin to think of the interests of the country as a whole and approve this vital channel of communication which is necessary to the stability and security of the two essential components of democratic strength—Canada and the United States.

It is still not too late in this second session of the Eighty-first Congress to pass St. Lawrence seaway legislation. Where there is a will, the proverb rightly says, there is a way. Where there is vision, determination on the part of leaders in the Congress, we can swiftly enact legislation on this urgent theme. Let us not allow our country to lose her vital sinews of national defense. Let us complete this great waterway.

Gas Barrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gas Barrage," from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAS BARRAGE

Proponents of the Kerr natural gas bill scheduled to come up today in the Senate are trying to have their cake and eat it too. They contend that this bill, which would amend the Natural Gas Act specifically to exempt so-called independent gas producers from Federal Power Commission regulation, would not take away any of the jurisdiction that the FPC now possesses. If that were the case, why would there be any need for a bill of exemption?

Natural gas producers are of two kinds—the producers affiliated with pipe-line companies, clearly under FPC regulation, and the independents. Independent in this sense is something of a misnomer. Although there are many small producers, a few large companies do most of the business, and some of the largest operators are oil companies. The authority of the FPC to regulate sales by independent producers destined for interstate commerce was affirmed by the Supreme Court in the Interstate case in 1947. It is true that the FPC has not actively regulated such sales in the past—principally because prices were not unreasonable—but it has not relinquished jurisdiction. Indeed, it is now using this authority in price proceedings against the Phillips Petroleum Co.

Senator KERR, among others, has admitted that a prime purpose in his bill is to facilitate increased prices. Yet there is no reason to believe that present prices, or the fair rate of return contemplated by the FPC, are discouraging enterprise; far from it. It may be suspected that another purpose of the Kerr bill is to remove gas as an active competitor of oil, which is unregulated. Since 1947 there has been a tremendous increase in the use of natural gas in cities (Washington, for example), and conditions have changed from a buyers' to a sellers' market. The effect of the Kerr bill would be to let large producers set the price all along the line to consumers. Not only would this discriminate against regulated pipe-line companies and affiliated producers, it would render all gas regulations more or less futile.

Aside from price protection, one essential purpose of regulation is to prevent the growth of monopoly among producers. A case can be made that the really small producers should be exempted from regulation. Also, it is undeniable that a great deal of confusion exists over what Congress actually intended in the Natural Gas Act, and a more specific law would be desirable. But a time when natural-gas regulation is taking on increasing importance is no time to be removing a fundamental protection which, once lifted, could be restored only with the greatest difficulty. Senators ought to take a very close look at the very large special interest that is masquerading today in the guise of free enterprise.

Is Our Social Security Sound?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Finance Committee today:

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to our social security system. It is unsound. Furthermore, it does not meet the needs of today's aged.

My remarks will be directed primarily at the old-age and survivors insurance usually referred to as OASI. The bill before you is a $12,000,000,000 a year program. It will cost that much when it matures before the close of this century even if the benefits are never again increased. It is actuarily unsound and I know of no actuary who is not in the employ of the Social Security Administration who approves or endorses it. Improving it, is not the answer. We need a new system.

It isn't necessary to argue that our social security system is not taking care of this generation of old people. Although the program has been in force 13 years, we have 8,400,000 men and women over 65 who are ineligible for its benefits. Apologists for the program promptly assert this is because the program is new. This argument cannot stand when we consider the admission of the Social Security Administration's head actuary that under H. R. 6000, 10 years from now there will still be 7,200,000 men and women over 65 ineligible for its benefits. This results from certain basic defects in the program.

Our present social security law is not only unfair, it is harsh and cruel. The benefits that are now paid are not equitably distributed. Individuals who are already out of the labor market, widows, who were widows when the law went into effect, orphans, whose fathers were not in covered employment, as well as countless millions who make their contribution to society without earned income are not helped by mere extension of coverage to all the occupations. They are outside the so-called insurance part of the social security law. Yet, in a social program these are the groups that should have first claim on whatever the American taxpayers can pay out for these purposes.

The program is geared to give advantage to the high-salaried and to discriminate against the low-paid. For instance, the man retiring on an average wage of $250 a month draws $16 a month more in OASI benefits than the man whose average wage was $100. Yet, he has only paid for $2.47 more protection in his social security taxes.

The present program as well as H. R. 6000 fails most of our aged, but offers attractive windfalls to the privileged few. A banker or a corporation officer whose salary has been $3,000 or more, who retires at 65 this year can, with his wife draw about $100 a month. The man's life expectancy is 12 years; his wife's is 14 years. He has paid into the social-security system a total of $390, or less than 4 months' benefits. Across the street there may be an aged individual who has toiled and produced for years, but if he were taken out of the labor market before he became fully insured, he either gets nothing or is subject to a needs test for relief. This means that he has to declare himself a personal bankrupt and turn his life over to a case worker. Social security advocates attempt to point out that the corporation executive has paid for his retirement and the other man has not. Mr. Chairman, the people know more about social security than you realize. They know that the individuals drawing the benefits have not paid for them. They have made a very small token payment only.

Of the primary beneficiaries now on the rolls, virtually none has paid more than $400, in employee contributions; some have paid less than $10, and the average total employee contributions for these benefits have been less than $150. For this average contribution of $150, each beneficiary will receive retirement payments totaling $3,000.

If allowance were made for the value of a wife's and other benefits, the value would be much greater.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the American taxpayers are to help orphans, they should treat all orphans alike. The survivor benefits under OASI are as discriminatory as the retirement benefits. A family of children of a deceased father who earned $50 a quarter in covered employment over a period of six quarters, is eligible for the minimum benefits. This deceased father had paid in taxes for these benefits the total sum of $3. How can you say to another widow and her fatherless children that they are not entitled to anything and that the first-mentioned family paid for their benefits. This program constitutes neither sound insurance nor a fair social program.

Our system of social security lacks flexibility. Who can say that 65 will be the proper retirement age toward the end of this century. Benefits cannot be tied to past wage records and still do the job in any particular year. H. R. 6000 is an admission of this. For 13 years our Government has been paying for the keeping of voluminous and detailed wage records allegedly because they were needed to figure benefits. Yet in the bill before you, benefits were revised to meet present-day need. Flexibility in a program is desirable. The wage-record system prohibits flexibility besides being a costly procedure.

Another objection to a program in which the number of beneficiaries is much smaller in early years than in later, is that, regardless of what financing method is adopted, there will be an uncontrollable tendency toward undue liberalization of individual benefit amounts. With only relatively few beneficiaries on the rolls now and in the immediate future, it is too easy to propose individual benefit rates be approximately doubled; that primary benefit amounts in excess of $100 a month be promised, as well as the combined husband-and-wife amounts of $150 a month. With a relatively small number of beneficiaries now and with present benefit disbursements far below contribution receipts, the ability to fulfill these promises over the next few years seems to be all that matters. The tremendous future cost that will result when there are many more to whom we have made these commitments is too easily ignored.

In our population over 65, only one out of five is now eligible for benefits. On this basis we are fixing benefits so high that when the time arrives that five out of five become eligible, the program will be an impossible financial burden.

I have repeatedly stated that H. R. 6000, 40 years from now, will cost $12,000,000,000 a year. This is a very conservative estimate. Compared with the life of our Republic that is not a long period of time. I have a son 10 years old. Adopting this program means that when he is 50, the taxpayers then must pay $12,00,000,000 a year for old-age and survivors insurance alone. The taxpayers of that day will have no voice in determining the amount of payment for it is in the nature of a contractual agreement. We have no right to force such a program upon our children. The workers today have no right to expect a retirement benefit for themselves that today they are unwilling to provide for their parents.

Someone may suggest that when these benefits are to be paid 40 or 50 years from now, they will be paid from an accumulated trust fund adequate to meet these benefits. This is a fantasy. It is a myth. In the first place, we have no assurance that the progressive tax rates will go into effect and that any such fund will be accumulated.

If the sum could be collected, how could it be managed? Should these many billions in the so-called trust fund be retained in cash by the Treasury? The effect of such a procedure on the economy is well known to you gentlemen. Should these funds be invested in securities other than Government securities? If this were done, the Social Security Administrator would soon control all the Nation's major business enterprises. That leaves only Government bonds as an investment. I maintain the Government cannot carry a trust fund in its own Government bonds.

When a recipient is to receive his benefits this year or 40 years from now, he wants them in dollars. There are only three ways to get dollars. These ways are (1) Current taxation; (2) issue of more bonds to borrow the people's money; (3) inflation through printing press money or devaluation. It matters not so far as our economy is concerned whether there are three warehouses of Government bonds in the trust fund or 40 warehouses of Government bonds. The people have to provide the money when the benefits must be paid.

What is the answer? We should adopt a pay-as-you-go program. We should make these benefits available now for all our aged, and all our widows and orphans. We should collect the money now. I submit that in any given year, those individuals who are so blessed as to have a job and good health should carry the load for those unable to provide for themselves in that particular year. The full cost should be paid each year and when that year closes, nothing is owed and nothing is promised.

If this basic change is impossible at this time, then I suggest that no legislation be passed or that a stop gap measure be approved providing additional money for the country's needy.

This should be followed by a thorough and objective study of the program. With due regard to the high caliber and public spirit of the individuals comprising the various advisory councils on social security, I regret these councils have not been able to make a more thorough reexamination of the fundamentals. Each council has been composed of experts in their own fields, and who, being extremely busy men in these outside fields, could not take the necessary time to make such reexamination; consequently, acceptance of the proposals developed by the Social Security Administration staff members became an almost inevitable course. I feel a study should be made by a group consisting largely of persons who can devote full time for several months to the work, who are largely technicians in this field, and who at the same time are fully independent of administration pressure. Only in this way can a wholly objective and thorough chart be laid for future development.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement addressed to the Eighty-first Congress by a group of citizens who were members of the Round the World Town Meeting of the Air Seminar. This group included Alfred A. Albert, of the American Civil Liberties Union; Irving Brown, European representative of the American Federation of Labor; Edith Sampson, of the National Council of Negro Women; George W. Welsh, of the United States Conference of Mayors; Sadja Stokowski, Dr. Clarence Decker, Robert S. Byfield, Robert Hansen, and Walter White. It is a statement which may be of particular interest to the Senate in its forthcoming consideration of civil-rights legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Eighty-first Congress.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned American citizens traveled at their own expense around the world from June to September to talk on a people to people basis about the questions which concern us all. We sought everywhere to interpret our Nation's aspirations and aims to those whose friendship and support we need to survive. We sought also to answer the misinterpretations and deliberate falsification in some instances of American democracy, not by attacking other ideologies but by telling the truth about the United States.

We were members of the Round the World Town Meeting of the Air Seminar but we wish to make clear at the outset that what we say to you in this letter is our individual and collective opinion as individuals. Neither the Town Hall nor the organizations we represented are accountable nor responsible for our views. They are strictly our own. The names of the organizations we represented are affixed to our individual names for purposes of identification only.

You as Members of the Eighty-first Congress are embarking on the second session of that Congress at what may be the most crucial time in contemporary history. As makers of the laws and formulators of the national policies of the world's most powerful and envied Nation the eyes of the world will be upon everything you say and do. Particularly will this be true when you debate and vote upon civil-rights legislation.

Wherever we went on our journey—Europe, the Near East, the Middle East, the Far East, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific—we were invariably confronted with questions regarding mob violence, discrimination in employment and education, disfranchisement and segregation based on race, creed, color, or place of origin. Repeatedly we were asked to explain the signing with 47 other nations of an international declaration of human rights by the United States when those same rights are denied certain minorities in the United States. We found that not only is Soviet Russia industriously spreading the news in Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world about our shortcomings but that many countries and peoples friendly to us are puzzled and made suspicious of us by these acts.

As American citizens we were appalled at the extent of damage to American prestige which these anti-American practices have done. It is for this reason that we appeal to you to keep in mind the world as well as national implications of your every word and act on this most basic of issues. We appeal to each of you to debate fully and fairly each one of the civil-rights proposals but refrain from obstructionism and undignified discussion. We appeal to you to refrain from any tactics to prevent a fair discussion and vote. We appeal to you to think of this issue of human rights as an American and not a politically partisan one.

Our Nation's reputation and security hang in the balance. We are confident that each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives will fully measure up to the grave responsibility which is his.

The Battle Against Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no more piercing appraisal of the national state of mind has been made than that entitled "The Battle Against Fear" by David Lawrence in a recent issue of United States News and World Report. I insert it in the RECORD for the edification of our citizenry:

THE BATTLE AGAINST FEAR
(By David Lawrence)

"The world may be destroyed by chain reaction from a hydrogen bomb. No time to lose. The clock is ticking toward disaster. There must be more armament. More bombs than Russia. Maybe they'll strike first. Maybe we should."

And so the whole world is enveloped in fears of its own making.

It is as if death-dealing weapons had never before destroyed men, women, and children—as if war had never taken a horrible toll—as if death by man-made bomb is any different from death by the sword or the bullet.

Many centuries ago the Commandment was given: "Thou shalt not kill." But man, while punishing individual murder, has condoned organized murder.

Has a sense of guilt finally overtaken the world? Is that the reason we are now weighed down by the awfulness of war itself?

It is easy to rationalize war. We proclaim with all sincerity that we never make war on others—we fight only when attacked and only in self-defense. And, it is asked, should there not be armament to protect against such aggression?

There must, of course, be armament and there must be defense forces—just as there must be fire houses and fire-fighting equipment. But there also must be fire prevention. Wars are not a matter of spontaneous combustion. Wars are man-made, and rarely is the guilt for a war wholly on one side.

Wars don't commence only when hostilities are begun. They begin years and years before in the hearts and minds of men. Communists with evil spirit were not born yesterday. Their exploitation of millions of helpless persons is the direct consequence of man's failure to deal with human problems—with the failure of man to take note of the plight of his brother.

We today are bringing on the next war. We may not yet see clearly our own tendency to become provocative. But it is there—a bland refusal to inform ourselves on the real issues, a willingness to accept superficiality, prejudice, hysteria, and mere arms as a complete substitute for any other approach to man-made dilemmas—as, for instance, the approach by faith and the spirit.

To many persons this is mawkishness, softness, and even insanity. They impatiently erect barriers in their own minds. They have been taught to fight with their fists. They know less about victories that come out of the head, out of genuine faith and out of honest self-examination.

We today are bringing on the next war—by our orthodoxy of method, our rigidity of formula in diplomatic intercourse, our pride, and our belief that vicious animals have never been tamed except by the whip.

Granting that in Moscow is a small band of evil men, how long will the few rule the many; forever? Are 210,000,000 minds really unreachable? Are they ready for extermination? Have they no fears like ours? Have the Russian people heard nothing about our B-36's and of the 70 target cities marked for destruction by our atomic bombs?

The whole world cannot continue to live this way, in an atmosphere of threat and counter threat, in abject fear.

The Scriptures speak of those "who through fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage."

We must have faith in man's genius, in man's capacity to find a way to improve living standards in a world of both poverty and abundance. Is materialism and selfishness our only doctrine? Do economic power and property afford the only enjoyment, the only compensations? Or are we ready at last to understand that spiritual compensations can bring greater happiness?

The battle against fear is a battle against guilt, against man's sins of omission in a world that has not yet learned true brotherhood.

We must begin to conquer our fears and face truth. Bombs themselves are harmless pieces of metal. Only man-directed weapons can destroy anything. It is fear of our fellow man and not of his contrivances that puts us in a panic.

When shall man learn how to control man? This is not a matter of physical weapons. It is a matter of justice, of fairness, of kindliness, of tolerance, of unselfishness, of sacrifice, of willingness to face evil with the strength that faith in God alone can give. "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me."

A Plea From Two Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent, Mr. Charles Eyanson, has forwarded to me an original plea from two children which contains much food for thought. It follows:

WE KIDS ARE DOING A LOT OF THINKING ABOUT YOU GROWN-UPS THESE DAYS

I

We are just a couple of kids—my sister and I.

Same kind of kids probably, that you have at home.

We haven't been around long and I guess we don't know much yet.

But we are watching you and we have to laugh.

It amuses us to see how you are thinking, the kind of things you grown-ups are doing and the stuff you swallow.

But at the same time we're a little scared.

II

We haven't been handed social-security numbers up to now but it won't be too many years before we get them.

All we ask of you is that you hold things in check for us so that we won't lose the kind of voting system that you have and so that our social-security number won't be a puppet string which will make us jump any way the Government wants us to jump.

If you do hold things then we'll stop laughing at you for acting like puppets yourselves.

III

You oldsters can't hold things in check just by cussing the people at Washington and the State capitol among yourselves.

You'll have to stop blaming the officeholders and politicians.

They will do what you say if you are right and if you convince enough of your friends and neighbors you are right.

No leader in this country can lead unless people follow him.

No officeholder can keep his job if the people don't want him.

IV

You can't be very happy when you think how this country is drifting.

You shouldn't think you are giving us a fair deal by preparing the socialist welfare state for us.

By 1980 most of you won't be here but we'll be in our thirties.

We would like to think then that you did as much to build this country and keep it on the right track as you think your father or your grandfathers did.

In 1980 we would like to be celebrating Washington's, Jackson's, Jefferson's, Lincoln's, and Lee's Birthday, instead of the birthday of some guy who got his ideas from Marx or Stalin or Fabian or some of the fellows who are trying to shape up things now in our country.

V

You say you'd "do anything in the world for you kids," and we know you mean it.

But no matter what you do it won't mean a thing to us in the end if you socialize us.

If by 1980 we are known only by our social-security numbers instead of our names and by what we have been able to do for ourselves, we'll say you gave us a raw deal instead of a fair deal.

When we go after our first job we want to pick it for ourselves and leave it when we like, without a permit from the Government.

We want to be able to make and save enough money to buy the things we need and want even after we are too old to work.

We will want our kids to go to public or parochial school where they can learn the things you learned and not what the Government planners say they should learn.

We will want to pick the doctor for them when they are sick and not have to take a Government doctor.

We don't want a government which says "we'll take enough out of your pay and load taxes on you to give you the things you need to live on and pay you a litle each month when you can't work any more.

We don't want that kind of government for ourselves and we don't want it for our children.

My sister and I want the same chance that your father and your grandfathers had and that you started out with but which you are now letting slip away.

VI

My sister and I are not so much afraid that you will let this country drift into a dictatorship like Germany or Italy were, or a Communist state like Russia is.

But we are afraid that you are going to hand down to us and to our children a government built on the new Socialist state idea as they call it in England or welfare state as they are calling it in Washington, D. C.

When we are told, as we were not long ago, that by the year A. D. 2000 the real income of my family and my sister's family will be $12,000 each a year even if we're only average, we get scared.

Today the dollar you earn isn't worth 100 cents by a long way.

It's worth only 43 cents.

If you let your Government go on with some of the things it's doing and some of the things it's planning to do, our dollar won't be worth anywhere near 43 cents.

Maybe it will take that whole $12,000 just to pay our grocery bill.

That's why we're scared.

You won't be here by A. D. 2000.

Neither will the President nor the governor.

Maybe there won't be any President.

Socialist welfare states don't have presidents.

VII

I am only in the first grade. My sister is in kindergarten so we can't read The Road Ahead by John T. Flynn.

But you better read it and do something about what's going on if you and other grown-ups mean what you say that you'd "do anything in the world for you kids."

VIII

We can't believe that you want us and our children to have any less of a chance than you and your father had.

I'll bet you want even better things for us.

You can give us better things if you will stop these planners and not let them lead you into a Socialist welfare state.

Yes, we'll be thinking of you in 1980 and in A. D. 2000.

Natural Gas Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has ever been more propaganda conveying erroneous impressions to the public through the medium of the press on any legislation than the attack constantly being made on the proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act, clarifying the original intent of Congress as to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over the independent producers and gatherers of natural gas, sold at arm's length.

We had this barrage of newspaper publicity at the time the House passed this thoroughly justifiable proposal last year and now as it is being considered in the other body, the same type of unfounded propaganda through columns and editorials is being presented in complete disregard for the actual facts.

If those who are responsible for such misleading information would only take the time to become informed, if not already, of the actual facts and intention of this highly technical problem, I am fully confident that their comments and writings would be in an altogether different vein. I do not like to imply that any person, editorial writers or others, would deliberately try to mislead the public. I fear some, though, may be deliberately doing this. However, most of the outstanding newspapers who have been making such attacks are simply in my opinion, not informed of just what is involved. They are misled and persuaded by certain ones of an economic result which does not and would not exist.

It is a sad commentary when the Commission itself carrying out the full intention of the act for 12 years found themselves in a dilemma by certain language in the opinion of the court and recommended that this Congress do just what this proposed amendment is designed to do.

There are two extreme views responsible for this dilemma. One I can readily appreciate but the other that no doubt is responsible for the activity at this time in many large centers where gas is consumed, is very difficult to understand. When any groups take a position that their special interest must be bailed out even though it was not the original intent of Congress or else an entire industry must be completely and wholly relegated to Federal controls they are in my opinion inconsistent in their philosophy and advocacy of free and competitive enterprise. It is a strange philosophy or principle of Government to adopt only when personal gain is the final result, even though the business has long since been recognized as a regulated controlled monopoly.

Seldom have I seen in the newspapers a correct analysis of this problem. There appeared in the Washington Post today, however, a communication which I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this Congress. It was written by Emby Kaye, of Tulsa, Okla. I do not know this party but it is the most factual discussion that I have seen in the press on this matter. I am, therefore, including it with these remarks:

A COMMUNICATION

The press from Washington has carried several attacks against Senator KERR keyed to his espousal of certain amendments of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The Kerr bill seeks only to preserve by law the right of an independent producer of gas—operating at arm's length from a pipe line or distributing company—to make a contract for the sale of gas from his own wells without regulation of any Federal agency.

The bill, if enacted into law, will not, per se, increase the price of gas, either in the field or at the consumer level. Under the present law, the Federal Power Commission has not claimed and never has exercised the right to control the price at which gas in the field is sold to the pipe line. The price has under the present law increased from 3 and 4 cents per thousand cubic feet to 6 cents in many fields and in some instances to as much as 10 cents a thousand cubic feet, with step-up provisions beyond these prices for future years. What the Kerr bill seeks is to confirm the present practice: the right of a producer to sell gas at arm's length at the best price the seller can obtain and which the buyer is willing to pay.

Oil and gas production are part of our free enterprise system. Unless there is nationalization or confiscation, or unless the business is by an irrational philosophy decided to be a public utility, there is no place for price fixing in that industry. Natural gas is not a monopoly. There are many fields producing gas which have no markets today. It is available to buyers.

City gas plants are not dependent upon natural gas. In the Eastern seaboard, practically every large city has contracted for and is clamoring for a larger share of available natural gas for one reason: it is cheaper than artificial or manufactured gas produced from coal or oil.

Gas companies taking on natural gas generally maintain their plants in working condition, against emergencies. Many continue to produce gas and blend their low B. t. u. gas with natural gas. If gas should unreasonably be advanced in price, the buyer could reduce his take and manufacture a larger proportion of his requirements. But that is not in the cards because purchase contracts are set up for long periods, generally 20 years. Certainly if fuel oil was to drop to the prices of a year ago or even lower, and gas could be manufactured at a lower cost than natural gas can be obtained, natural gas lines would get no new customers, and would be held to minimum deliveries by old ones.

Hitherto the producing end of the natural gas industry did not have to worry about the prospect of the Federal Power Commission fixing or limiting the price of gas at the well. Even today, with a tremendous market, gas in the field is generally underpriced, often brings 3 or 4 cents under "life of lease" contracts entered into many years ago. As a result, the regulatory authorities in the States of Oklahoma and Kansas have established by law or regulation a price of 7 and 8 cents, respectively, as the minima to be paid at the well. The courts are to test the validity of these steps. The writer does not applaud this means of obtaining an equitable price for gas.

The dispatches argue that a 6 percent profit set for utilities ought to be enough for a natural gas producer, that such a profit would content other industries. It is one thing to be content with 6 percent profit but quite another to have it fixed by the Government. As to the oil and gas industry, price fixing at the well is not sound. The critics apparently do not understand the hazards of drilling for oil and gas. Dry holes and poor wells must be paid out of income of those wells which produce. The law of supply and demand should determine the price.

I wonder whether the dispatches referring to "closing the loophole which permits oil and gas drillers and mining companies to charge off excessive depletion allowances" give the correct picture. The provisions in the present Federal income-tax laws governing "depletion and the charge of intangible development costs as expense have been worked out by Congress over a period of years as equitable and economical means of providing the necessary incentive for petroleum development that is indispensable to national welfare and security."

The Kerr bill seeks to give the approval of Congress to the historical practice in the industry so that a basically sound business philosophy might not be overturned at the whim of a commission, when chance changes the political or economic complexion of that commission. So basic a change, if ever made, should be in the purview of the Congress and not in the power of one of its creatures.

EMBY KAYE.

TULSA, OKLA.

Stuttgart Evicts Hitler Victims To House SS Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on March 9, 1950. If conditions exist in Germany as set forth in this article, I feel that this Congress should do something about it.

The article follows:

STUTTGART EVICTS HITLER VICTIMS TO HOUSE SS MEN—COURT ACTION COMES AMID DENAZIFICATION SCANDAL IN GERMANY

STUTTGART, March 9.—The government of the state of Wuerttemberg-Baden apparently is punishing no one and is not even pressing for a full investigation of the local denazification scandal.

United States officials here appear to have washed their hands of the matter, feeling that it is the business of the Germans to punish any local official guilty of selling absolution to the Nazis, as has been charged.

Yet at the moment another scandal, also involving former Nazis, is developing.

The denazification problem came to a head on February 6, when United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy criticized the State government for not investigating the case fully and attacked Minister President Reinhold Maier for having told the Americans that the scandal was none of their business. Although McCloy's statements were a sensation here a month ago, it has since become apparent that the High Commission is not planning to insist on an investigation.

CALLED A GERMAN AFFAIR

Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross, United States Commissioner for Wuerttemberg-Baden, now insists that the case is purely a German affair and the Germans are happily pointing out that this is exactly what they said at the start.

The new freedom of the state government to deal with the former Nazis is indicated by the case of the Rotweg housing development, where victims of Nazi persecution are being evicted to make room for former members of the SS, Hitler's Elite Guard.

The Rotweg project was constructed in 1939 when only high priority military construction was permitted. It is composed of 100 one-family houses with an average of five rooms each. The project was to house members of the SS and politically acceptable friends of the SS. These people moved in and lived there until the end of the war when a majority were arrested as Nazis.

The development was taken over at first by UNNRA and subsequently the refugee organizations to house Poles. In 1947 it was turned back to the city of Stuttgart and used to billet the victims of Nazi persecution and plain citizens in desperate need of shelter.

SS MEN DENAZIFIED

In the meantime the SS men were denazified by the Wuerttemberg-Baden Ministry of Justice. All the Rotweg families were ruled minor offenders. In the same class are a flat 80 percent of the personnel of the Ministry of Justice, including a majority of the former Nazi judges who sat in the denazification hearings. Purified of their sins, the Rotweg SS men promptly sued the city of Stuttgart to regain possession of their homes.

Ministry of Justice courts decided that they were entitled to them. They then sued for eviction of the present tenants and it was ruled that they should be evicted.

Feeling that they had at least a moral case, the evictees asked the United States officials for help. None has been forthcoming, although the Americans let it be known that they are following the case with interest. The evictions are continuing, however.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley States: "If It Is the Desire To Assemble Forces That Will Statistically Give the United States a Preponderance of Military Power Next Year, We Shall Have To Become an Armed Camp, Lower the American Standard of Living, and Permanently Adopt Large Peacetime Conscription"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading in the press for several days about a wonderfully clarifying statement with respect to national defense made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley in an address made before the Women's National Press Club.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I make an overstatement when in saying that there are but few men in the United States who more completely enjoy the confidence of the people in our country than does Gen. Omar Bradley.

Not alone is General Bradley a great soldier, he is a great scholar and philosopher and humanitarian whose every public utterance evidences his marked intellectual capacity to think a subject through to finality.

When General Bradley speaks, contemplative men listen.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one thing which today concerns the people of this country more than the question as to the adequacy of national defense and the security of this Nation.

Second to that is the economic and efficient operations and administration of our armed services and the Defense Establishment.

I have heard a great deal for a long time, spoken and written, about unification, of the savings effected, as to the adequacy and the inadequacy of the armed services, individually as well as collectively, and about their ability as well as inability to fulfill their respective missions.

The news article which brought General Bradley's statement to my attention quoted some of the general's associates as having said that he had given a great deal of time and thought to the preparation of what he regarded as a major statement on military policy.

"These associates," said that article, "indicated that the general was deeply disturbed by public skepticism about American defenses and by demands for bigger military forces."

It was not, however, until I read the editorial published in the Washington Post of Friday morning commenting on the Bradley speech to the Women's National Press Club that I determined to obtain a copy for study.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to point out that some of the nationally known columnists and commentators have been hypercritical of administrative policies with respect to the economies effected by Secretary Johnson and which at times they contended "were made at the expense of national defense."

Mr. Speaker, I have read and reread General Bradley's talk, and certainly no man could do so without reaching conclusion that it constitutes a great public statement emanating from a great authority and a great man.

Briefly, clearly, logically, and rhetorically, he analyzed and exhibited every facet of the question of the adequacy of our national defense when examined in the light of national and financial economy * * * in the face of the cold war that exists and * * * the shooting war that is anticipated.

My reading of the General's statement causes me to say that I can see very little difference existing between what has been spoken by President Truman, Secretary of Defense Johnson, Secretary Symington of the Air Force, and other members of the great team that now makes up the United States Department of Defense.

I wish every Member of this House would read and note the candor with which Gen. Omar Bradley discusses the realities of the continuing program of economy that has been reported to the people by Secretary Louis Johnson as contrasted with the doubts expressed by some as to whether or not the great savings made by Secretary Johnson had not adversely affected our national security.

I wish you would read what this trusted soldier and statesman had to say about what he called the $13,000,000,000 budget cut to fit the pocketbook of our people, and contrast that with the thousands among us who wish, as the general points out, to assemble forces that will statistically give the United States a preponderance of military power next year and which he said will result in our becoming an armed camp.

Mr. Speaker, with those few observations, I call to the attention of the Members of the House the speech made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's National Press Club, and which was inserted in the RECORD on Thursday, March 9, 1950, by the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas. It appears on page A1807 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick's Day is the traditional occasion in America when everyone becomes Irish. Americans of every national background sing Irish songs and praise the illustrious deeds of the worthy sons of Erin. For it was St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, who brought to that country, more than 1,500 years ago, a small band of Christian missionaries, and there began a struggle of ideas and ideals from which emerged the modern Ireland of the spirit. It is important to see what that spirit was, and is, because Irishmen have carried it to the uttermost corners of the earth. St. Patrick's Day celebrations, whether carried out in the full knowledge of St. Patrick's contribution or not, are a tribute to that spirit.

Most memorable among the poetic lines left by St. Patrick which exemplifies the spirit of freedom are these taken from the prayer known as the "Breastplate of Patrick":

I arise today
Through God's strength to pilot me,
God's might to uphold me.
God's wisdom to guide me,
God's eye to look before me,
God's ear to hear me,
God's word to speak for me,
God's hand to guard me,
God's way to be before me,
God's hosts to save me,

From the snares of the devil,
From the temptations of vices,
From everyone who desires me ill,
Afar or near,
Alone, or in a multitude.

In this lofty religious spirit St. Patrick carried on his missionary work and inspired the people of Ireland to codify the laws of their land and to purify the literature in their schools. St. Patrick loved the Irish character, and he struggled to save the ancient language and literature and to reconcile them with Christian character and literature. Not only did he accomplish this, but he also enabled the Irish people to throw off their ancient pagan beliefs and establish a national life and government according to Christian principles. Good government based upon a spirit of justice and enlightenment was the ideal of the Irish people, and this ideal spread throughout the western world, even as far as to America.

In the colonization of America the Irish were numerous, and they brought with them not only crafts and skills; through their societies they clamored for freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly. They were among the pioneers of the spirit of American liberty. The most determined, most vigorous defenders of the rights and liberties of the common man, the Irish furnished more than their share of leaders, not only for their own people but their more numerous English neighbors as well.

This is why we find so many Irishmen among the signers of the Declaration of Independence and among the Members of the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Interestingly enough, it was the success of the American Revolution that raised the hopes of freedom in Ireland.

Among America's greatest patriots are found sons of St. Patrick. Every schoolboy knows the story of Andrew Jackson—how as a mere lad he fought against the British in the Revolution; how he led the revolt of the pioneer and democratic West against the rule of the dynasties of profit and greed; how he was elected President and established the leadership of the new Democratic Party in the affairs of the Nation until the Civil War. Jackson was a typical Irishman. Irishmen in American politics today are generally found on all sides of every great issue, except that of coldly planned graft for personal gain.

Irish patriots in America have not limited their deeds to early wars in America. Famous "firsts" of Irish in World War II are fresh in our minds:

First. The first American bombardier to sink a Jap ship was Colin Kelly.

Second. First American to kill a Jap was Michael Murphy.

Third. First American flyer to bag five planes was Edward O'Hare.

Fourth. First American to be eulogized for bravery by the President was John Patrick Powers.

Fifth. First American Coast Guard member to catch a spy was John Patrick Cullin.

Sixth. First American to make himself a human torpedo was Edward O'Rourke.

Although the War Department does not classify data on the basis of nationality, the Irish War Veterans, United States of America, have estimated that during World War II 3,500,000 persons of Irish or part-Irish descent served in the armed forces.

What exactly have the Irish contributed to the American way of life?

The first thing that we can say is that the Irishman has cooperated enthusiastically to make the American way of life what it is.

Second. He energized both the democratic struggle for liberty and equality, and the struggle for territorial expansion.

Third. Even when he did not introduce a higher spiritual insight into individual living, he did introduce a loyalty to ancient spiritual sanctions sadly needed in American life.

Fourth. He contributed to the drive for social welfare, particularly the welfare of labor.

Fifth. He introduced an element of flashing humor into every difficult situation.

Sixth. He introduced a strain of poetic tenderness into neighborliness in American life.

Seventh. In company with his Celtic cousins in America, the Pennsylvania Germans, he introduced a love for the land and a skill in farming and conservation of natural resources, which, after 300 years of reckless exploitation, bids fair to set the example for a universal program of conservation.

Yes the sons and grandsons of Ireland have done as much as the men of any other race or nation to energize, spiritualize, and humanize the American way of life.

Is This a Partial Reason for New England's Troubles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a letter I received from Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers' Union, points out vividly some of the handicaps under which the New England area suffers. A pointed disregard by the Democratic administration of New England's problems is clearly demonstrated. Administration nonreciprocal trade policies; maintenance of excise taxes; political misuse of natural resources; and lack of representation on Federal agencies and boards all work to the disadvantage of this pioneer industrial area. Mr. Cenerazzo is an intelligent, broad-minded union leader, who realizes that what benefits America also benefits all of its citizens. I commend his communication to your perusal:

THE AMERICAN WATCH WORKERS' UNION,
Waltham, Mass., March 13, 1950.

Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Believing that you, as an elected official representing a segment of the New England population, are interested in the well-being and prosperity of New England, I am taking this opportunity of presenting to you some serious observations which I have made during the past several months in my efforts to obtain Federal Government assistance to preserve the century-old Waltham Watch Co.

It is my strong belief that the principal reason New England's economy is declining, that we are unable to compete satisfactorily on domestic markets, and that we have such rising unemployment is that New England does not have representation in the Federal Government agencies having to do with business and commerce.

The 10 Northeast States of the Union, the 6 New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio have 70 percent of the unemployment in the United States; and we, in New England, have a great percentage of this unemployment. These statistics make it apparent that New England could have a real depression while the rest of the United States would be fairly prosperous.

I would like to bring to your attention that there are only two New Englanders serving on the boards of all the independent agencies in our Federal Government: Paul Rowan on the Securities and Exchange Commission and Sumner Pike on the Atomic Energy Commission. Nowhere else will you find a resident of New England on the board of an independent agency.

When we realize the powerful impact independent agencies of Government have on our economy, it is cause for grave concern for the residents of New England. New England has no representation on the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the many other important independent agencies of our Federal Government.

In addition to this, we have no representation at the top level in the administration of the economic recovery program or in the Commercial Division of the State Department, where many important economic decisions are being made that affect the commerce of New England.

As for the Cabinet of the President of the United States, two New Englanders serve on it. Neither one has accomplished anything for the economy of New England in his present position. Of course, Attorney General McGrath has to do only with the courts of justice and law enforcement.

But Secretary of Labor Tobin is an advocate of the Fair Deal program which includes increasing the minimum-wage structure supposedly to equalize competitive conditions between the North and the South. This program advocates collective bargaining which brings about, and rightly so, increased wages, paid holidays, paid vacations, pension plans, group insurance, and other increment benefits.

What this program does not take into consideration is that Secretary of Labor Tobin has never raised his voice to speak out against those in the present national Democratic administration who have brought about the entry of foreign goods into the American market produced by workmen who do not exercise collective bargaining, and obtain wages far less than do American workmen.

It is unfair to raise the domestic cost of production through such measures as Secretary of Labor Tobin advocates and then allow goods to compete with domestic production from foreign countries that have no such comparable unit costs. There is no equality at the border today between domestic goods and foreign imports.

Most of the tariff cuts put into effect by the national Democratic administration have been on goods that directly compete with

New England products, rather than with products manufactured in other parts of the country. There is a great inconsistency in the program of Secretary of Labor Tobin and the actions of the Democratic national administration.

Add to the entry of foreign goods into the United States, at far less than we can produce them for in the United States, the effect of the basing-point decision which requires steel companies to charge freight from the factory to point of delivery, is having on the machine-tool industry and fabricated products here in New England, and one must come to the conclusion that dire days are ahead for us in New England unless drastic action is taken to change the pattern of our National Government.

Excise taxes on manufactured goods and transportation have sharply curtailed retail sales on manufactured goods. Inventory has piled up on the retail, wholesale, and factory level, causing lay-offs. New England has been particularly hard hit because of these excise taxes, as we are particularly an economy of many small companies in the manufacturing business. The Fair Deal program does not take the effect excise taxes are having on the New England economy into consideration.

Another point of great importance to us here in New England is that the Federal Power Act does not take into consideration that New England was densely populated before electricity was put into commercial use. The distribution lines for electricity were established by private utilities, and there is little room for expansion of distribution lines in New England. Our problem is the generation of power, not the distribution of power. To date, the Federal Government, through the Federal Power Act, prohibits New England utilities from utilizing Government funds in the creation of hydroelectric projects and the use of water power. No other method or program can give to the people of New England cheaper electricity than the creation of hydroelectric power and allowing the present utility systems to distribute it. Yet, the Fair Deal program talks about cheap power for New England but refuses to pass the enabling legislation to the Federal Power Act which would bring about cheaper power. It would rather castigate the private utilities than adopt the program that would coordinate Federal Government assistance and private distribution through existing utilities.

When one takes into consideration the amount of money which New Englanders pay in Federal taxation, both direct and indirect, and the small percentage of this that returns to New England, it seems to me that regardless of party affiliation, you, as an elected official, should help organize an effective voice to protect New England by the appointment of New Englanders to every independent agency of the Federal Government dealing with our economy.

I hope that you will find this information of interest to you.

Very truly yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President.

Kerr Natural-Gas Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Emby Kaye, of Tulsa, Okla., published under the heading, "Kerr natural-gas proposal," in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR NATURAL GAS PROPOSAL—A COMMUNICATION

The press from Washington has carried several attacks against Senator KERR keyed to his espousal of certain amendments of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. The Kerr bill seeks only to preserve by law the right of an independent producer of gas—operating at arm's length from a pipe line or distributing company—to make a contract for the sale of gas from his own wells without regulation of any Federal agency.

The bill, if enacted into law, will not, per se, increase the price of gas, either in the field or at the consumer level. Under the present law, the Federal Power Commission has not claimed and never has exercised the right to control the price at which gas "in the field" is sold to the pipe line. The price has under the present law increased from 3 and 4 cents per thousand cubic feet to 6 cents in many fields and in some instances to as much as 10 cents a thousand cubic feet, with step-up provisions beyond these prices for future years. What the Kerr bill seeks is to confirm the present practice—the right of a producer to sell gas at arm's length at the best price the seller can obtain and which the buyer is willing to pay.

Oil and gas production are part of our free enterprise system. Unless there is nationalization or confiscation, or unless the business is by an irrational philosophy decided to be a public utility, there is no place for price fixing in that industry. Natural gas is not a monopoly. There are many fields producing gas which have no markets today. It is available to buyers.

City gas plants are not dependent upon natural gas. In the Eastern seaboard, practically every large city has contracted for and is clamoring for a larger share of available natural gas for one reason: It is cheaper than artificial or manufactured gas produced from coal or oil.

Gas companies taking on natural gas generally maintain their plants in working contion, against emergencies. Many continue to produce gas and blend their low B. t. u. gas with natural gas. If gas should unreasonably be advanced in price, the buyer could reduce his take and manufacture a larger proportion of his requirements. But that is not in the cards because purchase contracts are set up for long periods, generally 20 years. Certainly if fuel oil was to drop to the prices of a year ago or even lower, and gas could be manufactured at a lower cost than natural gas can be obtained, natural gas lines would get no new customers, and would be held to minimum deliveries by old ones.

Hitherto the producing end of the natural-gas industry did not have to worry about the prospect of the Federal Power Commission fixing or limiting the price of gas at the well. Even today, with a tremendous market, gas in the field is generally underpriced, often brings 3 or 4 cents under life-of-lease contracts entered into many years ago. As a result, the regulatory authorities in the States of Oklahoma and Kansas have established by law or regulation a price of 7 and 8 cents, respectively, as the minima to be paid at the well. The courts are to test the validity of these steps. The writer does not applaud this means of obtaining an equitable price for gas.

The dispatches argue that a 6-percent profit set for utilities ought to be enough for a natural-gas producer, that such a profit would content other industries. It is one thing to be content with 6-percent profit but quite another to have it fixed by the Government. As to the oil and gas industry, price fixing at the well is not sound. The critics apparently do not understand the hazards of drilling for oil and gas. Dry holes and poor wells must be paid for out of income of those wells which produce. The law of supply and demand should determine the price.

I wonder whether the dispatches referring to "closing the loophole which permits oil and gas drillers and mining companies to charge off excessive depletion allowances" give the correct picture. The provisions in the present Federal income-tax laws governing "depletion and the charge of intangible development costs as expense have been worked out by Congress over a period of years as equitable and economical means of providing the necessary incentive for petroleum development that is indispensable to national welfare and security."

The Kerr bill seeks to give the approval of Congress to the historical practice in the industry so that a basically sound business philosophy might not be overturned at the whim of a commission, when chance changes the political or economic complexion of that commission. So basic a change, if ever made, should be in the purview of the Congress and not in the power of one of its creatures.

EMBY KAYE.

TULSA, OKLA.

Red Herrings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Leader, the daily newspaper of my home town, Madison, S. Dak., on the intriguing subject of red herrings.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRAWL STROKE

No recent political event has given this column more of a charge than yesterday's statement by Dean Acheson that maybe Alger Hiss wasn't such a good boy, at that.

This whole story of Russian spy entanglements in the executive departments of the Government, dating back to the Roosevelt regime, is gradually unfolding, step by step, until some day we will get it all.

First, the Un-American Activities Committee, of which KARL MUNDT, then a Representative, was an active member, was regarded by the administration and certain left-wing commentators as just a bunch of blundering publicity seekers.

There was much writing about unfounded charges against sterling citizens, who didn't have a chance to defend themselves as their reputations were being smeared in public.

One by one, some of these gents wandered into jail, and some of us rustics out in the hinterlands began to wonder whether our KARL hadn't dug up something important.

MUNDT kept coming back to South Dakota and, in speeches and interviews, told the story of the committee's work more fully.

About that stage, Mr. Truman pulled his red-herring remark, which has been quoted against him so many, many times.

When the committee actually prodded the Department of Justice to act on some of the evidence it had cleared, people started jumping off rooftops, indictments began to

pop out of grand-jury rooms, and in general the red herring began to assume the proportions of a red whale.

Although Alger Hiss was at Yalta, and MUNDT and others declare he was Roosevelt's principal adviser there on far-eastern affairs, the State Department's version of the Yalta Conference, recently published in a national magazine, doesn't mention Hiss in any way. He was the little man who wasn't there when we gave away Asia to Stalin in return for his staying in the war which was already won.

Now Acheson begins to admit that the jury which convicted Hiss might possibly be right. We thought in our stupid way that when a man is convicted by a Federal jury, he is guilty.

Next thing, we may get an official statement from the White House that maybe Boss Pendergast, of Kansas City, was the leader of a corrupt political machine.

But we doubt that.

Disability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the New York Times, by Mrs. Abraham Epstein, giving reasons why permanent total disability insurance should be included in the pending social-security bill, H. R. 6000.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABILITY INSURANCE—ITS INCORPORATION IN SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM IS ADVOCATED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Senate Committee on Finance is now holding hearings on H. R. 6000, the House-approved social-security bill. From the standpoint of the welfare of the American people, this is one of the most significant bills before this Congress. Among the improvements which H. R. 6000 would make in our social-security program is the provision of insurance against permanent and total disability, one of the most important links in the social-security structure. The adoption of disability insurance is an essential step toward greater security for Americans.

A majority of the groups who have studied the problem within recent years have concluded that permanent and total disability insurance is desirable. Fifteen out of seventeen members of the advisory council on social security appointed by the Senate Finance Committee recommended permanent and total disability insurance; a majority of the House Ways and Means Committee recommended the adoption of this type of protection; and last fall the House of Representatives overwhelmingly voted for disability insurance along with other amendments.

A minority, however, has recommended that needy disabled persons be taken care of through public assistance, with no provision for disability insurance benefits. Adoption of this recommendation would make it impossible to attain the objectives which these very groups wish to achieve—the strengthening of our social-insurance system and reduction of our swelling assistance loads. Prolonged total disability is one of the chief causes of poverty in the United States. At the present time over three-quarters of a million persons are on the federally aided public-assistance rolls because of disability, and an additional one-third of a million receive State or locally financed general assistance because the person who would normally support them is disabled.

The only way to keep the assistance burden down to a reasonable level is to provide disability benefits on a social-insurance basis.

The bill under consideration by the Senate committee would tie in the disability insurance closely with State vocational rehabilitation programs. The conservation of human resources which will result from this fact alone will save the Nation untold millions of dollars. Disability insurance and rehabilitation work hand in hand; a small, steady income, which the worker has helped to pay for, through his social-insurance contributions, assists in maintaining his morale and his desire to return to productive work, as well as the financial resources of the family, especially if there are added provisions for dependents similar to those of the old-age and survivors insurance program. Such insurance benefits would give a basic feeling of security and independence, but would be low enough so that the disabled person's incentive to improve his condition would not be destroyed.

The Nation can no longer afford the tremendous waste attendant on the continued neglect of our disabled population; adoption of disability insurance is essential to prevent this waste.

HENRIETTE C. EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, *February 16, 1950.*

A Reasonably Effective Defense Is Possible, if We Are Willing To Pay the Price, But We Cannot Rely on Defense Alone—The Enemy's Greatest Problem Is the Damage We Can Inflict Upon His Homeland and Source of Strength—For This Reason Our Strategic Striking Force Is the Greatest Deterrent to War Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that today's press carries a report that some of the members of the House Committee on Appropriations now wish to cut the defense budget for the coming fiscal year below the thirteen billion requested by Secretary of Defense Johnson as approved by the Bureau of the Budget and sent to the Hill by President Truman.

But a short time ago we were hearing a great deal spoken about the fact that in his administration of the Department of National Defense during the year he has been in office that Secretary Johnson had saved too much money; that his defense economy program had not alone "fried a lot of fat out of the armed services" and had saved hundreds of millions through the elimination of duplication of effort in defense activities but that he had made the savings at the expense of national security.

Mr. Speaker, there is no disputing the fact that Louis Johnson has affected a savings of nearly a billion and a half dollars in the last year and that he did so in the face of rising costs. At the same time, however, I am convinced that he improved the national defense as well as the security of the Nation.

When I think of Louis Johnson and his critics, I am ofttimes reminded of another great and good friend whom I shall always remember. He was possessed of one of the most intelligent, scholarly, and informed minds and was indisputably one of the most beloved men who ever served in the Senate of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to our good and mutual friend, the late Honorable Senator Ellison D. Smith, who for more than 35 years represented the State of South Carolina in the Senate of these United States.

Senator Smith, or "Cotton Ed," as he was affectionately called by his friends, not unlike Louis Johnson, frequently found himself the stormy center of heated debate while serving in capacity of chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

Senator Smith then had to contend with the cockeyed economic program of Henry Agard Wallace, the program for plowing up cotton, burning wheat, and drowning pigs—as practiced in the Wallace administration of our agricultural affairs.

I remember sitting one evening with Senator Smith, Senator Bankhead, our good friend Senator GEORGE, Congressman Kleberg, and several others engaged in a discussion apropos of the great surplus of agricultural products, which, then as now, were burdening our agricultural economy and had resulted in a marked decline in farm prices.

With a humorous twinkle in his eye, Senator Smith referred to the criticisms being leveled at him for the factually sound program he advanced with respect to the economic administration of our national farm problem.

He told of how he had certain senatorial colleagues who had condemned him for not supporting certain proposals they advanced and who were now condemning him for supporting those very proposals when made applicable to similar problems.

In fact he said he was reminded of a little jingle that goes something like this:

I can and I can't, I will and I won't
I'll be damned if I do, and I'll be damned if I don't.

Mr. Speaker, as it was with Senator Ed Smith, so it is with our great Secretary of Defense. He too has been criticized for having already affected a savings of nearly a billion and a half dollars and for having removed 151,542 from the civilian pay roll instead of the 135,000 promised.

He has been criticized for having reduced last year's expenditures, for having constituted himself as the watchdog of the Federal Treasury, and not spending all that the Congress appropriated

and—now comes critical proposal that he has not cut it enough—now it is proposed that the Congress itself should still cut expenditures by whittling another billion or two off the defense appropriations without regard to the security of the Nation.

That just does not make sense.

All of the foregoing is a sort of a prologue to the introduction of a talk delivered by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, at San Bernardino, Calif., on Friday, March 10.

It is a notable fact that every statement that comes to our notice from our Air Force today closely exhibits the business administrative program laid down by the Honorable Stuart Symington with respect to the administration operations and maintenance of the Department of the Air Force the very day that he was named as the first Secretary of that newly created Department of President Truman 2 years ago.

The United States Air Force is now recognized on a Nation-wide basis—as a young, virile, direct-action department of government headed up by young, administratively as well as battle-trained and seasoned veteran officers. Every statement which emanates from them is factual, short, brief, concise, and to the point.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg on that occasion, after a few complimentary remarks, limited himself to a mere 1,000 words, which were spoken in but 5 or 6 minutes.

Every sentence in General Vandenberg's speech is replete with facts. There is neither evasion nor verbose embellishment.

Certainly no man can read that statement and not recognize that the United States Air Force is on its toes and stands as one with the Secretary of Defense when he stated:

> We do not propose to be penny pinchers with national security. Security must always come first and economy second.

That statement is so brief, so timely, that it is something which, in the light of the cold war that now exists, should be read by every Member of this House.

It reads as follows:

I wish many more Americans could come to California at this time of the year and see how bright the sun and the sky and scenery can be. The experience would do a great deal to dispel some of the gloom that afflicts so many citizens at this time of the year. The gloom seems to be particularly thick this year, and not entirely without reason. Our Nation, despite its internal prosperity and progress, is faced with problems of military security which are more serious than ever before. No honest man who knows the facts can pretend that there are any simple and easy solutions. And we must not try to delude ourselves that there are any cheap solutions.

A few years ago we were so concerned about American lives that we paid little attention to dollars. We did spend a great amount of money. Under the leadership of the Secretary of Defense, all the services are making every possible effort to minimize the cost of national security.

Of all the services, the Air Force requires the highest investment in operating equipment. More than 2 years ago the Secretary of the Air Force insisted upon the introduction of modern management and cost-control methods into Air Force administration. We are very proud of our accomplishments in this respect, and of our increased savings and efficiency.

Our principal problem in the atomic age, however, is not one of savings, but of adequate defense. As the Secretary of Defense has said, we "do not propose to be penny pinchers with national security. Security must always come first and economy second."

A few weeks ago Mr. Symington, speaking at Baylor University, enumerated three facts which every American should know:

"1. Behind the iron curtain there has been an atomic explosion.

"2. Behind that iron curtain is the air equipment capable of delivering a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

"3. We have no sure defense against such an attack."

These statements are undeniably true and they are portentous.

The ability to conduct intercontinental warfare is no longer a future possibility. It is a present-day fact, with which we Americans must learn to live from now on. The employment of atomic energy in intercontinental warfare is no longer a matter for sole decision by the United States. It appears that Russia will soon have the ability to launch such an attack in considerable strength. The grave question now facing us is whether this ability is increasing more rapidly than our own ability to resist such an attack.

It is true that we can scarcely hope to achieve a defense that is 100-percent effective. But a reasonably effective defense is possible, if we are willing to pay the price.

The fact that no absolute defense is possible does not mean that we should neglect to provide such defense as is feasible. But it does mean that we cannot rely on defense alone. Our ability to strike back is of first importance. The best defense cannot win a war; it can only postpone defeat. The greatest problem facing a potential enemy is not the damage we might do to his attacking force. His greatest problem is the damage our retaliatory striking force could inflict upon his homeland and his source of strength. For this reason the continued existence of our strategic striking force is the greatest deterrent to war today.

If we should be attacked, this strategic striking force will be our primary reliance for the destruction of the remaining aircraft and bases of the long-range force directed against us. It will also be our primary means of reducing the enemy's capacity to continue his war effort, so that we may have time to mobilize for ultimate victory. Within the means available to us, the Air Force must continue as a matter of priority the modernizing, supporting, and training of this strategic striking force. It must be immediately effective when called upon. This strategic striking force includes only 18 of our 48 groups and only 16 percent of our total personnel, but it is our most essential element of strength.

Our ability to strike back is our best deterrent to attack and our best insurance against defeat, but our ability to resist the staggering blows that can now be directed against us must be rapidly increased. No other course of action is possible. We must get our air-defense system into full operation and in place on the alert 24 hours a day. We can no longer plan or depend upon a time-consuming mobilization period for our air-defense forces. An atomic offensive might suddenly be launched against us without warning in one concentrated effort designed to saturate our limited defenses. Unless effectively opposed, such a surprise attack would cripple our ability to strike back through the air, destroy our Capital, and devastate our great industrial centers.

The Air Force has other missions and responsibilities. We must be able to provide adequate support for our forces on land and sea. The extent to which we can carry out all our responsibilities is, of course, dependent upon the resources that can be made available for our employment. It is not within my province, as a military man, to determine the amount of the resources the American people can afford to invest in purely military security. My duty as Chief of Staff of the Air Force and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is to estimate and to state our military needs as I see them.

The ultimate decision concerning the extent to which these needs can be met rests with the Government and the people of the United States. Speaking for the Air Force, I can promise you the best possible employment of the means provided to carry out our full share of responsibility for the security of the Nation.

In this air atomic age we must build that type of air defense and air striking power which will serve as a deterrent to any aggressor.

Only if we are willing to face the facts can we have insurance against defeat and the slavery which would inevitably follow.

Surely we must develop as far as possible the strength we need to guarantee our security and our freedom.

British National Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Never Take This Road," published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of Thursday, March 9, 1950. I particularly call attention to the statement of Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, on the health and medical situation in Great Britain. He states that there were 72,125 more deaths in Britain after the national health program went into effect than in the preceding year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NEVER TAKE THIS ROAD"

Harold E. Stassen recently returned from England, where he made an intensive study of Britain's health program—a program which is similar in many particulars to the compulsory government health insurance scheme proposed for this country, Mr. Stassen's findings have been summed up in a series of articles in Reader's Digest.

According to Mr. Stassen, Britain's version of socialized medicine has been characterized by a lower quality of care, for more people, at a higher cost. Preventive medicine is being grossly neglected. Doctor's time and energies are largely consumed by malingerers and hypochondriacs.

Worst of all, to quote Mr. Stassen directly, "During the first year of the operation of the British National Health Service * * * the death rate in Britain went up rather sharply! * * * In infant mortality, the death rate has shown an improvement, and

this has been hailed by those administering the program. The fact is, however, that the slight improvement in infant mortality * * * has not been as great an improvement proportionately as that which occurred in the United States and throughout the western world. * * *

"It does seem that the additional tombstones in the British cemeteries—72,125 more than in the year before the national health program went into effect—are grim signposts on which we can read: 'Never take this road.'"

Will Americans be wise enough to profit from this sad example?

Veterans Honor Hon. James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, for Service to the Veteran and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, was signally honored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on February 15, 1950, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., when he was awarded a certificate of recognition for service to veterans and the Nation.

The National Tribune-Stars and Stripes issue of March 16 contains the following article which I feel will be of interest to my colleagues:

VAN ZANDT IS CITED BY VFW FOR SERVICE TO VETS AND NATION

In mid-February Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, three times commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, was awarded a certificate of recognition by the VFW at a congressional dinner in the Presidential Room of the Hotel Statler in Washington.

Acting for Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, the citation was conferred on VAN ZANDT by Junior Vice Commander in Chief Frank C. Hilton, of Wyomissing, Pa. Hilton read the following record of VAN ZANDT's organization services:

Representative JAMES E. (JIMMY) VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, has the unique distinction of being the only member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be chosen three times as commander in chief of our organization.

Naturally, we of the VFW think of "JIMMY" in terms of his outstanding service to the veterans of this Nation. We recall his election to the highest office which the VFW can bestow on any American in 1933. The qualities of leadership which he displayed and his militant battle on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents in the days of the famous Economy Act were widely recognized by the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and were effectively expressed by his unanimous reelection as commander in chief in 1934 and again in 1935.

We realize, of course, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has no exclusive claim to the leadership qualities, conscientious devotion to duty or dynamic ability of "JIMMY" VAN ZANDT. His entire life has been one continuous series of achievements, and for as many different groups or causes.

"JIMMY" VAN ZANDT was born in Altoona, Pa., December 18, 1898. He enlisted in the United States Navy a few days after the entry of the United States into World War I. After 2½ years of outstanding service he was discharged from the Navy with the rank of chief quartermaster. He immediately enlisted in the Naval Reserve and has been an active member to this date. In fact "JIMMY" almost failed to make the dinner tonight because he had a Naval Reserve inspection earlier this evening.

I know it is unnecessary for me to remind his colleagues in Congress of the contributions of Congressman VAN ZANDT to the security of our Nation in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, and Seventy-eighth Congresses. And we World War II veterans gratefully remember his successful efforts to secure a $50 monthly base pay for service personnel and provisions for dependency allotments.

The World War II service record of "JIMMY" VAN ZANDT was one of the finest in the armed forces. He earned three promotions in recognition of his courage, leadership, skill, navigation, and gunnery prowess. He was in command of LST units that landed Navy, Marine, and Army combat units and serviced them at 26 beachheads. He was promoted to captain and awarded the Bronze Star and the Naval Reserve Medal with Oak Leaf for more than 20 years of meritorious service.

Elected to the Eightieth Congress in 1946 "JIMMY" has continued his courageous support of those programs, sponsored in a large measure by the VFW, designed to promote the security of our Nation and the welfare of our citizens.

It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I, as a fellow Pennsylvanian and a comrade of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, present to Past Commander in Chief JAMES E. VAN ZANDT this certificate of recognition of his outstanding service to the VFW and the veterans of our Nation.

The Chance Was There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, March 15, 1950:

THE CHANCE WAS THERE

General Motors has just announced its 1949 profits—the biggest in United States history, 49 percent greater than GM's 1948 all-time high, 11.5 percent of its return from total sales.

We would be the last to begrudge General Motors this success. We only wish all the automobile manufacturers could approach such prosperity. It represents a triumph in sales enterprise and efficiency engineering. But, we are compelled to observe, GM has also scored something considerably less than a triumph in human engineering.

Just 2 weeks before announcing these record profits GM took full advantage of the cost-of-living clause in its contract with the United Auto Workers and cut employees' wages 2 cents an hour. It cut its car prices, too. But only $10 to $40.

The company acted fully within its rights. But, in the light of its extraordinary prosperity, and in the light of the rudiments of good human relations, did it have to? Might it not have invoked its contractual rights and then waived them?

The union lived up to its part of the contract and took the cut quietly. But when bargaining for a new contract opens in May, if the company is confronted with some extreme demands (and report now says it will be) and a militant union, GM's management should not be surprised.

Reply to Specious Arguments Opposing Reorganization Plan No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a resolution—House Resolution 512—proposing a rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 12 which President Truman recently submitted to the Congress together with 20 other reorganization plans, has been introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]. To enter such resolutions of disapproval is the privilege of every Member, but I must caution the Members that the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois to support his resolution of disapproval contains, in my opinion, misleading, distorted, and specious arguments. His statement will be found in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1927.

The gentleman from Illinois alleges first, that the plan is an illegal attempt, under the guise of being a Hoover Commission recommendation, to destroy the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act. In behalf of his allegation, he cites section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 which provides in subsection (4) that no reorganization plan shall have the effect of authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transferred to Congress. He argues that this subsection prohibits the President from vesting the National Labor Relations Board with the functions of the office of general counsel.

The gentleman indulges himself in a plain misreading of the law. By Reorganization Plan No. 12 the President is not authorizing the National Labor Relations Board to exercise any new statutory function. The President is merely authorizing the Board or its Chairman to exercise the functions heretofore vested in the Office of General Counsel. This is a simple transfer of functions within an agency, and the authority for such reorganization is amply and clearly contained in the Reorganization Act of 1949. The President is specifically empowered by that act to prepare reorganization plans to, first, make transfers of one agency or function to the jurisdiction or control of another agency; second, abolish all or any part of the functions of any agency; third, consoli-

date or coordinate the whole or any part of an agency or function with the whole or any part of another agency or function; fourth, consolidate or coordinate any part of an agency or its functions with another part of the same agency or its functions; fifth, authorize any officer to delegate any of his functions; and sixth, abolish the whole or any part of an agency which loses its functions upon reorganization.

What can be more clear than the authority of the President, particularly under items 2, 4, and 6, to transfer the functions of the Office of the General Counsel to the National Labor Relations Board or its Chairman, and to abolish the office?

The gentleman alleges secondly that the Hoover Commission did not recommend that the Office of General Counsel be entirely abolished and its functions transferred to the Board and its Chairman. By using the word "entirely" the gentleman begins to give away his case, for he implies that the Hoover Commission favored abolishing the office at least in part. The fact is that the Hoover Commission did not address itself specifically to the Office of General Counsel in the National Labor Relations Board. However, in its report on regulatory commissions the Hoover Commission flatly and unequivocally states as its first recommendation: "We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission." The Hoover Commission listed nine regulatory commissions of the Federal Government, including the National Labor Relations Board. By Reorganization Plan No. 12 the President proposes to carry out this basic recommendation in the case of the National Labor Relations Board, thereby making its administrative relationship of Chairman to Board identical with that of the other regulatory agencies for which reorganization plans have been submitted.

Apparently the gentleman fails to understand that the fulfillment of this basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission in respect to the National Labor Relations Board requires that the present division of responsibility and the administrative confusion created by the independent statutory Office of General Counsel be eliminated. Anyone who has studied the Hoover Commission reports and accepted their basic principles of government organization knows that one principle was emphasized above all others; namely, that clear lines of authority and responsibility be established and maintained. This was indeed the very first of all the Commission's recommendations, and one which all of the Commission members regarded as basic and fundamental. Reorganization Plan No. 12 is in accord with this recommendation as well as with the one specifically relating to the vesting of administrative responsibility in the chairman of each regulatory agency.

The gentleman cites the Hoover Commission's task force report on regulatory commissions to support his stand against Reorganization Plan No. 12. The citation is to a sentence on page 141 of that report (appendix N) which reads: "It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities." This is not a recommendation of the Hoover Commission; it is not even a recommendation of the task force; it is merely a tentative suggestion advanced in a discussion of various proposals for a better integration of the functions of the General Counsel in the Government structure. If anything, this suggestion supports the action of the President in Reorganization Plan No. 12 rather than the continuation of an administrative arrangement which is regarded as intolerable even by friends of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The task force plainly indicated its reluctance to make specific recommendations in a field so charged with controversial elements—appendix N, page 137. However, certain conclusions were drawn by the task force from its discussion, and the one relating to the matter at issue here, reads as follows:

> The Office of General Counsel should not be left independent of both the Board and the executive departments but should be integrated more closely into one or the other according to the functions to be performed. (Appendix N, p. 141.)

Nothing in this conclusion can lend comfort to the resolution of rejection introduced by the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman favors himself by citing the task-force report to the effect "that the Office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board was somewhat unique." The words quoted are the gentleman's own construction of what the task-force report said. Its indictment of the Office of General Counsel was far stronger than "somewhat unique." The task-force report pointed out in chapter XIII dealing with the National Labor Relations Board that the Board had been changed from a "unified organization" under the Wagner Act to a "bifurcated agency" under the Taft-Hartley Act—appendix N, page 134. It stated with regard to the Office of General Counsel:

> The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility. (Appendix N, p. 139.)

The task-force report pointed out further that the General Counsel is "in a peculiarly exposed position," subjected to heavy pressures without agency protection and tending to seek unduly for congressional committee advice in self-defense, thus blurring the desirable separation of legislation and administration—appendix N, pages 139–140. The task force also described the administrative position of the General Counsel as "anomalous" and giving rise by virtue of this unusual position with its divided administrative authority to severe internal problems of administration.

Our conclusion—

Reported the task force—

> is that the present position of the General Counsel is an unstable one. (Appendix N, p. 140.)

As demonstrated above, the task force left open the question of the final disposition of this office, seeing, as one of several possible alternatives, integration within the Board. This alternative was taken by the President in Reorganization Plan No. 12, particularly since the failure to do so would have rendered impossible the carrying out of the basic Hoover Commission recommendation to vest administrative responsibility in the Chairman of the Board. The Taft-Hartley Act had divided up administrative responsibility between the Board and its General Counsel.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in its majority report relating to repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and proposed new labor-management legislation, referred to "the evil of dual policy making" consequent upon the creation of the independent General Counsel under the Taft-Hartley Act and noted examples of internal agency friction and conflict which have plagued the Board since enactment of the 1947 law. The majority concluded on this point:

> The operation of the act to date fully vindicates the opposition to the establishment of the independent office of General Counsel. In the guise of separating the adjudicative and prosecutive functions, the act has transferred vast prosecutive, administrative, and injunctive powers to the General Counsel at the most critical stages of labor disputes. When to this concentration of power is added the internal disruption and the uncertainty and delay which the present system engenders, the conclusion is compelling that this experiment in two-headed administration has proved a costly mistake and should be scrapped (81st Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. No. 99, p. 41).

The minority report agreed with this conclusion to the extent of eliminating completely from its own version of the labor-management bill section 3 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act which had set up the office and authority of the General Counsel—Eighty-first Congress, first session, Senate Report No. 99, part 2, page 69.

Senator TAFT explained in the floor debate that the minority had agreed that the provision for the Office of General Counsel should be eliminated and "that we should return to the administrative procedure of the National Labor Relations Board"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 8712.

The Taft-Donnell-Smith version of the bill, with the Office of General Counsel abolished, passed the Senate on June 30, 1949.

Thus it is plain that both leading proponents as well as opponents of the Taft-Hartley law see no value in continuing the anomalous administrative

position of the General Counsel. Certainly its continuation cannot be justified on grounds of administrative efficiency and orderly conduct of governmental affairs. The Washington Evening Star, in an editorial of March 15 on the President's reorganization plan, states:

As a purely administrative matter, the division of authority between the Board and its counsel has not worked at all well. It is, at best, a clumsy arrangement.

The Star, in defense of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, raises the question whether administrative efficiency should not be sacrificed to the continued existence of a "Taft-Hartley policeman" in the person of the General Counsel. If this is the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois in opposing Reorganization Plan No. 12, then he is guilty of the action he attributes in such heated accents to President Truman; namely, attempting to foist a particular labor-management policy on the Government at the expense of efficient Government administration.

The President is proceeding in accord with a basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission. Whoever opposes this reorganization plan must bear the burden of opposing the most widely accepted principle of organization recommended by the Hoover Commission. In the President's words, Reorganization Plan No. 12 "eliminates a basic defect in the present organization of the National Labor Relations Board and provides an organizational pattern consistent with that established for other regulatory agencies."

Many Questions Raised by Electoral Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of March 12, 1950:

MANY QUESTIONS RAISED BY ELECTORAL REFORMS—HOUSE TAKES A CRITICAL VIEW OF LODGE AMENDMENT FOR THE PROPORTIONAL PLAN ACCEPTED BY THE SENATE—POLITICS IS A MAJOR FACTOR

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—The road to reform in the method of choosing Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States is littered with the wrecks of previous attempts. Though the inequalities and other defects of the present system are generally conceded, it has been protected from change for more than a hundred years by a mixture of natural American conservatism where the letter of the Constitution is concerned and a bipartisan political combination effected by what some major party politicians believed to be self-interest.

This same combination, unless overwhelming public opinion favors a change and registers itself as it rarely does no such issues, may once more defeat the most promising movement in this respect since the old method of choosing electors by districts was replaced by that of awarding all of the electors of a State to the candidates for President and Vice President who get a plurality, however small, over all others.

The current effort is the result of spade work begun in the early thirties by the then Representative Clarence Lea, of California, in which he was later joined by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee (then a Representative) Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas and a few more. At the last session of this Congress Mr. LODGE began the reform drive, of which he has become the spearhead and which owes its progress chiefly to him, that culminated when the Senate unexpectedly, on February 1, 1950, approved—64 to 27—the submission to the people of the Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution. This would prorate a State's electors in proportion to the popular vote cast for the several national candidates.

BLOCKED IN 7-TO-4 VOTE

But now it has been blocked in the Rules Committee of the House where 7 of the 11 members have refused to give the amendment a privileged place on the docket. The fact that three southern Democrats and one Republican from Mr. LODGE's State (Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER) voted to bring out the bill, and that four northern Democrats, and three northern Republicans voted not to, illustrates how the professional politicians think it would operate.

Together with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, a number of northern Republicans view the amendment this way from the standpoint of purely party interest:

It would always give the Democratic national candidates some electors in the populous doubtful States outside the South which over the years have gone more often to the Republicans en bloc under the present system. These electors would far outnumber the few which the Republican ticket might hope to pick up in the South by the prorata method of the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

The southern Democrats generally favor the amendment on this same reasoning; also because they think the South would regain its old place in the Democratic Party councils through the obvious fact that henceforth movements like that of the 1948 Dixiecrats would carry a larger defeat potential for the national party ticket.

BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION

A roving bipartisan band opposes any electoral change, partly because of natural conservatism, partly because they fear the Lodge-Gossett plan would encourage the formation of splinter parties. (Curiously enough, its authors are confident it would end the power of shifting, usually radical, groups which now hold or assert a large enough following to tilt an entire State bloc of electors.)

In agreement with this bipartisan band of rovers are many leaders of such groups.

Despite this mix-up of views, the Lodge-Gossett amendment has the support of President Truman and the spokesmen of Americans for Democratic Action—both very practical when it comes to politics.

Yet long experience with the present system has shown its operation can, and has, put Presidents in the White House with less than a majority of the popular vote and thrown national elections into the House of Representatives. If the Republican farm States from Ohio to Iowa had not given Mr. Truman the small pluralities he got there this would have happened again in 1948.

SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE

However, since the Senate approved submission of the Lodge-Gossett amendment (it must pass both branches by two-thirds and be approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures before it can become a part of the Constitution), it has been subjected to less selfish and nonpartisan scrutiny on a merit test. This has produced some support for the alternative reform proposed by Representative F. R. COUDERT, JR., of New York City, which reverts to the original method and was described by Madison as the one "mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted."

The Coudert amendment provides that each State be divided before a national election into electoral districts, which could have the same boundaries as the districts in which Members of the House are chosen. These districts would equal in number those which elect a Member of the House of Representatives. Each of these districts would then, by majority or plurality, choose a single Presidential and Vice Presidential elector, and the entire voting population of the State would select two others at large.

MANY SUPERIORITIES

The superiorities of this method over the Lodge-Gossett amendment are many. It dispels the factor of proportional representation which in practice, especially in Europe and the New York City Council, has given radical splinter groups disproportionate power to block and confuse. It maintains the geographical constituencies and gives an equal voice to equal units of the population rather than to equal aggregations of those who go to the polls. To make the district groupings wholly equitable, Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, who is a leading authority on electoral reform in this country, would require Congress to create, for national elections uses only, compact and contiguous districts containing, as nearly as practicable, an equal number of inhabitants.

Until, in Jackson's time, the system of submitting State-wide tickets which acquired all a State's electors by a mere plurality became general—it is now universal—the Coudert-Wilmerding proposal was the practice. One of its best effects is to prevent an entire State bloc of electors going to a candidate merely because of bad weather in the rural districts or because of the inequitable weight of an acute local issue in one district.

But the Coudert plan has found no favor with the political leaders of the House, one probable reason being that it is concerned entirely with sound reform and not with possible political consequences to the major parties and their internal factions as they now exist. The virtues of the proposal from the standpoint of the public interest, which Mr. Wilmerding has made plain, have thus far evoked no strong interest in the House.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement I made a few days

ago before the House Ways and Means Committee relating to a number of changes in excise taxes which I have proposed.

In my original statement I filed a num- of bills, reports, briefs, and so forth. I do not desire to have them placed in the RECORD today, but merely want to put in the remarks I actually made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I very much appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your distinguished committee today.

During the last few years I have introduced quite a number of bills and proposed quite a number of amendments relating to various excise taxes. To date, very few of them have been favorably acted upon since this is the first real study of the excise tax structure that has been undertaken by any congressional committee since the end of the war.

During the past few years a number of injustices and inequities have appeared, and I very much hope that Congress will do a thorough job of correcting these situations this year, since it may be some years before it will be possible to undertake another study of the excise tax structure.

There is no particular question of pride of authorship involved in these various proposals. I am not particular about who gets the credit for such changes as are made. I wanted to appear before this committee because, of course, all revenue measures must originate in the House. Also, I believe my proposals will have a better chance of ultimate passage if they are brought to the attention of this committee.

I shall not attempt to explain all of my proposed amendments in detail. Some of them have already been discussed in your hearings. I want to discuss just one or two. As to the others, I have prepared some written statements which I will file with the committee.

TAX ON "HOT TRACTOR FUEL"

I want to propose that section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code be amended in the manner provided by my bill, S. 2129. This amendment would eliminate the tax on tractor fuel. I would like to file a copy of my bill at this point.

This amendment will get rid of a useless and wasteful procedure which does not bring in one cent of revenue to the Federal Treasury. Under present law the definition of gasoline is so written that the Federal tax is levied upon a fuel used widely in my State and several other States known as "hot tractor fuel." This fuel was especially developed for use in tractors, and it has a higher boiling point than gasoline. Its properties are somewhere between those of gasoline and kerosene. It is used exclusively in tractors. It is absurd to classify this fuel as gasoline in the Federal Code.

Here is the point. The Federal Government does not get any revenue from the tax on this fuel now. The tax is all refunded to the user—the farmer. Our Internal Revenue Code sets up a system whereby the so-called gasoline tax can be refunded to the taxpayer if the fuel that is taxed is not used for propelling a motor vehicle along the highway or road. Under this system the farmers in my State and other States every year make out thousands of certificates certifying that "hot tractor fuel" that they buy is not used in a car or truck on the highway, and they get their money back. There is no revenue to the Federal Treasury as a result of including "hot tractor fuel" within the definition for gasoline. It simply requires a costly and time-consuming procedure of collecting a tax and then refunding it. Instead of losing Federal revenue, we can save on Federal expense if this amendment is adopted. We can cut out a lot of useless paper work that does not bring in any revenue.

I have introduced this bill, or a similar bill, several times. The Treasury has generally reported unfavorably on my bills. The only objection that the Treasury Department has been able to present, however, has been that this amendment would make more difficulties in administration.

My own State, Nebraska, also has a tax on gasoline, as do all the other States. In Nebraska, our State taxing authorities do not attempt to collect a tax on this fuel. The definition of gasoline is much more realistic. Our State law simply defines gasoline as any fuel with an initial boiling point under 200° Fahrenheit. I am informed that my State has no difficulty at all with enforcement of this tax, although the tax rate is much higher. In Nebraska we do not have a passion for useless paper work. If the State of Nebraska can administer a gasoline tax without trying to tax and refund on "hot tractor fuel," I do not see why the Bureau of Internal Revenue cannot administer the same kind of tax.

The farmers and the distributors of petroleum products in my State have been complaining about this whole foolish system for years. It makes unnecessary paper work. It requires the dealer to tie up hundreds of dollars unnecessarily in inventory and freezes his capital to that extent. The dealer suffers some loss when he neglects or is unable to secure the signature of the purchaser to the tax-exemption affidavit. It is just a nuisance all around.

This fuel cannot be used in a car. If you put a tankful in your car, it will not run. As a matter of fact, you cannot even start a tractor with it. You have to start your tractor with gasoline and then switch over to the lower cost "hot tractor fuel." I am advised that the type of automobile and truck that could burn tractor fuel in a mixture with gasoline has not been manufactured since 1931. I believe our tax law is just about 19 years out of date. I hope very much this committee will see fit to bring it up to date by adopting my amendment.

APPLICATION OF CABARET TAX TO BALLROOMS

The attention of the committee is invited to another proposal of mine, incorporated in S. 730, which would provide a specific exemption of ballrooms and dance halls from the carbaret tax. I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a copy of my bill, with the suggestion that some such language be incorporated as an amendment to the legislation that the committee is considering.

As the committee probably knows, a cabaret is generally a place providing food, drinks, and amusement in the way of a floor show or something of that sort. There is customarily no admission charge, and the tax is levied on the total bill rendered for the food and drinks consumed by the patron.

A ballroom or a public dance hall on the other hand provides primarily music and dancing facilities, and an admission is charged upon which the tax is paid at the time the patron enters the establishment. Any refreshments served are generally on the order of soft drinks, light sandwiches, and so forth.

During the past year there has been an attempt by some collectors of internal revenue to collect the cabaret tax on any items that may be sold inside the ballroom including soft drinks, sandwiches, cigarettes, charges for hat checking services, etc. I do not believe it was intended to collect a cabaret tax on these small incidental services and refreshments.

My proposal would make it clear that ballrooms would not have to pay an extra nuisance tax under the cabaret provision of the bill. They would, of course, continue paying the admissions tax. Both the admissions and cabaret taxes are at the rate of 20 percent.

Without going into this proposal in any great detail, I would like to file with the committee a brief that has been prepared for me on this subject.

TAX ON LIMOUSINE SERVICE TO AND FROM AIRPORTS

I now invite the attention of the committee to my bill, S. 181, of which I would like to place a copy at this point in the hearings. This bill is designed to correct an injustice. Under present law, taxicab services to and from airports is not subject to the tax on transportation of persons. Limousine service, covering perhaps the same group, is subject to the tax, which is 15 percent. This places firms operating such limousine services at a severe competitive disadvantage.

I do not believe we should discriminate in our tax treatment between the two types of services, but should treat them both equally and allow them to compete on a fair basis. I believe many of the limousine service have had the greatest difficulty in competing. In at least one case that came to my attention in my own State, it seemed that this discriminatory tax was driving the limousine operator out of business.

OTHER PROPOSED TAX CHANGES

This committee is already familiar with the proposal to exempt from the cosmetic tax those preparations used in a barber shop or beauty parlor. In fact, the committee and the House of Representatives approved a bill to take care of this situation, H. R. 3825, introduced by Congressman CURTIS, of Nebraska, in the Eightieth Congress. I will not take time to discuss this proposal, since the committee has previously studied it but will ask permission to place in your record a copy of my bill, S. 516, of this Congress, and also a copy of this committee's report (House Rept. 1970) on H. R. 3825 of the last Congress.

I have previously introduced a bill, S. 517, to exempt agricultural fairs from the admissions tax, and I hope the committee will consider that bill also. A great many other Members of Congress have likewise introduced similar bills, of course. I imagine that this committee if it takes the matter up might want to restore the exemptions for admissions to nonprofit, educational, and charitable functions as a group as we had before the war. I would like to place my bill on this subject in the record also (S. 517).

With respect to the general subject of excise-tax reduction, I proposed an amendment in the Senate a few weeks ago to a piece of pending legislation. My amendment provided for a fairly broad reduction in present excise-tax rates. I hope this committee will go just as far as we possibly can afford to go in cutting down or eliminating these wartime excise taxes.

I want to mention just one which I believe is particularly important, and that is the tax on photographic apparatus. I would like to place in the record at this time my bill, S. 515, which would make sharp reduction in the photographic tax.

I would also like to place in the record a letter I have received regarding the effect of this tax on the photographic industry. The committee will note that the tax has very seriously damaged production and employment in the industry and that volume in 1949 for the items subject to the 25-percent tax actually dropped almost 50 percent from the preceding year.

Annual Report of Wayne County (Iowa) Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Iowa, always forward looking, is taking no chances on losing its reputation for high productivity of its land, and in order to assure continued success in its great agricultural endeavors it is going all-out for soil conservation. An account of what is being done is contained in the annual report of the Wayne County, Iowa, soil conservation district, and for the benefit of other Members of Congress I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include this fine report of progress in my home county:

WAYNE COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT, DECEMBER 31, 1949

We, the Commissioners of Wayne County, take great pride and pleasure in presenting to you, the cooperators, our annual report for the year 1949.

We shall try to take stock for you of our accomplishments for the year in bold print; but, needless to say, there are some shortcomings of which we are not proud, but which we shall try in the future to remedy.

It seems fitting and proper for all of us to be proud of our county these days as we drive down the road and see the new barns going up, the full bins of corn, oats, and hay in them and piled up outside—the fact that we are making great strides in road surfacing, schooling; but the one that makes us swell our chest a little is the abundance of feed—and with less acres than before in the depression years of the thirties. We have come a long way since then and we feel that soil conservation has played a great part in this, the prosperity of the forties. When we think back over the forties, we have fought a long and prolonged World War; we have fought the equally important resurrection of those foreign countries, bankrupt, homeless, foodless, and without hope for the future, so that there is now some resemblance of hope in the world for peace and welfare. We have fought scourge of mankind—inflation. That is, we have the land almost free of encumbrance of debt; but think of this, gentlemen, even with all of the above happening in the decade of 1940 to 1949, the land of Wayne County is in better shape for production than before.

In looking back through the years it has always worked the other way. When a calamity faced the Nation the farmers would work to relieve the calamity, but with a loss of soil. To us this factor of soil conservation is the pay-off.

In the thirties, contouring, terracing, diversions, buffers, and the establishment of waterways were almost unheard-of practices. This is a start of a new age in farming, and demand for conservation has just begun. We repeat, the demand has just begun, and the clamor for help in conservation is so large that now four men are working night and day to take care of this great cry for help from the farmers.

The event to which goes a lot of credit is the annual field day, held this year at the Leroy P. Ohrt farm, 4½ miles south of Humeston. The field day was sponsored by the Wayne County USDA Council and made possible by contributions from the chambers of commerce from Humeston, Seymour, Corydon, Clio, and Allerton, the county farm equipment dealers, and earth-moving contractors—the Davis Bros. and Deane Bevard from Wayne County—and Mr. Henthorne from Decatur County.

This event was of only 1 day's duration, but in that day things really happened. Howard Ballew and his boys were responsible for a lot of planning with local organizations and field lay-out. Terraces, contour lines, surface drains, a pond, windbreak, and waterways were all carefully staked and established.

Bigger and better was the comment heard on all sides concerning the third annual field day held this year on the 22d day of September. It was estimated by the highway patrol that there were approximately 5,000 people visiting the various activities. It would be rather difficult to point out the outstanding event that day due to the various interests of farmers and their own pet projects. However, there were enough different projects present to keep everyone on his toes to see them all during the day.

Among the many distinguished guests and lookers-on were Dean Andre, Iowa State College; Herbie Hazen, chairman, PMA; Horace Chaney, agronomist, Iowa State College; Howard Oak, former Wayne County Work Unit Conservationist; Karl LeCompte, Representative in Washington from the Fourth Congressional District; Pearl McMurry, State senator; Gene Poston, State representative, and many others. Dean Andre gave an interesting and inspiring talk on agriculture.

An added feature of this year's field day was the State wildlife conservation exhibit. This exhibit of animals native to the State of Iowa attracted all the school children throughout the day and lots of grown-ups, too—like taking the kids to the circus—only pop wanted to go worse than the kids. One teacher was heard to remark that she had taken her children through three times, and that each time even she had seen something new and different to remember about the animals.

The plowing contest, held in connection with the field day, was very well received by the crowd in that very few of the people watching the contest had even seen one before this one. The contest was won by Dwane Lewis, with Rex Baker taking second, Howard Carter third, and Harley Sponsler fourth. The prizes were donated by the district commissioners and later reimbursed by the State committee.

The Humeston GI classes assisted in parking cars, getting canary grass for the establishment of waterways and various other jobs.

The district commissioners have embarked on a new program this year with the financial assistance of the State. Under a new law passed during the last legislature, Wayne County is to receive in money for conservation: $500 to be used to help pay the commissioners' yearly expense—transportation, advertising, postage, and printing, and so forth; and $2,000 to apply on additional help for the Soil Conservation personnel in the office and in the field, buying machinery to assist the farmers in their conservation programs and to buy equipment for the district.

We, the district commissioners, felt the crying need of most farmers was terracing equipment and, therefore, plans are going forward to the purchase of a whirlwind terracer to be loaned out to the cooperators for their own use in making their own terraces. We feel that this is a big step forward in the right direction toward more soil conservation.

We feel greatly indebted to G. E. Hibbs and W. A. Tock for the fine movie they made of the Wayne County field day. This movie is in color and takes about 30 minutes to be shown. We know that when the chance comes to see it, you, too, will enjoy it as much as we do. Then, too, we appreciate the cooperation and help of PMA extension service, Farmers Home Administration, county newspapers, commercial and civic clubs, veteran training groups, church groups, vocational agriculture departments, 4–H Clubs, State conservation commission, county board of supervisors, local earth moving contractors, Soil Conservation Service, and last, but by no means least, the farmers cooperating with the district.

If you remember at the start of this report, we mentioned that we had some shortcomings. We will admit they are numerous and long; but the main one is simply—there is yet so much to be accomplished. We have scratched only the surface in soil conservation thus far. The ditches are still yawning big at us, flats need draining, pastures need renovating, corn still needs contouring and hills need terracing. We feel that with your help in the coming year, more great strides will be made to correct this situation; and we, the district commissioners in Wayne County, do hereby promise that we will do everything in our power to make this country a better place for good farming with the help of Soil Conservation.

Some of the important accomplishments for the year 1949 are as follows: Plans prepared and signed, 51; acres, 9,134. Applications for complete farm plans, 67; acres, 10,546. Regular commissioners meetings, 12. Newspaper articles printed, 25 in three papers. Contouring on cooperators' farms, 2,085 acres. Waterway construction, 5,950 lineal feet. Area of upland flat drainage, 193 acres. Diversions, 17,992 lineal feet. Terracing, 4 miles.

WAYNE COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT GOVERNING BODY,
ARLO NOBLE, *Chairman.*
WALTER HICKMAN.
MAURICE GOODE.
ROBERT J. COULTER, *Secretary.*

World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. L. E. Burney, health commissioner of the Indiana State Board of Health, in the following letter, sets out his views regarding H. R. 334, which raises the ceiling of the budget authorization for the World Health Organization.

Coming from a doctor whose experience and public-health service has been extensive, I believe his opinion should be of great value to the Members of Congress.

STATE OF INDIANA,
STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
March 14, 1950.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: I understand that House Resolution No. 334 which raises the ceiling of the authorization for the budget of the World Health Organization from approximately $1,900,000 to $3,000,000 has been reported favorably by the Foreign Affairs Committee and is now before the Rules Committee. As one who is familiar with the fine work of the World Health Organization, I hope very much that favorable consideration can be given to this resolution.

We are rapidly becoming one world; certainly, as far as health conditions are concerned. The health hazards in foreign countries are of interest and concern to those of us in the United States. A good example of this is the case of the man from Mexico who traveled across the country to New York by bus, developing smallpox on the way and dying at his destination. Eleven other people died from smallpox as a result of contact with him, and several million people in and around New York City had to be vaccinated because of this one imported case.

The World Health Organization has accomplished a great deal in getting some of the backward nations to develop improved public-health programs especially for the eradication of certain diseases which have an adverse effect upon the economy. The Organization also has a record of being one of the most efficient and well managed of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Another important factor is that the language of health and the discussions regarding health are ordinarily not controversial and hence this specialized agency has an opportunity of being effective in promoting better understanding between nations.

In view of the amount of money involved it seems rather small as compared with what is being contributed for the international program, but considering the value of the work of the World Health Organization it is a most important item.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. BURNEY, M. D.,
State Health Commissioner.

Sale of Coca-Cola in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago I made a few comments regarding the lack of cooperation we are receiving from the French Government in the administration's program to open up trade channels throughout the world. I have particular reference to the legislation in the French National Assembly designed to bar Coca-Cola from France, and I said I thought the action showed clearly that the French are not very much interested in treating American business on a fair and reciprocal basis.

I now have a statement which I would like to insert in the RECORD, from Mr. James A. Farley of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which bears out my comments completely. It is evident from Mr. Farley's statement that the press dispatches have not made the situation entirely clear. I believe most Americans gained the impression from the newspapers that the proposal to bar Coca-Cola from France was primarily sponsored by the Communists in the French legislative body and was defeated.

Mr. Farley's statement makes it very obvious that the proposal was not defeated at all, and that Coca-Cola is likely to be barred, within the very near future, under the Boulet bill, sponsored by the MRP. The Boulet bill does not mention Coca-Cola by name, but authorizes the Health Ministry to bar particular products. The author of the bill has indicated that he had Coca-Cola in mind.

Mr. President, I am not personally concerned about Coca-Cola in particular, but I object very strongly to any actions by the French Government to bar any particular American product. I believe the incident illustrates my point that our so-called reciprocal trade agreements program is not reciprocal at all.

I ask to have Mr. Farley's statement inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., MARCH 9, 1950

On November 8, 1949, a Communist group in the French National Assembly proposed a resolution to prohibit the importation, the manufacture and the offer for sale of Coca-Cola in France, in Algeria, and in the countries and territories of the French Union. This is known as the Gros proposal.

On the same day and at the same session of the National Assembly, Mr. Boulet, a deputy of the MRP (Mouvement Republicain Populaire) Party, introduced a bill designed to bar Coca-Cola from France without specifically mentioning the product by name. Due to efforts of the French Government action on the Boulet bill was postponed.

On February 28, 1950, the Boulet bill, supported by an alliance of Communists and the MRP Party, passed the Chamber of Deputies by a show of hands. An effort was made by several Communist deputies to tack on amendments to the Boulet bill to specifically mention Coca-Cola by name, and these amendments were rejected by a recorded vote. After assurances from Mr. Boulet, the sponsor of the bill, that he personally approved of the intention of the amendments, the decision of the precise product to be banned, should be taken by the Health Ministry. It was suggested that the name of the beverage involved had been omitted because, otherwise, the bill would have violated existing trade agreements by discriminating against an established United States product.

The Boulet bill is now before the Upper Chamber, the Council of the Republic, and will become law unless further legislative action is taken.

On the following Saturday, March 4, the Communist deputies, dissatisfied with the Boulet bill, again introduced their own proposal to specifically and by name bar Coca-Cola, and this was again rejected.

It was the second attempt on the part of the Communists to revive the amendments rejected in the original bill that caused confusion in parts of the press.

The fact remains that the Boulet bill, specifically designed to bar Coca-Cola, will become law in France unless other legislative action is taken.

Meanwhile, the product Coca-Cola is still on sale in France, as no action can be taken under the Boulet legislation until it becomes law. However, French Government officials have resorted to tricks in delaying techniques and have placed an effective embargo on the importation of necessary raw materials from French Morocco, which will have the effect of closing down the business in several weeks when present supplies are exhausted.

The Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1950, by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn.:

THE ROAD AHEAD
(II Chronicles 10: 1–16)

During the period when Hitler was making his bid for power, the German church talked of theology and heaven, ignoring the social dangers rising all about it, and thus, through indifference and carelessness, added to Hitler's strength, and the world's eventual ruin.

I make no apology for taking the position I shall hold this day. It is time that church leaders who believe in democracy and the free-enterprise system stand up and say so. Others are speaking for us; others are saying that the tide of socialization is too strong to be halted and that we must go with the tide. This I do not believe. Today I speak in defense of the traditional American system of government and economics, and I speak against all leaders in all fields who are doing all in their power to wreck our national structure and land us in socialism.

In times past I have spoken to you of the dangers of communism at home and abroad. Because many so spoke, our Government has taken proper action, with the result that Communists have been located and labeled. But today I do not aim my verbal blows at communism as such, but at the socialism that is rising all about us. True, it does not so label itself and it is not a party headed by Norman Thomas, but it does exist in high places and is influencing our national leaders toward the socialized state. There are too many clergymen, educators, writers, and commentators, Senators, and Congressmen who think pink and talk pink. They are not Communists and most are not vicious people, but they are against our American system and are for the socialized state.

One more thing I would make clear: I am speaking as a Christian minister. I am not a politician; neither am I a fly-by-night medicine man or a stooge for some pressure group. I am not paid to say what I am going to say; nor do I say it to gain favor with those who want it said. I am a free American speaking about a dangerous trend in American life which concerns the whole future of the Christian church and the entire safety of this country.

I speak this day in defense of America's free-enterprise system and the democratic state. I plead for the deluded millions of the world who have been tricked into the slavery of socialism. I plead for the church, which ought to defend the rights of men, and ought to be a watchman on the towers of this Nation. I plead for the world in which our economic and political system represents the last dim lights of civilization, and when I so speak and plead I am still preaching the Gospel. Let no man doubt it. I want America to remain free from foes within and foes without. I have no desire to help kill Uncle Sam and I have no intention of attending his funeral.

Solomon and Rehoboam have been on my mind for weeks. Solomon was the original

tax-and-spend leader. He came to the presidency of his country cultured, schooled, and wealthy. He felt he had a right to do as he pleased with the historic forces of his land. Under his program of tax and spend the appearances of prosperity were present but the heart of prosperity was missing. The burdens of the people increased and they were asked to accept them as blessings.

In due time Solomon died, and his son Rehoboam came to power. He spurned the advice of the elders of Israel. He listened to the young men who knew all the answers to all the social questions of that day. The successor to Solomon increased the taxes and continued the program of wasteful spending. The result was the death of the nation.

Well, America's Solomon is dead and Rehoboam is in the White House. Our modern Rehoboam has turned his back on the elders of America and has listened to the young men who know all the answers, and who are thoroughly sold on the program of tax and spend. If the present policies are continued another 5 years I see no hope for the continuance of the American way of life.

With these thoughts in mind I call your attention to John Flynn's startling book, The Road Ahead. An abridged copy of it appears in the Reader's Digest for February. While I am not saying that Mr. Flynn is infallible, I do say that what he has to say is worth hearing, and his book ought to be read by every American, and certainly by every Christian.

The sickness of the twentieth century is socialism. Under the theory of offering something superior to our free enterprise system, this sickness rots away the structure of our Nation. Fortunately it is no longer just an exciting theory. We can see what it has done in Russia and the neighboring lands. We can see its results in Britain. It ought to be clear to all who read and think that socialism is a mirage that drives men mad.

Socialism is a dishonest movement. It does not permit itself to be labeled. Most Socialists talk about welfare, pensions, insurance, socialized medicine, aid to education, aid to the farmer, and all the time they are promoting socialism. The best of the Socialist welfare ideas could more profitably become a part of our traditional system, but the dreamers, the economic planners, begin with the assumption that our American system is useless: They must have a new one. They do all in their power to see to it that the old system does not work; they impede its progress at every turn, substituting socialistic ideas which they consider more modern and progressive.

THE BRITISH SOCIALIST EXPERIMENT

Let us examine the rise of the Socialist power in England and thereby be warned. It began in 1883 when a group of intellectual visionaries, attracted by the theories of Karl Marx, formed what they called the Fabian Society, naming their group after Quintus Fabius, the Roman general who defeated Hannibal by biting off a segment of his army at a time, thus destroying it piece by piece.

Here is the program they proposed to follow:

1. Establish a school for the training of Socialist leaders, writers, speakers, and so forth.

2. Never call an idea or program socialistic. Talk about pensions, compensations, health insurance, welfare, but not socialism.

3. Launch the program a bit at a time. Do not frighten people by showing them the whole program at once.

4. Assure the common people that their rights will be protected. Tell them that whatever is done will be done for the further well-being of the average man, "the little fellow."

5. Capture the labor unions, and through them destroy the Liberal Party.

6. Use the Liberal Party to get things going, and then cast it aside.

7. Work through schools, churches, and clubs. Never miss a chance to implant the seeds of dissatisfaction with the old system and a love for the new.

By 1905 the Fabian Society had grown in unity and power. The labor unions were duly at heel. These workingmen's organizations which were created for bargaining purposes now became political forces. In 1905 they made a deal with the Liberal Party, headed by Asquith and Lloyd George, whereby labor would support the Liberal Party in exchange for a number of things labor wanted enacted into law, one of these being the invalidation of the Taff-Vale Act making unions liable for damages incurred during strikes.

That is when the New Deal struck England. Out of Parliament came the 8-hour day, workmen's compensation, pensions, government-housing projects, public payment of election expenses. Labor was delighted. The deal had paid off.

The Fabians were more than delighted. The camel's head was now inside the free enterprise, democratic tent. Their final victory was merely a matter of time.

By 1914 the Labor Party had representatives in Parliament. By 1923 they placed Ramsay MacDonald, the Fabian fair-haired boy, in office as Prime Minister. In 1945 they took over completely and have socialized in a most unsocial manner. The only thing they lack is the British version of the iron curtain.

Think of it. In 1905, when the Fabians got their program under way in earnest, Britain was the strongest nation in the world. She had everything. In 40 years, the Fabian Society, which never listed more than 4,000 members, became the master of England. The two great wars, plus the Fabian weakening processes within, have made mighty England a land of tears and fears.

The Liberal Party died in 1923 when its leaders threw their votes on the side of the Labor Party. Since that time the Liberals have had neither strength nor standing in British politics. They were liquidated by the Socialists.

In 1924–25 when the Labor Party was first in power they spent nearly £800,000,000 spending more on so-called welfare than they spent on government. They boasted of their successes, and promised Englishmen higher wages, less work, and state control of all basic industries. They were taking over. They talked too much, and the Conservatives were returned to office, and remained in until 1929. World and national events were on the side of the Fabian dreams—the depression struck. The people, sickened by conditions, returned the Labor Party to power. Then began the full-scaled program to weaken the older order. They soaked the rich, and promised the poor a golden future on the rich man's gold. Yet they talked little of socialism. Always their programs were phrased in terms that would hide socialism and praise welfare. They let the glitter of gain blind the eyes of the masses to the fact that enslavement was the logical end of socialism. The end results were kept hidden.

This was the situation when Hitler began his rise to power. Pacifism gripped the British people. Little was done to meet the rising tide of dictatorships on the Continent. The Socialist government was loathe to tell the people the truth and curtail social expenditures in order to meet national preparedness needs. The leadership vacillated. They lacked the patriotic spirit necessary to the times. They lived so much in dreams that they feared realism. The result: England entered World War II as unprepared as Ethiopia. When the dark days came and Britishers needed a man with a voice and something to say, a man with courage and determination, a man big enough to match the hour, they called on Churchill—a Conservative, a reactionary, a man of the "old regime." The story of valiant Britannia under his leadership you know. But when the war was over the people, tired of austerity, listened again to the glib generalities and rainbow promises of the Fabians, and returned the Labor Party to office. Under them England has become a truly socialized country.

Has socialism blessed the British? The ordinary citizen now knows the full misery of heavy taxation. There are no rich people any more, and the Government owns most of the basic industries. Taxes are higher. Food is scarcer. Wages are higher. Production is lower. Cost of production is higher, and the cost prohibits the British from being strong competitors in the markets of the world. Not a single nationalized industry in England functions with efficiency. The workers mine less coal and produce less in the factories. Socialized men work less efficiently than they do for private owners under a free-enterprise democratic system.

Many defenders of the Socialist experiment will say that only 25 percent of the economic system has been nationalized. The fact is that all basic industries, except steel, have been nationalized and everything else in England socialized. The working people are frozen to their jobs. By law houses and businesses may be entered without legal warrants. Workers can be made to work wherever the Government decrees they must. Farmers who do not meet the Government quotas can have their land sold out from under them and Government managers installed. No wonder that many British firms are moving to Africa and Australia carrying with them their full personnel.

Prime Minister Attlee, after making an erroneous claim for his socialization program, now admits that it has helped only the lower third of the Nation. Think of it. They have wrecked the Nation in order to help the lower third. Yet, even so, under socialism the lower third now lives below the poverty line, and the upper two-thirds live closer to it.

I say to you in all sincerity that there is a diseased sympathy in the world as well as a healthy one. Socialism is diseased sympathy. It is short-sighted, and constantly mistakes mirages for the real thing. The fertile oases they envision do not exist.

Are the British people better off under socialism? If you were a Britisher today you would be allowed 1½ eggs per week, 3 ounces of butter, 6 ounces of margarine, 1 of lard, 1 of cheese, 1 of bacon, 8 of sugar, 6 of meat, and 2 of corned beef.

If you were a Britisher this morning with an income of $2,800 a year, and had a wife and two children, you would be allowed deductions of about $1,760, and would pay a tax of $288 on the balance. A workman in America would pay $26.

If you were a Britisher this morning you could be assured of Government care from the cradle to the grave. Every baby receives $16 at birth, and the Government will contribute $80 to his funeral expenses when he dies. The Government will also give him a few dollars a week for groceries. It will take care of all his medical expenses, and grant him a pension when he is too old to work. But the man gets nothing for nothing. He pays in taxes for every service rendered. No longer do the rich people help pay the poor man's bills. There are no rich. No longer does industry pay its millions. They pay no taxes because the Government owns them.

Britain today under the Labor Government is a restless, confused, unhappy land. The people are worse off now than they were during the war. Their leaders know the bottom is in sight. Spirituality is low, and distrust is rampant. Never has England

in office and give them further opportunities to kill America seems to me the epitome of stupidity.

Will the South measure up to the demands of this hour? Will we be willing to change our thinking sufficiently to enable us to rid America of this cancer that kills? The American Fabians are using the Democratic Party to bring about the death of Uncle Sam. What are you doing about it?

I am not pleading with you to go Republican. I am asking you not to be so traditional that you fail to protect this Nation against the sickness of the twentieth century which is now upon us. You can be either its victims or its victors. There is yet time to decide.

King Solomon is dead, and Rehoboam is in the White House. The wise young men in Washington who know all the answers are guiding Rehoboam and America down the path of socialism. Surely the Christian church has a better answer than the one they offer.

Recently the Memphis Commercial-Appeal carried the following parody on the Twenty-third Psalm:

"The state is my shepherd, I shall not work; it maketh me to die down on good jobs; it leadeth me by the still factories. It deadens my soul; it leadeth me in the paths of idleness for politics' sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of slothfulness and economic disaster, I will fear no evil, for it will be with me; its dole and paternalism, they comfort me. It prepareth a Utopia for me by appropriating the earnings of the frugal; it filleth my head with fool expectations; my mounting inefficiency runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; I shall live on the bounty of the state forever."

God save America. God save the world through America. God save America through us.

Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD a very short editorial regarding the REA cooperatives, from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman for March 14, 1950. This is a newspaper published in Omaha primarily for the farmers, the livestock dealers, and others active in the business life of the Omaha area. It is always heartening to me to see that the REA movement is supported by practically all groups and classes in my part of the country. I think that very fact is an exceptionally fine tribute to the way in which the program has been conducted.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTING ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Farmers take electricity seriously. Proof of that is the fact that some 4,000 of them, representing nearly 2,500,000 families now served by REA, journeyed to Chicago this year for the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association.

At the convention, the extent to which the farmer has embraced electricity was readily obvious. The seriousness of his talk, and the interest he showed in exhibits revealed that.

The farmer who has electricity is a big user of it. He averages using around 50 percent more than the average urban consumer. And that is not surprising when it is considered there are some 400 uses of electric power possible on a farm fully equipped to utilize it.

Refrigerators are in particularly big demand on farms, and in all probability, this item is first on the list for most farmers when electricity is made available to them. Washing machines, electric ranges, irons and home freezers are popular items. And there are countless extras, such as milking machines, electric brooders for pigs and chickens, milk coolers, water heaters and others which the farmer figures he can hardly afford to be without, once he has power.

Only recently the three millionth consumer received REA service. It is claimed 83 percent of farms in the Nation now receive electric power from a central station, as compared to 10 percent before REA. It is little wonder, considering this and the benefits which electricity brings to the farm, that farmers are staunch participants in electric cooperative matters.

The Byrd Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] last Sunday, March 12, in which he outlined the work of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 20)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In this talk I want to direct your attention to what has been offered as an economy move by a spokesman for the administration now in power in Washington.

I want to discuss a proposal set forth in a bill introduced in the Senate by HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Senator HUMPHREY's bill, if enacted, would make a saving in the cost of government of $12,000 to $14,000 a year. It would do this by abolishing the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures.

This committee is popularly known as the Byrd Committee. Its chairman is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, undoubtedly the outstanding leader in the fight to eliminate waste, extravagance and duplication in Federal Government.

Let me tell you who else serves on the Byrd Committee. Its membership includes the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the chairmen of the House Ways and Means Committee and of the Senate Finance Committee. It includes other ranking members of those committees. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget are members of this committee.

Yet, an administration spokesman has introduced legislation to abolish this committee which under the able and vigorous leadership of Senator BYRD has fought for 9 years against unnecessary spending and overloading of Federal pay rolls. It has saved the Nation and its taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars.

An administration which spends over $42,000,000,000 a year wants to abolish this committee. Despite the spending of over forty-two billions a year and a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000 for this year alone, it is suggested that savings can be achieved through abolishing a committee which spends less than $14,000 a year.

That may seem funny to some people. Perhaps it is. But more than that, it is a great tragedy. It reflects the thinking of an administration which believes in high taxes and big spending.

I am proud to say that I immediately associated myself with Senator BYRD and many other Senators—both Democrats and Republicans—liberal, middle-of-the-road, and conservative—to serve notice that we would fight the bill to the last ditch.

Among the leading Members of the Senate who have joined in this fight against abolishing one of the most important forces for economy in Congress are Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Finance Committee; Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, of Nebraska; Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire; Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware; Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota; Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and many others.

In the course of the debate I said:

"I know of no one in public life whose utterances are followed more carefully in my own State than those of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

"I should like to ask him a question. From the Senator's experience as a public official, not only as a Senator of the United States, but also as the chief executive of one of our leading States, is he of the opinion that one of the best methods of national defense is a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget?"

Senator BYRD replied: "I agree with the Senator that it is the greatest security we have."

Then I asked Senator BYRD this question:

"From the Senator's experience, does he believe that it is possible for us to fight a third world war, using the free-enterprise system, unless we do balance our budget and begin to reduce our public debt?"

Senator BYRD replied:

"I agree with the Senator that our greatest security lies in a balanced budget, sound government, and preservation of the free-enterprise system."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, it behooves us all to make it known in Washington that we too believe in a balanced budget, sound government, and the free-enterprise system.

During the course of debate one Senator arose to recall that last year he sat on a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which heard 453 Government witnesses testify regarding their budget requests. Four hundred and fifty-two of them asked the committee for more money than their agencies had spent the previous year.

Only one of them expressed himself as agreeable to taking a cut.

In the course of the debate also, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, quoted from a statement made by Senator HUMPHREY at the end of last September. Senator HUMPHREY declared at that time, and I quote:

known such depths. Yet, in the present general election campaign, the Fabians find excuses for the blunders and waste, and offer more golden promises.

Slowly but surely Englishmen are learning that the socialistic state is inefficient and expensive. It robs men of liberties, and imposes on men burdens too grievous to be borne. They are also realizing that the socialistic state cannot operate without penalties and compulsions. Where socialism reigns, liberty dies.

If this is the situation in England today with our Marshall plan aid, what would the situation be without it? What will it be without it? We must call a halt. Not only has the local Britisher been taxed to support the socialization of Great Britain, but I, here in Nashville, Tenn., have had to pay my tax for the same support. I have helped enslave my brothers in Britain. What a mess.

THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Let us now turn to America. What is happening here? Are we in any danger from this Fabian movement to overthrow our traditional Government and socialize America?

I say to you that the program is already well advanced and is walking in 7-league boots. There are a million signs aloft saying that we are being sold down the river.

In 1932 we were in a depression, but we still had our American system. Then Solomon became king, and Solomon soon decided to change the American system, to tax and spend, to browbeat and bludgeon men into doing the will of the Government; to make the Government the master of the people. By 1938 a new group came to power in Washington. These were not elected by the people. These were young men fresh from law offices, teaching positions, and businesses. They had no love for America's traditional system of government and economics. To them there was only one "good" system—socialism. Of course they did not call their ideas socialistic. They labeled them welfare, help for the average man, aid to the poor, and what not, just as they had in England. Remember Wallace? What a field day he and the unelected had.

In 1944 the Democratic Party made a deal with labor, the same deal the British Liberal Party made in 1905. For $500,000 on the barrel head labor was promised legislation that would grant labor an inside position in the life of the Nation. The labor leaders henceforth would be in the saddle and could spur the industrial horse to exhaustion if they wanted to do so. Remember Hillman?

In 1947 a new movement was created, called Americans for Democratic Action. It is about as democratic as Stalin. Look at its main figures: David Dubinsky from the AFL, Walter Reuther and James B. Carey from the CIO, John L. Lewis from you know where, A. F. Whitney from the Railroad Brotherhoods, Mr. Elmer Davis, Leon Henderson, Keyserling, Wyatt, Ewing, Douglas, Frankfurter, Senator Graham, and others, all of them leaning far to the left of the American system. Here is the source of all the programs, welfare, and otherwise, that are crippling this Nation. The Democratic Party has lost its soul to the Socialists just as surely as the Liberal Party in England did, and we are now in the control of the Washington economics planners, the young men who know all the answers. Big government is determined to destroy free enterprise and democracy.

I have a feeling that if Jackson and Jefferson should visit the Democrats in Washington today, they would challenge about 85 percent of them to duels in the cherry orchards within the next 24 hours. I cannot imagine these true Americans feeling at home with the present administration or feeling that the wise men who are leading us to statism and a "planned" (Socialist) economy are Americans save by birth.

What is happening to us? Well, look at the facts:

1. Government no longer is our servant. It is our master.

2. Government is no longer the legislative part of America.

It has invaded the realm of banking.

It has invaded the realm of electric power.

It has invaded the realm of agriculture.

It now proposes to invade the realm of medicine, education, and anywhere else where it can interfere with free enterprise and democratic liberties.

If we pass the Spence Act the President will have complete power over the entire industrial life of this Nation, empowered to do as he personally pleases and all under the pretense of helping to keep the free enterprise system alive. Imagine Rehoboam with that kind of power.

Then there is the Brannan plan. You know, the plan that buys up some 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes and then dumps them because it would cost the Government something to ship them where they can be used? This is the plan that paid a farmer in Minnesota some $2,500 for his potato crop, and then the farmer bought the whole lot back for about $16, and the potatoes never left his farm. What a system. And they call it "planned economy."

Well, what can be done? Mr. Flynn has several ideas, and so do I.

1. Let us find out what the free-enterprise system really is instead of letting the social planners tell us what it is.

2. Let us stand up to the economic planners. Let us defend our American system. Let us have an end to letting them have the field all to themselves.

3. Let individuals, groups, and communities stop looking to Washington for handouts. Remember that what the Government gives and spends is taken from our own pockets. The only money it has comes to it in taxes.

4. Remember that human freedom is the scarcest and most precious commodity in the world today.

5. Let us rid ourselves of the planners when the opportunity comes, as it will come.

6. Let us put an end to this wasteful spending on the part of our Government.

It is startling to realize that we spent only $147,000,000,000 to run the American Government in all the years from Washington through Mr. Roosevelt's first term in office. Mr. Truman has spent $184,000,000,000 in 3 years.

7. Let us look at Russia and Britain, and then fall in love with the United States of America.

I dare not close this address without saying a word about Mr. Flynn's condemnation of many of the leaders in the Federal Council of Churches. I must confess that I share Mr. Flynn's conclusions concerning the social and political views of Bishop Oxnam, E. Stanley Jones, and John C. Bennet. I do not think that these men are Communists or wicked. I do feel that they are opposed to our traditional American view of government and economics, and are Socialists at heart, though Christian Socialists. They, too, easily mistake human weaknesses for weaknesses of free enterprise.

Having said that, let me hasten to say that while this phase of the Federal Council's work is to be regretted and condemned, there is much in it to be praised. I feel that they have done much in the way of interdenominational cooperation, evangelism, Christian education, and the enrichment of worship. I feel that they have been of great help in speaking for Protestantism in Washington, where Protestantism does not always wield sufficient force. I do not feel that the answer to the shortcomings of the Federal Council is to be found in our withdrawal and self-righteous condemnation. It is not in retreat that victory lies, but in advance. Why don't we send stronger men to the meetings of the council, men who know where we stand on these matters as a denomination, men who will fight for our view? Why do we southern Presbyterians always think in terms of defense rather than in offense? Why do we always talk in terms of negatives rather than in terms of positives? Why not change the council so that it says what we and others like us to believe? I would regret our withdrawal from it, even as I regret their misrepresentation of us in matters of political and economic import. The Southern Presbyterian Church cannot honorably withdraw from the Federal Council until we have done more than we have done to improve it.

I have spoken unto you this day as a Christian clergyman. I want the free-enterprise system continued in a democratic environment. I see no reason why we cannot solve our various economic and social problems within the historic framework of our land. I see no cause for our becoming a socialistic land at a time when socialism is rotting away the liberties of all mankind. Under free enterprise and our republican form of government I see every reason why we can rise to still higher levels of greatness, and render to the world a service it sorely needs. Under the further socialization of America I see the death of the last sweet fruits of the struggles of valiant men throughout the Christian centuries. I would personally rather see my Nation die cleanly under the H-bomb than rot away under socialism.

Let us get clear in our thinking one thing: a social planner in Washington differs not at all from one in Moscow or London. They are all Socialists and therefore enemies of the basic liberties of men.

Can things be changed? As I survey the American scene it seems clear that the hope of America is to be found in the South. We are guilty of many sins, and we pet fondly many prejudices we should throw away, but we still believe in State rights and liberties. We are not purists to be sure, for we have been riding the Federal "gravy train" too often in recent years to call ourselves true champions of free enterprise.

Here in the South, where the war of brothers left us in poverty, surrounded by citizens, some white and some black, who were ill prepared to weigh the vital issues of our States and Nation, we have been compelled by circumstances to seek aid from beyond our southern borders. Much of this aid has been Federal money, granted by the economic planners. We are in a precarious political situation: on the one hand we condemn socialism, and yet at every turn we ask that a fair portion of the Federal socialistic "gravy" be channeled in our direction.

If the South is to serve its purpose of preserving the Union in the twentieth century by championing free enterprise and human freedom, then let us go all out, guarding ourselves against the human weakness of getting something for almost nothing.

The economic planners in the Democratic Party know our weaknesses and dire needs. They will play ball with us when it is to their advantage and spurn us when it is not. That is why the FEPC bill is so important to the economic planners who concocted it and are pushing it. That bill was not created from the moral fabric of a tender conscience which weeps for the downtrodden and the dispossessed. Oh, no. It is merely the political means of grabbing a bloc of votes which are of paramount importance to the social planners. With it they could hasten their rule over us all.

It is my personal conviction that the Democratic Party has lost its soul to these men who seek the death of our American way of life. I do not see how any serious-minded citizen who wants the free-enterprise system and democracy continued can again vote for this party. To keep these men

"The Senator from Minnesota does not believe in a balanced budget at this hour, nor is he afraid to say so."

I regret that the Senator from Minnesota apparently doesn't believe in a balanced budget at this hour, either, nor in efforts to reduce spending toward the goal of a balanced budget.

This is the Truman viewpoint, unfortunately. The President himself has declared there will be no budget balancing this year or next year, and probably not for years to come—that is, until there is some other President.

But people with that viewpoint, with complete willingness to have the country go deeper and deeper into the red, are out to protect themselves from criticism.

They want to protect themselves by abolishing the committee which calls for economy and attacks wasteful spending.

Their unwillingness to accept criticism, even from an official Government source, bears a close resemblance to the methods of dictatorship.

Yet this attitude persists. When President Truman was Senator Truman he took an entirely different view. Let me quote to you what Harry S. Truman said while he was still in the Senate. He said:

"It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

"I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever."

That was Senator Harry Truman speaking as chairman of the War Investigating Committee. That was a patriotic American, deeply concerned with wasteful spending of the people's money. That was a man who agreed that there must be a congressional watchdog over spending to prevent reckless, extravagant men from wasting the money taxed from the pockets and savings accounts of our workers.

The joint congressional committee—this Byrd committee—has been such a watchdog. But now the picture has changed completely.

This administration wants no watchdog committee, no criticism at all. Instead it wants to abolish the committee doing the very work which Senator Harry S. Truman said, only a few years ago, was so essential for the good of our country.

That is something for the people to consider.

In my opinion, the attempt to wipe out the Byrd committee and to deprive the people of its valuable service is another example of the stubborn opposition of the administration to every suggestion for cutting the cost of Government.

You all know about the fine work of the Hoover Commission, which submitted plans to increase efficiency and to reduce costs in the various Government departments and agencies.

The President strongly endorsed that report, except in two important things.

The Hoover Commission strongly backed up and supported the findings of the Byrd committee. The Hoover Commission found much waste and duplication in Government. The administration failed to endorse those findings.

And the Hoover Commission, like the Byrd Committee, called for numerous reductions in spending to effect a saving of 3 to 5 billion dollars a year.

It is significant that the administration has put into effect most recommendations of the Hoover Commission except those which would require cutting the pay rolls and the reduction of unnecessary spending.

The departments and agencies fought those proposed reductions hammer and tongs. And, I regret to say, backed up by the White House, they fought the cuts successfully.

That is the course taken by an administration whose leader and spokesmen declare that they are opposed to balancing the budget now or in the immediate future.

It is another manifestation of the spend-what-you-haven't-got school—the fellows who pile the national debt higher and higher with the explanation that it doesn't matter—our children and grandchildren will pay the bills.

I have quoted from several of those who spoke on the Senate floor in opposition to the bill to abolish the Byrd committee.

At this point, I feel you should hear the words of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, himself. In the course of the debate, he had this to say—and I quote:

"If we continue deficit spending, sooner or later we shall go over the precipice of financial disaster,

"Every Senator knows we are about to embark on another year of deficit spending—although it is a year of perhaps the highest prosperity the country has ever know—a year when there are no new economic emergencies abroad.

"The President has recommended in his budget message less foreign assistance money than is to be spent this year. There are no economic emergencies at home except that brought on by the coal strike.

"With all the earnestness of which I am capable, I ask Senators this question: If we cannot balance our budget now, in God's name when can we balance it? What reason is there to believe that it will be easier to balance it next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now, than it is now?

"I should like to say, further, that 2 years ago we expended $34,000,000,000. No worthy object suffered then. The economic crisis abroad was greater than it is now.

"Now we are spending $43,000,000,000, an increase of $9,000,000,000 in 2 years of peace, with no new emergencies to justify the additional domestic civilian expenditures at home. Six billion dollars of the increase for next year is purely for domestic civilian spending unrelated to past or future defense or foreign assistance. We have nearly doubled our non-war-connected domestic spending in 2 years.

"I think the time has come for us to face the situation squarely and realize that if we embark now on deficit spending resulting from domestic-civilian increases, under the conditions which now exist, we may never again balance the budget of the United States Government."

Those are words of deep significance and stern warning.

They were spoken by a sincere democratic statesman whose love of country rises above political consideration.

They should be given serious thought by every American regardless of political affiliation.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, to my friends on the Republican side of the House who fought the FEPC bill because they felt it would hamstring employers in selecting their workers, let me call to your attention an article appearing in the February 25 issue of Business Week, certainly not a New Deal or a Fair Deal publication. The article reports a poll of some of the largest corporations in the country who are operating under FEPC laws containing enforcement provisions, including the Prudential Insurance Co., the Alumium Corp. of America, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., the New York Shipbuilding Corp., among others. Without exception, the employers have indicated that the FEPC law has interfered in no respect with the right of the employer to select the most competent workers and they have had no discipline or grievance problems.

To my friends from the southern States, who charged the FEPC bill as being Communist-inspired, let me point out that the article cites the case of the Bridgeport Brass Co., of Connecticut, which reports that the bill has eliminated entirely a large and growing Communist campaign being waged among the large urban Negro groups and that it has widened job opportunities for minority group members without interfering in the prerogatives of management.

To my friends on the Republican side, again let me point out that the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, certainly not a New Deal or Fair Deal organization, has thrown its support in favor of an enforceable FEPC because they realized that voluntary FEPC under which the city had operated, was not the whole answer. I am sure this will give food for thought to those who insisted upon the McConnell bill.

CHICAGO NEEDS AN FEPC LAW—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE

CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: We're sending a letter of congratulations to the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. We hope that in the near future we'll be able to send a similar letter to your organization.

The Cleveland chamber is right on the ball. Thanks to its help—and that of labor and other civic groups—the city of Cleveland now has a fair employment practices (FEPC) law. As you know, FEPC makes it illegal to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or nationality when hiring, firing, or promoting.

When an FEPC was first proposed in Cleveland, the chamber there said: "Let's try it the voluntary way." So for about a year Cleveland groups tried a program of persuasion without the help of a law. They asked employers to hire people on the basis of their qualifications, not on the basis of their skin color or the church they go to or the country their parents came from.

The voluntary approach flopped. The Cleveland Press said editorially: "We learned that voluntary FEPC, no matter how diligently and sincerely run, is almost valueless." Chamber of Commerce leaders, admitting that the voluntary way was not the whole answer, put their stamp of endorsement on an FEPC ordinance. The city council passed it last month by a 27 to 5 vote.

Chicago already has a partial FEPC ordinance. It applies only to the city government and commercial firms with which the city has contracts.

In the past, whenever someone urged extension of Chicago's FEPC to commercial

employers, business representatives have usually said that the voluntary approach is adequate. They said the same about State and Federal FEPC bills.

We're praying that your organization will take a cue from Cleveland. We're hoping that you recognize that the voluntary approach in fair employment usually winds up in a let-Joe-do-it attitude. We're hoping that you recognize that FEPC is the only practical solution.

If you'll study the Cleveland FEPC, you'll see that the law itself embodies much of the voluntary approach. The law provides steps of moral persuasion. First, an attempt is made to settle every complaint of discrimination by a 16-member community relations board. If the board fails, then the mayor tries his hand. If the mayor fails, there is a public hearing. If the public hearing fails, only then is the complaint turned over to the city law department for prosecution.

In many States where FEPC is now the law, employers who first opposed it have since found that their old fears were groundless. They found that they could not only live under the law but actually thrive under it.

Let me give you an example of how they thrive under it. Let's say two men walk into your office and apply for a white collar job. In this case Mr. A is better qualified for the job than Mr. B but Mr. A is a Negro and Mr. B is white. Right now in Chicago, most businesses would pick Mr. B, the white man, if they had to choose between the two.

Under FEPC it becomes more and more the accepted thing to hire people for their ability and not for some phony reason. This is good for business and it is good for people.

We're hoping that you'll give FEPC the same consideration as did your chamber of commerce brothers in Cleveland.

EDITORS OF WORK.

What Would the Loss of Liberty Mean to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an editorial by that great American, E. F. Hutton, in the Palm Beach Daily News under date of March 7 last entitled "What Would the Loss of Liberty Mean to You?" Mr. Hutton was the founder of Freedom's Foundation of Valley Forge and has devoted a great deal of his time and thought in fighting communism here and abroad. I commend his editorial for your thoughtful consideration:

WHAT WOULD THE LOSS OF LIBERTY MEAN TO YOU?—THINK THAT THROUGH!

(By E. F. Hutton)

Six years ago Benjamin DeCasseres, one of the outstanding editorialists of our time, wrote the following message. He has since taken his long journey. It is worthy that this should be reread today by those who have forgotten, and those who, perhaps, never saw it—and particularly by our youngsters in the schools.

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"I am 153 years old, having been born on December 15, 1791.

"I am the first ten commandments to the Constitution. Until I was written into the Constitution, that document was like a body without a soul.

"I AM YOUR BILL OF RIGHTS

"Don't take me for granted. Like all mortal creations, I can be killed.

"The giant shadow of totalitarian state—slavery—moves over the world. Wherever that shadow falls, I am obliterated. That shadow has fallen over the United States.

"Three men—Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Mason—fathered me. As men brought me to life, I can be slain by men—and will be slain unless you and you and you traditionalist Yankee Doodle Americans organize to defend me.

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"I am freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly. I am the privacy and sanctity of your home. I am your guaranty of trial by jury, as I am the policeman who guards your property rights.

"Cruel and unusual punishment and excessive fines and bail cannot be visited upon you so long as I am alive. In order that all rights not specifically mentioned in the Constitution shall be retained by you—the people. I am the rights of the States against engulfing centralized power.

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"Your signed lease to spiritual, mental, and physical freedom. I ask you to meditate on all my ten clauses. Memorize them. Engrave them on your hearts.

"My existence depends on your vigilance—on how vigilantly you watch your rulers. And my eternal enemies, known as dictators, are abroad in the world and here in the United States.

"Personal unlimited power has destroyed the liberties of many peoples in ancient and modern times. It can happen to you, and maybe, subtly and unknowingly to you, it is happening.

"Put every law that is proposed in Washington and elsewhere into the crucible of my 10 commandments. Your question must always be: Not what does a law give me, but what does it take away from me?

"I AM THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"When I am violated, a part of you dies.

"I am 153 years old. Will I reach my 169th year? That depends on you and your children."

Liberty is our national asset. It belongs to "we, the people." There are those who are advocating communism, collectivism, and planned economy. If any of these "isms" become a fact, liberty then will belong to those in power. "We, the people" will have lost it. It is only by direct action on youth by the men and women of our country that a better society can successfully be molded.

Military Air Power in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present herewith an article appearing in the November issue of the National Air Review:

MILITARY AIR POWER IN EUROPE

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

A shadow is being cast across the face of Europe today by the wings of Soviet Russia's Red air force.

Soviet military aviation now consists of about 15,000 first-line aircraft divided among (1) air armies attached to the ground forces (2) the interceptor arm of the Soviet air defenses and (3) the independent long-range bomber force now being expanded by special order of Stalin. There also are air units attached to the Soviet navy.

The Red air force is numerically the strongest air force in the world although its offensive and defensive capabilities certainly are far below those of the combined strength of the United States Air Force and naval aviation. It is more than twice as large as the German Luftwaffe, which had nearly 6,000 first-line planes available on all fronts in the summer of 1940 to implement Nazi dreams of conquest.

New production for the Red air force includes a jet interceptor with swept-back wings, probably designed by Artem I. Mikoyan and Mikhail Gurevich, and four-engined bombers resembling the American B-29 Superfortress.

Soviet aviation is backed by an aircraft industry which—according to Stalin—produced 40,000 aircraft of all types, including trainers and liaison planes, in 1944. This, by way of comparison, was the year in which the United States constructed 96,000 airplanes, a large percentage of which were four-engined bombers.

The United States supplied 14,795 aircraft of all types to Soviet Russia during the recent war.

There is general agreement among strategists in Europe that the Red air force is a formidable instrument for cooperating with the Red army in a sweep westward across the continent. In fact, in its present composition it is an air force organized primarily for supporting ground troops—mechanized cavalry in particular.

Most strategists believe that with allied forces now available in western Europe—and these forces are being strengthened—the Red air force could hardly be bested or kept from gaining air superiority at any point east of the Pyrenees or the English Channel.

An accurate picture of Soviet air power, however, must bring into focus both strong points and weaknesses. There is evidence of the existence of many of the latter.

The Red air force, for example, did no strategic bombing worth mentioning in World War II. As a strategic air force capable of trading blows against industrial targets during the next 3 years with heavy bomber units of Great Britain and the United States, the Red air force is regarded as second or third rate.

This is so—even now that Soviet scientists have accomplished an atomic explosion—unless the British and Americans allow it to become first rate by default. All signs point to the opposite right now.

Morale of the Red air force, except under conditions of combatting invasion of the Soviet Union, is open to question. This is attested by the not insignificant number of deserters up to the rank of colonel who have been claiming refuge in western Europe during the past 2 years.

During World War II sizable aviation detachments of the German-sponsored Russian army of liberation, commanded by Lt. Gen. Andrei A. Vlassov, former hero of the Soviet Union, were organized at Marienbad and Eger, Czechoslovakia. Recruiting was from among captured Red air force pilots, General Vlassov's air chief was Maj. Gen. Victor Maltzev, former Red air force officer. Ground units of this anti-Stalin army performed well on the eastern front but surrendered without fighting to the Allies in the west.

It is not generally known in the United States that the Red air force high command has been purged again and again by order of Stalin from 1937 through the present postwar period. This is true also of the di-

rectorates of top Soviet aeronautical research centers such as the Zhukovsky Air Engineering Academy in Moscow.

Stalin's policy of using alternately the knout and sugar-candy reward is nowhere more apparent than in the Soviet aircraft industry. A. N. Tupolev, famous designer of bombardment aircraft, and many other outstanding aeronautical engineers have (1) served jail terms for crimes against the Soviet state and (2) received high decorations and Stalin prizes for aviation achievements.

During the last 12 years the post of chief of the Red Air Force has become almost as unhealthy for its holders as was that of Minister of the Interior under the last Czars of Russia. The latter office frequently became vacant suddenly as the result of direct action by revolutionists; the Red Air Force post is vacated only by order of Stalin and the Politburo but the changes come with the same abruptness.

Starting with Gen. Yakov I. Alksnis, who also held the position of Vice Commissar of Defense, the following commanders of the Red Air Force have been removed during the years indicated either by firing squads or by sudden demotion to insignificant posts and disgrace:

Gen. Yakov I. Alksnis, 1937; Gen. Alexander D. Loktionov, 1938; Gen. Pavel Rychagov, 1940; Gen. Yakov Smushkevich, 1941, and Marshal of the Air Force Alexander A. Novikov, 1946.

The careers of General Alksnis and Marshal Novikov shed light on what can happen to high officers in Soviet Russia who make political missteps. General Alksnis was an old-time Bolshevik who became chief of Soviet aviation in 1933. He was obsessed with the idea of making it as progressive and powerful as that of any other nation. In 1934 he visited Great Britain and the Netherlands to observe air progress, and in 1946 he visited Czechoslovakia for the same purpose.

This foreign travel evidently was a serious error. At the start of Stalin's widespread purges of Soviet military men accused of conspiring with foreign powers General Alksnis was appointed to the tribunal which condemned to death Marshal Mikhail N. Tukhacheveky. A short time later General Alksnis faced a firing squad himself.

Marshal Novikov came to power in 1941, a few weeks after the German invasion of Soviet Russia. More than 2,500 Russian planes were destroyed on the ground in forward areas by the Luftwaffe during the first few days of the war. General Smushkevich, then Air Force head, disappeared suddenly.

When he took over General Smushkevich's post, Marshal Novikov was 34 years old and a major general. Almost immediately he was promoted to lieutenant general and on January 18, 1943, to colonel general. The following month he became the first Soviet marshal of aviation and personally conducted Red Air Force operations at Stalingrad.

Marshal Novikov became friendly, as did his opposite number in the Red Army, Marshal Georgei Zhukov, with American military and air leaders. Apparently he lost prestige after Stalin and Molotov made a postwar visit to Germany and saw the results of the combined British-American strategic bombing offensive. There may have been no direct connection between this episode and what resulted, but early in 1946 Marshal Novikov was removed from his post without explanation. It is known that he was sentenced to from 6 to 8 years in prison. Only his outstanding war record saved him from the fate of General Alksnis.

RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY LAGS

Marshal Stalin is credited in official Soviet publications with being an authority in many fields, including economics, finance, agriculture, labor relations, painting, music, the drama, philosophy, education, literature, history, and others.

Some of Stalin's personal contributions to the arts and sciences are open to question, but there is no doubt about his direct and personal influence on Soviet air strategy.

Stalin's precocious son, Vassily, who at 29 is a Red Air Force lieutenant general, said publicly that not a single Soviet aircraft type existed which does not in some manner embody the suggestions and guidance of my father.

Probably no chief of state has intervened so often in air force affairs as Stalin, except possibly Adolf Hitler. It was Hitler who personally decided over the arguments of Air Marshal Hermann Goering and other Luftwaffe chiefs that the fast German Me262 fighter was to be used instead for bombardment.

This turned out to be one of the luckiest decisions of the war—for the Allies. How constructive some of Stalin's equally arbitrary decisions will be, remains to be seen. Until recently nearly 75 percent of Soviet air strength was assigned to air armies attached directly to and designed primarily to cooperate with the Red army commands.

Such air force organization and stress on ground support aircraft can be traced directly to Stalin's personal experiences in the Russian civil war. An official World War II publication of the Soviet government disclosed:

"In the summer of 1936" (NOTE.—Just before Stalin's first purge of the air force high command), "Stalin said that in 1920 he had observed the tremendous effect of low-flying attacks by Soviet planes on Baron Wrangel's retreating White Guards. Acting upon Stalin's instructions, Sergei Ilyushin designed the IL-2, a classical type of attack plane popularly known abroad as the Stormovik.

"In analyzing the rout of armored German troops, the historians of the future will note the important part played by the IL-2."

There is no question that the Stormovik was an excellent weapon for knocking out German tanks—particularly after the bulk of Germany's air power was shifted to the western front. This was done in an unsuccessful attempt to halt the British-American strategic bombing offensive which eventually paralyzed German oil production and communications.

Historians are likely to remember also, however, that Mr. Ilyushin, the Stormovik's designer, told American correspondents in a wartime interview: "We never agreed with the theory that aircraft would play an independent role in the next war * * * we believed that the air force would be an arm of the ground forces primarily."

Stalin now has changed his mind, reportedly after viewing the results of strategic bombing in Germany. Marshal Alexander A. Novikov, who put Stalin's ground support theories into practice during most of World War II, has been purged, and Gen. Alexander Golovanov, commander of the long-range bomber force which Stalin has ordered expanded, is now a Red Air Force marshal.

Mr. Ilyushin apparently can take a hint, for his most recent designing efforts have been concerned with a four-jet bomber patterned after the new United States Air Force Boeing B-47. This plane crossed North America earlier this year at better than 600 miles an hour.

Serious difficulties have been encountered in putting the new Soviet aviation policy in effect. The aircraft industry of the Soviet Union was the last of any major nation in the world to give up wooden construction of major portions of its first-line aircraft.

Marshal Konstantine A. Vershinin, who succeeded Marshal Novikov as chief of the Red Air Force on March 22, 1946, has been vociferous in calling for increased production efforts from the Soviet aircraft manufacturing industry "to counter the intrigues of international reaction."

In an address on the last Red Air Force Day, Marshal Vershinin, probably inadvertently, pointed a finger at three chief weaknesses of Soviet aviation. He stated then that the Soviet Union was putting special efforts into the development of (1) high-speed jet interceptors for defense; (2) multi-engined strategic bombardment aircraft, and (3) radar aids for all-weather flying.

There is further evidence that one additional weak point—possibly the most basic and important one—is jet aircraft engines. Paul H. Wilkinson, editor of Aircraft Engines of the World, and an experienced engineer, is certain that the Soviet Union is several years behind in jet developments as it was previously in piston engines.

At the beginning of World War II all engines used in combat aircraft of the Red Air Force were slightly modified or redesigned versions of America's Wright cyclone engine, France's Gnome Rhone and Hispano-Suiza engines and Germany's BMW, for which licenses to manufacture had been purchased.

During the early days of the present British Labor Government, the Soviet Union was allowed to purchase more than 50 British jet engines of the Rolls-Royce Nene and Derwent type, but this soon was stopped. Soviet designers have the present help of numerous German technicians but it is unlikely that they have solved all problems of mass producing an outstanding jet engine. This still is a kink in the United States aircraft industry which built the world's best piston engines.

In addition to its lack of strategic bombardment background the Red Air Force during World War II had no actual experience in countering strategic attacks with radar-directed interception. Nearly all escaped Soviet pilots have mentioned particularly the lack of electronic aids to all-weather flying available in the Soviet Union and the obvious progress of the United States in this field. Two years ago Soviet transport planes never operated at night, a feat which Americans have been doing for more than a decade, as ordinary routine.

BRITAIN STRESSES AIR DEFENSE

Britain is playing a vital role in European aviation today but for the time being it is chiefly a defensive one.

The nation is expanding and modernizing the British Royal Air Force and the Royal Navy Air Arm with primary emphasis on the defensive capabilities of both. All first-line day-fighter squadrons in the United Kingdom are equipped with Vampire jet interceptor-fighters of the type holding the world altitude record of 59,000 feet or with Meteor jet fighters having operational speeds of better than 600 miles an hour.

The total personnel of the Royal Air Force at present is about 228,000 as compared with 419,000 in the United States Air Force. There are 30 major aircraft-manufacturing companies in Britain together with 7 additional companies building aircraft engines. Nationalization of the industry is extremely unlikely, a member of the Ministry of Supply told this correspondent.

By June of 1950 the RAF expects to double the present strength of its jet day-fighter squadrons in Great Britain. It also plans to equip all night-fighter squadrons at present flying Mosquitos—one of the fastest twin-engined piston aircraft of World War II—with twin-jet night fighters.

A new swept-back-wing jet fighter developed from the Vickers attacker is being produced for supersonic interception. Fighter planes of superior armament and speed were the RAF's chief asset during the Battle of Britain and now, as before, quality of product is stressed.

Britain is selling relatively small quantities of Vampires and Meteors to all the

friendly nations of western Europe including Sweden and Switzerland. The nation's air representatives have followed this up with negotiations for producing these types under license in the above countries.

This is bringing about a standardization of both aircraft types and strategy among European nations faced with the threat of the Red Air Force.

One of Britain's most important air centers at present is the central fighter establishment located in Norfolk County and commanded by Air Commodore D. F. W. Atcherley. Its current No. 1 priority problem is defense against high speed bombers. This is linked with a study of the likely trends of future air attack against Britain and the nation's allies.

Every RAF pilot now is trained to fly in all types of weather. One cannot get his wings unless he has demonstrated competence as an instrument flyer. All-Empire schools specializing in instrument flight instruction are being created in Great Britain, and pilots from allied nations will be admitted to these and other specialist schools.

Although the British airmen feel that they are unable at present to afford large-scale production of giant bombers of the United States Air Force B–36 type, they have just flown their first jet bomber, the English electric A–1 twin-jet. Also, the nation is known to have larger ones on the drawing boards.

One year from now the RAF expansion program calls for limited production of medium jet bombers. The RAF bomber command's chief offensive weapon at present is the four-engined Lincoln, a conventional piston-engined bomber of slower speed than the American B–29 but larger bomb capacity.

Meanwhile, the Royal Navy has been conducting experiments with jet fighters in collaboration with the British Ministry of Supply looking toward the complete elimination of aircraft undercarriage in shipboard operations. This is done through use of catapults and a new secret flexible flight deck.

Some Navy enthusiasts even foresee the disappearance of the orthodox aircraft carrier with its long flight deck in favor of new carriers of the future which would be less vulnerable to bombardment. They look even further ahead and predict that small teams will be able to set up mobile catapults and mattresslike "flexible flight decks" on land in a fraction of the time now necessary for the building of even small airships.

The Vampire was the world's first jet aircraft to land and take off from a carrier at sea. A slightly modified version of the aircraft called the Sea Vampire already is in operational service with the carriers of the Royal Navy.

In spite of the Sea Vampire's superior performance, Royal Navy scientists conducting the landing experiments believe that complete elimination of the aircraft's undercarriage will save approximately one-twentieth of the all-up weight. This gain, they point out, could be translated into improvements in range, ceiling, climb, or firepower.

Initial tests were made first with models and gliders to determine hitherto unknown details about landing fast jet fighters having no undercarriage. Later production-type Vampires were used on an experimental "flexible flight deck" constructed at Farnboro and later they were repeated on the flight deck of the Royal Navy carrier H. M. S. *Warrior*.

The carrier *Formidable* is being reconstructed to take the Royal Navy's most modern jet aircraft including designs still under development. The flight deck and other equipment of the carrier *Indomitable* has just been surveyed with a view to modernization, for despite the achievements of the R. A. F. in World War II the British discovered that a strong and modern navy air arm was a great asset in modern warfare also.

RADAR WALL, JETS, GUN CREWS

The master plan for defense of western Europe against the Soviet Air Force calls for a radar wall around all of the democratic nations, backed up by jet fighter squadrons and antiaircraft batteries.

The radar wall will extend more than 1,500 miles from the Baltic Sea across Europe and the Mediterranean Sea to the southern boundaries of French North Africa. It will include western Germany and as much of the nation as is in democratic hands when the wall becomes operational.

Each of the nations which signed the Atlantic Pact is expected to take part in the scheme eventually, although the initial plans were worked out by Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France. These countries plan to start constructing radar stations on their own territory before the end of 1949.

The major part of the electronics equipment under present plans will be manufactured by Britain and France, although some may come from the United States.

Cooperation for air defense measures among the nations of the so-called Western Union passed the planning stage last month when on request from the Belgian and Dutch chiefs of staff, the British War Office dispatched two heavy anticraft training teams to Europe. One went to Deventer, about 20 miles northeast of Arnheim in the Netherlands and the other to the Belgian Artillery School at Brasschaat, north of Antwerp, for instructional purposes.

Maj. Gen. C. W. E. Heath, commanding general of Number One Antiaircraft Group controlling the air defense of London, went with them. The request, incidentally, went through the Western Union defense committee's advance echelon headquarters at Fontainebleau near Paris.

Nearly all the nations of democratic western Europe now have chosen the British-designed De-Havilland Vampire or the Gloster Metcor as their standard jet interceptor. Quantity delivery of Gloster fighters and dual-control jet trainers for the Belgian air force is about to start.

France, which is making a considerable effort to become a first-ranking air power, already has received a small number of Vampires from the British Government.

This correspondent learned in France that the nationalized French aircraft company Societe Nationale de Constructions Aeronautiques du Sud-Est had just signed an agreement with the British deHavilland Co. to manufacture the Vampire under license in France.

One of the most interesting developments in aviation on the European Continent is the return of private enterprise to French aircraft manufacturing. Before World War II the entire industry was nationalized and had a poor production record during the crucial months before the fall of France.

Part of this failure was due directly to the sabotage of production by Communist workers during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact. At this time official Marxist dialecticians were describing the fight of Britain and France against Nazi Germany as an imperialist war.

In the current post-war period which saw Communist ministers included in several French Cabinets, numerous Communist Party card holders wormed their way into positions of responsibility in the French aircraft industry.

A short time ago, while this correspondent still was in France, the government discharged nearly 300 aircraft industry workmen of the nationalized company S. N. C. A. du Nord. These men, all members of the Communist-directed General Confederation of Labor, appeared at a Paris airfield where a new jet fighter prototype manufactured by their company was being tested and vociferously attacked manufacture of weapons for the coming imperialist war.

Later the Government moved security troops into the company factory at Issy les Moulineaux. The 1,400 workers were advised that because of obvious and continued sabotage of combat aircraft construction the factory would be closed until further notice.

A bill has passed the French National Assembly which will allow the French Government to dispose of such parts of the nationalized aircraft industry as the Minister of National Defense designates. It is understood that the present middle-road French Government is anxious to close a large number of the nine nationalized and Communist-dominated aircraft plants in the Paris area.

The industry at present is still between 75- and 80-percent nationalized, but some of the outstanding new military aircraft prototypes are the products of private factories.

The French army of the air has a total effective personnel at present amounting to 73,000 men, Jean Moreau, the Air Minister and an old pilot, admitted to this correspondent that this is insufficient for bringing into being an air force strong and well organized in accord with the place which France and the French Union will occupy in the world of tomorrow.

Sweden is not a member of the Atlantic Pact but the cooperation between Sweden and Great Britain is much closer than is realized in the United States. Considerable numbers of British-built Vampires have been delivered to Sweden during the last 2 years and an unusual agreement has just been concluded. This will allow Svenska Flygmotor A. B. to build deHavilland Goblin jet engines at Trollhattan, send them to British duty-free for installation in Vampire fighters which then will be flown to the Swedish Air Force for delivery.

ONLY UNITED STATES CAPABLE OF HEAVY AIR ASSAULT ON RUSSIA

America's air power, in conjunction with the atom bomb, is providing the only real counterbalance in Europe to the strength of the Red air force.

Important elements of this air power include Air Force squadrons of very long-range bombers operating from bases on land, and Navy air units of very fast planes attached to carrier task forces capable of roaming almost at will the seven-tenths of the earth's surface which is water.

Britain's fast jet interceptors are beginning to gird western Europe defensively, together with radar and anti-aircraft batteries. It may be that in the unlikely event of war with the Soviet Union during the next 3 years these jet aircraft will be able to exact ruinous attrition from Red air force bombardment units.

British Hurricane fighters did that with Air Marshal Goering's invincible Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain and actually halted the attack. But defense alone does not win modern wars. And admittedly only the United States at present can afford to produce in quantity the complex air weapons necessary to exploit by offensive bombardment several clearly defined weaknesses in the economic and military structure of the Soviet Union.

How formidable is the gantlet of Soviet fighter defenses which they would have to run? According to press association cables from Moscow, the Soviet Union demonstrated some jet fighter planes so fast that foreign observers who watched them streak past could not agree on their characteristics.

This description of dazzling speed would have been more impressive if the detail that the jet fighters flashed across Tushino Air Field at altitudes under 1,000 feet had not been added. At low altitudes even 100-horsepower light planes look fast, as promoters of midget airplane races in the United States discovered some time ago, and the noise is terrific.

The low-altitude flying act is not exactly a new trick in the repertoire of Soviet propaganda. Thirteen years ago on May Day, 1936, press dispatches from Moscow reported that an air fleet which included squadrons of four-engined bombers skimmed the spires of the Kremlin and then at low altitude roared over the crowd with such speed that few figures on the size of the fleet agreed.

The previous May Day, 1935, according to other cables, a formidable air armada of 700 military aircraft came across the Red Square "flying so low that they seemed in danger of clipping the czarist double eagles which still top the Kremlin towers." The cables added: "Speed of the aircraft * * * impressed foreign observers."

During World War II speed was one characteristic for which Soviet combat aircraft were not noted, and although Red Air Force ground-attack aircraft such as the IL–2 Stormovik performed well, Soviet four-engined bombers made only a few sporadic raids throughout the conflict. It would not be well to underestimate Soviet jet fighters, but it also is worth keeping in mind that air shows in the Red Square are not intended to provide data for objective foreign appraisals.

The most obvious weakness of the Soviet Union right now is oil. Air Marshal Goering sourly stated a truism growing out of bitter German experience when he told his Allied captors: "Without oil nobody can fight a war." After American and British strategic bombardment of German oil-supply sources, German panzer units were stranded for lack of fuel. Fighter units could fly only once a week in many cases because they lacked aviation gasoline.

At present the Soviet Union, which produces only one-eighth of the petroleum available to the United States by conservative estimates, is not well supplied with petroleum products for the nation's own economy.

The nations of western Europe are relatively oilless. In the event of a Red Army advance toward the English Channel, the Soviet Union would need large additional quantities to operate the area's transportation system and industry. Before World War II, crude petroleum produced in western Europe amounted to less than 2 percent of the area's total consumption.

New oil fields are being exploited under intensive pressure from Stalin in Siberia and in the huge square of land between the Volga River and the Ural Mountains northeast of Stalingrad. Considerably more than 50 percent of all Soviet petroleum still comes from the rich and concentrated oil fields at Baku on the Caspian Sea.

Until recently, at least, approximately 80 percent of all Soviet aviation gasoline was refined in the Baku area. This, incidentally, is within easy range of American B–29's and British Lincoln heavy bombers based in the Middle East.

To modify this situation, the Soviet Union has been making almost frantic attempts during the last 2 years to move all existing equipment from the German synthetic-oil plants in their zone of occupation to undisclosed areas deep inside Russia. For several years these could produce unaided only a portion of the fuel needs of the huge Red Air Force. Even if sufficient, the benefits of this production would depend on the efficiency of the Soviet transportation system.

Actually, the railroads of Soviet Russia are considered by Allied strategists to be highly vulnerable to air attack, even though there are few marshalling yards in the European sense. The Soviet Union, with, roughly, three times the land area of the United States, has less than one-third the railroad mileage.

Under war conditions, the Russian railway system would be under severe strain without any outside interference. Air bombardment would certainly intensify the strain.

Other high-priority targets in the Soviet Union after oil centers and communications probably would be (1) electric power stations, (2) Soviet aircraft engine factories, and (3) centers such as Moscow. (Besides being a ball-bearing and aircraft manufacturing city, Moscow is the location of many top Soviet air research and aeronautical engineering laboratories.)

The United States Air Force is within theoretical reach of some of the most important strategic targets in Soviet Russia through B–29 units operating from Britain and western Europe, the Middle East, Scandinavia, Okinawa, and several other points.

These attacks could be supplemented and possibly supplied with fighter escort from highly mobile air carrier task forces of the United States Navy. Chiefs of this service have disclosed that the new North American AJ–1 bomber is a plane designed specifically for carrying the atomic bomb.

The United States Air Force is building its future long-range strategy around the huge Convair B–36 with the idea of "conducting, if necessary, intercontinental warfare from bases inside the United States." Gen. Muir S. Fairchild, Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told this correspondent:

"There is discouraging evidence that the full significance of our widely discussed long-range weapons is seldom completely grasped. Our possession of some such aircraft already has made obsolete the old method of defense against air power which involved conquering or absorbing all possible base areas which would be useful for strategic attack. Now that air attack is possible from great distances to the heart of any major power, none can defend itself from such an attack by piece-meal conquest of other nations."

Whether or not the B–36 is as good as the Air Force claims it to be, this correspondent cannot say. It is beyond question, however, that any future war involving the United States would see major emphasis put on the strategic air offensive. The B–36 has been chosen by the Air Force as its basic future weapon until a better one can be built. Its use should enlarge the capacity of the Nation to destroy any enemy's will to resist.

Tax Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editorial on Tax Freedom Day, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, particularly interested me, so I went to work to find out what our friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER] said to his people. What he said deserves broader distribution than that covered by the columns of his local newspaper as evidenced by the attention paid to it by the editor of the Times-Herald and my own interest therein.

Under permission heretofore granted, I am inserting both the editorial on Tax Freedom Day and the letter to which it refers:

TAX FREEDOM DAY

Representative HERBERT MEYER, of Kansas, has just reported that he is putting all the weight of his office behind a proposal made by the Florida Retailers Association to set aside April 28 as a new national holiday—Tax Freedom Day.

GOOD REASON FOR CELEBRATING

"All of us," says MEYER, "work for the Government from January 1 to April 28 this year—for that proportion of your income goes to pay taxes. On April 28 you will be liberated to work for yourself and your family."

The good Congressman then went on to point out that even those who pay no income tax still get nicked by hidden taxes, such as the 78 different taxes on a quart of milk and the 151 taxes on a loaf of bread and the 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline. Hidden taxes form one-third of all rent, food, clothing, and fuel costs.

We free Americans are now paying out 32 cents in taxes from every dollar we earn.

Let us by all means observe Tax Freedom Day—if only to commemorate the spirit of our ancestors who fought, bled, and died resisting foreign governments which sought to gain much less power over us than our own Government is grabbing for today.

VIEWING THE CONGRESSIONAL SCENE WITH CONGRESSMAN HERBERT A. (HUB) MEYER

The other day the Florida Retailers Association came up with what I think is an excellent idea. They suggested that April 28 be set aside as a new national holiday to celebrate Tax Freedom Day. You see, all of us, from January 1 to April 28 this year, work for the Government, for all the money you make goes just to pay taxes. On April 28 you will be liberated to work for yourself and your family.

Maybe you don't realize it, but 32 cents or nearly a third of every dollar you earn goes for taxes. Of that amount 21 cents are for hidden taxes, some of which I have told you about. Many people who pay no income tax are under the impression they pay no taxes at all. But the American Taxpayers' Association says this is a fool's paradise. You pay hidden taxes on everything. For instance, a man who earns $960 a year paid out $123.84 in hidden taxes, according to this organization. A man earning $1,800 a year paid out $243. Here is how you pay. There are 78 different taxes on a quart of milk; 151 taxes on a loaf of bread; 100 taxes on an egg; 125 taxes on a woman's cotton dress; 118 taxes on a man's suit of clothes; 154 taxes on a cake of soap; 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline. Hidden taxes form one-third of all rent costs and one-third of what you pay on food, clothing, electricity, gas, rent, fuel, and other items of everyday living.

Wanting to know just how all of these taxes affected you good folks of the Third District, I asked a tax-research expert to figure out just what share of the colossal national debt of $263,800,000,000 which is anticipated at the end of the fiscal year 1951, is owed by the taxpayers of the nine counties comprising the Third District.

Now hold your hats! You'll have to after you see these figures. Your share of this debt is $455,405,100. Here it is, broken down into counties. This computation is based on population estimates as of January 1,

1949, and a per capita debt of $1,759. Chautauqua County will owe $13,896,100; Cherokee's share is $51,362,800; Cowley will owe $65,434,800; Elk County's share of this debt is $12,485,900; Crawford will be hit for $92,347,500; Labette comes up with $59,102,400; while Montgomery County's obligation runs to $88,829,500; Neosho County is in the kitty for $41,336,500; and Wilson County's share is $30,606,600.

I venture to say you never realized that your shares in this tremendous debt ran into the millions.

But that isn't all so grab your hat again. The President has proposed a spending budget of $42,439,000,000 for 1951.

This tax expert broke down this figure for me to show what each county will be liable for in the 1951 proposed spending budget. He computed it on the consumer income figures in the district for 1948, since the spending power of the people will determine how much of this budget each community must pay.

Are you ready? Chautauqua County's share, based on consumer spending is $1,410,500; Cherokee is down for $4,421,700; Cowley's share is twice as much, amounting to $9,956,200; Crawford County would have to shell out $10,912,800; Elk County gets off easy with $1,264,000; Labette goes up to $7,481,800; Montgomery County has a whopper in $12,406,200; Neosho County gets by with only $5,588,200; and Wilson County comes up with $3,011,300.

Maybe you can get your mind off all this money you owe and your share of the national debt and the new spending program by spending a quiet evening at home reading such deathless prose which you can get for free but paid for by your tax money as Powdery Mildew of Ornamental Plants, Take Care of Household Rubber, and Food for Two, provided, of course, you have any money left to buy food for two.

Taxes have gone up 800 percent since 1941. You can hardly afford to live and if you die your friends have to pay taxes in order to bury you, for all you leave will be eaten up in Federal and State inheritance taxes and the balance due on your last income tax. "To be, or not to be," still is the question.

Revenue Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this morning a bill (H. R. 7738) providing for revenue revision and correction of many tax inequities to which I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House.

I have introduced this bill at the request of the section of taxation of the American Bar Association, and this bill represents long and tedious research and work of that section, and their work has been approved by the American Bar Association.

I feel that the views of these distinguished lawyers are worthy of our most serious thought and study, and while I may not concur in each and every item, I have read the bill and I do heartily concur in most of it. This bill, if finally passed, will not, in my opinion, affect the revenue to any great extent, but will remove many inequities that should have been corrected long ago.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a full summarization and explanation of the bill prepared by the section of taxation.

SUMMARY EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF H. R. 7738 AND H. R. 7825

These bills, introduced March 16, 1950, by Representative A. SIDNEY CAMP, of Georgia, and March 23, 1950, by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York, at the request of the American Bar Association, collect in an orderly fashion a number of proposed changes in the internal revenue laws recommended by the association.

The following statement is designed to set forth in summary the nature of each of the changes proposed by the bill and the reasons therefor.

TITLE I—INCOME TAXES

Section 101, taxable years affected: Except as otherwise expressly provided, all amendments made by this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949.

Section 102, elimination of the life-insurance factor of pension trusts from taxable income of employees: Under the present law, if a plan provides retirement-income-insurance benefits together with death benefits, the employee receiving such protection is deemed to receive current taxable income measured by the cost of term life insurance in the amount provided during the year. The result is inconsistent with the long-standing rule to the effect that group-insurance benefits are not currently taxable to employees. The amounts are generally small and the administrative difficulties far outweigh the advantage in revenue to the Government. PS–58, promulgated January 30, 1947, and revised March 7, 1947, mitigates this burden somewhat, but does not cure the administrative nuisance, both to the Government and to employers and trustees, of treating the life-insurance factor as taxable income. The bar association proposes to eliminate the insurance factor of pension trusts from taxable income by an amendment to section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 103, extension to 75 days of the time within which taxpayer on accrual basis may contribute amounts to pension plan and secure deduction therefor on year of accrual: Under the present law, a taxpayer on an accrual basis cannot take a deduction for accrued amount of payments to a pension or profit-sharing plan unless actual payment is made within 60 days after the close of the taxable year of accrual. The bar association has recommended that section 23 (p) (1) (E) be amended so as to extend this time period to 75 days after the close of the taxable year. The payments under many plans are determinable only when the audited results of the year's operations are known, and often this is difficult to obtain within 60 days.

Section 104, union welfare trusts, deductibility of contributions: The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act has brought into the limelight so-called union welfare funds, many of which provide pension or annuity benefits. It is understood that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has taken the position that contributions by employers to such funds which provide such benefits are not deductible for income tax purposes unless they meet the requirements of section 23 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to conventional pension or annuity plans. The result of this position is to put in jeopardy the deduction of such contributions, since it will be difficult in most cases, if not impossible to meet the requirements of actuarial soundness applicable to deductions under section 23 (p). Accordingly, it is proposed to rectify the situation by making it clear that the deductibility of contributions to welfare trusts which meet the requirements of section 302 (c) (5) of the code, relating to ordinary and necessary business expenses. This is believed to be consonant with the intention of Congress, which could hardly have intended that the 1942 amendments to sections 23 (p) and 165 of the code should apply to these welfare trusts. This provision is made applicable to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 105, pension and profit-sharing plans; extension of capital gains treatment to distributions made within 1 year on account of either the employee's separation from the service or death: Under the present law, if the total distributions payable under a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of such distribution is considered a capital gain to the extent that the amount exceeds the amounts contributed by the employee. This provision is a very desirable one because if, when an employee retires and receives a lump sum payment, he were taxed at ordinary income rates in 1 year on the total amount of distributions over what he has contributed, a large percentage of the amount he receives might be taken by the tax authorities. Subsection (b) of the bar association proposal would amend section 165 (b) of the code so as to extend capital gains treatment not only to situations where the payment is due to the employee's separation from the service, but also to situations where it is due to the employee's death after his separation from the service.

Subsection (a) is an amendment to section 22 (b) (2) (B), to extend the same capital gains treatment to nontrusteed plans. There seems no reason why, if the particular pension or profit-sharing plan of a corporation is set up on an annuity basis rather than on a trust basis, this technical distinction should mean a different method of taxation to the recipient of the payments.

This section would be applicable to all taxable years since 1941.

Section 106, pension plans for partnerships and individual proprietorships: Under existing law, partners and sole proprietors may not be included as beneficiaries under pension plans for their employees under section 165 of the code, although stockholders employed by their corporation are not so affected. The result is to discourage the establishment of such plans for the employees of business conducted in these forms, and to discriminate against employees of unincorporated business. Section 106 would amend section 165 of the code by providing that the sole proprietor or partner who performs personal services in the business shall be treated as an "employee" as well as an "employer" for the purposes of that section; that the part of his income from the business which is attributable to his services shall be deemed "compensation"; and that where both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors, the apportionment of income to services shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner.

Section 107, taxation of annuity payments: Under present law, annuity payments are treated as in part a nontaxable return of premiums, and the balance as taxable income. However, the formula used treats as taxable income all of the excess annual receipts over and above 3 percent of the amounts paid for the annuity. The result is that many annuitants are never able to recapture their outlay tax-free, while others, through such recapture, incur a sharp rise

in taxable income in the year following that in which the total cost has been recovered under this arbitrary formula.

The proposed amendment substitutes a constant yearly exclusion for the life of the annuitant. If he lives out his exact life expectancy, he will recover tax-free exactly the cost of the annuity. If he lives beyond such expectancy, he will recover tax-free more than his premiums paid; if he dies before the expiration of such expectancy, he will recover less. However, on the average, the results are equitable in that the revenues will not be reduced, and the annuitant's taxable income from this source will be constant.

Section 108, cancellation of indebtedness: Section 22 (b) (a) of the code permits a corporation in certain situations to elect to exclude from gross income the income which would otherwise be taxable to it upon the cancellation of indebtedness, on condition that the basis of its property under section 113 be correspondingly reduced. This provision, in situations to which it applies, relieves hardship by deferring an additional tax burden upon a taxpayer already embarrassed financially. However, the provision is a temporary one, not applicable to cancellations of debt occurring after December 31, 1949; the election to get its benefits must be made at the time the return is filed, it does not apply to noncorporate taxpayers, and it does not apply unless the cancelled debt was evidenced by a security as therein defined.

Section 108 would make the provision a permanent part of the code; would extend the period of election until the expiration of the period for filing a claim for refund; would make the provision applicable to all taxpayers; and would eliminate the requirement that the debt be evidenced by a security. The reason for extending the date for election is that there is great uncertainty under the decisions (Cf. *Helvering* v. *American Dental Co.* (318 U. S. 322) and *Commissioner* v. *Jacobson* (336 U. S. 28)) as to when cancellation of debt results in taxable income to the debtor, and the taxpayer is often unable to determine what action to take at the time the return is filed.

Section 109, last-in-first-out inventory: Subsection (a) gives the Commissioner of Internal Revenue discretion (which he does not now have) in determining when the taxpayer must exercise the election under the involuntary liquidation and replacement provisions as to elective inventories contained in section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, so that it will be possible for him to provide relief in cases of hardship where the necessary election has not been made within the period prescribed by the statute.

In cases where, upon replacement of elective inventories involuntarily liquidated, deficiencies or refunds are determined for the year of involuntary liquidation, the present law provides that no interest is payable on such deficiencies or refunds. Subsection (b) provides for interest on such deficiencies from January 1, 1948, or from the date for the payment of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever is later; and provides for interest on such refunds from January 1, 1948, or from the date of filing of the claim for refund, whichever is later.

Section 110, alimony paid under separation agreement: Under sections 22 (k) and 171 (a) of the Code, amounts paid in accordance with the terms of a separation agreement between husband and wife, where they are not legally divorced or separated under court decree, are not deductible by the husband or taxable to the wife. With the privilege of splitting income introduced by the Revenue Act of 1948, which is open to all married couples not separated under a court decree, it is believed that where separate returns are filed, amounts paid under separation agreements should be deductible by the husband and taxable to the wife, even though they are not legally separated under court decree. The proposed amendment is to that effect although it should be noted that the husband and wife who are thus separated may, at their option, file a joint return, in which event the recommended change would become inapplicable.

Section 111, deduction of worthless stock loss in case of affiliated corporation: This section amends section 23 (g) (4) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code to remove an apparently unintended discrimination.

Section 23 (g) (4) provides that a corporation may deduct as an ordinary loss the loss on worthless stock in an affiliated corporation. In defining what is an affiliate for purposes of that paragraph, section 23 (g) (4) (B) provides that a corporation shall not be deemed to be an affiliate with the taxpayer unless more than 90 percent of the aggregate of its gross income for all years has been from sources other than royalties, rents, dividends, interest annuities, or gains from securities transactions. The limitation was put into the statute in order to exclude holding companies from the benefits of section 23 (g) (4), but as now worded the law inadvertently excludes a number of operating companies, such as banks and investment companies, just because much of their income is derived from rents, interest, or the like. The proposed amendment would extend the benefits of section 23 (g) (4) to losses on the stock of corporations "actively engaged in a trade or business," whatever the source of their income.

Section 112, extension of business-bad-debt reduction: Under existing law a distinction is made between business bad debts and nonbusiness bad debts. The distinction is important because the former are deductible in full and the latter (in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation) are treated as short-term capital losses which are deductible only against capital gains plus not more than $1,000 of ordinary income. The nonbusiness bad debt is so defined under existing law as to include true business debts which do not become worthless until after the taxpayer has terminated his business. Since it is manifestly unfair to distinguish in this manner between business debts which become worthless while the business is still in operation and those which become worthless at a later date, section 112 amends the definition of a nonbusiness bad debt so as to exclude a debt arising in the course of the taxpayer's trade or business.

Section 113, change of election with respect to standard deduction: Existing law permits the individual income taxpayer to elect to take a standard deduction instead of itemizing his deductions. This election must be made on the tax return in a manner prescribed by regulations. An election so made is irrevocable. This provision has worked unjustly for taxpayers who find subsequently that they have acted unwisely or whose correct taxable income is subsequently found to be different from that on the return. Section 113 permits the taxpayer to change an election with respect to the standard deductions for any taxable year within the period of the statute of limitations. Such change must be made under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

Section 114, wages paid to dependents: Under existing law a taxpayer is permitted to claim a deduction under the income tax for wages paid by him to a person who is a dependent and for whom the taxpayer claims an exemption. Since these wages reduce the extent of the recipient's dependency, it is undesirable to allow the deduction while also allowing the dependency credit. Section 114 disallows the deduction of wages paid to persons who are dependents of the taxpayer.

Section 115, unpaid expenses and interest, related taxpayers: Section 24 (c) of the code was passed at the request of the Treasury to eliminate a great inequity against the Government. Prior to that act, corporate taxpayers would be permitted deductions on the accrual basis for amounts of salaries or interest or the like accrued to related taxpayers, but the related taxpayers (being on the cash basis) might delay for a long time paying or might never pay a tax on the income. Despite the clear purpose of section 24 (c) which was simply to correct the injustice against the Government which was previously possible, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has with success applied that section even to cases where the related taxpayer, although on the cash basis, is actually taxed upon the accrued item upon a theory of constructive receipt. See *Lake* v. *Commissioner* (148 F. (2d) 898). Section 115 of the bill would amend section 24 (c) so as to provide that, if the recipient of income is actually taxed on the income, whether or not received by him, the deduction will be allowed to the related taxpayer.

Section 116, credit for dividends received: Under existing law, section 26 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code limits the dividends received credit to 85 percent of the amount received as dividends from domestic corporations which are subject to income taxation. This credit is not extended to resident foreign corporations having substantial income from sources within the United States. Such resident foreign corporations are frequently owned by domestic corporations with the result that, although the foreign corporation is subjected to the regular 38 percent normal and surtax rates with respect to its earnings from the United States sources, dividends to the parent domestic corporation do not furnish a basis for the dividends received credit otherwise afforded similarly owned domestic corporations. The proposed amendment will remedy that situation by extending such credit, with what are believed to be appropriate limitations.

Section 117, installment sales: Section 44 (b) permits use of the installment method, in the case of sales of realty and casual sales of personalty, only where the payments during the taxable year in which the sale is made are less than 30 percent of the selling price. Where no payments at all are received in the initial period, the Treasury holds that the conditions are not met and the installment method may not be used. The proposed amendment would avoid this interpretation and would permit application of the installment sales provisions where no part of the selling price is received during the taxable year.

Section 118, installment obligations: This section extends to the estate or beneficiary of a decedent who has elected to report income from installment obligations upon the installment basis a deduction for that portion of the estate tax which was imposed upon the value of such obligations, where the executor or beneficiary makes a similar election.

Section 119, taxable years of approximately 12 months: This section gives specific legal sanction to the practice of authorizing the use of a 52-week or 53-week year for the purpose of reporting for the income tax.

Section 120, service rendered for a period of 36 months or more: Existing law provides that if at least 80 percent of the total compensation for personal services covering a period of 36 calendar months or more is received or accrued in a single taxable year by an individual or partnership, the tax may be calculated as if the income had been received ratably over the period, prior to such receipt or accrual, in which the services were performed. The relief provided by this averaging device is limited specifically to cases where compensation has been received in a single year for at least 80 percent of a complete task. Relief is denied in situations

where an individual is employed continuously for long periods but receives portions of his compensation for the work in lump sums at infrequent intervals. Section 120 extends averaging treatment to cases in which 80 percent of the total compensation for work done to date over a period of 36 months or more is received or accrued in a single taxable year. This provision is made retroactive to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Section 121, election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations: Many corporations having no substantial accumulations of earnings and profits nevertheless hold real estate or unlisted corporate securities not readily marketable but considerably appreciated in value. Several times Congress has passed temporary legislation to permit such corporations to be liquidated under certain circumstances without adverse effects upon the stockholders; that is, by taxing to the individual stockholder as ordinary income only that part of the distribution which represents accumulated earnings, the remainder being treated as a capital gain, but excluding from tax the unrealized appreciation in value of assets, that gain being postponed until the stockholder sells such assets. See section 112 (b) (7) of the code. Section 127 of H. R. 6712, the revenue revision bill of 1948, would have again provided for such treatment but only for liquidations occurring within some one calendar month in 1949. It is felt that the purpose accomplished generally by this type of legislation is beneficial to the public; and, if this is true, it should not be limited to a single short period. The proposed amendment would make permanent in the Internal Revenue Code the temporary provision of section 127 of H. R. 6712.

Section 122, gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations: Under existing law, if a corporation is liquidated by distributing its assets to its stockholders, no tax is imposed on the corporation on any appreciation in the value of the assets over their adjusted basis (or cost) to the corporation. As far as the stockholders are concerned, any excess of the value of such assets over the cost or other basis of the stock is taxed as capital gains.

On the other hand, if the corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, a tax is imposed on the corporation, and when the proceeds are distributed to the stockholders another tax may be imposed on them. In a great many cases disputes have arisen between the Government and the taxpayer as to whether a sale was made by a corporation or its shareholders. The problem first went to the Supreme Court in the *Court Holding Company case* (324 U. S. 331 (1945)), and again in the *Cumberland Public Service Company* case, decided January 9, 1950, where the Court said: "The oddities in tax consequences that emerge from the tax provisions here controlling appear to be inherent in the present tax pattern. * * * Congress having determined that different tax consequences shall flow from different methods by which the shareholders of a closely held corporation may dispose of corporate property, we accept its mandate."

Section 122 provides that if a corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, no gain or loss shall be recognized to the corporation. It contains safeguard provisions against liquidation being used as a device for paying at capital gain rates on sales in the normal course of trade.

Section 123, stock dividends: As the result of recent Treasury Department rulings, the receipt by a taxpayer of preferred stock tax-free as a stock dividend or in a corporate reorganization depends not only upon whether the dividend is in form a tax-free stock dividend or the reorganization is in form a tax-free reorganization, but also upon whether the preferred stock so received is sold by the receiving stockholder or whether it is subject to redemption under sinking fund provisions or by reason of an agreement that the stock may otherwise be redeemed by the corporation in whole or in part. This Treasury attitude makes uncertain the previously well-established law as to tax-free stock dividends and as to the tax-free status of stock received in exchanges under section 112 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. This uncertainty is hampering many legitimate transactions which should be consummated.

The effect of the proposed amendments is to state explicitly what is deemed to be declaratory of existing law, namely, that the effect of the tax-free character of a corporate distribution of stock should not be lost merely because the stockholder sells or intends to sell his new securities or that the new securities are subject to a sinking fund provision of reasonable length fixed with reference to assuring the marketability of the stock or that the stock is subject to redemption, in whole or in part, at the option of the issuing corporation. The proposed amendments also include a provision that would close any loophole that may exist by reason of a taxpayer entering into a tax-avoidance plan to receive a tax-free distribution of stock, sell the stock, and then to have the stock redeemed in the hands of the purchaser.

Section 124, involuntary conversion: Section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code postpones the taxation of profits realized in involuntary conversions where similar properties are acquired to replace those converted. The present statute has been construed to limit the relief to situations where the specific funds received on the involuntary conversion can be traced into similar property. It is often necessary to replace the property before the proceeds of the involuntary conversion are actually in the hands of the taxpayer. Section 124 of the bill amends section 112 (f) so as to provide that it is immaterial whether the money into which such property has been converted is expended directly in the acquisition of other similar property or whether it is used to replace funds already expended by the taxpayer in such acquisition.

Section 125, definition of reorganization: This section provides that section 112 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss in corporate reorganizations) be amended so as to provide that no gain or loss shall be recognized where assets exchanged solely for stock are transferred to a corporation which is a wholly owned subsidiary of the corporation from which the stock is received. Under the present definition of "reorganization" in section 112, as construed by the courts, a reorganization which would in all other respects be nontaxable may be made taxable if the assets transferred in exchange for stock are transferred not to the corporation issuing the stock but to a subsidiary of that corporation. The nature of the interest of the corporation transferring the assets and the nature of the interest of the corporation issuing the stock in return therefor are substantially the same whether the assets are transferred directly to the corporation which issues the stock or to a subsidiary of that corporation.

Section 126, distribution of stock on reorganization: This section of the bill provides for the nonrecognition of gain from the receipt of stock in certain corporate reorganizations known as "spin-offs." A typical "spin-off" occurs where a part of the assets of the corporation is transferred to a new corporation in exchange for all the stock of the new corporation which is thereupon distributed to the stockholders of the original corporation without the surrender by them of any of the stock of the original corporation.

A similar provision was contained in section 112 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1932 and prior acts but this was omitted in the Revenue Act of 1934 because the decision of the Board of Tax Appeals in *Evelyn F. Gregory* (27 B. T. A. 223 (1932)) indicated that such provision might be subject to abuse and held to apply to what was regarded as in substance the distribution of a dividend. The reversal of that decision in 69 F. (2d) 809 (CCA2, 1934), affirmed 293 U. S. 465 (1935), removed the danger of such abuse. Judicial and administrative interpretation of the law since 1934 has established safeguards which now prevent such abuse of the reorganization provisions. It is proposed to restore this provision to the law because it is believed that it is economically unsound to impede reorganizations which divide one corporate enterprise into a greater number of corporate enterprises where such division is undertaken for legitimate business purposes and is not a mere device for the distribution of a dividend. Where stock of a new corporation is distributed without the surrender of stock of the old corporation, the result is identical, in substance, with transactions in which stock of the new corporation is distributed in exchange for the surrender of either all or a portion of the stock of the old corporation—transactions which give rise to no recognized gain under present law. It is not intended to change the existing law as to such transactions but to amend the law so as to permit in the future the same substantial result to be accomplished with the same tax consequences by a "spin-off" reorganization, all three types of reorganizations being subject to the general limitations embodied in the Gregory case and subsequent decisions based thereon.

Section 127, basis of property included in decedent's estate: Under the present law, if property passes by virtue of a decedent's will or inheritance from him, the income-tax basis for such property in the hands of his estate, devisee or heir, becomes the value at the date of death (or such other valuation date as is used for estate tax purposes). With two minor qualifications, the foregoing rule does not apply to property transferred inter vivos by a decedent even though such property may be includible in his gross estate for estate tax purposes, as, for example, property transferred in contemplation of death. The proposed amendment would change the law so that if property were transferred either inter vivos, or by reason of the decedent's death, and if such property were includible in his gross estate for estate tax purposes, the income tax basis of such property would become, after his death, its value on the date of death (or other applicable valuation date).

Section 128, adjustment of basis for depreciation: This section amends section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code and prior revenue laws to mitigate the effect of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Virginian Hotel Corporation* v. *Commissioner* (319 U. S. 523 (1943)). Section 113 requires that the original cost or other basis of property be adjusted to reflect depreciation and depletion sustained since the property was acquired. In 1932 the provision was amended to require the deduction of depreciation "allowed" where it was in excess of the depreciation "allowable." The amendment was made at the request of the Treasury, and the legislative history of the amendment shows very clearly that the sole purpose of the provision was to cover a situation where the excessive depreciation resulted in reducing the taxes collected by the Government in a year which had become barred, so that if the excessive depreciation were restored the taxpayer would in effect be getting a double deduction against the Government. However, the Court in the Virginian Hotel case reached an incongruous and inequitable result. That deci-

sion prevents a taxpayer from correcting a prior erroneous depreciation figure, even when the Government has not been injured by the error. Section 128 would correct this situation in a manner similar to that proposed in H. R. 1104 introduced in the Eightieth Congress, first session. The amendment, in line with the otherwise universal practice of the Federal income tax statutes from 1913 to date, would permit a taxpayer to compute the taxes for any year on a correct basis, without regard to any error in prior years. so long as the error did not deprive the Government of taxes to which it was entitled.

Section 129, redemption of corporate stock in decedent's estate: Difficulty has been experienced by decedents' estates in providing money with which to pay Federal estate taxes and State inheritance taxes where the assets of the estate include stock of a closely held corporation. Stock and securities of that character are quite often difficult, if not impossible, to sell at a price approximating the value determined in fixing the Federal estate tax. A possible source of funds for that purpose is the sale of the stock to the issuing corporation, or the retirement of the stock if it is preferred or redeemable stock. Concern has been expressed, however, that in many such cases the redemption or purchase of the stock (unless the estate's entire holding is so disposed of) will be treated as a dividend, subject to income tax, under the provisions of section 115 (g), which taxes as a dividend distributions in cancellation or redemption of stock that are considered to be essentially equivalent to the distribution of a taxable dividend. To provide liquidity in this respect the proposed amendment makes section 115 (g) inapplicable to such distributions with the proviso that the stock must be subject to the Federal estate tax and with the limitation that section 115 (g) will be inapplicable only to the extent of the amount of death taxes to which the estate is subject.

SEC. 130, retirement of bonds: Section 117 (f) provides capital gain treatment for the redemption of bonds and similar securities in registered or coupon form, although the gain from payment of other evidences of indebtedness is ordinary income. Under the present law, it is possible to convert ordinary evidence of indebtedness into bonds and similar securities without gain or loss and the gain from the redemption thereof will be treated as a capital gain. The Treasury complained that ordinary income could thus be converted into capital gain merely by changing the type of the evidence of indebtedness and in order to prevent this practice H. R. 6712, the tax revision bill of 1948, contained a provision to the effect that capital gain would result in such cases only where the evidence of indebtedness was originally issued in coupon or registered form. It is believed that the purpose sought to be accomplished by this proposal was proper but that it was too extreme. Assets of a character which give rise to capital gain need only be held 6 months under section 117, and the proposed amendment provides capital gain treatment where the conversion occurred 6 months or more prior to the redemption.

Section 131, holding period for capital assets: Under existing law, it has been held (*Commissioner* v. *Gracey* (159 F. (2d) 324)) that if a noncapital asset is exchanged for a capital asset, the holding period for the former may be tacked on to the holding period for the latter for purposes of deciding whether the capital gain is long term or short term. This construction offers a loophole for tax avoidance, and the proposed section closes this loophole by preventing such a tacking on.

Section 132, capital gains upon maturity or surrender of insurance policy: Under the present law, amounts received upon the maturity of an endowment policy or the surrender of a life-insurance policy during the lifetime of the insured are treated as ordinary income. In practical effect, the present system amounts to the taxation in a single year of income that was actually accumulated over a period of many years, and the result is that the recipient may be taxed at a considerably higher rate than that at which he would have been taxed if the net gain had been paid out to him over the life of the policy in the form of distributed earnings. Section 132 of the present bill would eliminate this harshness by amending section 117 of the code so as to extend capital gains treatment to such situations.

Section 133, unlimited deduction for charitable contributions: This is merely a technical amendment correcting an error made in the current Tax Payment Act of 1943.

Existing law waives the 15 percent limitation on allowable charitable deductions of individuals in cases where, for 10 successive years, the contributions of the individual, plus his income taxes paid during the year with respect to preceding years, exceed 90 percent of his net income. However, under the current tax payment system taxes are paid with respect to the current taxable year rather than the preceding year. The current Tax Payment Act failed to make an essential amendment of section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the 90 percent limitation applies also to taxes paid with respect to the current year. This amendment, therefore, is retroactive to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

Section 134, net operating loss deduction: The present law permits a corporation, but not an individual, to include in the computation of a net operating loss carry-back or carry-over losses arising from the sale of property used in a trade or business. The proposed amendment is intended to accord to individuals the same privilege now granted to corporations.

Section 135, refunds based on foreign tax credit: Section 131 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code permits the Commissioner, without any time limitation, to assert additional tax for prior years resulting from any claim of foreign tax credit in excess of the foreign tax which is ultimately paid by the taxpayer. However, if the amount of credit claimed under section 131 for foreign taxes is less than the amount ultimately paid, and if the statute of limitations for filing refund claims has expired under section 322 of the Code at the time that the additional foreign taxes are finally determined, the taxpayer is barred by the statute of limitations from securing a refund of United States taxes paid for the earlier year because of his not having claimed a sufficient amount of foreign tax credit. In other words, the assessment of additional United States taxes is never barred, whereas the refund of United States taxes is barred within the customary periods in section 322.

The proposed revision affords parallel treatment in the two instances referred to, providing equality to taxpayers with respect to the treatment of such foreign tax credits.

Section 136, accrual of foreign taxes: Under present rulings, credits for foreign taxes are not allowable to accrual-basis taxpayers until the final determination of controversies abroad with reference to such foreign taxes. Delay in such foreign determination often results in the taxpayer's loss of any substantial benefit of the credit, because of reduction or elimination of foreign income in the later year and the resultant credit restriction under section 131 (b) of the code.

The proposed amendment authorizes the computation of such foreign-tax credits under the rule of accrual in the year with respect to which the tax is imposed.

Section 137, taxation of the income of estates and trusts: Under the law as it existed prior to 1942, the income of many trusts was wholly or partly taxable to the trust rather than the beneficiary, although the income was actually distributed to the beneficiary. To prevent this form of tax avoidance, Congress adopted in the Revenue Act of 1942 a very complicated set of rules for the determination of distributable income. Two of these rules, known as the 65-day and 12-month rules, require the computation of trust income for arbitrary periods of time, and have proved unduly burdensome and difficult to apply.

The proposed amendment will eliminate these highly technical rules without reopening the loophole for tax avoidance which Congress sought to abolish in the 1942 act. This is accomplished by taxing to the beneficiary any distribution from a trust, provided the amount of this distribution does not exceed the amount of net income realized by the trust by the end of its taxable year.

The amendment limits the amounts includible in the income of the beneficiaries to the net income of the estate or trust, thus abrogating the rules of the *Johnston* v. *Helvering* (141 F. (2d) 208), and *McCullough* v. *Commissioner* (153 F. (2d) 345). The amendment is intended to provide that income shall retain its character and identity in the hands of the beneficiary, thus making it clear that the estate or trust is a conduit of property passing through it to a beneficiary.

The proposed amendment also clarifies the law relating to the ultimate tax on items such as capital gains which are taxable as gross income under Federal tax law, but are treated as items of principal under State law. Such items under the proposed amendment will remain taxable to the fiduciary unless the will or trust instrument specifically provides for their distribution to a beneficiary.

Section 138, income of discretionary insurance trusts: This section of the bill provides that section 167 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the taxation of income of insurance trusts to the grantor, be amended so as to tax the grantor only to the extent that trust income is actually used to pay premiums on insurance policies on his life. This would bring the taxation of insurance trusts in line with the present taxation of maintenance trusts as to which, since 1943, it has been provided that the grantor will be taxed only to the extent that trust income is actually used for the support or maintenance of persons he is obligated to support.

Section 139, statute of limitations in case of failure to file return: There is presently no statute of limitations where no return was filed, however innocently. The proposed amendment would provide a 6-year statute of limitations (which is double the normal period) where the failure to file a return was not due to fraudulent intent. In the absence of fraud, the reasons underlying the policy of repose in other fields appear equally applicable to tax liabilities.

Section 140, statute of limitations where failure to file return results from commissioner's ruling: Under the present law, where a taxpayer files no return, there is no period of limitations upon the assessment of additional taxes even though, in failing to file a return, the taxpayer relied upon rulings of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Where the commissioner's rulings, at the time a return would otherwise be due, are to the effect that no return is necessary, the normal period of limitations should operate just as though a return had been filed, and this section would so provide.

Section 141, penalty for failure to file return: Under this section, the provisions of the income tax law relating to penalties for failure to file returns would be amended by liberalizing the conditions under which no penalty is applicable and by vesting in the Commissioner discretion to reduce or remit

penalties in proper circumstances. Under the present law, penalties are not imposed if failure to file is due to reasonable cause, but the courts have defined those words so strictly that in many cases the section works great hardship. This section proposes to eliminate this harshness by an amendment to section 291 of the Internal Revenue Code, and to eliminate a parallel harshness now contained in section 506 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code which denies a deficiency dividend credit to a personal holding company if there is a finding that any part of the deficiency is due to a failure to file the return on time, unless such failure is due to reasonable cause. The principal changes are (a) to provide specifically that if the failure to file results from the belief, founded upon a reasonable basis that no return is required, this shall be deemed reasonable cause and (b) to give the commissioner authority to abate, reduce, or refund the penalty, as he deems proper under the circumstances.

Section 142, period of limitations on claims against transferees: Under existing law, the Commissioner is given 3 years in which to assess income taxes against the taxpayer. If the taxpayer has transferred his assets without consideration, the Commissioner is given an additional year to assess against the transferee. Where, however, the Commissioner has done nothing within the 3 years and the taxpayer thereafter transfers his assets, there seems to be no reason to allow him to revive his dead claim by assessment against the transferee, and the proposed section would specifically prohibit him from doing so.

Section 143, transferee not bound, in absence of timely notice, by determination against transferor: The law provides generally that if assets of a transferor are transferred to another, the transferee, under the trust fund doctrine, shall be responsible for such taxes as may be held to be owed by the transferor. Under the present law, it frequently happens that after such transfer the Commissioner will issue a deficiency notice to the transferor without notifying the transferee against whom the tax will ultimately be assessed. In such cases, as in the case of a dissolved corporation, a petition may be filed by former officers who have no real interest in the liability and the decision may be rendered that the tax is due by the transferor. In a number of decisions it has been held that such a decision against the transferor is binding on the transferee regardless of the fact that such transferee has not had any opportunity to defend himself. Thus, the transferee may never have his day in court.

The proposed amendment provides that no decision rendered against the transferor after the transfer of assets shall be binding upon the transferee unless said transferee shall have been given personal notice of liability and a full opportunity to appear and be heard in said previous proceeding.

Section 144, limitation on refunds in case of waivers: Section 322 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code was inserted therein by section 169 of the Revenue Act of 1942. Section 509 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1943 gave this subsection retroactive effect. The stated purpose of section 322 (b) (3) was to extend the period within which claims for refund might be filed in cases where a waiver of the statute of limitations is given, by permitting such claims be filed at any time within 6 months after the expiration of the waiver. However, according to the interpretation placed upon these amendments by the Treasury Department, they have the effect of cutting down the usual 2-year period after payment within which claims may be filed, in any case where the waiver expires more than 6 months before the expiration of such 2-year period. The provisions of these amendments are quite complicated and, if the Treasury Department's construction is correct, have served as a trap to lull taxpayers into the belief that they would continue to have the right to file claim at any time within 2 years after payment. The amendment here proposed would have the effect in all cases of permitting a claim for refund at any time within 2 years after the payment of the tax.

Section 145, limitation period in certain cases before the Tax Court: By reason of uncertainties frequently existing as to the year for determining the deductibility of a bad debt or of a worthless security, the Revenue Act of 1942 provided a special 7-year period of limitations within which to claim refunds or credits attributable to the allowance of deductions for such items. This was accomplished by the insertion of section 322 (b) (5) in the Internal Revenue Code. This section (as amended by section 504 of the 1943 act) is applicable to years beginning after December 31, 1937.

Under section 322 (d) of the code, this special 7-year statute of limitations is made applicable to proceedings in the Tax Court but that section in this respect was made applicable only to years beginning after December 31, 1942. It thus happens that in certain proceedings before the Tax Court, the 7-year statute is inapplicable to years ending before December 31, 1942, although the taxpayer, had he not filed a petition with the Tax Court, would be at liberty to file a claim for refund and, if necessary, prosecute the refund in other courts. The proposed amendment would make the 7-year statute applicable in all such proceedings.

Section 146, extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee: Under existing law, both the taxpayer and his transferee may agree in writing with the Commissioner to extend the period of limitation for assessment of the tax. If the taxpayer does so, his time for claiming a refund of overpayment is correspondingly extended. However (probably due to a legislative oversight), such an extension of transferee liability under existing law does not extend the transferee's period for claiming a refund of an erroneous payment. The proposed amendment would remove this discrimination and give the transferee a similar extension of time.

Section 147, exemption of personal holding company classification of corporation joining in consolidated return: Under the Revenue Act of 1942, a personal holding company not filing a consolidated return was subject to personal holding company tax but not to excess-profits tax. When the 1942 act extended the privilege of filing consolidated returns to affiliated corporations generally, it provided that if an affiliated group wished to file a consolidated return all of the corporations in the group, including any affiliated personal holding company, must join in the return. The bar association believes that it was not the intention of Congress that a holding company in such circumstances should be subject to both the personal holding company tax and the excess-profits tax, and has recommended an amendment to section 501 (b) of the code which would exempt such corporations from the personal holding company classification. Section 131 of the Revenue Act of 1943 changed this rule for the later years of the excess-profits tax (See S. Rept. No. 627, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 64), and, of course, the bar association recommendation has no application to years after the elimination of the excess-profits tax. The recommendation applies only to correct inequities done in 1942 and 1943.

Section 148, family partnerships: This section would clarify the tax status of so-called family partnerships. This subject has become greatly confused by judicial decisions which have departed from the otherwise generally recognized principle that the income from donated or purchased property is taxable to the donee or purchaser of that property. The amendment proposed to section 3797 is somewhat longer and more detailed than might be wished, but this detailed treatment seems necessary in order to safeguard the Government's interest and prevent family partnerships from being used as a device to avoid taxes on the income from personal services of one member of the family. Under the proposed amendment, a partner who has contributed capital to the partnership must be recognized as a partner, even though he acquired that capital by gift. On the other hand, if the gift was made by a member of the donee's family, who continues as a partner, the proportion of the donee's interest in the partnership income must bear the same ratio to his capital as that of the donor; if in excess of that ratio, the excess would be taxed to the donor. In such a situation, it is also provided that, if the partnership agreement does not provide for a reasonable allowance for personal services rendered by the donor, a reasonable amount shall be attributed to such services, taxed to the donor and deducted from the taxable share of the donee of the partnership interest.

Section 149, mitigation of statute of limitations: The present section 3801 includes provisions dealing with certain situations in which one taxpayer is taxed on an item of income which has previously been erroneously taxed to another taxpayer, and is designed to avoid the Government's keeping both levies. As it stands now, however, such remedial effect does not apply except where the taxpayer who erroneously reported the income was, at the time of the erroneous reporting, related to the taxpayer who correctly reported the item of income, as (A) husband and wife, (B) grantor and fiduciary, (C) grantor and beneficiary, (D) fiduciary and beneficiary, legatee, or heir, (E) decedent and decedent's estate, or (F) partner.

The proposed amendment eliminates the requirement of relationship, so that if an item of income is taxed to any taxpayer, any other taxpayer who has already paid income taxes on the item will be entitled to a refund of such income taxes.

Section 150, net operating losses allowable to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganizations: Where there is a continuity of proprietorship in corporate reorganizations so that gain or loss on such transactions are not recognized for tax purposes, the nontax-recognized transaction should not establish a bar to the normal net loss carry-over and carry-back or the excess profits credit carry-over adjustments. Basis for assets and statutory invested capital are frozen in these transactions, and the successor is for all practical purposes indistinguishable from its transferor. Section 150 of the bill would permit the treatment of net loss carry-overs consistently with this identity, and section 192 would extend similar treatment to the excess profits credit carry-over.

Section 151, interest on deficiencies offset by overpayments for same year: In cases where there is an overpayment of excess profits tax and resulting underpayment of income tax, or vice versa, the taxing authorities charge interest on the entire underpayment from the due date of the return, but credit interest on the entire overpayment, only from the date it was paid, which may be the date of the last installment. Since the underpayment could have been paid in installments if it had been paid on time and since the amount of each installment of the overpaid tax was greater than was legally due, it is only fair to the taxpayer to set off the overpayment against the underpayment and charge or credit interest on the balance. However, present law does not permit this. The section proposal would require it.

Section 152, tax treatment upon death of partner: Partnership agreements often provide for payment of specified amounts of future partnership income to the estate or widow of a deceased partner. Such pro-

visions are designed to produce roughly the equivalent of the decedent's interest in the assets, including his share of income earned by the partnership but not received or accrued at death. The tax status of such payments is uncertain under existing law. In some cases such payments have been taxed as income to the surviving partners and to the estate or widow of the deceased partner.

Section 152 excludes amounts so distributed from the distributive share of the surviving partners, except that this rule does not apply to that portion of the distributions which represents payments for decedent's interest in tangible and other assets of the partnership which have an adjusted basis in excess of zero. Amounts so excluded from income of the survivors are treated as income of the estate or widow of the decedent in the year received.

Section 153, gain or loss on sale or exchange of residence: Under existing law a gain realized upon the sale or exchange of a taxpayer's personal residence is taxable, but a loss so realized is not deductible from income. During the current inflation in real estate, many taxpayers who have been forced by circumstances to move their residences have been taxed upon large gains when they disposed of the old residence but have been forced to reinvest the entire proceeds or even more in order to obtain a new home. This has caused widespread complaint at taxation of ephemeral profits, and it is believed that relief is warranted.

The proposed section 153 limits the recognized gain to the cash and other benefits received and not reinvested, with appropriate provisions to cover anticipatory replacement cases and the rather complicated problem of assumed mortgages. It also provides that the cost of the new property shall be reduced by the amount of gain not recognized on sale of the prior residence or increased by the loss on such sale, as the case may be. The effect is that there is a continuing transaction from the purchase of the first residence until sale of the second, with no tax consequences (except for cash received and not reinvested) upon the disposition of the first residence.

Section 154, employees' stock options: In *Commissioner* v. *Smith* ((1945) 324 U. S. 177) the Supreme Court held that an employee who exercised a stock option which had been given him as compensation was taxable, at the time of exercise, upon the excess of the value of the stock at that time over the option price. Since then the Treasury has laid down such broad rules based upon the decision that it is impracticable for corporations to issue incentive options to their employees, since if the tax accrues at the time of exercise of the option a large part of the stock may have to be sold at once in order to pay the tax, which in some instances, at least, may be based on a paper profit which may never be realized in cash.

This proposal provides deferment of the tax until sale or other disposition of the stock, with appropriate provisions to prevent tax avoidance. It also provides that the taxable compensation cannot exceed the gain recognized on sale of the stock. If the option is sold prior to exercise the entire amount realized therefor is treated as taxable compensation to the extent that it exceeds the cost basis. The proposal is applicable only at the election of the taxpayer, who may elect to be taxed under the present rules if he so desires. It is believed that this proposal will facilitate use of stock options as an incentive factor, will provide a reasonably simple, workable set of rules, and will afford adequate protection of the revenue.

TITLE IA—EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Section 191, effective date of amendments: Except as otherwise specifically provided, this title becomes effective upon the enactment of the act.

Section 192, carry-overs and carry-backs allowable to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganizations: This is a companion provision to that appearing in section 150, discussed above.

As the law now reads, the excess profits credit carry-over or carry-back is allowed only to the taxpayer. If a corporation loses its identity in a reorganization, the new corporation cannot carry over the unused credit of the old company or companies; neither can an unused credit of the new company be carried back against the excess profits net income of the old company. This section would permit the normal application of these credits by respecting the substantial identity of the old and new corporation.

Section 193, source of preferred stock dividends paid in first 60 days of taxable year, in enacting section 718 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, Congress apparently desired the conclusive presumption there established as to the source of distribution made in the first 60 days of the taxable year to act as a deterrent to the postponement of distributions by corporations into a succeeding year—postponement often carried out in order that there might be, by this manipulation and timing, a minimization of the reduction of equity invested capital for the year. In the case of preferred stock, where periodical payments are provided for under charter or bylaw provisions, there is no such field for manipulation; and there is no need for the application of a conclusive presumption which may be contrary to actual fact. Section 193 amends section 718 (c) (2) of the code to make the conclusive presumption inapplicable in such cases, and leave the effect of such distribution upon equity invested capital to be tested factually during the first 60 days just as it is tested factually during the remainder of the year.

Section 194, computation of equity-invested capital: Prior to the amendment of section 718 of the code by section 219 of the Revenue Act of 1942, in computing the invested capital of a corporation which acquired all of the assets of another corporation solely for the voting stock, only the basis of the assets on hand at the time of the acquisition by the new corporation could be included in invested capital. In other words, the deficit of the old corporation which did not reduce its own invested capital did reduce the invested capital of the new corporation. Section 219 of the Revenue Act of 1942 was designed to overcome that result and to provide that the invested capital of the new company should be the same as the invested capital of the old company and that the deficit of the old company would not be applied to reduce the invested capital of the new company. In interpreting that section in T. D. 5267 (adding section 30.718-7 of Regulations 109, approved May 27, 1943), the Treasury has taken the position that section 219 does not apply to a tax-free exchange involving two or more transferors. Section 194 of this bill amends section 718 (c) (5) of the code to provide explicitly that, if a corporation acquires all of the assets of one or more corporations under the conditions set forth therein then the benefits of that section should be derived by the resulting corporation.

Section 195, review of abnormalities by the Tax Court: This section would change existing law in the following respects:

1. Restriction of assessment and collection of deficiency while application for relief pending: Since 1924, it has been provided by law that, except in certain unusual cases, a taxpayer may litigate taxes, other than excise taxes, before being called upon to pay them. However, under the excess-profits-tax provisions, as now interpreted by the Tax Court and administered by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Commissioner may determine a deficiency in excess-profits taxes and may proceed to assess and collect such deficiency even though the taxpayer has pending a claim for relief, which may or may not eliminate the deficiency in whole or in part. The bill would amend section 732 (a) so as to prohibit the assessment and collection of the proposed deficiency until the claim for relief is finally determined.

2. Tax Court jurisdiction where tax not paid: In *American Coast Line, Inc.*, v. *Commissioner* (6 T. C. 67 (affirmed 159 F. (2d) 665)), the Tax Court held that it had no jurisdiction to review a denial by the Commissioner of a claim for relief under section 722 where all of the statutory excess-profits tax had not been paid. A dissenting opinion in that case described the decision as ascribing an "inconsistent and inequitable" purpose to the Congress, since the statute provides that the taxpayer may withhold a part of the tax in dispute until the relief claim is determined. The bill would resolve this apparent inconsistency and make it clear that the Tax Court may pass upon such relief claims before the tax is paid.

Section 196, appellate court review of abnormalities: Sections 732 (c) and 732 (d) of the code provide that decisions of the Tax Court rendered in relief cases shall be reviewed only by a special division of the Tax Court, and that no review shall be had of such decisions by the court of appeals. The special division of the Tax Court permits no hearing on review of the trial judge's decision. This proposed amendment provides for review of such relief decisions by the full Tax Court, and for review of law questions by the courts of appeals in the same manner as other decisions of the Tax Court are reviewable.

TITLE II—ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Part I—Estate tax

Section 201, estates to which amendments applicable: Except as expressly otherwise provided, the amendments apply only to estates of decedents dying after the enactment of the act.

Section 202, rates and credits: The present estate tax rate structure is, for historical reasons, complicated and unwieldy and should be simplified. The proposed amendment combines credits and makes possible computation of the tax due by applying a a single schedule to the net estate, which itself would be arrived at by subtracting a single specific exemption and then subtracting a single set of credits.

Section 203, proceeds of life insurance: This proposed amendment to section 811 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code would make it clear that insurance is to be treated like any other property, and affected by all provisions governing the inclusion of other property in a decedent's gross estate. When proceeds of policies are receivable by a beneficiary other than a decedent's estate and all of the incidents of ownership in respect to said policies were irrevocably transferred by the decedent during his lifetime, and not in contemplation of death, the proceeds of such policies should not be included in the gross estate. The present rule seems very unfair, in that life insurance, to the extent that the decedent has paid the premiums thereon, may not be assigned or transferred by complete and outright gift in such manner as to exclude the proceeds from the donor's taxable estate, although such a disposition can be made of any other kind of property.

Section 204, transfers in contemplation of death: This section of the bill amends section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to gifts in contemplation of death, to provide that no property shal be included in an estate on a theory of contemplation of death if the transfer occurred more than 5 years prior to death. In enacting the contemplation-of-death provision, Congress intended to meet those situations where, in a very real sense, the transferor attempted to

get rid of his property at a time which bore some reasonable relation to impending death. Where the gift has occurred long prior to death the likelihood of tax motivation is remote, and—of equal importance in the satisfactory administration of the law—the problem of proof of the motive for the gift is so difficult as often to result in much unfairness, simply by virtue of the fact that the executor is unable to prove his case.

Section 205, exclusion of interest in employees' trusts: Section 165, while it exempts employees' trusts from income tax under certain conditions, subjects the beneficiaries of such trusts to income tax on the benefits received. It seems undesirable and probably not in accord with the intent of Congress to subject these benefits to both income and estate taxes; and it seems more logical that they should be subject to the income tax rather than to the estate tax. Yet there appear to be some indications in the law today that Federal estate and gift taxes might be applied to the value of a deceased employee's interest in a plan, and to a living employee's power to deal with such interest, respectively. Sections 205 and 257 of the bill would clarify this by amending sections 811 and 1003 of the Code so as to provide that employees' interests in trusts qualified under section 165 shall be exempt from Federal estate and gift taxes.

Section 206, optional valuation: Under present law, an executor can elect at the time he files the estate-tax return to value the property of the decedent as of the date of death or as of a date 1 year after death. This election, once made, cannot be changed. It sometimes happens that at the time the return is filed, the executor considers the election to be of no importance because the value of the gross estate is less than the specific exemption authorized by the law. If the Commissioner of Internal Revenue later increases the value of the gross estate by adding inter vivos gifts which the executor had considered not a part of the gross estate, the election may become most important.

The proposed amendment would make the election available to the executor of an estate not only at the time the return is filed, but also at the time the election becomes important because of the inclusion by the Commissioner of other assets in the gross estate, or because of the increased valuation of reported assets.

Section 207, deduction of expenses paid from nonprobate assets: Under the existing provisions of section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, permissible deductions from the gross estate for administrative expenses, claims, and the like are only those which are recognized and permitted under laws of the jurisdiction within which the estate is being administered. As a consequence, where expenses have been incurred in connection with assets includable in the gross estate but not comprising a part of the probate estate, and such expenses have been properly paid out of nonprobate assets, a deduction for Federal estate tax has been denied. For example, in *Estate of Wright* (8 T. C. 531 (1947)), a deduction for attorney's fees paid by the beneficiary to collect life insurance which was included in the insured's taxable estate was disallowed. Section 207 of the bill would amend section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow a deduction on account of administration and like expenses which are in fact paid out of assets included in the gross estate but not administered as part of the decedent's probate estate, or which are paid by the persons beneficially interested in such assets.

Section 208, time for claiming credit for State death taxes: Under existing law, the credit for State inheritance, estate, legacy, or succession taxes is allowable against the basic Federal estate tax only to the extent that such taxes are paid and the credit claimed within 4 years after the estate tax return is filed. Usually, the amount of State taxes payable cannot be finally ascertained until the Federal estate tax liability is settled. Where that settlement is not reached within 4 years after the Federal return is filed, the credit is lost to the extent of any State taxes paid after the expiration of the 4-year period. The proposed amendment will remedy that situation by extending the credit for taxes paid within 4 years after the Federal return is filed, or before the Federal estate tax is paid, whichever is later.

Section 209, credit for gift taxes: At the present time the Internal Revenue Code provides for a credit for gift taxes paid by a decedent during his lifetime. The limitations placed upon this credit, however, are such as to result in a disallowance of a large part of the amount actually paid as a gift tax in those cases where property on which a gift tax has already been paid is for some reason still required to be included in the gross estate. Section 209 of the bill would amend section 813 of the code to make the credit equal to the full amount of gift taxes that resulted from the prior taxation of the property transferred as a gift.

Section 210, deduction for litigation expenses: In Federal estate tax cases which must be litigated in the Tax Court, the district courts, or the Court of Claims, it is not always clear under what circumstances a deduction is allowable from the gross estate for attorneys' fees and other expenses incurred in such litigation. While the Tax Court has promulgated a rule under which such deductions may be allowed, the proposed amendment would make the deduction of these expenses allowable not only in the Tax Court, but in the other Federal Courts.

Section 211, limitation period for transferees: This section would amend section 900 (b) of the Code to provide that the period of limitation for assessment of the estate tax against a transferee or fiduciary shall be the same as the period of limitation for the assessment of such tax against the estate, except where the estate is insolvent. The Commissioner should be allowed the additional year to proceed against transferees only where the additional tax was asserted against the executor within the 3-year period but was uncollectible because the transfer left the estate insolvent. See comments on section 255, below.

Section 212, extension of period of limitation: Under existing law, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has no authority to enter into an agreement with a taxpayer to extend the time within which the estate tax or the gift tax may be assessed. Such authority does exist in the case of income taxes. The proposed amendment would extend such authority to estate taxes, and section 253 would accomplish the same result in the case of gift taxes. Occasions arise in which the absence of this authority means that settlement negotiations must be hurried, or that no real negotiations can be undertaken at all because of the shortness of time within which the Commissioner may assess the tax.

Section 213, lien for tax: This would amend section 827 of the code to provide that the lien imposed by the estate tax provisions will be subject to the same limitations as liens for income taxes when applied against purchasers for value and others in like situations, such as bona fide mortgagees and pledges and judgment creditors. Under the present law, the estate tax is a lien for 10 years against the gross estate—a lien which need not be recorded, and which attaches to the property in all but a few instances even though mortgaged, pledged, or sold to a bona fide purchaser for value. It does not attach to property sold to a bona fide purchaser by a transferee, trustee, beneficiary, etc., but does attach to property mortgaged or pledged by such persons and also to property sold by an executor to a bona fide purchaser. It is felt that estate tax liens, like liens for other taxes, should be recorded in order to be valid against mortgages, pledges, and bona fide purchases for value. Section 213 of the bill, therefore, makes the provisions of sections 3672–3679 of the code, which relate to recording release and enforcement of liens for other taxes, applicable to the estate tax.

Sections 214 and 256, powers of appointment: These provisions simplify sections 811 (f) and 1000 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to estate and gift tax on powers of appointment.

The present law taxes all powers to appoint, whether exercised or not, except two specified classes of powers. One of these exceptions relates to powers to appoint to certain near relatives. The other is intended to exempt fiduciary powers but has proved inadequate for the purpose.

The present law is artificial and complicated to apply, and tends to force property dispositions into narrow and rigid patterns. It was enacted in 1942, but applies to powers created before as well as after its enactment. A short period was originally provided for the release of preexisting powers without tax liability where such release was legally possible. This period has been repeatedly extended because of widespread dissatisfaction with various features of the law. The current extension expires June 30, 1950.

The new provision would take effect July 1, 1950. It treats powers created before the effective date of the 1942 act separately from those created thereafter. Before the 1942 act only the exercise of a general power of appointment was taxable. The 1942 act taxed the exercise of such powers, and also the possession of unexercised general powers, the exercise of many limited powers, and the possession of those limited powers although unexercised. It applied to powers already in existence as well as to those to be created in the future. As to powers created before the 1942 act, the present bill restores the law which was in force prior to 1942, with one minor change, to eliminate the "passing" problem.

The provisions of the 1942 act, taxing the exercise of limited powers of appointment and the mere possession of unexercised powers, constituted a radical innovation. They extended, or might be construed to extend, to emergency powers to invade principal, discretionary powers given to trustees, and other types of powers which had theretofore not been regarded as powers of appointment. The prior law, taxing only the exercise of general powers, had been in force for nearly 25 years. In 1942 there were in existence a great many powers which had been created years before, in reliance on the law as it then existed.

Experience with the practical application of the provisions of the 1942 act to preexisting powers has demonstrated that the pre-1942 law should be restored as to those powers, for the above and other reasons, among which are the following: The impracticability of reviewing all wills and trust agreements already in force in 1942, in order to discover whether they did or did not create powers which might be taxable under the new law; the fact that many such powers will not be discovered until it is too late for the donees to do anything about them; the fact that often such powers are not legally releasable, and in many cases where the power is legally releasable the donee (usually a trustee) feels under a moral obligation not to release it, or the release would seriously impair the arrangements made by the creator of the power for the benefit and protection of his family; powers will be released in most cases where it is possible to do so; and application of a new statute to preexisting powers will tend to promote litigation. Little or no revenue will accrue to the Government, and such as is received will come

from the unwary or those who are powerless to help themselves.

As to powers created after the passage of the 1942 act, the bill subjects to estate tax the possession of an unlimited, unrestricted power of appointment which is exercisable in favor of the decedent or his estate, whether or not the power is exercised, and subjects to gift tax the exercise or release of such a power. This includes a general beneficial power to appoint by will. It also includes an absolute right to consume principal. It provides a test of taxability which is simple, clear-cut, and easy to apply. It is the same test which is used in the marital deduction provisions of the Revenue Act of 1948 to determine whether a power of appointment given to a surviving spouse is such as to make her the virtual owner of the property.

No revenue consideration is involved. Experience under the 1942 act indicates that whether the statute is narrow or liberal, powers will be drawn so that the possession and exercise of them will be nontaxable. The 1942 act tends to encourage the use of inflexible dispositions of property and to discourage the use of individual trustees. Both of these developments are undesirable. Neither the power of appointment provisions of the 1942 act nor the present amendments will bring in any appreciable revenue. The most important consideration is to make the law simple and definite enough to be understood and applied by the average lawyer, and the present bill will accomplish that purpose.

PART II—GIFT TAX

Section 261, gifts of future interests: At present any gift of a future interest is subject to gift tax irrespective of amount. The proposed amendment to section 1003 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code would allow an exemption from gift tax of any gifts of future interests to the extent of $3,000 in any year for all such gifts. The purpose is to remove the necessity of many small returns, and since the exemption for each year is nominal in amount, the effect on the revenue would be negligible.

Section 252, lien for tax: See the comments relating to section 213, above. While section 1009 of the Code divests property sold to a bona fide purchaser of the lien, there is no protection for bona fide pledgees and mortgagees and no specific provision for recording the lien, and this amendment would apply to gift taxes the provisions of sections 3672-3679 of the Code, which relate to the recording, release, and enforcement of liens for other taxes.

Section 253, extension of period of limitation: See the explanation of section 212, above.

Section 254, adjustment of values after period for assesment: While the concept of a statute of limitations is firmly grounded in our law, in the tax field one situation has arisen which is technically not covered by any statute of limitations but which in actual practice should be. In certain cases the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has altered the values placed by the taxpayer on property transferred by gift, after the expiration of the statute of limitations with respect to the gift tax return on such property; or the Commissioner has gone back and revised certain exclusions which were allowed or which were not questioned at the time. The Commissioner has contended that, although he cannot assert any additional tax deficiency based on an outlawed gift, there is no statute of limitations to prevent his placing a subsequent gift in a higher tax bracket by revising values reported in returns for earlier barred years. The result is essentially the same as an extension of the statutory period, however long the time elapsed since the transfer. This amendment to section 1016 of the Code would prevent an increase in taxes for open years by a revision of gift tax returns for earlier years to which the statute of limitations bars the collection of additional taxes.

Section 255, limitation period for transferees: Section 1016 (a) of the code provides a 3-year period of limitation on the assessment of deficiencies in gift tax. Section 1009 makes the donee personally liable for taxes not paid when due, and section 1025 gives an additional year for assessment against transferees, including donees. As construed (See Evelyn N. Moore (1 T. C. 14, aff'd 146 F. (2d) 824)), the Commissioner is allowed 4 years to collect from the donee, even where no attempt was made to collect from the donor within the 3-year period and where the donor was at all times financially able to pay. For the same reasons stated in connection with section 211, above, it is proposed to amend section 1025 to give the additional year to proceed against the transferee only in cases where timely collection from the donor was prevented by his insolvency.

Section 256, powers of appointment: This section is explained by the comments on section 214, above.

Section 257, exclusion of interest in employees' trusts: This section is explained by the comments on section 205, above.

TITLE III—MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Section 301, sale price: Section 3441 of the code, prescribing methods for determining the sale price by which various manufacturers' excise taxes should be measured, originated as section 604 of the revenue bill of 1932, which became section 619 of the Revenue Act of 1932. The report of the Ways and Means Committee on that bill (H. Rept. No. 708, 72d Cong., 1st sess., pp. 37-38) showed the intent to base the tax on the normal factory price, and that where, by reason of the relationship of the parties, the price charged does represent a fair value, the tax should be on the same value as in the case of similar sales between independent parties. However, the courts have held that, where the manufacturer acts as distributor or sells through a controlled sales agency, the tax must be measured by the distributor's sale price, while the manufacturer who does not perform the economic function of distribution is taxed only upon the factory price. See *C. W. Fitch Co.* v. *U. S.* (323 U. S. 582); *Campana Corp.* v. *U. S.* (38 F. (2d) 400); *Ayer & Co.* v. *U. S.* (38 F. Supp. 284). These inequities and discriminations would be avoided by the proposed amendment to section 3441, which would exclude from the tax base in such situations costs attributable to selling and distribution, as distinguished from manufacturing.

Section 302, removal of conditions on refunds: This section would repeal section 3443 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code which requires, as a condition to the recovery of overpayment of manufacturers' excise taxes, that the person who paid the tax establish (1) that he has not included the tax in the price of the articles with respect to which it was imposed, or collected the amount of the tax from the vendee or (2) that he has repaid the amount of the tax to the ultimate purchaser of the article or has secured the written consent of the ultimate purchaser to the credit or refund. These limitations on refunds are grossly unfair in at least two respects. They impose an impossible burden of proof as a condition to the recovery of taxes which admittedly were illegally collected. Generally taxes are refundable upon showing simply that they were illegally collected. If any restriction based on equity is to protect the Government against refund, the burden of establishing the existence and the extent of the equity should be on the Government which asserts it; and if the equity cannot be established the legal rights should prevail. Moreover, the provisions unjustifiably discriminate against one who has promptly paid the taxes claimed of him and in favor of those who have withheld payment.

Section 303, appeals to Tax Court: This amendment would give the Tax Court of the United States jurisdiction over disputes involving manufacturers' excise taxes imposed by chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code. At the present time the Tax Court does not have such jurisdiction, and, in contrast with the procedure permissible with respect to income, estate and gift taxes, a person has no alternative but to pay manufacturers' excise taxes and litigate their correctness subsequently—an alternative which is unusually burdensome in view of the restrictions on refunds discussed under section 302, above.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Amendments and provisions

Section 401, statement of grounds for deficiency: In some cases the Commissioner's notice of deficiency is not complete and the issues are not clarified by his answer to the petition. The Tax Court has held that in such cases it has no power to compel the Commissioner to state the basis for deficiency. Such power should be conferred upon the Tax Court and section 401 provides that this be done by an amendment to section 1111 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 402, small claims and settlement branch of the Tax Court: An increasing number of cases have been filed with the Tax Court involving small sums of money, and it is common knowledge that there are many more cases in which revenue agents determine deficiencies of a few hundred dollars, sometimes on more or less arbitrary grounds, and the taxpayer feels impelled to pay the tax because of the expenses of appealing to the Tax Court and going to some distant city to have the case heard according to formal court rules. The expense of such a proceeding and such travel may well amount to as much as the tax involved. The persons against whom such small amounts are determined are often people who can ill afford to pay such amounts.

The proposed amendment provides for the establishment of a small claims branch of the court to be administered by one judge of the court. The judge is authorized to appoint part-time commissioners in all of the collection districts throughout the United States who will hear these small cases in an informal manner similar to that prevailing in the small claims acts in effect in many States. All cases in which the deficiency or claim is less than $1,500 would be heard in this manner unless the petitioner expressly moves that his case be heard by the court in the usual manner. Provision is made for appeals from the commissioner to the judge of the court in charge of the small claims branch who will then decide the case appealed subject to review by the full court or by the appropriate court of appeals. Provision is also made that service of any person as a commissioner of the court under the proposed provisions shall not bar such person from acting as attorney in other cases against the United States. This last provision is believed important because it is hoped that the commissioners may be drawn from well-qualified lawyers who would serve in such capacity as a matter of public service thus assuring appointment of the high type of commissioners necessary to make such a plan a success.

Section 403, employment taxes; exemption of payments to employees' trusts: The administrative difficulties and burdens on employers arising from including payments under pension and profit-sharing plans in computing employment taxes are very substantial, because of the requirements as to records, reports and collection of the trivial additional taxes, and the problems arising in the computation of resulting benefits. It is, therefore, proposed to amend sections 1423 (a) and 1607 (b) of the code so as to eliminate from Federal employment taxes all contributions to and distributions from pension and profit-sharing trusts.

Interoceanic Canals—Modern Arms and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies on the defense problems of interoceanic canals, and their relation to national security, during the past 2 years, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of able papers and discussions by eminent authorities dealing with the broad subject of the atomic bomb, and the effect on national security and defense.

Most of these were the thoughtful productions of experienced officers with active service in the armed forces during World War II. Another timely contribution of major importance concerning the newest weapons and agencies of warfare, by Dr. Vannevar Bush, regarding as the foremost scientific military authority, was published in the February 1950 issue of Reader's Digest as a condensation of his recent book entitled, "Modern Arms and Free Men."

Dr. Bush, as Director of the Office of Research and Development during World War II, coordinated the work of 30,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians then engaged on the military and naval modern-weapons program. This position, he states, enabled him to observe "as much as any single man can see what science has done and can still do to the art of warfare." In his book he has most opportunely recorded his observations in a convenient form for others to share as "part of the obligation of any citizen who has been given such responsibility and opportunity." In this way he has publicized the essence of a vast and invaluable experience that should be of ever-increasing value in the future.

In my previous discussions I have regularly stressed the obvious deductions to be drawn from the writings of the distinguished authorities thus quoted by me, to the effect that any type of canal is vulnerable, regardless of its features of design; and that the defense of the Panama Canal, or of any other interoceanic waterway which may be constructed, depends on the combined might of the armed forces of the United States, supported by our industrial capacity, plus such local protective means as may be employed.

Underlying all that power, however, and fundamental thereto, as so ably presented by Dr. Bush and demonstrated during World War II, is the widespread scientific and technical ability of the American people. His study, though fully recognizing the terrifically destructive force of the atomic bomb, shows that the only defense against such weapons are potent military and naval organizations under capable leaders. In this respect he emphasizes that the combination of active protective measures and modern defense installations have reduced the ability of an enemy to reach the target; and that the future is far less dreadful and frightening than many have been led to believe. All this emphasizes the other all-indispensable factor I have sought always to stress: this, that the spirit, morale, and alertness of a free people must underly and support every agency and effort of defense.

The thesis of Dr. Bush strongly reinforces the central idea I have persistently presented to the Congress, viz, that the defense of any type of interoceanic canal like the defense of the ports, waterways, railroads, dams, locks, public utilities, and industrial facilities in the United States, is an over-all responsibility of the Federal Government, and depends primarily upon timely active defense measures of our armed forces, supported by the national economy and industrial capacity. It does not, and cannot, depend upon mere passive defense features, such as may be embodied in plans for construction.

In the light of information I have included in my previous remarks it is unmistakably clear that the interpretations, which have made the security and national-defense features in the report made pursuant to Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, supreme considerations and determinate, are entirely too narrow. The great volume of data on the atomic bomb, published since the submission of the report under the indicated law; that is to say, in December 1947, clearly indicates that the security and national-defense factors, as thus urged, are entirely obsolescent and outmoded, and should not be controlling in the designing of navigational projects.

Thus, the disposal of this argument of defense reduces the problem of planning to its true criteria, to wit, the operational refinements and capacity of the present high-level-lake type of canal.

To make Dr. Bush's study readily available to the Government—especially to the committees of Congress with legislative jurisdiction over interoceanic canals, navigable waterways, and national defense—under leave accorded, I am extending my remarks to include its full text; and I respectfully commend its careful consideration. It follows:

MODERN ARMS AND FREE MEN

(Condensed from the book by Vannevar Bush, scientific military authority. He was director during World War II of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which coordinated the work of 30,000 scientists, engineers, and technicians)

Is it true that a new all-out war, with atomic bombs and biological warfare, would destroy civilization? Can a democratic regime develop great military strength without distorting its true nature?

There are no precise answers to these questions, just as there is no complete answer to the bigger problem of how to avoid another war. But I believe the technological future is far less deadly and alarming than we have been led to think, and that the hopeful aspects of modern applied science outweigh by a heavy margin its threat to civilization. I believe also that the democratic process is itself an asset with which, if we can find the enthusiasm and the skill to use it and the faith to make it strong, we can build a world in which all men can live in prosperity and peace.

When the First World War ended there were in existence nearly all the elements for scientific warfare. For all the technical devices used in the second war, except only atomic energy, practically every basic technique had appeared by 1918, waiting only development. But the world then went to sleep on the subject, so the Second World War began almost where the first one ended. There were a few exceptions, of course, such as developments in aeronautics, in radar and sonar, and in the science of the atom. However, the whole gamut of new ordnance devices—rockets, recoil-less guns, guided missiles, proximity fuzes, bazookas, frangible bullets—waited for the pressure of war for development. And they then appeared largely outside the organized system of ordnance development, and sometimes in spite of it. Certainly in this country almost no scientific progress on military devices emanated solely from military laboratories or military men.

The Second World War was, far more than the first, a war of applied science. The great campaigns that swept across continents and oceans eventually drew heavily on the whole accumulated stock pile of fundamental scientific knowledge. Should a new war have to be fought in a decade or so, there will be innovations, but probably no such burst of new devices as accrued when organized science first turned its full effort into war, all but exhausting the great unused accumulations of the past.

WAR ON LAND MAY END IN DEADLOCK

There is no longer any such thing as land warfare, exclusively. Amphibious operations and the interaction of air operations with the movement of armies ended all that.

When the Second World War opened actively, with Hitler's offensive on the western front, it soon became evident that the deadlock on land, characteristic of the first great war, was virtually a thing of the past. Masses of mobile artillery could prepare holes, and cavalry in the form of the tank-air team could exploit them. Hitler conquered the Continent because his army had so perfected this method that it overwhelmed customary resistance.

From this fact it would be easy to jump to the false conclusion that the deadlock on land had been permanently and universally broken. Actually, the facilities of defense had improved enormously, and the means of successful break-through in 1940 had become utterly obsolete by 1944. In the final break-through many new factors were present: Long preparation by bombardment of communications, exhaustion of the enemy after 5 years of war, the finest armies the world has seen, effective coordination of allies in the field for the first time in history, unprecedented industrial production, and magnificent leadership.

One of the new primary aids to the defense that appeared in the interval was the use of great quantities of land mines. In the contest between land mines and means for removing them, the mines won out. Portable devices for detecting metallic mines were successfully developed; but they did not work for plastic mines. Dogs were taught to smell out mines—but there are too many ways of tricking dogs for this to be of much use. Great rollers, pushed ahead of tanks, had some success, but not much; an occasional very large land mine could wreck them. "Snake"—pieces of hose full of explosive, capable of being pushed ahead or pulled ahead by a small rocket—could be exploded to clear a lane. Tanks equipped with these devices could proceed, provided the tank itself was not destroyed, but this was a laborious method indeed for fields of great depth. The Russians ignored the fields, moved ahead, and accepted the losses. These could be very large, for example, when mines were built to project a can of explosive into the air to explode there and spread fragments over an area. Russian losses as they advanced reflect this fact. The

days when hordes by their mere number could overwhelm fully prepared positions approached their end.

Moreover, toward the end of the war, a defensive element entered that the Germans did not have: the proximity fuze. In the old method, the shell was timed to explode at a chosen distance above the ground; it was not very precise and could be used only when one could see the target area. The proximity fuze contains a little radio set that triggers off the shell at a predetermined distance above the ground. No observation of bursts and no difficult presetting are necessary.

This fuze increased the effectiveness of artillery against personnel in the open by perhaps ten times, and this gain was equivalent to having ten times as much artillery at work. When artillery effect is multiplied against moving men there is a strong turn in favor of the defense. The proximity fuze appeared in land use in December 1944, at the Battle of the Bulge. On the northern side of the break-through it caught German troops in the open, in the fog, at road intersections, as they advanced, and it spread consternation. Its power was by no means fully exploited; this was a first use, and artillery officers, and especially the high command, did not appreciate what had been placed in their hands. Yet, by means of this fuze, together with air effort as the fog lifted, the lack of fuel on the German side, determined resistance and adroit movement of divisions, the break-through was stopped. The proximity fuze may well have saved Liége.

Mere combinations of tanks and men cannot penetrate a mine field covered by artillery or mortars with proximity fuzes. The tank, moreover, nearly met its match in the last war; perhaps it should have. A relatively small explosive charge can be constructed that, if properly shaped to focus its effect, and triggered off at the right instant and in the right manner, can penetrate the thickest armor a tank can carry. This was the principle used in the bazooka, a light rocket-firing weapon that could be carried and fired by one man. Its muzzle velocity was very low, its precision was poor, it was dangerous to use, but it could stop a tank, and its advent was new strength for the infantry.

The recoilless gun was another innovation that spelled difficulty for the tank. This gun shot forward and backward at the same time. It sounds like an inventor's lurid dream, but the forward effort gave a projectile good muzzle velocity and precision in a rifled barrel, while a backward blast through an orifice removed the recoil and was harmless unless someone inadvertently got close behind the gun. The importance of the gun was that it produced a powerful, hard-hitting, relatively inexpensive weapon of low silhouette, readily moved and used by a couple of men. This weapon and the shaped charge such as was used by the bazooka were never combined. There seems no inherent reason why they should not be. A tank exposed to such weapons would have a short life.

Techniques for airborne-infantry assault were much improved during the war. But the experience of Crete, Normandy, Arnhem, the Rhine crossings showed rather well that the airborne assault is an auxiliary to the advance rather than a means of starting wide sweeps behind the enemy lines. There might be a place for airborne assault in connection with surprise invasion on the scale of an enlarged Pearl Harbor, although this is doubtful. Airborne attempt to penetrate a line adequately protected by early warning, radar, and with fast intercepter planes, would be suicide.

There is a strong indication, therefore, that the defense may again be in the ascendant in land warfare, that the deadlock of the First World War might well reappear if antagonists substantially equal from the standpoint of skilled use of ample technical devices met again at a long land frontier. This might merely throw the weight of the effort elsewhere, but it is an important factor to consider as we look to the future.

Amphibious warfare is another matter. Certainly we can be sure that if neither antagonist could penetrate the enemy lines on land neither could do so by amphibious methods on a thoroughly defended coast. For the difficulties of the landing itself are superposed upon those of penetrating a prepared line and exploiting the break-through. Even if there is no line at all, a successful landing involves dominance in the sea and air and suppression of the enemy under the sea. Obviously we need not fear invasion in the foreseeable future, if we are armed and ready.

THE WAR AT SEA: RADAR

The last conflict may well have seen the end of that most dramatic of the scenes of war: the clash of great fleets. The evolution of sea warfare in World War II, from a technical standpoint, revolved about radar. Radar had its real origin in 1925, when two physicists sent out short radio pulses and studied their reflections from the ionosphere, the conducting layers above the earth that reflect radio waves. There are two ways of using radiation to find the distance to an object: one, to examine the interference pattern of continuous radiation, and the other, to send a short pulse of radiation and examine the echoes. The first was used in the proximity fuze, and is excellent for short distances. The second readily won out as the better for naval use.

Using cathode-ray tubes in much the same way that a television tube displays a scene, radar can make the earth visible from a plane above the clouds, in fog, or at night, with a detail as though one had a map spread out before him. Such an instrumentality was bound to revolutionize many departments of warfare, and it did, especially on the sea.

There were great fleets of fighting ships in existence when the war started. As always, in naval shooting war, the decision in the long run went to the ships that could shoot straightest, soonest, and under most difficult conditions. After stumbling beginnings, we could shoot best, for we had the best radar.

The war ended, or became a contest against a relatively unskilled or unequipped enemy, before the full evolution of warfare on the surface of the sea had run its course. So one development of great potential significance that appeared did not come into full use. This was the guided, or homing bomb.

GUIDED BOMB VERSUS SURFACE SHIP

Bombing from moderate or high altitudes with ordinary bombs is a very haphazard affair. It is quite possible, however, to guide a bomb after it is released, and throughout the half minute or so of its fall, and thus attain real accuracy. This can be done either automatically or with manual controls. With a manual control, the bombardier holds a small joystick; as he moves this, so the bomb moves, for plane and bomb are connected by radio to transmit his signals. He can either watch the actual ship and the actual bomb, or he can watch two radar pips on a screen that correspond to the ship and the bomb, and a simple computer can help his judgment. In the automatic form all this is done by a mechanism inside the bomb itself, operating by radar or by thermal controls.

The Nazis first introduced this device in the Mediterranean during the Italian campaign, apparently prematurely and before sound engineering had made it reliable. Its performance was erratic and the bombs flew all over the sky. Nevertheless, the basic concept was sound and the weapon decidedly formidable. One wonders what would have happened if it had been really perfected and then put into use as a surprise and in ample quantity. As it was, it sank ships and was decidedly disagreeable to meet.

We introduced several forms of guided bombs and used them in eliminating the remnants of the Japanese Navy. In Burma, where an air effort to take out important bridges had been under way for a long time without much success, controlled bombs took them out promptly, the records indicating that one controlled bomb was worth a hundred ordinary ones. But most of the forms came too late to be of much use; in the European theater they did not catch on, largely because no really precision bombing was being attempted there except in support of troops, where rocket-equipped planes did very well.

In the future, guided bombs may be important indeed. With ordinary bombs, which fly many miles horizontally as they drop, high-altitude bombers cannot hit the side of a barn—they cannot even hit a small city with any assurance. The guided bomb alters this whole situation. It can hardly be made to hit with certainty a confused target such as one building in a city. But a great ship alone on the sea is a clear target to radar, and thus for a guided bomb.

Is there any effective defense against the very high bomber using guided bombs? If there is not, the days of large fighting ships—carriers as well as battleships—are over. In all probability, there is a defense, but how effective it may be will be questionable for a long time to come. In a possible future war, if it should occur while the world has its present general interrelationships, the only enemy fleet of any moment would be a submarine fleet.

SUBMARINES REMAIN THE BIG THREAT

The First World War showed the ability of the submarine to interrupt commerce, even though the U-boats of those days were clumsy, fragile affairs. In the interval of peace two things happened, one to the advantage of the submarine, one to its disadvantage. The submarine acquired more underwater speed, longer endurance, and a tougher hull. By the time the Second World War opened it could submerge rapidly to several hundred feet and maneuver in tight circles. The submarine could always use listening devices just as well as a surface craft could, and this fact, added to better performance, made the old forms of attack on the submarine practically obsolete. The depth charge, even when the second war began, was nothing but an ashcan filled with TNT with a hydrostatic fuse to explode it at a given depth, and it sank at a rate of only 5 feet per second, so that the submarine had considerable time in which to get out of the way.

However, during the peace a very important means of detection had been developed in naval laboratories both here and in England. Called sonar, the device is to underwater detection what radar is to air. The ship carrying it emits a pulse of relatively high-frequency sound and then examines the pattern of returning echoes. By timing the interval, and by a directional receiver, the distance and direction of the submarine can be obtained. Sonar can also determine the depth of the enemy.

It is important to note that radar pulses cannot travel more than a few feet under water. Moreover, there are strict limits as to what can be done wth sonar pulses and their reflections, because of attenuation of the signal and confusion of echoes from the bottom, so that a few thousand yards under good conditions seems to be the limit of range. There is no such thing under water as radar's range of many miles in air, and searching craft were further hampered by the fact that their sonar would not work at high speeds. Still, sonar seemed to be the answer to the submarine as it existed during World War II.

Perhaps it would have been, if there had been an equal advance in attack weapons, but we entered the war with the same old ashcans and held to them tenaciously even though they were clearly outdated. The undisputed power of sonar gave us overconfidence, and we paid for this later in excessive sinkings.

The submarine war developed into a race between techniques, and for a long time the issue was in doubt. By late 1942 sinkings of surface ships had mounted to the point where they threatened to cut us off from Europe and terminate our land efforts. By the spring of 1943, however, the power of new antisubmarine devices became decisive. Let us examine the methods of attack that saved the situation.

There were two great methods of broad search, highly effective at the time, and now both obsolescent or greatly reduced in value. The first of these was direction finding by radio. Through an error that will probably not be repeated, the Germans communicated by radio from Berlin with their submarines continuously throughout the war. Doing so enabled them to pass on information in regard to the position of convoys and to assemble their wolf packs for attack. But it was a boon to us. Radio stations listening to their messages could take cross bearings and give a rough position of the sending submarine. Consequently, we generally knew about where the enemy was located and could plan accordingly.

The second great method was that of radar. The submarines of the day had to spend a considerable fraction of their time on the surface to charge their batteries. When on the surface they could be detected by radar at a distance of 20 or 30 miles. A radar-equipped plane could therefore sweep great areas, as much as 5,000 square miles an hour. Even the enormous areas of the open ocean begin to yield when fleets of planes are thus equipped.

THE HUNTER-KILLER GROUP

The most deadly combinations, however, was the hunter-killer group. A small aircraft carrier plus other surface antisubmarine craft accompanied a convoy, or left it for direct attack upon a U-boat cencentration. Radar sweeps gave the necessary knowledge of position, and specially equipped aircraft alone or in combination with the surface craft pressed home the attack. When we thus carried the war to the enemy, the tide began to turn.

Magnetic airborne detection, MAD, also appeared. While severely limited in range, it could find a submerged submarine by the distortion the submarine produced in the earth's magnetic field. The device never came to full fruition and was used mostly in blimps in coast defense. Yet it very neatly denied the passage of the Straits of Gibraltar to submerged submarines proceeding quietly with the tide, after all other means had failed.

The sono buoy supplemented these means and was particularly useful from aircraft. One cannot listen to a submarine's underwater noise from an aircraft or for that matter from a surface craft at high speed. But one can drop a small buoy to lie quietly on the surface, listen through a microphone that it lowers to suitable depths, and broadcast by radio what it hears. A submarine submerged after having been caught on the surface by radar was no longer safe even if no surface hunting ships were present. Aircraft could keep contact with it by rings of sono buoys, each dutifully sending its identification signal and the news of the submarine's progress. Aircraft, in relays if necessary, could thus keep the submarine under surveillance until its underwater endurance was exhausted and it was forced to surface, or until surface craft could arrive and take up the trail by sonar. Moreover, new means appeared for attacking it while it was still submerged.

The large depth charge, which lost its combat value when submarine hulls became so thick that a nearly direct hit was necessary for lethal effect, was replaced by forward-throwing weapons which could spray a pattern of small charges well ahead of the attacking ship, by spigot guns or rockets. These charges sank rapidly, and when one hit the hull of a submarine it blasted out a hole bound to be lethal. The weapon was designed to cover an area with a pattern of charges like a shotgun pattern, leaving no gaps, and thus shooting became more deadly. Most important, it could be directed to one side or the other in accordance with last-second sonar observations and could be fired while the submarine was still under sonar contact, not after the attacking vessel in passing over the submarine had lost contact.

SUBMARINE-KILLING PLANES

The rocket-carrying plane was appallingly effective. To the U-boat crew on deck at night it must have been really terrifying. A high-speed plane, having located the submarine by radar, could come diving in at a moderate angle, switch on a blinding light for a final guidance or fire by radar alone. In the few moments of attack it had the fire power of a whole battery of field artillery. Its most deadly weapon was a rocket with a solid head. This was aimed to hit well short of the submarine; it had a long, shallow underwater trajectory; when it hit a submarine it went clear through, leaving a gaping hole on both sides and chaos within. Few submarines caught by surprise on the surface by such a plane could hope to survive.

It almost appeared that in the presence of the plane, radar and other deadly devices for attack, the day of the submarine was over, not only for the war but permanently. It might have been, except for two new and important improvements in submarines themselves, introduced by the Germans. If they had come soon enough they might have changed the course of the war. But when the Germans finally brought them out the battle had become much too one-sided for them to restore the balance.

These two innovations were the high-speed submarine equipped with snorkel, and the long-range torpedo.

The importance of the high-speed, relatively quiet submarines designed by the Germans lies in the fact that they can readily get into position for convoy attack and escape afterward. In fact, if they can outrun the surface antisubmarine craft, or travel at such speed that the latter's acoustic devices are greatly limited, they are much to be feared. They step up the pace at sea. During the past war we ran such ships as the *Queen Mary* safely without convoy because they were faster than the enemy submarines. If the submarine speed is the same as or greater than that of such ships, this method is ended.

The snorkel, however, is even more important than more speed. The snorkel is merely a pipe arranged so that the submarine can run submerged on its engines, with a small end of the pipe sticking out, like a swimmer breathing through a long straw. An ingenious contrivance prevents difficulty if the seas slop over the top of the pipe by momentarily closing the pipe so that no water enters, and this is the real technical advance. In the brief intervals when the pipe is closed, the engines draw their air from the hold of the submarine, with some crew discomfort, but otherwise without reducing performance. A snorkel is very hard to see, either by radar or by eye, especially when there is a bit of sea running. It does not make the submarine completely immune to radar search, but it decidedly decreases the possibility of discovery. It is undoubtedly possible to build submarines that run on their engines when completely submerged, thus dispensing even with the snorkel.

The long-range torpedo introduces an element of surprise that is highly significant. The point is that the range of sonar against submarines is limited, and the range of a torpedo can be made to exceed it if one makes the torpedo large and expensive enough. Thus, if the submarine can fire a deadly torpedo from well outside sonar range, the advantage seems to be entirely with the submarine, which can pick off the escorts of a convoy and then close in for the kill.

The fact that emerges is that the day of the submarine is by no means over. If we entered a war soon, against a technically and industrially strong enemy, and if that enemy could effectively apply modern devices at sea, we should have the whole job of overcoming the submarine to do over again on a new and unattractive basis. Again we should face the severe threat that a nearly immune submarine fleet might determine the outcome of the war in favor of the enemy. Many of the successful methods of the last war are now obsolete against the truly modern submarine. There is no cure-all. To cope with the situation we need to be forging ahead in a dozen fields of difficult technical effort.

The situation is by no means hopeless, of course. If a submarine can be pinned down by air cover, using sono buoys, MAD and diverse other devices, it can most certainly be disposed of, and it will not matter whether or not it is a modern submarine of high speed and long submergence. We may have to adopt new tactics, perhaps, to clear and protect sea lanes rather than to convoy. We may have to depend more than in the past upon mines and upon blocking the submarine in its ports. More probably, we shall employ methods and devices not now fully visualized and developed as experience with modern submarines may indicate. The job will be tough. It can certainly be done.

Twice in recent history aggressors have sought to cut the world apart by submarine and thus to prevail. Twice they have failed. We must make sure that a third similar attempt would also fail. For this assurance we need a vigorous program in the hands of a virile and generously supported Navy, in the closest of cooperation with science and technology throughout the country. We need a Navy intent on the full accomplishment of its main mission, and not diverted by the sirens of more spectacular fields, or arguing on the defensive in regard to its importance as compared with any other service.

IN THE AIR: IS MASS BOMBING OBSOLETE?

Dogfighting in the air, as a determining feature of really modern war, is probably now a thing of the past. The appearance of the jet fighter changed that. Jet engines increased the disproportion between the performance of the long-range bomber and the short-duration fighter. They made speeds in the air so high and turning radii consequently so large that dogfights became almost impossible. Jet engines increased the effectiveness of the fighters' operation over their own territory with the aid of land facilities, and correspondingly decreased the possibility of defending bomber fleets by accompanying fighters. They may well have made mass bombing at moderate altitudes against an alert enemy obsolete.

To understand this, one needs to remember radar's part in defense. First, the long-range early-warning installation, located on coasts, or borders, capable of detecting planes as far as the curvature of the earth permits—at 200 miles or so if the incoming planes are high. Second is the interceptor-control radar which places on the cathode-ray screen images of all the planes within its range in the sky. Finally, there is the radar on the interceptor planes themselves, used to effect the final contact, and even to fire the guns. To penetrate a defense thus equipped is an appalling task for any bomber fleet.

We have one more threat to the bomber to consider—the guided missile. Two developments have led to the guided missile: the advent of automatic controls and the appearance of new ways of projecting a body through space. Soon after large planes came into use there appeared, also, automatic devices for handling them, notably the automatic pilot. This takes over on a long flight, steers a straight course at constant elevation, allows for all the bumps and deviations, and gives the pilot relief. Now there were all the elements of one sort of guided missile—an aircraft with no crew, adapted to be preset and to fly to a designated target, carrying a load of explosives.

In addition, a number of new engines for propelling aircraft were developed during the war. The simplest by far was the ramjet. It is merely an open tube. Its own motion—it needs 3,000-miles-per-hour speed to work well—produces sufficient compression at the front end to blast hot gas out the rear and keep it going. A fire in the middle of the tube to heat the gas is the essential mechanism.

To drive short-range, high-speed missiles, the ram-jet is almost ideal. It can be shot out of a gun or driven by rockets to reach the desired high speed, and thereafter it can travel at bullet speed or higher and keep going for ten or perhaps a hundred miles. Over short ranges it certainly can be aimed in the vicinity of the target, and from there it appears that reasonably complex homing devices might bring it to the point where its proximity fuze could detonate it with lethal effect to an aircraft. The device is in its infancy, and only time will tell what can be accomplished with it. Its significance lies in the fact that it appears to be the great future enemy of the bomber.

Let us assume that devices of this sort can indeed attain a range of, say, 50 miles, and that with that range they can home with precision and a reasonable percentage of hits upon a bomber. Certainly the bomber cannot maneuver out of the way of a missile that comes in with the speed of a shell from a gun. Certainly it cannot survive a hundred pounds or so of high explosive detonated in close proximity. Perhaps the bomber can jam the controls of the missile, if it knows the missile is coming and knows its combinations of frequency, but the advantage here seems to lie with those on the ground, who can choose a variety of systems, so that if one is encountered others are not.

The days of mass bombing may be approaching their end. If so, it is a good thing for the world.

INTERCONTINENTAL ROCKETS UNLIKELY

No weapons in the form of pilotless aircraft appeared during the last war until near the end. The single entry in this field was the German V–I, the buzz bomb that began in June 1944 to harass London. This was just a self-controlled aircraft, redesigned for the specific purpose of bombing a city 30 miles in diameter, from a range of 200 miles. The air frame of the V–I was made simple and inexpensive for quantity production. Its motor was an exceedingly simple affair, cheap to build and capable of running only for an hour or two before it was worn out. Each V–I carried about a thousand pounds of high explosive. Had the Germans been able to launch these devices at the rate of about 3,000 per day as they had intended, they might well have stopped the invasion. But the device was highly vulnerable in the light of concurrent developments in antiaircraft artillery.

London, left wide open by the diversion of antiaircraft batteries to Normandy when the invasion occurred, suffered heavily from the buzz bombs for a while. When the batteries were replaced with radar-controlled guns, electrical computers and proximity fuzes, the buzz bombs made almost ideal targets, flying slowly at constant altitude and in a straight line. Ultimately the defense brought down some 85 percent of the buzz bombs that came within range. The buzz bomb was very decidedly countered.

The German V–2, unlike the V–1, was a true rocket, not a pilotless aircraft. It was an expensive and complex affair, involving great ingenuity and remarkable engineering skill. Its propulsive force was produced by a great blast of hot gases ejected to the rear. It flew in an arc, 75 miles up into the stratosphere, and descended at 3,000 miles per hour, well above the speed of sound, so that its arrival was not heralded, and one heard the roar of its passage through the air only after its ton of high explosive had detonated.

It was a guided missile in a certain limited sense. Its propulsion, which occurred only in its first flight up through the atmosphere, was somewhat erratic, so that its flight was watched by radar during this brief interval, and radio signals were transmitted to cut off its propulsion at the optimum instant. After that it flew in a free trajectory, and its precision was far from good.

Will high-trajectory guided missiles of this sort soon be spanning thousands of miles and precisely hitting chosen targets? Some eminent military men, exhilarated perhaps by a short immersion in matters scientific, have publicly asserted that they will be. We have been regaled by scary articles, complete with maps and diagrams, implying that soon we are thus all to be exterminated, or that we are to employ these devilish devices to exterminate someone else. All sorts of prognostications of doom have been pulled from Pandora's box of science, and these have had influence on the resolution and steadiness with which we face a hard future, and they have done much harm, vague as they are. But this one is explicit, and we can treat it.

The German V–2, of 200-mile range, carrying a ton of explosive, was nearly at the limit of effective range for a chemically propelled single-stage rocket. Its range can be substantially increased in three ways: Its payload may be decreased until at 400 miles or thereabouts it will carry no explosive whatever; its size and its cost may be increased to carry the present payload a greater distance, though range does not go up in direct ratio to size; it can be made into a multistage affair, with an enormous rocket giving birth, when it has done its work, to a smaller one that proceeds from there, and so on. If we are content to pay millions of dollars for a single shot at a distant target, it can be done in this way for any stated distance.

No escape from this dilemma is to be had in new chemical fuels. We are already near the limit of the amount of energy that can be chemically packed into a given weight. But doesn't the availability of atomic energy change this situation? Perhaps the best reply is that it is a close thing whether atomic energy can compete on a cost basis with chemical fuels for producing energy for commercial purposes even under the relatively easy conditions on the ground, where weight and space are not limited.

As we have stated, a rocket can be made to fly vast distances if one disregards costs. But can such a missile be made to hit anything at the end of its flight? The V–2 could be made to hit with reasonable frequency within 15 miles of a point of aiming at a range of 200 miles. A similar missile flying 2,000 miles could be depended upon to hit within 150 miles of its target with reasonable frequency. This performance can certainly be improved upon perhaps by adding to the missile instruments of precision, sights, and homing aids. It could then hit a target, perhaps within 10 miles, perhaps even within a mile or two if all went very well indeed.

Its cost would be astronomical. As a means of carrying high explosive, or any toxic substitute therefor, it is a fantastic proposal. If we employed it in quantity we would be economically exhausted long before the enemy.

There is a common notion that during war costs do not count. There is no greater fallacy. The error comes from the belief that civilian resources are unlimited. They are not. Costs are more important in war than at any other time, for the need for over-all effectiveness is then more imperative. Every development and procurement of a useless device detracts just that much from progress along highly necessary lines.

Before we devote a large amount of manpower and materials to building an expensive missile, we should be very sure it is going to damage the enemy more than the strain of building it damages us. No industrial concern would launch a development without prior cost studies or without causing it to run the gantlets of tough-faced engineers with sharp pencils. Military organizations can proceed without this unpleasant preliminary skirmishing, and often do.

NO WEAPON IS ABSOLUTE

What will war be like if it comes to the world in total form? It would involve intricate techniques, some of them new, but it would be no affair of push buttons. In fact, except for the greater use of the atomic bomb, it would not differ much from the last struggle.

No man can predict the future of the atomic bomb with certainty, but it is now clear that such bombs are expensive and will remain so. Of course radical short cuts in their manufacture may be found, but many of the best physicists, chemists and engineers of this country, and of Great Britain and Canada, have been seeking such a process now for nearly a decade. They have examined every conceivable approach, and they have not found it.

A large proportion of the cost of atomic bombs comes from the production of fissionable material itself; hence there is an accumulative factor which warrants close attention. Money spent in peacetime for weapons that deteriorate or become obsolescent may be money largely lost. But fissionable materials deteriorate very slowly, and they can be stored. In preparing for a war that may be remote, there is thus a considerable reason for concentrating on the weapon that is sure to last until needed, and this is especially important for democracies that fight when they must, not when they choose.

The atomic bomb is for the immediate future a very important but by no means an absolute weapon, that is, one so overpowering as to make all other methods of waging war obsolete. Indeed there is no sign whatever of the emergence of any device so deadly that it makes all others obsolete, and this applies to gas, the spreading of radioactive poisons, and biological warfare. The war gases have improved, but the means of delivering them have become more difficult as means of defense have improved. The spreading of radioactive substances offers great difficulties, and although the biological sciences have made spectacular advances which can be utilized in the spreading of diseases, they are also producing marked results on the side of protection. The theory that world conditions have so altered as to make biological warfare more effective is not supported by the facts.

If all-out war came tomorrow, or in a few years, or at any time before our enemy had a considerable stock of atomic bombs, would it destroy civilization? It certainly would not. War would again be a brutal contest, evil and distressing; the damage would be large, and we should share in it, but we would by no means be knocked out, and we would win it. Unless we get soft, unless we are clumsy in meeting the tactics

of cold war, we are not in immediate danger. If war begins, and the opening settles into a slugging match, the ultimate advantage will lie with that nation which has scientific and technical ability widespread among the people, industrial capacity and versatility, and a determined will to prevail. It is here that our strength lies, and it is in these aspects that we must preserve it.

A NEW PEARL HARBOR?

We ourselves cannot force a war, striking at some time when the advantage lies with us. For if we did thus embark on a prophylactic war, we should lose the very freedoms we cherish; these freedoms would have to be suppressed to cause us to embark on such a course. We would not strike, because our moral sense as a free people would not allow us to do so; we would not strike, because we would sense that we would lose our birthright if we did.

Totalitarian states are bound by no such inhibitions. Indeed one thing is certain: if another great war is started by a dictator, it will be opened by a smashing, great surprise offensive calculated to paralyze us before we are aroused. He would send his submarine fleets to sea and place them on strategic trade routes, and thus gain a heavy advantage in the undersea warfare to follow. He would mobilize in secret and set his armies in motion so that they would assault strong points before they could be fully manned. Above all, he would launch his air fleets, and, if he had atomic bombs, he would direct them at our key cities. We must also take into account the delivery of bombs by submarine, the bombs being lobbed into coastal cities by rocket projectors perhaps from submarines 25 to 50 miles at sea. The threat of such a surprise attack is a handicap we must face, and it is a severe one. It alters, and makes wider, the margin we must keep in the race of preparedness.

The old scarehead story that atomic bombs could be moved in suitcases may be dismissed. The idea of bringing in the pieces and assembling them in an innocent-looking warehouse or consulate is probably also farfetched. It could be done, of course, even though a great deal of skill in assembly is called for. But one bomb thus planted would hardly be an effective opening blow in a war.

A real peril would be to carry atomic bombs in innocent-looking merchant craft that can be moored near cities, to be blown up bodily when the time for surprise attack comes. More flexible, and hence more to be feared, is the scheme of planting the bombs on the bottoms of harbors or in canals, through trapdoors in the holds of merchant ships, to be detonated later by time fuse or even by radio signal. Presumably bombs thus placed near various cities would be detonated all at once as the opening shot in a total war. There is no trick method of determining whether a ship carries such a deadly load. The atomic bomb does not advertise its presence in the unmistakable manner of highly radioactive materials. The damage to a city could be very large if such an infernal machine went off in its harbor—not so large perhaps as some of the accounts would indicate offhand. Also, the wall of radioactive mist that spreads from the underwater explosion would be a very terrible thing.

The world is not now likely to be thrown into open war by accident as it used to be. It will come only if our potential enemy feels that his strength plus the surprise factor is sufficiently great to overcome us, and if he feels that time thereafter will be moving against him. We can decrease the value of surprise by staying alert in peacetime.

The principal element of our preparation for possible surprise attack is an intelligence system of high effectiveness, capable of warning us. No iron curtain is utterly impenetrable. The operations necessary to set in motion a major surprise attack are ponderous and far-reaching. Dictatorship and oppression produce individuals who dare to flee and then dare to talk. There is no reason why we should not know, reasonably well, what is afoot.

After the war a Central Intelligence Agency was created, but it has been under the command of military men whose careers have lain elsewhere, it creaks at the joints, and it is not yet sufficient for its tough task. Scientific intelligence is not conducted well by Mati Hari methods or through agents who know no science. We need a modern intelligence agency in every sense of the word, using modern methods as they were partially developed during the last war, not a musical-comedy affair or a stodgy refuge, not even the half-successful affair we now have, but an organization qualified to meet our needs in this kind of world. It does not cost much. We know how to build it, after the experience of the last war, for we did not do badly at all on intelligence work then, after we got our hand in and learned how. But the really able men who functioned then have largely scattered into civilian life, the type of ability needed is rare, and the work is not attractive. The task can be done, by an individual of great mental and organizational capacity, having ample authority and the full backing of the President of the United States. As we value our peace of mind we had better be about it.

We conduct the disagreeable contest of the cold war at great disadvantage. But the manifold blessings of freedom give us enormous strength, in its full development dwarfing the potential strength of any system of regimentation. It has been popular for many years to complain about the wastefulness of the democratic system of government. We had come to expect 50 cents' worth of results for every dollar paid in taxes. Benevolent dictatorship was thought be to efficient by comparison, and it was held that a dictator could get results much more generally and cheaply. But when research teams were sent into Germany after the war to study such problems as the German handling of strategic materials, manpower, propaganda, military organization and coordination, they were amazed. The Germans had made astonishing mistakes in every sphere of action, which continued throughout the war without correction. Every team we sent returned convinced that the democratic system is clearly more efficient, dollar for dollar and hour for hour, than any totalitarian system.

The teams also found the key to the difference, the key to effectiveness of the democratic system. It lies in the fact that in a democracy criticism flows both ways, up as well as down. This factor, plus our Government's ability to secure the completely frank judgment of experts in any field, far more than offsets the apparent looseness of democracy.

The type of pyramidal totalitarian regime that the Communists have centered in Moscow is an exceedingly powerful agency for cold war. It can force its people to enormous sacrifice and thus build great quantities of war materials. It can educate large numbers of men and women in science and engineering, construct far-flung institutes, mechanize agriculture and ultimately create mass production. But it is not adapted for effective performance in pioneering fields, either in basic science or in involved and novel applications. It has many of the faults of the German dictatorship, magnified to the *n*th degree. Hence it is likely to produce great mistakes and great abortions.

This does not mean that we can cease our own advances in the techniques of war. The Communists can copy and improve, and a whole mass of scarcely developed techniques remains from the last war as material for this process. It does mean that we must continue to break new ground, and that we can do so with our heads high; we have a system essentially adapted for the purpose, if we do not distort it or sacrifice it to false gods of fancied efficiency.

One source of strength is our widespread industrialization. The fact that there are literally millions of youngsters who can drive and repair cars, who build their own radio sets and communicate as "hams" all over the world, gives us a whole generation of competent, resourceful mechanics and electricians and the best possible insurance for strength and safety in a world of modern war. Every corner garage, every radio club, is a center of training; training that can be quickly transformed into ability to operate the complex implements of war.

During the Second World War, for example, one radio ham, whose formal education had been limited to grammar school, helped fight from a laboratory. He was a mechanic and had picked up his knowledge of radio while he made his living, just as millions of other American boys still do. He became America's principal designer of magnetrons. He can talk today with Nobel-prize physicists, and can tell them things they want to know.

In the long, hard race we have embarked upon we must maintain and increase our industrial sinews, keep our free-enterprise system on an even keel and thus foster the strength of our economy. It will profit us little to have stocks of bombs and planes and then bring our governmental and industrial system crashing down about our ears.

Future total war need not come if we fully maintain our strength. It need not come if we realistically resolve that it shall not. It need not come if we make our democracy work. It need not come at all, for if the strength of free peoples prevents it for a generation, that same strength can then produce a new sort of world in which great wars will no longer occur. For this consummation we face a task that will test us as we have never been tested before, that will test whether we really mean it when we say that we believe in human dignity and human freedom, whether we can really submerge selfishness and petty motive and bring our enormous latent power to bear, to make our way of life function with true effectiveness for the good of all.

Research on Disease of Oak Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append a letter from a valued constituent, William E. Gullam, of North Reading, Mass., in his capacity as secretary of the Massachusetts Tree Wardens' and Foresters' Association:

Massachusetts Senators and Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: By vote of the members of this association at our thirty-eighth annual convention, February 15–16, 1950, at Boston, the following resolution was adopted:

"Be it resolved, That this association go on record as backing the United States Department of Agriculture request for an appropria-

tion for research work on the diseases of, or on, oak trees; and so notify our Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress."

We sincerely hope that they will be supported likewise by all other groups similarly interested in the preservation of our State and national shade trees; and that all means available shall be exercised for their protection and maintenance, as well as the prevention of those diseases now threatening us on a national scale.

We most earnestly urge that suitable action be taken to establish funds and provide facilities for the conduct of necessary research, and that preventive remedies and all information gained therefrom be made available for our general advantage in meeting this grave situation.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM E. GULLAM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Tories Saw Business Ruin and Socialism in HOLC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the national weekly newspaper Labor, issue of March 18, 1950:

TORIES SAW BUSINESS RUIN AND SOCIALISM IN HOLC—NEW DEAL AGENCY PROVES GREAT SUCCESS, BUT SAME CRIES ARE RAISED AGAINST FAIR DEAL

A simple ceremony at the White House this week recalled events which should reassure the American people, when, as now, they read and hear assertions that the Government is ruining business.

President Truman watched approvingly while a $26,000,000 HOLC check was presented to John W. Snyder, who presides over Uncle Sam's Treasury. What was back of this ceremony?

In the days of the "Hoover hunger," there was desperation among the mortgage companies, building and loan concerns, and bankers who had financed homes at inflated values. Hundreds of thousands of jobless people could not keep up their mortgage payments. Real-estate money lenders all over the country faced bankruptcy.

The came the New Deal, like the Fair Deal of today, a bogyman of business. Congress created the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, gave it Government money and orders to save the situation.

Loud cries from the mortgage men pierced the skies. "The New Deal," they shouted, "was going in for socialism." Uncle Sam was embarking upon a foolish adventure that would cost him a loss of at least $1,500,000,000.

In short, the HOLC was greeted by Tories with the same outcries they make against Fair Deal measures now. But what happened?

The HOLC got busy, saved a lot of distressed home owners, and literally bailed out the banks, mortgage, and building and loan firms. In return for their sour mortgages, they got billions in good Government bonds from Uncle Sam.

The money lenders' frowning faces suddenly were wreathed with smiles. This HOLC is a pretty good thing after all, they privately admitted. But were they grateful?

As soon as they were saved, they turned around and tried to bite the hand that bailed them out. They pushed a bill which would force the HOLC to hand back to the money lenders all the mortgages which had become safe and sound, while Uncle Sam would keep all the mortgages which were still sour.

Of course, that would have made the HOLC a financial failure, and the Tories would have shouted we told you so.

That bill was fought and killed by John H. Fahey, an honest, able, and devoted public servant, who came from big business to head the HOLC. In all the country, Labor was the only newspaper of national circulation which supported Fahey in that fight. He was grateful and said so.

Under Fahey's management, the HOLC saved home owners, bailed out the mortgage men, and paid off $3,500,000,000 Government bonds provided for those purposes.

In the White House ceremony this week, the HOLC made its first repayment, $26,000,000, on the stock which Uncle Sam bought in that agency to give it a start.

Now, Truman said, the HOLC has paid off 95 percent of the Government's entire investment, and will soon pay the rest. Instead of the predicted $1,500,000,000 loss, Uncle Sam will come out with a handsome profit.

It is a good thing to remember that New Deal story, when the Tories of today shout ruin and socialism at the Fair Deal.

About Owen Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1950:

ABOUT OWEN LATTIMORE

Thomas F. Murphy, the Hiss case prosecutor, said the other day that one of the hardest things to find in these times is a man who will admit that he is a Communist. It is better, he said, to set up a persevering watch to determine how closely a man's opinions coincide with the party line.

We think this formula could be more profitably applied by Senator MCCARTHY, particularly in the case of Owen Lattimore. Whether he is a card holder or not, it would produce weighty evidence that this State Department adviser on the Far East rarely has had a thought that would trouble the Kremlin.

He was among the first of that coterie of left-wing experts to underwrite the idea that the Chinese Communists were simple agrarian reformers.

In his 1945 book, Solution in Asia, Mr. Lattimore said the Asiatic peoples did not intend to become the victims of imperialism again, and that the Allies must understand their drive toward self-expression and cooperate by helping them. "These people," he explained in an interview, "may not be able to read or write, but politically they are mature."

Once an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek—on President Roosevelt's recommendation—he later turned on Chiang and denounced him for dictatorial tendencies. There's little argument about Chiang being dictatorial.

But Lattimore's 1945 book was described by a sympathetic reviewer as an "appeal to Chiang to set free the democratic forces which have proved effective in northwestern China."

And what were those democratic forces?

Those democratic forces were, of course, the totalitarian Communists—and a year later Gen. Marshall was in China on an abortive mission to work out a coalition between the Chinese Communists and the Nationalists.

Last year, when the State Department's White Paper wrote off the Nationalist cause, paving the way to our present debacle in China, it accurately reflected the thinking of Mr. Lattimore.

More recently, in the January Atlantic, Mr. Lattimore wrote: "Sound (United States) policy would avoid premature or excessive strategic deployment in the Far East." That had been made our policy.

Again: "United States policy should aim to increase the ability of countries in Asia to do without Russia." That, too—the suggestion that a potential Tito could be built up in Red China—has been made our policy.

And again: "For the problem of recognition of the new government of China, the United Nations offers the ideal avenue to a solution. If * * * a majority of non-Communist countries in Europe, Latin America, and Asia should vote to seat new Chinese representatives (meaning Communists) to the United Nations, the United States should not vote against that verdict."

And that also has been made State Department policy. Only last week it was announced that we would abide by a majority decision in giving the Chinese Reds places in the UN. Which would be recognition by the back-door route, despite the fact that we still recognize the Nationalists as China's legal government.

What real difference would it make if Mr. Lattimore, and the others responsible, had the purest of intentions? Molotov himself couldn't have master-minded an American Far East policy more to Moscow's liking.

Resolution to Repeal Sixteenth Amendment (Income Tax Amendment)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution to repeal the sixteenth amendment, which authorizes the Federal Government to collect income taxes. The proposed amendment would permit the Federal Government to resort to an income tax only for the purpose of grave national emergency proclaimed by the President and approved by each House of Congress, and for the purpose of reducing the national debt and payment of the interest thereon.

Reduction of the debt is of the utmost importance to preservation of the value of the American dollar. If this amendment should become law, Congress should continue to pay off a minimum of at least one-half of 1 percent per year of the present $260,000,000,000 national debt by limited use of the income tax.

The income tax in the hands of reckless and irresponsible bureaucracy is the most deadly danger to the American system of government, and the liberty

which it was designed to safeguard. It is rapidly leading to complete breakdown of the States and localities as effective instruments of government, and transforming them into mere arms of the Federal Government to distribute Federal hand-outs. It is destroying the incentive and hope of the American citizen because it deprives him of the fruit of his toil and therefore of the possibility of independently achieving economic security. It creates an overpowering central government upon which the economically helpless citizen will become a servile dependent. What is left of liberty when government alone controls the pay check or the ration card?

Desperate situations demand desperate treatment. Only complete elimination of the Federal income tax power, or at least drastic limitation upon it, will effectively curb the destructive monster that the Federal Government has become—hence this resolution to repeal the sixteenth amendment, and to limit use of income taxes to the essential purpose of national debt reduction and payment of interest, and to use in war and emergencies akin to war.

Its enactment would curtail the activities of the Federal Government to a great degree and revitalize the States. It would leave sufficient funds to the Federal Government to provide for national defense, for veterans, and for the expenses of the general Government. The remaining necessary domestic activities now carried on at Federal level could be taken on by the States, which would have exclusive access to income taxation for that purpose.

Commitments for foreign aid by their own terms should expire in less than 2 years. There is little likelihood of adoption of such an amendment within that time.

Repeal of the sixteenth amendment would not affect the operation of the present Federal social-security system.

Only a thoroughly aroused public will get action. If all those citizens who are conscious of the menace of the Federal income tax system, emphatically and persistently demand action, action will be had. If the American Republic is to survive in anything like its present form, if the traditional liberties of the American citizen are to live, if dollar earnings and savings are to retain any value at all, then action must come quickly. Congress will act if enough citizens demand action. Of course, it will not be easy to dislodge anything as firmly planted as the Federal income tax. But if we shy away from the impossible, we shall be less likely to achieve the possible.

Tariff on Rubber Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in commenting further upon the great interest among all the people of the city of Malden in my district over a threatened reduction in tariff rates pertaining to imports on rubber footwear, I bring it to the attention of my colleagues that a resolution has recently been adopted by the Malden city government introduced by Councilman Jacob Aronson, passed by the common council and by the board of aldermen, and approved March 10, 1950, by his honor Mayor Fred Lamson. A copy of this resolution as it has come to me under certification from Raymond F. Mooney, city clerk, is as follows:

Whereas any further reduction in tariff rates pertaining to imports on rubber wear would result in mass unemployment and the employees would find it difficult to obtain similar employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Malden City Council go on record as opposing any further reduction in tariff on imports of rubber foot wear both waterproof and canvas.

St. Patrick, the Patron Saint of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of March we again honor St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland. In Catholic churches and at public meetings throughout the world, St. Patrick's benign spirit will preside with solemnity and prayerful mien over the altars of great and ornate cathedrals and over small and simple one-room countryside churches.

With graciousness and good cheer, the kindly spirit of St. Patrick will pervade the atmosphere surrounding the festive banquet tables of Irish fellowship clubs, the Ancient Order of the Hibernians, and other great Irish societies.

America is truly transformed on March 17 into an Ireland, with millions of Americans of Irish extraction wearing proudly the shamrock and the green carnation symbolic of the warmth and generosity of the Irish spirit and personality.

The story of St. Patrick, although well known, bears constant repeating. Patrick was born in greater Britain, the son of Calphwinius and Concessa. As a boy he fell into the captivity of warring tribes on three different occasions, each time being put to work keeping watch over flocks of sheep. Even at an early age he demonstrated a strong faith and reverent respect for God. It was his daily custom to arise before daybreak and pray at length; he would follow this procedure during the day and before retiring late at night in all kinds of inclement weather so as to adore and praise God.

After he was liberated, he undertook holy orders and began to study religious works. Suffering untold hardships, he traveled far and wide throughout France—then called Gaul—Italy, and the Tyrrhenian Sea islands.

Under the Primacy of Pope Celestine, he was consecrated a bishop and made his way to Ireland on behalf of the spiritual salvation of the Irish who were then worshiping idols. Only with the aid of a provident God could this sainted figure have succeeded in this mission where evil forces, enemies of the faith, physical hardships and privations were in the ascendancy.

These endeavors resulted in a religious revival during which catholicism spread throughout Ireland. Churches were built, priests ordained and bishops consecrated. Ireland became known as the Island of the Saints so effective was the preaching of St. Patrick.

The fame of St. Patrick spread to other lands. His prophesies and his spiritual greatness gave greater impetus to his endeavors on behalf of the Catholic Church to which he was endeared.

Exhausted and spent, after many years of fatiguing labors and administrative cares and responsibilities, St. Patrick, in the fifth century of Our Lord, passed on to his reward. Today he rests at Down, in Ulster, the apostle of Ireland.

On March 17, more than on any other day, I shall give kind thought and expression to the personal tribute paid me by the Irish government receiving as I have yearly, real Irish shamrocks—greetings to the Irish people through their legal representatives.

This bond of friendship between the people of Ireland and my humble self has been of many years' standing, for it was my great honor and privilege to draft and pass House resolution 49, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, declaring it to be the sense of the Congress of the United States that Ireland should be a free and independent state, free of British rule, oppression, and tyranny. Nothing in my legislative career of 44 years in the House has given me a greater thrill and satisfaction for I have always been cognizant of the heroic efforts of the Irish people in search of freedom, who in 1848 during the potato famine in Ireland, suffering the same indignities and privations of other immigrants from other parts of the world sought asylum here and went on to do their part to develop and contribute to the growth and progress of this great country of ours.

I always recognized and appreciated the broad and liberal views and policies of the Irish Nation on behalf of the oppressed and persecuted of other lands seeking refuge also in Ireland.

I wish to remind my colleagues that immigrants from Ireland, true to the American spirit, were like immigrants from other shores. It is because of the immigrant that the ideals of freedom and liberty, the foundation stones of our American Republic, have endured. These newcomers stood for political and religious freedom. They not only advocated these foundation stones—they fought for them. And so it has come to pass that from a country of 13 small States with a spread-out population of about 3,000,000 we have developed to almost 150,000,000 in 48 States, exclusive of our island territorial possessions, with more people desiring admission into our

sacred Union as, for example, Hawaii and Alaska.

I have seen a great many St. Patrick Days come and go, and with each passing I pay greater tribute to the immigrant Irishmen whose sons and daughters in each generation have faced, along with the sons and daughters of other immigrants, the difficult problems concerned with the maintenance and progress of our country. The Irish forebears met adversity and conquered it. They were willing and anxious to work, they helped build our buildings, our houses of commerce, they made their contributions to the professions—but more still they developed an unquenchable spirit for an American nationality which has become the desire of all peoples throughout the world to seek and attain.

How well this fact is demonstrated is seen in the development of my beloved city of Chicago. A perusal of its first city directory in 1844, when the population was 9,000, show a more than respectable number of Irish names, the Nortons, O'Briens, O'Learys, the Burns, the Burkes, the Caseys and Cassidys, the Daileys and the Donlins, the Gallaghers, the Givins, the Higgins, the Hogans, the Kellys, the Kennedys, and so on down the alphabet. They were men of the professions, tradesmen, artisans, and laborers. In short, they helped Chicago grow great—great in industry, in commerce, and more important than all, great in political and religious freedom.

I could enlarge further on the gifts of the Americans of Irish extraction to the growth and development of my beloved city, citing the names of mayors and governors in Chicago and the State of Illinois. Suffice it to say that at present our mayor, Martin J. Kennelly, recognized as an able administrator who is reflecting credit on, and following in the footsteps of, the many sons of St. Patrick who have dedicated themselves to the basic principles of the American system which dedicates itself to the equality of opportunity and self-improvement, a decent standard of living and the stimulation and preservation of human and spiritual values which the patron St. Patrick so eloquently typifies.

Well do I remember the many instances of the loyalty of Americans of Irish descent demonstrated in critical periods of our country's history. Many are the examples. However, one stands out very vividly in my mind, namely, the situation which prevailed in April of 1918 when we were at war with the Kaiser. At that time Ireland was still struggling for freedom from Great Britain. Irish patriots were fighting at great odds to escape the cruel and servile treatment of the selfish and unconscionable British aided by their Ulster allies.

It was at this time that Great Britain, sorely pressed after 4 years of hard fighting, called for conscription of the Irish youth. Immediately there began a fierce debate both in America and in Ireland. Should the Irishman, deprived of his constitutional and personal rights, allow himself to be conscripted into British forces? Should not—do not home rule and conscription travel together the same road? Is not Ireland fighting for moral issues—freedom and liberty against an aggressor? How then can Great Britain, it too fighting for a moral principle, require loyalty and fealty of Ireland when she refuses justice and equality to those of southern Ireland? Although evidently supporting the Irish cause and bitterly opposing Great Britain's persecution of the Irish in Ireland, the answer came immediately and without hesitation from the native-born and naturalized Americans of Irish extraction when they published that the Irishman in Ireland or their relatives and friends in America who do or say anything to hurt Great Britain in this her hour of peril strike at the cause of America and her allies who are banded together in common effort against a German war machine bent on enslaving the world.

I remember well how this sweeping declaration of faith and allegiance coming at a most critical period from the descendants of Old Erin brought renewed hope and courage to all engaged in the great battle "to make the world safe for democracy." For it brought heart to our disheartened allies whose low morale and tired bodies were giving ground to the sledge-hammer blows which the "boche" were dealing on French and Belgian battlefields. Revivified and with fresh courage and renewed confidence, the American doughboy of Irish origin, his comrades of all races and creeds, the English "Tommy" and the French "poilus" joined hands to carry on their counterattacks against the common enemy.

On the other hand, this declaration of fealty to the allied cause brought home to the Germanophyles all over the world and particularly the German propagandists in Ireland who infested the Emerald Isle that Ireland had rejected their advocacy of force and violence to foment discord and disunity in the country where they had hoped to stir up rebellion and civil war and from which they had hoped to attack England nearby. The campaign of treachery and treason had failed in Ireland. The open door was closed tight in the face of Kaiser Wilhelm and his boche hordes.

I must not fail to revert to my early days in my beloved city of Chicago where the memory of great and generous men of Irish origin who, many in number, helped make our city the great metropolis and melting pot it is. In public life, in our patriotic and civic organizations, be it in labor and industry in our commercial life, in the arts and sciences, in our schools, in the church, in our law-enforcing agencies, the men and women who on this day honor their patron Saint Patrick, always demonstrated a devotion to the ideals of good government and fine human relations.

I found them as a group true to every righteous cause of their country, indefatigable workers determined to carry on, in the best traditions of America, on behalf of justice, freedom, and democracy.

All praise and glory to the Irish on this St. Patrick's Day of 1950.

Uncle Bob Doughton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine tribute to a very distinguished Member of this great body.

The tribute appears in a recent issue of the Lutheran, a magazine of the Lutheran Church, and is contributed by a distinguished American, one of the leading pastors in America, Dr. Oscar Blackwelder, pastor of the Church of the Reformation in Washington.

The membership of the House, I know, will appreciate this splendid article:

UNCLE BOB DOUGHTON

I once asked the late Mrs. Robert L. Doughton if she realized that her husband's homely appearance is a political asset. She wanted to know what I meant by "homely." I can hear the chuckle in her voice yet. I told her of a relative of mine in the North Carolina district which Mr. DOUGHTON has represented for 40 years, who said to me, "All you have to do is to look at BOB DOUGHTON to know he is honest."

He is the oldest man in Congress and the second oldest in length of service. He has served 40 years (20 terms) without a defeat. Representative ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, has the longest service, with 44 consecutive years.

Seriously, I have come to feel that a strikingly handsome man is handicapped in public life. Men just don't vote for him. I could document that statement. The handsome may carry the ladies' vote, but men seem to mistrust them.

RUNNING AGAIN

Mr. DOUGHTON is 86 and running for reelection. His mental dependability and his amazing physical health belie his years. A Washington newspaper editoralized on him, thinking he should quit. The letters received inspired another editorial, which bowed to the manifest devotion in which he is held by his constituents. Anyone who attempts to run against him is just wasting his time, money, and energy, in my opinion.

I chanced to be in the gallery of the House when a young, freshman Republican arose to oppose an argument Mr. DOUGHTON had just made. The freshman began with a profuse apology for daring to differ with such a mature man. Mr. DOUGHTON thanked him for his courtesy but added, in effect, that if he could not hold his own without having people defer to age, he would quit.

WAYS AND MEANS

He has chairmaned the powerful Ways and Means Committee, perhaps the most important in the entire Congress, for a longer time than any other in American history. And he is not honorary chairman either.

Uncle BOB is a very early riser and gets to his office between 6 and 6:30 a. m. A story got afloat some years ago that as he came across Capitol Hill going to his office one morning he chanced to meet a stenographer on his staff. He congratulated her on her sense of initiative and enterprise. "Come on in and let's start on some letters," he said. She came in and went to work but in reality was just getting in from a dance.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

I hope I am not overpainting the picture of a good friend. Uncle BOB illustrates to me the way a man can make good in public life.

Here are some of the secrets of one of the most beloved men on Capitol Hill. He tends strictly to the business with which he is entrusted. He keeps close to his constituents and transacts their business with dispatch and accuracy. He is a great human being with splendid capacity for friendship. He is an indefatigable worker, capable even at his present age of long, strenuous hours. He has maintained the captaincy of his own conscience. He is a man of unimpeachable integrity. Men like BOB DOUGHTON make it easier to believe in representative government.

OSCAR F. BLACKWELDER.

Why an Investigation of Lustron?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest in the Lustron situation, I wish to submit for the RECORD the following copy of a letter I have written to Mr. SABATH, chairman of the Rules Committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1950.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Rules Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SABATH: On October 19, 1949, I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 393, to authorize a select committee to investigate the Lustron loan.

I mentioned this resolution recently when I appeared before your committee. I will appreciate it very much if you will call up this resolution for hearing before the Rules Committee.

I am enclosing a short memorandum which contains a brief account of the reasons why I think this investigation is of great importance to the Congress.

Thank you very much for your courteous consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Member of Congress.

WHY AN INVESTIGATION OF LUSTRON?

In 1947, the RFC made its initial loan to Lustron as a pilot project to determine whether houses could be produced by mass production. Thirty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars have been used for this purpose. Eighty-two thousand houses were promised by the end of 1949. Actually, 2,000 were produced.

Lustron is now in the hands of a receiver, and conservative estimates place the loss to the Government at $30,000,000.

The pilot project is a failure. The success or failure of this, and similar future proposals, is of tremendous importance to Congress. A careful, nonpartisan investigation would answer these questions:

First. What is the field for Government in promoting pilot or experimental projects?

Second. How may monopoly and unfair competition be avoided if such projects are undertaken by Government? For example, Harnischfeger, of Wisconsin, has produced thousands of excellent prefabricated houses which sell for $6,500 to $8,300. This firm, and many others, are operating without Government assistance. Can this firm, and the other prefabricated house manufacturers compete against free-and-easy Government money?

Third. Did Lustron fail because all such pilot projects promoted by Government are doomed to failure?

Fourth. Did Lustron fail because of mismanagement and favoritism, or just lack of foresight and funds?

I believe Congress and the people are entitled to the answers to these questions.

Case for "Thou Shalt Not"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of March 16, 1950:

CASE FOR "THOU SHALT NOT"—TAKING POSITIVE STAND ON ISSUES ISN'T ALWAYS THE MOST CONSTRUCTIVE; THERE'S ALSO VIRTUE IN BEING NEGATIVE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Americans are in the habit of hearing lectures on what a dreadful thing it is to be negative. Every proponent of some new scheme of spending billions of dollars of public funds for some vague and starry-eyed purpose tries to attach the adjective "positive" to his proposal and to blast its critics as persons cursed with a negative type of mind.

There are prophets of doom who suggest that America will go under if it does not propose some "positive" alternative to communism and prove that free institutions serve the average man better than dictatorships. Very often the suggested alternative turns out to be some form of leveling collectivism, very akin to communism, only without unpleasant features like concentration camps.

As for the supposed obligation of free political and economic institutions to prove their superior attractiveness, there is a very simple test that should convince anyone capable of being affected by rational argument. Line up on one side the people who often at personal risk to themselves and their families, have refused to live under totalitarian rule. Line up on the other those individuals who have voluntarily left free countries to enjoy the supposed blessings of dictatorship. The proportion in this fair and honest plebiscite would be about one hundred to one. And if one could interview freely the members of the minority, one would get some very sad and regretful stories.

"IT ALL DEPENDS"

But, so runs the argument, we must be "for," not "against," positive, not negative. Well, it all depends on the issue at stake. The Gadarene swine presumably were in a positive mood when they ran over the cliff and perished. They might have been better advised if they had been more responsive to negative arguments.

Nor is it true, as is sometimes alleged, that men can only be induced to fight and sacrifice and die if they are offered the prospect of being "for," not "against." It has often been easier to induce people to agree on what they don't have than on what they do.

It would not have been feasible to obtain general agreement among Englishmen of the seventeenth century on a positive political program. But most of them disliked the idea of being taxed without their consent, jailed without warrant and otherwise pushed around by agents of the Crown.

And so, out of many negative restrictions on the power of the executive branch, developed something very positive and very desirable indeed: the rights of the man and the citizen. The same story was repeated, with some variation, when the American colonies broke away from British rule a century later. The men who founded this Nation were united more by what they disliked than by what they favored.

In reading through the American Constitution it is remarkable how often those "negative" words, "no" and "not" recur. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press. * * * No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner. * * * The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. * * * Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. * * * No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed. * * *"

But out of these and many other limiting and prohibiting clauses in the Constitution emerged the edifice of our civil political liberties.

The French Revolution never produced what its ideologists dreamed of: a society in which liberty, equality, and fraternity were the guiding principles. But, with all its fearful excesses, the effects of which are still painfully felt in French psychology and in the nature of French society, the Revolution achieved certain negative benefits. It swept away antiquated privileges of birth and caste and made opportunity much more nearly equal for all Frenchmen.

RECORD OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

We heard a good deal in the last American election about an alleged "do nothing" Congress. Actually the record of the much abused Congress would compare favorably with that of its predecessor or its successor. But what a fundamentally absurd idea it is to judge the efficiency of a Congress by the number of laws it passes.

One might just as reasonably rate a physician's competence by the number of doses or operations he would order for a patient. There is a world-wide tendency to pass too many laws, with the result that many are unenforced and some are unenforceable. A legislative body that passed a minimum of new measures and repealed a good many old ones, would most probably deserve very well of all the people who elected it.

"The state swelled and the people shrank." This is how a great Russian historian, V. O. Kluchevsky, describes the growth of absolute power in Czarist Russia. And this is a universal law of history. As the state becomes more powerful the individual shrinks, sometimes to the point of extinction.

The contrary side of this proposition is equally true. Where the state is kept within bounds by a long series of "Thou Shalt Not's," by strict legal limitations on its power, the individual enjoys the best prospect of a free, and happy, and prosperous life. The history of human liberty is very largely a record of negative restrictions and limitations, checks and balances, devised for the purpose of preventing the state from succumbing to the invariable temptation to arrogate too much power to itself.

The Americanism of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the Americanism of Abraham Lincoln by Col. Robert M. Woodward of Chicago, Ill., broadcast from radio station WHFC, with studios in Chicago and Cicero, Ill., on Saturday, February 11, 1950:

February 12 is a date that is especially cherished, not only by all loyal and patriotic Americans, but also the world over by those who instinctively recognize greatness of soul in the conduct of human affairs. It can well be said, February 12 is a special day in the calendar of human advancement, for it is the one hundred and forty-first birthday of Abraham Lincoln, martyred sixteenth President of the United States, who alone of all the incumbents of that distinguished office, is considered worthy of being coupled with the Father of our Country.

We do well, to mark this annual occasion in American life with due solemnity, taking to heart Lincoln's inspired wisdom, marvelous patience, and touching kindliness which animated his being, and makes his truly blessed memory immortal. Here was a statesman and personality whose fame endures, and whose renown is as constant and as chastening as the stars: only he could have saved the Union and strengthened its foundation of freedom for all, as only his illustrious predecessor, George Washington, whom he idolized from the days of his youth, could have led our forefathers to freedom in their struggle for independence. Such leaders are, indeed, few and far between, they have marked out for all time, the course that must be followed in this great land of ours, if as Lincoln said in his classic Gettysburg Address, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

We know that we live in the most critical times, times that try men's souls. Fear, uncertainty, and mistrust prevail the world over. People everywhere are nervously asking, "What of tomorrow?" There is only one answer to this universal disquietude, and there is only one way to save the day and prevent the ultimate destruction of mankind by A-bombs and H-bombs, and perhaps weapons which may be even more dreadful and devastating. Now, as in Lincoln's time, when the Union was threatened with dissolution there is one hope for peace and for fraternal relationships between nations, and that is, by the application of the humanity and sanity of Abraham Lincoln, both in domestic and foreign affairs.

If the application of Lincoln's high, moral principles cannot solve such problems as our labor difficulties and end the recurring strife of wage earners and management, nothing else can. If the uprightness of Abraham Lincoln cannot do away with political corruption in city, State, and Nation, nothing else can. If the warmly, friendly approach of Lincoln in all matters and at all times, expressed so well by him, "with malice toward none, with charity for all" cannot resolve the stalemate between American democracy and proletarian dictatorship, nothing else can. The first thing we should take to heart as we feel Lincoln's noble spiritual presence in our midst, especially at this time, is that he loved and served his country with all his heart, soul, and strength. He was always concerned with safeguarding the future, and fulfilling the high ideals of the American Republic and to mankind at large.

His brooding concern for his native land made him keenly sensitive to any danger, both from within and without which threatened its growth, its happiness, and its very existence. Calmly he surveyed the situation, free from rancor, and it was consequently given to him to see with the eyes of a prophet.

I know of nothing that is better calculated to win for our beloved country, confidence in the uprightness and unselfishness of our intentions with regard to all other nations, and make it possible to adjust the existing differences, than the widest possible circulation, translated into every tongue the principles and ideals of Abraham Lincoln. We hope that as many Americans as possible are made aware that Lincoln defined the irrevocable objective of all true Americans within and beyond our borders.

We must be ever honest and sincere as Lincoln was in dealing with domestic and foreign problems of every kind, our faith and courage must be as dauntless as his was in pursuing this goal, which is nothing less than the goal of salvation for us and for all humanity.

Our prayer, as united Americans, now and always, must be that Lincoln's noble, human spirit may never cease to abide with us, for the minute that we forsake his counsel and his example, nothing else, however, formidable and seemingly invincible materially, can assure our strength and national security.

The Abraham Lincoln way of thinking and acting, and the exercise of the right to vote in all elections in every precinct throughout the Nation, is our only security. Furthermore, we must keep in mind that any kind of contravention of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States, is a thrust at the Nation's life, and treason to the American people. Make no mistake about it, violations of the rights, guaranteed by the Constitution, is subversive and more insidious than any other kind can possibly be.

Yes, I repeat, the Lincoln way of thinking and acting under all circumstances is the only way for all of us to conduct ourselves, whatever party we belong to, whatever creed we profess, and however otherwise we may differ one from the other. As I see it, our choice is between a united, strong, and impregnable America, and a divided, consequently weakened, despite our matchless material wealth and power.

We are called upon, particularly during the recurrence of Lincoln's birthday, to listen to a voice which will never cease to be heard by every generation of his fellow Americans, and humble ourselves, as he did, in seeking divine guidance in all matters affecting our national welfare and standing among the nations of the earth.

I conceive it to be the duty of everyone who is privileged to serve his fellow Americans in a public capacity, to steep himself in the life of Abraham Lincoln, and to conduct himself accordingly. Lincoln's life should always be the yardstick of public service, and those who are unwilling to be so guided in their public actions, demonstrate their unfitness to occupy positions of public trust of any kind, major or minor.

In the preservation of American freedom and democracy, Lincoln had an unfailing appreciation of the worth of all who toil for a humble living. He remains the champion of the cause of the common people from whom he sprung, and in whose interest he served to the end. "God must love the common people," he said, "He made so many of them." He repeatedly made mention of his humble origin. In a speech at New Haven, Conn., he declared: "I am not ashamed to confess that 25 years ago I was a hired laborer, mauling rails, working on a flatboat—just what might happen to any poor man's son. I want every man to have a chance." That is the American message, a message that will do more to rid the world of remaining autocratic and ruthless rule over the lives of the people of other lands, and points the way to real freedom and full opportunity, than is possible by any other course of action.

My fellow Americans, we can make our greatest contribution to the world's peace and progress by rededicating ourselves in these momentous days to the humanity and humility of Abraham Lincoln. A distinguished lawyer once said: "States are great only as men may make them great; men are great only as they dare and do." Lincoln said the rights and privileges preserved by the Constitution may not last unless every man, woman, and child shall recognize his responsibilities and duties under the Constitution.

You, my fellow citizens, are aware that many of us are often inclined to dwell on our rights rather than our duties. I say, it is the duty of every citizen in these critical times to stand firmly against all individuals or groups whose aims and purposes are to change our form of government, and I deem it appropriate to quote 10 golden rules of conduct so amply stated by the Honorable Leland M. Ford, who must have been inspired by the thoughts and actions of the immortal Lincoln when he stated:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing big men down.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner up by pulling the wage payer down.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound social security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

It has been wisely said that history is made up of the biographies of our outstanding men, men who have left an imprint on advancing civilization. It is from men of this character that we draw our greatest inspiration. They are the beacon lights that lead us onward and upward to greater and better things. This is why each year we should commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

In conclusion I wish to remind you that Lincoln's life was comparatively a short one. However, the span of one's life is not measured by its length, but by the deeds performed during its brief period. The span of life of Jesus of Nazareth was only 32 short years, but after 2,000 years His example and teachings are among the most potent influences in the world today. Abraham Lincoln died at the age of 56, but in that short space he acquired immortality.

We cannot all be Lincolns, but we cannot escape the influence of his life upon humanity. The world is a better place, by far, because Lincoln's principles still live in the hearts of his countrymen, because no man had a greater regard and understanding of the human spirit than did Abraham Lincoln. His benign influence shall endure for all time—as long as there exists oppression, intolerance, and injustice. The beacon torch of Lincoln's spirit shall point the way of all mankind to follow.

Giovanni da Verrazzano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article by Daniel Santoro of Staten Island on the discoveries of Giovanni da Verrazzano:

GIOVANNI DA VERRAZZANO—A SHORT HISTORY OF HIS DISCOVERIES

(By Daniel Santoro)

The year 1950 marks the four hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of the discovery of the Hudson River, the Bay of New York, and Staten Island by the Italian cosmographer and navigator, Giovanni da Verrazzano. The magnificent statue by Ettore Ximenes, erected in 1909 through the good will of the Italian colony of New York, stands symbolically overlooking the bay which he discovered. The inscription on the pedestal records a historic truth:

"In the year 1909, America and Italy commemorate Giovanni da Verrazzano, Florentine, the first European to sail these waters, preceding another, more fortunate, for whom they were named, and whose shores were destined to be the site of one of the world's capital cities."

Giovanni da Verrazzano, the son of Pier Andrea da Verrazzano and Fiammetta Cappella, was born in Greve di Chianti, near Florence, Italy, about 1485. Some historians have attributed a title of nobility to the Verrazzano family, and the coat of arms of a count may still be seen in the old house in Via delle Pinzocchiere, near the famous church of Santa Croce.

Early in life he had developed a love for the sea, and he became very familiar with the Mediterranean waters. Having acquired a certain skill and reputation as a pilot, we find him engaged in the services of France on an expedition to discover the supposed strait to Cathay. In August 1508, Verrazzano entered the Gulf of St. Lawrence, thus preceding Cartier by 27 years. This search for a water route to the East Indies, however, was futile, and the ship returned to France.

Not very much is known about Verrazzano's activities at this time. Undoubtedly he must have made the acquaintance of many leading Italian merchants and bankers who had fled from the Italian republics for political reasons, and had found refuge in France. Among these were the Rucellai, friends of the Verrazzanos.

Monarchs and merchants in their eagerness to expand their kingdoms and trade respectively, sought the services of Italian navigators who surpassed all others in knowledge and skill. Cristoforo Colombo had gained wealth and vast lands for Spain; Giovanni and Sebastiano Caboto, sailing on a northern route, had planted the banner of England on the coast of Labrador upon which England based her claims to the North American mainland; Amerigo Vespucci, serving the king of Portugal, discovered the great southern continent, and his name was given to both western continents. Giovanni da Verrazzano was chosen by France to fulfill her dream of wealth and empire.

Exhausted by religious strife, political rebellions and the war against Charles V, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and archduke of Austria, France lagged far behind England in projects of exploration and colonization. The Papal Bull of 1493, strengthened by the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494) excluded her from all territory beyond 370 leagues west of the Azores. With the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, Genoa's trade was ruined, while Venice's greatly declined as a result of Portuguese sailors who sailed around the coast of Africa thereby establishing cheaper trade routes with India. Thus the center of world trade had shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and France looked to the west.

Undaunted by the threat of excommunication imposed on all who sailed under the French flag, and willing to risk hanging by the Spaniards, Verrazzano saw his opportunity. Finding favor at the French Court (for the Italian Luisa di Savoia exerted great influence on her son; Luisa di Savoia became Regent of France during her son's capture after the Battle of Pavia), he obtained permission to organize an expedition from Francis I (Francois d'Angoulême, son of Luisa di Savoia, who, upon the death of his father-in-law, Louis XII, became King of France on January 1, 1515). Turning to the wealthy Italian bankers of Lyons, the fuorusciti (political exiles), as they were called, he succeeded in obtaining their financial backing. These merchants were only too eager to increase their trade, and were easily persuaded by Verrazzano's eloquence and reputation. In August 1523 Verrazzano and his crew of 50 men sailed from Dieppe on the 100-ton ocean-going caravel, the *Dauphine*, with three other ships.

A violent gale, however, compelled them to return to Brest. Two of the ships were lost, and the third, the *Normande*, refused to hazard the treacherous journey. On January 17, 1524, Verrazzano sailed aboard the *Dauphine* intent on finding a passage to the Indies.

Sailing along a route in the neighborhood of 34 degrees north latitude, he sighted the American Continent (at a point above Cape Fear, S. C.), and coasted southward for about 50 leagues. Aware that the Spaniards were exploring the lands to the south, Verrazzano turned and proceeded northward charting the coast and giving names. To the isthmus separating the ocean from Pimlico and Albemarle Sounds, which Verrazzano erroneously mistook for the Oriental Sea, he gave the name of Isthmus Verrazzano. Other names with which he baptized the sea coast include: Arcadia (Maryland), di Lorenna (Delaware), the first promontory Lanzone (Cape Henlopen), the second Bonivetto (Cape May), the largest river Vandoma (the Delaware) and a small mountain, di S. Polo (the Navesink Highlands).

Verrazzano's report to the King of France is the first original account (thus far known) of the Atlantic coast of the United States and it clearly describes his voyage of discovery and exploration. The account of his first landing on the American Continent reads thus: "The inhabitants being numerous, we saw everywhere multitudes of fires * * * We sent the boat on shore with 25 men to obtain water * * * Many of the natives came to the beach, indicating by various friendly signs that we might trust ourselves on shore * * * A young sailor was attempting to swim ashore through the surf to carry them some knickknacks, like little bells, looking glasses, and other trifles.

"He tossed the things to them, and turned about to get back to the boat, but he was thrown by the waves, and so dashed by them that he lay as if he were dead upon the beach. When the people saw him * * * they ran and took him by the head, legs and arms and carried him to a distance from the surf. The young man * * * uttered very loud shrieks in fear and dismay * * *

"Afterward they laid him down at the foot of a little hill, expressing great astonishment at the whiteness of his skin. Our sailors in the boat seeing a great fire made up, and their companion placed very near it, full of fear * * * imagined that the natives were about to roast him for food * * * But as soon as he had recovered his strength * * * they hugged him with great affection and accompanied him to the shore. The young man made his way safely to the boat, and remarked that the people were black * * * that they had shining skins, (were of) middle stature, (had) sharp faces and delicate bodies." (The translation used is that of Joseph G. Cogsell.)

Sailing northward Verrazzano made various landings along the coast, and finally came to "a very pleasant situation (between) some steep hills" (the Navesink Highlands, and the high ground at the east end of Staten Island) "through which a very large river, deep at its mouth flowed to the sea; from the sea to the estuary of the river, any ship heavily laden might pass, with the help of the tide which rises 8 feet. But as we were riding at anchor in a good berth, we would not venture up in our vessel, with a knowledge of the mouth; therefore we took the boat, and entering the river, we found the country on its banks well peopled, the inhabitants not differing much from the others, being dressed with feathers of birds of various colors." Verrazzano then goes on to relate how the Indians greeted them with shouts of joy, and how they showed them where to land safely with their boat. Going beyond these hills (inside The Narrows) he describes "a very beautiful lake (the upper bay) three leagues in circuit" where the Indians were rowing "in 30 or more boats from one shore to the other." He called this Bay Santa Margarita, and the river and the surrounding land Angoleme.

How long they remained here is uncertain. "A violent contrary wind blew in from the sea" and forced them back to their ship. Weighing anchor Verrazzano sailed eastward but always within sight of the coast, and proceeded from inlet to inlet, from bay to bay along the Atlantic seaboard, he discovered "an island of triangular form" (Block Island or Martha's Vineyard) about the size of the island of Rhodes which he named Luisa (in honor of Luisa de Savoia). He did not land here because "of the unfavorable weather" and proceeded toward the mainland till he came to a "very excellent harbor," Rifugio (Narragansett Bay). From here he continued sailing past Maine, and reaching as far as northwest of Sable Island, he turned the ship and headed back to Europe landing in Dieppe on July 8, 1524. Verrazzano failed to discover the route to Asia; instead he discovered the Hudson River, the Bay of New York, and Staten Island.

Little is known of Verrazzano after his return to France. Some historians maintain that he made a second trip to America. Ramusio states that he was devoured by cannibals in Venezuela; others say in Brazil. The Italian poet, Giulio Giovio, in a recently uncovered poem, states that Giovanni's brother Girolamo da Verrazzano, watched helplessly from the boat while Giovanni "was being devoured by savage Indians." However, this is not very probable since on May 11, 1526, Giovanni had made him the beneficiary in his testament, and it is not likely that one names as beneficiary a person who was to undertake the same dangerous mission. Nor did Girolamo, who was an excellent cosmographer, indicate on his map the place where the incident was reported to have happened. Others still say that he was captured by the Spaniards in 1527 and hanged.

The official recognition given to Henry Hudson as the discoverer of the Hudson River by the legislature of the State of New York on March 27, 1906, rightfully belongs to Giovanni da Verrazzano. Early Dutch historians, eager to claim credit for their nation, hardly mentioned Verrazzano, while they filled their history books with stories of

Hudson. The English could not have given him the credit since it would have been against their interest.

But the voice of truth cannot be silenced; it is louder than the roar of the waves; mightier than the power of the storm. It shall be heard.

A Long-Range Farm Program—Republican National Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the report of the Honorable Axel J. Beck, of South Dakota, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Republican National Committee. Mr. Beck's report gives the background of the committee's work as well as its recommendations.

The report follows:

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The Republican National Committee, at its January 1949 meeting in Omaha, with Chairman SCOTT's appointment and Chairman Gabrielson's continuation of a subcommittee on agriculture, recognized the problems confronting that industry as basic economic ones, and as problems having like importance from a political point of view, and by that act delegated to your subcommittee the difficult task of finding answers and solutions which not only would meet the requirements of practical farming under conditions which now exist and be receptive to the farmers, but which also would fit into the scheme and pattern of the philosophy and concept of free enterprise.

We, as members of your committee, accepted that assignment with a great deal of hesitancy. We were dubious concerning constructive accomplishments. We recognized the tremendous difficulties which were involved and we entertained no great hope of finding answers to questions which over the years had proved so baffling and concerning which there had been so much disagreement.

Our preliminary investigations and inquiries, however, soon led us to conclude that the viewpoints of practical dirt farmers on questions relating to a farm program had seldom been sought an never emphasized and that our committee, even though it couldn't find all of the answers which it had been called on to supply, could at least make a contribution in this field by furnishing an opportunity for the operators in the field of agriculture—the ones who had seen and felt the impact of Government entry therein, the participants and actual observers—to tell of actual experiences and to advise and counsel on legislative proposals relating to a long-range farm program.

With such self-imposed restrictions as to the scope of our inquiries, we found no difficulty in deciding upon the heart of the farm belt, with Sioux City at the junction of three of the great farm belt States in its center, as our field of operations and upon that city as the forum from which the agricultural voice of America should be heard.

We need not in this report stress all of the particulars which preceded or which took place during the Sioux City meeting, except those which ought to be stressed and which we regard as being highly important.

The reception given us by the host State and city belongs in that category. Iowa, under the leadership of its distinguished citizen and Governor, William S. Beardsley, and Sioux City, expressing itself through its popular mayor, Dan J. Conley, and cooperating through a smoothly functioning chamber of commerce, extended a welcome to the conference which not only gave official prominence to it, but a vivid interest setting also.

The presence of and participation in the conference proceedings by nationally prominent Republican leaders, likewise, was tremendously important and significant. The conference but for the attendance of Senators Aiken, of Vermont; Young, of North Dakota; Butler and Wherry, of Nebraska; Thye, of Minnesota; Kem, of Missouri; Hickenlooper, of Iowa; and Mundt, of South Dakota; and Congressmen Hope, of Kansas; Andresen, of Minnesota; Stephan and Curtis, of Nebraska; Talle, Hoeven, Gross, Martin, and LeCompte, of Iowa; Case, of South Dakota; Governor George T. Michelson, of South Dakota; and Chairman Guy George Gabrielson, would not have been appraised as an event having national significance. That attendance silenced our critics who were ready to charge the Republican Party with indifference toward agriculture.

The farm organizations' participation in the conference proceedings are events which must be classified likewise. The conference record without their statement would not have been complete. In those statements we have expressions from recognized farm leaders on basic agricultural policies, on existing differences in viewpoints and on approaches to the solution of the long-range farm problem. All of them merit study and full consideration since they represent results of painstaking and conscientious and technical and practical research over a period of years in the field of agriculture.

Other observations which we made concerning that conference are summed up in our statement of October 1. It in substance told of the character of the conference proceedings, the interest it created, the commitments our party made and what was accomplished by it. We submit it for the record of this committee and as a part of our final report. It reads as follows:

"The subcommittee on agriculture today, through its chairman, made the assertion that the Republican Party's next step in its fight for agriculture and a restoration of a sound economy and as a sequel to the recent National Farm Conference, should be to see to it that the majority recommendations from the farmers at that conference for a long-range farm program prominently be kept before Congress as it formulates legislation of that type.

"Those recommendations," he added, "consisted of demands for high level parity price supports, continuation of recognized soil conservation practices, storage, insofar as possible, on the farms, of adequate stock piles of nonperishable farm products, tariff protection at parity levels, and utmost freedom from Government interference with and control of farming."

"The Republican Party by sponsoring the conference and by inviting the farmers to participate in it," he continued, "impliedly pledged itself to keep those recommendations before Congress and it is a pledge that the party can be depended upon to keep.

"Something else, too," he emphasized, "came out of that conference, that same group of farmers reflecting the traditional independence and self-reliance of the farmers of America, declared themselves against subsidies and doles, strait-jacket Brannan-plan methods of regimentation, and the shackles and the chains it proposes for agriculture."

The farmers insisted in the course of that conference that adoption of the recommendations would result in prosperity for agriculture which in turn would mean prosperity for the Nation.

Commenting upon the character of those recommendations, he pointed out further, that the conference record consisted of complete statements from all of the major farm organizations, of statements by nationally known economists and of the experts in the field of agriculture and of more than 100 farmers from more than 15 Farm Belt States, and that those recommendations, therefore, represented a correct cross-section view of the farmer thinking of America.

"They reflected," he said, "realistic as well as constructive thinking on the part of farmers, in that they point the way to a gradual, safe, and systematic departure from our present rigged economy and a return to the American way of life and our system of free enterprise."

Concluding his remarks, he observed that the farmers of America at a conference spotlighted nationally, sponsored by the Republican Party, but otherwise nonpolitical, for the first time in history had a chance to tell their side of the story of agriculture. In telling it, they took the lead and they pointed the way. They warned that the rugged individualism, exemplified by the testimony of Dan Casement, the colorful Kansan who spoke at the conference, if invoked now, can be as harmful and as dangerous to our economy as the views of the extreme leftists and those who would make the farmers serfs in a welfare state. They brought practical sense to a problem which by reason of politics has been made confusing, and they give it an importance which must not be overlooked.

"The administration forces in Washington," he continued, "are already claiming that the farmers who spoke at the conference should be ignored, that their recommendations should be disregarded and that the conference record should have no effect."

"The Republican Party and the Republicans in Congress, on the other hand," he finally concluded, "will see to it that the conference pledge to the farmers of America will be kept."

Accordingly, your committee has reached the conclusion that recommendations as to objectives to be attained under a long-range farm program should be a part of this report. Such action is in line with the majority recommendations, which came out of that conference. It is in accord with the compact made with the farmers and the kind of results they were led to expect.

The recommendations we have agreed upon do not follow the methods or plans prescribed by any one of the farm organizations or by any individual or group of individuals, but are based on all of the evidence and testimony which is in the conference record and upon other evidence which has come to the attention of your committee and are intended as recommendations, only, for a plan, rather than the plan by which the desired objectives can be achieved.

OBJECTIVES

1. Administration by farmers through a system of farmer elected township and county committees and State directors, and a national farm board appointed by the President.

2. Full parity price at all times on all cash nonperishable crops, restricted only by marketing quotas on each farm when on August 15 of any one year the total estimated national supply of any specific commodity crop exceeds 150 percent of the predicted requirements for the next year.

3. Full parity price at all times, also, on all feed nonperishable crops—such crops to be in terms of production units based on feed value—limited only by acreage restrictions on individual farms when the supply of such

crops in terms of such units, stored thereon, on December 1 of any 1 year, will exceed 150 percent of its assigned production.

4. Unrestricted livestock production, supported at full parity in the market place, by Government purchases from livestock processors of enough of their products to maintain the market at that level. Losses, if any, from sales of accrued surplus, resulting from such purchasing operations, to be financed by a fee of $1 per hundred pounds imposed on the killing sale of all livestock. Such fee may in the event of a declared marketing emergency be increased to as much as $2 per hundred, or, when unnecessary by reason of self-sustaining market, or a sufficient surplus of fee collections, be entirely suspended.

5. Eggs and dairy products to be supported at full parity price levels by a fee on the products marketed, under the same general plan as is established for livestock. The fee base in this field being broad, it is safe to assume that a small fee will sustain such price structure.

6. Semiperishable crops to be maintained at full parity price levels, also, under a Government-purchasing and a market-quota system.

7. Facilities for storage of nonperishable feed crops on the farms.

8. A sound soil-conservation program to insure continued fertility of our soil, proper and essential mineral content, and one which will tend to minimize the disturbing facts of soil erosion.

9. Encouragement of research and new uses of agricultural products and the development of new industries to utilize additional production.

10. A flexible tariff at the parity level for all products of agriculture.

POLICY

The Republican Party, traditionally constructive, departs, under this plan, from negative philosophies of curtailed production and enters an era of full productivity.

By it we propose incentive for agricultural production records, efficiency in operations, and we point to permanent means by which a farmer can operate at a profit, hold what he has acquired, and meet the problems of ever-increasing overhead costs.

With it we propose production which increases sales, engenders demand for goods and labor, and which raises standards of living. We boldly reject the hopelessness of the scheme of a low price for a big crop and a high price for a small one, with the results in terms of dollar income virtually the same.

As we launch it we shall abandon the false concept of scarcity as a means of acquiring plenty, and we shall underwrite a program for farm income at 1948 levels and correspondingly high ones in other fields.

The Republican Party, under the terms of this plan, in conjunction with full parity price for all farm products, proposes an end to further unwarranted Government intrusions in this field, a restoring of administrative and operational control to farmers and a creed which may properly be called, the American code of agriculture.

FARMER ADMINISTRATION

Control of the industry in which the farmers are directly interested should and can be exercised by them through election of township and county committees and State directors and majority representation on the national board. Such representation shall be by appointment by the president from State directors or persons who shall have held such positions. Other members of that board shall also be appointed by the President in a manner so as to represent other interests in the Nation. Such a board shall have controlling power in all matters relating to administration and policy; the Secretary of Agriculture shall be ex officio member and its presiding officer.

PARITY

Parity is in the nature of an equalizing measure. It may also be referred to as a formula under which the price for the things that a farmer sells goes up and down as the prices in other fields fluctuate. Farm products, therefore, on principle, must be kept at full parity price levels.

SUPPORT PRICE

Full parity prices for cash and feed nonperishable crops can be maintained by 90 percent commodity loans callable at parity. This is in line with what experience has taught us.

STORAGE ON FARMS

Provisions shall be made to carry 50 percent reserve of nonperishable feed crops in storage on the farms at all times. Such a stock pile will protect the Nation against shortage in case of drought or war. It will operate as an automatic check on tendencies to overproduce. The useless costs incidental to Government storing will be eliminated. Shuttling of feed crops from farms to Government storage bins and back again when such supplies get low will be ended and savings will be effected both by farmers and the Government.

This method for storage will furnish insurance against crop failures, since the supply on each individual farm in short crop years can be sold on a higher market or used as feed. A crop reserve of that size in the possession and control of individual farmers can be likened to a reserve account by a corporation or a bank which is created to protect against unanticipated emergencies or losses. Such assets on every farm will add stability to the farming business and it will cover temporary individual farm unit setbacks, which otherwise might be quite serious.

SURPLUSES

By combining crop and livestock production under our plan, we are not only working toward more production normalcy in the field and more balance—factors which by themselves will simplify the troublesome question of crop surpluses and assure better incomes—but by the expedient of converting of increased amounts of such surpluses into livestock products—of which there is almost always a shortage and for which there is constant demand—we are providing channels for disposition which formerly did not exist, we are arranging to meet normal market demands and we are reducing the cost of absorbing such surplus to the extent that they can be paid without any expense to the Government and out of the fee we propose.

SELF-FINANCED

Upon a theory which from the standpoint of principle is comparable to that underlying minimum wages and the principle applied by business when it assesses the cost of its products, including taxes, to the consumer, we are not only freeing agriculture from the charge that it is recipient of subsidies and doles and holding prices of farm products at parity peaks, but we are also financing the whole venture by a fee which will be added to the price of the things which are produced.

SPECIAL FEATURES

The farmer under this plan will be free of the controls by overlords in the Department of Agriculture. He can make his plans for short periods or he can make them on a long-range basis. He can make his farming conform to special requirements of his own farm unit or to his own individual management pattern. He is once more restored to the position of independence he once held with a protection, however, which assures him earning opportunities comparable to that of individuals in other fields.

ISSUE PRESENTED

Your committee in making this report and submitting this plan, has sought not only to keep its pledge to the farm conference, but by our recommendations that the plan be submitted to the Republicans in Congress as objectives to be attained by the Republican Party in its fight for agriculture, we are not only suggesting specific commitments from our party to the farmers, but we are also focusing the attention of the Nation on the fundamental differences which exist between the so-called Brannan plan and the type of a farm program which the farmers want, which they must have, which they recommended in the course of that conference, which in substance is reflected by the plan we have proposed, and which as already indicated we have termed "the American code of agriculture."

CONCLUSION

The Republican Party is without a long-range farm plan. It must have one if it expects to win the confidence of the voters in the Farm Belt in the coming elections. That plan must be such as to appeal to the average, typical, and practical farmer. It must be positive and specific. Generalizations are not enough. The farmers are demanding a bill of particulars and are entitled to it.

This report contains proposals which meets those demands and it suggests objectives which not only fit into the American farmer's concept of free enterprise and ours, but also into the pattern laid down by the whole committee and the Republicans in Congress at the recent Washington meeting.

Your committee, in this connection, suggests that the 20-percent decline in last year's farm income, the predicted one for the coming year of an additional 10 percent, the admitted damaging effect of such declines on the whole economy and the Agriculture Department's implied admission of failure as it proposes dumping and destruction of surplus crops, has focused the attention of the Nation on need for specific and constructive measures to prevent prospective collapse of the farm products price structure. Announcement concerning such measures for that reason should be made at this time.

This report is being submitted to the chairman of the policy committee in accordance with the action taken by the whole committee at its executive session on February 5. We ask that it be filed and approved and that the recommendations in it, as to objectives, be submitted to the Republicans in Congress as suggestions for basic farm policy of the Republican Party.

Respectfully submitted.

Axel J. Beck, Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Republican National Committee; Subcommittee Members: Axel J. Beck, Chairman; Mrs. Gilford Mayes, Vice Chairman; Mr. B. L. Noojin; Mrs. A. C. Remmel; Mr. C. C. Spades; Mrs. Ralph A. Harris; Mr. C. Norman Brunsdale; Mrs. John B. Cooley; Mr. James P. Winne.

American Taxpayers Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Valentin Gubitchev, the convicted Russian spy, is going back to Russia, not to jail, and the United States Government is paying the major portion of his passage aboard a North Atlantic luxury liner.

The State Department arbitrarily dictated that Gubitchev be sent to his homeland and that he be freed from serving a just sentence of 15 years for stealing vital United States secrets.

Gubitchev, as a Russian attaché of the United Nations, is paid by the United Nations. The United States, through the American taxpayers, contributes 46 percent of the cost of operating the United Nations.

Gubitchev has been drawing his pay ever since his arrest and all the time he was on trial, and the United Nations is buying his ticket back to Russia.

Forty-six percent of Gubitchev's salary came from the people of the United States—the people he was spying upon.

Forty-six percent of the cost of the spy's trip home will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

Forty-six percent of all of Gubitchev's expenses while in the United States was paid for by the American taxpayers.

Bureaucratic Control of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution recently adopted by Unit No. 90 of the American Legion Auxiliary, Melrose, Mass., as certified to me by Emma L. Burns, president, and Irma L. Berthel, secretary. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free-enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion Auxiliary, Melrose, Mass., Unit 90 does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

One Freedom Indivisible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the story of Abraham Lincoln remains one of the greatest sources of inspiration in the history of our Republic. The annual observance of his birthday anniversary properly has become a source of renewed devotion to the cause of the people and their representative government. Under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to a challenging address delivered on Lincoln's birthday in his home city of Springfield, Ill., by Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and now president of the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Stassen's audience was made of Young Republicans in Illinois, whose enthusiasm gives renewed hope for the preservation of the principles so well exemplified by the words and deeds of the Great Emancipator.

Mr. Stassen's address follows:

ONE FREEDOM INDIVISIBLE

(By Harold E. Stassen)

Chairman BROWN, Congressman DIRKSEN, Congressman JENISON, National Chairman Tope, members and guests of the Illinois Young Republican Federation, Abraham Lincoln was one of those few men in all history who deeply understood the nature of man and had the unshakable courage to act in accordance with his convictions.

He believed—he knew—that man was meant to be free, and in moving addresses he declared that this Nation could not endure permanently half slave and half free.

Standing fast upon this principle, Lincoln welded together a powerful and victorious political party; he took the leadership of the Nation, and he brought it through its hour of grim trial as one undivided United States of America. There can be little doubt now of the everlasting rightness of his position or of the benefits that have flowed to all mankind, regardless of color, by reason of Lincoln's actions. We salute the memory of Abraham Lincoln tonight.

At this midcentury point, in America and in the western world there is another, but closely related issue which needs clarification and decision. After Lincoln's time, as freemen were stimulated to invent and place into extensive use machines to work for men, rather than to have men toiling as slaves to man, remarkable productivity was achieved and unequalled progress was made. But with this rapid industrial revolution came abuses and dislocations, and booms and depressions.

Some of the resulting problems were wisely met by the adoption of important new rules and regulations and provisions, such as the antitrust and antimonopoly measures, the early enforcement of which was associate with Theodore Roosevelt; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to safe-guard credit and deposits, which was set up under an amendment presented to the Congress by Senator VANDENBERG; and the social security measures to aid the temporarily unemployed, which were established under Franklin Roosevelt. These actions all applied the basic, sound methods of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They established rules and prescribed limits of action whereby the exercise of one man's freedom would not unduly infringe upon his fellow man's enjoyment of freedom. These same methods had been employed from the very earliest days of our Nation.

Through the vigilance of our Republican Party and through some key decisions by the Supreme Court, we have thus far, in the main, retained our individual economic freedom in America. This is the principal reason for the fact that our average worker's home has a better standard of living than the average worker's home in any other country in the world and it is the principal reason that the number of good jobs available to the worker is very high.

Under that liberty, individual management and free workers and capitalist tools have together increased the results that can be obtained from a day's work by 100 percent in a single generation of 25 years. Unfortunately, a goodly part of that gain has been taken away from the worker through the cheapening of the wage dollar by the unsound economic policies of his government.

Unfortunately also, in that generation, the whole world has been lured by another set of proposals. Frequently confused and rarely clearly defined, the central purpose of these alien proposals is that instead of piecing out carefully the means and limitations under which free men can work out their problems, with competition providing rewards for efficiency and penalties for inefficiency, these proposals manifest the belief that the simplest approach to any problem is for government to step in and take over the entire situation involved in that problem. "Let the government do it," is the slogan. Nationalization, government ownership, blanket controls, price fixing, heavy taxes, governmental distribution of goods, and governmental operation of all or a major part of the economy are the methods of this school of thought.

In various forms and in varying degrees it has crept into the entire western world. Its extreme form appears in the absolute collectivist views of the totalitarian materialists of the Continent: Marx and Engels and Feuerbach, Lenin and Stalin and Hitler. In the democracies, however, it has been frequently advocated as a defense against communism, as the ideal system of the future. Its purpose, so we are told emphatically, is to maintain the political and religious freedom of men.

But, as the various experiments in governmental operation of an entire economy, or in the nationalization of major industries or professions or sections of an economy, are attempted, we can observe the resultant effects upon the lowering standards of living, the decreased liberties, and the restricted way of life of the people. And as we watch the unfolding of these schemes a central point emerges. It is a point which I believe must be precisely stated and dramatically emphasized. It is this:

The economic freedom of man—that is, his freedom to buy and to sell, to work and to profit, to produce and to build, to invest and to manufacture, to mine and to distribute, to save and to spend, subject only to broad and fair rules of the economic road—cannot permanently be divided from his other freedoms.

In fact, in the long-term view, all of the freedoms of man are indivisible. The tendency to speak of a number of freedoms has resulted in confusion, it has created the impression that man can turn over to government a part of his freedoms and retain the rest. But throughout the world the evidence accumulates that man's situation is not static and that if he is but partly free, he will either gradually win full freedom or slowly lose all his freedom.

If a man becomes subservient to the men in authority in his government for what he may eat and what he may wear, for where he may work and what he may earn, for what he may produce and how he shall profit,

for what he may build and where he may live, then he cannot truly be free in what he may say or write, or how he may worship, or how he may live.

A man must either have complete freedom or he will not for long be truly free at all. A man cannot permanently be half a slave and half a freeman.

It is this great issue which our Republican Party must take hold of with a firm and confident grasp. Assuming clear and definite position, the party must translate the issue to the people in forthright terms. The issue must not be presented negatively, as mere obstruction, but by means of positive, dynamic programs by which progress can be made and freedom retained. Obviously there will be disagreements in the details of such a program, for no program of action can ever be worked out without adjustment of views and honest compromise freely arrived at. But on the great fundamental principle that the freedom of man is indivisible and that government must not have the power of economic life and death over its people, there can be no compromise, there must be no compromise.

I believe that this is the key truth which the Republican Party must make crystal clear and present to the people as its fighting issue.

It is the most progressive, dynamic principle of all time. Its correct interpretation will lead to greater progress, to better conditions of living, and to brighter prospects of world peace than any of the confused, pseudo-liberal, reactionary doctrines of these recent decades. It does not in any sense limit the objectives and goals of man. Rather it does precisely the opposite. It points out the only true course by which the goals of happiness and security can be realized and maintained. It sets the standards by which government shall establish fair boundaries to one man's exercise of his freedom, boundaries that prevent his infringing unduly on the exercise of the freedom of his fellowmen. It indicates the way in which government shall help in performing those functions which men cannot perform for themselves, but it prescribes methods that retain man's individual freedom and methods that do not subject him to the whim or caprice of other men in government.

And here are some more specific examples of what this principle does:

It emphasizes the importance of preventing monopolies and international cartels, which in effect take away man's freedom to buy and trade.

It brings to us a sharp realization of the fundamental evil of the dictatorial labor leader who prevents the members of his union from working though they wish to do so, who ruthlessly obliterates from his union those who have different views, and who slams shut the door on those who would be apprentices in the field of labor that he controls.

It warns that we must not permit Government to take over the control of the medical professions by any compulsory health plan.

It demonstrates that we must forbid Government to take actions which would greedily grasp such large portions of a man's earnings that he is denied the freedom to spend and use and enjoy the fruits of his own labor.

There is a double evil in the proposals to increase the economic power of the Government over the people.

I have emphasized the unfortunate restriction on the citizen's freedom. The other bad effect is that it increases the power and bigness of Government itself. All the warnings of the great men in our history against a too powerful and too centralized Government were wise. The current world scene corroborates earlier history in this respect.

Government is like a fire. If it is kept within bounds and under the control of people, it contributes to the welfare of all. But if it gets out of its place, if it gets too big and out of control, it destroys the happiness and even the lives of the people.

One of the lessons of America's unparalleled progress is that Government's principal role is to protect men and to prevent crushing burdens from being laid upon them and to leave them free—truly free and completely free. Our Government in the past has in the main held to that role, and the sum total of the results of the freedom it has fostered has been progress far in excess of anything that totalitarian systems can accomplish. Freedom means strength far beyond that of cumbersome and clanking collectivism, which cows the worker instead of releasing his energies. It is the virile idea which will penetrate iron curtains and push through colonial barricades and move all mankind toward progress and toward peace.

The bright source of the doctrine of the true freedom of man is that stream of philosophic thought that can be traced to ancient Greece. It received major impetus from the Christian religion and from Judaism, and was implemented by Magna Carta, by the Declaration of Independence, and by the Constitution of our country. The fundamental concept of man's inherent rights—that he is meant to be free and that he is an individual possessing human dignity—does not really permit of the mixed interpretations of socialism or of communism. Neither does it permit of a cold and ruthless capitalism, nor of a domineering, dictatorial hierarchy of labor. It requires the evolvement in this industrial age of a modern people's capitalism and a modern, free man's government which with skill and ingenuity and flexible adaptiveness constantly sets up those new rules and new limits to keep the game of life of free men fair, to ease the plight of those who are ill or unemployed or aged, but never to so burden the producer, or so reward the slacker, as to undermine the virility of an economy.

Let us always have in mind that every attempt in the history of the world to establish a loafers' paradise has wound up in a dictator's hellhole.

My message to the Young Republicans of Illinois and of the Nation today is this:

Let us rebuild the Republican Party as a dynamic, fighting party with this issue of the true freedom of man as our central rallying point.

Let us make it clear that if people are looking for a political party that will promise to everyone ever larger hand-outs from the Public Treasury, they should look elsewhere that we hold that the Public Treasury is in reality the people's pockets, and that we will not seek to win votes by false promises nor by leading the country down that road that inevitably ends in a cheapened dollar and ultimate misery and suffering for all when resources are drained.

Let us make it clear that if the people want a political party that will take over and politically dominate the medical professions in exchange for promises which the experience of Britain show cannot be fulfilled, they should look elsewhere.

Let us make it clear that if they want a political party that will try to delude them into thinking that someone else is going to pay the tax burdens, they should look elsewhere.

Let us make it clear we seek to build a political party that is frank and forthright with the people, a party that promises above all that it will not weaken or destroy any of the freedom of the people, that it will seek ever to maintain an incentive for every man and woman to use his hands and brains and capital in worth while and productive accomplishment and service, and that it will steadfastly refuse to maintain or to operate any system of governmental hand-outs, to provide soft cushions for loafers or chiselers or dishonest 5-percenters.

Let us also declare with deep sincerity that man cannot truly be free if discrimination against him because of his race or religion or ancestry shuts doors to him of education or of employment or of shelter or of justice. Thus we shall make clear that, having adopted this great principle, our party cannot contemplate and shall not consummate a fusion with those forces in our country affiliated by name with the opposition party who seek to join with us partially to protect economic freedom for themselves but even more to deny true freedom to others in their midst.

Rather should we associate ourselves with those thoughtful, forward-looking people throughout the Nation who seek sound and steady progress toward our high ideals for al' our people without discrimination.

Our objective further means that our people must have and hold fast to that code of moral and ethical conduct which has been developed from the depths of our great religions and which provides a self-discipline in our relationship to our fellowmen that is more important than any laws or rules or decrees. The lessons of history indicate that unless there is a code of conduct which causes people as a whole to have respect for the rights of their fellowmen, to regard them as individuals endowed with human dignity, to treat them with justice regardless of the terms of any laws or rules, that unless there is such a basis for the relationship between men, there cannot be true freedom, for the only alternative method for keeping such a society functioning is through laws and decrees possessing such detail and providing punishment so rutheless and extreme as to wipe out human liberties.

This approach means that we cannot rest in the face of misery and suffering, and it means further that in our humanitarian efforts to alleviate misery and suffering we must never ask that the rights of those who are in need be subjugated to government. We must instead ingeniously devise methods of aid that permit the retention of full freedom of the individual who is aided.

Let me say bluntly that if we adopt this basic objective, ours will not be an easy road. Embodying it in programs and instruments of government is difficult; interpreting it to the will and understanding of a people is complicated. But it is worth the price. It is not a route to easy victory in elections. But I believe it is the only route to victories that are worth while. It is the only route to victories that can be crowned by administrations that contribute deep and lasting value to the people of the United States of America and to all mankind.

We must alertly recognize that many men, either because of a sincere but mistaken belief in socialism or because of a cynical indifference to everything but victory at the polls, employing local political-machine techniques will make exaggerated promises of material gains to the people, hoping thus to win elections and as a byproduct to place more and more power in the hands of those in government.

The course I advocate would require that each of us must guard the freedom of his fellow men as jealously and effectively as he guards his own. The businessman's economic freedom to produce and manufacture and sell and profit is really inseparable from the professor's academic freedom to teach and write and research. The laboring man's right to work and to quit work and to change work is inseparable from the doctor's and dentist's right to practice their profession independently. The right to buy and to sell is inseparable from the right to publish and to assemble. The entire way of life of freemen springs from one concept of the indivisible freedom of man. It is as

freemen, thoroughly understanding the importance of their freedom and helping other men to win true and complete freedom, that Americans can gloriously fulfill their position of leadership in the world. This, as I see it, is the great task of the Republican Party.

I ask you young men and women gathered here tonight, and the citizens listening in, to step forward throughout the Nation to meet the challenge of this task.

Brock Pemberton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 14 regarding the death of Mr. Brock Pemberton.

My wife and I were privileged to know Mr. Pemberton for a great many years. He was a charming and loyal friend. He was an able craftsman of the theater. He was a leader. He participated generously in the community in which he lived. He was a civic-minded citizen who played an intelligent and contributive part in the many matters which affect the welfare of the men and women who lend their skills and talents to the stage. He was interested in their problems. He was greatly loved.

Beyond all this, he was a patriotic and courageous American who strove energetically to preserve the vital opportunities inherent in our free society. He was deeply apprehensive regarding the threats to that society, both foreign and domestic.

He will be greatly missed and deeply mourned, not only by those who knew him and loved him but also by many others for whom he represented a dependable and helpful influence in the theatrical world.

I extend to his wife and to his brother my deepest sympathy at this time of grievous loss.

His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world "This was a man."

The editorial follows:

BROCK PEMBERTON

Brock Pemberton was first of all an American. He came out of the Middle West and proved that he could win success in New York as definitely as anybody from overseas. That was something pretty important to do in the twenties when foreign names were fashionable and even quite talented artists sincerely believed that it was imperative to have a European background. To set up as native a work as Zona Gale's Miss Lulu Bett against such a pattern took courage, but Mr. Pemberton had his share of that quality and proved it again and again whenever there was need of it in his experience.

Perhaps he owed something to the example of William Allen White, under whom he trained in Emporia. In any case he remained a newspaperman by instinct if not in continual practice all his days. He possessed a keen sense for situations compelling in character, however simple and unpretending in other respects. Most of the plays he produced were matters of addition—works in which details accumulated until they reached a wholly natural climax. He judged a script by its power to create a demand in the mind of the audience and then to meet that demand by satisfactory action. There were occasions when he failed, but the net result of his endeavors was triumphant achievement. If only for Harvey, he will have a permanent place in the annals of the American theater.

The Return of a Native

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week Oakland Cemetery in Petersburg, Ill., claimed the body of a great American author.

Edgar Lee Masters, who became famous almost overnight in 1914 with the publication of Spoon River Anthology, was returned last Friday for burial in Petersburg, where he had spent his childhood days. It is significant indeed that he chose to be laid away here where Spoon River Anthology had its setting and in the same cemetery that claims the bodies of two of the writer's subjects, Mitchell Miller and Ann Rutledge.

Mr. Masters was not only a great author, as he had also distinguished himself as a successful lawyer prior to the time he gave up his practice in Illinois to devote full time to his writings. He was an active Democrat and while in Chicago was one of the founders and the first president of the Jefferson Club.

While he has passed on, his works will live forever. He will go down in history as a great American author and one who added much to American literature. As part of my remarks, I include an editorial by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register:

RETURN OF THE NATIVE

Edgar Lee Masters, poet and iconoclast, has come home. Always the land of the Spoon River was in his heart, and today he is laid to rest there, a native son returned to his own country.

Perhaps some future poet will pen as postscript to Spoon River Anthology, Masters' own epitaph. It will be as stark, as moving, as bitter as those of the anthology that lifted him to fame.

It was Masters' great tragedy to outlive his muse and the renaissance in poetry he created. His career was long and colorful, begun in great dreams and ended in frustration.

But always in his writings there persisted an unchanging affinity for the country of his boyhood. In one of his last books, the Sangamon, he tells in detail of the people whom he knew. Unlike much of his writing—caustic, searching, probing intimate depths—the Sangamon is written in a tender, reminiscent mood. To this country all of his life, Edgar Lee Masters gave unwavering devotion.

Today he returns a tired wayfarer. Squire Davis and Lucinda Matlock Masters, whom he idealized, are waiting for him.

The long journey is ended, and who can say how well or ill it was pursued? Better than us posterity can give the answer. Putting aside the triumphs and defeats and puzzling paradoxes, let us honor a man who used truth not like a swinging censer of mystic beauty as did Vachel Lindsay, but as a cutting edge, exquisitely keen, implacably wielded.

Let us not discuss his books or his philosophy or his individualism. Suffice it to say that Edgar Lee Masters has come home.

Inter-American Commission of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following request for cooperation presented by the chairman of the Inter-American Commission for Women, Senora Amalia De Castillo Ledon, to the women Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States on January 26, 1950:

INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION OF WOMEN—REQUEST FOR COOPERATION PRESENTED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION, SENORA AMALIA DE CASTILLO LEDON TO THE WOMEN SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 26, 1950

The functions of the Inter-American Commission of Women, as set forth in the Organic Statute of the Commission approved at the Ninth International Conference of American States, in Bogotá, include the following objectives: To work for the extension of civil, political, and social rights to the women of America; to study their problems and propose means of solving them.

The aforesaid Commission, which I have the honor to serve as Chairman, therefore appeals to you, the representatives of your countrywomen in the Congress of your Nation, to cooperate with active efforts and with your votes in promoting the adoption of laws that will tend to improve such aspects of the position of women in the United States as fall within the scope of the objectives of the Commission.

As you know, this Commission, which is striving to establish equality of rights between the sexes in all countries of our hemisphere, is not a politically partisan organization. Consequently its appeal for your cooperation is directed through me to all of you alike, the women Senators and Representatives of the two leading political parties in this country; for the problem of general interest, calling for a collective attempt to arrive at the solution, without distinction as to class or political parties and doctrines.

A Convention on the Granting of Civil Rights to Women, approved at the Ninth International Conference of American States, in Bogotá, was signed by the representatives of all the American countries except the United States.

With reference to that instrument the Assembly recently held in Buenos Aires by the Inter-American Commission of Women adopted a resolution which reads, in part, as follows:

"Whereas its importance (i. e., the importance of the convention) is bound up with the potential enjoyment of unanimous

support by agreements adopted within the framework of the American regional system;

"The interpretation of the term 'civil rights' has by now been made sufficiently clear in the constitutions and codes of a majority of nations, and reaffirmed by the 20 countries signatory to the above-mentioned convention,

"The Special Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women

"*Resolves*, To express the hope of the Inter-American Commission of Women, that the United States will proceed, in due time and in conformity with the special restrictions of its legal system, to adapt its laws to the juridical norms under which it is feasible to sign the Inter-American convention on the granting of civil rights to women signed by the 20 countries at the Ninth International Conference of American States, in Bogatá; and the further hope that the countries signatory to the said convention will proceed to ratify it as soon as possible, if they have not yet done so."

Accordingly, I ask for your influential and decisive support within the legislative body in which you serve as representatives of the women of North America, in order that the hopes thus expressed by the Inter-American Commission of Women may meet with a favorable response conducive to a satisfactory solution of the problem in the near future.

At the same conference in Bogotá a convention on the granting of political rights to women was likewise approved. This instrument was signed by 12 countries, including the United States.

Consequently, as Chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, I make this additional request: That you intervene with the appropriate authorities in order to bring about the swiftest possible ratification of the above-mentioned convention by the Government of the United States. Such ratification will undoubtedly serve as a stimulus to the other signatory countries that have not yet ratified the instrument in question.

For the rest, as official representatives of your countrywomen—representatives elected to posts of such high eminence from among the ranks of the most distinguished and the most able—you must surely be the women capable of exercising the greatest influence, in the Congress of which you form a part, for the purpose of enabling other women, in greater numbers than hitherto, to occupy in the future important elective posts in which they, like you yourselves, can strive for the advancement of women in every phase of life.

It is a well known fact that the number of women in the Congress of the United States has decreased rather than increased; and our most attentive and vigorous efforts are required in order to remedy this negative trend.

Thus, on behalf of the commission, I solicit your valuable cooperation and ask for expressions of opinion and for pertinent suggestions, to the end that our organization may serve the interests of American women in the present and in the future, responding as efficaciously as possible to the hopes that they have placed in it.

The women of the United States have at their disposal the power inherent in their organizations, and to those organizations also we look for effective support. Moreover, North American women are in a position to draw upon experience acquired through long years of arduous endeavor, and upon vast cultural and economic resources. In short, they have available all of the elements necessary for decisive and valuable collaboration; and it is this collaboration that I request in the name of the commission, to the end that the basic principles of our organization, principles concerned with the welfare of American women, may be successfully applied for the attainment of their rights.

American Veterans Committee Asks Excise Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD a transcript of testimony given before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 2, 1950, by Mr. Robert R. Nathan, an outstanding economist and lawyer. Mr. Nathan spoke on repeal of excise taxes and general tax policy, in behalf of American Veterans Committee (AVC), an organization of World War II veterans which consistently pursues its policy of "citizens first." I think this sound expression of policy, together with the very illuminating colloquy between Mr. Nathan and the able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, supplies essential background which we should all bear in mind as we approach the subject of new tax legislation.

Mr. Nathan's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT R. NATHAN, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. NATHAN. My name is Robert R. Nathan. I am an economist with offices at 3 Thomas Circle, Washington, and am appearing here today on behalf of the American Veterans Committee as chairman of their national legislative committee.

The American Veterans Committee, which is commonly called the AVC, is composed of World War II veterans. This organization is primarily interested in the preservation of the free and democratic process we have here, and in increasing the standard of living and achieving continued prosperity in America. The slogan of the organization is "Citizens First, Veterans Second." I think that signifies its general views.

In the last convention of the AVC organization held in Chicago about 4 months ago, there was stated in the platform the following reference to taxation:

"We favor adoption of a tax program based upon the ability to pay, flexible over time, and geared into a fiscal policy which will provide for full employment.

"One of the most pressing needs of our Government today is the revision of the national, State, and local tax programs to gear them to the needs of a fully employed and expanding economy with special reliance on the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Toward this end, we urge the President of the United States to appoint a special nonpartisan, technical tax commission, similar in principle to the Hoover Commission, this commission to work with the Council of Economic Advisers to set up a sound, just, and stable tax program.

"We oppose Federal, State, and local sales and excise taxes because they fall proportionately more heavily on lower-income groups, not being based on ability to pay. We urge the immediate repeal of all wartime excise taxes and substitution of more progressive taxes to make up the loss in Government revenues."

That was the statement included in the last platform adopted at the last convention of the AVC.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there, just for information, you speak of recommending that the President appoint a nonpartisan tax commission. You mean bipartisan?

Mr. NATHAN. Bipartisan, yes, I am sure they meant that.

The CHAIRMAN. If it were to be nonpartisan, I should like to get acquainted with them.

Mr. NATHAN. To elaborate just briefly on those taxation principles of the organization, first of all I would like to emphasize that we believe in the achievement and maintenance of prosperity and full employment in America. It depends in a very substantial degree on the type of tax program which the Federal, State, and local governments, but more importantly the Federal Government, adopt. It is our belief that of all of the instruments that the Government has for guiding and directing and stimulating economic activity, the tax program offers the greatest opportunity of all. If there is one area of legislation which has the greatest influence on economic activity and the well-being of the country, it is our feeling that the tax program is the one that is the most important of all.

It is not only the amount of tax which is collected, but also the types of taxes, because as we all know, certain taxes have a much greater incidence and much greater impact and much greater burden on certain economic activities than do others. While there are some people who believe in the general principle that taxes should be collected for revenue purposes only, that view completely ignores the fact that different taxes do have different economic impacts. Therefore, we ought to carefully consider the types of taxes we adopt in order to raise the revenue essential to pay for the Government's services which are needed.

For instance, if there is need for additional buying power because there is unemployment, we feel that taxes should be cut at those levels which would tend to increase buying power. If there is need for additional investment, taxes can be shifted so as to provide greater incentives for investment. If the country is faced with inflation, then the tax problem, it seems to me and to our group, is obviously of a different nature, the needs are of a different nature than the taxes which are essential if the country is faced with unemployment and deflation.

Therefore, we feel that great emphasis should be placed on the fact that the tax program should be geared primarily to the economic needs of the country in order to insure full employment.

As you all know, at the present time unemployment appears to be on the increase. The Census Bureau of the Federal Government reported 4,500,000 people able and willing to work and seeking work in the month of January of this year. Figures for February are not yet available, but there has been some discussion among those familiar with the background of the data that probabilities are that unemployment was probably higher in February. That is, higher than in January. Maybe somewhere between four and one-half and five million unemployed.

I think this is clearly the result of the fact that there is not an adequate demand for the products of American industry. Industrial leaders, managers, corporate executives hire people when they can sell the products which they produce, and they do not hire people and they do not produce goods when they cannot sell all they can produce. Businessmen are not inclined to hire workers and produce products just because they like to. They produce mainly because they feel there is a market for the goods produced.

Therefore, we feel that the tax program at this time must relate to the fact that there is at the present time an inadequate demand for all of the products of American industry, and that is why we have this level of unemployment somewhere between four and one-half and five million. That is why we feel a reduction in excise taxes is appropriate at

this present time. Excise taxes are paid directly by the consumer or are passed on to the consumer. Therefore, they tend to bear directly on consumption. They are a burden on consumption. They tend to cut down expenditures by the consumer, and we think it is in the interest of the country at this time to reduce excise taxes. These taxes, especially the wartime excises, were imposed during the war to keep down demand, to keep demand down so that the resources of this country during the war would be diverted to producing matériel essential to win the war. That purpose was largely fulfilled, and therefore the purposes for which the wartime excise taxes were imposed no longer exist.

That raises the question about Government revenues and the balanced budget, the relation between expenditures and receipts. We believe that a balanced budget and debt retirement are entirely appropriate and desirable in periods of full employment and high levels of economic activity. There is now a moderate amount of unemployment, and whether or not we should have a balanced budget depends on how we can raise the revenues and whether higher tax revenues will tend to further restrict employment.

It is our feeling that it is possible at this time to raise some additional taxes to offset the excise taxes and these increases will not further harm the employment picture or the economic scene. In his message to the Congress, the President suggested many ways and means of getting revenues to offset the loss from the excise-tax reductions. We believe that his proposals to close the gaps and loopholes can be especially fruitful. I would just like to mention a few of those very briefly.

I happen to be personally familiar with some of the economic facts in the oil industry, and it is my impression that these loopholes that exist in favor of individuals and corporations in the oil industry are entirely unjustified. If those loopholes are closed and the oil industry were not given added incentives and were not given added benefits of the magnitude they have today, the Government could get additional substantial amounts of revenue without in any way really interfering with the development in that industry.

We recognize that incentives are important in this economy of ours. Incentives are necessary and must be provided. But after all, there is a limit to these incentives, and the permission granted to the oil industry to deduct all of the development costs as current expenses, and especially the fantastically large depletion allowances, have permitted individuals and companies to earn very great amounts without paying taxes thereon.

I think the Secretary of the Treasury in the Department's official statement before this Committee presented some figures on how large those gains were and have been. We feel such loopholes ought to be closed, and this will help to offset the loss from less in excise taxes, which in turn will help the economy and help business.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that your last proposal?

Mr. NATHAN. The elimination of these loopholes in the oil industry we feel will offset the excise tax losses, and the last statement I made was that the cut in excise taxes would really help business.

I feel that making the oil industry adopt its share of the tax burden will permit us to cut these excise taxes, replace that revenue, and the country as a whole will be better off.

I feel the same thing might be said of the State and local bond interest payments. The Federal Government should not permit this loophole to persist. If people pay taxes on the interest which they receive from Federal Government bonds, the law should provide that future flotations of issues by State and local governments should not be tax exempt, and interest thereon should be subject to income taxation.

About the over-all picture of taxes, I want to emphasize again that it is our feeling that the tax instrument is the most potent one which can help us to achieve and maintain full employment and not go through booms and busts as we have in the past. For the past 10 years this country has enjoyed a period of intensive prosperity, largely as a result of the war effort, and the backlog of wartime demands. Already there are many disturbing signs that this prosperity may not continue. We as veterans feel that there is an obligation to veterans and to every citizen in this country for the Government of this country to do everything in its power to be sure that this prosperity which we have enjoyed in war will be enjoyed in peacetime. It is not going to be possible to achieve these objectives if we sit back and sort of hope that we will have continuous prosperity. The history of our economic development is a history of boom and bust, of going up and down. There is no reason at all to feel that in the future, unless we have positive measures and positive steps and constructive programs to avoid depressions, they will not come again. We feel that they will come unless something is done to prevent them.

And in the area of taxation, the Government has an important instrument of doing something to achieve that objective. In periods of inflation the Government must tax so as to avoid the weaknesses, the distortions that develop and bring on depressions.

I have studied the subject myself for a long time, and I am convinced that depressions do not come from some divine source or that they are inevitable. We can do something to avoid them. Depressions come because certain weaknesses and certain distortions develop in the system in boom times, and in those times we should adjust and shift and change our tax program to avoid those weaknesses.

Similarly, when business begins to decline, we have to change our tax program. We have to reduce taxes at lower-income levels so that there is more consumption. We have to give more incentive to business, perhaps in the form of accelerated depreciation, so there will be investment when investment is declining.

I think that need for flexibility in the tax system, flexibility in accordance with where we are—in terms of economic activity—where we are moving, what the trends in business are, is a very, very important principle.

In the last 10 years we have had very little basic change in our tax structure. Of course, the rates have changed. Types of taxes have changed. Ten years ago the total tax take by the Federal Government was a much smaller percentage of the national income than it is today. Today the amount of taxes has a much greater impact on our total economy than 10 years ago. Therefore, the time has come for a thorough reappraisal and overhauling of the tax program, an overhauling of a complete nature, a thorough study of the program in relation to the impact that it has on our economy and economic policy. For that purpose I want to reiterate that the American Veterans' Committee calls for a commission representing the Congress and the interested public organizations, like the Hoover Commission, to be set up to intensively study the role of taxation, not only as a source of revenue but primarily as a vehicle to help achieve economic stability. It should reconsider all of our tax structure, all of our tax rates, to try to introduce a degree of flexibility, to introduce into our tax system the basic principle that tax policies, tax programs, shall be geared to achieving economic stability. We can accomplish that objective and help bring about prosperity if an intelligent tax survey is made and legislated.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very much interested in your discussion of the tax problem and how it affects the economy of the country.

Your last remarks recommended a commission to make a comprehensive study of this problem along the line of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Hoover Commission report has been made. It is before Congress. What is the veterans' position on the report of the Hoover Commission insofar as it relates to veterans?

Mr. NATHAN. I am glad you asked me that. This last week end, Saturday and Sunday, we had a meeting here in Washington of the National Planning Committee of the American Veterans Committee, including 25 members from all over the country. We had representatives from Oregon, and Florida and Texas and Oklahoma, and other parts of the country. And unanimously that committee, which is the executive committee of the organization, supported the Hoover Commission recommendations for changes in the Veterans' Administration. We support fully and wholeheartedly the revisions that the Hoover Commission suggested with respect to the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there not been a great deal of complaint by many veterans over the country against the Hoover report, so far as it affects the veterans.

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, the American Legion has taken that position.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are the views of the veterans on that subject?

Mr. NATHAN. Different groups, of course, Mr. Chairman, do take different positions. The Legion has taken a stand against the Hoover Commission recommendations on the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Legion is pretty strong.

Mr. NATHAN. Quite strong, sir, in numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. If the veterans themselves cannot agree, I am not surprised that the Members of Congress should have difficulty in reaching a conclusion, either satisfactory to themselves or their constituents. I just want to get your viewpoint. I am very much interested in your entire discussion.

Mr. NATHAN. I feel there is almost no proposal or policy which would be recommended on any important subject on which there would not be quite divergent views, mainly because of vested interests. Some members of our organization in discussing this Hoover Commission proposal on the Veterans' Administration this past week end felt that some opposition to that revision was due to the feeling in some groups that they would not have as much power and control in the Veterans' Administration as before. Whether that is the reason they object to it, I do not know, but our own feeling was that the Hoover Commission recommendations were intelligent ones, well thought through, and would give more effective administration and would tend to save money.

I feel if there is enough education and discussion of this subject around the country, and there are many groups that have taken it up, the junior chamber of commerce has done an excellent job of organizing community forums, and if the people understand the implications of it, the Hoover Commission recommendations will be adopted. We could have a type of Hoover Commission report on taxation and it is likely that if they came out with a proposal of a certain nature, the NAM might take exception to this and the CIO might take exception to that; of course, we would not have uniform agreement.

If there is enough discussion and enough education so that people really understand

the issues, we can come to some constructive conclusion. I do not think we will get uniform support for all of the measures.

The CHAIRMAN. It does appear to me that you are taking a broad, patriotic, and unselfish view of this subject, right or wrong. That is the way it impresses me, very definitely.

You suggested that the tax system should be geared in two ways, in both of which I was very much interested; first, geared to fit the economy of the country; and, second, geared to produce adequate revenue.

Mr. NATHAN. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you visualize very great difficulty in reaching a sound conclusion on just how to gear a tax system to the economy of the country? Would there be as many opinions about that as there are business groups and industry organizations?

Mr. NATHAN. Yes, undoubtedly there will be, but may I just offer an illustration? In 1946 we were faced with quite an accumulation of wartime backlog demand. We have had considerable inflation in the postwar period. That inflation, I think, has brought certain difficulties to us. There are certain distortions in the economy that resulted from price relationships. I think that in the period from 1946 to the present period we had a much more rapid rise in investment, new plant and equipment, than we have had in consumption. That cannot take place for very long. I think that if in 1946, 1947, and 1948, we had tried to increase taxes to draw out some of this money that was going into investments, so we would increase our plant and equipment at a slower rate, of course, we would have had a lot of objections because certain individuals never want to pay taxes. After all, I do not think anybody really enjoys paying taxes. Nonetheless, if our program is geared to the fact that we can have continued good business and not have another 1929–1932 come along, and that is clearly understood, and again, it is a matter of educational process, we can bring enough American people around to have an overwhelming majority in favor of these principles. It is not simple.

The CHAIRMAN. What group in the country is there that does not complain about present taxes, or protest against higher taxes? The country is made up of groups.

Mr. NATHAN. As a matter of fact, I do not think there is any group in the country who would not object some way or other if you tried to increase taxes. For instance, I suggest that we ought to do something about these loopholes which I sincerely believe prevail in the oil industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard of any group opposing that?

Mr. NATHAN. The oil industry opposes it, sure, but that is always true. What we must do is try to place the broader interest above certain limited interest, and that is after all the democratic process. Maybe some of us would like to drive down the street 90 miles an hour and just enjoy it, but if we do, we will hurt somebody. So we have to protect the largest numbers by restricting those who would be inclined to go to extremes.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the people today would feel that we ought to close these loopholes in order to put the tax system on a more equitable, more just basis, and a sounder economic basis.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to gearing the tax program to the economic needs of the country, you stated that it also should take into account the fiscal needs of the Government. You referred to a balanced budget, but stated that you do not know whether this is exactly the time or not. I would like you to elaborate on that, whether we should continue the proposed rate of deficit financing, or whether we should have deficit financing, but on a lower scale at this time. Some of us believe that, so far as possible in peacetime, when the country is reasonably prosperous, Congress ought to provide sufficient revenue to pay the bills it incurs. I would like to have you elaborate on that a little at this time.

Mr. NATHAN. First of all, I agree with the general principle you just stated, namely, that in prosperous times we should have adequate taxes to pay the bills and to retire some of the debt. In times of less than full employment or in times when there is substantial unemployment, we cannot help but have a deficit, because the needs of Government spending are greater and sources of revenue are less.

At the present time, even with the four and one-half or five million unemployed that we have, the deficit can and should be reduced, but it can be reduced only if certain kinds of taxes are imposed.

May I illustrate? For instance, if your committee or the Congress insisted on cutting the deficit now by increasing excise taxes another two or three billion, that would be a tragic mistake. Such increases in excise taxes would bear directly on consumption. They would reduce the demand for goods. That would mean more unemployment.

On the other hand, if we today close some of these loopholes that exist, we could get more revenue, reduce the deficit, and it would not adversely affect the economic picture. We ought to move toward a balanced budget by trying to get taxes in those areas which will not affect total economic activity or have the least effect on them.

The CHAIRMAN. There are no proposals to increase excise tax revenues. On the contrary, there is a tremendous demand for some reduction in, and relief from the burden of, the excise taxes.

Mr. NATHAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you think we would be able to offset the loss of revenues that would result from reduction of the excise taxes by closing loopholes?

Mr. NATHAN. I can only rely on the official figures of the Treasury, and there the indications are that by closing four or five loopholes, we could offset them. We probably could increase our total Federal revenue and more than offset the cut in excise taxes by increasing the taxes in other directions.

For instance, in 1948, the total corporate profit picture would have permitted some further taxation on corporate profits without destroying incentive. Our tax program must take into account the fact that not only must we try to stimulate more consumption, more demand on the part of the people, but also more investment on the part of business insofar as the total consumption will support that investment. The corporate profits in 1948 were at such a level that we could get a higher total revenue from corporate profits without curtailing corporate investment below what it would be anyhow. That is another source of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose taxes on corporate profits are increased. It may be that profits are very high in some corporations, even unreasonably high, which has resulted because demand for goods was so far in excess of the supply, and the manufacturer and the merchants could ask about what they pleased and still could sell their goods. The time has come now when they probably cannot do that. Should we increase the corporate tax, I am asking for information now, then is it probable that the corporations would offset that tax as they do now by increasing the price of their goods, so the tax would be paid by the consumer as a concealed tax?

Mr. NATHAN. There is a big argument as to whether or not corporate income taxes really can be passed on to the consumer when you have intensive competition.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion?

Mr. NATHAN. In an intensively competitive industry, I do not believe that it can be passed on to the consumer. If companies do not have profits, they do not pay the tax. If they try to raise their price in order to meet that extra tax, I think the competitive situation will not permit that to take place. That is different from the steel industry.

The CHAIRMAN. I live in a section where the textile mills are a great industry. They have never been more fully employed, running night and day, than they are right now.

Mr. NATHAN. They had a decline last year.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know how the textile industry is in New England.

Mr. NATHAN. New England has had quite a decline and some areas of distress unemployment. But that industry right now is in better shape than a year ago. A year ago there was a decline. There are some industries where I am sure that the industry would try and probably be successful in passing on an increase in its corporate tax to the consumer, as in the steel industry. The steel industry raised its prices in December of 1949, presumably because they had the pension and welfare program, which I think was fully justified, and which was granted last fall. My own guess is that the steel industry in 1950 would have made, even without a price increase, more profits than ever in their history. Their cost of scrap has gone way down. Their cost of raw materials has gone way down. Yet they went ahead and raised the prices in face of record profits. That is not a very competitive industry where they can get away with that kind of an action. As soon as one company raised the prices, the others almost automatically did the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose the rate of taxation is geared to fit the steel companies. Income of other industries must be taxed at the same rate, but, in your opinion, can other industries stand as heavy an increase in the corporate tax as the steel industry? Might that not break the back of some other corporations or businesses?

Mr. NATHAN. It may, but first of all I would suggest that the increase in the rate be a modest one, and in the second place, in those industries where profits are not very high obviously the tax payment would not be high. If you went from 38- to 42-percent tax, obviously the amount of tax paid by a company not very prosperous would not be very much. But the amount of tax paid by a company which was very prosperous would be substantially higher.

I might add that we ought to restudy our whole corporate-tax structure and try to arrive at some kind of a progressive taxation on corporations which would introduce some of the principles of the excess-profits tax and some of the principles of the undistributed-profits tax.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the Government, in your opinion, be justified in adopting a fiscal policy that would increase the amount of our deficit financing? You have stated that ordinarily when times were reasonably prosperous and employment is high, we should not only balance our budget, but pay something on the public debt. We always expect some unemployment. Many people never will work and would not take a job to do a full day's work for a reasonable day's pay if you offered it to them.

Mr. NATHAN. There is always some turnover.

The CHAIRMAN. The unemployment problem is not very serious.

Mr. NATHAN. It is not what I would call satisfactory, but it is still not of major, serious proportions today.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you or do you not believe that we are spending too much money and perhaps should take some steps in lowering Government expenses to balance the budget and lighten the tax burden.

Mr. NATHAN. It depends on what we are spending it for.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is spent right.

Mr. NATHAN. If it is spent right we are not spending too much. We may be spending too little. For instance, I have talked to some people who think that a war is inevitable. At the same time they talk about cutting expenditures. If I were convinced that a war were inevitable, I would want to increase our expenditures 50 percent, maybe 100 percent for defense purposes. It all depends on the concept we have in mind. I do not think expenditures by the Government today are too high compared to the needs. Maybe we are not spending enough on certain defense areas. It depends on what the requirements are. To the extent, however, that there is any waste anywhere, obviously that cannot be justified. We should eliminate waste. We should increase the efficiency of government and eliminate duplication, but the biggest items of expenditures today are for defense, and the items that are related to the war, such as the veterans expenditures, and the ECA appropirations and interest on the national debt, which are fully justified. If our security were really seriously threatened today, perhaps we are spending too little, so the expenditures have to relate to the needs of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. So you do not believe that at this time there is any serious danger to the economy of the country from excessive taxation and unnecessary great expenditure of money?

Mr. NATHAN. By no means. I think that we have had in the last 4 years the greatest prosperity in peacetime we have ever had in America, except for a slight decline in the first half of 1949, with the highest tax rates we ever had in the history of this country, and actually we had higher taxes before the first part of 1948 than we have now. And we had great prosperity. I do not think that the present levels of taxation or expenditures are adversely affecting the economy.

The CHAIRMAN. Has not supply nearly caught up with the backlog in the demand for goods and services that developed during the war? And when production overtakes consumption, would that not affect the profits and employment, too? If we are about caught up, is not that one reason for unemployment?

Mr. NATHAN. We must realize that every dollar the Government spends, like on tanks or airplanes or ships, or every dollar it spends for veteran service or every dollar it spends for ECA appropriations is a demand just the same as you and I go out and buy groceries or buy automobiles or clothes. Government expenditures are demands for the goods of industry and create a market for American industry just the same as private. I agree, generally, it is much better to have the largest segment of the economy in private hands, rather than in public hands. I would like to see us, of course, go back to where we had a $5,000,000,000 budget of spending and $5,000,000,000 of taxes, but I do not think that is feasible under the present circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not go on record as saying you believe that a government can tax and spend itself into prosperity?

Mr. NATHAN. I believe it can spend itself into prosperity temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe a man can spend himself into health by taking a lot of dope, but what about later on?

Mr. NATHAN. That is not the solution. We ought to look for a fundamental solution.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you would not say that extravagance is the solution of our economic difficulties.

Mr. NATHAN. We spent our way into prosperity during the war presumably. In 1939 we had 10,000,000 unemployed, and by 1942 we had practically no unemployment. The reason was because the Government spent so many billions to demand the goods of industry. That is not certainly a desirable solution. The real solution is increased private spending, and a proper tax program can help achieve that objective.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

We thank you.

Mr. NATHAN. Thank you.

The Russian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Kelsonian Tribune, of Kelso, Wash. It is entitled "The Russian Question" and I feel confident that the Members of Congress will wish to read it:

THE RUSSIAN QUESTION

Why does not the Government of the United States take cognizance of a fact which should be self-evident to any schoolboy—that there will never be a permanent peace in the world until Stalin and his gang of Communist cutthroats are removed from power?

Why do we not build our foreign policy around the only guaranty which can insure world peace and prosperity—human liberty and equality throughout the world?

Why do we turn our backs on the lessons of our own Revolution, and dicker with dictators while their subjects writhe in slavery?

The average man will say, "Ah, but the policy you suggest will surely lead to war?"

Short-sighted viewpoint. The Communist world and the free world are drifting inevitably toward war as matters stand, and for the same reason that the North and the South clashed in the Civil War. The problem is the extension of the slave system, or the police-State system, into political and economic fields which both sides view as vital to their self-preservation.

The only hope of avoiding such a war lies in the overturn of Stalin's gang. The Communists see this clearly. They, too, want to avoid war. They want to avoid it by overthrowing all capitalist governments, and replacing them with regimes friendly to Moscow—that is, subservient to Moscow. This has been the announced objective of international communism for the past 30 years.

So there should be no reason to shrink from the reaction which would take place if we were to announce that our objective is to throw Stalin and his gang out of office, and replace them with a regime based on the voice of the people.

We found we couldn't do business with Hitler. We fought him, at great cost of life and substance. We are now trying to educate the German people in the ways of democracy.

Is there any reason to believe the Russians would be harder to educate in the ways of democracy than the Germans? No. There have been the seeds of democratic movements in the Ukraine, the Don Basin, the Caucasus, and all the satellite nations, for many years. Czechoslovakia was a true enlightened democracy until March 1939. She could be made one again tomorrow, if this country would announce its intention of ridding the world of Russian communism. If this country would initiate a movement of counter-revolution throughout the Russian dominated areas. If this country would immediately begin to give all aid, short of war, to anti-Communist movements anywhere. If this country would reactivate the OSS, and begin the all-out penetration of the satellite countries with agents, arms, political agitation and propaganda, all with one aim—to create islands of freedom within the Red empire, and eventually to link these islands together and strangle the Red power.

If anyone protests that this is impossible, our reply is simply this: Choose this path, or face the certainty of atomic war within the bitterly near future.

There is only one addendum to our woeful prophecy. This Nation is getting scant and unrealistic service from its State Department. To carry on the global struggle for self-preservation in which we are now engaged, we need more than diplomats in the State Department. We need tough-minded strategists, whip-cracking planners and do-it-now political manipulators.

In 1947, your editor submitted to the State Department a manuscript arguing in favor of the policy outlined here. The only comment of the female "expert" in the State Department who reviewed our manuscript was that it was "naive."

To one who was an intelligence officer in a fine infantry division during 3 years of combat, and who had written enemy estimates before the Anzio break-out, the annihilation of the Colmar pocket and the crossing of the Rhine, this gratuitous slap in the face from an armchair strategist was nettling, to say the least.

So we intend to keep hammering at this theme, whether anyone wants to listen or not. We are confident that history will write the final chapters with very few changes in the earlier text.

Voice of Alameda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the board of regents of the University of California recently ordered the members of the faculty to take a loyalty oath. Refusal to take the prescribed oath meant dismissal.

The faculty, through representatives, has announced resistance to this order. Nationally and internationally known educators at that great institution have led the fight against this move.

It is reported that among the regents who voted against the mandatory loyalty oath were Gov. Earl Warren and Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul.

The faculty group has not receded from its position as the deadline approaches.

The Alameda Times Star has published a timely and pertinent editorial on the subject. It points up the futility of trying to instill by law the love for our democracy that can only be sincere when it springs from within the individual.

The excellent editorial follows:

VOICE OF ALAMEDA

We are more than a little bemused to see that the board of regents voted for institution of loyalty oaths at the University of California, setting the penalty at dismissal for those who do not take them.

On many different occasions during the past year we have remarked that those people who vote for a loyalty oath to keep out Communists or other subversives do it either because they know no better, or because they have a cynical disregard for the public, thinking that by so voting they will keep themselves in public favor through this peculiar anticipation of the public's natural desires to keep subversives out of teaching posts.

Those regents who voted for the loyalty oath have shown themselves remarkably unwise in our opinion.

They evidently have not yet been able to realize that:

1. Communists are duty bound to lie when by so doing they will advance their cause.

2. Through swearing a loyalty oath, Communists will be able to take on a protective coloration which will deceive those poor dopes, who would otherwise throw them out, into thinking them to be honest Americans.

The Antismoke Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1950, which I consider most appropriate on the problem of air pollution:

THE ANTISMOKE JOB

Last November a special committee composed of two physicians, two chemists, and two engineers found evidence of serious air pollution in some parts of Staten Island. Residents of Rossville, across the water from industrial towns in New Jersey, complained of ill effects from smoke. A resolution called on the United States Public Health Service to make a comprehensive survey of air pollution on the island. Now we have the answer to that resolution. The proposed study has been deferred because "needed technicians for such a study are not available for the required 3- to 6-month period."

This, it seems to us, is a highly unsatisfactory conclusion. Medical men on Staten Island found 29 residents of the north and south shores complaining of stomach disorders, nose irritation, and inability to sleep. A Richmond County Medical Society committee confirmed that there was strong evidence of air pollution on the island. Yet a "scarcity of technicians" is permitted to prevent the thorough study that seems warranted in this interstate matter.

We are dissatisfied with the whole progress of air-pollution control in New York City. What the people need are periodic reports of the amount of sootfall in various locations, along with other objective measurements, so that they can tell for themselves whether the city is making any progress on pollution abatement. If any such measurements are being taken by the bureau of smoke control, they certainly do not see the light of day. Some years ago such measurements were taken for a time, and it would be useful if we had comparisons of sootfall in the same locations now.

Until we have scientific measurements throughout the city and such data are put in the hands of the public, we shall be forced to view with reserve all claims of progress.

Resolution of the FBI National Academy Associates of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the FBI National Academy Associates of Georgia met in convention in Thomasville, Ga., on January 18, 1950.

The membership of that organization are men who have a deep appreciation of the fine work which Director J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have done over the years in protecting the citizens of America from criminals and from those who have engaged in subversive activities.

The members of the above-mentioned organization share the natural resentment which the American people generally have felt and expressed regarding recent efforts of certain left-wing elements to discredit Mr. Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They, therefore, adopted in this convention a resolution expressing their respect for Mr. Hoover and commending him for the great contribution he has made to law enforcement and the protection of our country and Government.

This resolution also congratulates Attorney General McGrath and expresses the sentiments of the organization regarding several other matters.

I am glad to bring this resolution to the attention of Congress and under leave previously granted, I insert it herewith:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY ASSOCIATES OF GEORGIA ON JANUARY 18, 1950

Whereas our Nation's foremost law enforcement agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has recently been unwarrantedly criticized; and

Whereas the FBI is the guardian of our national freedom, and our individual rights as citizens and as law enforcement officers; and

Whereas having the highest respect for Director J. Edgar Hoover, and being appreciative for his contribution to law enforcement and the public during his nearly 26 years of service; and

Whereas attacks on the FBI are attacks on our Nation's security and serve the purpose of undermining faith in democracy and the destruction of confidence in democratic institutions, and disregard for law and order: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. Condemn vigorously the attacks which have been levelled at the FBI and Director Hoover.

2. Congratulate the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, for his clear thinking and forthrightness when he recently announced that he sees no reason to change the wiretapping policies with respect to the FBI.

3. Call upon the President of the United States to publicly endorse the policy of his predecessor as President who initiated the wiretap policies of the United States.

4. Commend heartily Director J. Edgar Hoover for his patriotism, protection of our liberties, and wise use of wiretaps.

5. Request Congress to authorize by law the FBI's right to use wiretaps in espionage and subversive activity cases where the national security is at stake, and in other types of criminal investigative matters where a human life is in jeopardy as has been the national policy set by the administration for so many years.

6. Expresses its indignation and most vigorous condemnation of the exhibitionism recently displayed in our courts and calls for an end to clowning in court and restoration of dignity to the courts.

7. In calling upon Congress to put an end to the Russian propaganda being spread by Communist and other disloyal persons; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary to—

1. The President of the United States.
2. The Attorney General of the United States.
3. Director J. Edgar Hoover, FBI.
4. Speaker of the House of Representatives.
5. President of the Senate.
6. Each United States Senator and Representative from the State of Georgia.

LT. JAMES H. WINN,
Secretary, FBI National Academy Associates of Georgia.

The Communists Don't Scare Easy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of March 16, 1950:

THEY DON'T SCARE EASY

Secretary of State Acheson has taken to the political stump to whip up interest in that new catchword of our foreign policy—"total diplomacy."

By that, as he has explained it, he means we should all get in the fight against expanding world communism and not leave it to the State Department alone—which is a more sensible thought than Mr. Acheson may suspect.

For instance, yesterday in his San Francisco speech the Secretary dramatically drew a chalk line between China and the rest of Asia, and warned international communism not to step over it. You know what'll happen if the Communists cross over? Well, America will give "limited" assistance to the resisting nations.

We very much doubt that this will stop communism in its tracks. In fact, there'll be no need for the Commies to cross the line—they've already gone around it. The Red threat that perils French Indochina today, for example, is not so much from a southward invasion as from the Moscow-assisted native Communist forces already inside the border.

The Chinese could tell Mr. Acheson all about that. But surprisingly we find Mr. Acheson telling them just how they got in their present mess:

"As old friends, we say to the Chinese people that we fully understand that their present unhappy status within the orbit of the Soviet Union is not the result of any choice on their part, but has been forced upon them."

This is a curious and belated departure from the old doctrine of the State Department left-wingers that communism in China

evolved from discontented agrarian reformers who represented the real Chinese people.

Mr. Acheson lamented that United States help "on a massive scale" after the war did not bring peace and recovery to China, whose conquest by the Communists he blamed on the failure of the Nationalists.

He did not mention that American support was withdrawn from the Nationalist Government because it failed to satisfy the Communists' demands for a coalition at a time when the Reds were all but defeated.

To Return St. Patrick to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I was much interested to note on a card sent me by a constituent commemorating the day of the patron saint of Ireland that St. Patrick's See at Armagh, his grave at Downpatrick, as well as the scenes of his boyhood at Slemish are cut off from the body of Ireland, being situated in Northern Ireland, which is still attached to Great Britain. Last month I introduced a resolution on the unification of Ireland which presents an effective plan for attaining this objective. The resolution provides for a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland to be taken under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the Charter. It is stated to be the purpose of such a plebiscite to create conditions which will make possible the entry of Ireland into the United Nations. Article 11 and article 35 relate to the powers of the General Assembly thus dispensing with Soviet obstruction or the veto and provide specifically for bringing to the attention of the General Assembly the dispute to which a state is a party whether or not such state is a member of the United Nations. In view of the dispute between Eire and Great Britain on the subject of Northern Ireland, a dispute which affects the maintenance of international peace and security in that area, it would appear to be a matter for the General Assembly. The General Assembly could then proceed in all Ireland as it did in the cases of Greece and Indonesia to appoint a commission which would supervise an election and establish the conditions for it. Then it would be clear for membership by all Ireland in the United Nations, a question of the greatest importance in view of Ireland's position in the North Atlantic area. It is to be noted that this is a very practical solution as United Nations commissions of this character have been very successful in just such situations in using their good offices to bring about a conclusion to a long-standing dispute dangerous to world peace and security.

This resolution follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that the people of all Ireland, including the people of Eire and the people of Northern Ireland, should have a free opportunity to express their will for union and that this be attained by a plebiscite of the people of all Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the Charter, which shall establish the terms and conditions of such plebiscite with the objective of the entry of Ireland as a member of the United Nations.

Imports of Foreign Nuts Imperil Western Nut and Cherry Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, large quantities of walnuts recently have been imported into California from Manchuria and are selling at more than 30 percent under the prices of domestic nuts. If these imports of nuts continue, our nut orchards of the Pacific coast, an agricultural business in which thousands of families are engaged, face ruin.

Nut raising is not like most other farm and business enterprises. It requires seven or more years to bring nut orchards into a bearing stage. Yet this business of nut raising, after years of work and investment to get it into a productive and profitable stage, can be ruined almost overnight if foreign competition from low-wage, low-living standard countries is allowed to flood the American market with foreign nuts.

If this should happen many hundreds of orchardists with years of labor and money invested in their orchards will find it necessary to cut down their trees and go into some other type of agriculture. We should act to prevent this calamity befalling them.

I have before Congress a bill, H. R. 6780, which would restore the peril-point principle to the making of reciprocal trade treaties. Under the peril-point principle, the Tariff Commission, when a reduction in the tariff on any commodity is being considered, will make a study of the effects of a tariff reduction on the industry involved and will make a report, based on factual material, showing the level to which a tariff could be reduced, in the commission's opinion, without destructive effects on the industry.

If the peril-point principle is restored, as is proposed in my bill, H. R. 6780, it is less likely that any trade agreements will be made which would cause irreparable harm to such industries as walnut, filbert, and cherry raising.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I append to this statement a letter I have received from John E. Trunk, general manager of the Northwest Nut Growers, an organization composed of hundreds of Oregon-Washington nut raisers. Mr. Trunk's letter follows:

A short time ago when I was in San Francisco calling on the buyers I found in the hands of one of our customers a quantity of Manchurian shelled walnuts. This gentleman gave me considerable information. He said 2,000 cases of 55 pounds each had arrived from Manchuria and had been stored in bond, and therefore were not reflected in the usual import figures. He had purchased a quantity at 42 cents and said additional could be had at 40 cents. This price schedule is duty paid, delivered San Francisco, and is more than 20 cents per pound under the prices for comparative grades on the domestic market.

A situation of this kind just seems intolerable to me. Here we are having our Government spend a huge sum of money on behalf of our domestic walnut industry so that millions of pounds of shelled walnuts can be diverted to the oil mills with practically no revenue to be derived from that source.

It is my understanding that all of China, and particularly Manchuria, are under Communist control or domination. It certainly can't be said that we should be thinking of reciprocal or free trade with countries of that type.

I would like very much to see this looked into. Our own man in Chicago, Mr. A. R. Mars, writes to say that the Walter Johnson Candy Co., of Chicago, and who have a branch in Los Angeles, are the world's largest makers of fudge candy. They use pecans and walnuts, and when we tried to interest them in our shelled walnuts they said they would like to use them, but they were buying Manchurian in the 40-cent bracket.

There is no necessity of my telling you what this is doing to an already overburdened and quite sick shelled-walnut market.

Anything you can do to probe into this situation will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

NORTHWEST NUT GROWERS,
JOHN E. TRUNK,
General Manager.

Perennial Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 8, 1950:

PERENNIAL QUESTION

A hardy perennial among questions asked by Americans of themselves and others concerns the reason why so many otherwise courteous, considerate persons become ill-tempered boors when behind the wheel of a car. The fact is obvious, but the reasons are far and difficult to seek. Some observers say it proves the average human being is not well fitted for the control and exercise of power. Others suggest drivers work off on the general public their peeves of various sorts, feeling fairly secure because of a large measure of ability to get away fast, and so on and on.

One main reason for discourtesy, or lack of courtesy, as the case may be, is found, we believe, in lack of education in safety and

lack of training in the use of an automobile. The community has an obligation to keep a program of education going all the time in this regard, but it is far easier to teach the young. This phase of traffic is just another reason why we think every graduate of a high school should have a diploma in automobile driving, in comprehension of the traffic laws, and in understanding of his obligation and responsibility to the general public while he is in the role of driver.

Income Tax—Gettysburg, 1949 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing a commentary on the preparation of income tax from an unknown author:

GETTYSBURG, 1949 VERSION

One score and sixteen years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are fair game.

Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculation, testing whether that taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure. We are met on form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who here spend their lives that they may spend our money.

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here, have gone far beyond our poor power to add and subtract. Our creditors will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here.

It is for us, the taxpayer, rather, to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that taxation of the people, by the Congress, for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish.

Payment of Salary to Valentin Gubitchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have discovered, to their great sorrow, that Valentin Gubitchev is on the pay roll of the United Nations at $6,000 a year, and that 40 percent of this salary is now being paid and has been paid ever since his arrest for spying on the United States, by the United States through its contributions to the UN. Is it not about time that he was taken off that pay roll? And is it not about time that the representatives of the State Department should show enough interest in the United States to stop this activity?

Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, since my speech in this House on February 21 in which I called attention to the un-American and immoral packing of the Federal Reserve Board I have been deluged with letters, telephone calls, personal visits, and telegrams from bankers, businessmen, lawyers, and other citizens from all parts of the United States, suggesting that I further explore the subject. I have received many letters on the subject; a truly amazing number in view of the very limited publicity given to my remarks. They reveal a state of mind—a fear of the powers and autocratic conduct of the Federal Reserve Board—on the part of bankers, bank customers, and business people generally that is quite different from any situation I have ever before noted in this Republic; and I think I am well advised to go into the matter more thoroughly and carefully.

I was very much surprised that no communication was sent to me by Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board, but I did note a rather impassioned one by the former chairman, Mr. Marriner Eccles. This indicated a weird situation of the Board wherein a former Chairman was mysteriously bounced from his job by President Truman, in a situation which has never been explained. Was it that the White House was aware of this packing procedure while Mr. Eccles was Governor, and in its soft-peddling way removed him from his position of one-man rule, surrounded by his stooges, and now still another stooge is yet in the person of the Chairman of the Board? I assume the communication is intended as a defense of his successful campaign to set up the Board as an obedient and submissive group who would do bidding without question or public remark. But, as a matter of fact, Mr. Eccles' letter openly confirms the most important criticism I have made; to wit, that the letter and spirit of the law has been violated in the selection of the Governors by failure to regard that provision intended to insure equitable geographical representation on the Board. Mr. Eccles does not deny that Governor Evans, a native-born, lifelong citizen of Iowa, a man who even to this day considers himself and refers to himself as an Iowan because of his large farming and business interests in that State, was, nevertheless, appointed from the grand Old Dominion State of Virginia, although he was only a temporary resident of that State because of his importation here to the Agricultural Department by Henry Agard Wallace, as Wallace's personal aid and protégé, as a corn-hog plower-under.

Mr. Eccles does not deny that the late Governor Clayton, a native-born, lifelong citizen of Utah, Eccles' personal protégé and clerk for more than 20 years, always, like Eccles and several members of his staff, a loyal Utah citizen, was appointed from, of all places, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Boston. What an unkind and underhanded blow to the ghosts of the sturdy New Englanders whose high principles of honesty and fair play have played such an important part in building the moral fiber of this Nation. In my previous talk on this subject I explained why the late Mr. Clayton was said to have moved to Boston shortly before his appointment to the Board.

Mr. Eccles did not deny that Governor Szymczak was reappointed at his, Mr. Eccles' insistence, in 1948 for a full term of 14 years, in spite of the fact that he had been serving continuously and without interruption as a member of the Board for more than 14 years; and that by his reappointment he would (and there seems no reason for his throwing up the "cushy" job)—if he serves out his term—he will have been a member of the Board continuously and without interruption for more than 29 years. This, in the face of positive provision written into the law by this Congress that no member of the Board would be eligible for reappointment if he had served a continuous term of 14 years. I am not interested in the devious evasions indulged in by Mr. Eccles, his staff of lawyers, and others, in accomplishing this continuance in office of one of Mr. Eccles' most loyal henchmen. What I am interested in is calling attention of this Congress to the brazen disregard of the letter and spirit of its laws, by these bureaucrats who, apparently and by their high-handed, star-chamber methods, regard themselves as untouchable and above the law and this Congress.

Mr. Eccles does not deny that in his own personal case as a member of the Board, the spirit of the law has been violated so that he, by having himself juggled and shifted from one term to another, will be permitted to serve a far greater number of years than the 14-year maximum which this Congress thought it was fixing when the Federal Reserve Act of 1935 was enacted. If Mr. Eccles serves out his present term he will have served as a member of the Board continuously and without interruption more than 24 years.

Stripped of all nonessential talk and consideration, the cold fact is that the great northeastern, southeastern, Southern, and southwestern sections of the United States are represented on the seven-man Federal Reserve Board by only one single bona fide resident of any of those vast areas, and that man is Thomas Bayard McCabe, a New Deal, Fair Deal, Republico Democrato, hailing

from Chester, Pa. Mr. McCabe is a pleasant, well-meaning and agreeable sales gentleman, with a limited knowledge and experience in Federal Reserve matters. The administrative ability as a public official of this delightful and successful sales manager of a toilet paper concern was thoroughly and painfully brought to light during the 4 months of hearings by the Senate committee which was considering his appointment 2 years ago. His ability as a private business executive is best illustrated by the fact that his paper company has progressed more in the few short years he has been away from it than it did during the entire period of his long career as its active president.

There is nominally one other representative of the Eastern States on the Board, a retired businessman named Draper, whose 10-year term on the Board expired on February 1 of this year, and he is serving in the embarrassing capacity of a "hang-over" awaiting the appointment of his successor. Governor Draper's service has been marked by routine and unquestioning obedience to Mr. Eccles, and I doubt that the minutes of the Board will reveal more than two instances during the entire 10 years that he voted contrary to Mr. Eccles' wishes.

At present there are only five members of this seven-man Board serving proper terms, Messrs. McCabe, Eccles, Szymczak, Evans, and Vardaman—with Mr. Draper occupying a sixth place because of failure of the President to name his successor. Governor Evans is absent from the Board most of the time, and has been for the past year or more, so four active members are conducting the Board's business in Washington, with Mr. Draper standing by "on sufferance," as it were. This is not a healthy situation, especially in view of the casual attitude of Mr. McCabe as an administrator and leader. It is a situation much to the liking, I presume, of Mr. Eccles and his hand-picked staff, because it gives them continued and practically undisputed sway in Board matters.

And my prediction is that unless this Congress puts some pressure in the proper place the two vacancies on the Board will not be filled, but the situation will be allowed to drag on indefinitely.

I note in the Eccles' letter no hint of the customary declaration that he was speaking as an individual and not for the Board. Of course, I thought—and so did the public, I believe—that Mr. Eccles had been repudiated and removed as head of the Board when Mr. McCabe was appointed Chairman in 1948. But after looking into the matter and asking many questions of people who should know, I don't seem to find any evidence that Mr. McCabe has done much else than to physically occupy the Chairman's office in the Federal Reserve Building, and causing Mr. Eccles the slight inconvenience of moving a few doors down the hall on the same floor.

As to Governor Vardaman, he is one of the closest personal friends of President Truman in Washington official life and there is less said about it than of any other man. I found out from long-time employees of the Federal Reserve Board, who are very uncomfortable about the one-man rule there, that Mr. Vardaman is regarded as the great dissenter in many of the Board's policies and I assume that his dissents reflect a very uncomfortable feeling of the man in the White House who sees a bureaucrat remaining as the real Chairman of the Board even after he has been displaced.

Certainly there has been no change in policy, or in basic thinking, or in arbitrary and bureaucratic conduct by the majority of the Board and Staff. It is true that the statements of the Board and its communications with the various committees of the Congress have become more verbose and longer and almost wholly innocuous and "straddling" in their content. But the old staff is still on the job, efficient, intact, and impregnable. Mr. McCabe has been allowed to bring in one economist, an excellent man, so I am told, by the name of Riefler, to try and teach McCabe the ABC's of national economics, fiscal finance, and otherwise guide him. This man has done a good job, it is said, but is apparently getting discouraged over his pupil, and it is rumored that he is considering becoming a member of the President's Economic Council—that new-thoughtist body headed by Mr. Leon Keyserling.

I am further informed that Mr. McCabe also brought along with him an able young assistant who up until a few months ago acted as his personal secretary. But late last year he too became discouraged, it is said, over the impregnability of the Eccles selected staff, and resigned his position with the Board and went back home to Chester, Pa., and the paper company.

As things now stand, Mr. McCabe is the nominal head of the Board, but he has not made one single major change in personnel or policy during his 2 years of administration. Since he has, presumably, the backing of the Administration, he could make almost any change he desired; so, I am bound to conclude, in view of his acquiescence and failure to act, that he, like some of his colleagues, is satisfied to be and function in all things as an Eccles satellite, or at least, as a messenger boy for Eccles' hand-picked board, and for Eccles' more thoroughly hand-picked staff.

It should be borne in mind that this Board is, theoretically, a direct agent of this Congress. It operates without any supervision whatsoever as to policies, personnel, or expenditures, except those broad provisions of congressional enactments directly applicable to the Board. It is not subject to the Bureau of the Budget. It is not subject to the Comptroller General. It derives its money from assessments on Federal Reserve banks made by the Board itself, and without recourse on the part of the banks. It spends its moneys thus derived without supervision or limitation or examination from any other Federal agency. It can employ as many people as it desires, and whoever it desires, without reference to any other person or Federal agency. And it can spend as much money as it wants for whatever legal purpose it wants, with little or no restriction, and with no accountability except to the Congress itself.

The only report of its activities and expenditures required by the Congress is the Board's long and laborious and boring annual report. This report covers the high lights of policy, activities, and expenditures, but is limited as to detail, and is in no sense a detailed financial report. There is also a policy record kept and filed with the Congress, I believe, but that relates solely to the official voting record of the Board members, and has nothing to do with other activities or expenditures.

I am not prepared to say at this moment that I am opposed to so much authority being given the Board; nor am I prepared to say that the Board has unduly abused its powers or made expenditures which were not justified. But one point I do want to make, and it is the one which is uppermost in my mind at the moment: And that is, that a Board such as this, with so much power for good or evil, for economy or extravagance, should be well above suspicion as to quality, qualifications, manner of selection, and legal qualifications of its membership. The selection of men to serve on such a Board should carefully follow the intent as well as the letter of the law. There should be no shifty skullduggery, or questionable procedure such as fake residency claims, technical avoidance of the law's letter as to length of service, or other technicalities. Above all, men of independent judgment, men of banking or business experience in their own right, and men above question as to their impersonal and objective approach to those questions properly coming before the Board should be selected. Any appearance of packing or of one-man control or domination; or overbalancing in favor of one political party or one school of thought—all of these weaknesses should be avoided.

And I submit that they have not only not been avoided in the case of the present Board; but I charge that many of the faults mentioned are present in the incumbent Board. And I think this Congress should look into the situation carefully and see just what this hand-picked Board and staff are doing with the tremendous and potentially dangerous authority it possesses, and just what is being done with the vast sums of money which the Board has at its command. And, too, I think the Congress should inquire into the question of Board membership to see if fraud was perpetrated in the appointment of Governors Evans and Clayton and in the reappointment of Governors Eccles and Szymczak. And the Congress might also inquire to see whether or not it is the intention of the administration to let the two present vacancies stand and allow the continuance of the present out-of-balance Eccles-dominated Board; or will the administration carry out the intent of the law and appoint two qualified men to fill these vacancies who shall give the Board

something in the nature of the legally intended balance geographically, economically, politically, and otherwise?

Repeal the District of Columbia Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, August 4, 1949, I introduced H. R. 5879 to repeal the District of Columbia Sales Tax of 1949. Revenues far in excess of anticipations have already been collected by this sales tax. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are now preparing to ask for legislation to abolish personal property taxation in the District and to lower the real estate tax. The real purpose of the District sales tax is thus being disclosed. Its purpose was not so much to meet the financial obligations of the District and relieve the Federal budget from making up the District's deficit as it was to take local taxpayers out from under their existing tax obligations and put the tax burden inordinately upon the consumers purchasing the necessities of life. The Committee on the District of Columbia has not yet given consideration to H. R. 5879, the sales-tax-repeal bill which I introduced last August. They should do so before acceding to the request of the District Commissioners for legislation to eliminate the personal property tax in the District and to lower the real-estate tax.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, March 17, the day of St. Patrick's death, more than 1,500 years ago, is commemorated through Ireland and wherever the sons and daughters of Ireland have immigrated, as a tribute to the holy bishop who brought to the Emerald Isle the knowledge of Christ's teachings. Loving God and one's fellow man was the lesson of the Gospels and this was the lesson that St. Patrick brought to Ireland. It was the Christianity of Apostolic times vitalized by the blood of the early martyrs and ardent with the zeal of the catacombs. Through all the vicissitudes of conquest, rebellion, and liberation the people of Ireland have kept the faith as St. Patrick taught them and are a living example that the minds and wills of men can be proof against any force however mighty.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Otto E. Koegel, of the New York bar, as the fifty-sixth Founders Day address, at the American University in Washington, D. C., on February 23, 1950. Each year the Founders Day address is dedicated to a distinguished American. This year the address was dedicated to Mr. Daniel C. Roper, for 50 years a public servant. I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2¾ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY—DOES IT COMBINE IDEALISM AND INDIVIDUALISM OR MATERIALISM AND COLLECTIVISM?

(By Otto E. Koegel, of the New York bar, member of the board of trustees)

FOUNDERS DAY ADDRESS

The American University was chartered by Congress in 1893. Its founders were a group of Christian statesmen who believed that the growing cultural and world importance of Washington made necessary the creation of an institution of higher education which would be distinctly American in its traditions and program. The vision of Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, of the Methodist Church, commanded the support and interest of Americans in all the States.

On founders day in 1943 a group of industrial leaders joined together to place in Hurst Hall a carillon in memory of Daniel C. Roper. The committee on the memorial was headed by the late Hon. W. A. Julian, then Treasurer of the United States, with Gov. Ernest Draper, of the Federal Reserve System, as its secretary. The inscription on the carillon plaque reads: "Daniel Calhoun Roper, 1867–1943, for 50 years a public servant."

"For the true liberal there is but one country—the world; but one religion—love to God and man; one politician—he who benefits and elevates the human family."

A condition in the gift of the carillon provided that each year on founders day a distinguished American should deliver an address devoted to the theme of the meaning of the word "American." The Daniel C. Roper address was delivered on the fifty-sixth founders day by Otto E. Koegel, Esq., of the New York bar, a member of the board of trustees of the American University.

PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
President.

You may recall that during the war King George VI, speaking to a world audience, expressing words of faith and courage, spoke these lines of M. Louise Haskins, "I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year: 'Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown.' And he replied: 'Go out into the darkness and put your hand into the Hand of God. That shall be to you better than light and safer than a known way.' " Deep spiritual significance is implicit in this metaphor.

Does it represent the idealism of most Americans? I think it does. But to some very influential ones and to some opinion makers it should not. Why do I say that? For the reason that a materialistic view of existence and ethics is held by a numerically small but influentially large number of social scientists, jurists, and others in and out of Government. Such view under the name of pragmatism is infiltrating into our philosophy of law and Government. For good or ill it is time that we should all examine it and see how it affects our historical conception of fundamental human values.

To get straight to the point, the basis of Christian ethics—to use that term in a broad and nonsectarian sense—is under attack from vantage points of influence. Those leading the attack have emphasized the preeminent position that jurists and lawyers are in to make that attack take on substance. Changes in our underlying legal concepts, such as that which Jefferson expressed in the Declaration of Independence, that men are endowed with certain inalienable rights by their Creator, can have far-reaching effects If the superstructure of the American way is adjusted to a certain underlying foundation, a shift of the foundation may topple the edifice.

There are amongst us those who feel that that would be a desirable result.

First, let me read to you a declaration of beliefs by a number of American intellectuals including John Dewey: "The time has passed for theism or deism—the universe is self-existing and not created—modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values." You may be astonished to learn that this is the pragmatism of Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The dictionary definition of pragmatism is the doctrine that practical results are the sole test of truth. The idealist agrees that honesty is the best policy, but he rejects the thought that it is solely a matter of policy. The idealist believes that virtue is its own reward without relation to objective experience.

Now let me read the opening words of the declaration of human rights adopted by the United Nations: "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

These words are in direct conflict with the declaration I first read to you. No real pragmatist would subscribe to them.

And the pragmatist haughtily rejects the words in the Declaration of Independence so familiar to us all. They are: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." And in the preamble of the Declaration of Independence refers to the laws of nature and of nature's God, which words they scorn even more.

Thus the main issue is joined between pragmatism—which is but a new look for materialism—and idealism, which is belief in a Divine Creator.

Most Americans accept idealism as their creed. Likewise they reject collectivism, believing it to be undesirable for them. Perhaps there is a connection between pragmatism and collectivism on the one hand and between idealism and individualism on the other. It seems we have two sets of twin ideas, not always identical and sometimes strange acting ones. But there is a discernible basic pattern of affinity between the ideas in each set. The outstanding collectivists denounce idealism as an arch enemy of the people.

To the pragmatist natural law—in the sense that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights as Jefferson wrote—is humbug, a favorite word of Mr. Justice Holmes.

Having deprived men of all natural rights and relieved them of all natural obligations to one another it becomes philosophically easy to justify might makes right which the pragmatists do—and that is but a step to tyranny. Generally, that describes one of the sets of twins.

Now for the second set. To the idealist those sacred words in the Declaration of Independence and those which refer to nature and nature's God, express true law just as Cicero expressed it 25 centuries ago. "True law is right reason comformable to nature, universal, unchangeable. * * * It is not one thing in Rome and another thing in Athens, one thing today and another tomorrow; but in all times and nations this universal law must forever reign, eternal and imperishable. * * * God Himself is its author, its promulgator, its enforcer."

Americans accept this view. They believe that no earthly law-making body, past, present, or future, can alter the requirement that men shall show good will toward one another. Told that they don't know what that means does not alter their viewpoint. Apprehension of it may change according to time and circumstance, and it is not perfect except in the ideal. But where the individual is thus idealized he assumes a responsible self-esteem. He develops selfreliance or individualism. It was Oliver Wendell Holmes, Sr., father of the great Justice, who said the author of the song America, "Created something imperishable by using the word 'My' in 'My country, 'tis of thee,' instead of the word 'Our.'" It thus clearly appears as a country of persons, each with an individual sense of proprietorship and responsibility; not one in which the individual is but a corpuscle of the State.

I think the prime political objective of all men of good will is to abolish poverty. As to how best to do that, well-meaning men disagree. However, most Americans believe that our way to do it is ever to strive to create a better society of opportunity and incentive for the individual—a society in which the individual will experience the maximum of self-reliance; where each individual having physical or economic handicaps will be assisted to overcome them in order that he may become self-reliant. This is a big order and of course cannot be done all at once but it is the American ideal. That ideal is under attack. It is against that attack that I am addressing myself.

The author of the Epic of America has said that the American mind bears within itself at the same time a strong idealism and a strong realism. President Wilson gave full expression to American idealism in his message to Congress in 1917 asking for a declaration of war. Many will remember the moral curses we placed on our opponents in two world wars for their might makes right philosophy. I have suggested to you that Mr. Justice Holmes held the same view. Norman Thomas says there is such a thing as chain reaction in men's thinking. Well, Holmes, the great jurist—actually a conservative in politics—has left a legendary reputation among lawyers as liberal and idealist. He was neither. He was utilitarian.

Let us examine in a little more detail the case for individualism as against its opposite number collectivism (a political inquiry) and save idealism versus materialism (a metaphysical one) for our last and most important remarks.

Our political thought is enveloped in a welter of confusion of terms. We are apt to be led into that hazy medium of words wherein we all drown. Conservative, used now by some in an opprobrious sense; progressive and liberal which have many connotations; New Deal, Fair Deal, right of center, left of center; left and right wing; and so on. It would be a blessing if we were always alerted to these propositions: That accumulation and concentration of power always lead to a demand for more power; that every supernumerary in Government or on a Government pay roll means less production; that a pyramiding public debt if not checked leads to national bankruptcy or socialism; that 160 years of clinical evidence supports our incentive society as the most productive; that as Wendell Willkie put it, only the productive can be strong and only the strong can be free; that we cannot proceed indefinitely in a direction away from private ownership and responsibility without destroying our incentive society; that once in a great while it is desirable that we should take our political bearings. It has been said that "the definitizing of error often is the beginning of its disappearance," or as Bacon saw it, "truth to emerge sooner from error than confusion."

Both major political parties and most Americans profess to be opposed to the general ownership and control in the State of the means of production and distribution of goods. That is what we call socialism. That term, like individualism, to Dr. Dewey is a majestic abstraction. I submit there is considerable room for a difference on that point. I should like to quote extensively from the late Dr. Borden Parker Bowne, one of our great philosophers, and a profound thinker in metaphysics and ethics. In his work the Principles of Ethics, he states the matter so clearly from my point of view that I feel justified in quoting extensively from him. He says: "The idealogist (not idealist) is a real menace unless he has practical wisdom or is held in check by others who have it. In particular, man is complex, and not always adapted to the schemes provided for him.

"(Socialistic schemes) have been favorites with speculative minds since the time of Plato; and in general they have had a lofty moral aim. * * * Socialism may have an aim essentially Christian. * * * The general difficulty with it is that it pursues a laudable end by unwise or destructive methods."

George Bernard Shaw has written that "modern socialism does not, like communism, advocate revolution as the only means for success. Neither does it reject it as a last resort. The difference is one of tactics and not of objective." A former New York City official in Philadelphia, on April 15, 1932, told the Academy of Arts and Sciences: "Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully if possible, and we would do it otherwise if necessary."

And returning to Bowne: "It is needful, first of all, to make clear to ourselves that the inequalities and evils found in society are by no means all due to society itself. To begin with, there is an inequality of power and faculty in the constitution of man, and no legislation in the world can ever remove this and its consequences. Equality, except in the sense of one law for all and impartiality in its administration, is an idle dream. Society can as little produce it, as it can enable a rhinoceros to sing, or legislate a cat into a lion.

"The most beneficent feature in the moral order is that which puts a premium on produce, skill, and character, and serves a writ of ejection on idleness, ignorance, and animalism."

Former Dean Pound, of Harvard Law School, said in New York last week that "security today is being made to include security against one's own fault, improvidence, or ill luck, or even defects of character; that to fulfill this expectation the law seems more and more to be called on to pull him out of the ditch, bind up his wounds, set him on his way, and pay his hotel bill. Relief from the burden of poverty, want, and fear are laudable humanitarian ideals, but much at least of the program, if not beyond practical attainment, is certainly beyond practical attainment through law."

Again, says Bowne, "The best thing about the view (that the instruments and forces of production should be taken over by the state) is the clear insight into the worthlessness of all the familiar, socialistic cure-alls; but its holders have never thought it out, whether in its economic bearings, in its internal organization, or in its adaptation to men as we find them. If it diminished production we should have less to divide. If it rewarded all service alike it would produce heartburnings and injustice. If it did not direct production there would be no security against wasted effort. If it did direct it we should need a very wise central authority and very submissive subjects. That we should have either is highly improbable. As to its adaptation to actual men, nothing could be more insane than the fancy that society is to be redeemed by removing the motives to individual effort which lie in private property and private ambition. It is pleasant to conceive of a society where each should exist for all, where the best should rule and the rest should serve, where the inventor should present society with the fruits of his genius, where those of feeble powers should thankfully accept the humble place assigned them by the ruling powers, and where everyone should have his eye fixed on the public good. Unfortunately, the men for such a scheme do not exist on this earth, and when they do the scheme will be needless. Meanwhile, we shall have to get on as we are, not only fixing our eyes on the millennium, but now and then taking some account of human nature itself."

And a great natural scientist, Prof. J. Arthur Thomson, of Aberdeen University, has said on the same subject, "Civilization has indeed mitigated the severity of nature's Spartan methods, and has thrown off the yoke of natural selection, but it has not put an end to struggle nor the need for it. We are face to face with ugly and terrible social arrears, and since we cannot return to nature's stern regions which Plato approved, it behooves us more strenuously to substitute for natural selection a similar method on a higher turn of the spiral. We cannot return to nature's tactics, but we must adhere to her strategy or perish miserably." He is saying that, in the long run, we will perish if we abandon individualism for collectivism. Continuing, he says, "Huxley saw in nature a vast gladiatorial show, a ubiquitous Ishmaelitism, every living creature for itself and extinction taking the hindmost. But he did not adequately appreciate the fact that throughout the struggle for existence in nature, there is often a pathway to survival and success through increased cooperation, kindliness, and mutual aid, as well as through increased competition and self-assertion. And it is this line of combination and mutual aid that man must especially follow; it is the one he has followed in making some of his greatest advances."

And Bowne, the sage and philosopher, was equally emphatic that mere opposition to all Socialist controls is not enough. Says he, "Legislation can do a great deal in the way of protecting public interests from private rapacity. Society also must look after the poor and the sick who are not otherwise cared for. It must do this also in a more humane fashion than has been the rule.

"But society cannot afford to do anything which will relieve the healthy individual from

the necessity of working out his own salvation."

Bowne, my kind of liberal, was by no means unsure of the common man. He disagrees with those who, since the time of Socrates, have urged that it is ridiculous to give the vote of the peasant as much weight as that of a philosopher. He says, "History shows that the peasant with plain sense and conscience is as trustworthy as the philosopher. Historically, distinctions of intelligence beyond those of plain common sense have wrought more harm than good."

The American people agree with Plato that the equality of unequals is inequality. But they also believe that human dignity demands that every man should be assured as a reward for his best efforts a decent minimum of economic security. What that should be and how to attain it is a big question, to be sure. However, one thing seems certain—most Americans do not wish to give up their idealism and individualism in exchange for a promise of more creature comforts. They know the promise, even if initially kept, would ultimately be repudiated. Inevitably tyranny rises as freedom of the individual sinks.

I now come to the most important characteristic of the American way, idealism, which I have suggested is a corollary of individualism.

The American way is entirely incompatible with the Freudian dictum that religion is "the universal obsessional neurosis." It is a rejection of the dismal dictum that all we are is but the result of "accidental collocations of atoms." On our coins we read "In God we trust." It is not with the quality of empty ritualism that we sing from one of our great anthems, "Our Father's God, to Thee, author of liberty * * * Great God, our King."

Yet, some leaders in legal thought in this country go to Freud, the scientist, in search of the ultimate explanation. These leaders, including some of our highest judges, poke intellectual fun at those of us who have what they call the "carry-over of the childish respect for paternal omnipotence," and they say we feed on dreams and delusions. They say this is derived from a filial emotion and that a child, "left to his spontaneous conceptions, finds nothing very sacred about God," a statement that suggests to some of us philosophical illiteracy. Emerson long ago had thought of this and he has the answer: "Children, it is true, believe in the external world. The belief that it appears only is an afterthought, but with culture this faith will as surely arise on the mind as did the first." That a child from its beginnings could be isolated and left to its spontaneous conceptions is a statement that does not even rise to the dignity of an hypothesis.

The chain reaction these views have produced has resulted in enthroning a few demigods outside of their own spheres. Mr. Justice Holmes, truly a very great jurist, is one. I have said before, many lawyers would regard him as a great liberal and an idealist. He was not an idealist and not a liberal in the sense of the current political use of the term. Perhaps utilitarian would be the best one-word description of him.

In a letter to Pollock when he was 88 years old, Justice Holmes said, "I see no reason for attributing to man [in the cosmos] a significance different in kind from that which belongs to a baboon or a grain of sand." When 85 years of age, in a letter to Dr. Wu, he said, "It makes me enormously happy when I am encouraged to believe that I have done something of what I should have liked to do, but in the subterranean misgivings, I think, I believe I think sincerely, that it does not matter much. This is private talk, not to be quoted to others, for one is shy and sensitive as to one's inner convictions, except in those queer moments when one tells the world as poets and philosophers do." There is not much inspiration in a philosophy that nothing matters much.

And, again quoting the great Justice himself, "I hardly think of man as so sacred an object as Laski seems to think him. I believe that Malthus was right in his fundamental notion, and that is as far as we have got or are likely to get in my day. Every society is founded on the death of men. In one way or another some are always and inevitably pushed down the deadline. I think it a manifest humbug to suppose that even relative universal bliss is to be reached by tinkering with property or changing forms of government so long as every social improvement is expended in increased and unchecked propagation. I shall think socialism begins to be entitled to serious treatment when and not before it takes life in hand and prevents the continuance of the unfit."

There is more than a little fuzzy thinking in that observation. First he would not substitute socialism for the status quo until we decrease propagation. If socialism has any validity it surely is not limited to a future population which will owe its existence to a state planned parenthood scheme. Mind you, the great judge was speaking not only of the reproduction of the congenitally unfit. As to them there is very little if any disagreement. He was speaking also of increased propagation. Then what are to be the rules for producing the master race? Who is to make the rules? In a collectivist state, theoretically at least, everyone. I submit this to the verdict of common sense.

Writing to Pollock in 1920, Justice Holmes says, "I loathe war. But I do think that man at present is a predatory animal. I think that the sacredness of human life is a purely municipal ideal of no validity outside the jurisdiction. I believe that force, mitigated so far as may be by good manners is the ultima ratio, and between two groups that want to make inconsistent kinds of world I see no remedy except force. It seems to me that every society rests on the death of men."

In summing up, Prof. Harold J. Laski, has said, "There is, in short, in Mr. Justice Holmes a Spinoza proclaiming that might gives to right its letters of credit."

In brief, to Justice Holmes there is no such thing as moral ought. In his view, so we are told, the Golden Rule is there is no Golden Rule. One school of legal thought, consecrated to his philosophy, with many followers in high places, rejects the idea of free will, which it says appears "throughout literature, religion, philosophy, and legal dogma, but has little scientific evidence to support it," and its followers profess to believe that "by controlling the individual's environment you can control his character, and predict his future actions." Writing cautiously, one of them says, "The task of doing this is stupendous." This is the understatement of all time. Who is going to devise the control; and who is going to control whom?

This same professor, writing in the Harvard Law Review, also said, "The wise businessman, distrusting the judicial process, stays as far as possible from it, and then to many scientists the legal profession rises but little higher than that of the osteopath," a somewhat adventitious observation. Perhaps this was intended to displease the osteopaths. However, I know of some highly placed jurists who esteem them.

Justice Holmes was possessed of great mind and resolution. He made immense contributions to our jurisprudence. Although saying somewhat scornfully that the law was not for poets, he, the son of one, wrote very much like one. The very artistic quality of his writing gives him an especial influence. He recognized that no deed could compare with the ability to influence thinking, and he said so. Influence on men's minds may be a creeping one and its insidious nature not always easy to perceive.

It has long been anachronistic to speak of inert matter, but today it is thought of in almost abstract terms. Now, in conventional thought, we regard matter as energy, and energy as an attribute; but an attribute of what? Also many able, scientific thinkers see no conflict between science and religion, but view them as incommensurables. There are others, many of them so-called social scientists, who hold a contrary view. As to creation of living creatures, science offers certain contributions to the discussion and then, as Professor Thomson says, we remain qua science agnostic. However, to most minds it seems imperative to go on to metaphysical theory and it is better to do this frankly and deliberately than unconsciously or at random.

I think many pragmatists simply resolve the problem qua science and do not bother further with the problem because of a colossal unawareness of its existence. Emerson said, 'He that has never doubted the existence of matter, may be assured he has no aptitude for metaphysical inquiries."

There would be less confusion in law and politics if we would accept the view that the law is an art and not a science, as some maintain.

"Where," asks General Smuts, philosopher and statesman, "was the Spirit when the warm Silurian seas covered the face of the earth, and the lower types of fishes and marine creatures still formed the crest of the evolutionary wave? Where was the Spirit when the solar system itself was still a diffuse fiery nebula?"

That question he has answered—but equivocally—affirming both idealism and what he calls naturalism. But our unequivocal and satisfying answer is the one found in the first four words of the most majestic passage of literature, the first verse of Genesis—"In the beginning God."

Or as Emerson has said it:

"Idealism sees the world in God. It beholds the whole circle of persons and things of actions and events, of country and religion, not as painfully accumulated, atom after atom, act after act, in an aged creeping past, but as one vast picture which God paints on the instant eternity for the contemplation of the soul. Idealism saith: matter is a phenomenon, not a substance."

Thoughts are things.

Lord Kelvin said "The only contribution of dynamics to theoretical biology is absolute negation of automatic commencement or automatic maintenance of life."

Dr. Einstein has given his approval to a book, The Universe and Mr. Einstein, in which it is stated:

"* * * if the universe is running down and nature's processes are proceeding in just one direction, the inescapable inference is that everything had a beginning.

* * * * *

"So all the evidence that points to the ultimate annihilation of the universe points just as definitely to its inception fixed in time."

Yet the pragmatist is not content to take a doubting position as to idealism. With confidence he issues a cold and barren manifesto in opposition. That is precisely the position taken by most leading collectivists of the world.

Science describes, but never explains. As it pushes back the frontier the philosophical problem still remains unchanged. "Science never destroys wonder, but only shifts it higher and deeper. When the halfgods go, the gods arrive." Then as Professor Thomson asks, Should we not get back oftener to

the emotional realization of height above height, which is expressed in Emerson's picture of the little child looking up through the maple branches—

"Over his head were the maple buds,
And over the tree was the moon,
And over the moon were the starry studs,
That drop from the angels' shoon."

Any subjective system of ethics must rest on a theistic foundation. Any other system is a precarious one. The Pater Noster—Our Father who Art in Heaven—is a part of the American way.

It was not a churchman but a victorious general in the hour of victory who stepped on the deck of the battleship *Missouri* to warn a listening world in these words: "We have had our last chance. * * * The problem of survival basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence."

The American people are progressive, not in spite of their idealism but because of it. Their idealism is what will make them continuously more tolerant and unbiased, without which there can be no progress. They know they have improved their incentive society and they are resolved with God's help to continue to improve it. In that they will succeed if they are not forgetful of fundamentals.

King Solomon's words have not lost their meaning, "Where there is no vision the people perish!"

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Annual Meeting of the Tri-State Sheep and Wool Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me before the annual meeting of the Tri-State Sheep and Wool Growers Association, at Washington, Pa., on March 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to be here with my own people—the folks from the farm.

Many of you know that I was born on a sheep farm, only 14 miles from where we are meeting tonight.

The first hundred dollars I ever accumulated was earned in the sheep business. That was a large sum of money in those days and represented a lot of hard work.

I know your difficulties and your problems. I know what competition from foreign markets means to you. I know what interference by Government can do to your business.

That is why I welcomed this opportunity to discuss with you the relations between Government and agriculture and the effect of that relationship upon the general welfare of all the people of the United States.

I had particularly in mind the trend in recent years toward greater and greater centralization of power in the Federal Government and the increasing danger of bureaucratic control over the destiny of every farmer and every worker.

Equally important, I wanted to hammer home the warning that a nation which adopts reckless, wasteful, and extravagant spending and continues year after year to pile up additional billions of dollars of debt is on the road to national bankruptcy.

So long as that course is pursued the day of reckoning must arrive. With it will come financial collapse. And what is more important, freedom of the individual will be destroyed.

The dictatorship of the socialistic state will gain control and this great Republic will no longer be the land of liberty and opportunity that made us the greatest nation on earth.

My friends, it is not pleasant to paint such a gloomy picture. But it is one that cannot be glossed over. It must not be ignored.

It would be easy to say it cannot happen here. But when we consider what has been happening and find that we are on the same course that has led other great nations into the strangling slavery of socialism we dare not fail to take warning.

Let us review briefly the increase in the size and the cost of Government.

In less than 20 years the annual expenditures of the Federal Government have skyrocketed from $3,000,000,000 to $42,000,000,000. In the same period the number of employees on the Federal pay rolls rose from 570,000 to over 2,000,000. The number of departments, bureaus, agencies and commissions increased fourfold to over 1,800.

Today the interest on the national debt alone is more than the total cost of Government only 16 years ago. And when we think about that debt, which now stands at almost $257,000,000,000 and is going higher every day, we must remember that it represents a burden of about $1,800 for every man, woman and child in the United States. That means approximately $7,000 for the average family of four.

Remember also that this staggering burden of debt, the greatest the world has ever known, is not a mere bookkeeping item. It must be paid. It will be left by those who created it as a liability to be met by generations yet unborn, our children's children and their children—far into the future.

During the present fiscal year the Government operated at a cost of $5,500,000,000 beyond its income. For the next fiscal year President Truman has recommended expenditures which mean another deficit of $5,100,000,000.

Is it not time to stop and ask ourselves how long we can survive as a free Nation if we are to continue to spend beyond our income at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year?

I submit that question to you as Americans and as patriotic citizens who are deeply concerned with the future of America.

No segment of our population is so much interested in preserving freedom as the farmer. He knows that liberty and national solvency are interwoven. One cannot exist without the other.

The American farmer is an independent citizen who knows the value of self-reliance, hard work and thrift. He wants to build his security on his own efforts, his own skill. He asks no special favors from the Government. All he asks is a fair price at the market for his products and a fair price when he buys the things he needs.

The farmer wants to stand on his own feet. He wants to do his own thinking, free from restrictions, regulations and regimentation by bureaucratic Government officials.

Instead he has been made the victim of an administration that seeks to gain political advantage by promising everything to the farmer if he will submit to a program of Government control such as has been proposed in the Brannan plan.

That fantastic scheme would place the farmer under complete regimentation from Washington. It would make the Secretary of Agriculture a supreme dictator over the 6,000,000 farmers of America. The farmer is promised a high income at the expense of the taxpayers, but he would have to give up all his independence. He would have to submit to acreage allotments, production goals, marketing practices including marketing quotas and conservation and good land practices.

All of these restrictions upon the farmer's right to run his own affairs would be directed from Washington. That means he would be told how many acres he could plant, what crops he could raise, how to cultivate his land and where to sell his product. He would have to keep detailed records of all his operations and report the figures to the Department of Agriculture. After placing himself in this socialized strait-jacket the farmer would have to depend upon a hand-out check from the government for his livelihood.

It is impossible to estimate how much such a program would cost. But one thing is certain. It would saddle the consumers and taxpayers of America—and that includes the farmer—with an additional tax burden of at least seven to eight billion dollars a year.

The cost of administering the Brannan plan alone could be staggering. It would require an army of investigators, inspectors, bookkeepers, accountants, supervisors, lawyers, and experts, all on the Government pay roll.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the leaders of most of the recognized farm organizations have denounced the plan as dangerous, socialistic, and destructive of the farmer's initiative and incentive.

In the Hoover Commission's report on the Department of Agriculture it was pointed out that in the last 20 years the department has expanded from 22,000 employees to over 82,000 and that its expenditures have increased from $26,000,000 to $2,500,000,000 in 1949.

With this expansion there has developed a great deal of costly duplication and overlapping of services. In some rural counties from 5 to 10 separate agencies operate at the same time. Short-term loans to farmers are made by four separate Federal agencies. Some of the funds received from the Treasury by these agencies are invested in Government bonds so that the Government pays interest on its own money.

The Hoover Commission cited the case of a farmer who wrote to the Department of Agriculture seeking advice on the best type of fertilizer to use on his soil. He received answers from five separate offices and all the answers were different and contradicted each other.

Recently one writer stated that the Agriculture Department can't seem to make up its mind whether it is supposed to increase the Nation's farm output or decrease it. He pointed out that the price-support people are paying out $1,400,000,000 this fiscal year to keep surplus crops off the market while another office, full of experts, is spending the taxpayers' money to help the farmer increase his output.

These are some examples of Government in agriculture. They lead to the conclusion that it would be better for all concerned if there were less Government in agriculture.

A sound, efficient farm program is essential to the welfare of the whole country. A prosperous agriculture is fundamental for a prosperous America. The initiative and incentive of the farmer must be encouraged as the best insurance that the consumer will

have an adequate supply of food and fibers produced on the farm.

He must be given tariff protection against the importation of unlimited agricultural and livestock products.

In the early years of our Nation's history we were largely an agricultural country. Ninety percent of our people were engaged directly in farming.

It was then that Thomas Jefferson, great champion of individual freedom, sounded a warning, from which I quote:

"Were we directed from Washington when to sow and what to reap we should soon want bread * * * when all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all powers, it will become venal and oppressive."

Jefferson recognized the value of agriculture as one of the most important of all the activities of mankind. He feared the time when a majority of the people would no longer be tillers of the soil. He feared the time when the Federal Government would assume power to regiment and control the farmer.

He fought against the dangers to liberty and an all-powerful control Government and Government at oppressive cost.

We must take up that fight. We must not stand idly by while political demagogues and socialistic minded do-gooders spend us to destruction. We must not accept the sugar-coated promise of security to be handed to us on a silver platter by a generous paternalistic government.

If we depend upon that false promise we will see our freedom slip away, a little at a time, until all liberty is destroyed.

From the days of Lexington to the surrender of Japan farmers have been in the front line, battling for the God-given freedom of the individual.

The farmer has been steadfast in support of the church and has aided in strengthening the moral fabric of our Nation.

It is a glorious record and has contributed so much to the greatness of America.

At no time in the history of the United States has it been more important than now to put on the short sword and to fight for righteousness, clean and economical government and for the American way of life.

We must all enlist in the battle for a strong, solvent, dynamic America.

All the various types of agriculture should organize to insist upon economy in government, sound fiscal policies and a balanced budget.

Working together in the spirit of patriotism, such organizations can wield tremendous influence for a better, happier, and more prosperous America.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, yesterday delivered a very notable address on foreign policy at Berkeley, Calif. I have in my hand a copy of an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune dealing with this address, and treating it very comprehensively and favorably. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASES OF POLICY

Secretary Acheson, in his speech at Berkeley yesterday, has stated with great strength and clarity the basic realities of the Soviet-western problem, and the basic principles and policies with which the administration, through him, is seeking to deal with it. Here is a considered capstone set upon that concept of total diplomacy which the Secretary, in a series of remarkable and forceful utterances, has been setting before the Nation and the world. And here is a firmness of grasp and sharpness of insight which are beyond challenge save on the most carefully weighed and responsible grounds.

The Secretary has been under simultaneous attack from two quite opposite directions. The idea that his policy is influenced by some insidious (and unexplained) sympathy for communism becomes merely frivolous in face of his masterly analysis of the real nature of the profound division between east and west—a moral issue of the clearest nature. The opposite, and more serious, attack accuses him of a do-nothing defeatism in face of this dangerous chasm, of inflexibility, of a failure to make new peace advances or think up new policies more apt than the present ones to soften the Kremlin's heart. Can this attack be sustained?

New policies or peace offers are obviously worse than useless unless they fit the actual problem at issue. The Secretary's statement of the nature of this problem is scarcely open to challenge. He outlines seven contributions which the Kremlin could make to the restoration of peace. Can any thoughtful American argue that asking for these is asking too much, or indeed that the United States could accept any peace settlement which did not provide at least these minimum conditions of assuagement and stability? They are, as the Secretary himself warns, conditions which the Kremlin has shown no desire of meeting. But can the west offer, within the limits imposed by the necessity of maintaining its freedom and its safety, anything which might change the Politburo's mind?

Those who so argue put themselves under a grave obligation to suggest just what such offers might contain. Unfortunately, it is one of the worst difficulties of the problem that the Kremlin today is quite satisfied with things as they are. Its tactics of infiltration and propaganda are doing well enough; it is under no breaking economic strain; it is not terrorized by atomic fears; it is under no particular pressure to make peace. It would probably be pleased if western rearmament were halted and could doubtless use western capital if it were offered in vast amounts, but it has given no hint that it needs these things badly enough to make any real changes of policy in return for them. The truth is that cold war is in large measure a necessary "way of life" for the Soviet dictatorship, and to convince the Politburo that it had better be abandoned is not an easy problem.

"Our attitude," says the Secretary, "is not inflexible, our opinions are not frozen, our positions are not and will not be obstacles to peace. But it takes more than one to cooperate." And no suggestion for bringing the Kremlin to believe that cooperation will serve its own interest has yet been advanced that gives as much actual promise as the Secretary's policy—a policy of firmness, of strength, of freedom, of courage to sustain the cold war burdens and unity in holding firm for a real peace. The only alternative yet to be advanced is that which the Secretary mentions—"to allow the free nations to succumb one by one to the erosive and encroaching processes of Soviet expansion."

Farm Production and Farm Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks by Mr. Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal, on the subject Crop Research Reward, as printed in the Nebraska Cattleman for March 1950.

In this address Mr. McMillen points out the great importance of conducting research to meet our problems of farm production and farm markets. As Mr. McMillen says, it may well be that $1 spent on research may accomplish more in the way of finding markets for our surpluses or new crops for our acreage than a hundred dollars spent on buying up and destroying surpluses.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROP RESEARCH REWARD

(Parts of an address by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Farm Journal, Philadelphia, Pa.)

Already this morning there has been considerable discussion of agriculture's biggest question. You have adopted a resolution on it—a magnificent resolution. That question is whether or not ranchers and farmers in America are going to continue to be free. There are innumerable aspects of the question, and perhaps I can illustrate only one of them by referring to a bit of agricultural history which is familiar to all of you.

There are, I see, among you a few who, like myself, can well remember, let us say, a quarter of a century ago, when, had anyone asked what was the foremost question before agriculture he would have been told that it was the question of farm surpluses. It was not long after that question first began to be acute when Government began to undertake to do things about it. Since 1933 Government has distributed in subsidies to agriculture, primarily intended to accomplish something to solve the surplus problem, more than $12,000,000,000, and has spent in addition the high percentage of cost for the administration and distribution of those subsidies, the political brokerage that goes on with all such matters.

We have had a series of laws designed to solve the surplus problem. Each law has cost a little more money. Each law has created new problems and set up new phases of the question. And today, 25 years later, right here in the very middle of the twentieth century, what do we hear? That there are rolling up great surpluses of wheat; that there is on hand a great surplus of cotton; that there are enough dried eggs in storage to provide a breakfast for every American for a year if the hens all quit laying; and that there are accumulations of this and that and the other; and that now, after $12,000,000,000 in 25 years, we must embark upon still more costly programs which impose upon farmers more and more problems. That is the history of Government whenever it undertakes to accomplish things which Government by its very nature cannot accomplish.

Government actually and properly has but two functions. One of them is to protect the

citizens and the Nation from any attack by foreign powers. That is the primary function of government. The other is to protect the citizen from aggression by his fellow citizens. Now, government does not too well accomplish either of those functions. If governments were capable of accomplishing these two jobs, it would have been possible for us to say that during some 10,000 years of human history that we can guess at or know about there might have been a little more than 350 years of peace. Governments do not do a good job on their first function. And anyone who has ever had occasion to get himself tangled up in the courts of law will cheerfully agree that government does not too well and certainly not too economically perform the second function of protecting the citizen from aggression by his fellow citizen.

We have in the United States by common consent more or less agreed that government might undertake certain other functions in fields where private and individual enterprises cannot supply enough capital, assume enough risk or expect rewards adequate to the capital and risks incurred. We are accustomed to having our mail delivered by government. It might be done better nowadays by private hands, but probably could not have been when the post office was instituted. We are accustomed to suppose that it is entirely proper—and I believe it is—for government to, let us say, keep statistics on the livestock industry and upon grain production and upon the business activities and the employment of the country. We need that and it contributes to the advancement of our country. It is entirely proper that the government should engage in certain kinds of research, particularly of the fundamental kinds that helps us to understand a little better the laws of nature. It is proper for government, we believe, to assume some functions in the promotion of education. We think there ought to be some definite limitation as to how far we ought to permit government to go in that field.

Taking the field of research as it is of concern to you: We, I think, have no disagreement upon the idea that it is a function of the Federal Government to combat the existence and spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico in order to prevent it from attacking our herds in the United States. Upon that point I might digress just long enough to say that we have known for years and years that there could be other outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States. Mr. Mollin said we have had them as early as the latter part of the nineteenth century. Had we been farsighted enough in 1920 to have established that laboratory that we are trying yet to get established, we might by this time know enough about the character of foot-and-mouth disease and how to fight it so that it would not be the menace that it is today. We are just starting 25 or 30 years too late to build that laboratory—but again it is better late than never.

Through research, we are constantly lowering our costs, and as we lower costs, we enable more people to enjoy more meat and to enjoy it more often. Through lowering costs we widen our markets. And it is unfortunate perhaps that we permit ourselves in agriculture to think too much about the price we receive and not enough about the costs we put out, because in the long run the income that enables us to enjoy something beyond the necessities of life is the result of price times the quantity we have to sell minus the cost of production. Those are all factors of our agricultural income. Quality becomes reflected in price.

During this quarter of a century we have made some progress. You are doing things on your ranches today that no one would agree 25 years ago you could be doing today. On every farm in America practices are being followed today to lower costs and produce goods that were not possible a quarter of a century ago, and these real ventures have one thing in common; nearly every one of them, I think, is the product of research which has been placed in our hands today because scientists and engineers have been constantly peering into these laws of nature and the materials of nature and come up with new facts with which our great business organizations and countless smaller organizations have been able to turn into new material and new buildings that we enjoy in our own labor.

The Government, you know, expended in order to look after the 1948 potato crop, something like $200,000,000. I inquired the other day as to how much was available during the same period for research to find out new ways to utilize potatoes. The figure was $69,000. That $200,000,000 to take care of a potato crop for 1 year was four times all the money that was spent for all kinds of research that year by the Federal Government. It didn't solve a single problem with potatoes. It created some new ones for this year.

Now, if we are going to spend any Government money should we not spend it in fields that are productive, in fields that will bring us results? You who live on the great plains would like to have more productive grasses. You would like to have some legumes, perhaps, if they exist anywhere in the world, that would add nitrogen to your soil. You in Florida would probably like to have a grass that would stand the heat and the freezes both so that you wouldn't have any interruptions, be without pasture. All over America we have the needs for new kinds of crops.

Just think of this: One new crop on the great plains of America that would pay a little better than wheat, enough better to tempt farmers to put 25 percent of their acreage in that new crop, would solve the wheat surplus probably once and for all. One new crop, or a few such new crops, in the cotton area, could prevent the recurrence of cotton surpluses.

Now we know that mere law making doesn't work. We know that research does work and there are plenty of places to look for new crops. We do know in the United States there are probably not more than 200 species of plants as crops. In the United States and Canada, north of the Rio Grande there are 15,000 species of plants native to our soil. On the face of the earth there are some 300,000 species of plants. Out of all that marvelous abundance we have found out how to use as crops only about 200. There alone is a field for research that challenges the imagination.

Rivers, Harbors, and Public Works in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the Committee on Appropriations on the subject of rivers, harbors, and public works in Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN

Mr. Chairman and members of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in submitting this statement I wish first to express my sincere appreciation of the recognition given by your committee to the urgent need of Pennsylvania for more effective protection against damage by recurring devastating floods.

The extent to which many areas of Pennsylvania have suffered loss of life and property and disastrous dislocation of production is well known to members of the subcommitee.

There is ample testimony of record to justify the expenditures now requested. On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania whose welfare and economic progress depends to a large extent upon the completion of the flood-control projects now under construction, I ask approval of appropriations in the amounts recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. These amounts, I am convinced, represent the minimum requirements to insure orderly and efficient progress on the individual flood-control projects.

I am therefore requesting this committee to approve appropriations as follows:

Conemaugh Reservoir, $9,000,000; Sunbury, $1,200,000; East Branch Clarion Reservoir, $2,000,000; York, $90,100; Williamsport, $1,200,000.

For the maintenance of existing projects I ask the committee's approval of amounts as follows:

Tionesta Reservoir, $60,000; Crooked Creek Reservoir, $60,000; Mahoning Creek Reservoir, $33,500; Loyalhanna Reservoir, $40,000; Youghiogheny Reservoir, $60,000; Johnstown, $15,000; Punxsutawney, $8,000; York, $18,000.

In addition, I ask the committee to appropriate the full budget amounts that will enable the engineers to proceed with the planning work on new projects authorized by Congress.

The projects and the amounts requested are as follows:

Allegheny River Reservoir, $30,000; Allentown project, $50,000; Bear Creek Reservoir, $50,000; Johnsonburg, $10,000; Prompton Reservoir, $25,000; Shenango River, $50,000; Swoyersville and Forty Fort, $30,000; Uniontown, $40,000.

Two other projects for which I ask planning appropriations are included in the omnibus civil-functions bill. They are the Dyberry Reservoir project for the Lackawaxen River for which $50,000 is needed, and the Bradford flood-control project which requires $50,000.

In turning now to the rivers and harbors projects, I would like to call your attention to the fact that Pennsylvania is the only State of the Union which has three great ports giving access to the ocean trade routes of the world—the port of Philadelphia, with access to the Atlantic, the port of Pittsburgh through the Gulf of Mexico, and a Great Lake port at Erie. The maintenance of these great ports is vital to the industrial strength of Pennsylvania and to the economic expansion of the Nation.

Two items for which I ask approval are to carry forward improvements on the Monongahela River which are of vast importance to the coal, steel, and other industries in western Pennsylvania. They are the Morgantown lock and dam located at Morgantown, W. Va., $2,000,000; and lock No. 2 at Pittsburgh for which $3,780,000 is requested.

The completion of these modern locks and dams is of such great importance to the industrial life of western Pennsylvania that I request an appropriation of $100,000 for

further planning of Monongahela River improvements.

I ask the committee to approve the item of $4,000,000 for culm-removal operation on the Schuylkill River; $500,000 for the Ohio River lock and dam construction; and an additional appropriation of $250,250 for open-channel work on the Ohio River.

The importance of providing sufficient funds for the maintenance and operation of river and harbors projects cannot be overemphasized.

I therefore request approval of the full budget amount of $3,248,000 for dredging the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea, and recommend that $2,000,000 be appropriated to maintain dredging operations in the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton, N. J.

I further request the full budget amount for the Monongahela River, $89,300 for maintenance dredging in the pools formed by the dams and $1,011,500 for operation and care of existing locks and dams; Allegheny River, $33,500 for maintenance dredging and $343,700 for operation and care of locks and dams; Youghiogheny River, $20,000 for maintenance dredging in the 9-foot channel between the mouth of the river and McKeesport; Ohio River lock and dam construction and open-channel work, $8,835,700 for maintenance; Schuylkill River, $1,000,000 to maintain dredging necessary to provide adequate facilities for the large commerce; Erie Harbor, $67,000 for dredging to maintain the 25- and 26-foot depths in channel entrances and the harbor itself, ranging in depth from 18 to 23 feet.

Radio Station WHAM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., is one of America's truly great radio stations. Public service has been the keynote in WHAM's operating policy since the station first went on the air in 1922.

In radio's early days, when the industry grew so rapidly, stations were changing frequencies and transmitting power almost at will, resulting in tremendous interference except in the cities where the stations were located. The persons who suffered by this interference were the farmers and small-town residents, who were almost completely forgotten by the then new wonder, radio.

On the advice of a group of radio engineers the Federal Radio Commission in 1928 set up 40 clear channels, interference-free frequencies, to give the neglected rural population at least part of the service which city residents then enjoyed. WHAM was assigned one of those clear channels, 1180 kilocycles. Then, as now, it proved worthy of that sacred trust—serving well its many listeners, rural and urban, in western New York and northwestern Pennsylvania.

To demonstrate the value of WHAM to its area I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on its highly valued orchard spray service, which is about to begin for another season, and to include also letters from agricultural leaders commending WHAM for this service.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAM'S CLEAR CHANNEL SERVES NEW YORK FRUIT BELT

Station WHAM is a 50,000-watt clear-channel station situated in the heart of the world-renowned fruit belt that lies along the southern shore of Lake Ontario in the State of New York.

Fruit growing is one of the really big industries in up-State New York. In the area served by WHAM, the 1949 fruit harvest totaled 20,090,000 bushels of apples; 1,428,000 bushels of peaches; 2,900 tons of sweet cherries; 17,500 tons of sour cherries, and 1,195,000 bushels of pears. Valuation of this crop was over $40,000,000.

Crops of this caliber are not products of chance. They are the result of scientific planning and culture, and Station WHAM plays a large part in the fruit program in up-State New York by cooperating each year in a fruit spray service that has pioneered a new orchard-growing technique that has gained prominence across the United States.

Back at the turn of the century, fruit growers in the WHAM area met their first big orchard foe, the San Jose scale. To combat this serious threat to the orchard industry, fruit men set up a spray program, the success of which was so obvious in terms of bigger and better crops that research in spraying was extended to other fruit pests and has continued without let-up in an ever-expanding program of endeavor and success.

Research has brought to light the priceless information that insect development and harmful tree growths are dependent upon combinations of precipitation, humidity, and temperature. Certain combinations of these factors will produce certain harmful results to orchards. Therefore in WHAM land, fruit specialists of the various county farm bureaus work in conjunction with the United States Weather Bureau, diagnose weather conditions, and then predict what preventive sprays or dusts should be applied.

In the early days of this technique, a telephone network was used to spread daily word of what should be done to prevent disease development. The slowness of this technique created a big difficulty. By the time the last member of the telephone network was contacted, it was often too late to spray effectively. In 1946, Ralph Palmer, fruit specialist for Monroe County Farm Bureau, worked out a plan with WHAM that overcame this objection. Special equipment in Palmer's home was remotely controlled from the station's studios. Each morning, after working out his specialized information, Ralph Palmer went on the air and told growers just what to do. The huge success of this plan in Monroe County paved the way for the same type of operation to be set up in Orleans and Wayne Counties. The broadcasts start early in March or April and continue until the middle of July. The system was of such importance that a full account was published by the United States Weather Bureau with its nationally distributed weather map for Friday, August 22, 1947, under the title "Weather and Fruit Growing."

Station WHAM considers fruit spray service one of its most dramatic examples of the assistance a radio station can extend to farmers and orchardmen when it has the facilities with which to do the job.

WHAM's complete farm division is rendering a highly valued public service to New York and Pennsylvania residents. Its fruit spray service is just one example of its value to the agricultural industry. WHAM, with its interference-free clear channel, is able to get this urgent information to growers over a vast rural area, many parts of which would have no radio service were it not for this clear-channel station.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND MARKETS
Rochester, N. Y., August 24, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Farm Announcer, Radio Station WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAEFNER: I have recently been in contact with a number of farmers throughout western and central New York and cannot refrain from writing to tell you how much they appreciate your agricultural news, particularly the morning and midday periods. Apparently WHAM has been able to reach out to many of our New York State farmers and these farmers with whom I have talked certainly appreciate your fruit report and Market News Service.

May I, at this time, add my personal thanks for the cooperation you have extended to this office in the use of our market reports.

Very truly yours,

H. H. DUNCAN,
Assistant Director.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NEW YORK,
Rochester, N. Y., August 22, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Radio Station WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAEFNER: I want to take this opportunity to write you about the radio fruit program which WHAM has broadcast in recent years. As you know, this program started under the regime of Tom Murray some 4 years ago and immediately attracted a considerable audience with a strong demand that it be enlarged and extended. This year witnessed a considerable expansion over the 1948 season and was widely listened to.

Starting March 23, we broadcast 6 days a week until mid-April, when we went on 7 days a week. By late June we were back to 6 days a week, July 1 to 5 days and July 15 to 3 days. The program was discontinued August 15 and might well have run another week.

While the program was designed primarily for fruit growers in Monroe and Orleans Counties, it was widely listened to in all western New York—especially after June 30 when it was the only fruit program on the air in western New York.

Although the timing information was not readily usable outside of western New York, there was also a substantial audience in such other fruit areas as central and northern New York, the Hudson Valley, New England, and along the shore of Lake Erie in Pennsylvania and Ohio. We estimate that more than 5,000 western New York fruit growers listen regularly.

Many farmers who grow no fruit listen to the weather portion of the broadcast.

The fruit growers are very enthusiastic about the service and it would now not be possible to go through a spray season without it. In addition to being a splendid service program it has been highly effective as an educational feature and many growers have learned more in a few years about fruit problems from this broadcast than in the previous one or two decades.

Your organization is to be complimented on this public service and you would have a real argument on your hands should the program be abandoned or restricted.

Better plan on starting again March 15 or soon thereafter in 1950.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH G. PALMER,
Associate County Agricultural Agent.

KENDALL, N. Y., *August 26, 1949.*

STATION WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. RALPH PALMER,
Monroe County Farm Bureau,
Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. ARTHUR WEST,
Orleans County Farm Bureau,
Albion, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: My thanks for the fruit broadcast service for the season which has just closed. You may not receive many letters but I am sure that all fruit growers appreciated it very much. I know of many city workers who listened to it every morning on their way to work in their cars, and it caused many questions to be asked as to our problems. The weather forecast was one which caused comment because it was nearly always nearer to what happened than the other regular forecast.

You all did a swell job and I hope that it will be repeated next year.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. TUCKER.

ORLEANS COUNTY EXTENSION SERVICE,
Albion, N. Y., August 23, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Radio Station WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR GEORGE: I would like to take this opportunity in behalf of our fruit committee to thank you and the management of WHAM for the excellent cooperation we have had this season in the radio fruit spray service.

We had about 1,200 fruit growers and about 600 vegetable growers following daily weather reports and spray service. Numerous city and village people listened in, too, and wrote for specific information on their trees or berries, and mentioned the program.

Fruit growers in adjoining southern counties also wrote us, indicating a wide coverage. A number of dairy-fruit growers report having put radios in the barn to get the daily spray service and weather reports.

Even the Geneva Experiment Station workers tune in to get the daily weather reports and follow field spray developments.

Growers are anxious to see the program continued again next spring, and we hope to have your continued fine cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR G. WEST,
County Agricultural Agent.

FEDERAL-STATE MARKET NEWS SERVICE,
Rochester, N. Y., August 19, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE HAEFNER,
Farm Director, WHAM,
Rochester, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAEFNER: We expect to start our daily market reports on or about August 24 and at that time we will begin sending you (via teletype collect) excerpts from these daily reports for broadcasting over WHAM.

This is the beginning of the twenty-sixth season during which this office has furnished your station with agricultural information of vital importance to growers and shippers over the large territory which you cover.

During the 9 months of each season that you broadcast this information we received many very favorable comments from both growers and shippers in this territory regarding your station and the manner in which you handle our reports. Sometimes during a period of 24 hours your announcers often repeated two or three times many special reports that we might furnish; such as frost damage in competing sections, etc. Such handling of market reports is most certainly appreciated by the rural population of New York State as well as adjoining States.

Again let me thank you for the splendid cooperation that continues to exist year after year between this office and WHAM.

Very truly yours,

A. L. THOMAS,
Local Representative.

The Ministrations of Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Looking at Life," written by Erich Brandeis, and published in the Morgantown (W. Va.) New Dominion, on March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AT LIFE
(By Erich Brandeis)

A few evenings ago a truck driving through one of New York City's crowded melting-pot sections, skidded on the icy pavement, and ran over a boy who was playing in the street.

Both of the youngster's legs were crushed. He was unconscious. It was evident that he did not have long to live.

Out of the crowd came a priest. He kneeled down by the boy's side and prayed. The boy was a Jewish boy.

The truck driver, tears streaming from his eyes, had stopped his vehicle and he, too, kneeled down by the boy's stricken form and prayed. The driver, as I later found out was a Protestant.

As usual in New York, before the ambulance had time to arrive, thousands had rushed into the block, where the accident had happened.

It was only with the help of two husky policemen that the grief-stricken mother could make her way to her son's side.

Tenderly, she took her son's head into her arms and prayed to God—in Yiddish.

Then the ambulance came. The boy was taken to the hospital where he is now confined.

The doctors are hopeful that he may live, although he may be crippled for the rest of his life.

However, perhaps their skill and the combined prayers of Catholics, Protestants, and Hebrews will make him whole again.

Not much of a story in these days of world-shaking events.

Yet in it may lie the answer to so many unanswered questions we ask ourselves.

In it may also lie the answer to the hundreds who have written me and asked why there must be so much dissension in religion.

There is no dissension in religion.

The dissension is among the churches.

Whenever there is a disaster, whenever man's weak ego cries out for God's help—man knows only one God—the God of his soul.

When God is needed instantly nobody asks those who need help whether they are Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish.

That priest, that truck driver, that mother, although each belonging to a different church, did not pray to different Gods. They prayed to the same God.

How many gods do you sticklers for methods think there are?

Do you, who believe that only in your faith lies salvation, dare to say that those who don't share it are heathens?

You may as well say that unless you pray to God dressed in a certain costume, He will not hear you.

You may as well insist that Heaven is reserved entirely for your own clique.

I, for one, deny that the very cleavages that divide man on this earth are God-made, I believe that man's soul cries out for unity, and I call upon the churches to set the example.

No FEPC Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Metropolitan Star of New York City. The statement will be useful, I think, to those who wish to evaluate accurately the position we are now in, in regard to civil-rights legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO FEPC RETREAT

Good victories are never bought cheaply. Sometimes, the road is easy. Sometimes it is a rough highway, filled with obstacles.

The road to passage of a just FEPC bill is not an easy one to travel. Progress in a democracy is slow but sure. That is the way of a democracy. That is the only way we would have it.

Thus, the good people seeking progress through enactment of a just FEPC bill should not be disheartened by the emasculated measure forced through the House by a coalition of narrow-minded Dixiecrats and reactionary Republicans.

There are liberal men and women in both parties—yes, even in the South—who will ultimately repudiate this blotch on American democracy.

This Congress was voted into office with a mandate to protect the civil rights of all Americans. There can be no compromise in this crusade. There can be no retreat from the front lines of decency and progress.

The FEPC fight now goes into the Senate. There still is a good chance of getting a good bill out of this Congress. But that will depend upon you—and you—and you.

The full force of American opinion must be brought to bear on Congress. Every enlightened American must inform his legislator of his intention to support a bill giving an FEPC power to enforce its decisions.

The fight for FEPC is not merely one against discrimination. It represents a battle that has been going on for years against reaction; against Rankinism and all that RANKIN apparently espouses. The entire world is watching the FEPC fight, for if we can wipe economic discrimination from the face of America we will encourage democratic forces elsewhere to combat discrimination, dictatorship, totalitarianism, and all the evils of bigotry.

We, in New York State, are fortunate in that both of our Senators are enlightened statesmen, in the forefront of the fight for just causes. Both our Senators—IRVING IVES, Republican, and HERBERT LEHMAN, Democrat—are pledged to support a just FEPC bill.

We must give them the support they deserve. We cannot falter now because of a temporary setback.

It is ironical that the cause of FEPC should have suffered its serious blow on the eve of Brotherhood Week. It is up to us to correct that situation.

The time for action is growing short. The Administration bill—supported by every forward-looking American—will be brought up in the Senate by March 10.

Let them hear your voice now. Let the voice of America tell the Senate there will be no retreat along the road to progress. Together, Americans all, we must march ahead and inspire the world with our good deeds—pointing the way to peace and brotherhood for all mankind.

Banking Service for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address by Mr. E. A. Mattison on banking service for everyone:

BANKING SERVICE FOR EVERYONE

(By E. A. Mattison, executive vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco, Calif; before the savings and mortgage conference, American Bankers Association, New York, March 13, 1950)

Banking service for everyone is probably an idealistic conception so far as the whole body of the banking business is concerned. Perhaps one way to achieve it would be to follow the suggestion which came to us in the form of a cartoon. The drawing showed a big sign over one of our larger branches reading: "No waiting, no delay, 48 vice presidents."

Even in a certain bank out in California, where banking service is already available for everyone, everyone doesn't use it. Everyone doesn't yet need banking service. But we are working on that, too.

Perhaps that indicates something of the nature of the job we face. Even though we are all progressive enough to think seriously of fully democratizing our banking services, and making them available to all who care to use them, we have an obligation to go farther than that.

The very nature of banking is uniquely one of service. Its only reason for existence is service to others. A shoemaker could wear his own shoes and a farmer eat his own corn and beef and a tailor wear his own clothing, and these three could trade around among themselves. But what good would the banker's product be merely to himself or a few neighbors?

The experience of some of us goes to show that the accomplishment of banking services for everyone is reached over a road which is made rough by many obstacles, many bumps and detours, misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and disappointments, and beset by vexations of the spirit and more than a few holdup men.

I, however, am not the man who would counsel you to stay off this road, as the scenery along the way is spectacular and your destination is worthwhile. And it is a road we all must travel, because no one can stand still where he is today, no matter how much he would like to.

A. P. Giannini, the founder of the Bank of America, who gave me my first lessons in actual banking, used to beat it into my head that the more important job was to conduct the business so that more and more people would want banking service—would need it. That meant operating in a way to advance the general economy, to foster growth and create opportunity.

I think you will agree that his point has been proved. You are well aware of California's economic position today. And that one bank, at last year end, had 4,088,000 deposit accounts, including 2,649,047 savings accounts. In that single year 1,398,000 borrowers were accommodated.

Therefore we can stipulate that savings and commercial banking is public service, and we can look anybody in the eye and make it stick. And mark this—it happens to be one of the living facts in the American scheme of things that can keep this trend toward the so-called welfare state from turning it into a farewell state—farewell to freedom, rising standards, and incentive.

I suggest to you, gentlemen, that if all bankers will unify into a shoulder-to-shoulder front on this concept of doing all business on the basis of public service, we will win the intelligent support of the people and cause the tide to turn.

Is that an extravagant statement? It is not. It is straight and narrow truth. Bankers are a lively force in every community throughout this land, and regardless of what is said by their traducers, bankers almost everywhere are respected and the example they set has a powerful influence for miles around.

Banking service for everyone, then, means more than opening the door to small accounts. It means constructive service to the entire community, a service which creates opportunity, enterprise, employment, and—naturally—new customers. By way of illustration let me mention that Bank of America has more customers today than there were people in the whole State of California 25 years ago.

I hope you'll pardon me making an occasional reference to that bank I just mentioned. I guess I'm like the man who was always talking about his wife. One day a friend protested. "For heaven's sake," he said, "don't you know any other women you can talk about?" And the man's answer was: "Oh, yes; but I know my wife better than the others."

Anyway, the effect of good banking service may be inferred from the recent figures which show the income of the average Californian is approximately $25 per month higher than the national average, and bank deposit figures show per capita bank deposits for the United States to be $894, as against $1,207 in California.

As a matter of fact, the banks of this country as a whole have advanced quite a way along the road of banking service for everyone. Some individual banks are lagging behind, but they are not represented here today. Everybody in this audience is here because he is progressive. So let us review the things that are being done to provide banking service for everyone.

First, we welcome a deposit account from anybody, whether he wears greasy overalls or a top hat, and we open his savings account for a buck even though it may cost us more than that to put it on the books.

We spend good money in advertising to bring these people in, and we spend more money to preach the gospel of thrift and to persuade these people to build up their accounts.

We incur increased operating costs by installing systematic savings programs such as Christmas Club and Thrift Club, knowing that although it costs us money we are making a sound investment, one which will bring us and our communities a fat return in happier, healthier and wealthier citizens, and a consequent big increase in the number of profitable customers.

We make a further investment in teaching oncoming generations the virtues of thrift by persuading the schools to install school savings systems, and we employ specialist tellers who travel to these schools and on specified bank days collect the deposits of the children. As we accept deposits of pennies the cost of collecting and recording and protecting them is often many times the cash value of the deposits, but we have proved by experience that no sounder investment could be made. The children who participate grow up familiar with at least part of the banking function. Many, many are the histories of substantial success won in the business world by men and women who got their first practical lessons in accumulating and conserving funds, and putting them to profitable work, through their school savings banking.

By the way, in these days of alarm over juvenile delinquency, there is a little noted constructive side to saving which was touched on in an editorial in a California newspaper last month. The editorial expressed the view that the youngster who is taught the meaning and value of thrift is not likely to grow up with a blind determination to get money or valuables which belong to others. The lad who is taught to save, said the editor, soon gains a sense of self-reliance and responsibility. He learns the importance of standing on his own feet and attaining his goals through his own efforts.

I have limited myself to savings banking up to this point because this audience is made up mostly of savings bankers, but the subject assigned me is banking service for everyone, which means I must touch lightly on other aspects of banking services before I wind up.

But before we temporarily turn away from savings, we of course have to refer to the lending services in that category, and here again the progressive minds in this audience will agree on this with me: That public service exists in the lending of savings funds just as emphatically as in the deposit services.

The insured loans in the FHA and the GI fields have enabled us all to extend credit for home construction to a much greater extent than would have been possible otherwise.

This has resulted in a much wider degree of home ownership with all its attendant virtues, which include more permanence in family life, a chance for more families to get their roots down, a chance for young folks to develop a real sense of home stability, a better standard of living, a higher moral tone, and an all-around healthier and happier mode of life.

If that isn't a substantial public service I never heard of one, and we have proved at the same time that the laborer is worthy of his hire by making some money at it. And it is only a small part of the story.

These same aspects appear in all types of real-estate lending, whether the loans are insured or not. That is—they appear when we have the wholesome view in mind that we are engaging in free private enterprise from motives of public service and enlightened self-interest. They do not appear where there is no motive other than self-interest. Fellows of that kind do not believe in banking service for everyone. A large "Do not disturb" sign, while not visible to the human eye, is as obvious over their doors and their desks as if painted on a card,

and it would make no difference how many vice presidents they had.

Of course, as I have hinted, this business of serving the public conscientiously is not all milk and honey. Popular acceptance can grow to the point where you stir up the destructive attention either of a jealous type of competition or of those professional reformers whose real profession is riding on the backs of those who really produce and achieve.

Any business institution, and especially a bank, can no more discharge its responsibilities to the community by merely paying taxes than can the individual citizen. We must all seek constantly for new services, new ways to extend our usefulness. And while on this theme let me mention that I agree with those savings bankers who believe that their lending functions, now legally limited to real-estate loans and corporation bonds, could, and should be extended to the personal-loan field, and bring more of this sort of financial service into the scope of banking.

Logic suggests that business done by loan companies must be bankable, as much of the money they lend is wholesaled to them by banks.

In the effort to render a full credit service, the savings banker is the most handicapped of all, and the field to which he is limited by law is one in which nonbank lenders are extremely active.

Incidentally, here in the East you savings bankers have a command of long-term money which gives you an advantage even over your cousins in the commercial banks. Perhaps you could apply more pressure to this advantage by paying more to your depositors to encourage their thrift and build your loanable funds, and earn more through your increased volume of lending. That would be no more than the type of good, clean competition from which the public would benefit.

The general scope of banking has certainly widened within this generation. To continue with the list of things being done to provide banking services for everyone, there are of course individual savings accounts, joint savings accounts, trustee savings accounts, Christmas club and thrift club savings accounts, time deposits, open accounts, allotment savings accounts, and certificates of deposit.

On the commercial side are the checking accounts, individual and joint, regular checking and tenplan, and such refinements as the personalized check, and such services as automatic transfer of funds from checking to savings accounts.

On the list of bank credit services, under a policy to provide the type of credit best suited to the needs of all, are commercial loans, real estate loans, loans to farmers, personal loans, automobile financing, automobile repairs, automobile loans, doctor-patient loans, household appliance and furniture financing, insurance premium financing, loans to buy, build, or repair homes, term loans for small business, loans to trucking concerns, industrial equipment financing, farm equipment financing, aircraft financing and GI home and business financing.

Then there are all the various trust services, the safe-deposit services, the collection of drafts and checks and installments for customers; courtesy cards, letters of introduction for travelers to correspondent banks, travelers checks, money orders for all occasions, and all the foreign banking services, including foreign exchange, letters of credit, collections and discounts and foreign-branch facilities.

That is just a quick run-down to remind us all how the variety of bank services has expanded and to indicate that, as we travel on, there is always a new horizon ahead for us all, new fields for healthy competition from which the public benefits.

It seems to me that an important part of providing these services for everyone is to see that everyone knows about it, just as much for the public-relations benefits as for increasing the volume of the business. But let us be sure we understand what we mean when we talk about public relations, because so many bankers interpret the term as no one else ever does, and they have been doing so for a long time.

I was sitting in our Los Angeles offices one day when an officer from a bank in Arizona dropped in. He said he wanted some briefing on public relations, as he had just been given that assignment by his bank. A bright young man of ours started on a thumbnail outline of public-relations concepts as we have learned them, but it soon became apparent our visitor was "all at sea." At last he broke in and said: "Hold on. I'm not talking about interpreting our bank to the public. I am a salesman after new business. How do I go about it?"

In other lines of business a sales representative never thinks of calling himself a public-relations man, and we in banking can hardly expect the public to understand our attempts at public relations if we do not understand them ourselves. And so it was patiently explained that while a salesman should not misrepresent himself as a public-relations man, he should nevertheless do his work with the knowledge that he must be governed by good public-relations policies.

Such policies must govern selling just as they govern all contacts with the public. And this brings me around to the most important point of this subject, the conclusion that good public relations demands we provide banking services for everyone. And that we sell them honestly, giving full value for value received. Any banker knows from experience with his customers that shoddy goods and services at fancy prices will ruin a business, and all the press blurbs inspired by another misconception of a public-relations man will not save it.

The full job of serving everyone takes us not only among the individuals to whom progressive bankers have opened their doors, but out beyond the walls of our offices to the groups and organizations and communities where opportunities for service may be found.

Take the organized American community, and when you set aside the few large centers where experienced financial guidance can be found within city government, there remain thousands upon thousands of cities, towns, and villages where professional staff talent of that kind simply does not exist. Consequently, when such communities are faced with bond issues and other problems of finance they would be exposed to exploitation and unnecessarily high costs but for the public-service-minded banker who makes the talents and facilities of himself and his organization available, at a fair cost, to that community. The very woods are full of opportunities to perform service for all.

In September, being convinced that no real depression elements existed in the economy, and believing that prices and quality were at a stabilization point, we inaugurated a campaign to instill confidence in people and inspire them to buy the things they desired but had been hesitant to purchase because of the uncertainties in these respects. Our buy-now campaign was waged over a broad advertising and merchandising front, through such mediums as newspapers, periodicals, billboards, radio, and direct mail. By these means, our thought and our voice were directed to help manufacturers and dealers to sell goods, and our credit facilities were made more widely available than ever before to assist people in acquiring worthwhile things.

Community building activity often calls for sacrifices of time and convenience, and thanks for it are often delayed, but it is the job of the banker to carry his share of the load, and he cannot make the claim of providing service for everyone until he does.

A good banker, of course, always counts the cost. But as he believes in balancing the books he counts the benefits as well. In addition to profits, one of the benefits is a growing appreciation for the banker in the community, and consequently a greater assurance of his continuance in business. There have been disquieting indications that without a larger degree of public appreciation the days of the private-enterprise banker in this country might be numbered. A. P. Giannini, in acknowledging the great growth of the Bank of America, made the statement that "if our institution has become great it is by consent of the people we serve." In my humble judgment that is a statement that could well be hung over every banker's desk. There could be no better reminder of who is boss.

Another area to be embraced by any complete set of banking service is that of small business.

Many of the small-business men in my circle of acquaintance are pretty self-conscious over the eternal fuss made about them by the politician. Out on the west coast, of course, the small-business man's financial needs are thoroughly taken care of by the private enterprise banker, and this was publicly confirmed by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer after his recent tour out there.

Incidentally, it was just a few years ago that a congressional committee came out our way to see what new laws could be passed to meet the financial needs of small business. After a few sessions in San Francisco the inquiry fell apart and the rest of the California schedule was abandoned. Small business had told the investigators: "Leave us alone. We are doing all right."

That illustrates exactly what I mean. When we do provide the banking services needed our customers tell the investigators: "Leave us alone. We are doing all right." We serve our own best interests by serving the public interest. Nobody denies that small business does have its financial problems. My point is, these problems can be solved with bankers who are willing and determined to solve them. It is when we neglect to solve them that the politician finds his opportunity to step in and close off another field to private democratic banking.

We have heard it said that in Moscow they teach the doctrine that capitalism has no basic soundness and therefore is bound to fall of its own weight. The Commies seem to think that all they have to do is give us a push or two, and then stand by to pick up the pieces.

That is a very queer doctrine in view of the most obvious fact that the whole modern industrial world was produced by capitalism, and it is equally obvious that without capitalism to support it, the world would disintegrate into chaos and poverty-stricken misery.

Since capitalism is founded on the principle of saving, and the use of savings in the production of goods and services by democratic privately owned enterprise, the importance of the role of the banker is as plain as the stripes in the American flag.

We must not let anybody take that importance away from us. We must not submit to constriction in our services, to derogation of our leadership in the economy, to a debasement of our functions or a subordination of our role. We must not continue submissively to accept bureaucratic or socialistic encroachments, for that could only end in defeat for all democratic enterprise.

Rather, we must advance. This advance can be made by providing banking service for everyone. Make it as cleanly competitive as you like, for ethical competition spurs progress.

Let's advance by improving our present services, hunting for new ones, promoting opportunity and employment. Let's shake off

inertia and any bindings with outworn tradition. Then, with popular support won by our combined efforts, we can prove, more than any other single segment of our society, that the American democratic-capitalistic way, properly administered, is more than a match for specious theorists who bait their totalitarian traps with appeals to human greed, slothfulness and ignorance.

We are on the right road. Let's keep going.

Commodore John Barry, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am extending my remarks to include an address on Commodore John Barry which, on the invitation of the Irish War Veterans and the urging of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable EUGENE E. O'SULLIVAN, I am undertaking to deliver on St. Patrick's Day at the annual ceremonies at the monument in Franklin Square in Washington, erected by a grateful nation in memory of one of its greatest heroes. The address follows:

It is fitting that annually on St. Patrick's Day those of Irish blood should gather at the monument of Commodore John Barry.

On the occasion of the dedication of this monument President Woodrow Wilson said of him that when John Barry left the shores of Ireland he brought with him to the shores of America his heart.

I would pause here to suggest that the greatest of all the many contributions Irish blood has made to the lands of their adoption has been that of human sympathy. The Irish heart is a tender heart and Irish ears are never closed to the cries of distress from those who are in need of friends and of help.

It is said that in the first half of the eighteenth century 500,000 young men of Irish blood left their native land to scatter throughout the world. They served in every army and in every navy in all the countries of the universe. Their descendants remained in those alien lands, and it is not too much to say that it was their influence on public opinion that either sparked or aided in the sparking of every good fight for practices and laws on the heart side.

It could not have been otherwise. The long years of oppression, of cruel injustices, and of bitter hardships had put deep in the Irish blood something that centuries under more friendly circumstances could never remove. How long the ancestors of my Irish grandfather and of my Irish grandmother were eking out existence in the bogs when their lands had been taken from them, and they would not bend the knee to the snapping of the fingers of an invader, I know only from the legends of my family which is not unlike that of most Irish-American families. But what I of myself know, as you of yourselves know, is that the voice of protest against any kind of inhumanity that in the years of Ireland's grief was planted in Irish blood still speaks in the blood that is in me and that is in you.

We cannot reach back into the yesterdays of history and ease the pain of Irish patriots and Irish martyrs. But God in His grace giving us strength and the opportunity, we will not cease wherever our lot has placed us to come to the aid of those who are abused and oppressed. The quickest way to reach the fighting Irish is through the heart.

Commodore John Barry in a very special sense is our hero of the War for Independence. I think this practice of giving special nationalistic acclaim to the fathers of our liberty serves a useful purpose. It tends to keep constantly reminding us of that which we never must forget. That which we have in this land of freedom, which we all enjoy and prize, was given us as the joint contribution of all the races and all the peoples from which we sprang.

For the memory of Commodore John Barry we feel an affection heightened by the fact that his modesty and spirit of self-effacement left it almost entirely to the researchers of history to establish long after his passing the tremendous magnitude of his work. In a period when many men in leadership were given, if not to self-laudation, at least to writing copiously of events in which they had been participants, Commodore John Barry did the job and having done it forgot it and started on another.

I am not surprised that one of his most recent biographers, not of his blood or of his religion, states that each new research into the forgotten records of the past establishes Commodore John Barry on an ever-heightening pedestal. His skill and his courage at sea and in combat long have been the subject of song and story. What we are glimpsing now, more and more with every year, is that Commodore John Barry was one of the outstanding constructive geniuses of his age.

I would say that the title that has been accorded him, "Father of the American Navy," is appropriately conferred and especially in one sense, which seems not to have received the attention it deserves.

During the years the American Navy has been noted for the independence of its officers and their impatience at times with civilian supervision. I do not wish to get into a discussion of this phase of Navy spirit in connection with recent events, as each situation must be judged strictly by the facts and circumstances governing that situation. Therefore any similarity, may I explain, is merely coincidental.

It is interesting, however, in viewing Commodore John Barry in the light of the title accorded him, "Father of the American Navy," to note that Barry was the first naval commander in our history to lock horns with a civilian authority that stood then much in the position of our present office of the Secretary of the Navy. The affair almost cost him his command. The vote in the Congress for his removal failed only because it was a tie. Had there been a change of but one vote, the genius of John Barry would have been lost to the American people in that field where he was so brilliantly preeminent.

What John Barry said to his civilian superior was that he knew more about ships than all the civilians put together, which, of course, was true, and when the superior thus addressed accused Barry of disrespect to the office of authority, Barry shot back at him this classic:

"Damn you, I don't value you more than my duty requires."

Barry was not a man of letters. His writing was confined to rough entries in the logs of his ships and the briefest of correspondence. Yet in the exasperation of receiving an order which to a seagoing man seemed the improper thing he coined a phrase which will live as long as his fame.

Commodore John Barry also was the first American naval commander to run head-on into an economy drive. The proud fleet that he had built, with the majestic flagship, the *United States*, the queen of the waves, was whittled down to the barest skeleton in the name of economy. Those were the years when the great sea power of Britain, opening to the British the rich commerce of the world, was in the building stage. One cannot but wonder how different might have been the fortunes of the British people for the last century and more if when economy was destroying the American fleet a similar economy was lowering the Union Jack.

But after his death the fame of Commodore John Barry gained the victory over another economy drive. In the name of economy the bill authorizing the building of this monument was fought in the Congress. Even after its passage, President Theodore Roosevelt was urged to veto the appropriation on the ground that the Federal Government could not afford to put $50,000 into a memorial for one of the greatest of heroes. President Roosevelt replied that he was determined to cut Federal expenditures to the very bone, but he didn't intend to begin by using the ax on good old Jack Barry.

We stand clustered around this monument on this St. Patrick's Day of 1950, as other gatherings will do in the years ahead, and we wonder if any appropriation of $50,000 almost four decades ago could have returned a richer yield. It is idle to say that the sight of a monument to a great man does not with all of us have the moving power of inspiration and of influence.

Countless thousands of men and women and children have stood before this monument and have gone back to their homes in every State in the Union, and to all corners of the world, the better for having had communion with the spirit of one of the greatest of our Revolutionary heroes.

Voteless Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why Freedom Can't Ring Here—Citizens of the Nation's Captial Treated as Defective Americans," written by Jesse C. Suter and published in the March 1950 issue of the General Federation Clubwoman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY FREEDOM CAN'T RING HERE—CITIZENS OF NATION'S CAPITAL TREATED AS DEFECTIVE AMERICANS

(By Jesse C. Suter [1])

It is surprising how many people from out in the States are amazed when they visit Washington and learn that their fellow Americans permanently residing in the National Capital have no part whatever in

[1] The writer, Jesse C. Suter, is a second generation District native. He is a member of the editorial staff of the Evening Star and the Sunday Star, acting chairman of the Citizens Joint Committee on National Representation, a vice president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, and former president of the Federation of Citizens' Associations and of the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia. He also was chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Council. He has for a number of years had a civic column in the Sunday Star, under the heading Civic problems, civic bodies.

the government of their country. For here these truly national Americans, holding allegiance to the United States but not to any State, are regarded as being American citizens solely for the purpose of bearing the burdens which fall alike on all Americans.

They are required to pay all national taxes, obey all national laws, and to fight, bleed, and perhaps die in the defense of their country, in whose government they are permitted no part.

Only in the bearing of these burdens are they on an equal footing with the citizens of the several States. But when it comes to the possession and enjoyment of valued fundamental American privileges, the equality vanishes into thin air.

Boys from the District and boys from the States serving overseas in the armed forces during World War II were brought to stern realization of this political inequality, when an opportunity was afforded servicemen to vote by mail in the national election. Those from the States were accorded the privilege of voting, while their comrades in arms from the District of Columbia, who were sharing the same hardships and dangers, could not in the same way participate in the government of their country for which they were fighting.

Viewing the originals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States always gives visitors to Washington a genuine thrill. But they will look in vain in Washington for an exemplification of the underlying principles of the American Government which makes it a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. However, here it is, in effect, a Government of a part of the people, by a part of the people, and for all of the people. As strange as it may seem, the shot fired at Lexington and heard around the world has not been heard yet in Washington, and consequently freedom can't ring here.

Existence of so amazing a situation deserves analysis and an explanation, as it should be accounted for in some manner. We find that these 100 percent Americans permanently residing in the District, exceeding in population a number of the States, are not permitted representation in the Senate and the House of Representatives, which constitute the Congress. The Congress is both the local and the National Legislature of these voteless people. We also find that these people have no vote for the President, even though he is not only their President, but is virtually their governor, for he appoints all of their local administrative and judicial officers. That gives an explanation in a nutshell, but not an excuse.

NO POLITICAL STATUS

The existence of this state of affairs is due to the fact that the Constitution of the United States neither provides for nor prohibits such representation and voting privileges for the citizens of the seat of government. Provision for representation in the Congress and among the presidential electors applies only to the people of the sovereign States which comprise the Union. It is even silent as to defining the political status of the bona fide residents of the seat of government.

The only reference in the Constitution to the seat of government is found in article I, section 8 and seventeenth clause. It is as follows: "(The Congress shall have power) to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may by cessions of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States."

This completes a full thumbnail diagnosis of the political ills and disabilities which beset these District people. The disease has been called political inequity, un-Americanism at the very heart of the Republic, but by whatever name it is called, it is a loathsome disease which should not be permitted to contaminate the entire country.

In a few words, the ailment is a complete lack of political status through omission by the founding fathers to include in the Constitution any provision for the enjoyment by these people of fundamental rights now denied them. It is hard to believe that those who had rebeled and waged a successful war against a similar condition would create at the seat of the new government a condition duplicating that to which they had so strenuously objected.

DISCUSSED IN 1801

Regarding the failure of the founding fathers to provide for the enjoyment of citizenship rights by the inhabitants of the future seat of government, of unknown location, Augustus Brevoort Woodward, in discussion on Some Considerations on the Government of the Territory of Columbia, published in Washington in 1801, had this to say:

"The novelty of the measure, and the great uncertainty which then prevailed whether the government they proposed would ever pass into actual operation, may serve as an apology for their not entering more into detail. * * * There can, however, be no apology for us of the present day, who have seen this Government prosperous and happy for 13 years; * * * and who now behold its advention to the place of its destination; if we refuse to turn attention to it at this period, and to make a deliberate, effectual, and constitutional provision for its participation in the general councils, and for its domestic government. * * *

"They have themselves afforded an easy and safe avenue to the amendment of that document which was the result of their labors. Not to use that instrument, which they have put into our hands, on an occasion which so urgently demands it, is to yield to a culpable lethargy. It would be an act of treachery to the people whose liberties are thus surrendered to the caprice of a legislature in which they hold no representation; it would be a vital wound to the existence of republicanism, in a nation which had such an example constantly in view."

AMEND CONSTITUTION

The diagnosis and case history having been completed, the next step is to apply the curative remedy. Many experts know that this will be thoroughly effective and will result in the complete Americanization of these voteless and unrepresented Americans.

The need is to amend the Constitution through an enabling provision under which the Congress could cure these unique political disabilities. During nearly 150 years, numerous proposals to amend the Constitution to correct this oversight have been drawn. A number of hearings have been held on such proposals, but the required joint resolutions carrying the proposals have had no consideration on the floor of either House of Congress.

Three times the Senate District Committee has made favorable reports. The House Judiciary Committee once favorably reported it, as did its subcommittee in 1945. Also in 1945, a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported the amendment, but the full committee did not act. The only adverse report was in 1941 by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

A DEBT OF GRATITUDE

The District Federation of Women's Clubs has for years supported the proposal and with other organizations of women participated in most of the hearings. The late Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, head of the woman-suffrage movement, appeared in some hearings and was represented by letter at others.

On one occasion, Mrs. Catt related how she had been questioned in the capitals of South American countries about the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia. "So I find," said Mrs. Catt, "that this question of disfranchisement in the District of Columbia is not a thing that concerns only our own country, but the entire two continents." Continuing, she said: "Now in going about, when people ask me why the people of the District are disfranchised, I find that no history, and no explanation * * * has ever satisfied the person with whom I have been speaking. It never seemed fair, nor right, nor just to me; and I have never consequently been able to make it seem fair to anyone else." She also said: "I have never felt more certain of anything in my life than that an amendment of this character would be quickly passed by the legislatures of our various States by a large majority."

It is interesting that among leading workers for woman suffrage were able District women who gave unstintingly of their time and influence. They worked, knowing all the while that when the nineteenth amendment was added to the Constitution they would not be among the beneficiaries unless and until another amendment was added giving the men and women of the National Capital the right and privilege of being represented in the House and Senate by members of their choice and of voting for the President and Vice President.

The enfranchised women of the Nation owe these District women a debt of gratitude which they should discharge by going wholeheartedly into the fight to Americanize their voteless and unrepresented sisters.

PENDING AMENDMENTS

Proposals for the required amendment are pending in the Committees on the Judiciary of both House and Senate. House Joint Resolution 320, by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, is the same as the Sumners-Capper amendment. Senate Joint Resolution 132, by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, of West Virginia, differs slightly in form.

The Neely proposal would add the following amendment to the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine but such representation and powers shall be no greater than those of a State. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

The District, as the seat of the Government, is a populous and permanently separate unit which is not and should not become a State or a part of a State. The intent of the amendment is to provide that the effective rights of these citizens' participation in the Federal Government shall be as nearly similar to those of citizens of the States as may be, without impairing the supreme authority of the Government over its capital.

When the Constitution is so amended and the Congress has implemented its provisions, then we can let freedom ring.

Membership of the Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan, written by Hon. Marriner Eccles, of the Federal Reserve

Board. This letter was written by Mr. Eccles in response to a statement by Mr. SHAFER upon the floor of the House of Representatives about the Reserve Board. In order that the point of view of Mr. Eccles be made available to the public, I believe this letter should be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 7, 1950.

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: Your statements about the Federal Reserve Board in your speech on the floor of the House on February 21 and in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 15, contain so many misconceptions and misstatements of fact that I cannot permit these utterances to go unchallenged. They do a great injustice to R. M. Evans and M. S. Szymczak, members of the Board of Governors, to the late Gov. Lawrence Clayton, as well as to myself. In making the unfounded charge that the Board has been packed through violating the appointment provisions of the law, you cast wholly unwarranted reflections upon the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Senate itself, in the discharge of its function of confirming appointments. As a matter of simple justice I believe that the correct facts, which are set forth below, should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the first place, you are obviously unfamiliar with the intent of the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act with regard to appointments. Section 10 of the act states:

"In selecting the members of the Board, not more than one of whom shall be selected from any one Federal Reserve district, the President shall have due regard to a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests, and geographical divisions of the country."

This section of the law was purposely drawn in very general terms as Senator Glass was at pains to explain when the Federal Reserve Act was first presented in Congress. The House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which Mr. Glass was the chairman, in a report which you will find on pages 305 et seq. of the authoritative volume, the Federal Reserve System, by the late Henry Parker Willis, who was the economic adviser to the committee, stated:

"The provision that the President in making his selection shall so far as possible select them in order to represent the different geographical regions of the country has been inserted in very general language in order that, while it might not be minutely mandatory, it should be the expressed wish of the Congress that no undue preponderance should be allowed to any one portion of the Nation at the expense of other portions. The provision, however, does not bind the President to any slavish recognition of given geographical sections."

The law provides for seven members of the Board; there are 12 Federal Reserve districts. Hence, all districts could not be represented on the Board at any one time. It was never the intent of the law that the Board should be representative of sectional interests. The wording of the law was designed to negative sectional representation, and to emphasize the public interest through broad distribution of representation of financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests.

Taking up the individual cases in the order in which you discussed them in your speech on the floor of the House:

You state that there was a deliberate evasion of the spirit of the law because Mr. Evans was appointed from the fifth Federal Reserve district. Mr. Evans has resided in the fifth Federal Reserve district since the end of 1936 and, in fact, established his voting residence in Virginia, though this is by no means required as a condition for appointment from a Federal Reserve district. He was appointed in March of 1942 for the unexpired portion of the term of Mr. Chester C. Davis, who resigned to become president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Mr. Davis, who preceded Mr. Evans as the Administrator of the AAA, was himself named to the Federal Reserve Board from the same fifth Federal Reserve district. His appointment, as was that of Governor Evans, was passed upon by a Senate committee of which Senator Glass was a member, and chairman of a subcommittee on Federal Reserve matters. As the chief sponsor of the Federal Reserve Act Senator Glass was presumed to know more about its content and intent than any other living person. Senator Glass did not and, of course, would not, knowing the law, raise any such far-fetched objection as you stated in your speech, either to Mr. Davis' or Mr. Evans' appointment. Both came originally from Iowa. Both had resided for a number of years in the fifth Federal Reserve district. Both were selected to be representative of agriculture nationally.

You also stated that Mr. Evans, at the time of his selection, was a close friend of Marriner Eccles. The fact is that I had only a casual official acquaintance with Mr. Evans. He was strongly recommended by Mr. Davis, who had an intimate knowledge of his fine record in the agricultural field. He was also supported by national farm organizations, particularly the American Farm Bureau Federation. To suggest, as you do, that Mr. Evans would lend himself to a packing of the Board is an affront and an injustice which I resent on his behalf. If you had any acquaintance whatever with the man and his record, you would know how false this imputation is.

Your statements with regard to Mr. Clayton are equally far from the truth. Again, because you are ignorant of the law as it was drawn by Senator Glass, you make the false charge that Mr. Clayton's appointment violated the spirit of the law. Then you state that in January 1945 Eccles had Clayton moved to Boston, Mass., where he assumed the nominal position of president of Clayton Securities Corp., of Boston, a company owned and operated by Clayton's brother. You added that before he went to Boston it was understood that President Roosevelt had agreed to his appointment to the board after he had established a residence in Boston. There was no such agreement whatsoever nor did I have Mr. Clayton moved to Boston. When Mr. Clayton left Utah at my instance in December of 1934 to be my assistant when I became governor of the Federal Reserve Board he sold his home there, gave up his voting residence and settled in Washington. He had no plans for returning to Utah. He went to Boston at the request of his brother, to my great regret and not with my urging—quite the contrary. He bought a home there and became a voting resident of the State. So far as I knew he intended to remain there indefinitely. Your insinuation that this move was a part of a scheme to circumvent the law is utterly baseless and again a grave injustice to a man of independent mind and judgment. I urged his appointment to President Truman because of an internal situation which had developed on the Board. Governor Szymczak was absent on an important mission in Europe as an economic adviser to our military government in Germany. Ronald Ransom, of Atlanta, vice chairman of the Board, was gravely ill, and, in fact, on his deathbed. Governor Vardaman, who had been on the Board a comparatively short time, was visiting the various Federal Reserve banks to become better acquainted with the System and, as a result, was absent for extended intervals. As a consequence, the problem of obtaining a quorum of the Board became acute. In this situation I recommended to President Truman that he name Mr. Clayton inasmuch as he had had a long experience in commercial as well as investment banking, he had been my close associate in Federal Reserve policy matters and administration ever since 1934. In addition to his experience in banking and in the Reserve System he was a graduate of the Harvard Law School. I knew of no one better fitted by experience, by temperament, by qualifications generally than Mr. Clayton to come on the Board and immediately assume the responsibilities which an inexperienced man could not have been expected to shoulder without a long period of apprenticeship.

Again, your imputation of "packing" the Board by Mr. Clayton's appointment is a grave injustice to all concerned, including the President and the members of the Senate committee who thoroughly inquired into his qualifications. I had personally discussed his appointment with Senator TAFT, who was well acquainted with him, with Senator WHITE and with Senator MILLIKIN, the three ranking Republican leaders, and also with Senator TOBEY, then chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. They all indicated that they would favor his confirmation if the appointment were made. Likewise, other New England Senators, including Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE, of Massachusetts; FLANDERS, of Vermont; MCMAHON, of Connecticut; and BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, were consulted and gave him their support. Moreover, the leading bankers of the First Federal Reserve District likewise supported Mr. Clayton's appointment. In fact, I am not aware of any dissenting voice that was raised in the New England district by bankers, Members of Congress, or anyone else. He was confirmed without a dissenting voice on the floor of a Senate in which the Republicans had a majority. Your insinuation that Mr. Clayton was a rubber stamp is as baseless as your other reflections upon Board members.

As for Governor Szymczak's appointment, your speech appears to imply that Board members should not serve longer than 14 years. The provision that "any person appointed as a member of the Board after the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935 shall not be eligible for reappointment as such member after he shall have served a full term of 14 years" was written into the Banking Act of 1935 for the first time and became effective on February 1, 1936. Previously there was no limitation. The 1935 act was not retroactive and there was no requirement, legal or otherwise, to stand in the way of Governor Szymczak's appointment as of February 1, 1948, to a full 14-year term. That was the judgment of counsel for the Board as well as the judgment of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which inquired fully into this question and recommended his confirmation by the Senate, where he was unanimously confirmed. It would have been a great misfortune to lose the services of Governor Szymczak who is still a comparatively young man. His industry and devotion to his task are well known to all who are acquainted with him. Your tortured misreading of the facts are as unjust to him as to the others.

As for myself, it is ludicrous for you to suggest any lack of independence on my part. If there is any one thing with which I have been charged above all else is that I have been too independent of White House or Treasury or other influences, in or out of Government. I have never run for, or sought, public office, nor have I ever engaged in political activities. I have no political or other axes to grind. As one who has spent most of his adult like in banking and business I am quite as solicitous as you are to preserve our system of private enterprise and our democratic institutions. To this end I think it imperative to prevent any "packing" of the Federal Reserve Board and to maintain its independence.

Sincerely yours,

M. S. ECCLES.

Secretary Acheson and the Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle entitled "Secretary Acheson and the Extremists" and an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Challenge to Russia."

I commend the sane and balanced tone of these editorials to the American people. They follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of March 2, 1950]

SECRETARY ACHESON AND THE EXTREMISTS

Secretary of State Acheson has been placed unfairly in a squeeze between extremist groups. We suggest that those Americans who are not extremists take stock of what's going on and give him the solid backing he needs to carry on with his job.

From one side, the leftists are heckling him for being too tough with the Russians. This is being carried on not only by the Communists but by a highly vocal segment of starry-eyed people who still believe humility on the part of America is the key to an accommodation with Russia. Both of these groups, for their various reasons, want Acheson to approach the Kremlin, hat in hand, and petition for another hearing on the atomic-energy matter and related problems. This would be highly pleasing to Stalin, and gratifying to Communists everywhere, but Acheson can see no further gain from holding our hat in our hand, and we believe most Americans thoroughly agree with him.

From the other side, the extreme rightists are giving him relentless trouble over the Hiss matter. From his statement expressing compassion for Hiss and from his previous statement that he would not turn his back on his personal friend, they are construing Acheson as a condoner of treachery and a partisan of communism. We do not see how this follows. It seems to us quite compatible with fundamental Americanism for a man to feel compassion for another, whatever the depths of his trouble. And Acheson's refusal to turn his back on his long-time friend impressed us as a position in support of human decency, rather than in favor of whatever defections of which Hiss might be guilty.

One thing is certainly clear—Acheson cannot be guilty of the accusations thrown at him by both sides, for they are irreconcilable.

We suggest that a careful review of Acheson's life and of his record in public office will disclose no shred of actual evidence that he is other than a human being and an earnest, devoted American. And his recent record convinces us that he is also a singularly competent Secretary of State, performing ably under a set of international conditions that render that job more difficult, and more critical in terms of potential consequences, than it has ever been in history.

Since the manner of performance of this international task bears importantly upon the lives, welfare, and survival, of all of us, we regret these systematic mud-slinging campaigns as aiming to diminish the effectiveness of the Secretary of State in the performance of his main duties. We do not, of course, expect the Communists to pipe down, and it would probably be starry-eyed on our part to expect the extreme rightists to realize they are playing into the Communists' hands. But there is need and opportunity for the overwhelming majority of nonextremists to raise their own voices in behalf of fair play, and a reasonable chance for Acheson to do the job he is trying to do for all of us.

[From the New York Times of Friday, March 17, 1950]

CHALLENGE TO RUSSIA

In two major statements on American foreign policy Secretary Acheson has challenged Soviet Russia to make good with deeds its propaganda for peace and the coexistence of the Communist world and the free world. In what may be taken as a reply to recent speeches in Moscow, Mr. Acheson has offered a seven-point program on the basis of which peaceful coexistence could be achieved and the cold war ended.

This program, in effect, calls upon Soviet Russia to halt its policy of aggression and to cooperate, with unmistakable evidence of good faith, in finding peaceful settlements for all outstanding problems. It particularly calls upon the Soviet Union to cooperate in concluding peace treaties with Germany and Japan, and final settlements with Austria and Korea, in conformity with Russia's wartime pledges and with the principles of the United Nations. It calls for the withdrawal of Soviet military and police forces from the satellite areas, so that the nations in these areas may achieve genuine independence and self-government, as agreed upon at Yalta. It calls for an end of Soviet obstruction in the United Nations and for Soviet cooperation in finding an effective system for the control of atomic weapons and the limitation of other armaments. Finally, it calls upon the Kremlin to stop using Communist fifth columns for the overthrow of other governments, to cooperate in assuring proper treatment for diplomatic representatives, and in general to cease distorting the motives and purposes of other nations and to open up Russia for an exchange of persons and ideas with other countries.

Mr. Acheson is, of course, aware that this program demands an abandonment of the Communist program of world revolution and a reversal of the policies which the Soviets have pursued during and since the war. For this reason he entertains little hope that the Soviet leaders will accept his challenge. Yet this is the only program on which we can negotiate without betraying the principles for which we stand and abandoning the nations which have placed their trust in us. It is a program for peace, but not peace at any price, or peace with dishonor.

Hope of progress in this direction not being bright, Mr. Acheson faces the grim alternative. This can be only a continuation of the cold war, in which we must wage total diplomacy until an honorable and trustworthy settlement can be reached. We cannot use Soviet methods of totalitarian diplomacy, but we can use programs of our own to build and strengthen a free world in which our way of life can flourish. This is the purpose of the Truman doctrine, the European recovery program, the North Atlantic and Rio Pacts, the military assistance program, the point 4 program for developing underdeveloped areas, and our championship of a world order based upon the United Nations.

Heretofore these programs have been of primary aid to western Europe. Now Mr. Acheson proposes to extend them to Asiatic nations as well, wherever they can be made effective within the limits of our resources. Recognizing that Asia is undergoing a revolution, he calls upon the forces of both freedom and nationalism in Asia to join in the struggle of the free world against Soviet imperialism and colonialism, and promises whatever aid we can give, either military or economic, as the case may warrant. He specifically warns the Chinese people against permitting their new Communist masters to plunge them into aggressive adventures beyond their borders.

This is a program which the American people can endorse as the minimum program for the achievement of the aims for which we fought in two world wars. It is a program aimed primarily at making peace with Russia. In supporting it, we will do well to consider the question whether we must wait upon Russia in all these matters, or whether we can adapt this program, in cooperation with the rest of the free nations, to extend the area of peace and freedom by making peace with our former enemies. This, too, would be an act of total diplomacy, the possibilities of which deserve examination.

Training Program for the United States Coast Guard Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent letter to me from Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. Admiral Sherman sets forth his reasons why the United States Coast Guard Reserve ought to be provided with a training program. The Nation understands that port security will be a question of major concern in the future. The House of Representatives is presently considering the wisdom of activating the Coast Guard Reserve in this session of the Congress. Admiral Sherman's views will be helpful to this consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE
CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1950.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I have your letter of March 10, as well as that of March 7, which you gave me during our attendance at Operation Portrex.

Your letter of March 10 is very much appreciated. I am grateful for your kind remarks and for your offer to be of help; both are quite heartening.

With respect to your letter of March 7, I feel that the interests of national defense will be well served by the establishment of a Coast Guard Reserve. That, of course, will require funds for the training of such a reserve at the present time. An annual appropriation of $4,100,000 for such purpose is not excessive.

In the event of mobilization, it is contemplated that the Coast Guard will perform the following specific functions: (1) Port security; (2) harbor master duty at advance bases; (3) beach patrol duty; (4) reactivation and manning of high-frequency direction-finding stations; and (5) harbor defense—inshore and offshore patrols in small craft.

A reserve component of the Coast Guard should be trained to proficiency in the foregoing matters. Such training would not

duplicate training now being given the Naval Reserve.

Thank you for your letters and your good wishes.

Cordially yours,

FORREST SHERMAN,
Admiral, United States Navy.

Fertilizer Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that fertilizer is a necessary product in the development of any successful agricultural program. Because of its importance and because of the necessity that the Congress and the various State legislatures be constantly alert to what is taking place in the fertilizer field, I have tried to secure the attention of the Congress to legislation that ought to be enacted into law. I offered H. R. 3045 more than a year ago in an attempt to deal with this problem.

Mr. William G. Holman, of Washington, has been devoting himself to this problem for years, and he recently wrote a letter under date of March 14, 1950, to the National Fertilizer Association, which is informative on this subject. In order that the record may be kept straight, under unanimous consent, I include that letter as part of these remarks:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 14, 1950.*
THE NATIONAL FERTILIZER ASSOCIATION,
Continental Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have just read a statement made by you in the March isue of the Fertilizer Review which reads as follows: "We knew from the price indexes that the cost of a ton of fertilizer is higher today than it was in 1925. The actual figure is—let's see—8 percent; a ton of fertilizer costs about 8 percent more now than it did 25 years ago."

A statement made by Mr. O. V. Wells, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, and published in the December 1948 issue of the Plant Food Journal, shows that your statement is far from being correct.

Mr. Wells said that: "The Bureau of Agricultural Economics indexes indicate that fertilizer prices last fall were only 55 percent above the average for the prewar years, 1935–39," and the Bureau probably did not take into consideration the facts that I shall bring to your attention.

Namely, that the farmer is forced to use 50 percent more fertilizer per acre today than would be necessary if the fertilizer had contained the same proportions of water-soluble and organic nitrogen that it did prior to 1925.

You failed to tell the public that prior to 1925, only one-third of the nitrogen in fertilizers was derived from water-soluble sources—such as nitrate of soda, and sulfate of ammonia—if we are to believe the source tags that appeared on the bags.

The remaining two-thirds of the nitrogen was derived from organic sources, such as dried blood, fish scrap, animal tankage, and cottonseed meal.

You probably know that Federal and State agronomists recommended these proportions, and believed that one-third of the nitrogen from quickly soluble sources was as much as the plant could take up before some of it was washed in the soil water beyond the reach of the plant roots.

You know that when fertilizer was made this way, the average consumption per acre was three to four bags—and it grew tobacco that made Buck Duke and Dick Reynolds rich and famous.

You also know that soon after the enactment of the Webb-Pomerene Act, a few fertilizer manufacturers acquired control of the phosphate market—see Federal Trade Commission report—and that soon after that they compelled other manufacturers to increase the water-soluble nitrogen content of the fertilizer to 65 percent, and to reduce the organic nitrogen content to 35 percent.

The farmers complained about this radical formula change, and soon thereafter, the State laws were amended. These amendments permitted the manufacturers to increase the total nitrogen content of all fertilizers 21 percent, to take the source tags off of the fertilizer bags, and to use almost unlimited proportions of the cheap, water-soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done.

The radical reduction in the organic nitrogen content of the fertilizer forced the farmer to use at least 50 percent more fertilizer per acre in order to get enough organic nitrogen to feed his crop to maturity, and this increased the amount of the farmer's national fertilizeer bill $250,000,000.

The use of so much of the cheap, water-soluble sources of nitrogen was soon followed by an extensive spread of destructive plant diseases that had never plagued the farmers prior to the time these radical formula changes were made, and eminent scientists believe that food crops grown with an excess of soluble nitrogen have a lot to do with the increased incidence of vascular diseases and degenerative diseases.

The record shows that the National Fertilizer Association was indicted and fined $9,000 in a Federal court in North Carolina for violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and for having exerted an undue influence on State lawmakers, and law enforcement officials, and the attention of the Congress has recently been called to the fact that the fertilizer interests have been subsidizing the research work of the Bureau of Plant Industry. For what purpose, gentlemen, for the public good or for the purpose of enlarging and extending the corrupting influence of these predatory corporations?

This is an evil influence, gentlemen, and one that strikes at the foundations of popular government.

If I were in your place, and wanted the respect and esteem of the public, I would openly advocate the enactment of H. R. 3045 that will compel all manufacturers to be honest with the farmers; such a law would make it easier for State enforcement agencies to see that the farmer got an honestly made fertilizer, and would help to protect the health of the people.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM G. HOLMAN.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks in the RECORD the proclamation of Wildlife Restoration Week, March 20–25, 1950, by the Honorable William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of Maryland:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, ANNAPOLIS, MD., GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, WILDLIFE RESTORATION WEEK, MARCH 20–25, 1950

Whereas 11 years ago the President of the United States declared the week beginning March 20 as Wildlife Restoration Week; and

Whereas those interested in conserving our valuable wild birds, mammals, fish, oysters, and crabs, have continued to observe this period from year to year by fitting celebrations and meetings to bring before the public the need for protecting and conserving these replaceable natural resources; and

Whereas Maryland is one of the richest States in the Nation in these resources, and much progress has been made by nature lovers, farmers, sportsmen, and all conservationists in providing a better environment for wildlife. It is, therefore, proper and fitting that we pause in our daily rush and struggle for survival, and give our valuable wildlife and its perpetuation, due consideration.

Now, therefore, I, William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor of Maryland, do hereby proclaim and declare the week beginning Monday, March 20, to Saturday, March 25, as Wildlife Restoration Week and urge the people of the State interested in and concerned with wildlife and the welfare and progress of the State, to properly observe this period, and educate the people in every way possible to the necessity of preserving and increasing our wildlife resources through proper land-use programs and wise conservation laws; and to cooperate with all the State agencies charged with their management, so that they may be preserved and wisely utilized and enjoyed by this and all future generations.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Maryland, done at the city of Annapolis this 13th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1950.

WILLIAM PRESTON LANE, Jr.

By the Governor:

VIVIAN V. SIMPSON,
Secretary of State.

Veterans and the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, two major proposals involving veterans and of much interest to our citizens are now very much to the front in Washington. One has to do with the educational features of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and the other with the Hoover Commission report and recommendations on the Veterans' Administration itself.

A report to Congress by President Truman, recommending a tightening up of the regulations having to do with GI education at Government expense is now before it. Weaknesses in failures in the program as operated since the war are pointed out, and the President has recommended that Congress take suitable action, as it has done previously with respect to other types of training, to assure that all trade and vocational training conforms with the original sound intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Advance notice to veterans taking GI educational courses will be issued on April 1, 1950, and will set up the Veterans' Administration policy for future guidance in such matters. In a report to Congress Veterans' Administration Administrator Gray states, "the crux of the matter is whether a veteran who has taken a course of training any time prior to July 25, 1951, and who has completed it or voluntarily withdrawn prior to July 25, 1951, will be eligible to initiate another course in the same or different field at any time between July 25, 1951, and July 25, 1956, the final termination date of the education and training provisions of the law for most veterans. This regulation says he will not be eligible to do so. We are convinced that this is in accord with the clear intent and legislative history of the law as well as being sound public policy. This regulation is important. The reason it is being issued so far in advance of July 25, 1951, is that this advance notice will provide opportunity for all veterans who are affected by it to make their plans in the light of it."

TIME PROVISIONS

The original servicemen's readjustment act provided that veterans should initiate any course they intended to take within 2 years after discharge or the termination of the war, which ever was later. This time was extended to 4 years by the Seventy-ninth Congress. For the purpose of this law the termination date of World War II was set at July 25, 1947, or 1½ years after general demobilization. Under this time limit most veterans would have had 5 to 5½ years after discharge in which to initiate a course of training.

We will be glad to assist any veteran in the Eighth District in any problem which he may have in this connection by obtaining additional information for him if he will send us his C number and information on his problem.

Tightening up is scheduled for some training courses and for a clamping down on schools and courses not beneficial to veterans. The President's message points out that there are many instances where a veteran was trained for occupation for which he is not suited and in which he will be unable to secure a job. The VA has recommended that Congress strengthen the educational program by prescribing minimum standards. Failure of some schools to cooperate has resulted in a volume of overpayments to students who ceased to take courses. VA also asks legislation to require schools to promptly report when veterans discontinue, interrupt, or fail to attend their courses.

Hoover Commission report on VA is now a storm center in veterans' circles. Certain officials of the American Legion have been outspoken in opposition to parts of the Hoover Commission recommendation for thorough overhauling of the structure of the Veterans' Administration. Similar opposition has been voiced by the Consolidated War Veterans Councils, representing nearly every organized veteran group in Michigan. The American Veterans Committee and the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the latter composed of many veterans, too, have endorsed the Hoover Commission proposals.

HOSPITALS

The Commission pointed out United States hospitals are being operated by the Army, Navy, VA, and Public Health Service and recommended these should be combined under one Federal system named United Medical Administration. The four agencies would operate Government hospitals in this field jointly. Penal and Indian hospitals would not be included. The Commission has recommended that all Government building construction be done under Interior Department. This would include VA hospitals but the VA would be represented on Interior's medical board.

INSURANCE

Pointing to deficiencies in the Veterans' Administration handling of United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance, the Hoover Commission proposes that an insurance corporation be set up within the VA to handle insurance matters.

LOAN GUARANTIES

The VA guarantees loans to veterans up to 50 percent of loans but not to exceed $4,000 on real property and $2,000 on personal and guarantees up to 20 percent of loans partially insured by FHA. Pointing out the VA is inexperienced in the lending field and foreclosures will add a burden of real-estate management, the Hoover Commission recommends that the veterans' housing loan guarantee program be transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Agency of Government, except the VA should continue to certify the eligibility of a veteran for these guaranties.

Duplications are also hit in the Hoover reports which show the VA has 88 different manuals, 665 varieties of technical bulletins, and over 400 circulars. It says there is also an excessive number of staff officers on major programs causing confusion. Lack of cooperation of the armed forces in fully advising servicemen of rights and insurance is blamed for other difficulties.

Great Record of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the New York Times of March 10, 1950, on the thrilling story of the accomplishments of the HOLC, which through these years has done so much to protect the American home:

WASHINGTON, March 9.—A faded document of a year of despair was swapped in President Truman's office today for a $26,000,000 check for the Treasury.

The money was the first installment being paid by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on the $200,000,000 advanced by the Government as capital stock in 1933 and afterward.

Thus, with the black ink of solvency, the Government began to write the final chapter of the vast operations that saved thousands of homes from foreclosure during the depression era. The $3,500,000,000 of bonded indebtedness of the HOLC has been paid off.

Only the old document was at the White House today. It was dated August 8, 1934, and it was a typewritten stock certificate, with faded signatures, for $26,000,000. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, had been notified by the Federal Reserve Bank in New York that HOLC had deposited the $26,000,000 check there.

Thereupon Mr. Snyder took out his pen, receipted the certificate and surrendered it to William K. Divers, Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board.

Expressing his pleasure in a long statement, President Truman harked back to the days when city homes were being foreclosed at the rate of 1,000 every day. He recalled that some people feared the Treasury would suffer huge losses by lending directly to home owners. Now that HOLC would be liquidated within a year, he asserted it would leave the Treasury a surplus of several million dollars.

VOICE OF AMERICA BEAMS STORY

The Voice of America made the most of the story, beaming it to Europe and over the iron curtain, apparently as an example of how a capitalist democracy copes with adverse economic forces.

"The record of the Home Owners Loan Corporation illustrates a lesson that has been proved time and time again in recent years," said President Truman. "It is that by wise use of its powers, the Government can engage in broad programs of social benefit—and conduct them efficiently and without waste of public funds.

"The Home Owners Loan Corporation was successful in terms of dollars and cents. But much more important, it was successful in terms of human values—in helping hundreds of thousands of families to maintain themselves as self-reliant home owners, secure in their hard-earned property, and free of the threat of eviction through no fault of their own.

"We should all be proud of this demonstration of bold and constructive Government action for the good of the whole country."

The certificate paid today was not the earliest that was issued, but it was the largest outstanding and so it was given priority for first repayment. Others at the ceremony were Raymond M. Foley, the Housing Administrator; J. S. Baughman, general manager of HOLC; O. K. Laroque and J. Alston Adams, members of the Home Loan Bank Board, and John Fahey, the former chairman of this Board.

Mr. Divers said the HOLC still has 125,000 accounts amounting to $175,000,000 on homes, the remainder of a huge program that once entailed more than 1,000,000 family accounts and $3,500,000,000 in their mortgages. The HOLC he continued, lost more than $300,000,000, or around 10 percent in defaults, but that this will be more than made up by the time liquidation is completed.

SALE TO BANK HERE CITED

The outstanding accounts, Mr. Divers continued, are being sold in public sales to banks, loan associations, and other fiscal institutions, all at better than 100 cents on the dollar—at premiums ranging at a fraction of 1 percent to 2½ percent. As an example, he mentioned that the Dime Savings Bank of New York about 6 months ago bought the 42,000 outstanding accounts in New York State for more than $100,000,000.

Mr. Truman credited the Democratic administration in 1933 for passage of the Home Owners Loan Act. He added:

"In 3 years, the HOLC refunded the overdue mortgages of more than 1,000,000 families with long-term loans at lower interest rates. These loans, with later advances, amounted to nearly $3,500,000,000.

"Not only did these funds save families from foreclosure, but at the same time it enabled banks, insurance companies, savings and loan associations, and other real estate investors to exchange defaulted mortgages for $2,750,000,000 in cash and Government bonds. This new lifeblood saved many hundreds of financial institutions—permitting them to pay off their depositors or investors as necessary and to remain in business.

"Further, the HOLC program aided city and town governments in meeting their pay rolls and keeping up their essential services. As paying for the overdue taxes of HOLC borrowers, local governments received nearly half a billion dollars in less than 3 years."

House Resolutions 508 and 509

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my remarks in connection with House Resolutions 508 and 509 that I introduced last week were included in the RECORD of March 13 and 14, I include the text of these resolutions as follows:

House Resolution 508

Resolution calling upon Interstate Commerce Commission in view of recent accident to ascertain adequate safety devices of Long Island Railroad

Whereas a railroad accident of unprecedented severity and tragedy occurred on the Long Island Railroad at Rockville Centre, N. Y., on Friday night, February 17, as a result of which 32 passengers were killed and more than 100 were injured, many of whom were valued, useful, and long-time residents of Suffolk County; and

Whereas it is clear that the catastrophe could have been prevented had the Long Island Railroad used one of the several recognized safety devices available for stopping automatically a moving train, where the engineer has disregarded a stop signal; and

Whereas the Long Island Railroad is at the present time under the control of and is technically operated by trustees in bankruptcy appointed by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission is the agency responsible for the installation and approval of requisite railroad safety devices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission, the body having jurisdiction over railroad safety operations, be requested to undertake an investigation of the adequacy of safety devices upon the Long Island Railroad and take such steps as may be found necessary to make such safety devices modern, efficient, and secure in all respects.

House Resolution 509

Resolution for the investigation of organized crime

Whereas organized crime constitutes a growing threat to the general welfare and internal security of our Nation; and

Whereas it appears that criminal organizations, syndicates, and mobs are engaged in interstate gambling and racketeering and insidiously attempt to intimidate, bribe, corrupt, and interfere with the proper functions of government officials; and

Whereas such organized crime increases our tax burden by defrauding the Federal Government of millions of dollars of revenue annually in many ways, including the filing of false income-tax returns: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the appointment was made.

For the purpose of determining whether additional legislation should be enacted in order to more effectively combat organized crime, the committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of organized crime in the United States, and further directed as speedily as possible to report their findings and recommendations.

For the purpose of making such investigations, the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any persons designated by such chairman or member.

Administration of Law in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine has just sent me the original copy of my charge to the grand jury of Greene County, Ala., in the year 1921, when I was serving as the special judge under the orders of Gov. Thomas E. Kilby and Chief Justice John Anderson, of the Supreme Court of Alabama, holding a special term of the Circuit Court of Greene County. This charge was, of course, taken down by the official court reporter, and I suppose was written out and given by the reporter either to the foreman of the grand jury and after the adjournment of the special term of court got into the hands of my friend, who was especially interested, as he had been accidentally shot by a friend whom he was seeking to aid during a warning visit made by the local Ku Klux Klan.

Thinking that this ancient history might be of current interest, the charge is here set out:

CHARGE OF JUDGE SAM HOBBS IN EMPANELING THE GRAND JURY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT IN GREENE COUNTY, ALA.

Gentlemen of the grand jury, it is certainly a pleasure to be with you, and seek, as we are all seeking, to have justice fully, fairly, and impartially administered in Greene County. I know that many of you personally regret that Judge Jones is not to be with you at this time, and I sympathize with you in those feelings, but I hope that you will let me warm myself at the fireside of your friendship, and make new friends, and I bespeak the same consideration for Solicitor Thompson, who is to be with you in your deliberations and is to assist you in every way he can. We, over in the fourth circuit, think him the best solicitor in the State of Alabama. Of course, you have just as much right to your opinion as I have to mine, and I guess you esteem your solicitor as highly as we do ours. I assure you that it is a pleasure for both of us to be here and work with you, seeking the common good, as we are all sworn and bound to do.

In the darker days succeeding the dark and bloody days of the sixties, when a justly proud civilization lay prostrate in the dust, trampled upon by a horde of enemies drunken with the new wine of authority; when the last vestige of power—civil, political, and military—was in the hands of the newly freed slaves and scallawags and carpetbaggers; when ignorance was enthroned; when virtue was a vice, and culture a crime in the eyes of the authorities; in that night of despair, when the stars of hope had, one by one, flickered and faded and died, after superhuman endurance, through a long and terrible travail, from the mother of all invention, sired by the dauntless spirit of the men who followed Lee, the "invisible empire" was born and a new day dawned.

Out of the waste of untilled fields, from the ashes of ruined homes, the heroic remnant of our broken armies sprang silently but quickly to the new task. Ignorance was dethroned; vice suppressed; livable conditions established; civilization saved.

Then, the only legitimate ends of such an organization having been achieved, those brave men forever abandoned the mask and sheet, disbanded, and continued to build the new South, the blessings of which we now enjoy.

All honor to them, for they took the only course which was possible under the conditions they faced, and did their duty well, striving for law and order. But with the reestablishment of real self-government, the last reason or excuse for the existence of the Ku Klux Klan vanished. Our fathers realized this and voluntarily and gladly let the Klan pass into history. The klansmen thenceforth were and are the strongest supporters of our Government of law, administered by officials chosen by the legally qualified voters.

There can be no excuse nor valid reason for the new organization masquerading in the costume and disgracing the name of the old except the fat profits which go into the pockets of its paid organizers and officers.

Do they say the officers of the law fail to do their duty? We have a Supreme Court which has many times proven that such officials can and will be promptly impeached. And if any official in Alabama fails to live up to his oath of office and willfully fails to enforce the law he has sworn to uphold and enforce, he should be impeached. It is the duty of grand juries to recommend impeachment in such cases, without fear or favor.

There is no possible excuse for any man, or set of men, to seek to trample the law underfoot or take the law into their own hands today. I know that you gentlemen will agree with me fully on this.

There is a rumor in this State that you have such an organization in this county. Whether that is true or not, I don't know, and it is none of my affair except that under my oath I am bound to do what I can to see that our laws are enforced. I am told that these men who compose this organization are gentlemen; that some of them are gentlemen of the old school; that they are law-abiding citizens trying to do their duty to enforce the law, as they see that duty. If that be true, then I, in the name of law and

order, invite every one of them to act as a gentleman, to act the part of a law-abiding citizen, and come into this court and confess his wrong, plead guilty, and assist us in enforcing the law as the law says it should be enforced, and we will welcome each addition to the ranks of good government. But we cannot for an instant consider any compromise with this thing if it is here. There is no longer any occasion whatever that such an organization be allowed to exist in Alabama. Our citizenship must throw this thing off, and, gentlemen, it is squarely up to you in your deliberations this week to think of your sworn duty; to think of the oath you have taken; to diligently inquire and true presentment make of all indictable offenses given you in charge by the court, or which may come to your knowledge.

Gentlemen of the grand jury, I charge you that if there is any organization in Greene County, where two or more men have met together for the purpose of violating the law in any way, this is, of itself, without more, a violation of the law, and it is your duty to indict them. Furthermore, where any man, or group of men, commits an assault and battery on another, that is another violation of the law. Where any two or more men threaten, or whip another, and invite or order him to leave the county, and so obtain his promise to do so, that is another violation of the law. Then there is the law against mayhem, if the activities of any man, or body of men, work such injuries to the person of another. So you see the law covers and prohibits the meetings of any organization such as sanction the doings of the modern Ku Klux Klan prove it to be as well as a good many of its activities. This thing which was here conceived, no doubt, with good intentions, is really an organized embodiment of a spirit of lawlessness. It breathes defiance to constituted authority, authority which the members of this organization themselves helped to constitute, no doubt. Its mission is to administer laws not written upon the statute books of Alabama, but written according to the dictates of its own desires upon the winds of its passion and prejudice. The only authority this organization has or claims, is the rule of do it. They do not play the game of government by the rules of our forefathers, as handed down to us, and as they exist in the constitution and laws of the State of Alabama.

The Constitution of Alabama guarantees to every citizen (no matter how poor or humble, no matter how grave a charge may be made against him) that his life, liberty, and person shall be respected; that he have a copy of the accusation against him; that he be not accused or arrested, or detained, except in cases ascertained by law, and according to the form which the same has prescribed; and that the right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate. The new Ku Klux Klan says that no man shall have any of these rights if the Klan chooses to deny them. Like the Kaiser, they regard the Constitution merely as a "scrap of paper." Gentlemen, we can't stand for it. If it can't be handled intelligently and firmly by your body by reason of failure to produce witnesses who know the truth and will tell it, then we possibly can get some indictments and convictions which will enable us to get Ku Klux indictments next week, and if not then, the week after, and if not then, the next week, and if not then, the week after that, for this thing is going to be rooted out of Greene County, no matter what it takes in men, in money, or in time. This thing has got to go. Not because I say it: but because the law says it.

Do any of you envy Russia? I know you do not, because you have looked me in the eye and sworn here that you believed in the enforcement of all the laws of this land. They don't believe in that in Russia. They believe in what they call a pure democracy. The only thing pure about it is the purity of the blood and gold ground from those poor, misguided people, and the only reason it exists today is because of the spirit which, in a small degree, is being manifested in your county. Lenin and Trotzky would joyously endorse and praise this sort of thing, with all their hearts. They would ask no better than to be able to lead this so-called crusade. I don't say that all these men are like them; there may be some misguided gentlemen who have become involved in this thing without a full sense of the enormity of what they were doing. I can't help believing that there are many members of this organization in this county that have been inveigled into it without thinking, and I invite all of them to do the thing which gentlemen ought to do under the circumstances. I invite them to accept this invitation by assisting in the vindication and enforcement of the law, and if they will but give one-half as much time to helping enforce the law as they have been giving to the Ku Klux Klan, every grievance of which they complain can be wiped out, to their entire satisfaction.

If I don't please these self-constituted regulators of society, they can do what they please with me, but this thing is going if it takes every dollar in the Treasury of this State, and every solicitor and every judge and takes the last man in the jury box.

Gentlemen, the law is and must be supreme; it must be enforced. You have sworn (and I know that you will keep your oath) to assist in doing it. You and those who from time to time constitute the grand jury of this court are the fountainhead of law enforcement in this county, and if you allow the fountainhead to become contaminated with this impurity, then it will be a sad day for Greene County; I don't believe that you are going to allow anything to stay your hand in the rigid enforcement of the law. Take the knife of the law, gentlemen, and cut this cancerous growth out of the body politic of Greene County before it goes too far.

Whether or not there have been any violations of the prohibition laws in your midst, I don't know. But I am told that there have been; that there are flagrant violations of them in Greene County. If this be true, that is a condition of affairs which threatens the bedrock upon which the structure of the good citizenship of this county stands. Common violation of any law, without adequate punishment, produces a disregard of all laws. So even if there were no better reason, we should enforce our prohibition laws. But there are any number of better reasons. These laws should be enforced for the sake of the blessings which they have brought—the money with which our savings banks are bulging, which would have been spent for grog; the happiness of many a home which had been cursed by liquor; the wonderful diminution in the number of crimes.

Over in Bibb County a few weeks ago we had one of the foulest crimes that was ever designed in hell. The evidence obtained by the solicitor in his investigation showed that this foul fiend had deliberately cleared off a spot where the crime was to be committed; that he went there the evening before and waylaid that little girl as she was returning from a singing school, but lost his nerve, and that it was only when a white man sold him a quart of whisky the next morning that he was enabled to nerve himself up to do that crime. How would you like to be that white man?

Gentlemen, this mean liquor breeds crime just as a mosquito bite breeds malaria. One drink, as one bite, may be a small and trivial thing, but it may mean death. One violation of this law may be harmless, or freighted with awful consequences. This summer I was told of a young man who bought a quart of liquor at Calera and was dead when his train reached Birmingham. It is not only dangerous in its collateral consequences, but per se, and so the only safe course, as well as the only honorable course under our oaths, is to enforce this law rigidly and impartially.

Gentlemen, don't let our young men, and, God save the mark, our young ladies, too, be contaminated by this accursed traffic. Say to yourself, I am going to do my duty no matter if it is my brother who should be indicted, for this traffic in poison has got to go. And the minute you say it, the perfume of your resolution will make the atmosphere sweeter and cleaner, human life will be safer in Greene County.

Let me tell you this: There is no other conceivable reason why our land values down here are not as high as they are in Illinois or Indiana than that the people up there don't realize that their lives would be safe in Alabama. Those people talk as if we are so bloodthirsty that we can't get up an appetite for breakfast until we have killed a man. They have circulated such rumors about the South, and while churches and schools and good roads have much to do with land values, yet the fact which makes the greatest difference in values is that the people, deep down in their hearts, are afraid to come here. They think the Negro is as good as the white man and that they will be treated the way they believe the Negroes are treated down here. Gentlemen, we must make human life safe in Greene County, and when you do, then you have started on the road to prosperity. So, even when we pitch our thinking upon the lower plane of dollars and cents, leaving out of consideration the higher moral values, it certainly behooves us to throw every safeguard around the priceless gift of human life, and do all that we possibly can to make its sanctity felt and respected.

Gentlemen of the grand jury, I could go on at length discussing the various violations of the law; I will probably have something more to say to you later in the week, as there are other violations of the law which I am required to give you in charge, but I want to be sure not to divert your attention from these three things which I have tried to stress in this charge. I hope that you will concentrate upon them and stay with them, and "fight it out along this line, if it takes all summer."

It is my pleasure to be with you gentlemen and serve your county in any way that I can. If I can be of any assistance to you, either day or night, I hope that you will command me. Mr. Thompson will be with you. He also is anxious to be of service. I hope that you will esteem him almost as much as we do when you have come to know him. Retire to your room, gentlemen, and begin your work, and I hope that you may accomplish the things that need to be accomplished in Greene County.

The Saga of John R. Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a speech recently made by the noted radio commentator Cedric Foster as reported in an article by the Clinton Daily Item.

Mr. Foster's brilliant speech was delivered at the centennial banquet celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of my home town of Clinton, Mass., an event which marked the beginning of a celebration which will continue the week of May 28.

The article follows:

THE SAGA OF JOHN R. FOSTER IS RECOUNTED BY HIS DESCENDANT IN BRILLIANT ADDRESS AT THE CENTENNIAL BANQUET

The Item regrets that the manuscript of the appropriate address delivered by Cedric Foster, internationally known Yankee network commentator, in responding to the toast, "Fond Recollections," at the centennial banquet, Tuesday night, failed to reach this office in time for its insertion in the Wednesday edition.

Mr. Foster held the undivided attention of the more than 700 guests, all of whom wished he might have extended his address as it revealed an unusual story that needed to be told to this generation, covering the life work of one of Clinton's philanthropists in a most intimate way.

The speaker's fine personality and his diction so typical of leading commentators over the air networks combined to present one of the highlights of the program.

The advantage of having in high places men such as Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN and Presidential Secretary Matthew J. Connelly was again demonstrated as, lacking the presence of these two distinguished Clintonians in Washington, the banqueters probably would never have been favored by Mr. Foster's presence here to pay tribute to the town and to his famous relative, the late John R. Foster.

It was while the speaker was in Washington that he came in contact with Secretary Connelly and Congressman PHILBIN whom he knew hailed from Clinton, a town that held deep interest to him and when they casually informed him that a centennial banquet would be served March 14 and asked him if he would be interested in attending the event he immediately and eagerly accepted the invitation.

In presenting Mr. Foster, Toastmaster PHILBIN said:

"The name of the next speaker is known throughout the Nation and in many parts of the world.

"It is particularly well known in Clinton not only because of the fame and success of our speaker—though that is gratifying—but also because it was closely and prominently identified with and indicative of the industrial progress, the civic spirit and benevolence of the town.

"His antecedents—one in particular, the late John R. Foster was a prominent citizen of Clinton during the last generation. It was he who donated to the town the beautiful water fountain which in resplendence and grace stood for years in Central Park until it was demolished by the hurricane of 1938.

"Our speaker is well versed in Clinton as you will now observe. Though not born and raised here he has caught the spirit of Clinton so completely that he is like a native son. And we are proud to claim him.

"Famed writer, lecturer, and noted radio commentator, he stands at the very top of his profession. It is very kind of him to be with us. I am highly honored to be present to respond to the toast, 'Fond recollections,' the distinguished and noted radio commentator and publicist—Cedric Foster."

DELIGHTED TO COME HERE

In his response to the toast, Mr. Foster said:

"I am delighted to be with you this evening, here in Clinton, Mass. I don't suppose that I have been in Clinton more than 3 or 4 times in my life. With the exception of your distinguished Congressman PHILBIN and Secretary Matthew J. Connelly, I don't suppose that I know any people from Clinton. Yet Clinton, Mass., holds a most affectionate place in my heart.

"Here in Clinton it was that my grandfather's brother, John R. Foster, came shortly after the Civil War, to settle and to start the beginnings of what I believe to be the first chain store system in the United States. Certainly that holds true of the clothing business to which he devoted his life and it may well be true of all types of business.

"Here it was that my father Arthur L. Foster, came to stay with his uncle, John R. Foster three-quarters of a century ago. My father, at that time was a lad in his early teens. He came down from the farm at Moretown, Vt., the same farm, incidentally, on which John R. Foster was born, at the request of his uncle.

"Here it was that John R. Foster afforded my father, his nephew, the opportunity of obtaining an education in the Clinton high school. There was no quid pro quo involved in that opportunity."

NO EXCEPTION FROM WORK

"John R. Foster, like so many of his contemporaries, was a rigid, and at times a hard taskmaster. The quid pro quo was not motivated, however, entirely by these qualities in his nature.

"John R. Foster believed that a boy should earn his keep and he was determined that my father, his nephew, should be no exception.

"The result was that in exchange for room and board and education, if you had been walking through the streets of Clinton 75 years ago, you might have seen in the wee hours of the morning, a tall, slender lad making his way to his uncle's barn there to water and curry and comb the horses and clean the stables.

"When these tasks were finished he would return to the house to carry in the fuel from the woodshed and to polish brightly his uncle's boots, left methodically by 'John R.' as he was known to his intimates to his face and as he was called behind his back by those who did not know him as well, or stood in awe of him, outside of his bedroom door."

TRAINING APPRECIATED

"In his later life my father, who died in 1922, often referred to his days in Clinton and he impressed upon me that it was the training that he received from the hands of his uncle which more than any other, contributed to his success in mercantile business.

"John R. Foster was born on a farm in Moretown, Vt., about the year 1830. He died in Clinton as I recall it, in the nineties. As a boy he was sickly and anemic. His father, who was my great-grandfather, had died when he was only 42 years old and John R. Foster's mother married a second time.

"John R. didn't like his step-father and the feeling was mutual, so my grandfather, Charles A. Foster, took the young boy—his youthful brother—to live on the paternal farm while the mother and step-father lived on in Middlesex, Vt."

JOHN R. FOSTER GETS $600 LOAN

"Farm work was too difficult for John R., and one day he came to his older brother, my grandfather, and told him he was going to get a job in the dry-goods business, in Waterbury, Vt., 4 miles to the north on the Winooski River. He worked there for 2 years or so and then he came to my grandfather asking whether he had any money.

"My grandfather told this brother of his that he had $600; that he had saved it from the money he earned hauling wood to the sheds of the Vermont Central Railroad, which used wood-burning engines in those days.

"He had hauled that wood for $2 a cord and that, by simple arithmetic, was 300 cords.

"John R. wanted that money to start in the clothing business himself and my grandfather loaned it to him."

CLINTON STORE STARTED

"John R. Foster came to Clinton and started the first store of what later developed into the Foster system and which, after that, developed an off-shoot known as the Besse system.

"Eight years later, John R. Foster returned to the farm in Vermont to visit his brother. He had already paid him the borrowed $600. He figured that the stock and good-will of the Clinton store was worth $10,000, and he had $8,000 in the bank.

"He wanted to sell the Clinton store and remove to Boston."

HUB JUST WAITING FOR A SUCKER

"His brother, my grandfather, remonstrated, 'Nope, John,' he said, 'I won't let you do it. Boston is a big city and they're just waiting for a sucker like you. Tell you what to do. You already have more money than you would have had if you had stayed on the farm all your life. You take $5,000 out of the $8,000 and start another store. If that doesn't make good you still have money in the bank and the store in Clinton.'

"That was the beginning of the first chain store in America and it started behind the barn in Moretown, Vt., where my great-uncle from Clinton and his brother, my grandfather, sat on a log, to discuss the financial future."

TAKES BROTHERS OFF THE FARM

"In gratitude, John R. Foster took his brothers off the farm and my father was one, to start them in the clothing business. In Bridgeport, Conn., where John R. Foster started his second store, my father, John E. Foster, my father's older brother, who was named after John R., and Lyman W. Besse were all working as clerks.

"About 1878, John R. Foster loaned my father and Mr. Besse $4,000 to start the first store of what turned out to be the Besse System.

"It was in Westfield, Mass., that my father started his first store and to that store he brought his brother, Charles F. Foster, whose widow is here at this dinner tonight.

"The store was sold, in Westfield, in 1884. Mr. Besse went to Springfield, my father went to Hartford, Conn., and my Uncle Charles went to Taunton. There they lived out their lives and there they died."

FORTY NEW ENGLAND CLOTHING STORES

"From the goodness and the largess of John R. Foster, who adopted Clinton as his home more than 40 clothing stores came into being in New England. They were individually owned and they were operated by men who lived in the communities they served. Yet they bought their merchandise as a unit and thus saved scores of thousands of dollars through wholesale purchases in large volume.

"Now you know my interest in Clinton, Mass. You know why I specifically asked your distinguished Congressman, PHILIP J. PHILBIN, that I be invited to this dinner and that I be permitted to speak.

"During the past 2 years I have traveled 80,000 miles in this country broadcasting each day and lecturing before civic organizations, schools, and colleges."

WORLD TRAVELER

"I have traveled 26,000 miles, in Europe, during the past year, from north of the Arctic Circle, in Finland, to the Grammos Mountains on the Greek-Albanian frontier, with the Greek Army in its campaign against the bandit-guerrillas. Two weeks ago, I was in England covering the British election.

"But I wanted to come to Clinton because my roots are deep. They are even in the soil of Clinton because my roots are deep here.

"To this son of Clinton I owe much as he gave my father the opportunity to go into business and to hand on to me the opportunity for an education."

AIM OF SPEAKER'S CAREER

"In this day and age, when so many people are searching for a substitute for work (when there is none), my father's description of the horses in that Clinton barn, the wood in the wood pile, and the boots outside the bedroom

door is an inspiration to me to continue my chosen career.

"The air of that career is to protect the free enterprise system and to fight tooth and nail against centralization of power. Thank you for listening to me."

The Federal Snoops Are After Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post carries a story written by Robinson McIlvaine which sounds a clarion call to all since the ever-increasing tendency toward nationalization of industry and the regimentation of the small-business man. Mr. McIlvaine is the editor of my home-town newspaper and it is with appreciation of his honesty and integrity that I commend this article to your attention:

THE FEDERAL SNOOPS ARE AFTER ME

(By Robinson McIlvaine)

I am owner, editor, publisher, advertising manager, and janitor of a country weekly newspaper called the Archive, in Downingtown, Pa., a town of 5,000 people 32 miles from Philadelphia.

I acquired this impressive string of titles in 1946 when, after nearly 5 years in the Navy, I bought the paper and a supposed 1,750 subscribers with every cent I had, plus a small assist from the local bank.

The fact that all but 60 subscribers had died and that newsstand sales ran to a total of 5 copies per week—as I learned after the deal was closed—was discouraging at first. But with the help of my wife, who shares all my titles except that of janitor—she has two children and the house to clean—we managed to build up circulation to 2,800. In order to do this, we have worked from 12 to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for the past 3½ years at varying degrees of deficits.

We were just about beginning to eat regularly when the roof caved in, literally, on the plant where the Archive was being printed, and we were forced to find ourselves a building and the necessary printing equipment to put out the paper ourselves. Luckily, we found another ex-sailor, named Ed Russell, who had some printing experience and a few dollars, and together we hunted up the equipment and converted an old livery stable into a print shop.

With another assist from the bank and some ancient machinery, we incorporated as the Chester Valley Press, Inc., and began printing the Archive ourselves in November 1948. I became president, my wife vice president, and Russell secretary-treasurer. I still kept my other titles, including janitor.

For 6 months the printing concern operated in the red. Hardly a week passed when we didn't have to buy a new part or replace a broken machine. The fellow who came in to set up our books called this capital outlay. But to us it was losing money that we didn't have. In the summer of 1949 things stopped breaking down, and we acquired more job-printing work to keep the boys—both of them—in the back shop busy Thursdays and Fridays after the paper was out. Day-to-day operations went into the black, and we began paying off the long-suffering suppliers with whom we had run up bills.

Recently we produced the largest edition in the paper's 75-year history. It was a Tuesday, and we were getting three runs off our 40-year-old press. In the midst of all the clanking, grinding, and whirring of typewriters, saws, and the press, a tall man with a face like a beaked eagle and with a bulging brief case under his arm, edged in through the door and, as he approached the long board table we call the city desk, whipped out a card case and thrust it under my nose.

I was doing the lead story and, as I had already been interrupted 15 times, only half listened when he explained that he was from the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor and wanted to make a routine check.

"Fine," I answered absently; "help yourself."

I introduced him to Mr. Peters, the retired railroad agent who works part time at our books, and went back to the typewriter.

When I finished the story, I noticed our visitor poring over the books, taking notes avidly. I was out in the shop, making up the next run, when he appeared at my side and said that he had a few questions to ask.

"I notice," he said, "that neither you as president nor Mrs. McIlvaine as vice president of the Chester Valley Press have drawn any salary."

"No," I laughed. "Sad, isn't it? But as you have noticed by the books, when we finish paying our compositor and linotype operator, our suppliers and the interest owed the bank, there isn't anything left over for us except a deficit. But," I added, hopefully, "the day may come soon when we can take out a few dollars."

"The law says," our Government man intoned without the trace of a smile, "that anyone working for a corporation must receive a minimum of forty cents an hour and time and a half for overtime."

I decided he had misunderstood the situation and hurried to explain that my wife and I were not employees, but officers of the company and, since we owned 75 percent of the stock, could make up our own minds what we were paid. I should have saved my breath.

"The law says," he repeated, "that everyone who works for a corporation is an employee and therefore subject to the Wages and Hours Act."

By this time I had forgotten the forms waiting to be put on the press.

"Do you mean to tell me," my voice cracked, "that we have to pay ourselves even though we don't have the money? That we must go to the bank and borrow enough to pay this minimum salary and then take it back, losing 6 percent on the way? That is, if I could persuade the bank to give me an added loan, in view of what I already owe?"

"I didn't say that," he replied with a shrug. "I merely interpret the law. I don't attempt to tell you how to run your business."

He left me sputtering like a Roman candle and returned to the outer office and our books. It was some time before I could pick up a stick of type.

In a few minutes he was back. "Do you have any business outside the State of Pennsylvania?" he asked at my elbow.

"No, we don't," I answered. "But if someone from New York, Chicago, or Timbuktu walked in now and asked us to print something for them, we certainly wouldn't turn them down."

He thought this over for a minute. Then, pointing his pencil at me, he continued, "Do you print any stationery or envelopes for Downingtown firms?"

I fell into a trap headfirst, "Sure, just as much as we can lay our hands on—after all, we are in the printing business."

I was completely unprepared for what came next.

"Would you have any way of knowing"—he let the words drop slowly, speculatively—"whether any of these envelopes you print for local firms are mailed out of the State?"

Surely he's joking, I thought, but a glance at his thin lips and narrowed eyes indicated otherwise.

"After all," I said, trying to keep my voice steady, "when we print a thousand envelopes for someone, we don't ask them whether they plan to use them for interstate love letters or wiping the floor. Our only concern is when their check comes in. Look," I said desperately, "if you're trying to establish the fact that we're under the heading of interstate commerce, why do we have to beat around the bush like this? We have a job pending that is from Connecticut. If that puts us in interstate commerce, then O. K."

When I finished, he just looked up and said calmly, "I never argue. I just interpret the law. The law says you are in interstate commerce."

Just then the office door crashed open, and in roared 26 kids ranging from 19 years down to 7. Our Government man almost swallowed his pencil as they whizzed past him shouting, "Hey, Bob, can we fold any papers today?"

Recovering slowly, our man asked, "What are these?"

I started to tell him how we could print only two newspaper pages at a time and that this meant folding and inserting each section by hand. While the men in the shop did the bulk of the job, a gang from the high school always dropped in after school, and we usually let five or six join the folding party and gave them cider, cookies, radio programs and lots of chatter for 2 or 3 hours, 2 days a week.

"It's sort of a private youth movement," my wife explained. "When they're not in here, many of them are running loose in the streets, getting into all kinds of trouble. Here they earn some money and, judging by applications, seem to have a good time."

But our investigator wasn't listening. He had already cornered the nearest kid and had begun to cross-examine him. The others tried to edge out the door, but he held up a warning finger, and they stood squirming, waiting their turns. As he began filling out detailed forms with names, ages, parents' names, and so on, I asked him why he was doing this. "They've all told you their ages, so why do you have to scare them?"

"It is illegal," he murmured, writing busily, "to employ children under 16. I have to check their ages and make sure they are telling me the truth."

I started to protest that the 2 or 3 hours a week they spent in our place could hardly be called oppressive or even employment.

He cut in, "I didn't say it was oppressive. I said it was illegal. In fact, it would be perfectly all right for them to fold papers out there," and he gestured toward the parking lot.

By this time I had been away from my work for an hour, which on that particular day so tied up production in the back shop that we ran into 4 hours of overtime. Aside from the wear and tear on my disposition, this "routine" check by Uncle Sam's man had cost me $25. It was only the beginning.

One of the children, a 14-year-old, was standing there with his lower lip going up and down like a loose piece of blubber. He had no father, and his mother had died a month before. His aunt, who worked for us evenings as a press feeder, was struggling to support him, and he came with her the three evenings she worked. He saw the older boys there folding and asked if he, too, could have a job. So we let him fold and also had him in Saturdays to sweep out the shop. For the first time in his life he had real spending money and now it was all over.

Outside, in the parking lot, the others were standing around in little groups, kicking at stones and glancing furtively at the door.

Once more I approached the inquisitor. "If it's illegal for the ones under 16 to work here, then we'll stop it. So why take down all their names?"

"But," he answered, "I must verify their statements by interviews at the school and at their homes."

Two days later I had a frantic call from the supervising principal. "What on earth are you doing down there?" he demanded. "Some character from the Government has been up here all day wanting to see the records of every kid who ever went to school. I had to dig them all out, and then he insisted on calling the pupils out of class for interviews."

This phase of the investigation took two full days and lost nobody knows how many man-hours to the school staff, not to mention the time the children spent away from their lessons.

It did keep him out of our hair for those 2 days, but he returned. This time he went through the petty-cash slips and came up with a fistful which he took to Ed Russell for an explanation. They were a bit cryptic. One read, "$3—Butch," another "75c—Red," and so on in that vein. There were 20 or 30 of them, and the wage-and-hour man obviously thought he had stumbled on the firm's private betting records. Ed, who was rushing to get a church program printed, replied quite simply: "Oh, those are chits for various guys who have folded papers."

It opened up a whole new line of investigation, and it was a honey because none of us knew the names of the individuals who at one time or another over the year had dropped in for a chat with a buddy and had ended up doing an hour or so's work. Most of them had long since graduated from school and were working, or were in the Army or Navy.

However, nothing was too much trouble for Uncle Sam's man. By reinterviewing most of the children he had already seen, he was able to tag full names onto "Butch," "Red" and most of the other names on the chits. Those he couldn't locate for personal interviews received mimeographed questionnaires marked: "Confidential. Do not show to your employer."

I first learned of the questionnaire one evening as I was walking home past the drugstore, where a group of the boys were hanging around holding up the wall.

"Hey, Bob, what am I supposed to do with this?" came a voice from the doorway. As I approached, the same Red who had been chalked up for 75 cents in the petty-cash box handed me the questionnaire. There were more than 40 questions, and they covered such essential data as date and place of birth, mother's maiden name, hours worked, when and by whom hired.

Putting our heads together, Red and I figured out his vital statistics, including his mother's name before she had married. The question of who had hired him and when he had worked was tougher. As he recalled it, Nancy, the president of the senior class, had passed him on the street and yelled out, "Come on over to the Archives and fold papers awhile." Since he worked 5 nights a week in the drugstore, and we only folded papers on Wednesday, he figured it must have been a Wednesday when he was off, and it was winter, because there was snow on the ground. "Rate of pay" we knew to be 75 cents because that was what the chit said, but he couldn't remember how long he had been there. He said he was quite surprised to get paid at all, because he had spent a half hour in a corner rehashing a basketball game, and by the time he got to the folding table there was a terrible argument going on about how many light-years it was to the moon, and he couldn't remember doing any work at all, though he supposed he must have folded a few papers. I bought him a soda while we threshed these fine points out, and finally arrived home exactly 1 hour late for supper.

That evening, and several thereafter, the rest of them dropped in at the office for help on their blanks. According to law, I was then serving at time and a half, or 60 cents an hour, and on that basis my advice ran to a little over $6. I still haven't paid myself.

Early in the second week of our routine check by the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department we stood charged with operating in interstate commerce, running some sort of a sweatshop for kids under 16 and discriminating against corporation executives. I couldn't help wondering when our man would get down to brass tacks and look into our four regular employees.

I didn't have to wait long. I returned to the office one afternoon late, after being out at a farm demonstration. The investigator had been there most of the time I was gone and had taken each employee off into a corner for cross-examination. According to the men, or rather, the boys—their average age is 24—he found something sinister in the fact that the 19-year-old linotype operator made as much as $110 a week. He showed great distress when he learned we didn't have a time clock, but just paid the men whatever they said we owed them at the end of the week. There was also something irregular about the fact that we paid the foreman a salary and gave him paid vacations, a practice we have since abandoned.

Very little work was done on the day of these interviews. Not that the actual questioning took so long, but by the time everybody had compared notes and told what he said and they said, it was about quitting time, so, rather than run into overtime, we closed up, and I stuck around till 2 or 3 in the morning to get the work finished and, incidentally, get myself some more overtime.

The chief result, to date, of the wage-and-hour visit is that we had to go out and get an automatic newspaper press that folds as it prints, thus eliminating all the part-time workers and the lady who fed the old press. Although we had hoped to put one in eventually, we were in no position financially to do it at this time. Even though we took it apart, moved it, and put it together ourselves, it had cost us $8,000 so far, despite the fact that it is at least 45 years old.

I don't know what the verdict of the wage-and-hour people will be, once all the data is filed. I suppose the three of us could go to the penitentiary or go broke. In talking about it with other small-business men around town, I am encouraged to believe we shall somehow survive. Most of them claim to have had more harassing experiences, and they are still operating at the old stand. Furthermore, they assure me that this is only the beginning, as I can expect another man from wage-and-hour along any day to check on the first one, and ultimately a third to check on the second; and, after all, I haven't been checked out by the State department of labor or the unemployment-compensation people, not to mention the income-tax man and the FBI.

There is, of course, one possible solution: We can close the paper.

Voyage of Ferdinand Magellan to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include as part of my remarks the statement issued recently by Maximiano Marmito Villareal:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EPIC VOYAGE OF FERDINAND MAGELLAN TO THE PHILIPPINES, MARCH 16, 1521

(By Maximiano M. Villareal, chairman, publicity committee, Club de las Americas, Washington, D. C.)

March 16, 1950, is the four hundred and twenty-ninth anniversary of the epic and adventurous voyage that brought Ferdinand Magellan and his fleet to Philippine soil. The greatest contribution was the bringing of Christianity and opening another part of the world to western man.

It is fitting that everyone and all unbiased thinking people everywhere, regardless of creed and race, should for a moment pay tribute to Ferdinand Magellan for his great service to the world in displaying his unusual courage and determination in crossing and passing the many unknown oceans and seas.

Magellan's voyage to the Philippines has greatly contributed to the present ideas of modern world travel, transportation, trade, and commerce, and economic problems of both the eastern and western worlds. It was unfortunate that Magellan was unable to return to Europe with his fleet. But Capt. Sebastian Elcano, his able companion, completed the round trip and back to Europe.

The great explorer was unfortunate that he was killed during an encounter against Lapolapo and his men, who were defending the island of Mactan, of which Lapolapo was the chief. The heroism and bravery of the defending natives led by Lapolapo marks the Philippines' heroism which became a legend and a tradition that inspired the generation to generation defense of the native soil which led to the establishment of the Philippine Republic.

Like the ancient Inca civilization of pre-Spanish Peru, the Mayan of Central America, and the Aztecs of Mexico, the Philippines had its advance culture and civilization many years before the arrival of Magellan and other Europeans.

Historic accounts show that about the year 700 A. D. the people of the Philippines had already been in regular contact with other civilized countries of the Orient in trade and commerce.

The Philippines was at one time a part of the ancient great Hindu Empire known as Hari-Visaya. Today the Philippines is one of the early members of the world organization, the United Nations.

The Spiritual Heritage of St. Patrick in the Modern Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Hibernian Society of Baltimore held its one hundred and forty-seventh anniversary banquet in that city on last Saturday night, March 18. This organization was founded in 1803 by leading citizens of Maryland of Irish ancestry. Like many similar organizations established in the early days of the United States, and even before the Revolutionary War, it was entirely nonsectarian and nonpolitical, its only object being to assist emigrants from Ireland to establish themselves in the New World.

One of its early presidents, Mr. John Oliver, who served from 1818 to 1823, bequeathed $20,000 to the society for the establishment of the Oliver Hibernian Free School. This example of promoting education has been followed by the society which now uses its investment income to provide scholarships for higher education to worthy boys and girls of Irish ancestry.

At the banquet last Saturday evening, grace was offered by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther Enders, pastor of the First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Baltimore. At the speakers' table were seated the Very Reverend Francis X. Talbot, S. J., president of Loyola College, Baltimore, and the Right Reverend Msgr. John F. Eckenrode, pastor of St. Patrick's Church of Baltimore. The benediction was pronounced by Rev. Joseph P. Bradley, chaplain of the Hibernian Society.

Presiding at the occasion was a distinguished citizen of Baltimore, Mr. Martin J. Welsh, Jr., president of the Hibernian Society. Present also at the speaker's table was Mr. Edward A. Smith, president, St. Georges Society; Mr. Jones, of the Welsh Society; Mr. Lewis Kurtz, president, German Society; and Mr. William M. Patterson, president of St. Andrews Society.

The able senior Senator from Maryland, Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, responded to the toast to the President of the United States. The Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. mayor of the city of Baltimore, gave the customary response on behalf of the city of Baltimore, and the Honorable James J. Lacy, comptroller for the State of Maryland, spoke for the State.

The Government of Ireland was represented by Hon. Brendan Corish, T. D., parliamentary secretary for the minister of local government in the Republic of Ireland. I felt very much complimented that in this company I was permitted to respond to the toast, The Day We Celebrate. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this response may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPIRITUAL HERITAGE OF ST. PATRICK IN THE MODERN CRISIS

When St. Patrick died in Ireland almost 1,500 years ago all western Europe was plunging into chaos. The old Roman Empire had been wrecked. Pagan barbarians who had swarmed everywhere over the frontiers had assailed even the impregnable city of the emperors and Christianity itself was under attack. Freedom and religion had reached their lowest ebb since first Christianity had won the minds of civilized men.

Tonight I venture to compare the condition of Europe in 493 A. D., the year the Apostle of Ireland was laid to rest, with the condition now existing throughout the whole world. I venture to point out the challenge the modern crisis presents to men and women of Irish blood and lineage to justify the tributes of loyalty, devotion, and praise they pay annually to the memory of St. Patrick, for the same threat to civilization against which he fought confronts us now.

We are part of a world-wide struggle between the spiritual and the materialistic. Freedom and religion once more hang in the balance. The dictators of a new tyranny who respect neither God nor man would enslave mankind. The Irishman who honors Patrick tonight can look back with pride upon the contributions made by Irishmen during seven centuries following the death of their patron saint to the reestablishment of freedom and Christianity in Europe, but he must ask himself what part he is willing to play in the modern crisis between God and mammon.

THE APOSTLE OF FAITH AND FREEDOM

It is not for us to retell the well-known story of St. Patrick's life, but rather to consider the meaning of the heritage which he bestowed upon the world and particularly upon men and women of the Irish race. He began his career in Ireland as a slave. He ended it there a bishop. He was an apostle of Christianity; of necessity, he was also a defender of freedom. He knew, as many in our time have forgotten, that the concept of freedom is inseparable from Christianity. Like St. Paul, he preached the "liberty wherewith Christ made us free," and he implanted this knowledge so deeply in Irish character that during the fifteen centuries since his death Irishmen have been distinguished chiefly throughout the world for their unswerving devotion both to the religion St. Patrick taught and to the ideals of human freedom he never ceased to proclaim.

We have the record not only in his own writings, but in the writings of some who walked and talked with him. Throughout his life Patrick engaged in a constant intellectual attack upon the pagan philosophy, trusting in Divine Providence to preserve his life and his strength and to deliver him from persecution. Mindful of his own sufferings when he had been made a captive in his youth, it was his practice to ransom captives with whatever money he had. He constantly urged the pagan to accept the gospels and he always exhorted his people to join him in a common endeavor to achieve justice and freedom for everyone.

This spirit of the great Apostle of Ireland was recognized with wonder and surprise by his contemporaries. One of them whom we know as St. Secundinus wrote a hymn during the lifetime of the saint extolling Patrick for these qualities. Translated into English, it may perhaps lack poetic quality, but its meaning is plain, as may be judged from the following stanza:

"Christ chose him for Himself to be His vicar on earth,
Who from twofold slavery doth set captives free;
Of whom very many he redeems from slavery to men, and
Countless numbers he releases from the dominion of the Devil."

We have, however, Patrick's own words to confirm this judgment of his purpose. There has been handed down to us with complete authenticity not only St. Patrick's Confession, but also a letter which, in the manner of St. Paul, the Irish saint wrote to the British chieftain, Coroticus. The latter, whose name would indicate a Roman origin, had raided Ireland, had slain many of the inhabitants at the spot where he landed, and had carried others off to slavery. St. Patrick's letter, though addressed to Coroticus in the hope that it would in due course reach him, was also directed to his own flock. He told them how the Christian inhabitants of France labored to convert the heathen and release the captive.

"This is the custom of the Roman Gauls," he wrote. "They send holy and fit men to the Franks and other heathen with many thousands in coin to redeem baptized captives. * * * Thou rather slayest and sellest them to a foreign nation which knows not God.

"What manner of hope in God hast thou, or has he who consents with thee, or who holds converse with thee in words of flattery? God will judge; for it is written, not only those who commit evil, but those who consent with them shall be damned."

This is a stern and affirmative Christianity. No man has a right to rest when his fellow men are enslaved, for every man is a member of Christ and must help keep his brother free. Money, good will, prosperity, culture, human skills, all the qualities of mind and body are simply means to carry on the fight for freedom and spiritual redemption against the "foreign nation which knows not God."

So seriously did St. Patrick feel this responsibility which he accepted for himself and which he believed every man should bear to every other, and so completely was it understood by his contemporaries and his followers that it was recognized in the legend handed down to us in one of the early lives of the great saint. We are told that as he approached his death an angel appeared to him to grant four petitions. The last and most important of these was bestowed by the angel in these words:

"That all the Irish shall be judged by thee in the day of judgment, as was said to the Apostles, 'And ye shall sit and judge the 12 tribes of Israel,' that thou mayest be the judge of those to whom thou wast an apostle."

The legend may, indeed, have been the fond fancy of an ancient follower of Patrick who was urging the Irishmen of his time to remain loyal to the ideals of faith and freedom that Patrick taught. We, however, who live now in the middle of the twentieth century, almost 1,500 years after Patrick went to his reward, facing as we do the same threat to religion and freedom that he faced, may well ask ourselves on St. Patrick's Day, "Are we willing upon the day of judgment to have Patrick pass upon our service to the ideals he preached?" Surely it must be clear that if this generation spurns the spiritual heritage Patrick left, materialism will engulf the globe and dictatorship, not freedom, will take over the world.

It is not mere chance that in our time we have seen slavery in a most repulsive and cruel form reappear in the nations which know not God, for the cynical repudiation of religion is likewise the repudiation of freedom.

So, tonight we look to the past, but only as a guide to the future. Let us remind ourselves of what our ancestors did, not to shine in their reflected glory, but rather to strengthen our own determination to emulate their devotion and to make a new record of loyalty to faith and freedom which perhaps some future generation may be willing to cite to our credit.

SEVEN CENTURIES OF IRISH TEACHING

It will be remembered that the Roman conquest of Europe never extended to Ireland. It was always beyond both the military and political sway of the Empire. The Roman legions penetrated Britain and remnants are still there of the old military roads they built. The ancient Roman ruled in Britain before Christianity came, but Patrick took it to Ireland before Augustine became the Apostle of Britain. The inspiration of his teachings was so potent that thousands of Irishmen, fired with his zeal, made Ireland in very truth the island of saints and scholars in the years that followed Patrick's death. To the abbeys and schools founded by the saint's followers in the Land of the Shamrock there flocked in the sixth and seventh centuries thousands of eager students who could not satisfy their search for knowledge and religion on the continent where the barbarian had almost destroyed the foundations of both civilization and Christianity.

In these same centuries and in the centuries that followed, including the twelfth, the saints and scholars of Ireland returned to the continent everywhere preaching and teaching and reestablishing the structure of faith and freedom which had been laid in ruins. To a demoralized Europe, the missionaries and teachers of Ireland, heirs of

St. Patrick, carried back the flame of faith and freedom that had been almost stamped out by pagan barbarians not unlike Attila the Hun, who dared call himself the Scourge of God.

This brilliant record, covering a period of seven centuries of intellectual and religious labors, has been obscured and almost obliterated in recent times by the sorry story of the seven centuries of Ireland's bitter, but unremitting struggle against British conquest. Throughout that struggle the Irishman's will to freedom remained indomitable. He knew, that since God Himself had made man free, no earthly agent can deprive him of that gift. The military power of Britain is no longer a threat to the political integrity of Ireland. It is now at last a really free nation even though six counties are still excluded from the essential unity of the island. All of Ireland, like all Britain, all Wales, all Scotland, all western Europe, indeed, the whole world now faces another threat to basic human liberty from a foreign nation which knows not God. Thus, once again, there is presented to the followers of St. Patrick the opportunity to place their intellectual capacity, their will to freedom and their devotion to religion in the forefront of the spiritual struggle against an advancing materialism more diabolical even than that which overwhelmed the Roman Empire in the fifth century.

Does the missionary zeal of Patrick survive among the Irish of our time? Patrick felt that all Christians were closely bound together and that they should burn with his own zeal for peace and freedom, a zeal which was aroused in him by the efforts of the pagan barbarians of his time to dominate and enslave the free Christians of Europe. The sons and daughters of Ireland have migrated throughout the world, but wherever they are, in whatever land they serve, they are, like us tonight, paying honor to the memory of St. Patrick.

AMERICA THE LAST REFUGE OF LIBERTY

To Americans of Irish lineage, however, I speak not alone of Patrick's message, but of the message of human freedom handed on year after year by Irish leaders wherever fate had cast them. I am thinking particularly tonight of one great Irish leader, a non-Catholic leader who was imbued with the eternal devotion of the Irish heart to freedom. He was one of the greatest orators of the old Irish Parliament, the disestablishment of which was decreed by the British Act of Union. Resenting this depredation of the right of Irishmen to legislate for all Ireland, he turned his eyes westward across the Atlantic and in 1783, 4 years before the Constitution of the United States was drafted, he referred to this country as "the only hope of Ireland and the last refuge of the liberties of mankind." These were the prophetic words of Henry Grattan, patriot and orator. He died without knowing how accurate his vision of the future was.

America is, in very truth, the last refuge of the liberties of mankind. If here in America we should falter, if we should fail to see that communism is sweeping now across the face of the earth in a more tumultuous torrent even than that which engulfed the Roman Empire, if Americans should be lulled into a false concept that the danger is not real, then be sure that totalitarianism, armed with all the scientific implements of our time, will suppress the human soul in a degradation deeper than that to which it has ever sunk before.

We are drifting with terrible speed toward economic disaster and a third world war because we do not seem to realize how vital and necessary the heritage of St. Patrick is in our time.

We shall successfully defend faith and freedom, not with armies and with bombs, but with the conviction of our souls and the determination of our wills, accepting the message of Christianity and dedicating ourselves, in the spirit of St. Patrick, to the demonstration that all men are free, that none can rightfully be enslaved, that all are brothers and the children of God.

Surely the world has learned that there can be no triumph in war. In the competition of destruction, there can be no victor. We thoughtlessly call ourselves the winners of World War II, but we have not paid for that war yet. It will leave its marks upon us all for generations to come. The United States gave more than 300,000 lives in that conflict. More than a million men were maimed in body and spirit and are living victims of the war. Peace and prosperity for the whole free world were undermined by that war and too many now are giving way to the futile and dangerous thought that free men, by living to themselves alone, can somehow hide from the struggle that is here, or are entertaining the more terrible thought that a new and more destructive war should be launched. Even without the will to war we are already involved in an armament race that inevitably turns us from the paths of peace and may easily transform us into a garrison state and eventually bring on a war more appalling in scientific destruction than even World War II, the peace treaties of which have not yet been written.

There is no spot upon the whole face of the earth in which a free man can protect himself from the totalitarian purpose to destroy religion and to make gross materialism the ruling passion of man. There is no hope for mankind in resort to force. Science has released to us the awful secrets of nature which must be used in the spirit of Christianity for the purpose of ennobling men, or they will be used to plunge us all once more into the depths of misery and confusion. Total war can result only in total destruction, and we are faced with a dilemma from which only religion and democracy can set us free.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM IS ESSENTIAL

When I speak of democracy, I mean economic democracy as well as political democracy. I mean the right of the individual to the free use of his own abilities to support himself and to govern himself. In no company can one with more propriety plead the cause of political and economic freedom than in a gathering which has assembled to pay honor to St. Patrick.

It will be remembered that the youthful Patrick while only a boy of 16 was captured and taken to Ireland in slavery. He escaped to the continent of Europe, but he had made up his mind that he would return with the message of Christianity to the people among whom he had been a bondsman.

I have often thought he must have found something in the character and spirit of those ancient Irish that convinced him they were ready to accept his message of freedom. We are told that he codified the ancient Brehon laws. An examination of this code shows that in early Ireland economic and social justice for all was recognized as the basis of society. No man under those laws could retain in idleness any land which another member of his community could use. In other words, no vested interest could restrain opportunity for the ancient Gael. Land was the means of production, and we shall best learn the lesson of economic freedom that Patrick taught if we realize that the principal cause of modern social and economic turmoil is that we have not learned that men cannot be economically free unless there is free access for every single individual to the modern means of production.

The totalitarian fears that there is not enough to go around. Filled with the determination that he and his group shall survive, he seeks to dominate the world and exclude from opportunity all but those he chooses to admit to his society. Murder and slavery for those outside his circle is the logical program of the dictator, who is driven by fear.

Our task is to demonstrate to all, even to those behind the iron curtain, that there is enough to go around, that in a free and Christian society when men live like brothers one to another they can by cooperation and by constructive use of the achievements of science in an atmosphere of liberty raise the standard of living for all to a higher level than has ever before been achieved.

The Communist dictators are convinced that religion and democracy are dead. They are dead—if the world receive not the spiritual heritage of St. Patrick. We who call ourselves his followers, we who know the cause to which he dedicated his life, we who know as he knew that God Himself is the Author of Liberty, we know that the forces of materialism cannot overcome Christianity if only we have the courage in our own lives to accept the stern responsibility of every man to the spiritual virtues of faith and freedom that St. Patrick taught and lived.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have recently received from Mr. Joseph Weston, of Tacoma, Wash., be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. Mr. Weston states nothing new in his views, but they are well stated and the example he uses is so typical of the results of continuing Federal rent controls in peacetime that I wish to bring the letter to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *March 14, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are reported to be opposed to a continuation of rent controls, for which we fervently say, "Thank you for these efforts to rid us of this instrument which can be explained only by political expediency." It may be that you will need some added ammunition for your debates. This letter, then, is to supply some material which may have been overlooked and to give you an example of the injustice of the rent-control laws.

We own a house in southern California. Hard work over a 10-year period cleared it. Our intention was to use this as a source of income when I can work no longer.

About 3 years ago I was transferred to Tacoma. The question arose as to whether to sell or rent the house we were leaving. At that time it was not under rent control, so we decided to hold on to it, although this decision meant careful economy of living on our part. We were offered $14,000 for the place, and could have used the money to reestablish ourselves in Tacoma.

Good people came to us asking to lease the place, and two figures were discussed—$90 with owner to care for the yard; $75 with the tenant to assume this responsibility.

(Incidentally, the house is on a 100 by 200 corner lot and was adjudged one year by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the Los Angeles Times as the outstanding half-acre ranch-type place in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. This was contingent on the garden more than the house. So nat-

urally we were concerned with having the place maintained.)

The tenant was happy—so were we.

Then last year the rules were changed. In itself an imposition, and I considered it a breaking of faith. Many people, like us, decided to rent instead of sell at the top of the market. Now where are we? Sales value has dropped and the rent is reduced one-third.

The rent, now set at $50—after maintenances, taxes, and depreciation—nets us less than nothing. (We have spent $193 so far this year on the sewage-disposal system.)

Aside from the fact that we are hurt personally, the larger phases of the subject are of profound importance.

Is it American justice—is it moral—for the Government to take from one man to give to another?

Why is every man's dollar except that of the person who has been thrifty enough to clear off a place for rental allowed to become inflated?

Per capita income has increased because of the lessened value of the dollar. Should the owner of a small rental place be discriminated against in this inflationary period?

Last year the American public is reported to have spent $9,000,000,000 on automobiles. This, in round figures, is two billion more than the total spent for new housing. I have no objections to people's buying automobiles. I quote the figures to prove the point that a rental subsidy particularly at the expense of individual American citizens cannot be justified on the grounds of inability to pay.

The people who own rental property pay taxes to support the local community as well as the broader taxes of State and the Federal establishment. Schools (for the renters' children), roads, library, police, and all the rest. Why is it the owner of a house which he rents is not permitted to bargain for his income? The law allows this to most everyone else.

In my case the tenant was well satisfied with our original agreement, and insofar as he is concerned his vote has not been purchased by the Rent Control Act. He wrote me this: "It is not difficult to understand your irritation over the Government restrictions. If our positions were reversed, I am quite sure that I would be extremely angry over the rent regulations."

I pay taxes to support the very rent-control people who tell me what I can and cannot do with a piece of property I worked for and bought and paid for with no help from any agency. How can any man accept such a control without anger and resentment?

It should be noted, too, that in my dealings with this governmental bureau I have found the most incredible inefficiency that can be imagined. Every step of the way has been filled with error from start to finish.

In April last year, trying to obey the law, I wrote from Iowa (I travel most of the time) and asked that instructions as to my procedure in filing the property be mailed to my Tacoma address.

Some time later a letter was forwarded to me which had been sent to me in Iowa. Guess what it said? "The rent regulations recognize only a lease under section (4), which provides for a 15-percent increase."

And so it went, back and forth, with docket numbers and forms that were impossible to understand clearly. Finally my son made trips to the rental headquarters in Los Angeles. He was told the place was only worth $35, but they would (out of the goodness of their heart) allow $45. Finally they settled on $50.

I am proud of the fact that I have had forbears in every war the United States has fought for governmental respect of the individual. I was in War I, my son was in War II. I am accustomed to standing on my own feet.

What bothers me terribly is that I cannot be proud of a legislative body that follows an administration which demands imposition of politically expedient regulations like those contained in the rent-control laws.

I wish you, sir, the best of good heart in your stand against such practices.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH WESTON.

Reorganization of the Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Maritime Shuffle," from the Washington Post of March 16, 1950.

The editorial points out that it is not enough to reorganize the Maritime Commission and consolidate it with the Department of Commerce, but that it is highly important that correct and proper personnel be selected for the new authority. The editorial calls attention to the fact that the Maritime Commission, according to the report of the Comptroller General, has flouted the law in granting excessive subsidies and that its flouting of the law has been confirmed by a report of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The editorial says:

If the reorganization plan is accepted, the President has a great opportunity to get rid of the Commission members who have abused their offices. This gain would be nullified, however, if the President (as is now reported to be his intention) were to appoint as Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation the present Maritime Commission chairman who has sided with the majority. By the same token it would be unfair to jettison Commissioner Raymond S. McKeough, who has fought a losing battle to administer the law as written.

Mr. President, I may say that Commissioner McKeough served with distinction in the House of Representatives for many years. At times we have been political associates, and at other times we have been opponents, but no one has ever questioned his great integrity and his great competence, and I believe the people of the United States owe him a debt of gratitude for the magnificent fight which he has been making to keep ship construction and shipping board subsidies down within the bounds of reason.

I renew my request that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARITIME SHUFFLE

President Truman's long-heralded reorganization of the Maritime Commission is both drastic and plausible in many ways. The danger is that the President may be mislead into believing that the trouble in the Maritime Commission will be cured by a mere reshuffling of authority. Whatever the administrative defects of the present commission, and they are many, the basic difficulty has been in the outlook of its members.

What the President proposes is to abolish the Commission and divide its duties functionally as recommended by the Hoover Commission and other studies. Replacing the present 5-member body, a 3-man Maritime Board would be set up in the Department of Commerce to handle regulatory and subsidy functions. With respect to ship construction and operating subsidy determination, this board would be subject to policy guidance from the Secretary of Commerce; but its decisions, once made, would be conclusive. In such regulatory matters as approval of rates the board would act as an independent agency.

To carry out other duties of the Maritime Commission—administration of subsidies, management of the Government-owned merchant fleet, and similar functions aggregating $162,000,000 yearly—the plan would establish a separate Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce. Separate, that is, except for the fact that the chairman of the Maritime Board would serve in a dual capacity as Maritime Administrator. In addition, the plan calls for the appointment of a new Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Insofar as it would bring about policy accountability on subsidy awards, the proposal would be a distinct improvement. The granting of subsidies is basically an executive function, and when this function is carried out by an independent agency, great abuse is possible. The plan would permit supervision to insure that presidential subsidy policy and maritime policy were not operating at cross purposes. Moreover, the plan recognizes the overlap of many maritime functions by providing for the use of the same staff by the Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration.

The question remains, however: How many ways can the same man be divided? Can an administrator responsible to the Secretary of Commerce in some matters remain genuinely independent in others? For that matter, would not the dual Maritime Board-Administration head be in a position to thwart other Board members, since all employees except personal staffs would be responsible to him alone? That has been one of the major complaints under the most recent reorganization of the Maritime Commission. Finally, if a Department of Transportation is the President's aim, ought not this issue to be met head-on? Should the already unyielding Department of Commerce be made more so?

Although the President's message does not mention it, undoubtedly a major factor in the shift was the report last summer by the Comptroller General dealing with the way the Maritime Commission majority had flouted the law in granting excessive subsidies—a report confirmed by the House Executive Expenditures Committee. If the reorganization plan is accepted, the President has a great opportunity to get rid of the Commission members who have abused their offices. This gain would be nullified, however, if the President (as is now reported to be his intention) were to appoint as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation the present Maritime Commission chairman who has sided with the majority. By the same token it would be unfair to jettison Commissioner Raymond S. McKeough, who has fought a losing battle to administer the law as written.

No reorganization plan can be stronger than the men chosen to administer it. In peculiar measure the chaos in the Maritime Commission is the result of incompetence. Far more important than the details of the reorganization plan, if it goes through, will be for the President to name as Under Secretary of Commerce a man specially qualified in the field of transportation and to appoint as Maritime Administrator and Board members men who have demonstrated that they can distinguish public from private interest.

Address of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson at Dedication of New Sinai Temple in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district in Illinois which I have the honor to represent the event in the month of March which held the general interest of my constituents of all faiths was the dedication of New Sinai Temple at Fifty-fourth Street and South Shore Drive in Chicago.

The name of Dr. Louis Mann, the present rabbi of the Sinai Congregation is known not only in Chicago but throughout the Nation, as were those of his brilliant and consecrated predecessors, Dr. Kauffmann Kohler and Dr. Emil G. Hirsch.

The late Hon. Henry Horner, the first governor of Jewish faith in our State and beloved by everyone, was a member of the Sinai Congregation and on the occasion of the dedication of the new temple our present Governor, The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, appeared to address the large gathering numbering many who during the years had worshipped in the old temple with his illustrious and revered prodecessor, Governor Horner.

The address of Governor Stevenson, which I am including in my remarks, is a noteworthy contribution to the literature of religion in its relation to social consciousness. The masterful address of Governor Stevenson follows:

Sometimes, in the day to day activities of my office, I feel an oppressive sense of futility. So it is gratifying to be able to participate in something that is of more than fleeting significance—that holds promise of lasting, worthwhile values for a very long time to come.

I am grateful, then, for the opportunity to be here today, to see and to participate in the dedication of this splendid modern temple which will house for years to come an ancient religious heritage and our oldest scholarship. Dr. Mann reminds me that for 150 years the commencement address at Harvard was in Hebrew and for a hundred years at Yale, and I think I will have a little research done on this at my college, Princeton. And I am grateful for this opportunity to pay my respects to you, the Sinai Congregation who made this beautiful blending of the old and new possible, and to my esteemed friend, Dr. Louis Mann, who has stood fast for so much that is good in ethical and social life of this community.

This ultra-modern temple is in keeping with the history of this Jewish congregation which for 90 years has never been afraid to venture into new fields, even as five Jews were not afraid to sail westward with Christopher Columbus' little band so long ago.

Yours was the first reform congregation established in this country. You were the first to sponsor public forums for people of all faiths. You pioneered in adult education and in progressive methods of religious instruction. Your congregation was the first to employ a psychologist on its counseling staff. Even more important, you have squarely faced the social challenge of each succeeding generation.

As in all human affairs, spiritual as well as temporal, your greatness as a congregation has been due to leadership—to a sense of the connection between the values of the past and the problems of the present. You have treasured the rich heritage of your fathers, but you have realized that this heritage can be preserved only if it lives in the present and serves the present. A temple must not be just a museum to house the dead relics of a bygone civilization, but a spring from which men and women of today receive spiritual replenishment.

And again your congregation has recognized that religion is not an air-tight compartment shut off from the rest of life, but that it encompasses all human activity. Perhaps this explains, at least partially, why so many enlightened men, including my own illustrious predecessor, the beloved Henry Horner, have been members of Sinai Temple, and why the effective ministry of your religious leaders like Dr. Kohler, Dr. Hirsch, and Dr. Mann, has not been limited to your congregation but has extended to all Chicago and beyond. It explains also why this congregation is known everywhere for its emphasis upon prophetic Judaism, and its social consciousness.

As Dr. Mann has recently pointed out, a religious organization needs more than a temple. It is significant that you have erected here not only a house of worship, but also a house of study and a house of assembly. By making this a house of assembly, a community center serving members of all races and creeds, you have given concrete expression to your conviction that a religious organization must serve not only its own members, but all mankind.

We live in a time of torment, trial, and challenge—a time in which the Jews have been the worst sufferers. In the tense struggle for peace on which rests peace itself, the mighty, and mightily neglected, power of religious faith is peculiarly our western weapon. We need that power, that weapon, on the battlefields of peace now just as surely as we need it on the battlefields of war.

I sometimes wonder if the chief cause of discord in our troubled world is not so much the undesirable nature of beliefs as it is the prevalence of competitive indoctrination among them. Alfred Adler once offered the opinion that "it is easier to fight for one's beliefs than to live up to them." In effect this is what we have across the entire fabric of human affairs: rents and tears caused by the constant vendettas carried on by competing faiths, religious, economic, social, and ideological.

If there is anything that the whole idea of liberalism militates against it is the notion of competitive indoctrination. And therein lies our potential strength in this current era of grace. When we start with the premise that we want human brotherhood to spread and increase until it makes life safe and sane, we must also be certain that there is no one true faith or path by which it may spread. We must forever banish the notion that there can be universal brotherhood just as soon as everyone gives up his faith and accepts ours. That day will never come. The richness of human diversity cannot be abolished. It can be resented and fought, but only at what an appalling cost. Difference is in the nature of life. It is part of our moral universe. It should be gladly and enthusiastically welcomed. There is nothing wrong with the fact of difference. What is wrong are our futile efforts to abolish it, futile as abolishing Mars or Jupiter.

To convince ourselves and others that there is nothing to fear in difference; that difference, in fact, is one of the healthiest and most invigorating of human characteristics, without which life would become lifeless, is a great task. Here lies the power of the liberal way—not in making the whole world Catholic, Jewish or, if I may even suggest it, Unitarian; but in helping ourselves and others to see some of the possibilities inherent in viewpoints other than one's own; in encouraging the free interchange of ideas; in welcoming fresh approaches to the problems of life; in urging the fullest, most vigorous use of critical self-examination.

I have said nothing that is new here, because this is a liberal congregation that knows the world was peopled by a compassionate God who loves us all. And so, upon the dedication of this new temple, I congratulate you, not only for your past achievements but also for the increased opportunities for service that today open before you.

United States Ban on German Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Von Wiegand Hits United States Ban on German Science," which was published in recent issues of the Hearst newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA, WAKE UP

VON WIEGAND HITS UNITED STATES BAN ON GERMAN SCIENCE

(By Karl H. Von Wiegand, dean of American foreign correspondents)

ROME, March 15.—Western policy under the leadership of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, commanding the sun of modern progress to stand still in Germany by forbidding scientific research in that defeated country, is strengthening the war and industrial potential of Communist Soviet Russia with some of the best brains in German science.

Freedom of research into every branch of science and scientific development, which has made this the greatest age of discovery and invention in history, is to the scientist what freedom of religion, press, thought, opinion, and human rights are to western democracy.

Soviet offer

The policy of America, Britain, and France toward Germany and its scientists of commanding the sun to stand still in that country is having the foreseeable consequence.

Moscow has made a new and wider "grand offer" in its bid to get a large number of German scientists, specialists, and trained men in every branch of science, research professors and teachers to come to Russia, according to reliable information which has reached Rome.

Inquiries which I have made in scientific circles in Germany have confirmed this information.

Moscow offers good pay, good living quarters, laboratories, research institutes, experimental stations and posts in institutes of technology with the fullest freedom of research and unlimited financial support.

Duty in China

Some of the German scientists sought by Russia are evidently wanted for duties in connection with China's reconstruction program which was agreed upon recently in Moscow between Stalin and Mao Tse-tung.

Private reports from Germany say many German scientists, professors, technologists, and specialists, intensely embittered by America, Britain, and France forbidding re-

search, have accepted Soviet offers and that others are preparing to do so.

Even such great scientists as Prof. Otto Hahn, of Stuttgart, works under the strictest supervision and control of the western occupation authorities.

Science in Germany had in part been driven underground, but more largely is now being driven into the service of Soviet Russia.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "FEPC," published in the March 18, 1950, issue of The State, of Columbia, S. C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC

The Saturday Evening Post, which by the greatest stretch of imagination could not be termed "a southern organ," yet indeed has been fair, had an editorial last month on FEPC which escaped our attention at the time. A friend kindly has forwarded it to us. The comment was occasioned by the celebration of Brotherhood Week.

We take the liberty of quoting the Post in part:

"The late Dr. George Washington Carver, Jackie Robinson, and Levi Jackson have done more to change attitudes contributing to discrimination than all the FEPC laws on the statute books. Force is always a tempting device, but in the long run the results of persuasion are sounder. The lengths to which the there-ought-to-be-a-law attitude can go was recently illustrated by the ill-advised effort of New York's Attorney General Goldstein to prohibit a bowling tournament because the bowling league which was holding the tournament restricted membership to white males. Perhaps bowling ought to be invariably interracial, but an effort to compel people to make it so runs into what Donald Richberg once called one of the most essential freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution—that is to say, 'freedom to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence or individual judgment, whether rational or irrational.'

"The truth is that even in areas where legal compulsion has some justification, it is usually the case that the public conscience and sense of justice have changed before the adoption of laws whose sponsors claim all the credit. Thus antilynching laws become a possibility after lynching has all but disappeared, and laws to protect the rights of minorities in jobs or housing come along when the prejudice which was behind discrimination in these fields has been largely liquidated. Indeed, it is quite possible that FEPC laws, which carry with them the danger of creating special privileges for groups at present regarded as the victims of discrimination, will set the clock back. In any case, such laws hardly promote brotherhood any more than religious unity would be promoted by forcing a Presbyterian into the college of cardinals."

If our readers will recall, the State has argued all along that FEPC will harm, instead of help, those whom professional vote lurers proclaim it would help. The Post, you will note, says FEPC would set the clock back.

Lions International—The Lions Code of Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the March 1950 issue of Governmental News, a national publication for public officials, there is an excellent article by Mr. Melvin Jones, secretary general of Lions International. In this article, Mr. Jones cites the magnificent record of this great service organization in national and international activities.

He reports that the Lions Clubs performed a total of 101,736 separate and distinct activities for the betterment of their individual communities during the 1949 fiscal year, and he cites many other excellent statistics, as well as interesting illustrations of their concrete work.

I had previously called attention to the splendid articles published in Governmental News, which is issued by George F. Breitbach and Sons, in Milwaukee, Wis.

I believe that Governmental News has performed a real public service in carrying Mr. Jones' article. Naturally every member of Lions Clubs throughout my State of Wisconsin and wherever Lions Clubs exist will feel a deep and justified sense of pride in the achievement of Lions International. But individuals who are members of other service groups, or who, for that matter, are not members of any service club at all, will also be proud, as Americans, of the outstanding record of civic contributions of Lions International.

These Lions Clubs prove that in the American way it is not necessary for government to attempt to do everything. On the contrary, it is infinitely preferable that wherever possible, private civic groups meet local needs because they are best acquainted with those needs.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Jones' article, followed by the Lions code of ethics.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM MELVIN JONES' ARTICLE

Describing what Lionism seeks to do in the fewest possible words, it might be said that its fundamental purpose is to make each club's home town, or community, a better place in which to live. This objective automatically puts the Lions into everything that goes on around town. It also points up a distinguishing characteristic of the Lions. No job is too small for them. This may explain why they have accomplished so many big ones.

Lions are international in scope, and international in interests, particularly in the promotion of good will and understanding among nations. International good will has a direct bearing on world peace and security under which civilization progresses, and thus the first object of lionism, as set forth in our international constitution, pledges Lions Clubs to create and foster a spirit of generous consideration among the peoples of the world, through a study of the problems of international relationships.

Closely correlated with this primary object are the other five objects of Lions Clubs:

"2. To promote the theory and practice of the principles of good government and good citizenship.

"3. To take an active interest in the civic, commercial, social, and moral welfare of the community.

"4. To unite the members in the bonds of friendship, good fellowship and mutual understanding.

"5. To provide a forum for the full and free discussion of all matters of public interest, partisan politics, and sectarian religion alone excepted.

"6. To encourage efficiency and promote high ethical standards in business and professions; provided that no club shall hold out as one of its objects financial benefits to its members."

FOUNDED IN 1917

This high aspiration to serve, in the fullest sense of the meaning, has been the guiding light of lionism through the 33 years of its phenomenal growth and expansion through 27 countries of the world.

LIONS CODE OF ETHICS

To show my faith in the worthiness of my vocation by industrious application to the end that I may merit a reputation for quality of service.

To seek success and to demand all fair remuneration or profit as my just due, but to accept no profit or success at the price of my own self-respect lost because of unfair advantage taken or because of questionable acts on my part.

To remember that in building up my business it is not necessary to tear down another's; to be loyal to my clients or customers and true to myself.

Whenever a doubt arises as to the right or ethics of my position or action toward my fellow men, to resolve such doubt against myself.

To hold friendship as an end and not a means. To hold that true friendship exists not on account of the service performed by one to another, but that true friendship demands nothing but accepts service in the spirit in which it is given.

Always to bear in mind my obligations as a citizen to my Nation, my State, and my community and to give to them my unswerving loyalty in word, act, and deed. To give them freely of my time, labor, and means.

To aid my fellow men by giving my sympathy to those in distress, my aid to the weak, and my substance to the needy.

To be careful with my criticisms and liberal with my praise; to build up and not destroy.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Set-back for Socialism," published in the Boston Traveler of March 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SET-BACK FOR SOCIALISM

The so-called middle-income housing bill that the Senate passed is a victory for sound and traditional financing, a defeat for the socialistic experimenters. There will be no disguised subsidies for the few at the expense of the many, no interest rates for housing cooperatives set low enough to knock out all competition from the Nation's banks. What was passed comprised an extension of present housing aids, chiefly administered by the Federal Housing Administration, with something new in the form of a loan fund for college housing.

The victory was mainly a defensive one and its margin was close but socialism has suffered a set-back. The taxpayers will not have to underwrite dream houses for people who can afford to finance their homes at the going rate.

In Search of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of the House know of the views of the FBI on the question of security checks and clearances under the National Science Foundation bill. I should like to call to the attention of the Members the following editorial from yesterday's New York Times which is an excellent contribution to the debate which is raging about security measures:

IN SEARCH OF SECURITY

Two and one-half years ago the President's Committee on Civil Rights, under the chairmanship of Charles E. Wilson, drew attention to two possible dangers in any governmental loyalty program. One was that "the standards by which the loyalty of an individual or an organization is to be determined may not be clearly defined." The other was that "the procedure by which the loyalty of accused Federal employes is determined may not accord with our traditions of due process of law." We do not believe these dangers have been avoided under the existing Federal loyalty program. The antics of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, in his current attack on the State Department have been prominent in the news. But behind the McCarthy episode is the difficult question, bound to be long-enduring in this time of cold war, as to how we can be wholly secure.

How difficult this question is can be seen from the current controversy over the House amendments to the National Science Foundation bill. One of these amendments would give the FBI authority to pass on the loyalty of candidates for Foundation employment of scholarships. The FBI, correctly foreseeing that such a measure would be a long step toward a "police state," does not want this authority. Unless we desire to turn our governmental employees into a set of identical wooden Indians, made to order for the purpose, we had better steer clear of this particular trap.

There can be no question that Russia will put her spies into the so-called sensitive departments of government if she can. In a few cases, in Canada and Britain as well as here, she apparently has done this. So long as our safety depends on keeping certain secrets we must do all we can to frustrate such spies. We must also do all we can to eliminate "poor security risks" who may not be consciously disloyal but who for one reason or another allow information to leak out to people who should not have it. It seems doubtful, after the experience we have had so far with the loyalty program, that the skilled, professional spy can be caught by any such network. Such a professional, for example, is not likely to join Communist-front organizations. He will probably present a seemingly flawless record and an unimpeachably respectable aspect. We have to keep an eye out for him—or her. But we cannot eliminate the spy by setting up foolish and unworkable standards of association or by turning a Congressional committee room into a circus for the display of private animus or personal lust for publicity. Surely this great Nation, fertile in political as well as scientific inventiveness, can do better than that.

If we cannot do better, if every Federal appointee to any important office is tried like a suspected criminal before he takes up his work and is thereafter likely at any moment to be assailed and denounced like an escaped convict, what sort of persons may we expect to have in public employment? Certainly they will not be the courageous, plain-spoken and intelligent men and women whom the urgency of our times demands. They are more likely to be weak mediocrities whose principal concern, like that of the minor functionary in far-away Russia, is to keep out of trouble. And democracy will become a pitiful mockery if its affairs are administered by people whose loftiest ambition is to make no mistakes.

There is a security inherent in democracy itself which may be lost, if we lose faith in free institutions. There is a security in the existence of intelligent men and women willing to make their own moral and intellectual decisions and abide by the consequences. There is a security in the fact that such men and women will not permit any agency of government, executive or legislative, to dictate such decisions to them. There is a security in the faith that does not shiver at every shadow or at the whistle of every wind. We must certainly devise a machinery, if we can, that will keep our essential secrets safe, but it would be far better for a few secrets to leak out than for this Nation to imitate the Communist of Fascist pattern and suppress, in the private citizen or the officeholder, the right of private conscience.

A Misguided Economist

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, March 13, our colleague, Mr. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, criticized President Truman's facilities for travel, vacationing, and entertaining. These criticisms have been completely and conclusively answered by a young Ohio newspaperwoman, Miss Jean Roberts, editor of the Clermont Sun, of Batavia, Ohio.

On March 16, 1950, Miss Roberts wrote an editorial entitled "A Misguided Economist," which is as follows:

A MISGUIDED ECONOMIST
(By Jean Roberts)

There are several Republican Congressmen in Washington whose screams of economy have turned them to attacking President Truman and some of the accoutrements of the office he holds.

Representative WOODRUFF, of Michigan, says that Truman is probably the best-paid man in the world, and seems to be complaining of the fact. Undoubtedly this same gentleman, in pointing out the glories of the democratic way of life, has stated that the American people are the best paid in the world. But he seems to draw the line at our top official having the same privilege.

In addition to the Presidential salary, he objects to the Presidential yacht, pullman car, automobiles, and planes. What he fails to mention, however, is that these are not the personal property of Harry S. Truman, private citizen, but Harry S. Truman, President, for only so long as he holds that office. He will not be taking all of them back home to Missouri when a new man takes his place.

Because of his position, any President is more or less required to have all of these things. A special vacation hideaway, as Representative Woodruff terms it, is necessary to the Chief Executive because of the insatiable curiosity of all Americans. You and I and John Doe next door can take our few days or week's vacation anywhere, and no one but our close friends are interested or concerned. What rest would President Truman get if he attempted to get a few days of much-needed rest at any of the more common vacation spots? Autograph hunters, newspaper and magazine reporters and photographers, crackpots with all sorts of ideas for solving the world situation, job seekers, politicians, and just plain citizens would be crowding around him all the time, requesting this, asking that, and demanding the other. Who could rest under such an atmosphere?

What happens when the President has a hurry-up call for a conference in some far-off spot in the world, or even in this country? A private plane, in this age of speed, is the only answer, not only for himself but for the use of members of his staff as well. A private pullman car is equally necessary, for both afford the privacy that is so vital to any serious undertaking.

A fleet of automobiles answers the same purpose for shorter trips. Since few Presidential decisions are made by the Chief Executive alone, he needs numerous vehicles to carry the people with whom he must constantly confer—Cabinet members, advisers, Congressmen, Secret Service men are always in attendance, and after the assassination of such Presidents as Lincoln and McKinley, and the attacks on many others, including Roosevelt, few can deny that their protection is needed.

For many, many years it has been a major complaint in America that that salary for high offices is so meager that the caliber of men so badly required are not attracted. They can do far better for themselves in private business, and not be open to the constant criticism and ridicule that accompany public office. President Roosevelt's death was more or less directly the cause of the position he held and the tremendous pressure of work. Who can say that a yearly salary of $110,000 was too much in such a case? Would you setttle for a mediocre man who would be willing to work for less?

Congressmen recently voted themselves a raise in salary, feeling that they were underpaid for the work they did. Like the President, much of their entertaining and other expenses came out of their own salaries, most of them necessary expenses that could be cut only slightly. Public relations is vital for anyone in the public eye, and one good form of public relations is entertainment of visiting firemen, whether they come from your own voting district or State, or from another country.

A reduction of expenses made by cutting the Presidential salary, or whittling down the staff he maintains, or his transportation, would be merely a drop in the bucket. It strikes us that Representative WOODRUFF could accomplish much more if he would

attempt to talk some of his fellow Congressmen out of their pet projects instead. The consensus of opinion of Capitol Hill seems to be, "By all means let's put some economy measures into effect, but we can't possibly sacrifice the new Federal project in Podunk Center, I might lose a few votes there because some jobs would be lost. Let's abolish the construction in the neighboring State instead."

Less logrolling and more long-range thinking could accomplish wonders.

Matthew Connelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, relating to the presence at the centennial banquet of Presidential Secretary Matthew Connelly, illustrates in some degree the high regard and real pride with which the people of his home town look upon Matt.

That he should have taken time out of such a very busy life to attend its centennial banquet will long be remembered by the people of Clinton.

OUTSTANDING FEATURE OF CENTENNIAL BANQUET WAS SECRETARY CONNELLY'S PRESENCE AT THE BIG EVENT

One of the outstanding features of the centennial banquet still being generally commented upon around town was the presence of Presidential Secretary Matthew J. Connelly.

Everyone in Clinton, especially officials of the centennial committee, were extremely apreciative of his attendance.

Secretary Connelly was hoping that his heavy responsibilities, in Washington, would permit him to get away for the Clinton event. President Truman's sojourn, in the South, apparently gave him the opportunity he was seeking.

Instead of taking the sea trip from Washington to Key West, Secretary Connelly came Clinton way post haste, thereby gracing the banquet table with the presence of a loyal Clinton boy very highly esteemed here and thus, from his standpoint, avoiding the seasickness pills and even more uncomfortable characteristics of the presidential cruise to Florida.

Because of his frequent talk about his home town, Clinton is often the subject matter of discussion and banter among the White House staff and in close Presidential circles.

On the night of the banquet, too late to be mentioned, a telegram was received from Washington pointing up Matt's presence in Clinton and concluding "Connelly for President."

After leaving here Wednesday, Secretary Connelly left Boston, by air, for Washington, to attend some businesses briefly at the White House and then took a plane for Key West, where he arrived in time to greet the Presidential party as it disembarked from its memorable trip through the storm-tossed seas off Cape Hatteras and other Southern waters, this morning. When the President and the boys saw Matt greeting them at the dock, somebody's face was red. And it wasn't Matt's.

Truly his presence here was a fine demonstration of his warm feeling for the old home town and was deeply appreciated by all. When he returns, in June, it is hoped he can persuade President Truman to come with him. A warm welcome awaits the President.

Food Is America's Greatest Bargain—To Further Reduce Farm Prices Endangers Our Country's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of this House during the week just passed we discussed a bill to correct certain inequities in existing acreage allotments for cotton and peanuts. Although this bill did not involve the problem of price support for agricultural products except in an indirect manner, certain representatives of urban constituencies took advantage of the occasion to renew their insinuations that American farmers are enjoying unwarranted and unfair prosperity at the expense of American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. What are the facts?

Fact No. 1 is that food is relatively cheaper here than elsewhere in the world. Nowhere else in the world today can an industrial or office worker supply his family with such abundant and nutritious food for so small a percent of his weekly wage or for so few hours of his labor. In this connection, I submit the following tabulation prepared by the United States Department of Labor and published in the November 1949 issue of Labor Review, volume 6, No. 5:

Minutes of working time required to buy 1 pound of food (or 1 dozen eggs)

	Flour	Rice	Bread	Beef average	Ham	Fish	Butter	Cheese	Milk	Eggs	Apples	Potatoes	Coffee	Tea	Lard	Oleo	Sugar
United States	4	8	6	29	28	19	32	26	9	27	7	2	23	56	9	14	4
Australia	4	------	5	22	------	------	34	25	10	53	------	4	------	43	------	------	6
Austria	15	37	15	92	------	------	164	132	22	244	------	12	308	538	108	53	33
Canada	4	------	6	42	------	------	45	38	9	33	------	2	39	64	16	------	6
Chile	13	18	16	------	------	------	182	103	23	122	------	6	88	241	102	------	15
Czechoslovakia:																	
Official	8	14	7	54	93	------	116	22	14	123	35	3	167	290	75	55	22
Black market	35	598	18	368	558	------	868	51	41	472	55	3	1,661	7,486	936	411	348
Denmark	6	------	11	53	------	14	64	36	8	108	9	2	57	141	------	27	4
Finland	6	------	8	------	78	32	108	76	12	109	------	2	214	------	48	30	18
France	20	40	10	------	80	41	146	122	22	106	------	3	124	------	56	76	27
Germany	12	------	9	------	------	------	120	85	------	298	51	4	640	------	------	57	27
Great Britain	5	17	5	------	44	------	34	25	16	57	------	3	76	72	23	11	10
Hungary	7	50	8	70	------	------	239	100	28	140	------	4	------	------	133	64	50
Ireland	7	------	8	77	------	48	87	69	20	170	------	4	------	87	38	57	11
Israel	10	12	6	78	------	45	41	25	22	77	19	5	------	------	------	31	8
Italy	22	21	17	136	300	74	222	151	28	112	------	6	191	------	108	------	46
Norway	6	23	5	41	------	15	61	25	10	79	------	3	40	192	------	10	8
Sweden	8	------	11	33	45	19	58	36	8	55	20	2	62	------	------	33	9
Switzerland	19	21	7	------	116	------	120	36	12	80	9	4	86	186	53	------	13
U. S. S. R.	52	145	25	254	------	294	542	------	59	158	141	6	706	1,506	------	------	141

To me, these facts prove conclusively that the American farmer is providing the American people with the lowest-cost food on earth.

As for the percentage of national income spent on food, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has this morning advised me that, according to their latest calculations, the people of the United States spend about 22 percent of their national income for food, outside of restaurants, and of this 22 percent the farmers get only about one-half, or 11 percent. At the same time, the people of Great Britain spend about 27 percent of their income for food, and the people of France spend approximately one-third of their income. There are no figures for countries like India and Haiti, but the percentage must approach two-thirds of their national income. Surely, in view of these facts, one cannot very seriously argue that American farmers are taking an unfair advantage of their city brothers or that they are enjoying an unfair share of our national income.

In fact, in 1949 the average net farm income, including the net return to the great corporate farms of California, including the income of the pullman car wheat barons and cattle raisers of the Plains, including the income of cotton plantations of the Delta, and including the income of the corn and livestock growers of the Middle West was only $1,705 per individual, including owner, renter, and day laborer, who actually worked in agricultural production, as compared with an average income of $3,250 per year wage paid to the men who work in the Ford plant.

Fact No. 2 is that farm income has dropped materially. In spite of the statement on this floor by a distinguished representative from one of our greatest cities that, "Food prices have just about doubled, whereas all other prices have not," the price of food over the past 2 years, the period then under discussion, has not only not "just about doubled." On the contrary, it has gone

down—probably it has gone down further and faster than the price of any other major item in the family budget.

From the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, I learn that the farm price of all foods dropped 30 percent during the years 1948 and 1949. The total drop in net farm income during this period was 24 percent. It would have been much larger had a kindly Providence not blessed our land with especially bountiful harvests during this period. If the critics of our farmers object to a discussion of the farm price of food and suggest that their quarrel is with retail prices in the large cities, I would suggest that in the spirit of fair play, it might be interesting to note who gets the consumer's dollar. The man who delivers milk in the city of New York charges 20 cents per quart. The New York farmer who produced that milk got 10 cents at his milk room, and the man who produces similar milk in Wisconsin gets only 6.7 cents per quart. I am advised that the delivery costs within the city itself are actually greater than the Wisconsin farmer's entire return on his investment and his labor combined. Need I cite other cases? They all show that the man who works with a food for only a few minutes takes more for his labor from the consumer than the farmer who has spent hours producing the same food. Most of these costs go for the physical handling or processing of the foods, as distinguished from the profits of retailers, and most of these costs are paid to urban people. In other words, a large part of the retail cost of food in our large cities is paid to the residents of those cities, not to the farmers.

Fact No. 3 is that the price of food has declined and is still declining. During the recent debate there were some unfair intimations that the price of food was rising and that the acreage adjustment legislation then under consideration would in some unexplained manner further raise the price of food. The very day this discussion took place, the Washington Star carried an advertisement of a large retail grocery institution comparing many present day prices with their prices of last year. The next morning the Washington Post carried a similar advertisement. I know of no more conclusive answer to the question of whether food prices are advancing or declining in urban centers than the actual offers to sell—here they are as shown by an actual ad in the Washington Post:

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
Evaporated milk:		
Cherub, 14½-ounce can	4 cans 49 cents	4 cans 45 cents.
Borden's, 14½-ounce can	2 cans 27 cents	4 cans 49 cents.
Carnation, 14½-ounce can	do	Do.
Pet, 14½-ounce can	do	Do.
Super Suds, 23-ounce package	Package 30 cents	Package 26 cents.
Ivory Flakes, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Ivory Snow, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Lux Flakes, 12½-ounce package	do	Do.
Duz, 20½-ounce package	do	Do.
Oxydol, 24-ounce package	do	Do.
Rinso, 24-ounce package	do	Do.
Fab, 18-ounce package	do	Do.
Tide, 18-ounce package	do	Do.
Dreft, 11-ounce package	Package 29 cents	Do.
Vel, 15-ounce package	do	Do.
Swan soap:		
Medium	2 cakes 19 cents	3 cakes 23 cents.
Large	Cake 16 cents	2 cakes 25 cents.
Fels Naptha soap	3 cakes 25 cents	Cake 7 cents.
P. & G. soap, laundry	do	3 cakes 20 cents.
Ivory soap:		
Medium	2 cakes 19 cents	3 cakes 23 cents.
Large	Cake 16 cents	2 cakes 25 cents.
Sweetheart, soap:		
Regular	2 cakes 17 cents	3 cakes 22 cents.
Bath	Cake 13 cents	2 cakes 21 cents.
Palmolive soap:		
Regular	2 cakes 17 cents	3 cakes 22 cents.
Bath	Cake 13 cents	2 cakes 21 cents.
Lifebuoy soap	2 cakes 17 cents	3 cakes 22 cents.
Camay soap, regular	do	4 cakes 29 cents.
Lux soap, regular	do	3 cakes 22 cents.
Ivory soap, personal	4 cakes 25 cents	4 cakes 19 cents.
Cashmere Bouquet soap	Cake 9 cents	3 cakes 22 cents.
Lux soap, bath	Cake 13 cents	2 cakes 21 cents.
Camay soap, bath	Cake 13 cents	2 cakes 21 cents.
Pork and beans, Heinz, 16-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Heinz vegetarian beans, 16-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Ritter's Pork and Beans, 15½-ounce jar	2 jars 29 cents	2 jars 23 cents.
Beans, Hanover Kidney, 20-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Tomatoes:		
Gardenside, 19-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Gardenside, 28-ounce can	Can 19 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Highway, 19-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Silver Run, 19-ounce can	2 cans 35 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Tomato Juice, Del Monte, 46-ounce can	Can 27 cents	Can 25 cents.
Syrup, Cary Maple, 12-ounce bottle	Bottle 69 cents	Bottle 59 cents.
Napkins, Graco Dinner, package of 60	Package 21 cents	2 packages 31 cents.
Towels, Hudson, package	2 packages 29 cents	2 packages 27 cents.
Corn, Del Monte White Cream, 17-ounce can.	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Flour:		
Aunt Jemima pancake, 40-ounce package.	Package 33 cents	Package 29 cents.
Pillsbury pancake, 20-ounce package	Package 17 cents	Package 15 cents.
Pillsbury pancake, 40-ounce package	Package 31 cents	Package 29 cents.
Suzanna pancake, 20-ounce package	2 packages 27 cents	2 packages 25 cents.
Bisquick:		
Twenty-ounce package	Package 26 cents	Package 25 cents.
40-ounce package	Package 47 cents	Package 45 cents.
Cake mix, Betty Crocker ginger, 14½-ounce package.	Package 28 cents	Package 27 cents.
Sugar wafers, Dutch Maid, 5-ounce package.	Package 19 cents	Package 17 cents.
Hydrox, Sunshine, 7½-ounce package	Package 25 cents	Package 23 cents.
Pretzels, Bachman, 6-ounce package	Package 19 cents	Package 17 cents.
Devil food squares, F. F. V., 6-ounce package.	Package 27 cents	Package 25 cents.
Kremox, Educator chocolate cookies, 8½-ounce package.	Package 23 cents	Package 20 cents.
Cookies, Weston butterscotch, 9-ounce package.	Package 21 cents	Package 19 cents.
Book matches, carton	Carton 17 cents	2 cartons 29 cents.
Reynolds foil wrap, 25-foot roll	Package 33 cents	Package 25 cents.
Catsup, Ritter's, 14-ounce bottle	Bottle 20 cents	Bottle 18 cents.
Corn meal:		
Indian Head, 2-pound package	Package 15 cents	Package 14 cents.
Mammy Lou, yellow, 20-ounce package.	Package 17 cents	Package 12 cents.
Flour, Harvest Blossom, 5-pound bag	Bag 38 cents	Bag 37 cents.
Macaroni:		
Mueller's, 8-ounce package	2 packages 23 cents	2 packages 21 cents.
Mueller's elbow, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Spaghetti:		
Mueller's, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Mueller's thin, 8-ounce package	do	Do.
Noodles:		
Mueller's fine, 6-ounce package	2 packages 27 cents	2 packages 25 cents.
Mueller's wide, 6-ounce package	do	Do.
Macaroni, Mueller's elbow, 16-ounce package.	2 packages 35 cents	2 packages 31 cents.
Spaghetti, Mueller's thin, 16-ounce package.	2 16-ounce packages 35 cents.	Do.
Noodles, Mueller's wide, 12-ounce package.	Package 21 cents	Package 20 cents.
Hormel's Spam, 12-ounce can	Can 45 cents	Can 30 cents.
Swift's Prem, 12-ounce can	Can 43 cents	Do.
Corned beef, Anglo, 12-ounce can	Can 47 cents	Can 43 cents.
Libby's corned-beef hash, 16-ounce can	Can 35 cents	Can 34 cents.
Armour's potted meat, 5½-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Libby's:		
Potted meat, 5½-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Deviled ham, 3-ounce can	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 35 cents.
Armour's Dried Beef, 2½-ounce glass	Glass 33 cents	Glass 31 cents.
Armour's Treet, 12-ounce can	Can 43 cents	Can 39 cents.
Weiners, Oscar Mayer, 13-ounce can	Can 49 cents	Can 47 cents.
Chicken, R. & R. boned, 6-ounce can	Can 79 cents	Can 75 cents.
Hamburgers, Claridge, 16-ounce can	Can 57 cents	Can 49 cents.
Mushrooms, Brandywine Button, 4-ounce can.	Can 39 cents	Can 37 cents.
Olive oil:		
Pompeian, 2-ounce bottle	Bottle 15 cents	Bottle 11 cents.
Pompeian, 4-ounce bottle	Bottle 27 cents	Bottle 18 cents.
Pompeian, 8-ounce bottle	Bottle 53 cents	Bottle 35 cents.
Wesson oil, 16-ounce bottle	Bottle 35 cents	Bottle 33 cents.
Pineapple, Dole crushed, 9-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Noodle soup, Lipton's mix, package	Package 33 cents	Package 32 cents.
Apple juice, Mott's, 32-ounce bottle	Bottle 23 cents	Bottle 20 cents.
Juice:		
Del Monte pineapple, 18-ounce can	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Del Monte pineapple, 46-ounce can	Can 38 cents	Can 35 cents.
Dole pineapple, 46-ounce can	do	Do.
Honey, Lake Shore, 16-ounce bottle	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
Clothespins, Ideal, package of 30	Package 15 cents	2 packages 25 cents.
Catsup, Del Monte, 14-ounce bottle	Bottle 19 cents	Bottle 17 cents.
Kidney beans, S. Hills Red, pound package.	Package 17 cents	Package 15 cents.
Salmon:		
Prince Leo Pink, 16-ounce can	Can 57 cents	Can 35 cents.
Gold Cove Chum, 16-ounce can	Can 49 cents	Can 33 cents.
Sardines:		
Tempest Oil, 3¼-ounce can	2 cans 21 cents	2 cans 19 cents.
Star Boat Natural, 15-ounce can	Can 19 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Star Boat Tomato Sauce, 15-ounce can.	Can 23 cents	Can 17 cents.
Tuna fish:		
White Star Light Meat, 7-ounce can	Can 41 cents	Can 39 cents.
Bumble Bee White Meat, 7-ounce can.	Can 55 cents	Can 43 cents.
Star Kist Grated, 6½-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 33 cents.
White Star Grated, 6½-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 33 cents.
Star Kist Light Meat, 7-ounce can	Can 41 cents	Can 39 cents.
Mackerel, Gorton's Salt Fillets, 12-ounce can.	Can 31 cents	Can 27 cents.
Herring, Plum Point, 15-ounce can	Can 17 cents	Can 13 cents.
Codfish Cakes, Gorton's, 10-ounce can	Can 23 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Broth, R. & R. Chicken, 12½-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Beef soup, Heinz, with vegetable 10¾-ounce can.	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Soup:		
Heinz chicken noodle, 10¾-ounce can	do	Do.
Heinz tomato, 11-ounce can	3 cans 35 cents	3 cans 32 cents.
Heinz vegetable, 11-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Heinz mushroom, 11-ounce can	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Heinz chicken, 10¾-ounce can	do	Do.
Shortening, Crisco, 3-pound can	Can 99 cents	Can 79 cents.
Nectar, Highway apricot, 12-ounce can	2 cans 23 cents	2 cans 21 cents.
Vinegar:		
Old Mill, pint bottle	Bottle 10 cents	Bottle 9 cents

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
Vinegar—Continued		
Old Mill, quart bottle	Bottle 18 cents	Quart 17 cents.
Old Mill, ½ gallon	Jug 35 cents	Jug 33 cents.
Old Mill, gallon	Jug 65 cents	Jug 59 cents.
Old Mill, white, pint bottle	Bottle 9 cents	Bottle 8 cents.
Shortening:		
Royal Satin, pound can	Can 31 cents	Can 25 cents.
Royal Satin, 3-pound can	Can 85 cents	Can 69 cents.
Spry, pound can	Can 35 cents	Can 29 cents.
Spry, 3-pound can	Can 99 cents	Can 79 cents.
Crisco, pound can	Can 35 cents	Can 29 cents.
Olives:		
Grandee Giant Queen Thrown, 12¾ ounce jar.	Jar 53 cents	Jar 49 cents.
Grandee Queen, 4½-ounce glass	Glass 27 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Grandee Stuffed Manz, 4½-ounce glass.	Quart 33 cents	Glass 29 cents.
Grandee Spanish Stuffed, 6-ounce glass.	Glass 55 cents	Glass 4[illegible] cents.
Grandee Spanish Stuffed, 3-ounce glass.	Glass 31 cents	Glass 29 cents.
Jelly, Schimmel's Currant, 12-ounce glass	Glass 27 cents	Glass 23 cents.
Preserves, Schimmel's Pineapple, 16-glass.	Glass 31 cents	Glass 29 cents.
Marmalade, Chiver's Old English, 16-ounce glass.	Glass 39 cents	Glass 29 cents.
Morsels, Nestle's, 6-ounce package	Package 23 cents	Package 19 cents.
Flour:		
Aunt Jemima Buckwheat, 20-ounce package.	Package 18 cents	Package 16 cents.
Aunt Jemima Buckwheat, 40-ounce Package.	Package 35 cents	Package 31 cents.
Aunt Jemima Pancake, 20-ounce package.	2 packages 35 cents	Package 15 cents.
Corn meal, Indian Head, 10-pound bag	Bag 63 cents	Bag 57 cents.
Juice, Del Monte Tomato, 18-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Corn:		
Del Monte Golden Bantam, cream style, 17-ounce can.	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Country Home W. K. Golden Bantam, 12-ounce can.	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Del Monte W. K. Golden Bantam, 12-ounce can.	2 cans 35 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Highway G. B., cream style, 20-ounce can.	2 cans 29 cents	Can 10 cents.
Niblets corn, 12-ounce can	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Niblets, Mexicorn, 12-ounce can	2 cans 39 cents	2 cans 35 cents.
Corn, Mitchell shoe peg, 20-ounce can	2 cans 37 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Green beans, Br'gate cut, 20-ounce can	Can 20 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Beans, Gardenside, cut green, 19-ounce can.	2 cans 27 cents	2 cans 21 cents.
Lima beans, Highway G. & W., 20-ounce can.	Can 23 cents	Can 15 cents.
Butterbeans, Seaside, 20-ounce can	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Limagrands, Superfine, 20-ounce can	Can 17 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Spinach:		
Emerald Bay, 27-ounce can	Can 19 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Emerald Bay, 18-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Hominy, Van Camp's, 29-ounce can	Can 15 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Sauerkraut:		
Libby's, 19-ounce can	2 cans 23 cents	2 cans 21 cents.
Libby's, 28-ounce can	2 cans 29 cents	2 cans 27 cents.
Green Giant peas, 17-ounce can	2 cans 41 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Potato sticks, O & C, 2¼-ounce can	2 cans 23 cents	2 cans 21 cents.
Potatoes, Dulany Irish, 19-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Kraft macaroni dinner, 7½-ounce package.	Package 15 cents	Package 13 cents.
Apricots:		
Valley Gold, halves unpeeled, 30-ounce can.	Can 31 cents	Can 25 cents.
Del Monte, halves unpeeled, 17-ounce can.	2 cans 43 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Sauce, Ocean Spray cranberry, 16-ounce can.	2 cans 33 cents	2 cans 31 cents.
Cherries:		
Del Monte dark sweet, 17-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 29 cents.
Del Monte light sweet, 17-ounce can.	Can 37 cents	Can 29 cents.
Fruit cocktail:		
Hostess Delight, 30-ounce can	Can 36 cents	Can 31 cents.
Del Monte, 17-ounce can	2 cans 45 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Del Monte, 30-ounce can	Can 37 cents	Can 32 cents.
Del Monte fruits for salad, 29-ounce jar	Jar 49 cents	Jar 45 cents.
Peaches:		
Del Monte YC, halves or sliced, 29-ounce can.	Can 32 cents	2 cans 47 cents.
Del Monte yellow clingstone sliced, 16-ounce can.	Can 21 cents	2 cans 33 cents.
Del Monte yellow freestone halves, 30-ounce can.	Can 41 cents	Can 37 cents.
Castle Crest sliced or halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 31 cents	2 cans 45 cents.
Highway sliced or halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 29 cents	2 cans 39 cents.
Pears:		
Del Monte Bartlett halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 45 cents	Can 33 cents.
Harper House Bartlett halves, 29-ounce can.	Can 44 cents	Can 31 cents.
Pineapple, Dole crushed, 20-ounce can	Can 29 cents	2 cans 51 cents.
Prunes, Del Monte prepared, 29-ounce jar.	Jar 31 cents	Jar 27 cents.
White Rice:		
Show Boat Zenith, pound package	Package 15 cents	Package 13 cents.
Show Boat Zenith, 2-pound package	Package 29 cents	Package 25 cents.
Show Boat Long Grain, pound package.	Package 19 cents	Package 15 cents.
Show Boat Long Grain, 2-pound package.	Package 37 cents	Package 29 cents.
Lima Beans:		
Sunny Hills large, pound package	Package 27 cents	Package 16 cents.
Sunny Hills large, 2-pound package	Package 53 cents	Package 31 cents.
Sunny Hills baby, pound package	Package 16 cents	Package 15 cents.
Sunny Hills baby, 2-pound package	Package 30 cents	Package 29 cents.
Navy beans, Sunny Hills, pound package.	Package 15 cents	Package 14 cents.
Split peas, Sunny Hills green, pound package.	----do	Package 12 cents.
Wesson oil, 32-ounce bottle	Bottle 69 cents	Bottle 61 cents.
Salad oil, Mayday, 16-ounce bottle	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
Cherries:		
Maraschino, 8-ounce bottle	Bottle 27 cents	Bottle 25 cents.
Maraschino with stems, 8-ounce bottle.	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 31 cents.
Heinz, Chili sauce, 12-ounce bottle	Bottle 33 cents	Bottle 32 cents.
McCormick, Parsley flakes, ½-ounce can	Can 12 cents	Can 11 cents.
M. & M. candy, 7-ounce package	Package 23 cents	Package 21 cents.
Cheese:		
Dutch Mill American, 8-ounce package.	Package 28 cents	Package 26 cents.
Kraft American grated, 2-ounce can	Can 15 cents	Can 14 cents.
Kraft relish spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 23 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft pimiento spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 23 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft olive pimiento, 5-ounce glass	Glass 23 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft pineapple spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 23 cents	Glass 21 cents.
Kraft Old English spread, 5-ounce glass.	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Kraft Roka spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Kraft Smokelle spread, 5-ounce glass	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Kraft cheese and bacon spread, 5-ounce glass.	Glass 29 cents	Glass 25 cents.
Cheese food:		
Kraft Velveeta, 8-ounce package	Package 29 cents	Package 27 cents.
Pabst Ett, 6½-ounce package	Package 27 cents	Package 24 cents.
Mayonnaise:		
Nu Made, 8-ounce jar	Jar 24 cents	Jar 21 cents.
NuMade, 16-ounce jar	Jar 43 cents	Jar 37 cents.
Piedmont, 16-ounce jar	Jar 37 cents	Jar 33 cents.
Piedmont, 32-ounce jar	Jar 69 cents	Jar 59 cents.
Dukes, 16-ounce jar	Jar 45 cents	Jar 39 cents.
McCormick, 16-ounce jar	Jar 39 cents	Jar 37 cents.
Kraft, 8-ounce jar	Jar 25 cents	Jar 22 cents.
Kraft, 16-ounce jar	Jar 45 cents	Jar 39 cents.
Duchess:		
Salad dressing, 8-ounce jar	Jar 20 cents	Jar 19 cents.
Salad dressing, 16-ounce jar	Jar 33 cents	Jar 30 cents.
Salad dressing, 32-ounce jar	Jar 59 cents	Jar 53 cents.
Miracle Whip:		
Kraft, 8-ounce jar	Jar 21 cents	Jar 20 cents.
Kraft, 16-ounce jar	Jar 35 cents	Jar 32 cents.
Cascade:		
Salad dressing, 16-ounce jar	Jar 27 cents	Jar 23 cents.
Salad dressing, 32-ounce jar	Jar 45 cents	Jar 35 cents.
Miracle Whip:		
Sandwich spread, 8-ounce jar	Jar 21 cents	Jar 20 cents.
Sandwich spread, 16-ounce jar	Jar 35 cents	Jar 32 cents.
Lunch box:		
Sandwich spread, 8-ounce jar	Jar 20 cents	Jar 19 cents.
Sandwich spread, 16-ounce jar	Jar 33 cents	Jar 30 cents.
Cheese, smoked Kaukauna, 6-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Jar 35 cents.
Cream cheese, Kraft, Philadelphia, 8-ounce package.	Package 18 cents	2 packages 33 cents.
Cheese:		
Kaukauna plain American, 6-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Package 35 cents.
Kaukauna garlic, 6-ounce package	Package 41 cents	Package 35 cents.
Raisins, Del Monte seeded, 15-ounce package.	Package 25 cents	Package 23 cents.
Margarine:		
Parkay, color quick, pound	Package 35 cents	Package 31 cents.
Dalewood, pound	Package 23 cents	Package 21 cents.
Blue Bonnet yellow quick, pound	Package 35 cents	Package 31 cents.
Mrs. Filbert's colored, pound	Package 45 cents	Package 39 cents.
Pure lard, pound	2 pounds 35 cents	2 pounds 29 cents.
Fluffo, pound	Package 25 cents	Package 22 cents.
Walnuts, Large Diamond, pound package.	Package 45 cents	Package 39 cents.
Eggs:		
Extra large grade A, Cream o' the Crop, dozen.	Dozen 65 cents	Dozen 53 cents.
Large grade A, Breakfast Gems, dozen.	Dozen 63 cents	Dozen 51 cents.
Cheese:		
Dutch Maid limburger, 8-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Package 37 cents.
Borden's Roquefort, 1¼-ounce package.	Package 23 cents	Package 18 cents.
Borden's Roquefort, 3-ounce package	Package 45 cents	Package 39 cents.
Beans, with pork, Campbell's, 16-ounce can.	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Kidney beans, Van Camp's, 17-ounce can.	Can 14 cents	2 cans 25 cents.
Tomato juice, Del Monte, 18-ounce can	2 cans 25 cents	2 cans 23 cents.
Hominy, Banjou, 20-ounce can	2 cans 21 cents	2 cans 19 cents.
Spaghetti, Heinz Cooked, 15¼-ounce can	2 cans 31 cents	2 cans 29 cents.
Apricots, Del Monte, halves unpeeled, 30-ounce can.	Can 33 cents	Can 31 cents.
FROZEN FOODS		
Rolls, Clover Leaf, 10-ounce package	Package 23 cents	Package 21 cents.
Asparagus spears, Birds Eye, 12-ounce package.	Package 57 cents	Package 51 cents.
Lima beans:		
Birds Eye, baby, 12-ounce package	Package 51 cents	Package 31 cents.
Birds Eye, fordhook, 12-ounce package.	Package 43 cents	Package 35 cents.

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
FROZEN FOODS—continued		
Lima beans—Continued		
Snow Crop, fordhook, 12-ounce package.	Package 41 cents	Package 34 cents.
Green beans:		
Birds Eye, cut, 10-ounce package	Package 29 cents	2 packages 49 cents.
Birds Eye, french, 10-ounce package.	Package 31 cents	Do.
Birds Eye, wax, 10-ounce package	Package 30 cents	Do.
Broccoli spears, Snow Crop, 10-ounce package.	Package 37 cents	Package 29 cents.
Cauliflower, Snow Crop, 10-ounce package.	Package 35 cents	Do.
Corn on cob, Snow Crop, 2 ears	Package 29 cents	Package 25 cents.
Cut corn, Birds Eye, 10-ounce package	Package 27 cents	Package 23 cents.
Birds Eye:		
Mixed vegetables, 12-ounce package	Package 31 cents	2 packages 49 cents.
Peas, 12-ounce package	2 packages 53 cents	Do.
Potatoes, Birds Eye, french fries, 10-ounce package.	Package 31 cents	Do.
Spinach, Birds Eye, 14-ounce package	do	Do.
Succotash, Birds Eye, 11-ounce package	Package 39 cents	Package 33 cents.
SAFEWAY GUARANTEED MEATS		
Pork chops:		
Ends	Pound 45 cents	Pound 41 cents.
Center	Pound 65 cents	Pound 59 cents.
Pork roast:		
Whole or half loin	Pound 51 cents	Pound 47 cents.
Rib end up to 3 pounds	Pound 41 cents	Pound 33 cents.
Loin end up to 3 pounds	Pound 49 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Fresh picnics, whole, bone in	Pound 39 cents	Pound 33 cents.
Spareribs, small meaty	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.

	Price Mar. 16, 1949	Today's price
SAFEWAY GUARANTEED MEATS—con.		
Hams:		
Ready-to-eat, whole or shank half	Pound 65 cents	Pound 63 cents.
Smoked skinned, whole or shank half	Pound 63 cents	Pound 55 cents.
Picnics, regular smoked, whole—bone in	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Sliced bacon:		
Webster	Pound 45 cents	Pound 39 cents.
Swift's	Pound 73 cents	Pound 62 cents.
Sausage meat, Briggs' all-pork	Pound 37 cents	Pound 33 cents.
Frankfurters, Briggs' skinless	Pound 47 cents	Pound 45 cents.
SAFEWAY FARM-FRESH PRODUCE		
Apples:		
York's	2 pounds 25 cents	3 pounds 25 cents.
Western Winesaps	2 pounds 31 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Beets	2 bunches 25 cents	2 bunches 19 cents.
Cabbage, new	Pound 7 cents	Pound 5 cents.
Pascal celery	Pound 17 cents	Pound 9 cents.
White celery	Pound 13 cents	Pound 8 cents.
Chicory	Pound 19 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Cucumbers	Pound 29 cents	Pound 19 cents.
Cellophane kale	Package 19 cents	Package 17 cents.
Lettuce	Pound 21 cents	Pound 14 cents.
Onions, boiling	2 pounds 29 cents	2 pounds 25 cents.
Potatoes:		
Maine white	5 pounds 29 cents	2 pounds 9 cents.
Do	10-pound bag 55 cents.	10-pound bag 45 cents.
New white	5 pounds 35 cents	Pound 6 cents.
New York White	10-pound bag 51 cents.	10-pound bag 33 cents.
Squash, yellow	Pound 19 cents	Pound 15 cents.
Tomatoes, cellophane package	Package 25 cents	2 packages 29 cents.

In view of these facts, is there anyone who will still contend that food prices are rising? If food prices are not rising, how can agricultural income do anything but fall even faster than the volume of production falls? In view of the fact that many basic farm products are now under marketing quotas and many more are evidently soon going under such control, the total volume of production is surely headed downward. The peanut acreage allowed in my State this year, even with the extra adjustment granted by the House last week, is nearly 40 percent less than that actually planted 2 years ago. The cotton acreage in Texas in 1950 is approximately three-fourths what we grew in 1949. The same is true of other crops and of other States. Do the gentlemen from industrial areas believe that it is possible to thus drastically reduce the volume of agricultural production and at the same time further reduce the price of farm products and still maintain enough purchasing power on our farms to buy the products of their mills and their factories? Do these gentlemen believe that it will profit the worker for International Harvester, or General Motors, anything to bring the price of eggs down to 10 cents per dozen if in so doing they place that industrial worker in the ranks of the unemployed? Of course, there are those who will suggest that with such low food prices the family could live on unemployment insurance—to which the farmer must contribute but in which he does not share—or even on direct relief. Doubtless there are those who will look no further than this, but surely the Members of this House must know that our Nation cannot survive under such a policy. The fact is that the industrial worker cannot afford to allow farm income to drop much further.

Fact No. 4 is that farmers are not now maintaining their relative economic position. Farmers have never throughout the long history of the world enjoyed rewards for their labors which were equal to the rewards enjoyed by urban people. I referred to this discrepancy a moment ago when I called attention to the fact that the laborer in the Ford plant with no capital investment makes more per year than the average farmer gets both for his labor and as a return on his investment. When the comparison is placed on the basis of hourly income, the difference is even more striking. No one can say just exactly what hours a farmer works, or just what he produces for sale within a given hour. We cannot, therefore, be too certain as to the farmers' returns for an hour of labor. I am rather familiar with the methods of producing cotton. I realize that there has been some increase in the efficiency of production in recent years, but I know that any student of the problem would agree that one and one-half times the price per pound for cotton will reflect a very generous estimate of the return or wage per hour the farmer receives for his labor. The present parity price of cotton is just about 30 cents per pound; one and one-half times that amount is 45 cents. The market price is about 10 percent lower. Cotton has always been considered as one of the most profitable crops. Therefore, it cannot be contended that the farmers' average hourly wage exceeds 50 cents. How many of the urban consumers in whose behalf complaint is made earn as little as 50 cents per hour? Frankly, I don't believe that most of these people want our farmers to work for less—at least so long as city people continue to enjoy wage scales far in excess of this.

The truth is many urban workers are even today asking for more pay for shorter hours. Today the official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Trainmen News, carries a banner headline reading, "Shorter Work Week Held Vital, No Pay Cut Either." It has been but a few days ago that the soft coal miners received a new and more favorable contract. A little earlier the steel workers got an increase. I am not raising the question of the justice of these increases, or of the righteousness of the demands of most Government employees that their wages be increased and their work be reduced, but I know and you know that all of these demands are, if granted, bound to be reflected in the cost of the things farmers buy. The truth is that while urban wages continue to climb, farm income is going down, and the difference between the purchasing power of the two groups widens. Actually, each group is dependent on the other for full markets. Both groups can sell freely and enjoy maximum prosperity only when both have sufficient income to buy freely. The maximum opportunity to exchange goods and services is evidently reached when farm prices are at parity. Parity may be difficult of exact definition. Doubtless, our existing legal formula results in some inaccurate determination, but it approaches as nearly to the exact as our imperfect knowledge enables us to approach. Are we then to excuse our failure to use the knowledge we have on the theory that if we cannot be perfect, we won't try to approach a fair relationship between the price of the things farmers buy and the price of things farmers sell?

To listen to the complaints of some of our colleagues one might think that they do not want our farmers to be able to buy the products of their own cities' shops. We hear violent protests, for instance, against the support price of eggs. Right now the farmers of central Texas are taking from 23 to 30 cents per dozen for their eggs. This is only 90 percent of parity adjusted—cut down—for time

and place. Does the housewife of any city ask the farmer to take less than 23 cents for eggs? The truth is the support prices provided by our agricultural program do not hold the price of any food up to even a fair price. No feed is supported above 90 percent of a fair price. The farm price support program never has and does not now compel any consumer to pay more than a fair price for food. Any time the farm price gets above 90 percent of equality, the Government quits supporting that price. Any time the farmer is able to get above 90 percent of a fair price, it is due to causes other than the price support program. The program does help farmers get 90 percent of a fair price. It does not force any consumer to pay more than a fair price.

Do the city dwellers expect to be able to cut farm prices lower and keep enough farmers in business to enable them to always buy cheap food? Mr. Speaker, such a thought is twin brother to the ever recurrent but always disappointing belief on the part of some people that if we would but allow great trusts and monopolies to destroy all small business, the consumer would profit. Of course, he would enjoy the low prices resulting from the effort of the small-business man to compete with the monopoly, but as soon as the independent business is done in, the monopoly always raises the price higher than it was to begin with; and as soon as enough farmers are put out of business, the city worker is going to feel not only the added competition of the displaced farmer for his job, but he is going to find that the man who succeeded in staying on the farm will no longer sell his products at less than cost.

All our farmers ask is parity or equality in the price structure. I have never come before this House asking more. The so-called farm bloc, to which our distinguished colleague scornfully referred, asks for no more—but we do ask for justice. We do ask that we be allowed to continue to provide the market for industrial goods which is so essential to the welfare of our city people. We do ask the opportunity to continue to furnish the American people with the cheapest and best food yet available in this whole world. We do ask our city brothers not to pull the house down on all of us. We know all America can prosper together. We know no one segment of our society can long prosper at the expense of other segments. We know there is no such thing as the "free" lunch. We are ready to do a full day's intelligent work, but we don't like to be branded as leaches or Shylocks when we ask something short of a fair price for the products of that labor. We are willing to sell our produce for less if you are willing to sell the things we must buy for less. You set the wage and price pattern for the Nation. We are willing for you to set it high if you wish, but we insist that you cannot maintain high wages, high profits, and high industrial prices if you depress farm prices far below their present level.

Snooping Bureaucrats Versus Small Business

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Federal Snoopers Are After Me" has placed my home town of Downingtown, Pa., in the forefront of the news and has emphasized in graphic manner the extent to which the Federal Government has proceeded in its harassment of the small-business man. Robinson McIlvaine, the author of the article referred to, is the editor of the Downingtown Archive and, incidentally, is the great-grandson of Abraham Robinson McIlvaine, who represented our district in Congress from 1843 to 1849. In the Post story Mr. McIlvaine recites a set of circumstances which would be extremely funny were it not for the fact they recount the ends to which bureaucracy will go to coerce its own citizens into obedience to governmental directives which Congress certainly never anticipated when it passed the wage and hour law. The pay-off in the story is found in the editor's conclusion that in order to comply with the governmental ukase he will either have to borrow from his local bank the funds necessary to pay his own salary or face the alternative of suing himself and going through bankruptcy. Nationalization—brother, it is closer than you think. The following news item is taken from the Coatesville (Pa.) Record and explores in more detail the incidents leading to the Post story:

GOVERNMENT ORDERS DOWNINGTOWN MAN TO PAY HIMSELF $582 BACK WAGES

An investigator for the Wages and Hours Division of the United States Department of Agriculture has just discovered that Robinson McIlvaine, editor of the Downingtown Archive, has violated the wages and hours law by not paying himself enough money.

Accordingly the Downingtown man has been ordered by the Labor Department to pay himself $582 back wages that his books show he owes himself. When McIlvaine pleaded that he did not have the money he was told to get it for the law must be served no matter how wacky it is interpreted.

As matters stand today, McIlvaine appears to have a choice of one or two ways out of his dilemma. He can go to the bank and borrow the money, pay himself and then put the money back in bank, but this will involve some interest expense. Or he can sue himself, get judgment, then go through bankruptcy proceedings.

Just how the Government investigator arrived at the amount of wages that McIlvaine owes himself is rather involved. It seems that the investigator spent many hours in the newspaper office going over the books. Under the law McIlvaine was supposed to pay himself a minimum of 40 cents an hour for 8 hours each day up to 40 hours a week and time and half time for all additional hours.

Considering the amount of time that McIlvaine spent working for himself he had underpaid himself to the extent of $582 at the minimum rate. The investigator also found that he had not complied with the law when he called a number of people to help him fold papers on press days, and he owed these people more than he had paid them for an hour or two of work once a week. But this matter was easily and quickly adjusted.

Ordinarily weekly newspapers with circulations under 4,000 copies are exempt from the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act, and because of this McIlvaine thought he was complying with the law. His troubles grew out of the fact that his newspaper and his printing plant are two different corporate entities and although he operates both his right hand is not supposed, according to Government investigators, to know what his left hand is doing.

He solved the paper folding problem by installing a folding machine and firing all of his part-time helpers who were quite satisfied to get some pin money for a few hours work each week. He is now trying to figure out how to solve his own problem by firing himself but he hasn't been able to come up with the answer yet.

According to reports the investigators are now busy going over the books of some other Downingtown industries with good prospects of making some more brilliant discoveries. Already it is said they made some discoveries in Kennett Square and Honey Brook that caused employers to feel the heavy hand of the law. And since the minimum wage has now been raised from 40 to 75 cents an hour there may be worse troubles ahead.

Electric Light and Power Companies Versus REA Loans

REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the big electric light and power companies have banded together and are on the march to destroy the rural electrification program. They are spending millions of dollars on radio programs and newspaper advertisements to spread misleading propaganda concerning the REA. The high-salaried executives of light and power companies have propagandized the public and have misinformed their employees and stockholders to believe that they will lose their employment or investments if the rural electrification program is successfully continued.

From the beginning of the development of our great country the farmer was the pioneer who cleared the wilderness and led the way for the cities and towns that followed. For many years the people living in cities have enjoyed modern conveniences provided by electricity. But the farmer and his family were compelled to continue to do without electricity and undergo the inconveniences and drudgery of the pioneer. Electric power companies could not make enough or as much profit in the rural areas because of the cost and distance of transmitting electricity to the farmer,

and their charges or rates were too high for the farmer's needs. Hence the rural areas were not served. For many years cities and towns have successfully owned and operated their own municipal light and power plants at great savings to the taxpaying citizens of such cities and towns. In the year of 1935 a similar plan was conceived to provide electricity for the farmers and rural areas. The Federal Government established the Rural Electrification Administration, generally known as the REA. Congress authorized this agency, the REA, to loan money to groups of farmers and people in the rural areas, who were not being served with electricity, and who organized and incorporated themselves into a legal company, generally known as electric co-ops, as and if authorized by State laws, for the purpose of generating and supplying electricity for their own use. Following the acts of the President and the Congress of the United States, the State Legislature of Missouri passed laws authorizing and controlling the incorporation of electric co-ops for the benefit of the farmers and the people residing in the rural areas who desired to provide and serve themselves with electricity.

The Rural Electrification Administration Act was enacted by Congress in the year of 1935 and it empowers the Administrator of the REA to make loans for the construction of power plants and transmission lines to serve rural areas. Before any loan is made to a rural REA cooperative, clear proof must be presented to show that the project will be self-liquidating, that there is need for the project, and that the Government will incur no loss. No loan is authorized for a project which would directly compete with any existing facilities, furthermore, the State and Federal laws so protect the private power companies.

You will recall the bitter opposition of the great power trusts against the beginning of the rural-electrification program in the years of 1935–36. The big power companies would not serve all the farmers and rural areas with electricity—but, like the dog in the manger, they did not want the farmers and the people in the rural areas to provide electricity for themselves. Why? They wanted to control and monopolize the supply of electricity and take "the cream of the business" by serving only a small percentage of the farmers in or near thickly populated areas. Neither did the power companies want the people to generally know that electricity could be produced and sold in sparsely settled rural areas at a price equal to or less than the power companies charged in the densely populated cities and towns.

Recently I have received numerous letters, the majority of which were from stockholders and employees of the Kansas City Light & Power Co. protesting against the REA loans to the Central Missouri Power Cooperative, of Missouri, and the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, of Missouri, for construction of a steam electric power plant by each cooperative for generating electricity for sale and use by their members and consumers only. I know that the persons who wrote the letters complaining and opposing the REA loans for construction of the steam power plants, were and are sincere, but I firmly believe that they have been generally and specifically misinformed of the facts and misled into fright psychology by the power companies' use of the scare word "socialism." The letters complain against the false allegations that the taxpayers are paying for the steam plants; that the Kansas City Light & Power Co. paid taxes and the farmers' electric co-ops did not pay taxes; that the SPA transmission lines and rural cooperative steam plants would be a wasteful duplication of existing facilities owned by power companies; that the proposed steam plants would destroy free enterprise, and were socialistic.

I believe that the persons who wrote such letters to me will give my explanation and argument in favor of the REA loans as much unbiased consideration as they and others gave to the representations made by the executives and managers of the power and light companies, who, in fact, grossly misrepresented the facts with prejudicial propaganda to arouse feelings of opposition, which is in accord with the selfish propaganda program planned by the power trusts to control or destroy the rural electrification program.

I am not a stockholder nor an employee of a power and light company. I am not a stockholder nor an employee or member of a rural electric cooperative power and light company. Therefore, I have no selfish personal interests which could influence my judgment or opinion on the controversy between the power companies and the REA. I have carefully investigated and considered all of the facts surrounding and in connection with the power companies' fight against the REA. I will not straddle the fence on the issue, but will give you an honest answer and statement of my opinions and arguments concerning this controversy.

Almost everyone agrees that the farmers and people residing in the rural areas should have the opportunity of the advantages and conveniences provided and served by electricity. The farmer, especially, has as much or more use and practical need for electricity than most other people. He needs electricity not only for providing lights and conveniences for his home, barns, and storehouses, but he also needs electricity to provide power for his use in the many productive activities on the farm.

Now let us examine and consider some of the contentions and misrepresentations presented by the power companies, and being used as propaganda to prejudice the public against the REA program and the REA loans for the construction of the steam-generating plants which I have mentioned.

REA LOANS ARE NOT GIFTS AT THE EXPENSE OF TAXPAYERS

The loans by the REA for the construction of the two steam-power plants in Missouri, to be connected and integrated with the SPA's hydroelectric transmission lines to serve the farmers and rural areas, positively are not grants or gifts. The money is loaned by the REA to the Central Missouri Power Cooperative and the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, both of Missouri, for construction of steam plants, and the loans will be repaid quarterly, with interest, and will not cost the taxpayers one cent. In connection with the subject of loans, I mention the activity of the RFC—Reconstruction Finance Corporation—a Federal finance agency, which was established and supported by the Federal Government. This agency was established during the period following the depression, and it loaned billions to big business corporations, such as banks, utilities, railroads, factories, and other business industries, to preserve our capitalistic system and encourage free, competitive enterprise. It was a worthy program of great benefit to the stability and resources of our country. But many of such big-business industries so saved and nourished back to health are now so strong and prosperous that they spread propaganda condemning and branding REA Government loans as socialism.

Again I emphatically state that the Rural Electrification Administration of the Federal Government loans the money to the farmers' electric cooperatives for the construction of the two steam-generating plants. They are sound loans and will be paid when the quarterly payments are due, with interest. Ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of all installment payments due on the principal of all REA loans made in Missouri have been paid when due, and in addition, as of December 31, 1949, the farmers' electric cooperatives in Missouri have also paid all interest due on the loans, amounting to a total of $4,403,000. No bank has a better collection record, and no borrower has a better credit record of payments.

TAXES

The properties of the REA co-ops are taxable. The Federal Government does not have authority to exempt cooperative property from State or local taxes. It is true that the electric-power companies pay taxes into the treasury of the county wherein their property and transmission lines are located—so do you and every farmer and businessman in the county—but bear in mind that the electric-power company conducting business in your county also takes hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the county, too, in return for its services and electricity sold. There is nothing wrong about that—but no other business concern or industry demands or expects to monopolize all of a certain business because they pay their share of taxes. It is true that most of the REA co-ops do not pay income taxes because they have not and do not earn a net income profit. No person, corporation, or business concern, pays an income tax when they do not make or earn a profit or income over and above operating costs. However, generating plants, transmission lines, and all other properties owned by the REA co-ops are subject to taxation in Missouri to the same extent as any commercial power company. Such assessment, levy, and collection of taxes are provided for, controlled and executed by the laws and officials of the State of Mis-

souri. Again, I emphatically reiterate and emphasize the fact that there is no law, State or Federal, which exempts the REA co-ops from payment of taxes, and they are subject to the laws of taxation to the same extent as any other property owner.

DUPLICATION OF ELECTRICAL FACILITIES

The Federal Government, in its efforts and program to control floods, constructed flood-control dams in different sections of the country. Some of the dams are designed and equipped to generate electricity. Several years ago the Government constructed the Norfork Dam and the Bull Shoals Dam in Arkansas primarily for flood-control purposes, and in order not to waste the power and to liquidate and pay part of the costs of the construction of such flood-control dams, they were designed to also generate electricity. The Southwestern Power Administration, generally referred to as SPA, is an agency established by Congress for the purpose of constructing and operating transmission lines to transmit and sell the hydroelectric power, so developed, to REA cooperatives, municipal power and light plants, and commercial power and light companies.

It is generally admitted that additional generation and transmission facilities must be constructed if the growing electrical power needs are provided for. The rural-cooperative companies should have the right to construct those facilities which are necessary to properly serve their members. To do so cannot be considered a duplication of existing facilities any more than it would be a duplication to build a road where none exists, or to build a four-lane highway where an existing two-lane highway cannot carry the traffic.

Electrical engineers recommend and it is generally conceded that the greatest efficiency and economic benefits can be derived from hydroelectric power when integrated with steam plants, to firm the supply of electricity. The SPA's hydroelectric power is largely used to serve peak loads, and steam-electric power is utilized to serve part of the peak and much of the off-peak loads. Half, or less, of the SPA electric power will be firmed, the rest must be firmed up with fuel generating steam plants. The REA loan to the Central Missouri Power Cooperative, for the construction of a steam plant in Cole County, will be connected and integrated with the SPA transmission lines from the hydroelectric dams in Arkansas, and, likewise, the same arrangement is proposed in connection with the steam-generating plant to be constructed by the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative at Missouri City.

Power companies have always actively opposed the rural-electrification program and also definitely refused to contract with the SPA for use of the hydroelectric power from the Government dams in connection with their steam-generating plants to serve the rural electric cooperatives at their load centers. The power companies refused to do so even though they were offered a monopoly contract for the hydroelectric power from SPA—Southwestern Power Administration. Interchange of power and pooling of electric facilities arrangements are common practice and important devices widely used in the electric industry to reduce construction, reduce investment, operating expenses, and power costs. That is the proposed arrangement by and between the Southwestern Power Administration and the rural electric cooperatives of Missouri. As a result of this arrangement in the REA loans for the construction of the steam plants, thousands of farmers, still without electric service in the rural areas, especially in our Second Congressional District, will get electric service for the first time, and thousands already served by the rural electric co-ops will get better service at lower cost. That is the arrangement the big power companies object to—they want the rural electric cooperatives to be entirely dependent upon and at the mercy of the power companies for electric power. There is absolutely no reason or justification for singling out rural electric cooperatives and denying them the benefits and advantages of interchange of power and integration of such facilities arrangements, as practiced by the power companies.

And, again I reiterate that the rural electric cooperatives program of constructing two steam plants in Missouri, and the interchange of power and integration of facilities arrangements, by contract with the SPA—Southwestern Power Administration—will in no way whatsoever interfere or compete with the Kansas City Light & Power Co., or with any other commercial power company. As I have stated, Federal and State laws protect the power companies by prohibiting such interference or competition.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND SOCIALISM

We all agree on the principle and need for freedom of enterprise, but like the freedom of the individual, it should not be abused to injure the rights and free enterprise of others. I am unalterably in favor of free enterprise—not for just a privileged few—but an opportunity for honest free enterprise to all. The electric light and power corporations demand and are on a concerted march to monopolize free enterprise and to control all generation of electricity and the supply of electric light and power business. They are spending millions of dollars on radio programs and newspaper advertisements to propagandize and prejudice the public against the REA program. They and their high-salaried executives and lobbyists brand and condemn all efforts of the Federal Government to aid and raise the standard of living for the farmer and laboring man as socialism. They lobby and fight against the REA, farm price-support program, labor-union laws, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and other programs which have contributed so much to our economic stability. Yet they, the electric light and power corporations, have enjoyed special and privileged protection of a price-support program for many, many years. That price-support program for the power companies is provided for by State laws which, first, prohibits competition in any area served by the electric power companies; and second, establishes and enforces the collection rates and charges for electricity based upon investment and cost of operation to assure a substantial profit for the power companies. They are also empowered by law to condemn and appropriate private property for use in the operation of their business, and they use the public highways or road rights-of-way for erection of poles and transmission lines without payment for such valuable and specific use. Those are a few of the special privileges which the power companies enjoy, and I ask the electric power companies, Is that socialism, or is it free enterprise?

During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations the big electric light and power companies were entrenched with great power and authority—they were eating high up on the hog. They were not satisfied with a good profit and the many special privileges and monopolies they enjoyed, but were so greedy and grasping for money and political power that they formed and set up holding companies, sold stock to the innocent public for millions of dollars, then manipulated and exploited the companies, leaving the stockholder holding an empty sack. During that same period the electric power companies set up huge "slush funds" which they used to bribe and influence public officers and control elections. The Union Electric Co. of St. Louis, Mo., was one of such companies which had a big slush fund, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars, which was used by its executives and officers to elect and control State and county officers and to control courts and juries. Now, I ask the light and power companies was that free enterprise? However, that condition and practice was eliminated by laws passed by Congress known as the Corrupt Practices Act, and some of the light and power company executives who indulged in such infamous and fraudulent practice were indicted, convicted, and sentenced to the Federal penitentiary.

Many small towns and cities own and successfully operate their own municipal light and power plants at a great saving to the taxpayers of such towns and cities. I have never heard anyone refer to a municipal power and light plant as socialism. Why do the power companies attack a similar plan for rural light and power plants as socialism? In fact, no one ever referred to the REA program as being socialistic until the big electric light and power companies decided to move in to control and monopolize the source of supply of electricity for use in the rural areas. How would you, as a businessman, or as a member of any company or organization, like to be compelled to buy your supplies from one concern, and be deprived of the right to provide your own supplies or commodities, or the right to provide or buy such supply or commodity at the lowest price source available? The farmers and the people residing in rural areas were and are confronted with this situation. They are in a servitude position so far as the wholesale supply of electric power is available, because commercial power companies insist upon contracts, in the supply of electricity to the rural co-ops, which are

prohibitive and restrictive for resale and use of such electric power. In many cases, the power companies' suppliers imposed such restrictions on their sale of power to the farmers' co-ops which made it practically impossible for them to render full service in the rural areas. Thus, the power companies have exploited and abused their monopolized electric power supply so as to deprive the electric co-ops of electricity necessary to enable them to accomplish a real rural area coverage. In addition to the problem of adequate wholesale electric power supply in some rural areas, the high wholesale price or charge by the power companies for electric power has created difficult problems for the farmers' co-ops. As one example, the Boone County Electric Cooperative paid during the month of December 1949, 20.02 mills per kilowatt-hour for all power purchased from one commercial power company on two contracts operating on a 30-day cancellation clause. The records show that this cooperative is not only paying an exorbitant wholesale price, but adequate power is not available at any price, It is reliably estimated that the steam plants and integration of power facilities' arrangements with SPA, which I have mentioned and explained, will provide electric power to the rural cooperatives in Missouri at a wholesale price of 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, or less, which is approximately one-third of the wholesale price or rate paid by the Boone County Electric Co-op.

If the rural electrification program is to reach its objective, electric power must be available to the farmers and people of rural areas at a price that they can afford to pay and in quantities whereby they will not be limited in its usage. Electricity has many uses on the farm and it will be utilized if the farmer, who is a hard working businessman, is given the opportunity to have and use the electricity at a reasonable price.

The REA cooperative is a private enterprise engaged in transmitting and supplying electricity to its members, and is an electric cooperative company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, and to deprive such company or organization of rural people of the right to borrow money from the REA to construct a steam power plant to generate electric power for sale and distribution to its own members or rural consumers would actually violate and obstruct free enterprise.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND RETAIL BUSINESS

Executives and managers of power companies have organized meetings of electrical workers and power company employees to prejudice them with concern for their employment. Nothing could be more unfair and unjust to the electrical workers and employees than such propaganda. In the first place, as I have stated, the REA program does not conflict nor interfere with the power companies' business. The construction of proposed REA transmission lines and steam power plants are let by contract to the lowest bidder, and the contractor will employ labor and electrical workers as he would employ labor in such construction work for a power company.

Furthermore, the providing of electric power to farmers and people in rural areas has and will continue to create a greater demand and market for many electrical devices and machinery, such as electric refrigerators, electric motors and machinery, electric stoves, heaters, and miscellaneous electrical equipment, thereby creating additional business and employment in the wiring of rural homes and buildings, and in the manufacture, retail sales, installation, and maintenance of such electrical facilities.

Therefore, I cannot understand electrical workers union opposition, if any, to the REA program, unless they are being coerced and wrongfully influenced by the power companies. Surely the electrical workers union know that the power companies have always opposed organized labor unions and laws for the benefit of the worker.

The REA rural electrification program will attract industries to rural areas where the raw product of such industries are available and we all know that a substantial part of the merchants and retail dealers' business depends upon the prosperity and standard of living enjoyed by the farmers and people in the rural area. I hope and believe that the merchants, bankers, retail dealers, and electrical workers, will join with the farmer and rural people in their fight for a successful rural electrification program.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

In addition to the great benefits which the REA program and steam-generating plants will provide for the rural areas, our national economy, defense, and security will also be improved.

An abundant and decentralized source of supply of electrical power is essential for our national security. In the present period of world strife and tension we must strengthen our national defense and security wherever possible. Such destructive explosives as the atomic and hydrogen bombs and the terrible mechanisms of warfare make necessary the decentralization of additional development of electric-power supply, so that, in the event of war and destruction of one or more power plants, we will have sufficient electric power from other sources to keep our industries producing. The widely separated steam-power plants and transmission lines of the REA program will provide this essential need for our security and defense of America.

Moviegoer To Get Full Amusement-Tax-Cut Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues before the Congress this year is the possibility of reducing those excise taxes which now represent a greater liability than an asset in the national economy. In the past month I have received several thousand letters from small-business men and other constituents in my district, urging the reduction or repeal of excise taxes, particularly on low-priced furs and jewelry products and on movie-theater admissions. These requests, it seems to me, have a great deal of merit, since the bulk of consumers in these fields are in the middle- and low-income groups.

One consideration in my decisions on any particular excise-tax reduction is the extent to which the benefits will go directly to the consumer in the form of lower prices. I know that many other Members share this view. For their information, I should like to present the following pledges by six motion-picture-theater executives. Almost all of the 18,000 movie theaters in the country are represented in the groups for which these men speak. Almost all of the 70,000,000 weekly movie admissions sold are in theaters covered by these groups. I have already turned these pledges over to the Committee on Ways and Means, and I urge other Members of the House to take them into consideration in connection with excise-tax reductions:

DEAR FRANKLIN: Replying to your letter of February 23, TOA has adopted the policy that any saving through the repeal of the Federal admission tax will be passed on to movie patrons.

In other words, if the present admission price is 50 cents, plus 10 cents Federal tax, or a total charge of 60 cents to the ticket purchaser, the moviegoer will be able to attend the same theater for 50 cents and save the extra 10 cents he now pays in Federal taxes.

Furthermore, we feel that the lower net admission will result in increased theater attendance and enable nearly all of the 8,000 marginal theaters threatened with closure to stay in business. Most of these marginal theaters are in small towns and villages where the average admission price ranges from 25 to 40 cents.

We are very happy to have you on our side in this fight, and I hope you will call upon me whenever I can be helpful.

All the best,

GAEL SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, Theater Owners of America, Inc.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your inquiry of the 23d as to whether the theater owners, in case the 20-percent admission tax is repealed, will pass on the savings to their patrons or pocket it themselves by increasing their admission prices.

When I accepted the chairmanship of this committee I stipulated that it must be understood that the public would be given the benefit of the saving resulting from repeal. I did this because I know from experience that that question invariably is asked by the Ways and Means Committee and I wanted to be prepared with the proper answer.

All the great theater circuits promptly announced that it would be their policy to pass on the saving to the public. In addition, all the independent theater associations have assured this Committee that their members also will give their patrons the benefit of the saving.

In some territories the theaters have signed individual pledges to this effect. For example, Allied Theater Owners of Texas, a theater association in that State, has sent us the separate pledges of over 700 theaters.

More compelling than all that, to my mind, is the fact that the trailers, posters, and other advertising accessories used by the theaters in reminding their audiences of the tax have stressed the fact that they pay the tax and that they will reap the benefit of its repeal. In view of this it would be a hardy exhibitor who would try to pocket the difference.

Let me say for myself that I have not the slightest doubt that the equivalent of the tax will be passed on to the theater-goers. Neither the theaters nor their customers like to handle pennies and the theaters, in collecting the tax, have generally adjusted their admission prices so as to arrive at a multiple of five. With the tax removed, I should expect the exhibitors to move their admission prices up or down to the nearest nickel break. For example, a 50-cent ticket today represents a 42-cent admission plus 8 cents tax. In that case, I should expect the exhibitor to drop to 40 cents. But a 70-cent ticket is made up of a 58-cent admission plus 12 cents tax and in that case the exhibitor may go up to 60 cents.

Assuming that this course is followed the increases and decreases in admission prices will pretty nearly balance and the moviegoers as a class will reap the full benefit of the repeal.

May I say in behalf of my New York associates that we have noted with deep satisfaction that you favor repeal of the tax. In addition, we greatly appreciate your interest in this subject as shown by your thoughtful inquiry. I am going to presume on this to the extent of enclosing a copy of the brief which we filed with the Ways and Means Committee last Tuesday. This is a comprehensive statement of our case for repeal.

With highest regard.

Yours very truly,

ABRAM F. MYERS,
Chairman, Committee on Taxation and Legislation, Council of Motion Picture Organizations.

(For Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors: Loew's Inc.; Motion Picture Industry Council; Variety Clubs International; Theater Owners of America; Motion Picture Association of America; Metropolitan Motion Picture Theaters Association; Trade Press Publishers; Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers; Pacific Coast Conference of Independent Theater Owners; Independent Theater Owners Association.)

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: The delay in answering your letter was occasioned by my absence from the city.

It is my position that the benefit from the repeal of the admission taxes should be passed along to the patrons of the theater.

The position of the Theater Owners of America which is in the forefront in the advocacy of the repeal of admission taxes can be obtained from Mr. Gael Sullivan, executive director of that organization which has its office at 1501 Broadway, New York.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. SKOURAS,
President, National Theatres Amusement Co., Inc.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: We have put ourselves on record that if the amusement tax is eliminated, we will pass the benefits on to our customers. It may be that an attempt will be made to eliminate pennies; in some instances by cutting the admission price which accrues to the theater, and in other instances by adding a cent or two to try to eliminate the necessity of using pennies, which we have found to be an annoyance to patrons, and a difficult problem for us. These increases and decreases will practically balance, so that the movie-going public will receive full benefit of the cut in taxes.

May I express my appreciation to you for your kind help in the matter.

Very truly yours,

J. R. VOGEL,
Vice President, Loew's Inc.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I have your letter with respect to whether it is our intention to have the admission price, if the tax is reduced or eliminated, reduced in accordance with the previous amount of the tax. The answer is yes. We intend to pass the benefits on to the public.

I want to thank you for your inquiry and if at any time we can be of service in helping you to arrive at any conclusions in this respect or any other, do not hesitate to call on us.

I was always a great admirer of your father and have watched with a great deal of interest the progress you have made in the public field. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

LEONARD H. GOLDENSON,
President, United Paramount Theatres, Inc.

DEAR FRANK: Thanks for your inquiry of February 23. One hundred percent of the admission tax as it is reduced will be passed on to the benefit of our patrons.

I want to thank you for the cooperation you are giving me, but then you and your family have always fought the fight of the poor man, so that this fight becomes traditional with you.

Sincere warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY BRANDT.
BRANDT THEATRES.

Labor's Role in Shaping Home-Building Policy and the Future of Cooperative Housing in America

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 4, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Herman T. Stichman, New York State housing commissioner, at the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami Beach, January 31, 1950, entitled "Labor's Role in Shaping Home-Building Policy, and the Future of Cooperative Housing in America."

In this address Mr. Stichman discusses in part the defects of the pending Federal cooperative housing bill now before the House and contrasts the provisions thereof with the New York State housing laws. He also shows the progress which has been made in New York in connection with housing.

I regard Mr. Stichman as one of the best-informed men in this country on cooperative housing.

The address follows:

LABOR'S ROLE IN SHAPING HOME-BUILDING POLICY AND THE FUTURE OF COOPERATIVE HOUSING IN AMERICA

You, representing workers in the building trades, and I and my associates in the New York State division of housing as the persons to whom the task of bringing about the building of more housing in the State of New York has been delegated, have completely mutual interests in the field of home building. You are interested in having employment for your men that will be steady in volume over the years; that will support a living wage for the man and his family; that will provide him with decent, safe, and sanitary working conditions; you are interested in home building as an industry that will furnish Americans with good homes at prices they can afford, that will give builders a fair but not an exorbitant profit, that will keep on a steady keel so that not only will your members be employed, but also those who work in the forests, in the mines, in the mills, in the factories, on the freight trains and trucks that produce and transport the materials that go into the final product of the home. We are working to attain the same objectives.

NECESSITY FOR STABILIZING THE HOME-BUILDING INDUSTRY

However, the home-building industry has never functioned on a basis that would produce the beneficial results which I have mentioned. One reason why it has not, and I think it is a challenge to everyone here, is that labor has never taken its proper place as one of the forces that should have a part in shaping policy. Up to this time, you have been largely content to have that policy controlled by realtors, mortgage lenders, developers, builders, and the Government, and you have been satisfied to be heard from solely in connection with wages and working conditions. That might be all right if the results of the control by these other interested parties had been satisfactory to most of those concerned, but not only has the history of the home-building industry not been beneficial to labor, it has not even been beneficial to the other forces which have formulated policy.

The history of the industry, as long as you or I can remember, has been one of booms and busts, and that was its record even before we came on the scene. Let us just go back to 1920. The number of new permanent nonfarm housing starts has varied thus widely since then, including the war period: 1920, 247,000; 1922, 716,000; 1925, 937,000; 1931, 254,000; 1933, 93,000; 1934, 126,000; 1935, 221,000; 1937, 336,000; 1940, 602,600; 1943, 191,000; 1945, 209,300; 1947, 849,000; 1949, over 1,000,000.

You know the effect this erratic course had on your own members. You know that about 90 percent of the workers employed in building the 937,000 houses in 1925 must have been out of work in 1933, when only 93,000 homes were begun, and similar conditions existed for a number of years before and after.

This affected not only your members. It adversely affected many others as well. Let us consider the workers employed in producing the materials used in those 937,000 dwelling units in 1925. What were they doing in 1933 when the construction of only 10 percent as many homes was begun? Who was supporting all these workers and their families?

You were still experiencing the results of the unstabilized building economy in 1946, 1947 and 1948. You felt it particularly at the cessation of hostilities when demands were suddenly made on you to produce in a few months enough trained workers to build, in a year or two, all the homes that hadn't been built in the 1930's, all the homes that hadn't been built during the war years, all the homes that were wanted by families who had doubled up during the 15 years of economic distress, all the homes that were needed by boys who had gone off to war leaving wives with in-laws, by boys who came

back from war years older and then wanted to marry, and you were asked to build them—right away—fast.

You keenly felt the results of this unsound planning in the public press, when you were unfairly accused by some persons of having failed to train sufficient apprentices and of responsibility for inadequate production because the average age of building-trades workers was over 55. No attention was paid to the fact that this had to be true because your workers were in their prime in the building boom of 1925, in their thirties and forties, and that, of course, no apprentices were trained during the 1930's because no young man in his right mind would seek training as an apprentice in an industry where no jobs for journeymen existed. So, at the cessation of hostilities, necessarily the average age of the workers was 20 years more than it had been at the peak of the boom in 1925, since the bulk of men in the building trades were the same ones who had built those houses in the 1920's and who had managed to survive the depression years.

And, as I say, labor is not the only group hit by this unbalanced home-building economy. The lender too is affected by it. If he feels that there is a ready market for mortgage loans only 3 or 4 years out of 10, and that then there is bound to be a bust, he will try to get a sufficiently high rate of interest on his money during those 3 or 4 years to compensate for the other years when he is taking money on deposit but can't lend it out. It has its effect on the realtor and the builder who will try to make a high speculative profit in boom times to carry them along during the depressed years. It has its effect on our railroad workers, on the men who drive the trucks, and on everyone whose living is dependent in any degree on there being a considerable amount of home building in every year if they are to have steady employment in a feeder industry.

But most vitally it has its effect on the public and on you, as representatives of building trades workers. Therefore, I believe that, for your own protection if no more, you must take a vital part in shaping home-building economy. But I do think your efforts to bring about stabilization will help all others concerned.

WHAT NEW YORK STATE HAS DONE TO SPUR STABILIZATION

I believe that New York State's program of cooperative housing is one of the keys to the solution of the long-continued problem. But first, let's consider more recent history which led to our developing a laboratory of cooperative home-building in our State.

As we look back over the years since the war, we see that the national housing economy is not improving. At the cessation of hostilities, there was no effective way to meet the tremendous demands for housing throughout the country from families who had been doubled up, from veterans who wanted homes of their own, as well as from young people who sought to marry, and this was not due to the results of the war alone.

Of course, materials were in short supply, but this was not merely because stock piles had been used up during the war. It was also due to the fact that the factories which had been producing them during the boom 1920's had turned to producing other things during the 1930's when the building bust was on. Factories were retooled to produce building materials, but some producers and distributors sought to take advantage of the unparalleled demand, or permitted others to do so, and the products went into the black market, which held back home building.

Although money was in plentiful supply, efforts were made, even by the Federal Government, to force mortgage interest rates up to a figure that was unrealistic under existing conditions. Drastic measures had to be taken—it became necessary to provide makeshift shelter, but we thought it was for only a few years.

The State of New York was the first to adopt an effective emergency housing program. When we saw that we could not get the number of permanent homes that we needed, our legislature, at Governor Thomas E. Dewey's request, made available a fund of $69,800,000 with which we provided emergency housing and educational facilities. We built 75 temporary projects in 40 municipalities in New York State, and about 60,000 veterans and their families have been housed in about 11,000 temporary apartments and over 13,000 college-dormitory accommodations which were provided as part of our program. In addition, we furnished hundreds of other facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, and libraries to aid the colleges take care of the great enrollment of veterans. The Federal Government had a somewhat similar program.

The State of New York also has leadership in clearing slums and replacing them with decent homes for low-income families for whom private enterprise has not been able, over the years, to provide with adequate housing at rents which they can afford. Our rentals are about $8.95 per room, on the average, in these public-housing developments. We have a $735,000,000 loan fund for those purposes, coupled with permissive annual cash payments of up to $25,000,000 to help keep rentals low. Today our permanent public-housing program under contract includes 51 projects in the State, of which 17 are in New York City. Of these projects 21 have been completed, 16 are under construction with some of them partly occupied, and 14 are under contract or in the planning stage. Eventually this phase of our program will provide homes for about 300,000 persons in the lowest income-earning groups. The Federal Government has a new similar program.

So far as middle- and lower-middle income families are concerned, there still is something radically wrong. There are still, in this fifth year since the cessation of hostilities, about 1,000,000 persons living in converted barracks, in Quonset huts, and in other temporary shelter throughout the country.

The Federal Government has tried several programs which have not produced homes at reasonable costs or rentals within the means of families of average income, and yet it has not profited by experience, as its newest bills, those pertaining to cooperating housing, make clear. It seems to be continually playing into the hands of speculative builders, instead of devising means to limit the speculators and so help labor and the public.

If you will glance at one of New York City's Sunday papers of the last 2 weeks, you will see advertisements such as these for new housing: One and one-half rooms, $78 monthly; one-bedroom apartments, $85 per month; two rooms, $70 and $80; two and one-half rooms, $90; three rooms, $95; three and one-half rooms, from $145; four and one-half rooms with varying rates, one advertisement listing $120 to $135, another $122 and up, still another $105. Of course, this is not the top quality—that is much higher. Does that help the average man looking for a home? The Government insured billions of dollars of loans for new housing built under its FHA program. But most of the housing developed under this program has had rentals, so far as our metropolitan centers are concerned at least, of $25 and $35 per room monthly, and more, which is far beyond the reach of the average wage earner. And so, of course, it has had no discernible effect competitively in bringing about any reduction in rentals for other new housing.

So far as the Federal Veterans' Administration housing loan program is concerned, you are familiar with the criticism of the sales prices and quality of materials in a number of homes constructed under it.

No really effective control was exercised by the Federal Government, under its programs, over the profits of the developers with the result that some speculative builders skimmed the cream and gouged the public with high rentals while labor was given an unfair share of the responsibility.

Now, let me contrast what the Federal Government proposes to do with what the State of New York, under Governor Dewey, for some time has been doing to help stabilize the home-building industry, help show what true building costs are, prove that it is not labor that is responsible for excessive housing prices, and provide good homes for lower middle-income families.

We have a law in our State called the limited dividend housing law under which, lower middle-income families seeking to build housing for themselves, and sponsors of rental housing for such families who are willing to limit their earnings on equity invested to 6 percent, may obtain a waiver of all State taxes and exemption from municipal taxation on the value of the new housing, but not on the land. We wanted to show true building costs—to prove who was and who was not responsible for the excessive prices demanded for housing—to make clear to the public that good homes could be built for lower middle-income families by private enterprise at reasonable cost. We developed a cooperatively owned housing program under that law. But we adopted a number of safeguards. These included prohibition against unreasonable mark-ups in the price of land; initial limitation of profits to 5½ percent in builders' contracts with all profits between 5½ and 7½ percent being shared equally by the builders and cooperators, and all over 7½ percent going to the cooperators; audit by the State of the contractors' books, and State supervision of the management of the housing developments after they are built. I conferred with the heads of more than a dozen of our building trades unions and they endorsed the proposal enthusiastically. Every cooperation was forthcoming.

Using that law, we organized a number of cooperative housing projects in which the participants make down payments of about $250 a room and become mutual home owners with carrying charges of about $14 per room, which includes amortization and interest on the mortgage, heat, repairs, and full maintenance.

Although mortgage lenders were requiring 4 or 4½ percent interest in the prevailing market, we persuaded the Bowery Savings Bank to lend over $7,000,000 for our first 800 family garden-type development, Bell Park Gardens in New York City, at 3½ percent, a good saving. That institution believes in our program and is cooperating in connection with other similar developments. Other savings banks are following its leadership. The insurance companies have not yet done so. Most of the 800 families are occupying apartments in the development now, and they all say that it is much better than they expected.

So productive was labor at Bell Park, and so efficient the contractors, that there will be a dividend of about $400,000 for the cooperators, in connection with building construction of about $7,500,000, equivalent to reducing their down payments to about $140 per room. Or it can be used to reduce carrying charges. We have found that most builders are willing to accept limitations of their profits to reasonable figures under our program and that they are anxious to participate. We have also, as part of the same program and with the same profit limitation, authorized the construction of rental apartments with rentals of less than $15 a room monthly. Altogether, we have approved the

construction of more than 6,000 home units at about these charges, including one for 2,000 families sponsored by local No. 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and employers of its members, and one for 288 families sponsored by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union in New York City. A third for almost 800 families with a smaller mortgage and higher participation payments is sponsored by persons affiliated with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. I anticipate the approval in the next few months of many more home units in the State to be cooperatively owned or rented at the figures I have mentioned.

This contrasts with the $25 to $35 and more per room monthly rentals and high sales prices demanded for housing built under FHA and Federal Veterans' Administration programs without the protective provisions found in the State programs. The reason for the difference is readily apparent. The State of New York has been seeking to help those who need homes, as well as labor. The Federal program seems designed to help the builder primarily. And many of those builders perform not a great deal more than the role of managers and takers of bids from subcontractors—with the actual job of building being handled by the latter. Profit is charged on profit and labor unfairly blamed for the result.

New York State's program proves that the responsibility for high costs has not been that of labor, because we have used the same workingmen, the same materials, paid the same prices for land, and used the same private lenders, but we have been watchful, we have required efficient building methods and we have eliminated speculative demands and have allowed fair and reasonable profits only. But the builders we have used have been more than satisfied—they are looking for more similar jobs.

DEFECTS THAT MUST BE CURED IN THE PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Now the Federal Government, despite the example of the State of New York, is continuing to play into the hands of the speculative builders. The Maybank-Sparkman cooperative housing bills will prove to be a $2,000,000,000 boon to some speculators rather than a benefit to labor and to lower middle-income families in need of housing, unless the profits of building promoters are specifically limited by Congress and the program made into a laboratory to determine true building costs, just as we have done.

There is room for Federal aid to cooperative housing and in reducing home building costs, but it should be such as will really help in those essential fields, and not of the kind that will really only aid speculative builders. The present Federal bills give no real help. They have no effective provisions for encouraging efficiency, reducing costs or lessening total financing charges. Instead, they seek to reduce annual carrying charges by providing for the lending of mortgage money by the Federal Government, through the device of a Federal guaranty, with an annual interest rate which it appears may be 2½ percent or somewhat more and lengthening the mortgage period to 50 years, or, in the event of refinancing, to 60 years, with provision for extending these periods three more years. This would increase the aggregate of carrying charges and merely spread the heavier burden over a longer period of years. So far as supposed savings are concerned, there is shadow through the device of a Government guaranty which would bring a lower annual interest rate but would carry with it greater aggregate outlays and obvious inflationary possibilities today. But there is no substance, no effort to cut real costs by spurning technological advances, encouraging efficient building practices and definitely limiting builders' profits, in return for the low interest rate, so as to eliminate a continuation of unfair and excessive builders' demands.

Indeed, the Maybank-Sparkman bills will in fact hurt the idea of cooperative housing as a laboratory to reduce costs by glossing over the present deficiencies in the home-building industry and concealing its speculative demands behind a curtain of extended amortization and interest payments.

It is as though the clothing or the radio, television, or automobile industries, instead of introducing efficient mass-production methods to lower true costs and meet competition, had asked that the Government provide purchasers with direct long-term loans or long-term Government guaranteed loans at a similarly devised lower interest rate to enable such consumers to buy their products and then offered the result as an example of cost savings. That would be a subsidization of inefficient methods in those industries—just as the present Federal bills would constitute a subsidization of present day builders' inefficiencies and their excessive demands. The price would not be cut, the monthly payments would be lowered but the purchaser would be paying more in the long run because of the higher aggregate of interest over a longer period of years.

Increasing the mortgage period from 34½ years to 60 years, under the Maybank-Sparkman permissive refinancing provisions which would undoubtedly be availed of, would increase total interest payments by 90.9 percent, almost double. That is, it would increase total interest payments by $5,510.62 on a loan in the principal amount of $10,000 at a 3-percent interest rate, and would effect only a 22.8-percent reduction in the amount of monthly carrying payment. Total interest payments over a 60-year period on such a loan would amount to $11,574.21, so that the borrower would be paying $21,574.21 to pay off a $10,000 loan. Whom would that help? Is that cutting costs? Increasing the mortgage period to 50 years would increase the aggregate of interest payments by 53.7 percent, that is, by $3,255.07 on a similar loan, and reduce monthly carrying charges only 17 percent.

The Federal bills, as I say, would demonstrate nothing to the country at large—the only people who would receive the benefits, questionable as they are in view of the increase in total carrying charges—would be those living in housing built under the Federal program. What we need instead in every State is an open laboratory, just as we have in New York, to demonstrate how all building costs can be reduced—whether built with Federal financing or private financing, unless it is proposed to have the Federal Government finance all the housing needed now and in the future.

I recommend that you take an active part in shaping any new legislation, and in seeing to it that the proper safeguards are inserted, instead of leaving it to building promoters and mortgage lenders.

The advantages and disadvantages of the pending Federal bills should be carefully considered by you so that you can determine whether they are really helpful to the home-needing public and to labor. While a reasonable rate of interest is advantageous and is a welcome contrast with Federal efforts in the past to increase the interest rates on mortgage loans, let's consider other possible disadvantages.

Direct Government lending at a rate too far below what savings bank depositors would like to get on their deposits, and below the amount of return life-insurance companies calculate on their investments in determining premiums, may adversely affect the loan market for saving companies and insurance companies. This, therefore, might decrease the amount of interest which savings bank depositors would receive as well as increase the premiums on life-insurance policies.

If the intent is not to reduce the interest rate substantially, then the proposed legislation is entirely unnecessary, since simply lengthening the mortgage period unduly would be disadvantageous. For such lengthening of the mortgage period to 50 and 60 and even 63 years, as is proposed, not only greatly increases the total amount of interest paid over such a long span of years, as I have indicated, but it abolishes, for all practical purposes, any ownership feature, even though the present bills purport to provide the basis for cooperative home ownership. If one bought at the age of 28 or 30, the executors of his estate would get the deed, provided he left enough to pay what is still owing. The Federal proposals would mean that 99 out of 100 so-called cooperators would never pay off their mortgages in their lifetime, but would die in debt. In reality, they would be renters throughout their lives, and their children would have to take over the mortgage debt or be left without the family home they thought was theirs.

The Federal cooperative housing bills can be justified only if the public is given benefits that at least balance the possible disadvantages to which I have referred. They can be justified only if excessive demands are eliminated and builders' profits are limited to a reasonable figure as we have done. They can be supported only if the Federal cooperative housing program is made into a great national laboratory to examine true building costs, which should have beneficial results in bringing down the cost of all housing. Builders should be willing to accept such a limitation of excessive demands if the program really is to aid them in the long run, as it must be supposed to do. They should not expect all other groups in the economy to make sacrifices for their sole benefit.

Of course, some will say that there is at least token recognition of what I have been urging by the language used in the bills that the proposed legislation is to be administered so as to assure that its benefits are not dissipated through speculative devices. That is not enough. A builder's profit of 20 percent may not be regarded by Federal personnel as speculative; certainly nothing in past performance indicates activity to curb profits that were even larger. A reasonable profit limitation should be written specifically into the bill if the public is really to benefit and learn who has been really getting rich. And the administrator of the cooperative housing program might well be appointed directly by the President so that the program can function as a true laboratory.

Otherwise, the Federal cooperative housing bills, which have mistakenly been called socialistic by some, will prove to be feudalistic instead. Socialism at least purports, no matter how it may fail in actual performance, to take from those who have and to divide it equally among those who have not, while the Federal bills would take, over a too long period of years in the form of high aggregate of interest payments, from those seeking home ownership, from savings-bank depositors and from those holding insurance policies, from labor in the form of an unbalanced building economy, and give to those who already have plenty—namely, speculative developers and builders.

New York State's program of cooperative housing brought clearly into focus before the public gaze all the facts which prove that we can get good housing for lower middle-income groups—the forgotten families with incomes just too high for public housing and too low to be able to afford rents and prices demanded by speculative builders—at costs within their means by using the same forces of private enterprise that have been used in the past, and that all that was needed was to eliminate abuses. We have proved that it was not necessary to substitute Government

for any factor of private enterprise, provided there is the proper control.

The Federal legislation, on the other hand, does nothing specifically to curb abuses and if, instead, all that it does is to spread costs over a longer period of years without materially reducing them, it will not help what you, as representatives of labor, and I are trying to accomplish: That is, to get building costs down to the minimum by eliminating speculative abuses and profits so that we can have a sufficient amount of housebuilding in every year to stabilize employment and the entire industry.

BENEFITS UNDER THE STATE PROGRAM

Every resident in the State of New York benefits by our nonpromotion cooperative housing. Let me recapitulate the benefits to the various groups:

1. Lower middle-income families who need housing and cannot pay current rentals or purchase prices.

Costs in cooperatives become about $14 to $15 per room monthly, including amortization, heat, interest, light, repairs, and maintenance, plus down payments of about $250 per room, with rentals of about $15 per room monthly, instead of $25 to $35 and more monthly. This is even less than New York City is charging in housing projects which it is building under its own so-called noncash subsidized program, and at least 40 percent less than other equivalent housing.

2. All those who need or may need homes.

While New York States recommends that only 5 to 10 percent of the homes needed be built under its nonpromotion plan with partial tax exemption, the results will aid others as well. The monthly savings of about $11 and more per room are not due solely to the value of the municipal tax exemption on the value of the improvement for a period of years, and the waiver of State taxes. This may be worth up to $3.75 per room monthly. The other savings of more than $7 per room monthly are becoming available to all families as builders reduce their prices to the public to reflect the actual costs, rather than speculative mark-ups, publicly demonstrated to be true by our projects as working laboratories. Our savings are achieved by:

A. Limiting the profit of the builder to 5½ to 7½ percent. In other building operations, builders' profits are twice as much or more.

B. Maximum production given by labor on these projects, since it is aware that an increased rate of production will not merely increase a builder's already large speculative profits.

C. State-supervised management of the developments, with maximum tenant cooperation and limited but reasonable dividends, results in reduced repair and maintenance costs.

D. Reduced interest charges on mortgage loans.

3. Builders and building-trades workers.

I have pointed out the booms and busts of our housing cycle. Elimination of speculative profits will make possible building even in so-called lean years, similar to the early 1930's, since costs will always be within the means of a major portion of the public. This will stabilize building and employment conditions, eliminate booms and busts, encourage sound apprentice training programs, and make possible a continuous flow of adequately trained workers.

4. All the public.

Demonstration that private enterprise, with cooperation from government at proper levels, can provide lower middle-income groups with good housing, is an answer to demands from certain quarters that Government must take over and build housing for practically all the people at public expense. Our program aids democracy by helping people to help themselves.

New York State's program proves that what we need is less Government interference and control but more public aid. If some of the forces in the field of private enterprise are abusing their prerogatives they should be controlled, but I do not think that Government should take over. That is the policy we have followed in New York State.

Not long ago, I visited a number of European countries and studied their housing and economic policies. Where the people, in order to correct abuses by private enterprise, allowed the pendulum to swing too far the other way and put government into business in competition with its people, we find economic distress. Let us not follow the same course here; instead, let us correct the abuses.

One way to make certain that we get that correction is for you to assert yourselves and take over your rightful place in the leadership of those who draft our housing policy. That is my first recommendation.

I also recommend that your member unions throughout the country take steps to have each State initiate a cooperative-housing program similar to ours, and, as I said before, that you see to it that our controls are made part of any Federal program. Indeed, the proposed Federal legislation might well be changed so as to provide matching benefits which would induce all the States to adopt nonpromotion cooperative-housing programs, and thus to ascertain true home-building costs. There then would be yardsticks to eliminate excessive speculative demands in the various parts of the country. If each State does what New York State is doing, I think we will soon produce enough housing at sufficiently reasonable costs and rentals to meet the needs of our lower middle-income families and all the public. We will also aid in stabilizing our home-building industry, with consequent benefit to you, to the employer, the developer, the builder, the lender, and to all America.

Alaska Statehood and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to quote below an article appearing in the March 19 issue of the New York Journal-American written by Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska:

GOVERNOR GRUENING TELLS WHY ALASKA STATEHOOD DELAY INVITES INVASION BY REDS

(By Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska)

WASHINGTON, MARCH 18.—"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide in the strife of truth with falsehood for the good or evil side."

Thus wrote the great American poet James Russell Lowell.

His poem, The Present Crisis, dealt with the impending Civil War. Its great issue was clearly stated by Abraham Lincoln. Our Nation, he said, "could not endure half slave and half free." The American people decided that issue for the Nation.

Today the issue is no less clear. It is whether all mankind shall be slave or free.

DECISION UP TO PEOPLE

Again the American people—through no choice of their own—are called upon to decide, this time for the whole human race.

In the present crisis, the greatest civilization has ever known, the leadership is ours whether we will it or not.

We can only go forward to victory or face the extinction of every freedom Americans cherish and that man has achieved in his age-long struggle upward from darkness toward light.

Today in a far deeper and more terrible sense than when our forefathers created government by consent of the governed, the alternatives are liberty or death.

We face today the most ruthless, unscrupulous, and fanatical enemy the world has ever known. His are the instincts of the brute, the cunning of Satan, and the weapons of modern science.

We are now engaged in the cold war.

FREE SOCIETY BETTER OFF

This is a struggle just short of shooting war to persuade the neutral, the apprehensive, the wavering peoples of the world that a free society is better than a fettered one.

We must win the cold war in order to avert a shooting war with the horror of the H-bomb.

Two parallel policies are imperative for victory:

1. Our defense must be strong. The stronger, the less the likelihood of attack.

2. We must live up to our professions of democracy. Deeds, not declamations, are required. We must be strong in our faith.

The challenge is here and now. It lies before the Senate of the United States. It rests in the Senate's opportunity to grant statehood to Alaska.

ALASKA DEFENSELESS

Alaska lies within naked eye view of Soviet Siberia.

Alaska is today defenseless.

Alaska could be taken in a few hours by two air-borne divisions.

They could overwhelm the 8,000 men who are all Uncle Sam has provided to defend an area one-fifth as large as the United States with its long fronts on the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean.

Our Alaskan airfields would then become the enemy bases from which every point in the United States could be bombed.

For years the Territorial Americans of Alaska have pled for adequate defenses for Alaska in vain.

For years before World War II, Alaska's voteless Delegate in Congress prophesied what would happen unless Alaska were defended.

And Alaska was the only portion of America invaded and for a time held by the enemy.

That enemy was driven out. Driving out a far more powerful enemy trained from the cradle in Arctic living and know-how and supplied from adjacent terrain would be a far different matter.

The cities of the 48 States could be destroyed while we are deliberating how to expel him.

Gen. "Hap" Arnold, the great commander and creator of the United States Air Force, shortly before his death wrote in his book Global Mission:

"Through to this day, Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves * * * but we were never able to get the money or allocations for the Air Force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then, and need more than ever now."

Alaskans know why. They know that as long as Alaska remains a Territory it will not

be adequately defended. Not merely Alaska but the whole Nation and all mankind will pay the price.

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE

In the last 3 years since the menace of a Soviet-enslaved world became crystal clear, Uncle Sam has poured billions of dollars into the still free countries of Europe to prevent the Soviet advance on an eastern front 4,000 miles from our shores.

It has undoubtedly been a good, calculated risk, and so far at least seems to have held back the Red tide over there.

The first session of this Eighty-first Congress unhesitatingly added $5,700,000,000 for economic aid and $1,400,000,000 for military aid to the billions voted in previous sessions. Virtually the full amounts requested were almost unhesitatingly voted.

But meanwhile the Communist hordes have overrun China and hold most of Asia.

On our western front neither a broad ocean nor free nations lie between them and us.

Yet the House of Representatives almost adjourned without action on the modest request for a mere authorization of $137,000,000 for Alaskan defenses. The decision to do so was announced last August.

HOUSE YIELDS

Finally, in response to the desperate outcry of Alaskans to secure a faint equivalent for our own national back door to that accorded the European front door, the House yielded.

However, it cut the requested authorization by one-third to $96,000,000.

If this pitiful fraction were immediately appropriated as well as the balance that was cut off and its expenditure speeded, it would be at least 2 years before Alaska could achieve a radar screen and the 25,000 ground troops which alone are contemplated as the Alaska defenses.

But action still lags.

It is now March and our principal construction season in Alaska is at hand.

We are in grave peril of losing another year. We are inviting attack through our back door left conspicuously ajar.

It is left ajar for invasion by an enemy who does not acknowledge the validity of the sale of Alaska by the Tsar.

It is from the Soviet standpoint still "Russian-America." They mean, if we will let them, to hold that part of America physically, permanently.

AMERICA'S ANSWER

Statehood—the full incorporation of Alaska into the Union—is the one clear answer America can make to this oft-uttered threat of annexation following invasion.

The people of Alaska 4 years ago requested statehood on referendum.

After 83 years under the American flag they are entitled to the equality of full citizenship. They are entitled to self-government on the established American pattern.

Can America continue to be concerned—convincingly—about the lack of democracy behind the iron curtain when it denies the simplest measure thereof to its citizens?

Can America lead the world effectively—toward its principle of government by consent of the governed, when it retains its own obsolete colonialism in Alaska and Hawaii against the expressed wishes of its citizens there?

Can we in America effectively preach to the whole world what we do not practice at home?

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide."

The moment is here and now.

The Senate of the United States can decide by an affirmative vote on statehood at this session of Congress that America will continue to fight the good fight and keep the faith.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following letter by a business leader on ITO should serve to refute the confusion which its opponents are trying to create. This letter should make it clear that ITO means what it says, that is, that it proposes to open up the channels of trade of the world now hampered by many avoidable restrictions. ITO does not deprive the United States of any freedom of action in our national interest; on the contrary, it is in the best interests of the United States because it is one of the greatest single means of attaining world recovery:

FEDERATED DEPARTMENT STORES, INC.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, January 19, 1950.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I wish to urge ratification of the proposed Charter of the International Trade Organization which is scheduled for early hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In its broader aspects, the Charter, in my opinion, lays the foundation for the establishment of a more rational world-trading system and thereby can strengthen our own economy and implement this country's foreign policy.

It seems to me that as a matter of practical self-interest, we are obliged to support measures which will stimulate the foreign trade of those nations we are seeking to help. If they are to become self-sustaining, the world's markets, including ours, must be opened to their export products. The alternative is that we shall be compelled to continue direct financial assistance and tax ourselves accordingly to pay for it.

As between these two choices, I believe that our course is clear. The European recovery program is essentially a stopgap measure and one that is intolerable for the long pull. There can be no lasting stability for any country in an economy which is based on American gratuities and our own economy cannot indefinitely stand the strain which this aid imposes on it.

I believe that the ITO Charter is a necessary adjunct of the European recovery program. By leveling the artificial trade barriers which now interfere with the export business of nations dependent on our help, it can serve to lighten our tax burden and protect the present American investment in European recovery.

I favor the charter for the following additional reasons:

1. It strengthens the free-enterprise system by substituting competition in international trade for artificial government controls. By helping the economy of participating nations, it will promote prosperity which is essential to the survival of the free-enterprise system.

2. The Charter is a logical extension of our foreign policy which is seeking to contain Communist expansion. The restoration of the world's economy through the encouragement of international trade can be the strongest bulwark against that dangerous trend.

3. The Charter gives wider scope to the reciprocal trade agreements program. It applies to a larger number of nations and covers many more aspects of international trade relationships such as commodity agreements, cartels, full employment, and economic development.

4. It supplements the functions of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Neither the fund nor the bank can operate with maximum efficiency in improving world financial conditions unless there is a free flow of goods from one country to another and unless each country can export enough to pay for its imports.

5. The Charter simplifies customs practices which at present set up a maze of conflicting regulations, all different for different nations. These have become in effect invisible trade barriers which hamper international trade.

6. It seeks to prevent discrimination by one nation against the trade of another.

7. The Charter enables foreign nations to remedy their dollar shortage by use of quotas to keep imports within their means of payment. But, at the same time, it provides an orderly procedure for applying these quotas and for their termination when a country's balance of payment difficulties are ended.

There are only two articles of the Charter to which I would take exception. These are Nos. 11 and 12, relating to international investment. Their purpose is of the highest importance—to stimulate private international investment. But I believe they are ambiguously stated and can be eliminated without weakening the main body of the Charter.

Although the Charter is not a perfect instrument, I believe it represents a notable start toward remedying some of the serious economic illnesses of the world. To reject it because it includes compromises which are essential in the drafting of any multilateral agreement would be a mistake. It provides, at least, a framework in which improvements can be sought and is flexible enough to permit such improvements to be made.

With the International Trade Organization, we shall have a code of rules which eliminates or controls many of the most harmful trading practices. We shall have a mechanism for interpreting, enforcing, and improving these rules and a forum in which trade problems may be handled in a spirit of international cooperation. Without the ITO, it is to be feared that we shall face a progressive stagnation of world trade.

It seems to me that our political and economic supremacy among the family of democratic nations obligates us to take the leadership in making the ITO a functioning body.

Yours very truly,

FRED LAZARUS, Jr.

Library Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter I am sending today to Mr. Joseph D. Keenan, director of the League Reporter. It refers to a completely erroneous and apparently intentionally deceptive article at page 3 of the issue for March 20. I am confident that all readers of this paper will be interested in the clear facts which led a

majority of 196 Members of Congress to vote against the passage of this bill.

MARCH 18, 1950.

Mr. JOSEPH D. KEENAN,
Director, League Reporter,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEENAN: I have just read your analysis of the vote on H. R. 874. I am sure you realize that the author of the article deliberately overlooks the convincing argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, that "There is no State in the Union that cannot afford to pay $40,000 a year for library services." His conclusion that those of us who agreed with Mr. KENNEDY were against furnishing library service to farm families completely ignores the fact that Massachusetts has realized that objective without calling upon the Federal Government to contribute one cent. Moreover, you must know that all Federal funds are collected, sent here, and then a substantial administrative fee is deducted before returning those funds to the sources from which they came. Probably the author does not yet know that Massachusetts has accomplished this result at a local expenditure of $1.21 per capita, while West Virginia was represented vigorously by its Representatives as being in need of Federal assistance but contributed only 13 cents per capita, and the great, rich State of Texas, also begging for this Federal grant, has contributed only 10 cents per capita.

I realize that you will not print this letter in the report. Consequently, I shall make it available, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that members of organized labor can compare the facts with the conclusions you seek to draw.

Sincerely yours.

Clinton Opens Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of March 15, 1950:

CLINTON OPENS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION—BANQUET IN THE FALLON MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, TUESDAY NIGHT, WITH GOVERNOR DEVER, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR SULLIVAN, CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN, AND OTHERS, RESPONDING TO TOASTS IN HONOR OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INCORPORATION OF THE TOWN—BRILLIANT SOCIAL EVENT IS ATTENDED BY APPROXIMATELY 700 GUESTS WITH THE PROGRAM INCLUDING VOCAL AND INSTRUMENTAL SELECTIONS BY GROUP OF THE TOWN'S TALENTED ARTISTS

Graced by the presence of the two highest officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, His Excellency, Gov. Paul A. Dever and His Honor, Lt. Gov. Charles F. Jeff Sullivan, of Clinton's favorite son, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, and other distinguished speakers, approximately 700 guests at the centennial banquet held in the Fallon Memorial Auditorium and the banquet hall, of the municipal building, Tuesday night, will cherish the memory of a delightful event until their dying day.

In as brilliant a social function as the auditorium has witnessed since it was dedicated 41 years next November, the event went into history as a fitting opening of the 100th observance of the incorporation of the town by the Massachusetts Legislature, March 14, 1850.

The appropriate decorations, the tables resplendent with silver and china, many of the guests in evening dress, the appetizing dinner professionally served, the unique menu cards typical of two plants of Clinton's "beehive of industry"—the Miron Mills, Inc., and the Colonial Press, Inc.—coupled with the presence of many former Clintonians who joined with their relatives and friends in recounting bygone days, the fine civic spirit dominating the event, the stellar addresses and the voices of the town's outstanding vocalists and instrumentalists, all provided a setting that will long abide with all so fortunate as to have had a part in it.

FIFTY VERSUS ONE HUNDRED YEARS

The banquet was in marked contrast to a similar event of 50 years ago at the time the town observed its semicentennial when a diversity of opinion militated against that feature of the celebration.

The memorial volume issued following the fiftieth anniversary of the incorporation of the town said:

"No feature of the semicentennial gave rise to more discussion than the banquet. To what degree should it be self-supporting? Where and when should it be held? What should be the price of tickets? Who should be the caterer? Should the speakers be distinguished men from abroad, or would it be better to rely on home talent?

"The subcommittee originally appointed grappled with these questions and after they had settled them in accordance with their own judgment and obtained the sanction of the general committee, tickets were offered for sale."

EVENT WAS ONCE ABANDONED

"One hundred and seventy-five seats were engaged at $2.75 per plate, but as a guaranty of 300 was required by the caterer, the committee did not feel justified in going further and reported that it seemed inexpedient to hold a banquet on the lines proposed.

"It seemed best, however, to the general committee that another attempt should be made, so a new committee was appointed to lead the forlorn hope.

"This committee, after a careful investigation, decided to follow the plans proposed by the original committee.

"The sense of responsibility for the banquet was so awakened among the members of the general committee, and the semicentennial in all its phases was finding such growing favor among the citizens, that this part of the celebration was carried to a successful issue by the new committee. Considerably more than the 300 tickets required for a guaranty were sold and the Town Hall was none too large to accommodate those who were anxious to attend."

ENCHANTING SCENE

"It was decided that it would be wise to set the banquet at an early hour, so that people might come with fresh appetites. By 6:30, Bigelow Hall, which had been tastefully decorated for the occasion, began to be filled by the arriving guests. There was a half hour of merry greetings and of conversation, with pleasing reminiscence as its central theme.

"Meanwhile, the Salem Cadet Band added to the cheer by its excellent music. Shortly after 7, those assembled marched to the hall above. The scene was one of enchantment. Through the art of the decorators, the ceiling and walls, with their flowing streamers and graceful folds were one mass of glowing color, in which red, white, and blue, with their emblematic significance, predominated, while touches of yellow and green were tastefully intermingled. From the center hung a great bell. To the illumination of the incandescent lights above was added that of the candelabra, with fairy lights on the tables below."

HARMONY IN 1950

Happily, this year, the preliminary arrangements were conducted with the utmost harmony and lack of criticism, perhaps indicating that Clintonians of the present generation are more united and more civic-minded than were some of the citizens of 5 decades ago.

From the very outset of the initial announcements of the centennial banquet a spirit of full cooperation by residents was in evidence and where, 50 years ago, only about 300 guests attended the semi-centennial event the 1950 program was participated in by almost twice that total, all imbued with the thought that the one hundredth anniversary of opening event must attain the heights as a harbinger of the main program, May 28 to June 4, next, which will conclude the anniversary.

PERFECT SETTING

Then again, the 1950 event was staged in one of the handsomest auditoriums in this Commonwealth, as contrasted with the 1900 banquet which was served in the old Town Hall, later destroyed by fire, on the site of which progressive Clinton erected ere the end of the first decade of the twentieth century one of the finest municipal buildings to be found in the Bay State.

Many of the out-of-town guests, Tuesday night, glimpsed their first view of the architectural beauty of the auditorium as they had removed from town before the new structure was built.

The horseshoe balcony where guests were seated who had been served the menu in the banquet hall, is vastly more attractive than was the gallery at the south end of the old town hall.

EVENT REPLACED BALL

Fifty years ago the semicentennial banquet was held the night of June 18, the fiftieth anniversary program having been opened with a concert and ball, in the old town hall, the night of March 14, 1900, as the initial event of the program, but this year, the date of incorporation fell in the Lenten season and the centennial committee wisely decided that it would be imprudent and would adversely affect the observance if dancing should be included and in its place the 1950 banquet was substituted, a decision that was heartily approved by all citizens of the town.

During the serving of the menu music was featured by Paul Redmond's orchestra and artists, Lilla Shaughnessy, violinist, and Mrs. Walter Shaughnessy at the piano.

After the diners finished the last course Chairman Kittredge announced that Patrick Henry Lynskey of New York City, native of Clinton would render the Star Spangled Banner, to open the fine program.

PROCESSION

At 7:45 the procession of speakers and special guests marched down the center aisle and included:

Judge and Mrs. Austin J. Kittredge, Governor Paul A. Dever, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, Lieutenant Governor and Mrs. C. F. "Jeff" Sullivan, Representative Henry W. Pickford, Matthew J. Connelly, Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., Patrick Henry Lynskey, Cedric Foster, Joseph M. Duffy, John Redmond Lynskey, Rev. and Mrs. E. Maurice Bussey, Rabbi Aaron Twersky, Paul P. Lavelle, Judge and Mrs. Morton C. Jaquith, Mr. and Mrs. Roy A. Freitag, Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Freel, and Mr. and Mrs. John J. Mitchell.

INVOCATION

The invocation by Rev. E. Maurice Bussey, pastor of the First Congregational Church, was as follows:

"Our Father and our God, Thou great unseen spirit, eternal and majestic, ruler of the heavens and the earth, before whom a

thousand years pass as a watch in the night, yet who art mindful of each one of us, we invoke Thy blessing upon us as we inaugurate our centennial anniversary.

"We are grateful for those sturdy pioneers whose imagination and devotion built bridges over which this generation is now passing—bridges of good government, churches, schools, industry.

"May we never be unmindful of their efforts and, building upon the foundations they layed, move on to greater accomplishments in the years ahead.

"Give us strong vision and a will for hard work that we may wisely weave from the patterns set before us, products of character and industry that shall endure.

"We, thy people, stemming from differing races, religion, and languages, would pause in humble acknowledgment of every gift which thou hast so graciously bestowed—peace in a world of conflict, liberty and justice within our borders, a beloved democracy rooted in our common life and kept secure through blood, labor, and tears.

"May the spirit of cooperation; unity of purpose; community pride and confidence in thy guidance, be our watchwords as we enter the years of mystery in the century we now face.

"May we be always aware of our spiritual and moral responsibilities and dedicated to every principle that shall enable us to remain strong as individuals and as a people.

"Lord God of Hosts, whose stewards we are, thy name be praised for ever and ever. Amen."

Judge Kittredge presented John Redmond Lynskey, of Hackensack, N. J., another native of the town, as master of ceremonies and the famous composer was given a tumultuous welcome.

Chairman Kittredge expressed the pleasure of the guests in having Matthew J. Connelly, secretary to President Harry S. Truman, present at the head table and asked the modest Clinton native to take a bow.

Next came one of the high lights of the program when the personable and popular John Redmond Lynskey stepped to the microphone to render, for the first time, in public, the Clinton Centennial Song, which he composed, with the recording by Carroll Gibbons, another native of the town and his famous Hotel Savoy (London) Orchestra, which has been the featured attraction in Great Britain's leading hostelry for more than a decade.

Never before in the history of Clinton have two musicians collaborated in presenting in the town of their nativity a composition which will be sung and hummed by the present and succeeding generations and which formed one of the high lights of the banquet.

CLINTON CENTENNIAL SONG

Mr. Lynskey dedicated the composition with these appropriate words: "Affectionately dedicated to the good folks of my old home town on its one hundredth anniversary. Sincerely, John Redmond Lynskey."

On the title page are the words, printed in blue, Clinton Centennial Song, words and music by John Redmond Lynskey, and the seal of Clinton, with 1850 at the left and 1950 at the right. The town seal, as almost everybody knows reads "Town of Clinton, Massachusetts, Incorporated 1850" with a picture of the old town hall building forming the center.

Mr. Lynskey has set the words to music that provide not only a catchy composition that in coming days will become Clinton's theme song, but one that will inspire marching feet wherever it is heard.

The offering is all inclusive in that it stresses the popular nicknames of sections of Clinton that have been familiar to every Clintonian since the town came into being.

Listen to the words he sang for the first time in public:

"You won't find a better town,
Than this seven-letter town,
C-l-i-n-t-o-n,
Visit once you'll call again.
Clinton! Clinton!
Happy anniversary!
Proud of you and should be,
Good old Clinton, Mass.
Cheerful, friendly,
Show me any city,
That is half as pretty,
Clinton has the class,
Cal-i-for-nia, the Acre,
Burditt Hill, and Germantown,
Duck Harbor, the North-End.
The prettiest town for miles around.
Clinton, Clinton!
I have been a rover,
Roamed the whole world over and say,
'You're the capital of the U. S. A.'"

SURPRISE SPRUNG

Next came the surprise number of the program when it was announced that Chairman Kittredge would talk with Carroll Gibbons, director of the Hotel Savoy orchestra, London, England, who had made the recording of the theme song which was repeated instrumentally. Stepping to a telephone at the left of the stage Judge Kittredge called London and in a comparatively few seconds he and Mr. Gibbons were talking over 5,000 miles of wire.

The chairman said, "This is Austin Kittredge, Carroll, how are you?" "Hello, Austin, I'm all right, how are you?" with the words clearly heard by all at the head table and by many seated near that area.

"I'm fine, Carroll," replied Judge Kittredge and then came the inquiry, "Where are you, Austin?" "In the Clinton town hall, Carroll, where we have just presented your recording of John Redmond's Centennial Song and we want to thank you for what you have done to make this great occasion memorable in the annals of Clinton."

Asking to speak with Congressman PHILBIN the toastmaster stepped to the phone and said: "Hello, Carroll, this is PHIL PHILBIN." Came the clear reply, "Hello, PHIL, how are you?"

Then Mr. Gibbons asked if he might speak to Mr. Redmond and the latter seized the phone and said, "Hello, Carroll, this is John Redmond Lynskey Korsakov," a sally that brought laughter and applause from the audience.

Mr. Gibbons said, "I am sorry I can't be with you, tonight, but I hope to be back in Clinton sometime in the near future."

Mr. Redmond asked the audience to send its greetings to the orchestra leader which it did by rising and expressing its appreciation of the hands-across-the-sea telephone conversation which will long be remembered by the banqueters as a novel and unexpected feature of the program.

FOSTER ADDRESS HERE

George Connors, for many years one of Clinton's popular vocalists, rendered One Hundred Years From Now, and Miss Dolores Baldyga was heard in a selection.

Mr. Redmond announced that when he learned that Secretary Connelly would attend the banquet he immediately composed a song which he hoped the President's right-hand man would sing, but learning that he was in good voice he would attempt to render it himself and out came the words, "I am wondering about Harry?" a bon mot apropos to the President's rough sea voyage to Key West, Fla.

Musical reveries of the past and present which included spiritual, classical, and popular numbers followed the speaking program. Miss Mary Cassidy sang The Last Rose of Summer; Will You Remember, was rendered by Miss Barbara Mooney; The World Is Mine, by Miss Jean O'Brien; Galway Bay, by Edward J. Walsh; Somewhere a Voice Is Calling, by Mrs. John E. O'Malley; Dear Hearts and Gentle People, by Joseph E. Fontana, Jr.; Thine Alone, by Miss Ethel Hester, concluded with Ave Maria, composed by Rev. Father Tracey and arranged by Mrs. T. Frank McDonald.

The benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Aaron Twersky, of Congregation Shaarei Zedeck, as follows:

Rabbi Aaron Twersky, in pronouncing the benediction spoke in both Hebrew and English, as follows:

"And concerning all the people that dwell in this community, Blessed art Thou O Lord our God, King of the Universe who has kept us in life and hast preserved us and enabled us to reach this hundredth historical anniversary.

"O Heavenly Father, as we leave this auspicious banquet of our beloved community, bless, keep, and safeguard the duly elected officers and inhabitants that live herein.

"Bless our Governor, Congressman, and all who are guiding us in the development and furtherance of the bastion of democracy of our country and our community. As we conclude our brilliant program instill in our hearts, O God, a love of Thy teaching, help us to live in peace and contentment as brothers under one flag.

"Raise aloft our country so that it shall shine as a beacon of light to a tottering, unstable world.

"Give us this day new inspiration to work for the greater glory and progress of our community.

"May it reach its two hundredth anniversary in freedom from fear, want, hate, and destruction.

"May we derive great civic pride in our accomplishment.

"Lead us, Heavenly Father, in Thy faith of righteousness and goodness forever. Amen."

With the stage darkened and a spotlight playing on the American flag, the chorus and audience joined in singing Auld Lang Syne and America.

The program came to an end at 12:30 o'clock this morning and even then many of the guests were reluctant to leave the auditorium. Hundreds lingered to meet out-of-town patrons, all of whom were former residents and whose love for the old home town made them eager to join with its citizens of today in the memorable event that marked the initial observance of century-old Clinton.

THE DECORATIONS

When the diners entered the auditorium they were greeted by a striking decorative motif. Draped on the balcony railings were festoons of the national colors, with the stage the center of attraction.

At the left were the figures "1850" in 2-foot high silver numerals and at the right, "1950," while in front of a green velvet drop extending the width of the stage was a silver motto, "1850—Our Centennial—1950."

Mounds of ferns, spring flowers, and potted plants marked the "1850," "1950" figures and the area surrounding a staff carrying a silken American flag spotlighted and waved by an electric fan.

The head table which filled the entire area between the east and west doors leading to the stage was ornamented with three large mounds of spring flowers and tapers in silver candelabra, while on all tables where the guests were seated were vases of jonquils.

A basket of artificial red roses made by Mrs. John F. Flannagan was a feature of the stage design. Giant palms reared their leaves at either side of the stage, all presenting a picture that will be long remembered by the guests.

Immediately after the serving of the menu scores of guests rushed to the head table where they kept Governor Dever, Lieutenant Governor Sullivan, Congressman Philbin, John Redmond, and other dignitaries busy for 15 minutes attaching their autographs to the menu cards.

DEBT OF GRATITUDE

Every resident of Clinton owes a deep gratitude to Chairman Austin J. Kittredge for the herculean work he performed in carrying to a successful and brilliant conclusion the most appropriate program. He was the motivating power of the big event and it was he who conceived the unusual features including the recording of the theme song by Carroll Gibbons, the toasts, and all of the countless angles of the banquet.

Paul Redmond's Orchestra provided the dinner musical program and Mrs. T. Frank McDonald and George Connors served as musical directors.

The hostesses, in evening gowns, included the Misses Margaret M. O'Malley, Bette Ann Kittredge, Mary Jaquith, Mary E. Freel, Shirley Coccione, Bamby Philbin, Gretta Nordstrom, Carrole Nordstrom, Joan Perla, and Janice O'Malley, all daughters of members of the general committee.

The menu included fruit cocktail, sweet mixed pickles, hearts of celery, roast tenderloin of beef, mushroom sauce, baked potatoes, frosted peas, banana and pineapple fritters, with wine sauce, chef's salad with French dressing, assorted cake, macaroons, assorted ice creams, frozen pudding, rolls, butter, and coffee.

Special Justice Austin J. Kittredge served as general chairman of the notable event.

The banquet committee included Austin J. Kittredge, chairman; Matthew J. Connelly, vice chairman, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, Representative Henry W. Pickford, Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., Wesley J. Officer, Paul J. Lynskey, Francis J. Coleman, Mrs. Hawley E. Morton, William J. Schott, Mrs. David E. Gallagher, Leo J. DeBlois, Dante F. Coccione, and Mrs. John T. Flannagan.

The executive committee was composed of Congressman Philip J. Philbin, honorary chairman, Member of Congress; Roy A. Freitag, honorary vice chairman; Dr. Charles R. Abbott, vice chairman; Miss Sarah L. O'Toole, vice chairman; Joseph T. Peters, treasurer; Mrs. Harold J. Mason, secretary; Robert E. Freel, Attorney Morton C. Jaquith, and John J. Mitchell.

The general committee includes Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., Rev. E. Maurice Bussey, Oresta J. Fontana, Selectman Paul P. Lavele, Mrs. Edward H. Mackay, Joseph F. McCaffrey, Attorney John P. McGrail, Axel P. Nordstrom, Joseph R. O'Malley, Daniel Paul, Mrs. George V. Raynsford, David B. Reisner, Deputy Sheriff Hugh F. Ruane, Orra L. Stone, and Walter E. Stuka.

The reception committee included members of the general committee.

Subcommittee on banquet in charge of following arrangements:

Dinner: Dante Coccione, Francis Coleman.

Tickets: William Schott.

Decorating: Mrs. David Gallagher, Mrs. Hawley Morton.

Stage settings: Leo DeBlois, Dante Coccione.

Arranging menus: Wesley J. Officer, Representative Henry W. Pickford, assisted by Henry M. O'Toole.

Public address: under direction of Fred Vorspohl.

Decorating interior, town hall: Paul Foley, Worchester, assisted by decorating committee.

Floral decorating: A. W. Schneider, florist. One hundred red roses were made by Mrs. John Flannagan.

Entertainment: Francis Coleman, Paul J. Lynskey.

Major Parties and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended two editorials from the Chicago Defender bearing on the outlook of American Negroes on the prospects for civil-rights legislation, when taken together, bear out a fundamental principle which I have been advocating. It is that civil-rights legislation, if it is to pass, must be bipartisan and that the administration must lay it aside as a partisan issue. This was again illustrated by the inability to muster on the House floor the necessary votes to pass an FEPC with enforcement powers, many votes of Representatives from the border States being lost on the Democratic side and many Republican votes for northern and western areas which should have supported such a measure being also lost. Dissatisfaction with both major political parties is a most unsatisfactory state of mind as far as both major parties are concerned to be driving the American Negro into. I urge most thoughtful reading of these two editorials by every Member:

[From the Chicago Defender of February 18, 1950]

THE REPUBLICANS STATE THEIR CASE

Of all the comment in the Nation's press on the new statement of aims and principles released by the Republican Party last week, the report of W. H. Lawrence, of the New York Times, seems most interesting.

Mr. Lawrence reported that:

"The proposal on the civil rights issue stirred considerable controversy and brought protests from Senator LODGE and Representative JAVITS. The party pledge as approved read: 'The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore, we shall continue to sponsor legislation to protect the rights of minorities.'

"Senator LODGE wanted the party to declare its 'forthright determination' to enact civil rights legislation at the present congressional session 'and to break a filibuster if necessary,' but he was overruled. Republicans have often found common ground with southern Democrats in blocking administration bills.

"Since the party had picked a Lincoln Day rally to unveil its 1950 manifesto, Representative JAVITS said he regretted that the statement 'did not declare unequivocally for FEPC, antilynching, and anti-poll-tax legislation in the best Lincoln tradition'."

Reporter Lawrence goes on to point out that Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, "asserted that the platform was filled with vague generalities which would appeal to persons who voted Republican anyway, but which would have no special appeal to the 'rank-and-file of the people who win elections'." The gracious Republican lady from Maine took the words out of our mouth.

[From the Chicago Defender of March 11, 1950]

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

As we enter the 1950 election campaign the Democrats, both locally and nationally, should do a little soul searching.

Locally there seems to be a growing conviction on the part of Boss Jack Arvey and company that the Negro vote is "in the bag" for the Democratic Party. As the song goes, they seem to think that they have the world "in a jug" and the stopper in their hands.

We would like to remind them of the delightful tune from Porgy and Bess, It Ain't Necessarily So.

The Democrats here have, as we pointed out some weeks ago, ignored the wishes of the people in the first and fifth senatorial districts by putting up hand-picked "hacks." They have shown similar stupidity by refusing to give Judge Wendell Green the designation for the superior court.

As a matter of fact, the Democratic Party as a whole seems to be suffering from indigestion. They have apparently been eating too high on the hog, and now they are sleeping on a full stomach. The Democrats in Illinois and in the Nation have been and are now in a position to live up to their promises.

Here are some of the questions in the minds of the voters:

1. When will the people see some leadership in breaking the bottleneck on Mayor Kennelly's housing program?

2. Can Governor Stevenson compare his record to date with past administrations?

3. What happened to the administration's leaders in Congress in the fight for a strong FEPC?

4. How did it happen that Chairman Boyle of the Democratic National Committee stated that Congressman DAWSON was vice chairman of the committee, and now nobody in Washington is quite sure what position DAWSON has on the committee?

5. Why were the qualified Negro candidates overlooked in the appointment of the new Governor for the Virgin Islands?

The action promised by the Democrats in 1948 caught the imagination of the people. Now, 2 years later, we have more promises and few accomplishments. This lack of action is cause for grave concern among voters who turned the tide in 1948 and who may turn the tide again.

The wishes of the people have been ignored and forgotten for the benefit of a small group of selfish men concerned only in maintaining their own little selfish political interests.

They have forgotten the people, but the people have yet to be heard.

Performances, not promises, will set the course.

Acheson, a Belated Convert to Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by George Sokolsky, noted columnist, who directs attention to the record of Secretary Acheson's in the China situation and his change of attitude. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Dean Acheson is now a convert to reality. After a career of error, beginning in 1941 and ending a week ago, he has finally come to a realization of the errors, but not to a recognition of his responsibility for them. His last gamble with destiny was a bad throw. He had fantastically assumed that reality was at fault and he played to lose on Mao Tze-Tung.

In any country other than ours, any man who had been so consistently and obstinately wrong would have been driven from public life. He would long since have been forced to resign.

All he seems to do here is to announce a change of policy, not even confessing his errors, and we are expected to accept his conversion without scrutiny or even wonder.

Acheson asks us all to unite in a total diplomacy against Soviet Russia, but how can we unite with him? From 1941 until last week, he and his teammate, Alger Hiss, were responsible for the appeasement of Russian policy. The record is clear.

Dean Acheson, graduate of the Harvard Law School, like so many others of the confused employees of our Government, entered upon his career in the Treasury, where he did not agree with Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic fiscal conceptions and was dropped.

In 1941 he entered the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State; then he became Under Secretary of State, a position he held until 1947 when he resigned. He returned as Secretary of State in 1949.

The Acheson influence in the State Department has been enormous. He was the smart man. His principal adjutant was Alger Hiss.

Alger's brother, Donald, became a partner in Acheson's law firm, which specialized in representing foreign countries in Washington, particularly such as had special relations with the State and Treasury Departments, Colombia, Greece, Iran, Denmark, Pakistan and Soviet Poland.

We must now go back a step to the Harold Ware Communist cell organized in 1934. That cell was organized to penetrate high levels of administration and it is clear from the evidence at both Hiss trials that Alger Hiss was of this cell.

At any rate, in 1939 Dr. J. B. Matthews, of the Dies committee gave to the Department of Justice the names of the members of the Ware cell. Among those names was that of Alger Hiss. Matthews showed me the list at the time.

Also in that year, Whittaker Chambers and Isaac Don Levine discussed most of the evidence that was brought out at both Hiss trials with Adolf A. Berle, then of the State Department.

Berle has testified under oath that as early as 1941, he had warned Acheson that the loyalty of both Alger and Donald Hiss was doubtful. In 1944, Berle, then security officer of the State Department, warned Acheson and others in the State Department that their pro-Russian policy was wrong.

The Acheson group, with Alger Hiss as Acheson's principal assistant, fought Berle, had him transferred to Brazil, and as Berle said: "That ended my diplomatic career."

Subsequent to Berle's reports on Alger Hiss, Acheson had his friend transferred from the Far Eastern Affairs Division, where he had no business to be as he knew nothing about the subject, to the Office of Special Political Affairs which Acheson ran and which had to do with all the peace efforts of the Government.

This was no place for a man whose loyalty was in doubt and who could have an affiliation with a foreign government that might imperil the negotiating power of the United States.

Acheson cannot plead that he did not know about Hiss; he can only say that he did not believe what he was told. But in his position, could he risk a doubtful personality as executive secretary of Dumbarton Oaks or as President Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta, or as secretary general of the San Francisco Conference setting up the United Nations?

Dean Acheson succeeded Joseph C. Grew as Under Secretary of State after Grew insisted upon prosecuting the spies in the Amerasia case. What power in our Government drove Grew out and put Acheson in his place?

Freedom or Bondage—That's the Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a letter that appeared in the Racine Journal-Times recently and in which the writer calls attention to the important choice that confronts this Nation. It carries a message that every citizen should fully understand:

[From the Racine Journal-Times of March 14, 1950]

FREEDOM OR BONDAGE, CHOICE OF AMERICANS

DEAR TEX: The constitution of the former American slave States generally specified that the masters must provide their slaves with adequate housing, sufficient food, medical care and old-age benefits. The Mississippi constitution also contained this sentence "The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves expect where the slaves shall have rendered some distinguished service to their country." The greatest reward a slave could get was freedom.

Slaveholders, then, like Government now, believed that they knew what was best for their charges. Proof of the error of their belief is that personal responsibility for one's own welfare brings increased material well-being.

Consider the remarkable progress of the Negroes who in 1862 were almost 100 percent slaves, and who today are about as self-supporting as any other American citizens. Compare their progress to that of the American Indians who were made wards of the Government and given State-guaranteed security instead of freedom. They have become less self-supporting and more dependent upon aid from "The Great White Father in Washington." There appears to be no scientific basis for belief that Indians are an inferior race. Those left to their own responsibility have proved as great a capacity for understanding and advancement as the Negro. Yet, there are 12,000 Federal employees directly taking care of 233,000 Indians at the present time.

GOOD INTENTIONS

Apparently most of the planners and advocates of government paternalism honestly desire to help the people, but their efforts always result in some form of bondage. For example, leaders of England's labor government never dreamed of bringing compulsory labor to England, but that's what happened. Lenin and Stalin probably never intended to bring slavery into Russia. Their expressed plan was to free Russia from the Czarist government. But look what happened.

Our ancestors knew that electing or appointing a man to office did not endow him with wisdom, only with power. Government can and should use force to punish crime, but cannot use force to create kindness, charity, to make people work, to solve their medical problems, to make them live in specific houses.

IT'S NOTHING NEW

State-guaranteed security is nothing new. It was written in the code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. In one form or another, it has been tried without success throughout history. The Romans called it bread and now we call it New Deal or Square Deal.

It is not too late to turn away from government-insured security.

The choice is ours. When one choses freedom—that is, personal responsibility—he should understand the decision is not a popular one, immediately. He will be called vile names while attempting to explain ultimate results of Government-insured security, housing, free medicine, compulsory security, and guaranteed jobs. The choice of freedom never has been easy. Freedom can only be held by the strong, not the weak whose character has been snapped, whose principles have been lowered, and who has lost the God-given right to help himself and exercise his own free will.

ALBERT LEVIN.

P. S.—Any expression in favor of government-secured security is an expression against our form of government. The two clash in principle.

Equal Perils—Not Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Compass of March 17, 1950:

AMENDMENT REPRESENTS NEITHER SOUND LAW NOR SOUND BEHAVIOR

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York)

Although I could not—dare not— pretend to be an authority on women, I do believe this choice will provide a fascinating challenge to most American women. They have a well-developed spirit of adventure, liberally mixed with common sense, imagination, intuition and humor—a delightful, charming combination. American women are regarded everywhere as the most beautiful, intelligent and capable in the world. Since she won the right to franchise, she has made tremendous strides in business, in politics, and in the professions. She is the motivating force in every community, the impetus, usually, to all forms of civic betterment and progress. The American male is justly proud of his mate, her talents and her achievements in a multitude of endeavors.

It is interesting to note that while the colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under the skin, fundamentally indivisible, they not only have "fashions" in clothes but in attitudes. Females have run the gamut from the Amazon to the clinging vine. If we should succumb to the allurements of a study of social organization, anthropology or archeology, we are piqued by references to former thriving civilizations in which matriarchies flourished.

One conjures up a picture of ancient man quite content with his lot of peeling what served them for potatoes, bustling around with the pots, dusting and polishing the lares and penates, firmly convincing junior of the general utility of the then current equivalent of hat, shoes, and overcoat in the middle of a cloudburst.

To bring it even closer to home, there are definite quiverings along my spinal column as I read the undoubted reports of the ambidextrous efficiency of the picturesque Carrie Nation and her hatchet. As an ardent foe of prohibition, waves of gratitude roll over my soul that the formidable Carrie "came, saw and conquered" in an era other than my own. I mumble prayers of thanksgiving that I shall never be exposed to the hazards of a personal encounter with that colorful creature!

Then, too, we have the recent advertising slogan, "Never underestimate the power of a

woman," and believe me, I don't. I've been married for 34 years.

With such heartfelt compliments, I optimistically hope that I have succeeded in riveting the attention of the fair sex. I have taken a verbal pounding, comparable to an artillery barrage, from representatives of various groups who have espoused the cause of the equal-rights amendment. I seem to recall an ill-found or perhaps idle rumor attributing to me sole responsibility for the tabling of the resolution in the House Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman. Actually, however, at the suggestion of my very charming, distinguished and able colleague, Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, for whom I have the highest regard, I referred the bill to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Several years ago the House was adorned by the eminent and able former Representative from Connecticut, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce. She would utter lively yet bitter complaint because women were judged as a different kind of people. Quoting from her own experience, she emphasized that her femaleness was always underlined; that more attention was paid to what she wore than what she said. She urged women in all walks of life to fight for the right to be judged equally with men.

Needless to say, Mrs. Luce found a willing and able audience. It is, then, in a mood of quiet desperation, staunchly clinging to whatever may be left of my legislative courage, that I am again sticking my neck out in the hope of compelling the women of the United States to give deeper consideration to the implications of the momentous innovations involved in the equal-rights amendment, which contains many economic and political pitfalls; yes, even social ones. These provisions can ensnare the unwary, possibly uninformed, too busy women of today. If their futures alone were involved, perhaps one would be tempted to place this fateful legislation in the laps of the legislative gods and await its destiny with equanimity and with the poised and casual air of smug sophistication.

The proposed amendment, however, would erase from the statute books laws relating to widows' pensions, the right of dependent wives and children to the support of the husband and father, alimony, and guardianship. Having washed away the protective legislation for wives, mothers, and widows, the so-called equal-rights amendment offers no alternative safeguarding measures.

We cannot deny that discrimination against women is present. Some States still have laws which forbid women to serve on juries, to hold certain offices, to handle their property without the consent of their husbands, etc. It is not defense of these laws that makes for opposition to the proposed amendment. It is the method that is decried. Using the Constitution for a broom with which to sweep away indiscriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior.

Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 16, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the executive secretary of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ and the resolution adopted by the Council of Agencies:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION
OF DISCIPLES OF CHRIST,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 7, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: We are pleased to enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by the Council of Agencies of the Disciples of Christ, a Protestant communion representing 1,800,000 members. This resolution is a petition for the United States Government to distribute surplus foods to hungry peoples of the world rather than destroying the same.

We understand that you have introduced measures somewhat along this line and we think that it would be of interest and value to you and to us if it could be known that this representative group of the Disciples of Christ has gone on record in support of such legislation. If we can be of any help to you in your efforts, aside from commending you for introducing such humanitarian proposals, we will be glad to help if within our power.

Cordially,

GAINES M. COOK,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FOOD BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO HUNGRY PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

Whereas there is continuing widespread hunger, poverty, and suffering throughout our world, resulting largely from a global war, to which America contributed a significant part, and thereby is implicated deeply in bringing about the tragic conditions of our time; and

Whereas the Disciples of Christ have set for themselves the goal of $1,500,000 for relief to be raised during the week of compassion, March 5–12, 1950; and

Whereas the Christian people of America are being called upon to participate sacrificially in the "one great hour of sharing" on Sunday, March 12, 1950, in order to bring relief to suffering and destitute peoples; and

Whereas there are great stores of food of various kinds being held by the Government of the United States that could be used to supply the needs of millions of hungry people around the earth; and

Whereas all the Christian people of America are also loyal citizens of our country whose Government holds in storage a vast quantity of food which has been purchased in part by the expenditure of tax money which these Christian citizens have paid into the Government; and

Whereas the gift of these large quantities of food to needy peoples in various areas of the world would show that America has the deep desire to aid all peoples in their distress; and also might lessen greatly the tensions created by fear, greed, hatred, and suspicion which lead to the increase of armaments and the preparation for war; and by such aid give greater hopes for peace and release energies for constructive purposes: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Agencies of Disciples of Christ through the international convention, That we appeal to all other religious bodies in America to join in an immediate petition to the Congress of the United States to promptly take the necessary action to give and to deliver to the peoples of the world the surplus food supplies which the Government now holds in storage, where and to whom, it will bring the greatest good to the health and happiness of mankind.

Adopted, Indianapolis, Ind., February 7, 1950.

Questions and Answers on Housing Act of 1950—H. R. 7402, Eighty-first Congress, as Reported February 23, 1950—Housing for Middle-Income Families (Cooperative Housing)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions and answers on the Housing Act of 1950, H. R. 7402, Eighty-first Congress, as reported February 23, 1950:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE HOUSING ACT OF 1950, H. R. 7402, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, AS REPORTED FEBRUARY 23, 1950—HOUSING FOR MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES (COOPERATIVE HOUSING)

1. Question. What is the purpose of this title?

Answer. The purpose of this title is to provide a means whereby good housing of adequate size for families with children can be produced for families of middle income. (1) By furnishing technical assistance to cooperative or other nonprofit housing corporations; (2) by making financial assistance available to such corporations for housing which will promote economy both in construction and in operation and maintenance; and (3) by facilitating the investment of private capital in the development of such housing.

The title would carry out the recommendations made by the President in his State of the Union message when he said: "To aid middle-income families, I recommend that the Congress enact new legislation authorizing a vigorous program to help cooperatives and other nonprofit groups building housing which these families can afford."

2. Question. What organizations are eligible for assistance under this title?

Answer. The two types of organizations eligible for assistance under this title are: (1) private, cooperative ownership corporations which will provide housing the permanent occupancy of which is restricted to the members of the corporations; and (2) any other private, nonprofit corporation authorized to provide dwellings either for sale to a corporation of the character described above or for rent to the families which will occupy the housing.

3. Question. Why are other organizations not eligible?

Answer. The basic purpose of this title is to provide a means whereby adequate housing is produced and made available at monthly costs which middle-income families can afford. The problem is essentially one of further cost reductions in construction, financing, and operation. Cooperative housing and other nonprofit housing offer the greatest promise of achieving such cost reductions and are the only forms of private enterprise capable of translating every possible economy directly into corresponding reductions in the monthly charges which the individual consumer must pay for the housing. Housing operated for profit (even though the profits or dividends are limited) necessarily involves additional charges which are passed on to the consumer. To that extent, if such housing were made eligible for assistance under this title, the purpose of the title would correspondingly tend to be defeated. It should be noted, too, that lim-

ited dividend or other corporations which are not eligible for aid under this title I may have recourse to government aids provided in other legislation, such as the mortgage insurance aids administered by the FHA.

4. Question. What type of housing can be built under this title?

Answer. The housing built under this title must be of sound design and construction; located in well planned neighborhoods; and designed for economy and efficiency in construction and operation. It may not be of elaborate or extravagant design, but must be of adequate size for family living. These requirements are designed to carry out the basic purpose of the title to provide good housing which middle-income families with children can afford. Within these limitations, the cooperatives and nonprofit corporations would be free to build whatever type of housing is best suited to the needs of their members and is acceptable in the community where it is located. Projects aided under the bill are not restricted to particular materials or types of construction. Masonry, wood, or other construction materials may be used if sound standards of design and construction are met. The projects may consist of large multiple dwelling structures, garden apartments, or two-family houses, and may also consist of single-family dwellings, including row houses and detached or semi-detached houses. Well designed projects combining several structural types would also be permitted.

5. Question. Who are the "middle-income" families?

Answer. The middle-income housing market for urban families in the country as a whole can be taken as comprising those urban families of two or more persons whose cash incomes were between $2,800 and $4,400 a year. One-third of the urban families in this country had annual incomes within that range during 1948, according to the latest Census Bureau study. Of course, the actual income range which defines middle-income families in any given community will vary considerably from the national average range. Thus, in cities with a population of 1,000,000 or more, one-third of the families in such cities had incomes within the range of $3,135 to $4,841. In smaller communities the income range for the middle third of the population dropped somewhat, until in communities of 2,500 to 10,000 population, the range was $2,451 to $3,929. Further variations will, of course, be found among communities within each population class.

6. Question. Is this title proposed as the single or major solution to the problem of housing middle-income families?

Answer. No. The statement has been made by an opponent of this title that the program authorized by the title is intended to serve all middle-income families, that there are about 8,000,000 such families; and that there is danger, that, once started, the program will snowball into huge proportions. However, the fact is that it is merely a supplementary program to aid additional, middle-income families obtain good housing they can afford. The great proportion of middle-income families will continue to be served by existing housing which they find satisfactory, and many others will be served by new FHA sales and rental housing which is coming on to the market at prices and rents which a considerable number of middle-income families can afford. Indeed, aids provided under title I of this bill are intended to supplement aids for moderate cost housing which are contained in existing legislation or which would be provided by amendments to existing legislation, particularly the amendments to the National Housing Act contained in title II of this bill and in H. R. 6070 passed by the House last August and now pending before the Senate. Thus, the program under title I was never intended to, nor can it, furnish a single answer to the housing problems of middle-income families. It does represent a very important and necessary means of rounding out our efforts in this field.

7. Question. What monthly charges for housing are middle-income families able to afford?

Answer. On the basis of the usually accepted rule that monthly expenditures for shelter should not exceed 20 percent of income, housing for middle-income families should be available at shelter rents ranging from $47 per month to $73 per month, or at a median shelter rent of approximately $60 per month. This range is for the country as a whole, and, of course, the ranges would differ for different communities. Gross rents, that is to say, rents which include utility costs, would run about $8.50 per month higher.

8. Question. Is sufficient housing being produced within the rents or charges which families of middle income can afford?

Answer. No. Various attempts have been made recently to prove that the middle-income housing market is being served adequately and that therefore the additional aids which would be provided by this title are not necessary. In each instance the arguments involved a misuse of national averages. The arguments were based on data purporting to prove that a given percentage of all the housing produced in the country during 1948 or 1949 was sold or rented at prices or rentals which were within the means of a given percentage—and it was always stated as a substantial percentage—of all American families. The fallacy inherent in such statements is that it balances off the low-cost homes, most of which are produced in the South and in parts of other sections where prevailing construction costs and income levels are lower or where savings in home construction are possible because the climate is milder, against the housing needs of middle-income families in higher-cost areas, such as New York, Chicago, or Detroit.

Another misuse of statistics to support the attempted proof that all middle-income families are being served adequately arises from the fact that so many of the houses and apartments coming on to the market, especially those which sell or rent at charges low enough to be within the means of middle-income families, are not large enough for families with children.

A detailed discussion of this misuse of statistics, and a summary of the actual facts concerning prices, rents, and room counts for new construction in many different localities may be found in the section of the committee report devoted to this title of the bill. These facts prove conclusively that a considerable number of middle-income families have been priced out of the market in most areas and that a wide range of such families have been priced out of the market in high-cost areas. Similarly, the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, testified how, in a number of cities visited by him, builders tried to convince him that they were meeting the needs of middle-income families, but how an actual inspection of the houses which middle-income families in that locality could afford showed that they were too small for families with children.

9. Question. Is financial assistance to cooperative organizations new?

Answer. No. For example, in 1921 the War Finance Corporation was authorized by the Congress to make advances to any bank or trust company or "to any cooperative association of producers in the United States which may have made advances for agricultural purposes." The Federal intermediate credit banks were established in 1923 to make loans to cooperative associations. The Federal Farm Board was created in 1929 to make loans to cooperative associations of farmers to promote the establishment and financing of a farm marketing system. The Home Loan Bank System was established in 1932 to provide a credit reserve for member home financing institutions, chiefly mutual savings and loan associations. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 authorized loans to cooperative nonprofit, or limited-dividend associations for financing the construction and operation of generating plants.

10. Question. To what extent can rents or charges for housing under this bill be attained below rents for new housing now being produced?

Answer. Taking full advantage of the provisions of this title, it should be possible for cooperatives to provide housing at a monthly cost about 25 percent below the rents charged for comparable conventionally financed housing. For example, a 4½-room apartment costing $8,000 to build will bring a rent of about $90 a month (thereby permitting a normal profit to the owners) if it is financed under section 608 of the National Housing Act. In contrast, the same unit, if built as part of a cooperative housing project aided under this title, could be made available at about $65 a month.

11. Question. What items which enter into the monthly cost of housing will be reduced under this bill to make such lower charges possible?

Answer. Cooperatives aided under this title will be able to provide housing at charges 25 percent below conventionally built and operated rental project rents because they will be able to:

(1) Eliminate promoter's profits (as distinguished from the profits of the building contractor) and profits on investment. This follows from the nonprofit nature of the enterprise. Also, cooperatives will not inflate their initial investment by carrying their land investment on their books at a sum higher than was actually paid or by allowing for the standard 5 percent of project cost for architect's fees when actually less was paid.

(2) Reduce operating and maintenance costs through self-help and better care by the occupants. This follows from the fact that the occupants as owners will be in a position to do a great deal of the maintenance work, particularly painting and redecorating, themselves. Experience has also shown that families living in cooperative housing will, as a matter of common prudence, as well as because of natural pride of ownership, take the best possible care of the housing in which they live and which they themselves own.

(3) Minimize vacancy and uncollectable rent losses. This assumption is based on a large body of actual experience in the field of rental housing and on a lesser—but nevertheless very substantial—body of experience gained since 1927 under New York State limited-dividend legislation. Smaller vacancy losses for housing built under this title will follow not only from its nonspeculative nature, but also from the fact that vacancy losses always tend to be much lower—particularly when economic conditions are less favorable—in moderate-cost housing than in higher-cost housing.

(4) Demonstrate greater stability in values hence permitting a longer amortization period. This follows from the fact that nonspeculative housing is designed to fill a long-range need, and that moderate-cost housing will serve a more stable market. Speculative housing, on the other hand, is often designed, constructed, and operated so as to obtain a quick profit rather than for long-range stability of value. Also, higher-cost housing fluctuates more in value than lower-cost housing.

(5) Obtain financing at a lower interest rate estimated to be about 3⅛ percent as opposed to a 4-percent rate (plus a one-half of 1 percent premium) for 608 projects. This follows from the aids provided by the bill, particularly the guaranty by the Government of the debentures issued by the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives, and from the greater stability of value.

12. Question. What groups support this title?

Answer. The following national groups have endorsed this title to the Congress: American Association of Social Workers, American Federation of Labor, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cooperative League of the United States of America, Jewish War Veterans, National Conference of Catholic Charities, National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association, National Housing Conference, National Negro Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

There are no doubt other groups who will support the title (many have supported similar proposals in the past) but who have not yet had time to obtain an expression of opinion from their memberships.

13. Question. What forms of technical aid would be made available to cooperatives under the title?

Answer. The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be authorized to furnish plans and methods for the sound organization of housing cooperatives, including technical advice and assistance in their formation and in the planning, financing, construction, and operation of their projects.

The following excerpt from a statement by Mr. William A. Clarke of the Mortgage Bankers Association gives a concrete example of the type of aid needed. Mr. Clarke is chairman of a committee of the American Friends Service Committee which is now engaged in setting up a housing cooperative in Philadelphia.

There is really very little in the form of literature or very little in the form of proposed corporate set-ups and what-not on which we can draw. I confess that many of us are feeling our way along with it. It would be, in our opinion, helpful to have some spot in the Government where that kind of thing could be done.

* * * * * * *

"We think the cooperatives are fine and I think the matter of giving assistance in the formation of them by advice, counsel, and planning is excellent."

14. Question. Are there precedents for such technical aid by the Federal Government?

Answer. Yes. There are numerous precedents. For example, the technical aid would be similar to the professional guidance furnished to agricultural production and marketing cooperatives and to rural electric utility cooperatives by various agencies of the Department of Agriculture. It is also comparable to the variety of services rendered to the building industry, land developers, mortgage lenders, and individuals by the Federal Housing Administration. Similar assistance was given to Federal (mutual) savings and loan associations by the Federal home loan bank system, particularly in the early years following the creation of the system in 1932.

15. Question. Will the Federal Government build or operate this housing?

Answer. No. The Federal Government will neither build nor operate the housing. The housing will be built and operated by private cooperative or other private nonprofit corporations. These corporations may either enter into contracts with private builders who will do the actual construction work or they may act as their own general contractors. In some cases, the members of a cooperative may wish to do some of the construction work themselves on a mutual self-help basis. The corporations will also operate and manage the projects themselves.

The Government will exercise certain limited controls as a condition of giving financial assistance under the title. These controls will assure the soundness of the mortgage loan; that the borrower is a bona fide cooperative or nonprofit corporation; that the housing is of sound and economical construction and of adequate size for families with children; that the location and planning will afford reasonable assurance of a stable neighborhood; and that the housing will serve families of moderate income. Similarly, under the mortgage-insurance programs, the FHA now approves construction plans and specifications, passes on the location of the housing, inspects the construction, and passes on the credit rating of the mortgagor. These functions and the final approval of the insured mortgage amount are performed by the FHA to assure that the housing is well designed, well built, and well located, and that the insured mortgage is economically sound or represents an acceptable risk.

16. Question. How would preliminary planning of projects aided by the title be financed?

Answer. The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be authorized to make preliminary advances of funds to soundly organized cooperative and other nonprofit housing corporations to enable them to formulate specific plans for the projects they proposed to undertake. The advances would be limited to the amount required for necessary work preliminary to construction. They would not exceed 5 percent of the estimated development cost of the projects, would bear interest at the going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent, and would be repaid out of any subsequent loans for the projects. It is probable that the maximum authorized advance loan would be required only in the case of relatively small projects, and that on larger projects the advances would run to about 3 percent of estimated project cost. The advances would be paid out only as actual progress was made in the formulation of the project and in the actual preparation of plans, thus reducing the risk involved in making them. Excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with a housing project would not be permitted.

17. Question. How much money would be authorized for preliminary advances?

Answer. A revolving fund of $25,000,000 would be authorized.

18. Question. Why are preliminary advance loans essential to the program under this title?

Answer. Experience has demonstrated the extreme difficulty which cooperatives have encountered in their efforts to obtain funds from normal lending sources for preliminary planning and development of specifications. Indeed, very few banks and other lenders have had any experience in making any type of loans to housing cooperatives. Without provision for some small preliminary advances to enable cooperatives to undertake and pay for the complicated job of formulating a housing project, the proposed program to aid cooperatives, which are a relatively new form of private enterprise in the field of housing, may well be seriously impaired. Also, with the aid of preliminary advances, cooperatives will not be in a position where they are forced to turn for help to promoters who will perform planning services in the hope of later gaining an excessive profit in connection with a construction contract or with the sale of land to the cooperative. Similarly, the preliminary advances may make it possible for the cooperative to purchase architectural and other technical services on a more economical basis than normally results when such services are purchased on a contingent-fee basis.

19. Question. Will advance loans lead to speculation?

Answer. No. Ample safeguards have been provided in the title to prevent speculation. Preliminary advances of funds cannot be made until the Commissioner has determined that the borrower is a bona fide cooperative housing corporation or other nonprofit housing corporation; that the borrower will undertake a housing project which will meet a need for housing families of moderate income in the locality; and that there will not be excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with the project. Also, as explained in the answer to the previous question, preliminary loans will enable the cooperative to purchase necessary planning, architectural, and other technical services on a sound economic basis. Without such advances, the cooperative might be forced either to purchase such services at greater cost on a contingent-fee basis, or else to turn for planning help to speculators who are interested primarily in selling land to the cooperative or obtaining a highly profitable building contract. Thus, the advance loans will tend to eliminate rather than to encourage speculation.

20. Question. What provisions of the title are designed to assure that the mortgage loans will be made available only to bona fide cooperatives and nonprofit corporations for housing within the financial reach of families of moderate income?

Answer. Before a mortgage loan could be made under the title the Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be required to certify to the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives that (1) the borrower is a bona fide nonprofit cooperative housing corporation or a private nonprofit corporation authorized to provide housing, (2) the proposed housing project will meet a need for housing for families of moderate income, (3) the proposed project will meet sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and (4) the development and management of the project will be such as to promote the economies contemplated under the title. Elaborate or extravagant construction would not be eligible for aid under the title.

The borrower would also agree not to pay any excessive fees, salaries, or charges and to establish and maintain schedules of rents or charges, satisfactory to the Corporation, which will permit the dwellings to be made available to families of moderate income. The title would also provide that the mortgage loan may not exceed the development cost of the housing project nor the amount which the Commissioner determines to be the upper limit within which housing can be provided for families of moderate income in the locality at rentals or other charges within their means. In the case of a loan to a cooperative corporation, the borrower would be required to have, to the extent permitted by State and local law, a priority in the purchase of the interest of each of its members in the event of sale of such interest. It should be noted too that a cooperative would be required to have 50 percent of the members proposed to be served by the housing at the time of making an application for a mortgage loan and at least 80 percent prior to receipt of any proceeds from such a loan. These provisions, plus provisions for democratic voting, would likewise assure that the cooperatives served would be bona fide cooperatives.

Penalties are provided for false statements or misrepresentations made to obtain benefits under the title.

21. Question. What are the major functions of the Cooperative Housing Commissioner under this title?

Answer. The major functions of the Cooperative Housing Commissioner would be to give technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives and other nonprofit housing corporations, to make advance loans to them for preliminary planning of their projects, and to supervise the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives. These functions would be required to be administered in a manner which will encourage the development by housing cooperatives and other nonprofit housing corporations (individually or through joint undertakings) of sufficient skills and services so that the technical advice and assistance by the Government may be gradually reduced and terminated.

22. Question. What functions would be performed by the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives under this title?

Answer. This proposed Corporation would make and service loans to private cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations in order to enable such corporations to provide housing for families of moderate income. In accomplishing this primary objective, the Corporation would perform such incidental functions as are authorized by the provisions of the title, including the issuing of obligations to obtain funds with which to make loans, over and above those which may be made from capital-stock funds.

23. Question. What is the nature of this Corporation?

Answer. This Corporation would be a mixed-ownership corporation and would carry out its functions under the supervision of the Cooperative Housing Commissioner. The Corporation would be managed by a board of five directors appointed by the Commissioner. Eventually two of the directors would be appointed from among members of stock-holding corporations or other persons representative of housing cooperatives.

Initially the capital stock of the Corporation would be subscribed for and purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States. But as loans are made to cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations, these borrowers would subscribe to capital stock of the Corporation in an amount equal to a designated percentage of any particular loan. From the capital stock paid in by private borrowers, all of the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury would eventually be retired.

24. Question. Is there any precedent for this type of mixed-ownership corporation?

Answer. Yes. The Federal home-loan banks, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, and the regional banks for cooperatives are among such precedents. The Federal home-loan banks, for example, were established in 1932 and began lending operations with $125,000,000 invested by the Government. Member lending institutions were required by statute to subscribe to stock in an amount equal to 1½ percent of their home-mortgage loans. The home-loan banks have gradually retired $50,000,000 of the stock investment of the Federal Government, and member lending institutions now hold stock in excess of $136,000,000.

25. Question. Who would subscribe to the capital stock of the Corporation?

Answer. A portion of the capital stock of the Corporation would be subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury. The balance would be subscribed by nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations and nonprofit corporations borrowing funds from the Corporation.

26. Question. How much capital stock would the Government purchase?

Answer. The maximum amount of capital stock of this Corporation which the Federal Government would be authorized to hold at any one time is $100,000,000.

27. Question. How much stock would be subscribed by cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations?

Answer. The maximum amount of capital stock of the Corporation which could be purchased by borrowing cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations is not prescribed in the title. The title does provide that a participating cooperative or nonprofit housing corporation shall, as a condition of obtaining a loan, subscribe for capital stock to be purchased over a period of time in an amount at least equal to 10 percent of the particular loan involved. Cooperatives would be required to purchase for cash 2½ percent when applying for the loan, 2½ percent when the project is completed, and 5 percent in installments within 20 years. Nonprofit corporations would be permitted to pay for their stock in installments over a 20-year period.

28. Question. What return would be paid on capital stock subscribed to by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Answer. The capital stock of the Corporation purchased by the Federal Government would be preferred as to dividends and assets; also, it would be entitled to cumulative dividends at a rate determined each year by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the probable period of the stock investment and the current rate on outstanding obligations of the United States.

29. Question. What provision is made for returning the Government's investment in the stock of the Corporation?

Answer. The Government's investment in the capital stock of the Corporation would be returned to the Government in this manner: After the paid-in capital stock from participating cooperative and nonprofit housing corporations equals $50,000,000, the Corporation would begin to retire dollar for dollar, out of privately paid capital, the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury at par plus accrued dividends. Retirement of such stock would not be authorized, however, if the net capital, reserves, and surplus of the Corporation would thereby be reduced to an amount less than $150,000,000.

30. Question. What would be the terms of mortgage loans made by the Corporation to cooperatives?

Answer. Mortgage loans to cooperatives and nonprofit housing corporations could not exceed the development cost of the housing project involved nor an amount determined by the Cooperative Housing Commissioner to be the upper limit within which housing can be provided for families of moderate income in the locality at rentals, prices or charges within their means.

Complete amortization of these loans would occur within 50 years by periodic payments. This period could be extended by the Corporation up to 60 years if the project should be refinanced at a higher interest rate (made necessary by increased cost to the Corporation of its borrowings in the private market). However, such an extension could only be made if the increased interest rate would otherwise result in increased rents or charges which would adversely affect the stability of the project.

Interest on these loans would be at a fixed rate on unpaid balances, which is determined on the basis of the cost to the Corporation of its capital and borrowings, plus its costs of operation and its reserves. See also the answer to question 41 which explains in greater detail how the interest would be arrived at.

Provisions could be made in the loan for deferment of principal and interest payments provided that the deferments did not extend the loan maturity for over 3 years.

31. Question. Is the maximum mortgage maturity permitted under this title too long?

Answer. No. In the case of conventional sales and rental housing, mortgage maturities are generally established at periods which are far less than they would be if they were based on the anticipated physical life of the buildings. These maturities are generally related to the shortest anticipated economic life of the structures. In the case of one- and two-family homes, particularly, maximum allowance is made for the possible encroachment of inharmonious and blighting uses of land in the neighborhood. In the case of rental housing, further allowance is necessarily made for the fact that business investors in such housing are often motivated by a desire to obtain the highest possible yield during the early life of the project. For this purpose, corners are often cut in the design, construction, and maintenance of rental housing. This fact and factors such as depreciation schedules for tax purposes or the mere traditional practice of lending institutions often lead to shorter maturities in the case of rental housing.

Experience has shown, however, that residents of an area, if motivated and combined by a common purpose, can sucessfully prevent the encroachment of undesired uses or blight, and that conservative operation of rental housing can prolong the economic life of such housing for periods far longer than customary mortgage maturities. These facts are particularly true of cooperative projects, in which the occupants form a closely organized group from the outset, and in which first choice of purchase of a member's interest is required to be given to the cooperative. It should be noted, too, that, under this title, a mortgage loan would be approved only after a determination that the "location and physical planning of the housing project will afford reasonable assurance as to the stability of the neighborhood." Furthermore, the cooperative and other nonprofit corporations eligible for mortgage loans under this title will not be motivated by desire for profit and will not attempt (as business investors often do) to obtain a maximum financial yield by "milking" the project during the early years. Instead, they will be motivated, in their planning, construction, and maintenance, by the desire to obtain maximum usefulness and stability of the projects during the entire period of their physical life.

32. Question. Is mortgage credit presently available to housing cooperatives from private sources?

Answer. No. The evidence presented to the Banking and Currency Committee established overwhelmingly that mortgage credit is not generally available from private lending sources to this relatively new form of private enterprise. Even where FHA mortgage insurance is available, many lenders are reluctant to enter into a transaction which may prove somewhat troublesome to them merely because it is, for the time being, unfamiliar.

33. Question. How would the title permit private capital from other sources to be invested in construction loans to cooperatives in place of construction loans by the Corporation?

Answer. The title would expressly permit a borrowing cooperative or nonprofit housing corporation, with the consent of the Corporation, to pledge the contract or commitment of the Corporation that it will make a mortgage loan as security for a construction loan to be obtained by the borrower from a private lender. Thus, where construction credit is available from other private sources, the title would encourage reliance on such sources, rather than on the Corporation.

34. Question. How would the Corporation raise the money to make the loans, apart from subscription to capital stock?

Answer. The Corporation would be authorized to issue and have outstanding on and after July 1, 1950, obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, in an amount not to exceed $300,000,000. One year later this amount could be

increased, with the approval of the President, by additional amounts aggregating not more than $1,700,000,000. In no event could the total outstanding obligations of the Corporation exceed $2,000,000,000; or 15 times its capital stock and surplus; or the amount of the unpaid balance of the mortgages contracted for or held by it, plus its investments and cash on hand and on deposit.

35. Question. Would there be any loss in connection with the Corporation's construction loans because of the cost of inspections or other services?

Answer. No. The cost of inspection and other services during construction of a project is to be borne by the borrower, as is customary in the case of construction loans. In addition to interest on the mortgage loan, the Corporation may charge up to 2½ percent of the loan principal for this purpose.

36. Question. What provisions are made for reserves of the Corporation to cover possible losses on mortgage loans made by it?

Answer. The Corporation would be required to establish a reserve for losses into which one-fourth of 1 percent per year on the outstanding balance of mortgage loans would be paid in semiannual installments. The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would also be authorized to require the Corporation to establish and maintain such other reserves as he deems to be necessary, and to make appropriate charge-offs for depreciation or impairment of assets. Dividends would be declared only from net earnings after such reserves and charges, and with the prior approval of the Commissioner.

37. Question. How does the Corporation's reserve for losses compare with FHA mortgage insurance experience?

Answer. Cumulative FHA losses from its inception to November 30, 1949, have amounted to approximately three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the face amount of mortgages insured. The one-fourth percent per year reserve against mortgage loans is thus eight times as great per year as the cumulative FHA loss over a 15-year period. While it is true that the FHA experience has covered a favorable economic period, the one-fourth percent per year provision is believed reasonable, in combination with additional reserve requirements which the Cooperative Housing Commissioner may impose if needed and with cumulative stock investments in the Corporation which borrowers are required to make, equal to 10 percent of their borrowings.

One further comparison between the Corporation and FHA is of interest. In the FHA system, insurance reserves are built up by the collection of annual mortgage insurance premiums. Under this title, a similar type of protection against loss would result from the requirement for a special loss reserve, to be built up at the minimum rate of one-fourth percent per annum of outstanding loans, plus the additional reserves which the Commissioner may require. Of the amounts received by FHA from premiums, it is estimated that an amount equal to one-fourth percent of insured loans has had to be allocated for administrative and operating expenses in connection with the mortgage insurance programs, leaving about one-fourth percent for reserves for losses. Finally, in the case of the Corporation, there would also be the additional protection resulting from the required stock investment by borrowers, which is analogous both to premium assessments in FHA and down payment requirements on FHA insured mortgages.

38. Question. What is the expected interest rate on the debentures to be issued by this new Corporation?

Answer. About 2½ percent at the present time, in view of the fact that the debentures of the Corporation would be guaranteed by the Federal Government. The current rate for long-term Federal obligations is now about 2¼ percent.

39. Question. If the Corporation can obtain the investment of private funds in its guaranteed obligations at about 2½ percent interest, why is it necessary for VA and FHA-guaranteed or insured mortgages to have an interest rate of 4 or 4½ percent?

Answer. The 2½ percent interest rate and the 4 or 4½ percent interest rate are rates charged on basically different kinds of investments. The 4 or 4½ percent rate is the gross rate charged to the mortgagor, from which must be deducted the costs of acquiring the loans, of servicing, of losses, and of operating a mortgage loan portfolio. On the basis of the published experience of four insurance companies, these costs bring the gross rate down to a net rate of slightly above 3 percent for 4½ percent loans and slightly above 2½ percent for 4 percent loans of average size. These costs, it should be noted, are different among different lenders, depending upon the size of the lender and the scale of its mortgage lending, tending to be lower for larger volume and also for larger size loans. Therefore, insurance companies studied had the advantage of geographical distribution, and probably better balanced portfolios in terms of type and size of mortgages than many small local lenders. Those lenders would have an even smaller net return on mortgage loans. The return on debentures to be issued by the Corporation will involve no such costs as are involved in mortgage loans. It is therefore comparable to the net rate on mortgage loans, rather than the gross rate. Also the Corporation's debentures will have greater liquidity.

40. Question. Why is provision made for the Government to guarantee the obligations of the Corporation?

Answer. The obligations of the Corporation would be unconditionally guaranteed by the United States (as are those issued by the FHA to mortgagees in case of foreclosures under the insured mortgage system). This guaranty serves to reduce the cost to the Corporation of borrowing money and thereby permits the Corporation to make lower interest charges to the cooperative and other nonprofit corporations which borrow from the Corporation. The guaranty is justified on at least two principal grounds. First, this program is designed to operate in such a way that soundly conceived cooperative-housing projects will be able to attain the low-cost financing essential to reduced monthly charges, and the benefits and savings thereby achieved are, in a cooperative or nonprofit operation, automatically translated into direct benefits to consumers in the form of reduced monthly charges. In other words, in an operation of this type, there can be no diversion into speculative profits of the financing economies made possible by the guaranty.

The second justification for the application of a guaranty to the obligations of the Corporation may be illustrated by analogy to the FHA insured mortgage system. Through that system the Federal Government has for almost 16 years underwritten mortgage loans which met certain predetermined standards and objectives. So far the Federal Government has not been called upon to make good the guaranty of those mortgage loans, since the system operates on a fully self-supporting and self-sufficient basis from the premiums and other income which the FHA receives. Nonetheless, the Government has assumed a contingent liability in that program under which there is no question that it would have to make good in the unlikely event that defaults exhausted insurance reserves. Thus, the Government guaranty has thereby effectively protected the private lender from any loss of principal or interest on his insured loans. A large share of the credit for the heavy current production of housing by the building industry, and the proportion of its for-sale product within the reach of moderate-income families in many parts of the country is due to this effective aid by a self-supporting governmental activity.

This title contemplates a program, largely new in actual operation but based on sound financing experience, in which housing projects of cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations can be financed through reliance on Government-guaranteed obligations. But if the projects are soundly conceived and soundly operated, there is no more reason why the income from interest charges, the investment of private stock in the corporation (as explained in the answer to question No. 27 and the build-up of reserves for losses (as explained in the answer to question No. 36) should not enable this financing operation to pay its way than is the case in the FHA insured mortgage operation.

It is true that under this title the contingent liability of the Government will be fixed in terms of a guaranty of the Corporation's debentures, rather than in the underwriting of the mortgages backing those debentures. Since, upon default on an insured mortgage, the FHA issues to the mortgagee its debentures which are fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the United States, the principle involved is the same, and the result, insofar as Government risk is concerned, should be as good. In the case of the FHA insured mortgage system, the contingent liability to the Government is, in the final analysis, protected by the value inherent in the properties underlying insured mortgages. Under this title the contingent liability of the Government in terms of its guaranty of the debentures of the Corporation is also protected, in the final analysis, by the value inherent in the properties securing the mortgage loans which the Corporation makes.

41. Question. What interest rate will be paid to the Corporation on mortgage loans made by it?

Answer. No specific interest rate on the mortgage loans is set forth in the bill. It is provided that the rate would be determined by taking into account the following factors: first, the cost of money to the Corporation; second, an amount adequate to defray the operating expenses of the Corporation; and third, an amount equal at least to one-fourth of 1 percent of the loans which is to be specifically set aside as a reserve for losses on mortgage loans plus such other reserves as the Cooperative Housing Commissioner may deem necessary. At the present time, it is estimated that this would mean mortgage loans (so far as initial loans are concerned) written at the approximate rate of 3⅛ percent. However, if this estimate should prove too conservative, the Corporation would, of course, be authorized to charge a higher interest rate. It should be noted that the presently contemplated differential between the cost of money to the Corporation and the interest rate charged by it is consistent with the loss and expense experience gained by larger insurance companies in their mortgage lending activities.

42. Question. Are the obligations issued by the corporation exempt from Federal taxes?

Answer. No. The title itself does not purport to exempt such obligations from Federal taxation and there is no other statute or principle of law which would exempt them. Actually, interest on or gain from the sale of obligations issued by the Corporation would be subject to Federal taxation under section 4 (a) of the Public Debt Act of 1941.

43. Question. Are obligations issued by the Corporation exempt from State and local taxes?

Answer. Yes. Obligations of the Corporation (as well as the Corporation's franchise

and intangible assets) would be exempt from State and local taxes. The title expressly provides that the Corporation and its obligations shall be exempt from taxes (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) by any State or local taxing authority. This is fully consistent with the law as applied to other mixed ownership corporations. For example obligations of the Federal home loan banks are similarly exempted by express provisions of law.

44. Question. Is real property or tangible personal property of the Corporation exempt from State and local taxes?

Answer. No. Such property is expressly made subject to State and local taxation and assessments to the same extent as other similar property.

45. Question. Would the housing of the cooperative and other nonprofit corporations aided by the title be exempt from local taxation and special assessments for local improvements?

Answer. There is nothing in this title that would in any way exempt housing provided under its provisions from State and local taxation or special assessments for local improvements. Neither is it true that buildings provided under the provisions of this title would be exempt from real estate taxes under the laws of the States in which they would be built.

Existing consumers' cooperative laws of the various States do not exempt real estate of cooperatives from taxation. In the absence of express exemption provisions, the general taxing laws apply to the real property of cooperatives in the same manner that they apply to real property owned by other private corporations. Even the property of rural electric cooperatives is subject to taxes in the majority of the States that have enacted special laws in regard to such cooperatives.

It may be noted in connection with this question that several States have adopted limited dividend housing corporation laws to encourage the provision of housing for persons of moderate income. It may be that some housing cooperatives aided under this title would be created in such a manner as to come within the provisions of some of these laws. These State statutes extend certain benefits, but only three States (New York, New Jersey, and Delaware) purport to grant partial tax exemption from normal real estate taxes. In each of these three States, of course, the partial exemption is designed to carry out specific policies which the State itself, acting through its legislature, has adopted.

46. Question. Are housing cooperatives un-American or socialistic?

Answer. No. Our earliest settlers used the cooperative device for their mutual defense, for building their homes, and in agriculture. Even in recent times, "barn raisings" and "house raisings" have been common in rural areas in this country.

Private enterprise has long used the cooperative device for accomplishing its purpose. It exists in many fields of business endeavor. The Associated Press is a cooperative. Savings and loan associations are mutual organizations, as are many life insurance companies. Independent retail merchants frequently unite in cooperative associations for buying, advertising, and other purposes, and farmers frequently unite in production or marketing cooperatives. Cooperatives are themselves a form of private enterprise. They are formed for the economic advantage of their members. The benefits of a cooperative accrue to its members, while in a commercial enterprise they accrue to those who have invested their money in the business. In the case of consumers' cooperatives, the benefits take the form of cost reductions in consumer goods or services.

Both Mr. William A. Reckman, representing the American Bankers Association, and Mr. William A. Clarke, representing the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, made it clear in their testimoney on this title that their opposition to the title was not based on opposition to the cooperative form of organization for the construction or operation of housing.

47. Question. Is this title inflationary and will it tend to increase housing construction costs?

Answer. No. By stimulating an increased production of housing within the reach of middle-income families, the program should help to reduce the inflationary pressures on the price of both new and used homes and on rents. These pressures have arisen because of unmet housing needs which have accumulated over a period of years. A portion of these needs will be met by housing produced under this title.

The title would provide about 250,000 dwelling units over a period of several years. The peak volume in any 1 year could hardly equal 75,000 units. In the light of the 1949 production level of over 1,000,000 housing units, and in the light of an ample supply of construction materials and sufficient construction labor to attain a very much higher level of production, it is clear that this title is not inflationary from a housing viewpoint. This is particularly true now that a major share of the backlog of demand for higher priced homes and apartments has been met. The market which has been served by section 608 rental housing designed to rent at between $80 and $125 per month, to choose but one example, is about exhausted, and should be replaced by other markets if last year's volume of residential construction is to be maintained.

With respect to the availability of construction labor and materials the following is of interest. At the Senate hearings on middle-income housing, Senator BRICKER asked:

"Is there plenty of labor, plenty of material, plenty of ability in the country to build a million and a half units as well as a million units a year?"

Mr. John C. Thompson, representing the National Association of Real Estate Boards, answered that there was. Senator SPARKMAN later questioned Mr. Thompson as follows:

"Senator SPARKMAN. Let me review it a little bit. You did say, did you not, that money was available, and labor and material were available?

"Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

"Senator SPARKMAN. To build a million and a half units a year?

"Mr. THOMPSON. Precisely."

Neither is the title inflationary from a credit viewpoint. The guaranteed obligations of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives would be sold over a period of years. The contingent liability of the Government on account of these obligations is no different in principle than that under the FHA mortgage insurance program, and the cushion against such liability would be even greater than in the case of the FHA program. Under this title, the cushion against ultimate liability on the part of the Government consists of the Corporation's required reserves and the borrowers' required purchases of stock in the Corporation. Added safety features result from the type of housing projects which are the ultimate security for the obligations of the Corporation. These projects will benefit from careful planning and supervision, from ownership characteristics of the cooperative housing, and from the fact that the housing will serve a much more stable market than higher priced housing.

Finally it should be noted that cutbacks in all housing programs are provided for when economic conditions make such cutbacks desirable, by the provisions of section 301 of the bill. That section would permit the President to reduce the maximum authorized principal amounts of any housing loans made, insured, or guaranteed by any Government agency or mixed ownership corporation, where such action is necessary or desirable in the light of general economic conditions.

48. Question. Would this title provide an unfair advantage to particular groups?

Answer. No. This program supplements a number of other Federal housing programs and should be viewed in the context of all existing Federal housing legislation. Thus, aids for public-low-rent housing to serve the lowest income groups, for farm housing, and for slum clearance were enacted during the last session. Existing programs of the Home Loan Bank Board and of the Federal Housing Administration have succeeded in producing adequate housing (both sales and rental) to serve the upper-income third of our families as well as many families, particularly in some regions, who fall within the middle-income third of our population. However, some middle-income families in all regions and a large range of such families in higher cost areas are not now being served by any of these programs. They can neither find existing housing nor afford new housing adequate for their needs.

This title (along with other provisions of the bill) are designed to aid such middle-income families in obtaining housing which they can afford and which is large enough for families with children. The cooperative or nonprofit organization is aided under this title because it is the only form of private enterprise through which the savings achieved in financing, in construction, and in management are automatically translated into direct benefits to the consumer in the form of corresponding reductions in the monthly costs which he must pay for his housing. Thus, the title is a supplementary means of serving additional middle-income families and will fill a gap which now exists in our present housing programs. The title gives no discriminatory advantage to any group. On the contrary, discrimination against middle-income families would result if the gap which now exists in our housing legislation were to be left unfilled.

Finally, it should be noted that any middle-income family is eligible to join with other such families in forming a housing cooperative which will receive the assistance proposed by this title.

49. Question. Will the program under this title deter other forms of private enterprise from building?

Answer. There is no justification for the apprehension that enactment of this title will deter other forms of private enterprise from building. It is clear that only a relatively small segment of the approximately 8,000,000 middle-income families will need or desire to take advantage of the cooperative housing formula. Rather, this title is designed to add one additional string to our bow. It is to be just one additional incentive and aid to private enterprise to capture another segment of the market which it would otherwise be unable to do. This program will increase the total market for private housing rather than take any part of the market away from established builders and lenders. Housing is so important a factor in family living that we cannot overlook any device which can facilitate the provision of houses for those in need of it. In the future, as in the past, by far the bulk of the housing being built in this country will be provided by private enterprise using the conventional types of ownership and financing arrangements.

50. Question. Will the program under this title hurt builders?

Answer. No. This program will provide additional building activity since it will serve a market not now being reached. Many private builders will participate in this program as general contractors for cooperative and other nonprofit corporations. Indeed, a healthy cooperative housing movement will

aid the entire building industry to operate at a higher level of activity and will act as a cushion against depression in that industry when the present temporary market for high-priced housing has come to an end. In this connection it should be noted that during periods of lessened economic activity the building industry is one of the first to be affected adversely and is traditionally the hardest hit. The program under this title would help reverse that trend.

51. Question. Will this title hurt the private-lending industry?

Answer. Mr. William A. Clarke, representing the Mortgage Bankers Association, testified in opposition to this title. He stated:

"I am perfectly willing to admit that we are now taking a selfish interest in connection with this matter. That comes about in this way: The life-insurance companies, the savings banks, the building and loan associations of the country are geared up and are now handling the mortgage loans of the so-called middle-income families. We feel they are doing a very competent job of it. This legislation, we believe, will remove from the market that type of mortgage for the so-called legitimate investor in mortgage loans. He is interested in the purchase of mortgages. Every one of them now has a portfolio that is almost too full of Government bonds. What is proposed here would be a Government bond. We feel that this is class legislation which gives a chance for a rate of interest which will take away from us the opportunities to invest money in mortgages, which in turn will have its effect on the dividends paid by life-insurance companies, dividends paid by savings banks, building and loan associations, and others."

Mr. Clarke's statement involves two errors. First, the mortgage loans to be made in connection with housing aided by this title will not, as he believes, take away from lenders the opportunities to invest money in mortgages. This error made by Mr. Clarke results from the failure to realize that the housing aided under this title will reach a segment of the middle-income market which is not now being reached at all.

The second error involves the failure to recognize that the Government-guaranteed obligations of the Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives will in fact be a desirable investment for insurance companies, banks, and other lenders. The interest paid on such obligations will constitute a net return to investors fully as high as the net return on mortgage loans since the higher interest rate on a mortgage loan must cover the cost of acquiring the loan, of servicing it, and of losses. This also explains why Business Week, in its January 14 issue, stated, in referring to this title:

"If the plan goes through, it will offer a new top-grade outlet for the big-time investor, such as insurance companies."

52. Question. Does this title involve a Federal subsidy?

Answer. No. On the contrary this title has been carefully prepared to avoid any Federal subsidy. Interest charges for mortgage loans to cooperatives and nonprofit corporations must be sufficient to pay all costs of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives. This includes the cost of the money which the Corporation borrows from the public, administrative expenses of the Corporation, special reserves sufficient to cover losses, and any general reserves which the Cooperative Housing Commissioner may require (question 41). The danger of any ultimate loss by the Federal Government is further reduced by required subscription to the Corporation's capital stock by borrowing cooperatives, as previously explained (questions 27 and 29). The specific reserves for losses of one-quarter of 1 percent (questions 36 and 37) and the private, capital-stock subscription by borrowers will build up an ample cushion against any possible future losses.

The basic security for any mortgage loan, of course, is the value of the property on which it is made and the economic stability of the borrower. Because of the required adherence to sound planning and construction standards by the coperatives and the elimination of speculative profits in construction and management of their projects, the inherent value of these projects will offer much better mortgage security than is now found in many rental projects built and operated for profit. The income from coperative projects also is likely to be more stable over the years because rents or monthly charges will be lower than otherwise available and the occupants will own the projects and thus have every incentive to keep them in first-class condition.

All of the administrative expenses of the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives will be met from the interest and fees charged borrowers. The interest charged must be high enough to cover the general administrative costs of the Corporation, and the costs for special services, such as inspections, will be met from fees paid by the borrowing cooperatives (question 35).

The initial stock investment in the Corporation to be made by the Government would be limited to $100,000,000; would bear cumulative dividends; would be preferred as to dividends and assets; and would be replaced over a period of time by stock investment made by private borrowers (questions 23 through 29).

The title authorizes the Cooperative Housing Commissioner to assist in the organization of housing cooperatives and in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects. Although this assistance naturally involves certain administrative expenses by the Federal Government, it is not a subsidy in any accepted meaning of the term. Rather, it is a public service comparable to many others furnished by the Federal Government. It is also designed to benefit the Government by protecting against losses on the mortgage loans to cooperatives. Many of those who oppose certain other features of the title agree that a program of technical assistance by the Government to housing cooperatives would serve a laudable public purpose and would be entirely justified (question 13). There are numerous precedents for such technical aid by the Government (question 14).

It should be noted, too, that the title would direct the cooperative Housing Commissioner to administer the program in such a manner that the cooperatives themselves, acting individually or through joint undertakings, would, as soon as feasible, supply their own technical advice and assistance and thereby gradually reduce and terminate such technical advice and assistance by the Commissioner.

The Cooperative Housing Commissioner would also be authorized to make preliminary advances to cooperatives to assist them in making plans for housing projects which are eligible for mortgage loans from the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives. This would in no sense be a subsidy program. The preliminary advances would have to be repaid out of the mortgage loans and the borrower would have to pay interest on the advances equal to the cost of money to the Treasury, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum. The sound initial guidance furnished through technical advice and assistance under the title would materially reduce the chance of losses on the advances. Before any advances could be made, the Cooperative Housing Commissioner would have to determine that the borrower is a bona fide cooperative or nonprofit corporation whose methods of operation are such as will avoid the use of funds for any speculative purpose or the payment of excessive fees, salaries, or charges (questions 16 through 20).

Dorothy Kenyon's Associations—She Is Judged by the Company She Keeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a wise man once said that what we say is not important but it is what we do that really counts. When Senator McCARTHY called attention to the organizations she has joined in the past and charged that she was keeping such bad company that she was disqualified from being a United States delegate to the United Nations, Miss Kenyon was incensed and said that the Senator was a liar. But in view of her record the Senator was absolutely correct.

Mr. George Sokolsky has rendered a real public service by setting forth a bill of particulars showing the groups to which Miss Kenyon was identified. His article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald for Sunday March 19, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Guilt by association is an ugly doctrine. Among some primitive peoples, if one member of a family were accused of a crime, every member of the family is held accountable. In some schools, teachers still hold an entire class responsible for the conduct of one pupil, which is a form of socializing guilt repugnant to our way of life which is based on individual responsibility.

However, the term, "guilt by association," as it is currently being used, is something quite different. What we do is to follow the old adage, "Birds of a feather flock together."

We go back to the proved sociological postulate that where there is a community of kind, there is likely to be an association of those who have similar tastes. When, therefore a person appears on a large number of Communist or Communist-front activities, the assumption must be that that person has made a voluntary choice to associate with such people and their activities.

Take, for instance, the case of Dorothy Kenyon. The lady says that she is not a Communist and has never been one. We must take her word for that. But how shall this record be explained?

1. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom petitioned to discontinue the Dies committee. This organization existed to defend Communists from investigation; Dorothy Kenyon appears among the signatories.

2. American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born has been officially declared subversive. This organization was established by the Communist Party and has been closely linked to the International Labor Defense (also listed as subversive); Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

3. In 1944 a number of American women of distinction sent greetings to the women of Soviet Russia. (We were then Allies in war.) Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

4. From 1934 to 1941, one of the principal transmission belts of communism in this country was the American Youth Congress. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

5. Earl Browder, testifying before the House Committee on un-American activities in September, 1939, described the Consumers

National Federation as a Communist transmission belt. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

6. The coordinating committee to lift the embargo was a Communist front organized to aid Soviet Russia's efforts in the Spanish civil war. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

7. The Council for Pan American Democracy was organized and supported publicly by the Communist parties of the United States, Canada, Mexico, Chile, Cuba, and Venezuela. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

8. The Descendants of the American Revolution was designed to be a left-wing organization to compete with and ridicule the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

9. A group of organizations came into being to bring pressures on the motion-picture producers to produce pro-Russian and pro-Communist films. The most active was Film Audiences for Democracy. Dorothy Kenyon appeared on the advisory board.

10. Simon W. Gerson, an active and admitted Communist, was given public office by the borough president of Manhattan in New York City. This led to an active protest. A committee was formed to defend Gerson. Dorothy Kenyon appeared on that committee as representing the consumers' unions.

11. The Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain was on the Communist side of the Spanish Revolution. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

12. League of Women Shoppers has been declared a Communist-front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities after prolonged investigation. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

13. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, successor to Friends of the Soviet Union, has been officially declared subversive. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

14. For many years Tom Mooney's imprisonment was used to raise money for the Communist Party. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared on the New York Tom Mooney Committee.

15. Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee was organized to aid arrested Communists and left-wingers. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

16. Morris U. Schappes, an admitted Communist, was tried in a court for perjury and convicted. The Schappes Defense Committee was organized for him. Dorothy Kenyon's name appeared there.

I have cited these examples to show a pattern of activity. This pattern does not necessarily make Miss Kenyon a Communist, but it does, in my opinion, open to question her judgment and her associations. In the present war between this country and Soviet Russia the constant association, for whatever reason, must stimulate concern.

The Best Recipe for Bean Soup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy working in the timber camps of the Northwest, where the men were hearty eaters and the food was substantial, bean soup was a staple. In discussing the camp fare the loggers were prone to quote the French lumberjack's maxim, "The little white bean makes the best pea soup."

Bean soup has become an epicurean delight in the repasts of our Nation's lawmakers and is regularly served in both the House and Senate restaurants, thanks to the legislative forethought of Idaho's past great senatorial leader, Fred T. Dubois.

The cooking class in the home economics department of Idaho State University, like education throughout our country, is advancing and has brought out a new recipe for making better bean soup, included in a press release recently received, which is respectfully submitted to the culinary department of the House and Senate restaurants:

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, Moscow, March 18.—When Author Kenneth Crawford recently criticized in the Saturday Evening Post the bean soup that has been served in the Senate restaurant at Washington since 1891 he really started things stirring in the home-economics department at the University of Idaho.

Crawford should have known better, for no one criticizes a bean—or potato—dish without causing a rattling of pots and pans by the Idaho home economists. Crawford innocently, however, said of the soup introduced to senatorial gourmets more than a half century ago by Senator Fred Dubois, of Idaho:

"Through all the years that I have covered the Senate, I have sustained myself in large part on this soup. It has got neither better nor worse, and still isn't too good, but will, as my continued existence proves, sustain a thin spark of life."

In Idaho, those were fighting words. Prof. Adah Lewis and her foods students, considered them not only a reflection on a former outstanding citizen of the State, but on beans, which are an important product of Idaho. Miss Lewis had her class first prepare soup according to the famed Dubois recipe, and then soups with variations. She reported today:

"Mr. Crawford's comments were unjustified. The Dubois recipe as given in the Post makes a fine soup. After sampling, we can understand why it has been served so long in the Senate restaurant. It is a heavy type of soup with high seasonings. Probably most of the Congressmen enjoy smoking, and, as this is inclined to dull the sense of taste, the high flavor of the Dubois recipe would be most acceptable.

"The majority of the class, however, felt that it was unfortunate that the excellent flavor of beans—particularly Idaho beans—is submerged in the Dubois recipe. A new recipe developed in the class by Margaret Weber, of Moscow, and Bernadean Reese, of Boise, keeps the bean flavor intact, and was voted superior even to the Dubois recipe which has stood the test of time."

In 1907, when the Dubois soup was dropped briefly from the Senate restaurant's menu, the Senate Rules Committee specifically ordered the restaurant manager to put it back quick. Now Miss Lewis would like the committee to order at least a trial of the new soup developed by the university students, which has been called Idaho bean soup.

The recipe (for 2 quarts): 2½ quarts of water, 5 ounces sliced ham hock or chunk of bacon or a mixture of the two, 1½ cups washed navy soup beans, 3 tablespoons diced onion, 1 cup mashed potatoes, 1 teaspoon chopped parsley, 2 tablespoons celery, 3 tablespoons butter, 1 teaspoon salt, pepper if desired. Braise onions in butter. Mix all ingredients in a heavy saucepan. Cover and simmer slowly for 2½ hours.

Mr. Truman Demagogues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, March 19, 1950:

THE DAY OF THE DEMAGOGUE

Mr. Truman took off for another vacation the other day, saying "I never felt better in my life or had less."

How he feels, we wouldn't know. But the other half of his crack is pure demagogic fraud.

Here is an exfarmer, a busted haberdashery dealer and ex-county judge, who came to Washington as a Senator in effect by appointment of a crook who was finally jailed for political criminality.

By a fluke Truman happened to be made chairman of a special committee on war contracts, which brought on a lot of publicity he could never in life have anticipated.

By another fluke, he was again in effect appointed to the Vice Presidency by the dying Roosevelt, who used Truman and his war made publicity status to duck a row between the Communists who wanted Henry Wallace again for Vice President in term IV of the Roosevelt dynasty, and the southern Democrats who wanted James Byrnes.

By yet another fluke, Truman succeeded to the Presidency of the United States just as the American Nation was winning the biggest and most expensive and most inexcusable war in history. The people promptly showed what they thought of him by electing an overwhelmingly opposition Congress.

That Eightieth Congress did a magnificent job of pulling things together out of chaos. Then, the Republican party laid down and took for granted that it could take over the Presidency in 1948 with less than nothing.

So still another fluke elected Truman to the Presidency. His campaign was a racketyrax, disjointed, quarrelsome show. But it did at least have the juice of life, and that tells why he won against the Republican nonentity.

POWER BY ACCIDENT

Never had less? Today, this little man of little force is the most powerful individual in civilization. He gets a salary of staggering size. On top of that, he gets a whopping, tax-free expense account. He gets his rent free in the biggest house in town, the most famous in the Republic.

He gets to ride around, all still free, in airplanes, yachts, trains and automobiles furnished him by the taxpayers of this country. Generals and admirals bow and scrape before him. Senators grovel for his nod.

Human nature being what it is, this little man has ballooned to think he is a genius. He pounds the desk with his fist and demands of the taxpayers a whole galaxy of socialistic undertakings.

We are all supposed to permit destruction of this country's health and growth, just to keep feeding this two-bit Caesar with the meat that makes him think he's great.

For, in spite of all his present power, Truman is greedy for more. He would put the Federal Government in full command of farming, education, housing, medicine, banking, mining, manufacturing, and in the final analysis, even the local selling and use of goods.

He asks taxation that is confiscatory, discriminates against one citizen in favor of

another, and so weakens the practice of business that private enterprise fears every day for its life.

Then, to deceive and conceal his actual arrogant abuse of office, this typical demagogue of our day pretends a humility and low estate with "I never had less."

Would you like to understand the condition of affairs that made Truman and also makes it basic to the life of this Republic that all his kind be driven out of power?

Well, we can think of no quicker, simpler, easier outline of the whole story than you will find in a little book called the Revolt of the Masses, now some 20 years old, but as fresh and timely as tomorrow.

THE TALE OF OUR TIMES

The author is one Jose Ortega y Gasset, a Spaniard. You can get an excellent translation in English, 204 pages, for $3. As you read it, a philosopher's tract of 1930, you see forecast all the fierce demagogues of our day, Hitler, Stalin, Roosevelt, Mussolini—and finally Truman.

What they are, why they are, how they came and how they can go. Revolt is filled with wise words everybody knows to be true. For instance:

"This is the gravest danger that today threatens civilization: State intervention; the absorption of all spontaneous historical action, which in the long run sustains, nourishes and impels human destinies.

"Society will have to live for the State, man for the governmental machine. And as, after all, it is only a machine whose existence and maintenance depend on the vital supports around it, the State, after sucking out the very marrow of society, will be left bloodless, a skeleton, dead with that rusty death of machinery, more gruesome than the death of a living organism."

So wrote a witty, shrewd little Spaniard 20 years ago, as he charted in advance the rise of fascism and communism, damned them both and warned against the demagogue in command of total power, wherever found.

Well, the Spaniard is still alive and around. What does he see for us, now? The United States of America, once the freest and most independent Republic in the history of the world, has suffered the infliction of two demagogues in 20 years. How much more can we take, and live?

It is not the demagogue, Truman, who never had less. It is the United States of America.

Salaries of Postmasters and Postal Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I have submitted to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in support of bills H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757, which are intended to correct certain inequities in Public Law 134 by a proper and more equitable modification of salaries of postmasters and postal supervisors:

STATEMENT TO HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERING H. R. 4678 AND H. R. 4757

Mr. Chairman, allow me to thank you and the members of your committee for granting me the opportunity to present my statement.

I am here today in support of H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757, which are intended to correct certain inequities in Public Law 134 by a proper and more equitable modification of salaries of postmasters and postal supervisors. It is my earnest conviction that these postal officials, who are directly responsible for the proper functioning of our postal service, are grossly underpaid in relationship to their responsibilities and the duties they perform.

I happen to be quite well acquainted with the postal set-up in New York City, my home city, which has the largest postal service employing many thousands of people and serving the world's largest manufacturing and industrial area. It requires men of great experience and long years of devoted service to plan and direct this important phase of New York's economic activity. Can you picture for a moment the paralyzing effect on this great industrial center if the mail service should suddenly or for any length of time become disrupted because of inadequacy or inexperience?

The bills which your committee is now considering are in no way to be regarded as a new effort toward a salary increase for one group of officials over another. I prefer to regard these measures merely as an overdue adjustment of salaries, or putting them in balance to make them commensurate with the duties and the responsibilities we have entrusted to these officials in the postal service.

We have heard it said so often that the Government is losing so many of its ablest and trusted officials because it is not according them decent salaries. Private industry has long ago realized the importance of paying its officials and employees in a manner commensurate with their responsibilities, and the result has been that many of our most loyal and capable men have been attracted to private industry. Today, we all know that it is poor economy on the part of the Government to refuse to make the necessary adjustments, in order to retain those who have served so faithfully and from whose knowledge and vast experience we all benefit.

Here we have an excellent oportunity to correct an injustice by placing the salaries of postmasters and postal supervisors on a par with salaries paid to people who hold positions of high responsibility in other Government services or in private industry. In my estimation, these overdue adjustments are quite modest.

I regard these bills, H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757, as meritorious legislation and strongly urge you to act favorably on them.

Relations Between Western Germany and Europe at Lowest Point Since War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star of March 16, 1950:

ON THE RECORD—RELATIONS BETWEEN WESTERN GERMANY AND EUROPE AT LOWEST POINT SINCE WAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

A dispatch from Germany states "United States observers in Bonn and elsewhere in western Germany are surprised and, in some cases, alarmed at the bitterness that has been aroused" by the agreement concluded between the French Government and the Saar territory.

It is not the bitterness which is astonishing. It is the astonishment of the allied observers which astonishes. Weeks ago this column warned that the Saar proposals would shake the whole west European structure. This has now happened. Relations between western Germany and Europe are at the lowest point since the war.

This deterioration comes in a critical moment. Unemployment in western Germany has reached 2,000,000—and this figure does not include the large number of the partly employed. Popular discontent is rising, the continued dismantling of industries furnishing an additional focus of discontent, especially among workers.

CRISIS AIDS COMMUNISTS

The Communists are taking advantage of the triple crisis: Saar, dismantling, unemployment. The currency reform produced a boom, as it brought to a famished market long-hoarded goods and opened employment. But the economic structure is basically undermined by the vast augmentation to the population of penniless expellees from that part of Germany annexed by Poland and from the satellite states. These number 9,000,000, including a disproportionate number of women, children and aged who must be sustained by the labor of others.

Among displaced workers unemployment is far higher than in the indigenous population. Now in this threefold crisis, Communist Poland has decided to expel those Germans who survived the earlier purges. This will add another 200,000 to 400,000 unemployed, and further complicate the disastrous housing situation.

Although the Allies are protesting in Warsaw and have said they won't take more than 25,000, it is impossible to throw them back, or to refuse Germans asylum in their own country.

The Franco-Saar agreement can be understood from the viewpoint of the Saarlanders, who, under it, are much more prosperous than other Germans. But the repercussions in Germany are inevitable. The Saar becomes, for 50 years, a colony of France. It leases France its coal mines for that period; integrates its railway system with the French; and puts its foreign affairs, customs, monetary, and economic policies under French control.

GERMANY DISMEMBERED

The irony is that there is no limit to which the Adenauer government would not go to achieve economic and political integration of the whole of western Germany with France. But what no German government could accept—and remain in office—is further dismemberment of the gravely mutilated country. Neither will any truth-loving person swallow the argument that the disposition of the Saar is still left to the "peace treaty." The disposition of eastern Germany was "left to the peace treaty" in the Potsdam agreement—while the expulsion of its population was agreed to. Germany has been dismembered by faits accompli and no one will believe that the British and Americans have permitted France to take an action they intend later to reverse.

Thus, the most pro-western and pro-French government Germany is ever likely to have, has been slapped in the face and, in the dynamics of democracy, has suffered defeat.

Last week, Secretary of State Acheson said America must mobilize the whole of her diplomacy. At the same time, it was announced that we are bringing pressure on the French to give more freedom to the Bao Dai Government of Indio-China. Now, what sort of diplomacy is it that permits the French to make a colony in Europe—and to take from an extremely friendly German Government what they had granted Adolf Hitler?

The repeated warnings of the rebirth of German nationalism are really silly. For the German has only three political choices: To become a good European, go Communist, or revive nationalism. And while the Communists are uniting communism with nationalism, the western allies are systematically frustrating Europeanism.

Furthermore, it is a very weak France which is thus cutting ties with a friendly German Government with the consent of the British and Secretary Acheson. Communist east Germany has an army on its feet which is stronger now than the French—five fully equipped divisions to the French's two—and while French Communists are preventing the landing of American munitions in French ports.

One only can say that whom the gods would destroy, they first make feeble and then feeble-minded.

National Uniform System of Automobile Registration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which will require Congress to take the initial step in encouraging the development of a nationally uniform system of automobile registration.

The bill was prompted by the fact that there is a wide variance among the laws of many of our States concerning automobile registration which often leads to injustice and uncertainty in commercial transactions involving automobiles, particularly in transactions which involve the movement of automobiles from one State to another.

According to the bill, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts is to be entrusted with the task of establishing a uniform procedure and appropriate fees for the registration of automobiles by clerks of the United States district courts. Automobiles are to be registered in the district where the owners reside or have their principal place of business.

As defined by my bill, the term automobile applies to all motor vehicles, including trucks, trailers, and motorcycles.

Registration forms will be supplied by United States district court clerks. Owners will have to enter their name and address; a description of the automobile, including manufacturer, type and model of vehicle, serial number and motor number; a statement of all prior transfers of title; and a statement of any liens against the automobile.

The bill prescribes a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for false statements knowingly and willfully made.

The clerk's certificate will be conclusive evidence of ownership of the vehicle but only presumptive evidence of the existence or nonexistence of liens.

If enacted into law it will be the first time a Federal law established a uniform system of registration of title of property.

It is hoped that because the law is permissive and not mandatory in term, it will be held constitutional if attacked in the courts.

It should be most effective, however, because of simplicity of the method established for proving ownership.

It is deserving of early consideration and speedy enactment.

Mr. Smith Locks a Barn Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Richmond News-Leader of Thursday, March 16, 1950:

MR. SMITH LOCKS A BARN DOOR

Every now and then we see in the press that some prophet of the political New Jerusalem is wagging a sorrowful head, full of the miseries that so many misguided sinners haven't found the true religion. The temptation, on reading these weep-easies, is to throw the newspaper at the cat and go for a long walk. Such a mood is upon us now, after reading Marquis Childs' lament at the Smith amendment to the National Science Foundation Act. Mr. Childs views this amendment heavily as a "chipping away of our freedoms," and he says lugubriously that it will "give the FBI the authority of a Gestapo and destroy a large area of academic freedom and the right of free inquiry."

What is the Smith amendment? It is a paragraph inserted in the Science Foundation Act by Virginia's Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, and it reads, in full:

"No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship shall be awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney-General or (of) any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

The prohibition against paying out tax funds to any person who at any time may have been a member of an organization now declared subversive is perhaps a little sweeping. Mr. SMITH himself confessed that "I feel I have gone pretty far," but viewing the amendment as a whole he regarded it—and so do we—as squarely in the public interest. What it means is that employees of the national foundation, privy to the gravest secrets of our national defense—the secrets on which the very survival of this Nation may depend—must not have soft spots in their loyalty to our way of life.

Is that a chipping away of freedoms, or is it a reasonable shoring up of those freedoms? Mr. SMITH said his idea was to lock the barn door, and reflecting upon the treachery of the eminent Dr. Fuchs, we can't think offhand of a better idea. The foundation's appropriations are limited to $500,000 at the moment, with an outside top of $15,000,000 per year; this is the barest drop in the bucket now being spent for scientific research. When Mr. Childs finds in this amendment the destruction of a large area of academic freedom and the right of free inquiry, he is finding spooks and bogeymen that simply are not there.

Perhaps it is worth observing again that this Nation's beloved rights and freedoms are not unlimited in their scope. They never have been, legally, traditionally, constitutionally, or any other way. The right of free speech gives no man the right to patrol a neighborhood's streets at midnight, shouting obscenities through a loud speaker. And the right of free inquiry and the freedom of academic research have similar proscriptions in the public interest. Mr. Childs may not see it that way, but to any man who views the Communists warily as so many rattlesnakes, the Smith amendment will seem a desirable safeguard of our national security.

How Bad Can United States Foreign Policy Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to present to the Members of this body a thought-provoking editorial from the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman for Sunday, March 19. Editor Robert D. Lusk has been critically interested in the foreign policy of this country and has devoted a good deal of time studying problems in international relations. I recommend this clear, concise editorial to all Americans who, like myself, wonder at times just where our present diplomatic policy is taking us.

The editorial follows:

HOW BAD CAN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY GET?

One of the most ridiculous assertions to be made by an administration official recently was that made Friday by a State Department official, John S. Peurifoy, when he charged that the current Senate investigation of possible communistic influences in the State Department is hurting United States foreign policy.

Peurifoy said that charges by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, against State Department workers have caused damage "both in terms of the day to day conduct of the foreign relations of the United States Government and in terms of human relations."

This would be a serious thing if it were an established fact that United States foreign policy was something definite and constructive, and that it has been a success and beneficial to the citizens of the United States.

But has United States foreign policy the past 5 years been anything that it would be criminal to disrupt or harm?

Consider Yalta and Potsdam. The United States negotiated terms at those places with the Russians which gave Manchuria away, and set up the Chinese disaster, which gave

Russia a chattel mortgage on the millions of people in central Europe, which committed an incredibly stupid blunder in putting the United States in Berlin to govern without any secure supply line to the city from the United States zone in Germany.

Consider the billions of dollars the United States had to spend on the Berlin airlift, a triumph of technology and airmanship made necessary by diplomatic stupidity.

Consider the Truman doctrine launched in February 1947, and how it took the United States away from the sincere support of the United Nations down the blind alley of unilateral action, with the United States trying to play Atlas and support the whole world single-handed. That doctrine put the United States into action in Greece and Turkey, destroyed its moral position of leadership, and marked an employment of force which the sad state of our armed forces converts into a bluff. It enabled Russia to employ force in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and China without the United States being able to criticize effectively because of its precedent in Greece with military action aaginst Communist guerrillas.

Consider the Marshall plan. It performed the humanitarian miracle of feeding starved millions for 2 years but as a diplomatic weapon it has only perpetuated certain economic and political evils. Chief among them is the continuation of the illusion that France is a reliable western ally. Its only reason for existing now is to help western Europe integrate its economy and create the tools for its own sustenance. There is no amount of proof that it is so succeeding.

Remember the Palestine muddle and how President Truman changed his attitude of the United States towards Palestine partition—during a congressional election time when New York votes apparently had priority over peace in Palestine—not once, but three times. This vacillation disgusted the British and other nations to a great degree.

Finally, consider how Marshall came back from China's civil war recommending a do-nothing policy and Acheson, the next Secretary of State, continued a hands-off and let's let the dust settle policy. The result was an easy victory for Mao Tse-Tung and his Communist armies and China and 450,000,000 more people came under the control of the Kremlin in Moscow. This loss was a terrific one for the western nations. It gave not only all of China to Red Russian control but set up the way for communism to take over the Near East. Even Secretary of State Acheson now realizes that, for he said in his San Francisco speech March 15:

"We now face the prospect that the Communists may attempt to use China as a base for probing for other weak spots which they can move into and exploit."

Acheson's vision is remarkably clear after the fact. Almost as clear as the vision of many who saw and voiced inevitable consequences of United States do-nothing failure in China before the collapse.

In the face of that dismal succession of failures, caused and permitted by decisions by President Truman, the Secretary of State, and their advisers, how can a State Department official have the intestinal fortitude to say that criticism of State Department is hurting foreign policy?

A review of United States foreign policy failures such as the foregoing strengthens agreement with the remark made by nationally known commentator Dorothy Thompson in Chicago last month that:

"We have found that policies have been made which are incomprehensible unless we assume that there were persons actively engaged in making them who wished to serve other than American interests."

A Blitz Against the Forces of Inaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to observe that the Massachusetts newspapers are alert to the outstanding service which our colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON, is performing in his tenacious fight to see that surplus food commodities are distributed to those who need them rather than being destroyed. If newspapers throughout the country took up the cudgels in the same manner as the Holyoke Transcript and the North Adams Transcript, it might be possible to get action out of the Administration forces to bring about greater sanity in the handling of this program.

As one of the four Republican Members who first introduced bills on the subject, I am grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts for his indefatigable efforts. When JOHN HESELTON tackles something, he never lets up so long as there remains a glimmer of hope for success. Although he has not received any satisfactory reply from the Secretary of Agriculture or from the President, vacationing in Key West, it is quite possible that the announcement by the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that he would hold hearings next Wednesday on our bills designed to assist in the distribution of food to the needy and hungry is inspired by the campaign without let-up which our capable and industrious colleague has waged.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following recent editorials from the Holyoke Transcript and the North Adams Transcript:

[From the Holyoke Transcript of March 10, 1950]

Congressman HESELTON has hit the jackpot again with his probe of the $100-a-minute waste for charges of storing food commodities. Even President Truman can't snap out an answer for it, not even a wisecrack.

[From the North Adams Transcript of March 13, 1950]

JUST NOT INTERESTED

The Federal Government is spending millions of dollars for surplus potatoes, eggs, dried milk, and other foodstuffs. It is spending more millions to store what it is buying—and then is storing it so long that it is spoiling.

At the same time local communities are spending millions of dollars for food for welfare recipients—at full market prices.

Appalled at such a situation, Congressman JOHN W. HESELTON has put these two facts together and come up with a proposal that, instead of storing food and letting it rot, the Government see that as much as possible of it be diverted for local welfare use.

This would relieve the Federal Treasury of the terrific storage expense it is now carrying, would cut local welfare food bills, and would reduce the terrific loss represented by spoilage.

It would seem that such a simple and practical solution—one that would mean really important dollar savings both to the Federal Government and local welfare departments, and resultant savings on both Federal and local tax bills—would be welcomed and seized upon by those responsible for carrying out the agricultural policies of the Truman administration.

But such an assumption is wrong.

At first, when the potato scandal was hot, it looked as though Mr. HESELTON might be going to get somewhere. But Federal insistence that local communities would have to pay for the transportation, packaging, and storage of any surplus commodities distributed for welfare use discouraged most cities and towns from even applying for the food.

Accordingly, on February 2, Mr. HESELTON and three other Congressmen filed identical bills under which the Department of Agriculture would be permitted to assume these packing and storage costs, paying for them with funds that otherwise it would have to spend anyway for storing them until they rotted and had to be thrown away—a dead loss.

Up to now, absolutely nothing has been done toward getting this common-sense provision enacted. Mr. HESELTON has continued to bombard Secretary Brannan—and finally even President Truman—with demands for action. So far he hasn't even received an answer from either of them.

Since February 2, when the bills were filed, he estimates that the Federal Government has paid out approximately $2,160,000 in carrying charges on 16 food commodities—money that could have been used to pay transportation and other costs necessary to get these foodstuffs in the hands of needy people who could well use them.

And that $2,160,000 represents almost exactly the full tax payments of 40,000 taxpayers earning an average of $3,000 a year.

Meanwhile, these carrying costs continue to mount, more food continues to spoil, and local tax money continues to be spent to buy welfare food at top prices.

Mr. HESELTON'S last move was a last-minute telegram asking President Truman to intervene before he left on his Key West vacation.

He didn't even get an answer.

So the President has gone fishing. The appalling waste continues. And the bill is being paid by all those who have been struggling the last few days to get their income-tax returns in by March 15.

It seems incredible, but apparently Mr. Truman and his administration just aren't interested in anything which offers a sensible and desirable chance of saving the taxpayers a few dollars.

The Tragic Situation of Jews in Iron Curtain Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have here an unusually interesting document which is highly revealing of the tragic

situation in which Jews find themselves in the countries behind the iron curtain. I want to recommend it to every Member of this House as "must" reading.

This document was prepared for the Labor Zionist Committee for Relief and Rehabilitation, whose main office is in New York. An emissary of this organization recently visited Europe, where he met with many people who had succeeded in coming out from behind the iron curtain through devious ways. For obvious reasons, names of certain individuals have been omitted.

Here is the true story about the treatment meted out to Jews in the so-called peoples' democracies of central and eastern Europe:

The information about the condition of Jews and of the campaign against Zionism and Israel in eastern Europe has been compiled from various sources, chiefly from discussions with tens of persons who have recently left those countries whom I saw in Paris, Zurich, and Vienna.

The situation in each country differs slightly. Yugoslavia generally is the exception to the rule because there is no antagonistic attitude toward Zionism and Israel in the main. The number of Jews who have remained there is small. There are about 5,000 Jews there. Bulgaria, too, is almost no problem. As you know, a sum of money had to be paid for each Jew who was taken out of the country. The other satellite countries follow, more or less, the "line" of Soviet Russia. Poland and Czechoslovakia are a bit more liberal, but Hungary and Rumania are as brutal as Soviet Russia itself.

Regarding Soviet Russia, we know from * * * that some time ago an elimination of Jews from all Government positions, the military, and diplomatic corps was started, the reasons for which are obvious. The campaign is not an open one, and the papers don't carry stories about it, but it is being conducted in systematic fashion. In the country, as well as outside the country, in one way or another way, all Jews are being recalled from their posts and in their places are assigned non-Jews. This is a result of the distrust that they have for Jews and their identification with communism and Soviet Russia is suspected.

They speak also of deportations of Jews from the large cities in central Russia to remote villages. This is also done with an excuse. The government which is the supplier of work for all citizens has started regulating the coincidence that actually for Jews who have lived their entire lives in Moscow and in other large cities, they find employment thousands of miles from any large center. This must have something to do with the secret war preparations of Soviet Russia generally. They do not want to have Jews in the centers of the country at a time of crisis.

From the aforementioned source, we also get the news that in Moscow there is now being prepared a large spectacle-trial, which will be a Jewish trial, although among the 120 accused—Jewish writers, poets, and composers—there will also be a number of non-Jews. The Jewish accused are guilty of causing the government embarrassment. For years they spoke, declared, and wrote that Jews identify themselves with the Soviet regime 100 percent and this has now been proven false, particularly after the recognition of the Jewish state. Those who have not yet paid dearly for this embarrassment will be punished legally. This will be a warning to all Jews on the one hand, and on the other, will be a quiet sort of justification for the present attitude of the government to Jews generally.

The situation is different in the satellite countries. In Poland there has started a dreadful campaign against Zionism and Israel and a wildfire is spreading against Jews who want to desert and become vassals of American imperialism. It is believed that those Jews who will not take steps immediately to leave this country, will meet more and more difficulty until the barriers will become entirely insurmountable and it will be too late.

Czechoslovakia which was, until recently, the most liberal country in eastern Europe as far as Jewish wanderers were concerned—and even for some time under the Communist rule—has also become unbearable. Escaped Jews from the neighboring countries are brutally returned and delivered into the hands of the special police from whose bestial hands the unfortunate victims can never twist themselves.

Generally, a certain amount of panic is quite evident in the Communist circles in all of the countries of eastern Europe. This is particularly true of Jewish Communist circles. Suspicion and insecurity have become an integral part of the mass psychology. Certainly there is not a single leading Communist in those countries who has the least bit of security and who does not constantly tremble in fear of the slightest mark on his record. This is also quite evident in the free countries where strong Communist Parties exist. In France, for example, the big name in Jewish Communist circles was Raisky, for years and years. He was also the editor of the daily New Press. During Gromyko's defense of the creation of a Jewish state in sessions of the United Nations, when all Communists understood the "go ahead" sign, Raisky excelled in editorials and impassioned speeches for the Jewish state and against Arab exploiters, former collaborationists of Hitler and Mussolini. Later, the "line" changed and Raisky had the misfortune not to follow it quickly enough and change to the new "line." Naturally, he spoke and wrote against Zionism and Israel, but not with the same conviction with which he had previously propagandized. So, a short while ago, he received orders from Poland to return with his family within 8 days. (Raisky, who came originally from Poland, had lived in France for more than 20 years). He begged for at least two more weeks so that he could sell his house and furniture. But a few days later, he received at his home the necessary funds for his house, furniture, and traveling expenses. He and his family left and it is already known (from Poland and France) that he and his family have disappeared.

The panic and the psychosis is even more pronounced in the satellite countries. Even in the highest positions in the regime there is great unrest and, consequently, political acrobatics are performed by everyone in order to be considered pure, even though this may often involve exposing another's impurity, may he be a relative or friend. (This last is the fashion these days.)

But all of this does not compare with the brutality and violence of these countries toward Zionism and Israel. Let us remember that even in Soviet Russia there existed Zionist mass organizations only a few years ago, and they carried on broad activities. Today there is no sign left of them. In both countries, Hungary and Rumania, Zionism and Zionists are terribly persecuted.

The Hungarian Government approved the departure of 3,000 Jews to Israel. But the price that they exacted is well known. The foreign exchange or its equivalent worth in goods is taken ostensibly for the construction of a hospital in Budapest for sick Jews. But everyone knows that this is no more than pretense. The 3,000 souls who will be permitted to leave are persons aged 55 years and children under 10 years. At the same time they must have relatives like brothers, sisters, parents, or children in Israel. No others will be permitted to leave even if they meet this expensive price. Naturally, no possessions can be taken with the eventual fortunate emigrants. The clothing of each one who leaves may not exceed in value the sum of $100. How long it will take before the 3,000 Jews will be able to leave Hungary, and generally if further changes for the worse will be made, no one knows.

The hate of the Communist Party and especially of the Jewish Communists against Zionism and Zionists is actually wild. The secret police and the entire security apparatus of the government betrays Zionists with the most bitter vengeance. This is especially true when they deal with Socialist-Zionists, Poale Zion. The previous trials against leading Poale Zionists were only a drop in the bucket in comparison with the administrative action and punitive measures which are enacted daily.

How the trials were conducted does not have to be detailed here. It is enough to say that some of the veterans and respected Poale Zionists confessed at the trials that they were guilty of everything of which they were accused and they even admitted that the Israeli consul in Hungary is an agent of the American Government. But, as previously stated, this is only a small example of the bitterness and vehemence of the administration toward Zionism. Hundreds of young labor Zionists are now in various labor camps and prisons and only because they are Zionist; 10 months, 1 year, 2 years—these sentences for Zionist activity are normal occurrences. At the same time, accusations and imputations are made without any basis and no proof is necessary. The verdict is always guilty and the sentence is always incarceration for a lengthy period.

Of the approximately 130,000 Jews in Hungary, certainly 90 percent would want to leave the country. Even for the great majority of the Jewish Communists this may be an answer to their dilemma about a way of life and not because of ideological conviction. In Hungary communism was always in the minority. At the last free elections (3 years ago), the Communist Party received only 20 percent of the vote. The entire so-called left bloc—Communists, Social Democrats, and other Socialist groups—received a total of 40 percent of the vote. But soon there started the offensive of unification on one side and of split on the other side—in accordance with the Communist tactics—until they started using terroristic methods and under the discreet arm of a few Russian battalions, the well-known secret election, with the privilege given to the masses to vote openly—and even after all that, when the Communsit regime was already sitting securely in the saddle, the masses rushed to enlist in the ranks of the Communist Party.

The brutality of the police forces can be felt most strongly in Hungary and Rumania in the question of Jewish emigration. The Hungarian-Austrian border is guarded most carefully. The number of Jewish victims who were shot while trying to cross the border is not small at all. Only recently (about a month ago) two members of our youth organization Busliah were riddled by bullets when they were trying to cross the border. Jews who are caught and survive the tortures and incarceration, consider themselves fortunate. It is no secret that mines have been placed in various locations near the Hungarian-Austrian border, just as during the war they were used as protection against the enemy's invasion.

Just as bitter is the situation surrounding Jewish emigration in Rumania. What spirit prevails among the Jewish masses in both countries? (In Hungary, there are 130,000 Jews and in Rumania, 350,000.) The majority is filled with defeatism. The terrible poverty, particularly in Rumania, has no

equal. The desire to go to Israel, which seems to many of them like an impossible dream, is still unwaveringly strong. They are afraid to go to the offices of the Israel consulate. Nevertheless, they brave it in the hope of a miracle. A short time ago, a transport of Jews left Czechoslovakia for Israel. It was arranged that the transport should leave via the Rumanian port city of Constanta. The Rumanian Government issued the necessary permits for the transport, eager probably for the financial profit involved. Rumanian Jews soon learned of the trainload of Jewish emigrants headed for Israel which was traversing many large and small cities and they waited for the train at the stations and forcefully pushed themselves into the cars, in an effort to save themselves.

Later, when a few more transports were expected, the Rumanian Jews hit on a new plan. A number of them, who knew that the transport was scheduled to arrive in Constanta, hid the night before its arrival in empty casks which were standing on the docks and later smuggled themselves onto the ship which was leaving for Israel. Lately, a tragedy occurred with a woman who was found hiding in a trunk. The entire port was immediately surrounded by the military and several hundred persons were arrested.

Whenever it has been possible of late to reach the heads of the governments of both countries and raise the question of emigration for Israel, the answer has always been that the Jews are needed in the countries in which they are living. An important government leader in Hungary spoke of the "5-year plan" of Hungary as the reason for forbidding emigration. He stated further, according to the same sources, that if the first 2 years of the 5-year plan prove successful, Jews will be permitted to leave. Contrariwise, it is clear that the entire switch in the attitude toward Zionism and the campaign against it in these countries, is influenced by Soviet Russia. In these countries, no change of a political nature is made without instructions from Moscow. Two days before the vote on Jerusalem in the United Nations, someone had a talk with the foreign minister of Czechoslovakia in Prague. The latter gave assurances that his delegation would vote against internationalization of Jerusalem. At the close of the conversation, the minister remarked: "If before the vote nothing happens." The Czechoslovakian delegation voted with the entire Soviet block for internationalization. And when later, the same person met with the Czechoslovakian foreign minister, and asked him: "Why?" the minister answered: "I told you 'if nothing happens.'"

Bricha (escape) still continues but with the greatest difficulty and high cost. At a conference in Vienna, I heard detailed reports of what has been done in the last few months with our funds in these countries and in getting people out of these countries. Figures and totals need not be mentioned in this report now. But this has been a heroic work, full of enthusiasm which is incomparable. The greatest credit for this must go to * * *, who efficiently used our funds in the best way and at the best time. One of his accomplishments was to rescue at one time 20 souls from Kvutza Mahler in Budapest and bring them to Vienna. In addition, he succeeded recently in bringing out a number of leading people, particularly of the youth section.

At this same conference, most of the time was devoted to the problem of our declassed friends, especially in Rumania. "Declassed" in this case means those who are known for their active Zionist past. For them, all doors are shut. If they hide out anywhere, they can do so only as long as they have the means with which to live. In order to get work, they must report their personal life and employment for the past few years. This is naturally connected with great danger and they must avoid it at all costs. In Transylvania alone, there are more than 500 persons in this category. Without help, they are doomed to actual death by starvation. The regime knows of this category of declassed persons who, according to the tenets of the regime, must perish as a destructive element, enemies of the people's democracy and burdensome to the state.

One of their proposals connected with our relief was actually that we should help support these people. Twenty dollars a month will enable a man and his family to live. In order to care for 500 in Transylvania, it would cost us $10,000 monthly. We must remember the tremendous moral, political, and Zionist aspect of this phase of our relief work.

The Communist Tactic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal American for March 19, 1950:

THE COMMUNIST TACTIC
(By E. F. Tompkins)

Senator MCCARTHY was entirely right in alleging that the State Department has been used as a nest of Communist espionage and treasonous intrigue.

If it were not so, Whittaker Chambers would not have had a bagful of stolen documents; Henry Julian Wadleigh would not have uttered his courtroom confession; and Alger Hiss would not have been convicted of perjury.

Yet, the New Deal's current investigation of itself can be easily distorted to discredit Senator MCCARTHY.

Travesties of this kind are made possible by common ignorance of the ramifications of Communist organization.

One thing that investigators of communism should understand is this—

Communism in this country is divided into two parts.

One part—the lesser of the two—is the Communist Party.

The larger part—and the more insidious one—is the Communist movement, which utilizes non-Communists as lackeys of the Communists.

The party does not have, and does not want, a great mass of dues-paying, card-holding members.

The party, in Nicolai Lenin's old language, exists and operates as the general staff of the Communist "class struggle"—as the cadre of the Communist revolution.

Hence the Communist Party is the hard core of the Communist movement, but the movement itself extends far beyond the party.

The Communists themselves establish fronts to obtain non-Communist support for Communist purposes.

They are trained to make use of respectable societies, such as church leagues and labor unions, to support their propaganda and to assist their "causes."

They know how to enroll the names of thousands of gullible or Marxist-minded educators, clergymen, and publicists to "endorse" their manifestos, to "sponsor" their rabble meetings, or to defend the "civil rights" of their agitators.

And they have the help of all kinds of fellow travelers.

By these means, literally millions of "joiners" are manipulated by the Communist Party, or by its accomplices, within the Communist movement.

One may thus be either a technical Communist, or a technical non-Communist; a "strategic nonmember" of the Party, or a genuinely deluded "innocent."

In these circumstances, when one's name appears upon an arrant piece of Communist propaganda, or as a supporter of a Communist enterprise, and one is called to a reckoning, one needs only to deny being a Communist, and may usually do so safely under oath.

If the outfit in question has been branded as subversive by the attorney general, one may simply plead ignorance or deception—and go right on posing as a humanitarian.

Take the case of Miss Dorothy Kenyon, who used to be a LaGuardia judge in New York and later had a State Department association.

Senator MCCARTHY said she had belonged to 28 Communist "fronts."

First Miss Kenyon called the Senator a "liar."

Then, on the witness stand confronted with the documents, she said she never was a Communist—but had been "a sucker."

This would seem to disqualify Miss Kenyon as a public leader.

For it is plain that the Communists have had the benefit of her "influence."

Granted that she was not a member of the Communist party—she was demonstrably a part of the Communist movement, whether she realized it or not.

The Insidious FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of articles from the Staunton News Leader, written by Maj. Gen. E. W. Opie:

The proposed FEPC law would declare it to be the policy of Congress to prevent "the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry" because such discrimination is contrary to the American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity.

"The right to employment," says the bill's introductory, "without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States."

When hearings were held on the bill, proponents were of the unanimous opinion that it proceeds upon a theory and philosophy which assure its effective administration. They argued for the bill on humanitarian grounds and declared it to be an essential step for strengthening our democracy. Donald R. Richberg, the noted constitutional lawyer, has declared, however, that the declaration of the right to employment without discrimination "is a declaration quite beyond the power of the Congress of the United States." * * *

"If the employer * * * is to be regarded as a mere instrument of state policy who can be required to employ anyone whom a Government bureaucrat finds to be 'qualified' for a particular job, why should not all employments be made through a Government agency?"

Bureaucratic judgment inevitably would be substituted for employer judgment under a law such as this, in the opinion of many who have studied it. As to its constitutionality, various authorities agree with Mr. Richberg. * * *

But clear unconstitutionality will not deter those who propose this legislation, nor will it be a protection when the Court test comes, as the present Supreme Court has too often looked upon the Constitution as a scrap of paper.

The bill would make it "an unlawful practice for an employer—

1. "To refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges or employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry."

2. "To utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race," etc.

It is also declared an unlawful practice for any labor organization to discriminate because of race, etc., or for an employer or labor organization "to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act."

Discrimination in employment on account of "race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry" clearly involves a probing of an employer's mind and intentions, which in most cases likely to arise under legislation such as the FEPC bill would be impossible. In some cases, evidence of expressions of dislike or hate, and of determination not to employ persons of a certain race, etc., might be obtained to prove discrimination. Generally, any accused employer would deny discrimination. Conviction would nearly always have to be based on presumptive evidence: failure of the complainant to obtain the job he sought, though he proves the requisite qualifications; the absence of any persons of the complainant's color or creed in the employ of the accused, etc. It would be impossible for any commission to read the mind of an employer and seldom could intent, the mandatory element in American criminal prosecution, be established. The Commission would substitute its judgment as to a complainant's fitness for employment which was denied him for that of an accused employer, who would then have to obey the bureaucratic edict or face prosecution.

In placing upon employers the responsibility for determining whether or not an employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source of personnel discriminates because of race, creed, etc., the bill would impose the impossible. Again comes up the question of intent. Without close investigation, which would be burdensome and perhaps costly, how could an employer tell whether or not an agency was discriminating? If he listened to hearsay or the opinion of bureaucrats, he could do gross injustice to an employment agency or school. The Federal Commission and its underlings could put out of business almost any agency which happened to fall under their displeasure.

The opportunities for bureaucratic persecution under bill are legion, and those for extending its application through interpretation, rules, regulations, etc., are infinite. Under the wide-open interpretations of the commerce clause of the Constitution by the Supreme Court and by the National Labor Relations Board, the enforcement Commission could apply its powers everywhere. True, the bill exempts employers of 50 or fewer, but it would only be a question of time before this exemption was removed. No business, however small or local, would long be exempt from the officious attention of the horde of bureaucrats which would be necessary for enforcement.

The Federal Commission established by the bill would be empowered:

1. To investigate any written charge of discrimination in employment, either by a complainant or by a member of the Commission and to "endeavor to eliminate any such unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion."

2. To hold a formal hearing if persuasion fails.

3. To issue cease and desist orders including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay.

4. To petition Federal courts to enforce its orders, the court petitioned being required to review the proceedings and issuing a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission. Court judgments and decrees would be final, except for review by a circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court. Any person feeling aggrieved by a Commission order could appeal to a Federal court, but it would be a costly procedure.

In addition to penalties that might be imposed through appeal to the courts, there is a direct provision for fines of up to $500 and imprisonment up to 1 year for anyone who shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission.

It is easily seen from these powers and the procedures contemplated that the Commission could be accuser, investigator, and judge, a triumvirate of powers which led to the grossest injustices under the old Wagner (National Labor Relations) Act and the National Labor Relations Board. This bill would repeat the mistake of investing such three-way authority in a single Commission.

It is equally clear that the army of agents which this Commission would create, like professional labor agitators, would have to justify their jobs manufacturing cases, and that they could and would indulge in the persecution of employers. Accused businesses would be put to tremendous expense and great trouble answering discrimination charges, either by disgruntled persons who failed to obtain the jobs they sought, or by Federal agents. This Commission and its regional bureaus and underlings would be a perfect set-up for political persecution of any employer who didn't favor the party in power. It could readily become a Federal gestapo which under some unscrupulous President could be as relentless and as cruel as the secret police of dictators.

At best, a commission and its agents possessing such powers as the above would be constantly snooping into the affairs of employers and worrying them with charges, which however unjustified, would be onerous to resist. Since the charge of discrimination because of race, creed, etc., concerns what is in an employer's mind and heart, the tendency would be to convict on presumptive evidence, often of trivial nature. Administration and enforcement of FEPC would create more injustice, confusion, and race hatred than it would correct or prevent.

Let's take a look at the sort of rules and regulations which have been promulgated by the bureaucrats of New York, whose law was the pattern for the FEPC bill and whose practice undoubtedly would be aped by any Federal set-up:

It is an unlawful practice (in New York) to inquire into the original name of an applicant for employment whose name has been changed.

To inquire into the birthplace of an applicant, or birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relatives.

To require a birth or baptismal certificate.

To inquire into the religious denomination of an applicant, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed or whether or not he is an atheist.

An applicant may not be told: This is a (Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish) organization."

An applicant for employment may not be told: "The following holidays will be observed by this firm and no others (naming holidays, i. e., Decoration Day, July Fourth, etc.)."

An applicant for employment may not be told: "Employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Inquiry into the complexion of an applicant is forbidden.

A photograph may not be requested.

Inquiry may not be made as to whether an applicant is a naturalized or native-born citizen, the date applicant acquired citizenship, whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born, or asked the date such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.

An applicant may not be required to produce his naturalization papers or first papers.

No inquiry may be made into the location (general) of places of business of relatives, nor inquiry into the places of residence of close relatives.

No inquiry may be made into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant and/or the maiden name of the mother of an applicant.

Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant is forbidden, into whereabouts during the First World War, or into organizations to which the applicant belongs.

Under the power of the President to write antidiscrimination rules and regulations into Government contracts, the contractor would have to obligate himself to waive a legal right of a free exercise of judgment in selection of his employees, points out one critic. Also such a contract might require a contractor to agree to compliance in all his operations although only a small force might be employed in fulfilling the Government contract.

In the hearings on the FEPC bill, Mr. Richberg offers this further argument against the bill: When a bill proposes to destroy the constitutional liberty essential to a free economy, and to provide Communists with a new and powerful leverage for disintegrating American industry, then any genuine liberal is obliged to say, "The alleged humanitarian and democratic purpose of this legislation is only a fraudulent cloak to conceal its communistic purposes—and its inevitable effect—to make a competitive system of private enterprise unworkable and to bring about industrial chaos and eventual collapse."

If the fair employment practice program had not been originally devised by Communist strategists they would have been ashamed of their stupidity. As a matter of fact it was a logical outgrowth of their orthodox plan. At the root of Communist ideology is the delusion of discrimination. At lot of people are miserable, they are told, not because of their own inherent or cultivated weaknesses, but because other men use their inherited or acquired power to oppress them. The remedy, they are told, is to have the State—a deceptive name for a tyrannical ruling class—control all power and divide up the proceeds of state enterprises without discrimination.

The program proceeds logically. The first step is to appeal to the least prosperous to fight discrimination. "Join the labor union and we will all fight the employers together and stop them from discriminating against anyone." But, the old-line unions were very discriminatory themselves. The craft unions aimed at giving a preferred earning power to skilled workmen—and at preserving monopolies of skilled employments.

The Communists naturally directed their efforts to the establishment of industrial unions. The early IWW and "one big union" movements were clearly communistic. In recent developments the industrial unions have cleverly adopted the slogan of democracy. They open their doors to the lowest paid, unskilled workers. They preach antidiscrimination and so appeal to every element of society that suffers any disadvantage because of racial or religious prejudice. But the ultimate object of the Communist strategy is not to create a democratic equality of opportunity through the exercise of individual liberty, but to create a uniform subservience to the political oligarchy that must rule the all-powerful government of a socialized society.

Every demand of organized labor for management control and every demand for legislation to substitute political regulation for managerial discretion will be supported by Communist agencies as an aid to weakening the power of private enterprise to meet its obligation to produce necessities and to provide employment and earnings through which the masses of the workers can retain the high standard of living which competitive capitalism under democratic government has achieved.

Every such demand is, of course, popularized by alleging that its objectives are a humanitarian improvement in the living conditions of the less fortunate and underprivileged members of society and a "democratic" elimination of all discriminations and special privileges that may give unjust advantages to anyone by accident of birth.

1. The proposed legislation is Communist-inspired and would have the effect of undermining the security of the country and of giving aid and comfort to its enemies.

2. The enactment of such legislation would hamper and impede the operation of established businesses by undermining the authority and efficiency of business management, by promoting discord among the workers, and by subjecting employers to burdensome litigation and hearings.

3. The enactment of the bill would seriously curtail the development of private enterprise generally by undermining the basic freedoms upon which the development of such enterprise depends.

4. If enacted, the proposed legislation would prove to be administratively unworkable because it would tend to undermine established social patterns based on law and custom, it would disrupt present progress in the field of race relations, and it would be impossible for the proposed commission to decide all cases on their individual merit.

5. The administrative history of the State antidiscrimination laws of New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, as well as that of the Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, does not justify the enactment of Federal legislation in this field.

6. The proposed legislation is unconstitutional.

It is perfectly clear that enactment of so-called fair employment practices legislation would create more wrongs than it would correct. It would inspire widespread industrial troubles. It would cause racial dissention, undoing much of the progress that has been made in promoting good interracial relations. It would deny religious denominations the right to conduct schools and colleges for their own people or to give preference to employment of persons of their own faith in positions having to do with the propagation of that fight.

Such legislation would substitute the judgment of Government agents for the judgment of employers as to the fitness of an applicant for a job; it would deny American citizens the constitutional right of choosing their associates; it would create an immense Federal bureaucracy whose agents, in order to justify their jobs, would constantly stir up complaints, harassing employers on trivial charges, threatening them with prosecution, and placing upon them an intolerable burden of defense against charges which could generally be sustained only on presumptive, intangible evidence without establishing discriminatory intent.

The bill would place in the hands of an unscrupulous President a weapon for political persecution of any who dare to oppose him, his administration, or party. By disrupting private industry and playing into the hands of Communists, as shown in the article dealing with the Communist source of inspiration, this kind of legislation could easily become the basis of a Communist dictatorship, or of any other kind of dictatorship a power-hungry President desired.

It is idle to say that these dangers are figments of the imagination because nothing of the kind has resulted in New York, Massachusetts, or New Jersey. The governors of those States have not had the police power to enforce their antidiscrimination laws, and have been content with the gesture of enacting them to win the support of minorities. A President of the United States, however, would have the instrumentalities of the huge Federal enforcement agency which would be created, the FBI, and packed courts.

A good precept is to create no unrestricted power, however benevolent and American our Presidents have been, which could be used for tyranny, entrenchment, and absolutism.

Trygve Lie's Proposal To Accept Communists as Representatives of China Is Stab in Back for UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter appearing in the New York Times of March 14, 1950:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Friends of the United Nations are deeply shocked at the suggestion of Trygve Lie, Secretary General of that body, that the authorized representatives of the lawful government of China be repudiated and replaced by the designees of a group which through fraud and force of arms has imposed its will for the moment upon a large part, but not all, of the Chinese people and Chinese territory.

International law and order cannot exist unless founded upon elementary morals. Nor can any instrumentality of international law and order long survive the negation of elementary morals. Counsels of expediency wrecked the League of Nations. Trygve Lie's proposal in the name of expediency is a stab in the back of the United Nations.

His argument is simple enough: The United Nations in order to function as intended requires the cooperation of the five great powers. One nation, Soviet Russia, refuses to cooperate unless the existing and lawful government of one of the five—namely, China—is repudiated and a self-constituted, usurping government is accepted in its place. Therefore, says Mr. Lie, repudiate the lawful government, notwithstanding its great contributions to the United Nations, and accept a government which has demonstrated itself to be the very antithesis of international peace and good will.

Entirely apart from bad morals which condemn the suggestion on its face, what does Mr. Lie hope to gain as a matter of expediency? Had Russia cooperated in furthering the aims of the United Nations before this issue was raised? Is there any reason to suppose that if the free nations yield despite the resulting injustice any genuine cooperation could be expected from Russia? Having yielded in this case, could the free nations consistently decline to refuse a similar demand when the next country in Asia or elsewhere is partially overrun by Communist aggression?

It would be an incalculable tragedy if the United Nations were to fail the hopes and prayers of the peace-hungry peoples of the world. If that failure should flow from Russian contumacy, Russia will inevitably answer sooner or later for that result. If failure should come because the free nations sacrifice justice and morals to Russian contumacy, the United Nations would still fail, though it might simulate continuance, but only as a symbol of universal cynicism and cruel mockery of mankind's noblest aspirations, and the free nations could not evade responsibility for that result. It was not Italy in Abyssinia or Japan in Manchuria which wrecked the League of Nations. It was the weak-kneed, spineless reluctance of the other powers to take a resolute stand upon the ground of manifest morals and justice.

The indication that the United States of America refrain from defining its opinion of Mr. Lie's proposal until a majority of the Security Council had expressed itself is unworthy of the position of leadership which events have accorded to America.

The issue is clear and calls for forthright policy.

There is a lawful, constitutional government of China. In the critical years when our own fate was in the balance that government faithfully, loyally, and successfully defended the bastion of Asia against our mortal enemy—and Russia's. With our allies we entered into a solemn obligation to defend the integrity of China against aggression.

We have done badly enough in fulfilling that obligation without participating in this final fatal betrayal suggested by Mr. Lie.

HAROLD RIEGELMAN.

NEW YORK, *March 13, 1950.*

Congressional Sounding Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bakersfield Press, Bakersfield, Calif., of Thursday, November 17, 1949:

CONGRESSIONAL SOUNDING BOARD

Officials of the National Farm Labor Union were extremely successful in using the recent Bakersfield hearing of the congressional Subcommittee on Labor and Education as a sounding board.

They got a lot of pretty irrelevant testimony into the RECORD designed to show that the so-called corporation farmer is responsible for the migratory agricultural labor problem.

This testimony was intended as explanation of the union's pretensions of having maintained a strike at Di Giorgio farms for nearly 2 years.

NFLU has maintained a picket line—in a spotty and dispirited sort of way. But a visit to Di Giorgio will show you that some 1,200 fairly-contented workers are crossing that picket line every day. So just whom does the NFLU represent? Certainly not Di Giorgio employees.

If you select a few Di Giorgio workers at random and talk to them, you'll soon discover they have little interest in NFLU. Matter of fact, they have things better than any NFLU member we have seen or heard tell of.

For instance, there is truck driver—he appears to be nearing 50—who came here from the Middle West in the the mid-thirties. He arrived in Bakersfield with 40 cents and a pregnant wife and went to work for Di Giorgio. He has been there ever since.

His two sons have graduated from high school and are working for Di Giorgio now. His daughter attends school in nearby Arvin. One son is married and lives with his wife in a cottage on the Di Giorgio ranch—a clean, nicely furnished bungalow with running water and modern sanitation facilities, excellent heating and an attractive well-kept garden. It is rent-free, and water and garbage disposal are provided by the Di Giorgios.

The father has bought, and paid for, his own home a few miles from the ranch.

During peak harvest seasons the wife and daughter help out in the packing shed. At such times the family nets nearly $1,000 a month in take-home pay.

Unmarried workers live in three large dormitories, where their quarters are furnished free. They eat in three equally huge dining halls, where they pay a total of $1.60 a day for three copious meals.

The ranch maintains recreation halls, tennis courts, and swimming pools for employees.

For normal off-season operation Di Giorgio employs some 1,200 permanent workers. At the peak of the harvest and the wine-making operation the pay roll soars as high as 2,500. But families of permanent employees make up nearly 1,100 of the additional helpers. It is seldom necessary for the farm to hire more than 200 migrant laborers.

So, how does the National Farm Labor Union figure that the Di Giorgios are contributing to the sorry lot of the migrant agricultural worker?

It would seem that the Di Giorgios are setting an example which NFLU might well use as a pattern of ideal conditions for farm workers.

Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Story City Herald, Story City, Iowa:

FIGURE THIS OUT

There are 11,500,000 workers in factories in this country. They earn nearly $60 a week each. Yet, if they turned in all their wages to the National Government, President Truman wouldn't have much over half enough to meet his proposed expenditures the coming year.

Unification or Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within recent weeks a high-ranking naval officer has been penalized because he dared to tell the truth as he saw it before a congressional committee. In reprisal against Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone for expressing an opinion contrary to that of his superiors in the Defense Establishment, a brilliant and distinguished officer has been summarily removed from his post as senior medical adviser to the Secretary of Defense.

This policy of reprisal on the part of the Secretary of Defense is an exceedingly dangerous. It witnesses before the Committee on Armed Services, or any other congressional committee, are to be punished for stating their honest opinions, Congress will be deprived of information essential in the interest of national defense.

In enacting the Unification Act, Congress did not intend to set up a military dictatorship in the Defense Establishment. The action taken in the cases of Admirals Denfeld and Boone would indicate, however, that such dictatorship has been assumed.

Under existing conditions officers in the military service must clear their opinions with the Secretary of Defense or risk their careers. This type of coercion is not only destructive of morale but threatens constitutional civilian control of the armed services. The security of the Nation is in jeopardy if Congress fails to meet this threat in time.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 14, 1950:

ANOTHER DENFELD CASE?

Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, one of the most able and distinguished medical officers in the United States Navy, has been unceremoniously booted out of his post as the senior medical officer in the Department of Defense. This came to light just after Admiral Boone had testified before the House Armed Service Committee that certain cutbacks in military hospital were short-sighted.

It looks like the Denfeld case, all over again. And, significantly, it comes just a week after the House Committee blasted the Navy and Defense Department heads for the firing of Admiral Denfeld, describing his dismissal as a reprisal.

The evidence is piling up. It seems clear that Secretary Louis Johnson, while taking the maximum credit for his economies, is inexorably pursuing a policy of intimidating witnesses who venture to testify against his party line when they are called by the House Armed Services Committee.

It is not a question of Mr. Johnson's authority over the Navy Department and other military departments. It is a struggle between Mr. Johnson and a committee of Congress. Some military officers, if they are to give honest answers to Congress, have to criticize Mr. Johnson's policies. If they are to be punished for this and their careers broken, the time soon will come when no congressional committee can hope to get the true facts from its service witnesses.

That is the real issue. It is a grave one, because it involves the power of Congress to control the armed forces. Civilian control of the military, accepted for 150 years in America, is challenged by the policy of reprisal which the Defense Secretary and a very confused Navy Secretary are pursuing. Congress will have to see this battle through, or else risk the break-down of its history authority over those executive departments which spend one-third of our total budget.

Acheson Sounded Warning to Asiatics of Pitfalls of Soviet Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Constantine Brown from the Washington Star. What a different picture we would face today in Asia if the State Department had adopted several years ago, or even 1 year ago, the general attitude and policies which the Secretary of State announced in San Francisco. Perhaps the situation can still be retrieved if the statement is implemented vigorously.

The article follows:

ACHESON SOUNDED WARNING TO ASIATICS OF PITFALLS OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

(By Constantine Brown)

Secretary of State Acheson spoke firmly in San Francisco Wednesday, for the benefit of hundreds of millions of Asiatics.

He warned them of the pitfalls of the thinly disguised Soviet imperialism. He pointed out that all nations which join with the U. S. S. R. become enslaved, in the real meaning of that word. Finally he described the Russians as genuine warmongers because "anybody who would violate the United Nations Charter would violate the peace of the world."

Moreover, Mr. Acheson amplified a statement, made earlier this month in Washington, that in our effort to stem communism henceforth we will be moved by the realities of the situation in various threatened countries rather than by ideologies.

POLICY LAID DOWN

Mr. Acheson has announced that America is prepared to help any country which opposed the Kremlin dictators, regardless of the form of government in that country. According to this new policy, we are ready to assist Communists like Marshal Tito, dictators like General Franco, and even the remnants of the Chinese Nationalist regime in Formosa, which the State Department in the past has labeled a corrupt reactionary government, unworthy of our help.

Mr. Acheson promised Asiatic peoples who are willing to resist Moscow's penetration that they can count on "appropriate aid," which ranges from economic and cultural help to actual military assistance. He did not specify whether military assistance would

be given in the form of war materials or in actual physical intervention.

The Secretary of State unquestionably had in mind the situation in Indochina. The Russians and their Peiping satellite have pledged themselves to give full support to Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the Viet Nam Communists, against the newly established rule of former Emperor Bao Dai.

It is possible that some commitments may have been made by our Government to give other forms of active help besides arms and ammunition necessary for the French-Indochinese force of 150,000 men.

TASK FLEET VISITS PORTS

An American task fleet now is visiting Indochinese ports and it is possible that the presence of American men-of-war may put courage into the hearts of the forces which have been fighting the Communists for nearly 4 years.

The Secretary's speech is interpreted in Washington diplomatic circles as an indication that the United States no longer accepts passively Russian inroads in Asia.

In congressional quarters which have pleaded with the State Department—and even threatened it—since the fall of 1947 to consider the situation in China realistically rather than ideologically it is felt that Mr. Acheson is locking the stables after the horses have gone. If when Mr. Acheson took over as Secretary of State last year he had been as realistic as he is today, it is possible that the Russian-supported Chinese Communists might have been prevented from conquering the whole Chinese mainland.

If the State Department had sent military supplies to the Nationalists in keeping with appropriations voted by Congress, and if it had accepted the suggestions that we send some hard-headed military advisers to the Nationalist forces, we might have avoided the predicament in which we find ourselves today.

Twenty-eight Thousand Greek Children Victims of Communist Terrorism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the crimes committed by organized communism are so numerous that some of the worst ones go practically unnoticed in a world which has been shocked so much it sometimes seems to have become shock-proof. Very little has been heard about one of the most vicious mass crimes of all time. More notice should be taken of it, and I am wondering if our Government has done all it should have done about it.

I refer to the kidnaping of about 28,000 Greek children by Communist guerrilla forces. These children have been torn from their parents and forced into countries behind the iron curtain. They are the victims of a policy of communistic terrorism.

In perpetrating this crime against all civilized standards the guerrillas acted from three principal motives. In the first place, it is said these abductions are part of a campaign of terrorism, intended to swell the flood of refugees and so intensify the dislocations of Greek economic life. This, of course, would be designed to discredit and weaken the non-Communist Government of Greece.

In the second place, the abductions became an instrument of blackmail. The Communists hoped that by snatching these children away from their parents, they would be in a position to apply pressure upon the parents and persuade them to yield to the Communist demands. Finally, they regarded the abductions as a method of recruiting future cells for the Greek Communist Party. They hoped that by training these young minds in a strictly Communist environment they would have some active party adherents in the future. It is understood that the principal iron-curtain centers for the encampment of these children are Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary. But it is, of course, a part of the master plan of international communism; and some of the children may have been distributed elsewhere.

We are informed that the kidnaping procedure of the Communist guerrillas has been brutally simple. On entering a peasant village, the Communists would instruct the inhabitants to bring their children to the main square or to the well. The parents would then be told that by orders of the rebel government their children were to be taken away "for their own safety and to receive a democratic education." The resistance of the parents was beaten down by force, if necessary, and there have been reports that some parents who forcibly sought to prevent the abduction of their children were murdered.

It has been pointed out that the tragedy of the children is great, but that the tragedy of the parents is infinitely greater. While life is hard and rigorous in the peasant villages, the children have supplied the incentive and the courage to toil and fight on. Without the children, life becomes hopeless and a hollow mockery.

It is no wonder that the Greek Nation recently set aside a day of national mourning over this outrage against civilization. But does not such moral degradation call for international mourning? The abduction of these 28,000 children is much more than a tragedy for these children, their parents, and the Greek Nation. That such an outrage can happen and go unpunished is a blot upon the spiritual progress of mankind.

This crime brought forth the usual protests to the United Nations. We have been assured that the United States Government will continue to give utmost support to the efforts of the United Nations and the international Red Cross organizations to bring about the return of these thousands of children to Greece.

It is my concern, in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, that the perpetrators of this unprincipled and immoral action shall not be left with the impression that the protest of the United States is merely perfunctory. I hope they will not be deluded into the belief that this Nation regards this crime as no more than just another incident in a long list of Communist offenses, of no more importance than the rest. By any respectable international code of human ethics, the wrecking of homes and families is a crime of the first magnitude.

It warrants the full force of the moral influence of this great Nation and of all civilized peoples. Action already taken should be vigorously followed up by further strong protests, and notice should be served upon the guilty that this Nation considers they have committed a serious international crime for which they will be held in the contempt of the civilized world until they have purged themselves by returning these children safely to their homes and their parents.

I hope the Government of our country will assume an aggressive leadership in the use of every moral device within our command to right this despicable wrong.

Aid in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Times, under date of March 11, 1950.

Will you please read it?

The concluding paragraph points up the necessity for prompt action.

The bill H. R. 7600 would extend the life of the Philippines Rehabilitation Commission and implement the procedure by which we can help a staunch and faithful ally:

AID IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

It seems to be agreed that if the United States is to make effective moves against the advance of communism in Asia some plans for stabilizing the situation in various countries must be initiated and adopted. Viet Nam wants military aid, at once, to meet the increased threat of the Communist-led forces of Ho Chi Minh. Burma has indicated a receptivity to American assistance, after having been somewhat fearful of foreign exploitation. Indonesia is seeking further rehabilitation loans. Discussions are in progress concerning the relation of American stock piling to Malaya's economy. A State Department mission is now in the field making a survey and a new Asiatic policy is predicted for sometime in the summer.

Meanwhile there is one danger point at which we can and should act without the need for further exploration. That is the Philippines. We have a direct military commitment and a strong moral commitment to the new republic's security and progress. It can be met, now, with concrete actions that will promote stability in the archipelago and at the same time give an earnest to the rest of Asia that we mean business. Here are some of the things that can be done:

1. The United States Congress should immediately make a further and final amendment to the War Damage Claims Act, appropriating the necessary $100,000,000 to bring the scale of payment up to the 75-percent level that was implicit in the original legislation. This is a matter of good faith, but it can be made also a matter of substantial economic gain for the Philippines by making some simple provisos. It can be stipulated, for example, that the additional payments to those whose claims have already been met in part must be used in projects designed to

further rehabilitation and economic improvement in the Philippines. This would assure the channeling of the funds into productive enterprises.

2. The United States should extend to the Philippines, now, a currency stabilization credit similar to that which was extended to Mexico. An amount of about $100,000,000 should be adequate. This is imperative, since adverse trade balances have drained away too much of the country's gold reserve. The peso is not now as stable as it should be and there is a black market.

3. The United States should dispatch, immediately, a small, really top-level and nongovernmental mission to examine and report on the possibility of private investment of the sort envisaged in the point 4 program. Such a mission, and it should be good enough to inspire complete confidence, should advise the Philippine Government on the steps necessary to encourage investment. It should also advise Americans as to where and how investment could be made profitably. There are opportunities in abundance. In this category could be placed certain public operations that could be funded with private capital, such as the rebuilding of the water supply for Manila and Baguio, the construction of some key roads, and the development of dam projects that would be a source of both irrigation and power.

4. The United States should quickly resolve any further dispute about our military commitments by strengthening its Philippine establishments. If we are to hold Clark Field there ought to be a ground force to defend it and its fuel sources should be made independent of the haul from Manila. If Subic Bay is to be our major naval station its fueling capacity should be made adequate. If we have other and wider programs for a solid establishment in the archipelago they should be started now.

The Philippines is at the moment in a shaky economic position. It is in a vulnerable military position. It can be turned into a bastion of great strength, economically, politically, and militarily, by prompt action. We and the Filipinos are in basic accord and we need not fear that we will be misinterpreted. We can act jointly. The important thing is to act now.

The President Should Not Appoint Professional Military Persons on the Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to H. R. 7601, a bill recently introduced that would require the appointment of one and, at the President's discretion, two professional military men to membership on the Atomic Energy Commission.

I feel strongly that this bill is ill-advised. I fear that it represents an attempt to attack, by indirection, the principle of civilian control over atomic energy, and that it seeks to create an entering wedge for military control.

Our problems will not be solved, our country will not be protected, and none of us will be relieved of responsibility simply by putting one man or two men in uniform upon the Atomic Energy Commission. This is an escapist path. This is a retreat from the philosophy which has always been the glory of our country—the philosophy that civilians must exercise basic direction and control of the great undertakings, military or otherwise, in our society.

We fought this battle 4 years ago when the McMahon bill for control of atomic energy was before us. At that time there were those who advocated military supremacy. But the public spoke up with a great voice and made it clear that America is still founded upon the civilian principle, and that civilians must direct our activities in the new and enormously threatening and enormously hopeful field of atomic energy.

Full provision is made in the law which we passed for consultation with the military. An unprecedented Military Liaison Committee was created to be composed of military people—and that committee was given the authority to appeal to the Secretary of Defense and, through him, to the President if any action or failure to act on the part of the commission is regarded as harmful to the responsibilities of the armed services.

This system has worked well. The Military Liaison Committee has not once felt obliged to exercise its special right of appeal to the Secretary of Defense and to the President. Former Secretary of Defense Forrestal expressed satisfaction, before his death, with the relationship existing between the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission. Secretary Johnson has just issued his annual report for the fiscal year 1949, and in that report there is not a hint of criticism directed at the present arrangement. On Thursday, March 9, the President of the United States again indicated his approval of a civilian commission and civilian direction of atomic energy—subject to the advice and counsel and knowledge of the military exercised through the Military Liaison Committee.

I want to express my emphatic agreement with the President that putting a military man on the Commission would be a mistake. I think that it would reflect panic, that it would promise no easy panacea for our problems. I think that, on the contrary, we will be safer and stronger from every viewpoint if we hold steadfast to the glorious American tradition of civilian direction.

Thirteenth Annual National Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February 1936 the late President Roosevelt called a conference of conservationists representing Federal, State, and private organizations to consider ways and means to restore our vanishing wildlife. At that time President Roosevelt said:

> It has long been my feeling that there has been a lack of a full and complete realization of our wildlife plight, of the urgency of it, and of the many social and economic values that wildlife has to our people.

The North American Wildlife Conference of 1936 was thus the father of our present National Wildlife Federation.

The National Wildlife Federation has made great strides since that month in 1936. Through its active membership it has done much toward reawakening the American people to the violent and destructive story of what has been done to our forests, grasslands, wildlife, and water sources. It had been a story of human energy that was unthinking and uncontrolled.

We can thank the National Wildlife Federation for their unselfish personal interest and their love of our national resources for bringing to light the unpleasant story of the need for conservation.

Our timber reserves had been reduced by 40 percent. More than one-fourth of our grazing lands, farm pasture lands, and croplands had been ruined or severely impoverished. We were and still are drawing upon our water resources with such lavishness that in a growing number of regions the water problem is becoming more acute.

Through the efforts of the National Wildlife Federation we have made real advances in the protection of wildlife but they are still endeavoring to make our people realize that innumerable forms of animal life, including even small mammals and beneficent insects, play their part in nature's economy. They have been sucessful in their long battle to obtain Federal recognition of the pollution problem. May their coming years be as successful.

Freedom and St. Patrick—George Washington Gave First Official Recognition to St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to review the part the Irish have played in the building of the United States, and I am not taking the time of the House today to recount the glorious history of Americans of Irish ancestry. This record is too well known.

It is doubtful we would be an independent Nation today had it not been for the Irish. More than half of George Washington's Army which brought America's freedom from British rule was made up of Irishmen. Many of his most competent officers were Irish. The pages of American history are filled with the part of the Irish in establishing a great nation here.

The Irish fought to build our Nation; they fought to preserve it in 1861; and they fought for its preservation again in World War I and World War II. On the battlefield in defense of their adopted land they were never found wanting. And of equal importance was their contribution to the progress of American industry, transportation, communication, and professional institutions. In every field the Irish have done their share and have much cause to look with pride upon their contribution to America's greatness.

We think of these things as we observe St. Patrick's Day each year.

It was an order from George Washington in 1776 that gave official recognition to St. Patrick's Day for the first time in the United States.

Maj. Wes McPheron, defense reporter on the Air Force Hour, told the story so well on the Air Force orchestra's fine broadcast over the Mutual radio network this past St. Patrick's Day, that I ask leave to insert his remarks in the RECORD. Major McPheron's remarks follow:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is your defense reporter, Maj. Wes McPheron. Tonight I'd like to tell you a story which I think is a little on the unusual side. It has nothing to do with jet airplanes flying near the speed of sound, nor does it deal with monumental decisions regarding the state of the Nation. It's a simple story. Its theme—freedom and St. Patrick. Perhaps the linking of the two seems a little far-fetched. Actually it isn't.

Little is known of St. Patrick, the date and place of his birth, but we do know that in his youth he was a slave. In his confessions which he wrote in the latter part of his life, he attributed his liberation to a number of apparitions which God used to show him the way to freedom. After living in a monastery for a while, he was sent to Ireland to minister to the people there. He died on March 17, A. D. 493. That briefly is the story of St. Patrick—a slave who found freedom and then dedicated his life to freeing the minds, souls, and bodies of other men.

Here in America, recognition of March 17 as St. Patrick's Day came about in a strange way; strange, yes, yet quite appropriate. The year was 1776. The place, Boston, Mass. The fate of a nation was at stake. Thirteen young, struggling American Colonies had united in a fight for freedom. For 7 months General Washington had laid siege to the city. With an army composed of New England militia and southern riflemen, he seized and fortified Dorchester Heights, which the British had neglected after their dearly bought capture of Bunker Hill. On March 17 Washington decided it was time to finish up. As he placed his artillery in strategic positions and prepared to blast the enemy out of Boston, Gen. Sir William Howe suddenly decided to give up the city. With 11,000 troops he sailed out of Boston Harbor and Washington's men triumphantly marched into the city.

After Boston had been made secure, Washington issued several orders from his headquarters at Cambridge. One named an Irishman, General Sullivan, as brigadier of the day. Another authorized the countersign as "St. Patrick." Thus these orders officially recognized St. Patrick's Day for the first time in the United States. It was recognized in a moment of triumph, and freedom was just a little nearer. That freedom finally became a reality. It has endured through the years—often threatened, but never lost. And now on this St. Patrick's Day our pledge should be that that freedom never will be lost.

Rogers' Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced H. Res. 450 to amend the rules of the House and providing "no bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

I have received from all over the Nation favorable comment on this resolution and a number of outstanding editors of the press have endorsed editorially the merits of this resolution. I was glad to have an editorial from my home paper, the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, and I am indeed grateful for the commendation contained in this editorial. I therefore am including the editorial as a part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

ROGERS' RESOLUTION

The people of this Nation were given another sorry example last week of the loose and shoddy voting procedure in Congress which permits vast sums of money to be spent without those voting for the spending being listed on the record.

Last Wednesday the House considered an appropriation bill which would increase the pay roll of the Post Office Department by some $163,000,000 annually. The bill was a rank discriminatory measure. It put war veterans on a special-privilege basis and set them apart from other post-office employees by giving them a pay increase up to $500 a year which other employees, of equal value and equal service to the Department, would not receive.

Proponents of this special-privilege measure conceded that on a roll-call vote their measure would not have passed. So the bill was maneuvered through the House by the standing-vote technique. A thumping majority of House Members, knowing they would not go on the record as approving such a bill, stood up and let the bill slide by. The result opened the window to let another $163,000,000 of public funds go flying away.

If this were an isolated case it might be pardoned. But it isn't an isolated case. It is standard practice whereby Congressmen can pay lip service to Government economy and then spend billions of dollars without any record being made of their vote.

In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress over $29,000,000,000 in appropriations were passed on in this manner. This tremendous amount of money was authorized to be spent without a record vote in either the House or the Senate.

It is a shameful and disgraceful commentary on our democratic system of government that such a system is tolerated by the people. Congressmen are elected by the people. They are supposed to represent the people. But most of them forget about the people and start representing a wasteful Government soon after the campaigns are over and they take their seats in Congress.

Only a few Congressmen have dared to question the propriety of the system whereby the elected representatives of the people can shirk their responsibility for spending the peoples' money. One of these Congressmen is our own DWIGHT L. ROGERS. Only recently he introduced a resolution in the House which would require a record vote on any spending bill coming before the House.

ROGERS' resolution makes sense. It would protect the people by making available to them the voting records of their Representatives on money bills. But the resolution is anathema to politicians who don't want to stand up and be counted. The standing vote system gives them a refuge and a shield from public censure. Under this shield and this refuge they can spend billions and billions and no one can determine how any individual Congressman did or did not vote.

Real government economy under this system is only a mirage. It is a catchword and a phrase which is useful for campaign purposes, but which can be conveniently dropped later on with nobody the wiser, excepting perhaps the "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" politicians who specialize in using the Public Treasury as a source of votes to stay in office.

Congressman ROGERS now seeks to force a change in this venal system. He seeks passage of a resolution which would make it compulsory for Congressmen to answer "yea" or "nay" and go on the record when voting on appropriations bills.

Congressman ROGERS isn't afraid to stand up and be counted because he believes in representing the people. It's a pity more of our elected Representatives do not share his viewpoint and his courage. If they did we would have a better government and an end to a system which sees billions of dollars of the people's money squandered away by politicians who can't be held answerable for their actions because there is no record of how they voted.

Greece Mourns for Her Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial entitled "Greece Mourns for Her Children," which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 8, 1950.

The editorial is as follows:

GREECE MOURNS FOR HER CHILDREN
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Twenty-eight thousand innocent Greek children are held captive behind the iron curtain.

Twenty-eight thousand helpless Greek mothers are weeping for the return of their children.

Despite all appeals to the Communist satellites, not one child has been returned.

The Communists have flagrantly disregarded the two resolutions of the United Nations Assembly requesting the immediate repatriation of the Greek children.

The Communists scorn law and order.

They repudiate the authority of the UN.

They disregard every moral principle of justice.

The International Red Cross is currently in session in Geneva. It will seek to obliterate this stain upon modern civilization. It will seek to liberate these children from communistic bondage. It will seek to terminate this crime against mankind.

The forceful detention of these Greek children has aroused the bitter indignation of the people of every civilized nation.

For it violates every feeling of love. For it is tantamount to the horrible crime of genocide.

The monsters of Moscow have launched a new kind of warfare. They intend to train these children in the inhuman doctrines of communism. They intend to train these children as a fifth column in Greece. They intend to train these children with a hatred against their God, against their religion, against their country.

The Red devils will never succeed in converting the Greek children in their heathen, hellish ideology.

The mothers of Greece have always been faithful to the religion of the Nazarene and in the faith of their proud race.

They rocked their babes to sleep to the rhythm of patriotic songs.

They told their children the stories of the glories of Greece. They taught their children to defend with their lives their church and their country.

The church has always been the nation's ark.

We have witnessed the final sunset of such godless creatures as Hitler, Mussolini and their bloodthirsty followers. We will witness, in God's good time, the final sunset of Stalin and his fellow tyrants.

When a nation like Greece remains faithful to the ideals of freedom of the spirit, there is no final sunset for its people.

"The people of Greece and the Americans of Greek descent owe an eternal debt of gratitude to the Hearst newspapers for its crusade to free the 28,000 Greek children from communistic iniquity," declared former Senator Phelps Phelps, chairman of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Kidnaped Greek Children.

Let America take the lead. Let America heed the appeal of the mothers of Greece. Let America help to return these children to their mothers.

We shall not—we must not—we will not—let them down.

The Enthusiastic Irish Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on March 17. Once again the Sons of Aaron join with the Sons of Erin in enthusiastically helping them to commemorate the birthday of their patron saint:

THE ENTHUSIASTIC IRISH TRIBUTE TO ST. PATRICK

Throughout a national history marked quite consistently by tragedy and suffering, Ireland has had the advantages of an unfailing source of spiritual sustenance. Devastating wars have swept the little island. Generations of its people have known political oppression and the sufferings of famine. Leaders in the struggle for freedom have died before a firing squad or on the gallows. There have been times when the people of Ireland have had little but their faith.

Today the Irish at home and those who are scattered throughout the earth's broad surface pay their tribute to St. Patrick, who left the people of Ireland when he died in 461 a heritage which they have cherished faithfully over the centuries. History records few men whose beneficent influence has been sustained so long. In fact, it has been extended as the sons of Ireland have been carried by their free and adventurous spirits to distant places.

It is a tribute to the character of the Irish people that their gratitude has been undying, that the passing of time does not dull the edge of their enthusiasm for the proper observance of a day which holds such a rich symbolism.

This Nation of ours is richer and stronger by reason of the liberal mingling of the Irish among its people. They have been among the very best of citizens and have made their own distinctive and generous contribution to the strength and the ideals of the Nation. The heritage given them by St. Patrick has helped to make them what they are. It is natural that they should honor his memory so unfailingly.

More About Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Tribune on March 15, 1950, entitled "More About Potatoes":

MORE ABOUT POTATOES

A conference committee working out differences between the Senate and the House on acreage controls for cotton and peanuts found time yesterday to work out a program for potatoes.

This plan would withhold price supports from the 1951 crop of potatoes unless potato growers accept rigid marketing quotas which prevent them from selling more than an allotted number of bushels. "Next year," said Senate Majority Leader LUCAS, "We will have marketing quotas, agreements, and orders on acreage, bushels, and bags. That," said Senator LUCAS, "will take care of potatoes."

The legislation the conference committee was discussing dealt with cotton and peanuts. Cotton planters have been bitter about the acreage allotments. Acreage was cut back from 27,000,000 acres last year to 21,000,000 acres this year, with the result that various "hardship cases" developed. The conference committee compromised that sharply political issue by adding 1,400,000 acres to the 21,000,000 which cotton producers have been allowed to plant.

In the matter of peanuts, the conference committee agreed to add 100,000 acres of peanuts to the allowed acreage for this crop in Texas and Alabama. However, if growers agree to devote their peanuts to the making of oil—which does not provide as great remuneration as selling peanuts for direct consumption—the conference committee agreed that all restrictions could be removed and the planters could grow as many peanuts as they desired. There is also to be a Government "peanut pool" to avoid shortages for candy makers.

In the name of Burbank, George Washington Carver, and all those other geniuses who devoted their lives to improving agricultural products and finding new uses for them, what goes on here?

Have we come to the time when a farmer must see his Senator, or at least his Congressman, in order to be permitted to plant and market the product of his labor? That seems to be the implication of this congressional addition of 1,400,000 acres to the land which may be devoted to cotton and 100,000 acres in two States to the land on which farmers may raise peanuts. By the way, the conference committee declined to add 4,500,000 acres to wheat land to take care of Colorado "hardship cases."

The principle of price supports to avert disastrous declines in the incomes of farmers has gradually been perverted to the point at which farmers must plead with Congress to be allowed to use their land economically. In some fields, notably tobacco, this business of acreage and marketing controls has reached the point where those who have "production records" have a virtual monopoly of the market, and few or no newcomers can put seed into the ground.

We begin to understand the Brannan plan more clearly. When the Government tells farmers what to plant and how much to sell, it is a short step to paying them out of the tax money and completing the subservience of this once, and we hope still, independent group of citizens. And so, a little at a time, independence vanishes and everything falls under the dominance of Washington.

An Honest Confession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Tribune on March 15, 1950, entitled "An Honest Confession":

AN HONEST CONFESSION

A year ago there was sharp opposition by administration forces in Congress to the home-rule provision in the rent-control bill, under which communities, acting through their official governing bodies, could have ordered the decontrol of rents within their borders.

Last week, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS told his colleagues in the Senate: "I should like to say in connection with rent control generally that, although I opposed the local option provision in last year's Rent Control Act at that time, I now keenly appreciate the fact that this provision furnishes us today with the safest rule-of-thumb measure we have for the still existing need of rent controls."

In other words, last year's outcry that this provision would ruin the rent-control law was somewhat exaggerated. As a matter of fact, Senator MYERS said the permission given communities to decontrol rents has not been exercised "to any marked extent." We congratulate Senator MYERS for his confession that he was wrong last year. And we suggest again, as we have many time before, that local government which is close to the people and their needs will ordinarily function more effectively than government on the Washington level.

The only reason big government seems sometimes to operate more efficiently than small government is that its mistakes are easier to hide and harder to uncover.

Haym Salomon's Loan to the American Revolution Should Be Repaid to His Heirs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to those who cherish thoughts of national gratitude to realize that this great Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to human dignity, has never formally recognized the claim of the descendants of Haym Salomon to reimbursement for the expenditure of his fortune in the American Revolution.

It is my purpose, in the very near future, to introduce and to press to passage a private bill which would authorize the payment of the amount of the claim to Haym Salomon's lineal descendants.

I must remind the House, Mr. Speaker, although it has often been said before, that this great patriot sacrificed his fortune, his health, and eventually his life on the altar of American freedom; he left destitute, at his death, a young wife and four children.

In addition to the sums loaned directly to the Revolutionary Government, Haym Salomon loaned or gave outright considerable amounts to individuals, including Thomas Jefferson and James Madison; but in all the years during which some effort has been made looking to the recognition of the debt, his heirs have never suggested reimbursement for anything except the principal amount of the loan to the Government itself, calculated at $658,007.43. It has never been suggested that his family should be reimbursed for the private loans and gifts, nor that any interest should be paid.

CLEANSE NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

Time cannot dull the ache of the national conscience until this debt has been paid, however long it may have stood. There is no statute of limitations on a debt to freedom.

Every American is proud of Haym Salomon, and every Jew is proud of him and of his comrades in arms who created on this continent "a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

The payment now of this long-standing debt cannot help the young widow and her four children who survived revolution and the patriot's death; but it can cleanse the national honor and conscience.

HAYM SALOMON STORY TOLD IN AMERICAN WEEKLY

Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD the story of Haym Salomon as it appeared in the western editions of the American Weekly a few weeks ago, and undoubtedly will appear soon in the East. The story carries the byline of Terry Gibbons, which is a nom de plume of Miss Frances Spatz, the Washington correspondent of the American Weekly.

I should like to add that my introduction of the bill is not the result of any solicitation by the living heirs, but is the result solely of my own interest. Miss Spatz informs me that she has talked to two of the living heirs who live in Washington, Mrs. Barnard—Faye Salomon—Green and Mrs. Louis—Natalie Salomon—Mulitz, who is the daughter of the late Gustave Bier Salomon.

There follows the text of the story by Miss Spatz as published in the American Weekly; the text of a part of the Drew Pearson column of Saturday, March 18, as it appeared in the Washington Post; and the text of the bill I propose to introduce.

[From the American Weekly of January 8, 1950]

SIX MILLION WITH INTEREST—THE DESCENDANTS OF AMOS PIATT WANT TO COLLECT FROM THE GOVERNMENT—AND MAY, TOO—BECAUSE HIS AUNT LOANED MONEY TO THE COLONISTS

(By Terry Gibbons)

"Goodness knows, we helped out the Government back in Revolutionary War days," Grandma Rhoda Ullom said. "We lent it money, didn't we? I mean the family did. Now all we want is the money back with interest. Six million dollars would come in quite handy."

Grandma Ullom, 78, was talking a while ago to her granddaughter, Mrs. Emerson O. Buchanan, of Bridgeport, Ohio, she told Mrs. Buchanan that a Buchanan ancestor named Amos Piatt once had written about the loan, which she said had been chipped in some time in 1775. Mrs. Buchanan began to hunt around for ways to prove it.

An old trunk in the home of one of her husband's relatives helped her. It yielded a yellowed manuscript which appeared to have been dictated by Amos Piatt, himself on his deathbed.

That manuscript is a leaf out of the past, a story of Indian massacre and colonists' endurance, and it is the basis of a formal claim, now, against the Government of today.

Amos Piatt's aunt, Marie Preh, loaned the money to the colonists, the ancient document says, and the sum was to be repaid to him or his children. Mrs. Buchanan's husband, a salesman, is a great-great-grandson of Amos.

"We all came to America from France in 1774," Amos wrote. "General Lafayette was a first cousin of my aunt, Marie Preh, who loaned the money.

"I never had any sisters. I had only one brother, Robert, and he was killed by Indians one day in an Indian massacre. They killed my little brother before my mother's eyes.

"They burned our home down and all our things and burned all our papers up that we had to prove our right to Aunt Marie Preh's money. There should be $6,000,000 principal and compound interest coming to me and you 11 children. Since all our papers were burned, we thought we could not get it, so we never tried."

It was time some one did try, Mrs. Buchanan decided, and she brought the claim to the attention of the Government's General Accounting Office, to the United States Archives and to her representative in Congress. A search of records was begun, too, in New Jersey, and there it was easy to find references to Maj. Daniel Piatt, Amos's father. One of them was an order from Gen. George Washington, directing Daniel to requisition 100 head of cattle near Morristown, N. J., and another was an order to associates to attend Daniel's funeral.

Proving the validity of the claim, which was said to amount to $6,000,000 back in 1848, when Amos died, is another matter.

It will take at least 6 months of intense research to determine the status of the claim, Mrs. Buchanan has learned, and the burden of proof and the expense of the inquiry rest with the claimant. The work will be handicapped by the fact that many revolutionary records were destroyed when the United States Capitol was burned by the British in the War of 1812 and others were lost later in a fire in the Treasury Department.

Eventually, if the claim should be deemed valid, a private bill would have to be introduced in Congress to authorize payment.

Nevertheless, it is possible today to collect such a claim. A bill providing for payment of $658,007.43 to heirs of another Revolutionary patriot, Haym Salomon, will be introduced in Congress soon.

Haym Salomon, colonist from Poland, spent his entire private fortune of nearly $1,000,000 in the cause of liberty, then died penniless in 1795, leaving a young wife and four children. He not only gave this financial aid, but also served as a spy and was imprisoned by the British when he was caught trying to sink a British ship. After his death, descendants sought to collect only the amount of the actual loans, $658,000, excluding all gifts to individuals, among whom were Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, and excluding any interest, which if compounded annually would bring the amount now to a total running into billions.

Previous bills in Congress, providing for payment, never came to a vote although committees of both Houses conceded the justice of the demands. Recently, Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York, revived the matter and a private bill was prepared for the Eighty-first Congress, second session.

"Time cannot dull the ache of the national conscience until this debt is paid," KLEIN said. "I will press this bill for passage."

It is not only hard to get such a bill passed, but merely to bring up an old claim is not always feasible—as descendants of Robert Morris, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, recently found.

They asked a Congressman to look up the possibility that their illustrious ancestor had lent the Government money which had never been returned. The Congressman reported that it seemed to be the other way around. He said the Treasury Department long ago found that Morris owed it $93,312.63. The Department, however, gallantly concluded that "having no knowledge of the system of posting accounts or the reasons for certain ledger entries in those days, it is neither fair nor just to assume that the balance is really due to the Government."

Descendants of Francis Vigo, a merchant, had better luck. More than a 100 years after he lent $8,616 to the State of Virginia, they collected $51,539.10 from the Federal Government, which has assumed all State Revolutionary debts.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 18, 1950]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—MONEY LENDER JOINS UNITED STATES HEROES

(By Drew Pearson)

A forgotten hero of the Revolutionary War, an unspectacular money lender, will soon be immortalized not far from Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. He was Haym Salomon, the little Jewish patriot who raised the money to fight the Revolution but died penniless without ever receiving a dime back from the Government whose freedom he financed.

Now after all these years, a memorial is about to be erected in Salomon's honor. This was authorized by Congress 12 years ago upon a motion by GUY GILLETTE, then Congressman but now Senator from Iowa.

It was left up to private citizens, however, to raise the subscriptions, so the project lay

dormant until this year. Now a Haym Salomon Memorial Society has been formed to raise the money, and the chief thing remaining is to have the Commission of Fine Arts approve a design.

Note.—At one time George Washington pulled Salomon out of a synagogue to scrape up the cash to meet the Army pay roll. Salomon also paid Jefferson's and Madison's board bills so they could attend the first Continental Congress.

The following is the text of private bill to be introduced:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the heirs of Haym Salomon the sum of $658,007.43, in full satisfaction of their claim for moneys loaned by Haym Salomon to the Government of the United States during the Revolutionary War.

Mississippi and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the dedication of the Woolfolk State Office Building, Jackson, Miss., Thursday, March 16, 1950, to wit:

MISSISSIPPI AND PROGRESS

I am honored by the invitation that permits me to participate in the ceremonies of this auspicious occasion.

The State Office Building dedicated today is the majestic and lengthened shadow of a remarkable man whose name, by act of the legislature, it bears.

The people of Mississippi commended the members of the legislature who, on March 6, 1946, appropriated $3,000,000 with an additional appropriation of $870,000 by the legislature in 1948, for the construction of a much needed and adequate State office building.

The act providing for the building was passed under the leadership and during the administration of the late-lamented Governor Thomas L. Bailey.

The members of the State Building Commission, including the chairman, Gov. Fielding L. Wright, the able and capable ex-Gov. Hugh L. White, the Honorable Walter Sillers, speaker of the house of representatives, Senator John W. Kyle, and the Honorable W. A. Williams, a member of the house, are entitled to the gratitude of the people of Mississippi for the location, supervision, and construction of the most imposing and complete State office building in the South, if not in the United States.

The completion of the structure marks a high point in the outstanding administration of our distinguished Gov. Fielding L. Wright. It is a credit to the State of Mississippi.

ELLIS TRIGG WOOLFOLK

No one was more responsible for the State office building than the late Ellis Trigg Woolfolk, a Representative from Tunica County, and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the house of representatives at the time the original appropriation was made.

This modern and lofty office building was appropriately named for our dear and devoted friend, Ellis Trigg Woolfolk, familiarly known as "Scrap" Woolfolk, who served his county and his State long, faithfully, and efficiently. Among other offices held by him, he was sheriff, State senator, and State representative.

I am gratified that this building was named for a former member of the legislature. Attention is thereby focused upon the importance of the position. There is no public office where the opportunity for constructive service is greater than in the legislature.

Ellis T. Woolfolk was well born. He inherited a good name. He was always jealous to preserve and transmit to his sons the good name inherited from his father.

He possessed a good mind. He took an active part in the improvement and development of his city and of his county. He was a leader among men.

He was a successful planter, banker, and manufacturing executive. He was successful in his business life before he undertook to manage the public business. He was thus better prepared because of his personal success for handling the affairs of the people.

He was a politician in the best sense of that term, and that means that he was a constructive statesman. He exerted a wide influence in the political affairs of his county and State.

He always took pride in the financial condition of his home county. He had much to do with the deserved reputation of Tunica County as being one of the best-managed counties in the State. It was his boast that Tunica County was substantially without debt or bonds. While progressive, he insisted that the city in which he lived and the county where he resided should live within their income. He knew the courthouse before he became an outstanding figure in the statehouse. He gave his best thought and his unselfish service for some 20 years in both branches of the State legislature. He was a master of county and State government.

He was a devoted husband and a fond and a generous father. He loved his home and his family.

He had many friends. He knew that the best way to have friends was to be a friend. He was slow to make promises, but his word was his bond. He was loyal to every friend, and he was faithful to every trust.

He loved his State. He lived, and wrought, and died in the Yazoo Delta, most fertile of valleys, by the mighty Mississippi, the greatest of rivers and the father of waters and of floods.

Scrap Woolfolk was not perfect. None of us is. The sun gives us light, but it has its dark spots. He was human, but he was courageous and dependable.

He was a man of convictions. He had the courage of his convictions. He never sought an easy place for safety nor a soft place for retreat. He measured up to the best standards of public office. He was able, honest, and faithful to the end. He "never sold the truth to serve the hour." He was a patriot of Mississippi mold. He exemplified in his public life the sentiment: "Destroy not the ancient landmarks that our fathers set."

While Scrap Woolfolk was qualified to fill almost any political office within the gift of the people, his claim to fame rests upon his service in the legislature. The building we dedicate today is a tribute to his memory and a just reward for the service he rendered the people of Mississippi.

GOOD GOVERNMENT

This office building is to accommodate and promote good government in Mississippi. The officials and employees who occupy the offices will take pride in the efficient handling of public affairs. Convenient offices promote good work. State officials and employees are the spokesmen of the State in dealing with the public. At its best, government is one of the most difficult and perplexing problems of man. Sometimes there is strife among neighbors. Often there is discord among States. Frequently there are rivalries among nations. It is often difficult for man to live happily with man. The people appreciate good work in State offices. I trust courtesy and efficiency that promote good government will always obtain in this stately office building of which all Mississippians are justly proud.

PROGRESS

This structure, costing approximately four times as much as the Capitol building, is typical of the progress of our State. We are proud today to be citizens of Mississippi. We are gratified that Mississippi is in step with the march of progress. Our agricultural and industrial resources are inviting home seekers and investors. Long well-known for cotton and lumber, for its fertile valleys and magnificent forests, Mississippi is now one of the great oil-producing States of the Union. Livestock and dairying are profitable. Manufacturing is encouraged. We have the climate. We have the soil, and we have the people. No State has made greater strides in the development of its natural resources in providing for solid industries and in promoting substantial agriculture than Mississippi. As we hear of the alluring, if not enchanting distant scenes and of green pastures far away, we frequently overlook the opportunities of our own State. I am familiar with the cities, with the farms, with the plains, the valleys, the coasts, and the mountains of all the other States in the Union that lie between the two great oceans and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. My thoughts, after traveling elsewhere, always fondly turn to my native State, and I am never so happy as when my feet are on Mississippi soil. I know of no State that offers better privileges or finer opportunities for a full and satisfying life than Mississippi.

Progress is on the march and our eyes are turned toward the future as we plan for a greater State and for a better civilization. We know that mere change is not progress. We know that progress means growth. We know that progress means development. We believe that changes in both society and in government should be tested by sound principles and by the experiences that have promoted happiness and freedom through the centuries. We believe that change that involves experiments, before it is called progress, should be tried. It should be tested before that change becomes permanent, and before mere change is called progress. History shows that experiments, in the test tube of reason and analysis, will often eliminate mistakes from mere changes which are not progress.

We know, too, that change is the law of life, that ideas and ideals change from century to century, but we also know that while concepts change, fundamental principles are constant and continued. Habits and customs and the values of concepts change from generation to generation. The Declaration of Independence enlarged the freedom of Magna Carta. We believe in a progress that is sound and constructive. As we behold the towering structure appropriately located near the magnificent capitol and the attractive capitol grounds, we are proud of the progress that our State is making today and we are determined that that progress shall increase with the passing years.

BALANCED ECONOMY

We must not, however, close our eyes to the facts of our economy. We must be realistic. When we mention agriculture we think of cotton. We believe in land ownership. We encourage tenants to become land owners. We promote the family farm, but we do not destroy or penalize the plantation. We stand for justice to all farmers, large and small. There should be no discrimination among citizens, and legislation

should be just to all alike. We are profoundly concerned that the exports of cotton for 1948 were substantially the lowest since the War Between the States. While they increased in 1949, this increase was largely from the use of Marshall Plan funds. The domestic consumption of cotton had decreased in 1948, but the consumption of rayon increased. Cotton, also, now has the competition of nylon. The rayon production in 1948 was equivalent to approximately 2,645,000 bales of cotton. The production of plastics and other synthetics, including nylon, is rapidly increasing. Paper today is cotton's second greatest competitor. We cannot overlook our competition, including foreign cotton. We cannot continue to overproduce cotton. There is no single answer to the cotton problem. We must not only compete, but we must balance our economy. We must encourage industries, and I do not mean fly-by-night but I mean solid industries. We must promote manufacturing. We must encourage cattle raising and dairying. We must diversify on a sound and solid basis. We must, in a word, balance our economy.

TOLERANCE

We believe in tolerance. Mississippians have their convictions, but we are constantly reexamining ourselves, and we believe in enlarging our vision and in improving our convictions. An individual, like a State, must grow or he will die. Growth or death is the law of life. We must be careful not to deserve to be called intolerant. We must continue to practice without malice or prejudice the political and economic tolerance that we accord to others. We respect the rights and views of others. We ask that our rights and our views have the consideration that we accord to others who differ with us. The attitudes respecting race, color, or creed were not created by law, and they cannot be changed by law. Customs and habits should always be in keeping with the best concepts of good living, but the legislature rather than the Congress is better qualified to consider improvements in racial or social relations. Any legislation dealing with the habits and customs of the people should always be supported by the majority of the people. I believe in the democracy of Jefferson and of Jackson with majority rule in government. An intolerant people will never enjoy the abundant life. Tolerance promotes understanding and cooperation.

THE SOUTH

The record of Mississippi and of the South in World War I and World War II is outstanding. Without making comparisons, we assert the record shows that the South more nearly unitedly supported the two greatest of all wars than any other part of our common country. We mention this fact not to boast, but in proof of the devotion and loyalty of the South to our common country. We believe in preparedness. We stand for national defense. We support an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force. We advocate better highways, improved rivers, progress in our schools, and the conservation of our soils. We are profoundly interested not only in growing but in selling our cotton and our cattle. We are interested not only in producing but in selling our oil and lumber. We are interested in cooperating in interstate and international commerce with the other States of the Union and with the other countries of the world. We believe in a strong America. We believe in the good neighbor policy. With us, partisanship stops at the waters' edge. I concur in the sentiment of the great English statesman of whom it was said: "In his fidelity to principle, he put to shame the brittle loyalties of party."

We are not selfish. We are interested in our own welfare. We have our convictions, but we accord to the citizens of other States with whom we like to cooperate, their convictions. We say to those who would like to change our habits or social relations and our way of life that unless it is to improve, and not impose: "Thou shalt not pass."

VETERANS

The United States and not the States wages wars. The Government and not the States supports the armies and navies. The Government calls to the colors. The aftermath of wars often is worse, if possible, than war itself. The disabled, the wounded, the widows, the dependents, and the orphans of those who made the supreme sacrifice, are entitled to a nation's bounty. Selfishness often supplants sacrifice, and greed is substituted for patriotism. Our veterans are determined that those who fought for their country shall have an opportunity to live for their country, and with them we are determined not only to maintain but to establish peace on earth.

REAL VOICE

The trend today is to listen to the voice from Washington, but progress in the States does not originate in Washington. Progress does not filter from the top down, but it results from fair opportunities and a good life for the people at the bottom. Real prosperity must grow from the bottom up. All must be treated alike. There is no place in our industrial life for selfish and greedy management, nor is there any place in our economy for the selfish labor leaders who are drunk with power. Regardless of what Washington thinks, the people in the States believe in justice to Capital and to Labor. They believe in collective bargaining, but they believe in the right to work. They oppose jurisdictional strikes. They oppose secondary boycotts. They assert that no man has a right to strike against his Government. The public welfare must be put above private welfare by both management and labor.

The true voice of America does not come from Washington, but the real voice of America comes from the farms, the factories, the schools and the churches. If we heed the voice of Washington, we become less self-reliant. We lose our initiative. We sacrifice our courage. We must not succumb to the voice from Washington for more spending and for an easy life.

It is not an accident that the United States is the most powerful nation in the world today. Those who founded America were sturdy and heroic souls. They had suffered persecution. They exchanged the tyranny of the Old World for the freedom of the New. They paid the price of freedom. Every generation must achieve its own liberty and freedom. We must rededicate ourselves to the old-fashioned virtues of self-reliance and initiative: "We must be guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship."

STATES' RIGHTS

We believe in the rights of the States, and that all functions not delegated to the Congress in the Constitution are reserved to the States. We rely upon the Bill of Rights. We insist that the rights of the States be respected. For 50 years I have advocated the rights of the States. I have insisted that State functions should be respected. I speak frankly. Unfortunately many who advocate the rights of the States are among the loudest advocates of the Federal spending today that is undermining the Republic. They urge that the Federal Government appropriate for private and not public functions, and for functions that are primarily the functions of the States. When they do they are undermining the rights of the States. Whenever the Federal Government appropriates the Federal Government controls. Centralization and States' rights cannot exist together. I urge that the best way to promote States' rights is to promote State responsibility. That responsibility is for the discharge of obligations that are peculiarly the province of the State. Centralization, I repeat, in Washington carries with it control in Washington, and control in Washington impairs not only the local rights but the local responsibility. I assert that the best way to promote the real rights of the States is to support the local responsibility of the States.

Deficit spending today is a threat and a danger to the security of the United States. I maintain that a Government whose expenditures, in times of peace and in the period of the greatest prosperity that the Nation has ever known, exceed its revenues—whose spending exceeds its collecting—is in danger of destruction in the event of either war or unbridled inflation.

OPPORTUNITY

The United States with its great resources, with its unparalleled production, following victory in the greatest of all wars, has reached the highest pinnacle of power and majesty ever attained by any nation in civilized history. We have the greatest opportunity that ever came to any nation, if we conserve our natural resources, if we take advantage of our unsurpassed production in this atomic age, to make unprecedented progress in the United States in the next generation.

Progress, however, must be more than material. As Edith Cavell said: "I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred for or bitterness toward anyone." The material must be accompanied by the intellectual and the spiritual. Science must be based upon morality. For Mississippians believe that science is the friend of man and that the greatest enemy of the human race is disobedience to moral law.

If we keep faith with the boys who went out in World War II, never to return, and if we put first things first, there will be a new era of progress in the United States. Our Government must be stable and our faith must be abiding—in man, country, and God. The material forces must be based upon moral forces, for moral forces have always determined the destiny of men and nations.

DANGERS

After the stress of war, there is always danger. The temptation is complacency. We think more and more of our rights and less and less of our responsibilities. We think more of security than sacrifices. We distort the meaning of public welfare. We overlook that there is a vast difference between public welfare and private welfare. The government is established to promote the public welfare, which involves doing for the people what they cannot do for themselves. I repeat, to emphasize, that the unbalanced budget is a danger today to stability and prosperity.

There are other dangers. The greed of organized minorities is a real danger. Measures to promote the public health are in order and hospitalization is to be promoted, but socialized medicine is a national danger. We believe in home owning and farm ownership, but we assert that socialized Federal housing will result in the socialistic, if not the communistic state advocated by those who first proposed public housing. Socialized farming will result in the regimentation of farmers and in the control of the food and farms of the Nation.

THE TREND

Following World War II, the trend was toward socialism, but the trend today is away from socialism and state control. In December 1949 New Zealand and Australia, where social democracy had advanced the furthest, turned away from socialism. In February 1950, the Socialists lost in Great Britain. Even though retained in power by a few votes, their tenure is uncertain. The moral in the trend is clear. Somebody has to

pay for the promises of socialism. Free medicine and free housing cannot be conjured out of the thin air. Somebody has got to pay for them. There is an end to the policy of robbing one citizen to pay another and of "robbing Peter to pay Paul".

I am sanguine enough and optimistic enough and patriotic enough to believe that the trend is also on the way out in Washington, and that Congress will repudiate the welfare state. There is no place in free America for subsidized agriculture and for socialized medicine.

STRONG AMERICA

We must be prepared for war, for there is still both chance and change in the world. Communism is on the march, but there is no occasion for fear of the destruction of the world in the event of another war.

The strength of America does not lie in the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb or any other single weapon. The strength of America lies in the faith and spirit of the people.

It would be most unfortunate if America were dependent upon any weapon. We would relax and become soft. We would cease to be vigilant. We must profit by the examples of history. The French placed their confidence in the Maginot Line rather than in a strong and stable government. France lost. She was easily overrun and conquered in World War II.

I do not underestimate the effect of the atom bomb, but I recall that at the conclusion of the First World War, poisonous gasses were being brought into play and it was announced that their use in the next war would mean the destruction of civilization. But the scientists who compounded the poisonous gasses were confined to no one country. While at the beginning of World War II all nations had supplies of gasses, yet not one country made use of them.

Already the Russians have split the atom. I believe that in this atomic age the scientists who discovered the atom bomb can perfect a defense against the atom bomb. Atomic energy should be used to build, not destroy, civilization. The strength of America is in the tolerance and intelligence, the faith and the courage, of the people.

REHABILITATION

We are profoundly interested in the rehabilitation of our allies in Europe and in the rehabilitation of the destruction of war, but the Marshall Plan is burdensome to the taxpayers of America today. That plan must be followed by other plans. We know that taxes are at their peak today. They can only be increased by reducing standards of living. We are straining our production. The Marshall Plan must be followed by better plans. I believe that the best aid that we can render our former allies in World War II, and the oppressed peoples of the world today, is to exemplify that in the American way of life there is the only hope of freedom for the downtrodden of the earth. The best assistance that we can render in rehabilitating Europe and China is to set an example and demonstrate that in America there is the freedom to worship, to speak, and to work, with the highest standard of living and the best opportunity for a good life in all the world. The United States can help the undeveloped nations of the world and provide for improving the lands and the peoples of the smaller and less fortunate nations of the earth by furnishing to them the scientists and the science to enable them to help themselves. If our churches send missionaries to foreign lands, I know of no better way of making good our advocacy of the good neighbor policy than by sending to foreign countries some of the brightest graduates of our colleges and of our universities who will find in those countries an opportunity to help humanity and to aid undeveloped lands and peoples.

YOUTH AND FRONTIERS

As we think of Mississippi and of our progress we are thinking of the youth of our State, for they are the best of our assets. There may be, in the future progress and development of our country, no new territorial frontiers to conquer, but there are frontiers available to the ambitious youth today that are probably greater than the physical frontiers that were available to our forefathers. We must use, without destroying, our lands. They are essential to our freedom. We must not waste our natural resources, for the conflict between progress and poverty is as old as the Biblical conflict between light and darkness, and it is as new as atomic energy. Scientists believe that as a result of the continued scientific researches in connection with atomic energy discoveries may be made that will enable the oceans and the gulfs to be farmed and food to be produced to provide for the expanding populations not only of the United States, but of the world. Scientists are optimistic enough to believe that, as a result of an invention whereby distilled waters may be available to the passengers of airplanes that may be stranded on the sea, these invention for distilling ocean water may be perfected so that waters of the ocean may be distilled and transported across the mountains for irrigating the great western plains to supplement the stored waters of the rivers so that the American desert may be as productive as our fertile valleys.

BUILDERS

As we improve our natural resources we must build our civilization. We can only build that civilization by supplementing the material forces with the more important moral forces. I would like for our generation to be constructive. I would like for us to build. "It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness."

I can express the thought I have in mind no better than by these words from John Ruskin:

"When we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, 'See! This our Fathers did for us'."

I believe in progress, tolerance, intelligence, freedom, moral force, the dignity of the individual, science based on morality, and obedience to the laws of God and man. Therefor have I spoken.

I believe in adequate public buildings and in able public officials. People reflect their own image in the type of public buildings they construct and in the kind of men and women they elect to public office.

The greatness of any nation depends upon the character of its resources, the character of its institutions, and above all, upon the character of its people.

In the Middle Ages, great cathedrals were constructed with the gifts of the poor of Europe. They were more than architectural wonders. They were monuments to the ideals of the people who built toward the stars, as the lofty spires pointed to Heaven. They were symbolic of the faith and the hope of the great masses of the common people of Europe. From their foundations to their spires, they typified the dreams and the aspirations of the average man for a better life here and hereafter.

I recall that it is said that during the building of one of these cathedrals a visitor passed through the stoneyard and saw many masons at work hewing and shaping the granite blocks. He stopped and asked one of the men what he was doing. "I am shaping the face of this stone," was the reply. He asked another stonecutter the same question. The second man replied: "I am cutting the keystone of an arch." The third man was asked the same question. He replied, as he looked up with pride: "I am building a cathedral."

As we conserve our soils, as we construct our highways, as we build our cities, as we improve the countryside, as we build our levees along our rivers, as we construct our dams to prevent overflows and to protect the lives and property of the people, as we build schools and churches, as we erect structures to be the monuments of our civilization, we are building America. We are building the great cathedral of American freedom, not only for ourselves and our children, but for the hope of freedom to the oppressed peoples of all the world.

The danger of the United States today is not in any invading foreign foe. "We the people" are not only the first words of the Constitution of the United States, but "we the people" are its danger, its power, and its hope. Above all, "we the people" must preserve America.

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed at This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, a great majority of the American people desire the immediate repeal of the wartime imposed excise taxes. It is my opinion that a substantial majority of the Members of Congress desire that this be done. These taxes were imposed as an emergency war measure. They were believed by everybody to be temporary. Part of the purpose for the enactment of this law on many commodities that bear this sales tax was to prevent too much material and too many man hours of labor going into the manufacture of articles that were not necessary for the prosecution of the war.

The imposition of these taxes are very discriminatory. They have placed an undue burden upon certain of our American industries. The war has been over for several years. There is no longer a shortage of critical material and there is no longer a scarcity of labor. The unemployment rolls in America are now approaching 5,000,000. It has been definitely proven that the continuation of these excise taxes have been crippling to business; they have materially increased the cost of living, and they are constantly contributing to the increase in unemployment.

The amusement tax on the picture shows, which affords many American families the only recreation and amusement they have, has made it very burdensome and expensive upon the American people and has denied many people the opportunity to participate in this wholesome, educational, and uplifting recreation.

All tax measures, of course, must originate in the House of Representatives. The Ways and Means Committee of the

House of Representatives have, for the past several weeks, been holding hearings upon this subject. We are told that this great committee recently refused to vote out a straight bill calling for the repeal or the reduction of the excise taxes and that they are contemplating later on reporting a bill, including the repeal of some of these taxes and the reduction of others, but to be coupled with a tax bill in substance increasing the tax on some industries so as to have the tax measure in one package. It is my opinion that this is a mistake.

A bill should be brought before this session of Congress addressing itself solely and alone to the repeal of excise taxes. There has been much talk since the President's message to Congress that there would be an effort made to remove or decrease the depletion charges now allowed to the coal-mining industries and other mining industries including the oil industry.

While these things are being contemplated, you hear on every hand that the mining industry is a sick industry. We have recently had before this session of the Congress a bill which seeks in substance to grant subsidies to the mining industries. We do not believe that the present depletion charges allowed the mining and oil industries should be taken away from them. To do so will make sick and crippled industries in much worse condition.

Both the coal industry and the metal-mining industry as well as the oil industry are vital to the economic prosperity of the Nation. Many taxes are already imposed upon coal and oil and their products. They are bearing the full share of the tax load. To further discriminate against them and to adopt the theory contained in the excise-tax law that certain industries should be singled out from the American economy and unusual and unequal tax burdens placed upon them, is an unwise and unjust tax policy.

If the administration and this great committee that has the responsibility of writing a new tax bill undertakes to, in one package, repeal and reduce many of the war-imposed excise taxes, and at the same time single out the coal industry and oil industry for the equivalent of increasing taxes, the whole bill will be in danger and the much-needed relief that can be gained by repealing the excise taxes may be lost.

To take from either the coal industry or oil industry the depletion charges now allowed under the law will be the exact equivalent of imposing upon them a burdensome and new tax. To do so will put many companies out of business and will increase unemployment by many thousands. We hear on every hand that the Federal Government needs more taxes and more money. The remedy for this situation is for the Federal Government to stop passing new laws that spend so much money. Another remedy is to speedily enact several of the proposed bills and measures to reorganize the executive branch of the Government so that more economy and more efficiency can be obtained. There will be serious opposition to only a few of these plans to reorganize certain branches of the Federal Government.

These measures which will be sharply contested could be deferred for the time being and the vast majority of them will be supported and can be enacted almost immediately into law. By taking these two steps, to quit spending and to reduce the size of some of the departments of the executive branch of the Government and to eliminate waste, can and will meet the situation.

We could far better spend our time by repealing these excise taxes and thus greatly increase the business and employment over the United States thereby creating wealth and more wages to tax than we can by allowing this much-needed reform in our tax laws to become snarled up with an unjust attempt to impose new burdens upon coal and oil. We can again far better use our time to cut down the size of the Federal Government and curtail its spending than we would do if we sought to impose new and additional tax burdens upon the people and the people's business.

When it is considered that the American industries engaged in the manufacturing and production of jewelry, kodaks, luggage, some wearing apparel, and many other American businesses affected by this tax and the moving-picture industry already pays enormous income tax and indirect taxes, it is quite unfair to single them out and continue to impose a 20-percent excise tax which not only cripples their businesses but falls most directly upon the American public.

Depletion charges are allowed upon all manufacturing machinery and equipment and upon rental real estate, and there is no just reason why the basic industries producing oil and coal should not be allowed these depletion charges also.

When coal and oil is removed from the ground it is gone forever, and the owners of the property should certainly be allowed depletion charges. The present law allowing these deductions is realistic and fair and should not be disturbed insofar as oil and coal are concerned.

The drug stores of America sell many hundreds of articles used in the home by millions of people every day that bear this burdensome, unfair, nuisance tax.

On Saturdays, in America, the school children are out of school. Most of them look forward to going to a good picture show where they can enjoy wholesome recreation. Often the parents of these children go with them and take the whole family. To have an admission tax of 20 percent levied and collected upon the tickets of every member of the American family is quite unjust. While parents are having the expense of educating their children and putting them through school, along comes this tax that has been demanded and collected for more than 4 years after the war's end.

Competition is now keen. We have changed from a sellers' market to a buyers' market. Thousands of articles manufactured and produced in foreign lands are flowing into our country. These articles are produced by cheap labor; they have no excise tax on them and they are underselling our businessmen. These taxes have caused the closing of many American factories and businesses producing watches, jewelry, kodak supplies, furs, perfumes, toilet articles, and many other articles. As a result of this, business is beginning to dry up here in these industries and millions of men have been let off from work.

When anyone sends a telegram or puts through a long-distance call in the transaction of his business, or because of sickness or death in the family, the long, tax-gathering arm of Uncle Sam taps him on the shoulder for a 25-percent increase in the charges he pays for this service. When we travel by plane, train, or bus, the same thing occurs.

These excise taxes have a strangle hold on the American income and American business is crippled as a result.

The dam placed across the stream of American economy has made business stagnant and caused millions of men and women to become unemployed. We should open up the floodgates and allow a greater flow of work, money, and profit to reach our people. Then the increased earnings of business and working people will create a broader tax base and create more taxes that can be collected without discrimination, and this increased national income will produce as much, and possibly more, Federal taxes than to continue to hamper and strangle business with these excise taxes.

The same is true of coal and oil, that meet very strong competition, and some of it comes from abroad. These depletion charges should still be allowed so that these industries will not be discriminated against, and we should go along in the fair American way.

I sincerely hope that we may be able at the present session of Congress to bring out a bill and pass it, repealing the excise tax.

Grant Nonquota Status to Adopted Immigrant Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1950, I introduced a bill which seeks to provide nonquota immigration status for adopted children of American citizens or for children coming to this country for legal adoption by Americans.

The bill provides that an unmarried alien under the age of 21, who is coming to this country to be legally adopted by an American citizen, is to be admitted as a nonquota immigrant for a period of 1 year, if he meets the health requirements of the immigration laws and if the citizen in the United States is financially able and willing to care for such alien.

If the legal adoption does not take place within the period for which the

alien was admitted, my bill prescribes that the alien is to leave the United States or may be deported, if he fails to do so.

United States citizens intending to adopt such alien children will have to furnish the Department of State with satisfactory evidence that they are legally and morally competent to adopt such children and financially able to care for them. They will also have to furnish to the Department of Justice and the immigration authorities a sufficient bond to assure that the alien child will not become a public charge.

The bill also provides for the entry on a nonquota basis of children adopted abroad by American citizens.

I hope the bill will receive early consideration and soon be enacted into law.

Arizona's Game of Tiddlywinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very fine editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News, of March 10, 1950. The editorial speaks for itself:

ARIZONA'S GAME OF TIDDLYWINKS

(By Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher)

A little group of Arizona men are playing tiddlywinks these days with a lot of jobs, a lot of homes, and a lot of businesses. It is not a pastime likely to amuse the people of southern California, however, for the jobs and homes and businesses involved are theirs, and they face the prospect of having their livelihood sold down the river—the Colorado River.

For these busy Arizonans have managed to finagle through the Senate a bill that would take away from California 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water to which the people of this State are entitled by legal contracts with the Federal Government. If they are similarly successful in the Congress, these Arizonans will have managed to infect California with a virulent case of creeping paralysis, to have put a definite ceiling on this State's development. The stake of the game, then, is our future, since new jobs, new homes, new businesses are possible only in direct ratio to the amount of water we have available.

The Arizona gimmick is a project, estimated to cost $800,000,000, to irrigate land in that State's Central Valley. As Arizona's seaport and supplier of much of the manufactured goods bought in that State, California would ordinarily be happy to get behind any deal that would promote Arizona's welfare and increased purchasing power, but the project proposed is just about as sensible as putting a $500 paint job on a $50 jalopy.

For that $800,000,000 necessary to put up and run the project is a sum greater than the assessed valuation of every inch of land in the entire State of Arizona. Further, having got in the mood for asking, the people of Arizona apparently decided they might as well shoot the works, so they have suggested the Federal Government fork over the money. The daily economics of the Arizona scheme are of concern to taxpayers throughout the United States, but the proposition really hits home in California.

For any approval of the project incidentally means giving Arizona water to run it—water for which Californians have legal contracts. It means, in short, benefiting some 4,000 Arizona farm families at the expense of 5,000,000 persons in this State.

Spokesmen for Arizona don't think much of this argument. That's too bad, they say, adding that the Government should never have entered into those contracts in the first place and that, in any event, the water rightfully belongs to Arizona. Such an argument could go on forever, and has, in fact, continued for three decades, a fact which seems to appeal to members of the Arizona water lobby, who may be short on logic but are plentifully supplied with wind.

For the argument could be settled—impartially and finally. It could, as spokesmen for California have repeatedly said, be taken to the United States Supreme Court. This is the fair and just way, and perhaps for that very reason finds little support in Phoenix. The Arizonans insist they are right, but they think it boorish of anyone to suggest that they prove it.

Instead, they say, let's pry $800,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury, let's put up the project, let's divert the water and make sure those 4,000 families are taken care of, and after all this is done maybe we can start talking business.

One gets the impression that putting the cart in front of the horse is chronic in Arizona.

Coal Miners in Standing Up for Principles Dramatized in Effective Way Iniquity of Taft-Hartley Law—Congress Should Act Now To Repeal Antilabor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the creators of the Taft-Hartley Act carefully selected quotes from Abraham Lincoln as they harangued Lincoln Day audiences recently—so carefully that they passed up all of the many words uttered by the great Lincoln on the rights of the Nation's workingmen.

Lincoln, in his time, said:

All that harms labor is treason to America. If any man says he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar. There is no America without labor.

Today, too many forget labor's importance to America—too many are too quick to condemn labor. The Taft-Hartley law is concrete evidence of this. Born in vindictiveness, it is nothing more than punitive legislation concocted to destroy organized labor.

The coal miners of America, at a tremendous sacrifice to themselves, have performed a great service for labor—they withstood the attempt to break their union. If they had failed in their fight, the Taft-Hartley club would have been extended elsewhere and there would be a general drive to break other unions.

The coal miners have proven that genuine collective bargaining remains the best remedy for labor-management strife.

Congress should act now to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

Under leave to do so, I include herewith an editorial from the March 15, 1950, issue of the Trainmen News, official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

THEY WOULDN'T CRAWL

When rich and arrogant employers close their eyes to the human considerations of labor relations and instead seek to club workers into submission with weapons fashioned in offices of the National Association of Manufacturers, there's bound to be trouble.

That's what happened in the prolonged, bitter strike in our coal fields and it explains why so much money was needlessly wasted and why so many men, women and children suffered grievously.

The operators were determined to crush the United Mine Workers' union with tools provided by the Taft-Hartley Act and with propaganda distributed in newspapers only too anxious to help out, hoping that the miners' undoing would eventually result in the undoing of all organized labor.

It simply didn't work. And the reason it didn't work is that human consideration the operators overlooked. They were waiting for Taft-Hartley to settle the issues their way and for the miners to crawl back to work on their bellies, begging for their jobs back under any conditions.

That didn't happen and never will. Men who risk their lives every day in the bowels of the earth get very close to the basic requirements of life and the toughness of the coal veins runs into their own veins to give them moral fiber and strength to fight for the principles they believe in. The coal miner, with his native militancy, has provided the backbone for all organized labor.

During the long controversy, 7 months, the mine operators, like some railroad executives we know, sat back, looked out the windows and waited for the law to settle matters their way.

When the injunction failed to get the "slaves" back into the pits, the operators banked on the courts to find them guilty of contempt. When the miners were cleared of that charge, the owners began to get a little uneasy, but it remainded for a proposed seizure bill that didn't guarantee them their profits under Government operation to get a semblance of collective bargaining under way.

The history of the coal strike completely discredits the Taft-Hartley Act, and it should serve as a warning to antilabor spokesmen in Congress for big business who are clamoring for a bigger and better union-busting law than that monstrosity.

The New York Times, commenting editorially, said: "More than 7 months of bitter controversy—a controversy which in its later stages threatened to rupture the very economic and social fabric of the Nation—are terminated with the agreement between the major soft-coal operators and the United Mine Workers.

"And this agreement was finally reached in the manner in which it should have been reached in the first place—by direct labor-management bargaining. The pity is that it required the threat of Government seizure and what amounted to Government arbitration to bring the disputants together."

The Nation owes the miners a great debt, for in standing up for their principles they

have dramatized in the most effective way the iniquity of the Taft-Hartley concoction. They have shown how such laws are not designed to protect the public, or stop strikes, nor to correct inequities, but only to help unscrupulous employers crush labor.

The best remedy for labor-management strife remains as always—genuine collective bargaining. It's also the keynote of a free economy and a functioning democracy.

The Democratic Heritage of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recent radio address, given at Springfield, Mass., by Prof. Frank Nowak, on the Justice for Poland program, sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress.

Dr. Nowak is a distinguished professor of history at Boston University and is also a member of the faculty at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

His address follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC HERITAGE OF POLAND

The drastic purges and renewed persecutions of recent date behind the iron curtain together with the appointment of a Soviet marshal, Rokossovsky, as virtual dictator of Poland are abundant proof of the complete bankruptcy of Stalin's Polish policy. Like Lenin in 1920 he has been compelled to admit, by deed if not by word, his false political reckoning that the Polish masses would welcome or even be reconciled to Muscovite tyranny and Communist slavery.

A cursory acquaintance with the history of Poland, her great western cultural heritage, and her extraordinary democratic achievements would have disabused both Lenin and Stalin of their oriental fantasy that a people imbued with democratic ideals for centuries could surrender that great heritage without a struggle, even in the face of overwhelming force.

Before the partitions of Poland in the eighteenth century by Russia, Prussia, and Austria the Polish Republic was the largest and freest federal republic in Europe created by the political genius of the Polish gentry. In the short space of 200 years, beginning with the pact of Koszyce in 1374 and ending with control of the highest judicial tribunal in the state in 1576, the Polish gentry effectively limited the power of monarchy and established a democracy of nobles who enjoyed all the guaranties of due process of law, habeas corpus, freedom of press, speech, assembly, religion, and representative government characteristic of the contract theory of government. Indeed, the Polish nobility in two centuries gained more extensive rights and privileges than did the English nobility in the five centuries from the days of Magna Carta in 1215 to the glorious revolution of 1689. They gained control of the highest offices in the state, elected their kings, voted all taxes through local and central parliaments, and proclaimed the sovereignty of the people.

In this gentry-democracy all nobles were brothers and equal before the law. Foreign titles were not recognized but specifically forbidden. It is significant, too, that the nobility of Poland were very numerous, constituting over a million persons in the eighteenth century or 12 percent of the population. They outnumbered the English nobility, who controlled the democratic institutions of that country by a ratio of 2 to 1.

Moreover, most of the Polish gentry were small landowners, farming their own lands and forming a kind of aristocratic-proletariat.

The peasantry also enjoyed an economic status higher than that enjoyed by the peasantry of any other continental country of comparable size, including Austria, Germany, and France. The democratic ideals, security, and higher standard of living of the people of old Poland, were a powerful magnet attracting numerous neighbors like Lithuania, Ruthenia, White Russia, and the Baltic States, who sought voluntary union with the Polish Republic.

In the eighteenth century, however, the whole structure of the Polish constitutional system was put in jeopardy by the rise of totalitarian states. The so-called enlightened despots of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, abhorring democratic republicanism and bent on aggression, intervened in Poland and by fifth-column activities succeeded in placing their own candidates on the Polish throne.

In opposing these puppet kings, the Polish gentry distorted the old constitution and adopted a policy of political obstruction that took the form of the filibuster, the liberum veto, the confederated diets, and reduction of the royal army to a paltry 24,000 men. Confusion and weakness invited further aggression by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The violent shock of the first partition of Poland in 1772, however, aroused the nation which now gave heed to the wise counsels of the great political reformers, Karwicki, Konarski, and Leszczynski. In the next two decades the Polish people experienced a remarkable renaissance in almost every field of endeavor—intellectual, social, and political.

The crowning achievement of the great reforms was the adoption of a new constitution on May 3, 1791, which corrected the old abuses and established a modern parliamentary democracy. Peasants and townspeople received increased freedom of action under protection of the law. The executive power was strengthened. The Liberum Veto was abolished. Under new leaders, there was a return to the positive, progressive features of the old constitution. The Polish Nation demonstrated that the country was fundamentally sound and could undertake far-reaching social reforms without the violence characteristic of the contemporary French Revolution.

The phenomenal success of the Polish democracy in 1791 in putting its own house in order under most trying conditions brought consternation to the courts of St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Vienna. The so-called enlightened despots joined forces to crush this "hydra" of democracy and annihilated the Polish state in the partitions of 1793 and 1795.

The partitions of Poland were a fatal blow to international morality and inaugurated the era of might makes right in international affairs. Political thinkers and lovers of freedom the world over from Jean Jacques Rousseau and Edmund Burke to our own Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson have condemned this international crime. Liberals in Germany, Austria, and Russia also raised their voices against this baneful precedent which undermined the cause of liberty and civilization everywhere.

Convinced of the justice of their cause the Polish people continued the struggle for freedom against overwhelming odds. Insurrection followed insurrection throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries until freedom was again achieved in the First World War.

In 1939 the totalitarian despots of Germany and Russia again invaded and destroyed the Polish state but the Polish people continued the struggle on almost every battlefield of Europe. Their heroism in France, Scandinavia, North Africa, Italy, and in the battle of Britain was widely acclaimed yet when the victory was won it was apparent that Poland had been freed from the domination of one neighbor only to fall a prey to another. Once again the betrayal of Poland was a blow to international morality and ushered in chaos in international affairs.

Appeasement of Russia has strengthened the tyranny of communism over the Russian people themselves who seek release from slavery by enslaving the whole world. This is no new phenomenon in Russian history. It was noted 110 years ago by the French diplomat, the Marquis de Custine, when he stated, "An immense inordinate ambition of the kind which can take root only in the soul of an oppressed people and be nourished only on the misery of the entire country is now astir in the hearts of the Russians. This essentially aggressive nation lives in a state of submissiveness so degrading that it seems to be expiating in advance at home, its expectations of tyranny over other men. The glory and booty to which the Russian looks forward turn his thoughts from the shame to which he is being subjected. This kneeling slave fills his dreams with visions of world domination."

By contrast the undaunted courage and will to live of the Polish nation and its devotion to the cause of democracy and freedom are a moral and spiritual phenomenon that Stalin can not and never will understand. His crude response to this baffling challenge is more arrests, bigger concentration camps, more Marshall Rokossovskys on the theory that might will make right.

Poland will rise again, for today as in the past the world has belatedly discovered that the treatment meted out to Polish people has become the touchstone of international justice and morality. Nor can it be said that the worst terrors of communism can destroy the spiritual and cultural heritage of a thousand years of Polish history.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the necessity for conservation of our natural resources. Knowledge of the tremendous growth of our population brings with it the realization that we are steadily approaching the point where our productive acreage will no longer be sufficient to provide the food that we need—unless steps are taken to restore lost acreage and to prevent the further destruction of the soil.

It is recognized that with our national conservation program there must also be conservation and restoration of our wildlife. It is an essential phase of the broad aspect of the conservation movement. It is significant that this important phase is recognized this week with the observance of the thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week.

The purpose of this observance is well set forth in the proclamation of my own

governor, the Honorable Allan Shivers, of Texas, which follows:

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

MARCH 7, 1950.

America's thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, originally established by Presidential proclamation in 1938, will be observed this year during the week of March 19–25, under the sponsorship of the National Wildlife Federation.

Conservation of natural resources vitally affects every citizen. Life itself depends upon soil and water, which must be conserved as the basic step toward preserving our natural heritage. Broader understanding of the fundamental concepts of conservation will inevitably bring into the picture the conservation and protection of wildlife.

With a solid background of knowledge and understanding for a foundation, we will be able to expedite efforts to restore wildlife for Texans. The extent to which this is accomplished will be stimulated by the cooperation of every individual citizen, even in the most remote areas.

The increasing interest in water- and soil-saving programs is indicative of the growing alertness of the citizenry to our unmistakable obligation to perpetuate our natural resources for future welfare and prosperity.

Therefore, I, as Governor of the State of Texas, hereby designate the week of March 19–25 as Wildlife Restoration Week in Texas, and urge that Texans observe this week with appropriate programs in schools, sportsmen's clubs, civic clubs, garden clubs and other groups and meetings.

ALLAN SHIVERS.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over radio-television station WXEL at Cleveland, Ohio, March 17, 9:30 to 9:45 p. m.:

The pilot who flew me from London to Dublin on my short trip last September had never seen Ireland. As we approached Dublin, the pilot said: "I can understand now why they call Ireland the Emerald Isle."

It was indeed a garden of green, resplendent in the morning sun. We drove from Dublin to the west coast of Galway Bay and were fascinated by the beautiful countryside and the warm personality of the people. Everyone expressed great interest in the United States and faith in its world leadership. The Irish are cognizant of the unity amid diversity of the United States and look for spiritual help from us to bring to their nation unity out of its diversity. They want their country to be what we proclaim America to be when we recite the pledge of allegiance to our flag—"One Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In a world in which the dominant ideological color is not black or white, but gray, there is nothing either indefinite or indefinable in Ireland's tragic story. The creative power of God brought it into being out of nothingness, and the burning zeal of Patrick brought it from darkness and superstition to make it an island of sanctity and learning.

From sea to sea—from the Bay of Belfast to the Cove of Cork—it is by nature one undivided entity. That oneness was sundered by the partition of 1920, which cut off its most sanctified and strategic segment, Ulster, where Patrick from the Hills of Tara, started Ireland on the high road to sanctification and where the intense struggle for freedom began. It was in Ulster that Theobold Wolfe Tone and his noble band of followers—not Catholics but Presbyterians—rallied to the cause to make Ireland and Irishmen throughout the world their everlasting debtors. Here was Ireland's Lexington and Concord, and this is the portion that is separated from independent Ireland by a line of demarcation that is an indictment of the natural law of boundaries, logic, and diplomacy.

One Nation under God was the prayer of Lincoln, and that prayer was answered after a hundred blood-drenched battlefields. A Mason and Dixon's line dividing our country today would present a parallel to Ireland as it is now partitioned. E pluribus unum, the mighty symbol of the United States of America, would be a folly and a myth had the Union not survived. President Lincoln said that by all means the Union must be preserved. Every nation today seeks its own unity. India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, to mention a few, have sought and found their own freedom within recent years. Present-day Germany, divided into French, Russian, British, and American zones, seeks to regain its unity as a nation. The same may be said of Korea, partitioned at the thirty-eighth degree parallel, occupied by the Soviets in the north and by the United States in the south. I hope and pray that the time will come, consistent with the freedom and liberty of those within its borders, when every partitioned nation may again join the family of United Nations.

The morally indefensible partition of Ireland ought to evoke a protest not alone from a sympathetic world, but from an understanding world. To retain the partition of Ireland is foolhardy when she alone, in proximity to quaking Europe, is untouched by communism.

"Divide and rule" were the military tactics of the Caesars and in their wake lay strewn the remnants of once mighty powers and world empires.

Today the world is threatened with those same tactics by the Soviets who have spread their tenacious tentacles over most of eastern Europe and northern and central Asia.

Lovers of liberty and righteousness cannot afford to permit Ireland to be the latest victim of "divide and conquer." A united Ireland would be an impregnable fortress against the onslaughts of communism with all its insidious works and deceitful pomps. Ireland stands as a flaming torch of freedom in a world threatened with communism. If given its unity and freedom of action, Ireland will throw its beam of faith and determination over land and sea to enlighten this spiritually darkened world, sorely in need of guidance.

Throughout the free world people are gathered to refresh in their minds and hearts the memory of St. Patrick and of his labors, to catch if they can, some spark of the love and faith which produced such labors, such fidelity, such zeal, not only in the saint himself, but in those who followed his footsteps.

It is more than 1,500 years since Patrick, captured by pagan Irish, was brought to Ireland to work as a shepherd tending the flocks on the hillsides. The churches he built, the schools and monasteries that he founded, multiplied over the land until it seemed there was no longer room to contain them and they overflowed on to the Continent of Europe.

Hosts of Irish missionaries trained in the monasteries and the schools of Erin's isle took with them to distant shores the faith and the lore which filled the island. With knowledge secular and divine they became the counsellors of kings and emperors, teachers of whole nations. Even today, Irish priests go forth carrying the message of Christ and of Patrick to Africa, to China, to Iraq, to Australia. From the earliest of them venturing across the channel into continental Europe, to the latest young priest from Maynooth setting sail for a parish in some backlands, they are the fruit of Patrick's planting.

From the days of gentle St. Patrick, to our present time, the Irish have played a part in world history out of all proportion to their comparatively small numbers.

There was a time in history when Ireland remained outside the path of the conqueror, the Roman legions overran the Continent and dominated even Britain. They did not cross the Irish Sea and Ireland was left free to develop its own civilization, its own native culture, its own illustrious schools. After the downfall of Rome, it was to Ireland that the civilized world looked for spiritual and intellectual succor. And again when Christian civilization was all but destroyed by the barbarian invasions which brought on the real dark ages, Ireland became the sanctuary and refuge of learning and culture, when to know the Greek language was a sure indication that the scholar was either an Irishman or had had an Irish teacher.

And it became the historic role of Irishmen to bring back to the continent of Europe the light which had almost disappeared, to relight the lamps of civilization. Ireland, the land of saints and scholars may have to reassume her ancient role in these distracted times, when men are trying to substitute might for right, to substitute material goods for spiritual values. Strong forces are seeking to drive God out of the world and to set up in his stead the false gods of money and power.

The Irish have always had a genius for spiritual values. In their entire history they have opposed the false philosophies which have often distored men's sense of proportion.

Driven from their native heath, by conditions imposed upon them by an unjust aggressor, Irishman have spread throughout the world and carried with them the same love of liberty and justice, the same hatred of oppression, the same reckless pursuit of an ideal, the same love of culture and learning, characteristic of their entire history.

Millions of the faithful Irish laity as well as priests and missionaries have streamed out from that tiny island carrying with them into their new homes beyond the seas, the faith their fathers received from St. Patrick. They have gone, and the faith and the church and the school always went with them.

The Irish are not invaders, not greedy of others' territory but they have ever been willing despite the cost, to fight the battle of freedom for others as well as for themselves.

From the year 1000 down to our own times, Irishmen have fought in what seemed a hopeless cause and against terrific odds for the very principles of liberty and justice upon which the American Nation was founded. Theirs would have been a lost cause at home if it had not been for the fact that they kept aglow their love and enthusiasm for liberty, truth, and justice.

Despite the severest handicaps imposed by tyranny and persecution, Ireland has built, from its own blood and sweat and tears, a nation which today is among the most stable in the world. If you want testimony of this, you may find it in the fact that the United States recently raised our diplomatic mission to full ambassadorial status.

On this feast of St. Patrick, every Irishman will acclaim with me this recognition by our Government that Ireland has found her place in the sun. One thing yet remains, however, before the full flowing of Ireland, and that, as I said before, is the reunion of the North and the South.

Resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars of Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 13, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Post Commander Charles D. Vocalis, of Greater Atlanta Post, No. 390, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, forwarding to me a copy of a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the members at a meeting held on March 7, 1950.

This resolution relates to a proposed reduction of employees of the Veterans' Administration, to be effective April 11, 1950.

In order that Members may have the benefit of the views of this post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding this important matter, I am inserting the resolution herewith:

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE AT REGULAR MEETING OF GREATER ATLANTA POST, NO. 390, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, CONVENED ON MARCH 7, 1950

Whereas further reduction of number of employees of the Veterans' Administration has been ordered because of an alleged reduction in the budget; and

Whereas it has been alleged that this reduction is to be made effective April 11, 1950, to prevent a more drastic reduction in July 1950, indicating that a further reduction will be announced in June 1950; and

Whereas the reduction to be effective April 11, 1950, will result in a drastic reduction in the number of employees in the claims and medical services under the jurisdiction of the Georgia regional office while no reduction but, in fact, an increase, in the number of employees, as distinguished from positions, will be effected in one or more other services, and it is assumed that the same will apply to other regional offices; and

Whereas it is believed that the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of veterans, as a whole, is that the most important services of the Veterans' Administration are those rendered by the claims and medical services; and

Whereas it is further believed that any reduction in the present staff of the Veterans' Administration claims and medical services will impair these important and essential functions; and

Wherefore, these statements hath been heard with attentive ears: Now be it

Resolved by the members of Greater Atlanta Post, No. 390, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting this, the 7th day of March in the year of our Lord, 1950, That—

1. A representative or representatives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States be called upon to personally bespeak the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, chairman of the United States Senate Civil Service and Post Office Committee and chairman of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of preventing or attempting to prevent reduction in personnel of the Veterans' Administration claims and medical services.

2. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States formulate and recommend any legislation to prevent or discourage future unwarranted reductions in the Veterans' Administration claims and medical services if it should be necessary and appropriate to do so: Be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted through customary channels for effectuating the purposes intended and that copies be mailed direct to all of Georgia's United States Senators and Representatives and the Veterans of Foreign Wars national rehabilitation director and legislative officer.

Certified:

JAMES G. HOOPER,
Post Adjutant.

Michigan State College—A Land-Grant College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herein a statement with particular reference to the Michigan State College, one of the finest educational institutions of the country.

I am particularly proud of the Michigan State College, located at East Lansing, in my congressional district. This college, under the leadership of President John A. Hannah, has established itself as one of the most progressive colleges of its type in America.

The legislature of 1855 passed an act which provided for the establishment of a State agricultural school, and appropriated $40,000 and 22 sections of salt spring lands for the purpose of purchasing land for the site of the new school, and for providing the necessary buildings and equipment.

The school was formally opened and dedicated May 13, 1857, at East Lansing, the site of the present college.

This was the first agricultural college in America and, largely as a result of its leadership, the Federal Congress in 1862 passed, and President Lincoln signed, the United States Land Grant College Act.

All income from the sale of the land appropriated to the college was to be invested by the State in safe securities yielding not less than 5 percent annually, and the State was "to keep the same invested, to constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished; and the annual interest shall be regularly applied under the direction of the State board of agriculture, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of the State agricultural college, where the leading objective shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

In regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration early in 1946, it was provided that, where land-grant colleges submitted cost estimates for the adjusted tuition rate, land-grant funds received from the Federal Government for instruction or teaching should be deducted in figuring the cost of tuition to be paid by the Veterans' Administration for the training of veterans.

The land-grant colleges began a series of conferences with the Veterans' Administration, in order to have this regulation changed or amended in such a way as to no longer compel the deduction of such funds in determining the adjusted rate of tuition. However, the Veterans' Administration refused to amend or change its regulation. Therefore, in order to remove the injustice and inequity of the Veterans' Administration's ruling, H. R. 7057 was introduced in the House. This was a bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to computation of estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions.

It was self-evident that, if H. R. 7057 was not passed, the total deficit of the land-grant schools would have to be made up either by additional appropriations from the United States Congress, the State legislatures, or increase the future tuition under the GI bill; and failure to pass this bill would be taking money out of one pocket to put in the other, just robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Everybody concedes that the Michigan State College has done a fine job on behalf of the GI. This college has a claim filed against it by the Federal Government, of around $500,000. The claim has varied from $130,000 to $500,000. If H. R. 7057 were not passed, the Michigan State College, its student body with its fine educational program, would suffer immeasurably. This bill would correct the inequities against State colleges that took the income on their endowment fund as a part of the tuition of the veterans.

I have watched the growth of the Michigan State College with particular interest. It is, as stated above, the first agricultural college established in America. It has grown remarkably in attendance and in efficiency, and stands today, under the leadership of President John A. Hannah, as one of the finest educational institutions in the country.

I was very happy when this bill passed the House yesterday by a vote of 245 yeas to 101 nays.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding rural electrification by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at its annual meeting in Chicago on March 6, 1950. I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2¾ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CLYDE T. ELLIS, EXECUTIVE MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL MEETING, STEVENS HOTEL, CHICAGO, MARCH 6, 1950

Mr. President, members of NRECA, and guests, this convention will be unique. It is tailored in detail to your expressed preferences. In your resolutions, regional and national, and in your post-convention questionnaires of last year, you indicated your desire for more audience participation and fewer speeches. You indicated some of the topics you wanted discussed.

All of that is in store for you exactly as you ordered it. For instance, nearly half of the time will be devoted to actual audience or group participation.

Since our rural-electrification program is truly "of the people, by the people, and for the people," perhaps we should strive to be the most democratic of national organizations. All our efforts, singly and together, all our hopes of future years, are justified by the conviction that each of our more than 3,000,000 members makes his or her contribution beyond a mere apathetic acceptance of service. Thus alone can we succeed.

During the next 12 months, almost a million rural people will attend our nearly 1,000 annual meetings in 45 States, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska. Out of this meeting should come much that will be helpful to you in conducting those meetings.

RURAL TELEPHONES

At New York last year you decided in favor of an all-out drive to extend the REA principle into the field of rural telephones, because phones are necessary to report electric outages quickly and because not many more farmers had efficient telephone service than had electric service in 1935. Not only did Congress pass the bill, but it approved administrative funds and loan funds approved to start the program.

The farmers of our country are eternally indebted to every Member of the Congress who withstood strong pressure to inaugurate that new service. We are indebted particularly to those able statesmen who initiated the bills and led the fights in their respective Houses, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Congressman BOB POAGE, of Texas.

For the next fiscal year the Bureau of the Budget has requested Congress to provide for the REA telephone program administrative funds totaling $2,100,000, plus $175,000 Solicitor's funds, and $50,000,000 in loan funds. Your elected legislative committee appeared before the House committee a few days ago in support of those items.

NEEDS FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

At New York you asked for an increase in the budget request for rural electrification administrative funds. It was approved.

Your legislative committee has now asked Congress to approve the budget requests for REA's electrification program next year, $7,425,000 for administrative funds, $559,400 for the Solicitor's office, and $400,000,000 for loan funds. Your recent annual survey of all systems indicates that you will need $4 2,000,000 in loan funds for next fiscal year. However, percentage-wise, the figures were so close that your committee, in supporting the loan item, told the House committee it was asking no increase over the budget request.

We provided the Congress with other valuable information from your survey questionnaires this year. You said you were serving 3,109,286 farms and other consumers on January 1. You said you expected to serve 1,823,675 more. Then our task of connecting the unserved in our areas is only 63 percent complete.

But note this. You connected 594,696 new consumers in 1949. Yet, you still planned to connect within 276,943 of as many as you planned to connect a year ago. Our systems are still growing in number and size, as our population increases.

But for some reason our loan applications are slowing down. Since we have undertaken to serve all who want service within our system areas, it would seem that we should endeavor to keep our construction programs speeded up until we are much nearer the goal.

You said in your survey that you would have to invest 23 percent of your total funds next year in heavying-up existing facilities. You said you would have to produce more of your own power.

Twenty-two percent of you reported a present power shortage. Twenty-six percent of you don't have enough power in sight. Forty-three percent say your present suppliers impose restrictions, involuntary servitude clauses, in your contracts prohibiting free use of the energy you buy from them. Thirty-four percent of you say your power costs went up in the past 12 months.

We told the committee this year, as we did last—and as you directed—that we will have to invest an increasingly higher percentage of whatever loan funds are available to us in our own generation and transmission facilities. In many areas further construction of distribution lines must await development of our own power sources. Either inadequate power is available or its high costs or restrictions are retarding area coverage.

VICIOUS POWER COMPANY ATTACKS

While the farmers' demands on REA for generation loans are and have been strong, the power-company pressures on REA against them have been stronger and often bitter.

We believe the recently introduced Thomas-Tackett bills to change the generation-transmission loan procedures would do great injury to the rural electrification program. While there is probably little danger of them being passed as independent bills, we have feared a possible move to tie them on as riders to the agriculture appropriation bill.

It is no secret that our generating program has been under fire in the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in recent weeks. The hearings were closed, so we don't know much of what happened.

Your legislative committee and I ran into this trouble when we appeared before that committee. As we entered the room President Frank Wilkes, of Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., was sitting outside the door checking the transcript of testimony he had given. A few minutes later some of the committee members read to us statements which he and other power-company officials had made against us. Evidently they had thrown everything, plus the kitchen sink, at us. Five power-company presidents and vice presidents, accompanied by several others—for moral support, I suppose—had testified against us for between 2 and 3 hours. We had no way of knowing what they had said except for the few quotations which committee members read to us from the transcript. Under the House committee rule we are not permitted to even see the record until it is published sometime later. It hasn't been released yet. Nor is a witness permitted to reveal what he told the committee until the record is published.

We stayed much longer than we were scheduled, and when we had to go the committee gave us permission to file a supplemental statement answering what we knew of the power companies' charges. We spent the next 5 days and nights preparing our 51-page reply.

Well, your committee did know by then a little more about what the companies had told the House committee, for evidently Vice President Warren L. Porter, of Kansas City Power & Light Co., had promptly released his statement to the press, and the Kansas City Times had carried part of it. We got a copy.

I have that February 15 issue of the Kansas City Times here in my hand. I want to read you some of Mr. Porter's and other power company officials' quotations from it concerning one of the Missouri generation loans. What big, ugly words they used trying to frighten Congress into stopping this comparatively small farmers' generating plant: "misappropriation of funds"; "Government bureaus furthering their own ambitions"; "funds originally intended to build lines to farm homes are being diverted to build steam plants"; "distortion of the intent of Congress"; "the industry is in a fight for survival"; "a move intended to destroy the Kansas City company."

But that's not the worst Mr. Porter and others told the committee. They said there is not now and never has been any power shortage in the Missouri generation co-op areas. Testifying a few days earlier before the Interior subcommittee against the same northwestern Missouri Generating Co-op, of Savannah—that testimony has been released—Mr. Porter said, and I quote from page 1279 of the hearings:

"Kansas City Power & Light Co. and four other utilities have provided ample power for these seven distributing cooperatives since their inception."

Missouri farmers know how incorrect both of his statements were. They are typical of the way power companies distort the facts before congressional committees.

ATCHISON-HOLT CASE DISTORTED

Take the case of the farmers of Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative, of Rock Port, Mo., one of the seven members of Northwestern Electric Power Co-op. Their co-op has never had enough power. It has spent several hundred thousand dollars following the power companies around with its own transmission lines to pick up any available kilowatts. Examples: 1. This same Kansas City Power & Light Co. and St. Joseph Light & Power Co. together sold it 300 kilowatts but the co-op had to build facilities to get it costing nearly $7,000. Ten months later, in November 1948, the co-op was ordered to quit taking power there and hasn't been able to use those facilities since.

2. St. Joseph Power & Light denied the co-op power late in 1947, claiming shortage. Finally, it sold the co-op a limited, inadequate amount subject to availability, to be delivered on the extreme edge of co-op's territory, provided co-op would agree to not buy power from anyone else. Co-op spent $400,000 building 40 miles of 33,000-volt transmission line—completed in December—to deliver the power to its own load centers, and when it got it there it wouldn't work. The voltages were too low because of the antiquated, overloaded power-company lines back of the pick-up point. Result: farmers' motors are burning out, radios won't play, and the farm wives are discarding their electric ranges for bottled gas.

3. Meanwhile, the power companies have been charging co-op 11 mills per kilowatt for power and spite lining its territory and taking its best potential consumers at the same time.

President John Buck and Manager Bruce Gibbs, of Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative, are sitting here beside me. Stand up, fellows, and let the folks have a look at you. President Buck, have I correctly stated the fact about your power supply? He says, "You told the absolute truth."

Still, Mr. Porter says here:

"Kansas City Power & Light Co. and four other utilities have provided ample power for these seven distributing cooperatives since their inception."

Will Congress believe these selfish Power Trust distorters of the truth or will Congress believe the people who seek only a little power to use?

The newspapers say the St. Joseph Power & Light Co. got into Washington to testify for these farmers, too. I have here in my hand a clipping from the February 15 issue of the St. Joseph News-Press. It quotes Vice President Douglas Merrifield as telling Congress:

"* * * the companies feel that the farmer is as much a victim of this plan to socialize the electric industry as the companies whose economic existence will be jeopardized by subsidized competition.

"In a very real sense I truly believe Administrator Wickard is guilty of what is tantamount to a betrayal of the great trust in which he is held by all farmers in permitting this slick and sly deal to be consummated."

Why didn't you tell Congress the facts, Mr. Merrifield, about how your company has been treating our several thousand farm members of Atchison-Holt Electric Cooperative? But then your trip would have been wasted.

BOONE ELECTRIC CASE DISTORTED

Now let's take the case of the farmers of Boone Electric Cooperative, of Columbia, Mo. It is a member of the Central Electric Power Cooperative, of Linn, Mo., another one which the power companies are trying to kill. Missouri Power & Light Co. is one of Boone Electric's two suppliers. The power company's assistant to the president, J. D. James, testified against the generating co-ops along with Wilkes, Porter, and Merrifield. Actually Mr. James did not say Boone Electric had had adequate power but other power company officials before and after him said it of the general area, and he sat there and didn't deny it.

Boone Electric has two contracts with Missouri Power & Light, both subject to cancellation on 30 days' notice. On one contract, for the month ending February 15, it had to pay the company almost 2 cents per kilowatt-hour for wholesale power, and on the other it had to pay 2.3 cents per kilowatt-hour. (Its power will cost it less than a third of that from the farmers' own generating co-op—about 29 percent to be exact.)

The power company limits the farmers at both co-op substations.

Boone Electric is supplying single-phase service to a rock-wool plant. The wool plant recently wanted three-phase service. The co-op figured out a way to provide it. The power company heard about it and told the co-op if it did the power company would cut the co-op off completely. The wool plant is still getting single-phase service.

Missouri Power & Light has indicated it would sell the co-op more power provided the co-op would agree to a 50-kilowatt load limitation, involuntary-servitude clause. The co-op has refused to sign it. Referring to this limitation, the president of Missouri Power & Light wrote Mr. Wickard on January 11, "We have no apology to make for this restriction."

So the co-op's power situation is desperate. Its farm wives even have an I Won't Wash on Monday Club out there and here is the certificate they use. Mr. James testified on a Monday, before the Interior Subcommittee. Don't you know these women would have enjoyed washing him that Monday?

Director Les Crews and Manager Joe Martin, of Boone Electric, are also sitting here beside me. Stand up fellows and make a bow. Director Crews, tell our people whether these things I've just said about your power supply situation are true.

Mr. Crews said, "That is the truth."

Is it possible that in this free country of ours Congress might believe those who would wreck our program when the tens of thousands of our relatively inarticulate farm people affected know the facts to be otherwise? If that happens it will surely shake the confidence of many of our best people.

POWER COMPANIES GET UNPRECEDENTED SENATE HEARING

The power company officials are also quoted here in the paper as saying they would take their fight against the farmers right on over to the Senate, if the House didn't stop these recent generation-transmission loans. I guess they did, for we have learned that a joint meeting of the Agriculture Subcommittee and the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has been called for Thursday of next week, March 16, to hear the power-company complaints against these generating loans. They want stop orders on many loans already made to generating co-ops, and they want no more such loans made. Immediately affected would be the loans to generating co-ops in South Carolina, North Dakota, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Michigan, and perhaps other States. Immediately affected also would be generation loan applications from Illinois, Louisiana, South Dakota, Georgia, Iowa, and Arkansas, and possibly other States.

We have asked to be heard at this hearing, and we hope the committee will place both the power companies and us under oath. The committees should find out who is telling the truth and who is not.

We all know, and we must somehow let the country know, what the facts are. We must let the people know that these examples are not isolated cases; that they are typical of what we are now confronted with. The power companies are being grossly unfair with the farmers, with Congress, and with their country.

MICHIGAN CASE DISTORTED

Here is another one. On that same February 15, there was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which had appeared in a magazine, written by James W. Parker, president of Detroit Edison Power Co. Here are a few of his classic lines:

"But with the farm job well over 85 percent accomplished, can anybody tell me why on earth the Rural Electrification Administration should still have unexpended appropriations of $1,250,000 at their disposal?"

Is that true, Mr. Wickard? The answer is "No." REA on that date had unloaned funds on hand totaling less than one-fifth of that amount.

"Money like that," says Mr. Parker, "never goes back unspent into the Treasury; it gets spent for something. And I'll tell you what they are trying to spend it on. They are going into the transmission business and coming up with the super co-op. It's cropping up in two places in Michigan right now. This is just plain competing with money that is already invested, with lines that are already in existence."

Our Michigan farmers in the area of which he speaks have long faced a desperate power situation similar to that of the Missouri farmers. If they could ever capture an extra kilowatt up in that country, they would probably put it on display and build a resort around it.

Mr. Parker, however, concludes with an optimistic note: "I'm not at all downhearted about this. It's good having a hand in trying to see to it that the public gets wise, and that's what we are out to do."

Well, if the public ever gets wise to who is making it wise and who is paying the bill, we won't be downhearted either.

It is quite obvious—even to the power companies—that the farmers are rapidly being driven to the conclusion that their electric co-ops which do not have a friendly source of power supply do not have a very long life expectancy. Is it surprising that the farmers who have seen the power companies juggle power supply to kill some of their electric co-ops already now conclude that they must either generate or perish?

If the time ever comes when the power monopoly can say to the American farmer, through Government or otherwise, that he cannot produce a product which he uses on his farm—and which he may not be able to get elsewhere—if that time ever comes, our freedom and our democracy will both be lost. That danger is a very real one this morning.

Our right to produce our own power is as sacred as any other right guaranteed to us in the Constitution. Whether we do produce it or not, the right provides us with our only bargaining position in negotiating power contracts. Actually we are producing only 6 percent of all the power we use.

TRANSMISSION LINE CASES DISTORTED

The transmission-line battle is the same fight. The issue is whether we shall have a reasonable power source or whether the power companies shall be permitted to monopolize the public's power too.

Last year at New York, you resolved vigorously and eloquently for the continuation of our Government's power policy, which embraces the development of our hydro-power potential and the delivery of that power over self-liquidating Government transmission lines for sale at wholesale, at the lowest possible rates, to the load centers of public bodies, cooperatives, and private companies.

The Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, nevertheless, last year voted to eliminate most of the lines that would help us and to which the power companies objected. This was true of Reclamation, Bonneville, and SPA lines. The committee cut out Southeastern Power Marketing completely. The Senate committee added a North Dakota line, which both the local power company and we wanted.

But why did the Senate committee cut out all those lines? In each case the power companies assured the Senators that the lines were not needed; that they would deliver the hydro power to the agencies' preferred customers, including the farmers' co-ops and power districts. They led the Senators to believe they would deliver it to us at our load centers on a permanent basis without restrictions and without charge. The committee relied on their statements.

But the Senate felt otherwise. After an extended fight, it restored all of the lines but one, some of them on close votes.

However, some say there was an implied mandate in the Senate debates for Interior's power agencies to endeavor to negotiate reasonable wheeling arrangements with the power companies, in lieu of lines to be built.

But what happened then? The power companies evidently figured they could ignore their promises to Congress, that they could get the power of the dams anyway, and on their own terms. They reneged. For instance, the two big Oklahoma companies, both parties to the without-charge delivery promises, promptly demanded contracts of SPA to take the hydropower—but refused and still refuse to agree to deliver power to us at our load centers, even in their own areas. We understand great pressure is being brought on the Secretary of the Interior to approve the contracts which they have submitted to him with those refusals

in them. They are also demanding heavy tolls for letting SPA power pass over such lines as they have. If Congress is going to give the power companies a monopoly to haul us over their toll bridges, it ought to make them at least agree to deliver us all the way and not dump us in the river. The power companies are not keeping their word with Congress.

The Montana Power Co. is negotiating with both Bonneville and Reclamation and demanding a 50-percent toll, one kilowatt-hour out of every two that would pass over its toll bridges for delivery to us.

Representatives of our cooperatives and power districts in Reclamation, Bonneville, SPA, and Southeastern Power Administration areas have already been before the House Interior Subcommittee in support of the agencies' budget requests for power facilities. Most of the agencies' requests for next year are inadequate. Many power company officials have testified at length before that committee. Those hearings have been published and we have read what they said. They said Government power lines are not needed in Montana, Idaho, Colorado, Oklahoma, Missouri, and other places where we know we must have them.

However, the power companies have become more incensed over the fact that the farmers are discovering ways to effect further significant economies in their generating co-ops wherever they can integrate them with hydro power like the power companies do. The companies just can't stand the fact that some of our rates will then approximate Bonneville's. Shows them up.

You who are not familiar with the SPA area will be interested to know how the generating co-op Government hydro integration works. SPA does not have and will never have enough hydropower to go around, not even enough to serve its preferred customers. All of its power will never exceed 20 percent of the requirements of the area.

Knowing this, the farmers of each generating co-op area have been studying ways to generate their own power for years. Only when power-exchange agreements with SPA became possible did most of the half dozen generating co-ops become feasible.

The Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corp., of Fayetteville, will achieve the lowest rate, so note what happens there. The farmers employed one of the best electrical engineering firms in the country to make what has been a 3-year study. Here is the plan. The farmers will set their own generator right under SPA's backbone transmission line and right on top of the coal and gas fields; and, I might add, in an area where the power companies which are fighting us, Mr. Wilkes and his group, now restrict our use of the power they sell us. Co-op will use a 30,000 kilowatt unit because its loads will require that much in 10 years, and because there is efficiency in the larger unit. No stand-by will be required because of the integration with SPA, and this will be a tremendous saving. Co-op will operate its plant constantly, in practice selling its excess at a profit to SPA. (Technically, co-op sells all its power to SPA and buys back its requirements.) SPA needs the excess in order to store water in off-peak hours and seasons, thus firming up substantial blocks of its secondary power which would otherwise have to be sold to some big power system at dump prices. So SPA makes money on the deal too. Co-op then buys from SPA whatever power it needs, whether more or less than it generates.

To bring the cost down further, it was found that there would be savings in the farmers leasing their transmission lines to SPA to operate in connection with its other lines. The power exchange contracts are for 40 years. The lease is for 40 years. The estimated life of the lines is about 40 years. Therefore, the rents from the lines must amortize them in 40 years. SPA requested and got an option to purchase the lines for a nominal price when they are amortized—upon the approval of Congress, of course. Could anything be fairer than that?

The rate of the current to the distribution co-ops will be under 4 mills, delivered at the load centers, without restrictions on its use. This will be the lowest or one of the lowest rates to a co-op in the United States.

A study of one of the distribution co-ops, Arkansas Valley Electric at Ozark, shows that under the last best wholesale power offers of the power companies the co-op can never hope to reach all the farmers of its rugged territory, but under this plan it can do so and still be in the black.

The power companies charge that SPA would thus ultimately own lines which Congress has denied to it. That is not true. On the contrary, this arrangement will obviate SPA building some lines which Congress has approved. If Congress doesn't want SPA to take title to any of these lines when the time comes, all it need do is refuse the authority.

This power company drive against both the farmer's right to generate and his right to purchase Federal hydro power over self-liquidating Government transmission lines is no more nor less than an effort to make him purchase whatever power he would be able to get from the power companies on their own terms and conditions, and with all the deadly restrictions they would impose. If the power companies succeed in this effort, they will wreck America's rural electrification program.

Our farmers in each affected area are practically unanimous in their support of the requested Federal agency transmission facilities which would deliver the hydro power to our load centers. Just as the power companies have banded together to kill each line, we must fight side by side 3,000,000 strong to save it.

POWER PROJECTS

Our hydro-power project troubles are not with the transmission lines alone. Just last week we learned that the Chief of Army Engineers had eliminated the power facilities in four dams to be built on the Licking River in Kentucky—in another power desert, in the area of one of our new generating co-ops. We are advised that both the district office at Cincinnati and the Board of Engineers at Washington had approved 180,000 kilowatt capacity for the four dams. We hear that the power features were eliminated because there was opposition. The Hoover Commission recommended that the river-basin functions of the Army engineers be transferred to the Department of the Interior. I'm sure Interior would not have knocked the power out.

The prospects for the St. Lawrence project, I am happy to report, are looking a little better. Many industries of the Great Lakes region which once opposed it are now favorable. Meanwhile, the power situation in the Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and New England area is becoming relatively more critical. House hearings are scheduled for April. On the Senate side, an attempt will probably be made to add the St. Lawrence to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill when it comes up in a few weeks.

ORGANIZATION COUNTS

One thing is certain: We've got to stick together and help each other on all our power problems. It makes no difference whether the fight is over our right to generate, over a transmission line, or over a power project, it is the same issue. A battle lost anywhere will hurt all the rest, including TVA. No one of our power programs can be much more secure than all the others.

That voice of the power companies, Electrical World magazine, calls for the defeat of Congressmen who support the Government's power program. It says George Gallup has "found that only 24 percent of the people think that the United States Government should own the power companies." That is not and never has been an issue. The United States Government is not in the retail power business anywhere, not even in TVA, and no one that I know of is advocating that it get in. I don't believe 24 percent of our farmers, or even 5 percent, favor that. But that is the way Electrical World deducts that the majority is opposed to the Federal hydro-wholesale power program. We know that a great majority of the farmers, and we believe a substantial majority of all the people, favor the present power program.

Electrical World concludes its editorial of January 16 with the demand that "the Congressmen who now vote in opposition to the will of the majority must be defeated in future elections."

If the power companies force this issue they will be sorry.

PEOPLE ARE PITIFULLY OVERCHARGED FOR POWER

In 1948, according to Federal Power Commission figures, the electric utilities overcharged the American people $2,097,071,724 by comparison with TVA rates—which also includes substantial taxes and income-tax equivalents.

The farmers' electric cooperatives and power districts paid the commercial power companies $30,681,759 for 3,191,543,216 kilowatt-hours of power last fiscal year, at an average cost of 9.6 mills. (I reckon we helped them some with their income taxes, too.) The average kilowatt-hour cost of all the power we purchased from the Federal agencies last year was 5 mills. If the 57 percent of our systems which purchased their power from the commercial companies last year had been able to buy their power at the average Federal rate, they would have saved $14,724,043.

CONCLUSION

These are but a few of the facts behind the one-sided cold war that is being waged against the farmers by the greedy power companies. The farmers don't want to fight anybody. They would like that war to end. They want to finish the rural-electrification job.

Like any democratic people, we desire peace. But we have no intention of forfeiting our freedom.

Our job of electrifying rural America is far from finished; the program is not yet safe from those who would destroy it; the enemy is making its most determined drive to eliminate us; and we must have the active participation of every farm leader and every farm family all the way from the meter box to the ballot box if necessary.

Accomplishments of the American Medical Profession and of Wisconsin Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of the 12-point program of the American Medical Association and the accomplishments of physicians of the State of Wisconsin along each of the 12 lines. I also ask unanimous consent

to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, the text of the program of the American Medical Association and the record of Wisconsin achievements as printed in the medical forum section of the Wisconsin Medical Journal in its issue of January 1950.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

PROGRESS OF WISCONSIN MEDICINE

Mr. President, throughout the public debate on the issue of the future health program of our Nation, I have emphasized that the medical profession of the United States is more than adequate and competent to meet the health needs of the American people without political nostrums—without socialized medicine.

I have emphasized that Great Britain's sorry experiences with socialized medicine underline the importance of our avoidance of European type political medicine. We here on this blessed continent have achieved the highest medical standards for our people in the world, thanks to America's private practitioners.

It is estimated that more than 60,000,000 persons now have hospital benefit insurance; 35,000,000 have surgical protection; 15,000,000 have medical benefit policies. It is with deep pride that I note that the State of Wisconsin has pioneered to provide prepaid health care. Nearly one million people in the Badger State are enrolled in various plans—the Blue Shield plan of the State Medical Society, the plan of the Milwaukee County Medical Society, Blue Cross, and so forth.

In the January 1950 issue of the Wisconsin Medical Journal published at Madison by the State medical society, there is an excellent statement on the 12-point program of the American Medical Association on such vital issues as research, insurance, mental hygiene, veterans medical care, and so forth. In this issue of this fine publication there is, moreover, a point-by-point analysis of the way by which the Wisconsin medical profession has pioneered along every single one of these dozen paths recommended by the American Medical Association.

Not only is this an excellent commentary on the pioneering vision, the industry, the energy, the resourcefulness of Wisconsin practitioners, but it shows that the American Medical Association has not simply set up paper plans but rather that its program is based upon reality, upon active measures which it will dynamically continue.

This 12-point program certainly belies the unfounded charges which have been constantly hurled at the AMA by the political quacks who are seeking to foist socialized medicine on our country. If one were to believe those political quacks, one would think that the doctors of America had no future program, no active interest in expanded medical services, no concern with the people's welfare, particularly of folks in the lower and middle brackets.

But let the record now speak for itself. Let the Wisconsin record and the AMA record demonstrate as I have previously demonstrated the utter falsity of the charges which the Socialist-minded Democratic administration and its adherents have hurled.

[From the Wisconsin Medical Journal of January 1950]

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION 12-POINT PROGRAM

WISCONSIN LISTS ACCOMPLISHMENTS ON MANY POINTS

A Federal Department of Health

1. Creation of a Federal Department of Health of cabinet status with a Secretary who is a doctor of medicine, and the coordination and integration of all Federal health activities under this Department, except for the military activities of the medical services of the armed forces.

Wisconsin: This is a national development, but one that has been recommended by the AMA since 1884.

Medical research

2. Promotion of medical research through a National Science Foundation with grants to private institutions which have facilities and personnel sufficient to carry on qualified research.

Wisconsin: Both the University of Wisconsin Medical School and Marquette University School of Medicine receive grants from the United States Public Health Service for medical research. Over $25,000 yearly from State funds goes to the University of Wisconsin for cancer research, $55,000 annually from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation with added amounts to several departments for related research, and many thousands of dollars from trust funds and bequests are earmarked for various specific research. Similar amounts are available to Marquette University from the United States Public Health Service, bequests, and trust funds. County-wide research projects by local medical societies are encouraged by the State society.

Voluntary insurance

3. Further development and wider coverage by voluntary hospital and medical care plans to meet the costs of illness, with extension as rapidly as possible into rural areas. Aid through the States to the indigent and medically indigent by the utilization of voluntary hospital and medical care plans with local administration and local determination of needs.

Wisconsin: The State medical society began experiments with voluntary prepaid hospital and surgical care plans as early as 1937. Experience with these plans resulted in the formation of Wisconsin Physicians Service (Blue Shield) in 1946. On December 1, 1949, it provided surgical, maternity, and medical coverage to more than 160,000 persons. The Nation's first medical society sponsored voluntary plan operated through private insurance carriers was developed by the society. It is the Wisconsin plan, which now covers more than 225,000 persons. A local Milwaukee County Medical Society plan reports over 195,000 coverage in Milwaukee County. Both the Blue Shield plan and the Wisconsin plan make their coverage available to people in rural areas, single-family units, and individual subscribers.

Medical care authority with consumer representation

4. Establishment in each State of a medical-care authority to receive and administer funds with proper representation of medical and consumer interest.

Wisconsin: This concerns the establishment within each State government of an agency to receive and administer any funds coming to the State as the result of Federal legislation for the medical care of the medically indigent as part of an over-all program to provide comprehensive medical care for the American people on a locally administered basis.

New facilities

5. Encouragement of prompt development of diagnostic facilities, health centers, and hospital services, locally originated, for rural and other areas in which the need can be shown and with local administration and control as provided by the National Hospital Survey and Construction Act or by suitable private agencies.

Wisconsin: The Hospital Survey and Construction Act is administered in Wisconsin by the State board of health. At present 35 hospital projects are actually under way, mostly in rural areas, and a total of $6,000,000 in Federal aid has been allotted to these projects. The medical society has supported this program and legislation to improve its administration. It has also sponsored legislation for the development of diagnostic and convalescent facilities for rheumatic fever and cancer victims.

Public health

6. Establishment of local public-health units and services and incorporation in health centers and local public-health units of such services as communicable-disease control, vital statistics, environmental sanitation, control of venereal diseases, maternal and child hygiene, and public-health laboratory services. Remuneration of health officials commensurate with their responsibility.

Wisconsin: The efforts of the State board of health in the field of communicable disease control has made Wisconsin one of the healthiest States in the Nation. Small-pox, typhoid, and diphtheria are virtually nonexistent, the State has one of the lowest venereal-disease rates in the Nation and there is every prospect that tuberculosis may be completely eradicated in little more than a decade. A new State laboratory of hygiene to provide additional modern laboratory services to rural physicians was authorized by the legislature at the request of the State medical society. The society is continuously supporting the establishment of local health units in county and city-county areas, and legislation to insure adequate salaries for public-health officers has been sponsored by the society.

Mental hygiene

7. The development of a program of mental hygiene with aid to mental-hygiene clinics in suitable areas.

Wisconsin: Since 1941 a mental health and hygiene program has been underway in Wisconsin through the State board of health with the active support of the State medical society. Up to $75,000 a year in Federal funds are used to demonstrate what child-guidance clinics can do, and local initiative takes over to maintain the clinic thereafter. Twelve such clinics are now operated in the State as the result of this program.

Health education

8. Health-education programs administered through suitable State and local health and medical agencies to inform the people of the available facilities and of their own responsibilities in health care.

Wisconsin: The State board of health and the State medical society devote a majority of their efforts to educational programs to inform the people of available facilities and personal responsibility for health care. Health councils, health meetings, and school health programs, as well as weekly radio and newspaper presentations on health, have accomplished much in the better education of the State's citizens. The medical society's radio program, the March of Medicine, carries the health-education campaign to the people via 25 radio stations.

Chronic diseases and the aged

9. Provisions of facilities for care and rehabilitation of the aged and those with chronic disease and various other groups not covered by existing proposals.

Wisconsin: A detailed study of Wisconsin's needs for the chronically ill and aged has been conducted by the State medical society. The resulting publicity has created considerable public support for legislation offered in the current session by the society seeking permissive laws for the building of county infirmaries for the aged and chronically ill, and State aid for their maintenance. Many counties solved the problem on a local basis, but others need State aid, and the so-

ciety is giving its support in every way possible.

Veterans' medical care

10. Maintenance of existing high standards of medical care for veterans, including extension of facilities where the need can be shown and, where practicable, care of the veteran in his own community by a physician of his own choice.

Wisconsin: The veterans' medical service agency of the State medical society has enabled thousands of Wisconsin veterans to obtain medical care at Government expense through the physicians of their choice. In the last 1½ years more than 21,000 Wisconsin veterans have been served through this agency. The veterans' hospitals in Wisconsin are closely affiliated with the medical schools of the University of Wisconsin and Marquette University, as well as private hospitals.

Industrial medicine

11. Greater emphasis on the program of industrial medicine, with increased safeguards against industrial hazards and prevention of accidents occurring on the highway, home, and on the farm.

Wisconsin: The State's industrial health program is one of the most outstanding in the Nation. Through cooperation between the State board of health's industrial hygiene unit, in-plan industrial health clinics are held for hundreds of workers and many employers. Great progress in safety and health education has been made as a result. The society's committee on rural health and accident prevention has carried on a constant campaign for safety on the farm, highway, and home. Through cooperation with the State workmen's compensation department, the society insures that most of the State's industrial workers have the benefit of free choice of physician in industrial accident cases.

Medical education and personnel

12. Adequate support with funds free from political control, domination, and regulation of the medical, dental, and nursing schools and other institutions necessary for the training of specialized personnel required in the provision and distribution of medical care.

Wisconsin: Better distribution of physicians through the preceptorship system of the University of Wisconsin medical school (which has resulted in many physicians locating in rural areas), a physician's location service of the State medical society to help bring physicians to communities needing them, and legislation for the appointment of "special medical officers" in sparsely populated areas to perform public-health duties and encourage them to establish a private practice in those areas.

Medical School at Yeshiva University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Paul E. Lockwood at the third annual dinner sponsored by the society for the establishment of a medical college at Yeshiva University, held in New York City on February 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with pleasure and a feeling of privilege that I am here to greet you tonight. The task you have set of creating a medical school at Yeshiva University is a great contribution to our society. All men must recognize in it profound significance and a humanitarian value of a very high order.

The Jewish people down the centuries—as much as or perhaps more than any other group—have contributed richly to the development of the art of healing man's physical ills.

From the earliest times, from the earliest Biblical periods, we find a recognition amongst the Jews of the principle of a science of medicine based upon experience and the laws of nature. Of this we find ample evidence in the Bible and in that great body of religious literature known to all men as the Talmud. As the first in the Western World to carry to mankind the principles of mercy and charity, the Jewish people naturally have produced distinguished healers and leaders of medicine. In the Dark Ages when the natural sciences were undeveloped and man looked to magic and superstition for his bodily well-being, it was Jewish men of science who were bold enough to search out the secrets of life and to seek means of checking sickness and death. It is enough to mention the great name of Maimonides, physician, philosopher, and interpreter of the law, to exemplify the great role of the Jewish people as pioneers in medical science.

Throughout the Middle Ages, when the lot of Jewry was so tragic, even their detractors came to Jews—sometimes secretively—with their problems of health. Rulers and kings, lords of realms, whatever their attitude in secular affairs in regard to Jews, were constrained to confer privileges on physicians of the Jewish group out of their self-interest for the health of themselves and their people. Even in ancient Spain, it was the Jews and the Moors who carried the inspiration of the search for truth in the fields of the natural and physical sciences.

It is not, therefore, surprising to find that the Jewish people who have unfailingly demonstrated an instinct for learning, should have continued to make such valuable contributions in the cultural development of western civilization. Nor is it surprising that a group which has always been so keenly sensitive of social responsibilities, should have turned its love of learning for its own sake to the application of that learning to the conferring of benefactions upon its fellow men.

In modern times the contributions of Jewish physicians and scientists in the field of medical research have occurred and reoccurred with a frequency that is no less than astounding. The names of discoverers and developers of revolutionary approaches in the medical field, whose bearers are Jewish, are legion. It is enough to mention Dr. Paul Ehrlich, the discoverer of salvarsan; of August von Wasserman, of the famous test of that name; of Bela Schick, whose test for diphtheria has saved the lives of hundreds of thousands, to illustrate the role of the Jewish people in modern medicine.

Our own country has been blessed with a multitude of Jewish physicians and scientists. The position of the United States, at the forefront of the medical progress of the world, is undoubtedly due in large part to their contributions. Recently your university honored Dr. Selman Waksman, of Rutgers, for his outstanding discovery of streptomycin and his work in soil microbiology. He is but another link in the great company of Jewish scientists and doctors who in laboratory and hospital have unrelentingly attacked the evils of disease.

Your university, now in its fifth year as such, has already attained a high standing among the great institutions of learning in our State. Its mission and its achievements will not be complete without a school of medicine. For its sake and for the sake of all of us, we wish you well in this great venture. With your own traditions and with traditions of a great people to inspire it, the contribution that a medical school at Yeshiva University can make will be regarded in the years to come as one of the great landmarks in the history of medicine and health.

America stands today far above all other nations in matters of health and medicine. At the same time we suffer a lack of physicians. This is difficult to explain in a country of such great wealth, cultural achievement, and blessed with such great institutions of education. Nevertheless, the fact is clear that there is a great shortage of physicians—not only in the rural areas but in many of the greater cities—most particularly in the field of the general practitioner. It is most unfortunate that for many reasons, which we hope to see drastically change, our medical schools until now have not been in a position to train enough physicians to meet the needs of our people.

There have been a number of factors which have brought about this condition. Among those factors, I regret to say, has been that of discrimination, based upon race or creed. It is cheering, indeed, to realize that in a world beset with so many problems that might have diverted us from a solution of this one problem, we can now say that here is a factor that will surely be no more. Upon the recommendation of Governor Dewey, the Legislature of the State of New York has passed and put into effect laws to remove effectively such practices in the field of education. That law, I am happy to say, is already having its effect. The same progress that has been obtained by similar legislation in the field of employment we are now developing at an even more rapid rate in the field of education.

We must not forget that there are still other factors that have resulted in the curtailment of educational opportunities. One of them has been the decline of medical-school facilities during the past four decades. It is an astonishing fact that there are fewer medical schools in the United States today than there were at the turn of the century. Again, as a result of the efforts of Governor Dewey and the State administration, vigorous and direct steps have been and will continue to be taken to lift those limitations.

There has been created a great new State university. It has 11 teachers' colleges; a notable school of agriculture; the first school of labor and industrial relations in the Nation; schools of forestry, ceramics, veterinary medicine; 5 new technical institutes; a maritime college; and 6 agricultural technical institutes.

It is in the difficult field of medical education that the State university is making a great contribution. Two existing medical schools, one at Syracuse and one in Brooklyn, have been incorporated into the new university and their facilities expanded. The expansion now increases the number of medical students in the two schools by a number equal to that of an entire new medical school. So that we now have what is in number of students a new medical school, and this has been accomplished without the delays that would have been necessary in building and staffing one. These, of course, are the first few steps of a massive program upon which the State university is engaged. It is already seventh in size among the universities of the country and you rightly can be proud of it.

Government cannot solve all the problems of expanding medical education alone. The medical center of the twentieth century, with hospitals, clinics, teaching institutions, and related research programs, requires the vast endownment of private philanthropy.

The men who staff such centers, the men who impart their rich knowledge to the students, the devoted scholars who labor their lives away over the microscopes and test tubes of the laboratory do so not because they want jobs in an institution at so much a week. They dedicate themselves and their lives to an aspiration, to an ideal. They respond to leadership—not direction—and from their devotion and their dedication comes a great university.

That is the challenge that faces you who with countless other Americans aspire to create a Yeshiva university college of medicine.

Moreover, in the field of education, we will lose an invaluable tradition if we have failed to obtain a broad diversity of institution and outlook. Therefore, it is most essential that a great institution such as yours should directly make its contribution to the field of medical education. Its contribution could not—and we would not wish it to be—a total solution to the problems of discrimination and limitation of facilities in the field of medicine. By the same token, Government's contribution to that solution should not be the sole one. Our Nation and our people were built upon diversity. Our educational system should reflect that diversity and all the rich values that diversity can contribute to a culture. In this pattern Yeshiva University carries a unique responsibility and for that reason all of us have a unique responsibility to it.

Who does not feel a thrill at the prospect of a great medical center under the auspices of Yeshiva where miracles of modern science will come under the influence of a tradition of thousands of years. What entering student can fail to feel a rich spiritual exaltation in being admitted to an ancient learning—a learning that began when men in the desert cast out the idols of the barbarian—idols at whose feet the sick sought escape from death—men who, strengthened by a belief in an eternal God, sought to find for themselves the true causes of disease. What student can fail to dedicate himself in the tradition of the ancient Jewish physicians who, when the world was dark, gave treatment and even life itself to their oppressors, and did so because of their belief in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

That is why Government sponsorship is not the answer. That is why it is up to you and to all of us to labor and to give to create this great institution. Then all of us may feel some of that inspiration. It is a great cause—let us all be worthy of it.

Decision of Hong Kong Court Awarding Certain Aircraft to Chinese Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in Time magazine, March 6, 1950, entitled "Hong Kong With His Majesty's Compliments."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONG KONG WITH HIS MAJESTY'S COMPLIMENTS

In Hong Kong last week a British colonial court decided that 71 United States-made planes, formerly the property of Nationalist China, now belong to the Chinese Communists. With the aircraft (including DC-3's, five Convairs, and five four-engined Skymasters) went 20,000 tons of maintenance equipment; altogether the property was worth $30,000,000.

The planes had been operated by Nationalist China's government-owned CNAC and CATC. As Communist armies overran the mainland, the lines retreated to Hong Kong's Kai Tak airfield. There, last November, most of their Chinese personnel declared allegiance to the Communists (Time, November 21) and shooed off Nationalist officials.

To get the planes out of Communist hands, the Nationalist Government sold the property to a United States corporation headed by its good friend of Flying Tiger fame, Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, who operated Nationalist China's other air line (CAT). But when Chennault tried to take possession, Hong Kong authorities blocked him. There were reports of Communist threats to British business interests; one story was that the Communists threatened to confiscate one British business in Shanghai for every plane that went into Chennault's hands.

Meanwhile, there was an unexplained delay in a final court hearing. Then, in January, His Majesty's Government recognized Communist China. In last week's decision, Chief Justice Sir Leslie Gibson ruled that British recognition established Red ownership of the disputed planes. "Any question as to sovereignty * * * of a foreign state," he said, "is a question on which the court must be guided by the attitude of His Majesty's Government. * * * Our state cannot speak with two voices on such a matter, the judiciary saying one thing and the executive another."

At Kai Tak airfield, exultant Chinese Communist mechanics painted Red flags on 71 fuselages.

This Intellectual Potential Must Not Be Utterly Wasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that war is wasteful; and among the most tragic of all wastes, in war and the uneasy peace that follows war, is the terrible waste of brains—of intellectual potential of a very high order, already trained.

The Second World War, precipitated by mediocrity raised to absolute power, was, quite naturally, more than usually wasteful of the best brains, and the cold war following has continued that extravagance.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the appeal made to me and to other Members by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, president of Union Theological Seminary of New York, and also an authentic leader of the non-Marxist liberal movement in this country. Dr. Niebuhr describes the situation which exists in the European displaced-persons camps—those traps for wasted human energy which are the late fruit of Hitlerism—today as far as the intellectuals are concerned.

It is particularly distressing that the intellectuals of the United States, or as we would be more inclined to say, the body of professional practitioners, far from welcoming the new ideas and the new personalities of the Europeans, fear them, and are trying to make it more and more difficult for professional men of foreign birth, regardless of nationality or gifts, to practice their arts and sciences in this country.

Nevertheless, those of us who believe that a world can exist without war and without mass antagonisms must respond to Dr. Niebuhr's appeal as best we can.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York, N. Y., March 16, 1950.

The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The ablest and best-trained men and women of Europe—30,000 of them—qualified practitioners in all the arts and sciences—are still rotting in the displaced persons camps of Europe today. While hundreds of thousands of their fellow refugees have gained acceptance for immigration as manual laborers, they have been passed over. The few who have found new homes did so often by acquiring new manual skills and trying to forget that they were once respected in their professions. This is the great tragedy of the present DP scene. Surely it is time that a solution to this tremendous human problem is sought out.

I am enclosing for your information the summary of a recent survey by the International Refugee Organization of the UN which indicates certain needed categories of professions which can be resettled in various countries. The International Rescue Committee, an organization with 16 years of experience in voluntary relief work, maintaining eight strategically located overseas field offices, is now preparing a campaign to aid the forgotten intellectuals and professionals of the DP camps.

Because I believe that this is a noble attempt by a responsible and well-equipped organization to eliminate this needless and costly suffering, I have agreed to act as general chairman of this rescue campaign.

With this letter I am asking you and other Americans prominent in the sciences and humanities to join me in this effort as a member of the national committee. The strongest possible leadership is vital if we are to arouse the American people to aid in saving these gifted European intellectuals and professionals from the corroding existence to which they are now doomed. We seek to restore them to a productive, satisfying existence in which they can contribute toward the enrichment of our civilization.

Will you please fill in and return the enclosed card indicating your willingness to serve as a member of the committee sponsoring this rescue work? I earnestly hope for your favorable and prompt response.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR.

MEMORANDUM ON FORGOTTEN INTELLECTUALS AND PROFESSIONALS

From: Reinhold Niebuhr.
To: The Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN.

In Europe today there are approximately 30,000 of the ablest, best-trained men and women of the continent—qualified practitioners of all the arts, sciences and professions, who at one time were leading citizens in their native countries. They are the forgotton intellectuals and professionals—now living in the most abysmal circumstances in the DP camps. They have been consistently passed over by most national missions selecting refugees for resettlement in favor of skilled and unskilled manual laborers.

Their talents cover virtually the entire range of human knowledge. There are musicians who have studied under some of music's greatest masters, distinguished historians, linguists who cannot only teach foreign languages but also, through first-hand experience, know the countries in which they are spoken. There are engineers who have been associated with some of Europe's best-known firms, doctors who have conducted original research and practiced in every field of specialized medicine, geologists who have led expeditions through some of the most remote parts of the world.

For example, among these refugee specialists is an agronomist who initiated work on the reclamation of arid wastelands in Macedonia and Serbia; the former prima ballerina of Latvia, a graduate of Moscow's famous ballet school; a doctor who has had extensive experience with tropical diseases in the Orient; a novelist whose second book won the Hungarian literary prize in 1947.

Their professional qualifications are established by close examination of their documents and special testing commissions, made up of recognized experts, who review their educational background, personally examine and interview persons who have lost their documents, audition musicians, view works of art, and evaluate levels of skill.

Most of these highly qualified professional and intellectual people need only to learn a new language to fit into a new land—and the majority of the refugee specialists already speak at least two foreign languages, one of which is frequently English. An appendicitis operation is the same in Prague as in Peru, the notes of a Beethoven symphony are the same in Belgrade as in Birmingham, a bridge is built fundamentally the same whether it is to cross the Danube or the Mississippi. And so long as there remain children to be taught, crops to be improved, sick to be healed, and bridges to be built, the world cannot afford to toss on the junk heap its teachers, doctors, agronomists, and engineers. A shocking waste of talent has already occurred as these refugees have had to wait in camps since the war while governments have hesitated to accept them as immigrants; yet there exist vast populations in dire need of the very services they have to offer in exchange for the right to freedom and citizenship in a new land. This short-sighted waste of human talent is the great tragedy of the postwar world.

There are, however, evidences that the world is beginning to recognize the contributions that these ably trained men and women can make. For example, Norway has recently chosen three dentists who have been trained for 6 months in Germany and found their methods perfectly adaptable. The Netherlands Ministry of Social Welfare recently made a spontaneous survey of Dutch farms, and obtained requests for 30 badly needed technicians and pharmaceutical chemists. A group of 53 refugee doctors were resettled in Pakistan last month. A recent world-wide canvass for specialists in professional jobs which was carried out by the International Refugee Organization under the leadership of J. Donald Kingley, Director General, indicates that there are certain needed categories in various countries throughout the world which could be filled by such DP specialists. A recent survey in the United States indicates that here also there are categories for professionals in which resettlement would be possible—e. g., top level mathematicians, clinical psychologists, etc.

There have been a few attempts to deal with this problem by American agencies. Of them all, the International Rescue Committee has had the greatest success. Last year IRC resettled 250 intellectual DP's—over 30 percent of its total DP program. Further, by its very nature IRC has experience in dealing with intellectuals. During the early days of the Nazi rise its work was primarily concerned with the rescue and care of anti-Fascist intellectuals. Consequently, of all the relief agencies, IRC is perhaps best equipped to handle such an effort. Through its field offices in eight European countries and its headquarters in New York City, this organization is prepared to begin the work of resettlement of the forgotten intellectuals in the DP camps of Europe. After thorough study of the problem it is estimated that resettlement would be possible for the sum of $500 per case. After conference with both IRO and UNESCO offices in Washington, who have pledged their full support for this effort, the International Rescue Committee is ready to begin work.

This project deserves the support of every American. The responsibility is ours. Only we have the material resources and the spiritual strength to sustain those who are able to contribute so much to the enrichment of our civilization. History is not only passing judgment on the totalitarian evil, it will also pass judgment on us if we fail to help in this gigantic tragedy.

In order to arouse the American people to action, I am calling on distinguished and representative men and women from the sciences and humanities to lend their support by endorsing this project.

R. N.

[From the New York Times]

BARRIER AGAINST BRAINS

On the day after Christmas an airplane took off from an Italian field, bound for Pakistan. In the plane were 54 men and women of various nationalities, religions, and professions. There were Latvians and Hungarians, Mohammedans and Protestants, doctors, and at least one entomologist of international reputation. These Europeans, who had been living in DP camps, were now seeking a new life and a new usefulness in distant Asia. Officials of the International Refugee Organization pointed out that the flight was particularly noteworthy as an outstanding example of our efforts to resettle specialists.

The man from Mars might indeed be excused if he thought that the easiest of all refugees to resettle in new homes would obviously be those whose training and experience were of particular value to humanity—the doctors, surgeons, and nurses; the chemists, physicists, and engineers; the teachers, artists, and writers. But in this most contrary of all worlds such is not the case. It is the height of irony that these specialists, the cream of Europe's displaced persons, are virtually as hard to place as the physically disabled, the totally blind, the hopeless invalids. Some of the scientists—more power to them—turn themselves into manual laborers in order to gain admission to new lands. In one country an agronomist and an industrial chemist are mining coal. In another a research chemist is handling a rock drill. But not all of them can do that; and right now there are some 25,000 of these specialists wasting away in the DP camps of Italy, Austria, and western Germany.

Partial IRO list of professionals and intellectuals still idle in the DP camps of Europe

Accountants	764
Agronomists	1,024
Architects	326
Artist	470
Chemists	471
Dentists	474
Engineers (civil)	788
Engineers (electrical)	353
Engineers (industrial)	173
Engineers (mechanical)	565
Engineers (mining)	80
Engineers (sanitary)	13
Physicians (general practitioners)	869
Physicians (specialists)	656
Musicians	862
Nurses (graduate)	739
Pharmacists	494
Sculptors	57
Singers	318
Teachers (arts and crafts)	279
Professors (academic)	4,383
Professors (technical)	496
Veterinarians	214
Writers	161
Other professionals	1,254

Besides these, it is estimated that 30 percent of the escapees from behind the iron curtain are professionals and intellectuals of standing.

Red China May Get an Air Force and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News, March 17, 1950, by Clyde Farnsworth entitled "Red China May Get an Air Force and Navy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED CHINA MAY GET AN AIR FORCE AND NAVY WITH RUSSIAN AND BRITISH HELP

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, March 17.—There are good reasons to believe that with Russian and British help Red China will turn up with an air force and navy of sorts when and if she attacks Formosa, or even earlier.

Russia's help will be in technical personnel mainly, Britain's will be mainly in supplies.

Heavy Nationalist bombing of Red-held airfields at Shanghai and Canton, together with preparation for black-outs in Formosa suggest that Chinese Nationalist Government is aware of an air threat.

Shanghai and Canton would be likely bases for air assaults on Formosa and Hainan. It's authoritatively estimated the Reds have about 50 war planes and 20 warships. Planes include American-made B–24 heavy bombers, B–25 medium bombers and P–51 fighters.

Warships run no heavier than mine layers. The Reds probably also are trying to arm fishing boats and even large junks. Most of the Red fleet is reported in the lower Yangtze. Nanking is especially mentioned as a concentration point.

Preparation of naval support for the Red's Formosa planning would account for tight security measures taken by Nationalist picket boats enforcing a blockade of the Yangtze. The Nationalists intend to keep the Red fleet bottled up.

PROPAGANDA AND PLANES

The Communists will try for propaganda purposes to preserve the paultry character of its air force and navy and still try to use them in an effective manner at sea. Their greatest chance would come if Britain ordered her fleet to crack the Chinese Nationalist blockade.

It would be much better for the Reds if they could score first with an air force entirely composed of American-made planes—theirs by capture or desertion from the Nationalists.

To make an air force out of 50 old American bombers and fighters is where the Russians would come in, certainly as technicians and possibly also as fliers.

Behind a front of 50 American-made planes the Russians could draw on their own wartime lend-lease receipts of American aircraft and equipment—and maybe send in whole planes. It probably will be the most indestructible 50-plane air force the world ever saw.

HOUSES FOR RUSSIANS

Recent arrivals in Hong Kong say the Reds in Shanghai requisitioned 100 houses in the vicinity of the Hungjao airfield, one of a cluster of four Shanghai airfields. These travelers said the houses were being taken over for a Russian adviser.

Even if the Russians are planning a substantial air advisory group, they wouldn't need hundreds of houses, so it's more likely that Shanghai is making room for many Russian civil administrators as well as airmen.

It's probable that the Chinese Red air force already has run one mission, an attack a few weeks ago on Hsichang, one of the principal cities of Sikeang Province held by Nationalist Gen. Hu Tsung-nan's army.

Just where the Reds will get aviation gasoline is an interesting question. Russia could provide it—and may have done so—but an easier way would be to take it out of Hong Kong.

WATCH HONG KONG?

If the United States embargo of critical items needed by the Chinese Reds is too effective, somebody's going to have to watch Hong Kong. The United States consulate says there have been no shipments of American aviation gasoline to Reds through Hong Kong, but it relies upon British reporting of Hong Kong's trading.

There have been considerable shipments of other motor fuels and Chinese Nationalist airmen have set up some bright fires in a Red China fuel dump at Shumchun just across the frontier from this crown colony.

Britain's greatest lift to the air-minded Communists, however, probably was the court turn-over of two former Nationalist air lines. The 71 planes still are here, but thousands of tons of spare parts, engines, instruments, and other equipment are reported being shipped to north China while litigation still is pending on the appeal from the Hong Kong Supreme Court decision.

The Reds probably would have planes also by this time if they had qualified fliers. The easiest way to get them would be for the British to grant Hong Kong visas to Russian ferry pilots.

Earle D. Willey, of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday I attended the funeral in Dover, Del., of one of the most outstanding men in my State. I was amazed at the number of persons from every section of Delaware and from every walk of life who came to pay their respects to their friend who truly had lived in his house by the side of the road and been a friend to man—for 60 years.

Without warning the Grim Reaper knocked at the door of Hon. Earle D. Willey as he sat in his home in the early evening of Friday, March 17, chatting with a friend.

Judge Willey, as he was respectfully and popularly known, has held many honorable public and private positions in the State of Delaware. Included in these were judge of common pleas and juvenile court, secretary of state, and Representative in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Earle Willey was a man of great kindness and friendliness, profoundly conscious of his obligations to all the people of his State and Nation. In these exacting and trying times such men are sorely needed. His passing leaves a void that cannot easily be filled.

Our Nation has lost a faithful and efficient leader. Our State has lost an outstanding citizen and public servant. I have lost a cherished friend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial in the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., Saturday, March 18, 1950, entitled "Earle D. Willey."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of March 18, 1950]

EARLE D. WILLEY

Delaware was shocked and saddened this morning by the sudden death last night of Earle D. Willey. It was only a little more than a year ago that the gentle and kindly judge resumed the private practice of the law in Dover after a long and useful career in public service. He was only 60 when he died—an age at which he might have expected many more active and useful years.

Last year Mr. Willey received the first citizenship award of the Department of Delaware, American Legion, in recognition of his services to the community, State, and Nation.

Those services were varied and many indeed. They began as long ago as 1915 in Washington, where Mr. Willey was pursuing his studies in the law. He was secretary then to Representative Thomas W. Miller, of Delaware; 27 years later he returned to Washington as Congressman in his own right. Among the many other offices he held were those of State librarian; judge of the court of common pleas for Kent County; deputy attorney general for Kent; and head of the Legislative Reference Bureau.

Throughout his long career he was a loyal Republican and son of Kent County. He will be missed both by the party and the county he served long and well and also by the host of Delawareans who claimed him as a friend.

"As a Layman, I Am Awed by the Incredible Advances in Medical Techniques"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there are always some men in any community who attract civic burdens as a lightning rod attracts a charge of static electricity; and such a man, in our great and teeming community of New York, is Charles H. Silver, philanthropist, businessman, humanitarian, good citizen.

Many men would find being vice president of the American Woolen Co., a large and successful business, a full-time job; not Charlie Silver.

With indefatigable energy, he pursues a multitude of private charities and benevolent enterprises, of which the most important is to occupy the presidency of Beth Israel Hospital. It gives me pleasure, under leave, to insert in the RECORD the text of an address by Mr. Silver which he delivered to the graduating class of nurses of the School of Nursing, Beth Israel Hospital, on March 8, 1950, and to associate myself with his tribute to the profession of nursing:

Nearly 50 years ago, a great neurologist and writer, Dr. S. Weir Mitchel, who made his home in Philadelphia, came to this city and delivered an address at the graduation exercises of the school of nursing of a hospital. Dr. Mitchel was one of the outstanding physicians of his time and I would like to quote just one statement from his address which, I think, has some relationship to the occasion this evening. He said:

"The better the woman the better the nurse. I want you to feel how noble is the life before you. I foresee for you that, which to me, has been a source of happiness, the satisfaction of work well done, of success where hope seemed dead, the pleasure of watching the return of health, of seeing the rose replace the lily."

Here are expressed thoughts that are timeless. As I was reading this address recently, I could not help wondering how Dr. Mitchel would feel and think and talk if he came back to earth and saw the tremendous and almost incredible strides that have been made in the field of medicine. Perhaps he would have, with his gift for expression, uttered words of exultation and joy that progress has been so sure and rapid.

Tonight, however, we are concerned with the human phase that enters into the conduct of a hospital; we have gathered to mark the attainment of a noble objective by a group of ladies in white. As a writer once said, they are the "supreme servants of humanity."

It has been my privilege to have been associated with Beth Israel over a quarter of a century. And as president of the hospital, I am in a somewhat better position than most people to observe the daily life and activities of this fine institution. I shall never cease to wonder at the powerful forces which combine every hour of the day, every minute of the hour, to give solace and healing to the sick and ailing.

As a layman I am awed by the incredible advances in medical techniques; it is overwhelming to note the almost daily progress that is being made; to read of the miracle drugs, all of which have brought about not only relief from pain and dreadful misery, but also longer life.

But what has always fascinated and enthralled me has been the smooth efficiency of the nurses, their silent devotion to duty, their constant attention of the patient. For no matter how breathtaking has been the advance in medical techniques, the nurse remains an indispensable factor in the work of the hospital. To her both doctor and patient turn for help and consolation. She is at the right hand of the doctor and at the bedside of the patient.

Patients see the doctor at certain intervals, friends of the family visit them at stated hours, but the nurse is with them almost constantly. You become part of their

lives at the hospital: You are their friend and companion, you are the one to whom they turn at a moment of pain and anguish when neither the doctor nor the family is with them. You supplement the work of the doctor and the compassionate attention of their families. And it certainly is true that you are the supreme servants of humanity by virtue of your skill and sympathetic understanding.

You who are about to receive your diplomas must realize that there is no blueprint for compassion; there is no chart for understanding and sympathy. The emotions lodged in the human breast are as old as life itself and in going about your work must have the strong inner necessity to come to the aid of fellow humans in distress.

You have seen much suffering and misery while in training; it is not pleasant to see people suffer pain. I am sure that you have not become hardened or callous for I have the feeling that what you have experienced in your training period has challenged you to give the best in you in following through in your chosen career.

We at Beth Israel—and I am sure I reflect the feeling of all who are identified with the hospital—are proud of you and we rejoice with you in the completion of your training period. Your garment of white is the symbol of a noble purpose and the realization of an ideal. For the women in white, and the men in white make up the backbone of a great hospital.

I must say a word of tribute to a lady of great personal charm who is held in deep affection by those in the profession of nursing. I refer to the head of the nursing department, Miss Claire Casey. I want to add that she is not only loved and respected by her immediate associates but by all of us at Beth Israel. It has been my pleasure and privilege to observe her at her work, and I want to say for the record that her competence is beyond praise. She has not only a true conception of her duties, but she has blended this knowledge of techniques with the humane approach to the difficult problems that arise almost hourly.

Tonight, my friends, we are indeed fortunate to have with us Dean McEwen of the Medical School of New York University with which Beth Israel is affiliated. When we received word that Dean McEwen would join us this evening at these exercises, we felt highly pleased and complimented.

It may interest you to know that when he became Dean in 1937, at the age of 35, he was the youngest dean of a medical college in the country. His medical interests, besides medical education in general, are principally arthritis and rheumatic fever. When he was at Rockefeller Institute, I believe he made extensive studies in connection with these diseases.

It is especially appropriate to have Dean McEwen with us because of his deep interest in the profession of nursing. He has been active for many years in helping to improve the standards of nursing and I am sure that under his guidance and advice nursing education has made definite and encouraging strides.

His interest in connection with research in rheumatic diseases has been very keen. Since the introduction of the so-called "wonder drugs," Dean McEwen has manifested an even greater interest in the treatment of arthritis and kindred diseases through the application of these new drugs. Dean McEwen is a credit to the medical profession, but above all is a highly useful and able member of our community.

And a final word of thanks from me to our graduates—not only thanks but a heartfelt wish that the years will bring you the health and happiness to satisfy that inner necessity to help your fellow human beings.

I have attended many graduations in the past, and it is always a genuine pleasure to be present. It gives me great personal satisfaction to know that Beth Israel is contributing, through you, to the well-being of the people of our great city. Congratulations and more power to you.

What Are Taxes Worth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, just now when we have all felt the pinch of the tax gatherer, I think it is well for us to consider why we pay taxes, and what privileges we buy with those payments. Malvina Lindsay discussed this subject in a recent column in the Washington Post. Her discussion is as usual both sparkling and profound. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include her column What Are Taxes Worth? in the RECORD, and call your particular attention to her quotation from the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, that taxes are our "investment in civilization":

WHAT ARE TAXES WORTH?
(By Malvina Lindsay)
TAXPAYER'S INVENTORY

Well, here you are again writing a check to support a lot of loafers and grafters—now, now wait. You sound like old Snortie on the bus, always griping about the bunch that's running something—anything. And he works for the Government.

Anyway, you're fed up with taxes and you're going to grouse all you please. Doesn't everybody? Didn't even our faultless forefathers when they grudgingly paid as much as $2 per capita over a period of 8 years to help finance the Revolution and the Continental Congress?

Still, you loathe bellyaching—at least in other persons. Put up or shut up, you think, when you hear the annual March 15 whining. Offer a better system (or a better country) or pay through the nose cheerfully.

Then what about yourself? Are you just vaporously crabbing or do you know where your tax dollar goes?

Oh, yes. Three-fourths to national defense, to pay the costs of past wars, to prepare for or prevent future ones. You think of all the money going directly for armament—weapons, ships, planes, men in uniform—between thirteen and fourteen billion out of a $44,000,000,000 budget; of the twelve billion for veterans' programs and for interest on the war debt; four billion to arm and feed foreign allies; eight hundred million for atomic energy; other millions for minor war costs.

What a change in your tax bill if the world were only at peace—or even without a cold war. But there's nothing you can do about that. Or can you?

You think of all the other calls on your tax dollar, flood control and reclamation, highways, education, research, postal deficit, housing, Government administration, farm price supports—

Ah, that's it. The farmer. Living off your tax dollar. Yet, if the farmer goes broke and can't buy, what happens to your job? You think of the 1920's when business got the lift and the farmer didn't. You think of 1929.

Anyway there are the bureaucrats. They're what's wrong with your tax dollar. They're what keeps your nose to the grindstone. Those loafers. You look at the budget. Their cost is around one thousand two hundred million. A little over 2½ cents out of your tax dollar.

Still it's the penny saved that counts. Why aren't all these things run at less cost? Then there are these income-tax inequities. Why isn't something done about them? Yet what are you doing—except grousing? How much do you know about how your tax dollar's being invested or squandered? Or about who's handling it?

Well, from now on you're going to look into things more. You've as good a right as anybody to do something—nose around, go to tax hearings, call a meeting, circulate a petition, get out a pamphlet, mount a soap box, run for office. That's one thing about this country. Anybody can raise a big fog about anything he doesn't like.

Yes, that is one thing about this country. Maybe, it's one of the biggest things you buy with your tax check.

You've never thought of the other side of it—what you get when you pay taxes. You've always thought of yourself as charitably and nobly bestowing a hand-out on a groveling Uncle Sam. You think of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes—what he said when he heard his young secretary grumbling about a tax bill. "Young man, I like to pay taxes. They're my investment in civilization."

What are you getting out of your investment? At least a lot more than the first taxpayers, the early serfs who had to give everything, including themselves, to the top boss. And more now than taxpayers in most other countries. Certainly more than taxpayers behind iron curtains.

And now it looks as if you were going to be paying big taxes for a long, long time. Even if you and other righteous citizens were to bring about a Utopia of efficiency and economy in Government there'd still be the cold-war world. Still 74 cents out of your dollar on defense.

So maybe it might make things easier in future to have a different attitude toward your taxes. Not to be so pinched in spirit about them. To write your check or open your pocketbook with the grand air of one making an investment in civilization. To think of the order, opportunity, comfort, civilized living, personal freedom they were buying you. Even to feel they might be buying a little more of these things for people everywhere.

ECA and the International Monetary Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a timely address delivered last September by Mr. Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It has considerable bearing upon a subject which this House will debate within the next week:

ADDRESS BY MR. EUGENE R. BLACK, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, IN PRESENTING THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

This is the third meeting of the Board of Governors that it has been my privilege to attend, and my first as president of the bank.

I am deeply aware of the important responsibilities of this new post, and of the high standards of achievement set by my predecessor, Mr. McCloy. But the sound policies and cooperative relations established under his leadership provide a firm foundation on which we can build the bank's future. I welcome the opportunity to work with you in this task.

The past year has been, I think, a period of substantial progress and accomplishment for the bank. Our activities are summarized at some length in the fourth annual report, and I shall not repeat what is said there. But I do want to touch briefly on a few high spots of our recent operations, and to suggest some possible implications for the bank of broader currents in the world economy.

Most of our loans during the past 12 months have been for projects designed to increase the output of useful goods and services in less developed countries. These development loans make up a considerable total and, as is indicated in the annual report, negotiations for the financing of a number of other development projects are well advanced. But I must say frankly that the volume of development loans granted to date has not come up to our earlier expectations.

This gap between hopes and performance is partly the result of overoptimism about the length of time it would take to get the bank fully organized—to bring together a competent staff, to define our policies and procedures, and make them clear to our member countries, and to gather the economic and technical data necessary for sound decisions. The acceleration of our activity during the past year shows, I think, that this preliminary phase is largely behind us.

More important at present are the difficulties which are more or less universal in underdeveloped countries—the lack of economic data, of experienced personnel, of well-organized projects, of local capital, and all the other deficiencies that are both the cause and the consequence of underdevelopment. It is no accident that the development loans we have made thus far have been mainly to countries where considerable economic and technical advance has already taken place, and to enterprises with a substantial record of experience behind them. The greater the progress a country has already made in development the easier it is for it to progress further; and by the same token it is almost always easier to expand a going concern than to start a new one from scratch.

Yet, the essence of successful economic development, and therefore the essential task of the bank, is precisely to bring new enterprises into being and new techniques into effective use in economically retarded areas—and the more retarded the country the more urgent and challenging is our task.

I believe we have made good progress in overcoming some of the special difficulties of economic development which are analyzed in the annual report. Through missions to most of our less developed member countries we have greatly enlarged our knowledge of their economic problems and needs, their capacity to absorb and service external loans, and the merits of particular development projects. A better understanding now prevails, I think, of the bank's policies and methods; and more and more governments are eliminating legal or procedural obstacles to loans from the bank by taking appropriate action to enable them to incur or guarantee such loans.

Perhaps most important, through our surveys and discussions with member governments, we are better able to assist the less developed countries in diagnosing and solving their own problems. Giving advice is not, of course, our primary function. But we have an immediate and vital concern in trying to promote conditions favorable to the success of our loans and to the increase of productive investment from other sources. I believe that one of the most constructive contributions we can make to the progress of development, especially in the least advanced countries, is to help make available to them the experience of other nations. Moreover, the resulting close and continuous relationship with our members helps to speed up the preparation of development plans and the execution of projects for which bank financing is appropriate.

The initial cultivation of the seeds of development has, therefore, been a somewhat longer task than at first we had hoped. I am confident, however, that we may look forward to an abundant harvest. The first fruits—the loans granted during the past year—are to me the source of considerable satisfaction.

It is also a source of satisfaction that the bank has been able during the past year to make its first loan to one of its members in eastern Europe. The difficulties and uncertainties cited in the third annual report still exist, and have hampered further loans by the bank in this region. But these difficulties have been lessened somewhat by economic developments—notably the increasing availability of manufactured goods in western Europe urgently needed by eastern Europe and the similar availability of essential materials in eastern Europe which are required by the western countries. If these trends continue and political tensions are relaxed, the possibilities for constructive assistance by the bank to its eastern European members should expand considerably.

I am also happy to report that during the past month we have been able to conclude our first loan to one of our Asian member States, and I feel confident that this financing will be followed by other transactions by the bank in that great region of the world. In the Middle East we have not yet consummated any loan, but, as the annual report shows, we have been examining a number of projects in various Middle Eastern countries, some of which I hope will qualify for bank financing in the relatively near future.

On the other side of the balance sheet for the year, I am sorry to say that we have not succeeded to the extent we had hoped in broadening the international character of the financial resources at the disposal of the bank. I refer in particular to our efforts to obtain additional consents to the use in our lending operations of the 18 percent local currency part of the bank's capital. Apart from the United States, which has made the full amount of its 18-percent currency available, some releases have been made by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, and the United Kingdom. They amount in the aggregate, however, to only slightly more than the equivalent of $12,000,000.

In my judgment, it is extremely important that the bank receive greater help from its members in this connection. The strength of the bank is that it is an international cooperative institution. Its ownership, its purposes and its responsibilities are shared by all its member nations. We who are familiar with the bank and its basic concepts appreciate, of course, that the international character of the bank's resources is best demonstrated by the fact that no matter in which capital market the bank may borrow, each member country pledges its credit that the bank will meet its obligations. This real but subtle point unfortunately tends to be overlooked by the world at large and there is an increasing disposition to cite the bank's reliance on dollars for lending purposes as evidence that it has only limited international participation.

My experience has been that the most effective answer to these criticisms is to show that the bank is making use of other resources besides dollars and in particular of the 18-percent currencies of members other than the United States. Accepting the reality that the United States must remain the chief potential source of lending capital for the bank for some time to come, I still believe that it is possible for a number of other member governments to make a substantial amount of their 18-percent capital subscription available for lending.

I do not make this plea for larger releases from the 18-percent subscriptions merely to underline the word international in our title. We have a definite use for these currencies. So long as inconvertibility continues many countries will be able to repay indebtedness in other currencies although they may not be able to service dollar loans.

It is true that most of the countries from which we would like consent to use their 18 percent subscriptions have pressing investment needs at home and are actually net importers of capital. But many of them still invest substantial sums abroad. I do not think I am asking too much if I call on these countries to make a part of their foreign investment through the medium of the bank.

There is another method by which many of our member countries can add to the international character of the bank's resources and that is to increase the eligibility for investment of the bank's bonds. Through legislative or administrative action in a number of countries, a substantial contribution can be made by our members to the creation of a broader market for those bonds. I attach importance to this matter and I propose to discuss it with you in more detail at a later stage of the meeting.

I should like to turn now to a matter much wider in scope than the bank's own operations but which nevertheless profoundly affects the bank and is of vital concern to all the countries represented at this table. I am speaking of the problem of European recovery.

As was foreshadowed in the bank's annual report a year ago, problems of development have increasingly occupied our attention. Since the last Governors' meeting we have made only two small loans to western European countries. Necessarily the principal role in assisting European reconstruction is being played by ECA.

Nevertheless European recovery is of vital importance to the operations of the bank because of the pivotal part played by the great trading nations of Europe in the functioning of the world economy. European purchases and sales abroad have long been a decisive factor in balancing international trade. Unless the European economies can be reestablished on a stable basis the economic position of almost every country, even of those in the dollar area, will be insecure. In passing upon loan applications, whether from countries in Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, or elsewhere, we always come face to face with the necessity for appraising whether the customary trade of these countries with Europe can be reestablished on a satisfactory basis. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to state that the soundness of all our loans is affected by the outcome of the European recovery efforts.

The first objectives of the European recovery program—to expand production and restore financial stability in the participating countries—have been achieved to an impressive extent. But we must face the fact that, though prewar levels of output have been reached and surpassed and though the menace of inflation has been curbed, progress along these lines alone is no longer enough. It has become plain, I think, that the time has now arrived for making fundamental readjustments in present patterns of trade and production. And if these necessary readjustments are to be made successfully, they must

include complementary action by both the European countries and the United States.

So far as concerns the European countries, the most urgent requirement is obviously to sell more of their production abroad, and particularly in dollar markets. In order to accomplish this, many things are necessary—but to my mind the most important are to reduce export costs and to make exports to the dollar area at least as attractive to individual producers as sales either in the domestic market or in other foreign areas.

In my judgment there are several lines of action which must be followed to achieve these objectives. The first, which I need not elaborate before this audience, and which is appropriately dealt with at some length in the annual report of the International Monetary Fund, is the establishment of a system of exchange rates which will assist the dollar-deficit countries to compete effectively in world markets, will furnish an incentive to exporters to increase their sales in the dollar area and will encourage importers to buy, to the extent possible, in countries whose currencies they can best afford. I do not underestimate either the complexities or the far-reaching consequences of such action, but I fail to see how it can be avoided.

The second line of approach must be to reduce the domestic costs of production, both by increasing the efficiency of management and labor and by limiting the burden of indirect costs, principally government expenditures, which must be borne by producers. In most countries the level of productivity has already risen substantially since the war, but they still lag far behind the United States and Canada.

It has been pretty well demonstrated, I think, that productive efficiency cannot be brought about merely through governmental edict or exhortation. To make the most effective use of existing productive facilities, real incentives are required, and perhaps most important, the pressure of competition. To my mind, one of the most essential steps toward solution of the dollar problem is for the dollar-deficit countries to start clearing away the wilderness of bilateral arrangements, special currency controls, quotas and similar restrictions, both internal and external, which have grown up over the past 20 years to protect inefficient production and trade practices. I don't suggest that this can or should be done overnight. The important thing is to begin now to move—and to move rapidly—toward a freer, more competitive exchange of goods.

The problem of reducing the burden of governmental costs on production is a difficult one, particularly susceptible to controversy and misunderstanding. Since World War II many governments have committed themselves to extensive programs of social welfare. No one can dispute their right to follow this course, if they have the means to undertake it. Unfortunately, however, it has become apparent that many countries cannot now afford ambitious programs of social services without either reducing their living standards in other respects or cutting back their productive investments designed to make possible a better standard of living in the future.

In addition to the necessary reduction in costs, it is important that the European countries undertake vigorous, concentrated measures to broaden their market in the United States and Canada. What is required, I believe, is not only the offer of a greater variety of goods adapted to American tastes and priced attractively, but also a wider and more forceful attack on the attention of the American consuming public.

If the European countries take energetic action along these lines in the months ahead, they should with continued ECA aid be able to make additional significant progress toward true recovery. I regard the continuance of ECA aid essential, but I believe it important that the aid should be so allocated as to give the participating countries the greatest possible incentive to pursue this new course of action. However useful the present method of ERP programing has been to date, I think the time has come when it, too, calls for review. I therefore welcome the announcement by Mr. Hoffman that allocation of ECA aid during the second half of the current fiscal year will be directly related to the performance of the participating countries, acting both individually and collectively through the OEEC, in effectively using the aid and realizing the objectives of the recovery program.

Up to the present time assistance from ECA has been allocated primarily on the basis of the anticipated dollar deficit of the respective countries—the largest shares going to those having the biggest deficits. It is true that, in estimating the deficits, it has been assumed that the countries concerned would take effective action to reduce the dollar gap. Nevertheless, the incentive has tended to be a negative one since the greater the gap, the greater the claim for aid, while the smaller the deficit, the less assistance was likely to be anticipated. Furthermore, so long as ECA dollars cannot be saved, but only used for current imports, the ERP countries have difficulty in building up adequate foreign exchange reserves, without which they cannot relax their trade and currency controls or face with confidence the difficult years after 1952.

I know that ECA is fully conscious of this problem and is doing all within its power to encourage the participating countries to carry out the necessary readjustments. I am nevertheless troubled about the situation because I believe that the basic difficulties may not be as readily susceptible of solution if dealt with only within the terms of the powers now available to ECA.

Specifically, I suggest that careful thought be given to the following approach: First, that the share of ECA aid to each participating country be defined as clearly as possible for the remainder of the recovery program, and each country be given assurance that its share will not be reduced if it earns or saves more dollars than had been expected, nor increased if its dollar deficit grows larger; and second, that all restrictions be removed from the use to which ECA dollars may be put so that such dollars will cease to be soft dollars and each country will have the opportunity to make the most economic use of the aid provided.

If this approach should prove feasible, it may have most salutary effects. Each country would know how much dollar aid it could count on and, knowing that no further aid could be anticipated, would be encouraged to husband it carefully. Responsibility would be squarely placed upon the participating nations to take the measures necessary for their own recovery.

I should like to emphasize one further point. Action by the dollar-deficit countries, however soundly conceived and vigorously executed, will not suffice to solve the dollar problem unless the United States takes complementary measures. For despite a rather remarkable shift in the attitude of the United States in recent years, some of its policies are still basically inconsistent with its position as the great creditor nation of the world. Modifications of these policies, like those that are necessary in Europe, may injure particular groups or interests within this country, but in my judgment such modifications are essential both to restore the health of the world economy and to maintain America's own prosperity.

United States tariffs provide the most important case in point. Their over-all level has been greatly reduced since the early thirties, but at certain crucial points they remain a barrier to the import of foreign goods. Moreover, producers in other countries fear, with some justification, that if they should succeed in establishing a market for their goods in the United States, their efforts would be negated by new or higher protective tariffs. Even where the level of duties does not exclude foreign goods, they are frequently kept out by unduly complex customs procedures and regulations.

In addition to tariff barriers there are also a number of other types of restrictions designed to protect American companies against foreign competition, which are hardly consistent with the expressed policy and long-range interests of the United States. In my judgment, it does not make good sense for America to encourage the production of goods for the domestic market which could more economically be imported, and certainly all attempts to use the aid programs as a vehicle for dumping surplus goods abroad should be strongly resisted.

I would like to close on a note of guarded optimism. When rationing stopped after the war, there was a shortage of many classes of goods. In some cases the shortage was so acute as to drive people to extraordinary lengths to obtain the goods they wanted. It is astonishing how quickly some of these acute shortages disappeared when there was a moderately increased flow to the market. To suggest that the dollar shortage can be compared with that of butter would be wishful thinking, but I do believe the world is somewhat in the grip of a shortage psychosis. If only—and it is no small "if"—if only we can start on the way toward equilibrium, we may find the effects of returning confidence highly cumulative and our difficulties dispelled more quickly than we dared hope.

Our Surpluses Meet Europe's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7797, the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, was voted out of our committee today, containing the Vorys amendment cutting the ECA appropriation $1,000,000,000 and substituting $1,000,000,000 in surplus agricultural commodities. While everyone knows that we have billions in farm surplus acquired in price-support programs, the question has been raised whether Europe's specific needs could be met by our surpluses.

The following table, furnished by ECA answers this question.

It compares $1,122,900,000 of requested food and agricultural imports from the United States with Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and loans on January 31, 1950. It shows that far more than $1,000,000,000 of surpluses are available now of the precise items needed by Europe; that of the whole $1,122,900,000 listed, all but $3,600,000 of dried fruit can be furnished out of surpluses which will be on hand before the new fiscal year begins, July 1, 1950. Of course, my

amendment leaves $1,950,000,000 of appropriations in the bill, of which $396,500,000 is programed for food and agricultural products, in addition to the billion furnished in kind.

We can meet Europe's precise needs by using a billion of our surpluses, and still leave plenty of flexibility in the ECA program.

The table follows:

Comparison of CCC stocks and loans, Jan. 31, 1950, with ECA-financed 1950–51 import estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	ECA-financed imports (FAS)	CCC stocks, Jan. 31, 1950 (cost)		CCC loans, Jan. 31, 1950		Loan due date
Cotton	474.7	614.5		382.5		June 30.
Wheat (and rye)	457.2	[1] 382.9	−74.3	585.0		Apr. 30.
Coarse grains	135.2	209.7		648.0		Apr. 30-Aug. 31.
Soybeans	12.0	[1] 6.9	−5.1	15.9		May 31.
Linseed and linseed oil	3.0	201.6		29.6		Apr. 30.
Cheese	5.0	8.5		----------		
Peanuts	7.5	9.2		17.6		June 1.
Eggs	2.5	98.1		----------		
Wool	7.0	40.1		----------		
Rosin	8.0	17.1		12.3		Mar. 31.
Turpentine	1.5	[1] 1.0	−.5	1.3		Do.
Dried Fruit	9.3	[1] 5.7	−3.6	(2)	−3.6	
Total	1,122.9	1,595.3	−83.5	1,692.2	−3.6	

[1] Jan. 31, 1950, stocks less than estimated ECA-financed requirements for fiscal year 1951.
[2] Jan. 31, 1950, stocks plus loans (if any) less than estimated ECA-financed requirements.

The New York Feis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following remarks:

THE NEW YORK FEIS

Every year during the month of June, millions of Americans have their attention drawn to the Irish feis, which is held by the United Irish Counties Association of New York, Inc., on the beautiful and spacious campus of Fordham University in New York City.

This successful Irish festival has not only become an established cultural event in the hearts and minds of all New Yorkers, but as a result of its success in New York it has also sown its cultural seeds in the form of other similar Irish festivals held annually in the States of Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. These festivals are patterned after the feis of New York. At present, there is located in New York an organization known as the National Feis Council of America, which gives expert advice and guidance to those contemplating the holding of a feis.

A brief outline of the background of the feis in Ireland is necessary at this point. The word "feis" (pronounced fesh) is a Gaelic word meaning festival; entertainment; convention; conference; parliament. Its plural is feiseanna.

Historically, the roots of the feis in Ireland extend beyond 1,000 B. C. It was founded by King Ollamh Fodhla at Tara (now in the county Meath), which was then the seat of the Ard-Righ or High King of Ireland. The name Ollamh (pronounced Ollav) in those days meant philosopher; consequently, King Ollamh was known as the sage King of Ireland.

Tara, located near the center of Ireland, witnessed the arrival at the feis of the learned men who lived in Ireland 1,000 years before the coming of the Christian era. These were the kings, poets, philosophers, judges, doctors, antiquaries, bards, scribes, and minstrels who came to compete at the feis of Tara in poetry and literature, law and medicine, history and genealogy, philology and archaeology, musical composition and instrumental music, elocution and story telling, and singing and dancing.

Following the invasion of Ireland by the English in the twelfth century, the feis of Tara was suppressed by the invaders. After seven centuries of such suppression, the feis was revived in many Irish towns and villages. Today, it is held in nearly all of the towns in Ireland and in populous rural areas. The biggest feis of all in Ireland is called the Feis Ceol which is held annually in Dublin.

The feis of Tara had a profound intellectual influence in its time upon the Celtic peoples of Wales, Scotland, and of Brittany in France. The effect of this influence is still felt; for even today, we see the Welsh, Scots, and Bretons participating in the Irish feis at Fordham.

The feis of New York is truly a revival along modern lines of the feis of Tara. It is a cultural institution which brings before the American people the ancient arts, customs, and traditions practiced in Ireland a thousand years or more before the birth of Christ; it is an instrument of good will which transfers a highly desirable cultural legacy to the American people.

Many feiseanna, of course, have been held by Irish societies in several parts of the United States throughout the past 100 years; therefore, the modern feis is not a relatively new arrival in America. However, the most successful feis in America is the one that has been organized, developed, and sustained by the United Irish Counties Association of New York; and which is held under its auspices each year at Fordham University in New York City.

The United Irish Counties Association is an organization composed of 32 associations; each bearing the name of one of the historic counties of Ireland. It is nonsectarian, has a membership of over 90,000 dues-paying members, and maintains a full-time headquarters for welfare, educational, and cultural purposes.

The feis of New York has been designed for all Americans. Nothing better can explain this aspect of the feis than the following quotation taken from the foreword of the 1950 feis syllabus, and carried over the signatures of the chairman of the feis committee, James J. Comerford, and of the president of the United Irish Counties Association, Thomas J. Ayers. It says:

"This syllabus, to a great extent, explains itself. It offers over 100 competitions; nearly all of them are traditionally Irish in their origin and growth.

"However, for the benefit of those not fully acquainted with our program, we wish to point out that each competition is open to all Americans.

"A survey of feis prize winners indicates clearly that neither national origin, nor color, nor race, nor creed has ever hindered any of the competitors from winning top honors in their respective competitions on the day of the feis.

"Many persons have contributed to the preparation of this syllabus. Their birthplaces reveal that collectively they reflect a wide geographical sphere of Celtic influence; for Wales, Scotland, Bretagne, as well as Ireland and the United States have provided us with contributors who are well trained and experienced in their respective fields. All are Americans. Yet, each one loves the traditional culture of the Celt."

Like most major, successful cultural events in America, the feis sponsored by the United Irish Counties Association of New York had small beginnings; it went through a relatively long period of planning and experimenting before it actually became that dynamic institution which it is today. Many distinguished Americans, active in Irish societies, contributed to its organization and development.

In August 1933, the first actual step toward the feis was taken by the United Irish Counties Association, when it held a very successful festival in New York. Each year, from then on, the feis grew in scope and in prestige, until it outgrew available facilities for its presentation.

In 1941, the feis moved into Fordham University at the invitation of the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of this world-renowned Jesuit university.

Here the beautiful campus and spacious buildings of Fordham offered ample facilities for the accommodation of the 2,500 competitors and the 35,000 spectators who by 1947 began to participate in this greatest of Irish festivals in America.

On June 18, 1950, the feis of the United Irish Counties Association will be held as usual at Fordham through the generosity of the present president of Fordham University, the Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S. J., who is honorary chairman of the Feis, and is also a great admirer of its educational potentialities as well as of its cultural gift to Americans.

The 1950 feis syllabus provides for 107 competitions embracing drama, elocution, essays, book reviews, recitations, arts, crafts, costumes, design, music, singing, including operatic and choral, dancing, both solo and figure, and many other events including Gaelic sports. Over 25 percent of the total program has its competitions carried out through the medium of the Gaelic language.

An important aspect about the New York feis is the fact that organizations representing the Celtic peoples of Wales, Scotland, Brittany in France, Isle of Man, and Cornwall send large contingents not only to see the feis but to participate actively in its competitions and exhibitions. Here at the feis on Fordham campus, in a true American way, the Irish, Welsh, Scotch, Bretons, Cornish, and Manx, together with other Americans of many national and racial origins pay a tribute to the ancient culture of the Celt.

The contributions of the Irish feis to the cultural life of America are many. In particular, it can be said that the feis has given to thousands of young Americans, regardless of religion, race, or color a magnificent opportunity to participate as competitors in some of the great and ancient

traditional cultural activities of the Irish people.

Many young Americans now ranking high as famous singers, dancers, musicians and performers in the entertainment field of our time, obtained the first start in their careers through recognition received for their talent after having the attention of talent scouts brought to them by virtue of winning top prizes at the Irish feis.

In addition, the Irish feis of New York together with the numerous feiseanna in the several other States have made it possible for hundreds of thousands of Americans to witness the various types of competitions in cultural events whose origin goes back over 3,000 years; and to see for themselves the age-old culture of the Celt being brought forward from the land of the Gael and transplanted in America where it impresses itself upon the customs of Americans with such an effect that eventually it becomes part of the warp and woof of modern American civilization.

However, we must remember that knowledge of the feis is not a relatively recent acquisition by Americans. Its origin was known to them in colonial days. Ezra Stile, president of Yale College in 1777 and one of the learned men of his time in the American Colonies, in a lecture delivered in May 1783 at Hartford, Conn., on the Future Glory of the United States, said in part:

"That great and wise monarch, Ollamh Fodhla, the Alfred of Ireland, 1,000 years before Christ, instituted an annual review and examination of all the achievements and illustrious characters in the realm; and, being approved by himself and the annual assembly of the nobles, he ordered their names and achievements to be enrolled in a public register of merit. This continued 2,000 years, to the time of that illustrious chieftain, Brian Boru.

"This had an amazing effect. By this animation, the heroic, military, and political virtues, with civilization, and I add, science and literature, ascended to an almost unexampled and incredible perfection in Ireland ages before they figured in other parts of Europe, not excepting even Athens and Rome. I have a great opinion of Hibernian merit, literary as well as civil and military, even in the ages before St. Patrick."

The present day Irish feis in America is far removed in space from its Tara site in Ireland and also far removed in time from the year 1,000 B. C. However, its dynamic cultural traditions are much closer in the United States today than we may think. The Feis of Tara still influences many Americans; for its offspring, the Irish feis of New York, affects the cultural environment of many Americans whose ancestors were other than Celtic.

Worth the Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 22, 1950:

WORTH THE MONEY

If Congress follows the advice of the House Appropriations Committee almost all Federal agencies will get less spending money than President Truman asked for them.

There is one notable exception—the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee says the FBI should have the full $57,400,000 proposed in Mr. Truman's budget, although that will be almost $5,000,000 more than it's spending this fiscal year.

The increase will enable FBI to hire more agents and other employees, and few even among the firmest advocates of economy are likely to object to this particular expansion of bureaucracy.

As the committee observes, "conditions at home and abroad" make it unsafe to save money at the expense of an agency which bears such heavy responsibility for national security.

Of course, Communists and their sympathizers hate the FBI. They call it a "police-state" organization. And, undeniably, in the wrong hands it might become something dangerously like that.

But we believe the FBI has, and deserves, the admiring confidence of most Americans. If so, great credit is due to the character of the man who has been its director for 26 years.

Under J. Edgar Hoover the FBI has won a reputation for high efficiency. More important, it has maintained a reputation for high integrity. He has insisted on keeping it what its name implies—a bureau of investigation, an objective fact finder, not a judge of such things as loyalty, not a state police agency or prosecution or persecution. He understands and practices the true American concept of justice and democratic government.

So we're glad that the FBI's appropriation includes a $4,000 salary increase for Director Hoover, to $20,000 a year. He'll be worth far more than that as long as he heads the FBI, and we hope that will be a long time.

Five-Cent Hike in Natural Gas Would Cost $145,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Five-Cent Hike in Natural Gas Would Cost $145,000,000," which appeared in the March 13, 1950, issue of the League Reporter:

FIVE-CENT HIKE IN NATURAL GAS WOULD COST $145,000,000

What is the natural-gas bill which the Senate will consider soon? Why should you be concerned with it?

The measure seriously would weaken Federal regulation of natural-gas rates. That means only one thing to you: Higher prices for natural gas.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, has obtained figures from the Federal Power Commission which show how many millions of dollars are involved in this fight between the people and a handful of wealthy oil companies.

If the Senate approves the House-passed legislation, natural gas companies will be able to increase their rates almost at will. Immediate increases of from 1 to 5 cents for 1,000 cubic feet of gas could be expected.

The American Gas Association estimates that a family heating a two-bedroom home with natural gas in New York State would use about 150,000 cubic feet of gas annually.

Based on 1948 figures, a 5-cent increase would mean that gas bills would go up $8,500,000 each year in Pennsylvania alone. Ohio consumers would have to pay $11,400,000 more for natural gas than they did in 1948. In Illinois the increase would cost consumers about $4,800,000 yearly.

Throughout the Nation the added cost to natural gas bills would total close to $145,000,000.

In the past 2 years there has been tremendous expansion of natural-gas lines in New England and the Carolinas. Natural-gas consumption also has increased greatly in the 33 States where it was being used in 1948. So the figures are conservative.

FPC now can regulate the price of natural gas from the time it is taken from the southwestern fields until it reaches your city. To be effective, rate regulation must begin in the fields and continue until you use the gas for heating and cooking.

Natural gas interests want to take from FPC the power to regulate the initial sale of gas from the producer to the pipe-line company. Then all rates could be determined by the prices the big concerns decide to charge in the fields.

Last year 24,000,000 consumers used natural gas. And 38 big companies produced 86 percent of the gas sent over interstate pipe lines.

Are your Senators going to vote for the interests of 24,000,000 Americans or for the interests of 38 large businesses?

The table below shows what 1-cent and 5-cent increases per 1,000 cubic feet would cost the 33 States where natural gas was used in 1948, the last year for which figures are available. The statistics are from the FPC.

[In thousands of dollars]

State	1-cent increase	5-cent increase
Alabama	593	2,965
Arizona	328	1,641
Arkansas	859	4,293
California	4,227	21,137
Colorado	557	2,783
Florida	88	439
Georgia	458	2,288
Illinois	954	4,769
Indiana	389	1,944
Iowa	320	1,598
Kansas	1,504	7,521
Kentucky	268	1,340
Louisiana	2,168	10,842
Maryland	42	212
Michigan	749	3,745
Minnesota	430	2,149
Mississippi	478	2,392
Missouri	731	3,655
Montana	288	1,441
Nebraska	468	2,338
New Mexico	270	1,349
New York	299	1,496
North Dakota	29	145
Ohio	2,288	11,441
Oklahoma	1,469	7,346
Pennsylvania	1,711	8,556
South Dakota	88	440
Tennessee	353	1,766
Texas	5,162	25,809
Utah	222	1,108
Virginia	37	183
West Virginia	811	4,053
Wyoming	213	1,063
Total [1]	28,943	144,714

[1] Discrepancies due to rounding.

The State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

desire to have included the following article by Mr. George Sokolsky appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of March 21, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Never before has the State Department been attacked as violently as during the past 10 years. The attacks did not begin with Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, nor will they end with his current reports.

The attacks began really in 1933 when we recognized Soviet Russia. They were intensified with the startling Amerasia case, in which 100 files from the State and other departments were found in the offices of this left-wing magazine in which was also situated photographing equipment.

That case was hushed up.

Those interested in the infiltration of the highest level of Government by known Communists, whose party membership could not be proved without their consent, continued to dig into the record. While much was discovered, little could be established, for what these men were engaged in was a conspiracy, internationally directed.

Their trail might be uncovered, but it could not be established by the rules of evidence applicable in a court of law. Only when they fumbled, or when one of them broke from the crowd, and stated facts under oath, was it possible to publish the already known facts.

The principals in this business, such men as George Mink, J. Peters, Gerhart Eisler, and others whom even now I cannot name with provable evidence, were clever, trained men.

The most damaging contribution to the subject has thus far been made by John Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of administration. His statement should have shocked this Nation.

When Maximilian Harden, the German journalist, called attention to a similar camarilla in the Kaiser's court, involving Prince Eulenburg, it shocked and astonished the world.

Yet, in this generation, in the United States, a charge that 91 employees of the State Department were dismissed for being homosexuals passes with little excitement.

Perhaps the reason is that the word, homosexual, is considered bad. It is not the word that is bad; it is the consequences of the deed that lay the individual open to blackmail. He is ashamed; he is frightened; he has become accustomed to secrecy, conspiracy, lying. He is always subject to blackmail.

Mr. Peurifoy said, in giving the figure 91:

"Most of them were homosexuals. In fact, I would say all of them were."

Of course, Mr. Peurifoy withheld the names of these persons and therefore it is not known what positions they held. For instance, if a homosexual held such a position as Under Secretary of State or as sensitive bureau chief, the menace to the United States would be that if the espionage services of a foreign power or of a world-wide conspiracy got at him, he would have three alternatives:

1. To resign yet to risk exposure. 2. To submit to blackmail and become a spy for a foreign power; or 3, to commit suicide.

I am dealing with this problem not from a moral but from a practical standpoint. There are some persons who excuse the homosexual on the ground that he was born that way. Others become involved in Freudian jargon and explain this phenomenon as due to a variety of causes. From our standpoint, it is merely a question as to whether a person whose conduct lays him open to blackmail is a good security risk.

Now, in all the arguments on the subject, those who defend the State Department and attack Senator MCCARTHY miss two points:

1. Our foreign policy has been wrong since 1943 (Tehran) because it was controlled by a foreign power, Soviet Russia. Dean Acheson's speeches in San Francisco must be read as a condemnation of these policies; otherwise they have no meaning.

What part did these homosexuals, subject to blackmail, play in the formulation and conduct of those erroneous policies?

2. Whereas some of the rest of us may be as black at heart as Al Capone, those in the State Department must be as pure in mind and purpose as driven snow, for that Department gathers the data, formulates the policies, lay down the techniques, short of war, for the defense of our country in times of peace and war.

A liar, advantageously stationed; a blackmailed creature in a sensitive spot; a frightened soul, caught in the web of conspiracy, can produce such a result as the conquest of China by Soviet Russia by consent. There is the menace.

Let's Eliminate Waste and Duplication in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, as Congress begins consideration of a $43,000,000,000 budget, we are faced with a deficit which may exceed $5,000,000,000. Only twice since 1932 has this Nation had a balanced budget. How long are we going to continue spending more each year than we collect in taxes?

We have before us the Hoover Commission report, which if adopted, would save from $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 annually simply by reorganizing the National Government and eliminating overlapping functions of the various bureaus and agencies. That amount could be saved, the Commission estimates, simply by eliminating waste and without curtailing any services now rendered by the Government.

There are some 1,800 Government bureaus, divisions, agencies, and commissions—all rushing to and fro on their own projects, knowing or caring little what other agencies of the Government are doing. They are fighting fiercely to protect their jobs, their departments, their red tape and their right to spend the taxpayers' money.

There are 38 different Government agencies that lend money; 16 different Government agencies are engaged in wildlife preservation, 34 agencies are engaged in obtaining land, 10 in Government construction, 9 in credit and finance, 4 in bank examinations, 65 in gathering statistics, 14 in forestry matters, 28 in welfare matters, 12 in home and community planning, and 25 dealing with the Nation's mineral resources.

A farmer wrote a letter to the Department of Agriculture seeking advice on the best type of fertilizer to use on his soil. He received answers from five separate offices in the Department and all the answers were different and contradictory.

The Army tore down a $16,000,000 camp in Alaska and shipped the lumber to Seattle, where it was acquired by the Department of the Interior, which shipped it back to a point less than 10 miles from the original camp site.

The Federal Government owns 848,567 typewriters, or better than 3½ typewriters for every stenographer and typist on the pay roll. Some bureaus and divisions have enough office supplies on hand to last them more than 100 years.

We often hesitate to make any cuts in the national defense budget, yet $7,000,000 annually could be saved if the Army, Navy, and Air Force could agree on uniform underwear for their personnel.

In the past 20 years the cost of the Federal Government has skyrocketed from $28 to $317 per capita. Just think of that. The per capita cost has gone up more than 1,000 percent.

To bring home what a $43,000,000,000 budget means to the people of my own State of Washington, consider this. Washington's State's share of the administration's proposed 1951 budget is $700,243,500. If we put into effect the Hoover Commission recommendations and save $4,000,000,000, it will save the taxpayers of Washington State nearly $100,000,000—nearly $30 saved for every man, woman, and child in the State.

It is time that we acted on the Hoover report—not next week, next month, or next session—but now. Every day we delay millions of dollars are being wasted. I believe some sections of the Hoover report should have further study, but the bulk of its recommendations should be adopted immediately.

We have reached a crisis in Government. If Congress is now unable to put through an honest, widespread, and effective reorganization, they and the taxpayers might as well surrender. If the bureaucrats win again, as they have before, we might as well concede defeat.

But I am convinced that governmental affairs can be conducted on a business-like basis, that we can set up efficient operating systems, eliminate red tape and promptly discharge department heads who put their own interests above those of the taxpayers. If we really want efficiency and economy in Government, now is the time to act.

Macy Asks Probe of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth in the RECORD a news article from the Washington Star of March 15, 1950, in connection with the introduction of House Resolution 509 by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACY]:

MACY ASKS SPECIAL HOUSE UNIT TO PROBE UNITED STATES ORGANIZED CRIME

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Representative MACY, advocating complete investigation of organized crime, be-

lieves Congress must meet the challenge of rackets that take in three times as much money as the Government now gives in foreign aid.

The New York Republican yesterday introduced a House resolution for a seven-member House committee to probe criminal activities on a country-wide basis.

But, he said today, he seeks neither glory nor more work for himself. He declared he "would be perfectly willing to suppress myself" in order to get immediate congressional action.

A somewhat similar Senate resolution, sponsored by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, won Senate Judiciary Committee approval February 28. It has been in the Rules Committee since then. On a comparatively limited scale, a House District Subcommittee headed by Representative DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia, is looking into crime, punishment and enforcement methods in the District.

NEW RESOLUTION BROADER

"I have been planning for a long time to propose a congressional investigation," Mr. MACY explained. "I withheld my resolution in the hope that the Senate resolution would make progress. I finally decided to put mine in, and I hope it will stimulate action all along the line, especially since mine is broader than the Senate measure."

Disavowing pride of authorship, and denying partisan motives, the 51-year-old legislator said he would have no objection if his resolution finally wound up with Senator KEFAUVER's to make a joint congressional committee investigation.

Prominence in investigative activities, however, would be nothing new to Mr. MACY, a former New York State legislator. More than 20 years ago he took a leading part in an investigation of the New York State Banking Department. Disclosures led to conviction and imprisonment of the then superintendent of banking.

A few years later, Mr. MACY joined in the Seabury inquiry that resulted in the resignation of the late Mayor James J. Walker.

One of his major assignments since he came to Congress in 1947 was to head a House Public Works Subcommittee that last year investigated a reported gray market in automobiles and steel.

Although not a lawyer, Mr. MACY is especially interested in law enforcement aspects that would be examined by the investigating committee he proposes.

"Naturally the subject of law enforcement would be an important phase of any thorough investigation of organized crime throughout the United States," he said. "I said many years ago in New York, and I still say, that it's not enough to make laws. If laws can't be enforced, they aren't worth enacting.

"Legislative bodies have a duty not only to make good laws but to look closely from time to time to see if they are enforced and if they can be enforced."

The Macy resolution would authorize the Speaker to appoint a special committee of seven Representatives with power to hold public hearings, hire expert assistance, subpena witnesses and records, and recommend possible changes to tighten Federal laws.

FIFTEEN BILLION YEARLY

Associates of Mr. MACY estimated that at least $100,000 would be necessary to assure an adequate investigation. Mr. MACY himself set no figure in his bill, but he remarked today:

"We have been told repeatedly that organized rackets, crime syndicates, and other criminal operations in interstate activities alone are costing the American people and the Government something like $15,000,000,000. That is three times the amount we are giving to help foreign countries. Surely, it is more necessary than ever at this time to try to cut down at least a part of the heavy cost of crime."

And from a Federal Treasury standpoint, he added, a comprehensive, hard-hitting congressional investigation of organized crime should sharply reduce tax evasion and hidden profits.

Others supporting the Macy resolution said they believed a prime purpose of the committee would be to find out who gets the big pay-offs for big-time crime and who really supports huge rackets.

The Kefauver resolution, as enlarged by the Senate Judiciary Committee last month, would allot $100,000 for an investigating committee project. Originally the resolution centered largely on an investigation of interstate gambling operations.

It now would also cover interstate prostitution, narcotics, loan-shark rackets, swindling schemes, organized murder and extortion, and preying on legitimate business and labor.

Address of Hon. Brendan Corish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Brendan Corish, parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Local Government of the Republic of Ireland, at the annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the Irish American Association, Panthervalley, Pa., March 16, 1950:

Before commencing my address to you tonight, I feel I must tell you what an honor it is to me to be here as your guest. The warmth and friendliness of the atmosphere in which I find myself almost wipes out the distance that lies between us and Ireland, for here is Irish hospitality, here are Irish people, and here I am among friends. On this eve of the feast of St. Patrick it is no wonder that distances should lessen, that ties of friendship should be stronger, and that Ireland should be seen, not as a small island but as a shining thread of green woven through the tapestry of the great nations. I feel this more strongly because, as one of the younger generation, it had not yet been impressed on me how strong is our "Nation beyond the seas." I knew the help that had always come to us at home whenever it was needed. I know how unfailingly the great weight of the influence of the Irish in America has always been thrown behind the cause of Irish freedom and how in the continuance of that influence there lies one of our greatest hopes for eventual unity. But it is not until now, when I am among you, that I realize to the full how closely you are bound to the motherland by a thousand links that can never be broken. I am here firstly as a member of the Irish Government. In that capacity it is my pleasant duty to bring you their greetings and those of the people of Ireland. No more welcome duty could ever be given to me. I must, however, as a member of the Irish Labor Party, add to it a special greeting to the forces of organized labor which I know to be in this district. Even in this we are in your debt. It is not yet 6 months since American organized labor came to the fore with a forthright statement on Ireland's claim to unity. The passing of a resolution at the annual conventions of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations condemning the partition of our country and calling upon the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to end it is still fresh in our minds and is evidence of the burning desire for justice which is always to be found among the working men and women of the great democracies. Representing as they do over 14,000,000 American workers, the gesture of these two great organizations has been one of the features of the relations between the two countries during the past year.

Significant too has been the action of the State Department in raising the status of their representation in Ireland to that of an embassy. It has long been felt, and we are proud that it has been finally acknowledged, that the special ties between the two countries call for the highest diplomatic representation that can be accorded.

If I were asked then my impression of how it is with the Irish in America I should not hesitate to say, "It is well." Everything I have seen since I arrived here serves to confirm that impression. You may ask me in return, "How is it with them at home?" and my answer would be the same. Ireland, like many another small nation, has vast problems before her today—problems of reconstruction, of economic recovery, of nation-wide improvement. But the existence of such problems does not mean that we have admitted their presence and failed to tackle them. With unity of purpose and with faith in our ability we have set about their solution. Here again the ever-present help of America is evident. The loans made available by Marshall aid under the Economic Cooperation Administration have helped us in a great industrial and agricultural drive to bridge the dollar gap which yawns between us and prosperity. Our investments abroad are being called home and placed in sound schemes for the development of the country. A vast land rehabilitation program is in course of operation—for we realize that we are primarily an agricultural country and that in a healthy soil and a careful and skilled agricultural economy lies our surest guaranty of future prosperity. Land drainage, reafforestation, turf development—all are part of the over-all scheme of improvement.

As far as is possible we are developing our industrial resources, particularly in those spheres in which our excellence is acknowledged. Our tourist trade, the most valuable of our dollar-earning industries, is gradually assuming more satisfying proportions and, what is more important to those of you who, we hope, will come and visit Ireland, more satisfying standards of excellence. Housing for our people is being provided in a vast housing scheme, and our hospital system, always a source of pride to us, is being enlarged and expanded by the provision of new modern sanatoria in several parts of the country. The life of the rural worker will, it is hoped, be lightened by the system of rural electrification which has been planned and which has already begun to operate in some places. I could continue to give you examples of the various avenues into which the energies of the people have been directed, but suffice it to say that they are all part of an over-all pattern of energy, of new life, and of concentrated effort. Ireland is building, Ireland is developing, but, above all, Ireland is working. We are content to be so. As a race we have never shirked our duty; we have never sought to avoid honest toil when it was for the benefit of our people and our country, and the Ireland of 1950 is determined to prove no less worthy of respect and honor than the Ireland of other generations.

We are facing our problems, and we think we are achieving a large measure of success. In this again I repeat that we owe a vast debt of gratitude to your Government and to the broad statesmanlike plan which made available at a crucial time the aid which

Europe needed. We can repay the debt in kind, but we can never repay sufficiently in warmth of feeling or in gratitude what we owe to you.

There is one problem, however, which remains before us as a challenge to our endeavors. For 30 years it has been the main object of every national effort, for 30 years we have striven to find a solution for it—and today we can only hope that the great desire for peace in the world will soon help us to solve it. You know what the problem is before I mention it—it is the division of our country. Today, as never before, the light of publicity has at least begun to make this problem one in which all peace-loving nations should concern themselves. It is difficult, I know, for us to whom it is a very vital concern, to realize that to many people the facts of the case have never been presented. If we are to succeed we must make the problem known, we must give the facts to the world and determine that justice shall be brought about finally.

The history of partition and its accomplishment and the story of its maintenance is a sad and sordid one. Nowhere in her long history does the perfidy of Britain show clearer than in her relationship with Ireland and nowhere in that relationship is the evidence more damning than in the story of partition.

If I ask you to examine that evidence it is not with any spirit of rancour and bitterness; it is, rather, to secure that you will continue to play your part now, as ever, to remove any cause of quarrel between Britain and Ireland and so aid the solution of a problem, which we feel is vital to world peace. Claims have been made by Britain that partition is an Irish problem but we maintain that Britain created partition, is responsible for its maintenance and has a responsibility to the world to secure its early removal.

In 1920, in defiance of the wishes of the elected representatives of the Irish Nation, an act of the British Parliament imposed partition and divided the six northeastern counties from the rest of Ireland. No Irishman voted for the partitioning act. The area thus cut off from the remainder had no basis in history, or geography. It was so designed that a majority could be found therein, who were opposed to home rule for Ireland and who since have been prepared to defy the will of the vast majority of the nation for a United Ireland. A boundary was drawn between the six counties and their southern brethren and this boundary has since been manned by British customs officers. Meanwhile, in the 26 counties, control of affairs passed into the hands of Irishmen and successive governments proceeded to take steps to remove step by step any constitutional limitations on their sovereignty—at one and the same time repugnant to Irish national sentiment and a bar to good relations with Great Britain. The bringing into operation of the Republic Act, 1949, last year marked the last step in that phase and left only one bar to true friendship with Britain—partition. On Easter Monday 1949, the Irish Nation rejoiced at seeing for the first time an Irish Republic internationally recognized. A partial rejoicing it must be admitted, for there remained yet one final step in the road to the achievement of its national objective; the reunion under its national flag of its fellow countrymen in the six northeastern counties. On that day the Irish Republic took its formal place among the nations of the world, amid world-wide messages of good will, and called on the world to assist in the removal of the last barrier to true friendship with Great Britain. Alas, in May 1949, the latter took a step, which can only be regarded as a measure of ill will. In that month the British House of Commons under a labor government passed the Ireland Act, which contained a clause iniquitous to the heart of any true Irishmen, handing over the right to decide the destiny of the area, known as Northern Ireland to the Northern Ireland Parliament for decision. No time was lost in voicing the protest of Ireland against this flagrant violation of democratic rule. Both Houses of Parliament met in special assembly, registered a protest in no uncertain terms and called on the British Government and people to end the present occupation of our six northeastern counties, and thereby enable the unity of Ireland to be restored and the age-long differences between the two countries brought to an end.

We regret sincerely that such an element should have been introduced into our relations with Britain. It adds to our sorrow when we recall that at the time of the imposition of partition the members of the party, who introduced and secured the passage of the Ireland Act, pledged themselves at the time to recognize fully Ireland's right to decide her own destiny as one nation. By the passage of that act one further chapter was added to the wrongs committed by Britain toward our nation and a flagrant violation of the democratic ideal. Irishmen cannot be blamed for feeling that Britain by that step has no true feeling for the democratic ideal when one considers the history of the Parliament to which she has committed the destiny of six counties of our national territory.

Is it not ironical to recall that as a result of the recent elections for the British Parliament 10 out of 12 representatives from the sundered area of Northern Ireland threaten the majority of the British Government, which passed the Ireland Act?

I have already referred to the area of jurisdiction of that Parliament, showing that it was deliberately designed that a majority could be found therein opposed at the time to the idea of home rule for Ireland and who have since ranged themselves as opposed to the unity of Ireland. Facts and figures as regard subsequent elections to it have demonstrated the success of its author's designs under a system of election, contrary to any democratic principle, the Tory party has always succeeded over an area, comprising one-third of the total area, of securing a majority even against the will of the people of the remaining two-thirds. By a process of gerrymandering worthy of any totalitarian state, large areas with a majority in favor of Ireland's unity have been deprived of representation in the Parliament, which under Britain's latest law, is to decide the destiny of the territory. Derry City, one of the oldest in the motherland, has 29,000 to 13,000 in favor of unity of the country. To deny representation to that majority in Parliament the city electoral division was rearranged. Part of the city was omitted altogether. Then the city boundaries, for Parliamentary elections only, were stretched 8 miles into the country to gather enough opposing votes to eclipse the will of the majority in the city as regards representation in Parliament.

Fired with repugnance for such a system and such examples of the violation of the democratic ideal, the vast majority of the motherland appeal to the sons and daughters all over the world to help them to bring this unhappy state of affairs to an end. It does so in no spirit of hostility to those of our fellow countrymen in its separated counties who are opposed to the ideal of a 32-county republic. On the contrary, our spokesmen have several times declared that we are prepared to afford them any constitutional guaranties that may be reasonably required to allay any fears, real or imaginary, that they may have. We recognize their finer qualities, such as doggedness, firm purpose and industry, and yearn for the time that these qualities will be brought to play under the banner of a 32-county Republic of Ireland. We in the liberated part of the motherland can point to a fine tradition of liberty, toleration, and respect for the human person among all sections of our people.

Accordingly we call on the citizens of this great democracy of yours, a democracy which has met and surmounted the ugly threat of partition, to assist us in our great task and we know that all sons and daughters of the motherland in this great country will do their utmost to insure that a 32-county republic of Ireland, united in territory and bonds of good will, will take its place among the nations of the world.

A Congressional Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, March 21, 1950:

A CONGRESSIONAL BLUNDER

In one of those acts of impromptu statesmanship that occasionally crop up in Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted yesterday to slash cash funds for the third Marshall plan year by a round billion dollars and to substitute an equivalent amount in American farm surplus commodities. The administration has asked for new authorization of $2,950,000,000 as an absolute minimum needed to continue the Marshall plan in full effectiveness. But the House committee decided to disregard this request, as well as all objections to its own plan, and by a vote that cut across party lines adopted a proposal by Republican Representative VORYS, of Ohio, which would reduce actual Marshall plan funds to $1,950,000,000 and authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to supply $1,000,000,000 worth of agricultural surplus goods as required.

No doubt Representative VORYS and the committee majority are inclined to regard their action as a clever piece of work. They are presumably prepared to claim credit simultaneously for a billion-dollar reduction in a deficit budget and for facilitating the disposal of American farm surpluses now carried by the Government at a cost of four billions. Both the budget deficit and the farm surpluses pose serious problems, but the committee's way is not the way to solve them. For, as Representative KEE, the chairman of the committee, warned, the Vorys plan, if adopted, would be certain to have a crippling effect both on the European recovery program and on the administration's farm support program, in which both parties have an interest.

It is bound to have a crippling effect on the European recovery program, because that program is not a relief program, as the committee majority seems to think, but a reconstruction program in which the supply of American food has been decreasing steadily in favor of raw materials, semifinished goods, and machinery to increase Europe's own productive ability. As a result, not only has western Europe's industrial production risen considerably above prewar levels but its agricultural production has also recovered so thoroughly that in some countries and some items the problem may soon be one of food surpluses. It is the present purpose of the Marshall plan to enable Europe to continue its recovery and to put itself in shape to sustain the new productive levels by its own strength, through an integration which would break down trade barriers and enable the surpluses of individual nations to move

across present frontiers to areas where they may be needed.

The House committee now proposes to interrupt this process by methods which would not only imperil the results attained but also give a semblance of justification to the charges of our opponents that the Marshall plan is merely a vast program for subsidizing our own production at the expense of those we profess to aid. Communists everywhere could be depended upon to exploit to the utmost this misrepresentation of our aims.

As for the farm surpluses, it will be noted that the Economic Cooperation Administration has supplemented the Government support program by buying foods in the open market and usually at lower prices than paid by the Government under the parity principle. The committee's action would thus merely foist upon ECA commodities at higher prices than it has paid before—a maneuver that would increase the dollar gap which the Marshal' plan is supposed to bridge, while at the same time forcing the Government to buy that much more in its support program at an additional expense to the taxpayers. Even as a farm-support measure, therefore, the Vorys plan is of more than doubtful value. Its enactment would be both a poor economy and a formidable blow to our whole foreign policy, giving aid and comfort to our opponents in the cold war. It must be hoped that either the committee or the House as a whole will reconsider this action and correct a blunder that could have serious consequences.

Television Revolution Will Be Digested, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting editorial resolves the currently much-discussed problem of television, children, and school or home work. Because of its timeliness, I commend it to my colleagues. May I also, Mr. Speaker, mention my opposition to an imposition of a tax on television sets now under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee to offset some wartime taxes that should be removed. The television industry in its infancy needs encouragement, not a tax burden to retard the progress.

The editorial, from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald of March 19, 1950, follows:

TELEVISION REVOLUTION WILL BE DIGESTED, TOO

The capacity of the American parent to be surprised and concerned over the activities of his offspring is exceeded only by the capacity of the American genius to provide newer and more stimulating things for that offspring to do.

Radio, the movies, comic books—all have had their day with the small fry, and all have taken their turn at being lambasted by parents and educators as pernicious influences on the young.

And years ago, before the advent of these modern delights, even the good books that are now esteemed so highly because fewer and fewer children read them, were the object of plenty of parental suspicion. In his time, the lad who kept his nose in a book to the exclusion of other interests, including home work, was the object of parental concern even as is today's devotee of Howdy Doody.

Now it's television's turn. All of a sudden everybody is concerned over the number of hours the kids spend before the screen. A survey of television habits among junior high school students in Stamford last week seems to have touched off a small explosion and, to mix a metaphor, everybody's getting into the act.

Why the results of the survey should be as surprising to so many is in itself matter for surprise. It should have been perfectly obvious from the time the first program appeared on the first television set that here was an innovation that was going to turn American family life upside down.

Moreover, results of surveys made so far, including the one in Stamford, have not attempted to correlate scholastic standing with television watching.

The kids claim that television doesn't interfere with homework, except in a few honest instances. And until such times as it has been proved that there is a definite relationship between slipping grades and increased video viewing, why become alarmed over a phenomenon that is only demonstrating the charm of novelty in the usual fashion?

While television is new and wonderful, practically everyone spends most of his free time watching it. And children, the least selective of enthusiasts, spend more time than anybody else, in part because they have more free time.

But those who have had television sets in their homes long enough for the novelty to wear off, report that in time television takes its place as only another adjunct to a full life. Selectivity returns, even to children, and the youngster who once would not have missed a radio mystery story only to become colossally indifferent to it after the arrival of the television set, finds that after a time Howdy Doody palls and even Milton Berle is much the same.

And at that point, he may even read a book.—N. H.

Near Eastern Armaments Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1950, I inserted in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Secretary of State, in which I protested the participation by the United States in the arms race in the Middle East. I have since received a reply from the Secretary, which is not a satisfactory explanation of the role being played by us in the Middle East, nor does it assuage my fears for the security of Israel. I do not intend to wait until a shooting war starts before we take action.

If the rearmament of the Arab states is truly for defense purposes against aggressor nations, then certainly Israel is an important ally and should be included in the defense plans.

Because of the widespread interest in this crisis, I am including in the RECORD the letter sent me by the Secretary of State on March 13, and my answer:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 13, 1950.

The Honorable ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DOLLINGER: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 7 concerning the near-eastern armaments situation. Since you have been following this matter closely, you are aware of the great importance which this Government attaches to the question of the establishment of peace and the maintenance of stability in the Near East, and of the Department's desire not to see an arms race take place in the area. I need not reiterate here those elements underlying the United States Government's position on the problem which were set forth in the Secretary's letter to Representative JAVITS, since you are doubtless familiar with the contents of that communication.

In considering the situation, it is useful to recall that on August 11 the Security Council, in view of the cessation of hostilities in the Near East and the tranquil conditions existing there, lifted the embargo which it had placed upon the shipment of arms to the Palestine area. In deciding thus, the Council took into consideration the important fact that the relations between Israel and the neighboring Arab States are governed by valid armistice agreements, under the terms of which the parties are committed not t. resort to hostilities. The execution of the provisions of these agreements is being effectively supervised on the spot in Palestine by United Nations observers. It is a matter of satisfaction that these observers report that the situation in Palestine continues tranquil and that no serious preparations are being made to resume hostilities. Should a threat to the peace arise in the area, it would be the duty of the United Nations observers on the scene, or of the states themselves, to report this development to the Security Council, the body which remains seized of the matter of the preservation of peace in Palestine.

An analysis of reports and information available to the Department leads to the conclusion, I am glad to say, that the trend in the Palestine area is away from war towards peace. Indications of this trend are the peace talks reportedly taking place between Israel and Jordan, various recent high level official Arab declarations categorically denying any intention of resuming hostilities in Palestine, the recent lifting by Egypt of restrictions involving foreigners whose passports bear Israeli visas, the agreement signed between Israeli and Egyptian representatives on February 22 involving the disposition of certain no-man's-land areas near the Gaza region, and a recent agreement between Jordan and Israel limiting the heavy arms to be located on the armistice lines between the two countries. The Department considers these developments encouraging and believes they represent a hopeful change in the previous attitude of the Arab States toward reaching agreements involving Israel. In connection with the general attitude of the Arabs and Israelis toward one another, it should be recalled that passions were raised to a high pitch during the Palestine conflict, and that a relatively short time has passed since the hostilities ended.

At the time the Security Council lifted the Palestine arms embargo, the United States and Great Britain stated that they did not wish to see an arms race develop in the Near East. The United States stands by this policy, and has been permitting the exportation to both the Arab States and Israel of military equipment which has been considered necessary for the maintenance of internal order and to provide for legitimate defense requirements. The United States will continue to receive applications from

all governments in the Near East for the exportation of military equipment and will consider these applications within the framework of the above policy.

The United Kingdom, which to the best of the Department's knowledge is guided in its near-eastern arms export policy by the same general principles as those underlying American policy, has been supplying to certain Arab states, notably those with which it has treaty arrangements, military material to enable them to provide for defense needs. You will be interested to learn that the mutual defense assistance program for the fiscal year 1950 does not provide to the United Kingdom any items of the kinds being furnished to Arab states. Neither does the mutual defense assistance program furnish to the United Kingdom replacement items for items thus supplied by the United Kingdom.

With respect to your reference to the release by the Department of news concerning the recent Israeli note on Israel's arms requirements, I can assure you that the Department had no intention of making public the Israeli request. However, the Department has no choice but to confirm the receipt of the note after correspondents learned from sources outside the Department that it had been sent.

You will be interested to learn that it had been previously agreed with the Ambassador of Israel that, if questioned by the press, the Department and the Israeli Embassy would confine their comments to a confirmation that the Israeli request had been made.

I assure you that the Department will continue to keep very careful watch on developments affecting the Palestine situation and that should information be received indicating that serious measures were being taken in preparation for the resumption of hostilities in the Near East, the United States Government would be quick to use all of its influence in an attempt to frustrate such plans. Happily, as I have said, the present trend in the area seems to be toward conditions of peace and stability.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

MARCH 21, 1950.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This will acknowledge your letter of March 13, in reply to mine of March 7, in which I protested the participation by the United States in the arms race in the Middle East, to the detriment of Israel.

Your reply does not give me the feeling of complacency that you intended, nor do I consider it a fitting explanation of the role being played by the United States in the Middle East at this time.

In your reply, you acknowledge the vast shipments of arms by Great Britain to the Arab States, and imply that this heavy rearming of the Arab States has the approval of our State Department. You discount any ensuing danger to Israel by saying that the present trend in the Middle East is away from war toward peace.

In my opinion, the State Department takes too bright a view of the situation, and I cannot share its optimism. It chooses to believe that the existing armistice agreements will be lived up to by the Arab States, and therefore, there is no danger of a renewed attack upon Israel. This is blind faith, when we consider the threats being made by Arab statesmen, press, and radio, that they are looking forward to the "second round" against Israel, and that there will be a war of revenge. In reality—there is a smoldering resentment toward Israel, which at any moment can burst into the flame of war. What assurances are there that the threats constantly being made by Arab States will not be carried out?

You state that the United Kingdom has been supplying military material to the Arab States to enable them to provide for defense needs. As I pointed out to you in my letter of the 7th, the military supplies and money being furnished the Arab States are far beyond the amounts necessary for ordinary defense purposes in peacetime. They are so far beyond normal needs that they constitute an invitation to conquest by the disgruntled losers, of their less prepared intended victim—Israel.

When you say: "Should a threat to the peace arise, it would be the duty of the United Nations observers to report the matter to the Security Council, the body which remains seized of the matter of the preservation of peace in Palestine"—you state an interesting fact. But, Mr. Secretary, by then the shooting war would be under way; bloodshed would have begun; Israel, not equipped for war by great nations in the meantime, would be put to another supreme test to preserve her liberty. This is what we do not want, this is what must be avoided.

Again I repeat—Israel wants peace. If her bitter and sworn enemies are to be armed by Britain, and indirectly by the United States, then in all fairness, Israel must be given the opportunity to acquire arms to the extent that a balance of arms will be established between her and the Arab States. If it is true that the rearmament of the Arab States is based upon a policy of security for the Middle East against possible invasion by a third power, then Israel should be equally included with every other nation, in that policy. In fact, if the eastern Mediterranean is considered so important in our world plans, Israel must also be a link in the chain, as strong as any other. Israel is a new nation, recognized by us and included in the United Nations. Therefore, it is our duty to treat Israel accordingly, and to give her the same consideration as any other nation, in defense plans.

Our aim is to preserve peace. On this ground, we can insist that Britain strengthen Israel as well as the Arab States if she persists in her present program which she calls defense. If this fails, it is our duty to give Israel all the help she needs to make her equally strong with the Arab States. But we must take a stand, and let it be known that the security of Israel is our concern; that we respect Israel's national integrity and expect other nations to do the same. If we continue with our do-nothing policy, we break faith with Israel and the world.

I urge again that the State Department fulfill its obligations under the authority vested in it, to take all necessary steps to avert the threatened war in the Middle East, and to give Israel the support to which she is entitled.

I, and all others interested in the preservation of the peace, and our integrity as a leading nation of the world, await your reply.

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Revision of the Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, March 20, 1950:

COUDERT TO ASK NONPARTISAN STUDY OF TAXES—SEEKS SWEEPING REVISION, DECLARES ENCROACHMENTS THREATEN AMERICAN SYSTEM

(By Tom O'Hara)

Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of the Seventeenth Congressional District, said yesterday in an interview that he will introduce this week in the House a resolution calling for a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a sweeping plan to revise the Federal tax structure.

The plan, Mr. COUDERT said, will serve to carry out the recommendation of the section on the national economy in the declaration of policy of the Republican Party as adopted last February 5 and to push the same idea as recommended by the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch, headed by former President Herbert Hoover.

"If we continue to go on as we are at present," Mr. COUDERT said of the mounting Federal encroachment in the field of taxes, "then the whole system of life in the United States will go overboard, the Federal Union will disappear, and we will inevitably break the treasury of the States and the Nation and have some sort of totalitarian set-up."

URGES STATES' TAX RIGHTS

Of necessity, Mr. COUDERT said, any study of the Federal tax structure must include the relation of it to the State and local governments. "Someone must get the ball rolling," he observed, "and I'd like to start it." He especially urged that the States should regain their right to certain taxes to erase a drain of some $5,000,000,000 now lost because so much handling is involved before the Federal tax moneys finally arrive back in local communities.

In the current Federal budget some $2,420,000,000 was handed back to the States and for the coming fiscal year some $3,265,000,000 will be given back, Mr. COUDERT said, and yet the total income of all the States was $7,000,000,000, indicating the Federal control over the State economies.

In 1948, he continued, the Federal Government took $600,000,000 in gasoline and oil taxes and yet only $315,000,000 of it came back to the States. The question was, he said, "Where did the money go?" New York State, he said, gave $100,000,000 in admission taxes on amusements to the Federal Government which took in a total of $569,000,000 in that category, a total more than enough to take care of the $300,000,000 Federal plan for Federal aid-to-education, a program which he said could best be done by the States.

FAVORS LOCAL CONTROLS

The chief virtue of returning taxes and therefore government functions to the States, he said, was that services performed locally under the eye of the voter and the taxpayer, and under local supervision are bound to be more effectively administered.

"The surest way to socialism," he warned, "is excessive expenditure and destructive taxation."

Mr. COUDERT said taxes are not dramatic but they are of vital importance to the domestic situation, and a good domestic situation determines the strength of the Nation in its dealings abroad. Enough public interest, he said, would force Congress to act, particularly on a nonpartisan basis.

Under the present administration, he said, nothing is done to aid business and industrial expansion, such as by reduction in taxes or diversion of taxing powers to the States to reduce costs. Nevertheless, the corollary is true that some 750,000 new potential wage earners enter the labor market each year and no place can be found for them in production.

Middle-Income Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith the following statement from the national housing director of the American Veterans Committee in regard to the middle-income housing bill:

MARCH 20, 1950.

The Honorable CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE,
Congresswoman from Connecticut,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. WOODHOUSE: In common cause with all other major veterans organizations, the American Veterans Committee (AVC) has warmly endorsed the provisions of the Housing Act of 1950 relating to middle-income housing.

Charges made that this legislation discriminates against the veteran are completely without foundation on fact. Statistically, a greater proportion of veterans of World War II are in the middle-income group, as defined by current legislation, than any other major segment of our population. Veterans stand to gain more proportionately from this legislation than any other group. Every year this legislation is delayed will cut into the ability of veterans to obtain benefits from it. In addition, veterans are widely organized in social groups that easily lend themselves to setting up bona fide housing cooperatives or nonprofit corporations.

We sincerely trust that the middle-income housing provisions are adopted by the House of Representatives as an essential step toward the elimination of the current housing shortage.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. HAWKINS,
National Housing Director, American Veterans Committee.

Lawyer's Reference Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the editor of the New Orleans States, Mr. W. H. Fitzpatrick, on his editorial of March 13 entitled "A Way To Beat Socialized Law," which I am incorporating herein.

The editor commends a constructive program of the American Bar Association which seeks to meet a definite need. His approach is affirmative. Agitation for Government programs seldom arises without some need or some abuse.

By recognizing such needs through intelligent action the pressure for Government intervention dies a-borning and the good are not punished with the bad as so often happens in reform measures adopted as a result of public demand.

The editorial follows:

LAWYER'S REFERENCE PLAN—A WAY TO BEAT SOCIALIZED LAW

The legal profession in many places has begun a far-seeing service to eliminate any possible need for socialized law. The medical profession, coping with its problem of possible socialization, could profit from a clinical study of what the lawyers are doing.

Sponsored by the American Bar Association, the service being initiated by many local bar associations is called the lawyer-reference plan. It seeks to make available to persons of moderate means legal advice and services at fees stipulated in advance. The leaders of the plan feel that the profession ought to supply such aid, and feel that if it is not done adequately and promptly by private initiative, a demand may arise for Government services similar to the demand faced by the medical profession.

As outlined by the president of the American Bar Association in an article reprinted by this newspaper Saturday, the plan works like this: The local bar association sets up a reference list of lawyers who wish to participate in the plan. A person of moderate means who feels the need of legal service goes to the association's headquarters, pays a small registration fee, consults with an experienced attorney in charge of the list, and then is sent by the consultant to an appropriate listed attorney. The listed lawyers agree to charge a flat fee, usually $3 or $5, for the first conference. Any other fees for further work are discussed before the work is done. Consequently, costs to the client are known in advance.

For developing the lawyer-reference plan, the legal profession deserves praise. The move represents the sort of initiative that characterizes the American way of doing things. It's an example of individual men, not government, working out a solution to the problems that give rise to socialization. The plan provides needed public service and at the same time preserves professional independence. The State and city bar associations here would do well to adopt this plan.

In contrast, the situation in the medical profession—as described by its own members—seems to lack the planned approach being taken by the lawyers. A view of the medical profession's difficulties was presented here last week at the Thirteenth Annual New Orleans Graduate Medical Assembly by the oldest physician attending. He was Dr. G. E. Cannon, of Hope, Ark., a general practitioner and surgeon for more than 50 years. He said:

"It's ridiculous to think of Government in medicine. It just won't work. But these socialized medicine people are encouraged by excessive charges being made by some practitioners."

He urged the medical men to "clean house" as the best way to fight socialized medicine.

"The medical profession is not without sin, but socialized medicine is not the answer," he said.

Dr. Cannon has made what seems to us an accurate diagnosis of the medical profession's case. The profession itself ought to move to remedy the situation that is encouraging the trend toward socialization.

The lawyers are taking preventive measures to block such a trend in their profession. If the doctors could take similar and appropriate action that would not leave room for an argument in behalf of socialized medicine, they would be doing the public and the medical profession a great service. They would preserve the necessary traditional independence of the profession. They would help block the spread of Federal domination into new fields. That domination looms as a threat to all phases of our lives.

Voting Machines for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. NOLAND

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch.

At the present time 18 State legislatures throughout the United States use an electrical roll-call system and save many wasted hours.

Practical objections to the automatic system of voting can easily be met with proper adaptation of such a system to the rules of the House.

The editorial follows:

VOTING MACHINES FOR CONGRESS

"I thank heaven for the voting machine," said Speaker Blackburn Moore, of the Virginia House of Delegates, recently. "I don't see how we ever got anything done without it."

Such, no doubt, is the opinion of everybody else in both branches of the State legislature. A machine was first installed in the house in 1923 and the senate in 1929, and these devices make it possible for the general assembly to transact in 60 days business that would take nobody knows how long if old-fashioned roll calls had to be resorted to.

Yet the Senate and House of Representatives in Washington, with much larger memberships, still cling to time-consuming roll calls. The situations in Richmond and Washington are not identical, it is true, and there are certain things that would have to be worked out in Congress in order for voting machines to fit snugly into the congressional system, but the obstacles seem far from insuperable.

An article in Collier's for March 4 by James C. Derieux, chief of its Washington bureau, calls attention to the clumsy and outmoded voting machinery which continues to function on both sides of our Nation's Capitol. Mr. Derieux says the cost of installing electric voting devices in both houses probably would be between $300,000 and $400,000, "which is not even piggy-bank change in these days of billions."

He feels that in addition to the great amount of time which would be saved in Washington by the use of voting machines, there would also be counteraction of the impression that Congress transacts its business in a clumsy and antiquated manner. Such an impression, if sufficiently widespread, could seriously injure the people's faith in our institutions.

Certain objections are raised to voting machines by members of the national legislature, although Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, has declared that antiquated voting procedure reduces congressional efficiency more than any other single practice.

It is contended that since Members are off the floor in Congress much more than in the State legislatures, and properly so, they would not be in their seats when a roll call by machine was completed in a matter of seconds. It seems reasonable, and feasible, to arrange for notice of 10 minutes, or even more, before the taking of a roll call. If this would mean wasting 10 minutes, at least it wouldn't waste from 40 to 45 minutes, which is the time consumed in calling the roll of the 435 House Members.

Mr. Derieux points to certain objections to mechanical voting which are not wholly

respectable. "The Member who waits to learn how the vote is going before throwing his yea or nay would be discomfited. Also, the Member who likes to avoid putting his vote on record except on selected bills would suffer political pains, for, if the machine is used on all calls, he could not count on the anonymity of the unrecorded voice vote," he says.

The House of Representatives would benefit more than the Senate by the installation of voting machines, since roll calls take so much longer there, because of the lengthy roll. It is argued that Members of the Senate and House necessarily spend much of their time off the floor in committee meetings, or in their offices. The present slow system gives them time to get to the floor after a roll call begins, but why cannot the same system of warning bells which is now operative, tell them that a roll call will begin within a specific period? This and other details can be worked out, if the Members really want to work them out.

Electing a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a series of three articles by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune the week of March 6, 1950:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1950]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ELECTING A PRESIDENT—I

The proposed amendment would make several changes in the method of electing the President and the Vice President. One would abolish the electoral college and the presidential electors. But this does not mean that the President would be elected directly by popular vote. The essence of the existing system is retained: The choice would still be made by electoral votes, each State being entitled as now to as many electoral votes as it has Representatives and Senators combined.

Standing by itself, this change is of little importance.

A second provision would make the election definitive if a candidate has a plurality of at least 40 percent of the total electoral vote. At present, under the twelfth amendmend, there is no election unless the candidate has a majority, and the choice is then thrown into the House.

The proposed amendment would reduce to an acceptable minimum the chance that the choice would not be decided in the popular election, and that the country would face the risk of a prolonged uncertainty while the House of Representatives elected a President.

The third provision deals with the situation that would arise if no candidate had a plurality of 40 percent and the election were thrown into the House. Under the twelfth amendment the vote in the House is by the unit rule. That is to say, each State casts one vote. This is obviously unfair to the larger States. The Lodge-Gossett amendment would have the President and the Vice President chosen from the two leading candidates by a majority of the two Houses sitting in a joint session.

This is an improvement on the twelfth amendment and, so far as we know, no serious objection to it has been raised by anyone. It should be noted, however, that no provision is made for the case where two candidates are tied with more than 40 percent of the electoral vote.

But the fourth provision, which is the heart of the amendment, is very important and very controversial.

Under the existing system, which rests on State laws and on custom but not on the Constitution itself, all the electoral votes in each State are cast for the candidate who obtains a plurality of the popular vote in that State. This arrangement is known as the general ticket system. It was almost certainly never contemplated by the men who framed the Constitution. It was introduced by political leaders in some of the States to increase their own power, and as early as 1824 Senator Benton attacked it, saying that it was contrary to the intent of the Constitution that each State should have a consolidated vote rather than each elector a separate vote.

The disadvantages of the general ticket system are many and they are serious. The Lodge-Gossett amendment is designed to remedy them. We believe, however, that the remedy is not the right remedy—that it has disadvantages at least as great, and probably greater, than those which it would remove, and that there is a better remedy. We dislike having to differ with Senator LODGE, since we are in complete sympathy with his purposes. The reason we have to differ with him is that we are opposed to any recognition of the principle of proportional representation in the American system of government. We believe that it is the fatal error of European democratic constitutions, the great cause of their worst difficulties, and we think it no exaggeration to say that if the principle of proportional representation were introduced here, it would end by destroying the stability of the Government.

Senator LODGE would, we know, object as strongly as we do to proportional representation in the legislative branch of the Government. But he believes, and we do not, that it could be introduced into the system of electing the President without any serious danger that it would then spread to the legislature.

In our succeeding articles we shall go into this more precisely in order to show, first, why Senator LODGE is right that the present general ticket system should be reformed—and second, why we think proportional representation is the wrong remedy and what the better remedy is.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 7, 1950]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ELECTING A PRESIDENT—II

We shall now discuss the disadvantages of the present general ticket system—that is to say the system by which all the electoral votes of the State are cast as a unit for the candidate who obtains a plurality of the popular vote.

This system allows a much greater weight to the pluralities in large States than they are entitled to on the basis of numbers. Suppose, to make the mathematics simple, that the Union consisted of only two States, New York with 47 electoral votes and Mississippi with 9. Suppose further that if the votes were cast by districts—in the same manner that Representatives are chosen—the Democrat got 23 in New York and 8 in Mississippi, the Republican 24 in New York and 1 in Mississippi. In such a case it would be quite clear that the majority of the people in the two States combined had elected the Democrat by a vote of 31 to 25. Yet under the general ticket system the Republican would be declared President by a vote of 47 to 9. This cannot be fair.

Furthermore, the system permits the most important event in our political process—the election of a President—to be determined by small and local caucuses. It puts a premium on accident. It puts a premium on fraud. It exaggerates the power of splinter parties. It exaggerates the power of special interests. It makes it possible for a State minority, rather than a State majority, to capture the whole vote of the State, and so perhaps to swing the whole election.

The system puts a premium on accident because any casual event—a rainy day in the rural districts, for example—may keep the voters of the State majority at home and swing the whole vote of the State to the voters of the minority. It is well known that bad weather affects urban voters less than rural voters and the two are commonly in different political parties.

The system puts a premium on fraud because by purchasing or fabricating a comparatively few votes in order to turn a popular minority into an apparent plurality, the whole electoral vote of the State can be had. In close elections in big States the temptation is very great.

Thus to use an example which will not offend any one at the moment, we know that in 1868 Boss Tweed manufactured a Democratic majority for the whole State of New York by fraud in the city of New York. This gave Seymour instead of Grant the 33 electoral votes of New York State. A local fraud determined the position of the whole State. In 1868 this fraud did not decide the choice of the President. In a close election it could have done that.

The present system exaggerates beyond all reason the power of splinter parties. Thus in the 1948 election the supporters of Henry Wallace held the balance of power in New York State between Truman and Dewey, and they were able to throw 47 electoral votes to Dewey. Wallace polled 509,000 votes. Dewey's plurality over Truman was 61,000 votes.

The system also exaggerates most undesirably the power of special interests in that a small shift of votes makes such a big difference in the electoral vote. In the election of 1888 Harrison carried the large States by small pluralities and lost the small States by large pluralities. Due to the mechanism of the system, a deficit of 96,000 popular votes was turned into a winning surplus of 65 electoral votes.

The present system, moreover, exercises a strong tendency to limit effective participation in democratic elections to the doubtful States—to make a considerable number of States—that is to say the sure States—so politically inactive that in fact the two-party system does not really operate. In the selection of presidential candidates, in the appeal to public opinion, political managers fix their attention on the large and doubtful States, ignoring those which are small or sure.

In the solid South few Republicans bother to vote. For they know that their votes will be lost. Nor do many Democrats go to the polls. For they know that their votes are not needed. In these States a very considerable number of electoral votes are controlled by a very few persons. Such an abdication of individual political power and responsibility by the voters cannot be a good thing in a democratic society. But it is the consequence of politics played under the rules of the game set by the general ticket system.

At first blush it might seem that the obvious remedy would be to abolish the whole electoral voting system and to leave the choice to a plurality of the people voting at large. But such a reform could not pass the Senate.

It could not pass the Senate because the present electoral voting system, by giving to each State a bonus of two votes regardless of size, works to the advantage of the small States. They will never renounce this advantage, which they regard as a genuine and

desirable element of the Constitution in its intention to protect them from the absolute power of the large States.

It ought not to pass because it is a sounder rule that the relative weight of communities in the electoral process should be proportional to their total population—voters and nonvoters alike—rather than to the number of their actual voters.

Furthermore, if the President were elected by the people at large all the evils which we have mentioned in connection with the general ticket system—accident, fraud, and so forth—would appear in aggravated form because they would not stop at the State lines. In addition, States would be under an inducement to compete with each other in lowering their voting qualifications. In Georgia, for example, children of 18 can vote; other States would soon follow or better the example. And in the end the Federal Government would have to step in and fix uniform voting qualifications, itself an undesirable result.

Yet the disadvantages and evils of the general ticket system ought to be dealt with. The question is how.

To the founding fathers and to many of the statesmen who came after them—to Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, John Quincy Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others—the district system was clearly the most satisfactory remedy. This is the system supported by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of New York, which he is offering as a substitute to the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

This district system, in the form which Mr. COUDERT seems to have in mind, would divide each State into as many similar districts as there are Representatives in the House. In addition, there would be two State-wide districts. The choice of a plurality of the people of each district would count as one electoral vote for the President. The choice of the people of the State as a whole would determine the other two electoral votes of the State. Thus, all but two of the electors of each State would be chosen by pluralities in a district and would be unaffected by the pluralities elsewhere in the State.

The district system, as we learn from Madison, was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted. It was supplanted by the general ticket system now in use as the only expedient for baffling the policy of the particular States which had set the example, that is to say, had adopted the general ticket system. It was a case of a bad system driving out a better one. For the district system in one State cannot exist in competition with the general ticket in another State. The State which operates under a general ticket system will then exercise more weight in the electoral vote than it deserves. Therefore, the only way that the district system can be restored is by constitutional amendment which would prevent any State from adopting the general ticket system.

In our view the district system is a better remedy than the Lodge amendment and it should be restored. Our reason for preferring this system, which is contemplated in the Coudert substitute for the Lodge-Gossett amendment, rests on our objection to the principle of proportional representation. We shall discuss that in the third and concluding article of this series.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ELECTING A PRESIDENT—III

We shall now discuss that part of the Lodge-Gossett amendment which employs the principle of proportional representation showing why we believe that the district system, as intended by the framers of the Constitution, is preferable. We realize that not for many years has the district system been considered seriously in Congress. But the reason, we think, is that American reformers were so strongly influenced after the middle of the nineteenth century by John Stuart Mill's advocacy of proportional representation. The apparent fairness of the principle of proportional representation hid the grave dangers and defects of that principle. The Lodge-Gossett amendment is based on that principle.

It does away with the State electoral colleges but it keeps the State electoral votes. These it distributes among the several candidates for President on the principle of proportion. Thus a candidate who receives 42.5 percent of the popular vote of a State would earn 42.5 percent of its electoral vote, etc., etc. The calculations in the Lodge-Gossett amendment are to be carried to three decimal places in an attempt to achieve mathematical accuracy.

The merits of this system are very easy to see. It gives to every political grouping of voters in the national election a weight as nearly proportional to its mass as the present unequal electoral weighting of the States permits. It avoids the seizure of minority votes by majorities. That is to say the arrangement, for example, by which in 1948 the 2,780,000 votes cast for Truman in New York were counted in the electoral college for Dewey, and the 1,960,000 votes cast for Dewey in Illinois were counted for Truman in the electoral college.

Moreover, the proposed method reduces the size of the electoral swings which may be caused by accident, fraud, or the power of minor parties. In large measure it destroys the political advantages of the large doubtful States. It would revive political activity in the sure States.

Its demerits are not so obvious. And yet we think they exist. They can best be brought out by comparing the Lodge-Gossett amendment with its alternative—the district system.

Let us consider how the two systems would probably work in practice. Under the district system accidents will generally have no effect upon the result of a national election. Bad weather keeps voters home in one district; local issues bring them out in another. But Democrats and Republicans are equally affected by the accidents; district results as a whole are not substantially changed. Each district casts its single vote just as it would have cast it had the weather been clear and the issues normal. Under the proportional system the accident is reflected in the distribution of the State's electoral vote and eventually in the Nation-wide electoral vote. So with fraud. Under the district system a manufactured vote can affect only the district in which it is cast. If the candidate on whose behalf it was manufactured carries the district without its help or if he fails to carry the district, the effect is nil; in other cases, the fraud will swing one electoral vote. But under the proportional system, a manufactured vote is always reflected in the distribution of the electoral vote and its effect is limited only by the size of the fraud.

This brings us to our main objection to the Lodge-Gossett amendment, to our main reason for preferring the district system amendment. We believe that if the system of proportional representation is applied to the presidential electors or, what comes to the same thing to the presidential electoral vote, that it will eventually be applied to the Representatives in Congress. And such a result is, we think, to be avoided at all costs—even at that of retaining the obnoxious general ticket system which we now have.

For by applying the principle of proportional representation to electoral votes the Lodge-Gossett amendment would provide a precedent, and, as Senator FERGUSON has remarked, no one needs to be told the importance of precedent in democratic government. It will be difficult to explain to a vigorous minority why it is entitled to a third, let us say, of a State's electoral votes and yet is not entitled to a third of its votes in the House of Representatives. In the 1948 election, for example, Wallace got 2.4 percent of the popular vote. Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment he would have been credited with 1.9 percent of the electoral vote. If such a system were in effect, it would be very difficult to explain to the followers of a Wallace that their votes were entitled to proportional representation in the electoral vote but that they were not entitled to proportional representation in the House.

This is more than a theoretical danger. The establishment of proportional representation in the congressional delegations might come about in one of two ways. It could be introduced piecemeal by the legislatures of the several States. Section 3 of the Apportionment Act of 1911, prescribing that Representatives in all States shall be elected on the single-member district system, is no longer on the statute books. It was declared by the Supreme Court in 1932 to have expired by its own limitation with the apportionment to which it related. Congress has never reenacted the provision.

Proportional representation might also be introduced in the House of Representatives by Congress itself. Suppose that the general ticket system for Representatives should come to be established by the State legislatures as the ordinary method of choosing Representatives—that is to say suppose Congressmen came to be elected at large rather than by districts. The evils following on this change would soon give rise to a movement for reform. Congress would be called upon to exercise its original and concurrent power to make or alter the State regulations in regard to the manner of holding elections for Representatives. With the example of the Lodge-Gossett amendment before it, it might plump for the system of proportional representation.

This contingency is not so remote as it might seem. Some States now use the general ticket system to choose Representatives and others have experimented with it from time to time.

The evils of proportional representation are, one, that it destroys the two-party system and substitutes for it a many-party system. This has happened everywhere that the principle has been applied and is one of the chief causes of the instability of democratic government in countries like France.

The second evil is closely related to it. The effect of proportional representation is to fill the legislature with men who are immoderate and uncompromising. For under proportional representation the constituents of a Representative are not the people living in a geographical area but an abstract group of voters who all think alike. A Representative does not have to consider those who may differ with him. He is merely the delegate of those who think alike. Therefore, he is not predisposed to moderate views and to compromises but to irreconciliability and extremism.

Moreover, under the proportional system the constituency of each Representative is mathematical rather than geographical, abstract rather than personal. The Representative does not know what actual persons he represents. Therefore his election is controlled by the party managers who really appoint him to represent the mathematical constituencies that the principle of proportional representation creates. And what the party managers will, therefore, look for in him is not thought but obedience. Anyone who has observed parliamentary government

in a country where proportional representation exists will realize how in practice this works out.

We regard these objections to the Lodge-Gossett amendment as sufficient to justify its rejection. We believe that the district system, as contemplated in the Coudert substitute, is not open to these objections and that it will cure all the evils of the present system quite as well as the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

Discrimination Against North Dakota Processed Grain Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cart Blasts North Dakota Bulk, Processed Freight Variance," from the Bismarck Tribune for March 7, 1950. Mr. Cart was formerly president of the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, and is now a member, elected by the people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CART BLASTS NORTH DAKOTA BULK, PROCESSED FREIGHT VARIANCE

North Dakota's processed-grain manufacturers are suffering discrimination in favor of bulk shippers through the Great Lakes region.

Public Service Commissioner Elmer W. Cart, in a statement prepared for delivery before the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, said:

"At the present time and, in fact, since the summer of 1942, there has been no water transportation available to transport these products on account of lack of package freight service from Superior to eastern lake ports such as Buffalo, New York, Cleveland, etc.

"Today, in practical effect, this useful and important water route is limited to the transportation of bulk freight. This should not be tolerated any more than having a railroad limited to hauling only bulk freight," Cart said.

Commissioner Cart noted that the costs of rail service compared to lakes transportation was a costly discrimination against the processed-grain dealers in North Dakota:

"During the shipping season of 1949, the contract rate for the movement of wheat as a bulk cargo from Duluth to Buffalo, N. Y., was approximately 11 cents per hundredweight. The all-rail rate, which processed-grain shippers used, was 53½ cents—a difference of 42 cents."

Cart said that North Dakota was one of the Nation's great producers of grain—amounting to 1,284,000,000 bushels of wheat alone during the 1941–1949 period. And a good share of that grain was processed here.

"Therefore," Cart said, "I urge your favorable consideration of shipping legislation which we believe will bring about restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes."

Cart said restoration of lakes service would not correct all the problems of rate increases plaguing the North Dakota processors, since rates are up on the lakes. But he said great progress would be made.

Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, Backed by Labor in Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Gould Lincoln, a well-known veteran political analyst of the Washington Evening Star, appearing in the Evening Star for March 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS BACKED BY LABOR IN RACE—LAWMAKER FACES HARD FIGHT; NOW CAMPAIGNING IN UTAH

(By Gould Lincoln)

Organized labor is expected to fight just as hard to reelect Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah Democrat, as it is planning to fight against the reelection of Senator "BOB" TAFT, of Ohio. Should it fail in Utah, it will be almost as much of a black eye for political labor as it will be if Mr. TAFT is reelected in Ohio.

Senator THOMAS, so far as the labor leaders are concerned, is the direct antithesis of Senator TAFT. It was Senator THOMAS who sat successfully on the lid—as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor—when the House passed bill after bill seeking to curtail the dictatorial actions of organized labor from 1940 on. Never, while Senator THOMAS was on the job, were any of these measures allowed to come up for consideration.

Next to former Senator WAGNER of New York, whose name was attached to the National Labor Relations Act superseded by the Taft-Hartley Act, Senator THOMAS has been more prominently identified with the labor group in Congress than any other. And labor, according to reports, will throw into the campaign all the funds that are necessary.

BACKED BY ORGANIZATION

Utah Democrats insist that Senator THOMAS will be renominated and reelected beyond doubt. They point out that he will have not only the active support of organized labor but that he will have all the school teachers—who favor Federal aid to education—back of him. Also, they say, the Democratic organization in the State will be strongly back of Senator THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS, however, is back in the State now, campaigning vigorously, long before the State conventions and primary elections—something which he has not felt essential for a long time. He has gone back there, it is believed, to head off a possible race for the Democratic senatorial nomination by former Governor Maw. If Mr. Maw made a contest, it might split the Democrats wide open and leave scars which might not heal before the election next November. Mr. Maw, politically ambitious, was twice elected governor—and failed in 1948, when he ran some fifty thousand votes behind the Democratic ticket.

Senator THOMAS, however, remembers that in 1946 the Republicans elected Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS when no one believed they had a chance for victory, and he remembers, too, that the Republicans in 1948 elected a governor, J. Bracken Lee. So he is out there beating the bushes and mending his political fences.

STRIKES ANGER FARMERS

Labor support is not entirely an unmitigated advantage for Mr. THOMAS. The coal strike made a lot of Utah farmers and other citizens angry, for example, and, on the other hand, despite his firm stand for everything labor has wanted, Senator THOMAS has not been able to deliver; he was entirely unable to lead the Democratic Senate last year to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and when the Thomas labor bill did pass it had been entirely rewritten to fit the idea of Senator TAFT himself. So there might be a slight lack of enthusiasm on the part of some labor leaders for Mr. THOMAS.

Also, although Mr. THOMAS has fathered bills for Federal aid to education time and again, he was never able to get one through the Senate, and it was Senator TAFT, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, who put such a measure through. This measure was repassed in the Eighty-first Congress, with Senator TAFT'S aid.

The GOP has a number of available candidates for the senatorial nomination to run against Senator THOMAS—among them Wallace Bennett, recently president of the National Association of Manufacturers; Brig. Gen. Franklin Riter, a Salt Lake City attorney who saw service in the last war; former Representative William A. Dawson; State Senator Rue L. Clegg, of Salt Lake City; and Preston D. Richards, an attorney, also in Salt Lake City. Utah has the convention-primary system for senatorial nominations. The conventions are held first and select two candidates—no more—who fight it out for the party nomination in a primary.

Republicans insist that Senator THOMAS is vulnerable—as was Republican Senator Smoot whom Senator THOMAS defeated in 1932—because he has given his time and attention to national and international affairs rather than to legislation which was of particular interest to Utah. Senator WATKINS, on the other hand, was involved in reclamation and irrigation projects for a number of years before he came to the Senate and has concentrated on getting things done for the State. Further, the Republicans claim that they have an even better chance to defeat Senator THOMAS than they had to elect Senator WATKINS 4 years ago.

Broadcast by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, on the Work of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me, over 26 stations in Missouri, on the work of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hello, everyone. This is JIM KEM, in Washington, reporting to the people of Missouri on the work of the United States Senate.

Several days ago the Senate began debate on the so-called Kerr bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. If this bill becomes law, it will almost certainly lead to a boost in the cost of living for millions of families in Missouri and other States. Farm folks will be affected, too, as well as consumers of natural gas in cities and towns. One of the sponsors

of the bill, is Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma. Usually he is a consistent supporter of the administration's program. Senator KERR freely admitted that the purpose of his proposal is to raise the price of natural gas in the gas fields, including those in Oklahoma.

The Kerr bill would take away from the Federal Power Commission its authority to regulate the price paid by pipe-line companies for gas sold them by so-called independent gas producers. These independent producers are, most of them, big companies that produce 70 to 80 percent of all the natural gas in the United States.

I opposed the Kerr bill when it came before the Senate. I spent practically all one afternoon telling the Senate just why I thought it was an unsound, unfair proposal.

For that is exactly what the Kerr bill is, unsound and unfair.

Here's why. Enactment of the bill would be a breach of faith with untold thousands of American gas consumers.

More and more families these days are using natural gas to cook their meals and heat their homes. Consumers have long had the benefit of gas manufactured from coal and other products. Now natural gas; that is, gas piped directly from nature's great underground storehouses, is rapidly being made available to cities and communities not previously enjoying its advantages. Since the end of World War II scores of huge pipe lines have fanned out from the vast bubble of gas underlying the old Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma dust bowl, and from other areas.

As a result, millions of American households and thousands of factories are now being, or soon will be, served with this most convenient of all fuels. Natural gas now costs much less than manufactured gas—it is cleaner—and it yields twice as much heat.

St. Louis has just recently been converted to straight natural gas. There, and in other cities and communities that are being served for the first time, gas-burning equipment has been either installed or converted at great expense to the consumer.

Now, after all this has been done, Congress has been asked to make it possible for the price of gas to be pushed up without regard to public interest. The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers estimates that the Kerr bill would cost consumers more than $200,000,000 a year.

While those living in our cities and towns would probably be hit hardest by the Kerr bill, our farm folks, too, would be hurt by this ill-advised legislation. Many farm families now enjoy the benefits of so-called bottled gas. Two-thirds of the supply of bottled gas is made from natural gas. So if the price of natural gas rises, an increase in the price of bottled gas will likely follow. Then, too, farmers buy many products manufactured by companies using natural gas as fuel. It has been said that natural gas is the "hot breath of life" for the cement industry. If the price of natural gas rises, it doesn't take a magician to figure out that the price of cement will also go up. And so it goes.

We who oppose the Kerr bill are charged by some of those favoring it as being enemies of free enterprise. I shall always stand for free enterprise. I stand on my record since I have been a member of the United States Senate.

For a hundred years or so it has been recognized that in order to make the free-enterprise system work, monopolies must be regulated. Monopolies must be restricted in the public interest.

From a consumer's standpoint, natural gas is a monopoly. If you want to buy a ton of coal, you can choose any 1 of 50 or so dealers in the telephone book. But, if you live in town and want to buy gas—there is just one place to go—and that is to the gas company that has constructed a gas line along the public street in front of your home under a public franchise.

Since the distribution of gas is a monopoly it should be regulated by public authority in the public interest. It is sometimes said that regulation should be on a State level. But when gas is consumed in one State, regulation by another State does not meet the situation. When the supply of gas is produced in Oklahoma and consumed in Missouri, the regulation must be interstate—the regulation must be by Federal authority.

If the Federal Power Commission is to do an effective job protecting Missouri gas consumers it must have the authority to regulate the price paid for gas from the first time it passes into the pipe line until it is sold to the local gas company. It cannot do this if the producers of the gas in the field are free to boost prices as they please.

The producer of natural gas isn't compelled to enter the public-utility market. He has other outlets for his product. He may sell his gas to a carbon-black plant, or to a chemical plant, or for other similar uses. But, if the producer decides to sell his gas to a pipe-line company supplying Missouri cities, he has entered the public-utility business. If he wants to play the game he should follow the rules. He should accept the responsibility to the public which becomes his when he sells to a public-utility market.

It's only fair that the gas producer receive a reasonable and just profit on the gas he sells. If a price increase becomes necessary in order to obtain a fair profit it should come only after full and open hearings before the Federal Power Commission.

We need not shed any crocodile tears for the condition of the natural-gas industry. The price of gas in the field is from 8 to 15 times higher than it was only a few short years ago. Very few other industries have enjoyed such price increases for their products or such a tremendous demand from buyers.

It is said that the policies of the Federal Power Commission have been confused and inconsistent. That may be true. This is partially due to the fact that some unwise appointments have been made to the Commission. It may be that certain changes are needed in the law to make the wishes of the Congress clear. If this be true, they should be made. But you don't knock out the windowpane just because dirt or frost makes it hard to see through. Neither should we scrap regulation of the gas monopoly because of confusion among the members of the Federal Power Commission.

The Federal regulation of gas rates has been effective and in the public interest. Since the passage of the Natural Gas Act in 1938, the Federal Power Commission has obtained reductions of more than $37,000,000 per year. This activity in the public interest should continue—it should continue unhampered. A bill similar to the Kerr bill didn't even get out of the Senate committee in the Eightieth Congress.

Let's take a closer look at how the Kerr bill would affect Missouri. Kansas City has had more than 50 years experience with the problem of a fair price for natural gas. All of the gas consumed in Kansas City is produced in Kansas and Oklahoma.

When the Kerr bill was before the Senate committee, David M. Proctor, city counselor of Kansas City, came to Washington to testify against it. Mr. Proctor told the committee that if the bill becomes law an additional cost and burden would be passed on from the gas fields to 100,000 defenseless consumers in Kansas City alone. When the Kerr bill came before the Senate, Mr. Proctor sent me a telegram opposing the bill. He said it would undoubtedly permit unjust and unwarranted increases in the price of gas to consumers.

A number of other city officials in Missouri sent telegrams opposing the Kerr bill.

Mayor Joseph Darst, of St. Louis, wired that many thousand householders, as well as important industries in his city, would be harmed by enactment of the bill.

Julian Bagby, mayor of Sedalia, said that in his opinion passage of the bill would be a major disaster to our communities.

Ronald Reed, city counselor of St. Joseph, also sent a wire. He said his city strongly feels that recent natural-gas rate reductions would be nullified if the Federal Power Commission is stripped of its authority to regulate gas prices in the field.

Mayor William Kemp, of Kansas City, sent a telegram opposing Senator KERR's bill, as did Mayor L. Russell McKee, of Joplin, and Otis L. Barbarick, mayor of Springfield.

I called these telegrams to the attention of the Senate.

In addition, I have received a very large number of letters from people all over Missouri—practically all of them opposing the Kerr bill.

Here's a typical letter from G. M. Ray, of Springfield. He writes: "If the Kerr bill passes, consumers will be forced to pay triple the present price for natural gas. Is it fair for working people to be 'held up' by another unjust deal?"

A similar bill has already passed the House. If cleared by the Senate, the bill will then go to President Truman—for his approval or disapproval. Last year Mr. Truman officially opposed the bill that was then pending. There are rumors in Washington that the President for some reason is ready to change his position. I hope these reports are unfounded.

The Kerr bill is a hodgepodge, piecemeal, special-interest proposal. It is a sorry example of the thinking of some of our leaders—they seem to be willing to have everybody regulated, or competed with, or interfered with by the Federal Government, except, of course, everybody but themselves.

High-pressure politics should not be permitted to influence a decision vitally affecting the welfare of 40,000,000 American gas consumers.

We should carry on by reasonable regulation of monopoly our earnest efforts to make the free-enterprise system work.

This is your Senator, JIM KEM, reporting from the Senate Office Building in Washington. Thank you for listening. I hope you will be listening at this same time, same station, next week.

Proposed Reduction of Personnel at Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY DARBY

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, in connection with the Veterans' Administration's recent decision to reduce personnel at veterans' hospitals throughout the country, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this time an excellent editorial entitled "The Heart of the Matter," from the March 11 issue of the Topeka State Journal, an outstanding daily newspaper published at Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

Amid all the confusing, ill-informed, and contradictory reports about the VA's attempted cut-back at Winter Hospital here, one truth seems to us to have come clear.

That is, there is room aplenty for economy and more efficiency in the total Veterans' Administration set-up, but in the way improvement is sometimes sought in the wrong way, the cutting is being ordered in exactly the service that shouldn't be cut—the medical service—while the real overgrowth is neglected.

Winter VA Hospital is described by the VA's own neuropsychiatry chief in Washington in these words: "We regard it as the best hospital in the world. It is a major training center and has been the force in the psychiatric training and treatment program."

The background for such an estimate is familiar to many of us. The VA came here a few years ago smarting under justified criticism directed at the old regime. It wanted to make a fresh start. Under the new leadership of Gen. Omar Bradley it took over Winter Hospital from the Army. Because the world-famed Menninger Psychiatric Center was located here, VA under General Bradley determined to get the Menninger Foundation's aid to create a model, a pilot institution that would become a pivotal VA medical center and show the way to others. Winter was not only to be a treatment but a training center. Physicians were to be trained in the modern psychiatric approach to mental and emotional ills. That was done, magnificently. Results and then recognition came. Several of the most influential national magazines sent their best writers here and told the story to the Nation of something that had never been done before. Hundreds of specialists from all over the world visited Winter, carrying away with them the vision and the inspiration not only of a great hospital, but of a new kind of hospital. We have talked to a great many of these case-hardened observers, know what they say and how they feel. As an interested member of the laity, we have seen Winter inside and out, lived with it here all these postwar years. This newspaper thinks Winter VA Hospital is something unique and vital nationally, medically, humanly. We believe in Winter Hospital and in all that is being done there for sick veterans of our wars.

Now, saying that, let us tell you that we have also studied the Hoover Commission reports on the VA, and its recommendations about what should be done. We found what the National Citizens Committee for the Hoover report found, and concur in its statement, to wit, "At no place in the Commission's reports were there made any recommendations for the increase or curtailment of medical benefits or other services to veterans. Its recommendations covered only the better management of existing programs." Policy decisions as to what the people owe to veterans are dealt with as strictly the affair of Congress, which has laid down the principles for existing programs. Everything in the Hoover report is geared to the question of how many veterans may be given the best of medical care. Economies are sought that would not impair essential, needed services.

The VA should be trimming, as we stated at the outset, but the hospitals, particularly the best, the pilot, the model hospitals of which Winter is the foremost, should be approached with the utmost care and caution, not the heavy hand of the recent order. It is in VA's paper administration, principally in Washington, and at employee's desks, that savings could and should be made, not at the bedsides of sick men. The Hoover Commission Task Force on Veterans' Affairs estimated that there could be annual savings of 70 millions in handling veterans' affairs, particularly as relating to insurance, claims, overcomplicated procedures, printing, schooling payments, overpayments (totaling 179 millions to date, of which 50 millions have not been recovered), and so on.

Most of the cuts ordered for Winter would cripple medical services to ailing veterans now in the hospital, and waiting to get in. The cuts would cripple the program of physician-training by reducing the staff, staff hours, and human facilities for training, by which many other VA hospitals have benefited and are benefiting in receiving doctors and specialists trained here. A training hospital needs more staff than others. We believe VA and the taxpayers are really getting their money's worth, and much more, at the hospital here.

The VA is well advised in its indication Friday that the order respecting Winter will be reexamined and reevaluated, in its recognition that Winter is a unique situation within the total medical set-up. Let VA trim the unessentials of administrative and bureaucratic falderal, of which it has been drawn a picture, and VA will earn the gratitude of veteran and nonveteran alike. But let VA hold on to its greatest psychiatric hospital, and to the way that has been pointed here, as to the heart of the matter, which in fact the Winter meaning is.

Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a compelling editorial for the case of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 21. The editorial is reproduced in full text:

HAWAII AND ALASKA

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs owes the public interest an early and extensive hearing on bills proposing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Both proposals have passed the House in recent days. And in the Senate there are pending a number of bills dealing with each case. But the Interior Committee, of which Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming is chairman, has not yet put any of them down for hearing.

There are a number of puzzlers in this situation. The logic of statehood for these important and increasingly sensitive American territories, is unshakable on its face.

Each is inextricably a part of our national surival. Each is tied to us by economic, strategical and political necessity.

Each suffers, in its present condition, from the oppressions of bureaucracy that are inevitably a part of Territorial administration by the Federal Government.

The necessities which bind these Territories to us are not going to get any weaker as time goes by, but instead will intensify. In a military way, alone, Hawaii and Alaska must be American to the core, for this Nation's well-being.

And just as the basic reasons for Hawaii and Alaska to be American grow in importance as time goes by, so does the necessity for them to shed the feeble status of Territories.

WHY IS THERE OPPOSITION?

They cannot ever really grow up as long as the Federal Government is running them as branch offices of the Interior Department and general playgrounds for bureaucrats on the make. And the longer that growing up is delayed, the harder it is to grow up at all.

Yet obvious as all the foregoing is, still there runs somewhere in both Alaska and Hawaii a current of opposition to statehood. We are frank to admit we don't know why there is opposition or who operates it, but we do sense it is there.

The earliest possible Senate hearings are indicated therefore, in order to get the opposition out in the open, examine it, understand it and demonstrate it's weakness.

Undoubtedly there are possible arguments against statehood for these two Territories, but none as important to the United States as the reasons for it.

The House has voted for statehood. The Senate owes the country some action on its own part. Now.

National Boys' Club Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we recognize the youth of today as the leaders of tomorrow, it is fitting that we pay tribute to the National Boys' Clubs which are being honored this week throughout the country. These clubs are doing for our young boys exactly what we who are interested in the spread of democracy would like to do on an international scale. Here is a marvelous opportunity for our children—learning to work, play, and live together; developing a comradeship, a sense of fair play, a will to share. Boys become united in these clubs even though there may be many dividing factors present. Race, color, creed—what do those words mean to the 300,000 members of boys' clubs? Not very much, I am sure. Those factors are relegated to a back seat and supplanted by a genuine admiration for good timing at the bat or "a fast curve." That is how it should be—appreciate talents and forget differences.

Boys' clubs which are nonsectarian were first organized on a national basis in 1906. There are now 325 clubs with over 300,000 members, aged 8 to 20. Although more attention is attracted to the work done with delinquents and underprivileged groups, the boys on the whole are average normal youngsters. The need for such organizations is only too apparent. Herbert Hoover who has been chairman of the national board since 1936 once estimated that over 3,000,000 boys would never find outdoor living except in crowded city areas. No wonder they all flock to the club where every possible chance is given them for wholesome recreation, physical development, and friendship.

Mr. David W. Armstrong is the executive director of the Boys' Clubs of America, Inc. In a recent article appearing in Coronet, Mr. Armstrong said that there seems to be a chain reaction. Many

boys who found fun and guidance through the boys' clubs have now become leaders. Armstrong, himself, belonged to a one-room club in Pittsfield, Mass. He did part-time work at the club and later became director of the club in Worcester from 1907 to 1941. His feelings for boys and the clubs are expressed simply:

Children are the most important of our natural resources. Most of them will grow up into useful citizens, but there is a minority that needs guidance. More important, there is the opportunity for making even the best of the crop more tolerant, more cooperative and more democratic.

The work of these clubs should never be underestimated. A glance at the lists of alumni reveals many leaders, clergymen, physicians, athletes, and such, that we acclaim. I would like to praise the boys today who are now members and extend my congratulations to the boys' clubs this week.

Reform in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of March 21, entitled "Reform in Connecticut." I think other States could well follow, as the editorial suggests, the excellent example set by this program initiated by Gov. Chester Bowles.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFORM IN CONNECTICUT

Following the example of the Hoover Commission, Connecticut is making a heroic effort to modernize its governmental system. Its commission on State government organization has issued a series of reports indicating that the task of shaping State institutions to the needs of the present day is no less urgent than in the case of the Federal Government. Since the obsolescence that is plaguing Connecticut is typical of conditions to be found in many other States, the example that Gov. Chester Bowles is setting may well prove to be contagious.

At an early stage in the Connecticut study it became apparent that one major millstone around the neck of good government is the State constitution itself. Connecticut has amended her constitution 47 times. The investigators found that it is no longer "fairly intelligible to lay readers." The only way to understand it is, quite literally, to read it backwards. Only a complete redrafting will make it a useful and reliable charter of modern government, and that is what the commission has recommended. Incidentally, the commission thinks it is feasible to avoid calling a constitutional convention—a method that has produced negative results in the past—and to have a new constitution prepared by a legislative commission for submission to the voters.

Much of the streamlining visualized by the commission would be accomplished by means of constitutional changes. Among the changes recommended are the short ballot, concentrating public interest in the election of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and members of the general assembly; automatic and periodic redistricting of the senate; reduction in the size of the house of representatives; annual sessions of the assembly, with no fixed adjournment date; prohibition of dual office-holding; elimination of elected sheriffs and probate judges; home rule for towns and cities, with no special local legislation; and a better method of effecting constitutional amendments and revisions. The reorganizers also suggest that provision be made for the recall of elected officers, direct primaries, the initiative and referendum, and an enlarged declaration of rights.

It is a mistake, as the report itself acknowledges, to place too much reliance on the recall, initiative, and referendum. The recall is likely to result in mere political harassment, and the initiative and referendum seem scarcely in keeping with the principle of the short ballot, although all three can doubtless be used to advantage in some situations if abuses can be avoided. What is really important is that Connecticut is moving to modify its governmental machinery and its organic law in accord with present-day requirements. The District of Columbia and other areas that are engaged in a similar struggle can only wish Connecticut well in its undertaking.

Dennis J. McMahon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the January issue of Marine News honoring the Honorable Denis J. McMahon, recently appointed collector of internal revenue of the second district of New York:

MEET DENIS J. MCMAHON, THE SHIPPING WORLD'S NEW COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

From Wall Street runner to runner-up for the top-flight office of collector of internal revenue for the second New York district in but a very few years, and to be appointed to this important post in the world's greatest port by President Truman—that is Denis J. McMahon. He has held only two jobs in his brief span of life so far, being probably the youngest collector of internal revenue New York ever had.

A Yorkville, Manhattan, boy, when he finished high school he went to work for the distinguished old Wall Street brokerage house of Clark, Dodge & Co. as a runner. Then he worked on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange.

When the 1929 crash came he had to look for another job. In less time than it takes to say, "Who killed cock robin?" he landed one in the upper West Side office of the collector of internal revenue, New York district. Soon after Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency for his first term Denis McMahon was appointed deputy collector.

As chief deputy, he supervised the other deputies charged with the enforcement of the collection of various Federal taxes, investigation of delinquent taxpayers, serving liens and levies, and assisting taxpayers who called at the office.

His was a big job, though one little heard of and about by the people of the metropolis. The tax work of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is divided up into different branches—three main divisions in New York: The special agents, who investigate all criminal fraud cases; the revenue agents, who are primarily auditors, and are responsible for uncovering much additional tax; and the collectors, whose job it is to see that the Government's tax money is collected. The special agents and the internal revenue agents work directly under the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington, D. C.

Denis McMahon could regale everyone in the shipping world with laughter relating some of his experiences—only he just hasn't got the time. However, if you want to get a big laugh out of him, just ask him about the batch of rabbit fur he had to confiscate for nonpayment of taxes that smelled up the whole building for weeks—until it was auctioned off. Then, there was the deputy who got his face slapped because he told a nice old lady she was delinquent.

McMahon learned all about taxes and such things by hurdling four civil service promotions to his job before being made collector. He's been a tax man for 16 years.

As a matter of choice, though, he prefers to use his talent for collecting money to help about a dozen outfits like the Poor Boys Priesthood Association, Beth Israel, or the Yeshiva El Torah. He's been doing that for about 10 years. Of course, it doesn't quite add up to the $30,000,000,000 a year in taxes from a million reluctant citizens that will fall to his lot now as collector of internal revenue.

Hanging on the walls of the collector's office in the United States Customs House overlooking Battery Park and New York Bay is a recognition from the Pope for work done with poor boys desiring to enter the priesthood; an honorary membership certificate he received in 1945 from the Internal Revenue Post 1255, American Legion, for meritorious service, and numerous other fine testimonials.

Young, alert, in every sense a good fellow; friendly, dynamic, with an infectious smile and a happy, wholesome countenance—that's Denis McMahon, collector of internal revenue for the greatest port in the world, New York.

Marine News takes this pleasurable opportunity to welcome, as well as congratulate him in his new high office, and to wish him everything this beginning of the New Year of 1950 can hold forth, and so to continue for many more years to come.

The Growing Protest Against Excessive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, there is a steadily growing volume of protest against present excessive tax burdens. One of the most articulate of these comes in a "grass roots" protest from the editor of the Casey (Ill.) Daily Reporter. Mr. B. F. Morgan, the editor, chose the week of income-tax payments to focus the attention of his readers on the steadily growing costs of Government. Under permission granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including the text

of his editorial, which, I might add, has attracted much attention and comment from his readers:

CASEY AT BAT

(By B. F.)

Good news next week. Navarily.

Or is March 15th one of good news?

Nine people out of ten wholeheartedly agree that the day has no significance but strongly indicates utter ruin if it continues a law of the land, nor is it one to produce even good thoughts. It is a day made so by man himself in which he discourages youth from thrift; in which he has caused more liars in America than any one law ever passed. This income tax law which was conceived and born below hades is one that is heart-rendering to one of ambition. The payment of such a tax is causing one who was or is possessed of ambition to lose courage, to give up in dispair and policy or to accept teaching that thriftiness pays. It is causing apathy in ambition because you pay out something with no value received. You pay out sums that have taken brains and toil to financially produce. What's the use of working to accumulate for old age or what's the use of being ambitious, just to see your savings go out in taxes that nobody knows where they go other than to see one group living handsomely on the profits of another group who works diligently to save to be thrifty, to have something someday so they too may live in better circumstances.

What good does it do to work hard and then give it away. What accomplishment is there at the year's end to have to part with savings that have been laboriously made. Isn't it about time to halt such an idiotic tax?

Our hat's off to Vivian Kellums in Connecticut who is even opposing collection of withholding taxes. She thinks she is entitled to compensation if this is a requirement. She has other things to do during the day besides collect such taxes, the use of such taxes for what purpose.

We need some more Vivians in this country to lead the way. If one will lead, then people are similar to sheep and the rest will follow. We have become so apathetic that today if somebody says "No" they are classed as radical. You can call the column a radical or whatever you want to but we like the idea of saying "No" when it seems necessary to do. Right here even in Casey we have become so used to never hearing the word "no" that most all walks of life sanction an ism that "Oh well, it may be all right. Why oppose it. Maybe it's all right." We know in one service club that attitude has taken place, we know other groups who follow suit. It's time to wake up. And if we don't wake up soon, you won't even have a ragged shirt to wear. You'll have a chain and serial number. This logic isn't hearsay. It's not fantastic. It's the way we're going, for all signs so indicate.

In the name of God and humanity, give us some men to run this country who can keep their heads cool and their feet on the ground. Give us some men who can implore the Almighty for guidance of the Nation rather than a bunch of poker-playing mammas. Give us some men who cannot fathom pussyfooting but who are possessed of common sense rather than a Harvard education; men who are for whom they serve instead of some foreign alliance; men who know the faith of their fathers, who built this country on private enterprise, rugged individualism, built on a better-mouse-trap idea; people who are free instead of burdened with taxes, for what? Yes; God, give us men. We are making life hard to live.

We send men to Washington and State legislatures who are no more fit to be there than a man in the moon. In Illinois the latest blunder coming out of Springfield is the school situation which was legislated similar to a cart before the horse. In Washington we send men there to govern affairs, but all they do is meet in committee and argue on some insignificant matter that doesn't amount to a whoop, whereas time is ill-spent. They squander but know nothing of how the money is made, by whom, and care little where it goes.

If we couldn't take a half-dozen ordinary citizens at random from this town and do a better job, then we'd come home with the tail under the hind legs; and the first thing, if we would ever be there, would be to let the people know that America comes first, the use of common sense so much outmoded would return pronto, and there'd be no excise tax, income tax, and all this other tomfoolery taxation. If a man made a dime, it would be his to spend, even for a glass of beer, and before we got this done we'd send Congress home and let the country have a major rest from legislation. There are so many laws now on the books and so many being passed and so many being written for approval that it's worse than nauseating, and the funny part—it's really comical—nobody knows what they're about, including the authors.

Let's wake up. Accumulation of grains of sand, though small, will soon build a sand bar, and try moving that in an hour. Let's wake up—get America back for Americans. Let's wake up with some common sense and practical knowledge rather than theory. Let's wake up and—it's not too late—enjoy life more abundantly with a free dollar, for with the present trend we are making life a burden.

It's time to wake up; it's time to rid ourselves of additional laws and taxes; and it's time to rid ourselves of such a deplorable, fraudulent tax as the income tax.

What do you think?

Presidential Electors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. J. Harvie Williams which appeared in the New York Times of March 6, 1950:

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS—AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR DISTRICT ELECTION SYSTEM ADVOCATED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Although the Lodge-Gossett amendment to change the method of electing the President passed the Senate by the necessary two-thirds majority, it has no chance of approval by this House of Representatives. If there is to be any electoral reform by this Congress, the opponents of the present highly unsatisfactory system must turn to the proposed amendment by Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., of New York, which provides:

"Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner as its Senators and Representatives are chosen."

It further provides that when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote the final choice will be made from among the persons having the three highest numbers by a joint session of the House and Senate voting as a body, with three-fourths of the combined membership necessary for a quorum. Election will be by plurality on the first roll call.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment would abolish Presidential electors, retain the present basis for allotting electoral votes to the States and divide the electoral vote in each State among the candidates for President in direct proportion to the popular vote they receive therein, calculated to the third decimal place and farther if necessary to resolve a tie. Should no candidate win 40 percent of all the electoral votes, the final choice would be made by a joint session of the Congress voting by the head.

DIFFERING PLANS

Both of these electoral reform plans are as different from the present system as they are different from each other. The Coudert amendment is really the plan of the founding fathers before it was violated by the States in the rise of parties. It will be offered as a substitute for the Lodge plan.

The structure of our general government is based on a mixture of Federal and National principles. The Senate, in which each State has equal representation, is the Federal body, while the House of Representatives, being based on population, is the national body. The Congress of the United States, in every action, expresses the Federal and National principle.

The founding fathers regarded the electoral college as a counterpart body to the whole Congress in joint session for the single purpose of choosing the President and the Vice President. To each State they gave electoral power equal to the congressional power. The electoral college was and still is necessary to articulate the Federal and National basis of the Presidency. It was and still is necessary to maintain the separation of executive and legislative powers, an essential element in the structure of our Government. There is no way to bring about the direct popular election of the President without destroying our dual sovereignty. By abolishing the electoral college the Lodge amendment would be a long first step in that direction.

The problem sought to be solved springs from the State-wide election of all of a State's presidential electors, so that a plurality of a single vote may elect 47 electors of one party in the State of New York without a commensurate shift in congressional power. A balancing of electoral and congressional power can be had by electing all Representatives on State-wide tickets, as Senators and electors are now elected, or merely by electing those electors corresponding to Representatives in congressional districts. That is one of the essential features of the Coudert plan of electoral reform.

EFFECTS OF ADOPTION

Adoption of the Coudert amendment would have these effects:

Division of each State's electoral power among the political parties on the same basis as its congressional power is divided among them, thus giving national parties (merely aggregations of State parties) Presidential power commensurate with their congressional power—an ideal situation.

Give the Presidency to any party winning the equivalent of a bare majority in the House (218) and a bare majority of the States (25 with 50 electors).

Give the President and the Congress as a body the same constituency, cast up in the same form, thus ending the basis of the ideological conflict inherent in the present imbalance of electoral and congressional power.

Reduce to proper proportions States now having large blocs of doubtful electoral votes and make able men from other States available for presidential nominations.

Besides, proportional representation would create a greater disparity in the States and

sections between the electoral power and congressional power of the parties—certainly no basis for party government. For instance, the Republicans would lose electoral power in the Northern States, where their congressional power rests, and gain electoral power in the South, where they have no congressional power.

The Coudert amendment will solve our electoral problem within the framework of the established structure of our Government simply and effectively. It should be adopted.

The freakishness of the Lodge-Gossett amendment should condemn it.

J. HARVIE WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, *March 2, 1950.*

For Want of a Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "For Want of a Code," which appeared in today's Washington Post, March 22, 1950:

FOR WANT OF A CODE

Much of the hullabaloo that Senator MCCARTHY has aroused with his trumped-up charges might have been avoided by a code of fair procedure for congressional investigations. Acting without any such code, the Tydings subcommittee made a sincere effort to restrict Mr. MCCARTHY to presentation of facts and to give equal prominence to the denials of persons recklessly accused of Communist sympathies. But its efforts have not prevented the broadcasting of irresponsible charges from the committee room. Nor have they prevented the spread of confusion and loose suspicions relating to our foreign policy. The primary responsibility falls, of course, on Senator MCCARTHY, but his tirades could and would have been shortcircuited by proper investigative procedures.

The best investigators of our time have worked quietly until they assembled substantial facts to go on. This means careful staff work before open hearings are held. It is the business of the staff to separate flimsy and groundless charges from charges that have some evidence behind them. Then when the open hearing goes forward, a consistent and well-rounded picture can be presented, without releasing any trial balloons filled with hot air or poison gas. Experience has shown that when individual reputations are at stake such preliminary investigative work and screening is imperative if the rudiments of fairness are to be observed.

At the beginning of the present inquiry Senator TYDINGS made extraordinary efforts to be fair. He insisted on bringing immediately into the record relevant facts about each case—facts that Senator MCCARTHY had ignored. In this way he exposed the hollowness of the McCarthy accusations. But the result was to fill the air with a bedlam of charges and countercharges highly damaging to our national unity and to the conduct of our foreign policy. As a practical matter, we doubt that any committee can be prepared to give immediate refutation to wild charges, and, if it could, a great deal of harm would nevertheless be done by officially airing mere rumor and disconnected bits of information that add up to nothing.

What has been lacking here is careful staff work. Only on Monday did the subcommittee get from Senator MCCARTHY in confidence a list of 81 cases of alleged Communist infiltration in the State Department. Obviously the subcommittee should have had this list and should have done extensive checking as to the facts before any hearings were held. Then it could have given the public facts instead of Mr. MCCARTHY's inflamed imaginings. With members of both parties and a competent staff on hand to see that the facts were properly sifted, there would have been no danger of a whitewashing. And the Senate could have saved itself from an orgy of mud throwing.

Apparently the committee now intends to sift the evidence carefully and check it against State Department records before any further hearings are held. That is all to the good. But the fact remains that, in the hearings to date, Senator MCCARTHY has succeeded in taking the ball and running wild with it. This seems to us greatly to strengthen the case for adoption of a code of fair procedure for all congressional investigations. Two years ago we printed a series of editorials pointing to the need for such a code, and outlining what it should contain. The pertinence of the rules we suggested, and perhaps additional ones, looms even larger today. For Congress is falling in the esteem of the people, and that decline is likely to continue until it curbs the misuse of its vast investigative power to serve petty, mean, and partisan ends.

Cooperative Housing for Middle-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Green, of the A. F. of L., in behalf of H. R. 7402:

The American Federation of Labor is wholeheartedly supporting H. R. 7402, the cooperative-housing bill for middle-income families.

There can be no doubt that additional legislation is needed to meet the acute housing needs of this group whose incomes are too high to qualify them for public housing and too low to afford the new homes being constructed by private builders. Discussion of this bill has developed an unusual amount of confusion. Yet the reasons why you should vote for it are essentially very simple.

The only way the housing needs of this middle-income group can be met without an outright Government subsidy is through a cooperative-housing program. In order for cooperative-housing projects to get underway they will need proper private financing. The bill provides this, without any increase in the public debt, by allowing private funds to purchase certain Government-backed debentures. The proceeds from the sale of these debentures would in turn be loaned to cooperatives.

Strict requirements have been included covering allowances for reserves (one-quarter of 1 percent) and administration (one-half of 1 percent). The cooperative-housing projects will be sound business enterprises, with a 10-percent equity required for all participants. Ample safeguards against speculation are also in the bill.

The results of utilizing the cooperative techniques together with the financing arrangements in the bill are the only way to make possible monthly payments of $60–$70 a month on units now renting for $85–$95 a month.

In behalf of 8,500,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, I specifically request that you vote for H. R. 7402, as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

New Iron-Ore Fields Found in Northwest Central Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, new discoveries of iron ore in northwest central Minnesota may bring new prosperity to a section of my own district, the Ninth of Minnesota, and may help solve the problem of finding needed iron ore for our Nation.

An interesting story of the discovery of iron-ore deposits was reported in the St. Paul Dispatch for March 7, 1950. I am sure the article will be of interest to Members of the Congress.

It follows:

NEW IRON-ORE FIELD INDICATED IN BECKER-OTTER TAIL COUNTIES

Location of a huge magnetic field with definite possibilities of commercial iron ore development in Becker and Otter Tail Counties was announced today by the University of Minnesota.

Dr. C. H. Schwartz, geology professor and director of the Minnesota geological survey, said he is very optimistic about the field uncovered by the aerial doodle-bug survey.

The doodle bug, or magnetometer detector unit, is slung from a specially equipped airplane by a long cable. It is used to locate, not ore itself, but the type of glacial drift known to contain iron ore.

"Locating the ore itself is like finding the plums in a pudding," Dr. Schwartz said today. "In this case I think experimental drilling by the iron-ore companies may be extremely rewarding.

"The glacial drift is between 190 and 300 feet deep, and drilling will be admittedly expensive but I feel strongly that it would be worth it. With the search for new ore fields extending to remote parts of the world, a new discovery in a strategic location like Minnesota would be invaluable."

The newly discovered magnetic field is in the shape of a rough letter "E," 50 to 30 miles wide, lying partly in Otter Tail and partly in Becker Counties.

Some exploratory core drilling was done in Otter Tail County in 1910, Dr. Schwartz says, and developed an ore-bearing rock formation at 350 feet. Because the glacial drift at this point was at 294 feet, work was abandoned as being too expensive.

Dr. Schwartz feels that the area should be systematically reexamined. He doesn't promise another Mesabi range, but he says, "You never can tell what you will find."

A Post Mortem on the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "A Post Mortem on the Coal Strike," which appeared in the St. Louis Labor Tribune on Thursday, March 16, 1950:

A POST MORTEM ON THE COAL STRIKE

The current issue of Labor, organ of the national railroad unions, stated that the new coal mine argeement signed last week was a triumph for both President Truman and John L. Lewis, and a stunning defeat for the Taft-Hartley Act.

That is a factual summation. As the article points out, President Truman "carefully calculated his moves, never lost his head, and paved the way for a peaceful settlement."

It also stressed the strongest link in the successful chain of events, namely the undaunted determination of the rank-and-file miners. Without belittling Lewis, the article declared, the rank-and-file in the last analysis won the battle.

As a characteristic indice of this determination, the article quotes a Cloverdale, Pa., miner who said: "We went on strike for a new contract, we went hungry for a new contract—and we won."

However, the one single individual who played the decisive role and served as the fulcrum which ended this stalemate, was Federal Judge Richmond B. Keech. The Taft-Hartley law encouraged the coal operators to resist collective bargaining on a reasonable basis because they thought the injunctive weapon provided by the Taft-Hartley Act would win the battle for them and force the miners back to the pits.

But unlike another Federal judge, Alan Goldsborough, who 2 years ago levied a seven-figure fine against the union for ignoring the court order, Judge Keech showed he was made of sterner stuff. He refused to play dog-in-the-manger for the mine owners. That forced them to quickly change their tactics and for the first time they bargained in good faith as they could have done any time during the previous 8 months after the old contract expired.

Labor owes Judge Keech a profound debt of gratitude, not only for showing that this injunctive phase of the Taft-Hartley Act is unenforceable and that you can't compel free American workers to work against their will; but because a contrary unjust ruling would not only have broken the mine workers' union but laid the ground work for the busting of all big industrial unions.

As one distinguished Senator, in close touch with the situation, said, "I have no doubt that the big financiers and industrialists, who are back of the coal operators, tried to block a settlement except on their own terms, because they thought that under the Taft-Hartley Act they had Lewis over a barrel. Furthermore, they figured that if they could break Lewis, they could go ahead and break other unions, too. Fortunately for the country, the plot failed."

It was indeed a great labor victory. But to make it a lasting one, Congress should heed President Truman's request to set up a fact-finding committee to make an exhaustive long-range study of this obviously unstable, sick industry, and find ways and means to stabilize it and prevent needless future labor-management clashes and contests for power like the one just closed.

Middle-Class Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore obtained, I include herein an editorial from the St. Louis Labor Tribune of Thursday, March 16, 1950, entitled "What the Middle-Class Housing Bill Could Do."

The housing shortage is an evil that cuts across income lines.

It has as little respect for the family whose earnings total $3,000 a year as it has for the family bringing in half that.

The bald fact is that rents are high—and rents on the few dwellings that do become available are completely out of reach of low-income groups, and well out of range of our middle-income families—those whose earnings amount to between $2,700 to $4,400 a year.

In the past week, for example, the flats and apartments advertised for rent in St. Louis newspapers show rents far above the ability to pay of our middle-income groups.

Here is an efficiency apartment, for example—a small apartment—to rent for $90 a month. Here is a one-bedroom place for $105. Here are dwellings upon dwellings that specifically declare "no children."

We are often told by real-estate men that a family's rent should not exceed one-fourth of its income. At that rate, our middle-income groups can afford payments for housing of only $50 to not more than $85 a month.

But we know too well that because of our national income structure, more of the group we seek to help can afford closer to $50 a month than $85.

Can these families buy homes? Most of those who write me can't even afford the down payments. Yet they are in desperate need of housing. They are potential buyers, but not at present high levels. They need lower prices, and they need lower down payments.

They need lower rents. They need rents they can afford, payments which will not be so high as to be met only by doing without other necessities.

In this program to spur housing for the middle-income group, we will be doing more than providing the means for many of our people to have decent and adequate dwellings.

We will be helping to provide jobs, and income, for many; we will be aiding business; we will be helping our own general national economic situation.

There are some who may claim that these middle-income citizens can help themselves. But can they? I maintain not. And I insist they are getting far less than value received for the dwellings in which they must live because of this national housing shortage.

We have talked about some of the places that are coming open now. But what of those already rented? Here in my St. Louis district is a family paying $90 a month for four inadequate rooms over a garage. The father—the only breadwinner in the group—brings home $65 a week.

Here in my district is another family, a man, his wife, and three children, paying $16 a week for three rooms—with an outdoor toilet. This is $70 a month rent for a family whose income is $45 a week.

This is not just a question of excessive rents. It is a question of providing housing for people who can afford to pay the rate provided by this bill—providing better housing and through it, better health, better sanitation, better living conditions.

It is a question of whether we are willing to meet our responsibility to responsible citizens. Our path is clear.

The editorial follows:

WHAT THE MIDDLE CLASS HOUSING BILL COULD DO

There are millions of lower-income families who can't afford to buy a home under current inflated speculative prices. They, along with other millions of families are compelled to pay more for rent than many of them can afford. Still other income groups, who have been forced to move to suburban and rural areas to find a place to live, have to spend more for additional transportation than what they often save in rent.

This means that excessive rent just leaves the average tenant with so much less for everyday needs such as clothing, food, medical care, and a lot of other things which also help our dwindling retail trades.

It therefore does seem logical to assume that a Federal law which promotes needed cooperative housing for middle-income groups on easy terms would be a boon to the Nation's commerce. It would make more jobs for building mechanics; stimulate the demand for building materials and supplies which provide work for millions of persons. It would give these middle-income groups more money to buy the products of the farmer, manufactured goods, various forms of services including medical and dental treatment.

In other words, the present proposed middle-income housing bill, if passed by Congress, will put more money in more people's pockets to spend at a time when there is a great need for greater consumer spending power.

Let's hope that Congress, which is now considering this bill, does not fall down on this opportunity to provide a powerful needed vitamin to the Nation's economy.

Housing Cost Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1950.

To: All members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Subject: Housing cost survey, March 6, 1950.

When the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, Jr., appeared before your committee to present

ADA's views on the subject of middle-income housing, he was requested to ask the national ADA to conduct a housing cost survey and to send the findings of this survey on to the committee. The national ADA through its local chapters has conducted such a study in 20 cities in 16 States. In each city, the best source of information was used: i. e., FHA, real estate board, local building and loan companies, etc.

The findings of this survey are indicated in the attached table. All cost figures are current as of March 6, 1950.

JOHN J. GUNTHER,
Legislative Reresentative.

State and city	2-bedroom frame			2-bedroom brick			3-bedroom frame			3-bedroom brick		
	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Connecticut (State-wide)	$7,500	$12,000	$9,300	$8,000	$16,000	$9,600	$8,900	$16,000	$10,500	$9,300	$29,000	$11,000
Illinois: Chicago (¾ of homes costing less $12,000 were 4-room units)	11,200	14,500	12,600	11,700	18,000	13,500	12,600	[1] 23,000	15,000	13,000	[1] 30,000	15,600
Indiana:												
Gary			9,800			11,500			12,000			13,000
Indianapolis	7,500	12,000	8,900	8,100	15,750	11,000	8,200	15,300	13,000	9,100	30,000	13,700
South Bend	7,900	12,200	9,500	8,500	18,000	11,500	8,500	15,800	12,750	9,500	[1] 25,000	13,500
Kansas: Lawrence	7,000	11,300	9,000	8,200	15,000	11,000	9,000	18,000	12,500	10,000	Up	13,500
Maryland: Baltimore	7,700	11,800		9,000	14,500		9,000	14,000		10,500	Up	
Michigan: Lansing	7,500	11,000	9,000	9,000	[1] 12,000	11,000	11,000	18,000	16,000	12,000	[1] 20,000	17,000
Minnesota: St. Paul							12,000	18,000	16,000	13,800	[1] 20,000	16,500
Nebraska: Lincoln	7,800	Up	10,500	10,000	15,000	13,000	12,000	Up	13,000	13,500	Up	15,000
New Jersey: Newark				10,500	16,000	14,000				14,000	Up	18,000
New York:												
New York	10,000	20,000	12,500	11,000	35,000	15,000	12,500	50,000	18,500	12,500	50,000	19,000
Rochester	8,000	Up	10,000				9,500	Up	12,500			
Utica	8,000	Up	10,500				9,800	Up	13,000			
North Carolina: Durham	8,100	Up	9,200	9,500	12,500	11,000	9,700	Up	12,500	11,500	Up	13,500
Ohio: Cleveland	9,000	Up	11,000	9,500	Up	11,750	10,000	Up	12,000	11,700	Up	13,200
Oregon: Portland	8,300	12,000	10,000	8,750	13,800	11,500	8,900	Up	12,000	10,000	Up	12,400
Pennsylvania:												
Philadelphia (row)				8,900	Up	11,000				10,500	Up	12,500
Pittsburgh	10,000	13,500	11,000	11,000	15,000	12,000	11,500	15,000	12,500	12,500	[1] 16,500	13,500
Washington: Seattle	8,000	12,000	9,500	10,000	15,000	11,500	8,500	[1] 13,000	10,000	10,800	[1] 16,000	12,000
Wisconsin: Madison	9,000	Up	10,300				10,300	Up	12,500			

[1] Over.

Triennial National Convention of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Secretary-General Trygve Lie at the triennial national convention banquet of B'nai B'rith at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday evening, March 21, 1950, and also the address of introduction of the Secretary General of the United Nations by Mr. Frank Goldman, president of B'nai B'rith:

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS BY MR. FRANK GOLDMAN, PRESIDENT OF B'NAI B'RITH

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of B'nai B'rith, I welcome you who are present at this dinner, as well as you who are our radio listeners throughout the United States and elsewhere in the world.

A handful of men in New York in 1843 established B'nai B'rith. B'nai B'rith has now grown to a membership of over 350,000 men and women of the Jewish faith.

It is the oldest and largest Jewish service organization in the world, and engages in a wide range of humanitarian activities. For more than a century it has sought to play an active, constructive role here and abroad to protect the freedom of individuals and institutions.

Last year, as the American constituent of the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, we became a consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. As a result, B'nai B'rith has had the privilege to participate in the work of the United Nations and especially in the field of protecting human rights.

We feel it most fitting that this dinner meeting during B'nai B'rith's Triennial Convention here in Washington should be dedicated to freedom and democracy. We are honored at the presence here of the Vice President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, the Congress, and the Supreme Court, and many other high officials of our Government and foreign governments and of the United Nations. There are present B'nai B'rith delegates from the United States, Canada, and other countries. We are delighted also to have with us a member of B'nai B'rith who has served so effectively and so selflessly on behalf of Jewish causes. I refer to Mr. Eddie Jacobson, of Kansas City, whom we will have occasion to honor later in our program.

We live in a world tragically divided and tragically insecure. Governments must devise policies premised on the continued existence of peace. The United Nations represents the most hopeful means of securing peace, of protecting the economic and social achievements of all peoples, and of building a world where people will practice tolerance and respect for one another.

Macaulay said: "Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely."

Especially in the field of human rights has the United Nations already registered great accomplishments. We who lost one-third of our coreligionists as a result of the Nazi scourge hail the progress made in the protection of human rights since President Roosevelt enunciated the four freedoms.

To help carry out the program for the protection of human rights, B'nai B'rith has urged on the United Nations a modest two-point proposal.

First, the United Nations should ask each member state to establish a National Commission on Human Rights.

Second, the United Nations should establish fact-finding commissions to provide for world-wide surveys regarding the observance and protection of human rights.

We believe that a most effective means to eliminate undesirable conditions is continually to expose the facts in responsible forums. It is for that reason that we have made our suggestions to the United Nations.

B'nai B'rith is honored that the Secretary General of the United Nations should make his first public speech in Washington from the platform of our convention.

His life history has marked points of resemblance to the life history of many great Americans and further indicates the true democratic tradition of Norway.

He was born in Oslo in 1896. While still in high school he was elected president of the Norwegian Labor Party's branch in a suburb of Oslo. Later he became legal adviser to the Labor Party and a member of its national council. He was active in settling controversies between labor and management.

He served Norway as Minister of Justice, as Minister of Commerce, and as Minister of Foreign Affairs. He headed the Norwegian delegation to the San Francisco Conference on the United Nations in 1945 and served as chairman of the commission which drafted the Charter for the Security Council. When the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations was held in London he was elected the first Secretary General of the United Nations.

The prodigious work of the Secretary General is well known to the world. He has devoted himself untiringly and with great skill and intense sincerity to accomplishing the purposes of the United Nations. He has made a great contribution to the peace and well-being of the world.

We are especially indebted to him and to the United Nations for assisting so effectively in bringing peace to Palestine, and Israel into the family of nations.

On behalf of B'nai B'rith I am privileged to present one who has aptly been called the world's first citizen, the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY GENERAL TRYGVE LIE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am happy to be able to accept your invitation to speak at the triennial convention of B'nai B'rith.

I feel it is especially appropriate for the Secretary General of the United Nations to talk with the members of an organization that is working for better human relations and is helping to make the community a better place in which to live.

Just as B'nai B'rith is working for these results in the American community and the American Nation, so the United Nations is working for the same objectives in the whole world.

International peace and security, friendly relations, respect for equal rights, self-determination, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, and religion, harmonizing the actions of nations—these words of the United Nations Charter express the most deeply felt desires of peoples all over the world. They are words that express the desires of people of every religious faith, every political belief, every social order, every cultural tradition, and every stage of economic development from the most backward to the most advanced.

You will agree that these are great words.

But, you have the right to ask, what effect is being given to them—or can be given to them by the United Nations?

Some people think that the United Nations has not done much about these goals and will not be able to do much about them. Some fear that the United Nations is impotent because of the veto, that it has been paralyzed by the great power conflict and that it has been consigned to the deep freeze by the cold war.

This is a natural impression for people to get. The destructive effects of conflict between nations rather than the constructive effort toward harmonizing the actions of nations has held the spotlight of attention during the past 3 years.

Nobody should underestimate the dangers and difficulties created for the world and for the United Nations by the cold war. Nevertheless, this impression of the weakness of the United Nations, natural as it is, is very wrong. It is a mistake that must be corrected if the world is to succeed in bringing the cold war to a peaceful end.

It was only 5 years ago this coming June that the Charter of the United Nations was signed in San Francisco. That is an extremely brief period of time by any measurement of history.

Yet during that brief span of 5 years the words of the United Nations Charter on human rights and freedoms for individuals and on equal rights and self-determination for nations have been proved by events to reflect more accurately the most fundamental forces actually at work in the world than any of the slogans of the cold war.

In my fourth annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization I referred to these events when I said:

"If the importance of these developments were correctly assessed, I believe that the world would find it possible to approach the present east-west difficulties with less hysteria, for they would be more easily seen in their true perspective. I believe that the rise of dependent peoples and the human-rights movement will, in the long run, have far more significance and give rise to greater events in the second half of the twentieth century than will the present ideological struggle."

As time passes, I think that more and more people will come to agree with that appraisal. We who live in these times are both witnessing and participating in some of the greatest changes in the history of the world.

Since the United Nations Charter was signed at San Francisco the following countries of Asia have gained their independence: The Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Jordan, Israel, Korea, Nepal, and the United States of Indonesia. All these countries are now either members of the United Nations or they have asked to be admitted. Together these countries have a population of over 600,000,000, four times the population of the United States and over one-quarter the entire population of the world.

The mere existence of the United Nations, with its Charter pledging human rights for people and equal rights for nations, has helped along this movement.

In Africa the United Nations, by the action of the General Assembly last fall, has become the liberator of former colonies. Libya will become independent in 1952 and Somaliland in 1960. At this moment a United Nations commission is consulting the people in a third former colony—Eritrea—in order to determine their wishes as to their future.

Elsewhere in Africa the national movements toward freedom and equality are not so far advanced. But here, too, the United Nations plays a significant role through its trusteeship system and through the application of those provisions of the Charter that establish for the first time in history a degree of international responsibility for all dependent peoples.

The human-rights provisions of the United Nations Charter were greatly strengthened in San Francisco by the influence of nongovernmental organizations like B'nai B'rith, who were there as consultants or observers. Besides its general pledges to promote observances of human rights, the Charter specifically provided for the creation of a commission on human rights.

Under the distinguished chairmanship of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt that commission worked for 2 years on drafting the universal declaration of human rights. The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted this declaration without a single negative vote—although there were some abstentions—in Paris on December 10, 1948, a little more than 1 year ago.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights goes beyond previous declaration of human rights in two ways. In the first place it is international. It is the first declaration of human rights for the whole world in all history. In the second place it includes not only the traditional rights to political and religious freedoms. It is also an expression of economic and social rights—such rights as the right to work, the right to social security, and the right to a decent standard of living.

Like its great predecessors in the Western World—Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man—the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not in itself a law. Like them, however, it is a source of law. It raises a standard to which all men everywhere can make appeal and by which they can measure the conduct of their Government.

Most of the rights proclaimed in this declaration are not yet enjoyed by most of the peoples of the world. Millions do not enjoy freedom of speech and religion. Millions are denied equal opportunity because of the color of their skin or their beliefs. Still greater millions have not yet won security from poverty and hunger.

Judging by what has begun to happen within a few months after it was first proclaimed, the Declaration of Human Rights is going to have a tremendous influence in helping people to win wider and more faithful observance of these rights from their governments.

Decades passed before more than a few dozen copies of the Magna Carta were made. Years passed before more than a few thousand copies of the Declaration of Independence were printed.

In only 12 months something like 2,000,000 copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have been printed. Already it has been, or is being, translated into 30 languages. It has been put on film and on posters and repeated in radio broadcasts. And this is only the beginning.

I prophesy that the time is not far distant when there will be not 2,000,000, but 200,000,000 copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it will be translated not only in 30 languages, but in 90 languages. If we work faithfully for it the time will come when there will be a copy for every schoolroom and every public bulletin board in the world.

Already the new Republics of Israel and Indonesia have borrowed from the Declaration in the drafting of the constitutional provisions for the human rights of their peoples. It has been cited in court cases in this and other countries. Meanwhile the Declaration is helping greater numbers of people all the time to be more articulate and effective in demanding and securing observance of these rights from their governments.

The United Nations is both influencing and being influenced by the rise of dependent people and the human rights movement in many ways. All the economic and social programs of the United Nations and the 12 specialized agencies associated with it are directed at winning more equal opportunity and wider enjoyment of human rights and freedoms.

The United Nations new and expanded program of technical assistance for economic development, which owes so much to the United States Government, and is slowly getting under way, is a case in point. The present financial scope of this program is modest. The possible ultimate results of the program, in terms of higher living standards, are immense, provided that technical assistance is accompanied and followed by capital investment over the next 10 to 20 years on a bold and creative scale.

Economic assistance programs carried out through the United Nations and the specialized agencies offer advantages to both lending and receiving countries and to the world as a whole. For the lending countries the United Nations offers such protection against charges of imperialism or of using economic aid for purposes of political pressure. To the recipient countries United Nations programs offer the opportunity to join on a basis of equality in planning and executing programs that are of benefit to lending and recipient countries alike. For the world as a whole every United Nations program of economic assistance offers another chance to ease the tensions of the cold war.

I was glad to note that your Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, declared in his speech at San Francisco last Wednesday that the United States in its financial, economic and technical assistance to countries in Asia would "work in the spirit and within the framework of the United Nations." I am certain that such a policy of working through the United Nations will be of benefit to the United States, to the countries of Asia and to the cause of world peace.

Another point should be made about the role of the United Nations in this vast movement of peoples toward equality in the world and toward a fuller realization of human rights and freedoms. The United Nations is also exerting constant influence to keep it within peaceful bounds. Such great changes as have occurred since the end of the war could not have taken place without far more violence and bloodshed if the United Nations had not existed.

I wish now to turn briefly to the great political issues before the United Nations.

One of these is the question of which government should represent China in the United Nations as a result of the civil war.

As you know, the world is strongly divided on the question of Chinese recognition and representation.

Of the countries with great power privileges in the United Nations, two—Great Britain and the Soviet Union—have recognized the new People's Republic Government in Peking. The other great powers, France and the United States, continue to recognize the Nationalist Government now on the island of Formosa.

Diplomatic recognition has been extended to the Peking government by 24 countries, 13 of which are member states. They include Asiatic countries like the neighboring states of Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, and Pakistan, and such European states besides the United Kingdom, as the Nordic countries, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, besides Switzerland and others.

The Nationalist Government at Formosa continues to have diplomatic relations with a somewhat larger number of governments, among them most of the American Republics. Finally, there is a third and smaller group of countries which do not have regular diplomatic relations with either government.

You will note that this division among the nations of the world does not at all follow the so-called usual lines.

I have been trying to help the member governments settle the question of who is to represent China in the United Nations. I am not doing this because the Soviet Union and its neighbors have refused to attend meetings at which China is represented by Nationalist delegates. I have never thought walking out of meetings and staying away from meetings was a good way to settle differences of opinion.

It is a serious matter to have the Soviet Union staying away from United Nations meetings, but that is not the first consideration. The first consideration is the people of China. There are 450,000,000 people in that country—the greatest in the world and in the United Nations in terms of population alone.

The 450,000,000 people of China are collectively original members of the United Nations by the terms of the Charter itself. They have a right to be represented in the United Nations by whatever government has the power to "employ the resources and direct the people of the state in fulfillment of the obligations of membership" in the United Nations. I repeat—whatever government is thus qualified, regardless of its ideology.

Before I conclude I wish to say just a word about the role of the United Nations in the cold war.

Can the United Nations do anything about the cold war?

I think it can.

United Nations programs of economic assistance and social welfare will help to reduce cold-war tensions, provided such programs are carried out on a nonpolitical basis.

The United Nations has demonstrated its capacity for mediation and conciliation of bitter conflicts in Palestine, Indonesia, and Kashmir.

The United Nations has been able to keep within peaceful bounds every other dispute between nations that has been brought before it. The great power veto has not prevented the Security Council most of the time from performing its conciliating and mediating role. The General Assembly, where there is no veto, has full power to supplement this pacific work of the Security Council and has done so with success in a number of instances.

It is true that no progress has been made for the last 2 years and a half toward getting agreement on the control of atomic energy, or on reducing other armaments, or on providing military forces to the Security Council to enforce its decisions.

Nevertheless, the United Nations has the great advantage of being able to apply to conflicts of power those moderating controls and conciliating influences that are the result of the principles of universality and sovereign equality among nations.

There are many resources for peace in the United Nations Charter and in the Organization that are either untapped or have been only partially used so far.

For example, the Charter calls for special periodic meetings of the Security Council at which the members can be represented by the foreign ministers or even the heads of government. Under the rules the Council should hold such meetings twice a year but so far there have not been any.

If such special meetings were to be held as a regular thing they should be devoted to a periodic review of outstanding issues before the United Nations, accompanied by quiet and private consultations on these issues among the foreign ministers.

Great results should not be expected from any one of these meetings. Their success or failure should not be measured in terms of decisions reached, but in terms of a step-by-step progress toward better understanding and the restoration of an atmosphere of mutual confidence more favorable to the peaceful settlement of outstanding issues.

Besides the opportunity for progress offered by high-level periodic meetings of the Security Council, the United Nations offers many other possibilities as well.

I think we should use all these resources in order to try to bring the cold war to an end.

I do not believe in political miracles. It will take a long series of steps to reduce the tensions of the conflict and bring the great powers together.

Equally I do not think the world can safely delay taking the first steps on this road of negotiation and conciliation. The danger of an indefinite continuation of the cold war in this age of the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and bacteriological weapons is too great.

I want to make certain that I am not misunderstood when I speak for negotiation among the great powers. I do not mean by negotiation surrender or appeasement by either side. I mean negotiation—which requires honest give-and-take by both sides.

I have been encouraged by the recent reaffirmations from the two leading great powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—about the possibilities of peaceful coexistence between them and between the different economic and political systems they represent. The United Nations was founded upon that belief and the hope of world peace depends upon its validity.

What we need, what the world needs, is a 20-year program to win peace through the United Nations.

I believe that most people everywhere in the world will join me in the desire and hope that member governments of the United Nations will make renewed efforts to get together on the first steps of such a United Nations peace program without delay.

Andrew Jackson—Great in War, Great in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including herein an editorial by Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared on March 15, 1950, in the New York Journal-American. The editorial follows:

ANDREW JACKSON—GREAT IN WAR, GREAT IN PEACE

History is the mirror of the past. It is the guide of the present. It is the beacon of the future.

Affection has no greater theme, wisdom has no nobler counsel, than the living actions of our sainted sires.

Today is the one hundred and eighty-third anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson. He was the son of destiny. He was the seventh President of the United States.

He was the great warrior in the Battle of New Orleans. He is in a class by himself in the history of Presidents.

He was the foe of oppression. He was the lover of justice. He was the friend of humanity.

The story of Old Hickory is always inspiring, is always new. His life sprang from the dark valley of obscurity like the peak of his favorite Alleghenies—rough, rugged, sublime, piercing every cloud till its summits bathed in the sunlight of heaven.

Like Niagara Falls or Mount Washington, his character more deeply impresses us the more it is contemplated.

Symmetrical, massive, and grand, it challenges admiration. It prompts high ideals. It excites wonder.

Washington was the Father of his Country. Jefferson was the philosopher of democracy. Jackson was its defender.

In what age did Jackson live? Where in the records of history is to be found an era in which the human race made mightier movements? Where is to be found an era in which occurred the formation and dissolution of European governments and the triumph of the American system?

Today our country is at the crossroads of destiny. Today we are engaged in world-wide ideological conflict testing whether or not our form of government shall continue to endure. We are engaged in a desperate struggle with enemies within our gates who would destroy our sacred institutions, who would impose on us an alien system that would mean the end of everything that is dear to us.

Here on this continent Andrew Jackson helped to perpetuate a way of living which has proved to be the world's greatest contribution to the dignity of man.

It is civilization's brightest promise. It is civilization's strongest hope.

Here in America the poorest lad can learn from the career of Andrew Jackson—an orphan at birth—that poverty is no bar to the strength of the free spirit.

Here in America the avenues of the citadel of our strength and the posts of honor are open to universal competition.

Here in America the freedom-giving institutions of our land call to the highest honors her children from the workshop, from the farm, from the city.

The ranks of American eminence have come from the humblest origin. In life, Jackson's career was like the blaze of the sun in the fierceness of its noonday glory. In death, Jackson was as lovely as the mildest sunset of a summer evening when the sun descends in cloudless, tranquil beauty. Let us serve our country as he served it. Let us serve our God as he served Him.

God grant us the wisdom, the courage to protect and preserve America.

Selected Statistics on Corporate Profits and National Income, 1929–49

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statistics:

Selected statistics on corporate profits and national income, 1929–49

[Millions of dollars]

Year	National income	Corporate profits before tax	Corporate profits after tax	Corporate profits after tax as percent of national income
1929	87,355	9,818	8,420	9.6
1930	75,003	3,303	2,455	3.3
1931	58,873	−783	−1,283	−2.2
1932	41,690	−3,042	−3,424	−8.2
1933	39,584	162	−362	−.9
1934	48,613	1,723	977	2.0
1935	56,789	3,224	2,259	4.0
1936	64,719	5,684	4,273	6.6
1937	73,627	6,197	4,685	6.4
1938	67,375	3,329	2,289	3.4
1939	72,532	6,467	5,005	6.9
1940	81,347	9,325	6,447	7.9
1941	103,834	17,232	9,386	9.0
1942	137,119	21,098	9,433	6.9
1943	169,686	25,052	10,646	6.3
1944	183,838	24,333	10,808	5.9
1945	182,691	19,717	8,502	4.7
1946	179,562	23,560	13,940	7.8
1947	201,709	31,602	19,091	9.5
1948	226,204	34,793	21,174	9.4
1949	221,500	[1] 28,800	[1] 17,300	7.8

[1] Estimated by the Department of Commerce on the basis of a projection of the profits of the first 3 quarters. Recent corporate reports indicate that this method may underestimate the recovery of the last months of the year.

Source: Survey of Current Business, published by Department of Commerce.

Earnings of insured commercial banks, 1941–48

Year	Net profit before taxes	Net profit after taxes	Amount per 100 percent total capital accounts: Net current operating earnings	Net profit before income taxes	Net profit after income taxes
	Thousands	*Thousands*			
1941	$504,622	$454,622	7.60	7.47	6.72
1942	520,192	440,651	8.18	7.48	6.34
1943	765,826	637,961	9.71	10.57	8.82
1944	954,070	751,249	11.12	12.36	9.73
1945	1,204,707	905,912	11.51	14.46	10.87
1946	1,225,674	902,346	12.21	13.60	10.01
1947	1,083,639	781,397	11.71	11.37	8.20
1948	1,020,758	745,336	12.46	10.26	7.49

Source: Annual Report, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Dec. 31, 1948, pp. 109, 110.

Earnings of a selected group of corporations for 1948 and 1949

Name of corporation	Amount earned 1948	Amount earned 1949	Earnings per share of common 1948	Earnings per share of common 1949	Date 1949 earnings released
	Thous.	*Thous.*			*1950*
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	$31,771	$37,151	14.35	16.78	Mar. 9
American Smelting & Refining Co	38,927	25,107	13.47	8.22	Mar. 13
Borden Co	19,179	21,890	4.46	5.10	Mar. 14
Burroughs Adding Machine Co	12,582	7,480	2.52	1.50	Mar. 8
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co	8,075	9,689	2.98	3.06	Mar. 15
Duke Power Co	8,199	10,578	6.48	8.36	Mar. 6
du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co	157,446	213,672	3.28	4.52	Mar. 9
Eastman Kodak Co	51,263	49,771	4.11	3.80	Mar. 8
General Electric Co	123,835	125,639	4.29	4.36	Mar. 10
General Motors Corp	440,448	656,434	9.72	14.64	Mar. 14
General Tire & Rubber Co	4,784	1,015	7.33	.94	Mar. 2
Hudson Motor Car Co	13,226	10,111	7.28	5.30	Mar. 15
Kennecott Copper Corp	93,807	48,110	8.67	4.45	Mar. 9
Lehigh Portland Cement Co	5,668	6,337	5.96	6.67	Mar. 14
Le Tourneau, R. G., Inc	2,748	922	----------	1.47	Mar. 6
Marlin-Rockwell Corp	3,331	2,629	9.82	7.75	Mar. 6
National Cash Register Co	14,016	10,597	7.82	5.92	Mar. 10
National Lead Co	13,304	14,749	3.62	3.88	Mar. 15
Packard Motor Car Co	15,109	7,706	1.01	.51	Mar. 10
Peoples Gas, Light & Coke Co	6,117	8,252	9.32	10.23	Feb. 28
Phelps Dodge Corp	52,247	34,715	10.30	6.85	Mar. 10
Staley, A. E., Manufacturing Co	6,623	4,338	7.60	4.90	Mar. 15
Stromberg-Carlson Co	878	478	2.74	----------	Feb. 28
Studebaker Corp	19,115	27,564	8.11	11.70	Mar. 9
Union Tank Car Co	4,062	3,565	3.77	3.31	Mar. 15
United Engineering & Foundry Co	5,046	5,654	6.08	6.83	Mar. 15
Westinghouse Electric Corp	55,656	67,269	4.11	4.95	Feb. 28
White Motor Co	3,426	971	4.98	1.41	Mar. 13

Sources: Wall Street Journal and New York Times.

Young Newspaperman Points Up Difficulty in Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House an extension of remarks which I inserted in the RECORD on February 21. It will be found on page A1305 of the Appendix and it is entitled "Weekly Newspaper Editor Points Up Difficulty in Reducing Appropriations."

This is an article written by a young man on the staff of the Warren Sheaf, published at Warren, Minn., in my congressional district. His name is Victor Aalbu, who each week does a fine job of turning out an interesting column for this outstanding weekly newspaper. His column is entitled "Chips Off the Block."

On February 21, in calling attention to the column which I had inserted into the RECORD, I had mentioned that it was written by Neil Mattson. Mr. Mattson since has called to my attention the fact that it was Mr. Aalbu who wrote it. I take this opportunity to make this correction and to again call your attention to this interesting article showing how difficult it is to reduce appropriations.

Birthday of Thomas Alva Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the memory of one of America's greatest sons was honored when the Nation, from coast to coast and Lakes to Gulf, combined in a spontaneous observance of February 11, 1950, as the one hundred and third anniversary of the birth of the late Thomas Alva Edison. Edison's genius, which gave the world the electric light, the phonograph, the motion picture, and numerous greater inventions, was memorialized throughout the Nation and by persons from all walks of life. Annually throughout the country, Thomas Alva Edison is memorialized and I want to include the very fine address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J., memorializing the great inventor:

THERE IS THE RISING SUN

To your eye and imagination, and to mine, nothing, I suppose, is more impressive than the rising sun; increasing the light slowly, yet with marvelous speed, from the faintest beginnings to the full splendor of a brilliant morning.

This planet of ours was a dreadful place in the old days before the sun had done its work. Monsters such as flying lizards and giant dinosaurs, bigger than 10 elephants, infested the earth. The air was so heavy, so filled with poison gases, that no creature now living could possibly have breathed.

But the sun has been working a long time to improve things, and we have a planet now upon which we can live and upon which we have made at least some start toward looking on nature's better side. In short, nature does not frighten us. It was not always so.

Solomon was called wise. But when the thunder roared, and the lightning flashed, and his conscience troubled him, King Solomon you recall, turned away from his thousand wives and his numerous other doubtful associates.

He ran to bed and put his head under an embroidered pillow. He just lay there and shivered. Sheba could do nothing for him. Poor Solomon.

It did not enter his mind that the lightning could be tamed and put to work.

So this is the story of the man who did it. I refer, of course, to Thomas Alva Edison. Edison was born February 11, 1847. You know much about his successes. Let me tell you before I finish something about his failures.

For it is by their failures and what they did in the face of their failures and misfortunes that we can know most about our

great men, and learn most that will help us all.

Edison, who lived to be 84, and whose formal education, as you recall, was limited to 3 months in the public school at Port Huron, Mich., insisted all his life that he could not have succeeded without the lessons of his misfortunes and failures. In fact, Edison always emphasized that even the misfortune of deafness, from which he never recovered, was a constant asset.

When young Edison, known as "Al" in his home town of Port Huron, was 12 years old he was working as a train butcher and newsboy on the Grand Trunk Railroad. He had a run between Port Huron, Mount Clemens, and Detroit. One of the way stations was called Smith's Creek. It was there the happening occurred which made Edison deaf.

Now we should see what were the facts.

There are many vivid and contrary versions of the origin of Edison's affliction, but what actually happened may be told in his own words: "My train was standing by the platform at Smith's Creek station. I was trying to climb into the freight car with both arms full of papers when the conductor took me by the ears and lifted me. I felt something snap inside my head. My deafness started from that time and has ever since progressed."

Here is a boy 12 years old, seized by a man and lifted by his ears; to be made deaf to the end of his days. A word of complaint? Never, throughout his long life. Bitterness toward the man—for this was the act of a man, not an act of nature. A feeling of self-pity, frustration, rancor: "Why did this have to happen to me?" Well, hardly. Look at the consequences.

Edison speaks of his deafness much as Helen Keller always speaks of her blindness.

Said Edison: "My deafness has been not a handicap but a help to me. From the very start, after the earache pain ceased, deafness probably drove me to reading."

He was, in his energy, courage, compassion, and sincerity even thankful for the necessity of adapting his experiments to his affliction. He attributed at least two important developments to that necessity: the telephone as civilization knows it today, and the phonograph.

"In experimenting on the telephone," he explained, "I had to improve the transmitter so I could hear it. This made the telephone commercial, as the magneto telephone receiver of Bell was too weak to be used as a transmitter commercially.

"It was the same with the phonograph. The great defect of that instrument was the rendering of the overtones in the music, and the hissing consonants in speech. I worked over 1 year, 20 hours a day, Sundays and all, to get the word 'specie' perfectly recorded. When this was done I knew that everything else could be done—which was a fact."

This greatest inventor of all time was never discouraged by his small knowledge of anything. It wasn't so much what he knew that helped him, but what he tried to know. He was a genius, true. But once when he was pressed for a definition of a genius, he coined the famous adage: "Genius is 1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration." For he knew that freedom and progress for an individual or a nation—or even for a genius—does not mean: "I do not have to work." He knew the future belongs to those who prepare for it. And he knew that the commonest form of opportunity and the most neglected is the opportunity for harder work and better work.

He knew that the heavy ball of progress needs a great deal of pushing. Said Edison: "I recall that after we had conducted thousands of experiments on a certain project without solving the problem, one of my associates expressed discouragement and disgust over having failed 'to find out anything.' But we had learned something. We had learned for a certainty that we couldn't do it that way, and that we would have to try some other way."

Further, with a full brimming measure of friendliness and goodwill, he consistently expressed gratitude to those who saw him through, and never stopped crediting the American free-opportunity system as an essential factor in what he was able to do for all mankind.

Into America's low-cost products, created by enterprises without which these products would not exist except for the rich and powerful, Edison realized that the industry, science, art, geography, commerce, and learning of the whole human race are assembled. He saw this an an asset for neighbors everywhere in our land like the assets flowing from the sun. "We live in a cooperative commonwealth," he said.

Time and again he pointed back to a date: October 24, 1878. This was the date on which 13 enterprising men who had resources and believed in Edison delivered to the New York County clerk's office the papers for incorporation of an undertaking to support and develop his work. Edison was one of the incorporators.

They called it the Edison Electric Light Co. To the public it sounded as strange as if you or I today were to form the Atomic Household Products Co.

This group was risking $300,000 in an enterprise that had as its only real asset the 31-year-old brain of young Edison.

But this brain, alive and humming with effort and imagination, was on a search for a filament that would glow brilliantly in a glass bulb when electricity passed through the filament. This was a problem of discovery which was buried deep in the mysteries of electric incandescence. In 4 days less than 1 year, with the support of his business associates, Edison produced a light which would light the world.

Actually, the lamp itself was only a fraction of what Edison needed to accomplish if the light was to be useful to people, on streets, in homes, in workplaces, and if the thousands of future tasks of electricity were to be born, in short, if men and women were to have an electrical age, electricity must be produced and distributed so effectively, so inexpensively, and so safely that people could afford to use it.

While the glowing lamp was the symbol of Edison's success, Edison had to develop, and his associates had to finance, an entire generating and distributing system including the invention and construction of giant dynamos, conduits, power lines, wires, insulators, sockets, meters, fuses—everything.

Of Edison's 1,097 patents, 360 dealt with the generation and distribution of power, viz, the hidden needs behind the glow in that little lamp which could light the country, light the world, and take up the task of light where the sun left off.

Edison's genius alone wasn't enough for the final result, the ultimate gift to humanity. While Edison overcame the scientific difficulties in the delivery of power and the defeat of darkness, he himself always pointed out that it was the cooperation, vitality, and risk-taking willingness of American business enterprise that sustained him on his job and brought his results within reach of all.

It was this enterprise, and the American opportunity for free enterprises, that left him free to develop his wonderful talents of invention and development. It ran the risk and supplied the vast capital needed to translate his inventions into tools for human advancement. In short, American enterprise made the inventions widely useful to average people, and at a low cost to all. And this is the essence of human progress.

But Edison's risks were not over. I spoke of failures a while earlier. This is what I meant.

About 1890, 11 years after the first success of his electric light, Edison set out to devise a system of mining and milling low-grade iron ore that would be economically sound. He was convinced that the country's known deposits of iron ore were disappearing. In short, he was now going beyond, and even deeper than the wires in the bulb, the power stations, dynamos. He was going to the problem of the supply of the iron ore itself.

His supporters stayed with him. Through his tremendous effort and what was for them an enormous expenditure of $3,000,000, Edison invented and put into operation a revolutionary method of reclaiming iron ore through ore refinement. It was called the magnetic ore separator.

But the undertaking did not work out. After 6 years, unforeseen developments left Edison and his backers with a terrible failure on their hands. New and immensely rich iron ore deposits were discovered by other men of imagination, working in other progressive undertakings. Edison's refining methods just could not compete.

Looking back on this period, Edison said: "For a good many years I worried about my pay roll; didn't know how I was always going to meet it. My trouble had been that I always had too much ambition and tried to do things that were financially too big for me. If I had not had so much ambition and had not tried to do so many things, I probably would have been much happier, but less useful."

Here, then, is a good example of what is meant by the profit and loss system in our country, a term which should always be used in referring to the way enterprises live instead of merely saying the profit system. For losses, you know, occur even more frequently than profits in business life. And they can occur even when an enterprise has in it a Thomas Edison. But there's a happier ending to this instance of loss. It ended in general wonderment and jubilation.

Instead of being discouraged and accepting failure, the great man redesigned the machinery and added new ideas. His backers stayed with him, and finally they substituted the making of cement for his original plan of rescuing low-grade iron-ore reserves. I believe it's hardly remembered, but Edison's ideas and the faithfulness of his business associates revolutionized the Portland cement industry in our country.

And in this way, a wonderfully American way, what had been a great loss, a tremendous mental and financial burden on Edison and his associates, was changed to a success.

Human progress is endless and continuous as the rising of the sun. Much has happened to the whole planet since the monsters disappeared. But more good things have happened to us than to men and women any place in the world. Further, as living Americans we are infinitely better off than we've ever been before on this earth. Look around your town, your home, your living room, your boy's school, your workplace, your parks and streets, your stores. And the greatest opportunities lie ahead.

The great days of America are by no means done. We have only touched the border of our achievement. If you and I did not believe this, we would not be believers in America. Because that faith is America.

Unlimited possibilities are ahead through the new Edisons being born today; the men and women of imagination and character who are each in their own way helping us today and will help us even more tomorrow in this wonderland of the world.

Rogers Bill Calls for Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it appears that my House Resolution 450 is receiving unanimous acclaim by the press of my State. As a part of my remarks on the merits of this bill, I am including herewith an editorial from the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., in the issue of March 14. May I state that the Miami Herald is one of the leading and outstanding newspapers, not only of Florida but of the South, and I am gratified to know that through the editorial columns they endorse the principle of this resolution and believe that the Congress should give it favorable consideration. The editorial is as follows:

ROGERS BILL CALLS FOR RESPONSIBILITY

Sixth District Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Fort Lauderdale, believes that Congress would be acutely economy-minded if a yea-and-nay vote were made mandatory on all appropriations of a public nature.

Representative ROGERS would "magnify the responsibility of each Member" by getting his name on the record for every money measure.

ROGERS would implement the conviction of every taxpayer that there would be a tremendous reduction in governmental waste, extravagance, and duplication if every Representative knew that his vote would be a matter available.

ROGERS' resolution is simple. It would insert this amendment in the rules of the House:

"No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

The need for such an amendment is pressing in the current national financial status—a time when we are better than $256,000,000,000 in debt and going daily into the red for an anticipated $5,000,000,000 deficit at the end of the current fiscal period.

Last year the first session of the Eighty-first Congress appropriated some $29,000,000 with no record whatsoever as to how the individual Congressmen voted.

During the same session bills appropriating better than $6,000,000,000 were passed where a yea and a nay vote was taken in one house but not in the other.

Billions of dollars have been appropriated in the House, where appropriations are initiated, without any vote of record. In some instances these billions of dollars were appropriated without a majority of the House being present.

It is one thing to appropriate money when all that is required is to shout "Yes." It's something else when a Congressman's vote is known.

Get the individual votes of the money-spenders down for all to see and the country will at once be benefited with magnified responsibility Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee envisions.

The resulting economies would be substantially below those of the President—and that without injuring our domestic economy or investigating our foreign commitments.

Shipbuilding and Ship Repair on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, at a convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, recently assembled in Portland, Oreg., on January 16, 1950, two resolutions were adopted which merit the attention of the Members of the House.

In times of war emergencies, approximately one-half of the war-built tonnage of ships is built on the west coast. West-coast ship-repair facilities are virtually indispensable if war damage occurs to ships in the Pacific Ocean. Four years were required, from 1939 to 1943, to bring the shipyards of the Pacific coast States from a condition of inactivity to full production. The skills which were needed had been largely lost due to years of inactivity. Unless appropriate action by the Congress is taken soon, the period of inactivity which the west-coast yards have again entered may endure until the men who have the skills have again disappeared with lapse of time.

The resolutions referred to read as follows:

Resolution 1

(Submitted by Shipyard & Marine Shop Laborers Local 886, Oakland, Calif.)

West coast shipbuilding

Whereas the wartime records of the Pacific coast shipyards and their workers, both in the building and repairing of ships, was a vital factor in the winning of World War II; and

Whereas since the conclusion of hostilities, shipbuilding, ship repair, and conversion have been awarded almost exclusively to eastern yards; and

Whereas shipbuilding facilities in the Parific coast are largely unused, and many experienced shipyard workers are either unemployed or have turned to other work for their livelihood; and

Whereas facilities which are unused deteriorate with the passage of time, necessitating the expenditure of large sums in their replacement, and personnel losses involve large and costly training programs not to be accomplished overnight; and

Whereas the concentration of our Nation's shipbuilding in limited area along the eastern seaboard leaves the industry vulnerable to destructive attack; and

Whereas, in testimony before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, a prominent Government official contended that there was only enough shipbuilding to keep a few yards going, and he favored the more efficient eastern yards; and

Whereas the favored few yards of the East, controlled by Big Steel, have obtained a monopoly on shipbuilding: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this tenth annual convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, meeting in Portland, Oreg., on January 16, 1950, affirms that we are opposed to this eastern monopoly on the basis of (1) national defense, (2) deterioration of facilities, (3) loss of skilled shipbuilding personnel, and (4) unemployment resulting therefrom; and be it further

Resolved, That failing to secure this allocation through either the President of the United States or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, legislation be initiated before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives to compel the allocation of work to our west coast yards; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President John P. Frey, of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor; President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; the President of the United States; Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; the Chairman of the Maritime Commission; and all United States Senators and Congressmen from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Resolution 5

(Submitted by Drydock, Marine Waysmen, and Stage Riggers Local 3116)

Twenty-five million dollars for Maritime Commission Reserve Fleet reactivation

Whereas the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission Ship Plans Committee recommended appropriation of $25,000,000 to reactivate merchant fleet ships; and

Whereas the Maritime Commission, cooperating with our Nation's military leaders, inserted an item of $25,000,000 in their budget for 1949–50 to accomplish this work; and

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget deleted the requested appropriation; and

Whereas our Pacific coast shipyards lie idle, facilities deteriorating and personnel unemployed, constituting a grave danger to national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Tenth Annual Convention of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, meeting in Portland, Oreg., on January 16, 1950, call upon the Congress of the United States to restore the $25,000,000 to the budget of the Maritime Commission for this reserve fleet reactivation work in the interest of national defense; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President John P. Frey, of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor; President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; the President of the United States; Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; the Chairman of the Maritime Commission; and all United States Senators and Congressmen from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Statement of W. R. New, Executive Secretary, Idaho Small Mine Operators Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho is a State of vast undeveloped natural resources. Most of these resources are in public ownership. In fact, the lands in Idaho are 72 percent federally owned.

Idaho has vast potential resources of water power and minerals, together with large stands of timber, much of it white pine, the most valuable species of timber found in the national forests. Idaho also contains large areas of range land that support many herds of cattle and sheep.

Traversing Idaho north and south we have two great arterial highways, No. 93 on the east side of the State, and No. 95 on the west side of the State. Steady progress has been made in standardizing these arterial highways, but much construction work remains to be done.

There is submitted for the consideration of my colleagues the statement made before the Committee on Public Works by William R. New, executive secretary of the Idaho Small Mine Operators and Prospectors Association, of Hailey, Idaho:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 7398, FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT, BY WILLIAM R. NEW

My name is William R. New, of Hailey, Idaho. I am executive secretary of the Idaho Small Mine Operators Association.

If you would take time to look at the course of Highway 93, you will note that it runs through the central part of Idaho from Montana south to Nevada.

The principal interest my group has in this highway is that it would open up a great storehouse of undeveloped mineral resources; but that is only one of the many reasons why this committee should give special consideration to this highway.

This is one of the few north and south arterial highways from Canada to Mexico. As I have said, it passes through some of the richest undeveloped natural resources of our Nation which will many times pay the cost of its construction.

It is one of the most beautiful scenic highways of our Nation and would give millions of tourists an opportunity to see the Salmon River country and many other beautiful spots that only our western country offers.

Modern warfare necessitates that the areas such as this highway traverses be opened; and you cannot afford to put it off many more years if the reports that I read in the papers are correct.

I trust and hope that the committee will give due consideration to this important project.

City Without a Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I offer for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 22, 1950:

CITY WITHOUT A VOTE

Imagine a city of 900,000 which works, pays taxes, lives and thinks like any other American community, and yet fails to enjoy local self-government. This is Washington, where citizenship carries only an abstract meaning. The questions of policy and administration, police and fire protection, schools and parks, traffic and transit, culture and civic development, and all the intensely local details of any city large or small apply equally to Washington. But the people who live in the capital, for all the interest they may feel in the real estate tax rate or the quality of schools, streets, and sanitation, have nothing to say. The government of the District of Columbia rests in Congress, down to regulation of barber shops, weed removal, street naming and shooing off the starlings. This is the height of government without representation, control of local affairs by committee and commission. The Washington citizen, if he may be called such, is helpless because he is a voteless neuter.

Now it seems reasonable that Washington, for all its national proprietorship, is entitled to home rule in essentially local matters. The taxpayer, without a vote, is an empty voice. If a city manager appears economically desirable, this is a choice and responsibility for those who pay the bills. Parents who send children to school have a right to elect the school board. The arguments have been hashed over and over, and are simply these: Washington deserves the same responsive home rule as any other American city, and Congress has more to do than act as Washington's nursemaid.

The United States Senate passed the Kefauver bill by voice vote on May 30, 1949. This legislation provides all the home rule that is feasible without constitutional amendment. It is a good bill, but the House of Representatives still fails to join approval because the District of Columbia committee has other ideas. This committee is weighted with southerners who apparently fear for racial segregation if Washington, with its 30 percent Negro population, should gain even the local ballot. The Kefauver bill is decidedly not a civil rights measure; it merely provides for a measure of local self-government. But the committee is determined on suppression, and the only hope for Washington home rule is to get the bill on to the floor by discharge petition. Of the required 218 signers, forty-four are still lacking. We hope that the rest will cross the line. Both parties support home rule; there is no sensible ground for objection. The vote should be taken. Washington, after all, also has a right to govern itself.

The Spirit of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the Polish American Journal of Scranton, Pa.

The article is well worth the attention of the American people because it typifies the real spirit of Poland and the Polish people. Everyone knows the heartaches and hardships which have been the lot of the Polish people over the centuries and the hardiness and perseverance of that great race have been an inspiration to the world. Despite the greatest of difficulties and the terrible loss of life in the last war, Poland is once again rising out of, and building on, its ruins.

As one who has seen at first-hand the results of war's destruction on Poland and its people, I want to commend the article and to say that, come what may, Poland will again resurrect and her people will once again achieve the freedom and independence which is every Pole's birthright.

Poland may be down, for the moment, but nothing can ever hold back the aspirations of this great people in their search for freedom and independence. The Americans of Polish ancestry are joined by all America in their desire to see the arrival of that day and we all look forward, with confidence, to the achieving of that objective.

I predict that the alien yoke now so evident in Poland will be thrown off and Poland itself, will be free from all outside influences. The Marshal Rossakowsky plan for Poland may be imposed on the country for the time being, but the day is not too far distant when Poland will be governed by Poles and that country will once again hold up its head and take its rightful place as an equal and sovereign partner in the family of nations.

The editorial follows:

THE SPIRIT OF POLAND

After the Warsaw Insurrection of August 1944, when the Nazis systematically bombed the Polish capital, block by block and building by building, Hitler's generals reported that "Warsaw is destroyed forever."

The report was made on these facts: 700,000 of the city's 1,300,000 citizens were dead. Of 16,300 buildings, 9,100 were destroyed or beyond repair. Of 900 churches and historical sites, 810 were gone. Of 2,800 factories, 2,520 were destroyed. Of 940 schools and universities, 658 were demolished. Of 440 hospitals, clinics and infirmaries, 352 were destroyed. There was no water, no electricity, no gas, no fuel, no transportation, no food, no tools, nothing—just rubble and corpses.

That was the situation when Warsaw was liberated on January 17, 1945.

But what of Warsaw today? Despite lack of materials and machinery the capital, is fast being rebuilt. The inhabitants with their hands are digging out of the ruins, and erecting modern buildings. Churches and sacred places are being restored wherever possible. A total of 2,000 new homes were built in 1949.

But why are the Poles rebuilding Warsaw? It would have been much easier to erect the capital city a few miles north or a few miles south.

The answer is obvious to every Pole and to every American of Polish descent.

Warsaw represents the very heart of Poland, of all that is Polish. Warsaw is the crucified and martyred city. It is a holy shrine and it must be rebuilt, it must rise again.

And the tenacity with which the people are rebuilding their beloved Warsaw represents the very spirit of Poland. It represents a people who will labor beyond any imagination for that in which they believe; it represents a people who will endure limitless suffering and hardship for their ideals; it represents a people who will never give up, no matter the odds.

And the spirit behind the rebuilding of Warsaw is the same spirit in every American of Polish extraction. It is one of Poland's great contributions to this Nation. Despite hardships in this country, despite discriminations and prejudices, the first Polish immigrants and later their sons and daughters have become and are an important part of this great Nation. In war and peace, they have shouldered the responsibilities of good citizenship.

Path to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended an eloquent resolution adopted at the annual meeting at Jacksonville, Fla., of the bishops' council of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, as proposed by the distinguished Bishop D. Ward Nichols, of New York. The solicitude of the churches for the path to peace is one of the more auspicious activities in favor of peace taking place in our country:

Resolution to President Harry S. Truman, White House, Washington, D. C., from annual meeting of the bishops' council, Jacksonville, Fla., February 15, 16, 17

While we are ever mindful of the continuing need for protecting our shores from any enemy aggressors, the African Methodist Episcopal Church must stand in condemnation of the philosophy of power as a path to peace. The African Methodist Episcopal Church was founded in 1787 in Philadelphia by one Richard Allen, whose philosophy of life has been adopted as the motto of this world-wide organization: "God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, man our brother."

We must reaffirm the historic position of our revered founder and urge your implementation of the doctrines of democracy by calling upon the citizenry of America and the entire God-fearing world to defeat the rise of any political religion with a renaissance of the principles of Christendom.

Taking due cognizance of the gap between the tenets of true democracy and its malpractice here in America, we urge you to use your high office in behalf of the following:

1. International control over the manufacture and distribution of the satanic A and H bombs with which mankind now threatens to destroy himself.
2. Speedy enactment of fair-employment-practices legislation.
3. Rightful exercise of your authority as Commander in Chief of our armed forces to speedily end all quotas and policies based on race.
4. Enactment of Federal legislation to equalize educational facilities for all children regardless of race or creed.
5. A forthright foreign policy designed to promote the brotherhood of all mankind and to end all forms of colonialism.

Robbie Conlin, Student in Covington Community Elementary School, Author of Prize-Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article which recently appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Covington Republican. The article, which follows, includes an essay "What Citizenship Means to Me," written by one of Covington's adopted sons, 11-year-old Robbie Conlin, foster son of Frank D. Conlin, principal of the Covington Community Elementary School:

ROBBIE CONLIN, STUDENT IN COVINGTON COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AUTHOR OF PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY

Robbie Conlin, foster son of Frank D. Conlin, principal of the Covington Community Elementary School, was this week listed as a winner in an essay contest sponsored by radio station WLS. Robbie's prize for the winning essay was two GE radios, one for himself and the other for his classroom. His name was announced last Monday over WLS.

Robbie wrote his essay on the subject, "What Citizenship Means to Me," and is herewith published:

"Just 7 months ago I was a citizen of France, but on the 24th of June of the past year I had the great honor of becoming a citizen of the United States.

"I was born in 1939 in the city of Metz, in Lorraine, France.

"As early as I can remember, German soldiers occupied the city in which I lived. We were horrified when the Americans dropped bombs and strafed the streets with machine gun fire. Many of our innocent people were killed or wounded and my own brother was a victim of the war. While trying to escape being run over by tanks, he fell on the icy streets and broke his hip. This fall crippled him for life.

"In 1946 I was adopted by my foster father who was an officer in the American Army. Then I was brought to the United States and to my new home.

"I was eager to become an American citizen but the law required me to wait for 2 years before applying for naturalization.

"United States citizenship gives me a feeling of safety from falling bombs and machine gun fire. It also means plenty of food, clothing, and security.

"The Constitution, which is the basis of the laws of the United States, promises many things that I could not have had if I had stayed in France. Citizenship guarantees me free speech and equal opportunities. When I am old enough I shall have a chance to take part in electing Government officials, a right to own property, and I shall have protection for myself and my property.

"Above all, citizenship means that I may now claim the United States of America as my country, the Star-Spangled Banner as my flag, and my neighbors as my fellow citizens. Citizenship, too, means that, in case of war when I am a man, I may offer my services to my country, the United States.

False Editorial Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1950, Mr. Walter Leckrone, editor of the Indianapolis Times, carried in his editorial columns an unfair, untrue, and intentionally misleading editorial. This editorial was supposed to be an answer to a speech which I made on the floor of the House March 4 concerning the settlement of the coal strike.

On March 10 I sent the letter following these remarks to Mr. Leckrone, asking that it be reprinted in his editorial column in order to correct the misleading, false, and prejudicial statements he made regarding my speech. Up to now he has refused to print my answer or to give the readers the true facts concerning the unfortunate editorial. Mr. Leckrone has sunk to a new low in a campaign to resell the Taft-Hartley law. Why does he refuse to print recorded facts concerning this law?

A free press contemplates a fair press. Evidently Mr. Leckrone is one of the few editors in this country who believes a public official should be a natural victim for malicious attacks regardless of the truth or facts involved. Fortunately, there are but a few editors of the Leckrone type employed by the newspapers in this country. In refusing his newspaper columns to me for the purpose of answering his false and unjust editorial, he is merely continuing his past reputation as a hit-and-run editor.

I hereby submit my letter in answer to his editorial which he refused to place in his columns:

MARCH 10, 1950.

Mr. WALTER LECKRONE,
Editor, the Indianapolis Times,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. LECKRONE: My attention has been called to an editorial in the Indianapolis Times of Monday, March 6, 1950.

The first line of this editorial refers to my speech in Congress on last Saturday regarding the coal strike as "demagogic double-talk." The last line says, and I quote "we do feel a Member of Congress has an obligation to tell the truth about matters of plain recorded fact." This line is merely a diplomatic inference that I was lying to the Members of Congress and to the American public regarding my two statements set out therein.

Enclosed you will find page 2823 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains the speech I made, to which you referred.

One of my statements was that "during the last 18 months, there have been more serious strikes than any year in our history." You conveniently omitted the next line of my speech which said "the only exception might be the first year after the war, when thousands of labor contracts that had been status quo for 5 years during the war period came up for renewal." As a proof that I was not telling an untruth in that statement, I am hereby submitting for your readers, plain recorded facts, taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, covering the last 15 years with the exception of the war years when union labor and management did not negotiate work contracts.

Number of man-days lost by strikes and work stoppages between 1936 and 1940, 16,900,000 (average per year).

Omitting the war years, we come to 1946 which was the first year after the war: 1946, approximately 116,000,000 man-days lost; 1947, approximately 34,000,000 man-days lost; 1948, approximately 34,000,000 man-days lost; and 1949, approximately 53,000,000 man-days lost.

Before 1935, the man-days lost by strikes in any year in our history, does not rank even close to the years 1946 or 1949. So, Mr. Editor, the plain recorded fact is that I was not untruthful in my charge that the Taft-Hartley law has caused more labor disputes than any year in our history with the exception of 1946.

Your second charge that I did not tell the truth about matters of plain recorded fact

that the Taft-Hartley law failed 100 percent in the coal strike:

In my speech, which you failed to include in your editorial, I stated that Cyrus S. Ching, Federal Mediator and former rubber executive, publicly stated several weeks ago that there had not been any honest effort at collective bargaining since contract discussions started last summer. The response of the coal operators to all collective-bargaining proposals was an emphatic "No."

I further stated that powerful interests in this country wanted the Taft-Hartley injunction tested. When President Truman proceeded with the injunction, 450,000 miners refused to go back to work in spite of the injunction, and I further stated that when the operators discovered the monumental failure of the Taft-Hartley law injunction, they proceeded to collective bargain with the union.

When good-faith collective bargaining was engaged in, the strike was settled in a few days. Furthermore, in your editorial, you stated that I failed to say what caused the coal strike the year before the Taft-Hartley law was passed or the year before that and the others previously.

You are correct on that statement, but you failed to also mention that there has been four separate coal strikes and work stoppages since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in the summer of 1947.

I am sure that your sense of justice and fair play as the editor of a newspaper, will prompt you to give this letter the same space in your editorial column as the editorial of Monday, March 6, 1950.

Very truly yours,

RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress.

Development of Peat Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the industrial progress of the great Midwest, I would like to join my friend and colleague from Minnesota, Hon. FRED MARSHALL, in calling to the attention of this House the importance of legislation to encourage the development and utilization of our peat resources.

I think we ought to give serious consideration to the bills which he has introduced, H. R. 7330 and H. R. 7574. The first of these authorizes vitally needed research and preliminary development and the second would authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to private business for better utilization of peat and its numerous byproducts.

The tremendous untapped peat resources of my own State and of other States throughout the country, if properly utilized, can bring industrial growth to many areas seriously retarded because peat lands were considered waste lands. Short-haul fuel and low-cost power will bring new industries into these areas and will create new jobs for our labor force.

As my colleague from northern Minnesota, Hon. JOHN BLATNIK, has already pointed out in support of this legislation, the effective development of our taconite deposits has been hampered for lack of a nearby fuel and power supply. If we can make use of the scientific advances which have been made in the production of peat, it will be a decided stimulus to effective use of our low-grade iron ore.

In considering the effect of such legislation in promoting industrial progress we must not overlook the many byproducts which have been discovered in the production of peat fuels. And its importance does not depend only upon its use as a fuel in the usual sense, but as a fuel to provide electric power for nearby industry and small business.

This importance is heightened in the case of Minnesota because of its geographical location which makes it dependent upon long overland and overwater hauls of fuel and raw materials. This strategic vulnerability can be reduced by development of nearby resources and can make possible sorely needed decentralization of industry and population in the interest of national defense and national security.

Minnesota's deposits of 7,000,000,000 tons of peat constitute half of the Nation's supply and on the basis of preliminary research have been found to be of good quality and easy access. Other large deposits are found in a number of States in every section of the country in what have come to be underdeveloped areas. A good peat-production program will be a boost to the local economy and will be a strengthening factor in the national economy.

Peat as a basic material could make possible low-cost production of such byproducts as alcohol, acetic acid, ammonia, ammonium sulfate, fertilizers, paraffin wax, phenol, asphalt, tars, oils, gases, and allied chemical products for American manufacturers. Because they would be byproducts of peat processing, they would be available at less cost than original production.

Because of their own economic needs, other countries with large peat deposits have made greater technological advances in development of this resource, but the impetus provided in this legislation can well bring us up to date and open even new roads to progress.

Peat deposits are found in about half of the States, and our total deposits are estimated to be about 14,000,000,000 tons. Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan combined contain 75 percent of the reserves; 14 percent of the country's total is in Florida; and the rest is distributed through the New England and Pacific coast States.

Unfortunately, those very areas in which the best quality deposits are found are the areas now considered underdeveloped because these co-called wastelands have hampered both industrial and agricultural development. To turn these lands into sources of productive wealth for both industry and agriculture will bolster the backward economy of these areas and make new jobs without taking away existing jobs.

It is because of these factors, that I ask those who are interested in maintaining healthy employment rolls for our labor force to consider the effect the proposed legislation will have in bringing new industry and new jobs to the underdeveloped areas of our country.

Census Bureau Should Not Be Permitted To Make Inquiry Concerning Private Income and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit officials and other representatives of the Census Bureau from making inquiry with respect to the income of private individuals.

The amount of the income and property of every man and woman is their own individual business and does not belong to the public. Folks just do not like to have census enumerators in their own communities inquiring as to how much money they make or how much property they own. It just does not set well.

Furthermore, the whole thing is absolutely unnecessary. If for some particular reason the Government deems it necessary to check the income of private individuals it can be done through the Income Tax Department of Internal Revenue. To permit census enumerators to pry into the private affairs of individuals is carrying things too far.

It should be observed there is no law requiring this information. It is just an unnecessary regulation of the Census Bureau. It appears the only way to prevent this intrusion is through the approval of this legislation.

Middle-Income Housing Bill a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, buying votes with promises is a profession. Those who do it skillfully can keep themselves in office indefinitely. The art is to keep new promises before the voters while making them forget unfulfilled past ones. Better yet, keep a few promises, and create the impression that all have been kept. The administration's program of houses for all is just such a political illusion.

One trick in stirring the emotions of people of good will is to give the impression that the Central Government is the only power that can remove slums and dry up disease, by itself building houses. But the Government propagandists do not show how this forces the tenants to vote for the political party which builds the houses, and charges the costs of all municipal services and deficits to the folks across the street from the political housing. Thus, it creates more slums than it clears.

There is another trick which has worked well from the beginning of all

time. Obviously, there are more renters than landlords. So, all Socialist governments force landlords to subsidize their tenants. This scares any future landlord, and creates a housing shortage. Then the government can rush in to meet the need. It can build some houses, lend money for others, and insure loans for the rest. In short order, it controls the nation's housing. Then those who want to enjoy government low-rent subsidies must vote to retain the party in power. It is all a blindfolding fraud, which causes us to surrender the freedom our forefathers cherished so much.

First, an appearance of a housing shortage must be created. Rent control did this by forcing landlords to sell their property. The total number of new dwelling units in the United States increased 4,000,000 from 1940 to 1947. Yet the number for rent actually decreased by 2,000,000. This meant a shortage for those who wanted to rent.

Most of the postwar housing was built by Government loans or insurance but only one-fifth of it was built for rent. The cost was such that many families could not afford brand new homes. Few people wanted to move from bargain rents in the old houses under rent control.

The cunning politicians rushed in, and promised "cheap" public housing for the low-income families. They posed as the saviors of those whose distress they had caused. After much talking and promising, the Eighty-First Congress, last year, passed a public-housing bill. The politicians felt they had delivered the goods for the low-income families. With scarcely a pause, they next advanced a Government plan for housing the middle-income groups.

This promise of Government aid for middle-income families is built on several frauds. First it assumes the Government has already taken care of the lower third. And, second, it claims that middle-income families cannot now afford to house themselves. Both of these premises are clearly false.

The Public Housing Act of last year provides for housing less than one cut of every ten low-income families. Even so, homes for this tenth will not be completed for at least 6 years and not until local communities agree to grant tax exemptions and free education for the children. So, it would take 60 years or more and many more billions before the lower third was housed.

As to middle-income families not being able to house themselves, we need only look at the Department of Labor's cost-of-living index. Since 1929, this index for all items has gone up more than 38 percent. Yet, the rent item has actually dropped almost 15 percent. So, rent is certainly not the reason for our high cost of living. Perhaps it is taxes. They have gone up 1,000 percent.

Administration leaders admit that shelter rent, not including heat and utilities, should be about 20 percent of a family's budget. Last year the Labor Department studied budgets in three typical cities, Houston, Denver, and Detroit. It found that families with incomes from $3,000 to $4,000 a year were spending only 12.1 percent, 13.9 percent, and 16.3 percent for rent, including heat, light, and refrigeration. The Federal Reserve Board, in its 1949 consumer survey, shows that home-owning families, with incomes of $2,000 to $5,000 a year, paid only 17 percent of their 1948 incomes for housing while those who rented paid a bare 13 percent.

This indicates that housing is available at prices middle-income families can well afford. The idea that middle-income families, the Nation's largest taxpayers, need a housing subsidy is a fraud. The bills now before Congress would not aid more than one in every 32 middle-income families. But it sounds nice. Before election most middle-income families will think they are going to be helped. They will not wake up until they get their next tax bill. And that can be blamed on the cold war.

Politics is a great game. Unfortunately, it is played for keeps. Ask any European who listened to deceptive promises like those being made by our own Fair Deal and do-gooder politicians of both parties.

Acheson's San Francisco Speech Impressive, but Main China Issue Still Undecided

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ACHESON'S SAN FRANCISCO SPEECH IMPRESSIVE, BUT MAIN CHINA ISSUE STILL UNDECIDED

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Secretary of State's speech in San Francisco last week is public confirmation that the administration is developing a scheme for saving non-Communist Asia.

As revealed by Mr. Acheson, this policy consists of help—military or political or economic—to Japan, free Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and to the Bao Dai regime in Indochina.

It includes some first class political warfare against the Chinese Communists in the form of statements to the Chinese people. The Secretary pointed out how the Russians are plundering their Chinese allies, and how food has gone from China to Russia at a time when China faces the worst famine in history. To be sure, he fell into a contradiction when he first stated that the Chinese Nationalist Government had fallen because the people abandoned it and then insisted that their present unhappy status within the orbit of the Soviet Union is not the fault of the Chinese people but has been forced upon them by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Acheson cannot have it both ways. He answered himself when he forcefully invited the people of Asia to recognize that "the major threat to their freedom and to their social and economic progress is the attempted penetration of Asia by Soviet Communist imperialism and by the colonialism which that penetration attempts to conceal."

PRIVATE INTERESTS GRATIFIED

This is God's truth. It was, however, just as true 4 years ago when Gen. George Marshall tried to compel the Chinese Nationalist Government to collaborate with the Chinese Communists and stopped all American aid to China when Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek refused. Had the American administration spoken in 1946 as Secretary Acheson speaks now, China might never have been lost.

The weakest part of the Secretary's speech was his offer to trade with Communist China on decent terms. This was honey to any American traders who might put personal profit above their country's welfare. It may tempt the Chinese Communist leaders who are responsible for their country's famine. It was a kick in the teeth for the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa and Hainan Islands who are bravely carrying on the fight. It implied that the United States will help break the Nationalists' blockade.

But the famine in China and rising discontent, plus the Nationalists' resistance on the islands, offers just a chance of overthrowing the Chinese Communists. The United States ought not to overlook any opportunity, however slight. The Chinese Communists should be compelled to stew unaided in the ruin they created.

AID PLEDGE WEAK

Another weak point in the Secretary's new policy for Asia is the half-hearted way in which he interprets the Truman doctrine of aid to Indochina. He promised Bao Dai not the kind of effective aid we gave to Greece, but aid within the prudent capabilities of our resources.

Obviously, if strictly limited aid is enough, well and good. It is not likely to impress the Russians or their Indochinese stooges.

It just happened that the Secretary's speech coincides with the report that Ho Chi-minh had gone to Peiping to sign a military alliance with the U. S. S. R. and with Communist China. Should this be exact, Ho will come back with a promise of something more than the prudent assistance promised Bao Dai by Secretary Acheson.

Apparently, too, Secretary Acheson has not yet made up his mind whether to support or not to support the Southeast Asia Union so sturdily championed by President Elpidio Quirino of the Philippines.

INDIA NEEDS SPUR

From recent remarks by External Minister Spender of Australia, that country is now ready to discuss such a scheme. Australia is one of the two bastions of strength in the area.

The other potential bastion, India, is still being kept in "neutrality" by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. Mr. Nehru has again refused President Quirino's invitation to a conference to discuss measures for meeting the Communist menace. Thereby he has again demonstrated how a distinguished fighter for freedom may turn out to be an inadequate statesman once freedom has been obtained. Mr. Nehru is still looking back at the imperialism his country has escaped from. If in the process he should be hit by the Soviet Russian truck it will be his own fault. Secretary Acheson might have reminded him that India's failure to cooperate with the other Asiatic nations could be taken as a sign that India does not properly qualify for aid under the Truman doctrine.

The San Francisco speech makes me think that the American administration has not yet faced the issue whether to defend southeastern Asia by all possible means or to let it go.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to the maintenance of a healthy democracy than a fair, honest, and accurate system of electing Presidents. Senate Joint Resolution 2, which passed the Senate recently by a vote of 64 to 27, and House Joint Resolution 2, now pending in the House, provide such a system.

In the current issue of ADA World, Mr. Bertram Gross has written an excellent article in support of this amendment. I offer his article for reproduction here in the RECORD:

LODGE-GOSSETT AMENDMENT—ELECTORAL CHANGE IS HAILED AS DEMOCRATIC

(By Bertram Gross)

Most liberals have long supported the Lodge-Gossett constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and split the electoral vote of each State among presidential candidates in proportion of their popular vote.

This is evidenced by the fact that men like Senators ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, were active in the campaign that led to the recent 64 to 27 favorable vote in the Senate and to a favorable report by the House Judiciary Committee. It is borne out by the support given the measure on the floor of the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and every other liberal Member of the Senate.

It has recently been suggested, however, that these liberals have been hoaxed and that the Lodge-Gossett amendment is a "dangerous sleeper."

A case is made that a division of electoral votes among rival presidential candidates would give southern Democrats more power in the Democratic Party and thereby make the Democratic Party more conservative. Those who argue in this fashion have no objection to abolishing the electoral college as such. But they believe in keeping—at least for the present—the unit system of giving a State's total electoral vote to the candidate who obtains a plurality within the State.

To appraise the validity of this argument, let's take a look at the probable effects of dividing the electoral votes of the States among candidates in proportion to the popular vote.

The first effect would be—in the words used by Senator HUMPHREY on the floor of the Senate, February 1, 1950—"a definitive step in the direction of greater democratization of our electoral process."

Under the present system, the votes cast within any State for the candidate who receives less than a plurality are simply not counted in the final tabulation. Thus, Truman in 1948 got no credit for the millions of votes cast for him in the State of New York. Because he nosed out Truman by a slight margin, Dewey won all of New York's 47 electoral votes. Likewise, Dewey got no credit in the final count for the Republican votes in Virginia, although these votes amounted to 46 percent of the total.

Under the more democratic method of proportional allocation, the same number of popular votes would have given Truman 21 electoral votes in New York and Dewey 4.5 electoral votes in Virginia.

From a strictly theoretical viewpoint, it would be better to have a direct popular election of the President or else to base the electoral vote of each State on the number of its voters rather than its population. But both of these theoretical remedies would go so far in reducing the power of the small States as to make it impossible, in the judgment of congressional liberals, to obtain a two-thirds vote in Congress and ratification by 36 States.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment provides the only attainable method of democratizing Presidential elections.

Second, it would promote active campaigning by both major political parties in those one-party States that are customarily regarded as safe or solid.

At present the Republican organizations in the solid South and the Democratic organizations in the rock-ribbed Republican northern States like Maine and Vermont and others, never really put up a fight in presidential elections. This is one of the reasons why the popular vote is so small in these areas.

It is also one of the reasons why congressional candidates in these areas have little interest in, and often directly oppose the national platforms of their parties. It is one of the keys—but not the only one—to the great riddle of American politics: "Why is it that a President can be elected on a liberal program but at the same election a Congress can be elected which does not have a liberal majority?"

The pending amendment would promote active political competion in the now "solid" Democratic South and the now "solid" Republican Northern States. Both parties in these areas would find a direct and immediate interest in wooing additional votes.

In the South this would mean a rapid stepping-up of the present trend toward more Negro voting. The written and unwritten barriers to Negro voting would be pushed aside as both parties actively campaigned for Negro votes. The labor vote would also get increasing attention, since the votes of southern workers, together with the Negro votes, would provide the largest increments in future elections.

As a result, southern liberalism—already beginning to flower—would grow more rapidly. Southern conservatives would gravitate toward the Republicans. Both political parties would be more capable of delivering upon campaign promises.

Third, there would be a wider geographical distribution of political power and prestige.

It follows from the previous points that there would be less sectionalism in American politics, more emphasis on national issues.

There would be less emphasis on selecting presidential candidates on the basis of their ability to carry some large State, more political opportunities for men and women in every section of the country.

These things, in turn, mean more attention in presidential politics to the economic and social needs of both the South and the rock-ribbed Republican Northern States.

But the 404 electoral votes outside the South would still be more important than the South's 127 electoral votes. Southern politics would by no means, as some have contended, dominate the national scene.

Fourth, and finally, the balance-of-power positions now enjoyed by many small groups in the most populous States would be weakened.

At present when a few thousand votes on one side or the other may throw a whole block of electoral votes—like New York's 47 votes—to one candidate or the other, many small organizations are in highly strategic balance-of-power positions. They wield power out of all proportion to their voting strength.

Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment these strategic positions would be weakened. This goes for liberal organizations as well as for conservative, reactionary, and radical ones.

The greatest losses, however, would be felt by those organizations with little voting strength. The least losses would be felt by large mass organizations such as labor unions.

Although the four propositions underlined above can be fully substantiated, reasonable people—including reasonable liberals—can readily differ on how much value is to be placed on each of them.

It's like the dilemma faced by the man who is thinking of marrying a girl who is beautiful and intelligent, but simply can't cook. If home-cooked meals are more important to him than anything else in life, then it makes sense for him to restrain his natural impulses and remain a bachelor until he finds a better candidate.

In the same way, if a liberal places more value upon a restricted area of political competition and the maintenance of certain balance-of-power positions, or if he takes a defeatist attitude toward the chances of winning the votes of the majority of the American people under a more democratic electoral system, then it makes sense for him to oppose the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

If a liberal is more interested in winning pleasant campaign promises from both parties than in building a truly liberal party that can keep its promises, then he should oppose the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

I might add that if these are what he values most highly, then it also makes sense to oppose a direct popular election of the President.

On the other hand, if a liberal places greater value upon steps toward more democracy and toward developing genuine two-party politics in one-party areas, then he should support the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

If any liberal refuses to decide where he stands on this matter until he sees a mathematical demonstration that the amendment will help the liberals rather than the conservatives, then he had better get a nice comfortable cushion and prepare himself to sit on the fence the rest of his life.

Statistics cannot tell you whether it will help liberals or conservatives, Democrats or Republicans. Or rather, one can develop equally elaborate statistical stories on either side. Further, statistics cannot tell exactly how many new voters would be brought to the polls under the Lodge-Gossett amendment, or how soon.

The key reason that statistics cannot supply the answer is that the constitutional amendment by itself would not shift the balance one way or another. It would merely change the rules of the game so as to provide new opportunities for both sides.

The conservative camp in America will unquestionably gain under this constitutional amendment if the liberals fail to adjust to the new situation and develop their political strategy in a dynamic fashion.

But the liberal camp will most certainly gain if:

(1) Negro leaders will realize that this provides the first great opportunity for the organization and political awakening of Negroes in the South;

(2) Labor organizations intensify their organizational campaigns in the South; and

(3) At long last a liberal program were developed for greater industrialization and higher living standards throughout the South.

Those few liberals who have voiced objections to the Lodge-Gossett amendment have performed a valuable service.

The debate they have initiated underscores the fact that American liberalism faces crucial problems of political dynamics.

When this debate is resolved in favor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment—as I am sure it will be—the country will have benefited from a more open discussion of the issues. And the liberal movement will have benefited from a more widespread appreciation of the fact that the adoption of the Lodge-Gossett amendment will call for a new strategy of liberal politics.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we will find that 95 percent of our political scientists and serious students of government endorse the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment as the best possible reform in our cumbersome and undemocratic electoral machinery. I wish to offer here for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of a committee of the American Political Science Association, in which he discusses and endorses the aforesaid amendment:

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
MAXWELL GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Syracuse, N. Y., February 27, 1950.

Hon. ED GOSSETT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOSSETT: I am very much interested in the proposed amendment to the United States Constitution, sponsored by you and by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, to revise certain provisions of the Constitution concerning the electoral college. It seems to me that your proposal is a major contribution to the perfection of democratic institutions in the United States. The principle involved in the proposed amendment is sound democratic theory, the idea that the electoral vote ought to reflect as fairly and accurately as possible the sentiments of the people themselves. Because it is solidly grounded in good democratic principles it is also a sound measure around which to develop our political institutions, institutions which are likely to function best when they implement the will of the people.

As a political scientist I have had a lifelong interest in American political parties, organizations without which a democratic government in a nation of 150,000,000 people is inconceivable. I feel that your proposal is very likely to have a good effect on the party system. It seems to me that the existing constitutional provisions governing the counting of the electoral vote make the development of an effective and responsible party system excessively difficult. The present system produces an electoral vote so unrepresentative of public opinion that it invites undemocratic, disruptive, and obstructive political practices. It places an undue premium on the vote of a few States and on the influence of certain minority and special interest blocs of voters in these States. One consequence of the adoption of your amendment would probably be to reduce political tension in a few States but to increase popular participation in Presidential elections throughout the country. In view of the fact that only a little more than 50 percent of the potential electorate has participated in recent Presidential elections it seems to me that broadening effects of the amendment would be beneficial. In general I should think that the tendency of the amendment would be to reduce sectional antagonism because it invites increased political participation by the whole Nation. Similarly, since it would make the electoral college vote reflect the popular vote as accurately as possible it might tend to reduce conflict between the President and Congress by keeping both branches of the Government close to the people. Finally, the existing system has tended, for a number of reasons, to discriminate more and more strongly against the defeated major party and to exaggerate the vote of the successful party so drastically that it has become something of a menace to the survival of the two-party system.

A committee of the American Political Science Association, of which I am chairman, has given your amendment a good deal of thought in course of recent years. While the report of the committee is not now ready for release and I am not authorized to speak for the members of the committee in this matter, I can say that the general trend of the opinion of the committee is similar to mine.

The questions raised by your proposal are so important that I hope that, regardless of the outcome of the present debate in the House, public discussion of the subject may be continued until the issues are clarified.

Sincerely,

E. E. SCHATTSCHNEIDER.

Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution memorializing Congress in favor of extending the effective period of the rent-control provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to provide by legislation that the rent-control provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 shall continue in effect until February 28, 1951; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, March 13, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 16, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Revival of Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a copyrighted story from the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, March 20, which the Christian Science Monitor Washington bureau has kindly given me permission to insert in the RECORD.

This story is challenging and seems to me to offer a possible solution to the overproduction in the coal industry. I think it is worthy of wide circulation, if it does nothing more than cause discussion of the various processes for the extraction of oil and other byproducts from coal. If the Federal Government is suppressing this process, as charged in the article, I think that looking into the matter would be one of the most profitable investigations that Congress could make.

The article follows:

COAL INDUSTRY REVIVAL FORETOLD IN OIL DISTILLED FROM UNMINED SEAMS—ECONOMIC GAINS OF KARRICK PROCESS CITED IN MONITOR WRITER'S SIFTING OF EVIDENCE—DELAYS SEEN KEYED TO PETROLEUM FIRMS

(By Harlan Trott)

If a process existed which would—

End the Nation's domestic oil shortage permanently.

Provide abundant high-grade oil at lower cost.

Open up a vast new demand for coal.

Keep John L. Lewis' coal miners working full time.

Produce a cheap, smokeless fuel to solve the soot and smog problem of cities like Los Angeles, St. Louis, and Boston.

Produce 3,000 cubic feet of high-value fuel gas and 100 kilowatt-hours of electricity as additional products out of every ton of coal.

Justify building and operating coal-oil plants—three times cheaper in capital investment than present methods—as utilities in most cities and towns and at coal mines.

Then presumably this would create a lot of public interest.

If this coal-treating process really worked, then the Nation could have oil for nearly 2,000 years at its present rate of consumption. There is that much coal available, according to the Department of the Interior.

Such a process does exist.

The public is not being told about it.

For simplification, it is called in this article the Karrick process after the man who developed it. It is a low-temperature method of distilling oil from ordinary soft coal. It is radically different from a three-to-four-times more expensive process of obtaining oil from shale by a German method, which is favored and now is being developed by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The oil-shale method now being operated at Rifle, Colo., never could meet the Nation's oil and coal needs, the Bureau of Mines concedes. It yields only oil and a shale rock residue which has to be thrown away.

Indeed, the German processes, the Bergius and the Fischer-Tropsch, now being developed by the Bureau of Mines in Louisiana, Mo., were purchased by Standard Oil and associated major oil companies of the United States from the I. G. Farben Trust in 1929.

SHALE PROCESS TERMED INADEQUATE

The Karrick process, on the other hand, could mean just as much to the coal industry as to oil. It yields both oil and gas of the same heating value as natural gas, also a superior solid smokeless fuel. The latter is much superior in heat yield and usability to ordinary soft coal. It is completely smokeless, however burned, with all that that could mean to sooty American cities.

This process, in addition to costing barely one-third of the German methods for the same oil-producing capacity, solves the enormously wasteful present system of burning soft coal and sending its valuable oil content up the chimney in the form of soot to plague cities and housewives. It extracts the oil to solve the Nation's domestic oil shortage, and sends an improved and smokeless coal to household furnaces, fireplaces, kitchen or parlor stoves, factories, power plants, and railroads.

Despite these apparent advantages of the Karrick or coal-distilling process, the Inte-

rior Department's top synthetic fuel experts, who are busy improving the shale-distilling process and are using a $60,000,000 appropriation from Congress for this and the costly German-Standard Oil methods, are opposing developing oil by a coal-distilling industry.

Bureau of Mines officials are reluctant to explain the reasons for this.

When pressed, their explanation boils down to the following: They grant the essential technological claims—and even the cost figures—for the coal distillation process. But in administering the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, they consider it the Bureau of Mines business to produce oil. They do not consider it the bureau's business to get involved in the production of oil and a smokeless fuel by-product, even though it is a superior fuel for making synthetic gas.

Laboratory tests—backed up by the operation of four commercial-size coal-distillation plants—have proved that a plant processing only 50 tons a day of ordinary soft coal would be economically profitable. Such a plant could supply all the electric power, gas, and inexpensive oil for a community of 1,000 inhabitants.

At the same time the solid, smokeless, coke-like by-product fuel would supply 1,000 coal-burning facilities several times over.

EXTREMELY LOW OPERATING COST

The operating cost of such a project is so low, according to these Government-pioneered studies, that the sale of smokeless fuel at the same market price as for raw coal would permit the oil from coal to sell for practically nothing and yield a profit.

These carefully checked facts about the Nation's long-range fuel outlook are being bypassed by Interior Department officials. Meanwhile the public is being told that the country must depend increasingly on foreign oil supplies. It is being told, too, that there will be progressively fewer jobs for coal miners in the near future because of markets lost to oil and natural gas.

According to unpublished Government engineering data, if the Nation's raw, smoky bituminous coal were displaced by this distilled (de-smoked) oil-free coal, 50 to 100 percent more raw coal necessarily would be mined in order to meet the new supply of oil, gas, and electricity obtained from coal.

Reduced to simplest terms, there is one question to resolve: Is the process commercially practical or not? Everything else hinges on that.

Top Government experts assert that the question is beyond the layman's ability to assess. They contend that only the Interior Department's experts are qualified to judge how the Bureau of Mines shall spend the $60,000,000 Congress granted it under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act to further Government research and development of oil-from-coal technology.

There are four points to establish as a prelude to any appraisal of the questions of public policy raised by the Government's failure to do anything about it:

1. What, in brief, is the process and what results are claimed for it?

2. Who developed the process and what are his qualifications?

3. Is documentary evidence available to support the claims?

4. Can other individuals who either are engineers or are competent in appraising coal and oil problems corroborate the evidence?

Answers to these questions will suggest whether the process is to be taken seriously and whether the Interior Department is at fault in not backing the process.

HIGH VALUE IN PROCESSED FUELS

First, the so-called Karrick process, named for Lewis C. Karrick who developed it, uses low-pressure steam to distill ordinary soft coal. The process is known as low-temperature carbonization of coal. The basic process did not originate with Mr. Karrick. Indeed, prior to the discovery of the first petroleum oil well in Pennsylvania, the city of Boston had no less than five coal-oil plants, making kerosene, gas, smokeless fuel, lubricating oil, paraffin wax candles, and axle grease from coal; and there were 55 such plants in the United States.

Mr. Karrick has extended the process and introduced refinements for special coal uses including complete gasification, all of which are covered in his 20 patents.

The products obtainable from a ton of ordinary, noncoking Ohio bituminous coal by the Karrick process are:

Smokeless fuel, pounds	1,500
Fuel gas, cubic feet	3,500
Cresols, gallons	10
Electricity, kilowatt-hours	100
Crude oil, gallons	26

The break-down in terms of corresponding revenues—based on commercial processing of Ohio coal shipped to the St. Paul-Minneapolis area—is equally startling:

Smokeless fuel at $14 a ton	$10.50
Fuel gas at 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet	.35
Cresols at 30 cents a gallon	3.00
Electricity at one-half cent a kilowatt-hour	.50
Crude oil at 6 cents a gallon	1.56
Total revenues	15.91

The combined cost of raw coal, freight, and processing is estimated at $10.80 a ton, leaving a net profit of $5.11.

Leaving out the crude oil and cresols, the net profit on a ton of processed coal would be 55 cents. Actually, therefore, the manufacturer could give away the oil products and still make 10 percent on the invested capital in his plant since the end-product of crude oil costs him nothing.

Second, who developed the process and what are his qualifications? Mr. Karrick is recognized as one of the Nation's leading oil-from-coal technologists. He has held the Government positions of chemist, petroleum-refinery engineer, oil-shale and coal technologist, and consulting engineer in the synthetic liquid-oils studies by the United States Bureau of Mines in Utah and Colorado, and in the Pittsburgh station while holding a research fellowship at Carnegie Institute of Technology. He is author of several Government papers.

Mr. Karrick also supervised coal-product researches at the University of Utah from 1930 to 1938 In 1943 he worked on the Alaska and Rocky Mountain coals for the United States Geological Survey, and showed them to be cheaper and better sources of oils than the shales of the naval oil-shale reserves. The following year he was given charge of new oil-source investigations for the Navy Department.

More recently, Mr. Karrick was hired by the State of Ohio to core drill and test the oil shales, discovering vast, apparently unknown oil resources in both oil shales and the coals.

Two years ago Mr. Karrick said in the opening address before the Ohio Society of Professional Engineers that on the basis of his studies of Ohio shales and coals there is enough oil in the oil shales and coals of southeastern Ohio to supply the entire United States with oil at the present rate of consumption for 2,000 to 10,000 years.

TESTED IN COMMERCIAL SIZE PLANTS

Third, what documentary evidence is available on this process? Mr. Karrick has built and operated a semi-commercial-sized plant in Utah, Colorado, and Pennsylvania, while making oil-from-coal studies for the United States Bureau of Mines.

He built and briefly operated a pilot two-unit commercial-sized plant in Ohio. He also built and ran a commercial scale, single-unit for the Navy.

Complete data on these operations and on the research behind them is both in his possession and that of the Government.

Fourth, what corroboration from competent sources? Mr. Karrick has a signed analysis attesting the high quality and value of the oil from his Ohio plant by Dr. Cecil E. Boord, head of the Department of Organic Chemistry at the Ohio State University.

He has a report by Dean R. B. Ketchum, of the University of Utah School of Mines and Engineering, surveying the Karrick process and recommending that the citizens of Salt Lake City adopt it both for its economic usefulness and to cope with the city's serious smoke problem.

Dr. Gustav Egloff, a former president of the American Institute of Chemists, and director of research for the Universal Oil Co., said in an address before the World Power Conference in London that the antiknock quality of the gasoline produced in Mr. Karrick's coal distilling plant in Pittsburgh, using Utah's cheap, nonchoking coals, is one-third better than the best commercial antiknock gasoline.

The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey offered to buy and to contract for the development and use of the Karrick patents.

Finally, this correspondent has checked the essential facts and cost figures of the Karrick process with those Government oil-from-coal experts who decline to recommend it, or to spend any of their congressional appropriation to further it. The chief among them, as will be reported below, has conceded their basic accuracy.

Mr. Karrick asserts that the Interior Department never has published his original Government-supported research data. Neither has it permitted him to write up an official summary of his studies covering the technology and economies of his oil-from-coal process as is customary on the completion of basic research of this kind.

Mr. Karrick said that Government employees are not authorized to publish original Government data privately. For that reason, he said, he undertook to release the facts about his startling discoveries after he left the Government by becoming a research director at the University of Utah from 1930 to 1938.

VARIED CLAIMS VERIFIED IN THESIS

The stupendous nature of Mr. Karrick's Government-suppressed discoveries are verified in a thesis on low-temperature carbonization by Myron W. Mellor and Robert C. Woodhead, candidate for bachelor of science degrees. Their thesis bears the signed endorsement of Dr. E. A. Beckstrand, head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Utah.

In formal acknowledgments prefacing their work, it is stated: "The authors wish to express their sincere appreciation to Mr. L. C. Karrick, fuels engineer, and formerly refinery engineer, for the United States Bureau of Mines. Mr. Kerrick directed the research; the methods and processes used were largely those worked out by him, and his excellent cooperation and advice, as well as material assistance, were most valuable."

Under the heading, "Conclusions," the work states:

"In 1935, a low-temperature carbonization plant was built in the coal-research laboratory at the University of Utah large enough to be classed as a pilot plant. From this plant sufficient data were taken to further verify previous research on the subject and to base the calculations for a large commercial plant. Enough byproducts, smokeless fuel, crude oil, and gas were obtained to permit ample testing and use of them.

"The tests made on the byproducts were focused mainly on the smokeless fuel because of the very thorough studies that were already made by Mr. L. C. Karrick.

"The conclusions made on the testing of this smokeless fuel versus raw coal are as follows:

"1. The smokeless fuel is positively smokeless, no matter how fired.

"2. A fire can be started as easily with the smokeless fuel as with the raw coal in any of the common forms of domestic heating appliances.

"3. The rate of combustion of smokeless fuel can be controlled more easily than the rate of combustion of raw coal.

"4. The efficiency of combustion of smokeless fuel is much higher and is much more constant over a wide range of firing rates than with raw coal.

"5. The combustion of smokeless fuel is from 4.14 percent more efficient in a cook stove to 65.9 percent more efficient in a fireplace than raw coal."

HANDS NOT STAINED AFTER HANDLING FUEL

"6. Smokeless fuels made from most of the Utah coals leaves no stain or dirty dust on one's hands after handling it.

"7. This coal can be classified as an artificial anthracite coal, but with free-burning properties.

"8. There is no need for anyone to purchase new house-heating equipment in order to make Salt Lake City, or like towns troubled with excessive smoke, smokeless when this new fuel is placed on the market.

"The conclusions regarding economic feasibility of the construction and operation of a commercial low-temperature carbonization plant for processing Utah coals, are as follows:

"1. It is economically feasible to construct a low-temperature carbonization plant the process tested in this thesis.

"2. It is economically feasible to construct a low-temperature carbonization plant using this process in series with a steam-generated power plant, and use the off-peak and exhaust steam for coal processing, while producing the power at a rate equivalent to the cost of maintaining the power-generating equipment.

"3. The low-temperature carbonization of Utah coals will save a large economic loss of fuel, and damage to property and health in our cities.

"4. The establishment of a low-temperature carbonization industry in Utah will expand the coal production from the Utah mines by supplying the heat energy consumed in the processing plants and by producing from Utah coal the oil products and the necessary city and industrial fuel gas. The coal mines will then operate at a more uniform rate throughout the year, and be a great boon to labor and to the inhabitants in the coal mining areas of our State.

The conclusions reached from the oil studies are as follows:

"1. High quality crude oil can be economically produced from Utah coals as a byproduct of a smokeless fuel industry. The studies have demonstrated that the coal oil can be cracked and refined into excellent yields and quality motor fuels and that the new liquid motor fuels are the equivalent of the best standard products.

"2. Many smokeless fuel demonstrations were made in our fuel laboratories throughout the winter of 1935-36 before representatives of all of the women's clubs of Salt Lake City. Luncheons were prepared on cooking ranges fired wtih various screen sizes of the smokeless fuels.

"The many visitors were permitted to light and care for the fires. The visitors were uniformly agreed that the fuel was perfect in its ignitability, easy to regulate, exceptionally good in holding a fire, completely free of smoke under all conditions of firing, there was no soiling of the inner surfaces of stove lids, the amount of ash was small, the fuel heated the ovens ready for baking more quickly than either natural gas or electricity, the fuel gave much more heat. They would gladly pay several dollars more per ton for this smokeless fuel than for any other solid fuel."

In 1930 a Standard Oil of New Jersey development company drew up a charter for a subsidiary development company tendering Mr. Karrick the position of vice president and chief engineer and one-third of the stock if he would turn over his patents and supporting research data. A contract was offered to him on these terms. Mr. Karrick declined the offer, preferring, he explained, that his patents be safeguarded in a way that would best insure their "broadest public use."

The phrase "broadest public service" harks back to 1926, when the late Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, and Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, urged Mr. Karrick to take out those patents and to see that they were used in a way to render "the broadest public service." Mr. Karrick attributes these words to Mr. Hoover. Mr. Karrick recalls Mr. Hoover as saying that only in that way, too, would full credit ever be accorded the Government and its researchers.

Certain officials in the Interior Department, interviewed by this reporter, are familiar with the Karrick process and its documented history.

SUPPORT HELD DENIED UNJUSTIFIABLY

They believe Mr. Karrick has been denied, without justification, adequate support in his efforts to use his process, which was developed by the taxpayers' money for the broadest public good. They are officials whose experience, competence, and opinion should not be lightly dismissed. They must remain nameless.

Certain Government lawyers, who likewise must remain nameless, have told this reporter that in their judgment, the Karrick process has been allowed to go unusued because big oil companies and their friends in Government have preferred to buy it or see it exploited independently if at all—with all the risks of establishing a new process in a field dominated by big and financially powerful companies which are ranked as tough competitors.

Back in 1944, when the question of spending Federal funds to develop foreign oil reserves was a serious wartime issue, Harold Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, told a Town Meeting radio audience that it is possible to make synthetic gasoline from the shale and coal of Utah, but at a great deal more expense than natural oil.

"If the American people want to pay more for their gasoline, why we can give you synthetic oil."

The Secretary of the Interior apparently was not aware of the data secreted in his own files contradicting this still prevalent assumption that oil from coal is more costly.

The high-cost oil-from-coal process mentioned by Mr. Ickes—the process favored by the Bureau of Mines—stems from patents owned by large oil interests, including Standard Oil and I. G. Farben.

In 1943, Dr. R. R. Sayers, then chief of the United States Bureau of Mines, told the Senate Public Lands Committee:

"Because of the huge stake which the public has in this matter, it is up to the Government to undertake the development work—to perfect the known processes, to design and establish new processes, to work out the engineering details, and otherwise as well to demonstrate satisfactorily the practical worth of synthetic fuel production so that industry would be willing to take reasonable risks.

"The Bureau of Mines is equipped to undertake this public trust."

At the same time, Dr. Sayers avoided mentioning Bureau of Mines data relating to Mr. Karrick's studies.

On the contrary, later testimony made it clear that patent rights to methods the Bureau of Mines is spending millions of dollars to develop were acquired by the Standard Oil Co. in 1929.

These methods involve conversion of coal to oil by the hydrogenation process. The Karrick process extracts oil from coal by low-temperature carbonization, that is, by distillation as applied in distilling oil from oil shales.

The president of the Standard Oil Co. testified that the cost of making gasoline by the methods for which the company holds the patent rights runs from 14.7 to 15.9 cents a gallon.

SEES PLENTY OF WORK AHEAD FOR MINERS

In 1944, the United States consumed 1,650,000,000 barrels of crude oil and 650,000,000 tons of coal. If all this raw coal were replaced on the market by the smokeless byproduct of low-temperature carbonization, the miners would have to dig 1,000,000,000 tons of coal, since a ton of raw coal only produces on an average two-thirds of a ton of smokeless solid fuel. Also it would take an additional 250,000,000 tons of raw coal to supply the fuel used in converting the coal to smokeless fuel, oil, gas, and electric power.

Processing 1,000,000,000 tons of coal would yield about 825,000,000 barrels of crude oil, or half the Nation's yearly requirements based on the abnormally high 1944 figures.

If this oil distilled from coal were hydrogenated in its refining, as is done in England, Germany, and in the United States to heavy petroleum residuums, the volume of crude oil would be raised to 60 percent of the national oil need, Mr. Karrick asserts.

As far back as 1924, he and his associates both in the Government and at the universities of Utah and Colorado had developed enough data to show that:

1. Crude oil could be obtained from Rocky Mountain oil shales, by several types of processing plants, for $1.50 to $2 a barrel.

2. That if distilled underground, oil could be extracted from shale for 65 cents a barrel.

3. That bituminous coals also could produce oils in similar plants at $1.50 to $2 a barrel without any credit for the sales value of the gas and smokeless solid-fuel residue.

4. That if solid smokeless fuel was sold wholesale at raw smoky coal prices, then the oil would cost nothing. One could afford to give it away.

The simpler Karrick type of plant is estimated to require $2,000 of invested capital a ton of daily treating capacity. The German processes of converting oil from coal require four times as much invested capital a ton of daily treating capacity, according to information supplied Congress by Standard Oil Co. officials.

Is this oil-for-nothing prospect the underlying cause of the road block which is holding back oil-from-coal development and confusing the public about its commercial feasibility?

The few informed Washington officials who secretly decry the situation believe the desire within the Government to conceal the facts about this economical oil-from-coal process stems from the unwillingness of private oil interests to start people thinking in terms of all the oil the Nation needs for "nothing a barrel."

In order to check the facts with the Interior Department as carefully as possible, this reporter questioned Dr. James Boyd, director of the United States Bureau of Mines; Dr. Arno C. Fieldner, chief of the fuels and explosives branch of the Bureau of Mines; and Dr. Schroeder, the Bureau's leading specialist on synthetic liquid fuels.

Asked what in his opinion was wrong with the Karrick oil-from-coal process, Dr. Schroeder said the oil distilled from coal is tar.

According to Dr. Boord's previously mentioned analysis of oil actually distilled by Mr. Karrick from Ohio coal, by his process, the oil may be evaluated three ways, namely:

1. As coal tar it will vary from $3.80 to $4.20 a barrel.

2. On the basis of the cresylic acid and neutral oils, it is worth $5.80 a barrel.

3. Separating and refining the low-boiling cresylic acids, it is worth $6.50 a barrel.

Domestic crude oil currently is selling for $2.53 a barrel.

Asked about Mr. Karrick's smokeless coal, Dr. Schroeder replied, "Where's Karrick going to find any market for it?"

ADMITS HIGH DEVELOPMENT TECHNICALLY

Asked what's wrong with the Karrick process, Dr. Fieldner said, "Technically it's pretty good." He went on to say it was workable. He said there are quite a number of patented processes in the field of low-temperature carbonization of coal and that "Karrick's compares favorably with the rest."

Dr. Fieldner explained that in evaluating the Karrick process, it is essential to consider two things, "technology and economics." He said Mr. Karrick's process was "not any worse than any of the others."

Asked what about the tabulated list of fuel products obtainable by the Karrick process (printed earlier in this article), Dr. Fieldner said the figures are "about right."

The tabulated break-down of revenues obtainable from a ton of ordinary Ohio coal by the Karrick process (also printed earlier in this article) was called to his attention. Dr. Fieldner remarked that these figures "are fair enough."

Asked to check Mr. Karrick's claim that his oil-from-coal process is four times cheaper in terms of capital investment than the costly German-pioneered process controlled by Standard Oil, Dr. Fieldner said the Karrick investment cost was not four times cheaper. "I think nearer three."

Dr. Fieldner was asked that that being so, would not the public want to know why doesn't the Bureau spend all its millions of dollars of public funds in developing the three-times-cheaper process? Dr. Fieldner replied he thought the public naturally would.

"What is the answer?" he was asked.

"That's one of those things you cannot give an answer to," Dr. Fieldner replied.

When this reporter insisted that there surely must be an answer, Dr. Fieldner explained that the Bureau of Mines' Administration of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act discards coal distillation because under the Karrick process oil is a byproduct.

Dr. Fieldner said the Bureau wants gasoline from coal. It isn't interested in backing an oil-from-coal process where the main product is smokeless solid fuel, and the oil is a byproduct.

He said it boils down to a simple economic matter of where is the market for smokeless fuel?

AIMS TO HALT WASTEFUL METHODS

What about the users of raw smoky coal? Dr. Fieldner was asked. It was pointed out that, according to Mr. Karrick's tabulations of products obtainable from a ton of ordinary bituminous coal, which Dr. Fieldner confirmed, we waste nearly a barrel of oil in every ton of raw coal. Last year the Nation squandered 300,000,000 barrels of crude oil in the form of smoke up the flue.

Dr. Fieldner said that was true but that was something for industry to take over and develop, not the Bureau of Mines, which is interested in converting coal to gasoline without any byproducts.

Asked why his Government branch did not publish Mr. Karrick's original research data relating to his oil-from-coal while employed in the Bureau of Mines, Dr. Fieldner said it was news to him that any of Mr. Karrick's Government research data was lying around unpublished.

Dr. Boyd became head of the Bureau in 1947, and consequently came into this controversy at a late date. However, he has reviewed it and stands on the recommendation of the Bureau's experts. His comments assume responsibility for the Bureau's actions, but indicate that the decision lay with Dr. Fieldner, Dr. Schroeder, and their fellow technologists.

Substantially the following colloquy took place between Dr. Boyd and this reporter:

"Question. Dr. Boyd, what do you know about Lewis C. Karrick?

"Answer. Mr. Karrick is a very competent engineer. We've had him in here two or three times and he has wasted hours of our time. We've examined his case thoroughly, and we don't think his process is worth pushing. That's not just my opinion but the opinion of some 30 experts in the Bureau.

"Question. What's wrong with Mr. Karrick's process?

"Answer. I suggest you talk with our experts, Dr. Arno Fieldner, a very outstanding engineer, and Dr. Schroeder.

"Question. What other strides has the Bureau of Mines made in the field of oil-from-coal development that outstrips the Karrick process?

"Answer. I suggest you talk with our experts.

"Question. Why was not the Bureau of Mines interested enough in the Karrick process to publish the original research data gained at the Government's expense? Why has the Bureau not published this data?

"Answer. I don't know. You'll have to ask Dr. Fieldner.

"Question. What about that exchange of letters between you and Mr. Karrick which he has in his possession and in which you informed him 2 years ago that a bulletin was being written on the subject? That was 2 years ago, and apparently nothing has been done to bring Mr. Karrick's process to the public's attention.

"Answer. I don't remember. Possibly Dr. Fieldner has not been able to find anyone competent to assemble it.

"Question. What about Mr. Karrick?

"Answer. That would be up to Dr. Fieldner. Bear in mind that it would cost money. Our funds are outlined by Congress. The money has to be available before we can undertake it.

"Question. But you spent millions of dollars for oil-from-coal methods admittedly three times more expensive than the Karrick process.

"Answer. You must realize that this matter was decided by the best Government experts.

"Question. Like Dr. Fieldner and Dr. Schroeder?

"Answer. Yes, they are extremely competent men."

BUREAUCRATIC PROTOCOL STILLS TONGUES

A few informed officials have been concerned about the Bureau of Mines' suppression of Mr. Karrick's original Government data since long before Senator O'MAHONEY'S oil investigating committee warned in 1947 that "this country cannot fight another war if it has to rely on its own oil supply." But they dare not violate the unwritten rules of bureaucratic protocol by speaking out.

The only basis on which Mr. Karrick is willing to dispose of those patents is to license them to whoever will (a) agree to develop them on the widest possible commercial scale, and (b) pay a nominal royalty on the processed tonnage for the maintenance of a coal research foundation to aid the coal miners and support vocational schools for labor.

Mr. Karrick declares that he never has felt reasonably certain that disposing of his patents to large private oil interests would insure their commercial development in the near future and at the same time safeguard his public trusteeship. He believes that the position of the major oil companies, particularly at this time, is not advantageous to his public-spirited purpose.

With domestic crude oil selling currently for about $2.53 a barrel, private companies naturally are interested in keeping up crude oil imports, it is pointed out, since crude oil can be obtained abroad for about 34 cents a barrel and shipped to the United States at a tanker cost of about 80 cents a barrel, and sold at a heavy profit.

Consequently, Mr. Karrick believes, the merits of his cheap domestic oil-from-coal process are unlikely to interest private oil companies, or the Interior Department for that matter, until the companies run out of sources of cheap foreign crude oil. But in the interests of his public trusteeship he is hopeful of persuading Congress to reappraise the Interior Department's administration of the synthetic fuels development program.

Central Arizona Reclamation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a resolution adopted by the assembly and senate of the State of California. It refers to the proposed central Arizona reclamation project, now under consideration by a committee of this House and gives information which I hope will be read thoughtfully by all Members. The joint resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relative to the central Arizona project

Whereas Senate bill 75 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, which would authorize the central Arizona project, is now before the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for consideration; and

Whereas the proposed central Arizona project is economically unsound and would benefit an estimated 25,000 residents in Arizona at an estimated cost of $738,000,000 to the taxpayers of all the States and Territories of the United States; and

Whereas sufficient water for the proposed central Arizona project can be secured only by diverting, to that project, some water now needed to maintain authorized and existing projects on the Colorado River; and

Whereas the diversion of water from existing projects will jeopardize the water supply of 3,500,000 residents of California, who, relying on their contracts for water with the Federal Government, have invested more than $500,000,000 to provide facilities to enable them to use their share of the water from the Colorado River; and

Whereas the passage of Senate bill 75, while benefiting a few thousand landowners in Arizona, will bring irreparable injury to 3,500,000 residents of California, and will increase the tax burden of the taxpayers of all the States and Territories of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the House of Representatives of Congress of the United States be memorialized to refuse the passage of Senate bill 75 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted in assembly March 8, 1950.

Adopted in senate March 16, 1950.

Let's Strengthen Navy Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., March 19, 1950:

NAVAL POLICY TAKING RISKS—FORCE OF SHIPS AND PLANES ABLE TO COVER WORLD NEEDED TO MEET RUSSIAN THREAT

(By Lester Allen)

With the ocean washing its shores, New England operates navy yards, ship- and submarine-building plants, plants to provide power for planes and ships, a concentrated and feasible target for attack in an atomic age, but apparently cares little about the calculated risk being taken with national security by defense plans that whittle down our naval power to an absolute minimum.

Capt. Ernest M. Eller, USN, in the 1950 prize essay of United States Naval Institute Proceedings, sums up the attitude of the people of the country by saying, "Although the sea is the very tide of her life, America has never believed in it. Some leaders have proclaimed its importance, the greatest being Washington, who, in an hour of crisis, declared that, however important armies are, in a war like the Revolution a navy must cast the deciding vote. Power on the sea—and in this twentieth century above it—has helped to save us through many great dangers, but the sea itself has never become a part of the heart of America."

BITTER TRUTHS

It is a trenchant essay—one which should be quoted in its entirety if space permitted, for it contains bitter truths important to the Navy brass as well as the civilian who foots the bills. He points out that with great lack of tact the Navy scorned the national craving for a cheap war (in lives and treasure) and said bluntly that this was "weak-minded madness before the facts of life."

"Having learned the hard way that nothing is easy, the Navy as a whole thus did not participate in the brief golden hallucination when America had the world in her grasp," he asserts. "For a space the United States was God and fate. We alone had the A-bomb. It was terrifying to hear the man in the street throughout this Christian country of ours declare that we should go drop bombs on all their big cities. When we had blasted enough families and cowed the rest, then the world would be safe for democracy."

FAIL TO SEE NEED

In conclusion, he says: "Anyone who looks impartially at the events of 1949 must come to the conclusion that the American public has accepted a progressive reduction of its Navy below a minimum safe level because it does not see the need for it.

"This occurs at the moment the United States has become the first power in the world; at a moment when she is champion, leader, and most of the strength of western civilization, with growing obligations in all the seven seas. It occurs at a time when the United States, and only the United States, in this generation, at least, has the power to give all peoples that constant freedom of the seas necessary for world peace and progress."

SHOULD BE BUILT UP

Navy power should be built up under the sea and in the air. Even the bitterest antagonists of the Navy admit that it is in these categories that the Soviet Union is making the greatest progress toward the kind of strength needed for global expansion.

New England has a major role in such a build-up of the kind of naval power required to meet the threat of Soviet expansion. The Red navy has 270 submarines, including 30 German-type 21's, which can easily do 17 knots submerged. We have built two submarine hunter-destroyers, the U. S. S. *Carpenter* and the U. S. S. *Owens*, and are building the K-1, 2, and 3, small killer subs as a countermeasure. Vice Adm. Francis S. Low is the head of a special program of antisubmarine warfare for the Navy.

New England yards should be turning out killer subs, killer destroyers, and other antisubmarine weapons if Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson's estimate of the situation is right.

MUST SHIP SUPPLIES

He has declared that we would retaliate instantly if attacked. He means atomic bombardment. That means from overseas bases. Overseas bases mean an immense tonnage of supplies and the $64 question is how the supplies are going to move overseas if the Navy doesn't see that they get there.

The fact is that the Navy won't get them there if Russian snorkel submarines are on the loose, because a snorkel is much harder to find and kill—even with radar at its present high development—than an old type submarine that came up for air and recharging batteries.

NAVY CAN CURB REDS

Even the build-up of the strength of the Atlantic Pact nations requires a Navy at a much higher ratio of strength than it is today. It's a Navy job to get the stuff across to Europe—once the shooting starts. With a Navy ranging around the coastal frontiers of the Soviet Union the immense numerical strength of the Red fighting forces is whittled down to a size than can be handled by the United States because they have to spread their forces around to meet the threat of coastal incursions.

New England's concern should be over the fact that the yards and the plants used to build ships and power plants for ships and planes are not being utilized in the way that they should be if the plan is to undertake a rapid expansion in the event of war. But, just how rapid could that expansion be? If the experience after Pearl Harbor means anything, it will be at least a year before the plants are turning out even the minimum required amounts of matériel.

A great many people shudder to contemplate the possibility of war. They would shudder more if they contemplated the possibility of quick defeat and what it would mean.

POLAR ATTACK NOT LOGICAL

Armchair strategists declare that if the Russians launch an attack it will be over the pole and that Arctic operations are of paramount importance. Just why the Russians should select the Polar approach with all its difficulties when, with a submarine fleet, western European harbors and an air force of its present strength, they could wreak incalculably greater damage, is difficult to understand. The Polar approach can be checkmated by a build-up of Alaskan defenses. The European approach can only be stopped cold by the existence of a strong United States Navy.

The fact is that there are too many calculated risks being taken. As long as the Soviet Union can be confined to land operations in Eurasia there is every chance of rolling them back to where they came from. But, let them get their feet into the Atlantic, or the Pacific, and it would be a tough, long, and probably futile effort to keep them from global mastery.

Too many people sell short the ability of the Russians to create a sea fighting force. They can't imagine what would happen if by any chance the Russians should possess carrier forces to attack our coasts and we had none. The fact is that we soon will have none unless naval aviation is beefed up.

NEED WORLD-RANGING FORCE

An offensive and defensive power capable of ranging around the world will contain the Soviet Union in its land mass until the international chaos precipitated by World War II and the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union is resolved.

Carrier strength has been cut from 12 to 8 to 6 to 4. Soon, because the Soviet Union has not announced the building of any carriers, we may have no flat tops in commission. They will all be tied up rusting out as any New Englander can see by looking down Boston Harbor. There is this warning to be taken to heart—tied-up carriers cannot be used. They have to have planes, men, training—lots of it. Otherwise they might as well be a pile of iron ore still in the ground at Hibbing, Minn.

ANTISUB WEAPONS ESSENTIAL

Whether the supercarrier that Navy planned to build is the answer or not is beside the point. But, Navy building of antisubmarine weapons is imperative because the Red navy has plenty of submarines, has the German submarine yards and German know-how and is building more.

The Russians are not building a submarine flotilla to operate in the Polar seas. They are building it to operate in the Atlantic and the Pacific—and if the crisis of war ever comes that's where they will have to be hunted down.

If we are attacked, our best hope is to roll the Russians back out of Europe and the start would have to be made on European soil. In order to apply power of the order needed, men and material would have to be transported not only to Europe but across the Pacific as well. All the atomic bombing won't alter that fact.

TIME TO STIR CONGRESS

The sea may never become a part of the heart of America, but New England has lived beside and off the sea for more than three centuries. It's about time that the New England delegation in Congress awoke to the fact that there's work to be done—that the Navy is New England's concern.

"The American public particularly does not understand," says Captain Eller, "that the trident navy of today requires strength to fight in the air even though no probable opponent may have carriers. This attitude is incredible but it exists.

"No man, except the few who deliberately seek to destroy our Nation from within, would advocate that if Uncle Sam had a club and a pistol, and his opponent in a dark alley had only a club, that Uncle Sam should discard the pistol. No man would imagine that the way to defeat a Goliath is by making ourselves weak where he is weak.

"Yet, if we clip the powerful wings of the Navy that gave us enduring strength over the oceans of the world, we restrict ourselves to meeting our probable enemy in the area of his own choice. The airplanes of the Navy, combined with the ships that provide mutual protection and that transport them across oceans, give us freedom to attack where we chose, forcing the opponent into an uneasy defensive on all his frontiers."

Thomas B. Feeney's Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., of recent date:

STORY OF IRELAND'S FIGHT FOR FAITH AND FREEDOM TOLD—GLORIOUS STRUGGLE PENNED BY FEENEY—NATIVE OF IRELAND, FATHER OF THREE PRIESTS, TRACES HISTORY BEFORE ST. PATRICK'S COMING TO CONVERT PEOPLE—PLEADS FOR ONE IRELAND

My friends asked me to write a little bit about Ireland for St. Patrick's Day 1950. There has been so much written about my native land, yet so much remains to be written to do justice to the Irish. This would be no small task.

There are many questions a student could ask about the customs and mode of living of the race of people who inhabited Ireland long before St. Patrick came to convert them.

Exactly 1,060 years before America was discovered by Columbus, Patrick, the Apostle, landed in Ireland. The nation to which he came was a most ancient race, derived from one of the primeval races that peopled the earth—from the great Phoenician family of the east. These ancient peoples landed in the remote mists of prehistoric times upon a green isle in the western ocean. They populated it, colonized it, established laws, opened schools, had their philosophy, their learning, and science and art, equal to that of any other civilization of the day.

They were a people well known to the ancient Greeks and Egyptians. The name of the island as it is known today—Eire—is only a name that came after the more ancient name, for the Greeks hundreds of years before the birth of Christ called the island Oggia; or the most ancient land. The most ancient Greek writers spoke of Ireland as the far distant ocean and as a place of wonderful beauty, as an island rising out of the sea, the fairest and most beautiful of all the sea's productions.

LAND OF DESTINY

Then the Milesians landed on an island they called Inisfail, their land of destiny. They brought with them an advanced degree of civilization. So the original inhabitants intermingled their race with the Milesians, and in that intermingling was formed the Celtic Constitution which divided Ireland into four kingdoms, all under one King (Ard-righ), the high king. The palace of this high king was built almost in the center of Ireland, a hill top, rich in verdure, crowned with a lovely wood on every side. It is the plain of Royal Meath. In this palace for centuries Ireland's kings lived. It was called in the language of the people Tara.

There on Easter Sunday morning in the year 432 early in the fifth century of the Christian era, a most singular sight presented itself, Ireland's monarch sat upon his throne, in high council, around him were the sovereign kings and chieftains of the nation. Also around him again in their rank were the pagan priests—the druids of the old fire worship, and around him again were the ancient minstrels of Ireland with snow-white flowing beards with their harps playing and filling the air with glorious melodies of Irish music pouring out upon the wings of song the time honored story of Ireland's heroes and their glorious kings.

Suddenly a man appeared with mitre on head, cape on shoulders and a crozier in his hand with the Cross of Christ upon it, and this man was Patrick who came from Rome, to preach Christianity to the Irish kings, chieftains, and people.

ST. PATRICK CAME

They received him and became a civilized and enlightened people. They did not stand like other nations in a wild hubbub of barbarism to denounce the truth, as soon as they heard it and put the truth teller to death. No, they sat down—these Kings—these minstrels—these judges of the land, these learned philosophers. They disputed with Patrick, they brought the keen weapons of human wisdom and human intellect to bear against that sword which Patrick wielded.

IRELAND'S CONVERSION

Oh, it was the sword of the spirit, the word of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, until at length that King and those chieftains, all these druids and bards found that Patrick preached a reasonable religion, that he brought conviction into their minds.

Up rose the head of all the bards, and that of Ireland's minstrels, the man next in authority to the King, and lifting up his harp in his hand he said:

"Hear one, oh high King and chieftains of the land, I now declare that this man who comes to us speaks from God, and so long as I live this harp of mine shall never sound again save to the praises of Christianity and its God."

And the King and chieftains and bards and warriors and the judges and all the people alike rose promptly, and never in the history of the world was there a people that so embraced the light and took it into their minds and hearts as the Irish people did on the day of their conversion.

Ireland took the message from Patrick's lips, surrounded him with honor, and before he died he received the singular grace distinct from all other saints—that he alone among all the other apostles that ever preached the Gospel found a people entirely pagan and left them entirely Christian.

This then briefly is the story of Ireland's conversion to Christianity.

STRUGGLE FOR FAITH

Ireland's faith was easy at first to keep, but, Lord, how they struggled later to keep it. For 300 years after Patrick preached the gospel Ireland was the holiest, most learned, most enlightened, the most glorious country in Christendom. From the ends of the earth students came to study in Irish schools. They came by tens of thousands, and they brought back to every nation in Europe the wondrous tale of Ireland's sanctity, of Ireland's peace, of Ireland's music, and above all the devotion of her priesthood, Ireland's love for the Blessed Mother of God, and the immaculate purity and wonderful beauty of the womanhood of Ireland. Ireland was then very quiet and very happy, but she was not destined to remain so long.

The Danes invaded Ireland and for 300 years every year saw fresh arrivals of armies, and for 300 years Ireland was challenged to fight in defense of her faith, and to prove to the world that until the Irish race and the Irish character were utterly destroyed the Catholic faith never would cease to exist in the land.

The nation (for thank God it was a nation in that day) drew the sword for their priests, for their altars, and for God. Think of 300 years of continuous war, look back if you will on our two World Wars, about 8 years duration for both; think of 300 years of slaughter. Every valley in Ireland tells the tale.

BORN IN IRELAND

There are many like myself, born in Ireland, who can remember the "rath," or mound, sometimes in the middle of the field, sometimes on the hilltop. The old people of Ireland will tell you that Ireland is full of them, and they will tell you that when the day of battle was over and the Danes were conquered and their bodies were strewn on the field, the Irish gathered the bodies together, made a big hole into which to put them, and covered them high with dirt and sods.

In every part of Ireland are found "raths," or mounds, and what do they tell? They tell this: That never until the day of judgment no man will be able to estimate the hundreds of thousands of Danish invaders that came to conquer Ireland only to find a place in the grave. This war with the Danes lasted over 300 years.

Well, we read of how the Danes were banished from Ireland by Brian Boru. Then came the Saxon, and another 700 years of war. The sword of Ireland was drawn against the Saxon at the beginning of the ninth century, and it is still out of its scabbard against the Saxon until all of Ireland will come under one head, one government doing business peacefully with the world.

DEVOTION TO MARY

The Irish people for 1,500 years fought for something they had never seen. They never saw Christ in the Blessed Eucharist. They never saw Our Blessed Mother and yet for all those 1,500 or more years they fought for that Christ on the Cross, for that Saviour in the Tabernacle and for Our Blessed Mother of Christ whose protection caressed the Irish people, not only in Ireland but scattered all over the world. The Irish always implore Mary's help and assistance. She is the Gateway to Heaven. St. Patrick taught them that God came to earth through Mary and that man can get into Heaven only through Her. Mary is the way to Christ and this is what Christ taught—belief in this divinely revealed truth, and all the other truths given to His Apostles.

St. Patrick spoke with no compromise to the Irish people. This is the reason that after all the persecutions the people of Ireland are able to keep the Catholic faith. St. Patrick brought them the joy of their redemption, the Catholic Apostolic Church, the acceptance of whose doctrine given us by God is the one and only way of protection against Satan and the wickedness of men. Christ is the sure road to salvation from all real harm in this world, and the one and only way of salvation in the world to come.

MYSTICAL DAY

This great Saint gave the Irish people all these wonderful things, and sure delights for their souls. He also gave them St. Patrick's Day, the day of gladness we celebrate. There is something mystical about the gladness of those who celebrate St. Patrick's Day. It is a gladness that is over and beyond anything racial or local. It is a merriment of heart that transcends the sweetness of Irish music or the lovableness of the Irish character. It is a gladness that seems to come from the very heart of Paradise.

One famous Irish poet has caught some of the spirit of it in these delightful lines in which he tells us that St. Patrick gave all the Irish a holiday in the middle of Lent:

And so in March gray
To drive troubles away,
God sends to the Irish
The saint and the day.

The late Reverend Father P. J. Carroll echoes the pride of the day in these beautiful words to St. Patrick:

Called son by many lands,
Thou art a father unto one.
Of all these mothers claiming thee,
By honored titles naming thee
We ask: Where is thy priceless birthright gone?
That blessed faith of thine,
They mothering thee have sold
But she, thy daughter dutiful
Has kept thy treasure beautiful
Through many sorrows in her heart of gold.

Criminal Penalties of the Sherman Antitrust Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the thorough and extensive hearings conducted by the Temporary National Economic Committee from 1938 to 1941, inclusive, and to the conclusions and recommendations reached by that committee, composed of the ablest Members of Congress and leaders of the executive agencies, after its inquiry into concentrations of economic power in the United States. More specifically, I wish to point out the unanimous recommendation of the Temporary National Economic Committee regarding increasing the criminal penalties of the Sherman antitrust law from $5,000 to $50,000. I am thereby including in the RECORD the unanimous recommendation of that committee regarding anti-trust-law penalties.

4. PENALTIES

In its preliminary report to the Congress this committee pointed out the inadequacy of existing civil remedies under the antitrust laws, as well as the inappropriateness of the criminal remedies in many cases. The committee then recommended the enactment of legislation which would subject corporations and corporate officers violating the antitrust laws to more stringent civil penalties than exist at the present time. The committee is still convinced of the validity of its earlier recommendation, and again urges the enactment of such legislation. A bill introduced in the Senate on June 28, 1939 (S. 2719) would, if enacted into law, carry into effect the recommendations here made. The committee also points out that the maximum criminal penalty, by way of fine (and the courts are reluctant to punish a criminal violation by imprisonment) is $5,000. This amount is clearly inadequate as a deterrent to businessmen or to groups of businessmen whose incomes are in the millions, and the committee therefore recommends that the maximum limit for fines be raised to at least $50,000, leaving discretion with the court to assess the penalty according to the means and circumstances of the defendant and according to the extent to which it has profited by the violation of the act.

(Approved with objection.) (Investigation of concentration of economic power, final report and recommendations of Temporary National Economic Committee, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941), p. 40.)

Grass-Roots Support for Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me most fitting that I should take this occasion to make public acknowledgment of a very commendable activity which recently was undertaken in the city of Alhambra, Calif., located in the district which I represent.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Alhambra and the Alhambra Post-Advocate jointly sponsored an educational campaign to acquaint the people of that city with the provisions of the Hoover Commission report. The project had the further purpose of urging the people of Alhambra to let their representatives in the House of Representatives, and in the other body, know that they are wholeheartedly in favor of the adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, in the interests of eliminating waste and extravagance in the operations of the Federal Government and thereby reducing expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

Yesterday the fruits of this commendable endeavor were brought to my attention in a most graphic manner. Mr. Clifford Cooper, who is not only a member of the Alhambra Junior Chamber of Commerce, but is also president of the National Junior Chamber of Commerce, came to my office and presented me with petitions, and coupons clipped from the Alhambra Post-Advocate, containing the names of more than 3,000 people urging the adoption of the Hoover Commission report.

Mr. Speaker, a recent Gallup poll indicated that more than 65 percent of the American people who were interviewed had no knowledge at all of the Hoover Commission's recommendations. This seemed to me a very startling revelation because of the great importance these recommendations hold for every taxpayer in the country. In Alhambra, the people of the junior chamber and the Post-Advocate determined to tell the whole story of the Hoover Report in detailed form in a series of articles in the Post-Advocate. The success of this endeavor to inform the people is apparent in the response that I received yesterday.

Divide and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1949, I addressed the House and stated in part that in an effort to combat false and malicious propaganda, as well as the whispering campaign which was employed against me during the 1948 campaign regarding my voting record, that I would periodically submit a factual report from the record how I had voted on every issue which would come before us during the coming session.

In keeping with this declaration I issued on August 15, 1949, a complete detailed record of how I had voted on each and every measure which had come before us up to that time, as well as a brief statement as to why I had so voted on each measure. I concluded this report by saying that—

> During the next year we will see in operation the most highly organized propaganda machine ever devised in America.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now being thwarted in their plan to misrepresent my voting record, they have resorted to a new technique which I would like to describe herein.

According to the official registration poll books the congressional district which I have the honor to represent has a majority of 12,000 registered Democrats. The fact that I, a Republican, have been elected to represent the district four terms, should serve as ample proof that the majority of my Democratic constituents are of the true Jeffersonian variety and approve most of the votes which I have cast.

As every Member of this House knows, I am a "middle of the road Republican," leaning toward the conservative. Personally I feel that I am still young enough to recognize and accept progress, yet old enough to know that we must cling to our basic American concepts of government if we are to progress safely.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since a majority of both Democrats and Republicans voting in the Eleventh Congressional District evidently approved, at least a majority of the votes which I have cast, the same opposition which was so unscrupulous in their 1948 technique conceived the idea of trying to divide members of my own Republican Party in an effort to defeat me in the primary. Acting in accordance with this planned strategy, they set up the following program:

Knowing that most Americans are headline readers, they decided to put misleading headlines on various statements which I had made. They were smart enough not to misquote me completely in the body of their articles, because charges could be preferred against them. However, there is no law to prevent their putting any title to an article which they claim to be their interpretation of the remarks. Let me briefly illustrate what I mean.

Shortly after the last election I stated, in part:

> You know I sometimes feel like giving President Truman everything he asks for. Perhaps if those who supported him really could see what would happen if his entire program were enacted they would become so sick of their bargain that they never again would vote that way.

The headlines appearing on that article were: "Representative BREHM willing to give President Truman everything he asks for."

On another occasion I was being interviewed regarding the Taft-Hartley Act. I stated, in part:

I am willing to vote to amend the act as recommended by the joint nonpartisan congressional committee which we set up to study and observe the law. I would also be willing to change the name or title if by so doing we would have some guaranty that labor leaders would cooperate for the best interest of their members, of industry, and for the country in general. This I think would be a small concession to make in exchange for industrial peace and production.

This time the headlines rang out: "Congressman BREHM will vote to repeal Taft-Hartley if that is what labor leaders want, because it will guarantee full production." Clever, are they not?

Still another time I was asked what I thought about the $100 per month pension for the miners. I replied:

Well, I have no way of knowing whether $100 is enough, not enough, or too much. In my opinion, all assistance should be on a basis of need. A person flat on his back might need twice that amount, while a fellow who had some other income might not need that much. This much I do know, with their dangerous assignment they are entitled to all they can get by bona fide collective bargaining.

Do you know what the headline was this time? "Representative BREHM says $100 too much pension for miners."

At another time I remarked that "I am not only interested in mine safety, but all types of safety which protect human life." I further stated that I intended to protect States' rights in mine safety legislation. This time, just because I did not agree to go along with the Federal position, with no questions asked, I received headlines which said: "Congressman BREHM Opposes Mine Safety Legislation." The article then went on to quote exactly the remarks which I had made. However, some of my supposedly good friends took this article and went among the miners, showing them only the headlines in an attempt to give them the impression that I was opposed to mine safety and wanted them all killed in some mine disaster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some may wonder why I am putting this particular speech in the RECORD. Well, the reason is quite obvious. If I did not put it in the RECORD the same unscrupulous individuals who are now attempting to divide the Republicans by their misstatements regarding President Truman's program, the Taft-Hartley Act, the National Cemetery, my office personnel, positions in the Post Office Department, over which I have no say, statements to the effect that I go back to the district and visit labor leaders, but do not call on my own committeemen, and all the rest of the tommyrot, could and in all probability would say that these were untrue statements. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am simply using the public record in order that all may know the truth and that the light of day may shine upon their false accusations.

If I were asked to name the most unpleasant feature of serving in Congress, it would be that we do not have enough free time to go back into our districts and renew old friendships and make new ones. As everyone knows, during the war we were in almost continuous session. Last year it was late October before we adjourned and as a consequence there was no time to get over the district and visit with those to whom I owe so much.

Now of course anyone who is interested in how or why I voted on any measure, has only to look at a copy of the public record which I sent out at the close of the last session. After all, that is the test of my position and not some newspaper article which can be slanted or interpreted any way some particular writer might want it to appear.

It is the privilege of anyone to work against me, vote against me, or run against me, but I intend to insist that he keep the record straight. Oppose me for my vote on some issue, O. K. Oppose me because they do not like me, O. K. In fact oppose me for any legitimate reason they choose, but let no one dare give as his reason that I am not loyal to the principles of my party. The public record as well as our Republican leadership in Congress readily disproves any such charges.

It seems to me that before anyone goes gallivanting over the country putting out half-truths against those of us who have been waging an incessant fight to preserve our beloved Republic, he should first be able to show some battle scars in his encounter with the enemy. If a person is sincere he does not sleep in the same bed with our enemies.

I may say in closing that one reason it is becoming more and more difficult to induce good Christian men and women to run for public office, is because they refuse to subject themselves to the unscrupulous and downright lying propaganda which has apparently become standard equipment in recent years of those who seem determined to rule or ruin.

More Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling and dangerous proposals which has been made in recent years is the suggestion that a Federal bureau should be set up for the purpose of licensing the motion-picture industry. Even actors and actresses would be required to take out licenses with the Government before they could appear in pictures. The ostensible purpose of this proposal is to improve the standard and quality of motion pictures. The ultimate effect of it, however, can be not only censorship of motion pictures themselves but also complete control of the individual lives of those who appear in and produce the pictures.

But the greatest threat inherent in this proposal is the precedent that would be established. It would open the way toward licensing everybody who engages in interstate commerce. This, in the final analysis, gives the Federal Government the power to deny a license to anybody whose business standards and personal behavior it does not approve. Right now we should be giving more thought to reducing the power of the Federal Government to control our individual lives and fortunes rather than considering proposals to increase that power.

The motion-picture industry has established its own governing body to enforce a code of morals and ethics. Under this procedure, the industry has been eminently successful in raising the moral standards of the films it produces. True, under this self-regulation, the code governs only the productions themselves and does not apply to the private lives of those who appear in the pictures. But I see no more reason for the Federal Government to set itself up as the arbitrator of the moral conduct of individuals in the motion-picture field than I do in any other field of private employment.

An excellent analysis of the proposal and the dangers inherent in it appeared in an editorial in the Washington Daily News of March 16. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of the editorial:

WRONG REMEDY

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, wants Congress to impose a strict Federal licensing system on the movie industry—on the actors and actresses, the producers, the distributors, and the films.

Persons convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude, or who admitted acts "constituting the essential elements" of such crimes, would be denied licenses. They would be barred from acting, in directing, producing, or distributing movies.

Films "tending" to promote crime and juvenile delinquency also would be denied licenses. They would be barred from shipment across State lines.

Among other things, Senator JOHNSON is outraged by the recently published amours of Ingrid Bergman and Rita Hayworth, whom he denounces as "Hollywood's apostles of degradation."

He accuses RKO Pictures and Roberto Rossellini, director of Miss Bergman's latest film, Stromboli, and father of her child, of "shameless exploitation" and of "deliberately exhibiting the moral turpitude of the leading lady to pack their theaters."

And he says that these and other matters of movie morals will be explored in hearings by his Senate Interstate Commerce Committee next month.

There's a great deal to be said for the movie industry's contention, that films should be judged by their contents, not by the private lives of the persons who make them. It must be admitted, however, that the publicly paraded private affairs of same persons who make movies has an influence on young and impressionable people that cannot be described as wholesome or uplifting.

But the remedy, in our opinion, is not Federal licensing—a dangerous proposal of doubtful constitutionality.

Part of the remedy can be applied by the movie industry, through the making of better films and through disciplines rather than rewards for actors, actresses, directors, producers, and distributors who transgress. And the industry, now asking the United States Supreme Court to outlaw State and local censorships, had better give thought to its responsibility if it wishes to head off Federal controls.

The other part of the remedy can be applied by decent American people, as Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, points out. Let them express their disapproval of objectionable films of errant Hollywood stars by refusing to go to see them.

UN as Bridge to One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Carlos P. Romulo, President, fourth session, United Nations General Assembly, at the New York Herald Tribune's High School Forum held in New York City on March 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMULO ENVISIONS UN AS BRIDGE TO ONE WORLD—CALLS AMERICAN MORAL LEADERSHIP BEST HOPE FOR PEACE; BACKS STRONGER UN

A free world, at peace and governed by just law—that is the world we want, the world we are trying to build through the United Nations. Lasting world peace and a durable world order presuppose some form of a limited world government. The alternatives are international anarchy, a state of perpetual conflict in a succession of cold wars each more dangerous than the last, or the ultimate catastrophe: a new world war fought with the weapons of mass destruction—atomic bombs, biological poisons and perhaps even hydrogen bombs.

There is no going back to national isolation. Such is the interdependence of nations today that no country—however great, powerful or prosperous—can stand insulated from its neighbors and oblivious of the plight and the problems of the rest of the world. It is not rhetoric but a simple statement of fact to say that peace and order are indeed indivisible, in the sense that only universal peace can really be effective, and only a system of law applicable to all nations can insure a just order in modern society.

World government, however cannot be established by fiat. We cannot have an effective world government until we have evolved a viable world community. This is precisely the function of the United Nations. Through a continual exchange of views, through declarations, agreements and covenants and—most important of all—through cooperative action by the member states, the United Nations is gradually building up a viable international body politic.

UN FACTOR FOR PEACE

The cold war has obscured the achievements of the United Nations in this most important task. The United Nations Charter itself is a milestone of the greatest significance in the evolution of human society toward a better and more stable order. By renouncing war and providing the means for the amicable settlement of international disputes, the charter has been a powerful factor for peace. It reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights and thereby serves as a bulwark against the perversion or denial of those rights. By pledging the member states to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, it has cleared the way for an unprecedented advance in these fields on a globe scale.

In pursuance of the principles and purposes of the Charter, the United Nations has produced the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is now drawing up an International Convention on Human Rights which will add legal sanction to the moral force of the declaration. The General Assembly in 1948 adopted unanimously the International Convention on Genocide. The Trusteeship Council has established the principle that the well-being of dependent peoples is a responsibility of the international community, and has rendered invaluable service in helping to prepare them for self-government.

The Economic and Social Council has achieved great progress in dealing with the problems of health, labor, trade, relief, and reconstruction through international action. In the political field, the mediation or intervention of the United Nations has facilitated the peaceful solution of conflicts involving some 500,000,000 men, women, and children, comprising about one-fourth of mankind.

BRIDGE TO ONE WORLD

Even under the stress of the cold war the United Nations has succeeded, to an extent not generally realized, in laying the foundations of international understanding and international cooperation in coping with problems of hunger, freedom, rehabilitation, security, and social progress. The United Nations is our bridge to one world, to that living community of nations without which we cannot hope to have effective world government.

We must not destroy this bridge in our impatience to get to the promised land on the other side. Rather must we strengthen it the better to enable it to fulfill its function of spanning the gap between the world as it is and the world as we want it to be.

I have myself been one of the most ardent advocates of a stronger United Nations. On more than one occasion I have argued publicly that the United Nations to be fully effective must be given more power and authority. During the San Francisco Conference, I opposed the grant of the veto power to the Big Five. After the conference, in the committees of the United Nations and elsewhere, I strongly and repeatedly urged the modification of the Charter to pave the way for the organization of limited world government.

At one time I suggested the conversion of the General Assembly, which now can only make recommendations to member states, into a genuine parliamentary body with legislative powers sufficient to prevent war. Such powers would include the authority to prohibit all weapons of mass destruction, to maintain an adequate international police force, to apply the necessary sanctions, and to establish world tribunals. Under such a scheme, the Security Council would become the executive agent of the General Assembly, and in that capacity would be freed of the incubus of the veto which has often rendered it completely helpless in moments of crisis.

The proposal would include such other features as the establishment, in place of the one-nation-one-vote rule, of a system of weighted representation whereby each member state would have a voice in the General Assembly commensurate with its actual position in the world, taking into consideration such factors as population, industrial power, and resources, literacy, military strength, and others. Representatives to the United Nations would, accordingly, be elected by popular vote.

Such was the main outline of my plan for turning the United Nations into a limited world government. Obviously, under such a scheme, every member state would be obliged to surrender a more substantial portion of its national sovereignty than it had hitherto yielded under the United Nations Charter. Matters of domestic concern would remain under the jurisdiction of the national states. The result would be a judicious compromise between the traditional concept of national sovereignty and the newer concept of international order, enabling the nations to establish a world government with strictly delimited authority, operating under the fundamental principle that, while it would have all the powers required for mutual preservation, all other powers would be reserved to the member states.

In the present state of the world, any plan which aims at the establishment of even a limited world government must appear to be impractical. It is a fact that the world today is divided into hostile camps actively engaged in a cold war which has so far precluded agreement on such vital problems as disarmament and the control of atomic energy. International relations have deteriorated to such an extent that our main preoccupation has been reduced from the building of one world to the establishment of a modus vivendi between the contending camps. Whatever the distractions and difficulties of the moment, however, we must never lose sight of our ultimate goal—a world community secure in its rights and freedoms under some kind of world government.

In the meantime we must foster all the influences for conciliation, understanding, and cooperation that will enable us to avert war and establish lasting peace. Nowhere is the need for tolerance as the key to peace more keenly felt and appreciated than in Asia today. Since the end of the war, there has been a strong movement among the free states of Asia for a union or association dedicated to peace. In 1947, the Asian Relations Conference, held in New Delhi, defined Asia's role in world affairs as an exponent of the moral factor, a mediator between embattled ideologies, a firm and consistent advocate of amity and understanding in a world divided into hostile factions.

The New Delhi conference envisaged an association of Asian states dedicated to peace and pledged to use their combined influence in support of freedom and justice. Since then the need for taking further positive steps has been felt by the free nations of Asia. In response to this need, President Elpidio Quirino, of the Philippines, has taken the initiative in proposing a new conference to provide the peoples of Asia with an opportunity to discuss their common problems, strengthen their economic and cultural ties, and take counsel together on how they could most effectively help to preserve the peace of the world.

Asia comprises a region which in size, population, resources, and strategic situation ranks with the most important in the world. The free states of Asia have no desire to enter into any hostile combinations or to aggravate in any way the tensions and conflicts that divide the world. All that they wish to do is exert their combined influence in behalf of peace. And they propose to act, as they have done in the past, strictly within the framework of the United Nations.

More than any other nation, America understands the importance of the moral factor in dealing with the problems of war and peace. America's moral leadership, more than her material power, constitutes the greatest hope that peace will be preserved in our time and maintained in the time to come.

CONFIDENT OF FUTURE

The task of securing the peace now centers on the issue of the control of atomic energy and other means of mass destruction. In this as in other equally vital problems, I am

confident that America's moral leadership will assert itself and produce a solution which will not only be effective but unassailable from the standpoint of justice. I am confident that the nation which possesses the genius and the ingenuity to harness the power of the atom, and is even now on the threshold of mastering the energy of the sun itself, will eventually work out a system of control acceptable not only to the great majority but to all of the member states of the United Nations.

An agreement on the control of the means and weapons of mass destruction would be the first major step toward the free, peaceful, and progressive world which all men and nations of good will desire.

Eighty-third Anniversary of Admission of Nebraska to the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on March 21, 1950, there was held in Lincoln, Nebr., a celebration of the eighty-third anniversary of the admission of Nebraska to the Union. I had the privilege of making an address at the founders' day celebration in the Cornhusker Hotel, in Lincoln, on that day, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Nebraskans, we love and honor our great State of Nebraska. It is true blue and truly American in principles and spirit. On this eighty-third anniversary of its statehood, we eagerly pay tribute to those sturdy men and women, those pioneers, who founded this land of opportunity.

God grant that America continues to find inspiration in the spirit of four Nebraska founders. They met their problems with courage and fortitude. They were not spoon-fed by bureaucrats. They were not promised security and a life of ease. They did not settle here and build Nebraska communities, under directives from a paternalistic Government at Washington.

They depended upon their own initiative, frugality, and enterprise to pioneer this flowering garden spot of the Nation. The incentive of reward spurred them. And, when they got their reward, they were satisfied and happy. There were no strings attached to it.

In their day, Government bosses did not take it away from them. These founders and the unbroken line of builders of Nebraska enriched themselves and the Nation. They did it the free enterprise way.

Today, all that we hold dear is in jeopardy. The fateful issues are: Whether we shall preserve in America, human liberty, the dignity of the individual, and freedom of choice, or surrender them to all-powerful Government, which seeks to control our lives and all our activities; and whether, in foreign affairs, we shall restore constitutional procedures, with even-handed justice, or continue to see the peace frittered away by secret agreements, incompetence, and drift.

The American people face the hard fact, that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago, they have not yet won the peace. They see we are losing the cold war. They are alarmed by the mounting cost of Government, deficit spending and administration demands for more and more taxes.

The American people are calling, indeed, praying for leadership along the road to lasting peace, prosperity, and contentment, and most of all, for a leadership that will keep open the doors of opportunity for their children and posterity.

The Republican Party has just adopted a platform that gives the people a clean-cut choice on these issues. It is now our job, and the job of all Republicans everywhere, to fight for the never-dying principles that protect human liberty and individual dignity, as pledged in this platform.

It is also our job, and the job of all Republicans, to see that candidates are nominated who stand foursquare for those principles.

Let those who believe in free competition, and the right of the individual to make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, come into our corner. And, let those who are for spendthrift socialism, get into President Truman's corner. Let's fight it out. Let's have the show-down in the 1950 elections.

Ah; don't be fooled. There are those who say President Truman does not want Congress to pass his socialistic proposals, that he is simply trying to lure the votes of pressure groups, with promises and more promises. Well, if that is true, he is insincere; he is a demogog, a hypocrite, and such tactics should be repudiated.

For my part, I think the President is sincere. He believes in spendthrift socialism. That is his official record. And, if he succeeds in getting elected to Congress men and women who believe in his left-wing, radical proposals, America will be legislated into strait-jacket socialism.

The present session of the Eighty-first Congress, has been under way 2½ months, traveling on a treadmill and getting nowhere.

President Truman who was unable to get along with the Democrat Seventy-ninth Congress, the Republican Eightieth Congress, and now the Democrat Eighty-first Congress, is using his promises again for this fall's election campaigns.

And, we Republicans must get out and fight, or he will get away with his phony panaceas once again.

This time, we Republicans are going to fight on clear-cut issues, and this time, we are going to win.

Before the adjournment bells for the present session of Congress ring, there will be battles over appropriations and tax bills.

The Republican Eightieth Congress cut taxes five billion, cut the national debt seven billion, and left a Treasury surplus of $8,500,000,000. But now the President is trying to blame others for squandering this surplus and running up a tremendous deficit. He says the present deficit has been caused by the cut in taxes made by the Republican Eightieth Congress, and by expenditures necessary to pay for past and possible future wars. On these two counts the President is dead wrong.

Anyone who will examine the budget will find the present deficit situation is the result of increasing expenditures, $9,000,000,000 over what they were 2 years ago; and that is four billion more than the tax cut voted by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

The situation is not due to tax reduction. And, furthermore, fellow Nebraskans, of that nine billion increase, six billion is for non-war-connected domestic civilian spending. It is not for national defense. It is not for foreign recovery. It is for spending here at home. The Truman administration is simply using national defense as a smoke screen to hide its extravagant expenditures here at home.

Of the forty-three billion four hundred million of estimated spending in the proposed 1951 budget, only nine billion four hundred million, or 22 percent, represents fixed charges not subject to reduction by Congress, the largest item of which is interest on the national debt of five billion six hundred million.

We Republicans have also worked to repeal excise taxes. And now that we have made great headway, the President comes forth with a "me too" proposal to reduce some of them, but at the same time increase corporation levies, so that there will be a net increase in the tax burden of $1,000,000,000.

All of this increase would eventually be paid by the people in their cost of living. The punitive, sky-high wartime excise taxes are killing business. The sensible course is to repeal them and give business a chance to operate. That will move goods and services, and the Government will receive more revenue.

Taxes can and should be cut by cutting the outrageously high cost of Government; balancing the budget; getting on a pay-as-you-go basis like we have in Nebraska; stopping the inflationary deficit spending; and cutting the national debt.

That is what the Republican Party stands for, and that is what the American people want.

The Truman approach, and that of his fellow travelers in Congress, revolves around the motto: Tax and spend, tax and spend, charge it to the public debt, and manufacture money for inflationary deficit spending.

Fellow Americans, elect a Republican Congress next November and put an end to this Saturnalia of incompetence, inefficiency, and waste.

If the constructive work of the Republican Eightieth Congress had been vigorously presented to the people in 1948, there would be a Republican President in the White House today. And there would be no Achesons undermining our national economy and losing the peace.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson is the most powerful man in the Government today. The voice is the voice of President Truman, but the hand is the hand of Dean Acheson. Apparently he has become so powerful, as the idol of the left-wing appease-Russia agitators, that President Truman is fearful, should he fire Mr. Acheson, he will lose the support of this radical, socialistic, pressure group in the coming elections and in 1952.

In the most vital fields of governmental activity is the hand of Secretary Acheson and the Hisses. Dean Acheson and the Alger Hiss clique have been close collaborators in the State Department for many years. They have been joint architects of many schemes that have run our foreign relations into the ditch until today even little countries like Bulgaria and Hungary trample upon our rights, and the United States of America is reduced to the ignominy of futile daily protests.

China falls under the heel of Moscow-directed Communists, and all Asia trembles in fear that the Red tide will engulf it.

Through power politics, with China as a springboard, all Asia is now dominated by the God-hating dictators of Russia.

Who sat at the side of our ailing late President, and prompted him with the answers at Yalta, when China was betrayed to Russia along with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all those other countries of eastern Europe? Why, of course, Mr. Acheson's pal, Hiss. When China pleaded for aid to resist the Red armies, who turned the cold shoulder on our faithful war ally and friend through the years? You know it was Mr. Acheson.

While he and the Hiss crowd have been calling the signals in the State Department, 14 men in the Moscow Politburo have captured control of one-fifth of the globe's land surface, 13,000,000 square miles, and one-third of all mankind, 800,000,000 human beings.

His belated warning in California last week, against further expansion by Red Russia, has a mighty hollow ring in the light of his appeasement record and total failure to win the peace.

If history repeats itself, Mr. Acheson is getting ready to further concessions to Russia, because each time he has issued a bristling warning, it usually has been accompanied by further appeasement.

Is he about ready to have President Truman officially recognize the Communist regime in China? Is his vacillation over admission of the Communists of China to the Security Council of the United Nations, a prelude to taking them into this powerful world organization? Why, recognition of the Red usurpers of China would compound the betrayal of the people of China. And freedom-loving people around the world would hang their heads in shame.

The United Nations Charter condemns territorial acquisition by aggression. Moscow directed the conquest of China. If the United Nations takes these Red usurpers into its highest governing body, it will stultify itself, and Mr. Acheson should now be in the forefront opposing such action.

Stung by the fingers of wrath that are pointing at Dean Acheson, and the administration, participants in the infamous, secret agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, have been issuing books and magazine articles giving their alibis for being hoodwinked by Stalin.

Now, they beg sympathy with protests that Stalin has not kept his agreements. They point to provisions for free elections, freedom of speech, and freedom of press in the countries handed over to Stalin.

Were they so naive as to believe that the tyrants of Russia would keep these pledges? No, no, fellow Americans; these alibis won't stick.

The overt act that opened the world to infiltration of communism culminating in the present cold war was committed in 1933, when the New Deal Democrat administration officially recognized the Soviet regime and welcomed Soviet Russia to the family of nations.

Republican Presidents, before 1933, had refused to recognize Soviet Russia, because her dictators would give no dependable assurance against spreading their propaganda to undermine and destroy our Republic.

Unfortunately, no such guaranty was demanded, and none was given in 1933, when Soviet Russia was officially recognized by the United States. That is when the seed of softness toward communism was sown.

Adolf Berle has testified before a congressional committee that when he was an Assistant Secretary of State in 1944, Acheson and Hiss headed a pro-Russia clique, while he (Berle) opposed appeasement of Russia. Berle said that eventually he was forced out of the State Department and appointed Ambassador to Brazil.

And we see the almost daily evidence of how these Russian appeasers are still running through the State Department.

Dean Acheson isn't content to just run the State Department, he reaches out into all branches of government. Within the last few days, the country witnessed the shocking action of Secretary Acheson in prevailing upon a United States court in New York City, to free a convicted Russian spy, Valentin Gubitchev, on condition he would leave the country.

When Gubitchev was arrested, for his conspiracy with Judith Coplon, to steal security secrets from Government files, Russia protested that Gubitchev was a Russian diplomatic officer and immune from punishment for spying.

Mr. Acheson rejected Russia's claim and asserted Gubitchev was subject to prosecution and punishment upon conviction. Having so determined at the outset of the case, Mr. Acheson should have let the law take its course.

Instead, after the jury of American citizens had found Gubitchev guilty, Mr. Acheson prevailed upon the Attorney General to tell the court Gubitchev must be given a suspended sentence of 15 years on condition he leave the country.

The State Department issued a statement that this leniency was necessary in the interest of good will between Russia and the United States. And it was suggested that by freeing Gubitchev, life would be made easier for Americans behind the iron curtain. Ah, but fellow Americans, friendship of Russia cannot be won by the bribery of turning loose her spies in the United States. We live in a country of law and order, and Mr. Acheson should keep his hands off the processes of justice, and not try to influence the courts.

In the national defense planning today, you will find Mr. Acheson in the center of the picture, just as Alger Hiss participated in the political agreements at Yalta, which have brought so much woe to the world.

In ECA and other schemes to siphon the cash and goods of the American people to foreign countries, including bolstering for the socialistic government of Great Britain, Mr. Acheson is a prime architect. ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman is merely an errand boy for Mr. Busy-Body, Mr. Acheson.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Acheson is a busy man, busy tearing down our national economy, through slashes in tariff protection for one example.

It is Mr. Acheson, with the blessing of President Truman, who has conducted the postwar international tariff conferences under the misnamed Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Under its provisions, the President has absolute power to slash tariff rates, but it is Mr. Acheson who wields the ax.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and ECA Administrator Hoffman are begging foreign countries to dump their goods into our domestic markets. They are helping foreigners find ways to capture markets here in competition with American producers. And, now, the tide of imports is rapidly overtaking America's exports.

According to the Bureau of the Census, January exports were valued at $743,600,000. Imports were valued at $622,700,000. This reduced the trade gap from $337,800,000 in December, and a monthly average of $447,800,000 for 1949, to only $120,900,000 in January. Just think of it, exports in January were 21 percent below the December value of $942,900,000.

But general imports of $622,700,000 in January, were higher than the $605,100,000 in December, and substantially higher than the 1949 monthly average of $552,200,000.

Farmers are being hit by the administration's tariff give-away policy along with other segments of our population.

For example, imports of animal and vegetable products in January 1950, were valued at $254,600,000, whereas our exports of these commodities were valued at only $158,200,000.

And, you livestock producers hear this: Imports of animal products in January amounted to $53,400,000, while our exports of the same products totaled only $27,100,000.

But this is not the only blot on our foreign policy picture.

American tourists and institutions are giving and spending abroad at the rate of about $107,000,000 each month. Subtract this $107,000,000 from the $120,900,000 for January, and the dollar gap is cut to $13,900,000 for the month.

Included in the Census Bureau figures on exports are ECA shipments, goods paid for by the American taxpayers and given to Great Britain, France, Italy, and the other ECA receiving countries. Eliminate the ECA shipments in January and the result is an unfavorable trade balance—more dollars going out than came in.

The pay off—in closed American factories, curtailment in oil production, and blows to agriculture—from the tariff give-away policy of the Truman administration and its global planner, Mr. Acheson, has just begun.

If the present trend continues, within a few months another 1,000,000 American jobs will be exported. Mr. Acheson admits that American industries are being hit. He proposes that the crippled industries be taken care of by subsidies out of the Federal Treasury.

ECA Administrator Hoffman suggests putting workers thrown out of jobs by tariff slashing on to expanded unemployment-insurance rolls.

All of this is the kind of cracked economics and disregard of the right to protection of American industry, agriculture, and labor, that runs through all of the socialistic planning of the Truman administration.

No wonder the Legislatures of Texas and Mississippi have petitioned Congress to thoroughly investigate the State Department and purge it of its pro-Communists and underminers of American prospertiy and security.

Mr. Acheson must go. He is a bad security risk. But cleansing the State Department alone will not get our country on the highway of peace, prosperity, and happiness, the road so clearly marked by the founders of Nebraska.

On a thousand fronts alien-minded schemers and plotters are boring from within our borders. There are more than a half million Communists in the United States, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

The Republican Party must meet this challenge. It is the only safe party to effectuate good government. Your job is to see that the people never lose sight of the truth that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Go forward as modern Paul Reveres and minutemen. Carry the facts to the people in your business, the shops, the homes, the forms, and into every voting precinct. Ring the doorbells.

We Republicans offer a new leadership untaunted by communism. We Republicans insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of constitutional procedure are followed; and that means no secret agreements bartering away our rights and liberty.

We Republicans favor aid to other countries resisting communism only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, and if there is a well-conceived program for progressive reduction.

We Republicans favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair competition, within the Republican principle that American industry, agriculture, and labor must be protected against ruinous importations.

We Republicans always have and will continue to insist upon national defenses adequate to any emergency. We Republicans are for the Taft-Hartley labor law because it guarantees the right of collective bargaining and recognizes unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of union members and the public.

Under this law union membership has increased to new highs and wages have risen to record levels. We Republicans favor amending the law in the light of experience

and denounce the Truman administration for blocking enactment of improvements in the act voted by the Senate last year.

And we won't stand for any bypassing of the law, as President Truman has done. His refusal to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act for months and months in the face of the mounting coal crisis, while the Nation's economy moved inevitably toward complete collapse, we Republicans condemn as playing politics with human misery.

We Republicans believe agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We favor fair prices for the farmers' products in the market place, aided by Government price-support loans until that need is made no longer necessary through enlightened adoption of programs that will utilize, not destroy, surplus crops. We Republicans denounce the so-called Brannan plan as a means to sovietize the farmers and rob them of their birthright of independence.

Fellow Americans, all of these Republican principles and objectives square with the American way of life. Upon these principles and with these objectives America will grow and be strong—strong economically, strong financially, and strong spiritually as the lighthouse for freedom-loving people everywhere.

The overwhelming majority of Americans cherish the heritage of freedom and opportunity handed down by the founders of Nebraska and their fellow pioneers across the land.

Let us here and now resolve to go forward in this crusade to see that the heritage handed down from our founding ancestors shall not perish. America is the custodian of human liberty. Let us be worthy of its guardianship.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, annually the Philadelphia Bulletin, a very outstanding newspaper, holds a forum, at which men of distinction from all over the Nation discuss subjects of interest to the people. At the forum held last night, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an address, which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, in this day of the airplane and the atom, we must face the fact that both peace and war are global in character. If we are to help maintain a free world of free men we cannot achieve our objective by closing the door to Communist aggression in Europe while the door is left wide open in Asia.

Coalition with communism is no more workable in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, or Rumania. Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. Last November in Chungking a Chinese official clearly put it in this way: "Senator, there can be no coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the beast."

During the 5 years I have been a Member of the United States Senate I have supported our foreign policy in Europe and been critical of it in the Far East.

The general objectives of our foreign policy have been clear to the American people and to the Congress. We have sought to establish a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure for this and future generations. Yet with this worth-while objective in mind we were not so naive as to believe that all nations would forego the use of military power to enforce their will on others.

The United Nations, it was hoped, would not only be a world forum for discussion but would also be an effective instrument for collective security.

It has not yet been put to the test of acting against an overt aggression of armed troops of one nation crossing the borders of another. That test may come this year or next in Yugoslavia, Iran, Viet Nam, or Burma. We do know that the Soviet Union, by its abuse of the veto in the Security Council, has put the world on notice that there will be no hesitation in blocking effective United Nations collective security action against aggression by another veto.

It was for this reason that our Government and those of western Europe clearly recognized that Marshall plan economic aid to help rehabilitate war-torn Europe was not sufficient in and of itself. The fear of aggression restricted the recovery so necessary if the free way of life was to have a fair chance for survival against totalitarian pressures.

Within the United Nations Charter the Atlantic Pact came into being. By its terms an attack against one of the North Atlantic nations would be recognized as an attack against all of them.

Outside of the North Atlantic Pact, by resolute action, Greece was saved from being engulfed by communism, Turkey, Iran, and Korea were given the tools with which their independence might be preserved.

In China our policy has contributed to the debacle in that area of the world. For more than half a century our historic policy had been to encourage and support a free and independent China. Today's realities clearly mean that this must also be a non-Communist China.

Yet at Yalta without consulting with China, our wartime ally and friend, we gave the Soviet Union a stranglehold on Manchuria. It was done without consultation with the American Congress or the American people.

Our State Department urged a coalition with the Communists. The government of the Republic of China quite properly refused. The United States placed an embargo against the shipment of arms and ammunition to the legal government of China while the Soviet army of occupation in Manchuria was turning over captured Japanese stocks of arms and ammunition to the Chinese Communist forces.

In July 1947 Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was sent out to China on a mission. He wrote a significant report dated September 19, 1947, which contained a constructive program to save China from communism. That report, containing information of great import, was suppressed for 2 years.

Until quite recently some of those who helped shape our China policy were speaking of Mao Tse-tung's followers as "agrarian liberals." It makes little difference whether this fatal miscalculation was because of design or ignorance. The end result is no less damaging to the future peace of the world and the security of the United States.

Our China policy has helped to undermine the Republic of China. While the Government was with its back to the wall the State Department issued the China white paper. Never before had we struck such an almost fatal blow at a historic friend during its darkest hour.

During the last 2 years the help that the Congress voted has been delayed or nullified. This can be and has been amply documented. Even purchases, military and civilian, with Chinese funds have been obstructed.

On January 5 the President announced that no further military assistance would be given to the Republic of China. We now know that this had been preceded on December 23 by a State Department memo to its officials overseas stating that the island of Formosa had no strategic value.

The interesting thing about that memo is that the State Department had no such advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Admiral Radford, commander in chief of our naval forces in the Pacific, or from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our supreme commander in the Far East.

In fact the statement ran directly counter to a State Department bulletin of June 3, 1945, which stated with reference to Formosa that "with the exception of Singapore, no location in the Far East occupies such a controlling position."

The difficulty with the State Department is that they have been more interested in China in saving face than saving freedom.

However, I do not want to spend too much time on the past.

Where do we go from here?

Last week in my State of California, Secretary of State Dean Acheson made two significant speeches. If implemented, they furnish the basis of having a policy in Asia that will be consistent with our policy in Europe.

Those who favor a temporary respite by a Munich type of agreement that would divide the world into spheres of influence whereby communism could digest its gains in Europe and Asia and sacrifice human freedom in the process, will get no satisfaction from these talks.

While the door to negotiation is left open the Soviet Union must reestablish its diplomatic credit standing. There are too many pieces of paper floating around to warrant reliance on a new one until the others have been redeemed.

It is clearly underscored that aggression in Asia is of no less concern to the law abiding nations of the world than it is in Europe or the middle east.

The nations of Asia are given hope that those who are willing to help themselves to maintain their freedom will be eligible to apply for and receive various types of assistance from us.

Standing by itself the speech of Secretary Marshall at Harvard on June 5, 1947, without congressional implementation, bipartisan in character, would not have bolstered for long a single tottering war-weary government of Europe.

Nor will Secretary Acheson's speeches be more than a temporary whiff of oxygen until and unless implemented by the Congress.

Up to now there has not been the consultation with the majority and minority parties on far-eastern policy that there has been in recent years on our European policy.

To the administration I would respectfully state: It is not too late to begin such consultations but it is later than you think. As has been pointed out before such consultations must be on the "take-off" and not merely on the "crash landings."

If an attempt is made to circumvent Congress by use of loans from already established agencies rather than by congressional appropriations, I predict an amendment will be added to some essential legislation that will close that loophole.

There is one great void in the speech of the Secretary of State dealing with our Asia policy. He treats the islands of Formosa, Hainan, Kinmen, Chosun, and the Pescadores

with their 8,000,000 people under the jurisdiction of the legal Government of the Republic of China as though they were ships which had been sunk beneath the waves of the China Sea and the Pacific.

Since Formosa alone has more population than either Australia or Greece, this is hardly realistic. Formosa is closer to the Philippines than the island of Luzon is to the island of Mindanao. It is hardly conceivable that this Government can view with unconcern the moving of international communism off the Asiatic land mass on its first major island-hopping venture.

An American missionary with years of experience in China recently said to me: "Senator, I cannot understand how Chiang Kai-shek can be the No. 1 target in the Far East of international communism and at the same time be the No. 1 target of the Far Eastern Division of our own State Department."

From my own observations in China last November and from recent communications from people still there and those who have just returned, I believe that the Republic of China has passed her darkest hour of Dunkerque and Valley Forge. There has been a new rebirth of morale that is of tremendous significance to those who are not so blind that they will not see.

The Benedict Arnolds, the Quislings, and the fair-weather friends have long since departed. The new Cabinet of President Chiang Kai-shek contains many young and able administrators who are men of integrity.

The civilian Governor of Formosa is K. C. Wu, graduate of Princeton with an outstanding record as wartime mayor of Chungking. The Premier is Chen Cheng, a man of lifelong integrity and one regarding whom most Americans, including the late General Stilwell, have spoken most highly. The commander of the ground forces is Gen. Sun Leh-jen, graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and a fighting soldier of the first rank.

Time does not permit me to name them all but I can assure you that they are as determined to maintain a China outside of the Communist orbit as we are to maintain our own freedom.

In developing a program for the economic and military assistance to the free nations of Asia, the non-Communist Republic of China should not and must not be overlooked.

To permit our tried and true friends of more than 50 years' standing to go down the drain of communism while we concentrate on new Asiatic continental countries that have many more internal problems than free China has today, can hardly be the basis of a policy warranting the support of the Congress and the Nation.

It is not realistic to ignore the fact that the Republic of China has approximately 600,000 men under arms, 300,000 of whom are excellent soldiers. This total number is greater than the combined troop strength of Korea, the Philippine Republic, the United States of Indonesia, Siam, Viet Nam, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and the United States forces in Japan.

The island of Formosa is not needed by the United States as either an air or naval base. In the friendly hands of the Republic of China, it presents no problem to our own defenses.

In the hands of international communism the many Japanese-built air strips and the excellent harbors would drive a wedge into our Pacific defense line that runs from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines. In unfriendly hands it would be a strategic loss that no competent military, naval or air commander would or has overlooked.

There are no simple solutions to the complex problems we face in Asia or in Europe. But out of the discussions and debate in forums such as this, on the floor of the Senate and the House, in the press and over the radio there will develop an informed public opinion without which no foreign policy can succeed.

Our secret weapon against any potential totalitarian aggressor is not the plutonium bomb or the hydrogen bomb. These secrets can be stolen from us by a Dr. Fuchs. Our real strength is that which communism dares not steal to take to the Soviet Union or its European or Asiatic satellites. I refer to liberty and the determination of a self-reliant people to be informed, make their own judgments, choose their own leaders and having the ability to rally overnight if their free institutions are threatened from within or without.

This priceless ingredient, which we possess, the dictators understand less than they do the intricate blueprints of a super weapon. In itself our free way of life is a time bomb that will destroy any dictatorship once their people know the truth. This may explain the frantic lowering and sealing of the iron curtain from the Elbe to the China Sea. It should renew our determination, through the Voice of America and otherwise, to penetrate the darkness.

National Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation issued by Gov. Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, in observance of National Wildlife Restoration Week.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR BOWLES' PROCLAMATION FOR WILDLIFE WEEK IN CONNECTICUT

Conservation of our natural resources is one of the foremost problems facing Connecticut, as well as the United States. The fertility of our soil, our water supplies, our food and our wildlife are dependent on measures taken to conserve the land. And a green and flourishing countryside has always been a great source of enjoyment and wholesome recreation to the citizens of Connecticut.

In our State and elsewhere in the country, land has in the past been abundant. Men in those days were able to ravage the land and move on to more virgin territory. This led to abuse by uneconomic cutting of forests; denuding much other land of both vegetation and fertility; reducing our water resources, and leaving eroded, dry, unsightly landscapes.

Most of these blighted and barren areas can be made green and beautiful if all citizens fully realize their moral obligations to others in the ownership of private, civic, or State land. Our forests, our farms, our cities, our roadsides, our church and school properties, our home and factory grounds should be planted with trees, shrubs, and grasses wherever the need exists. In our cities, trees and shrubs can filter dust, absorb noise, temper climate, provide better and more natural living.

Much of the future progress of our State, and its rare natural beauty rests upon the extent to which we replant and care for all the land. Our State can produce more if we strive to make and keep it beautiful. Everyone will benefit, in equal measure.

Therefore, as Governor of the State of Connecticut, I hereby proclaim a program and urge that each man, woman, and child throughout the State assume individual responsibility to conserve the natural resources of our State whether they be private or public property, and that, wherever possible bare land be planted with vegetation.

I also urge local governments, chambers of commerce, farm organizations, garden clubs, and other civic groups, the churches and schools, and the press, radio, motion-picture and other industries to cooperate fully in observance of the plant-Connecticuct-to-help-plant-America program as soon as possible by means of local committees and permanent, planned cooperative endeavors based upon local needs.

I urge that the proper agencies of the State assist in informing the public of the urgent need for conserving our natural resources by planting Connecticut wherever the need exists, and to give guidance and counsel to the public on this subject.

Housing for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on housing for Indians which appeared in the February 1950 issue of the North Dakota Welfare News and Views under the heading "Across the director's desk." The article was written by Carlyle D. Onsrud, director of the North Dakota State Welfare Board.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACROSS THE DIRECTOR'S DESK

(By Carlyle D. Onsrud)

"Why should American soldiers live like pigs?" is the shocking question posed as well as the title of an article by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald magazine, writing in the February 14 Look. It just happens that the February 4 Saturday Evening Post has as a lead article a contribution by Sally Carrighar entitled "The Reds Are Rapping at Our Arctic Door."

From the standpoint of current concern about our Alaskan frontier—just 3 miles of water separate our American Eskimos from Siberia at one spot—there seems to be a clear call for line-of-action concentration in this area in these times. This would mean better Alaskan defenses and better treatment of those expected to do the defending. Quite apart from this, however, is the shocking exposé recorded by Dr. Poling in connection with how American soldiers live in Alaska.

Apparently, there is little excuse for what exists. Dr. Poling points his finger in a steady, accusing way at the United States Congress. He points out that Japan signed final surrender papers on September 2, 1945. This is February 1950. A picture accompanying the article shows a one-room shack with no running water or plumbing which rents at $140 a month to a sergeant, his wife, and two children. This and many more cases like them causes Dr. Poling to state

that "living conditions in Anchorage and Fairbanks are worse than those in shack towns on city dumps."

He has high praise for the post commanders, the American Red Cross, and the chaplains in the area who are trying to create some sort of comfort in the searing shame that is the Alaskan environment of the American soldier. Dr. Poling is less kind with the Congress, which finally got around to appropriating some money for Alaskan purposes last October—too late and too little. He also criticizes quite severely American home-front organizations and their apparent unconcern about the situation even with knowledge of the fact from people like the doctor and others who have been shocked into a high state of indignation about twentieth-century care of American soldiers.

All we have to do here in North Dakota is to substitute Indians for soldiers and we have essentially the same situation. The American Indians, like the American soldier, in comparison with the attention we give to organized labor, organized business, and organized farming, are America's forgotten people. They have had little choice in doing something about their situation. The American soldier who is drafted or who gives in peacetime from a deep sense of patriotism, and the American Indian who was here before the white man, seem to be relegated in many instances to the worst housing, the least attention, and to the greatest inequities of any of our people. And they have the least to say about this situation themselves.

This is not to say that there is not evidenced in America a lip service concern, replete with resolutions and committees and slogans. Resolutions and committees and slogans do not put food into people's mouths, nor do they improve housing conditions unless there is purposeful, continuing implementation.

The State welfare board has failed. After three intensely cold and snow-filled winters in trying, together with the counties in North Dakota, to get adequate general assistance money for our North Dakota Indians, being so acutely aware of the minimum-minimum standards set up for general assistance Indians, it is disillusioned, disheartened, and administratively disheveled. Where do we go from here?

As readers probably know, the Federal Government, through the social-security programs, the State, and the counties in North Dakota, take care of the Indian who is over 65, the Indian mother with dependent children, or the Indian blind person in the same manner and with the same standards as it does the white. There is left the great area of general assistance to be attended to. This is the area where, in the case of whites, the county government provides assistance. Furthermore, if an Indian citizen is a resident of the county, he receives general assistance from the county welfare board with county funds also. In the reservation counties and in the case of the ward Indians, the Federal Government, through the Office of Indian Affairs, has been attempting these many, many decades to take care of these people when in need. The counties in North Dakota on which are Indian reservations are not financially able to take over this assistance burden which has been assumed and for which the Federal Government is overwhelmingly responsible. The State has never assumed a responsibility for the Indian in need of general assistance.

In December 1947, a crisis developed on the Indian reservations in North Dakota. Indian funds were inadequate. Lethargy and apathy seemed to be the rule. The country governments were unable to provide assistance. The State welfare board, together with the counties, put on an intensive campaign for Federal allocations during the winter of 1947-48. It is true that inadequacy had been prevalent in the granting of this type of assistance for many years. What made it worse in 1947 was the booming high cost of living, the diminishing resources of the Indian people, accentuated by a cold and snow-bound winter.

In the winter of 1948-49, the State welfare board set a precedent by allocating several thousand dollars as pinch-hit money to relieve suffering out of its general assistance appropriation. Most States do not have anything to do with Indian general assistance, not even to the extent of joining in with the counties in rapping at the Federal door. North Dakota has been singular in its State concern with the problem.

The State legislature in 1949 appropriated $100,000 to the State welfare board for the purpose of aiding Indians in need of general assistance if Federal funds ceased to flow and suffering had to be alleviated. This means only $50,000 a year. It is available to all Indians in need of general assistance in counties upon which there are North Dakota Indian reservations. When it is considered that one reservation estimated a winter need of $50,000 for 1 month it can be seen that the State welfare board appropriation, quite apart from the reason for which it was given for disbursement, must be used as pinch-hit money only to insure against suffering if Federal dollars do not flow and to insure that Indians on all reservations have equity assured.

That means, therefore, that it is with a good deal of frustration that the State welfare board and the county welfare boards watch the administration of general assistance by the Federal Government. We know that our whites or Indians on old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children would not want to live on the standards that their neighbors must receive when they are in need. We know of the money it would take to relieve the shacktown type of housing that these people receive. We know that the unacquainted or the careless will say that some Indians are not good workers, that they are poor managers, etc., even though we know that the same can be said about many white people, who, nevertheless, when in need receive at least minimum standards for care for themselves and their children.

Knowing that the State welfare board did not have the resources to do much more than stand by with pinch-hit money, we traveled to Washington last June in the interest of seeing whether a House appropriation bill could be increased in the Senate. We were fortified with estimates as to what would be needed this winter for these people. Needless to say, nothing happened. There is no blame attached to our North Dakota Congressmen, who, we must remember, are only a few of many in Washington. We are not interested in who gets the credit and who gets the blame. We are, however, disturbed by and apprehensive of a system which creates an immovable apathy, a hard, cold inaction in which everyone, apparently, subscribes to the need, but no one gets the results.

This writer has been told that the Office of Indian Affairs does not ask for enough money. We have been told that the Office of Indian Affairs is not vigorous enough in its representations. We have been told that even though enough was asked for and vigorous presentation was the technique used, nevertheless, it is the custom of Congress to only appropriate a token amount and rely on deficiency appropriations. The whole thing adds up to medieval treatment of a human problem. We are talking quite apart from the ramifications of self-support, good or poor management, or rehabilitation—rehabilitation: that sunshine word that is talked about like the weather but about which nothing is done. The fact remains that American citizens—North Dakota people—are depending on an erratic allocation system out of insufficient appropriations, and, if enough heat is turned on upon the ill-timed inadequacy of deficiency appropriations, made sometimes after cold weather is over. This all for a bare, frugal living. To add to disillusionment is the fact that nothing seems to be able to change the course of man-made action.

We are not speaking as crusaders or as going overboard for any certain class of people. We think that the person in need, no matter what the sex, age, or creed, should have a decent standard for the basic necessities. The American Indian, like the American Alaskan soldier, is not getting it.

Government Spokesmen Confused on Home Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on confusion by Garrett Winter, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 22 be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. It is to be hoped that some Government spokesman will undertake the difficult and perhaps impossible but interesting task of reconciling the contradictions stated by other Government spokesmen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT SPOKESMEN CONFUSED ON HOME NEED

(By Garrett Winter)

Confusion among Government agencies as to the Nation's housing needs was highlighted today with a Department of Commerce report that the postwar boom will end after 1952, unless builders widen the market for replacing old houses.

Only last Friday Commissioner Ewan Clague, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, contended that it will take several years more at the million-a-year pace to catch up with anticipated requirements.

A month ago at the National Association of Home Builders convention in Chicago, Administrator Raymond M. Foley, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, warned that more than a million new dwellings will be needed for many years to come, especially in rental housing and in larger houses priced below $8,000.

Last November, Leon H. Keyserling, acting chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, before the National Association of Housing Officials in Boston, called for an average annual output of 2,000,000 homes for the next 5 years.

The Commerce Department predicted today according to the Associated Press, that "three more years of building at the record pace of the last 3 years will exhaust the backlog of demand for an expansion of dwelling facilities." This will be followed, it continued, by a big construction slow-down, unless a lively demand appears for replacing old homes.

Commissioner Clague contends that American households have been increasing a lot faster than new dwellings for two decades. The problem, in his opinion, will be to find

enough three- and four-bedroom houses for an increasing number of families with three or four children, as long as builders continue to concentrate on four- and five-room dwellings.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards this week predicted that 1950 home building will at least equal the 1949 peak and that about half the units will sell for $8,000 or less, while rental housing, despite continued rent control, will approach last year's ratio of 23 percent of all residential building.

The Investigation of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the present investigation of the State Department, by Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—FIFTEEN THOUSAND LETTERS AND WIRES RECEIVED BY McCARTHY SINCE PROBE STARTED

(By Constantine Brown)

Senator "Bull" McCARTHY has received no less than 15,000 letters and telegrams since the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee started hearings on his charges against officials of the State Department.

The overwhelming number of these communications approve the investigation which was prompted by his accusations. It appears from the tone of the letters that the writers are less worried over the ideological tendencies of State Department officers who are involved than they are by their nasty moral habits.

Criticism, with few exceptions, is directed at the method of the investigation by the subcommittee, which so far neither has proved nor discredited entirely some of the charges vented at the public hearings.

DISSERVICE TO DR. JESSUP

For instance, Dr. Phillip C. Jessup, American Ambassador at Large, made a masterful presentation of his own case by reading a carefully prepared document setting forth not only the services he has rendered the Government of the United States, but also his impressive background of Americanism.

Yet it must be said, without prejudicing Dr. Jessup's statement in the least, careful analysis of his presentation shows that it was superficial. The fault is not his but is that of the subcommittee, which did not permit Senator McCARTHY to ask pertinent questions.

If Senator McCARTHY's request had been granted it is very probable that the last shred of suspicion would have been eradicated and Dr. Jessup would have been completely cleared during last Monday's hearing. As it was the Republican member of the subcommittee asked him some vague and perfunctory questions, leaving doubts in the minds of those who followed the hearings, particularly with reference to the Hiss case in which Dr. Jessup testified as a character witness for the defendant.

The Democrats followed by giving him a clean bill of health without going into the files on which Senator McCARTHY's allegations of "affinity" for pinkos were based. This was much more unfair and harmful to Dr. Jessup than to his accuser.

The insertion into the testimony of letters of commendation and trust from two outstanding Americans such as Gen. George C. Marshall and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was more impressive than convincing. Neither of these personalities have had the time or opportunity to look into the files which Senator McCARTHY collected and which now have been handed over to the subcommittee. It is recalled that two outstanding judges of the Supreme Court—Justices Frankfurter and Reed—took the stand in the Hiss trial and gave him their full endorsement.

ANCESTRY IS NO HELP

The fact that a person can trace his American ancestry back to the Eighteenth century—or even farther—does not necessarily place him beyond suspicion. Nor do his official activities and statements "on the record."

This is not intended, it must be emphasized, to cast any reflection on Dr. Jessup's statement that he has no affinity for any kind of subversive, Reds and pinkos. Alger Hiss testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that his loyalty should not be questioned, since he had served as a policy-maker at Yalta and was proud of his achievements there, and since he had come from a very old American family.

If Senator TYDINGS, the subcommittee chairman, had not acted on the spur of the moment he would have realized that he was rendering a real disservice to Dr. Jessup by refusing to permit Senator McCARTHY—the only man in the room who is supposed to have had pertinent questions to ask—to cross-examine the witness, whose character and discretion as a Government official were impugned.

Dr. Jessup unquestionably wanted to dispose of all such doubts once and for all when he eagerly offered himself for a searching cross-examination by his accuser.

The Indian as an Undeveloped Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article appearing in the February issue of North Dakota Welfare News and Views, by Carl F. Fryhling, State director of the North Dakota State Employment Service, entitled "An Undeveloped Resource—The Indian."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNDEVELOPED RESOURCE—THE INDIAN

(By Carl F. Fryhling, State director, North Dakota State Employment Service)

A Nation, State, or local community cannot prosper unless all of its resources are utilized to the fullest extent. Manpower, as a resource, will be a damper on progress unless its real and latent abilities are fully developed and utilized. The Indian, a native American, is such a source which has much to contribute to our economic well being if he is properly located and utilized.

World War II brought out numerous resources, material and labor, and utilized them very effectively in the successful winning of the war. We found on many reservations the percentage of enlistments among the Indians was much higher than among the whites. Hundreds more were employed in war plants. The war demonstrated that we fail to utilize this resource to its fullest extent during peace.

The North Dakota State Employment Service has, during the past 2 years, made a special study to determine the employability of Indians and has made a special effort to place Indians in employment off the reservation. Our experience has brought out the following factors: (1) the employer objects to hiring an Indian, not because he is unable to do the work, but because he is an Indian; (2) the Indian is hesitant in accepting employment off the reservation in fear of racial discrimination, (3) the employer, when he does hire an Indian, does not give him the same opportunity as a white man; the Indian makes one mistake and he is fired; (4) the Indian lacks aggressiveness and is easily discouraged; (5) many Indians lack dependability. He usually stays away from his job to help in caring for his child rather than to hire temporary help and thus enable him to keep his job.

Our experience indicated a need of a broad educational program. The employer needs training in the supervision of an Indian worker. The community needs training in accepting the Indian as an American citizen and in assisting him to improve his standard of living. The Indian needs training in assuming his responsibility to himself, his employer, his neighbors, and his community.

Let us get back to the actual experience of placing Indians in jobs. During the month of September the employment service placed 127 Turtle Mountain Indians in the potato harvest. Many of them earned up to $15 per day with this employment, lasting 3 weeks to a month. No trouble was encountered and many employers expressed satisfaction. From this program we stepped into a program providing broader utilization of Indians in more permanent jobs. The employment service accepted a challenge to find off-reservation jobs for 100 Indians during the months of October and November. We accepted this challenge during that time of the year when jobs were becoming more scarce and workers more plentiful. We did not place 100 Indians but we did find jobs for close to 70. This program demonstrated to us that employers will hire Indians if properly approached and the Indian is placed on a job for which he qualifies. The Indian's ability must be sold and not the Indian.

Drowning Out the Nation's Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drowning Out the Nation's Voice," which appeared in the Washington Post on March 23, 1950. In my

opinion, it is an excellent editorial, which will provoke much thought. I believe we should think much on the question raised by the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROWNING OUT THE NATION'S VOICE

Never in recent times has such a miasma settled upon the Washington scene. Doubt, distrust, lack of confidence—they are rampant. Even those with mud on their hands can throw mud with impunity. To foreigners the American scene must look as if our major concern is to breed a race of informers and intellectual eunuchs. The reason for the malaise, it seems to us, is that leadership is not measuring up to the potential followership. There is a rending conflict between the President and the opposition. But this cannot be resolved till Presidential leadership has been filled.

And in this latter respect there is nobody but the President who can assume the responsibility. The President and his Secretary of State have been playing Alphonse and Gaston. Mr. Truman wants to give Mr. Acheson his head, but Mr. Acheson simply hasn't the party or popular standing to sustain him. The speeches he gave on the west coast came back to the Capital with a hollow echo, whatever may have been their effect upon the country at large. It may be that the wild and whirring MCCARTHY might yet make Acheson a national figure. But the stated purpose of the Republican chiefs, speaking while the Tydings inquiry is still on, is to destroy him. This is hardly a promising curtain raiser for the April meeting of the Foreign Ministers. In any event the fact remains that the President as well as Mr. Acheson must get into the act.

Actually Mr. Acheson never wanted the role of substantive responsibility that Mr. Truman seems to be thrusting upon him. He has rigid ideas about the leadership function of the White House in foreign relations. He saw in the Secretaryship of Mr. Byrnes what he thinks was a bad example of a Secretary who seemed to be out in front of the President. And on taking office he determined to lean over backward in deferring to the President's primacy. In strange silence the President has handed him a role that must be as uncongenial as it is uncomfortable and unrewarding.

The President, however, is the primate, and nobody else. He is the elected choice of all the people—not as an administrative chief, but as a voice, as custodian and cement and driving force of their unity. Under our system he can be as big, as Wilson said, as he makes his office. It is in the nature of the institutions of this Republic that drift in the White House leaves the country rudderless. The Presidency is the fixed point in our corporate life—we dare to say, in the life of the entire free world. A Frenchman said the other day that American power must be on the side of the people's hopes. No other member of the free world has the moral let alone the material resources to demonstrate any strong faith in its destiny. Europeans are living for the day only; Asiatics from hand to mouth. Only the United States can furnish the battering ram against a condition which is a historical great panic. The future has to be challenged if the present is to be saved.

Yet there is this void at the top in the Capital, and the Capital, in consequence, is given over to the raucous spirit of faction against which George Washington issued his last warning. It is not a situation of normal party division. A progressive debility is seizing the body politic. The reaction in the country is bound to be felt sooner or later in the same day-to-day outlook that has captured the Old World. It is enough of a drain on human nature to bear the silent conflict in the world without having to go without inspiration from the Nation's leaders. In time this moral passivity at the summit is sure to trickle down through the layers of society till nothing seems worth while. "The vigor of civilized societies," said A. N. Whitehead, the philosopher, "is preserved by the widespread sense that high aims are worth while."

Evidence of neglect at the top in upholding morale started with the shattering emptiness of the H-bomb announcement. You can't do this to a democracy. The State Department line is that the ending of our atomic monopoly failed by any manner of means to change power relationships. It is a singular attitude. Few Americans seem to share it, and all Europe has a contrary opinion, for it is since the recent atomic events that the idea of a neutral Europe has grown in Europe. Even the belated start in shipping arms under the military-aid program has not sufficed to offset that reaction. And it is bound to gather strength from the exhibition of the current jitters and hysteria. So, on top of Asiatic strife, there is European disintegration and defeatism to cope with.

Truly the burden is cast upon America to show not only cohesion but example to nations which are themselves tearing their unity apart on issues which are irrelevant to the master issue of survival and the assertion of common values.

Yet the President is not altogether to blame for the impasse in leadership. He is a modest man with no sense of mission. But looking at his record, nobody can say he lacks courage. If he is given a program to expound, and it appeals to him, he is not afraid to assume the responsibility. He showed leadership on the Truman doctrine. It was his own jogging of the introverted State Department that laid the train for the Marshall plan. When the diplomats seemed to have run out of ideas, he turned to his immediate advisers, and they suggested point IV, and he adopted it over the head of the diplomats. Instinctively, the President wants to use American power for the common good. But around him there is a lack of that creative imagination which must always be at the elbow of the President to inspire as well as to spur.

So the need on the Executive side, as we see it, is twofold.

1. Reassertion of continuing Executive leadership in our world affairs.

2. More dynamic staff work in the White House and State Department to keep that leadership primed for the carrying out of the critical assignment that history has put on the American doorstep.

In these events there might be some chance of mending and expanding the bipartisan approach to foreign affairs. In these times there must be some biparty respect for the water's edge. The Executive has never been continuously loyal to bipartisanship. It is chiefly Senator VANDENBERG that the country must thank for what success has been achieved so far in bipartisanship. Now VANDENBERG is ill, and the yawning rift testifies to the loss of his disinterested services. Nevertheless there is a responsible Republican leadership, and the President must invite its cooperation. For you can never have total diplomacy in the sense advocated by Mr. Acheson when the two parties are clawing at each other's throat.

It is surely apparent that ranks can be closed in the country only when there is evidence that they are closed in the Capital. This is no plea for any coalition, for there is plenty of room for partisanship. The trouble is that there is so much of it around nowadays that patriotism is being crowded out. More of it and this country will begin to look to the people of another planet like a blinded Samson pulling down the pillars on which the house standeth.

Extension of Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on H. R. 6000, regarding proposed extension and improvements in the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system, made by the National Brotherhood of Packing House Workers, before the Senate Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our union, the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers, CUA, approves in principle, extension and improvements to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to amend the public assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes as set forth in H. R. 6000. We feel that in one respect, at least, especially with reference to temporarily or permanently and totally disabled workers the bill (H. R. 6000) does not make ample provision. The effective date should be immediately after passage. Since the cruel effects on those afflicted with polio and heart disease, or permanently disabled by industrial or other accidents, is a matter that should no longer be ignored.

All statistics on the permanently and totally disabled in our population are estimates subject to a very large chance of error. No census of the disabled has ever been taken. As the disabled are not entitled to any special benefits in this country, there also is nothing resembling automatic registration of these people.

The estimate of 750,000 as the total number of all people who are under 65 and permanently and totally disabled comes from the Social Security Administration. It is based upon sample surveys made in the year 1945. This figure includes only people permanently and totally disabled who are in the employable ages, that is, from 16 to 65. Permanent total disability, as used in this estimate, takes account only of disabilities which have lasted more than 6 months. H. R. 6000 will provide benefits for only a small percentage of all of the people who are permanently and totally disabled. To qualify for benefits, not only must the disability be of such nature as to completely prevent employment and have already lasted at least 6 months, but the claimant must be able to establish that he was fully or currently insured. In most cases this will mean that only people who have had pretty regular employment up to the time that they become permanently and totally disabled will be able to get any benefits. Many disease conditions, however, are of such a character that disability comes on very gradually. Many such people will not be able to attain or maintain the status of being currently and fully insured as that involves at least employment in covered industries in half or quarter years. Workers who are newly brought under coverage by the amendments to the Social Security Act made in H. R. 6000 will not be eligible to any total and permanent disability benefits until 1956 at the earliest.

Approximately how many people will be able to get permanent and total disability benefits should H. R. 6000 become law is even more of a guess than the total number of permanently and totally disabled persons. The best guesses on this point are those given in the report of the Advisory Council on Social Security on permanent and total disability insurance which was made to the Senate Committee on Finance in May 1948. On pages 15 and 16 of that report occurs the following estimate regarding the proposal for including permanent and total disability benefits in old-age-insurance benefits which was made by the advisory council:

"After the program has been in operation for a few years, the number of new disability claims arising annually will range from 20,000 to 50,000, although after perhaps a decade or so, when the full effect of the extension of coverage has made itself felt, this number will rise to perhaps 40,000 to 100,000. Eventually the total number of disabled persons who are on the benefit roll and who are under age 65 will number roughly 300,000 to 800,000. The eventual annual cost of the proposed permanent and total disability benefits as a percentage of pay roll will probably range from somewhat more than 0.1 to possibly as much as 0.3 percent of the pay roll, in terms of dollars this corresponds to about two hundred to five hundred million dollars a year."

The recommendations of this council were more liberal in this respect than H. R. 6000 but, in general, will also serve as an estimate of how many people will get benefits under H. R. 6000.

Another estimate relates to H. R. 6000 as passed by the House of Representatives. This was published last October by the House Ways and Means Committee as a separate document and is entitled "Actuarial Cost Estimates for Expanded Coverage and Liberalized Benefits Proposed for the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System by H. R. 6000." These actuarial cost estimates were prepared for the use of the Ways and Means Committee by Robert J. Myers, actuary to the committee. As appears on page 7 of this report, the total number of beneficiaries who are expected to qualify for disability benefits under H. R. 6000 by the year 1955 is 190,000 to 594,000. Totals will increase in future years. The very wide range in the possible numbers is explained on the basis of varying assumptions, but it is made clear that the lower estimate is the more likely. From the same report it appears on page 9 that by 1955 the cost of permanent and total disability allowances will range from 0.12 percent of pay roll to 0.34 percent. The ultimate costs (by the year 2000) are estimated at 0.36 to 0.93 percent.

At the present time approximately 2,000,000 persons, aged 14 to 64, who would otherwise be gainfully employed, are affected with serious disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months. It has been estimated that the chief causes of disabilities lasting more than 45 days fall into the following classifications:

	Percent
Respiratory diseases	18.8
Degenerative diseases	17.0
Accidental injuries	13.4
Digestive diseases	11.5
Communicable diseases	9.0
Female diseases	6.3
Nervous diseases	6.1

Latest available figures from the National Office of Vital Statistics show deaths from cardiovascular diseases and congenital malformation of the cardiovascular system in United States in 1947 between ages of 25 and 64 were 211,758, according to Edward Robbins, national labor representative of the American Heart Association.

When disability strikes a wage earner it may be economically more disastrous for him and his family than unemployment, death, or forced retirement, for, in addition to the loss of wages, there are the costs of medical care, hospitalization, special diets, the expense of moving to a more favorable climate, etc.

The problem is being met, to a minor extent, in a number of ways. In some cases the workers receive payments from the workmen's compensation funds of his State. However, such payments are possible only where the disability has arisen out of the worker's employment. There are also some companies which make payments to their disabled employees. In some instances the worker carries insurance against disability either as an individual or in combination with his fellow workers. In recent years a few States have provided by statute for disability insurance.

However, these various methods provide protection for only about 27 percent of the workers who are covered by unemployment-compensation laws. The only adequate solution of the problem is the establishment of a national plan. Only a national plan can give country-wide coverage and lifetime protection. There is a constantly occurring mobility between both industries and States. After disability occurs it may be necessary or desirable for the disabled person to change his place of residence. A national system would allow this mobility much more easily than other plans. Under a national plan the cost burden in the case of varying rates of disability between localities, due to epidemics, catastrophes, varying age, sex, and occupational characteristics would be equalized.

This national system should be operated in conjunction with the present old-age survivors insurance plan. The existing facilities of this plan, with its wage-record system and field organization could be used in the administration of disability benefits. Employers would have to keep only one set of records. Contributions could be kept in a single trust fund which would provide greater flexibility in financing. There would be no overlapping of functions and the number of administrators would be kept at a minimum.

However, the provisions of the proposed H. R. 6000 relating to disability benefits do not go far enough. The proposed bill provides disability benefits for only those workers who are totally and permanently disabled. The problem of the temporarily disabled worker is also of large proportions. Each day about 2,000,000 persons are kept from their jobs by disability which has lasted less than 6 months. In addition, there are large numbers of workers whose physical condition is such that they should not be at work, but who are there because they cannot afford the loss of wages. It has been estimated that the annual wage loss to the labor force through temporary disability is between three and four billion dollars. In addition to this wage loss the labor force also is subject to a medical cost of $3,500,000,000.

Temporary disability also means a loss in productivity which is a vital loss to the Nation. It has been estimated that this loss of productivity equals the total of the wage loss and the medical costs. This hidden loss must be deducted from profits or passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices.

In addition to the economic loss which the worker suffers as a result of temporary disability, he also suffers indirect losses. Among these are impairment of occupational efficiency, risk of permanent disability, lowering of the standard of living, and the psychological effect of want.

The bitter fight which is being made on permanent and total disability benefits in connection with the old-age insurance system centers around the possibility that the provisions for benefits may be greatly liberalized in future years. Under the restrictive conditions of H. R. 6000 both the total number of people who will get benefits and the cost of these benefits will not be great. The private insurance companies, however, do not want the Government to pay any permanent and total disability benefits although this is a feature of the old-age insurance systems in practically all other countries. Logically also a man who is permanently and totally disabled before 65 is from an economic point of view in substantially the same position as the person who is unable to work by reason of old age. Old age is itself for many people a condition of invalidity. Those who do not want us to get a decent old-age and survivors insurance system, however, oppose the logical step of providing benefits for people who are permanently and totally disabled before they reach old age.

DON MAHON,
President, National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers; Vice President, Confederated Unions of America.

Dental Operations on Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to call attention of Members of Congress to the following article:

Massachusetts' Health Commissioner Vlado A. Getting's precedent-breaking program permitting nonregistered dentists to perform dental operations on children is sharply rebuked in the current March issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association, the official organ of the American Dental Association, representing the Nation's 68,000 dentists.

While the American Dental Association went on record in a recent San Francisco conference as opposed to the Massachusetts federally-financed "training program," authorizing 2-year trainees to perform dental restorative work on children, the ADA Journal editorially suggests that Commissioner Getting "reconsider the program in the interests of achieving the broad objectives of his department."

With the Massachusetts dentists' committee, representing the State dental profession and backed by leading dental authorities throughout the Nation opposing the program as a danger to children's dental-health standards, the Journal declares:

"The commissioner might give some contemplated moments to a full and studied reconsideration in the interests of achieving the broad objectives, to which his department, and the American Dental Association, as a voluntary organization of the Nation's dentists are dedicated."

Commenting on Getting's program, which was origirally identified as a "research project," the Journal declares:

"There is good evidence that the commissioner's 'research project' was handled * * * subtly and without full and free discussion.

"The association does not," the editorial continues, "object to the type of research mentioned (in the Getting program) provided that it is really research and not just curious tinkering masked in the prestige of research."

This "curious tinkering" alluded to by the Journal, is a 5-year program financed through the Federal Security Agency with $250,000 whereby female hygienists are being given 2 years' training and then will be permitted to perform highly specialized dental work on children—work formerly entrusted to a registered dentist with 8 years qualify-

ing training, according to Dr. Richard D. Cunningham, chairman of the Massachusetts dentists' committee for repeal of the program.

"Meanwhile," Cunningham continues, "Massachusetts has become the first State in the Nation to lower her dental standards where they should be the highest—in the treatment of children.

"The problem of combating greatly increasing tooth decay," he adds, "will not be solved by training an inferior group to take over highly specialized professional work. This problem can be solved only by training more qualified dentists, to give competent treatment under rigid professional standards."

Meantime, the Massachusetts dentists' committee, backed by the New York Dental Society, whose president, E. Harold Gale, wired the Governor and legislative leaders urging repeal, has mobilized dentists throughout the State to press for repeal. The repeal bill sponsored by the dentists' committee is now pending in the State legislature and will be acted on soon.

Dewey Proclaims Wildlife Restoration Week for New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth the proclamation of the distinguished Governor of New York State, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, proclaiming the period from March 19 through 25 as Wildlife Restoration Week:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

The increase of our wildlife population in New York State is a goal of great public value. It is a valuable and integral part of the urgent problem of conservation of our natural resources.

The movement to add to the number of our wild birds and mammals goes far beyond the pastime of people who like to hunt and fish. This recreation has built up a vast industry in terms of dollars alone. It is estimated that sportsmen throughout the country spend more than $4,000,000,000 a year on equipment, clothes, gasoline, boats, and other paraphernalia. It is reasonable to calculate that in our State alone, hunting and fishing represent a $500,000,000-a-year industry. Moreover, these sportsmen bring in 450,000,000 pounds dressed weight of food in game animals and fish every year.

But the urgency of the matter goes far beyond this practical side. There is also an esthetic aspect which is immeasurable. Furthermore, it is necessary to remember that all life depends upon soil and water. If we allow the balance of our wildlife to be destroyed, we lower the productive capacity of our soil and water and this quickly decreases the quantity of products available to us. Our wildlife population, accordingly, affects the interests of every individual in the State, no matter whether he ever fires a gun or wets a fishing line.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the period of March 19 through 25 as Wildlife Restoration Week in New York State and I hope the people of New York and particularly the students in all schools will observe this week by making a special effort to acquaint themselves with the problems of providing and maintaining suitable habitat for wildlife and take positive action to restore and improve this habitat by planting and other conservative measures.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 16th day of March A. D. 1950.

THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Governor.*

Coast Guard Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely interested in the Reserve program of the Coast Guard. The limited extent to which it now exists depends entirely upon voluntary participation of civilians who are motivated solely by a sense of patriotic duty. These people receive no compensation. In spite of recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense, the Appropriations Committee has thus far refused to include funds for this program in appropriations measures. At present the Coast Guard Reserve exists in name only. The Congress should provide funds for the training of these people upon whom we must rely for port security in the event of another national emergency. Should another war occur the protection of our ports would be of prime importance. We are running serious risks if we refuse to appropriate the relatively small amount needed for this program. When the appropriations bill is up for consideration I shall support an amendment to provide funds for the Coast Guard Reserve.

Perhaps I am more conscious of this need than many of my colleagues because of the geographical location of my district. The security of the Nation's ports is, however, of importance to our entire Nation. A recent editorial in the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, one of the leading newspapers in my district, clearly tells the story of the importance of a well-organized Coast Guard Reserve. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD and I commend it to your thoughtful reading.

WHAT PRICE PORT SECURITY?

The United States Coast Guard is the only one of the comparable groups in the armed forces which is not supported by a Federal appropriation for its Reserve organization. Its Reserve component operates now entirely on a voluntary basis, without the kinds of compensation which other reserve bodies enjoy, and in consequence without some of the inducements which attract men of experience to maintain their knowledge of coast-guard work and to familiarize themselves with the techniques and the tools which they would use if they were called into active duty.

The result is an obvious handicap. President Truman has recognized the need for lifting this handicap in his recommendation last year for a small appropriation for the training of a Coast Guard Reserve, but Congress—for reasons which are not clear—would have none of it. An item of $4,100,000 was in the congressional works this year. It would lead eventually to the expenditure of about $8,000,000 a year. An Appropriations Committee subcommittee has now turned this item down, the full committee is described as likely to sustain this refusal, and the only hope appears to be a floor fight.

If it does not win approval, the Coast Guard Reserve will continue to have an existence (to quote George Fielding Eliot) "only on paper"; and the situation will continue to be that which the Seattle Times—published in a port—described in these words: "Coast Guard reservists by the hundreds have flocked to other reserve organizations, and no program whatever has been set up to train those who remain on the Reserve list in their port-security functions."

Note the emphasis on "port-security functions." The issue is national. But it is also peculiarly a Norfolk and a Tidewater issue. In an emergency the Coast Guard would be responsible for their port security—the safety of their water fronts, their harbors, their shipping, their ship and boat facilities of many types, even (since explosives are heavily involved) their whole safety. The Reserves would be thrown immediately into this work. In the late war, as Norfolk knows well, this was a major responsibility. The Coast Guard met it with high effectiveness.

All these functions, important as they have been in the past, are raised to a new level of significance in the atomic age.

The sum required to make the Coast Guard Reserve a real reliance, by enlargement from the small size to which its lack of financial support condemns it, and to keep it up to date, is no barrier in a $42,000,000,000 budget. If a reserve organization is worth having at all—and who questions that?—it is worth having on a realistic basis. In an era when the highest military leaders think that another war would hit hard from the start, this kind of training is surely essential.

Repeal of Children's Dental Experiment Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to call attention of Members of Congress to the following article:

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF HOUSE BILL 2034, REPEAL OF CHILDREN'S DENTAL EXPERIMENT LAW

The Massachusetts dentists' committee, sponsoring a bill in the State legislature to prohibit nondentists from performing dental operations on children, recently conducted a poll which revealed that 2,700 of the State's 2,800 dentists are opposed to the 1949 act which permits hygienists with 2 years' training to do restorative dental work on children.

Massachusetts was the first State to adopt this federally financed program, which lowers dental health standards and uses our children as guinea pigs.

DENTAL PROFESSION OBJECTS TO THIS PROGRAM

Under authorization of the 1949 act, the Massachusetts Department of Public Health is currently supervising a 5-year program at the Forsyth Dental Clinic in Boston, where hygienists are being given 2-year courses and

then authorized to do the work which was formerly entrusted to a registered dentist with 8 years' training.

Passage of this act came without the full approval of the Massachusetts Dental Society, even although certain of its officers spoke in favor of this act in 1949.

Passage of the act came without the full knowledge or consent of the dental profession in this State.

Passage of the act has been deplored and condemned by the American Dental Society by a vote of its house of delegates at the recent conference in San Francisco.

It is the opinion of the American Dental Association that restorative work on children's teeth cannot be entrusted to any person other than a fully qualified registered dentist. It is also the association's opinion that 2-year courses do not prepare trainees or hygienists for such highly specialized work.

It is the opinion of the Massachusetts dentists' committee and its members that the program undertaken by the Department of Public Health creates a dangerous new trend by establishing a substandard program in a field in which the highest possible standards should be maintained at all times.

We feel that Massachusetts has taken a dangerous step backward and that the dental health standards for the children of this State have received a serious setback, and that now is the time to cure the evil.

HOUSE BILL 2034 IS A PROTEST BILL

This bill may also be considered a protest from the heretofore disunited majority of the dental profession. The Massachusetts dentists' committee feels that it was completely ignored during consideration of the 1949 act. The first information the dental profession received of the existence of the act and the program it authorized, did not come until October 1949, 4 months after the passage of the act, and this information came through a notice in the New England Dental Journal.

We would also like to call attention to the fact that at no time did the governing body of the Massachusetts Dental Society, the house of delegates, approve this program.

We would also like to remind that only certain officers of the Massachusetts Dental Society approved this program, while the vast majority of 2,800 registered dentists were never polled nor given the opportunity to present their opinions on this far-reaching program.

The dental profession bases its opposition strictly on public health standards. We feel that if the filling of a tooth is isolated completely, as a mechanical technique, and has no bearing upon the general physical health of the child, the program instituted by the department of public health is liable seriously to restrict treatment in child dentistry. However, this is exactly what is proposed in the public health program.

A SOLUTION

Every member of the dental profession is interested in stopping the increasing rate of tooth decay in Massachusetts. However, we feel that this cannot be done by giving 2 years training to practitioners. The problem cannot be solved by training amateurs in this highly specialized field. The results of the program of the department of health would be likely to provide second-rate, substandard treatment to the children of the needy.

We would find that those children who require the highest quality treatment would probably receive the lowest, and it would probably provide a type of treatment which may have serious repercussion in the later lives of these children.

We feel that this problem can be solved by increasing the facilities for the education of trained, competent dental students. More qualified dentists are needed, not 2-year trainees. Ultimately, we feel, the problem will be solved by graduating from our dental schools increasing numbers of competent, fully-trained, registered dentists with 8 years qualifying training.

Formation of a separate group of mechanical technicians is not the answer

RICHARD D. CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman, the Massachusetts Dentists' Committee for Repeal of the Children's Dental Experiment Law.

Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from Atlanta's Suburban Reporter of March 20, 1950, and also one from the Atlanta Constitution of March 8, 1950:

[From Atlanta's Suburban Reporter of March 20, 1950]

THIS WEEK

(By Hubert Lee)

Our good friend, Congressman A. SIDNEY CAMP, of Newnan, who has represented the Fourth Congressional District since 1939, served as guest columnist for Editor Ralph McGill in the March 8, 1950, issue of the Atlanta Constitution.

Representative CAMP is a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, headed by North Carolina's Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. Representative DOUGHTON was elected to the Sixty-second Congress and has served with distinction ever since.

The Ways and Means Committee calls for great ability and leadership and southerners on the committee measure up. In addition to Representatives DOUGHTON and CAMP, southerners include Representatives JERE COOPER (Tennessee); WILBUR D. MILLS (Arkansas); NOBLE J. GREGORY (Kentucky); J. M. COMBS (Texas); HALE BOGGS (Louisiana).

Taxes is one of the many problems of the Nation demanding the attention of the 25-member Ways and Means Committee. Here are some quotes from Congressman CAMP'S guest column:

"I am more familiar with what is being done on my committee, which has been in daily session for more than a month in an effort to bring about tax adjustments to ease some of the worst pain now being suffered by our patient taxpayers, and at the same time, not endanger the integrity of the Federal revenues, nor further increase the Federal budget. * * *

"Some wag in the House once said that ours was not the Committee on Ways and Means but the committee on woes and moans.

We suggest that anyone who missed reading the Constitution dig up the March 8 issue and clip out Congressman CAMP'S guest column. It is worth reading and rereading.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 8, 1950]

TAX ADJUSTMENT IS A TOUGH JOB

(Ralph McGill is in Palestine. In his absence members of the Georgia House of Representatives will write guest columns. Today's is by A. SIDNEY CAMP, of the fourth district of Georgia.)

I am honored to be asked to write this column for Ralph McGill, but feel very humble in doing so, for no one in our State is more able or better loved than he.

I am more familiar with what is being done on my committee, which has been in daily session for more than a month in an effort to bring about tax adjustments to ease some of the worst pain now being suffered by our patient taxpayers, and at the same time not endanger the integrity of the Federal revenues, nor further increase the Federal deficit.

MOANS

The job is a hard one. If you could sit with us and hear the various groups and classes relate their particular problems and assure us that no other group is carrying so weighty a burden, you would then understand why some wag in the house once said that ours was not the Committee on Ways and Means but the committee on woes and moans.

And we cannot laugh off these moans of our people over their tax woes. They are entitled to as much relief as it is possible to give them. Most every group has appeared before us except the consumers of tobacco and alcoholic beverages. These groups pay the highest tax of all—the Federal tax on a pack of cigarettes is 7 cents, and most States impose an additional tax. The tobacco costs 3 cents, or less than half of the Federal tax, while the Federal tax on a gallon of whisky is $10. Consumers seem to think these products cheap at any price.

LOOPHOLES

The President suggested that excise taxes be lowered in the same amount as we might recoup for the Treasury by closing of loopholes and making adjustments.

Some of the loopholes mentioned were collapsible corporations, such as those set up by moving picture producers for the production of only one picture and its liquidation after finishing the picture and before receipts from its distribution start, and some in the construction business where liquidation takes place before the houses are sold, so as to permit the tax to be recovered on a capital-gains basis rather than from direct income.

Selling business property by going concerns, and some sales of livestock by cattlemen and dairymen, so as to deduct losses from income rather than to reflect them in capital-gains accounts are similar practices in the reverse.

The Treasury urges a change in the law relating to those organizations now enjoying a tax-exempt status under section 101 (12) and suggests that the regular corporation tax rate be applied to business activities engaged in by religious, educational, charitable, and eleemosynary organizations which are wholly unrelated to the ordinary functions of the organization.

Thus if an agricultural college operated a farm or a bookstore, neither would be taxed, but if it owned and operated a watch factory the profits of the latter venture would be taxed.

They have also urged our attention to a growing system of lease-backs, an example being where a manufacturing company sells or gives its plant to a college which makes an addition, then leases it back to the company who continue to operate it. The college collects tax-free rents which are more than enough to pay for the additions.

Some cooperatives and charitable trusts that do not pay out virtually all of their income each year for charitable purposes and are not supported by the public generally, are other organizations under study.

ALLOWANCES

Other suggestions are to reduce the depletion allowance against gross profits now permitted to operators of oil and gas wells, coal, iron, and other metallic as well as some nonmetallic mines. These depletion allowances were made for the purpose of covering

the exhaustion of their resources and to encourage the discovery of new mines and wells, but it is claimed the allowances are far too much, and suggests that the oil- and gas-depletion allowances be reduced from 27½ to 15 percent, sulfur from 23 to 15 percent, and others to remain at 15 percent, coal at 5 percent, and all nonmetallics at 5 percent.

Suggestions for changes in the law concerning short selling on stock and commodity exchanges were made.

Any revenue we thus gain is to be used in reducing excise taxes.

Some of these excise taxes are collected at the manufacturing level—like tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, alcoholic beverages, automobile tires and parts, etc., while others are collected at the retail level—like jewelry, cosmetics, furs, railroad tickets, etc. I think some of those which should be reduced first are the taxes on ladies' handbags of the medium and lower prices, toilet articles, telephone and telegraph messages, railroad and transportation, motion picture and other admission taxes.

BALANCE

I think the most important need in Government today is a balanced budget. Our tax rates are high enough, and now produce over $40,000,000,000 a year.

Federal spending should be cut now. It is the only way our budget can be balanced, but it cannot be done without the cooperation of our people.

When cuts are proposed here, the people back home begin to howl and form pressure groups, send telegrams, write letters, pass resolutions—mostly beginning like this: "We know the budget should be balanced, but—." In 1948 the House cut the appropriations some $2,000,000,000, but before those bills came back to us from the conference committees most of it had been restored. It was the same story in 1949 and may be the same in 1950.

The Federal Government is carrying too great a portion of the local program, and we could cut expenditures for national defense and European and world recovery if everybody pulls together.

I am going to vote for such reductions.

Perhaps I have heard too many moans and listened to too many tales of woe.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana this week is celebrating Wildlife Restoration Week. Mindful of this event the Governor of our State has issued a proclamation, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION
STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

Whereas we who have the privilege of calling ourselves citizens of Montana because of our nearness to the many bounties which nature has bestowed upon this State and our daily contact the multitude of natural blessings which we enjoy sometimes have to be reminded of the benefits and opportunities at hand. In constantly rubbing elbows with unlimited natural assets, we tend to lose sight of the fact that they are ours to enjoy. Were we not reminded of them from time to time, we would forget and start taking them for granted; and

Whereas the grandeur of the Treasure State and the abundant wildlife found here were recently set forth in the nationally circulated magazine Sports Afield, in an article written and prepared by Ken Thompson. Through descriptive text and highly illustrated photographs, Thompson unfolded for the whole United States to see just what we have within our borders; and

Whereas Montanans should be reawakened to the prizes within our borders. The magnificent mountain ranges, trout-filled streams, and the wild game that abounds should once again be called to our attention. We should take careful stock and, once again, we should be filled with a great appreciation:

Now, therefore, I, John W. Bonner, Governor of Montana, proclaim the period March 19–25 to be Wildlife Restoration Week in Montana and call upon all sportsmen's groups and conservation agencies to carry on a concerted campaign of education designed to reawaken public interest in the continuing need for a long-range wildlife-restoration program in Montana.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed. Done at the city of Helena, the capital, this the 13th day of March A. D. 1950.

JOHN W. BONNER, *Governor.*

Another Distinction for the Sunflower State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, Kansans as a rule are not boastful folks. They know that their State is the breadbasket of the world and that its many natural resources, its rolling plains, its salubrious climate make Kansas one of the great States of the Union. These blessings they modestly take in stride.

Recently, however, a new distinction has come to the Sunflower State which, with pardonable pride, I bring to the attention of my colleagues by quoting the following editorial from the Arkansas City Traveler:

ANOTHER DISTINCTION

Kansas picked up another distinction this week in the announcement by Head G-Man J. Edgar Hoover that the Sunflower State is home to only six card-carrying Communists. This probably is one of the lowest proportionate figures in the country.

Although the scarcity of the comrades in Kansas is just cause for satisfaction, in a way it is a bit surprising that even six of the tribe can be found in the State.

Kansans just aren't the sort of folks who go in for communism and similar crackpot theories. For one thing they are 100-percent-loyal Americans who don't believe in looking overseas for inspiration. They also are pretty thorough realists, who aren't a bit fooled by the fancy propaganda that comes out of Moscow. On the whole they are solid, hard-working people with a touch of rugged individualism in their nature and a high regard for personal liberty.

Kansas also doesn't have either the closely defined gulf between rich and poor or the high degree of class consciousness that exists in many places. The great middle class which dominates the State is a bulwark of good citizenship. Social lines are extremely loosely drawn. A real grass-roots democracy prevails in fact as well as in theory.

In such sturdy environment, communism offers no appeal whatsoever. The six exceptions to whom Mr. Hoover refers must be temporary importations from other areas.

Congress Spends Thirty-five Billions Without Record Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include therein an article from the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., contained in John Pennekamp's column entitled "Behind the Front Page." May I say that Mr. Pennekamp is one of the leading and influential civic leaders of our State. His views and his judgment are highly respected by the citizens of Florida. He has been a great force in bringing to a realization and fruition the present Everglades National Park. He is associate editor of the Miami Herald.

CONGRESS SPENDS THIRTY-FIVE BILLIONS WITHOUT RECORD VOTE

(By John Pennekamp)

During its first session the Eighty-first Congress authorized the expenditure of $51,000,000,000.

Should you undertake to find out how your Senators or Representatives voted on these expenditures, here is what you would learn:

There is no recorded vote in either the House or Senate as to $28,969,126,989 of this gigantic expenditure. That is considerably more than half of the total that was voted.

As to the next $6,500,000,000, only one or other of the two Houses took a record vote.

So, more than two-thirds of the whole amount was appropriated without a record that will show you how your Congressman voted.

How much is $51,000,000,000? Dr. Christopher Daniels, of London, who has been visiting in Miami, recently figured it in terms of time.

If a man—say President Truman—stood on the shore of the Atlantic Ocean and tossed dollars into the water at the rate of 1 a second he could dispose of only 31,536,000 in 1 year.

Had he begun throwing the dollars into the ocean, at the rate of 50 a minute at the beginning of the Christian era, and continued so doing every minute around the clock through the years, right up to the end of 1950 he would have then disposed of $51,256,000,000.

That means he would have left on the shore something like $500,000,000 of the total that was appropriated by the first session of Congress.

Largest of the items appropriated without a record vote in either House was the $12,949,562,495 for the Military Establishment.

And the smallest was $16,000,000 for the United Nations for Palestine refugees.

Other items included, for independent offices, $7,617,739,361; for Treasury and Post Office Departments, $4,090,528,903; for Labor-Federal Security, $2,387,779,885; and to cover a second deficiency, $354,838,710.

There was a Senate vote but none in the House, on $5,659,990,000 for foreign aid, and House votes but none in the Senate on $100,000,000 to authorize public-works planning and $664,178,190 for Army civil functions.

Fort Lauderdale's Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS has offered a bill to cure this situation. It will have a tortuous course to adoption, but most certainly it should become a law.

It would make mandatory a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriations of a public nature.

"I think," he says, "this bill would be a step toward economy and would possibly bring about a reduction in governmental waste, extravagance, and duplication.

"The light of public opinion would cause some of the Congressmen to think before going on record for too many appropriations."

He continued:

"They would become appropriation conscious and certainly no appropriation could be passed without a majority of the House Members being present which has not been the history of appropriations this far in the Congress."

In the light of the size of the figures involved it is safe to assume that few, if any, Congressmen have even a reasonable comprehensive knowledge of where the money is going. As a matter of fact, committee members directly interested in the appropriations would be unable to study their particular budget and digest it to the the point where they could give intelligent, detailed information as to it.

I wonder why more department heads aren't finding it possible to economize—to return unexpended balances.

It looks like some of them are given so much money they don't have time to spend all of it.

Open Letter to DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial printed on March 16, 1950, in the Trenton Times entitled "Open Letter to DAR." This editorial stresses the position which this historic organization can choose to play in support of the principle of freedom and justice under law by espousing the cause of limited world government. The editorial follows:

OPEN LETTER TO DAR

Ladies of the New Jersey Society, Daughters of the American Revolution:

As you convene today for your annual conference at the State house, we make bold to express the hope that you will chart a course in harmony with the free and revolutionary spirit of those ancestors whom, as an organization, you so proudly and justly venerate.

New Jersey, in recent years, has assumed the lead in many moves designed to spread and accentuate the ideals of freedoms.

It has come boldly to the defense of civil liberties.

It has taken a strong stand against racial segregation.

It has endorsed fair-employment practices.

And many of its Representatives in Congress, as well as thousands of its citizens, are lending their support to a type of world unity that offers the only promise of enduring peace and security.

In this latter connection, your New Jersey Society, if we may be permitted to say so, has a great and inspiring opportunity to break away from the narrow isolationism that has come to befog the thoughts and actions of your national organization.

We ask this: Do you have the courage to support the principle of freedom and justice under law on a world-wide basis?

The fathers of our country, implicitly and in general principle, did so when they conceived and gave governmental expression to the Federal doctrine of E Pluribus Unum (Out of Many, One).

Your society has vast potentialities for good. It can and we think should take a position of leadership in the quest for liberty, not only here in America but everywhere throughout the world.

We pray that you will join hands with the forces of progress and come out vigorously and unequivocally in affirmation of international freedom under law, of world government for all mankind.

As devotees of a revolutionary tradition, can you, at this critical moment, afford to follow the jingoistic, reactionary line?

Export Market for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, unless this country can maintain a substantial export market for wheat, it will be necessary for a tremendous reduction to be made in wheat acreage in the years ahead. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture put into effect acreage allotments on wheat and farmers were asked to reduce their acreage for 1950 11.7 percent below the planted acreage for 1949. For 1951 acreage allotments will again be proclaimed and the Department of Agriculture is tentatively considering a further reduction of 16 percent in wheat acreage. With a continuation of normal yields still further reductions will be forced unless exports can be continued on a substantial basis.

Because of the light which they shed upon the present situation and because of the constructive criticism of the present policies of the Department of Agriculture with respect to wheat which they contain, I am submitting herewith as a part of my remarks, first, a letter from Mr. Elmer W. Reed, executive vice president of the Flour Mills of America, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., dated February 20, 1950, and addressed to me; and second, a copy of a letter from Mr. M. F. Mulroy, chairman of the agriculture committee of the Millers' National Federation, dated February 15, 1950, and addressed to Mr. Elmer Kruse, Assistant Administrator of Commodity Operations, Production and Marketing Administration.

FLOUR MILLS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Kansas City, Mo., February 20, 1950.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLIFF: As a matter of information I am enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Elmer Kruse, Assistant Administrator of Commodity Operations, P. and M. A., who is the actual manager of CCC, as I understand it. It is a letter from Mr. M. F. Mulroy, of the Russell-Miller Milling Co., and chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Millers' National Federation. It is completely self-explanatory, but it does touch on a question that it seems to me is vital and which also seems to me is in danger of being kicked around among the departments of Government until too late.

As pointed out in a previous letter, what we are doing is sitting on a stock of wheat which includes an exportable surplus of at least 375,000,000 on the present crop, and to maintain our normal carry-over, it should be 75,000,000 more than that—we are doing a lot of worrying about a lot of burdensome surpluses, and yet we are making no move whatsoever to make a sufficient distinction as between our support price in domestic markets and the world price to permit the moving of that surplus grain into world channels. It is indeed unfortunate that that should be so, but I think you will readily realize it is actually the case.

It is all right for us to become independent in our marketing proposals so long as we are supplying the funds with which the commodity is to be purchased, but so long as the other major exporters, and particularly Canada, is daily aggressively pushing the sale of strictly top-quality wheat at prices ranging as much as 40 cents to 45 cents under our price, there obviously is little or no chance for trading so long as the buyer has complete freedom of choice in what he purchases.

Frankly, this is a red flag which the industry is waving being extremely fearful, in fact completely convinced, that unless drastic action is taken immediately to permit the moving of wheat into world channels at competitive prices, we are building surpluses that must inevitably create an even worse situation in wheat than now prevails in some of the other commodities.

I wonder if it is not time for the Congress to take cognizance of that fact?

Yours very truly,

ELMER.

FEBRUARY 15, 1950.

Mr. ELMER KRUSE,
Assistant Administrator of Commodity Operations, Production and Marketing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KRUSE: Your absence from Washington last week prevented me from answering your letter of February 3 in person. Mr. Smith, Mr. Borton, Mr. Benidt, and Menzies listened to the presentation of our problems.

We are not only interested in an increase of flour exports by an establishment of a wheat price that will permit us to sell in competition with other exporters; we are also interested in the movement of wheat and flour in quantities that will prevent piling up of a burdensome surplus. You can sell wheat to countries receiving ECA funds and to occupied countries without equalizing the price with other exporting countries. You can sell some wheat and flour at premiums over the prices offered by other exporting countries. You cannot, however, sell our wheat and flour in sufficient volume to prevent piling up a burdensome surplus unless our prices, quality considered, are competitive with the prices offered by other exporting countries.

We are going through a period where Canada is gradually taking the export business away from us and this will continue until they will have the major share of the export volume unless we are able to compete with them in all importing countries. It is very important that the subsidy be widened to cover countries not participating in the international wheat agreement and also to

cover countries who complete their quotas under the international wheat agreement. Now when a country completes its quota, Canada only increases their price from $1.80 to $1.96 or 16 cents a bushel while we have to advance our price 53 cents per bushel to Latin-American countries. We are, therefore, practically excluded from all countries not covered by the international wheat agreement and are excluded from countries who complete their international wheat agreement quotas.

All of this means that Canada will build up their export trade at our expense and we will be eliminated from countries who have been accustomed to buying American flour for generations. Your present handling of export under the international wheat agreement is causing a loss of volume on American flour in all countries. We are just too high in price to compete with Canada and they are making headway in every country.

Your policy of basing your computation of the subsidy on the price you can secure from countries using ECA funds or on the price you can secure from countries that will buy limited quantities of American wheat mixtures that probably are reduced as much as possible by including any cheap wheat available is giving Canada the opportunity to increase their export volume.

This year we were sure of a definite volume of exports to ECA countries and occupied countries and next year this volume will be reduced by the amount ECA funds are reduced and by the amount occupied countries can produce at home. Your own figures indicate an increase in the carry-over that is very alarming and if allowed to continue, we will have a repetition of the situation that existed in the early thirties. Two years ago, the carry-over was 196,000,000 bushels, last year it was 307,000,000 bushels, and we are headed for a carry-over of 385,000,000 bushels this year.

The increase of about 24.8 percent in Canadian exports while our exports decreased 37.8 percent must have some significance. Canadian flour exports decreased about 7.5 percent while our flour exports decreased 73.8 percent. I do not have Canadian official figures, but the above figures are very close to what the official figures will show. The difference of 62.6 percent between our loss in total exports and the Canadian record, and the difference of 66.3 percent in the loss on flour exports surely proves that we are right in worrying about Canada gradually taking over our export volume.

Acreage reduction can take care of part of the loss in exports, but it would take a large acreage reduction to compensate for the loss in volume that we are facing. As long as you maintain a support price away above world price levels, you have to use some method to reduce the high domestic prices to a basis that will permit the export of our wheat and flour. Otherwise, you will pile up surplus stocks that will become very burdensome.

Additional storage space is not the answer because we do not need a carry-over of 350,000,000 to 500,000,000 bushels of wheat. Reducing acreage will not reduce the volume of the crop as far as the acreage is reduced. Farmers will first eliminate marginal land and as long as they can get over $2 per bushel for their wheat, they will do a better job of farming which will mean more bushels per acre. There will be more bushels per acre in good years and more bushels per acre in drought years when good farming will be more noticeable.

We would like to set down a basis that we think would be workable and would stop the loss of the export of American flour to all countries:

1. Broaden the base of the subsidy to include all countries. Base the subsidy, outside of IWA countries, on the world price for wheat which is now Class 2 price for Canadian wheat and is about $0.15 higher than the $1.80 IWA price for No. 1 Manitoba at Fort William.

2. Use realistic quality differentials based on the price that can be secured for No. 1 Hard Winter 10 protein as compared to No. 1 Manitoba 13.50 protein. Base the quality differentials on No. 1 Red and No. 1 Soft on the differentials necessary to move these wheats when there is a surplus. When and if these wheats get in short supply, the differentials, of course, would change.

3. Apply price differentials between ports based on general rates and not on distress cargo rates.

4. Base wheat prices on the cost of round lots of wheat at seaboard and not on the price of single-car lots from areas that can only supply very limited quantities.

5. Base the subsidy on prices that can be secured from countries that are not dependent on ECA funds.

6. Base the subsidy on the price that can be secured for enough wheat and flour to prevent piling up a burdensome surplus.

7. Change the subsidy on market changes each day. Avoid the temptation of staying behind the market on upswings and ahead of the market on downswings. Flour and wheat have to be sold on the market price each day and if we are not on the market, then our competitors from other exporting countries will get the business.

Yours very truly,

M. F. MULROY,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee,
Millers' National Federation.

Grasping at Straws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a little more clear thinking such as is exhibited in the appended editorial from a recent issue of the Vineland Times-Journal, will save us many future headaches and many millions, if not billions of dollars. I am including it for the information of the membership of the House:

GRASPING AT STRAWS

How a large portion of the world's population is mired in ancient thinking is illustrated by a brief news article we spotted over the week end, buried far inside one of the metropolitan newspapers.

Says the headline on this article: "Sweden rearming as a buffer state"—and the article itself contains: "Sweden, standing between Soviet Russia and the Atlantic Pact nations, is building up its small Army, Navy, and Air Force into a strong defense. * * * The Swedish Navy has contracted for the construction of two destroyers at about $16,000,000 each. They will displace 2,350 tons and will have heavier armament than earlier types of Swedish destroyers. * * * The Army is reorganizing its infantry units and giving them several new weapons, including two highly effective antitank guns and a rocket rifle."

In this world of atom and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, supersonic planes, and the other modern creations of man's warped mind, is there any longer such a thing as a buffer state? We don't think so. Scientists have repeatedly warned there is no defense against the super bombs, yet a news story would have us believe that a couple of comparatively small warships, two antitank guns, and a rocket rifle constitute a strong defense. Even if Sweden's current armed force were multiplied tenfold, it could offer about as much resistance to concentrated Soviet might as the average lawn offers to a smoothly functioning power mower.

No criticism of Sweden, particularly, is here intended, for that Scandinavian nation is only a small arc in a circle of folly in which the United States is the largest segment. America, a few days ago, officially began what is known as arms aid to Europe. The cost will be a billion dollars or more this year, with the aim of creating barriers against further Communist expansion. If one Swedish destroyer costs $16,000,000, it stands to reason that a billion or two billion or even five billion dollars doesn't buy very much strength, spread out over 15 European nations. The average businessman understands the meaning of depreciation, and since nothing depreciates quicker than tools of war, it's an easy matter to visualize how this year's billion must be followed by more billions of dollars of American-arms aid in years to come. Today's bomber is obsolete tomorrow. Today's tank is a sitting pigeon tomorrow. Today's radar may be only false security tomorrow.

In attempting to combat communism by feverishly shipping arms to Europe, the United States is only grasping at straws. When we open our hands to see what we grabbed, all we find is a skyrocketing budget—and Russia just as strong and threatening as ever.

A second news story appearing the same day reported how the United States is using far more effective means than armaments to contain communism. Said the second news article:

"Paul G. Hoffman said today that Britain stood to lose $150,000,000 in Marshall-plan aid unless she joined with other European nations in a plan to lower trade barriers."

The United States Economic Cooperation Administration, under Hoffman, has blueprinted a European payments union, which would function as a currency clearing house for all Marshall-plan nations. Backbone of the project is $600,000,000 in Marshall-plan funds allotted exclusively to the currency pool.

In aiding Europe with food, raw materials, and machinery, and by trying to create freer world trade, the United States is employing the only effective means of halting Russian expansion. This aid, plus propaganda beamed on the Voice of America, reaches the people of Europe. Mere arms aid only the junk heaps.

What Chance Has Small Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable consternation and alarm that I read the article, The Federal Snoops Are After Me, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20. The article was placed in the RECORD by our colleague the Honorable PAUL DAGUE, and appears on page A2029.

A careful reading of the article, which I commend to the attention of all my colleagues, will indicate the extent to

which misguided zealots in the Federal agencies are going to hamper, hinder, and hamstring the small-business men of this country. The Federal statutes are being so badly misinterpreted in so many instances that I wonder how any free young American citizen has the courage to start out building up a business of his own.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if incidents such as those described in the article are occurring in my district—or yours—or any of the other congressional districts in the United States. If they are, I feel that they should be promptly reported and investigated by the Congress. If the bureaucrats are wrong, let us fire them. If the laws are wrong, let us change them.

Acheson Walks Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks our distinguished Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, has been subjected to a serious attack by Senator McCARTHY. I feel at this time that I must speak out in Secretary Acheson's defense. Senator McCARTHY has had ample opportunity to present to the Senate committee evidence of Communistic activities within the State Department, if any exists, and it has become very apparent that he is unable to produce this evidence.

The attack upon Dean G. Acheson and the Department of State seriously affects the entire Nation and this Government. I think the article by Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Acheson Walks Alone," presents a very clear statement of the situation, and I commend this article to the House of Representatives.

The article is as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION—ACHESON WALKS ALONE

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—On January 25, over 6 weeks ago, Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States, made his much-discussed declaration that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss.

On February 28, 2 weeks ago, Mr. Acheson, in response to urgings from Democrats in the Senate and House of Representatives, explained that his action was not intended to condone any of the deeds of which Alger Hiss was accused and convicted.

But not once in these past 6 weeks has any Democrat in the House or Senate got up on his feet in the Halls of Congress and defended vigorously or prominently the man who holds the highest post in the Cabinet of the United States against the attacks which have continued to come from Republicans against Mr. Acheson's personal position on the Hiss case.

Nor has any Democrat stood up in either Chamber of the Congress and defended the Secretary of State against the implied attacks on him and his policies which are involved in the McCarthy charges of alleged disloyalty cases in the State Department.

Diplomats from overseas watch this proceeding with amazement and bewilderment. They do not understand what it means. Here is the second highest official in the executive branch of the Government—the man who stands next under the President himself. Daily, for weeks, he and his policies have been the target of direct and indirect political attack. Yet the leaders of his own party in the Congress behave just as though he and his policies had nothing to do with them or their party.

This is a condition which no foreign diplomat in Washington can understand in terms of his own homeland. Such diplomats come from one of two kinds of countries—a dictatorship or a parliamentary democracy. In either case this condition would be impossible. Under a dictatorship such an attack on the foreign minister and his policies would be an attack on the dictator, and, therefore inconceivable. In a parliamentary democracy it would be an attack on a leader of the party in power who could be defended by himself in person in the parliament and by all of his colleagues. The whole party would have to stand or fall with the foreign minister.

The situation is already dangerous. No foreign government can possibly know whether Mr. Acheson does actually represent the foreign policy of the party in power. They hesitate to do business with him. They question the permanence of policies which are daily attacked and daily left undefended. It is not overstating the case one iota to say that today the foreign policies of the United States are crippled and ineffective. The State Department is not able to function effectively as a foreign office. It will not be able to function as a foreign office unless or until one of two things happens: either Mr. Truman finds himself a new Secretary of State who will be defended in the Congress by his own partisans against all attack, or Mr. Truman succeeds in obtaining a vote of some kind which would amount to an expression of congressional confidence in Mr. Acheson.

This situation also raises a most serious question—whether any man can function effectively as Secretary of State who is not a political figure in his own right. There are three men in the Cabinet who have political strength in their own right—Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; J. Howard McGrath, attorney general, and Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor. These men are frequently attacked, but they are also always defended. They are defended because they are in politics and have political friends and associates.

Mr. Acheson is a Democrat, but not a politician. He took office as a diplomatic craftsman to Mr. Truman. He has no power to defend himself politically nor to claim defenders in the Congress. If he is to be defended, Mr. Truman must either do it, or arrange for it to be done.

If Mr. Acheson were the diplomatic craftsman of the Department serving under a political Secretary of State the story would be quite different. No politician ever dared attack Cordell Hull or any of his assistants as they now attack Mr. Acheson and his. They never attacked James F. Byrnes as they now attack Mr. Acheson, although the big house cleaning of "security risks" has taken place since Mr. Byrnes left the State Department. A Secretary of State without a political shield is helpless in such a situation as this. It seems axiomatic that Mr. Truman must either be a shield for Mr. Acheson, or find a Secretary of State with the political power to shield himself.

McCloy Must Now Carry Out Nuremberg Sentences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, further delay in the execution of the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts on the top Nazi war criminals will completely destroy any faith the world may still have in American justice. We will be subject to the derision and contempt of all people who remember well the crimes against humanity committed by these Nazi fiends.

Believing that action should be taken at once, I wrote John J. McCloy, the United States High Commissioner for Germany, on February 1, urging that he carry out the sentences immediately. I received a reply from him dated March 7, in which he gave his excuses for the delay. Upon investigation, I found that, on March 9, official notification was sent by the State Department to Commissioner McCloy informing him that he, as High Commissioner, has complete and absolute authority to execute the death sentences. I am accordingly writing Mr. McCloy today pointing out that it is his duty to obey the mandate given him forthwith. I am inserting in the RECORD copies of our correspondence, so that my colleagues may know of the action I have taken.

We must stop coddling these Nazi criminals; we must countenance no further clever delays; we must insist that Commissioner McCloy fulfill the trust placed in him and rid the world of these death-dealing Nazis. I repeat what Telford Taylor, the Army prosecutor at Nuremberg, said:

> We have shown these Nazis far greater mercy than any convicted American murderer ever enjoyed. It is time they were hanged.

The letters follow:

MARCH 7, 1950.

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOLLINGER: This will acknowledge your letter of February 1, 1950, concerning the execution of the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts. I have read the excerpt, which you enclosed, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1950, containing an article by John Hohenberg.

In addition to the 16 prisoners sentenced at Nuremberg who are the responsibility of the United States High Commissioner for Germany, acting under the Department of State, there are a number of prisoners who were also sentenced to death for war crimes by military commissions, acting under the authority of the military commander at Dachau. Execution of these latter sentences is the responsibility of the Department of the Army.

Congressional inquiries concerning the sentences awarded by war-criminal tribunals, particularly those of the military

commission referred to above, resulted in a stay of execution of all capital sentences pending the results of investigation of the trials by committees of Congress. Although congressional interest centered in the trials conducted by the military commissions, it was not thought desirable to carry out any death sentences imposed for war crimes by courts for which the United States Government is responsible in Germany, whether at Nuremberg or under the jurisdiction of the Army, at a time when Congress was actively investigating the propriety and validity of the proceedings in any of these cases. Accordingly, both the Department of the Army and the Department of State joined in issuing a stay of execution of all capital sentences.

An additional reason justifying the stay was the impropriety of executing the sentences at a time when petitions were pending for review of decisions of the Nuremberg courts by the Supreme Court of the United States.

At such time as I receive notification that the stay of execution of these sentences has been lifted, I will take such action as is appropriate in the light of the circumstances surrounding each individual case. I am fully aware of the enormity of the crimes for which certain of the defendants at Nuremberg were tried and found guilty. Full consideration will be given to the nature of these crimes in any determination which I am called upon to make as to whether the death sentences will be carried out.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany.

MARCH 23, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner for Germany, Frankfurt, Germany.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 7 is before me, explaining your reasons for the delay in execution of the death sentences imposed upon Nazi war criminals by the Nuremberg courts.

I am informed that on March 9 official notification was sent you by the State Department, that you, as High Commissioner for Germany, have complete and absolute authority to execute the death sentences imposed by the Nuremberg courts. The responsibility is now fixed, and rests upon you.

Any further delay on your part will be not only unconscionable, but a violation of your duty, and a betrayal of justice.

In accordance with our democratic principles, the condemned prisoners have had every opportunity to protect their legal rights. They failed to demonstrate their innocence in the Nuremberg court; appeals to the United States Supreme Court have been denied—the Court refusing to review the verdict of the international tribunal. Proceedings brought in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, the Court of Appeals, have had the same negative results. Congressional investigations have long since been completed—and after months of delays, court actions brought to stall the carrying out of just punishment, and extensive hearings, not one sentence has been changed, and these death-dealing Nazi criminals stand guilty as ever.

I quote Telford Taylor, the Army prosecutor who fought the case before the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg: "We have shown these Nazis far greater mercy than any convicted American murderer ever enjoyed. It is time they were hanged."

We know, Mr. Commissioner, that the condemned, or persons in their behalf, can keep trying to delay execution by filing writ after writ in our courts. The time has come when you must ignore such futile attempts at delay—every legal avenue has now been closed to such petitioners. If you continue to delay, these men will still be alive many years from now, should you permit the filing of these useless petitions in our courts to take precedence over the mandate given you.

Our coddling and petting of the worst war criminals in history is losing us the respect of the world. Former top Nazis take it as evidence that "all is forgiven" and grow bolder in their efforts to push their way to the top spots in industry and government in Germany. Our entire denazification program has floundered—and we are fast losing our reputation as a Nation which keeps its commitments and covenants, and has the courage to carry out its decrees.

By speedily executing the sentences imposed at Nuremberg, you can help our Nation regain some of its lost prestige. Justice, American justice, will again be respected, and not looked upon with derision and contempt.

You have a duty to perform. Let it be done forthwith, for there are now no justifiable excuses for delay.

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
Member of Congress.

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the New England section of the Society of American Foresters relative to that part of the Hoover Commission recommendations which deals with the grouping of all major land functions dealing with soil, forests and grazing, including upstream water management, in the Department of Agriculture:

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (popularly known as the Hoover Commission), a nonpartisan body of 12 top-ranking men, gave expert and thorough study to Government structure and functions, and concluded that there has been and is now, wasteful overlapping and duplication in certain conservation, forest, range, and allied functions in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior; and

Whereas the Commission's task forces which studied these phases of Government administration, all recommended the consolidation of these activities and services as has been urged by students of government for many years; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission itself, as did its task force on Agriculture and task force on Public Works, believes it is logical and the best public policy to require that major land functions dealing with soil, forests and grazing, including upstream water management, be grouped in the Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas this New England section, Society of American Foresters, is intensely interested in forestry and forest research, and recognizes that 75 percent of the commercial timber-growing land lies east of the Great Plains and largely in private ownership; that 50 percent of all commercial forest land is in farm woodlots and intermingling small forest holdings; that these lands, when properly managed, yield a harvest as regular and dependable as any other crop; that forest and range activities are based on the biological sciences which have been historically the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New England section, Society of American Foresters, at its thirtieth annual winter meeting held in Boston February 23–24, 1950, urges the adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations that forest and range land activities be retained in the Department of Agriculture, and that similar functions of the Department of the Interior, particularly those concerned with administering crop-producing lands of the public domain and the Oregon and California revested lands, be transferred to the Department of Agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the executive council, Society of American Foresters, requesting that similar action be taken in behalf of the society at the earliest possible date, and that copies of this section and parent society resolutions be sent to Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman, Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, 15 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; to Fred Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, Washington, D. C.; the members of the congressional delegations of the New England States, and to members of congressional committees concerned.

Low-Income People Pay the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, when the day comes that the millions of Americans whose earnings are too low to pay much, if any, direct taxes, come to realize that by a clever system of hidden taxes it is they that are really paying for the extravagant cost of government, then, and only then, will we stop this incredible Washington waste.

I know of nothing more important than to give the people the truth on how they are being victimized. "Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

With the consent of the House, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent public statement that I made on this subject. I intend doing everything I can to make every man and woman in my district aware of this tax trickery. The statement follows:

WASHINGTON.—"If more Americans realized how much they pay in taxes—direct and hidden—each year, their clamor would force real economy in government," Congressman T. MILLET HAND (Republican, New Jersey) declared today in commenting on a tax study recently released by the American Taxpayers' Association, of Washington.

"Much spending at all levels of government has been permitted simply because too many people feel that they don't pay taxes because they do not own their own homes or make sufficient income to put them in the income-tax brackets," HAND said.

"This is the greatest fallacy of modern times. There isn't an item that any of us buy that isn't loaded to the hilt with hidden taxes. You don't have to be in the income-tax brackets or own a home to be a direct taxpayer. Every time you pay a nickel for a newspaper, every time you buy a loaf of bread, you are paying high taxes, pyramided through every level of government.

"The old saying about death and taxes was never more true than it is today, and whether you know it or not, you're helping to pay for all the multi-billion-dollar spending schemes that government in all levels concocts," Congressman HAND declared.

Citing the recent study of the American Taxpayers' Association, HAND said that actual case studies of people earning $960, $1,800, and $2,400 a year were made, and that itemized accounts showed that a man earning $960 a year paid $123.08 annually in hidden taxes; a man earning $1,800 paid $243; and a man with a $2,400 income paid $314.76 in taxes.

The hidden taxes were included in rent, excise taxes, licenses, import duties, and taxes included in freight costs.

The association traced various things everyone buys from the first step to the point of sale. It found 78 different taxes on a quart of milk, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, 100 taxes on an egg, 125 taxes on a woman's cotton dress, 118 taxes on a man's suit of clothes, 154 taxes on a cake of soap, 201 taxes on a gallon of gasoline.

"The study showed that hidden taxes take $10 on every $30 of rent, nearly $7 a year on every telephone, one-third of all normal day-to-day living expenses," Congressman HAND continued.

"On a cotton dress costing $7.85 it was found there were $2.20 in hidden taxes, 206 taxes on a new automobile amounting to from $355 to $466 on an automobile that costs $1,600 to $2,000. One tax study was done on a woman's hat, and it was found that it carried 65 Federal taxes, 43 State taxes, and 41 local taxes.

"Until the majority of Americans fully realize the huge slice that taxes take from their annual incomes, until they realize that no one escapes hidden taxes, there can be but little hope for genuine economy in government. It is too easy to hide taxes on the things everyone buys in order to give the public all the services and things that so many people think they get for nothing from the Government.

"Surveys have shown that, if all the money of the wealthy were confiscated, it would operate the National Government for only 31 days, which shows clearly that it is the average man and the low-income groups that pay the bulk of the tax bill," the Congressman said.

"Not until people generally become truly tax conscious will there be sufficient pressure to effect substantial Government economies," he predicted.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh.

STATEMENT FROM THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

The forests, fields, and streams of North Carolina are capable of producing enough wildlife to supply the recreational desires of every citizen. Nature, if assisted by man, will repopulate areas where wild living creatures once abounded but which are now in a depleted state.

Coming at a season of the year when there is evidence of renewed life on every hand, North Carolina Wildlife Restoration Week and National Wildlife Restoration Week present a challenge for every citizen to actively participate in some constructive measure which will assist our wildlife in regaining its former population. This, of course, offers opportunities for men, women, and children to use a portion of their time and energy in making plantings which will provide food, shelter, and a nesting place where wild animals can reproduce and prosper.

The interest of sportsmen, women's clubs, and all nature lovers in conservation has been encouraging and should be an inspiration to others for furthering the principles of proper management and wise use of this natural resource. It is a pleasure, therefore, to call attention to the period of March 19 through March 25, 1950, as Restoration Week for Wildlife in our State and Nation and to urge that these days be appropriately observed by planting suitable areas for wildlife, and through group and community programs stressing the value and importance of this natural resource. School officials and teachers, together with their pupils, may profitably devote a measure of their time and study to wildlife restoration problems.

The Need for Total Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, more than at any previous time in our Nation's history, the United States is called upon to play a prominent and decisive role in the determination of international affairs. The condition of the world is in a very critical stage, and upon our foreign policy may depend the future, even the survival, of the entire western civilization.

In crucial times like these, it is imperative that the free nations of the world pursue a forthright and determined course. Being fully cognizant of the demands of our times, the United States has formed and adopted a sound and constant foreign policy, a policy difficult to pursue because it not only requires patience, steady nerves, and persistent effort, but because, above all, it is based in its entirety upon the confidence, support, and attitude of the American people.

Our foreign policy, endeavoring to effect world peace, is exposed to persistent and unrelenting pressure from outside sources, whose aims are contradictory to those that we intend to realize. In order that it may not waver and crumble under this pressure, it needs the wholehearted backing of every American.

It is, indeed, tragic, therefore, that, for political and other unknown reasons, our foreign policy is also being subjected to internal pressure, instigated by persons who perhaps do not realize the irreparable harm that their actions are causing. Through untimely and indiscriminate accusations hurled at responsible leaders of our foreign policy, they, perhaps unwittingly, undermine that basic confidence which the American people must place in our foreign policy.

The following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 17 casts a timely light upon the gravity of today's crucial state of affairs, and for that reason I believe that it merits serious and sincere consideration of all the Members of this body:

WHAT THE UNITED STATES IS TRYING TO DO

The United States has a definite foreign policy. It is a sound one. Its ultimate aim is to bring world peace. But this does not mean peace at any price. The United States policy is difficult to pursue, because it requires patience, steady nerves, persistent effort.

Most of all, it needs the understanding and support of the American people.

This was the message of Secretary of State Acheson in his major foreign-policy speech at Berkeley, Calif., on Thursday.

This address was directed to the people of this country, even more than to the overseas world. Mr. Acheson was speaking to the "grass roots" of the Nation.

There has been some confusion in recent months about American foreign policy, more at home than abroad. There are many reasons for this. Americans have a long tradition of disinterest in foreign affairs; foreign policy has been a distant and mysterious thing to be dealt with by the President and the Secretary of State.

More serious elements of confusion have entered the picture of late. Worried Americans, disturbed deeply at the horrible possibilities of atomic warfare, unacquainted with the over-all aims of our foreign policy, have advanced demands for disarmament conferences, new peace meetings, high-level conferences with the Russians.

The State Department and its personnel have been under fire on various grounds. Men who should be first in line to support the Nation's strong policy against communism have been weakening the Department's position by continual assaults on the basis of personalities and details.

Senator MCCARTHY'S wild and wholesale charges, as yet unproved, that there are Communists in the State Department, exemplify these tactics—tactics which, in many cases, have resulted in furthering the Communist policy of creating confusion.

As a result of this disturbing situation—one that weakens our international efforts—Secretary Acheson has felt it necessary to "go to the people" in an effort to turn their eyes and minds back to the important things and away from irrelevancies.

He is telling the American people what they must realize unless all is to be lost—that they are the center of opposition to world communism and, as such, are going to be under unrelenting pressure for a long time. He is telling them that agreement with Russia will be reached only after we have built up "situations of strength" which the Russians will respect.

He is telling the American people that in this crisis period of "total diplomacy" they must be steady and patient and must always know the goals ahead. The people must, in fact, realize that they themselves are the greatest "situation of strength" in the free world and that if they falter the democratic world will quickly be submerged.

Mr. Acheson explains, as he has before, that this country is always ready to discuss, to negotiate, to agree with the Russians. We ask only that they agree to the simplest proposals (he listed seven) to lessen world tensions. We ask that they meet us in good faith and that they carry out agreements made.

Mr. Acheson says frankly that he does not think the Russians will bargain in such good faith at this time and expresses hope that if

this country holds to its present policies the time will eventually come when the Russians will be willing to do so. In the meantime, he says, this country does not intend to play any role of "international sucker."

Mr. Acheson is indeed wise to bring his story to the people in language that all can understand. Perhaps it would have been wise to do so before this. The time is past when our foreign policy can be conducted from the mountaintop. Today it must be based firmly in the people—understood by them and supported by them.

We have the utmost confidence that the American people, once they understand completely the policy that we are following in world affairs, will give it their utmost backing. We believe that they have the courage and moral stamina to hold to that course, whatever may be the machinations of our foreign enemies—or the unfortunate undermining policies of peanut politicians at home.

In further reflection upon the irreparable damage caused our foreign policy and the persons responsible for its conduct by the indiscriminate accusations cast upon them, I wish to add at this point another editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 21, which, I believe, needs no additional comment:

THE DAMAGE MCCARTHY IS DOING

Ambassador Philip C. Jessup flew back from halfway round the world to answer Senator MCCARTHY's charges that he had an "affinity" for communism. It seems to us that Mr. Jessup proved the falsity of the charges pretty conclusively in his testimony before the Tydings investigating committee.

The Ambassador did not need the enthusiastic letters of confidence that he presented from two outstanding Americans, Gen. George C. Marshall and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose loyalty has not thus far been questioned by Wisconsin's junior Senator.

The damage done by the McCarthy charges will not be corrected this simply, however. Throughout the world, the name of Ambassador Jessup has been clouded with suspicion. As he explained, declarations he made for this country while in the Far East will undoubtedly now be questioned. "It is impossible," he declared, "for anyone to estimate the harmful effect that the McCarthy innuendoes have had on the success of my mission and the foreign policy of the country."

In this connection, it must be remembered that Ambassador Jessup is but one individual named by MCCARTHY. The Senator has cast a cloud of suspicion over all of the thousands of State Department employees. He started his present campaign by saying that there were 205 "security risks" in the Department. He then revised this to 57 card-carrying Communists. Later, on the Senate floor, he charged that there were 81 "unsafe" employees in the Department. He has had a month to prove these charges and, to date, has offered no convincing evidence in even one case.

All over the world, the representatives of this country are under this cloud of doubt.

Wisconsin's junior Senator has harmed a number of individuals and this alone is a serious matter. But even more serious is the damage he has done, with his irresponsible and sweeping charges, to the State Department, its morale and its influence the world over. This strikes at the very heart of this country's position and its strength in the world.

It will take a long time to repair the damage that Senator MCCARTHY has done. At a time when our international situation is so grave, the burden on the Senator's conscience should be a heavy one—no matter what, if any evidence of communism in the State Department he still may eventually bring to light.

Resolutions Adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association at Its Annual Meeting, Topeka, Kans., March 16, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Livestock Association is a State-wide organization which speaks with authority for the livestock producers of the State. I am sure that the resolutions adopted at its recent annual meeting accurately express the views of its members. Because I believe these resolutions are of interest to the Members of Congress, I include the same herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

RESOLUTIONS

HOLDING TO FREEDOM

There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen, of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country, without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people, is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept, contemptible to freedom, the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable: the growing power and expansion of a wasteful Government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people; the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc., and by innumerable other false expedients—to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity, and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and numerous other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of prosperity is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear, and dire forebodings.

The course our Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Kansas Live Stock Association, in convention assembled at Topeka, Kan., March 16, 1950, deplore the fallacious policies that are beguiling our country into socialism, that we censure and condemn those in public office who support or tolerate these policies and that we call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them and to work energetically and courageously for the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and the restoration of the Republic.

Our decision to take this stand is supported by the firm conviction that the policies we here and now condemn are unrighteous and immoral in that they proceed in shameful denial of the inherent nature of man and in impious contempt of nature's eternal laws.

BRANNAN PLAN

Whereas the farm program proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan to the Eighty-first Congress would promote low market prices for all agricultural products, would subsidize consumers, rich and poor alike, and would eventually necessitate Federal control of all agriculture; and

Whereas the livestock industry cannot be successfully operated by governmental bureau: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to the proposed program. We consider it unsound economically and entirely impractical, and we urge Congress to reject it.

DAMS

This association objects to further Federal appropriations to inundate good productive Kansas land by the construction of outsized and unneeded dams until it is proven that soil-conservation methods are ineffective in flood control.

GREAT ATLANTIC & PACIFIC TEA CO.

The Kansas Livestock Association wishes to emphasize its interest in the efficient distribution of beef through retail channels. We oppose action by the Department of Justice against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. as contrary to the intent and purpose of the antitrust laws of the United States. Such unwarranted action against the A. & P., other chain organizations, or independent merchants could seriously hamper efficient retail distribution of beef and be detrimental to the common good.

TAXES

That this association sponsor a program of education to demonstrate the disproportionate share of personal property and ad valorem taxes paid by the farmers and stockmen of this State.

FREIGHT RATES

This association wishes to commend the stand taken by the Kansas Corporation Commission in resisting the efforts of the ICC to increase the intrastate livestock freight rates, and urge the corporation commission to continue the fight to prevent further Federal encroachment on rights of the people of this State.

FREIGHT-IN-TRANSIT RATE

The railroads have reduced the cattle feeding in transit charge to $7 per car, but tariff routes are so restricted that the privilege is impractical for many feeders or pasture men.

Railroads should liberalize the tariff routes so as to protect the through rate from point of origin to ultimate destination via the feed-in-transit point.

SLAUGHTER-IN-TRANSIT RATES

To facilitate more economical distribution of meat products to the large consuming centers from the vast producing areas, the railroads should recognize the fact that rail shipments of livestock into the slaughtering center is an integral part of the out-bound rail meat shipment.

We recommend the railroad publish slaughter-in-transit rates in lieu of the present system of assessing local rates on livestock into the slaughtering center plus the local rate on meat products to the consuming center.

BEEF GRADING

In the interest of better utilizing the present grade classifications used in grading beef, and a better distribution of our beef within those grades, and with more descriptive

names for the lower grades of beef, the following recommendations are made:

That a substantial percentage of present top Choice be graded in Prime; a corresponding percentage of top Good be graded Choice; and that good-quality beef which is now being graded Commercial be graded Good. As the grades Commercial and Utility have no appeal to the consuming public, we urge that these two grade names be changed to descriptive words that would help the consumer recognize the type of beef that would indicate value and economy.

We also recommend that useful beef produced on rations of grass and grain which has a yellow cast be graded according to its merit and not discounted on account of color.

TRUCK TRANSPORTATION

Whereas there is a definite variation in laws and rules governing the regulation of truck transportation in the several States surrounding Kansas; and

Whereas such lack of uniformity is not to the best interests of the shippers of commodities by truck: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the laws and regulations affecting truck transportation be so unified with those of surrounding States as to provide free and economical movement of commodities by truck between the several States.

TRUCK TRANSPORTATION

Whereas the laws governing truck transportation of commodities in the State of Kansas are an accumulation of statutes passed over many years and are therefore not well coordinated; and

Whereas the State has embarked upon a comprehensive highway program, the success of which may be damaged by overweight and overlength vehicles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the legislative council and the legislative committee of the Kansas Livestock Association should institute a thorough investigation to assure that the statutes will be revised to insure a full protection of the interests of the shipper of commodities, particularly of livestock, and to insure that our tremendous investment in highways will not be jeopardized.

PREDATORY ANIMALS

Whereas the loss to livestock interests from predatory animals is on the increase; and

Whereas the poison known as formula 1080 is effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the use of poison 1080 be permitted any place in the State of Kansas where approved by the Predatory Animal Division of the United States Biological Survey, Department of the Interior, and requested by the majority of land occupiers in the area.

GOVERNMENTAL REPORTS

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture be urged to publish monthly statistical reports on matters pertinent to the livestock industry and that daily market reports be continued and expanded at all principal commodity markets.

LEGISLATION

That the legislative committee of the Kansas Livestock Association be commended for its vigilance in supporting legislation in the best interest of the livestock industry and that it be urged to continue its efforts in this direction.

DR. A. D. WEBER

Among those persons now being considered for the presidency of Kansas State College is Dr. A. D. Weber, associate dean of the School of Agriculture.

Stockmen and farmers throughout the State of Kansas know from personal experience that "Dad" Weber is a scientist, an administrator, and an educator, who with language that every farmer and student understands has pointed the way to practical application of progressive research to the agricultural industry. He has been recognized for his accomplishments both nationally and internationally, bringing honor to his State, his school, and himself.

We know that Dr. Weber, a native of Kansas, a product of Kansas State College, can bring to the entire college of agriculture and applied science the outstanding leadership he has demonstrated in the field of agriculture.

It is the sincere hope of this association that Dr. A. D. Weber be the next president of Kansas State College.

APPRECIATION

Whereas our president, vice president, and directors of the association have spent much time and effort in the interests of our association, without compensation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we extend to each of them our sincere thanks and appreciation for their efforts in our behalf; and

Whereas the office force has been untiring in its efforts to further the interests of our association: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we extend to them our thanks and appreciation for their loyalty and devotion to their work.

We wish to thank the city of Topeka, Mayor Frank Warren, and other officials for their hearty welcome and willing asistance; to John Morrell & Co., Manager R. M. Owthwaite for the courtesy dinner for our executive committeemen, officers, and friends; to the three national banks of Topeka—the Central National Bank, the Merchants National Bank, and National Bank of Topeka, for the courtesy breakfast to convention visitors; and to the Producers Commission Association for the courtesy breakfast served Wednesday morning, the fifteenth.

We also wish to express our thanks and appreciation to each of those who contributed so much to our program in their talks and discussion, and who gave so generously of their time and efforts to be with us and to help make our thirty-seventh annual convention the success it proved to be.

Also, we wish to thank the Topeka Chamber of Commerce, Mr. John Miller, the Agricultural Commissioner; the Topeka Daily Capital, the Topeka State Journal for the publicity given our convention; and the Capper Publications for sponsoring our dance.

Respectfully submitted.

Richard Robbins, Pratt, Chairman; George Andrews, Kanopolis; Herb Barr, Leoti; J. W. Birney, Bucklin; W. J. Brown, Fall River; C. O. Heidebrecht, Inman; Dan Jackson, Coldwater; Earl Kiehlborn, Cambridge; O. W. Lynam, Burdett; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Wayne Rogler, Matfield Green; Conlee Smith, Wichita, Resolutions Committee.

Harbor Projects Are Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the construction of coastal harbors long has been recognized as one of the basic obligations of our Government toward its people. The continued development of such harbors along the north coast of California is vital to the fishing industry of our State. Such a need is explained admirably in an editorial which appears in the Press Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., for March 15, 1950. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this editorial:

HARBOR PROJECTS WOULD SPEED EMPIRE'S PROGRESS

Since he came to this region about a year ago Col. F. S. Tandy, district engineer of the Corps of Army Engineers, has covered thousands of miles studying the Redwood Empire at first hand and has become well acquainted with its major needs.

Thus, his keen interest in a proposed string of shallow-draft harbors along the north coast indicates their importance to the future development of the empire.

Surveys of harbor sites have been authorized by Congress, and the Army engineers are rushing the surveys ahead at full speed. One result of the harbors would be to open up new fishing grounds, stimulating both commercial and sports fishing.

This is the problem Bodega Bay fishermen, for instance, face at the present time:

Their best fishing grounds lie between the Russian River's mouth and Fort Ross, 19 nautical miles north of Bodega Bay. Good fishing continues northward from Fort Ross.

But to reach Fort Ross from Bodega Bay requires between 3 and 4 hours. Then, at the end of the day, fishermen generally must return to Bodega Bay, losing 6 to 8 hours just in getting to their destination and back.

The daily round trip is made necessary because boats can't enter the mouth of the Russian River, and Fort Ross Cove offers no protection from off-shore winds which prevail during warm months. Furthermore, dangerous rocks ring the cove. A fishing boat can anchor overnight only at serious risk.

The proposed harbors project would clear the rocks from Fort Ross Cove and throw up a protective jetty against off-shore winds. It would also make the mouth of the Russian River an important recreational harbor and harbor of refuge for commercial and sports craft.

Fishermen would be able to fish the waters off northern Sonoma County for weeks at a time, returning each night to Fort Ross Cove to unload the day's catch onto trucks, which would carry the fish to market or to processing plants.

If the projects are approved by the district engineer's office, they will go to the division engineer and then to the Chief of Engineers for final recommendation to Congress.

The many benefits offered by the harbors make their approval by Congress and the authorization of funds to construct them a high-priority goal for the Redwood Empire.

Congratulations, President Benjamin G. Browdy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1950, I called the attention of this House to the untimely passing of Daniel Frisch the day before. In addition to the tremendous void created by his

death to American public life, the office he held as president of the Zionist Organization of America also became vacant.

We are grateful to providence that the next in command of the Zionist Organization of America was Benjamin G. Browdy, who, during Mr. Frisch's absence from the country and during his illness, performed so ably in his place. On March 19, 1950, the national administrative council of the organization met in special session and unanimously elected Mr. Browdy as president.

Mr. Browdy is not only one of my neighbors, but one of my dear and intimate friends. He has long been an outstanding leader in every worth-while community endeavor. His leadership and abilities are of an extremely high order.

Mr. Browdy, who is also president of the Palestine Foundation Fund, in accepting the presidency of the Zionist Organization of America, pledged himself to support the programs and policies of his predecessor in order to continue to maintain unity in the Zionism movement. His intent to carry on in that way was confirmed by his statement that he would look for advice and guidance to such great leaders in the Zionist organization as Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council; Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, former chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency; and Dr. Emanuel Neumann, former president of the Zionist Organization of America.

The affairs of the Zionist Organization of America are in good hands. Under the leadership of its new president it will go forward to new and greater accomplishments.

Your Job Is Being Sold Wholesale by the Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make further reference to the seriousness of the one-way trade system established by the State Department with the blessing and connivance of a Democratic Congress. We now find that groups of employees are banding together in an effort to stem the flood of imports from slave-labor countries which deprive American workers of employment. Prominent in this movement is Matthew Woll, of the American Federation of Labor, who is alert to the dangers of indiscriminate trade policies. A disproportionate share of the burden is being borne by workers and management of a few industries. Many are facing complete disruption through lessening of their markets. Nothing could be more nonsensical than the advice of free-traders to seek other means of livelihood and to completely abandon American markets in rubber footwear, hats, pottery, watches, and many other lines of endeavor. Complete communities oftentimes depend upon one industry for their survival. Prominent examples in Connecticut are the United States Rubber footwear plant in Naugatuck, which employs more than 3,000 in a town of approximately 18,000 population, and the city of Danbury, which depends largely upon hat manufacturing for the support of its citizens. This problem is real and pressing to our people, and will not be solved by the fallacious and unreasoning policy of granting further trade concessions to foreign countries. I might paraphrase the famous statement of Winston Churchill and say that I did not come to Congress for the purpose of liquidating the jobs of the people residing in Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District. Furthermore, I refuse to stand idly by and watch a Democratic administration pursue this policy of industrial destruction.

I cite as example of the awareness of the results of such a program a resolution forwarded me by the Beacon Falls (Conn.) Republican Town Committee and a news story from the Wednesday, March 22 issue of the Bridgeport Post:

Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: At a meeting of the Republican Town Committee of the town of Beacon Falls held Thursday, March 16, it was unanimously voted to write to our Senators and Congressmen asking them to exert their efforts pertaining to tariff changes that will vitally affect and curtail the rubber and canvas footwear industry in which our town is economically interested.

Many of our townspeople earn their livelihood in this industry and tariff changes that are being considered will cause unemployment by allowing similar types of footwear made in foreign countries at very low rates to undersell items made in this country.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to call upon us for further information if necessary. Thanking you for anything that you can do for us, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
BEACON FALLS (CONN.) REPUBLICAN TOWN COMMITTEE,
F. G. MORGAN, *Secretary.*

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of March 22, 1950]

CZECH IMPORTS HIT HAT CITIES, TARIFF URGED—SLAVE LABOR THREATENS TO MAKE DANBURY GHOST TOWN, AFL CHARGES—PROTEST PLANNED—IMPORTS UP 300 PERCENT FROM BEHIND IRON CURTAIN SINCE WAR

Iron curtain slave labor is threatening to reduce the hat manufacturing city of Danbury to a ghost town, it was charged by an AFL spokesman in Washington today.

With 62 percent of its employment depending on the hat industry and allied trades, the city is being crippled by a wave of imports from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia, it was charged by Marx Lewis, general secretary of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union.

Citing Danbury as an example, Lewis said the American hat worker cannot compete with slave labor and survive. He was in Washington as a member of the executive committee of the National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policy.

Labor and management have combined in a demand for tariff walls against foreign imports of long felts for women's millinery which increased 300 percent in 1949.

In Norwalk, where the hat trade is also the largest single industry, Thomas J. Wall, president of the Norwalk Hat Co., asserted that the Czech imports were the largest in 1949 for any single year in more than 15 years and were affecting industry in an alarming manner.

Mr. Wall protested sending good American dollars behind the iron curtain to compete with our workers.

It could not be determined immediately how seriously Czech imports had hit employment in Norwalk, but in Danbury short work schedules were in effect in several plants during an ordinarily busy season.

The American market has been flooded with long felts—now used in women's millinery—from overseas, with many manufacturers finding themselves overstocked with domestic material of short felt type, it was said.

In Washington, the labor-management committee, representing nearly a score of industries which feel they are being unfairly affected by foreign imports, met in closed session to discuss the problems raised by America's foreign-trade policy.

Representing the hat industry with Mr. Lewis is David Harshaw, president of the Hat Institute, Inc., and president of the John B. Stetson Co., whose main plant is in Philadelphia.

"The position of the hat industry," Mr. Lewis said, "is similar to that of the other industries represented in the National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policies. It's this," he said:

"A billion dollars' worth of imports won't seriously affect the American economy. But if only a few industries, and especially smaller industries, are made to assume a disproportionate share of the burden caused by such imports, then the situation can be ruinous."

He said it is planned to present the hat industry's problem to a House labor subcommittee set up to study the effect imports are having on American labor and employment.

"Meanwhile," he said, "the United States Tariff Commission is conducting a preliminary survey of the hat industry's problems.

"If that survey shows what we are certain it will show, we shall demand a thoroughgoing investigation," he said.

"It has been suggested by some Government spokesmen that hat workers and others similarly affected try training for other types of work," Mr. Lewis said, and added:

"It won't work. Hat workers have been in the industry too long to be retrained for other work."

National Negro Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the vigor and enlightenment of the Negro press is well exemplified by the appended editorial from the New York Amsterdam News of March 4, 1950, on the event of National Negro Newspaper Week. It is

the most eloquent testimony of the reliance by Negroes upon the validity of our constitutional process, and the sense of justice and fair play of the American people that they are placing their greatest efforts behind the winning of public support through disclosure of the facts and discussion of their implications, the particular function of newspapers.

The editorial is as follows:

OUR MAJOR CHALLENGE

This year's observance of National Negro Newspaper Week, February 26 to March 4, marks the one hundred twenty-third anniversary of the founding of the Negro press by John Brown Russwurm. Newspapers founded, published, and edited by Negroes more than 100 years ago, served similar purposes in their time as the minority newspapers do today. They were and are largely organs of protest, watchdogs of civil and citizenship rights, and reporters of life and activities of their communities. Each Negro newspaper has had to meet the challenge of its own era and attempt to solve the problems of its own time, region, and needs.

The history and service of the Negro press, like those of other institutions, are praised by some and blamed by others. But it is not easy to find another institution in the United States that has given and achieved so much with so little material support from those whom it has served. In the meantime, however, the Negro press has grown in influence, power, and service. Today, its circulation runs into millions of printed copies and many millions of readers, drawn from every walk and activity of life.

President Truman cited the Negro press as a vigorous champion of minorities, and declared: "In recent years it has become increasingly a reporter of the condition of human rights the world over." Gov. James Duff, of Pennsylvania, praised the Negro press as a guardian of constitutional rights. The Negro press can claim with pride the praises and honors bestowed upon it by Presidents and governors; it can also claim much more than they have mentioned.

Champion, guardian, defender of rights, liberties, and privileges, the Negro press has also served as leader, reporter, interpreter, of the cause of Negro progress and the democratic way of life. Its responsibilities are to race, community, Nation, way of life, and to the world. In these days, when the future and welfare of minority groups are so closely related to the welfare of larger groups throughout the world, the Negro press would do well to prepare itself for a larger and more important role in shaping the thoughts and directing the actions and lives of its community of readers.

The decline of Europe, the rise of the United States, the Soviet Union, and the nations of Asia and the Pacific have placed Africa and the peoples of African descent in a new setting and given them a new importance in the economy, government, and defense plans of the world.

A new and larger world view of human problems, their implications and relationships must now take a more important place in the scheme of the Negro press than they have ever taken in the 123 years since the publication of Freedom's Journal.

The so-called Negro problem in the United States is not what it was even 10 years ago. It has lengthened into only one of many vexing problems which a growing Nation of all races, colors, creeds, and nationalities must face courageously.

The role, then, of the Negro press is becoming more and more one of devotion to principals, accurate knowledge of issues and problems, and courageous leadership on local, national, and international levels. Steadfastness of the right purpose will justify and vindicate the causes and purposes for which the Negro press was founded.

Revenue Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing today is a revenue revision bill representing the accumulated recommendations of many years of the American Bar Association, acting after exhaustive analysis and study by its tax section, which is composed of several thousand members of the bar of the country who are particularly interested in the field of taxation.

The purpose of this bill is to correct a great many of the inequities, largely of a technical nature, which presently exist in our vast tax system. The bill is identical with H. R. 7738, introduced on March 16, 1950, by my distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP. Mr. CAMP and I both feel that this legislation is and should remain nonpartisan because it is drawn with a view toward eliminating inequities and promoting a fair and better-administered tax system.

The tax section of the American Bar Association deserves the highest praise for its constructive work in this field. These distinguished lawyers have devoted themselves unselfishly to this task, not in the interest of their clients but in the general public interest of making our tax laws equitable in their application and better in their administration.

Unfortunately, there has been no general tax revision since the Revenue Act of 1942, and as a result there are a great many technical problems which have accumulated during the past 8 years which should be remedied with all possible dispatch. It is unfortunate indeed that these inequities and discrepancies, which are bound to develop in any tax structure as complicated as ours, have had to await correction for so long a period.

The provisions of this legislation do not primarily affect the revenue. The inequities dealt with are not social or economic in their nature, such as, for example, whether one particular group of taxpayers should be taxed more or less than another group, but are technical in character and are generally recognized as inequities by persons familiar with the practical operation of our tax laws.

A detailed explanation of the individual provisions of the bill prepared by the tax section of the American Bar Association was included in the extension of remarks by my colleague, Mr. CAMP, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 16, 1950, in pages A1978–1985 of the Appendix. This clear and excellent statement will be of inestimable value to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Congress, and it reflects the high caliber of work which these gentlemen have done.

It is a distinct pleasure to me to join my distinguished colleague, Mr. CAMP, in introducing this nonpartisan legislation embodying the tax recommendations of the American Bar Association. These highly meritorious recommendations deserve the most careful consideration, and favorable action should be taken by the Congress without delay.

United States Urged To Avoid Reds' Smear Tactics in Fighting Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Russell Barnes that appeared in the Detroit News of March 20, 1950:

UNITED STATES URGED TO AVOID REDS' SMEAR TACTICS IN FIGHTING COMMUNISM

(By Russell Barnes)

Japan used thought police to stifle political opposition.

Communists and Fascists destroy enemies of their reigns of terror with anything from death to massive doses of castor oil.

Totalitarian governments generally deal with political foes in special courts, where defendants are stripped of normal legal protections.

While communism is a dangerous menace, extremely difficult to combat in a democracy, such attacks as the one Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has been making on the State Department, raise these questions:

Are we beginning to copy Communist and Fascist tactics in this country?

Is it good American policy to sacrifice traditional freedoms and rights, legal procedures evolved over centuries to protect the individual, and the principle of competition in ideas as well as business, under the guise of fighting communism?

If we continue to smear persons in congressional investigations—where they have no legal protection—condemn people because of associations with individuals or organizations which may or may not be subversive, and see a Communist in anybody who has ever read Marx, is it possible we may destroy the traditional American system and end up with a kind of totalitarianism not too different from communism or fascism?

What chance is there of getting competent public servants when they are made targets for political abuse not based on concrete evidence of misconduct?

QUESTION OF POLICY

Unquestionably there have been—may still be—Communists who occupy strategic positions in Government.

But is it good public policy to destroy American freedoms and rights—debase our system to the deplorable standards of communism and fascism—to capture a few culprits?

Is there any real evidence that Communist subversion handicapped our war effort, or has prevented us from maintaining a decent national standard of living since the war?

Is there any good reason to believe that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the police, and regular courts are incapable of dealing with the internal Communist menace?

The difficult problem of combating a subversive opposition without sacrificing traditional American freedoms and rights is not

new. We were faced with the same problem when the Nazis and Fascists before the war attempted to build up fifth columns inside the United States.

HUMAN DECENCY

One of the great modern tragedies has been the extent to which democracies have had to cheapen themselves—drop their standards of human decency—to fight totalitarianism.

But how far should methods necessary in war be carried over into the peace, and applied against American people?

In his book Leaves From a Russian Diary, Pitirim A. Sorokin, the Harvard sociologist, comments that one of communism's biggest successes is that it has changed even its implacable enemies into its own image.

"Fighting the revolution, these enemies introduced into their group many traits of the revolution which they are fighting against," declared Sorokin.

The big American problem is obviously how to fight communism, and still preserve traditional freedoms and rights inherent in the American system.

Republican Headline Hunters on a Fishing Expedition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Fishing in the Records," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1950:

FISHING IN THE RECORDS

The demand that he open the loyalty files of the State Department people accused by Senator MCCARTHY compels the President to make a very difficult decision.

The State Department urges that the files be made available to the Senate subcommittee investigating the complaints. Presumably it feels that the files contain nothing detrimental to the accused individuals, and that the best way to silence Senator MCCARTHY is to let the subcommittee members look at the records.

The Department of Justice and the FBI are strongly opposed to this. They are afraid of the precedent that might be established. They think that if one committee is allowed to see confidential loyalty files it will be very difficult to deny the same privilege to other committees. There is also the problem of leaks. No matter what precautions are taken, there is always a danger that some committee member will tell what he has seen. If this should happen, the FBI fears that its sources of information would dry up, that its effectiveness in counterespionage work would be seriously impaired.

In this dilemma, there is talk that the President is thinking in terms of compromise—that he may let the subcommittee see some or all of the State Department records, but not the FBI files. There is small chance that this would do any good. For Senator MCCARTHY and his supporters would say—and it would seem plausible—that the investigators had been permitted to see only the meaningless files, that the real evidence was in the still-secret files of the FBI. It it worth remembering in this connection that State Department critics already have hinted that incriminating material may have been removed from the State files.

There is still another aspect of this matter which deserves some consideration. The demand that the files be opened is not coming from persons charged with disloyalty. The situation is not that of an accused man demanding to be confronted with his accusers and the evidence against him. It is Senator MCCARTHY, a third party to the relationship between the State Department and its employees, who is calling for the production of the records. And Senator MCCARTHY is in the strange position of saying, in effect: I have made certain charges against these people. The proof of those charges is in the secret files, which I have not seen. But if the subcommittee will insist on having access to the files it will find the evidence.

In other words, this business looks very much like a fishing expedition. And it is hard to see why any one should be permitted to fish in the Government's loyalty files—files which presumably contain everything from valid evidence, pro and con, to the rankest sort of unevaluated rumor and gossip, all collected and filed on the understanding that it would not be made public. The Star has never believed that the Federal loyalty program, properly conducted, was a threat to the reputations of innocent people. But this threat can become a very real one if the files are to be opened at the behest of every Tom, Dick, and Harry who may decide to sound off with sensational accusations and little or no supporting evidence of his own.

Address of Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, before the Illinois Housing Day banquet in Chicago:

The principal task that confronts every public administrator is attracting and keeping in public service enough talented and disinterested men and women to carry on effectively the many activities that comprise government. But I have not, I am happy to say, had to concern myself with the State's responsibility in the all-important field of housing, thanks to Mr. McFayden, the State housing board, and to many of you who are numbered among the 600 Illinois citizens serving without compensation on the 118 local housing authority boards in our State.

And I am glad to have this opportunity, while welcoming our distinguished guests from Washington, to give thanks for you, the soldiers of the line, who have given so generously of your time and energy without pay. I'm proud that Illinois has more local housing boards in active operation than any other State to lead the attack against our hardy, stubborn twin enemies—bad housing and no housing.

And we are thankful to the leaders of the private building industry who have participated in this conference and helped so extensively to break the building blockade during these trying postwar years.

The efforts and devotion to this important task of all you people and of the many public officials working with you is the only assurance we have that one day soon we will be able to substantially overcome the housing shortage that still plagues our State. You are the best hope for promoting and perfecting the teamwork between Government and private builders that long and frustrating experience has shown us is the only ultimate solution of our housing needs.

I'm told we are getting better teamwork and better understanding between public and private efforts. Last year the figures for private-housing construction broke the record. And now the Federal Housing Act of 1949 presents a great opportunity to correct many of the worst conditions throughout the country, and especially in populous States like Illinois, which are prepared to take advantage of its provisions.

I'm proud, too, that not since the passage of that act has any State attempted to do what we have tried to do here at this housing conference today. This is a pioneering effort to mass our forces, to enlarge our resources, to organize, to educate. Why? Because everyone in this room knows that in spite of all the accomplishments and all the selfless good citizenship and effort, the job has not been done and we have not yet provided housing that thousands of our people can afford to build or rent.

And so tonight we hand out no prizes, we distribute no rewards. It is too early. The fight has just begun, and the people will get no comfort out of self-congratulations here tonight.

Rather, let this meeting give evidence that we recognize that there is still an acute housing shortage in Illinois; that we have learned long since that no single group, public or private, can do the job; that only a direct, bold, and sustained drive by all segments of the public, by all agencies of the local community, the State, and the Federal Government can do it.

The formula is so obvious, the tools and weapons now so many and powerful, that such a drive by men of good will and sincere purpose cannot fail.

I could imagine no better earnest of ultimate success in our frontal attack on the menace of slums and bad housing in Illinois than this meeting itself. When public housers and antipublic housers, community leaders, bankers, labor leaders, private citizens, and public officials all sit down together to concert their power and purpose to search out the cause and cure of a widespread public malady, I think we are on the way. That it is a public malady none can deny.

Even a king of England said about 30 years ago: "It is not too much to say that an adequate solution to the housing question is the foundation of all social progress." Since the turn of the century criminologists and penologists have been directing their attention to bad housing as a spawning ground for juvenile delinquency and crime. Wherever housing is substandard, with inadequate sanitation and overcrowded living conditions, families doubled up or divided, normal family life is impossible and the juvenile delinquent and adult criminal are a natural product. The result is that a disproportionately large percentage of the inmates of our penal institutions are drawn from the slum communities of America. Only last Saturday I spent the day visiting the prisons at Joliet and I have most vividly in my mind this disastrous consequence of slum living.

In one section of the city of Chicago, 200,000 people are crowded together into three square miles. From among these 200,000 people, a mere one-twentieth of Chicago's population, come one-fourth of the total homicide and rape offenders and one-eighth

of all reported robberies. The direct relationship between crime and environment is all too common in American cities. The slums of Detroit produce five times as many crimes, and fifteen times as many criminals per 1,000 of population as do areas with adequate housing facilities.

These experiences are repeated with monotonous regularity in the criminal statistics of a score of other American cities. The total effect reveals a sordid pattern of slum-bred crime for the Nation as a whole. Every town and every city which has a blighted area is supporting a hidden subsidy all the time.

Just as the relation between bad housing and crime is definitely established, so has the beneficial effect of adequate housing become evident in many cities. The rates of juvenile delinquency and adult crime show marked decreases where good housing has been developed on former slum sites. The juvenile delinquency rate for the area now occupied by the Jane Addams public housing project in Chicago, for example, was cut in half when the slum dwellings were replaced by decent housing.

I believe there is no dispute among the sociologists that one of the greatest obstacles to the reduction of delinquency and crime in America is the slum, and that its eradication and replacement with a wholesome community is the most effective positive step we can take.

In short, the housing problem is a tremendous social problem. That is why I believe the money and effort we put into better housing are a sound investment. The housing shortage is not a political issue; its shame is the shame of all of us; its correction is the duty and the obligation of all of us.

Last year, as I have said, more housing units were started than in any previous year. Yet it cannot be overlooked that nearly all of this new supply of housing is outside the reach of a large portion of our population. And it must be remembered also that since the record year of 1925 our population has grown by many millions, and the annual production of our economy is several times larger. So we can only conclude that 1949 was but the beginning of our effort to house America properly and here in Illinois there is much yet to be done. In the poetic prose of the late Justice Cardozo: "The inn that shelters for the night is not the journey's end."

Hence, it is proper on this day, which has been set aside as Illinois housing day, that we consider our position and where we can go from here. The simple fact is that the housing shortage has been with us too long. The highest legislative bodies of the Nation, the State, and even of this very city have long ago formally recognized that it cannot be cured without governmental aid. We have the legal equipment, we have the organization machinery, we have an unexcelled foundation in our local housing boards, we have city money, State money, and now we have this huge Federal assistance program. If we have the will, the heart and the common horse sense, we can do the job without much more debate, consideration and reconsideration.

The aim, as I understand it, of the Federal Housing Act is to encourage, not compete with private housing. It seeks to encourage home ownership, which has been one of the strongest sinews of American life. It provides for the elimination of slums and for making these sites available to private builders. It allows local communities to decide if and how they wish to participate. It provides for an industry-wide study of building costs to find out how the expense of home building can be reduced.

These are all sound objectives which I believe most people approve. But there is widespread objection to the public housing features. You don't have to approve the principle of public housing or the idea of Government subsidies for some at the expense of everyone, to recognize that without public housing, it is generally conceded that only a limited and unsatisfactory answer to the slum problem can be expected. What's more we all realize that the new Federal act, or any Government subsidy, can never be the whole answer—that the housing deficiency can only be met in the final analysis by full-scale private building.

So it would seem to me that the public housing debate is over; that it is an essential step to slum eradication and better and low-cost housing. Our task, then, is to see that every local community in Illinois which wishes to take advantage of the public housing provisions of the Federal law has the opportunity to do so. Seeing that they do have this opportunity is the responsibility of each local housing board and each city administration. Some local housing authorities in Illinois already are taking steps to get projects under way. I hope that every community at least has the opportunity to consider the question fully in the light of its own needs.

I know that there are sharp differences of opinion among the many interests involved in the total housing problem—real estate men, private builders, mortgage bankers, labor, public officials, and housing officials. I know that there are differences of opinion, sincere differences, about the merits and even the need of public housing, about the selection of sites for housing projects and slum clearance. I don't decry such differences. These are an inherent, essential process of public policy formulation. But propaganda attacks against public housing on the one hand, and the private building industry on the other, serve no good purpose; nor do prejudice, hate, and selfishness. Rather, they destroy public confidence in the sincerity and ability of all these groups and agencies to work together.

I am not unmindful of the danger of oversimplification in a matter so complex. And I hope you don't think me one of that not uncommon breed who seems to believe that, to be facetious, by just being voluble the problem at hand is at once rendered soluble. I don't presume to say or know how the money should be spent; what types of dwellings should be built, where projects should be located and slum clearance undertaken.

But I do say that all these differences and all these considerations have been before us for a long time—as long as the housing shortage we are here to solve. The men, the machinery, and the money are at hand. And I feel that I can urge the responsible representatives of the various aspects of the housing field to seek more areas of agreement on a sound and constructive critical plane in keeping with the dignity of the industry they represent and the urgency of the problem they confront. Nothing will be accomplished by name calling, prejudice, superstition, political selfishness, and emotional exhibitionism.

It should be our purpose to encourage the contribution of what is called private or free enterprise in the solution of the housing problem. It should be no less our purpose to encourage the solution of this stubborn social and economic ill by the use of public authority and assistance in those areas where private enterprise cannot or will not reach. There is room for a great and purposeful partnership of which the people of Illinois will be the beneficiary.

For my part I hope we never hear again that grim jest: "America, the land of the free and no homes for the brave." May this day mark the resolution of Illinois to solve its slum and housing problem, to penetrate new frontiers of living, not in spite of one another, but together.

Pacific Northwest, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Chemical Engineering for September 1949:

PACIFIC NORTHWEST—1960
(By Ivan Bloch)

If the table above is anywhere near right, the Pacific Northwest is going to be quite a chemical center by 1960. Look at some of the minimum predictions: triple superphosphate to go from 60,000 tons in 1946 to 350,000 tons in 1960; that is a hike of 580 percent. Aluminum to jump from 148,000 tons to 1,300,000, up 780 percent; sulfuric acid up 380 percent; acetylene up 580 percent. And these are minimum predictions.

Such expansion seems fantastic, but it's all in the cards according to a report issued last October by the Army engineers. (Editor's Note: "Review Report on Columbia River and Tributaries," a many-volumed work released only for technical review and prepared to justify further hydroelectric development of the Columbia Basin. Its industrial sections were compiled for the Army by a group of technicians and economists under the author's direction while he was with Bonneville. For 2 years, 1945–47, they studied the industrial potential of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana. Their forecasts are based on three assumptions: That full employment and full production continue; that no major depressions or wars intervene; that power development is not allowed to lag industrial demand. Incidentally, power shortage has already turned away some would-be manufacturers during the 2 years since the report was written.)

Here is what the report has to say about the future of the chemical process industries in the Northwest, together with some comments on developments since the report was written. These are the high lights.

Aluminum: The report's almost unbelievable estimate for 1960 aluminum production, one and three-tenths to one and eight-tenths million tons, is based on a thorough analysis of potential United States markets. (See aluminum table.) Most of the potential market was allocated to the Northwest on the assumption that adequate power resources will not likely be developed anywhere else.

To match this aluminum reduction capacity the Northwest could use an annual one and nine-tenths to two and nine-tenths million tons of alumina production. Alumina now comes by rail from southeastern plants at Hurricane Creek, Baton Rouge, and East St. Louis. The Northwest could save as much as half the freight bill by building its own alumina capacity, figuring 15 to 25 years to amortize the new plants.

The Northwest has several possible sources of raw material for alumina production: It is feasible to import foreign bauxite. Clays of relatively high alumina content are abundant in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. There are billions of tons of amorthosite in Wyoming along the Union Pacific Railroad. And perhaps most interesting of all, there are the now well-known laterites (ferruginous bauxites) of northwest Oregon and southwest Washington. These deposits are estimated at 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons, averaging 31 percent alumina, 23 percent iron, and 11 percent silica. For the past 4 years Alcoa has been working on the laterites: Exploring, blocking ore, and ostensibly making metallurgical and chemical tests.

There appear to be at least two ways to process laterite ores: (1) A modified Pederson process where ore is smelted in electric furnaces to a high silica pig iron and a calcium aluminate slag; the slag could then be treated by lime-soda-sinter process prior to utilization in a Bayer plant; (2) treatment of the ores as red mud involving lime-soda-sinter processing prior to Bayer processing, with high iron and silica residues providing a possible source of iron for a Northwest iron industry. As to clays, the experimental ammonium sulfate process plant at Salem, Oreg., apparently demonstrated that alumina could be made from Northwest clays, but as far as the experiment was carried, costs were not competitive with bauxite.

Production of these enormous quantities of alumina from bauxite or laterite would require enormous quantities of chemicals like sodium hydroxide, sodium carbonate—and pure calcium oxide; 3 or 4 years ago Alcoa started extensive exploration of some extremely pure limestone a barge haul away in southeastern Alaska.

Magnesium: The future for Northwest magnesium doesn't look as rosy as for aluminum. Compared with Dow's Gulf Coast plant, a seawater electrolytic plant in the Northwest would pay more for fuel and raw materials (like limestone, chlorine or salt, sulfur). On the other hand, electric power and other operating expenses would be less. The report concludes that 1960 might find a modest six-to-twenty-five-thousand ton annual production in the Northwest—if, as the report expects, the 1960 market for magnesium reaches the peak wartime demand.

Phosphorous industry: Sixty percent of United States phosphate rock reserves lie in a belt in southeastern Idaho, western Wyoming, northern Utah and parts of Montana. Yet in 1946 only 8 percent of our mined rock came from there. Two things account for this neglect. First, the extent of western reserves is not altogether known, though estimated at 8,000,000,000 tons of better than 40 percent tricalcium phosphate. And second, the industry and its thinking are focused on eastern markets and eastern deposits; the "distant" west is somewhat terra incognita.

The picture is clearing though. Soil nutrient deficiencies of the 17 Western States were studied and estimated at about 500,000 tons a year of P_2O_5, with which western phosphates began to look more interesting to the fertilizer companies. To meet the interest, the Interior Department has for 3 years been promoting geological exploration, mining development work, research on rock beneficiation, investigation of markets and freight rates, and the revision of certain laws relating to public domain on which most of the western reserves are located. As a result new plants have been established or are being built and many more are in the wind. The report predicts tremendous expansion. (See big table and small phosphates table.)

The report goes into detail on phosphate cost factors. Mining costs would be about the same as in Tennessee, somewhat higher than Florida. Some areas might be strip-mined but most would have to be underground. High-grade rock lies in veins 4 to 7 feet thick and ranges from 30 to 34 percent P_2O_5, or 65 to 80 percent tricalcium phosphate. In these, the rock usually contains less than 2 percent iron and aluminum combined; it contains less silica than Florida rock. Some of the lower-grade rocks (30 to 50 percent tricalcium phosphate) are 75 to 100 feet thick. In certain locations the rock contains vanadium fractions, as V_2O_5, ranging from 0.1 to 0.5 percent. Experimental work by Federal agencies seems to indicate the need for nodulizing prior to charging in the electric furnace. On the other hand, recovery of vanadium fractions may yield juicy byproduct credits.

Estimators vary on the cost of producing elemental, electric furnace phosphorus in the western phosphate area. The report figures $140 a ton, based on 1946 costs and assuming 3 mills per kilowatt-hour for power. Coke costs to a western plant would be somewhat higher than to one in Tennessee; silica rock or gravel (for fluxing) would be about the same; 3-mill power, if it gets down to the phosphate area, would be under Tennessee and much less than Florida.

Phosphoric acid, the report says, could be made in the West by the combustion of elemental phosphorus for $39 a ton for 75-percent acid, or $26 a ton for 50-percent acid.

Triple superphosphate (48 percent available P_2O_5) could be made by electric furnace methods for $31 a ton in bulk, $34.50 bagged (which amounts to $64.50 and $72 per ton of equivalent P_2O_5). Into these costs the report has figured plant investment, labor, power, raw materials and all other costs, except selling and distribution. There is little future for production of ordinary superphosphate or sulfuric acid methods; the long haul from the Northwest to consuming markets precludes all but highly concentrated products. Best bet, says the report, is elemental phosphorus, shipped by tank car to consuming areas and there converted to phosphoric acid and on to fertilizer.

Some angles of the fertilizer story weren't hit by the report: There is a good chance that ammonia production, based on Wyoming natural gas, will come to pass in the near future. Production of concentrated fertilizer by the wet process may come if they recover sulfur from this same Wyoming gas.

Sulfuric acid in 1945, according to the report, the Northwest's two sulfuric acid plants—one at Anaconda, Mont., the other at Du Pont, Wash.—contributed less than 1 percent to the national total (see big table). A growing Northwest chemical industry will push the demand up considerably (see sulfuric acid table) and some expansion has already started. American Smelting & Refining is building an acid plant to recover smelter gas at Tacoma, and Kennecott Copper is expanding its acid plant at Garfield, Utah. Wyoming's natural gas is being developed as a local source of sulfur. Stanolind recovers some 75 tons a day from its unitized gasoline operation at Powell, and Texas Gulf Sulphur is reportedly getting set at Worland to produce 300 tons a day by 1950. Up to now the west had had to rely on imported Gulf sulfur or on smelter gas.

Calcium carbide: Analyzing the markets for calcium carbide, the report finds that over 60 percent of the acetylene made from calcium carbide in the United States in recent years has been used to make synthetic chemicals; in the West the bulk goes for cutting and welding metals. There's no reason, as the report sees it, why the West cannot get into the acetylene chemicals act and push its carbide production up to seventy to one hundred and forty thousands tons a year in or around 1960. (See small calcium carbide table.)

Northwest carbide producers—there are two of them, in Portland—pay more for raw materials than other areas; but on the plus side of the ledger are an important saving on power and, quite recently, discovery of chemical grade limestone near Baker, Oreg. Looking at potential markets for acetylene, the report sees promise for the production of acetic acid and anhydride—these for the rayon industry that could take root in the Northwest's cellulose resources.

Rayon: At present the Northwest sends dissolving wood pulp to the East and brings back finished rayon products. The report thinks the West could now support its own rayon industry; population is growing by leaps and bounds; Los Angeles is the Nation's second largest tire-producing center; and California's textile industry is growing rapidly. California's markets and cotton linters would probably bring the rayon producers there, except that California has a water problem. So rayon will presumably go next door to the Northwest, where there is plenty of pure water, plenty of pulp, and plenty of all other raw materials either on hand or potentially available. The report looks for 68,000–88,000 tons a year from the Northwest by 1960 or so; it even names possible plant locations. (See rayon table.)

Carbon bisulphide: If rayon does go to the Northwest, it will almost certainly create local carbon bisulphide production—around 25,000 tons a year, says the report. (And carbon tetrachloride, dyes, solvents, and insecticides might easily follow carbon bisulphide.) Wood waste for charcoal will be an important asset to Northwest bisulphide producers.

Chlorine and caustic: These are already well established in the Northwest; two plants were built at Tacoma in 1928 and a third went up during the war at Portland. Pulp and paper will continue to be the major outlet but there is a good potential in chlorinated solvents, DDT, rayon, and chlorates. (See chlorine table.) In fact, since the report was written, DDT production started in the Northwest.

Cements: The report's estimated increase in cement production, 60 to 80 percent over 1946, is probably overconservative. (See Portland cement table.) Numerous big new dams will require large quantities of cement, and so will settlement of some 800,000 acres of new irrigated land in the Columbia Basin project in Washington. To meet these demands by dams and population, cement capacity in the Northwest should be increased from 8,500,000 barrels at present to nearly 11,000,000 barrels a year by 1950, according to a recent estimate by a Portland consulting engineer (K. E. Hamblen, before the annual AIME meeting in San Francisco, February 1949).

Two factors may play a part in this potential increase. One is the possible use of Lepol kilns; they seem to save fuel, and transportation of fuel oil is a heavy production expense in the Northwest. The other factor is the possible use of laterites (ferruginous bauxite) to make quick-setting cements; recent work in the chemical engineering department of the University of Washington makes it look feasible. And the competition in aluminous cement is not stiff; there is only one producer in the United States—which may encourage cement people to try another plant of this type in the Pacific Northwest.

Manganese: The report sees a reasonably favorable prospect for electrolytic manganese

production in the Northwest. Counting chiefly on a growing demand for ferrous and nonferrous manganese alloys it estimates electrolytic production at seven to fifteen thousand tons a year by 1960.

Since the report was written, however, Manganese Products, Inc., of Seattle, has stirred up interest in the production of manganese oxide by a sulfurous-sulfuric acid leaching process. This company's chemists have turned in good laboratory results; and plans are now afoot to give the process a whirl on a commercial scale at the Salem experimental alumina plant. They would convert the plant for the treatment of stock-piled managanese ores from Nevada and possibly some of the siliceous manganese ores of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington. If the new process pans out, the manganese oxide it produces could spur ferromanganese production at existing plants and stimulate a variety of important manganese chemicals, for batteries in particular.

Artificial abrasives: The report forecasts a sizable installation of abrasives capacity in the Northwest—eight to twelve thousand tons a year of silicon carbide and ten to twenty thousand tons of fused alumina. Reasons for this optimism are cheap hydroelectric energy and a rapidly growing market in the metal-manufacturing industries. Since the report was written, Carborundum Co. started its big new silicon carbide plant at Vancouver, Wash., and rumor has it that other producers have been exploring around in the Northwest.

Ten years ago, Pacific Northwest basic chemical industries were generally limited to those for the production of chlorine and caustic, synthetic resins, nonferrous metals, some fertilizer, and a few somewhat isolated products primarily related to agriculture and the forest industries. Since then, enormous strides have been made, largely related to the rapid development of very large sources of low-priced electrical energy from the Federal dams at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. Today the region produces over one-third of the Nation's supply of aluminum; it has expanded its position in the production of copper, lead and zinc; it has three major ferro-alloy plants, two calcium carbide plants, a powdered-metal plant, several phosphate fertilizer units, more chlorine and caustic capacity, and many other new plants in both metallic and chemical fields. The region's population has grown by leaps and bounds: Since 1940 it has increased 37 percent as compared with 11 percent for the United States as a whole. Its hydroelectric supplies, once derisively viewed as economic monstrosities, are now unable to meet growing power demands of industry, home, and farm.

In general, the outlook for Pacific Northwest industrial development is decidedly favorable, even though it is to be expected that short-term readjustments will occur in line with national trends. However, the relatively undeveloped status of the region's resources—many of which are unique in their importance to national security and prosperity—provide a foundation for wide expansion of industrial and agricultural production through the establishment of new processing and manufacturing plants. These cannot avoid reflecting the most advanced of techniques, ultimately giving the area a highly competitive structure and a lack of existing plant obsolescence. The growing consciousness of the area's industrial and business leaders toward research is another factor which bodes well for future development of the magnitude described.

PRODUCTION PREDICTION

By 1960 the percent column on the far right should look a lot fatter.

Doubled production, or better, is expected of all but 6 of these items.

	1960, estimated Northwest production (thousand tons)		1946, estimated or actual Northwest production	
	Minimum	Maximum	Thousand tons	Percent of all United States
Phosphate rock mined	1,334	2,258	641	7.98
Phosphorus	101	187		
Phosphoric acid	400	625	63	7.38
Phosphates	30	40		
Triple superphosphate	350	550	60	18.62
Ordinary superphosphate	135	225	100	1.27
Sulfuric acid	226	380	60	.70
Calcium carbide	70	140	27	4.74
Acetylene (million cubic feet)	290	650	50	1.03
Acetic acid	4	15	1	.66
Chlorine	85	122	40	3.43
Caustic soda	109	158	46	2.46
Chlorates and perchlorates	4.6	7	4.5	20.45
Carbon bisulfide	25	27		
Rayon	67.5	87.5		
Wood pulp	1,635	2,544	1,740	16.4
Cement	1,500	1,700	927	3.01
Artificial abrasives	18	32		
Aluminum, primary	1,300	1,800	148	36.10
Magnesium, primary	6	25		
Zinc, primary slab	265	340	[1] 212	27.77
Lead, primary refined	130	180	70	20.70
Copper, primary refined	125	175	75	9.54
Antimony, primary	3	5	2.4	13.57
Electrolytic iron	5.4	36	[2] 9	22.5
Electrolytic manganese	7	15		
Rolled steel	400	480	[1] 290	.48
Rolled stainless steel	6	20		
Steel castings	40	50	22	1.52
Gray iron castings including pipe	150	190	75	.73
Malleable iron castings	6	8		
Ferro-alloys	55	100	[2] 30	1.76

[1] 1945.
[2] 1947.

NOTE.—In making 1960 estimates it has been assumed that the differential between minimum and maximum represents the range under conditions of moderate employment.

Phosphates, 1960.—Power demand and phosphorus production

ELECTRIC FURNACE PRODUCTION OF PHOSPHORUS IN NORTHWEST

Consuming industry	Estimated 1960 production (net tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Phosphoric acid	800	1,600
Phosphates	15,000	45,000
Phosphate fertilizer	85,000	140,000
Total	100,800	186,600

POWER CONSUMPTION BY PHOSPHATE INDUSTRY IN NORTHWEST

Consuming industry	Estimated 1960 kilowatt demand	
	Minimum	Maximum
Phosphate rock mining:		
Phosphoric acid	[1]	[1]
Phosphates	1,000	2,000
Phosphate fertilizer	8,000	13,000
Electric furnace operation:		
Phosphoric acid	1,500	3,000
Phosphates	24,000	73,000
Phosphate fertilizer	140,000	230,000
Other operations:		
Phosphoric acid	[1]	[1]
Phosphates	1,000	2,000
Phosphate fertilizer	19,400	32,800
Total	194,900	355,800

[1] Small amount is included in electric furnace operations.

Chlorine, 1960.—Markets accessible to Pacific Northwest producers

	Estimated 1960 demand (thousand tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Pulp bleaching:		
Pacific Northwest	45	60
British Columbia	15	20
Alaska	2	5
Chlorinated solvents, other chemicals	20	30
Water treatment, sanitation	2	5
Liquid bleach	1	2
Total	85	122

Sulfuric acid, 1960.—Markets in Northwest, exclusive of Utah and southern Idaho

For use in production of—	Estimated 1960 demand (thousand tons) (100 percent basis)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Superphosphate:		
Northern Idaho	12	28
Western Montana	50	57
Along Pacific Northwest coast	12	24
Ammonium sulfate fertilizer at Salem		61
Rayon at Tidewater	100	124
Sugar refining		7
Alcohol from wood waste	5	8
Chlorine and caustic soda	2	3
Aluminum sulfate	11	14
Explosives	12	15
Others	22	39
Total	226	380

Calcium carbide, 1960.—Markets accessible to Pacific Northwest producers

Use	Estimated 1960 demand (thousand tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Synthetic chemicals:		
Pacific Northwest	18	50
California		25
Cutting and welding metals:		
Bottled acetylene, Pacific Northwest	9	11
Shop-generated acetylene, Pacific Northwest	7	10
Bottled and shop-generated acetylene, other western States	32	39
Exports	4	5
Total	70	140

Aluminum, 1960.—Outlook for feasible markets in the United States

	Estimated 1960 aluminum requirements (million pounds)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Building products	350	700
Automobiles	285	1,380
Displacement of copper, mostly in wire and cable [1]	250	450
Trucks	211	968
Busses	40	56
Railroad cars	51	88
Aircraft	51	109
Displacement of zinc die castings [1]	34	52
All other uses	2,500	2,500
Total	3,772	6,303

[1] There is some duplication of figures representing displacement of copper and zinc because of the use of these metals in automobiles, trucks, and busses for which aluminum estimates were made without an analysis of metals displaced.

Rayon, 1960.—Annual production of viscose and acetate in Pacific Northwest

	Estimated 1960 production, (million pounds)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Eugene, Oreg. (viscose)	45	50
Longview, Wash. (viscose)	45	50
Puget Sound area, Washington (viscose)	45	50
Willamette Valley, Oreg. (acetate)	----------	25
Total	135	175

Portland cement, 1960.—Annual production rates by area in the Pacific Northwest

	Estimated 1960 production (thousand barrels)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Southwestern Oregon	680	760
Northeastern Oregon	375	420
Lower Columbia River area	790	840
Eastern Washington	1,400	1,470
Puget Sound area	4,550	5,130
Southern Idaho	340	380
Total	8,135	9,000

House Lobbying-Activities Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

AGENDA FOR OPENING SERIES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS IN HOUSE LOBBYING-ACTIVITIES INVESTIGATION

Chairman FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, today made public the agenda for the first three public hearings, beginning next Monday morning, in the investigation of all lobbying activities, including those of Government agencies, intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

Four college teachers and two specialists of the Library of Congress legislative reference service will participate Monday and Tuesday in sessions devoted to "The Role of Lobbying in Representative Self-Government." Budget Director Frank Pace, Jr., and Comptroller General Lindsay Warren will appear Thursday morning to discuss "The Role of Government Agencies in Influencing Legislation."

In addition to the chairman the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities includes Representatives HENDERSON LANHAM, Democrat, of Georgia; CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat, of California; CARL ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana; CLARENCE BROWN, Republican, of Ohio; and JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Republican, of Minnesota.

The agenda for the first three sessions, all scheduled for 10 a. m. in the House caucus room, is as follows:

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES—OPEN SERIES OF HEARINGS

1. The Role of Lobbying in Representative Self-Government.

Monday, March 27, 10 a. m., House caucus room.

Witnesses

Dr. Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology and director of the office of public opinion research, department of psychology, Princeton, N. J.; author of the Psychology of Radio, 1936; Invasion from Mars, 1941; Psychology of Social Movements, 1941; Gaging Public Opinion, 1944; Psychology of Ego-Involvements, 1947; Understanding Man's Social Behavior, 1947.

On the principle that Members of Congress by and large seek to represent public opinion in their districts as they interpret it, Dr. Cantril will discuss the factors which shape public opinion and thus, presumably, may influence the legislative process.

Dr. Stephen Kemp Bailey, assistant professor of government at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., author of Congress Makes a Law, 1950.

In the preparation of his book, which traces the birth, evolution, and metamorphosis of an idea for maintaining full employment into the Employment Act of 1946, Dr. Bailey interviewed hundreds of persons in the Congress, in Government agencies, and in various pressure groups for the story of the pulling and hauling which accompanied the development of this single piece of legislation. He will discuss the lobbying process in action on all fronts in that legislative battle in the Seventy-ninth Congress, occurring before the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act containing the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

Tuesday, March 28, 10 a. m., House caucus room.

A round-table or panel discussion in which the following experts, after making short, individual presentations on the specific phases of the subject as indicated, will then join informally with members of the committee in further discussion of the general theme of "The Theory of Identification and/or Regulation of Lobbyists by Legislative Bodies in the United States":

Dr. Edgar Lane, instructor in politics, Princeton University: Past Congressional Investigation of Lobbying.

Dr. Belle Zeller, professor of political science, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y., author of Pressure Politics in New York (1937) and of numerous articles on State lobbying laws and on the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act: "How the States Have Approached the Lobbying Issue."

Dr. George Galloway, senior specialist in American Government for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and formerly staff director of the LaFollette-Monroney Joint Committe on the Reorganization of Congress: "The Thinking Behind the Inclusion of Title III (the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act) in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946."

Dr. W. Brooke Graves, specialist in American Government and Public Administration for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; author of a special study for the Legislative Reference Service on the Administration of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act; now on loan to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as staff director of its Reorganization Subcommittee: "Operation of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

2. The Role of Government Agencies in Influencing Legislation.

Thursday, March 30, 10 a. m., House Caucus Room.

Witnesses

Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Bureau of the Budget: The Budget Director will discuss the necessity in a Democracy for the Executive branch of Government to make policy recommendations to Congress in the fields of activity of the various agencies and departments; the machinery established for transmitting these recommendations to Congress, and indicating their conformance to the President's program.

Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States. The Comptroller General will report on the work of the General Accounting Office, as an arm of Congress, in investigating improper expenditures by Executive agencies or departments, including any designed to influence Congress in violation of the Criminal Code.

"My Country 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty"

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Independence was a firm and courageous expression of the people of the Thirteen Original Colonies against oppressive, unnecessary, and burdensome taxes, and the unjust, unfair, and arrogant administration of Great Britain under the reign of King George III and his governor generals and power-drunk bureaucrats.

We fought a long and bloody war to prove to Great Britain that we meant what we said in that Declaration of Independence. It made us a respected and a free nation—free from the domination of all foreign powers—free of all the rest of the world, except ourselves.

Our freedom, our liberty, and our independence have made us a great and glorious nation, but the very Government which we have formed, which we have fashioned ourselves to protect us from foreign domination, has been fast becoming our greatest burden, our greatest threat to freedom; yes, our greatest enemy to the liberty and independence we fought for more than 160 years ago.

What have we been doing to ourselves? Where is this freedom and independence we fought so hard to preserve, the freedom and independence in which we took so much pride, which made this Nation so great and glorious both at home and abroad?

Have we allowed the Government of the United States to become greater than the people who created it? Has it become the master instead of the servant of the people?

Are we allowing this power to rise in our midst without realizing it, greater than the power that Great Britain wielded over us under King George III which demanded a Declaration of Independence 160 years ago?

Wheeler McMillen wrote in a recent issue of the Pathfinder:

The powers of government everywhere tend to revert to their ancient uses for oppression. In Russia estimates report seven to twelve million people subjected to forced labor. In the United States everyone is forced to work about 1 week out of every month for government. The difference is only one of degree.

If in our Government the influence of one pressure group or another continues to push spending and taxes upward, the number of slave day per citizen must likewise move upward.

This is what is happening now; this is not ancient history nor is it a fanciful prophecy of some crackpot. It is a sound and logical appraisal of the condition of our Government today with a public debt of two hundred and fifty-six billion and an annual deficit of five and five-tenths billion we are spending ourselves into subjection of an all-powerful government centralized in Washington.

Have we forgotten the wisdom of Grover Cleveland who said:

> The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while the people should patriotically and cheerfully support their Government, its functions do not include the support of the people.

How different is the trend today with the demands for paternalism of all kinds from pressure groups from the Government with no thought of the loss of freedom and independence of the individual.

Even before the Declaration of Independence Benjamin Franklin said, "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety. He who sacrifices his freedom for security loses both."

Many of those who look to the Government to do for them too many of the things they should do for themselves should heed the sound advice of Thomas Jefferson who said in a message to Congress in 1801:

> Agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise.

False propaganda and deception can delude and frustrate the people of this Nation just the same as it can and does the people of any other nation. Apt slogans and deft similes often carry more weight than sound common sense and logic in political campaigns.

The people of this Nation have withstood many a severe shock which has threatened our freedom and independence and unity in the past. Are we now to become the victims of our own folly? Is it not time to free ourselves from a rapidly growing trend in government that is sapping away our freedom and independence?

James F. Byrnes, a distinguished Democrat and former Secretary of State, said in a recent address at Washington and Lee University:

> We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, soon will be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

Are we so blind to our present danger that we will allow our Government to get so much out of the control of the people that it will be too late to correct or remedy the situation?

I believe the American people when thoroughly aroused to the present dangers will fight for freedom and independence rather than submit to servitude of an all-powerful government.

The abuse of power by the Government over the people can always be checked and controlled by the people in the United States because the powers delegated to the Government comes only from and with the consent of the governed. We must be alert to our responsibilities. We must not allow the Government to become greater than the people. We must cherish and guard our liberty and remember that liberty does not come from government. Liberty comes from the limitations of governmental power, not from the increase of its power over the people.

Address by Hon. Lewis Preston Collins, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 22, 1950, at 8:15 p. m., the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, recognizing the tremendously vital role of music in our Nation's quest for freedom, in cooperation with the Army Band presented one in a long series of gala special events to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

A series of concerts are being presented by the United States Army Band, each being dedicated to one of the Original Thirteen States in the order of their admittance to the Union. The concert last night was dedicated to Virginia. The Honorable Lewis Preston Collins, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, representing the Commonwealth of Virginia, was called upon to address the audience and, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including the address of Lieutenant Governor Collins on this occasion:

> Down through the ages man's freedom has come, gone, and then come back again, to evolve a bit higher in its approach to the ideal—always limited, however, in its ascent by the realism of mundane values. It is this eternal quest which is man's supreme epic, clothed at times, in the misery of poverty, war, pestilence, servitude, and all of the repressions, natural and contrived, which have served to retard and to stifle this greatest of human adventures.
>
> The dedication of this freedom-sings program to Virginia is an honor for which Virginia is grateful. It may be said with prideful modesty, I hope, that Virginia, with her Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Mason, Henry, Marshall, and countless others strove worthily in the establishment of a representative democracy with a constitution guaranteeing freedom as defined by a bill of rights indigenous to Virginia. This concept of our forefathers has more nearly provided the guaranty of individual freedom and therefore collective freedom, than any other concept birthed in all history. Thus our Nation, the greatest ever established, has come to live and play its historic part in man's epic quest for self-dignity and divine likeness.
>
> From across the seas and here in our own land the fundamentals which insure freedom are being attacked, the fundamentals which are traditional, historic, and a part of the soul of Virginia. Virginia will not surrender them easily during interims of political pot-valiancy or expediency. We in Virginia yet subscribe to the philosophy that it is the function of Government to protect the individual in his basic liberties from all forms of tyranny and to provide for the individual equal opportunity under Government, striving as best we can honestly through evolutionary processes to solve our economic, social, ethnological, and traditional problems among ourselves in a peaceful manner.
>
> It is not a part of us to lose freedom and liberty by creating a paternalism in government which tomorrow will be the tyrant to destroy the freedom of which we sing.
>
> The motto: "Sic semper tyrannis" is ever appropriate in man's epic quest for freedom, and it is Virginia's motto in the truest and deepest sense, today as always.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to speak on a matter that may come up for action in this House during this session, one on whom the other body has recently acted. I refer to the so-called equal rights amendment. In the form in which this measure was first brought to the floor of the Senate 2 months ago, it read:

> Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.
>
> The Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This proposal has been before the country almost 30 years, since the suffrage amendment was adopted. Some women have been consistently for it, others as consistently against it. I believe that those on both sides of this argument are women of good intention. They have all, in one way or another, in the past 30 years worked valiantly to promote the participation of women at all levels of government, to open up to women full opportunities for education and for jobs that fit their talents regardless of sex, to establish their dignity as persons and permit equal partnership with men in the complicated industrial society in which we live.

But the women who have worked for these goals are sharply divided on the question of how to reach them. They disagree on the consequences of putting into our Constitution a clause which says that "equality of rights" may not be abridged by law on account of sex.

Those who oppose this amendment, in the form in which it first came to the floor of the other body, and as I have quoted it above, are not opposed to "equality" and "equal rights in law" for women. But they do not want to lose for the working women what has been fought for and so painfully secured over the past 75 years—decent hours, minimum wages, sanitary working conditions, and so forth.

On one side, in favor of the original amendment, there is, for example, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller and the present Minister to Luxemburg, Mrs. Pearl Mesta, both prominent Democrats. Distinguished Republican women also support it, the Honorable Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and my distinguished House colleague, Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE. But just as strongly against the original amendment are Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, about whose championship of women's advancement there can be no shadow of doubt; Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor and now a member of the Civil Service Commission, both Democrats; Dr. Alice Hamilton, the pioneer in the conquest of industrial disease; Maybeth Paige, long a Republican member of the Minnesota State Legislature; and Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters. The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, which was set up by Congress to promote the welfare of women, has always been against this amendment, and the Labor Department itself, through both Republican and Democratic regimes, has held firmly to the position that the amendment would create new disadvantages and disabilities for women, instead of new opportunities.

For like reasons to those which have decided Mrs. Roosevelt, Frances Perkins, Alice Hamilton, and their colleagues, I, myself cannot endorse the equal rights amendment as I have quoted it. I believe it will destroy the protections for working women—there are now 18 million of them—that have been put on the statute books over the past 75 years. The struggle has been long and hard to get their hours of work shortened from 13 to 8 a day, and, through minimum-wage legislation, to raise their status from sweated labor to decent wage levels, particularly in industries where wages have been notoriously low. These measures have actually created for women workers something like an equal bargaining position with men in industry. As a matter of fact, raising the working standard for women has in many cases given impetus to raising the standard for men. No Federal wage and hour law, for example, was even attempted until the Supreme Court declared minimum wages constitutional for women. These laws have raised women out of the class of drudges whose work could be bought for almost nothing to a place that promises a level of health and decency.

Working women do not want these hard-won rights taken away from them. Their unions are firm on this point. The labor movement, through it two great national organizations, has consistently fought against the damage to working women's rights that would result if this amendment were passed. The amendment would also wipe out differences built up over the years to favor women as wives, mothers, and widows—the right of a widow to live in her husband's house, recognition of a mother's special interest in the guardianship of her children, the primary obligations of the husband and father for family support.

I myself am unwilling to see the hard-won gains of working women taken away from them, and I shall not vote for an amendment which legal experts say will do just this. My own record in this Congress shows my aggressive and consistent interest in the advancement of women. I have worked for equal pay for women—I have introduced a bill to establish this principle under Federal law; I have testified in favor of it before congressional committees. I have stanchly supported all efforts to keep down the cost of living, a subject near to the hearts of all women. I have introduced a bill which would permit working mothers to deduct the cost of a housekeeper from their income tax.

I have, in the interest of removing the remaining discriminations against women, sponsored a bill, the status of women bill, H. R. 2936, to determine where inequalities still exist, and to work out ways of getting rid of these inequalities. The remedy for these things is not in abstract feminist theory, based on the notion that identity of treatment with men is the solution to the special problems of women. The solution is, rather, in a rational and discriminating analysis of where the role of the sexes is the same and where differential treatment is required to create the genuine equality for women for which we are all striving.

The Senate recently debated the equal-rights amendment in the form I have quoted. Many Senators felt as I do, that they were unwilling to risk the loss of women's protections as wives and mothers and workers for the sake of the words "equal rights." The Honorable Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] then acted to guarantee that these rights would not be lost. He moved to amend the Senate resolution by adding the words:

> The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law upon persons of the female sex.

The Senate showed its understanding of the fundamentals of this argument when it voted to support Senator HAYDEN'S amendment and attach it to the original resolution. The equal-rights amendment, as amended, passed the Senate by a vote of 63–19. If that measure comes before the House, I shall support it, secure in the conviction that women will not be stripped of the rights and benefits that not only protect them as individuals, but that create, for our whole society, a modus operandi based on reason and a genuine understanding of the complementary functions of men and women in our modern world.

Repatriation of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling the attention of Members of Congress to the plight of thousands of Greek children who have been abducted from their homes.

I include herewith the resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

> Resolutions memorializing Congress relative to the repatriation of the children of Greece, who have been removed from their homes in Greece and detained in certain countries.
>
> Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has formally announced that 28,000 Greek children have been removed from their homes in guerrilla camps in Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, and were forced to fight for guerrilla forces, and were finally sent by said guerrillas to the Communist countries of eastern Europe; and
>
> Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has unanimously recommended the return of the children to Greece, has invited all member states and other states in whose territory said children may be found to take measures necessary to implement such recommendation, and has requested the national Red Cross organizations to assist in executing such recommendations and to aid these innocent victims in returning to their homes and their loved ones; and
>
> Whereas some of these communistic countries within whose borders these children are held captive have opposed, with flat refusal, any cooperation with the Red Cross organizations, while others have temporized or given evasive answers in stating their intentions relative to the return of these children to Greece; Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts, firmly believing in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human being, and in the equal rights of men and women, and of nations large and small, raises its voice in protest at the injustice and inhumanity perpetrated in the abduction and forcible detention, in lands outside their mother country, of these 28,000 children of the Hellenic nation and registers its indignation at the detention of these children under such conditions as evidence a complete disregard of every humane principle concerning family rights and the sanctity of the home; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges and petitions the Congress to reaffirm the tenets of the United Nations Charter, and to advocate most strongly that the United Nations General Assembly by rightful and lawful action implement its resolution adopted on November 18, 1949, relative to the repatriation of Greek children, so that these children of Greece may be saved from forcible detention and degradation, and be reunited with their people in Greece, thus insuring unto the people of all small nations the rights and privileges set forth in the Charter of the United Nations; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth and to the representatives of the United States to the United Nations General Assembly.

The Reporter States the Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this new magazine has been making a distinguished reputation in the field of helping our Nation plan for and implement its responsibility of world leadership, brought to it by the accident of powerful industrial and social organization rather than by design. Two significant contributions of the Reporter under the editorship of the distinguished Prof. Max Ascoli, are found in the appended excerpts from the January issue. The first is a juxtaposition of Soviet promises and Soviet fulfillment, the second is a timely warning about one of the most dire threats which faces not only world peace and security but the fundamental moral basis of all mankind. It discusses the grave danger of a new variation of the Molotov-Ribbentrop alliance of 1939 which signified the start of World War II, in a new alliance between a united Germany and an aggressively imperialistic U. S. S. R. arising out of the present stalemate and the revival of ultranationalism and former Nazi influence in the western German zones which the United States, Great Britain, and France now occupy:

PROGRESS OF A "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY"

THE PROMISE

Yalta, February 11, 1945: "The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should * * * be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. * * * This Polish provisional government of national unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part. * * *"

Potsdam, August 2, 1945: "We have taken note with pleasure of the agreement reached among representative Poles from Poland and abroad which has made possible the formation, in accordance with the decisions reached at the Crimea Conference, of a Polish provisional government of national unity recognized by the Three Powers. * * * The Three Powers note that the Polish provisional government of national unity * * * has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered electrons as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates, and that representatives of the allied press shall enjoy full freedom to report * * * upon developments in Poland before and during elections."

THE FULFILLMENT

June 21, 1945: A Moscow court convicts 12 of 16 Polish leaders on charges of underground activity against the U. S. S. R.

August 20, 1946: A United States note charges the Government with curtailing democratic activity and with irregularity in a referendum held on June 30.

November 22, 1946: Poland receives separate notes from the United States and Britain recalling the Yalta pledge of "free and unfettered" elections.

January 19, 1947: A general election is held. Results: Government bloc, 394 seats; Peasant Party, 28; Catholic Work Party, 12; others, 10.

January 28, 1947: The United States State Department issues a press release stating that the Polish Government employed coercion against democratic elements, and that the Yalta and Potsdam agreements have not been fulfilled.

October 24, 1947: Peasant Party leader Mikolajczyk escapes from Poland.

February 7, 1948: The Peasant Party joins the Communist coalition.

March 18, 1948: Socialist leader announces proposed merger of Socialist Party into a single party with the Communists.

November 7, 1949: Russian Marshal Rokossovsky named Marshal of Poland and Minister of National Defense.

December 9, 1949: Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the central committee, United Workers' Party of Poland, writes in the Cominform newspaper: "It is necessary to end rotten liberalism and to be more strict, morally and ideologically. * * * Our conception of a people's front has always been that the working class and its party are the guiding force. Any other conception of a people's front is detrimental and opportunist."

DEUTSCHLAND—THE KREMLIN'S RED HOPE.

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

In the days immediately after the war, when the Soviet Union was building up its empire of satellites to the deadpan tune of anti-imperialist propaganda, most United States representatives in eastern Europe were acting like innocents abroad. The Communists charged that they were hatching an imperialist plot; reactionaries at home said they were conspiring with the Communists. Both accusations were, of course, pure nonsense. What really gave Russia a clear field was the naïveté of many American liberals, and the defeatism (often expressed in the theory of "inevitable" war) of many American conservatives. The effect of that mixture was the paralysis of American initiative and an easy victory for Russia in what otherwise might have been a very difficult undertaking.

The American innocents started with the supposition that the magic word "democracy" would fight its own battle. They believed that the promise of free speech and free elections—and an account of the possessions of United States workers and farmers—would be enough to make Democrats of any people and to defeat the totalitarian Communists. Actually, of course, such propaganda offered no remedies for the immediate problems of eastern Europe and no guaranties against its most immediate fear, which remained Germany.

The innocents failed to consider that the word "democracy" could be exploited unscrupulously by others. At Yalta the Russians merely asked that the eastern countries be turned into democracies friendly to the Soviet Union. When the western powers agreed, the U. S. S. R. proceeded to make these nations friendly—i. e., satellite. It did not, however, occur to the United States Government that these countries could well be expected to be friendly toward the west at the same time, and so the United States did not bother actively to court such friendliness.

Active courtship would have included the immediate support of all democratic elements against all totalitarian influences, including the respectable antidemocrats of the prewar days. It would also have involved vigorous backing of essential social reforms. It would, above all, have meant offering eastern Europe security against political, military, and economic domination by Germany. Instead, James F. Byrnes, our Secretary of State, made a public speech in Stuttgart, which, rightly or not, was interpreted by east and west alike to mean that the United States favored the restoration of Germany as the center of European gravity. Liberal elements in the United States Government, meanwhile, ducked out of the problem of abetting social reform in eastern Europe, on the ground that, since the people there had never known a democratic regime anyway, the Soviets might as well do the job.

In those days an American correspondent returning from any of the satellite countries was in a curious position. If he reported that there was still a chance for cooperation with the democratic parties in Poland or Czechoslovakia (before the February 1948 coup in the latter) he was the object of suspicious glances. The iron curtain had been drawn, he was told, and everyone in a responsible position behind it was either a Communist or a fellow traveler.

A vocal minority, powerfully represented in the American press, publicized this viewpoint. These defeatists imagined the iron curtain before it really existed. They gave Russia a green light in eastern Europe by saying in effect that democracy had been written off before it had actually died. The theory of an inevitable iron curtain helped make the iron curtain inevitable, just as the theory of inevitable war helps make war inevitable. Anyone who suggested measures of peaceful cooperation in eastern Europe—even with anti-Communist, democratic elements—ran the risk of being charged with appeasement.

Actually Prague and, to a lesser extent, Warsaw were then still free cities. In Warsaw, I obtained interviews with Socialist and agrarian members of the government, although the Communists had tried to prevent them from talking.

If the United States had attempted democratic infiltration at that stage, it still would have been comparatively easy, and might have been fruitful.

But many United States diplomats objected to dealing with any eastern European party whose political views were to the left of Herbert Hoover's. When Dr. Eduard Benes, confronted by the treason of his own cabinet, was blackmailed into signing away Czech democracy, he was actually the victim of a squeeze-play between Russia and America. If he resisted the demands of the Communists—as he said in a secret address to the Communist ministers—he would have run a real risk of civil war. The Communists were, of course, assured of active support by the Red Army; Dr. Benes had nobody to rely on, except his own party of National Socialists, for the prevalent American formula was "Socialist equals Communist."

Thus the United States, by its lack of realism, made it easier for the Soviet Union to take over the satellites. But the lion's share of the credit must, of course, be conceded to the planning and plotting of the Russian leaders. In their master plan, Germany played the central role from the outset. The tipoff was Russia's violent opposition to the inclusion of France among the occupying powers. At Yalta the Soviet leaders again and again made it plain that they did not want to replace a strong Germany with a strong France. Since no continental power except a strong France could ever hope to neutraliz Germany, it is evident that Russia even then was determined to use a satellite Germany as the most direct means of ensuring Russian control of Europe.

Obviously the small nations of Europe, including the eastern satellites, were going to object to any such project. But Stalin and Molotov made it quite plain at Yalta that the small nations would not be asked what they wanted, nor be told what Russia

planned. (Indeed, Molotov once suggested irritably that the representatives of the United States stop worrying about public opinion and start telling the people what they were to do.) It was not surprising when eastern purges, arrests, and sentences soon began to thin the ranks of the democratic leaders in eastern Europe: They were labeled "Fascists," although most of them were members of the various anti-Communist socialist parties that Americans mistakenly lumped together with the Reds.

All this time—while they were steadily working for the creation of a satellite Germany—the Russians carefully exploited the small nations' fear of Germany and the obvious failure of the Americans to democratize their zone. In spite of the memory of Nazi-Soviet collaboration, this propaganda tune was effective, largely because the German record in eastern Europe was so horrible, the scars left there by the Germans so bloody and painful, and the blackout of Russia's real intentions toward Germany so tightly drawn. But by autumn of 1948 some light began to fall on the Russian intrigue to tilt the power balance.

Reports began to drift in from eastern Germany that the Russians were quietly sponsoring a movement for a strong and unified German nation. To do this without creating suspicion and hostility in the satellite belt, the USSR had to pursue a two-faced, two-voiced policy. Satellite newspapers continued to be fed material which portrayed Russia as the protector of eastern Europe against Germany; simultaneously, Russian-licensed papers in Germany were campaigning for revision of the German frontiers. They were quiet about the eastern Oder-neisse line, but they emphatically supported German claims to the Saar, and at every opportunity demanded the withdrawal of the Western powers, particularly the French.

In the course of 1949 it became increasingly clear that Germany—the eastern part at first, the rest later—was being groomed for the role of satellite No. 1. Nazis began to be reinstated in their old positions and promoted to better ones, provided they made no fuss about switching from one dictatorship to another. The people's police became the nucleus for an armed force, and the banners it carried around the cities documented the suspicions of many that the difference between national socialism and national communism was mostly a matter of nomenclature.

While Dr. Benes was being given a state funeral by the Communist government in Prague, newspapers in the Soviet zone of Germany referred to him as a murderer of innocent Sudeten Germans. Apparently the Soviet authorities agreed with those German sentiments. Some well-informed Germans, on the other hand, had noted that Karl Kreibich, chief ideologist for the present Czech régime, used to be a Sudeten German senator; that Evzen Erban, currently Minister of Social Welfare, was at one time secretary-general of a German-sponsored labor movement; and that Vaclav Kopecky, the Minister of Information, had on February 23, 1933, reproached Hitler for his failure to liberate the Sudeten Germans from the Czech republic. (Kopecky had spoken then for the small nations' right of self-determination, a slogan still used widely by Soviet propagandists, although Soviet leaders at Yalta opposed the small countries' rights in the United Nations.) Even within Czechoslovakia, the Communist hierarchy prepared for things to come by admitting into the party so many persons who had collaborated with the Germans that the Communists became popularly known as the immunists.

To explain away the speed-up in the satellization of eastern Germany, the Soviets began to pepper the satellite countries with alarmist diatribes against the west German government. Actually that speed-up became inevitable when the Communist timetable in France and Italy was upset, and especially when the whole structure of satellite solidarity was shaken by Tito's desertion. Tito's attractiveness to satellite Communists who feared Russo-German collaboration became a serious factor for the Politburo to contend with. One way it contended with it was by promoting German aims even more vigorously.

In a gigantic power-political game of this sort, an open switch of strategy calls for new security measures, particularly the protection of the rear. The Kremlin promptly charged Red Army Marshal Konstantin K. Rokossovsky with the defense of Poland. Polish territory thereby became little more than a zone of communications between Russia and Germany, ready to function as such whenever the Russians decide to withdraw from eastern Germany. Few would be surprised if by that time the German "army of liberation" should show up again (it and its commander, General von Paulus, have been missing since Stalingrad) to supplement the people's police with its elite Bereitschaften.

The only reason why no official change of command has taken place in Prague is that the Czech armies were placed under Moscow-dominated leadership in 1948, when practically the entire RAF-trained air force was discharged. It has become an open secret, too, that a young Russian colonel has taken over the intelligence.

The stage was set for the Russians' final move in the maneuvering that started at Yalta with their stand against France. Under Stalin's portrait Otto Grotewohl addressed the east German people as the new chancellor. A personal message from Stalin underlining the special status of the new member of the family was read. An amnesty restored full political rights to almost all Nazis and ex-officers. The Communist press, which had formerly attacked west German reconstruction, now lit into the dismantling program. The peoples' police intensified its recruiting drive, and staged Berlin's first post-Hitler torchlight parade.

By now it was time to tell the satellites and the people of Russia what had taken place; for now the double-face and double-talk had lost usefulness. Those who had flocked around the Kremlin for protection against a reconstructed Germany were told, on November 6, 1949, that their fears were no longer fashionable. "There can be no doubt," said Georgi M. Malenkov, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "that with the peaceful policy of the German democratic republic and the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union—peace in Europe can be regarded as secured." The new protector of the small satellites therefore was—Germany.

Unquestionably, the satellites have a fair idea of the meaning of this line-up. The Germans announced almost at once that they were about to send trade missions to Czechoslovakia and Poland, and they added promptly that the Kremlin had suggested such action. Unless Prague and Warsaw want to run the risk of being labeled "reactionary" and "fascist" they had better roll out the red carpet.

The eastern countries look with fear on Germany as a rival satellite, but Germany will not regard itself as a satellite at all. Although the new government may speak under the Soviet banner, it will see new opportunity in the role of pawn-turned-master. To German professional soldiers, an army is an army, even if it may call itself temporarily the People's Police. To German industrialists the market of eastern Europe is attractive; the prospect of economic domination there is far more promising than in the Marshall plan area, where the emphasis is on cooperation rather than on supremacy. The war has brought home to Germans the superiority of American industrial power, but they still feel technically ahead of the Russians.

Henceforth the lesser satellites will have more and more occasion to think of the Molotov-Ribbentrop alliance, and what it meant to Poland in 1939. The question remains whether they will also realize that American policy has undergone a rather remarkable change since the early postwar days of bungling. Dr. Benes' Socialists were abandoned to the Russians as unreliable "radicals," but Tito has not been denied American aid despite the fact he plainly calls himself a Communist. Land reforms in Italy have finally been given American approval. Economic "infiltration" into the eastern countries has just been recommended by Marshall plan officials. There are real indications that American policy planners are shedding both impractical idealism and pliant defeatism.

These are vital developments; for if the Polish Socialist and the Czech National Socialist begin to realize that a new link—perhaps an underground alliance—with the west is not a tie-in sale with laissez-faire capitalism, he may at last see an alternative. The United States this time did not insist that Tito hold free elections and declare democracy overnight. Our Government apparently is learning that white and black are unusual colors in the spectrum of European power politics; that various shades of gray must be tolerated to prevent them from turning darker.

Development of the Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest developments remaining to be undertaken by our Government is improvement of Snake River between its junctions with Columbia River at Pasco, Wash., and the confluence of the Clearwater and the Snake River at Lewiston, Idaho. For years the Snake River has been navigated during the high-water season between Portland, Oreg., and Lewiston, Idaho. Congress in its wisdom has authorized the construction of a series of multipurpose dams on the Snake River navigable the year round up to Lewiston, Idaho.

Recently I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of the appropriation to construct the Snake River Dam at Ice Harbor. My statement made before the Appropriations Committee is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO, BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 22, 1950

ICE HARBOR DAM AND LOCK, LOWER SNAKE RIVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak before this committee. We have an empire to make in the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Northwest, that needs the irrigation water, electric power, and building material of all kinds in the Columbia Basin.

Chairman MCKELLAR. You want a multiple-purpose project; is that it?

Mr. WHITE. Multiple-purpose dam.

Before proceeding further, I would like to present for the record a statement covering this subject.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Without objection, it will be placed into the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this statement is made in behalf of the Ice Harbor dam and lock on the lower Snake River, and is the first of four dams authorized by Public Law 14 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved March 2, 1945. It has been approved by the United States engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and is the only authorized multipurpose self-liquidating project in the entire Northwest for which appropriations have not yet been made and construction started.

"As I understand it, the principal objective of rivers and harbors legislation is to improve navigation and prevent floods; and the Snake River dams meet those qualifications more perfectly than any project in the Pacific Northwest, in addition to supplying sufficient power to liquidate the entire cost.

"FLOOD LOSS IN COLUMBIA RIVER

"The annual estimated flood loss in the Columbia River is $26,000,000, and in the severe flood of 1948 the property damage was estimated at $100,000,000 in addition to taking approximately 50 lives. Nothing has been done since that tragic flood to give any assurance that such a flood would not recur.

"The Snake River is the largest tributary of the Columbia, supplying slightly more than one-fifth of the main annual run-off of the Columbia River. It rises in northwestern Wyoming, travels the entire State of Idaho, irrigating some 2,000,000 acres on the way, and before joining the Columbia is joined by the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers of Idaho. The confluence of the Snake and Columbia Rivers is 140 miles below Lewiston, Idaho, and it is often the floodwaters of the Snake which created flood hazards in the lower Columbia River in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver and Longview, Wash.

"LOCATION OF LOCKS AND DAMS

"The four authorized dams and locks on the Snake River are between the confluence of these two rivers and Lewiston, and will contribute materially toward controlling these floodwaters. These dams would also contribute greatly to navigation by providing slack water between Lewiston, Idaho, and the Columbia River and on down to the mouth of the Columbia River at Astoria, Oreg., a distance of 495 miles.

"This is not an entirely new navigation project, but merely the authorization to finish a project which is already 90 percent completed, because navigation between the Pacific Ocean and Lewiston has been carried on for exactly 100 years. We merely want channel improvements that will remove some of the hazards so that navigation for this entire 495 miles can be carried on at all seasons of the year with a greater degree of safety and economy.

"River navigation from the Pacific Ocean to Umatilla Landing, Oreg., is already a reality and the completion of the McNary Dam will provide slack-water navigation to the mouth of the Snake River and the four authorized dams on the Snake River, of which Ice Harbor is the first to be constructed, will provide slack-water navigation for the 140 miles from the mouth of Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho.

"The savings to farmers and businessmen by the reduction of freight rates on the Columbia River from Umatilla Landing (site of McNary Dam) are already tremendous; and since 75 percent of the potential river tonnage in and out of this inland empire is above McNary Dam, these four Snake River dams will increase the potential tonnage 300 percent. Fully 90 percent of this potential tonnage would not, under any circumstances, move over the railroads because freight rates would be prohibitive. Much of this would be in the shape of Government-owned timber, low-grade ores, lime, and phosphate from Government-owned land on which the Federal Government would receive substantial returns.

"NEED FOR RAW MATERIALS SHIPPED BY RIVER

"Most of these raw materials will be needed to improve the farms and build the towns which will spring up on the nearby Columbia Basin project where the Bureau of Reclamation is preparing to irrigate 1,250,000 acres with waters from the Grand Coulee Dam.

"In addition to contributions to flood control, navigation, irrigation, and reclamation, Ice Harbor dam and lock, upon completion, will produce 260,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power so sorely needed in the Pacific Northwest, and also increase the firm power at down-river projects like McNary Dam and Bonneville Dam by smoothing out and keeping uniform the river flow.

"I will leave it to the United States engineers and others to explain the details of this project, and to assure you that the fishing industry will be adequately protected by fish ladders similar to those which operate so successfully to carry salmon over the Bonneville Dam on the way to their spawning waters. But I want to say to this committee that no other project under consideration so perfectly combines flood control, navigation, irrigation, and reclamation as the Ice Harbor Dam and lock.

"While the benefits to navigation, reclamation, and flood control would alone justify this development, the hydroelectric power developed at Ice Harbor will return to the United States Treasury 85 percent of the entire cost of this project.

"AN EMPIRE IN THE MAKING

"We have an empire in the making on the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Northwest that needs irrigation waters, electric power, and building materials of all kinds. In the area around the confluence of the Columbia and Snake Rivers at Pasco, Wash., and the immense territory where the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers flow into the Snake River at and near Lewiston, Idaho, we have between the main lines of the transcontinental railroads, the Northern Pacific Railway on the south and the main line of the Great Northern Railway on the north, there are 1,125,000 acres of fertile land in the Columbia Basin that is soon to be watered by the construction of a reclamation project. This project has cost our Government for the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, the storage reservoirs, and diversion canals over $200,000,000.

"Thousands of farm families are eagerly awaiting the completion of this project to move into the sagebrush land and add another western empire to the fast-growing western communities. Productive farms, towns, and cities will spring up, prosper, and grow in this new farming area.

"Up river from Pasco and Lewiston in a drainage of the Snake, Clearwater, and Salmon Rivers there is a vast area containing a great abundance of undeveloped natural resources, mostly in Government ownership, potential waterpower, timber, lime, building stone, iron, copper, lead, zinc, and antimony—all awaiting development and cheap water transportation to market.

"Complementary to the Columbia Basin development now nearing completion, our Government has spent vast sums to improve the lower Columbia River for navigation by constructing locks at Bonneville, Celio Canal at The Dalles, and the McNary Dam near Umatilla Landing. The completion of the McNary Dam will open the Columbia for navigation to the mouth of the Snake River at Pasco. This will give an outlet to the wheat and farm products of the Walla Walla and Pasco countries, but the wheat and farm products of the rich Camas Prairie and large farming country surrounding Lewiston, together with all the vast industrial resources of central Idaho and eastern Oregon above Lewiston, is still awaiting development and cheap water transportation to market.

"Congress has recognized the need for the utilization of this natural river highway to float the building materials so abundant in central Idaho to where it can be used in building the towns, cities, and farmsteads down river on the Columbia Basin project; and the transportation of the farm and manufactured products to coastal markets, by authorizing the construction of the necessary navigation and multipurpose dam on the Snake River between the mouth of the Snake River at Pasco and the confluence of the Clearwater at Lewiston.

"Money, $12,000,000, for the construction of the first of these dams at Ice Harbor has been authorized but has been left out of the appropriation bill now under consideration.

"I most earnestly urge that the item for the construction of Ice Harbor Dam be restored and the appropriation be made so that construction work can be started without further delay."

EXPANDING DEVELOPMENT OF SNAKE RIVER BASIN

Mr. WHITE. In supplement of what my good neighbor and friend, Senator MAGNUSON, said about the use of power, the need of power in this country, in the first place, we have two of the greatest atomic-energy plants in the United States, one at Hanford, and the other one building now in Idaho. They are going to be great consumers of power.

Now, as to the need for aluminum, the power generated on the Columbia River and its tributaries in the Northwest is the main dependence of our Government in processing aluminum for national defense. You will recall that during the war, bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is made, was brought from South America to concentrating plants located in Alabama and Louisiana, where it was reduced to alumina (aluminum-oxide), and then these concentrates had to be shipped all the way across the United States to plants in the Northwest where the needed hydroelectric power was available.

We have been all through that in wartime, and we know that it is absolutely essential that we have power and plenty of power to manufacture aluminum for our airplanes and supply the atomic-energy plants in Idaho and Washington State.

We are now dealing with one of the best means in the United States to bring power supply for the defense of our country.

In addition to that, I want to point out to you gentlemen on this map, which embraces half the State of Montana, the whole State of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, what the Columbia River means to our great country. We are now finishing up a $200,000,000 development in the Columbia Basin. We built first the Grand Coulee Dam to supply the power, and then we constructed the storage reservoirs. We constructed the diversion dams or canal, reservoirs to bring water to this Columbia Basin on 1,200,000 acres of land.

It is just a start in the development. There will be cities, towns, farmsteads, roads, and streets that must have material. We have that material close at hand.

A little way up the Snake River we have, at Lewiston, Idaho, the biggest sawmill in the world. The Government owns this vast area of national forests that is full of mineral deposits, and I have taken the trouble to indicate to you on this map the kind of metals or minerals we have. They include

gold, silver, lead, copper, zinc, antimony, tungsten, mercury, molybdenum, cobalt, manganese, phosphate, iron, and portland cement.

We had just above Lewiston a cement plant that is making commercial cement. We have limestone, building stone, and timber. Everything in central Idaho is mostly in Government ownership. The outlet to this treasure house, this storehouse of the Nation's wealth is down the Snake River and on down the Columbia.

We have made a wonderful improvement in the Columbia River for navigation. We built the locks at Bonneville. We have improved that rugged place where the salmon are having so much trouble getting over the dam.

UMATILLA LOCK, M'NARY DAM, COLUMBIA RIVER

We are now building a lock at Umatilla, at the McNary Dam. This is nearing completion, which would bring transportation all the way up to the confluence of the Snake River and the Columbia at Lewiston. That would drain all that vast area of timber country, mining country.

And there we have also the wonderful Kansas prairie with all this wheat.

We need this dam. It is the greatest development to come to our country, to be built in this country. This series of dams in the Ice Harbor project will open up the country, as has been done in the Southern and Northern States.

I have here a picture of a drawbridge showing you that at Lewiston in high water they navigate all the way up to Lewiston. Boats have already gone up that river. It is nothing new, but we simply want to make it a year-round propostion.

Then we also have here a picture of a barge taking oil up the river and bringing back wheat. Then we have here a picture of grain elevators that run wheat down to the boats.

We are right in the initial period of development in the Northwest. With the people flocking out here to settle on this land, with the 1,200,000 acres now just in the eve of settlement, we need this Ice Harbor Dam for power, for navigation, and also to supply water to the thirsty land.

I am not going into the details of what has been done. Ice Harbor is the only authorized dam in the United States for which no appropriation has been made. The money was dropped out of the appropriation bill and we are asking you at this time to restore it. If it is restored, we will be on our way with one of the best projects in the United States, in my opinion.

I thank you.

Chairman MCKELLAR. Are there any questions, gentlemen?

We are very much obliged to you, sir.

Behind the False Front of the Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, an experienced buyer takes nothing for granted. He ignores window dressing and gingerbread, and he looks behind false fronts. Whether his contemplated purchase is a horse, a house, or an irrigation project he applies this principle of operation.

I have gone behind the scenes of the proposed central Arizona project, H. R. 934, and what I have discovered, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to describe as astounding, for that is an inadequate word.

The concealed facts of this proposed project are nothing short of alarming. They present a serious threat to the stability of our national economy.

The State of Arizona has asked us, the Congress, to buy the largest reclamation rescue project ever proposed. The original cost would be somewhere close to a billion and a half dollars. When I say that the State of Arizona has asked us to buy this project, I mean just that, because we would be spending Federal tax money for it, and there would be no chance that this Government might ever be reimbursed.

However, Mr. Speaker, I shall not deal here with either the technical or financial infeasibility of this proposed project. That already has been done to a great extent, and it will be done to a greater extent in the near future.

Today I propose to take this House of Representatives on a short tour behind the scenes of the Central Arizona Project and to recount the shocking facts I have uncovered in my investigation.

I intend to charge, and to prove my charges, that:

First, the proposed central Arizona project is a land speculator's heaven on earth.

Second, that water is wanted in the project area primarily to save thousands of acres that were rushed into production during the war.

Third, that these thousands of acres were irrigated only to take advantage of high wartime prices; that it was known then that the water being used would soon be exhausted; and that these lands could have no adequate water supply without depriving other lands long developed.

Fourth, that hundreds of pumps were installed to take out underground water when warnings already had been issued that such mining of water would place established irrigation areas in dire jeopardy.

Fifth, that for years a wanton waste of underground water continued, but even so only a wartime shortage of materials prevented the installation of hundreds of additional pumps.

Sixth, that the entire project is designed to bring fortunes to big landowners.

Seventh, that these big landowners and speculators will not pay any of the cost of the project, but would receive it as a gift.

Eighth, that there is no water in the Colorado River available for the proposed Arizona project. That the Arizona promoters are attempting, not only to raid the National Treasury but to take water for their nefarious scheme from California's legal share of the Colorado River. They are seeking to have this Congress repudiate contracts between the United States Government and the State of California, contracts which years ago awarded to California the share of Colorado River water upon which the economic security of 5,000,000 persons now depends.

The term "rescue project" as I have used it here is not mine. It is Arizona's own description of the proposed project. The Arizona promoters are deceitful in their use of the term. They do not tell the whole story of the "rescue." They have dressed up their plan and given it a fine glossy coat. But when one lifts the hood and looks inside the truth is revealed.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the central Arizona project is designed to "rescue" wartime speculators, to continue their fortune making, and to make it possible for more speculation, all at the expense of other States.

For some time now we have been drenched in the propaganda of the Arizona promoters. We have heard their pitiful plea that unless they get their project civilization will be set back. We have been given terrible pictures of ragged and hungry men, women, and children trudging desert roads, their once charming homes and fruitful acres turned bleak with the curse of devastating drought. The tragic plight of Europe's displaced persons was not to be compared with the terrible conditions of Arizona's homeless, driven to wandering because they had used up all water God had given them.

That, gentlemen, is all unadulterated hog wash.

Now, what was this desert land worth before the speculators began "mining" water for it, for the purpose of making millions during the war?

Well, in 1940, ordinary unirrigated farm land adjacent to an established Arizona reclamation project was worth at the most about $50 an acre. With water on it the value of this land immediately rose to $300 an acre.

This was land outside established projects but within the area of the potential central Arizona project. Land more remote from a known, dependable underground water source was worth less.

To get water on this desert land, underground wells and pumps had to be installed. What did one of these installations cost? It cost all the way from $18,000 to $30,000.

Well you might ask right here how a farmer could afford such investments? I shall tell you. He could afford them, and the banks would help him, because the return on the money invested was swift and certain. Crops grow the year round in this area, and with wartime prices for agricultural products the investment was quickly paid off.

This was no long-time gamble. This was sure money, and big, certain profit.

But what was happening meanwhile to the underground water table? It was going down steadily, and there was no supply to replace it.

Who cared? Who cared about the immediate years to come? Not the Arizona speculators. Not the Arizona banks. Not even the Arizona government, which sold State lands willy-nilly, cashing in while the sun of inflation brightly shone.

There was no law in Arizona governing the taking of water from underground basins. Anybody could sink wells and pump water out, and the State did not care. Sink the wells and pump out the water, get the cash, and to hell with the future. That was the program.

All during the war, when they were cashing in and getting rich by spending their capital water, the Arizona promoters, the State officials, and the big landowners had a slick idea up their collective sleeve. Even as they drove down more wells they were working out the plans for the so-called central Arizona project.

"Don't worry, boys," they said. "Sink all the wells you want. Don't think about the future. We've got that all worked out. What we've worked out is a dilly of a scheme. It'll be like shooting sitting ducks.

"Now, listen close. Here's the racket. We're going to take the water we need away from California. We'll be desperate, see. We'll be drowning in a sea of sand, not water. Our land is going back to desert. That's what we'll yell. Save us. Save our kiddies from this awful fate. The Congress will go for that. You know, people in distress. The dry well and the dust in the eyes stuff. Never mind about what California will do. We'll get the water, because California ain't using it all right now, and water should go where it can be used right now, not in years to come. Never mind that California has built projects to use this water in the future. Didn't we tell you what to do with the future?

"What an idea, eh? So go ahead and pump, boys. Pump day and night. California and the United States Treasury will pay the bill."

In some respects the psychology of the Arizona schemers must be commended. For instance, they joined up with the Bureau of Reclamation, each putting out some money, to concoct a report on the proposed project. This was just dandy with the Bureau.

Today in the Bureau of Reclamation we find a group of men who have one paramount idea in mind. That is to perpetuate themselves and their policies. To do this they must have immense, long-range projects, projects that will take a generation to construct, and they must have absolute control of those projects. For, by controlling these projects they control the people, their lives, and their economy.

What happened? The Bureau of Reclamation issued a report advocating the Arizona project, but despite its craving for power the Bureau found it necessary to leave open a hatch door or two for a possible escape. Using a weasel's pen, the Bureau buried some qualifying phrases and statements deep in its report. The Bureau admitted there might be no water for the proposed Arizona project because California challenged Arizona's claims to the Colorado River water. If the contentions of California were correct, said the Bureau, there would be no dependable water for the Arizona diversion.

That fact did not stop either the Bureau or the Arizona promoters from asking Congress for more than a billion dollars to build a project for which there might be no water. Not at all. The Bureau and Arizona went right ahead.

Get the water first, and then let California squawk.

During the period of wild expansion and wanton pumping Arizona had no law governing the taking of water from underground basins. Anybody who had some land could sink wells and pump all the water they wanted, and the State did not care a hang. Sink the wells and pump the water, get the cash. That was the program.

Let us look at the record:

In the Bureau of Reclamation report on the Arizona project we find this on page R–6:

> There being no statute to control pumping from the ground-water basins in the State of Arizona, exploitation of the ground-water resources followed with increasing rapidity. * * * As a result of district and private drilling operations, the number of irrigation wells in the central Arizona project area increased from about 400 in 1920 to 750 in 1930, and to more than 1,100 in 1940. Since then, intensive drilling has taken place and by 1946 about 1,700 wells were used as a source of irrigation water.
>
> * * * during the period of 1940–44 the average annual pumpage exceeded the safe annual yield of the ground-water basins by an estimated 468,400 acre-feet a year.

In the Bureau's report History of Reclamation the following statement may be read:

> Beginning in about 1935 pumping over the entire area increased at an alarming rate.
>
> Soon after 1935, concern was being expressed over the gradual but continual lowering of the water table. It had become apparent that the ground-water supply was not inexhaustible. This seems only to have stimulated competition and the race was on for the water stored in the several underground reservoirs. Irrigation wells were drilled and pumps installed in all districts.
>
> * * * individuals and irrigation organizations vied during and after the war for the services of the limited number of well-drilling outfits.

A. L. Bartlett, president of the Pinal County Farm Bureau, told the Eightieth Congress in 1947:

> During the last 6 years the yearly draft on ground water has increased to such an extent that water requirements for the area now under cultivation are drawn from reserves in ground-water supply, the draft being greatly in excess of the amount recharged into the ground-water reservoir.
>
> About 1940 it became apparent that the safe yield of the basin was being overdrawn. With the beginning of the recent war period the bringing in of new land continued at an increased rate and with the intensive crop program practiced during the past 6 years the yearly draft on ground water has increased to such an extent that water requirements for the area now under cultivation are drawn from reserves in ground-water supply.

J. H. Moeur, president of the Arizona Reclamation Association, and an official of the National Reclamation Association, told the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1944:

> The underground water now being pumped for irrigation is largely in excess of the recharge to the different underground basins, and hence the underground-water supply is being rapidly depleted. If present practices are continued, serious difficulties will be encountered.

At the same hearings Ray Killian, secretary of the Roosevelt Water Conservation District, said:

> During the past 5 years the water table has lowered an additional 20 feet on the average throughout the district.

And J. H. Sossamon, of the Queen Creek irrigation district, testified in the past 6 years the underground-water level in his area had dropped over 20 feet, and that this "shows we are drawing water in that district beyond replacement of the underground flow. If it is to be continued, some of the land will have to go out of cultivation."

John W. White, a grower of the Eloy area, stated:

> All I have to say is our water level is dropping very rapidly * * * and if we keep on pumping water out in my estimate there won't be any there in a couple of years.

I might cite many more statements of this kind, but these will serve to illustrate that Arizona well knew what was being done, and that Arizona continued to plunder her own water treasury without abatement.

The State government of Arizona knew, too, and cooperated in the plundering.

In substantiation of this charge, I shall refer to the records of the Eloy and Maricopa areas in the Pinal unit outside the San Carlos project.

The certificates of purchase issued by the State land office in Phoenix for these sections were inspected. From these certificates a compilation was made of all land purchased from the State by private parties during the years 1939 to 1947, inclusive.

From the county assessor's office of Pinal County data were obtained that showed which of these lands were irrigated by pumps during these same years.

Let us look at the totals.

In the year 1939, in these areas, 32,532 acres were irrigated by pumping underground water.

In the year 1940 a total of 24,054 additional acres were brought under pump water.

In the year 1941, when we entered the war, 18,446 new acres were brought in.

The new acreage brought under pump water in 1942 was 17,067.

New materials for wells and pumps, as well as well-drilling labor, became scarce, and in 1943 only 7,029 new acres could be added, irrigated from underground wells. The new acreage for 1944, for these reasons, was only 6,388.

But in 1945, the year the war ended, material and labor became more available, and the dream of the central Arizona project was forming in the minds of the speculators and big landowners. In 1945 a total of 25,566 new acres were cultivated by pumps. The total of new acreage increased even more in 1946—to 28,067 new acres.

I have already presented evidence to show that this reckless expansion and profiteering was carried on in the face of knowledge that the underground water would soon be exhausted. That, as I have said, did not stop either the speculators or the State government from continuing their program of destruction.

So, in the years 1939 to 1946, a total of 159,149 acres were added to the draft on a constantly diminishing reserve. This was done deliberately, with knowledge that there were no surface streams to replace the accumulations of geologi-

cal ages that were being mined by the pumps put down in these 7 years to irrigate that 159,000 acres of desert. A hundred and fifty-nine thousand acres were thus brought into irrigation in just this one unit of the project to take advantage of high prices and with no regard for the future.

But this Eloy-Maricopa unit is just a small part of the story.

Let me read a few words about Pinal County expansion from Arizona's own propaganda book on the central Arizona project. It is called Presenting the Central Arizona Project to You, and on page 67 the Pinal County Research Committee states that in 1936 only 75,000 acres were irrigated in that county, and continues:

> In 1941 there were 110,000 acres of land irrigated, and in 1946 approximately 300,000 acres were under cultivation and irrigated principally by pumped water. * * * Water was withdrawn from underground reservoirs at a rate of 188 percent of the 1940 withdrawal.

On Arizona's own figures, the expansion from 1941 to 1946 was thus 190,000 acres. This was desert land, known to have no surface water supply. Until 1948 there was no State statute which might effect control over the sinking of new irrigation wells. A landowner could install as many pumps as he needed, regardless of the fact he might be contributing to the destruction of the underground basin beneath an entire area. Underground basins must be replenished the same as water in the radiator of an automobile; otherwise production stops.

The Arizona speculators and big landowners are continuing to destroy their underground reserves. Now this is where the central Arizona project steps in to save them.

They want 1,200,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River that does not belong to Arizona, that belongs to California. They are demanding this water admittedly to "rescue" their lands.

No, they do not want to stop pumping. They have invested immense amounts of money in pumps costing all the way from $18,000 to $30,000 each, and they have invested money in lines and stations to bring power to those pumps. They do not want to abandon this huge investment, even if they made it to make a killing in the wartime boom, and even though many of them have got back their investment several times over.

This is what they want:

They want the Colorado River water primarily to replenish the underground basins that they deliberately overdrew for wartime profits. They want this water in other areas to supplement the pumped water by flowing to their fields on the surface, and then going into the underground basins.

They want this water to "rescue" their wartime speculations.

Mr. Speaker, they want water that belongs to California to perpetuate a scheme born of the vicissitudes of war and nutured on wanton destruction and plundering.

Years ago the water Arizona seeks from the Colorado River was awarded to California by Federal contracts. And believing in the sanctity of these contracts, the people of California have obligated themselves to pay debts amounting to more than half a billion dollars for projects to bring Colorado River water to their cities and farms.

These Federal contracts are instruments of Federal law. Are we—the Congress—going to repudiate these instruments which we once sanctioned? Are we going to destroy these contracts to give water to a group of land sharks and water brigands?

Are we going to condone a gigantic project that is conceived of misrepresentation and humbug?

Are we going to take from 5,000,000 people in southern California the economic security we once gave to them? Are we going to jeopardize the future of millions of people, billions of dollars' worth of industrial developments, and more billions of dollars' worth of agriculture in California, for a handful of landowners in Arizona?

Are we going to hand these Arizona despoilers $1,500,000,000?

I ask you, look into this rescue project as I have done. I know that you will close the glossy book of Arizona propaganda and say, as I have said:

"This fantastic scheme will be defeated."

Mr. Lie Forgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington News of yesterday, March 22, 1950, I find reduced to its simplest and understandable language a classic example of straight thinking at its best, by Ludwell Denny.

The eloquence of Trygve Lie addressing the B'nai B'rith delegates was so impressive as to confound the average listener and even lead him to believe that a solution was being offered for the Russo-American deadlock.

It required the penetrating and analytical mind of Ludwell Denny to point out the obvious fallacies of the United Nations Secretary. Mr. Denny most ably points the way, and the only way, to an understanding rather than appeasement.

The article reprinted herewith speaks for itself and I commend it to the membership of this House, especially the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

MR. LIE FORGETS

(By Ludwell Denny)

Nothing will come of United Nations Secretary-General Trygve Lie's proposed 20-year program for American-Russian conciliation, in the judgment of diplomats here.

In suggesting negotiation which requires honest give-and-take by both sides, Mr. Lie specified "I do not mean by negotiation surrender or appeasement by either side." But it is pointed out here that unless Russia surrenders on her policies of aggression, subversion, and obstruction, any settlement would involve appeasement.

Mr. Lie distorts rather than clarifies the situation. His premise that the struggle is between the United States and Russia, and that they are both at fault, is fallacious. Doubtless Mr. Lie thinks this is a sign of his nonpartisanship or neutrality. But, regardless of his intent, this helps Russian propaganda.

The conflict is not essentially between the United States and Russia, but between the UN—the entire non-Soviet world—and Russia. The United States, as the major democratic power, carries most of the burden of defense. But our Nation, being farther away and stronger, is in less danger than weaker Europe and Asia.

The issue is not that Stalin is in conflict with some exclusive American policy, but rather that he is violating all the major allied agreements and treaties.

Mr. Lie in asking the United States to negotiate with Russia on a basis of honest give-and-take, apparently is forgetting three things:

In the allied agreements, in the satellite treaties, and in the UN Charter—all of which Stalin is now breaking—the western powers did the giving and he did the taking. In effect they gave Russia most of eastern Europe and the strategic points of China. They gave him extra representation in the UN; they gave him veto power with which to paralyze or kill that body.

There is nothing left which the United States can honestly give Stalin, even though it got something in return. Any such deal between Washington and Moscow would inevitably be at the expense of others. Washington has neither the lawful authority nor the moral right to legalize Stalin's violations of international agreements. Washington lacks the power—as well as the will—to sanctify Stalin's aggressions.

For legitimate negotiations there is no need of a Lie plan or any other. The facilities already exist in abundance. There are American and allied representatives in Moscow, and Soviet diplomats in the allied capitals. There is the UN, which is directly involved, as the proper seat of negotiations.

It is Russia that has walked out on the UN—not the United States nor its allies.

Housing Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was a great disappointment to me to have the House of Representatives, by a vote of 155 to 108, wipe out of the Housing Act of 1950, title I, or the new cooperative section. This was accomplished by the combined vote of the Republicans and the southern Democrats. The final vote on the bill, shorn of this new feature, was 361 to 10. Disregarding a special appeal from President Truman, from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and organized labor, the bill's objectors did not waiver in their opposition. The Republicans and southern Democrats voted title I out of the bill. It is important to note that they offered no substitute nor any provision that would afford housing for the middle-income families. Are there no middle-income families in their

districts? Or could it be that their desire to kill every Administration bill transcends their responsibility to their districts?

The President, in his 1950 State of the Union message, wisely asked Congress to pass a Housing bill designed to supplement existing housing legislation in order to provide relief and assistance for the forgotten class of our citizenry, the middle-income group—those who earn between $2,800 and $4,400. This group comprises one-third of the national population, the backbone of the Nation. What benefits them, benefits our Nation.

By the use of housing cooperatives and similar nonprofit organizations, title I would have provided good housing for middle-income families at a monthly cost which such families could afford to pay. These cooperatives or similar nonprofit organizations would have made possible a savings in management and operation not generally attainable in the case of rental projects operated for profit. Opponents of this bill claimed it was socialistic. They overlooked the fact that cooperatives are widely used by those in the high income brackets and this they do not consider socialistic. Title I was an endeavor to encourage free enterprise to invest capital, guaranteed by the Federal Government. No subsidy was involved. Safeguards were provided against the use of cooperatives for speculative purposes. They combined the best features gained in the course of 15 years of experience in two of our successful agencies administering governmental assistance to private enterprise and to housing—the Federal Home Loan Banks and the Federal Housing Administration.

The action of the House of Representatives in destroying the cooperative housing feature of this bill was a blow, not to the Administration, but to the people of the United States who rightfully looked to Congress for a solution to their housing problems.

Study Indicates Mail, Pets, Milk Ride Rails at Expense of Passengers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal, Pacific coast edition, for July 6, 1949:

STUDY INDICATES MAIL, PETS, MILK RIDE RAILS AT EXPENSE OF PASSENGERS—CARRIERS' PLEAS FOR HIGHER FARES, FREIGHT AND EXPRESS RATES MAY BE AFFECTED—LOTS OF RED INK IN 1948

(By M. M. Diefenderfer)

WASHINGTON.—The man in the parlor car may be paying part of the fare for the pet dog, the can of milk, and the bag of letters in the head end of his passenger train.

The head end is the front section of railroad cars separating the locomotive from coaches and pullmans. It carries mail, express, packages, pets, milk, and cream—everything but people.

Interstate Commerce Commission economists believe the head-end load is dead beating on passenger fares. If they're right, it means train passengers are bearing more than their share of the costs of running these trains.

Preliminary findings of a confidential study now under way at the ICC bear out the theory that charges for nonpassenger items don't always cover costs of carrying them. If the finished study shows people are more than paying their way at today's passenger rates, it will have far-reaching effects on the costs of sending anything by rail—either in freight cars or faster passenger trains.

WOULD AFFECT ICC DECISION

Immediately, confirmation of these thoughts would dampen the likelihood that 60 eastern railroads will get the 12.5 percent increase in passenger fares that they're seeking. But all railroads might get more mail pay from the Government.

The ICC's Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics expects to finish its study on the costs of carrying people and things on passenger trains before hearings begin in Brooklyn July 13, on the eastern roads' fare rise proposal. These railroads do more than half the Nation's passenger-train business.

The ICC study is the first ever to be made to break down passenger train costs for the 132 class I railroads—those doing a gross business of $1,000,000 or more annually. Though the roads report fully on revenues receive from each of 20 types of services offered on passenger trains, they make no effort to allocate the costs of each of these.

When its study is completed the ICC hopes to be able to pin point, at least for its own purposes, the comparative cost of carrying a person, a truck, a letter, or a can of milk on a passenger train. There is no plan at present for making the findings public.

But with such ammunition, the ICC experts, who approve all rail charges, can decide what part of the traffic should bear added costs of running the railroads.

PASSENGER SERVICE DEFICIT

In 1948, the railroads said their passenger train services ran $560,000,000 into the red—a record deficit. Though passenger-train revenues more than paid current operating expenses, there wasn't enough to pay the passenger service share of the general overhead expenses of running a railroad—roughly 24 percent of the total.

Head-end traffic makes up about one-fourth of total passenger-train income. The ICC study is expected to show that the costs of these services are more than a fourth of total expenses.

In 1948, for instance, the Nation's passenger-train services took in $1,435,000,000. Train tickets for passengers accounted for $962,600,000. Head-end income ran approximately $336,400,000 with mail service bringing in $198,900,000; express $116,600,000; milk delivery $14,500,000; baggage $2,600,000; and freight $3,835,000.

The rest of the income is from dining-car and buffet services, operation of hotels, restaurants, parcel rooms and baggage storage, telephone and telegraph services, and similar miscellaneous items.

In only 3 years out of the past 13 has the passenger-train service turned up a profit for the Nation's railroads. These were the peak war years 1942 through 1944, when passenger service made an average annual profit of $250,000,000. In the following 2 years, passenger trains paid their way but failed to turn a profit. The $560,000,000 deficit reported for 1948 is more than double the stiffest loss for the six prewar years from 1936 through 1941.

BEARING ON FOUR PROBLEMS

The cost figures now being worked up by the ICC are expected to have significant bearing on at least four problems now being mulled by the regulatory agency. These are:

Railroad mail pay: The railroads are asking for an 80-percent increase over the 1946 mail-pay rates. ICC in December 1947, granted a 25-percent temporary mail-pay hike, effective retroactively to February 1947 and continued to study further rises. It agreed to make its final adjustment also retroactive to February 1947.

If the full 80-percent requested boost had been in effect during 1948, passenger-train revenues would have been $128,000,000 more—and the deficit about one-fourth less. In 1948, mail revenues accounted for a little less than 14 percent of passenger-train income. If ICC finds carrying the mail accounts for more than 14 percent of operating expenses, it may order the Post Office Department—and it has the authority to do this—to pay the railroad more—up to the 80-percent increase—for the job.

Freight rates: Shippers protest that freight is bearing more than its share of the burden of supporting the railroads. They oppose the carriers' current plea for a new 13-percent hike in general freight rates over the 1948 level.

These shippers say their freight rates are being raised to help offset losses on passenger-train service. The ICC is now completing its report on this 13-percent freight rate boost; the findings of the passenger-train cost study are expected to have a hearing on the freight-rate decision, especially if ICC experts find some passenger-fare services aren't returning their share of costs.

WANT HIGHER FARES IN EAST

Passenger fares: The eastern railroads want to boost their fares from the present 3 cents per mile in coaches and 4 cents per mile in parlor and sleeping cars to 3.375 cents and 4.5 cents, respectively. The fares east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio are already a half cent higher than those charged on western and southern roads.

An ICC expert points out that if the cost-study proves to ICC's satisfaction that passengers are already paying their share of the expenses, the rate-setting agency won't burden the traveling public with increased fares to pay for the losing head-end services. Passenger revenues this year are already expected to be 12.8 percent below the 1948 level, due to a slow-down in train travel. ICC thinks higher fares, if not fully justified, may divert more travelers to other forms of transportation.

Express rates: The Railway Express Agency's dilemma is certain to be affected by the cost study's conclusions, say ICC insiders. In the wake of three rate rises since December 1946, express volume has more than halved, dropping from 231,000,000 shipments in 1946 to an estimated 100,000,000 shipments this year and 35,000 REA workers have lost their jobs.

Now the railroad-owned-and-operated agency is asking for another 10 percent increase in rates. At the same time REA claims it will be forced out of business unless the Post Office Department puts much stiffer rates on parcel post and cuts back drastically the 70-pound maximum weight for parcel post to the 11-pound maximum set by Congress in 1913. Their argument is that the Government is handling a large part of the package-carrying business which should go to the Railway Express Agency.

Volunteer Firemen Risk Their Lives To Serve Others Unselfishly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, from the floor of this House during the past 2 years I have frequently spoken on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of volunteer firemen throughout America.

On those occasions I have directed attention to the unselfish services which the volunteer firemen render in their respective communities. I have repeatedly called attention to the fact that volunteer firemen serve the public without remuneration and with great inconvenience to themselves. I have pointed out that they answer the call of the fire siren at all hours of the day and night and in all types of weather. I have also stated, Mr. Speaker, that in order to protect the property and save the lives of others they consistenly endanger their own lives in their devotion to duty.

As a single example of the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, I direct attention of the Members to the sacrifice and suffering of my personal friend, Guy H. Bowdle. Mr. Bowdle is an independent businessman in Dover, Del., and is a member of the Robbins Hose Co., of which I am also proud to be a member.

As a volunteer fireman Guy Bowdle recently responded promptly to the call of the fire siren in Dover. As the speeding fire engine on which he was riding swerved sharply around the corner he was thrown to the roadbed. Almost miraculously he avoided death but suffered a broken vertebra. This painful and serious injury has incapacitated Guy Bowdle for some time to come.

Mr. Bowdle is a young married man with two children. He is an overseas veteran of World War II. He is an active participant in public and community affairs. He typifies, Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of thousands of American citizens throughout this country who unselfishly serve as volunteer firemen.

As a part of my remarks I include the following editorial from the March 9, 1950, issue of the Index, which is published in Dover, Del.:

"GREATER LOVE HATH NO MAN"

Guy H. Bowdle, Dover industrialist, lies in bed at his home, suffering from a broken vertebra caused by his falling from a fire truck en route to a burning building. Guy, a much-liked man in this community, was not receiving, or hoping for, any remuneration whatever for his efforts when the accident occurred. He was acting in his capacity as a volunteer fireman in the organization here, known as Robbins Hose Company.

That the fireman is not dead, instead of suffering from such a painful injury, is due to a miracle. He fell as the truck, in which he was rushing to the blaze, swerved around a corner at a street intersection, and it would have been no extraordinary occurrence for him to find himself beneath the wheels of a fast-traveling motor vehicle, which would have crushed the life from his body.

It is our opinion that Guy Bowdle is a martyr to one of the noblest of causes—volunteer fire fighting for the protection of the life, limb, and property of our citizens—and we call upon all of our hero-admirers to write to him, or, better still, call upon him at his bedside and let him know that we really and truly appreciate the efforts of one who becomes critically injured while endeavoring to help his neighbors and friends.

Guy Bowdle didn't actually die for his friends, but he didn't miss doing so very much, and we would like to quote this biblical verse in giving this daring young man his just dues: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

Maybe, after a great deal of seeing with our own eyes the hardships they suffer, all of us will more fully appreciate the efforts of our fire-fighting young men. We sincerely hope so.

Should We Dye Farmers Blue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in this House an editorial appearing in the current issue of the Farm Journal. The editorial further explains the Farm Journal's recommendations for a new, long-range agricultural program for this Nation. I commend it to the attention of every Member. The editorial follows:

SHOULD WE DYE FARMERS BLUE?

No permanent solutions to the farm-surplus questions are going to be found by passing laws about surpluses. Man-made laws cannot change nature's laws.

Permanent solutions will come with new crops, with new uses for farm products, with feeding more of these products to livestock, with better methods, and with a larger buying population. But they do, naturally, come slowly.

Meanwhile nothing will stop Government from trying still further stopgap measures. It has been trying them for 20 years. They have varied from killing pigs and plowing under cotton to coloring potatoes blue. Some farmers have benefited from some of these temporary measures; and there is still the widespread illusion that Government can find all answers.

Many of these patchwork programs have tended to guarantee that more surpluses will be produced.

The best good sense in agriculture, it seems to us, ought now to turn resolutely toward two purposes. After 20 years of expediencies, farmers surely must be ready to demand more aggressive action toward ways to stop creating surpluses. That is number one.

Number two is to look for the least harmful and dangerous of the expediencies yet to be tried. If we are determined to patch with more baling wire, let's at least use the best wire.

Every sign indicates that a determined effort will be made to turn the Brannan plan into a major 1950 campaign issue, both in farm and city districts. Whether or not the plan wins votes, such strategy will push agricultural policy further than ever into the political mire. We don't think farmers want that to happen.

The farm program which Farm Journal supports calls for no miracles to be passed by Congress. We have proposed—and have supported by a series of how-to-do-it articles—a vigorous tightening up in feed and livestock production methods, so that animals can eat and store some of the surpluses; and then can be sold at prices which will bring farmers profits, but permit consumers to buy meat, milk, eggs. Promotional campaigns should then persuade consumers to eat more animal products.

We have urged that research funds be multiplied, so that new crops and new uses can step up the profitable opportunities in the farming business. We have urged cutting government down to the size the country needs, so that incentives to improve will survive.

We shall gladly support other measures when we find others that make sense, if they are needed, even though they may be temporary expediencies. But not the kind that clearly will lead to worse expediencies, and to perpetual surpluses.

We believe that agriculture in America can lead rather than lean; that it can influence labor and industry to produce more rather than less; that it can support a reasonable government, rather than have to be supported by government; and that it will not be necessary to dye farmers blue to accomplish these things.

The Aspiration for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk entitled "The Aspiration for Freedom," delivered by Mr. Beardsley Ruml before the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City, N. J., on February 28, 1950. Mr. Ruml is famous throughout the country as psychologist, educator, financial authority, businessman, and philosopher. He and I have been associated in many common interests and enterprises, among others the Committee for Economic Development which he is now serving so notably as vice chairman of the research and policy committee. In this speech Mr. Ruml gives us important new insight into the meaning of the word "freedom." This is indeed the most important word of our times. The attainment of freedom is the principal goal of the world's peoples. In this brilliant discussion Mr. Ruml calls upon his lifetime of experience as scholar and social scientist and as an active leader among men of affairs to provide us with a better understanding of the requirements of freedom and how our social institutions can contribute increasingly to the supreme ideal of promoting its attainment.

I am informed that the manuscript will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of

cost, and that the estimate is 2¾ pages at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASPIRATION FOR FREEDOM

For us in the United States, but not for us alone, the word "freedom" comes down the years as a symbol of ends and means, as a rallying cry for effort and sacrifice, as an organizing principle of human faith and aspiration.

From time to time, freedom has been the central issue in conflicts about religious worship, governmental forms, political parties, industrial organization, education, race, the pressures which make the familiy in institution. Freedom appears as "liberty" in the Declaration of Independence. The battle cry of freedom was raised in our Civil War in the last century. The four freedoms—freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom from fear, and freedom from want—set the elementary goals of the freedom-loving nations everywhere in the world.

The power in the insistent demand for freedom has cracked open religious institutions, upset dynasties, inspired revolutions, and armed tens of millions of men and women in its defense.

Yet for a long time in our ordinary everyday affairs, human freedom had been somewhat taken for granted in the land of the free. In principle, the dignity of the individual was accepted as a matter of course. But word of mouth acceptance of doctrines pertaining to human freedom and the relegation of its protection to the courts left us insensitive to practices by which these doctrines were being undermined. World War II aroused us to the dangers in this neglect, and the doctrines on which human freedom rests have taken on new strength and new meaning.

The freedom-loving nations were as little prepared for the moral struggle of World War II as they were to withstand the sharp edges of the blitz. They reached back into their honorable traditions and found good doctrines which they have put to use. These doctrines were dusty but in excellent condition, and they proved to have the power to inspire men to effort and sacrifice.

Our denial of the comprehensive and explicit blasphemies of the Axis turned out to be the affirmation of insights of great antiquity, and of the human doctrines of the American and the French Revolutions. The ambiguities and contradictions of World War I and of the political struggles of the 1920's dropped into place before the sweep and clarity of this new conflict for the possession of the human soul.

The ancient doctrines of freedom were proclaimed by the leaders of the freedom-loving nations. The heat-of-war violence and the early searchings of doubt as to victory gave to these doctrines a life and urgency which transcended to casuistry of political and literary formalism. Today, faced with the impact of Soviet imperialism, the conditions of men in the freedom-loving nations are being tested again in terms of these ancient and new-living doctrines. Many obvious and easy reforms are being made, others more difficult are being projected.

Whatever the future may bring, the humane ideals of personal freedom have become active official doctrine. The people will continue to believe that the true road leads toward freedom; and, with ups and downs, the people will follow according to their understanding and their intuitions.

What is freedom? Why is freedom so much desired?

The meaning of freedom has varied from time to time and the stated purposes of freedom have changed with the objectives of those who have invoked it. For some, freedom has meant the condition of man in a state of nature. For others, at the opposite pole, it has meant a range of human activity guided strictly by the dictates of reason. At times, freedom seems to imply mere equality under the law. At other times, freedom asserts the elevation of human rights to a position above man-made statutes.

Today we have our contemporary concept of what freedom is and what it is for.

Today what people want when they demand freedom is a condition under which they can realize with reasonable completeness the potentialities as persons that inhere in their capacities as individuals. The demand for freedom is a demand for fulfillment, for survival, for growth, for life, not in the material or biological area alone, but also in the realm of mind and spirit.

Within an accepted system of values, the individual human will fight for his freedom as he would fight for his life, indeed, it is his life for which he fights. Whether the protest against restraint be directed toward religious orthodoxy, hereditary autocracy, unequal suffrage, industrial decisionism, or bureaucratic regimentation, the emotional fury and the reckless disregard of material welfare reveal the struggle for what it is—a fight for survival in which no price is too great to pay to save what has been embraced as the essential core of freedom.

Just as plants and animals of the same species have common, irreducible necessities for their growth, so too do human beings have in common minimal conditions for the realization of the fullness of themselves as persons. These minimal conditions define the common content of freedom, and as our knowledge of what is useful and good for human development grows, our conception of what freedom requires grows along with it. And just as different animals and different plants require different foods and temperatures and ways of movement for their unfolding, so different individuals find different circumstances helpful for the meeting of their needs.

Since the demand for freedom is a demand for conditions that favor the achievement of full richness of personality and individuality, the specifications necessarily change from time to time and from person to person. It becomes clear why so little is required by many, and so much by a few. The demand for freedom reflects the culture of time and place and person, the things that seem worthwhile, and prevailing notions as to the nature of the personality.

In general terms it is therefore apparent that there exists the most intimate relation of dependency between freedom and education. But recognition of this relationship in general terms takes us only part way in giving to citizens, professional educators or laymen, who are deeply concerned with education, the perspective and the intuitions necessary to make substantive contributions in shaping today's education to respond to today's requirements in the preservation and advancement of freedom.

Accordingly, the balance of this paper will be devoted to a detailed analysis of certain aspects of the problem of freedom, which I hope may be of some practical use.

This analysis, which does not pretend to be comprehensive, falls into three parts. (1) The feeling of freedom; (2) the fact or freedom; and (3) order and consent as related to freedom.

No attempt will be made to make specific application to educational policies or to school practices although certain general inferences will be obvious.

THE FEELING OF FREEDOM

The will for survival is the impulse to freedom. But to understand freedom itself we must go beyond mere recognition of the impulse. When we go deeper we find that freedom has two distinguishable phases, the feeling of freedom and the fact of freedom. We shall observe that the feeling and the fact of freedom may exist independently one of the otLer. This separability of fact and feeling causes many misunderstandings about the problem of freedom, since, to satisfy our aspiration for responsible individuality, we must have both. One alone is not enough.

The feeling of freedom is a state of mind. It is a sense of power to make a choice between alternatives. It is a feeling of power to impose one's own will on the direction of events. The individual feels that his own uncoerced act has made events what they have become, and that he might have made them different had he decided differently.

The basis for the individual's feeling of power lies in his prevision of the consequences for the future that reside in his yet-to-be-taken choice between alternative actions. And it is in the feeling of power and in the feeling of the possibility of power over the course of events that we find the source of awareness of one's own personal dignity and worth-whileness. In this wareness we have the feeling of freedom.

Three conditions are required for the existence of the feeling of freedom. First, in the period of choice the future must enter into the conscious present as an influence on a decision yet to be made. Second, at the time the decision is being made the individual must be aware that the decision is being made, and the degree of the feeling of freedom is related in some degree to the keenness of this awareness. Third, the feeling of freedom depends on whether the area of choice is felt by the individual to be adequate for the act. To put it another way, it depends on whether the act is felt to be coerced by circumstances or by the laws of man or of nature.

Let us examine these three conditions for the feeling of freedom in more detail.

The first condition requires that, in the period of choice, the future must enter into the conscious present as being formative with respect to a decision yet to be made.

To feel free we must be able to see the consequences of what we are about to do. There is no feeling of freedom in blind choice, nor in decisions made merely to get on from one moment to the next. If we see the future which we are about to influence as a long one, our feeling of freedom has more significance to us than if that future is short. If we can see the consequences of our choice clearly, our feeling of power is greater than if the outcome is uncertain or unclear. If the events we determine seem important to us, we feel our free act to be more important than if the events seem trivial. In any case, we cannot feel free unless we are aware of a possible future which our present decision is intended to influence.

The second requirement for a feeling of freedom is that, at the time a decision is being made, the individual must be aware that a decision is being made.

People make decisions with varying sense of the imminent act of will. The sense of the act of will must be keen if the feeling of freedom is to be strong. The degree of keenness is lowered by fatigue and by the stress of emotion. It is lowered also by habit; by repetitive decisions, no matter how important, on questions which are familiar and the solution of which has become more or less routine. The human animal would have a hard time making his way in the world if every free decision were accompanied by acute consciousness of the act of choice. On the other hand, the dark of unconscious adaptation and of depersonalized judgments, expressed under conditions of fatigue or routine, must be illumined by occasional moments of explicit awareness of responsible choice. Without such moments there can be no feeling of power and no individual dignity. Clarity of apprehension of the act of will in the moment of decision is necessary if we are to have the feeling of freedom.

Finally, the feeling of freedom depends on whether the area of choice is felt adequate for the act; that is, whether the act is felt to be coerced. All decisions are made within

a frame of order. As we shall point out, this frame of order is determined by the laws of nature, by habit and custom, and by man-made rules. As long as the desired objective can be attained by the choice of alternatives within this structure, the individual feels uninhibited by coercive restraint. The feeling of freedom will, therefore, exist when the area of choice is wide enough to permit achievement if the correct decisions are made.

The feeling of freedom does not require unlimited discretion. Indeed, without a structure of order, the system of decision becomes amorphous and freedom vanishes. Decision involves a choice of alternatives within a system of pressures that gives rewards and imposes penalties. These pressures give significance to the act, but the act itself remains free. The pressures not only do not limit the sense of individual power, but they define the scope of risk, reward, and penalty. Accordingly, they give meaning to effort, success, and failure in determinations made freely by the personal will.

It follows from these three conditions that the feeling of freedom may exist under conditions of extreme regimentation and restraint. Once an individual accepts for himself the inevitability and propriety of the human and natural laws that bind him, once he limits his aspirations to achievements that can be had by successful decisions among alternatives within this frame, his feeling of freedom may be complete. All that is needed beyond this is present awareness of a future which is attainable, and clear consciousness in the moment of decision.

For this reason the feeling of freedom is not enough. Unless the fact of freedom is associated with it, the feeling of freedom can become, in the hands of the ambitious, an instrument for the degradation of their race. The illusion of freedom without the reality will be unstable, since, sooner or later, new leadership will arise to release the basic impulse to freedom. If such leadership does not arise from within, it will penetrate from without—today more easily and rapidly than ever before. Then, through education, compromise, or revolution, the march toward freedom will be resumed.

THE FACT OF FREEDOM

The feeling of freedom, being a state of mind, is largely determined by inner, subjective influences. The feeling of freedom exists authentically for one person under circumstances that would cause another to feel enslaved.

The fact of freedom, on the contrary, exists in the relations of the external world of things, persons, and events to the individual. As we have said, freedom is a condition in which people can realize with reasonable completeness the potentialities as persons that are inherent in their capacities as individuals. Obviously, these conditions are not the feeling which an individual may have about his world, satisfied or dissatisfied though he may be.

The individual cannot know completely the conditions that are necessary to assure him the fact of freedom. He may know, in part, the range of potentialities that are inherent in his capacities, and he may have some notion as to the circumstances that are required in order that he may achieve them. But he does not know all, nor can he. Nor are there experts who can specify the extent of possible human advancement. The science of physiology and psychology are incomplete and, in spite of great progress which can be expected in the future, they will doubtless remain so. The best that can be done is to draw on the intuitive and scientific wisdom that is at hand, and to establish in our society the institutions and practices which will give the known conditions for the fact of freedom. As our wisdom grows, the established conditions for the fact of freedom must grow as well.

Three conditions determine the extent to which the fact of freedom exists.

The first condition is a healthy and developed body and mind to serve as instruments of the will. The second requirement is the opportunity for responsible choice, for making the decisions through which the unfolding of the personality can in fact be achieved. And the third requirement is that the individual must have access in large measure to the natural world, to climates, soils, minerals, and seas, and to a normal human society of which he is a part.

First of all, a healthy and developed body and mind are indispensable if the will is to be well served. Many of the essential conditions for proper development of body and mind must be established in infancy and early childhood. The individual must learn to eat what is good for him, and he must have the opportunity to do so. Useful habits and skills must be acquired. He must be able to use a language, to speak, to write, and to read. A man who is illiterate cannot realize his potentialities, and therefore he is not free. A man who knows only one language is less free than one who knows more. He must have facility with the use of numbers. He must be at ease with ordinary social usage so that he can manage the conventionalities that will give him access to the social world which he needs to become a person fully himself.

The requirement of a healthy and developed body means the protection of the individual from accident and disease. It means access for all to resources for the repair of bodily injury and the treatment of sickness. It means a minimum of food and shelter, particularly for growing children.

The requirement of a healthy and developed mind is no less important than that of a healthy body. Here the influence of the home, the school, and the church will be crucial. The role of the political party, the social club, and the trade union will also be important in enlarging or limiting the mind of the individual as an instrument for his freedom. As citizens, we want each of these agencies to promote reason and to reduce ignorance on the part of the people over whom they have influence.

Our second condition for the fact of freedom is that of presenting the individual with events and issues where there is both opportunity and necessity for responsible choice.

Let us see what this condition has to do with the fact of freedom. Clearly, a healthy body and a mind of reason are nothing more than the instruments which make freedom attainable. Freedom itself resides in the act of will; and the value in freedom is the growth of the individual person through acts of will in moments of decision involving responsible choice. The fact of freedom is not attainable in a world in which there are no decisions to be made. The opportunity for full realization of what is potential in a personality depends vitally on the nature and scope of the situations in which the individual acts responsibly.

Acts of decision, to be of value for the growth of character, need not be important acts in a public or historic sense. Many authentic choices of a minor character are more fruitful for personal development than are the grand decisions in which the pressure of events and the numbness of conscience produce an automatic and meaningless response. The decisions that count are those in which the individual feels himself free, and for which he is prepared to be judged.

Not only must the individual feel free, his act being consciously his own, but the consequences of the act must be subject to moral, intellectual, or aesthetic evaluation. Was the act good or evil, wise or foolish, beautiful or ugly? These questions make decision difficult, and, as a result, freedom is sometimes a burden.

The third condition for the fact of freedom is access to the natural world. Given all the other conditions, unless the richness of nature is at hand within the area of choice, the unfolding of human talents will be restricted. The material and social world, as it presently exists, sets the boundaries of external stimulus and inspiration.

No one person, to be sure, will have the full measure of his contemporary world at his disposal. But most people could have more of it than they do have if it seemed to them important to make the effort to get it. Everyone can share vicariously in a world larger than his own through the medium of the arts. The arts, the sciences, and commerce have opened doors which for our fathers were closed. In this fact, our generation has an unparalleled opportunity for freedom, but even this opportunity will seem meager to the generations which follow us.

Why should the fact of freedom be set beside the feeling of freedom, equal with it and indispensable? What importance has the fact of freedom to one who feels himself free? Whose business is it? Why should people—why should I—carry an unwelcome burden in the fact of freedom if I can feel free within whatever binds me? And, particularly, if others do not want for themselves the fact of freedom, why should I assume any responsibility for them or for the conditions of their voluntary life?

There are two answers to these questions. First, no man can be free in a company of slaves, however well-contented they may be. He cannot be free because they will not permit him to be free. His words and acts will be a constant irritation to the easy conventions and superstitions of the mob and of its leaders. Having no conscience and no faith in human dignity, the unfree will restrain the free by violence if they are powerful enough to do so. Accordingly, the choice for the free is either to assume responsibility for securing the fact of freedom for all or to amass the force necessary to defend his own freedom against the unfree.

In the second place, it is good that other men should be able to achieve, for themselves, the fullness of personal development and responsibility which one desires for oneself. It is good that they should have this opportunity, whether they wish it or not; and they must not prevent others from enjoying it, even by persuading them that they do not want it. The justification of our aspiration for freedom lies, in part, in our purpose to bring freedom to others and to contribute, in the measure of our own capacity, to the emancipation of the human spirit everywhere.

ORDER AND CONSENT

We live in an orderly universe. The only unorderly element in it is the human will. There are some who do not believe in human responsibility or in the possibility of freedom. They include the human will with the rest of the universe, as determined exclusively by the impersonal laws of nature. For them there is no freedom, only order; only the illusion of freedom; no men, only animals. We must act on belief in human responsibility and the possibility of freedom in a world of order.

The order of the universe comes from three sources—(1) natural law, (2) habit, and (3) the rules of governments.

1. Natural law gives us day and night, the four seasons, rain in summer and snow in winter, the energy in oil and the nutriment in grain. It gives us the generations of men and the instincts of men, the compulsions of anatomy and physiology. It gives us the possibility of habit.

2. Habit is order imposed on protoplasm. The capacity of protoplasm to acquire habits comes from its nature, from natural law. The habits which it acquires, it acquires from its environment.

Habits may be acquired by plants, animals, and men. Wind, rain, and sun will affect the pattern of movement of branches and leaves. The training of horses for work and for amusement is the adaptation by habit of the inner animal to the outer world.

The habits of a man, like those of an animal, are order imposed on an already ordered protoplasm. Note the structure of man with legs and arms, and neither tail nor wings; the tensions, hungers, and sluggishness of his body; the sense organs he has, and those he has not; the endowment of organization in nerve, bone, and muscle, resulting in reflexes, instincts, and special talents and sensitivities. These are the orderings and the limitations of his nature.

Habit follows nature, superimposing order upon order. From the moment of birth, and before it, adaptation to the outer world begins. As adaptation continues, as the same situations occur over and over again, the response becomes certain, efficient, and unconscious.

Our behavior is ordered in part by our natural endowments, in part by habit, and in part by conscious choice, according to the uniformity and the frequency of particular experiences. But, fortunately for us, we are not required to pass attentively over the same ground, over and over again. Habit steps in to relieve us of that burden.

3. After natural law and habit, the rules of the rule makers give additional form and certainty to our expectations. When rules are wise, they are consistent with natural law. After rules have been operative for some time, they are assimilated and made effective as habits. When they have become habits, they seem as natural as natural law itself.

Rules differ from habits in that they always have their origin, at some time—perhaps long ago—in the decision of a rule-making agency. Rules are the pronouncements of the human will for the control of the human will. They display the insight and blindness, the generosity and greed, the care and carelessness of the human source from which they came.

The order arising from natural law, habit, and the rules of rule-makers gives us such certainty as we possess concerning expectation of the future. Certainty of expectation is indispensable to the full exercise of freedom. Our decisions and our choices always relate to actions whose outcome is in the future. We must have some assurance that if we decide one way, the outcome will be so; if we decide the other way, the outcome will be another. Without order in the universe, there could be no such assurance; and without assurance, without prevision of the consequences of choice, freedom of choice is meaningless. Freedom and chaos are incompatible.

The fact of order in the universe does not, therefore, preclude freedom, it gives freedom its moral significance.

The operations of natural law are generally accepted as limitations to which we must accommodate ourselves. But we need not conform to these limitations with complete docility. We can fight natural law with natural law. A lens can help us see, an electric current can help us hear. We have no wings, and yet we fly. We have quinine, and the recurrent chills and fever of malaria do not recur. For most of us, the limitations arising from natural law appear necessary and valid, and we do not raise the futile question whether they are desirable or not. The intrepid and dissatisfied scientist and inventor sees in these limitations to challenge and solves the problem, using natural law to his purpose. We all gain by this extension of our area of choice, not necessarily in the feeling of freedom, but in the fact of it—since through activity and experience we can become what otherwise we might never have been.

Consent to the existing structure of order is necessary to the feeling of freedom; and without the feeling of freedom, choice is irresponsible and the growth of individuality inconceivable.

Most people accept the order of the world that comes from natural law and habit. But the rules of the rule makers, if they are unwelcome, seem less necessary. They are man-made orders for the ordering of men. To be acceptable when they are imposed, they must be valid; they must be imposed with the consent of the governed. Minorities must concur, at least for the time being, in the decision of majorities. Otherwise, even though the laws of men be necessary and desirable in the building of order and certainty, they are unacceptable in a free society since they have been imposed by one will upon another will, without the latter's consent and without acquiescence in their essential validity.

The consent of the governed is sometimes consent to the rule itself, but, more often, it is consent to the rule making of some recognized authority which decides what seems best. Ordinarily, we cannot know enough about the complicated issues and essential facts to know, for ourselves, whether or not a rule is proper. We must depend on those who make the rules to study the whole situation and to legislate and to administer fairly in the best interests of all. Rule by consent is usually consent to the rule maker's authority, and from this follows, naturally, acquiescence in the rules themselves.

THE ATTAINMENT OF FREEDOM

In the United States the national state is committed fundamentally to the ideal of human freedom. It is committed by the declaration of its independence, and by the bill of human rights which reserve to the individual liberties which even the dominant governing power may not infringe. Its history, its internal dissensions, its conflicts with external national powers—all confirm the constant, if irregular, march toward the goal which inspired its beginning. The ideal of freedom is not merely a statement expressed in various forms in declaration, constitution, and the speeches of public leaders; but it is deeply embedded in the mind and culture of the people. The obvious imperfections in our attainment of this standard are overwhelmingly regarded as deviations from a norm, and not as the repudiation of the ideal. And, generally speaking, the country is committed to the elimination of these imperfections as rapidly as education, insight, and the orderly processes of rule by consent permit.

Now, in our own time, although common moral objectives have not yet been generally accepted, the moral issues of freedom have been drawn again. The issues are old ones, centuries old. Are human beings, all human beings, human? Are they created equal in their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Are they entitled to achieve freedom? Do they stand, as persons, above race, sex, creed, and nationality? Are the governments which are instituted among men—governments public and private—ends for themselves alone? Or are they the means of providing a frame of order within which the dignity and worth of each human personality may be actualized through responsible freedom of choice?

It is clear that human freedom in an absolute sense can never be attained. Freedom will always be relative, a matter of more or less. The life impulse to freedom will constantly drive toward more and away from less, even though it be toward a goal which constantly recedes as it is approached and is better understood. There can be no day when it will be said that human freedom has been finally won. Accordingly, we strike, not for a moment of victory that will divide the past from the future, the dark from the bright, but for an expanding opportunity for each and all of us to grow over the years in human stature. The obstacles along the way are ignorance, superstition, and the love of arbitrary power. These obstacles can be minimized by science and education, by spiritual insight revealing the worth and dignity of man, and by a rule of order established and administered with the consent of the governed.

In a country like the United States, so deeply committed to the ideal of human freedom, the various organizations and agencies—public and private—must safeguard and advance the ideal of human freedom. Imperfections and inadequacies are tolerated, but they are not excused. Repudiation of the ideal of freedom is neither tolerated nor excused. Governments may not legally infringe the rights of the people. Church, family, trade union, business, and education will be judged more and more explicitly by the aid they gave to the struggle for freedom.

And as the requirements for freedom are better understood, our social institutions will be tested against increasingly severe standards for individual growth and development; and each institution, according to its own nature, will contribute increasingly to the supreme ideal in promoting the attainment of human freedom.

A Salute to the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "A Salute to the Salvation Army," written by my old friend, Mr. Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 10. This editorial was printed on the seventieth anniversary of the Salvation Army, that fine organization which for the past 70 years has been exerting its efforts in behalf of the poor and the friendless. I think Mr. Schlacht's editorial is a well-phrased tribute to this organization.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE SALVATION ARMY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Anniversaries have a threefold meaning. They speak of the past with its inspiration. They speak of the present with its challenge. They speak of the future with its possibilities.

Today we salute the Salvation Army. It is 70 years young. It is an army of peace. It is an army of salvation. It is everybody's army.

It is salvation to all whom it serves. It is salvation to all who serve through it.

They are in the truest sense good Samaritans. They do not pass on the other side of the street when there is someone who needs a helping hand within sight or sound.

They do their Godly work without regard to race, color, or creed.

This uniformed army of salvation is not only ceaselessly fighting to succor hungry

and shelterless bodies but they fight for the souls in these bodies as well.

Where there's need—there is the Salvation Army.

It preaches the fatherhood of God. It preaches the reward of righteousness. It preaches the spiritual truths of the Scriptures.

It teaches God is love.

The Salvation Army is a living monument to the thousands of the most devoted and consecrated humanitarians the world has ever known.

They proclaim and exemplify through songs, word, and deeds the revitalizing message of the Scriptures.

They go out after the people. They go out into the streets. They go out into the darkest places. They go out with drums and tambourines. They search out the fallen, the homeless, those in need—for "a man may be down but never out."

The Salvation Army has achieved immortality in the practice of the spirit of Christianity.

It is a spiritual lighthouse. Its lights never go out. Its workers serve 'round the clock. Its workers serve through the calendar.

In times of war and in times of peace, they have served us well.

No sacrifice is too great.

Their welfare work among our fighting men has aroused the highest commendation of our Nation.

We are the army behind the Salvation Army. We must answer their appeal for funds. We must subscribe to their appeal for $1,292,000.

May our response be quick and generous.

May we remember today Gen. William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army.

May we help to build today a stronger foundation for our civilization of tomorrow.

May the seventieth year of the Salvation Army prove to be only one of the many milestones on the road of its blessed service to fallen humans.

Wildlife Restoration Proclamation by the Governor of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a wildlife restoration proclamation issued on the 7th of this month by the Honorable Okey L. Patteson, Governor of the State of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas a national observance of Wildlife Restoration Week was inaugurated 11 years ago by Presidential proclamation; and

Whereas various citizens, individually and through their organizations interested in conserving our country's soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife, have continued such an observance from year to year; and

Whereas West Virginia, more than many other States of the Nation, has been abundantly blessed with these resources, a consideration which renders this program worthy of our most serious attention:

Now, therefore, I, Okey L. Patteson, Governor of the State of West Virginia, do proclaim the week beginning March 19, 1950, to be Wildlife Restoration Week in this State. I deem it my duty, furthermore, to advocate the education of our people in every way open to us to the vital necessity of preserving and increasing our wildlife, through proper use of the soil and through the enforcement of the conservation laws, and to urge public cooperation with all State agencies charged with this most important phase of our program for living.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed.

Done at the capitol in the city of Charlestown, State of West Virginia, this the 7th day of March, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and fifty, and in the eighty-seventh year of the State.

OKEY L. PATTESON,
Governor.

The Individual Rights and Liberties of Workingmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have included therein the remarks of Robert N. Denham, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, before Town Hall at Los Angeles, Calif., on February 6, 1950, which remarks were based on his familiarity with the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act since it was enacted into law by the Eightieth Congress. His views, spoken on this occasion, present to many uninformed persons the efficient operation of the act since its inception, and the protection it affords the workers who are covered under it.

His remarks follow:

During the past 2½ years, the outpouring of words concerning the Taft-Hartley Act probably has been exceeded by no other single topic—public, political, or private—in the memory of any of us. We've heard the law condemned as vicious, as a union-busting device, as the slave labor law, and as a general menace to the welfare of organized labor. Then, too, we've heard it hailed—and I've done my share of it—as a great balance wheel in our structure of labor and industrial relations, and as one of the things that protects our national economy by its influence on, and stabilization of industrial peace, but we've heard little on the topic of what the Taft-Hartley Act means to the individuals of the Nation, both those who are immediately and directly touched by its operations, and those who feel its impact only indirectly.

Those in the first class are the workers who, according to the critics of the law, are enslaved by it. Those in the second class are the farmers, and most of the public who pay for and consume the products that this enslaved American labor turns out; and, believe me, when that labor fails to produce, the impact of such loss of production can indeed be tragic to those who are indirectly affected by it. It is then that this second group of individuals comes into the foreground. When things are going along smoothly, and production is uninterrupted, and prices are within reasonable reach of most people, little thought is given to this second group, to whom the Taft-Hartley Act probably is little more than a name until some sort of industrial wreck occurs, and then it is expected to serve as a rescue squad.

But the relation of the Taft-Hartley Act to the individuals who are the employees described in the act, are naturally the first ones we think about when we begin to attempt to appraise the relationship between the individual and the Taft-Hartley Act.

To get a fair picture of this relationship, it probably is desirable to make a short backtrack in the area of labor relations, searching for a clear concept of the reason for the things we have before us. Of course, labor relations in some form, have existed almost since the beginning of time, when one man was a boss, and the other was a slave or a servant. I don't think we have to go back that far. Let's confine ourselves to our own life span, or reasonably near it. Strikes are not new. We had them here, I think, in Philadelphia in the latter part of the eighteenth century. History gives us little as to the form or type of labor organization of that time, but there definitely was something, for the strikes seemed to be well timed and intelligently led.

A few weeks ago, I happened to come across some old copies of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly Newspaper, published, I think, in 1883. The papers were rather startlingly illustrated with what seemed to be wood cuts, and I was interested to note that the disorders in the field of labor in those days were just about the same kind of things we have to contend with now. There were pictures of strikers emptying milk out of wagons and letting it flow down the gutters; there were pictures of strikers overturning and burning streetcars (they used horse cars then, you know); there were illustrations of mob scenes during the then-current coal strike; there were empty and idle machine shops, and companies of militia acting as escorts or guards for the horse cars that were the subject of the dispute—all were reminiscent of some of the things that we've seen here in these United States during our lifetimes. Of course, the organizations of labor at that were sketchy, where they existed at all, but they at least reflected the thing that labor now has found, that in unity there is strength. They began to learn the lesson of the application of economic force in support of their demands, the hard way, because then there was no protection for the workingman who was unwilling, quietly and meekly, to just take anything the employer handed out.

From the late eighties of the last century up to the late twenties of this century, the whole history of the United States was one of rapid, prosperous industrial growth, unprincipled competition, and political domination by a not too scrupulous class of capitalistic entrepreneurs, who wielded their powers ruthlessly and without regard to the human, economic, or social rights of anyone else. Those were the days of laissez faire, and of the public be damned.

In those days the workingman had no legal and but very little economic protection. Organizations of workingmen were successfully prosecuted as conspiracies. Federal injunctions against concerted activities by labor organizations or groups of workingmen appear to have been available to employers almost for the asking. The social chasm between the employer and the workingman became progressively wider and deeper, and seemed to be more and more impossible of being bridged. It was because of these conditions that the Norris-LaGuardia Act that banned injunctions against labor organizations was placed upon the books in the early

thirties of this century, and other legislation was passed to protect labor organizations from prosecution as conspiracies. It was at about this time that a general realization began to assert itself among the American people that the individuals who have to work for their living have basic freedoms that are entitled to protection. The core of this freedom is the right of such persons freely and without restraint to join openly with his fellow men in concerted efforts to protect his economic conditions and to improve them. One of the important arms of this freedom is the right of the workingman, individually or collectively, to withhold his services in support of his efforts to obtain adequate pay for what he does, and to be furnished with appropriate working conditions. Just as surely, of course, that freedom means that, while those rights exist, the exercise of them will be protected, and that there also exists the right to refrain from doing these things and to be protected in so refraining.

By 1935 these freedoms were not only being withheld by all too many employers, but attempts to exercise them were heavily penalized. To be sure employees are not the only ones who have these freedoms and rights, for employers had and have their basic rights and freedoms also, and are equally entitled to protection in the exercise of them. However, in both cases, these basic rights are never unqualified. In exercising them, they must be accommodated to the basic rights of the rest of society and to the national welfare. When these rights and their exercise are not fairly balanced, they become menaces, but so long as they are reasonably balanced and honestly exercised, they become the fundamentals of the economic freedoms of the workingman and his employer as well.

The possession of these basic rights and freedoms by an individual is meaningless, unless there exists a way of halting violations of those rights by forces that are superior to the individual himself. One of the primary functions of our Government is to protect the individual against such violations of his rights.

It was because these rights were being invaded or denied by all too many employers, that the Wagner Act was passed in 1935. I hardly need point out that the basic principle of the Wagner Act was that the employee must be protected in his exercise of the right freely to join with other employees to set up labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining with their employers. It was designed to protest no one except the workingman, and in doing so, to promote the principle of collective bargaining.

To implement those principles, that act pointed out what we now know as unfair labor practices, as the means most frequently adopted by employers to defeat them; and authorized the National Labor Relations Board to prevent the commission of such unfair labor practices by the issuance of cease and desist orders directed to the employers involved. These are of the nature of injunctions, but may not go beyond the unfair labor practices as described by the law.

It's perfectly obvious, after observing how large a segment of the American people fall within the statutory definition of employees, that the collective bargaining contemplated by the law would have to be carried on by the organizations of employees that would exist for the benefit of and be controlled by the employees whom they represented. Certainly that was the indicated intent of Congress in framing the Wagner Act.

However, after the Wagner Act became firmly established, it took only a short time to reverse that concept, and to develop in the field of labor organizations, the philosophy that employees existed for the benefit of the labor organizations, and that the labor organizations had a vested interest in them. While an employee was protected against unfair labor practices perpetrated by the employer, he was afforded no protection against being imposed upon from any other quarter, including his own labor union, and, realistically, he had little freedom of action in many of the unions that sprang up under those new circumstances.

The Wagner Act gave the individual employee no protection, for instance, against coercion on the part of so-called representatives of labor organizations, who sought to force him to become a member, or to cooperate in strikes and other similar activities. The closed shop, which made membership in a union a condition precedent to getting employment, was an accepted instrumentality of the labor organization, under the Wagner Act, by which it forced employees into their unions, and was another form of coercion. Early in the game, the general attitude of too many of these organizations toward those who did not care to join the union, or to participate in the union activities, became progressively more arrogant and, in many instances, impossible.

I know of numerous cases where windows were broken, where bottles filled with paint were thrown through windows into homes, there to spatter their contents over walls. It is a common technique among some of the more lawless elements, and it still is practiced. Of course, these things may not have been done by the unions, but it is interesting to note that it is always a nonunion man, or the fellow who wants to work while the other fellows are striking for whatever cause it may be, who is on the receiving end of this type of conduct. Men have been beaten up because they wouldn't support the union; their families have been intimidated, and that, too, is going on even today, although some progress has been made to stop it. In short, the employee under the Wagner Act was in a position where, if the union decided it wanted to make it tough for him it could do anything it wanted to, and he had no recourse except to look to the civil authorities. The Government offered him no protection under the labor laws.

Under the Wagner Act the employee never had a chance, by virtue of any of the election processes, to rid himself of an unwanted union. If, at an election, the majority of those who voted, voted in favor of the union, then the only way the employees could get it out of the picture was to induce another union to come in and file a petition for an election, and then either vote for no union or switch from the old one to the new one, which, too frequently, was a case of going from the frying pan into the fire. In other words, he was stuck with it. If he sought to get out—if he sought to clean house in the union—if he sought to do any of the things which were, or at least should have been, his rights in this so-called democratic organization, he frequently found himself in the bad graces of the controlling officers of the union, and generally it was not very long then before some excuse was found to deprive him of his good standing in the union and of his job. He had no protection in that, either.

To be sure, the individual working under the Wagner Act was protected against being fired or otherwise mistreated by his employer because of association with, or membership in, a labor organization, or because of his efforts to bring about the introduction of such an organization into the plant. He was likewise protected in making his free choice of an organization for purposes of collective bargaining; and was protected in the right to insist that the employer freely and in good faith bargain with that representative on matters pertaining to wages, hours, rates of pay, and other conditions of employment. But he wasn't protected against being called out on a sympathy strike because his employer happened to do business with somebody down the line who was engaged in a dispute with the union. And he wasn't protected against long and expensive days of idleness growing out of strikes that were the result of some interunion dispute as to whether this union or that union had jurisdiction over a certain piece or type of work, and one of these unions was forcing strike idleness on all the workers, by putting up a picket line to force the employer to assign that work to the picketing union. There wasn't any way by which he could be protected against that terribly wasteful procedure, for, believe me, when those situations occurred, and the picket lines went up, he just couldn't go through, because if he did it would mean his membership standing or his being blacklisted, possibly forever, in his trade. Those are some of the things that the individual had to take under the Wagner Act. Neither the labor organizations nor their members seemed to realize there was another and better way to accomplish their economic independence. They still were living in the recollection of the old jungle warfare in which they had been raised.

The Wagner Act was practically a blank check to every labor organization to indulge itself without restriction or restraint, under the protection of a Board which gave every appearance of operating under a mandate to administer it in such fashion as to give the labor organizations all the breaks and to hold the feet of the employers to the fire on all possible occasions.

At any rate, that's the way the thing worked out, and as a natural result, the labor organizations became more and more demanding for their own account, and more and more audacious; and less and less considerate of the rights of society as a whole, and of the rights of individuals, in particular.

The next result was inevitable, for just as public opinion demanded the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935, in order to curb the conduct of the employers that had become progressively less and less excusable, so, in 1947, public opinion swung in the other direction, and demanded, not that employers be released from their obligations and responsibilities under the Wagner Act, but that the labor organizations, also, be forced and required to accept and recognize responsibilities on their part, for their misconduct that had been playing just as much a role, during the past 12 years, in the creation of industrial unrest, as the conduct of employers had done during the preceding time. Conscientious employers were demanding that the basic rights and freedoms of their employees be recognized and that the abuses of the unions be restrained. After many weeks of hearings, to which, I might add, the labor organizations of the United States contributed little or nothing, the Eightieth Congress put together a law which represents the first effort to bring about a balancing of the economic forces of industry and organized labor, and an equalization of the relations of the individual workman, the organization representing him, and the employer, one to the other.

The Taft-Hartley Act is built around the rights of the individual. It is not social legislation. It is purely regulatory legislation, growing out of abuses in the past, and out of the lessons taught by the fact that legislation, designed to protect one class or group at the expense of another, is bound to create only more turmoil, when its beneficiary is allowed to treat that legislation as his personal license to disregard the rules and conventions of society and the ordinary things which govern our relations, one with another, throughout this democratic Nation of ours.

I want to give you one little illustration of what this represents. In 1945, when the Wagner Act was the controlling legislation, three workers of a small plant in Kentucky were active in attempting to bring a labor organization into that plant. The other employees apparently did not want a union, so, when these persons approached the plant the next morning, they were met by a group of employees who told them they could not

enter the plant and work there. One of the three attempted to go in, regardless, was pushed around a good deal, and received some minor injuries, and, with this show of force, all three left the plant and quit their jobs. A charge was filed with the Board against the company for violation of the law and the company was required to reinstate those three persons into their jobs, and pay them whatever loss of pay they had incurred. The theory was that the employer owed a duty to these three union sympathizers to protect them against their fellow workers in the exercise of their statutory privilege to attempt to join or form a labor organization.

In 1947, after the Taft-Hartley Act had been passed, an almost identical episode occurred at Hagerstown, Md., except that in the second case, the gang that beat up the fellows that wanted to go to work were striking union employees. The victims were nonunion people who had no sympathy with the strike and wanted to work. Under the Wagner Act, there would have been no protection whatsoever for those nonunion people. Under the Taft-Hartley Act there is, and the union was held responsible. In other words, the basic right not to join a labor organization is as fully recognized and protected under the Taft-Hartley Act as is the right to participate in union activities. To take the labor picture back to the Wagner Act days, would take away from the individual many of the valuable rights he has today.

I want to run down, then, as fast as I can, some of the things that the Taft-Hartley Act means to the individual; things that he never had before the Taft-Hartley Act came on the books; things that were denied to him under the Wagner Act.

As I indicated a moment ago, the present law recognizes that the individual must have the right, not only freely to choose a labor organization to represent him, but the right to refrain from making such a choice, and also the right to get rid of that labor organization if its representation proves to be unsatisfactory. Under the Wagner Act, he could do none of these, but under the present law, the employees themselves may petition the Board for what we call a decertification election, and unless there is a valid contract in effect which would be a bar to any election, the Board normally will hold an election at which all the employees represented by that union in that plant will have the privilege of either confirming their selection of the union involved, or repudiating it. If they repudiate it, the union loses all representative authority, and the employees and the employer will neither be permitted nor required to hold another election in that plant for a period of 12 months.

I have pointed out that if a union, in the course of an organizational program, attempts to coerce an employee to become a member, the general counsel will entertain a charge to enjoin the union from continuance of such conduct. This extends to threats during a union organizational campaign as to what the union can and will do to persons who do not support them, after they succeed to getting into the plant.

I have spoken of the closed shop. Under the Wagner Act, the individual had little to say about this. The negotiators almost invariably demanded it from the employer—and usually got it. Thereafter, the employees joined the union and made sure they kept in the good graces of its leaders, for it was easy to merit their disfavor, and that often resulted in being expelled from the union—and fired from the job. Now, that is not possible. Now there is no closed shop—the most that can legitimately be found in any contract is provision for a union shop, and then, one can't be fired if he loses his good standing in the union for anything beyond his failure to pay dues. He doesn't have to be a union member in order to get a job. He does not have to go near a hiring hall, and the employer, who tries to require a union clearance, is himself guilty of an unfair labor practice. No; once again, the individual has acquired his basic rights and freedoms. He has been freed of his fear of the union bosses, for—at the very most—his only duty to them is to keep his dues paid. So long as he does that, they can't touch him—now. In fact, if he is expelled from the union for some cause other than nonpayment of dues, the employer not only is not required to fire him at the request of the union, but, if the employer should do so, both he and the union are guilty of an unfair labor practice, and the individual affected is entitled to come to the Board and file a charge which would be processed in regular order against both of them. All of which means that while the employee has, and did have under the Wagner Act, the right to file charges against an employer if he has been discriminatorily treated because of his membership or nonmembership in a union, he now can also file similar charges against the union if the union has exerted pressure upon the employer, as a result of which he has received discriminatory treatment, and require that such treatment be stopped in both directions.

Under the Wagner Act, it was entirely possible, and in fact in many places it was the practice, to incorporate in contracts, provisions for an automatic check-off. In such cases, very frequently, the employer and the union members had little to say about it at all; the contract provided for the check-off, and that was that. That provision was often a standard one found in many contracts, and the result was that the individual had his dues checked off and paid in whether he liked it or not. Many of the contracts would provide for check-off of assessments, fines, and other financial obligations, as well as the regular periodic dues. Today, the individual is protected and no check-off of any sort will be permitted without the written authority of the employee. He may make it as broad as he likes, to include all financial obligations, but no check-off may be made to be irrevocable for a longer period than 1 year. In other words, a check-off authorization may recite that it is irrevocable, but at any time after the end of a year from the time that it is signed, the employee may ask to have it revoked, and thereafter further check-off deductions may not be made. None of these rights and protections are found in the Wagner Act.

In the secondary boycott that I told you about, where an individual's employer may find his place picketed because he refuses to stop doing business with some person down the line who has a direct quarrel with the union, such an employee has no alternative. He must observe the picket line or lose his membership. Before the Taft-Hartley Act, there was no way he could avoid this loss of working time, but, under the Taft-Hartley Act, such a secondary boycott is prohibited. On the filing of a charge, the general counsel is required to seek an injunction to avoid such losses, both to the employer and the individual.

Under the Wagner Act, jurisdictional strikes, where one union was claiming the right to a job and the other was contesting that right, were regular performances that cost the working men of the country millions of dollars in lost wages each year. Today the Taft-Hartley Act provides machinery for the prompt and efficacious determination of those disputes, and provides, also, where circumstances warrant, that the general counsel may seek, and the courts may issue, injunctions to restrain picket lines or other media for obtaining the stoppage of work while the dispute is being determined. Again, the individual is being protected.

To be sure, labor organizations don't like this law because it requires them to recognize and adhere to the ordinary tenets of a highly civilized society. They say that the Taft-Hartley Act restricts their liberty. It doesn't restrict their liberty; it expands their liberty but restricts their license, and is, I think, an outstanding example of the propriety of wholesome regulation as defined in a statement by Daniel Webster that "Liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint."

In opening these remarks, I commented upon the fact that there are two types of individuals whose relationship to the Taft-Hartley Act will bear analysis. I've only been able to mention a few of the high spots that reflect the influence—beneficial influence, if you please—of the Taft-Hartley Act on the individuals who are directly affected by it. I may say I have found no one who has yet been able to point to any detrimental influences of that act upon individuals or on unions. It may have restricted indefensible license, but it has placed additional safeguards around the basic rights of both of them.

The individuals that are the public are entitled to even more thoughtful consideration. The power of a labor organization and the opportunity it has, by exercising that power, to cripple or destroy a segment of our economic structure is tremendous. The Taft-Hartley Act contains a number of elements that are designed to protect the individuals who make up the general public against these abuses.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act was designed to protect labor organizations from the harassment of employer-sought injunctions. I agree heartily with the general principles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, but the Taft-Hartley Act has recognized the fact that, in many instances, labor's power has grown to the point where an abuse of it can bring about widespread loss, damage, and public distress, and that provision must be made to prevent abuse of this power where such abuse takes on the form of unfair labor practices that are set out in the statute. In short, that there still are destructive abuses that should be stopped at the threshold of their practice.

I am not going to dwell on the coal dispute. It has already received enough publicity so that I believe the general public, if they do not know what it is all about, at least have some decided opinions on it. But I do want to point out one other thing that is currently in the picture.

One of the things that the Taft-Hartley Act does not tolerate is violence and misconduct on the picket line. It does not permit mass picketing, or interference in any way with the exercise by employees or officials or the public, of the right to go and come from the premises of any employer, or the stoppage of the conduct of that employer's business, even though the union may be conducting a strike and having a picket line to advertise it.

Down in Carlsbad, N. Mex., are three potash mines. Those three mines are the source of 85 percent of all the potash that is used in the United States of America, and the demands for potash are such that by working 24 hours a day these mines have been just able to keep abreast of the current consumption. As you know, potash is one of the vital component parts of commercial fertilizer. Because production is restricted in such a fashion, there is no stock pile. When the potash production ceases, the manufacture and mixing of fertilizer is stopped, and 60 percent, I am told, of all of the plantings in the United States depends upon fertilizer; and 70 percent of all the fertilizer used in the United States is consumed between the first of January and the middle or latter part of April of each year. That means 700,000 tons, incidentally.

On the 19th of November of last year, the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, which represents the employees in these three mines, went on strike as a result of being refused a 25¢ pay increase. They shut down the mines and they formed mass lines of pickets at the gates of the plant so that

even the maintenance men, belonging to two different unions, who wanted to go through, were turned back and not allowed to get into the mines. Needless to say, all others were turned back, too. The matter went on, and eventually came to our attention. About 3 weeks ago, we obtained an injunction from the Federal court to prevent mass picketing or other interference with any of those persons who desired to go to work, or otherwise do business with the company. At first, there wasn't a great rush to go back on the job, because the production workers were the strikers, but maintenance men returned immediately, and within 10 days or so, production had been resumed, with potash coming out at about 50 percent of the normal rate, or maybe a little better. Many of the strikers had returned, and after the injunction had been in effect 2 weeks, the company advised the union and the strikers that a certain date which, if I recall correctly, was 2 weeks ago today, would be the time when other persons would be hired to replace the striking production men. I was advised just the evening before I left Washington that during that day the striking union had offered to return to work en masse if the company would just stop hiring replacements and would put those men who had been replaced on a preferential hiring list so that they could go to work in the next vacancies that should occur. By now, I take it, the mines are in full production. The injunction's efficacy was excellent. Potash is again being produced, and the farmers of the United States, solely because of the existence of the Taft-Hartley Act and its injunction provisions, stand a reasonable chance of getting their supplies of fertilizer again this year. Had there been no Taft-Hartley Act, and had the Wagner Act continued on the books as it was, the mines would still be closed unless, of course, the operators had surrendered to the union and met their demands. Had this happened, 60 percent of the agriculture of the United States for 1950 would have had to be planted without benefit of fertilizer. But the law has pulled us over that hump, we hope. I use that one illustration of the relation of the Taft-Hartley Act to the farmer and to the public at large—there are many others, but time does not permit. In short, the individual that makes up the public finds protection here.

I wish I could go on and on and on. I like the Taft-Hartley Act. I think it is, basically, the biggest step forward this Nation has ever made in doing something to insure stability of labor relations. But it must be understood, and the individuals must understand, that they are the people who are affected by it. The individuals, in the main, who stop and think, are not complaining. The labor leaders are, and it is they who are making the noise about it, but the benefits to the individuals who work and to the public cannot be brushed off lightly.

But, best of all, our great American public and our labor of the country are made up of sane, intelligent, sound, loyal persons, who, I have all the confidence in the world, will do the right thing in the end. The Taft-Hartley Act has given them an opportunity now to clean house; it has given them an opportunity to throw out the Communists who have infiltrated into so much of our labor movement as well as into other places throughout the structure of the Nation. That's another thing that the individual has gained. The chance to throw them out. Thank God, we now have procedures that make the Commies who are officers of the labor organizations, stand up and be counted, and as that happens, a great house cleaning is going on.

The individual has a tremendous stake in this law, more than he has ever had in any current law. I just hope he will protect it.

Thank you.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement Tax Rates and Monthly Benefits—A Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as exhibit E a table presenting a comparison of social security and railroad retirement taxes and benefits under present and proposed legislation. On several previous occasions I have presented comparative statements on this subject. This table summarizes and picks out the high spots from the other exhibits I have previously presented.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT E

FOUR TIMES 1½ PERCENT EQUALS 6 PERCENT

One rail worker pays 6-percent railroad-retirement tax. One industrial worker pays 1½-percent social-security tax. Therefore, one rail worker pays as much tax as the combined tax of four industrial workers.

Social security provides four industrial workers and their families with retirement and survivor benefits as compared to railroad-retirement benefits received by one rail worker, for whom there are no family benefits until after his death.

Social security versus railroad retirement tax rates and monthly benefits—a comparison

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000 social security, proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Tax rate (percent)	[1] 1½	[2] 1½	[2] 6
Cost per month	$3.75	$4.50	$18.00
Cost per year	45.00	54.00	216.00
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 1 worker and his family:			
Old age	$45.60	$64.40	
Wife	22.80	32.20	
Husband and wife	68.40	96.60	
Dependent children	[3] 16.60	[3] 53.40	
Total	85.00	150.00	$144.[illegible]
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 4 workers and their families	85.00 85.00 85.00 85.00	150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	
Total	340.00	600.00	
Maximum survivor benefits possible: Widow and 3 or more children or 4 or more children, of 1 deceased worker	85.00	150.00	
Maximum survivor benefits possible to 4 families of 4 deceased workers [4]	85.00 85.00 85.00 85.00	150.00 150.00 150.00 150.00	102.32
Total	340.00	600.00	

[1] On $250 maximum earnings per month.
[2] On $300 maximum earnings per month.
[3] Prorated equally.
[4] 4 widows and 12 or more children, or 16 or more children.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

The above exhibit E has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committtee now holding hearings on H. R. 6000 for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same ratio of increases in benefits now proposed for those covered by social security and has been submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), March 1950.

Mysterious Disease, Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, several days ago I made an appeal to the Senate Appropriations Committee to authorize funds for research on one of the most dreaded of all diseases, multiple sclerosis.

Much too little is yet known as to what this disease is and what it does to its victims. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mrs. Amy Nichols, of Dedham, Mass., a victim of this disease. This story tells, vividly, what multiple sclerosis is and what it does to its victims numbering more than 250,000 in this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Let's keep it quiet," were the whispered words of the well-meaning friend who helped me from the office of the doctor who first diagnosed my puzzling, paralyzed condition. I was too dazed then to question her advice, as she continued, "Don't talk about it or you'll only get false notions."

I staggered home, with the voice of the doctor ringing in my ears as he reluctantly told me I had a disease that would probably trouble me all my life and was incurable. To console me he pointed out that it was not fatal. "A person can live with it as long as can the present-day diabetic, that is, a normal life span," he said. While I was fearfully considering his words, I was aware that he had not yet pronounced the name of the malady. Perhaps it was like leprosy or some other unthinkable disease. When the doctor finally said, "Multiple sclerosis," it sounded harmless. Little did I then know that I was afflicted by a disease that strikes twice as many as does polio.

Yet I was soon to note that, just as at the mention of leprosy, tuberculosis, and cancer so, also, at the mention of multiple sclerosis suddenly would fall a hush-hush atmosphere as though this disease were unclean or bore a moral stigma, it was a secret.

Against this fact of secrecy I rebelled, almost as much as against the disease itself. I didn't want to keep it quiet as my friend advised. False notions or not, I wanted to cry out to the world against this insidious crippler that fells so many of us early in life. Like all the many thousands of us, victims of multiple sclerosis, I was aghast that everyone seemed to be conspiring to keep it a secret.

It may be multiple sclerosis that has struck that young man or woman within a few blocks of you who is forced to spend the remainder of a long life within the confines of

four walls. To all appearances there is no deformity; there is no evidence, such as misshapen limbs, to indicate the victim's inability to ambulate in a proper manner. Yet, at best, there is a dragging of leg after leg as though each were attached to a leaden weight. And there is disturbance of the sense of balance that produces a wavering in the laboring gait. There is likely, also, to be distorted vision, faulty and uncertain manipulation of the fingers, and slurring speech. Was this prospect confronting me?

With dogged determination I found and observed many fellow victims. I discovered that among the men discharged from the armed services following World War II were some who were suffering from the initial attacks of this crippling disease. They survived a war only to be stricken by this tragedy. Many were married or were about to be married when this cruel development changed all that. For, except in rare cases, a victim of multiple sclerosis cannot expect to be able to earn a livelihood. I say "expect" because the instability that is part of multiple sclerosis is not compatible with the usual forms of regular employment.

There is nothing static about multiple sclerosis, as is the case of an amputated or ordinary paralyzed arm or leg. Today might be the end of a remission, as periods of alleviated symptoms are called, and tomorrow might be the beginning of an exacerbation, when the symptoms are aggravated. No one can tell when or why these irregular, erratic cycles occur nor how much deterioration takes place.

Several factors beside the name difficulty may account for the public being so long unaware of this disease. Multiple sclerosis, is not usually considered fatal. Though the victim may lose, gradually and insidiously, his power of locomotion, his sense of equilibrium, his control over the direction of his limbs, the dexterity of his fingers, his sense of touch, his continence, his good vision, his clear speech, his strength; or any or all of these; yet it isn't considered fatal.

Another factor which may account for the public's ignorance of multiple sclerosis is that there is usually no pain, as pain is usually described. The mental anguish at the loss of the powers described above does not constitute pain, it is true; but, oh, what suffering. The mental anguish felt when one learns that she failed to recognize, with her faulty vision, a friend who greeted her, or when made conscious of one's weaving gait, by a whispered "She must have had one too many," does not constitute pain, it is true; but oh, what suffering. The mental anguish felt when one sees that very little is being done to delve into the mysteries of this disease, does not constitute pain, it is true; but oh, what suffering. As you know, the sensation from being pinched is pain. One does not seriously object to a playful pinching, however vigorous, but if that same pinching were to continue, for an hour, a day, a month, ad infinitum, would you not cry out as if in pain? If you sit too long in one position and a leg or an arm goes to sleep, you voice a complaint. If that feeling were to last interminably, wouldn't you complain more loudly? When one of your fingers or a toe feels numb, or it calls attention to itself by the sensation commonly described as "pins and needles," is that not painful? When that sensation involves all of the fingers, and all of the toes, and if it were moreover to continue with scarcely a let-up, would it not make you miserable and cry out in pain? Just suppose you attached to each of your shoes a heavy weight; would you be happy to drag yourself about with these handicaps for life?

There is in addition to such discomforts described above an unrelenting fatigue, heaviness of body, extreme exhaustion, that tortures the multiple sclerosis victim. Despite all of these symptoms there is a desperate compulsion to keep afloat in the face of an increasing erratic paralysis.

This is the mysterious disease—multiple sclerosis. These are the tortures that over 250,000 of us are enduring today in this country.

Sumner Pike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, one of Maine's most illustrious sons is Hon. Sumner Pike, of Lubec, Maine, who is now the Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Portland Press-Herald in an editorial has stated a very good case for changing his acting status as Chairman to that of permanent Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIKE'S PEAK

When we suggested a month ago that Sumner Pike of Lubec would make an excellent chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, of which he is now acting chairman, we did not do so on the basis of his Maine nativity.

Two strong arguments support this recommendation. First, Commissioner Pike is the only holdover from the original five, and therefore the group's only link between its important formative years and current operations.

Secondly, the Maine man has a rare knack for imparting atomic data in a manner to be understood by the nonscientist. Furthermore, his good humor and sharp wit make his impartations palatable, but we don't seriously commend these to the President for consideration.

At Harvard University last week end we were privileged to spend a number of hours in conference with Pike, Dr. Shields Warren, biochemist of the AEC and others connected with the Commission. Newsmen from a number of New England papers heard Pike do what he is so good at, heard him bring a very difficult subject down to the level of a layman's mind.

Pike, for instance, in describing a rather complicated atomic process, would say that it was like "winnowing blueberries." At another time he discussed a certain type of explosion, saying that so many units of something-or-other were released "per unit of bang." And so on, for several entertaining and educational hours.

Those who heard him were once again impressed by his abilities to understand and to explain, his nonpartisan approach, his enthusiasm for his job. His listeners couldn't learn all there was to know in one night, but they learned enough to give them a better grasp of the problem when writing about it in New England newspapers.

The Lubec man has served the Government in several capacities, but never before has he served so brilliantly. He has now reached a peak which has brought great satisfaction to his home State and certainly a measure of satisfaction to the man himself. In naming a chairman for the all-important Atomic Energy Commission, President Truman would do well to select a man with Sumner Pike's variety of qualifications.

What if Mills Produced Billions in Surplus Goods?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What if Mills Produced Billions in Surplus Goods?" written by Herman A. Lowe, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IF MILLS PRODUCED BILLIONS IN SURPLUS GOODS?

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—Picture, if you can, Pennsylvania's factories turning out far more goods than they know the public will buy.

Picture them striving to increase production, knowing that the Government will guarantee them a profit for any surplus above what the public absorbs.

Picture Congress building warehouses to hold this surplus and giving it away free to foreign countries. And picture you, the public, being taxed for the cost.

Absurd? Ridiculous? Impossible?

Then add this final absurdity—Congress voting more money to build more factories to produce more surpluses to sell to the Government at a profit—with you being taxed for that, too.

Unfortunately, it is not impossible at all. Not only can it happen here; it is happening here. Just substitute the farm-support program for Pennsylvania's factories and you have the whole picture.

Citing chapter, verse, and United States Government statistics, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, told his colleagues in the Senate the other day that in 18 months "we have produced in this country approximately $7,500,000,000 worth of agricultural commodities more than we have consumed, all of which have been purchased with the taxpayers' money."

"Of that amount," continued Senator WILLIAMS, "nearly $3,500,000,000 worth of agricultural commodities have been given away at home and abroad, while the remaining $4,000,000,000 worth are at the present time deteriorating in our bulging warehouses and caves."

Senator WILLIAMS quoted sober fact and backed it up with the black and white figures. Congress is thoroughly familiar with the situation.

Yet, on the same day that WILLIAMS was making his statement, this headline appeared on page 1 of a Washington newspaper: "Farmers fail to cut crops as United States asks. Report on plantings indicates big yields under price props."

The article went on to explain that farmers were disregarding the Federal request for smaller crops of price-supported crops and were heading for another year of huge surpluses in potatoes, grains, peanuts and other things. Thanks to the law which guarantees them price supports, the farmers will be able to sell their surpluses to the Government at a profit.

Thus you have the absurdity under which farmers now grow crops not for use—but merely to sell to their Government to store,

or destroy, or dump in Europe. With the taxpayers picking up the check, of course.

That is the situation which would be so ridiculous if it were to happen to Pennsylvania's factories.

And your Government has been constructing additional bins and warehouses in which to keep the unwanted surpluses it is required by law to buy.

What is more, Congress is now in the process of making a law to give the Commodity Credit Corporation another $2,000,000,000 so that it can buy and hoard or dump still more surpluses in the next couple of years.

But then there is the ultimate absurdity referred to above. The Government has more than $1,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money already tied up in surplus cotton—a full year's supply of the stuff. The Department of Agriculture has ordered acreage restrictions to hold down production this year. Congress is now balking these restrictions.

It is making a law to increase this cotton acreage by 1,200,000 acres. Everybody in Congress knows the cotton grown on this land will be surplus cotton which must be purchased by the Government and hidden in a warehouse.

There is a huge surplus of peanuts. The Government is stuck with $25,000,000 worth which it was required to buy and hold off the market. The Department of Agriculture sought to restrict peanut acreage to hold down that growing surplus.

Congress is pushing through a law to permit the rise to an additional 100,000 acres this year to grow whole peanuts, plus an unlimited amount of land for peanuts to be crushed for oil.

It is equivalent to the Government building extra factories in Pennsylvania to manufacture surplus goods.

That's what's going on in Washington with the Nation $250,000,000,000 in the red, with a multibillion dollar deficit for this year, and with another multibillion dollar deficit already predicted for next year.

But, really, the factory owners of Pennsylvania shouldn't worry. They ought to rip out their machinery and rent the buildings to the Government as storage space for surplus persimmons and artichokes.

Hon. Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the New York Times of this morning carries an editorial which expresses the hope that ARTHUR VANDENBERG will soon return to take his seat in the Senate. The Times wishes to have the Nation hear again from the missing voice. I think this is a wish which is shared by most of us at home and abroad. I join with all Senators in compliment to the Times for its reference to one of the great Americans of his day. The Senate will benefit in every way when ARTHUR VANDENBERG answers again to his name. May everybody's good wishes add speed and strength to his recovery.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSING VOICE

It is devoutly to be hoped that Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG will soon be well enough to resume his seat in the Senate. The size of the place he occupied in that body, and his immense usefulness to his party and his country, were never so evident as in his absence in a time of critical debate. Without him the Republicans seem leaderless and uncertain. Even the Democrats miss the clear, authoritative voice that rises above the buzz of party politics to define American policy to the world. For Senator VANDENBERG's distinction is that he has given leadership to both parties in the development of foreign policy, and more than any other American has lined up behind it the massive popular support that has been our greatest asset in the postwar years.

This leadership is lacking today. There is no real question of continued support of the bipartisan policy sponsored by the Senator from Michigan. This is, after all, American policy; it is safe because it grows out of our basic interests and involves our national honor and good faith. Congress will grumble and try to pare down, but our commitments under the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact and other international engagements will be fulfilled. But we have to go forward from there, and where the vision, experience, and good-tempered statesmanship of Senator VANDENBERG are needed is in hard transitions like the present, when new issues arise and policy has to evolve to meet fresh tests and changing conditions. The wish for his speedy recovery is a wish not for him alone but for the country he serves so well.

Czechoslovakia Way Ahead in the Hat Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post is performing an excellent service in calling public attention to the damage being done to domestic industries through excessive importation of finished products. A striking example is the hat industry, which employs almost 6,000 people in two cities in Connecticut—Danbury and Norwalk. The Danbury concerns are now on a 3-day week, and spokesmen for the Norwalk industry state that they "wonder where the next year's business is coming from." Indicative of the Democratic administration's callous disregard for the workers' welfare is the remark attributed to ECA spokesmen before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the American worker is fortunate in that he may receive unemployment-compensation benefits." That is typical of the attitude which this group has. They are far more interested in helping foreign nations, and in the process, dragging the American standard of living down to correspond with that of other countries less fortunate.

I predict that the American citizens earning good wages and the ones with great amounts of capital invested in domestic industries will not look kindly upon those who foster this program.

Editorial and news excerpts from the Bridgeport Post follow:

HAT INDUSTRY SPEAKS UP

An American Federation of Labor official has made the charge in Washington that slave labor behind Czechoslovakia's iron curtain is threatening to turn Danbury into a ghost town. Norwalk feels the same way.

Imports from the Communist country are crippling the hat city's industries, declared Marx Lewis, general secretary of the Hatters' International Union and a member of the executive committee of the national labor-management committee on foreign-trade policy. This committee now in session represents nearly a score of industries which feel they are being unfairly treated by the amount of foreign goods being allowed to come into the United States.

The union spokesman said that American hat workers cannot possibly survive against slave-labor competition. And of course they can't, with foreign wages and transportation costs so low. What labor and management want in this case is a tariff wall against foreign imports of felts which 300 percent in 1949.

Thomas J. Wall of the Norwalk Hat Co. says last year's imports from Czechoslovakia exceeded any year's importation for more than 15 years, affecting the industry in an alarming manner. In other words, United States dollars are being sent beyond the communistic iron curtain to provide competition for United States industries, an unexpected version of communism versus capitalism.

This is an amazing revelation. Czechoslovakia is today nothing more than a puppet state, a satellite taking its orders from Moscow. Soviet Russia has been trying openly, for at least 5 years, to cripple our economy. There is every reason to believe that Czechoslovakia is playing its part in the Kremlin's attempt to injure American industry.

Within the year, it is fully expected in Washington, that Czechoslovakia, with the other puppets, will be incorporated into the Soviet empire, to become provinces of the totalitarian domain. Are we going to continue to do business with such a nation to the detriment of our own people, our own industries?

There are other industries similarly affected, among them the shoe and leather industry, which has already complained of the dumping of cheap Czech shoes into the American market. These United States industries have a real fight on their hands to convince Congress and the Tariff Commission of the dire need for protection against the old bugbear, cheap production from abroad. And this time it is cheap production from a nation which is forced by its rulers to be an economic and political enemy.

IMPORTS CREATING HAT TRADE SLUMP—DANBURY HAT PRODUCTION CUT TO 3,000 DOZEN IN 3-DAY WEEK

The combined impact of Czech iron-curtain importations and a general decline in business has tumbled Danbury's hat-making production from a capacity of 30,000 dozen for a 5-day week to 3,000 dozen for a current 3-day a week schedule, it was reported today.

Approximately 3,000 hat workers are employed in 14 main plants in Danbury and lack of business has forced the 3-day a week program, according to available statistics.

Union and plant officials who describe the situation as "very serious" declare that a hatless fad in various sections of the country is accentuating the critical situation in the hat industry.

In Norwalk, second largest hat-producing community in Fairfield County, a total of approximately 2,750 persons are employed in

12 companies. That does not include those employed in fur companies which provide hat materials.

Plant officials report business prospects are "not healthy" and that the imports from Czechoslovakia plus a decline in domestic sales are causing great concern.

"We are beginning to wonder where our next year's business is coming from," one official declared.

Warren S. Smith, secretary of the hat institute, trade association for America's hat industry, declared that the hat industry has dropped 1,500,000 man-hours since 1942 and that 1,300 workers have been forced out of the trade in the past 5 years.

He attacked the State Department's policy of insisting on imports at the price of the hat industry, but maintained that many other industries in Connecticut are being hurt by the trade-exchange program under the Marshall plan.

"Traditionally, we have imported a great deal of raw material from abroad," Mr. Smith said. "Now we are being forced to accept the finished product in competition with our own workers."

He declared that Czechoslovakia and Italy are the major competitors who have been fed ECA dollars to drive American firms out of business.

"Let them furnish the raw material," he asserted. "Let us provide the finished job."

Sacrifice of a city like Danbury "is a pretty steep price to pay on the altar of helping countries abroad," he declared.

SHOE MANUFACTURERS HIT CZECHOSLOVAKIAN IMPORTS

BOSTON, March 23.—The New England Shoe and Leather Association charged today that some 1,000,000 pairs of shoes will be imported from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia into the United States this year.

Executive Vice President Maxwell Field reported that the association has asked the Treasury Department to investigate so-called dumping of the shoes in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921.

Field added that the State Department also has been requested to advise the association of its policy permitting importation of the shoes from the iron-curtain country.

The association official stated that in the month of January alone 58,018 pairs of shoes were imported from Czechoslovakia. This, he said, was more than half of the total brought to the United States during the entire year of 1949.

Preservation of Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relating to preservation of wildlife, made by Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, on March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many people think of the woods, the waters, and the wildlife of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania solely from the viewpoint of pleasure and recreation, but these resources have a much deeper significance.

Barren hillsides cause a rapid run-off of waters producing destructive floods. This, naturally, leads to complete dislocation of the industrial economy so necessary to the interests of the Commonwealth.

In Pennsylvania, our reforestation program is outstanding. This program must continue in an effort to lessen the destruction caused by floods, and by replanting our barren hillsides to slow up the run-off of water.

To increase our awareness of these great natural heritages, and of the part they play in our daily lives, Pennsylvania has set aside for special observance various weeks of the year when conservation is uppermost in the minds of all of its citizens.

Beginning March 19, in conjunction with the National Wildlife Restoration Week, we will again observe Pennsylvania Wildlife Restoration Week.

This observance should have the wholehearted support of conservationists, nature lovers, sportsmen, farmers, schools, and all civic-minded organizations by stressing the value and importance of restoration of forests, waters, and wildlife to the Commonwealth.

One of the ways that this can be done is for each of us to rededicate himself to the national conservation pledge: "I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to defend from waste the natural resources of my country, its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife."

Tangled Economics, Dangerous Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tangled Economics, Dangerous Politics," published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TANGLED ECONOMICS, DANGEROUS POLITICS

As economics, the United States present farm program makes no sense. As politics, it can be understood but not supported.

As economics, the aim is for Government to help prevent waste and distress due to vagaries of weather and the farmer's inability to stabilize output as other producers do. Unstable agriculture can spell food shortages and lack of markets for the rest of the community.

But today the program as operated has produced such weird economic effects as these:

The Government, already holding $4,000,000,000 worth of farm products for which it can find no market, is asking authority to throw in $2,000,000,000 more.

The best chance of saving any of this is through one or more major crop failures—normally a disaster.

Citizens are paying millions to have surplus food destroyed so they will be unable to buy the rest of the crop at lower prices.

Government asks the farmer to cut production and pays him for surpluses; it urges diversification and rewards resistance to diversification.

What was intended as a floor to prevent disaster has become a cushion even for inefficient farmers.

These are some of the reasons the program makes no sense as economics. Here are some of the factors which make it understandable politically:

Both parties believe the farm vote can decide the next election, as they feel it did the last. Few Congressmen are independent of the farm vote.

Politicians are aware that American farmers have suffered a 20-percent loss in income since 1947 and expect the loss to be greater this year. For many individuals this average involves heavier losses.

A vested interest in Government aid has been created. And, as with tariff protection, conditions quite adequate for efficient producers spell distress to the inefficient or unfortunate.

Congress has been trying to taper off crop subsidies by setting dates in advance for curtailing payments or restricting acreages—restrictions that become delusive if per-acre production can be doubled. Indeed, the whole process is delusive. For when a date approaches, a new one safely farther away is substituted. So the old mañana game goes on.

Department of Agriculture experts figure what acreages will produce adequate supplies, but in the end politics decides what the farmer can plant. Acreages are increased according to the strength of voting blocs—and skill in logrolling. Wheat Congressmen help peanut Congressmen, and both help cotton Congressmen, so all get their acreages—and surpluses—increased.

As economics, it doesn't make sense. As politics, it is understandable, but deeply dangerous. For it permits special interests to override the welfare of the Nation as a whole. It is an abuse of representative self-government which weakens and discredits democracy at a time when democracy needs strength and prestige to meet totalitarian competition.

How shall Americans find a way out of this jungle of tangled economics and dangerous politics? Let special-interest groups recognize that their own larger interest depends on the welfare of the whole Nation. The good of one must be related to the good of all. In addition, let the ordinary citizen recognize that he has a large-enough stake in the general welfare to insist on this basic rule.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very necessary that all of our State governments exert every effort to preserve our fast-dwindling natural resources upon which the future of America's soils, waters, and wildlife depends.

The following is a proclamation issued by Gov. Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana:

PROCLAMATION—WILDLIFE RESTORATION WEEK, MARCH 19 THROUGH 25, 1950

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas the fact that all life is dependent on soil and water cannot be stressed too much or too often; and

Whereas nature has perfected a marvelous system for building productive soils and for maintaining them, and man can work with this system and keep soil and water productive while utilizing the products for his use.

He cannot abuse these resources without destroying productivity and quickly decreasing the quantity of products available to him; and

Whereas productivity of our soils and water has been reduced at an exceedingly rapid rate. Vast areas of land have been and are still being mined of their fertility which can only be slowly regained by natural processes; and

Whereas there is great need for more intelligent planning of developments to secure the greatest possible values from all resources; and

Whereas the National Wildlife Federation in sponsoring Wildlife Restoration Week is doing much to teach the fundamentals upon which the future of America's soils, waters, and wildlife depends. The continued growth of human population in this country forces us to give increasing attention to conservation of all natural resources as human utilization places increased demands upon them. Until every American is aware of his vital dependence upon natural resources and acts intelligently to manage them, there will be need of such educational efforts:

Now, therefore, I, Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim and designate the week of March 19 through 25, 1950, as Wildlife Restoration Week in Indiana, and do earnestly appeal to all of our citizens to recognize the importance of the problems of conservation of these assets in wildlife and to work with one accord for their proper protection and preservation, and to reflect upon America's riches of natural resources and the importance to our future well-being of perpetuating them.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 6th day of March 1950.

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

Robespierre From Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 22, 1950:

ROBESPIERRE FROM WISCONSIN
(By Marquis Childs)

Under the glow of the television lights Senator MCCARTHY is beginning to look pale and a little flustered. The material he is offering as evidence of his charges is so very thin that even he himself seems to lack confidence in it.

His strategy is to spread it out for as long as possible so that it will reap the largest harvest of headlines. It probably contributes to the campaign to remove Dean Acheson from the office of Secretary of State. And certainly it contributes to the uncertainty, the fear, and the suspicion that undermine the hopes for a positive, constructive American foreign policy both at home and abroad.

But, in my opinion, that is not the greatest disservice MCCARTHY is performing. What he is doing that is most dangerous and most reckless is to extend and confirm the technique of the indictment by association and smear.

You don't have to watch the process very long to understand what it is. It is the technique of the revolutionary tribunal, those fantastic mock courts that came into being in the holocaust of the French Revolution. It bears some relation to the methods of the purge trials in Soviet Russia. The whole approach could hardly be more directly at variance with the Anglo-Saxon concept of equal justice under law that has slowly and painfully evolved through the centuries.

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

Rereading Charles Dickens' thrilling novel, A Tale of Two Cities, you get some idea of what those revolutionary tribunals were like. Victims by the thousands were hauled before so-called courts. If it could be shown in any remote way that the individual had had contact with any aristocrat for whatever reason, the clamor for his blood went up and he was carted off to the guillotine.

Whether this 10-cent store Robespierre from Wisconsin knows it or not, what he is helping to do is break down law and order. The Senator can reply, of course, with the easy and cynical good humor that is natural to him that his victims are, after all, not guillotined.

But the smear can destroy, too. Denials rarely catch up with the original accusation. They are usually found back among the want ads while the charge itself has blossomed in big headlines on page 1. Few victims have the aggressiveness, the spunk, and the resources of Judge Dorothy Kenyon.

The investigation committee itself has a lot to answer for. The method of procedure should have been carefully mapped out before any evidence was presented. It is difficult to see why Chairman MILLARD TYDINGS should at the outset have given MCCARTHY his choice of presenting the charges in public or in closed session since this opened the way for public accusation with the accuser hiding under the cloak of legal immunity.

HICKENLOOPER RECALLED

A precedent existed for orderly procedure. That was in the inquiry conducted by the Joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee into the charges brought by Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.

HICKENLOOPER had a list of 27 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission whom he considered in the doubtful category. The names of those individuals were not spread across the front pages. Under Chairman MCMAHON they were thoroughly reviewed in closed session.

Long before the last case was reached, it was apparent to virtually all committee members that the charges raised were insubstantial. Attendance at the closed sessions fell away to the chairman and one or two others.

But the important point is that reputations were not subjected to lynch law. Elemental justice was observed. If at any time the Atomic Committee had agreed that an individual case warranted a public hearing, then the hearing would have been held. There was no inclination to keep back information to which the public was entitled.

SECOND-HAND EVIDENCE

It was too much to expect that MCCARTHY himself would show a sense of responsibility. Virtually all the material he has produced thus far has come out of the files of other investigating committees, including the notoriously irresponsible California Un-American Activities Committee. Or it is read out of newspapers and magazines.

This seems to me to call for something more than a mere political exchange between Republicans and Democrats. The Senate, under the Constitution, has the power to make its own rules of conduct and to compel its members to live up to those rules. This would be a good time to try to define senatorial responsibility by a new rule.

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 7382 which has for its purpose the repeal of the wartime excise nuisance taxes. These taxes were levied during the emergency of the war in order to secure funds for financing the war as well as to utilize to the fullest for the prosecution of the war the materials and the manpower of the Nation. A commitment was made at the time that at the ending of the war these taxes would be repealed. The war has now been over for nearly 5 years and the administration refuses to give the green light for the repeal of these taxes. They are a brake on the wheels of industry and are slowing down our productive enterprises and are one of the causes for the heavy unemployment we now have, which approximates five million.

I include as part of these remarks an excellent article showing the need for the repeal of these taxes, entitled "Struggle for Tax Reform," written by Beardsley Ruml, of New York, which appears in the Washington Post of this date:

STRUGGLE FOR TAX REFORM—A COMMUNICATION

The intense struggle for wartime excise-tax repeal should have been unnecessary. The wartime excises were designed to check specific kinds of consumption in wartime, with resulting reduction of production and employment. These taxes have no place in time of peace.

Except for the uniformed opposition of the Treasury and the support of the Treasury by the President, the wartime excises would have been repealed long ago. Not only are they punitive and discriminatory; they are harmful to specific industries and communities and weigh heavily on the general level of employment. The continuance of the wartime excise taxes is inconsistent with the clear mandate given by Congress to the administration in the Employment Act of 1946 to use its powers to maintain a high level of production and of employment.

But the struggle for the repeal of these taxes, unnecessary though it should have been, has served a useful purpose. It has developed economic research under the sponsorship of the National Committee for Wartime Excise Tax Repeal. In this research, Leon Henderson and his associates have shown that the net loss of revenue to the Government as a result of repeal will be far less than the country and Congress has been led to believe. These economic studies demonstrate that the net loss from the repeal of all wartime excise taxes and tax rates, except on gasoline, tobacco, and alcoholic beverages, will not be more than $1,150,000,000, and it may be substantially less.

The Committee for Economic Development, working entirely independently, has shown how wartime excises can be repealed, and how, without any new sources of revenue and with only moderate reductions in projected expenditures, the budget will be balanced with high levels of productive employment and will show a surplus besides.

These exhaustive studies of the National Committee and the CED, when taken together, give to the public a way of judging the merits of over-all wartime excise-tax repeal. The conclusion is inescapable that over-all repeal is possible and desirable. No evidence has been made available to the public, by the Treasury or otherwise, to controvert this conclusion.

The struggle has therefore resulted in demonstrating that both justice and prudence argue for over-all repeal.

Beyond the urgent and specific necessity for wartime excise-tax repeal, the struggle has brought sharply to public attention three reforms in basic fiscal policy that are long overdue. These three reforms when they are at last adopted will have an importance for the country's economic welfare even greater than excise-tax repeal itself.

The three reforms to which I refer are the following:

1. Let the Federal deficit or surplus be measured by the cash-consolidated budget instead of the administrative-control budget.

2. Let tax rates be set to balance this budget at agreed levels of high productive employment instead of by guessing what national income is likely to be a year or more away.

3. Let Federal disbursements for capital items that pay income to the Federal Government be funded instead of causing needless and burdensome tax levies on consumption, investment, and employment.

These reforms mean a basic change in Federal fiscal policy. They are a first long step in attaining built-in stabilizing fiscal measures at points where they will do great good. They bring debt management back into the economic picture so that it can be used as in the war as a stabilizing force for high employment. They eliminate the hocus-pocus of impossible business forecasting from the crucial job of setting tax rates. Above all, they make the test of surplus and deficit in terms of the hard realities of cash intake and cash outgo instead of the esoteric and inconsistent definitions of the administrative-control budget.

I have heard these reforms characterized as bookkeeping reforms—implying that they are of negligible importance. The importance resides in the ideas that underlie the bookkeeping and in the new and impersonal influence on high production and high employment these stabilizing reforms will bring.

The struggle for excise-tax repeal has been necessary to get excise-tax repeal. But it has served a deeper purpose in bringing out of the library and laboratory for public understanding fiscal reforms which, when adopted, will serve the people well for years to come.

BEARDSLEY RUML.

NEW YORK.

Operation of Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune.

I think this article is very timely right now due to the action taken by the House yesterday when considering H. R. 6567, regardless of political parties. This bill requesting $2,000,000,000 more to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation went through with such apparent ease that those of us from the East, who likewise have a good many farmers who need assistance, become very much alarmed. Unless I am misinformed, we already have a couple of years' crops of grain in storage bins throughout the Grain Belt. This extra money gives the Commodity Credit Corporation the privilege of continuing what has been going on in the past, which is the building of more grain-storage bins and again filling them with this year's grain crop. I should think some effort should be made to force the Commodity Credit Corporation to move these old crops, turn the stored grain into cash so the present funds they have would be revolving funds, like they were originally supposed to be. If this were the practice, of course, grain prices would break and our farmers in the East would, for a change, have the advantage of some cheaper grains to feed our cattle and poultry. This, in turn, would give the consumer a break on poultry products and milk. If our Western and Southern Representatives gave a little more consideration to this very important agricultural segment in the East, it would help considerably in reducing the grief we presently have here with both our farmers and our consumers. I personally know enough about grain, especially corn, to realize that it cannot be carried over indefinitely without considerable waste.

Mr. Sullivan's article gives you some idea of what the Department of Agriculture is costing the American taxpayers in personnel alone. Add to this the dollars involved from the support-price program, it is most discouraging to those of us who represent a large segment of the taxpayers who are bearing the brunt of this ever-increasing program. All we need now is something like the Brannan plan which would call for a staff in the Department of Agriculture probably twice as large as the present staff, along with the billions of dollars involved, and the farmers would be under complete control of the Federal Government and the backs of the taxpayers would be broken.

The article is as follows:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT IS PORTRAYED AS "AT EVERY UNITED STATES DINNER TABLE"—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS OPERATION OF PRICE SUPPORT MAKES IT GOVERNMENT WITHIN GOVERNMENT

(By Mark Sullivan)

The Department of Agriculture is a government within the Government. It enters every home in the country, stands beside every citizen as he eats his meals, and every member of his family. It determines or conclusively influences the price of nearly every form of food. In doing this the Department goes a second time into the home of a large class of citizens, the farmers. To them it in many cases pays large amounts of money to buy large quantities of their crops and keep them off the market, in order to support the price. Or for the same purpose, it makes nonrecourse loans to farmers. In a great many cases, and increasingly lately, the Department enters farmers' homes for a different kind of purpose, to inform them of the number of acres it has allotted to them for planting various crops.

A RECENT DEVELOPMENT

Such extensive control over such a fundamental aspect of the people's lives as food, is an immense exercise of the power of government. In the United States until recent years, such exercise of the power of government has not been practiced except in time of war. Introduction of it here in peacetime, during the 1930's parallels the practice of totalitarian governments such as Communist Russia, and during the last five years Socialist Britain.

The extent of the part played by the Department of Agriculture in Government and the lives of the people is suggested by the widespread scope of the operations and the number of its employees, not merely in Washington but throughout the country. Not all the employees are engaged in the function of price support; a large portion work in such activities as soils and seeds, insect and plant-disease prevention, and the like. But price support is a very large activity of the department, and the most dynamic one; and introduction of it has paralleled an immense increase in the number of employees.

The Department of Agriculture has branch offices in States and in hundreds of county seats. A recent report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, cited results of a sampling inquiry. It showed in one cotton county in Georgia 47 employees of field services of the department working with 1,500 farmers. In a fruit and grazing county in Washington State, 184 employees of the department were working with some 6,700 farmers. A dairy county in Maryland had 88 employees attached to field services working with fewer than 3,400 farmers. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently, Representative HOEVEN, of Iowa, gave the total number of employees of the department:

"A full-time staff of 59,556 employees and 12,274 part-time employees, or a total of 71,830. * * * In addition there are 137,037 people serving as State and county committeemen either on a per diem basis or at no salary * * * thus in all there are 208,867."

BASIC LIST EXPANDED

That number of employees is an enormous increase. The Hoover Commission report says that the number 20 years ago was only 22,000. And this expansion in the number of employees goes parallel with, and is almost wholly caused by, expansion of the Department's functions and activities. In this is potent significance.

A characteristic of such a government function as price support, is automatic expansion having almost the force of a law of nature. When price support was begun in 1938, the number of crops supported was six, called basic—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts. By additions from time to time the number of crops supported either in their original form or as prepared for market is today nearly everything produced on a farm.

With price support practiced about nearly all crops, large power is conferred by Congress on the Department of Agriculture. In recent laws and pending proposals, the Secretary of Agriculture is given discretion about the figure at which price support may be extended to a crop and whether or not to support a crop under given conditions. Expansion in cost of price support is shown by the Department's recent request to Congress for authority to borrow $2,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, additional to the some $5,000,000,000 which originally was supposed to be enough.

The Ellen Knauff Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I placed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times on the civil liberties implications of the case of Ellen Knauff. This morning, the publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch continued his praiseworthy efforts to awaken the Nation's conscience about this matter. The Post-Dispatch editorial which was carried as an advertisement in the Washington Post today is an excellent summary of the developments in the Knauff case. Moreover, our esteemed colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Judiciary Committee, has just announced that his group will hold hearings on the Knauff case, beginning Monday morning. His action is indeed gratifying to all those concerned about protecting our civil liberties. What may be most important about this case is the emergence of what we may hope will be a growth of congressional action in defense of civil liberties. We have, perhaps, tended to place too much reliance for that on the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Congress, which is closest to the people, ought properly to lead the fight against arbitrary action by administrative officials.

Following is the text of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial in the Washington Post of March 23, 1950:

(For the information of official Washington the St. Louis Post-Dispatch publishes, in the form of an advertisement, an editorial from its issue of yesterday, March 23:)

FOR A REVIEW OF THE ELLEN KNAUFF CASE

This editorial has to do with the perplexing case of Ellen Knauff to which the Post-Dispatch has devoted many news articles, editorials, and cartoons in the past 2 months. The case of this German war bride of an American combat veteran is as important as it is puzzling.

The Attorney General's summary order to exclude and deport Mrs. Knauff, who is held at Ellis Island as a risk to this country, puts her rights as a human being into head-on conflict with what the Department of Justice says is national security.

The question is: Under the Bill of Rights, which protects aliens as well as citizens, does not this little woman, many of whose relatives were killed in Hitler's persecution of Jews, deserve to know the specific charge against her?

Is she not entitled to a fair hearing on that charge? Should not this former employee of the RAF in England and the American Army of Occupation in Germany be confronted with specific accusations? And cannot these constitutional guaranties be accorded to her without disclosing really vital sources of information, and without endangering the Nation?

This conflict embraces a basic issue in democratic government. It is also an issue full of human emotions. For if Ellen Knauff cannot be admitted to the United States, then her husband, Kurt Knauff, must give up his country in order to live with his wife. How could a choice be harder?

WHAT A COMMISSION COULD DO

Because we think this case deserves more attention than it has received, the Post-Dispatch herewith reviews the case step by step and recommends the appointment of a commission of perhaps three distinguished citizens to look into the facts—in secret, should that be necessary. If the Attorney General is justified in excluding Mrs. Knauff without holding a hearing and without telling her why, such a commission could check the circumstances and report this conclusion to the country as a considered judgment.

So far the necessity for excluding Mrs. Knauff has not been made clear. Unless it is made clear, there will always remain the strong possibility that the exclusion was not necessary to national security, but was a cover-up to hide a bureaucratic mistake.

The Post-Dispatch does not say that the Department of Justice may not have facts which make it unsafe to admit Mrs. Knauff. There may be in her past an act which would prove her to be untrustworthy. But the haste with which the immigration officials tried to get her on a boat and started back to Germany suggests also the possibility that she may be the victim of a system which is trying to avoid a confession of error.

TWISTS AND TURNS OF 2 MONTHS

Here are the twists and turns of the case in the last 2 months:

January 16: The Supreme Court, by vote of 4 to 3, upheld the exclusion order, in a decision by Justices Vinson, Reed, Burton, and Minton. Justices Jackson, Black, and Frankfurter dissented vigorously. Justice Jackson denounced the plea of the Attorney General that evidence must be secret as abhorrent to freemen. Describing the procedure as dangerously wrong in principle, he said: "I should direct the Attorney General either to produce his evidence justifying exclusion or to admit Mrs. Knauff to the country." Justice Frankfurter, alarmed by the greater hazards of the informer's tale, without any opportunity for its refutation, said that "considerations of national security, insofar as they are pertinent, can be protected by a hearing in camera."

January 18: The Post-Dispatch printed a leading editorial, entitled "The Case of Ellen Knauff." The editorial predicted that this ruling will some day be reversed. It described the spectacle of Justice Jackson severely criticizing the conduct of one of his successors in the office of Attorney General, Tom Clark, now a Justice, as one of the most unusual in Supreme Court history.

February 3: Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota Republican, introduced a bill proposing that the Attorney General be directed to cancel any outstanding order of exclusion. The bill also proposed that Mrs. Knauff be permitted immediate entry into the United States. In accordance with custom, it was expected that hearings would be held before any further steps were taken to return Mrs. Knauff to Germany.

REVERSAL BY IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS

February 10: Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., New York Democrat, made public a letter to Attorney General McGrath expressing concern over the grave civil-liberties questions involved. Representative ROOSEVELT said that he was disturbed because Mrs. Knauff was denied a hearing before a board of special inquiry to which she might have presented evidence which would have cleared her of whatever charges there are against her. Representative ROOSEVELT, who is vice president of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, proposed that the Attorney General reconsider the wartime Executive regulation under which aliens may be barred without hearings.

February 15: William Farrell, Immigration Service Director of Information, said that Mrs. Knauff's deportation was being stayed in accordance with practice as a courtesy to Congress. This was a recognition of the bill introduced by Senator LANGER. It also seemed an assurance that no hasty attempt would be made to return Mrs. Knauff to Germany before hearings on pending legislation.

February 23: Immigration authorities arrested Mrs. Knauff in New York and returned her to Ellis Island where she had been held for 8 months before release on bond. Prior to this, the immigration officials had brought pressure on Senator LANGER to persuade him to withdraw his bill. Senator LANGER agreed to withdraw.

DEPORTATION STAYED BY COURT

February 27: Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of Immigration, announced that Mrs. Knauff would be deported on the following day. Asked why there was this break with the custom of staying deportation until action on a bill, Commissioner Miller said exceptions were made "in cases we believe may involve internal security or espionage." Mrs. Knauff was ordered to the Army Transport *Gen. Maurice Rose* in New York, Senator LANGER changed his mind and announced that he would not withdraw his bill. This followed a conference with Representative ROOSEVELT who told Senator LANGER that if LANGER withdrew his bill, he (ROOSEVELT) would introduce a bill to the same purpose.

February 28: New York District Director of Immigration Edward J. Shaughnessy declared: "There has to be a finality in every case. This one has dragged on long enough. She is not the type of person wanted in this country. And that is all there is to it." With Judge Learned Hand presiding, the United States Court of Appeals at New York stayed Mrs. Knauff's deportation until further court action March 6. The Immigration Service returned Mrs. Knauff from the pier to Ellis Island. The ship sailed without her. President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson were presented with Post-Dispatch editorials and news articles on the case.

March 1: Representative ROOSEVELT announced the introduction of an amendment to the passport laws to guarantee a hearing for "any alien who has arrived in this country." He asked Attorney General McGrath and Immigration Commissioner Miller to postpone deportation of Mrs. Knauff until his measure could be considered. He told the Department of Justice he was deeply concerned with the fundamental issue of "securing the most protection for our civil-liberties tradition that is consistent with national security."

March 6: Presiding Judge Hand and Judges Frank and Swan of the Federal Court of Appeals at New York, agreed to review the Attorney General's deportation order. In agreeing to this review, the court rejected the vigorous arguments of David McKibbon, chief of the civil division of the United States Attorney's office in New York. This review was expected to halt deportation proceedings for several weeks.

A THIRD BILL IS INTRODUCED

March 7: Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, introduced a private bill to require the Attorney General to cancel the exclusion order. Representative ROOSEVELT told the House that the Knauff case raised a civil liberties question that is "serious and immediate." He commended the Post-Dispatch, the New York Times, and the New York Post for their interest in the case.

March 16: Mrs. Knauff's lawyer, Gunther Jacobson, proposed to the House Judiciary

Subcommittee, through a letter to Representative WALTER, that she be subpenaed for a hearing. He wrote that he is "convinced the Government has no evidence against this young woman and that she is entirely innocent of any political activities."

Such is the confused and contradictory record of the perplexing case of Ellen Knauff in the 2 months since the Supreme Court's narrow decision against her admission as a war bride. From this record, no ordinary citizen can be sure that national security is at stake. Neither can the citizen be sure that human rights are not being ignored.

LET THE DOUBTS BE REMOVED

The Post-Dispatch, therefore, proposes the appointment of a commission of eminent citizens to investigate the facts and report to the country. We do not presume to nominate the panel from which such a commission might be chosen. However, we believe it would be reassuring if the commission contained men of the stature of former President Hoover, General Eisenhower, and General Bradley, former Secretary of State Marshall, former Secretary of War Stimson, President Conant of Harvard, Bishop Oxnam, and Cardinal Spellman.

We believe that a commission of citizens of this distinction, if called on to review the facts, would take the assignment for the important civic responsibility which it would be.

If the Department of Justice has a convincing case against Mrs. Knauff, let that be made plain, let the case be ended, and let her be returned to Germany.

But if there is no convincing case, let the country be so informed, the exclusion proceedings stopped, and Mrs. Knauff admitted to the United States as the wife of a former GI under the War Brides Act.

The Post-Dispatch urges the President, whose executive authority is involved throughout this case, to lift the issue to its highest level. We urge him to say, in effect, with all the prestige of his great office, that Ellen Knauff deserves better than star-chamber treatment at the hands of the United States Government.

Many Americans would applaud Mr. Truman were he to do so. It would be an act characteristic of the President's best qualities.

Can We Learn From the British?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appeared recently in the New York Times magazine dealing with the British health service. I believe that the British medical program offers many lessons to those of us who are interested in improving the quality and availability of medical care in this country. The author of the article, David M. Heyman, is president of three medical-care organizations—the New York Foundation, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, and Public Health Research Institute of New York City. He recently returned from a study of Britain's health service. The article is as follows:

BRITAIN'S HEALTH PLAN: THE LESSON FOR US

(By David M. Heyman)

England has now had socialized medicine for 18 months. The most ambitious and far-reaching phase of the Labor Government's entire program, the health plan is a critical testing ground of the viability of the welfare state. Few programs today are so keenly observed by the rest of the world as this historic effort to make the medical care of a people a national rather than an individual responsibility.

Is the plan working? If so, how successfully? Where lie its weaknesses and its merits? Can we in America profit from the experiment?

To find the answers to these questions I spent almost a month in England last fall. As a frank advocate of some form of prepaid—although not compulsory—health care for our own citizens, I surveyed the British plan with sympathy, if not, in many instances, with enthusiasm. I talked with interested officials, from Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, who directs the program, down to general practitioners and patients. In what follows I shall give what I believe to be the merits of the system, the faults, and the extent to which we in this country can learn from Britain in formulating a health program to meet our own needs.

Before discussing the plan, I should like to point out that its lessons for us come at a psychologically propitious time.

President Truman's compulsory health insurance plan demonstrates, regardless of its faults, that the problem of the Nation's health is becoming increasingly a matter of public concern. One need not agree with the President's plan to admit that health security is as important as social security; that good health is no less a concern of the Government than good schools and good housing. The issue is how best to achieve this objective within the framework of the American democratic tradition. England—despite her mistakes—can teach us much.

THE ADVANTAGES

To understand the drastic measures which the British Government took when it launched its national health service in July 1948, one must know something of the problems involved. The Labor Government inherited a population that had suffered from inadequate medical care, by and large, for a generation. The war, with its great need for physicians and existing health facilities, its austerities and disruption of personal habits, and the depression years which preceded it, bequeathed a vast backlog of persons in need of everything from new teeth to new stomachs.

The Minister of Health launched a full-scale attack on this problem along the entire front. Overnight, the British people found themselves embarked on a revoluntionary cradle to grave program. If food and clothing were short and taxes high, good health could be had. Moreover, it was free—or so it seemed.

The enthusiasm with which the plan was greeted is illustrated by the story of a working man stumping his district for a Labor candidate in a recent by-election. "Why, if it hadn't been for 'Nye' Bevan," he said, yanking a set of dentures out of his mouth and waving them proudly before his audience, "I wouldn't have had these yet."

The most positive aspect of the program is its impact on the mind of the man in the street. The average person has lost his former anxiety about payment of medical bills, and there is no longer a financial barrier which deters people from seeking medical advice when needed. The net result is that people do not wait until they are seriously ill before going to a physician, and many diseases are nipped before they advance beyond medical aid. Given time, this will raise the level of physical well-being of the English people higher than it has ever been. The ambitious nature of the act has created many weaknesses, but they are mainly administrative and financial. Psychologically, it has been an undeniable success.

A second great advantage of the act is its gradual redistribution of physicians geographically. As in the United States, many sections of the country were poorly served in terms of the ratio of medical personnel to population. At best, England's national average of one doctor to 2,200 persons (compared to 1 to 1,500 in the United States) stretched medical care very thin. Today, by refusing licenses to new physicians in areas that are declared overdoctored, the Ministry of Health is indirectly forcing doctors into counties and towns that need them.

This is undeniably hard on many physicians, but the Government argues that it is also undeniably good for the underdoctored areas. Young physicians have swallowed this bitter pill and made the best of it.

The third point in favor of the plan is its direct subsidies to medical schools, research groups and local health authorities. The British Medical Research Council, which was organized in 1913 and operates under the protection of the Privy Council, has always had an excellent reputation. The new plan has offered no political interference, while strengthening the research work financially. Nor have medical schools undergone any modification, with one exception. Before the war, about half of the students were from medical families and the remainder came from other sections of the upper classes. Today more and more students are applying from the middle- and lower-income groups. For the first time medical schools can afford to take them in substantial numbers without loss of quality. Local health organizations likewise no longer find it necessary to scrimp. John Bull is footing the bill.

THE DISADVANTAGES

Except from the doctors themselves, one hears few complaints about the operation of the act. Nevertheless, it is obvious to a visitor—and it is becoming evident to the Government—that the health plan has many defects. The main ones are these:

The plan has attempted to do too much too fast. The Government is in the paradoxical position of having made good too literally on one of its chief campaign promises. It is immersed in a gigantic cooperative effort without the necessary period of preliminary trial and error by which such movements usually succeed. The doctors, generally speaking, are overworked and underpaid.

Their patients, in many cases, do not get the individual attention they should have. A physician may take up to 4,000 persons on his panel; far too many, medical authorities say, to permit him to give the best service. This situation will be corrected as the country turns out a higher proportion of doctors to the population, but such a solution is years away. In the meantime, the plan runs the risk of foundering on the shoals of its own ambitiousness.

The plan has proved too expensive. The original estimate for the first year was £152,000,000. It has actually cost more than twice that—well over £300,000,000, or about 10 percent of Britain's total budget. One reason for this is that the average Briton is under the impression that the service is free. Because he pays for his share in general, rather than specific, taxes he has no idea of its costliness. As a consequence, malingerers and hypochondriacs have abused the system by needlessly taking up the doctor's time. Common sense in minor complaints has given way to demands for treatment. Since drugs were also free until the Government began charging a partial payment last October, the chronic pill takers enjoyed

an unprecedented field day. "I am appalled," Aneurin Bevan has said, "at the amount of medicine going down British throats."

The plan is too complex and unwieldy. At the local level, for example, there are four distinct administrative units: teaching hospitals, regional hospital boards, local executive councils, and local health authorities. Each unit administers a different phase of the program and there is frequently a lack of coordination among them. The preventive and curative aspects of medicine, for instance, are separated, although they are actually part of one over-all problem.

The effect, moreover, has been to create an enormous amount of paper work for the doctor. He finds himself in a baffling new world of regulations, previously reserved for members of the armed forces and civil servants. And it is slowly dawning on him that he is a civil servant with very little local authority. At best, he finds it hard to keep up his traditional relationship with patients.

A further result of this administrative complexity has been to create an organization far too complicated for efficient operation. Medicine, unlike insurance and social security, is not merely a bookkeeping operation but a skilled form of personal service. Whether public or private, it will always be expensive. Efficiency, therefore, is a paramount factor in holding down costs.

In England the incentive for the participants in the program to make it efficient is largely lost. Instead of following an already established pattern that existed in the fields of public housing and health—Government subsidies to locally administered groups—the plan sets up a cumbersome apparatus which has made for considerable waste.

The plan has inequities, both for the doctor and the patient. Dentists, who are paid on a "fee for service" basis, have profited beyond expectations; in fact, the Minister of Health has twice reduced dental fees. Physicians, on the other hand, receive a "capitation" fee or annual retainer of 18 shillings a year—$2.52 at the present rate of exchange—for each patient on their panel. Although this is a much sounder method, the rate at present is too low for the average doctor, compelling him to accept more patients than he can satisfactorily serve.

One result of this difference in method of payment is that as much money has been spent by the Government for the care of eyes and teeth as for general medicine. Obviously this is quite out of balance and should be corrected.

But a more serious fault of the plan has been its consolidation of an already dangerous trend—the overspecialization of medical practice. Previously the general practitioner held appointments in rural hospitals. With the nationalization of hospitals he has been pushed out and his morale has sunk correspondingly.

I believe it would have been better to have left the hospitals, both voluntary and public, in the hands of the local health authorities. Not only would local administrative units have been more careful of costs—since they provide part of their own funds through local taxes—but there would be a closer relationship between the curative and preventive services. Also, the Government would have been wise to encourage group practice—specialists and general practitioners working together. Instead, it has further compartmentalized an already specialized profession.

In fairness, it should be said that many of the foregoing draw-backs can, and no doubt will, be corrected. Nevertheless, they compel serious consideration by any nation contemplating a public-health program.

THE LESSONS FOR US

Any attempt to set up a prepaid health plan in the United States must begin with the realization that Americans show no indication of favoring outright socialization of medicine. The British, obviously, wanted such a plan. No program can be enacted—let alone succeed—until it has the support of those whom it is intended to help.

My inferences, therefore, are based on the assumption that we in the United States do not wish to take the drastic step that Britain has. On the other hand, I believe equally that Americans want some change, and that this is toward voluntary prepaid medical care. To put it bluntly, medicine in this country—especially its specialized branches—is gradually pricing itself out of the market. Some way must be found to make the great resources of modern medicine available to all, and at a minimum cost.

The fundamental lesson that we can learn from Britain is that some form of prepaid health program can equalize the disaster of sickness, just as insurance equalizes the disaster of fire, theft, and accident. Whatever we may think of the details of the system, it has proved that the old private-fee doctor relationship is not sacrosanct. None of the dire things predicted by opponents of this act has come to pass; British medical research and teaching are as good as ever, and medical care as good as it can be considering the structural weaknesses of the plan. Were the Conservatives to come into office, I am convinced that they would not abolish it, although some modification would undoubtedly be made.

A second important lesson is that whatever we do, it should be done only after thorough study of our specific problems, and with adequate preparation for meeting them. It would have been better for England to have proceeded in a series of coordinated moves over a period of time rather than to go forward on all fronts at once. Britons are paying the price of a program that in too many respects was hastily conceived and inadequately planned. We must not make the mistake of trying to do too much too quickly.

A third lesson is that a federally administered plan would be insufficient and virtually unworkable. If the program is unwieldy in Great Britain with its 50,000,000 population, how much more true this would be here. Federal support—financial and technical—of local or area-wide groups is distinctly feasible. A national program, controlled from Washington, is not.

Already we have ample precedent for the kind of Federal-local partnership I have in mind. Public housing, financed jointly by National and city governments, yet autonomously administered by local authorities, is one example. Public-health grants to States are another. The Rural Electrification Administration, with its aid to farmers' cooperatives, is a third. In all these cases, localities participate by paying part of the costs, and assuming most of the responsibilities. Only in areas that are too poor to take part should the Government step in directly, and then only for a period long enough to get the program under way.

One final lesson which we may draw from England is her failure to encourage group practice. National health centers, which might have represented a step in this direction, have had to be postponed for financial reasons. In the United States, the inertia of the medical profession is much the same as in England. Doctors are individualists. Local health authorities, by providing clinics or centers, can overcome this by making group practice attractive. Moreover, since the physician's earnings under a prepaid-care system would in no way be adversely affected by group practice, and should even be improved, he would have every incentive to cooperate.

I am not underestimating the resistance that a majority of physicians and many laymen will offer to prepaid medical care. Yet when such plans are actually gotten under way, it is surprising how unimportant most of the objections become. In New York City the health-insurance plan—a community-sponsored nonprofit institution which I helped organize in 1946—has enrolled almost a quarter of a million members.

At first we had difficulty recruiting enough doctors to serve our patients. County medical societies were actively hostile, and one society refused to let its members participate on penalty of dismissal. Such blind opposition has largely evaporated, and at present there is a waiting list of physicians who would like to join.

Why? Except for the high-priced specialists, they make as much money as they could in private practice, and without the trouble of having to render a single bill. Members, likewise, have discovered that the care they receive is just as good as that which they enjoyed at the hands of a private practitioner. In fact, except for the method of payment, the relationship between doctor and patient is virtually the same, for the member may take his choice of physicians from among the panel serving his group. And the cost is within the range of virtually every family—$103.68 a year if the insured pays the entire premium; $51.84 if (as is the case with members presently enrolled) his employer pays at least half. This covers every type of medical care except long continued care of tuberculosis and mental patients.

Whether other communities copy the exact structure of this plan is not important. What is important is that our health security be based on workable, democratic principles, fair to doctor and patient; that it continue to encourage initiative among doctors and not interfere with the advances in medicine that have given us a fuller and longer life. Government and the medical profession must become partners in achieving this aim.

Although our Government is now doing a good job in financing medical research through grants-in-aid to both private and quasi-public institutions, substantial Federal aid is required in other areas—particularly in medical education. Many of our teaching hospitals operate at a loss. Facilities for training physicians are badly distributed and in some sections of the country inadequate. The national Government should make direct subsidies to improve the quality of medical education, and also perhaps in the form of scholarships to promising students.

A second area in which governmental aid is needed is that normally served by local health agencies. The United States Public Health Service already does this to a degree, but there are still many sections—particularly rural—insufficiently covered by this program. Federally built health centers and clinics in "underdoctored" regions would do much to attract young physicians who normally resist settling in areas where the facilities are as poor as most of the patients.

The final step—perhaps the most critical of all—should meet the necessity of encouraging, through the lending of technical assistance and funds, the formation of organization to give medical care on a prepaid, group practice basis. As in the health insurance plan described above, the operation of such a plan would be financed by the participants. Nevertheless, the sizable sums needed to get the system going will in most cases have to come from outside.

Experimentation along these lines, I am convinced, will in time help us arrive at a national program, locally controlled, that will suit the needs of the American people as individuals. The alternative is a costly and unnecessary depletion of our human resources, unthinkable in a Nation as prosperous and great as ours.

The Lull Before the Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, last year, I made the statement to this body that the advocates of socialization will not long confine themselves to the field of medicine should they conquer it; that all professions had best prepare for attack.

Developments during the intervening months have certainly borne out the statement, which, at the time, was really a platitude. We have met and temporarily repulsed some of these schemes.

A couple of weeks ago, this body rejected the bill that would have been a start toward the socialization of libraries by the narrow vote of 164 to 161.

Resistance to the bill, which would have meant Federal aid for mining, the following week, was a little stronger. It was voted down 167 to 144.

Last Wednesday the defeat of the cooperative middle-income-housing measure by a margin of 63 votes was a decided reverse to the advocates of statism.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must not be lulled into a sense of false security by recent successes.

The reversal of the trend may be only temporary. Certainly the socialistic planners are neither discouraged nor idle. They are quietly marshalling their forces for an all-out drive at the most favorable time for their next major objective—socialized medicine.

Mr. Oscar R. Ewing and his ilk are plugging away tirelessly toward their goal. It is to be regretted that taxpayers foot the bill for much of this propaganda. Let us not forget that the drive for compulsory health insurance got under way in Europe away back in 1883. In England, Lloyd George started it for a small group of low-income manual workers as long ago as 1912. These people are patient and tenacious. Look where they are today in Britain.

I understand that now medical personnel there are paid upon a per capita basis. In other words they get a certain set amount per annum for each patient, the maximum number of patients limited, of course, by the Government. The dental profession, I am informed, balked at this basis of payment and held out for a time for what is known as a grant-in-aid. That is a system whereby the government sets a fee for each kind of service but the dentist is permitted to make his regular charge and the patient pays the difference between the government rate and the dentist's bill. This system is now in operation in several countries but the British Government refused to go along and forced their dentists to take a fixed rate for each type of operation. That represents a long advance since 1912. We must be alert or we will find too late that something of the sort has happened here. If the American medical profession loses its freedom, so will their patients and so will those who follow other trades and professions. As of yore, we cannot long endure part slave and part free.

Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the March 18 issue of the Poughkeepsie New Yorker.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployment picture surely does not look too rosy with some 4,700,000 persons presently out of work. President Truman's economic advisers believe we can still maintain a healthy economy should that figure increase to 5,500,000. Many are predicting that by late fall, we will have at least a million added to the present list of unemployed. In the face of this situation, I can see no reason for the delay in reducing our war emergency excise taxes. The idea taken by some that before reducing these taxes we must make up this loss in revenue by increasing other taxes to me seems beside the point. Previous experiences in our country and more recent experiences in Canada prove quite definitely that a fair decrease in taxes results in a greater increase in business, which would more than offset the loss of excise taxes. Now is the time to come to the rescue of business. Day after day we read of many leading retail stores having considerable decline in sales due largely to the excise taxes. We must work not only to keep employment up to at least the present figure, but we must do everything to encourage business expansion to take care of the approximate 600,000 new workers coming into the labor market each year.

Prof. Joseph S. Davis, of Stanford University, recently forecast a population growth of 50,000,000 in the United States within the next 50 years. I understand his estimate is a very conservative one. Our present population is close to 152,000,000, and, therefore, according to Professor Davis, our population will exceed 200,000,000 by the year 2000. This all goes to show that the United States is still a vigorously growing Nation. Our strength is in our people and the quality of our people. This growth of population means we must look ahead to take care of larger school enrollments and an expansion in business to take care of the increase in labor.

The editorial referred to follows:

GROWTH NECESSARY

Heavy unemployment used to be considered one of the hallmarks of depression, but that day seems to be passing.

According to Government figures, some 4,700,000 persons were out of work in mid-February. Offhand that sounds like a pretty sizable pool of jobless, but the economists don't view it too seriously.

For the whole country the unemployed represent around 7 percent of the labor force. Less than half the total have been out of work for as long as 2 months. Most of these are people moving from job to job.

The picture isn't so rosy, of course, in certain specific areas. Latest Federal data show 43 distress regions where unemployment is at least 12 percent. Only 39 were in this category the previous month.

Yet despite these black spots and the rather high national total of jobless, the outlook for business is not bleak. Most experts today are predicting prosperous activity for the remainder of 1950 and perhaps throughout 1951, too.

President Truman's economic advisers maintain their general optimism even though they believe United States unemployment may go to 5,500,000 this summer and possibly keep on rising into the fall and winter.

They are banking on the continuance of heavy demand in many basic fields. Market studies support their confidence. Not the least encouraging factor is the uninterrupted rise in the United States population. It is on this that many businessmen found their plans for expansion.

This very gain in population, however, accounts in part for the paradox of swelling unemployment in the midst of prosperity. Every year about 600,000 new workers start hunting for jobs. Industry must grow at least as fast as the population to absorb this steady stream.

To aggravate this problem, industry now is stepping up its productivity. That is, the output per man. Productivity rose pretty constantly in the decades up to World War II, but then slacked off. In the first postwar years, it was down below prewar levels. But in 1949 it picked up again. About 3 percent fewer workers were needed to turn out approximately the same goods and services as were produced in 1948.

If this productivity trend continues, and that is considered both likely and desirable, then more and more goods will be made by fewer and fewer workers in the years ahead. Obviously that can only add to unemployed rolls unless industrial expansion offsets this factor.

So, while economists are cheerful, they are also keenly aware of the need for promoting industrial growth to make job room for the millions of new workers and technologically unemployed.

And there is even talk of restoring some kind of pump-priming WPA at an early date, to cushion the effect of the often painful adjustments necessary. We have only recently been introduced to the idea of unbalanced budgets in prosperous times, now we may see a job-making WPA side by side with an industry producing at record rates and employing more people than ever in history.

Government Personnel Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House knows that the Federal Government has more than 2,000,000 employees on the pay roll today. Their salaries alone cost the taxpayers more than $5,000,000,000 annually.

Now every single one of these agencies has a personnel office. I want to call the attention of the House to some startling facts in this connection.

A survey of major agencies which employ 1,800,000 persons, showed that they had a total of 23,430 employees in their personnel offices alone. The annual salaries of these 23,430 personnel workers amounted to $76,000,000.

This means that there is one personnel worker for every 78 employees and that the average cost is $42 per employee served. Even more ridiculous is the fact that in some cases there is 1 personnel worker for every 38 employees.

Now listen to this—the total annual salary costs of personnel workers in all departments is now six times what it was in 1940. Where do we stop? Next we will have superpersonnel experts to take care of the personnel experts who take care of the pampered Government employees who in many cases do nothing more than draw their salaries.

And all costing the taxpayers millions yearly.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 22, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time I have been concerned about the arming of the Arab states, especially Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan, by the British Government, and I have also been receiving hundreds of protests in this connection from my constituents.

I am not at all surprised at the growing apprehension at this alarming situation. Last autumn I had the privilege of visiting several countries in the Middle East. I talked with many well informed persons there. I spent considerable time in Israel, and also traveled in Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon.

It is no secret that the Arab states, smarting from the humiliating military defeat in their conflict with Israel, are preparing for another series of invasions into Israel, and the starting of a second war. British airplanes, tanks, rifles, are flowing into Arab states in large numbers. Arab newspapers carried stories of the importation of these military weapons, and of the ultimate sinister use of these munitions of war.

It is sheer nonsense to offer as an alibi that these Arab countries need these weapons for security. Security against whom? Russia? Does anyone in his senses believe that these Arabs, who were defeated on the battlefield by tiny Israel, could resist invasion by Russian forces, if such invasion occurred? It doesn't make sense.

Are the allies, and Britain in particular, arming Arab states as a bulwark against communism? Have we forgotten that the Arab leaders were wined and dined and financed by Hitler, in plotting against the allies, and especially against Britain, when England was facing disaster? Israel, alone, of the Middle East countries can be depended upon to thwart the expansion of communism.

Arming the Arabs has naturally stimulated a competitive military race. The Israeli Government is forced to spend a larger portion of its budget for military defense against the possible second invasion by Arab troops. The Arab States, too, are thus encouraged to make excessive expenditures on military weapons, money which could better be spent to improve the standard of living of the poor natives.

Worst of all, Mr. Secretary, is the danger that this foolish policy of arming the Arabs might very well lead to a conflagration in the Middle East. Once started, that flame might spread and naturally provide the Communists with an opportunity to aid in overthrowing orderly government. Communists thrive on war, distress, and confusion. Witness China's disintegration and surrender to Communist influence.

It is no sound answer to say that Israel can also import arms. Even if licenses were more freely granted to export arms from the United States, it still is no answer. The United States should use its influence directly upon the British Government to cease her policy of arming the Arabs. If England refuses to listen to reason, then our Government should use its influence in the United Nations to prohibit such shipment of arms. It is the duty of the United Nations to thwart such sinister policies; and it is our obligation to make presentation to the British Government, indicating our desire to preserve peaceful relations in the Middle East. We owe it to Israel to be freed from the constant fear of attack.

I hope I may have a reply from you on this subject as courageous and constructive as was your recent San Francisco speech.

Respectfully yours,

ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Member of Congress.

State Department Representatives Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "I Don't Like Drunks and Fools Representing Me," written by Robert C. Ruark, and published in the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I DON'T LIKE DRUNKS AND FOOLS REPRESENTING ME

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, March 24.—Sometime back I got a boat for Africa and found it loaded with various State Department appointees to positions of delicate trust in the Near East—the oil country on which our future rests.

The boat was also loaded with the Arabs and Egyptians with whom our people must work. The Arabs and the Egyptians almost died laughing at our people.

One executive was an alcoholic. Another, a military attaché, was so flagrantly homosexual that he regaled strangers at the ship's bar with teary tales about his inability to write his boy friend everyday. Still another was so stupid that he made obvious love to an obvious floozie in the deck chairs—and him with a wife and two children aboard.

When a drunk is in charge of one set of papers and a homosexual is in charge of another and the fool reigns over still another, you don't need spies. Any half-stupid private detective, for 10 bucks a day, can catch any or all in compromise, and sock him for whatever you wish.

Later on I visited one legation that was a beaut. The military attaché was just about charming enough to wear a hostess gown in public. The head man was married to a French woman in a place where French are despised. Nearly everybody I met seemed to be either drunk or worse.

The cultural attaché was married to one of the most pathetic of women. She was a violent alcoholic. She was known to have got drunkenly ill at table at a state function. She hung around bars and picked up strangers—sailors, soldiers, and the natives. She was a joke with whatever ship ' 't port.

This is pitiful. This is pathetic. But she was, to my knowledge, condoned for over 2 years, although the time came when she was no longer asked to state functions. But her husband hung onto his job as our public representative abroad. For all I know he still has it.

I do not blame this poor dame, nor censure her husband, nor place any personal fault on the drunk, the fool, or the homosexuals. But I sure don't like the idea of having them represent me abroad. Especially in places that swarm with spies. The blame is on the permission of one man to rig a whole hierarchy of misfits in the State Department, and on our failure to recognize the rottenness and cut it out after the big sinner was caught and fired by President Roosevelt—a long, long time ago.

The State Department is largely a lip-service organization—much front, for advertising, and deeply involved in the welfare of our world. It seems awful dumb to put up with drunks and perverts and the husbands of town characters and fools and knaves when all espionage and checkmate diplomacy turns automatically to the weak link.

Indiana's Ku Klux Klan Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, reveals the sentiment throughout the State of Indiana regarding the almost extinct Ku Klux Klan. All of the officials, politicians, and persons identified with the Indiana Ku Klux Klan of the 1920's were convicted of crimes or have been reduced to disgrace in their respective communities or have disappeared to parts unknown.

AN UGLY CHAPTER COMPLETED

Release of D. C. Stephenson from the Michigan City penitentiary and his departure from the State will close the record on one of the most disgraceful periods in Indiana history—the era of the Klan.

The period of the Klan's rule in Indiana was brief, though the hooded order left its mark on the State for many years. A quarter of a century after Stephenson's conviction, a Governor is able to release him from

prison without setting off a major political scandal. That could not have happened even a few years ago. It has taken 25 years to eliminate the Klan as an ugly factor in our political life.

There have been many unsavory stories about Stephenson's trial and conviction. The prisoner was never able to establish them satisfactorily in a court of appeal. His release comes presumably on the basis of time served in the penitentiary and his record as a convict.

Recently there have been reports of a resurgence of the Klan in some of the Southern States, notably Georgia and Alabama. There have been incidents of night riding and violence. But also, and quite contrary to the situation a quarter century ago, there has been stern action against the night riders. There are State laws now to curb the Klan, and there is enforcement, even if it's not all that it should be.

We doubt that there will be any Klan revival in Indiana. Hoosiers certainly should have learned their lesson in the twenties. And the release of Stephenson now, bringing back to mind the disgraceful political events of 25 years ago, should increase our resolution that it shall not happen again.

The parole of Stephenson should write the last line in the record of Indiana and the Klan. But though the record is completed, it should not be forgotten.

Rearmament of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are enclosing herewith a copy of a letter from the Department of State, received by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, relative to the rearmament of the Arab states by Great Britain, with the sanction of the Department of State.

It is interesting to note that said letter from the Department of State confirms the shipment of arms to the Arabs. However, it assumes an optimistic view of the situation.

Mr. McFall places complete reliance on the existing armistice agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors. He, therefore, excludes the possibility of a violation on the part of the Arabs. The views of the Department of State, as stated by Mr. McFall, represent a manifestation of a naive faith in face of the existing tension in such an unpredictable section of the world as the middle eastern area, where nothing should be taken for granted.

One does not have to be a trained diplomat to appreciate that, should the Arab states resolve to carry out their military threats against Israel and begin a "second round," the damage will be done and it may too late for the Security Council to stop the conflagration. It may even ignite other sections of the world. No guarantee is offered by the Department of State against the renewal of the war by the Arabs; there is no pledge that, should a war of revenge against Israel break out, the United States would offer immediate military aid. At best, the views of the Department of State are speculative; it is a gamble with the lives of a people who have already suffered so much.

Verily, one should regard as dangerous the placing of a revolver in the hands of a potential murderer. Israel, against whom threats are constantly being made by the Arabs, is entitled, at least, to the opportunity of being placed in a position of complete preparedness for self-defense. Israel is anxious to avoid an arms race when the country is faced with so many internal financial burdens, but such an arms race is being forced upon Israel by the unprecedented shipments of arms to the Arabs, with the approval of the Department of State.

It is alleged that the middle eastern region is strategically important for the West in its cold war and, therefore, the rearmament of the Arab states is the logical sequence of that policy. If this be true, then it appears rather strange that the State of Israel, which is also a part of the middle east, is excluded from that policy. Israel is the outpost of democracy in that section of the world and, in case of an invasion by a third power, Israel, indeed, can be relied upon even in a much broader sense than the Arabs, as a faithful and cooperative ally of the West.

An equitable and realistic approach to the situation seems to dictate a course of action, on the part of the United States and Great Britain, whereby arms would be made available to Israel in the same manner as they are being made available to the Arab states. Thus, a balance of armament between Israel and its Arab neighbors will be established.

This is the basic issue.

There is tremendous concern about this question, and it is not limited to Americans of the Jewish faith. You will recall that recently, Messrs. William Green, president of the A. F. of L., and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, visited President Truman, protesting the rearmament of the Arab states.

As you well know, American Jewry is raising millions of dollars through the United Jewish Appeal, for the immigration and rehabilitation of the tens of thousands of DP's who are entering Israel, where they come in search for peace and security.

Israel needs peace even as one needs the oxygen of the air.

We sincerely trust, Congressman, that, consistent with your official duties, you will deem it proper to follow up this issue on the floor of the House. It is a principle which is in perfect harmony with the American policy of the pursuit of peace among the nations of the earth.

Please accept our deep appreciation for your sympathetic cooperation.

Cordially,

ELIHU D. STONE,
National Vice President,
Zionist Organization of America.

P. S.—We are also enclosing a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving all the information on this problem by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

High-School Essays on World Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an editorial from the Lyons Daily News, published at Lyons, Kans., which contains a copy of a letter from Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of Washington, D. C., to Mr. S. H. Jones, managing editor of the News, together with Mr. Jones' reply. I especially commend Mr. Jones' reply to the attention of Members of Congress.

FEDERATION REPLIES

This writer several times recently has criticized the assignment of the theme subject World Citizenship to high-school youngsters by the Federated Women's Clubs. His comments have been relayed through federation channels to Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C., and from her today we receive a letter.

In the belief that the letter may be of interest to a good many local persons, both members of Federated Clubs and individuals otherwise concerned, we print it, herewith, together with an open letter in reply:

"DEAR MR. JONES: Several recent editorials from your newspaper have been sent to me. They have criticized severely the program of women's clubs in providing essay contests among our high-school children on the subject of world citizenship.

"You have evidently been too busy locally to care about what is taking place in other parts of the United States or you would know that many highly intelligent and patriotic Americans are attempting to find some way of preventing the cold war that we are at present fighting with Russia from turning into a hot war. So many thinking people have considered that a third world war might be prevented by strengthening the United Nations and developing it into a form of limited world government that there are now before our Congress six resolutions on the subject of world organization.

"The General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled in 1948 adopted a resolution on the subject of world federation. Since that time an active program of education has been carried on in our member clubs, urging the study of the various proposals for world organizations as a method of preventing a third world war. We are naturally interested in having our children aware of what it would mean to be a world citizen should any of the proposals for world government be adopted. We want our young people, as well as our members to make up their own minds on the basis of knowledge of the subject and not on the basis of ignorance. We are not interested in what you call 'packaged thinking.'

"Very sincerely yours,
"Mrs. J. L. BLAIR BUCK."

"DEAR MRS. BUCK: I am happy to have your letter, and equally happy to reply. It gives me an opportunity to explain the difference between what I stand for and what those two words 'world citizenship' stand for.

"In the first place, I note with considerable interest your reference to wide interest in a limited world government. It is unfortunate, if that is what the federated clubs meant for youngsters to consider, that they did not assign that as the subject of the themes. There is a world of difference.

"For some years, as a newspaper man, I have been much in sympathy with the programs of various organizations embracing theme writing by youngsters on the subject of American citizenship. I would have been in sympathy with efforts to instill in our children a greater consciousness of the benefits of world mindedness or even a world alliance,. But world citizenship, never. And for these reasons.

"Actual world citizenship cannot be had without actual world government. Anything

else would be a mere alliance of nations, or world tolerance, or world mindedness. An actual world government would necessitate the subjugation of all the governments, including this grand one of ours, to the will of the majority.

"I can think of no quicker, no more certain way of surrendering our American heritage than that.

"America right now is pouring out billions of dollars of its wealth and substance to the other nations of the globe. The American people, including myself, are going along on the idea. Because we are doing it willingly we are proving that we are the most world-minded, most generous people the world has ever known. Surely nothing of the kind has ever been done in all of world history.

"But should we become part of a world government this would all be changed. We would be doing it, no doubt, but it would no longer be on a voluntary basis. The part we play would be dictated by the will of a majority, and it might or might not be our will.

"I think it is most unfortunate—or was it by design?—that the word 'limited' was not made a part of the theme subject on world citizenship. My daughter might then have written a theme based upon the limitations that could be inserted, to protect her American heritage. As it was, she was given no such choice, if she was to write favorably upon the subject assigned.

"In assuming that I have been too busy locally to know everything that is going on in America, I fear you were entirely right. I further fear there are quite a number of things going on which, if I knew about them, would disturb me a great deal. Any movement to trade my own or my daughter's American birthright for a mess of pottage would be one of them.

"I hope, Mrs. Buck, that you are, as you say, not interested in packaged thinking. I hope, more than that, that you have not helped to package this batch.

"Quite sincerely,

"S. H. J."

State and Municipal Employees and Teachers Should Be Excluded From Federal Social Security

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days of the last session of Congress, the House passed H. R. 6000 which is known as the social security bill.

The policy of the Social Security Board as set forth by the word and action of Mr. Altmeyer and those who dictate policy has been to bend every energy to bring under Federal social security all workers wherever they are and whatever they do. They want to socialize every worker in the country if they can.

Following this policy they did all they could to bring under Federal social security all State employees and all county and municipal employees such as courthouse employees and policemen and firemen and also school teachers.

I opposed this policy as vigorously as I could when the bill was before the Ways and Means Committee and before the House. With the help of those on the committee who agreed with me we were able to prevent a complete blanketing under the Federal social security of these groups which I have just mentioned. However, we are not able to strike out of the bill all reference to these employees as I should have liked to do. The bill when passed contained a provision that if a State through the proper authority petitioned the Social Security Administration to have any or all of these groups included under Federal social security, the Federal Board would have authority to enter into an agreement with such State to extent social security to such groups.

This cannot be done, however, until after the Governor certifies that a written referendum vote has been taken at which all affected workers have had a chance to vote and that not less than two-thirds of the voters in such referendum vote in favor of including their positions and services under the Federal social security. In other words, if one-third or more of the workers involved voted not to be included under Federal social security then they would be excluded.

One of the principal objections to this system is that mayors and governors and others wielding political pressure should they be in league with the Social Security Board might pressure these groups into giving up the retirement systems that they have built up and of which they are justly proud.

This bill, H. R. 6000, is now pending in the Senate of the United States. I understand that there is a strong sentiment in the Senate in favor of eliminating these objectionable provisions from the bill. Interested groups such as State, county and municipal employees, and school teachers should let their wishes be known to their Senators.

I hope the Senate strikes these objectionable provisions from the bill.

Your Government at Work in the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the United States Philippine War Damage Commission has done an outstanding job in carrying out the expressed will of the Congress in its work of rehabilitation in the Philippine Islands.

The Philippines are a long way from Washington. The Republic of the Philippines, our staunchest of allies, is without the same caliber of representation in Washington as is evidenced by the staffs of experts representing European countries that come here to ask our help and favor. One good and sufficient reason for this is that the war-ravaged Philippine Republic cannot afford the luxuries of missions to America. They choose to conserve what funds they now have and to use them in an effort to rebuild their country and their economy.

Mr. John A. O'Donnell, who has done a fine job as a member of the War Damage Commission, recently delivered an address, Your Government at Work in the Orient. In this he tells you some of the problems that confronted the War Damage Commission and some of the stubborn problems that confronted the Philippine Republic.

This document should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to your reading.

YOUR GOVERNMENT AT WORK IN THE ORIENT

Imagine yourself confronted with the problem of establishing the headquarters of a large Federal agency, 11,000 miles from Washington, D. C., in a foreign country and with a staff which numbered only 16 percent citizens of the United States. What would you do and how would you do it?

The problem was a real one to the three commissioners of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, an independent Government agency. Its headquarters are in Manila, with regional offices strategically located throughout the Philippine archipelago. It maintains a staff of over 900 employees, only about one-sixth of which are American citizens.

Created by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, this Commission is performing a function unique in history. Its purpose is the adjudication and payment of private and public claims for war damage caused in World War II and it is the first time that the United States or any other country has paid the citizens of another nation war damage remuneration on such a scale.

This act was intended as a manifestation of good will on the part of the United States toward the people of the Philippine Republic to whom we gave independence on July 4, 1946. Not only had friendly relations existed between the two countries for nearly half a century, but this was the only American territory that suffered heavy damage during the war. The Filipinos remained steadfastly loyal and underwent great suffering during the Japanese occupation. With the end of the war and the granting of independence to the Philippines, it was vital that this struggling republic received aid to rehabilitate itself in order that it might assume the position it deserves among the nations of the world.

As required by the act, two Americans and one Filipino were appointed as members of the Commission. The Americans were Frank A. Waring, the chairman, and John A. O'Donnell. The Filipino member appointed was Judge Fancisco A. Delgado.

The first problem facing these men was to arrange housing for the American personnel being brought to the Philippines and office space for the staff to be recruited. Anyone involved in the deployment of nonwar agencies from Washington before and during the war is aware of the problems involved in uprooting and transferring personnel, even for just a city to city move within the United States. Magnify these problems a thousand times and you have some idea of the task confronting the Commission. According to General Eisenhower, Manila was one of the most war-devastated cities in the world, second only to Warsaw. In the closing months of 1946, housing was next to impossible to locate. Office space was extremely scarce. Food was far below American standards. The country was in the throes of severe inflation and prices were several hundred percent above prewar level. There was no public trans-

portation. Communications were exasperatingly slow and the electric power system temperamental to say the least.

Arrangements were made with the Manila Hotel to provide housing in temporary barrack buildings in the hotel compound. The barracks were originally constructed by the Navy, and while extensive alterations were made, to put it simply, they were still barracks. A special rate for food was agreed upon and while neither the quarters nor the food could be called homelike the first obstacle had been hurdled.

The American personnel began arriving in November 1946. Nearly a hundred persons were flown to Manila in three flights through a charter arrangement with Pacific Overseas Airline. The cost per person, Washington, D. C., to Manila, was less than the minimum first class steamship fare from San Francisco to Manila, without taking into account rail fares, time in transit, per diems, and other expenses which would have been involved in rail and water transportation.

Meanwhile, plans were under way for the construction of a housing compound in Quezon City, a suburb of Manila. Upon the completion of this project, the majority of the married personnel were moved there. This compound is not only attractive, but provides safe play space for children, adequate room for adult recreation and a dust-free, cool retreat after the noise, heat, and dust of the average Manila workday. Two new downtown apartment houses were also leased upon their completion and these provide accommodations for the unmarried personnel and those with grown children. Employees received these quarters in lieu of the rental allowance provided under Bureau of the Budget regulations.

Next came the problem of office space. Fully 90 percent of the prewar offices and Government buildings were partially or completely destroyed. The Commission was faced with the task of competing with thousands of others who were looking for space. The Aguinaldo Building in downtown Manila was finally rented but the facilities and location were not good. Later, a compound containing eight two-story steel Navy buildings was obtained. These buildings provide large offices with good lighting and ventilation. There is a modern cafeteria where relatively low-cost food is served. A former Navy nurse operates a first-aid room. The facilities of the cafeteria and the dispensary are available to all employees.

Originally, the Commission borrowed an old Army bus to transport its employees to and from work. It had definitely been through the war and was not a very reliable means of transportation. It frequently broke down and the problem of getting employees to work was constantly arising. As soon as possible, busses were purchased and now handle the transportation of the American personnel.

Naturally, unemployment was at a peak never before seen in the Philippines. The Commission received 10,000 applications for approximately 1,000 openings. Among its first decisions was the determination that veterans, both Filipino and American, would be given preferential consideration for employment. Physical handicaps were not to bar applicants if their qualifications were otherwise satisfactory. Furthermore, the civil-service lists of the Philippine Government were to be studied to find eligible candidates for positions.

As soon as the first Americans reached Manila, the Commission began the recruitment of Philippine personnel. These employees have performed creditably and with a high degree of initiative and intelligence. To cite one example, the head of the division responsible for the recording of all incoming claims arrived at his desk one morning to find that his staff had been at work all night. They did it on their own initiative to catch up on the backlog of tabulation that had occurred, not through any fault of their own, but because the tabulating machines could not keep up with the load. This and considerable other overtime has been performed on a strictly voluntary basis.

A willingness to place Filipino personnel in key positions has been demonstrated and they hold such positions. The Commission maintains an internal promotion policy and considers all current employees whenever a better position is to be filled before it employs anyone from the outside. It has been interesting to note the keen competitive spirit of the Filipino employees—always striving to move ahead, yet never sacrificing quality for quantity.

In drafting the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, the Congress wisely recognized the economic problem which contronted the Commission with respect to personnel and exempted it from the obligations of the Civil Commission Regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Commission has sought to adhere closely to the civil service regulations insofar as they may be made to apply efficiently and economically. It has adopted several measures for the betterment of personnel and has been able to maintain most satisfactory employee relations.

As might be expected in such an overseas operation, there has been some turn-over of personnel, but the percentage has been relatively small. Several American employees have resigned and returned to the States but this was to be expected, for no one who has not lived and worked in a foreign country, especially the tropics, can visualize in advance what his reaction will be. On the whole, the Commission has been most fortunate in the choice of its American personnel.

Living allowances are paid under the same regulations as those which provide for rental allowances. The salary scale is relatively high, for both Philippine and American personnel. It was arrived at by the Commission after an exhaustive survey had been made of the Philippine Government agencies, business firms, etc., and living costs were found to be four and five times higher than before the war. Also, the agency is a temporary one, its life being definitely limited under the act which created it. Many of the American staff made personal sacrifices to go overseas and help the Commission do the job assigned by Congress. The payment of adequate salaries to Filipino personnel has instilled in them a sense of pride and has tended to remove temptation to succumb to pressures from those seeking favored treatment on claims. The Commission believes that decent incomes reduce temptation by relieving employees of the normal possibility of financial straits.

A grievance procedure that permits an employee to take his complaint to the Commissioners themselves has been adopted. The procedure for involuntary separations provides a complete safeguard for the employee. Charges of unfitness must be reduced to writing and forwarded to the employee through the Personnel Division. The employee has five working days in which to answer the charges and if his answers are not satisfactory to his office director, the employee may appeal in person to the Commission.

Numerous other measures have been adopted for the promotion of harmony among the employees. Among them is the fact that Philippine holidays as well as those celebrated in the United States are observed.

The Commission is now in the sundown of its existence and is required by law to complete its work by April 30, 1951. There is no question but that this goal will be attained. The task has not been an easy one but the Commission is justly proud of the record it has made. Over 1,250,000 private-property claims were filed and approximately 1,200,000 have already been liquidated. Funds have been allocated for the rehabilitation of schools, hospitals, government buildings, waterworks and irrigation systems. This record has been achieved only through teamwork and the splendid employer-employee relationship which has been established and maintained.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington News on March 21, 1950, on the subject of Home Rule for the District of Columbia. The editorial follows:

HOME RULE SHAM

Hypocrisy is fast becoming a Government policy here as it has in varying degrees in other countries. In its campaign against the Kefauver bill for home rule in the National Capital, the Washington Board of Trade has issued a pamphlet briefly emphasizing palpable frauds the bill contains. The principal one is:

"SEC. 404. The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District of Columbia by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the District council by this act including, without limitation, legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this act or any provision of this act."

The pamphlet asks: "Is that home rule?" It proceeds to remind Washingtonians that the bill permits the District to elect nine members of the proposed council, but lets the President appoint the other two; and that it lets persons temporarily living here, but retaining citizenship elsewhere, to vote here as well as in their own cities upon all municipal questions, including throwing the District into bonded debt to the extent of $80,000,000.

When the same measure was called the Auchincloss bill in the last Congress, this newspaper pointed out that, as a home-rule instrument, it was a fake. It still is. Its real purpose is to reorganize the municipal government under the domination of a city manager. But it would surrender no fraction of the present Federal control of our home community.

The pamphlet also stresses that the Kefauver bill would not give either the national franchise or national representation to the District. It still would leave our people voteless on national issues and candidates.

Many opponents of the bill favor national representation but object to local suffrage. That is not our position. We believe Washington should be fully enfranchised both nationally and locally—in the American tradition. But national representation is not home rule. The News believes thoroughly in genuine home rule, but insists that a home-rule bill which would impose a form of local government dictated by Congress is a sham.

We first should be given local autonomy and then be permitted to decide for ourselves whether we want a city manager or a mayor and city council like other large cities in the United States.

Mission in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an eloquent sermon entitled "Mission in Washington," by the Reverend Franklin D. Loehr, of Florence, Mass.:

MISSION IN WASHINGTON

Scripture: Luke 10: 25-37; Hebrews 11: 1-40.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

REV. FRANKLIN D. LOEHR,
Florence, Mass.:

House Foreign Affairs Committee planning meet privately January 18 to decide action or inaction on Atlantic Union resolution. Senate leaders, administration also, formulating policy now. Urgently need you in delegation seeing congressional leaders, State Department, White House, January 17 to 23, inclusive. Committee tentatively planning anniversary dinner 23d. Could you be present any or preferably all these days? Please wire our Washington office, 1111 Seventeenth Street NW.

OWEN J. ROBERTS.

For 10½ years I've been waiting for that telegram.

Ten and one-half years ago—in the summer of 1939—I first came across Clarence Streit's book, Union Now. That's the year it was first published, and I thank a kind providence for bringing me to it immediately.

For I had been bothered, for years even before that, with the evident inadequacy and deterioration of the peace-keeping machinery of the world. The League of Nations was going utterly to pieces, and Hitler was becoming daily that serious threat to history that he turned out to be. I was wondering, with all the radical urgency of youth, wondering if it were possible to build a peace that would be strong and good—or if, perhaps, peace were impossible of human attainment, and war a permanent curse on the human race.

By an act of will and instinct I refused to believe such a pessimistic fatalism; and even, with the help of the Naperville Youth Council, worked out an ambitious idea of our own—the Fellowship of the Fourth Circle. We had stenciled armbands for our meetings, a silhouette cross with five circles on it; and a special salute—hand up and then out; "We love God, and the Samaritan is our neighbor." We signed up members, wrote cards to our Congressmen, and did what we could. But we were so few and small and far away, and the problem was so big.

Then Clarence Streit's book appeared, called Union Now. (It became later a book-of-the-month.) Here was a master mind, one of the most brilliant political thinkers of this or any generation. Moreover, he had had a ringside seat: Mr. Streit was New York Times newspaper correspondent covering the League of Nations for 10 years, 1928 to early 1939. Here was the depth of historical analysis, the wisdom of man's political past, applied with stark realism to the practical need of our generation's growing world community. Here was the answer, in sweeping outline, tying past and future together in challenge to the fluid present; in practical detail outlining with compelling logic, the course of promise, and the start we could make right now.

It was only a book, but it stirred people. There were others who felt even as I, as they read it. Within 10 days of its publication a group of early readers, mysteriously drawn together by the magic of that book, met in New York City and founded an organization. It was a small group, and most of them had never seen each other before; but then and there they united, with the purpose of federating the free peoples of the world defensively, economically, culturally. The well-tested pattern to start with is our American Federal Union which united 48 States and brought us the strength, the peace, and the prosperity which we have known.

This was to be a nucleus for full world government as soon as possible. The plain facts of life in 1939 (and in 1950) said it was impossible to unite all nations immediately into a real world government, for some nations were on the rampage, and the last thing they wanted was effective government on the world level, because that was the one thing that could check and hold them—1939 wasn't too different from 1950 in this respect, was it? But a dozen or so plain citizens met in New York City that day in April 1939 and formed there—as disciples of Clarence Streit's idea—an organization to save the world. Such was the beginning of Federal Unionists, Inc., that movement which, though never enrolling millions, has permeated every State in our Union, every democratic nation of this globe. The Federal Union concept has so guided and established the thinking of practical men about freedom and peace that its humble leader, Clarence Streit, in this year nominated to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. (That's a bit of inside news which isn't out yet to the general public—that Mr. Streit, who spoke from this pulpit on Sunday morning, March 27, 1949, has been put up this year for the Nobel Peace Prize.)

I joined the movement as soon as I found out about it, sometime in the summer of 1939—and I've been working for it ever since. The summer of 1941 I was asked by the Federal Unionists in the Chicago area to set up the Chicago office, really the midwest regional office of Federal Union; my Naperville church granted me a 4-month leave of absence, June through September, to do so. We made the front page of the Chicago Tribune, and were even picketed on one occasion by We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc. I preached the first Federal Union convention sermon in Cleveland in 1941, and traveled from Westover Field to Chicago in 1944 to preach the fourth convention sermon.

During the war I gave out upward perhaps to 400 copies of that famous book, Union Now. When soldiers came in with that most poignant of all the questions they asked the chaplain: "Chaplain, what's the use? Will we have to do it all over again? Will my little boy have to go to war?" I did not send them empty-handed away. I had an answer: "No, we don't have to do it all over again—your little boy need not be condemned to go to another war, in his day; there is a way." And I put in their hands this solid, constructive book, Union Now.

And civilians wanted to know, too, as well as soldiers, if there is any real hope for peace—any practical way to establish law and order among nations, government in the world community, adequate to cope with problems and situations and persons like Hitler and Stalin, before they plunged us all into war. So I was asked to speak, again and again—more than 300 times, on this topic, an average of better than twice a month for all these 10½ years since first I found and read the book. And a dozen, a hundred, a thousand others were doing likewise.

And all the time we were planting seeds, idea seeds, to grow in the minds of thoughtful people. Streit resigned his good job as ace foreign correspondent for the New York Times, and without any backing but God and his own faith, set out to bring to the world this gospel for its twentieth century economic and political salvation. And I watched him, and prayed, and did the little things I could in the little corners where I found people willing to listen. And I met a lady in the Washington delegation this week, a lady from Chicago who looked at me and said, "You're the man who spoke on Federal Union at a tea party in Evanston one afternoon back in 1941. I was there, and I came up afterward and said, 'What can I do about it? Have you a membership blank? You'll need people, and you'll need money for this,' and I've been in it ever since. Just because of that talk you gave at a tea party in 1941." And then she introduced me to her husband, who was a colonel in the Marines during the South Pacific action.

So finally, Federal Union began to get places. Prominent people, people who could do something about it, began to listen seriously. And postwar events have built up tremendous pressure. The end of the war did not bring peace. The atomic bomb suddenly hung over us. Russia continually prods us to do something ourselves to make this a united free world, as we would have it, or to be absorbed in the dark night of her united slave world. Men in positions of leadership found world events crowding them, and their conscience pushing them, and the old props they'd leaned on going out from under them. Federal Union was growing, quietly gathering strength.

Then came a letter, a confidential letter, to only a few of us, from Federal Union headquarters. A new attack was in the making to carry this Federal Union idea at last into the arena of political action. Big names would general the attack, men whose very presence would make those who guide this Nation sit up and listen. Owen J. Roberts, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, head of the American legal section at the Nazi War Crimes Court in Nuremberg. Owen J. Roberts would come back and be active chairman of the political action group, for he felt that in Federal Union could be built an era of law and peace among nations.

Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, would be a vice chairman; Robert Patterson, former Secretary of War in the President's Cabinet, would be another vice chairman, perfectly representing how Federal Union is the greatest and logical answer to both our national defense and to our economic problems. Elmo Roper would be treasurer, and men of national prominence would form the national council.

We were now moving into political action, with a powerfully led Atlantic Union Committee introducing a resolution into Congress. Influential members in both the House and the Senate, Walter Judd, of Minnesota, Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Raymond Baldwin, of Connecticut, and several dozen more—would request the President of the United States to invite the other nations who had signed the North Atlantic Pact with us, to send representatives to explore the forming of an actual union—of these North Atlantic Pact countries and such other countries as the convention might invite—to form a union of free peoples, to safeguard our liberties, and unleash our economic powers, raise the standard of living, and bring about that enlargement of

citizenship whereby we can claim and establish the world as our common free human habitation.

Two weeks ago, this telegram came. The first blows have been struck. The resolutions have been introduced into both Houses of Congress. The preliminary hearings are coming up. We'll have a chance to talk to some high officials in the State Department, and in Congress and Senate. We'll have a few minutes with the President. Will you come to help us? Brother, would I? This was the telegram I'd been waiting for, working for, 10½ years.

The next question was primarily a local one, asked only at the parsonage: How much money was in the tithe account? The telegram didn't ask that. We asked it. For this trip had to be at our own expense. Delegates came from 17 States—Oregon, Mississippi, Florida, Illinois—most of them farther away than Massachusetts. All of us had given money to Federal Union and to the Atlantic Union Committee—had given again and again, to support its offices, spread the good word of peace and prosperity through the federation of the free. Now we were asked to dig down again—for we must pay our own way to Washington.

Here is where a tithe account comes in so handy. If you deliberately set aside 10 percent of your income to use for religious and charitable purposes, and keep books on it, then it is not a question of "Do we have the money?" for something that comes up like this, but rather "Shall we use the tithe this month this way instead of sending off to those other good causes on the list?" With us, the Federal Union work for a better world has always been at the top of the list in the tithe account, right alongside the church. It might use up the balance for January, and for February, too, and even March. But when you have a tithe account the money is there. So I went to Washington.

It would have been interesting, this mission in Washington, even if I had not had 10½ years back of it. Tuesday morning our delegation saw Congressman KEE, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I missed that—didn't arrive until Tuesday noon—but the delegates who were there "did well by our little Nell," and Congressman KEE has scheduled full hearing for the Atlantic Union resolution, probably in February.

At the luncheon Tuesday noon we were briefed by experts on ways of approaching our Congressmen and Senators. I saw both Congressman FURCOLO and Congressman HESELTON Tuesday afternoon, and both listened with interest. Both knew something of the proposition, wanted to know more about it, and expressed themselves as in sympathy with its purpose and essence. I believe both Congressman FURCOLO and Congressman HESELTON will stand up to be counted for the Atlantic Union resolution when the time comes to stand up and be counted.

I saw about a dozen Congressmen and Senators during my 3 days in Washington, and talked with the secretaries and assistants of over a dozen more, for whenever there wasn't anything else scheduled we delegates were calling on Represntativs and Senators. Some of the Federal Union delegates were influential, like Ed Orgill, Tennessee publisher; he gave a special luncheon for all his State's Congressmen, and had a powerful Atlantic Union talk for them. Others had enough prestige and weight to command attitude by their very presence: Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, for instance, whose chauffeur on Friday could drive her right up to the White House steps. Me? I just walked in anyway, into office after office up there on Capitol Hill; walked in and said that the people back home had sort of a sad feeling of betrayal, a sad feeling that the persons we'd entrusted with the peace had somehow muffed the job so far, and what was the use of this new hydrogen-helium atomic bomb, which will only bring us a few more years of time at best; what's the use of it if we don't do anything with the time it brings? And, after all, wasn't that what the war was for, to bring us another chance at making peace? And what had we done with that chance? It takes billions of dollars to buy time. It takes millions of lives to buy another chance. Let's do something about it.

And let's do it soon—now—this session of Congress. For look at the deterioration of the political situation this past year—all assisting communism: (1) The devaluation of money in European countries has wiped out $25,000,000,000 and more in private capital. That's just $25,000,000,000 closer to communism—for communism is trying to wipe out private capital, too; (2) the incredible loss of all China—a historic bungle of the first magnitude, which history will charge squarely against America; (3) the atomic bomb in Russian hands. All these underscore the urgency of the need, and the fact that, as Mr. Streit has been patiently pointing out for 10½ years, anything short of union is not enough.

I told Senator SALTONSTALL it would mean so much if he'd come out now for the measure. I thanked Congressman CHRISTIAN HERTER, who has come out publicly for it. I had 5 minutes with Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, cover man and feature of Time magazine for January 16 (I broke into politics working for him, 8 years ago—and his first wife came from Northampton)—and he, too, is deeply worried about the loss of China, and the Russian bomb, and the currency devaluation. I spent 20 minutes with the administrative assistant to Senator TAFT, pointing out two things: (1) that Atlantic Union is the finest answer anyone has come up with to our international political and economic problems; and (2) that if BOB TAFT came out for Atlantic Union now, he would plug the greatest gap in the public opinion of him—his lack of an adequate, effective foreign policy. And when I rose to go Senator TAFT's assistant kept me there and asked more questions, and said "You have convinced me," (I think he was very nearly convinced before I came.) * * * That isn't TAFT, of course, but it is someone very close to him.

I walked in offices of Congressmen from Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, New York, and several more, spreading the Gospel. I found a Congressman of North Dakota whose daughter I had met 21 years ago in my high-school days, and I used that, too, to open a door for Atlantic Union. I talked with secretaries and left literature in the offices of "the distinguished Senator"—(that's what they call each other)—from Michigan, Iowa, Maryland, Florida, Arkansas, Rhode Island, Georgia, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and Texas.

It was all very presumptuous of me, yes. But everywhere I was well received—partly because I was the pastor of the Florence Congregational Church of Northampton, as I proudly announced to each one I called on—and partly because I spoke for the Justice Roberts and Clarence Streit Atlantic Union resolution about which they wanted to know more. I gave them Mr. Streit's article showing how the various world government resolutions, now before the Congress, can be brought together into one—and why to insist on every nation being in it at the start is unrealistic, for Russia is vetoing and walking out on United Nations doings just as it is. If we try to force the United Nations into effective world government we'll probably not strengthen it, but rather blow it to pieces, thus destroying the one bridge we do have between the Russian and the non-Russian worlds.

Yes, we of the Atlantic Union delegation rang up quite a mileage total, tramping those lovely marble floors of the Capital buildings in Washington, D. C.; and it is a beautiful capital, and we Americans may well be proud of it.

And in between the personal calls came the exciting events—Press conference in the Capitol Building itself Wednesday morning, with Senators and Congressmen and Mr. Justice Roberts. And a Washington cocktail party Wednesday afternoon from 4 to 7 in the Metropolitan Club. * * * I've never before in my life invited people to a cocktail party. But every Congressman and Senator that was talked to Tuesday and Wednesday, by arrangement of our Atlantic Union delegation, got an invitation to this cocktail party—and if Atlantic Union goes over, I figure the Lord will forgive me.

You've heard of those Washington cocktail parties, haven't you? Well, they're just about what you've read. They have all sorts of fish eggs on little crackers to eat, and a dozen different things to drink. How did I make out? Well, I had one ginger ale—with nothing in it—and one coca-cola with a cherry, a green olive, and two bits of lemon peel in it. And the conversation I best remember was with Anatole Visson, who is head of the Time-Life Diplomatic Bureau in Washington, and who said that the only thing worse than a ginger ale was the second ginger ale. (That's why I switched to coca-cola the second time up.) One admiral, one Senator's young wife, and several others got just slightly happy—which made me feel that I'd really seen a Washington cocktail party, now.

Then everybody was invited out to the Streit's apartment, to fill up on sauerkraut, frankfurters, and potato salad—and review the events of the day. Mr. Justice Roberts told of his conference that afternoon with JOE MARTIN, Republican leader in the House, who is very worried about the world situation, and very interested in Atlantic Union, and who kept Mr. Roberts there a full hour talking it through. Then each of us in turn reported his bit.

Well, that's about all there was to it, excepting that Wednesday noon, just because I happened to be standing around the right place after the press conference, I was one of four that went along with Mr. Justice Roberts and Mr. Streit to luncheon. And Thursday we all as a delegation had 20 minutes, with Senator ELBERT THOMAS of Utah, head of the special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (he did most of the talking, but Justice Roberts smoothly pinned him down about the full hearing for Atlantic Union, soon). And Friday we all went to the White House and shook hands with the President, and heard him tell us that he saw "nothing but good" in the Atlantic Union proposal, "nothing but good." And if you want your hand to shake the hand that shook hands with the hand of the President, just come through the west aisle after church. And if you're a Democrat, you may shake it twice.

MISSION IN WASHINGTON

You know, I was grumbling, about 20 minutes to 4 Tuesday morning as the alarm clock rank and I had to get up, after 3 hours' sleep, and drive to Springfield to catch that 4:55 early morning train. I wondered why anyone was fool enough to leave a warm bed at that ungodly hour, and spend a good chunk of his own money to go on a mission like that.

And then I remembered how the young men I served as chaplain just four short years ago, were called out of bed at 20 minutes to 4, and at 20 minutes to 3, and at any time during the night or day. And their mission was not to ride a warm, safe train for 8 hours, but to fly a cold, dangerous bomber for 8, 10, 12 hours—to fly it in the 69-below-zero

cold of 20,000 feet altitude, and to fight their way through enemy skies to perform their mission. And then I thought of how the eleventh chapter of Hebrews—we read it in our Scripture today—applies not only to Noah and Abraham and Moses, and the rest of the Old Testament heroes of the faith, but also to our boys in the war. They, too, "obtained a good report through faith"—they did their part, kept the faith—but "received not the promise." All that our boys could achieve was not peace but another chance for us. "God having provided some better thing for us"—not better as being more virtuous than what they did, but as being the finishing half of the job—"that they without us should not be made perfect."

And thinking of my boys, our boys, and of the unfinished half of the job, which is ours to do, my grumbling ceased. And I went my way, accompanied, perhaps, on my mission to Washington, by the prayers and blessings of those whose missions of danger bought for Washington and for America, the chance, the mission, we have today.

Great Seal of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. George J. Hulme, of Boston, Mass., asking that attention be called to the fact that the great seal of our country is officially mistreated. His communication reads as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Inasmuch as our national ensign—Old Glory—has seven red stripes and six white, I submit there can be no real warrant ever to reverse the order of said stripes on the shield part of that great seal.

As a designer and engraver of wide experience, I have engraved that insignia on various articles, notably, among others, a dozen silver cigarette boxes given to Harvard professors by United States Navy officers taking communications instruction during the war. Even commercial interests seem more concerned about being correct than does official Washington, although the State seal of Illinois shows the shield striped correctly, as also do the figureheads of Admiral Dewey's *Olympia*, the sunken *Maine*, and other United States ships of that type.

If you will examine the seal on the reverse of a $1 bill, you will notice the shield is striped: six red and seven white. This is perhaps the most glaring fault. Of course, I am aware of a general public indifference regarding heraldic design, but since we do use such things they should be correct.

Many times I had considered writing our late President, but deferred because of succeeding crises of larger importance demanding his constant attention. Now I am prompted to try again because of the multiplying and, to me, somewhat irritating examples of official recruiting posters, painted tanks, etc., displayed hereabout.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE J. HULME.

P. S.—When President Franklin D. Roosevelt was here for the wedding of his son, John, I noticed the seal emblazoned on his official automobile was wrongly striped. The eagle's head was turned left (sinister) too. You may recall the late Secretary Knox having that head—with much ado—turned right (dexter).

Hold on to Your Hats!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, competition is a wonderful thing and it has unquestionably resulted in more and better goods for more people. Our higher standard of living was brought into being in just this manner. It cannot be denied that we wish to maintain this high standard. Certainly we desire to have others attain the same degree of success in theirs. But, by no stretch of the imagination can we accept a situation which would compel our adopting a course leading to a lowering of our standard of living at a level comparable to other countries. A free flow of trade makes a joke of the meaning of competition. What good is that type of trade when it begins to displace our own workers? How can we compete with cheap labor and still keep our workers on the job?

We are only in the early stages of the suffering to come from the effects of growing imports. The threatening shadow of increasing unemployment looms larger with each foreign product coming to this country. We cannot lightly dismiss this danger. Connecticut industries and industries throughout the Nation are beginning to feel the pinch resulting from the injurious trade policies which can be laid directly at the door of the State Department.

Particularly affected at this time is the hat industry of Connecticut and to bring this matter into sharper focus for the attention of all who are concerned about employment of our workers and our standard of living, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the columns of the Bridgeport Post of March 23, 1950:

IMPORTS CREATING HAT-TRADE SLUMP—DANBURY HAT PRODUCTION CUT TO 3,000 DOZEN IN 3-DAY WEEK

The combined impact of Czech iron-curtain importations and a general decline in business has tumbled Danbury's hat-making production from a capacity of 30,000 dozen for a 5-day week to 3,000 dozen for a current 3-day-a-week schedule, it was reported today.

Approximately 3,000 hat workers are employed in 14 main plants in Danbury and lack of business has forced the 3-day-a-week program, according to available statistics.

Union and plant officials who describe the situation as very serious declare that a hatless fad in various sections of the country is accentuating the critical situation in the hat industry.

In Norwalk, second largest hat-producing community in Fairfield County, a total of approximately 2,750 persons are employed in 12 companies. That does not include those employed in fur companies which provide hat materials.

Plant officials report business prospects are not healthy and that the imports from Czechoslovakia plus a decline in domestic sales are causing great concern.

"We are beginning to wonder where our next year's business is coming from," one official declared.

Warren S. Smith, secretary of the Hat Institute, trade association for America's hat industry, declared that the hat industry has dropped 1,500,000 man-hours since 1942 and that 1,300 workers have been forced out of the trade in the past 5 years.

He attacked the State Department's policy of insisting on imports at the price of the hat industry, but maintained that many other industries in Connecticut are being hurt by the trade exchange program under the Marshall plan.

"Traditionally, we have imported a great deal of raw material from abroad," Mr. Smith said. "Now we are being forced to accept the finished product in competition with our own workers."

He declared that Czechoslovakia and Italy are the major competitors who have been fed ECA dollars to drive American firms out of business.

"Let them furnish the raw material," he asserted. "Let us provide the finished job."

Sacrifice of a city like Danbury is a pretty steep price to pay on the altar of helping countries abroad," he declared.

SHOE MANUFACTURERS HIT CZECHOSLOVAKIAN IMPORTS

BOSTON, March 23.—The New England Shoe and Leather Association charged today that some 1,000,000 pairs of shoes will be imported from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia into the United States this year.

Executive Vice President Maxwell Field reported that the association has asked the Treasury Department to investigate so-called dumping of the shoes in violation of the antidumping act of 1921.

Field added that the State Department also has been requested to advise the association of its policy permitting importation of the shoes from the iron-curtain country.

The association official stated that in the month of January alone 58,018 pairs of shoes were imported from Czechoslovakia. This, he said, was more than half of the total brought to the United States during the entire year of 1949.

Granting of Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii Is Simple Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and the Northwest generally are very much in favor of granting statehood to the Hawaiian Islands and to Alaska in the interest of simple justice. I include in these remarks a leading editorial entitled "In Simple Justice," which appeared in the Oregon Journal in its issue of March 19, which is an excellent presentation of the merits of this proposal:

IN SIMPLE JUSTICE

This is a plea to the Senate of the United States of America.

It is a plea for simple justice for more than 60,000 second-class citizens, who are first-class people, the American residents of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

It is a plea for fulfillment of solemn promises made by the people of the United States 38 and 52 years ago, respectively, to the

people of Alaska and Hawaii—promises conditioned upon attainment of economic and political maturity; promises that have been violated for at least 30 years.

It is a plea for action at this session of the Congress—action that will be a telling demonstration to the world that the United States of America means what it says when it subscribes to the doctrine of self-determination—for its people as well as for the peoples of other lands.

The House of Representatives has already acted. In rapid succession, it has approved statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. It has said in effect that the foremost exponent of democracy, the United States of America, can no longer afford to cling to the outmoded system of colonialism. It can no longer subscribe to a system of taxation without representation. It has shown a willingness to give congressional recognition to plebiscites in both Territories expressing an overwhelming desire for statehood. It has finally accepted the fact, brought out repeatedly by congressional investigating committees, that both Alaska and Hawaii have met all the conditions of statehood.

NOW UP TO SENATE

The House has been actuated by enlightened self-interest, it is true. It has acted belatedly, but it has acted. And the Senate of the United States, in all fairness, can do no less.

The arguments for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii are so overwhelming that further congressional delay is inexcusable.

Let's take Alaska first.

This vast land, one-fifth the size of the United States, twice the size of Texas, the Union's largest State, was acquired from Russia in 1867 for $7,200,000 in gold. There was considerable outcry against Secretary of State William H. Seward who negotiated the deal. Alaska was called Seward's folly.

No one could foresee then, that the United States had acquired one of the richest and most strategic regions on earth for 2 cents an acre. But recognition came when gold was discovered in the adjoining Klondike 30 years later—gold that was to bring great wealth to America—almost $1,000,000,000 worth to date. in fact.

What is more important, Alaska has almost limitless wealth-producing resources that while scarcely touched to date are nevertheless producing approximately $150,000,000 every year or 20 times Alaska's original purchase price.

Alaska's fishing industry has produced $1,000,000,000 to date. Its annual salmon pack alone is valued at approximately $75,000,000. Its mines produce $15,000,000 a year. Its infant lumber industry is taking out $5,000,000 worth of timber annually. Its tourist business is running $25,000,000 a year. Its agriculture is considerable and growing.

Alaska has great deposits of coal, oil, tin, copper, lead, silver, and platinum. Its fur industry is third in importance. It has some of the greatest hydroelectric streams in the world. One site is said to be as good as Grand Coulee, mightiest power plant on earth. And its great spruce and hemlock forests are said to be capable of producing 1,000,000 tons of newsprint a year.

Alaska is not only one of the key bastions of national defense, it may soon become the air crossroads of the world in these days of transpolar flight.

And how has this great rich land fared politically?

Since it attained Territorial status in 1912 it has fared very badly indeed. Its repeated petitions for statehood and the long succession of bills providing statehood have been kicked around by the Congress, ignored or buried in committee. The answer has been either an outright "no," or "not yet" or "wait until you can afford it."

NO POLITICAL POWER

Alaska has a Territorial legislature. True, but its powers are greatly limited. It can be overruled by the Congress or by the Territorial Governor, who is appointed by the President of the United States. Its judges are appointed. Its Delegate to the Congress has no vote. It is ruled in large measure by Federal regulations, promulgated by Federal agencies operating in the Territory. Ninety-eight percent of its land is federally owned.

Thus Alaska's 95,000 people—about 35,000 of them Eskimos and Indians—have to pay Federal income taxes like residents of the United States (about $20,000,000 a year now), but they cannot vote for President, they cannot vote for Congressmen. They are dependent upon a Federal Congress and a Federal bureaucracy 5,000 miles away. They are disfranchised.

Alaskans are in no better position than were the American Revolutionaries who fought a war over taxation without representation. They have been neglected, frustrated, exploited by absentee owners. They have borne the brunt of war, bought bonds to help pay for it, without having a word to say about it.

To be blunt, they have been getting a raw deal.

Now take Hawaii.

It's ironic, when you come to think of it. But statehood has been the ambition of the Hawaiian islands (formerly the Sandwich islands) for almost a century—since 1853 when the Hawaiian monarch Kamehameha III participated in the negotiation of a treaty under which the islands were to be admitted to the American Union as a state.

Statehood was requested by the commission through which annexation of the islands was brought about in 1898. And statehood has been petitioned at least 30 times since then and is again petitioned by half a million residents.

Like Alaska, Hawaii is one of the richest most desirable bits of territory on earth. Now, since the war its eight inhabited islands export $180,000,000 worth of agricultural products annually—including approximately $100,000,000 worth of sugar and $75,000,000 worth of pineapple.

The islands produce almost every type of tropical fruit, vegetables, and plants, including bananas, sisal and coffee. They boast one of the largest cattle ranches on earth—a 500,000-acre spread.

The islands also constitute one of the choicest tourist spots on earth, attracting about $40,000,000 worth of travel business a year.

Hawaii, crossroads of the Pacific by sea and air, is also one of America's principal military outposts, one that bore the brunt of the first treacherous Japanese attack of World War II.

FULL LOYALTY PROVED

For the record, the Territory of Hawaii sent 33,144 of her sons to war among them two Japanese outfits which helped win the tough Italian campaign and became the most decorated outfit in the American armed forces. And Hawaiians bought more E bonds during the war than did residents of any State—$531 per capita as compared with Oregon's $420, Washington's $407, and California's $385. Yet some have had the nerve to charge that Hawaii's polyglot population—36 percent Caucasian, 33 percent Japanese, 15 percent Hawaiians and the rest Chinese, Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans—has no sense of patriotism or loyalty to the United States.

Why have these people of Alaska and Hawaii been denied full citizenship? Why is statehood withheld?

We have heard all the stock arguments and frankly we don't know.

These arguments go something like this:

Both Territories lack contiguity, the diehards say.

Think of allowing Alaska with fewer than 100,000 people and Hawaii with only fewer than 600,000 people 2 Senators each, as many as New York and California have with their 20,000,000 people, not to mention 1 Representative for Alaska and at least 2 for Hawaii. 'Taint right, they say.

If you give statehood to Alaska those Eskimos and Indians will run it. What about that? they ask. And if you give statehood to Hawaii, those Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos will run it. Either that or Harry Bridges will run it or the Communists will run it or the big bad sugar and pineapple kings will run it.

There is this, however: While certain well-entrenched business people in Hawaii have given lip service to statehood, their hearts are against it. At one time their objection was to possible local domination of the islands by people of Japanese ancestry; lately, with the long longshore strike fresh in mind, it is fear of the infiltration of those in labor circles who have ideas in common with Harry Bridges.

To be quite frank, these arguments are very thin indeed. They are the arguments of cheap politics, special interests, and intolerance. The facts belie them.

The charge of bloc voting by racial groups is not sustained by on-the-ground congressional investigators such as Senator GUY CORDON, of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Possessions, and Representative HOMER ANGELL, ranking member of the corresponding House committee.

ECONOMIC MATURITY SHOWN

The contiguity argument is meaningless in these days of fast transportation and in light of the strong ties of tradition and trade with the mainland.

Both territories have demonstrated their political and economic maturity.

They have shouldered the responsibilities of statehood without receiving the benefits of statehood.

They have met the crucial test of loyalty in war.

Despite their cosmopolitan make-up, they are unified American communities in the best American tradition.

Hawaii, for example, pays more Federal taxes than any one of 14 of the States—around $100,000,000 a year. It has more people than Arizona, Nevada, Vermont, or Wyoming.

Alaska has more people today than had most of the other 26 American Territories when the were admitted to the Union. Oregon, for example, had only 52,000 people when it was admitted in 1859.

Who, besides the people of Alaska and Hawaii, wants to see them given statehood?

Well, almost everyone, it appears.

OFFICIALS FAVOR STATEHOOD

The President of the United States, for example. The last three Secretaries of the Interior, Messrs. Ickes, Krug, and Chapman, Governor Gruening of Alaska and Governor Stainback of Hawaii, too. Every congressional investigating committee since 1937. The governors of every State, by resolution at national conferences. Almost every editor in the country, from the smallest weekly to the Oregon Journal and the New York Times. The people of the United States in national polls. The House of Representatives in 1947 and 1950.

Let's put it this way.

No responsible person acquainted with Alaska and Hawaii doubts that in size, population, economic resources, political history, and experience and in the loyalty and caliber of their peoples these great Territories are ready and qualified for admission as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States of the Union.

No one, that is, with the possible exception of certain eastern and southern Senators

who for reasons obscure still hold out on almost 700,000 of their fellow Americans.

There is hope, nevertheless, that even they may now come to the conclusion that Alaska and Hawaii have served their apprenticeship.

In simple truth, our Alaskan and Hawaiian neighbors have been second-class citizens too long.

National Grange Opposes Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from the legislative counsel of the National Grange which certainly speaks for itself:

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: This letter is written in response to telephone requests by members of the Committee on Public Lands for the views of the National Grange on the proposed Bridge Canyon project of the Colorado River.

It is our judgment that the authorization of this project at the present time is unjustified for the following reasons:

1. Since the President by Executive order January 3, 1950, has set up a Water Resources Policy Committee to study the problems and suggest policies of the Federal Government's part in watershed planning, priority of water usages, methods of testing economic feasibility, needed changes in legislative policies, and means of preventing past shameful duplication and waste in watershed development, we believe decisions on all major plans, and especially the Central Arizona project, should be held up pending the report of this Commission December 1, 1950.

2. There is no other major watershed in the United States where the use of water for irrigation power and other purposes is as important to the welfare of the watershed as in the Colorado watershed. As yet there hasn't even been a pretense of a careful, over-all study of the comparative economic uses of water of the Colorado River in all its possible alternative uses. Until a careful study of the best potential use of the water resources of the river is made, no one will be able to judge soundly and wisely on such a piecemeal project as is proposed for the Bridge Canyon. Such a project, if built, or if construction is begun, would establish irretrievable priority of water use that may or may not be the best possible use of the water. From the evidence presented, the Bridge Canyon irrigation use appears to be indeed among the most wasteful of possible uses of the resources of the river.

The National Grange at its last annual session stated that "We recognize the urgent need for coordinated development and use of resources on major watershed areas"; and we recommended that a watershed board be set up for each major watershed to coordinate the watershed planning and development and thus forestall just such uncoordinated, wasteful projects as the proposed irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project appears to be. We therefore believe that this project should not be authorized until it can be adequately studied and fitted into its rightful position in an over-all watershed plan of development for the Colorado.

3. We are also opposed to authorizing this project involving the fixing of water usage rights between States which is still in bitter controversy. In our 1948 annual session we passed a resolution opposing the assignment of the use of water in controversy between States until the dispute had been referred to the Federal courts and adjudicated by them. In stating this we are aware of the amended provisions of the bill but fear that if the bill were passed appropriations might also be passed and irretrievable commitment of water might be made or wasteful construction might be started.

4. We are also opposed to authorizing the irrigation portion of the Bridge Canyon project because it is reported that the actual cost of putting the irrigation water on the land would be over $1,700 per acre. If this is true, it is in violation of our policy as passed by the last annual session of the National Grange, that we are opposed to "approving any project for expenditure of funds unless a sound appraisal shows benefits in excess of costs." This applies both to a project as a unit and any integral part of a project. We are quite certain that the irrigation portion of this project does not meet this important policy of requiring that benefits from the proposed works must exceed the cost of them.

We woud like to see both new authorizations and new construction of such major resources development held to a minimum pending an effective balancing of the Federal Budget and pending the development of an over-all plan of watershed development and administration that will prevent such uncoordinated authorization or commitments of vast sums as are involved in the Bridge Canyon project.

Very sincerely yours,

J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

Does the Kefauver Bill Really Provide for Home Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Board of Trade, which is made up of the hundreds of businessmen in Washington, D. C., has prepared a booklet regarding the present home-rule controversy which has periodically presented itself to the Congress. I believe serious consideration should be given to the arguments of these businessmen in their opposition to the Kefauver bill, as certainly the individual businessman of a city has the interest of his community at heart. These men are not trying to inject any racial or other issues in this matter, but are simply stating the facts as they see them, and as they concern Washington, D. C.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the booklet entitled "Does the Kefauver Bill Really Provide for Home Rule?"

DOES THE KEFAUVER BILL REALLY PROVIDE FOR HOME RULE?

HAVE YOU READ THE 119-PAGE KEFAUVER BILL? (S. 1527, 81ST CONG.)

It is entitled "An act to provide home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia." It is hailed by some as a sort of present-day bill of rights for local citizens.

DOES IT PROVIDE HOME RULE?

The board of trade and many other citizen groups think not. For example, this home-rule bill clearly states that Congress can enact, repeal, or amend any law affecting the District no matter what the proposed city council or the citizens decide to do. Is that home rule?

NO REAL HOME RULE IS POSSIBLE UNDER THIS SECTION OF THE KEFAUVER BILL

"Reservation of congressional authority

"SEC. 404. The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as Legislature for the District of Columbia, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the District Council by this act, including without limitation legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this act or any provision of this act."

DOES IT CONFER AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS ON PERMANENT DISTRICT RESIDENTS?

No—emphatically no. Proponents of the bill promise much but actually the bill proposes nothing in this respect. District residents are given neither a vote for President and Vice President, no representation in the Congress. These rights are definite prerequisites to workable home rule. Without them, this and other so-called home-rule bills are meaningless delusions likely to be detrimental to permanent District of Columbia residents.

This pamphlet lists a few of the many objections to the Kefauver bill. The Washington Board of Trade hopes it will stimulate careful thinking by many citizens.

The Kefauver bill provides that registered voters in other places may vote in the District if they have lived here 1 year.

This means that thousands upon thousands of people voting and giving primary allegiance elsewhere would vote in the District. This group might well be the deciding factor in any election or referendum. The board of trade does not believe this provision is conducive to good government or fair to permanent citizens? Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for an 11-person District Council; 9 elected at large, 2 designated by the President of the United States.

The two members appointed by the President would not be responsible to the voters. This clearly provides the means whereby the President and the Senate could affect the action of the District Council, despite the retention of absolute power over the District as noted in section 404. This provision waters down even the negligible amount of self-government offered to the people of the District. The board of trade does not construe this to be a reasonable feature of home rule. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides that the District Council may only propose laws which would be subject to acceptance by the Congress and the President.

In other words, the District Council would exercise no more power essentially to legislate for the District than the present Board of Commissioners. The Kefauver bill does not provide for District Representatives in Congress who would protect our interests. Therefore the board of trade believes this offers only hope of confusion and bickering

and certainly no more home rule than there is today. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for appointment by the Council of a District Manager.

While many smaller cities have and like the city-manager system, it has never been tried in a city of Washington's size. There are compelling reasons for believing it would not work here. The board of trade objects to this unwarranted experimentation. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides that the District Manager may reorganize or abolish many agencies of the District government, shall appoint or dismiss department heads and shall possess extensive other powers.

The board believes this concentrates an undesirable amount of power in one person—the Manager. The bill abolishes the job of practically every important District official. New department heads would be selected by the Manager who would not even be required to consult the Council in many cases. We believe this is unwise, unfair to present efficient officials, and dangerous in its implications. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides that bonded indebtedness up to 5 percent (approximately $80,000,000) of the assessed value of property may be incurred when approved by a majority vote in a referendum.

First, the District has been debt-free for many years. There is a serious question as to whether the cash basis of operating should be dropped in favor of a system of deferring costs and paying interest. Second, the board of trade looks with grave misgivings on any proposal by which 1-year resident voters in other jurisdictions, intending to leave the District, could participate in creating such debts knowing they would not be required to help pay them. We do not believe permanent citizens should be responsible for an $80,000,000 debt voted by others. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for the elimination of many boards and commissions such as the Recreation Board, the Board of Public Welfare and places the power now exercised by them in one person.

While some streamlining and reorganization of the District government is needed, this bill goes too far. The board of trade believes it would actually lessen citizen participation in some agencies, and abolish some boards and commissions which have been established after lengthy experience clearly shows the necessity for them. Do you?

The Kefauver bill provides for a Federal payment amounting to 20 percent of local revenues.

On the surface this appears to be wonderful. But remember that actions of one Congress are not binding on those which follow. Many experts on the District of Columbia-congressional relationship confidently forecast rapid reduction if not elimination of the Federal payment if Congress passes this bill and appears to divest itself of control, hence responsibility to the Nation's Capital. The board of trade believes that it is a valid forecast. It is clear that this city cannot cover all its expenses with more than 50 percent of its property tax-exempt. We believe passage of the Kefauver bill will mean lessening or elimination of the Federal payment, and higher taxes for local residents. Do you?

One of the principal arguments used by many in support of the Kefauver bill is that it would relieve the Congress of much petty work and permit its Members to give additional time to pressing national and international issues. This is pure speculation and is no more valid than the belief of many others that Congress will spend just as much time on District affairs if the Kefauver bill is passed as it does now. Remember, every legislative proposal passed by the District Council must be referred to the Senate and House District Committees. If it be true that the past is prologue, then it may be expected that each proposal will be reviewed and debated in detail as bills are now. There is no valid reason for concluding that if the Kefauver bill is passed Congress will cease investigating education, crime, hospitals, parking, and other activities of the District. The board of trade believes that passage of this bill would not save much, if any, congressional time but that it would cause endless argument and bickering about the relative responsibilities of Congress and the Council which would necessarily be injurious to the welfare and progress of the city and harmful to its residents. Do you?

HOME RULE AS OPPOSED TO THE KEFAUVER BILL PROVISIONS

It is evident that S. 1527 contains no real home rule. The board of trade reaffirms its position that there can be no home rule for the District of Columbia until its residents are first accorded representation in the Congress and a vote for President.

Congressional lawmaking for the Federal District is a full and proper exercise of powers stipulated in article 1, section 8, paragraph 17[1] of the Constitution of the United States. This will always be, although the process may be camouflaged in the Kefauver bill and others. While the constitutional provision will not be changed, a supplemental provision can be enacted which will give the citizens of the District of Columbia these fundamental rights: Representation in the Congress; the right to vote for President and Vice President. This will be accomplished by the Neely and Teague joint resolutions. The board of trade supports these. Do you?

[1] (The Congress) shall exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession by particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.

Modern Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 19, 1950, although brief, contains a sad commentary on the state of diplomacy and international relations in our day. The story speaks for itself and needs no extensive comments or observations. It reads as follows:

NONSECRET DIPLOMACY—AN AMERICAN IN MOSCOW CAN'T EVEN GET CONFIDENTIAL, SAFELY, WITH WIFE

WASHINGTON.—Suppose you were a second secretary at the American Embassy in Moscow. You could tell your wife what was going on at the office only if you did one of two things:

1. You could motion her into the bathroom, turn on the water full force, and then tell her what you wanted to say.

2. You could go for a walk, wait until you hit a broad place in the street, make sure no one was directly on her heels, then tell her. The precautions would be necessary because of listening devices in your home. Besides that, there would be Russian guards at the doors of your office and your apartment. They would report on when you left and entered, and where you went. They would report on who called on you, whether Russian (practically never) or people of other nations.

In Moscow you take for granted that the Government has tapped all your phone lines. Usually when you dial your number you get nothing. You hang up, dial your number again, and get it right away. The American joke is that it takes the Russians that long to hook up their recording machines.

Your servants would be secret police. You have to hire Russians because someone who speaks Russian has to get to the markets at the crack of dawn before all the food runs out. The Government sends your servants to you, and they are all trained as spies, fingerprint experts, and rifiers of desk drawers.

That's what Americans are up against when they are assigned to Moscow, or the satellite nations, by either the government or by business concerns.

There is little room any more on such a job for a pair of striped pants. Today's diplomat is much better prepared if he knows how to write code, how to duck a bullet, and, if need be, how to send one. Diplomats have become the front-line men in the cold war.

Restrictions differ, country by country, in the nations that the Communists have grabbed, but they are all slowly approaching the Russian pattern of espionage.

In Rumania, for example, restrictions have not gone so far as in Moscow—but there is an added worry for that reason. Americans have tried to keep up friendships with decent, democratic Rumanians. But now that is beginning to mean that these Rumanians finally disappear.

Congress and the Hoover Commission Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including therewith an address entitled "Congress and the Hoover Commission Reports" delivered March 16, 1950, before the Society for the Advancement of Management by my distinguished and able colleague on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California.

I am sure it is encouraging to all to see the progress that is being made toward the adoption of the Hoover Commission reports. Mr. HOLIFIELD, as chairman of the subcommittee on executive and legislative reorganization, has himself given a long and exhaustive study to the whole problem posed by the Hoover Commission reports. Moreover, he has had a very able staff constantly at work on the problem. His report on the progress toward the adoption of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, I am sure, will be of interest to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Personally I am very much interested in adopting all of these reports that after careful study seem to promise a more

responsive, a more efficient, and a more economical executive department.

CONGRESS AND THE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS

In discussing the subject of Congress and the Hoover Commission reports, I propose to confine myself to a very brief survey of what has been accomplished up to this time, to an enumeration and brief discussion of the results which it seems to me Congress has a right to expect from the work of the Hoover Commission and the publication of its report, and finally, to a few concluding remarks on the outlook for the future of executive reorganization in the Federal Government.

In consideration of the fact that the members of this organization are already quite familiar with the story of the establishment and functioning of the Hoover Commission, it is unnecessary to dwell upon this background material. Suffice it to say that, according to the best available analysis, there were 331 recommendations contained in the entire series of reports. Some of these were of very great importance, while others would be regarded as of relatively minor significance. The Bureau of the Budget estimated that, out of the total number of 331 recommendations, 122 could be made effective by administrative action, and 82 by reorganization plan; 105 would require substantive legislation, while the remaining 22 could be put in effect by appropriation legislation. Thus approximately two-thirds of the recommendations fell within the field of executive action, one-third in the field of legislative action.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, substantial progress was made in translating these recommendations into governmental policy, and I predict that much more will be accomplished along this line before the adjournment of the second session. More actual reorganization has been accomplished already than has ever been achieved before in any like period of time in the history of the United States. Testifying before the Senate Expenditures Committee last week, former President Hoover, in response to a question from Senator O'CONOR, stated that in view of the tremendous demands made upon the time and energy of the Members of the Congress, it was his feeling that "astonishing progress has been made up to date." In transmitting his 21 reorganization plans to the Congress earlier this week, President Truman took occasion to remark that, "when these plans become effective, we shall have acted on almost half the proposals made by the Commission on Organization."

The measures adopted during the first session included a number of major pieces of legislation and six reorganization plans. (Of the eight plans originally submitted, one was disapproved and one was superseded by legislation.) Together these actions affected nine different principal functions or agencies of the Federal Government. When one adds to this the very significant actions of the Executive branch in making the recommendations of the Hoover Commission effective, it is clear that there is a good deal of reason for optimism regarding the final result. Substantial progress has been made in reconstructing the Federal budget along the lines of a performance budget, as recommended by the Commission. The President's Advisory Committee on Management Improvement has been set up. The Administrative Management Division of the Bureau of the Budget is now hard at work on a program involving the cooperation of all departments and agencies of the government, in this field of management improvement.

General management: Definite progress has been made with regard to a number of specific problems in the field of general management. First and foremost among these comes the Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law No. 109, which directs the President to prepare and transmit to the Congress reorganization plans by which agencies may be regrouped, coordinated, consolidated, or otherwise altered—with certain limitations—to promote economical and efficient administration. This basic enabling legislation permits the exercise of Presidential initiative in reorganization activities; under it, plans may be submitted by the President at any time when Congress is in session, up to April 1, 1955. Each such plan will have the effect of law after 60 days unless a constitutional majority of either House of the Congress disapproves.

Reference has already been made to improvements in budgeting and to the management improvement program. In this same general area, mention should be made of the progress achieved in carrying out the Hoover Commission's recommendations regarding the centering of responsibility for top management in the heads of departments and the chairmen of commissions, and for the establishment of administrative under secretaries in all major departments. A beginning was made last year when by legislation, provision was made for an Under Secretary of Defense and for four additional assistant secretaries in the Department of State. By reorganization plans, administrative responsibility was centered for the first time in the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission and the United States Maritime Commission. Of the plans submitted earlier this week, Nos. 1–6, inclusive, transfer to the heads of six departments the functions and powers now conferred by law on subordinate officials, while Nos. 7–13, inclusive, fix responsibility for the day-to-day administration of seven regulatory boards and commissions in the chairmen of these bodies rather than in the members collectively.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1949 was designed to improve the staff assistance to the President by transferring the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President. The first of these agencies assesses and appraises the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States from a national security point of view, and considers policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies concerned with national security, while the latter was established to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial and civilian mobilization. As President Truman stated when he submitted this plan to Congress, it is highly desirable that these agencies created for the purpose of advising and assisting the President in his work should be located in the Executive Office of the President, under his immediate supervision—as the Hoover Commission recommended.

General services: The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law No. 152, established in the Executive branch of the Government an agency called the General Services Administration—again in accordance with a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. This law deals with the housekeeping functions of the Federal Government, including the purchase, utilization, storage, and disposal of property, the keeping of official records, the management of buildings, and performing other internal services, all of which are now for the first time brought together under one central management. The new agency absorbed a number of previously existing and widely scattered organizations, some previously enjoying an independent status, others attached to one or another of the executive departments and agencies.

Although this agency has been in existence for a period of less than 9 months, it has already made real progress not only in organization, but in the development of plans for the more effective discharge of its responsibilities in the future. In its report covering the first 6 months of its existence, the GSA stated:

"During the period covered by this report, efforts of the Administration have been concentrated upon developing an effective organization and comprehensive program for accomplishing basic objectives. Progress made in merging the functions of the constituent agencies, in defining new functions, and in developing policies, plans and programs are set forth herein."

Aside from the problem of organization and carrying on prescribed immediate duties, the main tasks of this period consisted of making plans and initiating studies and surveys.

There are, as you know, 21 reorganization plans that were transmitted to the Congress by the President early this week. Although the plans recently proposed will not become effective for almost 2 months, it is worth noting that plans Nos. 15 to 18, inclusive, and plan No. 20, relate to the General Services Administration. I merely wish to point out that the submission of these plans shows the desire of the administration to cooperate with the Congress, using the instrumentalities at hand, to develop and perfect the organization and powers of the General Services Administration. At the same time, the Congress itself is proceeding to strengthen and improve this legislation by proposing the insertion of additional titles dealing with the subjects of traffic management and records management. From the point of view of both the application of sound principles of management, and economy in the transaction of the public business, no more important step has been taken in recent years than the establishment of this government-wide service agency.

Personnel management: Mention has already been made of improvements in budgeting and in departmental management, as well as in the procurement and property management field. Significant improvements have also been made in the field of personnel management. The first of these was the enactment, very early in the first session, of legislation designed to increase the salaries of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives (Public Law No. 2). This was followed later by the Executive Pay Raise Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 359), which increased the rate of basic compensation of the heads of executive departments to $22,500 with corresponding increases for other top-ranking executive officials.

These measures proved to be but the initial steps in a comprehensive program of salary adjustments covering all major divisions of the Federal service. The Classification Act of 1925 was completely revised and rewritten in the form of the Classification Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 429). Further pay raise legislation included Public Law No. 167, creating professional and scientific positions at increased rates of pay; the Career Compensation Act of 1949, providing pay increases for members of the armed services; and an act providing annual pay increases for postal employees (Public Law No. 428).

The substance of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949 which made effective another important Hoover Commission recommendation has already been referred to—namely, that in Federal administrative boards and commissions, the Chairman should be vested with executive and administrative responsibility. This step would result in a significant improvement in administration without interfering in any way with the bipartisan character of these boards when dealing with regulatory problems of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature. Plan No. 5 provides that the President shall from time to time desig-

nate one of the Civil Service Commissioners as presiding head of the Commission with the title of Chairman. The Chairman shall, in turn, appoint an executive director under the classified civil service. The old titles of President of the Commission, Secretary of the Commission, and Executive Director and Chief Examiner were abolished.

National defense: At least two important laws were enacted relating to the Department of National Defense. The first of these, Public Law No. 36, provides for the Office of Under Secretary of Defense as a first step toward a better organization of the armed forces. This is in line with the general recomendation of the Hoover Commission that there should be an under secretary in all departments, to function in the place of the head of the department when the latter is absent, and to assist him when he is present in the handling of a vast quantity of administrative detail which centers in the office of the head of any large department or agency.

Another act, Public Law No. 216, changed the designation of the National Military Establishment to the Department of Defense, and toward the end that the unification of the services might in fact become a reality, to clarify and strengthen the responsibility and authority of the Secretary of Defense, giving him full control over the organization and administration of the Department and authorizing him to delegate authority to subordinates. Included in this legislation were important provisions designed to improve the budgetary and fiscal practices of the armed services.

Commerce: Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949 provided for the transfer of the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Administration to the Department of Commerce, thereby carrying out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. There were three major reasons advanced in support of this change: the fact that the Department of Commerce is charged by its organic law with the responsibility for promoting transportation; the fact that the General Services Administration would have been handicapped in the servicing of executive departments and agencies by the responsibility for the performance of an irrelevant function; and the fact that neither the Federal Works Agency which had previously had supervision of the Public Roads Administration, nor its successor, the General Services Administration was the major Federal agency for the carrying on of construction work or for the administration of grant-in-aid programs affecting State and local governments.

Among the new plans just submitted, at least two have an important bearing on the Department of Commerce. Under plan No. 5, this Department, along with five others, is given a new Administrative Assistant Secretary. Under plan No. 21, the functions of the Maritime Commission are transferred to the Department, where they are reconstituted in a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administrator. This action is significant because it moves one step further in the direction of centering responsibility for national transportation policy in the Department of Commerce—a move which the Hoover Commission strongly recommended.

Foreign affairs: Public Law No. 73, designed to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, centralizes in the Secretary of State responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs. It laid the groundwork for the integration of the Foreign Service and other personnel in the State Department, and for the complete internal reorganization of the Department, both of which are in accordance with specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Through administrative action within the Department, this reorganization is now far advanced.

Labor: Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 was intended to strengthen the Department of Labor by transferring to it two, if not three, major labor programs—the administration of the public employment offices, of the unemployment compensation system, and of the veterans' placement program. The Bureau of Employment Security is responsible for two of these functions, while the third was partly in the Department of Labor. The transfer of this Bureau, long located in the Federal Security Agency, brought together in the Department of Labor two closely related functions, neither of which—by common agreement—can be fully and effectively administered except in cooperation with the other.

This move toward the rebuilding of the Department of Labor is carried further under the terms of Reorganization Plans Nos. 14 and 19 of the 1950 series. The first of these, for the purpose of coordinating the administration of labor standards under various statutes relating to Federal construction and public works or to construction with federally financed assistance or guaranties, authorizes the Secretary of Labor to prescribe appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures with respect to these matters and to make such investigations concerning compliance with and enforcement of labor standards as he deems advisable and desirable. The purpose is to assure consistent and effective enforcement of such standards.

Plan No. 19 carries out a specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission by transferring from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board and their functions. In support of this plan, the President says that it "is a further step in achieving the general objective of the Commission to strengthen the Department of Labor by bringing within it labor functions which over many years have been scattered throughout the executive branch."

Post office: In addition to the postal salary bill previously mentioned, the Congress enacted Public Law No. 91 providing for a research and development program in the Post Office Department. This, too, is in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations. The post office is a business undertaking of gigantic proportions. Its methods of operation have not kept pace with its own requirements; it has usually operated at a deficit. This legislation will make possible the development of new methods and procedures which should, in time, greatly improve the efficiency of the service and enable it to operate on a sound financial basis.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949 represented one more step in the direction of centering authority and responsibility in the head of a department or agency. This plan transferred to the Postmaster General the functions of all subordinate offices and agencies of the Post Office Department, and authorized him to delegate appropriate functions to subordinate officers within his organization.

Regulatory commissions: Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, based upon the same principle of centralizing administrative authority and responsibility, applied the Hoover Commission recommendation to still another agency, the United States Maritime Commission. The plan makes the Chairman of the Commission the executive and administrative officer of the Commission and vests in him responsibility for the appointment of its personnel, as well as for the supervision and direction of the activities of such personnel. This plan had also the effect of restoring an arrangement that had existed from 1942 to the end of the war when, under the First War Powers Act, the Chairman of the Commission had been vested with this authority.

In trying to consider these plans both from the point of view of the basic administrative problems involved and of the Government agencies concerned, one encounters certain difficulties. A given plan may have to be mentioned, for instance, in two or three different places. Such is the case with plan No. 21 of 1950, which transfers the functions of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce. On the basis of this section, it appears that plan No. 6 of 1949 was but a preliminary move, planned to prepare the way for the more important change now proposed. Both plans, however, have been in harmony with the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Under the heading of regulatory agencies, there arises also the question of the establishing of authority in the Chairman, in each individual agency, as distinguished from having the authority over day to day operations dispersed among the members of the board or commission. Reference is made again to Reorganization Plans Nos. 7–15, inclusive, in the 1950 series, under the terms of which this change is provided for in seven agencies, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

WHAT CONGRESS EXPECTS

I have been asked specifically to comment on what the Congress expects from the Hoover Commission report. Of course, I cannot speak for the Congress as a whole. In the presence of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I can at most reflect the point of view of the House. Even there, I am reluctant to assume that the suggestions I am about to make reflect more than my own personal views.

As I see the situation, Congress may well expect six specific results, some immediate, some long range, some of major importance, others less so, as a definite result of the Hoover Commission report and the widespread public discussion which this report has aroused.

1. I expect that all of the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission report will in time be carefully studied and evaluated, and that those which as a result of such examination and analysis are found to be in the public interest will, by appropriate means, be adopted and put into effect. This, in itself, will be a great accomplishment, and one which has never before been possible in the whole history of the American Government. The significance of this fact should not be overlooked or underestimated. The report is of such comprehensive character that a careful study of all of its recommendations must of necessity involve an examination of the structure of the entire executive branch of the Federal Government.

2. Since this examination and modernization of the structural machinery of the Federal Government will be completed within a reasonably short space of time, I assume that insofar as the decisions made are wise and are supported by the facts, we will have a far more efficient and orderly governmental structure by—let us say, 1952—than we had in 1947 when the resolution creating the Hoover Commission was passed by Congress.

3. In the consideration of the Hoover Commission recommendations in both Houses of the Congress, every effort has been and is being made to obtain the views of the executive agencies concerned before final decisions are made and legislation is enacted. On the basis of this cooperative procedure with regard to legislation, the Congress expects—and I believe it has a right to expect—the full and complete cooperation of the executive departments and agencies in the enforcement of the legislation growing out of the Hoover Commission recommendations. It is up to the agencies to put forth a sincere

effort to carry out the will of the Congress and to make the legislation work.

4. I believe that, over the years, financial savings in substantial amounts will be realized as a result of structural and procedural improvements growing out of reorganization. While I do not accept second place to any man in my desire to have public funds spent honestly, economically, and in the best interests of the citizens who pay the taxes, I assert again now, as I have done on many occasions in the past, that economy, as such, is not the major purpose of reorganization. Economy is a byproduct, but an almost certain byproduct of better organization and of more efficient administrative practices and procedures. No one has expressed this point of view better than Prof. Rowland Egger, of the University of Virginia, who said a few months ago in an address before the National Tax Association in Boston:

"The attempt to sell administrative reorganization legislation on the basis of tax reduction, however honorable the motives and however laudable the hopes of those who support administrative reorganization for this reason, is a snare and a delusion; the venality of the American people has been grossly overestimated. It has, of course, established relationships and provided managerial equipment which in the routine operation of the Government has permitted the Executive to reduce unit costs, to increase efficiency, and to raise administrative standards."

"But," he continues, "the legal basis for the systematic planning of revenues and expenditures, as well as the continuous reappraisal of operations has been on the books since 1921, and the machinery of executive management has been in existence since 1939."

5. Even if this particular effort at reorganization had not already accomplished so much, and if it did not bid fair to accomplish so much more, it would still have made a significant contribution in arousing a widespread interest in and discussion of the problems of executive reorganization. For the first time in our history, there appears to be some comprehension of the fact that reorganization is a continuous process. We cannot reorganize the Government now and proceed to forget about the problem. However well we may succeed in doing the job now, there must be constant vigilance if we are to keep our reorganized Government reorganized. This may now be possible, with Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments established in both Houses of the Congress, and with a sustained effort to maintain, and to guide and direct the widespread popular interest in the subject which now exists.

6. Finally, this effort at reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government has stimulated a great deal of activity at the State and local levels. There have been established so-called "little Hoover commissions," in more than half of the States and Territories. The excellent reports of the Puerto Rican commission and of the Connecticut commission have already been published; the latter is now before a special session of the State legislature for consideration and action. The reports of many of these groups will be considered at the regular sessions of the legislatures in 1951.

CONCLUSIONS

Many bills relating to reorganization are now before the several committees of the Congress. Speaking for the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and for my own Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I can say that we have bills on traffic management and records management which will receive serious attention, and a revised bill to establish a temporary commission to study the entire field of intergovernmental relations in the United States, all in accord with Hoover Commission recommendations. The final approval of this legislation and of the 21 reorganization plans recently submitted by the President—for I am confident that all or nearly all of them will be approved—will pretty well complete the action necessary to carry out the Hoover Commission recommendations relating to over-all management in the Federal Government.

Nevertheless, our task of reorganization will not be complete. There are still a number of important matters of a highly controversial nature upon which no action has yet been taken. It is well to remember that, in a government as large as ours, the task of reorganization cannot be completed in a few months, or in a year or two. It is a continuous and never-ending task, requiring the constant and long-term effort on the part of both the administration and the Congress. So far as the Congress is concerned, this task is the particular responsibility of the Committes on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I can assure you that these committees intend to carry through in the discharge of this responsibility.

As a matter of procedure, it has seemed reasonable to clear out of the way first those aspects of the reorganization recommendations on which there already existed a basis for general agreement. There has been no disposition to "duck" the controversial issues, although obviously their solution will require more time. The Hoover Commission itself was faced with a limited period of existence, and with a definite obligation to make recommendations regarding most of the important questions which came before it. Its members were not always able to agree among themselves; its reports are in fact heavily loaded with dissents and qualifying or interpretative notes and comments inserted by its members. The Commission had not continuing responsibility for carrying out its recommendations and making them work in the day to day process of administration. The Congress and the administration do have this responsibility.

The controversial issues will be taken up, each in due time, for the Congress is now alert to the importance of a comprehensive reorganization and, I believe, is in a disposition to follow through. On the basis of the record up to this time, there is already substantial evidence of an intention on the part of both the administration and the Congress to follow through on reorganization. When the President's reorganization plans of 1950 are considered in relation to those submitted in 1949, it is plain that he is moving farther in the direction of a sound administrative organization, and building on the foundation that has already been laid. Similarly, the measures now before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization will, when enacted, strengthen and improve the legislative basis of the Federal administrative structure and encourage sound management practices.

Time was when the science of management was largely the intellectual property of groups such as the Society for the Advancement of Managment. Gradually its principles came to be applied in the actual conduct of affairs, at first in private affairs, later in the public business, although because of differing major objectives, the application is not always the same. I believe that you now have, on the basis of what has happened during the last 12 months since the Hoover Commission reports were made public, substantial evidence that these questions of administrative structure and scientific management are now understood and acted upon by Government people, in both the executive and legislative branches. I am convinced that this concerns with problems of administration in Government will increase.

Your organization and others like it will view with satisfaction and pride these developments in the management field, a field in which you have been pioneer. Few pioneers live to see the fruition of the plans for which they worked. You, I believe, will have that experience. I am happy to participate on the legislative level with you in proving to the world that democracy can be efficient, that democracy can solve its administrative problems without endangering its basic freedoms.

Repeal of Wartime Excise and Amusement Taxes Requested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have received messages from approximately 8,000 citizens of the State of Delaware, requesting the repeal of the amusement tax on movie admissions.

I have, of course, received a considerable volume of correspondence from residents of Delaware requesting that early action be taken to repeal most of the other war-imposed excise taxes.

On several occasions during the past few months I have publicly stated that I favor the reduction or elimination of such excise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, with special reference to the approximately 8,000 messages I received pertaining to the repeal of the amusement tax on movie admissions, I wish to state that I had hoped and intended to answer each of these requests with an individual letter. As a matter of fact, I started to do so and more than 500 personal letters were sent by me to those who had requested repeal of the amusement tax. By that time, however, the volume of such requests had become so great that it was no longer possible for me to write individual letters at this time because of the pressure and volume of other congressional work. Consequently, I am taking this means to let all of those to whom I could not at this time write know that their messages have been received and that the matter of repealing the amusement tax is receiving my careful attention and support.

Especially for their information I wish to include at this point the letter which I did send to some 500 Delaware citizens and which I had intended to send to all of the others. This letter follows:

This will acknowledge with thanks the card which you recently signed, requesting that every effort be made to repeal the amusement tax on movie admissions.

I am glad to have this expression of your views and to say that I have publicly recommended on several occasions the reduction or elimination of wartime excise taxes, of which the amusement tax is one. Furthermore, members of my party in the Congress have made serious efforts to amend the excise tax laws but have thus far been unsuccessful because of opposition from the party in power.

I shall continue to do all that I can to obtain action on this matter. However, with

our Government running more and more in the red, I am sure you will agree that any reduction in taxes should be accompanied by substantial reductions in Federal spending.

Also as a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the letter which I sent pertaining to this matter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. That letter follows:

MARCH 23, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thus far I have received approximately 8,000 messages from citizens of Delaware urging that the amusement tax on movie admissions be repealed.

On several occasions I have publicly recommended the reduction or elimination of wartime excise taxes, of which the amusement tax is one.

In an extension of remarks in the House of Representatives on February 14, 1950, I stated in part, "I urge that in the interest of small businesses and of continued employment that final action on the subject of excise-tax adjustments be brought about at the earliest possible moment."

It is reasonable to assume that in addition to the approximately 8,000 citizens of Delaware who have sent messages requesting the repeal of the amusement tax on movie admissions, there are other thousands within the State holding the same point of view. Consequently, on behalf of all of those citizens whom I have the privilege to represent, I again urge that remedial action on the matter of wartime excise taxes, including the amusement tax, be taken at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

J. CALEB BOGGS.

I wish to state again, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely hope that favorable and conclusive action will be taken on this matter at the earliest possible date.

A Farewell to Sean Nunan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on this day, the Honorable Sean Nunan, who is retiring as Minister of Ireland to the United States, departs from New York homeward bound. Mr. Nunan first arrived in this country 31 years ago, and with short interruptions, has served Ireland and her people in various capacities during all that time. Seldom has it been possible for a foreign diplomat to know and understand the American people so intimately and so completely as did Sean Nunan.

As a young man, Mr. Nunan played an active part in the historic Rising of 1916 in Ireland, when Irish patriots rebelled against British tyranny and proclaimed an Irish Republic, which today has become a reality after more than seven centuries of struggle. For his part in the Rising of 1916, Mr. Nunan was sentenced to penal servitude for life by the British, but was subsequently released as a result of the general amnesty of 1918.

In the general elections of 1918, when the candidates for Parliament campaigned on a platform calling for an independent republic, 79 seats were won by the full self-government candidates as against 26 for the opposition. The popular vote was 1,211,516 for self-government against 315,394, making it almost a 4 to 1 choice on the part of the people. As a consequence of this vote, the Irish members of Parliament assembled in Dublin and created the Dail, the first Irish Parliament to sit since 1800, when Great Britain abolished the Irish Parliament. Mr. Nunan was appointed clerk of the Dail, having served as director of elections at this time.

Seeking funds for the new republic, Eamon De Valera came to the United States in an effort to finance a $6,000,000 loan through the sale of Irish bonds. Mr. Nunan served as secretary to Mr. De Valera and aided in making successful this sale of bonds throughout the country. Since Mr. Nunan could not obtain a passport from the British to travel here, but would have been returned to prison instead, it was necessary for him to work his way over in the stokehold of a ship. These Irish Republic bonds all bore the signatures of Mr. De Valera and of Mr. Nunan. In later years these bonds were paid off in full, together with interest in the total sum of 25 percent.

During 1922 Mr. Nunan returned to Ireland where he participated in the treaty discussions and served in the ministry of home affairs. The following year he returned to the United States where he was later joined by Miss Nan Ryan, a native of Tipperary, who came over to be his bride. The Nunans have one son, Dr. Seamus Nunan, who is a graduate of the Georgetown University school of medicine, and who is at present a resident physician at Providence Hospital here in Washington. Dr. Nunan is remaining in America and will become an American citizen.

Over a period of 10 years, Mr. Nunan engaged in various activities, principally the brokerage business in New York, until he was appointed to the Irish Foreign Service as Consul in New York in 1932. In 1938 his government called him to serve as First Secretary of the Irish Office in London, which post he held until 1941. He then returned to the United States along with Mr. Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for Defense, on a mission to obtain arms and munitions for Ireland. Mr. Nunan remained as counsellor in the Irish Legation in Washington until 1946, when he was appointed Consul General for Ireland in New York. The following year, 1947, Mr. Nunan was named Minister of Ireland to the United States and has remained here in that capacity until this time. Sailing today for Ireland, Mr. Nunan will assume the post of Assistant Secretary of the Department of External Affairs in Dublin, where he will head the divisions of political affairs and public relations.

Throughout his years of service in this country, Mr. Nunan has traveled extensively and has acquired countless friends for Ireland in almost every State in the Union. His kindly disposition, sincerity of purpose, and loyalty to his friends has endeared him to all who have had contact with him. His unswerving devotion to the cause of Ireland has made him an outstanding champion in the fight to regain for Ireland her sovereignty over all 32 counties of the Emerald Isle. He has constantly denounced the continuing occupation of the six Northeastern counties of Ireland by the British and toiled and labored unceasingly for the day when this last hallowed spot in Ireland, whence came so many of Ireland's great heroes and patriots, may at last be joined with the rest of Ireland and the fictitious border be removed. Few causes have had a greater champion than has the Irish question in Sean Nunan, for he has never failed to call attention to the partition imposed but 30 years ago by the British Parliament in London, nor to demand vigorously the elimination of this unwanted and unasked-for boundary.

In leaving, Mr. Nunan bids farewell to hosts of friends throughout the United States, friends who will long cherish their association with him and, as a result of his gentle influence, continue to carry on for him his determined fight for the freedom and independence of all Ireland—from our distant shores. In returning to Ireland, Mr. Nunan brings back to his people a knowledge of the American people which is both thorough and unique, and I am sure that his vast experience in the United States will be helpful in expanding the close ties which have held our two countries throughout the years. Moreover he can convey directly to the Irish people the assurance that the freedom-loving people of the United States will cooperate fully in Ireland's efforts to end the partition of their country and reestablish throughout all 32 counties the democratic principles of liberty and justice for all. We wish Mr. Sean Nunan every success in his new position and bid him godspeed on his journey.

Justice Down South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the charge is often made that whenever an act of intolerance or injustice is committed in any of the Southern States it is immediately brought to public attention in order to embarrass the South. My view is that wherever bigotry and intolerance of our fellow men is practiced, in any part of our country, it should be exposed. Every effort should be made to eliminate the cancerous growth of hatred and prejudice wherever it shows its ugly head.

It is deplorable that some of those who claim to represent the South encourage intolerance and bigotry by their words

or deeds, thus further inflaming the situation. These people fail to realize that there is a stirring of new ideas in the South which are making gradual, though slow, progress in the practice of the true principles of brotherhood.

I am happy today to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, and through them to that of the American people, that it is not all prejudice and injustice in our Southern States. There are forces there—and these forces are growing stronger from day to day—who are teaching by example a better understanding of our problems and their solution. The South is no longer stagnant, it is moving forward.

I am glad to commend to you the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1950, which compliments two of our Southern States for a new chapter in justice there:

JUSTICE DOWN SOUTH

Let us, for a change, speak well of Mississippi. An all-white jury convicted a white man last Thursday of the murder of three Negro children. The bestial crime was committed in January, and justice moved with utmost speed. The jury deliberated only an hour and a half; the punishment was a mandatory sentence to life imprisonment. The district attorney's peroration included these words: "Mississippi is coming out from the dark shadows of yesterday. Do your duty as Mississippians." This the jury did, in solemn awareness that all men, black or white, are entitled to exactly the same protection of law. Mississippi has done an excellent job, and the rest of the country applauds.

More light is also breaking over Georgia. On the same day that the Mississippi jury acted on stern duty, a Federal judge in Atlanta demonstrated that Negroes have the same rights as any other Georgians. A sheriff and his deputy were each sentenced to 12 months in prison and fined $1,000 for delivering seven Negroes to a masked mob for beating. The crime was that the Negroes had been deprived of their constitutional right of equal protection under law. The course of prosecution was admittedly difficult; Federal entry into such cases has been seldom attempted. The current case was first tried last year at Rome, Ga., and ended in mistrial when the jury deliberated without result for 50 hours. But the government returned to the civil rights assault, and this time the jury convicted 2 of the 10 defendants. Appeal to the Supreme Court is in prospect. But meanwhile it is perfectly evident, on the basis of 1 week's news from Mississippi and Georgia, that something vital and different is stirring through the South.

Address of Hon. Clifford P. Case of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting the following remarks of Representative CLIFFORD P. CASE of New Jersey at a presentation of the Myth That Threatens the World, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, Sunday evening, March 19, 1950:

To discover more effective ways to establish and maintain a peaceful world is the deepest concern of Congressmen as it is of all thinking people.

Among many proposals that have been made in Congress is House Concurrent Resolution 64. It was introduced on June 7, 1949. It is sponsored by 112 Members of the House.

It reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

The resolution, you will have noted, does not say what specific steps should be taken to reach its objective. Nor does it fix a time for its accomplishment. Some people, therefore, may think it of little consequence. Believe me, they would be quite wrong. It is not a little thing to say—and mean—that a world federation with power adequate to preserve peace through the enforcement of world law should be a fundamental objective of American foreign policy.

If that objective is realized, in certain areas at least, we would be subject to a government in which we would not have a controlling voice. It has many other implications, not all of them desirable. Among them, I believe, would be a tendency to freeze the status quo. For example, those nations which suffer under totalitarian rule would find it harder to throw off the yoke, for any revolt would have to be undertaken without help from outside.

These are not little things.

Individual liberty and the institutions essential to it are very precious. To preserve them scarcely any price is too high to pay. Before we risk them there is scarcely any other risk we ought not to take first. For myself, only the belief that another war would unleash forces capable of destroying all life on this earth justifies my urging world federation as an ultimate objective of our foreign policy.

And no one ought to buy the world federation idea lightly or on the ground that those who doubt or oppose it can do so only on selfish or stupidly chauvinistic grounds.

No one ought to buy it with the idea that it will be a quick short cut to lower taxes or a lessening of Government controls over certain areas of business enterprise.

It would be far better that the idea of world federation should be stopped dead in its tracks than that it should be accepted by the American people on any false basis.

We do believe, of course, that our proposal will, at least, increase the hope of avoiding either surrender or a total war in which our smallest concern would be confiscatory taxes and total controls. But there is no cheap, quick, or easy way to win the fight for peace in a decent world. And anyone who believes that such a way exists deludes himself. Anyone who persuades another that such a way exists weakens, by so much, our will and stamina for the long, tough, expensive fight.

It may seem strange that one who believes that world federation should be a fundamental objective of our foreign policy should speak as I have just spoken. But I could not do otherwise. For if the American people should embrace the idea of world federation lightly, and without clearly understanding its implications, they will not really have accepted it at all. And it would be disastrous if the American people should become so dazzled by the prospect of an easy way to peace, through world federation or any other big solution, that they falter in the steady support which our Government must have in the struggle which we face.

All, or at least the great majority, of the sponsors of our resolution have been and still are strong supporters of the major elements of our foreign policy.

We support our Government in its support of the United Nations. Our resolution declares expressly that the United Nations should be supported and strengthened. Indeed, it is the United Nations which we would seek ultimately to develop into the World Federation.

We support, also, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Alliance, and the point-four program. We recognize how essential all these and many other specific measures are for the creation, in the words of Mr. Acheson, of a state of facts or a situation upon which international agreements with real meaning can be based. Specifically, we recognize the need for such measures for the creation of that state of facts or situation on which the greatest of all international agreements, that of World Federation, can be based.

But we feel most strongly that all such measures and others like them, useful and necessary as they are, are not enough. We feel that even Mr. Acheson's recently announced "total diplomacy," as we understand it, is not enough. No combination of military, economic, or political measures will of itself suffice. A great moral objective is also necessary. We know that we have such an objective. But we believe that the idea of World Federation under law will give that objective increased strength and meaning.

Leadership in this matter must come from outside the Department of State.

To my regret, the Department, up to now, is opposed to our resolution and to the other related proposals which have been made. Its opposition to our resolution is based, as I understand it, on two broad grounds. First, it fears that overemphasis on a single institutional change would detract from the steady efforts for peace which must be made in many fields and on many fronts. Second, it doubts whether the American people understand the idea and its implications and whether, if they did understand it, they would support it.

I fully appreciate both of these points as I think I have already made quite clear. And the Department is right in its position that we can have no foreign policy which is not the product of the thinking and the desires of the American people themselves.

But it does not follow that these and all similar proposals should be dropped. It follows, rather, that they should be most fully and vigorously discussed throughout the length and breadth of the land so that our people can reach, and then register, a fully informed opinion upon them. And I am confident that when the American people make up their minds we can safely accept their decision.

But leadership in this matter must come from somewhere. And one of our major purposes in introducing the resolution was to stimulate public discussion and to attract public support. We are encouraged by the progress which has been made thus far.

The sponsors of the resolution in the House are the largest bloc ever to sponsor any foreign policy measure. They include a majority of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is entirely likely that the resolution will be favorably reported to the House during this session.

In the Senate, a companion resolution was sponsored by 22 Senators and the Foreign Relations Committee established a special

subcommittee to study it and other proposals having related objectives. This subcommittee held several days of hearings in February and plans to hold further hearings soon.

These activities have already attracted substantial attention on the part of the public. We hope this will be greatly increased as we move further along in the legislative process. And in all this the help of United World Federalists and other Nation-wide organizations has been, and will continue to be, of enormous value.

I emphasize again that our resolution would not interfere with or hinder the continued prosecution of any aspect of our foreign policy of which I am aware. It would in no way weaken our efforts or dissipate our energies.

On the contrary, we deeply believe it would give our foreign policy added vigor and effectiveness. It can help provide, here at home, the sustaining power which the American people must have for the accomplishment of the task which confronts us. It can add to our efforts everywhere an increased strength of moral purpose which is essential if the forces of democracy are to succeed in the struggle for the minds of men.

That is why, after long and very serious thought, I have made the basic decision to support the resolution, urging the development of the United Nations into a world federation open to all nations with powers, limited, but adequate to preserve peace.

Effect of Taxation on Our Mineral Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year at the New York meeting of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, Mr. Granville S. Borden presented a paper entitled "Effect of Taxation on Our Mineral Resources." While the complete paper is too extensive to be fully included here, I felt that the ideas contained in it were of sufficient importance to ask Mr. Borden to prepare a more condensed version. He has done so in the form of a legal brief called A Suit for Delineation of Boundaries Between the Plaintiff, Taxation, against the Defendant, Mineral Resources, and presents the case as follows:

I. NATURE OF THE CONTROVERSY

In the Constitution of the United States and in the constitutions of the several States, the people have delegated to their legislators the powers to levy taxes upon them. Notwithstanding certain constitutional limitations upon these powers, such as due process clauses, and equal protection clauses, the power to tax is the power to destroy. These legislators, in whom these powers to tax are vested, can aggravate inflation; they can cause depressions; they regulate our standards of living; they can destroy free enterprise; they can tax special groups and give the proceeds to other groups or foreigners; they can levy excises which will regulate any type of activity; they can, by devious means, confiscate and expropriate; they can, through discriminatory taxes, engender civil strife; they can make us vulnerable to foreign aggression; and last but not least, as shown later, they can convert our mineral resources into waste.

Who are these artisans of our destiny? They are our fellow citizens, whom we elect to make our tax laws. They secure these jobs by your vote and mine except when our votes are neutralized by fraudulent stuffing, purchasing and miscounting by political machines.

What guaranties do we have that these lawmakers will represent us honestly and intelligently? We have merely the right to petition, remonstrate and to strive to educate. Under our representative form of Government, it is our privilege and duty to howl and complain if we feel that our destinies and security are not being developed properly. If this is done collectively, the activity may be called lobbying, but this is our only recourse and it is one of the main adits into democracy. Correspondingly, as members of this institute, as men who can qualify as experts in the sciences dealing with mineral resources, it is our privilege and duty to petition, remonstrate and attempt to educate our lawmakers when we demur to the policies of taxing mineral deposits which we believe are discriminatory and unsound.

Every legislator, whether serving in the Federal or a State Congress, has among many other duties two conflicting duties. On the one hand, there is the obligation to impose nondiscriminatory tax burdens on our mineral resources; on the other hand, there is the obligation to encourage, stimulate and even in certain instances subsidize exploration, development and production. The performance of each task contravenes the obligations to perform the other task. Where is there a satisfactory compromise?

This is the crux of our problem. There are broad differences of opinion. The answers should not be derived by guesswork nor from pure political considerations. The answers should be distilled out of a knowledge of the profound complex factors involved.

Bear in mind that there are only a few of our lawmakers who have had the opportunity to learn how men prospect and explore; how they meet with disappointment; how infrequently they hit the jackpot. Only a few of these lawmakers know about the impact of tax increases on our mineral resources. Nevertheless it is their tax votes that spell prosperity or depression for the mineral producer; it is their tax votes which can change prosperous mining communities into ghost towns or vice versa.

Although many of our legislators have had no experience in the business of finding, developing and producing our fuels and our basic natural raw materials from the earth, the presumption seems sound that they are curious and interested in these activities; that they welcome instruction, especially from qualified experts when given in good faith and with the intent to promote justice and equality for all of our people.

II. QUESTION PRESENTED

Now in the light of all these circumstances, what should our membership do? Certainly we can not afford to be apathetic. We should complain to our legislators and demand equality when taxes jeopardize our vitality; we should commend them for wisdom and integrity when they are worthy of such commendations. We should strive to instruct them in the impact of taxation upon our mineral resources to the end that they, through their votes, can construct barriers inside our mineral resources to prevent irreparable damage from trespassing by taxation. We can as individual citizens offer instructions and training to our tax-law makers. If our institute should sanction the practice, the membership can act through the committees of the institute.

There are many facts which every lawmaker should know as he surveys the traverse of taxation through our mineral resources. Some are of broad general import; others relate to current specific problems. Some seem elementary; others are quite complex and technical. Some of these facts are recorded herein where they may be available for assignment to our tax-law makers.

The balance of this brief is a discussion of 12 points that every tax-law maker should know.

III. WHAT EVERY TAX-LAW MAKER SHOULD KNOW

A. General principles

1. Every tax-law maker should know that the magnitude of our mineral resources varies inversely with the magnitude of the taxes levied upon them.

Mineral resources are natural deposits containing valuable ingredients which can be exploited profitably. When the proceeds from the disposition of the valuable ingredients of any deposit are inadequate to meet the costs of production, the deposit loses its label as a mineral resource. It is converted into waste. As taxes on mineral resources are increased, more marginal deposits are converted into waste. For example, if the recoverable grade of ore is $10 per ton and the production cost is $9.50 per ton, this ore becomes waste if the State imposes a severance tax of $1 per ton.

2. Every tax-law maker should know that many additional levies on our mineral resources have effected net losses in revenue to the Government which imposed them.

As the tax rates increase, mineral resources decline. When the burden becomes too heavy, mines and quarries are shut down; ghosts invade our mining camp; men lose their jobs; suppliers lose their trade; stockholders lose their dividends; processors and refiners lose their raw material; and Uncle Sam and the State lose their taxes on the profits of the operator, the wages of labor, the royalties of the owner, the profits of the tradesmen. Furthermore, there is a loss of potential revenue from the discoveries which would have been made under thriving operations.

Not only does the loss of revenue ensue from the reduction in yield of income tax, but every increase in tax on the mineral resources effects some reduction in the fair market value of the deposit. With this decline in value there are proportional declines in the yield of: (a) the ad valorem tax of the State, and (b) the State's inheritance and gift taxes and (c) the Federal estate and gift taxes. Thus, although the tax rates have been increased, there frequently is a net decline in the flow of revenue.

3. Every tax-law maker should know that tax increases on our mineral resources reduce the number of discoveries of new mineral resources.

Exploration is an expensive, speculative activity. Every tax increase tends to evaporate the funds available for exploration, and every tax increase tends to impair the incentives to enter or continue in this speculative, expensive exploration business.

4. Every tax-law maker should know that every discovery of a new mineral resource creates new sources of revenue for the Federal and State Governments, new sources of employment, new stimulants to trade, new sources of funds for more exploratory ventures, and new barriers against poverty and foreign aggression.

5. Every tax-law maker should know that as additional taxes dry up the source of taxes, more taxes are imposed to meet the deficit. The merry-go-round of depression is accelerated and the geese that lay the golden, silver, copper, lead, zinc, and other metallic and nonmetallic eggs die.

B. Income taxes

6. Every tax-law maker should know that the producers of minerals, oil, and gas have not had a fair deal in the evolution of the Federal income-tax law; that the income-tax burden levied upon them is, in many instances, discriminatory and unjust.

This discrimination arises primarily from the failure of Congress to recognize that a producer of minerals is in substance and reality engaged in two business enterprises. First, he is selling his mineral deposit. Secondly, he is in the business of mining. The over-all profits from both businesses are taxed as ordinary income at the normal and surtax rates; but if he sold the deposit to you and you mined the deposit, he would be taxed at the long-term capital-gain rates on the difference between the sales price (value in place) and the cost.

We can concede for the purpose of discussion that the profits derived from the second business, i. e., the mining activity, should be taxed as ordinary income but the profit derived from the sale of the deposit should not be taxed more than profit derived from the sale of any capital assets.

Thus, if we grant that a producer is really selling his deposit as he mines the deposit, the conclusion seems clear that he should pay only long-term capital-gain rates on this portion of his income; that Congress by its failure to recognize this situation is effectively discriminating against our mineral producers.

It is noteworthy that Congress has granted taxpayers who cut timber the privilege of having their profits taxed at the rates applied to gains from the sale of capital assets.

7. Every tax-law maker should know the facts which justify the allowances of depletion deduction on percentages of income.

Percentage depletion is a complex subject, but some of the principal reasons for the allowances are briefly stated:

Generally, percentage depletion fails to set off the discrimination against producers discussed in point 6 above. As a rule, if A mines his deposit he will pay more income taxes, even with percentage depletion allowances, than A and B would collectively pay, if A should sell to B and B should mine the deposit—a case where no percentage depletion would be allowed.

But this gesture of percentage depletion toward equality is not all the story.

Statistics will prove that the tax savings which flow from percentage depletion are generally added to other funds and appropriated to determine where Mother Nature has hidden other deposits. These hunting expeditions are expensive and all of the ventures speculative. The cost of finding new reserves is higher than the cost of finding the reserves which are being depleted. This is true not only because of general inflation, but also because of the gradual decline in the quality and quantity of prospects. The merchant can replenish his inventory by purchasing new goods, but the miner replenishes his underground inventory by speculating and wildcatting. For example, to maintain our present domestic crude oil reserves the prospectors and explorers must find 2,000,000,000 additional barrels annually and this task requires a lot of fortitude whether you are speculating with your own funds or the funds of your stockholders.

Many of the important discoveries of the past would not have been made had there been no percentage depletion. In the first place, the funds in reserve available for prospecting would not have been adequate to support the more speculative type of ventures. In the second place, without some tax incentives the long-shot plays would never have been taken.

Even admitting solely for the purpose of argument that the Government is in the grubstaking business, a review of the past will prove that the producers have repaid these percentage depletion grubstakes with thousands of percent interest. The loss of revenue to Uncle Sam from percentage depletion is in reality a capital investment to serve all the people through the promotion of their security and their prosperity. The net results of the percentage depletion allowances are stupendous gains to the Government. The yield to our Government from new oil fields, such as Cuyama in California, and North Snyder in Texas, will set off all of the revenue losses from percentage depletion for a very substantial period. From the standpoint of insurance for prosperity, percentage depletion outranks any subsidies, loans, exemptions, aids, or benefits which are granted by our Government.

Finally, have our people forgotten the contributions of the mining prospectors and oil and gas wildcatters toward winning World War II? Had there been no long-shot wildcat discoveries in the prewar days of World War II of oil, gas, copper, lead, zinc, and strategic metals, we would be paying for a much longer war. Do they remember OPA; the "A," "B," "R," and "T" gasoline rationing tickets? Do they remember allocating metals and the hysterical search for strategic minerals? If their memories fail, let them refer to our current stock-piling programs.

After this narrow escape from disaster (wars cannot be won without adequate domestic mineral resources), can we afford to smother the enthusiasm of our prospectors and wildcatters, to the end that our underground stock piles will become exhausted from ordinary peacetime consumption so that we will be caught short of these indispensable sinews of war when the next sneak attack occurs?

As shown in the prior discussion of general principles, the inevitable result of a heavier tax load on the mineral producers will be a net loss in national wealth and national income, an impairment of our security from poverty and our power to defend ourselves against foreign aggression.

If the parties who insist that percentage depletion is a loophole should review the record carefully, they will undoubtedly reach the inevitable conclusion that any revenue which flows out of this loophole returns to our Government with a floodtide of accessions.

8. Every tax-law maker should know that the rules governing exploration and development expenditures by mining and oil and gas companies effects inequitable and unjust results. He should know the technical reasons for these unfair results. He should know how remedies can be procured.

There are regulations relating to the Internal Revenue Code which deprive, in certain cases, taxpayers who explore for minerals, oil, and gas, any tax benefit from the right to deduct these expenditures from income. The loss of these tax benefits arises: (a) If the deduction must be taken as an expense in a year when there is not sufficient gross income to absorb the deduction (or used as a carry-back or carry-forward deduction), or (b) if the expenditure must be capitalized to be recovered through depletion deductions in years when the depletion deductions are based upon a percentage of income.

The rules are extremely complicated, and there are no just reasons for this confusion. Clearly, every taxpayer should be entitled to deduct the money which he has spent for exploration and development either as a loss if no discovery is made, or as a deferred expense of exploiting the mines which have discovered and developed. The law should provide rules which will grant a tax benefit for every cent expended for finding new mineral deposits.

9. Every tax-law maker should know that the mineral producer is particularly vulnerable to hardships from an unjust rule relating to the recovery of depreciable capital established by the Supreme Court of the United States, commonly known as the Virginia Hotel rule. He should know the remedy.

10. Every tax-law maker should know that there is an obscure provision in section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with carry-back and carry-forward net loss deductions which has unjustly cost the producers millions of dollars and will continue to levy indirectly terrific unjust burden on our mineral resources.

The provisions to which reference is made are section 23 (s) and section 112 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the Internal Revenue Code. Hidden obscurely away in these confusing and bewildering sentences is the rule that the net loss of any year when carried backward or carried forward to serve as a deduction from gross income of another year, must be reduced by the percentage depletion allowances in excess of cost depletion for the year to which the net loss is carried.

The mineral producer falls in the category of feast or famine taxpayers who are vulnerable to wide fluctuations of income and losses over a series of taxable years. No other group of taxpayers are more equitably entitled to net loss carry-over and carry-back deductions. Nevertheless, these taxpayers, because of these obscure provisions in section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code, can seldom procure any tax benefits from these provisions. The gold producers who sustained losses from War Production Board Order L–208 were the first group to lose refunds of prior year taxes because the losses sustained while operations were shut down were absorbed by the percentage depletion allowances of the year to which the carry-back loss would have applied. Next on the list of victims were the operators who mined strategic minerals at a profit during the war followed by an era of heavy losses in the postwar period.

The point is noteworthy that the relatively small producers are the taxpayers most vulnerable to this inequity.

11. Every tax-law maker should know that income taxes can be assessed on the proceeds of new ventures before the operator has assurances that his investment will be redeemed.

12. Every tax-law maker should know that an investor in the share of a corporation engaged in producing minerals, oil, or gas may be assessed income taxes on dividends even though the amounts received are in fact redemption of the cost of his shares.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is submitted:

(1) The health and vitality of our mineral resources are in jeopardy from trespassing by taxes.

(2) The duty and the power to delineate the boundaries and construct the barriers against this invasion has been delegated to our tax-law makers.

(3) There are both elementary and complex facts pertaining to the taxation of minerals which every designer of mineral tax law should know.

(4) Every member of this institute owes a duty to his profession and his country to help in this chore of teaching our tax-law makers facts about our mineral resources to the end that they shall design and construct our tax laws intelligently—laws which will engender benefits for capital, labor, consumers, our State government, our Federal Government, and every citizen of the United States.

Thank you.

Submitted by:

GRANVILLE S. BORDEN,
San Francisco, Calif.

Let's Not Belittle Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on other occasions I have discussed the relative strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union; the appended editorial bears importantly on this subject. Complacency would be the worst thing possible for our efforts to withstand and win over the Communist drive, but a mature estimate of relative capabilities bears very importantly on the extent of the effort we must expend at any particular point and the confidence with which we may proceed:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1950]

LET'S NOT BELITTLE OURSELVES

The collapse of the Soviet-backed mark in eastern Germany serves to point up a fact that a lot of people of the West seem to have forgotten in recent weeks. The fact is simply this: That Russia, although it presents a formidable front and snarls ferociously, is not really a tremendously strong power in relation to the United States or the free world as a whole.

Currency is merely one measure of strength, but it is a pretty good measure, and the fact that the Germans greatly prefer the American-backed mark speaks for itself as an incidental commentary on their evaluation of Soviet power. They have little or no confidence in the Kremlin's money; they have little or no respect for it; and that in turn reflects a low opinion of Russia in general.

Americans would do well to give a little thought to this matter. Within the past few months, all too many of us have been acting and speaking—especially in connection with proposals for "new starts" on peace talks with the Kremlin—as if Russia were in a position to command a great deal of supplication from us. Actually, there are no supermen over there and no supersystem. On the contrary, as indicated by the currency situation in eastern Germany and by numerous other evidences of serious stresses and strains behind the iron curtain, there is more than a little reason to believe that the Stalin dictatorship—both at home and in the satellite countries—has good cause to be worried by its weaknesses.

True enough, of course, the Russians have a big fleet of submarines, a lot of planes and the largest of all land armies. But what else have they got? How much staying power can they put behind their armed forces in being? Politically, economically, and militarily, what are their reserves for the long pull? The answer to these and similar questions seems fairly clear, namely, that they have a long way to go before they can hope even to come close to matching the immense spiritual and material resources that can be mobilized by the free world. To understand this, we have only to keep in mind that their steel production is Lilliputian compared to ours, that their standard of living is miserably low, and that they sit on a volcano of oppressed peoples whose loyalty the Kremlin can never count upon.

In other words, although the Soviet facade looks impressive, the reality hidden behind it—the reality behind the iron curtain—adds up to a situation in which Russian power today, in a basic sense, runs a poor second to the power of the West particularly American power. This is an all-important fact that we ought to keep constantly in mind. We have lately been belittling ourselves much too much, and the effect on public opinion abroad has not been a good one.

Although the Red technique of infiltration and subversion constitutes a serious threat, the heartening truth is that the United States and the West as a whole have such overwhelmingly superior strength—actually and potentially—that they can be certain of victory in the cold war if they use that strength wisely and well, in unison. Among other things, as far as our own country is concerned, that means that Congress must guard against the kind of false economy that would slow down such vital projects as the Marshall plan.

Certainly, this is no time for slowing down. With all the power that we and our friends abroad now have, we ought to move forward with the greatest possible vigor on every key front in the cold war—militantly, confidently, not on a note of defensiveness, self-doubt, or vacillation, as if we were less strong than we really are.

Farm Surpluses and the ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of Wednesday, March 22, 1950:

FARM SURPLUSES AND THE ECA

Despite some overexcited comment to the contrary, the effectiveness of the Marshall plan is not likely to be undermined if Congress as a whole goes along with the House Foreign Affairs Committee in voting for the amendment offered by Representative VORYS, of Ohio.

Under the amendment, instead of authorizing the $2,950,000,000 in new funds requested by the Economic Cooperation Administration—an authorization approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—Congress would reduce the total to $1,950,000,000. But this cash cut would be offset by a provision under which the ECA countries, in accordance with their needs, would be able to acquire $1,000,000,000 worth of American agricultural surpluses from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. VORYS' proposal is designed primarily to put pressure on all parties concerned, including the Secretary of Agriculture, to force the use of unsalable surpluses now held by the CCC. It also is aimed—in a bookkeeping sense—at lightening the budget deficit. In both these respects, its wisdom and practicality have been sharply challenged. Nevertheless, although it might make the ECA's operations less flexible, it does not deserve to be branded as a mere dumping idea threatening to do serious injury to the Marshall plan by narrowing the scope of our vital aid to Europe.

This is so for the simple reason that the ECA itself, in requesting $2,950,000,000, has estimated that approximately half of that sum is needed to cover assistance in the form of food and agricultural commodities. In effect, therefore, the Vorys amendment, by balancing out its cash cut with a provision enabling the participating countries to acquire the equivalent of $1,000,000,000 in farm surpluses, would not really be changing the scope of the minimum aid deemed essential by the ECA's own careful calculations.

What the amendment would change would be the procurement procedures that have characterized the Marshall plan up to now. Under those procedures, the ECA has acted as a kind of banker extending credits with which the participating countries have acquired farm items chiefly through private American channels at open-market prices. Under the Vorys plan, their food and agricultural needs would be taken care of out of the surplus held by the CCC, with value calculated on the basis of figures no higher than prices prevailing in the open market. As for cases where the CCC might not have a commodity required by one country or another, the need would be met through private channels, with the ECA footing the bill out of the money appropriated for it by Congress.

On closer inspection, of course, enough "bugs" may be found in the Vorys amendment to persuade Congress—as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is already persuaded—to reject it as a device likely to have little or no practical effect on either the Federal deficit or the problem of farm surpluses. Whether or not that proves to be the case, however, the fact remains that it is hard to see just how the proposal threatens to "cripple" the Marshall plan.

Actually, though it would be happier with present procedures, the ECA itself seems to be satisfied that it could operate effectively with something like the Vorys proposal. Certainly, if Congress votes for amendments no more restrictive than that, we can be reasonably confident that the Marshall plan's third year will win important additional ground for the free world in the cold war.

A Quick and Easy Plan To Make Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, no doubt Americans lead the world in ingenuity. Besides all of our other inventions, we find that during the emergency of the Civil War when this country found itself without cash and low in credit, when Government non-interest-bearing notes—greenbacks—were of little value, the American bankers came forward with a revolutionary monetary invention—national-bank notes—paper money secured by the national credit. This kind of paper money was brought into circulation by the passing of the National Bank Act of 1863.

This monetary invention was so profitable to the banks of this country that it soon spread to the rest of the civilized world with the result that first the use of silver money was greatly reduced and finally the use of gold as money was discontinued.

The Federal Reserve paper-money system was an improvement (?) on the national-bank notes monetary plan. The Federal Reserve bank money scheme came into flower with the amendment of the Federal Reserve Act that made Government obligations—bonds—eligible as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes by the Federal Reserve bank.

The plan that is being followed by the banks in creating money is presented in a contribution recently made to a western newspaper which is reprinted here for the consideration of my colleagues:

[From Seattle (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of March 12, 1950]

LEGISLATOR EYES "CUTEST" SCHEME—MARSHALL PLAN FINE—EXCEPT FOR TAXPAYERS, IDAHOAN AVERS

(By COMPTON I. WHITE, Member of Congress from First District of Idaho)

To the EDITOR OF THE SPOKESMAN-REVIEW:

We've got the cutest little plan for making (creating) money. It's a scheme so cute that it's clever.

Uncle Sam, to get money to finance Government business, goes to the banks and puts up his notes (bonds) that bear interest, and then the bank makes a swap. They take Uncle Sam's notes, put them in their vaults and give him, in return, their notes, which do not pay any interest.

The notes of the banks (Federal Reserve notes) Uncle Sam gets in this financial trade are printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and are legal tender money, while Uncle Sam keeps on paying interest on his notes (the bonds in the bank vaults). Uncle Sam is really using his own credit, but he doesn't seem to know it.

Then he takes these Federal Reserve notes (money) he gets from the banks and goes out and buys wheat and things from the farmers and farm machinery and things from the factories, and he gives all this food and machinery he has bought to the poor governments in Europe, and these governments sell the stuff they get from Uncle Sam to their own people and get money to put in their treasuries.

These European governments have a lot of debts, and when the interest on their debts (bonds) comes due, the money for all this stuff Uncle Sam gives England and these Marshall-plan governments helps a lot in keeping all their government notes (bonds) good by paying the interest on time.

So this Marshall plan makes good times for everybody. For our banks, because they are using their credit and making a lot of loans to the Government and getting the interest, and the farmers and factories are making money on their wheat and things that they sell to our Government.

All the things we are buying and giving these European governments is making business good all around. The stores, railroads, factories, and everybody is prosperous in this country and business is getting better in the European countries. The bondholders in Europe are getting their interest on time and everybody seems to be happy—except maybe the taxpayers in this country. But then you've got to take off your hat to the people who thought up this Marshall plan. It may have come from Europe. They say that some people over there are smarter than we are.

Merchant Marine Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, March 18:

MERCHANT MARINE CADETS

One of the most effective ways of supplying our merchant fleet with competent deck and engine room officers has been the training of qualified men at the Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y. Approximately 1,100 cadets are in attendance on a 4-year course, the completion of which qualifies them for berths in the cargo ships, tankers, and passenger liners flying the American flag. These men have been as carefully selected, and go through as strenuous a course of study, as do the men who attend West Point or Annapolis.

Admission to the Academy is contingent upon the passing of a difficult entrance examination. The next 4 years are spent both ashore and afloat learing the rudiments of a skill which is important to the trading life of our country. At the moment this program is being imperiled by a congressional proposal to eliminate the modest allowances made to the merchant marine cadets to cover the costs of uniforms, textbooks, and minor personal expenses. If this proposal were to take effect, many of the cadets now in attendance would be forced to leave the Academy, while others would have to depend on allowances from home to guarantee the completion of their courses.

This same proposal has not been made concerning the cadets in training at the other military and naval institutions operated by the Government. It seems unfair to create hardships for a group of men who choose to serve their country effectively in a civilian capacity and who are Naval Reserve Officers on graduation, when their opposite numbers in the other services are not affected at all.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing on March 7, 1950, in the Daily Tribune, of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city.

This editorial presents some solid thinking, the kind of thinking people should do when they go to the ballot box and express their opinions. I commend it to my colleagues in the House for their reading:

PERSONALLY SPEAKING

(By Floyd J. Miller)

SOME MIDGET EDITORIALS

Here are some news stories I thought important, and the comment that could be stretched into a full column for every one. Lucky for both of us that time and space prevent.

1. The National Labor Relations Board orders John L. Lewis to give up the provision in the mine workers' contract that provided they should work under the agreed-on conditions when able and willing.

Imagine the mine operators saying they would pay a certain scale when able or willing. Or try to borrow somebody else's money from a bank on a promise that you will pay it back as agreed, if able and willing.

2. General Motors earned more profits—over $600,000,000—in 1949 than any other company ever made in a similar period.

Although it certainly doesn't look so now, the stockholders are still risking. Nobody promises them anything. In any year when the company has big earnings the rest of the country benefits even more than the stockholders. Last year the Government (that's we, the people, or our representatives) received $400,000,000 in excise and other taxes from G. M. before there were profits. The company had to sell $5,000,000,000 worth of goods, compared with $2,500,000,000 in 1936, which meant billions in wages and purchases. Of the $1,100,000,000 gross profits, the Government took another cut of $500,000,000 in corporation income taxes and individual income taxes. That left $600,000,000 in spendable income for the owners, many thousands in number.

3. Phil Spitalny, on tour and on the air with his all-girl band, reports that a large share of his big fan mail is from soldiers and sailors thanking him for the hymns on the program.

Our boys have souls and minds and a love for home in peace as well as wartime.

4. The United States Government has decided it will try to get back some of the $37,500,000 it lent the Lustron Corp. to build prefabricated metal houses. It figures it will be lucky to get back 5 cents on the dollar.

That's your money the man is talking about; remember, income tax, cigarette tax, movie tax, luggage tax, etc., etc., etc.? Men with little or no experience in the matters on which they pass judgment hand out this money. It is loaned too often because somebody thinks it would be a good thing. But that somebody risks your money, never his own.

5. Most doctors cure disease, but some make it worse, a University of Colorado psychiatrist contends. The offenders have not grown up; they inflict their immaturity on their patients.

Another complication society has been too busy to attend to. The medical profession itself could pay some attention to it. If our more successful citizens would help remedy defects in our system there would be less attempt by the Government boys to take it all over.

6. An Australian publication comments on President Truman's point 4 program for assisting the undeveloped regions of the world. It asks, "How far is today's American equipped and adjusted to live happily outside of America?"

Most Americans are childlike in their ignorance on this point. They assume that the rest of the world thinks and reacts as they do. It doesn't. Any adventures abroad should be preceded by a study of the target and of one's ability to adjust himself to new living conditions and a different way of acting. People do not always think Americans are pure and simple-minded.

Taxation Without Representation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening and refreshing to find an area which is wide-awake to the rights and welfare of peoples far distant but supposedly living under the same way of life and the same protective laws of the

land. So that the residents of Washington, D. C., and the Territories of our Nation may know how the people of my district feel about such problems as home rule for the District of Columbia and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a recent editorial from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, one of the leading daily newspapers of the West:

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

One of the injustices against which the early American colonists revolted was taxation without representation. Yet today there are under our flag many peoples—on both home and colonial soil—paying tribute in taxes to our Federal Government who have no representation in that Government.

The most flagrant and inconsistent example of this un-American practice is found, of all places, in our Nation's capital, where supposedly Americans not only preach but exemplify democracy. The citizens of Washington, D. C., have no more direct voice in their municipal government than the people of Czechoslovakia now have in their national government. Instead, the affairs of Washington are directed by Congress through three commissioners of its choosing. In other words outsiders govern the people of Washington who can not even vote for the Members of Congress who rule them—and also tax them.

This policy of taxation without representation is also followed in dealing with our Territories, Hawaii and Alaska, both of which are now seeking statehood. Each of these pay huge amounts in taxes to the Federal Government each year yet have no real representation in Congress, only delegates without a vote. Debates on the current statehood bills revealed that last year Hawaii paid into our Federal Treasury $90,824,693, which was more than any one of 11 States paid in; yet Hawaiians paying these taxes, after 50 years of colonial or Territorial status, have had and still have no representation in the Congress that taxes them.

No wonder peoples of the recently born republics say they cannot adopt the American system because it is so "theoretical and paradoxical." We gained our own independence in revolt against taxation without representation; yet expect these present colonials to remain loyal to us while we practice against them what we held was rank injustice when it was practiced against us. To the credit of the House of Representatives it has approved statehood measures for Alaska and Hawaii, though the Senate may delay—if not refuse—approval, as has been the case in granting home rule to Washington, D. C.

Tribute to the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 23, 1950:

TRIBUTE TO FBI

When an economy-minded House Appropriations Committee gives a Government agency all the additional money it asks for and recommends a salary raise for its head besides, there must be a reason. Beneficiaries of this extraordinary treatment by a group which has not hesitated to wield the ax on many other agencies were the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its long-time Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The reason for the committee's attitude is not hard to find. It lies in the FBI's remarkable record as a protector of the Nation's security in this cold-war era of spying and counterspying.

The committee, without a quibble, approved Mr. Hoover's request for $4,800,000 in additional funds with which to hire 700 more employees, including 325 new agents. In granting the full $57,400,000 asked by the FBI for the next fiscal year, the committee said it "does not feel justified in reducing the estimates of this Bureau in view of conditions at home and abroad." The new employees will help the FBI to reduce the backlog of nearly 14,000 pending security investigations. The committee agreed that such cases are too important to suffer any delay in searching out the facts.

The action of the committee is indicative of the high esteem in which the FBI is held at the Capitol and elsewhere as a result of its effective warfare on potential fifth columnists in the Government and outside of it. It has waged this difficult warfare without resort to witch-hunting tactics, without any semblance of police-state tendencies and without succumbing to political or other pressures. The FBI and Mr. Hoover well deserve the tribute implicit in the House committee's recommendation that both the Bureau and its Director be given more money for their outstanding work.

Money for Social Security Safe as Rock of Gibraltar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the newspaper Labor of Saturday, February 18, 1950:

MONEY FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SAFE AS ROCK OF GIBRALTAR—FINANCIAL PAPER EXPOSES FALSE PROPAGANDA WHICH MADE BENEFICIARIES UNEASY—INTERESTS RAIL WORKERS — UNCLE SAM HAS INVESTED PRECIOUS RESERVES IN BEST SECURITIES IN THE WORLD

Labor takes its hat off to the Wall Street Journal. That newspaper's views differ widely from Labor's on many subjects, but the "WSJ" rendered a great public service by presenting conspicuously, on its editorial page, a devastating exposure of a hoary old propaganda fake which has worried millions of railroaders, other workers and their wives.

That fake is the vicious "yarn" that Uncle Sam has made off with the money workers contribute to the social security and railroad retirement "reserve funds," so the money won't be there to pay the workers' pensions in old age.

Of course, Labor has exposed the falsity of that propaganda a hundred times, but the old fake continued to spread its slimy trail in newspapers from coast to coast. Finally outraged and "fed up," the Wall Street paper let loose its blast.

SAME WITH RAIL FUND

The Journal discussed only the social security old-age and survivors insurance pension system, or OASI, but its remarks are equally true of the railroad retirement system, which has the same sort of reserve fund, handled in exactly the same way.

"Letters to this newspaper," the Journal says, "show that misunderstanding of the OASI reserve fund is still widespread.

"Many persons still believe what some insurance company officials asserted in the middle 1930's, that the reserve fund, invested in United States bonds, was a fiction, and could result in the cost of pensions being paid twice over."

The insurance officials made that charge because they were then trying to prevent passage of the Social Security Act, by hook or crook. But, the Journal continues:

"Those insurance company men have long since realized their error." In 1945, a committee representing the three principal associations of life-insurance companies recanted and publicly took the fake charge back.

The Journal quotes the insurance men's lengthy confession, but points out that it is in too heavy language for the average person to understand.

The truth, the Wall Street paper declares, was put in clearer terms by the Senate Finance Committee's advisory council on social security, composed of 17 businessmen, economics professors, labor union representatives and insurance company executives. In 1948, this council said:

"INSURANCE FIRMS BUY UNITED STATES BONDS

"We do not agree with those who criticize investment of the OASI reserve in Government bonds. Actually, such investment is as reasonable and proper as the investment by life-insurance companies of their own reserve funds in Government securities.

"The investment of old-age-insurance funds in Government securities does not mean that people will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged."

The council then gave a mathematical example showing that if the social-security or railroad-retirement fund did not own the Government bonds, the bonds would be owned by somebody else, bankers or private investors, who would get the interest on the bonds if the pension reserve funds did not.

Hence the cost to general taxpayers would be the same, and workers would lose the Government-bond interest which now helps to increase the fund to pay their pensions.

REPEATS STALE ERRORS

Then the Journal says the Brookings Institution, a Washington research organization financed by big business interests, recently published a book which repeats the stale errors about the OASI trust fund. Its authors make the following untrue statement:

"The OASI trust fund is invested in Federal Government securities. Since the money is used by the Government in meeting its regular expenditure requirements, no real reserve is created. The obligations of the Government do not represent assets. The trust fund is thus a fiction."

In other words, the Wall Street Journal points out, the Brookings book makes one or both of two assertions.

One is that the bonds in the OASI reserve fund have no value, and hence are different from all other Government bonds. The second is that all Government bonds are worthless.

The first assertion is ridiculous, the Journal explains, because all Government bonds are the same. Either all "represent real assets," or all are worthless.

As a matter of fact, the Journal continues, if it were possible to divide Government bonds into two categories, the bonds in the pension reserve funds would have to be assigned a superior rating as assets.

BACKED BY UNCLE SAM

"They are the property of many millions of citizens, most of whom have little or nothing else to protect them from destitution in their old age.

"If this portion of the (Government) debt has no existence as assets, the remainder of the $252,000,000,000 debt doesn't exist either."

For these reasons, the Journal concludes, the Brookings book's propaganda that the Government bonds in the pension reserve have less value than fresh toilet paper is wholly false.

"The value of these bonds, like that of all other Government bonds, is assured by the Government's power to assess all the trade and industry of the country, for whatever it takes to pay the obligations.

"It is impossible to assert rationally that part of the national debt is rubbish and the rest is prime investments."

Of course, all that is known to life-insurance companies and bankers and other private investors. They would be delighted to pay more than par for the 3 percent interest bonds Uncle Sam puts in the social security and railroad retirement reserve funds. But no private investor can get Government bonds paying that much interest. Such extraordinary Government bonds are sold only to the social security and railroad retirement reserves.

Labor repeats the Wall Street Journal is entitled to a resounding pat on the back for having printed this splendid exposé of a most despicable piece of propaganda.

Uncle Sam Doesn't Fumble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News which shows the United States is paying more than its share of various expenses of the organizations to which it belongs. If we carefully study this editorial we will find one of numerous reasons why our taxes are so high and why our debt is so great.

The editorial follows:

UNCLE SAM DOESN'T FUMBLE

Uncle Sam doesn't do any fumbling when it comes to picking up the check for the expenses of the numerous organizations to which he belongs.

He pays—expects to and is expected to by other nations which are fellow members.

For instance, the United States pays $22,210,257 yearly for its membership in the United Nations and various allied organizations. That is 35 percent of the total cost; the rest of the world foots the bill for the remainder.

And this country's annual assessment for the cost of maintaining the International Children's Emergency Fund is $25,000,000, or 72 percent of the total.

Participation in the Palestine refugee relief effort costs this country $8,000,000 annually, or 65 percent of the total.

The cost of membership in the inter-American organizations to which the United States belongs is $8,000,000 a year, or 65 percent of the total.

And this policy is maintained in all of the international organizations to which the United States has a part and there are 47 of them. This country pays 47 percent of the expenses of these 47 organizations. And the United States is considering joining three more.

The bill for our share of the expenses of these 47 activities is more than $114,000,000 a year.

In addition there are the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to which this country has pledged nearly $6,000,000,000.

Of course, the role of the United States in world affairs has increased tremendously since World War II; of course, the American people want to meet their responsibilities, and, of course, they want to pay their share, in any movement designed for world betterment.

But, doesn't it appear as though we are doing more than our share?

The American people—some 150,000,000 in number—are paying almost half of the expenses of maintaining 47 organizations; the more than two billion in the rest of the world take care of the remainder.

And there is the probability that we are not getting the best possible result from use of these millions of dollars.

The Hoover Commission report says that, because of the great increase in this country's participation in world affairs, at least 46 of the 50 major departments and agencies in the executive branch have been drawn into foreign affairs to some extent, whereas foreign affairs used to be almost exclusively a State Department function.

A Senate subcommittee has said this change has resulted in "interdepartmental jealousies and rivalries" which have produced a lack of coordination.

This committee reported that there is "no single crystallized process for securing interdepartmental coordination in the formulation of presentation of United States policy with respect to international organizations."

Part of the blame was placed on the White House, the committee charging that the executive office of the President has failed to define the relative roles and authority of the State Department and other agencies.

The amount of money spent in these international activities is unimportant; the fact that the United States is paying much more than its share is neither of any great importance but results are important.

And results are far from satisfactory, as is indicated by the state the world is in today.

Possibly at least some of the lack of results is to be accounted for in the manner in which the money is spent and in which the activities are handled.

The mere spending of money rarely does any good; to make the spending worth while, to accomplish beneficial results, expenditures must be intelligently made and with a definite aim in view.

Shipyard Unemployment and a Neglected Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-fourth Congress and the President, some 14 years ago, established a merchant marine policy for the United States. The wisdom of this policy was proven beyond the remotest doubt and demonstrated to an extent that is realized by few long-range governmental decisions. This policy stood the test of an unprecedented war that encircled the earth and probably placed more demands in 4 years upon the United States merchant marine than had been imposed during the entire previous maritime history of the United States.

This great, forward-looking policy was the fundamental principle upon which the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was based. It was embodied in the opening declaration of that act and implemented by its subsequent provisions. Therefore, I believe it is most appropriate at this time to read and insert here the declaration of United States merchant marine policy, formulated and adopted by Congress, which is the very basis for our discussion here. I quote from the Merchant Marine Act of 1936:

TITLE I. DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States, and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

The principles I have just quoted had as much to do with the winning the Second World War as any other single factor. The implementation of the policy by ship-construction programs and adequate appropriations resulted in placing 60,000,000 tons of United States merchant shipping in operation and in extending to the remote corners of the earth vast supply lines to battle areas in every continent and in every climate. We would have been practically incapable of waging total war without this gigantic merchant marine which not only supplied our armed forces, but brought back essential strategic raw materials for the fabrication of the highly complex sinews of modern war.

It is for us to be rededicated to this wise policy; I say rededicated because our Government seems to have forgotten too soon the lessons of the immediate past.

The present condition of our entire merchant marine, beginning with the ship-building industry, indicates neglect. Most of our yards have been closed down, while an indispensable army of trained ship builders are unemployed. These men have been compelled to seek employment elsewhere and, unless Congress takes action immediately, their skills may be lost to this basic industry.

In the absence of a substantial long-range new-construction program, we should keep in the best possible condition the ships in our laid-up merchant fleet upon which we must rely in event of an emergency.

There are 2,000 of such reserve ships which need overhauling and recondition-

ing from time to time. Congress should appropriate sufficient money to provide for this work. No money could be better spent. A vital factor in our peaceful commerce and security would be preserved while the essential organization of shipbuilding trades would be kept intact and not scattered, as it is now, so widely as to impair seriously our well-being.

In my district and all along the east and west coasts, the shipbuilding industry is at a standstill while the men who trained over 1,750,000 shipyard workers to build 60,000,000 tons of war merchant shipping are experiencing unemployment and hardships.

It should and will be our objective, not only to provide for repairs to the land-up fleet, but to plan a long-range new-construction program of modern, fast, cargo ships.

We who were first in world shipping are losing our coveted place. We have only a little over a million of the 10,000,000 tons of new-ship construction now under way or on order among the maritime nations of the world.

It behooves us to look back upon the tragic year of 1940 when Hitler overran Europe and almost conquered Britain. Our security then hung upon a slender thread for if Britain had been conquered by Hitler, the shipbuilding capacity of our enemies would have outweighed our resources by 6 to 1.

For this reason we must be aware constantly of our merchane marine. If we neglect it, experience has shown in years just past we will place ourselves in great jeopardy. Wisdom counsels us to keep prepared eternally.

Federal Subsidies Are Varied, Widespread, and Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, in a talk before the Rotary Club of Wilmington, Del., a few weeks ago the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, presented one of the finest discussions of Federal Government subsidies which it has ever been my pleasure to hear or to read.

So that all Members of the Congress and citizens throughout the Nation may have the opportunity to study and analyze this serious and critical situation, I am including the full text of Senator WILLIAMS' talk as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as the Senator so ably pointed out, we have witnessed during recent years a growing tendency on the part of the American people to expect the Federal Government to underwrite functions which previously were recognized as individual or local responsibilities. Now, however, there is striking evidence that the American people are seriously alarmed and have come to recognize this principle of subsidization as a threat to our established economic system.

Although attention has recently been focused principally on agricultural subsidies, Senator WILLIAMS has emphasized the fact that Federal subsidies are varied, widespread and costly. He has pointed up the fact that Federal subsidies are going not only to farmers and agricultural interests, but also to air lines, railroads, newspapers, corporations, maritime enterprises, mining industries, banking institutions, State and local governments and others.

By reason of certain bookkeeping methods and the shuffling of accounts from one Government agency to another, the total and tremendous cost of Federal subsidies has been largely concealed from those who pay this cost—the Nation's overburdened taxpayers. Senator WILLIAMS has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that during the past 14 years Federal grants and subsidies to States, municipalities, corporations, and individuals have totaled approximately $43,000,000,000. So that the taxpayers may more clearly and more easily understand this cost, the Senator has further stated that this represents about $1,250 for each family in the country.

In view of this situation, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the most serious thought, attention and consideration of the Congress and of the people must be given to the matter of Federal grants and subsidies.

The text of Senator WILLIAMS' talk follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS, OF DELAWARE, AT THE ROTARY CLUB, WILMINGTON, DEL., FEBRUARY 9, 1950

During recent years there has been a growing tendency on the part of us, the American people, to expect the Government to underwrite those functions which were once recognized as our individual responsibilities.

This trend has expanded until today a substantial percentage of our annual expenditures can be attributed to the cost of these subsidies.

With our Government confronted as it is today with another huge deficit and the threat of a greatly increased tax rate, the American people are at last becoming alarmed and are beginning to recognize this principle of subsidizing as a threat to our economic system.

As evidence of this, we in Congress are being approached on the streets back home and are receiving volumes of letters urging a drastic reduction in government expenditures and a balanced budget. Practically all of these letters express criticism of some form of government subsidy.

If we were to conduct a poll of the American citizens, asking the question as to whether or not we should eliminate government subsidies, I think that the overwhelming response would be in the affirmative. I venture to say that if we were to conduct a poll of the members of the Rotary Club here today, we would receive an even more enthusiastic vote to abolish them.

Yet I wonder if we are not overlooking the fact that during the recent years this principle of government subsidies has expanded until today it has become an accepted part of our economic system.

The question is often raised as to whether or not, in a show-down, the American people would back up their representatives in Congress for an abolishment of this principle.

Sure—everybody would agree that all Government subsidy or support programs should be repealed—all except those which directly affect them.

The most of this criticism against Government subsidies is leveled against the Government farm-support program. The reason for this is that the Government's support of agricultural products directly affects not only the American farmer but also the budget of the millions of American housewives.

It is this program and its operations which I wish to discuss briefly here today. I have never been a supporter of the Administration's existing program of high farm supports; yet I want it made very clear that I do not consider the farm-support program any more threatening to our economic system than any other form of government subsidy. I shall merely discuss it here today since its operations do so vitally affect everyone.

Unfortunately, during the recent years this principle of Government subsidies has expanded in various fields until today practically everybody is affected, and I call your attention to the fact that in many instances those who are most vocal in their criticism of the farm-support program are themselves recipients of some form of Government subsidies.

As an example of how this principle has expanded to embrace many segments of our economic system, I cite a few examples.

For instance, the owners and officials of the air lines in this country would no doubt agree that the principle of Government subsidies is vicious; yet they are perfectly willing to accept subsidies from the Government amounting to many millions of dollars annually—subsidies which, in effect, guarantee their operations against loss.

Our American railroads were built and developed years ago under the principle of Government subsidies. Large grants of land were given to the promoters in the early stages of development. Today these same railroad lines are still accepting their subsidies for carrying mail.

Our American newspaper system has been rather critical of the principle of Government subsidies in general, particularly the subsidy as related to the farm-support program. Yet I do not recall a single instance where the members of the press have objected to their own subsidy in the form of low postage rates, nor do they object to the special earmarking of over $100,000,000 of the ECA funds to be used to subsidize the distribution of American newspapers in continental Europe.

If we were to conduct a poll of the leading corporations in this country—a group which surely believes in the principle of free enterprise—I venture to say that almost without exception they would express opposition to the principle of Government support prices. Still we find that a large number of this same group have endorsed President Truman's point 4 program which is merely a plan to let the American taxpayer guarantee the investments of the American corporations in foreign countries.

We find that our merchant marine—another division of our free-enterprise system—is perfectly willing to have the Government continue underwriting a large percentage of the cost of the construction of its ships, nor do they object to our Government's annual contribution of several million dollars to subsidize the operations of these same vessels.

We hear a lot of discussion among prominent men, many of whom are identified with our State and local governments, expressing grave concern over the encroachment of the the Federal Government upon the rights of the individual States; yet in many instances we find that these same officials are clamoring for more and more Federal aid for the construction of our State highways, our public schools, our hospitals, and in many other fields which were formerly recognized as inherent State functions.

Our western mining industry has been successful during the past 2 years, following a rather bitter fight on the floor of the Senate, in having legislation passed whereby the Government will support the price of their products. This subsidy, amounting to several million dollars annually, is also at the expense of the taxpayers.

Even our children, from the day they enter the public schools, become recipients of Government subsidies by virtue of the fact that our Federal Government makes annual contributions of several millions to the school-lunch programs.

One of the most conservative groups in this country is the American bankers; yet they have no objection to the policy of the Government guaranteeing a support at par under all Government bonds, thereby protecting their huge investments.

These are not all, but I have cited them as examples in order that while I discuss the farm support program here this afternoon, you will realize that farm subsidies are only a small part of the over-all subsidy picture.

In order that the administration's farm program might be appraised in its true light from the standpoint of the three most interested parties, namely, the farmer, the consumer, and the oft-times forgotten taxpayer, I shall outline as briefly as possible a few pertinent facts regarding its operations.

First of all from the standpoint of a taxpayer I want to explode completely the fantastic claims of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, that this program is not costing the taxpayers any money.

While the Secretary of Agriculture will now admit that this program might be costing a little money, it was only last year that he issued this statement:

"Support prices do cost money sometimes, even though it is true that CCC at present has a lifetime profit rather than loss on this type of operation."

(The Commodity Credit Corporation is the Government corporation which finances the farm support program. It is also the Government corporation which is now asking for an additional $2,000,000,000 without having rendered to Congress its annual audit reports for 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949, as is required by law. It is also the Government corporation which was charged last year, in the Comptroller General's annual audit report for the period ended June 30, 1945, with having spent $366,000,000 for which no accounting was available, and which is still unexplained.)

Knowing full well that this fantastic claim could not possibly be true, I directed a letter to the Bureau of the Budget on February 1 of last year, asking this simple question:

"Would you please furnish me at the earliest possible date the net results, from a taxpayer's standpoint, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation since its inception in 1933?"

On February 9, 1949, I received a reply from Mr. F. J. Lawton, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in which he completely denied that the Commodity Credit Corporation had made a profit and stated that the net loss sustained by the Corporation since its organization in October 1933, was $3,890,891,170.

In this same letter Mr. Lawton pointed out that the only way the Commodity Credit Corporation was able to show a surplus of $55,000,000 in its operations was by including as income the nearly $4,000,000,000 appropriations it had received from Congress.

I might say that the farm-support program is not the only subsidy program in which an attempt is made to conceal the true cost from the taxpayers. This erroneous practice of concealing losses by shuffling accounts from one Government agency to another seems to be the rule rather than the exception.

We are only kidding ourselves when we claim that the farm program or any of the other subsidy programs is not being operated at the expense of the taxpayers.

It has always been my contention that high support prices under agricultural commodities will not solve the long-range problem of the American farmer. On the contrary, a continuation of high support prices under Agriculture will inevitably lead to disaster.

A lot of oratory has been wasted on the question of whether the farmers are entitled to 60 percent, 75 percent, or 90 percent of parity, with some politicians advocating 100 percent.

What is the meaning of this sacred word "parity?" I question that there is a single Member of Congress who can define this term without referring to the law, and I doubt very much that there is a single individual in either the Congress or in the Department of Agriculture who can twice figure the same parity on any agricultural commodity.

If you will read the definition of parity as written in the law today, you will find that it has taken almost as many words for the Department of Agriculture to define this little word as it did for our forefathers to write the entire Declaration of Independence. Still no one can understand it.

So instead of discussing this program in terms of the unknown factor "parity," I propose to reduce it to language we all understand—dollars and cents.

I shall quote a few facts from two charts which I have with me. The first chart shows the total investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in all commodities as of December 31, 1949, including inventories and those under loan. The second chart shows the price at which these commodities are being supported and gives a comparison of the support price with the average 10-year price received by the farmer for the same commodities.

CCC inventories loan commitments as of Dec. 31, 1949

Commodity	Quantity	Value
Tobacco ..... pounds	367, 258, 290	$151, 891, 629
Cotton ..... bales	6, 036, 588	955, 109, 372
Wheat ..... bushels	465, 266, 944	996, 719, 026
Linseed oil ..... pounds	394, 827, 620	111, 337, 600
Flaxseed ..... bushels	13, 943, 222	88, 344, 527
Corn ..... do	510, 654, 685	713, 128, 735
Dried eggs (210,000,000 dozen) ..... pounds	69, 036, 207	89, 317, 233
Dry edible beans ..... hundredweight	4, 850, 795	42, 859, 926
Barley ..... bushels	24, 626, 019	35, 088, 096
Dried milk (750,000,000 quarts) ..... pounds	215, 799, 300	27, 399, 460
Butter ..... do	96, 260, 088	59, 518, 797
Wool ..... do	69, 403, 900	53, 510, 467
Other		320, 904, 449
Total		3, 645, 129, 317

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation

Commodity	Support price (actual price) [1]	10-year average price received by farmers 1940–49
Corn ..... bushels	$1.40	$1.16
Peanuts ..... pounds	.105	.0755
Wheat ..... bushels	1.95	1.49
Potatoes ..... do	.96	1.24
Cotton ..... pounds	.272	.225
Wool, shorn ..... do	.423	.406
Tobacco, flue-cured ..... do	.425	[2] .363
Barley ..... bushels	1.09	.98
Butter ..... pounds	.60	.498
Eggs ..... dozen	.37	.366
Hogs, March 1950 ..... hundredweight	16.20	15.20

[1] Support levels listed are those most recently announced. 1949 support price listed if 1950 program not yet announced.
[2] 1939–48 average.

No one can dispute the fact that if the Government continues this policy of maintaining artificially high prices on certain agricultural commodities, it inevitably is going to lead to a choice of one of two things:

1. Either we must launch a program of wholesale destruction of food such as the world has never known; or

2. We must place the farmers of this Nation under strict controls of a bureaucracy with adequate powers to enforce acreage and marketing quotas.

To attempt the former would be such a wanton waste of the taxpayers' money that the Federal Treasury could not stand the pressure.

To attempt the second would mean the complete regimentation and socialization of American agriculture.

During the past 14 years our country has given away in grants and subsidies to States, municipalities, corporations, and individuals a sum total of $43,000,000,000. That means more than $1,250 for each family.

Now, whenever any individual or political entity accepts from the Federal Government such financial assistance in the form of grants, gratuities, or subsidies, then that individual or political entity must of necessity relinquish to the Federal Government many freedoms guaranteed under our Constitution.

We are selling our birthright for the proverbial mess of pottage. And unfortunately, this price, this tremendous price, given in exchange for Federal assistance, is ofttimes not recognized by the recipient until it is too late. Then the recipient suddenly realizes that the cost of this assistance is the loss of our original American freedom and the substitution therefor of a socialistic form of government.

If we continue the destruction of a sound fiscal policy for political expediency by complying with the requests of every pressure group in our own country and the requests of every foreign country, we shall soon find ourselves in the same category as those countries in the past—countries which were rich and prosperous and powerful, but which have now passed into oblivion. And then the last hope of civilization shall have perished.

This country of ours was established and developed into its greatness by our forefathers who operated under the principle that it was their duty to support the Government and not the duty of the Government to support the people.

As a result of their hard work and sacrifices they have handed down to us our birthright of freedom.

Let us never forget the wise words of Benjamin Franklin who said, "He who trades freedom for security will lose both."

Home Rule for North Atlantic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States:

HOME RULE

Whereas the member States of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States recognize their responsibilities in administering the highway obligations; and

Whereas the highway officials of the respective 11 States and the District of Columbia have proved their ability to handle their jobs properly over the many years of their existence; and

Whereas the member States have men with extensive training in the fundamental and advanced problems of technical and administrative procedures who have proved their qualifications to expend Federal and State funds in the best interests of the highway users; and

Whereas the trend has been definitely indicated for increased Federal expansion and participation in the administration of State highway problems as reflected by the increase in the Federal Government's overhead cost for the administration of the highway program, particularly in the face of increased highway production which should normally reflect lower percentages of overhead cost: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States record itself as of the definite opinion that the member States' highway problems can best be solved at the State levels with a minimum of regulation from the Federal Government.

The foregoing is a true copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States held in New York City on February 23, 1950.

A. LEE GROVER,
Secretary, Association of Highway Officials of the North Atlantic States.

Significance of the Changing Characteristics of Agriculture to Farm Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Tyrus R. Timm, extension economist and professor of agricultural economics, Texas A. & M. College, at conference of directors and secretary-treasurers of Production Credit Associations of Texas, January 23–25, 1950, Houston, Tex.:

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHANGING CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURE TO FARM FINANCE

(By Dr. Tyrus R. Timm)

A person's figure changes through the years, requiring at intervals new styles, new materials, and different accessories to bring out its best points. Agriculture's figure changes too, and must be clothed at different stages of its growth and development with the style which will bring out its best points.

Thus today and in the years ahead agriculture may need drastically different accessories and aids to maintain good incomes and good standards of living upon the farms and ranches of Texas than was true in 1934, when the production credit associations were first organized.

You who are farmer-directors now take over the full reins of the 36 production credit associations in Texas. In my opinion, then, it is imperative that you understand and appreciate the terrific changes which have taken place in agriculture between the years of 1934, when the Government stepped in, and 1950, when you take over.

It is significant also that Federal production controls and price supports on a large scale are reentering the economic scene at the same time you assume complete command of your associations. The original entrance of these controls was about the same time that the federally sponsored production credit associations made their appearance. But their second debut may have vastly greater implications in the present farm economy, and consequently are of particular significance to farm credit leaders.

Let us examine these contrasts and developments to note their importance to you directors, both as lenders and borrowers, and particularly as farm leaders tremendously interested in the economic, political, and social welfare of farm and ranch families of this State.

1. THE RAPID INCREASE IN THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF AGRICULTURE

One of the really significant developments in the figure of agriculture since 1934 has been its growing commercialization. Agriculture is currently characterized by bigger investments, greatly increased cash production and living costs, and much more dependency upon the market place than was the case 16 years ago.

An example will indicate the magnitude of this trend toward greater commercialization. The costs in farming last year were higher than the gross farm income of farmers and ranchmen across this country for any year up to 1942. Of course, gross incomes, too, have risen considerably during this 16-year period and up until a couple of years ago, rose faster than costs. Therefore, the impact of these high costs on the whole has not caused serious financial difficulties. However, it will probably do so if prices of farm products continue to settle faster than prices of things farmers buy—and they are expected to do just that.

In the case of cash operating expenses, farmers and ranchmen spent some $5,000,000,000 in 1934, in contrast with an expenditure of nearly 18 billions in 1949. So, for every $5 on the average spent in 1934 for feed, fertilizer, and other operating items, $18 was being spent in 1949. Particularly significant is the fact that these costs have continued upward since the war. While net farm incomes for the Nation as a whole reached a peak in 1947, and has been dropping since, cash operating expenses the past 2 years increased by $1,000,000,000.

This is a matter of basic consideration for leaders in farm finance. Most farming systems now are set up for a high degree of commercialization, and it would be very difficult to rearrange their operations without substantial loss to the producers. With fixed costs and production costs running at record levels, the shift from intensive to more extensive operations, which will be required under acreage controls, may result in a serious increase in unit costs unless equally profitable alternatives can be found. Volume is a very important cost factor.

Credit leaders must also recognize that on many units there continues a situation which economists call capital rationing. That is to say, full use is not being made of the resources on these farms. Thus through a better balance and a fuller utilization of the farming system an additional income, more than offsetting the interest charges, is still possible. The needs of these units must not be overlooked in our current policy of growing cautiousness regarding the extension of credit.

2. THE GROWING INTERDEPENDENCE OF BUSINESS AND AGRICULTURE

Naturally, this growing commercialization which has brought about a decrease in the number of farms and ranches and an increase in the size of operations as well as an increase in items purchased in town for better living and better production, has also resulted in a closer interdependence of business and agriculture; in fact, of town and country as a whole.

A glance around the square or down the main street of your home town will prove to you the growing commercialization of agriculture and its attendant relationships with business. As you look around, compare what you see with 1934. How many more feed stores are there? How many more farm-equipment dealers? To what extent have veterinary supplies and insecticides become an important part of the local drug store's business? What has been the increase in electrical supplies sold in the surrounding rural areas? The changes which have taken place are nothing short of amazing when you think about them.

Producers, in 1934, spent about $272,000,000 for farm equipment used on farms and ranches. By 1949 the annual bill had risen to $1,200,000,000; in fact, $100,000,000 more than the outlay in 1947. In other words, farmers today average spending $1,200 for farm equipment for each $272 they spent in 1934.

Many people do not realize that this is the only country in the world in which farmers can go into small towns of two and three thousand population with the opportunity to take their choice among different makes of tractors, combines, and other farm equipment. Perhaps you can remember, after the First World War, and in some places as late as 1934, farm-equipment dealers were found only in the larger towns.

Volume purchases by farmers, brought about by changes in agriculture's figure, have made it possible and profitable for dealers to locate in the smaller towns. If the commercialization of agriculture should halt, the result will hurt these small-town dealers as well as the farmers; fewer dollars to spend by the farmer would mean the drying up of business for the dealers.

3. THE CHANGES IN FOREIGN-TRADE OUTLETS

Since the early nineteen thirties, foreign trade in agricultural commodities has increased substantially and the amount of trading by commodities has varied greatly.

In terms of physical volume, agricultural exports from this country are about 50 percent higher today than they were in the middle thirties. In dollar volume, largely as a result of much higher prices, current exports of agricultural commodities are 4½ times those of the same period.

An immensely significant trend to leaders in farm finance is the change in the export market for some of the crops which are extremely important in this State. As an illustration: Today cotton exports are less than two-thirds of those of the early thirties; on the other hand, wheat exports are running six times the 1930–38 average.

To production credit leaders, the share of the market for particular commodities which depends largely on the whims of foreign governments, is important. This share of the market is certainly more speculative than domestic use. Farm leaders must keep their eyes on international relations affecting these commodities. In the case of other products, such as beef, the story is a little different. Less than 1 percent of the beef produced in this country is exported; therefore, the important consideration (at least, in the short run), is more on the domestic supply-demand conditions and involves domestic policies.

4. A GREATER DEPENDENCY UPON THE MARKET PLACE

The points discussed so far point out that one of the accompanying results of the growing commercialization of agriculture has been a greater and greater dependency upon the market. This is just another way of saying that gross production per person in agriculture has increased, but that a very small share of the increased production has been used at home by farm families.

In fact, in 1947, the production per person in agriculture had increased 57 percent since 1934. In the last 2 years, the production rate

per person in agriculture has continued upward and now is 71 percent above 1934.

A significant trend to watch is that gross production per person in industry has made less gain during that period and has shown no gain during the last 2 years.

We often hear that a higher standard of living, in terms of material goods, such as bathtubs, food products, automobiles, etc., cannot be ours unless we produce more per person. This is true for the country as a whole, but it is also true that one segment of the economy may gain an advantage over other segments by producing at a less favorable rate. The degree by which one group—for instance, industry—might gain an advantage over others in the economy depends upon the relationship of its prices to those of other groups as the production rate is slowed down.

In other words, if industries outside of agriculture reduce their production of items which farmers buy thereby continuing to hold the lid on output per person, and at the same time, if agriculture continues to increase its rate of production per person, the overflow may result in a serious parity disadvantage for agricultural products. If this happens, farmers very likely will not reap the higher standard of living which should be the result of their increased per capita production.

5. AN OUTLOOK FOR LOWER NET FARM INCOMES FOR THE NEXT FEW YEARS

From 1934 to 1948, the outlook generally was for gradually rising net farm incomes. The outlook now is for gradually decreasing net farm incomes. No major depression of the intensity witnessed after World War I or in the early thirties is expected, but rather a general settling of prices and costs, with farm prices going down faster than the prices of products which farmers must buy.

On a number of products, the present supply and demand situation is much different from that of the period after World War I or in the depression which followed the economic collapse of 1929. For example, many producers, remembering other periods, have expected a steep drop in beef prices; each year, however, beef prices have continued good.

A major factor in this development has been the current favorable ratio of beef cattle numbers to the human population. At the end of World War I, there were about 400 head of beef cattle per 1,000 persons in this country. Today there are only 263 head per 1,000 persons.

In 1950, the net income to farmers in the country as a whole is expected to be down for the third straight year. Actually, if the further decrease expected occurs, net farm income in 1950 will be more than 25 percent lower than it was in 1947. Even at this level, net farm incomes will still double incomes of the period 1935–39.

In Texas in 1949, producers as a whole probably received their highest net farm income, significantly, possibly due to the tremendous cotton crop produced in 1949. If this is true, and if it is also true that the reason for it is due to the increased cotton production over 1948, the acreage adjustment problem is even more serious to us than to producers in other States.

Another indication of the seriousness of approaching farm economic problems worthy of consideration by leaders in farm finance is that in December 1949, the parity price index dipped below 100 for the first time since November 1941. It is presently riding at 98 percent of parity. As you know, this is the broad indicator used for comparing prices farmers receive with prices they have to pay.

6. MORE AND DIFFERENT KINDS OF GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

In 1934, direct Federal controls upon the production and marketing patterns of individual farmers were just beginning. As you take over full control of the production credit associations in 1950, these controls are being reinstated and broadened on a larger scale.

Believe it or not, while Texas farmers are enjoying incomes substantially above those of prewar years, there are more support-price programs in effect than in the past. In addition, there is the necessity of diverting some 5,000,000 acres to other uses, under the acreage allotment program of 1950. This is not in criticism of such action, for we realize that even though the general income position of farmers may be good, thousands of farmers need help. The $64 question is: How many programs of this sort can farmers stand as farm incomes begin to suffer more? This is something for each one of us to think about.

Another Government-control program of interest to farmers is that of the income tax. In my opinion, no relief is in sight. The President's budget of some $43,000,000,000 for next year means that a reduction in taxes will not be forthcoming soon. Billions are difficult for me to understand, but here is an idea of how much $43,000,000,000 is: If you had that much money, you could buy all the machinery and equipment, livestock, and crops stored on all the farms and ranches in the United States; in addition, you would have enough money left over to be able to spend more than $1,000 an hour for every hour that has elapsed from the birth of Christ to the present time. Government is not only big business; it is serious business.

7. CHANGED VALUES IN OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

So far, the contrasts given have centered on important economic developments since 1934, when the production credit associations began. There have also been social and political developments that must be taken into consideration in appraising possible demands upon future production credit programs.

A terrifically important social consideration is that the standard of living of a farm family also changes slowly through the years. I think of a standard of living as a pattern of attitudes of people toward certain things at any given time. For example, when production credit associations got underway in 1934, only 11 percent of our farms had electric lights. Farmers were anxious to have lights in those days, but I think you will agree with me that they would be even more anxious today if, as a result of lower incomes, they would have to consider doing without electricity. With more than 78 percent of farms with electricity, it has become accepted as standard equipment. My observation leads me to believe that farmers intend to keep electric lights, regardless of income trouble.

There are other significant standard of living trends which have taken place during this period of PCA's existence. How about the attitude on prices? If farmers' vote on various referendums and policies of farm organizations are true reflections of the general feeling of farm people, then this sort of "attitude pattern" seems valid for the present: If the marketplace fails to maintain a fair relationship between prices of things farmers sell and buy, it is right, they rationalize, for the Government to use what the economists call "distributive justice," such as taxation, price supports, or similar aids, to bring about a fair distribution of the national income to the farmer.

The important point here is that the desire of farm people for what they believe to be a fair share of the national income is a tremendous factor in shaping Government policy. Their wishes in the future will have an important bearing upon the nature and extent of Government participation. In analyzing the outcome of certain combinations of enterprises on any farm, the possible effects of these direct Government programs must be appraised carefully.

On the other hand, farm people today are not accepting Government ideas nearly so quickly as they were in 1934. Controversies are more widespread and deepseated. Production payments directly to the farmer asked last year by Secretary Brannan is a tremendously controversial issue today. It is an example of a new issue which may or may not become a part of the farmers' standard of living. The implications are deeply embedded in our entire society and the consequences are difficult to ascertain. As you all know, separating the tinsel from the gold in all of these Government issues is a very difficult and delicate process.

8. GROUP ACTION IN AGRICULTURE

The growth of group action among farmers in the last 16 years—ranging from special group efforts to general farm organizations—has been little short of phenomenal and a significant trend. Your associations have been an integral part of the development.

In 1934, there were 945,000 farmers in the three big farm organizations—the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers Union. Today, an estimated 2,722,000 farmers belong to these organizations.

Other "special interest" groups are better organized, too. One has difficulty in recalling, for example, that only a few years ago, industrial labor was not too well organized, with only 3,249,000 members in 1934. Today, the membership is indicated at 15,500,000.

Organized agriculture, industry, labor and other segments of the economy are playing a vital role in the political life of our democracy. These forces must be reckoned with, too, in appraising the extent and nature of Government participation to be expected in agriculture.

9. OTHER STRESSES ON THE NATIONAL POLITICAL SCENE

An interesting development in the "political institutions" relating to agriculture may be found also in Secretary Brannan's 1949 proposal. And that is the manner by which the proposal was developed and presented to the people.

Apparently very few farm organization and congressional leaders had an opportunity to discuss the proposal with the Secretary before it was released to the general public. In refraining from the usual practice of reviewing proposals with these leaders, the Secretary apparently had the full backing of the President, as evidenced by the fact that he spoke for the plan in his recent message to Congress.

The interesting aspect is that here we have the executive branch of the Government competing with the legislative branch for the starring role in leading farmers through the postwar economic wilderness. This approach is even more surprising when one remembers that in recent years there has been a definite tendency throughout the Government toward advisory committees of all sorts to analyze proposals, particularly before they reached the finished stage. The Brannan approach is a distinct departure from that procedure. I am not arguing the merits of the procedure, but merely pointing it out as one of those interesting political developments on the agricultural scene which will bear watching.

Other trends could be discussed and further interpretations made about the never-ending changes in agriculture's figure. More could be said about the kinds of accessories which will be needed to bring out the "best" in the figure from here on. But certainly, the increased commercialization of agriculture, the growing interdependence of agriculture and business, the changes in foreign trade outlets, the greater dependency upon the market place, the outlook for lower net farm incomes in the years ahead, and the fact that more and different kinds of Government control are already on the scene are important economic considerations, the

effect of which must be looked into as you plan your program ahead. They are not, however, any more important than the social and political contrasts which have been mentioned also.

It all adds up in the next decade, as I see it, to (1) somewhat lower farm profits but at levels considerably above those we had before World War II; (2) a highly commercialized agriculture which can't wait very long for needed price and cost adjustments to work themselves out. This means an agriculture that can go broke faster even though farmers have more money in the bank than before the war. Today's net worth, when compared with that of several years past, has little meaning, actually, in terms of security; (3) an agriculture that is more closely than ever related with Government power and with the other segments of the economy. In this last respect a delicate balance must be maintained in order to maintain freedom and encourage private enterprise.

This all means, too, that production credit-association leaders in the years ahead must assume even greater stature in the economic, social, and political struggles of the Nation. The appraisal of a livestock loan even today is only partly finished when the fieldman has completed his check on kinds and numbers of livestock and feed conditions on a man's ranch. Economic, social, and political issues affecting livestock transactions and originating outside of the farm fences may be very significant in the payment of the loan. Certainly these outside influences will continue to play an important role in the total picture.

I've talked about contrasts and significant changes, but I'm glad to report that one tremendously important factor affecting your associations has remained constant—and that is your leadership. Your earnestness, unity of purpose, and hard work has been evident throughout the 36 production credit associations of Texas and the Production Credit Corp. of Houston. Your success thus far may be best explained by the Chinese proverb: "Behind an able man there are always other able men."

I am very proud of the fine records compiled by our credit institutions in Texas—your associations, the commercial banks, the Federal land bank, and others. As a member of the Texas A. & M. College extension staff I look forward in our educational program to working closely with you and these other groups toward better farm-family living in our great State.

Let's Remember the Sea Gulls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial written by Jack Gore, editor of the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, the largest newspaper in Broward County, Fla.

The moral of this editorial might serve a purpose to evaluate the fundamental principles of thrift, self-reliance, and self-dependability.

The editorial is as follows:

LET'S REMEMBER THE SEA GULLS

We wonder if there isn't something of a moral for the American people in the story of what is happening to the sea gulls up in St. Augustine now that the shrimp fleet has left that area for Key West.

It seems the sea gulls up that way have forgotten how to catch fish for themselves. For many years they have been depending for their food on the scraps and waste thrown overboard from the shrimping fleet. It was a sort of super welfare state for the birds, and the free dinners made it unnecessary for the gulls to depend on their own talents to secure food.

But suddenly the shrimp fleet went away. New and more productive fishing grounds were located off Key West, and the shrimp boats deserted St. Augustine.

The sea gulls haven't been able to adjust themselves to the new situation. According to an INS report, the reefs and the shores around St. Augustine are lined with long silent rows of gulls with their dark eyes turned prayerfully out to sea—waiting for the shrimp fleet and the free meals that won't return.

Nature has played the sea gulls a dirty trick. As generation after generation of gulls learned to depend on the shrimp fleet instead of their own resources to obtain food, parent gulls apparently forgot to teach their little ones their age-old methods of catching fish. So today the gulls are starving. They are no different in physical makeup than the sea gulls of Fort Lauderdale. But whereas our gulls can exist through their own efforts, the gulls of St. Augustine are starving by the hundreds because their welfare state suddenly disappeared and with it went their ability to fend for themselves.

The people of St. Augustine are trying desperately to save the gulls that are left. A city-wide effort is being made to round up table scraps and movie popcorn to tide the birds over until they can once more learn to feed themselves.

But naturalists aren't too sure what will happen. They are puzzled over the apparent complete loss of the sea gulls' natural fishing instincts. Some believe the cycle will be completed without the gulls ever recovering their natural fishing ability.

It's a strange paradox that nature thus gives us. Here we have some of the most independent creatures of the universe, who were given marvelous talents to take care of themselves, victimized because they succumbed to the "something for nothing" lure. They became dependent on unnatural conditions to such an extent that parents apparently forgot to teach their offspring how to get along otherwise. Now with the free food gone, the offspring of these indolent parents are paying the penalty.

We wonder if people aren't a great deal like the sea gulls of St. Augustine. We wonder how many Americans have swallowed the idea of the welfare state to the point where they think it is no longer necessary to teach their offspring that the day of Government hand-outs and security for all may sometime draw to a close. And we wonder then how many Americans may be left like the gulls—puzzled and bewildered because their sustenance has disappeared and they have no resources of their own to fall back on.

Americans don't have to look far to see the sea-gull story translated over into human behavior. We have in England a living example of a "something for nothing" theory gobbled up by the people. Like the sea gulls of St. Augustine, the people of Great Britain have accepted unnatural conditions as a substitute for depending upon themselves. The English Government is the "shrimp fleet" which provides the people of Britain with food, clothing, and shelter. As long as this Government is firm and strong and as long as there are shrimp—meaning taxes—enough to keep it in business, the people will be safe.

But let the shrimp be exhausted, as is now happening, then the Government must seek new beds. It must, of necessity, move on and leave in its wake a mass of miserable people totally unaccustomed to using their own God-given talents and resources to exist.

There is the moral in the story of the sea gulls of St. Augustine. It's a pungent moral and one that every voting American should well consider. Nature has a way of exacting a heavy toll from those who look upon her gifts as unnecessary. As a Nation, we here in America have been singularly blessed with a tremendous capacity for using our skills and our ingenuity to ever improve our way of living. But we have earned our "keep" by wresting it out of the ground, the sea, and the air, through the exercise of our own talents.

We will keep those talents only by continuing to use them. The minute we cast them aside as no longer necessary we will forfeit them as surely as the sea gulls of St. Augustine forfeited their talent to provide themselves with food.

Let's not be that foolish. Let's remember what happened to the sea gulls whenever we are tempted by the Washington "shrimpers" to leave our own board and dine at the Government scrap table of false security.

Old Dame Nature is a wise, though sometimes cruel, teacher. She might have used the sea gulls of St. Augustine as a red flag of warning to the American people. Let's heed it while we still have time.

It Always Bobs Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News under date of March 22. This editorial relative to Federal aid to education brings out the fear many of us have—that Federal aid to our educational program will take power from the State and local authorities in operating our schools and will bring interference from the Federal Government.

Your attention is called to the statement in this article made by Congressman LESINSKI, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and one of the spokesmen for this administration. I quote Congressman LESINSKI:

It is impossible to draft a general Federal-aid-to-education bill which will not contain a degree of control over local school systems.

Mr. Speaker, the entire editorial is herewith submitted:

IT ALWAYS BOBS UP

The Mount Vernon teachers' association recently adopted a resolution favoring Federal aid to education without the imposition of Federal controls over the schools.

If a provision for an absolute guarantee against Washington bureaucrats dictating on public-school policies could be written into an education aid bill, nearly all of the opposition to appropriation of Federal money for school purposes would be eliminated.

But no one ever has been able to word a Federal school bill in a manner that meets the objections of those who are bitterly opposed to the Federal Government telling every community in the land how its schools should be operated.

And one doubts if such assurance can ever be given.

The House Education and Labor Committee just recently voted against recommending a Federal school aid bill for passage by Congress.

And when the committee's decision was announced, the group's chairman made this statement:

"It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid to education bill which will not contain a degree of control over local school systems."

A number of Federal aid bills have been drafted in the past year or two since the demand for financial help to the schools became widespread and insistent.

Some have been written by Members of Congress who are opposed to increasing the power of the Washington bureaucracy over the activities of the American people. Therefore, it goes without saying that these did everything in their power to eliminate control features from their proposals.

But still none of the bills submitted to Congress has been able to satisfy the committees, which have examined them closely, that they do not provide means for some Federal bureau to take over control of the schools as soon as the Government starts contributing money to their support.

It is history that whenever there is use of Federal money you have Federal control.

If Federal money helps build a road in Ohio, a Federal bureau says how, when and where the road shall be constructed.

The same principle applies to any other undertaking in which Federal money is involved. You do it the bureaucratic way if you use Federal money, or you lose the Federal help.

That's the way it would be with the schools. If Federal aid is supplied, control of the schools will be transferred from local communities to Washington.

Calumet-Sag Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to acquaint the House with what I believe to be one of the finest industrial projects ever to be introduced for the development of natural resources, that of the proposed Calumet-Sag waterway. I have backed this, not only for the furthering of trade and industry in Chicago and Illinois, but I have made an intensive study of this project in relation to its benefit to the Nation, and so feel that I am offering a great opportunity to the honored Members of the House of Representatives to work with me for increased appropriations to continue work on the Calumet-Sag project, so vital as part of the Great Lakes and Gulf waterways, noting that, with completion of this project, ocean-going vessels will carry cargo into Calumet Harbor, providing cheaper transportation to that point for millions of tons of freight, from there to be transferred to railroads and motor carriers for inland destination over the vast interior of some of our most productive regions of America.

This appropriation will save Federal money. It will hasten development and improvement for interchange of traffic between lake vessels, river barges, railroad, and motor carriers. Commercial and industrial advancement cannot be underrated should this appropriation be authorized by the Congress. The Calumet-Sag project, when completed, will be one of the most important in the United States. For instance, I have learned that in this district alone, there are more tons of steel produced each year than in the entire country of England. This waterway has been developing rapidly in tonnage of steel, ore, and grain. It is my conviction, when and if it is completed, the tonnage will raise from 2,000,000 to 30,000,000 tons a year. It, in reality, will pay for itself.

It has been approved by Army engineers, labor and material are available. It awaits only the appropriation of the additional funds to complete this great waterway. Gentlemen, at this point, in order that you may be thoroughly informed, I wish to include an address delivered before the businessmen of the Calumet industrial region on February 21, 1950 by Donald O'Toole, vice president, Pullman Trust and Savings Bank, entitled, "The Calumet Industrial Region Today." It is most inclusive and comprehensive, and I hope will open to you the vast possibilities contained within the Calumet-Sag project.

The address follows:

The Calumet industrial region is usually considered to be that concentration of heavy industries lying along the southern end of Lake Michigan from Chicago's south side to Gary. The great leaders in the industries of this area—around whom most of the others have been grouped as suppliers or consumers—have been the huge steel mills of South Chicago and Gary, the great oil refineries of Whiting and East Chicago, the tall grain elevators of the Calumet River, and the enormous railroad industry which shuttles ceaselessly between all of them and rushes the region's wealth of products out to the rest of the world.

This is indeed a vast center of industrial production—too vast certainly for a speaker of my limited comprehension. I'd like to confine that area somewhat to a smaller portion of it with which all of us are somewhat more familiar.

The smaller Calumet industrial area—in which most of us operate as businessmen—may be defined as the group of industries clustered about Lake Calumet and the Calumet River. This area lies between about Seventy-first Street in Chicago on the north, Lake Michigan on the east, and the limits of Cook County on the west and south.

Most of the industries in this smaller Calumet industrial area are—as in the larger Calumet industrial region—related to the big steel mills, oil refineries, grain elevators, and railroads as suppliers or consumers. Most of the people living in this area are employed by these industries.

It behooves us as businessmen to appraise the industries of the Calumet industrial area, for upon their success depends our own profits and our ability to survive as businessmen. Their success—as far as we are concerned—consists entirely of their ability to remain in production and continue to pay wages and salaries. We are not generally owners of these businesses, and we are, therefore, interested in their profits and general financial conditions only as indications of their continuing good business health. Of course, it stands to reason that fine profits and sound financial conditions are almost always evidences of good business prospects, but our analysis of these industries proceeds along this narrower line: Are they going to be able to produce economically, meet all competition for their product, and thus continue to provide employment for the people we serve?

Not long ago a few of us who are keenly interested in this subject chartered an airplane and flew over the area. What we saw was amazing—for businessmen of the area like you and me, it was positively thrilling. I am going to ask you to imagine yourselves in that airplane with me, while I tell you what we saw.

The land below us is flat, as far as the eye can see. No high mountain ranges confine us. No steep hills force railroads and highways through narrow, twisting, and costly passes. Traffic moves freely over our flat lands, and we expand outward at will whenever we need more space. Everywhere you can see new homes, new industries being added to the fringes of the areas already developed.

On literally thousands of transportation routes you see traffic pouring in and out of the area. Railroad trains come in from the West, from the South, and from the East with raw materials, and chug out again, hauling our finished products to the people in other sections of the country; highways, many of them built just within the past 15 years, carry thousands of trucks hauling millions of dollars of raw materials and finished products in and out of the area; freighters bring ore and grain down from the Northwest across the blue waters of Lake Michigan; barges bring grain, building materials, and other products up the Calumet-Sag Channel and haul gasoline and steel and other products back. Unseen pipe lines pour millions of gallons of oil into the Whiting refineries and millions of cubic feet of gas into our furnaces. Railroad trains, barges, and trucks move ceaselessly from plant to plant in the area, hauling products around from one to the other in the complex process of completing our manufactures from raw materials to finished products.

If you had been up in an airplane over this area 20 years ago, you would discover that vast changes have taken place in the past 20 years—changes of which we have been almost unaware and which have served to modernize our vast industrial plant and make it certainly efficient enough to compete with any industrial-producing region. To mention a few we know, Doty Road, the four-lane highway skirting Lake Calumet, built in the middle thirties; the straightening of the Little Calumet River just south of Lake Calumet which has aided barge traffic; the deepening of Lake Calumet at its south end and the construction there of docks and other facilities to handle ocean vessels; new bridges over the river on Torrence Avenue and on One Hundred and Thirtieth Street; widened and speedier highways on One Hundred and Eleventh Street, Torrence Avenue, One Hundred and Thirtieth Street, One Hundred and Third Street, and Stony Island Avenue. In fact, the pattern of highways and waterways and streets that we see in 1950 scarcely resemble at all what was visible in 1930.

And, as you look down upon these arteries so important to the efficiency of the Calumet industrial area, think of the things that are still being done: the Tri-State Highway which will soon be completed from One Hundred and Thirtieth Street south and will provide a wide and flat express route to Detroit; the widening and deepening of the Calumet Sag Channel which will step up the already tremendous shipments now taking place on this waterway—it seems almost unbelievable that the tonnage carried by the Calumet-Sag Channel has grown in 10 years, from 1939 to

1948, from 822,125 to 2,092,772 tons; the construction of the shipyard at the south end of Lake Calumet, and its recent acquisition by Calumet Harbor Terminals, where it is now operating, full-fledged, as a splendid terminal where oceangoing vessels, river barges, railroad freight cars, and trucks all meet and exchange their goods for shipment all over the world. The Calumet Harbor Terminals represents the first actual realization of the dream of the development of Lake Calumet as an industrial harbor, and we are indeed fortunate that its management is in the hands of men who thoroughly understand every modern means of transportation—trucks, railroads, barges, and steamships.

And, as we continue to cruise over the area, look at what has been happening to our industry. New manufacturing centers have developed at Eighty-seventh Street and the Illinois Central tracks, at Ninety-fifth Street and Cottage Grove Avenue, at One Hundred and Thirty-seventh and Indiana, and at countless other points. The vast former Pullman freight car shops at One Hundred and Third Street and Cottage Grove Avenue, idle for many years, are now fully engaged in the production of that most necessary and most modern machine—the Diesel electric locomotive. The new Republic Steel Co. mills in South Chicago is the most modern steel-making plant in the world. Thousands of small industries, operated by especially keen and aggressive men who are determined to keep their products successfully meeting all competition, have come into the area and have given our employment a far broader and more dependable base than the days when we were all dependent upon a handful of large manufacturing plants.

Before returning to the ground, let's see if we can picture the magnificent middle-western country beyond our horizon, in which we hold such a fortunate central position. We can visualize the mountain ranges of northern Michigan from whose mines iron ore is shipped by lake vessels to our hungry steel mills; we can visualize the rich Southern Illinois coal mines whose coal moves so economically over the Illinois waterway and the Calumet-Sag Channel, and over our railroad systems; we can picture the rolling wheat fields of Kansas and of the great Northwest whose corn and wheat are poured into our grain elevators to await shipment to other parts of a hungry world. We can see the stock cars on the railroads drawing corn-fed cattle and hogs from rich farms in Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin to be processed in the stockyards just north of the Calumet industrial area.

Yes, it's obvious that we are still the great processing and marketing center for the rich midwestern United States, and it seems also that we have worked successfully to keep our transportation system modern and up-to-date, providing better and better waterways, highways, and railroads so that products can move more swiftly and easily in and out of our great processing factories.

The peculiar position we occupy is that we are close to both sources of raw materials and to the rich, heavily populated markets of the East and the Middle West. Thus, it is the most economical of all systems to ship raw materials here in low-cost bulk transportation units like lake steamships and barges, process them into finished products, and then speed those products on by trains and trucks to the big nearby markets. And, we know, before returning to land, that we must at all times spare no cost in maintaining the transportation system that keeps our area great.

There are two other resources which we have. One is fresh water with Lake Michigan providing a vast and unlimited reservoir for us at all times. Many an industry now located in an area dependent upon wells may very well wish that it had the access to Lake Michigan enjoyed by the industries of the Calumet industrial area.

The other resource is our manpower. This is most important of all because it is within the capacity of our manpower to drag down or make even greater the magnificent situation with which nature and civilization have blessed this great industrial area.

Men must guide this industrial machine. They must operate its individual machines, they must plan its destinies, they must meet its competitors in the markets of the world, and they must work closely with each other to keep the whole machine in operation. What have we done about our manpower?

First, we have provided technical educational facilities. Our industries, ever hungry for skilled mechanics, are assured of a splendid annual supply from the magnificent new Chicago Vocational School and from the other technical high schools of Chicago. We earnestly hope that the Pullman Free School of Manual Training will somehow be able to continue to perform its job in the training of young mechanics. From the nearby great engineering colleges—Illinois Institute of Technology, University of Illinois, Marquette University, Purdue University, and University of Notre Dame—we receive a splendid annual supply of college-trained technicians.

There is ample room for housing all of our working people—laborers, mechanics, technicians, and executives alike. All we need to do when we need more housing is to build further out on our flat plains.

The only thing that can hamper us in achieving and retaining full employment conditions is the inability of men to get along with each other. This is a condition which all of us businessmen in this area must strive constantly to prevent. It would indeed be pathetic if such a great modern industrial plant, constituting our entire Calumet industrial area, should find it impossible to produce for a market hungry for our products, simply because of the inability of its men to settle differences as to working conditions and wages.

What can we do to prevent these work stoppages from overtaking us? Fortunately, we here have not yet been too seriously affected by local strikes, but I suppose the same thing can happen to us that has happened to others if we fail to face the situation fairly.

First, we can seek to know the problems of our factories in their labor relations, and attempt to help them to adjust misunderstandings with their employees. To do this, we must learn more about our industries—just how they operate and how they earn the money with which they pay wages and other operating expenses. Then, when we know the facts, we can take advantage of opportunities to counsel with our own customers who are employees in these plants. In many cases, they look to us, as their businessmen friends, for impartial advice. If we know that demands made by one side or the other are unreasonable, let's not be hesitant about expressing our viewpoints so that we can help to get differences settled quickly. We must be prepared to make real personal sacrifices of our own time in order to keep this industrial machine going.

Secondly, we must understand thoroughly the role of legislation in controlling the relations between labor and management. We must take a keen interest in every bill introduced in our own State legislature and in the National Legislature which will make it more difficult for our factories to operate. It is certain that the more difficult it is for them to operate, the more we lose our competitive advantage in marketing our goods to the rest of the world and the more we have thrown a wrench into the works of the great transportation system we have just viewed from the air.

Fortunately, the employers and labor leaders of our area have been relatively reasonable in dealing with each other. Perhaps it is because we went through our own period of adjusting to unionism before most other sections of this country, and our general labor relations are, therefore, rather mature. Moreover, both our employers and labor leaders have recently taken a considerable interest in our community affairs and have indicated a genuine willingness to have us understand their problems. We should take advantage of every invitation they extend to us to visit their plants and offices and to learn about their problems. It is an old American principle that teamwork solves problems better than individual heads. We always have one very strong interest in looking into their affairs, and that is to see to it that they keep working, and that wages and salaries continue to be paid to the people we serve.

From our experience as a bank, we know that the employers of this area are among the most enlightened, fair-minded, and aggressive in the United States. Their record of accomplishment in the field of industrial production is matched by their record for securing good legislation, good civic improvements, and sound living benefits for their employees. And it is really significant and to the credit of the labor leaders and working people of our community that we have had very few serious strikes that are purely local in character.

I think it may be presumed, therefore, that this vast industrial region, more modern and necessary today than it ever was before, is led by men who are intelligent and inherently resolved to get along with each other. Under such circumstances, I think that the future for many years is a very bright one for the Calumet industrial area.

Addresses of Col. Bradley Dewey and James R. Killian, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, recently two distinguished citizens of my State made outstanding speeches when the 1949 award for chemical engineering achievement was presented to the Celanese Corp. of America. Col. Bradley Dewey, president of the Dewey & Almy Chemical Co., in Cambridge, Mass., and wartime rubber director of the United States, chose to defend bigness in business—particularly in its relations to the national defense. James R. Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, spoke of the present-day threats to higher education and particularly the relations these bear to the economic strength and security of our country. Every thinking American ought to have the opportunity of reading these two splendid addresses, which I quote herewith:

STOP DEFENDING BIGNESS IN BUSINESS; PREACH IT—IT IS THE JOB OF EVERY MAN AND WOMAN IN THE PROCESS INDUSTRIES TO PREACH THE FACTS: IN PEACETIME, BIGNESS HAS A VITAL PLACE IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM; IN WAR IT IS OUR SALVATION

(By Bradley Dewey)

It was the great companies of America's industry that provided the arms and equipment with which our soldiers, our sailors,

and our airmen won World War II. And it is to these same big companies that the United States must turn if she is called upon to defend herself again.

Our big process companies teamed with the Government to furnish the technical brains, the know-how and the sheer power to produce in tremendous volume such industrial miracles as synthetic rubber, high octane aviation gasoline, toluene, magnesium, rocket powders, and the atomic bomb.

Teamwork won the war—and it was primarily big business that furnished the teams. Chemists and physicists—chemical, mechanical, and electrical engineers—production men and skilled workers—all trained by industry and its engineering consultants, made up the elaborate structure of the process industry teams that fought the war behind the lines.

If—and God forbid—we must again defend ourselves, then again we will have to call upon great and strong units of industry to provide us with what we need. Yet today we have the strange sight, the frightening sight, of the defense branches of Government spending billions of dollars for our defense, while other arms of the same Government seek to pull down and destroy our greatest defense asset—the bigness of the companies upon which we must rely in war.

I am not going to defend bigness in industry. I am tired of hearing it defended as though bigness in itself were wicked or immoral or criminal. Far from defending bigness in business, I assert its necessity; its necessity in peace and particularly, its necessity in war.

General Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, is only one of numerous military men to declare that we cannot hope to match Russia in masses of men, and that we must, therefore, rely upon technical superiority which must come from technically superior industry.

We in the process industries know that technical prowess is, as a rule, directly related to size. No process company can grow except by constant effort toward technical superiority; and bigness is the inevitable long-term result of technical improvement and superiority.

Trying to measure bigness in modern day industry is like trying to say how long is a piece of string. The biggest of corporations has competitors and in order to stay strong and healthy must give its rivals constant battle, striving daily to improve its own products and its own methods. Large, medium, and small companies are a necessary part of the American economy. All prosper together.

Should war come tomorrow—and again I say, may God forbid it ever come—there would be available to the Government not only the physical products of our industry's bigness, but there would also be available big industry's teams of scientists, engineers and skilled workers.

America amazed herself, and the world as well, by mass-producing synthetic rubber in World War II. But, as Rubber Director in World War II, I can testify that synthetic rubber in the quantities and of the quality required for the successful conduct of that war, could not have been produced if the rubber companies and the mighty process industries and their construction and engineering affiliates had not provided the teams of chemists, physicists, engineers, production specialists, administrators, and trained workers.

However it may have appeared to some outsider, it was not the Government that developed the processes, built the plants, or turned out the rubber. Government merely supervised, steered, advised. Men of the rubber, chemical, and petroleum industries and their construction associates and engineering consultants—they are the men who did the job. It was the technical prowess of these companies, so competitive in time of peace but pooled in time of war, which gave to the Nation the technical superiority it had to have to produce rubber after our enemies cut us off from our supplies of the natural product.

This, I submit, is the fruit of bigness—the bigness General Vandenberg and the other military leaders have in mind when they say our success in war will rest on technical superiority. Dr. Vannevar Bush points this up very succinctly in two sentences of his great new book, Modern Arms and Free Men, when he says, "Modern science has utterly changed the nature of war and is still changing it. * * * The combination of science, engineering, industry, and organization during the last decade created a new framework that rendered conventional military practice obsolete."

How quickly we can lose technical superiority if we permit misguided zealots to whittle down industry or to stunt wholesome, healthy growth to bigness. It is up to all to encourage bigness as long as it obeys the laws that govern us all. How can we hope to maintain modern science, upon which technical superiority is based, unless we give engineers and technologists elbow room in time of peace to team with our scientists and continue to build to the unlimited horizons of our democratic country?

If there was any one lesson more outstanding than another learned in the last war it was the absolute dependence of the armed forces upon the teams of industry and business for the development of new arms and weapons.

Among these teams were the ones who in prewar peacetimes had been able to work on problems which then had little hope of being used for a decade ahead. Among them were ones who sent teams of investigators to Germany to bring back the techniques which let us more quickly make butadiene and styrene for synthetic rubber. Among them are those who can afford to work on ideas and to pay for dreaming for the future.

The cry which we now hear that bigness in business is bad is a false cry and a dangerous one. It is as false to say that all big things are bad as it is to say that all little things are good. We have laws against big and little sinners and we should employ them against the big as well as the little in business. But in bigness itself there is no sin.

Now let me talk for a minute about a giant of industry. This one is so great that the Government turned to it to handle its top secret wartime atomic project construction and operation at Hanford, Wash. I refer, of course, to the du Pont Co. Today the same Government which disbursed more than $1,000,000,000 through du Pont during the war is attacking du Pont on the ground that it is too big. Yet it was the bigness of du Pont which led the Government to its door in time of national peril. The fact is that du Pont paid out to other companies 56 percent of all the money the Government paid to it and that although du Pont had the lion's share of the vast responsibility imposed by the Government, it shared profits with thousands of subcontractors, big and little. And after all operating costs were paid, wages and salaries eating up 44 percent, the du Pont Co. had left as its own profit to stockholders, after taxes, about one-fifteenth of a cent of dollar cost.

I did not single out the du Pont Co. for special mention. The Government did that. The Government which leaned so hard upon the du Pont Co. for help in the war now singles it out as being wicked because it is big. And if this attack were successful, misguided and misinformed zealots might single out other companies and blast them for the crime of bigness. But let us look at other companies.

What company except a big company like Monsanto could have replaced the Texas City styrene plant and its 34 top administrative, supervisory, and technical men in less than a year after an explosion had wreaked its havoc? Could any company less than the size of Monsanto have carried on five separate vital, large, wartime projects?

Consider Union Carbide and Carbon's power when it brought to the war effort the experience and abilities of more than 3,000 technically trained people—1,400 of whom were engineers and technicians working in 23 research laboratories spread through 185 plants. Carbide and Carbon made the butadiene from alcohol that was so vitally needed at the start of the rubber program. When we had to build the enormous butadiene plants (and reactions had to be piloted even while the plants were still under construction), where could we have turned except to the big oil companies like Standard of New Jersey, Humble, Standard of California, Gulf, Texas, Shell, Sun, Socony-Vacuum, Cities Service, Phillips, Pure Oil, Sinclair, Standard of Indiana, Imperial Oil, and Atlantic.

Only a great chemical company could do what Dow did when it not only supervised the construction but staffed the enormous styrene plants at Velasco, Los Angeles, and Sarnia, and, remember, it did this while designing and building the facilities for a giant magnesium program. Only a great company could have contributed the hundreds of top-flight executives, supervisors, engineers, and designers for such a prodigious undertaking.

Who but the great rubber companies could have taken on not only the polymerization of synthetic rubber, but at the same time largely redesigned tires and the machinery, processes, and factories necessary to fabricate new materials into tires to win the war?

Earlier I spoke of misguided and misinformed zealots because I believe that many of those who attack business because of its size have no idea what constitutes size or how modern business really operates. I think they honestly do not know that big and little business could not exist in our great democratic economy without each other any more than labor and capital or farmer and merchant could exist only for themselves and by themselves.

As a rather small-business man, I am well aware that my company could not exist if it did not have big as well as small customers to which to sell its products. As one who buys from, sells to, and competes with businesses as big as his own and also much bigger, I think I am in a position to understand how big and little businesses are dependent upon each other and how necessary both are to the American way of life.

But there is one more thing I have to say. How can misguided critics learn the truths about our process industries unless we who are in the industry tell these facts? How can the American public, upon whose passions and emotions misguided zealots are now playing with their incessant criticism of size in business, learn the facts unless we who know the facts talk about them?

It is the job of every man and woman connected with the process industries to marshal the facts and to preach the facts. Let us cease mere passive defense of bigness and let us start preaching aggressively the necessity of bigness for the salvation of the Nation in time of war.

We all know that only big companies can mass produce such products as automobiles and that only mass production can bring the automobile price within the range of most American incomes. But too many of our fellow citizens do not know that national defense in the future will depend almost entirely upon the quick mobilization of industrial teams and their integration into war teams. Bigness is a vital national asset in war and we can no more risk limiting this

bigness than we can risk giving the secrets of atom bomb construction or the blueprints of our newest guided missile to potential enemies.

We honor the Celanese Corp. of America tonight because it successfully risked millions of venture capital on research. Only a big company could do this. Let us now do what we can to put an end to loose and reckless talk of the badness of bigness. Let us make clear to all that in peace and in war bigness has a vital place in the American system. It insures our future. If we make our story heard by the American people, I for one have no fear of the outcome. The American people are not deaf to an appeal to reason as powerful as this appeal we make for our preservation as a nation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE UNIVERSITY—A MISSION IN PERIL

(By James R. Killian, Jr.)

THE UNIVERSITY HAS A TWOFOLD MISSION: STRENGTHEN OUR MORAL FIBER, STRENGTHEN OUR ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

In these parlous times of cold war and hot issues, what are the special responsibilities of our universities in serving our national security?

When considering the relationship of education to national welfare we must first separate out certain basic elements of our national strength. Most basic of all the fiber of our people—their spirit, their moral integrity, their maturity, and their capacity to govern themselves. We must have the kind of education which engenders and strengthens these qualities. Our colleges must give our students, who are tomorrow's leaders, an understanding of our American heritage and of the sacredness of individual liberty in a free society. They must help to create this common bond of our democracy. As President Sproul of the University of California recently said, "How necessary it is that the universities of America should constitute an affirmative force—the chief advocates of our traditions, our institutions, our way of life—that they should not only inquire fearlessly into the defects of our system, but also highlight and extol its advantages and aggressively clarify and strengthen the ideas upon which it rests." I submit that this function of our universities is vital to our national welfare.

Our universities must also do more than they are now doing to aid our young people to grow in moral and spiritual stature. Our people not only must be literate; they must harness literacy to ideals and to a sense of the first rate. Whitehead once said that, "Moral education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness." Better than any other agencies, our colleges can provide this vision of greatness. In a democracy it is vital that they do so.

Universities, if they are to serve our free society, must not only train men who can do the complex specialized work of society; they must also cultivate in these men a reverence for the dignity of the individual. Someone has said that democracy is most effective when it tries to make all of its citizens aristocrats. It might also be said that education for the protection of democracy is most effective when it strengthens the aristocratic virtues of personal dignity, self-reliance, and self-understanding. Men with these qualifications are more likely to resist all forms of statism and Stalinist communism that regiment and depreciate the individual and therefore weaken democracy.

Next to the fiber of the people as a component of national strength stands the health and wealth of our people. A healthy people, a prosperous economy, and ample natural resources are three of our main defensive lines, and all three of these now depend upon the endless frontier of basic science. Our universities must educate the men and conduct the research to keep this frontier endless.

In our dynamic economy we must constantly create more jobs for more people. We must steadily increase our output per man-hour, if we are to have better and cheaper consumer goods along with higher wages. To do these things requires a steady increase in our fundamental knowledge of nature. Research must also provide us with replacements and substitutes for depleted natural resources. In fact one of the major tasks of science in the universities and in industry in the years ahead will be the conservation of natural resources and the replacement of scarce materials by equally good or better substitutes. As the wellsprings of basic science, our universities are vital factors in meeting all of these requirements for a prosperous economy. They are also essential for educating men for the refinement and management of our industrial machine. The record seems to be clear that engineers have demonstrated an extraordinary capacity to manage great enterprises. I believe that in part this reflects the kind of training they have had, and that it points up the opportunities in our universities to train men still more effectively for management responsibilities. If we are to do this, we must educate men of professional competence who have a cultural reach beyond the techniques of their profession.

Let me mention one reason why a broader education is of practical importance to industry. Industry more and more is looking to technological schools for potential leaders, for the men who must be the managers, the industrial leaders of tomorrow. Graduates of engineering schools often enter industry through a specialized technical channel, with the result that only those few individuals with superior natural endowments rise to top-level posts in management. Industry, because of sound organizational requirements, must insist on specialization among its young scientists and engineers, and is therefore handicapped in increasing the quantity of potential leaders at a time when they are at an impressionable age. When technical education is too narrow, it tends to restrict the supply and development of leaders. By further broadening their teaching programs, our engineering schools have an opportunity to contribute to the solution of this problem, so essential to the management of our highly technical private enterprise system.

BUT IT FACES A TRIPLE THREAT: DEVELOPMENT AT THE EXPENSE OF RESEARCH, SECURITY BY SECRECY, IMPOVERISHMENT

As our educational institutions strive to nurture these elements of our national strength, they encounter today certain hazards which are inherent in the cold war.

Today, for example, we are under constant temptation to divert scientists and engineers in our colleges away from fundamental research by bending their interest too much toward development. If allowed to happen on a large scale, this could dry up the wellspring of new knowledge with ultimate disaster to our national security. Not even the knowledge that an atomic explosion has occurred in Russia can justify our weakening basic research by the diversion of undue numbers of our first-team scientists to development work or to crash programs. I believe that the national defense establishment can continue to work on the development of new weapons essential to our defense without aborting our basic research and educational programs by shifting the emphasis from long-term research to short-term objectives. If ever we are forced or deluded into such a program in peacetime, then we have cut the taproot of our future security and our industrial advance.

A second hazard to our universities resides in the imposition of restrictions on the free exchange and communication of information. Only under very special and urgent circumstances should secret work be brought into our universities. It is incompatible with the basic concept of an educational institution as a source and distributor of knowledge.

Both within and without our universities I believe that scientific advances are being retarded today by too much secrecy. In the public mind secrecy is mistakenly considered synonymous with security; actually secrecy and scientific progress are mutually inimical. I am not one of those who believe we should have no secrets—that is obviously absurd in a period of cold war. I do believe that we can achieve a better balance between secrecy and free exchange of information for the purpose of accelerating our scientific advance. If there were fewer secrets in our atomic-energy program, for example, we could forge ahead more rapidly in atomic physics. There would be more cross-fertilization, more mutual stimulation of active minds.

"It would be better," as Dr. Karl T. Compton recently pointed out, "to take the calculated risk of allowing some confidential information to get out of our hands, if such a policy would enable us to advance our own science and art at a more rapid rate which a competitor cannot hope to equal, than it would be to impose by regulation or public opinion a condition which seriously handicaps progress by rendering employment in these pursuits definitely unattractive to top-flight scientists and engineers."

A third hazard to universities as components of our national defense is their impoverishment. Prof. Seymour Harris recently pointed out that in 1932 our colleges and universities spent 1 percent of our national income. By 1949 this had fallen to less than one-half of 1 percent. Over this same period the enrollment of our universities had doubled. The situation is even worse if we examine the private institutions which are the pace setters of our educational system. Their share of the national income has suffered a greater reduction than the system as a whole. Implicit in this declining support of our privately endowed institutions is the danger of their losing their private status by being forced to accept Government subsidy and control. I suggest that this would be a major calamity. If the private universities come under Federal control, then one of the bulwarks of free enterprise will have been destroyed. The solution, I believe, lies in diversified support for these institutions, with industry, foundations, and Government joining together, and all recognizing the vital importance of these institutions remaining free of any kind of control. I submit, however, that we must adequately finance all of our universities, whatever the source of funds, if our system of higher education is to continue adequately to serve our democracy. Our universities, if they are strong and powerful, are a striking force that can be thrown into immediate action if needed, as was demonstrated in the last war. We must be sure to have in these institutions this kind of reserve strength.

Such are some of the responsibilities, obligations, and problems of education in this critical period. I believe that the symbiotic relationships between industry and education must be further strengthened if our educational institutions are to remain strong. I believe that industry has a responsibility to see that they do. I believe that our free institutions can continue as potent pillars of our national strength, if they are not diverted from their primary responsibilities, and if we can circumvent the hazards of these parlous times.

Article From Wall Street Journal of February 9, 1950, Answering Fallacious Attack on Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of February 9, 1950:

BONDS IN UNITED STATES PENSION RESERVE—THE STALE FALLACY THAT THE TRUST FUND IS A FICTION STILL CROPS UP DESPITE AUTHORITATIVE REFUTATION

(By A. F. Korsmeyer)

Letters to this newspaper from subscribers, among other things, show that misunderstanding of the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors' insurance of the Social Security Act is still widespread. Many persons still believe what some insurance company officials asserted in the middle 1930's, that the accumulation of a pension-reserve fund invested in United States bonds was purposeless, that the reserve was a fiction and that it could actually result in the cost of pensions being paid twice over. Those insurance-company men have long since realized their error; a sort of vicarious recantation came in 1945 from a committee representing the three principal associations of life companies. The committee said, in part:

"The first step in understanding this problem is to agree that pay-roll taxes are collected so that workers may currently make a contribution to the support of the OASI system from which they hope later to benefit. The money might conceivably be held in the form of cash to be used when needed. However, the Government must currently borrow large sums, and will later need large amounts for refinancing at least some of its rapidly maturing obligations. It is reasonable for the OASI system, if it has funds available, to take advantage of this opportunity to earn interest on its money by purchasing Government bonds.

"Furthermore the apparent double taxation does not involve an avoidable burden if it can be assumed that the excess of income over outgo is used by the Government for some essential purpose, and does not by its existence and availability stimulate unnecessary expenditures. The purchasing of bonds by the OASI system means that, later on, when it needs money in excess of pay-roll receipts in order to pay benefits, the interest on the bonds (raised, of course, by general taxation) will be available to meet the additional benefit load. However, if the bonds had not been bought by the system but were in the hands of the public, then not only would the interest on the bonds have to be raised by general taxation but additional general taxes would have to be levied to cover the deficit in OASI operations. Current pay-roll taxation to create a reserve fund, therefore, makes possible the use of interest which the Government has to raise by taxation anyway for a purpose which would otherwise require further general taxation on its own account."

SAME THING IN CLEARER TERMS

This heavy language is not much easier to understand than the cryptic chatter of an insurance agent trying to write another policy. A report from the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance, rendered in April of 1948, stated its like conclusions in clearer terms. This council was composed of 17 businessmen, economics professors, labor-union representatives, insurance-company executives, and scientists. Its report said, in part:

"We do not agree with those who criticize this form of investment of the OASI reserve in Government bonds on the ground that the Government spends for general purposes the money received from the sale of securities to that fund. Actually such investment is as reasonable and proper as is the investment by life-insurance companies of their own reserve funds in Government securities. * * *

"The investment of the old-age and survivors insurance funds in Government securities does not mean that people have been or will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged. The following example illustrates this point: Suppose some year in the future the out-go under the old-age and survivors insurance system should exceed pay-roll tax receipts by $100,000,000. If there were then $5,000,000,000 of United States 2-percent bonds in the trust fund, they would produce interest amounting to $100,000,000 a year. This interest would, of course, have to be raised by taxation. But suppose there were no bonds in the trust fund. In that event, $100,000,000 to cover the deficit in the old-age and survivors insurance system would have to be raised by taxation; and, in addition, another $100,000,000 would have to be raised by taxation to pay interest on $5,000,000,000 of Government bonds owned by somebody else."

GOVERNMENT'S "USE" OF PENSION REVENUE

Some correspondents of this newspaper stumble over the Government's "use" of its borrowings from the OSAI, reserve for general purposes, which they fail to distinguish from the alleged but nonexistent "use" for such purposes of the age-pension pay-roll tax revenue. The distinction is supremely important. Without it, the Government would be merely appropriating such revenue without compensation to those for whose present or ultimate benefit the revenue is collected. But the Government makes the distinction, and makes it effectively, by issuing Treasury obligations for the moneys it borrows from the reserve.

Lately, the Brookings Institution of Washington has published a work entitled "The Cost of Financing of Social Security," which, along with a considerable amount of useful information about other sections of the Social Security Act, unfortunately repeats the now stale errors about the alleged illusion of an OASI trust fund. Its several authors—for whose conclusions a foreword disclaims the institution's responsibility—make on page 155 the following weirdly untrue statement:

"The OASI trust fund is invested in Federal Government securities. Since the money is used by the Government in meeting its regular expenditure requirements, no real reserve is created. The obligations of the Government (liabilities) deposited in a trust account do not represent assets; they merely record future obligations which can be fulfilled only through the levy of future taxes upon the economy in general. The trust fund is thus a fiction—serving only to confuse."

Here the authors make one or both of two assertions. One is that the Governmnt bonds in the OASI fund are different from all other parts of the national debt in having no value as assets. The other is that all the Government's obligations are worthless. If the second reading were correct, the first would, of course, follow.

DEBT IS ALL GOOD OR ALL BAD

Now it is impossible to divide the national debt into two categories on any such (or any other) basis of distinction. If any segregation of the debt were imaginable, the bonds in the OASI reserve would have to be assigned a superior rating as assets. They are the property of many millions of citizens, most of whom have little or nothing else to protect them from destitution in the feebleness of their old age. If this portion of the debt has no existence as assets in the ownership of OASI beneficiaries, the remainder of a debt which the daily Treasury statement says is now more than $252,000,000,000, doesn't exist either.

The authors do not support their assertion that the Government bonds in the pension reserve have less value than fresh toilet paper. Their statement that the investment of funds in Government bonds is not procreative in character is true but has nothing to do with the asset value of the bonds in the pension reserve. Their value, like that of all Government issues, is assured by the power of the issuer to assess all the trade and industry of the country (including the procreative investments of the life companies and others) for whatever it takes to pay the issuer's obligations. The issuer, of course, will do that, without regard for their ownership in or outside of the reserve fund.

There is much that is open to criticism in OASI and the changes therein proposed by pending bills. But it is impossible to assert rationally that part of the national debt is rubbish and the rest is prime investment.

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me over Pennsylvania radio stations on the week end of March 17 to 19, inclusive. This is No. 22 in a biweekly series of broadcasts.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF MARCH 17–19, INCLUSIVE

(No. 22 in biweekly series)

Thoughts of springtime usually bring to mind things that carry us out of doors—perhaps working around the yard, or making plans for long drives on Sundays, or any of a great many other pleasant activities. The world in springtime is commonly regarded as a pretty nice place—and where most people have spring fever most of the time.

That's the picture, at least, that our poets and song writers and story tellers usually paint for us. But when our spring fever isn't too bad most of us realize that we have just about as many serious things to do this time of year as any other. There's still a living to be earned. There's still a family to be fed.

And for the housewife, in addition to her regular duties, there's generally the semi-annual job of turning the house upside down to air it and get things back in order.

Springtime often brings with it as well the first distant rumbles of the coming election campaigns. Now, perhaps, it's because of spring fever—or something—but for some reason not many people seem to hear these early political murmurs, and in all frankness this does bother me.

I'm bothered about this because, under our representative, democratic form of government, these beginning political activities are perhaps the most important of all in determining the kind of people we ultimately get to represent us in every level of government.

I'm speaking here of the events leading up to the primary elections where the voters of each party go to the polls to select—from a list of candidates—the particular candidate whose name will appear on the party ballot for each office at the time of the general elections in November. And I think it goes without saying that the interests of good government demand that each party have the best possible candidates on its slate.

Now, it may surprise some of you, but as a matter of fact, the primary election is something that wasn't even contemplated by our founding fathers when they drew up our Constitution, and for the first 60 or 70 years that the American Republic existed we got along on a single general election in any particular campaign.

About a hundred years ago machine politics developed to the point that the average voter was being pretty badly abused. It happened in this way: As you know, we've always had basically a two-party system in this country, but by the 1850's political machines in many parts of the country were so completely in control of both parties that voters on election day frequently found themselves confronted with no real choice between the candidates of the two parties. All too often the candidates on both tickets were merely corrupt and incompetent tools of the respective political organizations.

This is why the primary was born. It was felt that the voters rightfully had something to say about the selection of the candidates themselves on each party slate, thereby making it possible to overthrow the political hacks and putting in their places party candidates of integrity and ability. Pennsylvania was among the earliest States to adopt a primary election law.

Now, the way the primary worked was this: Any person who wished to be considered as a candidate on a particular ticket could get his name on the primary ballot as a Democrat or a Republican by having a group of eligible voters sign a nominating petition on his behalf, and usually it was necessary to post a nominal fee at the time the petition was filed.

The purpose of the nominating petitions was primarily to keep the ballots from becoming overburdened with a hopeless number of names of people who stood no chance of capturing a significant portion of the vote, and thus, by requiring a reasonable number of signatures on the nominating petitions, those who were without any support were discouraged from seeking the party nomination.

The earliest primary laws—for all their good intentions—had some pretty serious faults that weren't contemplated by those who proposed them. I won't go into these troubles in any detail except to explain briefly how it came about that you now must register as a Democrat in order to vote in a Democratic primary, and as a Republican to be entitled to participate in a Republican primary. There were no such requirements in the first primary laws.

Thus, it frequently happened that one party would raid the primary of the opposition party by turning out its organization to vote for the weakest candidate on the opposing primary ballot. These raids by one party upon the other usually resulted in an easy victory for the raiding party because such a weak opponent had been selected for the opponent's slate. It was to do away with party raiding that the primary laws were later changed to limit participation in primaries to voters who were registered as members of a particular party.

So much for history.

Primary elections will be held in Pennsylvania this year on May 16. At this time registered Republican voters will determine their choice of candidates for some two-hundred and seventy-odd State and Federal elective offices, and so will the registered Democrats. It is frequently true that there are instances on party primary ballots where, for a given office, a particular candidate may be without opposition. This was so in my own case in 1944 when I was unopposed in the Democratic primary as the candidate for the United States Senate.

I wish to make it clear, however, that the mere fact that one or more candidates on a primary ballot are unopposed in no way lessens the need to have registered voters of each political party participate in the primary elections to select the slate. There will be on the Republican and Democratic ballots alike this year office after office for which there will be strongly competing candidates, and, as I've said, it is certainly necessary in the interest of good government for the voters of each party to exercise the greatest care in the selection of the candidates they wish to represent them on their party's ballot.

I want to list for you—in outline form, at least—the various elective offices for which the people of Pennsylvania will select party candidates in the May 16 primaries. It will be necessary to select a party candidate for United States Senator, for 33 United States Congressional Representatives, for governor, lieutenant governor, State secretary of internal affairs, judges of the supreme and superior courts of Pennsylvania, 25 State senators, and 208 State representatives for the State general assembly. These, as I say, are for State and Federal elective offices only. In addition to this, selection of candidates must be made by both parties for various county and local political committees which must be filled in the coming fall elections.

Now, actually, the task of any particular voter isn't as complicated as I have made it appear. A primary voter doesn't select all 33 candidates for the United States House of Representatives; instead, he selects only the candidate from the congressional district in which he votes. This is also true insofar as the selection of the 25 State senators and the 208 State representatives, where, again, the individual voter selects only one candidate each for his particular district for the offices of State senator and State representative.

On the other hand, everyone who votes in the Republican or Democratic primary elections on May 16 will have to decide upon his choice of the party candidate for United States Senator, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of internal affairs, and the judges for the supreme and superior courts of Pennsylvania.

It is not yet clear how many candidates will be listed on each party ballot for these various offices in the coming primary, because it will be possible to file nominating petitions until March 27.

There is the background of the coming primary elections. Now I have a question for you to ask yourself. Are you registered to vote in the May 16 primaries?

If you aren't registered at all, here are the qualifications you must meet: You must be over 21 years of age by the day following the election in which you wish to vote. You must have been a United States citizen for at least 1 month. You must have resided in Pennsylvania for at least a year preceding the election—unless, of course, you previously resided in Pennsylvania for more than a year, then moved away and came back—and if this is the case, you must have resided in Pennsylvania for at least 6 months prior to the election after reestablishing your residence here. In addition, you must have resided in the precinct or election district in which you intend to vote for at least 2 months prior to the election. Finally—and this is essential if you haven't already registered to vote—you must register by March 25 if you otherwise meet the qualifications and intend to vote in the May 16 primaries.

Now, I am sure most of you are familiar with the fact that our voting registration in Pennsylvania is permanent—but in order to stay permanently registered, you must have voted at least once during the 2-year period preceding an election. So if you haven't voted in the past 2 years—even though you have been registered previously, you will have to register again in order to vote in the May 16 primary or in the general election next November 7.

Of course, if you're registered as a nonpartisan voter, you aren't entitled to vote in the party primary elections—and thus your participation is limited to the November general elections.

I do want to suggest to you, however, that you can change your registration if you haven't already changed your registration since the last general election. Thus, if you've previously registered as nonpartisan, you still have time to change over to a partisan registration and vote in the coming primaries. If you live in one of our cities of the first class, you have until March 25 to change your registration—or you have until March 27 if you live elsewhere than in a city of the first class.

Of course, as all of you know, your party registration—while it does affect the way you can participate in a primary—has no effect when you vote in the November general elections. Thus, a nonpartisan voter may cast his ballot in favor of either party, and a partisan voter may, if he wishes, cast his vote for candidates of the other party in the general election itself—though he is not eligible to do so in the primary.

I wish to say a bit now about the voting turn-out in Pennsylvania in recent years. The first great truth is the fact that people tend to neglect the primary elections pretty badly—there being a far smaller primary turn-out than occurs in the general elections. And this is especially true in the primaries for local candidates. Let me illustrate this by pointing out that less than one-third of the registered voters participated in Pennsylvania primaries in 1946—whereas two-thirds of the registered voters participated in the general elections * * * or in other words, twice as many voters turned out for the general elections in that year than voted in the primaries.

Another great truth is the fact that a far larger percentage of the registered voting population participates in presidential years than turn out in the off-year elections when the voting is for congressional and State offices. As I've already said, two-thirds of the registered voters engaged in the 1946 off-year elections, as compared to almost four-fifths of the registered voters who showed up for the presidential election of 1948.

There is one further truth to be found in the fact that not nearly all of our people eligible to vote are actually registered to

do so. For example, in 1948 there were over 7,000,000 Pennsylvanians old enough to vote—though it is true that some of these seven million were not yet American citizens, or were otherwise disqualified because they had not resided in Pennsylvania a sufficient length of time. The important point is, however, that only 4,750,000 Pennsylvanians out of that seven million were registered to vote in 1948.

Good government is everybody's business—and the extent to which our Government is good or bad reflects directly the degree to which our people show an interest in it, inform themselves on issues and candidates, and when the chips go down, engage in that most important duty of citizenship—the privilege of voting.

I am, indeed, gratified that voting registration in Pennsylvania increased by almost 200,000 in 1949 over the previous year. I believe this is a very healthy sign, and I want to encourage this sort of thing in every way.

So if you're not registered to vote—but otherwise eligible to do so, I can't urge you too strongly to get your name on the voting register by March 25 to participate in the May 16 primaries—or by September 16 to vote in the general election November 7.

Salary and Privileges of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been in progress a deliberate effort on the part of the Republican Party to set itself up as the great champion of economy and to portray the Democrats in the contrasting light of extravagance.

In line with this political-campaign propaganda, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] recently presented a survey, carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, under the title "Salary and Privileges of the President."

He began this presentation with the remark:

> Mr. Speaker, a survey into the resources and privileges of President Truman discloses that in addition to being one of the best, if not the best-paid man in the world today, he also enjoys services undreamed of by his predecessors.

And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] concluded with this statement:

> Mr. Speaker, everyone should agree that economy in every walk of life is a most admirable thing. In these days of wild-eyed and reckless public spending for almost every conceivable thing, good or bad, it is my opinion that those in high office should be the first to set an example for the people throughout the country. The above facts disclose beyond peradventure that economy has become a lost art in the highest office of the land.

Then the gentleman from Michigan proceeded to add all of the expenses of the President, as head of the State, into what the Congressman was pleased to call the President's real salary.

Such items as the cost of carrying on the State functions of the office of the President were included, the cost of Secret Service protection, the cost of maintaining and building destroyers and plane and such like items.

The tortuous statistical method used to gain the distinguished Representative's point is like adding the pro rata cost of operating the Congress onto his own salary to indicate that the real salary of the Congressman from Michigan is not $12,500 plus a tax-free expense allowance but in the nature of $100,000 or $150,000, per year.

For political purposes the distinguished Republican Member from Michigan has made his figures very plausible.

The Republicans in their self-appointed role of guardians of the public purse acted as prosecutor, judge, and jury of President Truman's expense account—and their verdict was "guilty."

But whom did they convict? Not President Truman; not the Democratic Party.

The ironic facts are that the legislation increasing the salary and the emoluments of the President was Republican in origin, was first studied and proposed in the Republican Eightieth Congress, and that an overwhelming majority of Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress voted for it.

Under the circumstances, therefore, our Republican colleagues will understand when I say that we, on this side of the aisle, in common with the public at large, regard to our colleague's fulminations on economy—at least in this instance, with a certain amount of skepticism. We can even go further and with complete safety in view of the facts of the case, and label this attack upon the President for what it really is: A completely unjustified and unwarranted political campaign libel based upon misrepresentation by omission.

In his statement—obligingly released to the press on the morning before its insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman from Michigan first of all omitted the fact that the subject was first brought under study in July 1947 by a subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

You will recall that at that time the Republicans were in the majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. You will recall also that Republican hopes were then high for the election of a Republican President the following year and, presumably, it was for the purpose of making the office of President more lucrative for the expected Republican incumbent rather than for President Truman.

At any rate, the result of the study by the Senate subcommittee on the whole subject of top-bracket salaries in the Government resulted in the introduction of a bill, S. 1537, by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, who was chairman of the subcommittee. This bill was reported favorably in the Senate on April 1, 1948, but title III, the portion dealing with top-bracket salaries, was subsequently stricken from the bill.

However, the report on S. 103, which did become law in this Congress—and of which our colleague now, a year later belatedly complains—adopted the Flanders subcommittee report in toto explaining that, with certain minor exceptions, "the bill, as reported, is identical with the bill recommended by the subcommittee." The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] did not tell you that—another grave omission of fact.

Neither did Mr. WOODRUFF recall to this House that former President Herbert Hoover—a former Republican President—testified before the subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress on December 14, 1948, in favor of increasing the allowances to the President.

At that time Mr. Hoover, who testified along with other members of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, of which he was chairman, said:

> I should think the American people would be perfectly willing, and perfectly willing and glad, to see the Government give board and lodging to the President. He does not get it now for he must pay his own board and that of numerous other people. He gets his lodging free, but even there he has to pay part of the upkeep cost. * * *
>
> He must receive a great many guests that he cannot charge to his allowance account, and so forth. We want the White House to be the leading and gracious home of the Nation. At least, I feel the American people would want that to be.

In his improper castigation of President Truman for accepting additional compensation which he himself did not seek but which was freely given by this Congress, the gentleman also omitted to remind you that this legislation was approved in the Senate January 13, 1949, by a vote of 66 to 9.

Almost three times as many Republicans voted for this measure as opposed it. The Republican vote was 26 ayes and 9 nays.

In the House this bill did not even come to a roll-call vote. It was passed January 17, 1949, under suspension of rules agreed to by voice vote of more than two-thirds of the membership.

In the face of such virtual unanimity on the part of this Congress in enacting a law giving the President the additional compensation he now receives, there seems to be no other explanation for the gentleman's recent diatribe on the subject than a desire to spread political propaganda.

Certainly the record of the House debate on the legislation at the time of its passage fails to disclose that the gentleman had any interest in the matter at all then. He did not even comment. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is bare of any utterance from him.

And finally, what other purpose than partisan politics could such a statement by the gentleman from Michigan serve? He does not ask that the Congress reverse its action. He does not propose reduction of the President's compensation to its former figure. He has not introduced any legislation to change the situation of which he complains.

I believe the public will rightfully mark down his present agitation of the subject—and similar transparent protestations to be expected the closer we get to election day—for what it is, pure a campaign utterance, completely unsupported by the facts.

Loyalty in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the editor of the New York Times, published in the March 27 issue of that newspaper. Written by Henry L. Stimson, who has served his country both as Secretary of State and Secretary of War, this letter reaches to the heart of the current so-called loyalty investigation in the Senate and presents a very clear exposition of the dangers involved by unfounded accusations against those in public service, both to the persons who are unjustly accused and besmirched and to the Nation as a whole because our foreign policy is dangerously impeded.

I congratulate Mr. Stimson on his masterful presentation of this difficult subject and present his letter in full for the benefit of those of my colleagues who may not have read it. I wish to add that I fully subscribe to the contents of the letter, which is entitled "Loyalty in Washington":

LOYALTY IN WASHINGTON—METHODS AND MOTIVES OF ATTACK ON STATE DEPARTMENT QUESTIONED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The present charges against the Department of State have not in my view deserved much attention. But the very widespread notice they have received prompts me to make certain comments.

First, this is most emphatically not the proper way in which to insure loyalty of Government employees. If that had been the real purpose of the accuser, he would have used the fully developed and tested procedure of the executive branch of the Government, under which charges are investigated and weighed by men of both parties and unimpeachable integrity. Any constructive result which may eventuate from the present charges would have been achieved far more surely and effectively by use of the existing procedures. The fact that the accuser has wholly ignored this well-established method indicates that his interest is of a different character.

Second, no matter what else may occur, the present charges have already spattered mud upon individuals of the highest integrity, and in the present state of the world the denial cannot always overtake the accusation. It should by now be wholly clear that indiscriminate accusations of this sort are doubly offensive; they damage the innocent, and they help protect the guilty. For if the accuser is so stupid as to connect a man like Ambassador Jessup with communism, are not all such accusations made suspect?

REACTION ABROAD

Third, and more important by far, the method of the present charges directly and dangerously impedes the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Government. It creates abroad a feeling that we are frightened and suspicious of each other; it diverts our attention, at home, from the genuine and pressing problems of our foreign affairs; it requires of many high officials that they desert their proper duties in order to prepare and deliver such extensive replies as that of Mr. Jessup. Not one of these effects would have resulted from a disinterested study of the loyalty of any suspected State Department employees; each of them is the direct result of the manner in which these charges have been made.

Fourth, it seems to me quite clear that the real motive of the accuser in this case is to cast discredit upon the Secretary of State of the United States. This man is not trying to get rid of known Communists in the State Department; he is hoping against hope that he will find some. Fortunately, the Secretary of State needs no defense from me. No one who knows his extraordinary record of able and disinterested public service can believe that he is in any danger from these little men. It is already obvious that in any test of personal confidence the men of honor, in both parties, will choose to stand with the Secretary.

But there is more at stake in this matter than the rise or fall of individuals. What is at stake is the effective conduct of our foreign policy.

RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

Every Secretary of State, second only to his President, and alone among appointive officers of the Government, stands before the world as the representative of the United States of America. No man who holds this office can fail to feel the extraordinary responsibility he carries for service to the country and its peace. No man has a greater right to ask the sympathetic support and the cooperation of his fellow citizens, and none is more properly exempt from the ordinary trials of politics. The man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country.

The American Government, led by the President and the Secretary of State, is currently engaged in a major effort to give leadership to the country in a time of changing international conditions and grave world tension. This effort will require as part of our democratic process widespread and earnest public consideration of the great problems now before us, so that the ultimate decision will surely reflect the basic steadiness and faith of our people. In such public consideration there is always room for honest differences, but now, as for many years past, the formulation of foreign policy most urgently demands an adjournment of mere partisanship.

This is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks. This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

HUNTINGTON, LONG ISLAND, *March 24, 1950.*

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, Before Philadelphia Federation of Greek-American Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me before the Philadelphia Federation of Greek-American Societies, in Philadelphia, March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are few American schoolboys who cannot tell you that the origins of the democracy under which we live are found in the ancient city states that flourished in Greece more than two millenniums ago. And the schoolboy can tell you too that the democratic institutions of the western world also trace their beginnings to the great days in the Golden Age of Greece.

I don't think, however, that this debt owed by the American Republic to those democratic beginnings so long ago completely explains the close bonds of friendship which have united the Greek and American people in modern times. Let us look for a moment, for example, at the struggles of a valiant Greek people about a century and a quarter ago to achieve national independence. In that era the young American Republic which had achieved its own freedom only a few years before, heeded the calls for help of the Greek people in their efforts to throw off the shackles imposed by the Ottoman Empire. Famous names in American history are found on the honor roll of those who made American aid possible. Thus we find on that roll such men as President Monroe, Daniel Webster, Henry Clark, Samuel Gridley Howe, and others, who bent their energies to aid the Greek people in giving a real meaning to the national independence they had declared in 1821.

The friendship between our peoples has been a deep and enduring one.

World War II brought home more keenly than ever the realization that freedom is everybody's business. Every American, aware of the bestial treatment visited upon so many of the Greek people by the Nazis during the long years of German occupation, could not help thinking that "there but for the grace of God are my family and my children." This thought explains in part—though there are many other reasons as well—why the American people have insisted that others the world over have the right to live in freedom under a government of their own choosing which safeguards their liberty and guarantees their opportunities for a secure future.

Europe emerged from World War II terribly shattered, terribly tired, and terribly hungry. The defeat of the Nazi and Fascist dictatorships was a great sign of hope for the future that democracy could be kept alive and permitted to flourish. But there were other forces at work amid this chaos.

Despite the fact that three-fifths of the prewar industry in Greece failed to survive the war, and despite the fact that her agricultural resources were then hopelessly inadequate to feed her people, there were nonetheless two free elections held in Greece during 1946. In the spring of that year, representatives to the Greek Parliament were selected in democratic general elections. Later, in September of the same year, once more in a free election, a majority of the Greek people chose to reestablish their monarchy. That was where the trouble started.

The Communist threats to Greece were part of a huge world-wide strategy to dominate the planet. The events which characterized the year or two immediately following the end of World War II furnish us with abundant evidence as to Communist designs for control of the world. Elsewhere in Europe in that period, the economic outlook for most of the people was just about as grim as that which confronted the people of Greece. The Russians, of course, had made pledges regarding Poland and the other independent states of eastern Europe, in which they agreed to cooperate in permitting the people to choose their governments through democratic elections. One by one, these pledges were broken. By 1946 the iron

curtain was a reality. Government after government behind the curtain tumbled into the Soviet orbit.

The people of Greece at least did not have to contend with the presence of a Red army which had refused to go home, and in this respect their situation differed from that faced by the people of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of Hungary, of Bulgaria, Rumania, and others behind the curtain. As a result, the Communist efforts to dominate Greece appeared in the form of an effort to stir up a civil war. Guerrilla forces, fed and armed by supplies which flowed across the borders from countries securely within Communist control, roamed at large through the mountain fastness of Greece, descending upon village after village to plunder and destroy them and ultimately to overthrow the Government chosen by a majority of the Greek people.

Turkey too was feeling the heat of Russian demands and was militarily unprepared to withstand any serious threat to its independence.

The democracies of the west used every possible means available in the United Nations to hold the Communists to their pledges, but they were inevitably confronted by a veto on the Security Council or by the walkout of Communist representatives in the UN General Assembly. By early 1947 it became clear that the Communist tactics would pay off in terms of selling out the free governments of Greece and Turkey unless someone acted, and acted at once. America's answer to this challenge was the Truman doctrine.

The Truman doctrine was a bold step, but judging it now in the light of hindsight, it is all the more remarkable that such a step was conceived and taken. Under that program, $300,000,000 was earmarked for immediate assistance to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. The bold step was a tremendous success.

In September of 1949, the Government of Greece was able to announce that the last guerrilla warfare had been stamped out. It was able to announce that civil order had once more been restored, that the guerrillas had either surrendered or fled from the country.

Then only a few short weeks ago, free elections were once more held in Greece. From the election returns we can draw one conclusive observation. The Communists have lost their political significance in Greece.

I do not pretend for a moment, however, that the troubles of the Greek people have all been solved. The people there are eating now, though to be sure, their diet is not one of abundance. There is enough food to go around, and enough to keep the people healthy and give them energy to carry out the big job which lies ahead of them. Agricultural production is larger than it was before the war, and industrial production has more than doubled in the past 4 years. This has not been enough to put the country on a self-sustaining basis. The progress that we have seen has resulted largely from the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, and of course, the hard work and ready cooperation of the Greek people themselves to improve their lot and bring to them the full measure of greatness which they so richly deserve.

In all likelihood that day is some time away. I am confident that the goal will be achieved under a free and democratic Greek Government. I say this because I know how sincerely the Greek people seek this goal, and I know, too, that America will do everything in her power, just as it has done in the past, to assist them.

The answer ultimately will lie, of course, in a greatly expanded industrial capacity for Greece, and in the achievement of a unified economy among the democratic nations of Europe.

The Marshall plan, as all of you know, has done a great deal to bring about economic recovery in Europe. The success obtained by the Marshall plan to date is almost miraculous when you consider that it has been in operation less than 2 years. In that brief time, representatives of the free, democratic nations of Europe have found an opportunity to sit down together and map out long-range plans for creating a balanced economy among the nations participating in the Marshall plan program.

This economic unification of the democracies is, of course, nowhere near complete. Mr. Paul Hoffman estimates that three billion American dollars are absolutely necessary this coming year to assure the ultimate success of the recovery program. That is a tremendous amount of money, and Mr. Hoffman is certainly the first one to appreciate that fact. However, I am in complete agreement with him that a cut made in the Marshall plan program at this time would cause a serious setback in the recovery efforts, and might very well hurl us back to the critical days of 3 years ago when we were faced with the alarming prospect that the Communists might control all of the continent of Europe, simply as a result of economic collapse in the democracies. The Marshall plan is our investment in a free world at peace, and quite apart from the horrors of another war, we have been assured by all our military advisers that we would be spending $30,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000 annually for our national defense alone at this time if the Communists were in control of Europe and its productive capacity.

As I have indicated, the Marshall plan plays a key role in our efforts to achieve world peace. But we cannot confine our efforts to that program alone. I am hopeful that within the next 10 days or so the Senate will complete its action on the long overdue changes in our displaced persons law. Every delaying tactic in the book has been used up to now by the handful of Senators who have for one reason or another, objected to passage of a decent DP law. I am satisfied now, however, that we are on the last lap, and that the Senate will pass a new law which will offer some genuine relief to almost 150,000 victims of political oppression brought about largely as a consequence of World War II. I might add the thought here that the pending provisions in the Senate open the doors of America to 10,000 Greek refugees who, up to the present time, have had no opportunity to take advantage of the displaced persons program.

I would not feel that my remarks to you this evening would be complete without some reference to the thousands of Greek children who were abducted during the guerrilla warfare, and who are still being held captive in the Communist-controlled countries north of the Greek border. This cruel and inhumane kidnapping has received the condemnation of every free nation in the world. The agencies of the United Nations are continuing to bring pressure on the nations now holding these children. President Truman and many Members of the Congress have been in close contact with His Grace, Michael, Orthodox Archbishop of North and South America, and we have followed closely every development thus far. I am sure most of you are familiar with the fact that a strongly worded resolution of protest against these abductions was passed by the House of Representatives last Wednesday, and a similar resolution is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I give you my full assurance that I shall support the resolution when it is brought before us for a vote, and that I shall continue my own efforts to make certain that these children are returned to their families and friends in their native land.

I have attempted to summarize, briefly, it's true, some of the more significant landmarks in recent history. My emphasis, as you can certainly understand, has served to highlight those aspects of American foreign policy which reflect the deep friendship between the American people and the people of Greece. I feel, however, that all of you can appreciate the international overtones of these acts of friendship. I am certain that you appreciate—and I'm certain that the American people as a whole appreciate—that the cold war is world-wide in its scope. The Communist aims at world domination present themselves to us along a whole, broad front of our foreign policy. It is quite apparent, I think, that the Communists will use every effort to create division and disagreement among the democratic nations, and to stir up difficulty in the internal affairs of the democracies.

I am absolutely convinced that America is now winning the cold war. Such programs as the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact and military assistance program, have served as an affirmative attack on Soviet schemes to catch us off guard. Successful as we have been to date, it is nonetheless apparent that we cannot relax our vigilance for a moment. We must move confidently ahead by projecting our existing programs to meet new situations as they arise, and we must adopt such proposals as the point 4 program recommended last year by President Truman as a means of assisting economically backward countries in lifting their living standards and strengthening themselves against the threat of communism.

As I say, our stakes in the future are tremendous. If we are to give a real meaning to our great dream of peace on earth under democratic forms of government, we will have to make use of every bit of intelligence we can muster. We will have to judge our moves rationally, thoroughly, and in an atmosphere of clear-headed cooperation. We can destroy our chances for achieving peace if we permit our foreign policy to become embroiled in cheap and petty political partisanship. We can also destroy our hopes for the future if we lose confidence in ourselves and in our ability to handle this admittedly difficult world situation.

As an American I am proud that our postwar foreign policy has been conducted on a high plane, and that it has enjoyed the overwhelming support of our people. We have not been stampeded by fear, and we have met our responsibilities of world leadership headon and realistically. So long as we continue to do so, and I am sure we will continue to do so, I have no fear for our future. A world at peace, a world in which the full dignity of every man is recognized through the existence of democratic forms of government, is our goal. We have made real progress toward this, and I, for one, am sure that we possess both the ability and the will to succeed.

Dependence and Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Dependence and Independence" from the March 18, 1950, issue of the Oelwein Daily Register. This thought-provoking and timely article was written by my

good friend and constituent, Mr. O. P. Larson, Oelwein, Iowa, and appeared first in a recent issue of the Construction Bulletin:

DEPENDENCE AND INDEPENDENCE

There are two words in our English language of particular and peculiar importance at the present time. Perhaps they are of greater importance right now than at any other time in our history.

The two words are dependence, which Webster defines as "a state of being subject to direction or disposal of others. Inability to provide for one's self. Reduced to a servile state"; and the other word is independence, which is defined thus, "Freedom from the control of others. Direction of one's own affairs without interference."

Obviously they are exact opposites in their meaning and equally obvious is the fact that one cannot have both.

Our great war for freedom in 1776 has been called the war of independence and our great national holiday on July 4 is designated as Independence Day all over the land.

To be independent of others, to be free from their control, to be able to operate without interference, to shake off the yoke of servility to an oppressive king were the reasons for that great struggle.

Now are we a people clamoring for dependence? Do we wish to exchange the freedom for the bondage, the dependence on government for all of our securities and our daily lives?

Yet, there is no choice. We must be one or the other, for Government control of prices, labor, agriculture, old-age pensions, medicine, and such will permit no other course. The loss of independence is the price of these things. And, whether they will admit it or not, the loss of independence and the right to independent action has been and is the price which the rank and file of union members have paid for their leadership.

The state of dependence is the goal of every type of dictatorship too. The pattern of their development has always followed the submission of the people to their plans. To steal away their independence of thought and action by assuming their normal responsibilities and developing a servility born of dependence is the first step.

The thinking person knows how impossible it is for the Government to guarantee the responsibilities of the individual, to assume his task of providing for his own welfare, to maintain prices of commodities and labor and other paternalistic provisions without complete control of the individual. But there are too many who dream and do not think.

Will we awaken too late to these things? Will the moral fiber of the rank and file of our citizens be too far weakened before the end is discernible to revolt against this trend in Government? Is it already too late? Those are serious questions—infinitely serious questions. They involve the present as much as the future. They also involve every principle of our treasured independence.

For 16 long years the people of this Nation have been fed a diet of fabulous promises. Promises upon promises. Bigger promises to hide the ones impossible to fulfill. And they are still being fed the same pap of impossible attainments. Attainments impossible so long as there is a shred of independence left in the land.

The wicked wax fat on their promises even as they did in Biblical times, but let us hope that the divinity that shapes our ends will assert itself in our God-given intelligence and we of this Nation assert our righful heritage and return to man's rightful character of independence and self-provision, for the Maker designed it so.

Deficit Spending a Threat to American Freedom, a Comfort to Collectivism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented to the New England congressional delegation by the Smaller Business Association of New England on March 27, 1950, at Washington, D. C., by John H. Campbell:

DEFICIT SPENDING—A THREAT TO AMERICAN FREEDOM—COMFORT TO COLLECTIVISM

"Democracy and freedom here and throughout the world depend upon the preservation of our solvency which is being jeopardized by growing debt and chronic deficits," from a statement by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, dated February 22, 1950. This is not the alarmist cackling of an uninformed crank, it is the considered statement of your colleague, a member of the important Senate Finance and Armed Services Committees, and chairman of the Joint Committees on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The SBANE has had for several years as one of its major planks the urging of a reduction in Federal expenditures. In our daily tasks of providing tools to employ nearly half of our national army of workers, we have to face economic facts. We direct the creation of that wealth from which taxes may be collected. But we must operate with a credit balance in the bank. If we have a bad year, we know that redoubled efforts must be exerted the next year or we will be forced out of business. And so it is with genuine alarm that we observe our National Government has been in the red since 1930, excepting for 1947–48. President Roosevelt used to tell us that we would balance the budget when we got out of the depression and President Truman tells us we'll do it when prosperity is greater.

We are alarmed that economic theorists are replacing recognized economic leaders in advising the President. We are alarmed by contradictory positions taken by the President on tax matters during the past 5 years. We are alarmed when the President says a reduction in Federal expenditures cannot be made, whereas only 2 years ago in 1948 the Government operated successfully on $8,200,000,000 less than he asks you Members of Congress to authorize for 1951.

We are alarmed when Government propaganda implies the blame for this increase is due to wars and foreign aid, when actually $5,300,000,000 is an increase in domestic civilian projects, exclusive of interest and defense and veterans' aid.

We are alarmed when Congress after having unanimously authorized the study of the reorganization of the executive department, fails to pass on the vital parts of the Hoover report. This report, completely nonpartisan, acclaimed as an outstanding public service by hundreds of outstanding citizens, is being made a political football. We realize it is not easy for you Members of Congress to vote changes that will disrupt the even tenor of bureaucratic existences. It is, however, just as patriotic a necessity as it was for millions of our young men and women to disrupt the even tenor of their lives in World Wars I and II.

In closing we are mindful that we were requested last year to be specific in our recommendations. To that end we are attaching to this statement a copy of Senator BYRD's $36,000,000,000 budget taken from his statement of February 22, 1950, and urge its adoption. Incidentally, we urge that this entire statement entitled "A Reply to Mr. Truman" be reexamined by each of you. It is startling to note that if this $36,000,000,000 budget be passed instead of the $42,400,000,000 asked by the President, the estimated savings to the taxpayers of Massachusetts would practically equal the total State budget for 1949. We also urge the prompt adoption of the report of the Hoover Committee on the Reorganization of the Executive Department. This is urged in order that the citizens of the United States receive the improved services possible under the reorganization plan. This promises both better service and reduced costs.

The hosts of collectivism are eager for a bankrupt America. Our personal freedom will then be in peril. A national debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars, and local, State, and Federal taxes that take nearly one-third of our national income, are warning signs. Heed them.

Finally we extend to you, our Representatives in Congress, the pledge to render every assistance in our power as citizens. It will not be an easy task to reduce Federal spending with the active opposition of the President. The fate of the Nation is as truly in your hands today as it was in the hands of the military during the war. Unfortunately we have glamorized wartime heroism almost to the exclusion of heroism in the line of peacetime duty. You have the opportunity and power to perform heroic service. May God give you strength to serve your country well in an hour of need.

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress, in tabular form, with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (will end next June 30), estimated [1]	Fiscal year 1951 (begins next July 1)	
			Byrd 36 "billion" dollar budget	President's Jan. 9 proposals
I. Domestic-civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	6.9	11.4	8.9	12.2
Social welfare, health, and security	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.7	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.1	1.8	1.2	2.2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.2	.1	.2
Labor	.2	.2	.2	.2
General government	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3
II. National defense	11.0	13.1	11.3	13.5
III. Veterans	6.6	6.9	5.3	6.1
IV. Foreign	4.8	6.0	4.8	4.7
V. Interest on Federal debt	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.6
Total expenditure budget [2]	34.2	43.3	36.0	42.4
Revenue [2]	[3] 42.2	[4] 37.5	[4] 37.5	[4] 37.5
Deficit/Surplus [2]	+8.0	[5] −5.5	[4] +2.0	[5] −5.1

[1] Jan. 9, 1950, revision.
[2] Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.
[3] Actual.
[4] Maximum estimate.
[5] Minimum estimate.

Washington News Letter From Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two news letters by me to the people of Pennsylvania, the first dated March 9, 1950, the second March 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARCH 9, 1950.

A $28,600,000 water bill for Pennsylvania in 1951 is pending in the Appropriations Committees of Congress. You pay a different kind of water bill at home monthly, but these Federal funds for water management by Army engineers are just as important to you.

Flood-control projects save lives and cut down on millions lost annually through property damage, disaster relief, and reduced incomes in flooded areas. Flood control starts on the land itself by planting cover crops and developing forests that absorb water and retard run-off. Dikes and levees keep streams within their banks and prevent overflow. And huge storage reservoirs like Conemaugh Dam near Pittsburgh hold back winter water surpluses and drain them off gradually in the drier summer months.

River-channel improvements permit shipments of vast tonnages of steel, coal, petroleum, and others along rivers like the Ohio and Delaware.

Harbor developments keep open the Port of Philadelphia and our other vital gateways to world trade.

We're flood conscious in Pennsylvania. The terrain of our State is a flood maker, and with our high rainfall, downpours often add their burden to melting snows, causing flood damage to our communities.

Every section of Pennsylvania will be affected by the proposed Federal appropriations.

Planning funds: $285,000 to draw up flood-control specifications for reservoirs at Prompton, Bear Creek, along the Allegheny, the Shanango, and at Uniontown, Johnsonburg, Swoyersville, and Forty Fort.

Flood-control construction: $13,490,100 for work at Monemaugh, Sunbury, Clarion, York, and Williamsport.

Flood-control maintenance: $294,500 to maintain and operate existing projects at Johnstown, Punxsutawney, Tionesta, Crooked Creek, Loyalhanna, York, Youghiogheny River Reservoir, and the Mahoning Creek Reservoir.

Construction on rivers: $4,530,250 for locks and dams on the Ohio and Monongahela. And $4,000,000 is proposed for Federal clean-up of the grimy Schuylkill between Norristown and Philadelphia. Government work is possible now that the State has reached the half-way point on this $52,000,000 Federal-State program for culm removal from the Schuylkill, a program made possible by the 1946 act of Congress which I sponsored.

River and harbor maintenance: $6,013,000 to dredge and maintain channels of the Monongahela, the Allegheny, the Youghiogheny, and the Delaware—and for work on the harbor at Erie and in the Port of Philadelphia.

Federal water bills are big. Congress balances carefully the individual need and merit of each project against our limited ability to pay for it. No projects can be approved unless the benefits achieved will be greater in value than the construction costs.

From idea stage to completed project, every step requires one or more separate laws. Thus Congress must satisfy itself over and over again in approving the various steps. So bear in mind that each stage indicated below calls for one or more new acts of Congress:

Authorization for initial study to determine benefits and costs.

Appropriation of funds for the study.

Authorization of funds for construction when benefits exceed costs.

Appropriation of planning funds.

Appropriation of construction funds on a yearly basis (so each year the work is reviewed before new funds are allowed).

These safeguards against waste explain why necessary projects often take 10 years to complete. But it is foolhardy to drag out the work too long. Water-control projects do little good until completed—so during construction benefits are few. And construction cost generally rise when a job is tackled piecemeal. Thus, across-the-board reductions in funds delay all projects indiscriminately—and are poor economy in the long run.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER — A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARCH 23, 1950.

More Government efficiency is on the way. President Truman sent 21 new reorganization plans to Congress March 13, 1950, to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations by clarifying chain of command—tying responsibility down to a single person for doing a given job by holding one individual accountable and giving him the proper authority to do his work (the Commission cited many instances in which it was impossible to determine who was responsible for what simply because of overlapping authority and conflicting jurisdictions); putting related jobs under the same roof—wiping out the inefficiency of having numerous "independent" agencies hacking at a small part of a big job.

Twenty percent of the Commission recommendations were put in effect in 1949. An estimated $1,250,000,000 will be saved annually by the 1949 changes. Major reorganization plans went through last year for the State and Defense Departments, and General Services Administration was formed to handle Government "housekeeping" affairs. Some changes were also made in the Departments of Commerce, Post Office, Labor, and in the Executive Office of the President.

The 21 new plans will take us almost to the halfway point on the job of reorganizing the executive branch along lines recommended by the Commission report.

Plans 1 through 6 clarify the chain of command for the Secretaries of Labor, Treasury, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce. Similar changes were made last year in the State and Post Office Departments. These plans also propose to create Administrative Assistant Secretaries to provide top-level assistance to each of the six Cabinet officers.

Plans 7 through 13 also affect chain of command by placing administrative responsibility and authority in the Board Chairmen of seven Federal regulatory agencies: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Power Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Federal Communications Commission. This will leave Commission and Board members free to handle rule-making and adjudicative duties without being bogged down with administrative details. Plan 12 also abolishes the statutory office of the NLRB General Counsel. A similar proposal was made in the Taft-Hartley Act amendments passed by the Senate June 30, 1949.

Plans 14 through 21 propose to bring related jobs under the same roof. Five plans deal with "housekeeping" by the new General Services Administration. Two plans transfer to the Labor Department certain wage-hour duties and unemployment-compensation matters presently handled by other agencies. And plan 21 takes a big step toward consolidating all Government transportation agencies by transferring the duties of the now-independent Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce and creates the new office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Opposition faces some of the 21 new plans. Recall that the least controversial changes were made last year—and at that Congress rejected one of the seven reorganization plans submitted by President Truman when it voted down the proposal to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Welfare as recommended by the Commission. Either the Senate or House may reject one or more of the new plans by voting against it prior to May 12, 1950—but plans not voted against by either House or Senate become effective on that date. No one can argue against efficiency in Government, but disagreement is expected to some phases of reorganization as to what is the most efficient course to follow.

Bipartisan efforts to carry out Government reorganization must continue. In addition to the 21 new plans, hearings are scheduled on all-important legislation to modernize the accounting and personnel practices of Government and on a bill to complete reorganization of the Post Office Department. I'm hopeful of early action on all these measures because efficiency in Government is above politics—and, as I've done since the Commission was first proposed 3 years ago, I intend to give my full support to this important work.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Let Us Have Peace in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the continued shipment of arms to the Arab States by Great Britain in excess of the armament actually necessary to maintain internal law and order within those states constitutes a serious threat to world peace in which the United States is vitally concerned.

Unless further shipments of arms to the Arab States are halted, there might conceivably be a break in the truce between Israel and the Arab States which could ignite the holocaust of a third world war, and immediate action to prevent such a catastrophe is imperative.

The embargo on the arms shipments to the Arab States was lifted by the Security Council of the United Nations in August of 1949.

In view of the threatening attitude of the Arab States at the present, in my opinion our State Department should immediately instruct our delegates to the Security Council of the United Nations to act to bring the issue of arms shipments by Great Britain to the Arab States up for reconsideration by the Council, and to make every effort to impose new controls on such shipments which would restrict them to armaments actually necessary for the maintenance of internal law and order.

Constituents in my district have written to me concerning this vital issue, and from Mr. Aaron Richie and Mr. Gustave L. Goldstein both letters are so similar I am submitting only one:

MARCH 10, 1950.

DEAR MR. MCDONOUGH: I am taking the liberty of writing to you today about two matters which are causing me grave concern and which have to do with the attitude of our Government toward the State of Israel.

The first concerns the continued shipment of arms by Great Britain to the various Arab States in the Middle East, and which was recently called to the Secretary of State's attention by Congressman JAVITS, of New York. Unfortunately, Mr. Acheson's reply that Britain is shipping arms to the Arab States in fulfillment of treaty obligations with the sole purpose of ensuring internal law and order, is wholly unsatisfactory and does not stand up against the real facts of the situation, well-authenticated reports indicate that the Arab States are accumulating heavy arms such as jet planes, submarines, tanks, and destroyers which far exceed those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal security.

The Jewish people of this country together with other large segments of the public, see in the rearming of the Arab States a threat to the work of reconstruction and rehabilitation now being carried out in Israel. It would involve the new State of Israel in an armament race which would divert manpower and capital into defense purposes and it constitutes a definite threat to the hard-won truce with the Arab States.

The second matter concerns the present discussions in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations regarding the internationalization of Jerusalem. A new scheme has been proposed by the Chairman of the Trusteeship Council, presented as a compromise but which retains all the objectionable features of the original plan adopted by the last General Assembly and strongly opposed by our own Government and also by both interested parties, namely, the State of Israel and the Kingdom of Jordan. It is of the utmost importance that our Government take the initiative to change the unfavorable climate prevailing in the Trusteeship Council so as to settle this problem of Jerusalem before it comes to the spring session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Because I know that you have always been willing to help in situations such as these, I urge you personally to intervene with the President and the Secretary of State in these two matters. Our Government should tell Great Britain to stop immediately these arms shipments to the Arab States which jeopardize the peace of the Middle East. We should use our influence in the United Nations to work for a just and equitable solution of the Jerusalem program and a reversal of the impractical decision of the last General Assembly.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

AARON RICHIE.

I have responded to these appeals by writing the following letter to President Truman and to Secretary of State Dean Acheson:

MARCH 13, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has been brought to my attention that the continued shipment of arms by Great Britain to the various Arab States in the Middle East in excess of the necessary armament for maintaining internal law and order constitutes a serious threat to world peace in which the United States is vitally concerned.

I, therefore, urge that you take whatever steps are necessary to protest this action by Great Britain which, if not halted, might conceivably result in a break in the truce between Israel and the Arab States.

It has also been brought to my attention that the compromise proposal of Monsieur Garreau, chairman of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, relative to the internationalization of Jerusalem actually retains all of the objectionable features of the original plan which was opposed by the representatives of the United States to the United Nations.

I, therefore, urge that our representatives to the United Nations be instructed to work for a just and equitable solution of the Jerusalem problem, and for the defeat of the Garreau proposal as well as a reversal of the impractical decision of the last General Assembly of the United Nations on this problem.

Very truly yours,

GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress.

It is my hope that the good offices of the President of the United States through the Secretary of State will be used to convince the Security Council of the United Nations that the potential danger of war in the Middle East may be the spark to set off world war III. The controversy over the administration of the holy places in Jerusalem should also be settled in a peaceful and conclusive manner.

Editorial Comment on Foreign-Policy Speech of Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 26 an editorial referring to the address on this floor of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] last week. It is an excellent editorial, and I think it would be of interest to those who read the RECORD to have it appear. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMING THE WORLD

It is high time the United States tried to capture leadership in the world of ideas in the manner Senator BENTON has suggested. The bolder foreign information effort he calls for, in a resolution introduced in company with ten other Senators, is affirmative action of the right sort. Reports from southeast Asia, one of the crucial areas, tell of the lag in knowledge of America and American aims. The riot in Saigon was a prime example of misunderstanding about American purposes. In this case, perhaps, the Voice of America cannot be blamed, for policy in Indochina still remains in semicloudland. It is basic that America be known as on the side of the hopes of the common people, not as the country whose arms are strewn all over the world.

India is another and even greater example of a land in darkness about America. Our editor, on his recent visit, noted three urgent requirements from America: more American library facilities, a steady stream of documentary films, competition with the British press ascendancy so that American news could have ready access to the Indian market. A tremendous need exists in a subcontinent which is in the throes of revolutionary change to show the people how America handled or is handling similar problems. Aside from being a vast country, India is one of many countries in the world which are in the grip of misconceptions about America produced by years and years of Communist propaganda. High and low the people speak the Muscovite patter about America. As an example, it took the representative of the Free Trade Union Committee of the AFL, Mr. Richard Deverall, about a year to live down the suspicion that he must be a Wall Street stooge. There are three excellent American libraries operated by American men and women with a sense of dedication, but they are simply scratching the surface, and the American investment is less than that of the British, let alone the Russian. Throughout the world the United States spends in total $34,000,000 in the information program, and this sum includes items that do not properly belong in that budget.

It is our experience in several other countries as well as India that the United States could profit from a thorough study of the methods pursued by other operators in this field of information. We can absorb a few lessons from the greatest propagandist in the world, viz, Russia. The Russians in this realm are supreme technicians. In India they keep in the background and work through such instrumentalities as Czech-Indian cultural institutions, the money seeming to come from the proceeds of Czech trade with India. The British Council, in its quiet and thorough way, provides splendid service in the field of education—night classes, library work—in such countries as Mexico and makes every penny count. Italians and French maintain institutes in far-away places which spread respect for the values of Latin civilization. All these operations, manned by intelligent and sympathetic persons, have provided true and rewarding mirrors of the sponsoring countries, and in the case of slave-ridden Russia even a vision of a fantastic workers' paradise. America, on the contrary, is seen in vast areas of this world through a glass very, very darkly as an ogre of a money-mad imperialist.

Senator BENTON would move ahead on many fronts—radio stations capable of reaching every receiver in the world; more aggressive efforts in the United Nations for freedom of information; support of the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; promotion of democratic education; a conference of non-Communist countries on information programs. We ourselves would pick out libraries and documentary films, a diplomatic crusade for freedom of the press, personal contact through American students and American teachers abroad, and radio stations—in that order. As to press freedom, it is our experience that the censor is beating out the newspaperman almost everywhere. Yet press freedom is a "value" the free world must treasure and must proselytize. Time was when Lord Hawksbury could write to

Bonaparte that "the King of England will make no concession to a foreign power at the expense of the liberty of the press" and when Alexander I could ask as soon as he arrived in Paris that the gags on press freedom should be removed. We applaud Senator BENTON for his initiative. Here is something affirmative, something truly fundamental.

Opposition of Labor to Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written for the Trainmen News by Alvaine Hamilton entitled "Labor Fights Bill To Boost Natural Gas Cost to Public."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR FIGHTS BILL TO BOOST NATURAL GAS COST TO PUBLIC

(By Alvaine Hamilton)

WASHINGTON.—A lot of Senators are watching their mail carefully these days, to see how to vote on the natural gas bill proposed by ROBERT KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma. This measure would increase the gas bills in every major city using natural gas to heat its homes and fuel its industries.

With the amount of natural gas used at least doubling between 1947 and 1952, and with expansion of the pipe lines carrying gas from the oil fields of Texas and six adjacent States going on apace, the issue of whether the Federal Government can regulate the rates charged by gas producers who don't own their own pipe lines is a crucial one.

A 5-cent increase in the price of natural gas, probable if Federal regulation is lifted by passage of the Kerr bill, could cost gas users in Ohio $11,441,000 a year; in Pennsylvania $8,556,250 a year; in Illinois $4,768,800 a year; and in Michigan $3,744,500.

This money would be paid by household users and industries in those States, and it would go to swell the coffers of a small group of powerful companies—Standard Oil, Phillips Petroleum, Skelly Oil, Continental, and Gulf—which made fabulous profits equal to about one-quarter of their assets in 1948 alone.

MAKE HUGE PROFITS

The 24 large producers whose gas sales would be subject to no Federal controls if the Kerr bill passes, are among the most spectacularly profitable outfits in the country. In 1948, they had total assets of $14,000,000,000, and income of $12,500,000,000. They now enjoy special Federal tax provisions which allow them to charge off to depletion each year 27½ percent of their income, a loophole which every recent President has asked Congress to plug, but which is still wide open. Treasury statistics show the big companies are escaping taxes on about half a billion dollars a year in profits from this provision alone.

The Kerr bill, already passed by the House, will be fought by a group of Senators including DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; HUMPHREY, Democrat-Farmer Labor, of Minnesota; GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa; AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont. It is expected to come to the floor soon.

The bill's supporters claim that, if passed, the bill will receive President Truman's signature. However, opponents point to the expression of disapproval of the original Kerr bill by the President's bureau of budget in hearings on the measure and claim that any changes since then have not changed its big steel character.

Federal controls over nontransmitting producers of this basic natural resource have been challenged on several occasions in the past. These efforts were largely unsuccessful because of the able battle by Leland Olds, then chairman of the Federal Power Commission, who saw how essential to consumers of gas was some effective regulation of rates in the public interest. It was this issue which led to the unsuccessful fight to secure his confirmation for another FPC term last summer.

Nothing but Federal controls on prices charged by nontransmitting producers will protect the public, opponents of the Kerr bill insist. They point out that the pipe lines which carry the gas are expensive; once a line is established from a producing field to a city like Cleveland, or an area like upstate New York, the city's consumers and the pipe-line owner are at the mercy of the producer. If they don't like his prices, they can't pick up their pipe line and move to another field where a competitor will sell at a lower price.

MAYORS OPPOSE BILL

And city officials and consumer spokesmen including the unions look with deep suspicion on the claims by Kerr and others that State price regulation will prove effective. The gas is highly concentrated in seven States—Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Kansas, and New Mexico. The oil producers in most cases virtually elect and run the legislatures in these States.

Twelve big companies, out of the 600 producers, who would be affected by this bill, sell over half of the natural gas in the United States.

The Panhandle and Hugoton fields in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas produce one-quarter of all the natural gas.

The United States Conference of Mayors and the Municipal Law Officers Association both are fighting hard against this bill, because they know what it will mean in terms of higher gas bills for the people of the big cities. Both CIO and AFL are working nationally and locally against the measure, to get Senators committed to oppose it.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Sound Housing Decision," appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOUND HOUSING DECISION

Rejection by the House of Representatives of President Truman's plan for a $2,000,000,000 agency to assist middle-income housing cooperatives seals the fate of another administration attempt to edge the Government still further into a field that should be left to private enterprise.

Our disapproval of this phase of Mr. Truman's program is not founded on the notion that there are ample homes available for families with incomes ranging from $2,800 to $4,400 annually. There is, in fact, an acute shortage of such homes.

The issues are whether it is sound public policy for the Government to invade an area in which private financing appears to be able to fill the need and whether, had Congress authorized the experiment, the housing shortage would have been materially relieved. The answer in each case is "No."

The most ardent believers in the aid-to-cooperatives plan say only 50,000 homes a year would result and that in 5 years less than 4 percent of the need would be met. This estimate should be compared to the 950,000 homes that will be started this year without benefit of the proposed program.

In the field of low-cost housing, where it is manifestly impossible for builders to produce homes within the reach of the lowest income group, the Federal Government has quite properly accepted responsibility. It is in this area of the greatest need that Federal assistance should be concentrated.

Criticism by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, of Proposed Reduction in ECA Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me regarding the proposed reduction in the ECA appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYERS SAYS ECA REDUCTION WOULD MAKE PROGRAM DOLE

ERIE, PA., March 11.—United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, insisted tonight that a reduction of 1951 ECA funds below levels recommended by Marshall plan Administrator Paul G. Hoffman, would "convert that program from one of recovery into a high-price dole—or worse still, jar Europe's economy so badly that Communist domination would be inevitable."

The Pennsylvania senior Senator addressed members and guests of the Erie County Bar Association here tonight.

"Economic stability," MYERS said, "is being accomplished in Europe today. By this I mean that recovery is a dynamic thing. The Marshall plan is not merely shoring up employment and providing the people of western Europe with a minimum diet. American aid thus far has permitted the democracies to make steady progress to a greater production—and in fact, industrial output today is well above the prewar level.

"Translated in terms of economic stability this means that western Europe is now finding it possible to reinvest 20 percent of its total product for the enlargement of its production facilities. Progress of this sort is the kind of guaranty required if Europe

is to close the dollar gap and become an effective, self-supporting working partner in our efforts to bring about world peace.

"The Marshall plan is perhaps the greatest cooperative adventure ever undertaken by man. It owes its birth to the proposal outlined by our great soldier-statesmen George C. Marshall, and without any doubt whatsoever, the brilliant leadership of Paul Hoffman has played a major part in the success the program has thus far achieved in bringing the democratic nations together as a team.

"As we look into the coming year, I am convinced that future world peace stands at the crossroads. Those whose duty it has been to administer the European recovery program have been completely honest in giving us the facts of the case—the bad right along with the good. When Mr. Hoffman and those who work with him have come to the Congress to request funds for the program, they have not overstated the case. They have not asked for more than they needed to bluff the Congress into furnishing what they really required. They have requested the minimum funds absolutely necessary to assure success of the recovery plan.

"For the coming year, Mr. Hoffman has asked the Congress to underwrite an appropriation amounting to $2,950,000,000. This is not a number pulled out of the air. This figure represents the realistic best estimate of men who are at once aware of America's ability to foot this kind of bill, and who, at the same time, keenly appreciate the alternative we face if the Marshall plan fails to accomplish its purpose.

"There are two ways we can meet this situation. We can stick with the job until western Europe can stand on its own feet without the need for extraordinary dollar assistance. To do this we must make adequate funds available to assure the continued expansion of Europe's economy to the point that it balances its trade under conditions of high-level employment. Mr. Hoffman has told us what this will cost during the coming year.

"But as I say, there is another way to handle the matter. We can reduce Marshall-plan funds below the level recommended for the coming year. By doing this—depending upon the size of the slice we whack off—we can slow down or halt economic expansion. If we merely slow it down, we postpone the day that Europe can become self-sufficient. Necessarily that will require American aid over a much longer period than we now plan, and we will wind up spending much more in the long run. If we halt expansion completely, we will leave western Europe with a still existing dollar gap, a still existing bare minimum level of subsistence. At such a point American aid will cease to promote recovery and will become no more than a hand-out to keep people from starving to death. It will not solve the problem. It will merely guarantee that the problem will remain.

"If European aid is cut too far or withdrawn altogether in the coming year, the situation will become far worse than this. We would, in effect, pull the rug out from under everything we've achieved to date. Unemployment will skyrocket. People will once more be starving, and Communist hopes of domination over the western democracies as a result of economic collapse will become a reality.

"America cannot afford the consequences of this. If the Communists controlled western Europe today, we would be planning a defense budget for 1951 in terms of twenty-five or thirty billion dollars at least—instead of the twelve or thirteen billion dollars we are presently considering. I do not, however, intend to justify the Marshall plan on the materialistic dollar savings it represents to us, though I think it quite obvious that such an argument is on economically sound grounds.

"Success of the Marshall plan is spelled out in two words—cooperation and hope. Without both, there can be no success. Cooperation faced tremendous obstacles when the recovery program was inaugurated 2 years ago. Traditional national jealousies, economic, political, and social, have divided the nations of Europe, built tariff walls and trade barriers between them, and have, in effect, been the very opposite of cooperation. But the nations of Europe have come a long way since 1948. Cooperation is steadily gaining greater meaning. But it's slow, and efforts cannot be relaxed. Curtailment of American participation in this cooperative venture would spell disaster.

"Psychologically, the recovery program has given Europe hope that its problems may be worked out together—hope that a bright future can be achieved if the present mighty efforts are continued. Perhaps hope is, in and of itself, our most effective cold war weapon.

"The Marshall plan is achieving a miracle. It is a model of what can be achieved internationally when men of idealism and ability can find the chance to join hands and work together in good faith for a common aim—the aim of peace in this world for all time to come. None of those who so deeply desire peace in a free and democratic world underestimate the size of the task that confronts us. The job will strain every ability we have. It will require steady nerves. It will require resolute insistence upon the basic premises of freedom. The stake in the future is huge. And so is the need for peace. The American people have a grave responsibility on their own shoulders to play a realistic part in the joint efforts of free people to reach this sought-after peace. I know we will come through."

Communists in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The McCarthy Rampage," published in the New York Herald Tribune of recent date, and excerpts from the sermon by Rev. Powell Davies, at All Souls Unitarian Church, on March 19, 1950, relative to the inquiry being made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MCCARTHY RAMPAGE

The promise of at least a week-end lull in the McCarthy uproar gives a chance to ask, with some soberness, what this is all about, anyway. It was early last month that Senator MCCARTHY suddenly broke out on his shotgun rampage against Communists in the State Department. Just what he was talking about has never been wholly clear, since he has seldom paused long enough to say; his specific allegations have been, altered, dropped, shifted in a bewildering torrent of words, but the general charge appears to be that the State Department is honeycombed with Communists and Communist sympathizers, all sheltered by Secretary Acheson himself.

At least a preliminary review of the resultant furor and fireworks now seems possible. The Senator has scored a point or two. He has forced an investigation, which is only just showing signs of struggling up through the party politics (prominent on all sides of this curious affair) and possibly doing some real investigating. He has trapped the State Department into an absurdly anomalous position in the John S. Service case. On the other hand, he caught a Tartar in Miss Dorothy Kenyon, whose description of the Senator as an "unmitigated liar" has not so far been widely challenged. His methods have been inexcusably reckless, irresponsible, and patently unfair; and they have called prominent attention to his own past, in which his record for balance, judiciousness and probity is far from invulnerable.

Nor has he begun even remotely to prove what seems to be the major thesis of widespread Communist infiltration in the State Department. He has not produced a single actual Communist, card-carrying or otherwise. What he has mainly done so far is to drag up a good deal of past history, most of it well known, to present it in the most invidious possible light. Most of the nine persons as yet actually named fall into a few familiar categories. The most important—it includes Messrs. Lattimore, Service, and Hanson—are the survivors of the State Department group which was impressed by the Chinese Red leaders (not by the Soviet leaders in Moscow), who were convinced that the Reds were going to win China (as they have done) and whose influence was generally in favor of basing American far-eastern policy on the Red movement. This group was undoubtedly influential; it may have been short-sighted and its influence misdirected, but it was certaintly not motivated by treason to the United States or hidden loyalty to the Kremlin. And to assail it now on such ground is certainly not the way in which to correct any defects it may have introduced into American foreign policy.

Around this group the Senator, by lavish use of the technique of guilt by association, has been weaving a wider net. Those who, like Miss Kenyon, may have been careless about Communist exploitation of their names; figures like Professor Shapley and Schuman who have lent repeated support to Communist attitudes or propagandas, fellow-traveling types of one sort or another—any of these who can be connected, however remotely, with State Department encouragement, are cited to show Communist infiltration of our foreign affairs. Elements in the Department may have been too gullible in such cases; it is again no proof of Communist domination and this reckless assault is again an extremely dangerous and useless way of correcting whatever real defects may exist.

The Senator may really have more than all this to bring out, and the proceedings are at least to be got on a somewhat sounder footing. So far, one can only say that if there is anything wrong with the Department it is not what the Senator implies that it is, while his method of remedy is the equivalent of burning down the whole house in order to roast a pig. We are in too deadly serious a world to permit of that way of conducting our foreign relations.

DR. DAVIES DEFENDS ACHESON—URGES "QUIET" LOYALTY PROBE

The Reverend Dr. Powell Davies yesterday defended Secretary of State Acheson.

In a sermon at All Souls' Unitarian Church, Sixteenth and Harvard Streets NW., Dr. Davies declared that Acheson is "desperately trying to arouse the Nation to a full recognition of its peril and * * * to unite us behind a policy that combines strength and resolve with a high sense of moral aim and worthy purpose."

Yet, he said, Acheson is "sniped at, whispered about, and badgered by the same paltry men who have done the same paltry things to every other man of stature in the Government."

He charged that political opportunists are sowing "suspicion and mistrust * * * pretending that they do it as patriots seeking to uncover disloyalty."

Searching out treason, Dr. Davies said, is a "delicate business, to be undertaken quietly, responsibly, and soberly by people who understand that business."

It is necessary, he continued, to identify efficiently "whatever traitors there are in the Government and then to deal with them to our advantage.

"This cannot be done by turning a Senate hearing into a sideshow at a circus," he declared.

"Mental balance and emotional maturity," he said, "are necessary if we are to defeat the Communists.

"The Communists are smart. Much too smart for Senator MCCARTHY, because he is doing exactly what they want him to do," he said. Wisconsin Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S charges of communism in the State Department were aired before the Senate last week.

America is giving Stalin what he wants "not through disloyalty but through stupidity," Dr. Davies said.

Political Investigations

REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, observing with microscopic nicety the tactics used by some Members of both Houses of this Congress, I am stimulated to wonder whether or not this is the second session of the Eighty-first Congress or just the curtain raiser of the current political campaign.

Seemingly, a few Republicans have resorted to every conceivable method to discredit the Democratic Party and some agencies of Government. If we have Communists holding responsible positions in our Government I advocate their discharge immediately, if not sooner, but when we make charges against any man or woman let us be certain we have adequate reasons and proof to justify said charges. False accusations clothed in legalized immunity are dangerous weapons before the eyes of Americans and a gross handicap to the peace and respect of the world.

It is a rather strange situation when Republican leaders constantly desire to institute investigations of the Democratic Party when they themselves are not living far in the annals of time from the Fall and Doheney caravan that goose-stepped across the United States to the tune of the sizzling Teapot Dome and many other similar escapades that left a trace of shame on our esteemed Commonwealth, including attempts of monopolistic exploitation of the American people in this Congress.

The party that has always been guilty of instituting investigations, and a few other individuals closely affiliated with it, have, in their rancor, reached the stage where I deem it expedient that an investigation committee be appointed to investigate those instrumental in giving inception to the original investigating committees. Those that live in glass houses should always refrain from throwing stones.

All the angels are not in any one political party, as some would gladly have you believe. This is true in the Nation and all the States of the constellation of States. The Republican Party has reason to hang its head in shame. And when I say this, I remember one of its governors in the State of Indiana that served time in the penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., and another one of its governors of the same State that pleaded the statute of limitations to keep from serving a similar term. What a record they established in their greed for wealth and power at the expense and exploitation of the common man.

Our Navy

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, 156 years ago today President Washington signed a measure creating our Navy. This was on March 27, 1794. The glorious history of our Navy and its part in preserving our early Republic needs no recounting. It would be appropriate today, however, to pause and recognize what a great debt we owe to our Navy.

There are those who—though I do not question their sincerity—would reduce this component of our armed services to minor proportions, and in so doing would seriously jeopardize our security.

At this time I wish to congratulate our Navy upon its birthday and wish for it a continuation of its long and glorious history.

Indiana has had an impressive part in our Navy, and at this time I include a list of some outstanding naval officers and recipients of the Navy Cross, who were from Indiana:

Rear Adm. M. K. Fleming, United States Navy (retired), was born December 6, 1906, in Winchester. He holds two Legion(s) of Merit awards as well as other medals. Was an aviator, commander of several attack groups during the war. Retired October 1, 1949.

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, was born April 3, 1896, in Spencer. He is presently the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (air) and is a naval aviator. He commanded the carrier U. S. S. *Saratoga* operating with a Pacific task force. He has commanded a carrier division and holds three Legion(s) of Merit, honorary commander of the Military Division of the most Excellent Order of the British Empire awarded him by the Government of Great Britain, as well as other medals.

Read Adm. Howard H. Good, United States Navy, was born August 12, 1888, in Warren. He served on many warships prior to the entrance of the United States into World War II. He was in command of the cruiser U. S. S. *New Orleans* at Pearl Harbor during the initial bombing of that base by the Japanese. The ship under his command later served with distinction during the Battle of Coral Sea. Besides the Legion of Merit, the admiral holds the Mexican Service Medal, the China Service Medal, and many others. He is now commandant, Thirteenth Naval District, Seattle, Wash.

Rear Adm. Robert E. Blick, United States Navy, was born July 8, 1899, in Peru. A naval aviator, he also holds a master of science degree in aeronautical engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He commanded carriers during the war and his ships participated with distinction in many campaigns. He holds the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit with Gold Star, the Presidential Unit Citation, and many other medals. He is now in command of Carrier Division 14.

Rear Adm. Morton D. Willcutts, Medical Corps, United States Navy, was born March 10, 1889, in Carthage. He saw much action in World War I as a medical officer and gained world renown in the Second World War when he was commanding officer of the naval hospital at San Diego. He holds medals awarded him by the Governments of China and Haiti as well as the Legion of Merit, and many other medals. He is now commanding officer, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.

Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, United States Navy, was born August 4, 1893, in Goshen. Prior to World War II he served in China and Iceland and elsewhere on warships. During the war he commanded the cruiser U. S. S. *Santa Fe* in Alaskan waters, then became commander of Cruiser Division 15 which saw much action in the Pacific. He won the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, three Legion(s) of Merit, and many other medals. He is now in command of the Seventh Task Fleet with orders to report as Chief of Information, Navy Department.

Commander Richard N. Antrim, United State Navy, born December 17, 1907, in Peru. He is one of three Navy men from Indiana who won the Medal of Honor, highest award in the United States presented to him by President Truman at ceremonies in the White House January 30, 1947, for conspicuous gallantry at the risk of his own life while a prisoner of the Japanese. He also holds the Navy Cross, the Bronze Star Medal, and many other awards.

Rear Adm. Norman Scott, United States Navy, was born August 10, 1889, at Indianapolis. Served on destroyers during World War I, and as naval aide to the President in 1918. He was killed in action during the Battle of Guadalcanal November 23, 1942, while in command of a task force. On December 9, 1942, the President presented the Medal of Honor to Rear Admiral Scott's family. The medal was "for extraordinary heroism and conspicuous intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty."

Col. David M. Shoup, United States Marine Corps, was born December 20, 1904, at Battle Ground. He served in the Philippines, China, and many marine stations within the United States. In the Pacific war he was wounded during the fight for New Georgia Island in the Solomons, and again at Tarawa. During the latter engagement, though shocked by an exploding shell and severely wounded by enemy fire, he continued to rally and lead his men until the entire Japanese invasion was annihilated. For this he was awarded the Medal of Honor.

Rear Adm. John B. Heffernan, United States Navy (retired), born October 21, 1894, in Washington; he is now director naval records and history. He served on destroyers in both world wars. He commanded a transport division in the assault and recapture of

Guam and later commanded the battleship *Tennessee*. He was awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with three gold stars, the Navy Unit Commendation, as well as many other decorations. His usual residence is 14 George Street, Washington, Ind.

Rear Adm. Royal Rodney Ingersoll, United States Navy (deceased), was born December 4, 1847, in Michigan, retiring from the naval service in 1919 to live in LaPorte, Ind., where he died in 1931. The admiral was the father of Admiral Royal Eason Ingersoll, United States Navy, and grandfather of the late Lt. Royal Rodney Ingersoll II. The destroyer U. S. S. *Ingersoll* is named for the late rear admiral and his grandson.

Admiral Raymond Ames Spruance, United States Navy (retired), was born July 3, 1886, in Maryland, attended high school in Indianapolis and was appointed to the Naval Academy from Indiana. He served on many warships during his naval career and in both World Wars. In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with two gold stars, the Distinguished Service Medal-Army, and the Presidential Unit Citation, Admiral Spruance also was presented medals by the governments of Greece, Belgium, and Great Britain. His wife is the former Margaret V. Dean, of Indianapolis. Official address: care of Monterey Country Club, Del Monte, Calif.

Admiral Jonas H. Ingram, United States Navy (retired), was born October 15, 1886, in Jeffersonville, Ind. For gallantry in battle at Vera Cruz, Mexico, in April 1914, he was awarded the Medal of Honor. He commanded battleships, destroyers, destroyer divisions, and battle fleets, as well as task forces during World War II. Besides the Medal of Honor, Admiral Ingram holds the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with two Gold Stars, Purple Heart, and awards from the governments of Brazil, Belgium, and Great Britain.

Vice Adm. Arthur B. Cook, United States Navy (retired), was born December 11, 1881, in Evansville, Ind. He served in World War I, qualified as a naval aviator in 1928 and served in aviation billets from thence on. He served as commanding officer of the carriers *Lexington* and *Langley*. He served in the Bureau of Aeronautics and as Chief of Air Operational Training and as Commandant, Tenth Naval District, during the late war. He retired December 1, 1944. His usual residence is Evansville, Ind.

Vice Adm. William S. Farber, United States Navy (retired), was born in Frankfort, Ind., on March 16, 1885. He served on or as commanding officer of many warships in his distinguished career. During the late war he served as head of the Fleet Maintenance Division, as Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for both Matériel and Maintenance, and as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations. He has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, and many other decorations, including one from the Government of France. Official address: Breezeland, RFD No. 2, Cazenovia, N. Y.

Rear Adm. Edward J. Marquart, United States Navy (retired), was born March 11, 1880, in Valparaiso, Ind. He was an ordnance expert during his career and served at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington during all of World War I, for which work he was awarded a special letter of commendation. He served as Commandant of both the Navy Yard, New York, and the Third Naval District during World War II before retiring April 1, 1944. Besides the Legion of Merit, he holds the Spanish Campaign Medal, China Service Medal, Philippine Campaign Medal, and others. Official address: 755 South El Molina, Pasadena, Calif.

Rear Adm. Robert W. Hayler, United States Navy. was born June 7, 1891, in Ohio, and attended schools in Muncie, Ind., before entering the Academy in 1910, appointed from the Eighth Indiana District. He won the Navy Cross for heroism while commanding the cruiser *Honolulu* in August 1942, and a second Navy Cross a year later. His ships won the Navy unit commendation for action against the Japs. While Commander Cruiser Division Twelve, he won a third Navy Cross. In addition to his Navy crosses, he also was awarded the Silver Star Medal, Legion of Merit twice, Bronze Star twice, and many other decorations. Official address: 800 East Washington Street, Muncie, Ind.

OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY BORN IN THE STATE OF INDIANA AWARDED THE NAVY CROSS, DECEMBER 7, 1941–AUGUST 1, 1948

Commander Richard Nott Antrim, United States Navy; born December 17, 1907, Peru, Ind.; home, 109 North Fremont Street, Peru, Ind.

Lt. James W. Barnitz,[1] United States Naval Reserve; born May 10, 1920, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. James Henry Bell, United States Naval Reserve (deceased); born December 19, 1918, Penville, Ind.; home, 1521 North A Street, Elwood, Ind.

Rear Adm. Russell Stanley Berkey, United States Navy; born August 4, 1893, Goshen, Ind.; home, 1620 South Elleroad Avenue, Tulsa, Okla.

Ensign Norman Burns Bitzegaio, United State Naval Reserve (deceased); born January 20, 1921, Caumont, Ind.; next of kin, 340 Prospect Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Capt. Robert E. Blick, United States Navy; born July 8, 1899, Peru, Ind.; home, 716 Spring Street, Michigan City, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. John Randolph Bowen, United States Navy; born March 8, 1917, Wiona Lake, Ind.; home, 6146 Primrose Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

Capt. Maurice E. Browder, United States Navy; born October 22, 1897, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, Indianapolis, Ind.

Capt. Charles A. Buchanan, United States Navy; born October 28, 1904, Brookville, Ind.; home, 1132 Isabella Avenue, Coronado, Calif.

Lt. Philip W. Cobb, United States Naval Reserve; born March 24, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, 1014 Throop Street, Saginaw, Mich.

Lt. Comdr. James W. Coe, United States Navy; born June 13, 1909, Richmond, Ind.; home, 211 North Fifteenth Street, Richmond, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. Albert Joseph Corsi, United States Naval Reserve; born May 12, 1911, Richmond, Ind.; home, 291 North Walnut Street, East Orange, N. J.

Lt. Comdr. Clement M. Craig,[1] United States Naval Reserve; born December 4, 1914, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, P. O. Box 276, Los Gatos, Calif.

Commander Robert W. Denbo, United States Navy; born August 2, 1906, Orleans, Ind.; home, 435 West Jefferson, Orleans, Ind.

Lt. (jr. gr.) Charles Hall H. Dickey, United States Naval Reserve; born November 25, 1920, Aurora, Ind.; home, 202 First Street, Morristown, Tenn.

Lt. Charles Owen Dodson, Jr., United States Naval Reserve; born November 17, 1920, Hammand, Ind.; home, National Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Ernest Willard Downey, boatswain, United States Navy; born November 3, 1908, Loogootee, Ind.; home, 923 East Whitman Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho.

Ensign William Robinson Evans, United States Naval Reserve (deceased); born August 11, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; next of kin, 5019 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Commander James Louis Fuelling, Medical Corps, United States Navy; born July 16, 1913, Allen, Ind.; home, 1720 North Bosart Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. Ronald Paul Gift, United States Naval Reserve; born February 20, 1919, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, Marlette, Mich.

[1] Gold Star in lieu of second Navy Cross.

Commander Irvin S. Hartman, United States Navy; born, September 14, 1911, Columbia City, Ind.; home, route 7, Columbia City, Ind.

Commodore Samuel P. Jenkins, United States Navy; born, June 3, 1893, Evansville, Ind.; home, 1145 Twenty-first Street, San Diego, Calif.

Lt. (jg) Robert L. Klingler, United States Naval Reserve; born, January 23, 1921, Clay City, Ind.; home, Clay City, Ind.

Lt. Robert D. Kunkel, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 2, 1918, Peru, Ind.; home, Dallas, Tex.

Commander Frank D. Latta, United States Naval Reserve (deceased); born, January 10, 1909, Indianapolis, Ind.; next of kin, 543 South Central Avenue, Burlington, Iowa.

Lt. John C. Livezey, United States Navy (deceased); born, February 12, 1909, New Castle, Ind.; next of kin, 6 Hawthorne Terrace, Leonia, N. J.

Lt. (jg) James Harold Livingston, United States Naval Reserve; born, August 11, 1922, Marble Rock, Ind.; home, 629 Washington Street, Monroe, Mich.

Lt. Carl F. Luedemann, United States Naval Reserve; born, June 11, 1919, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, 1009 Villa Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

Ensign Charles O. McDaniel, United States Naval Reserve; born, February 6, 1923, Rushville, Ind.; home, 217 North Spencer Street, Rushville, Ind.

Lt. Clark William Miller, United States Naval Reserve; born, December 15, 1919, Lebanon, Ind.; home, 212 East Washington, Lebanon, Ind.

Ensign James B. Miller, United States Naval Reserve; born, May 12, 1922, Howard County, Ind.; home, 7925 North Main Street, Dayton, Ohio.

Lt. Robert A. Morris, United States Naval Reserve; born, October 11, 1918, Muncie, Ind.; home, rural route No. 1, Farmland, Ind.

Capt. Allen Prather Mullinnix, United States Navy; born, December 12, 1898, Attica, Ind.; home, 2714 Thirty-fifth Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Lt. Comdr. Hugh W. Nicholson,[1] United States Naval Reserve; born, February 28, 1912, Campbellsburg, Ind.; home, Campbellsburg, Ind.

Lt. Jerome John O'Dowd, United States Naval Reserve; born, October 15, 1918, Fort Wayne, Ind.; home, 1802 Kingsington Boulevard, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. Robert William Ramage, United States Navy; born, October 25, 1918, Indianapolis, Ind.; home, 202 West Forty-fourth Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. Robert D. Reed, United States Naval Reserve; born, March 8, 1920, Muncie, Ind.; home, 709 Fifth Avenue, Venice, Calif.

Lt. (jg) Robert "G" Riley, United States Naval Reserve; born, January 10, 1921, Buckcreek, Ind.; home, rural route No. 2, Lafayette, Ind.

Commander Joseph Wayne Runyan, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 22, 1913, Terre Haute, Ind.; home, Los Angeles, Calif.

Commander William R. Staggs, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 11, 1912, Valparaiso, Ind.; home, Chicago, Ill.

Lt. Comdr. Alexander Vraciu, United States Naval Reserve; born, November 2, 1918, East Chicago, Ind.; home, 1604 One Hundred and Forty-second Street, East Chicago, Ind.

Lt. Comdr. William Thomas Williams, United States Naval Reserve; born, August 14, 1919, Rockville, Ind.; home, box 209, Robstown, Tex.

Rual Solen Wilson, MM1c, United States Navy; born, December 24, 1913, Shelburn, Ind.; home, Granite City, Ill.

Lt. John L. Wirth, United States Navy (deceased); born, April 25, 1917, North Vernon, Ind.; home, box 316, route 4, Pensacola, Fla.

[1] Gold Star in lieu of second Navy Cross.

Lt. (jg.) Charles Edward Young, United States Naval Reserve; born, August 5, 1921, Perry County, Ind.; home, rural route No. 2, box 209, New Albany, Ind.

Lt. Owen DeWitt Young, United States Naval Reserve; born, May 29, 1920, Fort Wayne, Ind.; home, 20 Westervett, Tenafly, N. J.

America Symbol of Fair Play and Freedom Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me from radio station WHAM in Rochester, N. Y., February 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For more than 160 years now the American Nation has been a symbol through the world of fair play and freedom among men. No belief is more deeply rooted among our people than this. Yet, as a Nation, we are not perfect, and the efforts to enlarge the freedom of opportunity of our people are continuing.

All of us are aware that not all of our people have achieved the status of full-fledged citizenship with opportunities equal to those enjoyed by other Americans. We realize this from our own experience in our own communities.

Much as I wish this were not true, I believe every American realizes that full and equal opportunity for all, vitally important though it is, cannot be achieved overnight. The problems which give rise to substandard citizenship result from misunderstanding—misunderstanding of the hopes and aspirations of others—misunderstandings that come about because our own experience has never afforded us an opportunity to know the personal problems and difficulties encountered by those whose beliefs differ from our own—whose skins are a different color—or who have grown up in another part of the world.

So, basically, our problem boils down to enlarging our experiences and developing our understanding. We have in this twentieth-century world of ours an almost unbelievable number of means at our disposal by which we can enlarge the knowledge we have of others, and the knowledge they have of us. The newsreel, the radio, and more recently, television—the huge presses which turn out our books, magazines, and newspapers—our churches and pulpits, the hundreds of thousands of neighborhood clubs, parent-teachers' associations, school boards, and other gatherings where we may come to know one another better, exchange our thoughts, and reconcile our differences—these are but a few of the many opportunities we have for getting at the heart of misunderstanding.

We have, of course, other avenues along which we may approach the development of greater individual freedom. One primary avenue is available to us in the form of the laws under which we live. All of us recognize, for example, our constitutional liberties of free speech, freedom of press, freedom to worship as we choose, the right to trial by jury, the right to be secure in our homes against unwarranted invasion by our Government, and all the other commandments contained in our Bill of Rights. We believe in these laws and we live by them.

The growing maturity of our people under our Constitution has steadily rounded out and given deeper meaning to our constitutional liberties. But we have as yet to give these rights their fullest meaning. Last week the House of Representatives fought out another round in the long struggle to give our Constitution the same meaning to all our people. The decision by the House on a law that would give many more Americans equal opportunities in their work was not the decision many of us had hoped the House would achieve. The House, by its vote, has seriously qualified the right to equal opportunity of employment.

In a short time this same issue will confront the United States Senate, and there, too, a great battle will ensue. I do not know what the outcome will be, but I will do everything in my power to see that we get a Federal law which will guarantee fair practices of employment in all channels of commerce between the States.

This week the Senate is debating another measure which also involves the issue of freedom in the form of the displaced-persons bill. For nearly 2 years it has been the policy of the American Government to offer our country as a haven to thousands of homeless people who have been exiled from their own countries by the forces of war. We are seeking now to enlarge that law in order that the exiled victims of Communist oppression in eastern Europe may now find new hope in the New World.

The strength of our country has immemorially been somewhat dependent on a continuing supply of new blood brought into our life stream by those who have fought for freedom in their own countries, and having failed in their efforts to liberate their people, have turned to join hands with us.

The Senate will have a fight on its hands this week over the displaced-persons bill, but I am satisfied that we will be successful in this small but important way in achieving another victory for the dignity of man.

These are but isolated attacks along the whole battle line for human freedom. This does not mean that they are unimportant, but it does mean that we must maintain constant vigilance and a readiness to do battle with the forces of oppression, tyranny, and misunderstanding wherever they appear. We are going forward to greater understanding every day, and despite the big job still to be done, we should take tremendous pride in each success as we achieve it.

Address of Hon. William E. Warne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address by the Honorable William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at a meeting of the New Mexico Indian Affairs Association in Santa Fe on March 10.

I make this request because this address, in my opinion, summarizes the serious problems which confront those of us who are deeply interested in the welfare of our Indian citizens. It reviews the progress which has been made, and outlines the steps which must still be taken before the Indians can participate fully in our national life. While it makes particular reference to the programs in our great Southwest area, such as the long-range Navajo rehabilitation bill recently passed by the House, I believe that the comprehensive policies which Assistant Secretary Warne advocates will provide a sound pattern for action throughout the Nation.

The address follows:

During the recent drought in New York City there appeared on the front page of a great New York newspaper an account of discussions between officials of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Interior Department on the problem of water rights for the Pueblo Indians living in Jemez and Zia and the water needs of the Los Alamos atomic energy plant, where many Pueblo Indians are now working.

There is no need to discuss this matter further at this time, except to say that the Atomic Energy Commission officials have publicly stated that they do not wish to do anything that will deprive Indians, or others living in the Jemez Valley, of life-giving water. My purpose in mentioning the incident is to emphasize again the fact that the Indians in the Southwest as well as their neighbors find themselves propelled rapidly into the atomic age. What this will mean to all of us, Indians and non-Indians alike, can now be but dimly seen. But one thing is clear. We shall have to adapt ourselves to the portentous problems of the future in order to survive. We shall have to adapt or perish, Indian and non-Indian alike. This necessity may give some of our citizens a more tolerant attitude toward the struggle of the Indians to adapt themselves to our intensely competitive, industrial society.

Throughout our still young and vigorous Nation today, each of us everywhere is reacting almost daily to problems of adjustment brought about by the changes taking place in the economy of our country, and, indeed, of the world. You in the Southwest must see these things in a dramatic way, in the adjustments that are being made by the Indians to fit themselves into our modern world. In the merging of modern and primitive cultures, the line between integration and disintegration of human values is formed. In this situation it is the duty of all of us to invest in an almost infinite patience in our dealings with the human problems involved in the passage of the Indians from their ancient culture to one whose customs and values are not yet finally fixed.

The Pueblos have shown a historic capacity to adopt certain non-Indian attributes while retaining an inherently Indian culture. They have been more successful than many other tribes in avoiding some of the less favorable aspects of our modern life. A new and particularly important development in the relations between the two cultures is represented by the Bernalillo County Hospital project. The construction and successful operation of the hospital will be a lasting monument to the cooperation of this community, the larger non-Indian community, the State, and the Federal Government. Negotiations for the construction of the hospital were begun in February 1949; in August of that year a bill was introduced in Congress, and in October President Truman signed it. At that time the President said:

"I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation, which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community. * * * assurances have been received from county officials to the effect that no forms of discrimination or segregated services were ever intended, nor will they be permitted, in the operation or maintenance of the hospital."

To me the most significant thing in the history of the new hospital is the constant give-and-take, the modifications, adaptations of methods by all of those who are involved. Representatives of the various pueblos took an important part in the discussions and negotiations. Meetings between Indians and non-Indians were held frequently. The all-pueblo council met three times to discuss the project. And this is significant because in the process of working together for a common cause, Indians and non-Indians come to understand each other better, to realize that each faces common necessities of life and common methods of meeting them.

All Indians have been citizens in the strictly legal sense since 1924. The privilege of voting, of course, is not automatically conferred with citizenship. Citizenship is governed by the Congress; voting is determined by State law. Today every State has granted the right of reservation Indians to vote.

At present, Federal courts in New Mexico are affording Indians an opportunity to sit on Federal juries. This is another instance in which Indians will participate in the educational processes of political democracy. It will be meaningful to them. As one Indian said: "This will give us an opportunity we have long been seeking, an opportunity to assist juries in understanding more adequately Indian cases that come before them."

We are making real progress. I have said before, but I think it worth repeating, that our unthinking impatience is perhaps the greatest enemy of the Indian today. We must remember that our major objective is not simply to be done with the so-called Indian problem, but to prepare these people for full and equal participation in the highly competitive society that we have developed on the continent that used to be theirs. We need not trace the dismal history of our efforts to break and subdue this continent and its 800,000 original inhabitants. But we can remind ourselves that it has hardly been 80 years since a Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported to Congress:

"No one will certainly rejoice more heartily than the present Commissioner when the Indians of this country cease to be in a position to dictate, in any form or degree, to the Government; when, in fact, the last hostile tribe becomes reduced to the condition of suppliants for charity. This is, indeed, the only hope of salvation for the aborigines of this continent. If they stand up against the progress of civilization and industry, they must be relentlessly crushed * * * they must yield or perish."

We have moved a long way since then.

I do not need to add that Dr. John R. Nichols, our present Commissioner, whom many of you know, and who asked me to give you his personal greeting and best wishes, shares no such view. A policy of self-determination has replaced the old one of extermination.

If a general picture of the Indians today remains one of poverty and of limited opportunity, still we can see measurable progress if we put the picture in perspective. I have mentioned two instances of what I believe to be progress; let me cite a few more:

1. The shrinkage of the land holdings of the Indians which, between 1887 and 1932, were reduced from 142,000,000 acres to 52,000,000 acres, has been arrested and the land base increase to 56,000,000 acres.

2. Almost 200 Indian tribal corporations, corporate business enterprises, cooperatives, and credit unions have been organized and are transacting their business effectively.

3. During the past 10 years, Indians have taken the lead in applying conservation practices on their eroding lands.

4. Trachoma, a scourge of Indians as well as of many other races, can now be successfully attacked among American Indians since a cure for this disease has been given to the world by its discoverer, Dr. Fred Leo, an Indian Service physician.

5. Indian accredited senior high schools have increased from 2 to 28 during the past two decades. Also during this period of time more than 2,500 Indian boys and girls have attended college with Federal assistance. Academic retardation of Indian children has been cut in half and normal progress through the grades established.

6. During the past two decades, Indians have increased their cultivated area by more than 300,000 acres and have withdrawn from leaseholders some seven million acres of range land for their own use.

7. During this same period, Indian-owned cattle have increased in number from 170,000 to more than 400,000.

8. In the 8 years between 1940 and 1948, agricultural income to Indians has more than quadrupled.

The principal source of agricultural income to Indians is from their livestock industry. Although the increase in numbers is remarkable, the improvement in quality is even more so. During the early thirties, Indian cattle were a drug on the market. Buyers simply did not want them. As a result of the livestock improvement program conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian cattle sales in most areas now attract buyers from all over the country. Often Indian cattle sales top the market.

9. The Indian Reorganization Act and the Oklahoma General Welfare Act authorized a total appropriation for the revolving credit fund of $12,000,000. At the close of fiscal year 1950, a total of $9,599,600 had been appropriated; of this amount, $3,000,000 was for the fiscal year 1950. The fund has actually revolved two times at the close of fiscal year 1949. Of the amount due, 97.8 percent of all repayments were met promptly. Only 1.8 percent was extended, only one-half of 1 percent was canceled, and less than 1 percent was delinquent.

The amount of the fund is far from adequate. At the time the original amount was authorized, less than half of the Indians were eligible for loans; now all are eligible. In 1935, the National Resources Board estimated that a credit fund of some $66,000,000 was needed. Today the amount required is necessarily larger.

10. One other thing should be mentioned. At the turn of the century, the Indian population was somewhere around two hundred thousand. Today's best estimates place the number around four hundred thousand. They are the fastest growing segment of our population. At one time it appeared as if a technologically superior group would completely wipe out the American Indians. Here again, as I am informed by sociologists, their increase in population is a sign of adaptation on the part of Indians to our modern world.

All this is about Indians in general. But what about those Indians close to you here in New Mexico? Let us take population figures here also. Prior to 1930, the Pueblo Indians were growing at only one-fourth of 1 percent a year. Since that time they have been increasing at a rate of around 2½ percent a year. In total figures, the population increase was from 9,295 in 1930 to some sixteen thousand in 1950.

Eighteen of the nineteen pueblos, all but Jemez, voted to accept the Indian Reorganization Act. Three pueblos, Isleta, Santa Clara, and Laguna, have written their own constitutions.

In 1930 school attendance in the pueblos was 69 percent of all those of school age. It was 90 percent in the last fiscal year. In New Mexico as a whole it has increased among Indians from 44 percent in 1930 to some 65 percent now.

Increasing attention is being given to public health. In 1930 there were only seven nurses for all Pueblo Indians. Today there are 38. Of course, this is not nearly enough, but when the Bernalillo Hospital has been completed, the situation will be greatly improved.

In New Mexico in 1933, lands held in trust for Indians totaled slightly more than 6,000,000 acres. This has grown to 8,000,000 acres. Congress recognized the necessity for an adequate land base for the New Mexico Indians when it passed last August a bill to add over 600,000 acres to the Indian holdings.

There has been a 28 percent increase in Pueblo cultivated areas, from 14,000 to 20,000 acres, since 1935. Acreage under constructed irrigation works has increased greatly. Storage facilities for the Pueblos have increased 6,900 acre-feet. Stock water development has increased from 177 separate units in 1935 to 259 units. Domestic supply has increased from 3.2 miles to 13.8 miles in supply lines.

But the answer to the Indian problem generally, I think, lies largely in the pattern set for the Navajos and Hopis. Both Houses of Congress have now passed a bill, S. 2734, to authorize the long-range program of rehabilitation for these two tribes. This bill was introduced after a previous bill, S. 1407, was reluctantly vetoed by the President because it had been amended to include provisions which, with some qualifications would have extended State criminal and civil laws to the two reservations. In accordance with the President's desires expressed in his veto message, appropriation requests to carry out the first year of the long-range program are included in the budget for the fiscal year 1951, beginning July 1 of this year. These requests amount to approximately $14,000,000 in cash and $6,000,000 in contract authorizations.

I do not want to go into all the details of the proposed $88,000,000 Navajo-Hopi 10-year rehabilitation program, but, in general, it includes:

Development of small irrigation projects on the reservation, and survey costs of the Shiprock-San Juan project;

Transfer of colonists to the irrigable lands on the Colorado River Reservation;

Industrial developments on the Navajo Reservation;

Seasonal or part-time employment away from the reservation; and

New school, road, and hospital construction.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say that this 10-year program is not an end-all plan.

It will have to be followed by other constructive measures, because the situation on the Navajo Reservation today does not even provide a good base upon which to build. This program should provide that base, the foundation. It will succeed in accordance with our expectations if it does. Please keep that in mind. This is the starting point, not the last lap in the grind to rehabilitate our largest and most impoverished tribe.

The next rehabilitation program being considered is the $23,000,000 program for the 7,000 Indians living on the Papago Reservation. As in the case of the Navajo, this program would call for irrigation, stock water development, soil and moisture conservation, construction of education and health facilities, roads and community facilities, and relocation projects.

This, then, is the pattern of Indian development and rehabilitation, one that fits in with an Indian policy that has been reasonably consistent since the Meriam report of two decades ago. That policy includes:

The maximum utilization of Indian resources by Indians so that they may become self-supporting. To reach this end they must have education, health, credit, and other facilities, as well as an adequate land base.

Increasing participation by State and local governmental units in programs, services,

and operations, in order that they may integrate Indians in normal civic functions with their fellow Americans.

At a recent hearing before a congressional committee, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman spoke of the need for a reevaluation of our Indian policies. As an Assistant Secretary, and later as Under Secretary, Mr. Chapman has had long and sympathetic experience with these problems. In tracing this experience, he pointed out the tremendous progress which has been achieved in recent years, and said he felt we were ready to move ahead with new policies which could further achieve the aim of enabling the Indians to achieve full participation in our national life.

This is not a task for the Secretary alone, or even for the Interior Department and its Bureau of Indian Affairs. The groups like your own which have given valuable service to Indian affairs and who rightly share the credit for the progress that has been made, must enter into these considerations.

Rehabilitation bills may provide some of these answers. Other problems exist—lack of resources, lack of training, health deficiencies—combine to make it difficult for Indians to survive either on or off their reservations. Communities where Indians seek to live and labor are often sympathetic in words but not deeds. The people in these communities retain some traditional suspicion of the Indian that they acquired in childhood, or they persist in giving life to some unreal myth or stereotype about the habits and responsibility of the Indian that show little insight or understanding of him as a human being, or as an American citizen, or as a veteran of the recent war. Every American in his own home and town can help the attack on this problem, because largely it is the ind'vidual problem of each of us.

Let me conclude by saying that the old policy of denying civil and religious liberty to the Indians has been reversed and the constitutional rights of this, the oldest of our minority groups, have been completely avowed, with the result that the spiritual aspirations of the Indians as a group have revived and have reached a new high level. This has been accomplished by the recognition of the rights of Indians as American citizens, while, at the same time, protection has been afforded their property rights and their economic assets. The credit for this result does not belong to one individual or group. This has been accomplished by many, by you here, by the Indians themselves, by those of us who are working steadily on the problem in State offices, in Washington bureaus, and in the halls of Congress. Much more remains to be done, but in the spirit that now prevails of live and help live, I am confident we will reach the goal that Jefferson saw for the Indians and the non-Indians long ago:

"The ultimate point of rest and happiness for them (the Indians) is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people."

The Postmaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit an article by Mr. W. H. McWilliams, who writes for the Martins Ferry and other Ohio newspapers, under the pen name of Hi Waters. I believe this column of Mr. McWilliams could apply to many areas in this country. Mr. McWilliams writes with a down-to-earth viewpoint and expresses the sentiments of the average man better than anyone I know.

The article follows:

HI WATERS—RIGHT AROUND HOME

(By W. H. McWilliams)

Outside of a doctor and a school teacher, the most important person in our lives is a postmaster.

At least, we have more to do with a postmaster than most any other guy. A doctor escorts us into this world and therefore we kinda hang around him out of self-protection.

A school teacher trains us to use sense for the first 12 years of our lives so we kinda string along with them, in second place.

But a postmaster stands behind the little windows with the iron bars over them and keeps us in touch with the rest of the world. A postmaster is the go-between with us and our neighbors no matter whether they live next door or on the other side of the world.

Who's the most pleasant postmaster you ever dealt with?

Well, here's a list of the 15 most pleasant postmasters in eastern Ohio as I have dealt with them. As you look into the eyes of these 15 master postmasters you feel yourself bein' lifted up and you leave feelin' good like you had just been given a shot of hard cider on an empty stomach.

1. Edithe Glass, Short Creek.
2. L. E. Buffington, Morristown.
3. Zilvio Zanzanella, Adena.
4. Alice Wilson, Jerusalem.
5. Kenneth L. Burley, Bridgeport.
6. Stella E. Dickerson, Glencoe.
7. Rolland Jackson, Neffs.
8. Mrs. Delude P. Levi, Connorsville.
9. Enoch Carman, Belmont.
10. Harry C. Stratton, Piney Fork.
11. L. E. Fowler, Hendrysburg.
12. W. F. Mock, Powhatan.
13. P. M. Keyser, Shadyside.
14. Mary I. Timko, Barton.
15. Pearl Calovini, Lafferty.

Now, of course, there are other postmasters who could almost qualify for membership in this team. But they just didn't quite make the grade. Take Frank Vannelle, of Bellaire, who has just been there for a short time. Frank tries to grin, out of habit of being a politician for so long but he hasn't had the length of time behind the windows that would test him out.

I know some postmasters who, if you would walk up and say, "Any mail for me today?" would look at you as sour as a pint of green Damsel plums before breakfast, and makes you feel like a dried bread crumb on the table of Belshazzar, last king of Babylon.

But the 15 I selected, every one of 'em—smilingly handle the cares of countless people and grin sweeter than a bride when the preacher says, "I now pronounce you man and wife" and her husband turns around quiverin' like a jar of raspberry Jello and kisses her on the cheek.

I respectfully request all of you to watch carefully the next time you walk into the post offices of any one of my 15 and see for yourself. Watch that sly smile that sweeps like a summer shadow over a field of ripening grain as he, or she, caresses the letters and hands them lovingly through the bars to us. Ah, such postmasters are the honey on the bread of life or horseradish on the bacon of existence.

They have a hard job to fill in this life. Most everybody jumps on a postmaster because some erring relative, or friend, fails to write when they should. They get the devil when a money order ain't enough and Sears, Roebuck sends a cheaper article. They are criticized when the weather report says rain or when it don't.

I know some unthinking people who deny a postmaster even the small satisfaction of readin' the post cards that come through the mails—imagine that.

But what a service they perform for us. You can send a letter for 5,000 miles for 3 cents. That's the cheapest thing in the United States—except what the Government pays the postmasters.

Yes, sir, a postmaster is the No. 3 person in our lives in importance. He is outranked only by the doctor and the school teacher. Instead of conkin' him over the head when the mail didn't come, you ought to go up and shake hands with him and say, "Listen, friend—you can't do everything."

So, the next time you go to the post office for the mail, look at your postmaster and see if, in his eye, lurks the smile that you have a right to expect and a grin that warms your skin and makes you feel glad you ordered that last catalog of the seeds that never fail.

Yea, postmasters—my 15 most pleasant ones in eastern Ohio.

The Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me broadcast from radio station WHAM in Rochester, N. Y., on March 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Most of you, I think, are aware that if you visit Washington while the Congress is in session, it is usually possible to obtain a seat in the visitors' galleries of the House or the Senate, and thus you may witness and listen to the debate then taking place.

If you are observant, you may notice one of the stenographers whose job it is to make shorthand notes of every word uttered by the Members of each body while it is in session. The stenographers are men, and I imagine they are frequently mistaken for a Senator or Representative, because they usually seat themselves in a vacant chair nearby the Member who is then speaking. You can usually spot the stenographers scribbling away in their long notebooks, and occasionally, when the debate shifts from one side of the Chamber to the other, you'll notice a stenographer rise, and still writing as he walks, move closer to the Member then speaking.

The stenographic record made during each daily session of the Congress is printed in its entirety during the course of the night and appears by 9 o'clock the following morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a remarkable document. As I've already indicated, it contains in writing every word spoken in the Senate and the House during the preceding day, and thus it furnishes a permanent account of all the legislative proceedings in Congress.

These day-to-day issues of the RECORD make it possible for the Members of Congress to reexamine more carefully the points raised

in previous debate, and, of course, the RECORD makes it possible for any Member to discover what has taken place during the period he may necessarily have been absent. Furthermore, the RECORD lists the names of those who favor or oppose a particular issue at the time a vote was taken.

Last year the Eighty-first Congress was in session from January 3 until October 19, a total of more than 10 months and a half. During that first session, 198 issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were published. The combined proceedings of the Senate and the House during that time filled 15,386 pages of small print. In addition, the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing letters, speeches delivered elsewhere, and other material of general interest, totaled another 7,180 pages.

These pages cover the official legislative record of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives over the 10½-month period, a record more than 22,000 pages long. Neglecting the cost of the paper, it cost the Government $85 a page to set up the type for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in other words, more than $1,750,000. This is a lot of money, but I would certainly be the last to recommend that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be abolished.

By and large the material contained in these 22,000 pages of small print is worthwhile and useful information. But this is not completely true by a long shot. I believe, and I think anyone familiar with the proceedings of Congress would agree with me, that ofttimes the proceedings of the Congress are filled with useless repetition of the same old thoughts and the same old arguments. Now, heaven knows, it is very often necessary to say something over and over again in order to convince others that what you say is true.

It might be argued that endless repetition doesn't contribute any new facts that aren't already known and understood. On the other hand, repetition of the same thought can be, and has been, used constructively to prevent injustice and to broaden general understanding of an issue.

Repetition can be misused. When talk is no longer confined to the merits of an issue, when the talk serves no other purpose than delay, delay, delay on the part of a handful of willful opponents of a particular measure, a serious threat to our representative democratic government presents itself.

Free speech is one of the fundamental and absolutely necessary requirements of the democratic process. Under dictatorships, no one dares voice his opposition, and that is certainly the last thing we want here. Our important problem legislatively, a problem we still haven't solved completely, is to draw a line which on the one hand, permits unlimited opportunity to criticize and to speak with the intention of influencing others—and which, on the other side of the line, puts a stop to the kind of talk which is not intended to inform or influence, but which has for its purpose instead the obstruction of the majority will on matters which in no way violate the fundamental rights of minorities. There's our problem.

In trying last year to draw up that kind of law by changing the filibuster rules of the Senate, our efforts failed. We are still confronted with the situation in which a willful minority may overrule the majority simply because the minority doesn't like a measure which in no way invades its constitutional rights. So the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does more than keep us posted on legislative events. The 22,000 pages in the 1949 RECORD provide us with documentary evidence for the need of bringing filibusters under control. Filibusters are still with us in the Senate, and until we've found the answer, the full measure of democracy will never be available to all our people.

Why Farm Groups Hit ECA's Use of Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have requested permission to insert in the Appendix the following article from the March 24, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which, in my opinion, sets forth the most convincing reasons why Congress should not give its approval to the idea of using the Marshall plan as a device for unloading surplus farm products:

WHY FARM GROUPS HIT ECA'S USE OF SURPLUSES

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—When the four farm organizations get together on anything, it makes news. When they get together in opposition to some one thing done in the Congress, it also shows that several Members of that legislative group failed to do the usual prelegislation reconnaissance.

The four farm organizations are together today, for the second time in modern history. They—the Grange, Farm Bureau Federation, Farmers Union, and Council of Farmer Cooperatives—are opposed as one to the idea of using the Marshall plan as a device for unloading some of the mountains of surplus farm products cluttering up the United States.

It seemed like such a good idea to Congressmen when they were sitting around in the committee room figuring out what to do with the third-year appropriation for the Marshall plan. The ECA expects to need $1,400,000,000 of United States farm products for export to Marshall-plan-receiving countries during the upcoming third year of the plan. The Commodity Credit Corporation has that much in surplus farm products on hand—and more, too. Why not get rid of some of the surplus and save money on ECA?

Put that away, it sounds like quite an appealing idea.

However, there is one trouble with it which the promoters of the idea do not seem to have thought of in advance. If ECA gets most of the United States farm products it ships to Europe through the CCC, there will be that much less buying of farm products through the ordinary marketing channels. It means that the wholesalers and commission merchants who have been handling this business in the past will cease handling it. The deal would have taken $1,000,000,000 worth of business out of the hands of free enterprisers.

Also, there is another objection in the minds of the farm organizations. If the ECA supplies are taken from the existing mountains of surplus, there is going to be a fresh accumulation of surplus in the markets where ECA normally does its buying.

Out of this springs one of those episodes which make American politics so confusing to visitors. The man who proposed the plan of getting ECA supplies out of the surpluses on Government hands is Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio. Mr. VORYS is a Republican. Mr. VORYS is also a solid believer in free enterprise. The two biggest of the farm organizations which oppose the Vorys plan are generally regarded as conservative—the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation. Also, the dominant political coloration of those organizations is Republican. In the joint letter which the four farm groups have mailed to every Member of Congress, they assert that the Vorys plan would inject more government operations quite fruitlessly into the Marshall-plan operation.

So, in effect, we have a plan proposed by a Republican legislator in the interest of economy being rejected unanimously by the farm organizations on the ground that it would narrow the area of free enterprise and expand the area of Government operations in the United States.

The farm groups have other objections, too. They point out that to take ECA supplies from surpluses would play into the hands of Russian propaganda which alleges that the Marshall plan is just a device for dumping United States surpluses overseas. They also object that the plan would make the farm price-support program bear the cost of ECA supplies and thereby make the farm program appear to cost $1,000,000,000 more than it actually does. This, of course, would be a political liability for the farm program.

But the real, basic objection of the farm groups is that the plan would take $1,000,000,000 worth of ECA business out of the regular market and put it into the Government market, which would be bad for farm business.

It is not always easy for a legislator to be sure these days which side of an issue is the free-enterprise side and which the Government-in-business side.

Give Harry the Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, March 25, 1950:

GIVE HARRY THE BYRD

The House Appropriations Committee has just nicked Truman's 1951 domestic budget by $1,500,000,000. And the House Foreign Affairs Committee has slashed another billion from the foreign-aid funds demanded by "Handout" Harry.

For all of which we give thanks. However, it still leaves the country faced with a $4,000,000,000 deficit. So when the big appropriation bill comes up on the floor next Monday the Republicans are going to try to cut another three billion off the total. We wish them luck.

But we believe Senator BYRD, of Virginia, a member of Truman's own party, has a better idea. BYRD announced last December that he thought the 1951 budget should be kept down to thirty-six billions.

This would be six and one-half billions below Truman's estimates but higher than the budget allowed in 1948 when it was balanced.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress that balanced that 1948 budget by spending only thirty-four billions.

The action of the House Appropriations Committee, which is dominated by the administration, shows how utterly foolish is Truman's contention that you can't cut the budget.

LET'S PAY OUR DEBTS

We hope the House will honestly take another whack at the big bill when it hits the floor and that the Senate will complete the job when it gets on its side of the Capitol.

The budget should be cut back to where it not only balances but to where it produces a surplus to pay off some of the huge national debt that is hanging over the country.

Chairman Spence Introduces Bill To Extend Rent Control in Cities Like Chicago

REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion on previous occasions to call the attention of the House to the situation in Chicago which would result if rent controls ended June 30 of this year. I do not wish any Member of this House to consider my statements as being even slightly on the exaggerated line. I am, therefore, calling the attention of my colleagues to an article on page 16 of part I of the Chicago Sunday Tribune of yesterday. The headline of this article reads: "High-rent flat easier to get; few low ones," and the subhead reads "Want-ad survey shows housing situation."

This article states that—

A survey yesterday of the rental situation in the Chicago metropolitan area disclosed that * * * the ads of those seeking apartments are more than double the supply and still rising.

The article further states that—

Comparative figures taken from Sunday want ads, the largest offering of any day shows that * * * the lineage of "wanted to rent" ads has risen this year from 962 lines on January 8 to 1,036 on February 12 and 1,139 on March 12.

The situation, briefly, as stated in the Republican and conservative Chicago Tribune of yesterday is that people with money now have "considerably greater opportunities to find apartments in the upper rental bracket," but that it is becoming increasingly difficult for people in ordinary circumstances to find homes within their means.

If rent controls are ended on June 30 of this year an immediate increase in rents above the ability of tenants to pay is inevitable. I say inevitable because of the law of supply and demand which must operate in such a situation.

As the only Chicago member of the Banking and Currency Committee I have felt keenly my responsibility not only to the tenants of Chicago, but to the general welfare of my city, which would suffer if after June 30 we had no protection for a considerable number of our workers who would be forced on the streets with their families because of their inability to meet rental demands.

Feeling this responsibility, I remained in Washington during the early weeks of December, working on the problem and with such results that I was able to give to the press a statement which was widely printed throughout the country stating that the administration, in my opinion, would not permit rent control to die until the housing shortage had been removed to such an extent that the relaxing of the rent controls could be effected without forcing many thousands of tenants to face an impossible housing situation.

During the present session I have been in constant touch with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of our committee, with other Members of the House and with the distinguished gentlemen who represent Illinois in the other branch, Senator LUCAS and Senator DOUGLAS. I can assure the House and the country that there is no disposition to let down Chicago and the other cities similarly situated. The time is fast running, and with June 30 only approximately 3 months away there is naturally great uneasiness prevailing among the people of Chicago and of other large cities in a similar situation. Meanwhile, I understand that one or two or perhaps other Members of the House are preparing bills for the extension of rent control. It would be unfortunate if the publicity attending the introduction of such bills should lead the people, not familiar with the procedures that obtain in this House, to false expectations.

As we know, but unfortunately the country is not as well informed, it is the bill introduced by the chairman of the committee that receives serious consideration. Thus the Housing bill was the Spence bill, and the rent-control bill which will be considered and brought before the committee and the House will be the Spence bill.

I am authorized to say by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of my committee, that at the proper time a bill will be introduced by him to continue rent control in those urban centers like Chicago where at this time the termination of controls would have such serious repercussions as is suggested by the statements in the article in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of yesterday to which I have referred.

Fortunately, and as we had all hoped, the need for rent control in a number of States and in many localities has ended. I hope it will be a matter of only another year until the need of such controls has been ended in my city of Chicago and in other cities in similar situation. Until that time arrives I bespeak the cooperation with us in protecting the people of Chicago and of other like cities of those Members who no longer have the immediate interest in the subject which they did in the time when their constituencies were in need of the controls.

I am further authorized to state that when the bill is introduced by Chairman SPENCE and public hearings are started by the House Banking and Currency Committee, that the mayors of a number of the large cities in need of continuing rent control will personally appear to testify as to the actual conditions existing in their respective cities.

Farm Plan of Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram from the president of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture in regard to the farm plan adopted by the Southern Commissioners of Agriculture on December 10 at their meeting in Atlanta, Ga., as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *March 25, 1950.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I note AP story from Washington your splendid effort to get into the RECORD plan adopted by southern commissioners of agriculture and kindly referred to as the Linder plan. This is actually now the plan of the commissioners of agriculture of most of the cotton-growing States.

It seems obvious that minimum labor wage makes it imperative to have minimum raw-commodity prices to keep our economy in balance. Otherwise, it will continually be necessary to appropriate tax money in large and larger amounts to keep a prop under raw commodities, especially farm crops.

Under the proposed plan, taking cotton, for example: Each farmer would have allotment in bales or pounds, eliminating all necessity for measuring or allotting his acres. He would be issued certificates covering his number of bales which would entitle their sale in the domestic market at or above minimum price. Any cotton grown in excess of his allotment could be carried over another year, could be sold for export at world prices, could be sold to another producer having excess certificates, but no appropriation would be required.

The southern commissioners desire at later date to present their plan to Congress through proper committees, and we hope that numbers of Congressmen and Senators from the Cotton Belt and other farm States will see fit to take up this fight and champion this plan. I note your intention to pursue this matter and want you to know that other sponsoring commissioners and I appreciate the splendid job you are doing.

TOM LINDER,
President, Association Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this telegram refers to an effort on my part, at the request of Hon. W. E. Anderson, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Louisiana, to present the farm plan of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture and to have the same included in the record of the House Committee on Agriculture. This was refused. However, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture did state that at some later date the committee would consent to the inclusion of this proposed program in the hearings of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this matter was presented by me when my bill, H. R. 7134, and House Joint Resolution 430 was being considered by the committee, and inasmuch as my bills dealt with the question of farm surpluses, support prices, and the farm program generally, it was

and is my opinion that it is proper to have this proposed plan of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture printed in the hearings of the Committee on Agriculture in order that the committee, the Congress, and the citizens of this country might be acquainted with the program proposed by this informed and patriotic group. Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to be an expert on agricultural problems; however, in view of the discussions in the Congress and throughout the Nation in regard to proposed changes in our farm policies, I think that any and all plans presented should have fair and reasonable consideration, and while I do not know that the plan proposed by the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is the best plan, I do believe that the same is worthy of consideration, and, therefore, I desire to read the proposed plan into the record at this point in order that the same may be brought to the attention of our people:

A SUBSTITUTE FARM PLAN

(By W. E. Anderson, commissioner, agriculture and immigration, State of Louisiana)

The main trouble with so-called agricultural plans, price supports, etc., has been that they have been dictated by political expedience rather than by statesmanship.

Let's analyze the situation calmly and honestly and let the chips fall where they will.

In the first place, it is wrong for the Government to use the taxpayers' money to subsidize any group. Therefore, any plan which involves the expenditure of tax money either to raise prices or to lower prices is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

Congress and the President have no right to make any plan for the special benefit of the farmers, for the special benefit of labor, for the special benefit of the consumer nor for the special benefit of industry or business.

The Congress of the United States and the President do have a right and it is their constitutional duty to take such action within the Constitution as will best serve the general welfare of the whole public.

Due to our tremendous national debt, and other debts, it is imperative that the Nation's income be maintained at a level of not less than $250,000,000,000. It is also necessary that the income of unorganized groups shall be on an equality with organized groups. This is necessary for the benefit of all the people—not for the benefit of any group.

It is most essential that prices of raw products, including agricultural products, be maintained at a figure which will provide a national income of $250,000,000,000, or more. This is not to be done for the special benefit of the farmers or other raw material men. It is to be done in the interest of the entire people.

If maintaining high prices for farmers would benefit farmers only, then it would be wrong for Congress and the President to do it. If maintaining high farm prices will benefit all the people, including the farmer, then it is right for Congress to maintain those prices provided it is not often done by subsidizing from the taxpayers' money.

It is now generally recognized that the national income will be seven times the amount received by the farmers. It is also generally recognized that the national income will be five times the amount received by farmers and all other producers of raw materials.

It therefore follows that, in order to have a national income of $250,000,000,000, the income of farmers and other raw-material men must be maintained at $50,000,000,000. The income of the farmers alone must be maintained at $36,000,000,000. This means cash income and cannot include any other income such as food and feed consumed on the farm or other benefits from the farm.

When organized labor asked Congress for a minimum price for labor, Congress did not deem it necessary to guarantee a job for all labor at the minimum price. Congress did not deem it necessary to make loans to labor to maintain a minimum price. Congress simply passed an act making it unlawful to buy a man's labor, if he came within the definition, at less than the minimum price.

If Congress had subsidized labor and paid a part of labor's wages out of the tax money, that would have been a Brannan plan for labor. I think most everyone would agree that it would have been ridiculous for the Government to subsidize labor and then have said to industry we are going to see that labor gets a fair wage, but we are also going to see that industrial management gets cheap labor.

It is equally ridiculous for the Government to say we are going to see that the farmers get a fair price, but we are also going to see that the general public gets cheap farm products.

Since Congress and the President were able to provide a minimum wage for labor without a subsidy from the taxpayers' money, it should not be any more difficult for Congress to see that the farmer gets a fair price for his crops, which is his labor, without giving the farmer a subsidy out of the taxpayers' money.

Since cotton is still our main cash crop in the South, let's see how this plan would work with cotton. If it works with cotton, then with proper adjustments it can be made to work with other major crops.

Suppose that when Congress meets in January, it would enact a law on the same principle as the minimum wage which law would require that cotton could not be purchased for less than parity. No subsidy, but simply make it unlawful to purchase cotton for less than 100 percent of the parity price.

I mean, of course, actual parity based on present conditions and not some fake parity as we have been having, based on conditions that ceased to exist in 1914. Let's assume for the purposes of this statement that actual parity for middling fifteen-sixteenth inch staple is 35 cents per pound. There is no more reason why a farmer should get 90 percent of parity or 80 percent of parity than there is why the laborer should receive 90 percent of the minimum wage or 80 percent of the minimum wage. The farmer should receive 100 percent of parity as a minimum price. This minimum price, of course, would have to be limited to the number of bales of cotton consumed in our domestic market.

If our domestic market in the past 12 months has consumed 9,000,000 bales of cotton, then we would assume that 9,000,000 bales would be required for the next 12 months for our domestic market. Instead of going out and measuring each farmer's land and giving him an acreage allotment, each farmer would receive certificates qualifying him to market the number of bales which he is entitled to produce for the domestic market—one certificate for one bale of cotton.

Each farmer would get the same number of certificates as the number of bales of cotton he was entitled to sell for domestic consumption at not less than the minimum price. On an average this would give the cotton farmer an income of $1,575,000,000. This, when translated in the seven-time turn-over, would contribute to the national income. $11,025,000,000.

Now let's take an individual cotton grower and see how this plan would operate on his farm: John Jones is a farmer who now has or will have an allotment of 15 acres for cotton. He is given this allotment on the supposition that 15 acres of his land will produce 10 bales of cotton. Therefore, John Jones will receive 10 certificates enabling him to market 10 bales of cotton at not less than the minimum price in the domestic market.

Suppose that Jones plants 15 acres and has an extra good year, making 12 bales of cotton instead of 10. Or, suppose that Jones decides to plant 20 acres instead of 15 and that he makes 16 bales of cotton. In either case he will have produced more cotton that he will have certificates to enable him to sell for domestic consumption. In the one case he would have 2 extra bales—in the other case he would have 6 extra bales. What can he do with these extra bales?

Before answering that question, let's consider Bill Smith, a neighbor of John Jones. Bill Smith has certificates also for 10 bales of cotton, but he only produces 4 bales due to a bad year or to the fact that Smith decided not to plant very much cotton that year. In that case, Smith has 6 certificates more than the number of bales of cotton he has produced.

Smith has 6 certificates which he does not need—Jones has 6 bales of cotton for which he has no certificates. If Jones and Smith can agree on a transfer of Smith's certificates to Jones, then Jones can sell all his cotton for domestic consumption and Smith can also sell all his cotton for domestic consumption.

Suppose, though, that Jones is unable to find a neighbor who has extra certificates, or who is willing to transfer his certificates, then Jones can do one of two things: Jones can simply keep his 6 bales of cotton until the next year and reduce his cotton crop the next year or Jones can sell those 6 bales of cotton to an exporter at the export price. Cotton sold to an exporter would have to be exported because the exporter would have no certificates to enable him to sell into the domestic market.

On the other hand, there would be no imports of foreign cotton because the importer would have no certificates to enable him to sell imported cotton into the domestic market. The farmer producing cotton would have the minimum price on all domestically consumed cotton just as labor has a minimum price on a day's work.

This would give the American market to the American producer of cotton. The American producer would be protected against competition from foreign cotton. His income would be protected by a minimum price.

It would be necessary to apply the same rule to competitors of cotton and to fix a minimum price on each competitor which would prevent such competitive material from having an advantage in the domestic market over cotton.

This, of course, is a two-price system. It is an American price for domestically consumed cotton and a world price for cotton that is exported. Under this plan no cotton farmer would be forced to compete with the world market. At the same time, any farmer who believed that he could produce cotton at a price that would enable him to sell in world markets would be at liberty to produce all the cotton he wished to produce.

Such a law, would of course, defeat the so-called reciprocal trade agreements. It would give the farmer in the United States the same protection against cheap foreign products that protective tariffs have given to industry and labor against cheap foreign labor and cheap foreign products. It would give the farmer parity—it would give him equality. It would adjust the domestic supply of cotton to the domestic demand for cotton without the necessity of going out surveying and measuring each farmers' acres, and without the necessity of ploughing up and destroying any crops because the farmer happened to overplant.

It would make the farmers politically independent because they would receive parity as a matter of law and would not be dependent upon changing administrations and changing pressure groups to get appropriations of tax funds to maintain the price.

No patriotic, intelligent American wants American labor's wages on a level with foreign labor's wages. No patriotic, intelligent American wants salaries in America on a level with salaries in foreign countries. No patriotic, intelligent American wants American farm prices on a level with foreign farm prices. To equalize our wages, salaries, and farm prices with foreign countries would mean the lowering of the American standard of living to that of foreign countries.

The only possible way to maintain the American wage standard, the American salary standard, and the standard of living in America is to maintain a minimum price on the raw materials so that the five times turnover of all raw materials and the seven times turn-over of agricultural products will maintain a national income of not less than $250,000,000,000.

The fixing and maintaining therefore of a minimum price at parity on farm products is for the benefit of the entire population of the United States and is not for the benefit of the farmers only. The farmers will not benefit any more than all the rest of the population regardless of the economic group to which they belong.

The farmers cannot continue to operate if the Government continues to reduce cotton acreage, to reduce peanut acreage, to reduce tobacco acreage, to reduce the acreage of wheat and other crops. The farmer must plant his land in order to continue to exist and to feed and clothe the Nation.

It is bad enough for the farmer to have to compete with foreign production in world markets. It is intolerable for the farmer to be forced to compete with foreign production in the American market, whether such foreign competition is brought in under the cloak of so-called reciprocal trade agreements or otherwise. Think this over.

The American Manufacturers' Association says the farmer must produce cotton cheaper. The international-minded Committee for Economic Development says the farmer must produce cotton cheaper. Some farm leaders and some farm Congressmen, parrot-like, repeat, "The farmer must produce cotton cheaper." Anyone who wants the farmer to produce cotton for less than 100 percent of parity is no friend of the farmer.

Everyone who has given even casual thought to the subject is bound to know that we must maintain a high economic level, a high monetary level, and a high standard of living in the United States. To do less will necessarily result in the complete disintegration of our national economy. It might even result in the disintegration of our Government itself.

Also, anyone who has given study to the subject must know that the income from the sale of raw materials, including agricultural products, determines the level of our economy and the level of our standards of living.

For 15 years we have had some form of Government support for the price of basic crops. At present, the contest in Washington is between the different variations of the plans heretofore tried out and the so-called Brannan plan.

The so-called Brannan plan would have most farm crops to sell for whatever they would bring without any legal support of prices. The Government would then make up the difference between what the farmer received and what the Secretary of Agriculture determined was a fair price by a subsidy from the Federal Treasury.

Let's analyze the prospects of the farmer if the so-called Brannan plan were enacted into law.

The first long range price support law was enacted in 1938 and provided for 52 to 75 percent of parity for wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn, rice, and peanuts.

From 1938, to the enactment of the Steagall amendment, loans were made to the farmers on these basic commodities. Another part of the program was very similar to the proposals of the so-called Brannan plan. Through this legislation Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments. These payments were supposed to amount to the difference between what the farmer actually received at the market place and the price that the Secretary of Agriculture fixed as parity. While Congress made large appropriations for this purpose, it failed to appropriate enough money to make full compensation to the farmers except in 1 year. This program was in effect during the years 1938 to 1942 inclusive, a 5-year period; 1942 was the only year when Congress appropriated enough money to make up the difference in price to the farmer. The only reason that the appropriation in 1942 was enough was because of rising farm prices incident to the war.

The first year 1938, Congress appropriated $211,742,000, whereas $666,601,631 would have been required if the farmer had received parity. Thus the farmer lost $454,859,631 in the deal of 1938. The amount appropriated was 31.8 percent of the amount the farmer was entitled to receive.

In 1939, the appropriation was $196,761,000, whereas $598,550,956 would have been required. This left the farmer a net loss in his parity payment of $401,789,956. In 1939, Congress appropriated 32.9 percent as much money as the farmer was entitled to receive.

In 1940, the appropriation was $196,908,000, whereas the farmer was entitled to receive $584,042,337. The farmer was short-changed $387,134,337 in 1940. The appropriation that year was 33.7 percent of the amount the farmer was entitled to receive.

In 1941, even after farm prices had made considerable advances, the appropriation was $10,453,137 less than the farmer was entitled to receive. The appropriation in 1941 was 95.1 percent of what the farmer was entitled to receive.

As stated above, 1942 was the only year that sufficient money was appropriated to make the parity payment to farmers.

It is most important that we keep in mind the fact that when the farmer most needed the parity payments was the time that Congress appropriated the least.

It is important that we impress these figures on our mind in order to visualize what would happen to the farmers if they were dependent on a Government subsidy and congressional appropriation to give them a decent income.

If the price of agricultural crops were allowed to go unsupported and forced to compete with imports under the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements, then it is certain that present farm prices would drop not less than 33⅓ to 50 percent. That would mean that in order for the farmer to get substantially present prices Congress would have to appropriate each year around $10,000,000,000 for farm subsidies.

Is there any reasonable-thinking person, farmer or otherwise, who believes that Congress would appropriate $10,000,000,000 to subsidize the farmers? Is there any reasonable person who believes that $10,000,000,000 could be appropriated annually for farm subsidies without creating a revolution among the consumers of the Nation whose lack of understanding of national economics makes them easy prey to newspapers and radio agitators?

Liquor Ads Are Degrading and Flaunt Temptation in the Faces of Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there are companion bills before Congress to bar liquor advertisements. Senate bill 1847 and House bill 2428 which have my unqualified support, as I have stated in the hearing before the Senate committee in charge of the legislation which is inserted here for the consideration of my colleagues H. R. 2428:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE IN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record, I am COMPTON I. WHITE, Member of Congress from the First District of Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to our magazines, and publications, and radio carrying liquor advertisements. I am in full support of the bill under consideration by this committee.

One of the most distressing and discouraging things you find in our civilization today, particularly in our everyday life, is to find some fine young man whose father is taking great pains in raising and educating him, and he is ready to go into business, and probably gets married, becoming a liquor addict and is unable to control his appetite that is fastened upon him.

I want to commend the good work that is being done by the Alcoholics Anonymous, the AA, to assist these men, young folks, and immature people, to overcome that habit. They cooperate and lend their support, and they are doing a wonderful work, and I do not see why we should permit advertising to induce people and lure people to become addicts of liquor. There is temptation enough without having these luring advertisements we find in the magazines—expensive advertisements, I may say, that appear in these national periodicals and on the radios. I think that this bill is a step in the right direction, that we should curtail and eliminate those advertisements.

If you and I had a constructive project to finance, if we wanted to advertise, if we needed venture capital to develop a mine or to develop any industry, the SEC would step in and under their present rules in effect today absolutely make it impossible for you to make any public announcement, or advertise, in any way obtain capital to employ people and build a worth-while industry. Try it if you want to see.

The SEC will tell me "If you want to put any advertisements out you must print your whole prospectus." You must use two or three sheets of the newspaper to advertise, if advertise at all.

But when you come to liquor you can go out and put in these attractive illustrated advertisements, these allurements, if you please, to fasten this destructive habit on the people, and I am opposed to it.

I think if we are going to enforce regulations that prevent people from advertising constructive industry and constructive projects, as the Securities and Exchange Commission is doing, certainly we cannot permit

these breweries and these distilleries to advertise a product that fastens degrading habits on the people such as it does. For that reason I am very much in favor of this legislation.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Congressman.

New England Workers Pay the Price in Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent with each passing day that the cut-throat foreign competition provided by the importation of goods manufactured abroad is costing us a pretty price. As the alarming aspects of our foreign-trade policy begin to open the eyes of the American worker the fact is brought conspicuously to the forefront that the inevitable injury caused by growing imports is not confined to just a few industries. It is definitely encroaching on other areas of our economy.

The oft-repeated, yet unassailable truth is that American workers cannot compete with the low wages paid in other countries. Excessive imports can mean only one thing. The administration prefers to risk the closing of our factories. It seemingly remains unconcerned about the much-dreaded picture of men without jobs, a condition it is now in the process of creating.

Connecticut and New England with its concentration of industries are faced with the paying of a terrific toll in jobs lost, if the flow of foreign-made products continues unchecked. The indiscriminate, ill-conceived administration foreign-trade program is doing one thing that is definite. It is starting American workers on a discouraging march for jobs that will soon be nowhere available.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Haven Register of March 24, 1950, which gives some indication of the damaging effect upon one of New England's great industries by low-wage foreign competition:

CHEAP IMPORTS HELD HARMFUL TO JEWELRY TRADE

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 24.—An official of the New England Manufacturing Jewelers' and Silversmith's Association says "a flood of foreign merchandise produced by low paid, substandard workers" is pouring into this country.

George R. Frankovitch, executive secretary of the association, told the New England council's committee on economic research last night the United States is encouraging import of merchandise from prewar competitors.

Frankovitch declared:

"Produced under conditions unthinkable in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, the pearl industry of Japan is again sweeping away the jobs of pearl workers in New England.

"Slave or nearly slave labor in Czechoslovakia is again producing a cheap-type jewelry that is slowly stilling the machines of the New England plants."

Frankovitch described New England as one of the greatest jewelry manufacturing centers the world over.

He said that more than half of the industry's 80,000 workers in the United States are employed in New England. Most of the others he said work in the New York-New Jersey area.

He reported that Rhode Island is the greatest jewelry producing State in the country, while entire communities southeast of Massachusetts are totally dependent on the manufacturing jewelry industry for their livelihood.

Frankovitch attacked the 20 percent luxury tax on jewelry and declared that it has been the greatest detriment to full employment, greater stability, and general prosperity in the jewelry industry.

Small Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following statement of Mr. S. Abbott Smith, of the Thomas Strahan Co., manufacturers of fine wall decorations, Chelsea, Mass., presented in behalf of the Small Business Association of New England, Inc., before a meeting of the New England Senators and Congressmen, and officers and principal committee chairmen of that organization held in room 18 in the Capitol Building on Monday, March 27, 1950.

This statement is most interesting, enlightening, and helpful, as a step in the right direction to assist and improve small business in New England and to help and relieve the serious unemployment situation in that section of the country:

Gentlemen, we very much appreciate your coming here this morning and giving us this opportunity to present our views on these important problems facing small business. At the same time, we hope these meetings may be profitable to you also in obtaining a boiled-down picture of the feelings of many of your constituents.

My subject is the great need of small businesses all over the country for adequate long-term and equity capital financing. That this need is increasing all the time is evidenced by the increasing number of applications to the RFC, by the hundreds of applications to the American Research and Development Corp. in Boston, and by our own personal contacts. I do not doubt but what your own mail tells you the story directly. All this is still further corroborated by the statement of Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, that the burden of the testimony before the Investment Subcommittee was that while private savings are at record-breaking levels, our private-enterprise system is starving for lack of debt and equity capital. The pressure is building up for supplying this capital from Government funds. Most of us, however, feel that such moves are unsound and will probably not be satisfactory.

Our banks seem to be adequately taking care of the short-term financing needs of our businesses but most of them stop there. The Bank of America is apparently doing an outstanding job on the west coast, going much farther. Some individual banks in New England are doing a good job, too, but in general all too many of our banks have become repositories for their depositors' money rather than performing what used to be considered full-banking functions. They are quite right when they say it is not the job of a commercial bank to supply equity capital; there is a very real question as to how long maturities they ought to allow on loans and what security should be required. All this merely accentuates the wide gap between the financing needed by business and what is being supplied by the banks.

The RFC has been of help to some small businesses but its loaning abilities are restricted, its purpose is not to lend equity capital and it very obviously is not filling the need. Furthermore, if it can possibly be done, we should prefer to see this financing come from private sources rather than be done with Government money.

Just why do we have this paradox of the greatest accumulation of savings in history and yet the dearth of long-term and equity capital for small businesses? The answer lies fundamentally, I believe, in our present tax structure. The quickest and best solution to the financing problem would be to reduce taxes, let companies plow back their earnings, eliminate the double tax on dividends. If you want hosts of new small businesses, just eliminate all taxes on profits and dividends from new small businesses for say the first 5 or 10 years.

If the reward is proportionate to the risk, you will no longer have to worry about a lack of equity capital.

Obviously, in view of our present budgetary situation, the above steps cannot be taken all at once anyway so instead of attacking the root of our trouble, we have to find some way, in spite of the present tax structure, to provide at least partially the long-term and equity financing needed by our New England small businesses—and preferably from private sources.

Last year, you will remember, we suggested that a capital bank might be one of the answers. It has been amazing and pleasing to see the swing of sentiment in many quarters in favor of such a plan. All this sentiment was crystallized a few weeks ago when Senator O'MAHONEY introduced in the Senate, S. 2975.

This bill would amend the Federal Reserve Act and authorize the creation of the 36 such banks, 1 in each Federal Reserve or Federal Reserve branch district. No Federal appropriations or guaranties are involved but this bill would provide a means for channeling some of the funds of the commercial banks, savings banks, life insurance companies and other financial institutions, as well as those of individuals, into local small businesses. All of these sources are expected to supply the initial capital by buying the original stock.

The capital banks would be a part of the Federal Reserve System and under the general supervision of the Federal Reserve Board. Each bank would have a board of directors of nine men, three appointed by the Federal Reserve bank in the district from the public and six by the stockholders.

The general powers of the capital banks would be to:

1. Insure loans by banks to small businesses up to $10,000 each and 5 years maturity.

2. Make loans direct to small businesses or buy obligations of small businesses from banks and other institutions.

3. Purchase equity or other securities of small businesses.

4. Purchase shares of local industrial development corporations which specialize in furnishing venture capital for new businesses. Such purchases would be limited to 5 percent of the capital, surplus, and authorized indebtedness of each corporation.

There are various other qualifications of the above powers, but there is no need to go into more detail now.

Applications to the capital bank for financing would be initiated through the local banks and other cooperating institutions. In this way the usual local bank-customer relationship which is so desirable will not be disrupted. Furthermore you will observe that the capital bank picks up where the local commercial bank generally stops, i. e., at long-term and equity financing, thus filling that gap which has become so glaringly apparent.

Personally I believe that a capital bank can and will be profitable if properly managed. However, Senator O'MAHONEY offers an additional inducement to the investors in this bank: It and its income will be exempt from Federal, State, and municipal taxes (except on real property) for a period of 15 years. Parenthetically it seems to me this provision backs up my original suggestion as to how to really supply small business with plenty of equity capital.

The bill also provides that the capital banks shall use the facilities of the Federal Reserve System and the Department of Commerce and shall provide consulting and advising services on a fee basis.

That, gentlemen, is a very brief statement of a very big subject. We hope each of you will study this bill carefully because, although not perfect by any means, we do think it along the right lines. Considerable discretion and latitude must be left to the directors of such banks because experience will undoubtedly show the need for changes not now foreseen. The main thing is to get started.

This subject is of particular importance to us in New England. New England money financed the development of a great deal of the United States in many fields, yet today our own little businesses cannot obtain the financing they need. Money is today being pumped out of New England pockets by Federal taxes to irrigate western sands to produce more of what, in many cases, we already have too much of. Our money is being used to develop other parts of the country which at the same time are enticing our men and businesses away from us.

Last Friday I participated in a panel discussion at the New England Council quarterly meeting in Providence on the subject of community industrial financing. Other parts of the country are way ahead of us. We must wake up and mobilize our resources to see to it that our New England businesses get the financing they need, the new equipment and buildings they must have to compete successfully. We must encourage our young men and develop new ideas, not just coast along on ideas which have now grown old.

The development of New England has always gone in cycles. When the clipper-ship era passed, we pioneered and developed textiles, shoes, and other industrial enterprises. Now those are slipping, but new ideas are flowing in streams from our research factories along the Charles River as well as from our thousands of businesses throughout New England. We must see to it that those ideas do not die aborning or move elsewhere just for lack of financing here.

We need a capital bank run by men of vision and keen financial judgment, cognizant of and sympathetic with the needs of small businesses. Such men with these facilities will put new vigor into our New England businesses and New England communities. Therefore, we hope that a bill similar to S. 2975, perhaps better, will be introduced in the House.

We urge you to study this bill. Improve it if you can. Give it your whole-hearted support. We must have long-term and equity financing.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen Oppose St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, representing employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad lines west, is opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

For the benefit of Members of Congress, I am inserting a resolution adopted March 21, 1950, and outlining the reasons why the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The resolution is as follows:

GENERAL GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Richmond, Ind., March 21, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At a recent session of the Full General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Pennsylvania Railroad, Lines West, the following resolution was adopted:

"COLONIAL HOTEL,
"Cleveland, Ohio, March 14, 1950.

"To Officers and Members, General Grievance Committee, Pennsylvania Railroad, Lines West, in Special Session at Cleveland, March 14, 1950:

"Whereas there are in the United States and Canada, selfish business interests who are attempting to influence the governments of both nations to reconstruct the channels of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River to provide a channel for the maritime traffic of the world; and

"Whereas these selfish interests have caused legislation to be introduced in the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction and maintenance of the project, to be known as the St. Lawrence Seaway; and

"Whereas such proposed seaway could only be used a few months each year, due to the subzero temperatures which causes the lakes and the river to be frozen over during the winter months; and

"Whereas the cost of the proposed seaway of several hundreds of millions of dollars is to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States, with little or no benefit to the people; and

"Whereas the selfish interests promoting the proposed seaway hope to benefit from its operation through lower transportation rates, without any reduction whatever in the prices of commodities to the consumers; and

"Whereas the territory in the United States to be served by the proposed seaway is now adequately served by transportation facilities which were able to efficiently handle all of the military, industrial, and civilian transportation needs of the world wars, and will be able to meet the needs of our peacetime expansions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the general committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen on the Pennsylvania Railroad, Lines West, in meeting assembled in Cleveland, Ohio, March 14, 1950, go on record opposing the legislation to provide for the construction and maintenance of the St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the governors, United States Senators and Representatives in Congress of all States served by the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

"G. H. GATES (421),
"J. N. NORTON (141),
"J. B. PHILLIPS (298),
"Resolutions Committee.

"Moved by McGrath (225) and Sandilla (198) that the resolution be adopted.

"Motion carried unanimously."

Hoping that you will not concur in this proposed wasteful enterprise, which will only make the rich richer and the poor poorer, I am,

Sincerely yours,

U. D. HARTMAN,
General Chairman, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Pennsylvania, Lines West.

Protection on Import Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, imports of foreign commodities under our reciprocal trade agreements policy have in many instances been injurious to domestic industry. Many plants have either closed down or curtailed their operations, throwing many thousands of workers out of employment. Representatives of labor and management in affected industries have formed an organization known as the National Labor Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy. Their position on import competition has been well stated by Mr. O. Strackbein, chairman of the organization, in a letter appearing in the Washington Post on March 27, 1950. I trust that Members of the House will read it and give consideration to what Mr. Strackbein has said.

PROTECTION ON IMPORT COMPETITION

As chairman of the newly organized National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, may I express to you the position taken by the labor and management groups which make up the council in regard to the impact on certain American industries of the Administration's import policy.

Lower wages than those prevailing in the United States create the principal competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign countries when they ship dutiable merchandise into our domestic market. These lower wage rates often result in lower foreign costs and confer a price advantage upon the shipper to our shores, since his productivity is not generally so far below our own as to offset the lower wages. With the exception of a few products, such as automobiles, that are mass-produced by us, other countries are not

very far behind us in productivity and are rapidly catching up in many lines because of the spread of mechanization.

In the meantime, however, and contrary to the theory of classical economists and free-trade advocates, the competitive advantages of imported dutiable goods in our domestic market are not generally reducible to superiority of natural resources, soil, climate, or greater efficiency in the countries of origin. Unfortunately they are attributable in some cases to simple exploitation of labor.

Competitive goods that derive their cheapness from this source therefore enter higher-standard countries with a spurious economic advantage rather than a fair one. Instead of spreading the economic benefits often attributed to trade, they undermine the living standards in the higher-standard importing countries.

In order to prevent the destruction of high-labor standards and to maintain the possibility of reasonable business profits, a high-standard country is therefore fully justified in taking measures to prevent the economic erosion that may result from unimpeded importation of competitive, as distinguished from complementary, goods from lower-wage countries.

Protective measures that are designed thus simply to place competitive foreign products on a fair competitive level in the market of a high-standard country cannot properly be described as trade barriers or obstacles to the flow of healthy trade. The United States is unique in the world of trade because all other countries operate on a lower-wage standard. Nevertheless approximately 60 percent of our imports are now free of duty, consisting largely of noncompetitive items and raw materials. The economic conditions of their production overseas cannot directly undermine our standards and our consumers can enjoy the lower prices without hurting domestic production.

However, the claim of consumers to the enjoyment of lower prices on the 40 percent remainder of our imports, which are competitive goods, is not valid if the lower prices of the latter merely reflect lower-wage levels abroad, since such a claim would be based on the destruction of our economic standards.

The postwar economic stiuation, characterized by an unprecedentedly high national debt, calls for the continuance of an unusually high annual national income, or one of well over $200,000,000,000. This requirement binds us, however, unwillingly, to a high-price level.

The interests not only of labor and management but also of the public therefore make it imperative that they seek reasonable safeguards against unfair and deflationary foreign competition.

O. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman, National Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Trade Policy.
WASHINGTON.

Unemployment Classified by Usual Occupations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statistics on unemployed persons in the United States on January 1950, classified by usual occupation:

Major occupation group:	*Number of persons*
Professional and semi-professional workers	124,000
Farmers and farm managers	25,000
Proprietors, managers, and officials, except farm	146,000
Clerical and kindred workers	348,000
Salesmen and saleswomen	218,000
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	728,000
Operatives and kindred workers	1,153,000
Domestic service workers	135,000
Service workers, except domestic	377,000
Farm laborers and foremen	316,000
Laborers, except farm and mine	771,000
Never had a job	141,000
Total unemployed persons	4,480,000

Admiral Cook in Formosa as Adviser on Strategy to Chinese Nationalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the March 25 issue of the Washington Star with respect to the naval adviser to the Chinese Nationalist Government, Vice Adm. S. C. Cook:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—ADMIRAL COOK IN FORMOSA AS ADVISER ON STRATEGY TO CHINESE NATIONALISTS

(By Constantine Brown)

Vice Adm. S. C. Cook, former commander of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific, is in Formosa in the capacity of naval adviser to the Nationalist Government.

Admiral Cook, who retired from the Navy about 2 years ago, agreed to go to Formosa to help the Nationalists continue their struggle without any specific authorization from the United States Government.

The arrival of Admiral Cook has put some new life in the defenders of that island. So long as the Chinese Communists do not have the necessary landing craft and a powerful air force, it will be difficult for them to cross the nearly 100-mile stretch of water which separates the island from the mainland.

DEFECTION CHIEF FEAR

The possible defection of the Nationalist navy and air force was more feared by their government than an actual invasion. American observers on the spot have reported since last December that so long as these two branches of the Nationalist force remained loyal, the chances of a successful Communist landing remained slim. Communist propagandists have urged the air and naval personnel of the Nationalists to give up, since the United States and Britain had written them off.

The fact that the British Government broke diplomatic relations with the Nationalists and recognized the Peiping puppets did not worry the defenders of Formosa very much. Britain's prestige had been at a low ebb for some time.

But the Nationalists' abandonment by the United States was an entirely different story. The Chinese know that we stood by them ever since the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931, and considered us their only friends. Our attitude in recent years has severely undermined the morale of the Nationalist forces. It was more recently reflected in the doubtful loyalty of the personnel of the naval and air forces gathered in Formosa for a last stand.

PRESENCE ACTS LIKE TONIC

The mere presence of an American retired admiral, well known to the Chinese because of his previous associations with them, has acted like a tonic. Within a few weeks after he assumed the position of adviser to the Nationalist naval forces, a daring commando raid was staged on the mainland. On March 15, the town of Sugmen was occupied for a few days. After executing a number of Communist officials in that area, the raiding party split in two: one group went into the interior to join the guerrillas whose number is increasing rapidly; the other returned on board the raiding vessels and had a triumphal reception at the Keelung naval base in Formosa.

From a military standpoint the raid was of no consequence. But from a psychological warfare view it was more important than almost anything the Nationalists have done in the last 2 years. It raised the morale of the Nationalist armies which had suffered only defeats since 1947; it impressed the subjugated Chinese peoples who saw for the first time since the fall of Canton and Chungking regular troops on the mainland and it compelled the Communist army to detach two divisions from the south to prevent another possible incursion.

The rank and file of the civilians and military on Formosa probably are not aware that Admiral Cook is a civilian so far as the American Government is concerned. They look upon him as a representative of the American Navy and rejoice that Washington has finally decided to give them some assistance. The moral effect of Admiral Cook's presence on Formosa in terms of stiffening the resistance of the Nationalists is worth more than the ECA assistance we are giving their government sparingly.

Crucial Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of recent date:

TALKATIVE CONGRESSMEN

Congressmen are always complaining that they don't get the truth, or at least all of it, from such important arms of Government as the State and Defense Departments. But they themselves are partly to blame, because few of them know how to keep a secret. They're undoubtedly right that they don't get the full story.

Of course some of the information they don't learn is too vital to security to be passed around, even within the departments. We're not thinking about rigidly classified material.

But lots of other data Congress could wisely lean upon for intelligent lawmaking it never gets. What it does find out about the state of our defense or political and

diplomatic conditions abroad is too often not distinguished either for accuracy or clarity.

The departments, to be sure, can't be whitewashed of responsibility for their part in this. Many Government officials have a generous contempt for the people's representatives and are predisposed to tell them as little as possible, just on general principles.

The thing is further complicated by the departments' dependence on Congress for money. Department officials come to Capitol Hill as bargainers, trying to put the best conceivable case for the granting of the funds they seek. Understandably, some inconvenient truths may not get told.

But there's another side of it. Congressmen as a rule are among the poorest guardians of a confidence to be found in Washington. Tell them something confidential and, like as not, it'll find its way into print in record time.

The average Congressman fairly bursts with self-importance when he's lugging a big secret around in his brief case. He can hardly wait to fish out a shiny photostat fresh from Government files and show it to a colleague, a visiting constituent, or a reporter.

The information usually is passed on with appropriate warnings not to disclose it. Yet few who relay such data to reporters can have any illusions about where the material will ultimately wind up.

The plain fact is the Congressmen want it known that they have important information. It increases their stature, they believe.

Actually, their stature would be a lot greater if they showed more responsibility in preserving confidences. They can't expect to be entrusted with crucial data so long as they spill the contents of their brief cases to every good listener who hits their offices.

There'll be more point to their demand for important facts when they learn to curb their schoolboyish eagerness to command attention.

The Faith That Created America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Everett (Mass.) Evening News-Gazette. This editorial brings a hopeful message to all Americans who believe in preserving our ancient landmarks. The editorial follows:

THE FAITH THAT CREATED AMERICA

John W. McPherrin, editor of the American Druggist, recently spent 5 weeks in England studying socialized medicine. He said that Britons seem to have accepted the "false doctrine" that the state alone can bring security, though, he added, "I don't think they really believe it deep down in their hearts." He quoted the British health minister, Aneurin Bevan, as saying in a private interview, "The method we are using to provide health for all the people will spread throughout the world. Such a change is inevitable. America must come to it."

Then he gave his own view, in these words: "After 5 weeks in Great Britain I came home with a new reverence for the faith in mankind that created America. The same faith did not create the welfare state."

The main importance of socialized medicine—and of the compulsory Government health-insurance scheme now being proposed for this country—is that it is not a thing complete in itself, but part of an infinitely larger plan to give Government either ownership or absolute control over the people's resources and the people as individuals. According to the classic Communist dogma, socialized medicine is one of the most important steps in this direction. If it cannot be achieved all at once, an attempt is made to bring it on by degrees. To take a current example, Congress now has before it two bills, one of which would authorize Federal handouts to medical schools, and another which would make the Government responsible for the medical care of children within certain age groups. The obvious purpose is piecemeal socialization.

The welfare state, in all its many facets, is the antithesis of what we have believed to be the American tradition. Sooner or later, it would destroy that tradition totally.

Farmers Union Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in these troublesome times, the farming situation in the Northwest is growing more troublesome, and from month to month it becomes even worse. The decline in prices of farm products steadily lowers the buying power of the great food-producing sections of our country. Looking backward to other such depressions, many are brought to a realization that hard times in rural sections frequently have been the forerunner of a national decline in prosperity.

Temporarily, Government expenditures may seem to protect the industrial centers, but loss of the purchasing power of the rural centers, in which reside nearly half our population, is a warning to all people. The number of the unemployed has mounted steadily in the past few months. It now is in excess of 4,000,000 workers, one of the unfavorable indications which quickly follows a decline in agriculture.

At the annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, in Eau Claire, there was brought together a large group of practical men as representatives of their great and growing organization. Most of these delegates come from the big dairy centers, from the dairy farms which produce such a large percentage of the milk and milk products which supply the Nation's industrial and commercial centers. These able men are students of economic conditions, as well as the details of dairy farm and home life. They speak from the wisdom born of long experience and observation. They know whereof they speak, and they speak not because of a love of vocal expression, but because they know and feel the difficulties with which all our people are confronted. Their thoughts are well worthy of the consideration of all people who recognize the gravity of the problem, and the necessity of a solution.

The debates of this big and important convention are in part embodied in a series of resolutions adopted at the convention. They were as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FHA

Whereas the Wisconsin Farmers Union is basically concerned with the welfare of all Wisconsin farmers, especially those operating family sized farming units and who are in need of financial assistance, and farm and home management guidance; and

Whereas many farmers in Wisconsin, both veterans and nonveterans with good agricultural backgrounds and experience lack the necessary land, livestock and equipment to be successful as farmers; and

Whereas the Farmers Home Administration, as an established agency in the United States Department of Agriculture, has for many years demonstrated its ability to give such financial aid, farm and home management guidance to needy veterans and other farmers, through its supervised credit program; and

Whereas this agency does not compete with any other agency by making loans only to worthy and qualified farmers, who are unable to get money through banks or other loaning institutions, and gives guidance not provided by other loaning sources; and

Whereas the funds annually appropriated for the use of the agency are entirely inadequate to meet the needs of eligible farm families; and

Whereas the need of eligible nonveteran farmers is particularly apparent at this time to be as great or greater than veterans, because many veterans have received the excellent service rendered by the FHA in recent years; and

Whereas prices of farm products, especially poultry and dairy products have dropped sharply this past year and continue downward with practically no reduction in farm supplies; and

Whereas the current drastic drop in farm income has been accompanied by a very pronounced tightening of local agricultural credit: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the Twentieth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is being held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17–20, 1950, do favor the Farmers Home Administration being given the continued active support of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, and that our national office take such steps as are needed to inform Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture of the need for more appropriations so as to enable the FHA to meet the needs of eligible farm families; and be it further

Resolved, That our national office review the appropriation and the needs of this agency, and to inform Congress of the need of a deficiency appropriation if advisable in the light of current agricultural conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and all Wisconsin Congressmen.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Whereas years of effort have been devoted to the proposition of developing the St. Lawrence River as a joint seaway and hydroelectric power project by the Governments of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the Canadian Government has completed a considerable part of its commitments with respect to developing the St. Lawrence River as a joint project of the two nations, and is now waiting for the United States to take decisive action; and

Whereas dairy, grain, and livestock farmers in central and midwestern United States have a definite stake in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway as a means of gaining access to foreign markets for the products; and

Whereas freight rates and handling costs have increased more than 50 percent in the last few years and these costs must be borne by consumers in our eastern cities in higher food prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union delegates attending the organization's twentieth annual convention in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17–20, 1950, do hereby reaffirm our previous stand that the St. Lawrence seaway be developed as a means of giving the landlocked central and midwestern farmers an ocean gateway; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be forwarded to Wisconsin's congressional representatives with the request that they push for action on this project.

THE BRANNAN PLAN

Whereas the American farmer has done a wonderful job producing food and fiber to meet the needs of the whole world; and

Whereas it is unfair to any group of society not to be insured of a decent standard of living, especially after having contributed so wholeheartedly of their sweat and toil to feed the world; and

Whereas the present agricultural program is inadequate in that it concerns itself primarily with the prices of individual farm products. With the program now in, there are no funds for the Secretary of Agriculture to use, so it means nothing to the price-support program; and

Whereas the Brannan plan program is designed to provide the American farmers with a sounder and more effective farm program than is now available to them. At the time it aims to assure consumers of plentiful and steady supplies of agricultural products at reasonable prices; and

Whereas the proposed program carries a definite and realistic income objective and uses price support as a means to that end: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the twentieth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is being held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17 to 20, 1950, go on record supporting the Brannan plan; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators.

ABOLITION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Whereas our present system of an electoral college for the purpose of electing a President and Vice President of the United States is not only outmoded but also undemocratic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union, by action of the delegates attending the twentieth annual convention of the organization, held at Eau Claire, Wis., February 17–20, 1950, do favor the abolition of the electoral college and instead favor the direct election by popular vote of the President and Vice President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our congressional Representatives with the petition that they initiate legislation to accomplish this object.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Whereas competent studies show that the United States will need school buildings for at least six and a half million additional children during the next 6 years; and

Whereas at least 2,000,000 American children of school age are not attending any school; and

Whereas hundreds of rural communities in the United States are unable to finance a sound system of rural education; and

Whereas we contend that education is the keystone of our representative form of government and a cardinal requisite for the preservation of our democratic way of life; and

Whereas in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses the United States Senate passed a bill to provide Federal aid for the Nation's schools, but twice the reactionaries in the House of Representatives killed this legislation; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his budget message to Congress last month requested an appropriation of $400,000,000 for education and general research; and

Whereas we believe that this sum is insufficient when contrasted to the $13,600,000,000 requested for national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the Twentieth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which is being held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 17 to 20, 1950, do hereby go on record in favor of reducing the request for defense funds and increasing funds for educational aid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin congressional representatives as an expression of our views with the request that they support our proposals with their votes.

John M. Cashman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following eulogies that appeared in the newspapers in the city of Lynn, Mass., following the passing of one of the outstanding members of the bar of that city.

This lovable member of the profession, Attorney John M. Cashman, had served with honor and distinction as the assistant city solicitor of that city for a number of years.

The statement "Cashman files brief" appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News on Thursday, March 23, 1950. The other article entitled "John M. Cashman" appeared in the Lynn Daily Item of that city. The entire city of Lynn and members of the legal fraternity, friends, and associates outside of that city respectfully mourn his passing:

CASHMAN FILES BRIEF

Assistant City Solicitor John M. Cashman presented the final and most important brief of his brilliant career early Tuesday morning as he faced the supreme judge of all—St. Peter.

It couldn't have been too lengthy a summation since John had received little notice of the assignment. It must have been something he hastily composed when the angels of death began to hover about him in his lonely hospital room at the Palmer House. But then John was never one for literary hemorrhages, he had a penchant for saying things as speedily as possible and his success in the legal field was attended by that reputation that he was a man who came to the point early in a discussion.

John could have told St. Peter many things the other morning, that he had always been a devoted husband and companion, a doting father, a man who had not the time to belabor his fellowmen with criticism, a churchman who had always taken his religion seriously, but knowing him as they did his friends are certain his summation went something like this: "You've been keeping the books. What's the verdict?"

John M. Cashman won the game of life, for he never allowed it to become too important to him. In death he is even greater than in life, for only now may the populace truly appraise the exemplary existence of this man. There is no great sorrow over the death of John Cashman, for death is inevitable and it meant nothing to him. He could have met it as a boy or as a young man, but a kind Providence allowed him to round out a full and complete life before separating from his loved ones. That was how John looked at it. He never at any time during his mortal span ever stopped being thankful for his blessings.

True, Lynn has lost an outstanding citizen, the city an able servant, the bar an insatiable student, and his loved ones a devoted companion, but balancing all of these things is the lesson of the life he lived; that man is not important upon his earth, that his reward, if there is to be one, must come in still another sphere. There is no doubting the fact that John Cashman enjoys that rich reward today, the pains gone from his chest, his stiff knee strong and new, the multiple correspondence he signed for the rotary machine a memory, legal opinion and briefs a hazy item of the past.

John M. Cashman, virile, strong, brilliant, wealthy, chose to live with the Almighty for the greater portion of his life. Were legal opinions necessary in his new domain, no doubt he'd command a dozen of the most talented stenographers in Heaven.

JOHN M. CASHMAN

Lynn has lost one of the most brilliant members of the legal fraternity and a public servant of the highest integtrity in the death of Attorney John M. Cashman, assistant city solicitor for the past 29 years.

John Cashman loved his profession and brought to it an ardor that never waned. He was thoroughly versed in the intricacies of the law, particularly in municipal law, a field in which he won recognition throughout the Commonwealth. His private practice was large and fruitful.

The respect and esteem in which he was held by his professional colleagues was best attested by the fact that he was chosen by them to serve 15 years as president of the Lynn Bar Association, an honor not to be regarded lightly in a community plentifully supplied with legal talent of a rich order.

Mr. Cashman was a man of unimpeachable personal character, devoted to his home and family and to various civic causes to which he brought the same enthusiasm and industry that he demonstrated in his professional duties. His sense of humor, his keen intellectual background, his inquiring mind and his genial amiability won him countless, enduring friends in many circles. Lynn is the poorer in his passing.

Putting the Votes on Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., appearing in their issue of March 25.

This editorial endorses and favors my House Resolution 450 which would require a record vote—yea and nay—on

all appropriation bills of public funds or of a public nature.

The editorial is as follows:

PUTTING THE VOTES ON RECORD

Representative ROGERS of Florida wants to have the House of Representatives do a very sensible thing—require a yea-and-nay vote (which becomes a matter of public record) on every bill or resolution that appropriates public funds. He has introduced a resolution to that effect and has asked the Rules Committee to approve it, so that it can be brought before the House.

Mr. ROGERS points out the interesting fact that last year Congress authorized and appropriated upward of $28,000,000,000 without a record vote in either House or Senate to show how individual Members voted. Record votes were taken on some measures in the Senate, omitted on others. Mr. ROGERS believes that when the people's representatives vote to spend the people's money, their votes should be taken down. He is right. It should be required. His proposal merely establishes a rule that no one can quarrel with: That the people are entitled to know who voted for and against what spending.

The Propaganda War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Propaganda War," published in the Bridgeport Post of March 24. It is the judgment of my community of Fairfield, Conn., that Mr. George Waldo, Editor of the Post, wields one of the canniest and wisest pens in the newspaper world. Of course, I am most happy to submit for the RECORD this particular editorial entitled "The Propaganda War," because it indicates the support of this eloquent writer and this influential newspaper for the greatly enlarged campaign of ideas which I advocated last week on the floor of the Senate. I know such support will make its influence felt in Congress, in the administration, and in the State Department.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPAGANDA WAR

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, is the only Member of the Senate with actual State Department experience—in his case, as a former Assistant Secretary of State. When he took the floor the other day and uttered a plea for Secretary Dean Acheson, asking Congress to be his adviser on foreign policy but not his executioner, he had the advantage of being able to delineate State Department problems, not from hearsay, but from direct knowledge. His plea was an effective one.

But the important part of Senator BENTON's speech was not his defense of the present Secretary of State, but his offering of a resolution, supported by a group of his colleagues, which would vastly extend our activities in giving the rest of the world the truth about American politics, American affairs, and American intentions.

Senator BENTON made his point most effectively. He proved that Communist infiltration depends upon propaganda, not upon war or force, and that in the propaganda war the Communists thus far have marshaled forces far exceeding our own.

They are telling the rest of the world that the United States is headed for an economic crash, that its rulers are Fascists and warmongers, that the rich are getting richer but that everybody else is getting poorer, that starvation is rampant, that our ideal of freedom is a fraud, that we practice racial and religious discrimination, and that we are culturally barbarous, money-mad, lawless, and crime-ridden.

Propaganda of this nature is pumped forth from Moscow every day. It reaches every Russian and it probably reaches most of the people in the satellite countries, not to mention a great many others beyond the borders who hear the Russian radio blasts or read the Russian periodicals.

A great part of the world is completely puzzled regarding the United States because our counteroffensive in the propaganda line has been weak and ineffective. It isn't enough that we in America know the utter absurdity of Russia's lying charges against us. The rest of the world does not know. To tell the world is our foremost duty if we would win the cold war.

As Senator BENTON well says, this is not merely a struggle for territory, it is a struggle for the minds, the hearts and the imagination of the rest of the world. He proposes a propaganda offensive on three fronts, by radio, the movies, and the printed word, and on a scale in keeping with our size and resources and the importance of this issue. He admits that this would cost money. Some might call it big money, he says, as compared with the appropriation for the Library of Congress, but it is small money as compared with the cost of the Navy or the hydrogen bomb.

We hope Senator BENTON's idea will receive the most serious consideration. Russia's admitted victories in the propaganda war have been injurious to our prestige, harmful to our pride, and costly to our pocketbooks, in the sense that we have tried to gain good will solely by dumping dollars. It doesn't work.

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the proclamation of the distinguished Governor of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, expressing his interest in the conservation of wildlife during this fitting period of National Wildlife Restoration Week:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing.

PROCLAMATION—NATIONAL WILDLIFE RESTORATION WEEK

Michigan's citizens are becoming increasingly aware of their obligation to coming generations to help in conserving our natural resources.

Michigan has held a position of acknowledged leadership since the inception of the conservation movement in this Nation. Michigan is a leader now in a movement to teach conservation principles in the State's public schools and to take boys and girls into the outdoors where they can learn first-hand about soil, water, trees, minerals, and wildlife, and all the God-given natural resources on which our well-being and prosperity are dependent.

Prudent management of our natural resources, including water, soil, trees, and all other plant as well as animal life, is imperative if we are to continue to prosper as a State and as a Nation. To this end it is essential that we enlist the interest and cooperation of every citizen in the carrying out of good conservation measures.

It is fitting, therefore, that Michigan should play a leading part in the observance of America's thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, and that each individual should dedicate himself to the conservation pledge which states:

"I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully to defend from waste the natural resources of my country—its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife."

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim the week of March 19 to 25 as National Wildlife Restoration Week, and urge the participation of all Michigan citizens in the observance of the week and in public programs which will emphasize the importance of conservation to us and to future generations.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan this 26th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1950, and of the Commonwealth the one hundred and fourteenth.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Something to Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Somerville (Mass.) Journal. This editorial reflects, I am sure, an attitude on the part of our people which is steadily becoming more pronounced and more vocal. The editorial follows:

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Socialism versus capitalism has become the biggest peacetime issue in this country. And yet voters have never had an opportunity at the polls to express a clear-cut preference. Everyone appears to be against socialism, European style. At the same time its physical manifestation here in our own land is steadily growing.

At present, the Federal Government costs us close to $50,000,000,000 a year out of our total income of about $200,000,000,000. The Federal, State, and local governments, combined, take about one-third of everything we produce. We work for ourselves only 2 out of every 3 days. With a 40-hour workweek, we have less than 27 hours, or about 3½ days per week to produce our food, clothing, and shelter, and to maintain our health and education.

Government already owns one-fourth of all the land in the United States. It has also become the biggest employer in the world. It now has more than 2,000,000 civilian employees. They receive a half billion dollars per month.

Many more million citizens have become dependent upon payments, benefits, subsi-

dies, and hand-outs. One out of every six adult Americans receives checks regularly from Washington. A United Press report sets the figures at 15,830,899. If each check went to a different family, that would mean that 42.7 percent or nearly half of the American families now balance their budgets with money from Washington.

Each year our tax burdens increase. Each year others join the ever-increasing ranks of the 15,830,899 who are directly dependent on Washington's management of their lives, either in whole or in part.

No one has a greater stake in the issue of socialism in the United States than each one of us as an individual. It is an issue which goes to the very roots of representative government. It is an issue about which we must think intelligently and constructively. We must become vocal in our opposition to the socialistic trend, sugar-coated though it is, and we must vote for those who still believe that as this country became great under a representative governmental system with regulated capitalism, so it can continue to be great and to grow stronger and greater under that same system.

Editorials From the Progressive Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Progressive Farmer, an outstanding farm magazine, there appeared two editorials which I think will be of interest to the Members. I include them herewith:

YES; FARMERS NEED SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION

"Aren't there any old-age benefits for farm workers or benefits for his widow and children—like there are for town workers?"

This question was put to us by a farm hand a few months ago. And our answer, of course, had to be, "No." Thus far Congress has done nothing to provide payments for farmers, farm tenants, and farm hands such as are provided for industrial workers when they reach 65, or if they become permanently disabled at an earlier age.

We believe the time has come when Congress should make such provision. Three reasons why stand out clearly in our viewpoint:

1. Every day farm people are paying to provide such benefits for other classes, but getting no such benefits themselves.

2. Unless capable farm tenants and farm hands get such benefits soon, they are more likely to get town and city work where such benefits are provided.

3. Any right-hearted farmer would hate to fire a man because of age or disability, yet he may feel that he cannot afford to support such a man by paying him regular wages. Under the social-security plan, employer and employee both pay into an insurance fund that takes care of such payments.

Some further questions commonly asked about this program and the correct answers, according to the best information we can get, are as follows:

"What classes of benefits would be given farmers under the social-security program and how much?"

There are three classes of monthly payment benefits as follows:

1. Old-age or retirement payments at age 65.

2. Total disability payments.

3. Payments to widow and children in case of the death of the farmer, farm tenant, or farm laborer.

"Suppose I am a farmer or farm tenant or farm worker, with net income of $200 a month; how would these payments work out?"

1. If you should become totally and permanently disabled at any age, you would receive $62 a month as long as disabled.

2. If you should retire at 65 (or later) you would receive $62 a month the rest of your life; your wife, $31 a month after reaching age 65; and any child under 18 would receive $46 a month till he or she reached age 18.

3. If you should die leaving a wife and children, your widow would receive $46 a month until your youngest child becomes 18 and continuously after reaching age 65. Each child would receive $31 a month until reaching age 18.

So much for monthly payments to persons who have paid premiums based on a net income of $200 a month. If your income has been $100 a month, you would receive about 80 percent as much; if $300 a month, about one-sixth more than the amounts just given. Corresponding amounts will be given for larger or smaller incomes.

"How much would it cost the farm people to be thus included for social-security benefits?"

The farm operator and tenant farmer would each pay a premium of 2¼ percent on the first $3,600 of his net (not gross) farm income per year—such a net income as your income tax would show after all deductions are made. This would be $45 a year on a net income of $2,000. The premium rate would gradually increase until 1969, when it would be 4⅞ percent. The farm hand would pay 1½ percent of his wages to begin with, and after 1969, 3¼ percent. The employer and employee contribute an equal amount to provide protection for the farm hand and his family.

"What reports will the farm operator have to make?"

The farm operator and tenant farmer would each report annually with their income-tax returns, and pay the premiums indicated. The reports of farm hands would be handled either on a quarterly return or a stamp-plan system.

We repeat our belief that farmers, farm tenants, and farm workers should write our Congressmen and Senators and ask to be included in this social-security program. It will make farm tenants and workers and their families more contented and therefore more efficient and stable. It will save farm owners from the ever-present threat of having to look after disabled workers or needy widows and children, or else see them suffer.

Furthermore, these important facts should never be forgotten: (1) All manufacturers now pay to provide social security for town and factory workers; (2) manufacturers add these social-security payments to their production costs when fixing the prices of manufactured products we buy and pass these costs on to consumers; (3) therefore, farmers, farm workers, and farm tenants are every day paying large amounts to provide social-security benefits for industrial workers while farmers and farm workers have no such protection.

WE ARE LOSING PATIENCE

American Government is big business. Able men of unquestioned honesty and integrity are required in its administration for the public. Yet, no sooner does an able, courageous man accept an important post in public service than he becomes a target for the sharpshooters. No matter how honest he may be, no matter how capable in carrying out the duties of his post, the villainous crew starts tearing him apart.

There's always room for difference of opinion. Difference of opinion invites argument. But an argument, even though it be heated, does not justify vilification.

We are losing patience with those who differ with others just for the sake of being different. We have long since lost patience with those who, in their effort to win an argument, stoop to vilification of the person with whom they differ.

We hold no brief for those few who seek public post with selfish intent. These few are soon unmasked and made to pay the penalty. Such persons should be exposed, and we honor those who bring their shame to light. But in seeking out these few, why crucify the far greater number who are working diligently, earnestly, and ably in behalf of the public good?

How can any man in position of public trust render best service when he is forced to spend much of his time in parrying personal slander? How can any man, feeling the dejection that comes from unjust attacks, be expected to render top service? How can any able businessman, one who enjoyed the accomplishment of building up and directing a successful business, one who has enjoyed the prestige that comes from such accomplishment, have the courage to accept a high position in Government, where he will be the target for all types and classes of vicious snipers? The ablest among us sometimes are the most sensitive.

We have many, many able men who have been in public service over a long period of years. These men continue to flinch when hit by the barbs cast their way. These men still have feelings. But their appreciation of the importance of the work they are doing, their feeling of responsibility for the proper performance of this work goads them on, dulls the pain from the uncalled-for attacks. We feel for these men who have the courage to remain in public service. We are losing patience with those who can see no good, those who can think nothing but evil.

What Oleo Can Do That Butter Can't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a constituent to the editor of the Des Moines Register:

WHAT OLEO CAN DO THAT BUTTER CAN'T

To the EDITOR:

A short time ago Hoard's Dairyman outlined six things that oleo can do that butter cannot do, and seldom has any editorial message been as widely reprinted.

Here is what it said:

"If you think the oleo monopoly has been mistreated, read these advantages:

"1. Oleo can use benzoate of soda as a preservative.

"2. Oleo can use glycerides to change melting point.

"3. Oleo can bleach their natural greenish-gray product to a more desirable white.

"4. Oleo can hydrogenate and clean up oils going into its manufacture.

"5. Oleo can fortify its product with synthetic vitamins.

"6. Oleo can use the drug diacetyl to correct and imitate flavor.

"7. Oleo can use any color in the rainbow except yellow by Ohio law (before the November referendum).

"Butter would be branded as adulterated if it did any of the above. Don't you think oleo has gone far enough?"

By the way, in his opening campaign speech at Adel in 1948, it seems that Harry Truman said something about somebody sticking a pitchfork in the farmer's back. In signing the new oleo bill, I wonder who is wielding the pitchfork now on the dairy farmers.

P. W. PETERSEN.

WILLIAMS, IOWA.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech, delivered in Rhode Island on St. Patrick's Day by the majority leader of the House, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

I am honored and happy to be with you tonight on this festive occasion, particularly to be on the same speaking program with my close friend of years in Washington, Vice President BARKLEY, and my very close and valued friend, Father Slavin, president of Providence College.

The quaint mixture of Irish fancy and grim realism may well serve to remind us that one of the most important qualities which the world needs today is a willingness to face facts—no matter how unpleasant—and at the same time remain steadfast to high ideals and principles.

I mention this quality—not to the exclusion of others equally praiseworthy—but to emphasize it as an Irish characteristic peculiarly applicable to the saint whose day we celebrate.

It was approximately 1,500 years ago that the mortal remains of St. Patrick were wrapped in the shroud said to have been woven by St. Brigid, and laid to rest in the soil of the land that he had won to the heart and love of God.

Over the span of those centuries, perhaps no individual in the calendar of the saints has grown larger in stature, won greater popular affection and devotion, or wielded greater influence for good.

The secret of that growth and popularity and influence is found in the name of your society. For all the adjectives which might be chosen to describe him, none is so apt as "friendly." The secret of the success of his mission in Ireland is discovered in his friendliness to all of God's creatures. In one of his biographies we are told that "he could never look unmoved on the sorrows and sufferings of the underdog," and he is described as "full of compassion and sympathy for the poor and suffering"—a man "whose disinterestedness in his own regard was completed by a great generosity toward others." Such is the saint whose name and feast we honor and in whom we may, with just pride, rejoice as his "friendly sons."

Patron of the land where he labored, revered by Christians and religious-minded persons everywhere, an illustrious example of religious zeal and patriotic fervor to all men in all ages, the slave boy who became a saint is universally acknowledged as one of the great figures in all recorded history.

Because he had experienced the degradation of slavery and fought so fiercely against the horrible slave system of pagan Ireland, St. Patrick's mission to the Irish people was marked by strong emphasis upon the virtue of freedom and the inherent dignity of man. So well did he labor, so indelible was his teaching, that ever since, the Irish people have been foremost in the world in their burning love of independence and in their positive declaration of the natural rights of man.

Modern diplomacy might well take heed from the example of St. Patrick. In fact, the history of the conversion of Ireland to Christianity should be required reading for all who aspire to the role of statesman. For of all of his great accomplishments, none distinguished the missionary bishop to Ireland more than his political acumen and his astute diplomacy.

As a Roman provincial from Britain undertaking a mission in a pagan land, St. Patrick might easily have courted failure and disaster. His passionate love for the Irish people, however, and his sympathy and respect for native culture and traditions assured his success.

While his primary motive was the winning of souls to God, his way was that of the mild, sincere, and persuasive diplomat. He made friends and converts among Irish lawyers, poets, and chiefs of clans, and with their help, he strove to conform native legislation with Christian ethics. St. Patrick respected Irish social conventions, and Irish manners and customs insofar as they did not conflict with the principles of the spiritual truths and the philosophy which he preached.

As a result, while he met with trying difficulties, St. Patrick enjoys the unique distinction of converting a whole people without strife, persecution, or bloodshed. At the same time, so deep was the impress of his Christian thought on the matter of government that as late as 1938, when the present Irish constitution was adopted, the Irish people formulated their organic charter in the name of the Most Holy Trinity and in profound acknowledgment of their obligations to the Saviour of mankind. Parenthetically, I might here pose a question: Is it not significant that the one country in modern Europe which boldly acclaims God and His Divine Son as the beginning and the end of all things is also the one country where the evil doctrine of communism has no chance of acceptance or survival?

Indeed, the work and the teaching of St. Patrick has stood the test of time. He came to the people of Ireland, not as a disdainful representative of a foreign culture, not as a dictator to enforce his mission by coercion, but as a friend bearing the gift of his friendship, the hope of his doctrine, and the sublime faith of a religion which has endured to this day as the bulwark of the land and its people.

We well know, as students of history, that the tribal nation to which he had come as a missionary was a land of warlike people. The Ireland—a united Ireland—to whose embracing soil he was committed at his death was already known to the then civilized world as the isle of saints and scholars. This tremendous and significant change had been brought about by the heroic life and labors of a single man of intense faith—St. Patrick, Ambassador of God to Ireland.

On the day we celebrate, 15 centuries after his death, the fruits of his ministry are still being harvested in an ever-widening garden.

His seed was the grain of truth—the divinely revealed truths of the Christian religion—and the natural truths of freedom, charity, and justice.

His granary was the fold of the faith—faith in God, faith in the idea of Christian brotherhood, and faith in the supernatural dignity of man as a creature of his maker.

It is this faith which is today the living legacy of St. Patrick.

In Ireland itself, the preservation of that faith has been the paradox of history.

Some ascribe it to a natural antipathy to England and everything English.

The English, in turn, have been want to ascribe it to a natural obstinacy which they claim to be inherent in the Irish.

Others are inclined to ascribe it to a native conservatism and the Irish love for antiquity.

All of these reasons may have in them the germ of truth, but none of them, nor all of them together, can explain the moral miracle and supernatural fact that a whole people for many generations chose confiscation, extermination, degradation, exile, and death rather than give up their faith.

The true reason is that the light of their faith, so fully revealed to them by St. Patrick, fired their intelligence, steeled their will, fortified their character, and endowed them with grace and strength to the extent that hell itself could not prevail against them.

Truly, indeed, have the Irish people and their descendants "fought the good fight and kept the faith." Our generation has witnessed their triumph.

When St. Patrick, in defiance of the high king's edict, lighted the Paschal fire on Slane Hill, it is recorded that the Druid priest said to the king:

"Unless yonder fire be this night extinguished, he who lighted it will, together with his followers, reign over the whole island."

That fire was dimmed only by the brilliant glory of the dawn of Easter, and its flame was exceeded in intensity only by the passionate faith of the man who ignited it.

St. Patrick conquered—and he still reigns over the whole island.

To us, and to the legion of other spiritual descendants of St. Patrick all over the world, with his spirit inspiring us, and with God and his infinite wisdom guiding and directing us, that fire will never die out.

To the troubled world of today—it is the fire of hope and of success.

The fire of St. Patrick lit centuries ago and which still burns with strength and splendor is the fire of God and his law; the fire of true and firm faith; and is the fire of the way of life we believe in which has its origin in God, Himself.

It is the fire of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Appropriation for Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of increasing—and in many instances justifiable—clamor within the Nation for economy, it is my thought that when additional funds are appropriated for purposes as controversial as the House Un-American Activities Committee has been in the past, some remarks of justification are in order.

I must admit that when I accepted membership on this committee a year ago, it was with some misgivings. It was far more unpopular than popular. Since serving for more than a year now as ranking member, under the most able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] I feel that the many hours spent in committee have enabled me to make good use of the main privilege afforded me as a Representative in Congress—that of serving the interests of not just a few at a time, but of the

entire Nation at one and the same time. I do not think it can be denied that the record of the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Eighty-first Congress proves that the comportment of the committee has greatly changed under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia. While we have been successful in making new disclosures of activities dangerous to the security of our country and of machinations aimed at the destruction of our form of government, not the least of our accomplishments has been our effort—and I feel a successful one—to protect those whose reputations might be irrevocably impaired by the hasty release of uninvestigated or unsubstantiated reports or information.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, is sparing no time or effort to review for the benefit not only of the individuals concerned, but for the preservation of the very basis of our system of Anglo-Saxon democratic jurisprudence, an enormous volume of information trying to preserve the rights of individuals, to protect the innocent or innocently involved and to expose the real culprits.

It is both an honor and a pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of a man who understands all that is at stake in the important work of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am taking this opportunity to add to the remarks already on record that I deem it a privilege to serve on the House Un-American Activities Committee and I wish to commend our chairman and my colleagues on this committee for excellent service at the not most savory of tasks.

Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tribute to the FBI," from the Washington Star of a few days ago, which pays a highly deserved tribute to J. Edgar Hoover.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE FBI

When an economy-minded House Appropriations Committee gives a Government agency all the additional money it asks for and recommends a salary raise for its head besides, there must be a reason. Beneficiaries of this extraordinary treatment by a group which has not hesitated to wield the ax on many other agencies were the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its long-time Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The reason for the committee's attitude is not hard to find. It lies in the FBI's remarkable record as a protector of the Nation's security in this "cold war" era of spying and counterspying.

The committee, without a quibble, approved Mr. Hoover's request for $4,800,000 in additional funds with which to hire 700 more employees, including 325 new agents. In granting the full $57,400,000 asked by the FBI for the next fiscal year, the committee said it "does not feel justified in reducing the estimates of this Bureau in view of conditions at home and abroad." The new employees will help the FBI to reduce the backlog of nearly 14,000 pending security investigations. The committee agreed that such cases are too important to suffer any delay in searching out the facts.

The action of the committee is indicative of the high esteem in which the FBI is held at the Capitol and elsewhere as a result of its effective warfare on potential fifth columnists in the Government and outside of it. It has waged this difficult warfare without resort to witch-hunting tactics, without any semblance of police-state tendencies and without succumbing to political or other pressures. The FBI and Mr. Hoover well deserve the tribute implicit in the House committee's recommendation that both the Bureau and its Director be given more money for their outstanding work.

Startled by Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I was much struck with the sound reasoning of Doris Fleeson in her recent column in the Washington Star headed "Startled by Reaction." It appeared to me to be an excellent analysis of the dilemma facing the reactionary group in the Republican Party in its effort to repudiate the civil-rights principles in the Republican Party national platform. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD:

STARTLED BY REACTION—GABRIELSON NIBBLES AT FORBIDDEN APPLE OF DIXIECRAT-GOP COALITION

(By Doris Fleeson)

Republican National Chairman Guy Gabrielson has been nibbling at the forbidden apple of a Dixiecrat-GOP coalition. The reaction in the form of protests from Negro organizations and others has proved somewhat startling to the politically naive chairman and more embarrassing than somewhat to those who manage his public relations.

In an interview Mr. Gabrielson offhandedly mentioned that he had recently discussed with States rights leaders a trial marriage at the top between them and the GOP.

ELEMENTS OF STRATEGY

The elements of this strategy which could defeat President Truman in 1952 are:

The Republicans meet first and nominate their candidates. The States righters then convene and nominate the same men. The invention of the Alabama State chairman, Gessner McCorvey, this scheme is guaranteed by the Dixiecrats to produce twice as many southern electoral votes as they got in 1948. Many Democrats agree and are heartily afraid of it.

The gimmick, however, is that such an arrangement necessarily implies that the Republicans and States righters have a preconvention understanding on acceptable candidates. At the least it would give the States' righters a veto power over the GOP slate.

It also suggests a veto power for them over civil-rights legislation, as many people are briskly pointing out to Republican headquarters. The difficulty of making a direct answer without pulling the rug out from under a very important person is obvious. It is probable, however, that the national chairman will be more careful in the future both of his conferences and confidences.

REPLIES TO NEGRO REPORTER

Mr. Gabrielson has had difficulties in matters of this kind before. In reply to a Negro reporter's question about whether he favored FEPC, he told a press conference that you could not legislate human relations. An aide swiftly struck in with a reminder that his own State of New Jersey had an anti-discrimination law often praised by Republican Governor Driscoll. The chairman gulped and clambered safe to shore with fuller explanations that FEPC was a fine thing.

It is not too hard to understand that Republicans are greatly tempted by devices that after 20 years may put them back in power. The conservatives, of whom Mr. Gabrielson is one, are especially restive and in a mood to try anything once.

But to accept the Dixiecrat proffer involves sacrifice of the civil-rights principle by the party of Abraham Lincoln, southern newspapers which are editorializing widely on the Gabrielson-Dixiecrat discussions, warn that Republicans cannot get the South without abandoning civil rights enforced by the Federal Government.

Republican sentiment on this question will be tested in the Senate soon when Majority Leader LUCAS calls up the FEPC bill and asks that cloture be applied to the inevitable southern filibuster.

Meanwhile Republicans are shopping harder than ever for an astute press agent for the national committee and Mr. Gabrielson.

Guy George Gabrielson, Republican National Chairman, May Not Realize It But He Gives Aid and Comfort to Moscow and Follows Communist Party Line in His Attack on American Foreign Policy; if Gabrielson's Efforts Were To Succeed, Kremlin Would Rejoice and Danger of War Would Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith timely views as expressed in excerpts from a radio broadcast by Mr. Elmer Davis over the American Broadcasting Co. network on March 22, 1950. Mr. Davis' remarks, heard locally over Station WMAL, follow:

It has been clear for some time that Senator MCCARTHY's real target is not the minor figures he has been talking about, in the State Department or formerly in the State Department or never in the State Department. The man he is trying to get is the Secretary of State. Until last night he had

little help from his fellow Republicans. To put it in military terms, MCCARTHY seemed to be an expendable advance guard pushed out to make a reconnaissance in force. If he found anything the main body would move forward and back him up; if he didn't find anything, MCCARTHY could be left out on his limb.

The main body has not yet moved; but last night two strong forces came up to support him—Mr. Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, and Senator WHERRY, the floor leader. Speaking in Omaha, Mr. WHERRY said the Secretary of State must go; he is a bad security risk. He is, said Mr. WHERRY, the idol of the left-wing appease-Russia agitators. This idea would never occur to anybody who reads the papers, but Mr. WHERRY is apparently too busy to do that. Acheson and the Hiss crowd, he says, have been calling the signals in the State Department, thus betraying China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all the countries of eastern Europe. Mr. Gabrielson doesn't quite say that Acheson is a Communist; he merely implies it, and supports Senator MCCARTHY's story that the Government is infested with Communists. The attack on Acheson is not yet a formal Republican policy; but two eminent Republican leaders have now joined MCCARTHY in demanding that Acheson must go.

Well, Acheson is not going to go. He has not the slightest intention of resigning, nor has the President the slightest intention of removing him. But it might be worth while seeing what would be the consequences, if this McCarthy-Wherry-Gabrielson crusade did succeed. Mr. Acheson has lately laid down the policy of the United States for dealing with Russia—to get not merely solutions but satisfactory solutions of seven problems, before we could live in the same world with the Russians in reasonable security; and to do so by building up situations of strength which the Russians must recognize. That is a tough and a bleakly realistic policy. It offers no comfort to the appeasers or the let's-hope-for-the-besters; it is already being attacked by the people who either still trust Russian promises, or else are simply scared. It is a policy which will take time, and cost money, and will entail some danger. Any policy entails some danger; this in my judgment entails less than any other, but it does entail some danger to us and still more to our European allies who are nearer to Russia. Nevertheless, it looks like the policy that offers the best hope of preserving a just and honorable peace.

If Acheson were thrown out, that policy would be thrown out with him. You are not going to make foreign nations believe he is a Communist; they know better. And they are never likely to understand the motives of the Gabrielsons and the Wherrys. If Acheson were thrown out every foreign nation—the Russians, and our allies, and the nations of southern Asia that were still on the fence—they would all conclude that the United States had repudiated the Acheson policy. And our allies, if they take Mr. Gabrielson seriously, would conclude that we had repudiated them too. For he says that socialism is just about as bad as communism, and leads to the police state; he says the third force on the continent of Europe is neo-communism, though as everybody with the slightest knowledge of current history is aware, it is the most active and most effective opposition to communism. Socialist England, Socialist Norway and Denmark, France where the third force is keeping the Communists down—those nations are now our allies. But if they thought that Guy George Gabrielson spoke for the American people every one of them might reasonably look around now and pick out the nearest exit, see what terms they could make with the Russians. For if his crusade and his ideas should prevail they could well conclude that the United States was ready to run out on them; ready to turn either to appeasement or to isolationism.

If Acheson were thrown out, no man who might succeed him could pick up his policy—that tough and bleak but realistic policy—and make it work; for you could never persuade either our enemies or our friends, after that, that the policy had the support of the American people. That would mean an end to any hope of stopping the Russian advance by a vigorous and intelligent diplomacy; it would leave us no way to stop it but by war, and a war which we might have to fight alone, since Mr. Gabrielson has repudiated our allies.

Now Mr. WHERRY and Mr. Gabrielson of course do not intend to work this vast injury to the interests of the United States; they mean well, they simply don't know. They have no idea that if their crusade against American foreign policy were successful, it would greatly increase the danger of war, and would also greatly increase the danger that we would lose the war. Fortunately there are Republicans who do know. Congressman NIXON, while reserving his judgment about the personnel of the State Department, says that its policies need united support during the cold war. There must be other Republicans who share his concern on that point; and who might reassure our European allies that when Mr. Gabrielson writes them all off as no better than Communists, he doesn't speak for his party.

In the meantime there is this reassurance; the Secretary of State is not going to resign.

Economizing at Expense of Veterans' Hospital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Vet-Times newspaper continues to accurately report to day-to-day happenings in Washington and throughout the 48 States which affect our veterans. I especially want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an editorial concerning the recent action which will result in the firing of several thousand medical employees.

With new Federal hospitals to be opened in the remainder of this fiscal year and in 1951 our veterans' hospital program should be an expanding one with the addition of medical employees to properly staff the new installations. The Congress should not aggravate this situation by providing a further cut in Veterans' Administration medical appropriations and those of us who are concerned about a well-balanced veteran program regret to learn that the House Committee on Appropriations has recommended a cut in the 1951 Veterans' Administration budget of $7,500,000. I trust that we will be successful in having this amendment restored in the Appropriation Act.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial that appeared in Vet-Times on March 25, 1950, entitled "Inhuman Economy":

INHUMAN ECONOMY

A "penny-wise and pound-foolish" Congress—which annually squanders billions of dollars on nonsensical political programs—is now, by its gesture toward economy, endangering the entire medical-care program of the Veterans' Administration.

The medical-care program of the VA, elevated from a "third-rate" status in 1945 to a "second to none" status in 1950, is the victim of a senseless and unreasonable attempt to save a paltry few millions of dollars.

The situation has now become so acute that Chief Medical Director Paul B. Magnuson soon must choose between closing additional hospital beds or letting the standard of medical care revert to the status of 1945.

In order to save peanuts at the expense of the ill and disabled of World War II, Congress is destroying the morale of VA's entire medical staff and, according to a confidential survey made in VA's neuropsychiatric hospitals, may be dooming thousands of mentally ill veterans to permanent insanity.

The situation now existing in regard to operating funds for VA's medical program is a shame and a disgrace, both to the Congress and to the veterans' organizations which are supposed to protect the ill and disabled from such threats to their well-being and security.

The senselessness of the phony attempts at economy was never better illustrated than this week.

On Monday, the House of Representatives passed a bill which virtually hands some 70 land-grant colleges in the United States a gift of $12,000,000 in GI bill funds—despite the fact that, in many cases, it represents double payment for veterans' tuition.

On Tuesday, the House Committee on Appropriations recommended that Congress cut the 1951 budget for VA's medical-care program $7,500,000 below the minimum figure requested by the tight-fisted Budget Bureau—this in face of the fact that VA's medical-care staff already is being reduced by almost 5,000 employees.

Dr. Magnuson, who has waged a relentless fight to prevent influences—both inside and outside VA—from diluting the medical-care program, is virtually sick at heart over the penny-ante tactics of Congress. He is faced by a threat of wholesale resignations of his top medical men; he already has had to intercede personally to prevent one of his chief aides from resigning; and he is now being urged to close down additional hospital beds, in a desperate attempt to save the quality of VA medicine.

According to the confidential survey made of conditions in VA's mental hospitals, the necessity for reducing present activities may mean the difference between sanity and insanity for large numbers of mental patients.

The survey stresses that forced reduction of personnel in the medical care program will necessitate limited activities programs; will require VA to curtail leukotomies (brain operations), whereby one-third of the mental patients operated on have been able to go home afterward; will require curtailment of the shock therapy program, which demands the services of highly trained personnel; will force VA to use more physical and chemical restraints on mentally ill patients; and offers a serious indirect threat to VA's entire residency program.

Ever since the end of World War II, the Vet Times has given generous support to Federal Government programs requiring billions of dollars in American aid to the war-devastated areas of the world, and we have urged and supported the expenditure of vast sums of American money to contain communism in Europe and Asia.

We have supported such programs because we felt they were tied in closely with the wel-

fare of the United States, and because we felt that Congress was being reasonably generous in its treatment of our war veterans, and particularly generous and concerned over the quality of medical care provided for veterans.

Now, however, it appears that this supposed generosity was merely temporary and that Congress is too lazy and unconcerned to investigate the inhuman effects that its picayunish attempts at economy have cost the ill and disabled.

The Vet-Times demands that steps be taken forthwith to assure adequate money and manpower for VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery. This is not the area in which to economize at the cost of untold human misery.

The Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by the Honorable ED GOSSETT, of Texas, before the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Convention on March 15, 1950:

THE COLD WAR

First, gentlemen, I want to congratulate your organization and your membership for your rugged individualism and for your adherence to what many of us believe to be sound American principles. About 1 year ago your president, Mr. Bryant Edwards, testified before the House Committee on Agriculture in opposition to the so-called Brannan Plan. He startled a good many people in Washington when he put your membership on record as being opposed to subsidies and controls for the cattle raisers. He pleased most adherents to American democratic principles by reaffirming your faith in a comparatively free and competitive economy.

In response to repeated requests for the subject of my today's remarks, I announced that I would speak on the cold war. That subject just about covers the entire field of domestic and foreign affairs. Our magazines, our radios, our newspapers, our pulpits, and our public forums have of late been filled with little else than a discussion of the cold war. Congressional mail has been filled with overtures and appeals and suggestions as to what this country can do and must do in the current crisis.

On one thing I think most everyone can agree: Unless we survive the cold war, we will not be able to survive the hot one. Win or lose, another great conflict would doubtless be the end of American democracy, and would wipe us out as a Nation of free people. Instead of two cars in every garage, we would probably have two Russians in every home and would be lucky if permitted to live in the garage.

Among the nostrums, panaceas and expedients now being urged upon this country is the Atlantic Pact, world government, or a world federation, offensive and defensive alliances of various kinds, a 4-point program to bring competence and teach democracy to the people of the world, etc.

Perhaps the three most notable speeches delivered in the United States Senate during the current session of the Congress have been one by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, in which he appealed for universal reduction and control of armaments, and the two other such speeches have been by Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee of the Congress. The Senator with grave and sincere eloquence is crying out for world control of atomic weapons and of the most recent prospective hydrogen bomb.

Amidst all of this excitement and near hysteria it might be well for us to consider calmly just what we are going to do. Since I was 15 years old I have been making speeches on world peace. My first intercollegiate debate was on the subject: Resolved That America Should Join the League of Nations. I was a youthful idealist. However, my idealism has been tempered with realism. I am somewhat of a "reformed reformer." It is my contention that if the cold war is to be won it must be won in the hearts and minds of the American people and on the homefront. Many of us are convinced that such security as we may have must in the last analysis rest in the strength of American institutions and in the integrity and devotion of the average American citizen to sound political and economic principles. Leagues, alliances and treaties have been futile in the past to preserve the peace and will probably be of equal futility in the future. If our country drives or is driven into national socialism we lose. If we preserve a healthy democracy we win, regardless of all other considerations. Isolation and appeasement are, of course, discredited doctrines, and we know we cannot live unto ourselves. We know equally well that we cannot buy friends. A brief panoramic view of history should convince us that we must in the last analysis rely upon our own strength, and that if such strength be dissipated in grandiose schemes to create utopias we shall have destroyed our hope of survival.

A hundred years prior to World War I the victorious allies under the leadership of Czar Nicholas set up the Holy Alliance. In the preamble to its constitution it declared its purpose to be to perpetuate the truths of the holy religion and to preserve the peace. In a few years it became a conspiracy to destroy free governments and a free press. Prior to World War I numerous alliances were made and balances of power set up for the purpose of avoiding war. Following World War I we know what happened to the League of Nations. The Kellogg Peace Pact, which we negotiated, was always a scrap of paper. We got into World War I and II largely because our potential enemies thought first they could bluff us, or if bluffing failed they could whip us. Regardless of cost we must be sure that no potential enemy again makes such a mistake.

Finally, the two greatest eras of world peace since the birth of Christ have rested upon the strength and integrity of some major dominant power. First there was Pax Romana. It lasted 100 years and rested upon the strength of Roman arms and the justice of Roman administration. For almost 100 years prior to World War I there was an era of comparative peace which might be designated the Pax Britannica. It rested upon the strength of the British Fleet and the intelligence and justice of British administration. If we are to have a Pax Americana it must rest upon the strength of the American Nation and the intelligence and integrity of American democracy. If this Nation marches into national socialism we immediately dissipate this strength and integrity and we immediately become a prey to barbaric hordes which unquestionably would devour us. It is well, of course, for us to promote world brotherhood and Christian principles, but to surrender sovereignty to those one cannot trust or to our questionable friends who may become avowed enemies is a stupid and futile thing.

Excluding Russia, we are spending twice as much on armaments as is all of the rest of the world combined. Yet we must know that a million miles of superhighways, a multibillion-dollar radar screen around our border, thousands of planes that can circle the globe at 1,500 miles an hour or more, mountains of hydrogen bombs and atom bombs will avail us nothing if spiritual and material decay robs us of internal strength and integrity.

Approach this problem from any direction and one comes back to the one big question: Preserving American democracy against the corroding influence of national socialism. In other words, the cold war is more a domestic problem than a foreign problem.

One brief look at the national socialism of England should make Americans recoil in horror and should place every honest man on guard.

Mr. Strachey, the gentleman who has just become War Minister in the British Cabinet, has recently boasted that under national socialism there are now only 250 persons in England who have incomes of as much as $14,000 per year after taxes. In other words, in the whole British Isles there are not as many individuals as I now address who have incomes equal to your own. In taking over the railroads British socialism boasted they would make $250,000,000 per year for the Government. On the contrary rail service deteriorated and the first year's operations cost the Government $118,000,000. On taking over the mines British socialism spent $170,000,000 on mechanization. Still production failed, per man-hour output decreased and the National Coal Board lost $95,000,000 on the first year's operations. Last week hundreds of Britain's doctors were striking against the regimentation of socialized medicine. Socialized medicine in its first year of operation cost the British Government $300,000,000 above estimates, or to exceed $1,000,000,000. Public housing under national socialism has built fewer homes than were being constructed prior to the war, to say nothing of the cost. Furthermore, in that great country which gave to the world the Magna Carta and the bill of rights all men between the ages of 18 and 50 can now be ordered to take any job anywhere, i. e., compulsory labor is legal.

Many years ago the great William Pitt, in a speech on the excise bill, declared that:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown.

"It may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter, but the King of England cannot enter.

"All his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

Now the agents of 17 ministries can ransack an Englishman's home from cellar to attic without even a letter of introduction, to say nothing of a search warrant. National socialism has made austerity to deprivation and poverty the perpetual and common lot of all Englishmen.

On the other hand, what have the incentives of capitalism, the practices of the free-enterprise system, and adherence to democratic principles done for America. With a little more than 6 percent of the world's people, and a little more than 5 percent of the world's land, we possess more than one-half of the world's material wealth. We have 78 percent of the world's automobiles, 52 percent of the world's trucks, 58 percent of the world's telephones, 51 percent of the world's radios, and so on ad infinitum.

Notwithstanding these graphic comparisons we now stand in danger of embracing national socialism and losing the cold war.

The road into national socialism, like the road into hell, is paved with good intentions.

At the danger of oversimplification and confusion let's briefly put our finger on the five interrelating reasons why we may march into national socialism and thence into oblivion. Let's call these five conditions, or states of mind, perils.

Peril No. 1 we call ignorance and confusion. Great masses of good people simply do not know or do not understand social, political, and economic problems. They do not understand that money of itself is worthless, that it gets its value from goods and material produced. The average man looks at our tremendous national wealth and assumes that we are immune to poverty. He doesn't know that the total assessed value of all the property in the United States of America is approximately $186,000,000,000, while our national debt is now $254,000,000,000. In other words, in terms of money we are broke. Our wealth consists in manpower and production capacity. Our mass production technique could easily be destroyed and our economy go to pot overnight once public credit is impaired and public confidence destroyed. We are rich in human resources alone and intangible and spiritual things, the nature of which we need to understand. Again, ignorance and confusion is preyed upon by propagandists of various hues. The average American must learn to understand the campaigns that are put on by those who wish to sell him on Utopias and supposedly humanitarian objectives. The average citizen of today must be above average.

A second peril we might call indifference. There is an old saying that there is one generation between shirt sleeves and shirt sleeves. This means that the son of a wealthy father too often dissipates his inheritance. A prosperous civilization usually destroys itself because of the contentment of the individuals who refuse to stay on guard. In my early youth I was puzzled and distressed to discover that few happy people ever wrote a book. Most books, I discovered, were written by those who had an ax to grind, who wanted to dynamite some existing institution, revolutionists, agitators, and impractical theorists who wanted to sell their generation on something, people who wanted to start a crusade, folks who wanted to shock their conventional contemporaries—these are the people who write books, as a rule. The great tranquil stream of humanity lulled into indifference refuses to take note of, or to be alarmed because of these movements. The proponents of national socialism, through aggressive and militant activity, wring compromise after compromise from their less militant brothers. Indifference, therefore, becomes a sin, which too often lulls people into disaster.

A third peril we might call big government or expanding bureaucracy. In the first 152 years of our national life, or down to 1940, our Government spent $167,000,000,000. Since the war, or from 1946 to 1949 inclusive, our expenditures have amounted to $177,000,000,000. In other words, we have spent more money since the war than we spent during our entire national life prior to the war. Even though our national income during the last several years has amounted to more than $200,000,000,000 a year, we find ourselves now operating on a $5,000,000,000 national deficit. Even a school boy could look at these figures and readily understand that all is not well. If we spend $5,000,000,000 more than we make in times of great prosperity, what are we going to do when national income falls. Prior to the war we thought ourselves in great danger when operating on a $9,000,000,000 budget. Now we take a $40,000,000,000 budget as a matter of course. We create a temporary bureau, and it becomes permanent. We establish a small bureau and it becomes a large one. The bureaucrat is an ordinary American businessman who is placed at the head of an agency; with typical promotional ingenuity he begins to reach out for more authority and more money and begins to enlarge his activities. It is obvious that this sort of thing, unless curtailed, will continue to grow until the national economy is completely destroyed.

A fourth peril we might call security psychosis, or a mania for security. Too many people now imagine that through Government planning and programs the individual citizen can be given absolute security against all the hazards of life. Such, of course, is utterly impossible. The only absolute security of which I know is the security of the grave and the security of the jailhouse. The slave is secure only so long as his master is kind and solvent. Striving for security, of course, is a virtue, but when supposedly obtained it generally defeats its own ends. Imagine what effect it would have upon the character of youth to know that if he were unable to earn a livelihood or to own a home that such would be furnished him by his Government. The illusion of security eats out of the individual his primary attributes of good citizenship. Of course, the antithesis of the indolence which comes from security is the madness which comes from fear. Both extremes are to be avoided. Fear dethrones reason and induces madness. It is not quite as simple as Mr. Roosevelt's pronouncement, borrowed, I believe, from Bacon, that "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Individually and collectively we, of course, must continue to strive for better standards of living and better security. But we must not delude ourselves into thinking that we can get something for nothing, that everybody can live off of everybody else and nobody work. I personally subscribe to Emerson's philosophy that everything is paid for at some time or other in some way or other. The books must be and will be eventually balanced. Someone has said, "A grafter is one whose income exceeds his service to society." Governments must make the ways of grafters and transgressors uninviting. Governments should protect the weak against the avariciousness of the strong. Government should write the rules of fair play, and enforce such rules, but Government should never undertake to extend to its citizens the illusion of complete security. Governments should not do for the individual what he can do for himself.

People grow strong through discipline and denial. People grow great through sacrifice and service. England never rose to greater spiritual heights than when that distinguished statesman, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, on coming to power said, "I promise you nothing but blood, sweat, toil, and tears." It was this great man, too, who said he did not become the King's Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. His declining years must be sad indeed as he witnesses his successor, who apparently did become the King's Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire by illusory promises of security to the British people.

A fifth peril we might call political apostasy. Even when the average good citizen becomes concerned with the issues of government, under the political machinery and the political practices of our country he often feels futile and helpless. We elect our Presidents, the most important official in the world, through a hocus-pocus system called the electoral college. Under the electoral college the Presidential candidate who gets more votes than any of his opponents in a particular State gets all of the electoral votes of that State. For example, in the last campaign Mr. Dewey, with 48 percent of the vote in New York State, received all 47 electoral votes of New York State. Under this system powerful organized minority pressure groups in the big States of the Union have become dominant. They write the platforms of both of our major parties, and to a large extent dictate national policy. More and more the great American public is victimized by the selfish and unfair demands of these organized minority pressure groups. There is now pending in the Congress an amendment to our Constitution which would abolish the electoral college and provide that each person vote directly for President and that the vote be counted for the person for whom he votes. This has been called the Lodge-Gossett amendment, and is now my major legislative objective in the Congress. In my judgment, to abolish the electoral college and to divide the electoral vote of each State in exact ratio with the popular vote will go a long way toward saving this country from eventual national socialism.

We must evolve a system of electing Presidents in this country under which the people can vote on honest issues and make their voices heard. Platforms and policies must be written on the basis of the general welfare and not on the basis of political expediency.

To summarize, gentlemen, we cannot win the cold war through misguided zeal. We can lose the cold war through ignorance and confusion, through indifference and complacency, through a dissipation of resources by our Government in its efforts to serve ourselves and to serve others, through a mania for security, or through stifling the honest political expression of a majority of our people in a surrender to minority domination. Truly democracy is on trial for its life. Upon this generation of Americans depends the hope of the world for the next 1,000 years. Devotion to the principles and the ideals that have built this country and that have made us a great people is our only hope of survival.

"Tax the Co-ops," Moley Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a full-page article by Raymond Moley, appearing in a January issue of Newsweek magazine, harped another old tune to an old song—Tax the Co-ops.

The Moley article was answered in a masterly fashion by my good friend, Von O. Pinkerton, of Marion, Ind., editor of the Farm News, one of Indiana's outstanding farm publications.

The Farm News is printed and published in Marion, Ind., a different issue being prepared each month for each of eighty-odd Indiana counties. Scores of thousands of Hoosier farmers receive and read this publication and it may certainly be considered an accurate spokesman of their views and opinions.

Von Pinkerton is a real Hoosier pioneer in the co-op movement and has built his personal prestige and fortune in the typical American manner, having commenced, I understand, with one old printing press, hope in his heart, and faith in his soul. What he writes is not for political effect, but are the words of an earnest and sincere man, written to be read by equally earnest and sincere people.

Therefore, I desire at this time to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Von Pinkerton's answer to the Moley attack, as published in the Farm News, of Grant County, on March 17, 1950:

"TAX THE CO-OPS," MOLEY SAYS

Jim, who lives on a well situated 40 out on Route 6, came into our office this week to tell us he's worried because some of the big shots are advocating "tax the co-ops." "Did you see where Raymond Moley had an article on that subject in the January Newsweek?" Jim asked.

We had seen the article—we had read it. But we didn't get enthused or worried. It was like chewing on some Thanksgiving turkey hash in January. Mr. Moley may have some new ideas on the subject, but, if so, he was careful not to divulge any of them.

You know many of the high-priced magazines are getting so many high-priced hard-liquor advertisements that it is a question what to do with the white space they use to separate the advertisements. They are just likely to slap in anything to fill the space. That's certainly the only reason for Mr. Moley's article.

The ex-New Dealer starts his misleading tirade with a nice soothing sentence intended to lull the reader into complacency. He says, "Of course, no one wants to destroy the cooperatives." How any feature writer or otherwise can use a sentence like that and then expect his readers to believe any of his other sentences is beyond us. He didn't believe that remark, and the publishers of the magazine don't believe it. The publishers know they could have filled that page with the names of organizations that would like to destroy the co-ops.

Then as he goes into his next two paragraphs to prove why the co-ops should be eliminated he breaks down and weeps because the co-ops have gone far beyond their humble beginnings. That means, of course, that so long as the co-ops didn't offer any competition there was nothing to worry about, but now that they are getting a lot of business because of rendering a real service we ought to stop 'em dead in their tracks.

He unintentionally or deliberately misleads his readers when he attempts to point out how much revenue the Government is losing by not taxing the co-ops, like some organizations would like to have them taxed. He bases his figures not on the amount of business the co-ops are doing but upon the amount a Congressman says they will be doing 5 years from now. If a reader can find any Congressman who knows what he (the Congressman) is doing today and not what somebody else will be doing 5 years from today he is lucky.

He says the co-ops did $13,000,000,000 worth of business in 1946, and NOAH MASON (the Congressman) estimates their gross business will reach $25,000,000,000 in 5 years.

We have read considerable literature on both sides of this proposition, including official estimates wherein co-ops attempt to project their thinking into the future. Not a single co-op official has said he expects to have the dollar volume of their business doubled by 1955. But why do the co-op officials figure and worry over the subject? All they have to do is ask Raymond Moley and NOAH MASON. They know the answers.

Anyone who has read anything on the subject of tax the co-ops will immediately recognize where Moley got all his information. In fact, his article is a disappointment, because one really expects him to inject at least one thought, but he didn't. It's just NTEA literature with Moley's name on it.

The tenseness engendered by the article is relieved by the stock NTEA joke with which the article is concluded. Our readers have heard it many times, but as it gets funnier every time it is told we will repeat it here in NTEA Moley's words:

"With heavy taxes and a Government drive against big business there will be a great incentive to private business to reorganize as cooperatives. John Hartford, head of the A. & P., said some weeks ago 'that if the Government won its suit against the company, he would convert the business into a huge tax-free cooperative. This shift would cost the Treasury about $15,000,000 a year. There is no reason why many other companies would not follow the same course.' "

After you get through laughing, reread the punch line at the end which says, "There is no reason why many other companies would not follow the same course." If Raymond Moley believes that, he is totally ignorant of the whole subject of cooperatives.

The truth is, any individual, any association, any organization, including A. & P. can legally avoid paying the Federal income tax exactly like the cooperatives. All they have to do is to avoid having a net income. That can easily be done by cutting prices so there won't be any profit, or legally obligate the organization at the beginning of the year to return all the overcharges (profit) to the purchaser, like the cooperatives. Do you expect A. & P. or any other profit organization to do that?

The difference is, A. & P. knows, even if Moley doesn't, that the United States Treasury Department has said, "The exclusion of patronage dividends from corporate gross income is not the exclusive privilege of cooperative associations. Any corporation making payments to its customers under the conditions prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the courts is granted the same treatment." It has also said, "It is held to be immaterial whether refunds are distributed in the form of cash, stock, certificates of indebtedness, or credit notices."

In addition, even the bonuses paid by A. & P. to Mr. Hartford for doing a good job as head of the organization or for any other reason are subtracted, before the company figures its Federal net income tax.

Sometime when we have a quarter inch of space left we will print the names of all the profit companies that have or seriously contemplate converting to the cooperative method of doing business.

Can a "One Package" Appropriations Bill Succeed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am for a single consolidated appropriation bill provided we can make it work without abandoning the basic principles we must follow if we are to have an intelligent method of spending the taxpayers' money. I want it to work. I shall do everything within my power to make it work. I will not, however, under any condition waive or give up the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to originate appropriations; neither will I give up the right of the House of Representatives and of the Appropriations Committee as the servant of the House to make and control appropriations.

I shall oppose any move to delegate that power directly or indirectly to a few men whether in the executive or legislative branch of the Government. I want no czars in our financial set-up, whether they be in the executive, legislative, or committee branch of the Government. That is what the proposed system will ultimately lead to if followed. I repeat, I want the single consolidated appropriations bill to work. It is not working under the system proposed here. I believe it can be made to work without sacrificing any of the principles referred to.

Before we discuss this so-called one-package bill we are trying to adopt, let us compare it with the system we have been operating under in past years. Prior to this year, we had as now a number of subcommittees. A bill was assigned to each subcommittee. These subcommittees commenced hearings on their bills sometimes as early as December. After the hearings which took sometimes as much as 10 or 12 weeks, depending on the size of the bill and on the number of departments or agencies in the bill, the bill was reported to the full committee. Only the members of the subcommittee which handled the bill knew anything about that bill up to that point. Acting on the repeated instructions from the House and of the members of the Appropriations Committee, several days were permitted to elapse after the bill was reported out and before it was brought before the full committee. The Members of the House and particularly of the full committee had an opportunity of studying the hearings and report, and examining the bill before it was considered by the full committee. I recall that on several occasions strenuous objections were made when a bill was considered by the full committee the day after it was reported out.

When the bill came before the full committee, the chairman of the subcommittee explained the bill in detail, answering questions as he went along. When he finished his presentation the bill was open to amendment. Arguments were sometimes vehement and questions rather revealing. The full committee usually devoted from 1½ to 2½ hours to the consideration of each bill before it and took a vote on reporting it to the House. The members had an opportunity of informing themselves and did inform themselves on each bill and usually knew what they were voting on. Each subcommittee had the benefit of the criticism of the other members of the full committee which often proved very valuable and sometimes avoided making serious errors.

Under this system the Members had from 3 to 4 days as a rule to read the hearings on each bill, read the bill, and examine the report. The bills as a rule were presented to the committee and the House at intervals of approximately one a week which gave ample time for careful consideration before the bill came before the full committee. Each bill was carefully explained and members were informed so they could ask intelligent questions from the subcommittee reporting the bill. All this was done before the members including those reporting

the bill were asked to vote on the question of reporting the bill out of committee and to the House with the recommendation that it do pass. The recommendation of the committee meant something because it was based on facts and information of all the members of the full committee.

Bills began going through the House sometimes as early as February 1 and committee hearings were often held in December by the subcommittees. Bills usually had all passed the House before May 1 and sometimes much earlier. The last 1950 appropriation bill passed the House on April 13, 1949.

HOW DOES THE NEW SYSTEM WORK?

Now let us examine the new system of operation:

First. The full Appropriations Committee consists of 45 members which is divided into 9 subcommittees and 2 special subcommittees.

Second. The nine regular subcommittees consist of five members each, three of the majority and two of the minority party. They handle all appropriations with the exception of the legislative. The special subcommittees appointed so far are the legislative subcommittee handling the legislative appropriations bill of approximately $56,000,000 and the so-called central committee. What I say here applies only to the nine regular subcommittees.

Third. Each regular subcommittee handles one bill designated as a title in the consolidated bill covering one or more departments and agencies. It holds hearings on this bill, drafts the bill, and presents it to the full committee as heretofore. Hearings are released as printed. The hearings on all titles this year covered 14,723 printed pages. These subcommittees as usual did a magnificent job on their particular bill or title this year. The subcommittees worked hard and many of them felt as I did that we were crowded too much to be able to give the bill the careful consideration we would like to have given it. However, I have never been fully satisfied with any bill that came out of my subcommittee, whether under my chairmanship or under the chairmanship of three other members who served during my 14 years on the subcommittee.

While the hearings were sent out as published, each of the 45 members was so busy preparing his own bill that he had very little time to read those hearings. Furthermore, the hearings as a rule were so large that the usual custom was to examine the report, select the doubtful items, and read those parts of the hearings in which there was some doubt in the mind of the members or in which he or his district was particularly interested. This was impossible, inasmuch as the report was not then available.

The members, and particularly the older members who had served some time on the committee, had a fairly good understanding of each bill as it came up. On Friday night, March 17, the 425-page consolidated bill and the 337-page consolidated report, covering 11 titles of this $27,266,403,664 consolidated appropriation bill, arrived at my office. The same mail brought me a notice that the full committee would meet Monday morning at 10 a. m. to consider the bill. Trying to handle this 425-page consolidated bill and the 337-page consolidated report, based on 14,723 pages of hearings within that time, was an impossible and hopeless task.

Monday at 10:05 a. m. the committee was called to order by the chairman. There were nine titles, not including the small legislative bill and general provisions. As each title came up, the only members who had any information as to that title were the five who were on that particular subcommittee and who had reported that bill or title to the full committee. The other 40 members knew practically nothing about that title or bill. No statements were made explaining the bill to the full committee, and questions asked were confined as a rule to items of particular interest to the member asking the question or to his district. When the vote came to report this consolidated bill to the House of Representatives with a recommendation that it pass, there was not a member who had adequate information to act or vote intelligently on any of the eight titles other than the one he had considered in his subcommittee. This $27,000,000,000 bill was reported out on the judgment of the five men on each subcommittee, and not on the combined judgment of the 45-man committee, as it should have been and was under the old system. Because of this reason, I voted "no" in committee.

The recommendation of the full forty-five-man committee to the House of Representatives that the bill pass means very little, if anything, as it is not based on information as to the facts involved and the Members know very little, if anything, about the bill itself as a whole. Not even the chairman of the committee with all his help and certainly not the gentleman from Michigan who is now speaking to you, could ask or answer many intelligent questions as to the bill now before the House for consideration.

Surely the framers of our Constitution did not have such a method in mind when they wrote into the Constitution that all revenue bills—which included appropriations as well as taxation bills—must originate in the House of Representatives. A further examination of the facts will, I believe, verify this statement.

Let us look at the record and see just how much consideration was given to and how much time was spent by the full committee, not only on each title, but on the entire consolidated bill appropriating more than $27,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money before a vote was taken on each title and on the motion to report the bill to the House of Representatives with a recommendation that it pass. I kept a careful and accurate record of the time when each title was taken up in committee, when it was approved and when the motion to report the bill was passed. Here is the record according to the committee clock:

Monday, January 20, 1950, the full committee was called to order at 10:05 a. m. by Chairman CANNON. At 10:12 a. m. the committee had approved—

Title I, making an appropriation for the District of Columbia for $12,000,000.

Title II, making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for $56,822,450.

Title III, making appropriations for the Department of State, Commerce, Justice and Judiciary for $1,110,870,462. Total titles I, II, and III appropriations aggregating $1,179,692,912 were approved by the full committee in exactly 7 minutes.

At 10:12 a. m. the committee took up title IV, making appropriations for Department of Treasury and Post Office for $1,131,155,600. In exactly 8 minutes the full committee had approved this $1,131,155,600 appropriation bill.

At 10: 20 a. m., the committee took up title V, the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation for $2,271,099,614. It took exactly 7 minutes to approve this bill.

At 10: 27 a. m. the committee took up title VI, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, for $764,-032,761. In exactly 12 minutes the committee had approved this bill.

At 10:39 a. m. the committee took up title VII, making an appropriation for the Department of the Interior for $621,-634,130. Within 71 minutes, 55 of which was spent in arguing four amendments which were turned down and again without explanation of the bill title VII was approved.

At 11:50 a. m. the committee took up title VIII, making appropriations for the independent offices, including Veterans' Affairs, for $8,024,877,007. The bill was approved after spending exactly 20 minutes or an average of 2½ minutes per billion dollars.

At 12:10 p. m. the committee took up title IX, the $632,620,000 civil-functions bill. This bill covers rivers and harbors, flood control, both maintenance and construction, Panama Canal, and so forth. The budget recommended $834,867,500. The subcommittee cut it $202,247,500 or approximately 25 percent. This bill reaches into nearly every congressional district in the United States. It was this bill which was in conference last year for 121 days. The full committee took it up at 12:10 p. m. and after careful consideration without explanation approved it in exactly 21 minutes.

At 12:31 p. m. the full committee adjourned until 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 21, 1950.

Tuesday, March 21, 1950, at 10:05 a. m., Chairman CANNON called the full Appropriations Committee to order and title X was taken up. This was the $13,000,000,000 national defense appropriation bill and at 11:06 a. m., in exactly 61 minutes, and after spending less than 5 minutes per billion dollars, the bill was approved.

At 11:06 a. m. the committee took up title XI, consisting of 14 pages of general provisions of law. After careful consideration for 3 minutes and without reading the provisions, title XI was approved at 11:09 a. m. A motion was passed on a purely partisan vote to report the entire

one-package bill to the House with a recommendation that it pass.

Under the old system we would have taken 20 or more hours for the consideration of this bill in full committee. The record shows that we took exactly 206 minutes to put this $27,000,000,000 appropriation bill through the full committee. When we deduct 55 minutes devoted to 4 amendments to the Interior bill which did not pass and 3 minutes we devoted to general provisions of law which we did not read, we find that we devoted exactly 152 minutes to the consideration of the subcommittee recommendations of the entire bill of 10 titles. In other words, the appropriation went through the full committee at the rate of $180,000,000 a minute or $3,000,000 a second. That is putting appropriations through the full committee at what we would call in Air Force language a supersonic speed.

It cannot be argued successfully that the full committee could act intelligently on this bill under this method and according to this record. If this system is continued it will mean that the Congress will soon accept the Budget Director's figures and will have lost it power of regulating and controlling expenditures of the various departments or bureaus. I am very much afraid that under this system the one-package bill is doomed to failure.

I have given this matter a great deal of thought. The solution of this problem is not too difficult. I believe it can be made to succeed. I believe that we can have the so-called one-package appropriation bill without taking power away from the full committee and without sacrificing everything we did in the past to inform our membership on every bill. Here is my suggestion:

First. Proceed with each appropriation bill just as we have done heretofore. Have each subcommittee commence hearings at the earliest moment; start some in December if possible.

Second. Consider each bill, report it out to the full committee, explain it to the membership of the full committee as it is reported out, giving the Members of the House and of the committee at least 3 or 4 days before the bill is brought before the full committee, so they may study the bill, report, and hearings.

Third. Report each bill to the full committee, just as heretofore, taking it up in the House and considering it in the Committee of the Whole up to but not including the third reading.

Fourth. Hold each bill in the House until all of the bills have been passed up to the third reading. Offer a consolidated bill as a substitute for the individual bills. Then, if the consolidated bill is still too high, offer a motion to recommit the consolidated bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce it by the amount desired. If it is reduced, it will be the House and not a few men on the committee who will do the reducing. We will know what our income is and what total appropriations will be before we pass the bill. The recommendation of the full committee will mean something because it will be based upon information as to all titles contained in the consolidated bill.

Claims Adoption of Hoover Report Would Destroy Veteran Preference in VA Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1945, I extended my remarks to include a letter and the contents of a booklet by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The extension carried the title, "A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports."

In response to this extension I have received a letter from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director for the Disabled American War Veterans, in which he points out a glaring weakness in at least one of the arguments presented by Mr. Steinkraus—pointing out that under the recommendation the merit system and veterans' preference in Federal employment would be destroyed.

Because of the importance of Mr. Sullivan's observations I herewith include the text of his letter in these remarks:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.
The Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHAFER: In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page A1945, you quote a letter written by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, together with the content of a booklet published by the chamber entitled "A Veteran Explains the Hoover Reports." The DAV would like the opportunity to reply to this letter and to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The DAV is surprised to note the admissions made by Mr. Steinkraus relative to the subject of personnel management as it affects veterans' preference. We feel that these admissions certainly bear out the position of the veteran organizations in opposing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

In answer to the question, "What was the chief feature of the Commission's proposals for Government personnel?" Mr. Steinkraus states, "The main recommendation was that the heads of Federal departments and agencies be permitted to do their own hiring instead of relying on the slow, cumbersome Civil Service Commission procedure."

This answer is proof positive that the proposed recommendations would destroy the merit system, and with it the long-established policy, since 1883, of veterans' preference in Federal employment. By recommending such freedom of personnel selection, every Government agency would become a little kingdom within itself, free to hire and fire whomsoever it chose, setting up its own standards, giving only lip service to veterans' preference and render the Civil Service Commission impotent to enforce the laws of the United States with respect to the merit system.

The next question in Mr. Steinkraus' letter is, "Would this mean setting up thousands of independent hiring boards to replace the single Civil Service Commission?" and is answered, "Not at all. It would simply enable the executive of the Federal agency to hire the right man for the right job at the right time. The present system sets up all sorts of barriers against hiring the best man, against promoting the best man, and against firing the worst man. Veterans on the civil service register for junior professional assistant have found out all too well how slow and uncertain the Civil Service Commission system works."

Here again the answer by one of the foremost proponents of the Hoover Commission recommendations indicates that the worst fears of veterans with respect to complete abolition of veterans' preference in the civil service is confirmed. It is admitted that at times the merit system of hiring and firing veterans is slow and cumbersome, but it is fair, and whenever complied with by agency heads free from arbitrary abuse. I feel certain that the Members of Congress do not wish to endorse a system that would permit agency heads to hire and fire without regard to the civil-service laws and without regard to other safeguards designed to allocate Federal positions equally among the citizens of the 48 States.

That an executive head of any Federal agency could hire, promote, and fire at will, without regard to an open, competitive hiring and firing process would result in a complete return to the spoils system. Mr. Steinkraus' answer to this second question removes every shadow of doubt that adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations would destroy the long-established principle of veterans' preference.

We would appreciate having the same publicity given to this partial reply to Mr. Steinkraus' letter as he in turn enjoyed.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director.

Reaffirmation of Support for House Concurrent Resolution 64

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the ideological counterpoint to the Communist drive is the establishment by the United States as the objective of its foreign policy of a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law. If we are to avoid the martial threat to all civilization inherent in beginning production of the hydrogen bomb, we must bring an end to the very real competitive arms race now going on between us and the Soviet Union. A realistic and practical hope for the resolution of this cold war struggle is the development of the United Nations into a world federation. In this way with the guaranties inherent in a world legislature, executive and judiciary, and with a fundamental world law governing all and control of military means in the hands of the world collectively we can give what ought to be acceptable assurances to the minority, and it is clear in this case that the minority is the Soviet Union and the countries within its orbit. It is for this reason that utilization of the United Nations machinery alone is

inadequate, as there is no way to give the minority guaranties under the United Nations except of our good faith; and yet the minority—to wit, the Soviet Union—has by its veto the power to block any constructive action for peace and security. In view of the fact that communism worships lack of good faith, we can hardly believe that it will ever depend on it in others, regardless of how often we in the United States and others of the world's democracies may have manifested it.

What we lack now is an adequate rallying cry by which the peoples outside the Communist orbit can express their faith and their aspirations. Thus far, the United States, leading the democracies, has depended upon the worth of our cause in preserving freedom with much blood and treasure, in giving peoples rights of self-determination and in the great program of self-help and mutual cooperation to save peoples from economic anarchy and to raise their living standards. The next step is to adopt as the objective of our policy, world federation, and in this way to give eloquent voice to a program which can evoke the evangelical zeal that communism evokes from its disciples and yet be infinitely superior to it in terms of the material and spiritual values which it can deliver. It is for this reason that 102 Representatives and 22 Senators introduced House Concurrent Resolution 64 stating that—

> It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

So far the European recovery program has been our most positive ideological response to the Communist ideology. ERP is fundamentally grounded on regional organization in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Should we adopt as the objective of our foreign policy world federation, these regional organizations become the necessary precedent step by which the free world can organize itself in units greater than national units and yet not as great as world federation but in preparation for world federation. The program of those interested in world federation therefore should be to promote all such regional organizations and primarily for mutual economic development but also for mutual security. There has been great activity in this regard in Europe with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Atlantic Pact, and the Council and Consultative Assembly of Europe, but we need now to move into Asia with a Far East recovery program urgently required as an ideological response to the Communist challenge in China, into an African program for the purpose of developing the vast resources and the vast markets which can be attained through greatly increased economic development and through raising the standard of living, education, and health of the African people and finally into a program for the Americas, themselves, a vastly underdeveloped area, all for the benefit of the economic and moral strength of the free world.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 should be considered when the question of military appropriations is brought before this body; it should be considered when veterans' benefits are before us; it should be considered along with the military defense assistance program—for all this legislation is necessary because we live in a world where we are neighbors to all but where not all are friendly. The unarmed peace we enjoy with Canada has saved us untold amounts that would have been spent in fortification on our long borders shared with the Dominion, the world's second largest nation. What the United States and Canada have done—even after a history replete with mutual invasions—the rest of the world must do if it is to save itself.

Two Hoosier Philosophers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in Marion, Ind., in the heart of my district, we are fortunate enough to have at least two Hoosier philosophers in the grand tradition of Riley, Ade, and Nicholson. Each, one in the prose and one in verse, can make us take a moment from the busy workaday world to smile awhile at ourself and our foibles or even to shed an abashed tear for things, events, or people of an earlier and perhaps happier day.

Paul L. Hillsamer, publisher and editor of the News-Herald of Marion, is the prose expert and his recent article on the old-fashioned threshing ring tugged a string in my heart. I am sure that at least two-thirds of the Members of this House, myself included, know from experience exactly what Mr. Hillsamer was talking about when he wrote in the March 17 issue of News-Herald the following article:

OH, THE VIRTUES WE'LL SING

It is time for someone to write about it, for soon the last rig will be junked and then, not so much later, the last participant will die and who will sing the joys of the old Indiana threshing ring?

The "ring" was a group of farmers living fairly close together with roughly the same amount of wheat and oats to separate from the straw, which is why the threshing machine was also called the separator. These complicated machines, powered originally by steam engines and later by ordinary tractors, were fed by two huskies, one on each side, unloading the sheaves of grain—always one at a time, head in and straight. To throw in a sheaf sideways or butt first was to incur the wrath of the captain, a solitary, stern individual who paced the top of the separator much as the Ancient Mariner may have strode the deck of his trusty vessel. Now he stooped to oil a vital part, now to guide the blower in the blowing of a perfect stack, now to bellow words of jollification, advice, or rebuke into the ear of one of the unloaders. When an unloader left his post or one finished ahead of the other the captain grabbed a fork and pitched in, and when the machine clogged it was he who gave the signal to stop and then plunged his arm in (up to the neck) the straw, string, dirt, and chaff which had stopped the works.

Steam engines were before our time. We only dimly remember Cordia Shinholt's ancient rig. On the tractor-powered outfits a lanky, half-grown, half-naked boy usually sat on the tractor seat, more or less (mostly less) alert to the captain's signal to stop or start.

Two grain wagons handled the grain on small rings. The separated grain poured like a cascade from a reversible tin trough approximately every 20 seconds. Three pourings filled a sack and getting the full sack out of the way and the empty sack over the mouth of the trough before a bushel of wheat or oats came charging out was no feat for amateurs. For some reason older men usually operated the grain wagons, possibly because unloading them was such an easy task. All that one needed do in unloading was to pick up the 130-pound sack, hoist it 3 or 4 feet above one's head, and dump it over the wall of the granary, that's all.

Also no mean feat was loading one's wagon to haul to the separator. Wheat and oats were shocked 12 or 15 sheaves to the shock, with two caps—sheaves spread out and put on top as a roof. Thirty-five shocks made a nice load, though show-offs took 40 and smart men 30. One loaded by laying a ring of sheaves around the wagon, butts out and heads in, and then filling the center with alternating bundles, first reaching one way and then the other. All very simple when the top of the load was the bottom of the wagon, but rather complicated when the top was 12 feet in the air. Racks tapering off at a 90° angle; in other words, 6 feet high to nothing, fitted on the sides and 6-foot high ends, to the ends of the wagon, thus saving, one fondly hoped, the whole load from sliding down to mother earth.

About 8:30 you commenced to sweat. From then on in you never ceased. The huge dinner and its accompanying quantities of iced tea or lemonade did nothing to halt the phenomena.

Your editor always maintained a small local reputation, out in Washington Township, as a sweater. Looking at labor, much less doing it, always caused us to break into profuse perspiration until we looked as though we had been dipped in a horse trough. But the harvest field sweat was a healthy one which did not harm, all of us fat men could well afford to pay $20 a day for the privilege now.

In the old days not feeding every man threshing at her home would have been sacrilege to a housewife. With the advent of the automobile many wives started delivering their husband's dinner in person and gradually the mass feeding became extinct.

Just what did feeding the threshers entail? Eight bundle haulers, four grain wagon men, the captain, the tractor man, two or three boys, the housewife and perhaps three assisting neighbor women constituted the crowd. For these 20 or 22 people, a gracious old Washington Township lady-friend assures us that the following menu is, if in error, on the light side:

(Editorial note, 1950—"Aunt Annie" Hillsamer since passed away.)

Eight fried chickens, half a bushel of mashed potatoes, 2 gallons of gravy, 1 gallon of coffee, 5 gallons of lemonade (though this was to last all afternoon), 10 pounds of green beans, cream corn, lettuce, turnips, three or four kinds of pudding, 10 home made loaves of bread, 3 pounds of butter, 8 pies, 5 cakes.

That was before the war. Either one of them.

In the early days fights were common but as the Civil War veterans died off, so did the

scraps. Most disputes centered around who should be threshed next; occasionally trouble flared if a stack were built too near a neighbor's line fence—threshing spread a lot of weed seeds.

Every year a new host entertained at the settling up—an involved process in which everyone paid everyone else 30 or 40 cents an hour and the women gossiped and the little kids played hide-and-go-seek and everyone ate ice cream and cake until they were in sweet misery. To the sharp-eyed reader who observed the omission of those—neither man, woman, nor kid, but sweet sixteen—well what did you do when you were that age?

When we started this article we aimed to paint a picture of the old-time threshing ring—an institution which has taken a mortal beating during the past 15 years. Now we find, we haven't, our vocabulary can't paint a picture of the scene, can't make you smell the wheat and straw and grease and dirt and sweat and fried chicken. We cannot reproduce the taste of the cold drink from the harvest jug, the feeling of comradeship of the wheatfield. Neither can our poor words describe the feeling of the thresher, wending homeward his weary way, or the peaceful spectacle of a new stack silhouetted against a Hoosier sky. You who have experienced all this know what we want to say. You who haven't don't know what we're talking about. So let's let well enough alone.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. John J. Kolher, also of Marion, has, during the past few years attained recognition as one of Indiana's finest poets. I particularly desire, at this time, to call attention of the Members to one which I consider really outstanding:

INDIANA

It could be her gentle, kindly folk,
Who share their smiles and tears,
And warm you with a welcome,
That allays all doubts and fears.

Or the air perfumed by flowers,
That fill her fields in spring;
Or music from each tree and hedge,
Where a million warblers sing.

The matchless scenic grandeur
Of lake and stream and plain,
Her dark majestic forests, or
Her fields of ripening grain.

Her roads like magic ribbons,
Through an endless holiday,
Where blue skies like to visit,
And warm breezes seem to pray.

In the lore of primal legend,
Every milepost is enshrined.
Romance, drama, set to capture
And enslave the heart and mind.

Could be the regal pheasant,
Who struts before his mate;
Or tense moments in a blind, where
Migrant mallards keep a date.

The great bass in the rushes
And a shower of silvery fry,
As he breaks for open water,
Where we cast our feathered fly.

Could be her crystal fairyland,
Seen through the silent snow;
And a million other wonders,
But this one fact we know.

There's a strange and subtle something;
The enigma of these parts,
That reaches out and gently takes
A hold of human hearts.

They lost nostalgic yearnings,
Settle down to work or play,
And vow they'll be good Hoosiers,
'Till the dawn of judgment day.

—*John Kolher.*

Fame and Infamy—Communism in Hollywood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated communism in Hollywood.

It found Hollywood literally reeking with communism and using the moving-picture industry to spread its poisonous propaganda.

They were not only attempting to spread their atheistic propaganda throughout the Nation, undermine this Government, and destroy our American way of life, but they were attempting to destroy the moral fabric of America by poisoning the minds of the children of the Nation.

It is about time the Christian people of this country, the conscientious, decent, moral men and women throughout the Nation, joined in the battle now being waged by such men as Lloyd T. Binford, chairman of the Board of Censors of the City of Memphis, Tenn.

At this point I am inserting a statement issued by Mr. Binford a few days ago against the filthy, loathsome pictures of Ingrid Bergman, which I hope every Member of Congress, in both Houses, as well as every Christian mother and father in America, will read.

The matter referred to follows:

FAME AND INFAMY

One of the primary requirements of worldly fame is virtue. Without virtue, fame becomes infamy.

The most infamous example of the manner in which the motion-picture industry flaunts its devilish disdain of Christian ethics and principles is the Rossellini-Bergman case. Not only have these people defied the laws of man; they have defied God's laws; not only have they attempted to glorify their perfidy; they are now attempting to entice millions of theatergoers to pay them, through the box office, high wages for their widely publicized sin.

It is the considered opinion of the Memphis and Shelby County Board of Censors that it would be inimical to the public morals and welfare to permit the public exhibition of a motion picture starring a woman who is universally known to be living in open and notorious adultery.

RKO Radio Pictures, Inc., is releasing the picture Stromboli, which stars Ingrid Bergman and was directed by her paramour, Roberto Rossellini. In RKO's advertisements there appear running headlines in prominent letters that read: "Raging island; raging passions."

The star of this production with its crude manner of commercializing vice is a reminder of all the impurities of sexual abnormalities of lust-driven delinquents.

Stromboli itself is a sordid tale of marriage; a marriage consummated without love as its basis. It is a story which, while carrying the unborn child of her husband, she engaged in a clandestine affair with another man. It is a story in which the husband beats her while she is pregnant—the witnessing of which would have effect of degradation even upon the minds of the calloused adults.

Sadistic, unmoral, immoral, and featuring a woman who deserted her own husband and daughter and became the mother of an illegitimate son by a roue, already married to another woman whose children he had fathered—such is the picture of Stromboli, from which the vendors of vice expect to make millions. In truth, it is the picture that should make millions turn away nauseated from all the box offices and motion picture theaters until the producers of motion pictures have come to their senses and will not attempt to abort and corrupt motion-picture screens of the world with indecent, godless, communistic filth.

When Ingrid Bergman came to America she was greeted with open arms by all motion-picture fans, young and old. Seeing in her all the beauties and virtues of divine womanhood, they gave her their affections and contributed dollars to assist her in rising high on the ladder of success. Now, Ingrid Bergman has given birth to an illegitimate child, conceived in illegitimacy, who will bear the brand of his parents' disgrace as long as he lives.

Not only has this alien now proved herself unworthy of the love and respect she was given and the trust that placed in her, Ingrid Bergman has cast a shadow of shame upon the entire world of women. She has disgraced her own homeland. She has deserted her own young, innocent, legitimate daughter of her legitimate marriage and both she and Rossellini have heaped coals of shame upon her little girl's head.

The Memphis Board of Censors does not undertake to judge Ingrid Bergman, for her conduct as exposed by her, is between her and her God; and while she has violated the laws of God and man she has evidenced no regret or repentance and the word of God makes it very plain that the repentance must precede forgiveness.

There is not an instance in the Bible where Jesus condoned or pardoned any sin without evidence of repentance. The much quoted reference to the woman taken in adultery (John 8: 1–8), we must confess that we hardly see a trace of analogy. There, the woman had been caught in the act of adultery and was on trial for her life by stoning, a penalty that was justified in the light of ancient laws of Judaism (see Deut. 22: 22–23) and (Lev. 20: 10). The point is, Jesus did not condemn her to death by stoning as her accusers wanted him to do. On the other hand, He did "condemn" her sin, the sin of adultery, as the words, "henceforth, sin no more" reveal. It is unfortunate that so many well-meaning persons have distorted so grievously this ancient passage of scripture through their sheer ignorance of its true contents.

This is not a matter of "who hath no sin amongst you, let him cast the first stone at her" (John 8: 7). For it should be remembered that the woman did not approach the Savior bragging of her "pure love" but, rather approached Him truly repentant, asking that she be forgiven.

As long as millions of unthinking, maudlin, sentimentalists condone the acts of those who commercialize vice by attending theaters in which it is displayed at so much a seat, just so long will virtue live in rags, and, finally crushed by poverty and lack of appreciation, sell itself for riches and become vice.

Those who attain worldly fame have an obligation to all humanity. It is their God given duty to uphold the morale of the laws without which society cannot safely and happily exist. It is their duty having been blessed with worldly wealth and affection, to show their appreciation by living exemplary lives. It is their duty (especially for those who admire them and look up to them as the very acme of all that is noble and

good) to set an example of such finesse and fidelity that never will they create disillusionment with its tender cynicisms, distrust, discouragement and—even despair.

Dr. Fosdick said: "There is bound to be a reaction against this flaunting of promiscuous sensuality; this glorifying of adultery, this flippant deriding of love, which contributes to the demoralization of the social life."

We want no more of Stromboli, the Raging Island of raging passions, for it is indeed regrettable that there are producers of stage and screen players so disinterested in the welfare of the physical and spiritual health of the American people—especially their boys and girls of impressionable age, that makes boards of censorship necessary.

LLOYD T. BINFORD,
Chairman of the Board of Censors of the City of Memphis, Tenn.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio address recently made by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, the Attorney General of the United States, "Justice for Poland," including the introductory remarks made by former State Representative Stanley Borsa, made on a radio program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress:

INTRODUCTION BY MR. STANLEY BORSA

It was only a few short years ago that people thought and dreamed of one world. Today everyone talks in terms of two worlds. The difference between the Soviet Union and the western democracies has proved too deep to be ignored. There are some who believe the main difference is a conflict between socialism and capitalism—economic structures. Others think it is a political problem between freedom and tyranny. The common denominator of these differences can probably be summed up in terms of morals. The division of the world has been profoundly accomplished by the religion of immorality invented by Marx, preached fervently by Lenin and carried to unimagined extremes by Stalin. Marx dismissed God as a hoax, Lenin accepted this belief and advanced toward sowing hate, revolution and scorn and Stalin has accepted the doctrine of both to completely stifle freedom in Russia and suppress any movement toward it. Religion, poetry, art, education, scholarship and even pure science are twisted to the momentary needs of the tyrant. These things are not only true in Russia but wherever the influence of the Communist conspiracy extends. Poland and other satellite countries furnish us a shocking example. Communism deprived them of independence and are crucifying their religious beliefs. "No compromise with immorality" should become the battle cry and guiding principle of every individual in every still uncorrupted government in the world. Only upon the upholding and teaching of Christian moral standards can civilized life be maintained. The Honorable J. Howard McGrath is the sixtieth Attorney General of the United States. He was born in Woonsocket, R. I., and after graduation from college was admitted to the bar. From his early college days, Mr. McGrath has been interested in the law, politics and the science of government, devoting the past 20 years to public service. In 1934 President Roosevelt appointed him as United States district attorney for Rhode Island. He has served his State as governor and Senator and his Nation as solicitor general, Cabinet head of the Department of Justice as Attorney General. From President of the Young Men's Democratic League of Rhode Island in 1924 he advanced step by step to become chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1947, serving in that job until his elevation to the office of Attorney General. His career has been marked with his vigorous defense of human rights and the American way of life. It gives me pleasure to present a recorded address by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States.

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

(By Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General)

I deeply appreciate the opportunity afforded me by the Polish-American Congress of Western Massachusetts to broadcast a 1950 message on the Polish devotion to freedom and justice.

Throughout the centuries freedom-loving humanity all over the earth has been inspired by the historic battle of the Polish people for liberty—the God-given right of all men.

Their thousand-year record is emblazoned with struggle, suffering, and sacrifice in freedom's cause. Year after year, despite defeat and tribulations that would have broken the spirit of the less faithful, they have ever fought on and on toward the coveted goal.

Centuries of partition and enslavement by powerful and ruthless neighbors have failed to quench the Polish thirst for liberty. Time and again they have ripped off the shackles of their oppressors to enjoy for brief intervals the blessings of a free people. One such period followed the First World War, when our own Nation helped to restore their independence.

But that independence was all too short-lived. For in 1939 Hitler's Nazi madmen overran Poland's sacred soil. Notwithstanding the fact that she was outnumbered and militarily unprepared to meet that vicious attack, she was the first nation to battle Hitler. There were no quislings in Poland.

The Communist grip on Poland is a warning to the democratic world. The democratic world is learning that communistic ideology denies the inalienable rights of man, suppresses freedom of expression, prohibits the participation of the people in the affairs of their own government, and substitutes the rule of a minority for the rule of a majority. Yes, the rule by a controlled few for the rule by free millions.

We know this wicked doctrine takes away man's most precious possession—the right to religious worship in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. We do not forget the bitter lessons of history vividly reminding us of nation after nation crumbling in the dust, never to rise again, whose people have turned away from God.

Founded on faith in God, never wavering; established on the rock of religion, unshakable against all the winds of adversity, our country has developed and grown into the most prosperous and most powerful Nation on the face of the globe.

We do not say this in the spirit of exultation, but with deep humility as we strive to carry out the eternal mandate to do good—"To love thy neighbor as thyself, to feed the hungry and heal the sick."

The bond of friendship between the Polish people and the American people has continued since the days the courageous Polish pioneers helped to found the Jamestown colony, the first English settlement on American soil. In the new year of 1950 it is particularly gratifying and inspiring for us to reflect that many distinguished Polish names have enriched the story of America from the days of our independence to the present hour.

Americans will ever remember those fearless Polish pioneers of the Jamestown colony. Records show that the Polish pilgrims of that day and time, artisans in glass and soap making, demanded political rights—the right to vote.

The attainment of this privilege is considered by some as the first victory in America for the right of suffrage. Immense strides in liberty's cause have been made since then. Renowned Poles have graced the Halls of Congress, honored governors' chairs, and embellished other places.

Nearly a million American boys with Polish blood in their veins valiantly fought in two world wars that we were forced to wage in defense of our democracy in a single generation.

One of the first to enlist in our country's Revolution for democracy—for human liberty—was Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Selfless and heroically he fought in our war of liberation and gave his life in the siege of Savannah, Ga. General Pulaski was not an American, but he was a fighting exponent of freedom and he came from a country that cherished freedom above all else. No nationality, no race, no creed has exclusive ownership of liberty. Liberty is indivisible, it is universal, it is the birthright of every human being. God meant it so to be.

As I have said on other occasions, Poland has furnished us with more than a great national hero. She has steeped our country in her culture and ideals. Her musicians and writers, her artists and singers, her missionaries, teachers and inventors, her gallant fighters, aviators, and seamen have added, year after year, to the grandeur of General Pulaski's supreme gift. For a thousand years Poland has been stanchly devoted to her Christian ideal of religious tolerance and democracy.

Pulaski is a symbol of that democracy. In these tense and uncertain times it is both fitting and vital that we reemphasize the ideals for which Pulaski gave his life. While a United States Senator, I had the privilege and honor to introduce a bill in Congress to provide a permanent memorial in honor of General Pulaski—a national memorial which would serve to perpetuate the lofty ideals for which he laid down his life. As in the past, displaced persons coming from Poland will add to the fullness of our way of life.

Would that the rulers all over the world heed the terrible lessons of the past and learn once and for all that the flame of liberty cannot be forever extinguished in the hearts and souls of men. The torch of liberty must be kept ever burning to light the way to a better world.

War has not been and never will be the final solution to mankind's problems. It is not civilization's answer. War does not eliminate lust for power, greed, suspicion, intolerance, and tyranny. Such discords in life can only be conquered by education, mutual understanding, and brotherhood through peaceful processes.

As President Truman has so aptly said:

"The world today needs the spiritual guidance of inspired leaders, who can rise above creed or class, who can help humanity gain security.

"If civilization intends to avoid destruction, nations must learn to live together in harmony with each other."

With the aid of divine providence, we are determined to go forward until we reach the peak of freedom and security, peace, and happiness, for peoples everywhere.

Address by Rev. James S. Barry, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a recent excerpt from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item containing the text of a speech by the Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church in that community.

Father Barry traced the history of the churches in Clinton in an outstanding address given at the centennial banquet March 14 in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Clinton.

In introducing Rev. Father James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church, Congressman PHILBIN said:

"Clinton has long been noted for the religious life of its people, the strength and fervor of their faith, the broad toleration of their outlook, the sincere spirit of their brotherhood, the large number of its sons and daughters who have been called to vocations. The free religious worship guaranteed by our Constitution has found strong, profound rock upon which our community is built.

"There is no man among us better equipped to discuss our religious life than the fine Christian gentleman I am about to call upon.

"Scholar, devoted spiritual leader, of keen penetrating mind, broad and unselfish, highly honored in the new diocese of Worcester, always gracious, kind, and considerate, beloved by all, I am happy and proud to present to respond to the toast, 'Our Churches,' the Reverend James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church, Father Barry."

Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., pastor of St. John's Church, in responding to the toast, "Our Churches," said:

"Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, today we celebrate the centenary of the beginning of the town of Clinton. To appreciate what that really means, we must needs go back over the history of those hundred years. The religious history of the town logically divides itself into two equal periods: before the year 1900 and since that year."

THE FIRST CHURCH

"The first church in point of view of origin, in Clinton, was the Congregational, whose parent parish recently suffered a heavy loss in Lancaster. In 1840, Sabbath school was held, in Clintonville, with Congregationalists, Baptists, and Methodists worshipping there.

"The first Congregational was formally organized in 1844 and a chapel was built near the foot of Water Street on Main Street where religious services were held for 2 years.

"The first pastor was Rev. J. M. Eaton. A new church was erected on Walnut Street in 1847. This church was remodeled and rededicated February 22, 1869.

"This church was replaced by the present edifice, erected on the same site, and dedicated May 29, 1899.

"Thus, briefly, the history of Clinton's oldest parish whose present pastor is Rev. E. Maurice Bussey."

THE BAPTIST PARISH

"Baptists: During the first quarter of the nineteenth century there lived within the present limits of Clinton several earnest Baptists. In 1816, when the New Brick Church was being built, in Lancaster, a new Baptist society was formed and meetings were held in private homes; such as those of Charles Chace, John Burditt, and Levi Howard.

"When the Congregationalists determined to build, on Walnut Street, they urged the Baptists to begin worship in the chapel, on Main Street. Rev. Charles M. Bowers became the first resident pastor in 1847. This chapel soon proved too small, and, in 1849, the new church on Walnut Street was dedicated January 10. Before Clinton became a town the parish numbered 90 members.

"A new Baptist Church was dedicated February 1868. This was later moved back to become the chapel of the large brick church.

"March 23, 1894, the brick edifice, with the chapel in the rear, was dedicated. On the night of January 30, 1934, this beautiful brick church was destroyed by fire.

"But with characteristic enthusiasm a new church was pledged and dedicated in 1936. The present pastor has been in charge for 11 years, including a leave of absence in the Army. He is Rev. Donald B. Weymouth."

THE METHODIST CHURCH

"Methodist: In 1842, the Methodists secured the use of the brick school house, on Main Street, for their Sunday services and then later in private houses. The building of the church was completed in 1852, during the pastorate of Rev. T. Willard Lewis. Several pastors have served this church. During the year 1850, the first regular preaching began, under Rev. Philip Tcque. In 1867, the church was razed and during the next 2 years extensive repairs were made. Later, in 1897, extensive repairs were made. In 1900, the Methodist Church was on High Street, then later, property on Walnut Street was purchased where the present church was erected. A new unit of a community hall and Sunday school was dedicated in 1927. This community hall now has been made into the auditorium. The present pastor is Rev. Andrew R. Eickhoff."

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

"Episcopal: The Church of the Good Shepherd is a development of All Saints Parish, Worcester, and Christ Church, Fitchburg. In February and March 1874, services were held in Bigelow Hall and it was decided to hold regular services, beginning with the first Sunday after Easter, Rev. L. Gorham Stevens, a deacon, took charge of the mission.

"In March 1875, Rev. J. C. Hewlett became the regular pastor. Plans for a church building developed, and at the suggestion of Rev. Dr. Bowers, the old library building site was acquired.

"The church was completed and consecrated April 17, 1877, when Rev. Henry Foote became the first settled director. In January 1884 a fire did some damage to the church and Rev. George F. Pratt became the first rector. In December 1889 the church was enlarged and later, June 10, 1892, the chancel was dedicated.

"Gradually the parish developed along the lines forecast by the early founders. The name, the Good Shepherd, was suggested by one of our distinguished townspeople, Miss Ellen K. Stevens. Since 1900, there have been seven rectors, who have left pleasant memories behind them.

"In November 1949 the seventy-fifth anniversary of the parish was celebrated, when Bishop Henry Lawrence presided. The present rector is Rev. T. Frederick Cooper."

THE GERMAN CHURCH

"German Evangelical Church: This parish was organized in 1887 with 52 members. The church building was erected in 1888, and, with many improvements and additions to the original structure, is still in use. In the course of the years, eight pastors have served, beginning with Rev. F. S. F. Scherf, and the present pastor is Rev. Harold S. Winship. Three members of the parish have entered the Christian ministry. Since 1944, all services of the church have been in English."

THE UNITARIAN PARISH

"Unitarian: The Unitarian Church was originally dedicated in February 1853 and enlarged in 1873 when practically a new building was erected. Since then the church has remained practically the same.

"Rev. L. J. Livermore was the first official pastor but during the formative period Rev. George M. Bartol, of the mother church in Lancaster, was truly the guiding director.

"Rev. James C. Duncan became pastor in June 1886 and his remarkable career, as pastor, ended with his death, in 1937, having been the pastor over 50 years.

"Judge Jonathan Smith took a very keen interest in the early years of the parish and was active in the life of the parish. The parish observed the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the church, in July 1925.

"In November, of that year, a memorial tablet commemorating this event was unveiled and, after extensive repairs, the church was rededicated.

"October 19, 1936, Rev. James Cameron Duncan, D. D., completed 50 years in the ministry when four of the five young men who had entered the ministry were present. Dr. Duncan lived 4 months more, when he died. The present pastor, Rev. John H. Taylor, began his ministry here, September 1, 1949."

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

"Presbyterian: The First United Presbyterian Church, in Clinton, was organized February 6, 1893. Ground was purchased, on Chestnut Street, from the Bigelow estate and an edifice erected which was dedicated May 6, 1894. This proved too small and a new church was dedicated, January 27, 1901.

"This is the present building with some later alterations and improvements. The present pastor is Rev. Robert C. Shaub who has proved to be a good neighbor to St. John's for the last 3 years."

THE THREE CATHOLIC PARISHES

"Catholics: The history of the Catholics, in Clinton, naturally revolves around the history of St. John's Parish. Irish people slowly arrived, in Clintonville, and, in 1845, several were engaged in the construction of the Clinton Co.

"From the expanding parish of St. John's, in Worcester, a mission was established in Clinton. As early as 1845, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered here by Father Matthew Gibson. Services were held in private homes for some time.

"In 1847, Father John Boyce came and after considerable difficulty construction of the first church began and was dedicated under the patronage of St. John the Evangelist.

"Clinton's first resident priest in charge of the parish was Father John Connolly. During the years, several pastors have served at St. John's, and I would like to mention these: Most Rev. William A. Hickey, D. D., who later became Bishop of Providence. It was he who started the present parochial school; Most Rev. Patrick T. O'Reilly, D. D., once an assistant at St. John's, later called to become the first bishop of the new Springfield Diocese; Rev. Michael H. Kittredge, who was the only native of Clinton to serve here as pastor; Rev. Richard J. Patterson, who began the longest career that any priest had as a pastor in the year 1868, which was ended the last day of the past century.

"His pastorate was most notable, especially because during the time there came the dedication of the present—third church—in 1866.

"The present pastor, Rev. James S. Barry, D. D., has had the honor of serving both as a curate and as pastor which he shares with

Father John O'Keefe and with Bishop Hickey.

"The parish celebrated the centennial year of the first church here, in 1949.

"During this centennial year of Clinton's history, the Catholics of Clinton joined with those of all Worcester County in acclaiming Most Rev. John J. Wright, D. D., as he became the first bishop of the newly created Diocese of Worcester."

THE ROSARY CHURCH

"The parish of Our Lady of the Rosary was formed in 1909, a division of St. John's. It was fortunate in having as its first pastor, Rev. Edward J. Fitzgerald, long and favorably known to Clinton people as the trusted assistant of Father O'Keefe. He erected the striking school and rectory which overlook Clinton from the south.

"The school hall serves as the place of divine worship. Father Fitzgerald was a well-known orator and delivered a stirring address on the occasion of Clinton's fiftieth anniversary. The present pastor, Rev. James B. Kennedy, has served with great success over 6 years."

ST. MARY'S PARISH

"In recent years the Poles came to Clinton in numbers sufficient to justify a new parish in 1916, under Father Fox. For some years they attended St. John's Church, and later Our Lady of the Rosary where Monsignor Cyran was then an assistant.

"Father Bloom built St. Mary's School. The first church was destroyed by fire.

"But with characteristic energy, the parishioners rallied to the task and a satisfactory emergency building was erected.

"Rev. John Oszajca is the present pastor of St. Mary's, where he has presided for some years, guiding his flock in the way of the Lord."

TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH

"We can begin the second half of Clinton's life by recording the history of Trinity Lutheran Church which had its origin at the turn of the century. Pastor Kaestner, of Worcester, came here at first to hold services at the request of a number of Lutherans in Clinton. These were held in a private home.

"Increased numbers necessitated renting a large room in the Pierce Block, on High Street. Various pastors continued the work but, in 1913, Pastor Rademacher became the first full-time pastor. The church building, on Chace Street, was dedicated in April 1915. Shortly after, in 1919, certain services were conducted in English, and now both German and English are in use. The congregation was incorporated in 1925. The present pastor is Rev. Theodore Martin.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE CHURCH

"First Church of Christ Scientist: Although Christian Science services were held in Clinton as early as 1892, regular services began in 1908, and were held in GAR Hall, in the Bank Block. The organization became a regularly recognized society in October 1903, with readers chosen from its own membership. During May 1911 the meeting place was changed to Music Hall, in the municipal building.

"The society constructed its church home at the corner of Water and Hammond Streets, ground being broken in September 1921, with completion in January 1922.

"The society was recognized by the Mother Church in Boston as a branch church, and is now known as First Church of Christ Scientist, December 13, 1923. The present president is Elie Rivollier."

ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH

"Greeks: We have an unusual group in Clinton, who form the Greek Orthodox parish whose church is dedicated to St. Nicholas. The church was first established in 1913, with Reverend Thaddeus as the first priest. Many of the charter members still reside in Clinton.

"Two years after the first mass, the parishioners purchased the property on School Street, which is now the site of the present church. The building has been used as a hospital and served as a church until 1926. Then with an enlarged population the present church was erected.

"In 1941 a fine choir was formed, considered one of the best a capella choirs in New England. January 1, 1947, a young group of directors took over the management of the church and were sworn in by Rev. Constantine J. Polymeros, who is the present priest in charge of the church. Daniel J. Paul, at present, presides as president of the various officers."

OTHER DENOMINATIONS

"In this short review we should not forget the Congregation Shaarei Zedeck, which has an imposing synagogue on Water Street where Rabbi Aaron Twersky officiates. He has received definite marks of distinction this very year.

"The Free Methodist Church of Clinton had its beginning in 1906, at which time the congregation worshiped in the Coulter Building. The first pastor was E. H. Wyeth. The church was built in 1923 under the pastorship of Rev. Charles E. Ross. The present pastor is Rev. M. A. Parker.

"Let us one and all thank Almighty God for the sufferings and privations endured by the early pioneers of the various parishes in Clinton, through which they have left to us of today the noble edifices that distinguish our town, which can rightfully be named the town of churches. May a true religious spirit ennoble its citizens always."

Aid in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, March 11, 1950:

AID IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

It seems to be agreed that if the United States is to make effective moves against the advance of communism in Asia some plans for stabilizing the situation in various countries must be initiated and adopted. Viet Nam wants military aid at once to meet the increased threat of the Communist-led forces of Ho Chi Minh. Burma has indicated a receptivity to American assistance, after having been somewhat fearful of foreign exploitation. Indonesia is seeking further rehabilitation loans. Discussions are in progress concerning the relation of American stockpiling to Malaya's economy. A State Department mission is now in the field making a survey and a new Asiatic policy is predicted for sometime in the summer.

Meanwhile there is one danger point at which we can and should act without the need for further exploration. That is the Philippines. We have a direct military commitment and a strong moral commitment to the new Republic's security and progress. It can be met now with concrete actions that will promote stability in the archipelago and at the same time give an earnest to the rest of Asia that we mean business. Here are some of the things that can be done:

1. The United States Congress should immediately make a further and final amendment to the War Damage Claims Act, appropriating the necessary $100,000,000 to bring the scale of payment up to the 75-percent level that was implicit in the original legislation. This is a matter of good faith, but it can be made also a matter of substantial economic gain for the Philippines by making some simple provisos. It can be stipulated, for example, that the additional payments to those whose claims have already been met in part must be used in projects designed to further rehabilitation and economic improvement in the Philippines. This would assure the channeling of the funds into productive enterprises.

2. The United States should extend to the Philippines, now, a currency stabilization credit similar to that which was extended to Mexico. An amount of about $100,000,000 should be adequate. This is imperative, since adverse trade balances have drained away too much of the country's gold reserve. The peso is not now as stable as it should be and there is a black market.

3. The United States should dispatch, immediately, a small, really top-level and nongovernmental mission to examine and report on the possibility of private investment of the sort envisaged in the point-four program. Such a mission, and it should be good enough to inspire complete confidence, should advise the Philippine Government on the steps necessary to encourage investment. It should also advise Americans as to where and how investment could be made profitably. There are opportunities in abundance. In this category could be placed certain public operations that could be funded with private capital, such as the rebuilding of the water supply for Manila and Baguio, the construction of some key roads, and the development of dam projects that would be a source of both irrigation and power.

4. The United States should quickly resolve any further dispute about our military commitments by strengthening its Philippine establishments. If we are to hold Clark Field there ought to be a ground force to defend it and its fuel sources should be made independent of the haul from Manila. If Subic Bay is to be our major naval station its fueling capacity should be made adequate. If we have other and wider programs for a solid establishment in the archipelago they should be started now.

The Philippines is at the moment in a shaky economic position. It is in a vulnerable military position. It can be turned into a bastion of great strength, economically, politically, and militarily by prompt action. We and the Filipinos are in basic accord and we need not fear that we will be misinterpreted. We can act jointly. The important thing is to act now.

Long Island Railroad Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to set forth the telegram I have this date sent to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission:

MARCH 23, 1950.

Mr. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.:

Request immediate action toward directing installation of automatic tripping safety devices on Long Island Railroad to insure

safety of Long Island commuters and prevent repetition of recent catastrophe costing many lives. This matter is urgent and will not wait for lengthy investigations or red tape. This railroad is floundering in a confusion of bankruptcy, investigations, lawsuits, low-employee morale, and poor management. The public must be given this minimum protection at once.

Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM,
Third District, New York.

Address of Hon. Joseph M. Duffy, Chairman of the Clinton (Mass.) Board of Selectmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my address at the centennial banquet March 14 commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of my home town of Clinton, Mass., and the address of welcome delivered by the Honorable Joseph M. Duffy, chairman of the Clinton Board of Selectmen, both of which appeared in a recent issue of the Clinton Daily Item:

Chairman Joseph M. Duffy, of the board of selectmen, in extending the welcome to the audience, said:

"Mr. Chairman, honored and distinguished guests, fellow townspeople, it is indeed a rare pleasure for the board of selectmen to extend to each and every one of you a hearty welcome, as we join in celebrating this one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of our town.

"This welcome, from the board of selectmen, extends to those assembled here tonight and to the great family of Clintonians, and friends of Clinton, wherever they might be.

"To our visiting dignitaries, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth, and to the many visitors from our neighboring cities and towns, who will be with us on this memorable anniversary, we extend our warmest greetings.

"As I stand here this evening, I am aware of the deep feeling, intense love, and tender memories that are part of our Clinton heritage, nor am I unaware of the many trials and hardships our townspeople endured down through the years in the growth of our splendid town.

"And so it is with profound respect for the passing of the past 100 years, and with abiding faith in the future, that we gather here tonight to memorialize this centennial year.

"And as we look into the uncertain future, with its inevitable changes, we ask Almighty God for His loving guidance for this, our town, which we so deeply cherish. Thank you."

In responding to the toast, Clinton and the United States, Congressman PHILBIN said:

"Judge Kittredge, Reverend Clergy, Your Excellency Governor Dever, Your Honor Lieutenant Governor Sullivan, my friend Matt Connelly, distinguished guests at the head table, fellow Clintonians, and friends, I am exceedingly thankful to Judge Kittredge for his very kind personal allusions but fear they are far more generous than I could possibly deserve.

"Let me say of him, however, at the very threshold of this program that our town is deeply indebted to Judge Kittredge for most able leadership in arranging such an impressive, interesting, entertaining, and epoch-making program. To him and all his assistants I am happy to make earnest acknowledgment and render the warm thanks of our fellow townspeople for a difficult job magnificently done.

"Let me also express my genuine appreciation for the honor which the committee has conferred upon me this evening in selecting me to preside over the speaking program and to respond to the toast, 'Clinton and the United States.'

"Within the bounds of propriety applicable to an event which mingles solemnity and festive joy and to be sure in keeping with the dispositions of the several very eminent men who will address you whom it is not my desire or intention to inhibit in any respect, I will endeavor, so far as I am concerned, to carry out the program expeditiously enough to satisfy even an impatient listener.

"If, as the poet once said, 'brevity is the soul of wit,' I shall hope to leave the wit to John Redmond and, insofar as is possible and seemly, strive for brevity.

"Reflection, reminiscence, contemplation, and rededication must be ours tonight. Surely we cannot hope to face and conquer the grave problems of this atomic, mechanized age without recourse to the great fountainhead of tradition and heritage and inspiration which nourishes and guides us from our honored past. No more than we can solve these problems without actively adapting ourselves to the new needs, new demands, and new techniques which are so much a part of our current life and the contemporary world. Thus, if we are wise, we would seek to adjust our thinking and our acting so as best to utilize at once the sound invaluable lessons of the past and to modulate to the swift motion of our dynamic progress in this rapidly changing, constantly shifting, and very uncertain, confused, and bewildered cycle of human history.

"It comes as somewhat of a redundancy for any of its native sons to praise the town of Clinton and the magnificent achievements of its people during the century we observe. The fame of Clinton has spread far and wide to the far corners of the earth. From distant Australia whose one-time Premier was a person with Clinton blood in his veins to the magnificence of the Hotel Savoy in London, where talented Carroll Gibbons holds sway, yet and leaving Congress out of it, to the innermost sanctum sanctorum of the White House itself where our own Matt Connelly so ably serves as the right arm of the great President of the United States, the name and fame, good deeds, accomplishments, and humanities of Clinton boys and girls are known and felt in many places. This has given a universal and global quality to the town which is reflected in the essentially rare and distinctive atmosphere in which Clinton lives.

"On this memorable anniversary we must recall that Clinton is part of an area settled by pioneer colonists in very earliest American days. Its tradition, its history, its lofty psychological approach, its high moral tone, its burning patriotism date back to the days of John Prescott whose courageous band of undaunted men and women literally carved a civilization out of a wilderness and established the basic institutions of government, religion, economics, and sociology by which in steadily and greatly expanded and enriched form since that very time we have lived as a municipal and social organism.

"It is to this strain of early American blood, 'Yankee' if you will, which in fierce struggle and bitter sacrifices forged the early history of this community that we owe so much that we express our profound gratitude here tonight. We of the present as well as our posterity can note with benefit and profit their faith, their dedication to freedom, their attachment to fundamental values.

"As the history of the Nation unfolded, as we grew in population, in strength and in the development and implementation of our democratic institutions, may races and many peoples, often the victims of cruel persecution in foreign lands, seeking the opportunities of free activity which America afforded came to our shores and settled here. These peoples were of different national origins and racial stock and embraced practically every people of Europe. The rich infusion of their blood, the happy admixture of their ancient cultures, their passionate love of liberty; their devotion to religious and moral law has proved an incredible boon and a momentous contribution to the progress of our town and Nation.

"To a degree almost unbelievable these various strains of peoples of entirely diverse and dissimilar national and cultural backgrounds in the course of time and with relatively negligible friction and discord merged into a compact, friendly, cooperating political and social unit characterized by the zeal, industry, thrift, and loyalty of its members and were able to forge here the splendid, free, prosperous, healthy and patriotic community to which and for which we pay our most heartfelt tribute of glory and gratitude here this evening. They kept their eyes fixed on the stars but their feet on the ground and trusting God they built wisely and soundly upon the solid rock of a government and a community based upon the rights of the individual.

"This is a one hundredth anniversary and the people we most honor and thank on this occasion are not alone those of the present generation but for the most part those of past generations to which I have alluded whose steadfast fidelity, indomitable will and tenacious purpose overcame the great obstacles of distance, political dissension and almost every conceivable economic and social deficiency to establish and preserve the dynamic, progressive and colorful town of which we are all so proud.

"Theirs was no easy lot. They grappled and struggled with the stark, bleak facts of mere existence. They clung tenaciously to their ideals of freedom and morality. Their service was not for themselves alone, although they fully recognized and practiced the democratic American doctrine of self-help. But they sought in their very thought, word, and deed to serve the community, the State, and the Nation with unselfish and zealous devotion.

"Their labors and efforts were not confined to times of peace. Perhaps their more glorious contributions, excepting those in the spiritual realm, took place in time of conflict and war. It should be noted that the men of this political subdivision of which Clinton is a part, sons of who were born and raised within a stone's throw of this very hall, fought in the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, in the Indian wars, in the great struggle to preserve the Union and to establish the principle, once and, I hope, forever, that all men are equal; that all men are first class American citizens regardless of their race, their color, their national origin, or their condition in life.

"Men of Clinton fought in the Spanish-American War, and while the line is drawn thin now many of those heroes still remain with us and are among our finest citizens. Clintonians fought for the Nation in World War I. Their deeds of heroism and gallantry resounded around the earth at the Marne, at Chateau Thierry, at Belleau Woods, at Verdun, and on the high seas and in the air. In 1941, when the Nation called once again to its citizenry to rally to its defense, there was a spontaneous response from the boys and girls of Clinton and again they fought in every corner of the world to protect our free institutions, and in every branch of the

service they achieved a record second to none.

"Yes, my friends, in the defense and service of the United States of America and the ideals which it represents, the men and women of Clinton have ever offered themselves willingly and conducted themselves courageously and achieved gloriously in the preservation of our cherished freedoms. Their blood saturates every battlefield of our Nation since the time of the struggle for independence. It drenches and enriches the fields of Europe, the South Pacific and Asia. The lives of Clinton heroes were sacrificed in almost every clime, on every sea, in every airway of the world to keep alive the great and immortal spark of human liberty which has been so zealously guarded in this community.

"I cannot possibly recite in this brief time the sum total of Clinton's contributions to the United States. It has been emphasized time and time again in civil, professional, and business life. Thousands of Clinton boys here and elsewhere have risen to positions of great importance, influence and power in the affairs of the Nation and have reflected undying glory upon our town—outstanding lawyers and judges, some of them adorning this gathering tonight, doctors, scientists, writers, composers, captains of industry, teachers, journalists and distinguished churchmen and many others.

"We have sent outstanding representatives to the National Capital, boys who were born, educated, and brought up in this town or to whom Clinton was their real home. We have had several Members of Congress, the Honorable Edward Kenny, of late and lamented memory, a Clinton boy who served with great distinction for many years in Congress from the State of New Jersey, my own brilliant predecessor and distinguished friend and colleague, our neighbor, and an outstanding son of Clinton, the Honorable Joseph E. Casey, whose record in Congress and reputation as a lawyer has given luster to our town.

"I have already mentioned the superlative service of Matt Connelly, one of Clinton's greatest sons. We are all proud of him.

"As the crowning glory to all these contributions of our sons in the public service at Washington stands those of the distinguished and unforgettable Senator David I. Walsh, of revered memory, one of the Nation's truly great statesmen, a man fired by birth and nature with unsurpassed patriotism, motivated by noblest principles, gifted with great eloquence, and extraordinary talents and ability. The principles he courageously fought for, the vision and foresight he displayed, the lessons in fundamental Americanism he proclaimed will long exert powerful influence in this land. He was Clinton's most illustrious son, Massachusetts' outstanding statesman and one of the great national figures of our times and generation.

"Clinton can feel proud, indeed, of these great men it has given to the Nation and of the faithful service of its sons and daughters and mothers and fathers in war and in peace.

"In this same spot in the old town hall 50 years ago on a similar occasion our people gathered to celebrate their fiftieth anniversary and to express rededication to the purposes of our free Government and in the aspirations of our people. In the same devout spirit, with strengthened will to meet every test of our Americanism that may come, it is fitting tonight that we, too, as the living embodiment of the Clinton of the present should pause to hail and thank those of the past to whom we owe so much. Let us resolve that, inspired by their example and sacrifice, their patriotism and their willingness to give and serve, yes, inspired by their determination to cling to the paths of righteousness, of virtue, of freedom, we, too, will face the future with fortitude and confidence that this community will continue, God willing, to grow and develop and give of itself unselfishly to the great cause of preserving our heritage and building a greater, stronger, more prosperous, happy, and peaceful Nation.

"In these fateful days we shall need something more than passive citizenship. We shall need a united and determined Nation—a people free from the fetters of provincialism and intolerance, a people keenly aware of our responsibilities to the Nation and mankind, a people aroused to the urgency of preserving their liberties in a world tattered and torn with dissension and hostility to democracy.

"The future is in the hands of unsurpassed and splendid youth who must and will, I know, courageously take up the burdens and responsibilities of conducting and advancing our town and our Nation. They have a precious legacy. We all have a precious legacy. If we heed its lessons, those gathered here on the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Clinton will be able to proclaim to the world that we of this generation have faithfully and successfully achieved our great mission and that Clinton and the United States having overcome and solved the problems of the present are walking humbly, but majestically, in the sacred pathways of freedom, tolerance, security and peace."

Mr. Lie Oversteps Bounds of His UN Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the correspondence columns of the Washington Star for March 14, 1950:

To the EDITOR:

The United Nations Secretary General, Trygve Lie, seems to put his own interpretation on the extent of his duties. The result brings discredit to the very important office that he holds. Through the issuance of private memoranda and public utterances, he deliberately uses his influence to unseat the delegates of a member nation, the Nationalist Government of China.

Mr. Lie indicates the direction of his efforts through attempts to shape our thinking with respect to the repeated Soviet walkouts from almost every Council and Committee of the UN. Moreover, he has no inhibitions in bypassing the proper UN organs when he speaks as the sole authority about what should be done concerning the "A" and "H" bombs or the methods the member nations should follow to reduce the production of conventional armaments. High lighting all of Mr. Lie's words and actions is a theme that has a familiar ring: In order for the UN to carry on its work, the Soviet Union must be persuaded to return to the council tables, and to do this we must set aside our silly moral principles.

Mr. Lie is the UN's chief administrative officer and is supposed to act in that capacity and nothing more. He is not supposed to take over the functions of the various Councils, but to keep a record of their findings and report to the General Assembly. He is not supposed to express his own political opinions nor act like a party politician in lining up one power or group of powers against another as he now tries to do.

As an individual, Mr. Lie has all the rights and privileges of self-expression. However, his position, as Secretary-General of the UN, is so important that anything he says may mislead the American public immediately and influence the opinion and even the policy of other governments in a manner that could prove detrimental to the best interests of the United States and the UN members in general.

In this critical period of world relations, the Secretary-General should be made aware that his present actions contribute in no small way to a rising dissatisfaction over the bald-faced attempts by the Soviet Union to use the UN as a forum.

HAROLD J. THOMPSON.

One Hundredth Anniversary of University of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on February 28, 1950, the University of Utah celebrated its centennial. Alumni gatherings all over the United States were held and on the campus a series of meetings, lectures, and various types of gatherings took place.

The University of Utah, established as it was in the first year of our Territorial government, reflects one of the American ideals in regard to education. That is, that the State and its educational institutions should grow up together. The fact that this has occurred especially in many of our Western States, is responsible for America's basic belief that democracy can only properly function where there is a trained citizenry. Utah has never been without trained leaders as a result of her university. The university, in very deed, has been a light that shineth on a hill and has been the sun to the youth of Utah throughout the hundred years of our State's and Territory's existence.

During one of the meetings of the centennial, Dr. H. L. Marshall, dean of the medical college, an alumnus of the class of 1908, and a nationally recognized leader in his field of study and endeavor, on behalf of the faculty saluted the university on its one hundredth anniversary. Because of the State-wide and national interest in Utah's centennial, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Marshall's remarks be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Lee, Mr. President, and friends, the faculty salutes the university on its one hundredth anniversary.

While affirming its own youth and vigor, this faculty in frankness acknowledges that it is almost as old as the university. But not quite so old, however. The institution was framed and fashioned 100 years ago today.

But the snow of the following November had whitened the Wasatch before we the faculty was born. The "we" is used in the editorial sense, for this was a single, not a multiple birth. During the first semester there was only one of us; he was listed under the rather confusing academic title of Dr. Cyrus W. Collins, M. A. Have no misgivings, however; this faculty of one was directed and carefully supervised—as we are now—by 13 solicitous regents.

By the end of the fourth semester, we the faculty had multiplied to three. And then we did an unusual thing—for a faculty, a most astonishing thing—we disappeared. When the legislature cut $5,000 from the university's annual appropriation—i. e., changed the appropriation from $5,000 a year to zero—sensitive and naturally reticent, we vanished from shock.

It took 15 years before there were any signs of quickening, and 2 years later, with John R. Park, M. D., officiating, we were born again. More durable and resistant this time, we grew steadily, but slowly, for 60 years. Lately, of course, we have expanded like an umbrella. According to current count, we number about 500.

It is my personal good fortune to have been associated with the university as a student and as a teacher during one-half of its existence. Possibly my selection here today is due to realization that this situation will not likely be duplicated at the next centennial celebration.

In defense of my own youth, however, let me explain that half a century ago the university was a very small college and also a sizable high school as well. Some of us were admitted in those days at a very tender age. I taught my first class in 1905, became a professor during my twenties, and have served under five presidents. Except during various leaves of absence, I have known all members of the faculty intimately—until the last few years. Now it is necessary for us to wear labels at our infrequent meetings.

While the faculty has lost much of its intimacy and perhaps some of its solidarity, it is now less provincial, and a more restless and competitive scholarship is evident—particularly in the area of investigation and research. The high tempo of the new college of medicine and the graduate school has added candlepower to the night lights of the laboratories.

In days when the faculty was small and intimate, questions both trivial and grave were debated in faculty meetings with eloquence and oratory suggestive of the late Daniel Webster. One of the graver questions, as I remember, was whether to wear or not to wear the cap and gown on ceremonial occasions like this. As sure as the buttercups blossomed each springtime, that subject was debated.

Spearhead for the affirmative was George M. Marshall, professor of English, who pointed out that the academic robe and tasseled hat would bring to our callow halls an echo of the solemnity and dignity of the English cathedrals. For the negative, George Q. Coray and Joshua Paul denounced the garb as monkish—smacking of popery and monasticism.

Through many years this issue raged, until practical William G. Roylance calmly pointed out that the academic robe is inexpensive and also concealing. Adopting it, therefore, could easily save the price of a new suit or a new dress at every commencement.

Our attire here today attests the persuasiveness of the Roylance logic.

Mr. President and friends of the university, this occasion calls for more than levity, or repetition of that which now seems humorous. In attempting to represent the faculty of today, may I also presume, in some measure, to represent the faculty of yesterday—Joseph T. Kingsbury, James E. Talmadge, Joseph B. Toronto, Joshua R. Paul, George Q. Coray, William G. Roylance, William M. Stewart, George M. Marshall, Robert Lindsay McGhie, Benjamin Rogers Howell, Jacob Bolin, J. L. Gibson, Frederick W. Reynolds, and many many others whom I knew.

In their name and in the name of the faculty of today, we salute our 100-year-old university, and we pledge to it anew our loyalty and our effort.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously commented on the Senate floor on the outstanding organization of which we in Wisconsin are particularly proud—the Fraternal Order of Eagles. I discussed the great record of civic contributions of the FOE particularly in connection with emblem-day legislation which we in the Senate passed last year on May 23, and which has since been pending before the House Judiciary Committee. I had been glad to introduce the emblem day bill, Senate Joint Resolution 62, to honor on June 20 of each year the American Bald Eagle—symbol of the FOE and symbol of our American Republic. In the House of Representatives, my colleague, the Honorable FRANK KEEFE, of Oshkosh, who has had a long and distinguished record of service in the fraternal order, sponsored a companion measure.

We are all familiar with the fact that the Fraternal Order of Eagles has literally been in the vanguard of sponsoring a tremendous amount of social legislation. Its magazine, Eagle, whose editorial offices I am proud to say are located in Milwaukee, has constantly brought to the attention of its devoted readership the frontiers still existing for social pioneering. It is fitting that the home of this editorial pioneering should be Milwaukee, which possesses the largest aerie in the world and which has as its headquarters a magnificent building with wonderful facilities.

I have in my hand a copy of the January 1950 issue of Eagle. On its very last page is a brief statement of belief and policy excerpted from the official committee reports and resolutions adopted at recent Grand Aerie conventions. These excerpts indicate that the great pioneering crusade which led to workmen's compensation, widows' pensions, old-age security, and other safeguards, particularly for the low-income American wage-earner, continues. While there might be differences of opinion in some quarters on some of the elements of the Eagle program, there has never been, and undoubtedly never will be, any difference of opinion on the patriotic zeal, the humanitarian sympathy, the stirring enterprise of the FOE.

We are proud of the Aeries of Wisconsin and of their members, and I ask unanimous consent now that the excerpts of their position, as stated in resolutions and reports, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THIS WE BELIEVE

We believe in the democratic way of life, where all can live and work and worship in freedom and security as befits the God-given dignity of man; that we best protect that way of life by positively presenting its advantages and by buttressing the home and family as the bulwark of society against destructive forces.

We believe that there is no substitute for the protective guidance and influence of true, religious homes; that handicaps faced by parents and children in large- and low-income families should be lessened; that the challenging task of guiding boys and girls toward good citizenship is everybody's job.

We believe that full employment, with jobs for all who are willing and able to work, should be the goal of industry, labor, agriculture, and Government; that the annual wage is a practical and attainable economic objective; that out of a just division of the profits of industry will come a new recognition of the role that management and labor must play in our society.

We believe that social security must be extended to include all employed workers not now protected by an adequate retirement system; that all self-employed persons should have the opportunity to participate on a voluntary basis; that social-security benefits must be adequate to provide a decent standard of living, adjusted to meet violent fluctuations in living costs.

We believe that handicapped persons are a good labor investment; that disabled war veterans are entitled to assistance and employment; that victims of industrial accidents should be given training and guidance to help them help themselves.

We believe that the threat of decreased income and increased expenses during periods of ill health should be met by disability benefits similar to those provided for workers during time of unemployment; that wage earners be reimbursed for major medical, surgical, and hospital expenses on a schedule basis for the family unit; that the relationship of doctor and patient should be untouched, and no new relationship of Government and medical practitioner created.

We believe that people-to-people understanding must be the basis for national progress and international cooperation; that our military defenses must be adequate to back up our foreign policy and safeguard our national security; that citizen interest in world affairs and support for the principles of liberty, truth, justice, and equality must be the foundation for enduring peace.

We believe in democracy as a way of life, where rights and responsibility walk hand in hand, where the least well off among us shall find some measure of opportunity and security; where men are free to live as friends and neighbors and to work as partners for the common good.

Unfair Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I

include the following editorial entitled "Unfair Legislation" from the Shreveport Times of March 15, 1950:

UNFAIR LEGISLATION

In an effort to offset Post Office Department deficits created annually in large part through creaky, tangled, political and outmoded operational structure dating back to the ox team days, the House of Representatives has passed a bill including hikes in the postage rates for large newspapers and most nationally circulated magazines.

The bill now is pending in the Senate where it seems to be the intent to bring it to floor consideration without further committee hearings on the ground that the Senate, after committee hearings, previously passed a postal rate increase bill and that committee hearings would be mere repetition.

That is incorrect. Committee hearings certainly should be held on this measure, which is quite different in several major factors from the original Senate bill. The House bill is filled with discrimination in its provisions on second class postal rates for newspapers and magazines. The ultimate effect of this discrimination will be to increase the cost of circulation of large daily papers and most national magazines in rural areas. Thus the cost of distributing large newspapers with full coverage of news, entertainment, educational and/or other features to rural residents will be hiked by a special postal assessment from which smaller publications, lacking both the quantity and the quality of the larger publications, will be exempted. In addition to exemptions on smaller weekly and daily publications, the bill would exempt farm publications and also publications with a small proportion of advertising no matter how big they might be.

Here are examples of the thoroughly unfair and needless discrimination in the House postal-rate bill as it affects second-class rates on publications:

A weekly newspaper of 5,000 or less circulation is exempt from the rate increases but a weekly of 5,100 circulation must accept the hikes, while the very prosperous Country Gentleman and the Farm Journal, each with more than 1,000,000 circulation, also are exempt. So is the great Reader's Digest, with its tremendous circulation—because less than 5 percent of its content is advertising.

The effect of these exemptions is to exclude from postal-rate increases 975 of the Nation's 1,776 dailies, and 8,000 of the Nation's 8,700 weeklies.

In other words, the whole thing is comparable to selling cosmetics at one price for blondes and another for brunettes.

The larger publications of the Nation are not objecting to an increase in postal rates. But, they do believe that any rate increase should be equitable all along the line and not set up in a manner to provide what amounts to a tax-paid subsidy for one group and special assessments for others.

Under the present system, the larger daily newspapers do most of the work involved in distributing their issues by mail. In most instances, they deliver the publications, at their own expense, to rural post offices in their circulatory territory and the post office has only the job of redelivery along established rural routes. The cost of transportation from city to city and of sorting at both ends of the journey does not fall under the Post Office Department, as with most other mail, but is carried by the publisher.

The remedy for Post Office Department deficits does not rest with discriminatory postal-rate assessment of one group while granting special favors to another group.

It rests, according to the Hoover Commission task-force reports, in complete rejuvenation and regeneration of operation of the Department, which now has virtually the same operational structure that was established in 1836—nearly 115 years ago.

According to the Hoover Commission task-force reports, the Post Office Department has had no basic organizational change in that time, although just about every other organizational form in either Government or private business has changed completely. The reports state that 80 percent of the mail-sorting operations could be performed more quickly with the help of mechanical devices—that it costs the Department (meaning us the taxpayers) 2½ cents for every post card delivered—that 1,000,600,000 pieces of mail are carried free each year (including political documents for Congressmen now planning discriminatory rates on publications)—that the Post Office Department is so loosely organized that it takes 58 separate congressional appropriations each year to operate it, ranging from $500 to $500,000,000 each—that the Department actually subsidizes certain types of mail for far more than its books show and that no one actually knows how much tax money is paid out in subsidies to air lines, steamship lines, and other carriers.

None of these things are attributed to operational personnel of the Department—from Postmaster General Donaldson on down. Their causes lie in the weak and toppling organizational structure. It is there that Congress—and Congress alone—can act. It is there it should act—not in setting up special penalties for one group of users of postal facilities and special favors for other groups. Under the House bill—as usual—the poor farmer will get it in the neck through higher rural mail increases or complete discontinuance of delivery by publications. En passant, who is going to pay for the recent coal miner increases? The mine companies or the consuming public? You guess.

Address by Thomas R. Callahan, Member of Speakers' Bureau, Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very enlightening address delivered by Thomas R. Callahan, of Somerville, Mass., member of the speakers' bureau of the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, to the members of the Holy Name Society of St. Pius' Roman Catholic Church, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, March 12, 1950:

Why are we here?

Why is it necessary for you and me to discuss the question of separation of church and state?

Why are we, as a group of Catholic laymen, discussing a controversial issue which directly concerns the Catholic Church?

The answer to these questions lies in the circumstance that the issue has been publicly raised by Protestant laymen, and it should be publicly answered by Catholic laymen.

You and I know, as Catholics, that many questions concerning the relationship of our church to our Government are propounded to us in our daily association with those who are not members of our faith. We know too, that while some of these questions are asked in a spirit of honest inquiry, many times they are prompted by motives far less worthy.

We know also that some of the people who ask those questions have no direct contact with Catholic priests, and that many of them do not want such contact. Can you conceive of a more dangerous weapon, to be placed in the hands of those who are antagonistic to the Catholic Church, than the admission that, as individual Catholics, we are unable, without first obtaining the advice of a priest, to answer a simple question concerning the relationship between the Catholic Church, as such, and that organization of our fellow citizens which we know as our Government?

A current book, which is critical of the Catholic Church, is receiving considerable notoriety. This book, which I will not further advertise by announcing its title, was the subject of a recent debate between a Catholic priest and the author of the book, which unfortunately, is now going into its twelfth printing. In this book we find this statement:

"Every Catholic is forbidden, in general, to explain or defend the truths of his faith publicly."

That was the man whom a consecrated Catholic priest was obliged to answer in a public forum while you and I and other indolent Catholics sat comfortably in our homes watching the wrestling matches on the television. If you shall say to me that the priest did not have to debate with the author, then I shall ask you are we, as intelligent Catholic laymen, going to permit these published attacks on our holy church, to remain unchallenged while there is now pending in the Legislature of this Commonwealth, and in our national Congress, legislation the consideration, and the disposition, of which cannot help but be affected by such distorted concepts of the responsibilities of Catholic laymen in our State and national Government.

We are assembled here with the consent and approbation of the brilliant and militant archbishop of this diocese because one of the constitutional precepts of the founders of this country, which was originally intended as a shield for the protection of all religions, is now, through the forces of bigotry and political expediency, being converted into a sword, which is aimed directly at the heart of the Catholic Church.

Reference to our history books will show that one of the results of the Revolutionary War was a wave of bitter resentment against the Church of England, the Episcopal Church, the official church of our enemy during the war.

A member of that church, James Madison by name, in order to defeat the possibility of that church, or any other one religious denomination, being recognized and maintained as the official church of this country, presented to a constitutional convention, the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States; the first amendment provides, and I quote:

"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

There, my friends, is the only time the word "religion" appears in the Constitution of the United States. Let me repeat that for emphasis, there is the only time the word "religion" appears in the Constitution of the United States.

The fourteenth amendment which had for its purpose the extension to the several States of the provisions of the first amendment which applied only to the Federal Government, reads in its pertinent part as follows, and I quote:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or the immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

There you have before you the two constitutional provisions which we so often hear cited as the enunciation of the doctrine of the separation of the church and state.

Can anyone show you where, in those quotations from the Constitution of these United States, it says that a child going to attend a parochial school may not ride in a school bus going in the same direction and carrying children who attend a public school? Can anyone show you in those portions of our National Constitution any prohibition that a parochial school which relieves the State of the tremendous financial burden of providing education for children shall have no right to look to that State, or to the Federal Government, for financial assistance in its efforts to discharge what is legally the obligation of each of the States and of the Federal Government?

In order that we may know that we have grave reason to be concerned and that we are not just crying "wolf" because of imaginary dangers, let me read to you please, from the Boston Pilot, issue of February 12, 1950:

"MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION UPHOLDS LEGALITY OF BUS PETITION

"Legality of an initiative petition aimed at repealing a State law which allows parochial and private school pupils to ride on State-financed busses was upheld here by the Massachusetts State ballot law commission.

"In rejecting a protest by Chairman John C. Carr of the State Democratic committee, the commission held unanimously that at least the required 20,000 of 21,183 signatures on the petition were valid.

"Carr said an appeal to the State supreme judicial court against the commission ruling would be considered. Unless the court reverses the decision, Massachusetts voters will find the issue on the ballot in the November elections."

And on the reverse side of that news item we find the following item with a Washington date line, reading as follows:

"'NOT ONE PENNY' FOR CHURCH SCHOOLS, SAYS NEW BARDEN PROPOSAL

"WASHINGTON, February 9.—Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, took the occasion of the annual meeting here of Protestants and other Americans united for separation of church and state to unveil partly the 1950 model of his Federal aid-to-education bill. * * *

"But Representative BARDEN, whose 1949 measure aroused Nation-wide protest from Catholics, also avowed that 'not one penny' of Federal funds would go to parochial and other private school pupils under the provisions of his bill."

And in the Boston Globe issue of February 14, 1950 we find the following:

"In a tense atmosphere that flared with denunciation at times, some Protestant spokesmen yesterday demanded the legislature permit voters to decide whether parochial school pupils should continue to ride on publicly supported busses.

"Catholic doctrines and tactics of * * * leaders in seeking to invalidate the proposed referendum both came under fire during an all-day hearing on the issue at the State house. * * *

"A committee member, Representative Maurice A. Donahue, Democrat, of Holyoke, demanded that one speaker declare whether he was implying that parochial schools were 'un-American' when the individual referred to the Catholic Church's doctrines as 'authoritarian.'

"I say that what they teach is un-American replied the speaker, Carl Haartz, of Andover."

Before we go any further, let us see just how un-American the instruction that parochial school children receive really is.

(Mentions local boys from St. Pius.)

Would Mr. Haartz and his playmates care to challenge the Americanism of those boys.

Let us look a little closer at the un-American activities of boys who attended parochial schools in the city of Lynn.

The honor roll of St. Mary's boys high school, Lynn, Mass., shows:

John Perkins, class of 1935, killed in action.

Myles Hannify, class of 1938, killed in action.

Hugh Noonan, class of 1938, killed in action.

Ralph Cormier, class of 1939, killed in action.

Joseph Flynn, class of 1939, killed in action.

Robert Riley, class of 1940, killed in action.

In the class of 1935 there were 38 graduates, 26 went into service.

In the class of 1936 there were 40 graduates, 22 went into service.

In the class of 1937 there were 38 graduates, 19 went into service.

In the class of 1938 there were 41 graduates, 30 went into service.

In the class of 1939 there were 46 graduates, 32 went into service.

At this point we have 203 parochial school graduates of which number, 135, or 66.5 percent, went to the defense of our Nation.

Let us continue this analysis of the un-Americanism taught in parochial schools:

In the class of 1940 there were 48 graduates, 36 went into service.

In the class of 1941 there were 62 graduates, 48 went into service.

In the class of 1942 there were 68 graduates, 56 went into service.

In the class of 1943 there were 87 graduates, 57 went into service.

In the class of 1944 there were 82 graduates, 61 went into service.

At this point we have 347 more graduates of parochial schools of which number 258, or 74.3 percent, went to the defense of our Nation.

Hurling facts such as these back into the teeth of those who calumniate our parochial school system is not a job for the priest alone. It is your job and the job of every intelligent Catholic layman.

In the Boston Post issue of January 31, 1950, we find the following:

"Attorney Thomas W. Vinson, of Winchester, a former Republican Member of the House and a supporter of the Batcheller petition which would bar parochial school children from riding free on school busses. * * * said: 'The issue * * * is whether public money shall be used for the benefit of private institutions. It is going further than anybody ever dreamed of. It opens the door not only to free transportation, but to supplying rubbers to youngsters so they won't get their feet wet, free textbooks, lunches, and for everything else parochial-school officials want the public to pay for.'"

So the boys want to play on a dollars-and-cents basis. O. K. Let's play it their way:

Suppose tomorrow morning Father O'Kane should say to Sister Mercita, "Take the 295 pupils from our parochial school down to the school committee for the city of Lynn and tell them that I have found another use for the school building and that, since the parents of all of these children are paying taxes in the city of Lynn, it is up to the school committee to arrange for their education in the Lynn public schools, as they are legally bound to do." Then the pastor of St. Jean Baptiste should send down to the school committee the 362 pupils of his elementary school and the 157 pupils in his high school and the pastor of St. Joseph's should send down his 773 pupils in his elementary school, and the pastor of St. Mary's should send down the 1,000 pupils in his high school and the 996 pupils in his elementary school, and the pastor of St. Michael's should send down his 328 pupils and the pastor of the Sacred Heart Parish should send down his 400 pupils. Add up the cost of educating these 4,563 children in the public schools, Mr. Vinson, and see how many pairs of rubbers that sum will buy.

In the year 1949 it cost the cities and towns of Massachusetts for public schools $113,300,662, toward this sum the State paid to the cities and towns, in reimbursement, $17,293,603.59, of which the sum of $1,485,070.86 represented reimbursement for bus transportation provided school children. That same bus transportation on which it now appears likely you will be called upon to vote in the next general election in this State.

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the number of children attending parochial schools during the year 1948 was 162,741. The Massachusetts Department of Education has set the cost of educating a child in the public schools as $191.46 per pupil. That is what the State is willing to pay for a State ward.

Multiplying the number of pupils attending parochial schools by the per capita figure provided by the State we find that in this Commonwealth alone during 1 year there was saved to the taxpayers through the maintenance of parochial schools the sum of $33,069,162.66. I wish you would try to keep that figure in mind when someone asks you how or why they should vote on the bus referendum which, so far as we know now, will appear on the ballot at the next State election.

Remember that figure, $33,069,162.66.

And now let us bring that figuring a little closer to home: I am informed that the estimated annual cost of educating a child in the public schools of the city of Lynn is as follows: Elementary $178 and high school $312.

In this parish 295 pupils attend St. Pius' Elementary School. If we multiply the number of those pupils by the per capita figure of $178. We arrive at a figure of $52,510.

If we engage in the same multiplication with regard to the 3,409 pupils enrolled in the seven elementary parochial schools in Lynn and the 1,153 pupils enrolled in the parochial high schools in this city, the mathematical result will be elementary schools $606,802 and high schools $359,736.

These two figures combined will show that the Catholic Church in this city is saving the city of Lynn, and in turn the taxpayers of the State of Massachusetts, the sum of $1,019,983 every year by maintaining parochial schools at the personal expense of the members of the several parishes.

It has been suggested to me that my figures may be inflated. In a spirit of fairness let us consider their argument in that regard: In general it goes substantially like this:

In Lynn we have some classrooms which could take care of additional pupils and in other instances we have empty classrooms and all that is necessary is a teacher. The increase in numbers of students in a school does not necessarily increase the cost to the city by $178 because there may be vacant seats in certain rooms to which these additions may be assigned.

In other words, the cost per pupil does not increase by $178 unless there is no vacancy in any room assigned to a certain grade. If, however, a new room has to be newly opened, then $178 may be the proper

cost, but as soon as it is 50-percent filled this cost does not increase because any additional pupil uses the same teacher, room and supplies.

Conceding for purposes of this discussion, that there may be some merit in this argument, would it stand up if tomorrow morning the city of Lynn was required to provide school buildings, teachers and equipment for the 4,563 pupils now attending parochial schools in this city?

On a national scale the sum so saved by the maintenance of parochial schools is in excess of $200,000,000,000 and the capital outlay for buildings and equipment is in excess of $100,000,000,000.

The Catholic Church has at no time in the past, and does not now, insist that parochial schools be supported by the Federal Government. The Catholic parents in this country stand willing, as always, to contribute by the payment of taxes, to the support and maintenance of public schools, while at the same time they are paying additional money out of their own pockets, in order that they may continue to exercise their God-given privilege, their constitutional prerogative, and their inalienable legal right, to send their children to a school of their own choosing.

The Federal aid which it is expected shall be extended by our Federal Government to all school chilren of America may be set out in a few simple sentences:

First. Bus transportation to and from whatever school they may be attending.

Second. Periodic medical examinations.

Third. Text books.

The Barden bill as originally presented to the Congress contemplated that $300,000,000 should be paid to the several States for Federal aid to education.

As we have seen from recent newspaper items, opponents of the Barden bill insist that it should contain a proviso that not one dollar should be spent for bus transportation, medical examinations, or textbooks for those children who are attending parochial schools, because such a payment, so they say, would be an indirect contribution to the support and maintenance of the Catholic Church, as such, and would therefore be in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

We are told that a child who attends a parochial school may not ride in a school bus because, under Federal aid, the bus would be maintained in part by Federal funds, and that if such bus should bring a child to a parochial school the Federal Government would thereby be helping the Catholic Church, which action, so they say, would be unconstitutional and in violation of the so-called principle of separation of church and state.

If that same child walks to a parochial school he must use the sidewalk. Is there, in any city or town of any State in these United States, a sidewalk on any one of the principal streets of any community which has not been paid for in whole or in part by Federal funds made available under the ERA or the WPA programs? Have you ever seen a policeman order a parochial-school child to get off a sidewalk?

In the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Everson case* (67 Sup. Ct. 604, Feb. 15, 1947) Mr. Justice Jackson admitted that if a parochial school should catch fire, a fireman, paid from public funds, could save those children from the burning building which is, admittedly, owned and maintained by, and for, the Catholic Church. Common sense will tell us that the fireman, under those circumstances, would not be helping the Catholic Church, as such. He would be performing a humane act, in the interest of the public welfare, for the common good of all school children, and that is precisely what the proponents of Federal aid to parochial-school children are asking the Federal Government to do. That is, to make available to all school children, public and parochial, whatever money is appropriated as Federal aid for the health and welfare of all of the school children of America.

There is abundant proof that those who would deprive a school child of such aid, simply because the child attends a parochial school, do not want to approach this question in a sane, logical, sympathetic manner.

If they would stop imitating the ostrich and would withdraw their eyes, and their minds, from beneath the sands of bigotry and prejudice, they would see that the Federal Government, on many occasions, has actually paid money to Catholic schools and colleges.

Ever since the inception of our Government, and more particularly during time of war, the Federal Government has provided chaplains to care for the spiritual needs of the men in the Army and Navy. The Government has not only provided these chaplains with food, lodging, and transportation, but in addition they have paid each one of them a salary as a commissioned officer in the armed forces. Do you doubt, for one moment, that those people who now so vigorously challenge the proposed Federal aid to little school children are not fully aware that the money so paid to Catholic chaplains found its way into the treasury of the Catholic Church, and that they also know, in the case of those priests who are members of religious orders, and who have taken a vow of poverty, that the entire sum so paid, after deducting their ordinary personal expenses, was turned over, by them, to the head of their particular religious order.

Have you ever heard anyone challenge the constitutionality of a chaplain in the armed forces?

When, in 1935, there was widespread unemployment and restlessness and our Nation found itself with 3,000,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 25 on the relief rolls, did not the Federal Government say to more than 600,000 of those young people, enroll yourself in the National Youth Administration, go to any school you choose, obtain part-time employment in that school, and we will pay your tuition whether the school you may select is Protestant, or Catholic, or nonsectarian.

Have you ever heard anyone challenge the constitutionality of the National Youth Administration?

And now let us see if we can make the comparison a little more direct. The Federal Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided in section 243–a that the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives should arrange with the board of education in the District of Columbia for the education of the young boys who act as pages, messengers, in both of the Houses of Congress. Let me read, please, and I quote:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) said page or pages may elect to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice: *Provided, however,* That such private or parochial school shall be reimbursed by the Senate and the House of Representatives only in the same amount as would be paid if the page or pages were attending a public school under the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section."

Can anyone show you a more direct contribution to the support and maintenance of a parochial school? No one has ever questioned the constitutionality of the Federal Legislative Reorganization Act.

And today tens of thousands of veterans of World War II are being educated at the expense of the Federal Government under the so-called GI bill of rights, in schools of their very own choosing, Protestant and Catholic, including those conducted by Catholic religious teaching orders. Have you ever heard of anyone challenging the constitutionality of the GI bill?

Perhaps some of our Protestant brethren are not wholly convinced of the adequacy of the education which is made available in parochial schools. Let me submit to you, please, the opinions of a leading American figure concerning the relative merits of the public schools, and also the inherent character of parochial schools:

In a message to the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, an interdenominational association, the then President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had this to say, and I quote:

"If the Catholic schools prepare youth for better citizenship; if our country will be immensely benefited by a character formation built on the eternal principles of religion and morality, then they are rendering a public service, and since these schools are not operated for profit, they are in reality public schools."

My friends, I believe, as you do, that Christ told Peter that He had founded his church upon a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.

I also believe, as you do, that the juggernaut of religious prejudice has been grinding against that rock for more than 1,500 years.

I also know, as you do, that the process of the friction of the metal of prejudice against the rock of eternal truth causes the sparks of controversy to shoot forth. In today's discussion I have attempted to capture one of those sparks. Through intelligent discussion that spark of prejudice can be converted into a flame with which we can bring the light of our own faith to those who are still lost in the darkness of misunderstanding and intolerance, until ultimately there will shine forth the eternal truth of God's justice and of his plans for the welfare of all mankind.

If each one of you will try, as I have tried, by reading Catholic books and magazines, to equip yourself for the battle that lies ahead, the battle against bigotry and misunderstanding, we will then be able to answer questions concerning the manner in which, and the purpose for which, we devote our efforts to the betterment of our Nation and the glory of our God. If each one of us will make a sincere effort to do this, then we will indeed be paying homage to Him in whose holy name we have banded ourselves together.

Unification, Not Duplication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misconception in some quarters with respect to the role assigned to the Coast Guard in time of war.

One of the most important missions of the Coast Guard, under present plans, has to do with harbor protection, and is in no sense a duplication of any job given to the Navy. It would indeed be unfortunate were this mistaken idea to result in curtailing appropriations for the program for training Coast Guard Reserves. In the hurried expansion that would be incident to any real emergency the Coast Guard would have immediate

need of trained Reserves, just as would the other armed services.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith part of an illuminating article on this subject by John G. Norris that appeared in today's Washington Post:

Several military experts recently have warned against the danger of a Communist tramp slipping atomic bombs into United States harbors, or of subversive forces destroying ships and piers by setting fires or other sabotage activity.

The Government agency charged with port security is the Coast Guard—a Treasury Department force which becomes part of the Navy in wartime. But active Coast Guard personnel and boats assigned to such work are barely adequate for normal peacetime harbor control.

To answer emergency needs and give some protection against the tramp steamer-sabotage threat, the Nation's war plans rely on having a trained Coast Guard Reserve ready. But though Federal law provides for such a Reserve, and some 4,000 officers and 500 enlisted men are on the rolls, the force has never received any funds for training.

The President's budget calls for spending $4,100,000 for initiating a Coast Guard Reserve training program. Training of 1,900 officers and 6,000 men is planned, the bulk of whom would be assigned to port security duty. Ultimately an Organized Reserve of 2,469 officers and 26,645 men is desired.

Despite strong support of the proposal from the Department of Defense, however, the money was knocked out by the House Appropriations Committee. The movement to restore the funds will be backed by some members of the group, as well as members of the House Armed Services Committee.

"The proposed reactivation of the Coast Guard Reserves is a matter of strong concern to the Department of Defense," states Secretary Louis Johnson.

"It is vital to national defense that a modest but highly trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent water-front fires and explosions, control the identity of water-front personnel, etc."

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, in a recent letter to Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington, emphasized that the Coast Guard Reserve training program did not duplicate training now being given to the Naval Reserve.

While the Navy and its Reserve have a harbor-defense function, as reported in the Washington Post yesterday, under a division of effort the Navy handles antisubmarine nets, electronic devices, etc., to prevent enemy craft from sneaking into harbors, and the Coast Guard the job of protection against subversive activity of ships and persons lawfully permitted to enter.

Another Industry Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made on March 27, 1950, and an editorial from the Bridgeport Telegram of Bridgeport, Conn., dated March 27, 1950:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVIS LODGE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT, FAIRFIELD COUNTY, CONN., ON MARCH 27, 1950, WITH RESPECT TO THE IMPORTATION OF HATS AND HAT BODIES FROM ABROAD

Once again the policies of the Democrat administration are resulting in dire economic distress in New England.

A short time ago, the administration sponsored the move of the Chance Vought Aircraft plant at Stratford to Dallas, Tex. This has resulted in widespread unemployment and displacement of Connecticut workers.

Now, the welfare of our hat makers in Danbury and in Norwalk is being seriously threatened by the import of hats and hat bodies from abroad.

This matter demands immediate attention on the part of responsible officials in the Department of State. The Committee for Reciprocity Information, as well as the Tariff Commission, should take action without delay.

It is impossible for American industry and labor to compete in a market flooded with goods manufactured in iron curtain countries with slave labor. Moreover it is not in our national interest.

The situation facing our domestic hat industry is cause for grave alarm. In the light of these conditions it is particularly to be regretted that the Eighty-first Congress eliminated the peril-point clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There is no excuse for prejudicing American industry and the working men and women of our country in order to provide dollars for iron-curtain countries. We cannot base a successful foreign policy upon any proposition which calls for helping our self-styled enemies in the great east-west conflict in which we are involved. Surely there is no obligation to provide dollars to those who are seeking to destroy us. This is a self-defeating policy which we can ill afford.

If we are to continue aid to Europe, a strong and healthy American economy is an essential pillar not only of our national security but of world peace.

An immediate solution is necessary if Connecticut workers are to be protected and employment opportunities continued.

I shall continue my efforts to expedite action on this matter. I shall insist that appropriate officials of the Department of State and of the Tariff Commission take the steps which are necessary to protect our own citizens from such cut-throat competition.

[From the Bridgeport Telegram March 27, 1950]

ANOTHER INDUSTRY PROTESTS

The domestic hat industry, following a tremendous increase in importations from the Communist satellite, Czechoslovakia, has entered a vigorous protest with the Government against the effects of reciprocal-trade agreements. The Federal Tariff Commission has promised an inquiry into the situation, although some Government spokesmen have been credited with giving the absurd advice that Norwalk and Danbury hatters "should learn another trade."

The hat industry is not the only industry affected by imports from the iron-curtain country. The New England Shoe and Leather Association has asked the Treasury Department to investigate the importation of cheap shoes from Czechoslovakia, estimating that a million pairs may be imported this year, to the detriment of American manufacturers and workers.

In January alone, 58,000 pairs of women's shoes, equal to more than half the importations of 1949, came into the United States. The lowest price of a Czech shoe, compared with similar American-made footwear, the Treasury has been informed, is a sandal priced at $1.20, to retail at $1.95 to $2 a pair. The comparable American-made shoe would sell at $4 the pair.

It is obvious that United States manufacturers and shoe workers cannot compete with such products. It is equally obvious that something must be done to remedy a situation which is so detrimental to American industry. It will not solve any part of the problem either, if administration officials tell the shoe workers to go and learn another trade. New England shoe workers, like the hatters in Danbury and Norwalk, have been employed in their industries too long to start looking for different occupations.

Shirt makers are also beginning to worry about imports. They say they are not yet alarmed, but they don't like the prospects. While only 1,000 dozen Japanese shirts have come in, which can be sold for between 88 and 98 cents apiece, United States manufacturers fear the effects of a deluge of such cheaply made products in the domestic market.

The situation is serious and cannot be brushed off by Washington officialdom. "Go learn a new trade" is by no means the answer to the import problem.

Extension of Borrowing Power of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity of inserting an excellent editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald of March 24, referring to the unanswerable arguments made by our colleague, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, on the floor of the House during the consideration of the extension of borrowing power by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This editorial emphasizes the indefensible situation in which the House found itself when it approved a conference report containing provisions identical with the measures introduced by Mr. KEATING, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., and myself, and then reversed its position within a few short hours upon the specious and untenable argument that these bills were loosely drawn and badly worded. Coming, as it did, from the gentleman whose committee had framed the conference report and who had supported vigorously the identical language taken from section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949, it had a most hollow ring. It is regrettable indeed that so many of our colleagues seem to have forgotten the action they took earlier that afternoon and permitted themselves to be maneuvered into this illogical position.

Our colleague from New York has been consistently urging prompt remedial action and I am sure that his logical and common sense arguments will eventually prevail in this body. It is gratifying indeed that a newspaper in New York should clearly recognize the mess in which we find ourselves and come to the support of a solution which cannot be ignored indefinitely. The appalling waste, not only of the taxpayers' hard-earned money, but of wholesome food,

will sooner or later become apparent to the people of America. This is particularly so since many more newspapers have analyzed this situation and have written strong editorials demanding action. There have been a series of striking cartoons published throughout the country which should have excellent effect. I only hope that more and more newspapers will lend their support to a solution of this matter and will join in creating an overwhelming public demand for action. I suggest that if the readers of these newspapers would take it upon themselves to send messages to the President at Key West, insisting upon his action under existing law, he could not continue to ignore the situation or resist the overwhelming public demand for action.

The editorial follows:

STILL ANOTHER PHASE

We'd hate to spoil your evening completely; but while we are on the subect of surplus farm crops you might just as well absorb another phase of the matter, which was described in detail to the House Agriculture Committee this week by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, N. Y.

We all recognize, of course, that the surplus foods bought by the Government have cost not only millions but billions of the public's money, and have also had the effect of compelling the public to pay more for their eats than otherwise would have been the case.

What most of us may have never even thought of, but on which Representative KEATING dwelt most effectively, is the fact that the carrying charges on these surplus foods purchased by the Government, and which are now in storage, are costing the American taxpayers $400 each minute of every 24 hours.

"These charges," the Rochester legislator declared to his colleagues, "include storage, insurance, transportation, and handling, and they constitute a staggering percentage of our present outlay for supporting agricultural prices.

"They amount to $105,000,000 for just the first 6 months of this fiscal year—the period from July 1 last to December 31, 1949.

"That means $25,000 an hour, or $400 a minute; and I understand that these carrying charges are running at an even higher rate now."

Representative KEATING happened to be speaking in support of identical bills introduced by himself and Representatives JOHN W. HESELTON, of Massachusetts, and ROBERT J. CORBETT and HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., both of Pennsylvania.

These measures would authorize the Government to pay transportation costs for all surplus foods delivered to welfare agencies.

Mr. KEATING pointed out that the conference report on cotton-peanut acreage included a provision authorizing such payments on surplus potatoes. The new package appropriations bill, he added, also authorizes transportation to public agencies.

And he contended that the provision should be extended to apply to private and international agencies and to nonprofit hospitals.

We cordially agree with him.

Every effort should be made to unload these surplus foods to the best possible advantage, and thus save storage charges on the one hand or dumping on the other.

In the meantime, it won't do any of us any harm to realize just how costly this whole, inefficient set-up is—and why it is that Federal taxation, direct and hidden, is so high and so burdensome to the rank and file of American citizens.

Socialized Medicine: What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I have prepared for broadcast on the subject Socialized Medicine—What It Means.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—WHAT IT MEANS

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE FOR YOU

Socialized medicine may be a term of uncertain meaning to some of my Idaho constituents. Briefly, under socialized medicine, doctors, dentists, nurses, and hospitals would be employed or managed by the Government. You, as a citizen, would obtain all of your medical and dental service from the Government and you would pay for that service in some way whether you need it or not. Right now you select your own doctor or hospital and you pay for services rendered.

That complete choice of doctors would not continue under socialized medicine. Every citizen or patient would tend to lose his identity and become a number. The doctor would work more for the Government and less for the patient. Red tape and delays would increase. Doctors would tend to lose that personal interest in patients. They would work by the hour instead of for the patient, and, under socialized medicine, the incentive for research and improved medical service would greatly diminish. The Fair Dealers advocate socialized medicine mainly as a means of providing them more control over the people. They are concerned only with obtaining control of the people by means of socialized medicine, and, to me, such deceit and intent are not a new deal or a fair deal, but a raw deal.

But let us look into the history of socialized medicine. Where did the idea come from and why is it advocated at all? Why is the present administration of your Government so anxious to thrust socialized medicine upon the American people? I shall give you some information about this problem and let you decide for yourself whether or not you want socialized medicine in Idaho.

WHERE IT CAME FROM

Following the Russian Revolution of 1917, Lenin, the father and founder of modern communism, set up in Russia a welfare scheme to which he gave the name socialized medicine. He considered this program of such great importance that he called it the keystone of the Socialist state.

Perhaps it may be somewhat confusing to find that the father of communism claimed his political schemes were socialistic, but communism and socialism have always had similar aims and purposes. The Socialists and the Communists both want government ownership and complete control of all means of production, distribution, and communication. The Socialists seek to gain these ends by a so-called process of nationalization based on elections and ballots, while the Communists take the more direct method of bullets and bayonets in order to carry out the communization of any country. In either system the citizen ends up as the property and the slave of the state.

Both Socialists and Communists conceal their real purposes by talking in terms of "public welfare," "planned economy," and "social security." These words do not have the unpleasant meanings that are attached to socialism and communism. But no one need be deceived about any scheme which looks to Federal ownership or Federal control of the resources, industries, farms, homes, and lives of the people in any State of our Union. Such a scheme inevitably involves either socialism or communism.

Having in mind the common aims and purposes of these two political systems, you can see why Lenin considered himself a Socialist, why he named his most important scheme socialized medicine, why the Russian Communists call themselves Socialists, and why Russia itself is officially named the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Returning to the subject of socialized medicine, I want to point out that as long ago as 1930 one of the present Communist leaders, named Dmitri Manuilsky, said to the Communist Congress of Moscow:

"In the United States, for instance, the Communists must launch a powerful movement for social insurance. They must place themselves at the head of this movement and lead it to victory."

HOW IT SPREAD

Since 1930 the red tide of communism has swept over Europe, then into Britain, and finally across the Atlantic to North and South America. Five years ago the Communists allied themselves with British Socialists and Laborites to defeat Winston Churchill and win political control of the United Kingdom. Since then Britain has been ruled by the Communist Socialist-Labor Government of Prime Minister Clement Attlee. Between 1945 and 1950 the British Empire has been liquidated and nearly everything for which millions of Englishmen spent billions of dollars in the last 350 years has been destroyed. The national economy of Great Britain is now dangerously near complete ruin; but what is worse, informed British opinion predicts that the people may accept complete communization, including pure paganism in place of Christianity.

Long ago in one country after another the Communists and their fellow travelers launched a powerful movement for socialized medicine, or compulsory health insurance. In July 1948 the process of socialization by an act to nationalize medicine became effective in Great Britain; and here in America we now have a bill pending in Congress which closely follows the British socialistic pattern. This bill is named for Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, as they are two of its sponsors. So when you hear of the Murray-Dingell bill, you will know that it provides for socialized medicine, or compulsory health insurance.

POWER OVER PEOPLE

There is an old saying that the human hunger for power is like a cannibal whose appetite is never satisfied. It is a sober fact that our bureaucrats in Washington are always reaching for more and more power over the industry, the business, the agriculture, the resources, and the people of the United States. If the Murray-Dingell bill becomes a law, the Federal Security Administration will carry out its provisions, and in so doing this agency of our Federal Government will inevitably exert a large measure of control over your home, your occupation, your life, your living, and the lives of those you love.

The socialized-medicine program will compel practically all salary and wage earners to allow deductions from their pay checks and wages; and employers will also have to contribute their share to the support of another army of Federal workers who will be put on the pay roll. No official figures as to the cost

of this latest socialistic scheme are available, although unofficial estimates fix the figure at $15,000,000,000 a year. Pay-roll deductions and employer contributions may, possibly, produce about $6,000,000,000 of the required amount; but this leaves an estimated annual deficit of some $9,000,000,000 to be made up by boosting our taxes again. Those who think they are going to get something for nothing in socialized medicine are going to have an expensive experience.

WHAT IT COSTS

The socialized medicine or compulsory health insurance program in Great Britain has cost twice the amount of money estimated for it, and it has been a fraud and a failure. Hundreds of bald-headed men have been able to get wigs for nothing; thousands of old folks have obtained ill-fitting sets of false teeth, as well as spectacles, supposedly free. Then, too, more thousands of people with minor ailments or imaginary ills have been given medical attention and pounds of free pills they probably did not need. But those who have been injured or who have been seriously sick have been unable to obtain prompt or adequate surgical, hospital, and other services.

American reporters who visited Britain and surveyed the situation found that injured and dangerously ill persons, as well as those who needed surgery, have had to wait for weeks, or even as long as 15 months for medical care. British doctors, nurses, and dentists are so overworked that they attempt to serve each office patient in 4 or 5 minutes and each home call in 10. The human body, however, is far too complicated to be repaired by such crude or careless efforts. The tragic increase in British deaths has therefore been the result of neglect, and the inferior medical care given to the sick and suffering.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING?

Many British doctors, dentists, and specialists refused to join in the socialization of medicine, and some hospitals made the same decision. A like condition will occur here if the Murray-Dingell bill ever becomes law; and if your doctor, dentist, or hospital is one of those who are wise enough to stay out of this program, you will probably not be able to obtain their services under the socialized-medicine scheme. You may still have the free choice of a doctor, dentist, or hospital that the Murray-Dingell bill promises you, but you will pay double for medical, hospital, and dental services, because the regular deductions will continue to be made from your salary or wages, even though you pay your own privately employed doctor, dentist, or hospital. This is just what is being done in England by all who can afford good medical services. The British now know that they cannot obtain high-quality care at bargain-basement prices.

Our leading doctors have warned us, just as the doctors in Britain warned the people there, that schemes of compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine, will ruin the standards and the quality of medical and dental care. The predictions of the British doctors have already come true; and a like disaster for us can be seen in the similarity of the provisions contained in the British act and our Murray-Dingell bill.

WE HAVE BEST MEDICAL CARE

We now have the best system of medical care in the world. There are some 56,000,000 American citizens who have voluntarily provided themselves with prepaid hospitalization. About 28,000,000 have surgical benefits in advance of any actual need, and 13,000,000 have obtained extra medical care beyond hospitalization and surgery. Group insurance and other plans give health insurance protection to more than 62,000,000 of us and this number is constantly increasing.

In the industrial field medical care is provided for more than 30,000,000 American workers, and this service includes doctors, nurses, and other experts in some 18,000 factories. We have State, county, and city hospitals that are staffed with doctors, nurses, and other personnel. Church and nonprofit hospitals, as well as those operated for profit, must be added to the available hospital facilities. We have more than 170,000 physicians, 45,000 specialists, 93,000 dentists, and 400,000 nurses.

This information does not give a complete picture of our resources and facilities for medical care, but I offer them in response to the propaganda of falsehoods and half-truths with which the Communists, Socialists, radicals, and others have flooded the country.

American medicine is based on freedom and private enterprise, and so possesses all the vigor and vitality that competition, ambition, and human hope give to human affairs. The slavery of socialized medicine has not produced in Russia a system that can compare with ours; but in less than 2 years, socialism has wrecked and ruined the practice of medicine, surgery, and dentistry in Great Britain.

THINK IT OVER

Your future health and freedom, and even your life, will eventually depend upon the quality of medical care available to you. I am most anxious that you decide whether you want a free system of medicine, such as we now have, or socialized medicine with its destroyed freedoms and its medical monopoly in the hands of the Federal bureaucrats.

That is the picture of socialized medicine. But perhaps there is another side to the problem. I have heard much of it. Before New Zealand and Australia threw their socialistic governments overboard, we heard lavish praise of socialized medicine in those countries. But the fact that the citizens of these countries have tried and discarded these schemes should make us think carefully before accepting the socialized-medicine program now being advocated for our Nation. Think it over, my friends. Decide for yourselves what you want. This is the American way, and I am anxious that we continue this American way. It is what has made our Nation great and strong. Let's continue it so.

Should Communists Be Denied Federal Appointments?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at the request of the editor of the Daily Compass, which is published in New York City, I prepared an 800-word statement delineating the true scope and purpose of the subversive activities control bill of 1950, S. 2311, which has been introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, and which has been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary by a 12-to-1 vote. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE MUNDT BILL BECOME LAW?

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, sponsor of the subversive activities control bill)

The so-called Mundt bill (S. 2311, subversive activities control bill of 1950) is not the result of any sudden impulse nor is it the product of hasty or careless consideration. It has been slowly but steadily evolving into its present form for approximately 3 years.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I first introduced a bill about 3 years ago to control subversive activities in this country by processes of registration, identification, and exposure rather than by punitive measures such as outlawing the Communist Party by name or denying it use of the ballot, the mails, and the radio. That legislation was known as the Mundt-Nixon bill; it passed the House by a 319 to 58 roll call vote. Before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee could approve it, that session of Congress expired. Now Senators FERGUSON of Michigan and JOHNSTON of South Carolina have joined with me in sponsoring a modified and more clear-cut version of this legislation. This new measure about 2 weeks ago was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee by the highly significant vote of 12 to 1. Only Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, voted against it.

In their frantic efforts to discredit this Mundt bill and to recruit support against it the spokesmen for the Communist Party in this country have determined upon the strategy of charging everything against it in the desperate hope everybody will believe something and that by one device or another opposition to the bill may be aroused, organized, and be made articulate. The Communists have called it a thought-control bill—an antilabor bill—a bill of attainder and they have hurled equally false and misleading charges against it. They have made full use of the stock Communist formula of trying to smear those who oppose it; they have even called it an antipeace bill but they have stubbornly and sullenly refused to print its full text, to analyze the printed provisions of the bill, or to base their criticisms upon its actual contents.

Such totalitarian tactics may make sense to Communists and some of their willing and witless dupes, but they have little influence in Washington and add even less to the general level of public information. The end result of these Communist-inspired and directed tirades are sometimes ludicrous in the extreme. Last week for example a New York lady wrote me, "I am violently opposed to the Mundt thought-control bill. It is very bad legislation. Please send me a copy of the bill so that I can read what is in it." Naturally such artless and artificial opposition is something less than influential.

Here, in brief, is what the so-called Mundt bill would actually do: In section 4 it would make it unlawful "knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other persons to perform an act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual."

Only that, and nothing more. Just a clear-cut statement making it illegal to "substantially contribute" to the destruction of our cherished American freedoms here by subjecting the United States to the dictatorship of a foreign ruler. Judging from the manner in which the Communists clamor that "this would outlaw communism," they are suffering from a guilt complex or a bad case of jitters. The words "communism" or "the Communist Party" are not even mentioned

in that prohibitive provision. Apparently the Communists by their frantic cries of alarm now admit what they have long tried to keep secret—that their efforts and their program are determined and dictated by men in Moscow. If that is established in the courts and if the Communist Party does not cut the umbilical cord by which it is force-fed from Russia, the provision will of course apply to it. Otherwise, it will not. However, it would have applied equally to the German-American Bund in 1938 and to the Japanese Black Dragon Society. Informed students of totalitarian movements realize that communism and fascism have much in common; they are in fact the Siamese Twins of human slavery.

Not by the wildest stretch of imagination by an orderly mind could such groups as labor unions, so-called liberal (sic) groups, the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, or other organizations advocating change by American methods ever be affected by this provision.

Additionally, the Mundt bill makes peacetime espionage a crime; it denies Communists two privileges accorded loyal citizens by barring them from Federal appointive positions and from securing Government passports; it requires the Communists to label and identify their printed propaganda and radio programs, much as the Republican and Democratic Parties must; it requires them to make an annual public financial report; and it makes them identify their false fronts—organizations operated by them but concealing their true identity.

None of these are police-state methods, but all of them are necessary to protect this free Republic against the alien agents who by stealth and conspiratorial tactics would destroy our American freedoms by delivering us to the police-state dictators of Fascist-Communist regimes. In this era of the cold war to do less than this would be a policy of appeasement of treachery which by comparison would make Chamberlain at Munich look like Horatius at the bridge.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by me on March 27, 1950, entitled "Happenings in Washington." I may say it is program No. 21 of a series.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 21)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In this broadcast I want to tell you about recent developments in Congress that have a direct bearing on the principles for which I have been fighting since I came to Washington a little more than 3 years ago.

You know I have battled every step of the way for less Government spending to put an end to deficit financing, and to cut down the mountain of debt which is a tremendous burden on the back of every taxpayer.

I have fought against the growing centralization of power in the Federal bureaucracy at Washington which robs local and State governments of their rightful functions and authority.

I have opposed Federal controls and regimentation by which big government attempts to regulate the lives of the people and destroys freedom of the individual.

Those of us in Congress who have fought for these principles believe they are the only course by which the United States can be saved from national bankruptcy and a socialistic form of government.

Because you pay the bill out of your earnings, recent events in Congress have been extremely important to you, the people, both financially and spiritually.

Singly these things may not mean very much. But collectively they add up to the beginnings, just the faint beginnings, of a turning aside from the helter-skelter drive down the road to economic collapse and socialism. Not a revolt, mind you, but just a step or two in the right direction.

Ten days ago the House Committee on Education and Labor finally rejected the highly controversial Federal aid to education program, at least for the remainder of the session.

You will remember that I opposed this program for two reasons:

First, because it would have injected increasing Federal control into the operation of State boards of education and the local school districts.

Second, because the $300,000,000 price tag for the first year of the bill was only a drop in the bucket compared to its vastly increased cost when in full swing.

Even supporters of the bill told me frankly that within a very few years the annual appropriations from Washington would have to climb well above a billion dollars annually.

What interested me especially was the comment of one committee member. From the very beginning he had strongly and eloquently favored the Federal aid-to-education plan. He had fought for it and voted for it and worked hard to influence his fellow Members of Congress in its behalf.

But as he gave the proposal more intense study and heard the arguments presented by supporters and opponents, his mind filled with doubt. Then his views changed.

Finally, the other day, this Congressman admitted—and it was not an easy admission for him to make—that he had been wrong.

This is what he said, and I quote him:

"I am now convinced that we can't have Federal funds without Federal control. Children are the greatest collateral that the United States has. Politics must be kept out of the school system if we are to preserve the future of the Republic.

"We are dealing here with human minds, not public roads. This is in many ways the most serious issue before the Congress. Once we take the step down the road to Federal control, we can never retreat."

The Congressman who made that statement is a former teacher and former superintendent of schools in his home community.

That action and those words, my fellow Pennsylvanians, constitute the first straw in the wind to which I want to call your attention.

A few days earlier the House voted down a new project which would have cost $36,400,000 the first year and increasing millions in subsequent years. Under it the Federal Government would have gone into the business of financing a rural-library service for the States.

This was a second action in which economy was achieved despite determined administration pressure.

The third happened last week in the Senate. There the administration forces turned on the heat to force through Mr. Truman's so-called middle-income-housing plan.

This was a scheme under which the Government would lend up to $1,000,000,000 of your money at interest rates of 3 or 3¼ percent to provide housing for those earning from $2,700 to $4,400 a year. They would be able to borrow this money, to be repaid in 50 to 60 years, by forming housing cooperatives.

That was highly discriminatory. It would benefit only a small group at the expense of every taxpayer. It would put the individual home owner who did not join a cooperative at a competitive disadvantage. He would have to pay a higher rate of interest and amortize his mortgage in 20 to 25 years. And in addition he would be taxed to support the gravy-train group.

If a man happened to make $4,500 a year instead of $4,400 a year, he would be unable to benefit from the plan. Yet, part of the money he pays in taxes would be used to support the scheme.

And, of course, the easy credit provided would be highly inflationary.

Well, despite all the heat and all the whip-cracking the administration forces could command, the Senate, under the leadership of the able Senator from Ohio, JOHN W. BRICKER, defeated the scheme.

I find that a third straw in the wind.

These, my friends, may be relatively small things. But there is a fourth in the making. Together with this beginning of a curb on spending, there seems to be the beginning of a curb on taxing.

In the last 20 years the American people have seen their taxes go up and up—becoming a heavier and heavier burden. Only once in all that time did the people get a tax reduction. Do you know who gave it to them? It was the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Yes, in an entire generation the only tax relief the American people have gotten came from the Eightieth Congress which has been denounced and ridiculed by President Truman and his cohorts.

Well, this year, there may be another break—a reduction in excise taxes. The economy-minded Members of Congress are fighting to wipe out or reduce the heavy wartime excises.

We battled for this cut all during 1949, the first year of the Eighty-first Congress. Finally, this year, the demands of the people became so strong that the administration is being forced to do something about it.

Most of these taxes were imposed during the war, not to raise revenue but to curb as far as possible the use of critical materials and services.

Today the people are demanding elimination of these taxes. You are going to get some relief—though not all the relief I believe you should have. Because the administration insists that for every dollar of excise tax it lifts, it must get another dollar through another form of taxation. So, while they plan to put some of this excise-tax money back in one of your pockets, they will be reaching into another pocket to take it away from you again.

You know, Mr. Truman asked Congress last January for a number of brand new spending programs which he said would help the people. The cost of his proposals would have been $875,000,000 for the first year and progressively more in subsequent years.

But now the administration makes it clear that you can't have these things unless Congress will levy new taxes to pay for them.

That should convince you that there is no such thing as "Government money." The only way the Government gets money is to tax every worker, every farmer, and every businessman.

Unlike a lot of these deep thinkers here in Washington, I don't believe the Government should tax all your earnings away from you so that it can spend it for you.

I believe in the kind of government which permits the people to keep most of their own

money, to spend, to save, or invest in any way that they see fit.

I am sure that nearly all of my fellow Americans believe in that, too.

I have been attacked many times and criticized because of my fight against the insidious, crawling socialism which has been spreading in our land. But I shall keep on fighting.

There have been dark days. However, I know now that it can be a winning fight if you keep up your fighting spirit and let your Congressman know you mean business.

More and more the American people—yes, and the American Congress—are becoming aroused about the danger of a government which wants to take care of everybody from the cradle to the grave.

We are having some success, but it does not mean that victory has been attained. It simply means that we must fight harder.

Let me quote some great truths from a recent writing about Abraham Lincoln. See if you don't agree with me about them. I quote:

"The unused hand withers.

"The unused brain ceases to function.

"The unused heart hardens.

"Where there are no calls for courage, for sacrifice, these do not come forth.

"The chief thought, even of those sincerely seeking a better social order today, seems to be that of putting props under people. A state which becomes the universal provider, policeman, and employer necessarily becomes also the breeding ground of weaklings and of slaves."

Those, my fellow Pennsylvanians, are great words. I ask you to give them some thought.

If we permit a central government to do everything for us, we shall become weaklings. Our unused hands shall wither and lose their skill and our unused brains shall cease to function.

If we permit the all-powerful central Government to step in and take over all the functions of charity and welfare, then, as the writer has so well declared, our unused hearts shall harden.

Through history, from the very beginning, wherever this has happened, the people, their nation and their government have gone down to destruction.

Under the American system of Government, our people have enjoyed more of the good things of life than any other people in the history of the world. It has given every citizen equal opportunity to improve his station in life.

Under our system the American people have achieved the highest living standards and the highest cultural and spiritual attainments.

This system has been our pride. It has become known to the whole world as the American way of life. It has been the envy of the rest of the globe.

I don't want it to be transformed and swallowed up by a creeping socialism.

I don't want our people to be robbed of their courage, their initiative, their self-reliance.

There has been a great deal of discussion as to the policies of the two opposing political parties.

I am proud to be a member of the group fighting to preserve the solvency of our Republic.

That is the paramount issue confronting the people of the United States. An insolvent nation cannot long retain its freedom.

Government spending must be reduced. We must halt deficit financing. We must not assume obligations that we cannot afford. We must return to a pay-as-you-go basis. In prosperous times we should cut down the national debt.

In the long run, this will make our country stronger and keep it stronger. The heritage of freedom and opportunity we pass on to our children and grandchildren will be as sound and as solid as that handed down to us.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

REA and Public Power Record of Hon. Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a personal statement prepared by me covering my REA and public-power record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA AND PUBLIC POWER RECORD OF HON. ELMER THOMAS, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

When I first entered the Senate in 1927 due to the fact that Oklahoma is a farm State, I requested assignment to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

After more than 20 years' service on the committee, I gravitated to the top and now am its chairman.

The jurisdiction of my committee extends to all matters pertaining to farms and farming.

JURISDICTION OVER FARM POWER

Under the law, the distribution of power to farms and rural areas comes under the jurisdiction of my Committee on Agriculture.

In the Congress, where appropriations are involved, it requires two laws to get the job done.

With respect to the development of hydroelectric power from flood-control dams, and this is the only kind we have in Oklahoma, the first law that must be passed is one approving and authorizing the construction of the project.

Such legislation is handled by the Committee on Public Works, of which Committee my colleague, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, is a member.

APPROPRIATIONS NECESSARY

After the project is approved and authorized, it requires an appropriation to construct the dam and reservoir.

On the Appropriations Committee of 21 Senators, I am second from the top.

MY ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR OKLAHOMA

My high position on this committee has given me the opportunity of securing funds to build the many flood-control and power dams in Oklahoma.

The question naturally arises, what have I been able to accomplish by reason of my being Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and being second from the top of the Senate Committee on Appropriations?

In 1933, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I helped develop and pass the law creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since 1933, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have supported liberal appropriations to develop the said TVA.

In 1938, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, I helped develop and pass the law creating the Rural Electrification Administration and, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have supported liberal appropriations to develop and expand the REA system.

I am now a member of the Cotton Electric Cooperative with headquarters at Walters, Okla.

In 1935, in cooperation with Congressman W. E. Disney, I introduced a bill in the Senate and thereby secured funds for the construction of the Grand River Dam and hydroelectric power plant located in northeastern Oklahoma.

This dam and its connected hydroelectric works, together with the steam power plant at the Choteau-Pryor Ordnance Works, form the basis of the Oklahoma State public power development.

As a supporter of the REA and as a co-op member, I want plenty of firm power at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am securing all the funds possible to construct flood-control projects and where water is available I am demanding the development of hydroelectric power.

We now have plans for the development of hydroelectric power in Oklahoma and Arkansas to the extent of doubling the amount of power that is now being produced by all existing power plants in the two States.

I want our farmers and rural citizens to have all of this power that they can use at low rates and at the same time I want such power produced as cheaply as possible to the end that the surplus may be used to attract industries to Oklahoma and the Southwest.

OKLAHOMA HAS CHEAP ELECTRICITY

Electric rates are based upon the cost of the production and distribution of the energy or power; hence, to secure cheap electricity we must keep costs down.

Under the Oklahoma-Arkansas plan only that part of the cost of any dam assigned to the production of power is charged to power.

To date a relatively small amount of money has been used for the building of transmission lines; hence, we now have the second lowest electric or power rates to be found in the entire United States.

Only in the Columbia River Valley, where the flow of water is fairly constant, do we find a lower power rate.

FLOOD CONTROL COMES FIRST

The plan for the control of floods by contour farming, terracing, and farm ponds upon the headwaters of streams and then by large dams and reservoirs on the main stems of the streams and rivers was placed in operation in Oklahoma by Congressman PHIL FERGUSON and myself.

At that time, 1935, Congressman FERGUSON, from the Eighth District, was a member of the House Committee on Flood Control and thereby he was able to secure approval and authorization of the first flood-control projects in Oklahoma.

Of the flood-control projects authorized to date, with the help of our Oklahoma House Members I have been able to get funds to construct the following:

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS COMPLETED OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Fort Supply, on the North Canadian River in northwestern Oklahoma.

Great Salt Plains on Salt Fork River in northern Oklahoma.

Lake Texoma, on Red River between Oklahoma and Texas.

Grand Lake, on Grand River in northeast Oklahoma.

Wister, on Poteau River in southeastern Oklahoma.

Hulah, on Caney River in northern Oklahoma.

Canton, on North Canadian River in western Oklahoma.

W. C. Austin, on North Fork River in southwestern Oklahoma.

Fort Gibson, on Grand River in eastern Oklahoma.

Tenkiller Ferry, on Illinois River in eastern Oklahoma.

Heyburn, on Polecat Creek at Sapulpa.

The following flood-control projects have been authorized and some funds have been appropriated to start construction:

PROJECTS READY FOR CONSTRUCTION

Oologah, on Verdigris River in northeastern Oklahoma.

Boswell, on Clear Boggy River in southeastern Oklahoma.

Optima, on Canadian River in Panhandle of Oklahoma.

Eufaula, on South Canadian River in eastern Oklahoma.

Additional projects are being surveyed and made ready for approval and authorization:

PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Keystone, on Arkansas River in central Oklahoma.

Hugo, on Kiamichi River in southeastern Oklahoma.

Mustang-Union City, on North Canadian River in southwestern Oklahoma.

Markham's Ferry, on Grand River in eastern Oklahoma.

Short Mountain, on the Arkansas River in eastern Oklahoma.

Webbers Falls, on the Arkansas River in eastern Oklahoma.

It is the policy of the Government to build flood-control projects only where the residents in the area are favorable to such public improvements.

In our State of Oklahoma the flood-control dams and connected hydroelectric facilities already completed and the others now under construction will necessitate a total expenditure of over $250,000,000.

The construction of other dams and power facilities now planned and being planned will cost another quarter of a billion dollars, so that the total cost of controlling Oklahoma floods and developing a million kilowatts of electric power will be approximately one-half billion dollars.

Through this program hundreds of thousands of acres of our richest lands will be reclaimed and at the same time electric-power development will be doubled in Oklahoma.

When this power is developed it will be used and the result will be a duplication of industrial activity now found in the Tennessee Valley and in the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific Northwest.

Oklahoma's dream of industrialization is already coming true.

Pitfalls of a Fallacious Political-Economic Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the term "expanding economy" is coming into more common use and acceptance in this country because it reflects that dynamic spirit which has made America great. The President played upon that acceptance when in his state of the Union message he painted the economic future of the United States for the next half century in terms of glowing optimism. An expanding economy, bringing with it greater well-being for all people, is a legitimate and greatly desired goal of all American activity. Sober thinking, however, impresses one with the undeniable fact that an expanding economy must rest on solid foundations of bedrock. Careless thinking, reckless practice and political optimism in the fields of economics and fiscal policy lead not to the desired goal but to ruin.

A correspondent has sent me an article from the Brooklyn Eagle which quotes two distinguished Americans, James A. Farley and Dr. Edward G. Nourse, on the pitfalls and fallacies of a political-economic fiscal policy which can offer only bogus security and prosperity. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEFFERNAN SAYS, "POLITICAL HAY AND A 10-CENT DOLLAR"

When at the recent hundred dollar a plate campaign fund reimbursement banquet the well-rounded periods of the grand cavalier of the Democratic action left wing got a meager Chautauqua salute, while the unterrified from Park Avenue to the Battery roared their applause at the mention of James A. Farley's name, some political writers jumped at conclusions. Mr. Farley was candidating himself for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination.

However, on Friday night at Syracuse, Mr. Farley made an address which had no apparent voter bait in it. There's a little classic the former Postmaster General wrote some time ago, about as long as a famous Gettysburg speech. It was on the making of a good politician. Summed up it is that he must first be a good American. "This problem," said Mr. Farley on Friday night, "is not a political issue. It is an American issue."

Here are a few paragraphs from Mr. Farley's address:

"In an address early in January, President Truman said that on the basis of the growth of this country over the past 50 years, we would in another 50 years have a national income of a trillion dollars. I have no doubt about his figures nor his expectations, but we can reach some frightening conclusions when we take the past 50 years as a measure of the increase of the next 50 years.

"One of those conclusions is that if we take the cost of government for 1900 and compare it with the cost of government for 1950 and then figure the same rate of increase for the next 50 years, our Government would cost $6,000,000,000,000, or six times as much as the whole national income. On that basis, we would also have working for the Federal Government alone 20,000,000 men and women. The lesson of these simple figures is that unless we find some way to reducing the cost of government it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but everything that we have all saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us."

Almost as an echo of Mr. Farley's warning is an article by Dr. Edward G. Nourse in the January Tax Review. There's room for one paragraph only:

"We shall find that this beautiful theory of 'managed inflation' means we get on a fractious horse and we run the grave risk that we can't control it. When the rate of inflation begins to accelerate and the people begin to discount the future value of the dollar, then we are going to be in for trouble. I was impressed recently in a meeting of top-drawer executives, that when they got to talking in rather loose terms about some of these elements of danger, they begin to talk about the possibility of a 10-cent dollar. When people even speak of this as a possibility, then we get a long way from the idea of a healthy stimulative effect of deficit financing and a mildly inflationary trend which would give us confidence that people and business will spend vigorously. The next step moves away from the stimulus and the incentive stage to the fear stage. This is the natural consequence if we pursue this bland policy—and I characterize it again as a political-economic fiscal policy—of deficits as a way of life, or inflation as the means to full employment."

The eminent economist who recently headed the President's Economic Council is not happy over the prospect of 10-cent dollars. Sympathetic as he was with the principle of making hay while the sun shines against the day of rain, he does not like the political hay that is sure to get all wet when comes the deluge.

Ireland's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 8), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "Ireland's Day" with which I am in complete agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRELAND'S DAY

Now that the tumult and shouting has died it is possible to give attention to some of the profounder thoughts expressed in connection with St. Patrick's Day. Thoughts, we said, but really there is only one thought on the minds of most Irishmen these days. And that is ending partition.

The only St. Patrick's Day card we received was from the Irish Legation in Washington. It showed a map of the Emerald Isle with 26 counties in green, and 6 in orange. "On this St. Patrick's Day," it urged, "pledge yourself to help undo the dismemberment of St. Patrick's Island."

The desire of the people of Ireland for national union is an entirely natural one. History, geography, cultural associations, and economics all point to island unity. And there can be no doubt that the action of the British Government in arbitrarily partitioning the northeastern Ulster Counties after World War I disregarded the expressed desire of the great majority of Irish people.

Remedying the evil now is not so simple, however. The people of Ulster, or a substantial part of them, now favor continuation of their British tie, but perhaps because they have been treated better than other Irish by the British. Shall their view prevail or shall the views of the Irish people as a whole? It is a question for a Solomon, and one suspects that only an Irish Solomon can safely render a verdict.

And yet the answer profoundly affects the rest of the world. In this cold war between West and East, it is vital that all on our side work together. Yet the bitterness engen-

dered by the partition controversy is deeply affecting western unity. Ireland remains outside the United Nations because of Russian opposition to her membership. But she refused to join the Atlantic Pact in protest against partition. And harmony within the Council of Europe and OEEC is jeopardized by Anglo-Irish friction over the same issue. Conceivably, a united Ireland might even return to the British Commonwealth.

Perhaps Ireland makes too much of the dismemberment issue. But a restoration of good feeling between the two parts of Ireland and between the free Ireland and Britain is urgently necessary. Settlement of the partition feud appears to be an unavoidable prerequisite.

The democratic solution would be for Ireland to win a sufficient number of Ulstermen to its side in the antipartition fight to force the issue in the six counties themselves. And there is evidence that a concerted effort to this end is now in progress. In a recent speech, Irish Internal Affairs Minister Sean MacBride reiterated his government's guaranty of complete religious and democratic freedom for Protestant Ulstermen under a proposed united Ireland and offered to give them "any (other) reasonable safeguards that may be necessary to allay any fears, real or imaginary, that they may have."

In the past the industrial North has had an economic incentive to keep aloof from the poorer South, but the association with Socialist Britain also has its drawbacks and the tide of opinion may well be changing for this reason, too.

We join our good wishes to the hopes of the Irish orators. We have taken the pledge.

The Nation Needs the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an article written by Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations, entitled "The Nation Needs the Navy," appearing in Collier's of April 1, 1950.

In the light of the existing world conditions, the opinions of Admiral Denfeld, one of the great Americans of this era, a distinguished gentleman and an experienced officer, are worthy of the serious consideration by all Americans. His opinions should be of particular interest to all officials entrusted with responsibility for our national defense and to Members of the Congress.

The article follows:

THE NATION NEEDS THE NAVY

(By Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, former Chief of Naval Operations)

We can win a world war of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb—yes; we may be able to prevent it—if we prepare for it now. I believe the country today neither realizes the problem nor is properly equipped to meet it. So far as the strength of our defense as a whole is concerned, the trend is downward. So far as the Navy is concerned, the intent of the Pentagon administration is apparently to reduce it to a minor role.

The Navy has been plagued by having its strategy dictated by nonprofessionals who are ignorant of the conduct of warfare in general, and by others who know nothing of the Navy or its use of air power.

The country's chief mental hazard just now is overreliance on one concept—the Air Force idea of intercontinental bombing, which is the most expensive way, and perhaps the most ineffective, to get explosives to an enemy's vitals. The closer you get to a target the cheaper and more efficient is the delivery of a weapon, whether from a bomber, a field piece, or a fleet. We need to operate from bases as near the enemy as possible, be they land airfields or the floating bases of the Navy's task forces.

Another mental hazard is too great reliance on the bomb itself. Suppose we do manage to transport concentrated explosives in $5,000,000 airplanes across the polar ice cap. We can't win a war by terror. The Russians die readily, but they don't scare readily. To defeat the Soviet Union, if it brings war on us, we shall have to overcome the will of the Russian people—to convince them that they would be better off in a world where our ideas prevail than in one ruled by the Kremlin philosophy. We shall not do that merely by obliterating their chief cities and killing their people.

Nor can we protect our friends in Europe solely by dropping bombs, no matter how awful their effect.

Look at the geography of our potential enemy. The Soviet Union occupies a great land mass. On the north the coastal waters are shallow, and closed by ice several months of the year. Most Russian ports and harbors are on enclosed bodies of water. The entrances to the Baltic and Black Seas are controlled by other nations. This explains the Russian drive to become self-sufficient and virtually independent of outside commerce.

Suppose we bomb her principal cities and her principal ports. That does not mean that she is crippled politically, industrially, or militarily. Under intercontinental bombing she can and will decentralize further, and expand into western Europe, all of Asia, and Africa, until she gets ready to move into the Western Hemisphere.

We cannot win a war on foreign soil by staying at home. A powerful Navy will be an effective partner of the Army and Air Force, carrying the war to the enemy and keeping it there. It can capture and hold bases near the enemy's homeland, and deliver the GI's without whom victory is never complete.

The Air Force was perfectly justified in developing the B–36, the plane on which it would rely for intercontinental bombing. As provided in the functions paper written after the meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at Key West, each service should have the right to carry a new weapon up through the prototype stage. But I don't believe the Air Force was justified in investing $1,000,000,000 in the B–36 before that bomber had been thoroughly tested.

I was removed as Chief of Naval Operations last October for criticizing, among other things, this heavy-bomber thinking.

The original order for 100 B–36's, placed during the war and later reduced to 95, surely gave the Air Force enough latitude, and enough money. With the changes the total cost per plane exceeds $6,000,000. In January 1949, although we in the Navy understood that the Air Force intended to cut back the B–36 program, more were ordered without consultation with us. In April, about the time the Navy was denied its own new weapon, the flush-deck carrier, still more B–36's were ordered, and in accordance with what I conceived to be the spirit of unification, I did not protest when the matter came before the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The whole B–36 program, as laid before Congress, will cost between $988,500,000 and $1,022,000,000 for 170 planes, or about $5,800,000 each. Even disregarding the doubt about intercontinental bombing, this is too large a piece of the country's military dollar to spend on a weapon that may be highly vulnerable.

The House Armed Services Committee asked for a test of the B–36 against the Navy's fast fighter, the Banshee. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, in testimony before the committee, made much of the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, over my signature as senior officer, unanimously opposed the test. We did oppose a public test, but by all means the Banshee and every other available fast fighter should be tried against the B–36 in secret.

The Weapons Systems Evaluation Group is the proper agency for this test. This group is headed by Lt. Gen. John E. Hull, who was my Army commander when I was commander in chief in the Pacific, and in whom I have the highest confidence. To the extent its conclusions would not reveal information of value to a potential enemy, they should be made public.

The Air Force is tied to a single weapon, the airplane. The Navy is tied to a function, command of the sea, and its weapons change.

The Navy must be kept a flexible and mobile force, for a democracy such as ours is forced to fight at a time and place that a totalitarian enemy chooses, and we must be ready to wage any kind of war in any part of the world. Who knows where a war will start or at what time of year? Control of the seas means that we, not our enemies, dictate strategy.

An atomic war will bring changes both in defense and offense. We are being warned by scientists and others that if Russia attacks us she will attempt, by exploding hydrogen or atomic bombs, to cripple our great ports on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Atomic bombs could be dropped from the air, discharged from a surface ship or submarine at sea, or smuggled in by merchant vessel. Loss of life would be tremendous, ships present would be rendered useless, and the harbor would be poisoned until fresh river water cleansed it.

But naval strategy takes account of this danger. No great concentration of warships can be permitted in any one port. As proved in the last war, our task forces can be fully supplied at sea. If our ports are actually choked by bombs, supplies can be sent out and received over beachheads, as they were in our invasion operations during World War II.

The answer to superbombs, which take their greatest toll against large cities and their masses of population, is dispersion and mobility; and the Navy provides dispersion and mobility at sea through its task forces.

MINES DEADLIER THAN BOMBS

As a matter of fact, mines constitute a greater danger to ports than do atomic bombs because they last longer. The Russians are known to be mine-minded. Whereas an American likes to blow something up while he can see it, a Russian is content to sow an area with death and let it flower when it will.

Army spokesmen have claimed that large-scale amphibious operations such as we knew in World War II are no longer possible because of the atomic bomb. This is a dangerous philosophy and can only mean rigidity of plan and abandonment of one of the great arts of warfare in which we lead. As Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said recently in answer to a question as to whether amphibious operation will be a part of warfare of the future, "We would be very foolish today to allow to die in our services the very great knowledge we have of that type of operation. We are ahead of everybody in amphibious operations. * * * It would be foolish of us to drop back. We should keep pushing ahead. I would be very much against letting that type of warfare be neglected."

Another way in which world war III will differ from previous conflicts is in the field of ideas. It has been said that a Russian idea captured certain Chinese and that those Chinese then captured China. Last time nazism and fascism had little appeal for our people. We know only too well that communism does appeal to some Americans. And one man possessed by an idea can destroy a city, by putting poison, germs, or gas in its water or its air.

The question is often asked: "Why do we need a powerful Navy when no potential enemy has sizable naval forces, and when we have British, French, and Dutch Navies between us and the enemy anyhow?" Even Gen. Omar N. Bradley has been touched by this thinking.

In his memorandum to Secretary Johnson opposing the Navy's proposed flush-deck carrier, he advanced this as one argument: "The U. S. S. R., except possibly in the field of submarine warfare, is not a naval power of consequence. Further, the U. S. S. R. is not dependent on maritime shipping to reach sources of raw materials. Thus, the vast preponderance of Allied naval power—which in addition to the United States Fleet, overwhelmingly the largest in the world, includes the second naval power, the British Empire, and the additional naval forces of other potential allies—will have but little opportunity to operate against Russian surface vessels and should be more than adequate to cope with the major naval threat, the hostile submarine."

We need a fleet not merely to match the Russian Navy, but to overcome it. We need the kind of Navy that can go after the Russians, not merely meet them halfway or off our own coasts. Furthermore, the uninformed seem to think that defeating an enemy's navy is an end in itself. They get this from the Army concept of forcing the surrender of an enemy's army, which means the war is won.

Our great fleet, to which General Bradley referred, is largely in moth balls. On the other hand, the U. S. S. R., besides maintaining great land armies and building a large air force, now has a navy greater than Germany's was in 1939, and is developing stronger naval forces suited to its particular geography. In terms of ships in commission, the Russian Navy has more cruisers and battleships than we have, and many times more submarines.

In combat ships, we outnumber Russia only in carriers and destroyers. As time goes on, unless the attrition of our Navy is stopped, the weight will shift further in the Soviets' favor.

It is common knowledge that the Russians have from 300 to 360 submarines, some of which are of the high-speed snorkel type that can breathe without surfacing. It is well to remember that the Germans, starting with not many more than 50 U-boats, were almost victorious in the early stages of two World Wars. The Russians can start with six or seven times that number.

Jane's Fighting Ships, the recognized private authority on the world's navies, puts the number of Russian submarines now in existence at 360 and reports that the U. S. S. R. hopes to have 1,000 by 1951. In addition, Russia is said to be completing two or three battleships with towers for firing radio-controlled aerial torpedoes. Our only battleship in commission is the *Missouri*—and that perhaps not for long.

Certainly if Russia sees our fleet deteriorating she will expedite her own shipbuilding in inverse ratio and bring the war to us on the sea, under the sea, and over the sea. And if the Russian high command can send against us anything like 1,000 submarines of the improved type that the Germans used at the end of World War II we must expect terrific losses, and shall need not only a big Navy but a big merchant fleet.

Russia realizes the importance of sea power to us. She knows that unless the United States Navy can keep command of those sea areas which must be used to support an overseas campaign all of our armed forces will remain in this country biting their nails and reading news of the overrunning of the homelands of our friends and allies.

In case of war, Russia will try by any means to deny us command of those sea areas, not by submarines alone. She will use her land-based air against our ships, both merchant and naval, in European and Asiatic waters. She may use guided missiles. In short, the idea advanced by critics of the Navy that we can go where we please when we please is dangerously fallacious. We're going to have to fight our way through, as always.

Only the Navy can provide immediate fighting power to protect our ships at sea, and it must be given the means and skill to do the job. It can have these only if it remains effective in peacetime, because a Navy is not something that can be built overnight.

It would be easier to guess the nature of a world war III if we knew when it was coming, because the concept of warfare changes so fast. If it should come in the not distant future, an educated guess is that the fighting at sea would be intense from the outset. While Russia's ground troops marched westward and her air force bombed the Allied strong points, the Russian navy would try to launch attacks on our coastal cities with atomic-headed missiles from submarines or surface ships.

MENACE TO WESTERN EUROPE

The bulk of her navy, operating under land-based air cover, might try to sweep around Europe from the Baltic and northern waters and to control the vital coastal areas which we would need in aiding the beleaguered countries of western Europe.

Both in land and sea strategy the Soviet commanders would take full advantage of the Communist fifth columns that exist in the industrial centers of Europe.

The encircling naval movement would threaten our lines of communication through the Mediterranean to the important oil sources in the Near East. They would also threaten Allied control of Africa. Whether or not through our neglect, the bulk of Asia has been communized. We should not repeat the error by letting the poison spread through Africa. Russian soldiers might not be far behind any successful Communist Party missionaries.

We have the job also of supporting our occupation troops, both in Europe and Japan. Their capture would make Bataan look like a minor disaster.

The Atlantic sea lanes would have to be kept open for strategic and critical materials—uranium, for example—as well as for munitions needed by our European allies. On this side of the ocean, we have treaty obligations with Latin America and Canada which mean defense of the whole Western Hemisphere. In the early stages this would fall primarily on the Navy. Our great ports must be kept open and coastal shipping must be protected. Venezuelan oil must not be cut off. There must be free access to and passage through the Panama Canal.

In the Pacific, Russia has about 70 submarines—as many as we shall have in operation in all oceans under the budget proposed for the fiscal year to begin next July 1. She is able to ship the parts over the Trans-Siberian Railroad and assemble them in Pacific ports.

The outlook for our defenses in the Pacific will grow gloomier if our naval forces are allowed to shrink further. The spread of communism through China assures Russia the ice-free ports on the Pacific which she has long coveted.

We must keep unbroken our present chain of defenses from Japan to Okinawa, the Philippines and Guam, backed up by the islands of the trust territories (the Marianas, Carolines, Marshalls, and Palaus) and Hawaii. Guam has been built into a powerful base and should be kept powerful.

The island of Formosa is a desirable link in the chain. I cannot forget that Jap planes from airfields in Formosa, and others ferrying through Formosa from Japan, caused us a lot of trouble in retaking the Philippines.

There is grave danger of communism spreading not only throughout the Asiatic mainland but to Indonesia. The Philippines must be defended against infiltration, or direct attack by airborne landings. We must keep naval bases and airfields in those areas, and enough men, ships, and planes to strike an immediate blow anywhere in the far Pacific. The lessons of Pearl Harbor and Guam, the capture of our troops in the Philippines, and the long, hard fight back across the Pacific must not be forgotten. This time our outposts are even closer to the Asiatic mainland—in Japan—and supply lines from the United States would be even longer.

Army and Air Force spokesmen are fond of saying there will be no island-hopping in the next war, and that therefore the Navy's emphasis on its aviation needs is overdone. But if we do not keep up our guard in the far Pacific we may have to hop islands all over again someday. Let's not get "caught in the bight" a second time.

The northern end of our defense chain rests on our bases in the Aleutians and Alaska, and a weak anchor it is. On a clear day the Siberian mainland can be seen from a hill on the Alaskan side, 55 statute miles away; indeed an American island in the Bering Strait is less than 3 miles from one owned by Russia. Our country is belatedly coming to realize the danger there.

In the Pacific Northwest, needless alarm was created by Air Force reference to the relative vulnerability of that section in explaining the transfer of certain production from Seattle to Kansas. Russia's copies of the B-29 doubtless can reach Puget Sound, but many other sections of the country are equally vulnerable. Indeed, no part of the country is really safe.

Greenland, whose strategic value we have long overlooked, offers a stepping stone to the United States almost as convenient as Alaska. It is an easy jump from the Soviet air and naval bases in Franz Josef Land and from Spitsbergen, where Russia has a suspiciously large number of "miners" behind a local iron curtain.

Peary Land, the extreme northern part of Greenland, has snow-free areas usable for landing fields. Even the névé of central Greenland will support planes, troops, and mechanized units. It is certain that if we do not use it the Russians will.

SOVIET AIR POWER IN ARCTIC

The Russians are an arctic people, much more skilled than we at polar operations. They have ringed the Arctic Ocean with airfields from which to launch attacks on us in case of war. They have about 60 arctic research establishments comparable to small American colleges. During the warmer months they can now go by ship from Archangel to Siberia via the Arctic Ocean. We are prone to think of that ocean as impassable, but a powerful ice breaker such as the Russians are known to possess could plow right across it, making way for a convoy.

Even now our largest ships cannot go through the Panama Canal, and if it should be closed by a bomb the route around the Horn would assume great importance. To protect that route, we would have to keep the enemy out of the islands that lie between Antarctica's Palmer Land Peninsula and the tip of South America. Russian exploring ships and planes have recently been reported in that area. The Navy's Operation High Jump II, which would have increased our

knowledge of Antarctica and given our men needed training under conditions like Greenland's was canceled last summer for reasons of economy. We couldn't train in Greenland itself for diplomatic reasons.

The country cannot afford in peacetime the forces which its military leaders feel it otherwise should have. This economic ceiling is inescapable, but beneath it come the allotment of available funds between the services, and the designation of how each service shall spend its allotment.

In my opinion, the 1951 budget proposals throw the defense structure out of balance heavily in favor of the Air Force. The Air Force retains its 48 groups and 13 separate squadrons, totaling 416,000 men, little changed from this year. The Navy and Army are cut.

The Navy has been told it can have for fiscal 1951 a total of 238 major combatant ships of specified types, and reduced numbers of air squadrons. When I was Chief of Naval Operations I protested against the practice of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in telling each service what it could do with its money, contending that it should be permitted to decide how best to use the funds. I still hope the system will be changed.

How the consistent use of such restrictions can throttle a service is shown in the case of the Marines, who find their fears of relegation to guard duty being realized by indirection. In 1946 the Army proposed that "it be recognized that the land aspect of major amphibious operations in the future will be undertaken by the Army, and consequently the Marine forces will not be appreciably expanded in time of war"; and that "it be agreed that the Navy will not develop a land army or a so-called amphibious army, Marine units to be limited in size to the equivalent of the regiment, and the total size of the Marine Corps therefore limited to some 50,000 or 60,000 men."

By the end of fiscal year 1951 the Marines will have been cut to 62,000 enlisted personnel, not far above the figure proposed by the Army. Worse, they have been told that they may have only six infantry battalions. The funds are almost sufficient to maintain a peacetime division on each coast, each with six battalions of infantry, which the Marine Corps wants to do. Now it is expected still to maintain two divisions. But a three-battalion division is really only a regiment, and is inefficient both for peacetime employment and as a basis for quick wartime expansion.

The Navy has several weaknesses: It is short of combat carriers, it is short of modern airplanes, and it needs funds to install the latest equipment on destroyers, destroyer escorts (the slower kind used for escort duty), and submarines. The needed equipment, which is mostly electronic, is expensive. The minimum number of combat carriers in operation should be 10. As to the number of planes, the recommendation of the President's Air Policy Commission (Finletter Board) made 2 years ago seems reasonable: This was for 5,793 front-line planes, and 5,100 in support, a total of 10,893. The 1951 budget figure is 8,415, including 1,844 for the Naval and Marine Reserves.

More of our submarines should be modernized into the snorkel type, with their high submerged speed. The Navy should also be permitted to build its flush-deck carrier, construction of which was canceled by Secretary Johnson. It will take 4 years to build under peace conditions.

Time is of the essence in warfare. In peace we have plenty of time but limited funds. In war we have unlimited funds but no time. A war is fought with weapons that are in the prototype stage when hostilities begin.

All three services should be at work on new weapons, sacrificing numbers of personnel if necessary during peace to concentrate on equipment. Men can be recruited and trained much faster than weapons can be designed and manufactured.

I have been accused obliquely of neglecting antisubmarine warfare. The statement is made that although that is a primary naval mission only bout 8 percent of naval appropriations was devoted to that heading. This is an absurd charge. Antisubmarine warfare is a mission of the whole Navy.

Furthermore, antisubmarine warfare is not a mere matter of finding the submarines on and under the high seas and bombing them to death. That, in fact, is the least efficient means of combating them. The best way to get submarines is in the shipyards where they are being built and fitted, in the submarine docks and pens where they are being refueled, rearmed, and supplied with trained crews. Effective attacks on such targets have to be made by low-level bombing, which is only emphasized in this country by naval and marine aviation. The flush-deck carrier was designed to be an essential tool for that operation.

A submarine on the high seas will always be, to a certain extent, a menace.

The antisubmarine is one device developed during my tour as Chief of Naval Operations. This is a small interceptor sub that can lie in wait along the sea lanes. Other submarines—able to surface quickly, fire guided missiles, and submerge again speedily—are part of the Navy's program.

I brought to Washington a top submarine expert, Rear Adm. Charles B. Momsen, inventor of the Momsen lung and other devices, and put him in complete charge of antisubmarine warfare preparation. I highly approve of the recent appointment of Vice Adm. Francis S. "Frog" Low, another submarine expert, as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics.

We have a tremendous fleet in moth balls. Under grease a recent count showed 87 carriers, 58 cruisers, 14 battleships, 204 destroyers, 92 submarines, and about 1,500 other vessels. They are surveyed now and then to eliminate those that wouldn't be useful in a future war.

But it would take, under present conditions, from 3 to 9 months to unwrap ships of the moth-ball fleet. As they increase in age and need up-to-date improvements, the process will be longer. The carriers might have to be modernized, chiefly through the strengthening of their decks, and this would take from a year to 18 months even on wartime schedules with the mechanics working around the clock.

After these ships left the moth-ball fleet and put to sea it would take in some cases months for them to become efficient fighting ships. The training required to weld a carrier and its embarked air squadrons into an effective unit is a long, exacting job.

The modern Navy is a carrier Navy. We have three of the Midway (45,000-ton) class, and are allowed to keep four of the smaller (27,000-ton) Essex class. In setting up a task force, the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic or Pacific Fleet assigns cruisers and destroyers (and sometimes submarines) to support the carriers. A hunter-killer group used in antisubmarine warfare usually consists of a light carrier and half a dozen destroyers. In any expansion of the fleet for war, numerous hunter-killer groups will be formed as soon as flat tops and destroyers are out of moth balls and their crews have been trained. Other destroyers will be used for convoy work.

Air Force leaders have taken fright at mention of the fact that the Navy, too, could use the atomic bomb, fearing that the Navy is encroaching on their field of strategic bombing. Far from envying that role, the Navy questions the effectiveness of the atomic blitz.

I believe that in time atomic weapons for tactical use against military targets—airfields, troop concentrations, ships—will be perfected for all three services. There are many fields in which the Navy could use them, such as against submarine-building yards and submarine bases. Sub pens were hard nuts to crack in both World Wars.

At the present stage of development, atomic bombs are too costly for tactical use, especially against moving targets such as ships. The effects of radioactivity have been exaggerated. The experiments at Bikini were against ships huddled together as targets in an enclosed body of water, but a convoy in the open ocean would be far less vulnerable and would quickly leave contaminated waters behind.

THE FLEET'S MOST VITAL TASK

My policy as Chief of Naval Operations was to try to build a fleet, and maintain one, that could keep the sea lanes open for the unmolested importation of vital materials without which our industry would have to bank its fires, and for the safe transportation of air power, manpower, and industrial power to the enemy's coast. That kind of Navy is not measured by tonnage alone, but by application and efficiency. And from bitter experience I do not believe that the Army, the Air Force, or the budget manipulators know as well how to tackle the problem as we of the Navy do.

The Navy is in danger of losing one of its greatest assets—its spirit. I am gravely concerned to see such great naval fighting men as Admirals Blandy and Bogan discouraged and choosing retirement, and an attempt being made to withhold promotion from Capt. Arleigh A. Burke. Our Navy selection system has stood the test of 30 years and two World Wars. It would be a pity, indeed, if promotions should be awarded through pressure and influence rather than merit.

I am concerned also at the prospect set before young officers entering the service. They have the inspiring example of the five Crommelin brothers, all naval officers, two of whom gave their lives in World War II. But they see one with a particularly distinguished career—Capt. John G. Crommelin—so alarmed at the Defense Department's conduct of naval matters that he gives up his chance of promotion to make public protest.

Encroachments on the Marine Corps have disillusioned its leaders and disturbed its entire personnel. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, the Medal of Honor man who made the Tarawa landing possible, retired in disgust. The Marines are our emergency fighting force, ready to go anywhere without notice, whose claim to honor, in the words of their commandant, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, is that they "have sought for themselves little more than a life of hardship and the most hazardous assignments in battle." The efforts to cut their amphibious and air activities and reduce them to guard duty are indeed disgraceful.

The Navy has always emphasized decentralization of authority. The nature of warfare at sea dictates this. The commander of even the smallest war vessel is pretty much on his own. Efforts to impose on the Navy, in the unification process, a centralized system such as is embodied in the Army's General Staff organization have not only increased overhead costs but have resulted in loss of initiative and feelings of frustration.

Morale and fighting spirit demand that every American in uniform must feel that his own is the best service in the world. He is entitled to and must have the respect not only of his superiors but of the men in all the other military branches. This pride of service is being replaced by growing disillusionment. The trend can be stopped by more enlightened leadership in the Defense Department, and the active encouragement of self-reliance in all ranks.

I believe that the hearings in Congress which resulted in my removal as Chief of Naval Operations have greatly improved public understanding of national security. My recompense for the treatment I have received lies in the belief that, once informed, the American people will act wisely.

Swiss Cheese Land in Wisconsin—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including the second of two extensions on the subject of the Swiss-cheese industry in my district as reported by Mr. Emery A. Odell, publisher of the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times:

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP REMAINS TRULY RURAL

Washington is a township unit by itself, having no corporate village. It is wholly rural, the sole occupation being dairy farming.

Of average size in land area, 22,871 acres, it has 21,581 acres in farms averaging 187 acres. Cows being milked are reported at 3,189, with average production per 100 acres of 96,092 pounds of milk. Thus, Washington ranks with Monroe, Clarno, Sylvester, and Jefferson as one of the five leading milk-production townships in Green County. The population, however, is only 672.

The way in which the various branches of the Little Sugar River reach out over the township has made highway bridges a costly public problem. This has been overcome largely by modern improvements in construction. Substantial steel and concrete structures now cope with the menacing streams.

All highways have been widened and hard-surfaced for modern motor traffic. Except for the two eastern corners, however, the township is without permanent pavement.

Native rock quarried from the hillsides, in addition to being crushed for the hard-surfacing of roads, now is pulverized to add to the fertility of the soil in the modern farming methods, contributing an effective step in overcoming erosion and loss of valuable soil.

Highways and bridges were always controversial issues on the county board and the interest of Washington Township figured in the forefront. Supervisors recognized the natural situation and regularly conceded the road and bridge chairmanship to the Washington member. Washington Township chairman, C. W. Loveland, now holds chairmanship of the Green County board.

The oldest Green County cheese factory still operating is the Wittenwyler-Burgy, located in the southeastern corner of the township. It was started by Nick Gerber in 1870 as the third of his factory enterprises and has been in continuous operation since.

The factory was in Bilten territory, although that main settlement was further to the north and west of Monticello. Highway changes removed the old surviving Gerber plant to the side road nearly 30 years ago.

This part of Washington township is interesting since as early as 1837 it was settled by people of English descent, some from New England and others from the South. Interest of the settlement was represented in a rural community surrounding Center Methodist Church erected in 1874. Names well remembered with many of the families still represented in Green County life include Holloway, Loveland, Lemon, Harper, Simmons, Fessenden, Crouch, Smith, Perrin, Clayton, Confer, Norton, Gill, and Grinnell.

Center Church was closed and moved away to the Loveland farm a few years ago eliminating the once active community center.

Bilten settlement organized the Bilten Swiss Reformed Church, the structure dedicated in 1876 resembling the house of worship in the Old World. This church, now known as Washington Reformed, remains active today with a pastor supplied from Monticello.

The old Gerber factory, Wittenwyler-Burgy, always has made Limburger. American farmers at first complained of the odor but when Gerber began shipping cheese east they took note of the checks which came back. It did not take them long to join in the cheese production as a community industry.

Gerber first bought the milk outright and then in 1873 John Boss bought the milk and conducted the factory. It became a farmer cooperative in 1893 under the name of Wittenwyler-Burgy. Jacob Burgy, now 80, who has lived on the adjoining farm since he was 3 years old, has been secretary-treasurer of the factory since 1893 and has figured the milk payments to the farmers for those 56 years.

His grandparents and their son, Jacob, Sr., came by sailboat from Switzerland in 1847. They first located on a farm north of New Glarus. They moved in 1870 to Washington township, acquiring the Frank Parkin farm. The Burgy farm now consists of 410 acres and is operated by Mr. Burgy and his son, Fred T. Mr. Burgy makes his residence in Monticello.

The township has one public building, the town hall, located at the intersection of county trunk highways C and N, west of Monticello.

Close by on the east-west highway is the Town Hall streamlined Swiss cheese factory, newest of the farm plants within the township boundaries.

Town Hall factory is owned and in complete control of the cooperative with 30 patrons delivering milk. The plant has been successful beyond expectation after a year of operation.

GERBER WAS CASUALTY OF EARLY CHEESE BATTLE

There has been nothing spontaneous about the development of the Swiss cheese industry in Green County. The infant, fathered by Nick Gerber, had to battle for its life almost from the cradle.

For 20 years the settlers had been raising wheat with notable lack of success. Milk was skimmed for butter, and the skim milk went into cheese for home use. Identity as to type was completely lacking until Gerber founded the first factories in 1868 and 1869.

Consumers were tiring of skim-milk cheese and the demand was for Cheddar or American type. Some even went abroad to London, but heavy expense and losses cut off this market.

Swiss and Limburger cheeses were new, and demand had to be created. Curiously enough, it was New Glarus, center of the first Swiss settlement, which almost struck the death blow to the struggling industry. In 1870 an American cheese factory was opened in the village which never had a Swiss cheese plant. The factory was supplied by 400 cows.

Dayton began manufacturing American cheese with 180 cows, and American factories also were started in Mount Pleasant Township, York, and Albany. By 1873 there were 4,260 cows in the American cheese-production picture, as compared with 1,300 cows supplying Gerber's factories.

Gradually, however, the arguments of Gerber for foreign-type cheesemaking began to gain notice. He claimed 250 pounds of Swiss cheese to the cow and that his four Limburger factories averaged about 300 pounds.

"Still we are not happy," he admitted as he argued with the farmers being influenced against his venture.

He gained further support, however, from Farmers Grove, Adams Township, where Jacob Karlen, Monroe, began opening Limburger plants. The size of the checks Gerber was receiving from buyers in the East also began to interest the farmers.

Gerber's Green County factories numbered eight, including one in Mount Pleasant where he made cheese and resided with his family. He bought the milk from farmers and had his own cheese outlets. As new factories appeared, he also bought cheese and the industry was considered to be fairly launched on a basis helpful to farmers.

Gerber met with financial reverses. He spent 10 years in pioneering before a serious market slump and new competition caught up with him. His resources were swept away and his Green County Cheese Manufacturing Co. failed. He went to eastern Iowa to make a new start but after a second unfortunate ending in 1882 he retired from the cheese business and returned to Monroe where he died May 9, 1903.

Karlen, John Boss, Jacob Regez, and the many others who followed went on to promote and foster growth of the foreign-type industry which now has Monroe for the trading center.

New Glarus later lost its only factory when the condensery business came into flower. Condenseries now operating at New Glarus, Albany, and Browntown have had the effect of pressing inward on cheese factory milk sources, as well as moving outward to take the milk of adjacent counties.

In 1948, these condenseries produced 45,543,000 pounds of evaporated milk, 2,255,000 pounds of powdered skim milk, and 2,043,000 of powdered whole milk. Butter production was 3,329,000 pounds.

There was some indication last year, however, that cheese factories were more than holding their own.

While the condenseries and butter plants showed declines from the total of 58,600,000 pounds for the former and from the 4,067,000-pound butter output in 1945, cheese production made a healthy gain from 1945 to 1948.

Green County factories had set a new high in Swiss production in 1945 of 13,095,000. The total had climbed to another record of 14,569,000 in 1948.

Limburger production in 1945, however, of 2,538,000 pounds was above last year's 2,265,000. Brick was up slightly from 1945's 255,000 pounds to 266,000 in 1948. Green County American output in 1948 was only 822,000 pounds.

The soaring Swiss production has resulted despite the dwindling number of factories. There were 152 plants in Green County 20 years ago producing 16,000,000 pounds of all types of cheese, half of it Swiss.

The factory figure had dropped to 125, 10 years ago but Swiss output climbed to 10,655,000 pounds. Last year 80 factories produced a total of 17,903,000 pounds of all types of cheese, including 14,569,000 pounds of Swiss. This is 33.7 percent of the total Swiss output in Wisconsin.

This bespeaks constant improvement of factory efficiency and techniques, more modern plants, improved herds, and farm practices. The higher production came from fewer factories, a narrowing milk land area due to inroads of other dairy products plants and in some cases fewer but more productive cows.

These changes, including streamlined factories, however, have not entirely erased the marks left over by pioneers of Bilten area who had the strongest faith in the cheese industry.

MODERNIZATION OF FACTORIES ASSURES FUTURE OF INDUSTRY

Probably the most startling development in eight decades of Swiss cheesemaking in Green County has occurred in the last 2 years or more.

Most residents, in and out of the industry, have been aware of some part of it. Others, but only a few, have realized its full extent. Everyone, however, should benefit in the future from the all-inclusive scope of the program.

This change for the better concerns the widespread rebuilding, remodeling and in some cases replacement of farmer factories which have been the background of the cheese enterprise.

A. J. Reppen, State inspector of factories for the Department of Agriculture, is authority for the report that 63 of the 78 licensed plants in the county had shared in this modernization project by October 1, 1949.

His report becomes all the more impressive by revealing that Franklin Swiss factory, 4½ miles southwest of Monroe, was the first to complete remodeling, having started late in 1946 and finishing in 1947.

These projects stemmed from many sources of stimulation: urging of the State for improved sanitation conditions, a desire to advance quality of cheese and make manufacturing less hazardous, and a realization that only through modern making methods and practices could factories compete on markets in the favored position won through decades of fine Green County foreign type cheese.

The projects have involved new making rooms, in stainless steel fittings, stainless steel intake tanks, larger automatic boilers to supply heat at constant temperature levels and steam for cleaning fittings and filters, gleaming white tiled walls for making rooms, curing and holding cellars, full control refrigeration systems, automatic can washing machines and even special lights for suppression of unwanted bacteria action.

Modern truck loading and unloading platforms are common features. Septic tanks and underground systems for disposal of wastes and a general brightening of factory exteriors and premises are featured on every hand.

Investment has ranged from $35,000 to well above $100,000. Making capacity has been expanded by additional kettles and storage facilities increased. Many times this has meant closing of antiquated factories or plants which no longer fitted into the economic planning of the cooperatives and their patrons.

In addition to the 63 factories already modernized, Reppen reports several others were ready to begin work late in 1949 or early in 1950. A few more factories may drop by the wayside but there will be no slackening of production capacity in view of the general increase in operating facilities by the more modern units.

The trend to improved plants began as early as 1928 when the number of factories had declined to a total of 152 after decades of continued increase. Production that year was 16,000,000 pounds, half of it Swiss. Ten years later, the number of factories was down to 125 but Swiss production had moved up to 10,655,000 pounds.

Last year there were 83 factories producing a total of 17,903,000 pounds, 14,569,000 of it Swiss.

It is impossible to pick out factory projects as particularly outstanding. There are too many of them and each represents some special enterprise which makes it almost unique.

We can, however, call attention to the pace-setting Franklin factory, the streamlined Town Hall plant which replaced four other units in a merging operation, and the large Jefferson Center factory at Twin Grove, planned for expansion to at least 24 kettles, as prime examples of new Swiss plants.

The largest of the new Limburger plants is the Wyss co-op factory on county trunk N 5 miles north of Monroe, operating under lease to the Kraft Foods Co. The latter two plants have adopted exterior architecture of Swiss lines, making them colorful additions to the rural scene.

Following in alphabetical order are the Green County factories which have modernized in the last 2 years:

Swiss: Advance, route 5, Monroe; Apple Grove, route 1, Argyle; Balls Mill, route 2, Monroe; Bidlingmaier-Isely, route 4, Monroe; Biggs Co-op, northeast of Argyle; Brager, northeast of Blanchardville; Burkhalter, route 2, Monroe; Davis, Browntown; Decatur, west of Brodhead; Dill, west of Browntown.

Fairview, route 1, Monroe; Farmers Grove, route 1, New Glarus; Five Corners, southeast of Monroe; Flanagan-Olson, east of Argyle; Franklin, route 1, Monroe; Giese, southwest of Brodhead; Green County Co-op, Monroe; Gutzmer, east of Woodford; Hay Hollow, east of Blanchardville; Health Valley, near Juda; Holstein Prairie, west of Monticello; Casper Jaggi, Brodhead; Jefferson Center, Twin Grove; Jordan Center, northwest of Monroe.

Jordan Prairie, northwest of Brodhead; Klondike, northwest of Monroe; Krause, route 4, Monroe; Kubly, route 1, Monroe; Maple Grove, southeast of Juda; Maple Leaf, route 1, Albany; Monroe Co-op, Monroe; Monticello North Side; Newman, southeast of Juda; Pleasant Valley, route 3, Monroe; Poplar Grove, west of New Glarus (not making Swiss in 1949 but licensed); Prairie Hill, route 5, Monroe; Priewe, route 1, Monroe; Puddle Dock, east of Argyle; Ridge, northwest of Monroe.

Rock Hill, route 2, Brodhead; Saw Mill, east of Blanchardville (licensed but not making Swiss in 1949); Spece, west of Browntown; Speich, route 2, Monroe; Spring Creek, route 2, Brodhead; F. L. Stauffacher, route 4, Monroe; Strommen, near Blanchardville; Town Hall, route 2, Monticello; Twin Gable, Martintown; Union Hill, route 1, Juda; Walnut Grove, east of Blanchardville; West Clarno, route 1, Monroe.

Whitehead, route 1, Monroe; White Oak, route 2, Monroe; York Center, east of Blanchardville, and York Prairie, northeast of Blanchardville.

Limburger: Clarno Center, route 5, Monroe (also licensed but not making Swiss); Grinnell, north of Monroe; Wyss (Kraft Foods licensee), north of Monroe; Milwaukee Cheese, Monroe (also licensed but not making Swiss—producing brick type special cheese); Pioneer, route 2, Monticello; Silver and Lewis, east of Monticello; Spring Cheese, route 1, Monticello; Wittenwyler-Burgy, southwest of Monticello; Wuetrich (Four Corners), 6 miles northeast of Monroe.

There were 63 factories in Green County making Swiss October 1, not including four others licensed but producing other types. One Swiss factory license north of Browntown was withdrawn shortly before the list was compiled. Eleven factories are licensed for Limburger and 10 hold American permits. One factory, Poplar Grove, is licensed for brick muenster.

Lakeshire-Marty Co. holds the only processed cheese license for Swiss gruyere. One firm, Paul Grossenbacher, New Glarus, holds a cheese food compound license.

Three factories have butter-plant licenses and there are condensery permits at New Glarus, Albany, and Brownstown, the latter also holding a powdered-milk permit. Frautschy and Herbert Clarno, have the only milk-receiving-station license.

That completes the present day report on Green County's foreign-type cheese industry, except for the number of kettles in the Swiss plants. This figure has changed so rapidly since 1947 that a definite total would be good only as of the moment. It is believed, however, that more than 450 kettles are now set up in various plants with more envisioned.

With this report, the series on Swiss cheese's 80 years of production development comes to a close. The Green County cheese story, however, will remain an unending history with bright pages in the future.

It will have that encouraging prospect if today's heirs of nineteenth century tradition contribute their share to continued advancement of dairy farming, and to an industry which has premium appeal throughout the Nation.

STEINMAN DAIRY TOLD STORY OF PIONEERING

Green County historians of the future owe a great debt to the memory and diary of J. C. Steinman who in his twilight years answered a question too long unasked:

"Where would one go to establish the exact location of the first Green County cheese factory turning out a product having a cash value in an outside market so a tablet could be erected to honor the men whose vision launched Green County's dairy business?"

The question was asked by Emery A. Odell, publisher of the Monroe Evening Times. Mr. Steinman who had kept a daily diary for 40 years had the answers. As a boy of 14 he had worked on the J. C. Blum farm and delivered milk to the first Limburger factory a mile away on the Albert Babler (now Meadow Valley) farm.

His diary also supplied the location of the first Swiss cheese factory on the Dietrich Freitag farm.

Mr. Steinman was 13 when he went to work at $6 a month. His mother brought him to Monroe on his seventh birthday from New York after 57 days on the ocean. They learned his father had enlisted in the Civil War for what he thought was a short term of service while awaiting his family. He was killed in action. The mother and son joined an uncle in Monroe, Dietland Thomm, and then located later in Washington township.

When Mr. Steinman was 20 he became a Limburger-cheese maker for Jacob Karlen at Farmers Grove. Later he was in business in Monticello and an influential citizen. He served 13 years on the county board, 9 as county supervisor of assessment and bank director and was active in the Swiss Reformed Church at Monticello. He died in 1942 at the age of 88.

The boulders placed in 1939 at the two factory sites by the Green County Historical Society and Mr. Odell presented a problem. Native stone was sought but since the site of the first Limburger factory was in the unglaciated area, a boulder finally had to be brought from Monticello Woolen mill site.

Nazism is Still a Dominant Factor in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear all sorts of perturbing reports on conditions in Germany which make us wonder whether continued neglect of the situation may not prove to be tragic in the years to come. We hear reports about the revival of nazism and anti-Semitism, reports on the trend toward dictatorship, the failure of our denazification policy, the lack of a sense of guilt and shame on the part of Germans

for the horrible crimes committed during the recent war, and the ridiculous efforts to pin the blame for starting the war on the Allies or anyone but the Germans.

Dr. Saul K. Padover, a noted American author and historian, who knows conditions in Germany well and has served with the American military government there immediately after the war, has gathered some pertinent information on the trend of thinking in Germany today. Dr. Padover, who is dean of the School of Politics of the New School for Social Research in New York and the author of several books on Thomas Jefferson and on the European politics and history, draws some interesting conclusions on the basis of the information gathered.

Following is a brief article written by him entitled "Nazi Domination of the German Mind," published in Hadassah Newsletter, March 1950:

NAZI DOMINATION OF THE GERMAN MIND

(By Saul K. Padover)

Public-opinion surveys of Germany add up to a pretty discouraging picture. They show that in 1950 the Germans are much the same as they were 10 years ago. In some respects, indeed, they are worse.

Perhaps it was too much to expect that a defeated people would alter its ways and thought under the rule of conquerors; but the data contained in the surveys are almost too overwhelming as evidence of the nearly total failure of the occupation.

NO FAITH IN RADIO OR PRESS

The Germans believe in less and are distrustful of more. Nearly half of them do not listen to the radio, and only a little more than half, 56 percent, read newspapers, compared with 75 percent 4 years ago. Many have stopped reading the press because they have no confidence in its veracity or impartiality.

A large segment of the population is convinced that the occupying powers are a hindrance to German recovery. Shortly after the war, well over half of those interviewed thought that the Allies were there for the good of Germany. Today fewer than one-fourth (23 percent) think so.

There is no grass-roots political movement. Germans are still apathetic to politics in general and to politicians in particular. Political parties are viewed with skepticism and political officeholders with disrespect. Two out of three Germans say they would turn down a responsible political post if one were offered them. Sixty-four percent admit they are in no way interested in politics. During elections they vote in great numbers, but mainly because they are ordered to do so.

RACE BIAS AND NATIONALISM PERSIST

Race prejudice has shown some fluctuations. While anti-Semitism has declined slightly, racist and other bias has increased. Nineteen percent are still outspokenly anti-Semitic, despite the fact that the Jewish population has been reduced to a mere 20,000 as against 500,000 in 1933. Intense nationalist and racist feelings are stronger than ever.

An illuminating survey has been made on Hitler's Mein Kampf, which was in effect the bible of the Third Reich. But who really read it?

We now have exact information on the subject, and it tells us much about the German mind, politics, and social structure. The following data, to be sure, relates only to the American zone and Berlin, but it is a safe assumption that it reflects the rest of Germany.

To begin with, an astonishingly large number of Germans—19 percent—say that they have read all or part of Mein Kampf. On the basis of population of some 70,000,000, this means more than 13,000,000 readers. Of these, 5 percent, or 3,500,000, claim to have read the whole book.

Who were these readers? Forty-four percent of them were Nazi Party members. Three-fourths of them had nine or more years of education. Well over half (54 percent) belonged to the upper and upper-middle income groups. The majority of readers were professional men, businessmen and government officials.

TREND TO DICTATORSHIP, NOT DEMOCRACY

While Mein Kampf is not being read today, at least not openly, nazism is still very much alive. In November 1945, 42 percent of those interviewed said that Hitlerism was a bad thing. Today, only 38 percent consider it bad.

Democracy—its principles and outlook—is an alien mode of life to most Germans. Sixty percent express the opinion that, if they had to choose between a democratic government that did not guarantee economic security, and a dictatorship that did, they would prefer the dictatorship. A year ago only 56 percent gave dictatorship as their preference.

There is no vigorous intellectual life, no soul searching, and no desire to examine what ails the nation. The overwhelming majority of Germans vehemently reject the charge, or even the suggestion, that the German people are responsible for the war or guilty of any crimes. If anybody is guilty, they say, it is a few Nazis and the Allies—for having allowed the Nazis to come to power. The Nazis, of course, say that the Allies are the criminals. Every trend indicates that most, if not all, Germans are ripe for a new dictator. What hope there is lies in the young people, and we are now, belatedly, trying to do something about them.

EAST-WEST RIVALRY REINSTATING THE NAZIS

What makes the situation more tragic is that both the Anglo-Americans and the Russians are now wooing the Germans. In the struggle between the East and the West, the enemy of a few years ago has suddenly become a desired object to be won and cherished. Denazification has been abandoned. The Americans are pinning their hopes for the success of the Marshall plan on a restored Germany. Nazi leadership, in business and in public life, is rapidly coming back. The Nazis are now winning the war.

The present Government of western Germany is not Nazi, but it is rigidly conservative. As such, it is not the kind of government that can democratize Germany.

An Eminent Scientist Analyzes the National Science Foundation Bill as Amended

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the scientists and educators of the Nation, as I have remarked on other occasions, there is a strong feeling that the great promise held forth both to our industrial development and our security by the National Science Foundation bill is sadly dimmed by the Smith amendment. This feeling is growing, and I am sure my colleagues would wish to give the subject further study in the light of the intelligent and well-considered objections raised in so many quarters of unquestioned loyalty.

Among the many letters on the matter received by me from my district, which includes the great University of Chicago, is the following from Joseph E. Mayer, of the faculty of the Institute for Nuclear Studies of the University of Chicago:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
INSTITUTE FOR NUCLEAR STUDIES,
Chicago, Ill., March 27, 1950.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The passage by both Houses of Congress of a bill establishing a National Science Research Foundation has been a source of great gratification to those interested in the strengthening of fundamental science of this country. We look forward with satisfaction to what we hope will become great benefits from this bill. Nevertheless, there are certain features of the bill which may not be ideal. In particular, some changes have been made by the House in the original bill, H. R. 4846, at least one of which, if retained, would be so undesirable as to be considered completely crippling.

I find section 14 (1), which requires FBI investigation and certification of loyalty by the FBI for recipients of scholarships and all persons employed by the foundation, to be incredibly bad as written at the present. The objections to this section are various.

(1) The broadening of the requirement of FBI investigation to recipients of scholarships independently of the eventual employment of these recipients in any classified work is a completely undesirable extension toward the methods of a police state, and is in direct opposition to our American democratic way of life.

(2) The extension of the duties of the FBI to include the investigation of a large number of people not connected with classified information necessarily reduces the effectiveness of the FBI in fulfilling its useful function of investigating persons who have access to secret information.

(3) The extension of the function of the FBI beyond that of investigation, to give certification of loyalty, will necessarily further reduce the usefulness of the FBI and at the same time is a completely undesirable unification of two different functions into the hands of one organization which smacks of the methods of totalitarian governments.

(4) The particular requirement placed on the FBI to declare disloyal any person who has at any time been a member of an organization declared subversive is an incredible extension of the definition of disloyalty. Many individuals have mistakenly and innocently joined such organizations either before or after they had been declared subversive. Indeed, in many cases these organizations, which sometimes had the highest aims, were in no sense subversive in their original inception and individuals who joined at that time and later resigned should not be penalized for the later changes in the conceptions of the organization.

I find that section 14 (m), which requires FBI investigation of any national of a foreign country who shall be associated with the Foundation in any capacity, to be very undesirable. It is probably not extremely important that National Science Foundation money shall be used to support the researches of foreign nationals in this country. However, the inclusion of this section would greatly complicate the operation of a university research project supported by the Foundation. The United States has profited greatly from foreign scientists who have come to this country either permanently or as temporary visitors. The temporary visitors bring to our research projects a knowledge of the

methods used abroad and furnished tremendous stimulation to our own progress. There is no reason why fundamental research projects in this country should be excluded from availing themselves of this benefit. Section 14 (m), if retained in the bill, would have only this effect.

Section 15 (a), which has been amended to limit the annual appropriation to the Foundation to $15,000,000, appears to me to be unwise. I would not look forward to having the dominant source of funds for science in this country coming from the Federal Government. I would doubt if the Foundation appropriation should exceed $15,000,000 in the first few years. However, the writing of this limitation into the law presumably excludes larger appropriations at later times. I believe that considerably larger appropriations will be eventually desirable. The present budget of the Office of Naval Research, spent largely on fundamental scientific research without any appropriation for scholarships, is approximately half this figure. I would believe that the Science Foundation should eventually support the great majority of these projects now supported by the ONR, which are in a field of science much more limited than that of the Science Foundation. The effect of the limitation to $15,000,000 may well be to decrease the total Government support for research in the fundamental portions of physics and chemistry.

Section 10 (b), which requires a loyalty oath for any recipient for a scholarship or fellowship, appears to me to be undesirable. I do not believe that loyalty oaths play any role other than that of irritant. I do not find this amendment in any way crippling to the fundmental purposes of the bill, but I would oppose its retention.

Finally I find it undesirable that any provision is made for the National Science Foundation to support classified research. I believe that classified research should be supported by the appropriate division of the Secretary of National Defense and by the Atomic Energy Commission. The inclusion of support for classified research in the National Science Foundation in times of peace weakens and complicates the operation of that Foundation. I would prefer to have a scientific foundation even if it includes classified research than to have none at all, but I would prefer to see all reference to classified research eliminated from the bill.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MAYER.

Swiss Cheese Land in Wisconsin—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the dairy industry is Wisconsin's biggest business. It is composed of thousands of farmers who own and operate their farms.

Green County, Mr. Speaker, is in my congressional district, and I am very proud of it. Recently Mr. Emery A. Odell, publisher of the Monroe Evening Times, published a booklet entitled "Eighty Years of Swiss Cheese in Green County, 1869–1949." In a masterful way he has pointed out the development of this Swiss cheese industry in our State. He calls attention to the fact that dairying history appears to have reached the point where the past is more dependent upon the record in keeping alive the story of the origin of our unique cheese enterprise. He said, "Links between the living and the past are steadily reduced with the passing years."

Mr. Speaker, this story deserves perpetuation in the archives of our Government and with leave to extend my remarks, I am including the first installment herein:

SWISS CHEESE LAND—NO. 1

GERBER'S FACTORY LAUNCHED INDUSTRY IN COUNTY IN 1869

This year marks the eightieth anniversary of the most significant event in Green County history, the opening of the first farmer factory for the manufacture of Swiss cheese.

It was the start of the factory system and the pioneering step in production of regular Swiss and Limburger types in Wisconsin.

Changes have come with the years and the old frontiers have been driven back in places but the general geographical locale, with Monticello and Monroe as concentration points, gives promise of holding firm as the greatest centralization for specialized cheese production in dairy history.

The steadfast resistance to encroachments is a tribue first to the vision of Nick Gerber, who founded the first Swiss factory in 1869, and to the dairy-minded settlers from Switzerland who occupied the area which became known as Bilten, a district without definite limits but settled by people of unlimited capacity for knowing how to put the land to work.

Nick Gerber introduced manufacture of Limburger in the Mohawk Valley of New York State before coming here. He never realized upon the enterprise he fostered in Green County, but the residents of Bilten and the contiguous area, with Monroe as its hub, went on to build an industry to which the county owes much of its comfortable condition of today.

Mr. Gerber's first Limburger factory in Green County on the former Albert Babler farm, New Glarus Township, and the first Swiss factory on the Dietrich Freitag (now the Nick Freitag) farm in Washington Township, disappeared long ago. Nothing remains today except a portion of the latter building, now a machine shed, and two markers erected by the Green County Historical Society 10 years ago.

His third factory, however, started in 1870 in Washington Township for Limburger making flourishes today as the Wittenwyler-Burgy factory, producing a delicate brand in a greatly improved plant.

Best picture of Green County's old Swiss-cheese frontier is found in a 25-mile radius north of Monroe, including Monticello, Washington, New Glarus, and Monroe Townships. Anyone who has an interest in what has been happening amid these hills for the last 80 years can see the story of Swiss cheese, of Bilten settlement, and the modern-day perfection of dairying and factory production in a brief afternoon's ride in the colorful countryside.

It will be a ride revealing in striking contrasts with methods of the past and yet giving full evidence of the unchanged strength of the people and the system which made the Swiss and Limburger industry flourish.

Driving north from Monroe, one finds that Monticello is the threshold for entry into the land of cheese. It is a village which, as a center for the immediate cheese-making area, reflects the character and enterprise of the families who came from Switzerland more than a century ago.

In that century the lands have been farmed diligently but with care. There are no signs of neglect or deterioration. Everywhere in the farm lands and in the village there is a Swiss air of prosperity.

In 1847 Monticello was unnamed and not recognized as a stopping place by the Government mail carrier between Monroe and Madison. Now it has all the indications of modern community progress, meanwhile retaining architecture of foreign derivation.

On the village's main street are two structures of rough stone exterior with rounded line and tower effect. The names "chateau" and "chalet" further suggest Switzerland. These buildings are of native limestone quarried from the hills from the same underlying bedrock known to impart desired qualities to milk products.

Monticello was dependent on stage coach transportation until the Illinois Central was built through from Monroe to Madison in 1888, the same year that the Milwaukee road extended the Brodhead branch connecting Monticello and New Glarus.

The first brick building block was erected in 1888 by J. C. Steinman who was long an influential citizen of Monticello and a county official. He was familiar with the cheese industry from its infancy. His sons and grandsons followed in the building profession with advanced ideas of architecture in home, business structures, and modern cheese factories.

On reaching the end of the main street, the tourist may turn briefly to the right to see the Monticello northside Swiss factory, one of the larger producing units in the area.

But it is to the left from the main street that the threshold to the pioneering cheese county lies. A modern hard surfaced road leads out of the village in a sweeping turn cutting through pasture lands into the valley known as lange where Brown Swiss cattle have grazed these many years. The silver tones of their bells can be heard throughout the outdoor grazing season as they welcome the tourist into the land of the Swiss.

A mile or so off Monticello's main street is the Nick Freitag farm. It is identified by buildings on both sides of the road.

And one of these buildings on the right was the cradle of the Swiss cheese industry in Green County. A stone marker with a bronze plate, on the left almost at the driveway to the house, tells the story.

FIVE PATRONS SOLD MILK TO FIRST SWISS FACTORY

What is left of that first Swiss cheese factory in Green County still stands as a landmark on the Nick Freitag farm just north out of Monticello on the Madison road.

A portion of the old building, on the right side of the road, is used as a machine shed. It still houses some of the early cheese-making equipment. The brick chimney marks where the stone boxed walls contained the wood fire for the boiler.

The large kettle was supported on an iron arm and was swung into place over the wood fire bed for forming the curd. Revolutionary changes mark the present-day operations, but the fundamental manufacturing process is the same.

Nick Gerber started the factory in 1869 with five patrons, Dietrich Freitag (father of the present farm owner), Jost Voegeli, Dietrich Stauffacher, Jans Blumer, and Melchior Schlittler. He operated it until 1875 when it was taken over by the farm patrons.

The Freitag farm dates back to Hiram Washington Bane, who obtained the Government grant in 1844. Bane conveyed the original 40 acres to Fridolin Streiff, one of the New Glarus founders, in 1848, and Streiff made cheese there in 1850. Streiff and J. Jacob Tschudy had been the leaders sent out from Switzerland to locate and lead the original colonists to their new home. Dietrich Freitag bought the land in 1869, the year that saw the Swiss cheese industry launched on his land. His son Nick, born there nearly 78 years ago, holds the original Government patents of conveyance.

Next farm around the bend in the road is the Voegeli Valley Grove farm in possession of the family since Jose Voegeli located there in 1854. It is one of the show places of Wisconsin and famed far and wide as an outstanding Brown Swiss breeding farm.

Three generations of the family made brick and Limburger there, and the old copper kettles are retained as antiques. Jacob, son of Jost, erected a large barn, 144 by 52, and one of Green County's largest, as Voegeli's Brown Swiss hotel in 1917. He also erected the fine home which, combined with hillside setting of the striking barn, offers one of the outstanding rural vistas of the Nation as seen from the road.

To the north, the highway knifes through the Stauffacher brothers property, now run by Conrad Stauffacher, Jr., as another of the outstanding examples of modern farming. The residence on the right towers at the edge of a bend in the road. The huge barns and dairy buildings, all electrified and kept in immaculate condition, attract many touring dairy industry groups annually.

Conrad Stauffacher, Sr., who came to this country from Switzerland in 1871, built up the 600-acre property. His sons, the late Fred H. and Conrad, Jr., took over in 1923 and pioneered in strip cropping and contour farming.

Continuing north, the entrance of New Glarus Woods State Park is reached. There a turn to the left is made, past the marker designating the road as the Old Lead Trail, reminder of the lead-mining days in Exeter.

Driving west, the first break in the woods to the north reveals a brief glimpse of New Glarus in typical Swiss valley setting. After passing the intersection with county trunk N, the next turn to the left off the trail onto an unmarked road is the gateway to the Bilten settlement movement.

Houses and barns are secluded, almost hidden from view in the valleys.

The white-frame Meadow Valley School is seen at the bottom of a long hill. Directly ahead is Meadow Valley farm, once the Albert Babler place, with its huge barn and scenic, wide valley.

Here another historical society marker designates the site of the first Green County Limburger cheese factory, also started by Nick Gerber in 1860.

The country road presents unending surprises as the journey continues. It follows a branch of Little Sugar River which becomes a lively stream at this point, a lure for trout fans.

The pleasing panoramic page of history is graphically illustrated with the variety of dairy barns, all of double doors, stonemasonry foundations, and foreign-type grillwork mow ventilators.

Entering Washington Township, the traveler comes upon the Fred K. Hefty farm which has been in the family a century. The buildings are landmarks of early dairying, offering some of the best examples of Swiss rural design. The gable of the white-frame barn, which is of unusual lay-out, bears the date 1848.

The large barn's stone basement houses a large Holstein herd and the double doors provide ventilation. A driveway opens into the upper level barn loft.

Across the road is the quaint stone barn, built in 1862, with overlapping brick ventilators, the work of Swiss stonemasons in faithful reproduction of an Old World design. It is a prized landmark.

Mrs. Hefty, widow of Fred K., still lives on the farm which comprises more than 400 acres.

The large, fine farm properties representing a century of ownership in the Freitag, Hefty, and Voegeli families were linked in a triple wedding in 1895. The son and daughter of Dietrich Freitag married a son and daughter of Friadolin Hefty, while another Hefty daughter married a son of Jacob Voegeli. Nick Freitag still lives on the farm where he was born on Christmas Day, 1871, and his sister, Mrs. Fred K. Hefty, resides at the Hefty farm. The other bride, Mrs. Albert Voegeli, resides in Sylvester, and conducts her own farm.

From the Hefty farm, the tour winds east to the intersection with county trunk N where the cheese student can turn south. A short drive beyond is the Town Hall Swiss factory at the intersection of country trunk C.

This fine new Swiss plant, served by 30 patrons, was opened in July 1948, and stands out as one of the best of modern white-tile factories—a perfect example of the enterprising industry founded on the farmer-patron system by Nick Gerber.

Further south, halfway to Monroe on county trunk N is the new Wyss Limburger factory, completed in May 1948, and operated as a Kraft Foods Co. producing unit with cooperative ownership. Here again is a modern example of Swiss architecture, combining the Old World atmosphere on the exterior with the gleaming, stainless-steel efficiency of the modern day inside.

Five miles south, the tour turns back to Monroe on Highway 81, the Argyle Road. That completes the visit to the frontiers of the Swiss industry which have shifted slightly to the south in the last 80 years but continue to hold firm with Monticello and Monroe as the anchor points of the concentration.

BILTEN SETTLEMENT PACES MODERN DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Green County's distinctive cheese industry originated in the fertile valleys of Little Sugar River.

Imported from Switzerland the now important dairy business did not come all at once. The unfolding took 20 years before the cheese factories came.

Original colonists of 1845 founding New Glarus were industrial people engaged in textile weaving in the province oppressed at the time by war. Because of their fear of hard times and famine they felt forced to look elsewhere for livelihood. They came here in Wisconsin seeking homes in new country.

A second sizable group, 70 at one time, came from the town of Bilten, off in a corner of Canton Glarus in Alpine lowlands. Bilten was more agricultural for it had pasture lands. The new group knew cows and was experienced in their care. The journey was by ocean-sailing vessel, the lake route to Milwaukee and overland to New Glarus. Arriving in New Glarus in 1847, they set out at once for the country where they might have land, timber, and stone. The few artisans among Swiss settlers were masons, which accounts for the general prevalence of stone in the old time building of homes, barns, stable basements, school houses. Many of the structures still mark the landscape, especially the barn basements and spring houses.

Land around New Glarus had been taken up and their search took them into Washington Township south of New Glarus and north of Monroe. Government land was available at low price. They established homes as a community group and named it Bilten settlement.

New Glarus township was absorbing the in-pouring population previous to 1847 but the years immediately following the movement was greatly increased. Green County's population in 1840 was 933 and during the decade from 1840 to 1850, the period covered by rapid settlement due to increased immigration, it rose to 8,566. Swiss participation amounted to 364. This means that only 4 percent of the total population at the time were to stamp their habits and characteristics so indelibly on the history and industry of Green County.

Bilten settlement of 12 families soon proved important far beyond its number in its immediate influence on countrymen back in the old homeland, as shown by later marked penetration by Swiss people. The years immediately following 1847 saw population boundaries extended to unoccupied Washington Township valleys to the west and south.

The first cows, one to a family, and selling at $12, were received at New Glarus in 1846.

Nick Gerber, also a Glarner (born 1836, died 1903), came to America in 1857 and located at Booneville, N. Y., where he opened the first cheese factory, introducing Limburger in the Mohawk Valley. He spent 11 years there, and in 1868, informed of the successful start being made in raising cattle in Green County, he came here to investigate.

He met Albert Babler at New Glarus and toured the Bilten area, where he found just what he was looking for in a new country. He at once arranged with farmers to take their milk, opening a Limburger factory in a log building on the Albert Babler farm in New Glarus Township.

He made the cheese himself and had outlet for his product in the East. Six farmers delivering milk to the first Limburger factory had less than 50 cows—Albert Babler, 15; George Legler, 10; J. C. Blum, Andrew Hoesly, Balthazer Kundert, and Christopher Babler, the remaining 25.

What was then known as Long Valley extended across the top of Washington Township to Monticello. Bilten settlers claimed the valley and others of the smaller tributaries of Little Sugar River. Another valley to the south and west was left for the arrivals from Bern. They came from the valley of Emmen River, Emmenthal, where Swiss cheese made in the form of large wheels originated.

A few cheesemakers applied their skill and took rightful place in what was to become Green County's basic industry. Beginning the making of regular Swiss in 1869, the industry was developed in both Swiss and Limburger.

Nick Gerber had the necessary contacts for sale of his products in the East. They now are staple cheese items on counters of food markets the country over. Thus, the development marked the beginning of factory manufacture of Swiss and Limburger cheese here and in Wisconsin.

BILTEN DISTRICT PIONEERS CLEARED HEAVY TIMBERLAND

Mention of Bilten settlement after 100 years is apt to sound legendary to most present-day readers. Those familiar with the history of the region and the institution of dairying when the country was mostly timber, however, do not hesitate to credit Bilten as the stimulus of early-day cheesemaking.

Adam Blumer, 1737 Fourteenth Street, this city, was born in Bilten settlement. His grandfather, also Adam Blumer, came from the old town of Bilten with his wife and five children. The grandfather was reared on a dairy farm where he was familiar with cows and cheesemaking.

Arriving in Green County he entered 240 acres of land from the Government in Washington Township, west of Monticello. The year following he bought five cows and was making butter and the farm variety of cheese from skim milk.

The land was heavily timbered. He bought two ox teams and started clearing and building with logs. Ten to twenty acres of land had to be broken every year in addition to the farming duties. The son, Adam Blumer, later head of the Monroe brewery, the youngest of the family, was 5 years old when he came here. The father died in 1855.

Adam Blumer, the grandson now retired and living here, became master brewer. The Blumers moved to Monroe in 1891. In re-

calling his farm experience, he said as a boy he had the care of three spans of horses and milked 12 cows morning and evening when his father had 101 cows on the Blumer farm.

The Blumer farm was the dividing point between the north and south valley of the Little Sugar River west of Monticello. Because the settlers were from Bilten, it became known as Bilten Thaele (Bilton Valley). They were Glarners, among them the families of Frick Becker, Henry Hefty, three Bontley brothers, Andrew, Casper, and John; Adam Blumer, three Blum brothers, Werner, Fred, and Jacob; John Schuler, Gottlieb Wittwer, Jacob Schlittler, Alex Tschabold, Henry Aebly.

The west end of the Little Sugar Valley in Washington Township was known as Berner Thaele, the settlers coming from Canton Bern. Among them were Jacob Zimmerman and sons, Jacob and John, Christ Loertscher, Christ Theiler, Jacob Theiler and Jacob Weissmiller.

Werner Blum, grandfather of the Monroe family, came in 1848 and took up land at the extreme west edge. This area was known as Fox Hollow because it appeared to be the favorite haunt of fox. Blum in his later years became one of the founders of the present Washington Reformed Church. His son, the late Werner, was the first American-born Limburger maker in the township.

During early building, the newcomers managed to hold together as a group insofar as possible, for the old ties of their fatherland held firm. Settlers who came later had to spread out into new country, but identity as to Canton and community of origin was fairly established by their countrymen here.

Bilten descendants have been proud of their connection with the original expedition because of the success attained in their venture after failure of wheat growing. Family names and dates of establishment in new world homes were enlightening and meant much to their countrymen. Thomas Hefty, Rudolph Blum, Casper Becker, J. Jacob Zwickey, all came in 1847; Emmanuel Weissmiller and Anton Baumgartner in 1848; Adam Blumer 1849, David Benkert 1851, Martin Zumbrunnen 1852.

Americans had settled in central Washington after Bilten settlement was established. Recorded dates of arrivals include Linus Hare, Eldridge Cheesebro, Hames Confer 1854; John Naughton, Silas Moore, 1856.

Glarners and Berners settling in the northern section of Washington Township had the Little Sugar River fork separating the two valleys.

The Freitag, Stauffacher and Voegeli farms to the east on the main Monticello and New Glarus highway are in the big valley sloping to the east where the Little Sugar tributary in Mount Pleasant takes its course eastward to main Sugar River and eventually to Rock River.

The Glarners and Berners got along harmoniously. They finally joined in bringing Swiss cheese to Green County and the old divisions have disappeared in the promotion of common interest in the industry.

Oscar Ewing Reports on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some very interesting observations were recently made at the midwinter conference of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization in this country which is doing such fine humanitarian and medical work in Israel, by Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing. He had visited Israel several months ago. His impressions and sentiments indicate how quickly he grasped an understanding of the state and its people, the problems facing them, and their determination to settle these problems in a democratic fashion as understood in the western sense.

I am glad to place in the RECORD excerpts from his address at the Hadassah conference, as they appear in the Hadassah Newsletter, in the issue of March 1950:

HADASSAH'S WORK IN NOBLE AMERICAN TRADITION

(By Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator)

Even if I had never visited Israel I would have been delighted to come to this meeting of Hadassah. But I have just returned and the impact of my first-hand impressions is so great that nothing could have kept me away today. For 38 years the women of Hadassah have been engaged in a great humanitarian program. Those of us who have seen the end product of that program know how well you have wrought. I congratulate you for the good that you have done, for the idealism which inspires you, and for the determination with which you are facing the future.

The people of Israel are supremely sure that they can solve their problems. I share their confidence. I know that they are building for the centuries. They have had the courage and the imagination to pluck from the disasters of our generation the victory of hope and of fulfillment.

PROUD OF UNITED STATES ROLE IN HELPING ISRAEL

I am proud of the part played by the American Government, during the vicissitudes of the past several years, in ultimately making it possible for the new State of Israel to be born. I am equally proud of the voluntary role played by American citizens, including especially the members of Hadassah, in helping to bring success to Israel.

But more than this, I am proud that there are among my fellow humans people who have been able to live through the centuries of European persecution, through the concentrated poison of the Hitler terror, without succumbing to the pitfalls of self-pity or vindictiveness.

The people of Israel, as I saw them, had no time to worry about the past. They are too busy building the future.

Everywhere I went—along the roadsides, in the towns, in the villages, on the farms—there was construction. New buildings were going up, new houses, new shops and mills, new lands being surveyed for farming improvements. The real national song of Israel is played with the plow and the saw.

Yet I do not believe it will be possible for Israel to achieve success unless there is continued help from its friends abroad; and by that I mean principally in America. Every citizen of the United States ought to be proud of the voluntary assistance that has been rendered by you and by many other American organizations toward the upbuilding of Israel.

MORE DRAMA IN PEACEFUL CONSTRUCTION

This work must continue. It is only half done. The melodrama of past battles, the headline urgency of past suffering, may have gone. But they are replaced by an even more dramatic and an even more urgent need today.

I think there is more glamor in bringing up a nation of healthy children than in fighting a battle in the desert. I think there is more drama in establishing a stronghold of peaceful, constructive, democratic civilization along the Mediterranean than in the battle for international recognition, however important this may have been in the past.

Some people in this country seem to be concerned about the question of dual loyalty among American citizens who take an earnest interest in the future of Israel. I think such fears are silly. It is part of the American nature to help other people. It is part of the American tradition for us to hold strong sentimental attachments to others abroad.

AID TO OTHERS IN AMERICAN INTEREST

My ancestry is a Scotch-Irish mixture, and I am not ashamed of the fact that, during my recent trip abroad, I felt an especially warm feeling when I was in Ireland and in Scotland. I do not see that this is, in any fundamental way, any different from the feeling that many American Jews have for Israel.

I will go beyond that, I believe that the American influence—in its proper interpretation—is a healthy thing everywhere in the world. Wherever we let our own spirit of individual liberty, of human dignity, of democratic methods, of equal opportunity, make itself felt, we are striking a blow for freedom everywhere and for the fundamental interests of the American people.

Israel is a stronghold of democracy in the western sense. If we reinforce the country's economy, if we bolster its faith in western democratic ideas, we are not only helping the people of Israel but we are also acting in the highest interests of the people of America.

That is the way I see the work of Hadassah. I salute you as stanch Americans precisely because of the magnificent work your organization has done for Israel. I know you will go forward with courage, with imagination, and with determination.

Methodist Church Backs Point 4 of President Truman's Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate on the ECA bill I stressed the importance of title 3 which aims at building a world of contentment and of good will through the use of our capital, our skill and our know-how in the development of other lands under point 4 of President Truman's inaugural address plan.

I was happy this morning to receive a telegram from Charles F. Boss, Jr., of Chicago, who is the executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, which gives us assurance that the great Methodist Church, and its large membership in all the States of the Union, are behind President Truman in this most important point 4. The telegram follows:

MARCH 27, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In annual session November 8 and 9 the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist

Church unanimously adopted the following statement: "We rejoice in the point 4 proposals of President Truman's inaugural address. To make the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas, and calls for the further implementation of these proposals, by such public and private funds and other resources as may be needed." I, therefore, wish to urge your hearty support in the adoption of title 3 of omnibus bill 7797, act for international development, calling for the appropriation of $45,000,000 to be used in both the United Nations and the United States technical assistance program.

CHARLES F. BOSS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there must be an end to the fear which seems to be paralyzing action by the administration to call up for hearings the resolution providing for United States membership in the International Trade Organization and approval of its charter. The evidence is cumulative and very strong, particularly from business leaders in the best position to know that the International Trade Organization is of the most vital importance to our Nation's effort as the leader in world trade. The appended letter brilliantly analyzing the implications of ITO to the prosperity of the private economy of the United States from the vice president in charge of foreign operations of the Ford Motor Co., one of America's great corporations, speaks eloquently on this point:

FORD MOTOR CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 17, 1950.

Hon. JOHN KEE,
Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

SIR: As head of Ford International, I should like to advise you of my hearty endorsement of House Joint Resolution 236 and to urge congressional approval of the Havana Charter. From 30 years of active experience in selling American products in the foreign markets, I have learned on a day-to-day basis the problems of foreign trade. Today, as always, there are a number of people who speak authoritatively on the subject without personal experience with these problems. It is easy to sit back in the comfortable quiet of the study and think up criticisms and theoretical solutions. It is something else again to have to face the increasing obstructions to foreign trade and work out correctives that will make possible the survival of the trade in which we Americans believe.

Anyone who has to deal with this problem every day knows that without some concerted attack on the mounting road blocks that impede competitive private trade today, we American businessmen are going to lose our foreign markets.

We, in America, stand before all the world for freedom, individual initiative, the benefits that result from industrial democracy, free enterprise, and advanced technology. The decisions we take, particularly on foreign legislation, have decisive influence on the economic and political decisions in almost all other countries. We have provided the initiative for the restoration of multilateral trading—principally because our economy and our business way of life cannot survive without it. The Habana charter offers a vehicle for the restoration of multilateral trading.

We, in the United States, have taken the initiative for the restoration of international trade because of the wide area of free trade within the United States. It would be unfortunate—politically as well as economically—if we were to walk out on the deal just when there seems to be a chance of putting it over. We, as a Nation, have a keen appreciation of the fact that the economic progress of the world, including the United States, can be exactly measured by the progress which is made in the exchange of goods and services. Among nations, of course, this exchange is nothing other than international trade. I believe that world peace will result only from a combination of three factors, namely, sound diplomatic policy, sound military policy and a sound basis for the conduct of international trade. These are the keystones which are fundamental to peace and to the orderly development of the United Nations.

The practical solution to the present barriers to international trade requires (and the ITO provides) a concerted attack on all trade barriers, including our own, without delay. Four years have passed since the end of the war, and 2 years have passed since the Habana charter was drawn up. If the trend toward Government controls, State trading, and economic nationalism is to be reversed, further delay will make the job almost impossible. Vested interests grow rapidly around Government controls, making them difficult to shake off when they are long established. Even in countries where controls have been imposed as emergency measures, this is the case. If these controls and barriers are not rooted out soon, American hope for closer economic and political relationship with the non-Communist world will be seriously retarded.

The December 1949 issue of Fortune magazine contained an interesting article on the United States tariff and made the important point that, if the United States really intended to take the lead in promoting international trade, we should not only consider lower tariff rates but should give particular attention to procedural tariff reform which are often referred to as the invisible tariffs. Such are the complexities of the law and the regulations that it has become a specialized branch of the law and there has developed a large group (expert in its intricacies) known as custom brokers. Briefly, administrative and procedural reforms in the customs law and practice are even more important than a reduction in tariff rates.

When the need for action is so apparent, it seems only common sense to pick the best available plan or plans to improve international trade and go to work. The Habana charter drafted after months of arduous negotiation, under the able and patient leadership of William L. Clayton, chief of the United States delegation to the Habana Conference, within the framework of the United Nations provides a practical method to launch an orderly attack on governmental controls and trade barriers. Only a large number of trading nations, such as that grouped in the ITO, can even hope to tackle the restrictions now preventing restoration of multilateral trade. It it easy for individual nations to set up trade barriers, but they almost never take them down unless they are sure other countries will do the same. The Habana charter is the contract of 54 nations to do just that. Without an overall agreement of this sort, hope for reversing the present trend toward more and more trade barriers and government controls seems dim indeed. With the ITO, backed by energetic American support, we would have our best chance of sustaining the United States exports, encouraging private enterprise, and at the same time, we would contribute greatly to the important task of bolstering economic recovery abroad. Unless international trade is stimulated and encouraged, the important gains made in European recovery through ECA and other American assistance will be lost and the money contributed by the United States will be completely dissipated.

Of course, the charter can be criticized. It can be criticized both for its omissions and its commissions. In other words, some essentials have been left out; on the other hand there are certain things in the charter on which we may have reservations or which are not phrased strongly enough, having been watered-down or overqualified in the process of negotiation.

But—the essential considerations are these:

First, the charter does present after years of negotiations the best practicable compromise arrived in democratic fashion among the freedom-loving nations;

Secondly, the charter provides that indispensable element in the whole United Nations scheme of things; namely, an agency which has for its broad mission the purpose of dealing with problems dealing with international trade and providing a forum for their discussion and solution.

Since the initiative for the creation of this agency came from the United States and since without it the United Nations is incomplete, I strongly recommend that the charter be adopted by the Congress with any such reservations as in its opinion it feels essential to the preservation of American principles and interests.

Very truly yours,

GRAEME K. HOWARD.

The Isolationist Come-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a column by the eminent student of foreign affairs, Mr. Walter Lippmann. Twenty years from now may be too late, and by that time saying "I told you so" will not do any good to the millions who may have lost their lives if we stupidly annihilate any opportunity to carry forward an intelligent foreign policy. The entire future of the world, as well as this country, is at stake, and to stoop to partisan politics at this time may be to bring on mass destruction of our civilian population a few years hence.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE ISOLATIONIST COME-BACK

(By Walter Lippmann)

At the week end the true character of the McCarthy affair became much clearer. Senator VANDENBERG's statement and Mr. Stimson's letter brought out the critical fact that the Republican opposition in Congress is now in open rebellion against the men who have led the Republican Party since Pearl Harbor.

VANDENBERG and Stimson represent, and indeed played the leading part in forming, the bipartisan policy of national unity for war and peace. But whereas once they spoke with authority for the Republican Party, they are now on the outside appealing and protesting against the men who have captured the leadership of the party.

The men who have captured the leadership of the Republican Party are the old isolationists, that hard core of irreconcilable and unreconstructed isolationists who dominated the party from the Harding administration until Pearl Harbor. During the war and for a few years after it they deferred to the other Republicans. But now they have recovered their power. Though MCCARTHY himself is small potatoes, Senator BRIDGES, and above all Senator TAFT, are not. In the collapse of the bipartisan policy the old isolationists have once again taken over the party.

That is why Senator TAFT and Senator BRIDGES are not troubled by the fact that the method of the assault on Secretary Acheson, on Ambassador Jessup, and on the State Department in general is paralyzing the conduct of our foreign policy and is undermining the prestige of the United States throughout the world. In the last analysis MCCARTHY and the more important Republicans who are backing him do not believe in a foreign policy in which the United States plays a responsible and cooperative role in the world. They do not really care how much they injure American policy because they do not like the foreign policy which, since Pearl Harbor, they have been compelled to support. They would not regret, they would be very much pleased, to see the whole national effort of the United States in war and peace cease to be a matter of popular pride. For then their own records in war and peace, which have been embarrassing to them, would be vindicated.

This isolationist come-back was not at first clearly recognizable because the leading figures in it have been so ardent for intervention in China. Moreover, some of the leading crusaders for intervention in China, notably Senator KNOWLAND and Senator SMITH of New Jersey, are not isolationists and have not meant to throw the country back into the position it was in from Harding to Pearl Harbor. But the acid test of isolationism has never been mere withdrawal within the 3-mile limits. Some isolationists have been pacifists. But most of them have been men who, in any action abroad, wished to act alone and unilaterally, or not at all.

The real isolationism is a dislike of collaboration with other powers, and especially with European powers. Even Senator TAFT, who is a good deal of a pacifist, was willing to use the American Navy in Formosa in an American adventure. But the formation of a common policy in Asia with the other leading and friendly Asiatic powers—notably with Britain and India—has not interested him. In fact, the Republican position on China is essentially a veto on any change of American policy which would permit us to work with Britain and India, in the United Nations and elsewhere, on Asiatic problems.

It is not a debating point, but the deep truth of the matter is that the isolationist campaign which began with Formosa and went on to the McCarthy business is playing straight into Russia's hands. I believe that every informed and serious observer would agree that the great objective of Soviet foreign policy is to push the United States out of Europe and Asia and back into the Western Hemisphere. Everything that happens here which renders it impossible for the United States Government to work with our allies and partners brings the Soviet Government nearer to this objective.

The Republican campaign about China, though it cannot possibly restore Chiang Kai-shek, has made it impossible for this Government to take any of the necessary measures of an Asiatic policy. As long as we are entangled with Chiang and indirectly at war with Red China, we are not only in conflict with Russia, but we are divided from Britain and India, and we are denied the possibility of dealing with the situation in southeast Asia through the United Nations. It is perhaps no accident that the Harding Republicans who made the League of Nations unworkable should now be making the United Nations unworkable. The details of the story in 1950 are different from the details of the story of 1920. But the results are very similar.

Those who know the story of 1920 and of how the isolationists defeated Wilson will remember that the first isolationists did not begin their campaign by demanding that we withdraw from Europe. Though they ended by making a separate peace with Germany, they began with a furious assault on what they regarded as Wilson's softness in dealing with Germany. The original attack was very like the Knowland-Smith, or the MacArthur, attack on the softness of the administration's China policy. Then, as now, isolationism evolved from a campaign for a super-hard policy into a general rejection of all policy—much as the immediate result of the Formosa crusade against communism was the vote in the House to refuse aid to Korea.

Then, as now, it should also be noted, isolationism grew as the Wilson administration adhered rigidly, stubbornly, and unimaginatively to its own policy. In the end, the Wilsonian peace was broken down and then rejected because Wilson, who was a sick man, was too inflexible to work with his critics or to rally his supporters. Mr. Acheson would do well to ponder that experience.

Army Engineers Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present an editorial appearing in the March 23, 1950, edition of the Shreveport Journal regarding the splendid work of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. It reads, as follows:

ARMY ENGINEERS COMMENDED

Under the caption, "Army engineers earn praise," the Journal some time ago commended the long-time service of these engineering authorities for their record in planning and having charge of flood control and other waterways projects.

Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, who recognizes the value of the Army engineering corps, had the editorial in question inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This fact was noted with interest by George H. Palmer, president and publisher of the Marine News, New York, who in a letter to the Journal advised that its published comment had come to his publication's attention, and continued on the subject, which is of special interest to Red River Valley residents:

"It always gratifies us to see that distinctive organization, the Army engineers, commended and defended. Some of the things that have been said about them lately border on puerility and asininity.

"An editorial in the Engineering News-Record in September 1935, titled 'An Enviable Record,' said: 'For more than a century, Congress, in planning for the Nation's waterways, has laid upon the Corps of Engineers of the Army the responsibility of investigating proposed work and of carrying on work that it authorized. This year, seemingly in acknowledgment of that long service, Congress named the corps as the permanent agency to carry forward such work. The service record thus recognized is one of which any body of men may well be proud. Scandal, graft, undue respect for political influence—these stains that frequently mar the record of so many public bodies—are peculiarly absent from this one. Year after year the multitude of schemes for river improvements, harbors, and waterways that are pressed upon Congress by their enthusiastic promoters have been referred to the Army engineers under whose supervision they have been carefully analyzed, made the subject of public hearings, and, ultimately, the subject of a favorable or unfavorable report to Congress. And not infrequently unfavorable reports have been made in defiance of the demands of politically strong individuals. Though difficult at the time for the officers concerned, this firm adherence to the conclusions drawn from an engineering study has benefited the corps by building up in the minds of Congressmen full confidence in the inherent honesty of that organization. Congress now has written its acknowledgment of that confidence into the law of the land. Engineers in civil life will gladly add their approval, for though they may at times disagree with the Army engineers' conclusions or may rebel against their occasional displays of arbitrariness, yet they recognize that in the long run the record of the Corps of Engineers is one that does honor to the whole profession.'

"Two years later in August 1937 the late Gen. Hugh Johnson said in the press that:

"'The United States Corps of Engineers mapped the West, laid out the great transcontinental rail routes, improved all our harbors and inland waterways, harnessed the rivers, created the Great Lakes navigation system—by all odds the most efficient waterway development in human history—and built the Panama Canal after many attempts had failed. Through more than a century that corps has built for itself, in the confidence of Congress and the country, an almost incredible something that exists nowhere else in this or any other government—absolute assurance of impartial, completely nonpolitical, nonbiased, efficient, and incorruptible planning and administration.'

"A large part of the present strength and wealth of America is its harbors and waterways and its flood-protection works, vital both in peace and in war. Growing strength and added wealth depend largely upon their continued development. With their distinctive record and accumulated experience who is better qualified than the Corps of Engineers to plan and supervise this investment in the building of a nation?"

The Army engineers have been tried and proved to be efficient in handling flood and other waterway problems, which affect the entire Nation. A sensible move for the Government is to let the set-up go undisturbed instead of trying something new as a sort of experiment.

Throughout the Red River Valley, and the valleys of the Mississippi and other streams of this and other sections of the country, the service rendered by the Army engineers is regarded as the best possible service of the kind to be had. There have been efforts, some not in the distant past, to have Army engineers replaced with others to be politically chosen, but these efforts have failed to get the results desired by those wishing them put in effect. In the Red River Valley especially the Army engineers' work is appreciated. Repeatedly waterway leaders of this section have commended the Army corps, and justifiably. Only recently their efforts contributed to control of the swollen Mississippi and its tributaries.

For Federal Regulation of Life-Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, of paramount importance in the news is the announcement of a new plan whereby the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States states that it would buy new freight cars and lease them to the railroads.

The Committee on the Study of Monopoly Power of the House Judiciary Committee examined to some extent the assets and operations of life-insurance companies. It was ascertained that assets are now between fifty-five and sixty billion dollars and that the companies have been finding it more and more difficult to invest these huge assets profitably and efficiently.

We now find that the Equitable Life Assurance Society has a new plan to buy and lease freight cars to the railroads. Standing by itself, this proposal appears sound and should be most helpful to the railroads, most of which are in financial difficulties. It points up, however, the need for thorough exploration of the ever-growing magnitude of the assets of life-insurance companies and the lack of proper and organized supervision of same by State agencies.

The preliminary investigation made by our committee showed that with few exceptions, regulation of the disposition of these assets was negligible. The larger of these companies are practically laws unto themselves. Their combined power is incalculable. Today, the Equitable Life Insurance Co. buys and rents freight cars. Another of the so-called Big Five—Metropolitan, Prudential, New York Life, Equitable, and Mutual—may possibly next buy and rent locomotives or Diesel engines, and the third, passenger cars, the fourth, parlor cars, while the fifth might propose to electrify railroads. Many railroads are down at the heel and need help, and the insurance companies can be a source of great aid. However, what are the end results? These insurance companies would practically control the railroads—and this is not looking for ghosts under the bed.

The insurance companies are already involved in numerous types of business. They construct housing projects: they build commercial and industrial structures and rent them for short or long periods. They are in the banking business and make loans to all manner and kinds of business. There is neither floor nor ceiling to their financial activities, save that they may only invest in capital stock to a limited degree.

The admitted assets, according to Dunne's International Insurance Reports, as of December 31, 1947, of the big five insurance companies, were: Metropolitan, $8,548,422,601; Prudential, $7,321,488,722; Equitable Life Assurance, $4,504,971,753; New York Life, $4,234,184,598, and Mutual Life of New York, $1,942,722,347. Since 1947, the figures have gone considerably higher. They are permitted to throw their financial weight around for good or ill with little or no outside supervision. It is for good, when men like Thomas I. Parkinson, president of Equitable are in control, but what of his successors? What guaranty has the policyholder and the public that efficient and just management will always be present?

We cannot leave such power to chance.

Although the companies are usually mutual, the policyholders have neither control nor voice in the management. The State laws make it impossible. The officers and boards of directors are self-perpetuating.

I am personally convinced that Federal regulation is necessary. Insurance is interstate commerce. It is not, of course, my thought to superimpose Federal regulations upon State regulations which would result in 49 regulatory bodies. Rather, the solution lies in Federal regulations which would govern in any conflict between State and Federal law. What the shape and stringency of that regulation should be, I cannot now say. Further inquiry is needed.

Our inquiry clearly indicated that there is no greater safety in big insurance companies than there is in small insurance companies, and the premium rates are no lower.

If Arizona Is Not To "Die on the Vine," Congress Must Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the fact is generally recognized that Arizona desperately needs water which is now flowing in the Colorado River within her own limits for 300 miles across the State and 400 miles along her border. It is a less-known fact that if Arizona is to get her legal quota of that water, there must be—because of Arizona's unique circumstances—an authorizing act of Congress as the necessary first step.

Ah, you may say, since diverting Colorado River water into Arizona is too expensive for Arizona to do, of course, it requires an authorization for the Federal Government to do it, and that is the reason why an act of Congress is the first step. That is true, but that is not the reason to which I now refer. There is another more compelling reason why authorization by Congress is absolutely necessary to enable Arizona to get her own water, or any other benefits, from the Colorado River. Please get this explanation: Arizona's Colorado River problem presents a unique case because of a certain legal fact which does not apply to any other Colorado River Basin State nor to any other State in our Union. It applies to Arizona alone. Congress walled Arizona off from the Colorado River in 1910.

No, I am not thinking now of the physical features or handicaps which must be overcome to put Colorado River water on Arizona land, but I am thinking of this legal fact—the shutting off of Arizona from the benefits of the Colorado River—which fact must be known and understood for any appreciation of Arizona's peculiar problem. This great handicap imposed on Arizona—to which I have recently referred in committee and on the floor of the House—was originally imposed by Congress, and it can only be overcome by Congress. This hampering condition is a provision which Congress wrote into Arizona's Enabling Act of June 20, 1910, as found in section 28 thereof. The provision reserved to the United States, and caused to be withdrawn, all power dam sites and lands bordering the Colorado River. Arizona was required to accept the provision and to incorporate it into her State constitution. It is found today in section 6 of article 10 of the Arizona Constitution.

Now the effect of this provision of the enabling act, passed by Congress and required of the new State in her constitution is to legally fence Arizona away from the Colorado River so that Arizona can build no dams or power plants on the Colorado and can divert no water from the Colorado River without an authorizing act of Congress, even though the legal right to her use of the water is absolutely clear.

Am I, a layman, the only authority pointing out Arizona's situation on account of this enabling act provision? Certainly not. Able lawyers have done so, and the Supreme Court has done so in the case of *Arizona* v. *California* (283 U. S. 423). Quoting the Supreme Court in that case:

> Arizona has, of course, no constitutional right to use, in aid of appropriation, any land of the United States, and it cannot complain of the provision conditioning the use of such public land.

What the Court was referring to was the fact that Arizona was required by its enabling act to disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated and ungranted public lands lying within its boundaries. Furthermore, reserved to the United States, and expressly excepted from any and all grants made to the State, was "all land actually or prospectively valuable for the development of water power or power for hydroelectric use or transmission" which might be designated by the Secretary of the Interior within 5 years after the admission of the State. Thereafter, all power sites and public lands along the river were so designated by the Secretary of the Interior. Thus Arizona was fenced off from the great Colorado River which flows 300 miles across the State and 400 miles along her border, although the Colorado River is Arizona's greatest resource. Let me repeat: These conditions were not imposed upon any other Colorado River Basin State. Congressional action brought about this condition. As a Member of Congress, I say that it is the duty of Congress to see that Arizona

receives her due share of that water from which she was fenced off, and to which she is otherwise legally entitled.

Granted all that is said above, it may be said and it has been said, "There should be a decision by the Supreme Court clearing Arizona's title to the Colorado River water she seeks before the irrigation project is authorized." I have frequently said that nobody is more anxious than I for an immediate and definite decision by the highest Court of the land, as to Arizona's legal rights on the Colorado River. However, the ablest lawyers in the West, including some of the ablest lawyers in the United States Senate, have declared that such an authorization act which passed the Senate February 21, 1950, by a vote of 55 to 28, is the one and only method of getting this water controversy squarely before the Supreme Court. The method of litigation has been proposed during the last 4 years, and suit resolutions were considered by four different committees, two in both Houses of Congress in the Eightieth Congress and in the Eighty-first Congress, but none of the suit resolutions were favorably acted upon. Thus the many lawyers on these committees must have agreed with what able water lawyers in the West say is a legal fact—that an authorization by Congress is a necessary first step before there can be final litigation of Arizona's rights in the Colorado River.

Senator Paul Douglas Versus Natural Gas Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, no one in the Nation has done more to make the issues clear in the attempt to take the independent producers of natural gas out from under Federal regulation than has the Senator from Illinois, Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS.

As one who opposed this legislation when it was considered in the House in the first session of the present Congress, I give every ounce of moral support possible to PAUL DOUGLAS in his gallant fight in behalf of the millions of American consumers who would be victims of increased rates if the so-called Kerr bill becomes law.

In this connection I include with my remarks an article by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post, of this morning. Mr. Childs' article follows:

DOUGLAS AND THE KERR BILL—GAS MONOPOLY FIGHT

(By Marquis Childs)

Being a United States Senator is really tough these days if you take your job at all seriously. In an earlier day, some high-falutin' oratory got you over the rough places.

But in the face of an issue as that presented by Senator ROBERT KERR's bill to take the independent producers of natural gas out from under Federal regulation, oratory is not enough. It takes hard, thorough, conscientious digging into the facts and figures that spell out certain basic economic relationships in this country.

That hard, thorough, conscientious digging is what Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has supplied in the controversy now moving toward a climax. His initial speech and the part he is playing in the give and take of debate constitute a remarkable performance.

DOUGLAS has got down to the hardpan of the argument so that no one can fail to see what the realities are if they choose to.

In the background knowledge he has brought to the fore and in the way he marshals it, DOUGLAS makes old-timers think of Senator George Norris at his best. For one thing, DOUGLAS' presentation is completely in the American tradition. It owes nothing to any alien ideology.

The Senator from Illinois went back to the early attempts of State governments to regulate private monopoly in the gas and electric industry. Here, as he pointed out, was none of the vital force of competition which can and does under our system act to bring prices down and give the consumer value and quality.

"This was not," said DOUGLAS, "public ownership. It was an attempt to avoid public ownership by providing for private ownership and operation but with public regulation to protect consumers and also investors. It was not socialism as some may imply, but America's answer to socialism."

In this last there is good American common sense. It is a sound and valid answer to the distorters who cry socialism at every form of Government activity.

But the States found themselves debarred from regulating the sale of natural gas transported from one State to another. Only the Federal Government has the power to regulate interstate commerce. For that reason, as DOUGLAS develops the argument, Congress adopted in 1938 a law giving the Federal Government through the Federal Power Commission authority over the sale and transmission of natural gas.

In the course of the debate the Senator has presented a remarkable array of figures, statistical tables, and supporting data. They show in a way difficult or impossible to refute that the so-called independent producers are, for the most part, the big oil companies. These companies, which in past years have shown exceedingly generous profits, would be in a position to make an extraordinary killing on the basis of the gas reserves they own and the contracts now in existence, if Congress gives them a go sign.

DOUGLAS has thoroughly analyzed these contracts and he seems to me to knock down one of Senator KERR's chief arguments, which is that they provide for a fixed price over a long period of years. Even if the companies were freed from regulation, that is to say, they could not hike the price. But DOUGLAS points out that most of these contracts have favored-nation clauses providing an increase for the company if it can be shown that a higher price is being paid to another producer.

And, incidentally, throughout the debate the Senator from Illinois has kept away from name calling. He has not felt it necessary to impugn Senator KERR's motives. Consistently he has pounded in facts and figures and always he's come back to the main theme—that the choice is between unreasonable profits for a few producers with drastically increased prices to northern consumers and, on the other hand, reasonable profits and comparatively low prices benefiting millions of citizens.

The vote on the Kerr bill will be closely scanned in a great many States, and one reason is because Senator DOUGLAS has contributed so much toward making the issue crystal clear. He got his preparation years ago when the jerry-built utility empire of Samuel Insull was crashing into ruin in Illinois.

They say that PAUL DOUGLAS is running for President, or anyhow, Vice President. He puts this aside, sternly saying that all he wants to do is be a good Senator. And that, in my opinion, is one of the best possible ways to run for President.

Best Highway Route Through the Rocky Mountains Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, when the uncompleted section of the Lewis and Clark Highway between Missoula, Mont., and Lewiston, Idaho, is finished, we will have an arterial road between Chicago and Portland, a short route traversing the lowest pass through the Bitter Root Mountain range that makes the boundary line between Montana and Idaho.

Inserted herewith for the information of my colleagues are the facts presented to the members of the Public Works Committee in my statement concerning this road, when the public-roads bill was under consideration by that committee:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The CHAIRMAN. Please state your name for the reporter.

Mr. WHITE. COMPTON I. WHITE, Congressman representing the First District of Idaho.

I want to talk to you about one of the most important transcontinental roads across the country.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have you with us, Mr. WHITE, as always.

Mr. WHITE. For the purpose of the record, and for the information of the committee I would like to use two maps.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to the committee a few minutes about an arterial road under construction across the State of Idaho.

I want to call the attention of the committee to a peculiar situation that between U. S. No. 30, which crosses the southern part of Idaho, and U. S. No. 10 which crosses the northern part of Idaho we have a blank space here in the great United States of 330 miles. There are 330 miles in Idaho between Wallace, Idaho, on U. S. No. 10, and Gooding, Idaho, on U. S. No. 30, where there is no way of crossing that country, right across Idaho, which is the route traveled by Lewis and Clark on their famous expedition when they made an exploration of the Columbia Valley and the Pacific Northwest in 1805.

They came to where Missoula, Mont., is now and from there across the Bitter Root Mountains, and got down to the Salmon River but had to retrace their steps back to the Lolo and found a route, the lowest pass through the Bitter Root and went on down through that pass to the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers and on to the mouth of the Columbia at Astoria.

Later when General Howe, in his campaign against the Indians thought that he had Chief Joseph surrounded, Chief Joseph and his Indians got away, got through the Bitter Root Mountains by the pass followed by Lewis and Clark, and got out on highway of

the plains of eastern Montana, and got almost to Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. WHITE. That was back in 1877. 1805 was the time Lewis and Clark made their famous expedition to the Northwest. When Chief Joseph eluded General Howe and took his horses, his squaws, and his people with him he went through this famous Lolo Pass which is traversed by the Lewis and Clark Highway. This road is now under construction and has been for a long time but if you look at the map here (indicating) you will see that there is a dead end to it on both sides. This arterial highway is almost completed. There is about a 40-mile stretch of it remaining to be built. This road extends down from U S 10 down to Lolo Pass, and it ends there, a dead end. It is built up along the Clearwater River, up to a point in the mountains, and there it ends.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And for 30 years we have been trying to induce the Forest Service and the United States Bureau of Roads to complete that highway project.

They have spent up to now over $4,000,000 on it, and I will get the exact figures, and it is being left neglected and uncompleted. We have $4,000,000 invested in that road, and we do not get a nickel out of this road investment that has been made. We do not get any gasoline tax, and we do not get much in the way of service. It is just a dead investment. We need a little more money to complete that road. It is on the Federal aid system. It will be a short cut from the East down through Lewiston and Walla Walla down along the Columbia River into Portland and to the Pacific at Astoria. It is one of the most important roads that we have that remains to be built. I have the figures from the Bureau of Public Roads showing that there has been $2,424,820.62 invested in that road, in addition to over $2,000,000 in other road money, and it is still a dead end.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not mean to interrupt the continuity of your very excellent presentation, but let me ask you this, Mr. WHITE: Has your State highway commission selected that road for construction?

Mr. WHITE. I think some years ago it was put on the Federal aid system. It should be built, as other roads in the national forests are with funds allocated to the national forests. Yes, the State is going the limit with their limited means in matching Federal-aid money.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, the commission has recommended that as a priority road.

Mr. WHITE. They are building short sections. The Forest Service seems to be bypassing the thing. The Forest Service let a small clearing contract about 2 years ago. I asked then what they were going to do about it this year, and they said we will carry that little $300,000 clearing and a mile and a half construction contract over until next year. This highway project is being stymied and blocked. It is one of the most important roads for military defense and for the utilization of our resources and the use of travelers and tourists to go through the country. It is a short cut, if you please, between Chicago and all of the big cities beyond there, to Portland, Oregon, and Pacific coast cities.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are absolutely sound. As you know, this committee makes a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is up to the Bureau of Public Roads and the highway authorities of Idaho to spend that money where they think it ought to be spent.

Mr. WHITE. It is up chiefly to the Forest Service. Lewiston is one of our biggest Idaho cities, and it is dependent on the development of that road for its natural growth. The representatives of the chamber of commerce went to the Forest Service when Fred Morrell was regional forester some years ago, to their headquarters at Missoula, to work out some plan for completion of the road. They were promised some forest-road money would be spent to finish the road each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. WHITE. I want to tell you just a little more about this road, and then I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; go right ahead.

Mr. WHITE. They went over there to the regional headquarters of the Forest Service and saw Mr. Morrell and he told these people that they could not build this 45 miles as one project, but that each year they would put some money on the project. The Forest Service kept their agreement for a few years, and then the money previously allocated for this project was transferred somewhere else, and that road is still standing there incomplete. Four million dollars' investment made on which we are getting nothing at all.

I wanted the committee to know something about it. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We are mighty glad to have that information and we thank you very much, Mr. White. We are always glad to have you appear before us. You always bring a map with you when you come, and if you do not bring a map you bring photographs, and you always put on a good show.

Tax Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DANIEL A. REED, Republican of New York, ranking minority member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee charged today that the Bureau of Internal Revenue's recent ruling exempting from the 20-percent amusement tax the proceeds of the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally was a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism and that the Federal Government had been cheated out of over $100,000.

Congressman REED declared:

In view of the position of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the $1 paid to attend the Republican Lincoln Day box-supper rally at the Uline Arena in Washington was subject to the 20 percent amusement tax, I requested on February 20 the Bureau to advise me whether a similar tax was payable on the $100 per person Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day rally held in the Armory in Washington on February 10.

After more than 1 month's delay I have just received the Commissioner's reply that the approximately $530,000 proceeds from the Democratic spree is not subject to either the admission or cabaret tax in the same manner that the proceeds from the Republican rally were held taxable. In view of the basic similarity of the two events, both of which included professional entertainment and political speeches, this ruling is a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism. Although the Presidential henchmen hunger for the pennies paid by even our children in the form of the amusement tax on their movies, museums, playgrounds, county fairs, and many other simple pleasures, they avoid applying the amusement tax to any fund destined for the Democratic coffers for use in fostering their socialistic program.

As a result of the Bureau's ruling, the Federal Government has been cheated out of over $100,000 in revenue. Even more significant than this is the revealing fact that the Democratic Party is unwilling to help the working men and women of America shoulder their tremendous tax burden.

This type of tax discrimination and favoritism is indeed a new low in politics.

Discrimination in the City College of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure that Members will agree with me that loyalty to this Nation and to its democratic institutions and traditions should be a prime consideration in the selection of the teaching staff of any school, college, or university; and, with a choice of proved loyal Americans, that the designation should be made to the candidates considered best qualified, without regard to race, religion, or national derivation.

In the City College of New York an anomalous situation has been uncovered in which it would appear at this stage of the investigation that a certain Prof. William Knickerbocker has been able to force the promotion of two individuals of less than unquestionable loyalty to the United States, and not alone to its institutions; and that in the process he has been able to bypass qualified candidates who happen to be Jews or Negroes.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement from the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League of 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York; a news article from the Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 26; and miscellaneous clippings on the subject from the New York Post-Home News:

NONSECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE
TO CHAMPION HUMAN RIGHTS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 17, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS T. SPAULDING,
Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: In view of continued and very widespread public concern as to whether practices detrimental to the rights of religious and racial minorities in the City College of New York have been effectively terminated, the directors of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League consider it imperative that the office of commissioner of education should institute a sweeping independent investigation of antidemocratic practices within the administration of the

City College, including a general review of background educational attitudes, promotion practices, and public policies with respect to intergroup relationships.

Such a study ought to give consideration to general civic and educational values, rather than to narrowly circumscribed academic regulations concerning primarily administrative matters.

Without impugning the methods or motives in your disposal of the City College case recently before you, we feel that we should point out that your action was based solely upon narrow technical grounds, and only upon the papers submitted to you from below, without any independent investigation whatsoever on the part of your office, and in spite of formal recommendations on this subject made in a unanimous report of a special committee of the City Council of New York.

We are especially disturbed by a generally understood custom with respect to current faculty appointments at City College, pursuant to which City College graduates are in effect discriminated against for appointment to the faculty of their own institution. Such a procedure, while defended by the City College administration as an attempt to prevent "academic inbreeding," when practiced to the considerable extent apparently prevailing, actually works a discrimination against graduates of City College, and particularly against the great majority of those graduates who happen to be of the Jewish faith, as well as the smaller group which happens to belong to the Negro race.

At present it is estimated that between 80 and 85 percent of the City College student body is of the Jewish faith, and that only 22 to 27 percent of the faculty of full professorial rank is of the Jewish faith. It is obvious that the general pursuit of the principle of "no inbreeding" means that the majority of City College graduates who are of Jewish faith have vastly less possibility to develop academic careers than is the case for the average Gentile college graduate.

"No inbreeding" thus becomes nothing but a new name for the numerus clausus and other time-worn devices of religious and racial discrimination.

This peculiar and all but unique inversion of the feeling of academic self-confidence which seems to have now developed at the City College is, in the opinion of a considerable portion of the academic community, strongly suspect of being a mere camouflage for a much more sinister purpose—a purpose which has at other times and places been cloaked by the phrase "quota system," or openly practiced according to dictates of agitators of the John Elliott Rankin stripe. In the particular case of Prof. William Knickerbocker, the chairman of the romance language department at City College, this lack of institutional self-confidence in the college's own academic products has been carried to a further extreme, as may be observed by even a casual study of appointment and promotion policies, with the result that not only have City College graduates—and particularly those who happen to be of the Jewish faith or the Negro race—been subject to discrimination, but in an effort to avoid granting promotions in this group, definite preference has been given, on important occasions, to teachers whose personal histories should have led them to be held in doubt as to their qualifications for advancement in an institution founded on democratic traditions.

Without meaning to imply that a specialist in a field of art or literature should be compelled to adhere to any specific doctrine, it is nevertheless established American practice to contend that, particularly on the undergraduate level, a devotion to civic principles, including democracy and Americanism, is at least highly desirable.

It is noteworthy that during the administration of Professor Knickerbocker two very important promotions were made where the instructors had earned considerable portions of their academic standing as a result of activities carried on, with Professor Knickerbocker's knowledge or possible advice, in countries and institutions at the time clearly and openly at variance with democratic traditions.

The first is the case of Prof. Guido Errante, who joined the City College staff as an instructor in 1932. During the ensuing years from 1932 to 1938, while serving as an instructor, Errante was also a featured New York correspondent for Il Giornale d'Italia, of Rome, a newspaper at that time edited by Virginio Gayda and internationally notorious as the most quoted Roman press outlet of Benito Mussolini's Fascist regime.

Errante, however, was strongly recommended by Professor Knickerbocker for promotion to an assistant professorship in 1944—this recommendation being made over the heads of at least four other instructors possessing similar or greater seniority and academic attainments. Of these four, whose availability was thus ignored, three were Jews and all were City College alumni. Yet, in advancing Errante's claims, Knickerbocker justified his action in a meeting of members of the department, on the ground that Errante's journalistic experience was of a character to merit his promotion. Thus, service as a correspondent for Il Giornale d'Italia during the critical period 1932–38 became a basis for credit toward promotion in the romance languages department. Errante, in 1947, thus became an assistant professor.

In 1949, Knickerbocker again recommended Errante for further advancement—this time to the rank of associate professor—a recommendation which is still pending.

If experience in Italian journalism had been a sine qua non at this time, it is scarcely necessary to remind you that there were in the United States a considerable number of exiled scholars who had been forced to leave Italian universities as a result of the totalitarian policies of Mussolini, and many of these scholars were then securing appointments at institutions of the first rank, including Columbia, Harvard, Yale, the University of Chicago, and other schools of similar rating.

To give preference under such circumstances to a man, one of whose claims for promotion included his service as a New York correspondent to the outstanding newspaper of Mussolini's Fascist regime, at the expense of relegating qualified City College graduates (sometimes with the suspicion that such action might have been related to the fact that they were of Jewish faith) further down the promotion ladder, would cast grave doubt upon the conduct of this particular department's business.

A parallel example is to be found in the case of Dr. Gaston Gille, who, after serving for several years as a lecturer or instructor at City College, was given leave of absence to complete his doctorate at the University of Paris in 1941, at a time when Paris was under the jurisdiction of a puppet regime established by Adolf Hitler—the head of which regime was subsequently imprisoned for life by decree of the French Republic.

It is entirely possible that Dr. Gille (who also served for a time in the French Army) may have completed his study of the French language at Paris in 1941 without becoming seriously infected with any of the doctrines of anti-Semitism which so characterized official Paris of that day. Yet, it would seem to cast considerable doubt upon the conduct of the romance languages department—in which a majority of the students were and are of that particular religious groups against whom the then-existing regime in Paris had directed its most hateful venom—that such a leave should have been granted at that particular time, and have been immediately followed by recommendation for and promotion to an assistant professorship, over the heads of at least three Jewish members of the department with equal or greater seniority, and at least equal academic attainments. This promotion—as also in Errante's case—was soon followed, by Professor Knickerbocker, with a recommendation for a second advancement, to the rank of associate professor—again over the heads of three or more equally qualified Jewish members of the department.

It would appear that much of the doubt that the public continues to feel with regard to the loyalty of the City College administration to established practices of American democracy cannot be wholly allayed until these and other instances of similar type have been fully and publicly investigated.

We commend to your attention therefore an immediate investigation of the entire promotion policy at City College under the no inbreeding rule of the present administration, and with particular reference to the romance languages department.

Such an investigation should consider not only the question of dubious advancements or advancements out-of-turn, as in the instances just cited, but also the circumstances under which at least four members of the faculty in this department were apparently penalized for having spoken out against certain openly anti-Semitic utterances made by the department's chairman.

The equally urgent issues of Negro segregation and inadequate faculty representation, which were partly raised, but never fully investigated, in the case of Dr. William C. Davis, should also be adequately dealt with by your office.

In view of the above considerations, and in view of the record, the League's board of directors, following 3 weeks of intensive review of the whole situation, therefore urgently requests that you institute a complete investigation, on your own, of the entire question of appointment and promotion policies within the faculty of City College, together with instruction or administration policies which tend to limit or affect the basic rights of Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Only in this way will it be possible to meet the grave questions which have already brought our city's largest educational institution into an embarrassing degree of public obloquy.

The world's largest city cannot afford to maintain an educational institution which is even suspected of having succumbed to those practices which have from time to time irreparably harmed other American educational centers, as notably in the instance of the University of Louisiana during the administration of the late Huey Long. These are practices and customs which do not belong in our community, and the traces of which we hope your office will be able to eradicate.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES H. SHELDON,
Administrative Chairman.
HERMAN HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1950]

INQUIRY SOUGHT IN ALLEGED BIAS AT CITY COLLEGE—ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE CONTENDS MINORITY GROUPS SUFFER IN FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

(By Judith Crist)

A request for a sweeping independent investigation of antidemocratic practices within the administration of City College has been submitted to State Education Commissioner Francis T. Spaulding by the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, 165 West Forty-sixth Street, it was learned yesterday.

In a letter to Dr. Spaulding, James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman of the League, asked also for a general review of background educational attitudes, promoting practices, and public policies with respect to intergroup relationships.

The investigation, which Mr. Sheldon said yesterday should be conducted "by a half dozen first-rate educational authorities from out of State," would revolve around two major complaints. Neither of these, Mr. Sheldon said, had been brought before the commissioner in previous cases involving City College.

KNICKERBOCKER INVOLVED

The first has to do with what was termed the discriminatory effect of the college's policy against "inbreeding" on its faculty. The second is concerned with the appointment and subsequent promotion of two members of the romance languages department by Prof. William E. Knickerbocker. Dr. Spaulding recently cleared Professor Knickerbocker of long-pending charges that he had already made anti-Semitic statements, but his specific actions in the two faculty cases, Mr. Sheldon said, had not been examined by the commissioner.

The college's professed policy of preventing "academic inbreeding" by appointing few City College graduates to its faculty, Mr. Sheldon said, "actually works a discrimination against graduates of City College and particularly against the great majority of those graduates who happen to be of the Jewish faith, as well as the smaller group which happens to belong to the Negro race."

He said that between 80 and 85 percent of the student body is Jewish, while less than 30 percent of the faculty is of that faith. "It is obvious," he said, "that the general pursuit of the principle of 'no inbreeding' means that the majority of City College graduates who are of Jewish faith have vastly less possibility to develop academic careers than is the case for the average Gentile college graduate."

A preliminary inquiry revealed, he said, that in the last year, in the chemistry department, 21 persons were recommended by the department for tenure, of whom 14 were Jewish. All 7 of the non-Jews were given tenure but only 6 of the 14 Jews received it from the higher nondepartmental faculty committees that passed on departmental recommendation. In another situation, he said, 8 men, including 6 Jews who were City College graduates, were recommended for tenure. Two Jews—and the two Gentiles—got it.

In the electrical engineering department last year, Mr. Sheldon said, seven tutors who were City College graduates were recom- Under the "no inbreeding" policy, he said, five of the tutors, who were Jews, were dismended by the department for retention. missed. The two non-Jewish tutors were retained. "That is too large a number," he said, "to be pure accident."

"The 'no-inbreeding' clause," Mr. Sheldon said, "thus becomes nothing but a new name for the 'numerus clausus' [quota system] and other time-worn devices of religious and racial discrimination."

Not only have City College graduates, particularly Jews and Negroes, been discriminated against in appointments and promotions, Mr. Sheldon said, "but in an effort to avoid granting promotions in this group, definite preference has been given, on important occasions, to teachers whose personal histories should have led them to be held in doubt as to their qualifications for advancement in an institution founded on democratic tradition."

CASE OF REPORTER NOTED

Two cases Mr. Sheldon cited to the commissioner were in Professor Knickerbocker's department. The first was of Professor Guido Errante, who was a correspondent from 1932 to 1939 for Il Giornale d'Italia, Virginio Gayda's newspaper that was regarded as a press outlet for Benito Mussolini's regime. Mr. Sheldon said Professor Knickerbocker subsequently had successfully urged Professor Errante's promotion on the ground that his journalistic experience added merit to his case.

The second case was that of Dr. Gaston Gille, whose promotion has also been successfully urged by Professor Knickerbocker. Mr. Sheldon said that Dr. Gille completed his doctorate studies at the University of Paris in 1941 with the full approval of the Vichy regime.

Both men, Mr. Sheldon said, had been promoted over the heads of three or more equally qualified Jewish members of the department.

"It would appear," Mr. Sheldon told the commissioner, "that much of the doubt that the public continues to feel with regard to the loyalty of the City College administration to established practices of American democracy cannot be wholly allayed until these and other instances of similar type have been fully and publicly investigated."

[From the New York Post of March 20, 1950]

ANTI-NAZI GROUP ASKS CCNY PROBE

The long-smouldering controversy over alleged discriminatory teaching at City College was fanned into a new flame today when the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League demanded a sweeping independent investigation of antidemocratic practices within the CCNY administration.

Charging that the officially backed no inbreeding policy in faculty appointments and promotions is but a device for religious and racial discrimination, the League said:

"One result of this policy has been the promotion to a professorship of a man who, while an instructor on the City College staff, served as a correspondent for Mussolini's leading Fascist newspaper, Il Giornale d'Italia.

"Another result has been granting a leave of absence to a second instructor to complete a French doctorate at a university then under the jurisdiction of Hitler's Vichy regime."

The League said the office of New York State commissioner of education Spaulding has so far conducted no investigation of its own into charges of anti-Semitic policies by Prof. William Knickerbocker of CCNY and anti-Negro acts by Dr. William C. Davis.

[From the New York Post of March 23, 1950]

ALLEGAROO AND BIGOTRY, TOO?

I was happy to see that the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League insists on Mr. Spaulding making a genuine investigation into the question of discrimination at City College. I think it is just about time that we brought into light of day exactly what goes on in City College and why it is permitted. At least in New York City, the people have reason to believe that discrimination just won't be tolerated.

STEPHEN A. MARKS.

[From the New York Post of March 27, 1950]

TEACHER QUOTA?

As a graduate of City College, I am glad that the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League is at last trying to bring out the facts concerning the use of "no inbreeding" policy with respect to appointments at the institution. Before I graduated, I had hoped to follow an academic career, but everyone from whom I sought advice advised me against it, pointing out that out-of-town appointments for members of a minority group were violently restricted and that the policy in city institutions was such that only a fraction of those who belonged to a minority group could ever hope to be appointed. With the situation such as it is in out-of-town schools, where does an aspirant for such a career look if not to the colleges maintained by the city of New York? If the people really find out what goes on, the situation will certainly be corrected.

SIDNEY BERNSTEIN.

Informational Broadcasts by Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter addressed to Mr. Robert J. Coar, coordinator, Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Wayne Coy.

It is my opinion that this communication clarifies the policy of the Commission to a great extent, and is helpful in ascertaining procedure to be followed with respect to informational broadcasts by Members of Congress.

Mr. Coy's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1950.

Mr. ROBERT J. COAR,
Coordinator, Joint Senate and House Recording Facility,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COAR: I have your letter of February 2, 1950, in which you ask for information concerning the Commission's position with respect to certain transcribed radio programs regularly furnished to local radio stations by Members of Congress. You set out in your letter a quotation of a statement of a station licensee who quotes his Washington attorney as reporting to him certain statements allegedly made with respect to these programs by the enforcement section of the Commission, to the effect that they have always been considered as political broadcasts. The Commission has no enforcement section, and to the best of our information no such general statement which disregards the decisive importance of the specific factual circumstances relevant to each situation has ever been made by any member of the Commission's staff. If you should furnish us with the names of the

station licensees and the Washington attorneys quoted, we would be pleased to look into the matter further to ascertain the facts.

We have summarized below the Commission's position with respect to the questions raised by your letter, to the extent that they can be definitely answered on the basis of applicable law and in the absence of specific factual circumstances.

Under the Communications Act of 1934, the selection and presentation of radio program material are generally the responsibility of the individual radio station licensees, subject only to their obligation to conform the operation of their stations to the statutory standard of the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Section 315 of the act provides that where a station allows its facilities to be used by a legally qualified candidate for public office at any election, it must provide equal opportunities for all other legally qualified candidates for that office to use its facilities. But regular broadcasts by Members of Congress to their constituents under circumstances which establish that they are not in connection with an election campaign would not appear to come within section 315, and this provision of the Communications Act does not expressly require that licensees provide equal time to representatives of opposing views in connection with any other types of programs except those covered by section 315. It is important to note, however, that the ascertainment of when an election campaign begins and who is a legally qualified candidate for public office presents questions of fact, which, in all cases, must be resolved by reference to the particular facts and circumstances as well as pertinent State and local statutes. It will depend, therefore, on the particular circumstances involved, whether the broadcast of transcribed speeches by Members of Congress will bring into operation the requirements of section 315. In the light of these problems, the Commission has consistently followed a policy of determining whether a particular case falls within the provisions of section 315 only when the complete facts in an individual case are presented to it.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that the Commission does not determine the programs or persons to be presented by any radio station, and is specifically prohibited by section 326 of the act from exercising any powers of censorship over radio-program material. Its duty to insure that operation of stations is in the public interest, as required by the Communications Act, is performed by periodic review of the over-all applications for renewal of station licenses. The Commission has consistently held that one of the important elements of such operation in the public interest is the presentation of a balanced, well-rounded program service including the expression of representative opposing viewpoints on controversial public issues of interest and importance to the community served by the particular station. At the time of such review, however, we are not concerned with whether a particular station was correct or incorrect in presenting or refusing to present any particular program or person, except as it is one factor in our determination of whether the station's over-all program service demonstrates its ability to serve the public interest. In this connection your attention is called to the Commission's report in the matter of editorializing by broadcast licensees, a copy of which is enclosed.

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion will serve to illuminate the problems covered in your letter. For your information there is enclosed a copy of section 315 of the Communications Act as well as a copy of section 3.190 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations which deal with the question of political broadcasts. If there is any additional information concerning this matter which we can furnish you, please do not hesitate to let us know.

By direction of the Commission:

WAYNE COY, *Chairman.*

Bad Security Risks on the Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Congressman could find the time and opportunity to read the discussions carried on inside the committee rooms, and especially when the subcommittees of House are considering various issues on current legislation.

Since we are all concerned with foreign affairs and rightly so, an article in the New York Daily News of March 24, 1950, wherein our colleague and personal friend, Representative CLEVENGER, of Ohio, asks some very pertinent questions of Bernard L. Gladieux, executive assistant to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, this will interest every one of us. You will notice in this discussion that even the Democratic Chairman ROONEY of the subcommittee was quite disgusted with the testimony of Mr. Gladieux.

In considering the employment by the State and Commerce Departments of bad security risks, who is to blame for the employing of this type of person in the first place? Whether they are soft-shouldered on Russia, believe in appeasement, or are homosexuals, the question in my mind is why is such a type of citizen considered for these top positions when there are so many good Americans that we could employ. It would be interesting to know who promotes the hiring of such misfits.

The article follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 23.—That secret session of the House Appropriations Committee last February 27 high lights the tremendous problem confronting Americans of both parties when it comes to stamping out bad security risks and traitors who have bored deep into our Government. In particular, a reading of the transcript of the testimony (still with much supersecret data stricken out) reveals a situation we have long complained about.

This is it:

You can kick out a bad security risk from the State Department, for example, and find that he has popped up again on some other Government pay roll. That is particularly true of sex perverts, homosexuals, and those with twisted emotional aberrations. They are susceptible of being blackmailed for national secrets or capable of an emotional attachment for a foreign representative or a cold war opponent.

Back when the shooting war ended, the phonies, the privileged draft dodgers, and the rest of the trash which riddled the Moscow-praising Office of War Information, the UNRRA, civilian aids to Lend-Lease, etc., were, according to public declaration, washed off the public pay roll.

But many of those old familiar names popped up again on the State Department pay roll or overseas in some branch of the civilian government of surrendered Germany or as aids at the various war crimes trials. All strictly phonies; all on the pay roll. And it still goes on.

When the competent Under Secretary of State, John Peurifoy, a month ago told a Senate committee that his security board had fired 91 State Department employees for flagrant sex perversion, he could assure the questioning Senator, STYLES BRIDGES (Republican, New Hampshire) that none of them had slipped back into the State Department, but he had no way of being sure that they hadn't got into some other Federal set-up.

That was testimony on the Senate side of Capitol Hill. Now it's revealed that over on the House side, at the same time, the problem of the security danger of homosexuals in Government was being taken up by a subcommittee headed by JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York. This time, the investigation was directed not at State but at Commerce—where a foreign spy could find a ripe field of operation in Commerce's National Bureau of Standards, in Foreign Trade, in Civil Aeronautics, the Weather Bureau, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Bernard L. Gladieux, executive assistant to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, and in charge of security, was in the witness chair. When the unhappy Gladieux stepped down from the stand, he had been hauled over the coals by Democratic Chairman ROONEY and Republican KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, and CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Ohio.

CALLS COMMERCE STORY INCREDIBLE

ROONEY had kicked the administration's security expert in Commerce brutally—and stated bluntly that in his view Gladieux's testimony was incredible when he said that his operations had failed to uncover a single sex pervert risk among the 46,000 employees.

But it was the tough CLEVENGER who hauled out for the record the fact that because of the directive issued by President Truman, which impounds in secrecy evidence on security dug up by department investigators, the bad security risks kicked out of one department can get another job in the Government—and have.

We quote from the record:

CLEVENGER. "The reason I am asking this (whether you would put other departments on notice in the cases of individuals dropped for sex perversion) is this: It is the third year I have gone through this situation. The identical situation came up a year ago. My question as to whether that was done (notifying other Government departments) is on the record. The forthright reply by the officer was that the President's directive was that this should not be done."

RED HERRING OR DEAD MACKEREL?

"Now, I want to say this, I am not so sure that the Chief Executive in the White House knows the difference between a red herring and a long-dead mackerel, lying in the moonlight, shining and stinking and stinking and shining.

"But I do want to make sure that if we find any more of this sort of tripe in our Government employment that they do not go back on the pay roll in any Government department. After the security effort has been made and these persons are discovered and admit their guilt, I do not think there is any right to whitewash them and let them be reemployed in some other department that has not checked up on them. I'm sticking my neck out, but it's about time somebody did because these people are fooling with the security of our country."

The unhappy Gladieux muttered something about thoroughly agreeing with the Ohioan's sentiments and said his outfit had taken every reasonable precaution to warn other departments about homosexual risks, when the Republican broke in:

"So did this fine officer from this other department. All respect to him, but by presidential directive he was forbidden to do so. I sympathize with him, but I also sympathize with my country when all of us are trying to bolster up its security."

Gladieux got little sympathy from the chairman, ROONEY. When Sawyer's assistant insisted that he had been diligent and cautious in investigating loyalty in the Commerce Department and wound up with a flowery defense and praise of Congress, ROONEY snapped at him:

"That is so much nice language, and to me it doesn't mean a thing. You came up here to acquaint us with the situation in the Department of Commerce. The results are nil. We have not had the cooperation from you that we had from the State Department. You refused to take us into your confidence. I have tried to handle it in an amicable way. You reacted in the other direction. Now we are far apart and will stay that way. They speak of communism in the Department of State. I think the Communist situation is in the Department of Commerce."

Flood Control and River and Harbor Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table:

List of projects showing 1951 budget estimates, House committee allowance, and congressional district

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

Project	Approved budget estimate	House committee allowance	Congressional district
Arizona: Tucson	$700,000	$350,000	2.
Arkansas:			
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	3,500,000	2,500,000	4 and 6.
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	18,000,000	14,000,000	3.
Narrows Reservoir	1,750,000	1,500,000	4.
Nimrod Reservoir	150,600	----------	5.
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.	170,000	150,000	3, Arkansas; 7, Missouri.
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La.	700,000	500,000	4 and 7, Arkansas; 1, Texas; 4 and 8, Louisiana.
West of Morrilton	600,000	----------	5.
California:			
Cherry Valley Reservoir	500,000	450,000	2.
Farmington Reservoir	1,634,000	500,000	3.
Folsom Reservoir	6,500,000	4,000,000	3.
Isabella Reservoir	3,500,000	2,000,000	10.
Los Angeles County drainage area (exclusive of Whittier Narrows Reservoir).	9,500,000	7,500,000	21.
Merced County stream group	234,000	200,000	9 and 2.
Pine Flat Reservoir	13,500,000	10,000,000	9.
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries.	1,000,000	750,000	1, 2, and 3.
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	7,500,000	5,000,000	21.
Connecticut:			
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir	2,800,000	2,000,000	2.
Winsted	88,500	[1] 50,000	5.
Florida: Central and southern Florida.	7,500,000	5,000,000	6 and 4.
Georgia: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	22,000,000	16,000,000	10, Georgia; 3, South Carolina.
Idaho: Lucky Peak Reservoir	5,000,000	3,750,000	2.
Illinois:			
Columbia drainage and levee district.	250,000	100,000	26.
Chouteau, Namcoki, and Venice drainage and levee district.	60,000	[1] 30,000	25.
Degognia and Fountain Bluff drainage and levee district.	160,000	80,000	26.
East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek drainage district.	450,000	400,000	26.
East St. Louis and vicinity	500,000	200,000	25.
Farm Creek Reservoirs	1,000,000	600,000	18.
Galena	298,100	[1] 280,000	16.
Grand tower drainage and levee district.	300,000	200,000	26.
Miller Pond drainage and levee district.	117,700	110,000	26.
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity	200,000	[1] 100,000	26.
Rosiclare	385,000	[1] 350,000	24.
Wood River drainage and levee district.	500,000	250,000	25.
Indiana:			
Cagles Mill Reservoir	2,077,000	1,400,000	6 and 7.
Cannelton	149,500	135,000	8.
Evansville	600,000	300,000	8.
Indianapolis	533,400	400,000	11.
Lawrenceburg	260,000	240,000	9.
New Albany	2,500,000	2,000,000	8.
Iowa:			
Coralville Reservoir	4,500,000	3,500,000	1 and 2.
Little Sioux River	500,000	250,000	7 and 8.
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska. (See Kansas.)			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri.)			
Kansas:			
Fall River Reservoir	40,000	([2])	4.
Hutchinson	750,000	400,000	5.
Kansas City, Mo. and Kans.	7,000,000	5,000,000	3, 4, and 5, Missouri; 2, Kansas.
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska.	7,000,000	5,000,000	7 and 8, Iowa; 1 and 2, Kansas; 2, 3, 4 5, 9, and 12, Missouri; 1, 2, and 3, Nebraska.
Wichita and Valley Center	500,000	100,000	4.
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans. (See Oklahoma.)			
Kentucky:			
Ashland	$1,733,000	$1,100,000	8.
Covington	2,300,000	1,500,000	5.
Dewey Reservoir	1,340,500	([2])	7.
Louisville	4,500,000	3,500,000	3.
Maysville	800,000	600,000	8.
Newport	733,000	[1] 700,000	5.
Wolf Creek Reservoir	22,100,000	[1] 19,000,000	9.
Louisiana:			
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River.	428,000	[1] 375,000	3 and 7.
Mermentau River	1,000,000	800,000	Do.
Shreveport	150,000	[1] 120,000	4.
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
Maryland:			
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va.	1,500,000	1,080,000	6, Maryland; 2, West Virginia.
Savage River Reservoir	1,029,000	[1] 950,000	6.
Massachusetts:			
Adams	500,000	350,000	1.
Knightville Reservoir	50,000	[1] 45,000	1.
North Adams	500,000	350,000	1.
Michigan: Red Run	565,000	[1] 490,000	7 and 17.
Minnesota:			
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers	1,482,100	[1] 1,350,000	9.
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn.	1,800,000	1,000,000	9.
Missouri:			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo.	1,461,000	([2])	1 and 2.
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.)			
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska. (See Kansas.)			
Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3.	400,000	300,000	8, Missouri; 26, Illinois.
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)			
Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)			
Nebraska:			
Harlan County Reservoir	18,000,000	12,000,000	1.
Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska. (See Kansas.)			
New Mexico: Jemez Canyon Reservoir.	1,000,000	500,000	1 and 2 (at large).
New York:			
Hoosick Falls	500,000	[1] 500,000	33.
Hornell	500,000	450,000	39.
Montour Falls	370,000	[1] 340,000	39.
Olean	1,300,000	800,000	45.
Portville	1,300,000	[1] 850,000	45.
North Carolina: Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	30,000,000	27,000,000	4 and 5, Virginia; 2, 4, and 5, North Carolina.
North Dakota:			
Baldhill Reservoir	460,000	([2])	1 and 2 (at large).
Garrison Reservoir	35,000,000	27,000,000	Do.
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)			
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)			
Ohio:			
Dillon Reservoir	2,500,000	1,000,000	15 and 17.
Massillon	624,800	([2])	16.
Muskingum River Reservoirs	1,000,000	500,000	11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.
West Fork of Mill Creek Reservoir.	1,800,000	800,000	2.
Oklahoma:			
Canton Reservoir	375,000	[1] 118,000	6.
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.	1,100,000	[1] 380,000	3, Oklahoma; 4 and 13, Texas.
Fort Gibson Reservoir	9,000,000	5,000,000	1 and 2.
Great Salt Plains Reservoir	43,000	[1] 40,000	8.
Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans.	1,200,000	[1] 600,000	1, Oklahoma; 3, Kan-

See footnotes at end of table.

List of projects showing 1951 budget estimates, House committee allowance, and congressional district—Continued

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL—continued

Project	Approved budget estimate	House committee allowance	Congressional district
Oklahoma—Continued			
Kaw	$138,400	[1] $125,000	8.
Oklahoma City floodway	500,000	----------	5.
Oologah Reservoir	900,000	----------	1.
Polecat Creek	180,000	[1] 160,000	4.
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	8,000,000	5,000,000	2.
Wister Reservoir	431,300	[2]	3.
Oregon:			
Detroit Reservoir	20,000,000	13,000,000	1 and 4.
Dorena Reservoir	800,000	720,000	4.
Fern Ridge Reservoir	56,300	50,000	4.
Lookout Point Reservoir	16,000,000	10,000,000	4.
Umpqua River and tributaries	55,400	50,000	4.
Willamette River (bank protection).	500,000	200,000	1 and 4.
Pennsylvania:			
Conemaugh River Reservoir	9,000,000	7,000,000	26 and 27.
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir.	2,000,000	1,500,000	15 and 19.
Sunbury	1,200,000	850,000	12.
Williamsport	1,200,000	800,000	15.
York	90,100	80,000	21.
South Carolina: Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.)			
South Dakota:			
Fall River Basin	500,000	400,000	2.
Fort Randall Reservoir	37,500,000	28,000,000	1 and 2.
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	6,000,000	3,000,000	Do.
Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.)			
Tennessee:			
Center Hill Reservoir	$6,300,000	[1] $4,800,000	3, 4, and 5.
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek.	750,000	600,000	10.
Texas:			
Belton Reservoir	3,500,000	2,500,000	11.
Benbrook Reservoir	3,000,000	2,000,000	12.
Fort Worth floodway	760,000	650,000	12.
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	4,500,000	3,000,000	13.
Grapevine Reservoir	4,000,000	2,000,000	12 and 13.
Hords Creek Reservoir	50,000	40,000	21.
Lavon Reservoir	4,500,000	3,500,000	4.
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway.	2,800,000	2,000,000	21.
Texarkana Reservoir	4,500,000	3,200,000	1.
Whitney Reservoir	15,000,000	12,000,000	6, 11, and 12.
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.)			
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.)			
Virginia:			
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C. (See North Carolina.)			
Philpott Reservoir	5,000,000	4,000,000	5.
Washington: Mud Mountain Reservoir.	263,900	[1] 200,000	6.
West Virginia:			
Sutton Reservoir	2,000,000	1,300,000	2 and 3.
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.)			
Total, construction	457,877,000	327,838,000	

RIVER AND HARBOR

Alabama: Demopolis lock and dam	$4,000,000	$358,000	1 and 6.
Alaska:			
Nome Harbor	1,156,000	800,000	Delegate.
Wrangell Narrows	750,000	350,000	Do.
Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	850,000	500,000	5 and 6.
California:			
Crescent City Harbor	1,000,000	750,000	1.
Sacramento River 30-foot ship channel.	2,500,000	1,500,000	3, 4, and 5.
San Diego River and Mission Bay	2,500,000	1,500,000	23.
District of Columbia: Potomac River, north side of Washington Channel.	100,000	75,000	
Florida:			
Jim Woodruff lock and dam	5,000,000	3,500,000	3, Florida; 8, Alabama; 2, Georgia.
Jacksonville Harbor	925,000	700,000	2.
Tampa Harbor	200,000	100,000	1.
Georgia:			
Savannah Harbor	600,000	300,000	1.
Buford Dam	1,000,000	400,000	9.
Illinois:			
Illinois waterway mile 0 to 291	1,000,000	700,000	1 through 20.
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers:			
Chain of Rocks	9,000,000	8,000,000	25 and 26, Illinois; 10, 11, 12, 13, Missouri.
Regulating works	850,000	750,000	
St. Anthony Falls, Minn	1,500,000	200,000	3 and 4, Minnesota.
Keokuk Lock, Iowa	1,500,000	----------	1, Iowa; 20, Illinois; 1, Missouri.
Other work	825,000	600,000	2, Iowa; 19, Illinois; 9, Missouri.
Ohio River locks and dams (exclusive of New Cumberland locks and dams, Ohio).	500,000	450,000	8, Indiana; 2, Kentucky.
Ohio River open-channel work	250,250	200,000	1 and 4, West Virginia; 10, 15, 18, and 19, Ohio.
Iowa: Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa.	4,000,000	3,000,000	3, Missouri; 2 and 3, Nebraska; 7 and 8, Iowa.
Kentucky: Cheatham lock and dam, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.	3,000,000	1,800,000	6 and 7, Tennessee; 1, Kentucky.
Louisiana:			
Calcasieu River and Pass	750,000	500,000	7, Louisiana.
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district): Algiers cut-off.	4,000,000	3,000,000	1 and 2.
Pearl River, La. and Miss	750,000	650,000	6, Louisiana; 6, Mississippi.
Waterway from Empire to the Gulf of Mexico.	118,000	60,000	1.
Maine: Portland Harbor	94,000	30,000	1.
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels.	800,000	500,000	1 through 5.
Massachusetts:			
Boston Harbor	380,000	200,000	8 and 10 through 13.
Fall River Harbor	250,000	[2]	14.
Michigan:			
Port Sanilac Harbor	530,750	300,000	7.
St. Marys River	1,300,000	1,200,000	11.
Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth.	$2,500,000	$2,200,000	2, 4, 5, and 9.
Montana: Fort Peck, Missouri River	1,725,000	1,200,000	2.
New Jersey:			
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers.	1,500,000	1,000,000	5 through 14, New Jersey; 2 through 26, New York.
New York and New Jersey Channels.	3,000,000	2,500,000	3 and 5 through 14, New Jersey; 2 through 26, New York.
New York:			
Buffalo Harbor	1,000,000	800,000	42 through 44.
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway.	1,000,000	750,000	31 through 44.
Hudson River channel	350,000	250,000	3 and 5 through 14, New Jersey; 2 through 26, New York.
New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas.	400,000	250,000	Do.
Ohio:			
Cleveland Harbor	3,000,000	2,500,000	20, 21, and 22.
Lorain Harbor	58,000	[1] 50,000	14.
Oregon:			
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to Kennewick, Wash.	259,000	[1] 225,000	2 and 3, Oregon; 3 and 4, Washington.
Columbia River at Bonneville	500,000	300,000	3, Oregon; 3, Washington.
Coos Bay	1,000,000	750,000	4, Oregon.
McNary lock and dam	45,000,000	35,000,000	2, Oregon; 4, Washington.
Pennsylvania:			
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.:			
Lock 2, Pennsylvania	3,780,000	2,750,000	23 to 33, Pennsylvania.
Morgantown lock and dam, West Virginia.	2,000,000	1,500,000	1 and 2, West Virginia.
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	4,000,000	2,500,000	1 through 7.
South Carolina: Georgetown Harbor	480,000	[1] 440,000	6.
Texas:			
Houston Ship Channel	900,000	750,000	8 and 9.
Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district).	2,000,000	1,500,000	2, 8, 9, 14, and 15.
Sabine-Neches waterway	1,500,000	1,000,000	2.
Trinity River Channel to Liberty	1,000,000	750,000	2.
Virginia:			
Norfolk Harbor	1,472,000	850,000	1, 2, and 3.
York Spit Channel	410,000	300,000	1 through 5, Maryland.
Virgin Islands: St. Thomas Harbor	1,500,000	----------	Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.
Washington:			
Chief Joseph Dam	17,500,000	12,000,000	5.
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River	971,000	750,000	3.
Total, construction	150,784,000	105,838,000	

[1] House committee report indicates project should be completed with amount recommended in bill.
[2] House committee report indicates project should be completed with funds heretofore appropriated.

Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article by Norman J. Futor, which recently appeared in 10 Federal Bar Journal 366, with slight revisions. In general, Mr. Futor's position is that:

First. Section 307 is a section which broadens and amplifies section 305 rather than restricting or limiting it.

Second. In cases in which applicability is predicated on expenditures, section 307 has no bearing on section 305.

Third. The distinctions between section 305 and section 308 are "distinctions without a difference"—differences in form rather than differences of substance.

Fourth. Sections 305 and 308 have concurrent applicability but have virtually identical reporting requirements.

Fifth. Neither section 305 nor 308 are limited in any way by any "principal purpose" concept—the only limitation on the applicability of either section is the doctrine of "de minimis non curat lex."

Sixth. The act is constitutional.

Seventh. Section 308 is not affected in any way by section 307.

It is interesting to note that the constitutionality of the act was sustained on March 14, 1950. In the case of *United States* v. *Roger C. Slaughter* (Criminal No. 1433-1448), defendant had filed a motion to dismiss the indictment on the ground that, inter alia, the Lobbying Act is unconstitutional as being so vague and uncertain as to violate the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution and that it offends the first amendment "because it deprives the people of civil liberties thereby protected." In dismissing defendant's motion, and sustaining the indictment—charging defendant with violating section 308 of the act—Judge Schweinhaut rejected the defendant's attack on the constitutionality of the statute.

The judge said that section 308—may stand alone and apart from other provisions and * * * is not on its face unconstitutional. * * * The section does not abridge constitutionally guaranteed privileges (freedom of speech, press, petition, etc.) since it leaves everyone free to exercise those rights, calling upon him only to say for whom he is speaking, who pays him, how much, and the scope in general of his activity with regard to legislation. This, the Congress should and, in the court's opinion, does have the right to demand.

The article follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL LOBBYING ACT [1]

(By Norman J. Futor*)

INTRODUCTION

A basic legislative problem is the adjustment of the conflicting interests represented by the divers State and National organizations of interest groups: teachers organizations, labor organizations, farm organizations, religious organizations, veterans organizations, pension organizations, business organizations, real-estate organizations, public utilities, and so forth.

A legislator knows: (1) That any interest group believes that its program is meritorious and in the public interest; and (2) That

* Trial attorney, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; formerly assistant attorney general of Oklahoma. For a short time the author assisted in the lobbying investigation conducted by Irving R. Kaufman (then special assistant to the Attorney General), now United States district judge (Southern District of New York), and is indebted to Judge Kaufman for acquainting him with many of the problems discussed in this article; however, the views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily represent either the views of Judge Kaufman or the position of the Department of Justice.

[1] Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (60 Stat. 839; 2 U. S. C., ch. 8A):

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(a) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

(b) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(c) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

(d) The term "Clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

(e) The term "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

DETAILED ACCOUNTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be the duty of every person who shall in any manner solicit or receive a contribution to any organization or fund for the purposes hereinafter designated to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions of any amount or of any value whatsoever;

(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution of $500 or more and the date thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization or fund; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made and the date thereof.

(b) It shall be the duty of such person to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure of such funds exceeding $10 in amount, and to preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least 2 years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

RECEIPTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Every individual who receives a contribution of $500 or more for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within 5 days after receipt thereof rendered to the person or organization for which such contribution was received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution and the date on which received.

STATEMENTS TO BE FILED WITH CLERK OF HOUSE

SEC. 305. (a) Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in subparagraphs (a) or (b) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter a statement containing complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more not mentioned in the preceding report; except that the first report filed pursuant to this title shall contain the name and address of each person who has made any contribution of $500 or more to such person since the effective date of this title;

(2) the total sum of the contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

(3) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year;

(4) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such person, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(5) the total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);

(6) the total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

STATEMENT PRESERVED FOR 2 YEARS

SEC. 306. A statement required by this title to be filed with the Clerk—

(a) shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, District of Columbia, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk of its nonreceipt;

(b) shall be preserved by the Clerk for a period of 2 years from the date of filing, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

PERSONS TO WHOM APPLICABLE

SEC. 307. The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and duly organized State or local committees of a political party), who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be

an interest group may oppose him at the next election if he does not vote in accord with its views. In the light of these considerations, it is difficult to make any sense out of those State statutes which purport to require that discussion of legislation with a legislator shall be limited to discussion on the merits.

In the course of gaining election and reelection to office, a legislator has occasion to acquaint himself with the legislative programs of the various interest groups and to appraise the degree of concern which is manifested in such programs by the voters of his district. Unless voters of a legislator's own district display serious concern as to a particular legislative issue, the legislator will not be seriously concerned with the attitude of a particular interest group on that issue. For that reason, the State and national organizations of many interest groups devote considerable effort to stimulating their members (as well as members of the general public) to display a serious and intense interest in the sponsored legislation, so that the legislators may become aware of such interest. Such organizations undertake direct mail campaigns, advertising campaigns, and other campaigns calculated to stimulate activity at the local level.

"Lobbying" is a word which may conveniently be used to designate the processes used by organizations to stimulate such activity by their members (and by the general public) as will impress legislators with their serious interest in the sponsored legislation. "Lobbyist" is a word which may conveniently be used to designate such organizations and to designate their employees (who may be individuals, firms, or corporations). No good purpose is served by those State statutes which define "lobbying" as an attempt to influence legislation by unlawful activities. Since unlawful activities are already covered by other statutes, the word "lobbying" had best be reserved for attempts to influence legislation by lawful means.

In drafting a statute to deal with lobbying, it is not possible to distinguish between good organizations and bad organizations, or good legislation and bad legislation, or good lobbyists and bad lobbyists. Such distinctions can be made only on a subjective basis; there are no objective criteria on which such distinctions can be made. And for a statute, objective criteria are required.

The constructive approach to the problem is to make available, to the legislators and to the general public, statements as to the receipts and expenditures of the interest groups (and their organizations and employees) in connection with their attempts to influence legislation. Statements as to receipts (and sources thereof) and expenditures—and recipients thereof—will give some indication as to what the organizations actually do. It was to require such statements that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was enacted.

---

used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

REGISTRATION WITH SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 308. (a) Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall, between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary a detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purposes; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials; and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other comments, or paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or individual, engages in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to such legislation.

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPORTS AND STATEMENTS TO BE MADE UNDER OATH

SEC. 309. All reports and statements required under this title shall be made under oath, before an officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

PENALTIES

SEC. 310. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title, shall, upon conviction, be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine or not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) In addition to the penalties provided for in subsection (a), any person convicted of the misdemeanor specified therein is prohibited, for a period of 3 years from the date of such conviction, from attempting to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or opposition to proposed legislation; and any person who violates any provision of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 311. The provisions of this title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act nor be construed as repealing any portion of said Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

(Sec. 1 (b) of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Aug. 2, 1946, ch. 753, 60 Stat. 812) is a separability clause applicable to all titles of that act. The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.)

I. NATURE, SCOPE, AND VALIDITY OF REQUIREMENTS

A. Reports and identifying data: The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act requires the filing of reports in connection with the financing of attempts to influence legislation. It is well for all reports to include such identifying data as name and address, nature of business—and name of employer, if any—as well as data on legislative interests, anticipated duration thereof, and publications issued in connection therewith. Some but not all of such identifying data are expressly required by statute; but, by reason of the subject matter of the statute, all of such data serve to meet the requirement of adequate identification—a requirement inherent in the concept of reporting. The act requires that organizations and individuals shall—before beginning activities—register by filing a preliminary report (section 308); and that—after beginning activities—they shall file, for each calendar quarter, a quarterly report (secs. 305 and 308):[2]

(1) The preliminary report states the nature of the anticipated expenses, and (if for an employee) states what the reimbursement is to be for services and for expenses.

(2) The quarterly report is required by both sections 305 and 308 to contain certain financial data; i. e., data as to receipts[3] (in-

---

[2] Particularly in parts II and III of this article, considerable attention will be given to secs. 305, 307, and 308. Detailed treatment does not appear necessary in the case of secs. 303 and 304, and the following statement should suffice:

Sec. 303 requires the keeping of a record of certain data as to receipts and expenditures. Without the keeping of an adequate record, it would not be possible to file adequate quarterly reports.

Sec. 304 requires that, within 5 days after receipt of a $500 contribution, an agent must notify his principal of: (a) amount received; (b) date of receipt; (c) name and address of contributor. Were it not for sec. 304, a principal might prefer that the agent not give formal notice of the contributors' names; then the principal could file its quarterly reports without giving the names, and if a question were ever raised, the principal could plead that it had assumed that the lump sum which had been turned over by the agent had been received in the form of small contributions; and, in such a case, the agent could obligingly admit that he had failed to communicate full data to the principal. By penalizing an agent who delays more than 5 days in giving notice of all the data in question, sec. 304 serves to discourage such maneuvering.

[3] Receipts: In this context the terms "receipts" and "contributions" may be used interchangeably. "Contribution" is defined as "that which is contributed" and "contribute" is defined as: "to give (money or other aid) for a special object" (Webster's New International Dictionary; 13 C. J. S. 1318). "'Contribution' * * * may be employed as equivalent to, or synonymous with 'assessment' * * * and 'dues' * * *" (18 C. J. S. 1 citing *Jones* v. *Loaleen Mut. Ben. Assn.*, 169 NE 254, 258, 337 Ill. 431, and *Mueller* v. *Grand Cove, U. A. O. D.*, 72 NW 48, 69 Minn. 236). Thus, things of value con-

cluding contributions and loans [4]), sources [5] thereof, expenditures [6] (including loans [7]),

tributed to organizations and individuals may be considered as having been paid to or received by them and include such items as fees, salaries, and commissions received by them. The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, including printed or duplicated matter. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual, for such printed or duplicated matter, is a contribution. Sec. 302 (a) of the act, dealing with "contribution," does not purport to limit the definition of the term, but extends its application as follows:

Sec. 302 (a): "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution."

Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes. (See note 5.)

[4] Loans received are to be reported. (See note 3.) But since repayment will be involved, loan transactions are to be kept separate from other items of receipt or expenditure. In order that there may be a coherent running account in the quarterly report, the following are to be indicated: (1) Total now owed to others on account of loans; (2) borrowed from others during this quarter; (3) repaid to others during this quarter.

[5] Sources of receipts: It is required that the report identify each contributor whose contributions, from January 1 through the current quarter, total $500 or more.

Salary, commission, or fee can be considered a contribution for personal services, but identification in such case is accomplished when the contributor is named as employer.

An employee is to file, each quarter, as many reports as he has employers; except that: (1) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, by all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (2) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single report—naming both persons as employers—is to be filed each quarter.

[6] Sec. 302 (b): "The term 'expenditures' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure."

Expenditures involve such items as public relations and advertising services; wages, salaries, commissions, and fees; contributions to other persons; printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost; office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.); telephone and telegraph; travel and taxi; lodging, food, and entertainment.

[7] Loans made to other persons are to be reported. (See note 6.) But since repayment will be involved, loan transactions are to be kept separate from other items of expenditure or receipt. In order that there may be a coherent running account in the quarterly report, the following are to be indicated: (1) Total now owed to person filing; (2) lent to others during this quarter; (3) repayment received during this quarter.

[8] Recipients of expenditures: The report is to specify name and address of each recipient of an expenditure (including loans), and the date, amount, and purpose thereof. Section 305 provides a $10 limitation while section 308 provides no express limitation. But under the maxim de minimis non curat lex, no express limitation is necessary in the case of a person receiving less than $10 in the entire calendar year—such an item is too inconsequential to require identification.

[9] The term "person" as used in the Lobbying Act includes organizations as well as individuals. For the statutory definition of "person," see sec. 302 (c) of the act, set forth in note 1. For the statutory definition of "legislation," see sec. 302 (e) of the act, set forth in note 1.

[10] The distinctions to be made between secs. 305 and 308 are "distinctions without a difference"—see part II of this article, particularly subdivisions "C" and "D" thereof. See also note 64.

[11] *Bristol-Myers Co.* v. *Lit Bros.* (336 Pa. 81, 6A. 2d 843, 848 (1939)): "The court is not bound to a strictness at once harsh and pedantic in the application of statutes. The law permits the qualification implied in the ancient maxim, de minimis non curat lex. Where there are irregularities of very slight consequence, it does not intend that the infliction of penalties should be inflexibly severe. If the deviation were a mere trifle, which, if continued in practice would weigh little or nothing in the public interest, it might properly be overlooked."

[12] *United States* v. *Hocking Valley Ry. Co.* (194 Fed. 234, 249, 250 (N. D. Ohio 1911)).

[13] *Natl. Labor Relations Bd.* v. *Cowell Portland C. Co.* (108 F. 2d 198, 201 (CCA 9th, 1939)): "The quantity of cement shipped out of State was not de minimis merely because it is but a small percentage of respondent's total sales. Otherwise, we would have the anomaly of one plant under Federal regulation because exporting its entire product of 14,000 barrels while alongside it another competing plant under State regulation because, though shipping the same amount of 14,000 barrels, they constituted, say, but 4 percent of its product."

and recipients [8] thereof [9]. Compliance with both sections 305 and 308 can be accomplished by a single report.[10]

B. De minimis non curat lex: By reason of the de minimis doctrine, there can be no prosecution under the Lobbying Act for failure to file reports, in case only trivial amounts are involved in the attempt to influence legislation [11]—just as there can be no prosecution under the Interstate Commerce Act in the case of discrimination in rates, when the amount involved is trivial. In *United States* v. *Hocking Valley Ry. Co.*,[12] the court sustained an indictment charging a discrimination in rates in violation of the Interstate Commerce Act. The indictment had been attacked on the ground that the Interstate Commerce Act was too broad in scope, in that "mazes of complaints, involving matters of little consequence," could arise. But the court held that this fact presented no "occasion for alarm," since—

"Criminal law, as well as civil, honors the maxim 'De minimis non curat lex' which has controlling application to the enforcement of [such] a statute."

It has been held that the value of 14,000 barrels of cement could not be considered de minimis merely because it constituted only 4 percent of the manufacturer's product.[13] On the other hand, it has been held that a $150 loss, resulting from a trustee's erroneous extension of credit, should be considered de minimis in view of the fact that the trustee supervised a vast amount of funds.[14]

C. Definiteness: The Lobbying Act would appear to be sufficiently definite. In the *Hocking Valley* case, supra, the Interstate Commerce Act was also attacked on the ground that it was "void for indefiniteness" because "the law leaves it to each jury to determine the scope of its operation, and makes possible that in the same state of facts one jury may find an offense and another nothing reprehensible, and therefore one engaging in practices susceptible [of being characterized as unlawful] * * * cannot know in advance whether he is violating the law."

But the court held that such a contention "overlooks the function of the court in an attempt to enforce the law criminally. It is for the court to first pass upon the application of the law to the facts which a prosecution offers against a defendant. The proper performance of this duty leaves to the jury no latitude for speculation on the question which is the court's alone."

D. Constitutionality: It can reasonably be asserted that the Lobbying Act is constitutional. But because it embraced a field which had not theretofore been the subject of Federal legislation, there are those who have looked on the act with suspicion. For some people, "unfamiliar" tends to be synonymous with "void for indefiniteness" and "unconstitutional." Until the newness had worn off, Workmen's Compensation statutes were held unconstitutional in many jurisdictions.

For many years, a large number of States have had statutes requiring registration by those attempting to influence legislation, and none of such statutes has ever been held unconstitutional. The Kentucky statute was held constitutional in the following language:

"The Bill of Rights declares it to be an inherent and inalienable right of all men to apply to those invested with the power of government for all proper purposes by petition, address, or remonstrance. There is no attempt in this law to restrict the legitimate exercise of that right. * * *

"To protect its members, and for its own information, the legislature undoubtedly had the right to require the registration of special interests and to regulate their activities." [15]

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act [16]—on which the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was patterned [17]—has been held constitutional.[18]

E. Income-tax exemption: An income-tax exemption is (by 26 U. S. C., sec. 101 (6)) granted to certain types of organizations, "no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation." The mere act—of filing reports pursuant to the Lobbying Act—does not, per se, indicate that the activity of attempting to influence legislation is such a substantial part of such organization's activities as to deprive such organization of the tax exemption.

[14] *Wilson* v. *Kable* (177 Va. 668, 15 S. E. 2d 56 (1941)), eighth syllabus: "Under the de minimis doctrine that trustee who supervised vast amounts of funds for military school erroneously authorized extension of credit to instructor, resulting in loss of $150 of school funds, would not constitute a breach of trust which would authorize trustee's removal or liability against trustee for such loss."

[15] *Campbell* v. *Commonwealth* (229 Ky. 264, 271, 17 S. W. 2d 227, 230 (1929)).

[16] 43 Stat. 1070 et seq.; 2 U. S. C., ch. 8.

[17] See part II (A) of this article.

[18] *Burroughs* v. *United States*, (290 U. S. 534 (1934)). See also *ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S. 651 (1884)).

II. ORIGINS AND APPLICABILITY OF THE ACT

A. Origins and applicability in general [19]

Introductory: An inquiry into the origins of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act requires that attention be given to an adaptation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which was introduced as H. R. 11223 (74th Cong.), February 17, 1936. The nine sections of H. R. 11223 were combined with a section adapted from S. 2512 (74th Cong.) to form H. R. 11663 (74th Cong.) introduced March 6, 1936. Two significantly different versions of H. R. 11663 came to a vote in the House of Representatives in the Seventy-fourth Congress: The original version of H. R. 11663 (hereinafter referred to as "narrow 11663") had narrow applicability provisions, while the amended version of H. R. 11663 (hereinafter referred to as "broad 11663") had broad applicability provisions. "Narrow 11663" was passed by the House (March 27, 1936), while "broad 11663" was defeated by the House (June 17, 1936) by a vote of more than three to one. But the Lobbying Act was patterned after "broad 11663" rather than "narrow 11663." A more detailed treatment is set forth below.

H. R. 11223, S. 2512, H. R. 11663: All nine sections of H. R. 11223 (introduced February 17, 1936) were carried virtually unchanged into H. R. 11663 (introduced March 6, 1936):

(a) Sections 1–6 of H. R. 11223 became sections 1–6 of H. R. 11663. (It was from these sections that secs. 302–307 of the Lobbying Act were derived.)

(b) Sections 7, 8, 9 of H. R. 11223 were carried into H. R. 11663 as sections 8, 9, 10, in order that the designation of section 7 in H. R. 11663 could be given to a section patterned after S. 2512 (which had been passed by the Senate April 28, 1935); thus, there was brought before the House a measure which did not altogether ignore the views of the Senate.[20] (It was from sec. 7 of H. R. 11663 that sec. 308 of the Lobbying Act was derived.)

The two versions of H. R. 11663: Although "narrow 11663" had passed the House on March 27, 1936, "broad 11663" which had been broadened by a conference committee [21] came to a vote and was defeated by more than three to one on June 17, 1936. The significant differences between "narrow 11663" and "broad 11633" were in sections 4 and 7, as follows:

(a) Section 4 of "narrow 11663" did not authorize predication of applicability on expenditures. In "broad 11663," section 4 was broadened to authorize predication of applicability on expenditures.

(b) Section 7 of "narrow 11663" was applicable only to those who "accept employment." In "broad 11663," section 7 was broadened so as to be applicable to those who "engage" themselves.

Difference in attitude: Seventy-fourth and Seventy-ninth Congresses: The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, would have been defeated in the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress. The Lobbying Act is patterned after "broad 11663" which, because of its broad coverage, had been defeated by the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress by a vote of more than three to one, scarcely more than 2 months after the House had passed "narrow 11663":

(a) Section 305 of the Lobbying Act follows section 4 of "broad 11663" in authorizing predication of applicability on expenditures. In section 4 of "narrow 11663," predication of applicability was limited to contributions.

(b) Section 308 of the Lobbying Act follows section 7 of "broad 11663" in being applicable to those who "engage" themselves, rather than those who "accept employment" (as in section 7 of "narrow 11663").

B. Origins and applicability of section 305 and section 307

"Expenditures" dropped. As stated above, sections 4 and 6 of "narrow 11663" had been taken from H. R. 11223 without even a change of section numbers. Section 4 had been adapted from section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act,[22] which authorizes predication of applicability on "expenditures" as well as "contributions," but section 4 dropped "expenditures" as a category on which applicability could be predicated.[23] Thus, under section 4, predication of applicability was expressly authorized only on contributions received directly, which were to be used "in whole" for (or for the "sole purpose" of) influencing legislation. It was for that reason that section 6 was added—making explicit the applicability of section 4 to "Indirect," [24] "Multipurpose," [25] and "Other purposes" [26] contributions.[27]

"Expenditures" restored: Section 4 of "broad 11663" returned to the provisions of section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act [28] in authorizing the predication of applicability on expenditures as well as on contributions, and those provisions were carried into section 305 of the Lobbying Act. And the provisions of the Lobbying Act were derived) could not be used to extend the range of the applicability provisions which precede them. Thus—even though a numbered paragraph in sec. 4 required the reporting of expenditures—applicability could not be predicated on expenditures, as long as the first sentence of sec. 4 did not contain the phrase "or expending any money." If, because of contributions received, sec. 4 became applicable to a person, then it was required that expenditures as well as contributions be reported.

[19] Derivation of form of Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act:

	Federal regulation of Lobbying Act	H. R. 11663 [a]		H. R. 11223	Federal Corrupt Practices Act
		"Broad"	"Narrow"		
Short title	Sec. 301				Sec. 301.
Definitions	Sec. 302abcde			Sec. 1abcd	Sec. 302defg.
Records required	Sec. 303a (1–4) b.			Sec. 2 (1–4) (5) c.	Sec. 303b (1–4)
Recording contributions	Sec. 304			Sec. 3	Sec. 304.
Applicability provisions	Sec. 305a			Sec. 4	Sec. 305a.
Reporting requirements	(1–6)			(1–6)	(1–6).
Cumulative requirement	b			(7)	b.
Manner of filing	Sec. 306ab			Sec. 5bc	Sec. 308bc.
Amplifying applicability	Sec. 307			Sec. 6	
Requirements rephrased	Sec. 308	Sec. 7	Sec. 7 (from S. 2512).		
Oath required	Sec. 309	Sec. 9	[Sec. 5a]	[Sec. 5a]	[Sec. 308a].
Penalties	Sec. 310	Sec. 10	Sec. 8	Sec. 7	Sec. 314.
Separability clause [b]		Sec. 12	Sec. 9	Sec. 8	Sec. 317.
Excepts activities covered by Corrupt Practices Act.	Sec. 311	Sec. 13	Sec. 10	Sec. 9	

[a] Secs. 1–6 of H. R. 11663 were taken from Secs. 1–6 of H. R. 11223 without change in form.
[b] Sec. 1 (b) of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Aug. 2, 1946, ch. 753, 60 Stat. 812) is a separability clause applicable to all titles of that act.

[20] S. 2512 was introduced April 4, 1935, passed by the Senate April 28, 1935, and referred to the House Judiciary Committee June 5, 1935. H. R. 11223 was introduced Feb. 17, 1936. H. R. 11663 was introduced Mar. 6, 1936, and reported out by the House Judiciary Committee Mar. 19, 1936.

[21] Appointment of the conference committee had resulted from the action of the Senate in striking all after the enacting clause, substituting other language, and passing H. R. 11663 as so amended.

[22] Sec. 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act makes the requirements of paragraphs 1 through 6 applicable to a "political committee" which is defined by sec. 302 (c) of the Corrupt Practices Act to include "any * * * organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence [etc.]."

[23] The six numbered paragraphs setting forth the reporting requirements of sec. 4 (from which the paragraphs of sec. 305 of

[24] "Indirect" contributions: In the case of receiving contributions indirectly, sec. 6 serves to give sec. 4 the same applicability as sec. 4 has in the case of direct receipt of contributions.

[25] "Multi-purpose" contributions: Just before "narrow 11663" was passed by the House, sec. 6 was amended by substituting the word "principally" for the words "in whole or in part." The result of the amendment was as follows: In the case of contributions—to be used principally to aid in influencing legislation but partly for other purposes—sec. 6 serves to give sec. 4 the same explicit applicability which sec. 4 has in the case of a contribution to be used wholly to aid in influencing legislation. Before the amendment: sec. 6 served to make sec. 4 applicable in the case of any contribution to be used partly to aid in influencing legislation and partly for other purposes.

[26] "Other purposes" contributions: In the case of persons whose principal purpose is to aid in influencing legislation, sec. 6 makes it possible for the applicability of sec. 4 to be predicated on the receipt of contributions which are allegedly received for "other purposes" than influencing legislation.

[27] The significant parts of secs. 4 and 6 of "narrow 11663" are quoted below. The great difference between sec. 4 and sec. 305 of the Lobbying Act is the inclusion of "expenditures" in sec. 305 as a category on which applicability can be predicated. There is no material difference between sec. 307 and sec. 6 as quoted below.

Sec. 4: "Every * * * person receiving any contributions * * * for the (purpose of influencing legislation) * * * shall file * * * a statement (etc.)."

Sec. 6: "The provisions * * * shall apply to any (person) * * * (except a political committee (etc.) * * *) * * * who * * * directly or indirectly * * * receive(s) money or other thing of value (1) to be used principally to aid, or (2) the principal purpose of which person is * * * to aid(,) in (influencing legislation) * * *."

Since alternatives "(1)" and "(2)" are separated by the disjunctive "or," they may be stated separately, as follows:

(1) "The provisions * * * shall apply to any (person) * * * who * * * directly or indirectly * * * receive(s) money or other thing of value to be used principally to aid * * * in (influencing legislation).

(2) "The provisions * * * shall apply to any (person) * * * who * * * directly or indirectly * * * receive(s) money or other thing of value(,) * * * the principal purpose of which person is * * * to aid in (influencing legislation)."

In alternative "(2)" above, the word "is" appears to be an unfortunate usage—"being" would have been better.

[28] See note 22.

of section 6 of "narrow 11663" were carried into "broad 11663" and thence into section 307 of the Lobbying Act; however, the Lobbying Act and "broad 11663" had no more need for such provisions than did the Corrupt Practices Act. Since section 4 of "broad 11663," section 305 of the Lobbying Act, and section 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act authorize predication of applicability on expenditures as well as on contributions—contributions (in the case of these measures)—are of no practical consequence in determining applicability: (1) The purpose of an expenditure is easier to establish; (2) expenditures are less subject to ambiguities.

Effect of headnote: As above stated, provisions carried from section 6 of H. R. 11223 into "narrow 11663" and "broad 11663" finally became section 307 of the Lobbying Act, with the headnote "To whom applicable." But section 305 (with the headnote "Statements to be filed with the Clerk of the House") contains the basic applicability provision, as follows: "Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated * * * shall file a statement * * * [etc.]." The headnote of section 307 cannot alter the fact that the section itself merely makes explicit the applicability of section 305 to "multipurpose," "indirect," and "other purposes" contributions.[29] In *United States* v. *Sischo*,[30] Mr. Justice Holmes said, in an opinion for the Court, reversing judgment for defendant in a smuggling case:

"There is no canon against making explicit what is implied and adding a little emphasis to the endeavors to make the proposition broad."

Section 307 contains language extending and amplifying the applicability of section 305 rather than language of restriction or limitation.[31] In the case cited, supra, Mr. Justice Holmes said that there was no canon requiring that the words of a statute be interpreted restrictively when—

"The words on their face indicate rather an extension than a restriction * * *. It is a most unnatural way of saying that henceforth * * * [such statute] shall not include something that otherwise might have been included."

No ambiguity results from any headnote in the Lobbying Act, but—even if it did—"resort may not be had to a headnote to a section to create an ambiguity."[32]

[29] See notes 24 through 27.

[30] 262 U. S. 165, 168, 169.

[31] Observe how differently a restriction would read:

(1) A restriction could have been modeled on sec. 311: "The provisions of this title shall not apply to persons who do not have as their principal purpose, etc."

(2) A restriction could have been modeled on the parenthetical exception contained in sec. 307 itself: "The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except persons who do not have as their principal purpose, etc.)."

(3) Still another method of imposing a restriction would have been as follows: "The provisions of this title shall apply only to those persons whose principal purpose, etc."

[32] "Whatever ambiguity there may be grows out of the language of the headnotes to the section. They might indicate that, at some time during the progress of the bill through the houses of the legislature, there was in the body of the section a provision extending the term for another year in case of default in giving notice. * * * A headnote is, in no proper sense, a title. In some sense it is an index. Plainly, where the language of the act itself is clear and unambiguous, resort may not be had to a headnote to a section to create an ambiguity, and thereby to furnish a reason for supplying an alleged omission." (*Trader* v. *Jester* (40 Del. 66, 1 A. 2d 609, 613 [1938]).)

"The general revenue bill of 1925 * * *, in fixing privilege taxes, contains the following:

"Mineral water dealers: Each person, firm, or corporation, selling either distilled water or water from springs or wells, or mineral water for drinking or other commercial purposses shall pay a tax as follows.'

* * * * *

"It is argued that the subtitle 'Mineral water dealers' indicates that it was not the intention of the legislature * * * to include one dealing in plain drinking water, containing no mineral or medicinal properties, and for this reason it is insisted complainant is not liable for this tax.

" 'Mineral water dealers' is, however, only a subtitle. It is not the caption of the act, and in no wise, therefore, restricts the scope of the act. The section of the act above set out clearly imposes the tax upon one engaged in the business of selling 'either distilled water or water from springs or well or mineral water,' thus clearly including such a business as that of complainant." (*Seven Springs Water Co.* v. *Kennedy* (156 Tenn. 1, 299 S. W. 792, 793 [1927]).)

C. Origins and applicability of section 308

Section 308 of the Lobbying Act was patterned after section 7 of broad 11663 rather than section 7 of narrow 11663. Section 308 requires the filing of reports by "any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation."[33] Section 308 may be considered applicable to organizations[34] as well as individuals and to employers as well as employees. The language of section 308 means that reports are required of any organization or individual which shall engage itself for pay or for any cause "for the purpose of attempting to influence * * * legislation." According to 14 Words and Phrases 592, [35] the judicial construction of "engage" is that: "It does not import that the person so employed must be in the employ of another." And, according to 3 Words and Phrases 563,[36] the phrase "for any consideration" is judicially construed to be synonymous with "any motive" or "for any cause."[37]

D. Concurrent applicability of sections 305 and 308

Upon analysis it will be found that the distinctions to be made between sections 305 and 308 are distinctions without a difference. The differences which exist are differences in phraseology rather than differences in substance—differences in form rather than differences in function.[38] In the

[33] It is stated in sec. 308 that "the provisions of this section shall not apply" in certain instances. It is interesting to note that public officials and newspaper owners and employees are the only occupational categories given special consideration—lawyers are not included:

(1) Newspaper owners or employees: When the owners or employees (of a regularly published newspaper or other periodical) make committee appearances—or in the ordinary course of business, publish comments, news items, or advertisements which may tend to influence legislation—receipts and expenditures occurring in the ordinary course of such publishing business are not receipts and expenditures to which the provisions of sec. 308 apply. But if the attempt to influence legislation involves receipts or expenditures outside the ordinary course of such publishing business, the provisions of sec. 308 would appear to apply.

(2) Public officials: When a public official, acting in his official capacity, makes committee appearances—or otherwise attempts to influence legislation—his official receipts and expenditures are not receipts and expenditures to which the provisions of sec. 308 apply.

(3) Other persons: For the average citizen, appearing before a congressional committee would mean a loss of earnings—it would involve taking time out from gainful employment. Sec. 308 provides that "* * * this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears [etc.]." The use of the word "merely," restricts the exemption so that it includes the average citizen but would seem to exclude persons who make committee appearances in connection with their gainful employment. In the case of those lawyers, economists, and others—who make committee appearances tending to further the interests of those whom they are paid to serve—their appearances would seem to be in the category of gainful employment, regardless of whether such appearances are expressly required by their contracts of employment.

[34] See note 9.

[35] Stating the holding in *Carpenter* v. *Strickland* (20 S. C. 1, 5), as follows: "In General Statutes, chapter 2397, giving a mortgage lien to persons making advances to any person or persons who are 'employed' or about to engage in the cultivation of the soil, 'employed' is synonymous with the word 'engaged,' and includes those who are already engaged, as well as those about to engage, in the cultivation of the soil. It does not import that the person so employed must be in the employ of another. The statute does not authorize a mere employee to give a lien."

[36] Sixth syllabus: "Under Revised Penal Code, section 618, making it an offense to buy or receive in any manner upon 'any consideration,' property knowing that it has been stolen, the gist of the offense is the buying or receiving with such knowledge, and an information is not bad for omitting to allege that the property was bought or received 'upon any consideration'; that phrase being synonymous with 'any motive' or 'for any cause.' " *State* v. *Pirkey* (118 NW 1042, 22 S. D. 550, 18 Ann. Cas. 192 (1908)).

[37] If this were a section applicable to employees only:

(1) It would have followed "Narrow 11663" instead of "Broad 11663," by using the expression "accept employment" instead of "engage himself." In debate on "Narrow 11663" the expression "accept employment" had been criticized because it did not cover those who—although "engaged" in lobbying—could not be said to have "accepted employment" in connection with lobbying (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4515, 4518).

(2) Instead of repeating the preposition "for," to make a second prepositional phrase ("for pay or for any consideration"), section 308 would have used a single phrase (for pay or any other consideration), in order that the rule of ejusdem generis could limit the word "consideration" to a contractual connotation.

[38] Comparison of secs. 305 and 308:

(1) Sec. 308 (but not sec. 305) requires identification of employers, while sec. 305 (but not sec. 308) requires identification of contributors of $500 or more. But the result is simply that persons having no employers to identify or contributors to identify will state in their reports that they have none. (See note 5.)

(2) In the matter of identifying recipients of expenditures, sec. 305 provides a $10 limitation while sec. 308 provides no express limitation. But under the maxim de minimis non curat lex, no express limitation is necessary in the case of a person receiving

case of requiring a report as to receipts and expenditures, it is doubtful that any meaningful distinction can be drawn between different categories of persons, regardless of how the statute is drafted. Receipts and expenditures will still be receipts and expenditures, whether the amounts are large or small, and whether reported by an employer or an employee. Since sections 305 and 308 have substantially the same requirements, it is practically as simple for the quarterly report to accomplish compliance with both sections as with a single section. Thus, the fact that sections 305 and 308 have concurrent applicability (in the sense that each covers the entire field) does not add to the reporting burden. It is true that section 308 requires a person to register by filing a preliminary report, but this (aside from identifying data) need only state the nature of the anticipated expenses, and (if for an employee) state what the reimbursement is to be for services and for expenses.[39]

III. CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE [40]

A. Debate on narrow 11663

Amendments considered: When "narrow 11663" was before the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress, consideration was given to two amendments which, for convenience, may be designated as the "$5 amendment" and the "'principally' amendment":

(a) "Five-dollar amendment": An amendment to section 4 was proposed, under which it would not be necessary to identify contributors of less than $5.[41] It was pointed out that section 4—requiring identification of all contributors without limitation as to amount—would place a very heavy burden on large organizations having hundreds of thousands of dues-paying members.[42] (It would be necessary to identify each dues-payer because section 6 of "narrow 11663", as taken from H. R. 11223, extended the applicability of section 4 to contributions made even in part for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation.)[43] But the $5 amendment was defeated.[44]

(b) "'Principally' amendment": After defeating the "$5 amendment," the House passed the "'principally' amendment."[45] This amendment substituted the word "principally" for the words "in whole or in part" in section 6.[46]

Effect of "'principally' amendment": Before adoption of the amendment, some concern was expressed, by Members of the House, as to the effect which "narrow 11663" would have on a large number of organizations.[47] But little criticism of "narrow 11663" was voiced after adoption of the amendment,[48] and the bill was passed by the House on March 27, 1936.[49] After all, "narrow 11663" did not authorize predication of applicability on expenditures—applicability could be predicated only on contributions. And, while the contributions could be partly for other purposes, it was necessary that they be principally to aid in influencing legislation (unless the principal purpose of the organization was to influence legislation). This meant a very narrow coverage.

B. Debate on "broad 11663"

Introductory. In part II–A, supra, entitled "Origins and Applicability in General" is a paragraph entitled "The Two Versions of H. R. 11663," in which it is pointed out that: (a) Section 4 of "narrow 11663" did not authorize predication of applicability on expenditures; whereas, in "broad 11663," section 4 was broadened to authorize predication of applicability on expenditures; (b) section 7 of "narrow 11663" was applicable only to those who "accept employment"; whereas, in "broad 11663," section 7 was broadened so as to be applicable to those who "engage" themselves.

In part III–A, supra, entitled "Debate on 'narrow 11663'" is a paragraph entitled "Effect of 'principally' amendment." That paragraph deals with the adoption by the House of an amendment to section 6, substituting the word "principally" for the words "in whole or in part." Adoption of this amendment may be considered an acknowledgment by the House that the words "principal purpose" (in sec. 6) did not effect an exemption for organization "not organized for the principal purpose of influencing legislation"; because—had such organizations been so exempt—questions as to the use of their receipts would have been irrelevant; i. e., whether their receipts were used "in whole," "in part," or "principally" for influencing legislation, such organizations would still have been exempt.

Proponents of "broad 11663." When "broad 11663" was before the House in the Seventy-fourth Congress, one of the three Members who spoke in favor of the bill said: "Someone has said this will not affect the utilities. That is exactly what it is intended to affect." He also said: "The American Federation of Labor is not affected * * * because [it] * * * is not organized for the principal purpose of affecting legislation." [50] Another of these three Members said: "* * * This bill does reach * * * the American Federation of Labor." [51]

Opponents of "broad 11663." Thirteen Members of the House spoke against "broad 11663." One of them—after referring to the American Federation of Labor, United States Chamber of Commerce, and National Association of Manufacturers—warned that: "In this debate it will be insisted that this legislation will not affect these organizations." He insisted that "broad 11663" was applicable to them and went on to say:

"Indeed, it does not end there. The law would be applicable to all farm organizations, all patriotic organizations, all women's clubs, all peace societies—in fact, to every group or organization which might, directly or indirectly, be interested in the passage or in preventing the passage of any given legislation. The Members of this body will realize the magnitude and far-reaching effect of any such proposition. * * *

* * * * *

"I think I speak for the Judiciary Committee when I say that no one doubted but that these various organizations would be included." [52]

The other 12 Members who spoke against "broad 11663" in the House indicated accord with the views above quoted.[53] The bill was defeated in the House by a vote of more than 3 to 1,[54] apparently because of its broad coverage.[55]

C. Debate on the Lobbying Act [56]

When the bill which became the Lobbying Act was considered in the House four Members spoke on the measure. The first discussed sections 307 and 308 but not section 305, and advocated passage of the measure.[57] The second and the third opposed the measure in language which is quoted, in part, below. And the fourth Member expressed accord with the views of the third.[58]

The second Member who spoke on the measure said:

"Mr. Chairman, with the centralization of Government which has grown up in the past number of years, it is almost necessary for organizations like the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation to have their representatives here practically all the time * * *

"I am not in favor of corrupt lobbyists, yet * * * if you estop the people of this country from being able to come down here in decent form and under the Constitution petition this Congress you are doing a great disservice to this country." [59]

---

less than $10 during an entire calendar year—such an item is too unconsequential to require identification.

(3) Section 308 specifies both House and Senate as repositories for reports, while sec. 305 specifies only the House. But since secs. 305 and 308 have substantially the same requirements, it is practically as simple for the quarterly report to accomplish compliance with both sections as with a single section. Thus, for one section (sec. 308) to require the filing of such report with the Secretary of the Senate, has the same result in practice as if both sections required such filing, since secs. 305 and 308 have concurrent applicability. (See notes 10 and 64.)

(4) Section 305, but not sec. 308, requires that the report shall be cumulative for the calendar year. But this merely involves copying the totals from the preceding report into the current report and adding them to the figures for the current quarter.

(5) The instrument which is to be filed each quarter is termed a "statement" by sec. 305 while it is termed a "report" by sec. 308. But this is obviously a distinction without a difference.

(6) In the matter of reporting income, sec. 305 requires a report of contributions while sec. 308 requires a report of receipts. This is another distinction without a difference. (See note 3.)

[39] See notes 10 and 64.

[40] For certain aspects of the congressional debate which are not considered here, see Futor, An Analysis of the Federal Lobbying Act (1949), 10 Fed. B. J. 366 at 381.

[41] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4533.

[42] The history of the reporting requirement, as to identifying contributors, begins with the Corrupt Practices Act. Under that act, the requirement is limited in that it applies only in the case of contributors of $100 or more. But when H. R. 11223 was adapted from the act, the limitation was dropped, and the requirement was made applicable without limitation as to amount. This unlimited requirement was carried into "narrow 11663," and "broad 11663." But, under the Lobbying Act, the requirement is made to apply only in the case of contributors of $500 or more.

[43] See notes 25, 27.

[44] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4534.

[45] Id. at 4535.

[46] See notes 25, 27.

[47] 80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4516, 4519–4522, 4530–4534.

[48] Id. at 4535.

[49] Id. at 4541.

[50] Id. at 9751.

[51] Id. at 9748.

[52] Id. at 9746–9748.

[53] Id. at 9432–9434, 9743, 9747–9750.

[54] Id. at 9752.

[55] The following statement, made by a proponent of the measure, clearly explains why it has such broad coverage:

"We could not write a bill here and say that it shall apply to the utility companies, but that the bill shall not apply to the Townsend plan or the Coughlin plan or some other plan * * *. Are gentlemen prepared to say that we want a bill that will apply to the utilities and yet will not apply to somebody else who is doing the same kind of thing? * * *" (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9751).

[56] As has been pointed out earlier, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was patterned after "broad 11663"—the version which the House, in the 74th Cong., had defeated by a vote of more than 3 to 1, because of its broad coverage.

[57] 92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10088–10090.

[58] Id. at 10091.

[59] Id. at 10090.

The third Member who spoke on the measure said:

"Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we are violating the Constitution. It is directly implied in the Constitution that we have no right to intimidate people * * * so that they cannot petition the Congress. What is this but intimidation? It is the same sort of curb you put on enemy agents during the war.

* * * * *

"How have the damaging bills that have come through this Congress heretofore been brought up? They have been brought here by a group of financiers in New York who see somebody down here in the bureaucracy and start these things like Bretton Woods, the British loan, and all of these other things that are unconstitutional. The bureaucracy sees all these CIO's, women's clubs, business groups, and so forth, and lines them up; then day after day we are bombarded with letters * * *

"What does this bill do? It says that if the man whose business is going to be taken by the OPA or the Bretton Woods agreement or the British loan or some of the rest of this iniquitous legislation hires a lawyer, the lawyer has to register exactly the same as an enemy agent registered during the war.

"Mr. Chairman, the people are going to soon rise up and stop this totalitarian way into which this Government has fallen recently." [60]

The following colloquy in the Senate is of particular interest because of the fact that Senator LaFollette was coauthor of the measure:

"Mr. HAWKES. Some of the finest organizations in the United States are somewhat concerned lest the provision against lobbying be constructed to apply to institutions such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, for instance. Does not the bill contain language to the effect 'if they are organized to do a business of lobbying principally'? Is not the word 'principally' used in the bill? And does that not mean something to the Senator?

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It will all depend on the type of activity that is carried on. I cannot give the Senator a blanket interpretation.

* * * * *

"Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, there is no exemption of the chamber of commerce from the provisions of the measure.

"Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Nor any other organization." [61]

Also of interest is the following statement made in the Senate:

"Mr. MCMAHON. The Senator [MCCLELLAN] spoke of the CIO, the PAC, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and other organizations. I want the RECORD to show that personally I should like to have them all come under the provisions of this bill, together with 500 or more others that ought to come under it also." [62]

Thus, in the case of the measure which became the Lobbying Act, its broad coverage was considered by some Members of Congress as a reason for an affirmative vote and by others as a reason for opposition.

CONCLUSION

Whether the courts will sustain the Lobbying Act, and whether they will construe it broadly or construe it narrowly, remains to be seen. In the meantime, the cautious and conservative position would be to recognize that the Lobbying Act may receive a broad construction. Persons who act on the assumption that the Lobbying Act will be invalidated or construed narrowly, may of course be making a sound assumption—but that remains to be seen.

If the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act be approached without preconceptions, and without antagonism toward its purposes—the act will be found to be reasonably simple and unambiguous. It would appear that support for this conclusion is found in the legislative history of the act, when carefully examined.[63] In falling short of perfection in draftsmanship, the Lobbying Act is not unique. Of the legislation which has been sustained by the courts, only a small part has been free of rhetorical deficiencies.

The Lobbying Act does not interfere in the least with activities engaged in for the purpose of influencing legislation. Such activities are, of course, of numerous categories and of varying degrees of importance. The most highly publicized activity is that of the professional lobbyist who undertakes to "buttonhole" Congressmen, but this is probably the least important category within the purview of the Lobbying Act. Of primary importance, on the other hand, is the activity which consists of encouraging members of an organization—or members of the general public—to write or speak to their Congressmen in behalf of a particular point of view.

When reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Act: (1) Disclose that thousands of dollars have been expended in order to develop a "grass roots" pressure campaign and (2) Identify the persons who have contributed $500 or more to such campaign—then the Congress, and the public, can know that the campaign was something less than spontaneous. By causing information of this type to be made available, the act would appear to serve a worth-while purpose.

Appended to this article is a suggested reporting form which would accommodate all data required by sections 305 and 308 for either a preliminary or a quarterly report.[64]

---

[60] Id. at 10091.

[61] Id. at 10151–10152.

[62] Id. at 6551–6552.

[63] The Lobbying Act has been the subject of an article and of notes as follows: Zeller, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (1948) 42 Am. Pol. Sci. Rev. 239–271; notes (1947) 56 Yale L. J. 304–332; (1947) 47 Col. L. Rev. 98–109; (1947) 15 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 455–463. These are of some interest insofar as they discuss (1) the considerations which make some type of reporting requirements desirable and (2) State legislation relating to lobbying. However, their approach to the Lobbying Act leaves something to be desired. All of them attempt to use legislative history in construing the act, but they do not appear to have been thorough in their investigation. They make reference to H. R. 11663 and S. 2512 but are apparently unaware of the following: (1) That H. R. 11663 was a consolidation of two earlier bills: (a) sec. 7 was adapted from S. 2512; (b) secs. 4 and 6 (along with the other sections) were derived from H. R. 11223, which was an adaptation of the Corrupt Practices Act; (2) That, in adapting sec. 4 of H. R. 11223 from sec. 305 of the Corrupt Practices Act, "expenditures" (as a category on which applicability could be predicated) was dropped, and sec. 6 was therefore added, in order to extend applicability rather than to restrict or limit it; (3) that in "narrow 11663:" (a) sec. 4 did not authorize the predication of applicability on expenditures; (b) sec. 7 was limited to persons who accept employment; (4) that in "broad 11663;" (a) sec. 4 was broadened to authorize predication of applicability on expenditures; (b) sec. 7 was broadened to apply to persons who "engage" themselves; (5) that secs. 305 and 307 of the Lobbying Act were patterned after "broad 11663," which, because of its broad coverage, had been defeated by the House in the 74th Con. by a vote of more than 3 to 1, scarcely more than 2 months after the House had passed "narrow 11663." (See pt. II of this article.)

In the matter of congressional debate, they accept uncritically certain statements of dubious value, while neglecting statements which would seem to have more significance. (See pt. III of this article.)

---

[64] File 3 copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and file 3 copies with the Secretary of the Senate:

1. For each set of 3 copies execute the affidavit on 1 copy and type in the blanks in the affidavits on the other 2 copies.

2. This page (p. 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

3. Circle a letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:

(a) "Preliminary" report: To "register," circle the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

(b) "Quarterly" report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this report, circle the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. Such additional pages should be of plain paper, the size of this page. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the act.

REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

Organization or individual filing: State name, business address, and nature of business:

Employer: State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "none." (If the employee is paid by "A" to work in behalf of "B," list both "A" and "B" as employers.)

Legislative interests, and publications in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If legislative interests have terminated with the current quarter: Please explain, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Citations of statutes; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills; (c) short titles of such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of each publication which the person filing has issued or caused to be issued in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity published, (c) date of publication, (d) name of printer.

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

NOTE.—If this is a "preliminary" report: In addition to the other data required in the space above, state the nature of the anticipated expenses; and (if an employee) state what the reimbursement is to be for services and for expenses.

----------}ss:
----------}

Affidavit

The undersigned affiant, being duly sworn, says:

1. That he has examined the attached report, numbered consecutively from page 1 through page —, and the same is true, correct, and complete as he verily believes.

2. That he is ----------, of the above-named organization for whom such report is filed, and that he is authorized to make this affidavit for and on behalf of such

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ohio State Journal of February 3, 1950:

SENATE ACTION ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT DISAPPOINTS BACKERS, BUT THEY'LL FIGHT ON

(By Sarah Mills, State Journal women's editor)

Ohio's most ardent backers of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution are anything but happy about its fate in the Senate. But they're not despairing either.

Shocked and disappointed are the words Clara Snell Wolfe, 1841 Roxbury Road, chairman of the Ohio branch of the National Woman's Party, used yesterday to describe her group's reaction.

They were echoed by Ernestine Breisch Powell of Worthington, State second vice president, and Dr. Mary Alice Price, chairman of the Columbus chapter. Dr. Price is on the faculty of the bureau of educational research at Ohio State University.

The Columbus branch has a membership of about 125.

Passage of the proposed amendment was a triumph. It declares in part: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

But the rub comes in the Senate's approval of the Hayden rider which preserves female protective legislation now on the books.

"The days of Lady Bountiful and the poor working girl are over," Mrs. Powell, an attorney and mother of 3 children observed. "The women involved should be permitted to determine their own working conditions."

Contrary to some belief, outright equal rights would have no adverse bearing on such things as another's pensions and maternity legislation, she added.

"There's a difference between need legislation and sex legislation," Dr. Price observed.

The National Woman's Party was founded in 1913 to obtain by constitutional amendment, the right for women to vote. That won, since 1921 it has had as its goal enactment of the equal rights amendment, to remove "all remaining discriminations against women in the United States."

It has had the amendment introduced at every session of Congress since 1923. But not until 1950 could the necessary two-thirds vote be mustered in the Senate. The amendment has never been voted on in the House.

The task now, Mrs. Wolfe, an original member of the party said, is to defeat the "protectionists" forces when the amendment goes before the House. It is now in the hands of that body's Judiciary Committee.

"We just want the plain amendment, without riders submitted to the States," she declared.

Slight, soft-spoken Mrs. Wolfe, has been militantly concerned with women's rights for almost 40 years. The wife of A. B. Wolfe, retired Ohio State University professor, she's a one-time suffragist who went to jail for her convictions.

She entered the political arena in 1912 at the request of Judge Florence E. Allen of the United States circuit court of appeals at Cleveland. The jurist then was a student at Western Reserve University and Mrs. Wolfe was just out of Oberlin College.

They took to the soap boxes on street corners in a referendum campaign to give Ohio women the vote. Their cause was "snowed under." Undaunted, they moved into Wisconsin, with the same results.

By 1918, the suffragist strategy had changed, and Mrs. Wolfe was in Washington, picketing the White House. She landed in jail the day the pickets, under the leadership of famed Alice Paul, burned "President Wilson's words."

"That was during the First World War," Mrs. Wolfe recalled. "We were saving the world for democracy, but we didn't have it at home."

She was held in jail several hours then released. The courts later ruled the arrests illegal. By June 1920, that portion of the fight was over. Women had the vote.

"It took us 72 years to get it," Mrs. Wolfe said in her quiet way, "and the arguments against that were just as silly as those being offered today against equal rights."

---

person. [If the report is for an individual, strike out paragraph "2".]

[Print or type name below signature.]

(Signed)_____Affiant.
(Typed)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ____day of_____, 19__.

_____
(Official authorized to administer oaths.)

Receipts (including contributions and loans from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in connection with legislative interests)

Receipts (other than loans):

1. $_____ Dues and assessments.
2. $_____ Gifts of money.
3. $_____ Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift.
4. $_____ Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter.
5. $_____ Received for services, i. e., salary, fee, per diem, etc.
6. $_____ Other contributions received.
7. $_____ Total for this quarter (Add items 1 through 6).
8. $_____ Received during previous quarters of calendar year.
9. $_____ Total from Jan. 1, through this quarter (add 7 and 8).

Loans received:

10. $_____ Total now owed to others on account of loans.
11. $_____ Borrowed from others during this quarter.
12. $_____ Repaid to others during this quarter.

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this quarter):

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "Yes" or "No":_____.
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from Jan. 1 through the last day of this quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page; tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and address of contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is Mar. 31, June 30, Sept. 30, or Dec. 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amounts	*Name and address of contributor (period from Jan. 1 through _____, 19__)*
$1,2500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
3,285.00	Total.

Expenditures (including loans) in connection with legislative interests

Expenditures (other than loans):

1. $_____ Public relations and advertising services.
2. $_____ Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item 1).
3. $_____ Gifts or contributions made during quarter.
4. $_____ Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost.
5. $_____ Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.).
6. $_____ Telephone and telegraph.
7. $_____ Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment.
8. $_____ All other expenditures.
9. $_____ Total for this quarter (add 1 through 8).
10. $_____ Expended during previous quarters of calendar year.
11. $_____ Total from Jan. 1 through this quarter (add 9 and 10).

Loans made to others:

12. $_____ Total now owed to person filing.
13. $_____ Lent to others during this quarter.
14. $_____ Repayments received during this quarter.
15. $_____ If there is an employer, state what amount of the expenditures for this quarter has been or will be defrayed by such employer.
16. Recipients of expenditures: In the case of expenditures made during this quarter be, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or dates," "Name and address of recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amounts	*Date or dates—Name and address of recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks bill."
2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten and Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800 per month.
4,150.00	Total

United Europe Is Our Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star is a Republican newspaper published in my district. Since I am of opposite political faith I am not always in agreement with its views although I must acknowledge that it has always been very fair and generous with me personally.

The March 17 issue carried an editorial which I consider a particularly

enlightened discussion of that problem with which we are concerned today. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD for the consideration of all the Members of this body:

UNITED EUROPE IS OUR BUSINESS

Two World Wars have convinced most Americans that they have a big stake in a free and peaceful western Europe. Otherwise Americans would not be willing to give many billions of dollars in European recovery aid. Nor would they be willing to commit themselves to go to war again in event of an attack on any Atlantic nation.

But many Americans don't fully appreciate today's need for a practical unification of European nations which can secure the peace and freedom for which American lives and wealth have been given in such abundance. Too many people still look on a union of the states of Europe as the business of Europeans but not of ours. But if a free and peaceful Europe is our business, so is a united Europe. Russian imperialism makes it increasingly improbable that the former can long exist without the latter.

On Wednesday three noted world figures came to Indianapolis to campaign for the growing movement for European unity. One was Paul Reynaud, former premier of France and a leading spirit in the Council of Europe. Another was Lord Layton, British economic authority. The third was Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, who now is giving his time and talents to the chairmanship of the American Committee on United Europe, a private group dedicated to the support of the unity movement.

There are many ways Americans can help Europe to unite. General Donovan's committee is one way. Civic, educational and other groups can get behind the movement and help spread an understanding of it among American citizens. The Federal Government can help the most by putting pressure on European governments through the recovery program. Such pressure could force timid governments to rise above the ancient, petty interests which have always blocked the way to real European unity. United Europe is no longer a dream, but a practical opportunity. It also is a virtual necessity in securing the peace and freedom of Europeans and Americans alike. That makes all of us partners in the effort.

A Way for the World to Live Without the Cold War Becoming a Hot One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so many people do not know which way to turn, when so many are tempted to say there is no way out but war—and in the same breath say that war will destroy victor and vanquished—it is refreshing to find an article by a thoughtful, respected observer of world affairs that offers a positive, constructive approach to the troubles that beset the world.

Mr. Walter Lippmann for many years has been one of the most consistently constructive writers on world affairs. In my opinion he has never made a more valuable contribution to the common welfare than in an article in the current number of the Atlantic Monthly, entitled "Break-Up of the Two-Power World." With his permission and the consent granted by the House notwithstanding its slight excess over the customary space, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Atlantic Monthly of April 1950]

BREAK-UP OF THE TWO-POWER WORLD

(By Walter Lippmann)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In late September, shortly after the announcement that the Russians had the atomic bomb, Walter Lippmann left Washington on an extended trip to western Germany, France, the Middle East, and South Asia. On his return he felt under the increasing necessity of redefining the Atlantic community in the face of present realities. This he has done in a series of talks, the first at the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, again on the occasion of the Newton D. Baker Memorial Lecture in Cleveland, and still more recently at the American Council of Foreign Relations in Chicago. The article which follows is the development of his main points.)

It is my very good fortune to have worked under Newton D. Baker—very far under him, I hasten to add, and in a quite humble capacity, but yet near to him personally—in a time when he was facing grave and momentous decisions. I remember one hot evening in July 1917, when he called me into his office in the War Department, saying he had finished for that day, but would I stay a little longer and just listen to him while he put his feet up on the desk and talked out loud and tried to clear his mind.

He was deeply troubled and puzzled, he said, by something which he had never in all his public experience come face to face with before. He had lived in the conviction that any problem could and should be taken to the American people, and that after they had heard the whole story argued out publicly, they would come to the right decision.

THE CRISIS OF OUR DESTINY

But knowing, as Secretary of War, what I know about the power of Germany, the weakness of the Allies, and our own unpreparedness, he said, I don't know whether I dare to tell the people how badly the war is going that they are just beginning to take part in. If they were told the whole truth, if they knew all that I know, would the Germans not learn where to strike at our weakest points, and would not our people be so discouraged and confused that they would not do what will have to be done to prevent a disaster? And yet if our people do not know the whole truth, will they believe us when we ask for their sons and send them to the battlefields in Europe?

And if we fail in the war, will our people ever forgive us, and ought they ever to forgive us, when we did not trust them in the crisis of their destiny?

I wish Newton Baker were with us now. For the question that he raised that night in Washington, nearly 35 years ago, is with us now, is with anyone who undertakes to talk about the crisis—the indubitable and immense crisis—in which we and all the world are involved.

When we look at the Far East, at southeast Asia, at Germany, at the United Nations, and at the race of armaments in which we are engaged, the facts are grim.

But the raw facts will seem more desperate and more hopeless than they really are, only, I believe, if we interpret them and measure them in the light of the outdated theories, the doctrines, and the conceptions which were popular during the past 3 or 4 years. I am referring to the ideas, expectations, and plans which are based on the Truman doctrine and its corollary, the policy of the military containment of Russian communism.

FAILURE OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The mounting crisis in our foreign relations marks the failure of the Truman doctrine, and if we cling to the ideas of the Truman doctrine, the collapse of our influence in China will be followed by the collapse of our influence in the whole of Asia and in central Europe. But I believe that this menacing movement of events can be stopped if we are able to brace and nerve ourselves to reconsider and to revise our policy in the light of a fresh, objective analysis of what is actually happening.

Let me begin by naming six developments which are of critical significance.

The first is that the American monopoly of atomic weapons ended sooner than the State Department, the Pentagon, and the Congress and the public expected.

The second is that Mao Tse-tung has succeeded in capturing the leadership of the Chinese revolution in the whole of continental China.

The third is that in southern Asia the British Empire and the Dutch Empire have been dissolved and have been succeeded by the independent Asiatic states of India, Pakistan, and Indonesia.

The fourth is that in the rich colonial area of southeast Asia, in Indochina, Malaya, and Burma there are civil war and anarchy because the authority and power of the European empires have been undermined, but no native independent states capable of governing themselves have emerged.

The fifth is the secession of Marshal Tito from the Soviet orbit in eastern Europe and the tendency of Titoism to spread to Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

The sixth is the revival of Germany as a power in Europe.

All of these developments have come to a head within the past year. None of them was, of course, entirely unforeseen. Yet it is the combination of these events which has, I believe, created a radically new situation that will compel all the governments to reexamine their estimates of the cold war and their calculations and their policies.

I venture to suggest that the net effect of all these developments combined marks the beginning of the end of the idea that the world must, and that the world will, aline itself in two camps, the one directed from Moscow and the other from Washington. That idea has been at the root of Soviet policy, and also of American policy. It is the one idea which the Communist world and the non-Communist world agreed upon. Both have said it was a true prediction of what would happen.

The orthodox Communists regard this doctrine of the division of the world into two camps as the guarantee of a beautiful hope. They believe that if the world can be divided into two camps, the non-Communist camp will break up because it is not united by a common doctrine, because it is not ruled with an iron hand, and because it represents all stages of political development from advanced democracy to the most reactionary, corrupt feudal and imperial regimes.

The Western World, on the other hand, has regarded this division as an ugly necessity forced upon it by the unity of the Communist world, which compels it to organize in one grand coalition all the non-Communist states. In every doctrine of the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist creed we have challenged the basic principles except in this one. We too have said that the world would be, could be, and had to be divided into two camps.

I believe the time has come when we have a right to ask ourselves whether the theory is in fact true.

We have a duty to ask ourselves whether in fact our minds have not become infiltrated and misled by the basic dogma of the very creed against which we think we are fighting. And I believe that if we examine the

facts of the world as they are, rather than the Communist theory, if we look at what is really happening and what is most probably developing in Asia and in Europe, we shall find the strongest reasons for doubting whether mankind can be or will be organized into two and only two coalitions.

Even before the events of this past year the two coalitions were by no means complete and they were far from solid. We know to what lengths of suppression and terror and purging the Cominform has had to go in the satellite countries in order to keep them subordinated to the Kremlin. And we know from our own experience how complicated has been the task of achieving unity of action in western Europe under the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Security Pact.

Everywhere on both sides of the iron curtain nationalist and separatist forces have interfered with the organization of the world into two great alliances.

II

If we look more closely at the six big developments which I named before, leaving aside for the moment what has happened in the field of atomic energy, I should like to point out that there is a common denominator in five of these developments—namely, the rebellion of Tito; the Chinese revolution; the independence of India, Pakistan, and Indonesia; the break down of authority in southeast Asia; and the revival of Germany. In each case one or both of the two coalitions has lost or is losing control of an important region. But in no case is it at all certain that the one coalition has won the region that the other has lost.

TITOISM AT WORK ELSEWHERE

Russia has lost control of Yugoslavia.

It by no means follows that Tito could or would aline himself wholly and reliably with the western powers. The tendency which we know as Titoism is manifestly at work in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. We know that from the purges conducted against Communists who have devoted their lives to the movement.

On the other hand, it would certainly be a delusion to suppose that Communists who rebel against the domination of the Kremlin have become intellectually and morally converted to the ideology of the western democracies.

There is strong evidence that a similar tendency is at work in Germany.

It manifests itself in the concessions which the Soviets are making to the east Germans in order to appease and to seduce the German nationalists inside the Christian Democratic Party, the Social Democratic Party, and the parties of the right. There is, on the other hand, growing evidence that even the west German Republic is more and more disinclined to accept the position of a docile and subordinate member of the western coalition.

GERMANS TO MAKE GERMAN POLICY

I think it is no exaggeration to say of Germany that with the establishment of the government at Bonn and its unmistakable growth in political and economic power we are in the process of relinquishing our control over the future of Germany.

I think no one can go to Germany today and continue to believe that Mr. McCloy and his colleagues, the British and French High Commissioners, have it in their power any longer to determine the future of Germany. They are in fact liquidating the power of the western allies over Germany, and are being drawn into negotiations about a series of demands made by the Germans.

No doubt the United States, Britain, and France still have a certain discretion as to the rate at which the Germans shall recover their sovereignty. But the time is already clearly in sight when the Germans will recover it and when the Germans will make German policy.

I shall not dwell at any length upon the developments in southern Asia, except to point to the well-known fact that there are seven new independent states in southern Asia, namely, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Israel. Of these the biggest and most influential is India.

As these states have achieved their national independence, they have declared that they will not enter into the military and political coalition of the Western Powers or of the Soviet Union.

NEHRU SPOKE PLAINLY

Pandit Nehru was quite explicit on that issue when he was in the United States, and I have no doubt myself that here he reflects the purpose of all the new national governments of Asia. They have decided, as this country did 150 years ago when it was new and weak, to avoid a policy of entangling alliances. There is little reason to think that anything but an overt military invasion of southern Asia by Soviet or Chinese Communist armies could alter their decision.

When we turn to the Far East there is, of course, the obvious fact that the Chinese government which we backed has been defeated. The victorious leaders of the Chinese civil war are Communists. They have declared that they are the allies of the Soviet Union. They have turned their backs on Washington. They have gone first to Moscow.

But it is by no means certain that the marriage of the two Communist revolutions is indissoluble. For many generations the imperial interests of Russia and the national and imperial interests of China have been in conflict all the way from the Sea of Japan to the Pamir Mountains along a borderland that extends 4,000 miles into the heart of Asia.

Moreover, over the larger part of that immense borderland the peoples on both sides of the political frontier are neither Russian nor Chinese but are peoples of various tribes and nationalities of Asia over whom both China and Russia assert power and influence.

While it is true that we have lost our power and, for the time being, most of our influence in China, it by no means follows that Russia has won control of China or has achieved an enduring alliance with China.

It is not wishful thinking, but common sense informed by historical experience, to say that if Russia finds it difficult to maintain its domination over small countries in the Balkans, there is no reason to jump to the conclusion that she can consolidate her dominion over this much vaster and more complicated region of the world.

Turning to Japan, it is clear, I think, that our position has been seriously weakened by what has happened in China. The main economic connections with Japan are on the mainland of Asia. There lie the most important sources of Japanese imports. There lie the principal markets of Japan. Nor can it be denied that the strategic security of Japan has been greatly affected by the fact that the whole mainland of east Asia—all the ports and airfields and the whole hinterland—is in Communist and anti-American hands.

III

I have left until the last the event which was announced by the President on September 23: that there had been an atomic explosion inside the Soviet Union.

This event marked the end of the short-lived American monopoly of atomic weapons.

Let us make the most favorable assumptions: Let us assume that we can make more bombs and bigger bombs than the Russians, that we can build faster planes with longer range, and that we can organize better defenses to detect, to warn, and to intercept.

Even on these dangerously optimistic assumptions no one can doubt, it seems to me, that the military situation has become radically different from what it was when we had the monopoly of atomic weapons. The difference will, I believe, be felt soonest in Germany and in Japan.

During the period of our monopoly there existed a military stalemate between the Red army and the American strategic air force armed with its atomic weapons. The one was a deterrent upon the other. The military defense of western Europe and of western Germany rested on our capacity to bombard the vital centers of eastern Europe and of Russia. The American atomic bomb pinned down the Red army. It acted as a military shield behind which western Europe could attempt to organize itself to revive its military defenses and to carry on its economic reconstruction.

On the other hand, the American monopoly of the atomic bomb, though sufficient for defensive purposes, was not sufficient for any policy which required direct military pressure upon the Soviet Union. The capacity of the Red army to occupy the vital centers of Germany and of Belgium and of France excluded from the consideration of any reasonable man the idea of preventive war or of a diplomacy which aimed to compel the Russians to accept western terms for the settlement of Europe.

CHANGED BALANCE OF POWER

The Soviet achievement of the atomic bomb, even if relative to us the Russians have only a few bombs, has changed the balance of military power. It has changed it most radically and critically, and first of all, in western Germany and Japan. The question now is no longer how they are to be defended against the Red army alone but how they are to be defended also against atomic bombardment.

Until a few months ago that question had not been faced. It did not enter into the calculations and the plans of the North American Security Pact, or of the American military-aid program.

It was believed until September that, while some day no doubt the Russians would achieve atomic weapons, that day was still in the future.

Therefore the question of how the countries adjacent to the Soviet Union were to be defended against atomic weapons was hypothetical and could be passed by.

But now it is an actual and urgent problem.

Both Germany and Japan are small countries containing highly concentrated industrial areas. The ultimate defenses against air attack—namely, dispersion and space—are not available to Germany and Japan.

Germany and Japan are in fact the ideal targets of atomic warfare.

Even if it is technologically possible to create an effective aerial defense against atomic bombardment, the difficulties of doing that are peculiarly great in western Germany and in Japan, and the cost would be, I believe, prohibitive.

We are compelled, therefore, to reexamine the strategic situation.

For the strategic formula on which we have operated from the proclamation of the Truman doctrine in the spring of 1947 to the signature of the Atlantic Pact in the spring of 1949 had as its major premise the American monopoly of the atomic bomb. Working on this premise, our chief military problem was to design and construct aircraft capable of penetrating the Soviet defenses in order to deliver the bomb.

But now we have the additional problem of creating defenses in a large number of countries which we have guaranteed, and in two countries, Germany and Japan, which we occupy and have disarmed—defenses that cannot be penetrated by the Soviet air force carrying atomic bombs and by the Soviet navy carrying atomic bombs.

Until recently there has been almost no public discussion of this problem in the United States. But it is being discussed anxiously abroad, and beneath the surface the reaction is profound.

The effects of the new strategic situation in the countries I have just visited are unmistakable to anyone who looks beneath the official appearance of things.

IV

In the exposed and vulnerable countries along the periphery of the Soviet Union the effect, I believe, has been to reinforce decisively their natural impulse to disassociate themselves from the two coalitions and to seek such security as they can find by recovering their independence from both.

For in this new strategic situation neither the U. S. S. R. nor the United States can offer the vulnerable countries any guaranty, or even any reasonable hope, of security against the fearful devastation of atomic warfare.

The Russians cannot offer that security to the Germans or the Japanese if they join the Soviet Union in an alliance, and we cannot offer those countries security if they join us in an alliance. These countries have neither the offensive power of retaliation nor the power of defense. They are caught between two lines of fire, and whichever side they turn to can offer them nothing but the prospect of devastation from the other side.

The Germans cannot once again become the allies of Russia, as they have so often in the past, because Russia cannot defend them and they cannot defend themselves against American air power. But by the same token western Germany cannot become the military ally of the west, as Field Marshal Montgomery and some of the French generals so fondly hope, because Britain and America cannot with certainty and effectiveness promise to defend western Germany against Russian aerial attack.

NO ONE WANTS TO BE BATTLEGROUND

The Germans are a highly intelligent people, especially in military matters, when they are not befuddled by demagogs like Hitler. They are confronted with a dilemma and they know it, and there is only one way out of it open to them which offers them any prospect—even if it is not a certain prospect—of security.

The Germans will take that way out because there is no other way out.

They will recognize that they lie between two armed coalitions, each attempting to win them over to it. They will exploit this middle position to recover their national independence by making demands and gaining concessions from both sides. They will by this method restore their unity. They will shake off the controls of the occupying powers. They will get rid of the military occupation. Then they will develop their middle position in the heart of Europe outside either alliance, and in between both alliances, to regain their power and influence in Europe.

This policy will reflect the realities of their military position and their own vital interests.

The Germans may call it a policy to neutralize Germany, or a policy of independence and isolation, or a policy of liberation, or conceivably a policy designed to make them equal members of a European federation of nations, which is not part of either the Russian or the American military system. But whatever the Germans choose to call their policy, the course they are most likely to take—unless there is a general collapse and a civil and international war—is similar to the course which more and more of the leading nations in the borderland all around the Soviet Union are also trying to take.

It is the policy of avoiding entangling alliances in a two-power world.

That is the course which India, Pakistan, and Indonesia have already decided to take.

It is the course which Tito in effect is trying to take.

It is the course which Austria is bound to take.

It is the course which every country in the Soviet orbit would take if it could disentangle itself from the grip of the Red army.

It is the course they will all be taking if the Germans succeed in putting an end to the occupation of Germany and, therefore, to the presence of the Red army on the Stettin-Trieste line.

The logic of the German situation is also, I believe, the logic of the Japanese. Because General MacArthur cannot guarantee Japan against atomic attack from the Asiatic mainland, the Japanese struggle to survive must take the form of a struggle to make Japan independent of both military systems.

V

This vast and complicated process, which is well begun but far from completed, is in fact the disintegration of the military alliances envisaged by those who have believed that the world could be organized into two military coalitions.

Can this process of disintegration be stopped and reversed?

I believe that in practice it will prove to be impossible for the United States to reverse this process in the countries immediately adjacent to the Soviet Union.

That is to say, it cannot any longer be the object of our policy to meet the Soviet expansion by organizing a military coalition in which western Germany, Japan, and China are to be, as we once conceived it, the principal outer bastions—in which the United States, Great Britain, and France would be the arsenal, the citadel, and the headquarters.

That was a conceivable arrangement in the days when General Clay appeared to be supreme in western Germany, when General MacArthur appeared to be supreme in Japan, and when Gen. Chiang Kai-shek was still the chief war lord of the greater part of China.

It was just conceivable then because the United States had the monopoly of atomic weapons and could strike the Soviet Union without the prospect that the Soviet Union could strike back at the United States or at Great Britain or at France.

It is not conceivable now.

My own view is, therefore, that the paramount object of our policy cannot be to contain Soviet expansion by organizing a global coalition. The paramount object of our policy from now on will have to be to frustrate and to disorganize and to disintegrate any Soviet attempt to form a global coalition.

OUR AIR POWER IS STRATEGIC

The critical areas in which such a policy must operate are Germany, eastern Europe, China, and Japan. We should prevent Germany, as she recovers, from making an alliance with Russia. That can be done. And the strategic air power we possess should be the perfect instrument of that policy.

It should be plain to the Germans, even without the necessity of our making it plainer than it obviously is, that if they ally themselves with Russia they become the first target in case of a war with Russia. But since, if they ally themselves with us, they will become the first target of the Russian attack, we cannot ask the Germans, and we must not expect the Germans, to ally themselves with us.

Therefore we should influence and encourage the Germans to do what so many Germans already want to do: namely, to identify German nationalism and German patriotism with German unity and with German independence.

We should help the Germans to neutralize themselves in order to end the military occupation and the partition.

We should clear our minds of the fallacy that neutrality is altogether obsolete because so many neutral countries from Belgium in 1914 to Denmark and Norway in 1940 have been unable to maintain their neutrality. The fact is that, while some countries could not pursue the neutrality that they desired, others did manage to achieve it. In Europe, Sweden, Switzerland, Ireland, Turkey, and Spain managed in the second war to remain nonbelligerent. And it will, I believe, be increasingly difficult to convince a growing number of Europeans that the risks of attempting neutrality and disentanglement are greater than the alternative.

We must not misunderstand or minimize how people feel who know themselves to be disarmed, who know they cannot be guaranteed against invasion or bombardment, when they are expected to commit themselves irretrievably to participation in war in which their allies and their enemies can offer them only the certainty of devastation.

They know as well as we do that there is no certainty in a policy of neutrality.

It may well be, they know, that they will be overrun, occupied, and destroyed. But on the other hand they know also that as members of either alliance they are certain to be fought over. As neutrals they might have a chance of staying out of the havoc.

I believe therefore that we cannot ignore these feelings; that we shall fail if we try to override them. We should regard every country around the Soviet Union—which seeks by diplomacy and by its own forces to preserve its independence—as a military asset in the defense of the free world, as one less liability against our overextended military and economic commitments.

WE MUST NOT DRIVE NATIONS INTO ALLIANCE WITH MOSCOW

Within the framework of this new policy we, the British, and the French, as the leading members of the Atlantic community, should support Titoism in eastern Europe by taking a firm and unequivocal stand, as in fact we have, not against communism as such, but against Russian imperialism and Russian aggression. But in encouraging Tito to remain independent of Moscow we should not ask or expect him to become our ally.

In China we should do what Secretary Acheson has indicated that he wishes to do. We should offer China what we have offered all Chinese Governments since the time of John Hay 50 years ago: our support, which the Chinese will eventually need, against dismemberment and imperialist aggression. They should be made to feel that they have an alternative to submitting to the demands of Moscow, that they can turn to Washington and London, that they are not imprisoned in the Soviet system, that they are not limited to the economic help which can be drawn from it, that when they feel they need support and seek it, the doors will not be slammed in their face and they will not be driven back into the arms of the Russians.

We should base our policy in Japan on a recognition of the vital interests of Japan. We should make it plain to the Japanese that we know as well as they do that they must trade with the Asiatic mainland, and that therefore they must be allowed to have diplomatic relations with their two Asiatic neighbors.

Japan cannot be expected to join our alliance because we cannot defend Japan against Soviet atomic attack; but we can prevent Japan from joining the Russian alliance because we have the power to attack Japan if she does.

I am quite well aware that I cannot possibly have answered all questions and resolved all doubts. I do not know all the answers, nor have I resolved all my own doubts. I feel sure that the basic conception of our foreign policy will have to be reconsidered, and in important respects revised, in view of what is happening in Germany and in eastern Europe, in the Far East, and southern Asia, and in the field of atomic energy.

I think that our best course from now on is to work toward the general objective of disintegrating the Soviet coalition.

That would mean that we put our influence and power behind the general tendency toward national independence, toward military neutrality, and toward diplomatic disentanglement—a tendency which is manifest in almost all of Asia, and in much at least of central and eastern Europe. I believe that in the last analysis the matter reduces itself to this: that since we cannot encircle the Soviet Union by a military coalition, we should cultivate and exploit all the national forces, all the human impulses to escape from the havoc of war, in order to prevent the Soviet Union from forming its coalition and in order to disintegrate its military alliances in eastern Europe and those which it hopes to achieve in Asia.

WE ARE NOT A BIG LAND POWER

I believe we can never afford to forget—as we form our policy—the true nature and the essential limitations of our power in the world. We are a continental island, separated by the oceans from the great land mass of the Eurasian continent. Inside that great land mass we have and can develop great striking power exerted at long range. But our power to occupy, to fortify, and to hold secure large land areas on the other side of the two oceans is limited.

We are not and will never be a great land power on either continent.

We can base no policy on the assumption that we might be. Nor can we base any policy on the assumption that the heterogeneous peoples of Europe and of Asia can be united, consolidated, armed, and defended in one military system.

We cannot organize military coalitions inside the Eurasian continent which require the presence or the immediate availability of large American land forces.

The kind of naval and air power that we have and that we can exert will not support a policy which seeks to organize such a coalition. Our kind of power can be used, however, to support a policy which seeks to deter aggression by the Soviet Union by the threat of retaliation. Our power will support a policy which seeks to disorganize that coalition by encouraging the natural and almost universal human impulse, the national and personal search for an escape and for a refuge from the ravages of war.

In taking this new line, we may look back, recalling how the dream of one world was shattered, and then how the nightmare of a two-power world is breaking down. But now there is opening up the prospect of a world of many powers associated in the universal society of the United Nations, but not alined irretrievably and not committed to the monstrous heresy and fallacy which we have inadvertently adopted from Communist doctrinaires, that all mankind can be divided into two and only two camps.

Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege in the fall of 1947, as a member of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid to spend 2 days at the home of our then Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, Mr. Laurence Steinhardt, in Prague. Mr. Lippmann was with us at that time. I shall always recall some of the things those two outstanding men of our times said about the problems confronting us in the reconstruction of Europe and the rebuilding of faith in the world.

Today, the papers carry the word of the tragic death of Mr. Steinhardt in a plane crash near Ottawa, Canada, where he has been our Ambassador. We can ill afford to lose the experience, the knowledge, and the forthright skill of Laurence Steinhardt, in the diplomatic world. But in presenting this paper by Mr. Lippmann, I feel that I can safely say some of the thinking and insight of Laurence Steinhardt have been preserved for us.

Mr. Speaker, these are fateful days for the world; they are fateful days for the people, the common people of every land. May God grant us the wisdom to choose the right course for humanity's sake and the courage to carry out our part of the task.

ECA for a Third Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the very important consideration of the continuance of the European recovery program is now in progress, I believe it apropos and timely to insert an editorial appearing in the March 26 issue of the Milwaukee Journal entitled "ECA for a Third Year." The editorial adequately and thoroughly analyzes the Marshall-aid program and, in truth, is a résumé of that program and the arguments in favor of it being continued.

ECA FOR A THIRD YEAR

Measures authorizing the third year operation of the Marshall plan at a $3,100,000,000 level have won approval of House and Senate foreign affairs committees.

Attempts to slash the amount asked by Paul Hoffman, Marshall-plan chief, failed. They will undoubtedly be renewed in the appropriations committee and on floors of the two houses, but it seems evident that the final appropriation will be around this $3,100,000,000 mark. Of this, $150,000,000 is left over from this year's funds and would simply be reappropriated.

The 1949 Marshall plan spending totaled $5,695,000,000 and the spending in 1950 is estimated at $3,778,000,000. No estimates have yet been made on the need for 1952, last year of the ECA program, but it should be substantially less than in 1951.

Failure of Marshall-plan opponents to dent appropriations requests indicates the faith of Congress and of the American people in the Marshall program as one of the chief weapons in our campaign to secure peace and fight communism.

There can be no question about the almost phenomenal success of the ECA. In 2 years, it has helped Europe to build overall industrial production up to 20 percent above prewar levels, to curb inflation, stabilize prices, restore agricultural production, increase dollar earnings and bring intra-European trade almost to prewar levels. Thus the job of restoring western Europe as a stable economic and political entity is well started.

Two provisions in the House version of the ECA measure deserve some scrutiny. The first proposes that $1,000,000,000 of the 1951 aid be in American surplus farm products. This seems a plan of our agricultural politicians to dump on the Europeans a lot of farm products they may not want or need. Mr. Hoffman has said he would not want to be in "that kind of a strait-jacket" and his desires should be respected. The four major farm organizations have also opposed this amendment, pointing out wisely that it would only provide grist for Russian propaganda against the ECA.

The second proposal restricts $600,000,000 for financing of a European payments union. It says, in effect, that if the western European countries can't agree on such a union, then they will lose the $600,000,000. Western Europe needs such a union, in some form, as a major step toward unifying continental economy. Mr. Hoffman and the ECA organization are working toward it.

Their chances of success would seem better if they could depend on argument rather than clubbing tactics, even of a financial nature.

The Role of Labor as Seen by Philip Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the president of the CIO, Mr. Philip Murray, has just given us the benefit of his views on the role of labor in the world today, its quest for peace and freedom and its contributions to economic progress. He sets forth some interesting observations and conclusions which should be helpful toward a better understanding of labor's position and labor's aim at the present time.

Mr. Murray's article, What Union Labor Wants, appeared in the New Republic, March 27, 1950, as part of a series which that publication is currently running on certain aspects of western civilization at the halfway mark of the twentieth century. The article is as follows:

WHAT UNION LABOR WANTS

(By Philip Murray)

More than 200 reporters were in attendance at the convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in November 1949, and they telegraphed nearly a million words to their respective newspapers and magazines. Their presence, and the tremendous bulk of their journalistic endeavor, is proof—if proof is needed—of the widespread public interest in the policies and actions of organized labor, the CIO in particular.

In the press and on the radio the public is treated to a daily fare of speculation concerning both the short-term and long-range aims of our American trade unions. The attitude is expressed in the often voiced question: "What does labor really want?" The question carries with it a certain connotation of concern and alarm—as if to indicate that our unions and their leadership are hiding deep within their hearts a secret to which the public has no right of access. It is a question I have heard not only from

liberals who are warmly sympathetic to labor, but from conservatives who watch the progress of unionism with undisguised dismay.

Nevertheless, that interest in labor's goals and aspirations is natural, healthy, and historic.

Foster Rhea Dulles, in his excellent Labor in America—A History, gives us a constant reminder that labor's role in our society has been a matter of concern since the colonial period. While it may be no solace for workers encumbered with the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act, there is room for gratitude for our progress since 1630, when the Massachusetts General Court set a wage ceiling of two shillings a day and proclaimed as law a measure providing that "all workmen shall worke the whole day, alloweing convenient tyme for food and rest." There is a marked similarity between the look-with-horror advertisements which McGraw-Hill and other corporations have directed at organized labor, and Alexander Hamilton's complaint that incentives to engage in manufacturing are impracticable in the face of "scarcity of hands, dearness of labor, want of capital."

Clearly, the issues that today embroil us in disputes between labor and industry, or that engage the Members of Congress in extended debate, have deep roots in the history of our country. The issues are neither novel nor superficial. They involve each and every one of us, since our society is more closely interdependent than at any time since the first colonists established their little communities and went to work to create a new life in a new land.

The questions that were being put to the infant labor organizations of a century ago are still being asked to our unions today. And the answers, too, remain much the same. What labor really wants is to give its members, and the general public, a consistently rising standard of living in a democratic society which will protect the rights of each citizen while making possible his maximum contribution to the general good.

The history of labor in America—and particularly the history of labor since the birth of the CIO in 1935—offers ready proof that our unions have made a major contribution to the national well-being. I see no indication that labor's role, or labor's contribution to the general welfare, will diminish in the decades ahead.

The 1949 convention of the CIO was a step toward ensuring the continuance of labor's effective dedication to the development of our democratic society. The CIO, at that meeting in Cleveland, took drastic and necessary steps to eliminate Communist influence in the American labor movement. Some cartoonists, in the shorthand vocabulary of their craft, have sought to picture the CIO, prior to our 1949 convention, as a bewildered gentleman at the crossroads, uncertain whether to take the rocky road to communism or the more appealing path of democracy. Yet the CIO was never confronted with such a limited choice; never for a moment has the CIO been in doubt whether to maintain its independent status as a free trade-union or to place itself under the dominance of the Communist Party and its Kremlin policy makers. Rather, the CIO was faced with a condition that became more grave with the passing of each postwar year. We faced the practical alternative of either taking no policy position on major issues, in order to placate the handful of Communist-dominated union officials, or to adopt policies in which we sincerely believed, only to have our course of action sabotaged by this same obstructionist group.

In my report to the CIO convention at Cleveland, I commented that—

"The Communist program for American labor is a program of destruction. Couched in terms of pseudomilitancy, it invites defeat for labor, rupture of our organizations, failure of attainment of even our most modest goals. * * * The program of the left wing would enslave us to the aims and aspirations of a party whose interests are not those of American labor but are directed toward the establishment of a retrogressive dictatorship in our life. * * * We are committed to broadening of our democratic structure, not to its destruction. We are committed to orderly and constructive progress by labor in America; we are not and never will be committed to a policy that makes our movement the slave a dictatorial state apparatus."

That statement of position is in accord with the sentiments of millions of workers in this country who have read with increasing concern of the sacrifice of liberty and human dignity in the dictatorship nations or who, in the framework of their own experience, have seen efforts to paralyze the effectiveness of their own union organizations by cliques of financial totalitarians.

By eliminating the practical influence of the totalitarians, the CIO is freeing itself of a cumbersome dead weight. Freed of internal obstructionism based on adherence to a faulty ideology, the CIO has opened the way for accelerated organizational campaigns, for even stronger campaigns in behalf of civil rights, and for a political-action program of expanding dimensions. Let no one doubt that in casting off the influence of Communist puppets in a few unions, the CIO is destined to become more active and more successful in attaining its objectives.

Nevertheless, there have been expressions of concern by some liberal newspapers and magazines lest the decisive series of actions which the CIO took to rid itself of Communist obstructionism result in a diminution of labor's militancy, its efforts to improve civil liberties, its basic devotion to the democratic process. These are groundless fears. They spring, I think, from the erroneous belief that the Communists have a monopoly on the capacity to stir the heart or brain, or to activate the legs of the picket or the finger of the doorbell ringer. The Communists have energy, but they have no monopoly on energy. That was proved during the 1948 elections. The so-called left wing was completely energized over the candidacy of Henry Wallace—but millions of union members in both the CIO and AFL paid little attention to the misguided fanaticism of the Wallaceites.

In 1946, to cite another example, Communist groups in some of the northern cities energetically passed resolutions and staged parades against discrimination in Dixie at the time the CIO was launching its southern organizing drive—but it was a group of loyal, democratically minded CIO workers who were—and still are—carrying on the long, hard, often dangerous job of bringing unionism and attendant civil liberties to backward industrial areas of the Southern States.

A second overdrawn conclusion has been made since our convention: that in removing Communist influence, the CIO is acting to silence all internal differences of opinion. That is a most unlikely possibility. An organization whose leadership embraces such diverse personalities as Joe Curran, Jim Carey, Walter Reuther, Jack Potofsky—to name a very few of my associates—faces no foreseeable danger of hardening of its cerebral arteries. No organization the size of the CIO could try for long to smother the thinking of its constituents without complete paralysis and disintegration.

What the responsible CIO leaders have objected to during these past few years is not the statement of diverse or unpopular ideas, but the all-or-nothing series of demands through which a small minority of party liners sought to hamstring a great organization and render it impotent and ineffectual in relation to some of the great issues of our day—the European recovery program, the 1948 election, the achievement of a Fair Deal legislative program.

The CIO has put its own house in order through the actions of its 1949 convention. It is ready now, in a more effective way than at any other time in the recent past, to devote itself to the important problems that we as Americans and as workers must face.

What, then, is labor's program in terms of economic advancement, legislative activity, and political action? Obviously, millions of workers and their families are interested in improving their standard of living, of achieving security—not only from unemployment, but from the crisis of illness and accident and from the financial burdens that so tragically haunt the lives of millions of our older citizens. They are insisting upon a strengthened structure of civil rights and democratic liberties. They seek the abundant life which America can produce for all of us, and they are determined to use their unions and their Government to achieve it. They want an intelligent, constructive militance from their union; they want a government devoted wholeheartedly to a Fair Deal program that will act in the general public welfare; and they are interested in the creation of political-action mechanisms which will insure the election of legislative bodies capable of overcoming the stand-pat complexes of entrenched minorities.

There is, in truth, nothing new about such a program. The same plan was in the minds of the people in the early years of our Republic, when they insisted upon the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. It is a program of liberalism and instinctive desire for economic progress which has been handed down from one American generation to the next. Our problem, in a world of breath-taking scientific progress and life-taking dictatorship, is to shape that program into practical form for application to the needs of our citizens today.

Freedom and liberty are not abstractions to the man whose right to picket has been abridged by a Taft-Hartley injunction or whose right of assembly and speech has been repealed by the owner of a factory-controlled southern village.

To workers and their unions, whose legitimate struggles have constantly met with repression and hostility from employers and sections of the governmental structure, civil liberties are an immediate and pragmatic problem. Having seen the practical effects of the deprivation of those basic rights, they have little use for the highly theoretical "viewing with alarm" that emanates from corporation front offices and from corporation front organizations. American workers will pay scant attention to the views of economic reactionaries who hold that our labor organizations or our Government cannot embark on economic or welfare programs because such a course of action does not jibe with the writings of eighteenth-century British theorists. A union member requires no unusual economic insight to realize that $20,000,000,000 in corporation profits constitutes a shameless maladjustment in our economy. They know that mass unemployment is a needless waste of human resources and economic strength. The benefits of a TVA or the merits of eliminating sweatshop conditions can be appreciated without a Ph. D. in economics.

There exists in our country a vast backlog of unfinished legislative business. It is spelled out both in President Truman's Fair Deal program and in the legislative program of organized labor. Indeed, our own CIO program lists 26 major points on which action is necessary and desirable as soon as possible. Since 1938 Congress has taken a leave of absence from social-welfare legislation. Perhaps, although it is by no means certain, the lapse was excusable during the war years. The fact remains that action is now long overdue.

We must get ahead with the legislative job. The atrocious Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed. The minimum-wage law, though improved in 1949, still needs considerable broadening of its coverage. There can be no further delay in modernizing our obsolete social-security law; in getting to work on great public-power projects in the river valleys; in providing real protection against unemployment; in removing from our tax laws the loopholes which big business is using for a horde of nefarious fiscal practices; for putting sharper teeth into our anti-monopoly statutes.

Congress must soon come to grips with the expensive and not particularly effective method by which the average American receives medical care. It must have the courage and the imagination to realize that our civil rights need strengthening.

There is no need to enumerate each item on the list of unfinished legislative business. The demand for enactment of this program lies in the hearts of our people—within and without the labor movement—and they have made clear their sentiments at the polls.

Labor's program promises no blueprint for utopia, and accordingly it is subject to criticism by the utopians. We in the labor movement are constantly being asked to appraise and endorse schemes that are guaranteed to end all human woes, or to provide easy answers to some of our outstanding problems. Many of the proposals that come to us have merit; many of them could be successfully managed if the American labor movement had even a small fraction of the financial resources of the great corporations; and almost all of them are offered in good faith by their proponents. But practical considerations rule out most of these proposals. And American workers do not want their unions to leap into the unknown with schemes that may sacrifice the solid gains of the past in the quest for future successes.

The Fair Deal program enunciated by President Truman in his 1949 state of the Union message and the legislative programs adopted by organized labor in recent years point the way toward attainable objectives. They are solidly based on our legislative history during both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, and their enactment would produce a definite strengthening of our national levels of economic stability, civil rights, and social welfare.

The adoption of such a program—and I feel confident that it will be enacted within the foreseeable future—will solidify our Government's determination to provide at least minimum protection for the needs of our people. To many critics of forward-looking governmental policies, the concept of the "welfare state"—in fact, even the most primary elements of President Roosevelt's New Deal—has appeared as a form of dictatorial "statism" that would force every section of the population, organized labor included, to submit to the whim of an all-powerful government. But American workers have too much faith in the validity of their democratic institutions to accept uncritically any such type of horror propaganda.

Nevertheless, the expansion of governmental activity into many new fields will require, on the part of organized labor, a continuous reexamination of its own functions, and of its relations with government. There was a time when leaders of labor opposed any government move toward social insurance as a threat to the effective operation of labor unions. That attitude, though admittedly shortsighted, had an understandable background in the type of government that we tolerated during most of the first three decades of this century. Today, we can visualize far broader areas of cooperation between the labor movement and the Federal Government.

However favorable the administration we enjoy in Washington or in the State capitals, labor has no intention of surrendering its functions to Government. Nor does organized labor in this country intend to become a mechanism of Government by yielding its power to make decisions or policy to the State machinery. Looking about our world today, we are more than ever convinced of the correctness of our traditional policy of labor independence. The European labor movements are, of course, acting within the framework of their own traditions, and they are well serving the democratic needs of their own people. But our own labor tradition, which increasingly recognizes the need for effective political action, gives full value to the pioneering experimentation of the collective-bargaining process. I visualize organized labor as a great stimulant to governmental action, and in carrying out this process we help to retain the self-reliance of our people.

Thus, it seems clear to me that labor's economic activity has been primarily responsible for the recent increase in the Federal minimum wage. That legislative improvement was attributable directly to the wage increases that labor has won through the collective-bargaining process. Proposals for the modernization of the social-security structure languished for years until organized labor, in the course of negotiations with industry, began to emphasize its demands for contractual security provisions. In both these cases, the efforts of an independent labor movement provide effective, if indirect, stimulus to legislative action. I want to see organized labor in America keep this leverage.

Labor, it is obvious, can contribute most effectively to the welfare of its own membership and of the general public by acting in concert with an administration of liberal political attitudes. The Taft-Hartley Act confirmed a lesson that we in the CIO had realized many years before—that labor cannot concentrate its attention on collective-bargaining problems without regard to the rules under which collective bargaining functions. Taft-Hartley was the final proof that labor must, if only for self-preservation, take an active part in the political-action process. Our political successes have been considerable during the last decade and I feel confident that labor's political action is our best guaranty of continued liberal government.

Labor has helped the two-party system, which for a time had lost much of its meaning, by giving such concentrated attention to issues as to force most officeholders and candidates to declare their positions in terms of liberalism or conservatism. In the North, that process is far along; in the South, it still lags. But the steady union organizational progress in the Southern States will certainly produce a change, over the long run, in the attitudes of the men and women who serve in Southern legislatures and congressional delegations.

As labor's political influence grows, and the political parties respond to expressions of the people's will, the clamor for a third party is almost certain to diminish. Where the people cannot beat a reactionary candidate with one liberal opponent, I am not sanguine about their ability to defeat reaction with a divided opposition. And in those sections of the South where we are saddled with the equivalent of one-party rule, we must look not toward a third party but toward a second one. A militant program, such as the Democratic Party adopted in 1948, and a slate of candidates pledged to its enactment are our best guaranty of legislative progress. With labor more politically conscious than ever before, it is difficult to visualize the surrender of both major parties to the outright control of reactionary industrial and financial interests; and it is only in such an event that a third party could win public acceptance.

With labor at the crest of power and influence—and responsibility—in America, the way is open for long-range programs of social and economic reform. I have already mentioned the social-welfare program which labor regards as desirable and necessary. We must also come to grips with the problem of monopoly control of our Nation's industry and natural resources. The staggering accumulation of financial power accruing to the great corporations in recent years threatens a serious lack of balance in our national life. The Federal Trade Commission reports that in 13 major industries, three or fewer corporations maintain more than 60-percent control; three steel corporations own 49.2 percent of that industry's net capital assets and 58.9 percent of its steel-ingot capacity. Government statistics show that the rich are expanding their control over our national wealth and savings while millions of families live at submarginal levels.

More effective checks and balances over the distribution of wealth and economic power are in order, both for our own domestic welfare and for the preservation and strengthening of America's democratic influence throughout the world. Tremendous masses of privately controlled financial power can rock our Nation—and in fact our world—as effectively as a cannon rolling loose in a ship's hold. Unsocial investments, at home or overseas, can create stresses and tensions from which all of us will suffer. I believe firmly in free enterprise, but I also am firmly convinced that the business community has no license to act without responsibility for the public welfare.

These are problems of great dimensions, but they will certainly be solved within the framework of our capabilities as a democratic Nation. During a lifetime devoted to the labor movement, I have witnessed advances in the status of our workers and of the entire population which exceed the most optimistic forecasts of my youth. During these decades our social and economic institutions have become more complex, but we have progressed steadfastly toward the better life which is the aim of all men and women of good will. The intelligence, common sense and courage of the American people have carried them through two wars and a series of economic crises. Today, as we stand at the threshold of the atomic, electronic era, I remain optimistic that the qualities which have inspired labor and the Nation in the past will enable us to continue a role of world leadership in humanity's quest for peace, freedom and economic progress.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Brewing Boom," which appeared in Newsday, Hempstead, N. Y., on February 23, 1950, and an editorial entitled "It Looks Like Farley," which appeared in the Riverhead New York County Review, March 2, 1950.

My good friend, Jim Farley, has been one of the most outstanding members of the Democratic Party of the entire Nation. He has always been a friend of

Queens County, and, more particularly, a friend of the Democrats.

[From Newsday, Hempstead, N. Y., of Feb. 23, 1950]

THE BREWING BOOM

Particularly in Queens County and in upstate rural districts, a boom has begun to have former Postmaster General James A. Farley nominated as Democratic candidate for Governor of New York in the election next fall. The trend was first noticed when Farley got a rip-snorting warm reception from 2,400 party leaders at a dinner in New York last month. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., was set to star that evening, but his star flickered. Genial Jim was the man most cordially received.

The Farley-for-governor boom makes sense. Here is a straight party man for the Democrats to promote, a superlative politician, an experienced administrator. Hopeful Junior has still to win his spurs. But Farley manipulated the first two of Pop Roosevelt's Presidential nominations and deserves more of the high-riding Democrats than a testimonial vote of gratitude. He would probably rate White House backing if he chose to run, for he supported Truman in 1948 when lesser New York Democrats had fled.

When Republican county chairmen meet in Albany next week they will be trying to figure out what Governor Dewey intends to do. If he chooses to run again, a Dewey-Farley race would be an interesting spectacle, one FDR, Sr., hoped to see in 1938. Whichever won, the State would be in safe hands for another gubernatorial term.

A master of politics, Farley is straightforward in telling the public how politics operates. "I am perfectly conscious," he once wrote, "that when political organizations begin thinking about jobs and nothing else, when they forget that the public business should come first, they have begun their own death chant without realizing it. * * * The protest of the public is the best way to discipline an organization against that sort of thing."

Come to think of it, Jim Farley is one of our favorite Democrats. We hope the Democratic leaders have the good sense to tap him for that nomination. This third man in current talkfest looms big.

[From the Riverhead (N. Y.) County Review of March 2, 1950]

IT LOOKS LIKE FARLEY

Although the gubernatorial campaign of 1950 is still a long ways off, it now looks as though James A. Farley sentiment is daily growing and as though nothing but a sharp reversal of Democratic opinion or Mr. Farley's personal refusal to run can head off his nomination as the Democratic candidate. The wind is blowing so definitely in Mr. Farley's direction, in fact, that Leo Egan, eminent political writer of the New York Times, dwelt upon the subject at considerable length in a recent issue of the Times.

This is gratifying to the County Review, for if it cannot be credited with launching the present Farley drive, it must, at least, be credited with being the first newspaper to go all-out in advocacy of his candidacy. In a first-page editorial of its issue of January 12, it came out unreservedly for the "Genial Jim," and gave its reasons for doing so. The response to that editorial has been pronounced and it has convinced us that countless New York State citizens were only waiting for someone to say what the County Review said.

If the subject has to be discussed on a purely political basis, it is our opinion that Mr. Farley, if picked as the Democratic candidate, would have more than a reasonable chance of victory at the polls. Our advocacy of him, however, is not based on his strength as a vote getter. We base it on more practical grounds.

Every taxpayer in the country must know by this time that indiscriminate spending is becoming the fixed rule of government. Those who by virtue of their position can reach into the public purse do so without reserve, always consoling themselves by the thought that "there is more where that comes from." Now and then, we discover some of the unwarranted leaks which prove costly to us, but not yet have we learned how much of our money is going down the drain without rhyme or reason.

One reason why this is so is that we feel politicians alone are to be trusted with our affairs. We get the politicians regularly but we seldom get real statesmanship and it is even rarer that we get good business management. We will never get away from this sort of thing until we start electing businessmen who will run our business as they would run their own business and who will spend our money with some such consideration as they would their own. "That is purely elementary," as Sherlock Holmes used to say to his friend, Dr. Watson.

Mr. Farley is a good businessman. He has proved that in some fairly big-sized jobs. If sent to Albany, it is certain that he would put the State's business on a solid, sane business foundation and teach those under him that the taxpayers' money is to be respected. Jim might not discuss money matters in such flamboyant phraseology as we often have handed out to us, but he can be counted upon to apply the rules of simple arithmetic and to reach the proper conclusion through the process of sane reasoning. Jim has a goodly amount of that good, old-fashioned gumption which has pretty much gone into the discard in recent years but which is just as valuable today as it ever was.

Jim Farley would make a good governor. He would cut red tape of the fantastic order down to a minimum. He would face any issue and face it speedily—with fewer round-table discussions and less time lost in squabbling over irrelevant phrases of the question.

As we said in our editorial January 12, Farley is our man. We think, after giving due thought to the matter, that the average man will make up his mind that Farley is also his man.

This Is Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY

(By Louis Bromfield)

Watching the country, it seems to me that the chances favoring the Republican Party are increasing apace, indeed more rapidly than the Republicans are taking advantage of the situation. Issue after issue is being made for them by the assertions and actions of the Truman-Boyle Democratic machine, while the Republican general staff and the congressional leaders in Washington go off into vague and grandiose statements of policy or on investigations of this or that which may or may not produce pay dirt and all too frequently backfire. Unless the Republicans can uncover some really serious cases of spying and Soviet sympathy, they are wasting time from a political point of view.

The Hiss case and the Coplon case both proved how much treachery was going on inside our Government during the long years of a Democratic administration and their exposures were immensely valuable to the Nation as a whole.

They also make excellent political capital especially, insofar as both trials revealed the indifference and carelessness of a desperate situation which President Truman airily referred to as "a red herring."

There was plenty of evidence as well that there were efforts made from within the administration to block or at least confuse the issues.

But the Communists as a whole have never been held in such contempt and their stock has never been so low as at the present time. They are only secondarily an issue.

The issues which can win the vote of the majority of honest American citizens are lower taxes, more jobs, lower living costs, and the cleaning up and reorganization of our Federal Government upon some plan which makes sense. Every day from farm-subsidy programs to the administration of veterans' funds, the issue becomes more obvious.

BECOMING A TIRED PEOPLE

The American people (the most vigorous people in the world) are becoming a tired people. They are living in a distracting and worried world, bad enough in itself, but the Truman administration brings them no confidence or relief from anxiety.

It merely operates from day to day on a crisis basis, constantly accentuating and playing for political advantage on all the fears already harassing the American people.

It harps upon the declining income of the farmer, upon the increasing unemployment, upon the impossibility of coming to any terms with Russia, upon the desperate need for a state-managed security in which the Government takes your money, spends it for you and adds to the expense many times through the burden of bureaucratic administration.

In no case whatever does the administration attempt to encourage or strengthen the natural optimism and vitality of the American people and their confidence in themselves and their system. It merely tries to sell the socialistic state so that no one need ever worry, or, presumably in the end, even work.

Meanwhile, every workingman labors approximately 47 days for the Government, every skilled workman works approximately 67 days. Professional people and people in small businesses work as much as 3 or 4 months a year for the Government.

Some of our ablest citizens, the ones whose brains and energy largely provide prosperity and jobs for the rest of us, work sometimes as much as 7 and 8 months a year merely to sustain in part a vast and increasing bureaucracy which constantly becomes more burdensome and expensive and constantly muddles up the biggest and worst-run business in the world—the United States Government.

HARP ON MORE TAXES

In the face of this, Mr. Truman and his machine keep repeating that we must have higher taxes, that it is impossible to make any cuts in expenditure.

He keeps repeating with the silly air of the ward politician, "Show me where any cuts can be made," and when perfectly obvious cuts are proposed by the Hoover Commission or by other men of unqualified ability and integrity, he and his friends pretend that they did not hear and go on increasing the number of Government employees for whom you and I have to pay more taxes every year.

It is like the caginess of Secretary Brannan in refusing ever to give any estimated figure of the billions which his solve-all farm plan would cost the average citizen in added taxes.

The Republicans might add that when you build a house you pay about 600 different taxes, that every time you take a ride in your car, you pay about one-fourth of the cost to

Government in gasoline taxes, that you could afford that train trip or afford to send that telegram if Government were not taking a fat share in taxes which just makes the difference, that you could afford to go to the theater or the movies more often if the Government did not take 20 percent of what you pay directly out of your pocket in addition to a fat income tax.

The Republicans might also add that all of this makes your dollar buy less each year and causes the value of your Government bonds to decline sharply while, in time of great prosperity, Mr. Truman cannot balance his budget and wants constantly to borrow money or increase taxes.

The Republicans might ask "What happens when we hit hard times?" The Republicans might suggest a good long look at Britain where panacea plans are already in operation.

These are issues every man in the street understands and the Democrats have no defense whatever against them. They only say "We need more taxes and more money to hire more bureaucrats to make life more miserable for you." I suspect that after 20 years of it, government by crisis and improvisation is beginning to wear thin with the tired American people. They'd like to see some sensible action.

Government Gets Bigger, but Politics Keeps Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial from the March 23 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal. Since it pertains to the appropriations bill soon to be considered, I am sure it will be of value to all Members.

GOVERNMENT GETS BIGGER, BUT POLITICS KEEPS UP

The constant efforts of Congress to cope with problems of Government in a world of many complications has brought forth a new wrinkle. It may be a sign of the times that are beginning to set in the human mind a fear of confusion. The appropriations bill just approved by the House committee wraps almost everything up in one massive package, around $29,000,000,000.

Previously there was a sheaf of separate bills for the departments, leading to interminable debates, log-rolling, and ragged, piecemeal adjustments. The new way sounds efficient, though one can hardly help asking how far streamlining and obstacle-jumping can go as a general proposition.

After this reflection one may turn to the bill itself. For all that it cuts a billion and a half dollars from the President's budget requests, it is still the administration bill in policy and purposes. It will still be the target for attacks on the floors of Congress, with Republicans oiling up their larynxes to win whatever virtue comes from economy preachments in an election year.

But the Democrat regulars have pretty well fortified the bill against radical operations. They have applied the cuts in the committee chamber, as if to get the jump on the inevitable. They take their stand on the proposition that they have done their best and that as the world goes today, anything more would be dangerous. Members of the opposition freely admit they will have plenty to say on that point.

You can just bet your life they will, and many a Democrat besides. They will be out in the open then, for all to hear. Sweet are the uses of economy, as a catchword as well as an intrinsic virtue. The Members with fire in their eyes insist that $1,500,000,000 isn't nearly enough to cut, and that they will fight to lop off $3,000,000,000 more, if it takes them right down to election day.

The amount is incidental, but the idea is the best in the world. We only wish we could resist the temptation to point out the catches in it. One of them is that this is 1950, when everybody in the House and one-third of the Senators will be running for reelection. It is never too soon for a candidate to start building a record to which to point with pride on the hustings. But he probably knows the score—let's say, last year's score. There was the same cry, bipartisan and furious. There was the promise to lay a meat ax to the budget. And there was, in the end, actually more money appropriated than even Mr. Truman had asked for.

The average economy shouter knows that the difficulty of saying no to appropriations is even greater in election year than ever. Let's take, for example, the announced plan of the committee members to cut the request of $834,000,000 for river-harbor-flood-control work down to $675,000,000. This is the local project, like floodwalls here and up and down the Ohio. Last year a diligent effort was made by honest economizers to cut this item from $751,000,000 to $450,000,000. As it came out of the works at last, it was even bigger than it had started. And nobody was running in 1949.

To be sure, the main consideration is far more serious than this one of the pork-barrel bill. It touches on the situation in the world, and the enormous obligations thrust upon America. But for this, there would be no debate at all about the need of economy, about the utter folly of running Government deficits in times of the highest prosperity. As it is, the principal wish of the American citizen is that when and if the cutting is done—and we don't doubt there are plenty of spots for it—it will be done with discrimination and with an eye on the facts of global life.

Statement Supporting the Habana Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT SUPPORTING THE HABANA CHARTER

Manufacturers of medicinal products have a large stake in the maintenance of a high level of export trade. They have a direct interest, therefore, in any practical program for eliminating the multitude of restrictive controls and barriers that restrain profitable trade, or make it burdensomely complicated, in many parts of the world. The Habana Charter provides such a program and also the means of carrying it out through the International Trade Organization. It is important to this industry, therefore, that Congress approve House Joint Resolution 236 and thereby enable the United States to give its full and active support to the ITO.

The export of drugs and pharmaceutical products has grown phenomenally since the war; few industries have shown such expansion. Whereas the normal prewar exports of the industry were only about $18,000,000 annually, today exports average $200,000,000. The exports of Eli Lilly & Co. have increased five times, thus contributing to the continuous high level of employment in Indianapolis and to the well-being of not only our employees but also the many professional people and tradesmen who furnish them with goods and services. All of them have a direct stake in the continuance of our export markets.

Because of the fact that the need for drugs is sufficiently great that even countries with a meager supply of dollars give drugs a high priority in allocating their foreign exchange, drug exports have held up well while American exports in general have declined considerably in the last 6 months. The relatively favored position of our industry, however, does not blind us to the fact that the welfare of United States exports as a whole is of real concern to us. The same factors that would expand world trade in general will help sustain our exports and the factors now restricting foreign trade are a threat to our own trade.

Exporters are increasingly distressed by the malignant growth of barriers and controls imposed on international trade since the war. If not checked these barriers will eventually force trade to such low levels that our own domestic prosperity will be adversely affected. Further loss of exports may well be accompanied by unemployment in important sectors of our economy and by the retrenchment of formerly profitable and tax-paying industries. As foreign aid under the ERP is reduced and eventually eliminated in 1952, the present downward trend in exports could snowball with disastrous results unless some active measures are taken to restore the fabric of world trade. Other countries need our export products and we need their business if we want to retain our economic health. The important thing is to provide a means for them to pay for our goods. This can only be done by increasing world trade and, more specifically, by stimulating multilateral trade.

I am in favor of the International Trade Organization because it is the best available means for attacking existing trade barriers and controls that prevent restoration of multilateral trade. It is important that the Habana Charter obtained the agreement of 54 nations; without an agreement of such scope there is no practical possibility of dealing with the problem. It is also important that the charter covers the entire range of trade barriers, from import quotas to cartels. It is important that these restrictions are dealt with in detail and cover the interests of all industries engaged in trade. For example, my industry is benefited by the requirement (art. 45 (a) (ii) and (iii)) that countries cannot use import restrictions under the guise of health regulations without showing legitimate cause. If this is done today we have no recourse. With the ITO we shall be able to register effective complaints and have our Government follow it with action if necessary.

Without such detail the charter would be loose and meaningless. It is also important that the ITO would provide a source of detailed information on existing and projected trade restrictions and trade statistics. Finally, it is important that a mechanism would be established which would permit trade disputes to be settled peacefully.

I am aware that there have been some sharp criticisms of the charter for the ITO. Some of these criticisms have a certain amount of justification. Certainly the charter does not constitute an ideal document from an American point of view. However, by the same token, it does not constitute an ideal document from the point

of view of many other countries which differ considerably from us in economic condition and thinking. To anyone who has a real stake in foreign trade, however, criticisms of the present charter must be examined in a practical light. Do the critics have anything better to offer? To the best of my observation, the answer is no. In fact, I have yet to hear one constructive suggestion on the part of opponents to the ITO. The interests of the United States and American foreign trade are not served by abstract debate which leads to no constructive results. We must deal in realities. We badly need an International Trade Organization, and only one practical charter for such an organization exists. We should approve it without delay if we hope to advance American interests in foreign trade.

FORREST TEEL,
President, Eli Lilly International Corp.

General Eisenhower Voices Warning Against Further Disarmament by This Country in Face of International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a warning which is voiced by a person of preeminent qualifications to speak is one which should not be ignored and should be heeded as an expression of utmost authority.

General Eisenhower has recently voiced the grave warning to our country against the eventuality that we may fail to maintain our defense establishment at the level of security and in this connection I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials in comment on General Eisenhower's recent statement which have appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, of March 24, last, and the Nashville Banner, of the same date:

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of March 24, 1950]

WE CAN'T AFFORD WEAKNESS

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's warning that this country cannot go further in reducing its armed strength without the gravest kind of danger is justified by his accompanying statement that when even one power "builds and maintains a military machine beyond recognized needs of reasonable security, a war of aggression remains a constant threat to peaceful nations."

Although the former commander in chief of the Allies in Europe is a military man, he is not an advocate of militaristic diplomacy. On the contrary, he is one of the most effective spokesmen for peaceful understanding among nations.

We accept as genuine his concern lest the United States, having hastily demobilized most of its strength at the war's end, should reduce its armed strength to a point that would invite attack. He was one of the engineers of the current military program and he is alarmed lest economies guide the defense organization below the danger point.

It is an American ambition to lead the way to peace, but in seeking the goal it is necessary to keep in mind General Eisenhower's declaration that "America can do nothing unless she is strong."

[From the Nashville Banner of March 24, 1950]

EISENHOWER SAYS "DON'T DISARM"

General Eisenhower's warning against disarmament in the face of a Soviet threat which no intelligent nation can ignore, is the word of a man who knows the score. He speaks from no impulse of hysteria, and from no position of one who is uninformed.

As soldier and citizen, his opinion carries weight, and the Senate Military Affairs Committee properly has called him for an outline of his views—bearing as they do on security matters now before it.

To a great extent, America has disarmed. It has dismantled much of the defense machinery, has put much of its fleet in mothballs, disposed one way or another of much air strength, allowed supercarrier construction to be canceled, et cetera. The battle of the Pentagon was allowed to jeopardize the Navy. Now a program of heavier spending is being undertaken to make some repairs.

Of late, the State Department has stressed that the only persuasive influence which the Communists understand and respect is force, which is another way of saying that physical weakness invites attack; also that where this enemy is concerned, the convincing argument is superior strength. In the face of that fact, it is no time to be frittering away our substance, or demobilizing might.

As General Eisenhower observes, Russia knows the disarmament status and capitalizes on it. Nothing less than physical strength will deter Moscow, or compel her to come to taw on policies which could convert the cold war to a hot war.

Congress needs all the light it can get on the matters before it, having to do with the initial steps of preparedness, and Eisenhower can furnish some light. He isn't an amateur in the business of national defense. He isn't a warmonger. He is a soldier and citizen concerned for the security of the United States of America.

Verifying his statement, it certainly isn't a time to disarm when a hostile power is arming to its utmost with the precise objective of conquering by war if need be.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the act of the English Parliament in detaching by its legislation six Counties of Ireland on the ground that they are pro-British has no more foundation in law or common sense than would be the act of the English Parliament in detaching the six States of the so-called New England States of the United States on the ground that they are pro-British.

In the ECA legislation the United States is providing huge sums with a view to breaking down customs and monetary barriers between the nations of western Europe and in the same bill we are providing funds to England whereby directly or indirectly England is enabled to maintain an artificial, unnecessary, and expensive customs barrier separating six Counties of Ireland from the rest of the Nation.

Ireland is our oldest friend. Ireland was our friend when England was our enemy. Our voice is raised loud in proclaiming that we are interested in freedom and justice all over the world and in raising economic standards all over the world; and that we must be so interested in order to frustrate world-wide communism. Ireland has not threatened to go Communist and participates but meagerly in Marshall plan aid. What she does ask us is that the United States, her friend, do not participate directly or indirectly in imposing on her the yoke of partition.

An Appeal for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for printing in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Robert Gemmer, a minister of the gospel residing in my district. This letter was written to me after he had visited Hiroshima, and incorporated in it is a letter from the orphans of Hiroshima, appealing to the leaders of the world not to make of it another Hiroshima.

I realize that the accomplishment of an answer to their prayer is not so simple as these children might suppose, but the goal to be attained thereby is so precious that no effort should be spared in our endeavors to attain it.

The following is the English translation given us of the original text which was written in Japanese by the senior high girls of Hiroshima. The letter was sent to President Truman, Premier Stalin, and the United Nations. Each of the 600 girls in the school signed the letters personally as well as a fourth copy they planned to send to India, asking her to use India's influence as a neutral nation to bring the major powers together. Each of the girls and the 850 junior high girls also decided to write personally some world leader.

No adult or teacher met with the students. Classes waited. They took seriously our challenge to translate their prayers for peace into work for peace. Some of the girls told us about their meeting later:

"We decided to pray, and as we prayed something wonderful happened. We really felt God was helping us. All the girls whose parents had died in the bomb stood and prayed. We didn't want anyone else to have the experience we had.

"On the World Day of Prayer we bring to mind the horrible experience at the time of the atomic bomb, and we feel deeply the urgent need of a world peace for the sake of the welfare of all people.

"That day on which our dear fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters, and friends were taken from us. On that day tens of thousands of people in Hiroshima lost their lives as victims of the atomic bomb, and the city, full of life until that morning, was

burned to ashes in but a few seconds. And it was thought that never again would we be able to stand up. The grievous calls for help which came from under the fallen buildings lying within the devouring fire which had wrapped the completely destroyed city, are still calling us and pushing us into the road to peace.

"We do not want others to suffer this piteous tragedy which war has brought to us. No matter how science may prosper, man cannot make man. When we think how important each individual is, and of how lightly they were treated in the war, we firmly pray that such a thing will never happen again.

"But even if everyone had gone through the terrible experience, people are still preparing for war.

"The leaders of each country say that they will use weapons as a means to peace. But as long as weapons exist, we firmly believe that we cannot hope for true peace. We pray that the large sums used for armaments will be turned to render services for the happiness of mankind.

"We want you to listen to our prayers which we are shouting from the bottom of our hearts.

"We pray from the bottom of our hearts that you, the great leaders of Russia and America, who have the greatest strength, will take the leadership and work wholeheartedly for the purpose of world peace."

In further discussion that evening, one of the girls summed it up saying: "Today our school did something really good, and we're all so happy we can hardly stand it, but we still have to study and go to school, so we say: 'Please everyone do something too!' "

ROBERT GEMMER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include an editorial from the Okmulgee Daily Times, Okmulgee, Okla., of March 10 endorsing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

The House of Representatives has passed bills providing for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. It is up to the Senate now to say whether the forty-ninth and fiftieth States shall be added to the Union. President Truman is on record in favor of statehood for both.

We can think of no sound reason why they should not be admitted to the Union. Though the population of both is small—Alaska about 100,000 and Hawaii 530,000—it is our conviction the people of both can govern themselves better through state governments than the Federal government can through territorial administration.

There has been a lot of shameful exploitation of Alaska, much of it with the knowledge if not the actual connivance of Federal agencies. This probably could and would be stopped if the Alaskans were to find themselves in the position of governing themselves and being responsible for the conservation of their own resources.

Hawaii, if admitted to statehood, will be the first offshore State in the Union. Some consideration from a military standpoint has been given to that aspect of the situation; but it need not greatly concern us, because our responsibility for the protection of Hawaii is the same whether it is a Territory or State.

We hope the Senate will not dilly-dally with the statehood bills now that they have reached their present status after long years of fighting on the part of Alaska and Hawaii.

Toward Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the speech which won the New Jersey State Oratorical Contest for high school students, conducted this year in Morristown, N. J. The speech was written and delivered by Wellington D. Kohl, a student at Central High School in Trenton. The speech itself is an outstanding achievement, and the boy who wrote and delivered it is truly representative of American tradition. An orphan, Wellington Kohl is a ward of the State of New Jersey. He earns his spending money by working after school, and is an honor student in his class. This young Negro boy is an outstanding American—I believe, with his teachers, that he shows strong promise of becoming one of our Nation's leaders. I am proud of the opportunity to present herewith the speech with which he won our State's oratorical contest for 1950:

TOWARD DEMOCRACY

(By Wellington D. Kohl)

I speak as an American Negro. I speak with pride, for my racial heritage is a worthy one. When the 13 colonies wrested their freedom from the hands of the British tyranny, free men of African descent laid down their lives along with their white comrades at Saratoga, at Monmouth, at Yorktown. Even in the dark days of slavery when the leaders of the South defied the Union, the wealth, the power on which their defiance relied, came from the toil of Negro men and women. And what of more recent years? What have we achieved since emancipation freed us from the profitless toil of slavery? In art, in literature, in science, in statesmanship our record is no cause for shame. I am proud to be of the same race as Marion Anderson, as James Weldon Johnson, as George Washington Carver, as Ralph J. Bunche.

So to the members of my race I say: Take pride in your racial heritage. Be too proud to ask or accept special consideration because yours is a race that has been grievously wronged in the past. Be too proud of your race to attribute any failures of your own to the fact that you belong to it. Devote your life to proving again what has already been proved in the past—that the American Negro can stand on his own feet, living valiantly in a way that adds to the glory of our country.

And now for my friends whose skin is white. There are two expressions I wish you would strike from your vocabularies and thinking. The first of these is the phrase "typical Negro." Who can be typical of a whole race? Just as you have, we have our cultured and our cruel, our virtuous and our vicious. I do not ask you to forget our race. I ask only that you judge us as individual members by the standards that apply to all Americans. The second expression to forget is "tolerance." I think it is a misnomer for what is really meant, but it is an offensive misnomer. Tolerance implies condescension. We do not tolerate our friends and equals. We like them or we dislike them—and active dislike is better than tolerance that says, "Make allowances. Not too much can be expected of him."

Then what can you do? All that we ask is that you go on doing what many of you have already been doing. Treat us as individual, responsible human beings. Judge each individual by what he is and by what he does. Respect the worthy. Censure the unworthy—but keep in mind the fact that our members include both.

And finally to my friends of both races. There is no sense in denying the existence of a racial problem. It is here. It is not so ugly and vicious as it once was, but it still exists, kept alive by irresponsible members of both races—members of whom both groups are properly ashamed. But it is diminishing. Great strides toward its elimination have been made, and they have been made not through conflict, but through cooperation. The disappearance of segregation in our public schools, the adoption of the fair employment practices law in New Jersey, the lessening of Jim Crowism everywhere—have not been the result of the efforts of one race. Fair-minded men and women of both races have worked together, have planned together to bring to all people the freedoms that are the rightful heritage of every American.

We of the Negro race are grateful to our white friends who have helped us to win these advances. Indeed, without their aid most of the progress would have been impossible, for we are in the minority. But their task is drawing to a close. Every step forward that we take adds to the share of the load that we of Negro ancestry must bear ourselves, for growth in freedom means growth in responsibility. And that is democracy—a society in which each individual can be measured not by what he is born with but by what he is—not by his race, his religion, his ancestry, but by himself. That is true democracy.

The Personal Equation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Personal Equation," which appeared in today's Washington Post, March 28, 1950:

THE PERSONAL EQUATION

Reckless drivers like Senator MCCARTHY seem to forget that the people they knock about in their mad careenings are live, flesh-and-blood individuals. A reminder of this has come from Haldore Hanson, a State Department employee, one of the Senator's hapless victims. In a letter to Senator TYDINGS, he reported that neighbors near a farm he owns in Loudoun County, Va., have begun referring to him as a Communist and a Russian spy, and that a petition has been circulated calling his family undesirable and urging their expulsion from

the community. Much the same harassment was reported by Mrs. Esther Brunauer in testimony before the Tydings subcommittee yesterday. Neighborhood communities are liable to believe what they are told by a United States Senator—even when what they are told is unsupported by any evidence whatever.

Senator McCARTHY has not hitherto displayed a sensitivity that could lead one to expect him to show much concern about these collateral consequences of his recklessness. But there ought to be real concern on the part of his colleagues in the Senate. For it is on that body that the darkest shadow of the Senator's conduct falls. The American people, for all their anxiety about communism, have not lost their sense of fair play. It is still considered profoundly un-American to hit a man who has no means of hitting back. Senator McCARTHY has been using the immunity conferred on him by his membership in the Senate to hit men like Haldore Hanson who have no chance to return the blow. The spectacle is an unedifying one.

Light on Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of March 27, 1950, entitled "Light on Lobbying":

LIGHT ON LOBBYING

The House investigation into lobbying opens today with the promise of being a very enlightening inquiry. Representative BUCHANAN, chairman of the investigators, wants to know why only 500 of an estimated 1,500 lobbying groups have complied with the act of 1946 requiring the registration of lobbyists. The committee also has a keen eye open for any underhanded schemes to influence congressional legislation. Yet these are more or less side issues. What the committee is basically interested in, as we understand it, is probing to the bottom of the lobbying process. It insists on knowing not only how lobbyists work, but where they get their strength, how the ideas sponsored by lobbyists originate, and what is the effect of lobbying on representative government.

As the first witness the committee is calling Dr. Hadley Cantril, professor of psychology and director of the office of public opinion research at Princeton, who will discuss the factors that shape public opinion and thus influence the legislative process. The committee realizes that lobbying begins at the grass roots. Perhaps the most effective lobbying is done, not directly with Members of Congress, but with their constituents. This is true in the case of lobbyists in the Government service as well as those working for private interests. If an idea takes hold among a large number of people, it is usually not very difficult to get Congress to accept it.

From the committee's agenda it appears that it intends to make a scientific study of how public opinion is developed and finally reflected in legislation. This can be an immensely useful study; for, as we have often pointed out, lobbying is an essential part of the democratic process. It becomes vicious only when special interests—outside or inside the Government—bring undue pressure to bear upon the representatives of the people. Out of this proposed comprehensive survey should come not only a better understanding of lobbying but also clearer ideas as to the efficacy of the present law and how it can be improved.

The Man at the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "The Man at the Top," which appeared in today's Washington (D. C.) Post, March 28, 1950:

THE MAN AT THE TOP

So Senator McCARTHY's top Soviet spy in the United States—the man on whose case the Senator stands or falls—is Owen Lattimore, director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins. An analysis of the file about him has now been shown the Tydings subcommittee. In addition, Mr. Lattimore is hurrying back home, presumably to demand a hearing, with the possibility, also, that he may prefer a slander suit against Senator McCARTHY. It is clear that his usefulness in his present work in Afghanistan has been impaired, if not undermined; he has been on a mission there for the United Nations.

Mr. Lattimore happens to be perhaps the leading American authority on Inner Asia. He has written a round dozen books on that huge arc of land stretching from the Yellow Sea through Manchuria, Mongolia, Sinkiang along to the northwestern frontier of India. For his work he has the esteem of literati on both sides of the Atlantic. If his volumes are merely fronts for Soviet Russia, hundreds of scholars will be rated as dunces, Johns Hopkins, the haven of sedition, and organizations throughout this country and most of the important newspapers carriers of propaganda. A further detail about Mr. Lattimore's work in inner Asia was provided in Mr. Drew Pearson's statement on Sunday that Mr. Lattimore had provided an asylum in Baltimore for two Mongol princes and the high priest of Mongolia who were in danger of their lives from the Russians. Guilt by association, indeed.

At times we have been at variance with some of Mr. Lattimore's conclusions. But whatever sections may be torn out of the context of his writings, whatever joining he has indulged in, we feel confident that he will be able to divest himself of the atrocious label that Mr. McCARTHY has pinned on him. The Russians are not so silly as Senator McCARTHY makes out. On analogy the top Soviet spy in this country would be somebody now occupying a seat near or with the mighty, someone who is a rabid anti-Communist engaged in keeping the animals stirred up. That, at any rate, is the sort of activity that would fall under the head of strategy of terror. As Mr. Edmond Taylor explained that strategy in the book by that name, the technique in France was to get the master minds in Nazi expansion in France to join anti-Nazi groups. In Japan there was the case of the Soviet spy, Sorge, who actually became the Emperor's counselor—perhaps the leading illustration of planting a spy in the least obvious place. The only safeguard against this kind of thing is to keep the national eye on the ball and to rely upon the FBI.

The Hickenlooper charges, says Dr. Frederick Seitz, in the latest issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, have "probably done as much to impede the progress of that organization (the AEC) as could a number of well-placed Russian agents." As much could be said of the McCarthy charges. The fantastic nature of these charges is already clear in the record. Mr. Lattimore's name is being used to expose the State Department, but he has nothing to do with the State Department. Senator McCARTHY says that he still has a desk in the Department, yet nobody else seems to have seen it. Five years ago he was on the Department's pay roll as an expert attached to the Pauley reparation mission to Japan. Whether the selection was Mr. Pauley's or the State Department's is immaterial; his experience and his knowledge would entitle him to consideration on any mission of such a nature. Before his work on the Pauley mission Mr. Lattimore was in the Office of War Information and prior to that was adviser to Chiang Kai-shek on White House recommendation. The most conspicuous item in his record at Chungking was his opposition, in behalf of Chiang, to Secretary Hull's trial balloon for a limited accord with Japan in an effort to stave off hostilities. What this record has to do with the McCarthy charge is as much of a mystery as how Mr. Lattimore's extracurricular activities bear out that charge.

Facts in Colorado River Dispute Should Be Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News of March 24, offers a good deal of food for thought:

FACTS IN COLORADO RIVER DISPUTE SHOULD BE KNOWN

One reason why Congress has given California the worst of the deal in our dispute with Arizona over Colorado River water is that people in the States east of here have not been familiar enough with the facts.

Our natural tendency as a people is to favor the under dog. Arizona is smaller, less populous, and less wealthy than California. Hence, to millions of Americans, any argument between the two States would seem, in the absence of information, to be a fight between a pygmy and a giant.

This may be a commendable spirit as between individuals, but even then it is possible for small persons to be wrong and large persons to be right.

As far as Arizona is concerned there is a way to offset the feeling that California is wrong because it is large. That is to tell people the facts. When San Francisco was preparing for her 1915 Panama Pacific Exposition she sent emissaries to eastern legislatures to get them to adopt resolutions to hold exhibits at the exposition.

California could very well send emissaries to Midwestern and Eastern States to tell them the truth about the Colorado. One of the first and largest truths to be told is that California's size is an argument in her favor. Under riparian laws everywhere population, or the need of people for water, is what counts above everything else.

Increasing Antitrust Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7827, a bill by Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, proposes to increase the maximum criminal penalties which may be imposed under the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000. Witness after witness appearing recently before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power has stressed the utter inadequacy and impotence of the present paltry penalty as a deterrent to some of the major violators of the antitrust laws. The great General Electric Co., for example, for six fines imposed in the last 12 years, paid a grand total of $30,000. No wonder the Department of Justice has concluded that a violation of the Sherman Act is frequently considered as a sound business risk. Under unanimous consent, I wish to place in the RECORD an excerpt from a report by the Department of Justice to a congressional committee, wherein it expressed this conclusion and emphasized the inadequacy of the present penalties under the antitrust laws.

Congress has noted in several instances the extremely small penalties that are imposed on individuals and corporations for a violation of the antitrust laws. In some respects the penalties are so low that violation is regarded by businessmen as a good business risk. The ineffectiveness of the small penalties to create a proper sense of responsibility in corporate officials is shown by a statement of an official of the Hartford-Empire Co.; in a memorandum written in 1925 regarding a future antitrust case against the illegal combination, he said (ex. 76, Hartford Empire Record, pp. 12573–12574):

"It may be well to consider here, also, what would be the result should any or all of these matters be upset by Government action, as follows:

"O'NEILL

"* * * Meanwhile the O'Neill organization and business as a going concern would have been irrevocably disposed of. We might be forced to put our O'Neill United States patents up for auction and sell them for a song and perhaps lose a few thousand dollars this way, but I cannot see that anything serious can happen in any event as to this transaction.

"FEDERAL

"Under similar circumstances, a dissolution here might be much more serious, depending upon the nature of the decree. It could hardly force us to give up any patents taken out in our name. We might conceivably be forced to dispose of patents practically taken out in the name of T. R. & B. and assigned to us. By the time, however, that such decree would become final, we would hope that the situation would be such that those Federal patents would not be worth much to anybody. We might lose whatever value we paid for them, but that would be all.

"Of course, the court might order that we transfer the entire Federal licensing business to some other party and turn over to that party the Federal patents. This, of course, would simply restore to a certain extent the existing situation and establish a competitor. It would have either one of two results—either that competitor would be in a reasonably strong position, in which case we could probably dispose of all these assets as a going concern for somewhere near what we paid for them and take our chances with competition, or by that time the situation would be such that it would be practically impossible to restore the old Federal competition even if it had all the Federal patents; in which case we wouldn't get much for the sale of these assets, but, on the other hand, the competition wouldn't be serious.

"Meantime, we would have gotten out our own patents; probably had the income from Federal licenses for several years; and very possibly also, as a result of the Federal and the other deals, we might have brought in Hazel-Atlas under license.

"I therefore do not see much danger of having any of these deals upset, as set forth. If they are upset, I still believe that by that time we will be in a better position even with such dissolution than we would be otherwise; and I see no danger whatsoever of any criminal liability, because the cases are necessarily so doubtful in the matter of law that they could never get any jury to convict, and I doubt if any prosecuting officer would ever attempt any criminal action. Criminal action in cases of this sort so far has practically been nonexistent."

The TNEC recommended a sharp increase in penalties in criminal cases as well as civil cases so that fines, etc., would be more commensurate with the damage to the public interest done when a large industrial corporation violates the antitrust laws. One recommendation not made by TNEC which the committee may wish to consider is to provide for mandatory increased criminal penalties for repeated violations of the antitrust laws.

Lesson in Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting an editorial which appeared in the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle, on March 10, 1950. There has been a wave of protest throughout the Nation against the tremendous waste and extravagance in the purchase of foodstuffs under the Government subsidy program. This has been particularly true in recent weeks in the case of potatoes, with the threat that many millions of bushels would be destroyed because Uncle Sam was to become the best customer of our farmers. Lehigh County, in the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, has thousands of acres cultivated for the growing of potatoes; in fact, on numerous occasions it has ranked No. 1 in Pennsylvania on the yield per acre and always has been one of the leading potato-growing counties in the State. However, I am very pleased and happy that the potato farmers in Lehigh County see fit to market their own products at a price less than that granted by the Government under the price-support program because of their desire to be independent of Government controls and regimentation. The editorial referred to is as follows:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS
LESSON IN AMERICANISM

As refreshing as those breezes that are calendared for next month was one of this morning's headlines which read: "Lehigh County potato growers protest United States support program."

It is a declaration of independence that does eternal credit to our local farmers and serves notice to the administration in Washington that at least their votes are not to be bought by Government hand-outs.

They make it clear that Lehigh County growers have taken little, if any, part in piling up the huge potato surplus, millions of bushels of which are now being dumped, for which farmers elsewhere in the country have been paid more than $80,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

In fact, they say the results of a price-support program that was supposed to help them out of their postwar marketing difficulties has destroyed that very market by imposing upon them an infiltration of out-of-State potatoes. They fear that by the end of the normal marketing season many of them will be out of business because of the Government's interference in the natural law of the land, the law of supply and demand.

Only 3 to 4 percent of the locally grown potatoes have been sold to the Government under its price-support program, most of the local growers having sold their crop through regular channels and at a lower price than support figures, rather than become dependent upon a nationalized control of their produce.

The Nation's welfare would be served immeasurably if this example of the kind of American independence that made this country great were followed by farmers in every section of the land.

St. Louis Banker Says Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Restored Public Confidence in Nation's Banks and Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a very interesting letter from a St. Louis, Mo. banker which I think should be read by every Member of Congress. As a former chief national bank examiner at St. Louis from 1920 to 1930 and later as chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, this man, Mr. John S. Wood, chairman of the board, Manchester Bank of St. Louis, certainly is in a position to speak with authority on banking matters.

Mr. Wood recites that from 1921 to 1933 he saw the number of commercial banks in the United States decrease from approximately 30,600 unit banks to fewer than 14,000 banks. He saw the loss of public confidence in both banks and bankers. It took the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to restore that confidence, Mr. Wood states in his letter.

Now, Mr. Wood warns it would be "gambling with fate to, in any degree, diminish the fund that enables the FDIC to promptly take care of the depositors of any insured bank that may get into an unsafe condition."

The letter which I received from Mr. Wood follows:

MANCHESTER BANK OF ST. LOUIS,
St. Louis, Mo., March 24, 1950.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The leaflet, containing your statement to Congress relative to the record of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in preventing any loss to a depositor in an insured bank during the past 6 years, has just come to my attention.

I congratulate you on making such a clear-cut presentation of this fine record of the FDIC. It is a sentiment of the management of this bank that there should be no reduction in the present rate of assessment.

I was chief national bank examiner at St. Louis from 1920 to 1930. During 1930 I became chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, and, in that capacity, directed the operations of the examining department of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

From 1921 to 1933, I saw the number of commercial banks in the United States decrease from approximately 30,600 unit banks to fewer than 14,000 banks. The public lost confidence both in banks and bankers. The FDIC restored public confidence both in banks and bankers. It is gambling with fate to, in any degree, diminish the fund that enables the FDIC to promptly take care of the depositors of any insured bank that may get into an unsafe condition.

I hope that your statement to Congress has as deeply impressed your fellow Members of Congress as it has impressed me.

Very truly yours,

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman of the Board.

The Price of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations, on March 12, 1950, in South Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-fourth celebration of the evacuation of Boston by the British:

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

My friends and fellow countrymen, it is a great honor for me to meet here with you to celebrate an event of especial significance in the history of our Nation. Your presence, your great love of country moves me deeply, for so long as our citizens pay tribute to the past they will guarantee the future. In this era of world unrest, at this moment when all men of honorable intentions yearn for peace and yet have just cause to view tomorrow with apprehension, it is fitting that we look back to the days when we were struggling to become a nation. Even a glimpse of that period increases our spirits, renews our confidence and sheds light to guide our way ahead.

But as dark as our course in world affairs sometimes now seems, as futile as our national efforts for peace often appear, I still feel that the clouds hanging over us are not nearly as dismal as those endured by our forefathers.

This event that we mark each year—Evacuation Day—was not the end of the war for the embattled colonists—on the contrary, they still faced 5 years of bitter strife. But that victory in 1776 was of enormous portent. Out of it flowed increased determination, proof that our military leaders were competent, and assurance that our sacrifices would lead to final and complete victory.

Such an event is worthy of closer examination; let us, therefore, review briefly the circumstances which led up to and brought about Evacuation Day—March 17, 1776.

As a result of the Boston Tea Party, the British Crown denied Massachusetts Colony the right of self-government. And as if this were not punishment enough, 8,000 troops under General Howe held the city of Boston in bondage. A fleet of British ships manned by 2,000 men filled the harbor thus closing the port. Our people were cut off from the outside world and in this beleaguered state the colony was slowly strangling.

From the summer of 1775 until January of 1776, the economic choking of Boston and the surrounding area continued. It seemed to be only a matter of time until the colonists would be forced to surrender. This was the condition when General Washington took command in Cambridge on July 3, 1775. Because of lack of artillery, Washington could do little to relieve the situation until Colonel Knox arrived on January 18, 1776, with 55 pieces of artillery seized by Ethan Allen the previous May at Fort Ticonderoga.

The placing of the guns on Cobble Hill, Lechmere's Point, and Lamb's Dam, and the subsequent seizure and fortification of these heights by General Thomas and his 2,000 troops brought about General Howe's decision to evacuate Boston. I have omitted many of the details, heroic deeds, which contributed much to the freeing of our beloved city and State—but I have done so purposely.

The one detail that I do wish to impress upon you is the strong and steady courage displayed by our forefathers during those terrible months of siege. Had they lacked that courage, they would never have forced the invader to leave. Without that valor of heart and soul they could not have struggled on to survive Valley Forge. Courage of purpose sustained those patriots from Boston to Yorktown—and after the last battle was fought, courage emerged as the basic ingredient holding us together as an infant Nation.

Since that memorable day of March 17, 1776, we have faced many enemies and fought many wars. The events bringing about those conflicts have been varied—but fundamentally, the evil common to all has been tyranny.

Now we hear the rumble of trouble once again—but this time the specter of war rides two horses—tyranny and godlessness. This latter evil is at work in our land, being spread by individuals who would have us believe that our way of life has outlived its usefulness. They attack every institution that has helped to make America strong and a decent place in which to live. They deny every high motive written into our Constitution and Bill of Rights. They impugn our right to be a nation because under our system a man has religious as well as political freedom—neither of which are tolerated in the slightest degree by the ideology they teach.

We need have no physical fear of such people. The only real harm that can come to us will be of our own doing. We must never permit ourselves to be persuaded, under one guise or another, to willingly give up even one of the many liberties we have fought to preserve.

And when we leave here today, let us go forward with renewed faith and confidence. Let us also prove that the calm courage of our forefathers has not been diluted by the passing of years—rather let us show all mankind that we are the worthy heirs of our freedom, ready and capable of extending it for the generations to come.

The World's Largest Oasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1923, a group of surveyors and engineers, led by the late William Mulholland, made a weary trek across the burning, empty desert of southern Nevada. Their goal was the Colorado River, a wild and treacherous stream that tore its way through immense canyons few people had ever seen.

There were no roads through the desert. Because of this the men had come out from Los Angeles by train to Las Vegas, Nev., and then had set out overland for the river.

The men were not gold prospectors, but they were looking for something that would bring untold riches to the cities and towns on the Pacific coast, 400 miles behind them. They were looking for a new source of water to meet the steadily increasing demands of southern California.

The water they wanted was there in the Colorado River, and specifically their mission was to find a route for an aqueduct that would carry that water over hundreds of miles of uninhabitable desert, over mountain ranges and high rock mesas to the people who needed it.

Doubtless few persons visiting southern California think of it as an oasis. It is unlikely that the easterner especially realizes that the luxuriant groves, vineyards and fields, the miles of homes, parks, gardens, factories, and mills between Los Angeles and San Diego stand on land that was once inhabited mainly by lizards and cactus. Southern California, from the Tehachapi Range to the Mexican border, is the world's largest oasis. More than that, it is a man-made oasis and its existence depends on a few comparatively small sources of water. A person familiar with great rivers of the Midwest, the East and South, would look upon any of southern California's main water supplies as a mere trickle. It is hardly conceivable to the traveler, seeing southern California's development for the first time, that the water which made it possible was imported for hundreds of miles.

The extent to which southern California depends on imported water can be realized when it is understood that a few well-placed bombs, atomic or old-fashioned, could bring all human activity to a grinding halt. Destruction of the Owens River and the Colorado River aqueducts, for instance, would place the lives of more than 6,000,000 persons in

peril, and would result in an unimaginable exodus from the Pacific coast.

These aqueducts are the lifelines of southern California, and during the war, when victory depended so greatly on Pacific coast production of matériel and trained personnel, the United States took adequate precautions to see that these vital water supplies were not interrupted. Constantly, for hundreds of miles across the deserts to the east and northeast, they were patrolled by soldiers. Never was vigilance slackened, for a break in these lines would have threatened the great national defense plants with a shut-down, and would have forced the removal of hundreds of thousands of troops from desert-training areas.

As vital as these aqueducts were during the war period, they are no less vital to the immediate future of southern California. One of them, the thin line of concrete from the Colorado River, is the only means with which southern California can meet its ever-growing demands of the present, and the demands which may be expected to come.

Serious threats to this vital supply now exist. They are based on the demands of the State of Arizona in H. R. 934 and S. 75 for an immense portion of the Colorado River water which years ago was awarded to California by contracts with the Federal Government. The controversy now rages in Congress.

Los Angeles, although the metropolis of the Pacific coast, typifies the struggle southern California cities and towns have had in defeating their greatest enemy, a dry water hole.

In 1877, the year Engineer Mulholland arrived in Los Angeles, the city had a population of 9,000. Its water supply was an open ditch, and the ditch was also used for washing clothes, watering stock, and bathing.

The source of the water in the ditch was what is laughingly called the Los Angeles River, a rocky wash that was occasionally a flood, but mostly a dance floor for dust spouts. With what water could be diverted from the uncertain river into storage, and with water pumped from underground wells, the city managed to survive and to grow. By the turn of the century the handwriting on the water table was clearly visible. Upstream the city was taking all the water which came into the river, and downstream the city was taking all it could from underground. There was not any more to be taken upstream, and the wells were going dry. That was because the water which normally would have flowed into the underground reservoirs from the river was being used before it got there.

Meanwhile the population of Los Angeles had passed the hundred thousand mark, and there were no indications it would not grow even faster. The city fathers, if not the people, were alarmed. More water had to be secured.

Out into the desert went City Engineer Mulholland and his crew. It was in 1904 they reported an accessible and dependable source had been found on the eastern slope of the towering Sierra Nevada Mountains, about 250 miles from the city. The people of the city readily dug down for the necessary cash. By a vote of 10 to 1 they approved a $23,000,000 bond issue for purchase of a right-of-way and construction of the Owens River aqueduct. It was completed in 1913.

Los Angeles thought it had solved its water problem for years to come. Only a short period passed before the fallacy of this belief became clear.

The growth of Los Angeles continued with increasing speed. A dry cycle struck southern California, and the aqueduct flow fell below the danger point. Once more engineers understood the city would soon face another crisis, and they began to look around for another source of dependable water.

This time they looked even farther away, out across the hundreds of miles of desert to a river that ran unchecked through a little known land. They looked to the Colorado whose towering canyon walls mark the boundary between Arizona and California.

By this time virtually all the cities of southern California were facing problems akin to that of Los Angeles. They joined forces and they all looked eastward to the river of hope.

Out once more into the desert went Engineer Mulholland, but this time he was accompanied by colleagues from various sections of southern California. The plan to bring Colorado River water to the desperate coastal areas was a southern California plan, for it was clear that with an overdraft on all sources new water must be imported for the entire southern California metropolitan area, not only the city of Los Angeles.

The route for the Colorado River aqueduct was found. This, too, was to be a people's project, and once more the people opened their pocketbooks. They mortgaged their homes and lands with a bond issue, and construction was begun in the last week of 1932. The project cost was set at $220,000,000.

The work was started none too soon. In the district which the aqueduct would serve lived 2,000,000 persons. Many cities were scraping the bottom of their water barrel. Los Angeles could see the exhaustion of its water supplies, but no end to new population.

For 9 years thousands of men toiled in the burning California desert on the Colorado River aqueduct, and the first purified water was delivered through it in June 1941, only 5 months before Pearl Harbor.

What this comparatively small line of concrete has meant to the oasis of southern California has been suggested above in this story. What it means to the future of the world's largest oasis has not been as fully stated.

The Colorado River aqueduct is southern California's life insurance. It was completed just in time to avert serious situations in many cities and their surrounding areas. All future development in southern California depends on an uninterrupted flow of water through it. Water from other sources would not by any means meet present needs. Already many cities, such as San Diego, Santa Monica, and Long Beach, depend for more than half of their water supply on this aqueduct.

The Colorado River aqueduct was constructed, not only on a sound concrete base, but on what was believed to be a sound legal base. Under the Boulder Canyon Project Act the water stored by Hoover Dam can be used only under contracts made with the Federal Government. The Federal Government approved the aqueduct and signed contracts with the metropolitan water district to supply it, subject to the Colorado River compact, for the water which was to flow through the aqueduct in the years to come.

It was on that foundation, the contracts with the United States, that the people of southern California invested their money in the aqueduct. They had every reason to believe in the sanctity of contracts with their Government, every reason to believe these contracts would never be repudiated.

Now the people of southern California are not so sure. The State of Arizona says the Government never had the right to permit California to take so much water from the Colorado River. Now Arizona wants an enormous part of California's Colorado River water, and has asked Congress for it, to be used in a gigantic Arizona project.

California says let us take the whole problem before the United States Supreme Court for final settlement, but Arizona will not agree to that, except on condition that Congress first authorize a fantastic billion-dollar project for central Arizona. Arizona wants Congress to repudiate its contracts with California, and give Arizona the water.

The people of southern California have demonstrated their concern. The water Arizona wants is water which the world's largest oasis must have to survive. The Colorado River aqueduct is southern California's last waterhole. If it dries up, all progress and development abruptly stop, and disintegration and retrogression start.

That is why California is asking the defeat of S. 75 and H. R. 934.

Using Hoover as a Cat's-Paw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very pertinent and timely observation by Willford I. King, nationally known and respected commentator. This article appeared in the biweekly news letter issued by the Committee for Constitutional Government:

USING HERBERT HOOVER AS A CAT'S-PAW

(By Willford I. King)

When fate brought Harry S. Truman to the White House, many felt a sort of pity for the naive little man from Missouri who was suddenly called upon to step into the shoes of the most adroit politician ever serving as

President of the United States. Largely forgotten was the fact that Truman had trained under Pendergast—a man who was no amateur in the game of politics. Hence, there was great surprise throughout the Nation when, on the evening of November 2, 1948, the returns showed that Truman had turned into victory an election which all the pollsters had predicted would be a walk-away for Governor Dewey. And, since that day, he has shown so much political astuteness that his erstwhile critics are beginning to wonder whether, as a politician, he is really inferior to the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself.

One example of his cleverness is the way in which he has used the FEPC issue to keep the Republicans and the Dixiecrats from forming an alliance against him—an alliance which, if consummated, might be a great menace to his future political career. Another example is his handling of the coal strike. He carefully avoided intervention until the fuel shortage became acute. He then used the threat of seizure as a whip to force the employers to grant most of the miners' demands. By refraining from seizure, he avoided open conflict with the mine owners; by settling the strike before most areas actually ran out of coal, he escaped calling down upon himself the dire wrath of the general public; and, by securing higher wage rates and more pension money for the coal miners, he intensified the loyalty of his most dependable group of supporters—the members of labor organizations.

But, for thoroughgoing political adroitness, his latest move probably eclipses any of his previous political maneuvers. He is actually arranging to use the prestige of Herbert Hoover to solidify the hold of Harry S. Truman upon the labor unions. Here is what is asked for in the message which he sent to Congress on March 13, 1950. It requests Congress to adopt 21 plans for reorganizing various agencies of the executive branch of Government, thus ostensibly merely carrying out the recommendations outlined in the monumental report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government—a report which was prepared under the direction of Herbert Hoover, and which has received almost universal acclaim for its unbiased and scholarly analyses and discussions of ways and means to secure greater efficiency and economy in governmental administration. All this seems highly laudable.

But, hidden away in the middle of the message is the seemingly innocuous plan No. 12, through which, according to President Truman, unified responsibility is once more established in the National Labor Relations Board by transferring to the Board and its chairman the functions of the general counsel, and by abolishing the statutory office of the general counsel. This plan will bring to an end the confusion which has resulted from the divided responsibility.

Evidently, by this explanation, the President hoped to lead Congress and the public to look upon this step as being merely a move to systematize the operations of a bureau.

In reality, however, the National Labor Relations Board has little resemblance to an administrative bureau. For all practical purposes, it is a court, the chief function of which is to adjudicate disputes between employers and employees. Under the Wagner Act, it really operated merely as an arm of the CIO. Following the Russian model, the functions of prosecutor and judge were combined, and, in most instances, regardless of the evidence, the case was decided in favor of the labor organization involved.

One of the main reasons for repealing the Wagner Act and adopting the Taft-Hartley law was to get rid of this un-American set-up. In the new statute, the functions of the prosecutor were separated from those of the court. As general counsel, Robert N. Denham, by his fair and unbiased enforcement of the law—neither employers nor employees being shown any favoritism—has gained the respect of all parties, not only for himself, but for the Taft-Hartley law as well. And now President Truman proposes to eliminate from the picture both Denham and his office and go back to the iniquitous system prevailing under the Wagner Act.

But the super-ironical twist to this scheme is that it is proposed under the guise of carrying out a mandate of the Commission headed by Herbert Hoover. And, to add insult to injury, under the general reorganization act passed by Congress, this plan will automatically go into effect unless it is specifically repudiated by a positive vote of at least one branch of Congress. Does a "doubting Thomas" still remain who is unwilling to concede that Harry S. Truman is a past master of political strategy?

If you are opposed to having the President usurp the constitutional powers of Congress in order to secure the financial support and votes of labor monopolists, tell your Congressman and Senator that section 12 of the President's message reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board should be voted down.

Reorganization Plan for Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the Washington Post carried an editorial in unstinted praise of the reorganization plan for Connecticut. Its appraisal was based upon general rather than specific knowledge, and its eager, though illogical, advocacy of change for change's sake alone.

Many months were required for the commission to complete its survey which recommended sweeping changes in the form of Connecticut's State government. With "government by emergency" the vogue since January 1949, the Governor summoned the general assembly in special session slightly more than a week after the commission's final report was made public. Thus the legislators are asked to pass immediately upon extensive reforms, including a completely revised State constitution, without ample time for careful study and thought. This—though our citizens have managed their public affairs adequately under the present constitution for 130 years.

My knowledge of the proposed changes is sketchy because of my multitudinous duties here in Washington; but I fear that an acceptance of all the recommendations, based upon haste and possible political advantage, would do irreparable harm.

Many public-service groups have now realized the danger inherent in adoption of many of the proposals, and are performing their public duty by calling to the attention of the legislature imperfections which may well lead to partisan political control of many State functions which have hitherto been outside that sphere.

The letters-to-the-editor column of the March 26 Washington Post contained the following pertinent comment on that score by Edgar Fuller of the National Council of Chief State School Officers:

REFORM IN CONNECTICUT

Your March 21 editorial comment that a little Hoover Commission is making a heroic effort to modernize Connecticut's State government is probably true in regard to a large part of Connecticut's State Constitution, but your indorsement is too sweeping. The commission would make the Governor a dictator. In some parts of the State government, the commission would go far enough toward totalitarianism to endanger democracy itself.

If the Connecticut commission has its way, the Governor will be given complete authority to appoint all department heads to serve at his pleasure and to fix their salaries at his discretion below a statutory maximum. He could veto the general assembly on any appropriation or any portion of any appropriation. He could transfer, consolidate, or abolish any State function or governmental organization by executive order, unless both senate and house affirmatively disapproved by a majority vote of their entire membership within 30 days of continuous session.

Connecticut's little Hoover Commission would strip the State board of education of its powers, abolish the trustees of the university, and place all public education directly under the Governor.

The commission's proposals do particular violence to the principle that a State agency for education must be organized and administered on a politically nonpartisan basis. It is impossible to teach effectively in a political atmosphere.

Similar principles of operation apply to the official agencies through which the people govern their system of education. Partisan politics has no place in local boards of education, where board members are as close to the people as any political officer. Neither does it have a proper function in the State board of education, for here is the State's quasi-judicial and rule-making source of professional decision. Only as the general assembly makes high general policy for the State system of public education along with all the other functions of State government should public education and our system of politics merge.

As a practical matter, no governor could give the time and attention required to perform the policy-making functions now performed by the State board of education, even if he should be qualified and inclined to do so. The commissioner of education would be forced to become an educational dictator, safe in his dictatorship as long as he remained in the good graces of the Governor.

We should keep the schools close to the people and at the same time free to operate on a professional basis and without partisan political interference. Our system of education in local comunities is a State system. Local board members are legally State officials locally selected. If the State agency for education is organized and conducted on a political basis with its potentially great powers of supervision over local schools the entire system will inevitably become political. It is a fundamental principle that the practical problem of policy development for education must be one for laymen selected on a nonpartisan basis rather than for either politicians or professional educators.

The same principles apply to the operation of teachers' colleges, vocational schools, the State department of education, and the university. The Governor cannot take the place of a lay State board of education in formu-

lating policies and evaluating programs in these areas of State school administration, if for no other reason than the Governor's insecure tenure and his lack of personal time to develop educational policies. Experience in many States proves that a governor's bad record in education becomes evident too late to protect the schools and colleges.

If the little Hoover Commission in Connecticut has its way, partisan politics will interfere with the best aspects of the present administration of education, undermine both the State and local school systems, and reduce the quality of all the public schools and colleges of Connecticut.

EDGAR FULLER,
National Council of Chief State School Officers.
WASHINGTON.

Impartial Study of Steel Industry Asked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement released by me for the press yesterday, as follows:

I am deeply disturbed by the recommendations and the implications contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. They sound like a blueprint for socialism, and are suspiciously close to the arguments advanced by the British Labor-Socialist Party in England in the late 1930's advocating the nationalization of industries. It is shocking to find that a philosophy so alien to the American system of free enterprise, the system that has made us the greatest Nation in the history of the world, has obtained so strong a foothold in the Halls of Congress. It is apparent from a study of this report that unless the American people assert themselves immediately, the days of reward for personal initiative and private enterprise will be lost beyond recall. Fortunately, there is still time to rebel against being made to walk the plank into the stagnant, enervating waters of socialism.

The viciousness of the report lies more in its portentousness than in its immediate recommendations. The thinly veiled plan of things to come is easily discernible. In the name of "free enterprise" the report seeks to lay the ground work for nationalized industry by instilling in the minds of the people a distrust and an antagonism toward what has come to be known as big business. Starting with the preconceived notion that the steel industry is an enemy of the people and of free enterprise, the report proceeds to set up a future program which, if the committee's most recent effort is any indication, will merely serve as a sounding board for advocates of the socialized state.

It is admitted in the report that the steel industry is the backbone of our economy. It is also generally conceded that the strength of this industry is one of our greatest bulwarks against aggression. Does it not, therefore, seem ridiculous that we should be continually hammering at its foundation and seeking to sap its vitality? No more effective way could be devised to undermine the faith of the people of this country in the American way of life then these irresponsible political investigations which spread seeds of hate in the mind of the public with the apparent sanction of the Congress. Investigations of this sort should be curbed immediately.

For more than a quarter of a century, we have been conducting periodic investigations of the steel industry. (Currently we have three separate investigating committees digging in this field at the same time.) The findings of some of these committees has been such as to raise a serious question as to their value. The report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is a glaring example of this. For one thing, it seeks to make it appear that, in condemning the December 1949 price rise in steel, its conclusions are based on investigation. However, as the minority report points out, the chairman of the committee had the temerity to announce his conclusions more than 5 weeks before the investigation began. Such predetermination might meet with approval in the satellite countries, but it does violence to our notions of justice. Parenthetically, I might add that such conduct does much to bring all congressional investigations into disrepute.

The committee's report characterizes the December 1949 price rise in steel as unwarranted. It also intimates that it constituted price gouging resulting from monopolistic practices, and was a studied act in derogation of the business and economic interests of the country. If this be true, then the policy of the steel industry has suffered a complete about-face during the past 12 months. Throughout 1948, the Committee to Investigate Questionable Trade Practices, of which I was chairman, conducted an intensive investigation of the "gray market" in steel. We did not limit ourselves to a 4-day public hearing as did the joint committee, but instead spent 12 months investigating the sales policies and practices of every major steel producer and most of the smaller steel producers in this country. And we double-checked our findings by tracing the steel through hundreds of distributors and warehousemen into the hands of the manufacturers.

The evidence disclosed that the major steel producers, those responsible for 90 percent of our steel production, were making an honest effort to prevent inflation by holding the price line in steel during the months of extreme shortages following World War II. There was no evidence that any attempt was made by the major steel producers to take advantage of the fact that steel was in short supply. I believe that this policy of the steel companies was perhaps the largest single factor in preventing runaway inflation during that period. I am not a champion of the steel industry, and I am not blind to its faults. But I do believe in being fair and giving credit where due.

The joint committee's report suggests that further study be made of the steel industry and to this extent at least I concur in its recommendations. Since competition is the very life-blood of our system of free enterprise, I believe it would be desirable to have a continuing check against monopolistic practices. But for any such study to command respect, it would have to be conducted on an impartial basis. Every step should be taken to eliminate the possibility that any charge of "political bias" could be legitimately leveled. I, therefore, propose to introduce a resolution calling for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to carry on this work and report its findings to the Congress from time to time. I feel that this is the best way to insure that the Congress will receive correct information for its guidance in regard to this basic industry.

I have no pride of authorship in such a resolution and will welcome any suggestion or will cooperate with anyone wishing to assist in the drafting. My only suggestion is that such action be taken without delay.

Here's a Business Poll Congress Might Ponder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal for March 23, 1950, is so enlightening upon the subject now under debate that I desire to have it printed in the RECORD. I hope every Member of this body will read it:

HERE'S A BUSINESS POLL CONGRESS MIGHT PONDER

Europe must trade with us or go under. And trade is a two-way proposition. If the Europeans cannot sell in American markets, the only way they can be kept going is through outright American subsidy, whether we call it a gift or a loan, knowing in the case of the latter that it cannot be repaid until and unless the debtor does have greater access to our markets.

That simple but hard fact is acknowledged by expert economists and hard-headed businessmen alike. Businessmen in the ECA, for instance, calculate that the Marshall plan will have meant almost nothing unless the nations of western Europe are permitted to sell us an additional one and a half to two billion dollars worth of their goods and services each year. Priming the pump of European production, in other words, is a waste of time and money and false hope unless we are prepared to offer a market to some of that production. And since all but the blindest of us are aware that we desperately need a strong and stable and prosperous western Europe as our ally in a cold war that could go hot, many Americans consider opening our markets to increased competition of European goods a small sacrifice indeed for the cause of world peace and the certainty of stronger western defense against possible aggression.

There has been much evidence, however, that individual businessmen are willing to welcome increased foreign competition for the other man—but not for themselves. Tariffs are the wall that keeps out foreign goods. Every time a lowering of these protective tariffs is considered, Congress is deluged by lobbyists determined to keep their own particular market protected.

It is highly encouraging, therefore, to discover that many of the most practical businessmen in this country—purchasing executives—face the prospect of greater foreign competition with good cheer, and, more important, believe that we must run the risks involved in tariff reductions so that European nations can achieve greater dollar earnings in American trade and thereby spend more here for American goods.

This discovery was made by the magazine Purchasing in a Nation-wide poll of purchasing agents, and we hope every Congressman has a good look at its detailed findings before he accepts the stuck-pig arguments of a few protection-obsessed lobbyists as gospel for all business. Seventy percent of Purchasing's pollees said that "no harm would come to their companies' domestic sales by downward revision of present tariff rates," and a healthy 57 percent agreed that, in any case, "we must run the risks involved" in opening our markets to increased foreign competition.

No businessman is more vitally interested in the problem of supply and competition than the purchasing agent. That makes

some of these survey rejoinders well worth the attention of other businessmen. "Since when," asked one, "has American business really feared competition?" And one, quite aware that whether it actually feared competition or not, some segments of it had shown great tariff-law ingenuity in killing it, observed:

"Quite often protective tariffs subsidize inefficiency and lack of vision and initiative on the part of management (and labor). Welfare 'from the cradle to the grave' is to me the tariff as applied to the businessman."

There is a greater welfare involved now, and more and more Americans are coming to see it. More, too, are seeing the hard, common sense in the curt reaction of still another executive: "If we are going to send them money, let's let them work for it." And they can't do that if we wall out the products of their work.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News:

IT'S THAT BIG

Budget requests made by President Truman were trimmed more than a billion dollars by the House Appropriations Committee which prepared an omnibus measure to finance various Federal agencies for the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

Despite the lopping of such a huge sum from the total of Mr. Truman's spending plan, however, the budget, if adopted by Congress without further reductions, will mean a deficit of more than $4,000,000,000 during that year.

That is striking evidence of the enormity of the spending program which Mr. Truman has outlined for the 12-month period.

Budget deficits are unavoidable in time of real emergencies, such as wars and great depressions. Spending in such times of stress cannot possibly be held within income without running danger of losses that would far exceed the amount of debt that is accumulated in combating such emergencies.

However, great budget deficits are indefensible when emergencies are not to be contended with and when income is high as a result of prosperous conditions. They are not only indefensible, they are dangerous.

Just about everybody in the country, outside of those in charge of the Government, realizes the danger contained in our fiscal policies.

But President Truman and his advisers who dictate the Government's spending policies take a strange view of financial policies.

They apparently see no danger in piling up deficit after deficit, each one raising the level of the national debt a few notches higher.

With Government revenues at an all-time high, some of the money rolling into the Government Treasury should be applied toward reduction of the debt, for sound financing policies call for reducing during lush times the debt accumulated during years when extraordinary situations are to be dealt with or Government revenues drop to low levels.

Such policies have been consistently ignored during the Truman administration.

In fact Mr. Truman is going into the records as the greatest spender in the history of the United States Government.

Total expenditures by the United States Government during the administrations of 32 Presidents, including the late President Roosevelt's first two terms, were $176,620,113,645.

In five years, the Truman administration has managed to disburse $191,081,394,191 of the people's money. Thus, under the Truman policies, the Federal Government has spent in 5 years about $15,000,000,000 more than was expended in all the previous years there was a United States of America.

But that does not tell the whole story.

Government spending would be much higher than it is if all of Mr. Truman's proposals were put into effect.

He has a long list of domestic projects, the cost of which has never been accurately estimated, but which would run many billions of dollars a year. And then there is his proposal that the American people assume the cost of raising the living standards of all countries in the globe.

If all these had been adopted our forty-odd-billion-dollar budgets we now have would look small in comparison with the amounts of money the taxpayers would be called upon to provide every year.

And the danger of this happening has not been dispelled by Congress' coolness toward most of the Truman projects.

If the administration should gain control of Congress at this year's elections, at least some of these tremendously costly ideas would be enacted into law, maybe all of them.

That puts it up to the people when they go to the polls next November. Only the election of a Congress dominated by sound men, who have sane ideas on Government spending can protect the public from extravagance that would out-rival anything in history.

Consecration of Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to be a guest at an awe-inspiring service conducted in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, last Friday, March 24, 1950, consecrating His Excellency Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the diocese of Springfield, Mass. The bishop was installed in his new diocese this morning at St. Michael's Cathedral, Springfield, Mass., with the solemn service of the Catholic Church.

Bishop Weldon was born in New York City, September 6, 1905, the son of Patrick and Mary Dwyer Weldon. He attended Montreal College, Montreal, and St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y., and was ordained September 21, 1939, by the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes. After ordination he took special studies in philosophy at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Between various parish assignments in the New York archdiocese, he taught from 1931 to 1935 at the Newman School, Lakewood, N. J. He was named a papal chamberlain with title of Very Reverend Monsignor, on October 29, 1947, and a Domestic Prelate in December 1948.

After 4 years' service as a Navy chaplain, he served as master of ceremonies to His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, in 1946 and 1947. He has been executive director of Catholic Charities of the archdiocese since 1948.

The bishop will be the spiritual leader of 300,000 Catholics of the four western counties of Massachusetts. To this position he brings a demonstration of capacity for leadership and organization as a curate, an educator, a naval chaplain, and executive director of the Catholic charities of the archdiocese of New York.

In the name of the residents of the Second Congressional District, the entire area of which is included in Bishop Weldon's diocese, I address to the new bishop a sincere "ad multos annos."

The Abducted Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday western Massachusetts, together with other sections of the country, commemorated Greek Independence Day and also took occasion to call the world's attention to the tragic plight of the 28,000 abducted children.

The demonstration in Springfield was an inspiring one and I know it has been helpful to the cause.

You all well know of my long interest in this matter, so I do not intend to again speak on the subject at this time. But I wish to call your attention to the resolution that was unanimously adopted at the Springfield meeting. I urge you to give it your full support with as much spirit and courage and will to succeed as you would if your own children were among those who had been abducted. This is not a Greek problem—it is a problem for all of us because it is a matter of justice, decency, and humanity. I will read the resolution to you:

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON ABDUCTED CHILDREN

Whereas the abduction of approximately 28,000 children from their homes in Greece and their forcible detention in countries alien to their natures, customs, and birthright has profoundly shocked the civilized world; and

Whereas the countries of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet occupation zone in Germany have ignored unanimous resolutions adopted by the United Nations Assembly on November 27, 1948, and on November 17, 1949, and refused to cooperate in securing the release of these children and their return to the arms and hearts of their parents, and the comfort and security of their homes; and

Whereas forcible detention of these children and the attempted severance of all their ties of family, home, and country is tantamount to the horrible crime of geno-

cide and an abominable crime against humanity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to take appropriate steps and to enact such legislation and adopt such measures as may be necessary and expedient to bring to the attention of the afore-mentioned countries the feeling of the world-wide revulsion at this infamous crime and to demand the liberation of these children and their prompt repatriation; and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress, and that the latter be urged to do all in their power to accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

The Late Honorable J. F. T. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Secretary Snyder at unveiling of portrait of J. F. T. O'Connor, February 18, 1950:

It was my good fortune to have enjoyed the friendship of J. F. T. O'Connor and to have worked with him during the banking crisis of the 1930's when, as Comptroller of the Currency he was called upon to perform duties which had a profound effect upon the future of the American banking system.

Before coming to the Treasury Department as Comptroller on May 11, 1933, Mr. O'Connor had achieved prominence as a teacher, lecturer, legislator, and attorney. During 5 years in the office which today receives his portrait—years which amply tested his varied qualities—he met the grave challenges of the times with courage and intelligence.

People in the Treasury remember him best for the leadership he gave in expediting the termination of bank receiverships. In the realization that great hardship had been visited upon millions of individuals whose money was tied up in insolvent banks, Mr. O'Connor from the beginning of his services as Comptroller lent untiring energy and understanding to this major problem which came in the wake of the "banking holiday."

Through the application of time-saving procedures instituted by him, the liquidation of 1,417 banks which remained closed at the end of the "banking holiday" was carried out in record time. Some idea of the effectiveness of this program can be gleaned from the fact that by December 31, 1937, $1,600,000,000 of the $1,900,000,000 impounded in insolvent banks had been released.

As one of the original members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. O'Connor was active in the organization of this agency, particularly in helping to build up a force of competent examiners to inspect the accounts of thousands of banks before FDIC insurance could be effective.

The closing chapter of Mr. O'Connor's interesting life was written on the Federal bench, where the former Comptroller of the Currency served with characteristic distinction for the 9 years prior to his death last fall.

I believe it was Bacon who said that "the mould of a man's fortune is in his own hands." Thus measured, it may be truly said that "Jeffty" O'Connor made much of his life.

The Master Planners and Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, March 25, I was privileged to address 150 members and guests of the Dane County Dental Society at Madison, Wisconsin's capital city.

With modesty, but with the hope that my remarks may contain information of usefulness to those who read them, I present the text of my address for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MASTER PLANNERS AND COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

Chairman Dr. Simley, members of the Dane County Dental Society, and guests, I am pleased to be able to meet with you here today. I cannot come to you as a member of your profession, but my position as a dentist's husband more closely approximates that of your wives who have accompanied you here.

If I were a minister, I suppose I should have a text, and if I were to quote a text it would be this: "America is being spent and planned into socialism."

If it was shocking for you to realize (and I hope it was) that our Federal Government went in the hole almost $2,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year ending June 30—a year of high prices, high employment, and high taxes—it should be more shocking to recall that the deficit for the current fiscal year will exceed $5,000,000,000 and that the President's proposed budget for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, contemplates a deficit of a similar amount. By the end of the next fiscal year our Federal debt will have climbed to $265,000,000,000.

What attitude should we take toward this deficit policy—the immoral policy of passing on the financial responsibility of this generation to succeeding generations of Americans?

There are three current attitudes. One is simply to not worry about it—to consider deficit financing as the normal thing in these times. That is the attitude of the President, who so stated over a Nation-wide radio hookup. Evidently there are a large number of Members of Congress who agree with him. At least there are many who continue to vote for all the appropriations but refuse to consider the sources of revenue that are necessary to meet the deficits caused by those appropriations. There seem to be a number of them who feel that the best way for them to stay in office is to vote for all appropriations and against all taxes. Evidently that is a good way to be reelected, but it is a darn poor way to run the Government of the United States.

A second attitude is that we should meet the deficit by increasing taxes. Most leading economists agree, however, that this is a poor time to burden a rather unsettled economy with increased taxation. Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, and Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee maintained that attitude during 1949. Now, in 1950, attempts to increase the total Federal revenue are meeting with stiff opposition. For the most part, I think you will find that those who have been most zealous in the advocacy of increased taxation have been those who seek not to balance the budget by that means, but rather who see in the increased revenues the wherewithal for financing a large additional number of projects on which they would like to see the Federal Government embark.

The third attitude, and the one which sounds the most reasonable to me, is to reduce the spending so as to bring it in line with the level of income. Most people heartily approve of this verbally, but too few of them are willing to take the action which is necessary to conform to their words.

WHAT ABOUT THE HOOVER REPORT?

A common state of mind these days is to point to the reports of the Hoover Commission as the answer to the problem of duplication and waste and overspending, the answer to Federal deficits. Plainly speaking, the reports of the Hoover Commission will not solve our deficit dilemma for two reasons: First, they will not be put into effect in a wholehearted manner; and second, even if they were put into effect 100 percent our Government would still be operating at a deficit. The most optimistic estimate of saving under the Hoover Commission reports was from three to four billion dollars. Quite obviously, as important as this saving would be, it could not erase our existing rate of deficit. We could total up the salaries of all Federal employees and we would still come far from accounting for all of the Federal spending. After these salaries have been added up, and the foreign spending and the interest on the public debt, and the veterans' benefits have all been totaled, there still remains a large portion of the Federal budget that is unaccounted for. The answer is that large sums of money are being paid out to all sections of the country and to all classes of people in the forms of various grants, subsidies and Federal aid programs. By these means we have reversed the normal relationship of the levels of government. Their proper relationship, it seems to me, can be illustrated by a triangle, the broad base which represents our local units of government, the governmental units which are closest to the people, most responsible to the people, and can in most cases most effectively deal with their problems. As the triangle narrows from the broad base we reach the legitimate area of the operation of the State government. This area of problems includes those which cannot be adequately handled at the local levels. Then as we approach the apex we reach the legitimate area of the operation of the Federal Government in dealing with our domestic problems.

We have, however, completely reversed this traditional relationship. Under our current practices, the broad base of the triangle now represents the enveloping field of activities of the Federal Government. The triangle then narrows into the area of the State government with a closely confined area of local responsibility in the region adjacent to the apex. Our tax moneys are being poured in at the top of this inverted triangle, the largest portion taken by the Federal Government, and then what is left trickles down into the area of the State and local governments. Thus have the legitimate areas of taxation of the State and local governments been usurped. Thus has the Federal Government made it impossible for these units of Government to meet the responsibilities which are rightfully theirs. I think we can attribute no small portion of the general lack of, and the break-down of,

civic responsibility and civic morale to the fact that State and local governments have been placed in a completely dependent and subservient position with relation to the Government in Washington.

The greater the amount of Federal spending and Federal taxation, the more that local and State units of government are rendered impotent to perform their legitimate functions, the easier becomes the task of those in high places who are waging a persistent and relentless campaign to governmentalize the American people, to fit us all to a pattern so that we shall conform to the master plan. It is time that we begin to recognize who these people are and what they plan to do. It is fit and proper that we should be meeting here today, for we are fighting in the same conflict—a conflict with battle fronts extending from Washington, D. C., to Madison, Wis., to San Francisco, and back across the Nation again. You are in the front line of battle here. It is my high honor and it is my dedication to be in the front line of our common fight in Washington.

THREE BILLS EXPOSE THE PLAN

The picture in Washington today of the efforts of those planners to slip the noose of governmental controls over our heads is as sordid as it is dangerous to the future of this Nation. This effort can be exemplified, but is by no means limited to, three legislative proposals.

One is the proposed Economic Stability Act of 1949, H. R. 2756, better known as the Spence bill. The second is the proposed S. 1971, better known as the Brannan plan. The third, and the one with which you are most familiar, takes the form of S. 1679 and H. H. 4313, the Thomas-Pepper-Taylor-Humphrey-Dingell-Biemiller bills.

These three, while ostensibly separately sponsored and wrapped in separate legislative packages, are part and parcel of the same legislative program. They are brain children of the same group of planners who have ensnared the President and through him the Government of the United States—the Ewing-Keyserling-Brannan-Altmeyer cabal. Shrewd, scheming, ambitious, and not too scrupulous, these men are the brain trust of the Fair Deal. These are the men to whom, in his confusion in mid-1948, the President turned in desperation, and then, incredibly, Harry Truman, mouthing the words that they prepared for him, won the Presidency in his own right. This was a windfall which placed the Ewing cabal in the driver's seat. They are now playing the tune to which the Missouri pianist dances. Unfortunately for them, but fortunately for America, the Eighty-first Congress has balked at implementing their grand plans. There have been serious set-backs. None of the aforementioned big three of their legislative program has been or will be enacted into law by this Congress. The disappointment of the planners has been expressed by leaders of the Farmers Union which usually faithfully follows the Ewing-Brannan line. In their issue of March 3, National Farmers' Union in Washington said: "It became apparent this week that President Truman's Eighty-first Congress may be worse than the Eightieth in many respects. Observers here are calling this Congress the Eighty-worst."

SIMILAR MOANS IN MADISON

Similar wails of anguish have frequently come from the ivory towers of the local Ewing-Keyserling-Brannan-Altmeyer mouthpiece—and I don't mean the Wisconsin State Journal.

But what of the Eighty-second Congress? What if the American people permit themselves to be bought with their own money, let themselves be carried away by the promises of the planners? What if the majority of the Americans look only at that part of the Spence bill which promises "maximum production and supply," "improved distribution of essential materials and facilities," and "prevention of price movements which inflict serious hardships or impede economic stability"? What if they look only at the portion of the bill to implement the Brannan plan which says: "Stabilize farm income and farm prices"; and "provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in commerce"?

What if in 1950 the people read only that portion of the Biemiller bill which promises: Adequate health services to all our people regardless of residence, race, creed, color, or economic status?

What if the Esaus of 1950 are captivated by the slogans: "A job for everyone," "High prices for farmers—low prices for consumers," "Free medical care"? What if they should select a Congress which gives ear to the planners' palaver and enacts the Ewing-Brannan-Keyserling-Altmeyer program for planned employment, planned farming, and planned medicine? The answer is as plain as the handwriting on the wall, or rather as plain as the printing on the paper.

SPENCE BILL DRAFTED BY BUREAUCRATS

First and briefly, let's take a look at the Spence bill, a copy of which I now hold, the proposed Economic Stability Act.

Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, is the elderly chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. He is a Fair Dealer but lacks the crusading zeal of the Ewing cabal. It is obvious that the bill was drafted and presented by the planners in a Federal agency.

Purely on his own motion, and under conditions of which he is the sole judge, the President would be empowered to (and remember these are peacetime powers):

1. Establish compulsory quotas for production.
2. Establish Federal programs to supplement private enterprise.
3. Construct and operate new plants or factories, open and operate new mines.
4. Regulate imports and exports.
5. Fix maximum prices.
6. Establish compulsory allocations and priorities of materials (this provision alone gives the power of life or death over every private enterprise in the Nation).

These powers are based on no emergency. They simply and brazenly provide the blueprint for a planned economy for industry—an economy to be absolutely controlled by the President and those to whom he delegates his powers in accordance with the terms of the bill. Obviously, a planned economy and a controlled economy are one and the same. They have to be. Which of the great planners would be satisfied to plan without the authority to compel adherence to it? How futile indeed would such a plan be.

STRAIT-JACKET FOR OUR FARMERS

The Spence strait-jacket plan for industry is paralleled by the Brannan strait-jacket plan for farming. This plan, evidently for lack of a sponsor, has never been introduced in legislative form in the House. Chairman THOMAS, of Oklahoma, of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee is its sponsor in the Senate. It is the slickest and most fundamentally dishonest political scheme the planners have yet devised. In its full-blown form it spelled out the end of farm price supports. The farmer was simply to sell his produce in the open market at whatever price he could get. But he could continue to get farm-support prices since the Federal Government would step in to pay him the difference between his guaranteed price and his selling price. Thus everybody should be happy—the farmer to get high prices, the housewife to buy at low prices. How simple—it's a wonder someone didn't think of it before. As a matter of fact, someone did. It has been kicking around in the Department of Agriculture for about 10 years, since a fellow whose first name was Henry and whose last name I shall not mention, was Secretary of Agriculture. That in itself ought to be enough to put us and the farmers on guard.

BRANNAN DOESN'T KNOW COST

What about the poor people who make up that differential in price—the taxpayers, who include the consumers as well as the farmers? And what about the thousands of Government employees who will need to check on the millions of farmers and ascertain the payments due? What about the duplicate or triplicate copies of reports every farmer will need to make every time he sells a dozen eggs or a peck of potatoes? What about the army of inspectors who will decide whether a farmer keeps within the production unit quotas allotted? What would such a plan cost? No one, not even Mr. Brannan himself, will hazard a guess, and Mr. Brannan and his fellow planners apparently do not care.

The plan itself has undergone considerable change. It is almost impossible to know just what is in the so-called Brannan plan at this particular moment. The attempt to apply it generally to all agricultural products has long since been forgotten. The cotton, peanut, and tobacco growers will take their present 90 percent of parity—thank you, suh—and Mr. Brannan has bade them welcome. The 1,800 units of production limitation, heralded as giving the benefits to the so-called small farmer—that, too, has long since disappeared, which makes poppycock of the claim that this plan is to help the family-sized farmer.

If there is any farmer who is attracted by the glow of the current administration plan, I'd like to have him take a look at the ready-made form-fitting strait-jacket which Superschemer Brannan has prepared for him—15 solid printed pages of penalties contained in the Senate-introduced version of the Brannan plan.

SOCIALIZED HEALTH BILL NOT NEW

Today's third example of the efforts of the master planners is the one with which you of the medical and dental professions are most familiar—the Ewing-Altmeyer compulsory national health-insurance program. Like its country cousin from the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Security Administration's plan is not entirely new. The current Thomas-Pepper-Taylor-Humphreys-Dingell-Biemiller bills are simply revised and refined versions of proposals which Isadore Falk and Wilbur Cohen have been preparing at taxpayers' expense for several years. Never before, however, have they been able to get a President of the United States to make it a major political issue. Never before have the left-wing planners been so strong in the executive department of the Government. Perhaps it is because never before have they had as their spokesman and figurehead so shrewd a political manipulator as the former vice chairman of the Democratic Party who now serves as Federal Security Administrator.

In May of 1948 Ewing called the Second National Health Assembly. Some 800 representatives of the healing professions were invited to go to Washington for this conference. Ewing purported to be seeking advice and recommendations for his report on the Nation's health, which President Truman had in January requested him to make. Actually, the drafting was already well along, and Ewing's real purpose was to attempt to force a recommendation for his compulsory health-insurance scheme through the assembly. You see, the assembly had been disproportionately loaded with members of the two "front" organizations sponsored by the planners in the Federal Security Administration and their friends—the Committee for the Nation's Health and the Physicians' Forum. But the scheme miscarried. While the assembly approved the statement that

the Americans are not receiving adequate care, that medical science has advanced beyond the present general application, and the economy can support more medical care, it did not approve of compulsory health insurance. But Oscar Ewing is not one to be bothered with such a set-back. His report, entitled "The Nation's Health—A Ten-Year Program," issued in September 1948, blithely ignored the health assembly and recommended a Government medicine program. This election-year campaign document of 1948 has become the bible of the advocates of Federal medicine.

EWING REPORT FILLED WITH ERRORS

As every physician, dentist, nurse, or hospital manager who has read the report knows, it is filled with misrepresentations and inconsistencies. The figures have obviously been cut to fit the cloth. They have already been too well exposed to require further attention.

It is rather interesting, if not amusing, to note that while in one place Mr. Ewing states, "The Government plan would ultimately cover everyone in every State," at another point he says, "Full freedom of choice should be left to doctors, hospitals, and other instrumentalities of health as to whether they will participate."

This is indeed in keeping with the planners' idea of a free choice—the choice of members of the health professions to stay outside and starve; the choice of the patients to pay dearly for medical services they do not use.

Knowing well that the American people are instinctively repelled by socialized medicine, the planners deny that their program amounts to that. They like to use the terms "prepaid medical care" and "national health insurance." Their smooth persuasion is: "Why, everything would be just the same as it is now; the only difference would be that the Government would pay the bill instead of the patient having to do so at the time the service is rendered."

I believe Senator TAFT answered that quite well when he said: "The fact is that this is not insurance. It is a plan for Government administration of all medical care, supported by tax on pay rolls. There is no difference between a pay-roll tax and any other tax. This can't be insurance if a man has no option except to pay for it."

Spokesmen for both the Committee for the Nation's Health and the Physicians' Forum have admitted that the fee-for-service method of payment could not be used. Dr. Ernest T. Boas, head of the Physicians' Forum, said: "Insurance guaranteeing complete medical coverage cannot be set up, except at a prohibitive cost, if the fee-for-service principle is retained."

MIGHT FOLLOW BRITISH COURSE

The other alternatives are putting members of the healing professions on a capitation or panel basis, such as now is frequently used in Great Britain, or on a straight-salary basis. Does that sound to you as if "everything would be the same as it is now"? You, as members of the medical and dental professions, and we, as your patients, know that things would not be the same. I do not doubt but what in dollars and cents you might be better off at least until after some Government official decided you should make less money, but you would live, just as the physicians, dentists, and nurses of today in Great Britain are living, in fear—fear for your professional positions, fear for the quality of the work being done, fear of what is to come. For my part, as a patient, I would not relish the prospect of competing with the inevitable malingerers and hypochondriacs for 3 minutes of the time of a harried, harassed, overworked, form-swamped, government practitioner. British patients are putting up with that today.

These are the obvious and immediate trappings of compulsory medicine, but the issue is more basic and fundamental. Allen O. Gruebbel, executive secretary of the Council on Dental Health of the American Dental Association summed up the case very well when he said: "A federalized system of health care would affect the life of every citizen of this country. It would affect his initiative and his sense of responsibility to himself, his family, his community and his government. It would affect the health service he would receive from his dentist, physician and nurse. It would affect the advancement of the health sciences. And finally, but by no means least, it would affect our social structure by greatly increasing the power of the Central Government.

"These are the risks that must be weighed carefully by every citizen who has a stake in the welfare of this and succeeding generations. These are the risks that form the core of the issue."

THEY WOULD SOCIALIZE AMERICA

A few minutes ago I expressed to you my belief that this program to fasten a system of compulsory health insurance on America is part of a master plan to concentrate vastly expanded powers of government in the hands of a tightly knit group of planners in Washington. To put it bluntly—the scheme is to socialize America. The American people must realize, they must wake up to the fact, that while each of these proposals is presented as if it were a single reform for the benefit of the American people, the proposals are all related. I have used three of them, the Spence plan, the Brannan plan, the Ewing plan as illustrations here today. I hope I have been able to demonstrate the common motive of these three. There is little doubt but that their sponsorship interlocks. I have not been able to find anyone who will admit the authorship of the Spence bill, but I do know that Ewing approves of the Brannan plan, and that Brannan sent a letter to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommending the passage of the Dingell-Biemiller bill.

LEADERS ON DANE COUNTY FRONT

The Washington master planners have their satellites and cohorts on the Dane County front, where the leading advocates of the Brannan plan are the Farmers' Union, the CIO Council and those three Madison dirt farmers, Gaylord Nelson, Horace Wilkie and Miles McMillan. I would assume from other experiences with these related plans that you would also find them in the forefront of the fight for compulsory health insurance along with these three others:

1. Thomas R. Amlie, the former radical Congressman from Wisconsin's First District who appeared before the committee in support of the Biemiller bill, and now gives Madison as his place of residence.

2. Margaret Stein Frankel, who until recently was closely and actively associated in Washington with both the Physicians' Forum and the Committee for the Nation's Health—the leading front organizations of the planners for Federal medicine. I have learned that she has recently transferred her activities to Wisconsin and if I don't miss my guess she will be popping up in Madison soon.

3. Representative ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, the most active legislative sponsor of the Ewing-Altmeyer compulsory health plan. Representative BIEMILLER must be contended with on the Dane County front, as well as on the Washington front, because of his proximity, influence, and coworkers here.

JOIN IN FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

These plans and these people—these are the instruments which endanger the freedom and the effectiveness of your great professions, endanger the service to humanity which you can give, and endanger the freedom of the American people. But if you will join ranks with the businessmen and the workingmen who are fighting against the threat of the Spence plan and the farmers who are fighting to keep their freedom from the Brannan strait-jacket, the good fight can yet be won. The majority of Americans are not yet ready to capitulate to the master planners in Washington. They need only the assurance, just as you need it, that they do not fight on alone.

Close ranks, then, and march together with all men who fight for freedom on their own soil. Individual stimulating freedom or planned stagnating socialism? It's up to us—in Washington, in Dane County, in all America.

Central Arizona Project Would Give Millions Free to Hundreds of Landholders

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, nothing in reclamation history can equal the economic tragedy that is proposed in the plan of the central Arizona project, now awaiting action before the House Public Lands Committee.

All the spectacular financial schemes of the past fade into insignificance before this reclamation development proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and State of Arizona.

One need not be a financial wizard to analyze the scheme of the central Arizona project. All that is needed is simple arithmetic.

First, let it be understood that the Arizona landholders who would benefit from the project would pay none of the irrigation construction costs. I repeat: None.

Yet, the Government would be spending at the rate of $1,280,000 per 160-acre farm. This would be a gift from the Nation's taxpayers. I repeat: A gift.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on page R–12 of the Bureau of Reclamation report on the project, this statement is to be found:

> The largest individual farm in terms of irrigated acreage averaged 10,430 acres under irrigation during the period 1940–44.

With even a dull pencil it may be easily figured that if the Government spends at the rate of $1,280,000 per 160-acre farm, it would spend at the rate of $83,440,000 for a 10,430-acre farm.

Perhaps I should repeat that latter figure: $83,440,000.

That would be a gift from the taxpayers of the Nation to one Arizona farmer.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of farms containing more than 160 acres each in the project area. In one section of the project area alone, Pinal County, there are nearly 200 farms larger than 160 acres. In this section there is 1 farm of more than 6,800 acres; 1 of more than 5,800 acres; 1 of more than 4,200 acres; 6 of nearly 3,000 acres; 19 between 1,000 and 2,000 acres; 10 over 900 acres; 7 over 800 acres; 3 over

700 acres; 37 over 600 acres. These are merely example from one section of the proposed project area.

Under the project plan the Government would spend at the following rate for these farms:

Acres:	
6,800	$54,400,000
5,800	46,400,000
3,000	24,000,000
4,200	33,600,000
2,000	16,000,000
1,000	8,000,000

This is, indeed, incredible. There was never anything like it offered the Congress before, nor was there any such fantastic scheme I know of ever seriously proposed by a responsible Government agency.

The proof, however, that such a scheme is now being proposed to this Congress is easily demonstrated.

And here is the proof:

Cost of construction for irrigation features of the project would amount to $392,000,000. This would be paid for by consumers who buy electric power produced by the project. It is a hidden sales tax on public power to subsidize private landowners.

Interest during the construction period would amount to $98,000,000.

Interest during the repayment period would amount to $274,000,000.

Adding these two interest figures together brings a total of $372,000,000. This interest would be paid by the Nation's taxpayers.

Now, adding together the irrigation construction cost and the interest total we have $764,000,000.

But that is not all. The project bill authorizes the construction of an additional 80-mile tunnel and appurtenant works which would bring the total cost up to $1,799,000,000.

That is the amount the taxpayers and power users, almost entirely outside the State of Arizona, would pay.

The project farmers who would benefit would pay none of these costs. And let me repeat again the word "None."

There, Mr. Speaker, you have the uncontrovertible facts about the most fantastic project ever conceived—at no cost to the Arizona farmers, but as a gift from the great, generous American taxpayers in every other State of the Union.

Famed Smyrna Air Force Base Dedicated to Memory of Valiant Tennessee Airman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, last, the famed Air Force Base at Smyrna, Tenn., located in Rutherford County, in the Fifth District, was the scene of impressive ceremonies marking the renaming of this military establishment in memory of Maj. Allan J. Sewart, Jr., gallant Tennessee boy, who was killed in action in an air engagement over the Solomon Islands in the Pacific theater of action in November 1942.

This was a most solemn and impressive occasion which assembled not only the family of this brave soldier and airman, but his many friends in Rutherford County and Tennessee and officials of the United States Air Force including the distinguished Assistant Secretary for Air, Hon. Harold Stuart. The name of Smyrna Air Force Base, one of the permanent installations of our military and defense establishment, is honored and famed. As Sewart Air Force Base, this establishment will carry on the same fine tradition of service which has characterized it in the past and be a fitting tribute to this brave and valiant young Tennessean who was lost in the performance of his duty to his country.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials—one from the Nashville Banner and another from the Nashville Tennessean of the issues of Sunday, March 26, last, marking this dedication ceremony and paying tribute to Major Sewart. Also, I should like to have included a copy of the excellent and appropriate address which was delivered on that occasion by Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Stuart.

The editorials and speech are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean]

AIRMEN'S MEMORIAL

Sewart Air Force Base. In memory of Maj. Allan J. Sewart, Jr., United States Air Force, who was killed in action November 1942 in the Pacific theater of operations during World War II.

Thus has the memory of a heroic Nashville bomber pilot been perpetuated at the former Smyrna Air Force Base.

It is a fitting honor to this warrior who died while fighting against heavy odds in the early part of the war for which we were not adequately prepared.

But it was a graceful act for Assistant Secretary for Air Harold Stuart to remind us that in honoring this individual the Air Force and Nation were also paying tribute to all of the 63 airmen from Davidson and Rutherford Counties who were killed in the war. All of these were actuated by the same high motives, and all freely gave their lives for their country.

Major Sewart and his associates represent the spirit of the American fighting men, of whatever branch of service, and their valiant service reminds that the courage and the patriotism from which this country was born flames as brightly as ever.

The family of the man whose name has been so signally honored, the high officials and distinguished guests who attended the dedication ceremonies, but share the sentiment of pride and homage that exists in this county and region from which the heroes went forth to battle, thinking only in terms of victory for their homeland and its ideals.

[From the Nashville Banner]

SEWART AIR FORCE BASE

Allan J. Sewart, Jr., of Murfreesboro lost his life in the Solomon Islands while performing valiantly his duty to the United States of America. His name, chosen by the Air Force from a list of heroes, today was officially given to the Air Force base near Smyrna.

Major Sewart was no candidate for any such distinction when he set out on the mission which brought his death over Buin. He was doing a grim job which he and millions of fellow Americans had been called upon to do when their country was in peril. Others shared his fate, and—as his memory is honored at Smyrna today—the memories of other fallen heroes are honored likewise. His name stands for his comrades, too.

It is entirely fitting, and truly American, that the Air Force has established a policy of renaming its bases in honor of men who died in service. The people of the United States are grateful for men like Major Sewart. To them, the tragic consequences of war impart an abiding sorrow which accompanies pride and thankfulness, for Americans are people with individual hearts even in times of collective necessity.

Sewart Air Force Base it now is. The brilliant ceremonies conducted there today are in keeping with the obligations all of us have for Major Sewart and all of those other Americans—up and down the ranks—who brought us out of the worst of all struggles for national existence.

REMARKS BY HON. HAROLD STUART, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, AT DEDICATION OF SEWART AIR FORCE BASE, TENNESSEE, SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1950

Distinguished guests, officers, and men of Sewart Air Force Base, this is a day of great honor to Smyrna, to the State of Tennesseee, to the United States Air Force, and to the Nation.

Today we gather in tribute to a man who died heroically on a far-flung battlefield of the air during World War II.

We gather to honor him. In truth, it is he who has honored us.

Maj. Allen J. Sewart, Jr., gave his life so that the American way of life might be preserved.

The freedom we now share in a world still shorn of freedom was achieved in mortal conflict, bitterly contested, bitterly won. Major Sewart was a representative and a symbol of the spirit and the courage and the heroism that made such victory possible.

We now take occasion to memorialize his contribution to his country—his full sacrifice in our behalf:

It is fitting that this Air Force installation at Smyrna—in the heart of his own great State—exists to perpetuate the memory of this valiant son of Tennessee. Sewart Air Force Base is well named—proudly named. I consider it a privilege to be with you today, as the representative of the United States Air Force, to participate in its dedication.

Your civic committee, which recommended the man for whom this base is named, summed up its task with the statement, and I quote from the committee's report: "This was a serious and sacred duty."

Allan Sewart was one of 63 Air Force men from Davidson and Rutherford Counties who made the supreme sacrifice in World War II.

As your committee stated, and I quote: "Each of them is entitled to the status of an American hero."

Allan Sewart represents all of these heroes. In the Air Force we know of him as the kind of man they would have chosen to represent them.

We can all take pride in the fact that the man in whose honor this base is named was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, second highest decoration it is within the power of this Government to bestow.

As we now strive to maintain the peace—and with it the freedom gained in battle—it may be well for us to remember the manner in which Allan Sewart—and all these combat heroes—carried out their tasks of war.

These men made no claim of being supermen. They faced the problems of war as average Americans, most of them with little concept of the huge task they would be called upon to perform, or of the far corners of the world in which they would be called upon to fight. In many instances, the odds were against them and they knew it. But they stood up to their obligations. They had missions to perform and they performed them.

To Allan Sewart a mission was a sacred trust. I spoke recently with an Air Force veteran who accompanied him on one of his many long and grueling bomber missions in the South Pacific. On this occasion the target was an enemy aircraft carrier, a rich target in this theater of operations. Our weak forces in the South Pacific during these early days of the war could bring only four Flying Fortresses to bear against this target. The carrier was well protected by enemy fighters. Two of our four bombers never returned from this mission. Allan Sewart approached the carrier at dangerously low altitude. He was reaching his maximum radius of action. But he flew on. He made the bombing run with enemy fighters all around him, firing bullets into his plane. The bomb run didn't satisfy him. He wanted to be sure of his bombing accuracy, so he circled and came back again over target—using up more gasoline and exposing his plane to more bullets. A crewman suggested they had taken about all the damage they could stand. But he flew on, over the target, until he had scored direct hits on the enemy vessel. His comment to his crew was crisp and to the point. "We didn't come this far to miss," he said.

Allan Sewart fought his war—our war—just that way.

It was a backyard war waged in the far reaches of the South Pacific, in support of the invasion of Guadalcanal and eventually from Guadalcanal itself. It was a hard, driving war, in which air crews were called upon to fly tiring and difficult missions day after day, with no rest because there were no replacements. Allan Stewart and his fellow crewmen had been assigned to hold the fort. It was a highly vulnerable fort, but it had to be held until our nation could mobilize and industrialize for war.

These were the first few months after Pearl Harbor. As a nation, we had been caught napping. The Eleventh Bombardment Group, in which Allan Sewart served as a squadron commander, was one of the few units we could pit against the enemy. And always the enemy was vastly superior in numbers and equipment—superior in everything except that quality which Allan Sewart and others with him possessed—the will to accomplish a mission.

Brigadier General Laverne G.—popularly known as "Blondy"—Saunders was in command of all heavy bombardment units in the South Pacific at the time. One of our great Air Force leaders, Blondy Saunders was at one time a football star and a football coach at West Point. Later in the war, he commanded B-29's in India, and lost his leg in an airplane accident there. In the South Pacific, General Saunders knew his subordinate commanders personally and well.

"Al Sewart," General Saunders said recently, "was the best commander I ever had."

In Air Force circles that is high tribute. And General Saunders added this—"Major Sewart had all the qualifications for a general officer."

General Saunders, who is now retired and living in Aberdeen, S. Dak., had hoped to be with us today. He has asked me to express his regret at being unable to attend this dedication.

A week before his death, Allan Sewart and other pilots of his bomber group were called in to the commander's tent to discuss a bombing mission they had just completed. Their claims of Japanese fighter planes destroyed on the mission added up to 30—before Allan Sewart was asked for his evaluation. Then they asked him about it. "Divide that 30 by 3," he replied. Allan Sewart looked life and death straight in the eye.

His death, during the mission which won for him the Distinguished Service Cross, came during one of the most vicious combat missions of the war. It is described in the official citation as follows, and I quote:

"Major Sewart, as flight leader of a formation of five heavy bombardment airplanes, proceeded on a mission to bomb enemy objectives near Buin, Solomons Islands. Reaching the target, Major Sewart's flight immediately launched a bombing run over enemy surface vessels of Kahili Airfield, choosing a stationary vessel as target. Due to mechanical difficulties, the bombs did not release and a second run was made through heavy antiaircraft fire and fighter opposition. On this run a number of 1,000-pound bombs were dropped on the cargo vessel from all airplanes of the flight except that of Major Sewart. In the face of continuous and close attack by approximately 18 enemy land-based and float-type fighters, Major Sewart did not turn away from the attack even though he could not release his bombs. Shortly following this action, Major Sewart lost his life and his copilot was mortally wounded during a frontal attack by an enemy fighter pilot."

Allan Sewart, as this citation testifies, never turned away from an attack—never turned away from his mission, from his responsibilities.

This ability to stand up to a mission and carry it through to completion despite all odds is a human resource which must be placed at the top of all our vast national resources. It cannot be built and it cannot be purchased at any price. It is born and bred into a man—into men like Allan Sewart.

Today, as we engage in a vital mission to maintain the peace—and it is a mission for each of us—the odds often appear to be overwhelming, the objective unattainable. But we must not—if only in their memory—ever turn back from our mission. It is our obligation to Allan Sewart and to the thousands of war dead who helped win the peace.

In Allan Sewart we find another lesson for the Nation. It is not an easy lesson to face, but we cannot escape it, nor should we try.

We asked Allan Sewart to hold the fort while we made ready our defenses, to do the job of 10—20—50 men while we as a Nation caught up with the world in military strength. He and his fellow fighters held that fort, but he paid the price, and as a Nation we paid the price. We feel the need of Allan Sewart's courage and leadership today.

In our search for peace we have twice, in our time, tried unpreparedness and found it wanting. In a world of new and terrible weapons which narrows the margin, perhaps eliminates altogether, the period for holding the fort—indeed, which for the first time in history, may bring the fortress into our own back yards—we canont afford to risk unpreparedness again.

This Air Force base we dedicate today in Allan Sewart's name—a vital training center for bomber pilots during the war—and today an equally vital center of troop-carrier operations—gives evidence that we intend to keep the peace with the strength and courage that it deserves.

To the mother and father of Allan Sewart, to his widow and daughter, who are with us today, the United States Air Force bows in humble tribute. We join the citizens of Smyrna and all of Tennessee in this proud salute. We dedicate Sewart Air Force Base as a living monument to the spirit and deeds of Maj. Allan J. Sewart, Jr.

Resolutions of the Indiana General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the other day, during debate on the library extension bill, I stated that our 1947 Indiana General Assembly passed a resolution stating Indiana wanted no Federal funds.

I stated also that immediately following—in fact the very next resolution—the same general assembly, with the same Republican majority in membership, passed a resolution asking for Federal funds for flood control and soil conservation.

Now, since some folks thought I was mistaken, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD both resolutions, with reference to their pages in the official acts of the eighty-fifth general assembly:

ACTS, 1947, INDIANA, EIGHTY-FIFTH SESSION

CHAPTER 377

(H. Con. Res. 2, approved January 30, 1947)

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Indiana needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington, will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the senate concurring: That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home.

Resolved further, That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us, and we with them to restore the American Republic and our 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

CHAPTER 378

(H. Con. Res. 3, approved March 1, 1947)

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control and soil conservation in the Ohio River watershed area and tributaries thereto.

Whereas farming and grazing land of the State of Indiana is one of the basic assets of the State and the preservation of such land and the produce gained therefrom is necessary to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of the State and Nation; that the breaking of

natural grass, plant and forest cover has interfered with the natural factors of soil stabilization; that there has been an accelerated washing of sloping fields; that these processes of erosion facilitate dissipation of valuable top soil, causing exposure of less fertile and more erosive subsoil; and

Whereas the consequences of such soil erosion are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water which causes destruction of food and cover for wildlife; an increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve; and

Whereas similar conditions exist the entire length of the Ohio River from its source at the juncture point of the mighty Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers, all in defiance of the efforts and ingenuity of man to cope with nature run rampant and bent upon destruction of life, property, and resources as aforesaid: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring)—

SECTION 1. That the Eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

SEC. 2. The principal clerk of this house is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana.

Speaker Rayburn Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MONROE M. REDDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, March 25, you honored my district by speaking to the North Carolina Young Democratic Clubs at Asheville. The overflow audience of more than 2,000 people applauded you frequently, and it was common talk after the meeting that we had heard one of the greatest democratic speeches to be delivered in that section in many years.

Your speech was commented on editorially by the Asheville Citizen in Monday morning's issue of this week. I hope that this editorial may be read on a wide scale. It points up some of the thoughts which you so eloquently expressed.

The editorial follows:

SPEAKER RAYBURN SPEAKS OUT

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, 37 summers a Texas Congressman and Presiding Officer of the House of Representatives for more years than any man in history save Henry Clay, brought his eloquence and the wisdom of his long experience to an audience of western North Carolinians Saturday night.

A Speaker rarely speaks and never votes except in case of a tie. Tar Heel Young Democrats who heard Mr. RAYBURN Saturday, however, must have been impressed with the candor and logic of the Speaker as a platform debater. He put the case vigorously for the Democratic Party in the Nation and for democracy in the world. In the course of his address he made two telling points:

1. The indiscriminate practice of pinning the Communist label on innocent persons is both irresponsible and dangerous. In obvious reference to reckless JOE MCCARTHY, Speaker RAYBURN predicted that "in the long run that gentleman is going to get what those of his kind deserve."

2. A strong America is an America which must maintain leadership in world affairs through the Marshall plan and other foreign-aid programs. Mr. RAYBURN is a Woodrow Wilson Democrat, both in theory and practice. "I want to help keep the friends we've got in other parts of the world," he said.

SAM RAYBURN has been around Washington for more than a generation. He entered Congress on the March day in 1913 when President Wilson, perhaps glimpsing the war clouds, first took his oath of office and told Americans: "Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try?"

During these 37 years and during the distinguished period of his war service as Speaker, SAM RAYBURN measured up to the trust and never grew faint of heart.

He saw Woodrow Wilson die a prophet among men yet maligned for the daring of his vision. In the atmosphere of Washington, then, he puts little stock in label-pinning and name-calling. And out of devoted service to his country and to the cause of democracy, he has little patience with the isolationists and their clamor to turn the clock back on issues and men.

All of this was a strong breath of clear air in a region where there is cause to be proud of—and no cause to apologize for—the world leadership which the Democratic Party has maintained with the help of enlightened Republicans such as Senator VANDENBERG, to whom Mr. RAYBURN paid tribute.

It should help to focus our thoughts not on negative things but upon the positive values in national issues which are before the American democracy and the Democratic Party.

Broadcast of Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to the People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by me to the people of Pennsylvania, over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co., Monday evening, March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I suppose that it's just about impossible for some people to believe that anyone who has spent a dozen years in Congress can lay aside temporarily his mantle of political-party affiliation and speak as just one more American addressing his fellow citizens.

But in the few minutes I have on the air this evening I'd like to attempt just that.

I am sure all of you know that America today enjoys the highest standard of living in the world—and what is more, the highest living standard in our history.

We have, during the past 17 years, risen from the pit of the worst depression we ever had. The American economy—in addition to underwriting our own gigantic military effort in World War II—turned out a significant part of the fighting equipment, food, clothing, and money needed by our wartime Allies to make victory possible.

And America has emerged as the only Nation which today is in a position to help the free nations bolster their economic foundations against the forces of Communist oppression that now threatens the peace.

Now, without any question, the achievement of world peace is the central issue of our time, and the problems which confront America in this year of 1950 differ in many important respects from those of the depression paralysis of the early thirties.

Where our task 17 years ago was to put people to work and get our economy back on its feet, we find today that our free-enterprise system is humming along with record-breaking production, big profits, and high levels of employment.

Our greatest energies in this postwar period have been directed at this issue of peace. The Communists have hurled a challenge at the democratic institutions of the world, and the democracies have answered the challenge in terms of affirmative measures which meet the Communist threat head-on. America has played a leading role both in the formation of the anti-Communist policies, and has, as well, underwritten in terms of billions of dollars the costs of these programs.

In recent weeks American foreign policy has been vigorously attacked on new fronts. In the first instance, the criticism comes not from the Communist Party, but has been hurled by a handful of public figures who charge that our State Department is infested with card-carrying Communists, and, furthermore, they infer that our American foreign policy has been shaped by those same communistically inclined people. It is interesting to note that shortly after the first of these attacks was made the Kremlin had something to say about our foreign policy. Mr. Stalin issued a blast at Secretary of State Acheson and the American State Department, charging them with drawing up a Fascist scheme to plunge everyone into a third world war in order to destroy communism.

In this broadcast I want to dig back into a little recent history. At the outset I want to make clear my firm belief that there are few Americans today who underestimate the task before us if world peace is to be attained under democratic forms of government. In this atomic age in which man, for the first time in his history, has devised a means of destroying civilization altogether, the stakes in the future are simply enormous. If the democracies are to win the cold war, there is a duty upon the people of the free world to make use of every bit of intelligence they possess, if we are to meet head-on the Communist challenge to freedom. Our policies must be designed clearheadedly by the best minds in the democratic world. We cannot afford to be stampeded by fear or hysteria. If

division is stirred up among the democratic nations themselves, or if serious differences develop internally in the democracies, we will play squarely into the hands of the Communists.

There is no question at all about this. The Communists are pegging their success upon what they regard as the essential weakness of democracy. They are relying heavily upon economic collapse in the free nations—the economic collapse which the Communists have predicted for so long.

In the years which immediately followed World War II, the Russians fully expected to gain control of all of Europe because they believed the democracies too weak economically to get back on their feet in time to avert disaster.

The Communists have realized fully that social chaos and economic despair have turned more people over to dictatorship than have all the copies of all the Communist propaganda ever printed. The Russians realize full well that a man who sees his family hungry, and cold, and frightened may frequently be willing to sell his freedom to a dictator who rashly promises security in the future.

Democracies, in bending their efforts behind the Marshall plan, have come up with an affirmative answer to the chaos which threatened Europe 3 years ago. The best military minds we have in this country assure us that all of Europe would be under the domination of the Communists if it had not been for the inauguration of the Marshall plan in 1948. These same military experts tell us that our national defense budget for the coming year would be two or three times as large if Russia had the entire productive capacity of Europe at its disposal today. Said another way, this would mean that we would be called upon to spend $30,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000 this year for national defense instead of $13,000,000,000.

Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Marshall plan Administrator, has estimated that we should spend $3,000,000,000 on European aid during the next year. In doing so, we are investing in a secure future for the people of Europe. This is just as important to us as it is to operate the FBI or to maintain our armed forces.

Mr. Hoffman knows the value of a dollar—and he knows the value of $3,000,000,000. The evidence submitted by Mr. Hoffman shows clearly that a reduction in Marshall plan funds would convert the European cooperation program into a dole instead of one to bring about recovery. If that were to happen, we would no longer be building the peace. We would simply be keeping the people of Europe on the charity list, incapable of going forward to economic self-sufficiency without the continuing need for American funds to keep them going.

Within the past few days the first shipments of American military aid have started to flow across the Atlantic to bolster the defenses of the European democracies, and thus make it possible to give real meaning to the North Atlantic Defense Pact, signed last year.

We have pending now in both Houses of Congress another program which takes an affirmative approach to the factors which cause war. President Truman's point 4 proposal is primarily intended to help economically backward nations build up their own standards of living in order to ward off the forces of communism which threaten them internally.

Altogether, our international programs will cost us close to $5,000,000,000 in the coming year. In addition to this, as I have already indicated, we will spend some $13,000,000,000 for our national defense. I would like to point out that a national defense budget, whether it costs us $13,000,000,000 or $35,000,000,000 a year, does absolutely nothing toward eliminating the causes of war. Military protection is police protection. But it does nothing at all to eradicate the economic conditions in which communism so quickly flourishes.

The Marshall plan has stopped the Communists cold in Europe. But the Marshall plan has not completed its work, and if we interrupt the miraculous progress it is now making, there is a grave likelihood that Europe would fall back into the same sort of peril which faced it only 2 years ago when the Communists were so busy exploiting the impending economic crisis.

As I've already said, American participation in world peace making is costing us billions of dollars a year. These costs, however, are small by comparison with the dollar costs of another war. I feel there are those who too often fail to see any relation between our foreign and domestic policies. It is, I think, instantly clear when we stop to think about it that another depression in America would cause our peace-making efforts to fail completely. Another depression would force us to abandon the Marshall plan, give up point 4, and our other programs to promote peace.

This is, of course, exactly what the Communists have predicted, and it is what they are expecting will happen.

If America is to bear the burden of affirmative peace making, our free enterprise economy must stay healthy, and continue to expand. It is true, as I said earlier, that American business today is in sounder shape than ever before in its history. Employment is still close to record levels, but there are more people unemployed because there are not enough new jobs being created to take care of our growing population. To meet our international responsibilities, we must make the fullest use possible of our economy by setting ever higher production records and by having ever larger numbers of people at work. We must continue our efforts here at home to assist our free enterprise economy in such an expansion, and we must go forward with this important work.

We have, in the past few years, accomplished a tremendous amount in blocking the expansion of communism. We, nonetheless, have ahead of us a huge task in continuing to shape policies which will assure our victory in the cold war. To do this, we must above all retain our confidence in ourselves and in our future. We must, as I said earlier, use every bit of intelligence we possess in drafting policies which will assure that victory. And it is equally important that these policies be carried out by people who are unswervingly loyal to America and the democratic way of life.

If we are to meet our responsibilities, every problem which faces us must be considered squarely on its merits. We cannot, in these crucial times, afford the luxury of cheap political partisanship which destroys our confidence in ourselves and in the people we have charged with the responsibility of administering our policies. There is a vast difference between criticism directed to the facts on the one hand, and criticism which has no support in fact whatsoever. This business of shooting from the hip irresponsibly, in complete disregard of personal reputations, in disregard of confidence in ourselves and our policies, could, if it got out of hand, immobilize our efforts to bring about world peace and destroy any hope that democracy can survive in the world.

As all of you know, charges of the gravest nature were leveled at the State Department a month and a half ago. It was flatly charged that 205 known card-carrying Communists were then at work in the Department of State. The charges have been altered a lot since that time—81 card-carrying Communists, 57 card-carrying Communists, or what have you.

A unanimous Senate moved at once to investigate. The charges at the outset looked like the smear campaigns which have cropped up in election years in the past, but the Senate, recognizing that the charges, if true, were serious, insisted on getting the facts, and ordered its Foreign Relations Committee to conduct an immediate investigation. You may be sure that the investigation will leave no stone unturned. If there are Communists or Communist sympathizers in the Department of State, they will be exposed.

The Senate investigating committee has been in almost continuous session for nearly 3 weeks, but as of this very hour the record does not contain one shred of evidence to prove or substantiate these political charges.

On the contrary, the evidence thus far is most reassuring. It demonstrates that we have every right to place confidence in the loyalty of those carrying out our foreign policy.

I am proud that our press and our people have not been stampeded into fear. The Nation-wide reaction seems simply to be that our vigilance must be maintained, just as we are doing at present, and that we must keep a cool head and a steady hand if our great stake in the future is to be attained.

In closing I repeat that I am proud of the mature fashion in which we, as a nation, are facing our world responsibilities. Charges of socialism in our program at home or of card-carrying Communists in our State Department must be decided on the facts, just as we are doing now. There is no place in this picture for irresponsible fear mongering. So long as we continue to insist upon the facts, to examine them clearheadedly and confidently, and guide our actions realistically, I have no fear for the future.

Address of Archie M. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, beloved among his fellow citizens in the city of Chicago because of his long-standing interest and active participation in the city's great communal activities is Archie H. Cohen. A distinguished lawyer, a master in chancery, a former referee in bankruptcy, for many years he has been a leader in the city's charitable and civic organizations. He has been a long-time member of the Republican Party in the State of Illinois, and has done much to bring credit upon his political organization because of his wisdom, his ability, and his refusal to be bound by adherence to sterile, hidebound conservatism. I would certainly describe him as a Republican with Democratic leanings.

Archie Cohen is a brilliant speaker. One of his great addresses was made during the American appreciation program sponsored by the Milwaukee B'nai B'rith conference on February 22, 1950, in Milwaukee, Wis., an address of particular significance because of its reference to four great chaplains of the last war.

On March 27, I introduced House Joint Resolution 443, a bill to commemorate the heroic acts of the four chaplains, Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode, in making the supreme sacrifice in order that their comrades in arms might live. My bill requests that February 3 of each year be designated as Dorchester Day in observance of their heroism on the Army transport *Dorchester,* which was torpedoed on that day.

I am incorporating House Joint Resolution 443 with my remarks and the address of Mr. Cohen. I believe they should be read together as significant contributions to our goal in seeking to achieve our great American democratic ideal of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

House Joint Resolution 443

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 3 of each year as Dorchester Day for the observance and commemoration of the deaths and the heroic acts of Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode

Whereas on February 3, 1943, at 12:55 antemeridian, when the Army transport *Dorchester* sank following a torpedo attack, United States Army Chaplains Clark V. Poling, George L. Fox, John Patrick Washington, and Alexander D. Goode, symbolized both ministerial faithfulness and supreme human courage by giving their lives that others might live and doing so in such a way as to indicate the element of brotherhood common in their Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths; and

Whereas this event symbolizes the courage and hope humanity can gain from a spirit of brotherhood among these creeds; and

Whereas no other single event has so moved men to think on the elements of unity in these three great traditions and creeds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on the 3d day of February of each year, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the deaths and the heroic act of the four foregoing chaplains.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY ARCHIE H. COHEN AT STEUBEN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, MILWAUKEE, WIS., FEBRUARY 22, 1950, ON AMERICAN APPRECIATION PROGRAM SPONSORED BY THE MILWAUKEE B'NAI B'RITH CONFERENCE

To my way of thinking, America is more than an aggregation of 150,000,000 people. It symbolizes the hopes, the dreams, and the prayers of those who, by accident of birth, were born here and those who came here seeking a haven of refuge from political and religious oppression, to build unselfish lives that spell true brotherhood.

Unfortunately, bigotry and intolerance need no passports to come into this country. The jealous, petty, arrogant, mean, and little people of the world have always wondered at the American way of life. They fail to understand that, in America, laws are enacted to point a way by which men shall live, and not as the edicts, decrees, and manifestoes of the dictators by which men shall die.

Carved in the stone on the outside of the Supreme Court Building in our Nation's Capital are the words: "Equal justice under law," which assures justice to every citizen regardless of race, creed, or color. America has been made safe for differences by the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution of the United States of America guarantees to every citizen, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I hold these truths to be self-evident: that man was made to be happy; that happiness is attainable only through useful effort. You will find, as you look back upon life, that the moments that stand out are those moments when you have done something for somebody else without any hope of reward. I strongly feel that life is an opportunity given to us to learn how to live; that the world is a schoolroom, not a playground; that life is an education, not a holiday; that life is a measure to be filled, not a cup to be drained; that we come into this world without being asked and that we go without being considered; therefore, it behooves us to live useful, purposeful, and intelligent lives.

Surely you will agree with me that selfishness is a disease that should be labeled a crime. If we try to be in tune with the Infinite, we will strive to avoid wars that bring misery, destruction, heartaches, and untold sufferings to innocent men, women, and children, and create, as an aftermath, more serious problems than those that existed before men engaged in slaughter on the battlefields. We do not all look alike, act alike, talk alike, or think alike, but that is no reason for hating one another. The history of the progress of mankind clearly establishes the fact that nothing constructive has ever grown out of hatred. Bigotry and intolerance have no place under the cross of a cathedral, the spire of a church, or within the walls of a temple or synagogue. Any man who incites strife between different classes and different creeds is a menace to America and a disgrace to his faith.

The heart of America is sound. Its sense of justice is universal. You can trust it. You can appeal to it. But you must never betray it. I am not so much concerned with the insurrection of the ignorant as I am with the indifference of the intelligent. The real American, whether he be a Christian or a Jew, is he who brings comfort where before there was wretchedness, who feeds the hungry, who clothes the naked, who enlightens the ignorant, and who does justice, and by his words and actions inspires a love for God and for man. I cling to the belief that God is my friend and every man my brother.

No one can gainsay the fact that equality and freedom build human dignity in man and nation. We add to our moral strength when we concern ourselves with the preservation of all those values which make life worth living. As decent men and women, we must ever be vigilant to protect the civil and political immunities of every American regardless of his race, color, creed, and social or economic status. No sacrifice is too dear if only freedom prevails.

America must be intellectually immune to the virus of hate. Every person should realize that his highest good requires the observance of the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

We should constantly strive to make America so good that to be a private citizen in the United States will be greater than to be a king in any other nation.

By our devotion to American ideals, we emphasize that we live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths; in feelings, not in figures on a dial. We count time by heart throbs. We cling to the belief that he most lives who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best. The rights and privileges that we enjoy as American citizens must not be taken for granted. We must be mindful of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and should remember that, next to God, is country, and next to religion is patriotism. The duty of patriotism is the duty of justice and of gratitude, and it is just as important to be patriotic in time of peace as in time of war. We should ever be loyal to the life and welfare of our Nation, strong in our love of, and devotion to, the institutions of America. Anyone trying to sow distrust and hatred in this blessed land is carrying out the mandate of the enemies of this country and is guilty of conduct that is most despicable and unworthy of a true American. Such bigoted individuals who loudly shout that America has failed them, have in truth failed America.

Thoughtful Americans must take to heart the indisputable fact that victories won on the battlefields are all in vain unless in peace we prevent the hatreds that start wars all over again. America's destiny is to point out to the world the force of an idea, rather than the idea of force, and to spread the idea of human dignity so that everywhere there will be strengthened the conviction in the minds of the leaders of the people throughout the world that human rights must be respected.

Ours is a land of peace and faith. This is a government of the people, not of kings, princes, or dictators. This is a country of citizens, not of military captains. Our leaders represent peace and religion. My fervent plea is that instead of ignorance, let there be truth; instead of weakness, let there be strength; instead of fear, let there be courage; instead of hatred, let there be love.

An event that took place during World War II stands out vividly in my memory. It occurred during the month of February 1943, on the U. S. troop ship *Dorchester* which was struck by a torpedo fired from a Nazi submarine in mid-Atlantic. The boys in uniform who were being transported to European shores to battle against the Nazis, were rushing about frantically seeking to procure life belts. The ship was listing heavily, doomed to a watery grave, when four Army chaplains—a priest, a rabbi, and two Protestant ministers—observing the frightened lads, took off their life belts and gave them to four soldiers. Then, placing their arms around one another's shoulders, they looked heavenward and prayed to Almighty God, each in his own way, as these Americans, representing the three great faiths, faced death together unafraid. From this true account of the last moments of these brave chaplains of the United States Army, can we not find inspiration and courage to face life together unafraid and in true brotherhood?

I urge that we strive to make this world as good a place for others as we would want it to be for ourselves. To me, America is all that the submerged races of the world wish to be and cannot. To me, America is the concrete realization of what the ages have hoped for and labored for. It is a definition. It is a creed. It is a challenge. God built a continent of glory and filled it with treasures untold. He carpeted it with soft rolling prairies and pillared it with thundering mountains. He studded it with soft flowing fountains and traced it with long winding streams. He graced it with deep shadowed forests and filled them with song. Then he called unto a thousand peoples and summoned the bravest among them. They came from the ends of the earth, each bearing a gift and a hope. The glory of adventure was in their eyes and the glory of hope within their souls, and out of the labor of man and the bounty of earth, out of the prayers of man and the hopes of the world, God fashioned a nation in love, blessed it with a purpose sublime, and called it America.

Schism in the NLRB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 26, entitled "Schism in the NLRB." I have been deeply concerned about the President's plan No. 12 to abolish the post of general counsel and to transfer his functions to the NLRB. I have been deeply concerned because I believe in the separation of the function of prosecution from the judicial function in all cases where it is practicable. And if functions of the NLRB were predominantly judicial and if the general counsel's duties were predominantly that of a prosecutor, I would oppose the President's plan No. 12.

However, I agree with the Post editorial that the schism by the Board and the counsel has created more problems than it has solved.

The editorial to which I refer is as follows:

SCHISM IN THE NLRB

No effective case has been made, in our opinion, against President Truman's reorganization plan to end the schism between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel. Certainly the President had authority to take this step. The NLRB was not exempted from the reorganization powers conditionally delegated to the President. Since this change was effected in one of a series of orders designed to improve the working machinery of the independent regulatory commissions, it would have been strange for the President to have exempted so obvious a defect as the separation of the NLRB counsel from the Board itself, has proved to be.

The NLRB was thus divided against itself in the Taft-Hartley Act in a laudable effort to separate the prosecuting and judging functions of that body. To many it seemed an experiment worth making. But in practice it has proved a failure because of the continued friction between General Counsel Denham and the Board. The Board members are now unanimous in saying that the division should not continue; for it has resulted in two NLRB policies instead of one and placed the Board in the anomalous position of having to rely upon an antagonistic counsel to carry its cases before the courts. In short, the schism has created more problems than it has solved.

Under the new plan the general counsel would be subject to supervision by the Board, while still exercising a large degree of independence in his prosecuting activities. Investigative and judging functions would not be entrusted to the same persons. This seems to us to satisfy the requirements of fairness if unbiased personnel is chosen. There is less argument today for keeping the prosecuting arm outside the Board than there was under the Wagner Act, when the Board's sole function was to foster the interests of labor and deal with unfair labor practices on the part of employers. Today it is concerned with unfair labor practices by both employers and unions. It must assume an impartial attitude if it is to serve its function properly. The same is true of the prosecuting arm. There seems to be a dangerous tendency on the part of some groups to regard the general counsel as partial to employers and the Board as favoring unions. Perhaps that is an inevitable consequence of the separation. In any event, the aim must be for high-minded and impartial service on the part of both, and we suspect that this can be most readily attained if the present invitation to friction is removed.

Principles of National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON FOREIGN TRADE POLICY, MARCH 21, 1950

Lower wages than those prevailing in the United States create the principal competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign countries when they ship dutiable merchandise into our domestic market.

These lower wage rates often result in lower foreign costs and confer a price advantage upon the shipper to our shores, since his productivity is not generally so far below our own as to offset the lower wages. With the exception of a few products, such as automobiles, that are mass-produced by us, other countries are not very far behind us in productivity and are rapidly catching up in many lines because of the spread of mechanization.

In the meantime, however, and contrary to the theory of classical economists and free trade advocates, the competitive advantages of imported dutiable goods in our domestic market are not generally reducible to superiority of natural resources, soil, climate, or greater efficiency in the countries of origin. Unfortunately they are attributable in some cases to simple exploitation of labor.

Competitive goods that derive their cheapness from this source therefore enter higher-standard countries with a spurious economic advantage rather than a fair one.

Instead of spreading the economic benefits often attributed to trade, they undermine the living standards in the higher-standard importing countries. Only if the imports are economically complementary to production in the importing countries rather than competitive is the injury avoided.

In order to prevent the destruction of high labor standards and to maintain the possibility of reasonable business profits, a high-standard country is therefore fully justified in taking measures to prevent the economic erosion that may result from unimpeded importation of competitive, as distinguished from complementary, goods from lower-wage countries. Just as bad money drives out good money, goods produced at unfair wages tend to drive out of the market those produced at fair wages when the two are in open, unobstructed competition. Recognition of this fact led this country to adopt national minimum-wage legislation to prevent the destruction of labor standards from within its own borders.

Protective measures that are designed thus simply to place competitive foreign products on a fair competitive level in the market of a high-standard country cannot properly be described as trade barriers or obstacles to the flow of healthy trade. The United States is unique in the world of trade because all other countries operate on a lower wage standard. Nevertheless, approximately 60 percent of our imports are now free of duty, consisting largely of noncompetitive items and raw materials. The economic conditions of their production overseas cannot directly undermine our standards, and our consumers can enjoy the lower prices without hurting domestic production.

However, the claim of consumers to the enjoyment of lower prices on the 40-percent remainder of our imports, which are competitive goods, is not valid if the lower prices of the latter merely reflect lower wage levels abroad, since such a claim would be based on the destruction of our economic standards.

The postwar economic situation, characterized by an unprecedentedly high national debt, calls for the continuance of an unusually high annual national income, or one of well over $200,000,000,000. This requirement binds us, however unwillingly, to a high price level. The increase in statutory minimum wages by Congress and the maintenance of high support prices for farm products have put the stamp of governmental recognition on this view.

The interests not only of labor and management but also of the public, therefore, make it imperative that they seek reasonable safeguards against unfair and deflationary foreign competition. Their interests are mutual in maintaining high standards of employment, production, and wages, and in the prevention of action that would undermine such standards. Such reasonable safeguards will not materially reduce imports but would remove from the dutiable ones the threat to our employment that they would otherwise carry.

To avoid the maintenance or imposition of unsound, while assuring proper, measures of protection, the following principle should be honored:

Any legitimate industry in the United States that pays prevailing wages and that is able to market its products at prices returning a reasonable profit under fair competitive conditions and succeed in setting aside reserves for research and development is not only economically justified but is entitled to protection. The degree of protection should be roughly equal to the advantage of foreign producers in this market as a result of their lower labor standards, modified by relative productivity.

How Taxes Have Mounted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article mailed me by a constituent. When writing to me, this constituent states that this article tells more than she could write.

I hope the Members have the opportunity to read this article as it shows very clearly how taxes have increased, not only for the rich, but also for the not so rich. The Democrats will do well to take heed too for this article points out that the tax reduction put through by

the Eightieth Congress is being appreciated and the people have not forgotten which Congress made this possible.

The article follows:

HOW TAXES HAVE MOUNTED

EDITOR THE COURIER NEWS:

Every year at income-tax time, I recall what was told me in the 1930's when I expressed alarm at the greatly increased Government spending, viz, "What are you worrying about; only the rich will get soaked." How untrue that remark was is partially revealed by the comparison of pay-roll taxes which follows:

Yearly salary	1929	1950
$2,100 (married)	No tax	$147.50
$2,600 (married)	do	230.00
$3,600 (married)	do	389.00
$1,560 (single)	do	157.40

This comparison, unfortunately, illustrates only to a minor extent how the "not so rich" also are being soaked, since a much greater portion of taxes of people in the low-income bracket are, as FDR said "paid indirectly in the cost of things they buy."

These hidden taxes include corporate income taxes (increased from 11 to 38 percent), taxes paid by business on pay rolls, oils, transportation, telephone, telegraph, electricity, liquor, playing cards, tobacco, etc., excise taxes on autos, tires, tubes and parts, on electric, gas, and oil appliances, on light bulbs, refrigerators, gasoline, musical instruments, photographic materials, sporting goods, radios, etc., also luxury taxes on furs, jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, admissions, etc.

I once estimated that a single woman earning $2,340 a year paid over $800 a year in taxes including Federal, State, city, and the above hidden taxes, and although it is about $100 less now, thanks to the reduction given by the previous Congress, it's still terrific.

Despite all the publicity given in newspapers regarding wasteful Government spending and inefficiency, and their effect on taxpayers' ever-increasing debt burden and high taxes, too many taxpayers are too busy having fun to take a few minutes time to write their Congressman telling them (1) to repeal all war taxes, (2) to balance our budget immediately, and (3) to stop wasting their money.

That is why Government spending, the cause of taxation and debt, has gone steadily from bad to worse.

O. PITSCHMAN.

Jacob Henry's Battle for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to read a proof copy prepared by Philip Slomovitz, the distinguished editor of the Jewish News, and which appropriately enough is to appear in the Passover issue of March 31. The article is captioned "Jacob Henry's battle for civil rights."

JACOB HENRY'S BATTLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Philip Slomovitz)

Israel's festival of freedom—the Passover—is a glorious occasion on which to recall important battles for justice on the American Continent. There are numerous instances of heroic efforts, dating back to colonial times, when high-minded Christians fought for the right of man to worship—or not to worship—as he pleased.

Thus far, the triumphs of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and scores of others, who have succeeded in writing into our Constitution the basic principles of religious liberty, remain the pride and the cornerstone of our American heritage.

There are some lesser-known names whose contributions to the cause of justice and untrammeled freedom have helped build a strong foundation for this great Republic. Among them was Jacob Henry, who was elected to the North Carolina House of Commons in 1808, served for a year and upon his reelection in 1809 faced the challenge as to his right to hold office on religious grounds.

At that time the North Carolina constitution prohibited non-Protestants from holding civil offices. Henry, who was elected to the North Carolina State Legislature from Carteret County, became the center of a political issue. Many of the State's leaders came to his support and Roman Catholics, who were similarly affected by the law barring non-Protestants from holding civil positions, were on his side.

Henry won an overwhelming victory to retain his seat after delivering an address which has won such wide acclaim that it has been included in the famous collection, "The American Orator." Henry's triumph, however, was only partial. While he was permitted to retain his seat in the legislature, the discriminatory North Carolina clause remained on the State's statutes. It was interpreted to mean that legislative offices were not necessarily civil, that Catholics and Jews could participate in making laws although they were prohibited from interpreting and executing them.

After the Civil War, when Southern States began to liberalize their constitutions, North Carolina granted full religious liberty to all its constituents in 1868.

Jacob Henry was born in Philadelphia in 1776. His activities after his rise to fame in the battle for religious equality in 1809, when he delivered his great oration, the date and place of his death, are unknown. His name at birth was Jacob Gratz, and it is believed he was the brother of the Philadelphia merchant Michael Gratz. Jacob changed his last name to Henry when he moved to the South.

In his powerful book on the battle for liberty for all faiths, "Cornerstone of Religious Freedom in America" (Beacon Press), Joseph L. Blau reprints in full the famous oration by Henry and makes this interesting reference to Henry in a chapter on "The Affirmation of Civil Rights for Religious Minorities":

"North Carolina, whose constitution required its officials to accept the divine authority of the New Testament, but whose declaration of rights granted religious freedom, was faced with the necessity in 1809 of deciding between these two instruments.

"Jacob Henry, a Jew, was elected to the house of commons by the voters of Carteret County. It was, of course, impossible for Mr. Henry to affirm the divine authority of the New Testament. His right to his seat was, therefore, challenged. Mr. Henry was granted the privilege of speaking in defense of his right to retain the seat, and did so in a brief speech which was long considered one of the gems of American oratory. There has been some question raised as to his authorship of the speech; it is reported by one of the historians of North Carolina to have been written for him by Chief Justice Taylor, of the State supreme court. This attribution was solely on the basis of hearsay, and we are justified in attaching the name of Jacob Henry to this speech until trustworthy evidence of other authorship is furnished.

"The speech itself, though brief, is a ringing reiteration of the view that religion is a personal matter between the individual and his Maker, and that no one has the right to challenge or question this personal relation. As long as one does not hold religious opinions dangerous to the state, the state has no power to exclude him from any privilege or obligation of citizenship. The statement was clear-cut and incisive—and it is a pleasure to report that it was decisive. Mr. Henry was overwhelmingly granted the right to his seat in the commons, and some years later the constitutional provisions were changed."

In 1818, in the heat of debate over a similar issue in the Maryland Assembly, while discussing the so-called Jew bill which was aimed at the repeal of a test act that prevented Jews from entering the legal profession and public office, the Honorable H. M. Brackenridge spoke of Jacob Henry's speech as being "a part of our education as Americans to love and cherish the sentiments uttered by him."

The Maryland battle, which began in 1797, when the Baltimore Jew Solomon Etting first petitioned the Maryland House of Commons against the restrictions on Jews seeking office or entrance in the legal profession, the part played in it by Thomas Kennedy, "ardent Jeffersonian and a persistent fighter," Col. W. G. D. Worthington, and H. M. Brackenridge, form another glorious chapter in the struggle for religious freedom in this country. The "Jew bill" was adopted by the Maryland House of Delegates on the last day of the session, February 26, 1825, and was confirmed, as required by law, in the following session of the house, on January 5, 1826. Mr. Blau, whose book also contains the complete text of Mr. Brackenridge's historic address, comments that "the Jeffersonian principle was vindicated and sustained in Maryland just 6 months before the death of Jefferson himself."

Brackenridge's speech on the Maryland "Jew bill," delivered in 1819, has gone down in history with the greatest orations in defense of civil rights. Brackenridge had this to say on the question of tolerance:

"Sir, I abhor intolerance, whether it be political or religious; and yet, I can scarcely regard religious tolerance as a virtue. What has weak and erring man, a right to give permission to his fellow mortal, to offer his adorations to the Supreme Being, after his own manner? Did I not feel myself somehow restrained from pursuing this subject, I would endeavor to demonstrate, that the idea of such permission, or toleration, is not better than impiety. But I content myself, with calling your attention to what has been the effect, in this country, at least, of leaving religion to be taught from the pulpit, or to be instilled by early education."

Is this a Christian land? Brackenridge had something to say, also, on this score in his famous speech. To quote him again:

"But, we are told, that this is a Christian land, and that we are Christians. I rejoice to hear it, and I hope we will prove ourselves worthy of the name, by acting on this, and on every other occasion, with Christian spirit. But this is a Christian land. And let me inquire of the page of history, by what means it became so? Was it through the instrumentality of peace and good will to our fellow men? * * * No, sir, the soil we inhabit yields its fruit to the just and to the unjust; the sun which gives us life, sheds his glorious beams impartially on all. But the great majority of the dwellers of this land are Christians; therefore it is a Christian land. For the same reason, it might be a Catholic, Episcopal, or Presbyterian land. Our political compacts are not entered into as brethren of the Christian faith—but as men, as members of a civilized society. In looking back to our struggle for independence, I find that we engaged in that bloody conflict, for the rights of man, and not for the purpose of enforcing or defending any particular religious

creed. If the accidental circumstance, of our being for the greater part Christians, could justify us in proscribing other religions, the same reason would justify any one of the sects of Christianity, in persecuting the rest. But, sir, all persecution for the sake of opinions, is tyranny—and the first speck of it that may appear, should be eradicated, as the commencement of a deadly gangrene, whose ultimate tendency, is, to convert the body politic, into a corrupt and putrid mass."

This is the stuff of which the ideals of freedom and democracy were made in this great land of liberty. We pause on the Passover Festival of Freedom to pay tribute to the molders of free expression and free living and thinking in our great land.

TEXT OF HENRY'S GREAT ORATION IN CAROLINA HOUSE OF DELEGATES IN 1809

I certainly, Mr. Speaker, know not the design of the Declaration of Rights made by the people of this State in the year 1776, if it was not to consecrate certain great and fundamental rights and principles which even the Constitution cannot impair; for the forty-fourth section of the latter instrument declares that the Declaration of Rights ought never to be violated, on any pretense whatever; if there is any apparent difference between the two instruments, they ought, if possible, to be reconciled; but if there is a final repugnance between them, the Declaration of Rights must be considered paramount; for I believe it is to the Constitution, as the Constitution is to law; it controls and directs it absolutely and conclusively. If, then, a belief in the Protestant religion is required by the Constitution, to qualify a man for a seat in this house, and such qualification is dispensed with by the Declaration of Rights, the provision of the Constitution must be altogether inoperative; as the language of the Bill of Rights is, "that all men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences." It is undoubtedly a natural right, and when it is declared to be an inalienable one by the people in their sovereign and original capacity, any attempt to alienate either by the Constitution or by law, must be vain and fruitless.

It is difficult to conceive how such a provision crept into the Constitution, unless it is from the difficulty the human mind feels in suddenly emancipating itself from fetters by which it has long been enchained: and how adverse it is to the feelings and manners of the people of the present day every gentleman may satisfy himself by glancing at the religious belief of the persons who fill the various offices in this State: there are Presbyterians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Mennonists, Baptists, Trinitarians, and Unitarians. But, as far as my observation extends, there are fewer Protestants, in the strict sense of the word, used by the Constitution, than of any other persuasion; for I suppose that they meant by it, the Protestant religion as established by the law in England.

For other persuasions we see houses of worship in almost every part of the State, but very few of the Protestant; so few, that indeed I fear that the people of this State would for some time remain unrepresented in this house, if that clause of the Constitution is supposed to be in force. So far from believing in the 39 articles, I will venture to assert that a majority of the people never have read them.

If a man should hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the state, I do not hesitate to pronounce that he should be excluded from the public councils of the same; and I trust if I know myself, no one would be more ready to aid and assist than myself. But I should really be at a loss to specify any known religious principles which are thus dangerous.

It is surely a question between a man and his Maker, and requires more than human attributes to pronounce which of the numerous sects prevailing in the world is more acceptable to the Deity. If a man fulfills the duties of that religion, which his education or his conscience has pointed to him as the true one, no person, I hold, in this our land of liberty, has a right to arraign him at the bar of any inquisition; and the day, I trust, has long passed, when principles merely speculative were propagated by force; when the sincere and pious were made victims, and the light-minded bribed into hypocrites.

The purest homage man could render to the Almighty was the sacrifice of his passions and the performance of his duties. That the ruler of the universe would receive with equal benignity the various offers of man's adoration, if they proceeded from the heart. Governments only concern the actions and conduct of man, and not his speculative notions. Who among us feels himself so exalted above his fellows as to have a right to dictate to them any mode of belief? Will you bind the conscience in chains, and fasten conviction upon the mind in spite of the conclusions of reason and of those ties and habitudes which are blended with every pulsation of the heart? Are you prepared to plunge at once from the sublime heights of moral legislation into the dark and gloomy caverns of superstitious ignorance? Will you drive from your shores and from the shelter of your Constitution, all who do not lay their oblations on the same altar, observe the same ritual, and subscribe to the same dogmas? If so, which, among the various sects into which we are divided, shall be the favored one?

I should insult the understanding of this House to suppose it possible that they could ever assent to such absurdities; for all know that persecution in all its shapes and modifications, is contrary to the genius of our Government and the spirit of our laws, and that it can never produce any other effect than to render men hypocrites or martyrs.

When Charles V, Emperor of Germany, tired of the cares of government, resigned his crown to his son, he retired to a monastery, where he amused the evening of his life in regulating the movements of watches, endeavoring tq make a number keep the same time; but, not being able to make any two go exactly alike, it led him to reflect upon the folly and crimes he had committed, in attempting the impossibility of making men think alike.

Nothing is more easily demonstrated than that the conduct alone is the subject of human laws, and that man ought to suffer civil disqualification for what he does, and not for what he thinks. The mind can receive laws only from Him, of whose divine essence it is a portion; He alone can punish disobedience; for who else can know its movements, or estimate their merits? The religion I profess, inculcates every duty which man owes to his fellow men; it enjoins upon its votaries the practice of every virtue, and the detestation of every vice; it teaches them to hope for the favor of heaven exactly in proportion as their lives have been directed by just, honorable, and beneficent maxims. This, then, gentlemen, is my creed—it was impressed upon my infant mind; it has been the director of my youth, the monitor of my manhood, and will, I trust, be the consolation of my old age. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you cannot see anything in this religion to deprive me of my seat in this House. So far as relates to my life and conduct, the examination of these I submit with cheerfulness to your candid and liberal construction. What may be the religion of him who made this objection against me, or whether he has any religion or not, I am unable to say. I have never considered it my duty to pry into the belief of other Members of this House. If their actions are upright and conduct just, the rest is for their own consideration, not for mine.

I do not seek to make converts to my faith, whatever it may be esteemed in the eyes of my officious friend, nor do I exclude any one from my esteem or friendship, because he and I differ in that respect. The same charity, therefore, it is not unreasonable to expect, will be extended to myself, because in all things that relate to the State and to the duties of civil life, I am bound by the same obligations with my fellow-citizens, nor does any man subscribe more sincerely than myself to the maxim, "whatever ye would that men should do unto you do ye so even unto them, for such is the law and the prophets."

Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Welfare State, delivered by me at the Harvard Law School Forum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., on March 24, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE STATE

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dulles, and friends of the Harvard community, I appreciate the opportunity to be your guest this evening. I do consider it a privilege to be here. Harvard has a high reputation among those of us who hail from the University of Minnesota. I remember that one of my professors was accustomed to repeating in his class a statement by President Lowell, of Harvard. President Lowell, he used to say, claimed there was a great deal of knowledge at Harvard because the freshmen always brought a little bit in and the seniors seldom took any of it out.

The subject of our discussion this evening is the welfare state. Frankly, I am amused to find that it is still an issue. I recall reading not so very long ago that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey delivered a lecture at (if I may be so bold as to mention) Princeton University. The New York Herald Tribune in reporting that lecture, given under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, said, "The battle-frayed welfare-state issue of New York's 1949 Senate campaign was publicly jettisoned here tonight by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who said it must have been 'some very clumsy Republican' who tried to pin that label on the Truman administration." Governor Dewey went on to say, "The man who first used the phrase against our present Government did his cause no good, to put it mildly."

Nevertheless, the welfare state remains an issue, and defines clearly the distinction between the Fair Deal program and those who would oppose that program.

Former Supreme Court Justice Stone once advised a group of law students, "If you are strong on the facts but weak on the law, discuss the facts. If you are strong on the law but weak on the facts, discuss the law. If you are weak on the law and the facts, bang the table." These sharp observations of Justice Stone come to mind readily as I observe the Republican Party banging

the table and using the welfare-state slogan. I might also say that I consider the use of the slogan "socialism" by the Republican Party to be in the same category of ghost-haunting and irresponsible politics.

For many years now those of us who call ourselves liberals or New Dealers or Fair Dealers have been accused of trying to change our form of government and our form of society. Our critics say we are trying to create a welfare state or a Socialist state. In my opinion, the use of these slogans is an attempt to confuse the issues and to escape facing the issue. I hope this evening that our debate will raise the level of political discussion so that the issues rather than the slogans—so that the realities rather than the ghosts—are discussed.

I would not deny that there is some merit to the Republican claim that the Fair Deal program seeks the welfare state as an objective. The welfare state is a legitimate objective: one that is perfectly consistent with our traditions and with the current wishes of the American people. A state which is devoted to the welfare of its members, a state which looks upon man and his welfare as an end in itself, is one I support and urge you to support.

The United States began as a welfare state when its Constitution charged the Government with the responsibility of the general welfare of its people. In a sense this was one of the great differences between this new country which was born and the tired nations of Europe in the eighteenth century.

From that day until this day the history of the American development has been a history of providing greater welfare for its people.

As early as 1806 Thomas Jefferson as President of the United States asked Congress to approve a donation of lands for a National Establishment for Education. In a measure I think it is fair to characterize this step as one of the earliest forms of Government subsidy, since land was a clear financial asset. The use of land during that early period played an important role in developing the concept of Government subsidies. Our Government eventually granted 250,000,000 acres of land for various welfare purposes: for education; for wagon roads so that everyone, not only the rich, could travel easily; for canals and levees; for public buildings; for railroads.

Let us not forget too the significant role played by the Homestead Act of 1862 in developing our Nation and in bringing it to a position of power and responsibility in the world. For those who were not able to make an adequate living in the industrial areas of the East, Congress gave away vast areas of public lands to individual families. Today the Federal Government no longer gives land grants. The modern expression of that program, however, is legislation in behalf of unemployment insurance and social security. Today the method of payment is changed. But land or money, income-producing property or income, there is no change in principle.

To provide financial assistance for welfare programs has always been a part of America's tradition. Furthermore, I issue the challenge tonight that it is an American tradition which even the opponents of the welfare state want to preserve. The only question which remains an issue is the question of whose welfare.

As early as 1791 Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton—the symbol of conservatism—made a plea before the House of Representatives for Federal subsidies to manufacturers.

During the nineteenth century the United States Government gave to the railroads a total of 179,000,000 acres of land.

At this very moment the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Export-Import Bank assists private industry financially. I suggest that Mr. Guy Gabrielson, himself one of the leading exponents of reaction in America and spokesman for the Republican Party, is in favor of continuing that form of Government subsidy, since the Carthage Hydrocol Corp., which he heads, has received the total of more than $18,000,000 in loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In this connection, I have one further observation to make. I am a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In our committee is a bill to raise postal rates. The same magazine and newspaper publishers who daily attack the Fair Deal as a welfare state and oppose Government subsidies for the American people are daily in my office and before our committee, insisting the Government postal subsidy to their business be maintained. Last year the newspaper and magazine publishers of America received a subsidy upward of $200,000,000.

Many of these Government subsidies to business are desirable. But if they are desirable to help profits, they are desirable to help people.

Those of us who would advance proposals for welfare legislation do so because we are striving for a more perfect democracy in which the American people through their Government can build a constantly improving society.

Abraham Lincoln said in 1854, "The purpose of government is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, or cannot do so well for themselves." That is philosophy which the New Deal and the Fair Deal represent, and which I today represent.

What we strive for can best be put in the phrase "economic democracy." That phrase means a system which preserves the political fabric of democracy and the freedoms traditionally associated with it at the same time as it searches for increased economic freedoms.

A wise man once said, "Hungry stomachs do not make good political advisers." It is our objective to use the great wealth, the greater resources, and the great genius which is ours toward strengthening the establishment of a society free from economic insecurity.

We are moving into the second half of the Twentieth Century, a century which has seen America's productive strength grow beyond the dreams of even the most visionary of our national founders. Today we have the natural resources and the technical knowledge to open up a new vista. President Truman's recent messages to Congress have demonstrated the possibilities that are open to us. Merely by continuing our past rate of growth we can within 5 years increase in production 20 percent, which would mean increasing the average family income by about $1,000 a year. Within our grasp in the next 50 years we can treble today's standard of living which would mean average family incomes of $12,000 a year.

We have an opportunity for the first time in the world's history to establish a society in which every family can have a decent standard of living and in which luxury living will be available to an increasing number of our citizens. It can be a society in which all have enough without unduly limiting the rewards avalable for the more industrious and the more able.

Yet as these possibilities come to mind, there also comes to mind the increasing complexity of our society.

In the not too distant past opportunity was open to all. If a man was willing to make the effort he could have the richest land and the richest resources for the asking.

Today millions of families are dependent on jobs that may disappear tomorrow with no others available. Millions of families live on tiny worn out farms eking out a bare subsistence.

In this the land of plenty—in this the century of progress—we in America still have almost 10,000,000 families, or about one-quarter of our population, trying to get along on less than $2,000 a year.

Here is the crisis we face. Here is why we need a Fair Deal program, working toward an increasing welfare program, working toward greater economic democracy.

There are some who feel that the realization of the dream which is before our eyes cannot be achieved without sacrificing the free enterprise system—and they prefer the free enterprise system.

They are of little faith. I believe in the free enterprise system—I am not a Socialist. No other system could have made the progress we have made in the past 150 years. But the free enterprise system in America as we have seen it has always been one receiving encouragement, stimulation, and protection from Government activity—from Government welfare programs.

Let us not forget that the protective tariff, the darling of big business for so many years, was one of the most flagrant examples of Government interference in behalf of business.

The greatest threat to the free enterprise system in America is not social security, minimum wage, aid to education, rural electrical programs, and the like. The greatest threat to free enterprise in America is growing monopoly in America.

There are those who would have us believe that an unbalanced budget spells the end of free enterprise in America. That is nonsense. I am more concerned about the fact that the Federal Trade Commission recently reported to Congress another half a dozen industries which are dominated by four to six companies making a total of 19 highly concentrated industries out of 26 studied. I am more concerned that three companies control 95.3 percent of the tin cans and other tinware industry; that three companies control 92.1 percent of the linoleum industry; that another three companies control 88.5 percent of the copper smelting and refining industry. In this connection, Anaconda Copper alone controls almost half the capital assets of the whole industry and another quarter of the capital assets of the copper industry is controlled by Kennecott Copper Corp.

I am concerned about the future of the free-enterprise system when I learn from the Federal Trade Commission reports that 113 companies, all with assets of more than $100,000,000, own almost half of the manufacturing plant and equipment in the whole of our United States.

The free-enterprise system is in danger but the danger does not arise from welfare programs. The danger arises from the fact that from 1940 through 1948, according to the Federal Trade Commission, more than 2,450 formerly independent firms in the manufacturing and mining industries alone disappeared as a result of merger and acquisitions. The asset value of these firms amounted to about $5,200,000,000 or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of our manufacturing corporations in America. Moreover, nearly one-third of the companies merged were absorbed by the very largest corporations, those with assets exceeding $50,000,000.

It is monopoly which threatens a free America. I do not consider unbalanced budgets to be desirable objectives. Unbalanced national budgets however are no indication of the basic health of the American economy. The Republicans would balance the budget but they would do so, I suggest, at the expense of unbalancing the American economy. I remember well the days of the balanced budget under Ogden Mills, Andrew Mellon, and Herbert Hoover, and I remember that those balanced budgets spelled unbalanced family life for millions of Americans. I am more concerned with balancing the daily lives of Americans and their families so that they have full employment; so that they can enjoy the fruits of their labor; so

that they can participate in the good life which is possible in our society.

If the Republican Party should succeed in its program of opposition to social-welfare legislation, if it should succeed in its efforts to curtail Government expenditures at the expense of the middle- and low-income families of America, if it continues to advocate a favor-the-rich tax program such as the one it enacted when it was in power during the Eightieth Congress and which incidentally was primarily responsible for the unbalanced budget of the last 2 years—the Republican Party will be the threat to free enterprise in America.

I recall the prophetic vision of Theodore Roosevelt when he said, "If socialism ever comes to America the Republican Party will bring it."

I realize this sounds like a facetious statement to many but to me the only real safeguard for America, its freedoms and its economy, is a welfare program for America—a state which is concerned with real protection of free enterprise to the point of controlling monopoly, and a state which protects the American citizen from being governed by private corporations. We must have a government which wants to raise the standard of living for everyone not just increase the wealth of the industrialists and financiers. We must have recognition of a man's right to work at a living wage.

In the dark days of 1938 President Franklin Delano Roosevelt warned the American people. He said: "Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations, not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity. * * * In desperation they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need * * * to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

Yes, this program and these principles which I state have international implications as well. America must prove to the peoples of the world that political democracy and political freedom is not synonomous, as the Communists would have them believe, with industrial anarchy, growing unemployment, and the monopoly state. American democracy must prove that political freedom and political democracy can bring about an economy which is a healthy economy—one which is concerned for the welfare of the people. In fact, political democracy and economic oligarchy are incompatible and there can be no lasting political freedoms so long as economic control is in the hands of the few and so long as economic security is missing in our society.

The philosophy of the welfare state which I have been asked to represent aims to satisfy at least five major objectives:

1. A comprehensive social-insurance program including insurance and provision against the hazards of old age, disability, unemployment, and costs of medical care.

2. Prevention or mitigation of unemployment through public works planning and monetary and fiscal policies.

3. Improvement of the standard of living through such programs as slum clearance and public housing and by providing better facilities and opportunities for education.

4. Limitations on the growth of powerful corporate enterprise with a view to protecting the interests of small business firms and less privileged elements within our society.

5. The extension and guaranty of political liberty and economic opportunity to all persons regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

This issue of welfare state brings a vision to my mind. This vision symbolizes the choice which the American people face. On the one hand are those who would judge America and its accomplishments in terms of balance sheets and accounting records. On the other hand are those who judge America by its concrete accomplishments and by the happiness of its people. Those who oppose the welfare state remind me of the frightened men toting up their balances while the American people continue to go forward, build dams and houses and electric and telephone lines.

In conclusion my friends I make a plea for a rational rather than an emotional approach to the problems of government. I make a plea that we respect the facts.

It is difficult for the American people to understand when Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., head of the board of General Motors, makes a statement on January 15, 1950: "In recent years economic incentive has been weakened by the ever-increasing take of Government. I fear the effect is beginning to be felt on the economy." And then for General Motors to announce that it had earned $600,000,000 profits in 1949—more than any other company has ever made in the history of American industry. I suggest this is not a rational approach to discussing political issues.

Since the war American big business according to the Federal Trade Commission has been making approximately 20 percent profit on its invested capital after taxes. This compares with about half that figure before the war.

If our political opponents wish to label the program we stand for as a welfare state—then let it be so. Call it what you will—one fact, however, stands out in bold relief. This program has raised the living standards of American people. It has given a modicum of security to all areas of our population. It has provided a floor on living standards. It is furnishing relief from the apprehensions and anxieties which lead men to surrender their freedom. It is providing minimum protection against the hazard of old age and unemployment. It will provide prevention from catastrophe of sickness and disease. It is giving decent shelter to more and more of our people. It is putting a floor under wages. It will provide Federal aid to education so as to give every boy and girl equal educational opportunities so that none will remain the slaves of ignorance.

These programs are strengthening the ring of freedom that centuries of struggle has drawn around western man.

These programs are providing the incentive and will set the example which will undermine totalitarianism wherever it may be.

Electrical Voting Conduits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been introduced which would provide for electrical conduits in the floor of the House. It would be a great disservice to future Congresses to fail to make provision that an electrical conduit system be installed when the House floor is reconstructed this summer.

I hope that action will be taken on one of the appropriate resolutions by the House Administration Committee, and that it will soon be reported to the floor.

The following is an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch:

ELECTRICAL VOTING CONDUITS

During the first 2 months of the 1950 session of Congress, we are advised by Editorial Research Reports, 77 roll calls were taken in the House of Representatives. Each of them required at least 30 minutes—and the 38½ hours thus consumed is more than one-fourth of all the hours the House has been in session since January 3. This sorry record of wasted time and lost efficiency prompts us to suggest again that Congress drop one of its horse-and-buggy habits and install electrical voting machines. Every observer is aware that voting conditions in Congress are not exactly comparable to those in the Virginia General Assembly, but the advantages in electrical equipment more than outweigh any inconvenience that might be caused in changing a leisurely and expensive custom. At our own State Capital electrical equipment has become clearly indispensable. The mechanical roll calls, tabulating the vote of 100 men in a matter of seconds, provide permanent records that are fast, accurate, and easy to understand. Indiana's Representative JAMES E. NOLAND has sponsored a fresh resolution aimed at the installation of electric conduit when the House is further remodeled this summer. His resolution may not pass—congressional customs being the ironbound things they are—but surely it deserves wholehearted support from those who believe in conducting legislative business in a businesslike way.

Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely interesting letter by Mr. Charles H. Porter, who is professor of accounting, emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Professor Porter in his letter clearly shows a defect in the Coudert proposal for counting electoral votes by districts, which is that it is impossible for a district not to be gerrymandered. Therefore the Lodge-Gossett amendment is the best way to effectuate electoral reform.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING EVERY VOTE COUNT—COUDERT ELECTORAL PROPOSAL CALLED RED HERRING TO DELAY REFORM; LODGE-GOSSETT PLAN PRAISED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In the Herald Tribune of March 19 you printed a communication from Prof. Hugh A. Bone pointing out difficulties in fixing fair district boundaries if the Coudert proposal for presidential elections is adopted. I would go farther and maintain that fair district boundaries are impossible.

Consider a State where 55 percent of the voters are Democrats and 45 percent are Republicans. If the State were so districted that each district contained 55 percent Democrats and 45 percent Republicans, the entire electoral vote of the State would be counted for the Democratic candidate as at present. Whether the Republicans had 45

percent of the popular vote or only 5 percent would not be reflected in the electoral college vote.

Or if an all-wise and completely neutral individual could be found to gerrymander the districts so as to balance exactly the inequities on one side against inequities on the other side, he would also need to be a prophet, because the distribution of voters in 1952 will not duplicate the distribution of voters in 1948. The opinions of some voters change and a new generation of voters replaces those voters who have passed on. What any system of basing the electoral college vote on districts really does is to substitute 480 smaller inequities for the 48 larger inequities of the present system, the total inequity being of the same order of magnitude in either case. The counting of Republican votes in Texas for a Democratic candidate and of Democratic votes in Vermont for a Republican candidate is an inequity.

A fallacy in much of the argument about electoral systems is the assumption that the popular vote will be identical, regardless of the system. This is not the case. There are a substantial number of voters in Louisiana who would vote for a Republican candidate for President if they knew that the system made their votes effective but who do not trouble to vote for President under the present system. I have just spent a month in Louisiana and did not hear a single person say a good word for Truman.

Unless the President can be elected by a total popular vote, the Lodge-Gossett amendment is the only proposal which makes the ballot of every Republican and every Democrat effective.

By making every State a battleground, we would stimulate a greater and much needed interest in politics. The Coudert proposal is a red herring to postpone a vital reform.

CHARLES H. PORTER,
Professor of Accounting Emeritus of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

TRYON, N. C., *March 21, 1950.*

Death of Dr. Francis T. Spaulding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the people of the State of New York have been saddened by the untimely death of the State commissioner of education, Dr. Francis Trow Spaulding.

Under Dr. Spaulding's direction, the State of New York has pursued an unusually vigorous policy in education. Dr. Spaulding was particularly effective in improving the administration and curricula of our high schools. He was a man of high idealism and of complete integrity. It will be very difficult for any man adequately to fill his place.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on March 28 in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCIS TROW SPAULDING

Dr. Spaulding took office less than 4 years ago as State commissioner of education. His death at the age of 53 deprives the State and the Nation of an able and useful leader. He had served the armed forces in an educational capacity in two world wars. Among the high posts he held was that of dean of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard. Many States benefited from his experience and writings. When he became commissioner on July 1, 1946, by unanimous election by the board of regents, he was already familiar with New York State's school system from earlier studies.

During Dr. Spaulding's tenure a general reorganization of the department of education was undertaken. New and higher minimum salaries for public school teachers were mandated by State law, the State University of New York was created, a more vigorous policy of informing the public on educational problems was initiated, and new emphasis was directed to improving the high school. The commissioner was an advocate of generous State financial aid to education, and on occasion came into conflict with other high officials on the extent of such aid. His decisions on several controversial issues reflected a policy of avoiding interference with local school authorities when possible. Confronted with the task of implementing legislative orders under the Feinberg antisubversive law, he issued a memorandum admirable in its concern for safeguarding the conscientious and the innocent.

Dr. Spaulding leaves a vacancy hard to fill. The area of jurisdiction is large and varied, the powers great. The commissioner must be an educator from the top drawer. He must also be a man of courage and highest integrity. The commissioner of education is always on the firing line, both from within and outside the school system.

Mr. Acheson's Ordeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Acheson's Ordeal," which was published in the London Times of yesterday. This editorial was the "leader," as the phrase goes. The London Times leader exercises vast influence throughout the Empire and the world. This editorial substantiates the misgivings recently expressed by Mr. Stimson, the distinguished former Secretary of War and Secretary of State, when he said that the current attacks upon our State Department are creating a feeling abroad which can only hamper the effective conduct of our foreign policy. The London Times observes that the attacks on Mr. Acheson have caused both bewilderment and alarm abroad and have weakened the foreign policy of the United States at a critical moment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ACHESON'S ORDEAL

The campaign in the American Congress and press against Mr. Acheson, the United States Secretary of State, has caused both bewilderment and alarm abroad. When Mr. Acheson was chosen to succeed Mr. Marshall the choice was felt to be singularly happy and likely not only to shed luster on the administration but also to provide international leadership of a high order. Mr. Acheson had been closely associated with the unfolding of a creative American foreign policy to meet the challenge presented by communism and the disruption caused by the war. In office he has demonstrated a notable capacity to illuminate the real issues in foreign affairs.

His second speech in California a fortnight ago, for example, made it clear that the United States was prepared at any time to enter into negotiations with the Russians, but insisted that fundamental and far-reaching changes in Russian policy must precede any agreement that would be worth the paper it was written on. It is Mr. Acheson's view that at present agreements are likely only in specific situations where sufficient strength can be mobilized by the democracies to command Russian respect.

Nothing could be farther than this from appeasing Russia. Yet in Congress, Senator WHERRY, the Republican floor leader, has presumed to call Mr. Acheson a "bad security risk" and his resignation is demanded by a number of Republicans on the ground that he is tolerant of Communist sympathizers in his Department. Senator MCCARTHY, a Wisconsin Republican, has not the official backing of his party for his wild and so far quite unproved charges that the presence of untrustworthy officials in the State Department accounts for recent American diplomatic defeats in the Far East. But his party has done nothing to restrain him and there is no doubt that if any single item in Senator MCCARTHY'S barrage of indictments should prove to have some substance, however small, it would be exploited to the full in the autumn elections. It has long been a favorite Republican thesis that the Democrats are "soft" toward communism. It is proof of Mr. Acheson's courage, if not his discretion, that he went out of his way after the conviction of Mr. Alger Hiss, a former State Department official, to announce that, while he abhorred the crime, he would not turn his back upon the man. Such open defiance of the Republican lightning had the effect of leaving Mr. Acheson in temporary political isolation. Unlike some of his predecessors, such as Mr. Hull and Mr. Byrnes, he had no political machine of his own; he has never been a member of the Senate. Democrats who normally would have rallied to his defense took refuge in silence, believing they could not afford to increase their political liabilities in an election year.

This is a critical week in Mr. Acheson's ordeal. The Republicans threaten a parade of anti-Acheson speakers. The President, himself engaged in a tussle with Senator MCCARTHY, has come to the defense of the Secretary of State, denying widespread rumors that he is to be replaced. Mr. Jessup, United States ambassador-at-large and himself accused of an "affinity for Communist causes," has counterattacked, charging Mr. MCCARTHY with a "shocking disregard for the public interest." Senator BENTON, newly appointed by Governor Bowles of Connecticut and a former colleague of Mr. Acheson, is the first Democrat bold enough to take his place by the side of the Secretary of State and the President.

The realization is growing that irresponsible partisan attacks weaken not only the State Department, but the foreign policy of the United States at a critical moment. Mr. Acheson's lack of a constructive policy for Asia, by which they mean his refusal to allow the United States to cling any longer to the sinking ship of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, is the chief Republican grievance against him. Yet their attacks have robbed the Secretary of State of the time and energy that should have been available for urgent decisions on aid to southeast Asia and for mobilizing support for new approaches to Europe's problems.

The first stage, to which Mr. Acheson's California speech was directed, is to convince the American public that there are no short cuts in the struggle between democracy and communism. Any illusions on this score sap the will to support the efforts already being made, through the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact, and make Congress and the public less inclined for fresh endeavors.

Congress, quite apart from the campaign against the State Department, is struggling to reduce the $5,000,000,000 deficit in the budget, and foreign spending is likely to feel the sharp edge of the pruning shears, for cuts here offend directly no domestic interest. Even the bill for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries is regarded as having doubtful prospects, modest though its scale is. The only increased spending that can be looked for is on defense. Here presidential economy has aroused congressional alarm. The fact-finding mission of Mr. Jessup to the Far East and other reviews of American policy provide the basis, however, for the limited economic and military assistance that Mr. Acheson forecast for the countries of southeast Asia, the details of which are likely to be made known this week. A plan for helping to close the dollar gap in the trading accounts of friends and allies is, as Mr. Webb, the Under Secretary of State, declared last week, probably the largest single contribution which the United States can make toward strengthening the free world. It is a hopeful sign that Senator VANDENBERG, whose illness has crippled the foreign-affairs leadership of the Senate, has suggested the creation of an unpartisan commission to consider solutions of this problem, much as the Harriman committee's investigations laid the foundations of the Marshall plan. As Mr. Webb noted, the difficulty is to stabilize world trade at a sufficiently high level. Recent reductions in the dollar gap are due to the decline in American exports as well as increases in imports; if this went on damage would be done, not only to recovery abroad, but to stability and employment in the United States.

In September there will be another opportunity for the President to use his powers to reduce tariffs further, on manufactured articles as well as raw materials. But the deliberate organization of a higher level of American imports is politically far more difficult than the passage of foreign-aid programs. There is room for expansion; imports now represent a much smaller proportion of the American gross national product than they did in 1929. Yet even the very moderate increases that have already taken place have brought bitter complaints in the watch and textile trades, not only from managements but from trade-unions as well. Neither of the political parties is free from this kind of pressure. It has even been tentatively suggested by both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman that industries badly affected by foreign competition, in the national interest, might be given Government assistance. This is the kind of proposal that might with advantage be entrusted to the commission which Senator VANDENBERG believes should study the new responsibilities of the world's greatest creditor Nation. With problems of such import and complexity in hand, it is matter for universal concern and disquiet that the conduct of American foreign affairs should be subjected to irresponsible political attacks.

Mr. BENTON. In addition and as a postscript, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the London Communist Daily Worker of yesterday at the opposite end of the pole in reputability from the London Times, published the following comment:

Short of starting a third world war next week, it is difficult to see how Mr. Dean Acheson, the United States Secretary of State, could manifest more hostility to communism than he has done.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from George D. Stoddard, former commissioner of education of New York, now president of the University of Illinois, and chairman of the National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Dr. Stoddard is world famous as psychologist and educator. His courageous leadership and great contribution to UNESCO and to the United States National Commission for UNESCO are well known not only in this country, but throughout the world. He speaks with authority as well as wisdom on the need for immediate consideration by the Senate of the resolution which I and 12 other Senators submitted a week ago today.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPAIGN, ILL., *March 27, 1950.*
Senator WILLIAM S. BENTON,
Senate Office Building:

Have now read in detail your proposed six-point resolution and supporting speech of March 22. Congratulations on your logical analysis, courage, and imagination. It restores to the American people what they have relied upon in all crisis from Revolutionary War onward, namely faith in the power of ideas, the power of ethical principles. Arms we must have but military preparedness alone is not enough. We need plans for banding together like-minded people in defense of freedom. We need action, programs based on such plans. Your resolution shows the way and the relative cost is small. This is the true answer to communism.

GEORGE D. STODDARD,
President, University of Illinois.

Death of Francis T. Spaulding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Francis T. Spaulding," published in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, March 28, 1950. In his untimely death the State of New York and the United States have lost a distinguished public servant, a great educator, and a great American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCIS T. SPAULDING

Francis T. Spaulding, State commissioner of education since 1946, was a career educator of marked attainments. His sudden death at age 53 is a serious loss to the State. New York's education system is intricate and many-faceted. The commissioner is the executive head, named to carry out policies laid down by the board of regents to guide all schools in the State from the elementary to university and adult education levels; he is also president of that vague entity, the University of the State of New York. Direction is exercised through the regents' powers to inspect and require reports, to conduct entrance examinations, to confer and evaluate degrees, and to incorporate educational institutions.

Before the State university was established, the regents administered upward of 30 teachers, and technical colleges. Dr. Spaulding himself served on the Young commission, which drew up the university plans, and had undertaken a reorganization of his department following the transfer of actual administration of these colleges to the university trustees. The department is called upon to interpret the State law in knotty personnel cases. It fell to the commissioner, as the executive of the board of regents, to make the regulations for carrying out the Feinberg law to deal with subversive teachers.

Dr. Spaulding, formerly dean of education at Harvard, served with distinction during the war as head of the Armed Forces Institute, organizing educational opportunities wherever United States military forces were stationed. He has fought for adequate appropriations for the schools and for construction to meet future needs. Commissioner Spaulding's expert knowledge of the complexities of New York's education system and his level-headedness in handling them will be hard to duplicate.

American Dairy Association Award to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to note in the newspapers the news that the American Dairy Association representing 5,000,000 dairy farmers has presented its annual distinguished service award to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. The news of this award supplements information which has come to me from many dairy leaders and organizations in Wisconsin, pointing out their excellent experiences with the A. & P. as a purchaser of a tremendous amount of wholesome, nutritious dairy products.

In these days when there is so much criticism in so many quarters against so many companies and groups, it is heart-warming to note evidence of praise and appreciation of notable contributions rendered.

The American Dairy Association is, of course, tremendously well represented in America's dairyland. Our Wisconsin Dairy Association has always been to the

fore whenever an issue was involved relating to the income, the welfare, of the 175,000 farms of the Badger State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a news release describing the dairy award to the A. & P. be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION SERVICE AWARD VOTED TO A. & P.—CONTRIBUTION TO BETTER LIVING WINS CITATION

CHICAGO, ILL., March 27.—The American Dairy Association, representing 5,000,000 dairy farmers, presented its annual distinguished service award to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., here tonight.

The award, made at the eleventh annual ADA banquet at the Morrison Hotel, was voted to the 91-year-old food chain for "advancing the Nation toward an ever better standard of living." George W. Diehl, director of A. & P.'s national butter and cheese department, received the plaque on behalf of the company.

The citation was presented by Owen M. Richards, manager of the dairy association, who said the award was a means of recognizing the friends of the dairy industry who are joined with the dairy farmers in providing an ever-improving diet and nutrition for the American people.

The award read as follows:

"A. & P. food stores long since has proved its worthiness to the American people in making available good food and good service at low prices, with its operating efficiency a hallmark of the American way of initiative and enterprise.

"A. & P. food stores, in advancing the Nation toward an ever better standard of living, has always stressed the wider use of the good things of life, including the foods produced on the Nation's millions of dairy farms—the milk, butter, cheese, evaporated and dry milk—all the dairy products that are such good foods for a better life for all mankind.

"For these contributions to the welfare of the Nation and its dairy farmers, the American Dairy Association, with its membership in 41 States producing more than 90 percent of the Nation's milk supply, is happy and proud to present this distinguished service award for 1950 to A. & P. food stores," the citation concluded.

During the past year, A. & P. cooperated with the dairy farmers all over the country in finding a larger market for their products.

GI Educational and Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by a veteran from my district. There has been so much talk and publicity concerning abuses and rackets under the GI educational and training program that at times the great amount of good accomplished has been overshadowed and not fully appreciated. The veteran's letter expresses his gratitude for the benefits which he has received. The letter speaks for itself. It presents a picture in striking contrast to the one which is most frequently publicized. I desire to pass it on to my colleagues.

The letter follows:

CHIEF, EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING,
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICE,
Roanoke, Va.

DEAR SIR: With the hope that this letter might in some way facilitate the closing of my scholastic records at your office, it is with great pleasure that I inform you of the successful completion of my legal training at the T. C. Williams Law School of the University of Richmond. My course ended as of February 6, 1950, and on that date I was recommended for bachelor of laws degree to be given in June. Thus, I am no longer entitled to subsistence or tuition from the VA.

At this time I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to the VA and United States Government for the splendid educational opportunities which have been afforded me. But for the program your office administers, and the finest Government in the world, it would have been exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for hopes to have become realized. A Government never owes its citizens for the services they render as such, and with this fact in mind, it is even now difficult to realize that one nation has seen fit to do so much for so many.

For your information if necessary, my company number is C-9421237. I remain

Respectfully,

WALLACE B. STOCKDON.

Wasteful Federal Construction Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., March 27, 1950.

Hon. BEN JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There is enclosed a copy of a letter recently addressed to President Truman by Mr. Ray B. Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, dealing with the wasteful construction methods of the Bureau of Reclamation. As you well know, this is not the only example of the senseless squandering propensities of this agency but I thought it would serve the public interest to record with you one more item of that nature. This is the reason I am bothering you about troubles in California when I know you probably have plenty of your own.

It is extremely galling to encounter such costly bureaucratic oppression in connection with a facility which in itself, from a public interest standpoint, can never serve any useful purpose and can only be a financial drain on the entire project and an unnecessary charge against the water users supposed to benefit from the project.

If there is any way you can help correct this situation you will be rendering a signal service not only to the Federal Treasury but also to the unfortunate victims of Bureau caprice and oppression directly involved in this complaint.

Very truly yours,

EDSON ABEL,
Assistant Director,
Public Utilities Department.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., March 10, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States, White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is addressed to you on account of the urgency of the complaint which it presents. This complaint was filed with the Bureau of Reclamation officials of region II to no avail. A letter was addressed to Mr. Richard L. Boke, under date of February 7, 1950. He replied under date of February 9, 1950, to the effect that he hoped to "be able to give * * * a full reply within a few days." To date he has made no reply but on February 16, 1950, the Government filed a condemnation action covering the properties involved in this complaint. Perhaps this is the reply he had in mind. In any event, he has never replied. On February 20, 1950, a letter was received from Mr. Carl H. Kadie, Jr., district manager. It evaded the real issues which are the downright squandering and sheer waste of public moneys and arbitrary, unnecessary, and unwarranted oppression of citizens involved in the construction of high-voltage transmission lines on the west side of the Sacramento Valley in the Central Valley project.

A map is attached to give you a clear picture of what the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to do. In building the so-called west side transmission line of the Central Valley project, the Bureau has to construct a line between the two points marked with a red "X." Instead of going in a straight line as indicated by the broken line on the map and traversing what is mostly grazing land of little comparative value, it insists on taking an out-of-line route into intensively developed agricultural land.

The route which it insists on taking is shown on map and takes a right-angle jog at its upper end into good, irrigable land which it traverses for a little over 20 miles, passes into the hills for some 15 miles, and then debouches into intensively cultivated lands for the remainder of the distance. On the other hand, by selecting the direct route, it would shorten the over-all length of the line by 3 miles and would traverse for the most part only low, hilly grazing lands which are not now and never will be susceptible of intensive agriculture.

The map attached is a section of an official publication of the United States Department of Agriculture delineating the irrigated and unirrigated areas of California. The areas in lighter shades are unirrigated and here are mainly grazing lands. The areas of darker shade are irrigated and consequently more intensively developed. No adequate reason has been given by the Bureau of Reclamation for this unnecessary lengthening of the transmission line with its consequent and unnecessary invasion of highly developed agricultural lands.

The arbitrary action complained of is aggravated by the fact that actually the forcing of this right-of-way as proposed effectively takes out of production a much greater acreage than the Bureau of Reclamation has told anybody about. The land affected is peculiarly adapted to rice culture and is not much good for anything else. Economic rice culture, whether on 10-acre plots or large acreages, requires the use of airplanes for planting, fertilizing, and other cultural practices of a preharvest nature. Farmers not using airplanes are at a complete disadvantage which cannot be overcome.

The route selected by the Bureau of Reclamation parallels that of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. high-voltage transmission lines 1,400 feet to the east. The areas between the two transmission lines cannot be served by airplanes because of the danger to the plane operators. This is the statement of plane operators customarily working in that area. As a result of this complication, instead of the 15 acres per mile which the Bureau estimates will be taken out of serv-

ice, nearly 200 acres per mile is affected in that manner. The severance and loss-of-use damages on this route will be far in excess of any estimate made by the Bureau.

According to the estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation, the 12 miles or more of right-of-way in the more intensively developed section are to cost the Federal Treasury $50,000. This on the basis that 193.5 acres are to be taken. This is a gross underestimate, as that many acres per mile will be taken out of production and the value of the property interests to be taken in this one stretch will be more in the order of $500,000 rather than the mere $50,000 estimated by the Bureau.

As stated before, this matter was taken up with the Bureau of Reclamation officials here. They pretended to make a study of the direct route but we are quite skeptical of their good faith in the matter as we know that they had already advised the Department of Justice the route they had selected for condemnation purposes and had already let a contract for the steel towers to be used in constructing the line. In fact, they had advertised for these towers even before the authorization legislation had been approved by the Congress.

The over-all result of this arbitrary abuse of its powers by the Bureau is that the economy of a highly developed agricultural area is disrupted and the Federal Treasury is mulcted to the tune of over a half million dollars. This may be only peanuts in these lavish days but if it can be saved we submit it should.

We respectfully request that you have an investigation made of this profligate waste of Federal funds when the need for economy is so great. Such an investigation will convince you that the direct line route is the one which is most consistent with the public interest, and the one which the Bureau of Reclamation should be required to follow.

Very truly yours,

RAY B. WISER,
President.

MARCH 29, 1950.

Mr. EDSON ABEL,
Assistant Director,
California Farm Bureau Federation,
Berkeley, Calif.

DEAR MR. ABEL: I am pleased to acknowledge your letter of March 27 along with copy of Mr. Wiser's letter to President Truman.

I am sure you know that for several years Congress defeated the building of the west side line, because of the fact that this huge expenditure of the American peoples' tax dollars could by no stretch of the imagination be justified. However, Congress did make the initial appropriation for this line last year, since it was a part and parcel of the President's Federal socialized electric power program, which in due time is designed to take over all electric power in America, as has already been done in England.

I have decided to place your letter and this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read, in the hope that the American people and their Congress will awaken to the dangers before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Death of Laurence Steinhardt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Nation was shocked yesterday to learn of the tragic and untimely death of our Ambassador to Canada, Mr. Laurence Steinhardt.

For many years I was honored by Laurence Steinhardt's friendship. I knew him as a successful young lawyer and later as a highly respected and beloved member of the diplomatic corps. He served his country with great distinction in six top diplomatic posts. He brought to each one of them indefatigable effort, firmness, tact, and courage. His untimely passing is a great loss not only to his family and host of friends, but to the foreign service in which he served so long and so usefully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD editorials carried this morning in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 29, 1950]

LAURENCE STEINHARDT

At 57, Laurence Steinhardt was the most widely experienced diplomat in the service of the American people. He had held no fewer than six top-ranking posts as Ambassador, and in all but the last of these he was confronted with special circumstances which were a test of his ability and good judgment. He was our representative in Sweden and then Peru when these nations were struggling to recover from an international depression which had dealt them particularly heavy blows. He was our Ambassador in Russia in the days when Molotov and Ribbentrop were negotiating secretly to divide the spoils of a European war. He was our Ambassador in Turkey when Soviet pressure was brought to bear on that country in the maneuver which led to the formulation of the Truman doctrine. He was our Ambassador to Czechoslovakia when Communist carpetbaggers took over control of that nation under the protection of Russian military power. Only in his last post, as Ambassador to Canada, did he find relief from particularly harassing problems and a task as pleasant as that of drawing still more firmly together the already close relations of two good neighbors.

This remarkably varied experience made Mr. Steinhardt one of the most valued members of the American diplomatic service. It gave him an opporunity to bring into full play his natural alertness, courage, and vigor. His tragic death yesterday in an accident along the well-traveled air road from Ottawa to Washington is a cause of deep sorrow to his many friends and a real loss to his country.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 29, 1950]

LAURENCE A. STEINHARDT

Laurence A. Steinhardt entered upon diplomacy after a successful career in the law, bringing with him a conviction that most differences can be settled by understanding and mediation. His time of service was cast amid great events, and the posts he held called him to places of utmost stress. Moscow, Ankara, and Prague tell by themselves a story of forces in delicate balance and issues of fateful import. In Russia before the last war Mr. Steinhardt saw and communicated to his Government the coming of the Hitler-Stalin pact; a year later he was able to advise of the complete reversal which was to bring Germany and Russia into deadly grapple. Turkey, his next post, was crucial in determining our prestige throughout the Near East; and Czechoslovakia, where Mr. Steinhardt went in 1945, was an ill-fated testing ground of democracy's ability to survive within the Communist orbit.

His most recent post was of a different kind. Our relations with Canada have moved in stable channels over the years, and Mr. Steinhardt's distinction and experience served as a witness to the importance we attach to Canada's friendship rather than as qualities necessary to the solution of vexing problems. His death, in an airplane accident in the midst of his duties, comes as a shock to the country he had represented with single-mindedness and skill.

Reduction in VA Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1950:

SHARP VA PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS CALLED BLOW TO MEDICAL MORALE—SOME HOSPITAL BEDS MAY HAVE TO BE CLOSED AND BACKLOGS AT MENTAL CLINICS WILL INCREASE

(By George Beveridge)

Sharp personnel reductions are expected to cut seriously into the Veterans' Administration's vast medical program, and already have dealt "a terrific blow" to morale of medical leaders supporting it, the Star learned today.

About 7,800 jobs are slated to be lopped off the VA pay roll April 10.

More than 4,800 of them, including some doctors, nurses, and dentists, will be cut from the agency's often-praised medical service. In addition, it was reported:

1. VA officials knew 9 months ago they were exceeding medical personnel provided by the 1950 budget, but on instructions from Veterans' Administrator Gray did not cut jobs off.

2. In the cut-back next month, some hospital beds may have to be closed.

3. Backlogs of patients at mental hygiene clinics will increase, and some veterans may have to be routed to neuropsychiatric hospitals for treatment at increased expense.

The cuts, it was learned, have raised concern at VA over whether present standards of medical care can be maintained.

Asked about specific effects, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, medical director, said medical divisions now are reviewing tentative cuts in terms of beds and patients. Preliminary estimates for the different divisions, he added, may be adjusted.

"It's hard to tell at this time just what the effect will be on the whole program," he said. "But it looks bad."

Dr. Magnuson said one of his greatest concerns is the terrible reaction coming in from the non-VA doctors who have helped develop the agency's medical training and treatment program throughout the country.

"There is the feeling among the medical profession," he declared, "that you can't trust the Government because there's no assurance of security or continuity of programs."

An official who asked that his name not be used said the abrupt cut-back announcement has the effect of shoving it down the profession's throat.

"This sort of squeeze," he added, "throws us out of balance with some of their projects."

He said the blow could have been eased last fall, if VA had dropped some medical workers and refused to replace most of those who left jobs later in the year. At that time, he said the medical department was about 3,000 personnel above its budget limits.

General Gray is reported to have told medical officials to keep employees if they were needed.

PLANNED TO AVOID FIRINGS

There were rumors last September of a sizable personnel cut, but VA officially announced its intention then to cut down on expenses without resorting to firings.

Officials stressed that Congress provided personnel they asked for this year, but that VA personnel requests had been trimmed sharply by the Budget Bureau.

Actually, they explained, they received more medical personnel than in fiscal 1949. But the additional workers were earmarked to staff new hospitals in VA's expansion program.

The April 10 cut of more than 4,800 medical personnel will save only about $2,500,000, it was reported. Because most workers have accrued annual leave, many will be carried on the rolls until the early part of May.

Present budget estimates for the year starting July 1, moreover, would not replace personnel lost by the 4,800 cut, officials said.

"Me-Tooism" Socialism Loses in England Just As It Lost in United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of March 3, 1950:

"ME-TOOISM" SOCIALISM LOSES IN ENGLAND JUST AS IT LOST IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

After sleeping on the subject a few nights, one gets a clearer understanding of the reasons for the defeat of the Conservatives or victory of the Socialists, however, you prefer it, in the British parliamentary election.

There were those who forecast the result before the votes were counted, based upon the me-too campaign of Winston Churchill and his running mates. Some of those who did so were unkind enough to make a comparison between the British election campaign and an earlier contest between Messrs. Truman and Dewey in which the result was most unexpected.

There still are lots of folks who say that in order to win a conservative victory, or at least win a victory that will call for a halt on the spending, deficits and other policies that are watering down the purchasing value of the United States dollar, you have to go along with most of what the New Deal-Fair Deal boys promise.

They proclaim this in spite of the concern felt in this country not only for security but for the value of the money in which we are paid for our day's labors and to buy our daily bread. They say it in spite of the fact that the women of America, like those of Australia and New Zealand, simply are waiting for a leader to tell them the plain and blunt truth about our political and economic fallacies, which mean that the Government buys potatoes for dollars and sells them back to the grower for cents, even while there is need in the land.

"What has all this to do with the British election?" you may be asking by this time, and it is just this: If Winston Churchill and his party leaders had followed the lesson taught by the Australian election, they would have stopped shilly-shallying. They would, in that admirable British term, have faced up to it, and told the naked truth rather than have attempted to buy the election with nice promises that nobody was going to be disturbed in his enjoyment of the pap which the Socialists had handed out at the expense of the solvency of what once was mighty Britannia.

This ceases to be theory; it readily can be documented. Early in January the News published a splendid series of articles on the reasons for the repudiation of the Socialist Governments in Australia and New Zealand. Written by Morley Cassidy, they left no doubt of the strategy employed by the opposition to the Socialists. His dispatch, appearing in the News January 16, told that there was money in every pocket; wages were high and everybody had a job, but the people were disturbed about the Socialist tendencies, and in fighting them, Mr. Cassidy said:

"Seldom has any party, anywhere, stated its purposes more clearly and with less mumbo-jumbo and 'bait' to unthinking voters, than the combined Liberal and Country Parties in the election just past.

"Every voter was told, in the firmest possible language, that a vote for the Liberty-Country Party ticket would be a vote for free enterprise against the Socialist state. * * *

"He would be voting for a firmer hand in dealing with unjustified strikes which have crippled Australian industry. * * * He would be voting finally to 'desocialize' much that has been done in the past 8 years—to fight side by side with the banks—imagine—in repealing the legislation aimed at creating a state banking monopoly; to restore competition between national and private air lines and shipping companies; to wipe out the government monopoly in FM broadcasting and television."

The closeness of the result in Britain suggests that Mr. Churchill, had he followed such a course based upon sound principle and statesmanlike leadership, might have won another victory instead, perchance, of snatching defeat out of the mouth of victory. Indeed, does not the decision of Prime Minister Attlee to call a halt on nationalization strongly indicate that the Conservatives could have won the election if they had boldly faced up to the issue? Mr. Churchill never lacked the courage to stand up to the Nazis, but somehow he lacked the sagacity to sense that the British people in this time of crisis might readily have responded to candor.

Neglected City Folk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial titled "Neglected City Folk" which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of March 26, 1950. This editorial points out that the great forgotten class in America is the middle-income families whose problems have been almost wholly overlooked. The editorial calls attention to the inconsistency of those Members of Congress who label as socialistic and inflationary a modest proposal in behalf of our city dwellers and at the same time advocate much more expensive programs for other groups of citizens.

NEGLECTED CITY FOLK

In closing debate on the bill that would have provided for low-interest FHA loans to cooperative middle-income groups seeking cheaper housing, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK put his finger on one of the greatest weaknesses of the Republican Party—failure to do anything for the city-dwelling middle-income group.

One paragraph of his speech in the Congress illuminates this neglect of the sound core of any political movement—the middle income—middle-class individual. He said: "When it comes to something for the middle class and the middle-income group in this country, when it comes to trying to put through a cooperative plan so that they can build little homes for themselves, then it is socialism—it is dangerous—then it is everything that is bad."

The measure under consideration contained no subsidy—even as the question of increasing the borrowing capacity of Commodity Credit Corporation by $2,000,000,000 impended. The difference was that the CCC measure was for farmers—and the cooperative-housing-loan measure was for city dwellers.

Plans for Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of March 27, 1950, entitled "Plans for Southeast Asia":

PLANS FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

With the appearance of roving Ambassador Jessup before congressional committees this week after his extensive Asiatic trip, we should have some concrete suggestions as to how our help can be effectively given to the threatened areas of southeast Asia. The Secretary of State has already declared that it will be our policy to furnish such assistance subject to the limitations of our ability and the ability of the recipients to profit by our aid. The framework of that limitation is large and there should be room for forthright and substantial action.

Dr. Jessup will certainly be expected to state, also, that this action should be prompt. The situation in some areas is critical and delay at this stage may mean the loss of the chance to do a job that needs doing. Fortunately, not all the plans have to wait for some master program in strategy. In the case of Burma, for example, the British commonwealths have already moved to put badly needed resources at the disposal of the hard-pressed government. It should be a relatively simple matter for the United States to associate itself with that action, either in adding to the amount to be given or in making it easier for the commonwealths to make their resources available.

The United States has funds already appropriated that can be used for many purposes in the critical area. There is a large residue of the economic-aid funds. There is the President's discretionary fund. These can be put into action now. Moreover, there is legislation already before Congress, such as aid for Korea and further funds for the Philippines, that can be adopted speedily. Surveys are now being made that will make the beginning of the point 4 program easier and quicker as soon as it receives the green light—all the more reason why Congress should act affirmatively and speedily.

It is recognized that there is one grave danger to all of southeast Asia, but the ways of meeting it can and should be varied and flexible. Indochina, for example, needs military aid right now; it should be given and then backed up with a long-range program of assistance in the development of the economy of the country, the amelioration of living conditions, and the raising of standards. The Philippines need a prompt strengthening of their military position and a program of investment for profit and advancement. Indonesia needs further credit for the rehabilitation of production and trade, and we can support them. Some changes in our stock-piling program would have an instantly helpful effect in Malaya, and they should be studied at once.

Many persons in this country have been critical of our past policies because of their hesitation and overcaution. Likewise, many of our friends in Asia are timid and worried because of the fear that we will not act with our full forces and act in time. Those two factors in our present relative weakness can be overcome by bold and imaginative decisions. We can inspire confidence by regaining it ourselves. We do not have to wait for a Marshall plan for Asia or for a new federation, or for a defensive alliance.

The Hat Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 28 on the retirement of Mr. Max Zaritsky as president of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union of the A. F. of L., and the nomination of Mr. Alex Rose to succeed Mr. Zaritsky.

My good friend, Max Zaritsky, has been an able and enlightened leader who not only won substantial gains for the members of his union, but who demonstrated a rare understanding of the economic and political complexities of the times.

His union has stood firm against reactionary forces of both the left and the right, and has long recognized that the interests of American labor and those of the American public are inseparable.

I am very happy to know that Mr. Zaritsky's post as president of the union will be filled by Mr. Alex Rose, whose talent and courage are so well known both in the labor movement and throughout the State of New York. I know that the fine tradition of the hatters' union will be preserved under the guidance and leadership of Mr. Rose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAT UNION

The rise of mammoth unions in the mass-production industries has taken the spotlight away from such long-established organizations as the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union. There are single locals in the automobile and steel unions that have more members than all the hat locals put together. Even in the needle trades the United Hatters is dwarfed by its "big brothers," the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. But the salutary influence of the hat union on the American labor movement is not measured by its size. Here is an organization, once steeped in the traditions of revolutionary socialism, that was among the first to recognize that the welfare of its members depended on the well-being of the industry in which they worked. It fought off the encroachment of Communists and underworld elements. It stamped out jurisdictional strife in its industry. It tried unsuccessfully to ward off the split between the AFL and the CIO.

Max Zaritsky, who is about to retire from the union presidency on reaching the age of 65, was a principal architect of the enlightened policies that have made the hatters a force for good in the country's social and economic life. Alex Rose, who has been nominated by the union's executive board to succeed Mr. Zaritsky, has been equally conspicuous in his efforts to promote industrial peace. Mr. Rose is even better known to the public for his mobilization of labor's political forces in municipal, State, and national elections. He refused to continue in the American Labor Party when he and others of its founders were convinced that it had been captured by Communists. We have not always seen eye to eye with Mr. Rose in the candidates he has supported as a leader in the Liberal Party, but we respect him as a sincere American whose views are rooted in a recognition that labor is part of the community and must assume the responsibilities, as well as the benefits, that go with such a position.

Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Cooperative Association, in Chicago, March 6, 1950.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, may I add that Administrator Wickard is giving the department one of the ablest and most effective administrations in the history of the service.

His administration has been marked by strict adherence to the letter of the law in the interpretation of the statutory duties and functions of his agency and by exceptional service to the consuming public in whose behalf the agency operates.

He has established a record for efficiency which might well be taken as a model by both public and private executives.

Mr. Wickard's address follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

It is a privilege and a pleasure to come again before your great convention to tell you of the accomplishments of the past year and to discuss with you plans for future years.

During the last year the REA program reached new and greater heights of accomplishments. Over a half million consumers were added to REA lines. The lines which were energized on REA systems last year would circle the earth seven times. During recent weeks the three millionth consumer received REA service. REA passed the $2,000,000,000 loan mark shortly after the first of this year. Today 83 percent of the farms in the country have central station electric service.

In my estimation, the REA program also reached a new height in popularity and acclaim during the last year. This occurred despite strong and concerted attacks by its enemies. Some of these attacks are as skillful as they are malicious. They are perpetrated by organizations which operate at every level. They lobby in Washington and in the halls of State legislatures. They talk and appeal to local business and civic groups. Their propaganda is carried by newspaper advertisements and radio commentators, endeavoring to leave the impression that the work you are doing is unethical, unfair, and even un-American.

I am glad to see a meeting of this kind held in a large city like Chicago, in order that city people and the metropolitan press may see at first hand the character and the earnestness of you people who are responsible for this program, which means so much to those who produce the food, the fiber, and—yes, the new blood—without all of which this great city could not exist.

It is not necessary for me to take the time of you people, who come from the rural areas, to tell you how much electricity means to your health, happiness, and prosperity. If the people in the cities would stop to think how deplorable it would be if they had to do without electric lights and electric power in their homes and offices and factories, and how chaotic it would be to have to do without essential things like running water and refrigeration, they might have a better idea of what electricity means to people in rural communities. City people don't know that you are receiving electric service through a program which is founded on the soundest of governmental theories, and which is being developed in keeping with the very best traditions of democracy, and within the framework of our private competitive enterprise system. It is of vital importance to the future of the program that the American people understand this fact.

The responsibility for getting this fact recognized and fully understood rests squarely on you, the electric co-op leaders in the Nation's rural communities. Unless you are convinced of it yourselves, you cannot provide the leadership needed to assure that this vast program will continue to develop along sound lines and with sincere adherence to the democratic process on which our Nation's greatness is based. If we fail to understand the REA pattern clearly, or if we fail to do our utmost to have the rural people understand it and make it work, the program will fail to achieve the full benefits it should hold for rural people and for the Nation as a whole. In fact, failure to get recognition and acceptance of the principles underlying the REA program might well mean the end of the program, something disastrous to the welfare of rural America and detrimental to the national welfare.

The relationship between the Government, as represented by REA, and the organizations of rural people which you represent, is founded upon a very sound governmental principle stated by Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's theory of the function of government was that it should provide things which people cannot provide for themselves, but which are essential to their welfare and to the Nation's welfare.

As you know, after half a century of urban electric power development, about 90 percent of our farm families were still denied electric service by the commercial power industry. Only then did the Government step in to help rural people obtain this service through their own efforts by extending credit and by providing a minimum of technical assistance which they could not obtain in any other practical manner.

I want to emphasize that the financial aid was in the form of credit—not in the form of a dole or grant. Farm people believe in paying their debts and they are paying back their rural electrification loans in a most laudable manner. You leaders, beginning with little or no experience in electrification, have made a great financial success of an operation which the spokesmen for the commercial power companies said was sure to fail. Today, the percentage of delinquency on REA loans amounts to only four-tenths of 1 percent, the lowest in any recent year. You have now paid back into the Federal Government almost $225,000,000 in principal and interest. You have assumed the burdens of management and you have provided your own technical assistance in ever-increasing amounts. This is proven by the fact that despite the most rapid expansion of this great program since the end of World War II, the number of REA employees has increased only slightly. This is again proof of the fact that the Government is extending only the help which rural people cannot themselves provide.

There is a great deal of discussion today about how much public ownership is necessary or essential. I believe that Lincoln's theory on the function of government can be used very well as a test on this question. All of us must accept the fact that government ownership of some things is necessary and proper. In the early history of this country there was considerable difference of opinion as to whether the mail should be government or privately operated. I believe that everyone will agree that it was wise to adopt Benjamin Franklin's advice in this matter.

In early years many of the roads of this country were privately owned. I can well remember the old toll road which traversed my State of Indiana from one end to the other. I lived near that road, and I know how much better it was when the ownership was taken out of private hands.

I give these two examples to indicate that there is need of public ownership of some things which are essential to our national welfare. It is sound policy for the Government to own and operate those facilities which cannot be provided satisfactorily through private ownership and operation.

Let us take the development of our rivers. Private capital could never be expected to do the things that have been done in the Tennessee Valley, the Columbia Valley, and on the Colorado, Missouri, and rivers of the near Southwest, and the things that ought to be done on other great rivers, particularly on the St. Lawrence. It is too bad that big corporations have opposed, and are continuing to oppose these developments by the Federal Government which are so essential to our national welfare. I would like to remind the people of Chicago, Detroit, and other large industrial cities in this area, that their industrial future depends on the development of the St. Lawrence.

It is most vital that the development of these rivers by the Federal Government be for the benefit of the public. For instance, the electric power from these developments should be distributed widely, at low cost, and free from restrictions of monopoly. This does not mean that the Federal Government operation must go so far as the selling of power at retail. I believe the ideal arrangement, both from the standpoint of sound Government practice and public benefit is exemplified in the loans which REA has made during the last year to the privately owned free-enterprise REA cooperatives of this country to put in the facilities which will enable their patrons to receive full benefit from the power developed by the Federal Government on some of these great rivers. I refer to the generation and transmission loans which we have made to help REA co-ops get the full benefit of the preference which they have under the Flood Control Act of 1944 for the hydroelectric power that has been or will be developed from the multipurpose dams on the Missouri, on the Roanoke, on the Red, the Brazos, the Arkansas, the White, and other great rivers. No one can deny that REA cooperatives do have preference under the law. However, REA co-ops can't serve their members with preference. In other words, they have to use their preference to get the power.

Now, all these dams have two kinds of power. One is firm—the kind or the amount generated all the time. Another kind or amount, because of uneven stream flow, is available only a part of the time even though it may be most of the time. It is much cheaper. It is called secondary. If someone has a fuel plant whose power can be used when this secondary power is not available he can make this secondary power firm power. If the commercial power companies firm up the secondary power they get the benefit. If the cooperatives have the fuel plants, and the required transmission lines are available, they benefit. They are the ones under the law which should benefit. That is why we have been making loans for the necessary fuel plants and transmission lines.

The benefits which the REA members will receive through these generation and transmission loans mean that the cooperatives involved will have an assurance of more power delivered in a more reliable manner, and at a much lower cost. To put it in another way, these loans decide the difference between a full development and a limited development of the REA program in the territories involved. Those are the facts and you and I must do everything we can to see that the people are aware of them so they will not be misled by the power company representatives who make statements to the contrary.

Making this type of loan is in keeping with long-established REA policy. That policy was established during the first few months of REA by its first Administrator. It was discussed by Senator Norris on the floor of the Senate in the debate of the passage of the REA Act in 1936. It has been discussed many times in Congress since then. It is written in REA's book on policy, and I quote it:

"1. The Rural Electrification Administration will make loans to finance the initial construction of generation facilities and transmission facilities only under the following conditions:

(a) Where no adequate and dependable source of power is available in the area to meet the borrower's needs, or

(b) Where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than the cost from facilities financed by REA."

I want everyone to know that I will conscientiously follow this policy until it is changed by Congress. I believe this policy is sound, in that it is in keeping with Lincoln's theory of the proper function of the government. If commercial power companies can and will make available better sources of power at lower costs than can be obtained through the use of Government financing or generation and transmission facilities, I believe the REA cooperatives should obtain their power through the commercial power companies. Now, I recognize that there are times when we differ as to what may be better or cheaper. However, that does not mean that the policy is wrong.

I also want to make it plain that the loans we have made for the integration of REA-financed facilities with those of the facilities belonging to either private or public agencies is not at all new so far as REA is concerned. One of the first loans made for generation provided for the integration of REA generation facilities with those of the Bull Run Power Co. at Manassas, Va., in 1936. The same kind of integration is provided with commercial power companies in the loans made for the installation of facilities in North Dakota and Iowa. Several loans have been made which provide for integration of REA facilities with those of public agencies such as Bonneville and the Bureau of Reclamation. None of these loans has ever been made without their legality being approved by the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, and in appropriate cases by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. I am assured by the Agriculture solicitor's office that the loans are in keeping with the intent of Congress so far as that office is able to determine. In view of the law and the long-established REA policies, and the precedents which have been set over a period of years for integration of REA facilities with those of other power suppliers, it is difficult for me to see why there is such violent objection to the loans we have made recently for the integration of REA-financed facilities with those of public agencies such as the Southwest Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation. This is especially true when these very same loans, on the basis of the latest power company offers, mean an annual saving of over $3,000,000 to the members of the cooperatives involved. These loans make it possible to proceed immediately with our complete area coverage program in the areas involved on a self-liquidating loan basis. They mean the difference between uncertain service and satisfactory service. In fact, they assure greater benefits from REA service in every respect.

Speaking of savings, I know a great many of you people, who are not going to get your power directly from any of these loans, realize the amount of savings annually that is coming to your cooperative through the authority which REA has to make loans for generation and transmission. This authority has been most helpful to many of you in negotiating power contracts during recent months, which will mean an annual saving of another $200,500,000 or more. Thus it can be seen that the annual savings to which I just referred amount to over $5,500,000 a year. This is not taking into consideration the annual savings and benefits which accrue to other cooperatives which are benefiting directly or indirectly from REA's authority to make loans for generation and transmission, amounting to several more million dollars each year.

Perhaps you can see now why the commercial power companies of this country are so insistent upon restricting ECA's authority to make generation and transmission loans. I think you can take it for granted that if it were not for this authority the commercial power companies' wholesale rates would go up to all REA cooperatives as they have been going up to other consumers. This is especially apparent when we note the advances in wholesale power rates offered to REA cooperatives in New England and New York States, which are not in a position to install their own generation facilities.

Now, I have taken this much of your time to describe what REA is doing in the making of loans for generation and transmission facilities in the hope that you may better know what your interests are and what action you should pursue to protect them.

In the beginning I made reference to the fact that the REA program was being conducted in accordance with the best traditions of free, private enterprise and democracy. There are many other facts which bear out my contention. My time will only permit me to briefly mention a few of those which I consider the most important.

One of them is the effort that you are making to give your members good, reliable service in the most efficient and economical manner. With but few exceptions I hear the highest compliments being paid to the kind of service REA cooperatives are giving to their members. Let us resolve that there will be even fewer exceptions in the years to come. This is easier now, when more plentiful supplies of power and materials are available than has been true in the past.

More attention must be given to the maintenance programs than we have had time to give during these recent years of rapid expansion of REA-financed facilities.

The cost of operation must be kept at a minimum and commensurate with good, reliable service. After all, REA cooperatives are established for service, and there are many sound reasons why REA cooperative service is and should be better than the service offered by any other type of supplier.

REA cooperatives have established an area coverage policy in rural areas which has never even been approached or challenged by any other type of supplier. I am happy that the REA cooperatives throughout the Nation are, with but a few exceptions, very earnestly trying to complete their area-coverage program as soon as possible. That kind of a program is in keeping with the true neighborly spirit. It is in keeping with the mandate of Congress. If cooperative officials fail to do everything possible to complete their area-coverage program they are betraying their trust to the public, to the Congress, and to their neighbors.

It is too bad that in many cases the policies and the tactics of commercial power companies are making it impossible for rural people in their service areas to receive central station electric service without exorbitant, and sometimes prohibitory, costs. We have many letters in our files from rural people who are in this situation and I am indeed sorry that it is impossible for us to do anything for them. Their helplessness in this situation makes me even more anxious that every REA cooperative in this country faithfully carries out its area-coverage program.

I realize that some cooperatives may be fearful that the feasibility requirements of the law interfere with area coverage. If you have that fear, tell us about it. I believe we can prove to you, without exception, that you can keep your projects feasible and at the same time see that everyone in your service area receives the benefit from this great program.

It is sometimes pretty hard to make people see that REA cooperatives are member-owned and member-controlled. I sometimes hear it said that when these cooperatives will have paid their debts the facilities will then belong to the members. It should be emphasized that the co-ops' facilities belong to their members from the day they are installed. People own their farms or their homes even though they have not fully paid for them.

One of the best ways to drive home this fact is for your organization to adopt the capital credits plan and notify each member just how much credit is being given him for the paying off of the debt to the Federal Government. I see more reasons all the time why some such plan should be adopted by every cooperative and I hope that those of you who have not adopted this plan will give it your early and earnest consideration.

It is hard for REA co-op members to realize, if they are not given full information and full freedom of expression, that they are in full ownership and control of their own cooperative. Everything about the REA program, whether it be in Washington or in your cooperative office, must be open to the closest examination and scrutiny. We must account for our every effort and expenditure. If anyone has doubts, let him be given full opportunity to ascertain the facts.

As you are all aware, my organization has been under congressional studies and investigations. In some cases complaints and investigations have been made concerning the conduct of the affairs of REA cooperatives. I am sure that you, like we in REA, do not object to anyone's making a study of our operations or offering constructive suggestions as to how we may be more effective or more efficient in carrying out our responsibilities. If there is anything which in any way seems to be unethical or not in keeping with the public interest, we want it eliminated as soon as possible.

It is very important that everyone realizes that REA co-ops are organized to function in keeping with democratic principles. This means, among other things, keeping members informed about every phase of the REA program and encouraging them to fully participate in the affairs of the cooperative. Such things as favoritism, proxy voting, and candidate slates are not conducive to democracy or confidence in the cooperative. News letters, reports, and well-attended and open annual meetings are in keeping with democratic processes.

About 4 months ago the organization which I head was given the responsibility of helping rural people obtain another essential service—telephones—which service had been denied them partially or wholly in many areas of our country. We have been doing all we can to expedite the development of this program. Above all, we want to see it developed in accordance with sound principles.

There are many inherent difficulties in the development of this program which we do not have in the rural electrification program. To us in REA it is more apparent all the time that your help is essential if this program is to be of maximum benefit to rural people. I am glad to know that we are going to have a panel for discussion of the telephone program later in this meeting, and I will not take any more of your time now to talk about it.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the leaders in these programs must endeavor at all times to discharge their responsibilities in keeping with sound policies and procedures, in keeping with the best traditions of our great Nation. This is very important to the welfare of rural people. It is even more important to demonstrate that citizens and their Government can work together effectively for the benefit of the people; that democracy, in action, provides opportunity, security, and freedom for all its citizens—things that are as precious as life itself.

Let's Remember the Sea Gulls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, even the world of nature has fallen victim to the lure of the "something for nothing" state, and with the same unfortunate results. I am indebted to a former mayor of my home city of Paris, Ill., now wintering in Florida, for a particularly effective editorial on this issue I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Mr. E. P. Huston, now living at Fort Lauderdale, has called my attention to the editorial, Let's Remember the Sea Gulls, published in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News. In modern parable form, it points up the situation in a revealing manner. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am including it in the RECORD. It follows:

LET'S REMEMBER THE SEA GULLS

We wonder if there isn't something of a moral for the American people in the story of what is happening to the sea gulls up in St. Augustine now that the shrimp fleet has left that area for Key West.

It seems the sea gulls up that way have forgotten how to catch fish for themselves. For many years they have been depending for their food on the scraps and waste thrown overboard from the shrimping fleet. It was a sort of super welfare state for the birds, and the free dinners made it unnecessary for the gulls to depend on their own talents to secure food.

But suddenly the shrimp fleet went away. New and more productive fishing grounds were located off Key West and the shrimp boats deserted St. Augustine.

The sea gulls haven't been able to adjust themselves to the new situation. According to an INS report, the reefs and the shores around St. Augustine are lined with long, silent rows of gulls with their dark eyes turned prayerfully out to sea—waiting for the shrimp fleet and the free meals that won't return.

Nature has played the sea gulls a dirty trick. As generation after generation of gulls learned to depend on the shrimp fleet instead of their own resources to obtain food, parent gulls apparently forgot to teach their little ones their age-old methods of catching fish. So today the gulls are starving. They are no different in physical make-up than the sea gulls of Fort Lauderdale. But whereas our gulls can exist through their own efforts, the gulls of St. Augustine are starving by the hundreds because their welfare state suddenly disappeared and with it went their ability to fend for themselves.

The people of St. Augustine are trying desperately to save the gulls that are left. A city-wide effort is being made to round up table scraps and movie popcorn to tide the birds over until they can once more learn to feed themselves.

But naturalists aren't too sure what will happen. They are puzzled over the apparent complete loss of the sea gulls' natural fishing instincts. Some believe the cycle will be completed without the gulls ever recovering their natural fishing ability.

It's a strange paradox that Nature thus gives us. Here we have some of the most independent creatures of the universe, who were given marvelous talents to take care of themselves, victimized because they succumbed to the something-for-nothing lure. They became dependent on unnatural conditions to such an extent that parents apparently forgot to teach their offspring how to get along otherwise. Now with the free food gone, the offspring of these indolent parents are paying the penalty.

We wonder if people aren't a great deal like the sea gulls of St. Augustine. We wonder how many Americans have swallowed the idea of the welfare state to the point where they think it is no longer necessary to teach their offspring that the day of Government hand-outs and security for all may

sometime draw to a close. And we wonder then how many Americans may be left like the gulls—puzzled and bewildered because their sustenance has disappeared and they have no resources of their own to fall back on.

Americans don't have to look far to see the sea gull story translated over into human behavior. We have in England a living example of a something-for-nothing theory gobbled up by the people. Like the sea gulls of St. Augustine, the people of Great Britain have accepted unnatural conditions as a substitute for depending upon themselves. The English Government is the shrimp fleet which provides the people of Britain with food, clothing, and shelter. As long as this Government is firm and strong and as long as there are shrimp (meaning taxes) enough to keep it in business, the people will be safe.

But let the shrimp be exhausted, as is now happening, then the Government must seek new beds. It must of necessity, move on and leave in its wake a mass of miserable people totally unaccustomed to using their own God-given talents and resources to exist.

There is the moral in the story of the sea gulls of St. Augustine. It's a pungent moral and one that every voting American should well consider. Nature has a way of exacting a heavy toll from those who look upon her gifts as unnecessary. As a nation, we here in America have been singularly blessed with a tremendous capacity for using our skills and our ingenuity to ever improve our way of living. But we have earned our keep by wresting it out of the ground, the sea and the air, through the exercise of our own talents.

We will keep those talents only by continuing to use them. The minute we cast them aside as no longer necessary we will forfeit them as surely as the sea gulls of St. Augustine forfeited their talent to provide themselves with food.

Let's not be that foolish. Let's remember what happened to the sea gulls whenever we are tempted by the Washington "shrimpers" to leave our own board and dine at the Government scrap table of false security.

Old dame nature is a wise though sometimes cruel teacher. She might have used the sea gulls of St. Augustine as a red flag of warning to the American people. Let's heed it while we still have time.

Conservation Month in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. BURKE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of Ohio:

STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

PROCLAMATION—CONSERVATION MONTH, CONSERVATION WEEK, AND ARBOR DAY, APRIL 14, 1950

Whereas the citizens of the State of Ohio must continue to recognize the importance of the conservation and restoration of our natural resources of soil, water, forests, minerals, and wildlife; and

Whereas the people of Ohio must depend year after year upon the rich heritage of fertile topsoil, unlimited deposits of minerals, vast acres of forests, unlimited sources of usable water and an abundance of wildlife and the recreational facilities provided by these resources; and

Whereas these natural resources with which Ohio is so richly endowed cannot fail to meet the demands of progressive people in industry, business, agriculture, and labor; and

Whereas the annual observance of Conservation Month tends to remind our citizens of the importance of these resources in preserving our principles of free enterprise and democracy through a program of conservation education in our schools and community activities sponsored jointly by the State department of education and the department of natural resources in cooperation with other State and community agencies and organizations;

Now, therefore, I, Frank J. Lausche, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim and designate the week of April 10 through April 14, 1950, as Conservation Week in the schools of Ohio, and Friday, April 14 as Arbor and Bird Day, and ask a general observance by all the citizens of the State of the entire month of April as Conservation Month.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the great seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 8th day of March, 1950.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE, *Governor.*

A Thin White Line Through the Desert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, gazing with squinted eyes across the vast distances of the California desert, many west-bound travelers have caught sight of what appears to be a thin white line threaded through barren red hills and across burning yellow flats.

"What's that?" they ask. "Look, it goes right through that mountain."

Perhaps another day passes before the full answer is known. Then the travelers have reached the luxuriant coastal plain of southern California—the groves of the valleys, the towns and cities that spread their streets and highways for miles along the Pacific shore.

The newcomers learn then the significance of the thin white line they glimpsed in the desert. It is the Colorado River aqueduct, the longest domestic water-supply line in the Nation. It is the life line of the world's largest oasis, unromantically called the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Yet, there is romance in the aqueduct, in the story of its building and in the life and progress and security it makes possible. Today this life line is seriously threatened by H. R. 934 and S. 75, bills introduced by Arizona to take away the aqueduct water.

The clear, pure water it brings from a remote land goes into millions of kitchens and bathtubs. It gives sustenance to the little backyard garden and the country estate. It bubbles from corner drinking fountains, and it puts out fires. It feeds steel mills and breweries, automobile plants and pie factories, oil refineries and soda fountains. It made possible the great national defense plants and military and naval establishments that made southern California a fountainhead of production during the war. A vast, empty hot area was needed for the training of troops for the vital campaigns in Africa and Europe. The area was found in the southern California desert, and making possible its use was the thin line of concrete that might be tapped for the necessary millions of gallons of good water. There was no water there before the aqueduct was built, and there is no other water there today.

It was in the early twenties that the coastal area of southern California, which included the swiftly growing cities of Los Angeles, Long Beach and San Diego, became sharply aware that a large and dependable supply of additional water would soon be necessary. For instance, Los Angeles, already a city and port of major importance, twice before had weathered a similar crisis. First, the meager supplies of local water, including rainfall and underground supplies, had been carefully conserved and developed. When it was realized that these sources would soon be inadequate, Los Angeles had gone more than 200 miles northeast into the Owens Valley, bought land and water, and at great expense brought it to the city's homes and industries. Only a few years went by before it was seen that another new source of water must be secured to meet the ever-increasing demands.

Engineers looked far eastward to a comparatively skinny river that boiled and tore its wild way through the great canyons that mark California's eastern boundary—the Colorado, known to the Spanish explorers, the Forty-Niners and the emigrants that conquered the West as a treacherous, mad river of death.

But to the people of southern California in the twenties the Colorado was seen in an entirely different guise. It was a river of life.

Now other cities and areas joined with Los Angeles to bring the Colorado's life-giving water, upon which all future development and progress depended, some 400 miles across uninhabitable deserts and mountain ranges. This was a project of the people. They mortgaged their homes and farms to underwrite the bonds that would make construction of the aqueduct possible.

The Colorado River aqueduct costs approximately $220,000,000. When engineers first began to survey its route from the river to the coast, there were about a million persons living in the district it was to serve. Actual construction took about 10 years, and when the first scientificially purified Colorado River water was delivered to Pasadena in 1941, there were more than 2,250,000 people in the aqueduct service area.

Many times it has been recorded what has happened in California since the war started in Europe in 1939. The greatest migration in American history has moved over the roads to the Pacific coast in that period.

Today in the area served by the thin white line of concrete live more than 3,500,000 persons. The migration has not halted. The southern California oasis is still the mecca of thousands of other Americans each month.

In all, the population of the southern California coastal plain, a narrow strip less than 200 miles long and a quarter that distance in width, has passed the 5,000,000 mark.

What of the future? Will there be another water crisis like those of the past?

Not only hydrological engineers are asking these questions. The people of southern California are asking them, and with good reason.

The Colorado River is southern California's last waterhole. This is not a new realization. It was fully recognized when the plans for the aqueduct were drawn, and due to this foresight the aqueduct was built, not for the present, but for the future.

Before the people could be asked to invest millions of dollars, the builders of the aqueduct; that is, the local governments sponsoring the projects, had to make certain that water was assured for years to come. No one, no government body or group, can simply take what water they need out of an interstate stream. The basin of the Colorado River contains parts of seven immense States, and these States must share the water under an agreement approved by the Congress. This is the Colorado River compact, and since the waters are stored by Hoover Dam, Congress, before building that dam, directed that no one should use these stored waters except under contracts made with the United States.

The aqueduct builders of California, therefore, got their water under contracts with the Federal Government. Under the law, the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to make such contracts.

This was done, and the metropolitan water district of southern California received a legal right to take 1,212,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River, and distribute this water through its aqueduct to the cities and towns of the coastal plain. The then Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, signed the contracts for the United States Government.

Then, why are the people of southern California concerned about their future water supply? They have contracts with the Federal Government for their aqueduct water, and certainly these contracts will always be honored. Certainly the Government would not repudiate these contracts, and leave the aqueduct standing empty, a monument to broken faith, as the desert sands sift into its canals and tunnels.

Nevertheless, the people of southern California, as stated by their government officials, have reason for concern. Powerful forces in Arizona want the water upon which California's progress and security depend and are seeking congressional authorization to take it for an immense Arizona project. They claim the Federal Government had no right to give so much Colorado River water to California.

The battle rages in Congress. California says the controversy is one for the United States Supreme Court to settle.

Meanwhile, the thin white line continues to bring the water to the cities and towns of southern California. Many of them, such as the urban centers of San Diego, Long Beach, Pasadena, and Santa Monica, depend for their existence on this lifeline that is woven for hundreds of miles through the California deserts. Many other smaller cities receive half or more of the water they use through the aqueduct's single vein. All future growth in the great city of Los Angeles must depend upon this single source of water.

For no area as large and as thickly populated in the world depends so much on a thin line of concrete for the water that makes life possible. And the new travelers to southern California, seeing the thread of the Colorado River aqueduct stitched through the burning red mountains and barren valleys of the desert, must likewise look to it for their own security, and that of their children, if they would live in southern California.

That is why California is asking that Senate bill 75 and House bill 934 be defeated.

Statement by Broughton Lamberth on Pending Social-Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on pending Federal social-security legislation made to the Committee on Finance, United States Senate on January 23, 1950, by Broughton Lamberth, commissioner, Alabama State Department of Public Welfare:

I come before this committee today as Commissioner of Public Welfare for the State of Alabama. Although I have been in this position only a few months, my interest in social security and human well-being is deep-rooted. From 1947 until my appointment as commissioner last November, I was vice chairman of the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare, of which the Governor is chairman. My appointment as commissioner was made by the State board of public welfare. During the last two sessions of the Alabama Legislature I represented two counties in the Alabama State Senate. In that legislative body it was my privilege and responsibility to serve as chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Welfare and Correctional Institutions and also as chairman of the legislative interim committee which reviewed welfare problems throughout our State of Alabama for a period of 2 months.

I should like to say, too, that one of my first requests as commissioner was to ask that I be heard before this committee if and when hearings should be conducted on amendments to the Social Security Act. We do not now have any real security in Alabama for our needy people. We think that more security could be provided if there were changes in the Federal social-security law. That is why I am here today. I want to confine my remarks, however, to those areas of greatest need and to those aspects of the present and proposed legislation which I think are most important for Alabama.

All of you well know that Alabama is a farming State. Our farm population of 47 percent in 1940 was more than twice the figure—23 percent—for the Nation as a whole. We are also a State where per capita income payments over a period of years have been among the lowest for the Nation. Our 1948 average of $891 was far under the $1,410 national average. In fact, payments are less in only three States than they are in Alabama. The States are South Carolina, Arkansas, and Mississippi. This means that most of our people farm and that they have very little in our world's goods. They do not make enough to save for a rainy day or for old age or for any long period when they are unable to work. The result is that we have today in Alabama a large number of farmers who have grown old and, through no fault of their own, must face the present and the future without security.

Therefore, the first thing I would like to talk about to this committee is our Alabama farmers who have grown old and can no longer make a crop. For most of them their only recourse is old-age assistance. In 1935 under the original Social Security Act they were excluded from the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance. They still are excluded. Yet, when they come to the welfare department and ask for old-age assistance, even though they are eligible under the law, they cannot receive enough for a decent living. Our old-age payments are a little more than $20 a month on the average for the State as a whole. Even where two members of a family might qualify, two payments at $20 each would not mean security.

You may ask why Alabama cannot pay more. Briefly, there appear to be two reasons. We have larger and larger numbers of needy old people and correspondingly smaller numbers within the population who can earn and pay taxes. Not only do we have an increasing number of old people, but we are a State with an unusually high proportion of children. This, obviously, narrows considerably the number within the total population who are in their working years. Thus, it throws our whole economy out of balance. And, in the light of our continuous low per capita income, a large percentage of the people who get old are needy when their working days are over. It all sounds very well to say that people should practice thrift and lay something aside each year. I certainly agree—when there is something to save. Alabama had an average per capita income of $154 in 1933. This had risen to $242 by 1939, to $644 by 1943, and to $891 by 1948. Could you live decently on $154 or even on $891? And yet this was an average figure—many Alabamians never had that much. They not only had nothing to save—they had too little to eat. That is, both young and old.

It is consequently easy to understand why we have a high old-age assistance recipient rate—456 per 1,000 as compared with 231 for the Nation. Our rate of applications for aid also continues to be high as there is less and less demand for unskilled and older workers. Right now, too, I would like to make one point clear. Alabama has one of the most restrictive old-age programs in the Nation. We have this high recipient rate in the face of a $420 income-limitation clause written into our Old-Age Assistance Act. In other words, no one can qualify for aid by State law in Alabama who has income amounting to as much as $40 a month. By administrative regulation, we also have added to this a property limitation. Ownership of real property with a net value of $2,000 excludes a person from assistance. Thus, you can see that when persons qualify for aid under the Alabama Old-Age Assistance Act and present State regulations, they are needy by anybody's definition.

When some States are easily securing sufficient money to pay old people $40 and $50 and even $75 a month, we in Alabama are

having a hard time getting up the $5 it takes to match Federal money for a $20 old-age payment. Yet, not only do we keep on having a high rate of applications for aid, but we also find about three-fourths of the applicants eligible to receive a check. We do not know where the money is coming from to grant them aid. But they need it, and old-age assistance is their honorable and just right.

You are now considering H. R. 6000 to amend the Federal Social Security Act. The formula this bill includes for increasing Federal grants-in-aid for old-age assistance and other assistance programs is of vital concern to States like Alabama. As our welfare budget now stands, this formula would enable us to increase average old-age payments by about $5. We still could not pay anything like the $45 national average or the $75 average paid in Colorado, but we would like for people not to suffer because they live in Alabama and grow old there. We think that the Mills formula is an immediate answer to the problem of getting more Federal money quickly into the low-income States where assistance payments are also low. Nevertheless, we would hope that at some future date a formula can be devised that would allocate Federal funds to States on the basis of relative need and fiscal ability. This principle has been applied in relation to funds for the school-lunch program and hospital construction and might well be considered in regard to grants-in-aid for assistance to those unfortunate people who need it.

Also, in the light of these facts, I hope you will give consideration to developing a plan for providing old-age and survivors insurance benefits for farmers. Our people want the kind of security that comes to them without a means test. They want a monthly check when they are too old to work and they want to pay in to get that check while they work. They do not earn enough to pay for an individual annuity plan. But they could contribute to old-age and survivors insurance. And they want an opportunity to do so. Farmers are frequenting old-age and survivors insurance offices throughout Alabama with the query, "Why can't I qualify?"

Of course, I realize that changes in the law today still would not take care of the thousands of needy people we already have with us. That's why I want to see the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act changed so that we can help those already too old to work now. But I hope the insurance can be extended to farmers with a clause to provide coverage at an early date for many of those who are now approaching the time in life when they can no longer earn a living.

It is not within my province to suggest administrative procedures for farm coverage. It is my understanding, however, that the Social Security Administration has developed what appears to be a feasible plan. I would hope that this committee would examine those proposals and give favorable consideration to incorporating them into the social-security amendments.

In considering extension of coverage of old-age and survivors insurance, I hope you will also bear in mind that many farmers work off and on in covered employment. In this way they may contribute to old-age and survivors insurance yet never achieve coverage. Estimates of the number so affected throughout the country have been fixed at 31 percent of farm operators and 38 percent of farm workers. For example, there are farm laborers who work in sawmills and textile mills during part of every year. There are farmers who worked in industry during the war years. Their contributions to old-age and survivors insurance are actually a loss to them. Also, our farmers help pay for the cost of old-age and survivors insurance in much of the goods they buy. For example, an employer rightly considers his contribution for employees as a cost of operation. He is going to get that cost back in the price of the product he sells. So, while technically the farmer and his tenant might not contribute, actually they do. Is it fair to exclude them from the program and its benefits?

H. R. 6000 extends coverage to many workers not now included. It also makes benefit provisions more adequate. These proposals I would support insofar as they go. Alabama's coverage under H. R. 6000, however, would be no more extensive than present national coverage of 60 percent of employed persons. The original Social Security Act anticipated that old-age insurance would carry the major load, supplemented by old-age assistance for a smaller number of people who did not or could not earn benefits during their working years. Unfortunately, the reverse has proved true. Alabama has less than 19,000 aged old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries now and over 77,000 recipients of old-age assistance. Only a small proportion—less than 2 percent—receive a small old-age and survivors insurance benefit supplemented by old-age assistance.

Old-age assistance has had to carry the load for two primary reasons: too few people have been covered, and benefits have not been related to living costs. Average payments in Alabama over the past several years illustrate what I mean. There has been relatively no rise in average old-age and survivors insurance payments—they still range close to $15 a month in Alabama.

While old-age assistance has not kept up with changing prices, payments are more than double what they used to be. Policies in regard to determination of need have kept up with living costs—but funds have been the limiting factor. Likewise, old-age and survivors insurance maximums have held rigid while ceilings have been raised on assistance payments.

Thus, I would hope that this committee would support amendments which would implement the social-insurance program and make it possible for the majority of our people to reach old age secure in the knowledge that they would have an income for the rest of their days. And by income I do not mean an assistance check based on a means test. I refer to a benefit check earned by individual contributions.

I have already said that while insurance needs to be extended there must be provision for the needy now. We are especialy troubled in Alabama over one group whose sufferings are acute and for whom almost no provision is made. I am talking about a group we call the totally and permanently handicapped. We have in Alabama nearly 8,000 individuals who are too young for old-age assistance and too old for aid to dependent children. They are not blind, yet their handicaps are so great that they cannot work now and can have no hope of ever becoming self-supporting in the future. We have very limited State and local money even for matching Federal funds in the social-security categories. We have still less for this group who are wholly dependent on money from the State and its political subdivisions. Average payments today for aid to the handicapped in Alabama are about $13 a month, yet most of these people need nursing care, special diets, medical attention, and other special provisions which are related to long-time illness. Their needs are far from met on $13 a month.

I would hope, therefore, that this committee would consider favorably the provisions in H. R. 6000 for setting up a new category of assistance—aid to the permanently and totally disabled. We at least could increase our payments to about the level paid for aid to the blind and old-age assistance if this category were set up.

Because time is limited, I will not go into the other aspects of H. R. 6000 or other areas of social security where changes might well be made. In Alabama we have long limited public-assistance payments to the unemployable. We see no prospect for changing this. Our State, nevertheless, has done fairly well by its people. Welfare appropriations have increased materially since the department was set up. Expenditures from State funds in the 1948–49 fiscal year were about four times the amount spent in 1936–37 from this source. Despite Federal grants-in-aid, however, funds have never been sufficient to meet need. There has been no real security even for old people, the children, and the disabled who have been eligible for aid from the agency.

In spite of limited money, however, we have provided child welfare services and social services in an attempt to prevent dependency. Such services predate the assistance program in Alabama, where we have long recognized that prevention is as much a welfare job as relief. We knew that as we could provide social service, we often could help a person to help himself. Furthermore, we have long been aware of the effects of one program for human betterment upon another. Thus, we recognize clearly that the whole Social Security Act is important, that all the programs it provides are necessary. We believe in legislation to safeguard maternal and child health, for instance, as much as we do proposals for increasing grants for aid to dependent children. I would, therefore, like to indicate here my support for the over-all social-security legislation.

I do not want this committee to consider my interests narrow although I have confined my remarks chiefly to the need for old-age insurance for farmers and for increases in Federal grants-in-aid for assistance payments. These are merely the points that need greatest emphasis if the welfare of Alabama's people is to be improved because most of Alabama's needy people are old and most of them have lived on farms. We now issue more than 100,000 assistance payments monthly in behalf of more than 150,000 persons in Alabama. One reason for this large volume is the small number of old-age and surivivors insurance beneficiaries in the State, presently about 37,000. It is clear that low coverage and inadequate benefits have contributed to dependency. I think we recognize together that the welfare of each child and each old person is important to the welfare of us all. I would urge you to consider this as you consider revising social-security legislation.

The Real Work of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News:

THE REAL WORK OF CONGRESS

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a journal of the proceedings and debates of the Eighty-first Congress, printed in Washington every night after adjournment and delivered to Members each morning at the Senate and House Office Buildings.

The RECORD for Thursday, March 23 reached Passaic by mail on Saturday morning. It devoted 124 pages to a stenographic report of everything said and done on Senate and House floors and 38 pages to an Appendix containing the undelivered speeches of

Members, which Congress had neither time nor the wish to hear.

What happens on the floor and what the RECORD reports each day represents only a small part of the work of Congress. Members get an enormous amount of mail which requires personal attention. Visitors from home must be welcomed. Requests for help are many, such as straightening out GI Joe's difficulties with the Veterans' Bureau and seeing the immigration people about Uncle Herman, who's sweating it out in Frankfurt.

It is in the morning hours, when neither house is in session, and sometimes in the afternoon that Members get the real work of Congress done—in committee. Ray Tucker's Washington column describes today how the Appropriations Committee has been whittling down items in the administration's big bill for 1950 Government spending, a bill which accounts for the income and excise taxes you pay. Republicans have the sharper knives, naturally, but many Members of Mr. Truman's party, who are in the majority on all committees, join in the paring process.

Contrary to popular belief, Congressmen aren't pompous people who spend all their time making speeches. Some are brilliant, others dull. Sensible and conscientious men far outnumber the demagogues, especially in the lower house. Those who are on the job earn their pay. Except those who were well off before election to Congress, few die rich.

Ownership of Lands and Resources Beneath Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to confirm ownership in the States of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly, memorializing Congress to confirm ownership in the States of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States

Whereas since its inception, the State of New York, a free and independent sovereignty and one of the original 13 States, has claimed and exercised ownership, dominion, and jurisdiction over the lands under the ocean seaward for a distance of 3 miles and the lands under all tidal and navigable waters within its boundaries; and

Whereas the State's title to these lands, in common with all unappropriated lands, was and is based upon the sovereign character of the people of the State of New York as successors to the sovereign rights of the Crown of England; and

Whereas, as sovereign, the people of the State of New York own approximately 5,600 square miles of submerged lands in the Atlantic Ocean, and in New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, the Hudson River, and the Mohawk River, including vital stretches of the State barge canal, the Niagara River, the St. Lawrence River, the Great Lakes, and other inland streams and waters, and

Whereas all of the private improvements on the New York side of New York Harbor, with the exception of the lower end of Manhattan Island and others elsewhere, have been built on what was formerly State-owned lands, and all these improvements were built and have been enjoyed by their owners in reliance upon their source of title in the State of New York, and no disquieting claims against that source should be made, no matter how baseless or trivial, by any agency of the United States Government, and

Whereas, as a result of these improvements, there has been an incalculable increase in assessed valuation of these lands, upon which municipalities and the State rely as a basis of taxation and great revenue, and

Whereas the title of the people of the State of New York to these lands and the title of those holding the lands by grant from the people of the State of New York has been upheld by numerous decisions of the New York courts and the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as by the assertion and actions of the Federal Government, its various departments and divisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York favors continued State ownership and control, subject only to the Federal powers over navigation, interstate commerce, and national defense, of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Members of the Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Members of the Congress are hereby requested to give their active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress of the United States.

In senate, February 28, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:
WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

By order of the assembly:
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

The Late Ellis A. Gimbel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 18, 1950, upon the passing of a distinguished citizen of Philadelphia, a great merchant and outstanding philanthropist, Mr. Ellis A. Gimbel. This eulogy is as follows:

ELLIS A. GIMBEL

Few distinguished citizens of Philadelphia have known and loved so many of their neighbors as Ellis A. Gimbel. Not alone by his many benefactions, but by personal greeting and his genuine interest in others he made a host of them his friends.

Many were customers of an outstanding American merchant, a pioneer in modern storekeeping and salesmanship, but they knew him better as a kindly gentleman, sensitive and thoughtful and something of a philosopher, who might well have made himself a public figure if his career had carried him no farther than the keeping of a country store.

In the latter part of his life, alert and vigorous beyond his years, he made it a faithful custom to greet all gatherings held within his great business establishment, which he made an important center of his city's social and cultural life. Two thoughts were always included in his messages.

Simply and earnestly he spoke of his country, almost in the phrases of a prayer of gratitude. Simply and sincerely he said, "God bless you," to his friends. He left warmth and the true spirit of fellowship with his guests, as he has left to Philadelphia the gracious memory of a loving and lovable man.

Blind Men on Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial titled "Blind Men on Parade," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 28, 1950:

BLIND MEN ON PARADE

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has said that a number of Republican Senators are going after Secretary Acheson. This will take the form of a series of public attacks, and the parade, he says, will begin this week.

The New Hampshire Senator has not named those who will march in his parade. Perhaps it does not matter, for the marchers, whatever their names, will be easily recognized as the blind following the blind.

These Republicans do not see that in going after Mr. Acheson they are tearing down the foundations of our national security. There is no doubt that they see a political issue from which it may be possible to torture some partisan advantage. But they cannot or will not see the larger picture; they do not understand that the hopes of freemen everywhere are linked inseparably to the prestige of the United States, and that they can chip away at that prestige only at the price of crippling this country's capacity for leadership in the decisive struggle now under way throughout the world.

If they cannot see this, it is not for lack of evidence. Here in Washington, the capital of the free world, a woman is loosely accused, without proof, of disloyalty. And she is immediately assailed in her home with anonymous phone calls, with threats, and with demands that she move out of the neighborhood or be carried out in a box. If it has come to this in our own city, what are we to expect in other parts of the world? How can we suppose that our friends in other

lands, constantly exposed as they are to a substantial threat of Communist aggression, will be able to sift the real from the unreal, to know where the line should be drawn in our performance between truth and shabby political fiction? Can we blame them—will Senator BRIDGES and his followers be able to disclaim responsibility—if in the end our friends abroad should conclude that the men in charge of our foreign relations are, at best, incompetents; at worst, Communist sympathizers, and that it is not safe to follow their lead?

There are some Republicans who will not be found marching in Senator BRIDGES' parade. Senator VANDENBERG will not be there. Nor will Henry L. Stimson, one of the party's distinguished elder statesmen, who has served his country well both as Secretary of State and as Secretary of War. It is not likely that Senators KNOWLAND and SMITH will be among the marchers. Another who will not be there is Representative NIXON, who had a big part in turning up the facts in the Alger Hiss case.

These men, and there are others like them in the Republican Party, do not believe that Mr. Acheson is infallible. In their various ways they have differed with him—strongly on some issues: But they realize that one of the surest ways to bring on another war is for the Republican Party to lapse into a role of negative opposition, a role in which partisan advantage has a higher priority than the security of the Nation.

The hope is that the number of this company will grow, that more Republicans will stand up and say that they refuse to join Senator BRIDGES' parade. This will not come about if the President and other ranking Democrats fail to do their share. But if Mr. Truman and his aides will refrain from cheap politics in the forthcoming campaign speeches, and if a few more prominent Republicans will assemble under the standard which has been raised by Senator VANDENBERG and his associates, the parade of the blind may yet turn out to be an unimpressive spectacle.

Port Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 29, 1950:

PORT SECURITY

Although Congress has been unusually attentive to most matters of military defense, the security of American seaports—a responsibility of the Coast Guard—has received short shrift. Adequate patrolling of harbors and piers and inspection of vessels in wartime would require a great expansion in the Coast Guard's 22,000-man force. Yet the Coast Guard Reserve, which would be the nucleus for such expansion, has received no funds for training.

Actually the denial probably is due more to the anomalous status of the Coast Guard than to any deliberate effort to deprive it of funds. In wartime the Coast Guard becomes a part of the Navy, but in peacetime it is under the Treasury. Thus the $4,100,000 for Reserve training recommended in the President's 1951 budget came under the jurisdiction of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. But since the full committee had laid down a rule against new appropriations, the funds were knocked out of the omnibus bill. Similar misfortunes befell the request in the 1949 and 1950 budgets, though last year the Senate did pass a $3,500,000 deficiency appropriation which was eliminated in conference.

Whatever the reasons for the oversight, it is apparent that here is a defect in defense which must be remedied. Both Defense Secretary Johnson and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Sherman, have attested to the need. An adequately trained Coast Guard would be imperative in an atomic war, when an innocent-appearing freighter might blow up a harbor and a city.

Propaganda and the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, I am, of course, interested in good labor relations throughout the country. Since coming to Congress I have been reading reports about the Di Giorgio Farms in California, and allegations regarding treatment of agricultural labor there.

It is gratifying, therefore, to get the whole truth about this situation in the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I want to commend the Congressmen who prepared the statement, based on personal observation at the Di Giorgio Farms.

I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD with these remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of March 15 upon this subject. It should be of interest to every Member.

The editorial follows:

PROPAGANDA AND THE FACTS

The findings of a congressional subcommittee as to the merits of the strike against the Di Giorgio Farms in Kern County should prove of interest and concern to American labor generally.

Di Giorgio has under cultivation some 11,000 acres of farm land, nearly all of which the corporation has converted, by scientific methods, from barren wasteland. The farms employ about 1,200 permanent workers, which rises to 2,500 in harvest time.

Two and a half years ago the National Farm Labor Union undertook to organize the workers. When the corporation refused to recognize the union as exclusive bargaining agent, a picket line was set up and the long strike got under way.

There ensued a campaign of propaganda by the union leaders purporting to show that working conditions at the farms were pitifully substandard; that living conditions were frightful; that the management exploited its workers at every opportunity. Climax of the campaign was the production of a film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, which undertook to give substance to these accusations.

The House subcommittee, after an extensive, first-hand investigation, has now found that the charges made by the union were almost wholly unsupported. It found the corporation's wage levels are, if not the highest, at least as high as any in the area. It found that housing conditions at Di Giorgio Farms are at least as good as any to be found on similar property in agriculture. And as to the motion picture, which was shown widely throughout the country, it had this to say:

"The National Farm Labor Union film, Poverty in the Valley of Plenty, insofar as it purports to represent conditions existing on Di Giorgio Farms is a shocking collection of falsehoods, almost wholly unrelieved by any regard whatever for the truth and the facts. The subcommittee believes that responsible labor leaders will join with it in decrying the attempt of the National Farm Labor Union's organizers to win their case by dishonest presentation. The cause of organized labor is not aided when one group of union organizers are willing to besmirch the public reputation of labor as a whole in order to advance their own interests."

We would go one step further.

Regardless of whether the local leadership of the National Farm Labor Union was Communist-inspired—and there is no evidence that it was—the fact remains that the tactics employed by the union in this instance are tried and true Communist tactics. The reckless attachment to expediency—the philosophy that the end justifies any means—is the very essence of Communist dogma and in utter violation of the American doctrines of integrity, sincerity, and fair play.

We do not question the right of unions to campaign for organization of workers. But that right by no means embraces the right of vilification, of distortion, and misrepresentation of facts. And as to the union's demand for legislation to correct the abuses of corporation farmers and their lobbies, the union's own tactics have rendered its position ridiculous. The inescapable conclusion arising from the subcommittee's report is that such laws as now exist curtailing the right of labor leaders to achieve their ends by coercion and misrepresentation have found precise justification in the Di Giorgio strike.

Cities and Atomic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of March 19, 1950:

CITIES AND ATOMIC DEFENSE

Mayor Fletcher Bowron, of Los Angeles, complains before a congressional committee that the cities of the United States have no idea of what they should do to protect their people in the event of atomic warfare. All other mayors, we believe, will agree with his complaint.

The cities, as a matter of fact, are virtually incapable of planning atomic defense by themselves. If we consider the position of Newark, Jersey City, or any other of our New Jersey cities, it is readily apparent that a regional agency is needed to coordinate atomic defense.

These cities are, in the light of present conditions, nothing more than fragments of the real communities created by modern

transportation. The prospect of atomic warfare serves only to magnify the need for regional civic organization.

The effects of an atomic bomb would radiate around the point of the strike in ever widening circles, with the heaviest degree of destruction in the center and a gradual lessening of severity toward the outer limits. Even the smallest circle of destruction, that of the most intense degree, would embrace more than the map of Newark or of any other of the New Jersey cities.

It is obviously true, therefore, that the cities do not know what to do and cannot possibly know what to do unless they are embraced in regional units of a size sufficient to encompass commuting areas and the destructive range of the atomic bomb.

Vocational Education for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a letter received by me from the Honorable Andrew V. Ruckman, director of veterans education and training, State of West Virginia, relative to operation of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in connection with vocational education.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Charleston, March 23, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAMSAY: My attention has been directed to a chart appearing in the Report on Education and Training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, pertaining to the percent of profit vocational and trade schools which were established subsequent to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This chart shows West Virginia to be one of two States in the Union with 100 percent of its profit vocational and trade schools established subsequent to enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

What the chart fails to explain is that only six profit vocational and trade schools have been approved in the entire State of West Virginia since the GI bill became law, an extremely low figure when compared with some other States. Approval for most of the six schools was granted by this office at the behest of the Veterans' Administration. Typical of the pressure applied by the Veterans' Administration for the establishment of private trade schools in West Virginia is the following copy of a letter written to this office by an official of the Veterans' Administration in Huntington:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
"REGIONAL OFFICE,
"Huntington, W. Va., April 3, 1947.

"Mr. H. L. DUNCAN,
"Director of Veterans' Education,
"State Department of Education,
"Charleston, W. Va.

"DEAR MR. DUNCAN: In reply to your letter of March 31, 1947, concerning the Martin School of Watchmaking, Clarksburg, W. Va., it is noted that you state they have no school, equipment or students. This office was advised by the school through our field officer that they were ready to begin operations. However, the Veterans' Administration in accordance with paragraph 14, Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 2, title II, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, may not permit enrollment of any veterans in an institution unless the institution has the prior approval of the State Approving Agency.

"Therefore when you consider the fact that this school is being established at the request of the Veterans' Administration to furnish training in watchmaking to a number of veterans, who are unable to enroll elsewhere due to a lack of facilities, it is desired that this school, if they meet the State's requirements in regard to facilities, be approved to start their course of training prior to the enrollment of any students.

"It is requested that you have your field representative in that area contact Mr. J. S. Lunsford, at the Veterans' Administration contact office, Clarksburg, W. Va., at your earliest convenience, in order that this facility may be established without further delay if at all possible.

"Very truly yours."

The name of the writer of the above letter has been left blank by this office because he is now connected with the Veterans' Administration in Washington and we have no desire to cause him embarrassment.

Relations with the Veterans' Administration in West Virginia have generally been harmonious, and we have worked together to prevent abuses under the GI bill. We are making this explanation, however, because we feel that the chart mentioned above gives an erroneous impression of the approval agency in this State. We believe that West Virginia has done a better than adequate job of restraining fly-by-night schools in West Virginia and that you have no apologies to make for the manner in which the GI bill of rights has been administered.

One of the weaknesses in the present bill is the fact that while the approval agency is charged with the responsibility of approving institutions for the education and training of veterans, no funds have been provided for the supervision of such institutions once they are approved. In our opinion, legislation now pending before Congress, which would provide the States with funds to enable them to perform the required services, should be enacted.

Yours very truly,
ANDREW V. RUCKMAN,
Director of Veterans' Education and Training.

Hon. John S. Wood, Chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming vote here March 23 for the necessary funds to continue the invaluable work of the Committee on Un-American Activities is a vote of confidence in that committee and its work. It is more than that, it is a vote of confidence in, and appreciation of, its able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHN S. WOOD.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I returned from a 2 months' study of European conditions, as chairman of the Post War Economic Policy and Planning Committee, some 5 years ago, I have stressed upon the Congress and the country that the real danger of communism was not in the danger of a shooting war with Russia, but rather the danger of infiltration by Communists in this country. I still adhere to that assertion. The Committee on Un-American Activities has rendered an invaluable service in alerting public opinion in this country to that danger.

Under the able leadership of Chairman WOOD this committee is continuing that great service to this country. Congressman WOOD enjoys the confidence and respect, not only of his fellow committee members both Democrats and Republicans, but of the Members on both sides of the aisle generally. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine appreciation that I add my humble words of commendation, not only to the committee, but to its distinguished and able chairman. More power to you, Chairman WOOD, and your colleagues on the committee.

United States Did Not Turn Its Back Upon the Rest of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those readers of the public press who believe in fair play, even in the field of politics, are under obligations to Mr. Constantine Brown, the noted international writer, for revealing the unjust, inaccurate, partisan statement made by the President of the United States in his recent letter to Chairman KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that:

The United States turned its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War.

Under consent heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Mr. Constantine Brown that appeared in the Evening Star under date of March 28, 1950, in which he presents the facts clearly and conclusively that the United States Government did not turn its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War.

The article follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—FACTS SHOW UNITED STATES DID NOT TURN BACK ON REST OF WORLD AS TRUMAN REMARKS.

(By Constantine Brown)

Whoever drafted President Truman's letter to Chairman KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, warning the American people that any slicing of Marshall-plan appropriations by Congress would create the risk of a new world war, slipped badly in his facts about what this country did for Europe between World Wars I and II.

"The United States turned its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War," the President's letter stated. "Some

20 years later we found that we had to fight another war."

The facts contradict this assertion. Soon after the end of World War I we invited the major European nations, together with Japan and China, to a conference in Washington and as a result of that conference two treaties were concluded dealing with China and the political situation in the Pacific.

FEAR OF JAPAN CREATED

The Washington conference grew out of the fear that Japan might try to expand territorially by aggression, and the limited international parley initiated by the United States was supposed to establish peace in the Pacific.

While it is true that we did not join the League of Nations and made a separate peace with Germany at the conclusion of World War I, it is equally true that at no time during the 21 years of truce did the United States relax its efforts to maintain world peace and did what it could to help its wartime associates.

American private capital flowed into Europe throughout that period. Two prominent Americans, Charles G. Dawes and Owen D. Young, headed committees which were named to settle the German reparations question when it became obvious that the Germans could not live up to the economic provisions of the treaty of Versailles. Both men took part in this work with the tacit approval of the American Government.

NEARLY $2,000,000,000 LOST

Between 1921 and 1924 American money poured into Germany. It was a speculative investment for American money lenders and the speculators lost nearly $2,000,000,000. This investment in Germany cost American capitalists no more than UNRRA cost American taxpayers after World War II and the results were about the same. The difference was that loans to Germany hurt only those who could afford to get hurt while UNRRA hit the pocketbooks of all American taxpayers.

When in the spring of 1925 the French Government, headed by Edouard Herriot, came to the verge of bankruptcy and the French treasury was unable to meet its current obligations, New York banks came to the rescue and advanced the Bank of France $500,000,000. It was a strictly commercial transaction—with the approval of the State Department—and the money was repaid after Raymond Poincare succeeded Herriot and devalued the franc.

In 1931, when the European financial structure showed signs of collapse after the French had bankrupted the Austrian and German banks, the United States intervened immediately and President Hoover obtained a moratorium on all war-debt payments.

REFUSAL TO PAY ACCEPTED

The effect of the moratorium was negligible, it is true, because France delayed too long in accepting, but it is not correct to say that America "turned its back" on Europe in those days of stress. Finally we settled the war debts of our associates, incurred both before we entered the war and afterwards, at 10 cents on the dollar. All of them—except Finland—reneged on payment of even this small sum. We philosophically accepted their refusal to pay.

In the political field, although we did not become a member of the League of Nations, the American Government initiated and sponsored more than a dozen disarmament conferences. They all failed because the nations of Europe refused to accept honest and genuine disarmament at a time when Russia was still a weak military power and Hitler had not yet taken over in Germany.

When the British began to worry about our naval potential we met with them, the Japanese, the French and the Italians in London in 1931 and agreed to naval parity with Great Britain in the hope that such a commitment might smooth the path to peace.

PARIS PACT SIGNED IN 1928

Finally, it was on the initiative of the American Government in 1928 that the Paris conference was held and concluded the pact which was to outlaw war forever as an instrument of national policy. The Kellogg-Brian Pact—also known as the Pact of Paris—was signed at Versailles in August 1928 by all the civilized nations.

On the basis of the solemn pledges contained in that pact we further reduced our armed forces, while the others increased theirs. When the Japanese invaded Manchuria in September 1931, we brought the matter before the League of Nations in an effort to prevent growing military aggression. The League did nothing effective, merely deciding to investigate the matter on the spot. But we earnestly endeavored to collaborate with the world powers, at least to attempt to prevent the actual beginning of World War II.

This is the record of American cooperation with the rest of the world. The facts disproved President Truman's statement that "the United States turned its back upon the rest of the world after the First World War."

Congress Running Out of Old-Style Orators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have requested permission to insert in the Appendix the following article from the March 27, 1950 issue of the Chicago Daily News written by Paul R. Leach, entitled "Congress Running Out of Old-Style Orators." I believe every Member will be greatly interested in reading this article.

CONGRESS RUNNING OUT OF OLD-STYLE ORATORS—CRISES OF DAY RULE OUT POINTLESS SPELLBINDING

(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON.—They're disappearing from Congress, more's the pity—the old-style, free-wheeling, self-starting, welkin-ringing orators.

Time was when a man would run all the way to the Capitol to hear Jim Reed, of Missouri, tie into Jim "Ham" Lewis, of Illinois, in the Senate; or to see Borah, of Idaho, shake his flowing locks. Or somewhat further back, John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi.

What they talked about did not matter; how they said it was what counted. And Congress was packed with their like.

Today you can number on the fingers of one hand the Senate's spellbinders—Republican VANDENBERG, of Michigan, Democrat PEPPER, of Florida; Republican MILLIKIN, of Colorado, especially if he's in a story-telling mood; the brash young Democrat HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Democrat PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, when he gets worked up.

You can't overlook ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, but he has been silenced by the Vice Presidency. You have to hear him outside.

In the memory of House old-timers, Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, with his dry stogie; shaggy, deep-eyed Finley Gray, of Indiana, and debonair Nick Longworth, of Ohio, best lived up to the traditions of Clay and Calhoun. There were many more like them 20 years ago.

As in the Senate, they're now few on the House side. FRANK KEEFE, Republican, Wisconsin, does the home-and-mother theme well, and GENE COX, Democrat, Georgia, has an old-style, appealing way about him.

JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, Mississippi, is the best fire-and-brimstone haranguer while JOHN TABER, Republican, New York, is tops when it comes to telling the Truman administration on spending.

The real champion in the House today for all-around, long-or-short-range Fourth of July type of public speaking is DEWEY SHORT, Republican, Missouri. He can and does talk on almost any subject—without having a written manuscript before him.

Why are the old-style flowery orators disappearing?

For one reason, since the depression began, we've had a crisis every other day about something or other. In the days of Tom Marshall's 5-cent "seegars" big issues were few, and political infighting was a national pastime.

Today our Congressmen must be hard-headed, factual to the point. They are more like tired corporation lawyers arguing a case in court.

Because they have so much to do in committees and on the floor, most of their long speeches, read without gestures, are prepared by executive assistants, something the old-timers never heard of.

The campaigning microphone that they've had to learn to use, with precisely timed radio speeches, has slowed them down, too. Maybe television will bring back some of the fireworks.

They're interesting, but they don't raise the hair on the back of your head as the old masters did.

There was, for instance, some years ago, the famous oration by Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst of Arizona. He had been called to account for changing his mind. After a moment's reflection, Ashurst delivered a half-hour talk on "The Virtues of Inconsistency." It was a classic.

Jim Reed and Jim Lewis, both self-starters in oratory, tangled one day on the Senate floor back in the 1920's. Reed flayed Lewis in one of his bitterest speeches, but when he finished Lewis flabbergasted him with this:

"I always enjoy an encounter with my esteemed colleague from Missouri, but when I draw my trusty blade against his saber I always tip it with a rose."

Many Members have fought with the man in the White House, whether they were of the same party or not. One of these epic rows occurred only 6 years ago. ALBEN BARKLEY was the speaker.

He was then Democratic leader. President Roosevelt had vetoed a tax bill with the words, "it is not a tax bill, but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy."

BARKLEY not only had sponsored the bill, but had steered it through the Senate.

"That statement," he said on the floor, "is a calculated, deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members may do as they please, but as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down."

He tore into F. D. R. for 15 minutes, and never repeated a word. He wound up by announcing that the next morning he would present his resignation as majority leader to the Democratic caucus.

Both Houses overrode Roosevelt's veto, and BARKLEY's resignation was hooted down.

Real-Estate Lobby Again an Election Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the heavy correspondence which is reaching me it is clear that a deep wave of resentment is sweeping the country in the wake of the defeat of the administration's bill to bring decent housing within the reach of the large segment of our population in the so-called middle income bracket.

The bill which was defeated by the mortgage bankers and the real-estate lobby would have reduced the monthly shelter cost from $90 a month to $64 a month on a $8,000 home.

It was opposed by the real-estate lobby because it would have ended the housing shortage. A housing shortage is meat and gravy to the real-estate lobby.

It was opposed by the mortgage bankers because it cut into interest profits even though all that it did in that line was to give the buyers of homes the same 3-percent interest rate on home mortgage loans as the farmers enjoy in their CCC price-support loans.

The real-estate lobby and the mortgage bankers now face the impossible job of defending before the people of America in November of this year the action of their friends in the Congress in depriving one-third of the families of our country—those with incomes of from $2,000 to $4,600 a year—of even an honest opportunity of finding decent homes within their financial ability to buy.

The political repercussions to the victory last week of the real-estate lobby and the mortgage bankers are discussed in an article by Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1950, which I am including in my remarks. The article follows:

AGAIN THE WHISTLE STOP—TRUMAN VERSUS CONGRESS TO BE ISSUE IN PRESIDENT'S CROSS-COUNTRY TOUR

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

President Truman undoubtedly hoped to swing some votes and perhaps eke out a slim victory when he sent a telegram to the House last week urging adoption of the loans to cooperatives in the housing bill which subsequently was defeated.

But he had another and long-range objective, as was clearly revealed in the detailed and rather specific case he presented on behalf of this provision which, he argued, is the only way people in $2,000 to $4,000 income brackets can get decent homes. He was making a record for the congressional election campaign. His party floor leader, Representative MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, frankly told the House this would be an election issue.

SAME ISSUE AGAIN

One can almost hear Harry Truman at one after another not-to-be-forgotten whistle stop on his forthcoming May cross-country tour and that which is to follow in the fall: "There was a bill in Congress to give you folks decent homes. And what happened? The Senate cut out a provision that would help you. Then it went over to the House. And I thought that body might show some sense. But to make sure I sent them a telegram asking them to put that provision back in to help you folks. What did they do? They beat it, too. Just remember that. They'll all be out here asking you to send them back to Congress. Just look up the record on your Representative. Don't let him fool you. That's all I ask you to do. You can do the rest."

Toot toot. Off to the next stop.

The issue again, as in 1948, will be Truman versus Congress.

With, of course, a difference which may not make much difference in the end. The difference is that it was a Republican Congress against which he railed in 1948. The Eighty-first Congress is a Democratic Congress, organized and run by the Democratic Party at least nominally, and its failures would normally be charged to the Democratic Party, and Mr. Truman would be charged with failure of leadership.

HARD TO MAKE IT STICK

He will undoubtely be so charged, but it will be harder than it once was to make it stick, even though it is an element of his own party that has defeated or held back social-welfare measures in which so many voters are interested and about which the President will pitch the domestic phase of the congressional campaign.

On such issues, the votes of southern conservative Democrats have been decisive by being thrown in with Republicans in that now familiar coalition which, on such issues, controls Congress and has become in effect, the second major party time after time.

Millions of voters interested in social-welfare measures, particularly well-organized labor and progressive groups, have become educated to the attitudes and the continuous repeat performances of this coalition and have ceased to identify the southern Democrats with President Truman, or blame him for this blockade. They identify the President with what might be called the Truman Democratic Party.

He has helped along this educational process himself by seeking to divorce himself from the southern conservatives of Dixiecrat tendencies. Practically, as a matter of political preservation, he is seeking to offset its defection, which cost him four States in 1948, by forming a new alliance of labor, so influential in urban voting, and Midwest farmers. Such a loose alliance was responsible for his 1948 victory.

This he will promote in his whistle-stop campaigns this spring and fall, immediately to elect, if possible, for progressive Democrats outside the South to offset southern conservatives in Congress, and beyond that, to strengthen this farm-labor alinement for the 1952 Presidential contest.

Point 4 Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 27 issue of the Shamokin News-Dispatch, Shamokin, Pa.:

POINT 4 NONSENSE

Just when a cut in foreign spending appeared as a likely aid to balancing the national budget in 1952, along comes a new scheme, point 4. The bureaucrats and superidealists are at it again. Heaven help the poor American taxpayer.

What are the merits of this new plan to pour American billions out abroad? Its advocates say it is designed to aid backward nations by showing them American know-how and technical skills. That will increase world markets and world trade, and thus the United States will benefit, runs the argument. The idea is a good economic theory, but economics do not hew to set patterns because of wars and the human element in governments. We might build up all sorts of trade areas and be cut off from them ourselves by restrictive trade barriers, quotas, and other means.

Another thought on this subject is worthwhile. While we are going about demonstrating our technical skills to the tune of billions of American dollars in undeveloped areas of the world, what are our own underdeveloped areas supposed to do? We have plenty of undeveloped areas in the United States. And it's high time somebody pulled the idealists down from their soft chairs and pointed that out to them. Charity might well begin at home in this case.

We could spend billions developing our country, its potentials, education, skill, power projects, and industries. We still have a long way to go in the United States. The Government now doesn't even have money to build post offices and hospitals where they are badly needed. Yet we are talking about a point 4 program for the world—its undeveloped areas.

The American people must not be led down the sucker route on this issue. They must learn the facts in time. Talk about it, meet about it, and tell your politicians about it.

Taxation of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture; also Mr. Raymond Moley's article entitled "Taxing Co-ops," which appeared in the Monday, March 27, 1950, issue of the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1950.

AN OPEN LETTER

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have read with much interest the statement opposing taxation of cooperatives which you submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 3. The committee is now holding executive sessions, seeking particularly to determine what excise taxes should be reduced, what loopholes in the present law should be closed, and how much additional revenue would derive from the taxation of certain tax-exempts. Since your stated opinions are at considerable variance with

those expressed by the general counsel of the American Farm Bureau Federation and other recent witnesses before the committee, I should greatly appreciate an explanation of certain points that you made in your statement. I am sure that other members of the committee, as well as myself, would be grateful to you for whatever further help you might give us in this matter.

I would like you to clear up the following points:

1. You say that the real objective of those who propose "a change in the tax status of cooperatives" is "to destroy cooperatives." Taking such specific examples as the Cooperative Grange-League-Federation Exchange of Ithaca, N. Y., the Consumers' Cooperative Association of Kansas City, Mo. and the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co. of San Francisco, will you demonstrate by actual computation of the corporation tax on all earnings in 1949, including patronage dividends, how payment of tax at the regular corporate tax of 38 percent would destroy these cooperative corporations. (I have included CCA because its published earnings in 1949 amounted to only $86,334, though it had earned $8,320,206 in 1948.)

2. You quote co-op theory that patronage dividends are not taxable to the cooperative corporation because they belong to farmer members who have been underpaid for products marketed or who have overpaid for supplies or service. Will you take one practical case, say the sale of grain by a Minnesota farmer through the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, and explain how profits made by the cooperative corporation in such extraneous operations as lending money, storing grain, or speculating in the commodity markets can legally or morally be deemed an adjustment of an underpayment for the farmer's wheat? How would you have solved the problem faced by the Indian Farm Bureau Cooperatives, about 1947, when $1,000,000 untaxed capital gain was made in selling a group of oil wells? Would you divide such a profit among members and call it the refund of their overpayment for feed or fertilizer?

3. You speak of cooperatives as "an effective force for combating monopolies." But I am sure you remember the case, here in Washington a couple of years ago, in which a judge of the district court dismissed prosecution of the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative for price fixing and other monopolistic practices when the co-op attorney quoted the Capper-Volstead Act and said "Elimination of competition is a perfect legal right of a cooperative and the very end and purpose of a cooperative. It is our right to become a monopoly." Do you consider a co-op monopoly an effective force to combat other monopolies? Would you support an amendment to the Capper-Volstead Act, such as I introduced in the present Congress, to give the Attorney General, instead of the Secretary of Agriculture, the power to prosecute cooperative monopolies such as now exist in the marketing of oranges, lemons, cranberries, walnuts, avocados, and other products?

4. Corporation taxes in 1949 amounted to about $11,000,000,000, which contributed to the Department of Agriculture's appropriation of nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars. In line with your quotation from the Treasury's document apparently granting regular corporations permission to avoid income taxes by adopting the cooperative method of distributing earnings to customers, would you recommend the adoption of this method of operation, knowing that it might seriously reduce the Government's revenue and result in heavy curtailment of your Department's activities?

5. British city consumer cooperatives are known to own farms where they produce livestock, vegetables, fruits, and so forth, for low-price sale to city workers. The growing movement of labor-owned consumer co-ops in the United States is reported to have similar ideas for the future. Inspiration for all this is the cooperative tax escape. Would it be advantageous for the farmer, do you think, to hold on to the cooperative tax subsidy at the cost of provoking new competition by labor-owned farms?

6. On page 1 of your filed statement you say that taxation of the cooperatives "would result in only a little additional revenue." On page 4 you say that taxation might "detrimentally affect the financial structure of many farmer cooperatives." Will you justify those two statements, and tell me, please, if the amount of money involved would be so insignificant, why do you object so strenuously to the cooperatives paying their share of the high cost of government?

The committee is engaged this week in a study of loopholes. Your answers to the above questions will therefore be especially valuable at this time.

Thanking you in advance for any clarification you may make that will help our committee in its attempt to spread the tax load equitably, I remain

Yours sincerely,

N. M. MASON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Chinese Journal of Commerce of March 27, 1950]

MOLEY—TAXING CO-OPS

Like many other good words appropriated by socialistic-minded politicians, "cooperative" covers a multitude of sins. Congress seems to have finally killed the President's scheme to bribe middle-income people with what is called cooperative housing.

This proposal will serve to illustrate the basic difference between a policy in which Government takes measures to prevent any individual or group from falling below a minimum subsistence level and a policy of Government hand-outs to all classes, irrespective of proven means and need. The latter is called by the British Labor Party fair shares. It really means equal shares. And it is socialism, no matter what fine verbal plumage it may wear.

In this instance, it was a shrewdly calculated political move to induce support for the Fair Deal by offering housing to what might be called our middle classes on terms that would not only have expanded the bureaucracy and raised the burden of Government expense, but would have added new thousands to those dependent on Government aid. The coalition in Congress saw the nature and purpose of this measure and killed it.

It will not be so easy to penetrate the defenses of another form of vested interest which is hidden in the fine word "cooperative." For many big businesses in competition with taxpaying private enterprises enjoy immunity from the obligation to support the Government from which they receive unmeasured services and benefits.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, who is rapidly achieving the distinction of being the most socialistic of all important members of the Truman family, presented on March 3 a plea to the Ways and Means Committee against the taxation of cooperatives. Congressman NOAH MASON has offered a powerful reply in a letter to the Secretary.

After disposing of the Secretary's argument that fair taxation would destroy cooperatives, the Congressman moved to the very heart of the argument for a fair measure of taxation on operations that are extraneous to the original purpose of cooperatives.

Since Brannan claimed exemption for farmers on the ground that they have been underpaid for their products and have overpaid for supplies or service, MASON cited in reply the case of a Minnesota co-op which made large profits in such operations as lending money, storing grain, and speculating in the commodity markets. He also cited the case of an Indiana co-op which has an untaxed capital gain of $1,000,000 from the sale of a group of oil wells.

As is often the case in Secretary Brannan's methods of argument, he succeeded in this case in contradicting himself. On the one hand he declared that taxing co-ops would result in only a little additional revenue, and on the other that taxation would destroy these lusty children of privilege.

This suggests the Secretary's claim that on the one hand his farm plan would not cost more than present farm supports, and that on the other his proposed subsidies would bring new prosperity to the farmer and lower the cost of living to the consumer.

Brannan cannot have it both ways, and neither can the co-op.

Black Diamonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in the bituminous coal fields of Pennsylvania are much concerned about the future of the soft-coal industry.

Much has been said and will be said as to the remedy necessary to stabilize the industry and which must include new uses for soft coal.

Mr. Herman Reifsnyder, editor of the Altoona Mirror, Altoona, Pa., located in my congressional district, had the following to say on the subject:

BLACK DIAMONDS

At the turn of the century if you were to have suggested to grandma a new stove replacing her wood- or coal-burning kitchen range by a stove whose fuel gas was piped clear across the Nation from Texas, she undoubtedly would have believed her offspring a little "teched." At least too far ahead of the times.

Now, what for years has been a commonplace in transmission of gas as fuel, not to mention the flood of oil, a relatively short period in the past was regarded as fantastic, impossible.

At present we are talking about a trip to the moon, a vacation on Venus via space ships. We hear, too, quite a lot about flying saucers, little men from Mars. Does that sound ridiculous? Don't answer that one just now. Better wait a little while.

And so it goes. But let's take a little time out to enter the realm of fantasy, if you will, and consider something that, while it may sound a little farfetched, may have in it real possibilities and at a not too distant future.

In casting about for development of new industry to bolster a sagging economy, it might be well to consider revitalizing an old industry which has been hard hit by competition, by work stoppages, by antiquated methods of production, and by lack of modern methods of marketing its products.

Altoona is within one of the greatest soft-coal fields. Other fuels, largely the class called laborless fuels, are rapidly displacing coal, so much so that mine owners are beginning to wonder a little nervously about the future. That future takes in Altoona.

Recently a central Pennsylvania coal-mining company called attention to some very pertinent facts that are spelling doom to the coal trade. Coal is a sleeping giant; it is being rocked to sleep by oil and gas, chiefly. Once it gets awake and its power is handled

on a competitive basis with oil and gas, there will be a lot of coalmen much happier than they are today. And yet, there will be plenty of room for all three, gas, oil, and coal.

Sometimes one waxes enthusiastic about the wonders of modern development in machinery and utilities that make daily life a bit easier on the physical side. But perhaps the greatest wonder is that people have had to wait so long for our present-day improvements in many categories.

Since the days of Benjamin Franklin and his improved stove, little real progress is noted in the use of coal as a fuel. You still have ashes and all that goes with a coal burner. There are many types of central heating plants on the market, too—many of them complex gadgets and costly—employing coal.

Wouldn't it be like a dream to have push-button heating? It need not be a mammoth job to switch over from coal-burning heat equipment to heat units employing electricity. It could be very simple, if it were made that way.

To come right to the point: Why handle soft coal half a dozen times in its travel from mine to consumer? Why not convert the coal to electrical energy right in the coal field and transmit the power by less expensive and antiquated methods to do the same heating job? Coal also could be converted into gas or oil and similarly transported to where it will be used.

Wholesale use of electrical energy for heating would not need to be prohibitive in price. Maybe in the long run it would be cheaper than the present methods of employing coal. Keep in mind that electricity, somewhat like gas and oil, can be distributed over fairly long distances to an untapped market of customers.

What about the thousands of people in the countryside who still rely on wood for heating because their soft coal as the present time costs them $18 to $22 a ton in some localities? Wouldn't these thousands of customers provide a great market for coal once turned into a product like electricity, gas, or oil and piped to them?

A ton of coal contains a certain number of British thermal units, measurement of heat. A kilowatt of electricity has a certain heat value. At current electrical rates home heating hereabouts would be fantastic, but a good conversion job for a waiting market would handle the price angle at the proper time. It should not cost near so much to transfer the heat in a ton of coal over a certain distance, as it costs to transport the coal and then extract its heat energy.

Changeover into such a radical new utilization of coal naturally would not be overnight. It would cause, indeed, disruptions in other lines of business. That always happens as business and commerce evolve new methods.

Take China as an example. As much as we look upon railroads as great factor in civilization's progress, the introduction of railroads in China threw countless thousands of men out of work who had depended on the old methods of transport to make a living. The result was many turned to banditry to survive. The same thing happens in countries more advanced than China, but the "banditry" is more subtle and refined; no less effective in the long run.

There are some electrically heated homes now, but for full utilization of coal use of this type of heat would have to be expanded a lot. We use electricity to heat hen houses, why not our own houses? Nothing could be cleaner and safer. There is always the inherent danger of being asphyxiated by coal gas; there is danger of fire, and sometimes even having your home blown up. There are, of course, dangers connected with other fuels, too. But electric power would seem to be the acme of safety and convenience bar none.

Consider one other phase of home heating that would tie in very closely with the use of electricity. Take the ordinary five- or seven-room house. The central heating plant keeps each of those rooms warm (theoretically at least) 24 hours of the day. If, during the night one used but two rooms, why waste heat on the other three or five rooms; reduce it and save fuel. Also, in daytime, if only one or two rooms are used, why heat all the rest? It could be perfectly simple to push a switch and reduce heat in various parts of the home if electricity were used.

When something new strikes the market there are usually a lot of gadgets that are worthless and expensive. That goes for a transformation from customary heating methods to home heating by electricity. It might be made a very simple transformation whether one employed hot-air heat, hot water, or steam. It certainly could be a more compact heating unit and also the necessary size wire to carry your heat energy need not cost what pipe sells for at present.

There are already on the market many models of small room electric heaters. Some are good, some not so good. There are even steam radiators, of portable type, employing an electric element. A British firm has been turning out a radiator filled with oil instead of water—nothing to freeze up if you decided to turn the current off in the dead of winter.

These instances just mentioned point to the fact that there is an evolutionary process toward quicker, cleaner, safer home heating. But how long will it take to go the whole way? How long will it take to turn the black diamond field into a modern market for transmission of its worth to the cities and the countryside where it will be used in almost unlimited quantities?

This might all be, as was said, a little farfetched, but at the same time those who are apt to scoff at such schemes better keep in mind that someday, somebody is likely to come along with a heating scheme that will knock out once and for all not only coal but gas and oil as well.

Unquestionably if the dream of home heating by electricity were to come true there still will be for many years to come industrial uses for coal, for gas and oil. But it seems there is a great market for coal if it were transformed into a modern laborless product.

It is a question whether householders convert from coal to gas and oil heat because of so-called work stoppages. Rather they act because of the convenience involved, even though it may cost a little more. In some cases it costs less. However, installation costs are pretty high, costing many hundreds of dollars, a cost that certainly could not be jutified in a transformation to electrical heat.

It may be that the afore-mentioned scheme is going a little too far, but if the coal business cannot find a market for its products, it may eventually find itself in the same category as the canal boat, the stage coach, hoop skirts and many other things we read about nowadays in history books.

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the March 23 issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune which answers so cogently the indefensible argument made to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States that these two areas should not have equal representation in the Senate along with the present 48 States:

THE STATES ARE EQUAL

Senators resisting admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States have been using some pretty feeble arguments. Take the one about disproportionate representation the forty-ninth and fiftieth States would have in Congress. It goes like this: Why let Alaska's 100,000 people and Hawaii's 530,000 have as many Senate votes as New York with a population of more than 13,000,000?

Surely those who ask this question realize that it is entirely beside the point.

Senate representation never was intended to be in proportion to population. The upper House was created to preserve the identity of the Original Thirteen States. Some critics hold regional representation responsible for the Senate's tendency to parochialism. This may be true, but it is unreasonable to blame Hawaii and Alaska. As Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, of Hawaii, has said, neither Hawaii nor Alaska asked for two Senators. That is determined by the form of government under which we live.

As a matter of fact, 1? 404,224 people living in 18 States in 1940 could outvote New York's 13,478,142 in the Senate by 36 to 2. On the other hand, New York now has 45 Representatives, or 10 per cent of the membership of the lower House of Congress.

If it is bad for each State to have two Senate votes, the thing to do is amend the Constitution. Why discriminate against Hawaii and Alaska when 35 other States have already been admitted to the Union with all the rights and privileges of the Original Thirteen?

The United States grew to its present geographical proportions under a wise colonial expansion policy laid down in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. That policy provided that whenever a Territory could boast a population of at least 60,000 people it could be considered for statehood on a basis of equality under the Constitution.

Aside from Texas, which came in as an independent republic; Maine and West Virginia, which were separated from other States; and Vermont and Kentucky, admitted without previous Territorial status, all other new States were accepted on terms inspired by the ordinance.

Frank Buck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, millions of people in America and around the world were saddened by the announcement on last Saturday of the death of Frank Buck. The "bring 'em back alive" animal authority thrilled multiplied millions by his jungle exploits, his magazine stories, his radio and screen appearances, his lectures, and his devotion to the great outdoors.

Frank Buck, whose name is known in nearly every household in this country,

began his career as a big game hunter back in 1911 when he made his first trip to South America—the first of a series in search of rare animals and reptiles that built his "bring 'em back alive" reputation.

From the time he was 18 years old, Buck roamed the earth, making repeated expeditions into the wilds of Malaya, India, Borneo, New Guinea, Siam, and Africa—to mention but a few. He loved his work, risked his life many times, and in his quiet, unassuming and modest way liked to recount his experiences in danger spots of distant lands where the average person would not dare go and would probably not return alive if he did. Buck possessed the finer qualities admired so much by Americans—courage, character, energy, ambition, and an insatiable love for adventure.

I have known Frank Buck many years, and like so many others, enjoyed the warmth of his friendship, his pleasing personality and his interesting conversation. He lived in my home town of San Angelo, Tex., where he often went to rest and visit with his family and friends between his journeys into the world's darkest spots. He belonged to Texas, to America, and he was a citizen of the whole world. His inspiration and influence will be felt for generations.

Frank Buck left his mark and has turned in his hunting togs. In Singapore, in Cape Town, in Borneo, in those far-away places, as well as at home, folks are mourning the passing of this great and distinguished American. I am honored to be privileged to pay this tribute to his memory.

Job Shortage Causes Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 27, 1950:

JOB SHORTAGE CAUSES WORRY; MANY IDLE EXHAUST BENEFITS—OFFICIALS FIND WORK OPPORTUNITIES ARE NOT INCREASING ENOUGH TO CARE FOR THOSE AT YOUTH AND AGE ENDS OF SCALE

(By A. H. Raskin)

One hundred and sixty thousand New Yorkers have drawn all the State unemployment insurance checks they are eligible to receive in the present "benefit year." Two million workers in various parts of the country exhausted their insurance rights last year and 800,000 of these wound up the year still out of work. Massachusetts and Rhode Island are looking to the Federal Government to bail out their depleted job-insurance funds. One-fifth of Oregon's labor force is on the insurance rolls.

These are symptoms of a national unemployment situation that is giving increasing concern to Federal, State and municipal officials in all sections. The Census Bureau reported 4,684,000 idle workers in mid-February out of a total civilian work force of 61,637,000. This meant that 1 worker in every 14 was without work at a time when demand for steel, automobiles and many other products was at near-record levels.

Officials do not expect any dramatic worsening in the unemployment picture. On the contrary, they expect a modest improvement in the next month or two. What worries them most is the evidence that employment opportunities are not increasing fast enough to provide jobs for those at both ends of the age scale—the young and the old.

They are afraid that the unemployment statistics will not show what is happening in sufficiently graphic form to produce any national will to do something about the problem. The March census report may show a slight rise in unemployment as a hangover from the coal strike, but most Government economists expect a considerable improvement in April and May.

SCHOOLS TO ADD TO LISTS

Jobless lists will go up again in June as schools and colleges throw hundreds of thousands of new recruits into the job market. But by the end of the year, the unemployment total will be no higher and perhaps somewhat lower than the February figure, according to Federal forecasts.

Another factor likely to stir complacency about the volume of unemployment is that job-insurance payments, which set a record high in January, will probably taper off as older workers use up their benefit rights and disappear from the insurance rolls. Workers looking for their first job do not show up on the rolls at all because they have built up no eligibility credits.

When unemployment lasts long enough, relief rolls start to soar but there is usually a considerable time lag between exhaustion of insurance rights and application for relief on the basis of need. As a result, officials foresee a period in which most indicators will point to a downturn in joblessness without any real improvement in the basic situation.

With a congressional election coming up in November, the administration is not disposed to put too much accent on the extent of idleness and the permanent character of the problem it presents. That is why economists in closest touch with the situation feel the economy is suffering a particularly pernicious form of unemployment.

When business is on the skids and wholesale lay-offs are being made, every one is concerned. Demands for action come from all sides. When unemployment piles up slowly through the failure of the economy to absorb the increased labor force that comes with a growing population and a longer life expectancy, the pressure for action is much less insistent.

EXPANSION OF ECONOMY URGED

Leon H. Keyserling, acting chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, warned a Chicago audience earlier this month that the number of jobless workers might rise to 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 4 years hence unless ways were found to expand our economy sufficiently to provide new jobs.

All economists stress that they have little worry over the prospect of any abrupt collapse in our present employment situation. New applications for unemployment insurance, the most sensitive barometer the Government has of idleness due to lay-offs, dropped from a weekly average of 378,100 in January to 290,100 last month.

In New York State the volume of new and continued claims for insurance reached a high level of 507,937 in the week ended January 13. In the week ended March 17 the figure was down to 418,451. However, part of the decline was accounted for by the elimination of workers who had drawn all the benefits for which they were eligible. Nearly 7,000 workers a week fall into this category.

Under the law a worker may receive not more than 26 weekly checks in the 12-month period from June of one year to June of the next. This means that none of the 160,000 New Yorkers who have exhausted their benefit rights for this year may apply for benefits again until next June. Those who had some work in 1949 will be eligible for additional payments at that time if they are still out of work.

However, many of the workers who have been dropped this year will have no benefits to look forward to next year. A substantial percentage lost their jobs in the industrial slump of 1948 and have not worked since.

GROUP OVER 45 HARD HIT

Persons over the age of 45 make up a large part of the group that is using up its benefits without being able to find new jobs, according to samplings made by State officials. Older workers are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain placements. This applies not only to those 65 and over, for whom old-age assistance and industrial pension plans are available, but also to those 20 years younger. Two-thirds of the men who exhausted their benefit rights in December were in the over-45 group.

Federal officials report that the situation for aging workers is the same in most parts of the country. When they have jobs, they usually are among the most valued workers. But when they lose their jobs, they are almost impossible to place. The spread of industrial pension systems and the attendant increase in premiums an employer must assume when he hires an older worker have aggravated this problem in many industries, officials say.

Consideration is being given in Washington to the formulation of special employment programs for the young and the old. Officials feel special attention is needed for those trying unsuccessfully to break into the job market for the first time and also for those trying to hold onto opportunities for useful employment after industry has labeled them too old.

EARLY LEGISLATION UNLIKELY

Administration thinking on programs has not advanced to a point that makes it appear anything will be sent to Congress this session. It is recognized that public works or construction programs would be of little value, especially in meeting the needs of the aged. It is also recognized that made-work programs would meet wide opposition in and out of Congress unless they met a clear-cut public need.

All Government experts agree that the unemployment insurance program does not represent a basic answer to the kind of unemployment the country now has. The insurance program is calculated to meet the first impact of unemployment but not to carry a worker for a period of more than 26 weeks. It helps bolster purchasing power in period of large-scale lay-offs but other devices are necessary to bring new jobs into being.

Co-op Housing Defeat May Be Campaign Issue—Democrats See in It an Appeal to Many Voters in Middle-Income Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Times of March 26, 1950, writ-

ten by Clayton Knowles, entitled "Co-op Housing Defeat May Be Campaign Issue":

CO-OP HOUSING DEFEAT MAY BE CAMPAIGN ISSUE—DEMOCRATS SEE IN IT AN APPEAL TO MANY VOTERS IN MIDDLE-INCOME GROUPS

(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The one fresh proposal for attacking the national housing shortage died, and a political issue was born last week, when the House administered the coup de grace to the Administration's program for cooperative home building.

This program was designed specifically to meet the needs of the middle-income third of the Nation. In this bracket are the families in smaller communities earning between $2,450 and $4,000 and those in the big cities making between $3,100 and $4,800 a year. Eight million families fall in this category.

These 8,000,000 families, who cast about 15,000,000 votes, come election day, would have been eligible for 40- to 50 year, 3- to 3¼-percent loans for home building, if the program had cleared Congress. With its defeat, the best Government-facilitated financing they can get is 4½ percent, under Federal Housing Administration programs, or 4 percent GI loans, if they happen to be veterans.

DEMOCRATS' ADVANTAGE

Out of such situations campaign issues are born, and the Democrats seeking to retain control of Congress this fall can be counted upon to make political capital out of the defeat of this program, which was engineered by the Republican Party.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic leader of the House, left no doubt of his party's intentions when, trying to crack the almost solid Republican opposition to the administration bill, he warned of inevitable political repercussions.

"You may fool the public today but not next November," he cried. "This is going to be a live issue—an issue which I hope will be used advantageously next fall."

LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION

This program, incorporated in an omnibus housing bill authorizing a $4,100,000,000 Federal commitment for other forms of assistance to private building, would have set up a new corporation empowered to sell Government-guaranteed debentures on the open market. From the proceeds of these sales, the corporation would have made loans to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations for home construction.

The administration was certain that the program would take hold and make a substantial dent in the housing shortage. President Truman thought so much of it that he sent a special message from Key West to the House urging that it be passed.

The administration's concern over the fate of the co-op feature of the housing bill, however, had a broader basis than the Nation's housing needs alone. It dealt with the important part a high rate of home construction played in national prosperity.

An unprecedented number of new housing units—1,000,000—were built in the United States last year. It is estimated that the country needs that much new construction each year just to stay abreast of the housing demands created by new families and obsolescence.

Against this background testimony gathered during long congressional hearings indicated that construction in 1950 would not exceed 900,000. This is not only too little to avoid losing ground in housing accommodations, but also—and more importantly, according to high administration spokesmen—dangerous to the Nation's economy.

Should actual construction in 1950 fall below this estimate to, say 800,000 units, economists to whom the administration pays heed believe a recession might ensue, the equal, perhaps, of the recession of 1937.

Sixteen-Percent-More-Wheat Bread Sweeping Kansas Like Wildfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Members of the House and Senate had an opportunity to try out a new bread recently developed in Kansas which uses 16 percent more wheat than the loaf put out by the ordinary baker. Many Members of the House have told me how much they enjoyed the flavor and taste of this new bread and have expressed the hope that it might be made available here in Washington.

In that connection I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald which tells of the tremendous demand for this new bread on the part of Kansas people.

The bread which was served in the House and Senate restaurants last week was baked in the bakery of J. S. Dillon Sons, which organization operates a large number of food stores in the State of Kansas. As a part of this extension I desire to submit the formula which was used by the Dillon bakery in making this new bread and also the old formula which was supplanted by the new. This formula is available to any bakery anywhere and in view of the marvelous reception which has been given this bread wherever placed on sale, it is believed that bakeries everywhere will want to use this new formula.

The matter referred to follows:

TASTE OF NEW LOAF SELLS IT

A new kind of wildfire is sweeping Kansas.

This time it is the 16-percent-more-wheat bread, the brainchild of Kinsley wheat farmer Morris Coover and later developed and produced by J. S. Dillon and C. O. Mammel bakeries in Hutchinson.

"We are working overtime to keep stores supplied with the new 'farm' bread," said Fred Beeman, head of Dillon's bakery.

"We have had to put on an extra bread shift and will have to enlarge the entire baking set-up if orders continue at the present rate," said Lee Scott, Mammel's bakery chief.

Neither the bakers or the store managers can explain the unexpected rush of customers for the new-type bread. At first they thought it might be a momentary fad but instead of leveling off or decreasing, the orders continue to climb.

"My store managers have only one thing to say these days," said Scott, "and that is a plea for more bread."

Orders for the new bread at the Dillon's bakery for next Saturday alone top by 1,000 loaves the entire output of bread by the bakery for last week.

Stores in the Dillon's organization which formerly ordered 100 to 150 loaves on Saturday are now ordering 800 to 1,000 loaves of the new-type bread, Beeman said.

Scott said the enriched bread is outselling any other type which has ever been sold over a Mammel's counter.

Beeman believes the better taste of the new bread accounts for the unbelievable sales.

In addition to containing 16 percent more flour, the Dillon bread has a high milk content. "It sounds corny but it does taste like the bread which mother used to make," said Beeman.

Dillon store managers are equally sold on the new bread.

Dale Jaye, Fifth and Adams: "The store has run out of Farm bread several times during the day but customers wait until a truck can arrive with more of the new bread rather than take some of the older type."

Al Puls, B and Main: "We have had to reorder the new bread several times a day."

John Graham, Great Bend: "Bread sales over the week end were four times normal. We sold 2,600 loaves which equals the normal week-end sales of all bread."

Scott said one of Mammel's managers carries a loaf of the bread around with him during the day and offers each customer a slice. He said Mammel managers complain that they cannot keep enough new bread on their counters.

The factor which makes the new bread better for toast is that it's less elastic and spongy than the older type bread, said Beeman. As toast, it breaks easier than the old formula.

Because of the new quality, customers will now have to use something beside the squeeze test in buying bread, said Beeman.

Formerly a customer went into the store and pinched loaves of bread until one was found which squeezed the easiest. The belief was that the fresh bread was softer. To make a loaf which would squeeze, bakers had to give up some good eating qualities.

The new type is more substantial and will not give as easily when pinched, so customers will have to buy on a taste test, said Beeman.

Beeman said he has been told by persons who never ate bread before that the new type bread has converted them into eaters of bakery bread.

The new type bread has to cost more money because it costs more to produce, said Beeman. Extra material in each loaf costs an additional 1 cent and 10 percent more baking time, said Beeman.

The wheat farmers who, through the Western Kansas Development Association, were the first to get into the more-wheat-in-bread movement are all in favor of the new bread.

Beeman has received many letters from wheat farmers.

C. M. Patmon, Hoxman, wrote: "Thanks from a wheat farmer. Your bread is a step in the right direction."

An example of how the wheat farmers feel was shown by a man who walked into a bank here Thursday.

"What kind of bread do you eat now," he asked the teller?

"That new type bread," was the answer.

"It is a good thing," the farmer replied.

"This is one time the farmers have an opportunity to put something good over and we will see now how the city folks stand behind us."

DILLON'S FARM BREAD

Dillon's Farm bread was developed by the following procedure:

Original formula of Dillon's enriched bread:

White flour, 100 pounds.
Water, 63 pounds.
Yeast, 2 pounds.
Salt, 2 pounds.
Powdered skim milk, 6 pounds.
Sugar, 5 pounds.
Shortening, 4 pounds.
Yeast food, 8 ounces.
Mycoban enrichment tablet, 3 ounces.

New formula on Dillon's Farm bread:

One hundred percent fine-ground whole wheat flour, 6 pounds.
White flour, 110 pounds.
Water, 63 pounds.
Yeast, 2 pounds 5 ounces

Salt, 2 pounds 6 ounces.
Powdered skim milk, 6 pounds.
Sugar, 5 pounds.
Shortening, 4 pounds.
Yeast food, none.
Mycoban enrichment table, 2 ounces.

You will note that we have added 16 percent more flour—6 pounds whole wheat fine ground, and 10 pounds white flour. The moisture or absorption then drops from 63 percent of the flour to about 54 percent.

This makes a more solid loaf, a more nutritious loaf for two reasons: First, there is more of the outer part of the wheat berry and, also, there is more flour in the bread.

You will note we have a bread with a high content of milk solids. This also makes the loaf more nutritious.

Mycoban is a product of du Pont. It prevents mold.

The baker can run either the straight dough or sponge method, using about his normal methods, varying if necessary to fit his shop conditions.

Canadian Wheat Purchases Under ECA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration in September 1949 in regard to the purchase of Canadian wheat by Great Britain under the ECA program. This statement should serve to answer the many questions asked on the floor of the House during the debate in reference to this matter. Also in connection with the same subject, I include copies of letters exchanged at that time between the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Paul G Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which letters were attached to and a part of the statement above-mentioned. They follow:

WASHINGTON, September 15, 1949.—The Economic Cooperation Administration agreed today to permit Great Britain to use ECA funds to purchase $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat in an effort to alleviate the critical drain on British gold-and-dollar holdings.

The agreement came after consultations between ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman and Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan on the British dollar crisis and the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of the United States.

The Secretary said he believed Mr. Hoffman's proposed action was fully warranted. He has issued the following statement:

"The effect of ECA's decision will be beneficial to United States farmers as a whole, including wheat producers, because it will increase our foreign markets for a number of agricultural products and help to maintain a traditional pattern of international trade with England, Canada, and other countries which has been beneficial and can continue to be beneficial to farmers of this country.

"To wheat farmers it should mean as large, if not a larger market for exportable wheat this year. What ECA has done is help England pay for wheat which they had contracted to take from Canada during the last year of the 4-year British-Canadian wheat pact. However, England has agreed to buy $30,000,000 of wheat (about 15,000,000 bushels) from the United States which had not been previously planned. This has been made possible by the relief to British dollar resources resulting from Administrator Hoffman's action.

"Under the international wheat agreement, Canada has an export quota of about 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. Any sales under the British-Canadian contract count on that quota. If the British were to shift purchases from Canada to the United States this would entitle Canada to claim other outlets under the wheat agreement which we expect and prefer to fulfill.

"Due to the relief being granted by ECA, the United Kingdom will also buy $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of United States perishable surplus agricultural commodities that had not been planned. These purchases will help relieve our growing surplus of these commodities.

"Finally, Canada will reexamine restrictions on import of fruits and vegetables with the view of giving relief where possible from restrictions that are especially burdensome to United States producers.

"In the final analysis, the action taken by Administrator Hoffman, which I believe was fully warranted under the circumstances, will enhance our export marketing not only for the American wheat farmer but for the entire agricultural economy."

Since March 1949, ECA has not financed the purchase of wheat from any source other than the United States. As a result, Great Britain has been spending its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

The ECA action permits Marshall-plan financing for a little more than half of the $309,000,000 worth of wheat which Great Britain will purchase from Canada during the current fiscal year under British-Canadian wheat buying programs.

Greater flexibility in the use of Marshall-plan dollars by Great Britain was one of seven measures adopted during the Anglo-American-Canadian monetary conference to relieve the British dollar crisis.

In addition to authorizing the use of ECA funds to pay for part of the United Kingdom's Canadian wheat purchases, ECA also agreed to finance certain "vessel disbursements" by the United Kingdom which were heretofore ineligible for ECA payment. The "vessel disbursements" are for bunker fuel purchases which require payment in dollars and port and harbor expenses which can be documented. They amount to about $30,000,000.

ECA said it is exploring the possibility of making other nonagricultural commodities and services, which are causing a drain on Britain's dollar reserves, eligible for ECA financing. ECA emphasized that while the agreements broaden the use of Marshall-plan dollars they do not increase the amount of dollar aid for the United Kingdom.

Administrator Hoffman and Secretary Brannan, in an exchange of letters concerning the proposal to finance a portion of the British purchases of Canadian wheat, agreed on the importance of checking the drain on British dollar holdings.

"Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves," Mr. Hoffman said. "This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European recovery program."

Secretary Brannan, in reply to Hoffman, said the interest of his Department centers about the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of the United States.

"We believe, as stated in your letter, that the financing by ECA of a portion of the wheat moving under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will not diminish the over-all exports of United States wheat but may even result in a slight increase, and, in view of the other measures which you point out will be taken, the proposed action will facilitate an increase of United States exports of other agricultural commodities to Canada and the United Kingdom," Mr. Brannan said. "The Department's statutory responsibility in this matter is to determine whether our supply of wheat is in excess of domestic requirements. The determination that such a surplus exists presents a situation for the consideration by you of your discretionary authority under the Foreign Assistance Act. The combination of the circumstances recited in your letter and in this response we believe fully warrants the action which you propose to take in facilitating the purchase by the United Kingdom of Canadian wheat."

Mr. Hoffman said that as a part of the general arrangements the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States about $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat. In addition, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable surplus agricultural commodities in the United States.

During the discussions leading to the decision to finance with ECA funds a portion of the United Kingdom purchases of Canadian wheat, the Canadian Government reaffirmed its policy to keep under constant review its restrictions on the import into Canada of United States fruits and vegetables. It is understood that in the process special consideration will be given to those instances where such restrictions are especially burdensome to United States producers.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 13, 1949

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, one of the measures proposed by the United Kingdom during the three-power financial conferences was the financing with Economic Cooperation Administration grant funds of the British requirements for wheat from Canada.

The facts, with which you are familiar, are these:

The United Kingdom is the traditional and normal outlet for the major portion of wheat exported by Canada. Three years ago these countries entered into an agreement under which the United Kingdom was to purchase 140,000,000 to 160,000,000 bushels of wheat annually from Canada. The quantity of wheat involved for 1949–50, the final year covered by the agreement, is 140,000,000 bushels at an agreed price of $2 a bushel, in store Fort William. The total dollar f. a. s. cost of the wheat involved for 1949–50 amounts to $309,000,000.

You have on several occasions advised us that wheat is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, and it is my understanding that this condition still prevails. Effective with deliveries after the first calendar quarter of 1949, the

ECA discontinued authorizing the use of its funds for the purchase of Canadian wheat, and as a consequence, the United Kingdom has been using its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves. This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European recovery program. It is, therefore, a vital necessity to take all steps possible to end the drain on British gold and dollar reserves.

In an effort to avoid this grave contingency and to extend such help as is within our power, we propose, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act, to agree in part to the British proposal and authorize the use of $175,000,000 of ECA grant funds to finance a portion of this year's purchases of Canadian wheat by the United Kingdom. Aside from the vital importance of such action to European recovery, we believe that the proposed action is also in the interests of agricultural producers in this country in that it will not result in any over-all decrease in United States wheat exports and will facilitate additional exports of other agricultural commodities, both to Canada and the United Kingdom.

As part of the general arrangements under which it is proposed that ECA funds be used to finance part of the United Kingdom purchases of Canadian wheat, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States some $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat. Consequently, net exports of United States wheat may be slightly larger as a result of the proposed action. Furthermore, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable surplus agricultural commodities in the United States. Without the contribution which the financing of $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat will make to the British dollar position, it would be difficult if not impossible, for the United Kingdom to purchase these commodities.

The Canadian Government reaffirmed its policy to keep under constant review its restrictions on the import into Canada of fruits and vegetables from the United States. It is my understanding that in reviewing these restrictions the Canadian Government will give special consideration to those instances where the import restrictions are especially burdensome to United States producers.

In view of the above considerations, it will be appreciated if you would advise us whether you have any objection to the proposed ECA financing of the purchase by the United Kingdom of $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat during the current fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1949.

Hon. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: This is in reference to your letter of September 13, 1949, in which you discuss the proposal that the Economic Cooperation Administration authorize the use of $175,000,000 of grant funds to finance purchases of approximately 80,000,000 bushels of wheat by the United Kingdom from Canada during the year 1949–50.

You are correct in your understanding that wheat at this time is surplus to our domestic requirements and, therefore, is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act. Your letter, however, sets forth the disruptive effect upon the economic recovery of the participating nations that would flow from a failure to adopt the proposal. You propose, therefore, to exercise your authority under the act to arrange for the financing referred to above, and you request our comments on the proposed action.

We are, of course, familiar with the importance of the proposal to the furtherance of European recovery; however, the interest of this Department naturally centers about the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of this country.

As you state, Great Britain is a traditional outlet for much of Canada's wheat and is under agreement with Canada covering purchases of 140,000,000 to 160,000,000 bushels annually. The failure by the United Kingdom to take the 80,000,000 bushels from Canada would result in a very large Canadian excess. Canada would, of necessity, be forced to use every means at its command, including price reductions, to dispose of these stocks in other markets, which would be largely those now supplied in whole or in part by the United States. Moreover, as an exporting country under the International Wheat Agreement, Canada, like the United States, is assured of a market for its guaranteed sales of wheat. These purchases by the United Kingdom would be chargeable to the guaranteed sales of the exporting country. If the United States were to sell any part of this quantity of wheat under question to the United Kingdom, Canada would, therefore, have the right to sell a similar quantity to other importing countries under the International Wheat Agreement. Many of these other countries are our traditional markets which we desire to retain.

Thus, the only net result of a switch from Canada to the United States of any sizable portion of the United Kingdom requirements for wheat would be a compensating shift of Canadian exports to markets which the United States would otherwise supply. There would, in consequence, be no net advantage to American wheat producers.

We believe, as stated in your letter, that the financing by ECA of a portion of the wheat moving under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will not diminish the over-all exports of United States wheat but may even result in a slight increase, and, in view of the other measures which you point out will be taken, the proposed action will facilitate an increase of United States exports of other agricultural commodities to Canada and the United Kingdom. It is observed also that, as part of the general arrangements, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States some $30,000,000 worth of our wheat and also to purchase from the United States from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable agricultural commodities.

The Department's statutory responsibility in this matter is to determine whether our supply of wheat is in excess of domestic requirements. The determination that such a surplus exists presents a situation for the consideration by you of your discretionary authority under the Foreign Assistance Act. The combination of the circumstances recited in your letter and in this response we believe fully warrants the action which you propose to take in facilitating the purchase by the United Kingdom of Canadian wheat.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Fifth Annual Report of the Harrison Soil Conservation District

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Fifth Anual Report of the Harrison County (Ohio) Soil Conservation District. My farm is located in this county, and I am a cooperator in this district, which is doing a good job in one of the most important phases of farm life, that of soil conservation. I am proud to be a member of this soil-conservation district and hope that I can do my part to promote its ideals and objectives.

The report follows:

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT, HARRISON SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1949

Progress has been made in the Harrison district during 1949. On the part of the farmer there is a better understanding of the purpose and program of the district. Technical progress is evidenced by the location of several closely knit neighborhood groups.

The beginning of 1949 found the Harrison district in the low point of the cycle. The district was organized in 1945. Don Hover at the request of the board of supervisors, was assigned to the district as farm planner. Don was familiar with the district, having worked in the CCC camp. Don took up where he had left off when called for military duty and succeeded in developing plans for 66 farms in 1946. Harry Bell reported as assistant farm planner in June. January 1, 1947, Hover was promoted to district conservationist and Bell assumed the duties of farm planner. During 1947, 45 farm plans were developed. In February 1948, Bell resigned to accept a scholarship in the graduate school of Rutgers University. In April 1948, John Foisley was assigned to the district as farm planner. The combination of circumstances which left the district without a farm planner for a few months during lay-out season and then with a planner who knew no one in the district resulted in greatly reduced interest in soil conservation. The board was not successful in reviving that interest at least until the new farm planner had won the confidence of the farmers of the district. Accordingly for 1949 the assistance of an aide was requested only part time.

Some of the details of the achievements for 1949 are presented in the appendix of this report in table form.

The year 1950 opens with much brighter prospects. Mr. Feisley has made very creditable progress in winning the confidence of the people of the district. I trust this process has been speeded up by the activities of the various members of the board as well as those of the board.

The board is very much encouraged with the progress in neighborhood group planning. The principles back of neighborhood activities seem sound. Neighbors do work together and enjoy it. A degree of success had been achieved in working with neighbor groups in previous years. During the past year a dozen groups were located and the spokesman for each identified. One group completed the planning process and appeared

before the board for approval of their farm plan. The remarks made by various members of the group were sufficient to convince one of the advantage of neighborhood activities in complete farm-conservation planning.

The educational activities of the past year include field days, tours, and participating in State plowing match, in addition to the usual press articles and radio broadcasts.

A field day on the Jewett School farm in April provided a demonstration of trash-mulch seeding. Dr. H. L. Dorst, of the experiment station, was present to supervise the work and answer questions. The late V. G. Applegate, extension agent; Elias Lewis, vocational agriculture instructor at Jewett; and John Feisley planned the program for the day. Approximately 5 acres of broomsedge land was thoroughly disked, limed, fertilized, and seeded. Reverend Rothel donated the use of equipment and the Hanna Limestone Co. the limestone. The vocational agriculture boys demonstrated the methods of tree planting. Seventy people attended.

A result demonstration tour, including the Jewett School farm, was held in August. The program was planned by the newly appointed county agent, Larry Sarbaugh, and John Feisley. Dr. H. L. Borst represented the Extension Service; Mark White, fish management agent, seined the two ponds on the farm to demonstrate the method and discussed the balance between fish species which give the best results in farm ponds.

Dr. Borst discussed the method used in making the trash-mulch seeding. The seeding has succeeded beyond expectation. The tour included the Taylor Addy farm. Lunch was eaten at the Pleasant Valley Church near the Addy farm. The ladies of the church furnished coffee and served ice cream furnished by Mr. Addy and the district. Through the cooperation of the neighbors, wagons were furnished for touring the farm. Trash-mulch seeding, renovated pastures, and dense alfalfa meadows were noted. Forest Dean, of the Extension Service, called attention to forestry practices as observed in the farm woods. The 75 farmers in attendance seemed to be sold on the idea of soil conservation.

In June the district was represented at the Belmont County experiment farm field day. The entire farm is operated under a complete soil-conservation plan for a grassland farm.

Harrison district was represented at the State plowing match by four tour leaders and many others who took advantage of the program.

The second air tour for the district was held October 16 and 17. It was made possible through the management of the local airport. A course was chartered over the western part of the district and included 12 marked farms, 3 of which belong to district supervisors. Forty-four pupils and twenty-eight farmers were briefed and flew the course.

The first tree farms in the district were dedicated November 22. The Donald Baker farm of Jewett was dedicated as No. 93 in the State. The Charles Standiford farm of Freeport as No. 94. Tree and multiflora rose planting were demonstrated by the vocational agriculture boys of the respective schools. Power-saw demonstrations were by Rothel and Sinclair.

The annual meeting was one of the high lights of the year and did much to develop a favorable attitude toward the district. This event held at Asbury Chapel was attended by 120. A fish dinner was the feature of the occasion. The idea of a fish dinner was obtained by one of the present members of the board at the district supervisors' 1948 school, sponsored by the Mississippi Valley Association, and had much to do with the enthusiasm which went into the meeting. T. C. Kennard, State conservationist, was the main speaker of the evening. Glenn Rockwell, of the Belmont district, showed slides and explained the trip to Litchfield Park, Ariz., as winner of the Goodyear contest. Clarence McKnight presented several novelty musical numbers on a set of bottles.

Through the cooperation of the county bankers' association, Elias Lewis, vocational agriculture teacher of the Jewett and the Scio Schools, was sent to the conservation laboratory at Leesville for the summer term. He reported to the board of supervisors and showed pictures illustrating the work of the course. The report was also given before various other groups and thus helped to bring the conservation message to more people.

The Harrison district recognizes the advantage of united effort and has worked with other districts in numerous ways in addition to those mentioned above. The district was represented at the annual meeting of the State federation. One of the members of the board served on the federation strip-mine law committee. Another member served part of the year as member of the State federation executive committee. The district was well represented at the annual work group district supervisors' meeting. Dues to the State federation and national association were paid.

The board wishes to express gratitude for the contribution which the late V. G. Applegate made during his long service as county extension agent. He met an accidental death during the year while carrying out the duties of his office. He played an important part in the organization of the district and assisted in getting the conservation program under way.

The board welcomes Lawrence Sarbaugh as county extension agent, and appreciates his cooperation in pushing forward the soil-conservation program. His contributions are indispensable.

The board takes pleasure in acknowledging the contribution which many others have made toward the soil-conservation program. Among those are the schools, including vocational and veteran instructors, churches, the Farm Bureau councils, granges, chambers of commerce, other Federal agencies, the airport, the bankers, and other businessmen, all who contributed to the promotion of the soil-conservation program by mentioning soil conservation in their advertising or by talking soil conservation. Special mention must be made of the press and radio. Both are very effective in promoting the program.

The experience of the past 2 years has demonstrated beyond doubt (if there were any) the vital part which the trained personnel and the efficient organization of the Soil Conservation Service are making toward the soil-conservation movement. The district takes this occasion to express gratitude for that cooperation.

As we start the new year, 1950, the district board earnestly solicits the continued cooperation of every individual and of every group and agency who are in position to help promote this program. It is a task that challenges the united effort of all of us. The values at stake involve the welfare not only of our own families and our descendants but of our Nation as well.

Achievements, 1949

Contour strip cropping (acres)	662
Trash mulch seeding (acres)	62
Wildlife area planted (acres)	24
Thinning of woodland (acres)	8
Tree planting (acres)	40.5
Farm ponds (each)	1
Diversion terraces (mile)	0.2
Prevention of grazing damage (acres)	229
Multiflora rose planted	4,500
Neighborhood groups located	12
Number of families	155
Applications received	53
Acres	6,619
Complete conservation plans developed	26
Acres	3,516
Active conservation plans at present	143
Acres	21,334

The board of supervisors of the Harrison Soil Conservation District are Raymond Galbraith, chairman, Tippecanoe, Ohio; Emerson Mizer, vice chairman, Cadiz, Ohio; J. R. Blackwell, secretary-treasurer, Cadiz, Ohio; John Bardall, Freeport, Ohio, M. W. McKlveen, Scio, Ohio, members.

Paradox: Unemployment During Good Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, among the many and complex problems that confront a Nation none is more distasteful than the subject of unemployment. The word in itself is a veritable storehouse of meaning. The tie-in of words like poverty, hunger, despondency, and economic break-down, to cite a few, is immediately recognizable. Is it any wonder that the mention of unemployment causes a feeling of dejection and prompts a reaction of fear? Since it is a recurring problem, a tough nut to crack, that cannot be ignored or set aside in favor of a less challenging one, it is, by all means, the fortitudinous thing to do to look the matter squarely in the eye whenever it rears its ugly head.

However, there are many searching questions to be tossed at the contention that unemployment ranks are increasing the while the Nation is supposedly enjoying good times. Closer examination of the facts are surely desirable in so paradoxical a situation. Who is right and who is wrong? Are we already embarked upon discomforting days of depression or are we actually wallowing in prosperity?

Concern over this somewhat confusing state of affairs is indicated from two sources to which I should like to invite attention by including, under permission to extend my remarks, a paragraph from Labor's Monthly Survey of March 1950, published by the American Federation of Labor, and a special report which is the result of extensive research by United States News and World Report under date of March 31, 1950, entitled "Needed By '55: 12,000,000 Jobs":

[From Labor's Monthly Survey, American Federation of Labor, for March 1950]

CHECK UNEMPLOYMENT NOW

Unemployment, creeping slowly upward, has reached proportions which call for action. Thus far in 1950, 2,000,000 more workers have been unemployed than in the corresponding months of 1947 and 1948. The number of areas reporting 12 percent or more of their

labor force out of work has risen from 39 in December 1949 to 43 in January 1950. In more than half the other important industrial centers from 7 to 12 percent of the labor force are unemployed; only a small part of this unemployment is seasonal. These reports are disturbing because there is at present no prospect that business activity will increase enough in 1950 to restore "full employment." Meanwhile, new workers coming into the labor force increase the number out of work.

[From U. S. News and World Report of March 31, 1950]

NEEDED BY 1955: 12,000,000 JOBS—GROWING LABOR FORCE OFFSETS BUSINESS RISE

Despite good times, nearly 5,000,000 are out of work and the number is growing. Unemployment is beginning to look permanent.

Trouble is growth of the labor force. Jobs cannot open up fast enough to keep abreast, at present business levels.

How to meet the future is the problem. Public works, earlier and bigger pensions, shorter work week, all are suggested remedies.

Five years from now, unless business activity rises steadily from the present high level, there may be 12,000,000 unemployed in this country. If business should fail to hold as high as it is now, the number of unemployed will go above the 12,000,000 mark.

The returning problem of unemployment may be here to stay. It is coming back because of two main factors: (1) the steady flow of new workers into the ranks of job seekers, and (2) the year-by-year gain in man-hour output as industry's huge postwar investment in new and more efficient plant and equipment pays off.

The resulting problem, essentially, is this: Out of jobs and seeking jobs today are about 4,700,000 individuals. That is about 1,500,000 more than the number of unemployed a year ago. Number of unemployed will shrink seasonally in the period just ahead, but will be greater a year from now unless the general level of business activity rises.

New workers will add 2,900,000 people to the labor force in the years 1950 through 1954. That is the net increase to be expected after allowing for older workers who will drop out of the labor force. The rise in labor force in this year alone will approach 700,000.

Jobs to be affected by more efficient use of labor total about 4,400,000 from 1950 through 1954. That assumes an annual increase of 2 to 2.5 percent in man-hour output—a gain that is in line with normal experience. Rising hourly wage rates add to pressure on management to find ways to reduce the use of labor.

Added up, as the chart on page 39 shows, the prospect is 4,700,000 unemployed now, plus 2,900,000 to be added to the labor force, plus 4,400,000 to be displaced by improved efficiency—a total of 12,000,000. This number will be unable to find jobs in 1954 if business activity fails to rise above the present level and if efficiency in use of labor increases at the normal rate.

The 5-year solution to the problem of growing unemployment, if there is to be one, is this:

Total employment will have to climb from the present 57,000,000 civilian jobs to 67,000,000 jobs, if unemployment is to be held below 3,000,000.

Business activity—total spending, called gross product—will have to expand from the present level of $260,000,000,000 a year to $300,000,000,000 in 1954 to provide the needed additional jobs.

This is the total amount that will have to be spent for goods and services to keep the population fully employed. The $300,000,000,000 figure assumes that prices will stay where they are today. In that figure are the total outlays of consumers, home builders, business investors in plant and equipment, and Government spending at all levels, Federal, State, and local.

This need for expansion is beginning to worry officials even now. Recent increases in unemployment are not due to a slackening of business activity but to a growth in the labor force. The number of people wanting jobs is increasing faster than the economy is expanding to provide those jobs. At the same time, output per hour is starting to rise again.

The experience of the last year shows what is happening. Total output today is almost as large as it was a year ago. Total civilian employment also is almost as large. The labor force, however, is larger by almost 1,500,000. Result is that unemployment increased by the amount that the labor force increased. At 4,700,000, unemployment is at a postwar high.

If this trend continues, unemployment will exceed 5,000,000 within a year. And unemployment at above 5,000,000 is recognized as a political problem.

Actually, there are only two developments that can prevent a rise in unemployment. Either private industry must expand, providing more jobs in factories, in construction, in trade and services, or the Government must move in.

Business expansion at the rate necessary to provide full employment appears to be a difficult task. High employment in all past periods has been sparked by a high level of investment in plant and equipment and in construction. At present, investment in new plant is falling off, although orders for new equipment recently have increased. The construction industry has been in a boom for 2 years and is headed for a third year of boom in 1950. It seems unlikely that this industry will expand much more.

Most other industries appear to be able to produce as much as people want. The automobile industry expects to meet most of the demand for new cars by the end of this year. There appears to be no urgent demand to expand output of such things as refrigerators, household appliances, or other hard goods. The soft-goods industries already have been producing surpluses. The steel industry apparently is able to satisfy all customers and the coal industry is plagued with too much capacity.

Moderate expansion can be expected through population growth and family growth. The population is likely to increase by 7,000,000 by 1954 and the number of families probably will grow by about 4,000,000. That will add to the demand for the products of industry, but even with the probable growth ahead, the increase in job seekers may readily outpace the expansion. Any recession in business activity would result in rapid expansion in the number of unemployed.

To provide employment for ten to twelve million more workers by 1955—to reach a $300,000,000,000 output by that time—means that private business investment must continue at a higher rate than in 1949. That expansion also must be steady. In past periods, business expansion never has been steadily upward, its rise has been marked by periodic spurts and setbacks.

However, if private business expansion fails to check the rise in unemployment, political pressure will grow for a Government program to accomplish the same result. In fact, agitation for Government action can be expected if unemployment exceeds 5,000,000 by this time next year.

The outline of a Government program already is beginning to take shape in official planning.

Public-works expansion is under study now. The Federal Government is aiding States and cities with public-works planning. On the shelf are Federal projects for river-valley developments, public-power expansion, and land reclamation. President Truman's proposal for a New England power program is an example. New England is one of the areas hardest hit by current unemployment.

The experience of the New Deal suggests, however, that public works cannot provide the complete answer to the employment problem. It is unlikely that Mr. Truman's Fair Deal will be content with public works alone.

Higher old-age pensions are being offered as one way to draw older workers out of the labor force to make way for newcomers. Experience suggests, however, that, as jobs become harder to find, persons with jobs are reluctant to give them up. Union contracts, moreover, usually stress seniority that gives older workers a first claim on the jobs that are available.

A shorter workweek is another suggestion that is stirring in Government and union circles as a solution for unemployment. Agitation for a 30-hour week was intense in the early days of the New Deal, and a 40-hour week finally was established through the wage-and-hour law. A shorter workweek could be established by an amendment to the present law. That law already has been amended to push the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

Reduction of the standard workweek from 40 to 35 hours would mean a cut-back of one-eighth in total hours of labor for one worker. Applied to a working force of 40,000,000, a 35-hour week would mean an additional 5,000,000 jobs to produce the same volume of output. The appeal of such a device could become important in a period of rising unemployment.

At present, proposals for treating unemployment are still in the discussion stage. The official hope is that the rising trend will be reversed in the months ahead and the problem may solve itself. But, if unemployment is higher a year from now, proposals for a shorter workweek promise to become a political issue.

Mr. Voorhees Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, March 26, 1950, which pays a deserving tribute to a distinguished Brooklynite who will shortly leave Government service:

MR. VOORHEES RESIGNS

A large part of the American people will share the particular reluctance with which President Truman accepted the resignation of Tracy S. Voorhees as Under Secretary of the Army. The loss of so diligent a public servant at this time will be deeply felt. It is additionally grievous, since it comes upon the heels of the resignation of the Army Secretary, Gordon Gray. Thus, at one time, our defense establishment loses two of its top-ranking civilians and two of its most competent and conscientious officials.

The public, nevertheless, will be sympathetic toward the reasons that have prompted the resignation of Mr. Voorhees. His service has been long and strenuous. It has

had a wide variety of ramifications that have entailed grave responsibilities. His letter to the President mentioned the "intensity and continuity" of these, noting that they seemed "inherent and inescapable." There is modesty as well as truth in that last statement. Those responsibilities were inescapable as far as Mr. Voorhees was concerned because of his own appraisal of the gravity of the tasks with which this country was faced and his determination to meet that gravity with the most earnest and ceaseless endeavor. If now he pleads guilty to some degree of fatigue he has every right to do so. If he can get some degree of rest he has most richly earned it.

This case again brings up the difficulty of finding enough men of high enough caliber to meet the complex demands of our constantly increasing affairs. Those men whose civilian training and experience have given them the capacity for first-class public service can undertake that service only at very great sacrifices. Those sacrifices are not merely monetary. They are the sacrifices entailed in accepting work that demands almost inexhaustible energy and virtually limitless patience. The man in high office must be able, not merely to do a competent job, but to endure a multiplicity of little frictions and frustrations that cannot help but have, in time, an eroding effect.

The replacement of a man such as Mr. Voorhees, therefore, is not easy. It is not merely his technical shoes that have to be filled. What must be found is another competent person equally willing to give his services, his strength, his personality, over and above the call of duty.

Death of a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Evanston Review, Evanston, Ill., in connection with the death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable Ralph E. Church:

DEATH OF A CONGRESSMAN

The sudden death this week of Congressman Ralph E. Church struck home closely to a vast number of Evanstonians and other residents of this area. Almost continuously since 1918 he had served the interests of the north shore in legislative halls, State and National. He had become almost an institution—a tradition.

From the standpoint of personal attention to the needs and perplexities of his constituents he was close to being the ideal representative. His campaigns for office were invariably conducted on a personal basis. He consistently refused to rely to any great extent on party organization support and insisted on meeting the voters of his district man to man.

In the National Capital, amid the intricacies of Government machinery, he was in a very true sense the personal friend and representative of his constituents. No reasonable request for information, advice or active assistance was ever refused. He never became too important to listen to the plea of the humblest citizen, and hundreds in this city and this district will testify to his helpful personal assistance, at times when dealing with a complex bureaucracy has grown most difficult for the private citizen.

Although his loyalty to his party's welfare never wavered, Mr. Church could not be classed correctly as an organization man. He was an independent within the ranks and as often as not won elections despite organization opposition. Even in the hottest debates, his personal honesty and rectitude were never questioned.

Naturally, many differed with Mr. Church's views, but the fact that he was returned again and again to Congress even in years when his party met severe national defeat, is eloquent testimony that he faithfully represented the political and social philosophy of this large district.

His zeal in the public interest was the cause of his fatal heart attack.

Uncle Sam's Untapped Tax Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest of April 1950:

UNCLE SAM'S UNTAPPED TAX MILLIONS

(Condensed from the American magazine)

(By NOAH M. MASON, Member of the House of Representatives, Ways and Means Committee)

Administration leaders today are frantically searching for new ways to raise revenue. I maintain we can raise at least $1,000,000,000 in new revenue merely by plugging the loopholes in our present tax laws that permit United States businesses to hide behind tax-exempt fronts. And we can raise this revenue without adding a single cent to the bill of the regular taxpayers.

Our tax laws, as now written, exempt charitable, educational, and religious organizations, cooperatives, labor unions, and many others. When these exemptions were granted, many years ago, our lawmakers did not dream that they would be used to shield vast corporate, profit-making enterprises. But that is precisely what has happened. By various means—all perfectly legal—thousands of organizations are escaping the normal 38-percent tax on their business profits, forcing numberless conscientious taxpaying businessmen to the wall and shrinking the pool of taxable United States wealth.

Here are the five devices widely used to escape taxes:

THE CHARITY TRUST DEVICE

There are many conscientious trusts and foundations dedicated to public service. But thousands have sprung up in recent years that are little more than pawns in the game of outsmarting the tax collector. The Russell Sage Foundation, a conscientious organization, has made a study of some of the newcomers. Its report states: "A disturbing number of such 'foundations' appear to have no headquarters other than the office of a law firm, to be modest to the point of complete silence about any program for social or public welfare, and indeed to be making no present contributions of any sort from their accumulated and accumulating wealth."

The fabulous 95,000-acre Montana wheat ranch of Tom Campbell, America's largest wheat farmer, has been sold to a "charitable" trust in Omaha for $2,000,000. Its earnings, which have been subject to a 38-percent tax, now go tax-free. Mr. Campbell continues to manage his ranch at a handsome income.

An enterprising young Omaha lawyer named Gordon Diesing bought the ranch of behalf of the United States Wheat Corp., which Diesing set up last April "exclusively for charitable purposes." This corporation's profits, after paying Diesing's salary, expenses, etc., go to another charitable corporation, the Sacred Heart Foundation Fund, which is capitalized at $10.

Mr. Diesing is listed as its president, secretary, treasurer, chairman of the trustees, general counsel, and resident agent. In effect, his second corporation, capitalized at $10, bought control of a $2,000,000 ranch. Evidently not much money changed hands.

Mr. Diesing also has bought for $4,800,000 the 35,000 acres of cotton land in the San Joaquin Valley run by California's cotton king, Russell Giffen. For this he set up another "charitable, nonprofit corporation," which he heads. Giffen remains as manager.

A significant aspect of these deals is that the two ranches in the past year have drawn almost $5,000,000 in United States Government farm loans. Thus, in effect, the United States Government guarantees that they make a profit, while not being able to tax those profits.

Then there are the six tax-exempt "charitable" trusts set up by President Royal Little and his aides in the $60,000,000 Textron Corp. To these trusts was given title to much of the Textron empire. A Senate subcommittee which investigated this set-up reported: "Many millions of dollars have been received by the trusts and but an infinitesimal portion thereof has been paid to the beneficiaries. * * * It is clear that [Textron] has made wide use of so-called charitable trusts as a means of providing risk capital to itself. * * * These trusts have never paid a cent of income tax."

THE EDUCATIONAL DEVICE

Our founding fathers decided, properly, that education should not be burdened with taxes. But they had no notion that universities would go into business in direct competition with taxpaying companies, as several dozen have done.

The University of Michigan now owns Willow Run airport. Wittenberg College in Springfield, Ohio, has purchased a $200,000 supermarket. Girard College, Philadelphia, through a trustee foundation, operates coal mines. Oberlin College owns 5-and-10-cent stores. Washington University in St. Louis has money invested in 51 business buildings, a railroad freight station and a switching yard. The University of Louisville is in the horse-racing business. A tax-free foundation which will have the university as a beneficiary has bought the famous Churchill Downs track, the profits of which no longer will be taxable.

Yale University (through a subsidiary called Connecticut Boola, Inc.) recently bought a new $4,5000,000 department-store building which R. H. Macy & Co. had built for itself in San Francisco. Then Yale leased the building back to Macy's for 31 years, at an average annual rental of $240,000. This sale-and-lease-back procedure is today fairly common. Both sides win: the business firm involved gets cash for expansion; the educational institution gets a tax-free real-estate investment. The United States Treasury, of course, loses.

The C. F. Mueller Co., macaroni manufacturer, sold out to a nonprofit foundation acting in behalf of New York University. New York University and its affiliated foundations own and operate, in addition to the macaroni factory, a $3,000,000 pistonring factory in Missouri, a $3,300,000 pottery factory and a vast $35,000,000 leather-goods company. A spokesman for the university has admitted that these four companies would have to pay $1,500,000 in United States taxes each year if they were not under the university's protective wing.

THE RELIGIOUS DEVICE

Churches are taking millions of dollars' worth of property off the tax rolls with their investments. Father Divine has bought a large hotel in Newark, N. J., giving it tax-free status. It is estimated that Milwaukee is losing $2,500,000 a year in real-estate taxes because churches and fraternal organizations have become such large property owners. Methodist officials are disturbed over the untaxed profits some of their churches are making on properties which have such nonreligious tenants as taverns and pool halls. Samuel Cardinal Stritch, of Chicago, denied permission to the Catholic order that sought to purchase real estate in Lake County near the city; one factor in his decision was that the county already was seriously burdened by tax-exempt properties.

It is my belief that churches should be taxed on all profits from nonreligious enterprises. The Mormon Church engages in a great variety of commercial businesses, yet has always insisted on paying its full share of taxes on profits.

THE COOPERATIVE DEVICE

Co-ops were given their privileged tax-exempt status in 1916, when they were merely small groups of neighboring farmers trying to get a better return on their crops. The Federal tax then was only 1 percent. Today, however, the tax concession is 38 percent, and many co-ops are monster corporations performing multi-million-dollar transactions in fierce competition with taxpaying businessmen.

A spectacular example is the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co., which operates the biggest sugar refinery in the world at Crockett, Calif. Dominated by businessmen who also operate plantations, department stores, etc., in Hawaii, C. & H. makes millions of dollars in profits but hasn't paid a Federal income tax since 1927. In that year it became a farmers' cooperative, simply by changing its corporate structure. It remained, however, a corporation, with many of the same stockholders.

Independent oil jobbers in the Midwest have had a desperate time surviving in the face of a great upsurge of tax-free co-ops, which are buying up hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil wells, pipe lines, and refineries. One single co-op owns 805 wells.

Co-ops run vast machine-assembly factories, chemical plants, phosphate mines. They handle 75 percent of the Nation's fluid milk, operate vast feed mills, and the biggest grain elevators in America.

One of the so-called farmer co-ops is the California Fruit Growers Exchange, which did a $300,000,000 business last year. It markets the famous Sunkist orange and 85 percent of America's lemons. One of its subsidiaries, the Fruit Growers Supply Co., in 1944 bought the entire lumbering town of Westwood, Calif., for $11,000,000. The purchase included lumber mills, veneer mills, box factories, and valuable timber.

There are today at least a dozen co-ops that would have to pay the Treasury an average of a million dollars each per year if they were taxed on the same basis as their competitors. Yet they escape most taxes because they claim to be nonprofit. When co-ops split a melon at the end of a year they say they are handing out a "rebate" or a "refund" or a "final payment due."

The labor union device. When tax exemption was granted to labor unions, I'm sure the lawmakers did not anticipate that unions would branch out into commercial enterprises having no relation to union needs. In many cities unions receive rentals on store and office buildings they own, and pay no tax on the income. In LaSalle, Ill., a local union is even in the saloon-renting business.

Our biggest unions are planning to operate giant co-op supermarkets in union towns throughout America, in competition with taxpaying grocers. CIO's United Automobile Workers already has a dozen co-op stores in the Detroit area, selling groceries, appliances, clothing, etc. Their announced aim is to capture 50 percent of all local retail trade.

Some small progress is being made in getting tax-exempt organizations to pay their fair share of taxes. The Treasury Department has finally forced a showdown with the Mueller macaroni firm, contending that there is nothing "charitable, scientific, literary or educational" in noodle making, even though the profits go to New York University. The issue is now in the courts. Also, a few States are taking action. Indiana, for example, has a law taxing business income of all churches, colleges, foundations, co-ops, etc. The law has produced no noticeable hardship. And—partly because of public outcry—a few farm co-ops are now voluntarily paying some taxes.

Isolated State laws and voluntary acts, however, are not enough. What is needed is an overhauling of our national tax laws to eliminate tax inequalities. Such a change would not in the least hinder schools, churches, unions and charitable institutions in their primary functions. It would, however, cut the props out from under most of the legal tax dodging by commercial profit makers.

The Wilder Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by request, I am inserting in the RECORD, as an extension of remarks, a letter from Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN to Gov. Harold J. Arthur, of Vermont, concerning a resolution on the Senate Calendar relative to the Wilder Dam and a letter from Governor Arthur in reply thereto.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 23, 1950.

Hon. HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
Governor of Vermont,
Montpelier, Vt.

DEAR HAROLD: As you know, the landowners in Newbury have made a settlement with the power company. There is on the Senate Calendar, however, a resolution which would require the Federal Power Commission to reopen the Wilder Dam case. This resolution failed to pass the Senate last fall only because unanimous consent was required and one Member of the Senate objected.

I have, however, had communications urging the Congress to pass this resolution in order that the State might take an appeal to the courts if the Federal Power Commission is required to reopen the matter.

There is no question in my mind but what the land which would be rendered unusable by reason of raising the dam to the 385-foot level instead of the 380-foot level is of much more value for agricultural purposes than for power production. An annual output of only 13 to 14,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity is involved as compared with a large acreage of class I meadowland.

Before urging the adoption of this resolution by the Congress, however, I should know whether the State of Vermont intends to appeal the FPC decision, if there is an opportunity to do so. As the final determination rests with you, I would like to know your decision. If you desire to go ahead with the appeal, I will do all I can to get the resolution through the Congress. There is still an opportunity to save the land for the State even though the landowners have made a settlement with the power company.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

MARCH 11, 1950.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have your letter of January 23 advising me of the present status of the Wilder Dam resolution and also advising me that you have had communications urging passage of the resolution "in order that the State might take an appeal to the courts if the Federal Power Commission is required to reopen the matter." You ask if the State of Vermont intends to appeal the Federal Power Commission decision, if there is an opportunity to do so.

Your letter and your question seem to assume that the decision in the reopened case would be the same as when the case was reopened before at the request of the State and further hearing had and brief filed by the State. That decision was rendered October 31, 1946, and there was no appeal to the courts by the State or anyone else. I append to this letter a brief synopsis of the whole Wilder Dam history in order that you may have it before you. I also append a copy of the opinion of Attorney General Clifton G. Parker.

I have carefully reviewed the history of the Wilder Dam case and have read the decisions of the Vermont Public Service Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the claims of the parties and much of the important evidence on both sides, as well as the decision of the Vermont Supreme Court in the matter, and the United States Supreme Court decisions which under existing Federal statutes place the control of the use of water of the Connecticut River exclusively in the Federal Government. I have consulted with Attorney General Clifton Parker and with Senator Walter B. Renfrew, Judge Frank N. Brock, Representative William J. Taisey, Vermont farm leaders, and other interested parties.

I have constantly tried to promote the best interests of the Vermont farmer because the prosperity of the whole State is closely related to that of our great agricultural community. My illustrious predecessors as governors have opposed all unwarranted infringements upon our farm land whether the infringements were for power dam or other purposes. I heartily approve the actions taken by them. You have done all that you could to prevent such infringements. You are aware of my sympathies toward the cause espoused by the landowners involved. You may recall that I appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee as master of the State Grange in regard to the Wilder redevelopment on which that committee, at your instigation, conducted extensive hearings.

I find that there has been great exaggeration of the damage to tillable farm land to be anticipated from the proposed redevelopment. For instance, Joint Resolution No. 26, adopted by the General Assembly in 1945, set forth in the preamble that the license of the Federal Power Commission for the redevelopment of Wilder "will result in flooding or otherwise rendering useless for agricultural purposes over 8,000 acres of fertile valley land in the 40-mile area extending north along the river from Wilder to Wells River, Vt."

The commission appointed by authority of this resolution and which was headed by our good friend, Stanley G. Judd (now commissioner of agriculture), reported, however, that the land in Vermont to be permanently flooded would not be over 540 acres. No classification of the land was stated. At

the trial before the public service commission the undisputed evidence was that the dam at elevation 385 feet would flood in Vermont 538 acres of land—classified as river bank, 220 acres; nontillable meadow land, 129 acres; and tillable land, 189 acres. If we add to this 189 acres that will be flooded all of the 224 acres of tillable land in the area between elevations 385 feet and 390 feet and which will not be flooded but will be somewhat damaged, though still usable to some extent for agriculture, we have only 413 acres of tillable land to be flooded or damaged by Wilder. There seems to be no evidence available to show anything more than minor damage on a very small acreage above elevation 390 feet. This figure is far from the 8,000 acres we were first told about.

From a legal standpoint, I am forced to the conclusion that the State of Vermont is not in position to hope to overturn the decision of the Federal Power Commission by which it granted its license for a redevelopment of Wilder to elevation 385 feet. The Federal Power Commission at the request of the State reopened the case in 1946 and permitted the State to present any evidence it desired and which was available in opposition to the redevelopment. To present evidence covering the same ground again would be very unusual.

It must be borne in mind that the situation has now changed materially. Every Vermont land owner affected by the proposed raising of the water level has sold to the power company the flowage rights desired. In other words, their damages have been paid and the power company owns the rights in all land affected in Vermont by the proposed dam and if we should seek to prevent the company from using its own property, we must stand on very strong ground. My discussions with Senator Renfrew and other interested individuals indicate that no new favorable evidence is available.

Moreover, the power company, in compliance with the order of the Federal Power Commission, has raised the money for the redevelopment and has been engaged for a long time in the construction of the proposed new dam and plant. This morning when I drove past the site, the construction appeared to be well advanced toward the final stages when a large additional amount of badly needed electric power can be supplied from there. I am informed that next October is the date scheduled for putting the completed plant into operation. We are fully aware of the great need for more and cheaper electricity in Vermont, especially for agricultural purposes.

It seems to me, therefore, that the State of Vermont should not proceed further in opposition to the Wilder redevelopment. The legal phases are res judicata. The damage claims of our people have been settled and paid.

To seek a reversal of the Wilder redevelopment order under existing conditions would be asking something contrary to all rules of equity and fair dealing. We would be asking that these landowners or former landowners be permitted to keep both their land and the money they have received for it or for damages to it.

Moreover, the millions of dollars spent by the power company toward carrying out the order of the Federal Power Commission to supply the much-needed electric power would be lost and the new dam at Wilder would stand as a memorial that people cannot safely rely upon the unappealed-from actions of State and Federal authorities. Whether or not we believe the decisions were right, we cannot afford thus to weaken faith in Vermont and Vermont ideals of justice and fair dealing.

I am confident that when appraised of all of the facts, the people will support these same conclusions.

With kindest personal regards and assuring you of our confidence in your continued interests in behalf of the State of Vermont, I am,

Cordially and respectfully yours,
HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
Governor.

The People's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from three addresses prepared by me for delivery in Vermont; one at Barre, Vt., to the Vermont Dairymen's Association on the occasion of their annual banquet on February 10, 1950; one at Montpelier, to the Women's Republican Club on the occasion of their Lincoln Day dinner on February 13, 1950; and one at St. Albans, to the St. Albans Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of their annual dinner on February 14, 1950:

ADDRESS TO THE VERMONT DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION, BARRE, VT.

I speak nonpartisanly tonight, my friends, to tell Vermonters—

1. That the administration is very much alarmed at the fall of farm-price averages below parity.

2. That the Brannan plan is considered by a present majority of the Members of Congress as both dangerous and altogether socialistic.

3. That the public debt presently is $257,000,000,000—billions, I said, and will be $264,000,000,000 by June next year.

4. That we will have a $5,000,000,000 deficit looking toward next year.

5. That the end is not in sight but those who realize what is going on appreciate the fact that the spending program must stop now.

6. That millions of people share the illusion that Government can, by passing laws, accomplish results which are beyond the powers of any government to accomplish.

7. That President Truman believes this illusion as evidenced by the fact his message to Congress proposed high expenditures, high taxes, and continuing to spend more than the Treasury takes in. Each and all of these are a threat to freedom. Spending means high taxes; high taxes deprive the citizens of freedom to undertake to decide how to use their earnings; that lowers everybody's scale of living; deficit spending reduces the value of the dollar.

8. That the Brannan plan, the proposals for Federal housing, the continuation of rent control, the Federal power projects, all also are threats to freedom. When the Government becomes able to tell us, the people, who can buy electric power, how much, and from whom, it will be able to control the location of the industry, say where you and I may work and live, and what we may produce; that is intolerable to Vermonters.

9. That Federal aid, as such, always invades the rights and reduces the responsibilities of the States as it limits the opportunity of the people.

10. That we common folks have an inalienable right to manage our own lives; to spend our own money we earn as we see fit, subject only to paying our debts and our just share of the cost of a wise and frugal government, with noninterference with the rights of our neighbors, or by the Federal Government.

11. That we realize the door opener to socialism is Federal aid for services which citizens could and can as well or better perform for themselves, for which, in the long run, they themselves must pay.

12. We agree with the statement once made by one of Vermont's most distinguished sons, one Calvin Coolidge, while President, to the effect that no complicated scheme of relief, no plan for Government fixing of prices, no resort to the Public Treasury, will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture.

13. That social security, as such, comprehensive in nature, rests with the individual, in the ultimate and as the source, who, in the long run, will have to pay all the bills and who, therefore should know just where every cent he pays in taxes goes, or has some idea in order to secure to and for him the social security he seeks and of right should have.

14. That the proposals advanced by the administration for the great extension of the Social Security System embracing compulsory health insurance; permanent and temporary disability benefits; a broadening of Federal participation in public assistance; etc. etc., ultimately will have to be paid for by the people. They should not be fooled by the promises and a confident attitude not warranted by unstable conditions of the world in which we live, which gives no security guaranty either of safety or of sustenance today.

ADDRESS TO THE WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB OF VERMONT AT MONTPELIER, VT.

Abraham Lincoln might not like it, but I have a sneaky notion he would not object to my saying that up to now I have almost consistently voted for such contribution financially to our friends across the seas as they have been able to satisfy the powers that be that they should have. Frankly, I am through with such generous attempts to give away our liberty and to bankrupt America and incidentally and indirectly to impose heavier and heavier burdens on the taxpayers of the United States.

If that be treason, make the most of it.

I am at last satisfied it has not only been a costly but a tragic and fantastic venture, as well as a mistake for our leadership to undertake to impose on or to sustain American democracy in sections of the world where I feel and am satisfied conditions not only do not justify such an attempt, but demand an entirely different form of government.

Until and unless some of these people show evidence of a purpose and of an intent to save themselves by going to work and to stop living off us taxpayers, I shall be very cautious concerning my vote of interference with their internal policies backed by the hard-earned American dollars of hard-working citizens.

It has been well said, and I have come to agree that it is stupid, as a matter of policy, as well as morally wrong for us to fight abroad by way of dollars for the support and establishment of a democracy in any section of the world where the economy of that particular section will not itself promote and support the democracy we know.

For us, democracy is a natural, as well as the greatest of all political ideals. To them it means a source of supply of dollars.

We should not let our misguided enthusiasm for democracy destroy it here by bankrupting it.

Charity begins at home.

Those who undertook to save against old age by buying bonds and insurance for beneficiaries as of and prior to 1933 are confronted by the fact that the dollar, which cost them 100 cents they said is worth but 43 cents to-

day. Those in power are responsible against our protest for the situation which obtains and can neither evade nor avoid.

In 1934 they devalued the dollar by act of Congress. They cheapened the dollar by reducing its value in gold by 41 percent.

They increased the Nation's money supply with printing-press money—and gave us what Gov. Al Smith called the boloney dollar.

They quadrupled the number of bureaucrats and increased the cost of government for nonmilitary purposes from $4,000,000,000 in 1932 to $19,000,000,000 in 1946 and the end is not yet.

They planned high prices, forced up wages, and caused the never-ending race between wages and prices.

They taxed industry to the point that new plants cannot be built nor old ones enlarged. So goods are in short supply.

They deliberately adopted policies which discourage work, curtail production, and destroy savings.

Business taxes are so high that one-third of our food bill consists of taxes. When we pay 15 cents for a can of beans we pay 10 cents for the beans and 5 cents for taxes—taxes paid by the farmer, canner, wholesaler, and retailer, but passed on to us because this tax cost must be added to the price we pay.

Food which cost you $1 in 1933 now costs $2.63. This is the price we now pay for 16 years of incompetent, irresponsible New Deal government, which its supporters are attempting to revive as a Fair Deal for a welfare state.

Unless the people of Vermont and of the United States wake up they may say farewell to the State, as such.

Your insurance and savings protection has decreased from the 100-cent dollar of 1933 to the 38-cent dollar of today. Think that over, and weep and vote as you should.

While I have talked in dollars, as you count those 38-cent dollars for which you paid 100 cents in sweat and blood and tears, which bear the slogan "In God We Trust," ask yourselves the question—How long will God help those who will not help themselves?

ADDRESS TO THE ST. ALBANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ST. ALBANS, VT.

In the first place, because of some things said in your county lately, I would like to pay my respects to our Governor. I have known Harold Arthur before and ever since he was a page in the Vermont Legislature. Just don't let anybody tell you or try to fool you into thinking that anybody is going to boss this man Arthur, or that he is going to be Governor by indirect control.

As a boy and as a man, he has demonstrated that he has the independent qualifications of which real governors are made. I speak as one who has known governors for 50 years, good and bad. If you ask me, he has the stuff.

Now let's get to something national.

First, the orgy of national spending must stop. How many times have I said it? What ever has been done about it? Nothing. We are almost out of soap. I am voting as I talk to save the money of the taxpayers for them.

We are getting bankrupt. The time has come when we must limit our contributions to others measured by what is going to happen to us. Charity begins at home. It will have to do so pretty soon, God save us, or we will all be on the Franklin County poor farm, if there is any such place now. I know there used to be such a place. I always thought that if worst came to worst, I could always take up my residence in Franklin County and get a living off you folks at that refuge. Incidentally, I remember hearing about it as it once was.

Now, seriously, and while this issue of the spending of the taxpayers' money is not to be dodged, yet the most dangerous enemy which confronts us in Vermont and Nationwide is the American counterpart of the British Fabian Socialist. If you don't know what I mean, you had better find out before it is too late. These Fabians (they love to be called that) deny they are Socialists. They operate behind a mask which they call national planning or some other name equally as repulsive to you and me, as they ask for power controls, and hundreds of other things which, on their face, are attractive but from the top down lead us into a mire and the quicksands of socialism, from which we can never wade.

These folks have led the countries overseas, to whom we are contributing our hard-earned dollars, down the dark road which has led England, at least, and others, to their doom. God save us from them. We must save ourselves.

Had it not been for the rugged individualism of the Vermonters who represented their several towns in the State of Vermont in the legislature for the State of Vermont of late years, they would have made more progress toward socializing the State of Vermont than they already have made, which is too much. You know—these folks have a soft and soapy way of undertaking to "show" those who think this is a good country in which to live so long as they can live off it, that if the plan which they offer is adopted or could be adopted, the State of Vermont would engage in flood control, in navigation control, and in the manufacture and distribution of electrical power and energy; we would have a power control board; we would have about every weapon necessary for their undertaking to destroy individual enterprise and to turn everything over to the socialized State. We would tell the farmers what to plant and how much.

These folks should be stopped in their tracks now.

You and I and all the American people face the hard fact that though we won the war, we have not won the peace. We should not permit these socialistic Americans to dictate our policy.

Basic American principles are threatened by the program which they offer for a planned economy. It includes price and wage control and rationing, socialized medicine and regional authorities, etc., ad infinitum, ad nauseum, all of which proposals are wholly out of accord with the true wishes of workers and farmers and businessmen of Vermont and the Nation.

Capital Must Reflect Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times Leader, one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district.

This editorial appeared on Monday, March 27, and I think it is one of the shortest and most effective arguments for home rule that I have yet read.

The editorial follows:

CAPITAL MUST REFLECT IDEALS

Of all the burdens saddled upon Congress, acting as a city council for Washington seems the silliest. Long hours are devoted to details of municipal government that are admittedly tiresome to most of the lawmakers involved.

Actually no one likes the arrangement. Washington's residents want to govern themselves just as do citizens everywhere else.

Both major parties went on record in their 1948 platforms as favoring home rule for the Capital.

Despite all this, action on home rule legislation is stymied in Congress.

Why has the home-rule proposal been blocked when so many appear to favor it?

The answer is simple. Between a fourth and a third of the Capital's population is Negro. Some people say that to enfranchise Washington voters will mean giving this minority more than its proportionate strength at the polls.

There can be no defense of such a viewpoint in this country.

Certainly Washington is the last place democratic America should wish to see barriers raised against use of the voting privilege.

The fact is Washington is a Capital first and a border city second. As the Nation's Capital it must reflect in daily practice the country's loftiest ideals.

How can a city symbolize democracy if it doesn't live it?

Cooperation in the Development of Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a notable address delivered by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1950. Secretary Chapman spoke on the subject Cooperation in the Development of Public Power.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC POWER

I want to express my great appreciation for the invitation extended to me to participate in this annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

A review of your magnificent efforts in the name of the people, and of your achievements, would convince any observer that this meeting is an example of democracy at work. You have come from all sections of the country, and you represent the labors of men and women who have moved with determination and intelligence to create a better way of living for themselves and their fellow-citizens.

It is particularly gratifying to be here today, because the work of the Department of the Interior has both a direct and an indirect bearing on problems which confront many of your member organizations. The Department is now operating and marketing the largest aggregate of hydroelectric capacity in the world, under policies which make it inevitable that there must be many points of contact between us.

You may rest assured of the wholehearted cooperation of the Department of the Interior, through its various power agencies, in efforts to work out our mutual problems. We are partners in a common cause.

I am deeply interested in the progress of rural electrification cooperatives. The bringing of electricity into the farm homes of America has been one of the outstanding accomplishments of the first half of the twentieth century. In 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established, only 11 percent of our farms had electric current. By the middle of 1949, almost 80 percent of these farms had been electrified, and the program is continuing to grow.

I am certain that the rural people of America will never forget that the 840,000 miles of lines energized in the last 12 years have come into being because of the vision and energetic action of two great Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

President Roosevelt believed that the benefits to be derived through the proper development of our resources should not be turned over to individuals or corporations for their own financial enrichment, and that they should rightly go to the people themselves as the owners of these resources.

President Truman continues to maintain the leadership of this great movement to safeguard and develop our natural resources for the benefit of all the people, rather than for a privileged few. His courageous and determined stand has won Nation-wide approval. And he realizes with a strong conviction what the development of these resources means to the people of this country, and to the increasing strength of our national economy.

The cause of rural electrification is being well served, and its support by the present administration will continue.

As the second half of the twentieth century approaches, we are a growing and thriving Nation. The evidences of our prosperity are all about us, and our country experiences a sense of internal well-being.

We are moving forward today to make our economy even stronger and to plan an even greater security for the people of America. Only recently the President outlined the objectives we should set for ourselves. He told us that our present national income of $225,000,000,000 can be increased greatly, that we can soon achieve a national output of $300,000,000,000, and that family income during the second half of this century can reach a level three times that we now know.

The prodigious effort and the steady production needed to achieve such a goal is obvious to all of us. And along with the human energy we shall devote to this effort, we shall have to develop and utilize most wisely, and with great efficiency, the natural resources which belong to us as a people and which promise to serve our needs well.

Your organization knows, and the Department of the Interior is well aware, that the importance of power in our expanding economy cannot be overestimated. It has become an essential to farm and city, and it is, in fact, the lifeblood of our Nation.

The generation of electrical energy is now at an all-time peak, but its production by all agencies, public and private, cannot keep abreast of demands. Fortunately for our country, we have been blessed with vast natural resources which can be developed to make available to us a tremendous amount of electrical power.

It is particularly important that we recognize the national need for low-cost electricity, for here is a key to thriving farms and industries. It is precisely this low-cost power which the development of our water resources is making possible and will continue to produce. The reclamation programs in the West and the power developments in the Tennessee Valley and the Southwest are demonstrating that power can be made available to satisfy national demands, and that power can be produced at lowered costs.

It is here and elsewhere that the interests of people served by rural electric cooperatives tie in closely with the efforts now being made, and to be made in the future, to harness the water in our rivers. Recognizing this very close relationship, I want to talk briefly about some of the things we have accomplished by working together, and of some of the problems still to be solved.

As you know, the Congress long ago laid down the policy that public bodies and cooperatives shall have preference in the distribution of power from Federal plants in order that its advantages may be as widespread as possible. This advantage for consumers, as the objective of national policy, has not always been simple of accomplishment. After power is generated, there remains the problem of delivering it to the public agency, the cooperative, and the consumer.

In many cases, this has meant that the building of power projects, made possible after long and strenuous effort by the people, has been but the first step in the delivery of low-cost power to homes, farms, and cities. The transmission of this power is all-important, and it has been the subject of much conflicting debate, and of frequently bitter conflict. Even today, those who would deny the right of the people to own and manage their resources continue to exert pressures aimed to prevent your Government from transmitting power to you over lines you build.

The right of the people to transmit their power to the places where it is needed has been established in our national policy, but the unending and vigilant cooperation of all of us will continue to be needed to safeguard this right.

In the meantime, the Department of the Interior is moving ahead at a record rate in setting up facilities for the trunk-line transmission of energy from power plants now operating or under construction. At the same time, it is making numerous cooperative arrangements with rural electric groups to insure to them power distribution at low rates as rapidly as possible.

The power policy of the Department of the Interior, based on several acts of Congress, is aimed at the accomplishment of certain specific objectives, and I want to repeat them at this point. Federal dams shall include, where feasible, facilities for generating electrical energy. Preference in power sales shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives. Power disposal shall be for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers. Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. Disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use, and to prevent monopolization.

The Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration are all vitally concerned with rural electrification, and are working closely with many of your component cooperatives in furthering this power policy. This same vital concern will characterize, I am sure, other power agencies which may be established in the future.

Here are some examples of our cooperative relationship: The Kerr-Anaconda and the Havre-Shelby lines in Montana, the west side lines in California, and the Flatiron-Brighton line in Colorado have all been approved after considerable controversy. The Havre-Shelby line is particularly significant and illustrative of the objective I have been discussing.

Although Fort Peck power has been available since 1944 for marketing by the Department of the Interior, only limited transmission facilities have ebeen available for wheeling this power to some cooperatives. Other cooperatives were starved out or received the small amounts that were offered from other sources. The Havre-Shelby line was fought bitterly every step of the way, but, with last year's authorization the poles are going up, the wire is being strung, and we are well on our way to serving four cooperatives in the Havre-Shelby area.

We have been successful also in removing the restriction on installation of generating units at the Canyon Ferry power plant in Montana. As the matter now stands, the Bureau of Reclamation can install and operate its own generating units instead of providing space for the installation of units by a private utility for its exclusive benefit from this public construction.

These two examples of our efforts to serve cooperatives in Montana are not unique, and have been mentioned to indicate the direction of our efforts to work closely with your member groups. There are many other examples.

The Southwestern Power Administration has recently entered into contracts with four generation and transmission cooperatives within the area it serves. These contracts provide that the Southwestern Power Administration will lease and operate high-voltage transmission lines constructed by the cooperatives, that it will purchase the entire output of steam generating plants they construct, and that it will supply the entire power requirements of the cooperatives at substantially reduced rates.

Such contracts as these will be mutually beneficial to the Government and the cooperatives. The steam power from cooperative plants will firm up the Government's hydroelectric power. The entire facilities of the Government will be made available to the cooperatives, which will give them a more dependable lower-cost power supply. Finally, the cost of generation in the cooperative plants will be reduced by higher load-factor operation as a result of the contracts.

Results like these are but another indication of the interrelationship of rural electric cooperatives and the federally constructed projects already at work in this country. This mutual interdependency will increase as we strive to satisfy more of our national power needs.

The speed and the completeness we shall achieve in this effort to feed electric energy to the Nation will be determined by the clarity with which we envision our common goal and by the support we continue to secure from the people. If the programs of the Department of the Interior and the Rural Electrification Administration are to be maintained in all their strength and potentiality, the work of such public-spirited organizations as your own will be very much needed.

It is through such organizations that the Administration and the Congress find support in combating those forces which would subordinate public power to their own personal profit. If we continue to work together toward our mutually understood objectives, we shall be able to achieve great progress for the welfare of the Nation's people.

What are the things we can accomplish in the future?

During the 17 years in which I have been with the Department of the Interior, I have seen 98 percent of the present 3,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric capacity installed on western rivers and streams. Our 6-year program for the Bureau of Reclamation alone has for its objective nearly doubling this capacity of public plants, and we have planned the installation of 2,300,000 additional kilowatts.

To this amount will be added 650,000 kilowatts of installed capacity in plants under construction by the Corps of Engineers, which will be marketed by our Bureau of Reclamation. Approximately 500,000 more

kilowatts will be brought into the Columbia Valley by the Engineers, to be marketed by the department through the Bonneville Power Administration. About 500,000 kilowatts will be marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration.

But even these figures are dwarfed by the ultimate possible production from the hydroelectric development of our water resources The Federal Power Commission has estimated this potential at 77,000,000 kilowatts. With our country living in peace, and with our economy expanding, we should certainly be able to install 25,000,000 kilowatts of capacity within the next 15 years.

The thought of such an achievement ought to stir the imagination of all of us who are concerned with the electrifying of rural America. With REA lines tied into such a system, worries about the extent of the next fuel bill for individual plants, or about keeping the current flowing if the fuel supply is not available, will be a matter of much less significance. At the same time, the problems of fluctuating rates will be solved, and your cooperatives can move forward with a sense of security now too often lacking.

Our scientists speak occasionally of the possibility that the rays of the sun may some day be put to work. But right now the water which is deposited on our high mountains is being captured and put to work as it falls away to the sea, and it is the one great source of power we have which does not expend some of our valuable natural resources.

By constructing great storage reservoirs, we are able to regulate the flow of a river and ensure a water supply for power, and for irrigation in dry seasons, through holding back water near its source and by preventing floods as rain comes too heavily.

The benefits other than power production which come from our vast reclamation projects may, at first glance, lack immediate interest to rural electric cooperatives who are your members. But I urge you to study them closely for your objectives are closely related to their purposes.

The building of dams was begun for the purpose of irrigating arid areas. The public-power program got its start in 1905 as a very incidental phase of reclamation when a 1,000-kilowatt generator was constructed on an irrigation project in Arizona. Since that time, the Federal reclamation program has brought irrigation water to more than 5,000,000 acres of arid western land.

For each of the last 4 years, the gross crop production from this federally irrigated acreage has totaled more than a half-billion dollars. Those of you from the Western States know what your land would be like today without irrigation.

It is from these projects to water our dry land, by the building of dams and reservoirs, that our great hydroelectric production has sprung. The separate benefits of irrigation, or flood control, or power production are valuable to the Nation in themselves. Taken together, they constitute an integrated program of water-resources utilization, multipurpose in nature, from which there will continue to flow profits to our economy large in their potentialities for the people's enrichment.

At the present time, of course, the area served by these projects for which the Department of the Interior is responsible lies within the Western States. I am glad to report that a sizable share of the additional kilowatt capacity the Government is already developing will be in an area which we all have recognized as needing special emphasis. This is the great Missouri River Basin where the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army are pushing forward with the greatest program of river development in the history of mankind. And in the development of our great river basins, I am aware of and cannot overlook the other values that must be safeguarded.

The Congress determined in 1944 that something should be done about bringing the Missouri under control. Since the end of the war, we have been making great strides in this program, which will permit the development of an estimated 2,500,000 kilowatts of installed power capacity, the irrigation of some 5,000,000 acres of land now subject to the hazards of uncertain weather, and the achievement of other multiple benefits of modern resource development.

Power production and transmission are being firmly and carefully related to the physical and financial structure of this program. The initial power plant will be placed in operation during this summer at Kortes Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming. Additional capacity will be added rapidly with the completion of two dams on the Missouri in 1954.

There has been an unprecedented demand for the initial block of power, and applications for it have far exceeded available capacity. We have many reasons to believe that the needs of cooperatives within a 150-mile radius of these big dams will be cared for. In order to avoid needless duplication of transmission lines by generating cooperatives, we are already proceeding with an advance construction program of transmission lines in North Dakota, and we are studying the possibility of a similar program in South Dakota. We expect to be able to meet REA needs well in advance of the availability of power from the two dams I have mentioned by wheeling REA-generated power over federally owned lines.

This is another example of the kind of cooperative arrangement between our Department and cooperatives which can result in a substantial saving to both. Others could be described if time permitted.

The operating agencies responsible for marketing power in the Department of the Interior have been negotiating wheeling contracts with private utilities as well as with public agencies. I want to assure you that there is no arrangement, present or contemplated, which will affect the preference status of rural cooperatives. These wheeling arrangements represent a sincere effort on our part to make power available to cooperatives at the earliest possible date, and at the lowest rates consistent with repayment requirements as provided by applicable Federal laws and sound-business practices. Contracts will be made only when the rights of preference customers are protected.

Cooperation in the development and use of public power has been close between the Department of the Interior and the groups you represent. I hope that it will be increasingly a practice of the future. We shall make it our business to understand your needs, and to give them careful consideration in the execution of our programs.

I urge your members, in turn, to make it their business to study the meaning and the impact of water-resource development, and to grasp clearly what it will mean to them in the future.

We are all joined in a mighty national movement to develop our natural resources, and to put them to use for the benefit of all our people. As our farms and industries grow in production to expand our national economy, the need for low-cost power from our rivers will continue to increase. Considerable attention is already being directed toward the study of water and power potentialities in some of our eastern areas, particularly in the New England States.

President Truman, recognizing the impressive importance of an adequate water supply, recently appointed a commission to make a thorough study of the problem. This Commission is already at work, and considerable progress toward a final report has been made.

Two New England governors have recently gone on record as favoring river development for the production of electric power from their rivers.

The people in New England, awakening to the realization that rates for electric energy are higher in that area than in any other part of the country, are discovering that less is being done in their homes, on their farms, and in their factories by electrical methods than elsewhere in the Nation. The present Congress will soon consider an amendment to the flood-control bill, by Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, which would establish a New England commission of Federal and State representatives to make investigations and survey resources available.

We are presently organizing in the Department of the Interior the Southeastern Power Administration to market power from Army projects in the 10 Southeastern States. This organization, like others in the Department, will give preference in the marketing, over a 6-year period, of 1,500,000 kilowatts to cooperatives and public bodies. Since the projects in the Southeast are widely distributed, we hope and expect to be able to serve many of the REA groups either directly or through the generating and transmission cooperatives now being formed.

There is abundant evidence that the people of our country are becoming fully awake to the importance of their natural resources, and to the potentialities for human betterment which they promise. It is the intention of the Department of the Interior to continue our cooperation with your organization and other groups to make sure that these potentialities are fully realized.

We know, as you know, that the campaigns by selfish interests to defeat the people's will can be expected to continue. Legislation to sell power only at the bus bar, or the point of origin, will be pressed by those who would profit by such an arrangement. The development of public power will be called socialistic, and a threat to free enterprise.

But if we never falter in our devotion to the democratic principle that free men can direct their own affairs for their own greatest welfare, such campaigns will not succeed. Our Department, and your organization, will go on strengthening the democratic patterns which guide us to our common objectives.

Girl on a Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Girl on a Train," published in the New Hampshire Sunday News of March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIRL ON A TRAIN

Mavis Benjamin of Nashua, the whilom apple blossom queen of Hillsborough County, is off to the National Capital this week, as the guest of the New Hampshire Sunday News and the New Hampshire Society of Washington. She will appear in the Capital's annual Cherry Blossom Festival, and may win the title of "National Cherry Blossom Queen."

Miss Benjamin—who placed near the top in last year's Miss New Hampshire contest—was chosen for the Washington trip by the

Sunday News on extremely short notice, after an urgent telephonic appeal from the New Hampshire Society. This newspaper considers itself a most excellent, as well as totally disinterested judge of feminine pulchritude and charm. We will back Miss Benjamin against the field, and feel certain she would win the national title if only the choice were left to a board of flesh-and-blood experts instead—as it happens—to the decree of pure chance involved in the spinning of a wheel.

Whether or not fortune brings her the title, Miss Benjamin will remain queen of the Hillsborough apple orchards. A small anecdote will illustrate why we think her freshness and lack of sophistication, as well as her good looks, entitle her to this claim. It had been our plan to send her on to Washington by herself, to be met there by a chaperone furnished by the New Hampshire Society. Miss Benjamin demurred. She felt she should get her chaperone at this end, and make the trip with her. Questioning developed that Mavis, who is 22 and a professional model had never spent a night away from home—except with relatives—and had never gone even so far as New York on a train.

We were glad to accede to her wishes, and glad to send her to Washington as the glamorous but unspoiled symbol of all the nice New Hampshire girls who spend most of their nights at home, and seldom get the chance to go anywhere on trains.

Letter From James K. Knudson to Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter sent to me under date of March 24, 1950, by Mr. James K. Knudson, who has recently been nominated to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The letter is in the form of questions and Mr. Knudson's answers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 24, 1950.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: It was my privilege Wednesday March 22 to appear before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are a member, in connection with Senate consideration of my appointment by the President to the Interstate Commerce Commission. During the hearing acting chairman Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, suggested that it would be in keeping with your informal request if I submitted to you answers to certain questions which, I understand, you would have propounded had you been present at the hearing. The acting chairman handed to me two sets consisting of five pages of such questions, and I propose herein to answer them to the best of my present ability. I am sure you will realize that I am not presently acquainted with all of the problems implied by the questions to the extent that I hope to be as a commissioner, and that, therefore, some of my answers must be somewhat tentative. I shall answer the questions in the order in which they appear:

1. "What is your theory as to desirable rate making in the field of domestic transportation?"

I can truthfully say that I have no theories or predilections concerning this matter. I believe that the Commissioners and the Interstate Commerce Commission staff should be governed by the rate-making principles set forth by the Congress in the several parts of the Interstate Commerce Act, and particularly by the National Transportation Policy and section 15a of part I, and similar sections in other parts of the act.

2. "Do you believe that the free play of economic forces alone should govern in the transportation field?"

The answer to this question is obviously "No," for a "Yes" answer, as I understand the question, would suggest the desirability of no regulation whatsoever. Again, I refer to, and propose to be governed by, the intention of Congress in the National Transportation Policy, as it relates to this question.

3. "Do you believe that 'lowest possible cost of transportation' is always the cheapest form of transportation, and do you believe that such a standard must preserve a fair, compensatory return to the carriers?"

I do not believe that the lowest possible cost transportation is always the cheapest, in the long run. Unless competition is preserved in a balanced form there is always the possibility that the cheapest form of transportation will overcome other forms and be left as a monopoly in the field. Obviously, no carrier can operate long in the public interest without a fair compensatory return.

4. "Do you believe that one form of transportation, in competition with other and weaker forms, should be tolerated to make rates which either are noncompensatory, or made at no higher than 'out-of-pocket' cost levels?"

Noncompensatory rates are not lawful under the Interstate Commerce Act. But the zone of reasonableness in rate making is flexible, and depends to a large extent on the judgment of regulatory agencies. Such agencies should be governed in the exercise of that judgment by the intention of the framers of the act to prevent "destructive competitive practices."

5. "Do you agree that by such rate-making practices the stronger of the competing forms must inevitably drive the weaker forms out of business?"

Pursuant to the national transportation policy, it is incumbent upon the Commission to so administer the act as to develop, coordinate, and preserve the national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as by other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. So long as the Commission keeps this congressional mandate in mind there should be no danger of one form of transportation driving another form out of business.

6. "Are you acquainted with the highly essential role played in the war, at a time of high urgency, by the seagoing vessels of the coastwise and intercoastal fleets of the United States?"

This question calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer, and the answer is "Yes." This affirmative answer should be implemented by the recognition of the need for coastwise and intercoastal transportation media, both for purposes of national defense and in the interest of a balanced transportation system. I think it is only fair to add that I am also cognizant of the vital role played by motor carriers, pipe lines, freight forwarders, and railroads in the war effort.

7. "Are you familiar with the serious difficulties being experienced in preserving these vital facilities, or forms of water transportation because of the intensive competition of rival forms?"

This question also calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer, and the answer is "Yes," but perhaps I should add: Domestic coastwise and intercoastal water transportation is presently undergoing severe operating difficulties. Even though the national transportation policy may be fully observed, other steps may prove to be necessary to preserve their vitality as a national defense transportation medium. It is to be hoped that new and more efficient operating methods will be discovered and employed by domestic water carriers that will offset the burden of some of their rising costs of operation.

8. "Were such evidence placed before you, would you not be disposed, as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to act affirmatively and to the fullest extent of the powers conferred on the Commission in the direction of safeguarding against the elimination or crippling of these forms of domestic water transportation?"

Yes, as a Commissioner, I would, of course, be bound by the terms of the Interstate Commerce Act as a whole, but it may well be that further study of this problem would convince even the most objective thinker that the Interstate Commerce Commission, acting by itself, cannot solve the problem in its totality.

9. "Are you acquainted with the extent to which the Interstate Commerce Commission has admonished one particular form of competition against rate-making practices calculated to destroy other forms?"

I am partially acquainted with the extent to which the Commission has admonished carriers to cease destructive competition. Where the threat of destruction is real and has been proved of record, it may well be that mere admonition is not sufficient. Again, I refer to the binding provision of the national transportation policy.

10. "Are you acquainted with what has been identified as 'judicial restraint,' whereby the judiciary has liberally construed the powers of administrative and regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission?"

If by "judicial restraint" is meant the reluctance of Federal courts to overturn the administrative findings of fact of regulatory bodies, I am acquainted with the doctrine. It has been otherwise identified as the doctrine of administrative finality. The courts have gone a long way in the direction of honoring findings of fact made by administrative tribunals. The extent to which this doctrine has become rooted makes it ultra important for such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission to decide issues only on the basis of fair and complete showings of the facts. The enactment of the administrative Procedure Act reflects an added intention of Congress that the findings of regulatory agencies be made on the basis of substantial evidence, and affords the reviewing court a wider discretion to review facts than formerly declared.

11. "Conceding that the great values of such bodies, as viewed by the courts, turn on ability to cope with the highly technical and complex character of the business to be administered or regulated, would you agree with the suggestion that when such bodies, thought of as possessing a quasi-judicial status, move too far in their judicial procedures and concepts, they tend to destroy their effectiveness, and frustrate the purposes for which they were designed and created?"

It is my understanding that the Interstate Commerce Commission possesses three powers incident to the will of Congress: (1) a quasi-legislative power, pursuant to which it makes rates for the future, among other things, (2) an administrative power, pursuant to which it handles its day-to-day business, and administers such legislation as that requiring boiler inspection, prescrip-

tion of safety measures, etc., and (3) a quasi-judicial power, pursuant to which it can, inter alia, award reparations on a basis similar to that of a Federal court. Obviously, the Commission could destroy its effectiveness by moving farther than the law allows in any of these fields.

12. "In the light of the highly technical field of transportation and of the complexities of our present economic environment, do you believe that the primary functions of such administrative and regulatory bodies are effectively performed by the assumption of a status of an umpire?"

Formerly, it could be said that the Commission was, in a way, only an umpire in the field of transportation because of limitations in the law, but since 1920, when the original act was amended to broaden the Commission's powers, and particularly since the water carrier, motor carrier, pipe line, and freight forwarder parts have been added, the Commission acts in fact as a regulatory agency, and no longer "simply calls strike-outs and foul balls."

The questions answered below are from the second list submitted by you to the acting chairman, and I have used the same numbering as appears therein:

1. "Do you believe the maintenance and development in full vigor of common carriers by water, operating self-propelled vessels in the domestic trades, is necessary to the national economy and the national defense?" (This is a paraphrase of the statement of policy in the Merchant Marine Act, 1946.)

I am familiar with the declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The question is not a complete paraphrase of that policy. But I do believe the Interstate Commerce Commission should be constantly aware of all declarations of congressional policy that have an effect upon the administration of the Interstate Commerce Act. Stated otherwise, there should be proper correlation and enforcement of all laws enacted by Congress. I observe, again, however, that the Interstate Commerce Commission is primarily bound by the statement of national transportation policy given as a prelude to the Interstate Commerce Act. In all of this legislation, common carriers by water are assured the right of healthy existence.

2. "Are you familiar with the postwar problems and difficulties of water carriers operating self-propelled vessels in the domestic trades?"

The answer is "Yes," but I would expect to become even more fully informed through Commission channels and otherwise concerning problems that might arise of which I should take cognizance.

3. "What do you understand to be such problems and difficulties?"

So far as I am presently informed, the root of the water-carrier problem is increased operating costs. Whether such costs have been increased disproportionately with the operating costs of other forms of transportation is a question that will have to be decided on the basis of established comparative facts. It certainly is not a matter that I would care to prejudge. Allegations of unduly depressed rates, noncompensatory rates, and destructive competitive practices, regardless of what transportation agency they are directed against, should have the most painstaking scrutiny of any regulatory agency sifting the charges. The Commission has ample powers under the Interstate Commerce Act to deal with these problems.

4. "Are you familiar with the decline in number and capacity of self-propelled vessels operated in the domestic trades under Commission regulation?"

The answer is "No," except in a very general way, my understanding being that fewer vessels are now operating in intercoastal and coastwise trades than prior to the war.

5. "What is your position on the question whether the railroads should be allowed to maintain depressed rates on a level lower than normal rates where the principal object of such rate-making practice is to destroy or impair competitive water service?"

I believe I have already answered this question in my answers to questions No. 4 and No. 5 above, in the first set of questions:

6. "The Commission has from time to time in connection with general rate increases admonished rail carriers to adjust unnecessarily depressed rates. What has the Commission done to see that its admonitions have been followed? If nothing, why not?"

I regret that I cannot answer this question, because I do not know fully what the Commission has done, nor would I know its reasons for any action or inaction.

7. "You recognize that it is the duty of the Commission to maintain and develop a healthy and adequate coordinated system of transportation for the Nation. Indeed, was this not the plea of the Commission to Congress at the time it sought and successfully obtained jurisdiction over domestic water carriers? The foregoing being the case what if any affirmative rather than passive action has the Commission taken to fulfill its obligation?"

I believe I have fully covered my intended approach to these problems in the answers I have given above under the first set of questions Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 9.

8. "Since you recognize that restoration of the domestic trades is important to the national defense and national economy, would you please tell us what you or the Commission have done or propose to do to restore such services to their proper position in the national transportation picture?"

It would be manifestly impossible for me to foretell what the Commission proposes to do with respect to the matters contemplated by this question. I can only pledge that my actions vis-à-vis water carriers will be governed by the context and intent of the laws, by the factual records that are made by the parties of interest, and with a view to protecting the public interest in the premises.

9. "Do you believe the Interstate Commerce Commission should take the initiative in attempting to solve the problems and difficulties of water carriers in the domestic trades, or do you feel that it should merely await some action by those carriers?"

I am not adverse to the Interstate Commerce Commission's taking action on its own motion whenever circumstances warrant. The Commission has undertaken many investigations on its own initiative and, it is my understanding, has been handicapped in this field, in part, by budgetary limitations. In view of the Commission's heavy case load, I believe it is not inappropriate to suggest that there is a responsibility resting upon the various transportation agencies to keep the Commission acquainted fully with their problems. Although the Commission has an affirmative duty to maintain and preserve a national transportation system, this duty should not encompass the proper functions of the private managers of the Nation's transportation properties.

10. "A proceeding entitled 'Pacific Coastwise Rates' (Doc. No. 29722) is pending before the Commission. Following the release of an interim report, further hearings were held in February 1949, and the case was argued before and submitted to the full Commission in July 1949. The water carriers in Pacific coastwise trade have repeatedly advised the Commission they could not plan adequate resumption of service until that case had been decided, yet it is still pending. Can you offer some explanation for the reason for the delay in deciding that proceeding?"

I can offer no explanation for the Commission's not having decided the issues involved in this proceeding.

11. "Is there any Commissioner in the Interstate Commerce Commission who has had any experience in or familiarity with water transportation and its problems?"

I do not know.

12. "Do you believe that some member or group of members of the Commission should be delegated the prime responsibility of familiarizing themselves with the operation and problems of water carriers?"

I think that all Commissioners should become familiar with the operations and problems of water carriers and other transportation agencies as well. At present writing, I would not know whether water carrier matters within the Commission are sufficient to warrant the establishment of additional units for purposes of giving such matters expedited consideration.

13. "How many members of the Commission's staff have had actual experience in the field of water transportation?"

I do not know.

14. "Do you believe that the problem of competitive rates as between rail and water carriers is a pressing problem confronting the Commission at this time?"

Yes.

15. "Has the Commission done anything, other than deciding cases presented by complaining parties, a case-by-case approach to the problem, to resolve the problem of rate relationships as between competing types of carriers?"

I do not believe that the Commission's approach has been on the limited basis suggested by the question. If there are areas needing additional exploration, the Commission might well take the initiative within the limitations of its resources.

16. "What explanation do you have for the Commission's failure to attempt to work out some general policy covering the intercarrier competitive rates?"

I do not believe it would be appropriate for me to be either an exponent or an apologist for the Commission.

17. "The Transportation Act has been operated to abolish coastwise and intercoastal trade. Do you interpret the Commission's responsibilities under the act to accomplish and continue such abolition of competition?"

The first sentence of the question rests on an unsupported assumption. It is my understanding that considerable coastwise and intercoastal trade is now developing. The Commission should foster and protect this development to the extent authorized and directed by the national transportation policy and under the other terms of the Interstate Commerce Act affecting all carriers involved.

I trust that the foregoing answers reflect my earnest desire to be fair and impartial, and, to the best of my human ability, to administer and interpret the law without fear or favor.

I am returning herewith the two sets of questions handed to me.

Respectfully,

JAMES K. KNUDSON.

Loyalty Hysteria Boon to United States Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a constructive and incisive commentary on the current headlining of loyalty charges, written by John A. Kennedy, editor and publisher of the San Diego (Calif.) Journal of March 25, 1950. Mr. Kennedy's article is entitled "Loyalty Hysteria Boon to United States Foes."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE PUBLISHER'S DESK—LOYALTY HYSTERIA BOON TO UNITED STATES FOES

These are troublesome times in Washington.

Anyone in Government who has ever been known to have had a liberal thought or an acquaintance of liberal leanings—no matter how long ago—is considered by some politicians to be fair game in the latest klieg-light headline hunt in Washington.

The easiest way to explain away this new development of hysteria on the Potomac is to say that a brash young Senator with an inflated ego (JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin) is trying to smear the State Department in particular and the administration in general for his own selfish political motives. Unfortunately that is not the whole story.

There is an uneasy feeling that this is an inspired fishing expedition type of smear campaign. It goes like this:

Fill the air with charges, even though there is not a scrap of evidence to substantiate them, with the hope that some kind of case, even though a weak one, may be made to stick in one instance. Then the cry: "See! Washington is filled with Reds."

In a more serene period of history, this whole thing could be dismissed as a crazy political side show. But in a period when our Government is trying desperately to mobilize its full moral, economic, and political strength to stave off another world war, these antics give a great measure of comfort to our enemies.

The men in the Politburo may not have outlined the pattern for this campaign, but certainly it is doing for them what they have been unable to do for themselves. It is creating confusion and even distrust, not alone among some Americans, but also among some of our friends abroad.

It is easy to shrug off a charge that our Secretary of State is a "bad security risk" as just another political maneuver. But think what this charge means to the propagandists in the Politburo. It is not difficult to picture them gleefully congratulating each other on "our new allies in Washington" who have joined in the campaign to discredit democracy everywhere.

Can the loyalty program be divorced from politics?

The answer will in a large measure determine how Congress, as well as the country, will survive this latest subversive onslaught from those who, in the words of Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY, see in "every angle worm a spreading adder."

Political issues can be debated—and debated fully, and any and all so-called bad security risks can be weeded out of the Government, without the whole structure of Federal Government being held up to ridicule and scorn before the entire world. Anyone who rejects this reasonable assumption shows little faith in American processes.

President Truman acted wisely, in our opinion, when he established the Loyalty Review Board and named as its chairman Seth Richardson, an outstanding Republican lawyer. We think Mr. Richardson and the Board have performed a valuable public service, despite the noisy attacks from the far left and the far right.

The country is growing tired of the way many of the congressional hearings are conducted. Remember the Howard Hughes fiasco? That hearing, strangely enough, was conducted by the same body, the War Investigating Committee, that won such a great reputation for fairness during the war. The reason lies in the method of conducting the hearing.

The work of the War Investigating Committee was so outstanding that the then Senator Truman was given the Democratic nomination for Vice President in 1944.

That committee conducted its investigations on a nonpolitical basis. It heard witnesses in executive session; only when the facts seemed to warrant public action did it present the matter before public hearings. Witnesses were told that charges had been made against them and they were given ample opportunity to present their cases in advance—before it was hauled before the klieg lights. As a result, the committee performed a great public service.

Remember the Pearl Harbor investigation? Almost endless testimony and political bickering resulting in 39 volumes that have been read by few people. This was due, at least in part, to the method of conducting the hearing as well as the political climate prevailing at the time.

Contrast that investigation with the work of the Hoover Commission. The work of this Commission largely has been kept out of the realm of partisan politics—and we feel one of the major restraining influences has been the presence on the Commission of a group of outstanding private citizens.

We regret that the work of the Loyalty Review Board, composed of the same high-type Americans, has not been supported with similar vigor by more Members of Congress. Possibly this is due to the fact that some feel it is an administrative agency far removed from Congress.

If this is true, the problem could be rectified by the establishment of a joint commission, composed of Members of Congress as well as outstanding private citizens, to hear and investigate loyalty charges against prominent officials and to review cases that proceed through the normal agency—loyalty board channels.

And in addition, Congress should give serious thought to the promulgation of certain rules of fair play, to assure basic rights to every person under attack.

As Senator LUCAS has suggested, these might well include: (1) the right to compel the committee to subpena at least a limited number of defense witnesses; (2) the right to appear personally before the committee, before any charges are publicly aired; (3) the right to cross-examine witnesses, personally or through counsel. We believe too that Congress might well reexamine its privilege of immunity.

If Congress is to turn on the klieg lights every time some politically ambitious individual hauls cut a blunderbuss and aims it at a public official, then Congress, for its own good, should give the most careful consideration to the overhauling of its investigating machinery. If it fails to act in that direction, it may seriously damage its own prestige.

Every American has the duty as well as the right to insist that Government officials be competent, honest, and loyal. But if loyalty probes are not conducted on a more sensible, honorable basis, our Nation's prestige will suffer in the eyes of the world. This we can ill afford.

JOHN A. KENNEDY,
Editor and Publisher.

Alaska's Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article entitled "Alaska's Defenses," written by Marquis Childs and published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA'S DEFENSES—DANGER POINT IN ECONOMICS

(By Marquis Childs)

A decision has been taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff which illustrates all the problems of the Defense Establishment in relation to that much-debated word, "economy." Military installation of the United States in the Aleutian Islands off Alaska are, with one or two exceptions to be abandoned.

This is certain to cause both public and bureaucratic clamor. The decision was taken with a full realization of the risks involved, including the risk of public controversy.

The Aleutian chain extends for about 900 miles into the North Pacific. The islands are, for the most part, barren and fog-shrouded. The most important base to be given up is on Shimya, which is one of the few in the outer chain that is so flat planes can come in for a landing over water without difficulty.

Northwest Airlines uses Shimya as a base on the route to Japan. If this stop is abandoned, Northwest in all probability will have to change to a route on which another line is already operating. The Civil Aeronautics Board is expected to protest the abandonment of Shimya.

During World War II the Navy developed at Adak in the Aleutian chain a fairly large base. According to present plan, this will be maintained as a naval base, if only on a stand-by basis.

In the lengthy debate by the Joint Chiefs the decision on the Aleutians was based finally on the following reasoning. Possession of the outer Aleutians is of little value militarily either to the United States or to its potential enemy, the Soviet Union. The islands are extremely difficult to supply and the persistent fog greatly reduces their value as operational air bases.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff were fully aware of the public reaction should the islands be taken by the Russians in the event of war. An immediate demand would arise that they be retaken. The Joint Chiefs of Staff would resist that demand on the ground that they would be more of a liability than an asset to the enemy.

In World War II United States troops recaptured Attu and Kiska in the Aleutian chain from the Japs. The assault operations were badly bungled and unnecessarily costly.

As to the savings, one estimate is as high as $30,000,000. This is believed, however, to include savings to be made on the mainland of Alaska as well as in the island chain. The defense line for the mainland is based on Fairbanks and Anchorage in the belief that the wild and almost empty terrain to the west would be little use to an invader.

Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska has publicly expressed his deep concern over the

safety of Alaska, suggesting as others have that it might become the Pearl Harbor of another war. Total request in the 1951 budget for Alaskan defenses was $137,000,000. House economizers have cut this to $96,000,000. Gruening believes that not less than a billion dollars should be spent on Alaska's defenses during the coming fiscal year.

Gruening is an ardent advocate of statehood for the Territory, believing that only in this way can Alaska obtain funds sufficient for its defenses. The House already has approved a statehood bill and a Senate committee is expected to start hearings. Certain Senators have been using delaying tactics to prevent a vote on statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

This is, of course, a political question with which the Joint Chiefs cannot concern themselves. On a related issue they are conducting a debate with the Bureau of the Budget.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have asked for $100,000,000 for housing desperately needed for troops in Alaska. Present facilities are woefully inadequate for the approximately 8,000 stationed there and an expansion program is essential to take care of the 25,000 now planned for the defense of the Anchorage-Fairbanks line.

The Budget Bureau has suggested that only $75,000,000 of this could at the most be spent in one fiscal year. The Joint Chiefs of Staff argue that construction must be speeded up and the full amount spent in a 12-month period if Alaskan defenses are to be put on a stable basis.

A somewhat similar argument is going on over whether $50,000,000 or $35,000,000 can be spent in 1 year for construction of the radar warning network around North America. The network is also vital to Alaskan defenses.

The outsider has no means of judging the merits of these individual arguments. But the belief is growing that when economies originally made by military men themselves are compounded first by committees of Congress and then by the House and Senate, the danger line has in fact been reached or passed.

Peace of Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely and thought-provoking editorial, entitled "Peace of Mind," which appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram edition of March 28, 1950. The editorial follows:

PEACE OF MIND

Future historians and philosophers may, as Dr. George Gallup suggests, look back on this present period of man's experience as a time when men and women were sorely troubled—not by physical discomforts, but by an uneasy frame of mind, unhappiness and a seeking after a peace of mind that so often seems so elusive.

For extremely high percentages of the American people have confided to Dr. Gallup's pollsters that inner happiness and peace of mind are definitely getting worse for them, while their health and knowledge have been improving.

This seems, at first glance, a rather queer commentary on a civilization which has brought man more material comforts and luxuries than the richest and most powerful kings had a generation or so ago. American families have their automobiles, radios, televisions, and electric refrigerators, yet the indications are that happiness—real peace of mind—is somehow eluding them.

There is considerable verification for Dr. Gallup's findings, too. There has been a rising interest in psychiatry, and the psychiatrists' offices are crowded. Books—one of them in fact was called Peace of Mind—on attaining happiness and spiritual satisfaction have been selling at a phenomenal rate.

It is true, of course, that there have been powerful forces to destroy anyone's peace of mind. The atomic bomb, the world wars, the depression and the prevailing uncertainties of the age have all added up to inner conflict for many people. Yet Dr. Gallup's poll figures show, perhaps, one of the fundamental reasons for many cases of unhappiness. The American people say moral conduct and faith in religion have suffered severe setbacks in recent years. They have declined in about the same percentage as has man's peace of mind, according to those questioned by Dr. Gallup. There does seem to be a connection between the declining faith in religion and human unhappiness.

Centennial of Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a recent excerpt from the Clinton Daily Item containing the address of State Representative Henry W. Pickford at the Clinton, Mass., centennial banquet on March 14:

"The next speaker is known to everyone in this hall," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, the toastmaster, in introducing State Representative Henry W. Pickford.

"Born in Clinton, educated in our local schools where he distinguished himself not only as a student but as an athlete, able, prominent and successful lawyer, honest and courageous in his convictions, he has represented this district in the general court for several years. He has served our district with marked ability, earnestness and distinction.

"I am happy to present to respond to the toast 'Clinton and the general court,' Clinton's distinguished member of that body, the Honorable Henry W. Pickford."

Representative Henry W. Pickford, in responding to the toast, "Clinton and our general court," said:

"Congressman Philbin, Your Excellency, members of the clergy, Judge Buttrick, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

"To participate in a birthday party observing the one hundredth anniversary of a birth is indeed a rare privilege. It is also an occasion for joy and happiness which I am sure we all appreciate to the utmost.

"Commonly when marking an important milestone in the life of an individual one becomes retrospective and reminiscent about the days when the child was born. And it is none the less interesting to do so when observing the centennial of our municipality."

PETITIONS SIGNED BY 342 CITIZENS

"In January of 1850 eight petitions endorsing the idea of dividing Clintonville from Lancaster were signed by 342 citizens of Lancaster and through Representative E. W. Holbrook of West Boylston, with a bill were filed with the General Court of Massachusetts on the 17th and 23d days of January in that year. Some of the petitioners were Charles G. Stevens, Edward H. Fiske, Andrew L. Fuller, Alanson Chace, Levi Harris, Nathaniel Hastings, E. W. Goodale, Franklin Forbes, James A. Weeks, Charles Paine, C. L. Swan, J. C. Howe, James C. Kittredge, and Nathaniel Rice."

THE REASONS

"The reasons for the establishment of the town of Clinton, as set forth in these petitions, were 'that a manufacturing village called Clintonville has recently sprung up in the south part of said town, containing already a population of nearly 3,000 persons, whilst its favorable location, with the amount of capital invested in manufacturers gives assurance of a large increase. That the inhabitants of Lancaster proper and of Clintonville have separate and distinct interests and wholly different business associations; that the distance from the center of the town renders it expensive, while their occupations make it highly inconvenient for citizens of Clintonville to meet with other citizens of Lancaster, as they are now required to do, to hold elections, and for other municipal purposes.'"

LANCASTER ACTS

"Following the filing of these papers, legal notice of the same was served upon the elected officials of the town of Lancaster. Thereafter, on February 15, 1850, Lancaster held a town meeting to take action on this question.

"At this meeting it was voted 'that a nominating committee be appointed by the chair to report a committee of five persons who are to confer with a like committee from Clintonville, and report as soon as may be, what terms, in their opinion ought to satisfy the town of Lancaster, to consent and not to oppose a division of the town and said committee reported the following: John G. Thurston, Silas Thurston, Jacob Fisher, Henry Lincoln, and Nathaniel Warner.'

"The meeting was adjourned for 40 minutes, after which time this committee reported to the meeting the terms desired and they were accepted by the voters. A committee of three, consisting of Henry Wilder, Benjamin Whittemore, and John G. Thurston, was then appointed to ensure the inclusion of these terms in the act of incorporation."

OPINIONS DIFFERED

"The birth of this child, Clinton, however, was not accomplished without protest. Then, as now, differences of opinion existed and divergent views prevailed. Seventy-six residents of Lancaster proper and forty-seven residents of the part to be set off filed remonstrances with the legislature protesting the proposal of separation. The former group asserted 'we do not believe that this ancient town of the Commonwealth ought to be dismembered'—and 'the difficulty of making any just division the increased expense which another town organization will require' justify the remonstrance. While one element of the second group thought that the distance between Clintonville and the center village was not enough to cause a division as it was 'but 2½ miles over a good road, level nearly the whole distance with railroad accommodations in addition; that the territory of the

new town is too small.' And another faction in Clintonville, apparently concerned about taxes, set forth as their objection that 'a very costly town hall has been erected for the accommodation of the whole town for their public business.' "

BILL ENACTED

"However, the bill to incorporate the town of Clinton was enacted into law and approved 100 years ago this date on Thursday, March 14, 1850, and emerged as chapter 72 of the acts of 1850. This act set forth the area of Clinton, its tax obligation, requirement to care for paupers, imposed the necessity of paying Lancaster $10,000 in ten equal annual installments with interest as its share of any obligation due from Lancaster and provided the manner of holding the first municipal election.

"It is interesting to observe the matters of public concern considered by the legislature 100 years ago when Clinton was being incorporated."

STRANGE BILLS IN 1950

"These include a petition to grant some aid to a blind Indian of the Dudley Tribe; another petition that persons coming into the Commonwealth from those States in which colored seamen are imprisoned on account of their color may be required to give bonds to keep the peace while in this Commonwealth, especially toward its colored citizens; a bill relating to the carrying of sling shots; one to prevent the adulteration of spiritous liquors and several bills for the abolition of capital punishment.

PROPHECY FULFILLED

"Thus, tonight, we of Clinton revel in the fulfillment of the prophecy of our forebears made 100 years ago in their assurance for the town of a large increase and congratulate all of our citizens who have in the past century contributed to the present development of the town of Clinton. And in the present-day atmosphere of public thought, even as 100 years ago, of regard for our distressed citizens, concern with racial questions and public welfare generally we hope the birthday anniversary 100 years hence will find a still greater, more forceful and outstanding town of Clinton.

"In conclusion we salute and hail Clinton on this anniversary and say, 'Happy birthday.' "

Moslems Enjoy Full Rights in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, reports from the little State of Israel show how to teach democracy by practicing it. Its citizens of the Moslem faith are receiving a full voice in running their own affairs as well as the affairs of the state. This is a most encouraging development in view of the many problems still facing the countries of the Near East, which at times appear to us to be insurmountable. Courts, schools, community councils, and settlements are being operated by and for the Moslem Arabs, who number in Israel, 120,000 people. Moslem tribunals are already functioning at Nazareth, Acre, Haifa, and Majdal, and a fifth tribunal will soon open in Jaffa. Moslem committees are cooperating with the Israel Ministry of Religious Affairs in providing care for orphans and the aged, and for religious libraries and mosques.

There are now reported to be 150 Moslem officials in the Israel Government, the highest of these being Sheik Taher el-Tabari who is Israel's first district judge for civil and religious matters. That freedom of worship and cultural autonomy are not merely paper ideals is attested by the fact that Moslem religious rites now are conducted in more than 70 mosques in Israel, and the Arabic language is being taught in 27 schools. The Government has also appropriated substantial funds for the development of Arab villages and farming.

These and many other facts indicate that the Moslem population of Israel is accorded and is enjoying the same privileges as all other citizens of this newest democratic state. I have long urged that if there was a minimum of interference on the part of outside forces, the Israeli and the Arabs would come to an early and complete understanding creating a better relationship between them and a lasting peace in that troubled area.

A Shameful Trick

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we all know about a month ago the Republicans put on a great Lincoln Day celebration in Washington. Twelve or fourteen thousand attended this celebration and the price of admission was only $1.20 per person. The Government, through the tax on admissions, took 20 cents of that amount. A few days later the other party, whatever it may be called, Democrats or New Dealers, or a combination of both, put on a great show at a hundred dollars a plate, and paid absolutely nothing. They should have paid a tax of at least $100,000. When the President talks about closing loopholes he should not lose sight of this $100,000. He need not worry that he would be doing an injustice to persons earning small wages. Any person who can afford to pay $100 for a seat at one of these New Deal banquets surely can afford to comply with the law and pay the tax that he should pay.

Our distinguished and beloved colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. DANIEL A. REED, has put out a very positive and pungent release with reference to that situation involving the legality of the action of the Treasury Department.

Mr. REED's statement is as follows:

Congressman DANIEL A. REED, Republican, of New York, ranking minority member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee, charged today that the Bureau of Internal Revenue's recent ruling exempting from the 20 percent amusement tax the proceeds of the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally was a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism and that the Federal Government had been cheated out of over $100,000.

Congressman REED declared:

"In view of the position of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the $1 paid to attend the Republican Lincoln Day Box Supper Rally at the Uline Arena in Washington was subject to the 20 percent amusement tax, I requested on February 20 the Bureau to advise me whether a similar tax was payable on the $100-per-person Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally held in the Armory in Washington on February 10.

"After more than 1 month's delay I have just received the Commissioner's reply that the approximately $530,000 proceeds from the Democratic spree is not subject to either the admission or cabaret tax in the same manner that the proceeds from the Republican rally were held taxable. In view of the basic similarity of the two events, both of which included professional entertainment and political speeches, this ruling is a shocking example of taxation by political connivance and political favoritism. Although the Presidential henchmen hunger for the pennies paid by even our children in the form of the amusement tax on their movies, museums, playgrounds, county fairs, and many other simple pleasures, they avoid applying the amusement tax to any fund destined for the Democratic coffers for use in fostering their socialistic program.

"As a result of the Bureau's ruling, the Federal Government has been cheated out of over $100,000 in revenue. Even more significant than this is the revealing fact that the Democratic Party is unwilling to help the working men and women of America shoulder their tremendous tax burden.

"This type of tax discrimination and favoritism is indeed a new low in politics."

St. Patrick's Day Address by Hon. John Cashmore, President of the Borough of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1950, the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, delivered an inspiring address at the one hundred and first annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn. Under permission of the House heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include the text of Borough President Cashmore's address:

President Cronin, Father Flynn, distinguished guests, and members of the St. Patrick Society of Brooklyn, I feel, tonight, you are paying me a twofold honor.

To be your guest at this first annual dinner in your second century of progress is a rare distinction. But you have also given me the privilege to speak at your first annual gathering since that day last April—a day that will live in history—when Ireland threw off the yoke of bondage and became once more a free and independent nation.

So, I am grateful to your president, your officers, and to each and every one of you for this heart-warming act of friendship toward me.

The preceding speakers—and Father Flynn especially—have spoken this evening with great eloquence. I am sure that St. Patrick, looking down on this happy gathering, must be pleased. In fact, I would not be at all surprised, nor would some of you, if St. Patrick were to enter here and extend his blessing. Certainly the spirit is here, and I am not referring to the other kind of spirits which seem to go with an occasion of this kind.

Now, like many of you, I have never been fortunate enough to see the lakes of Killarney. Neither have I been privileged to visit where the River Shannon flows.

But, I am sure, I can find in my veins at least the one drop of Irish blood which, I know, your society requires for membership. I know, too, I can gain admittance in one other way. And that is by mentioning just two magic words, St. Patrick, that same password the American patriots used over 150 years ago—on the night of St. Patrick—when the British were evacuating the port of Boston.

That password, St. Patrick, is but one example, I think, of the manner in which the patriotism of the Irish has been interwoven in the whole history of America. To honor their patron saint, we, of America, need only to glance at the heroic deeds of the sons of St. Patrick in our own land. They are many and historic. And it is in the achievements of his sons that the true greatness of a good and loving father can be seen and appreciated.

From our earliest days, our Nation in its struggle for independence, had one of its greatest bulwarks in the Irish. Ireland set the example. In their own native land, and down through the centuries, the Irish laid down their lives in thousands to resist oppression. With such a history, is it any wonder that Irish immigrants should have played such a vital part in the founding and making of America?

The hopes, ambitions, and strivings of the Irish have always been for freedom. The principle upon which the American Nation was founded, the end to which it was dedicated, is that same freedom. Easy to explain, then, is the fact that the Irish immigrant has never found it difficult to be a faithful son of St. Patrick and a loyal citizen of the United States.

In rich full measure we have seen that American loyalty of the Irish immigrant. During the Revolution, more than one-half the soldiers in General's Washington's Continental Armies were Irish. Our own beloved Brooklyn was defended against the redcoats of Cornwallis by General Sullivan.

Indeed, if you gentlemen are willing to take the word of a statesman in the British House of Lords, with regard to the Revolution, I offer you the classical remark of Lord Mountjoy. In explaining the British disaster in America's War of Independence, he readily admitted England was defeated by "Irish emigrants."

So it is that in this year of 1950, Irishmen and the sons of Irishmen find no need to protest their American loyalty. For the Sons of St. Patrick have marched beneath the Stars and Stripes for a century and a half. Their bones lie beneath our every battlefield, their blood illuminates our history's every page. And the true measure of their greatness lies not merely in what they have done, but in that which they have not done. Comb the pages of America's history as you will. No traitor to this Nation will you find among them. Commodore Barrys, General Sullivans, Father Duffys you will find in profusion, but an Aaron Burr or a Benedict Arnold—never.

Yes; the Irish have given much to America—and to the world. And more than mere loyalty was theirs to give.

To France and Germany they brought Christianity and the love of God even as they brought liberty and the love of freedom to America. But the civilization they brought, the way of life they preached, was always taught—never imposed. It was a culture carried, not by the weapons of warriors—but borne on the lips of poets and scholars, who came to sing and teach of God and peace.

Throughout her long history, that same deep spirituality, that same love of peace remained the keynotes of Ireland's international conduct.

By a happy coincidence, it was one whose memory we honor tonight—the great John Boyle O'Reilly, who set forth in words undying the splendid record of Erin's peaceful statesmanship. O'Reilly's proud boast is one that few nations can equal and none can surpass:

"We have wronged no race, we have robbed no land,
We have never oppressed the weak;
And this in the face of Heaven is the nobler thing to speak."

Much of our own American credo of peace we see contained in that poetic statement of a nation's peaceful past. And happy, indeed, we in America should be, that this ancient and honorable race has been reborn this year in the family of free nations.

Ireland that has given so much to so many nations of the world in the past, today, like all other nations, needs the world. And the world needs Ireland—because a people that believes in peace and works for peace is sorely wanted in the councils of nations.

A world in agony cries out for men of faith and principle who will die if need be in defense of their faith and their principles.

With whole races enslaved by an alien Godless tyrant, oppressed people everywhere need the spark of hope and courage that can come only from men who have freely offered life and fortune for God and freedom.

If the races enslaved in Europe are ever to rise—and rise they must—they will need the inspiration of nations that have overcome a despot's rule.

Significant it is that the slave master of Europe and Asia has thrice vetoed the application of the Irish Nation for admission to the world forum we call United Nations. Eire can wear those three Russian rejections as medals of honor. For the world knows now that those medals of honor are the symbols of freedom and liberty. They are the credentials of free men who believe in the fatherhood of God and the dignity of man.

It is also significant, I think, that only 2 days ago the first American envoy of ambassadorial rank, ever to represent this Nation in the capital of the new Irish Republic, left for Dublin. By that gesture we acknowledge, we emphasize, that America stands on the side of men of principle, lovers of liberty, and defenders of freedom. By our action we indicate to a world seeking vainly in its councils for peace, that we Americans can commend to it the example of this brave and ancient Celtic nation, free at last after 700 years.

And in commending to the world this Irish Nation, we act in the hope that side by side with America she may help bring peace to a troubled universe.

God grant that Ireland and America whose destinies have been so long interwoven in struggles for lasting peace and freedom, may achieve together their hope of centuries.

And may Ireland whose brave sons gave their lives to fulfill the American dream of independence, may this glorious Ireland achieve her ambition of the ages, to be like America, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Depletion—Parallel Cases in the Lumber and Mining Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 24, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, much consideration is being given at this time to depletion allowances made to mining companies for taxation purposes. To make a comparison between depletion allowance made to a small lumbering operation and a small mining operation, and ascertain the method by which depletion is computed in taxing these two basic industries by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I have submitted parallel hypothetical cases to the Bureau and insert my letter and the Bureau's reply for the information of my colleagues:

MARCH 10, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: With reference to the plan of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in making depletion allowances, I would be very pleased to have a statement concerning the depletion that would be allowed in the following case.

The Ale Co. owned a timber stand of 10,000,000 feet valued at $1 per thousand. Under their operating program, one-tenth or 1,000,000 feet would be cut and manufactured each year; and at the end of 10 years, this timber stand would be completely exhausted. What depletion is this company allowed annually?

And I would be very pleased to have a statement concerning the depletion that would be allowed in the following case:

The Byron Co. owns a lead-silver mine with an indeterminate quantity of ore. The company, by their mine operation program, will extract and process 10,000 tons of ore, valued at $10 per ton, that will be marketed annually. There is an indication that the ore deposits in the mine will be completely exhausted in 10 years. What depletion will be allowed annually to this company?

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 22, 1950.

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: Reference is made to your letter dated March 10, 1950, relating to the depletion allowance provided by the Internal Revenue Code in the case of taxpayers who are in the timber business and the mining business.

With respect to the timber allowance in the case of the Ale Co., if the adjusted basis of this timber under section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code is $1 per thousand feet, then the annual depletion would ordinarily be computed by multiplying the number of thousands of board feet cut in

any year by $1. Of course, if exactly 1,000,000 feet were cut each year the annual allowance would be $1,000 or 10 percent of the total basis. Although depletion may be determined on the basis of the percentage of the total stand cut, as a rule it is simpler to multiply the units cut by the proper unit rate.

It may be noted, that if the taxpayer so elects in his return, the provisions of section 117 (k) (1) of the code are applicable. That is, the difference between the adjusted basis for depletion and the fair market value as of the first of the year for the timber cut during the year may be treated as a long term capital gain, provided the timber has been owned for more than 6 months prior to the beginning of the taxable year.

In the example cited, if the fair market value as of the first of the taxable year is $2 per thousand feet, then the difference between this figure and the adjusted basis may be treated as a long term capital gain under section 117 (j) as follows:

Fair market value of timber cut (1,000 at $2)	$2,000
Adjusted basis of timber cut (1,000 at $1)	1,000
Capital gain	1,000

If an election is made under section 117 (k) (1) then the fair market value of the timber cut during the year shall be considered to be the cost of the timber which was cut, in lieu of the actual cost or other basis of such timber, for all purposes for which such cost is a necessary factor.

With respect to the Byron Co. the percentage depletion would be 15 percent of $100,000 (10,000 tons at $10 per ton) gross annual income from the property, or $15,000, provided that the net income from the property before depletion was at least $30,000. If the net income from the property before depletion was less than $30,000 the allowable depletion would be 50 percent of such net income as provided in section 114 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code. However, section 114 (b) (4) also provides that in no case shall the depletion allowance be less than it would be if computed with respect to the adjusted basis. Section 114 (b) (1). The depletion computed on the adjusted basis might be substantially greater than the percentage of income depletion.

Since information as to the cost or adjusted basis of the property under section 113 (b) (1) (B) is not available, and you state that the reserve of minerals is indeterminate, it is impossible for this office to compute the alternative allowance for depletion provided in the Internal Revenue Code. It would be highly desirable, however, for the taxpayer to make some reasonable estimate of the mineral reserves and determine the depletion allowable on the adjusted basis since the statute provides that the larger of the two computations is allowable in each year and that the basis shall be reduced by such amount. It might be necessary in some future year for this taxpayer to determine the correct adjusted basis for the purpose of determining gain or loss in the event of sale. Under such circumstances it would not be permissible to compute the adjusted basis on the theory that the reserves of mineral are indeterminate. Hence, some determination of the reserve should be made in the light of the facts which are known by the taxpayer even though such a determination of the reserve of mineral may be only a rough approximation.

If any further correspondence is necessary in connection with this matter, you are requested to refer to the symbols IT:EV:NR-LPA.

Very truly yours,

GEO. J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

Crop Insurance Is Here Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the editorial from the March edition of the Louisiana Farm Bureau News entitled "Crop Insurance Is Here Again." This reads as follows:

CROP INSURANCE IS HERE AGAIN

Many Louisianians have noted with interest the fact that crop insurance, once killed by Congress because of heavy losses suffered by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, is on its way back. The experimental program authorized by Congress has proven much more successful and crop insurance once again promises to be an important part of the national farm program. This year, cotton crop insurance is being offered in Bienville, Richland, East Carroll, Catahoula, Washington, Caddo and Natchitoches Parishes. Combined insurance on cotton, corn, sweet potatoes and rice will be offered in St. Landry Parish and combined insurance on these crops plus sugarcane in Lafayette Parish.

The new program differs from the old in several ways. First, it is intended not to assure the grower of any particular percentage of a regular crop, but rather of his investment in his crop. It offers protection against complete disaster and provides the insured grower with money to pay his costs or put in another crop next year. Secondly, premium payments and indemnity payments are figured in dollars and cents rather than in pounds of cotton.

But the most interesting difference, perhaps, is the combined insurance plan, which makes crop insurance available in general farming areas and not just in cotton areas, or wheat areas, as the case might be. The general farmer takes insurance on his investment in his entire crop, not just one of his crops. Since he has several opportunities for hitting, so to speak, his rates are lower than the rates for insurance on a specific crop.

Since the coverage for both cotton insurance and combined insurance is on a different basis from the old cotton crop insurance program, rates in general are lower and the program appears to be on a somewhat sounder basis.

Address by Hon. Austin J. Kittredge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Austin J. Kittredge at the centennial banquet on March 14 in honor of the founding of my home town of Clinton, Mass. The remarks of Judge Kittredge, chairman of the centennial committee, appeared in the columns of the Clinton Daily Item of March 15, as follows:

(In his introductory remarks and in presenting the toastmaster Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Chairman Kittredge said:)

His Excellency, Lieutenant Governor, Congressman Philbin, Reverend Clergy, Representative Pickford, Honorable Judges, Mr. Foster, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen:

No birthday party would be complete without song and music and it becomes my happy privilege at this time to present our master of ceremonies, one whose accomplishments and success in that field gives assurance of a pleasant and enjoyable evening.

His life has been one of song; his profession a noble one; his purpose in life is to spread cheer and happiness, to gladden the heart music, to stir the imagination, to bring a sparkle of the eye and laughter to the lips. All this he has accomplished by his many compositions which have won for him a place high in the ranks of his profession.

During the last war he gave freely and generously of his time and talents to brighten the lives of his fellow servicemen in the camps and in the hospitals.

Honored by the members of his profession by being elected to high office in the American Society of Composers and Publishers, he has come home to be with us tonight.

He has given to us our centennial song which you will hear tonight for the first time.

It is with profound pleasure that I give you our genial, talented and lovable master of ceremonies John Redmond Lynskey.

On behalf of your committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, I extend to you, one and all, a very cordial welcome and wish to thank you for your very generous response to our invitation to be with us tonight.

On March 14, 1850, just 100 years ago today, an act of the legislature incorporating our town of Clinton was approved by the Governor. Tonight we celebrate her anniversary.

The story of her growth and development, the achievements and success of her distinguished sons and daughters, I leave in more capable hands and to more eloquent tongue than mine.

(Chairman Kittredge read the following letters:)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 11, 1950.

DEAR MR. KITTREDGE: The foresight of the citizens in establishing Clinton as a town a hundred years ago is amply justified by the things accomplished during the last 10 decades.

Clinton had the advantage in sharing in the historic traditions of the fine old town of Lancaster and thus came into being under happy circumstances. It also has had the advantage of superior location, rich natural resources, and a diversity of industries.

Great as are all of these assets, I am one who thinks that any community's chief wealth is in its men and women. And Clinton has raised up a very large number of able citizens who have enriched the life of the State of Massachusetts and the Nation.

I have in mind one citizen, a Clinton boy born and bred. I wish it were possible for me to be with you next Tuesday evening so that I might acknowledge to the community the debt of gratitude and appreciation I owe to Matt Connelly for his invaluable service to me through many years. Wise, resourceful, industrious, and always tactful, he is one of those faithful and efficient public servants without whom government could not function.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

AUSTIN J. KITTREDGE,
Chairman, Clinton Centennial Committee, Clinton, Mass.:

Many congratulations to the town of Clinton for having completed its first century. Deeply regret that my necessary presence in Washington in connection with the current investigation of the State Department makes it impossible for me to leave the Capital. Otherwise I would certainly be present to extend my warm personal greetings. As a Senator from Massachusetts, I am always proud to refer to Clinton as a particularly progressive American community. May the next 100 years be prosperous for you all. Please call on me for any service that I can render.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
March 13, 1950.

AUSTIN J. KITTREDGE, Esq.,
General Chairman, One Hundredth Anniversary Committee, Holder Memorial, Clinton, Mass.

DEAR MR. KITTREDGE: It is a great pleasure and a real privilege for me to convey to the good citizens of Clinton my hearty congratulations and sincere good wishes on the occasion of the Clinton centennial banquet. An event such as this, celebrating 100 years of achievement, is one in which you all can take great pride and in which the Commonwealth and Nation can properly join.

Since that faraway day in 1654, when John Prescott began grinding corn in his mill on South Meadow brook, the growth of this town we know and love today as Clinton has been steady and sound. Although a full century has passed now since Clinton came to maturity as an incorporated town, there has been not a single year in which it has not made an important and valued contribution to Massachusetts and to New England. In business, in industry, in education, in Government, and in religion, the town of Clinton played a valued and vigorous role always. We all salute the town with pride and with enthusiasm. May this centennial year have many happy returns.

Sincerely yours,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senator.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
THE SUPERIOR COURT, BOSTON,
March 11, 1950.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very much distressed at my inability to be present at the centennial of the town of Clinton, but it is impossible for me to attend.

It will be 53 years the 10th of the coming September since I started the practice of law in the town of Clinton, and it seems like yesterday. I owe a great deal to the people of Clinton, and I wish for them the following: health, prosperity, and an enriched cycle onward to through the next century.

It is a great privilege, to assemble to observe a centennial to pay our respects, and honor a town so rich in heritage. Clinton is the birthplace of many famous men and women, folks who have left their mark and their influence felt in the far corners of the earth.

Clinton has kept abreast of the times with her pioneer spirit, always at the front, ready for a new day in industry, and modern methods. We have come a long way within a hundred years. The mother town of Lancaster has every right to be proud of her offspring. We can count on Clinton to keep faith in the twentieth century and to forge ahead as successfully as in the past. We shall continue to improve our living conditions, and overcome hardships, as in the past.

Sir John Prescott, our founder, would be proud to see the vast changes which have come to pass here in the Nashua Valley during the past 300 years.

Yours truly,
ALLAN G. BUTTRICK.

Under an article in the warrant for town meeting held on October 17, 1949, a committee of 25 was appointed to make all arrangements and to conduct a celebration worthy of the occasion. Tonight we officially open the celebration. The general celebration will begin Sunday, May 28, and continue up to and including June 3 of this year. If hard work and careful planning mean the success of any undertaking, I know that your celebration will be a huge success.

I wish at this time to sincerely thank the members of the general and executive committees and all subcommittees and organizations for their generous and wholehearted cooperation. I further desire to thank the press for their liberal donation of time and space in their papers. To each and every one who have given of their time and ability, I extend my sincere thanks. I thank all our distinguished guests for their kind acceptance of our invitation to be with us tonight.

To his excellency, the Governor of our Commonwealth, who has honored us by being with us, I give my sincere and grateful thanks.

The chairman of every committee has its compensations as well as its worries, and tonight I feel fully compensated in having the honor and pleasure in presenting Clinton's most distinguished citizen, a man who has never failed to answer the call of civic duty, many times at a great personal sacrifice; a man who has, and always will, acquit himself with credit and distinction wherever he may go, be it in the halls of Congress or elsewhere; a man who will continue to bring still greater honor to himself and to his town, your Congressman, my Congressman, the people's Congressman, our Toastmaster, PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

False Social-Security Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the continental Foundry and Machine Co.—Chicago works—circulate the following unfair and false propaganda to its employees. It is fortunate that the employees today are informed and cannot be mislead or intimidated. Twenty years ago this propaganda might have been effective:

JANUARY 11, 1950.

FELLOW EMPLOYEE: Why the pay cut? You may find a little less than you expected in this pay. It isn't our idea. This year, because of the failure of Congress to postpone the evil day, your and the company's social-security taxes were increased from 1 to 1½ percent, beginning with the first pay roll in 1950. This means that this year we are compelled by law to hold back from your earned pay one-half again as much as we did last year (up to $45 a year) and turn this part of your pay over to the Federal Government, together with an equal amount from the company.

You get nothing more for this increase in your taxes. It is simply that the cost of the original social-security program has naturally gone up as more and more of us are reaching 65, and Uncle Sam has no sources of revenue to pay the cost of this or any other Government program except what you and we, as taxpayers, provide. This pay cut is the way the Government collects from you its increasing cost of operating this one program.

If the cost of social security continues to go up, and it probably will as more and more people retire, these taxes are almost bound to be increased again. In fact, if the Senate this year follows the lead of the House of Representatives and passes a proposed amendment of the social-security law, your social-security bill will go up to 2 percent of your regular pay next year and will keep on going up.

No matter what the cost, you and we, as taxpayers, will have to pay the bill for whatever social-welfare programs we adopt. Unlike some other countries, Uncle Sam has nowhere else to turn when he needs money except to us.

So, for 1950, your social-security tax will be 1½ percent of your pay. Where it will go from there is partly up to you. Think it over.

CONTINENTAL FOUNDRY & MACHINE CO.

A Measure of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, published in the April 11 issue of Look, is "must" reading for every good American. The author, Arnold Forster, is the civil rights director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The league annually surveys the status of civil rights in the United States. Its chairman is New York State Supreme Court Justice Meier Steinbrink.

In sending this article to me the director of Look magazine states:

We believe this is the strongest blow to bigotry and intolerance ever published by any magazine. I am sure you will want to read it and hope you will bring it to the attention of other Representatives.

I agree completely with what he says about this article, and I am glad to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

Listed in the article are the big-time bigots who use anti-Semitism as a means to fill their purses and to undermine democracy. Here, too, you will find the answer to the question, "Are our colleges really democratic?"

The article is as follows:

A MEASURE OF FREEDOM

(By Arnold Forster)

How far can a rabble-rouser go in inciting an audience in a public hall against a religious group? In deciding this issue, the nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court felt compelled last May to write four separate opinions.

The case was that of the *City of Chicago* v. *Arthur Terminiello.* The constitutional principle involved was that of free speech. Did Terminiello have the unlimited right to stand up in a Chicago auditorium and make an inflammatory speech against a religious group?

The majority position of the court can be summed up in the phrase: "Let them get it off their chests." This view is supported by such a liberal group as the American Civil Liberties Union.

ANOTHER VIEWPOINT

But there is another section of opinion, equally concerned with the preservation of democracy, which asks the question: "Haven't we learned from the tragedies of Nazism that you must protect the people against the dissemination of completely false and vicious appeals to religious hatred?"

This is no mere academic dispute. It reaches directly into our daily lives.

The majority opinion of the Court rejected a concept of law which would prohibit such acts of incitement as Terminiello's speech. It declared that one function of free speech is to invite dispute. "It, free speech, may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger." Deciding that the case at hand evidenced no "clear and present danger of a serious substantive evil that rises far above public inconvenience, annoyance, or unrest," the majority held that Terminiello's speech was protected from censorship.

LIBERTY OR ANARCHY?

Against this majority view, Mr. Justice Jackson, speaking for himself and Mr. Justice Burton, wrote: "This Court has gone far toward accepting the doctrine that civil liberty means the removal of all restraints from * * * crowds and that all local attempts to maintain order are impairments of the liberty of the citizen. The choice is not between order and liberty. It is between liberty with order and anarchy without either. There is danger that, if the Court does not temper its doctrinaire logic with a little practical wisdom, it will convert the constitutional Bill of Rights into a suicide pact."

Freedom to speak, or freedom to destroy a religious or racial group? Can we protect the first and stop short of the second?

This much can be said with certainty: Only an antidemocrat can espouse serious restriction upon the rights of free speech, assembly, press, religion, and the other guarantees of the Bill of Rights. But unfettered license to say and do as one pleases does not limit the right of others to condemn what is said or done as a threat to the country's welfare.

If Gerald Smith has the absolute right to label the Jews, before an audience of a thousand Americans, as a menace to the country, Jews have the right to label him an anti-Semite and declare it from the rooftops. If the KKK has the right to condemn Catholics for allegiance to the Vatican, Catholics have a right to label the hooded order un-American. If Congressman JOHN RANKIN proposes that American Negroes be deported to Africa, it is right for these Negroes to label him as a racist.

THE FREE SPEECH ISSUE

Some freedom-minded men are reluctant to label any viewpoint un-American. To condemn a viewpoint as antidemocratic may be to silence it forever. And there, once again, we are confronted by the same clash over free speech.

Until the questions arising from this issue can be resolved within a democratic framework, one must use the weapon of public condemnation intelligently and cautiously. But there can be little argument today about the wisdom of exposing democracy's enemies. No wall can keep the facts of prejudice from democracy's citizens.

We now realize, too, that no group or class is safe from corroding prejudice so long as any single one among them is insecure. When a United States Supreme Court judgment declares that restrictive covenants in real estate are unenforceable, it protects not only the Jew or the Negro in the free right to choose his home; it also prevents the development of slum ghettos.

JEW HATING IS BIG BUSINESS

One responsibility falls upon all interested in preserving democracy—to encourage those who are helping the Nation and to expose those who are trying to destroy it with racial or religious hatred.

Organized bigotry seeks to undermine the security and welfare of minority groups. It is the "white supremacy" and anti-Catholicism of Klan groups; the distorted theology preached by hypocrite "reverends."

Money is the inspiration of organized hatred. A handful of promoters who make Jew hating a business enjoy a comfortable income. But for the bulk of the bigots the pickings are slim—a fact which explains the disappearance in the last year of at least 35 once-active groups.

In 1949, 57 organizations, 23 of them newcomers or reactivated groups, were engaged in spreading anti-Semitism in the United States. Nine other propaganda outfits, while not directly involved in such activity, were controlled by known anti-Semites. These groups used an assortment of façades in search of respectability; 36 disguised themselves as politico-economic groups; 16 others used religion as a front; 2 posed as educational organizations; 12 boldly publicized themselves as out-and-out racist groups.

There are 49 anti-Semitic periodicals. Their format varies from crudely mimeographed throw-aways to expensively printed magazines. The basic anti-Jewish themes they embrace are monotonously repetitious.

THE LEADERS AND THE LINE

The petty hate merchants take their cues from a handful of top propagandists. These leaders, wittingly or otherwise, interpret current events in the light of their own prejudices and issue a line which is promptly absorbed by a mass of followers.

These leaders include:

Gerald L. K. Smith: Bigotry is big business with Gerald Lyman Kenneth Smith. He makes it pay substantial dividends. In 1949, his total "take" exceeded $150,000. Though making a very good living, he fails to win any serious following for his crackpot Christian Nationalist Crusade.

Attendance at Smith's meetings varies from 50 to 2,000, depending upon locality and the intensity of his planned publicity. In 1949, he concentrated in the Los Angeles area, where he spoke before several overflow audiences of 2,000. In other sections of the country, he drew an average of less than 300.

The 1949 convention of his Christian Nationalist Crusade, held at the St. Louis Kiel Auditorium, was sparsely attended; audiences were as small as 30 and never exceeded 150. But the virulence of his program was undiminished.

Circulation of Smith's monthly magazine, the Cross and the Flag, remains virtually constant at about 25,000. He also continues to issue his usual quota of pamphlets and newsletters.

Hardly a year passes without Smith's becoming involved in the creation of some veterans' organization. Last year was no exception. In the fall, he lent a hand in the formation of a National Veterans of America, whose offices were established in the St. Louis headquarters of the Christian Nationalist Party. The charter aims of this enterprise include: the preservation of America as a white Christian nation, and the limitation of immigration to European white Christians.

Smith depicts himself as the archenemy of the Reds. Despite the preposterous exaggeration about the number of his followers—more than 3,000,000—Smith undoubtedly makes some impact upon the more unstable elements in some communities in which he appears.

Joseph P. Kamp: In one respect the suave Joseph P. Kamp is a greater nuisance than the crude Gerald L. K. Smith; Kamp has succeeded in deceiving a greater number of important people regarding his real nature and true purpose.

As this is written, Kamp faces a possible prison term. Indicted in December 1944 by a Federal grand jury for self-righteously refusing to reveal the officers and contributors to his Constitutional Educational League, Kamp has thus far avoided serving his 4-month sentence by a series of legal maneuvers. A petition to the Supreme Court for a review of his case is now pending.

While preoccupied all through 1949 with an impending jail term, Kamp found ample opportunity for his propaganda work as acting chairman of the Constitutional Educational League.

HITLER'S APPROVAL

His record of antidemocratic propaganda began in 1933. Some of his early efforts earned him the approval of World Service, an official Nazi news bureau. Join the CIO and Help Build a Soviet America, which he wrote in 1936, was recommended by the Hitler news agency in 1938; it was also sold at the German-American Bund's Aryan bookstore in Los Angeles.

In the early days of World War II, Kamp's destructive propaganda concerning this country's war effort finally got him into difficulties. In July 1942 and again in January 1943, his Constitutional Educational League was named as an organization used as a tool by groups indicted by Federal grand juries for conspiring to undermine the morale of the armed forces.

Walter Winchell, who publicly branded Kamp a Fascist, was the subject of a vicious pamphlet in which much space was devoted to a discussion of the columnist's alleged real name (originally pinned on him as a joke by humorist Harry Hershfield and then maliciously spread by Fritz Kuhn). Actually, Winchell is his real name.

A substantial part of the league's income comes from subsidies and contributions which Kamp promotes from large industrial organizations and wealthy individuals interested in his antilabor, antidemocratic propaganda. Kamp has a list of 500 such contributors.

Upton Close: In a banquet speech on October 29, 1949, Upton Close, the former radio-network news analyst, accused Roosevelt and the Jews of having caused his removal from the NBC network in 1944.

Close's career, which began in the early 1920's, gave no clues in its formative years to the role he eventually was to play. An obscure author who had traveled widely in the Orient, Close eked out a living during that period by speaking before ladies' clubs on such innocuous topics as Cherry Blossoms and Pear Orchards. Twenty years later the same Upton Close, by then a national network news analyst, was being denounced as a Fascist and anti-Semite.

CLOSE BLAMED THE JEWS

The commentator's metamorphosis became evident in the early forties. He was one of those who minimized the threat of Hitler and Japan. At the same time, he developed an antagonism toward Jews, who, he claimed, were pushing the United States into war.

In 1941, in a San Francisco speech, Close declared: "There will be no more democracies ever again in Europe until the Island Empire and its umbilical protégés outside cease interfering in Europe, and I have an idea that that is what many of you still think while the Anglophiles and the Jewish people on the umbilical coast east of the Hudson River lose their heads. * * * I can quite understand how those two groups

can be taken for a ride in the taxicab of sympathy for England or hatred for Hitler."

In 1945 Close revealed his attitude toward the so-called Jewish problem in an open letter to Nathan M. Ohrbach, the department-store owner: "I wonder if four million or forty million dollars' worth of hired agents can buy or wheedle the love of people. I wonder if there is any solution at all to the problem of keeping the majority from regarding with some reservations a minority which makes its basic principle that of maintaining its own peculiar identity."

In 1946 Close attacked Chcago's Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, and the Catholic prelate blasted Close's "untruthful statements, unjust implications, despicable insinuations and utter intellectual dishonesty."

Close climaxed his checkered career as a network commentator by appearing over the Mutual network under the sponsorship of Merwin Hart's National Economic Council. Beginning in February 1946, these broadcasts ended abruptly on February 11, 1947.

There followed a period of hard times for Close. For a while he turned to Mexican stations. Late in 1949, however, he began to stage a comeback. In November he reported to his subscribers that his transcribed propaganda was being carried by more than 100 stations.

Close maintains that he is neither anti-democratic nor anti-Semitic. He once made an offer of a $1,000 war bond "to any person who will produce anything I have ever written or said in public that is anti-Jewish."

But his record belies the denial. He incorporates thinly veiled attacks against Jews or sly innuendoes aimed at them, as when he stated: "We have just passed through Brotherhood Week, as very skillful promoters named the week of collecting for a program of racial tolerance under the National Committee of Jews and Christians. * * * The idea of brotherhood is very often twisted. Some one faction, or element, wants to be the big brother and boss all the rest * * *."

His fundamental distrust of democracy was made evident in his radio broadcast of March 20, 1949: "The Government of our Nation is a representative Republic," he said. "All the wise men who won independence and founded it agreed that it should be a representative republic, not a democracy."

Merwin K. Hart: Anti-Semitism such as Merwin K. Hart exhibits is never a sudden acquisition. It takes years to develop. Hart's antidemocratic roots lie deep. But as president of the National Economic Council, the Harvard-bred propagandist likes to pose as a high-minded patriot whose organization is "dedicated to the preservation of human liberty, including maintenance and invigorating of private enterprise, rights of property and American independence." His record hardly fits this high-sounding description.

Hart never reveals his anti-Semitism in a vulgar way. His attacks upon Jews are cloaked in opposition to opinions among different groups of Jews. If the group does not exist, he creates it.

Hart repeatedly disavows anti-Jewish prejudice; his record makes it necessary.

After Roosevelt's death, Hart immediately issued one of his council letters on America's destiny, and used the opportunity to attack Jews in American life. He captioned his piece: "Shall alien minds determine America's future?" and then listed 81 men and women in American life (most of them persons whose loyalty and distinguished service to the Nation are universally esteemed). Of the 81, no less than 72 are Jewish. Included were the late Stephen S. Wise, Henry Morgenthau, James P. Warburg, Paul M. Warburg, Albert Einstein, Nathan Straus, Abba Hillel Silver, Albert D. Lasker, Felix Frankfurter, Benjamin V. Cohen, Walter Winchell, Leonard Lyons, Adolph Sabath, David E. Lilienthal, Bennett Cerf, and Ben Hecht.

THE GIESEKING CASE

Rarely does Hart miss an opportunity to inject his prejudices into a public controversy. When the United States Government refused to approve the visit of Walter Gieseking, the German pianist, to this country in 1949, the Economic Council Letter reported: "Jewish Communist influence dictated this high-handed procedure. It is clear this influence overruled agencies of the Government of the United States."

Anti-Semitism is not Merwin Hart's sole activity. He devotes much of his attention to pro-Franco propaganda. He pleads the cause of the Spanish dictator with every means at his command.

In 1944 Walter Winchell exposed a particularly unsavory aspect of Hart's pro-Franco operations. The columnist discovered that Hart was cooperating with Jane Anderson, an active Spanish agent who later broadcast Axis propaganda over the Berlin radio.

Hart's Franco sympathies, like his anti-Semitic attitude, stem from an anti-democratic bias. In 1940, he publicly proclaimed his fundamental distrust of American democracy. Speaking before the Nassau Club in Princeton, N. J., he declared that democracy is the rallying cry under which the American system is being prepared for despotism.

The same year, a distinguished New York Union League Club gathering heard him declare: "It is time to brush aside this word 'democracy'."

Hart is a shrewd fund-raiser. Last year the National Economic Council's "take" was at least $140,000. Most of this came from a small group of prominent industrial leaders who see Hart as an ardent champion of their narrow concept of the American way of life. A current list of contributors reads like a section of Who's Who in American industry. One wonders whether the officials of these great businesses know him for what he is—one of the Nation's key bigots.

Now let us see how much prejudice there really is in America.

Fortunately, there seems to be little deliberate anti-Semitism in responsible quarters. The basic democratic ideal is violated from two sources: first, prejudices which have led to deeply imbedded discriminatory practices; second, community tension or controversial public issues which bring hatreds to the surface.

In Congress, for instance, there were fewer anti-Semitic remarks in 1949 than in 1948. Representative ED GOSSETT, Democrat of Texas, used the displaced persons problem as the lever for his expression of anti-Jewish bias. He told a Washington, D. C., audience of the American Association of University Women that the admission of Jewish DP's was "an injection of virus into our bloodstream which is already becoming polluted."

In connection with the same DP issue, Senator PAT MCCARRAN demonstrated his essential hostility toward Jews. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he refused to allow any testimony at the hearings to amend the DP Act of 1948, concerning the plight of European Jews. Ironically he agreed to schedule hearings on displaced Pakistanians, Arabs, and Germans.

THE QUOTA SYSTEM

When we come to the realm of unspoken prejudice which exists in deeply imbedded practices, however, we have another problem. Such a problem is the racial and religious quota system used in admission to colleges.

Theoretically, the doors of American colleges and professional schools are open to all students who have the necessary financial resources and scholastic ability. In practice, however, many institutions exclude or limit Jews, Negroes, Italians, and in some cases Catholics and others.

The discrimination suffered by Negroes who seek higher education differs from that of members of other minority groups. Segregration of the races is established by law in 17 States and the District of Columbia. Negroes cannot share the same classrooms with white students in these jurisdictions. Segregation and exclusion of Negroes in the South is, of course, a publicly avowed policy. No college or professional school, however, publicly admits using a quota system to restrict the admission of minorities.

ADMINISTRATORS CONDEMN IT

Administrators of 140 liberal arts colleges, questioned by the Anti-Defamation League on their policies of admission, were remarkably unanimous in condemning the quota system: "I think it would be a fine policy if all higher institutions would admit students irrespective of race or religious creed. * * * I am in hearty accord with your efforts to eliminate discriminatory practices in the field of college admissions. * * * We do not tolerate quota ideas. * * * Our admissions policy is based purely on a student's school record. * * * I am not interested in whether a student is a Jew or a Negro."

And yet discrimination does exist. In November 1949, Dr. Floyd W. Reeves, chairman of the Committee on Discrimination of the American Council on Education, provided a conference of educators meeting in Chicago with the following facts:

1. All researchers agree that there exist racial, religious, economic barriers to higher education.

2. For many youths, restricted curricula and inadequate educational facilities present formidable obstacles to education.

3. Many institutions employ techniques in the admission of students which lend themselves to discriminatory practices and appear to serve no purpose other than that of discriminating against youths from certain minority groups.

The Anti-Defamation League in 1949 made a study of the application forms of 518 liberal arts colleges and found that over 92 percent contained at least one question which could lead to discrimination (such as race, religion, or parents' nationality).

One additional research project deserves mention. In October 1949 two letters were sent to each accredited liberal arts college in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. One letter was signed with an apparently Jewish name, and the other with an apparently non-Jewish name.

DISTINCTION IS MADE

Both requested application blanks for entrance in the fall term of 1950. No qualifications were given by the "applicants."

Of the total of 106, 41 responded differently to the non-Jewish letter. This distinction in handling was revealed in any number of ways. In some instances, the "Jewish" applicant received only an acknowledgement, while the "non-Jewish" applicant received an application form; or the "Jew" received no response whatever, while the "non-Jew" did; or the "Jew" received only a primary application form while the "non-Jew" received a final application form.

To prevent any unfair conclusions from this survey, these 41 institutions were tested again in November with another apparently Jewish and another apparently non-Jewish letter. The final codification of the two surveys disclosed that only four institutions in both instances gave apparently preferential treatment to the non-Jewish names.

Strangely enough, on the campus itself, the students show less anti-Jewish prejudice than their elders. College students are overwhelmingly opposed to quota systems and other discriminatory admissions policies.

In an ADL survey just completed, only 1 out of 10 seniors expressed a preference for colleges which discriminate. By contrast, almost one-third of the general adult population—including college graduates and non-graduates—are so inclined.

To determine how much prejudice college students feel toward Jews, Negroes and other minorities, researchers asked a series of key questions which probed such sensitive areas as education, social contacts, housing, employment and intermarriage.

AN ENCOURAGING PICTURE

An encouraging number of students did not want to set any limits, short of actual intermarriage, to their association with minorities. Almost 80 percent of the non-Jewish seniors said it would make no difference to them if a member of a minority group worked beside them, and almost 70 percent would be willing to entertain any of them in their home. When it was proposed to move a minority group member into the neighborhood, the shoe really began to pinch—but even here 47 percent said they would not object.

Although the college seniors were overwhelmingly outspoken against barring minorities from college admission, they were slightly more prejudiced about admitting Jews to fraternities and sororities. There was still an over-all majority opposed to any discrimination even here; although not a majority of fraternity members.

Since the exclusion of Jews from Gentile fraternities and Gentiles from Jewish fraternities is the usual rule on American campuses, it is encouraging that this rule finds so few defenders who frankly admit they prefer it that way. When the Phi Kappa Psi chapter at Amherst recently put up a fight for its right to pledge a minority group member, it was voicing a growing preference among college students.

The low index of prejudice on the campus is apparently, however, not the result of a college education. The incidence of prejudice among seniors is largely the same as that for freshmen.

YOUTHFUL IDEALISM

It is difficult to say why American colleges have made no significant contribution in reducing anti-Semitism. Perhaps the major job of education in fighting prejudice is being done in high schools, and the only prejudiced students left are bitter-enders with whom education has already proved ineffective.

Actually, the absence of prejudice among many college students may be due to the idealism of youth. Perhaps, in 10 or 20 years, these same students may be considerably more narrow-minded and prejudiced.

In all of this, we, as citizens, have a democratic responsibility. Unwholesome racial and religious prejudice and discrimination in the United States are blemishes on an otherwise healthy body politic.

The strengthening of democratic life in America is the job not of any single group or individual, but of every citizen who would enjoy the benefits and the freedom that America gives. Men and women in the conduct of their daily affairs must at all times be aware of the need to protect their democratic heritage.

A BACKWARD STEP

Wholesome attitudes must be instilled into the hearts and minds of all the people. Attention must be focused on flagrant violations of justice and fair play; and public opinion must mobilize behind the forces struggling to shape this Nation into a better likeness of the ideals upon which it was founded.

The sorry failure in the last year to obtain the passage of even one Federal civil-rights law in Congress was not just a matter of standing still; it was a step backward.

By comparison with other years, the enactment of civil-rights legislation on the State level indicates true progress; the overall picture is heartening.

At the beginning of 1949, only four States had fair employment practice laws. Today, there are eight such States. The enactment of fair employment practice acts has also begun. Legislation forcing the Ku Klux Klan to unmask is spreading throughout the South.

There are three fundamental forces which can be used to fight prejudice—law, education, and community action. Education may prod a community to action and lead to the enactment of legislation. At the same time, legislation itself is frequently a potent educative force.

AIMING AT TARGET

In the use of these forces, it is not enough to rest with the expression of well-meaning generalities. It is necessary to deal with realities. The targets must be pointed out clearly. Lip service to the concept of equality is not enough. There must be an insistence upon such steps as elimination of discriminatory practices in housing, in education, in employment, in voting, and in the use of public accommodations.

A secure and free people who have adequate opportunity to lead happy lives will reject those who spread hatred. On the other hand, exhortations will have little effect in breaking down racial and religious hostility while men are frustrated or while they are afraid.

There can be no freedom from discrimination in employment until there is full employment. There can be no freedom from discrimination in higher education until there are adequate facilities for all persons capable of higher education. There can be no freedom from discrimination in housing until there are ample housing facilities for all. Where there is scarcity, and men compete desperately for the basic necessities of life, the minorities—and eventually the majority—will be at the mercy of those who stir up hatred and fear.

Racial and religious bigotry cannot thrive in an economically and democratically healthy society.

Planes Over Shanghai Raise a Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose copy of an article entitled "Planes Over Shanghai Raise a Question." This article was forwarded to me by Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, retired, a former resident of the State of Louisiana who is now in China. It is worthy of consideration, thought, and study by the Congress. The article is as follows:

PLANES OVER SHANGHAI RAISE A QUESTION

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, March 21.—Appearance of strange fighter planes over Shanghai, as reported by the Chinese Nationalist Air Force, raises the question of how far Russia will go to clinch the final victory of communism in China.

If these were fighters of the new Chinese Red Air Force or of a Russian or international volunteer group—and there is no other possible explanation—they mark a new phase of Russian intervention.

Three blunt-nosed planes diving out of the Monday morning sun over Shanghai's Lunghwa airfield while Nationalist P-51s reconnoitered there probably mean Russia will go as far as she can without openly assuming a belligerent role in China.

She would not want to precipitate American help to the Nationalists whom the United States State Department has repeatedly written off as ineffective champions of a lost cause. Yet, that "lost cause" has become an increasing threat to the China Red regime and the Russians are aware of it.

The Communists will never be secure in China so long as Chiang Kai-shek and his followers continue their stand in Formosa and Hainan and keep needling the Reds by sea, air, and occasionally by land, with a view to a mainland come-back.

(A United Press dispatch from Hong Kong reports that between 5,000 and 10,000 Russian troops are taking an active part in China's civil war. These troops reportedly are (1) helping bolster Chinese Red resistance against increased Nationalist air attacks, (2) may be used to discourage uprising against the Red regime by starving Chinese and (3) may be used to insure the pro-Kremlin faction of China's Communists against nationalist Communists.)

Nationalist air attacks on strategic targets in China's largest city, Shanghai, seem to be forcing Russia's hand. The three strange planes probably are part of a 50-plane fighter force which the Russians are said to have furnished Red China, along with technical and probably flying personnel.

Recent bombing of Shanghai's airfields and the former air training center near Hangchow were intended to wreck that fighter force before it could be uncrated or assembled, it was disclosed here. Perhaps the fighters were of the group previously reported ordered from Czechoslovakia.

The P-51 scouts who reported the Red planes said they were of a kind not used by the Nationalists. They looked something like Japanese Zeroes. Indeed they could have been Zeros if the Russians have taken the trouble to preserve those captured in Manchuria in 1945.

Significantly, Red China's air arm seems to be making ready with non-American planes rather than with the American-made fighters and bombers that fell into their hands.

Appearance of the new type in this way tips Russia's hand both as to planes and pilots.

New fighter types probably mean that Russians or other experienced foreigners are flying them or that Chinese pilots were trained in such craft long ago in Manchuria. Fighter pilots cannot be produced overnight and readily transferred from a known kind of plane to an unknown.

It is possible, of course, that every plane in Red China will be used eventually. But it has been generally accepted that the Reds would first take the air in P-51's, B-25's, and B-24's, if for no other reason than to foster the fiction that the Chinese Reds armed themselves largely from American-made equipment captured from or surrendered by the Chinese Nationalists.

Since there was no shooting in yesterday's encounter over, Lunghwa, it could be assumed the Reds' new fighters were merely being tested.

This Is the Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said that is misrepresentative concerning the central Arizona project that I feel impelled, as one of the authors, to state briefly just what the project is, that all may read and check my statement.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands held lengthy hearings on H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 in March, April, May, and early June of last year. The record of those hearings has been printed and is available.

H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 are bills authorizing the central Arizona project and the construction, operation and maintenance of the Bridge Canyon Dam together with appurtenant dams and canals, to generate power and take badly needed water from the Colorado River into central Arizona for lands that are now irrigated but with an inadequate supply of water. The project will make available greatly needed hydroelectric power and the water to be diverted to central Arizona will save the economy of that entire State.

The testimony and evidence presented at the hearings clearly establishes: (a) the need for the project. It is clear from the testimony and the evidence that without additional water on lands now cultivated in central Arizona the economy of the sovereign State of Arizona will enter a period of decline ending in chaos and disaster to the great detriment of the entire Southwest and of the United States.

The need for the project and the need for the water in Arizona is admitted by the few opponents of the authorizing legislation.

(b) It is clearly established by the evidence that the water is available in the Colorado River for the proposed diversion to central Arizona of 1,200,000 acre-feet per annum. All the engineers agree that the water is physically available in the river.

(c) The plan of the development to serve the needs as outlined above is clearly established by the evidence to be the best possible plan and to establish the fact that the works to be authorized by the authorizing legislation will serve the need.

(d) It is clearly established by the evidence that the project is feasible and that the cost of construction will be repaid with revenue derived from the sale of power and from the delivery of water and it is clearly established that all of the cost, except approximately 1½ percent made nonreimbursable for benefits to flood control and fish and wildlife conservation, will be repaid in full within a period of 73 years.

The economic feasibility is clearly established by the report of the Bureau of Reclamation and the independent economic analysis of the Doane Agricultural Service of St. Louis, Mo., and by the testimony of many men who are thoroughly familiar with the area and the people involved.

Companion and identical bills were introduced in the Senate of the United States at the same time that H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 were introduced in the House. Lengthy hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that committee made certain amendments and reported the bills as thus amended to the Senate of the United States as S. 75.

Other amendments were made on the floor of the Senate and the Senate on February 21, 1950, passed the bill as thus amended by a vote of 55 to 28. The act as passed by the Senate has come to the House in due course and the Senate amendments are acceptable to me and my colleague as the sponsors of H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 and therefore we urge passage of S. 75 by the House.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate amended the bill as originally introduced to provide for the protection of Indian rights with provisions which were accepted by and are acceptable to the tribal councils of the Indians involved, and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and further amended the bill to make reimbursable costs of benefits, which in the original bill as introduced were made nonreimbursable and to prohibit the construction of any steam plants for the production of electrical energy, none of which were ever contemplated at any time and also to remove any possible objection from the National Park Service by limiting the height of the dam to a height which was and is acceptable to the National Park Service.

All of these matters are fully and clearly set forth in the Senate debates on the floor on February 6, 17, and 21, 1950, and the positions of the Federal agencies and departments are clearly set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for those days or in the record of the hearings. The Senate further amended the bill as originally introduced in order to permit suit to be brought by any State which might allege that the use of water for the central Arizona project would in any manner interfere with or jeopardize any of its uses or rights.

Arizona, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Interior, the Colorado River Basin States Committee, representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the Senate of the United States are firmly of the opinion that the water for the proposed central Arizona project for use in Arizona is clearly within the legally established right of the State of Arizona and that the use of that water does not in any manner jeopardize or interfere with the use of water or the right to the use of water of any other State in the Colorado River Basin.

Their opinion is based upon the law of the river, the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the California self-limitation statute and the Arizona water delivery contract of 1944 between the United States and the State of Arizona under which the United States undertook to deliver water from the Colorado River to permit the beneficial consumptive use to the maximum gross quantity of 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum. The water for the central Arizona project is certainly within Arizona's share of the water. Arizona has the right to rely upon the Congress of the United States to see that the State of California respects and lives within its solemn agreement and covenant with the United States which was made expressly for the benefit of the State of Arizona and the other basin States forever and unconditionally limiting the use of the waters of the Colorado River in California. The law of the river is clearly established and under it Arizona is clearly entitled to the water for the proposed project.

Certain special interests in southern California dispute that belief and accordingly provision is granted by S. 75 as passed by the Senate to the joinder of the United States in any suit brought by any State to challenge Arizona's right to the use of the water and it is provided in the authorizing legislation as passed by the Senate and as now before this House that works to be used solely for the diversion of water from the Colorado River into central Arizona shall not be commenced until the termination of such a suit if one is brought.

The works authorized by the bill to be thus deferred until the conclusion of such a suit if one is brought, are by the Bureau estimated to cost some $267,000,000. The works about which there is no dispute and which it is admitted are all badly needed in the Southwest are estimated by the Bureau to cost approximately $440,000,000. All of these figures are from the estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation based on costs as of July 1, 1947. Actually costs are now declining and contracts have been let by the Bureau of Reclamation for much less than their estimates. In recent months the Bureau of Reclamation has let contracts 15 to 42 percent below the estimates of July 1, 1947. The construction of the works authorized by the authorizing legislation will necessarily extend over many years and it is apparent at this time that the cost of the works authorized by this legislation when built will be much less than the estimate of July 1, 1947, of the Bureau of Reclamation.

This Congress in the act admitting Arizona to the Union as a sovereign State, imposed a condition reserving to the United States all the dam sites on

the Colorado River and lands across which transmission lines or canals could carry either power or water from the Colorado River into Arizona and in the enabling act required that the State of Arizona agree to such conditions in its constitution, and Arizona did so.

The Congress therefore, by such act, effectively walled off Arizona from power and from water from the Colorado River unless there be later authorization by the Congress of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States—Two Hundred and Eighty-third United States Reports, page 423—has held that Arizona cannot utilize any of the water of the Colorado River without the consent of Congress.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held—Two Hundred and Eighty-third United States Reports, page 423, and in Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth United States Reports, page 558—that there does not now exist any controversy over the use of water for the proposed project within the jurisdiction of the Court and that the Court cannot take jurisdiction in any such matter unless and until Arizona is authorized by the Congress to divert water from the Colorado River. Then and then only can any State that might feel injured or that might allege that it was injured by the authorized diversion bring an effective action to enjoin such diversion.

Such court action is authorized in S. 75 as passed by the Senate and as now before the House, so that any State that feels a grievance will be given its day in court and in the meantime no construction of any works which might be involved in such action could be undertaken.

Authorizing legislation is therefore essential now in order that a controversy within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court might be started, if any State feels endangered, in order that the Supreme Court might by final and definite judgment end the controversy and the dispute which has delayed many years the development of the natural resources of the whole Colorado River Basin to the detriment of the people of that region and of the United States as a whole.

In no other way can the matter be authoritatively and finally settled. Every possible safeguard of the national interest and of all the States and of each of the States of the Colorado River Basin has been written into and is contained in Senate bill 75 as passed by the Senate of the United States. With the passage of that measure by the House of Representatives and the approval of the measure by the President of the United States, peace will come to the Colorado River Basin and the full benefits of that great natural resource will be made available to the people of all the States of the Colorado River Basin and to the great benefit of the whole of the United States.

Such, briefly stated, is the legislative case of the central Arizona project now before the Public Lands Committee of the House.

Is Holy Writ a Traitor's Bible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the following article which appeared in Destiny magazine, Haverhill, Mass., for March 1950:

IS HOLY WRIT A TRAITOR'S BIBLE?

ACHESON QUOTES THE BIBLE

The jury has convicted Alger Hiss of perjury and he has been sentenced to a prison term. His lawyers have appealed the case to a higher court and, in the meantime, he is out on bail. Without awaiting the outcome of this appeal, Secretary of State Dean Acheson has stated that, regardless of the action of the jury and the courts, he will not turn his back on Alger Hiss. He then cited certain verses in Matthew, chapter 25, as a precedent for his expression of loyalty to his friend.

In the chapter of Matthew's gospel in the New Testament referred to, Jesus Christ was instructing His disciples concerning those nations who were to enter into the blessings of the Kingdom of God. He stated that when the Son of Man comes, all nations will be gathered before Him and He will separate the goat nations from the sheep nations. The sheep nations in the parable questioned Him as to what they had done to give Him meat to eat and water to drink, or when did they see Him as a stranger and take Him in? Jesus replied that insofar as they had done these things unto one of the least of His brethren, they had done them unto Him.

TRAITOR IS A CRIMINAL

Mr. Acheson should read these passages over again and carefully note that our Lord did not say criminals were to be given this aid and comfort; rather, it was His brethren who were to receive such succor. By no stretch of the imagination can Alger Hiss, a traitor to his country, be placed in this group. He has not shown himself to be a righteous man, nor can he be numbered among those who have suffered because of service to the Lord in faithfulness to Christian standards.

In its actual setting, this parable is national in aspect and the goat nations are those who have demonstrated their propensity toward evil aggression and tyranny against the peaceable. The sheep nations are those who have desired peace and abhorred war, yet have been willing to become involved in war to go to the assistance of those who are downtrodden and persecuted. The Secretary of State has overlooked the real intent of the parable, and also that Jesus said it was the stranger or foreigner suffering unjustly whom the sheep nations were helping and for which they were to be rewarded.

ACHESON REWRITES BIBLE

When Mr. Acheson undertakes to construe our Lord's instructions to mean that individuals should be loyal to persons convicted of crimes, and that they should defend them regardless of the evil acts committed by them, he is giving voice to the criminal's code of conduct, not the high ethical standards and teachings of the Scriptures.

Alger Hiss was convicted of perjury. Under the righteousness of the law of the Lord perjury is a serious crime, even carrying the death penalty in certain cases. Treason to the Government is punishable by death. In stating that he would support Alger Hiss regardless of the facts, Secretary of State Dean Acheson has violated the Scriptural injunction that, upon conviction for a crime, the criminal must pay the just penalty. No official may forgive or forget a crime committed against the state, but must mete out true and impartial justice, making the punishment fit the crime.

BIBLE A BOOK OF JUSTICE

"The law, 'Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe,' is a rule governing the administration of justice, demanding that the punishment fit the crime and that there be no excessive punishment in any case. If a hungry man steals a loaf of bread, he should not be punished as the thief would be who robs his neighbor of all his goods.

"Jesus referred to this law and declared it was the law, but He counseled individuals not to conduct their personal relations, one with another, in accord with this rule of law governing the judges who must make the punishment fit the crime. Individuals can forgive and forget all manner of trespasses committed against each other, but the judge cannot forgive and must administer the law in justice." (Digest of the Divine Law, p. 143.)

CRIME AGAINST THE STATE

This principle is equally applicable to all officials in Government. Mr. Acheson has a definite duty in his official capacity, for the crime was committed in the department of the Government of which he is today the head.

When the commandments, statutes, and judgments of the law of the Lord were originally given, the people of the nation were instructed concerning what their attitude must be when a criminal is convicted of a crime against the welfare of the state:

"Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him." (Deuteronomy 13: 8.)

WHAT OF HUMAN SLAVERY?

If Mr. Acheson is so desirous to keep the requirements laid down by our Lord concerning help for the oppressed, setting the prisoners free, and liberating the slaves, as well as visiting those in prison, let him, as the head of our Department of State, set in motion ways and means to aid the millions in prison behind the iron curtain. God-fearing men and women are suffering and dying, and many are even now languishing in prison who have committed no crime other than to desire personal freedom.

What of the unfortunate Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, whose nations we allowed to be enslaved by the tyrants in the Kremlin with hardly a protest? What of the millions of unfortunate human beings in China being thrown by our State Department to the Red wolves of Moscow? They are strangers it is true, but it was the stranger, not criminals, we were to help.

DARE ACHESON TURN ON HISS?

Can it be that Mr. Acheson is trying to hide something and actually dares not turn his back on Hiss? His defense of a convicted criminal leads one to wonder if he is not serving notice that, in case Hiss should talk later, he, Mr. Acheson, is remaining loyal to him, thus notifying Hiss to refrain from implicating him in any way with previous questionable activities within the State Department? If Hiss finally faces no alternative but a prison term and should decide to talk, the revelations would very likely have all the force of a bombshell explosion in their implications. Could this fear be one of the reasons why Mr. Acheson has experienced some sleepless nights since the conviction of Alger Hiss for perjury?

Why a Coast Guard Reserve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the article entitled "Why a Coast Guard Reserve?" by Lt. Walter K. Handy, Jr., United States Coast Guard Reserve. The article is excellently written and presents in a strong manner the reason for a Coast Guard Reserve. I invite the attention of all the Members of Congress who are interested in the preservation of this country to read it carefully. The article is as follows:

[From the Reserve Officer of October 1949]

WHY A COAST GUARD RESERVE?

(By Lt. Walter K. Handy, Jr., USCGR, president of the ROA Coast Guard Headquarters Chapter, Washington, D. C.)

It requires only about 20,000 to 25,000 officers and men to perform the peacetime duties of the Coast Guard, but another 150,000 are necessary to carry out its wartime functions. And for these the Coast Guard must rely on its Reserve.

In peacetime the Coast Guard, which is the smallest of the military services, operates under the Treasury Department as a law-enforcing, life-saving, life-protecting agency. It regulates and supervises the loading of dangerous cargoes, inspects vessels and enforces maritime safety regulations, and maintains search and rescue services, aids to navigation, weather stations, iceberg patrols and many other services for the safety of persons at sea and the protection of both lives and property in normal times and in time of disaster.

But the Coast Guard must always be prepared to undergo a rapid transformation, expanding to many times its peacetime size in order to fulfill its roles as a specialized service within the Navy in time of war. The key to this rapid expansion for wartime service is the Coast Guard Reserve. The experience during World War II is a vivid illustration of the importance of the reserve in wartime expansion. Prior to our entrance into the war the Coast Guard numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. By VJ-day the military strength of the Coast Guard exceeded 172,000 persons, of which about 144,000 were reservists. In short, it requires only about 20,000 to 25,000 officers and men to perform the peacetime duties of the Coast Guard, but another 150,000 are necessary to carry out its wartime functions. And for these the Coast Guard must rely on its reserve.

But the whole story is by no means told in terms of numbers. The United States code specifies that "the Coast Guard Reserve, as established on June 23, 1939, is a military organization and a component part of the Coast Guard for the purpose of providing a trained force of officers and enlisted persons which, added to the personnel of the regular Coast Guard, will be adequate to enable the Coast Guard to perform its functions and duties at all times."

The reference to "trained personnel" adequate for the performance of the Coast Guard's functions and duties at all times is significant. In meeting the responsibility for manning vessels assigned to the Coast Guard, the maintenance of aids to navigation, search and rescue services, merchant marine inspection, and similar functions. the Coast Guard can utilize the training and background of its regular personnel augmented by reservists trained or experienced in these fields. Many reservists with the proper training and background will be required to augment present crews and to man vessels of all types. Others will operate high-frequency direction-finding stations used to locate distressed vessels and aircraft. The inspection of merchant vessels for safety, the examining and licensing of merchant marine officers and the investigation of merchant marine disciplinary cases both in the United States ports and overseas will require additional reserve personnel in wartime. Pilots and crews for rescue craft will also be required by the expanded necessity for search and rescue services. In addition, the increased requirements of wartime communications, the administration of personnel and maintenance of records will all necessitate the rapid availability of reserves to supplement the regular personnel.

In addition to the expansion of normal activities, however, the functions of the Coast Guard expand greatly in time of war, and the performance of many of these specialized functions requires the special training or experience of reservists in fields not normally stressed in the training and experience of the regular personnel. Most of these specialized functions fall within the field known as port security, which includes all of the measures necessary for the protection of ports and vessels in port from sabotage, fire, explosion, or other danger.

One of the greatest dangers in the operation of a port during wartime is the ever-present danger involved in the loading and unloading of tremendous quantities of explosives. Unless proper precautions are observed and proper care taken in the handling of these explosives, many lives, many ships, and vital port facilities may be destroyed through explosion. The Coast Guard reserves are the men relied upon to prevent such catastrophes. They must have a thorough background of training in the nature and properties of various types of explosives, the precautions to be observed in handling and stowing them, the operation of ships handling gear, stevedoring equipment, fire fighting where explosives are involved, dangerous combinations of explosives or explosive chemicals and acids, and many other detailed and specialized factors in providing safety from explosion, not only in port but after the ship has put to sea. This is obviously a specialist's responsibility, and the Coast Guard must rely on its reserve to provide such specialists. It is significant that not one explosion occurred in the loading of any vessel supervised by the Coast Guard during World War II, although over 29,000,000,000 pounds of explosives were loaded under their supervision.

The prevention of fire at port facilities is another highly specialized field in which trained and experienced reserves are required. This specialty involves the determination of proper preventive measures against both the start and the spread of fire. It requires a knowledge of the design, construction, and alteration of buildings, warehouses, piers and other water-front facilities for the maximum protection against fire. These specialists must be able to appraise the probability of fire originating in any particular water-front facility, the extent to which it might spread, the structural, operational or other modifications which will reduce the probability of fire, and the fire-fighting facilities which should be provided for the best protection against fire.

Closely related to fire protection is fire fighting, which requires thorough training in the tactics used in fighting fires of all types on vessels, piers, or other water-front facilities. Personnel trained and experienced in fire fighting under all conditions will be needed promptly for proper protection of the ports. This need can be met adequately only by the maintenance of a Reserve which includes fire fighters trained thoroughly in combating all types of fires ashore and afloat and under unusual conditions, as in cases where explosives are involved.

In addition to these specialties, the protection of port facilities requires large numbers of personnel with an adequate background of training in all of these specialties to provide adequate inspections and patrols of vessels and water-front facilities. These men must also be trained in the detection and prevention of sabotage, evacuation procedures for endangered water-front areas, law enforcement, general police duties, and must have a thorough knowledge of Coast Guard regulations for the security of vessels and water-front facilities.

Any adequate program for the protection of our ports must also make provision for well-trained and organized identification specialists to screen and control the personnel having access to vessels and water-front facilities.

Our ports are the bottlenecks through which supplies and men must flow in time of war. The destruction or impairment of any of these ports, whether accidentally or by sabotage, would seriously disrupt the flow of essential men and material. Therefore, it is obvious that all possible precautions must be taken to protect them and the ships which use them from any damage; otherwise all of our other defense preparations may be jeopardized or to a great extent nullified.

In order to give our ports this protection, the Coast Guard must be prepared to place on duty within a matter of hours sufficient nmbers of men, thoroughly trained in all of the aspects of port security, to assure the complete safety of all port facilities and vessels from sabotage or accidental damage by fire or explosion. The Coast Guard can meet this responsibility only if it has promptly available a well-trained Reserve which is prepared to assume its role in fulfilling the Coast Guard's responsibility at a moment's notice.

Point 4, Corn, and Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Point 4, Corn, and Mexico," published in the Des Moines Register of March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4, CORN, AND MEXICO

Corn is far and away the most important crop in the United States, in total value, in

number of bushels, in number of farmers who grow it, in its widespread adaptability (it is grown in nearly every county of the United States).

But corn is relatively unimportant to the United States in comparison with Mexico and other Latin-American countries.

The Latin Americans almost literally live on corn. Mexico, for example, devotes about 60 percent of its cropland to this crop, and corn is the predominant food. South of the Rio Grande little corn is fed to livestock, because the people cannot afford such luxury. They must consume the grain directly, supplementing it with beans as the most important source of protein.

Clearly, the first step toward higher living standards in these corn-bean diet countries is to increase the production of corn. That would provide an excess that could be fed to livestock, thus improving diets with meat and milk. It would release manpower to make industrial goods (or to produce excess agricultural products which could be traded abroad for industrial products).

Mexico averages only about 10 bushels of corn to the acre. If that yield could be doubled, Mexican living standards would rise rapidly. Mexicans would no longer have to import corn and could begin to expand their livestock production.

What would this mean to the United States?

It would mean the loss of a tiny export market for corn. In the past we have exported somewhere around 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bushels of corn and 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 pounds of corn meal annually to Mexico. This is considerably less than the production of one Iowa county.

In return for this insignificant loss, we would get a large increase in exports of industrial products which would in turn mean more industrial employment and greater demand for farm products in the United States.

Mexico, like all Latin-American countries, has such a small production per man today that it is unable to contribute much to world trade and world prosperity. One of the easiest ways to keep our own economy prosperous and expanding is to find new markets, and one of the easiest ways to find new markets is to create them by helping the world's poor people toward higher living standards.

This is the idea behind President Truman's proposed point-4 program of technical aid to backward areas: Help ourselves by helping others.

The Rockefeller Foundation already is applying this idea with a considerable degree of success in Mexico. Since 1943 it has been carrying on a research and educational program designed to increase Mexican agricultural production. So far, 24 improved varieties of corn have been released to Mexican farmers. The Rockefeller scientists have not waited until they could develop hybrids suitable to Mexico; they have distributed open-pollinated seed from selected better varieties.

Last year about two-thirds of a million acres were planted to these improved varieties. This program already has begun to have an impact on total Mexican output. In 1948, Mexico did not import corn for the first time in 35 years.

The Rockefeller people are also making progress with new varieties of wheat, beans, and other crops. Most important, they are teaching hundreds of Mexicans how to conduct their own research and educational programs.

This is point 4 at work—in a field that Iowans know well. Corn gave us the start for our chain reaction of economic progress, too.

The Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me, affecting the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

When Congress established the Federal Communications Commission in 1934, it set up a bipartisan board to regulate the radio industry. It was clearly intended that the Commission would operate for the benefit of the people of the Nation. The Commissioners were given wide authority. They were entrusted with broad discretionary powers. It was not presumed that they would use such powers to any narrow partisan ends.

I am sure no Senator in this Chamber has any desire that the Commission should now abuse its powers to accomplish unauthorized ends. Particularly, no Senator would desire to condone the operation of this board for purely partisan purposes.

Surely it would be a serious abuse of authority if the Commission, in granting or withholding a license to operate a radio station, were motivated by partisan considerations.

It has been suggested to me that a case now pending before the Commission may have some political motivation behind it.

Therefore, I am going to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado that he direct the attention of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hearings now being held on the renewal of radio station licenses granted to stations KMPC (Los Angeles), WJR (Detroit) and WGAR (Cleveland).

Reference to these hearings already has been made in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan who has raised the issue of fairness in these proceedings. I wish to join the Senator from Michigan in insisting that these Commission proceedings be scheduled and handled in a dignified and impartial manner without political bias.

Certainly there are some aspects of the present hearings which suggest that some of the parties concerned are acting in a narrowly partisan spirit. I do not suggest that the Commission itself or its Chairman are conducting these hearings for political purposes.

I ask, however, that the Senate committee take cognizance of this case so as to make certain that a majority of this bipartisan Commission does not abuse its authority to control political thinking. It would be outrageously un-American if any radio station were denied an extension of its license merely because the management of that station did not subscribe to the political opinions of the present administration.

The hearings to which I refer were brought about under the following circumstances.

I am told that James Roosevelt, a candidate for Governor of California, wrote a letter on stationery of the Democratic State Committee of California. Mr. Roosevelt supported a complaint against the issuance of a license to the stations I have listed. The principal stockholder in these stations is Mr. George A. Richards who, I understand, has been very critical in his personal expressions of more than one member of the Roosevelt family.

I am not acquainted with Mr. Richards. I have never met him. I know nothing personally of his views. I am told that he is a former New Deal supporter who broke with the party in 1940 and has since been a strong critic of the administration. I am told that the complaint against Mr. Richards is that he allowed his personal political views to slant or distort news reports.

If it is true that these stations are distorting the news, it is a serious charge, and I certainly, for one, do not condone it. I hope the Commission is always vigilant against such distortion in presenting the news to the general public which relies on the impartiality of the broadcaster.

Every Member of the Senate is aware, however, that such distortion is affected by radio stations. I am of the opinion that much of the distortion in news reports that go out over the radio has been done in favor of the administration. This is only an opinion.

It is interesting that the Federal Communications Commission, at the request of James Roosevelt, has invoked seldom-used powers. The case should be considered on its merits. I hope the Senate committee will explore this matter.

I hope it will explore also the question of whether this operator is being singled out while other station operators are given complete freedom to support the party line of the administration in violation of the Communications Act.

The power to regulate can be distorted to become the power to censor. This must not be allowed to happen in the United States.

I want the Commission to enforce the Communications Act fairly and aggressively against any violator. It should make no difference whether a violation is committed by a member of the Democratic or Republican Party.

Surely, however, the Commission should not penalize any loyal American citizen for his personal views if his radio station is properly operated in conformance with the Communications Act. The three stations concerned here have a long history of public service, I am informed, that never was questioned prior to 1940 when the owner broke with the party of the administration. This case may be important to any American who cherishes our heritage of civil liberties.

The Commission must be supported in any attempt to carry out the communications regulations which bar the use of radio news broadcasts as a propaganda medium. However, we want to be assured that the Commission does not become an instrument of thought control seeking to put out of the communications business any station because of this control by a loyal American citizen because of that individual's personal views and expressions.

I am sending to the Senator from Colorado documents which have been sent me concerning this case.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a speech in Lincoln, Nebr., on March 21 by Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

A part of Mr. Gabrielson's speech concerns itself with the Brannan plan and some of the left-wing connections with that program. It particularly recites that the head of the northeastern division of the Farmers Union, one of the principal advocates of this so-called Brannan plan, was accused in 1945 of being a Communist, and when he sued for libel the jury found in favor of the defendant.

This man, Archie Wright, is still one of the leaders of the Farmers Union, which says, "the Brannan plan is our plan."

With the Communist front boring into every segment of American life, it is important that they be exposed. This is particularly true when the Secretary of Agriculture consorts with radicals and adopts their program for attempting to lure the American farmer into the trap of Government control of their farms.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have discussed tonight the Communists and the Socialists in the Truman administration. There is another group in the Government who would destroy the opportunity, the freedom, of the American people.

They are the men who serve only political gods. All they want is to win elections even if in the process they destroy the American system. They are the men who operate on the principle of the big city political bosses that the American people—the farmer included—can be bought into slavery if they offer enough Government money. They are the people who are willing to acept the support and even defend the treasonable Communists so long as they retain their political support. They are the people who do the front work for the Trojan-horse Socialists while giving lip service to free enterprise.

In all charity for them, I say that perhaps they, from President Truman downward, do not understand what they do or the dangerous effects of the course which they pursue. They want only votes, votes, votes.

And now I want to discuss with you one of the high apostles of this latter group. One of those who serves only political masters and who, I trust, only ignorantly and not willingly, follows the designs of those who would entrap the farmer into Government control and eventual slavery.

I refer to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and his so-called Brannan plan. I shall not attempt to go into an economic discussion of the Brannan plan. Mr. Brannan does not attempt to do that in trying to sell it to the farmers.

Actually the Brannan plan exists in a sort of never-never land of what is it. Mr. Brannan himself dashes frantically up and down the land (at your expense, incidentally) making speeches. He denounces your great farm leader, Allan Kline. He speaks glibly of how the Brannan plan would give higher prices to the farmer and lower prices to the consumer. But he refuses to even estimate what the plan would cost. And, of course, he never mentions that the farmer and the consumer whom he would buy with Government money are the very people who pay this money into the Federal Treasury with back-breaking taxes.

I have analyzed Mr. Brannan's speeches carefully trying to make some sense out of what he says. My analysis boils down to the following conclusions:

1. The Brannan plan is like the old shell game that the suckers used to play at county fairs—now you see it, now you don't.

2. Still using the country fair parallel, it is like the medicine man's bottled remedy—good for man or beast and will cure anything that ails you. Just 50 cents and we throw in a bottle of the best perfume direct from Paris for the little wife.

3. This plan was not written by farmers to help farmers make a better livelihood, but is an instrument for the destruction of free farmers, framed by the radicals who surround your Secretary of Agriculture.

In analyzing Mr. Brannan and his plan you folks out here in Nebraska will want to remember where the Brannan plan came from. And, equally important, who are the friends of the Brannan plan and the friends of Mr. Brannan himself; also those who are against it.

There is an easy answer to the question who is against the plan. The free farmers of America. But let's look further. I have examined into this subject. I find the American Farm Bureau Federation, speaking through its board of directors, denouncing the Brannan plan. I find Mr. Goss, head of the National Grange, speaking out against it, and also leaders of your own Nebraska Farmer's Union. I find Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, a recent Democratic Secretary of Agriculture. Two of the great agricultural publications, the Farm Journal and Country Gentleman. I find Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. He did a masterful job of revealing its origin when we held the Republican Farm Conference in Sioux City, Iowa, last year. Representative HOPE pointed out that the Brannan plan, so-called, had its origin in a resolution adopted by the national convention of the CIO in Portland, Oreg., more than 1 year ago. The idea was taken up by various labor papers and publicized rather extensively before Mr. Brannan thought to affix his name to it. And, I find your two great and influential legislators in Washington, Senators WHERRY and BUTLER, and your able Nebraska Republican Members of the House of Representatives stating publicly that the Brannan plan is a vote trap for the farmer, which would eventually take away the farmer's right to run his own farm.

Now let's take a look at who are the supporters of this Brannan plan.

One of the most insistent spokesmen for the Brannan plan is that hybrid big city voice of the New Deal bureaucrats, avowedly political in nature, the Americans for Democratic Action.

Then the political organization of the CIO chants repeatedly on the dual subject of the Brannan plan and the farmer-labor groups.

Finally, we come to the only national farm organization supporting the Brannan plan and that is the Farmer's Union, which boasts over and over again that "it is our plan."

I wish time permitted to examine with you intimately some of the activities and public statements of the Farmer's Union and its president, Mr. Patton. I do not mean to imply that Mr. Brannan or Mr. Patton are Communists. I do charge now, however, that the company in which these two gentlemen, Messrs. Brannan and Patton, travel lays them open to the suspicion of being taken for a hay ride, knowingly or not.

I do not make this charge lightly; I expect to have more to say on the subject in the future. But I wish here to recite just one example of the type of company Messrs. Brannan and Patton keep; where some of the support for the Brannan plan comes from.

Six years ago the Farm Journal carried an article in which it publicly accused one Archie Wright of being a card-carrying Communist.

And who is Mr. Wright? He was at that time, and still is, the president of the northeast division of the Farmers Union. He was called a card-carrying Communist.

After this article was printed by the Farm Journal Mr. Wright sued for libel, apparently thinking his tracks had been so well covered that it could not be proven. Like so many of these Communists who are exposed he issued an immediate denial and attacked his accuser. But the Farm Journal writer had done his work well.

The case went to a jury in the Federal court in New York. The jury heard the evidence that Mr. Wright was a Communist. It heard Mr. Wright's defence evidence. Then it returned a verdict exonerating the Farm Journal and Mr. Robert McManus, the author, of libel in calling this Farmers Union official a Communist.

Mr. Patton knows this. Mr. Brannan, who works intimately with Mr. Patton, also knows it. Patton says the Brannan plan is "our plan." Yet Archie Wright continues as the head of the Farmers Union in the whole northeast area.

In the face of this evidence, don't we have the right to ask again, "What are the influences back of this Brannan plan?" "Are there other Archie Wright's working among the farmers all over the United States—in Nebraska—attempting to lead and propagandize them into eventual slavery to a Government machine?"

I ask you to remember that the farmer was the first object of Communist mass murders in Russia because they would not bow their necks.

I ask you to remember that in 1920 the Communist leader Lenin wrote to his comrades in New York, urging a survey of revolutionary prospects here, and inquiring: "Have you no farmers in America?"

I ask you to remember that in 1923 Moscow sent $100,000 to this country to aid in the organization of a Farmer-Labor Party.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a report telling how homes can be and are being built on a large scale by the so-called middle-income group in the private enterprise way, by which our country has become great and strong, and without the paralyzing hand of Federal socialism.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement received from Ted Baldwin, of New York, who is director of a campaign in several cities in connection with the good American home program, which is sponsored by the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association and the United States Savings and Loan League.

Mr. Baldwin's report indicates that private initiative and private industry are more than willing to provide all the homes potential home owners of the

middle-income group are interested in purchasing.

Furthermore, the cost of these homes is within the reach of the middle-income group, as the price range of homes in the good American home program extends from $7,500 to $12,000, and can be purchased by prospective home owners whose annual take-home pay is from $3,000 to $4,800, the middle-income range.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TED BALDWIN, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 11, 1950.

To the Honorable Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY:

When you and your colleagues in both Houses of Congress weigh merits of proposed new housing legislation I feel sure you will be interested in the good-American-home program, which is demonstrating two things.

1. People in the modest and middle income brackets can afford to buy good homes at today's prices on their present income. They are doing it.

2. The building industry is erecting houses to meet the needs of this modest and middle income group.

The good-American-home program is a public educational effort to prove by actual demonstration that the above facts are true and that proper use of the family budget permits home ownership. It is sponsored nationally by the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association and the United States Savings and Loan League. Local demonstrations all over the country are being sponsored by local and regional builders associations, individual private builders, dealers in construction materials and financial institutions. All types of public-service groups are cooperating.

Homes built under the program must be within the price range of from $7,500 or less to a maximum of $12,000. Such homes can be purchased on take-home pay of from $3,000 a year to $4,800—the middle income range.

Official designs, prepared by the noted New York architects, Chapman, Evans & Delehanty, permit building under the money-saving principles of modular construction. This means that mass-production economies can be made at the building site without the use of stereotyped prefabricated homes.

The first demonstration homes were opened in Detroit January 22 and still are being viewed. They were built by members of the local sponsoring group, the Builders Association of Metropolitan Detroit. Because of the public-service feature, press, radio and television, theaters, business, and public officials all cooperated to bring the demonstration to the attention of the public.

For each demonstration house, a model budget was worked out, based on Detroit price levels and checked through the cooperation of Wayne University, Detroit businesses, and financial institutions. People are buying the houses—proof of satisfaction with the price and quality. One builder sold 30 the first day.

The Home Builders Association of Greater Cleveland is starting a similar demonstration. So is the Long Island Home Builders Institute in the New York area and the New Jersey Home Builders Association. Other demonstrations are being arranged in New England, in the Middle Atlantic States, South, and far West.

The good-American-home program is not a plan to build houses. It merely brings together people in the middle and modest income group who want homes and the large number of private builders who are putting up good homes for this group at prices it can afford. It is proving that people of modest means do not need charity and that private industry is meeting their needs and that both sides like it that way—the good American way.

Respectfully submitted.

TED BALDWIN.

The Biggest Swindle in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which is to be published in the April 11, 1950, edition of Look magazine.

This is an exceptionally interesting and informative article, written by an outstanding American businessman, Mr. L. C. Hart. Mr. Hart is vice president of Johns-Manville Corp. and is an authority in the field of management and human relations. He is an experienced businessman and it is evident that he is an expert in public relations.

Mr. Hart shows accurately and vividly the wide difference between what Communists promise and what they actually deliver when they gain power. He discloses that the rulers of Soviet Russia are the greatest confidence men in history; that they have sold the Russian people a gigantic gold brick.

Mr. Hart makes it clear that no sincere liberal can support this swindle which becomes a slave state.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the end of the war, when Stalin made it clear that he prefers two worlds to one, I—like most Americans—have become increasingly alarmed about what the Communists are up to. Recently I decided to read again some of the Communist writings to get a better idea of what their philosophy really is. So I studied an anthology of extracts from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Joseph Stalin himself.

I won't pretend that it was easy reading. Nor will I attempt to expose here the economic fallacies which Communist theorists, writing in and about a world that no longer exists, believed. Anyone who looks at the standard of living and the great political power of labor in democratic countries today, under systems of private property, must surely realize that they do not bear the faintest resemblance to the starvation, misery, terror, and helplessness which Marx and Lenin predicted were the inevitable lot of the working man. At least that is what some of our best informed labor leaders tell us.

What I do want to write about is something that struck me so hard I haven't been able to put it out of mind: the amazing difference between what Communists preach, and what they do, once they get a chance to put their theories into practice. I am convinced that only people hypnotized by their own imaginings, only people psychologically incapable of looking at facts, can possibly support both communism and Soviet Russia.

Here are some basic principles of communism; let's compare them to the facts about the Soviet Union.

1. The power of the state must be reduced until the state itself withers away. But the state in Soviet Russia is more powerful than any state in history. The men who run the Soviet Union have made the state more and more absolute since the day they took power. (Even the Czars, operating one of the most corrupt and brutal regimes on record, did not liquidate, exile, or terrorize one-tenth as many people as the Communists have done and are doing.) That the gigantic power of the state in Russia today will be reduced, much less wither away, is something only fools can believe. In fact, the very idea is verboten now, in the writings of the faithful.

2. All the means of production will be owned by the people. The people in Russia are told they own the means of production; but the men in the Kremlin use the resources and manpower of the Soviet Union as they wish. There is no way for the Russian people to assert their ownership—to protest against the Kremlin's actions or the Communist Party's program, or vote the elite out of power, or even put up a candidate for a local school board who has not been handpicked by the regime. Own the means of production? Why, any large American corporation is owned by its stockholders (who have the power to vote, criticize management, throw out directors, influence policy, collect dividends) in a way the Russians dare not even dream of. Would men in a prison be better off if they were told they own the prison?

3. Monopoly, and all its evils, will be abolished. But the Soviet regime is itself the biggest monopoly on the face of the globe. The Kremlin exercises absolute monopoly control over every single phase of life—wages, prices, supply, agriculture, politics, law, the courts, education, the press. * * * No capitalist trust or international cartel ever had one-thousandth of the monopoly power exercised by the leaders of the Soviet Union.

4. A Communist regime represents the dictatorship of the proletariat. Communism certainly is a dictatorship—but not of the proletariat. It is a dictatorship over the proletariat. Do workers dictate policy or action in Russia today? The Soviet Union is, in fact, privately owned—lock, stock, and barrel—by a handful of men. They are self-appointed and self-perpetuating.

5. The rights of workers will be expanded. But even Communists admit that the worker in Soviet Russia does not have the right to change his job or strike or move about freely or speak his mind or protest against low wages or high prices or factory speed-ups or piecework—rights that every American worker takes for granted.

6. Communism will bring true democracy into the world. But the Soviet Union has abolished the most elementary human rights, freedoms, and civil liberties. Soviet Russia is actually a caste state. And the men at the top have more power, privileges, security, and status than any group of capitalists in the world.

7. Science, thought, and art will flower into real freedom under communism. Then why the repeated purges of writers, teachers, artists, and scientists in all countries under Communist control? No intelligent person can maintain that thought in Soviet Russia is free. The record clearly proves that the Kremlin's preferences, in everything from the ballet to comic books, are imposed on all

those subjected to Communist rule. This is true even in the sciences; consider the official glorification of the unscientific genetics expounded by Lysenko, whom Julian Huxley, the distinguished English scientist, has just exposed.

8. Since all workers will become Communists, the Communist Party will represent all the workers. But according to their own figures, out of 200,000,000 people in the Soviet Union, only about 2½ percent are in the Communist Party. It is a well-known fact that no one gets into the Communist Party who isn't completely subservient to the top officials, and that no one stays in the party who doesn't toe the party line.

Conclusion: What other conclusion is possible, to anyone with eyes to see and a brain to use, than this: Any sincere believer in the theory of communism ought to be passionately anti-Soviet today. For the Soviet Union, according to the writings and creed of its own founders and leaders, is the biggest swindle in history.

Address by P. S. Marthakis Commemorating Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on March 22, 1950, the Honorable P. S. Marthakis, a senator from the county of Salt Lake, in the Legislature in the State of Utah, delivered an address commemorating Greek independence. Because of its timely interest and because all citizens of America who have Greek ancestry will be interested in reading the words of Mr. Marthakis, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout the civilized world this week, the people of Greek descent will recall with honor and pride that memorable March 25 of 1821 when Greece threw off the yoke of Turkish Empire and proclaimed its independence. Like those thrilling days of 1776, when the Continental Congress ratified and signed the Declaration of Independence, so did the members of the Greek First National Congress bravely set forth the standards of the cross and proclaim the freedom of the fatherland to all the world.

It was the same indomitable courage and spirit that had brought laurels to the Hellenic standards at Marathon and Salamis, the victory to the campaigns of Alexander the Great and the battle between the holy cross of Greece and the crescent of the Turks at Constantinople. This was the culmination of over four long centuries of oppression and suffering under the heel of a tyrant who sought not only to destroy the glorious past that belonged to Greece but to bury in the ashes of time the spirit of her brave people.

But just as democracy, with its free enterprise and opportunities for all, triumphed here in America, so did the same principles win out over tremendous odds in the 7-year struggle for the establishment of a democracy in Greece.

It is fitting and proper as we approach another milestone along freedom's pathway, that we again recall the splendid spirit of cooperation, both spiritual and material, which has been extended by the peoples of this great America to their compatriots across the seas.

When word was first received of the beginning of the Greek struggle for independence, President James Monroe, in his message to Congress, said, "The name of Greece fills the mind with the highest ideals and arouses in us the most exalted emotions which exist in the human nature. Superior skill and refinement in arts, heroic gallantry in action, and devotion to liberty are connected with our memories of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their conquest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

That sympathy was first manifested on December 11, 1823, in the city of Philadelphia, when a committee was appointed to give aid to the people of Greece.

Since those early days, millions of American dollars, tons of foodstuffs and clothing and military supplies have gone from the United States to the aid of the Greek Republic. And today, that tiny republic, nestled on the shores of the Aegean Sea, stands as one of the last outposts of democracy in the Old World. There has been little time down through the years for the people of Greece to enjoy immunity from the torments of war. Enemies on all sides have sought to destroy the fruits of long labor; two world wars have cast their shadows across the Greek homeland to bring more suffering and chaos. And now the forces of communism and democracy are engaged in a death struggle on Greek soil.

We have but to harken to the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, in paraphrase: We are met upon a great battlefield in a struggle to determine whether this Nation or any nation under God shall long endure. That pattern is repeating itself today in the cold war of nerves which we pray shall never erupt into another holocaust more terrible than man has ever witnessed or can long survive. We can gain some ray of comfort from the established fact that the people of Greece, in their continued struggle for freedom will exhibit a persevering courage, a spirit of enterprise, and a contempt of danger and suffering worthy of the best days of ancient Greece. They are determined to stand up manfully and perish before they submit.

This same spirit is the symbol of America, and we of Greek descent who have made our homes in this glorious land can only hope fervently that our peoples will emerge once again from the darkness to the light of the dawn of peace over a troubled world. Let us hope that the torch of freedom which still burns on the frontiers of democracy will continue to shine as a beacon of hope and courage to all who place country above self, free enterprise above socialism, religious freedom above bigotry, and the pursuit of happiness for all mankind.

Status of the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short article appearing in the News Letter published in Lawrence, Kans., by the Home Missions Council. The program of this council is to establish and to foster a unity of spirit and service among Indian missionaries, mission board members, Government employees, and other friends of the Indian; to affirm their group consciousness; to share their experiences, and to establish orderly means to discuss any matters affecting the welfare of Indians and Indian missions.

The article is entitled "Are Indians No Longer Wards of the Government?" The author of the article is Mr. G. E. E. Lindquist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE INDIANS NO LONGER WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT?

(By G. E. E. Lindquist)

In the American Magazine for January 1950 appears an article entitled "How We Scalp the Indians" by Don Eddy who, after one trip to the Indian country, "a good 9,000 mile buggy ride," "to get the facts about the Indians" reports, among other alleged "facts" that "Indians are no longer wards of the Government." Continuing, this self-constituted analyst says (p. 88), "Every native-born American Indian has been a citizen since Congress gave him that status in 1924 as a gesture of gratitude to young braves who, although they were exempt from the draft, volunteered and served gallantly with our troops in World War I."

While the American Magazine writer insists that "Indians are no longer wards," he did bump into some "facts" which caused him to realize that the alleged citizenship might perhaps be dubbed as "second-hand" and not "full." "Confusion is the only word to describe our relations with the Indians and their thinking about us. They are confused because when they try to assume the initiative of citizens, they bump their noses on special rules and regulations set up by the bureaucracy which bosses them, the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

That the above-quoted author is not the only one confused on Indian citizenship status is evident from recent Washington news releases. For example, last June there appeared under a Washington headline the following: "On June 2, Indians will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the date on which they gained full citizenship." No attempt was made to explain the limiting features of that citizenship. As early as 1916, the United States Court held (in the case of *U. S.* v. *Nice* (241 U. S. 591):

"Citizenship is not incompatible with tribal existence or continued guardianship and so may be conferred without completely emancipating the Indians or placing them beyond the reach of congressional regulations adopted for their protection."

In this and in other decisions the interpretation has been well established, that citizens can be subject to restrictions, exemptions, and special regulations based on the possession of Indian blood or the identification with some group designated as "Indian." (Quoted from Indian Wardship, revised copy. New York: Home Missions Council of North America, 1944; pp. 10–11.)

That Indians were citizens before 1924, by treaty, by the operation of allotment acts, etc., may come as a surprise to many Americans.

In one way or another, the majority of American Indians were already citizens of

the United States before 1924. The Handbook of Federal Indian Law (p. 153) estimates the proportion as approximately two-thirds. The remaining third were swept into citizenship by the act of June 2, 1924, which provides:

"That all noncitizen Indians, born within the territorial limits of the United States, be, and they are hereby declared to be, citizens of the United States."

But the citizenship thus granted was not incompatible with continued guardianship and trusteeship on the part of the Federal Government through the Interior Department or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indeed, this very law went on to declare, as many another law concerning the Indian has done:

"*Provided,* That the granting of such citizenship shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of any Indian to tribal or other property."

Citizen or not, he would find the trust remaining upon lands held for him; his name upon a tribal roll would still entitle him to share in any distribution of funds or land which other members of the tribe might receive. (Op. cit., pp. 10–11.)

After 450 years of contacts with the dominant race, of which 160 have been spent under a Government bureau, some pertinent questions may very well be asked concerning our first Americans, known to us since Columbus as the Indians. One such question was asked in the Halls of Congress not many years ago by the Senator from South Dakota: "Why aren't the American Indians free?" (See Reader's Digest for August 1945; Set the American Indians Free, by O. K. Armstrong.) Others have raised similar questions: "How can Indian Bureau domination of every aspect of Indian life be reconciled with the basic principles of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution? How can such devices as Indian reservations, Indian segregation, rations, and wardship be reconciled with full citizenship?" (See One America, edited by Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, p. 439 ff.)

Does the Indian desire to be considered Uncle Sam's stepchild forever? The answer is "No." Wardship with all its paternalistic trappings is increasingly distasteful to him. Without going into detail, wardship may be summed up as the relation of the Indian to the Federal Government in matters regarding which the average citizen deals with State or local governments or acts on his own initiative. Obviously, no single sweeping enactment will wipe away in a moment the tangled issue of exemptions and restrictions accumulated during a century and a half. Old treaties, numbering at one time 389, have to be fulfilled; tribal claims have to be adjudicated; land problems must be worked out tribe by tribe, often on an individual basis. However, a definite goal should be set for the ultimate release of Indians from Federal wardship.

In this connection it is noteworthy that the term "wardship" has been soft-pedaled of late in bureaucratic circles, both in and out of Washington. Even the Hoover Committee Report on Indian Affairs (October 1948) does not mention wardship by name, although it does emphasize the importance of "target dates" in "the progressive transfer to State and local governments" of functions now exercised by the Indian Bureau.

While Bureau officials taboo the use of the word "wardship," presumably because of its unsavory connotations, or dismiss it as "a greatly overworked rationalization," there have been some indications in comparatively recent years that at least lip service has been paid to the possible withdrawal of Federal supervision of the American Indian. (See the Withdrawal of Federal Supervision of the American Indian, a paper presented at the National Conference of Social Work, April 15, 1947, by Assistant Commissioner John H. Provinse.) Hon. HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, calls attention to this in a speech in the United States Senate, October 7, 1949, when he states:

"It is interesting to note that William Zimmerman, the Acting Commissioner and now Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, on February 8, 1947, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Civil Service, recommended that a group of 10 Indian tribes were then ready for freedom from the Indian Bureau and 19 Indian tribes would be ready to be released from Federal supervision 10 years from that time—February 8, 1947. None has been released, yet the Indian Bureau now comes asking that Congress appropriate millions of dollars for the rehabilitation of some of these same tribes.

"It is a tragic fact that during the past 15 years fewer Indians have escaped from the Indian Bureau into citizenship than have done so during any period of like length during the past 100 years. If now we enter upon a 50-year program of expenditure to establish the Indian Bureau on a grander scale than ever before, there will be fewer and fewer of them becoming real citizens. We must save the Indians from the Indian Bureau."

Congressional leaders have shown increasing concern toward making a start toward the goal of Indian equality before the law with other citizens. Some efforts have been made toward introducing legislation which would furnish an impetus toward the emergence of the present generation of Indian-Americans from what someone has characterized as "the clumsy and outgrown bureau and reservation system," but with no tangible results to date. However, as recently as October 17, 1949, Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, introduced into the United States Senate a bill (S. 2726) "to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended." In a statement describing the bill, Mr. MALONE contends, among other things, that—

"The Indian has never had the full rights of other American citizens even since 1924, when Congress declared him a citizen of the United States (43 Stat. 253). The only way he can get these rights is through removal of the two chief obstacles: (1) The Indian Bureau, and (2) the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. The latter has had the effect of hiring the Indians with taxpayers' money to stick together in tribes and thus of separating them from the rest of American citizens. Originally organized with a well-meaning intention to protect both white man and Indian, the Indian Bureau has come to raise a needless and ruinous barrier between the two races for its own selfish reasons.

"The grip of the Indian Bureau has been tightened over the years by its multiplication of favors such as loans from the Government, appointments to lucrative positions, and by other influence. In fact, Government paternalism at its worst is strikingly exemplified in the Bureau relationship to the Indian. It has undermined the confidence of the Indian in himself and in his own resources. How can the moral fiber of new citizens be built up under such conditions?

"The only solution which will really cut the Gordian knot, so to speak, and it is a solution which only Congress can effectuate, is to tear up the Indian Bureau by the roots and set our fellow citizens of Indian descent free from the deathlike grip of this 'old man of the sea.' Only by the abolition of the Indian Bureau, coupled with the repeal of the Indian Reorganization Act, can the Federal Government remove a gross injustice and right an ancient wrong, once and for all.

"The Government of the United States should determine definitely what its debt to the Indians amounts to—individually and collectively—pay such debts and allow them to take their place in the communities of this Nation on an even basis with other citizens—they have been on probation long enough."

Coming back to the American Magazine correspondent one should not dismiss his story without recognizing that he has brought to light some facts which Americans will do well to ponder deeply and then act upon through their chosen representatives in Congress. He admits that finding the answers is not easy. However, his concluding statement is worthy of more than passing comment—

"Restitution for past wrongs is not so important to present-day Indians as the right to be treated as equal citizens. To accomplish that might necessitate vigorous reorganization of the Indian service, overhauling the five thousand-odd laws it is expected to administer, selection of administrators familiar with Indian psychology, and eviction of those old retainers who still consider themselves 'little white fathers.' Certainly it should give the Indians equal voice in shaping a new policy aimed at alert helpfulness and honest advice, rather than hypocritical chicanery.

"If and when this is done, we stand to create an immensely loyal, valuable body of citizens from a bewildered, distrustful people whose only past sin was protecting their homeland, and who are getting a thoroughly un-American raw deal."

Low-Cost Housing in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, first, a news story appearing in the Des Moines Register of Thursday, February 23, 1950, in which a young man, unwarrantedly, in my opinion, attacks the Governor of the State of Iowa for certain alleged actions in connection with housing at Drake University in Des Moines.

Following that I should like to have printed the reply of another young man, whose name is Keith E. McWilliams, a student at Drake University, who lives in a trailer camp with his wife, who answers the first young man by expressing his adherence to the doctrines of self-help in America, and his desire to assume the responsibilities for his own destiny.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register of February 23, 1950]

STUDENTS ASK STATE ACTION FOR HOUSING

The Young Democratic Club of Drake University Wednesday urged that Gov. William S. Beardsley call a special session of the legislature to obtain low-cost housing in Iowa.

About 50 club members voted when Neal E. Smith, senior law college student from Packwood, presented the motion. James Naughton, of Sioux City, seconded it.

The club's action followed a fire which February 15 destroyed the trailer home and belongings of J. Royer Seagren, 22, his wife, and infant son, in the Drake trailer court.

NEGATIVE ACTION

In a letter to Beardsley, Neil B. Little, of Hampton, president of the Drake Young Democrats, charged the Governor has taken "a weak, negative action by polling the member of the house and senate who could not possibly be as familiar with the present situation as you are."

Little declared Beardsley personally is standing between the the Federal Housing Act of the Eighty-first Congress and the opportunity for all Iowa families to have decent low-cost housing.

Under adverse weather conditions, a fire could destroy the whole trailer court, Little contended.

"It is your responsibility as chief executive to administer the affairs of the State of Iowa when the general assembly is not in session," Little wrote to Beardsley.

"YOUR DUTY"

"Your duty is to familiarize yourself with the seriousness of this condition [housing] and take positive action to call the general assembly to act.

"You should take positive action to call the assembly to Des Moines to pass an enabling act to make available to the Iowa taxpayer his fair share of low-cost housing units. Our tax dollar is being spent in 42 other States.

"Adequate housing in Des Moines will relieve the pressures so my friends will not be forced to live in shacks."

[From the Des Moines Register of February 28, 1950]

VOICE OF FREE AMERICA FROM DRAKE TRAILER CAMP

To the EDITOR:

I can assure you that this letter has considerable support from the residents of the Drake trailer camp and it is not my feelings alone.

In the February 23 edition of the Register an article appeared whereby "the (Drake) Young Democrats" were seeking to denounce Governor Beardsley's passive attitude concerning veterans' housing problems. To give rise to their "deep concern" of the housing problem, they utilized an unfortunate incident that took place in the Drake trailer camp, namely, the destruction of one of the trailers by fire, which incidentally was the second such fire in a period of almost 4 years since the formation of the camp.

It would seem that everyone has the idea that the veterans who live in the trailer camp are living in miserable piano boxes with little heat or comfort. This is far from the truth. True, we haven't the modern conveniences of running water in our trailers; nor do we have a great expanse of room. To be sure, we have our problems, but we don't need a hand-out to solve them. The trailers are insulated, compact, and for the most part cozy. Certainly we all dream of owning our own homes and having the modern conveniences of running water, owning our own furniture and washing machines, but we are willing to sacrifice now and obtain those things on our own.

GOVERNMENT HELP

Can this dependency on the Government continue forever? We get Government subsistence; the Government pays our tuition, books, etc., and when we get through school even makes it possible for us to obtain a loan to build a home. The State gave us a generous bonus—we don't seek more.

No doubt there are people who are in dire need of housing, but the Young Democrats need not use the Drake trailer camp as an example. The people who live here have enough fortitude to solve their problems. They don't need a politician to solve them for them. If we felt we were unduly abused, we would sell our cars and cash our savings so we might live in better quarters. For the large part we're happy where we are; the average couple who live here have enough of their own personal initiative to make out for themselves. Our country was founded on freedom and personal initiative; let's keep it that way.

The founder of the present Democratic policies, F. D. Roosevelt, once said, "Any government, like a family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that the continuance of that habit means the poorhouse." Either F. D. R. was mistaken or the country is headed for the poorhouse.

NOT LIKE ANIMALS

No politician need worry about the trailer-camp housing; having lived here for 3 years, I can assure you that we don't live like animals; we are comfortable to a reasonable extent and the majority of us are able to solve our own problems without the help of an insincere politician.

I assure Mr. Little we don't live in shacks. Ours is a temporary housing program. No one told us to live here or to go to school here. It is our own choice. Peddle your sympathy elsewhere; we don't want anyone feeling sorry for us; we don't; we are sincerely resentful that we should be used as a tool of a cheap political move that is meant to secure votes for the forthcoming election.

KEITH E. MCWILLIAMS.

DES MOINES.

Propaganda Affecting Proposed Basing-Point Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a most vicious, deceptive, and willfully misleading piece of lobbying propaganda, obviously intended to deceive retail druggists as to Senate bill 1008, the conference report on which I hope will soon be considered by the Senate.

I have received, as have other Senators, a number of letters from retail druggists opposing S. 1008. Since this bill has no effect upon them, I have been unable to understand the reason for those letters.

Now, Mr. President, I have, and want the Senate to know, the reason.

The National Association of Retail Druggists has sent a bulletin to their members urging them to deluge us with an avalanche of messages opposing the bill. It urges them to tell us what the elimination of the Robinson-Patman Act means to (their) business, and claims that before enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act small independents were being driven out of business by the thousands.

The association might just as well have told the druggists of the horrors of having all their homes burned, for it is as truthful to imply that the bill eliminates the Patman Act as it is to imply it will eliminate their homes.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The National Association of Retail Druggists, Washington bulletin, vol. 7, No. 3, March 28, 1950]

THIS BILL, S. 1008, STILL PLAGUES US

It is an afflictive evil—it is a scourge—infestation. It not only harasses small business, but pierces the heart of the Robinson-Patman Act—the friend and protector of small business.

EXTREMELY URGENT

Most of the conferees authorized to work out an agreement on the highly controversial S. 1008, the bill cleverly written to emasculate the Robinson-Patman Act, did a swell job for monopoly. In reality they worked out on small business to a fare ye well. When monopoly plays—it doesn't play for marbles—it plays for keeps. If small business is killed off in the melee that's all right too.

The conference report is now back again in the Senate for consideration. It is minus the Kefauver and Carroll amendments—the amendments which at least would have softened the hurt to the Robinson-Patman Act.

EXTREMELY URGENT

There are many Senators who have not had time to thoroughly study S. 1008 because of other pressing duties. Consequently they rely on the advice of legislative colleagues. Here's where an avalanche of messages from the folks at home will have a telling effect. Let the Senators rely on you.

It is again time to telephone, wire or air mail your two Senators and tell them in your own words what the elimination of the Robinson-Patman Act will mean to your business. Get your friends and associates to do the same—your bread and butter is involved in this fight. Do you want big business to conspire—eliminate competition among themselves then divide the markets of the Nation among themselves?

EXTREMELY URGENT

Before enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act small independents were being driven out of business by the thousands—that's why NARD spearheaded and worked so hard for the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Small independent businessmen don't go crying to Government for subsidies—all they want is a fair shake of the dice. The Robinson-Patman Act gives them that—why invalidate it? S. 1008 is a bad bill to begin with—there is no need for it. The conference report without the amendments is worse still. S. 1008 does a disservice to the South and West.

EXTREMELY URGENT

You know that when one manufacturer sells cheaper to one merchant than he does to another the former has a distinct price advantage to be used as he sees fit. If S. 1008 is enacted all of us must ask the President to veto the bill. If organized pharmacy has what it takes, now—right now—is the time for urgent action. S. 1008 favors the biggies—it smites small business.

Cordially,

GEORGE H. FRATES,
Washington Representative.

Mr. Lippmann and the Lodge-Gossett Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper entitled, "Mr. Lippman and the Lodge-Gossett Amendment," written by Mr. Joseph E. Kallenbach, associate professor of political science at the University of Michigan. This is an extremely impressive and valuable paper on the subject of reform in the electoral system.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LIPPMANN AND THE LODGE-GOSSETT AMENDMENT

(By Joseph E. Kallenbach, associate professor of political science)

In this recent series of articles on the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment (see issues of the Herald Tribune for March 6, 8, and 9) Mr. Walter Lippmann has presented a critical analysis of it which could have much influence upon popular and congressional thinking regarding the advisability of adopting this very desirable reform. Mr. Lippmann, while conceding that the Lodge-Gossett plan has numerous merits, concludes that it is not the right remedy for the present weaknesses in our presidential electoral system; that "it has disadvantages at least as great, and probably greater, than those which it would remove"; and that there is a better remedy. The better remedy which Mr. Lippmann would hold out for, even apparently at the risk of perpetuating indefinitely the present illogical and dangerous electoral vote system, is a plan by which presidential electoral votes would be awarded automatically to candidates on a district plurality vote basis. An amendment proposal of this nature has been advanced in Congress by Representative COUDERT, of New York, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, and others.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment and one embracing the automatic district electoral vote idea, endorsed by Mr. Lippmann, are both infinitely preferable to the present system. I would heartily favor adoption of either one. I cannot, however, follow Mr. Lippmann in his argument for the superiority of the district vote plan over the Lodge-Gossett proposal. Much less can I follow him in his contention that the disadvantages of the Lodge-Gossett plan are so great that even the present system might be preferable to it. To oppose adoption of the Lodge-Gossett amendment solely on the ground of its failure to embrace the district vote formula is to strain at a gnat while swallowing a camel; and if my understanding of Mr. Lippmann's line of reasoning is correct, an imaginary gnat at that.

Mr. Lippmann's reasons for favoring the district electoral vote system over what he mistakenly refers to as the Lodge-Gossett proportional representation formula in distributing a State's presidential electoral votes boil down to two: (1) The district vote plan will minimize the effects of accident or fraud in terms of the final electoral vote results, and (2) acceptance of the Lodge-Gossett formula might well lead to the adoption of proportional representation in the choice of Members of the House of Representatives.

With regard to the first point, the oversight in Mr. Lippmann's reasoning is quite obvious. His argument is that if some extraneous factor such as the state of the weather or interest in local contests affects the turnout of voters, the effects on the presidential vote will be confined to the electoral vote of the district or districts affected. Moreover, supporters of all party candidates for President will presumably be equally discouraged from or encouraged to turn out in these areas; consequently the result in terms of presidential electoral votes in such districts will not be altered. He goes on to maintain that if the actual popular vote in such cases is reflected in the distribution of the State's electoral votes among the various candidates, as would happen under the Lodge-Gossett plan, then the national electoral vote totals will reflect these vagaries in local election-day conditions. Similarly, he maintains, fraudulent popular votes will always be reflected in the national electoral vote totals; while under the district vote system they will not affect the final result unless these fraudulent votes constitute the critical element in a close popular vote in an electoral district.

The point which Mr. Lippmann overlooks in this line of thinking is that popular votes cast or not cast because of the vagaries of the weather or other such accidental factors, or popular votes obtained or lost through fraudulent practice, assume significance in the final election result only if, in their cumulative aspect nationally, they are preponderantly on one party's side, and if the margin of advantage gained by one party through such factors constitutes the difference between defeat and victory for that party's candidate in the national contest. Looking at the matter realistically, it would seem to me just as probable that the outcome of an election nationally might hinge upon factors of this nature operating at the district level preponderantly to the advantage of one party, as at the national level under the Lodge-Gossett formula. While a margin of a few hundred or even fewer popular votes at the district level may determine the party column in which that district's electoral vote is recorded under Mr. Lippmann's plan, it would, on the average, require about 100,000 such marginal votes to cause a difference of one electoral vote in the national vote totals.

Furthermore, while straining at this gnat of a possible miscarriage of the popular will under the Lodge-Gossett plan, Mr. Lippmann fails to note that his proposal to use congressional districts as electoral-vote districts opens the way to a distortion of the popular vote in terms of electoral votes in a way which the Lodge-Gossett plan obviates entirely. State legislatures in discharging their function of defining congressional district lines have notoriously been influenced by considerations of partisan and sectional advantage. Consequently it is not uncommon to find congressional districts of widely varying population in the same State. To cite one of the many horrible examples, the Fifth Ohio District has a population (1940 census) of 163,000 while the Twenty-second Ohio District has 686,000. The district vote system in Ohio would mean, therefore, that a voter in the down-State Fifth District would have a voting power more than four times as great as his fellow Ohioan in the Twenty-second District who happened to have the misfortune to live in the Cleveland area. Even the present system, with all its faults, has at least the merit of giving equal value to all the popular votes in a State for determining how that State's electoral votes shall be cast. It can be said, of course, that there could be included with the district vote plan a provision to insure, by national action if necessary, a fair and equitable system of districts within each State for congressional and presidential election purposes. Inclusion of such a feature, however, would be an additional handicap in securing ratification by the necessary number of State legislatures. Those bodies are not likely to surrender lightly and willingly the power which they now possess to define congressional district lines with a view to personal, partisan, and sectional advantage.

The second point Mr. Lippmann makes in his attack is wholly insupportable. It is based on a misconception of the true nature of the Lodge-Gossett proposal. Since the election of 1800 the principle has been accepted in this country that the choice of a President is actually made by the people. The electoral college system has been tolerated for so long only because it has been possible to modify and adapt it to this purpose. What the Lodge-Gossett plan proposes to do is to clear away the useless and potentially dangerous machinery of the electoral office, abolish the unwholesome general ticket system which has grown to be a part of the present system, and go as far as practical considerations will permit in the direction of bringing our method of choosing the President into harmony with political realities.

For cogent reasons, which Mr. Lippmann recognizes, the Lodge-Gossett plan does not propose to make the Nation one single constituency for election of the President by a simple direct popular vote; it proposes to keep for the States the present relative political weight which they have through Presidential electoral votes based on their respective number of seats in the Senate and House. To do this and at the same time to give appropriate effect to the expression of popular support for the various candidates, State by State, requires the use of the Presidential electoral-vote device for canvassing the results nationally. Popular votes are merely translated into presidential electoral votes at the State level for a national canvass of popular sentiment. Mr. Lippmann, as some others in and out of Congress have done, seizes on the concept of proportionality inherent in this process of equating the popular vote for a candidate in a given State to an electoral vote for him and brands it a scheme of proportional representation.

I have no inclination here to question Mr. Lippmann's views on the dangers to our political institutions inherent in schemes of proportional representation. He may well be right in this. But the proportional-representation argument is strictly a red herring as applied to the issue presented by the Lodge-Gossett plan. It is utterly impossible to have a scheme of proportional representation in electing a single officer, such as a President. A one-man office cannot be divided up among the various contestants. The nearest approach that could be managed would be to permit the various candidates to hold the office for that proportion of a year, or of a month, or of a week, to which their proportionate shares of the votes would entitle them. If the Lodge-Gossett plan is a scheme of proportional representation, or if it would give encouragement to adoption of proportional representation in the election of other officers, then we had better look to our present scheme of electing governors, Senators, Representatives, and the like. For do we not credit the candidates in the voting districts and counties with the exact proportion of the popular vote they received and carry these totals on through to the final canvass? That is just what the Lodge-Gossett plan proposes to do, except that the proportions of popular votes are translated into the common political coin of Presidential electoral votes at the State level before the Nation-wide canvass is made.

It is clear enough that the influence of certain key States, such as New York and Ohio, and of strategically situated organized

minority groups in them, on party strategy, the shaping of party platforms, and the selection of candidates, would be diminished somewhat by the adoption of the Lodge-Gossett amendment. I can understand why some individuals oppose the amendment on such grounds, even though I cannot give decisive weight in my own thinking to objections of this sort which arise out of narrow personal, group, and sectional interest. It is unfortunate that Mr. Lippmann, by advancing objections to the Lodge-Gossett amendment purporting to be founded on considerations of wise public policy, has strengthened the hand of those whose reasons for accomplishing the defeat of this fundamentally sound proposal have merit only in terms of narrow self-interest.

The Awakening South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Awakening South," published in the Anniston (Ala.) Star of March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AWAKENING SOUTH

Theme of a recent issue of the Reporter, fortnightly magazine of facts and ideas, was the South Moves Forward, and supplying one of the most illuminating articles for the issue in question was Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution. "The real reconstruction begins," is the heading of the article which makes a number of pertinent observations with respect to the improving South. Very much to the point, for example, is this sharp contrast between the old and the new on our farms:

"In the South 10 years ago, a green field in January was an oddity. Today all over the South are rich meadows on which cattle can graze the year around. The livestock population has more than tripled, and there is almost a distinct cult of farmers who favor the new grasses and legumes that keep fields green in winter: sericea, lespedeza, ladino, white Dutch, manganese and crimson clovers, Kentucky 31 fescue, and its rival from Oregon, kudzu—the miracle plant that heals land wounds that time alone will not heal, but worsen. Cattlemen from Nebraska, Kansas, and Illinois come to look, and some even stay. There is also a trend toward small grains. Many a farmer, quitting cotton, has started planting oats and wheat, and found them rewarding."

Mr. McGill brings out that along with the trend toward clovers, grasses, and grains, including hybrid corn, there are other evidences as well to indicate that a new era of progress and prosperity is at hand in southern agriculture. He mentions rural electrification, the marketing of millions of broilers each year, improved and expanded dairy herds, new cheese factories, and pumps in the wells and water in the houses of our farms today. Nor is progress confined to rural areas, since in towns and cities, too, growth and improvement are very much in evidence. The editor of the Constitution does not argue that all our ills have been remedied, but he makes the telling point that measured by the past, the South's gains have been dramatic.

"* * * The South today has a feeling it is out of the woods," he states factually. "It still has its frustrations, and its infections, like the Ku Klux Klan, and the demagoguery of some of its politicians, but even these plagues are not as virulent as they used to be. The talk today is not so much of the two lynchings last year, but of the more than 20 that were prevented by forthright action of local law-enforcement officers. As for the Klan, it is an almost impotent organization, unfeared save in the few remote rural regions where population is sparse and frustration and poverty worse. Even in such areas, the Klan is growing less resolute."

Listing education as the South's major problem, the article in the Reporter takes note of developments in two Southern States to show how great has been recent progress in this field. One concerns the recent action in the Dixiecrat State of Mississippi, where the Dixiecrat Governor took the lead in appropriating money to equalize educational facilities in that State, both as to equipment and pay. Meanwhile, in Mr. McGill's own State of Georgia, school appropriations have been increased by the Georgia Legislature from $14,457,132 in 1938 to $50,875,000 in 1950. Such increased budgets, Mr. McGill adds, are "more or less the rule all over the South."

Finally, he takes up in his encouraging article the matters of public health and per capita income in the South. And in both particulars, the showing is one of great improvement. For instance, malaria, once the South's worst plagues, has been markedly reduced, and in many areas entirely eliminated. And whereas a study conducted by the University of Georgia in 1935 disclosed that the South's percentage of the Nation's industry in 1930 was almost exactly that of 1865, the period since 1930 has witnessed great industrial expansion in our part of the country. Mr. McGill cites all of this, and more, in support of his entirely tenable proposition that while the new South has not yet overcome all its handicaps, the birth pains are at last beginning.

Foreign Information and Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in view of the plan of the House of Representatives to reduce the appropriation for the State Department, which contains the Voice of America item, I think it would be useful to have in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whispering Voice," from the Washington Post of this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHISPERING VOICE

Thirty-four million dollars is all the United States may be allowed to spend on its whole foreign information and education program during fiscal 1951. This, seemingly, is all that can be mustered for defense in the realm of ideas at a time when the country is laying out some $13,000,000,000 for the military aspects of its defense. Thirty-four million against thirteen billion. This dismal contrast comes as the Kremlin is increasing its propaganda efforts in critical areas, both in radio broadcasts and in pamphlets. Nor is this all. Perhaps the most formidable opponents of the United States, propaganda-wise, are the Communist Parties which receive untold support from Moscow. Indeed, practically every major country is spending proportionately more on its information program than the United States; impoverished Britain, for example, before devaluation was spending the equivalent of $27,000,000 for information services alone.

In cutting the foreign information appropriation from $36,500,000 to $34,000,000, the House Appropriations Committee stipulated that none of the cut should come out of Voice of America broadcasts. Yet these broadcasts are only a part of the program, and, as respects such areas as southeast Asia, perhaps not the most important part. Movies, libraries, personal contacts are essential there as means of reaching the people directly. To be sure, maximum expansion cannot come immediately, and perhaps not a great deal more money could be spent wisely at this time. But what is needed is a new and bold concept along the lines suggested by Senator BENTON, a recognition of our tremendous stake in the battle for men's minds and plans to enlarge our operations accordingly. Surely the richest nation in the world can do better than the present piddling effort.

Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 6 I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first two installments of a series of articles by Mr. Charles Van Devander, Washington correspondent for the New York Post, analyzing the career of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr. In view of the deep interest in the series I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the two following installments of the article.

There being no objection, the two installments were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[Installment No. 3]

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON, December 7.—Six weeks before VJ-day the writers war board, consisting of top authors who had dedicated their talents to the war effort, took formal notice of the wartime broadcasts of Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual's 7 p. m. Washington news commentator.

The writers (Clifton Fadiman, Carl Carmer, Franklin P. Adams, Rex Stout, Russel Crouse, and others) called his radio period "a shockingly isolationist, intolerant, and divisive program."

Lewis' steady harassment throughout the war of the unpleasant, but essential, programs of rationing and price control thoroughly justifies the adjectives, "intolerant" and "divisive."

The charge of isolationism is based on less voluminous, but still convincing, data.

Lewis normally devotes his destructive radio talents to domestic affairs, in which he is a consistent foe of anything remotely connected with the New Deal or the Fair Deal. However, in the fall of 1939, immediately after Hitler plunged Europe into war with his attack on Poland, Lewis made a notable, if indirect, contribution to the debate then going on in the United States over what our foreign policy should be.

He was the friend and agent through whom Col. Charles Lindbergh arranged for two speeches over the Mutual system; broadcasts in which Lindbergh argued for complete and inviolate neutrality as between the cause of Hitler and that of England and France, including the prohibition of credit or arms shipments to the Allies.

A year later, with France fallen and England under the first hammer blows of the aerial blitz, Lewis joined the violent isolationists—Wheeler, Nye, Clark, and the rest—in detecting a bid for dictatorship in President Roosevelt's request for passage of a peacetime Selective Service Act.

NO NEED FOR DRAFT ACT

Lewis approvingly quoted Senator Wheeler's statement that there was no need for the draft act and his charge that "the real forces behind this draft bill are super patriots."

As to the convention that administration leaders were seeking to establish a dictatorship, Lewis told his Nation-wide radio audience on August 5, 1940, that he had done some independent checking and had, in effect verified that charge through admissions he obtained from Senator PEPPER, an advocate of the draft act. (PEPPER had told Lewis that he favored giving President Roosevelt full wartime powers to meet whatever emergency might arise.)

Throughout this period Lewis was on terms of close personal friendship with members of the German Embassy staff here. Their reports to Berlin, which were captured and are now in the possession of this Government, eventually will require some comment—in the form of denial or explanation—from Mutual's star Washington commentator.

The captured German documents are being issued in installments under an agreement among the Allied governments. Those relating to Lewis will be published in about a year.

In 1941 and 1942 Lewis was on the pay roll of the National Association of Manufacturers for a series of broadcasts from defense plants around the country. These programs were a glorification of industry's defense production effort, and were designed as a contribution to industrial morale. Lewis received a nominal salary of $250 a week from the NAM, in addition to the income from his regular broadcast.

His destructive attacks on gasoline and tire rationing, and on the Government officials in charge of those essential programs, started shortly after Pearl Harbor and continued into 1943.

In a typical broadcast in February 1943, he cited "common criticism" that "the economics professors in the OPA * * * apparently are rationing just for the sake of rationing."

"It's an orgy of Government regulations," he went on, "in which the economics theorists and the people who write Government pamphlets on dietetics and nutrition and such things are having a fine time making guinea-pig experiments on the helpless American people."

At the time of that broadcast Americans were fighting on Guadalcanal, Russians were killing Germans at Stalingrad, and President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill had just finished their momentous conference at Casablanca. The rubber and gasoline saved by the economics professors, with the hearty cooperation of most Americans, were useful in all of those endeavors.

Lewis, culminating his series of attacks on rationing, said:

"I hope that the gentlemen here in Washington who are involved will realize that I'm not indulging in any personalities. I'm merely trying to be constructive." * * *

Most of them had no such realization.

In 1944, with the war in full blast both in Europe and in the Pacific, Lewis began a similar campaign against price controls. His keynote, which he embellished with personal attacks on those Government officials who were attempting, against even more trying difficulties, to maintain economic stability, was this assurance to his millions of listeners:

It would be "perfectly safe (and this in 1944) to remove all price ceilings and let prices simmer down to their own level."

Two years later when ceilings finally were removed, prices "simmered" up through the roof—but Lewis was one of those who wasn't too badly inconvenienced.

LEWIS' AUTHORITY: PATRICK J. HURLEY

Since the end of the war Lewis appears to have tacitly accepted the bipartisan foreign policy. He has had little to say on the subject. Recently, however, he has revealed symptoms of itching to join in the Republican assault on the conduct of United States relations with unhappy and strife-torn China.

As a start, he has adopted as his authority Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, an amateur diplomat who was completely duped by both the Chinese Communists and the Chinese Nationalists during his spectacularly unsuccessful mission to China near the end of the war.

"If there is anybody in the world who should know what he is talking about (on China) it is General Hurley," Lewis observed a few evenings ago.

[Installment No. 4]

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON, December 8.—Postwar restlessness was widespread in the United States in 1946.

The forces of greed and selfishness which had been under restraint since Pearl Harbor were bursting out of bounds on a dozen fronts. The meat-shortage hysteria which swept the country just before the congressional elections of that year was a symptom of national state of mind.

To some degree this restlessness was natural and inevitable, but it was exploited and aggravated by reckless men for their own ends. One of these was Fulton Lewis, Jr., Washington news commentator for the Mutual Broadcasting System, who generally plays hand-in-glove with the most reactionary elements in America.

Lewis selected for his special mission the destruction of any effective price control. Riding with the tide in his campaign against OPA, Lewis reached the peak of his popularity among confirmed antiadministration elements of the population—and with that the ultimate of his power to mobilize pressure against nervous Members of Congress.

At the same time, he established a new low for sustained misrepresentation and distortion of the facts by a supposedly responsible news broadcaster.

Occasionally, Lewis professed that he was only trying to correct the faults in the administration of price controls by Chester Bowles and his hard-pressed band, although his tactics of magnifying every small error was hardly directed toward this end.

"I don't want to discontinue OPA, and have so stated over this program many times," he asserted. But on another occasion he declaimed:

"The truth is—the plain truth is—that the greatest single force in America today for inflating the cost of living and making you pay higher prices than you ever paid before is the OPA itself and the very price-control system which they say is your protection against inflation."

Stepping back into the disguise of a friend trying to save OPA from its own mistakes, he told the country—or as much of it as was tuned to his MBS program on May 3, 1946, that the Republican drive in Congress to amend the Price Control Act by cutting out its heart was only a case of corrective surgery.

"Don't be fooled by this stuff and nonsense, that this is a question of whether price is to be controlled or not," he said. "It is no such thing. It's a question of whether the slide rule quiz kids in OPA are going to be permitted to continue to run things just as they jolly well please, without any restraints, without any requirement that they straighten out the mess they've made."

This was the same Lewis who in 1943, when the fortunes of a world war were hanging delicately in the balance, told his radio audience that the "economics professors in OPA" were "rationing just for the sake of rationing," and who in 1944 said it would be "perfectly safe to remove all price ceilings."

Not many Americans had listened to his divisive pleas then, but now he was riding high on the tide of postwar discontent. Lewis rode it for all it was worth. In his sweeping condemnation of the OPA and his reckless assurances that prices would fall once controls were removed, he easily outdid the National Association of Manufacturers and Senator TAFT combined.

Throughout the campaign Lewis adroitly switched back and forth between the self-contradictory roles of a partisan advocate and an objective Washington news commentator.

Night after night he belabored OPA with the case of the three little Swiss. These pets of Lewis were owners of a San Francisco restaurant, who had unsuccessfully sought permission to increase their prices after remodeling the place. It is possible that the three little Swiss were victims of overzealousness—the case was at least questionable. But on the strength of this single case, Lewis condemned the OPA from top to bottom.

EXHORTED LISTENERS TO WRITE CONGRESS

At the height of the battle in Congress Lewis begged for support from his listeners. He told them that Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the CIO and the Communist Party were stirring up OPA supporters to write to Congress.

"Let's show them what some writing is," Lewis countered. "Get your neighbors to write, too. Get the members of your family to write. * * * Don't delay this."

The response was tremendous. That one Lewis broadcast is credited by former price control officials with having changed the preponderance of congressional mail from pro- to anti-OPA. With the 1946 congressional elections only months away, the effect of this demonstration on nervous Members of Congress may well have tipped the balance toward adoption of the amendments which finally spelled the death of OPA.

TURNED HIS GUNS ON WOMEN'S GROUPS

Shortly after this incident, Lewis violently attacked the leaders of 23 women's organizations which joined in an appeal to the Senate Banking Committee to preserve OPA. The organizations included the American Association of University Women, the National Board of the YWCA, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Women's Trade Union League and the National Councils of Catholic Women, Jewish Women and Negro Women. Lewis assailed the officers of all of these groups for presuming to speak for all of their members.

A nasty scene ensued, in the Mutual studio and on the air, when Dr. Caroline Ware, who

had presented the statement of the 23 organizations to the Senate Committee, appeared with Lewis on his program to answer his attack.

ASSURED LISTENERS PRICES WOULD DROP

Lewis had given her 3 minutes to present her reply. She ran over the allotted time by 50 seconds, and Lewis then spent the remaining few minutes of the program upbraiding her for taking an unfair advantage of his offer of free air time. He devoted his entire broadcast the following night to more of the same.

Lewis repeatedly assured his listeners that without price controls prices would go down, not up.

Official warnings to the contrary, he said, were panic-stricken and hysterical bugaboo tales * * * horrible ghosts and specters in the haunted house. He accused the OPA of resorting to thoroughly unprincipled and immoral methods * * * in their propaganda.

When all price controls temporarily lapsed July 1, 1946, following President Truman's veto of an unsatisfactory bill, newspapers from coast to coast reported immediate and startling increases in food prices. Lewis, speaking from Washington at 7 p. m. that night, accused OPA of having invented these stories as propaganda.

Butter prices were in every newspaper headline. Lewis asserted that actual shopping tests by himself and his staff proved that, in fact, butter still was selling in stores throughout Washington at the old ceiling price of 67 cents a pound—not at 97 cents, as reported in all of the local newspapers.

He was equally confident that prices of manufactured articles would not go up.

"I have talked to the top leaders of the automobile industry today," he said. "* * * Most of them told me that they have no intention of increasing the prices on their cars at all. * * * I have contacted top officials of the steel industry * * * and there is no indication that there will be any increase (in steel prices) at all."

HIGHER PRICES ENTIRELY TEMPORARY

During the fall, Lewis joined wholeheartedly in the hullabaloo over the meat shortage, dutifully echoing the antiprice control propaganda of the stock raisers. Chester Bowles warned that if meat price controls were abandoned, prices would jump 40 to 50 percent within 60 days. Lewis retorted that prices would go down, not up.

When controls actually were lifted in October, cattle and hog prices shot up even higher and more rapidly than the most pessimistic Government official had predicted. Lewis, however, was unshaken.

"These present prices are entirely temporary, indeed momentary," he asserted confidently, "and they'll last only a few days."

Prices, in fact, continued to hit new highs for months after the date of that broadcast, but by then Lewis had changed the subject. He had begun a campaign to destroy the so-called veterans' housing program and was regaling his radio listeners with invented fantasies and nonexistent scandals involving frantic young Mr. Wilson Wyatt and his hyperthyroid housing program.

Just last week, however, Lewis stirred some nostalgic twinges when he referred briefly to the coming 1950 battle over extension of rent control. He quoted the authorities on whom he relies as saying that "in reality rent control is holding rents up, not down. * * *"

"They said," Lewis droned on, "that when rent controls are dropped, as shown by actual experience in places where rent controls have been dropped, the increase in rental rates is negligible or nonexistent."

Hold onto your hats; here we go again.

Plight of Jews in Countries Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting document containing a description of the status of the people of the Jewish faith under the various iron-curtain regimes in eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, which I have received from a highly reputable organization known as the Jewish Labor Committee.

Mr. President, in view of the claims sometimes made by apologists for the totalitarian regime of Soviet Russia regarding the alleged freedom of these areas from racial prejudices and alleged freedom from persecution of the so-called racial and religious minorities, I think this document should be required reading for anybody who is inclined to have any illusions in the matter of Soviet Russia. The organization sponsoring this report is headed by individuals of such repute as Mr. Adolph Held and Mr. David Dubinsky.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpts from report on plight of Jews in countries behind the iron curtain, delivered at meeting of national executive committee of the Jewish Labor Committee, March 12, 1950]

In February 1949, at the national convention of the Jewish Labor Committee, a survey of the condition of Jews in countries behind the iron curtain was presented to the delegates. In that study we pointed out that liquidation threatened the Jewish communities in all the countries dominated by Soviet power. A year has gone by and we deem it advisable to bring to public attention a report of what has happened to Jewish life in the same countries since our original survey was published.

Our conclusion is: While for most of the people living under the Soviet regime that reign means impoverishment, slavery, and moral degradation, for the Jews and the Jewish groups it spells thorough spiritual annihilation as well. The national liquidation of the Jewish populations in Communist-dominated countries is now proceeding with an iron hand.

SOVIET RUSSIA

According to the last Soviet census of January 17, 1939, there were 3,020,141 Jews in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. With the incorporation of the Baltic republics, eastern Poland and Bessarabia into the Soviet Union in 1941, about 2,200,000 persons were added to the Soviet-Jewish population. Allowing for a slight natural increase, the grand total of Soviet Jews prior to Hitler's attack on Russia in 1941 amounted to 5,300,000. At present, after Hitler's mass extermination of Jews, the national strength of Jewry in Russia is estimated at 2,000,000 persons, which means that about 3,300,000 were exterminated by Nazi legions, died in Siberia, or were liquidated in concentration camps.

The campaign to exterminate Jewish national cultural life was officially launched by Ilya Ehrenburg, himself a Jew, on September 21, 1948, in the Communist newspaper, Pravda, in Moscow.

In January 1949, a pamphlet by the Soviet economist, T. A. Genin, proclaimed that the aims of Jewish nationalism and Zionism are similar to the aims of reactionary capitalism and American imperialism. In November 1948, Einikeit, the only Yiddish newspaper published in Russia, was liquidated.

During 1949, almost all Yiddish literary figures, even though they were members of the Communist Party, vanished. The most outstanding of these were Itzik Feffer, Peretz Markish, David Bergelson, L. Kvitko, S. Alkin, and Nistor. Inquiries by American-Jewish organizations at the Soviet Embassy concerning the fate of these Yiddish literary figures have met a stone wall of silence. When the Yiddish literary almanac, The Star, in the Ukraine, was closed, the reason given was that it "cultivated Jewish national consciousness."

Simultaneously, a drive started against all Jews who occupied important places in general Soviet life—the struggle against so-called cosmopolitanism. Of all the so-called followers of cosmopolitanism who were liquidated, about two-thirds were Jews. The most important of them were active in Soviet literature, science, philosophy, history, the theater, and included even special writers on sports matters. The Communist line was that Jews are landless, stateless, and are not an integral part of Russia and her people, and that they are devoted to abstract Jewish nationalism, which is basically Jewish chauvinism. Cosmopolitanism, which was largely identified with Jewish national culture, was harshly castigated. In particular, Jewish literary figures were pictured as lifeless corpses, renegades, men wearing traitor's masks and were accused of playing up the cosmopolitan idea of the existence of a world-wide Jewish literature and of putting Soviet writers on a par with burned-out businessmen of America and Palestine.

During the year, concrete signs of anti-Semitism emerged. In a very prominent position among those attacked were persons who had Jewish names, and who for years had been writing under Soviet pseudonyms. In numerous instances the Russian names were followed by the original Jewish names in parenthesis.

The worst, however, that the Jews had to go through in 1949 was the mass deportation to Siberia of Jews from the Ukraine, Eastern Galicia, Bukovina, Bessarabia, and the Baltic States. Some 30,000 Jews were deported from the city of Lemburg, alone. Very little information about this forced exodus has reached the outside world. American relatives of some of these victims have given up hope of locating them. Letters are returned with a notation that the whereabouts of the addressee were unknown.

During the course of the last 12 months, the Communist legend of a Jewish republic in Birobidzhan has dissolved in thin air. The Birobidzhan territory in the Far East has been completely cut off from Russia herself. Even non-Russian Communist journalists are not permitted to visit that territory. All hopes for Jewish settlement in Birobidzhan have been destroyed. In all the years of its existence, only a small number of non-Soviet Jews, all together 784 persons, was reported to have come there. According to conservative estimates only about 23,000 Jews in all were present in the Birobidzhan region in 1939. According to all available information the idea of Jewish mass settlement in Birobidzhan was a complete failure.

In Soviet Russia today there is not a shred of Jewish cultural life remaining. All

Jewish institutions and organizations, including the Yiddish press and Jewish publishing houses, have been liquidated. The Russification of the Jewish population has been carried out with an iron hand. All contact between Soviet Jews and Jews in the western world was destroyed. In Russia today Israel is considered an American-British colony, and sympathy for its constructive efforts is ruthlessly suppressed.

Very few Jews have remained in government employ. Needless to say, the emigration of Jews from Russia is strictly forbidden and correspondence with relatives abroad is most dangerous. The 2,000,000 Jews in present-day Russia are on the precipice of spiritual annihilation.

POLAND

Officially there are between 60,000 and 70,000 Jews in Poland today. Though their economic condition is not worse than the plight of the general Polish population, their natural cultural life has in 1949 been subjected to a savage liquidation similar in intensity and form to that in Soviet Russia. Though the destruction is not going on as brutally as in Russia, the direction is the same and we are rapidly approaching the complete liquidation of the Jewish community in Poland.

All Jewish economic institutions, cooperatives built mainly with American-Jewish financial resources, were taken over by the government. The Central Committee of Polish Jews, which included all Jewish groups—Zionists, Bundists, Communists, and religious Jews, was converted into a thoroughly communistic institution. The Jewish Central Committee of Poland, though formally still in existence, has been taken over by the Communists and has become a caricature of its former self. The Jewish district committees were dissolved.

Simultaneously, all Jewish political organizations were liquidated. On January 16, 1949, the Jewish Socialist Party, the Bund, was forced to merge with the Jewish section of the Communist Party. Following this, all Zionist groups and Jewish religious organizations were smashed, and many prominent Jewish religious leaders escaped from Poland.

The relief efforts of the American Joint Distribution Committee, OZE and partly of the ORT, were declared illegal.

The Yiddish schools were subjected to the same treatment. All studies above the fifth grade in the Jewish schools, may henceforth be conducted only in the Polish language. In the school year 1948–49, there were still 25 Jewish schools with an enrollment of 3,086 pupils. At the beginning of the school year 1949–50, these schools were taken over by the government. Similar treatment was accorded to all Hebrew schools. A few minor Jewish papers are still allowed to publish and there remain 39 libraries, 43 cultural clubs, and 6 Jewish orchestras in Poland, which are all on the verge of destruction.

At the beginning of 1949 the government announced that Polish Jews will be allowed to emigrate to Israel, and close to 30,000 Jews registered for emigration. The Jewish Communist press, however, simultaneously launched a vicious campaign against this exodus, describing the Jews who wanted to emigrate as traitors to Poland. This campaign of intimidation served to halt the registration and only a small number of Jews have to date succeeded in leaving the country.

In January of this year, leaders of the Jewish Communists, M. Mirsky and S. Zachariash, declared at a Jewish meeting in the city of Lodz that "the Jews in Poland will not be misled by Jewish nationalism. They will not submit to the agitation to go to Israel where cultural annihilation and unemployment awaits them."

Insecurity, loneliness, homelessness, and forced assimilation are the lot of the remaining tens of thousands of Jews who are compelled to remain under Soviet-Communist domination in Poland today.

RUMANIA

About 350,000 Jews are in Rumania today—this being the largest Jewish population in Europe, after Russia. The economic plight of the Jews in Rumania is most difficult, with 80 percent of them not being self-sustaining. Most of them are selling whatever possessions they have left in order to eke out a miserable existence. A Jew can find employment only upon joining the Jewish section of the Communist party. Most Jews in prewar Rumania were engaged in trade, and under the new regime have been completely declassed.

The destruction of Jewish communal life has been proceeding at a rapid pace. Jewish non-Communist communal leaders have been eliminated. In March 1949, the American Joint Distribution Committee office in Bukovina was ordered to close its doors. This was followed by similar orders to ORT and OZE. The possessions of these organizations were turned over to the so-called Federation of Religion Communities, which is fully controlled by the Communist Party.

In April 1949, 256 charity institutions were liquidated, including orphanages, children's homes, and 19 Jewish hospitals. At the beginning of 1949, 3,000 Jews were in prisons in Bukovina province. By the end of 1949 some 11,000 Jews had been incarcerated in Rumania on the so-called pretext of speculation and Zionist propaganda.

In June 1948, there were 69 Jewish elementary schools and 23 high schools, with a student body of 13,000 and a teaching personnel of 1,000. By August 1949, all these educational institutions had been taken over by the government. Opposition to the liquidation of the Jewish language in the schools was penalized as an act of sabotage against the state.

In order to abolish Jewish religious life, these institutions were turned over to Jewish Communists who overnight became the so-called religious leaders. The conduct of religious rituals was punished severely and Communist dogma took their place. In one instance, 28 Jews were arrested at a Jewish wedding because they sang Hatikvah, the Jewish national anthem. Under the leadership of a Communist, Marcelle Fisher, a Jewish organization to fight religious customs and ritual was organized. Young Jewish Communists were given instructions to invade synagogues and force the people to join them in singing the Rumanian national anthem.

The dream of Rumanian Jewry today is to leave their country of birth. In January 1949, the Rumanian Government agreed to permit 3,600 Jews to emigrate, and then withdrew this permission. All Zionist organizations were forced to go out of existence and immigration to Israel is considered by the government as an anti-national act. Illegal emigration through Hungary to the displaced persons camps in Austria is practically impossible, as the guards have orders to shoot on sight, anyone who attempts to flee the country.

Jewish communal life in Rumania is on the brink of physical and material extinction.

HUNGARY

The rapid nationalization of the economy in Hungary has actually brought Jewish economic life to catastrophe. Prior to the war, Jewish wealth in Hungary amounted to about one and a half billion dollars, which was confiscated by the Communist government. Many Jewish government employees were fired because of the general appeasement policy which the Communist government has been pursuing toward undemocratic and anti-Semitic elements in the country. Jews have now been eliminated from positions in the Communist Party.

A particularly notorious case of discrimination and injustice against Jews is the episode of the "gold train," a train loaded with gold, jewelry, and precious things which the Horthy government had shipped out of the country during the last days of its rule. American authorities in Germany seized this gold train and discovering that a rather important part of the precious cargo had been looted from the Jews, returned the whole property to the Hungarian Government, which promised to restore the valuables to their former owners.

The Communist government, however, kept the entire treasure. On January 26, 1949, Perens Yeshensky, the director of the Hungarian National Bank, declared that the items in the train were not the property of Jews, as most of these items had Fascist inscriptions. We have since learned from former high Hungarian officials now in exile, that these Nazi inscriptions were made by the Communist government itself, in order to deny the valid Jewish claims.

The same pattern of destruction of Jewish religious and cultural life as observed in Russia, Poland, and Rumania repeated itself in Hungary. All Jewish schools under the direction of the Jewish community were nationalized and the teaching of Hebrew was outlawed. Non-Jewish Communists have replaced the Jewish teachers in the school system. Jewish pupils are forced to attend school on Saturday and the government ordered all Jewish shops and places of business to remain open on Saturday. Political spies and informers have been placed in synagogues and wherever Jewish ceremonies are held.

At the beginning of 1949, the Zionist organization was officially disbanded. Following this, some 60,000 Jews registered for immigration to Israel. By that time, however, the Hungarian Government had become hostile to Israel and proclaimed it an Anglo-American colony. A number of Zionist leaders who did not escape in time, were arrested and given prison terms of 6 months to 3 years.

Today, no Jew can emigrate from Hungary and we witness the complete national cultural destruction as well as the physical impoverishment of Hungarian Jewry.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Only 55,000 of a prewar Jewish population of 360,000 remained in Czechoslovakia after VE-day. By September 1949, there were only between 18,000 and 20,000 Jews residing there. Their economic plight is a difficult one. All hopes for restoration of their former possessions have been dissolved in thin air. Nationalization deprived the Jews of their former means of livelihood. Anti-Semitic excesses are not a rarity, the most violent having taken place on August 20, 1949, during a demonstration in Bratislava, in Slovakia.

Czechoslovakia, like Russia and the other satellites, had at the beginning given support to Israel. It should be underscored, however, that the Czech Government has, for its shipment of arms to Israel during the latter's war with the Arab, been well paid. The campaign against Israel was commenced about September 1948, and was followed by the liquidation of Zionist groups and the arrest of Zionist leaders.

At the beginning of 1948, an understanding was reached between Czechoslovakia and Israel to allow 20,000 Jews to immigrate to Israel within a period of 3 to 4 months. This agreement was not kept by the Czech Government and only a small group of Czech Jews succeeded in leaving the country. The Czech Government also halted the practice of issuing transit visas for Jewish refugees from Rumania.

The remaining Jewish population in Czechoslovakia is in agony, as their hopes for survival in their country of origin have been shattered. They are rapidly dying behind the bars of the iron curtain.

Surplus Farm Products and Activities of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from Barron's, a weekly business and financial paper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAVO SENATOR!

It is always a pleasure, especially in the dreary realm of farm policy, to be able to pass some bouquets around.

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, deserves just that for his speech in the Senate last week wherein he advocated: (1) Defeat of the administration's request for an additional $2,000,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is already bulging with some $4,000,000,000 worth of surplus farm products, including prunes, turkeys, and rosin. (2) Repeal of the 90-percent parity props under the country's so-called basic commodities (wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, and peanuts).

Taken together, these two suggestions are radical enough to bring down on the Senator's head charges that he is trying to ruin the American farmer, pull the plug under the commodity markets, and plunge the Nation back into 1933 conditions.

Actually Mr. WILLIAMS has an eye on the interests of eastern poultry and dairy farmers who find themselves squeezed by the high price of feed grains. Beyond this his position is both courageous and temperate. In February he joined hands with Senators IVES, HENDRICKSON, and SALTONSTALL, in a vain attempt to have price supports lowered. Now he has returned to the fight for restoring some measure of sanity in a farm situation that daily grows both more serious and ludicrous.

Consider the news of last week on the agricultural front. At home the Department of Agriculture released figures which must come as a jolt to all those who believe that American farming can really be controlled in the interests of price maintenance. The figures showed that farmers this year will put 360,000,000 acres of land into cultivation as against a hoped-for cut to 340,000,000. Even where farmers have followed Government orders in some crops they have expanded operations in others—notably corn, oats, barley, sorghum, and soybeans.

While American production continues full blast world demand is definitely slackening. China is gripped by famine but cut off from even a give-away program. West Europe's output is on the rise. Two years ago France imported some 149,000,000 bushels of wheat in a year. Today, thanks in part to ECA, tractors and other aids, she is a net exporter. In addition, she is overburdened with output of butter and of meat. And Russia has offered export of grains to European countries.

Congress has no real answer to this shift in the economic weather. While attempting to deal with the American surplus of potatoes it last week actually increased acreage in peanuts and cotton. The House Foreign Affairs Committee came up with its dazzling economy plan for cutting ECA's appropriation by $1,000,000,000 while empowering the Secretary of Agriculture to give away $1,000,000,000 of farm products abroad. This would, of course, wreck such autonomy as is left to the ECA without saving the taxpayer a nickel. For as the Department gave supplies away it would be buying an equal amount in the market.

Most preposterous performance of the week was the Government's announcement that it had sold some 32,000,000 pounds of dried eggs to the British for $7,000,000, with the implication that this was a shrewd deal. But, when various domestic and foreign subsidies are taken into account, it turns out that the Government paid $1.26 per pound for the eggs, and sold them at around 3 cents per pound. This egg deal was only one of many examples offered by Senator WILLIAMS to illustrate the phoniness, if not downright dishonesty, of the Government's accounting. What happens is that the Commodity Credit Corporation buys products from farmers and then resells them to other agencies, including the ECA which gives them away.

Looking to the grand total Senator WILLIAMS was able to show not only that CCC has accumulated nearly $4,000,000,000 worth of commodities over the past 18 months, but that in the same period the United States has given away nearly $3,000,000,000 worth. The United States has thus produced approximately $7,500,000,000 of farm products more than it has consumed or sold.

This burden on the taxpayer is in Senator WILLIAMS' view intolerable. It is also intolerable that at a time when the United States needs to use its resources to best advantage it is in fact subsidizing waste on a gigantic scale. The cure is precisely where Senator WILLIAMS puts it—elimination or at least reduction of Federal price supports which encourage the over-production that no amount of acreage controls can possibly prevent.

For years it has been the fashion to believe that in some miraculous way the American farmer could be isolated from the action of the free market which is at the basis of America's economic life. Senator WILLIAMS' speech is a portent of an awakening common sense—doubly refreshing in view of the straddle which Republican politicians make on the issue. From this point of view the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21 (pp. 3736–3740), makes exciting reading.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a poll I conducted among my constituents on various important issues facing the Members of Congress today. I regret I could not send a questionnaire to every citizen, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of the majority in the Seventeenth Ohio District.

In my district, the population is divided almost evenly between city and rural residents. Represented are nearly all of the labor and farm organizations of our Nation as well as large and small businesses, two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to every occupational group: committeemen and women, both Democrats and Republicans; laborers; attorneys; barbers; housewives; public-office holders; salesmen, and educators. Also included were those engaged in business and industry, newspaper, radio, and professional work.

Over 3,000 blanks were mailed to individuals and replicas of the questionnaire were published in six daily and eight weekly newspapers in my district. The total number of returns, approximately 2,000, proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the important issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them.

Attached to many completed questionnaires were letters and notes explaining why that particular person answered various questions as he did. I am very pleased they took the time to do so. It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of the feelings of the people of his district on important matters, but through the questionnaire method I feel I have gained an insight into the wishes of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE FROM HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SEVENTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT

1. Do you favor the continuation of the European recovery program as recommended by President Truman? (Giving or loaning to foreign countries for the next 12 months, including the giving or loaning of money, food, and military equipment direct to foreign governments.) Yes ____ No ____

2. If voting "yes" on question 1, should distribution be made direct to the people or to their governments? People ____ Governments ____

3. Do you favor the President's new program of giving assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world (a program similar to our former WPA)? Yes ____ No ____

4. Do you favor:

(a) Outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes ____ No ____

(b) Amending the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes ____ No ____

(c) A closed shop which requires an employee to be a union member in order to retain his job? Yes ____ No ____

(d) A requirement for both labor and industrial leaders, in contract negotiations, to sign a noncommunistic pledge? Yes ____ No ____

5. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation) even though it might threaten local control and jeopardize our teachers' retirement fund in Ohio? Yes ____ No ____

6. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental profession and operation of our hospitals under Federal control? Yes ____ No ____

7. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production? Yes ____ No ____

8. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages? Yes ____ No ____

9. Do you favor Government-support prices regardless of supply and demand? Yes ____ No ____

10. Do you favor the repeal of the veto power in the United Nations even though it might mean severing our relations with Russia? Yes ____ No ____

11. Do you favor the admission into the United States of about 300,000 additional displaced persons? Yes ____ No ____

12. Do you favor the present policies of the administration attempting to place tax-free Government enterprises on a competitive level with private businesses confronted with threats of tax increases? Yes ____ No ____

Please write on the back of this page your comments on the above questions and any suggestions which you might give to aid me in better serving as your Congressman.

Signature _____
Address _____
Occupation _____

Please return this questionnaire to me, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked my constituents to sign their names and give their occupations, and this information enabled me to secure the opinions of individuals according to occupation. Following is the percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to occupational classification:

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1. Do you favor continuation of the European recovery program as recommended by President Truman? (Giving or loaning to foreign countries for the next 12 months, including the giving or loaning of money, food, and military equipment direct to foreign governments.)

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	33	67
Attorneys	57	43
Barbers	20	80
Business, industry, salesmen	31	69
Farmers	29	71
Housewives	20	80
Labor	26	74
Ministers	75	25
Newspaper and radio	37	63
Professionals	38	62
Public-office holders	25	75
Retired	49	51
School teachers	51	49
Occupations not given and unemployed	43	57

Question 2. If voting "yes" on question 1, should distribution be made direct to the people or to their governments?

	People	Governments
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	69	31
Attorneys	57	43
Barbers	100	----
Business, industry, salesmen	68	32
Farmers	81	19
Housewives	87	13
Labor	74	26
Ministers	75	25
Newspaper and radio	----	100
Professionals	73	27
Public-office holders	71	29
Retired	64	36
School teachers	55	45
Occupation not given and unemployed	51	49

Question 3. Do you favor the President's new program of giving assistance to the underdeveloped areas of the world? (A program similar to our former WPA.)

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	10	90
Attorneys	10	90
Barbers	----	100
Business, industry, salesmen	7	93
Farmers	11	89
Housewives	6	94
Labor	8	92
Ministers	36	64
Newspaper and radio	----	100
Professionals	10	90
Public-office holders	10	90
Retired	4	96
School teachers	27	73
Occupations not given and unemployed	16	84

Question 4. Do you favor (a) outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	5	95
Attorneys	4	96
Barbers	25	75
Business, industry, salesmen	2	98
Farmers	4	96
Housewives	4	96
Labor	12	88
Ministers	10	90
Newspaper and radio	----	100
Professionals	----	100
Public-office holders	5	95
Retired	3	97
School teachers	8	92
Occupation not given and unemployed	10	90

Question 4. (b) Amending the Taft-Hartley labor law?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	49	51
Attorneys	68	32
Barbers	33	67
Business, industry, salesmen	47	53
Farmers	47	53
Housewives	61	39
Labor	44	56
Ministers	67	33
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Professionals	40	60
Public-office holders	52	48
Retired	43	57
School teachers	35	65
Occupation not given and unemployed	66	34

Question 4. (c) A closed shop which requires an employee to be a union member in order to retain his job?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	7	93
Attorneys	9	91
Barbers	17	83
Business, industry, salesmen	4	96
Farmers	4	96
Housewives	4	96
Labor	17	83
Ministers	18	82
Newspaper and radio	----	100
Professionals	1	99
Public-office holders	----	100
Retired	3	97
School teachers	12	88
Occupation not given and unemployed	11	89

Question 4. (d) A requirement for both labor and industrial leaders, in contract negotiations, to sign a non-Communist pledge?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	91	9
Attorneys	86	14
Barbers	100	----
Business, industry, salesmen	91	9
Farmers	93	7
Housewives	92	8
Labor	95	5
Ministers	83	17
Newspaper and radio	100	----
Professionals	95	5
Public-office holders	100	----
Retired	95	5
School teachers	80	20
Occupation not given and unemployed	84	16

Question 5. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation), even though it might threaten local control or jeopardize our teachers' retirement fund in Ohio?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	11	89
Attorneys	9	91
Barbers	----	100
Business, industry, salesmen	7	93
Farmers	8	92
Housewives	8	92
Labor	10	90
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio	13	87
Professionals	7	93
Public-office holders	4	96
Retired	2	98
School teachers	34	66
Occupation not given and unemployed	30	70

Question 6. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental professions and operation of our hospitals under Federal control?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	4	96
Attorneys	4	96
Barbers	----	100
Business, industry, salesmen	1	99
Farmers	3	97
Housewives	2	98
Labor	6	94
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio	----	100
Professionals	1	99
Public-office holders	4	96
Retired	1	99
School teachers	12	88
Occupation not given and unemployed	6	94

Question 7. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	3	97
Attorneys	9	91
Barbers	----	100
Business, industry, salesmen	1	99
Farmers	2	98
Housewives	1	99
Labor	4	96
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio	----	100
Professionals	1	99
Public-office holders	----	100
Retired	----	100
School teachers	5	95
Occupation not given and unemployed	6	94

Question 8. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	3	97
Attorneys	7	93
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	1	99
Farmers	2	98
Housewives	3	97
Labor	4	96
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio		100
Professionals	1	99
Public-office holders	4	96
Retired		100
School teachers	2	98
Occupation not given and unemployed	8	92

Question 9. Do you favor Government support prices, regardless of supply and demand?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	4	96
Attorneys	9	91
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	1	99
Farmers	6	94
Housewives	3	97
Labor	5	95
Ministers	8	92
Newspaper and radio		100
Professionals	1	99
Public-office holders	4	96
Retired	1	99
School teachers	8	92
Occupation not given and unemployed	6	94

Question 10. Do you favor the repeal of the veto power in the United Nations, even though it might mean severing our relations with Russia?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	73	27
Attorneys	63	37
Barbers	71	29
Business, industry, salesmen	77	23
Farmers	72	28
Housewives	76	24
Labor	74	26
Ministers	80	20
Newspaper and radio	75	25
Professionals	85	15
Public-office holders	83	17
Retired	71	29
School teachers	75	25
Occupation not given and unemployed	50	50

Question 11. Do you favor the admission into the United States of about 300,000 additional displaced persons?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	24	76
Attorneys	36	64
Barbers	9	91
Business, industry, salesmen	25	75
Farmers	19	81
Housewives	23	77
Labor	15	85
Ministers	70	30
Newspaper and radio	50	50
Professionals	30	70
Public-office holders	14	86
Retired	27	73
School teachers	44	56
Occupation not given and unemployed	22	78

Question 12. Do you favor the present policies of the administration attempting to place tax-free Government enterprises on a competitive level with private businesses confronted with threats of tax increases?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	5	95
Attorneys	4	96
Barbers		100
Business, industry, salesmen	3	97
Farmers	4	96
Housewives	3	97
Labor	6	94
Ministers		100
Newspaper and radio		100
Professionals	2	98
Public-office holders		100
Retired	4	96
School teachers	5	95
Occupation not given and unemployed	14	86

Jewish Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, March 24–31, 1950, has been designated as Jewish Youth Week in the United States by the National Jewish Youth Conference. The conference is a permanent Nation-wide youth body which represents local and regional youth and young adult councils and national Jewish youth organizations. The theme of the week, "Working Together—Jewish Youth Builds," is described in the editorial in the March edition of the National Jewish Welfare Board Circle. Our Jewish young men and women have willingly accepted their responsibility of citizenship and service and have given generously of their time and efforts in working for deserving community projects. They have accomplished much and will continue to work, with the vigor and inspiration of youth, to build a better world for all of us.

The editorial follows:

JEWISH YOUTH BUILDS

A world at peace does not mean a world in which nations think alike, feel alike, act alike. One world does not mean one mind. Neither does unity require uniformity. Differing opinions are, in fact, essential for the progress of humanity, provided, of course, they are accompanied by a mutual respect for the right to differ.

"Working Together — Jewish Youth Builds," the theme of this year's Jewish Youth Week, which the JWB-sponsored National Jewish Youth Conference has set for March 24–31, reveals significantly the fact that American Jewish youth have learned the art of working together around areas of common interest for a healthier, happier, more positive community. Through youth and young adult councils—which in the majority of cases, are representative of all organized Jewish youth in the community—they have been able to develop dynamic programs for a richer, vibrant Jewish life.

Reflected also in the theme is the recognition by Jewish youth of its role in the growth and development of the American Jewish community. Across the nation, young people have taken their seats on boards of Jewish community centers, Jewish community councils, Jewish welfare federations and on committees of national organizations such as the National Jewish Welfare Board itself. They have made such rapid strides that there now exists a Nation-wide Jewish youth body—the National Jewish Youth Conference—which is representative of 300 local and regional youth and young adult councils and most of the national Jewish youth organizations.

During Jewish Youth Week, the searchlight of the communities will be turned on the major advances which Jewish young men and women have been able to make by working together. Through such events as cultural festivals, Youth Sabbath services, exhibits, rallies, conferences, forums, institutes, pageants, athletic and social events, Jewish youth will demonstrate its abilities, accomplishments, role and responsibilities, and needs. They will demonstrate the fruitful results of concentrated efforts to build together a better world.

These are the future leaders of American Jewry, and, for that very reason, the future of American Jewry looks bright. They are building on a solid foundation, a sound premise. There is indeed a way for people of varied interests and ideological differences to meet on common ground.

CIO Leader Condemns Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Philip Murray at the Knights of Equity banquet at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., March 19, 1950:

I have engaged myself with you this evening briefly referring to the things which in passing our good friend, Father Duffy, talked about * * * the wit of the Irish. I know that meetings of this description have matters to consider that are more relevant to the issues of the day than the telling of stories. One which was pressed home for some consideration by our good friend, Mr. Hayden, the president of the Knights of Equity, this evening had to do with a united Ireland. Now every decent citizen, every honorable and upright citizen, every citizen possessed of integrity who believes in justice recognizes the prime need of the Irish people for unity, a united Ireland.

I am delighted as the president of an organization of some 6,000,000 organized workers to say to this group here this evening that my own union, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, at several of its recent conventions, particularly at its last convention held in the city of Cleveland November of last year, unanimously adopted a resolution against partition in Ireland. We authorized our duly accredited representatives, who participated in the formation of the new International Federation of Trade Unions—some 60,000,000 people being affiliated with that body, 60,000,000 organized workers from 57 countries—to secure approval of our CIO resolution at the London conference of trade-union workers held in the city of London last October, and that resolution has

been referred to the executive committee of the trade-union movements of the democratic free trade-union countries for their special consideration sometime during the coming summer; and it is the purpose of our organization here in the United States to give effect to that resolution by pressing not only for its consideration but its actual adoption by the trade-union internationals of these 57 countries presently affiliated with this world federation of trade-unions. It is a tremendously important subject. It has to do with the question of servitude, an issue which was fought out here in the battlefields of the United States of America where your forefathers and our forebears fought for the freedom of this, the greatest nation of all. The people of the United States are wedded to the idea that there should be a united Ireland. There can be offered no justification for the maintenance of a situation in Ireland which provides disunity. The overwhelming majority of the people in Ireland seek freedom from the economic and political bondage of the British Empire. Their cause is a justifiable one and all right-thinking citizens, whether in the United States of America or not, should support the position of the Irish people in their fight for complete over-all independence.

Oh, I know that we here, although in the spirit of gaiety, and jollity and observance, regard this as a kind of a festive occasion; nevertheless, must needs give special consideration to the more important fundamental things which attach themselves to the observance of this great holiday.

Our Nation and the nations of the universe for the moment are greatly disturbed. The Irish people are disturbed because they are not accorded their rightful recognition as an independent state by the British Government. It should be the business of not only the British Government to seek and secure the unity of Ireland, but I dare say, it should also be the business of the great Republic of the United States of America to assist them in a very practical way toward the attaining of that goal. Our Federal Congress must needs direct its attention to the consideration of this very vexing problem. Our State Department must of necessity, if it seeks the abolition of colonial enterprises, also give consideration to the formation of a united Ireland.

So that no time could be more appropriate for proper consideration of this all-important subject than now. We all have a common understanding of the international travail and sorrow that prevails throughout the world right now—the danger of a hydrogen bomb, the ideological conflicts which are going on in almost every nation throughout the world, the unrest, the confusion, the disorder which prevails no matter where you go. But great organizations such as yours, Mr. Toastmaster, outstanding organizations such as yours can lend much toward the attainment of these great democratic goals to which we all achieve, all aspire. I oft-times wonder if we who are living in the midst of this travail today here in the United States and in other countries, busy as we are rushing madly to do things that have to be done every day we live, if all the peoples throughout this universe, particularly those who are afflicted or who may be in danger of affliction, yes, even the United Nations itself, if these groupings and those peoples could only rest their bodies long enough to permit their souls to catch up with their bodies, we might then be able to solve many of the problems and solve satisfactorily many of the problems which our universe has confronting it today. The prayers, the solicitations, the devotion, the advocacy, the intelligent constructive thoughts that proceed from a mind that is clear and has not designs lending comfort to the afflicted and lending solace and assistance to the nations who are dependent would lend much, lend a great deal toward the attainment of the lofty objectives to which we all aspire.

I'm happy to be one of you here tonight. Unfortunately, for me I do not have the opportunity to meet with too many of my townsfolk too often. Life is that way. It takes you from your hearthside, from your family and from your friends and from your community life because you have other things to do and do in so many places. I am doubly grateful therefore, that the opportunity has been provided me to break bread with you here tonight. I hope out of these associations, these St. Patrick Day celebrations, and other celebrations of a similar nature, we may be able to attain many of the things in the very near future to which we so logically and so constructively aspire. My good friend, Dennis Mulvihill, Jr., the toastmaster here, when I came to the head of the steelworkers in the city of Pittsburgh some 15 years ago, he together with Vince Sweeney did a lot of collaboration with me. Dennis used to come down to the steelworkers' office a good deal lending his spirit, h's soul, his mighty intellect constructively and in a very cooperative fashion to another group of dependent people. They were not independent in those days. They suffered under the yoke of tyranny also here at home. They had economic millstones thrust around their necks and then they formed an organization. An organization dedicated in the name of God to serve, to render service to others unselfishly and self-sacrificingly and that organization in the course of the past 15 years has become a rather substantial segment of our community life here in the city of Pittsburgh. It has grown from no membership in 1936 to over 1,000,000 members today. It has brought more bread and more butter and more meat and more medicine and more clothing into the homes of the people than they ever had before. It has placed pictures on their walls, carpets on their floors, and music in their homes, and it has provided greater cultural and educational opportunities for the young than their fathers and mothers had, at least. So we have an organization like your organization that is an organization of service dedicated to the good of the community and the Nation. We are in the midst of some ideological conflicts for the moment with certain subversive influences who are bent upon the undermining and ultimate destruction of our form of government. I make particular reference now with a special significance to the Communist Party. Our organization of the CIO the United Steelworkers, and all of the affiliated organizations of the CIO presently, are fighting these despots, these atheistic people who would undermine not only the economic well-being of the people who inhabit our Nation, but undermine the principles of a true God-fearing people, destroy their souls and their characters and their homes and inject into the economic life-stream, blood-stream of the United States of America like they have done in other countries their despotic system of dictatorship. So, like you, we are engaging ourselves in the holy crusade on that front lending comfort and assistance to the peoples of the United States and to our Government in a fight against totalitarianism, against dictatorship, against atheistic communism, against any form of subversion which has for itself the purpose, the undermining of the peoples for the destruction of our Government.

Those are our ethics, those are our codes. That is our catechism. Those are the things in which we believe. And to you, worthy toastmaster, and to all the members of the Knights of Equity and to your many friends of many faiths who are here tonight, may God speed you in your blessed and your noble work.

What's Happening to Eggs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. DAVIES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DAVIES of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Consumer Reports for March 1950:

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO EGGS?—A CASE STUDY IN FOOD PRICES AND THE BRANNAN PLAN

(By Edward M. Brecher)

(Consumers Union, for reasons set forth in the June 1949 Consumer Reports, favors the Brannan farm plan as the best proposal currently under consideration for maintaining farm income while permitting retail food prices paid by consumers to fall to reasonable levels. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's proposals have in recent months been widely attacked. Many of the attacks, Consumers Union believes, are based on mistaken facts and false assumptions. To clarify the issues, Consumers Union here presents a study of one specific food—eggs—to show how present price-support laws are working, and how much better, from the point of view of both farmers and consumers, the production payments underlying the Brannan plan would work. While the study is limited to eggs, the same principles apply quite generally to other foods now being supported at high price levels under present laws.)

Housewives in Washington, D. C., who paid 75 cents a dozen for large grade A eggs last October were buying the same eggs early this year at 46 cents a dozen. Housewives in New York City who paid 95 cents a dozen for large grade A whites last September paid 55 cents or even less for the same eggs just 4 months later. In Minnesota and Wisconsin, eggs were selling at the farm for as little as 20 cents a dozen during January 1950. Throughout the country the same dramatic fall in egg prices affected both consumers and farmers.

Consumers asked three questions as they saw eggs fall to bargain prices from near-record highs in the space of a few short months.

First, why did prices fall?

Second, what held prices up before?

Third, isn't there something that can be done to prevent the price of eggs from shooting back up again?

Here are the best answers CU has been able to find, based on Department of Agriculture statistics and other sources:

First, prices fell in part because the Government lowered the support level at which it buys eggs to hold prices up. Increased production, consumer resistance to excessive prices, speculation on the egg exchanges, and seasonal factors may have contributed to the sharpness of the drop, but an anticipated change in the Government buying price was the immediate cause of the collapse in retail egg prices.

Second, just as Federal action caused the collapse, so it was Federal action—specifically the price measures of the Eightieth Congress—which held prices high throughout 1948 and 1949.

Third, there is a better way to manage prices than the Federal egg-buying program which kept prices too high for consumers for 2 years, and then let them fall to levels which mean distress for farmers at the moment. The better way was proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan last year, and promptly rejected by Congress. Briefly,

the Brannan plan would not spend tens of millions of dollars to support the price of eggs, as in the past. It would let wholesale and retail eggs prices fall in accordance with the supply and demand situation. Farmers, however, would not suffer as a result. The hundreds of millions heretofore spent to hold egg prices up, or a part of them, would be spent to maintain farm income directly.

Conversely, the Brannan plan would prevent the wasteful accumulation of so-called surplus eggs. Currently, the Government has in storage, in caves and warehouses throughout the country, more than 2,500,000,000 eggs in powdered form. These were eggs which we didn't consume because the price was too high, and which the Government bought to keep prices high. Under the Brannan plan, such surpluses would not accumulate at all. We'd eat them up.

Meanwhile the present bargain prices for eggs at retail, in some stores and cities, are likely to prove short-lived. Already Congressmen from the poultry States are putting the heat on the Department of Agriculture. Additional Federal egg buying designed to raise prices again—though not to 1949 levels—has already begun. Thus, following a brief interlude in which farmers were getting too little for their eggs, we are likely to return to a situation where consumers are charged too much. To see just how we got into this jam, let's look at the egg record of the past 5 years.

1945

This was the year in which egg eating in the United States hit an all-time high. There was a meat shortage, and for the first time in history Americans consumed more than an egg per person per day. Even so, a small surplus developed, for American hens cooperated by laying more eggs per hen than ever before in history. But the British wanted all the eggs they could get under lend-lease, so the surplus was useful. Prices were controlled by OPA.

1946

The production of eggs exceeded the 1945 record by a wide margin, while prices rose when OPA controls were ended. Consumption declined. As a result, a 3,600,000,000 egg surplus—eggs which could not be sold domestically at prevailing prices—was purchased by the Government. Again the British were prepared to take the entire amount. Despite the enormous surplus, prices remained firm as a result of Government buying for the British.

1947

Almost as many eggs were purchased by the Government to hold prices up as in 1946. But by 1947 Lend-Lease was dead, and the British had dollars to buy only a small portion of the excess—even though eggs were offered them below the price which the American Government paid. Some of these 1947 eggs, in frozen form, remained in Government warehouses into 1949. Total cost to the Government of the 1947 program for acquiring and disposing of eggs: about $52,000,000.

Despite the enormous unsalable 1947 surplus, average retail prices were actually kept higher through Federal purchases in 1947 than in 1946 by more than 11 cents a dozen. Thus, the net effect of the 1947 price-support program in which millions of dollars were spent was to raise the cost of eggs to consumers some $440,000,000 over 1946 costs.

1948

For a variety of reasons, egg production dropped somewhat, and egg consumption rose, so that there was a much smaller 1948 surplus. Again the Government had to buy eggs to support prices, however, and again it bought enough to lift egg prices above the levels of the previous year. Many of the eggs purchased, in dried form, are still stored in caves and warehouses.

1949

Under the Agriculture Act of 1948, the Department of Agriculture was required to support egg prices at a level which would bring the farmer an average of 45 cents a dozen on the farm. This level was achieved by purchasing eggs in dried form. Purchase price of the eggs to the Government: about $80,000,000. Effect on consumers: prices of grade A whites rose as high as 95 cents a dozen.

At the end of 1949, the Government had on hand, in dried form, some 2,500,000,000 1948 and 1949 eggs. A small part of these eggs were being given away through the school-lunch program.

Surplus dried eggs were also being offered for export at less than half the price which the Government paid for them. This is a process known as dumping—selling abroad at less than the cost of production and less than the domestic price. It is a process on which the United States has frowned for many years when other countries attempted it. Dumping is likely to build unlimited ill will on the part of other countries which make a living in part by exporting the products we are trying to dump. But even at the equivalent of 14 cents a dozen—the present dumping price—there are few takers for dried American eggs.

Numerous proposals were made for avoiding the evils of dumping by turning unsalable surpluses over to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, for distribution to countries where they are desperately needed. But according to Washington scurces, the State Department has resolutely opposed such measures.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1950

After years of holding egg prices high for the benefit of farmers, it began early this year to look as if the end of that road was at hand. Indeed, the pendulum swung to the other extreme, and it was farmers who were victimized by egg prices below the cost of production. Farmers, remembering the great depression, talked "strike." One poultry State congressman summarized the situation in mid-January:

"Eggs in the Midwest are 20 cents a dozen at this time. Eggs in the Midwest were 20 cents a dozen in November 1932 when Mr. Hoover was defeated for President. * * * Are the egg producers back where they started? Or further back yet?" [1]

Egg production per hen, at a record high in 1949, is expected to go higher yet in 1950. With enormous stocks of 1948 and 1949 eggs on hand, the Department obviously has no desire to buy up all the eggs in sight for a third straight year. Moreover, the money is not available. Congress seems determined to force the Department to hold farm prices up by wasteful purchase and storage of surpluses; but it has not so far shown its willingness to vote the billions of dollars such a program would cost.

Here is the way Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Knox T. Hutchinson sums up the situation:

"In the past 4 years the Government has spent an average of $85,000,000 a year to support the price of eggs. And consumers have paid out an estimated $125,000,000 to $200,000,000 more for eggs than they would have if the support program had not been in existence. Thus in reality the public has shelled out from $200,000,000 to $285,000,000 a year for egg support."

One way out of the egg-price omelet, of course, would be to eliminate Federal concern with the level of farm prices altogether.

Such a policy is politically impossible, and—in Consumer's Union's opinion—unwise even from the point of view of the consumer who wants low-egg prices. For American farmers are an integral part of our total economy. When farm income falls so low that farmers are unable to buy the things they need, the entire economy suffers. Major depressions have frequently been ushered in by farm depressions, and there can be no doubt that a serious drop in farm income now would promptly be reflected in unemployment and depression for other groups as well. For better or worse, the United States is irrevocably committed to maintaining a reasonable level of farm income.

When steel production exceeds the demand for steel, the few companies which control the steel industry promptly curtail production. The same is true of other dominant industries. But farmers, by themselves, cannot adjust supply to demand in this way. There are too many of them. Indeed, when surpluses occur and income falls off, the average farmer is tempted to increase production of some crops, in order to maintain his personal income. The effect is to pile up still larger surpluses.

But while CU applauds the principle that a fair return to farmers is a proper concern of Government, the particular means for achieving that fair return—namely open market purchase and storage of surpluses—is an outrageous imposition on the consumer in many respects. It keeps retail prices too high. In this way, it discourages consumption and therefore leads to still further surpluses. It also opens the opportunity for commodity speculation at the expense of consumers. Egg speculators on the Chicago and New York egg exchanges, for example, can gamble on a price increase, and thereby drive prices up, without much risk of losing money if the price later falls. For if it does begin to fall, the Government is always standing by to purchase eggs and relieve the speculator of his risk. Finally, Federal purchasing of surpluses subsidizes the giant corporations which manage farm factories as well as the family farmer for whom the program is ostensibly designed.

A better way

Under the Brannan plan, instead of buying up surpluses, with all its attendant evils, the Government would permit wholesale and retail egg prices to fall to whatever level supply and demand might dictate. For 1950, that would probably mean an average retail price of grade A eggs in the vicinity, let us say, of 45 or 50 cents a dozen—or even less during months when the supply is large as at present.

Such a retail price might force farm prices down to bankruptcy levels. Accordingly, at the end of the year, the Government would use the funds it has heretofore used for buying surpluses to make production payments direct to farmers.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that, for the money we have been spending to buy surpluses during the past few years, production payments to farmers averaging 5 to 8 cents a dozen could be made. This payment would be enough to make up the difference between the farm price of eggs and a fair return to farmers.

The arguments against the plan

Four major arguments are being made against the Brannan plan. One is that it

[1] The 20-cent price has since risen to 23 cents or 25 cents. These prices apply, moreover, to eggs of low quality, produced in the Midwest where egg prices are traditionally lower. The 1950 support program is geared to provide farmers with a national annual average price of 37 cents a dozen after balancing out seasonal, regional, and quality variations. This means retail grade A egg prices lower than in 1949, but in all probability higher than the average consumers paid in January and February.

would cost the Federal Treasury too much—perhaps billions. But buying up the surpluses also costs billions; for eggs alone, the cost has been $340,000,000 over the past 4 years. Whether the Brannan plan would cost more or less for any given crop in any given year is difficult to calculate. In general, the same conditions which might make the Brannan plan very costly would also make the present farm program very costly. There is no reason whatever to believe that, on the average, the Brannan plan would cost more—and it might cost less. It would certainly cost much less when the savings to consumers in lower retail prices are included in the calculation.

Second, it is argued that the Brannan plan's production payments would make the farmer a recipient of Federal charity and that consumers would object to spending Federal funds to subsidize farmers. But the Brannan plan is no more charity than the present plan. And consumers, if they once learn the full facts, are much more likely to revolt against the spending of billions to hold prices up, as at present, than they are to revolt against a reasonable program for maintaining farm income while permitting retail prices to fall.

Third, it is urged that the Brannan plan means forced curtailment of production—a type of economic waste which riles both farmers and consumers. But production curtailment is an essential element in the present illogical system of price supports, and a number of crops are actually being curtailed this year. Under the Brannan plan, increased consumption because of lower prices would make curtailment unnecessary in many cases where it is necessary without the Brannan plan. Curtailment of production would be necessary, in fact, only where production exceeded the full amount that consumers would want at reasonable prices.

Finally, it is alleged that the Brannan plan is a two-faced "pie in the sky" scheme which promises low prices to consumers on the one hand and high income to farmers on the other. Clearly, say the plan's enemies, you can't both eat your eggs and have them, too, as Secretary Brannan promises. But actually there is nothing at all contradictory in the consumer and farmer aspects of the plan. There is a real saving from the plan, and it is this saving which benefits both farmers and consumers.

A part of the saving would come from middlemen and food processors. Under the present plan, the farmer gets only a portion of the Federal expenditures. Middlemen and processors, through whose hands the surpluses pass before the Government gets them, get the rest. Needless to say, the middlemen who would lose their cut in the Federal subsidy bitterly oppose the Brannan plan.

Another major saving would result from a reduction in wholesale and retail mark-ups on the food which reaches consumers. These mark-ups are generally figures on a percentage basis. When farm prices go up, the wholesaler's and the retailer's margins go up proportionately. With eggs at 45 cents a dozen on the farm, for example, the average store price is likely to be around 75 cents. Knocking a dime off the farm price may knock 16 cents or more off the store price.

A third saving would come, under the Brannan plan, by limiting benefits to family farmers who need them. Production payments would be made only up to a cash farm income of about $26,000 per farmer. Farmers could continue to earn whatever they were able to earn, but they would participate in production payments on the first $26,000 of marketed crops only. The limitation would affect only a small percentage of the farmers, but it would save the Treasury millions now channeled into the profit ledgers of large farm corporations. The benefits from all these savings would be shared by consumers and farmers alike.

Perhaps most important of all, under the Brannan plan there would be no surpluses, so-called. Consumers would eat them up. For actually there is no surplus of eggs, or of many other crops. If all consumers ate as many eggs as the moderate and upper-income consumers now eat, there would be a shortage. The so-called surplus is simply an accumulation of eggs consumers can't afford to buy at Government-pegged prices. Under the Brannan plan, prices would fall to a level where consumption of eggs would equal production.

There are weaknesses in the Brannan plan—chiefly its limitation to a few crops and its failure to provide consumer representation on the administrative bodies which would make the basic price decisions. These and other shortcomings CU set forth last June. But compared with the folly of the surplus-purchasing program under legislation passed by the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, it would be a long, long step in the right direction.

Secretary Brannan is still fighting for at least a trial run of his plan. But he has received a cold shoulder from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress—with a few noteworthy exceptions. While such reactionary farm organizations as the National Farm Bureau Federation oppose even trying out the Brannan plan, an increasing number of farmers and at least one farm organization—the National Farmers Union—are in favor of the plan. CU believes that consumers would do well to join forces with such farm groups to demand a return to sanity in our national farm-price programs.

A look at the egg problem—and others

Tobacco	$151,891,629
Cotton	955,109,372
Wheat	996,719,026
Linseed oil	111,337,600
Flaxseed	88,344,527
Corn	713,128,735
Dried eggs (210,000,000 doz.)	89,317,233
Butter	59,518,797
Wool	53,510,467
Dry edible beans	42,859,926
Barley	35,088,096
Dried milk	27,399,460
Other	320,904,449
Total	3,645,129,317

Authors of Our Defeats Still Manage Our Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, George E. Sokolsky, noted columnist, has reviewed our foreign policy in a searching editorial. This is "must" reading for Members who are interested in the forces that are changing our lives. I include the article as a part of my remarks:

REVIEW OF OUR DESCENT IN POLICY OF DEFEATISM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It is important for those who wish to think straight to get away from the headlines of the day and to consider the forces and movements that are rapidly changing our lives.

As one listens to the clack-clack on the radio or looks at the enormous headlines in the newspapers, the emphasis is on the unbelievable. Communists everywhere; a King upsetting Belgium; Great Britain in the hands of Socialists; the President sunning himself in Florida while his country is stunned by homosexuals and Communists in high places; a Nation frittering away its wealth while it loses battle after battle in what is called a cold war, which is neither cold nor a war, but a steam roller flattening out the world.

It would seem to be profligate and wasteful to worry about partisanship or about the careers of individuals in the face of our necessity to build a great strength to withstand the shock of the next few years—and we shall be shocked as every nation is that has lost a war.

Let us recapitulate:

In 1939, Europe went to war because Hitler sought to build an empire based on the destruction of the freedoms of man. The world did not know that the Hitler-Stalin alliance included the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact for the division of Europe and Asia between Germany and Russia.

In 1941, the United States entered that war on two fronts; one in Asia; the other in Europe. The United States stated its war objectives in the form of the Atlantic Charter, which set forth high ideals of human freedom and national independence, for friend and foe, for countries large and small.

By 1943, we had deserted those principles. At the Tehran Conference, arrangements were made which, for Europe, practically implemented the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. By 1945, the Tehran principles were also applied to Asia.

The world was divided between the Russian and the Anglo-Saxon countries, at the River Elbe, with the thirty-eighth parallel as the dividing line in Asia.

The acceptance of this Byzantine concept of human bondage by the United States and Great Britain, a departure from the traditions of the race since Magna Carta, at the Potsdam Conference after the war, encouraged the Russians to believe that the western nations had shot their bolt and were hereafter to be regarded as decadent.

We now need to move from what we know to what we may presume; namely, that the Russians analyzed our weaknesses from their own experience with us. They established in each western country an effective Communist Party whose members despised their own country and willingly served Russia.

They found such persons not only among the proletariat, but in the upper intellectual circles, among old families of distinction, among the wealthy and within the Government. This has been as true in the United States as in France, Italy or Great Britain.

They also discovered a marked tendency for the intellectuals, particularly scientists, to forsake the basically Christian traditions of their civilization.

Therefore, they decided to move swiftly. In Europe, they resorted to Marxian propaganda; in Asia, they successfully went to war. In Europe, their influence has expanded beyond the Elbe, but they failed to take Italy, France and western Germany. They have, however, taken Czechoslovakia and Hungary, which were altogether in the Christian world.

The governmental resistance to this advance has been trifling. American diplomacy based itself entirely on dollars, which is not enough. Even in the expenditure of dollars so many subterfuges had to be employed that no rallying to a great set of principles of life appeared.

While such a concept as the Marshall plan can produce a statistical success, it has failed as a spiritual force. In Asia, China was deserted and became Russian by default.

Now this is the story and here is where we now are. And all the apologies of such a man as Dr. Philip Jessup and the strongly worded speeches of Dean Acheson will not help, because the map is what it is.

Denials do not prevent the lines on the map from moving and whenever they do move, it is to our disadvantage. Yet, this also is true: the authors of our defeats, the makers of our failures are still managing our affairs.

Housing Activity in the Nation and in 15 Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I include in the RECORD a statement by Ewan Clague, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, dealing with housing activity in the Nation and in the 15 metropolitan areas:

HOUSING ACTIVITY IN THE NATION AND IN 15 METROPOLITAN AREAS

NATIONAL HOUSING VOLUME AND HOUSING DEMAND

With 80,000 new nonfarm dwelling units started in February the Nation has just completed the most spectacular winter home-building season in its history. Builders have been starting new dwellings at the rate of about 80,000 units a month since last December, a volume we would not normally expect until the spring. Still, this monthly volume represents a seasonal drop of 16 percent from the huge November figure of 95,500. Thus the usual seasonal pattern has been maintained, but with activity at a very high level.

The unexpectedly large volume of housing so far this year reflects assurance about costs, which most experts agree will probably change little over the year. Added to this has been uneasiness about credit after expiration on March 1 of the emergency mortgage insuring provisions of the National Housing Act. Unusually favorable weather in many parts of the country has also contributed to the winter's large volume. Housing demand continues virtually unabated, buoyed by high consumer income and the continuing high marriage and birth rates.

Accomplishment this year follows the home building record achieved in 1949 when, as latest estimates show, 1,025,800 new units were started, nearly 10 percent above the previous peak of 937,000 in 1925. Even without the 36,000 public units started, 1949 surpassed all other years in housing activity. What is more, while attention was centered on the boom in apartments (41 percent above 1948), builders started the largest number of one-family houses in any single year in history. About 790,000 single-family homes were begun last year, up 3 percent from 1948, when the previous record was established.

What inroads had we made in the housing shortage by the end of 1949? One way of answering this question is by comparing the number of new dwellings started with the increase in the number of households over the past few decades.

The number of new nonfarm dwellings started in the 1920's outnumbered by a million and a third the increase in the number of households (approximately the number of family units) between 1920 and 1929. This housing advantage, however, was completely wiped out in the thirties, when the increase in households outdistanced new housing volume by 1,840,000. The gap became wider still in the 1940's, when nearly 1,500,000 more nonfarm households were added than new dwellings started. The housing deficit, created largely during the depression and war years when new home building dropped sharply, exists primarily in urban areas. We do know that building of new rural nonfarm dwellings had exceeded the increase in rural nonfarm households by the end of 1949.

This discussion has so far been confined to provision of new housing units. For one thing, there is no accurate information about the volume of converted dwelling units—housing provided by conversion of nonresidential structures to residential use or by conversion of old residences to include additional apartments. A large proportion of converted units are in any case makeshift accommodations. In addition, if they are weighed against the units lost by change from housing to nonhousing use, it appears that conversions have provided a relatively small addition to the permanent housing supply.

Indications are that the new dwelling units started each year will have to exceed a million for several years to wipe out the backlog, as well as to meet current population increase and effective demand.

HOUSING IN 15 METROPOLITAN AREAS

Because of the backlog in urban places, the housing shortage is especially acute in the Nation's metropolitan areas. For this reason, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is now engaged in studying the volume and characteristics of the new housing started in 15 major metropolitan areas—Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D. C. We are comparing here for the first time the results of the surveys in these areas with respect to the volume of new housing started since the war. A little later this year we shall present the results of the Bureau's studies of the characteristics of the new housing provided in the 15 areas.

The Bureau's surveys show that New York and Los Angeles far outstripped all other metropolitan areas in home building since the war. The 293,260 new nonfarm dwelling units started in the New York-northeastern New Jersey metropolitan area, and the 277,325 started in the Los Angeles area, constituted 16 percent of the Nation's new housing units begun in the postwar years, 1946–49. No other area came within as much as 40 percent of the New York or Los Angeles achievement. Next in housing volume was Chicago with 95,660 units. Pittsburgh, among the first 6 metropolitan areas in the country in size and industrial importance, was one of the least active in home building among the 15 surveyed.

The reason for such wide variation in housing activity lies in differing rates of population growth as well as population size. In general, the metropolitan areas which were among the leaders in population increase from 1940 ranked high also in home-building rate (number of units started per 10,000 population). Of nine areas for which an estimate of 1949 population could be obtained, Miami, the smallest, ranked first in population increase from 1940 (53 percent) and greatly surpassed all the others in the number of postwar dwelling units started per 10,000 population. Miami held only seventh place, however, in the actual number of units started, but nevertheless ranked ahead of both Boston and Pittsburgh. This may be explained by the fact that the Boston and Pittsburgh areas held the last two places, respectively, in population growth, with less than a 10-percent increase between 1940 and 1949, compared with Miami's 53 percent.

The most urgent housing need in the metropolitan areas is for rental units. Home builders in these areas have responded variously to this need. Apartments were 7 percent of the total number of nonfarm dwelling units started in the Detroit area in 1949, and, at the other extreme, 69 percent in the Washington, D. C., area. In 1949, as compared with 1948, significant gains were made in the number of apartments started in the majority of the areas, but there were declines in Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, Miami, and Seattle. In the Boston area, the entire 1949 increase in rental-type units was in public housing; in New York, public housing accounted for nearly two-thirds of the rise in apartment construction.

In the majority of the 15 surveyed areas, the proportion of rental-type units to the total of nonfarm dwellings started was greater than the proportion in the United States as a whole (23 percent). This is to be expected, however, since rental housing is largely urban and is most common in the largest cities. It is more extraordinary that the ratio of rental-type units to the total started in 1949 was less than the United States ratio in the Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, and Detroit areas.

TABLE 1—*Number of new nonfarm dwelling units started—1948, 1949, and 1950*

Period	
1948	931,300
January	53,500
February	50,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	95,000
August	86,600
September	82,200
October	73,400
November	63,600
December	52,900
1949	[1] 1,025,800
January	50,000
February	50,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	95,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	99,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	[1] 95,500
December	[1] 79,000
1950:	
January	[2] 80,000
February	[2] 80,000

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

TABLE 2.—*Postwar home-building rate and population change in 9 metropolitan areas*

Metropolitan area	New permanent nonfarm dwelling units started, 1946–49			Population change, 1940–49 [1]	
	Total number	Number per 10,000 population in 1949		Percent	Rank [2]
		Number	Rank		
United States	3,476,600	237	------	+11	-------
Miami	55,270	1,348	1	+53	1
Los Angeles	277,325	688	2	+41	4
Washington, D. C.	82,300	592	3	+41	3
San Francisco-Oakland	76,920	351	4	+50	2
New York-Northeastern New Jersey	293,260	230	5	+9	7
Philadelphia	65,540	182	6	+13	5
Chicago	95,660	177	7	+12	6
Boston	40,360	139	8	+9	8
Pittsburgh	30,020	134	9	+7	9

[1] Data for metropolitan areas are based on unofficial estimates. Data for the United States are from the U. S. Bureau of the Census.
[2] Ranks assigned before rounding.

How About America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa., in my congressional district, has the following to say about the state of our national defenses:

HOW ABOUT AMERICA?

While Congress wrangles over how many more millions of American public funds to hand Europe, and while the State Department urges that still more millions be allotted, and Mr. Truman refuses curtly to speak in anything except vagaries, and Russia single-mindedly builds up Russia and prepares to take over all of Asia, two of America's foremost military leaders sound a warning note.

Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff, on March 8, warned this country against any immediate lone-handed disarmament.

Last night, Thursday, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower declared America has slashed her armaments below the danger point in a world that has not yet attained peace.

These are warnings that should be heeded. In Washington today, much of our governmental operation is in charge of men who were not in positions of active leadership during the war. Both General Eisenhower and General Bradley were in such positions. And, as war ended, both made notable addresses in the cause of peace, General Eisenhower, in 1946, even urging that world leaders ignore the word "war," make no mention of it in the future.

Now, his words unheeded, General Eisenhower, Thursday, asserted that our weakness in the face of Soviet strength is "well nigh as criminal as war itself."

He declared, "America already has disarmed to the extent—in some directions even beyond the extent—that I, with deep concern, for her present safety, could possibly advise, until we have certain knowledge that all nations are doing likewise.

"Only by deliberate lies can the propagandist—foreign or domestic—stretch our arms program into more than reasonable posture for the defense which George Washington urged on his countrymen. And the heads of state everywhere, even the most suspicious and fearful, know that it is below that level."

At least two things are noteworthy in the general's address. His reference, in the latter paragraph, would appear to strike at recent statements by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, who spoke of our adequate military strength, and how we "could lick hell out of Stalin."

And, secondly, the general obviously does not concur in the New Deal-Fair Deal tendency to relegate the wisdom of George Washington to the dead past.

It is the usual practice of administration spokesmen to answer opponents who quote Washington, Jefferson, or any of the founding fathers, by declaring that "things are different now."

But, they are not.

Europe offers the very same menace to America today that it offered when Americans rebelled against the others of King George in colonial times.

The only real savings made in a major Government department has been in that of national defense, at a time when Russia, the only world power besides ourselves, absolutely refuses to join with us for world peace.

Instead of reducing expenditures abroad, and of trying to reduce the mammoth bureaucracy at home, America's defenses are being whittled away for political purposes, and short-sighted leaders who already appear to have forgotten Pearl Harbor are centering our defenses in western Europe while Russia spreads across half the world.

Archduke Otto, of Austria, speaking in Pittsburgh the other day, said Soviet activities in central Europe are just a cover-up for Stalin's big push across Asia.

He declared America is losing the cold war because we are not considering the world as a whole, as Stalin does.

In other words, our internationalism ends in western Europe.

Russia is deliberately unfriendly. She is openly aggressive. She rejected insultingly the greatest peace move made by any nation—the United States offer to share the atomic bomb secret nearly 3 years ago, provided all nations would agree on controls and UN inspection of each nation.

Russia is now the predominant military power in the world.

It is time to forget western Europe for a while and to think about maintaining freedom in America, and defending it.

Letter to Editor of Oneida (N. Y.) Daily Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1950.
EDITOR, ONEIDA DAILY DISPATCH,
Oneida, N. Y.

SIR: I note that the battle you are leading against me is continuing in full swing and it is O. K. with me.

However, I take issue with you on the following, I note that you are emphasizing the fact that I have sent out material under the frank which is "a cost to us taxpayers of a minimum of a thousand dollars."

May I remind you that the Oneida Dispatch during 1949 franked its own propaganda which was likewise paid for by the taxpayers and which reached more than three times the tonnage I sent, according to official Post Office Department estimates.

While you are making such a to-do about my right to defend myself against your ruthless attacks, please also point out to your readers that you are fighting me with taxpayers' money.

It is no more than fair that the voters of Madison County should understand that your newspaper has used and is using as many tax-dollars to subsidize mailing out your papers as I use in like periods of time. I will continue sending to the voters remarks of mine which you refuse to print but which are nevertheless utterances by an elected representative of the people and should be made public by any patriotic local newspaper.

In other words, you are guilty of the same abuse you attribute to me, possibly on a more colossal scale.

In spite of the tremendous advantage you have over me from a financial standpoint, I expect to challenge any Goliath which attempts to put me in a bad light with the fellow-members of my party.

It is obvious that you do not want a man who is nominated by the Republicans of Madison County unless he answers to your beck and call and does what you want him to.

I repeat, my record is 93 percent Republican in Congress which is among the highest and your challenging a man on that record in a Republican primary is asinine, regardless of your petty personal dislike for me.

Sincerely,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Problems of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered on Monday, March 27, 1950, before the Conference of American Small Business Organizations at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Chairman Virkus and members of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking to you at this luncheon. I shall speak generally with reference to the problems of government, realizing that all problems and policies of government, and all legislation, whether in the foreign or domestic field, effects every small-business man in the Nation.

I know you realize the present serious condition of the state of the Nation. I should like for you to know that the majority of the Members of Congress are serious-minded men who probably realize more keenly than any other group of men in America the serious state of the Nation on both the domestic, and in the foreign field.

We are struggling with the problem from day to day in the hope of stabilizing the economy of the Nation, maintaining the financial solvency of the Government, and eventually bringing about more amicable relations with foreign countries which may lead to world peace.

I know of no single group in America who is cooperating in a finer spirit to this end than the small-business men of the Nation. National defense and financial solvency on the home front are the two main essentials for the preservation of our Government, and the contribution it can make toward world peace. Without a strong Government financially we cannot have adequate defense, we cannot preserve the American way of life, we cannot make our world contribution to peace. There is much to be done along this line on the home front.

Your Government needs your cooperation and effort on the home front as never before. I know you realize this need. And I know you are contributing to, and will continue to make your great contribution to this end. Throughout this land the over 5,000,000 small-business men who still represent the pioneer spirit that has made America great have been lending the Government your solid effort and contribution to preserve free enterprise, and a sound economy

in building a greater America. You have defied and resisted the poisonous virus of socialism.

You represent a great and powerful force in the business life of the Government that asks little or nothing from the Government except to be let alone. You want less meddling of the horde of bureaucrats in your private business affairs. You are against the expanding and building of a greater bureaucracy in Government. You are opposed to Government continuously entering the business field in competition with private business, paying little or no taxes to the support of the Government. You are concerned and opposed to present confiscatory taxes on small business and all of the people. We serious Members of Congress join with you in this same effort.

The time is here now when the small-business men who are the backbone of the economy of this Nation must greatly expand your organizations and make yourself felt as a mighty political force in the future to protect the ideals of government for which you stand.

You can be a mighty force in this effort as you employ 90 percent of the nearly 60,000,000 wage earners of the Nation. You furnish approximately 75 percent of the investment capital of the Nation. You are not only competitors of big business, but you are producers, fabricators, suppliers, and distributors for big business, rounding out and making possible the most dynamic economy the world has ever known. You furnish the greatest amount of risk capital necessary to the expansion of business throughout the Nation. Retail merchants complete the job of distribution.

You are opposed to the present socialistic trend of government, to governmental regimentation, to government waste and spending that threatens the destruction of free enterprise and representative government.

BIG GOVERNMENT

The greatest threat to the Nation today is big government, its expense to the taxpayers and the abuse of its power over the people. It carries the imminent threat of financial bankruptcy with the loss of freedom for all, and the death of our representative system of government that has preserved our liberty. Big government, through big bureaucracy, now in peacetime has 2,000,000 people employed on the Federal pay roll at a yearly cost approaching $5,000,000,000.

The Federal debt is $260,000,000,000. Our Government, in addition, has guaranteed loans, or obligations up to $93,000,000,000, much to which it may later have to pay.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We have given to foreign countries since the close of the war $28,000,000,000, and a bill is before the Congress today to give in aid to foreign countries another $5,000,000,000. All of this money has to be borrowed from the people.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The President has before the Congress a budget request for $42,500,000,000—the biggest budget ever requested to date. He admits that if this amount is granted that at the end of the coming fiscal year we may still have a 2-year total deficit of $10,000,000,000 which must be added to the national debt through deficit financing.

When you realize that your Federal Government, in years of the highest income the Nation has ever known, against which the highest taxes in peacetime have been levied, still spends each year $5,000,000,000 more than we take in, you must come to the conclusion that financial bankruptcy is imminent, unless drastic action is taken to reduce the cost of Government. No businessman can follow such a policy without going broke. The Government cannot follow such a policy without bringing about the same result.

Many of us Members of the Congress will attempt to reduce the budget by a minimum of $3,000,000,000. With the cooperation of the President it could be done and the business of the Nation would expand to a point where possibly more taxes would flow into the Treasury than the amount of the budget cut.

Unfortunately, in the face of this danger, the President has asked for new and unnecessary legislation that would possibly add $20,000,000,000 a year to the present budget request of $42,500,000,000. The Congress is stubbornly resisting the passing of such new legislation with its additional expense.

SOCIALISM

The small-business men of the Nation see the threat of socialism and are against it. Much socialistic legislation has already been passed. The Federal housing and slum clearance passed in the last session is a typical example. It will cost billions and billions in the future unless it can be repealed at a later date. The attempt of this administration to pass its companion bill last week, the Federal housing bill which the Congress soundly defeated is another example.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The administration's effort to pass a socialized medicine bill which would increase medical cost to the people and bring them a lower type of medical care is another example.

BRANNAN FARM PLAN

Its support and agitation for the Brannan farm plan, socialistic to the core, that would regiment the farmers as never before, and add an extra cost of probably $10,000,000,000 a year to the Government, is another example of the present dangerous trend in Government.

HIGH TAXES

High taxes are a powerful force in bringing about the socialized state. It operates by taxing business until it dries up risk investment. Then the Government proclaims that business and free enterprise has failed and the Government must step in and take over. You may remember some months ago that the President threatened to put the Government into the manufacture of steel, claiming that the big steel organizations were failing to produce in sufficient quantities. It was a ridiculous statement, but illustrates the point.

The Federal Government, on an average, takes over six times as much in taxes out of the States as is collected in all taxes for State, county, municipal, and other subdivisions of Government.

Something must be done to stop the impoverishment of the States from the confiscatory tax load imposed upon the people by the Federal Government.

CORPORATIONS

Corporations are taxed from 36 to 40 percent in some instances, with individuals up to 85 percent, and the President asks that a heavier tax now be laid on corporations. Small-business men find present tax loads a great burden that makes it difficult to obtain new risk capital for expansion. Large corporations experience like difficulties. We are following too many of the socialistic policies that have wrecked the government of England and established the socialized state. It can happen here unless the small-business men and the thinking people of America rise up in mass and demand a drastic reduction of the cost of Government which is the only way to lower the present tax burdens.

THE THREAT OF BIG LABOR LEADERS

The No. 2 and serious threat to our Nation is the power and policy of the big labor leaders. They boldly boast through the press that they are raising millions of dollars to defeat the Members of Congress who will not take their dictation. If they can defeat 17 men in the House and 6 in the Senate, they can control the Congress.

If they can control the Congress, they can control the Government and bring about a Socialist labor government here like in England. That is their aim.

The coal strike is the best example of the chaos that would befall us Nation-wide if they are allowed to gain this power.

NO ONE GROUP SHOULD CONTROL THE GOVERNMENT

All legislation enacted should seek to bring about the best climatic atmosphere under which agriculture, labor, and business can operate as harmoniously as possible, bringing their great combined contribution to the welfare of the Nation. The 5,000,000 businessmen, of which you are a part, must keep up the fight to cut the cost of Government spending; stop waste, reduce taxes, balance the budget, and begin the reduction of the Federal debt. In this effort you will have the continued support of the serious Members of this Congress who realize that this must be done in the interest of all our people. Let's keep the faith and continue the fight together to save America.

Educational Program To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, in connection with Senate Resolution 243, favoring an increased educational program by the United States in combating communism in foreign countries, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Boston Globe of March 24, 1950, entitled "Wanted: More Steam," and the other from the Boston Post of March 24, 1950, entitled "A Louder Voice."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe of March 24, 1950]

WANTED: MORE STEAM

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, deserves hearty public support for his plea urging the institution of a Marshall plan of ideas. The former Under Secretary of State in charge of the Voice of America knows whereof he speaks. His complaint, that no adequate governmental program of affirmative news about this country is being directed toward the outside world, is amply justified.

Senator BENTON urges complete reorganization of our efforts toward this end. He wants better broadcasts, more thoroughly representative motion pictures, and an expansion of the foreign information service so as to meet and counter the distortions and plain falsehoods which are being disseminated abroad against America. Our opponents are sleeplessly on the job in this struggle for the minds of men. Thus far, we have been attempting to counter them half-heartedly and half in a doze.

[From the Boston Post of March 24, 1950]

A LOUDER VOICE

The world, despite the jet-propelled illusion of diminishing distances, is still a big place, dotted with sinister watch-your-step signs at the crossroads and full of confused or fearing people who think that Santa Claus is a free-handed giver only because he has some racket which he wishes to work on the unwary.

The propaganda mills of the Kremlin have spared no expense nor effort to sow the suspicion from pole to pole that the little package marked "made in the United States of America," may contain a time-bomb instead of a pair of Argyle socks. People living in terror, past or present, naturally succumb to such doubts and innuendoes.

Returning travelers tell the tale. They are alarmed by the antipathy held for America among people in countries we lifted literally out of the bottomless pit of communism by their galluses and made a part of the free world that looks to the gold star of hope instead of the red star of reaction.

The answer is simple. We have beaten the Russians in the Berlin airlift. We have defeated them at the polls in France and Italy. We have united the Europeans in the common defense of their ancestral acres and are implementing their will to battle for them with weapons to match those of the foe.

While nourishing their war-weakened bodies, giving them something more than their fists to fight with and making them more self-sufficient by restoring their factories and farms, many evidently are still unconvinced. We haven't got at their minds.

A freshman Senator would tackle that next. BENTON, of Connecticut, in his maiden speech in the Senate, backed by 14 colleagues, launched a plan to coordinate the information programs of the world to combat communism.

In his own right, an able advertising man, with State Department experience added, he would gather the non-Communist countries together for conference in which they would pool their propaganda-making apparatus and battle the Reds in the field of thinking by a cooperative, concerted, and all-powerful effort.

The new Senator from Connecticut is not selling wooden nutmegs with that idea. It's sound. It would make the Voice of America the voice of free men everywhere. It would be fighting communism at its best—propagandizing.

Some Statistics We Must Never Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, those who harbor thoughts of world war III in which our Nation might become involved, should seriously consider the statistics of previous wars.

The following frightful figures are taken from data prepared by the United States Veterans' Administration:

War	Participants	In-service deaths
Revolutionary War	395,000	4,000
War of 1812	536,000	2,000
Mexican War	130,000	13,000
Spanish-American War	392,000	11,000
Civil War	2,192,000	364,000
World War I	4,744,000	131,000
World War II	16,535,000	409,000

Our Global War on Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, during my years in government service, prior to my election to Congress, I was fortunate to serve with, and know, such outstanding men as Harry Anslinger, Malachi Harney, George White, and many others who exercise a constant vigil over narcotics consumption. These gentlemen, from Commissioner Anslinger down to the agents in the field, perform what is far too frequently an unobtrusive public service.

Due recognition has come their way in a Reader's Digest reprint of an article in American Mercury. Without fanfare the narcotics agent performs his duty, hazardous though it is. I am pleased to insert the above-mentioned article as part of my extended remarks:

OUR GLOBAL WAR ON NARCOTICS

(By Frederic Sondern, Jr.)

It was late afternoon in the ancient city of Istanbul. As street vendors, beggars, people of every race and dress jostled along the Rue Cabristan, no one paid much attention to a group of workmen digging a ditch outside a little cafe. Suddenly, at a window above the cafe, a shade jerked up. Immediately the ditch diggers dropped their tools, rushed into the cafe and up its stairs, pistols in hand. In a few moments four cursing men emerged from the building, prodded forward by an American seaman. Before a crowd could gather, police cars had whisked them off.

Within the hour Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger of the United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics received a cable from the American seaman—United States Narcotics Agent George White: "Able today to buy quantity pure heroin from biggest ring of dealers here and arrest same. Brilliant support from Turkish police who have seized refining plant and 900 ounces of narcotics, source large shipments to the United States."

Agent White's triumph in a city on the other side of the globe was not an unusual project for the Narcotics Bureau. A tightly knit organization of some 300 officers, the Bureau deals with one of today's most intricate law-enforcement problems.

With the end of World War II, habit-forming narcotics began to flow again to Europe and the United States from dope racketeers in the Far East, the Middle East, and South America. In the United States the drug traffic climbed rapidly back toward prewar levels. By 1949 more than 10 percent of the inmates of our Federal prisons were men and women convicted under the narcotics laws. Drug trafficking and addiction were contributing more and more to crime of all kinds—from gang warfare and murder to prostitution and larceny by addicts in need of money to satisfy their expensive craving.

Some months before the raid in the Rue Cabristan, field offices of the Bureau of Narcotics reported to Washington that heroin, most vicious of the opium derivatives, was getting into the illicit market from a new source. Examination showed it to be of Turkish manufacture. Narcotics-squad detectives of New York's police department ferreted out a Greek sailor and two friends who seemed to be doing most of the peddling. They were shadowed to their cache—a suitcase in the parcel room of a bus terminal. After arrest, the sailor told of a big heroin ring in Istanbul which sold to seamen.

Commissioner Anslinger decided to push right into the enemy's camp. A few years ago that would have been difficult. Owing to the work of the United Nations, however, new weapons have been put into the hands of the men who fight the illicit drug traffic. Anslinger telephoned the chief of the narcotics section of the Turkish police, then sent for Supervising Agent George White of the San Francisco field office.

A few days later, in Istanbul, the Turkish police welcomed their American colleague. They briefed him on persons in the Turkish underworld who might be involved, on their habits and headquarters, warning that undercover men had a way of being found in the Bosporus with their throats cut.

Disguised as an American merchant sailor, White began frequenting water-front bars. He dropped hints that he had money to spend, had connections in New York, and was open to business if the profits were right. The scouts of the dope syndicate reacted almost at once. For more than a week he was put through a grueling inquisition. Questioned and cross-questioned by Turks who seemed to know a great deal about our underworld, he was aware that one slip would mean a quick bullet or a knife in the back. White's answers, based on an encyclopedic knowledge of our criminal elements, passed muster. He was finally taken to the Rue Cabristan café where he met the four men he had come 5,000 miles to catch. They agreed to let him have $6,000 worth of heroin the next day.

The gangsters arrived at the appointed hour. White was to signal the ditch-digging police outside by raising the window shade when the deal was consummated. After endless delays and arguments the precious carton containing the drugs was produced. White said that he wanted to examine it in better light. And then—the shade stuck. White fought with it, too violently. The others reached for their guns but the agent managed to draw first. At that moment the disturbed shade flew up with a bang, and tthe police pounded up the stairs.

Other raiding squads converged on headquarters and plants of the gang in and near the city. It was a clean sweep, the biggest catch in Turkey in recent years.

Almost as soon as a gang in one of the drug capitals is knocked off, however, another takes its place. With heroin selling in New York or Paris for $300 to $500 an ounce, the returns for drug racketeers are high. A single shipment which United States customs inspectors found not long ago in the tail assembly of an airplane at LaGuardia Airport would have been worth over a million dollars in the underworld retail trade.

When Charles Luciania (Lucky Luciano), former New York racketeer, was deported to Italy in 1946, after serving 10 years in prison, he had big plans. In Rome he allied himself with the cream of Italian black marketeers and arranged for a flow of drugs from the eastern Mediterranean. Then he obtained an Italian passport and permission to visit Cuba. In Habana the suave Signor Luciania began to establish contact with correspondents in Miami, New York, and Chicago.

Actually the Narcotics Bureau knew his plans before he left Italy. They let him carry them out—up to a point—to see what contacts he would make. Then the Commissioner suggested to Cuban authorities that Luciania be deported. Just as Lucky saw his dream of another empire coming true, Habana detectives appeared at his door one morning and asked him to pack; his plane was leaving shortly.

This swift and silent international cooperation often results in underworld catastrophes. The steward known as Louis was nervous as the steamship *Santa Luisa* from South American ports steamed into Charleston harbor not long ago. He was carrying

a big load this trip. The customs men made their usual careful search, apparently found no contraband, and cleared the ship, Louis was relieved. The next day he decided that the coast was clear. His runner, a colored newsboy, had come aboard and the two sauntered to the cleverly concealed cache in the forepeak. No one was around except a steam fitter, who seemed absorbed in his work. Quickly Louis opened the cache, the boy slipped several small bags into his clothing and shuffled off. The steward had just closed the compartment when he felt a hand on his shoulder. It was the steam fitter but he had a badge. The newsboy found agents waiting for him at the foot of the gangplank.

Louis's cache had been under guard from the moment customs searchers had found it—not many minutes after they had come aboard. A message from narcotics men in a Latin-American country, who had been watching a big new syndicate that was building up a coastal trade, told Washington that the ship was "hot." They had not been able to identify the runner, however, and Anslinger wanted him. So, from the time the ship landed, narcotics and customs agents dressed as electricians, steam fitters, and longshoremen took turns staying in sight of the cache until their quarry sprung the trap.

A nemesis to many a narcotics trafficker has been the international list of narcotics violators, which is kept up to date by the Bureau of Narcotics from reports sent in by other nations. Besides names and descriptions of all known illicit drug traders, the international list describes every unusual smuggling trick tried in recent years. There are some classics. An Egyptian syndicate discovered a new method of concealing narcotics in the camel trains which they dispatched across the Sahara Desert to Casablanca and Tangier. Metal capsules containing morphine and heroin, fed to a camel, would lodge in one of the storage compartments of his peculiar digestive system. Each animal could carry tens of thousands of dollars' worth of drugs. At the end of the journey the camels were slaughtered and the capsules recovered. It was expensive transport, but the returns justified the investment.

Egyptian customs inspectors missed this trick until the price of camels went up sharply. Then an Egyptian officer investigating the phenomenon had a bright idea; he examined the camels by fluoroscope, and the syndicate had to look for a new transportation scheme.

It takes time, infinite patience, and ingenuity to build up an ironclad case against the shrewd operators cataloged in the international list. Take Joseph "Pip the Blind" Gagliano, who was until recently No. 121 in the book.

Several facts were known about Gagliano. His headquarters in New York were modest—the back room of a bar on East One Hundred and Seventh Street. His runners smuggled in opium from Mexico, brought it to his secret New York factory to be converted into heroin. From there dealers and peddlers fanned out across the country, did a huge business. Pip never handled dope himself and would discuss a deal only in his back room with no witnesses present.

A Bureau agent whom we'll call Jackson, after months of building himself up as a prosperous racketeer from the west coast, finally succeeded in developing an acquaintance with the gangster. But to obtain a conviction he had to get Pip the Blind to hand over narcotics and accept payment—or order one of his men to do so—before witnesses.

Jackson drove up to the gang's headquarters one morning and honked his horn. One of the boss' musclemen responded to the summons. "I've got to see Pip," said Jackson. "Big deal. But I've banged up my leg. Can't walk on it." He exhibited a foot swathed in bandages; crutches leaned against the seat. "Pip don't never talk to nobody on the street," the gunman replied. "But since it's you I'll see what he says." The agent held his breath. Behind his seat, in a reconstructed baggage compartment, crouched another agent with his eyes at a peep slot from which he could see and hear anyone who came to the side of the car. Across the street, in an innocent-looking truck, were more agents and a camera.

Pip the Blind walked toward the car with his chief henchman. What he said in the next few minutes and the orders he gave his assistant sealed his doom. The next day Jackson and his helpers repeated the process with his two principal lieutenants. Police traps snapped shut from New York to the Mexican border. Pip the Blind later hanged himself in his cell.

Narcotics Bureau agents thus concluded another case—with quiet satisfaction. For, as Commissioner Anslinger's executive officer, Malachi Harney, said to me: "When you break a narcotics case you not only nab some of the nastiest specimens in existence but you save a lot of people from a lot of misery. An ounce of cocaine sold in New York may account for a hop-headed hold-up man who kills a peaceful citizen in Dallas or a doped-up driver who rams a school bus in Ohio."

Men in Light Stetson Hats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe that the first men to wear the light broad-brimmed hat came from south of the Rio Grande, who came into the southwest country to carve out a new empire. But we do know that the Texas Rangers, who for a hundred years protected the frontiers of Texas, wore the light-colored hats.

In that broad expanse of territory from Fort Worth, south to the Rio Grande, thence north to the Dakotas, and between this line and the Rocky Mountains, is the home of the stockman.

Seventy-five years ago, these cowmen, who trailed the cowherds from Texas to Wichita, Abilene, Ellsworth, Hays, and Dodge City, wore the light, broad-brimmed hats. The men who rode these trails—guardians of law and order—makers of peace—all wore the light, broad-brimmed hats. This hat in those distant days was a badge of courage. It also was, by reason of its workmanship and size, the most useful article of dress. It protected its wearer from the scorching heat of the high plains. It served as a useful dipper to water both man and his faithful horse. At night, it could be used as a pillow when sleeping under the star-studded heavens. So this hat had its utilitarian purposes as well as a badge of honor.

The descendants of these men of the light hats still live in this land known as the Great Plains area. They no longer ride the trails to Dodge City or Hays, but they are still cattlemen. They take their cattle to Fort Worth or Kansas City by truck or rail. They no longer worry about the quicksands of the Canadian, Cimarron, or the Arkansas Rivers.

They don't fear the drifting of their cattle into the dry beds of canyon breaks during the winters' driving snows. No longer do the cattle rustlers offer a menace to their herds.

Where do these cattlemen look for danger in these modern days? The prairies are peaceful; water tanks, fed by windmills and ponds, furnish the water. Cottonseed cake takes away the hazards of the wintertime. Now, where are the dangers for "the men of the light hats"?—in the Nation's Capital—Washington.

These men are still individuals. They survived the days of OPA, rationing, WPA. All they ask is to be let alone. They ask nothing from the great white father in Washington—except their freedom.

"These men of the light Stetson hats" just know these fundamental facts—that you cannot socialize the schools, mills, mines, farms, ranches, medicine, and money without socializing the people. They know the more we accept of Government hand-outs and doles in any form or by any name, from necessity we will be told what to do and when to do it. The net result—we lose our freedom and independence.

These men know also that socialism subsidizes inefficiency, and where inefficiency exists, there is no profit, and where there is no profit, there can be no welfare or security for anyone.

These men who now ride in automobiles still wear their "light Stetson hats" because to them it is a heritage of the past, of brave, fearless men who could and did buy a thousand head of cattle by only their word. Honesty to them was not just something taught in school, but was a matter of principle.

On these high plains of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas, occurred the last conflicts between the westward movement of hardy pioneers and the Indians. The law of the Indian was the survival of the fittest. The Indian fought back for the land of his fathers. These men in "light colored hats" who have conquered the "great American desert," as it was called 150 years ago, were not descendants from the cast-offs and the riff-raff of more cultured eastern seaboard. They were hard, but they were gentlemen. They sought to mold from a raw material the finished product of a new country.

In recent years, the descendants of these men who forded through the quicksands of the Pecos, the Canadian, the Cimarron, the Arkansas, driving their cattle to the valleys and hills of the Smoky Hill for shipment to eastern markets, have been all over the world. They built bridges over the Rhine and the Danube, landed on the unheard islands of the Pacific. Some drove tanks up the beaches of Normandy on to the Siegfried Line and waded through the snows of Belgium during the Bulge.

Now these men are home. They wanted to live as their fathers had lived, as freemen in a free Nation, paying a fair share of taxes to help maintain a Government that belonged to them.

Maybe there is still to be a frontier—maybe in the scheme of things to come—this broad expanse of high-plains country will again be the. last frontier of freemen who will continue to wear the "light Stetson hat" as the badge of courage.

To my colleagues, I commend to you a resolution recently passed by the Kansas Livestock Association. This resolution shows what the stockmen are thinking about. These men just know that there is no such thing as security in a bankrupt Nation.

The resolution is as follows:

HOLDING TO FREEDOM

There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen, of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

The threat lies in the fact that our country—without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—contemptible to free men—the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of a wasteful Government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people; the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc., and by innumerable other false expedients—to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity, and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and numerous other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of "prosperity" is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear, and dire forebodings.

The course our Government is now taking, unless it is prompty reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Kansas Live Stock Association, in convention assembled at Topeka, Kans., March 16, 1950, deplore the fallacious policies that are beguiling our country into socialism, that we censure and condemn those in public office who support or tolerate these policies and that we call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them and to work energetically and courageously for the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and the restoration of the Republic.

Our decision to take this stand is supported by the firm conviction that the policies we here and now condemn are unrighteous and immoral in that they proceed in shameful denial of the inherent nature of man and in impious contempt of nature's eternal laws.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Robbins, Pratt, chairman; George Andrews, Kanopolis; Herb Barr, Leoti; J. W. Birney, Bucklin; W. J. Brown, Fall River; C. O. Heidebrecht, Inman; Dan Jackson, Coldwater; Earl Kielhorn, Cambridge; O. W. Lynam, Burdett; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Wayne Rogler, Matfield Green; Conlee Smith, Wichita; resolutions committee.

I also set out herewith an editorial by Mr. A. L. Shultz of Topeka State Journal. His comments on this resolution are most timely:

TOPEKA, KANS., MARCH 22.—Kansas stockmen in Topeka last week wrote a new Magna Carta that ought to be printed on the fly leaf of every text book in every classroom in America.

More than 600 men who produce beef steaks for hungry people around the world sat in a hall and cheered a pronouncement that "the course our Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy." One man in the hall voted "No."

Those men who take their winnings and their losings in the stride of pioneers who made America great, disdained the dole. They asked no favors. They wanted their chance—were willing to fight for it. They are not afraid of the elements. They have faith in the laws of God, but contempt for the laws of politicians who seek votes and self-glory.

That's the story of it all. Those cowmen, who are the bravest most rugged individuals, the most forthright characters to band together in these days of confusion and distress, took their stand without blinking an eye. Of paternalistic policies as presented from Washington, the stockmen almost held their stomachs as they wrote words of derision and contempt. For men in public place everywhere who subscribe to doctrines of a welfare state where man does not enjoy the fruits of his labor, those characters from the feed lots and pastures snorted holy condemnation.

"We call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them," those almost righteously indignant individuals declared in a resolution that was as refreshingly simple and honest as it was astoundingly bluff. Not a politician in all this big, broad land will fail to understand every word of it. Dan Casement, in his most rugged manner, never more daringly denounced regimentation of the people who feed the world.

Hundreds of conventions come to Topeka. Most of them sound off with words of glittering generalities. Not so these growers of beef steers and their cousins. They recited a principle and a policy that was as solemn and sincere and sacred as defined in the foundation laws of the land. Republicans and Democrats alike had given 2 days and 2 nights to the writing of that declaration of principles. The sponsors believed in it, were ready to fight for it. Somehow, it seems, the pronouncement should echo in the Halls of Congress.

There's none of the "me-tooism" of succeeding Republican national platforms in that resolution which keynoted the statement from the stockmen's meeting. There wasn't a word of pussyfooting, office-seeking applesauce in any line. It was a call to arms by a group of strong men of both major parties. Richard W. Robbins, of Pratt, a Republican leader, was chairman of the committee of 12 men. Herb J. Barr, former Wichita County legislator and candidate for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator, helped draft the resolutions. No member of the committee protested a line of the document. No stockman in the hall took the floor to challenge an utterance.

Nothing comparable in strong, concise indictment of a philosophy of government has come from any group of people assembled in Kansas in this generation. So this column is breaking a custom and a practice to present the text of the resolution. We hope it will afford guidance and inspiration to people everywhere who rebel against Government dictates for a life which defies the laws of nature. Try these words for comfort and solace:

"There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen of all shades of political belief, feel it is our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

"This threat lies in the fact that our country—without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—contemptible to freemen—the socialized state.

"Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. They include the growing power and expansion of a wasteful government, the colossal public debt, the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people, the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc.—and by innumerable other false expedients, to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other; in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

"Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of prosperity is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world; and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear, and dire forebodings.

"The course our Government is now taking—unless it is promptly reversed—will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state.

"We deplore the fallacious policies that are beguiling our country into socialism. We censure and condemn those in public office who support or tolerate these policies and we call on all patriotic Americans to denounce them and to work energetically and courageously for the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and the restoration of the Republic. Our decision to take this stand is supported by the firm conviction that the policies we here and now condemn are unrighteous and immoral in that they proceed in shameful denial to the inherent nature of man and in impious contempt of nature's eternal laws."

That intrepid band of cowmen harpooned the Federal Department of Justice for disruption of the free channels of marketing in beef through its antitrust suits against

A. & P. store chains which annually distribute millions of pounds of meat. The Brannan plan was denounced as an attempt to "subsidize consumers, rich and poor alike, and eventually necessitate Federal control of all agriculture. We are opposed to the proposed program," is was asserted, and "we consider it unsound economically and entirely impractical, and we urge Congress to reject it."

Some of the State's most prominent and successful stockmen were on the committee with Robbins and Barr and aided in drafting the fearless pronouncement of principles. They included: George Andrews, Kanopolis; J. W. Birney, Bucklin; W. J. Brown, Fall River; C. O. Heidebrecht, Inman; Dan Jackson, Coldwater; Earl Kielhorn, Cambridge; O. W. Lynam, Burdett; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Wayne Rogler, Matfield Green; and Conlee Smith, Wichita.

Valley Forge General Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, to close Valley Forge General Hospital in Pennsylvania on July 1st, as anticipated, in my opinion would be a very grave mistake. I want to be recorded as vigorously opposed to such action.

Certainly, we cannot indorse the hasty withdrawal of needed medical facilities from servicemen, veterans, retired personnel, and dependents of servicemen, without any provision being made to meet these needs.

In particular, I wish to invite attention to the situation at Valley Forge General Hospital, located at a historic site just outside of Philadelphia, Pa. That hospital has a capacity of almost 2,000 beds and cost the taxpayers some $11,000,000 when it was built in 1942–43. To replace it at current costs would take from forty to sixty million dollars depending upon the location and type of construction. Valley Forge General Hospital has heretofore served the Army, Air Force, and veterans in the Philadelphia area, and is currently meeting a very real and substantial need. Yet it is proposed that this hospital be closed down, without replacement, and possibly before the new veterans' hospital in Philadelphia will be in operation. In addition to providing general hospital care for approximately 100,000 troops in this densely populated area, it is the principal center of ophthalmologic or eye surgery, and practically the only one providing specialized diagnosis and treatment for liver diseases. These programs might possibly be carried on elsewhere, if facilities were available; but such relocations would involve substantial delay and major costs before they could become fully effective. To close the Valley Forge General Hospital at this time, along with the others slated for inactivation, would leave the Army and Air Force with only one general hospital in the United States east of the Mississippi River; namely, Walter Reed, in Washington, D. C.; and this is already overcrowded. Inactivating Valley Forge General Hospital will mean that the Army and Air Force will lose substantially all of their existing facilities for treating hepatic-metabolic cases, over 80 percent of those for plastic surgery, and two-thirds of existing capacity for specialized eye surgery. These specialized programs, which are a necessary part of first-class medical and surgical care for personnel of the armed services, cannot be reestablished in small isolated hospitals, nor can the latter afford necessary training and experience in such specialties to young medical officers of the services.

In short, closing Valley Forge General Hospital at this time achieves economy only at the expense of necessary medical and surgical care for servicemen, veterans, and dependents. In reaching this result, it totally disregards the taxpayers' $11,000,000 investment in the facility, the specialized treatment and training programs carried on there, and the very real need of maintaining this installation in operation until more nearly adequate facilities are available for veterans' care in that area.

Unpartisan Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of March 27, 1950:

UNPARTISAN POLICY

The strong ebb tide of economy swirling through the House of Representatives which threatens to sluice away $500,000,000 from the funds requested by President Truman for the continuation of the Marshall plan had its beginning in a vacuum created for partisan political purposes while the chief spokesman for the bipartisan foreign policy, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, has been away from the Senate Chamber because of illness.

The warning from President Truman that a slash in the Marshall plan funds would bring the peril of world war III closer may not be heeded by those who press for economies—regardless of prudence and foresight. It is no accident that Senator VANDENBERG has made an appeal to both parties to support the European recovery plan and to create an unpartisan commission to recommend a long-range economic and peace policy for the United States.

The Michigan Senator's warning that it would be unwise to lose sight of the forest of Soviet aggression because of the trees of incomplete achievement of the Marshall plan drives home the fact that 2 years ago a Republican Congress enacted the Marshall plan at a time when the United States was threatened with isolation in a communized world.

President Truman must of necessity consider foreign affairs from the standpoint of their effect on domestic policies. It is fortunate that a statesman of the breadth of vision and stability of character of Senator VANDENBERG has made the forthright declaration that we bought temporary security at a dark hour in our history and swept communism away from the western shores of Europe. Otherwise, the whole question of our present security might fall into an abyss created by a niggardly and imprudent economy of a bloc chiefly concerned with creating an issue for the congressional campaign of 1950.

The proposal of a commission to study and recommend an economic and peace policy to carry the gains of the Marshall plan beyond 1952 when our investment in European stability comes to an end is one of the most statesmanlike acts of Senator VANDENBERG'S long career. His choice of a title is particularly felicitous. Nonpartisan is generally less emphatic than unpartisan. Unpartisan means not partisan, and such a commission should be just that.

To trifle with our foreign affairs with baseless charges and partisan pleadings is dangerous at any time, but laden with dire peril today. The Marshall plan is a keystone of our present foreign policy. To chip away any part of it might bring the whole bastion against Communist expansionism down in a heap of rubble.

Pacific Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address delivered by me over Station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., upon the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Pacific Mills of Lawrence, Mass.:

Two men stood on the banks of a New England river many years ago and they were thrilled by what they saw. In those days, the picture was that of the river, the forests, and meadows which stretched away from it as far as the eye could see, and a few scattered farmhouses.

It was hardly an exciting scene on the surface. But these two men were looking not only with the organs of physical "seeing" but with the superior foresight and vision of their "mind's" eyes.

And what they saw was a tremendous opportunity.

It would take effort and risk and persevering courage to bring the dream into being. It was fortunate that these men, Daniel Saunders and Abbott Lawrence, had the ability and the character to do the job. For their example was an inspiration to the long line of managers and workers who followed them and established our community as a leader in the world of textile manufacturing.

They saw not only the energy of a great river which could be utilized to power machines that would make cloth and provide jobs and earn profits for themselves. They were businessmen, but they were also men with a conscience. Although competition from foreign producers who had an established market in the United States was keen, and although they had to weather various

national economic crises, these men had a heart for their workers.

The Pacific Mills, which they founded, not only won ceremonial honors and exposition medals for the quality goods which it produced, Pacific saw, long before others, that something would have to be done for the mutual security of employer and employee.

With thousands of workers massed in this industrial community and dependent upon one major industry, many suffered whenever the wheels of production slowed down.

One of the finest tributes that can be paid to Pacific is that it faced these problems realistically. It is one of the few mass-production industries in which there is a minimum of labor-management strife. Long, long ago, before the days of labor unions and collective bargaining, the men who guided Pacific took a personal interest in their workers. That has paid extra dividends in understanding and teamwork.

In 1854, when such things were unheard of, and at a time when Pacific was fighting for its financial life, the company bought a 2,000-book library for the benefit of its employees.

Abbott Lawrence, worn out by his exertions, was dying. He called one of his associates to his bedside and gave him these orders, and I quote: "Remember, what I want is not only a mill that can make a profit for its owners and pay wages to its workers. I want to prove something more with Pacific Mills—that a business can afford to recognize the right of all men and women who work for it to better their own lives while they better the business, to buy homes and bring up their families in a decent atmosphere and educate themselves."

Pacific has stuck to that enlightened policy ever since.

In the intervening years, there have been difficult periods for management and workers alike. It is reasonable to say that these have been caused by economic forces beyond the control of anyone belonging to the corporate family known as Pacific Mills.

Several years ago we celebrated the one hundredth birthday of Lawrence as a city. Today we rejoice on the similar anniversary of its younger brother, the Pacific Mills. Both grew up together, and both will continue to help one another out of filial loyalty to the proud heritage which they share.

Such a long record of service is proof that Pacific advances with the times.

The new century of its life dawns with every promise that this humane and successful enterprise will still be catering to the needs of the people in A. D. 2050.

Construction of School Facilities on the Hoopa Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced in the first session of this Congress a bill to authorize construction of school facilities on the Hoopa Indian Reservation in Humboldt County, Calif. This bill received the full support of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of the Budget. It was approved unanimously by both Houses and signed by the President.

An expenditure of $800,000 was proposed in the 1951 budget, but the House Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to strike this sum from the omnibus appropriations bill, H. R. 7786. It has done so with the excuse that California has assumed the responsibility of educating all the children of the State. This tells but half the story. It is true that California assumes the expenses of education, but there is no provision whereby the State can construct a school building at Hoopa. The land of this reservation is tax-free, and there is no taxable property within miles. Present school conditions at Hoopa, serving a community of 3,700 Indians, are intolerable.

By failing to appropriate funds to construct these school facilities at Hoopa, this Congress would be shirking its responsibility toward the American Indians. It would thereby be abandoning a policy established years ago to provide for their welfare.

In today's mail I received a letter from a grade-school teacher at Hoopa describing conditions as they exist today. Its plain language tells the story of the needs so well that I wish to insert it in the RECORD for every Member of Congress to read. Following is the letter:

HOOPA, CALIF., *March 25, 1950.*

HUBERT SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCUDDER: Please, Mr. SCUDDER, do all that you can to reinstate the bill which would give Hoopa school district, Humboldt County, Calif., money for a new schoolhouse which the community needs so badly.

The building that is being used at the present time is a three-story affair. Fourth-grade pupils are housed on the third floor and on north side of the building. Artificial lighting is necessary.

The eighth grade is housed in the basement; again artificial lights must be used. Nothing else to be done under the present conditions. The rooms are all overcrowded and in the beginning the building was not planned as a school building.

Trusting that this will receive your personal attention immediately,

I remain respectfully,

MARY E. HANNAH,
Fourth-Grade Teacher.

Interview With Carl Vinson on Military Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, as we become more deeply involved in a cold war more concern is expressed about our state of military readiness. It is reassuring to the Nation as a whole to know that our national defense affairs are constantly under the careful scrutiny of the far-sighted chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

A recent exclusive interview given Mr. John T. Carlton, outstanding journalist for the Cox newspapers, reflects Mr. VINSON'S acute knowledge of our military affairs, and in an article written after this interview by Mr. Carlton, our distinguished chairman and great American sounded a very timely warning which should be called to the attention of Americans everywhere. The article is as follows:

"LAZY" UNITED STATES INVITING DANGER, VINSON SAYS—NATION MUST STAY READY TO KEEP PEACE—FIGHTING WAR WITH REDS NOT INEVITABLE, GEORGIAN DECLARES

(By John T. Carlton)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Georgia's CARL VINSON, the congressional iron man of the Armed Services and probably the Nation's outstanding authority on the subject, spoke Saturday from his 35 years of experience to assure the Nation it has "acceptable" security and a formula for permanent peace.

In an exclusive formal interview with this reporter, the long-time House armed services leader discussed calmly and dispassionately the military aspects of international peace problems, professional disagreements among military leaders, the issue of civilian control of the military, and current requirements for national preparedness.

EXPERT ON SERVICE PROBLEMS

In incisive language born of his long-time service in Congress and his virtually judicial authority over the services for many years, he explained in everyday language the significance of problems which have stirred the Nation under postwar unification.

Mr. VINSON, a lawyer who has been a judge and Georgia House speaker pro tempore, has been in Congress since 1914 and is the fourth ranking Member of the National House, in years of service. Most of those years he has supervised the services. For 16 years he was naval affairs chairman and during World War II he directed the building of the greatest Navy the world has ever seen—the Navy which won the greatest of all victories. After World War II, he helped write the unification law and he has directed the shaping of congressional policies in legislation making the United States a force capable of supporting militarily the Nation's position of preeminence in world affairs.

"FAT AND LAZY" DANGER

Mr. Vinson believes unification of the services is here to stay—but he says professional differences such as those between the admirals of the air arm and the air generals will and should continue as "healthy," developing "soundest national defense." He does not believe war with Russia is in any sense imminent, or that it ever need develop, but he warns that Americans are in real danger—largely from themselves and temptations to the "fat and lazy" life.

He believes the Nation currently has "extremely able leadership" in the Pentagon, and he does not believe there is any desire in the military to duck civilian control. While foreseeing no war, he cannot visualize any early justification for substantially reducing armed services below present strength—and costs.

INTENT OF CONGRESS

He makes it unmistakably clear that Congress intends to remain in consultation on military matters at the earliest stages and at the highest echelons. Consultations on the White House-Pentagon-congressional level are everyday affairs but in a continual tug of war.

The Georgian does not dismiss as insignificant the recent displays of temper and questionable judgments in the Navy-Air Force fight over air power—a scrap which has captured the headlines more than possibly any other congressional subject during the past year. But he provides a salty summation which may be an epigram.

"The sad truth," he says, "is that no one knows which side is right."

Mr. Vinson was presented a series of questions relating to security and his opinion of the prospects of war.

ACCEPTABLE SECURITY

"Our present strength," he says, "with some areas of weakness that I would like to see corrected provides acceptable security."

He agrees with Defense Secretary Louis Johnson that, if attacked, the United States can strike back within the hour.

"I am not as sure as he," Mr. Vinson adds, "that we can strike back 'effectively'—for here we enter again into a series of variables. I am more interested in whether or not we can ward off effectively the first enemy attack than I am in whether or not we can strike back 'effectively' immediately. The ability to strike back at once is mainly for the purpose of keeping the enemy from starting a war; but should he go to war anyway, I want to be sure that his opening attack cannot disastrously cripple us and our allies."

REAL DANGERS

The real dangers for the United States in the world today?

"Most basically, I think we need a more vigorous foreign policy to carry the initiative in world affairs and to place Russia in a position of countering instead of keeping us eternally in that position. There is the danger that as a nation we may get tired of providing for defense—a real danger in this country, because we do not like the military very much.

"There is the danger of getting isolationist once again—and signs of this are multiplying in Congress and elsewhere. There is the danger of getting fat and lazy—refusing to put the requisite zeal and determination in our relations with the rest of the world, especially with those vital and vulnerable areas in Asia where the local governments are likely to go by default to a despotic, hostile system unless we do more than we are today.

"There is the danger of letting our guard down to the extent that we might once again be caught napping some Sunday morning by atomic bombardment of our industrial and governmental areas, by guided missile attacks from submarines on our ports and harbors and coastal cities, by sabotage, by sudden march into western Europe. Nothing truer was ever stated than 'Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.' The danger is that we will forget it."

Mr. VINSON says he sees no war in the near future—"a fighting war I mean." But—

"The Communists have been at war with capitalism for 30 years. We are at war now, in many respects—but not in a fighting war. I see many reasons why there is not likely to be a fighting war for several years at least—and if we are vigorous enough internationally I believe we can avoid war entirely."

WAR WITH RUSSIA?

Are there reasons why we should ever go to war with Russia?

"Yes, there could be reasons. * * * Should she start hostilities, for example, we would have to go to war. Moreover, I do not believe in peace at any price. The situation could arise that would demand armed resistance to excessive Russian pressure here or there in the world.

"But I do not think that Russia will intentionally begin a war—not soon, at least. So the only real possibility for war that I know of would be as the result of some rash act, unpremeditated, that might inflame passions on both sides.

"So long as we stay reasonably prepared for war, and so long as we stand firmly where we must, I see no reason for war to come that would require the use of direct military force.

"Some say war with Russia is inevitable; that we should attack before the Soviet can.

"I vigorously deny both statements. War is not inevitable—if we exert ourselves vigorously enough today—and we should not attack. Should we begin the war by a sneak attack, the moral fiber of our Nation would be destroyed.

"It is an academic subject anyway. The people would not permit it, and would respond violently toward any President who attempted it, in my opinion.

"The services now have a strength of about 1,500,000 men—630,000 in the army, 460,000 in the Navy and Marines, and 416,000 in the Air Force.

"I see little likelihood that the forces can be reduced to any important extent for some time into the future. The way things are going internationally, the converse looks to me to be more likely over the long haul."

CUT-BACKS CITED

But there already have been some cutbacks—and the 1951 budget reflects as a result augmenting of Reserve and National Guard training.

"This is even true in the Navy, where very sharp reductions have been imposed in nearly all areas. I should expect this process to continue, but not to accelerate, because the standing forces cannot be very markedly reduced."

About the training of the civilian components, a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee is set up to study complaints of the Reservists and Guardsmen.

"It is likely that some inquiry will commence before this session of the Congress adjourns. I do not want to prejudice its problems or anticipate its conclusions."

But about the controversial proposal to merge the Army's National Guard and Reserves.

"The National Guard has traditionally had the edge over the Reserves in the Army, and now in the Air Force. Why? Because the Guard has political support in each State in the Union and can demand the right to be heard within the services. The services have had a 'federalized Reserve' for 30 years, but it has been a sad record. When you lay these two facts side by side, I fail to see any basis for the contention that the national defense would be benefited by the federalization of the National Guard. Quite the contrary, in my opinion."

With respect to unification and the multifaceted problems created, Mr. Vinson says discussion must be based upon definition.

WORKING REASONABLY

"No single Chief of Staff, no merger, no elimination of the Congress has yet occurred wholly; some would say that is success, some would say that is failure.

"If you mean by 'unification' a blending of effort of the three expert military services and a concentration of civilian control throughout the Military Establishment, then I would say that unification is working reasonably well. * * * It needs amending, in my opinion, to insure a properly balanced defense program and to keep the Congress properly a part of the national defense team.

"I think the Congress will never return to a loosely coordinated organization of the armed forces, and to that extent I believe that unification—whatever it means—is here to stay. It is less certain that the Congress will not at some future date do something to make a bit more certain that the Congress is kept in the picture on national defense problems and to keep joint planning among the services on a reasonably high level instead of trickling so far down that the uninformed are making vital decisions.

"I know of hardly any person in public life or in the services who opposes reasonable coordination and control of the three services. But the trouble is in deciding what is reasonable. That is a matter of judgment. I do not think this kind of difficulty will ever be eliminated; it should not be."

Will unification save money? And is it not actually a triplication instead?

EXTREMIST LEADERS

"Unification will assuredly save money. It already has, and more savings will follow. Savings, however, are a byproduct—not the goal of unification. Unification's goal is an efficient national security program, soundly based—a blending of armed forces capabilities to give us the best defense possible. To the extent that this produces savings, to that extent we are better off; but security and not economy is our main objective.

"We have both unification and triplication under the unification act. Actually, I think there is a real question as to whether or not it will be more or less costly to operate the armed forces under the new organization than under the prewar system.

"All of the services are having to maintain vast overheads in Washington to effect all of the coordination required nowadays before decisions are reached. All of this is expensive and should be charged off against the claimed savings under unification."

Mr. VINSON denies unification resulted from the Air Force fight for a separate service.

"The air leaders of the Navy and Air Force are simply in complete disagreement on fundamentals of the art of warfare. That disagreement would have continued regardless of unification. Of course, extremists in the Navy and Air Force have complicated the problem—Air Force extremists doing all manner of things to diminish the public emphasis on the Air Force. But basically, the trouble grows out of a fundamental disagreement, honestly produced—inevitably produced because of different training—on the best way to fight a war.

"The sad truth is that no one knows which side is right."

EXCEPTION TO PRESS

Mr. VINSON takes exception to the popular headlines which informed the public of "revolt of the admirals" and interservice "bickering and quarreling."

The House Armed Services Committee was the aggressor in last October's sensational Capitol Hill clash between the service leaders.

"As to what happened before the hearings, however, you are at the old question of who comes first, the chicken or the egg, and which is the chicken and which is the egg. In my opinion, there were both defenders, both aggressors. Both right, both wrong. Probably the first stone was not cast by either side; I suspect it was the Italian duetto."

"The results of the public argument of the services have been extremely healthy, in my opinion. Again I say that a basic disagreement exists, no matter whether the waters are calm on the Potomac or not at any given time, and the disagreements cannot be removed by any fiat by someone. Things like this should not be resolved by someone issuing an order, so the public would get an idea of false agreement. The issues are too basic to the Nation's security to have them handled in this fashion.

"The more public information, the sounder public decisions. I have no doubt that the Department of Defense benefited a great deal from the committee's October hearings, and that we will have a sounder national defense as a result."

About Admiral Louis Denfeld, removed as Chief of Naval Operations:

"Admiral Denfeld has not 'rebelled' against a law of Congress. He has criticized, as have many others, the administration of the law. Whether or not he would be subject to discipline on that score is not properly an area for comment. If someone should think so, I believe it would be most difficult to prove.

"Service disagreements must not be labeled 'bickering' and 'quarreling.' The disagreements are professional disagreements; the public interest requires that such disagreements must not be hushed up or forced into the underground, or stopped by official

ukase. There is wisdom in counsel, and I firmly believe that the soundest national defense will come from free expression of views."

The Name Without the Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Times-Herald of Washington carried a news article yesterday, in which it quoted the Congressional Quarterly as reporting that scores of residents of the Washington area contributed thousands of dollars to the Democratic national campaign last year and that in contrast, only one person in this section was listed as giving a $1,000 donation to the Republicans.

Under such conditions one wonders how the propagandists are still able to persuade many that the GOP is dear to the hearts of the "special interests" and the group the late President Roosevelt used to characterize as the creatures of entrenched greed.

It grows more apparent each election that these "fat cats" have migrated, so far as their campaign contributions are concerned. About all the Republicans get from most of them is some lip service and token hand-outs, now and then.

But their memory lingers on, seemingly with nine lives in true feline tradition. The rabble-rousers still denounce the Republican Party for harboring economic royalists, but the royalists seem to have folded their tents and silently slipped over to the opposition.

Under leave, I include an editorial from yesterday's edition of the traditionally Democratic Baltimore Evening Sun:

THE OTHER HALF

Once upon a time, long, long ago, the Republicans had all the fat cats and the Democrats had the lean and hungry look. Now, of course, the GOP dines frugally on box lunches to raise cash and reflect the common touch while the Democrats eat high on the hog at $100 a plate to fill their war chest and celebrate victories achieved and hoped for in the future. To cap this state of affairs, the GOP comes through with an admission tax on their folksy little rallies while the party in power revels untaxed. O tempora. * * *

In 2,000 words which we may assume were well and carefully chosen, the chief counsel for the Internal Revenue Bureau has ruled that no Federal tax applies on the Jefferson-Jackson day dinner. This has caused the loyal sons of the elephant to become very angry indeed, and not without cause. Out of the paltry returns from their brave little box supper they gave Uncle Sam upward of $2,000. If the Democrats paid the same percentage on their opulent festival, the Treasury would be enriched by more than $100,000.

Internal Revenue officials have declined to make public the ruling which they handed down. It is undoubtedly ingenious in nature and may even be reasonable and right. It is, however, hard if not impossible not to sympathize with the box-lunching Republicans. Apart from kindly feelings for the mighty who have fallen, there is the practical point that it might do the Democrats some good to pay a full tax bite on their affair. It would remind them how the other half lives.

The Most Certain Things of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if you should ask a southern Californian to name the most certain things of life, his reply might surprise you. It is unlikely that he would mention good weather. More likely, his answer would go something like this: "Death, taxes, and a water problem."

There is good reason for inclusion of the latter in such a statement. Water today is the greatest economic problem facing the soaring population and expanding industries of southern California. And today southern California's water supply is dangerously menaced by H. R. 934 and S. 75, now before Congress.

If you look at a topographical map you will see a narrow coastal plain along the southernmost coast of California. In this small area, which contains only 10 percent of the land area of the State, live approximately half of the State's population. It is estimated by the United States Census Bureau that close to 10,500,000 persons now call California their home. More than 5,000,000 of these Californians are crowded into the small area of the coastal plain along the southern coast.

An easterner might well be expected to take water for granted and might not think of it as he looks for the first time upon the luxuriant groves, vineyards, fields, parks, and gardens of southern California. The water problem of easterners too often takes the form of a fight to keep it from flooding their farms or cellers.

The southern Californian, however, has every good reason for including a water problem among the most certain things of life.

Although half the population of California live in the southern coastal plain area, this area has only 1.4 percent of the total water resources of the State. The other 5,000,000 Californians, scattered throughout the State, have available 98.6 percent of the State's water resources.

The southern California coastal area is the world's largest and most heavily populated oasis, and many years ago its natural local water resources were largely exhausted. Today, every drop of water to be used by new residents, new industries—every type and kind of expansion or development—must be imported.

Where is it to come from? It can only come from one place, and that is the Colorado River, a comparatively small stream that is the subject of the most serious water controversy in western history.

The Colorado River forms the border between California and Arizona, 250 to 350 miles eastward from the Pacific coast. Between it and the coast is the great Mojave Desert, an immense area of barren mountain ranges and alkaline valleys, with very little natural water.

From the days of the Spanish padres to the turn of the present century, southern California depended entirely on local water supplies. These included a few temperamental rivers, which for a great part of the year were dry washes, and underground water brought up with pumps.

But more than 40 years ago Los Angeles, for instance, was obliged to go far afield for water necessary to support it as a swiftly growing metropolis and Pacific port. The most available water at the time was found in the Owens Valley, 250 miles to the northeast, and the people of the city shelled out $23,000,000 to build the Owens River Aqueduct.

Only a few more years went by before it was realized that this supply would soon be insufficient. Now other cities and districts joined Los Angeles in a new search for water. The last available source was found in the Colorado River. Contracts were signed with the United States Government permitting southern California to take the needed water from the Colorado, and once more the people mortgaged their future to underwrite the building of an aqueduct. This time a bond issue for $220,000,000 was authorized, and the great Colorado River Aqueduct was built. It was completed just in time to prevent a chaotic state in southern California during the record-breaking wartime expansion.

Despite the continued influx of new people, now averaging 8,000 a month, southern California would have reason to feel sure of adequate water supplies if it were not for one thing.

That is the current attempts of the State of Arizona to take an enormous amount of water from the Colorado River for a gigantic Arizona project. According to the United States Bureau of Reclamation there already is a deficit in the Colorado River. That is, the projects already constructed or authorized by Congress will need more water than the quantity available to the States of the lower river basin. Therefore, any water Arizona takes in addition to her projects which are already built or under construction would have to come out of the share needed by projects that are already operating.

Arizona wants to take it from California, and has asked Congress to repudiate the contracts California has with the Federal Government for Colorado River water.

In a 1949 study of the State's water problems, the University of California said:

> Most of the (water) resources are within the State. Southern California, however, must rely on the Colorado River, which supplies water originating mostly outside California. California has a limited share of Colorado River water.

It is not only the future that creates a water problem in southern California.

Despite the critical situation, the average daily consumption has sharply increased.

In 1940, residents of Los Angeles used an average of 120 gallons a day. Either they were much cleaner or much thirstier, perhaps both, in 1948, for in that year they averaged 135 to 140 gallons per day each. The people of Beverly Hills outbathed and outdrank the Los Angeles residents, however, by establishing a record daily consumption of 270 gallons for every man, woman, and child.

What is going to happen in southern California?

All future residents of southern California, all future development and progress, must depend entirely on water from the Colorado River, water awarded to southern California under contracts with the Federal Government. If Arizona should succeed in securing a large part of this water, southern California would face a desperate situation. Without the present allotment of Colorado River water no new residents could be sustained in southern California, no new industries could be built to create employment, and it is probable that a large percentage of the natural increase of the population would be forced to leave.

The southern Californian is not joking when he includes his water problem with death and taxes as sure things in life.

That is why California is asking for the defeat of H. R. 934.

United Labor Unions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of March 29, 1950, written by Robert M. Hallett:

LABOR PULLS TOGETHER

NEW YORK.—Periodically the question arises: Can the big American labor organizations come together under one roof again?

Several local, national, and international developments in recent months bring that question to the fore once more. Even if the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations do not reach the difficult goal of organic union there is growing evidence that they are headed towards closer cooperation on the political front at least.

Factors that have brought the big labor giants closer together have been:

1. The teamwork established between them in formation of the new anti-Communist International Federation of Labor in London.

2. The successful combination of political forces in New York City in the elections last fall. Labor was given much of the credit for the victories of Mayor William O'Dwyer, and Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN. This subsequently stimulated the labor groups to form a permanent joint political organization, and has stirred talk of national labor political unity.

3. The closer cooperation developed through their common opposition to the Taft-Hartley law.

4. The purge of Communists and pro-Communists in the CIO, making closer relations with the CIO more acceptable to the conservative AFL.

Particularly since passage of Taft-Hartley, labor has felt it must strengthen itself politically. Philip Murray, CIO president, recently declared: Labor will be hit by an economic H-bomb if congressional candidates it opposes are elected this fall.

He pleaded for backing of prolabor candidates by labor funds and assistance. He compared contributions of unions to the CIO's political action committee to union dues in importance. Both are necessary to protect the interest of the laboring people, and improve their living standards, he said.

In New York City the United Labor Committee has been set up to carry forward on a year-round basis the political alliance that was forged temporarily last year. The new committee has full jurisdiction over all political matters affecting the city, including the conduct of relations with city hall, the formulation of views on pending legislation, and the approval of candidates for public office.

The first target of the new political combine will be the State elections this fall. Should Gov. Thomas E. Dewey run, as is expected, the new group will oppose him bitterly. Labor spokesmen have indicated the line of their campaign. The issue, they say, will be between the "welfare state" which they endorse and the "special interest state" of the Republicans.

A somewhat parallel AFL–CIO political movement is under way in Connecticut. Organized labor there has agreed to join forces for next November's elections. It is no secret that the prime objective of the labor campaign will be the reelection of Gov. Chester Bowles and other Democratic officeholders.

From the New York experience it is apparent that while labor is tending toward political teamwork, unanimity is not and probably never will become total. Not long ago the New York Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York (AFL) removed a member of one of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union from its membership for not conforming to the political program of the council.

David Dubinsky, ILGWU president, appealed to the national AFL to rescind the council's action and his words sounded a note of rebellion against the imposition of political ideas from the top down in labor:

"The principle is whether a central labor union, or for that matter, the executive council (of the AFL) itself, has the power or the right to compel uniformity of political thought and action by all council members."

Furthermore, many left-wing former CIO unions will line up behind the Progressive Party.

For the most part these defections will be relatively minor and labor's growing political coalescence may greatly increase its political power.

The Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Missouri Basin: Growth and First Harvest," delivered by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at the Farmers' Day Celebration, held at Chamberlain, S. Dak., on February 28, 1950. The address exceeds the length of speeches generally authorized to be printed in the RECORD without a statement of cost. However, it is of such a vital character, setting forth the plan of the Department of the Interior, and its policy with regard to distribution of electricity and other benefits coming to a 10-State area by virtue of the development of the Missouri River program, that I ask that it be printed in full at this time. I wish to compliment the Assistant Secretary on his able address. I approve of the plan generally, as it has been outlined and specifically as herein set forth.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make 2⅓ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be with a Missouri River Basin audience tonight. I have met with groups like yours in the basin 19 times since I went to Valley City, N. Dak., in 1943 to explain the then forthcoming Missouri River development plan. Every meeting has been useful to me, because I have taken away from each additional understanding of the complex problems with which we wrestle in the vast region that the Missouri River drains.

The Missouri Basin's water resources problem was recognized some 55 years ago. But for half a century, very little was done about it, except in an inadequate, piece-meal way.

It took repeated catastrophes to open the way for us to get started. The great droughts of the 1930's devastated the Plains. And the disastrous floods of 1943 drowned people and ripped away vital parts of great states. The 1940 census figures showed that this region was slipping backward in population. These were the prices we were paying for 50 years of delay.

Against this background, the Federal agencies with major responsibilities brought their studies to conclusion and in 1944 put them together into a plan that the Congress adopted for prosecution by the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers.

Now, after more than 5 years right here in South Dakota, the Angostura Dam has been completed, the first major reclamation dam to be completed in the Missouri Basin project. I remember that I came out to help start Angostura Dam several years ago. I said it wasn't the mightiest dam in the world, but it would have a great place in the history of the West. It is the vanguard of the 100 or more dams on this biggest, most complex, and most significant construction project which our Government has ever undertaken in peacetime.

Today, we have 14 reclamation units under construction in the Missouri Basin, and 13 more being started this year and next. We have 4 major reclamation dams, either completed or substantially so. The whole project is accelerating with enormous speed.

This year, the Interior Department is spending over $80,000,000 on this project. For next fiscal year, the President is asking Congress for more than $100,000,000 for our part of the work.

The Army Corps of Engineers is moving forward with construction of Fort Randall, Oahe, and Garrison Dams, and other works primarily of a flood control or navigation type.

As these works rise, all over the basin, we can now see on the horizon the power, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits that

will change the future of your State and the other Basin States.

As the joint project is now envisioned, it will bring six and one-quarter million acres of new and supplemental irrigation, and ultimately more than 2,500,000 kilowatts of installed hydroelectric capacity to the people of these 10 Basin States. Further inventory of the vast potential power resources of the basin, including your State, from both hydro and fuel, are now being made.

The wealth and good living that you have already contributed to the Nation with the basic resources previously available to you are sign posts pointing to what you will do with these new resources.

The additional crops from the 53,000 farms to be irrigated by this project, alone, will be worth an estimated $130,000,000 per year, even at prewar prices. They will be worth far more than that in the future.

Add to this the effects of great blocks of low-cost power, the protection from floods, and the other benefits, and you will have a terrific acceleration of your economy.

South Dakota is already feeling the impact of this program. It is commonplace to say that it will change the lives of every one of you. The changes will occur in many ways. They will occur gradually as unit after unit goes into operation. Younger generations coming along may not realize their full import. But you, whose toil and sweat, and sometimes tears, mark the road to where we stand today, will be able to measure the difference.

The Missouri River Basin project will bring both power and water. The two are inseparably bound. Power helps pay the costs; power moves the water. In this region, particularly, where a great part of the irrigation must be done by pumping, the water systems themselves require immense amounts of power.

Power is a mighty resource, in its own right. It is high on the list of national shortage items. Perhaps, it is highest of all on the South Dakota list.

For a long time, this State has ranked near the bottom in the amount of electricity used per person. It has ranked near the bottom in the percentage of farms with electricity. The Missouri River Basin project will help you change all that as within your borders there is a potential but undeveloped hydro capacity of over 1,000,000 kilowatts.

A moment ago I said that present plans already envisage more than 2,500,000 kilowatts of capacity as the present goal of the project. But with the work barely under way, we've already found out that ultimately the people of this great basin will require still more than that. No longer do we hear the critics say reclamation power plants will become "white elephants." The question, "Who, on earth, would buy all that power?" is as dead as the legendary "dodo."

We have learned that once the reclamation resources of an area are opened up for use by the people, we can set no limit to the possibilities and potentialities for expanding the economy. That will be true here in South Dakota, as in many other places where it has already been dramatically proved.

The Missouri River Basin project, as now authorized, provided for development only of the most advantageous power generating sites.

We have already expanded our original power goals. Now, it is obvious, that we must search out and develop every hydro-kilowatt that can be beneficially used in the Missouri River basin. In addition to that, your huge fuel resources will ultimately supplement and extend your power supplies. But first we should develop the presently wasting water power.

Abundant power will help open the other natural resources of the region. Through the development of lignite and oil-shale beds, it may add vital new supplies to our Nation's stock of short resources.

The Department of the Interior has given some study and thought to the extensive beds of manganese ore here in the Chamberlain area. As you know, this manganese is too difficult to extract to be commercially useful now. But abundant cheap power may bring it nearer to the point where further studies of commercial development will be justified.

Manganese is one of the few items in which our Nation is not self-sufficient. It is conceivable that at some future time of restricted sources or national emergency, the studies we have made of these beds, and the measures we have taken to bring power into the area, may prove to have been of vital importance to our prosperity and security.

The Federal Power Commission estimates that by 1970, this area will need more than 9,500,000 kilowatts of capacity. This means that about 4,000,000 kilowatts will have to be added to the existing and presently planned fuel and hydro-generating capacity.

When 1970 comes, we will probably still be needing more power. Our industries, the development of our resources, and the enhancement of our daily living, all depend on having as much electricity as we need at our fingers' ends. Experience has taught us that bringing in power creates a demand for still more power.

Not only will your soaring power requirements require fullest scale development of new power generation, but there is another factor of paramount importance to the basin, and of direct concern to the individuals who will be served by this project.

Power is the paying partner of irrigation. Undoubtedly, you have heard that repeated many times. We cannot develop the basin's fullest measure of irrigation, unless the sale of power brings in enough revenue to defray the irrigation costs that exceed the farmers' ability to repay from the products of their fields.

And the Department is committed to complete financial as well as physical integration of the power generating and transmission facilities whether connected with Army or reclamation dam plants. We believe that is what the Congress intended when the Flood Control Act of 1944 was enacted.

Thus, the financial success, as well as the physical success of this vast project calls for maximum development of your power resources.

As a result of the Fort Peck Dam, some of your people in the northern part of South Dakota already are experiencing the initial benefits of low-cost Federal power. Two units are in operation at Fort Peck with a combined capacity of 50,000 kilowatts.

By October 1951, we expect to have a third unit of 35,000 kilowatts in operation. But the main sources of project power for this State will be Garrison and Fort Randall Dams, now under construction by the Army Corps of Engineers.

In accordance with the latest Corps of Engineers estimate, the first power from Fort Randall will be available in April 1954, when, according to plan, the initial 40,000 kilowatt unit will begin operation.

By the end of 1955, Fort Randall should have four units with 160,000 kilowatts capacity, and Garrison should have three units in operation with a combined capacity of 240,000 kilowatts. The ultimate capacities of these plants will be 400,000 kilowatts for Garrison and 320,000 kilowatts for Fort Randall.

This, combined with the Fort Peck capacity, will then give a total installed capacity on the main stem of the Missouri River of about 900,000 kilowatts with an average annual output of nearly 4,500,000,000 kilowatt hours, from facilities already in operation or under construction.

Construction of power plants at Gavins Point, Oahe, and Big Bend, all in your State, will add still more to the power which can and will be developed for the benefit of the Missouri Basin system.

Depending upon congressional appropriations, the Oahe site can begin delivering power in 1959 or earlier. Eventually it will provide 400,000 to 500,000 kilowatts capacity, and the proposed Big Bend plant will yield another 120,000 kilowatts.

Keep in mind this is not all firm power. However, as other power developments are brought into production in other parts of the system, and as the units are linked together and tied into the system as a whole, the proportion of firm power available to all areas will greatly increase. One of the startling things we have learned from the last World War is that pooling and coordination of power supplies greatly enhance the efficiency and reliability of power, especially water power.

You are aware of the copartnership of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers in the construction of the project. All of the project's power, though, is marketed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Power production and transmission are being firmly and intelligently integrated, basin-wide, into the physical and financial structure of the project. This was contemplated in the coordinated Reclamation-Army plan when the project was authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Department of the Interior adheres to this full integration.

Now, how about the distribution of this power. That concerns you quite pointedly.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to build and operate the main transmission lines to carry power from the generating plants to the wholesale load centers. That means that we shall take it to the main points of wholesale distribution, where supplemental, or feeder lines, can carry it to the various localities for retail distribution.

In order to provide the basin with the maximum measure of firm, dependable power, the entire main transmission system will be welded into a single, interconnected grid. It is necessary for efficiency and reliability that this system be fully coordinated and integrated, and the operation be directed by a single dispatching organization.

The strong backbone of this grid will be a main 230,000-volt loop which will run generally north to south, from Garrison, N. Dak., to Sioux City, Omaha, or perhaps farther south. The return part of the loop will run north, generally along the eastern State lines of South Dakota and North Dakota. The two parts of the loop will be connected together through Fargo and Bismarck. A strong tie will also extend west from Garrison to Montana's Fort Peck power development.

There will be loops and radial lines of 115,000-volts capacity. There may be lines of even lower voltage in some localities.

You, of this audience, are directly interested as the consumers who will use and pay for this power—and as citizens of a State whose economic future will be greatly improved by the impact it will have upon your economy.

Let me restate for you, the five cardinal points of Federal policy, as laid down by the Congress in the distribution of this power. Undoubtedly you have heard them many times before. They are as follows:

1. Federal dams shall, where feasible, include facilities for generating electrical energy.

2. Preference in power sales shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives.

3. Power disposal shall be for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers.

4. Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles.

5. Power disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization.

The Department of the Interior will adhere firmly to these principles.

The initial block of some 300,000 kilowatts of firm power will become available from Fort Randall Dam in 1955. That is not far

away, when measured by the time it requires to work out arrangements for distribution, build the transmission lines, and get ready to put the electricity into your farms, homes, and plants.

In South Dakota, you have some particularly knotty problems to be solved. Just recently, 21 of your South Dakota rural electrical cooperatives sent representatives to Washington to discuss these problems with your congressional delegation, the REA, and the Bureau of Reclamation. We are quite sympathetic with your needs, and are most happy to help you to meet them in every way we can.

As you know, the Bureau of Reclamation is now negotiating the contracts and is planning or building the transmission lines for distributing Missouri River Basin project power. South Dakota will share in the initial energy made available from Fort Randall, and in subsequent blocks of power as they come on the line.

The initial allocations of this power have not yet been made. But we have now on file with the Bureau of Reclamation, applications for power in 1954 in almost triple the amount of the block that will be made ready in 1955 at Fort Randall. Preference customers—cooperatives and public agencies—are asking for 638,000 kilowatts in 1954, and other applicants another 246,000.

Under the marketing criteria established last August by the Secretary of the Interior, contracts for firm power will be negotiated only for the delivery of this block of power within North Dakota and South Dakota, and within those portions of Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota lying within a 150-mile radius of the Fort Randall power plant.

One of the major problems involved in the distribution of this power in South Dakota is how to transport it from the Government lines to the rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and other retailing distributors.

There are many transmission and subtransmission lines, both publicly and privately owned, in the area. Most of them are already carrying the maximum power loads possible. But some of them, I am told, are not used to capacity.

Again, some of REA's are considering the construction of transmission lines, backed up by generating facilities to firm up the secondary power. As cooperatively owned facilities, such lines would be given favorable consideration if they could offer service comparable to that provided by a wheeling arrangement.

The REA's and others in your State are concerned about the prospect that the Bureau of Reclamation may make contracts for the wheeling of project power over these feeder lines to points of ultimate consumption. Some of them have expressed fears that preference customers under the law will not be able to get all of the power coming to them if the Government uses lines of private power companies to deliver them power under so-called wheeling contracts.

It is the policy to make such wheeling contracts only when line capacity is available and when the rights of the preference customers are firmly protected by the contracts, both as to receipt of their full share of the power and to their enjoyment of the fullest measure of benefit from low power rates.

Furthermore, it will be our policy to see that such contracts protect in full the objectives and interests of the Missouri River Basin project, both in building up and stabilizing the basin economy, and in the repayment of project costs allocated to power revenue.

Where satisfactory agreements that fully discharge these responsibilities cannot be made, it will be necessary to place before the Congress the question of building feeder lines as a part of the required facilities of the project.

Our guiding principle is to make the arrangements which are most economical in the interest of the Government and the public, and which will not interfere with the orderly development of the public-power program. We could not justify a request for funds from the Congress on any other basis.

In Montana, and in some other places, we have "wheeling" arrangements in effect right now. In these areas we found that the number of preference customers was not large enough to justify building our own feeder lines, and the utility company would carry the current at a cost to the Government as low as could be obtained by any other arrangement. So we made the "wheeling" contracts, and they enabled us to get power to the irrigation loads and to the REA cooperatives much earlier than we could have by any other means. In some cases, under such an agreement, we were able to serve customers we could not otherwise have reached.

I have described the Montana arrangements. The wheeling contracts we have under consideration for South Dakota contain provisions giving still greater protection to the preference customers and to the irrigation pumping needs. Such contracts would serve to expand, rather than restrict, opportunities to serve and help the cooperatives and other public retailing distributors.

However, no contracts will be signed until there has been ample opportunity for all State interests concerned to make comment.

The Department of the Interior, through its Bureau of Reclamation, either has under initial construction, or is planning for future construction, "backbone" power-transmission facilities adequate to market all power from Federal plants in the basin. This construction is being scheduled so as to meet area requirements as the power becomes available at the generating plants.

If the Congress provides the necessary funds, we will start construction of the main tie line from Garrison Dam to Fort Randall in the next year. Thereafter, we plan to build transmission lines to the major load centers, when and as the funds are made available to us.

We have had proposals, from REA's in your State, to proceed with the construction of certain lines in South Dakota in advance of the time schedule we have established. These proposals look toward the possibility of obtaining temporary power from sources other than Fort Randall, prior to the time the generators at the dam go on the line. In view of the urgent need for more power and additional transmission facilities in your State, we are giving these proposals most careful consideration.

Now I would like to step back from this power question and glance for a moment at some of the other ways in which the Missouri Basin project may be important to you personally.

There is a big map of the Missouri River Basin in my office. That map has splotches of color all over it showing possible irrigable acreage. There is a liberal scattering of these oases of color around Chamberlain.

Northeast of here is the great Oahe unit with a potential 750,000 acres to be put under irrigation. This work is now on the drawing boards with $700,000 being spent on advance planning this year and $875,000 proposed for next year's budget. Construction of the irrigation work is geared to the completion of Oahe Dam and power plant, now scheduled for 1959.

To the west of Chamberlain, three tributaries flow into the Missouri River. Above you are the Cheyenne and Bad Rivers, and below you is the White River. On my map, their banks are liberally dotted with spots of color denoting numerous smaller areas which can be irrigated by pumping as soon as upstream storage dams are built and pumping power is available.

For example, along the White River there are 42,000 acres of potentially irrigable land. The Bureau of Reclamation is spending $150,000 this year and next in planning a multiple-purpose reservoir and a water-distribution system. We hope to get the work under way in fiscal year 1953, and to have water flowing to the first 10,000 acres of land by 1955 when power will be available from Garrison and Fort Randall for pumping purposes.

In the northern part of the State, preparation of design and plans for the Bixby Dam on the Moreau River is under way. This dam will catch the water from a drainage area of 1,585 square miles and level out the flow along the river below the dam so that a possible 11,000 acres may be irrigated.

Still further west is the Angostura Dam. Construction of an irrigation system will start there this spring, and water will be running down the ditches to a possible 16,000 acres of land by 1953.

At the same time, to the north and south of you on the main stem of the Missouri River, the dirt is flying as construction proceeds on Fort Randall and Garrison Dams. All this construction past, present, and future, ties in together.

In addition to the irrigation and power benefits, these units will enhance your recreational opportunities. People are already coming to Chamberlain from all over the country to shoot upland birds. With this resource—and that's what it is—augmented by the recreational facilities of the reservoirs and the improved river, vacationing can become a new and valuable industry for this region.

You are in the middle of the breadbasket of America. When conditions are right, the wheat almost jumps out of the ground. During the war years you helped to feed people all over the world, with some of the greatest crops the world has ever seen.

But what happens when conditions are not right? Mother Nature has been mighty kind to the high plains in recent years as far as growing conditions are concerned. It has not always been that way. There were the droughts of 1934 and 1936. There have been floods.

The Missouri River is a resource that is finally to be used as other rivers are being harnessed and put to work in other areas all over the Western States. It has the strength to smooth out the high hills and deep gullies of the weather nature has dealt this region.

Your Government, and the people of the United States, are staking billions of dollars on the future of the Missouri Basin. I am confident that they will reap rich returns for you and for those living afar, everywhere in the country. Just as the catastrophic drought that drove 300,000 from their homes in the Missouri Basin in the 1930's hurt the whole Nation, so the economic growth and stability that the Missouri Basin project will bring here will enrich all Americans in the future.

Let Every Schoolyard Become a Living Textbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska is the home of the late J. Sterling Morton, who was Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of President Grover Cleveland. Mr. Morton was the founder of Arbor Day which is now observed in every State of the Union and many foreign countries. Trees are of great importance to the prairie State of

Nebraska. One of the most progresssive and widely read newspapers in my district is the Pierce County Leader, of Pierce, Nebr. Mr. William M. Cox is its editor and publisher. In a recent editorial, Mr. Cox makes a most important suggestion about planting trees in schoolyards. I believe that this is a very valuable contribution and effective plan to supplement the idea of J. Sterling Morton and also supplement the important shelter belt program in the Plains States. Because of the importance of this editorial, I include it herewith with my remarks:

ARBOR DAY, APRIL 22—LET EVERY SCHOOLYARD BECOME A LIVING TEXTBOOK

Why is it? There are trees available for many purposes from various tax-supported divisions. These trees in some instances can be obtained for specified purposes without charge or for a very nominal fee. Here is a fact that baffles all belief: Somewhere is an unwritten law that says not one tree available for a school yard.

School boards will buy a textbook that shows in a poor illustration the difference between an oak and an elm, but still all these tax-supported tree nurseries say don't let children see the beauty or enjoy one of these trees.

The Government spends much money to convince father that a row of trees on a farm will save soil, protect crops, etc. But these same agencies refuse to let a small school child watch a free tree grow in a school yard.

Why can't one of these tax-supported nursery divisions make up a package of five trees of each variety that are suitable for the area to be planted and send them to the school teacher or school board?

In a shelterbelt planting there are often as many as six to eight varieties of trees and shrubs—wouldn't each of these properly labeled be an education in each school yard?

No, that's not how it's done. Send a youngster to grade school for 8 years then high school for 4 years and then after he starts to farm is the time to start to tell him of the value of a tree.

Nebraska often points with pride as being the home of J. Sterling Morton, yet 50 percent of the school yards are barren land surrounding a school house.

This is the second year the leader has pounded on this subject; it may be just a weak sound, but this plea for trees for schools is more fitting for Nebraska than governmental hide-bound rules that say every tree must have a fence around it or no tree.

There will come a day when a school yard instead of a school book will be the source of teaching young folk about trees. So till that day when some agency will "spare a tree for a school," the children will have to look on page 210 for an elm and on page 213 for maple. To keep within the rules and regulations don't let the teacher take that youngster into the school yard and let him water a growing elm or maple that will furnish beauty and shade.

With the World Afire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an interesting editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic on February 19, 1950. It should be read by all Members.

WITH THE WORLD ON FIRE

The President of the United States made a speech to the Nation Thursday night. He spoke via radio to millions of Americans who may be living on borrowed time, now that an avowed enemy is building weapons of atomic destruction aimed at America. The President spoke to a people who have been told that the even more fearful hydrogen bomb may wipe out civilization and all life on this planet in one flaming breath. At the moment he spoke, the red tide of communism that has engulfed almost all of the continent of Asia was pressing hard against the last friendly outposts in the Pacific. In captive Berlin the noose again was being tightened by a new blockade.

On the same night the President spoke, the fires were going out in basic industries all over America. Schools were being closed, and homes and hospitals were reaching into their last reserves of coal. Men by the thousands were being laid off their jobs, trains were being canceled, and the Nation was faced with suspension of vital telephone service. Food products bought with the taxes of the people were being piled up to rot while millions throughout the world went hungry to bed. As the President spoke, citizens all over the Nation were reflecting on the treachery of those in high positions of trust who had been found guilty of betraying their country. And all over the world desperate men were shoring up the hasty defenses of freedom.

Against this background of national peril and acute drama the President of the United States made a speech.

He said the only danger to the American Nation is the Republican Party.

In the name of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln we reverently ask: How much lower can the leadership in Washington descend?

Strengthening the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CLARK, BOGGS, PETERSON & BECKER,
Columbia, Mo., February 17, 1950.

In re House Concurrent Resolution No. 64.

Mr. MORGAN MOULDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MORGAN: I would like to recommend that you vote for House Concurrent Resolution No. 64:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

I know you are interested in securing a condition of peace and in relieving the American people of the terrific tax burden of the cold war and the armament race, and I know you are interested in protecting our civilization from destruction by scientific weapons.

The United Nations was a step in the right direction but only a first step. Because it lacked attributes of government and the power to make and enforce world law in the fields necessary to preserve peace, it has failed. It was always the intention to preserve peace, it has failed. It was always the intention of the framers of the United Nations to gain the confidence of the people and to strengthen it from a multilateral treaty to an agency of government. We have been slow and hesitant about vesting in some authority the power to preserve the peace.

The State Department will always recommend against any foreign policy which would interfere with its balance of power politics and its power politics. Consequently, it is necessary that the people speak to the State Department in order that there can be no misunderstanding about the desires and hopes of the people.

This resolution is simply a statement to the State Department to get to work to strengthen the United Nations and to vest in it defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace. Other plans have been suggested, some of which involve bypassing the United Nations, but there is no good reason for not attempting to strengthen this agency already in existence.

There may not be much time to do something to prevent totally destructive warfare. I think a limited world federation will enable us to bring the cold war to an end, remove the fear which obsesses everyone, and give us some relief from the burden of a wartime Federal budget.

The following is a partial list of the United Federalists in Missouri who are backing the resolution: E. R. Windegger, chairman; E. E. Amick, insurance; H. Roe Bartle, Scout executive; Mrs. Marion C. Blossom; J. Lionberger Davis, banker; Dr. Geneva Drinkwater, educator; Hon. Raymond Elliott, Missouri legislator; Hon. Raymond Karst, Congressman; Dr. Charles Lee, professor of education; Hon. Arnold Leonard, attorney; Jay E. Minton, insurance; Stratford Lee Morton, insurance; Col. J. M. Sellers, Wentworth Military Academy; Hon. Murray Thompson, former Speaker, Missouri House of Representatives; Raymond Wittcoff, manufacturer.

There is some opposition by some few people who call anyone with an idea a Communist, but I believe that the class of people backing this is sufficient to insure the integrity of the sponsors.

I suggest that you discuss this with RAYMOND KARST or Congressman BOLLING.

Your attention is also called to the editorial in the New York Times of February 6, where that paper which has no enthusiasm for world federation states: "We are compelled, in short, to accept the concept of a world government insofar as atomic weapons are concerned—or, indeed, so far as any manifestation of scientific war is concerned."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. BECKER.

Hon. Louis B. Heller, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1950, Hon. LOUIS B. HELLER was honored by Sgt. Harry G. Rogovin

Post, Jewish War Veterans, in Brooklyn, N. Y., when Post Commander William Weinstein, in behalf of the post, presented the Congressman with a plaque in appreciation of his outstanding work in communal and civic affairs and his ardent advocacy of civil-rights legislation.

I am sure that many Members of this House are as pleased as I am that this recognition has been given our distinguished colleague. His sincerity and outstanding accomplishments in behalf of his constituents, have earned for him all the praise that can be given him.

The address delivered by the Congressman upon presentation of the plaque was so enthusiastically received by the audience, and so many persons who were prevented from attending have expressed their interest in it, that I am inserting it in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply honored by this very gracious act on the part of the Harry G. Rogovin Post, Jewish War Veterans, in presenting me with this beautiful plaque, and I assure you that this recognition coming to me from this great organization is something that I greatly appreciate.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States has now become a great institution, filling a large and worthy part in the American scene.

Possibly it is not generally realized that it is the oldest of all the veterans' organizations now active. It was first organized by veterans of the Jewish faith who had served in the Civil War. That was in 1896. The Grand Army of the Republic was at that time composed of vigorous men in middle life. Decade by decade since then, over more than half a century, the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic became thinner and thinner until this last year a handful of survivors met in their last encampment to disband the organization. The great general veterans' organizations of the present day, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for example, have all been inaugurated in more recent times, leaving the Jewish War Veterans as the senior extant organized group of those who have served in the armed forces of the United States in time of war.

This organization has been rapidly growing, and today comprises more than 110,000 members. It is operating in 40 States. It has over 630 separate posts. Such a body of patriotic and high-minded citizens can be a great force in the affairs of the Nation. Its size and the character of its membership bring prestige and influence. By the same token such an organization has a responsibility commensurate with its size and influence. It should represent the highest ideals. It should serve the community in the several ways which are open to it. Its weight in public discussions should always be on the side of the welfare of citizens and of the Nation as a whole, not exerted for partisan and selfish interests.

I am proud to say that the activity of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States has been and is, just this.

You are serving 5,800 persons a month in a specific way—veterans and dependents who need the specific guidance and assistance that such a powerful organization can bring to them. You advise the isolated or unschooled veteran of the benefits which our Government has so generously offered to him, in the various forms of pension and compensation, of disability relief, of hospitalization and domiciliary care, of vocational rehabilitaton for the handicapped, of training in industry and on the farm, of higher education in the colleges and the universities, of loans and insurance, and other measures great and small. So generous are these provisions, comparable to nothing in all the long past history of warfare, which our democratic government offers to its citizens who have risked their lives in its defense, so varied and so complicated are the various types of need to which they minister, that the Government would be hard put to it to work out the details efficiently, and the veteran himself would be lost and bewildered, if it were not for the aid that organized veterans associations are giving to the official agencies. For this reason, the Veterans' Administration, welcoming this assistance, recognizes some veterans organizations and gives them responsibilities in this connection. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States is one of these recognized organizations, and is doing immense public service in this connection. Though organized frankly on a sectarian and racial basis, it is ready to extend its helping hand, and actually does lend its services, to all veterans without distinction of creed or race.

For this purpose a staff of professional counselor and guidance specialists is maintained.

Great attention has been given to those whom society so easily forgets because they are out of sight, the veterans who are in hospitals. Through the JWV and its splendid ladies auxiliary more than 80,000 hospitalized veterans of the two World Wars are sought out and assisted in their needs of welfare and recreation.

Yet perhaps most important of all is the contribution to American life which the Jewish War Veterans of the United States is making in the pressure which it is constantly exerting in the area of public opinion and legislation toward making this Nation of ours a better place for all its citizens. The stand which the organization takes is courageous, explicit, and forward-looking. It seeks the more liberal admission of displaced persons, victims of the war and the material for the finest future of citizenship, whose entry into this country is in the great tradition of America's past. It supports the Fair Employment Practices Act, which seeks to remove unjust discriminations which prevent many persons from earning a living on even terms with those who have been, by the accident of birth, more privileged. It supports a national health act for the future well-being of all citizens. It advocates that unpopular measure so important for our national defense, universal military training, a measure to which all veterans must be committed who have seen American boys die by the thousands unnecessarily, by being sent into warfare for which they have not been properly trained. Other measures, liberal and sensible but sometimes controversial, have been frankly backed by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

The question might arise, perhaps it has arisen here and there, why should there be a separate veterans' organization for Jewish veterans when there are already great national veterans' organizations occupying the field, organizations which make no distinctions of race and creed? Is this a piece of narrow-minded separatism, or is there good reason for it?

I might answer that question in several ways.

First, I would point out that it is not a matter of competition. All members of the JWV are urged to join one of the general organizations as well. In fact, 80 or 90 percent are actually members of other veteran groups of a more general character.

There are some functions, however, which the more general organizations cannot perform, or to which they can give little attention because of their size, and wider general interest. These hinge on the fact that the Jews in this country are a minority group with certain needs and interests and problems especially their own.

I deem it important that the tradition shall be kept which shall inform both the public and our own group of the part which Jews have taken in all the emergencies when men have been called to risk and yield their lives for the defense of the country. This is little known and easily overlooked. But the part men of Jewish blood have taken is a very large one.

I like to note that the story begins a long time ago—300 years ago in fact—and in our own city of New York. The first Jews in New Amsterdam came in the summer of 1654. They met with some prejudice and some difficulties. One was that they were exempt from general training and guard duty. There were dangers from Indians, and some threat of danger from other colonists, as well as from lawbreakers in general. All citizens had to do guard duty. It was a responsibility and also a badge of citizenship. But Jews, owing to the prejudice of the governor were not admitted to guard duty in defense of the colony (though they were expected to pay a certain sum each month in lieu of service). Under the leadership of Asser Levy, who has been called "the first fighting Jew in the New World," the issue was fought out with the governor, Peter Stuyvesant. The Jews won the right to do military service for the little city, and thereafter mounted guard on the stockades of Manhattan. They fought for the right to do military duty.

From that day to the present the Jew has done his full military duty to the Nation, and something over. It is the same story in every conflict—the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Indian wars, and the First World War.

In the First World War about a quarter of a million Jews served in the armed forces of the United States. While the percentage of Jews in the whole population is estimated at 3.27 percent, the proportion of Jews in the armed forces was 5.73 percent. Three thousand five hundred were killed, 12,000 were wounded, 3 received the Congressional Medal of Honor, while 1,129 received other decorations and citations. Meanwhile on the home front, other Jews were meriting the thanks of the Nation for their organizing leadership. Of the seven members of the Advisory Council of National Defense, the body which organized the home front, three were Jews, and I cite the well-known names of Bernard Baruch, Samuel Gompers, and Julius Rosenwald.

I do not need to describe to you the part which Americans of Jewish identification took in the last war, because you were there and know for yourselves. Upward of 550,000 served, again a larger portion of the whole than the proportion of Jews to the whole population. Eleven thousand died in service and 40,000 were wounded. Fifty-two thousand received some kind of decoration, citation or award, including one Congressional Medal.

Notable features were that 60 percent of all Jewish physicians in the country who were under 45 years of age, entered the service. There were 35 Jewish families which sent 6 or more members into the armed forces.

The individual tales of heroism are touching and endless.

It is not right that the memory of these things should be allowed to lapse—not because of sectarian pride, but because here and there the voice of calumny is raised still, and the facts should be known, in the interest of the country as a whole.

Furthermore there are services which a Jewish organization can render to the Nation because of their peculiar position in the Nation's life. We face the threat of totalitarianism. Right now it is in the form of communism, but it might be also in the form of fascism, which is not totally extinct. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States are in a position to render a unique protection to the Nation. No group knows better what evils live in totalitarianism than do the Jews because no one has suffered more because of them.

Moreover, outside these more or less formal movements, communistic or fascistic, there is still in this country enough of ignorance or prejudice on the part of people who would be shocked to think they were talking the language of either German nazism or Russian communism—which seeks to blow up into flames all kinds of dissension—but who nevertheless have not eliminated from their minds all the things on which these movements feed. As President Truman has expressed it in his gentle but effective way:

"We have only recently completed a long and bitter war against intolerance and hatred in other lands. A cruel price in blood and suffering was paid by the American people in bringing that war to a successful conclusion. Yet in this country today there exists disturbing evidence of intolerance and prejudice similar in kind, though perhaps not in degree, to that against which we fought the war. Discrimination, like a disease, must be attacked wherever it appears."

As veterans, the members of this organization can work with other veterans' organizations, and with nonveterans' groups, toward the elimination of these prejudices, under conditions of exceptional advantage.

Not then in a narrow or sectarian or a vengeful spirit but with a firm resolution to purge American life of a destructive something within it, the Jewish War Veterans will confront evil prejudice and in so doing will confer a benefit on the country at large.

The thought I would leave with you was never better expressed than by a chaplain, Roland Gittlesohn. The place was the island of Iwo Jima. The occasion was the dedication of a cemetery for the dead of the Fifth Marines who fell in battle there.

"This is perhaps the grimmest, and surely the holiest, task we have faced since D-day. Here before us lie the bodies of comrades and friends. Men who until yesterday or last week laughed with us, joked with us, trained with us. Men who were on the same ships with us, and went over the sides with us as we prepared to hit the beaches of this island. Men who fought with us and feared with us. Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses or beneath the Jewish Star of David there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet—to find the way perhaps for all to live in plenty, with poverty and hardship for none. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth in their memory.

"We shall not foolishly suppose, as did the last generation of America's fighting men, that the victory on the battlefield will automatically guarantee the triumph of democracy at home. This war, with all its frightful heartache and suffering, is but the beginning of our generation's struggle for democracy. When the last battle has been won there will be those at home, as there were last time, who will want us to turn our back in selfish isolation on the rest of organized humanity and thus to sabotage the very peace for which we fight. We promise you who lie here to build the kind of world for which you died."

Halleck an Asset to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of March 22, 1950:

HALLECK AN ASSET TO AMERICA

Among the leading lawmakers giving ardent support to the aims of the Hoover Commission is Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. After The Star had exposed the padding of personnel rolls in the Post Office Department, Congressman HALLECK said last week the situation proved the Hoover group "knew what it was talking about when it recommended drastic reorganization of bureaucratic activities."

It is characteristic of CHARLIE HALLECK to back the Hoover report. Throughout his eight terms in Congress he has demonstrated an unfailing ability to distinguish between genuinely progressive legislation and socialistic, big-government proposals disguised as progressive legislation.

Congressman HALLECK is a liberal in the real American sense of that misused word. He has always championed sound progress and the changes required by changing times. But he has been an effective foe of pseudo-progressive measures aimed at the limitation of individual liberty. He was one of the first, for example, to detect the evil of the infamous court-packing plan of the 1930's and to speak out against it.

Mr. HALLECK'S objective approach to lawmaking after the voters of his district first sent him to Congress in 1935 helped the Republican Party to gain added prestige. It was inevitable that he should come to the attention of party leaders and be given new responsibilities which eventually made him House majority leader. In his present job as assistant minority leader he continues to give distinguished service to both country and party. As the man who single-handedly wrote the GOP congressional campaign platform in 1946, he recently was one of a committee of three which drafted a statement of principles for the 1950 campaign.

Representative HALLECK performs the same invaluable function in the House of Representatives that Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, performs in the Senate. Both are devoted servants of the areas which elect them and of their party, but both also give service which is national and international in scope. CHARLES A. HALLECK'S stature honors his district. His reelection in 1950 will give his district, his State, and his Nation another 2 years of high-principled congressional service.

Misuse of Hoover Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the President, Harry S. Truman, is misusing the Hoover label, which many people construe as a guaranty of economy and efficiency, to further his own political interests and the political interests of his party, is disclosed by two statements of the Committee for Constitutional Government, dated March 21 and 23, and which read as follows:

MARCH 23, 1950.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: You—Members of the Congress—all citizens are confronted with an attempt to usurp the legislative powers vested exclusively in the Congress. The President's plan is to use the Herbert Hoover report as a "cat's-paw" to destroy an important provision of the Taft-Hartley law by turning over its execution to Presidential appointees. Thereby will be restored to the Labor Relations Board the function of prosecutor and judge—a dual power which was seriously abused before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law.

Here is the background history: The President first tried to prevent the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law by his veto message. It was passed by substantial majorities of both Republicans and Democrats over his veto.

Then, in return for the financial and vote-getting help of the labor-union-monopoly leaders, the President obligated himself during the election campaign to do all he could to secure immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, a bill, prepared in the departments, was presented to the Congress in a most unique way. At the hearings of the subcommittee on this bill no amendments were allowed.

At the hearing when the bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, it was not even read section by section to the full committee. The chairman of the Labor Committee of the House tried to secure a cloture rule from the Rules Committee of the House which would have denied to any and every Member of Congress an opportunity to offer any amendment to the Lesinski bill. When this measure came before the Congress on an open rule, Congress defeated it by substituting the Wood bill for it on May 3, 1949.

In September 1949 the President stated in a Labor Day address in Pittsburgh, that he planned to "rip the Taft-Hartley Act out of the statute books."

So, having failed in all of these efforts, he now tries through a fraudulent use of the Reorganization Act to do immeasurable injury to the Taft-Hartley Act by restoring investigatory functions to the National Labor Relations Board which had so abused these powers during the 12 years they held them that the Congress had insisted upon depriving the Board of investigating and prosecuting functions.

Please read the statement by Dr. Williford I. King, chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., Using Herbert Hoover as a Cat's-Paw.

If Congress submits to this usurpation of legislative power granted by the Constitution solely to Congress, it will have permitted another long step toward one-man rule and executive dictatorship. A constitutional question of the gravest importance is involved. Shall the people through their control of Congress lay down the policies, make and uphold the laws? Or, will the Members of Congress who are trustees for the constitutional rights of all citizens allow these to be undermined and usurped by the Executive, to secure campaign money and votes from labor monopolists?

If you want to protect constitutional government from this insidious attack, you must take action and speak up now. Tell Congress section 12 of the President's recommendations reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board must be voted down.

Sincerely yours,

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
SUMNER GERARD, *Trustee.*

USING HERBERT HOOVER AS A CAT'S-PAW

(By Williford I. King)

When fate brought Harry S. Truman to the White House, many felt a sort of pity for the naive little man from Missouri who was suddenly called upon to step into the shoes of the most adroit politician ever serving as President of the United States. Largely forgotten was the fact that Truman had trained under Pendergast—a man who was no amateur in the game of politics.

Hence, there was great surprise throughout the Nation when, on the evening of November 2, 1948, the returns showed that Truman had turned into victory an election which all the pollsters had predicted would be a walkaway for Governor Dewey. And, since that day, he has shown so much political astuteness that his erstwhile critics are beginning to wonder whether, as a politician, he is really inferior to the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt, himself.

One example of his cleverness is the way in which he has used the FEPC issue to keep the Republicans and Dixiecrats from forming an alliance against him—an alliance which, if consummated, might be a great menace to his future political career. Another example is his handling of the coal strike. He carefully avoided intervention until the fuel shortage became acute. He then used the threat of seizure as a whip to force the employers to grant most the miners' demands. By refraining from seizure, he avoided open conflict with the mine owners; by settling the strike before most areas actually ran out of coal, he escaped calling down upon himself the dire wrath of the general public; and, by securing higher wage rates and more pension money for the coal miners, he intensified the loyalty of his most dependable group of supporters—the members of labor organizations.

But, for thoroughgoing political adroitness, his latest move probably eclipses any of his previous political maneuvers. He is actually arranging to use the prestige of Herbert Hoover to solidify the hold of Harry S. Truman upon the labor unions. Here is what is asked for in the message which he sent to Congress on March 13, 1950. It requests Congress to adopt 21 plans for reorganizing various agencies of the executive branch of Government, thus ostensibly merely carrying out the recommendations outlined in the monumental report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government—a report which was prepared under the direction of Herbert Hoover, and which has received almost universal acclaim for its unbiased and scholarly analyses and discussions of ways and means to secure greater efficiency and economy in governmental administration. All this seems highly laudable.

But, hidden away in the middle of the message is the seemingly innocuous plan No. 12 through which, according to President Truman, "unified responsibility is once more established in the National Labor Relations Board by transferring to the Board and its Chairman the functions of the general counsel and by abolishing the statutory Office of the General Counsel. This plan will bring to an end the confusion which has resulted from divided responsibility."

Evidently, by this explanation, the President hoped to lead Congress and the public to look upon this step as being merely a move to systematize the operations of a bureau.

In reality, however, the National Labor Relations Board has little resemblance to an administrative bureau. For all practical purposes, it is a court, the chief function of which is to adjudicate disputes between employers and employees. Under the Wagner Act, it really operated merely as an arm of the CIO. Following the Russian model, the functions of prosecutor and judge were combined, and, in most instances, regardless of the evidence, the case was decided in favor of the labor organization involved.

One of the main reasons for repealing the Wagner Act and adopting the Taft-Hartley law was to get rid of this un-American setup. In the new statute, the functions of the prosecutor were separated from those of the court. As general counsel, Robert N. Denham, by his fair and unbiased enforcement of the law—neither employers nor employees being shown any favoritism—has gained the respect of all parties, not only for himself, but for the Taft-Hartley law as well. And now President Truman proposes to eliminate from the picture both Denham and his office and go back to the iniquitous system prevailing under the Wagner Act.

But the superironical twist to this scheme is that it is proposed under the guise of carrying out a mandate of the Commission headed by Herbert Hoover. And, to add insult to injury, under the general reorganization act passed by Congress, this plan will automatically go into effect unless it is specifically repudiated by a positive vote of at least one branch of Congress. Does a "doubting Thomas" still remain who is unwilling to concede that Harry S. Truman is a past master of political strategy?

If you are opposed to having the President usurp the constitutional powers of Congress in order to secure the financial support and votes of labor monopolists tell your Congressman and Senator that section 12 of the President's message reorganizing the National Labor Relations Board should be voted down.

Great Lakes Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, Washington, D. C., March 29, 1950:

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

I am privileged to appear before your committee in support of legislation endorsed by so many of my colleagues who have a genuine interest in reviving package-freight service on the Great Lakes waterway.

You are undoubtedly familiar with the fact that, in the decade prior to the recent war, about 20 vessels were employed in the Lakes' package-cargo trade, and that most of these vessels were transferred by the Government, in the early years of the war, for service in salt water. Due to the high cost of replacement of suitable vessels, there is no package trade on the Lakes today, and no reasonable hope for its revival is foreseeable unless the Congress enacts legislation for the purpose expressed in these several bills before your committee.

Witnesses appearing before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on identical legislation have demonstrated the importance of package-freight service to my city, Buffalo, N. Y. It was pointed out that, prior to the war, 2,500 persons were employed in stevedoring and shoreside services connected with package trades, and today there are not more than 50 employed in these capacities.

We who support this legislation are aware that ship operators who bought war-built vessels for salt-water trades oppose our effort to revive the Lakes' package-freight service on the ground that it is inconsistent with the policy of the Ship Sales Act of 1946. We are, also, mindful of the fact that the salt-water operators have, under the Ship Sales Act, purchased war-built vessels to the limit of their needs, and that the 10 ships proposed to be converted for use on the Lakes would otherwise lie dormant in our reserve fleet. The sale of ships under this act, at admittedly favorable prices, has not allowed the purchase of a single vessel for operation on the Great Lakes.

There are many who view the Ship Sales Act as having been discriminatory against waterborne commerce on the Lakes. This legislation would, in some degree, overcome that objection. In addition, it will provide many millions of dollars of work for our shipyards and will afford jobs for seagoing personnel and those employed in the necessary shoreside trades.

In addition, it will rehabilitate a transportation medium that has, historically, been most valuable to the entire Lakes region.

Believe it or not, more tonnage is carried by American vessels each year on the Great Lakes than is carried by all United States flag ships engaged in foreign commerce. Before the war, water transportation on the Great Lakes included bulk carriers, package freight ships, and passenger steamers. Today our passenger tonnage has been reduced to but a fraction of its prewar level; our package freight vessels have been totally eliminated. These two classes of ships so necessary to service Great Lakes commerce have not been available since the Government requisitioned during the war and took them for use on the high seas.

High building costs for new vessels have discouraged private capital from returning to the Great Lakes package and passenger trades. Shipbuildings costs have risen tremendously over prewar construction figures, and operating costs have also climbed. It is impossible for private operators to pay the high costs of building new ships and still give service to Great Lakes commerce at rates low enough for their service to be attractive to shippers. If we must wait to build new ships, I doubt that the package freight and passenger trades on the Great Lakes can be revived in the foreseeable future.

Our Government owns thousands of ships which are presently rotting away in the laid-up fleets. Not only is no revenue received from these vessels, but their upkeep and maintenance costs the taxpayers many thousands of dollars each year. It seems ridiculous to me that these vessels should not be made available for use by the people of the Great Lakes States: After all, the people of the Great Lakes States contributed heavily in their taxes to the building of these ships. It is particularly ridiculous that our people should not be able to use these ships when the sole reason that they are unable to do so is because of a highly technical interpretation by the Maritime Commission of the word "reconvert" in the existing Ship Sales Act.

The essential purpose of the bills now before this committee are to permit allowances for the conversion of these war-built vessels for use on the Great Lakes in the same manner as allowances are presently granted for the reconversion of these same vessels for use on the ocean. Many purchasers today can buy vessels from the Maritime Commission and receive allowances up to 100 percent of the selling price of those vessels in order to reconvert them to a theoretically standard-type ship. There will be presented to this committee a table showing actual cases in which reconversion allowances granted by the Maritime Commission to people who bought these vessels for use on the ocean have exceeded 90 percent and in some cases have reached 99 percent of the total Ship Sales Act selling price.

But even though an allowance up to 99 percent were given to a Great Lakes purchaser for the reconversion of a vessel, that reconverted vessel would be of little value in the Lakes trades. These war-built vessels were constructed for use on the ocean; when reconverted back to a standard type they are suitable for ocean use but completely unsuitable for Lakes use. All this bill does is to say that the allowances similar in effect to those available to reconvert a vessel for an ocean purchaser shall be equally available to Great Lakes purchasers for the

conversion of the same vessels to Lakes use. As a matter of fact, these bills would provide less advantages to a Lakes operator than is presently granted to an ocean operator. For while the latter can get up to 100 percent of the Ship Sales Act selling price for his allowances, this bill would limit the allowances to a Lakes purchaser to 90 percent of the purchase price.

Several facts regarding this bill must be made clear to this committee. In the first place, enactment of this bill will not cost the United States Government one single penny. On the contrary, our Treasury will receive substantial payments under this bill. Lakes buyers will pay the same amount for ships sold under the terms of these bills as they would be required to pay for the same ships under the existing Ship Sales Act. It is particularly important to invite the attention of this Committee to the fact that purchasers who would buy vessels under this bill for use on the Great Lakes would pay exactly the same amount for the same type ship as a purchaser under the existing law would pay for that ship.

Under the bill now before this committee, presently useless Government-owned ships could be put to a useful purpose on the Great Lakes without a penny of cost to the Government and without a penny of reduction in the Ship Sales Act selling price. If this bill is enacted, I feel confident that vessels will be purchased from the Government for use on the lakes. Jobs will result to seamen and longshoremen, taxes on wages and earnings will accrue to the Government, and manufacturers and consumers in the Great Lakes area will all benefit from lower freight rates. It seems to me that under these circumstances the Congress is almost duty bound to enact this legislation.

May I point out that section 4 of this bill merely extends the Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Act to cover purchase of vessels under this bill for use on the Great Lakes.

Purchasers today who buy ships under the Ship Sales Act are required to pay only 25 percent down and are given a mortgage by the Maritime Commission for the remaining 75 percent. Because this will not be available to the Great Lakes purchaser who must pay high conversion costs and who must, therefore, borrow from private banks, it seems only fair that they can get the benefits of the mortgage insurance provisions up to 75 percent of the value of the vessels' cost and the costs of conversion. The principle involved is similar to that now in use in various housing acts.

In a recent communication on this bill, the Maritime Commission mentioned that certain clarifying language might be required. We certainly have no objection to such clarification if your committee feels that to be advisable. In its letter the Commission noted that the moving of these vessels to the lakes was hazardous and difficult. I am informed, however, that the engineering studies show the complete feasibility of this movement; moreover, all risks involved can be insured against.

The Great Lakes taxpayers have contributed much to the Maritime Commission's ocean shipping program. Our taxpayers have had large amounts of their taxes allocated to subsidize ocean shipping. Not one penny has been spent for Lakes water transportation. It seems to me to be of doubtful taste for the Commission and ocean shipping owners to do otherwise than vehemently support this legislation.

In conclusion let me urge upon this committee the prompt enactment of this bill. It is necessary if Great Lakes package freight and passenger shipping is to be revived in our lifetime. Never has a more salutary objective been subject to accomplishment without cost to our Government.

Sneak Attack on the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Wednesday, March 29, 1950, entitled "Sneak Attack on the T-H Act":

SNEAK ATTACK ON THE T-H ACT

Because the Taft-Hartley Act, as passed by the Eightieth Congress, whittled the power of union leaders down to size, it was promptly denounced by them as a slave law. Mr. Truman, eager for election in 1948, promptly echoed the epithet.

Neither he nor the labor leaders bothered to explain why they considered the T-H Act a slave law. Presumably, they acted on the political principle of the late Herr Hitler, who said that people will believe a lie—if it is big enough and repeated often enough.

Ever since he became President in his own right, Mr. Truman has used every means at his disposal to maneuver Congress into killing the Taft-Hartley Act. When it became evident that even a Democratic Congress was unwilling to repeal the act Mr. Truman changed his tactics.

He abandoned the frontal attack on the law and tried end runs. He appointed his own fact-finding board, a three-man political instrument whose prejudices on the pension issue precluded an impartial recommendation.

In the coal strike Mr. Truman followed the same tactics. With both industry and Congress begging him to invoke Taft-Hartley injunctive powers to end a dangerous midwinter shortage of fuel, Mr. Truman again bypassed the law and named a personal board; but John L. Lewis spurned its good offices, and the President was finally forced to comply with the law of the land.

Now he has resorted to a sneak attack on the T-H Act—from the rear; he wants to abolish the office of the NLRB's general counsel, Robert H. Denham.

The maneuver was well timed. While the Nation was engrossed in the State Department sensation, he filed with Congress 21 reorganization plans. All of them were reported to have been recommended by the Hoover Commission.

One of the 21 demanded the abolition of the office of NLRB general counsel. Mr. Truman says he wants to abolish Mr. Denham's office "in the interest of economy." Yet this economy would hamstring the Taft-Hartley Act by destroying the balance of power between the Labor Board and its quasi-autonomous counsel. It was not recommended by the Hoover Commission.

It was recommended, urgently and in some cases profanely, by the bosses of the CIO, the AFL, and the UMW. Mr. Denham is cordially hated by union leaders. He has been nonpartisan and fair in the administration of his office.

Mr. Denham is a lawyer of the old school. He believes that a law, once passed, is automatically removed from the sphere of politics and should be enforced without fear or favor. We understand that he has initiated three times as many cases against employers as against unions, and that the first injunction he sought under the Taft-Hartley Act was against General Motors.

There had been no demand for his ouster until the Eighty-first and nominally Democratic Congress convened in January 1949, when Mr. Truman, still flushed with the heady wine of unexpected victory, told Congress that he and it had a mandate from the people.

Mr. Truman did indeed have a mandate, a mandate from a handful of union leaders who insisted that he bring about the demise of the Taft-Hartley Act as promptly and violently as possible.

But Congress withstood the union assault, and hostilities were desultory until last January when Mr. Denham, in a New York address, advised employers to go to the courts if they wanted fair play. The next day telegrams from CIO leaders deluged the White House, clamoring for Denham's scalp.

Last week the President once again yielded to union pressure. He smuggled the knife intended for Denham into an economy package endorsed by the Hoover Commission. The House Committee on Executive Expenditures approved the package as a whole.

The President must not be allowed to get away with this underhanded maneuver to emasculate a law which the Nation as a whole approves. It is of a piece with Senator HUMPHREY'S attempt to kill the Byrd watchdog committee in the interest of economy.

Addresses Delivered at Fifteenth Annual Dinner of the Chicago Decalogue Society of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished bar associations of the city of Chicago is the Decalogue Society of Lawyers. With its membership of approximately 1,200 lawyers, it is the third largest association in the city and the fourteenth largest in the Nation.

Each year the Decalogue Society of Lawyers presents an award of merit to the person whom it considers to have made a most significant contribution to the community. Its award for the year 1949 was bestowed upon Col. Jacob M. Arvey, an outstanding lawyer of the city of Chicago and the chairman of the Cook County Democratic organization, at the fifteenth annual patriotic dinner of the Decalogue Society held on February 15, at the Palmer House in Chicago. Among those who received similar recognition in previous years were Rabbi Stephen M. Wise, Bartley Crum, Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, and Leo A. Lerner.

In tendering the award on behalf of the society to Colonel Arvey, Mr. Oscar M. Nudelman, of the Chicago bar and a past president of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, delivered a most inspiring address and set forth the reasons for which the society's award for 1949 was given to Colonel Arvey.

Col. Jacob M. Arvey's reply, I believe, is significant in setting forth the political philosophy of a truly able and successful political leader.

The addresses of Mr. Nudelman and Colonel Arvey follow:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY OSCAR M. NUDELMAN

Mr. Chairman, Colonel Arvey, honored guests, fellow members of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, ladies, and gentlemen, beckoned to our shores by an abundance of God-given natural resources and freedom and equality of opportunity, prevailing since the days of the founding fathers, sturdy men and women of all races and creeds, with willing hands and fertile brains, pioneers all, regardless of the time of their coming, and their descendants have made this the richest, freest, and most progressive country in all the world.

In this atmosphere of freedom and opportunity, firmly maintained, and defended to the death whenever threatened, it is natural that we should rear large numbers of that peculiarly American phenomenon which we call the self-made man.

Without benefit of aristocratic birth, inherited wealth or a system of nepotism, a great many of our citizens, often first-generation Americans and even immigrants have, through their own efforts, risen to places of eminence in business, finance, Government, the arts, and education.

Every such incident naturally evokes our warm admiration and applause. Upon reflection, however, we find that no successful man is really self-made. Most often he is a product of that society whose guiding principles of freedom of choice and opportunity constitute, in the main, the catalyst, in the absence of which his growth and development could never have begun.

Thus, while most of us are prone to admire and some to give unthinking adulation to mere success, many have become more exacting and apply certain standards to assess and measure the growth and stature of self-made men.

What such men ultimately do with their lives, their wealth, or their power, is, of course, the real criterion of whether they continue to grow or stagnate and to what extent, if any, their personal success is a boon to society. And because our annual award is given, for the most part, to encourage emulation by others, we, of the Decalogue Society, must be exceedingly careful in our selection of each recipient.

In our yearly search we find that there are some who, having grown only to the point of self-satisfaction, when, in their own eyes, they have reached their goal, arrest their own growth prematurely and spend the rest of their incomplete lives in the drab existence of self-complacency. Having no sense of obligation to society, they vigorously oppose all efforts at the expansion of opportunities for others lest their own positions thereby become insecure. Such men are, in reality, failures and do not merit our consideration.

Others, who have only a vague sense of obligation to society and to their own good fortune, may contribute, even generously to traditional philanthropies, and consider such giving as payment in full. They are, of course, to be commended for their generosity, but unless they do something more, something constructive, we may be certain that their growth has slowed down and will soon be completely stopped by the limitations of their own personalities. Nor do they merit our further consideration.

Then there are some who, in the process of growth, have attained power, power and ability to benefit large numbers of their fellow men by their continued efforts and activities. Too many among them, lacking confidence in the future and intimidated by criticism which comes to all who dare to be different, demonstrate their lack of vision and courage by retiring prematurely into the oblivion of private pursuits. They, too, are not counted among the truly great.

We find still others displaying none of these faults, but who, in the activities which we applaud, neglect the very people from whom they stem. In that event, they have misread American history and have failed to understand the American way of life.

Ours is a Nation comprised of many minorities, and no real American will criticize another for being counted, even conspicuously, among one or another of the minority groups. It is the very essence of our form of government and its underlying philosophy that each of us is expected to make his own peculiar contribution to American life in accordance with the religious, cultural, ethical, and esthetic concepts and heritage of his own group.

It is precisely because our Nation was founded on differences synthesized only by a common love for our country and its institutions that we refuse to become streotypes, all cut from the same pattern.

Our formula, therefore, becomes clear. In order to qualify for our annual award one must have made a significant contribution to American life. He must have vision and courage and a strong sense of responsibility to society. He must be a loyal member of his own group in order to be a better American. He must be strongly imbued with the ideal of the brotherhood of man and generous with his substance and his energy in the service of all mankind. Above all, his life must be such as to inspire others to emulation.

Such men are not easy to find. But this year's choice was inevitable by any standard.

The fourth of seven children, Jacob M. Arvey was born in Chicago, of good pioneer immigrant stock. He gave early evidence of loyalty, grit, and determination by working with his father delivering milk from a horse-drawn wagon in all sorts of weather.

He learned his Judaism and its heritage of the democratic way of life and firm adherence to social justice from his father who was a founder and officer of one of the first synagogues established in Chicago and from his mother who was a pious and saintly soul all her days.

He was only 13 when his father died and in order to assist in the support of the family, he worked in his mother's neighborhood candy store. When he was old enough, he got a job in a factory at $3 a week and was graduated from high school the hard way—by attending night classes. The same was true of law school and he was admitted to the practice of the law in 1916, when he was barely 21.

In the First World War, he was so impressive as a 4-minute man that in 1918 he was appointed as assistant State's attorney. Here he first demonstrated his love for justice by refusing to prosecute in any case unless he was fully convinced by the evidence that the defendant was guilty.

In 1923, he was elected alderman from one of the largest wards in our city. In that day, this district was inhabited principally by immigrants from eastern Europe where a governmental regime and public officials spelled tyranny and were best avoided. This was at once a challenge and an opportunity to assert his devotion to the lot of the common man; to awaken in the immigrant confidence in the American way of life and to instill respect for American institutions. In that task, he succeeded admirably, for soon, fear and distrust were replaced by devotion and love for American ideals and hearty cooperation in government.

In the council, too, he continued his growth and soon became chairman of the important finance committee, a position he held until his resignation to enter the armed forces.

During all this time, his heart responded generously to every plea for help from both public and private, religious and secular, and general and Jewish charitable organizations.

For many years he had been a member of the Illinois National Guard and in 1941 he held the rank of captain. When, after the enactment of the Selective Service Act, his regiment was about to be transferred to the United States Army, he was privileged to resign. He was beyond the draft age. With war imminent, many men younger and more robust than he would have welcomed the opportunity to remain at home—and many did. Not so with him. Although he could have rendered distinguished service in support of the war effort on the home front—service which would have satisfied almost any man's conscience, his convictions as to the rightness of the struggle against tyranny and oppression, his indignation at the Nazi efforts to brutalize all mankind, and his great love for America compelled him to remain with his regiment and the record of the quality of his service is part of our country's contemporary history.

Leaving his family, his friends, and his business, he served for almost 5 years, first giving inestimable guidance in the organization and administration of camp life in this country and then, distinguished himself by more than 2 years of duty in the Pacific theater. Discharged as a lieutenant colonel in late 1945, he is now a colonel in the Reserve Corps. Among other decorations, he is the holder of the Silver Star and the Legion of Merit.

Upon his return from the war, thin, to the point of emaciation, tired to the point of exhaustion from the rigors of severe campaigns, sick with the memory of human carnage and misery, his desire to retire from public life would have been understood and justified by all. But the very experiences of the war and profound meditation about its causes and effects, gave him a new vision of a better world and a better life for the common man, which, in turn, stimulated renewed vigor and courage to resist the temptation to seek isolation.

His associates sensed this new power and he was appointed a member of the Chicago Park District and soon thereafter elected chairman of the Cook County Democratic Central Committee.

The area of his efforts and influence was expanded. He could now make practical application on a broader scale of liberal and progressive ideas which he had always sought to put into practice. His influence began to be felt in national circles. Many of his ideas were incorporated in the national platform of his party. In this recent period, his genius, his energy, his foresight and his perseverance resulted in the crowning achievement of his career—the selection of the highest type of men, approved by the voters and the envy of the whole country, to govern in our city, our State, in the House of Representatives, and in the United States Senate.

Yes; he is the new liberal, the real liberal of the practical kind, with his eyes on the stars but his feet on the ground. It is of him that a Member of Congress from our own State wrote recently, "He played a much larger part than is generally known in getting to the floor of the House, and passed by the House, the social-security bill bringing under coverage 11,000,000 more men and women. His influence was behind the minimum-wage law, and I know it is a matter of pride to him that all the Congressmen from Illinois of the party of which he is the leader have gone all out in support of the Federal fair employment practices bill."

Nor did his loyalty to Judaism and his Jewish brethren ever diminish. His tact and diplomacy have often been called into play in the solution of purely Jewish problems. Only recently, he was selected to head a committee of three to represent Chicago Jewry in the settlement of a fund raising controversy which might otherwise have caused a serious rift in Jewish life in our community. Many such incidents could be related in addition to his being one of the founders of the YMHA in Chicago many years ago and more recently, being the sponsor of the Chicago Lawndale Lodge of B'nai B'rith, of which he remains honorary president, as well as his

membership, in most instances on the boards, in any worth while Jewish religious, charitable and educational organizations including several congregations.

But his outstanding contribution to Jewry and the remnant of Israel was the role he played in those critical days when Palestine was partitioned by the United Nations and Israel was recognized by the United States. With characteristic modesty he will decline to speak of his part in the establishment of a new democracy in the world. But when that chapter of history is written depicting America's participation in the establishment of Israel, his name will stand out in bold type as an illustrious American Jew.

It is of him that one of the leading Zionists of America said recently, "Very few know the significant role he has played in the emancipation of our people and in the restoration of our dispersed to nationhood."

It is of him that the recipient of last year's award, himself a lifelong Zionist leader, the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, of blessed memory, said, "No one will ever know how much he did to help the final decision on Israel."

Our choice for this year, therefore, meets all the requirements of our formula; he has made a significant contribution to American life by making us all conscious of our civic duty to participate in government and by demonstrating that such participation results in good government. He is a loyal member of his own minority group, the Jewish people, and is thereby a better American. He is generous with his substance and his energy in the service of his country and all mankind. He is imbued with a deep sense of responsibility to society and with the ideal of the brotherhood of man. He clings loyally to his friends and is well known never to break his word once given. He has vision and courage in abundance. He is kind and modest and humble. He inspires emulation by all of us. He has grown to full stature but his growth continues.

He is supremely qualified for our award of merit and I am honored to be the instrumentality through whom it is delivered. Colonel Arvey, on behalf of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of which you yourself are a distinguished member, I take pleasure in presenting to you the award of merit for the year 1949, with our best wishes for a long healthy life of continued service to your people, your city, your State, your country, and all humanity.

(Reading from scroll accompanying award:)

"The Decalogue Society of Lawyers award of merit for the year 1949 presented to Col. Jacob M. Arvey for his distinguished service to his country as soldier, statesman, and civic leader; for his profound understanding of and unyielding devotion to the American ideal of equality of opportunity and justice for all; for his historic achievements in bringing good government to his city, his State and his country; for his zealous and fruitful labors on behalf of Israel and the Jewish people; for the high-minded humanitarianism manifest in his lifelong devotion to the realization of democratic principles.

"CHICAGO, ILL., *February 25, 1950.*"

ADDRESS OF COL. J. M. ARVEY

Few things that have happened to me in my career as a Chicago lawyer have moved me as deeply as this tribute you pay me tonight.

In accepting it, I realize fully that it is more than merely a tribute to me as an individual.

I am happy to accept the award, not as a personal honor, but rather as your recognition of the growing importance of a group which I—and many of you—represent—the lawyer in politics.

May I, therefore, express my gratitude not for myself alone, but in behalf of those frequently maligned, often misunderstood, yet indispensable leaders of our democracy—the lawyers in politics.

As members of the American bar as well as of the Decalogue Society, we men of law bear a twofold tradition. This tradition carries with it, I humbly believe, the solemn obligation to use our knowledge of law and legal methods to resolve the contentions which threaten our way of life and the peace of the world.

If there is to be any hope in the world for continued peace and justice, it must come through the development and application of legal concepts and legal mechanisms acceptable to all governments—and not from the use of the hydrogen bomb.

Ours is peculiarly a Government of law. As such it is to a large extent a Government by men of law. Three hundred of the 531 Members of Congress are lawyers. Perhaps this might be expected in a body of lawmakers. But 343 of our 1,600 top Federal officials also hold one or more law degrees. That is roughly 220 times as many lawyers in top Government positions as would be the case if we selected these officials by drawing straws out of a hat.

Certainly, in no other country in history, have legal and political ideas and methods been so closely connected as in the United States.

To the critics of the lawyer in politics—that is in party politics as well as in Government—let me simply remind them that of the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence 25 were lawyers. And that famous bill of particulars against George III was drafted by the greatest lawyer-politician of his day—Thomas Jefferson.

Of the 51 men who framed our Federal Constitution, 31 were lawyers.

This state of affairs has continued. Not only has the meaning of our Constitution always been interpreted by lawyers sitting on the Supreme Court bench, but of our 32 Presidents, 26 have been lawyers—or judges, if we include President Truman. Of our 54 Secretaries of State, 50 have been lawyers.

As a matter of fact, the chief objector to the lawyer in politics has usually been the man who feared democracy most—the tyrant.

There is a story to the effect that when Peter the Great of Russia was visiting London—that was long before the present spy scare, of course—he was surprised at the number of lawyers in Parliament. "I have only two lawyers in all my dominions," said Peter. "And I intend to hang one of them as soon as I get back."

Lawyers had little or no place in Mussolini's corporate state. They had little or none in Hitler's Nazi Reich. They have practically none in Soviet Russia or in any other country dominated by a dictator.

As long as America continues to be a Government of law, and as long as members of the bar remain free to talk and act according to legal processes, we have little to fear from tyranny—either from the left or the right.

As long as the lawyer continues to take the same active part in government and politics as did Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Otis, Samuel Adams, and our other first American lawyer-politicians, we shall remain a government of law.

I believe there is altogether too much of an attitude of looking down the nose at the politician by people who forget that politicians—and most of them lawyer-politicians—made the United States possible.

As a lawyer in politics, who is generally regarded as a practical party leader, I am as thoroughly convinced of the need of working in one or the other of our major political parties as were Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt—the greatest and most effective reformers of their times.

In saying this, I do not wish to belittle the importance of independent groups and minor parties working for definite reforms. I am merely pointing out that the main road to political goals, in our American political system, has always followed a major political party.

Only as a political-party worker or leader can you be fully effective—even if your goal is reforming the party itself. You can't clean a house from the outside. You can destroy it—working from without—but you've got to get inside to renovate.

As the titular head of my political party in this community since 1946, I have had a dual objective. I've tried to make democracy with a big "D" work outside the organization, and I've been trying to make democracy with a small "d" work within the organization.

I don't want to be the leader of a rubber-stamp organization. I want to be the leader of a dynamic group of men and women capable of challenging and improving every constructive idea I can promulgate for the good of the order. I feel that it would be foolhardy and presumptuous for anyone in my position to attempt to substitute his ideas, or those of a mere handful of men, for those of thousands of precinct and ward leaders and the millions of voters with whom they have contact.

On the other hand, of course, a ruthless party boss could clean out the deadwood in his organization. He could put go-getters in key positions. He could pick human dynamos for top administrative jobs, and intellectual wizards for top-drawer policy jobs.

Instead of letting members of the organization work out their problems and reach their own decisions in the precinct, the ward, the congressional district, and so on, by the slow, tiresome, wasteful democratic process of discussion, bargaining, and compromise, this political master mind could bypass all this. He could pick whom he considered the best candidates and officeholders, determine what he considered the most expedient policies—and save time, effort, and money.

But granted you could find the right kind of superman for your political boss—a man surpassing all his fellows in wisdom, astuteness, and political knowledge—one with the highest ethical standards and the greatest understanding of human problems—in turning over party rule to this single human being, you would be killing democracy and, of course, history discloses the existence of no such superman.

It is true there are political leaders, commonly called bosses, who do not believe as I do. There is no reason why they should, they are under no compulsion to adhere to the pattern I am employing unless it should turn out, after my theories have been fully tested that I am right and they are wrong. Frankly, some of my own very closest political associates disagree with my views, even though I, and not they, operate under the title that would permit such boss rule.

I realize old forms are always hard to break away from, but that is not, in my opinion, the best of reasons why they should be retained.

I think a bit of experimentation is called for. I believe the end result will be good for the party and its objectives and good for the community.

Now, as I see it, a party leader if he is to lead intelligently must inspire his fellow party members to recognize and embrace those measures and movements which spell not only party success but community progress.

He must encourage the leaders in the organization under him to accept ever greater responsibilities toward the party and its public relations. The broader the base of leadership, the stronger will be the party structure.

As a party politician, I believe our greatest strength as a Nation will come when both major parties are led by strong courageous men who represent the will of their party members, each party having a definite stand on great public issues.

I believe such an alinement would do away with the privilege and pressure groups which are afraid to submit their political ideas to the American people for their decision in the open, but work in the dark.

I have already paid my respects to the nonpartisan and independent groups. I have reason to be grateful to them. Within the past few years they helped the Democratic Party of Illinois and Chicago elect a great governor, a great United States Senator and a great mayor. I know that independent votes helped decide these contests.

Yet, while these independent groups exercise undoubted influence in naming candidates and electing them, they lack the discipline of party responsibility. Thus, when the candidates they help elect, come into office, with either no party responsibility, or a divided responsibility, the result is what we saw in the Eightieth Congress and what we see today in the Eighty-first Congress. Witness the fate of the displaced-persons bill, the civil-rights bill and other important issues.

Voters in a national election vote on issues.

They vote on the basis of what they read in the party platforms. They have a right to believe that the parties mean what their platforms say. They have a right to believe that the candidates running for Congress are pledged to vote for the measures in their party platforms.

Without party responsibility, I see no way to hold a candidate to his pledge. I see no way to have party responsibility that means anything unless we have political parties strong enough to hold officials to their campaign pledges. Of course, resolutions help, public opinion helps, newspaper editorials help.

But in the final analysis, it is only the party, whose support means the difference between nomination and rejection, election and defeat, that can make a congressman and a congress toe the line.

At the local level, this question of party responsibility is not, generally speaking, nearly so important. Local candidates are not ordinarily elected on national issues, and do not have the same relation to the party as does a congressman or a United States senator.

The party's broader principles are not so deeply involved, so that mayors and even governors may properly consider themselves to be more or less on their own, accountable primarily to the personal platforms upon which they have been elected.

In Illinois, as in most States, the gubernatorial candidate's platform usually becomes the basis for the party platform.

Such officials, however, run certain risks in straying too far from party councils.

The danger of such a divorcement is that they fall into the hands of special-interest groups, or of self-serving individuals who owe allegiance to no one but themselves. More than one well-intentioned public official has been ruined by his friends.

Adherence to party associations provides, at the least, the safety that lies in numbers.

I would be the last to maintain that political organizations, including my own, are spotless and unsullied. But I do ask you to consider this—for every man in public life who is corrupt, there are plenty of men in private life who are corrupters.

On the whole our political organizations represent a fair cross section of the people of Cook County.

On the whole the average party member compares favorably with his nonpolitical neighbor. I mean in terms of honesty, ability, and interest in good government.

It is particularly fitting that this recognition of the lawyer's place in politics and goverment should come from this society.

We are told that the earliest concept of government by law, instead of by men, came from the Decalogue, handed down to Moses, our first lawgiver, on Mount Sinai.

In the Decalogue, in the sacred books and in the oral decisions, interpretations and commentaries later written down in the Talmud, we have the first written constitution and the first constitutional law in history.

By two great traditions—that of the American bar and that of the Decalogue—we men of law have a double obligations to American democracy.

It is the obligation to lead in the democratic processes of drafting our laws, administering our laws, and supporting the new legal concepts under which alone we may continue to expand as a government of the people.

Sholem aleichem—peace be with you—has come down to us from the days of the Decalogue as a common greeting. It expresses the age-old hope of peace. By establishing government by law—instead of by force—our forefathers laid a foundation for peace upon which we can build.

The foundation of government by law came to the new world long before the American Revolution. It was brought by the displaced persons of their day. I mean the Puritans and other religious dissenters who sought asylum here. For many years the Hebrew law, as it was interpreted by their spiritual leaders, ruled the first American colonies.

When the American Revolution broke, it was the spirit of law, interpreted largely by the lawyers of that day, the lawyers who became the first American politicians, which made possible the founding of our Republic.

It is the same spirit of law, of government by law, the same rule of reason and of conciliation, that alone can lead mankind out of his present wilderness.

Today, more than at any time in the entire history of mankind, we have need for those orderly processes to which legally trained minds turn instinctively. We are living in an era of chaos, a terrifying time in which our civilization is threatened by ideological conflict that persists even after two World Wars.

The fight for world peace—for those ideals toward which we have been groping through all the years of horror and holocaust—we can never abandon. In the end, we will win out through unity, and unity can only come through understanding. Ultimately, we must have understanding at universal levels, but that cannot be possible unless it exists at all of the lower levels, including the smallest unit of all—the precinct.

That is where a responsible political organization can play its part.

My profound conviction is that political enterprise operated through political organization can be instrumental—though the development of leadership and the promotion of good will—in attaining these high goals.

This I consider to be the most important part of my task, and that is the objective I have set for myself.

Allow me to again thank you for this memorable night. I take from it new encouragement to believe that what I am doing serves in at least a small way the welfare of my country and the world in which I live.

What About the Ex-Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article appeared in the New York Times of February 19, 1950, entitled "The Complex Issue of the Ex-Communist." It was written by Mr. Arthur Koestler, novelist and former foreign correspondent. It should be read by those Members who are interested in problems presented by the ex-Communist:

THE COMPLEX ISSUE OF THE EX-COMMUNISTS—WAS CHAMBERS THE REAL VILLAIN RATHER THAN HISS?—"NO," SAYS ARTHUR KOESTLER, AND HERE HE TELLS WHY

(By Arthur Koestler)

The second trial of Alger Hiss happened to coincide with the publication of a book in which several former Communists and Soviet sympathizers, including myself, relate their experiences. This explains the letter from which the following extract is taken. The writer is unknown to me—she is a woman obviously of German origin who now lives in a Latin-American country.

"Reading about Alger Hiss I always think: There but for the grace of God and the Communist Party, stand I. I belong to your generation, in age and in spirit. I was one of those who, had the party only asked for, would have spied on God Almighty without the least bit of a bad conscience. It is not my merit that they never did ask me things like that, because the only function I ever held was that of a dumb cashier of party dues and later on I was fortunately only a no-account typist in one of their organizations in Berlin, still later in Spain the same during the civil war, in a party office in Barcelona. It was around that time, summer 1937, when I changed my mind about our "Religion" and no doubt, had Alger Hiss gone through this school he would have changed his mind also. But Americans were rather a few years later in finding out, you know the political reasons for that very well, I suppose. It seems one has to be a European with a left-wing past to understand the Hiss story * * *.

"That is where the call for you comes in. Defend Alger Hiss on ground of his motives. I only know of the Hiss case what I have read * * *. Still, the story seems in a way very clear to me and though I believe he did what he is accused of, I see it in the light of his then decent motives. The question would rather be: have the United States really been harmed through him? I cannot believe that. It must be his difficult position and regard for his family that makes him insist on his innocence which, in a higher sense, is real. Come to think of it, for the American public the case is really a bit involved, but you could make it clear. Maybe, if you did, you would prevent a suicide. Could not this trial be brought around to the real issue: even if he did steal the documents, What were his motives? Probably, sometime between now and then, when Alger Hiss changed his mind as so many did who had been Communists in good faith, he was in no position to announce that change. It must have been like this and Whittaker Chambers is the real villain because he didn't keep his mouth shut about things past and done with."

I have quoted this long extract because I believe that it expresses, in an admittedly

exaggerated and overstrung manner, the vague feeling of uneasiness in a considerable section of the European and American public. The outstanding aspect of the trial was that it was not a case of the State or society calling a citizen to account for an alleged crime. It was a public and deadly duel between two individuals—one persecutor, one persecuted. Thus the abstract equation of justice between individual and society became transformed into a personal equation between two men, and the whole picture became distorted by the public's emotional reactions to these two so utterly different human types.

As far as personal impressions and the testimonies of high-standing witnesses go, the persecuted Hiss appeared as the prototype of the decent, modest, hard-working, well-spoken, happily married, idealistic American liberal who, even if assumed to be guilty, could not be suspected of having acted for any base reason or for personal gain. His persecutor on the other hand appeared as a man who unblushingly admitted having committed perjury, traveled with forged passports, lived with mistresses under false names and was described by some academic gents as a psychopath. To put the whole matter into a nutshell: from the spectator's point of view the casting of the parts was wrong—Chambers should have got the part of Hiss and Hiss the part of Chambers.

But the roles were only apparently miscast. For there is a tragic consistency and deep symbolism in both characters. Without doubting the verdict of the jury, there are many who agree that Hiss' innocence is "in a higher sense real," and that he kept passing those documents to the spy ring happily like a starry-eyed Boy Scout doing his one good deed every day. These people would feel that he is the classic type of well-meaning dupe who becomes addicted to the Soviet myth as if it were a drug and who never finds his way back from the lost week-end in utopia.

Hiss denied to the end and persisted stubbornly on his single track: Chambers confessed, recanted his past, and came out on the side of the angels. One would think that this after all decisive fact should tilt the balance of sympathy toward Chambers. Yet my correspondent excuses Hiss' impenitence by his "difficult position" and calls Chambers the real villain because "he did not keep his mouth shut about things past." And here again she seems to lend a shrill voice to a vague public sentiment. For though it is said that 1 repentant sinner causes more rejoicing in heaven than 10 righteous men, people here on earth not unnaturally prefer the 10 righteous men; and the public spectacle of the repentant sinner causes at best a feeling of embarrassment, at worst a feeling of repugnance. And here, I believe, is the core of the whole problem.

I remember how at a New York cocktail party some time ago a lady journalist of obvious sincerity attacked me with some vehemence. I don't remember what exactly she said, but the gist of it was that people who had once been Communists should shut up and retire to a monastery or a desert island instead of going 'round "teaching other people lessons." She spoke with deep conviction, and what she said obviously reflected a widespread popular feeling: mankind's instinctive horror of the renegade.

This horror probably has its roots in the collective unconscious, in past loyalties to church, clan, or tribe which, even if apparently buried, remain potent emotional forces. Even those who in principle agree that there are considerations of a higher order which may force a man to override his loyalties and who accept the ethical justification of a given renegation—even those feel esthetically repelled by the spectacle of the act itself. In short, people don't mind if you betray humanity in the name of some particular cause; but if you betray your club or party they will turn from you in contempt.

This leads us to the curious fact that in our society most people are in the habit of manipulating two mutually exclusive sets of ethical rules without being conscious of the contradiction between them. The first is expressed by sayings like "right or wrong, my fatherland," or "if the party demands it, I will spy on God Almighty Himself," and by the value set on unconditional loyalty. The second demands that a man should have the courage to become a traitor, renegade, or apostate if the interests of humanity or of peace, justice, or freedom demand it.

Some of the war trials of the last years were good examples of the confusion created by the simultaneous application of these contradictory rules of ethical conduct. Even more startling is the example of France, where people were shot, imprisoned, or sentenced to national ignominy for having loyally obeyed the orders of their own legal government. I do not wish to plead the case of either the prosecution or the defense; I wish merely to point out that if you feel contempt for Kravchenko or Chambers, then you should feel sympathy for Laval or Schacht; and vice versa, if you condemn people for having collaborated with a totalitarian regime, then you must acquit those who have deserted such a regime.

But of the two coexistent and contradictory rules of ethical conduct, the first, which demands unquestioning loyalty to some flag, social body, or institution, is much older and deeper embedded in our unconscious psyche. This may be illustrated by comparing the public's attitude to a Catholic convert on the one hand, to a defrocked priest on the other. Everybody, including hardened atheists, respects the convert, but even atheists are embarrassed or repelled by a defrocked priest taking a girl out to a dance.

Now, in fact, both are renegades who have repudiated their former convictions. But the convert has only deserted the amorphous mass of unbelievers who do not represent a social institution and have no flags, emblems or party cards; whereas the priest has deserted a church with powerful binding symbols. Hence even those who agree on principle with his decision have an uneasy feeling that somehow he shouldn't have done it—or at least if he had to do it he should not take a girl out to a dance, though for everybody else this is a perfectly proper thing to do.

I think one must accept the fact that Chambers and Kravchenko and the rest of us who have once borne allegiance to the "god that failed" will always be looked upon somewhat like defrocked priests regardless of the differences in each individual's history and motives. It is no use to argue whether this attitude is justified or not. It should be recognized as a psychological fact. And the fact itself would be without much interest if it merely concerned the few individuals in question. In this case the simplest solution for these would be to follow the lady journalist's advice and satisfy the demands of good taste and discretion by retiring to a monastery or a desert island.

But if Chambers had followed this advice, his repentance would have become meaningless and the public would never have learned certain facts which it was essential for it to learn. And the same is true of Kravchenko and Barmine and Silone and the others. My correspondent asks why they can't "keep their mouth shut about things past and done with"; and people with esthetic sensibilities, repelled by this flood of renunciations, disclosures, and ringing mea culpas, ask with a shudder the same questions.

The answer is simply that these things are neither "past" nor "done with." The inner structure of a totalitarian regime and the physiology of its tentacles stretching abroad; the facts about the arctic subcontinent of slavery, about the servitude of satellite governments and the psychology of the Communist Parties of the West—all these data, essential for the ideological and strategical defense of our civilization, could never have been assembled if these men had had the discretion and good taste to keep their mouths shut. For only those who have worked inside the hermetically closed regime know its true character and are in a position to convey a comprehensive picture of it; and in this sense at least it is true that one repentant sinner is a more valuable asset than ten righteous men who have never swerved from the path of democratic virtue.

Obviously the decisive fact about Chambers is that he has performed a service of great social utility. It is equally obvious that not all acts of social utility curry favor with the public or make the man who performs them appear in a favorable light. But it is essential that these two facts, the first of an objective the second of an emotive character, should remain neatly separated; and that the emotional factor should not obscure political judgment or interfere with the discharge of justice.

It is not to be expected that the public should like the runaway "priest"—even if the "church" from which he has run away happens to be devoted to perverse idolatry. It is not even important that it should believe in the purity or otherwise of his motives to quit. The public is entitled to feel attracted or repelled by him, but it is not entitled to let its bias interfere with its judgment: to talk of betrayal where loyalty would mean persistence in crime; to talk of persecution mania when millions are persecuted; to defend an evil regime on the grounds that those who denounce it are no saints. The greatest danger to liberalism today lies in such starry-eyed confusion.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever before put into the RECORD a letter from a constituent but the following one is too good to keep to myself. This letter is from one of the outstanding real old-fashioned American citizens of northern New York. I thought it would be of interest to the Members of the House and I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will especially note its contents.

MASSENA, N. Y., *March 28, 1950.*

Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLARENCE: I see where you boys have decided that you are going to dip into the dividends of the common man now, asking the corporations to withhold 10 percent, and turn it over to you boys, to be spent wisely, or otherwise. Don't you think it would be all right just to let the stockholder finger the thing a little bit before you take it away from him, so that he would know what it is like?

I know very well that you Congressmen never figured this thing out, but it is about time you started calculating a little on your own hook, before you start letting the fellow with the pompadour haircut and the possum bellied pipe, who probably has figures enough in his head, or handy by, to figure the devil right out of hell, and also

us taxpayers out of all our money. You had better look into this a little, son, and see that it does not happen.

Kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER F. WILLSON.

Final Solution of the DP Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are still several hundred thousand people in the displaced persons camps who are under the care of the International Refugee Organization—IRO. This organization has done marvelous work in the past 3 years in resettling about 700,000 DP's and repatriating another 70,000 people.

But what about those who still remain in the camps? If sufficient funds are not made available to this organization, IRO will not be able to complete the task with which it was entrusted at the time it was established, that is, find homes for the DP's and resolve the DP question which has been such a burden since the end of the war.

We are nearer a solution of that question than we have ever been in the last 5 years. It can be completely solved and eliminated within the coming year or two if we undertake the following steps: First, speedy action to liberalize the present DP law by admitting a larger number of DP's; secondly, appropriation of the necessary funds for IRO to make it possible for this organization to complete its task of resettling the remaining DP's.

In connection with this matter, I direct your attention to an editorial from the New York Times of March 22, 1950, as follows:

CONGRESS AND IRO

The International Refugee Organization has been told by the State Department that no American funds will be forthcoming to continue its operational activities beyond the next 12 months. Since the United States pays nearly half IRO's annual budget, this is equivalent to informing IRO that it must plan definitely to close down. The background of the situation is this:

When IRO was set up in mid-1947 to take care of the gigantic refugee problem, it was thought that its purposes might be accomplished in 3 years, or by June 30, 1950. The Organization has performed splendid work, measured in figures by the resettlement in new homes of over 700,000 war-displaced human beings and by the repatriation of another 70,000. The miracle is not that the job is still unfinished after less than 3 years but that so much has been accomplished. In any case, a few hundred thousand refugees still remain; and the brutal facts of the situation required a decision last fall to prolong the life of IRO to March 31, 1951, by which time it was hoped that the World War refugee question really could be fairly well solved. To this end, the United States agreed to contribute $25,000,000, almost half the necessary sum, for the 9 months' extension. But in asking Congress for this amount the State Department has had to promise that it would make no more requests for IRO, whether the refugee problem is liquidated by this time next year or not. There is every reason to hope that Congress will approve this year's $25,000,000; but whatever the merits, there is no reason to hope that it will grant any more next year. This is what the representatives of the State Department are trying to make clear in Geneva now.

In these circumstances, much depends on whether the existing Displaced Persons Act is liberalized. If we do not do our part in receiving this wealth of human material, the mere abolition of IRO next year will prove nothing. The refugees will remain; they will have to be cared for; and inevitably the funds to care for them will come in good part from the United States. Congress cannot have it both ways. If it wants IRO to disappear, it must take positive action to remove the essential reason for IRO's existence.

Highway Post Offices May Provide Solution to Slow-Mail Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems affecting the life of the smaller communities and rural regions is the steadily dwindling transportation service for carrying the mails, resulting in slower deliveries and less frequent service in a large section of the country. It is a matter of common knowledge that economic conditions have resulted in the abandonment of hundreds of local trains, and the mail service further crippled thereby.

We must face realities in the problem of mail delivery, as in everything else. If local train service is a thing of the past, the Post Office Department must move into new forms of transportation, or another serious blow will be struck at the community life of America.

A constructive suggestion for meeting this situation comes from James W. Wells, Jr., editor and publisher of the Newton Press, located in the county seat of Jasper County. Mr. Wells suggests that highway post offices may provide the solution to the slow mail problem. As one of the Illinois members of the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Offices I am deeply interested in his suggestions. Through permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including his article on the matter:

HIGHWAY POST OFFICES MAY PROVIDE SOLUTION TO SLOW-MAIL PROBLEM

Newton is known far and wide for having one of the finest post offices and postal staffs to be found in all of southeastern Illinois.

Virtually all patrons concede that Postmaster John E. Nichols and all postal workers in Newton extend the best in courteous service. It is a well-known fact that they do everything they can do to please the public within the limits of Post Office Department regulations.

Mail received in Newton is delivered with unusual promptness, and material deposited here for dispatch to other cities is started on its way with like speed.

But it is a fact that the mail service here and in other towns and cities of this area has taken a backward step during the last few years due to the withdrawal of passenger trains on branch lines of the railroads. These trains carried mail cars which provided service to dozens of towns.

DELAYS ARE COMMON

Most of the mails now received at the Newton Post Office are redistributed at offices located at the terminus of a star route. Likewise, the mails dispatched from Newton are taken to an office at the terminus of a star route and there redistributed and dispatched to mail trains and other star routes.

This arrangement often results in serious delays.

For example, a letter mailed in a city less than 100 miles from Newton recently required 3 days to reach here. And newspapers mailed Saturday afternoon in a city 41 miles distant do not arrive until midmorning on Monday.

Letters mailed in still another city, approximately 40 miles away, frequently require 2 days on the road before landing in Newton.

Mail which must be sent from Newton to certain cities for redistribution more or less travels at its own risk as far as date of delivery is concerned. Two cities in this section are called upon to handle a large amount of redistribution mail, and postal staffs apparently cannot keep up with the load on frequent occasions.

For this reason, much mail sent out of Newton requires 48 hours to reach destinations within 20 miles of this city.

One solution for expediting the delivery is the establishment of highway post offices in areas where train service is not available.

These highway post offices are busses made especially to distribute mail in transit and are fitted inside with racks where mail sacks are hung and boxes where letter mail is distributed.

Vehicles thus far placed in use are 33 feet long and can accommodate 200 bags of mail. The interior arrangement is identical to that of a railroad mail car.

Mails are distributed in transit and made ready for dispatch at points where train service is available.

TRAINED CLERKS

Clerks employed on these mobile post offices are railway postal clerks who are specially trained in the distribution of mails in transit and required to take examinations every 6 months on the scope of their work.

Exams are on the postal laws and regulations, State schemes of post offices, changes in time schedules of mail trains, airplanes, star-route service, and other important points.

Mail busses are in great part owned by the Post Office Department, but some are owned and operated by private concerns and manned by the postal service.

The first highway post office was established in 1941 between Washington, D. C., and Harrisonburg, Va. As of January 1, 1950, a total of 64 had been established in the United States, principally in the East and Southeast.

NONE IN ILLINOIS

None has been established in Illinois, but Indiana has three in operation—one between South Bend and Indianapolis, another between Fort Wayne and Indianapolis, and the other between Indianapolis and Vincennes.

This type of service probably is more costly than star routes, but it is greatly preferred because it results in expediting the mails.

Regarding cost, it is widely known that the Post Office Department has been operating at a loss for years. However, it provides a service that reaches the rich and poor alike, and probably no other Government agency does this to as great an extent.

Revenue from the Post Office Department is turned into the United States Treasury and in turn paid out for the operation of the

Post Office Department. A large volume of the mail handled originates in other governmental departments which contribute no revenue, although it creates as much expense for the postal service as paid matter.

PEOPLE EXPECT BEST SERVICE

The public has grown to expect the best mail service obtainable and makes its desires known through proper channels.

Newton people point out that this city is on two excellent paved highways, and they believe that highway post office service could be obtained on either the Mattoon-Evansville or Effingham-Palestine routes, or both.

They also point out that United States Highway 40 from Effingham to Terre Haute should not be overlooked. While this famous route parallels the Pennsylvania Railroad, practically all the trains on this line are nonstop carriers.

Due to weather conditions and other factors, this is not a satisfactory service because of damage to mails delivered from fast-moving trains.

It also is common knowledge in Newton that mail sent from this city to places along the Pennsylvania frequently is carried to Terre Haute or Indianapolis before being returned to the proper town.

SHOULD BAND TOGETHER

Many people feel that towns in this area should band together and ask the Post Office Department to launch one or more highway post office routes.

Those who have investigated the subject declare that the Mattoon-Evansville route held No. 2 priority on Illinois plans drafted some time ago, and that the No. 1 route has since been found unnecessary. The same leaders feel that a movement should be launched at once in an effort to at least get this route established.

Crime Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the editorial page of the March 28, 1950, edition of the Framingham (Mass.) News. The crime statistics presented are a sharp reminder that we cannot afford to abandon any of our youthful guidance programs at national, State, or community levels.

The editorial follows:

CRIME INCREASES

A year ago an FBI spokesman was quoted as saying that it was improbable the high crime rate of the postwar period would continue in 1949. Actually the FBI's number of recorded crimes for the year totaled 1,763,290, an increase of 4½ percent over 1948.

As computed by Mr. Hoover's bureau, that total is at the rate of one crime every 18 seconds. But that is not as impressive as the fact that in the category of major crimes the figures add up to a daily average of 293 persons, feloniously killed or assaulted, more than 1,000 burglaries and almost 3,000 robberies and other thefts. Car thefts averaged 440 a day.

To be taken into account also are such offenses as embezzlement and fraud, forgery, commercialized vice, gambling, and sex offenses.

What consolation may be drawn from the fact that declines were noted in the number of murder, negligent manslaughter, and auto theft cases is more than offset by the showing that more than one-half of all crimes against property were committed by persons under 25. They numbered 54 percent of those charged with robbery, 59 percent of those charged with burglary, 67 percent of those charged with auto thefts, and 54 percent of those charged with rape.

That among the 792,029 persons arrested the predominant age was 21 years is even more cause for sober reflection, for it shows discouraging progress in the face of the mounting emphasis given the responsibility of the home and of society in general for youth training.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in many areas of this country today there is a growing fear that we are heading toward a premature termination of rent control which has given protection to millions of families during the crucial war and postwar years when we were faced with the terrific problem of lack of housing. Unfortunately, that problem is still with us. We are nearer a solution now than we were a year or 2 years ago, but there are still millions of families who urgently need the protection which this law affords them, and there are still hundreds of thousands of families who have to live doubled-up because of lack of sufficient housing.

On March 10, 1949, when we were considering a 15-month extension of the rent-control law, I stated on the floor of this House as follows:

We have had rent control for a long time. We may have to have it for a long time to come. There is no man in this House who will stand on this floor and say that we want rent control or control of any kind as a permanent part of our free American Government and its institutions that are so dear to all of us. But so long as we are in an emergency period we are going to ask for emergency legislation. * * * But do not fool yourselves. We will not relieve the housing shortage in 90 days or a year or 15 months.

I am not seeking the plaudits of a prophet. But more than a year has gone by since then and the housing shortage still remains acute in various parts of the country. In view of the fact that rent has always been a basic factor in the cost of living for many millions of families, and in view of a slow but gradual increase in unemployment in many sections of the country, we should not be too hasty in suspending this means of protection which will unquestionably hurt the lower-income groups very severely.

I fear that if we allow the rent control law to lapse, that if we do not renew it for another year, our inaction or refusal to extend its protection to those millions of our citizenry who still need it, may lead to a chain of events which would seriously undermine the economic stability of many areas of the country. It would then be impossible for the country as a whole to escape the effects of economic turmoil.

We cannot take such chances at this time when we must maintain national unity and a high degree of national morale to bolster our position in the world. We dare not allow the forces of evil and corruption abroad to ridicule us before the world for failing our own people.

I hate to think of the effects of a sudden disruption of landlord-tenant relations which exist today in 43 of the 48 States. At last reports, effective rent protection for tenants was still extended to 12,000,000 rental housing units throughout the Nation, which means that 12,000,000 families were afforded this protection. It does not require a great deal of imagination to foresee the chaos and turmoil in many communities next June 30 if the present rent-control law is allowed to expire.

My State has taken itself out from under Federal control. It has, nevertheless, chosen to continue rent control on its statute books and to extend to the citizens of my State some form of protection. Extension of Federal rent control will not affect my State. I am not now talking for my constituents, but for yours. I believe rent control is still a vital need for the entire country. I belive that it is our duty to enact a Federal law to afford some form of rent control protection to those communities which are unable for one reason or another to establish any form of rent regulation of their own.

The housing shortage is by no means over. Not until that problem is fully solved can you relinquish that obligation to the people whom you represent here. Let us now encourage economic chaos; let us not contribute to economic instability. Rent control is still a matter of emergency legislation. It is absolutely necessary.

Hiss and the Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by William E. Bohn which appeared in the New Leader shortly after the conviction of Alger Hiss:

HISS AND THE "LIBERALS"

(By William E. Bohn)

From so-called liberals—many of them men of distinction—we have had a strange outpouring since the verdict was handed down in the Hiss trial. Most of those who have made statements openly or covertly impugning the verdict have not been in court during the progress of the case. How many of them have scanned the record I do not know. Probably none. But they all try to cast doubt on the jury's decision.

Now this, I submit, is a singular situation. A man has been found guilty by a jury after a long and obviously fair trial. The judge leaned over backward in admitting evidence. The defense attorneys were men of obvious ability. The prosecution limited itself to a rather dry and factual presentation of its evidence. Anyone who listened carefully to the testimony and examined the exhibits will agree that the case for conviction of perjury was overwhelming.

Yet we have had, since the trial ended, expressions from distinguished journalists directly saying or clearly implying that the whole thing is a mistake. Among them are Max Lerner, Marquis Childs, Frank Kingdon, and the Alsop brothers. Mr. Lerner implies that Hiss and Chambers are equally guilty and that from now on both will be victims of their consciences. Marquis Childs calls the whole thing "persecution—and persecution of men and women for the ideas they hold." Frank Kingdon does not go that far, but he is ready to excuse Alger Hiss as "an honorably intentioned man" who has been "distorted by the confusions of the times."

The statement by the brothers Alsop deals exclusively with Dean Acheson's declaration of friendship for Hiss. Mr. Acheson has been rather closely tied up with Alger Hiss. Donald Hiss was formerly his law partner. Mrs. Hiss testified that she joined the League of Women Shoppers at a meeting held in the Acheson home. The two men were simultaneously employed in the State Department. The Acheson statement, backed up by a passage from the New Testament, said that the Secretary of State will not turn his back on Alger Hiss; the Alsops' comment that Dean Acheson "insisted on his own high standards," and that in standing by a friend who is in deep trouble the Secretary set an example of Christian charity.

It did not occur to Joseph and Stewart Alsop that there was any reason why the Secretary of State either should have held his peace or should have made a two-pronged statement. The deeds which led to the conviction of Hiss were performed in the Department of which Mr. Acheson is now head. In the course of the trial, sworn evidence was submitted which showed that Alger Hiss was not the only disloyal man in that department. Stories are going the rounds that there are still men there who are more loyal to a foreign power than they are to the country which delivers their pay checks.

It is all very fine for the Secretary to stick to his friends and quote Scripture. But the people of the United States, who want to know what this trial means, are concerned about the possibility that others may at this moment be extracting papers from Government files and making them available to unauthorized persons. Yet neither Mr. Acheson nor the brothers Alsop have a word to spend on this public aspect of the case. Their attention is exclusively fixed on the nobility of personal friendship. It is an ideal of public service and comparative values which goes back to the days of Mark Hanna or to the later times of Warren G. Harding.

Even with regard to the friendship angle of the case, all of these men are curiously blind to the realities. Max Lerner and Marquis Childs seem to believe that Alger Hiss has been persecuted—that this is an American Dreyfus affair. Lerner goes to great length to show that the jury's verdict is the result of cold-war hysteria. Childs thinks, "We make ourselves over in the deformed image of what we profess to loathe." The Alsops are very sorry for Hiss without saying why they are sorry. Frank Kingdon is the only one of the lot who shows any consciousness of the real tragedy that lies at the bottom of the case. Hiss may have taken his course believing he was "serving the highest kind of patriotism." That such a brilliant young man with such a high future before him should make such a tragic mistake—that is something to shed tears over.

Anyone who followed the evidence as the jury did—and who did so with an open mind—will be convinced—as the jury was—that Alger Hiss is guilty as charged. Any man who has any sensitivity, any religion, any kindness, any decency, will be hurt deep down inside by being forced to this conclusion. But if his brain functions normally on what his ears and eyes take in, that is where he will land. Max Lerner was simply too soft-hearted—or soft-headed—to follow through. The other commentators whose thoughts I have criticized were not present at the trial and simply do not know what they are talking about.

Celler Asks Churchill's Intercession in Interest of Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 7, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to Winston Churchill, receipt of which was formally acknowledged, I pointed to the distorted perspective of the present British Government which is blocking the peaceful development of both the Israeli and Arab areas. A copy of the text of the letter follows:

MARCH 8, 1950.

Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL,
London, England.

SIR: I address myself to you because the event of the elections in your country clearly established you as England's most potent voice for peace. There can be no doubt now that in all external British areas of influence, yours will be the decisive leadership, and because of that fact, your interest, direct and immediate, should be brought to bear on the Middle East.

The distorted perspective of the present British Government with reference to this area has blocked and continued to block the peaceful development of both the Israeli and Arab areas. Just so long as the British Government continues to sell heavy arms to Arab countries, just so long will Arab leadership cherish the ambition to reopen the war with Israel. Torpedoes and tanks and jet planes and submarines are weapons of aggression. To speak of them as defense arms is to place great strain on adult logic. Do the English honestly believe they are arming the Arab countries against Russian aggression? If that is so, is it not pitiful that British leadership is convinced that such arms as the Arab countries can buy and do buy could withstand a Russian assault for even a day? The recent martial history of the Arab countries reduces such confidence in Arab ability to absurdity. Most certainly, the moneys used by the Arabs to buy such arms could more advantageously be used for the bettering of the economic life of the people, which is a far more effective weapon against communism than the arms they can buy.

But such arms as they can buy can be used against the small, young State of Israel. The peaceful development of Israel which gives the greatest promise for the economic and social stability of that whole area is retarded by this supplying of arms to the Arab countries. Moneys that should be spent for agricultural and industrial constructive uses must, of necessity, be diverted to military purposes. The Israelis are aware of the obvious if the British Government is not, that the Arab leaders are still smarting under the humiliation of the defeat. They are likewise aware that not only must these leaders recapture their lost prestige, but must distract their peoples from viewing the benefits of a democratic state in their own midst, lest the democratic ideology prove infectious.

You once remarked that the promulgation of the MacDonald white paper which closed the doors of Palestine, then a British mandate, to the Jews was the filing of a petition in moral bankruptcy. Is this arming of the Arab countries any less so when the use to which they can be put is apparent.

You clearly understand what a viable, stable Israel means in terms of peace and plenty for the whole area. You clearly understand how the blundering attitude of Britain toward Israel's struggle for independence has resulted in self-injury and humiliation both at home and abroad.

I do not exaggerate when I say that now you have the power to change the mischievous policy of your country toward Israel. In doing so, you will serve most effectively the cause of peace.

Respectfully yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Trade in Strategic Materials With Iron-Curtain Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information in answer to questions put by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] during debate on H. R. 7797, a bill to provide foreign economic assistance.

First, as to trade in strategic materials with countries behind the iron curtain. It is hoped that the gentleman will appreciate that commerce in strategic items is, in some respects, a matter that must be kept confidential. Its delicate nature, from the standpoint of international relations, is obvious.

However, this much is apparent on the face of the record. Ten of the participating countries are parties with us under the North Atlantic Pact. These 10 are also recipients of assistance under the mutual defense assistance program. Under both undertakings they are engaged with us in the most solemn engagements of unity of policy and execution in regard to all strategic matters.

One of the countries, namely west Germany, is under occupation by this Nation and two of its allies, France and the United Kingdom. The same unity of policy and execution as affects our allies in the North Atlantic Pact and mutual defense undertaking applies in the administration of Germany.

Also, two of the recipient countries, namely, Greece and Turkey, are under obligations to us parallel to the obligations entered into in connection with the North Atlantic Pact.

It is their security just as much as ours, and even more immediately than ours—that is concerned in strategic economic policy toward the countries behind the iron curtain.

It would be a matter of personal satisfaction to be able to tell the gentleman the precise figures as to what is considered strategic material and what amounts of such material are concerned in trade between eastern and western Europe. It would be imprudent, however, to make such data public. I can assure the gentleman this: that all participants in the Marshall plan are obliged to establish the same policies as we apply respecting trade in strategic materials with the iron-curtain countries insofar as products derived from Marshall plan assistance are concerned.

The gentleman from Nebraska asked also about the use of dollars in the counterpart funds. There are no dollars in counterpart funds. There are local currencies which may be discussed in terms of dollar equivalents. Were those currencies employable in the dollar markets to obtain those things which only dollars can buy and which are essential to European recovery, then perhaps we should need no Marshall plan. Unfortunately, that is not the case. So the local currencies are impounded in proportion to the amount of aid we tender. They are used in such manner as agreed upon between the country and ECA as will best promote the purposes of the recovery program. In many instances, the best way to use them is not to use them at all—for the time being. To release all these funds in the markets of Europe would produce the most devastating inflation imaginable. I am sure that even the most severest criticis of the Marshall plan would not want that.

Three Brilliant Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, J. C. Rich writing in the Hat Worker for February 15, 1950, cites the case of three brilliant men who have startled the world by their attachment to communism. The article is a most interesting one, and I recommend it to all Members:

THREE BRILLIANT CRIMINALS

Far be it from this correspondent to pull a Dr. Binger on unsuspecting customers, but in the circumstance he has no other recourse than to throw some long-distance psychiatry at the high-class delinquents in the current news. There is the snooty frat boy, Alger Hiss, for instance. Then there is the amazing Dr. Klaus Fuchs. And for accent and emphasis there is the no-less-distinguished Dr. Alan May.

All three are intelligent, cultivated persons of the highest intellectual rank. All three are either present or potential jailbirds. All three have either confessed or been found guilty of criminal betrayal of trust. They have been faithless with their country, faithless with their friends and associates, faithless with the missions entrusted to them. Each of them has divulged information of the utmost secrecy to agents of a foreign power when it was their official duty and moral obligation not to divulge such secrets.

Two things will disturb thoughtful observers in connection with these refined traitors. One is the capacity of intelligent and intellectually gifted persons to indulge in criminal perverseness. The other is the capacity of equally intelligent, but morally upright persons to indulge these offenders in their crimes and even give them aid and comfort when their criminal acts are exposed.

The example of Alger Hiss is a case in point. Here was a young man with grace, charm of manner and deportment, favored with a brilliant intellect and with privileges and associations such as few outside his category can hope to enjoy. Very likely he was spoiled by the ease with which he was able to charm people and bend them to his advantage. He was quite supercilious with the congressional committee which first broached a few hesitant questions as to his connections with the Communist Party in general and the former Soviet agent Whittaker Chambers in particular. Ridiculous. How could it ever occur to anyone that he could be a Communist? Deliver State Department papers to foreign spies? Preposterous. As for anyone named Whittaker Chambers, he did not know the man and had never heard the name before.

It was at this point that the lie Alger Hiss lived for many years entrapped him and the web of falsehood in which he willingly became ensnared as a Communist adherent tightened around him. Had he stated simply and candidly: Yes, I was a Communist once; Yes, I was misled by what I thought to be a movement of humanistic and idealistic aspirations; Yes, I did serve the Communists once even to a seeming betrayal of office and trust, he might have escaped not alone punishment for his offense but even the devastation to his fortunes and his career that followed when the threads of his falsehood were untwined. Instead he chose to depend on his wits, on his brilliance, on his pose of haughty and injured innocence. He denied everything until proof forced him to revise his denials. He admitted nothing that was not crammed down his throat by overwhelming evidence.

Two juries examined this evidence and found him guilty.

Now, this is no slight thing, this fact that two juries studied the evidence with meticulous care and both found him guilty, one by a score of 10-to-2 and the other unanimously. There can be no doubt that both juries were as dubious of Hiss' guilt and as inclined to favor the defendant as people had always favored Alger Hiss. They found him guilty because no other verdict was possible in the case. He did lie under oath. He did perjure himself when he said he had had no association with a Soviet agent. He did swear falsely when he said that he did not deliver State Department papers to agents of a foreign power. He did, he did, he did betray his trust and his country.

We come now to the second item in our present psychiatric study, the capacity of intelligent and morally upright persons to condone if not aid and abet such criminal perverseness as Alger Hiss demonstrated. Secretary of State Dean Acheson has stated that he would not turn his back on a friend in distress and even cited a Biblical reference to support his stand.

This hardened soul takes such pious references in stride and is not overly impressed when scripture is cited to support the devil. The chapter Acheson leaned on is a particularly unfortunate one, for it relates how the Lord was able to discriminate between the sheep and the goats, the saints and the sinners. By the test in Matthew xxv Hiss was no saint, for he was haughty, proud, and faithless. However, Acheson could still show Christian forbearance toward his friend, and justify his support of him, if by any indication he showed dismay at and condemnation of the crime his friend committed. This Acheson did not do at any stage of the long and fully illuminated proceedings. He did not do so, and this is the moral obtuseness which is so disturbing to anyone concerned with present-day concepts of ethics, morality, and social responsibility.

It seems that Acheson, a man of high-minded purpose, could not alone forgive but even condone falsehood and betrayal when perpetrated by one on his side of the tracks, one whom he accepts as a social equal, if that one committed his crime in favor of a Communist clique. It is this acceptance of the Communists, this tacit acknowledgment that treachery and falsehood are justified if sanctioned by the Communists, this granting of special dispensation to communism that is distressing to men who insist that truth, freedom, and human dignity must prevail as the basic verities of human society.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt showed a similar blind spot toward Alger Hiss. Mrs. Roosevelt, justly revered as one of the lofty-minded humanists of our generation, stated that while she believed that Hiss told a lie, she could not believe that he betrayed his trust and delivered Government documents to a foreign agent. This self-contradictory statement might be dismissed as the charming feminine nonsequitor of a charming and lovable lady. Obviously if she believes that Hiss lied, she must also believe that he betrayed his Government, for it is the act of betrayal that he lied about.

The only reasonable explanation of this attitude of practicing and semipro liberals is that in the first place they are defending themselves when they stand up for Hiss, and in the second, that communism is to them not so invidious a sin as it is to others. Acheson puts the mantle of his protection around Hiss not alone out of Christian charity, but also out of a sense of familial loyalty to him. Hiss is one of his kind; one of the family. He is a frat boy of the select Greek letter aristocracy, and not one of the barbarians who have invaded Washington as a result of the war. Hiss' association with the Communists was perhaps more far reaching and involved than that of others in the higher realms of pink society, but it is a peccadillo, an aberration that the exclusive set will readily excuse.

As for Mrs. Roosevelt who knew Hiss well and favorably, she cannot lead herself to believe that one so able, so intelligent, so brilliant can be guilty of crime, if, indeed, it is a crime to be a Communist fanatic.

But these brilliant, highly favored, highly gifted Communist fanatics are capable of crime. Here is this Dr. Klaus Fuchs. Here is this brilliant scientist who acknowledges that he was capable of lying to his friends, playing false with the land that gave him refuge, and betraying the trust invested in him when he was given the keys to the atomic Pandora's box. He opened the box and let evil and contagion escape, and he knew it was wrong and even accepted money not as a price for his services, but as a token, as pieces of silver, as acknowledgment that he was playing a Judas role.

And here also is Dr. Alan May, another British scientist, caught when the Soviet spy activities in Canada were disclosed. He is now servng a 10 year term in prison and there is no word from him, but his act and his crime speak for him and his like. Yes, he says, these educated, these gifted, these privileged people are capable of doltish surrender to an evil and conniving force.

Why did they do it?

Well, Hitler also had fanatic adherents, and some of them were in this country ensconced in high places. There was a time which they were in the America First group and one like Lindbergh could see a wave of the future in Nazi terrorism and Nazi dominance.

Can it be that these men of brilliant mind need to seek support in brute force for their essential weakness of character? Can it be that they respect the dictators because it is not necessary to think, not necessary to choose and make decisions under a dictatorship? Can it be that they who seek to rectify seeming wrongs welcome a panacea simply because it is offered in one package, so apt, so convenient, so fully packed? Is it a love of easy solutions and ready-made cure-alls that drives them to the snake oil of communism, Hitlerism, fascism, or Yogi hypnotism? How pleasant it must be to drink a heady elixir instead of striving to clear the fountains of social sustenance.

Whatever the case, it is time that these well-placed and privileged characters stop being so almighty superior about their capacities. They will do well to come down to earth and learn a few lessons from lowly working people. Surely the labor movement has done better in respect to the Communist (and Nazi and Fascist) delusion than have the snooty intellectual actors upstage. Surely labor has shown greater perspicacity, greater devotion and greater courage in the struggle for freedom, equality, and liberty, than has the class of brilliant but weak-minded intellectuals who presume to be our guides and mentors.

Integration Is Working Well in the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's Committee on Equality and Opportunity in the Armed Forces has just issued its first report on how the program of racial integration in the Air Force is proceeding. The Air Force established a new racial policy last summer abolishing segregated units and prescribing equality of training and assignment for whites and Negroes.

Now, after its first survey of progress, the committee reports that this program of integration is "working well and without friction," and that 71 percent of the Negroes in this branch of our armed services are already "living and working in integrated conditions." Significant is the following statement in the report which refers to the views of the commanding officers on the new racial policy:

> Without any exception, they (i. e., the commanding officers) added that their fears had been completely groundless, and that they were amazed at the ease with which the new policy had been effected and the absence of trouble.

All of which proves that if we are really serious in our desires to solve this minority problem, to improve human relations in our own country, to afford all our citizens the full benefits of American democracy, and to bring about greater unity among the people of this Nation, we can really accomplish all this in a peaceful manner, with a minimum of loss of privileges to any part of our population and with great possibilities of acquiring additional prestige and leadership throughout the world.

Following is an article from the Washington Post of March 27 on the report of the President's committee:

AF REPORT PRAISES RACIAL INTEGRATION

(By John G. Norris)

Integration of Negroes and whites is "working well and without friction" in the Air Force, President Truman's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces reports.

Last May the Air Force established a new racial policy, which called for breaking up of most segregated units and complete equality of assignment and training on an integrated basis. The President's committee, which had urged the change, has completed a first survey of how the program is working.

E. W. Kenworthy, executive secretary of the group, was sent on a tour of major Air Force bases for a first-hand look. He reports that 71 percent of the Negroes in the Air Force now are "living and working in integrated conditions."

"Almost without exception," his report states, "commanding officers stated frankly that, although they had recognized the merits of the new Air Force racial policy when it was announced, they had been apprehensive.

"Without any exception, they added that their fears had been completely groundless and that they were amazed at the ease with which the new policy had been effected and the absence of trouble."

Kenworthy views this "quiet social revolution" inside the armed forces as influencing racial relations thoughout the Nation. Telling of his conversations with both white and Negro officers and enlisted men at seven USAF bases, he said:

"It was the opinion of some officers that this program could not but have an effect, eventually, on civilian attitudes; that it was impossible for a white boy to live and work beside a Negro in basic training and in the technical schools, without some real change taking place in his attitude toward race and racial equality."

The report attributes the success of the program largely to the "quality and resolution" of commanding officers to make it work.

"Unquestionably, however," it was added, "the almost total absence of opposition that had been anticipated in the enlisted man is a contributing factor in the success of the policy. The men apparently were more ready for equality of treatment and opportunity than the officer corps had realized."

Bolling Air Force Base was one of those inspected. The others were: Maxwell Base, Biloxi, Miss.; Lackland Base, San Antonio, Tex.; Davis-Monthan Base, Tucson, Ariz.; and Williams Base, St. Louis, Mo.

"At Bolling," he said in his only reference to the local base, "there has been virtually no Negro personnel prior to the new Air Force policy. Presently, there are Negroes at Bolling assigned to maintenance, refueling, transportation, food service, and medical squadrons."

Only at Maxwell was there still a segregated squadron. Of the 25,891 Negroes in the Air Force (as of December 31, 1949) 7,402 were still in separate units, with 11,456 in mixed units, and the remainder in "pipe lines"—mostly in integrated schools. Negroes, it was reported, make up 7.2 percent of the enlisted strength of the Air Force. At one technical training school, the percentage of Negro students was over 10 percent—well above the average.

Extracts from the report follow:

"Jobs—Wherever I went I saw Negro mechanics serving and repairing planes in the hangars and on the line. There were Negroes in radio repair. There were Negro instructors in classes. I saw Negroes in personnel work and in Air Police. There were Negro jet pilots."

"Housing and messing—with the exception of Maxwell Field, I saw no Negroes who were separately messed and housed. Nor was there any attempt at segregation within the individual barracks or at the table. Individual Negroes were interspersed with whites; there was no clustering at one end of the barracks or one end of the table."

"Recreational facilities and social functions—the Air Force policy was limited to military utilization and said nothing about recreational facilities or social life. The disposition of these matters has been left to the individual commander, and there was no fixed pattern in the arrangements and customs observed.

"At some bases there was complete integration of clubs, swimming pools and dances. At others there was a tacit, though incomplete and unenforced, segregation in service clubs and pools, and separate dances for white and colored enlisted personnel. * * *

"Prior to the adoption of the new Air Force policy, there were separate pools or certain days reserved for Negroes. Negroes are no longer prohibited from using any pool, though the local custom varies. * * *

"Dances at the officers clubs and some NCO clubs are attended freely by Negro officers and NCO's. As for dances in the airmen's and service clubs, the custom varies. In some stations there are no separate dances for whites and Negroes. In most camps, however, there continue to be dances for Negroes and for whites. However, Negro couples are not excluded and do attend, though in relatively small numbers.

"Movies and athletic contests are everywhere unsegregated, and Negroes are on service teams. In the South, where scholastic teams refuse to play against service teams with Negro players, the Air Force commanders are now generally taking the view that these schools must either play mixed service teams or be dropped from the schedule.

"Reaction—It was interesting to get the reaction of officers from the South. Some of them stated quite candidly that they did not like the new policy * * * but (they) were quick to add with equal candor that the new policy was working well and without friction.

"Most commanding officers remarked on the increased military efficiency of the new policy and the improved utilization of manpower. * * *

"If press comment is a reliable reflection of community attitudes, the Air Force policy and program are resented in the South. * * * Local commanders have taken the position that while the men under their command must obey laws off the station, the policy of the Air Force need not be attenuated on the station merely because of its geographical location * * *

"The difference between the attitude and treatment of Negroes on base and in civilian Biloxi is startling. The Negro airman who on the post, sleeps, eats, works, studies, plays side by side with his white fellows in uniform, finds when he goes off base that he is not permitted to walk on the main street of the town."

Liberals—What Would They Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Liberal is a paradox in the political life of this country.

Mr. Murray Baron asks a very interesting question about this phony. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his article:

WOULD BACKS BE TURNED IF HISS WERE FASCIST?

(By Murray Baron, chairman, New York County Liberal Party)

To this reader the widespread expression of sympathy for Hiss and admiration for Acheson's loyalty to him accentuates the double standard by which so many of our Liberals live.

Substitute for Hiss a Nazi or Fascist equivalent and for Acheson a Senator MCCARRAN (perish the thought), would we sympathetically describe how the young, brilliant pro-Nazi State Department employee came by his Nazi ideology—how the depression years and growing international crisis contributed to his sincere conversion—to the Fascist ideology? We must assume that some pro-Nazis are possessed of intelligence, brilliance, culture, ambition, and yes, even idealism. We must not fail to recognize that Nazis and Fascists may have been motivated by the sincerest conviction that the cure of social and international ills required the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews—that a happier world community would develop under the rule of pan Germania.

But are these personal attributes to be divorced from the moral and human frame of reference within which they are exercised? Would all Liberals concede that, in my hypothetical case, the mythical, I hope, pro-Fascist State Department prototype of Hiss and his assumed superior, "Secretary of State MCCARRAN," may both be sincere in their fanaticism and bigotry?

The emotional and intellectual conditioning of many Liberals apparently does not yet enable them to evaluate the menace of the Communists and communism by the same criteria by which they judge the Fascist and fascism. This is likewise manifested by the double code of conduct when they oppose the recognition of the second-rate menace of Franco Spain and favor the recognition of the first-rate menace of Communist China. Both states crush religion, free trade-unions, democracy, and freedom. Both states repress Liberals and Democrats of all shades, both are the beneficiaries and in part creatures of external aid from dictatorships.

Time, as we say, is of the essence. In this day of the H-bomb, the presumably anti-Communist Liberal had better open both eyes, the left and the right.

My sympathy, if any, in the Hiss-Chambers case goes out to Chambers. Socially ruined, bereft of a well-paying job, the subject of vicious rumor, spurned and pilloried by many so-called Liberals, he emerges as a tragic object lesson for any current member of the Communist Party who may contemplate escape from that sordid, pervasive, soul-destroying conspiracy. He will not be sheltered by that civilized, sophisticated, intellectualized Liberal community which never compromises with fascism and Fascists. Not he, but his exposed erstwhile Communist colleagues will be the objects of sympathy and understanding and benign tolerance.

The mentality which confuses liberalism with communism is assuredly not less confused when it comprehends this universal double-standard of morality which yet plagues so much of modern liberalism.

It is a similar category of mind which confuses intelligent conservatism with fascism. Because here, too, the irresponsible conservative fails to cultivate the same conditional reflexes vis-à-vis the Fascist as he does vis-à-vis the Communist. The great democratic liberal-conservative middle blocs in our democracy should be governed by one standard, unremitting and equal combat against the twin menaces of communism and fascism.

Application of Social-Security Bill to Wisconsin Retirement Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the final day of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on amendments to old-age-security legislation, testimony was heard from the executive director of the Wisconsin retirement fund, Mr. Frederick N. McMillan. The director testified on behalf of the some 25,000 folks covered by this pioneering Wisconsin retirement fund—the largest retirement system for public employees in my State. I believe that his views on the unique background of the Wisconsin retirement fund and on the provisions which have been inserted in the Wisconsin statutes for integration for that fund with a broadened social security system, and his comments, will be of interest to my colleagues, particularly those who serve on the Senate Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of Mr. McMillan's statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO INTEGRATE EXISTING RETIREMENT SYSTEMS WITH SOCIAL SECURITY

I submit this testimony as the executive director of the Wisconsin retirement fund. This is the largest retirement system for public employees in the State of Wisconsin, and it has been constituted the basic retirement system by the Wisconsin Legislature. Ultimately, after legislative enactments have taken full effect, presumably the only other retirement systems for public employees in the State of Wisconsin, outside of systems for the city of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County, will be the State-wide teachers retirement plan.

The Wisconsin retirement fund now includes more than 25,000 active employees, and about 4,000 inactive accounts of persons who eventually may be eligible for a retirement annuity. Besides the State, 76 cities, 15 villages, 37 counties, and 33 other governmental units have voluntarily acted to include all eligible employees.

This presentation will be confined to a discussion of section 106 of H. R. 6000, which relates to the coverage of State and local employees.

OPPOSITION BASED ON FAULTY REASONING

It is difficult to understand the reason for the almost hysterical opposition to the inclusion of persons under existing public retirement systems which has emanated from certain quarters, and which has resulted in so much pressure being exerted on Members of Congress. I suggest that these persons have acted precipitously without fully thinking the matter through. There are sound reasons for concluding that a little less heat and more light on this matter would probably produce very different conclusions. I think it can be definitely established that if a little ingenuity is used, a way can be found to transform each retirement system into a supplementary system with the following results:

1. The aggregate annuities payable would be increased.

2. Valuable protection will be provided for dependents which is now largely lacking.

3. Survivors of annuitants will continue to have annuity income after the death of the participant, whereas under existing plans many survivors are left without an annuity.

4. There need not be any material change in the cost to either the employee or the governmental unit.

SIMILAR FEARS PREVIOUSLY PROVED UNFOUNDED

This is not the first time that there has been an atempt to stampede the Senate with a proposal for exclusion. In 1935 when the bill establishing the social-security system reached the Senate, an amendment by Senator Clark, of Missouri, was adopted to exclude those persons covered by existing retirement systems maintained by employers. However, this Senate amendment was eliminated by the conference committee.

This decision has proved to be a wise one. While exact statistics evidently are not available, it appears that there were about 650 private retirement systems in business and industry in 1939, covering approximately 2,000,000 persons. By 1949 this had increased to at least 13,000 private systems supplementing social security and covering at least 7,000,000 persons. It should be common knowledge by this time that the existence of social security has not operated to reduce the coverage of private systems, but rather the trend is exactly the opposite. There is no logical reason to assume that the experience would be any different with respect to public employees.

The Advisory Council on Social Security appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance in 1947 gave careful consideration to this matter, and their conclusion as contained in their official report to the Committee on Finance on April 8, 1948, concisely states the essentials:

"Many proposals previously advanced for covering these workers have advocated excluding, on either a permissive or a mandatory basis, various limited groups of State and local employees, apparently in fear that coverage under old-age and survivors insurance would weaken or even completely destroy their State and local retirement system. As pointed out in the Council's recommendations for coverage of Federal and railroad employees, retirement systems supplementary to old-age and survivors insurance perform a valuable and necessary function. When coverage is extended to State and local employees who are members of staff retirement systems, those systems can be adjusted to supplement the basic old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Private employers have demonstrated that such adjustments can be made satisfactorily and without any loss in total retirement protection. The Council believes that in light of (a) the incontrovertible merit of the retention and development of supplementary plans, (b) the fact that employees under industrial pension systems did not suffer losses in benefits attributable to adjustment to the old-age and survivors insurance program, and (c) the fact that State and local governments have recognized the need for, and taken action to provide, retirement protection for their employees, any fear that the availability of old-age and survivors insurance will lead Government units to reduce the total protection afforded their employees is unjustified."

WISCONSIN HAS A PLAN FOR INTEGRATION

The Wisconsin Legislature and the governing bodies of the 161 governmental units are specifically committed to the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the old-age and survivors insurance system established by the Federal Government. From the very inception of this Wisconsin sys-

tem there has been written into the law (sec. 66.903 (2) (f) of the Wisconsin Stat.) a provision whereby these public employees may also be given the advantage of inclusion under social security as soon as this is made possible by the Congress. Automatically the Wisconsin retirement fund will then be transformed into a plan providing supplementary benefits.

The practical result would be that the contributions of employees and governmental units to the Wisconsin retirement fund will be reduced by the amount of the respective contributions to social security. However, the employees will then receive the full benefits of social security, they will retain without change all accumulated credits under the Wisconsin retirement fund, and they will continue to build up additional credits under the Wisconsin retirement fund. Both employee groups and the fund staff have considered this carefully, and no one has yet been able to find any person who would not gain materially by obtaining the benefits to be derived both from social security and from the existing Wisconsin retirement fund.

In practice, integration would work out this way in Wisconsin: At present, for general employees, the employee contributes 5 percent of his earnings up to $350 per month and the governmental unit matches that with a current service contribution of 5 percent. (The governmental unit also pays all prior service, disability, death, and administration costs.) Under integration, beginning January 1, 1951, the employee would pay 2 percent to social security and only 3 percent to the Wisconsin retirement fund. In like manner, the governmental unit would pay 2 percent to social security and its matching current contribution to the Wisconsin retirement fund will be reduced by that amount. Thus, the contentions which have been advanced to the Committee on Finance that "there are grave doubts that many States and subdivisions thereof can afford to have both" and that such "would impose a double burden of contributions upon the underpaid public employee" are completely unfounded. There is no reason why every existing public employee retirement plan cannot be modified in the same manner as the Wisconsin retirement fund

REASONS WHY INTEGRATION IS DESIRABLE

Those who have opposed making it possible for persons under existing public employee retirement systems to procure the material benefits of social-security coverage also would do well to examine the advantages to be derived from dual coverage Here are some of the reasons why such integration seems desirable:

1. Since there is a rapidly accelerating tendency to provide supplementary retirement plans for employees in business and industry, it would be grossly discriminatory to deny the same advantage to those in public employment.

2. Inasmuch as the old-age and survivors benefit system has fallen far short of being self-supporting when considered from an actuarial standpoint, and since the benefits paid are far in excess of what can be provided actuarially from the actual contributions, the system is sound only because taxpayers are liable to underwrite the cost differentials. It is unjust to require public employees to help underwrite this cost without being able to participate in the benefits to be derived therefrom.

3. As previously indicated, each participant would naturally benefit to the extent to which his annuity from two sources would exceed that to be derived only from the existing system. It is not possible to state the exact amount of the increase, since this would vary with length of service and the exact years when the service occurred. However, as an illustration consider a person earning $250 per month who contributed to the Wisconsin retirement fund from age 45 to age 65, and who would at age 65 receive a life annuity of $66 per month. (If he had begun work at age 30, the annuity would have been half-pay.) If the integration authorized under H. R. 6000 were to become effective, the combined annuity which he and his wife would receive, instead of being $66, would range from $130 to $161, depending upon when the service occurred.

4. The protection for dependents would be particularly valuable. Under most existing retirement systems, if an employee dies leaving a wife and minor children, ordinarily the only payment made is a modest death benefit or the refund of the employee's own contributions. Contrast that with the payment under H. R. 6000 where a widow with two minor children would receive $123 per month if her husband had earned only $200 per month and had been covered for only five years. This should provide considerable peace of mind for an employee who now worries about what will happen to his dependents in case of his death.

5. Of equal value is the provision for a surviving widow. Under most existing systems, the widow receives little or nothing unless the employee elects a substantial reduction in his own annuity. For example, of 1,279 now receiving annuities under the Wisconsin retirement fund, in 1,163 instances the widow would receive nothing, with possibly few exceptions. But H. R. 6000 makes substantial provision for a surviving widow which would relieve the worries of a retired employee with respect to the support of his wife after his death.

6. Existing retirement systems provide very limited protection for persons who have spent most of their working career in private employment and have entered public employment later in life. Many pathetic letters are received from old people in this category who find it impossible to live on the small amounts they receive. Yet it is unreasonable to expect the taxpayers of a municipal government to provide a full annuity for a person who had devoted only a few years to serving the public. It is, therefore, important that such persons shall be permitted to participate in the social-security program. This necessity can be shown by the following example:

Suppose that a man had worked in private employment from January 1, 1913, to January 1, 1946, and then would work for the State or a city from January 1, 1946, to January 1, 1956, at which time he would attain age 65. Assume that he earns $200 per month in public employment during the last 10 years of his working career. Since the Wisconsin retirement fund is devised to provide half-pay of $100 in this instance only where a person has worked from age 30 to age 65 at least, the annuity in this case would be about $25 per month, obviously too small to support himself, let alone a wife. Because he had been in covered employment for only 9 years since 1937, he would not have acquired any rights under social security. Thus this man and his wife would be denied any participation in the protection of this national program even though he had devoted the 33 best years of his working career to private employment.

It is difficult to understand how anyone can justify the continuation of any such unreasonable discrimination.

7. Integration is essential for those who leave public employment in the future to enter covered employment. Certainly there should be no disposition on the part of anyone to deny a public employee the free choice of employment by trying to chain him to his present job. In many existing systems, such a change in employment results in the loss of retirement rights. Therefore it is important that he be given full social-security protection. Such change of employment is not rare. In Wisconsin in 1949 those under the Wisconsin retirement fund who terminated public employment for reasons other than death or retirement equaled 12 percent in a single year, and this in a State where the spoils system has been virtually eliminated at both the State and local levels.

8. The fears that existing retirement systems will be abandoned seem to be entirely unfounded. The records of past years do not disclose that sound retirement systems for public employees have been abandoned. Since the trend is to constantly expand the benefits provided for those in private industry and business, there is no reason to anticipate a contrary trend in public employment. There is no reason why these retirement systems cannot be transformed into supplementary systems in the same manner as has been written into the Wisconsin retirement fund law.

9. The safeguard written into H. R. 6000 requiring a referendum in the case of existing public employee retirement systems should effectively allay any alarm that may exist. This means that a ballot must be submitted to each present participant under a public-retirement system to permit him by secret ballot to say whether he wants to integrate the system with social security. However, there appears to be no justification for requiring a two-thirds vote. The American tradition of majority rule should also be allowed to prevail in this instance.

It would be inexcusably selfish for the members of any retirement system which for any reason preferred to remain out of social security (which right they could protect by referendum) to try to prevent the members of another retirement system from being included when it was clearly to their advantage to be included.

10. If the State of Wisconsin and the municipalities under the Wisconsin retirement fund are absolutely barred from including public employees under the social-security system, this will result in impairing the recruitment of qualified employees as vacancies occur in positions covered by the retirement plan. Individuals will hesitate to accept such jobs when it will mean that their dependents and survivors are denied the full protection provided by social security. This will lower the quality of the public service, and may even increase the cost of government.

SPECIFIC CLASSES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES SHOULD NOT BE EXCLUDED

It has also been suggested that specific classes of public employees be barred from participation in the old-age and survivors insurance plan—such as, for example, policemen and firemen. Under the Wisconsin system this would be very unfair to policemen and firemen. Under the Wisconsin law all policemen and firemen, outside of the city of Milwaukee, who are hired after January 1, 1948, and many other policemen and firemen, are included under the Wisconsin retirement fund which specifically provides for integration with social security. It would be very unfortunate if in any city the employees of the street department, the park department, etc., were given the additional social-security protection, while the policemen and firemen—working for the same employer—were compelled to be confined to the lesser benefits provided under the Wisconsin retirement fund. This would be entirely indefensible.

REFERENDUM PROVISION SHOULD BE CORRECTED

With respect to the referendum provision, it seems quite cruel to require that present annuitants participate in the referendum which is made mandatory for existing public-retirement systems. Such participation will only lead them to hope that their annuity will be increased because of such integration, when this would be wholly impossible under the proposed bill. This should be modified to exclude annuitants from the referendum.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS SHOULD BE UNIFORM

A final comment on the administrative proposal. There seems to be no logical basis for treating governmental employers any differently than private employers from an administrative viewpoint. State governments should not be required to assume the responsibility and the expense of administration which the Social Security Administration pays for private employers. Likewise, it is believed that municipal and county governments and their employees will have a more comfortable feeling if their payments and records are transmitted directly to the responsible Federal agency, rather than channeled through a third party, thus increasing the likelihood of errors and confusion.

CONCLUSION: OPPOSITION TO INTEGRATION ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY

It would appear that in reality all of the pressure which has been brought to bear upon the Congress to induce it to prohibit the integration of existing retirement systems for public employees with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system is completely unnecessary. All that the Congress would do in H. R. 6000 would be to enact enabling legislation. The real choice as to what would be done in any State would be made within that State. This is entirely proper, since the Federal government should not try to dictate policies with respect to State and municipal employees.

Consequently, there is no logical reason why any State legislature should memorialize the Congress on this point. The final choice in that State will be made by the State legislature under H. R. 6000, not by Congress.

Likewise, there is no justifiable reason why the representatives or members of any retirement system for public employees should exert pressure on Members of Congress. These members of retirement systems will presently have ample opportunity to present their case to their State legislature. Then, even if the legislature should happen to disregard their wishes with respect to integration, these employees still have complete control, since they have the prerogative to reject integration when the referendum is held.

In view of this complete control by each State legislature and also by the members of each existing retirement system, it would seem to be utterly selfish to try to prevent integration in one State where integration is wanted, simply because such is not desired in another State.

American Information Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was pleased to note that the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD for March 27, 1950, on page A2219, an editorial from the Washington Post of March 26 entitled "Informing the World." This editorial praises the position taken by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] in a recent speech to the Senate calling for a more aggressive American information policy through the Voice of America.

I have in my hand a letter published in the Washington Post on March 29, commending that editorial, and testifying to the vital importance of a revised and expanded American program to win the minds and loyalties of the peoples of the world. This letter is from Mr. J. Earnest Fisher, formerly chief adviser to the Bureau of Public Opinion of the American Military Government in Korea. Mr. Fisher pleads eloquently for the sending of "missionaries of democracy and Americanism" who can speak directly to the peoples of other nations in their own language. I commend the letter to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMING THE WORLD

Your March 26 editorial, Informing the World, emphasized the one feature of the cold war which will decide whether we win or lose it. Our Marshall plan, Atlantic Pact, point 4, and ECA are all well and good, and have their proper place in our strategy, but we will get more results for our dollars spent in a well-planned program of information and education than in all of these other programs combined. And without this sort of a program our economic- and military-aid programs will definitely not achieve their ends.

In this program of information and education of other people on the meaning of democracy and on America's attitudes and intentions, there is one type of activity that has had entirely too little attention. I refer to direct, personal propaganda by persons who know and love America, know democracy, and know the people and the conditions in a particular country. The suspicions regarding America's economic aid that are built up by clever Communist propaganda can be dispelled only by the personal impact of those who are known and respected by the people of the various countries in which such suspicions have taken hold.

Building up friendship for and confidence in America can be done satisfactorily only by those who have had years of experience to qualify and train them for this vitally important part of the program. Except in some rare cases, the men appointed to administer our various international programs do not have this background of experience. They are strangers in the countries to which they are sent, and it will taken them a long time to win the confidence of the people and secure their sympathetic cooperation in our efforts to help them. Meanwhile Communist agents are taking advantage of every mistake that our administrators and specialists make; their lack of understanding of native psychology, culture, and customs, and are building up in the minds of the nationals confusion, suspicion, and hatred.

Our regular diplomatic staffs—Ambassadors, Ministers, consuls, etc.—cannot adequately perform this function of making friends and influencing people. The very nature of their positions prevents the type of activity that is demanded. They are the official diplomatic representatives of America, and they are not supposed to identify themselves with local causes and organizations.

The people of the countries that we are helping are, for the most part, friendly and grateful, and they would like to know more about us, and why we are spending our money so freely all over the world. The explanations they usually get are too impersonal and foreign, in their language and nature, to really convince and reassure the masses of the people. The way is thus left open for the Communist propaganda agent to misinterpret and distort.

There are two general types of people who are qualified for this work of being "missionaries of democracy and Americanism" in foreign countries. There are the nationals of those countries, who have spent many years in America, have become naturalized citizens, have a knowledge of English, and have not forgotten their own native language. They must be familiar with the philosophy of democracy and also know the psychology and present-day attitudes of their mother country. Then there are Americans who have spent many years in a foreign country, as teachers, missionaries, business agents, or diplomatic representatives, and who have a wide circle of friends among the nationals of the country who know and trust them. There are undoubtedly persons of both the above-mentioned types who are available, and who would be glad to serve America and world democracy by going to the countries where they are known and where they would be welcomed.

In Asia at this time such people are desperately needed to prevent the rest of that vast area from going the way of China, and to win China back from the Soviet orbit, which is still possible. Gen. William J. Donovan, of OSS fame, who recently returned from a trip to southeast Asia and the Far East, says: "Non-Communist Asiatics want to be on this country's side, but only if we are safe to be with, if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad." The countries he mentions are Burma, India, Thailand, Indochina, the Philippines, Formosa, Korea, Japan, but all countries outside the iron curtain might be included.

The only way that these countries can be convinced that we will stick with them when the going gets bad is by sending Americans to them who know the people and are trusted by them. To give economic, technical, and military assistance to these people without accompanying such assistance with an adequate staff of men who know and understand the people and are known and trusted by them is very likely to be an "operation rat hole."

J. EARNEST FISHER,
Formerly Chief Adviser, Bureau of Public Opinion, American Military Government in Korea.
WASHINGTON.

Basing-Point Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. W. K. Kelsey, which was published in the Detroit News on October 18, 1949. In the article Mr. Kelsey analyzes and criticizes the so-called basing-point bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

The small independent businessman took a wallop from the House of Representatives last Friday when that body adopted the basing point bill recommended by the conference committee of both branches of Congress. In effect, the House majority, after having licked

the big-business lobby in the preliminary rounds, threw in the towel at the end, apparently on the peculiar theory that if it gave big business what it asked for, it would behave itself.

The result is that there is a sharp division between the legal staff of the Federal Trade Commission, whose powers are emasculated by the bill passed by the House, and the Department of Justice, whose spokesman in this matter is Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson. And that seems strange, for Attorney General McGrath, while still a Senator, voted for the Kefauver amendments which aimed at preserving the powers of the FTC, and which, along with the Carroll amendments adopted by the House, were stricken from the bill by the conference committee.

It is likewise extraordinary that the House, by adopting the conference report, acquiesced in the nullification of its action by that committee in tossing out the Carroll amendments, thereby acting contrary to the advice of its chief conferee, Chairman CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee. The crucial vote was 178 to 138, with 110 Representatives absent, paired, or not voting.

The only inference the Commentator can draw from these proceedings is that the House majority, composed in this case of members of both parties, didn't understand the conference report, or was so overwhelmed by the big-business lobby that it voted for the so-called "compromise" just to get the bill out of the way.

The fact is, there was no compromise at all. The object of big business was to kill the Kefauver and Carroll amendments, which stood in the way of its complete freedom of action in crushing competition. It abundantly accomplished what it set out to do, so far as the House is concerned.

FAVORING THE MONOPOLISTS

The bill as passed by the House legalizes the basing-point system of price fixing by sellers acting independently. That means, for instance, that a seller may adopt Detroit as a basing point for a district, including all of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and quote one price to any purchaser within that district—the price being the same to a purchaser in Detroit, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, or Rock Island. Necessarily, the delivered price includes the average freight rate, so that the purchaser in Detroit and points near Detroit helps pay the higher freight on purchases made by buyers in distant cities.

Court decisions have not outlawed this practice, provided it is carried on without combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement, such as was proved in the famous Cement case. But the new bill goes on to say that it shall not be unlawful discrimination for a seller, acting independently, to sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different delivery points or if differences between such prices are not such that their effect upon competition may be prohibited by this section.

That looks fair enough, until one comes to this definition: "The term 'the effect may be' shall mean that there is reliable, probative, and substantial evidence of the specified effect."

That definition changes the meaning of the Robinson-Patman Act and knocks the ground from under the feet of the Federal Trade Commission.

Hitherto the FTC has been able to issue a cease-and-desist order if it saw "reasonable probability" that a discrimination in prices quoted to buyers tended to create a monopoly. That interpretation has been upheld by the courts. But under the bill passed by the House, the damage must be accomplished and proved before any action can be taken to remove it.

"Such a law as this," said opponents of this section, "might be compared to a traffic law which made it illegal for motorists to run through stop signs only if, after having run through a stop sign, the motorist found that this act had caused a substantial accident."

GOOD-FAITH DISCRIMINATION

But the House measure goes still further. It permits a seller to justify a price discrimination "by showing that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith or to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor, and this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains," unless there is a combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement to that end.

The Carroll amendment sought to outlaw such price discrimination if its apparent effect was to threaten or destroy competition. How, you may ask, could competition be threatened if one company cuts its price to meet the price cut of another company? It could happen thus:

A dealer supplied by X informs his regular supplier that another company, Y, has quoted him a lower price for a certain commodity. To keep his customer, X agrees to meet the price quoted by Y, but only in this particular dealer's case. Thus the dealer secures an advantage over his competitors who must continue to pay the regular price; and if the advantage is great enough he can in time force his competitors out of business.

If you don't think this practice has been fairly common, ask the various small independent dealers' associations. It is one way by which a large selling corporation can secure complete control of outlets in any territory, if it so desires, and thereafter maintain any price it may choose to fix, to the detriment of consumers.

The defense of X would be that he cut his price to the dealer in good faith, because Y had offered a lower price; and that defense, under the House enactment, would be complete unless there was positive proof that there had been collusion between X and Y.

FAVORING THE LARGE BUYERS

Say the opponents of the conference bill: "The tendency of sellers to grant special price concessions to large buyers is one of the most widely observed characteristics of business behavior. * * * The price discrimination which is philosophically indefensible on any grounds is that which goes beyond cost savings and permits large buyers to drive small buyers out of business. * * *

"When a large seller, with national sales outlets, makes a special low price in one particular territory, at least one other seller will usually meet this special price. In this case, the good-faith defense would exempt the discriminations from a cease-and-desist order, even though the result was to drive out of business small competing sellers having only local or regional sales outlets."

Enactment of this bill clips the powers of the FTC to enforce competition, and plays into the hands of monopolists. By a well-reasoned veto, President Truman could get himself a wonderful issue for his party in the next campaign.

Effect of Taxes on Workers' Incomes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Taxes Are Hijacking Workers," published in the Philadelphia Dispatch of March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES ARE HIJACKING WORKERS

More and more in the United States the thoughtful people are beginning to realize the gravity of our tax situation. Chief Justice Marshall once said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Our taxes have now reached 25 percent of our national income. Great Britain has gone above the mark and we see what is happening over there. The people are in doubt about the future, as shown by the results of the recent elections, and there seems little doubt that the old stable, apparently unconquerable British Empire is passing out. There are indications that we are following the same route.

According to a survey prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board, our taxes in 1948 aggregated $56,300,000,000. Of this amount $39,500,000,000 were in Federal taxes and $16,800,000,000 in local taxes. This is a fraction more than 25 percent of our national income which indicates that we are now at the brink and apparently about to take the plunge that was made by Great Britain.

But this is not all the bad news. The rate of rise in taxes has been greater than the rise in the national income. In short, our national income has increased tenfold since 1902 while our taxes have increased 4 times as fast as our income. To go a little further, Federal taxes in 1948, the last year surveyed, were seven times as great as in 1939 and local and State taxes during the same years more than doubled.

Now what are we going to do about it? The sound Senators and Representatives in our National Congress are calling attention to the situation and the disposition is to check further tax increases. Whether the tendency will continue after the November election remains to be seen. But increasing taxes in the States seems to go on unheeded. Many people are lulled into a false sense of security by the belief that Uncle Sam is helping them. What they fail to take into consideration is that the money which Uncle Sam pays back to the States and to them comes from them in the first place.

President F. D. Roosevelt, who became an advocate of lavish spending, said while he was running for his first term that the taxes come from the sweat of the workingman's brow. But since he doesn't pay the money out through the tax collector's window the worker too often doesn't realize how he is being hijacked through rising living costs. Until he gets hep to himself, lowering taxes is going to be a slow and difficult job.

General Eisenhower Advocates Peace Measures Under a Strengthened United Nations

REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant statements of this year is the marvelous address delivered by General Eisenhower at Columbia University on the evening of March 23. It would be unfortunate if

his treatment of defense needs should overshadow a remarkably fine statement on the development of a peace organization that must be built if we escape the burdens of armament that would wreck this and other nations. House Concurrent Resolution 64, which more than 100 Members are sponsoring, is designed to strengthen the United Nations and develop that agency into an effective instrument for peace. I do not know, of course, what General Eisenhower's judgment is on this subject, but his language indicates that he is thoroughly in sympathy with the resolution's purposes. He advocates a United Nations police of carefully defined powers and asserts that to such a police organization a nation would give up nothing beyond its equitable share in men and money. Included in his address is the further comment, "How this organization is to be constituted or how it is to be controlled, has yet to be worked out, but with the principles honestly accepted, the procedural problems would be easy of solution."

Such words from one of the world's distinguished leaders bolster hopes for a stronger United Nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from General Eisenhower's address:

It is possible, even probable, that hopelessness among a people can be a far more potent cause of war than greed. War—in such case—is a symptom, not the disease.

On the collective side of the coin, peace requires an international society liberated from the threat of aggression by neighbor on neighbor, a threat forever present when one or more nations are committed to the building or maintenance of gigantic military machines. No sane man will challenge, under present circumstances, the need for defensive strength designed to secure against internal or external attack the independence and sovereignty of a free state. But the continued existence of even one purely offensive force—a force for which there is no apparent need based in the logic of self-defense—denies enduring peace to the world. Those who have spawned such a force must either eventually destroy it by demobilization and find justification for the heavy cost already laid on their people; or use it, tacitly or actively, as a threat or as a weapon. There is no middle course. * * *

The two requisites to an enduring peace—the elimination of deep-seated incitements to strife and hopelessness, and the elimination of armament for aggression—are, or should be, within the realm of feasible attainment. But man can remake the face of his physical environment and can harness all the powers of the universe more easily, it seems, than he can learn control of his temper as a member of the international community. Nevertheless, those who term these twin requisites utopian and visionary are cut from the same bolt of cloth as those of an earlier day who claimed that epidemics were an inescapable companion to human existence, and denounced the preachers of sanitation as balkers of God's will.

To prevent the crime of war, all nations and all ideologies can unite without sacrifice of principle. But lest self-interest in minor matters breed a carelessness toward the gravity of this problem, there is required unity of understanding concerning the facts of modern war. After the world-wide devastation that grows daily more possible, none may be able to distinguish between the victor and the vanquished of a future conflict. Confronted by that outcome to another world war, all of us—east and west—are in the same boat. The boat can be swamped in a series of atomic blasts; but, sustained by understanding of a common peril, it can also carry us through to final peace. Thus, the possibility of almost total destruction, terrible though it is, could be a blessing as all nations, great and small, for the first time in human history, are confronted by an inescapable physical proof of their common lot. Franklin's "If we don't all hang together, we shall each hang separately" has its international application today. * * *

In a disarmed world—should it be attained—there must be an effective United Nations, with a police power universally recognized and strong enough to earn universal respect. In it the individual nations can pool the power for policing the continents and the seas against international lawlessness—those acts which involve two or more nations in their external relations.

I do not subscribe to any idea that a world police force or a world organization should be permitted entrance to any nation for the purpose of settling disputes among its citizens, or for exercising any authority not specifically and voluntarily accorded by the affected nation. At this stage of civilization's progress any effort to push to this extreme the purpose of international law enforcement will defeat legitimate objectives. National sovereignty and independence have been won by most at too great cost to surrender to an external agency any such powers.

But by the establishment of a United Nations police of properly defined and restricted but effective powers, no nation would surrender one iota of its current national functions or authority, for none, by itself, now possesses a shred of responsibility to police the world. To an international peace organization, a nation would give up nothing beyond its equitable share in men and money. How this organization is to be constituted or how it is to be controlled, has yet to be worked out, but with the principles honestly acccepted, the procedural problems would be easy of solution.

Evil Fruit

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is recorded in the Book of Matthew that "a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit."

If modern proof of this eternal truth be needed, witness the treatment given to our overburdened taxpayers by the Truman administration earlier this week. The amount is $100,000—and the Truman administration decided not to pay. The American people, patient and forbearing as they are, cannot help but wonder at such behavior. The Bureau of Internal Revenue must have tongue in cheek after exempting from taxation the $100-a-plate festival held in honor of Jefferson and Jackson. This is the same Bureau of Internal Revenue that assessed a 20-percent tax on each $1 admission ticket to the Lincoln Day box supper held by the Republicans here in the Nation's Capital only a few days prior to the Democratic frolic.

Both of these functions were political in nature; both included professional entertainment, refreshments, and political speeches. The Democrats enriched their party coffers by more than half a million dollars without paying one cent of taxes. The Republicans, on the other hand, paid a 20-percent tax on their admission tickets, and contributed all of the profit from their box supper to charity.

I doubt that in the history of our Republic there is a like example of political favoritism in taxation. But this is only one aspect. Consider, if you will, the broader implications. Mr. Truman and his group have resisted all attempts made by the Republicans in Congress to lighten the tax burden upon our people. They, the so-called Fair Dealers, do not object to taxes on baby lotions, wedding rings, suitcases, telegrams, railroad tickets, and a thousand other items of every day use—but they refuse to pay an admission tax or entertainment tax on their own lavish feasts. A housewife must pay a 20-percent tax to attend a movie in her neighborhood theater; a schoolboy must pay a 20-percent tax for the privilege of cheering his team at a basketball game; a businessman must pay a 20-percent tax to entertain a business client; the Republicans must pay a 20-percent tax for admissions to their functions. But the Trumanites exempt themselves from tax liability on their gold-plated political shindigs. Is this equality under the law? Is this in line with the traditional American concept of fair play? Is this simple justice? Or is it a display of corrupt power?

Mr. Speaker, the next time any one of Mr. Truman's disciples rises to talk about plugging the tax loopholes, he should by all means be reminded of this fertile field in which to collect $100,000 of unpaid taxes. $100,000—this sum would pay the President's salary for 1 year. Of course, it would not defray his annual $90,000 tax-free expense accounts nor would it pay the upkeep on his yacht, or his fleet of automobiles, or his luxuriously appointed plane, or his retreat at Shangri-La. It would not pay for his expensive and frequent Florida vacations. Incidentally, newspaper reports indicate that Mr. Truman's staff is busily working in his Florida beach home on political speeches which he intends to use in a forthcoming tour of the Nation—a tour in his private railroad car, from which he will harangue our people about alleged special interests and special privileges of the Republican Party.

Special privilege. Has any administration in our political history been so clothed with it? Mr. Truman is the all-time arch-practitioner of special privilege. The luxury-loving gentleman from Missouri has put new meaning into the very words "special privilege."

Mr. Speaker, the masquerade of the Truman party as the champion of the common people now lies exposed for all to see. Abraham Lincoln said, "you can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." Our people are not so gullible as Mr. Truman believes. They will not be misled by the same false prophets again, for they have learned the harsh truth

that deeds not words are the measure of a man's integrity. Next election day they will heed the biblical admonition—"by their fruits ye shall know them."

Panama Sea-Level Project Apparently Ditched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for many months instructive articles, with clear-cut analyses and interpretations, by distinguished Members of the Congress, have effectively pointed out and exposed the many serious fallacies involved in the proposal for the construction of a new Panama Canal of so-called sea-level design. Congressional recognition of the results of this outcome may be said to have been taken in the interim report of the investigation of Panama Canal tolls, of August 23, 1949—House Report 1304, Eighty-first Congress. This report, adopted by the full committee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, dismissed all consideration of the sea-level plan, and invited consideration of the completion (at comparatively low cost) of the authorized—and partially constructed—third locks project of the present lake-lock type canal, modified to include the principles of what is known as the terminal lake plan.

The investigation of Panama Canal tolls, under the able direction of Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and the supervision of the late Representative Schuyler O. Bland, of Virginia, long-time chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, inevitably extended into the field of the management of the Panama Canal, and its organization; and subsequently was the subject of a communication from the President of the United States to the Speaker of the House, on January 31, 1950—House Document 460, Eighty-first Congress—forwarding a report made by Director Frank C. Pace, Jr., of the Bureau of the Budget.

The thanks of the entire country are due Representative THOMPSON, chairman of the special subcommittee for his highly important and tireless work in the premises—and to his subcommittee associates who, also, effectively aided, and cooperated with him. They have, indeed, performed a most difficult task with marked success.

The present status of the Canal situation was well described by Jim G. Lucas, the very capable, and always interesting, writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, as appeared March 29, 1950, in the Washington Daily News (noon edition), and other publications of the Scripps-Howard organization. In this article Mr. Lucas emphasizes the views of Budget Director Pace with respect to the supervision of the Panama Canal. The subsequent announcement, on the same day, of the selection, by the President, of Mr. Pace to be the Secretary of the Army, will support the President in his effort to reorganize the executive branches of the Federal Government, particularly the Panama Canal and its various activities. Secretary Pace will certainly support the recommendation of Director Pace, and the liberalization of the Panama Canal Government and organization, with their transfer from the supervision of the Secretary of the Army to that of the Secretary of Commerce, will, it is believed, be now assured. The transfer can be made by executive action, and enabling legislation to effect the other recommendations of Director Pace will shortly be introduced and considered in the Congress.

Under leave granted, I am including herewith the full text of the article by Mr. Lucas:

SEA-LEVEL CANAL APPARENTLY DITCHED
(By Jim G. Lucas)

President Truman apparently has given up hope Congress will approve * * * plans for a $2,500,000,000 sea-level Panama Canal.

The sea-level canal project originated with the Army engineers. The Army argued that it was the only kind of canal which could be defended from an atomic attack. They said the present lock canal could be knocked out by a single bomb.

Opponents of the sea-level canal protested it would cost closer to $7,500,000,000. They argued that no canal can be defended against atom bombs; that the safest defense was to shoot down enemy planes before they arrived over the target. They proposed to expand the present locks to accommodate bigger ships.

ARMY VERSUS SHIPPERS

Essentially, the argument was between the Army on one hand and commercial shipping interests on the other. The Budget Bureau apparently has sided with the shippers. It recently recommended to the President that he transfer control of the Panama Canal from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Truman said he wanted to study the recommendation, but indications are that he will approve. If the shift is made, it apparently will eliminate the last remaining support for the sea-level canal project.

"It is essential that Panama Canal policies be coordinated with the objectives of national transportation policy and such coordination can best be achieved through supervision by the Secretary of Commerce," Budget Director Frank Pace wrote Mr. Truman. "Staff facilities already exist in the Department of Commerce which could be developed to furnish necessary assistance to the Secretary in fulfilling his responsibilities. Such facilities do not now exist in the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense and military staffs cannot satisfactorily be employed for this purpose."

Mr. Pace said the "historic reasons for placing the Panama Canal under the Secretary of the Army's supervision no longer apply. The construction phase of the Canal's operation long since has been completed. * * * In time of war, or when war is threatened, the Panama Canal could be placed under military supervision and control."

MILITARY IN TOP JOBS

By tradition, the Governor of the Canal Zone has always been a general in Army engineers. Since the Wilson administration, Army and Navy officers have held the majority of the important jobs. The Budget Bureau was critical of that practice.

"Under the present system," it said, "civilian employees may not aspire to a number of the top positions. Another important objection to the present system is that it unduly restricts the Governor in the selection of several of his chief assistants and tends to reduce his control over them. * * * The best policy for the Panama Canal would be one which permitted the selection of the most highly qualified personnel from whatever source available, military or civilian."

Currently, 71 Army and Navy officers hold important Canal jobs, the Budget Bureau said.

Mr. Pace said the Hoover Commission recommended that all major nonregulatory transportation activities be grouped in the Commerce Department. He insisted the recommendation included the Panama Canal.

Trend Toward Socialism May Be Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered on March 19, 1950, over an Indiana station.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREND TOWARD SOCIALISM MAY BE HALTED

The congressional brakes have been applied to President Truman's program of forcing British socialism on the American people.

I expect to show in a review of the record of the Eighty-first Democrat Congress in nearly 90 days of its second session that it has joined the Republican Eightieth Congress in refusing to go along on this program.

Mr. Truman said in Madison Square Garden in New York City on October 28, 1948: "What a wonderful thing it was for the people of this United States that they didn't have a President that would go along with that good-for-nothing Eightieth Congress."

I can say right here there are a lot of people in this country who today are saying: "What a wonderful thing it has been for the people of this United States that neither the Republican nor Democrat Congress would go along with the President's program of socialism."

You are quite familiar with the record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. It ran along for 10 months, 3 months beyond the legal limit, and yet not a single piece of Mr. Truman's socialistic legislation was adopted.

The second session of that same Democrat Congress has proceeded to pass only two major bills in nearly 3 months and neither of them is on Mr. Truman's socialistic program. Just two bills have been enacted into law in this session and both of them were half way through Congress when the session began.

First came the Korean aid bill calling for $150,000,000. That passed the Senate in the first session and the House voted it through on February 9 this year. Next came the oleo-tax repeal. It had passed the House in the first session and the Senate voted its approval on January 18 of this year. It was held in conference between the two Houses, however, until March 7 when the conference report was approved and Mr. Truman signed it into law on March 16.

These are the only two bills of any importance passed by the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Now, let's take a look at the progress report on some of the more sensational requests Mr. Truman asked the Eighty-first Congress to pass—either in the first or second session, or both. The Brannan farm plan, for example.

Mr. Truman asked for this program in his state of the Union message in January 1949, after he had flip-flopped back and forth between rigid and flexible price-support programs for a year. The Brannan farm plan, a blood cousin of the socialistic compulsory health-insurance plan, has had the brakes applied by the Congress and most farm organizations.

Hearings are going ahead on the farm problem in both Houses and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan is going ahead with his efforts to sell the program, but it appears to be certain there will be no Brannan plan in this session. After all, not a single elected official now holding a Federal office had the Brannan plan in his platform when elected, because the Brannan plan was not proposed until after the last election. It will definitely be an issue in the coming election.

Since we have mentioned the blood cousin, socialized medicine, let's take a look at what is going on with it. The short report is: "No action." The long report is: "No action for a long time." Of course, committees continue to compile evidence from time to time because Director of Welfare Oscar Ewing has not given up the fight for this program.

He made no bones about his attitude when he went to England last fall to study England's socialized-medicine program. Mr. Ewing said in England and again when he returned that we were going to have the English medicine scheme—lock, stock, and barrel—or better still, we were going to have it—wigs, pills, and pains.

I can say rather optimistically that I think the socialized-medicine program will not be passed in this session of Congress, but will be offered again next year.

Mr. Truman would like to have this issue forgotten—just as he would his request for a tax increase a year ago—but nevertheless it is still his Congress and he did ask the Eighty-first Congress to give him stand-by authority to control prices and wages.

Remember that? Well, so does Congress and it isn't doing a thing about it either.

Another one he would like to have forgotten is his request for authority to build Government production facilities. This one grew out of a demand for steel, but was not limited to steel.

Today there is plenty of steel and Mr. Truman's fly-by-night legislative policy is safely—for the moment, that is—bottled up by Congressmen who are showing good judgment in this matter.

The same sensible consideration was given another request by the President. He had asked for universal military training. The draft which was voted proved useless to the armed services and the Congress has taken a somewhat distant view of forcing military training on all young men unless there appears to be a need for it. So, we haven't heard anything more about it and probably will not.

Oh, yes, there was point 4. Mr. Truman first revealed this plan to develop all underdeveloped areas in the world in his inauguration speech in January of 1949. The Democratic Eighty-first Congress heard his request then for the first time. They heard it again later that same year and he included his request for authority to proceed with this global program in his 1950 message to the present session.

A long study has been carried on by committees in both Houses of Congress in the last session and this session on this subject but no action. The first step calls for some $35,000,000 to finance technical assistance to the underdeveloped areas. That, of course, is not the complete program.

However, on the specific point of technical assistance, a House committee, on February 21, ordered a favorable report made on the bill. That is the first action taken on point 4, which indicates this highly controversial program has a long road ahead before it gets through the legislative processes.

There are some requests by Mr. Truman which will receive congressional approval in this session. One of them may not be, however, his extension of Federal housing by creating a new Government corporation. This section of the housing bill, which was defeated in the Senate a few days ago, was a badly misrepresented section. It was classified as a middle-income housing bill. It was not that at all.

The only middle-income citizens who would benefit from it would be those who would form a cooperative to build houses or apartments. In addition, it offered a lower interest rate for a longer-term loan than is being given the war veterans and users of FHA loans. Its discriminatory features prompted the vote against that section.

Mr. Truman asked for extension of rent controls, but the home-rule system enacted in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress proved little need remains for such vast Federal controls over private property. I will be surprised if rent controls are continued this year beyond the expiration date of June 30.

There are other measures on Mr. Truman's Socialist list I would like to discuss in detail here today, but I would also like to use a portion of these 15 minutes to talk about what Mr. Truman's followers in the Congress try to do to the legislative program for political reasons. I also want to talk a moment about the spending habits of this administration. Mr. Truman is asking for a budget of $43,000,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1951.

That is $10,000,000,000 more than the Government spent in fiscal 1948 and is at least $6,000,000,000 more than will be collected in taxes. We hear many excuses given for the greater cost of Government in the coming year, but we do not hear good sound reasons for the $10,000,000,000 increase over 1948.

Did anybody in this country, or in any of the countries we are supporting suffer because the Government only spent $33,000,000,000 in 1948?

The Eighty-first Congress will not match the Eightieth Congress in effecting a balanced budget in this session, but I do believe some reductions in Mr. Truman's proposed expenditures will be accomplished. Continued spending beyond our income can be counted as one of the important steps leading toward socialism. The Eighty-first Congress, like the Eightieth Congress, is going to try to stop it.

Now I want to talk a bit about the Taft-Hartley Act. You know the Senate voted 28 good amendments to this act in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Amendments favorable to unions.

You know, too, that Mr. Truman's followers in the House of Representatives Labor Committee have made a political football of this important piece of legislation. They have sat on the amended bill because they believe it will be politically advantageous to congressional candidates not to amend the Taft-Hartley Act. Mr. Truman's boys would rather have a campaign issue than fair and equitable labor-management relations.

The same attitude was displayed by Mr. Truman in the coal strike. He flaunted the law of the land. He played politics with human misery. He taught the strikers to ignore the law. Then, as Congress was about to take corrective measures, the strike was settled and Mr. Truman's followers in the Congress immediately whined that no further action was necessary.

Again they demonstrated they were willing to leave the people at the mercy of such political maneuvering. Remove Mr. Truman's New Dealers from their key positions in the Eighty-first Congress and you would have action in this very session of Congress that would protect the American people from the dangers of future sufferings such as occurred in the coal strike.

But what can you expect from an administration that first protects and coddles disloyal persons in its red herring bosom—then, trapped in its own mire, sends its Secretary of State around the country telling the people they do not understand the dangers of communism in this Nation?

Dean Acheson, the man who refused to turn his back on a convicted traitor in his own Department, is now calling upon the people of America to band together in the cold war against Russia. I can tell Mr. Acheson that the American people have fought a harder cold war against Russia than he has and for a lot longer time. They have paid their billions of dollars into the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine to stop communism in other countries while it was permitted to infiltrate into the sacred halls of our own Government.

They have been helpless against the policy of pouring money into western Europe to stop communism while our own State Department policies are benevolent in nature to the Communists in the Far East.

I could discuss these issues at great length with you if time would permit, but in closing, let me say again that the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses—one controlled by Republicans, the other by Democrats—have put the brakes to Mr. Truman's Socialist bandwagon.

These two Congresses have also established another record of merit. It was during the Eightieth Congress that evidence was revealed of the subversive activities within our own Government. The Hiss case was brought to light—with some difficulty growing out of administrative agencies, I might add. Eleven Communists were brought to trial and convicted on the strength of evidence unearthed by congressional committees in the Eightieth Congress.

During the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress we have seen congressional committees pierce further into the armor that has protected subversives for too long a time.

There will be some—and you can guess who one of them will be—who will say the Eighty-first Congress was another do-nothing Congress. When the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses stopped socialism and exposed communism in our country, they did a good day's work for the American people.

Wall Street Journal Predicts Many Ills Ahead for the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting article appeared in the March 21, 1950, issue of the Wall Street Journal concerning the coal industry. This article written by Philip Geyelin,

staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, furnishes much food for thought.

The article is as follows:

COAL ILLS AHEAD—FEDERAL EXPERTS SEE BITUMINOUS PRICE WAR IN A FEW MONTHS—SAY MARGINAL MINES WILL BE FORCED OUT AS OPERATORS VIE FOR SHRINKING MARKET—WHAT WILL MR. LEWIS DO?

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman's coal experts think the soft coal industry is going to be mighty sick before many months roll by.

At the moment it's benefiting from a palliative—demand for the fuel from strike-starved coal consumers. Last week prices were marked up 10 to 30 cents a ton.

But the experts are keeping an eye on such statistics as these: Week before last bituminous coal output soared to 13,200,000 tons. At that rate the miners would produce some 660,000,000 tons in a 50-week year. Such a total would top the record-breaking 630,000,000 tons mined in 1947. It would be almost half again as much as the 435,000,000 ton production of 1949, when supply managed to keep up with demand.

PRICE WAR AHEAD

"There's going to be a full-scale price war in the industry in a matter of months," says one top Government mine man. As soon as the operators start battling for the shrinking coal market, "hundreds of high cost, marginal mines are going to fall by the wayside," he adds.

That will mean a return of the industry's basic ailment: Overproduction in a dwindling market, from which fuel oil and gas are luring more and more customers.

Most coal experts believe the industry would have been faced with a severe postwar readjustment before this, had it not been for John L. Lewis' stabilization efforts with the 3-day week and his holidays for miners. By limiting output, the United Mine Workers chieftain spread production across the industry, kept prices up and enabled many high-cost mines to stay in operation.

Hostilities between the mine operators and Mr. Lewis stopped 2 weeks ago when a new wage agreement ended 8 months of costly wrangling over terms. The new agreement can't be opened until April 1951. But Federal officials take small comfort from this one-year peace treaty. They expect a different kind of warfare to break out—keen competition among operators.

COAL DEMAND FALLING

Coal demand has been falling sharply from war and postwar levels.

In 1947 exports to coal-short European countries and to Canada totaled 69,000,000 tons. Last year they were down to some twenty-seven million as European mines got back in full operation.

In this country 3 years ago, coal was supplying 50 percent of the energy for homes and industry. By last year its share was down to 38.9 percent.

The railroads have been taking less and less coal as they put in more oil-burning Diesel engines. In 1947 they bought 109,000,000 tons of coal. Last year they took less than 70,000,000 tons, a drop of 37 percent. More electric-utility companies are finding it's an economy to shift to oil, too. They consumed only 80,000,000 tons of coal last year, compared with ninety-five million in 1948.

Meanwhile, householders have been swinging to oil at a rapid clip. Last year oil-burner sales were up 39 percent over 1948, while factory shipments of warm-air coal furnaces dropped 47 percent. Where natural gas is available, this fuel is grabbing some coal customers, too.

These shifts to competitive fuels are expected to continue apace unless the coal industry can lower the price of its fuel, industry observers believe.

With the industry's capacity to produce still at war level, and Mr. Lewis' power to limit production curtailed in the new coal contract, Government experts are predicting several developments.

DEVELOPMENTS IN PROSPECT

Within 120 days, says one official, coal stocks will be at or near record proportions. Heavy buying will quickly replenish above-ground supplies. Then what?

Customers will start getting finicky, the experts believe; they'll buy only higher-grade coal. This will force many small open-face mines out of operation. Some marginal, less careful strip mines where the fuel is dug from the surface, produce a lower-grade bituminous than that extracted from the bigger, underground pits, or from modernized strip operations.

As customers get choosier, bigger mining enterprises will begin feeling the pinch. Deep-mine companies without far-flung sales organizations will be hit.

At this stage, the experts predict, price cutting will begin. As the mine owners vie for business by lowering prices, high-cost, inefficient mining operations will be forced out. They won't be able to stay in business and pay the $14.75-a-day wages to the miner and the 30-cents-a-ton welfare-fund royalties won by the United Mine Workers in its new coal contract.

A BACKWARD LOOK

How far will this process go? Federal officials note this statistical history: In 1915, before World War I, some 5,500 soft-coal mines were in operation. By 1923 wartime demand had upped this to 9,300. But the coal market fell off badly in the late twenties and early thirties. Consumption by 1932 reached a record low of 306,000,000 tons, compared with five hundred and eighteen million in 1923. By 1933 the mines in operation had shrunk to 5,500 again. Today the number is back over the 9,000 mark.

Comments one Bureau of Mines official: "It may be more than just the old cycle, with the way fuel oil and natural gas have been gobbling coal customers."

The Mines Bureau functionary thinks the number of coal mines in the United States could drop below the 5,000 figure in the years to come. This doesn't mean the industry's productive capacity would be cut proportionately. He explains that most mines shutting down would be small, and the big, heavily capitalized producers would probably weather the storm.

These Government mine experts base their views on the assumption that the mine owners will have a relatively free hand in the next 12 months. Either John L. Lewis or Congress could alter the outlook by stepping in with their own recovery programs. There's been talk of Federal price propping, a subsidy for coal or some other legislation to bolster the industry.

THE QUESTION OF MR. LEWIS

What Mr. Lewis may have in mind is, as always, a mystery. But the mine owners think their new contract puts strict limits on the union's power to control coal production. The operators succeeded in eliminating the controversial able-and-willing clause. This specified that the miners need work only when able or willing. When Mr. Lewis thought coal was too plentiful, the miners were conveniently unwilling to work. With this contract loophole, the union chieftain shut down the mines for 1 week last spring, put his coal diggers on a 3-day week much of the summer, and closed the mines completely for 52 days last fall and 1 month early this year.

This had the effect of spreading work among the UMW's 370,000 coal diggers. While coal consumption dropped some 20 percent from 1948 to 1949, the number of miners employed in the industry fell off only 7 percent. Coal was kept relatively scarce by Mr. Lewis' manipulations.

Says one Bureau of Mines official: "Economically there's no justification for the number of mines in operation today. The 3-day week was an artificial prop for inefficient mines that came in during the war. It succeeded in spreading the work but only delayed the day of reckoning."

Whether Mr. Lewis can continue to exercise any control over production without his able-and-willing proviso is a big question. It looks now as if he can't. But, as one Government official puts it. "You never can tell with John L.—he's always thinking."

COAL LAW COMING?

As for the chances of congressional action designed to help the industry, any coal legislation would be delayed at least a year if Congress sets up a commission to diagnose the ills of the industry, as President Truman has proposed. The commission would need that much time to study the problem and make its report.

At the moment, Mr. Truman's proposal for a commission is fast losing the enthusiasm of Congress. With the coal crisis over, lawmakers are turning to other issues. Mine operators insist any such commission should make a careful study of labor conditions in the industry, and Mr. Lewis is bringing quiet pressure to squelch the whole idea. If the plan collapses, it would clear the way for speedier action by Congress. But even so, new coal legislation in the near future isn't likely.

The administration isn't ready to push for a coal law now. Mr. Truman's aides aren't sure just what's needed. And coal experts in the Government are inclined to give the industry a chance to solve its own problem without interference.

"There's a lot to be said for normal forces of economics." comments one top official who recalls the Government's experiences in the late 1930's with the now defunct Guffey Coal Act. That law allowed the Government to fix minimum prices for bituminous fuel. Federal price propping enabled high-cost mines to stay in business. But it cost Uncle Sam millions of dollars and mountains of paper work to set some 400,000 price minimums for various grades of soft coal in different parts of the country.

Nonetheless, the administration and Congress might go into action if a wave of mine shut-downs created serious pockets of unemployment in coal-producing States. Smaller operators would press for congressional aid if their bigger brothers captured the bulk of the market at low prices which the small mines couldn't meet. The United Mine Workers would also be clamoring for aid, of course, if unemployment should grow in the coal fields.

Reduction in Flour Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Unhappy Millers," written by

Edward Hughes, and published in the Wall Street Journal. I believe the article contains matters of special interest to wheat risers, flour millers, and those who are employed in the milling industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNHAPPY MILLERS—FLOUR GRINDING CLAN SHRINKS AS DEMAND FOR PRODUCT TAKES TUMBLE—HOME FRONT IS EATING MORE MEAT, VEGETABLES; SALES ABROAD SHARPLY LOWER—100 MILLS CLOSED SINCE 1947

(By Edward Hughes)

WASHINGTON.—Candidate for the title of today's least merry businessman: The flour miller.

A slow appetite for his product on the home front and a terrible tumble in foreign demand are making things rough for him.

Since 1947, more than 100 mills have bowed to shrinking profit margins and gone quietly out of business. A score more are on the verge.

It's a sharp adjustment from the biggest boom in milling history. Just 3 years ago, production of flour was at a record annual volume of 30,000,000,000 pounds. This year, output will be at least 25 percent under that level.

THE STEEP SLIDE

The big slump in export demand paces the downturn. Two years after the war, shipments of United States flour abroad had soared to nearly 10,000,000,000 pounds a year. That was in 1947. By last year, exports had dropped to about 3,000,000,000 pounds. And the slide continues into 1950. February shipments were only 30 percent of the year-ago level.

A fading American appetite for bread doesn't help matters. Domestic consumption of flour is sliding back to the prewar level—despite population growth. It was just over 20,000,000,000 pounds last year, near the 1942 level. It points a trend that has long caused anxiety among millers: Mr. and Mrs. America are eating less and less bread. At the turn of the century per capita consumption was 225 pounds of flour in a year. These days, with a greater zest for meats and vegetables, plus weight-reducing diets, per-person flour use is only about 135 pounds a year.

These statistics have tightened the noose around the neck of many a miller. In the late war and the immediate postwar years, every bit of idle plant capacity that could be found was put to work to furnish the greatest demand the industry has ever known.

SHRINKING NUMBERS

According to the Northwestern Miller, flour-milling trade publication, there was a total of 2,571 flour mills, big and small, in the Nation at the end of 1945. At latest count, this number was down to 1,553 mills.

The Millers National Federation, which maintains an office in the national capital, can point up the trend among the bigger mills. It has a list of 101 sizable mills—with capacities of 40,000 pounds or more daily—which were going full blast in 1947 and which are now out of business.

Those that survive aren't happy about the way things are going. Pillsbury Mills, Inc., of Minneapolis, is an example. President Philip Pillsbury says his firm's earnings for 1949, at $2,274,155, were less than half its earnings in 1947.

DOWNTURN AT DENVER

Denver's Colorado Milling & Elevator Co. had an even greater drop in net income in those 2 years. After taxes, 1947 income was $4,016,778. Two years later, its net income was $1,451,641.

Another example: The net income of Commander Larabee Milling Co., of Minneapolis, slipped from over $3,500,000 in 1947 to just $238,000 in 1949. That's smaller than the company's 1939 return.

What's behind the export slump? European farm recovery is of course a big factor. But it doesn't tell the whole story. Milling industry spokesmen contend United States farm-price supports on wheat—the grain that goes into flour—are forcing millers to charge too much for their product in foreign countries.

"There's no doubt about it," says one. "We are simply pricing our flour out of the world market." Then he asks: "What can millers do about it? They're trapped by high wheat costs."

LATIN AMERICAN LOSSES

Shipments to Europe are off drastically. But that's not too surprising—United States millers haven't expected to hold onto their war-inflated European markets.

They've hoped to be able to keep some of the big buyers in Latin America, however. But take a look at what's happened down there: In 1947, Brazil took 836,000,000 pounds of our flour. Last year, Brazil bought only 131,000,000 pounds. More than 366,000,000 pounds of United States flour went to Cuba in 1947. That's been trimmed by more than 100,000,000 pounds in the last year or so. With minor exceptions, that's the picture for the whole Latin-American area.

It all stems from the old problem of the dollar. South Americans, and other good United States customers, have too few of them. So they skimp on purchases that require the hard currency. In some cases, they try to shift to nondollar sources like Australia.

WHERE CANADA COMES IN

But there's not enough nondollar flour to go around. So buying nations look for dollar-flour producers who can provide the least expensive product. That's where Canada comes in. With a much lower cost for wheat, flour millers in Canada can undersell—and have been underselling—this country in many markets.

Currently, say millers, United States export prices are a full 40 cents per bushel (wheat-price equivalent) above comparable Canadian flour for sale to South American countries. "That," says a flour man, "is why Canada's exports of flour in the last 2 years have decreased only 7 percent, while ours are off more than 70 percent."

On the home front, the statistics which food experts trot out on changing dinner table habits over the past three decades show why the flour man is losing ground. Folks are filling their stomachs with other foods.

Back around the First World War, the average American consumed an annual 188 pounds of fresh vegetables. Today, he eats about 250 pounds. Meat consumption: In 1930, per capita use averaged 128 pounds a year. Today the level is running around 146 pounds—and moving upward.

The United States citizen who ate an annual 35 pounds of eggs a generation ago consumes nearly 50 pounds today. He's eating more chicken and turkey, too.

Capehart Is Tough Foe of Isms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "CAPEHART Is Tough Foe of Isms," written by Harold Cross, which was published in the Hammond (Ind.) Times on Sunday, March 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN, EVERYDAY AMERICAN—CAPEHART IS TOUGH FOE OF ISMS

(By Harold Cross)

INDIANAPOLIS.—There is an awfully good reason why United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART is battling at all times to retain the American way of life.

He is a symbol of that type of life.

The biographical trail left by Indiana's senior Senator in his 52 years on this earth spells America in great big letters. And he isn't forgetting what he found was possible in America as he goes about the State and Nation preaching against socialism, communism, or any other ism that might be dreamed up from time to time by those who seem to find things wrong with the American system.

You take a good long look at HOMER and then you say to yourself:

He isn't a politician.

He isn't a narrow-brained business tycoon.

He isn't a flowery orator with meaningless words.

He isn't a radical—nor a conservative.

So you just roll all these things around in your mind a bit and you come out with these deductions:

HOMER is just a plain, everyday American who is sincerely trying to save for America what he thinks is its greatest asset—its form of government.

In fact, the affable gent who went from a farm in Washington, Ind., to a Senate seat in Washington, D. C., makes a great talk entitled "Our Greatest Asset," and it's his gospel.

The man whose upturned grin and big cigar form a Capehart trade-mark has done a good many other things in his 5 years and more in Washington than just talk about our Government. But the American way of life is his basic philosophy and all other activities revolve around it.

Both the man and the philosophy were born near the little town of Algiers, Ind., on June 6, 1897, when Alvin and Susan Capehart had a son they called HOMER.

That start in life was not a glorious one, but typical of so many Americans. HOMER'S father was a tenant farmer and HOMER was the second of four children, there being two other sons and a daughter when the final roll was read.

The going is not easy for tenant farmers, but Alvin Capehart, whose ancestors came from Wales in colonial days, managed to provide for his family through hard work and economic management.

HOMER, as a boy, knew the feel of wheat stubbles on his bare feet. He knew the chill of 4 a. m. while donning his dungarees for the morning chores.

He also knew the need for the necessities of life at times.

Nevertheless, HOMER used his 16 wakeful hours of each day to mix schooling with farm chores and out of it came a high-school diploma and a respect for courage.

The diploma and World War I arrived at the same time and the strapping farm boy from Daviess County was the first enlistment in his home county at the age of 19.

From a buck private in the rear ranks he moved to sergeant in the army in the 2 years he served.

Then, endowed with the spirit and courage to make a success under the American system, he tackled the business world as a salesman. Up to this point HOMER CAPEHART had not sold anything except himself on the

fact that under the free-enterprise system you can make a success from any beginning.

It was as ham to eggs that he took to selling plows. But later it was as milk to vinegar that he went into the advertising business. Nevertheless, he kept on eking out the necessaries of life, even though they were quite sparse at times. There were a few incidents in this part of his 52 years that were about as tough problems for him and his newly-acquired family responsibilities as you would want to meet up with.

The pickin's were pretty lean, but the chance was there under the American system and HOMER never knew the words "give up."

His indomitable spirit was made to order for salesmanship and he became sales manager for the Holcomb & Hoke Manufacturing Co. in Indianapolis.

In 1928 the name of CAPEHART first blazed across the business world of America when he organized the Capehart Corp. in Huntington, Ind.

The next year he moved his manufacturing operations to Fort Wayne, Ind. He was for many years associated with the Rudolph Wurlitzer Co., of Cincinnati, and North Tonawanda, N. Y. He founded the Packard Manufacturing Corp. in Indianapolis in 1940. HOMER, the farm boy, the poor boy, was on his way.

When World War II enveloped the United States the Packard plants turned to war production and won repeated awards for their excellence in producing tank parts, plane parts, and parts for 30-caliber carbine rifles.

Your reporter, who has been covering politics in Indiana for more years than he likes to admit, had reason to know CAPEHART long before this point in the career of America's No. 1 booster.

Back in 1938 on a hot August day I joined a good many thousands of other Hoosiers in a trek to the farm of CAPEHART near Washington, Ind. This was when CAPEHART'S name first appeared on the political horizon of Indiana.

He had seen the trend under the New Deal toward changing that system of government which he loved and cherished so much and the poor little successful boy decided to do something about it.

Those thousands of Republicans gathered at the Capehart farm and pledged to fight with all their might against New Deal efforts to change the American system.

It worked.

That very same year the Republicans elected a secretary of state. Two years later they carried the State for Wendell Willkie and reelected the secretary of state. In 1942 they won the legislature and all State offices except governor which was not subject to election.

From that huge gathering on CAPEHART'S farm which has become famous in Republican history as the "cornfield conference" the Republican Party surged forward in Indiana to complete landslides in 1944 and 1946.

Yes, in 1944 the Republicans won a landslide and into office with that landslide went HOMER E. CAPEHART—into the United States Senate. The farm boy, the salesman, the successful businessman, the American, the United States Senator, was now where he could do the most good for that philosophy of his.

To get into the Senate, CAPEHART faced in the general election the man who has been proclaimed in politics as the State's greatest vote-getter, Gov. Henry F. Schricker.

Schricker had just completed a 4-year term as governor and was hailed as a cinch to win the Senate seat on the strength of a complaint-free term in office.

Up and down the State went the man who was new to the game of politics. He shook 100,000 hands, he claims, and visited every nook and corner of Indiana and doggone near every grocery store and filling station. He won over the man they said couldn't be beat, but HOMER never did know the meaning of those words: "give up."

The same old push marked his way through the Senate. He wasn't in Washington long until he found his way around like a veteran.

Who Are "The People"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Are 'The People'?" published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star on March 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO ARE "THE PEOPLE"?

In a slashing attack on Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, the AFL's Political Education League has used the time-worn political trick of smearing an opponent by association. "CAPEHART," the weekly league reporter says, "has again lined up with the special interests and against the people. He is opposing the middle-income cooperative housing bill."

The implication is that anybody who opposes this piece of legislation is a tool of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and is against the people. Simply because Senator CAPEHART happens to have decided to vote against a bill which that organization opposes, he is charged with being a stooge for a special interest. That sort of attack is not only unfair, it is both vicious and untrue.

Who are the people for whom the AFL presumes to speak? Are they the 55 percent of all the people in all the United States in small-income groups who own their own homes; people who would have to pay off not only their own mortgages, but part of the mortgages of that specially privileged few who got Government subsidies for cooperative housing? Are they the people who are now living in rented homes and are satisfied with the rent they pay? Are they even the majority of the members of the AFL, few of whom would benefit from this middle-income housing bill, but all of whom would have to pay the taxes to support it? We doubt it.

The AFL's league reporter speaks only for those few political experts who edit it, and for the few labor leaders who control the AFL for their own political and personal purposes. It no more speaks for the people than does the National Association of Real Estate Boards. In a previous attack on GOP Congressmen on March 6 the reporter said that the McConnell FEPC bill keeps civil rights from being enforced. It implies AFL support for an FEPC with compulsory enforcement.

Yet the constitutions of many AFL unions today prohibit Negro membership and ban Negroes from being apprentices. How can the AFL political educators reconcile these two opposing actions? And how can the people have any confidence in the sincerity or the accuracy of the league reporter when it puts out such hypocritical opinions as these?

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "United States Has Real Obligation To Accept Hawaii and Alaska Into Full Family Membership," which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on March 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES HAS REAL OBLIGATION TO ACCEPT HAWAII AND ALASKA INTO FULL FAMILY MEMBERSHIP

The lower House of Congress has approved bills to admit Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States of the Union. Although opposition is reported brewing in the Senate, it may be hoped that the upper chamber will act as forthrightly and intelligently.

The two States would be the only ones not contiguous to continental United States. However, modern transportation and communications facilities and some potent lessons from the Second World War eliminate distance as an argument against statehood. Petitions of the two Territories are correctly being considered separately and each on its own merits. However, there are many reasons for affirmative action, especially at this time. We need to bring all members of our American family closer together spiritually and practically.

Absentee Federal direction undoubtedly has hindered economic and population growth of both Territories. Though they both seem a long way from continental United States, the air lines and modern communication facilities have brought them much closer than were some of the "frontier" Territories in former days.

Hawaii has been ready for statehood a long time—socially, economically, and politically. The islands are a crossroads of the Pacific, a center of trade and cultural relations between all peoples of the Pacific area. Here is a good place to exhibit democracy at work. The argument that Communist strength on the islands should keep Hawaii out of the Union is a weak one. A government in which citizens participate to a greater degree should discourage residents from flirting with subversive ideologies. Eighty-three percent of Hawaii's citizens are American citizens.

Hawaii has been seeking admission to the Union since 1854. The island Territory has had constitutional government since 1840 and has been a Territory since 1900. Hawaii's present population of 540,000 exceeds that of six States and almost equals four others. The population is larger than that of any territory when it was admitted to statehood except Oklahoma. Hawaii's land area is larger than several eastern States. Its contribution to the Federal Treasury of $90,824,693 last year was more than was collected in United States taxes in any 1 of 11 States.

Alaska and Hawaii are vulnerable points in our national defense, it is true. Pearl Harbor proved, however, that an attack on a United States Territory or possession is as important to the rest of the country as if Oregon or Georgia were invaded. The Territories of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be secure

until they are admitted to statehood. They should have stronger voices and votes in the Congress.

Alaska remains largely underdeveloped and vulnerable to attack 83 years after the Territory was purchased from Russia. The proximity of the peninsula to Russia dramatizes the urgency of making it as strong as possible militarily, with a complete democratic government. Though much of it is a remote, icy wilderness, Alaska has tremendous natural resources, such as timber and minerals and open places for settling Americans in new homes. Its possibilities have hardly been tapped. Statehood no doubt would enhance stability settlement and development.

Admission of Alaska has been opposed on grounds it would be unfair for a State of 100,000 population to have the same representation in the Senate as States of several million people. If that argument is valid, then it is unfair for Utah and Nevada to have the same number of Senators as New York and California. This practical arrangement is the price that was paid for the Union in the first place.

Alaska has more population than 12 States boasted at the time they entered the Union. Population per square mile there is greater than that of Nevada, Minnesota, and Oregon at the time they became States. After an extensive investigation, the House Public Lands Committee has concluded that Alaska should be able to support itself financially under statehood.

Arguments against statehood for the two great Territorial outposts are almost a century late. The United States assumed a solemn obligation to accept them into full family membership and to defend them when the Nation acquired them.

Mental-Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand clippings reporting a horrible disaster in a mental hospital. Nine men were trapped by fire, and went to their deaths. It is reported that they were chained to their bunks.

It is hard to believe that such a tragedy could occur in this day, and yet I realize that the practice of restraining mental patients is mainly due to a lack of trained personnel.

Although this was a private mental institution, this practice of shackling patients goes on, I understand, in many tax-supported hospitals throughout the country.

Our veterans hospitals have made a notable advance in abolishing these restraints, and yet the recent veterans' cuts in personnel threaten to reduce the standard of care that is given. In a statement made by the American Psychiatric Association, which I would like to insert in the RECORD, it is stated:

One of the most serious threats of the cut-back is the reduction in training programs at VA hospitals, particularly for nurses and aides. It is inevitable that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase. Moreover, decreases in supervisory personnel will inevitably encourage an increase in the use of physical and chemical restraints for disturbed patients.

I think it is not only necessary to stop these cut-backs in the Veterans' Administration, but it is clear that we must step up our whole mental health program in the country, as carried on by the Public Health Service.

Neither society nor the Congress can condone inhuman practices. Therefore, society at large, and the Congress in particular cannot afford to neglect any steps that can be taken to eradicate such medieval action in our mental hospitals.

When, by appropriating a small amount of money, we can find new treatments, train personnel to apply them, send patients home as soon as possible, and take care of their rehabilitation, Congress ought to find a way of providing that money.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a release by the American Psychiatric Association and a newspaper article entitled "Tragedy at Mental Hospital Near Philadelphia," published in the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the release and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concrete evidence to support the American Psychiatric Association's warning that current cuts in Medical personnel in VA psychiatric hospitals and clinics would have disastrous results, was made public today by APA president, Dr. George S. Stevenson, New York City. On March 4 the association publicly declared that unless the personnel cut-back were prevented, "medical care of nervous and mentally disabled veterans would deteriorate below accepted adequate standards.'

About 3,000 of the VA medical staff are involved, approximately 1,200 of them being doctors, dentists, psychologists, nurses, social workers, and aides in VA psychiatric hospitals and clinics.

Stating that his information was based on reports received from the VA hospitals and clinics in the past 2 weeks, Dr. Stevenson declared the evidence was all too clear that the VA's fifty-thousand-odd psychiatric veteran patients would be the ones to suffer from the lowering of standards and services necessitated by the personnel cut.

For example, he said, the VA hospital at Gulfport, Miss., will eliminate its vocational rehabilitation and education program. At American Lake, Wash., insulin therapy will be stopped. At Downey, Ill., the recreation program for TB patients will be cut out. At Port Lyon, Colo., the leukotomy (operation on frontal lobes of brain) program will be drastically limited. At Marion, Ind., the hydrotherapy program will be reduced. At Togus, Maine, one medical and one surgical ward will be closed.

Particularly distressing is the effect of the cut-back on the VA hospitals which care for tuberculous psychiatric patients, Dr. Stevenson said. They are asked to reduce their staffs by 5 to 50 people. Yet in a recent survey of four of them, not one was found to provide adequate medical care. The cut-back can only agitate already serious deficiencies.

One of the most serious threats of the cut-back is the reduction in training programs at Veterans' Administration hospitals, particularly for nurses and aides. It is inevitable that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase. Moreover, decreases in supervisory personnel will inevitably encourage an increase in the use of physical and chemical restraints for disturbed patients.

The corrective therapy and vocational rehabilitation and education programs will be drastically curtailed, and in many hospitals eliminated altogether. Dr. Stevenson continued. These are crucial activities in preparing patients for release from the hospital and readjustment to community life.

The cut comes at a time when there are about 4,000 psychiatric beds unused in the Veterans' Administration hospitals for lack of personnel to staff them; and when there are about 5,000 "emergency beds" in use—crowded into sun porches and recreation rooms, over and above normal capacity. Yet 21 Veterans' Administration hospitals report they will have to close nearly 1,400 more beds as a result of the cut, and more would be closed if it were not for local community pressure to keep them open.

The situation is aggravated, Dr. Stevenson stressed, by the fact that the Veterans' Administration is asked to staff new hospitals being constructed within present personnel ceilings. In a program analysis approved recently by the Chief Medical Director of Veterans' Administration, it was estimated that the Veterans' Administration needed 4,000 more medical personnel to maintain its present psychiatric hospitals and provide for the new ones planned this year.

Turning to the Veterans' Administration mental-hygiene clinics, Dr. Stevenson described them as the first line of defense against hospitalization. About 25 percent of nearly 25,000 out-patients now being handled by the clinics would have to be hospitalized if clinic treatments were not available. All of these cases involve service-connected disabilities. Yet the personnel cutback requires the clinics to reduce personnel by about 13 percent—foreshadowing a backlog og about 10,000 untreated service-connected cases by the end of 1950. The cutback also will require the clinics to rely more on fee-basis physicians, which costs about a third again as much per treatment and results in less adequate medical care.

At present there are no clinic facilities in Alabama, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming, Dr. Stevenson said, and, in general, large areas of the Midwest, South, and Southwest have few or no out-patient clinic facilities. There are 470,000 service-connected cases now eligible for clinic out-patient treatment. Only 25 percent of them have been cared for thus far, Dr. Stevenson stressed.

Dr. Stevenson expressed the hope that a widespread public protest to the Congress would result in a deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration which would put a last-minute stop to the personnel cut-back.

THE EFFECTS OF VA PERSONNEL CUT ON INDIVIDUAL HOSPITALS

American Lake, Wash.: Can't close beds; stop insulin therapy; eliminate affiliate nursing program; reduce total push; less supervision of personal care; return to back wards.

Bedford, Mass.: Cannot elminate 235 emergency beds; no social service on Sunday; hydrotherapy reduced from 16 hours to 1 hour 5 days a week; cannot do family care.

Augusta, Ga.: 280 patients to lose treatment; serious reduction in service; nursing service covers dietetics; need two more nurses for insulin therapy.

Canandaigua, N. Y.: Close 289 beds; eliminate insulin program; PMR (physical medicine and rehabilitation) for 200 patients reduced.

Chillicothe, Ohio: 39 emergency beds eliminated; no effect on patient care.

Coatesville, Pa.: Close one hospital building; have stopped admissions; total push decreased.

Danville, Ill.: Have to stop admissions for 5 months to reach standard capacity; cannot man all nursing stations; unsafe to operate wards; cold food served 1 hour before

meals; 45 patients deprived of treatment; eliminate attendant training.

Downey, Ill.: Cannot operate additional tuberculosis ward; no recreation for TB patients; two vacancies for doctors canceled; professional people have to do administrative work.

Fort Custer, Mich.: Close 35 beds; eliminate VR & E (vocational rehabilitation and education program); reduce PMR program.

Fort Lyon, Colo.: Close 106 emergency beds; 225 patients to 1 doctor ratio; leukotomy program decreased.

Fort Meade, S. Dak.: Have only 146 aides; will reduce push program.

Gulfport, Miss.: 110 beds should be closed but cannot for the sake of serving community; eliminate VR & E; all MAT (manual arts therapy) but one shop eliminated; special training for 25 catatonics eliminated; habit training for 140 abolished; no hydrotherapy on acute service; lessen group psychotherapy; close staff dining room; lose five ward clerks (nurses to do administrative work); have to double up patients in day rooms; no aide training.

Knoxville, Iowa: Close 78 beds or eliminate the 38 beds for TB–NP patients.

Lebanon, Pa.: Are opening beds; need more staff for new beds—but can't hire in advance for training some reduction in PMR activities.

Lexington, Ky.: Inadequate coverage of wards due to lack of nurses and attendants.

Lyons, N. J.: Close 400 beds (have 288 emergency beds); 350 patients needing PMR not getting it; unless get more personnel, have to close beds; PMR activities somewhat reduced; inadequate coverage of wards.

Marion, Ind.: Cannot close beds—too crowded; cannot open new unit for infirm; 200 patients have no sports; movies for wards down 50 percent; stop night hydrotherapy; no PT for TB patients; curtail ward OT (occupational therapy); 4 buildings, no CT (corrective therapy); lessen dietetic ward service; special services activities reduced; hydrotherapy and physical therapy activities curtailed.

Murfreesboro, Tenn.: OT on wards curtailed, fewer activities off wards; shortage of psychiatrists and nurses continues.

North Little Rock, Ark.: Close 86 TB-NP beds and transfer patients; else eliminate 86 other beds.

Northport, Long Island, N. Y.: Stop new admissions, eliminate emergency beds; hydrotherapy reduced from 24 to 16 hours and 16 to 8 hours; off-ward activities for patients curtailed.

Palo Alto, Calif.: Can't reduce beds; must reduce programs, won't do lab work for annual physicals; reduction in ward coverage and ward activities, or increase use of restraint and sedation.

Perry Point, Md.: Patient care will suffer by curtailing program.

Roanoke, Va.: No emergency beds; increase waiting list; reduce lobotomy program (112 operations; one-third gone home); decrease shock program; residency training will suffer.

Roseburg, Oreg.: Ten emergency beds; diminish training for aides; eliminate ward OT; limit lobotomy retraining; need eight more medical jobs; reduce push programs; marked reduction of OT on wards; reduce off-ward activities; reduce lobotomy program.

Sheridan, Wyo.: Reduce extent of off-ward activities; coverage on wards in some cases reduced to danger point; hydrotherapy and other PMR activities reduced.

St. Cloud, Minn.: Need for additional physicians on acute intensive treatment service.

Togus, Maine: Close one medical and one surgical ward; NP hospital personnel never adequate.

Tomah, Wis.: Some reduction in off-ward activities; attendant ratio low.

Topeka, Kans.: Close 200 beds.

Tuscaloosa, Ala.: Cannot reduce beds; discontinue two VR & E jobs; lessen insulin and electric shock therapy; cut down lobotomies due to inadequate nursing; lessen push programs.

Tuskegee, Ala.: 200 beds closed by curtailing administrative; eliminate 5,000 program—2 jobs; eliminate two PMR programs.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1950]

TRAGEDY AT MENTAL HOSPITAL NEAR PHILADELPHIA—NINE DEAD IN FIRE WERE CHAINED TO THEIR BUNKS

PHILADELPHIA, March 30.—Nine men mental patients, tugging in terror at the chains which bound them to concrete slabs, died today in a fire in a private sanitarium.

The dense smoke which killed them, pouring into their barred cells from a basement fire, felled two other patients in the ward. They were in critical condition at Montgomery Hospital in Norristown, Pa.

A male nurse, George Lewis, 51, saved the lives of the four other inmates of the violent section. He groped through the smoke and unlocked the leather-bound chains which shackled them either by the wrist or ankle to an iron ring in their concrete beds.

When the dead were laid out on the rug-covered floor of the administration building, the cuts and bruises told the story of how they struggled futilely to break the shackles that held them.

THIRTY INJURED

About 30 other persons, including firemen and attendants, were overcome or sickened by the dense smoke from a rubbish fire.

Amid the confusion of smoke, the rescuing of 75 terror-stricken inmates and firemen battering at cell doors, there was heroism.

Mrs. Theresa Shaw, 38-year-old New York nurse, crawled on her stomach through the smoke to lead firemen to the locked doors of bed-ridden patients.

Heroic firemen carried other patients, naked or clad in night clothes or underwear, to safety down ladders in the chill early morning hours. Spectators, drawn to the scene by smoke and fire sirens, aided in the rescue work.

Mrs. Shaw had just returned to work at the Belle Vista Sanitarium in the exclusive Chestnut Hill section when the flames broke out.

REASSURES PATIENTS

Immediately, Mrs. Shaw went to help her patients.

"There was no way and no time to get at the ward records, so we could first rescue the most feeble," she said. "I just called on my memory. As each patient was led or carried to safety, I called her by name and assured her that everything was all right."

The blaze, confined to the basement, was discovered at 10:45 last night.

Most of the patients took the emergency calmly once they noticed the presence of the assuring attendants. Others, however, screamed and fought with their rescuers, flailing their arms violently.

One woman patient choked a fireman as he carried her from the L-shaped two-story stone building.

CHAINED TO SLABS

Fireman Walter Rohrbach of Flourtown said he rescued 12 women, carrying them down ladders 1 at a time.

The patients in the violent ward were chained to the concrete slabs on which they sleep shortly after the evening meal, about 5 hours before the fire broke out.

Straps encircling one arm and one leg of each patient were linked by chains to hooks embedded in the concrete, fireman said.

Other mental patients, not considered violent, were restrained to their beds by simple leather straps in the other wards of the institution. Senile and nervous cases were not restrained.

Opportunity and Justice for All America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Opportunity and Justice for All America," by Harold Cross, published in the Hammond (Ind.) Times, on Monday, March 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CAPEHART'S CREED: OPPORTUNITY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL AMERICA

(By Harold Cross)

(Pt. II)

INDIANAPOLIS.—The name of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART flashed around the world when he revealed that Japan had slipped a peace feeler to the United States through Russia. Our officials, who had become habitually secretive about matters of concern to the country, denied the Capehart assertion. But Indiana's then-junior Senator stuck to his guns and eventually his claim was confirmed.

Legislatively, Senator CAPEHART felt his way for the first 2 years, gaining experience and the appreciation of his colleagues as he went along.

In the 1946 campaign in Indiana Senator CAPEHART teamed with the Bill Jenners and the Ralph Gateses and the Tom Baths and the Charley Hallecks and the Hobart Creightons and other big guns in the Republican ranks to swing a rousing Republican victory.

When he returned to the Senate for the Eightieth Congress, Senator CAPEHART was properly equipped to become Indiana's senior Senator. He lost no time in introducing a bill to clarify the portal-to-portal pay problem which was sweeping the country. It was at this same time, too, that labor-management developments in the Nation indicated corrective legislative measures were needed. Senator CAPEHART, whose practical experience as both a worker and employer served him well in his course of action, criticized the Wagner Act, but at the same time criticized the original Taft-Hartley Act, contending it should be amended in several respects.

His completely harmonious labor relations as an employer gave Senator CAPEHART access to sources within the ranks of organized labor which made possible constant discussions with those sources on the problems which arose on labor questions.

He also moved into important positions on the major Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Banking and Currency Committees.

Consistency is a jewel in anything, particularly politics, so Mr. CAPEHART can claim that jewel. In 1944, Mr. CAPEHART stressed in his campaign the dangers of foreign isms creeping into our Government through disloyal officials. Six years later the Alger Hiss conviction confirmed that danger.

Mr. CAPEHART also campaigned on a platform of economy in Government and a balanced peacetime budget. Six years later he finds need for the same platform.

The Eightieth Congress also formed a Small Business Committee and Senator CAPEHART became a member and was made chairman of the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee which had charge of

investigating the newsprint shortage. It was through his deft handling of this critical situation that the problem was solved without Government interference.

While many administration Senators clamored for Government control of newsprint, Senator CAPEHART calmly called a conference of publishers from throughout the country and a voluntary system of distribution of newsprint was adopted. Today, as a result of Senator CAPEHART'S judgment, the press of America remains free from Government controls.

FIGHTS FOR AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

When the Marshall plan was brought to the fore in the Eightieth Congress it came face to face with a man from Indiana who insisted American principles be applied to aid for Europe. As a member of an investigating Senate committee which had toured the war-torn nations of Europe near the end of World War II, Senator CAPEHART was familiar with the European problem. But he also was familiar with what American principles could do toward restoring prewar conditions there.

He opposed the system designed for the Marshall plan, but not before offering a substitute plan which won great support in the Senate although it was not adopted. Today there are many who originally supported the existing Marshall plan who openly admit Senator CAPEHART'S plan would have succeeded in the restoration of Europe in less time and at far less expense to the American taxpayer.

When inflation loomed its ugly head in December of 1947 and President Truman first urged restoration of rationing and controls, Senator CAPEHART again stepped to the front with a 14-point plan for increasing production as a means of combating inflation. Again he was right. For it was greater production that finally defeated inflation.

In 1948 when the Republican Eightieth Congress worked toward a long-range farm program, the Indiana Senator who had grown up on a farm and who today actively operates one of Hoosierland's finest farms knew the course to take.

FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORT

He supported the flexible price-support plan for long-range use because in his farming experience he had learned the ups and downs of farming and felt qualified to work out the solution to them. Senator CAPEHART contends today that had the Hope-Aiken flexible price-support program been given a chance to operate it would have prevented the growing inequities that today threaten chaos in the farm program.

While we are on the subject of farming it is quite appropriate to mention something more about Senator CAPEHART'S farm. It stretches for 1,800 acres over his beloved Daviess County just a few miles from Washington, Ind.

Consisting of some of the finest farmland in the State, the Capehart farm borders along the west fork of the White River. It is a farm efficiently operated with the actual supervision and as much of the actual work as possible being performed by the senior Senator himself.

The Capehart farm is not many miles from the Capehart birthplace and the Hoosier Senator expects to close his life on the farm he owns not far from the farm on which his life began so ruggedly.

His wife, Irma, who was a school teacher in Wisconsin before she became Mrs. Capehart, wife of a struggling sales manager, shares the Senator's love for his Indiana farm. So do his two sons and daughter.

Earl Capehart, the eldest son whose full names makes him a junior when the Homer is added, is a practicing attorney in Indianapolis. He won his degree from Harvard law school.

Tom, a graduate engineer from Purdue University, is now the president of his father's Packard Manufacturing Corp. in Indianapolis and carrying the full load of responsibility for continuing the success of the Capehart business reputation.

Both boys are also sharing their time and efforts toward making the Capehart farm tick.

The daughter, Patricia, youngest of the three children, is in her junior year at the University of Maryland. She is a pretty, dark-haired and vivacious girl who exemplified her illustrious father last summer when she took a job as waitress in a Maine resort to earn her own vacation the hard way.

WILL TOUR THE STATE

Well, that is the background of the man who will again be going up and down the State soon shaking another 100,000 hands and an upturned grin wrapped around a big cigar.

He'll be preaching Americanism at every turn just as he did last December when he toured the State for seven public debates with Representative ANDREW JACOBS, of Indianapolis, on the subject of British socialism.

The big and dynamic Senator has had a creed these many years and it pretty well sums up the American way of life that HOMER CAPEHART believes in so thoroughly and at the same time forms a short and effective biography of the man himself.

It goes like this:

"I want to retain that form of government under which the farm boy of today can become the farm owner of tomorrow; under which the worker of today can become the successful businessman of tomorrow; under which the poor immigrant of today can become the prominent citizen of tomorrow."

Russia's Portrait of Us Must Not Hang Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Russia's Portrait of Us Must Not Hang Alone," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 30. The editorial relates to the joint resolution introduced a few days ago by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], which was jointly sponsored by himself and 10 other Senators, of whom I am proud to be one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S PORTRAIT OF US MUST NOT HANG ALONE

In too many countries around the world too many people look upon the United States as a power-mad, money-mad, selfish, imperialistic ogre. Those same people, in most cases, have been sold and believe the vision of slave-state Russia as a worker's paradise. The cause, in both cases, is Russia's skillful, highly effective propaganda, open and disguised, promoted not only by the Kremlin but by its satellites and by converted native agents everywhere.

The United States has an obvious interest of the first importance in combating this Russian distortion of truth and in giving other peoples of the world a true mirror of itself. But on this battle for the minds and the possible allegiance of other peoples it now is spending the trifling sum of $34,000,000 a year—far less even than the British, much less the Russians.

Senator WILLIAM T. BENTON, properly alarmed by this situation, has with 10 other Senators introduced a resolution calling for affirmative action to right it. More money is necessary but incidental; the program is the thing. Senator BENTON, who helped to develop our present foreign information program, with its Voice of America broadcasts and its libraries and cultural missions abroad, wants greater American action on every propaganda front: radio stations capable of reaching every listener in the world, a renewed and more aggressive campaign in the United Nations for freedom of information, support of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, promotion of democratic education, a conference of non-Communist countries on information programs.

There are other activities that might be included, too, such as the export of more American teachers and students to friendly nations, more American libraries and well-chosen documentary films (with some sensible discouragement by Hollywood itself of those of its cheap distortions so helpful in promoting Soviet caricatures of us). But Senator BENTON is on the right track, and we hope that he will succeed in getting congressional action. A true picture of the United States can win us friends and influence the world, but if we do little to put it before the world we can hardly be surprised if Russia's venomous portrait of us, hanging alone, is accepted as the one and only.

The Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, Thomas L. Stokes is a distinguished American journalist. He is a winner of the Pulitzer prize and the Raymond Clapper memorial award, and has received other marks of distinction. I believe his views concerning the Kerr natural-gas bill recently passed by the Senate will be of interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by him entitled "On 'Special Interests'." published in today's Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON "SPECIAL INTERESTS"—FAILURE TO VETO KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL MAY EMBARRASS TRUMAN ON COMPROMISE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

President Truman may find himself embarrassed in attacking the "special interests" in his projected cross-country "whistlestop" tour to begin early in May unless meanwhile, he vetoes the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill that frees independent natural-gas producers

from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

It would cost the 40,000,000 natural-gas consumers millions of dollars annually.

The measure, which soon will be placed on his desk for decision, was sponsored by Democrats and put over in the Senate this week, as in the House last session, by Democratic votes in a Democratic Congress. A bill of similar purpose, though broader in scope, could not even get through that Eightieth Republican Congress which the President denounced in 1948 as the worst in history.

OIL COMPANIES TO BENEFIT

This was, indeed, a "special interest" coup. The result in the Senate is disturbing evidence of the weight now exerted by big oil in the Democratic Party. Big oil was behind the bill which will benefit handsomely a handful of the Nation's major oil companies. They own the bulk of natural-gas reserves in the Southwest and will enjoy virtually a monopoly status if it becomes law. Credit for the victory goes to Senator Bob KERR, of Oklahoma, former Governor of his State, who is, himself, a big oil and gas man, and has emerged as a powerful figure in Democratic politics. This victory may prove costly to his party.

On his way across the country the President will travel through States where consumers are vitally affected by this measure. A number of Republican Senators from that area, reflecting this consumer concern, fought bitterly against it and voted against it, so that it will become a lively political issue. Republicans supplied the majority of votes against the bill in the Senate, 22, with 16 Democrats voting with them. Twenty-eight Democrats voted for it, along with 16 Republicans.

At the western terminus of his tour the President is to dedicate a great public power project, Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State. There, it is presumed, he will say something, as he has in that area before, about the administration's policy of regulating utilities in the public interest. Natural gas is freed from regulation at the source under the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill, so that the consumer cannot be protected properly by other regulation along the line in pipeline transmission and sale at the other end. Incidentally, it was while on a visit to Grand Coulee in his transcontinental tour in June of 1948 that the President made his crack about the Eightieth Republican Congress being "the worst in history."

The Democratic Party's leadership in Congress plainly defaulted on this issue, though a minority of individual Democrats in the ranks fought it. President Truman, who openly opposed it in the last session of Congress, was represented about the lobbies of the Senate during its consideration as now accepting it, though this was denied by aides at Key West. At the same time, Democratic National Chairman William Boyle, Jr., belatedly was reported as bestirring himself against it. Pressure from consumer and labor groups got very hot.

LEAD ASSUMED BY DOUGLAS

Senator LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois, the administration's Senate leader, walked out completely on the fight. Shortly after the Senate took up the bill he went back home to campaign for reelection, was absent during the debate, and did not even return for the final vote. Nor was it announced how he would have voted, had he been here, which is customary practice.

Leadership in the fight against the bill on behalf of the Democratic minority opposed to it was assumed by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, who had thoroughly informed himself on the vital issues involved affecting the public interest. So effective was his direction of the battle, with the able help of a number of Republicans and a few other Democrats, that the reported overwhelming majority claimed for it at the outset was whittled down to a very thin majority ultimately.

The Democratic Party hasn't heard the last of this.

Appropriation for Veterans' Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am reliably informed that General Gray will ask for more money so that some of the personnel of the Veterans' Administration hospitals will not be discharged. Apparently the Veterans' Administration realizes it made a mistake in not asking for more money than it did.

Dr. George S. Stevenson said that in reducing the personnel by 4,700 in the Veterans' Administration would result in special abuse not only to the patients but to the nervous and mentally disabled.

I am extremely glad that General Gray, as I am reliably told, will ask for more money and I hope that a mistake of that kind will not be made again.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post by N. S. Haseltine:

HOSPITAL CUT FOUGHT BY PSYCHIATRIC BODY

(By N. S. Haseltine)

Preliminary success in relieving hemophilia, the inherited bleeding disease, with a relatively new plant food drug was reported here yesterday.

The new use of the drug, rutin, was reported at the fifteenth annual Chemurgic Council, at the Statler Hotel, by Dr. James F. Couch, of Philadelphia, an analytical chemist with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Rutin, which can be extracted from buckwheat, is already used widely by older persons to fortify themselves against "capillary fragility," or the tendency of the tiny bloodways to break down. The condition is frequently found in patients suffering from diabetes or high blood pressure.

OTHER ADVANCES REPORTED

Other chemurgists, the scientists who seek new uses for agricultural crops, told of developing a tough, varnish-like furniture coating from potato starches; of fattening livestock from the waste products of distilleries, and of making the hen a better egg factory.

Dr. Couch said that the first inkling that rutin might prove effective against hemophilia came in 1945 with a request for some of the drug from a California physician. Dr. Couch's laboratory, where the drug possibilities were being investigated, filled the order with the notation that there was no reason to believe it would do good, he said yesterday.

SIXTEEN CHILDREN HELPED

The patient, a prominent California businessman, was relieved of much of his suffering, Dr. Couch said. Since then, he added, some 16 hemophiliac children have been given rutin therapy, daily oral doses of the nontoxic drug. These children, he said, have received varying degrees of relief.

He emphasized that the drug, which he termed "really a food," does not cure the condition but relieves many of pain and apparently staves off many of the irregular sieges of suffering in hemophilia. Victims suffer severe hemorrhages, often from the slightest injury.

COATING RESISTS SCRATCHES

Dr. Frank L. Teuton of this city, a member of Agriculture Department's bureau of chemistry, told of the development of "allyl starch," a coating material that has proved highly resistant to heat, scratching, and "glass rings," the markings on furniture from beverage glasses.

The coating, which is painted on like varnish, can be made from many starch and sugar materials, such as potatoes, corn, and sugar.

Dr. Philip J. Schaible, of Cincinnati, Ohio, executive director of the Distillers Feed Research Council, told of the livestock food use of whisky-mash residue.

When the grain is processed only the starches are removed, he explained.

SUPERIOR CATTLE FEED

The rest, enriched in the distilling processes, with yeast, becomes a feed superior to the original grain, he said. Used in combination with natural grain and roughage for livestock and poultry feeds, the distiller feeds produce heavier animals in quicker time, he said.

Dr. H. J. Prebluda, of New York, a nutritionist with the United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc., traced the productivity of the hen back from horse-and-buggy days. Today's model, he pointed out, lays about twice as many eggs for each pound of feed as the 1900 hen.

Much of the increase, he said, can be attributed to the scientifically developed new feeds which provide concentrated egg-building substances.

The 3-day meeting is scheduled to end at a banquet tonight, with Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, the principal speaker.

The Veterans' Administration was warned yesterday that its plan to wipe out about 4,700 medical jobs by April 10 would seriously hamper the care and treatment of veterans, particularly nervous and mental cases.

The complaints were made by the American Psychiatric Association and the American Legion.

Legion Commander George N. Craig sent President Truman a telegram of protest and asked him to take emergency measures to keep the medical staff at its present strength until the full needs of the Veterans' Administration are determined and a more orderly process of adjustment effected.

APA president, Dr. George S. Stevenson, of New York, said reports from VA hospitals and clinics in the past 2 weeks made it all too clear that the VA's fifty-thousand-odd psychiatric veteran patients would be the ones to suffer from the lowering of standards and services necessitated by the personnel cut.

He cited specific hospitals where treatment of mental patients would have to be curtailed, and said a reduction in training programs for nurses and aides made it inevitable that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase.

"Moreover, it will be necessary to increase the use of physical and chemical restraints for violent cases, since lack of supervisory personnel makes it impossible to do otherwise," he said.

Dr. Stevenson expressed hope that a widespread public protest would cause Congress to provide more money for the VA and put a last-minute stop to the proposed cut-back.

VA Administrator Paul R. Gray, Jr., has announced that he will lop off 7,800 VA jobs by April 10. VA officials said about 4,700 of

these would be in the medical program, but not all would be doctors and nurses.

They said the cut was necessary because the agency found it was going to be in the red about $30,000,000 on April 1 largely because Congress voted pay raises last year but didn't provide extra money to pay them.

A VA spokesman said it would be impossible to tell until the job cut went through what the effect would be. He pointed out that the reduction will be in jobs, not actual employees. And he noted that some hospitals had not hired all the staff they were entitled to so in some cases there might be no firings at all.

The following is a letter sent to me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and an article by Mr. Beveridge of the Washington Evening Star:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1950.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: So that the Members may have the information before them to answer letters that may be received from veterans about the recent hospital situation, I wish to call to your attention the fact that, when the Veterans' Administration appropriation was up, the Appropriations Committee and the Congress allowed and approved the full amount asked for hospitals.

This statement was made in the report:

"The reductions in this item arise principally from reduced needs in all programs other than medical and hospital care which are provided for in full as proposed in the estimates. The total cost of the medical program is $566,666,400. The committee has not reduced this sum by 1 penny and directs the Administrator not to reduce it."

General Gray has been before both the House and the Senate Committee twice since this bill was considered, once in the last session and once early in this session. No mention was made of the fact that they were short of money or that they would be obliged to discharge employees connected with and needed in hospitals.

Under all the circumstances I fail to see how it is possible that the Congress is responsible for the cut in employees of the veterans' hospitals.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER.

DOCTORS SAY VA PLANS BIG CUT IN MENTAL CENTERS—PSYCHIATRISTS CHARGE 1,200 WILL BE FIRED, BEDS CUT BY 1,400

(By George Beveridge)

The Veterans' Administration plans to fire about 1,200 medical staff workers and do away with at least 1,400 beds in neuropsychiatric treatment centers as a result of its sudden personnel cut-back, the American Psychiatric Association charged today.

In some hospitals, veterans will be cut off from treatment, the APA declared, and programs of treatment in others will be drastically curtailed.

VA has announced it will lop off about 7,800 jobs on April 10. The association gave the first detailed public disclosure of its effect.

The Star 2 days ago revealed that more than 4,800 workers would be lost in the vast medical service alone, reporting that the cuts have dealt a terrific blow to medical leaders supporting the program.

LISTS PERSONNEL AFFECTED

In its lengthy statement, the APA said the firings involve 3,000 medical staff workers, about 1,200 of them being doctors, dentists, psychologists, nurses, social workers and aides in VA psychiatric hospitals and clinics.

Reductions in service, APA declared, at some hospitals involve shock treatment, hydrotherapy, and vocational training programs.

"It is inevitable," it added, "that incidents of abuse of nervous and mentally disabled patients will increase. Moreover, it will be necessary to increase the use of physical and chemical restraints for violent cases, since lack of supervisory personnel makes it impossible to do otherwise."

The group's statement was based on official reports received from hospitals, estimating effects. VA officials here are studying the reports, it was learned, and may make some adjustments among various hospitals during the next several days.

LOOKS TO PUBLIC PROTEST

Dr. George S. Stevenson, APA president, said he hopes a "widespread public protest to the Congress would result in a deficiency appropriation for the VA, which would put a last-minute stop to the personnel cutback."

Several Members of Congress already have taken the floor to protest the firings.

VA officials pointed out, however, that present VA budget estimates for the fiscal year beginning July 1 would not allow for reinstating workers lost in the cut-back. A deficiency appropriation, therefore, would provide the personnel only through June.

VA officials knew last fall they were exceeding personnel authorized by the budget, but firings were not announced until this month.

The APA said 4,000 psychiatric beds are unused because of lack of personnel in some hospitals, many of them in isolated areas, and that in others about 5,000 emergency beds have been crowded into sun porches and recreation rooms.

"Yet 21 VA hospitals report they will have to close nearly 1,400 more beds as a result of the cut—and more would be closed if it were not for local community pressure," it declared. In most of such cases, a VA official said, hospitals probably will close off beds as patients now occupying them leave.

WAITING LIST TO GROW

The APA said cuts would increase waiting lists of patients at mental hygiene clinics from 6,000, at present, to 10,000. The move will force some clinic patients to be treated on a fee basis by private doctors, at a cost increase from $7.50 to $12, it was reported.

The APA said only 25 percent of 470,000 eligible veterans with mental ills have been treated so far. VA medical heads have stressed the importance of the clinic program in the hope that early care would correct ailments before they require costly hospital treatment.

Of the 99,000 patients in VA hospitals, about 53,000 are in mental hospitals. About half the patients have service-connected ailments.

The psychiatric association said cuts at hospitals caring for tubercular psychiatric patients are particularly distressing. A recent survey showed not one of four of such hospitals gave adequate care and the cut can only agitate already serious deficiencies, it added.

SPECIFIC HOSPITALS CITED

To document its statement, the APA included effects on a large number of individual hospitals. Included were those located at:

Augusta, Ga.: "Two hundred and eighty patients to lose treatment; serious reduction in service; nursing service covers dietetics; need two more nurses for insulin therapy."

Canandaigua, N. Y.: "Close to 239 beds; eliminate insulin (shock) program; PMR (physical medicine and rehabilitation) for 200 patients reduced."

Coatesville, Pa.: "Close one hospital building; have stopped admissions; total push decreased."

Perry Point, Md.: "Patient care will suffer by curtailing programs."

Tuscaloosa, Ala.: "Cannot reduce beds; discontinue two BR&E (rehabilitation) jobs; lessen insulin and electric shock therapy; cut down lobotomies (psychosurgery) due to inadequate nursing."

Bedford, Mass.: "Cannot eliminate 235 emergency beds; no social service on Sunday; hydrotherapy reduced from 16 to 1 hour, 5 days a week; cannot do family care."

A Policy of Life Insurance on Our Nation Can Be Written Only in the Hearts and Minds of the Boys and Girls Who, in the Public Schools of the Land, Are Training for Citizenship

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days the Committee on Education and Labor of the House will make another effort to agree upon a measure to authorize the appropriation of funds for Federal aid to the elementary and secondary schools of this country, to be administered by the school authorities of each State to which this aid is extended.

The promises on this subject made by both political parties have long been in default.

During the week ending March 4, 14,000 educators from all over the Nation meeting in Atlantic City made an intensive study of the public-school problem now confronting the people of this country. This meeting was the Seventy-sixth Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators. It is the most influential policy-making group in the public-school field. The theme of the meeting was Education, Dynamic of Democracy.

In all of the discussions the speakers emphasized the importance of creating a sound school system for the protection of the American way of life. They agreed that without good public schools the American tradition of freedom would be endangered. It was also generally agreed that the people of this country have not yet recognized the importance of our free education system.

The president of the association stated that the people of the United States still regard teachers as mass baby sitters. This charge was based upon the starvation diet that our free public schools are compelled to accept.

The United States Commissioner of Education and the classroom teachers in attendance all warned that our schools are in a critical condition. We need more elementary school teachers, more buildings, more equipment, more supplies—more of everything.

It is becoming more and more difficult to obtain sufficient money to meet the increasing demands of our schools. Resistance to increased school budgets is increasing. States, counties, and cities are beginning to say, "We gave you more money last year and the year before. Why do you come back for more?"

To the complaint that the schools are asking for too much money, Tennessee's Dr. Andrew D. Holt, president of the National Education Association, pointed out the unanswerable fact that the schools need more money because enrollment has increased to an unprecedented extent. More children are being born. President Holt predicted that within the next 5 years the enrollment of children in our elementary schools will increase 40 to 50 percent. This means these added milions of children will need more schoolrooms and more school facilities.

The educators estimated that to properly care for and instruct this increased number of our school children will require an additional 350,000 teachers.

In no other way can this tremendous increase in new children be cared for and taught.

This increase in the number of elementary-school children can only be properly housed by the construction of 500,000 new classrooms. The cost of these new school buildings will be in the neighborhood of $13,000,000,000. This cost is staggering unless the people understand the facts creating the necessity for additional school facilities. The vast sum of money necessary is disturbing to public officials and to the taxpayers. The school officials and those interested in an adequate system of education who do not wish to see this oncoming host of future citizens denied adequate training realize that education will have to compete with social security, national defense, the cost of our farm program, and all other Government needs.

The majority of those who considered these questions were convinced that the local and State governments alone could not solve the problem in many parts of the country. It was accordingly proposed that a Federal-aid-to-education bill and a bill to aid school construction are necessary if the need of school construction and additional teachers is met. Practically all of the school superintendents and other officials favored Federal aid.

There is nothing new about Federal aid to education. Land-grant colleges and other colleges throughout the country have for years received Federal aid. The principle of Federal aid is now taken for granted, and if our schools are to continue to afford the adequate and necessary education to the children of our people, the passage of a Federal-aid-to-education law by Congress is inevitable. Despite the reverses that have been suffered by Federal-aid-to-education bills now pending in Congress, it is by no means certain that Federal aid to education has been killed as some of its enemies are hoping and are proclaiming in the columns of the papers they control and in their editorial columns. Many friends of the school children of this country expect such legislation to be enacted before this session of Congress ends.

On the question of whether or not Federal aid should be confined to the free public schools of this Nation, a resolution adopted recited that the grant of public funds should be confined to free public schools. Only two of the 7,000 delegates who voted on this proposition voted in favor of the minority report. In this connection, one of the most encouraging developments in public education today is the growth of citizen school groups in all parts of the country. Parent-teacher associations, working hand in hand with the teachers and with the pupils themselves, will insure an adequate number of teachers thoroughly trained for the duties of their high calling at salaries which will attract and hold them in the teaching profession. The free school is the institution that will preserve us as a free people.

THE NEEDS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS EXPAND AS OUR SCHOOL POPULATION INCREASES

Within the years 1949 to 1952, inclusive, more than 13,000,000 children of this country will enter the first grade and the greater number of them will graduate from our elementary schools. Within that same period more than six million will enter and millions of them will graduate from the high schools of this country.

Dr. Andrew D. Holt, executive secretary of the Tennessee Education Association, stated in a public address in Knoxville, Tenn., on Friday, March 24 of this year, that the birth rate in Tennessee is steadily increasing. In 1945 births numbered 66,620. In 1946 this number increased to 79,098. In 1947 it increased to 88,193. It is certain that Tennessee will have an enormous increase in school enrollments during the period from 1951 to 1953.

In our State, school attendance has increased 60,143 in the past 3 years.

If there is to be 1 teacher for each 30 pupils, the State will require an additional 2,000 teachers. Due to the lack of funds the school system in Tennessee has been enabled to add only 750 teachers. This shortage of teachers is responsible for the overcrowded classrooms in many localities.

The large Federal projects at Oak Ridge, Tullahoma, Memphis, and in other sections of the State will inevitably further increase our school population.

These increases in school population necessitate larger teaching forces and expanded facilities.

The vast majority of these young people will receive no other schooling than what they receive in the elementary and high schools. It is, therefore, of supreme importance that the teachers in these schools be loyal, competent Americans, able and fully equipped to instill in the minds and hearts of these future American citizens the inspiring truths of our great history and the opportunities this land affords to these boys and girls. The future of this country will be in the hands of these young Americans. They are America to the extent of their ability to influence its destiny for weal or for woe.

THE EDUCATION OF THIS NATION'S BOYS AND GIRLS IS OF TRANSCENDENT IMPORTANCE

Adequate salaries for their teachers should not be denied by penny-pinching.

The Federal funds made available by this program are paid by the people of the States. The beneficiaries are citizens of our common country.

The Federal Government is levying and collecting heavy taxes on the incomes and business of our people. The Federal tax collector takes his toll out of the clothes, the food, and the shelter of all our people.

The pennies and nickels of the school children do not escape the grasping hands of the Federal tax collector. When the boys and girls of our grade and high schools stage a school entertainment, a game of baseball, basketball, or football, the United States tax collector is there to take a heavy share of the admissions to such entertainments and games.

I have introduced a bill to repeal this unjust tax and have urged the Committee on Ways and Means to report this measure to the House for a vote.

Abraham Lincoln furnished us our best definition of a nation. He said:

A nation may be said to consist of its people, its territory, and its laws.

Our country is endowed with varied and boundless natural resources, majestic and enchanting scenery. It is teeming with homes, schools and an industrial system that is the envy and admiration of the world.

Our Government, in the words of Lincoln, was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Under this Government, "so conceived and so founded," the American people have enjoyed greater liberty and wider opportunities than have blessed any other people in all the 5,000 years of recorded history.

Under our system of free enterprise, private ownership of property, individual initiative, the right to earn, own, and enjoy the fruits of our labor, the American people are better housed, better fed and better clothed and have more of the good things of life than any other people on earth.

Can we keep this Republic and all that it means to our children and our children's children?

We live in a hostile and dangerous world.

There is no company on earth that can write a policy of insurance on the life of our Nation. There is but one institution where such a policy of insurance can be written and that is our system of free public schools.

Such a policy can be written only in the hearts and lives of the boys and girls who are training for citizenship in the public schools of the land.

Money invested in the education of our children will bear compound interest forever. The education of our children is a policy of insurance on the life of our country.

We spend billions that our youth may fight, and if need be die, all over the world. Why not spend $300,000,000 to teach them to live here at home?

The home is the unit of society. Man's greatest possession is his child. To rear, educate, and equip their children for the duties of life is the high calling of parents.

When the accounts of fathers and mothers are finally made up the greatest credit that will be given them will be the watchful care, the sacrifice, and devotion they have lavished on their children.

The most that the average parents can give their children is an education. When the two political parties promised the fathers and mothers to give their children better schools, they appealed to the finest qualities of their minds and hearts. The leaders of no political party have the right to trifle with a parent's love for his or her child.

Next in character-forming influence in the lives of our children are the school teachers.

Someone is said to have asked Demosthenes why he made speeches instead of writing books. The great Grecian orator replied, "I would rather write upon the hearts of the living than upon the hides of dead sheep."

If anyone on this earth writes upon the hearts of the living, it is the school teacher. Standing within the schoolroom, where wells the fountain of perpetual youth, dealing with the plastic, impressionable, unfolding minds of boys and girls, the teacher weaves into the warp and woof of his pupils' lives the very fiber of their thoughts and being. There is no more powerful, no higher calling on this earth than that of the teacher, save perhaps the Christian ministry.

We must give school teaching the dignity, the security, the income its importance deserves, and thus assure our boys and girls teachers of the highest ability and character.

The millions of young Americans now in our public schools, and who will pass through them within the next 4 years, have the fate of America in their hands.

For 5 years as a teacher in the public schools of my home county, Campbell, in Tennessee, in my 2 years as county superintendent of public instruction and in my years of service on county and city school boards, and down to this good day, I have seen young America on the march. In the hands of this precious host, in their enthusiasim, their optimism, their boundless energy, and dauntless courage is the unfolding future of this Nation. They will meet our enemies in the gates. They will build, protect, and defend this Nation. The men and women who teach them are the staff sergeants, the commissioned officers who are training the youth in whose hands is the future of this Nation. They are the seed corn of the Nation. There is nothing too good for them. We must not fail them, nor break faith with them.

Remember that in dealing with the parents, the teachers of these boys and girls, you are dealing with men and women of character and intelligence. Shadow-boxing, shilly-shallying, breaking faith with them will be known from ocean shore to ocean shore.

Let us redeem the promises made to fathers and mothers, the teachers of these boys and girls, and to the boys and girls.

I join with the friends of the public schools of this country in the hope that this Congress will enact into law an adequate Federal-aid-to-education measure.

Truman Seen as Using Hoover for Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Evening Star of March 28, 1950:

THE POLITICAL MILL—TRUMAN SEEN AS USING HOOVER FOR POLITICS—GRAVE CONCERN EXPRESSED OVER CASE OF LABOR BOARD

(By Gould Lincoln)

The attitude of President Truman and his advisers is giving supporters of the report of the Hoover Commission, dealing with the reorganization of the Federal Government, grave concern. Instead of following the recommendations of this bipartisan and nonpartisan commission, Mr. Truman is seeking to use the report as a vehicle to put across political tricks.

A case in point is his proposal to do away with the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and to transfer to the Chairman of the Board the functions of prosecutor. This is a palpable attempt to get by indirection what the President has tried to get from Congress—his own Democratic Congress—without success. That is the repeal or nullification of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

Under that act, Congress sought to separate the prosecuting function from the judicial, leaving the Board to exercise the judicial function as it properly should, and placing the prosecuting function in the hands of the general counsel. What Mr. Truman is now trying to do is to make the Board, and particularly its Chairman, both prosecutor and judge. That is going back to the old days of the Wagner Labor Relations Act—when the Board did the prosecuting; the judging, too. The result was a completely one-sided operation, since the Board was stacked with 100-percent supporters of organized labor.

DENHAM TARGET OF SPITE

The Hoover Commission, of course, never made any such proposal as that now submitted by Mr. Truman. The President has undertaken, however, through the authority vested in him by Congress last year to submit Government reorganization plans to insert this proposal. He has done it because organized labor hates Robert N. Denham, the present general counsel, and the members of the Board itself dislike Mr. Denham almost as much.

Whether Mr. Truman can get away with it is another question. Senator TAFT of Ohio has filed a resolution disapproving this particular reorganization plan—No. 12 in a list of 21 recently submitted by the President. Under the reorganization law, a recommendation by the President can be blocked and prevented by the action of one House of Congress. A House committee has approved the plan to do away with the general counsel—by a party vote. The Senate Committee on Expenditures, headed by Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Democrat, plans hearings on the TAFT resolution to turn down the proposal. Provision is made in the law that reorganization recommendations, which are challenged in either House, must be voted upon. There is no way that a filibuster by administration supporters could delay a vote until enough time has elapsed to make these recommendations effective. Since the Senate has been entirely unwilling to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, the President's recommendation to do away with the general counsel will have a tough time.

MARITIME CHANGE PROPOSED

Mr. Truman stepped beyond the Hoover Commission report, too, when he proposed to abolish the Maritime Commission and set up a Maritime Board in the Commerce Department. What the Hoover Commission recommended was that that business operations of the Maritime Commission—like the charter of ships—be placed in the Commerce Department, but that the Maritime Commission retain its authority over rates, subsidies, and conditions of service.

Nearly all the rest of the President's reorganization recommendations are in line with the Hoover Commission report. However, Mr. Truman has not tackled yet the main money-saving proposals of the Hoover Commission, and there seems little prospect he will, certainly before the elections. These, for example, are the proposals to place the civil functions of the Army engineers under the Interior Department, along with the Reclamation Service, and to have the Agriculture Department take over certain functions relating to land now operated by the Interior Department.

There is a great mass of public opinion back of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, due to a desire for more efficient and more economical Government. It may be defeated, however, by exigencies of partisan politics, aided and abetted by the so-called vested interests, the interests of incumbent job holders.

President Truman's Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I attach hereto a statement issued by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor last month in regard to point 4, which is carried in section 3 of H. R. 7797 now under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The American Federation of Labor strongly urges the adoption of President Truman's point 4 program and reiterates the stand taken in the statement by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor above referred to.

Will you kindly read this letter and the attached statement into the RECORD at the proper time when point 4 is under consideration?

Very truly yours,

WM. GREEN,
President.

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

After giving careful consideration to the report of Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorpe on point 4, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor declares:

1. We reaffirm our support of the guiding lines and policies elaborated in the comprehensive resolution adopted by our sixty-eighth convention held at St. Paul in October 1949 dealing with President Truman's point 4 program.

2. In view of the disaster which has befallen the geat Chinese people through the overrunning of their country by the Russian-directed military forces and fifth column operating under the orders of the Cominform, the executive council underscores the great urgency of speeding up the application of point 4 policies in the non-Communist areas and countries of Asia.

3. In line with our convention declaration, we urge our Government to aid the Republic of India in overcoming its immediate food difficulties, in developing public education and in the improvement of her public health. We also urge American initiative in the World Bank for a loan to speed the development of an agricultural extension service in India. Vigorous and generous application of point 4 in Formosa, where encouraging economic achievements have already been obtained through the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, will not only further improve the economic and social conditions on this very important island of resistance to Communist totalitarianism in China. It will also dramatize to the people of occupied China and to freedom-loving people everywhere that America has not turned its back on the struggle for liberty and national independence in this vast Asiatic country with which our Nation has always had the friendliest relations.

4. We cannot reaffirm too strongly our convention resolution which emphasizes that labor must have adequate representation in the formulation and application of specific plans and policies and that technical aid to underdeveloped areas in Asia and elsewhere should include provisions for the transmission of bona fide trade-union, cooperative, and farmers' know-how which will enable the workers and peasants of Asia to build effective democratic unions and self-help organizations. This will permit the toiling folks of Asia not only to secure their material betterment but also to enhance their appreciation of their dignity as human beings on a basis of equality with all other races and peoples of other continents. American aid to such moral and spiritual enhancement will far outweigh in importance and lasting value the generous dollar aid we have been providing for the conquest of poverty and tyranny and for overcoming the threat of war.

5. The successes attained to date, through the ERP, raising the levels of production in the countries aided, only underline the necessity of preparing now for the time when the Marshall plan as such will end. It is clear that in the interest of developing a sound and balanced economy in the free part of the world, the democratic nations must lose no time in combining the various measures taken under ERP and point 4. There can be no effective integration of the economy of democratic Europe unless its economic life becomes more closely related with that of Africa, the Western Hemisphere, and the democratic countries and areas of Asia. More and more western Europe should be able to find markets for its manufactured products in the underdeveloped countries. Given this common outlet, the various European national economies, which are competitive in many respects, would tend to integrate more easily. In return, these underdeveloped areas could provide western Europe with the raw materials which it needs for its manufacturing industries. By following such a policy, we would be able to eliminate any attempts to expand business relations with Russian-dominated areas and thus to prevent the feeling of appeasement generated by business-as-usual tactics. This business-as-usual attitude might prove catastrophic to the democratic cause in the event of German heavy industry producing for the Chinese market. The present Russian "baby" blockade of Berlin and the Communists' accelerated national unity campaign in Germany are no doubt part of the Kremlin's over-all strategy for wearing out and drawing Germany into Moscow's military-economic orbit. Thereby, Russia hopes to conquer Europe and Asia.

6. The urgency of gradually combining the basic features of ERP and point 4 is made all the more imperative by the fact that the increased productive capacities of Europe and America are operating in a much-reduced trade area. Totalitarian communism has torn out of the world market nearly half of the population and about one-quarter of the area of the entire globe. Because Russia and its satellites in Europe and Asia have militarized their economies and are gearing themselves solely for aggressive warfare, very little trade in the normal and peaceful sense of the word is possible for them.

7. In view of this critical situation, all efforts and energies of the democratic world should be bent toward raising the productive capacities of the free peoples and toward increasing the possibilities for mass consumption by improving their purchasing power and living standards. There is no other way of counteracting the effects of Russia's disruption of the world market. There is no better way of demonstrating the moral and material superiority, and assuring the triumph of the democratic over the totalitarian Communist world than by our creating and expanding these conditions of life and labor which will enable many additional millions of people to attain more liberty, greater material well-being, and spiritual happiness.

Easterners Have a Lot To Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Easterners Have a Lot To Learn," published in a recent issue of the Bedford Times-Mail, of Bedford, Ind

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTERNERS HAVE A LOT TO LEARN

Two things in the past few weeks have roused our anger. We took a West Indies cruise in February. Most of the people were from the eastern seaboard; all of those with whom we talked had been to Europe a few times and were taking their second or third cruise—but not one of those people had ever been west of Harrisburg, Pa.

Finally, we blew up at a couple who lived in Philadelphia, and said, "You ought to be ashamed of yourselves, Europe three times, Caribbean twice, but not a minute for Indiana, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Montana, or Arizona. There are some wonderful things to see out there—and what's more, they are yours, they are American, and they are worth seeing." They didn't talk to us after that.

This was a background for supreme anger at an article in Time magazine this week which listed eight Senators as being the most expendable. In the group was BILL JENNER, of Indiana. All eight had the same fault, according to Time, they were isolationists. They put the interests of their own country ahead of the interests of a lot of countries which are jealous of our prosperity, and want to tear us down to their level.

Senators JENNER and MCCARRAN were attacked for their opposition to the present bill to admit more displaced persons. In private conversation JENNER said, "Here we have 4,500,000 unemployed in the United States. There are 600,000 youngsters coming out of colleges and high schools every year, and most of them won't find jobs this year. Why should we bring in a lot of black marketeers, hoodlums, Communists, and yeggs from Europe? I don't see it." Neither do we.

Time and the folks we met on the cruise are typical of too much thinking from New England through Virginia. They look eastward across the Atlantic, not westward across America.

If the folks from Philadelphia would have listened we would like to have told them something like this:

Get in your car, drive out through Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. Sure, the land is flat and not spectacular, but it is pushing up corn to feed people and animals all over the world. You sense the power of production, the joy of fertility, the thrill of growth. You feel America.

Then drive through northern Wisconsin and Michigan, with their thousands of wooded lakes full of fish, where a man can commune with nature and all the religious ecstasy that goes with the great outdoors.

Stop at Minneapolis, the most beautiful city in the world, and that counts Paris, too. Look at the lakes, feel the civic enthusiasm which has built a great industrial and retail center.

Go to Duluth, stop your car on the bridge just south of the city, survey the landscape, look at the great iron boats opening their mouths to the endless stream of ore cars from Mesabi, and appreciate the strength and greatness of steel, the sinews of America, your country. It's thrilling.

Drive through North and South Dakota, look at the flat country growing wheat that has put white bread on every table in America, and still had enough left over for any part of the world that will work hard enough to produce something to exchange for white bread.

Go to Montana; it's still sort of a frontier, where the men wear cowboy boots, use silver dollars, and play pinguinny in cigar store windows. Have breakfast on the balcony of Many Glaciers Hotel, in Glacier National Park. Nowhere, not even in Switzerland, is there a more majestic view, water, mountains, sunshine—America.

Drive along the Columbia River highway. For breath-taking vistas it has no equal.

Stop at Salt Lake City. Think about its history. A century ago, when Brigham Young came into the valley, there was one lone tree. He said, "Water will flow in the streets of the city we will build for our God." Today Salt Lake City is the cleanest of all American cities. Water flows down Temple Street.

Go to Los Angeles. Sure, it's gaudy, flamboyant, and overpriced—but only 50 years ago it was a desert. Today it is a wonderful collection of homes, boulevards, and industry—a tribute to American adventure,

willingness to take risks, to build, to overcome obstacles.

We could go on like this indefinitely. It all adds up to one thing—there is a lot to see in America, it's the most wonderful country in the world. It doesn't owe a thing to the Old World.

Our forefathers who came here were not the rich and well-born. They were the poor and downtrodden. The rich stayed home and got poor. The poor came to America and got rich.

Instead of being a term of scorn, "isolationist" is an expression of honor, of patriotism, of belief in your own land—of standing on Manhattan Island, looking west, not gazing with servile sentimentality toward a culture which has long since ceased to exist.

There is one bright spot, however. Such biased, slanted reporting as Time is putting out brought Newsweek into the field, and now Newsweek is threatening the circulation and advertising leadership of its older competitor. Isolationists like truth—and they like America. Count us in.

Fair Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler from the Washington Times-Herald of March 30, 1950:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The unemployment figures always must be false where there is pay to be had for nothing in the guise of insurance or relief, but there is no doubt that the number of legitimately unemployed and needy workers is again formidable and growing.

Actually, there never has been an hour of substantial, valid recovery from the miscalled Hoover depression. Instead, for one long period, there was pump priming and made work, leaf raking and shovel leaning, which absorbed the more urgent clients and put a little money in their pockets.

It put a lot of money into the pockets of contractors and other deserving Democrats, too. This cost billions at a time when a billion still had a little prestige in the popular imagination, but those billions were forgotten as other expedients were tried in quick succession, all of them negative, all resulting in no substantial gain. We lost ground steadily.

When the war became inevitable in Europe, we were in the dumps again. Although the capitalists or tories are fiercely accused of promoting wars to profit in the agony of the working class, it is a prominent fact that the strongest opposition to war and to the economic underwriting of the war came from the capitalists of the United States, not the New Dealers.

The New Deal had turned out to be a misdeal. It was unworkable. It could produce nothing but debt and deficit, and there we were again, after all that squandering.

Roosevelt's motives were whatever they were. Did he prepare for war because he honestly believed Hitler and the Japs were coming after us? Did he harass the Japs so that the Communists whom he favored in so many ways could capture the Orient? Or did he seize this opportunity and provoke the Nazis and the Japs to create a war boom and put back to work the millions who were idle again?

The haste, the urgency, the clamorous propaganda for conversion and tooling up come back dimly out of memory. The New Deal had created unions and driven millions of citizens into them, and this was called a labor movement.

But it had not revived private industry. The rich magnates of the unions, grateful for the concession granted them freely to exploit these millions and to exploit the danger to democracy, spent money lavishly to whoop up the anger and fear of the people.

Remember the political action committee? The teamsters' dinner? Unemployment was big again in 1941, but as the war effort became not quite total but certainly predominant and overtime and mock work sent wages to inflationary heights, the debt went up and up until thought of the future and the reckoning was put out of mind except by a few practical individuals who seemed morose amid the excitement. Roosevelt haters, no doubt. Pro-Nazis, no doubt. Red baiters, spreading disunity.

After the fighting American industry continued to grind. Now it is producing for the relief and rehabilitation of Europe at American expense and without the slightest thought for the future.

American industry, the American economy, American labor became dependent on the necessity of the European countries, including even the late enemy.

Our biggest business was the manufacture of stuff—all kinds of stuff—to replace the stuff that had been destroyed and feed Europeans who couldn't feed themselves. They couldn't pay for it, so we loaned them the money.

How long had we been doing that, off and on, in various ways under successive plans? Ever since the twenties. God help America, if the Europeans ever got clothes on them, shoes on them, and wheels under them.

God help America because these charity cases were our only important customers. As for our own postponed wants caused by war shortages, they were intentionally postponed still further by strikes causing shortages of steel and hard products or we would have caught up with ourselves sooner.

Even with the strikes and all, we finally did get caught up, and now we are caught up in Europe. Our best customer—the customer on the cuff—has filled his needs and used up most of his credit, and so Americans, by the million, are out of work again.

Russia is not the gallant ally—the mighty democracy that we thought she was. Russia deceived us. The pity of it. So tool up again. Total diplomacy. (Dean Acheson.) War economy. (Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut.)

Hold your hats.

Arming of the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has been tremendous concern about the situation in the Middle East, and it has not been limited to Americans of the Jewish faith.

On Tuesday last, accompanied by a group of 34 Members of Congress, it was my privilege to call upon the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, with regard to the problem of the arming of the Arab states by Great Britain. Our delegation lodged a formal protest with the Secretary and urged that the United States, through the United Nations, prevail upon Great Britain to put a stop to the sale of such arms in the interest of peace.

I consider this issue so vitally important insofar as world peace is concerned that I am herewith presenting the State Department's account of our meeting for the information of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

ACCOUNT OF CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTAL OFFICIALS AND A GROUP OF CONGRESSMEN ON THE SUBJECT OF THE NEAR EAST ARMAMENTS SITUATION, ON MARCH 28, 1950

Secretary Acheson received a congressional group, headed by Congressman TAURIELLO, of New York, who as spokesman of the group began by saying that many Members of Congress had received letters and visits from their constituents in which the latter expressed their concern over the sale of arms by Great Britain to the Arab states, particularly Egypt. The Congressman added that he and his congressional friends who were present in the office were deeply interested in Israel and believed that anything that happens in Israel affects the United States. They feared that there might be a recurrence of the Palestine war. They also thought that Israel should not have to participate in an arms race at a time when it was so essential for Israel to devote all its energies to the tasks of peace, settlement of immigrants, and reconstruction. Representative TAURIELLO then asked if the Secretary could explain the Department's policy on the Near East armaments situation.

After additional comments by other Congressmen present, the Secretary began by stating that in the first place there was a great deal of misinformation on both sides in this question. The Department had seen reports emanating from Israeli and from Arab sources which gave exaggerated and inaccurate accounts of the armaments allegedly already possessed by, or on their way to, one side or the other.

The Secretary then briefly outlined our policy on the export of arms to the Near East, referring to the fact that as long as the UN Palestine arms embargo was in effect no arms were permitted to leave this country for the Near East, and that the British had adopted a similar course. After the arms embargo was lifted, the United States adopted the policy of permitting the export to the Near East of only such arms as we considered necessary for the preservation of internal security of the states concerned and for legitimate self-defense needs.

From the viewpoint of this Government, the Secretary said, there were two problems involved in the question: One was the relationship between the Arabs and the Israelis and the other was the defense of the eastern Mediterranean. The latter was of the greatest importance to the United States and the United Kingdom. The British, from their experience in two wars, well knew the strategic importance of the eastern Mediterranean, an area which contains the vital oil supplies of Iran and Iraq and Saudi Arabia, as well as the important and strategic Suez Canal, the route to India and the Far East. These elements were also of tremendous importance to the United States, and the United States as well as the United Kingdom considered it essential that the states in the area have some kind of defensive forces to enable them to assist in the protection of the area as much as possible. In these circumstances the United Kingdom had a military program of assisting the near-eastern states, particu-

larly Egypt, to strengthen their defensive positions. The amount of arms involved did not appear excessive. The Secretary emphasized that there was close cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom on this matter.

With regard to Arab-Israeli relations, the Secretary stated that the United States Government was following this matter very closely, and that the gist of information received from reliable sources was that the trend in the Near East continues to be away from war and toward peace. The Department had received categoric assurances from high Egyptian authorities to the effect that Egypt has no aggressive intentions toward Israel. At least one prominent Israel official had told the Secretary that he was not concerned by the military situation, but much more preoccupied with the present settlement and reconstruction problems facing Israel.

With regard to arms shipments from this country to the Near East, the Secretary said that since the lifting of the embargo we had permitted the shipment to the Arab states and to Israel of a certain amount of military equipment destined for defensive uses. The Israel Government had recently made application for permission to acquire a quantity of additional military equipment from commercial sources. The Department was discussing this request with the Defense Department, upon which the Department must necessarily rely for technical advice as regards the question of whether a particular request is justifiable within the legitimate defense needs of the state concerned.

The Israeli Embassy had also made a request for arms which were only available from the United States Government stocks. Here again there were important factors involved, the principal of which were our commitments to supply arms to other nations under mutual defense assistance legislation. The amount of surplus military equipment in Government stocks was limited, and as a matter of fact inadequate for complete fulfillment of these prior commitments. Here again the Department relied upon the opinions and findings of the Defense Department.

At this point, Mr. Rusk emphasized that what happened to north Africa and the Near East was of overriding importance in terms of the United States strategic position. The maintenance of communications with the Far East was particularly important. Moreover, the attitude of the peoples in the Near East toward the United States was a prime factor. We considered it very important that we be able to count on the friendship of these peoples in any future emergency in that area.

In response to a question concerning British policy toward the Palestine area, the Secretary said that the Department was of the opinion that the United Kingdom sincerely desired to see peace and stability reestablished in the Near East. It was to the advantage of the United States and the United Kingdom objectives in general in the Near East to assure that peace was maintained among the states in that area.

In response to another question, the Secretary said that he planned to discuss the Near East armaments situation with Mr. Bevin when they meet in early May. In order to illustrate the close watch which the United States is keeping on the situation, the Secretary added that he had talked to Mr. Bevin about Near East armaments four times in the last year.

A question was asked concerning whether it was possible that the United Kingdom was shipping to Egypt arms supplied by this Government to the United Kingdom. The Secretary responded that he was confident that this was not true, as the items being furnished Egypt were not of the kind being furnished the United Kingdom under MDAP. He added that Egypt was paying the British for the arms furnished.

In response to a question as to whether any of the funds being sent from the United States to Great Britain under the ECA program were being used to facilitate the manufacture in England of arms for the Arab states, the Secretary said that his impression was to the contrary.

The Secretary received us most graciously and afforded us every courtesy. From our conference, it could be seen that he is well-informed on the problems of the Middle East.

However, personally, I was not satisfied with the Secretary's explanation of this grave problem. The whole gist of his explanation was to minimize and gloss over the fact that arms have been and are still being sold by Great Britain to Egypt and the other Arab states. It is no secret that British airplanes, tanks, and rifles are flowing into Arab states in great numbers. Arab newspapers carry stories of the importation of these implements of war and of the ultimate sinister use for which they are intended.

The Secretary's explanation that these arms are being sold to Egypt and the other Arab states for the purpose of protection would seem to be misleading because if these states are fortifying themselves from any Communist attack then, certainly, Israel, which is the outpost of democracy in that part of the world, should be included in the defense plans against any aggressor and should be afforded the same opportunity.

It is a well-known fact that the Arab states are still festering under their recent military defeat and are only waiting for another chance to rise again against the Israeli Government. Everyone knows that there remains much ill feeling between the Arab states and Israel. This bitterness finds expression almost daily in the Arab newspapers and radio broadcasts.

A renewal of this conflict would be a tragic development which must not be allowed to take place. The very fact that the Arab states can obtain implements of war in great quantities makes the situation a tense and dangerous one which is very apt to start another conflagration in that part of the world.

The United States has been spending millions of dollars in its earnest and sincere desire to maintain peace. How can we in conscience condone this intolerable situation which might become the tinderbox of another war, causing the loss of thousands of lives and the destruction of property, and which might well spread throughout the globe?

Israel wants peace and needs peace. Whatever funds are at her disposal should be spent in peaceful economic development and reconstruction.

As the foremost bulwark of democratic principles, the United States owes it to the infant Republic of Israel to devote all its energies in helping this tiny country take her rightful place in the family of nations whose objective is permanent and lasting peace.

We must remain, consistently and unfalteringly, a guiding beacon to all small democracies, especially while some of them are now shrouded in darkness by totalitarian aggressors who seek to destroy our democratic beliefs and our very way of life.

Therefore, in the interests of democracy and justice, I again respectfully urge Secretary Acheson to keep this matter under his close personal supervision and I reiterate my earnest desire to have the United States immediately lodge a protest through the United Nations demanding that the sale of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain be stopped.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I herewith include a list of the Members of Congress who accompanied me to the State Department and I also include a letter which I have just received from Mr. Elihu D. Stone of the American Zionist Council dealing with this vital problem.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO MET WITH SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON ON MARCH 28, 1950, TO PROTEST THE ARMING OF ARAB STATES BY GREAT BRITAIN

ADDONIZIO, HUGH J., New Jersey.
BARRETT, WILLIAM A., Pennsylvania.
BIEMILLER, ANDREW J., Wisconsin.
BYRN, EDWARD, Ohio.
CHESNEY, CHESTER A., Illinois.
CHUDOFF, EARL, Pennsylvania.
CLEMENTE, L. CARY, New York.
DAVENPORT, HARRY J., Pennsylvania.
DELANEY, JAMES J., New York.
DOLLINGER, ISIDORE, New York.
EBERHARTER, HERMAN P., Pennsylvania.
GRANAHAN, WILLIAM T., Pennsylvania.
GREEN, WILLIAM J., JR., Pennsylvania.
HEFFERNAN, JAMES J., New York.
HELLER, LOUIS B., New York.
JAVITS, JACOB K., New York.
KARST, RAYMOND W., Missouri.
KELLEY, AUGUSTINE B., Pennsylvania.
KELLY, MRS. EDNA F., New York.
KLEIN, ARTHUR G., New York.
LATHAM, HENRY, New York.
MCSWEENEY, JOHN, Ohio.
MCGRATH, CHRISTOPHER C., New York.
MULTER, ABRAHAM J., New York.
O'HARA, BARRATT, Illinois
O'NEILL, HARRY P., Pennsylvania.
QUINN, T. VINCENT, New York.
RODINO, PETER W., JR., New Jersey.
ROONEY, JOHN J., New York.
ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN D., JR., New York.
TAURIELLO, ANTHONY F., New York.
YATES, SIDNEY R., Illinois.

The following Members were unable to attend because of previous engagements but went on record as supporting the action taken by the above Congressmen:

BYRNE, WILLIAM T., New York.
CELLER, EMANUEL, New York.
DAVIES, JOHN C., New York.
GARMATZ, EDWARD A., Maryland.
KEOGH, EUGENE J., New York.
MCCORMACK, JOHN, Massachusetts.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We deeply appreciate your thoughtful cooperation in joining the delegation which called on the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, relative to the rearmament of the Arab states in the Near East, on March 28 current.

As spokesman of the delegation you have rendered a noble service in presenting the problem in its true light.

It is difficult to reconcile the optimism of Mr. Acheson as to the outlook for peace with the existing reality. A special dispatch to the New York Times of March 29, from Cairo, dated March 28, describes the pressure which the Arab League is bringing to bear on King Abdullah in order to prevent a peace agreement between Jordan and Israel. The former was even threatened with sanctions, should peace negotiations be resumed between Jordan and Israel. The aforesaid dispatch sums it up as follows:

"In any case, the chief result of the Arab League crisis of the past 4 days has been to reduce sharply the likelihood that some type of separate peace agreement will be concluded between Jordan and Israel and that other Arab states may then follow suit."

Moreover, the granting of a seat at the current sessions of the Arab League Conference in Cairo to the representative of the former Mufti of Jerusalem is hardly an indication of any improved attitude on the part of the Arab leaders toward Israel, as reported in the said dispatch to the New York Times. It must be remembered that the Mufti is a former collaborator of Hitler in Berlin during the war and that he is one of the intellectual authors of the extermination of European Jewry by the Nazis. Thus, for the first time, the notorious Mufti obtained an official voice in the Arab League. It is an evil omen, even though Mr. Acheson apparently disregards it.

The kind of arms, including jets, Sherman tanks, etc., which England is delivering to the Arabs may not be a direct part of the arms supplied by the United States to Great Britain. Nevertheless, in effect, the arms shipments to England from the United States constitutes a replacement, and, therefore, indirectly the American taxpayer is footing the bill. Thus, it appears clear that while the United States is supplying certain amounts of arms to both the Arabs and Israel, Great Britain is the additional source of supply of arms exclusively to the Arab states, giving them a preponderance of power. Hence, there is the danger that the Arab threats may be translated into violent action against Israel.

Who is there to guarantee that a "second round" will not take place? It is gambling with the lives of the Jews in Israel, who have already suffered so much.

The tragic experience of the last few decades clearly demonstrates that our statesmen, both American and British, were capable of making errors—errors for which mankind paid a terrible price in blood, and the Jews in particular were the most cruel victims.

Painful events did come to pass in our own day and even very recently—events which our statesmen never anticipated.

Who, therefore, is there in the Department of State today who can speak with an absolute finality and with infinite wisdom as to what might come to pass tomorrow?

It is obvious, therefore, that Israel's fears and eagerness to be militarily prepared in case of a possible attack by the combined Arab states is human, reasonable, and justifiable.

We are grateful to you for your friendship, and we hope that you will continue your efforts in the direction of peace in the Near East.

The need of the hour is not an armament race between Israel and the Arab states, which is now in progress, but rather a disarmament race, so that Israel and its Arab neighbors may jointly enjoy the fruits of peace and jointly maintain the security of the Near East against any attack by a third power.

Your understanding and sympathetic cooperation will always be recalled with deep gratitude.

Respectfully,

ELIHU D. STONE.

Unemployment and Imports, One Caused by the Other

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have, on previous occasions, addressed myself to the ill effects of imports upon our national economy. Every day the disaster of this course is becoming more evident. We have an unemployed force of almost 5,000,000 now with the prospect of more at the end of the current school year in June. In the face of these figures, our State Department is contemplating further cuts in tariffs, thus enabling goods made by cheap labor to unfairly compete in the American market.

We all realize that the American dollar is today the most sought after commodity by the nations of Europe. ECA and other foreign relief programs aimed at expanding European recovery are aiding these nations to compete with our own citizens for our purchasing dollar. More consumer goods are being withheld from their own people by these countries so that production of goods can be exported and sold for dollars.

Ample evidence of the damage being done to industry is the continuing unemployment in a period of relative prosperity in this Nation.

Articles which illustrate this point follow:

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of March 9, 1950]

TARIFF REDUCTIONS NO REMEDY FOR DOLLAR GAP

(By Richard H. Anthony, secretary, The American Tariff League)

(Asserting the tariff is not a tool with which international trade can be tinkered into balance, Mr. Anthony contends there are important American industries still dependent for survival on tariff protection. Cites case of Waltham Watch Co., and denounces proposal of ECA to lower tariffs so that Europe's exports to United States can be increased $2,000,000,000. Denies present United States tariff has any importance in current over-all international trade picture. An address by Mr. Anthony at a meeting of the export committee, American Paper and Pulp Association, New York City, February 22, 1950.)

The appearance of a Tariff League representative at a meeting of exporters might seem to be as perilous as the fly's acceptance of the spider's invitation to visit her parlor, but I assure you I anticipate no bodily harm. Indeed, I feel a community of interest for the league subscribes to the truth in that old cliche, "Trade is a two-way street." All we ask is that you recognize that two-way traffic requires a certain amount of regulation; that full freedom of traffic to wander where it will, although desirable perhaps as an ideal, is as unrealistic in practice as is free trade.

Is the exporter actually facing any problems fundamentally different from the salesman in the domestic market? Your domestic sales potential is not the sum total of demand for your and your competitors' products, but rather the demand of that segment of our population which is able to pay for them in dollars. By the same token, foreign demand for United States goods, unaccompanied by ability to pay in dollars, should not be taken as a true measure of sales potential abroad, unless you are in favor of continuing the present system of selling to foreign customers and sending the bill to the United States taxpayer. The fly in that ointment is that you are also a taxpayer and so are paying your customers' bills, at least in part.

When the exporter is thwarted from selling abroad all he thinks he should, he may become aggrieved and in his grief he is likely to forget that he has no inherent right to demand free access to any but the domestic market. Foreign sales are frosting on the cake. It's nice to have the frosting, but it is more important to have the cake.

However, there are some people, including Government officials, who will tell you that you can have the cake and the frosting and eat it all, too, by getting the United States to increase imports from foreign countries and so provide more dollars abroad with which to pay for your foreign sales.

Now, we in the league have no quarrel with that advice up to the point where they tell you that you should injure or even liquidate some domestic producers in order to buy more competitive products from abroad.

Our tariffs used to be set and revised in accordance with the needs of our domestic economy. Now they are talked of as expendable or, to be more exact, the American industries that depend on tariffs are now being treated as expendable, in the effort to foster imports and so balance our foreign trade at current abnormal export levels. Some of these industries are being marked for sacrifice and when they go, men lose jobs, investors lose money, suppliers lose customers, and the country loses some of the elements in a diversified economy.

CASE OF WALTHAM WATCH CO.

Can we stand the loss of the Waltham Watch Co.? We have only two old-line watch manufacturers left. Who benefits from liquidating Waltham? Switzerland perhaps? That admirable, democratic country is worth having as a friend, but is she making reciprocal sacrifices on the alter of friendship?

Here is what Prof. Friedrich A. Lutz, of Princeton, said about the Swiss at the last annual meeting of the Academy of Political Science: "Switzerland has no shortage of dollars, and yet she adheres to a system of bilateral trade agreements, chiefly because she aims at preserving a certain structure of her exports by making the partner countries to these agreements import watches and other Swiss export goods and allow their citizens to travel in Switzerland. She has even gone so far as to make balances of Swiss francs accumulated by Argentina and the bizone of Germany inconvertible into dollars, so as to force these countries to use the balances for purchases or travel in Switzerland."

Perhaps Switzerland must resort to these measures to protect her economy and her democratic processes. Whatever the answer, these Swiss measures are restrictive and discriminatory, whereas our low-average tariffs are the mildest kind of trade regulation.

Let's get down to fundamentals. We need certain raw materials and we like certain finished products that come from abroad. In order to induce the foreigner to send them to us we must send him what we have that he needs or wants. You can disguise and complicate the problem ad infinitum by the introduction of currency, exchange, etc., but the basic fact is that our foreign trade starts with a deficiency on our part which must be paid for by transfer of a portion of our production. The latter-day idea that the amount of goods we can or want to ship abroad should be the measure of what we

take in, even though some domestic producers go bankrupt in the process of balancing income and outgo, puts the cart half a mile ahead of the horse.

ECA PROPOSALS

The latest agency to urge that we should artificially foster our imports at the expense of certain of our domestic producers is the Economic Cooperation Administration.

The ECA had two jobs to do: (1) Geographical containment of communism, and (2) fostering economic recovery of foreign nations. In Europe both goals have been accomplished. Communism has made no further encroachment to the west; and the European ECA countries, except Germany, have either surpassed or achieved approximately their prewar production and export positions quantitatively.

Now ECA says, in effect: We are getting ready to pull out of Europe and when we go we want the incoming and outgoing elements in the United States-European trade to balance, and furthermore to balance at the current United States export level. Translated into figures, ECA's suggestion means that Europe must expand its exports to the United States by $3,500,000,000, an increase of 300 percent or more. Clearly, Europe is in no position to meet this extraordinary demand, no matter what inducements the United States may offer. Yet, ECA publishes a list of United States commodities on which there are individual tariffs of 25 percent or greater and says, in effect: Slash those and help close the gap.

We say it misleads the American public and lays the ground work for international ill-will to offer any such illusory hope that further slashing of our tariffs, which, at an average of 13 percent, are the lowest in our history, or even eliminating them entirely, will have any appreciable effect on closing the trade gap. Cutting tariffs in such an indiscriminate fashion can ruin individual companies or even whole industries in the United States, but it will not close the foreign-trade gap at the current export level.

The tariff has no measurable importance in the over-all trade picture anyway. Our imports rise and fall with our national income, despite the level of tariff at any particular time. Over the long years our imports have shown a general upward trend that echoes our increase in population.

It so happens that the amount necessary to balance the current ERP dollar deficit is roughly the same as the value of the products of the entire pulp and paper industry in the United States for 1947, i. e., $3,700,000,000. I assume you would not be willing to sacrifice your industry, employing 200,000 wage earners, in order to bring in imported commodities sufficient in value to equal that figure.

If you have any doubts about the misleading nature of the ECA recommendations, let me suggest that you read what the experts say and apply every statistical test of which you know. I have done both and the answer keeps staring me in the face—slashing tariffs is of no avail in tackling the trade-gap problem.

Here is what Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard, told that same Academy of Political Science meeting: "Despite the large reduction in tariffs here and increased restriction abroad, which should have facilitated European exports and depressed their imports, despite the widespread use of controls abroad to raise exports and reduce imports, despite the much larger rise in money wages here—despite all of these, the United States has been flooded with gold and the world is short of dollars."

Now, just a few figures to document the league's conclusions. The data are for 1948, but preliminary 1949 reports indicate no substantial change in the size of our foreign-trade gap. According to ECA's own figures, we imported from ERP countries in 1948, $2,400,000,000 of goods and services, of which $1,200,000,000 consisted of merchandise. We exported to those countries $5,900,000,000 of goods and services, resulting in an export-over-import imbalance of $3,500,000,000. That $3,500,000,000 is the gap. When people talk of cutting United States tariffs in order to bridge that gap they are suggesting that we expand $1,200,000,000 of merchandise imports from Europe to $4,700,000,000, a 300-percent increase. If they expect services, such as tourist expenditures abroad, to increase also, they may shave that merchandise figure, but still it is going to be close to 300 percent. Professor Harris says that should devaluation reduce dollar prices of western European products by a fifth, the required increase would be 400 percent. According to a year end International Monetary Fund report, such dollar prices are nearing that margin of decline.

I won't bore you further with figures provided you will take on faith that to ask a 300–400-percent increase in production for export in Europe is a fantastic demand, particularly when ECA is asking Europe to integrate its economy and step up its internal trade as well.

DANGER OF TARIFF TINKERING

Actually there is surprisingly little dispute over the figures or the facts. Practically everyone who has studied the trade-gap problem realizes that tinkering with the currently low-average United States tariff is not going to solve it, but what puzzles us in the League is why, with this general acceptance of the facts, there is the illogical demand to go ahead and cut tariffs across the board, anyway. We suspect that those who make this proposal are motivated not so much by a desire to close the trade gap as by a desire just to slash tariffs.

The favorite argument for tariff-cutting as a desirable operation per se, is that it will foster the importation of goods from low-labor-cost foreign countries and thus save money for the American consumer. Let me give you the latest illustration of how wrong this argument can be.

We have had a dwindling wool-raising industry in the United States for some years. During the war it was essential, if not vital, because hauling wool from Australia through submarine-infested waters was uncertain and dangerous. Since the war the argument that the wool tariff was adding pennies to the price of your winter suit came to the fore, and, despite the pleas of the American wool growers, the tariff on raw wool was cut at Geneva in 1947 for the benefit of Australia. Since then our western herds have dwindled still more and Australia has virtually cornered the market. Last month at the wool auction in Sydney, private buyers from the United States and Great Britain found themselves bidding against state trading company representatives from a number of countries for the wool clip, with the result that the price of wool has gone soaring and you may have to pay a little more for your next suit as a result, and despite the lower tariff.

While we are considering object lessons, I also would like to say that coffee, on which there is no wicked tariff whatsoever, is fast becoming a luxury in many households, indicating that free trade is not exactly a solution to the problem of the high cost of living.

The tariff still has a part to play in our economy. It is, by universal admission, the mildest and fairest regulatory measure in international trade and we need it to preserve competitive conditions in our domestic market as between foreign producers and certain of our industries with a high labor element in their total production costs. It is as unrealistic to demand the elimination of tariffs because most of those industries are not now being injured, as it is to demand the elimination of the fire department because the city's fire record has improved. There is nothing in the present state of affairs that gives us any confidence that the current abnormal level of domestic demand and production will continue in its present pattern. Indeed the pattern is beginning to change, and as it tends toward the normal situation, injuries due to unwise tariff slashing will come forcibly to public attention. Already a number of danger flags are fluttering.

Under a flexible tariff system we could vary our rates to match changing situations, but we have no flexible system at present. Our tariffs are being continuously cut by international agreement. Any move toward subsequent upward readjustment of a rate, however just, creates an international incident and so is avoided by our Government, although foreign governments can take such unilateral actions with impunity. We have also seen that the philosophy of downward revision only of tariffs has so permeated our Government departments and commissions that the trade agreements escape clause, which was supposed to safeguard our domestic producers from injurious duty cuts, has not once been invoked nor has any of the many showings of injury even been followed by recommendation that the clause be invoked. Some have not even been thoroughly investigated.

The tariff is important to certain domestic industries. It is not a tool with which you can tinker our international trade account into balance. I urge you to let the tariff perform the function for which it is best fitted, and to tackle the trade-gap problem with tools better adapted to the purpose.

SLAVE LABOR COMPETITION

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of March 29, 1950]

The Danbury News-Times has called attention to the fact that American imports of hats and hat bodies from Czechoslovakia increased 4,000 percent during 1949, while those from Italy rose 300 percent in dollar value. The figures were supplied by the Census Bureau.

Lowered tariffs on these products opened to foreign competition the world's richest market—the United States of America. In the case of the watch industry, similar tariff policies have been devastating even to such long established concerns as the Waltham Watch Co., where American craftsmen were thrown out of work by the hundreds and left to shift for themselves.

There are many strong arguments for a reasonable reciprocal trade program but when that program strikes at the very livelihood of American workmen it is only to be expected that there will be heightening demands for its reappraisal in the light of realistic comparisons of the living standards of the workers in the competing countries.

Generously giving foreign countries which are friendly to us a fair whack at the rich American market is a thing altogether different from giving them opportunity to put American industry out of business in the American market and American workmen out of jobs by lowering tariffs too much. One may well question the extent to which any serious effort is made to strike a fair balance that will give domestic manufacturers and their employees at least an even break.

But in the case of Czechoslovakia, taken over by the stooges of Moscow in a coup that replaced democracy by despotism, an altogether different factor enters the picture. The laborer in that country is not free. He works where his Red masters tell him to work and the government determines how long

he shall work and how much he shall be paid and how much his earnings shall buy. To put it plainly and simply, he is a slave laborer. Reciprocal trade policy which operates, at the cost of American livelihood, to enable Communist puppet regimes to consolidate their usurpations cannot be defended by any standard of fair play whatever. It is rather silly of our Government to tell Danbury's skilled hatters to go find other jobs because our high-policy makers in Washington persist in ignoring the fact that the Czechoslovakia with which we entered into a trade agreement was an altogether different Czechoslovakia from that Red puppet police state which today is using slave labor in a state owned and operated hat industry to do American workers out of their jobs.

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register, March 27, 1950]

UNITED ACTION NEEDED

United action on the part of Connecticut's Senators and congressmen is vitally necessary to protect Connecticut's hat industry, which is threatened by a startling rise in imports of hats and hat bodies from Czechoslovakian and Italian factories, under reciprocal trade agreements.

Imports from Czechoslovakia, where the hats are manufactured in State-owned, red-controlled factories, with the profits presumably going to the red regime, increased 40 times in dollar value during 1946 to 1949. Similar imports from Italy increased 300 percent in dollar value during the same period. And every hat imported here means that there will be less work for employes of the hat factories in Danbury, Norwalk, and other hatting centers.

There is pressure in some government circles for further reductions in tariff rates on imports of hats and hat bodies, which, if granted, would cause further harm to the Connecticut industry.

The Federal Tariff Commission has promised the domestic hat industry to investigate the situation, but The Danbury News-Times reports that the attitude of some administration spokesmen is, in effect: "Let American hatters learn another trade."

That seems to be a strange attitude for persons who are paid to look after the best interests of the American people. Connecticut's congressional delegation certainly should waste no time in making certain that the jobs of their constituents are given full protection.

Spring's Call to Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to a very splendidly written article concerning our great State of Kansas. It is especially well written by one of the leading editors of Kansas, Mr. Rolla A. Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times, El Dorado, Kans. It portrays a very splendid description of springtime in Kansas. I commend your reading it.

SPRING'S CALL TO KANSAS

Today marks the birth of spring—even though madcap March shows some unawareness of the fact—and all over Kansas land a surging stir is manifest. For this is the season of sowing, of awakening, and of renewed effort for sterling accomplishment here under the sign of the sunflower.

Kansas is not yet 90 years old, calculated by the date of her formal admission into the sisterhood of the States, yet has contrived to etch manifold achievements upon the consciousness of the Nation. She lies at that Nation's heart, her outline of the parallelogram sweeping upward and westerly from the valleys of the Missouri and the Kaw to the foothills of the Rockies.

Within her borders and from the wealth and variety of her soil a sturdy and self-reliant civilization has developed. Kansas has been endowed with a plentitude of what have aptly been called "plus factors," and these factors illumine the way as another vernal period dawns. Hearken to a partial list of them as buds burgeon on the branches of the cottonwood, the State tree, and while the meadow lark—the State's bird—begins to entertain first impulses toward her annual nesting.

Kansas long has been supreme as a grower of wheat. In other words, she produces sufficient of this grain to yield 50 loaves of bread a year for every American citizen. From her good earth spring two score agricultural products; she raises more cattle than 43 other States, and stands fourth in meat packing. No State mills as great a volume of wheat as she, while her bluestem pastures provide some of the finest grazing lands in the world. The big beef steer and his little red sister comprise her true animal aristocracy, and these specimens of royalty stand knee-deep in grass laced with the greatest variety of wild-flower life to be found anywhere in the Republic. The farm and orchard domain of Kansas covers the magnitude of 52,000,000 acres, and she excels in such widely separated particulars as growing 90 percent of all apple seedlings in the United States and having this country's largest market for broomcorn.

To this profuse agricultural array Kansas has welded a vigorous industrial empire from native resources—thereby bolstering her economy and assuring its long-time future. Thirty-one main types of products appear in her mineral field. The serried ranks of her oil derricks stretch away to the horizon in nearly two-thirds of her counties—and the State ranks fifth in production among the petroleum titans of the country. At Hugoton, she has the largest reserve of natural sweet gas in the world. Kansas stands third in zinc and sixth in lead output, and nearly two million tons of coal roll out annually from her mines. Cement plants feed plentifully from her lime deposits, millions of tons of building stone and ballast pour from her quarries and she has enough salt to savor the Nation's diet for half a million years. Kansas ranks second in the Nation in highway mileage and fifth in miles of railroads. a huge stream of electric power flows from her 27 privately owned and 71 municipal plants. She is a leading builder of aircraft, numbers more flying farmers than any other State, and provides more days suitable for flying than any other section of the country.

The most encouraging part of all this accounting is that Kansas keeps right on growing. While the percentage of increase of manufacturing workers in the United States during the period 1939–48 went up 53 percent, the Kansas portion rose 92 percent. When retail sales in the country gained 211 percent during those years, Kansas hiked its total 307 percent. Again, as the national value of minerals produced in those years showed an upthrust of 56 percent, the Kansas gain zoomed to 86 percent. Likewise, Kansas per capita income increased 237 percent, against the national 162 percent; and Kansas bank deposits swelled 312 percent against 151 percent.

All these attainments did not just happen, but came about both because of the richness of Kansas environment and the indomitable character of the State's people—many with pioneer background. Men and women are still living in Kansas today who saw the prairie broken—and who played important roles thereafter in the drama enacted upon its acres. They clearly perceived the challenge that was first laid down—and met it with courage and good will. Their course has been one of toil and perseverance—but they have seen it pay off with rich reward.

And now another spring smiles. All over Kansas the zestful urge that has animated her true-hearted sons and daughters all the way sends forth its tremors anew. Kansas' achievement has been vast but much remains to be wrought. So the present stir of planting and dressing and garnishing moves with mighty purpose. In this year of the half century, Kansas has reached a milestone which signifies no goal attained, but which serves only as a marker ordaining redoubled energies. Her eager spirit—kindred with her sunshine and prairie grass, her sheltered valleys, and rolling high plains—shuts out complacency and self-content, because she "has no ruins grey that men revere; her time is now—her heritage is here."

That Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

THAT AMERASIA CASE

Senator MCCARTHY, in his inconclusive speech yesterday before the Senate, touched on a matter which, in our opinion, could be mined for real gold—if it were tackled by an exhaustive pick-and-shovel investigation.

We refer to the Amerasia stolen documents case of 1945.

It is doubtful that there is any other case in recent American history whose mishandling has had such a decisive and cumulative effect on the trend of United States policy in Asia and subsequent world developments.

The case broke while our war with Japan was still going on. A large number of important military secrets had been purloined from the State Department, Navy, and Office of Strategic Services. More documents—and more important—than all those involved in the Hiss-Chambers case. Six persons were arrested. By some abacadabra, never fully explained, the case was taken out of the hands of one grand jury and turned over to another. The latter grand jury indicted only three of the arrested six.

One was permitted to plead guilty and assessed a small fine. Another pleaded nolo contendere and paid a still smaller fine. The charge against the third was dismissed.

There was never any public trial.

We have often wondered what would have happened had there been a public trial with all the evidence spread out.

Remember, this happened a year before General Marshall was sent to China with a directive to force the Chinese Nationalists to take the Communists into their government. It happened before General Marshall arbitrarily cut off all United States arms to Nationalist China. Before the Russians delivered the Japanese Kwantung army's great store of munitions to the Chinese Communists.

Of course, we can only guess at what might have happened had there been a public trial. But our guess is that the pro-Communists in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department probably would have been fired from the State Department. That General Marshall would never have been given the directive to form a coalition government in China. That Chiang Kai-shek instead of being battered back to the island of Formosa, might have driven Mao Tse-tung's Red army into the fastnesses of Siberia.

And China's mainland, whereon reside 450,000,000 people, might today be ruled by a government friendly to the United States, instead of by a Soviet satellite.

Sure, that's only speculation—but with good reasons behind it. And it's pleasant to contemplate that we might have been today one long step up in this cold war—if only the lid had been taken off that smelly Amerasia case.

Fleming's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, March 29, entitled "Fleming's Letter":

FLEMING'S LETTER

A remarkable agglomerate of confusion has wound up the new hearings of the Hardy subcommittee on the subsidy excesses of the soon-to-be-abolished Maritime Commission. Perhaps the high light of a pretty shabby performance by the Maritime Commissioners was the introduction on Monday of a letter from Commission Chairman Fleming to the Attorney General, dated February 3, stating plainly that he supported the subsidy actions in question. This development came just after General Fleming had testified that the review of past subsidy determinations was still in progress—in other words, that he had not made up his mind.

Last fall a scorching report by the Comptroller General charged, among other things, that the Maritime Commission had lost some $25,000,000 in the granting of unjustified subsidies and national defense allowances on three contracts involving six ships. The Hardy subcommittee of the House Executive Expenditures Committee held extensive hearings on Commission practices with respect to ship construction subsidies, and its report, backing up the Comptroller General, was adopted unanimously by the full committee. As a result, President Truman called upon the Maritime Commission to review its actions and asked the Attorney General to investigate the interpretation of the Merchant Marine Act. General Fleming's letter to the Attorney General was offered in connection with this request.

Although he took a definite stand in the February 3 letter, General Fleming testified later that the matter was still under review. This was his position before the Thomas subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on February 6. On February 7 he testified that Commissioner Mellen's letter of last September attempting to rebut all the Comptroller General's charges was no longer the official line. Yet on February 24 he wrote Representative THOMAS agreeing with the Mellen letter and asserting that everything the Commission had done was legal and proper and required no amendment.

These inconsistencies are magnified by the curious manner in which General Fleming's letter to the Attorney General was composed. He stated, for example, that he usually consulted the full commission on policy matters. Certainly this was a major policy decision. Yet it was brought out in the hearing that General Fleming wrote this letter without consultation—surely a usurpation of authority. He stated that he had sent copies to all members of the Commission. Yet Commissioner McKeough (the one-man minority exonerated by the previous Hardy report) testified that he had to get his copy from the Attorney General's office; and even Commissioner Carson, though he agreed with the letter, admitted confusion over how he obtained his copy.

What all this shameful pulling and hauling demonstrates is, first, that the chairman of the Commission has associated himself definitely with the subsidy excesses on the part of the Commission majority that led to the Presidential reorganization; and second, that either General Fleming's memory is very poor or his testimony was deliberately at variance with the facts. Surely the President should require no more evidence that both he and the public have been poorly served by the men to whom the Maritime Commission has been entrusted, with the conspicuous exception of Mr. McKeough. It would be compounding the disgrace to carry such men over as members of the new Maritime Board.

Publications of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who has an abiding faith in today's young people. Through the years, it has been my privilege to speak to students in a great many schools. I have always found them eager to learn about representative government. And I have felt it a personal opportunity to point out to these young men and women, the blessing we possess in living under a government of law—a Republic.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I frequently have requests from students enrolled in civics and government classes asking for copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, bills, reports, and committee hearings.

The proceedings of this Congress, one of the last free legislative bodies in the world, should be available to the students of every school in the country, and I am always glad to comply with these requests because I feel such students are seeking first-hand knowledge in the procedures of representative government.

Such publications give valuable information on the issues facing the Nation and an added opportunity for those studying government to know the problems confronting our lawmakers.

It seems to me, that it is most important for our young men and women to become well acquainted with the operations of our Republic for it is they who soon will be the voting citizens that make the decisions of government.

Thus, in truth, we are providing the background for tomorrow's leadership.

Harold Russell, Both His Hands Gone, Learned of Man's Inner Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe of March 29, 1950:

GUIDEPOSTS OF LIFE—TOUGH EXTERIOR OFTEN HID DEEP RELIGIOUS FEELING OF PARATROOPS—HAROLD RUSSELL, BOTH HIS HANDS GONE, LEARNED OF MAN'S INNER RESOURCES

(By Harold Russell)

It sometimes takes cold, black disaster to inspire one to achieve the heights of success.

But for my accident I would now be back at my prewar job as a butcher. Instead, I have been in motion pictures, on the radio, subject of magazine articles—but best of all, I have had a chance to show other disabled veterans like myself that it is possible to bounce back from utter despair to undreamed of success and happiness.

On that black June day in 1944 when I lay on a hospital bed looking down at two big bandages where my hands used to be, I frankly thought it meant the end of useful living for me. "What can I do now?" I asked myself bitterly. "Probably just live out my years on an Army pension."

This self-pity and despair didn't last very long though. There is something in most people that won't let them take defeat lying down. Call it anything you like, but to me it is faith—faith in God and in myself, faith that I can always rise from every set-back. A man is licked without this.

At Walter Reed Hospital there was no funeral atmosphere. Nobody pitied himself or anyone else. A guy with both legs gone was called "Shorty"; a man with but one leg "Limpy"; and a soldier with only one arm "Paperhanger." As for me—I was "Hooks." This may sound grim, but we had to develop a sense of humor, and this was the best way to do it.

My first reaction to the hooks which were to serve as my hands were one of dismay. The first day I tried them on, it was worse—it was torture. Unable to make them do anything, I was ready to give up. But the next day I tried again, and kept on trying until I made them work.

My first experiences out of the hospital were also trying ones. Those I met with a sense of humor were most helpful. Take the little old lady to whom I sold meat before the war. When she saw me, broke out with: "Oh, you poor boy."

Then, realizing that this was the wrong approach, she stopped and chuckled. "No wonder you lost your hands. Goodness knows you sold them to me often enough weighing my meat. They didn't belong to you anyway; I bought them many a time with my pot roasts."

I liked that reaction, frank and sassy.

Before my accident I recall during our combat training that religion never showed much on the surface, but was very much

there under the surface. All of us put up a tough front. We belonged to the school of realism. War was rough, so our actions and talk had to be rough, we figured. And the paratroops, I can safely say, were the toughest bunch of all.

One man in our company, Big Joe, was the most awesome physical specimen I have ever known. Huge in stature, a calloused hulk of muscle, Big Joe swore furiously, drank mightily, and was ready to fight at the drop of a hat. He might have been Satan himself as far as the others were concerned, but I knew different.

On our practice jumps I sat next to Big Joe in the plane and jumped right behind him. As the tense moment arrived just before we were to go spilling out into space, I could see Big Joe's face relax. It grew gentle, serene, and his lips moved in a quiet prayer.

At this moment I think he felt very close to God. But once on the ground, he was a man of fierce action again, ferocious, grim, the devil himself.

Not all soldiers concealed their religion with such camouflage. I know of one soldier—we'll call him Steve—who did just the opposite. He was friendly, brimming with good humor, a thorough extrovert in every sense. To appreciate this story, you must get the picture of the inside of an Army barracks. Bunks are lined up on either side, sometimes as many as 30 on one floor. Privacy simply doesn't exist.

In the evening, just before lights went out, there was always a terrific hubbub—men coming in from pass, loud arguing, singing, and constant traffic back and forth to the showers. Steve was always right in the middle of the loudest argument or the noisiest singing—until he saw time running short. Then he would break away and hustle out of his clothes.

But just before he climbed into bed, he always knelt quietly with folded hands at the side of his bunk and prayed.

The noise, the bright lights, the confusion never bothered him. No one ever made fun of him or kidded him for it. In fact, underneath these hard-bitten men admired and respected him for his open faith. To them it represented real courage in the face of possible ridicule. But I actually believe that Steve never felt that he was being conspicuous. To him it was the right and natural thing to do.

I mention these few experiences because I have heard so many people say that the youth of today are turning away from religion. Nothing can be further from the truth. What many people consider irreverence on the part of youth is merely impatience—impatience with churchmen who won't take more initiative in working out some of the postwar problems.

Young Americans, especially veterans of the past war, want to see the men of God roll up their sleeves and tackle some problems like these same ex-servicemen tackled the problem, say, of demolishing an enemy pillbox. Just talk isn't enough. They want action.

My chance to act the part of Homer Parrish in The Best Years of Our Lives was one of the finest things that will ever happen to me. Not because it made me a Hollywood celebrity, but because it gave me a chance to show thousands of other disabled people that a handicap can give them the necessary impetus to achieve more than if their calamity had never happened.

I know this to be true with many others beside myself. A close friend of mine was a great athlete before he lost both legs. This blow changed the course of his life, and now he is a brilliant lawyer with a great future before him. He admits that but for this accident his present achievements would never have been realized.

There are hundreds, thousands of similar cases. And they were all able to rise from the depths, I feel sure, not only because they had courage, but because they also had a great source of inner power, religious faith.

Back to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following thoughtful editorial, Back to Isolationism, appearing in the Newark Evening News of March 30, 1950:

BACK TO ISOLATIONISM

Appointment of John Sherman Cooper as his chief consultant represents a praiseworthy attempt by Secretary Acheson to arrest the disintegration of our bipartisan foreign policy. Mr. Cooper is, of course, a Republican. He is a former Senator from Kentucky who supported the administration's policies and program abroad, and he has served as John Foster Dulles' replacement on the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

On the score of capacity, there can be no doubt that Mr. Cooper has it. Less certain, however, is the likelihood that his appointment will appease those Republicans in the Congress who are intent upon wrecking domestic unity in world affairs and leading their party back to isolationism.

Bipartisanship works, or should work, both ways and there are some indications that the administration has not fulfilled the terms of such a partnership. Complaint has been frequent that the administration first makes decisions on foreign policy and only then looks for Republican assent. But such indifference to the spirit of bipartisan collaboration is not the primary cause of the resurgence of Republican isolationism in the Congress.

Mr. Cooper's designation, which follows so closely upon Senator VANDENBERG's patriotic appeal for a united front against communism, is obviously intended to redress the bipartisan balance. Yet, it is extremely doubtful that Mr. Cooper's selection, of itself, can moderate the all-out assault on the State Department of which Senator MCCARTHY's charges, the "economy drive" against ECA aid, Senator STYLES BRIDGES' one-man declaration of war on Mr. Acheson are major manifestations.

Unhappily for the country, and incidentally for the Republican Party, there appears to be less and less willingness by the party's real leaders in the Congress to accept the wise counsel of Senator VANDENBERG. In the existing situation there is little evidence that they intend to encourage that "practical harmony" among the western nations which he says is essential "for the effectual defense of their mutual heritage."

This drive against effective collaboration abroad is reaching its climax at a time when military experts at The Hague are attempting to evolve "an integrated defense plan" for the North Atlantic Treaty nations. But of what use will such planning be if our allies, notably Italy and France, are suddenly deprived of the economic supports which have thus far kept them from plunging into communism?

Republican isolationists may think this retreat to their pre-Pearl Harbor position is the way to win the congressional election of 1950. On them the political history of the last 20 years is wasted. They are apparently willing to risk again the public anxiety and mistrust which have impelled the people to reject at election after election Republican claims to national and international leadership.

A Tragic Situation Faces the Citizens of Chicago if Rent Controls Are Ended June 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned on several occasions in the House the tragic situation in which the city of Chicago would find itself if the protection of all rent controls was removed on June 30 of this year. The fact is that at the present time the housing shortage is so acute that there are practically no residences available to and within the financial means of families in the middle-income bracket.

In order that my colleagues may understand that there is no exaggeration in what I have been saying and that my motivation has not been political, I am including in my remarks a letter just received from a prominent Chicago lawyer and a Republican of high standing, Eugene T. Devitt, brother of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, former Congressman Edward Devitt.

Mr. Devitt's letter follows:

CHICAGO, *March 29, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have noted with interest your position on a compromise rent bill now pending before the House Banking Committee.

I am particularly interested in the rent proposal because I was a trial attorney for the Office of Price Administration and the Office of the Housing Expediter from 1943 to 1949. I followed the progress of those past measures particularly close when my brother, Edward J. Devitt, was a member of the Eightieth Congress from St. Paul, Minn. In addition, I am especially interested as I live in Elgin, Ill., which, as you know, is some 38 miles northwest of Chicago.

Although I am a registered Republican and a candidate for clerk of the Supreme Court in the primaries on April 11, 1950, I feel that some form of Federal rent control is absolutely necessary to prevent chaos, particularly in the Chicago metropolitan area. As the father of three children, I believe it would be absolutely impossible for me to rent any housing accommodations in the city of Elgin under $100 per month. As a matter of fact, I feel rental housing is tighter in the city of Elgin than in a goodly proportion of various neighborhoods in the city of Chicago, and I sincerely believe that any proposal to continue controls in the larger cities should most assuredly encompass the entire Chicago metropolitan area.

Would you be kind enough to send me a copy of your proposed bill to extend rent control? I do know that the problem of enforcing such a bill is, and would be relatively easy in all of the suburban areas.

Thank you kindly,

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE T. DEVITT.

Mr. Speaker, from Mrs. John A. Renn, 3141 West Sixtieth Street, Chicago, I have received the following letter, which is similar to hundreds of others from Chicago housewives and heads of families:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 23, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I need your help as do friends of mine all over the city of Chicago.

If rent controls are allowed to expire, we shall be caught in a trap. So will every person on a fixed income. You know my husband is a postal clerk, and his increases have never kept up with the rising cost of living. Like others, we have had to spend judiciously or go without, to build up a small savings toward old age. If rent controls die, we shall be drained of everything we can make, or have saved, to live. There will be nothing to prevent landlords from charging all the traffic will bear—and getting it, because housing is so scarce. In many cities and your own is one, the result will be chaos. Some form of rent control must exist for awhile, if thousands of people are to live, or want to keep on living. We have had a 15 percent rent increase since the war. Instead of rent control expiring entirely, another raise by percentages would be far better. A limit could be set on percentage raises according to the age and condition of the building, and services actually received by the tenants. When we must burn our gas oven and an electric heater, as we do all winter because of inadequate heat, (below 68°) then we have had, in effect, another rent raise. The same applies when we buy faucets, window shades, and new screening. For years most landlords have made their tenants put up with very little or no cleaning, and what we have done raises our rent higher.

We are trapped now by these circumstances, and submit to them because there is no place to move.

We beg of you, please do all that you can to help us, and thousands in a like plight.

Some form of rent control must remain—we must have help from Congress—or we face certain personal disaster.

Yours very truly,

ZORA E. RENN,

Mrs. JOHN A. RENN.

Foreign Economic Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7797, to provide foreign economic assistance has been debated over a period of several days. It has been debated with unusual vehemence on both sides and this debate has served to bring out the real points at issue. As I have said repeatedly, if the measure does not serve to help keep our Nation out of a third world war, its real purpose will not have been accomplished. As I have spent most of my legislative life on the old Military Affairs Committee and the present Armed Forces Committee, I am most sensitive to the danger of and the need for preventing the outbreak of a shooting war which will usher in the use of the frightful atom bomb. I have therefore gone to unusual lengths to prevent such an eventuality.

The measure calls for the expenditure of a large sum of money, however, and taking into consideration the state of our national finances, we must strain a point and make some reduction of this authorization. I think a half billion dollars could be taken off the bill without destroying the effect of the program. I hope the bill is reduced to this extent.

This measure is an authorization measure. I have learned in many other instances that changes and reductions may be effected when the appropriation bill comes to us for consideration. While I realize the financial plight of this Nation; should conditions change after the passage of this measure but before the appropriation bill has come to a vote, further reductions may be brought about.

Petitions on the Repeal of the Excise Tax on Entertainment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of this body some additional petitions that have come to my office from movie patrons in my district urging that the 20 percent Federal excise tax on movie admissions be repealed.

These petitions have come from the RKO Hillstreet Theater, from the Paramount Downtown Theater, from the Metzger-Srere Theaters, from the Fox Westlake, Los Angeles and Cameo Theaters, and from the Bill Robinson Theater.

On February 16, 1950, I submitted for the RECORD petitions containing almost 4,000 names. To date that number has been increased by close to 13,000 names, making a grand total of approximately 17,000.

These petitions represent the feeling that is current not only among my own constituents in the Fourteenth Congressional District in California, but in the country as a whole—namely, that the tax is discriminatory, that it falls on those least able to bear it, and that the war emergency which engendered it has long since passed.

I should like to quote briefly from a letter sent by one theater manager, but expressing the feeling of all:

We feel sure that if you were to witness the eagerness with which these petitions were signed you would realize how much the elimination of this tax means to the working classes, especially the low-salaried working classes of people who attend theaters as their only means of entertainment.

Since 1947 I have introduced bills to repeal various wartime excise taxes. My most recent bill, H. R. 6151, introduced on August 26, 1949, would repeal all wartime excise taxes except those of a purely regulatory nature, such as the tax on tobacco, liquor, narcotics, sugar, coconut oil, and adulterated butter.

I feel, as my constituents do, that the continuance of wartime excise taxes on such items as movie admissions and baby oil are unnecessary and unfair.

As additional petitions are received from movie patrons in my district, I will ask permission that they also be recorded.

Russian Crab Imports

REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called the attention of the House to the fact that 59,000 cases of Russian crab meat, valued at $3,000,000 have been landed in the United States during the past month.

Of these shipments, 15,000 cases were purchased by an American importer from Russia and were shipped into the United States direct from Russia. The other 44,000 cases were obtained from Russia by Great Britain and then were trans-shipped into the United States by the British.

I wrote letters on March 17 to both ECA Administrator Hoffman and to Secretary of State Dean Acheson protesting to these imports of Russian canned crab meat, which, I said, if continued, will ruin our Atlantic and Pacific coast crab-fishing industries.

Today I received a reply to one of my letters of protest from William Foster, Acting Administrator of ECA. In this reply Mr. Foster says:

Although we recognize general objections to the distribution of any canned crab produced in the U. S. S. R., we believe it quite difficult to protest the sales of this product by the British when United States interests are also importing the same thing directly from the U. S. S. R.

This put the question of what is to be done about Russian crab-meat imports squarely up to Secretary of State Dean Acheson to decide. It is for him to say whether the State Department will continue to permit Russian goods, produced by slave labor, to invade American domestic markets and thereby destroy the property, the jobs, and the livelihood of American workers in the American fishing industry.

The State Department in reply to my letter of March 17 said it would investigate the matter of Russian crab-meat imports and give me a statement as to the Department's policy in regard to

these Russian crab-meat imports. Up to this time, 2 weeks after my letter, I have not received the State Department's reply.

I append to this statement copies of the letter which I wrote to ECA Administrator Hoffman and the reply to it which I received this morning from the Acting Administrator of ECA:

MARCH 17, 1950.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am greatly disturbed, as have been many residents of the Pacific Coast, by recent announcements in the press that 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at approximately $3,000,000 have been landed at the ports of Seattle and Boston during the past month.

I cannot escape the conclusion that these imports of Russian crab are helpful to our cold-war enemy, Russia, and harmful to the economy of the United States.

Of the 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab imported, 44,000 cases came from Britain. The news reports said these 44,000 cases were part of a shipment of 80,000 cases secured by the British from the Russians in a barter deal.

I would like the ECA to obtain for me a statement from the British showing what goods the British gave the Russians in return for these 80,000 cases of Russian canned crab. I believe that the Congress and the country, because of our heavy American contributions to Britain through ECA programs, has a right to know what goods the British are supplying to Russia.

It is my understanding that the Russians did, with our consent, gain control and jurisdiction over most of the crabbing waters of Asia that were formerly fished by the Japanese. As a result, the Russians today have supplanted the Japanese as the great crab packing nation of the Far East. In prewar days Japan packed an average of 445,102 cases of canned crab annually and in some years as much as 600,000 cases. Russia, due to her new control over these crabbing waters, now, probably, is packing about 500,000 cases of crab annually.

Most of this Russian crab, caught and packed by slave labor, will, I fear, unless steps are taken to prevent it, be dumped onto the American market. Should that happen our Atlantic and Pacific coast crabbing industry, in which millions of dollars are invested and by which thousands of workers are employed, soon will be ruined. Such a calamity certainly would weaken our economy by adding to its unemployment and make America less able to carry on our cold war against Russia and assist Russia to more effectively wage her cold war against us.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL V. MACK,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 30, 1950.

Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: This is in reply to your letter of March 17, 1950, in reference to Russian canned crab meat which the United Kingdom has been exporting to the United States.

We are assurred by the British that the canned crab meat was not obtained from the U. S. S. R. as a part of the barter transaction whereby British goods were exchanged for the crab meat. However, there was a bilateral trade agreement between the two countries, signed in December of 1947, which included seafood as a permissive item. That is, in determining the balance of trade, any purchases of seafood by the British from the USSR would be counted. Any monetary settlement under that trade agreement was to be in pounds sterling.

Within the framework of that 1947 trade agreement the British negotiated for and purchased a quantity of canned salmon of U. S. S. R. production but, we are informed the Russians refused to sell the canned salmon unless an undisclosed quantity of canned crab meat was also purchased. Thus, the crab meat was obtained as a tie-in rather than through barter.

It is our understanding that none of the canned crab meat was intended for sale by the British Ministery of Food in England because the relatively high price would not fit into the food distribution program under the austere conditions prevailing there. It is our belief that the British, recognizing the dollar earning value of the canned crab meat, had planned that it would assist their economic recovery to a greater extent if sold for dollars than if sold for home consumption.

We have carefully examined the United Kingdom sales to the U. S. S. R. under the terms of the 1947 trade agreement and assure you that no items were sold which are considered to be critical or strategic materials. In general, the items were textiles, textile machinery, ceramics and similar goods.

Although we recognize general objection to the distribution of any canned crab meat produced in the U. S. S. R., we believe it quite difficult to protest the sales of this product by the British when United States interests are also importing the same product, apparently directly from the U. S. S. R. Any dollar earnings of the British reduce the need for economic assistance, and in estimating dollars to be available we are sure the British had contemplated the sale of the canned crab meat. One of the reasons the United Kingdom was willing to purchase United States canned fish, including salmon, last year was the anticipated dollar earnings from the sale of the crab meat.

We appreciate this opportunity to give you this information and to assure you we are satisfied that the crab meat was not obtained by the British from the U. S. S. R. either through barter or sale of goods to which the United States could object.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

Natural Gas and Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the New England Council, Boston, Mass.:

FUELS FOR NEW ENGLAND

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, PROVIDENCE, R. I., MARCH 23, 1950

Natural gas

Whereas on March 19, 1948, the New England Council, at its ninetieth quarterly meeting sponsored the first public presentation of arguments for and against the introduction of natural gas into this region; and

Whereas while at that time no formal action was taken, it has become increasingly clear that the introduction of natural gas into this deficit fuel area would be not only desirable but immediately and importantly beneficial to a large proportion of the people of New England, both in their homes and in their economic activities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the New England Council assembled at Providence in their ninety-eighth quarterly meeting, desire to be recorded with the chairman and members of the Federal Power Commission, in connection with hearings now in progress before that body, as strongly in favor of action by the Commission, at the earliest possible date, favorable to the transmission of natural gas into New England under terms and conditions most suitable to New England and equitable to all the interests concerned.

Oil

Resolved, That approval by Congress of any measure designed to restrict or reduce oil imports into the United States will be contrary to the best interests of New England.

ICC Understaffed and Handicapped in Efforts To Promote Rail Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the New York World-Telegram is to be congratulated on a series of articles which it has published on the subject of rail safety. I invite the attention of the House membership to these articles and urge every Member to read them carefully.

There is now pending in the House rail-safety legislation. I hope that it soon gains the approval of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce so that it can be considered on the floor.

Under leave to do so, I include herewith three of the articles which appeared in the World-Telegram:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 25, 1950]

JAPANESE BEETLES VERSUS COMMUTERS' LIVES—UNITED STATES AND STATE SKIMP ON RAIL SAFETY CHECKUPS—ONLY 22 ICC INSPECTORS ON JOB; PSC SHORN OF POWER

(Prompted by the recent disaster on the Long Island Rail Road, the World-Telegram and Sun conducted an exhaustive study of conditions on all of the railroads serving the metropolitan area. It found that maximum safety is nowhere to be found, that human errors can bring new tragedies and that Government supervision is almost a mockery. Staff writer Allan Keller reports on the findings today in the first of a series of articles of vital interest to every person who rides a train.)

(By Allan Keller)

There are more Federal employees looking for Japanese beetles than there are checking on signals that protect the lives of about 300,000 commuters riding trains in and out of New York City each day.

There are more officials worrying about insecticides for livestock than there are inspecting the locomotives that pull hundreds of commuter trains.

POWER IS VESTED IN ICC

The safety of the commuter on the railroads serving New York—and every other community of large size—rests largely on the railroads themselves. The Interstate Com-

merce Commission, vested by Congress and the courts with the duty of insuring that safety, is short-handed, slow moving, and hamstrung by tradition.

The Public Service Commission of New York State, although empowered by legislative mandate to insure "safe and adequate" service, actually is shorn of any such power where it involves signal and safety device systems. It is superseded by the ICC, whose 22 signal inspectors are responsible for the greatest trackage on earth—hundreds of thousands of miles.

The picture of Government supervision of railroad safety is one of incredible ineptness, of criminal failure to give it the importance it rates and of actual reliance, in the final instance, on the railroads themselves.

That death has not ridden the rails more frequently is due to the engineering skill of most of the carriers and the general high level of performance of the men operating the trains.

DEVOTE ENERGIES TO RATE FIXING

As a matter of practical truth the Federal and State regulatory bodies supervising common carriers devote hundreds of hours to the fixing of rates and tariffs to every hour invested in the protection of human life and limb.

On the wall behind the desk of Col. J. Monroe Johnson, chairman of the ICC in Washington, there is a map of the United States. In it are stuck pins for the inspectors who look after the signal and control systems of the Nation's railroads. There are very few pins.

One pin jabbed into the map at Rutherford, N. J., represents the ICC inspector of signals responsible for all the commuting railroads feeding thousands of workers into New York every morning and taking them home every evening. On his shoulders rests the ultimate onus for enforcing the rules of the commission.

Naturally, the commuters are not the only persons involved. The long-haul passengers are equally his responsibility when in his district.

LONG GAPS BETWEEN PINS

Colonel Johnson's map has wide open spaces where the inspector must watch the operations of railroads over thousands of square miles. It is an insuperable task. Between the colored pin at Washington, D. C., and the pin at Jacksonville, Fla., there is no other along the eastern seaboard. The nearest is inland at Atlanta.

It would be incorrect to assume that the ICC is unaware of this situation. A short time ago Colonel Johnson went before a congressional committee studying the ICC budget and told the members of his predicament.

ONLY 22 SIGNAL INSPECTORS

"I scarcely see how 65 locomotive inspectors * * * are able to inspect more than 40,000 locomotives, nor how the 131 employees in the railroad safety bureau are able to maintain close supervision of the countless safety devices that govern our rail operations," he said.

It should be pointed out here that the latter classification of inspectors includes not only those who guard the signals and control devices but also those who check on such things as the hand brakes of boxcars, the handles on cars of all types, steps, running boards atop freight cars and the like. Only 22 are primarily concerned with the signal devices that guard the right-of-way.

A FISCAL DILEMMA FOR ICC

Congress recently ordered the ICC to pay certain echelons of employees more money and advised that the pay increases must be absorbed from funds presently available.

"There seems to be no way in which this can be done other than by placing a great number of employees on furlough without pay or by separating a lesser number from the service," said the Chairman.

HOOVER COMMISSION'S VERDICT

It is no wonder that the Hoover Commission task force that studied the regulatory commissions cited the fact that the ICC is understaffed, has vacancies that need filling, and is having difficulty obtaining the proper type of employee to meet its needs.

The Hoover Commission was a hard-headed group seeking economies in government, but it sensed the dangers that are inherent in a situation where a commission with many added duties has seen its total employment drop from 2,649 in 1940 to 2,139 in 1949.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 27, 1950]

ONE-WAY TRESTLE OVER NEW JERSEY FLATS COULD MEAN DEATH A LA LONG ISLAND—TEMPORARY 3 YEARS, STRUCTURE SERVES TWO ROADS, HAS NO TRIPPERS

(By Allan Keller)

A commuter doesn't have to ride the Long Island Railroad to run the risk of death or injury on the railroads.

So much has been said about the Long Island Railroad many persons forget that the same lone inspector of the Interstate Commerce Commission who checks and approves signal and control devices for that line also is responsible for every other line running in and out of the metropolitan area.

VISUAL SIGNAL

Two of these are the Central Railroad of New Jersey and the Pennsylvania, which share the tracks of the New York & Long Branch Railroad, serving the Jersey seashore.

Over the waters of Matawan Creek, near Matawan, N. J., the line runs across a one-way wooden trestle built about 3 years ago to replace one that burned in 1946. Far beneath it are the tidal flats of an inlet from the Atlantic.

Although two railroads operate over this narrow trestle, with all the opportunities of such an operation for mistakes and errors, no automatic devices are installed to stop trains if the engineer ignores a visual signal.

LONG ISLAND PARALLEL

This is potentially such a death trap the engineers themselves slow the trains down before venturing across the temporary trestle. Riders on this line know, however, that the Rockville Centre gantlet track of the Long Island Railroad was also a dangerous spot. Nonetheless the engineer rocketed past full-stop signals and into the path of a train coming from the opposite direction—at a cost of 32 lives.

Any accident like that on Long Island, occurring on the Matawan trestle, scores of feet above ground and water, would lead inevitably to a major disaster.

At the time the trestle was built it was stated officially that it was a temporary replacement for the one that burned. Riders have often written to the railroads asking what was meant by the word "temporary" but have never received a definite answer.

JERSEY SUPERVISION

In Washington, officials of the safety bureau of the Interstate Commerce Commission told this writer that while their inspector had jurisdiction over the signals for this structure and the adjoining right-of-way, the Public Utility Commission of New Jersey supervises the bridge itself.

Just such overlapping and conflicting problems of jurisdiction bedevil all railroads and the Government bodies regulating them.

After the recent wreck at Rockville Centre, the Long Island road installed automatic brake trippers at the ends of the gantlet. Before it did, it sought authorization for the step, leading to the comedy of errors described by an official of the New York Public Service Commission in these words:

"Talk about your mix-ups * * * the Long Island didn't know whom to apply to for permission, so it applied to both the ICC and the PSC.

"The law establishing the public service commission instructs it to see that railroads maintain 'service that is safe and adequate' but we know the ICC supersedes us on that matter of safety. There are 13 railroads in the State, with thousands of miles of tracks and heavy train movements. Yet, the Federal law says the ICC shall inspect the signals and then it assigns two or three men at most to do the job."

LIVES IN BALANCE

This opera bouffe handling of jurisdiction would be comical if the lives of thousands of commuters did not hang in the balance. A passenger on a train that collides with another, or which hurtles off the track through an open switch, is disinterested in which government agency is responsible for supervising the railroad.

Another potential danger area exists where the trains from the shore join the main line of the Jersey Central, which also carries the Reading trains and those of the Baltimore and Ohio.

The routes come together at Elizabethport in a maze of cross-over tracks. Here, too, although located in a heavy commuter area, there is a right-angle crossing at grade. Trains from Newark roll across the four tracks of the main line, protected from collision by visual signals, but not by automatic brake trippers. Chance for human failure is always present.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 27, 1950]

NEW YORK CENTRAL SAFE TILL SOMEONE ERRS—TRAIN EVERY 40 SECONDS OVER MAZE OF TRACKS UNGUARDED BY TRIPPERS

(By Allan Keller)

Every morning and every evening trains of the New York Central and New Haven Railroads roll in and out of the city on a headway that often runs under 40 seconds.

The four tracks from the junction near the Mott Haven yards in the Bronx to Grand Central are so crowded that often all four are occupied at once.

Yet from the station to the junction, above ground and underground, there are no automatic brake-tripping devices to serve as a safety check on human failure.

In this stretch of heavily used right-of-way is a drawbridge across the Harlem River that swings open to permit tugs and other river craft to pass. Dangerous as it is, it, too, is unguarded by automatic trippers.

TRACKS TURN OFF

North of the One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Street station in the Bronx, the tracks of the New York Central's Hudson River division, the main line, turn off from the Park Avenue route which carries the New Haven line and the Harlem division of the Central.

In this stretch of tracks, many blocks long, there is a labyrinth of switches over which trains move at a rapid pace. These switches are guarded by interlocking signals if anything is wrong or if two trains are in danger of collision.

These systems are virtually foolproof if the engineer or motorman is alert. Where they fall down is where the system at Rockville Centre gantlet track on the Long Island line broke down—when there is human failure.

USED BY THOUSANDS

Scores of thousands of commuters use these tracks each day and so do other thousands of riders on such crack trains as the Central's Twentieth Century Limited, the

Empire State Express and the Pacemaker and the New Haven's Merchants' Limited and Yankee Clipper.

New Haven commuters are familiar with the junction at New Rochelle, where trains for Grand Central Station and others for the Hell Gate Bridge route to Pennsylvania Station separate on their way to the city.

Many long freight trains originating on the Hell Gate route have to join the main line to New England at the same junction. Interlocking signals protect the riders but not as adequately as interlocking signals plus automatic train-stopping devices.

All these riders are relying, in the final analysis, on the men at the controls in the locomotive cabs. They are among the finest class of workmen on earth but, being human, they are susceptible to human failures.

The World-Telegram and Sun believes with many commuter organizations that sections of right-of-ways, where the traffic is as dense as that in this city and its suburbs, should have the added protection of brake-tripping devices.

One thing has been made patently clear since the disaster on Long Island: Passengers who rely upon the public service commission to guarantee safety are trusting to false gods. It is shorn of most of the power needed to force railroads to maintain maximum safety.

FEW ICC INSPECTORS

On the other hand, the Interstate Commerce Commission, with full responsibility for supervision of signal and control systems, is functioning with a bare handful of inspectors, Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Chairman of the ICC, himself admitted that in practice the Government regulatory body must rely on the railroads to police their own trackage, with not too frequent checking by the undermanned safety bureau inspectors.

In the past two decades the ICC has been overburdened with the problems of supervising the motor carriers of the Nation. The incredible mushrooming of this type of business has had the effect of making rail transport of secondary interest to the Commission.

Most of the Commissioners would willingly see the work of the safety bureau transferred to a Department of Transportation if one were formed.

SEES LIMITED BUDGETS

"Until transportation—one of the five major businesses of the Nation—is given real stature by a place at the President's Cabinet table, you must expect limited budgets and curtailed services," said Colonel Johnson.

All of this makes tragic reading for the commuter. He knows of the billions being spent on farm crops that wind up as fertilizer. He knows eggs are being sold to Europe at a penny a dozen. He knows of scores of other places and ways in which the taxpayers' money is being spent by an easy-handed administration.

Inevitably he wonders why a few more dollars cannot be invested in the safety of American citizens who ride the trains to work each morning and each evening.

The FBI Files

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I herewith insert three editorials from three newspapers.

The first is the Times-Herald, a radically bitter anti-administration publication.

The second is from the Indianapolis News, a Republican newspaper that puts patriotism above partisanship.

The third is from the Louisville Courier-Journal, which is a moderate Democrat publication as I understand it.

It is remarkable that each arrives at the same general conclusion.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 30, 1950]

IT'S THERE, FIND IT

J. Edgar Hoover has made a case nobody can shake for keeping FBI files confidential. That is clear. But it is equally clear that President Truman is hiding behind the FBI in his attempt to choke off senatorial investigation of State Department corruption at the hands of the Communists.

The situation sums up as follows: The Senate has directed the Tydings subcommittee to subpena executive department files as just one element of the investigation. Mr. Truman has ordered that no executive files be turned over, and is pushing the FBI out front as the clay pigeon for senatorial shooting.

WHAT DOES THE RESOLUTION SAY?

And now, believe it or not, just as the President refuses all executive files to the Senate, the President's own executive loyalty board asks the Tydings committee for its files on Communist matters. The fight therefore exposes itself as an absurdity, except as to the FBI.

Some Senators are saying that if Mr. Truman does not fork over in response to congressional subpena, he must be impeached. We cock an interested ear. But be that as it may, the Senate resolution which dictates the operations of the Tydings committee is one of the most powerful and all-inclusive ever written. It says for that committee to find out not only who is but also who has been corrupting our State Department through Communist influence.

Such an investigation does not stand or fall on the mere issue of whether the Senate can riffle through executive files. There is plenty of evidence elsewhere. Find it, Senators. And act on it.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 28, 1950]

END THE PARTISAN PROBE

J. Edgar Hoover, in whom the country has high confidence, is eminently right in opposing surrender of FBI loyalty files for congressional investigation. To do so would play directly into the hands of Moscow. The information thus revealed would be calculated to do this country far more damage than any possible service that might accrue.

It is to be hoped that the Hoover testimony will bring an early end to the grotesque and politics-ridden publicity field day that has surrounded the charges made by Senator McCARTHY against the State Department.

The national disservice which this so-called investigation has done can only lend weight to the responsible suggestion that the whole business be taken out of the hands of the politicians. Enough public fears have been aroused, however, to warrant a fresh start on an impartial and higher-minded basis.

What is called for is the appointment of a nonpartisan commission with a sufficient sense of responsibility and direction and with enough public confidence to conduct an inquiry on the evidence alone. Such an investigation, conducted with dignity and without headline hunting, should be able to produce the facts on the true situation in the State Department—and that is what the people want.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 29, 1950]

A PLOT TO TRUMPET WHISPERED CHARGES

In an atmosphere of which a gestapo-minded man might have taken prime advantage, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has acquitted himself admirably on two occasions in the last few days.

The first instance was Mr. Hoover's rejection of a proposal by Virginia's Representative HOWARD SMITH that the FBI be made to pass on the fitness of all employees of the National Science Foundation. It would have given the FBI unprecedented power as detective, prosecutor, judge, and jury over the inquiring minds of free men. It would have established in this country for the first time a secret police.

Now, Mr. Hoover has displayed equal vigor in protesting the use of FBI secret files in connection with Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY'S blunderbuss charges of communism in the State Department. At immediate issue are the FBI dossiers gathered in the course of loyalty checks on Federal employees.

As Mr. Hoover himself remarked, "One report may allege crime of a most despicable type, and the truth or falsity of these charges may not emerge until several reports are studied, further investigations made, and the wheat separated from the chaff."

The files include everything which neighbors or acquaintances have told special agents about the persons under investigation. Much of it is hearsay. Some of it may be the distortions of personal animosity or ignorance, or the overdramatizations of the suspicious. All of this misinformation is a rightful part of the secret file, because—to borrow Mr. Hoover's metaphor—investigators must gather chaff with the wheat before they can start winnowing. Aside from outright misinformation and unsupported charges that find their way into investigation files, there is a great deal of intimately personal information which has no bearing on the Communist or anti-Communist inclination of the subject. None of this material should be bandied about in public. There could be no worse invasion of the right of privacy.

Mr. Hoover advanced other reasons why he does not want the files put to a use for which they were not intended. They would reveal many of the FBI's informants, ruining their future value if not actually endangering their lives. Indeed, in one sweep, disclosure of the FBI confidential files would smear hundreds of innocent people; it would betray the whole intent of the Bureau since it was organized in the Department of Justice 42 years ago; and it would destroy much of the value painstakingly built into the Bureau.

It is neither the assigned nor intended function of the FBI to ruin or persecute innocent people. The Bureau has jurisdiction over investigations of espionage, sabotage, treason, and other offenses against internal security of the United States. In addition it is charged with investigating violation of some 120 Federal laws, including those dealing with banking, kidnaping, automobile theft, white slavery, and atomic energy.

Americans feel an instinctive revulsion against anything that smacks of a secret police. The outcry which invariably follows reports of wire-tapping is proof of this. The idea of a law-enforcement agency invading the privacy of any individual is distasteful enough even when the invasion is legally warranted, and the results are kept secret. But Senator McCARTHY and Representative SMITH, ostensibly fighting totalitarianism, would cheerfully resort to its very

own weapons. Mr. Hoover, Attorney General Howard McGrath, and President Truman are defending American institutions when they take a stand against such folly.

Old-Age Funds Already Spent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I am including as part of these remarks a timely article by Sigrid Arne entitled "All of $14,000,000,000 Collected as Old-Age Funds Already Spent," which appeared in the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, in its issue of March 14, 1950. The article follows:

ALL OF $14,000,000,000 COLLECTED AS OLD-AGE FUNDS ALREADY SPENT

(By Sigrid Arne)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Every dollar of the nearly $14,000,000,000 paid in under the old-age benefit section of the social-security program by employees and employers has been spent. It paid for office costs. It paid for the comparatively small number of monthly checks now going to workers who are 65 and over. It paid for $11,893,083,053 worth of United States Government bonds held in the United States Treasury for the old-age fund.

The money paid for these bonds went out to cover general Government expenses.

This is generally known to insurance and financial experts, but at Senate hearings on the social-security system Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN, Republican, Colorado, said he suspected the fact escapes public attention.

Money left after benefits and operating costs have been paid has to be turned in for Government bonds. The law says so. The law was written after long study in the thirties by a large group of insurance experts. These experts thought the money would earn interest if it was put into bonds and thereby increase the fund that must eventually pay workers their old-age checks.

Now that idea is under attack in the Senate Finance Committee and by the Brookings Institution, a private nonprofit research organization.

Social-security experts, including Administrator Arthur J. Altmeyer, stoutly defend the system. Here's the background, as they and Treasury Department people outline it:

Employees and employers in covered occupations pay into the social-security fund for every pay check. In 1948 payments amounted to $3,600,000,000.

Payments now more than cover the sums that have to be paid to retired workers.

But sometime there will be so many retired workers that payments will not cover their checks. Then the Social Security Administration will have to go to the Treasury, with its Government bonds in hand, and ask for cash.

When that happens the Treasury will have on hand just the money it has any year—the money that comes in that year. That includes (1) the taxes it collects; (2) any surplus, and (3) the money it gets by selling bonds to private investors.

The Treasury would have to tap one of those three sources.

Consider surplus first. There is little hope now for a surplus for many years to come.

The Government owed $256,477,511,689 as of late February. It paid off part of its debt in 2 years since the war: $750,000,000 in 1947 and $8,400,000,000 in 1948. Now the debt is jumping again.

TAXES BEST SOURCE

Even if the Government could pay off at the 1948 rate from now on, and if no more were added to the debt, it would take until 1982 to tear up the mortgage.

Now take bonds. Treasury experts think that is a likely source of quick cash. Even at the bottom of the depression, in 1933, the Treasury took in $3,000,000,000 in its bond deals with the public.

But the most likely source of revenue for old-age payments would be taxes.

But MILLIKIN said at the Senate hearings that he feels this would result in taxing people twice for their old-age benefits.

Altmeyer argued that the same people would not be taxed. MILLIKIN countered that it would be the same taxpayer, but Altmeyer maintained that the taxpayer would not be taxed twice for the same thing.

The Federal Reserve Bulletin for February says the Government has already used $38,000,000,000 out of the social security, postal savings, veterans insurance, and bank deposit insurance trust funds.

MILLIKIN said that as long as the Government was going to spend these trust-fund moneys, he feels it should use them to pay off the debt, and not just for the general Government expenses.

The Brookings Institution is much more critical than MILLIKIN.

It says: "Since the money is used by the Government in meeting its regular expenditures, no real reserve is created. The obligations of the Government deposited in a trust account do not represent assets; they merely record future obligations which can be fulfilled only through the levy of future taxes upon the economy in general. The trust fund is thus a fiction—serving only to confuse.

Treasury people argue that as long as the Government bonds pay interest they are assets. Brookings says:

"The operation of the old-age insurance fund is not similar in character to that of a private insurance company. Private insurance reserves are usually invested in projects that directly participate in, or promote, the production of goods and services. Thus they earn income."

Brookings adds the Nation may undergo another depression in which the Government will collect small tax totals and yet have to put out more in social-security payments.

It says there are four possible courses for the Nation's social-security program:

1. Helping old persons and others in need by paying the cost out of each year's taxes and making no long-term commitments. Brookings favors this course.

2. Payment of a minimum to all eligible needy without considering what other income they have.

3. Payment of a standard minimum to all eligible but with additional amounts to those who had higher earnings when they worked. This idea recognizes some relation between benefits and the customary living standard of the worker.

4. Payment of such high benefits that it would insure many workers their customary purchasing power.

Demopolis, Ala., Lock and Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleagues from Alabama, was greatly disappointed when I learned that the House Committee on Appropriations had cut the budget recommendation for further construction on the lock and dam just below the confluence of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers at Demopolis, Ala., from $4,000,000 down to $358,000. This is a cut of more than 90 percent.

This great lock and dam at Demopolis, Ala., is a very vital step in improving navigation on the Warrior River, which connects the coal fields of Walker County, Ala., and the industrial city of Birmingham with the port of Mobile, Ala.

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker. The lock and dam at Demopolis is the first step in the development of the great Tombigbee inland waterway that would connect the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Lakes of this country by water transportation.

The Tombigbee inland waterway has great industrial possibilities, and of even more immediate importance its construction would be a great defense asset to us in that it would reduce the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile and our atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by some 300 miles.

I recognize that it is imperative that we do all we can here to exercise every reasonable economy in the operation of our Government. But a 90-percent cut at Demopolis is unwise and unjust. It seems to me that it would be much fairer to cut allocations for all river-and-harbor projects by a flat 10 percent.

When the appropriation bill comes on for debate next week an effort will be made to restore the $4,000,000 recommended in the President's budget message for the Demopolis lock and dam, less a reasonable across-the-board cut for all projects. I sincerely hope that the members of the House will see the justice of our position, and in the name of national defense and internal development will allow the project at Demopolis to go forward.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Thursday, March 23, 1950, issue of the Cullman Tribune published at Cullman, Ala.:

LITTLE RECOGNITION

Alabama, famous for its many rivers, was given a severe jolt this week when the House Appropriations Committee cut a requested $4,000,000 waterways improvement to $358,000. This is less than one-tenth of the amount approved by Army engineers for the further development of the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers and the lock and dam at Demopolis.

The Tribune is in agreement with those who are demanding less Federal spending. But it is false economy for the fund slashers

to cut appropriations as was done on the Alabama waterways. It would be well for the members of this committee to reconsider their actions concerning these projects. There are other Federal programs that could be trimmed in order to give more funds for the waterways.

Improvements of the rivers will afford protection and benefits. These public-service projects will give employment to many people on constructive work under planned supervision. When completed, there will be better navigation on the rivers and better flood control. Alabama, with its splendid dock facilities at Mobile, definitely needs more improvements on its rivers.

Maybe Alabama would attract more attention in Congress if there were a two-party political system in operation. It certainly received little recognition for its waterways.

Fate of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 30, 1950, and in other newspapers throughout the country:

FATE OF FREEDOM

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"He who holds Alaska holds the world." (The late Gen. Billy Mitchell.)

Today marks the eighty-third anniversary of the Alaskan Purchase. The treaty under which the United States acquired the Territory from Czarist Russia by payment of $7,200,000, was signed March 30, 1867. The pact was negotiated under the stewardship of William H. Seward, Secretary of State in President Johnson's Cabinet. Alaska is a fabulous country. It is a land of tomorrow. It is a land of today. It is a source of great wealth in the fish from its waters, the gold from its sands, the silver from its mines, the lumber from its forests, and the choicest of furs. It is preeminent as an empire of scenic wonders.

Soviet Russia has claimed that Alaska belongs to it. At the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, Molotov declared that the purchase of Alaska was a fraud. Russia today has numerous air bases in Siberia. She is building additional airfields there. She is concentrating on air power. She is believed strong enough to seize our Alaska bases, from whence she could launch attacks against the United States proper.

The Hearst newspapers long have publicized the shocking inadequacy of military defenses in the arctic and subarctic areas.

Alaska's Governor Gruening has warned that the Territory's Army, Navy, and air bases are so weakly garrisoned that they can be overpowered by a comparatively small air-borne enemy force.

Let us sound the clarion call for action. Let us shout, "Wake up, America." There is but one thing that the Russians understand and respect. That is strength.

Soviet Russia is planning to exterminate democracy. She is planning to crucify humanity. For the sake of our Nation, for the sake of freemen everywhere, let us admit Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. Statehood for these Territories and adequate defense are inseparably linked.

The President of the United States has recommended statehood for both. The House of Representatives has approved such action. Let the Senate of the United States take a similar patriotic course. Let that action be taken at once. Let us give Alaska and Hawaii statehood now.

Do We Dare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the edition of April 1950 of the Methodist Challenge, published by Robert P. Schuler, pastor of Trinity Methodist Church, Los Angeles, Calif.:

DO WE DARE?

Do we dare acknowledge the facts? Are we courageous enough to face the cold, unpleasant truth? The people called Methodists are in a position where they must search their souls. Our church has been accused of friendliness with an atheistic ideology that is seeking to enslave the world. We are also under grave suspicion of having lent ourselves to organizations and agencies that seek the destruction of the American way of life. These accusations do not extend to the whole membership of either the clergy or the laity. Indeed those accused are very few among us, but very strong and powerful in church organizations and councils. The accusations are undoubtedly true and justified.

The Alabama Christian Advocate is the only Methodist publication that I have seen that actually faces up to the facts. The Christian Advocate (Chicago) does say that the Methodist Federation for Social Action has no right to speak for the Methodist Church, but further editorial comment is weak and spineless. The Michigan Christian Advocate and others go to the defense of the situation as is. I have seen two very cautious statements from two of our bishops, in which they deplore and defend. A strange silence has characterized those bishops and other leaders named in the accusations.

However, the daily press and secular publications generally are speaking, and they are of one accord. Several of the largest churches in Methodism have spoken through their official boards and they have not minced words. While most Methodist pulpits have mouthed weasel words of alibi and excuse, yet more than one pulpit has heard the challenging voice of a real Methodist prophet who has proclaimed against this terrible thing that has been done to us by a minority of our leaders.

Thus far I have not heard or read one actual denial of the facts. The line of defense is as unworthy as the cause. The Michigan Christian Advocate voiced it perfectly. Stanley High and John T. Flynn got part of their information from an "unfrocked" Presbyterian, while Flynn himself is a Roman Catholic, so reported by the Michigan Advocate. What a confession! Have we no stronger defense than that? Is the great Methodist Church, 9,000,000 strong, dependent on name calling and a resort to bigotry for a defense against the charge, proven by documentary evidence, that a group of powerful Methodist leaders have been flirting with atheistic communism? What a confession.

What matters where the information came from, if the information is true? Who cares what church John T. Flynn belongs to, if he wrote and published the truth in his book, "The Road Ahead"? That High and Flynn have published the truth is conceded. Many of the facts published by them have been published before and are not disputed. True, a few frightened apologists seek to mislead by claiming that the facts are fragmentary and that some quotations were not complete. The facts are full enough to be horrible and the quotations complete enough to convict beyond any doubt at all.

Face this: The Methodist Federation for Social Action has its office at 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, gets its mail there, has its telephone there and does business there. That's Methodist headquarters, my dear reader. Then face this fact: A Methodist bishop is president of this indefensible organization and four Methodist bishops and a dean of a Methodist school of divinity are vice presidents. Face this fact: Sixteen bishops of the Methodist Church, two heads of two of our most important boards in Methodism, numerous editors of Methodist publications, and district superintendens galore are active members of this organization, listed by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive. Face this fact: The executive secretary of this now notorious organization is appointed every year to his place of leadership by a Methodist bishop.

Then face this: "The federation rejects the method of struggle for profit as the economic basis for society, and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discrimination and privilege." (Taken from the masthead of Social Questions Bulletin, official organ of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. That's as near as Americans dare write the creed of communism.)

If some dense mind needs more, face the fact that the executive secretary, spokesman for the federation, recently declared that the purpose of the organization was not the "improvement of the present social order but its revolutionary abolition and replacement anew." That's Marxism.

No amount of twisting and squirming will do now. Whitewash is not enough to wash this stain away. We must either repudiate this subversive movement and soundly rebuke those who have betrayed us or we must suffer the just and merited contempt of all good Americans of whatever name and creed. This is an hour when Methodist people must awaken, arise, advance, and stand upon the walls for the protection of that which is genuine in our church and Nation. We have been betrayed.

Personally, I am grateful to Mr. High and to Mr. Flynn for having brought out the facts and presented the truth which our Methodist sentinels either failed to see or were too cowardly to announce.

I am also encouraged that many of our pastors and people have refused to swallow blindly the alibis and flabby efforts at defense of a few of our leaders, following this unsavory revelation. Unfortunate as is our plight, there is in it the possibility of great blessing if only we awaken, arise, assert ourselves, and refuse to be delivered by a little group of Socialist planners and fellow travelers.

A New Concept on Asia: Asians, Not Americans, Are Chief Losers to Russia and Communism—Filipino Advances New Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer, writer and economist, has a new analysis of the situation in Asia and the role that America plays on that continent of more than 1,000,000,000 people. I hope and urge those who are interested in the subject, specially the State Department policy makers, to read his analysis, for it may be the key to a new approach to the problem that is becoming more and more involved everyday.

Mr. Villamin's thesis in his own words is as follows:

(a) The Asian peoples should be made clearly to realize that the basic issue in Asia today is not between Russian communism and American democracy, not between Russia and the United States, but rather between Russian communism and Asian nationalism, culture, religion, economic interests, and its own philosophy of life—the Asian old order; (b) that it is of infinitely less consequence for America to lose Asia, as many Americans put it, than for Asia to lose America; and (c) that in losing America, Asia would be getting Russia, with its material poverty, its ideological severity, and its comprehensive restriction of individual freedom and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make Mr. Villamin's statement a part of my remarks.

The statement follows:

A NEW REALISTIC ATTITUDE TOWARD ASIA

(By Vicente Villamin)

At present, by force of circumstances, the United States policy actions in Asia may be said to be on a day-to-day basis. That is practical. That is a necessity. As long as the intent is honest and the purpose constructive, inconsistency in action is not a violation of virtue. The United States wants to help Asia, continuing a long tradition and policy. And Asia wishes that help to continue. But the Russians and the Communists have muddled up everything, misrepresented the United States and, unrealized as yet by the Asian peoples, are placing those peoples under the Communist severe regime, lorded over by the powerful and undaunted masters of the Kremlin.

There is an imperative need for a redefinition and reclarification of what the present attitude of America is and what it might be. There is no necessity for a fundamental modification of policy, for it is honest and constructive. What is desirable is a revision in the placement and intensification of emphasis.

The thesis of this paper is this: (a) The Asian peoples should be made clearly to realize that the basic issue in Asia today is not between Russian communism and American democracy, not between Russia and the United States, but, rather, between Russian communism and Asian nationalism, culture, religion, economic interests, and its own philosophy of life—the Asian old order; (b) that it is of infinitely less consequence for America to lose Asia, as many persons put it, than for Asia to lose America; and (c) that in losing America, Asia would be getting Russia, with its material poverty, its ideological severity, and its comprehensive restriction of individual freedom and liberty.

This new approach to the Asian situation requires a repositioning of the observer of the Asia-American scene from the present vantage point of the United States. There are many Americans who think and talk as though their country, instead of Asia, would be the chief loser to communism and to Russia. And that is center and circumference of the present misunderstanding of the issues that are being fought on that continent.

"We (Americans) Are Losing Asia Fast"—that is the title of an article in the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Stewart Alsop, a writer who recently made a flying visit in Asia. He says that Asia is being lost by America to communism, which means to Russia.

One does not lose anything, tangible or intangible, unless he owns or possesses it. What is America losing in Asia since she does not own or possess it physically or ideologically? Is it Asia's friendship she is losing? Is it Asia's democracy that is being lost by the Asians themselves?

Governments in Asia may be at odds with America on certain questions, but it is safe to state that the Asian peoples are friendly and grateful to America for solid reasons. Of all the "foreign devils," referring to all Western foreigners, the American has been the least selfish and the most helpful. Those peoples have a suppressed fear of the Russians, who say "comrades" in one side of the mouth and shout "obey" in the other.

Asia never has had any democracy, the sort America has, to lose to communism. Every realist knows that basic fact. It has its own philosophy of life, individual, family and national, that is neither communistic nor democratic.

What then is Asia losing to communism? What Asia is losing to communism is its very soul—the old order, which is its very own and its most precious possession. Asia, not America, is the loser. But America, cleverly aided and abetted by Russia, is creating a delusion for herself and confusion among the Asians by seeming to be the loser. That is why many Asians place the responsibility for their ultimate salvation on America instead of on themselves, and also why America is causing so much disappointment to them today. But that is not all the harm that is being done. America is unwittingly preventing the Asians from fully realizing that it is their very soul, their old order, that they are losing to communism.

Therefore, let this be crystal clear: Russia is ousting from Asia the Asian old order rather than America, which is hardly there. Russia wants the world to think that she is driving out imperialist America from Asia for the good of Asia. And apparently America, an unknowing victim of Russian propaganda, believes that Russia is doing just that and she worries about her world mission to save democracy and about her own world security. But the plain, commonsense fact is that Russia is planning communism in Asia for her own good by suppressing its old culture, its religion, its civilization, and its time-honored way of life.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that, largely as the result of the clash of American and Russian actions and propaganda, Asia does not yet comprehend that the issue it is facing is not Americanism against Russianism, but Russian communism against the Asian old order. When Asia comes to realize that this is the issue, it will find itself more consciously, assert its innate nationalism, and consider Russia as another foreign devil to be resisted, shunned, and rejected.

Russia's work of proselyting Asia is effective because she has a definite objective in Asia, which is to establish her authority and her system there, to have it in her political orbit and under the protection of the Russian armed forces. On the contrary, America's counsels on Asia are chaotically diverse, contradictory, and nebulous. No wonder Russia advances, while America falls back. And even American thinkers say we are losing Asia fast.

Because the real issue is befuddled, Asia does not realize clearly another tremendous fact. It is that Asia is losing America, the only foreign country that can and is willing to help it; substantially and unselfishly. Asia does not seem to know of Russia's poverty in material things and in spirit to be of help. Asia should know that Russia's plan is to help herself to the human and economic resources of Asia. When Asia loses America for Russia, it will result in the intensification of its poverty and the restriction or constriction of its liberty.

What is the logical philosophy of action for America in the present situation?

If America's influence in support of the old order is to be felt in Asia, she must make more positive disclosure of her motivations and objectives. As a part of that disclosure, America must make unequivocably clear that those motivations and objectives are radically different from Russia's, citing historical and contemporary precedents, and interpreting their respective purposes in the light of their comparative natural resources and their financial and industrial potentials. Asia will see the elemental wisdom of being with rich and liberal America than with poor, tightfisted and totalitarian Russia.

Asian governments may become communistic or "peoples' " governments because presently nationalism is defeating itself, but when the people come to know fully and clearly the mission of Russian communism, on the one hand, and the loss of American assistance and collaboration, on the other, they will present such formidable resistance to the new order, even if it be silent at least in the beginning, that the new Communist leaders of Asia will be compelled to relax their relations with the Russians and to reject both their actual and subtle domination of Asian life and affairs. That would be Asia's day of revindication and regeneration.

What the old order in Asia is differs with each country. But at bottom it is identical. It is the quintessence of thousands of years of both recorded and unrecorded history. Between it and Russian communism there is much more conflict than harmony and they are fundamentally beyond conciliation or even synchronization. They are oil and water.

In China, the old order was represented by the Chiang Kai-shek government. That government had done or did not do many things that made it unrepresentative of that order and the people lost faith in it. It is the loss of that faith, which infected even the army, that helped the Communists to win.

In Indochina, the Communists are good tacticians enough to say that they are fighting French colonialism and thus native nationalism; the old order is left dormant and beguiled. The political expedient of putting up a former royal playboy as the head of the country, when everyone knows that his main support is the French Army of 150,000 men, will inevitably be declared a failure.

In Korea, the Communists have separated themselves and created North Korea. In South Korea, the Japanese order has been expunged and under President Rhee there is a reassertion of the old order. America is directly helping that country to help herself.

In India, the old order is Indian, which was influenced at the top by British philosophy and culture. With its present political

independence and its circumspect and cautious leaders, India is a formidable bulwark against communism.

In Indonesia, the old order clings around the broad conceptions of Buddhism and Mohammedanism built on an agricultural and oceanic economy. Four hundred years of Dutch colonialism have served both to develop the country materially and to accentuate the nationalism of the Indonesians to the point that many of the present leaders of the Indonesian Republic fought against the Dutch in the last war on the side of the Japanese, for whom they do not have much love. Indonesian nationalism, the efflorescence of the old order, will beat communism hands down.

In the Philippines, American democracy has taken deep root and communism is being fought according to the democratic rules—enlightment instead of suppression. The preservation and strengthening of the Philippine democracy will serve to make it a visible model for all the peoples of Asia to emulate.

In the face of militant communism, fighting down discredited nationalism and old-fashioned colonialism, and encountering disorganization and disintegration, Asia seems fated to succumb and be annexed to Russia's ideological dominion. If that happens it would be but a transient condition, for when the peoples of Asia find out that they have lost America, lost their age-old liberties, and have acquired Russia, its poverty, its severity, and its regimentation, they will rally to the old order and, with their leaders, the wiser for the experience, they will expunge communism from their life and tell Russia to quit Asia for good and all.

America, either voluntarily or upon the urging, either expressed or implied, of Asia, could help powerfully the Asian peoples to preserve their old order in an atmosphere of the present-day concepts of liberty, opportunity, and independence.

The Legion G-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following short editorial that appeared in the Boston Post, March 29, 1950:

THE LEGION G-DAY

The American Legion and its national chaplain, the Reverend Edward J. Carney, OSA, of Lawrence, are to be congratulated for the establishment of G-day—a day to be set aside during the week of April 16 for observance as God's Day. The nearly 17,500 Legion posts and nearly 13,500 women's auxiliary units, located in virtually every village and hamlet in the Nation, should prove a powerful factor in turning the attention of peoples of all faith and creeds back to God.

This nonsectarian observance, which has already won the endorsement and approval of leaders of all faiths, can be a tremendous force in every community, large and small, and should show the American people that the Legion's motto, For God and Country," really means something to the members of the world's biggest and greatest association of war veterans. The Legion should have full public support in making this splendid observance a great success.

Congress Due To End 25-Year Back-Pay Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of Monday, March 27, 1950, which gives the background of a bill, H. R. 7767, now before the Judiciary Committee, to provide for the payment to Federal Customs employees of extra compensation for services performed on Sundays and Federal holidays after September 29, 1931:

CONGRESS DUE TO END 25-YEAR BACK-PAY ROW—BILL WOULD MEET CUSTOMS CLAIMS

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—A controversy which started a quarter of a century ago over back-pay claims of Federal customs inspectors may be settled soon by congressional action. A measure spelling out rights to overtime pay of inspectional employees has been drafted by the National Customs Service Association and introduced by Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, Michigan.

There are 2,530 customs inspectors at various United States ports. Approximately a fourth of these are stationed in New York. John F. Doyle, of the customs service's liquidation division in New York City, is vice president of the group which drafted the proposed legislation.

LONG, UPHILL FIGHT

Alfred F. Beiter, national president of the association, asserted today that congressional action to provide for back-pay claims is long overdue. Officers and employees of the customs service, he declared, "Have tried for years to have their rights to amounts earned under extra compensation statutes fairly and fully recognized by the administrative departments."

The controversy started early in the 1920's, Mr. Beiter explained. It continued until the middle of the 1930's, when employees took a test case to court. It dragged for several years, but a favorable decision was finally handed down by the Supreme Court in 1944.

DID NOT APPLY TO ALL

Under that decision, according to Mr. Beiter, certain of the employees received payment back to September 1, 1931. But when the employees attempted to persuade the administrative department to apply the Supreme Court decision to other cases where the same type of services was performed, the department refused and still further litigation was necessary.

The customs inspectors won another favorable Court of Claims decision in 1946. Nevertheless, Mr. Beiter said, the administrative departments "have continued since then to refuse to recognize certain aspects of the judicial decisions in settling similar claims, and the matter is still not satisfactorily settled. It is the objective of this bill effectively to dispose of that long-standing problem."

The Dingell bill provides that if any person to whom extra compensation may be payable has died or become legally incapacitated, the money will be paid to his legal representative.

WOULD SET UP SPECIAL UNIT

The measure would lead to creation of a special committee to determine the amounts of money to be paid to any employee. One member would be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, another by the Comptroller General and the third, an employee representative, by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The bill has been referred to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for consideration. Representative DINGELL said he would press for early action.

Strengthening the Army of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Harry H. Schlacht which appeared in the Hearst newspapers of March 28, 1950:

STRENGTHENING THE ARM OF LIBERTY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country."

We salute today the Boy Scouts of America on the happy completion of four decades of distinguished service to American boyhood. The Boy Scouts of America have become part of the very heart of our Nation. The group is an American institution. It is representative of our Nation. It is nonsectarian. It is adapted to the boys' needs. It teaches our lads to practice the fundamentals of good citizenship, of self-reliance, of fair play for others, of the love of God.

The boys are trained in the Scout spirit, living the ideals of Scouting, living the ideals of team work in the homes and church, in the schools and community.

They are taught to cherish loyal and devout adherence to the principles of Americanism. They are taught to respect and support their religious institutions, for a republic cannot live without the spiritual strength of God. They are taught that democracy is America and that America is democracy. The boys live it. The boys practice it.

The Boy Scouts of America have initiated their declaration of purpose in 1950 to strengthen the arm of liberty. They believe that true liberty is rooted in a belief in God and in the brotherhood of man. They believe that love of country is born and fostered through the spirit of service.

The Boy Scouts of America in this fortieth anniversary crusade year are pledged to strengthen the arm of liberty by strengthening themselves through the practice of the Scout Oath "To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

They pledge to strengthen community and Nation through civic good deeds, through faithful performance of religious obligations, through contributions to good citizenship in terms of self-reliance and self-discipline.

This modern crusade for strong Americanism launched by the Boy Scouts of America is America's answer to all the modern isms of dictators.

This epic crusade is a bugle call and a challenge to every American.

And so we say on this happy birthday, a hearty toast from coast to coast to the Boy Scouts of America.

Sustained by faith in America, sustained by faith in God, may you help achieve the objective of mankind, peace—not by force, but with freedom.

Our greatest weapon is our example.

Our greatest strength is our devotion to God and country.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the people in my congressional district are becoming very concerned because of this continuous spending of their money, and they are alarmed over the growing magnitude of the national debt. They want to know for whom and for what their money is being spent and what brakes, if any, the Congress is applying. It is hard for them to keep up with all the programs of the Fair Deal and the New Deal.

For instance, let us examine just one program. There is confusion in the minds of people in my district over the so-called price support program—some believing that the farmers in my district receive benefits under the CCC program—some believing that the program is paying for itself. Nothing could be further from the truth. Yesterday, Ralph S. Trigg, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation that runs the price program, told a congressional committee that on February 28 this Government had invested more than $4,000,000,000 in farm-price supports. We are to be confronted soon with a request of the Secretary of Agriculture for another $2,000,000,000 for the same program. From January 1 to February 28 the amount invested in this price program increased $400,000,000 and, in simple arithmetic, that means that the Government has been spending on this program about $10,000,000 for every business day. If these programs were a success, perhaps no one could complain but, in potatoes alone, the losses to the taxpayer run into millions and millions of dollars. Just to pick a few of the items in addition to corn, cotton, and wheat which amount to about a billion dollars each, we find listed $14,000,000 in tobacco; $92,000,000 in beans; $23,000,000 in peanuts; $100,000,000 in dried eggs; $1,000,000 in raisins, and so on and so on. The cost of carrying charges—storage, insurance, and so forth—for these items is $25,000 per hour or $400 per minute. Does this look like the program pays for itself? Incidentally, the farmers in my district do not raise tobacco and cotton and the taxes they pay are not just peanuts.

How silly can these governmental agencies be? Well, at the very time when we had stored milllions and millions of dollars' worth of surplus food, we find an agency of the United States Government, to wit: the Quartermaster General, advertising in a newspaper in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., for bids on potatoes and eggs for the use of the armed services. Small wonder that the people have become obstinate about this spending program.

As long as we are stuck with the program, we should try to do a few things to alleviate its impact upon the taxpayers' pocketbooks. I have introduced a bill which would compel any agency of the United States Government to first receive a certificate from the Secretary of Agriculture or the CCC that there are no surplus eggs or potatoes available before bids can be received by any of these agencies for the purchase of eggs or potatoes. Why buy something we alreay have paid for and is going to waste? I hope that the Committee on Agriculture and the Members of the House will support this bill. If the CCC authorities who are entrusted with the power of disposing of surplus commodities lack sufficient business acumen to dispose of these commodities in a businesslike way, then the Congress should take the necessary action to force this agency to do so.

The Burleson amendment should be adopted. Under it we could use spoiling surplus commodities for hard dollars. Why give money when we have in abundance the very things these ECA countries could buy elsewhere—with American dollars?

One other disposition of surplus is feasible: the grain surpluses which are hoarded by the CCC should be distributed to our poultrymen who badly need these grains at a fair price, thereby assuring the Government of at least some return. These are only three suggestions to ease the burden. There are many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the hard-working people who have to pay for all of these "shots" are in revolt against the ruthless expenditure of their money. In good conscience let us reassess our position and, as representatives of the American people, let us try to do a decent job for them. The bill under consideration now on the floor of the House, and the appropriations bill soon to come, provide us all with a golden opportunity to do just that.

Title III of the ECA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append two telegrams showing the support of two of the great churches of our country for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. These are eloquent and self-explanatory support for this measure:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 30, 1950.*

JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building:

The Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches hopes you will give strong support to point-4 legislation now being considered. We consider leadership of United States of utmost importance in this matter. We urge also that provision be made to give such technical assistance through United Nations so far as possible.

RAY GIBBONS,
Director.
HERMAN F. REISSIG,
International Relations, Secretary, Council for Social Action.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 30, 1950.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS:

Urge strong support for legislation which will enable our country to play leading role in expanded program of technical assistance under auspices of United Nations Federal Council of Churches on record believing point-4 program of genuinely international character should be in forefront of American bipartisan foreign policy.

WILLIAM SCARLETT,
Episcopal of Missouri, Chairman, Federal Council, Department International Justice and Good Will.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith a copy of a speech which I recently made over the radio on the Brannan farm plan:

It is now almost a year since the Brannan farm plan was presented to the public. During that time it has been widely discussed. In fact, during a period which has been notable for the happening of many world-shaking events and when some history-making sensation occurs almost every day, the Brannan farm program has continued to be a subject of great interest. This interest is due in part at least to two things: First, the plan's unquestionable political appeal and, second, its questionable economic soundness.

The secret of its political appeal is that it offers something to everybody. From that standpoint it's a stroke of political genius. On the one hand its advocates say to the farmers, "The United States Government is going to guarantee you an income at high wartime levels." And to consumers they say, "We are going to give you low-priced food." That comes mighty close to being utopia. It sounds too good to be true. And unfortunately it is, because when you bring the plan down from the stratosphere and look it over to see what makes it tick you find that a lot of ugly, unutopian things show up.

You find that this isn't legerdemain after all and that if farmers are to get high incomes and consumers are to have cheap food, someone is going to have to pay a bill, and a pretty big bill it's going to be if the plan is carried out on the scale envisioned by its proponents. How big? Secretary Brannan says he doesn't know. Up to date no advocate of the plan has come along with any

figures. They don't like to talk about that part of it.

A good many people have tried to make an estimate. The Department of Agricultural Economics of the University of Illinois has said: "It could easily be as much as the total Federal budget before the war." The same department, taking hogs as an illustration, has estimated that hog supports alone might cost $700,000,000 annually and hogs represent only one-seventh to one-eighth of the output of our farms. The American Farm Bureau Federation, after a study of the cost of the plan as to milk alone, estimated it would amount to $2,480,000,000 annually.

Other estimates as to the cost of the plan as proposed have ranged from $2,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 per year. Some of the advocates of the plan have compared it to the British food subsidy program, the cost of which has increased every year, amounting in 1948 to the colossal sum of $2,272,000,000. Our population is three times as large as that of Britain so on the basis of population alone the cost of a similar plan here could run to almost $7,000,000,000. But that doesn't take into account that the British are on an austere diet. If they consumed per capita the food we do in this country their cost would undoubtedly be higher and so we are safe in assuming, I think, that the plan here would cost more than three times as much as the British plan is costing.

To make the plan work someone is going to have to dig up billions of dollars because there's no other way to give the farmer high income and the consumer low prices. And where will the money come from? Well, from Uncle Sam—and the only money Uncle Sam has is what you and I give him. That means that every consumer and every farmer is going to have to dig down in his pockets and fork over the money to carry out this gigantic spending operation, and when you count taxes this cheap food may be pretty high-priced food.

But suppose we don't dig up the dollars? Suppose Congress says that with a five-and-a-half-billion-dollar deficit already existing, we just can't appropriate the additional billions which will be necessary to enable Uncle Sam to pay a part of everybody's grocery bill.

What will happen then? Well, initially at least the farmer will be left holding the sack. He will have done his part. He will have produced all that the Secretary of Agriculture asked him to produce. By reason of this heavy production his prices will have declined just as they always do in a time of heavy production when there are no price supports. The consumer will be getting his cheap food but the Secretary will have to tell the farmer. "It's too bad but Congress didn't appropriate the money." Maybe consumers will think that is a good thing, but if they do they will be taking a very short-sighted view because low farm prices and bankrupt farmers in the end mean depression and hard times for everyone. At least that's been the case in the past.

So the Secretary will have to look around for some other means to make good his promise of high incomes for farmers. What can he do? Well, for one thing he can start limiting and controlling the production of farm products on the theory that scarcity will bring high prices. To do that in any effective way will in all probability result in the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. We'll have in this country exactly the same thing they have in England where the Government tells every farmer what he must produce and how much he must produce and if he doesn't carry out the orders in that respect he loses the use of his farm and it is turned over to someone else to operate.

If this sounds farfetched to anyone I suggest they write their Congressman and get a copy of the bill S. 1971 which puts the Brannan plan into legislative form. This bill was written in the Department of Agriculture and sent to Congress for introduction. It was introduced in the Senate on May 31, 1949. It is 86 pages long. A part of it is a restatement of some of the laws already on the books but much of it is new. Fifteen pages of the 86 relate to penalties upon farmers and there are more pages with penalties for those who deal in agricultural products. I think most farmers would be interested in reading the provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the bill. This section provides that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such reports as may be required by the Secretary; and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $500. And if they make a false report of record they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned for not more than a year. My prediction is that if this bill ever becomes a law we'll either have to have more farm bookkeepers or bigger jails.

We've never had any experience here with an absolute Government-controlled agriculture so we don't know exactly how it will work out but if the history of other countries is any criterion we know that such control will eventually mean less production and more inefficient production. It will mean higher food prices. So in the end the Brannan plan will be just as much of a gold brick for the consumer who has been led to think he will get cheap food as it is for the farmer who wakes up some morning and finds that he has lost control of this farm. Is all this an exaggeration? Not in the least, if the Brannan plan is actually carried out to the extent necessary for its proponents to make good on the promises which they have been making to both producers and consumers.

I think it should be said in justice to the farmers of this country that the Brannan plan did not originate with them. They were not consulted. They had no part in formulating it. Rather it originated with the political leaders of organized labor. It is frankly an effort on their part to form a political coalition between farmers and organized labor. They say in effect to farmers, "Help us elect Members to Congress who will repeal the Taft-Hartley law and we'll help you get the Brannan plan." The labor politicians can't lose on that one. If successful they get repeal of Taft-Hartley toward which they've been moving heaven and earth, and cheap food temporarily. And I know of no way farmers can win on it because the ultimate result must inevitably be lower farm prices, or in the alternative Government control of all agricultural production and ultimate nationalization of the industry. Politically what will happen is what has always happened when a farmer-labor coalition has been attempted. The labor politicians take over the organization and the farmer is left out in the cold.

Now let me make it clear that what I have been discussing is the political Brannan plan of something for everybody. That's the basis on which its proponents are trying to sell it and the basis on which it must be judged. I don't think the farmers of this country will fall for this political Brannan plan. They are too smart to be caught that way. The wonder is that anyone who knows farmers would expect them to be for it. I am afraid that the labor politicians who concocted this plan have gotten their idea of a farmer from the funny papers and are laboring under the delusion that he will buy the Brooklyn bridge if a sufficiently clever line of salestalk is used.

A lot of farmers are wondering why, if the Brannan plan is such a good thing for farmers, it wouldn't be just as good for the manufacturer and the workingman. Why not apply it to the production of automobiles or farm machinery or much-needed housing? Everybody knows the prices of those things should come down. This could be done by reducing wages and cutting other costs. No one would lose. Workers would get a subsidy out of the Treasury to make up the loss of wages. Employers would be given Government payments to make up their losses. And the public would get cheap automobiles and farm machinery and housing and maybe a lot of other things. Something for everybody. Isn't it lovely?

Insurance Against Mass Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 17, the Union Labor Advocate of St. Louis, Mo., a newspaper dedicated to the upholding of the principles of the American Federation of Labor, carried a story pointing out the useful purpose which transit radio can serve in these unsettled times.

It is heartening, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to learn in these times of uncertainty that organized labor recognizes the value of civil defense and is appreciative of any and all elements in connection therewith which might save the lives of thousands in the event of an attack upon our cities.

Most of us can recall the chaos that was caused in this country in the late thirties by what was intended to be an entertaining broadcast by an imaginary invasion by men from Mars upon New York City. There was at that time no threat of war facing this Nation. There were no stories being circulated at that time even of flying saucers. Yet the mass hysteria caused by that supposedly entertaining radio broadcast startled this Nation and made us the laughing stock of the world.

Today even the most optimistic authorities admit that we must expect, in the event of war, attacks upon our centers of population. We as a democratic nation must also assume that such attacks will be our first knowledge that we are at war.

It has been said recently by members of the Senate that mass hysteria could do more damage to America's war-making potential than the bombs in an atomic attack on this country.

Our communications, particularly all elements of broadcasting, mobilized to meet such an emergency constitutes our best defense against the chain of fear which might result in mass hysteria, for only through communications can people be warned and fears dispelled.

Again may I say that it is encouraging to note that organized labor has, according to the story which I have mentioned

in the Union Labor Advocate, published in my city, recognized the value of transit radio as an element of defense.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the story to which I have referred:

PUBLIC LIKES TRANSIT RADIO, JACOBS FINDS—POLL AMONG RIDERS OF STREETCARS, BUSSES, PROVES IT, UNION CHIEF SAYS

The present newspaper uproar over the merits of transit radio on streetcars and busses is not only rather silly, but not in accord with the opinion and feelings of the riding public say several union officers who were interviewed by an Advocate reporter.

Union memberships in sampling polls said they enjoyed music while they rode, these labor leaders said. The innovation is new to St. Louis and a few complaining letters have appeared in the daily newspapers.

It is evident, however, that the other side, while the vast majority of riders, has been less vocal.

One rider after another, interviewed, said they enjoyed the transit radio programs, music, news, weather reports, etc., as relaxation after a hard grind on the job. Objectors were few.

Among the prominent union officers making such checks of bus and streetcar riders was Business Manager Frank W. Jacobs, of AFL Electrical Workers, Local No. 1.

Other officers and members of local No. 1 took part in the opinion survey, with results already noted.

Besides a desire to ascertain public opinion factually, local No. 1 has an additional interest, since members of that union install and service radio in busses and streetcars and also are employed by radio stations.

Many of the objectors could be classed as cranks and confirmed "crabs," Jacobs told the Advocate, after compiling results of the check-up.

In these unsettled times, Jacobs points out, transit radio can serve a decidedly useful purpose by discounting possible false rumors and advising the public promptly of major happenings, advance knowledge of which could put the people on their guard.

Jacobs characterized the scattered attacks on transit radio as a tempest in a teapot—a cracked pot, at that.

Reorganization Plans of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD memorandums compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the 21 reorganization plans submitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, 1950. Each of the 21 plans is covered in detail as to purpose, background, their relation to the Hoover Commission reports, and possible issues that may be involved.

I submitted for the RECORD on Tuesday, March 21, 1950, as appears at pages 3699–3702, a brief summation of these plans in relation to their conformity with and deviation from the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Plans Nos. 1 to 6 are covered in a single memorandum, all of them providing for the centralization of functions in the Departments affected—Treasury, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. A special memorandum on plan No. 1, on which resolutions of disapproval—Senate Resolutions 246 and 247—have been filed, will be prepared and submitted to the Senate prior to beginning of hearings, on April 11.

The general provisions of plans 7 to 13, on regulatory agencies, are also covered by a single memorandum, relating to the vesting of administrative functions in the chairman, appointment of chairman by the President, and so forth. A separate memorandum covers details of plan No. 12, scheduled for hearings before the committee beginning Tuesday, April 4.

Separate memorandums are submitted on plans 14 to 21, inclusive.

These memorandums have been prepared with a view to assisting Senators in answering inquiries relating to the plans, and to provide them with a concise summation as to the contents and intent of each of the reorganization plans.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
March 25, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81–2–40]

REORGANIZATION PLANS 1–6 OF 1950: CENTRALIZATION OF FUNCTIONS IN (1) TREASURY, (2) JUSTICE, (3) INTERIOR, (4) AGRICULTURE, (5) COMMERCE, AND (6) LABOR DEPARTMENTS

On March 13, 1950, the President transmitted various messages to Congress for reorganization of Government agencies, under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949: (a) A general message discussing 21 proposed individual plans as a whole; (b) another general message on the first 13 of the 21 plans; and (c) 21 messages presenting individual plans. His first general message describes plans 1 to 13 as designed "to establish clear and direct lines of authority and responsibility for the management of the executive branch" which is urged in general terms in Hoover Commission Report No. 1 on general management, and in specific terms in Commission reports on individual departments.

The second general message discusses more fully the centralization in six department heads of the functions now scattered among subordinate officials (the other three Cabinet Departments of State, Defense, and Post Office were acted on last year). It emphasizes a "principal finding of the Hoover Commission (that) the first and essential step in the search for economy and efficiency in the executive branch of the Government is to correct the present diffusion of authority and confusion of responsibility. * * * Without this action all other steps to improve organization are doomed to failure. * * * The heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments (and) department heads must have adequate staff assistance. * * *"

The second message then states that the above Hoover Commission finding is developed in plans 1–6 through provision of "a clear line of responsibility and authority from the President through the department heads down to the lowest level of operation in each department * * * Each department head (is provided an Administrative Assistant Secretary) to assist him in the managerial side of his responsibilities (because) specific improvements in management can be made only through continuous attention to the effective performance of such aids to management as budgeting, accounting, personnel, and management analysis. Appointment of these new civil service officials by the department heads with the approval of the President will tend to establish a career pattern for these positions extending across departmental lines. (Additional Assistant Secretaries) will provide more adequate staff assistance in supervising and directing the policies and programs."

Resolutions of disapproval of plan No. 1 were introduced in the Senate (S. Res. 246 and 247) for Senators ROBERTSON and CAPEHART, on March 31, 1950, and hearings are scheduled before the committee beginning on Tuesday, April 11.

Other provisions: Plans 1–6 authorize each Secretary to delegate functions, to transfer records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriation, and to appoint an administrative assistant secretary under the classified civil service, with the approval of the President, at $14,000 per year. In addition, the President is authorized to appoint assistant secretaries, subject to confirmation by the Senate, at the usual salary, as follows: One in Interior, in addition to two now authorized; two in Agriculture, in addition to one now in office (only one addition is urged in the Hoover Report on the Department of Agriculture); and one in Justice, who will replace an assistant solicitor general to be abolished, and who will supplement the six present assistant attorneys general and one solicitor general. (A deputy attorney general is also created in lieu of the present assistant attorney general). No addition is proposed to the present three assistant secretaries in the Labor Department, and to the two each in Commerce and Treasury Departments. (Hoover Task Force E on Departmental Management recommends at least three assistant secretaries in even the smallest department.)

ISSUES INVOLVED

The limited opposition to plans 1 to 6 thus far indicated follows:

Plan 1, Treasury Department: The American Banker, banking newspaper, is opposing centralization of Treasury functions because it would further detract from the prestige and authority of the self-supporting Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. This old office supervises and controls national banks, especially through regular examinations, meets with the FDIC, and reports to Congress. The newspaper states that few bankers will question the present Secretary of the Treasury * * * since he was, at one time, a national bank examiner (but) future Secretaries of the Treasury might, in effect, virtually end the office's time-honored functions, and adds that the merger of Treasury and Comptroller legal divisions under Mr. Morgenthau's regime in effect, ended the assumed independence of the Comptroller.

A total of 300 communications, from 37 States, have been received by the committee to date, all except one being in opposition to the plan.

Plan 2, Justice: There has been some oral objection voiced to the proposed centralization of powers in the Attorney General as weakening the status of the FBI. Actually the plan would increase his present powers in but small degree.

Plan 6, Labor: This plan would centralize in the Secretary all functions throughout the Department of Labor. It was included in the original 1947 proposal to return the United

States Employment Service to the Department of Labor, but was dropped before that return was authorized after two rejections by Congress. The present limited plan again raises the question of the propriety of a head of a Labor Department (which, by organic act of 1913, is dedicated to fostering primarily the welfare of the wage earner) taking over regional determinations under the Fair Labor Standards Act relative to wages and hours, now independently administered by the Administrator of the combined Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions. In practice the same Division personnel, both departmental and field, takes care of wage, hours, safety, and other requirements of the Public Contracts Act, and the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, although the Secretary of Labor has ultimate authority.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has submitted a memorandum urging rejection of Plan 6 on the grounds that (a) it was a segment of the larger related rejections by Congress already mentioned; (b) it would improperly subject the above Administrator to a Secretary charged by statute with partisan labor interests; (c) it would be unthinkable to place the present particularly partisan Secretary in direct punitive power over practically all employees, and (d) not even the most fair-minded Secretary should be asked to resolve the basic conflict which exists.

With respect to all six plans, it is to be expected that objections will frequently be voiced over any disturbance of the status quo of subordinate officials. The basic question pertinent to each plan is whether power should be centralized in the responsible department head or be scattered among his subordinates.

HERMAN C. LOEFFLER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

March 20, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81–2–35]

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 7–13 OF 1950 RELATING TO REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The major purpose of Reorganization Plans 7–13 of 1950 is to vest all administrative responsibility for day-to-day operations of the Government's regulatory commissions in each Commission chairman.

This is accomplished by (1) transferring (subject to certain limitations hereafter defined) of all executive functions to the Commission Chairman and (2) authorizing the Chairman to delegate these functions to officials, employees, and staff units of the Commission as he deems appropriate.

Such action is in accord with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, not only in its first report on general management of the executive branch (recommendation 14, "Heads of departments must have full responsibility for conduct of their departments"; recommendation 18, "Each department head should receive from Congress administrative authority to organize his department"; recommendation 20, "The department head should be given authority to determine the organization within his department"); but more specifically in its report on regulatory commissions (recommendation 1, "We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission"; and recommendation 6, "That the statutes be amended to permit commissions to delegate routine * * * work to members of (their) staffs.")

Elsewhere the Commission observed: "Purely executive duties * * * have been imposed upon these commissions with the result that these duties have sometimes been performed badly"; and, "Administration by a plural executive is universally regarded as inefficient. This has proved true * * * with these commissions."

ANALYSIS OF REORGANIZATION PLANS 7–13 OF 1950

Provisions applicable to all regulatory agencies concerned

Plans 7–13 transfer functions relating to (1) appointment and supervision of personnel; (2) distribution of business among personnel or administrative units; and (3) use and expenditure of funds, subject to limitations noted, to the Chairmen of the following regulatory bodies: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communications Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Limitations: The Chairman shall be governed by general policies of the Commission authorized by law; appointment by Chairman of heads of administrative units shall be subject to Commission approval; full time, regularly employed personnel in Commissioners' offices (other than Chairman's) are exempted from plan; budget estimate revision and distribution of appropriated funds are reserved to the Commission.

The plans also authorize the Chairman of the affected regulatory Commissions to authorize the performance by any officer, employee or administrative unit under his jurisdiction of any functions transferred to him under provisions of the plans.

Provisions applicable exclusively to individual agencies

Plan No. 7 (ICC) provides specifically that director of locomotive inspection and two assistant directors shall perform their functions subject to direction of Chairman.

Plans Nos. 7 (ICC), 8 (FTC), 9 (FPC), and 10 (SEC), transfer the functions of choosing a chairman from the Commissions to the President. The Commission made no comment on this proposal, but the task force report made specific recommendations to this effect. (Already provided by statute for FCC, NLRB, and CAB.)

Plan No. 12 (NLRB) provides specifically for transfer of functions of general counsel to Chairman, or to NLRB. Abolishes the general counsel.[1]

CONCLUSION

Firm resistance from many quarters has developed to Reorganization Plan No. 12 which would abolish the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on March 23, 1950, rejected House Resolution 516 (HOFFMAN of Michigan) to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 12, reporting it unfavorably by a vote of 18 to 7, with four Members reserving the right to support the resolution on the floor. The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on a resolution of disapproval introduced by Senator TAFT on April 3, beginning on Tuesday, April 4.

The statutory background of the general counsel, issues involved in the current dispute between the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel over the latter's independence from the Board, and arguments relating to his retention under existing statutes and his abolishment under legislation pending are contained in Staff Memorandum No. 81–2–33, March 20, 1950.

Some opposition has been previously expressed relating to the vesting of all administrative responsibility in the respective Commission chairmen.

CAB considered such action impractical in its report on the Hoover Commission's recommendations (S. Rept. 1153, p. 261). FPC disagreed with the recommendation (and also the task-force recommendation that its chairman be appointed by the President) for fear "our other members would be subordinated to the chairman," and that the proposal would enable the chairman "to exercise dominant authority in respect to policy matters" (S. Rept. 1158, p. 279).

It is understood, however, that these objections would not necessarily apply to Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 to 13, since the plans are not as extensive in coverage as proposed in the legislation pending before the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has informed the staff that the plans were cleared with the Commissions before presentation to the Congress.

MILES SCULL, Jr.,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 20, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81–2–33]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12 OF 1950, TO REORGANIZE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

PROVISIONS

Section 1 transfers to NLRB Chairman executive-administrative functions of the Board and of the general counsel, including: (a) appointment and supervision of personnel, (b) distribution of business among personnel and administrative units, and (c) use of expenditure of funds; subject to following limitations:

(A) The Chairman shall be governed by major policies, regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations of the Board as authorized by law;

(B) The appointment by the Chairman of the heads of the major administrative units under the jurisdiction of the Board shall be subject to approval of the Board;

(C) Full time, regularly employed personnel in the immediate offices of members of the Board other than the Chairman are exempted from provisions of the reorganization plan;

(D) The Board's functions relating to revising budget estimates and determining distribution of appropriated funds according to major programs are reserved to the Board.

Section 2 authorizes the Chairman to delegate to any officer, employee, or administrative unit of NLRB any function transferred to him by section 1.

Section 3 transfers all functions of general counsel not transferred by section 1 to the board. Abolishes office of the general counsel.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947

The office of the general counsel of the NLRB was established by section 3 (d) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act) as amended, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session (29 U. S. C. 153 (d). Its provisions follows:

"SEC. 3 (d). There shall be a general counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance

---

[1] In its final report on Regulatory Commissions the Hoover Commission made no recommendations exclusively directed to either the National Labor Relations Board or its general counsel. (See Staff Memorandum 81–2–33 on NLRB, March 20, 1950.)

of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law."

Senate and House managers of the conference upon H. R. 3020 which became Public Law 101 of the Eightieth Congress expressed their intent in establishing the general counsel in the following language of the conference report: [2]

Conference report on Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947

"The conference agreement does not make provision for an independent agency to exercise the investigating and prosecuting functions under the act, but does provide that there shall be a general counsel of the Board, who is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years.

"The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding the trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. He is to have, in addition, such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law. By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual, who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress.

"The House bill, in the section providing for the Administrator, provided that the regional directors and the chief regional attorneys were to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It was believed that better administration will result in having responsibility lodged in one person rather than having it diffused through numerous regional directors and regional attorneys, and the conference agreement omits this provision.

"Section 4 of the conference agreement provides that each member of the Board and the general counsel of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum. This section also provides that the Board may not employ any attorneys for the purpose of reviewing transcripts of hearings or preparing drafts of opinions, with the exception that any attorney employed for assignment as a legal assistant to any Board member may, for such member, review transcripts and prepare such drafts. There was a provision in the House bill and also in the Senate amendment having the same effect. This section of the conference agreement also provides that no trial examiner's report can be reviewed either before or after its publication by any person other than a member of the Board or his legal assistant, and in addition trial examiners are prohibited from advising or consulting with the Board with respect to exceptions taken to their findings, rulings, or recommendations. A similar provision was contained in the Senate amendment, but there was no such provision in the House bill. The combination of the provisions dealing with the authority of the general counsel, the provision abolishing the Board's review division, and the provisions relating to the trial examiners and their reports effectively limits the Board to the performance of quasi-judicial functions."

National Labor Relations Act of 1949

S. 249, the National Labor Relations Act of 1949 (81st Cong., 1st sess.) as reported would have repealed the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act) and reenacted with minor changes the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (the Wagner Act), thus abolishing the office of general counsel of the NLRB. A substitute for this act by Senator TAFT et al., which passed the Senate June 30, 1949, reenacted major provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act with numerous important changes, one of which was abolition of the general counsel.

Report of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 249

In its report on S. 249 (S. Rept. 99, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare declared that "the broad powers of prosecution and administration which the act (the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947) concentrates in the new office of general counsel, plus additional powers delegated to that office by Board (NLRB) members, make the general counsel a virtual dictator in the administration of the law."

Other pertinent comments upon the general counsel by the committee (pp. 39–40, S. Rept. 99) follow:

"The general counsel has unlimited discretion, 'on behalf of the Board,' over the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practice. When the general counsel exercises this discretion by refusing to issue a complaint his action cannot be reviewed by the Board. Three consequences flow from this statutory provision: (1) In such cases the general counsel is both prosecutor and judge, exercising in fact quasi-judicial functions similar to those entrusted to the Board, and his decisions cannot even be reviewed by the courts; (2) the general counsel has an absolute control over the cases which he will allow to come before the Board; and (3) conflicting rules can be established in similar cases, because the general counsel can refuse to issue a complaint in a case which under Board decisions would be an unfair labor practice.

"One of the most acute impacts of the evil of dual policy making is felt in the area of injunctions. It is generally recognized that an injunction of even the briefest duration will effectually dispose of the issues which give rise to a strike, since the employees are deprived of the only real bargaining power they have, the use of the strike. The interests of thousands of workers may thus be effectively jeopardized by a single decision of a single individual. Through the medium of securing preliminary injunctions, the general counsel may effectuate, and indeed has effectuated, views which the Board may later wholly repudiate.

"Although in entertaining petitions for injunctions, the courts are restricted to granting or denying temporary relief and only the Board may adjudicate the merits of the complaint, two United States courts of appeals, on appeals from district court preliminary injunctions, have passed upon the statutory construction of sections 8 (b) (4) (A) and 8 (c) in their impact on peaceful picketing in aid of a secondary boycott (*United Brotherhood of Carpenters, etc.* v. *Sperry* (the Klassen and Hodgson case) (170 F. (2d) 863); *Printing Specialties Union* v. *LeBaron* (23 L. R. R. M. 2145)). The act thus undermines the purpose of Congress in enacting the National Labor Relations Act of relying upon the Board's expert judgment for the decision of cases. If the Board disagrees with the court of appeals should it accept the court's view of the law, and abdicate its duty under section 10 (c) or should it overrule the court to which, ultimately, the Board's order will go on review? Since original adjudication has been reposed by statute in the Board, it would seem appropriate that the Board's views as to applicable law as well as facts be available to the court when it is called upon to deal with a case. An advantage of original adjudication by an administrative agency in a complex field like labor relations is that the courts, on review, have the benefit of the deliberations of a specialized body. The dual lines of appeal created by the Taft-Hartley Act reverse this process. The general counsel's independent views are tested in the first instance by the courts, with the danger that the Board may ultimately be reduced to the status of a mere finder of facts.

"Another fertile field for internal agency conflict has been the administration of representation cases. In this area the effective use of consent procedures makes it necessary that Board policy be effectuated regionally with a minimum of delay. Under present procedure, all instructions to field staffs are formulated by the general counsel, frequently without clearance by the Board. The Board members are thus isolated from their staffs and are substantially restricted to formal decisions in laying down representation case policy. They exercise no supervision over employees engaged in the performance of duties for which they, as Board members, are responsible.

"The Board members, of course, exercise ultimate decisional authority over representation cases. But even the Board's decisional authority in representation cases is impaired by the separation of functions. Section 9 (c) (3) of the act provides that economic strikers who have been replaced (as distinguished from workers whose strike was caused or prolonged by employer unfair labor parctices) shall not be eligible to vote in Board elections. In the Board's own view it must presume and hold that strikers have lost their eligibility to vote unless the general counsel issues a complaint against the employer and the complaint is sustained (*Matter of Times Square Corp.* (22 L. R. R. M. 1373)). Thus the general counsel is able to determine the outcome of an election conducted during a strike. If for any reason he refuses to proceed on charges filed by the striking union, the strikebreakers will vote in place of the strikers whose jobs they hold.

"Another source of internal friction lies in the general counsel's dual legal role. As prosecutor before the Board he is a litigant; as counsel for the Board he is required to express to the courts the Board's view of applicable law. In the past, the Board's views have differed from those of the general counsel on many important questions, both procedural and substantive. In such cases, the Board has no authority over the actions of the individual responsible for the views.

"The separation of powers constitutes a constant threat to the functioning of the agency. An adamant position too long maintained can lead to chaos. An area in which this danger is acute is that involving the bonds of the agency's jurisdiction. The Board members tend to adhere to the position taken by them under the Wagner Act. Except where secondary boycotts are involved, they reserve the right to decline to exercise jurisdiction where the effect of a dispute on commerce is slight. The general counsel, however, holds that under Taft-Hartley the agency must exercise jurisdiction wherever it can be said technically to exist. Where the minimum legal requirements are present, he denies the power of the Board members to decline to exercise jurisdiction. Neither side has shown signs of yielding. Unless the general counsel alters his position, he will bring to trial and present to the Board for decision cases which he knows the Board will decline to accept—an absurd potential result of the two-headed monster which the act creates. Meanwhile unions and employers in border-line industries must remain uncertain as to their coverage under the law."

[2] Conference report, Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (H. Rept. No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 37–38.

CONFORMANCE OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 23, WITH HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Reorganization Plan No. 12 conforms to the Hoover Commission's recommendations affecting the Government's regulatory commissions in that it vests administrative authority in the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and gives the Chairman authority to delegate functions to subordinates as recommended by the Hoover Commission in its Report on General Management of the Executive Branch (pt. III), as follows: (Recommendation 14) "Under the President the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down through every step of the organization, and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior."

In its Report on Regulatory Commissions, the Hoover Commission made the following specific recommendations supplementing those in its Report on General Management of the Executive Branch: (Recommendation 1) "We recommend that all administrative responsibility be invested in the chairman of the Commission." (Recommendation 6) "The Commission, therefore, recommends that the statutes be amended so as to permit the commissioners to delegate routine, preliminary, and less important work to members of their staffs under their supervision."

However, nowhere in its final reports did the Hoover Commission recommend that the office of general counsel, or the general counsel, be abolished. The Commission made no recommendation which exclusively affected NLRB.

The Hoover Commission's task force on regulatory commissions, which conducted an organizational survey of the National Labor Relations Board at the Commission's direction, held that the position of the general counsel (1) is an unstable one, (2) has given rise to several internal administrative problems, (3) is anomalous. The task force's comments follow:

Comment of Hoover Commission task force upon NLRB general counsel [3]

"Another problem that has caused us considerable concern is the position of the general counsel. As indicated above, he is a prosecutor, an administrator, a policy maker. The incumbent, Mr. Robert Denham, has noted that his powers are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency." [4]

"The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.

"Such an official is in a peculiarly exposed position. In view of the wide powers of the office, it is inevitably subject to heavy pressure from all sides, and lacks the protection of either a multiheaded agency or an executive department in resisting such pressures. Experience during the first year indicates a tendency to develop close working relations with the joint congressional committee established by the act. To the extent that this has involved advice and suggestions with respect to interpretation of the act and its application to specific situations, the practice seems doubtful and likely to blur the desirable separation between the legislature and administration.

"But the administrative position of the general counsel is also anomalous. Thus the field offices under his supervision are engaged partly in representation work which is the direct responsibility of the Board, and partly in investigating, issuing, and prosecuting complaints, on which the general counsel has final authority. Under the act, the Board has the authority to appoint the regional directors and other employees. In part, as has been seen, the work of the general counsel is essentially prosecution of violations of specific offenses under the act. But insofar as his actions establish policy, they are of the kind frequently assigned to an independent commission.

"The unusual position of the general counsel has given rise to several internal administrative problems. One is significant enough to be noted here: In unfair labor practice cases, regional directors issue complaints, though only with the approval of the general counsel in some types of cases. The finality of refusal to issue a complaint has led to demands for an appeal; and it has been further urged that an appeal to the same unit in the counsel's office whose advice was followed in the original refusal is illusory, and that the appeal should be to an independent body. This problem high lights the nature of the authority the general counsel is exercising.

"Our conclusion is that the present position of the general counsel is an unstable one. Various proposals have been made for integrating the position more securely into the Government structure. Some have suggested assigning him to the Department of Labor or of Justice, but each has serious drawbacks as the preceding discussion of his functions should indicate.

"Our staff recommends the creation, by Executive order, of a Council of Labor under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, and including the general counsel and other Federal officials concerned with labor problems. The function of the council would be to coordinate Federal labor policy and to advise the President on appropriate action. This represents a compromise between the present independent status of the general counsel and his subordinates to a department head.

"Others have strongly urged that the office should again be placed under the Board. To this the objection is made that the prosecuting functions should be separate from the hearing of complaints. But as has already been indicated, only in part are his present duties genuinely prosecution; some parts are administrative and parts are a species of rule or policy making. It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities."

DIVERGENCE OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12 FROM HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

As indicated previously, the Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation for abolishment of the office of general counsel or of the general counsel of the NLRB.

Nor did the Hoover task force recommend the abolishment of the office, but suggested creation of a council of labor which would include the general counsel. (See above.)

POSITIONS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND OF GENERAL COUNSEL

The positions of the National Labor Relations Board and of the NLRB general counsel upon the independence of the general counsel under provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are expressed in the attached statements of recent date issued by each.

On March 23, 1950, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments rejected House Resolution 516 (HOFFMAN), which would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 12, by a vote of 18 to 7, thus in effect approving the plan. The Senate Committee on Expenditures will begin hearings on the plan April 4.

MILES SCULL, Jr.,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

(Attachments: (1) Statement by National Labor Relations Board revising delegation of functions to general counsel. February 25, 1950. (2) Statement by Robert N. Denham, general counsel, NLRB, relating to revision of delegation of functions, March 2, 1950.)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1950.

NLRB REVISES DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS TO GENERAL COUNSEL

The National Labor Relations Board today announced revision of the delegation of authority under which the general counsel performs certain functions on behalf of the five-member Board.

The general counsel's powers derive both from the provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act and the Board's delegation of authority to him. Today's revisions—the first since the memorandum of delegation of functions was adopted by the Board in August 1947—do not, of course, affect in any manner those powers of the general counsel which flow from the statute.

Today's revisions, the full text of which will appear in the Federal Register, are mostly of a clarifying nature. They were originally discussed by the Board with General Counsel Robert N. Denham in September and October 1949.

The two major revisions in the delegation of functions involve: (1) A clarification of the general counsel's role in the enforcement of Board orders in the courts; and (2) a modification of personnel policy affecting the agency's top field officers and the establishment of regional offices.

(1) Court litigation of Board decisions: As regards the enforcement of decisions and orders of the Board in the Federal courts the statute (sec. 10 (e)) provides: "The Board shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States * * * for the enforcement of such order." The Taft-Hartley Act further provides (sec. 10 (d)): "The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members)."

The 1947 memorandum of delegation of functions provided:

"General counsel will, upon direction and in behalf of the Board, petition for enforcement * * * and resist petitions for review of Board orders as provided in section 10 (e) and (f). * * * When directed to do so by the Board, the proceedings described immediately above will be initiated by general counsel without exception. Successive proceedings by way of appeal or on petition for certiorari will be prosecuted by general counsel unless directed to the contrary by the Board."

Today's revisions in the delegation of functions changed the above section to read as follows:

"On behalf of the Board, the general counsel of the Board will, in full accordance with the directions of the Board, petition for enforcement * * * and resist petitions for

---

[3] Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions (appendix N), pp. 139–141.

[4] Remarks of Robert N. Denham before the labor-relations section of the American Bar Association, Cleveland, September 23, 1947.

review of Board orders as provided in section 10 (e) and (f). * * * When he is directed to do so by the Board, the proceedings described above will be initiated and processed by the general counsel without exception. Successive proceedings by way of appeal or on petition for certiorari shall be prosecuted by the general counsel upon, and in full accordance with, the directions of the Board."

(2) Regional offices: As regards the personnel in the agency's regional offices, the statute (sec. 3 (d)) provides: "The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over * * * the officers and employees in the regional offices." The statute further provides (sec. 4 (a)): "The Board shall appoint * * * examiners and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties."

The 1947 delegation of functions to the general counsel gave him "full and final authority on behalf of the Board over the selection, retention, transfer, promotion, demotion, discipline, discharge, and in all other respects of all personnel engaged in the field * * *."

Today's revisions in the delegations of functions added the following language to the above grant of authority to the general counsel: *"Provided, however,* That no appointment, transfer, demotion, or discharge of any regional director, or of any officer in charge of a subregional office, shall become effective except upon approval by the Board. * * * The establishment, transfer, or elimination of any regional or subregional office shall require the approval of the Board."

Shortly after the Board adopted the delegation of functions in 1947, the Board's Chairman thus described what was originally intended in the memorandum of delegation of functions:

"The Board (had to devote much of its energy during the early weeks to the pioneering tasks of devising new administrative procedures which would both implement the intent of Congress and make for operating efficiency. * * * Several objectives had to be kept in mind:

"In the first place, the unfettered independence of the general counsel in investigating and prosecuting unfair-labor-practice cases was axiomatic under the provisions of the new law.

"Second, it was necessary to preserve the Board's own ultimate responsibility for the administration and interpretation of the statute as a whole, and its continuing responsibility for the conduct of representation and (election) proceedings.

"Third, it was essential to accomplish these things without either imposing on the taxpayers the burden of having two entirely separate staffs in the Board's field offices, or creating a single hybrid field staff. * * *

"A practical solution was called for. The Board therefore made an agreement with the general counsel that was premised upon his statutory authority to supervise the field and most of the legal staff without interference by the Board. * * * It was understood that so much of this authority as is delegated could be revoked by the Board at any time. * * *

"The law requires separation; it does not contemplate divorce."

The Board now consists of four members: Chairman Paul M. Herzog, and members John M. Houston, James J. Reynolds, Jr., and Abe Murdock. Paul L. Styles will be the fifth member when he assumes office next week.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1950.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT N. DENHAM, GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

When I was appointed to the office of general counsel of the Board, President Truman, in the presence of the then members of the Board, instructed me that, notwithstanding his opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act, it was the law of the land and as long as it remained such, he expected me to administer the law the way it is written and in accordance with the intention of the Congress. For 2½ years, I have done this, without criticism from my boss, the Fresident.

The National Labor Relations Board, however, on February 23, 1950, attempted to revise the structure of organization under which the Taft-Hartley Act has been so administered. The Board, in commenting on the attempted revision, stated that it does not, "of course, affect in any manner, those powers of the general counsel which flow from the statute."

It is because the so-called amendments which the Board is attempting to accomplish affect powers of the general counsel which do, in fact, flow from the statute, and would, if effective, deter the general counsel from the performance of the duties and the carrying out of the responsibilities imposed on him by Congress, that he finds it necessary to advise the public of that fact and of his refusal to submit to such action.

One of the primary objectives of Congress in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act was to separate the judicial from the prosecuting functions of the agency. Thus, the conference report of the managers on the part of the House, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 5, p. 6362, commenting on the duties and powers of the general counsel, stated:

"The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of prosecution of such complaints before the board. * * * By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress.

"The House bill, in the section providing for the Administrator, provided that the regional directors and the chief regional attorneys were to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It was believed that better administration will result in having responsibility lodged in one person rather than having it diffused through numerous regional directors and regional attorneys, and the conference agreement omits this provision."

If the above expressed intent of Congress means anything, it is obvious that the Board, by its action of February 23, is trying to exercise authority it does not possess. Contrary to these clear expressions of the intent of the Congress, it undertakes to assume control over "what takes place in the Board's regional offices" by attempting to control "the selection, retention, transfer, promotion, demotion, discipline (and) discharge" of all regional directors and officers in charge of subregional offices. While this is limited to a single class of field personnel, it clearly carries with it a presumption that the Board also has the power to exert similar control over all other regional office personnel, as well as the attorneys who are under the same "general supervision."

The job of the regional officers is to investigate and prosecute violations of the Taft-Hartley Act. Because the statute makes this prosecuting function the responsibility of the general counsel rather than of the Board, it follows that the regional officers can only be responsible to and controlled by the general counsel. Otherwise the general counsel could not function independently of the Board as was intended by the Congress. The general counsel could not legally delegate this prosecuting function to a Board member or to the Board itself. Obviously, therefore, he could not delegate the function to an agent controlled by the Board members. In the present scheme of things, the regional directors are clothed with broad autonomy, as the general counsel's representatives, to exercise this prosecuting function.

During the past 2½ years the criticism formerly common under the Wagner Act that the Board was judge, jury, and prosecutor has not been heard. The reason is that the general counsel acting through the regional officers, has investigated and prosecuted violations of the statute "independently of any direction, control, or review" by the Board members. He has been able to do so because of the erstwhile recognition by all concerned that the regional officers must be likewise independent of control by the Board members and responsible only to the general counsel, who in turn is responsible only to the President and the Congress. The Board has been, and by Congress was intended to be, judge and jury, but not prosecutor. Should the Board possess the authority it is now attempting to assert, such independence of action in the regional directors would be impossible.

It is important, particularly at this critical time in the Nation's economic history, that everything be done to maintain the confidence of the public and of labor and management in the fact that the labor laws of the country will be administered in the manner prescribed by the peoples' representatives. Because that is so and for other reasons herein stated, the general counsel should not and cannot acquiesce in this attempt by the Board to usurp authority not granted it either by the letter or spirit of the statute. Were the general counsel to take any other position in this matter, he would not be fully and faithfully carrying out the responsibilities which the people, through the Congress and the President, have imposed upon him.

Other material changes attempted to be made by the Board's action of February 23 have to do with the enforcement and defense of its orders before the courts.

Obviously the Board is entitled to look to the general counsel for representation before the courts and to direct the general counsel when and whether to proceed with enforcement petitions and defensive actions. However, there are some limitations on this obligation of the general counsel, measured by the nature of the issue involved, by the effect such action might have on the relation of the general counsel to the court as an officer of the court, or by the canons of ethics that apply to all attorneys. An outstanding example is found in several cases where the Board has issued orders which, in effect, assert that it has the authority to decide whether or not a complaint should have been issued at all, even though the facts show a violation and the Board has clear jurisdiction in the case. Two of these orders are now before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Judicial Circuit (*A-1 Photo Service,* (83 NLRB No. 86), and *Haleston Drug Stores, Inc.* (86 NLRB No. 125). In

each case the general counsel has argued to the Board that its order exceeds its own statutory authority and invades that of the general counsel contained in his exclusive and final authority to issue complaints or to refuse to do so. The general counsel cannot now, on behalf of the Board, urge the courts to approve this action. Accordingly, the general counsel has suggested that briefs in such cases be prepared under the supervision of the Board's Solicitor with the aid of whatever help may be required from the general counsel's staff, and that the case then be presented to the court by the Solicitor. This procedure will insure that the courts are fully informed of the Board's position in those cases. The general counsel, however, cannot be expected to urge the courts to approve the Board's incursion into his own area of statutory responsibility or to accept the Board's delegation to him of this type of assignment.

In the other cases where the status of the general counsel as an officer of the court has been affected, he has similarly suggested that briefs be supervised, signed, and argued by the Solicitor to avoid embarrassment and to insure an adequate presentation of the Board's position.

With the exception of such unusual assignments, of which only four or five have arisen, the general counsel is prepared as always to enforce the Board's order to the best of his ability consistent with his obligation to the court and in conformity with the canons of ethics governing the profession.

MARCH 21, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-36]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 14 OF 1950, LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT

PURPOSE

There are a number of Federal laws which provide for the maintenance of certain standards as related to the employment of laborers and other persons engaged on contracts to which the United States is a direct or indirect party. At the present time the administration of these acts prescribing labor standards and the enforcement thereof are a responsibility of the heads of the respective agencies which may be involved. Thus, it may be seen that such administration and enforcement vary according to interpretation and to method utilized under the processes of any particular agency.

For the purpose of assuring uniformity throughout the Federal Government, both as to administration and enforcement in relation to all such labor standards provisions, authority is centralized by this plan in the Secretary of Labor to prescribe uniform standards, regulations, and procedures for observance by all Federal agencies concerned and to make investigations so as to insure compliance with, and enforcement of, such standards.

CONFORMANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

In his letter of transmittal, the President states that this reorganization plan is in general accord with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. While the staff finds no specific recommendation of the Commission for the action taken by this plan, the following paragraphs would tend to indicate that this centralizing in the Secretary of Labor of responsibility for rules of administration and enforcement of labor standards is agreeable to the tenor of the Commission's attitude toward the Department of Labor and with the Commission's general position that similar functions should be grouped together.

The Hoover Commission definitely favored rebuilding of the Department of Labor by returning to it many functions previously severed and by placing in that Department functions hitherto lodged elsewhere. For example, in Report No. 13, Department of Labor, Recommendation No. 7 is prefaced by a statement that " 'Prevailing wage' inquiries incident to determining wages for blue-collar Federal employees are now conducted by the several agencies, and should be centered in the Bureau of Labor Statistics." Recommendation No. 7 itself states that there should be centralized in the Bureau of Labor Statistics responsibility for collection of data, research, and analysis relating to wholesale prices and living costs, employment and unemployment, working hours, wages, pay rolls, and productivity.

Further, at the beginning of chapter IV the Hoover Commission's report on the Department of Labor is an enumeration of eight separate agencies and functions suggested for transfer to the Department of Labor. This does not constitute one of the numbered major recommendations of the Commission but is in the nature of an inferential recommendation. The fifth item in the enumeration is "enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts (from contracting departments and agencies)." The staff wishes to emphasize to the committee the distinction between the significance of the foregoing quotation and the transfer proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 14. That distinction is that, whereas the quoted excerpt from the Hoover Commission's report relates to the actual enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts, Reorganization Plan No. 14 relates to the prescribing by the Secretary of Labor of "appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures" with respect to the administration and enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts. The importance of the distinction is that the enforcement and administration of labor standards are not transferred by the plan but remain vested in the individual agencies and departments of the Government.

Particularly pertinent to Reorganization Plan No. 14 is the following quotation from chapter V, entitled "Enforcement and Promotion of Employment Standards," of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Public Welfare (appendix P, p. 459):

"1. Regulation of employment standards is an established function of the Federal Government, partly as a means of preserving prevailing wage rates in the construction industry on Federal public-works contracts, and partly to promote economic stability by establishing a national wage floor for economic competition. These functions are centralized in the Labor Department, with the exception of the enforcement responsibilities in connection with contract violations, and the Maritime Commission's function of setting minimum wages in operating-differential subsidy contracts with private American companies engaged in foreign shipping. These are appropriate functions of the Labor Department, to which they should be transferred in connection with clarifying amendments to the coverage and exemptive provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

ACTS AFFECTED

This reorganization plan enumerates the laws of the United States in which are found the labor standards provisions with respect to which authority for prescribing standards, regulations, and procedures, and for the making of investigations as to compliance and enforcement is centered in the Secretary of Labor. There follows a list of those laws and a brief identification of each.

Act of March 3, 1931: This is a general law which provides that each contract in excess of $2,000 to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party and which involves the construction, alteration, or repair of public buildings or public works, shall contain a provision stating the prevailing minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be paid various classes of laborers and mechanics to be engaged.

Act of June 13, 1934: This is a provision of law that prohibits anyone from inducing, through threat, intimidation, or similar force, any person employed under a construction contract to which the United States is a direct or indirect party to give up any part of his compensation. The Secretary of Labor is already, in this case, empowered to establish reasonable regulations for contractors and subcontractors.

Act of August 1, 1892: This is an 8-hour law for laborers and mechanics generally, and specifically for any persons employed to perform services similar to those of laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging or rock excavation in any river or harbor of the United States or the District of Columbia, on work for which the United States or the District of Columbia is the direct employer or is a contract party.

Act of June 19, 1912: This law is similar to the act of August 1, 1892, and may be defined as a general 8-hour law for laborers and mechanics involved in work to which the United States is a contract party.

Act of June 3, 1939: This is a law relating to insurance by the United States of financial institutions to preserve them from loss as a result of loans and advances of credit and similar financial operations in connection with alterations, repairs, and improvements to existing structures and the building of new structures.

Specifically, section 212 (a) of this act provides that the National Housing Administrator shall not insure against loss in connection with construction unless the principal contractor certifies that the laborers and mechanics employed on the project have been paid not less than locally prevailing wages for corresponding classes of employees. This law already provides that determination as to prevailing wages shall be by the Secretary of Labor, and this plan would transfer to him additional authority relating to uniform administration and enforcement of labor standards.

Act of August 13, 1946, Hospital Survey and Construction Act: This is a law relating to construction of hospitals. Specifically, section 625 (a) of the act provides that a State plan for construction thereunder must include assurance to the Surgeon General of the United States that rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction on the project will not be less than prevailing wages, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for similar work.

Act of May 13, 1946, Federal Airport Act: This is a law relating to construction of airports. Specifically, section 15 (b) of the act provides that all contracts in excess of $2,000 for work on projects approved under the act and wherein labor is involved shall contain provisions establishing minimum rates of pay, such rates to be predetermined by the Secretary of Labor. Under this reorganization plan the Secretary of Labor will be empowered to prescribe rules relating to the administration and enforcement of labor standards, in addition to his existing authority relating to determination of prevailing wages.

Act of July 15, 1949, Housing Act of 1949: This law relates to slum clearance, community development, and allied activities. Specifically, section 109 provides that each contract for financial aid under the act shall contain provision for payment of locally prevailing salaries to architects, engineers, draftsmen, and technicians, and for the payment of locally prevailing wages to laborers and mechanics employed on the project, such locally prevailing wages to be determined by the Secretary of Labor. Reorganization Plan No. 14 will empower the Secretary of Labor

to prescribe rules for the administration and enforcement of labor standards in addition to such determinations of prevailing wages.

CONCLUSION

So far as the staff has been able to determine there is no important objection to this reorganization plan. It should be reported, however, that the proposal was previously made in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, defeated by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. That plan consisted of three sections, the third designed to accomplish the same results as this present Reorganization Plan No. 14. Section 1 would have transferred the United States Employment Service permanently from the Social Security Board (Federal Security Agency) to the Department of Labor, in which it had been placed originally after creation by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933; and section 2 would have transferred the functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor to the Secretary of Labor.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments recommended disapproval of the plan and, with respect to section 3 thereof, stated that, while there appeared to be some justification for centering in one official the responsibility for coordinating the administration and enforcement of Federal labor standards laws, it was felt that at that time it would be more appropriate to require careful consideration of the matter by appropriate congressional committees. The House had no more to say regarding section 3 and the significance of what it did say is not apparent from the record.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947 was considered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which recommended against passage of the concurrent resolution to defeat the plan. In its report, the Senate committee stated with regard to section 3 that coordination by the Secretary of Labor of the administration and enforcement of labor standards provisions should make for more consistency therein. Thus it may be seen that, when the ends sought to be attained by this present Reorganization Plan No. 14 were previously before the Congress, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was in favor thereof while the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments took an adverse viewpoint, although the exact nature of the objection is not apparent. Nevertheless, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947 was defeated by both Houses of Congress. Obviously, however, that defeat sprang from objection to sections 1 and 2, and was not due to any important objection to section 3, with the purpose of which we are here concerned.

The staff wishes to report further that this plan has been discussed with legal representatives of the Department of Labor. We are informed that, although under the language of the plan it may well be possible to construe that by it the Secretary of Labor is given authority with respect to "white collar" employees, the Department takes the view that the plan is intended to convey to the Secretary of Labor authority as to "blue collar" workers only.

THOMAS A. SAPPINGTON,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 27, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-41]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 15, ALASKA AND VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS

PURPOSE

This plan proposes to transfer the responsibility for administering the Alaska and Virgin Islands public-works programs from the General Services Administration to the Department of the Interior.

Government sources have indcated that the following basic administrative improvements may be effectuated if the plan is permitted to become effective:

(a) That local public works will be geared to the long-range interests of the inhabitants, and coordinated with the Department of the Interior's policies and programs for promoting the general welfare of the people of Alaska and the Virgin Islands.

(b) The GSA's primary mission is central administrative services, whereas these programs authorize construction which may be considered as an adjunct to community development, and properly belong in the Department of the Interior.

(c) The Department of the Interior has a paramount interest in the affairs of Alaska and the Virgin Islands, and should, therefore, be responsible for these programs.

(d) The centralization of these functions in a single agency will reduce duplication of effort and facilitate administration. This will also make it possible to hold designated officials responsible for execution of the programs.

(e) The plan is comparable to, and in accord with, the theory underlying the transfer of the Alaska Roads Commission to the Department of the Interior (44 Stat. 446).

THE ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

The Alaska public works program was authorized by Public Law No. 264, Eighty-first Congress, approved on August 24, 1949. The purpose of the plan is to foster a settlement program and increase the number of permanent residents of Alaska, to stimulate trade and develop resources, and to provide facilities for community life through a program of useful public works, including schools, hospitals, sewer and water systems, colleges, institutional and public buildings, incinerators, and other community facilities.

Under Public Law 264, any public body may apply for public works construction. The application must be made to the Community Facilities Service of the General Services Administration. The application must be approved by the Governor of Alaska and concurred in by the Secretary of the Interior, after which the Community Facilities Service enters into a contract with the local body stipulating that the Community Facilities Service will build the facilities and, on completion of the project, that it will be turned over to the local body at not less than 25 percent or more than 75 percent of the estimated cost.

The size of the Alaskan public works program is limited by law to a ceiling of $70,000,000, and duration of the program shall continue until the $70,000,000 is obligated, or, in any event, is to terminate on June 30, 1955.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

The Virgin Islands public works program was authorized by Public Law No. 510, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved on December 20, 1944. The act was designed to assist in the internal development of the islands, and authorized an appropriation of $10,028,420 for construction of about 29 projects specifically set forth in the act.

The act provided further that an appropriation of $2,028,420 should be made in fiscal year 1945, and $2,000,000 each year thereafter during the next 4 years. To date allocations total $5,643,942, or about one-half of the original program has been financed. The General Services Administration has, however, requested $1,300,000 in appropriations and $1,460,000 in contract authorizations in the budget for fiscal year 1951.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAMS

Pursuant to Public Law No. 264, the General Services Administration is responsible for administering the Alaska public works program. The administration of public works in the Virgin Islands was vested in the Federal Works Agency by Public Law No. 510. When that agency was abolished, under Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, its functions were also transferred to the General Services Administration. The Senate Public Works Committee has considered the question of jurisdiction over public works in Alaska and the Virgin Islands on three different occasions during the past 3 years. The long years of experience of capable technicians and the established organization available in the General Services Administration influenced the committee in making its recommendations that this agency should retain jurisdiction over these public works programs.

STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

No public works have been constructed in Alaska under Public Law 264, because the building season has been closed since the approval of the act. Appropriations of $1,000,000 and $4,000,000 in contract authorization, were approved by Congress on October 28, 1949, for fiscal year 1950. The General Services Administration requested an appropriation of $12,000,000 for this program for fiscal year 1951, and contract authorizations in amount of $13,000,000. The Administration recently opened a district engineers office in Juneau, to which has been assigned four employees who are authorized to supervise the local projects and to establish field offices in order that the program may be carried forward as soon as the weather permits.

Public works construction in the Virgin Islands was initiated in 1944, pursuant to Public Law No. 510, which vested the responsibility for administration in the Federal Works Agency. On July 1, 1949, this Agency was abolished and its functions transferred to the General Services Administration by Public Law No. 152. The General Services Administration is responsible for the design and construction of the projects, but, on completion, the projects are turned over to the local authorities for use and administration. Some of the programs have been developed and prosecuted within the limits of available funds. Others have been retarded because the officials in charge failed to consider local needs, had misconceptions in design, and failed to maintain adequate liaison with local officials. As a result some of these programs are behind schedule.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation relating to this plan. The Commission did recommend (No. 2, Department of the Interior) that the Department of the Interior be reorganized along more functional and major-purpose lines, and that community services (including public works) be transferred to the Department of the Interior, because of the major-purpose aspect. (Recommendations No. 4 and 8—Department of the Interior.)

The Commission supported these recommendations in the following language (Report on Department of the Interior, p. 17):

(a) Regrouping of development of natural resources and construction, according to major purposes, to secure coordinated policies in these fields.

(b) Provision of a center for coordination of State and Federal action in these fields.

(c) Provision for the Congress of an overall view of the major construction activities of the Government.

(d) Provision of a center for planning and action of Federal construction to be coordinated with the ebb and flow of employment.

The Commission did recommend that Federal construction should be centralized in

the Department of the Interior, and grants-in-aid or loans for construction should be vested in the major-purpose agency.

HOOVER COMMISSION DISSENTS

Commissioners Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe dissented in a separate report (p. 54) in which they admitted that the Department of the Interior should be reorganized, but contended that: "Finally, the addition of all Federal construction programs, as some members (of the Commission) suggest, even further dilutes the major purpose of a resources department. To combine in one agency works and resources emphasizes too largely the construction aspect. The purpose of the construction, which varies greatly from one agency to another, is lost, as it were, in this effort to build a department of many unrelated purposes."

These members of the Commission submitted the following alternate recommendations:

(a) Placing public building construction in the General Services Administration.

(b) Community services with health, education, and other related major-purpose activities.

(c) Hospital construction work in the agency concerned with Federal hospitals (the United Medical Administration).

ISSUES INVOLVED

In contacts with the various agencies affected by this plan, the staff has been advised that there are certain provisions of this plan which should be carefully considered by the committee, some of which are as follows:

(a) The Department of the Interior does not have the technical facilities to administer these programs.

(b) Centralizing all such responsibility in one agency, would not permit of intergovernmental checks by one group as against another.

(c) Local pressure on residential Government officials might result in one community's getting "the lion's share" of the projects, while another goes begging.

(d) Conflicts between the Alaska Field Committee and the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior might bring about confusion, delay, and dissatisfaction.

(e) No savings in funds or personnel is indicated or claimed by the administration should this plan become effective.

CONCLUSION

This plan does not accord with specific Hoover Commission recommendations, nor with the views of Commissioners Acheson, Pollock, and Rowe, in the following respects: (a) The President has not established a central public-works agency either in the Department of the Interior or as a separate agency; and (b) the plan, therefore, proposes to transfer a few small construction functions to the Department of the Interior without reorganizing the parent department as recommended by the Commission.

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 28, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-43]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 16, ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

PURPOSE

This plan proposes to transfer the functions relating to assistance to local school districts, and grants and loans for water-pollution-control projects, from the General Services Administration to the Federal Security Agency.

The President's message accompanying the plan states that by placing these functions in the agency of the Government best informed in matters of public-school administration, and the agency presently responsible for the preparation and adoption of plans for water-pollution control, will simplify Federal-State relations and improve administration of these programs.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Federal aid to overburdened school districts was originally authorized under title II of the Lanham Act, approved June 28, 1941 (55 Stat. 361). The provisions of this act have been extended each year during the past 4 years. The last extension was by Public Law No. 306, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 10, 1949. Under this act the General Services Administrator is authorized to make contributions to local school agencies located on Federal reservations or other federally owned property, to overburdened schools adjacent to defense areas, and in those areas where acquisition of land by the Federal Government has reduced school revenues.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

The Federal water-pollution-control activities are based chiefly on Public Law No. 845, Eightieth Congress, approved June 30, 1948. This act authorized governmental action of several types, and distributes the responsibility of the program between the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and the Federal Works Agency. (The functions of FWA were recently absorbed by the General Services Administration.) Under this act the Public Health Service (FSA) is charged with the preparation and adoption of comprehensive pollution-control plans for interstate streams. These plans are developed in cooperation with other Federal agencies with State and interstate water-pollution agencies and with the municipalities and industries affected.

A further function of the Public Health Service is that of initiating legal action to compel the abatement of water-pollution conditions declared to fall under the act's definition of public nuisance. On the other hand the Administrator of General Services Administration is authorized to make loans to States, municipalities or interstate agencies for construction of sewage treatment works. The loans cannot exceed $250,000 or 33⅓ percent of the estimated cost, whichever is lower. The plans must be approved by the Surgeon General (PHS), the Administrator of General Services, and the State water pollution agency.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

At the present time a number of agencies are engaged in helping local school districts overcome the financial burdens imposed by the withdrawal of taxable land for governmental purposes, or by sudden increases in the child population caused by the establishment or reactivation of Federal installations. The programs of the agencies involve different standards and varying financial arrangements, with the result that the situation generally is unsatisfactory both from a Federal and local standpoint.

Last year an appropriation of $7,250,000 was made available for aid to schools in defense areas and on Federal reservations to be allocated by the Administrator of General Services. Practically all other Federal aid to education programs are administered by the Office of Education. Plan No. 16 is designed, through the transfer of these functions to the agency best informed on these matters to bring about improvement and better coordination of these programs.

Approximately $1,750,000 has been appropriated each year since enactment of Public Law No. 845, Eightieth Congress, for the purpose of eliminating water pollution. Under this act the prevention and abatement of water pollution and treatment of industrial waste and other filth discharged into interstate streams has been under the joint administration of the Public Health Service, the General Services Administration, and the State pollution agencies.

The Public Health Service is responsible for the preparation or adoption of pollution-control plans for interstate streams. The plans are developed in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water-pollution agencies and with the local municipalities. In effectuating these responsibilities the surgeon general is authorized to conduct joint investigations with the cooperating agencies. He is also directed or authorized to encourage cooperative activities by the States, promote the enactment of uniform laws relating to water-pollution control, encourage compacts for the prevention and abatement of water pollution, disseminate information relating to water pollution, and make investigations into specific problems upon the request of any State or interstate agency.

SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONSIDERED JURISDICTION OF WATER POLLUTION

The jurisdiction and control of water pollution was carefully examined by the Senate Committee on Public Works during the first session of the Eightieth Congress and the committee stated that the responsibility for diagnosis of the causes of stream pollution is properly entrusted to the Public Health Service. The execution of the remidies, involving the design and construction of sewage-treatment works by non-Federal public bodies and industries were to be financed, in part, by loans from the Federal Government. The committee further indicated that the agency presently organized on a Nation-wide basis and best qualified to supervise this type of non-Federal construction program is the Federal Works Agency—now GSA. (Senate Rept. No. 462).

The committee further stated that—

"The Public Health Service and the Federal Works Agency, each contributing its special skills and working together cooperatively, can accomplish more than either of them working alone."

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

This plan is not specifically covered by any of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, but is in accord with its determination that Federal-State relations be concentrated where feasible, within the Federal Security Agency, and that major-purpose functions be grouped together in a single agency.

The Commission did recommend that Federal construction should be centralized in the Department of the Interior and grants in aid or loans for construction should be vested in the major-purpose agency. The major functions involved under this plan are public health, and their transfer to the Federal Security Agency is, therefore, in accord with this recommendation.

ISSUES INVOLVED

The issues involved in this plan may not be considered serious, with possibly one exception, and it is understood that both the GSA and FSA have agreed that the responsibility for administering Federal aid to overburdened school districts should be transferred to FSA.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor has held extensive hearings on H. R. 4115, after which a clean bill, H. R. 7940, was introduced (March 30, 1950) to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities. This bill also provides for transferring the administrative responsi-

bility for Federal aid to education in those areas from the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Bureau of Reclamation to the FSA. If this bill is approved, the FSA will be responsible for administering all of the Federal-aid programs except those which are under the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Under the law and procedures now in effect the Public Health Service of the FSA is responsible for administering the major portion of those functions created by Public Law No. 845 relating to water-pollution control. Should this plan be approved there is some question as to whether the GSA will be able to liquidate its functions by the time the plan goes into effect. Part of this objection will be overcome by transferring the funds, records, and personnel to FSA as contemplated by Reorganization Plan No. 16.

CONCLUSION

There is considerable merit and general agreement that the responsibility for administering Federal aid to education should be vested in the Office of Education. This plan merely transfers one of these functions, however, and it is believed that similar functions now administered by other agencies, such as Deparment of Defense, Bureau of Reclamation, etc., should likewise be transferred to the Office of Education.

On the other hand the functions involved in water-pollution control are administered jointly by the GSA and the Public Health Service. This program may be classified as a construction function relating to areas in which the Federal Government has a primary responsibility, whereas the local communities have added interests which relate to health, education, and community facilities. Notwithstanding the construction phase of this part of the plan it is reasonable to assume that water pollution is a function that is directed chiefly toward the improvement of health of inhabitants of urban or rural communities.

The committee has received no indications as to any opposition to the plan, and only one letter, from the National Council of Chief State School Officers, favoring its adoption.

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

APRIL 1, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-46]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 17, PUBLIC WORKS ADVANCE PLANNING AND OTHER FUNCTIONS

PURPOSE

This plan proposes to transfer the functions relating to advance planning of non-Federal public works, and the management and disposal of certain war public works from the General Services Administration to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The administration believes that by centralizing these responsibilities in a single agency better administration will be attained, and simplified relationship will be possible between the Federal and local agencies concerned with non-Federal public works as well as improvement in the management of certain war public works activities.

ADVANCE PLANNING FOR NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS

Public Law No. 352, Eighty-first Congress, authorized the Administrator of General Services to advance Federal funds to State and local governments for the purpose of preparing plans for non-Federal public works. The purpose of the act is to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to maintain an adequate reserve of fully planned public works readily available in order that construction may be started promptly when economic conditions make such action desirable. A similar program was carried out under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, during the period 1944 to 1947 which is now being liquidated. The current activities are for the most part concerned with recovery of advances previously made under the act of 1944.

Advance planning as contemplated under the new act is an extensive operation, but its duration is temporary in that all applications for approval must be submitted on or before October 13, 1951. Each application for an advance must be reviewed and approved by GSA from the standpoint of local planning, engineering, legal, and financial responsibility of the governing body to support the projects. After an application is approved funds are allocated to the local body for use in preparing blueprints, engineering surveys, and plans for construction. As soon as construction is commenced the local agency repays the Government for the total amount advanced, without interest. The act specifically provides that the making of advances to States or other political subdivisions for preparation of public works plans does not commit the Congress to appropriate any funds for construction.

The types of public facilities which have been planned with the aid of advances under Public Law No. 352, and its predecessor, consisted of sewer and water systems, schools, hospitals, and recreational facilities. These facilities contribute to the health, comfort, and welfare, as well as the physical development, of the communities in which they are located. Many of the loans under this legislation have been made to rural districts and comparatively small communities.

WAR PUBLIC WORKS

Under title II of the Lanham Act, as amended (55 Stat. 361), the Federal Works Administrator was authorized to provide public works necessary to the health, safety, or welfare of persons engaged in national defense activities. The facilities provided consisted of water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, hospitals, schools, and necessary public buildings. These facilities were provided under two categories: (1) Those in which the local community financed construction with the aid of loans or grants from the Federal Government, and (2) those facilities financed and constructed by the Federal Government. The latter public works were owned and operated by the United States and as a result maintenance and disposition of such property became a Federal responsibility. It is this phase of the title II program, together with the liquidating functions on locally sponsored facilities, which continues today as a function of the General Services Administration. These responsibilities will be transferred under this plan to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, where the Administration believes that they can be carried on more effectively than is possible under the present arrangement.

Since 1944 the Federal Government constructed 1,572 war public works projects at an aggregate cost of over $179,000,000. As of February 28, 1950, 985 of the 1,186 projects which were to be disposed of by sale had been sold or leased with an option to purchase. The 201 projects which remained to be sold represented an initial cost of over $36,000,000.

It is contended that the Government will have a substantial number of the title II projects on hand for a long time because some of them serve emergency housing projects. Experience in disposing of these projects to date indicates that many communities are reluctant to make a reasonable offer for these facilities due to the possibility that bills may be introduced in the Congress authorizing donation of such property to the municipality or local subdivisions.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

As indicated above, the Administrator of General Services is responsible for reviewing applications for advance planning of non-Federal works. This entails screening such applications from the standpoint of engineering feasibility, conformance with legal requirements, and the financial position of the applicant. It is understood that the functions and activities involved in administration of the program have been performed efficiently. The proponents of the plan contend that from an organizational standpoint, this work should be performed by a line agency which is primarily responsible for community development instead of an agency whose primary object is procurement, property management and central administrative services. It is understood that only 17 employees are engaged in property management and disposal of the title II facilities now on hand in the General Services Administration. This represents a very small proportion of the total number of employees and magnitude of a similar program which is presently being administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Because of the relationship of sewer, water, and other related facilities to housing development and the disposition of war developed housing projects it is almost impossible to dispose of the utilities without disposing of the housing projects. It is contended, under the present arrangement of dual responsibility that neither war or defense housing, nor community facilities, are being liquidated effectively because of inter-agency negotiations together with the correlation of the activities of each with the local communities. Other informants have denied that any such difficulty exists, stating that very few, if any, of the remaining facilities serve housing projects still held by the Government.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADVANCE PLANNING

The Senate Committee on Public Works considered the question as to whether or not the General Services Administration was the proper agency to handle advance planning programs and unanimously decided that, inasmuch as its predecessor (the FWA) had been doing this type of work since 1945, the GSA was best qualified, and, therefore, delegated such functions to that agency under Public Law 352.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hoover Commission did not make any recommendations which specifically cover this plan. The advance planning program was not established until after the Commission had completed its survey of the executive branch.

The Commission did recommend that Federal construction should be centralized in the Department of the Interior, and grants-in-aid or loans for construction should be vested in the major purpose agency.

ISSUES INVOLVED

(a) Advance planning of non-Federal public works is independent of public housing financed by the Federal Government: It is conceivable that if plan 17 is approved the development of advance planning in small communities and rural areas would be neglected or subordinated to plan preparation for urban districts.

The reason given in the President's message for vesting the responsibility for advance planning in the Housing and Home Finance Agency is that the transfer "will result in more economical administration of those activities of the Federal Government which are concerned with the over-all planning and development of communities." It

may be noted, however, that the community planning functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are performed in connection with its public housing and slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs. Thus, they are primarily big-city projects. The advance planning program, on the other hand, is designed to provide a shelf of public works for communities of all sizes and even for rural areas.

(b) Dispersal of Community Facilities Services of GSA: It is contended that plan No. 17 (and to a certain extent plans 15 and 16) are intended to transfer functions from GSA which are unrelated to its primary mission of providing central administrative services for the executive branch of the Government.

A careful examination of this claim and other information on the subject indicates that these plans are intended to disperse the functions of the Community Facilities Service; transfer those functions to HHFA which that agency wants, but leave stranded in GSA certain other functions which are equally unrelated to its so-called primary mission.

In the latter classification are certain functions now in GSA which are not transferred by any of the plans now before the Congress and which so far as is known are not to be transferred. These consist of the liquidation of the following programs:

1. Public Works Administration.
2. Works Progress Administration.
3. War Public Works in the District of Columbia.
4. Veterans' education and facilities program.

These are liquidation functions, but so is the disposition of war public works which is transferred to HHFA under plan No. 17.

(c) Transfer of programs of limited duration: As indicated above, the disposition of war public works is in process of liquidation. Likewise, the act (Public Law 352) authorizing advance of Federal funds for public works planning is a temporary measure which expires on October 13, 1951. Some question may arise as to whether it is worthwhile to effect transfers of this sort of temporary program in view of the delay and disorganization that may result from such moves from one agency to another.

(d) Diverse types of projects: The advance planning program is very broad in its scope. Under the statute advances may be made for detailed preparation of plans for public works of all types, exclusive of housing. Over-all community planning is to some extent a function of HHFA, but that agency is primarily concerned with housing, which is specifically excluded from the advance planning program. Hence it may be argued that by reason of its diversity there is no agency to which the advance planning program should go under the "major purpose" concept, and that it should properly remain with the "general service" agency of the Government where it can be administered more impartially as between competing types of projects than in any "functional" agency.

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 24, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81–2–39]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 18, BUILDING AND SPACE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this plan is to transfer to the Administrator of General Services the functions now vested in other agencies with respect to leasing and assigning general purpose space in buildings, and the operation, maintenance, and custody of office buildings. This proposal is aimed primarily at centralizing the responsibility for leasing, maintenance, and control of office buildings outside of the District of Columbia.

Functions transferred

(a) Responsibility for leasing (except post offices), and assignment of general purpose space from other agencies to the General Services Administration.

(b) Excess of space not needed by post offices to the General Services Administration.

(c) Operation, maintenance, and custody of leased and Government-owned buildings to the General Services Administration, (excludes post offices predominantly occupied by the postal service).

Special purpose buildings excluded

(a) Military posts, arsenals, navy yards, hospitals, etc., and other special-purpose space, unless authorized by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) Post Office Department's leasing authority.

(c) Buildings located in foreign countries.

(d) Post Office building space used by it or leased for its purpose.

(e) Other Government space which GSA finds is wholly or predominantly used for special purposes, such as housing, manufacturing plants, penal institutions, etc.

(f) Treasury Building, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, buildings occupied by Bureau of Standards, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Priority

(a) The Post Office has priority in assignment of space in its buildings.

BACKGROUND

Under exising law the General Services Administration is largely responsible for leasing and allocating space, custody, maintenance and repair of Government office buildings in the District of Columbia. The responsibility for performing these functions outside of the Washington metropolitan area is now largely vested in other departments and agencies of the Government. The President, in his message accompanying the plan, states that he believes centralizing these functions in a single agency, will improve administration through the elimination of confusion, waste, and inefficiency, and effect considerable savings in space, maintenance, personnel, and funds. The plan classifies the functions outside of the District of Columbia into those that relate to general purpose building space, that is space which is suitable for use by a number of Federal agencies, and special purpose space. Under the special purpose classification is included buildings on military posts, arsenals, navy yards, hospitals, laboratories, factories, and other similar installations.

The assignment of space in Government-owned buildings outside of Washington is divided among many agencies. While the Public Building Service constructs a large part of the Government buildings, it operates and controls the assignment of space in only a small portion of them. The Post Office Department operates and allocates the space in post-office buildings, several hundred of which contain substantial amounts of office space available for other agencies. During and immediately after the war several other Federal agencies acquired office buildings in the field. As their activities diminished, surplus space in many of these structures became available for other use. Since there was no central clearing house available in the field to equitably allocate the space, excessive space was occupied by some agencies or it remained unoccupied, while others were going into the open market to procure high-cost space to meet their requirements.

This plan excluded the leasing functions now vested in the Post Office Department and such space which is used by that Department for postal service. This exclusion is intended to safeguard the interest of the Post Office Department by giving it priority on all space under its jurisdiction, while at the same time make it possible to release such space as is in excess of its needs. In other words, if a postal building is predominantly used by that Department its custody and operation would remain under the Department; but, if only a portion of the building is used for the postal service, the remainder of the building would be allocated to the General Services Administration for assignment, maintenance, and upkeep. Under this arrangement it is anticipated that insofar as the cost of operating the postal system is concerned a reduction will be made because these nonpostal expenses are now charged against postal revenues.

A recent survey conducted by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration shows that as of September 30, 1949, 11,088,000 square feet of Government-owned office space, outside of the District of Columbia, was under the control of various agencies, representing approximately 58 percent of the total space in field offices. In addition, the Government leased over 11,000,000 square feet of space now under the control of various agencies. This represents over 54 percent of the total space leased by the Government. A tabulation of space in the postal buildings located in major cities throughout the country shows that, of the total space available, from 51 percent to 90 percent is now used for nonpostal purposes. Under this plan, the space which is excess to the needs of the postal service would be assigned to other agencies by the General Services Administration.

SUMMARY

(a) Approval of this plan will make possible better utilization of Government space, reduction in personnel, appropriations, and space requirements.

(b) Centralized control should reduce confusion and facilitate coordination of the Government's space requirements with proper centralized administration responsibility.

(c) The plan is in accord with the spirit and intent of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

This plan is in conformance with the Hoover Commission's recommendation No. 6 on Office of General Services (pp. 10–11, Report No. 3).

ISSUES INVOLVED

The National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees has issued a "special news letter" urging its members to communicate with Members of Congress urging disapproval of this plan. These employees contend that, if the plan is approved and they are transferred to GSA, a reduction in salary from $20 to $740 per annum, involving reductions in every classification will be effected. At present, maintenance and custodial employees are paid under the rates established by Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (Postal Classification Act of 1945), whereas employees performing comparable work for other governmental departments are paid at lower rates established pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949 (Public Law 429, 81st Cong.). In each classification or pay group postal employees are paid more than their counterpart in other agencies of the Federal Government.

The staff has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that a regulation or administrative order is being issued to protect the pay grades, and to make appropriate adjustments in regard to accumulated annual and sick leave of the postal employees who may be transferred by virtue of the taking effect of this plan.

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 21, 1950.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81–2–37]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 19 OF 1950, EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUNCTIONS

PURPOSE

This reorganization plan transfers the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor. The plan also transfers from the Federal Security Administrator to the Secretary of Labor functions with respect to employees' compensation, including workmen's compensation, and functions with respect to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board. The distinction here made as between the functions of the agencies and the functions of the heads thereof is necessary because there are involved certain organizational responsibilities peculiar to the position of agency head rather than to the agency itself.

Also transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor, as a necessary adjunct to the transfers enumerated above, are related personnel, property, records, and funds.

CONFORMANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

As stated by the President in his message of transmittal, this plan is in exact conformity with recommendation No. 2 of Hoover Commission Report No. 13 on the Department of Labor, which is as follows:

"We recommend that the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board be transferred to the Department of Labor."

In this relation, however, it may be pertinent to record that, in the Hoover Commission's Report No. 15, Social Security, Education, and Indian Affairs, a minority statement by Vice Chairman Acheson and Commissioners Aiken and Rowe contains a recommendation that the Bureau of Employees' Compensation be retained in a Department of Welfare, which would have been created from the Federal Security Agency. This dissent sets forth the opinion that the compensation functions administered by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation bear no resemblance to any other program of the Department of Labor. On the contrary, the dissent maintains workmen's compensation is a form of social insurance and therefore naturally belongs in the Federal Security Agency.

As also relevant to the foregoing, the staff feels that due note should be made of the fact that the dissent referred to was transmitted to the Congress in report No. 15 on March 18, 1949. On June 20, 1949, the President submitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949 which transferred, among other things, the Bureau of Employment Security, including the function of unemployment compensation, from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor and, although resolutions of disapproval were presented to both Houses of Congress through the appropriate committees, the resolutions were disapproved and the plan became law on August 20, 1949. Thus the statement in the dissent that workmen's compensation functions bear no resemblance to any existing operating program of the Department of Labor cannot be said to be true at the present time.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The functions of the present Bureau of Employees' Compensation and of the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board originally were lodged in the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, an independent organization. Under authority of Public Law 263, Seventy-ninth, the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945, the President on May 16, 1946, submitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946. Section 3 of that plan abolished the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and transferred its functions to the Federal Security Agency to be administered under a single head, as distinguished from its previous administration by a quasi-judicial commission of three. Section 3 of that plan also directed that there be established in the Federal Security Agency a Board of three persons which would discharge the appeals functions formerly discharged by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. Thus, in lieu of the single agency, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, there came into existence, as a result of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, two entities, the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, both located in the Federal Security Agency.

On June 24, 1946, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives reported favorably House Concurrent Resolution 151, disapproving the reorganization plan. In accompanying House Report No. 2327, the committee stated that its recommendation for disapproval of the reorganization plan was based on its belief that the abolition of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission violated section (5) (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act of 1945, which provides, in part, that no reorganization plan thereunder should impose on any quasi-judicial function then possessed by an independent agency any greater limitation upon the exercise of that function than existed prior to the reorganization. The committee stated further its belief that Federal employees who have claims under the United States Employment Compensation Act are entitled to appeal to a bipartisan commission that is not subject to the administrative control of another executive agency or department head.

On July 9, 1946, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported unfavorably Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, which would have disapproved Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946. As to section 3 of that plan, the Senate committee stated that the language therein to the effect that the functions of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission should be performed "in such manner" as the Federal Security Administrator "shall prescribe," referred only to the technical performance of functions, that is the matter of forms, procedures, etc. The committee took the position that there was no intent or attempt to place the appeals determinations of the Commission under the jurisdiction of the Federal Security Administrator. Thus, it would appear that the Senate committee found itself completely out of sympathy with the stand of the House committee. In any event, the plan was disapproved in the House, but disapproval failed in the Senate and thus the plan became law, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission was abolished and its functions have since been discharged in the Federal Security Agency by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, under a Director, and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, consisting of three members, one of whom is Chairman.

LAWS INVOLVED

The several acts of Congress which are administered by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation are as follows:

Act of September 7, 1916, as amended: This is the basic compensation law for Federal employees and provides compensation for civilian employees of the United States who suffer personal injuries while in the performance of duty. The act benefits, in addition to all civil employees of the Federal Government, certain employees of the District of Columbia; members of the Naval Reserve Force, of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, of the Coast Guard Reserve, and of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, under certain conditions; evacuees in war relocation camps, persons employed on certain Federal relief projects, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, and certain other groups.

Act of March 4, 1927: This law provides workmen's compensation benefits for employees in private enterprise while engaged in maritime employment on navigable waters of the United States.

Act of May 17, 1928: This law extends the provisions of the act of March 4, 1927 (see preceding paragraph), to private employments in the District of Columbia.

Act of August 16, 1941, as amended by the act of December 2, 1942: These two acts extend the provisions of the act of March 4, 1927 (see identification above), to employees on United States military, air, and naval bases in foreign countries, on certain military and naval installations outside the continental limits of the United States, and on certain other projects of the United States outside the country.

Act of July 3, 1948: This is the War Claims Act of 1948, certain parts of which are involved in this transfer of functions, relating specifically to claims of employees of certain contractors with the United States for wages due on account of detention by the enemy during World War II.

Other legal functions: In addition to the foregoing, there are also involved certain miscellaneous activities involving civilian war benefits and claims of certain American civilians and certain contractors arising from World War II.

CONCLUSION

So far as the staff has been able to determine, there is at present no important objection to this plan.

Attention is directed, however, to the Hoover Commission minority dissent reported above under "Conformance with recommendations of the Hoover Commission." Also in this relation, in a letter of July 14, 1949, addressed to the chairman of this committee, Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, commented as follows with respect to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board:

"As these two functions relate primarily to compensation for injuries of civilian employees of the Federal Government, I am considering them together. Frankly, I can find no tangible reasons why these functions should be transferred from this agency. I feel strongly that the relation of these functions to other Federal social insurances is of much greater importance, and call your committee's attention to the separate statement of Vice Chairman Acheson and Commissioners Aiken and Rowe, which appears on pages 46, 47."

After quoting from the dissent of Vice Chairman Acheson and Commissioners Aiken and Rowe, Mr. Ewing concluded as follows: "I am opposed to the proposal to transfer these functions."

The staff has again consulted the Federal Security Agency regarding this transfer as contemplated by Reorganization Plan No. 19. We are advised that, although the letter of July 14, 1949, referred to above, expressed the views of the Federal Security Agency at that time, now, in view of the President's announced program, the agency voices no present opposition to the transfer.

THOMAS A. SAPPINGTON,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

MARCH 27, 1950.

[Staff memorandum No. 81-2-42]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 20 OF 1950, TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

PURPOSE

The purpose of this reorganization plan is to transfer to the Administrator of General Services certain preservation, publication, and certification functions now lodged in the Secretary of State and in the Department of State with respect to acts of Congress, amendments to the Constitution of the United States, certificates of appointment, and votes of electors of the President and Vice President of the United States, and official papers of the Territories from which the States of the United States were formed. The Administrator of General Services would be empowered to delegate this authority within the General Services Administration as he may consider appropriate.

The plan would also abolish certain obsolete functions now required to be performed by the Secretary of State, namely (a) the procuring of copies of all statutes of the States of the United States, which function is now performed by the Library of Congress; and (b) the publishing of Presidential proclamations and treaties in a newspaper of the District of Columbia, now published in the Federal Register. Further, treaties are now made available in slip form.

In conjunction with the functions transferred, there are also proposed to be transferred incidental records, property, personnel, and funds.

CONFORMANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

There is no specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission relating to the transfer of the functions covered by this reorganization plan. However, the plan is in direct conformance with the position of the Hoover Commission as expressed in Report No. 1, General Management of the Executive Branch, to the effect that improvement of the organization and administration of the Government must include "a more orderly grouping of the functions of Government into major departments and agencies under the President." The Commission further stated in Report No. 1 that by placing related functions together in an agency duplication could be eliminated and coordinated policies could be developed.

A part of the General Services Administration is the National Archives and Records Service, and, as will be seen from the ensuing section of this memorandum, the statutory enactments involved place the functions proposed to be transferred squarely within the operational field of that Service.

LAWS INVOLVED

Enactments of Congress affecting functions proposed to be transferred:

Section 204, as amended, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 159): This is a requirement of law deriving from an act of September 15, 1789. It requires the Secretary of State to preserve the originals of all acts of the Congress.

Title 1, section 112, United States Code: This provision of law requires that the Secretary of State shall cause the compiling, editing, indexing, and publishing of the United States Statutes at Large, prescribes the contents thereof, establishes the status of the Statutes at Large as to legal evidence, and provides for the timeliness of their publication.

Section 210, as amended, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 165): This provision of law requires that the Secretary of State shall furnish to the Public Printer a correct copy of every act of Congress and of every treaty and international agreement.

Sections 3805 and 3806, as amended, Revised Statutes (44 U. S. C. 192, 193): These statutes, respectively, relate to correction by the Secretary of State of newly printed acts of Congress and treaties and to printing by the Public Printer of postal conventions, which are considered as international agreements.

Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 609, 615, as amended; 44 U. S. C. 191, 196): This law, as incorporated into the two sections of the United States Code, provides, in the first instance, for certain mechanics of printing of laws and international agreements, and, in the second instance, constitutes a repetition of the contents of the law referred to above at title 1, section 112, United States Code.

Act of April 12, 1904 (33 Stat. 587; 44 U. S. C. 197): This provision of law relates to certain mechanics in the preparation of the United States Statutes at Large.

Section 205, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 160): This is a provision of law which requires the Secretary of State to have published, and to certify with respect to, amendments of the Constitution which have been adopted.

Title 3, sections 6, 11-13, United States Code: These sections of the law relate to custody by the Secretary of State of actions by electors of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1104, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 167, 168): This law relates to collection by the Secretary of State of the official papers of the Territory from which each State of the United States was formed, and to publications thereof.

Act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 510; 5 U. S. C. 168d): This provision of law relates to the functions enumerated under the law defined in the paragraph immediately preceding.

Enactments of Congress affecting functions proposed to be abolished:

Section 206, Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 161): This is a provision of law which requires the Secretary of State to maintain a complete collection of the statutes of all of the States of the United States. (Now also performed by the Library of Congress.)

Act of July 31, 1876 (19 Stat. 105, as amended; 44 U. S. C. 321): This is the provision of law which requires publication in a newspaper of the District of Columbia, as designated by the Secretary of State, of Presidential proclamations and treaties. (Now also published in the Federal Register.)

CONCLUSION

In the preceding section of this memorandum, there are defined briefly the various legislative enactments involved under Reorganization Plan No. 20. An important feature of the plan is the reservation of the Secretary of State of all printing and publication functions, including compiling, editing, and indexing, with respect to treaties, other international agreements, Presidential proclamations related thereto, and postal conventions. So far as the staff has been able to determine, there is no important objection to any feature of the plan. Discussions have been had with various representatives of the Department of State and the General Services Administration. It is generally agreed that the plan is thoroughly sound and marks a distinct step forward in the development of better governmental administration. It may be said that the plan places all functions involved, which are of a domestic nature, in the hands of the Administrator of General Services, while retaining those of an international character in the hands of the Secretary of State.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION

In the course of its investigation of this plan, the staff disclosed and directed to the attention of both agencies concerned a contingency corollary to this reorganization plan, and which inevitably must ensue almost immediately after the plan becomes effective. The staff wishes to direct this matter to the attention of the committee because in the interest of better administration some action of a legislative nature should be taken. At the present time the United States Statutes at Large are issued as required by law on the basis of a session of the Congress and, through custom, publication is made in two segments, the first containing, generally, public laws and reorganization plans, if any, and the second containing, generally, private laws, treaties, other international agreements and related proclamations. Thus, it is readily apparent that retention by the Secretary of State of his functions with respect to the Statutes at Large as related to treaties and other international agreements and proclamations, creates a difficulty for the reason that the function of incorporating private laws and any other inclusions into the second segment of the Statutes at Large are transferred by this reorganization plan to the Administrator of General Services. Obviously, either an unwieldy working arrangement must be attained between the Department of State and the General Services Administration so as to correlate their respective work as to publication of the second segment of the Statutes at Large, or, as an alternative, the Statutes at Large must henceforth be published somewhat differently, as to segments, so as to permit the Department of State to perform its functions regarding treaties and other international agreements and proclamations independently of the General Services Administration.

This latter alternative is exactly what the Department of State and the General Services Administration feel should be done. Further, both agencies agree that, as there is no particular relationship between a session of the Congress and the publication of treaties and other international agreements and proclamations, it should be permissible to have the publication thereof done on the basis of a calendar year. The reasons for this change are very persuasive and the staff is wholly in sympathy therewith.

It should be reported further that, by identical letters of June 10, 1949, to the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State submitted for consideration of the Congress a proposed draft of legislation which would amend applicable law to permit removal of treaties, related proclamations, and other international agreements from the Statutes at Large and authorize their publication in a separate volume on the basis of a calendar year. This draft bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, where, after some preliminary investigation, it has remained dormant. The matter has been discussed at length with representatives of the Department of State and the effect sought to be attained by the legislation is still desired by the Department. Of course, the draft bill should be thoroughly revised so as to reflect developments proposed to be brought about by Reorganization Plan No. 20.

The staff recommends in this relation that, immediately upon Reorganization Plan No. 20 becoming effective, an appropriately revised bill be drafted and submitted to the appropriate committee for consideration. The benefits from such legislation can reasonably be expected to be manifold, including better administration with respect to publication of the international documents and a very probable considerable monetary saving arising from elimination of the so-called Malloy volumes in which, from time to time, such international papers have been printed as Senate documents.

THOMAS A. SAPPINGTON,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

[Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-44]

MARCH 28, 1950.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 21: TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PURPOSE

This reorganization plan provides for the establishment of a Federal Maritime Board and a Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce to which would be transferred all the functions of the United States Maritime Commission, in the following manner:

To Federal Maritime Board:

(a) To the Chairman: Executive and administrative functions of present chairman (including functions transferred by Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949).

(b) To the Board: Regulatory functions over rates, services, practices, tariff rules, etc.

(c) Subsidy awards, hearings, sales, assignment or transfer of subsidies.

To Maritime Administration:

(a) The administration of subsidy agreements made by the Board.

(b) Administration of the operating programs, such as ship construction, charter, operation, and sale.

The functions transferred to the Maritime Administration would be vested in the Secretary of Commerce with authority to redelegate such responsibility to the new Administrator or any other subordinate. The Maritime Commission would be abolished.

BACKGROUND

Within the past 3 years three different groups have studied the administration of the Maritime Commission. All have concurred that the operating deficiencies of the agency arise from inadequate, inappropriate, and unsound organization, and that a fundamental reorganization is essential. The first study was made in 1947 by the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine. This committee stated:

"It appears to the committee that the organization structure of the Maritime Commission as set up in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is wholly inadequate for the efficient conduct of the multitude of diverse activities for which the Maritime Commission is now responsible. The deficiencies of the statutory organization for action are regarded by the committee to be the most serious obstacle standing in the way of the development of the merchant marine of this country."

In 1948, the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made a management survey of the Maritime Commission and reported on December 31, 1948, in part, as follows:

"The Maritime Commission is generally considered to be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, but its position is anomalous. It is almost wholly independent of the President and he has virtually no power to require that it conform with the general policies of the Government. The Commissioners who direct the agency are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the Chairman of the Commission is named by the President. However, after they have been appointed, confirmed, and installed, they can act independently without fear of removal from office, except for neglect of duty or malfeasance, until the expiration of their 6-year terms.

"Although matters over which the Maritime Commission has control affect many other departments and agencies in the executive branch, it is possible for the Maritime Commission to be operated without regard to national policy. In times of emergency, this lack of correlation with other components of the Government could have serious results.

"It might be said that the Maritime Commission is responsible only to the Congress. However, this responsibility is nebulous and is only effective through the control of the purse strings and through specific substantive legislation.

"In the discharge of certain of its duties, its independence is an asset. In performing its quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative, and regulatory duties there is an advantage of shielding it from political influence and reprisals. However, as a promotional agency, as an operating arm of the Government, and as a potential military auxiliary, it should be controlled, directly or indirectly, by the President and be operated in conformance with current national policy" (p. 3).

The report then concluded:

"The fundamental weakness of the Maritime Commission as it is now constituted lies in its prescribed organization."

The Hoover Commission in its report on the Department of Commerce, in discussing the Maritime Commission, stated:

"The United States Maritime Commission, made up of full-time members, has a dual function. It exercises regulatory functions affecting the whole merchant marine and at the same time buys, sells, and subsidizes shipping and makes loans on ships on a huge scale.

"It is an anomaly that a regulatory commission should also conduct the executive function of managing a huge business; that executive functions should be carried on by an agency that is not subject to Presidential direction; that executive functions should be carried on by a full-time board of which all members have equal responsibility and authority, instead of by a single administrator" (p. 17).

Basically the administrative difficulties of the Maritime Commission as it is now constituted arise from the fact that the agency is responsible for administering two types of programs which are incompatible and diametrically opposed to each other. These programs are (a) regulatory and (b) operating and promotional. Management consultants and organization specialists who have participated in the surveys discussed above agree that the regulatory functions of the Maritime Commission should be performed by a separate organizational component from that which is responsible for the operating and promotional activities.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Reorganization Plan No. 21 provides for the establishment of a Federal Maritime Board to be composed of three members who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The Board members would be appointed for terms of 4 years and the President would designate the Chairman who would be ex officio administrator of Maritime Administration. Not more than two members of the Board would be of the same political party.

The Board would be an agency within the Department of Commerce, but independent in carrying out its responsibility in respect to holding hearings, recruiting and supervision of its personnel, issuing rules and regulations, establishing rates, tariffs, subsidies, and related functions, but coordinated with the general policies of the Secretary of Commerce.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

As indicated above, the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board would be ex officio Administrator of the Maritime Administration. The plan also provides for a Deputy Maritime Administrator to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with the Administrator. The Deputy Administrator would be under the classified civil service and perform such duties as prescribed by the Administrator, but would not sit as a member or acting member of the Federal Maritime Board.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Under Secretary of Commerce: The plan provides for the establishment of an office of "Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation."

Joint utilization of personnel: The Chairman and Administrator may make joint use of the employees under their control.

Conflict of interest: The provision contained in section 201(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which prohibits any commissioner, officer, or employee of the Maritime Commission who has a pecuniary interest in water carriers, contractors, shipbuilders, and so forth, from employment by the Commission, is extended by this plan to all officers and employees of both the Board and the Maritime Administration.

Interim appointment: Until other commissioners, officers, or employees are appointed, the present personnel shall continue in office until new appointments are made, but such personnel shall not continue in office in excess of 90 days unless reappointed.

Transfer of records, property, and funds: The records, property, personnel, and funds of the Maritime Commission will be transferred to the Department of Commerce to be used and expended in connection with the purpose of this transfer; however, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to make such determinations or dispositions as he feels consonant with the plan.

Abolition of Maritime Commission: The United State Maritime Commission would be abolished, and the Secretary of Commerce would terminate any outstanding affairs not otherwise provided under this plan.

The functions transferred under this plan are not subject to the provisions of plan No. 5 of 1950 (which transferred to the Secretary of Commerce all of the functions heretofore vested in subordinates of that Department).

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hoover Commission recommended (No. 2 in its report on Department of Commerce and No. 9 on Regulatory Commissions) that the functions of ship construction and the operation, charter, and sale of ships be transferred from the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce, and that the functions relating to rates, conditions of service, and the granting of subsidies remain with the Commission.

The above recommendations were based upon the conclusion of the Hoover Commission's task-force report on independent regulatory commissions (staff rept. on U. S. Maritime Commission, pt. 4, p. 32), which are summarized as follows:

"1. Creation of Maritime Administration:

"A. A Maritime Administration, headed by an Administrator should be established in the executive branch.

"B. The Administrator should take over from the Maritime Commission all its operating, administrative, promotional, and other functions except as stated in 2 below.

"C. The Administration should be part of an appropriate department; in peacetime, the Department of Transportation, if one is established or if not, the Department of Commerce; * * * and in time of war, the Department of Defense.

"2. Changes in Maritime Commission:

"A. If recommendation 1 is adopted, the Maritime Commission should continue as a five-man independent agency—

"(1) It should exercise regulatory control over rates, fares, charges, agreements, and practices in the maritime industry, upon complaint by the Administrator.

"(2) The Commission should also have authority, upon the petition of carriers, to investigate the administration of the subsidy program by the Administrator and to report publicly its conclusions.

"B. If the Maritime Administration is not established (as recommended in 1 above),

the Chairman of the Maritime Commission should be made responsible to the President for the administration of the agency and for policy making as to its operating functions."

Other general observations of the Hoover Commission relating to reorganization of the Maritime Commission follow:

(a) Appointment of Commissioners is frequently below standard because of inadequate salaries or appreciation of the importance of the position.

(b) Purely executive duties have been imposed on the Commissioners with no one really vested with over-all authority.

(c) The amount of work in the regulatory field has been so heavy that promotional functions have been neglected.

(d) Delegation of authority to the staff is practically nonexistent.

(e) The Chairman is too frequently the presiding officer with no over-all planning responsibility.

(f) Lack of coordination between the Commission and executive departments (pp. 3 and 4 of Report No. 12 on regulatory commissions).

MINORITY VIEW OF THE COMMISSION

Commissioners Brown and Pollock dissented from the majority, in that they believed that all of the regulatory functions in the transportation field should be consolidated in a single transportation regulatory commission, and that the Maritime Commission should be abolished in favor of a new agency created to take over its regulatory functions.

ISSUES

It is possible that the shipping interests may oppose this plan, but there are indications that the industry is apprehensive lest the whole question of subsidies be brought into the debate if they appear before the committee in opposition to the plan. Large shipping interests may ask to appear against the plan, but in that event the small shipping lines may ask to testify in favor of the plan (in order that their interests may be more sympathetically considered by the Federal Government).

One specific question has arisen as to the application of that part of section 106 (page 3) providing for the administration of functions, under which the chairman "shall be guided by the general policies of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to such functions." It is contended that this provision is in conflict with the language of the same section, which states that the chairman "shall be independent of the Secretary of Commerce," and that "general policies" might encroach on the functions of the chairman.

COMMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION

In 1949 when the Hoover Commission report was received by Congress, the Maritime Commission was requested by the chairman of this committee to comment on the recommendations contained therein. The chairman of the Commission opposed the recommendations affecting it (pp. 261–263, S. Rept. No. 1158) concluding that:

"The so-called business or executive operations of the Commission are in fact so closely interwoven with the regulatory and subsidy activities of the Commission that to separate them would only compound the alleged difficulties in the present administration of the law. * * *

"The Commission is convinced that the belief (which is hardly more than a hope) that the administration of nonregulatory, or executive, or business operations of the Commission can be separated from the regulatory and subsidy functions without serious complications is without foundation. * * * The Commission cannot emphasize too strongly the undesirability and danger of attempting to establish separate administrative agencies for governmental activities in respect to the oceangoing merchant marine. Historically and basically the continuance of promotional or operational or business functions concerned with the merchant marine in the same agency charged with the regulatory activities is a fundamental necessity for the successful administration of the merchant marine policy for the United States. Any other method would simply be a case of letting one hand function without the required amount of coordination with the other hand. * * *

"The Commission is unanimously and vigorously opposed to any proposed splitting of the functions now vested in the Maritime Commission with respect to the merchant marine."

Recently the chairman and two members of the Commission stated to the press that they would support the President in his efforts to improve the merchant fleet and promote efficiency in the administration of maritime affairs, and that they would not oppose the plan. The fourth Commissioner (Mr. Mellen) stated that "he was highly in favor of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21."

GLENN K. SHRIVER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the program in connection with the graduation exercises of the members of the forty-third session of the FBI National Academy, and a very able and constructive address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary:

PROGRAM

Call to order—Mr. Hugh H. Clegg
Assistant Director, FBI
Invocation—Rev. Robert S. Lloyd, S. J.,
Manresa-on-Severn, Annapolis, Md.
Address—Mr. Lester H. Eisenhut
Fort Wayne, Ind., president of the
graduating class
Address—Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY
Representative from New York
Address—Dr. Norman Vincent Peale
Marble Collegiate Church, New York City
Presentation of the guests of honor—
Director John Edgar Hoover, Federal
Bureau of Investigation
Recommendation for the awarding of the
diplomas—Mr. Clegg
The awarding of the diplomas—
Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman
and the Director
Benediction—Rev. Robert S. Lloyd, S. J.
Musical program—
The United States Marine Band and
Orchestra

The inspiring address of Congressman ROONEY is as follows:

I am indeed honored and very happy to have the privilege of being here with you this morning. The FBI National Academy, since its founding in 1935 under the guidance of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has symbolized law enforcement at its best—aggressive, alert, and loyal to the democratic tradition of America. The peace officer, in the truest sense of the word, has become the guardian of the rights, lives, and property of the citizenry of our Nation.

The National Academy, to my mind, symbolizes a fundamental principle—the voluntary cooperation of law enforcement, local, State, and National, through democratic methods to achieve a common aim. This principle could be applied, I think, with great benefit to many other phases of our national, yes, even our international, life. This idea of which you, as the forty-third graduating class are a part, presents a solution, at least to some extent, to many of the evils of our time.

As chairman of the House subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, I have closely followed the work of the FBI. Just a short while ago Mr. Hoover appeared before our committee and gave his usual frank, extremely lucid, and interesting analysis of the many phases of the FBI's activities. I was greatly impressed by the FBI's deep interest, and the amount of time and energy expended in strengthening local law enforcement. The Identification Division, the FBI laboratory, the uniform crime reporting program, the FBI National Academy—all of these FBI facilities are available, free of charge, to local police departments, sheriffs' offices, State police organizations. My own State, New York, for example, has 115 graduates from the National Academy. And I am proud to say that the graduating class today contains two more men from the great Empire State of New York.

Almost 15 years have passed since the establishment of the National Academy. At that time we had divided allegiance in law enforcement. Many law-enforcement officers were intensely jealous of their own prerogatives and privileges. They were reluctant to cooperate, not only with other law-enforcement agencies, but even with brother officers. If they possessed an informant, a special investigative technique—well, that was their property, and no persuasion or threat could prevail upon them to share it. These men were "self-contained men"—at least they liked to think of themselves as self-contained. They thought, through their own abilities and talents, they could handle the problems of law enforcement on their beat, in their city or county. Not only were they unwilling to share, but they were unwilling to learn. When law enforcement was dominated by men—and departments—possessing this mentality, it became a merry-go-round, going round and round in the same groove, while the criminals robbed, murdered, and raped to their heart's content.

I need not recall to you the conditions of crime and law enforcement in 1935. Vicious gangs were roaming large areas of our Nation: kidnaping, bank robbery, and murder were common occurrences. Criminals were sneering at law enforcement, almost daring officers of the law to come after them. For example, Alvin Karpis, one of America's most notorious criminals, was still at large. In November 1935, Karpis and four associates, armed with machine guns, shotguns, and automatic pistols held up an Erie Railroad train at Garrettsville, Ohio. They made a score of $34,000 in currency and several thousand dollars in securities. Imagine the audacity of hardened criminals like Karpis and Harry Campbell holding up an American railroad train in broad daylight—amid the circus effects of a wild-west show. Certainly, something had to be done—criminals like Karpis, Campbell, and their ilk, had to be swept from the American scene. The

challenge was there—open for all to see. The criminals were utilizing the latest scientific techniques—the automobile, the radio, the airplane. They crossed State lines with virtual impunity, and learned to cooperate with fellow hoodlums—all for the purpose of preying upon the law-abiding citizens of the Nation.

Americans everywhere, I think, are today proud of the record achieved by law enforcement, by you men and your brother officers at home, in counteracting the criminal challenge. Law enforcement, working harmoniously together, blunted the criminal attack. The criminal gangs were broken up, some members were killed while resisting arrest, others brought before the bar of justice. Not that crime was extinguished. Not at all. Unfortunately today, after a terrible war, crimes rates are high, much too high. But the spirit of cooperation, of a united law enforcement, local, State, and National, linked together, in voluntary and fraternal association, is the thrilling point. Better training, more modern equipment, higher professional status—these are the components of good law enforcement. But good as these are, or may be in the future, the key point is the spirit of the men themselves. Unless the will to succeed, the urge to conquer the evildoer, is present, the very best in training and equipment falls to the ground—mere dead letters.

The impetus of the National Academy, which, for 15 long years kept sending out graduates, men like you, helped turn the tide. Mr. Hoover, in founding the Academy, realized the weaknesses of law enforcement, and set about doing what he and the FBI could to remedy them. He knew that local officers, wherever they may be, must possess the latest equipment, be well-trained, and, above all, be animated by the spirit of moral integrity and a devotion to duty. I can testify, as a former prosecuting attorney [in Brooklyn] to the good work which well-trained, fully equipped law enforcement can accomplish. The law-enforcement officer is a man of many skills, each skill dedicated to the service of his fellow man. He must be ready, day and night, in season and out of season, to render the maximum protection to his community. To do anything else would mean betraying the past and forfeiting the future.

Most important, however, in recalling the history of law enforcement during the past 15 years, is this fact: American law enforcement, unlike in so many other Nations of the world, developed in the democratic tradition.

Our law-enforcement agencies are not secret police. They are not sending men and women to concentration camps, to die in a dungeon or on a bleak, snowy hillside. No, indeed not. American law enforcement is the servant of the citizenry, controlled, directly or indirectly, by the elected representatives of the people. It is dedicated to preserving, not assassinating, the liberties of the individual.

The National Academy, by training selected police officers from throughout the Nation, is strengthening the democratic tradition. Some people have the effrontery to say the FBI is a Gestapo. This is pure nonsense and hokum. If these critics were here today they could see, with their very eyes, the stupidity of their charges. The National Academy itself is a bulwark against a police state, a fascinating and effective instrument to improve and to strengthen local law enforcement. Mr. Hoover time after time has reiterated that America has no need for a national police state. He has just hung up a record of 25 years of service during which time he has gained a shining place in public esteem for the FBI.

The system of voluntary law enforcement, local, State, and National, has in the past and will continue in the future to handle the problems of the day. The inadequacies in law enforcement—and there are many—are due, not to the system itself, but the way it operates. And that is what the National Academy—with your help as honored graduates—desires to do; to improve, in a voluntary and democratic manner, the American system of law enforcement.

As a Member of Congress, I am intimately familiar with the principle of the separation of powers, between the executive, the legislative, and judicial branches of our Government and the vital need, in order to advance the best interests of our Nation, for sincere and wholehearted cooperation. This does not mean the stifling of discussion, the predominance of one unit over another, or the adoption of a single way of doing things. Absolutely not. Sincere cooperation encourages free discussion, the free interplay of ideas, the expression of dissent. All sides of the question—and many issues have more than two sides—are discussed, analyzed, weighed. Each person has his share to contribute and to learn. That is the way progress is achieved in a democracy.

America today, perhaps more than in any previous period in its history, needs the cooperation of its citizens to work toward a common, mutually beneficial goal—the fundamental principle symbolized in law enforcement by the National Academy. Sinister forces, the demons of communism, are abroad in the world today. They have conquered large areas and are attempting, with ruthless determination, to subject the free world. Who is not with them, they reason, is against them. Democracy, the way of life which has nurtured the magnificent blessings of freedom and liberty in this Nation, must be destroyed. Every speck of free thought must be identified, tracked down, and exterminated. The dunce cap of intellectual sterility and moral perversion, the essential elements of Communist philosophy, must be slipped over the head of the world. Then, and only then—when the entire world has been conquered—will clear vision, straight thinking, and individual judgment be liquidated. And, then, the age of darkness will have descended—and the age of communism begun.

We Americans must work together to conquer this menace. There will be voices of doom, wailing that America must compromise, must give way, at least partially, to the Communist ideology. I defy this point of view—America can, and must, defeat the totalitarian threat. To compromise, in the least iota, is to undermine the very foundations of democratic society. The principles of free government are sacred and inviolate. If this Nation is to remain free, and to serve as a symbol of justice and right for the peoples of the world, we must work unceasingly to unmask the Communist and to expose, for all to see, his true wares: hate, hypocrisy, sham, and intolerance.

The task will be long and hard—make no mistake about it. The best energies and talents of each individual citizen will be required. Communism must be fought, straight from the shoulder, with truth, knowledge, and the unimpeachable facts.

The entire Nation—and world—could benefit from the principle epitomized by the National Academy—the voluntary cooperation through democratic methods to achieve a common aim. This principle is wider than law enforcement—it encompasses the entire range of human life. If this philosophy could be applied honestly and sincerely today, many of our troubles would disappear. As you return to your various communities this afternoon, you gentlemen can well feel proud of being a part of this great endeavor to make law enforcement ever more effective. By doing your part, wherever you may go, you are doing a share for your Nation.

Letter of Students of Cleburne (Kans.) Rural High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD a splendid letter written by the high-school students of the Cleburne (Kans.) Rural High School.

This display of intelligent and vigorous citizenship is to be commended. I hope my colleagues will read the letter with care.

The letter follows:

CLEBURNE RURAL HIGH SCHOOL,
Cleburne, Kans., March 28, 1950.

Hon. ALBERT M. COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Believing that, in ourselves our future lies, and that the present is yours, the future ours, we, the undersigned students of the Cleburne Rural High School, feel impelled to raise a red flag warning you of some dangers ahead.

Among other things, we study history, citizenship, and current events. We have decided to pool a few of our ideas and send signed copies to our United States President, Vice President, Congressmen, and some committee members. If we are concerned enough about the future of our country to spend 3 weeks formulating this letter, you should give 15 minutes of your time to read it personally. Some of us are Democrats and some Republicans, but we believe parties are only means to an end, namely, the welfare of the people.

First. We are unable to understand how so frequent big strikes function to promote social unity and economic stability in a healthy democracy. When labor is allowed to dictate to a property owner, and by clubs and guns, tell him how to run his business, our laws are weak somewhere. We are taught that America stands for a free-enterprise system. Any laborer should have a right to take a job as it is or leave it alone, but he has no right to shoot another man who is willing to work under the employers' terms.

We believe John L. Lewis is a dictator, working for the interests of communism, and is apparently powerful enough to bluff Congress and the President of our United States. If a hungry man steals a loaf of bread he is fined; if I overspeed my car I am judged a menace to society and fined. Lewis can shake the economic and social foundations of our country and keep his freedom, and gets every demand he asks for. When the sum of the parts get to be greater than the whole, then both geometry and democracy are only fairy tales.

Secondly. We are much alarmed over the economic stability of our country. We are taught thrift, economy, saving for emergency, and the dangers of spending beyond our income. It is a pretty weak admonition for a parent who steals, to try to teach his children honesty. Likewise, we look to our Government which is supposed to have the best experts in economic training, as our best and most authoritative teacher. If you Government experts (?) think you can spend the country out of debt or save an economic crash by piling up debts, we cannot go along with you. One may keep climbing a ladder,

even add extensions and climb higher, but finally it will get top heavy and fall with a crash. Are economic laws any less inevitable than physical laws? Just how long do you figure you can spend $5,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 a year more than your income, and still avoid a crash? If you can't make ends meet in prosperous times when wages jump up every time John L. Lewis says "frog," and production is high, how will you pay your debt when hard times come, as they surely will?

This joy ride we are taking on the road to prosperity with borrowed money is a delusion. It cannot work. Let's think of the long walk back home, and stop this runaway vehicle before we wreck the machine. Red-ink financing and increasing of taxes will rob us of everything we have including our personal freedoms. History and logic both prove that statement.

Suppose we merely balance the budget (which we are not doing) we still could never get out of debt. Suppose we pare down present unnecessary and extravagant Government expenditures $15,000,000,000 a year. We could easily do this and still not weaken our economic or social structure in the least, nor would it lower our standard of living. Five billion dollars paid annually on our debt, plus $5,000,000,000 a year interest, would take us 55 years to square up. That is a long time but it won't get any less by adding $5,000,000,000 debt to it every year. Furthermore, a depression could strike in the meantime, and as our parents know, then even interest alone is hard to raise under such circumstances.

We say it is an alarming situation and high time to decide whether we are willing to sacrifice our freedoms for the miragelike panaceas of planned economy which have ruined other nations, or take the simple lesson seventh-grade arithmetic teaches.

You can lay politics aside, use some common sense, and cut out thousands of your unessential employees, merge departments, stop overlapping similar activities, and quit paying money to man one group to a certain thing (example, reclaim waste land to produce more food), and another group to do the opposite (take care of surplus and curtail production).

We believe that there are too many subsidies and too much price support, and wages are going too high. It's like the hitchhiker, the more free rides he gets the more dependent he becomes on free rides. He finally forgets how to run his own vehicle. Too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. We feel that there is too much centralized power and that all this bureaucratic concentration of power adds up to socialism. We don't want that. It is only one step from socialism to communism. Let he who craves socialism move to England, and if he craves still more centralized power let him take the first boat to Russia. We want democracy in Washington.

We know the gigantic public debt must be paid or we perish. Why must you hand down to innocent generations the burden of your folly? You are selling our birthright for a mess of pottage.

Third. We believe Congress should submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for a maximum of two terms for any one person to act in the capacity as President of the United States. A longer term provides too great temptation to accumulate power. After three or four terms in office a political machine can be built up with a wall impervious to the will of the voters. It is too much "you vote for me or else." That smacks of totalitarian tactics. Furthermore, 8 years of the physical and mental strain entailed in the great responsibility as President of the United States is enough for any one man.

Fourth. We are giving too much aid to foreign countries. When we give too much of our own blood, who will furnish a transfusion for us? More wisdom, less waste, and less politics, will accomplish greater good at less expense.

Fifth. We do not believe in the present draft system. It is undemocratic. In peace or war you should adjust salaries and other conditions, making them so attractive that enough volunteers will always meet our needs. That is fair to all, and no one could have any logical objection.

Sixth. We do not favor the building of the Tuttle Creek Dam project, suggested by the Army engineers, across the Big Blue Valley. This is proposed under the guise of flood control. People do not treat a thorn in the flesh by putting on salve and wrapping the wound. The wise method of treatment is to pull the thorn out, and it will heal itself. So, why not control floods at the source? This dam calls for $80,000,000. One-half of that amount spent on resodding hillsides, planting forest trees and shrubs, together with a few small dams properly placed in the upper tributaries of the Big Blue Valley will accomplish in a much more sensible way the control of floods. Slow run-off is the answer.

Seventh. We stand for the equal and civil rights of all men regardless of religion, race, or color. Give every man the same rights under similar circumstances.

Eighth. We present these seven outstanding points as constructive criticism. In a democracy the Government promotes the welfare of all the people. There is a cooperative spirit and sense of joint ownership. We are taught that the qualities of each official has much to do with the success of our democracy.

We are soon to assume the responsibilities you now have. We do not want to inherit a public debt beyond our ability to pay, nor a "yes-yes" government controlled by lobbyists, strike leaders, and antidemocratic politicians.

We are emotionally conscious of the tenacious struggle and sacrifices of our forefathers against famine, flood, disease, and tyranny. Overcoming obstacles is the only road to success. The all but overwhelming struggles of the past have given birth to our heritage, the democratic freedoms. So well does it meet the needs and demands of a progressive people that it has stood the ravages of many isms both from within and without.

We believe a properly guided democracy will live forever, just as we believe that all truth, good, and beauty will ultimately triumph over evil. The Almighty will not fail in His purpose. But His creation is not finished. We have very fundamental responsibilities in helping Him finish the task. Just as He has furnished the raw materials and man refines and molds them into finished fountain pens, watches, and radios, so He has given us a mind capable of reason, and certain talents and responsibilities. We must take these and refine and mold them into a great democracy built of happy homes, useful schools, and influential churches, the fundamental foundation stones of a democracy.

If you do not hand down to us a more stable democracy than you took over, then you have failed in your trust. We expect you to put the highest good of the people above all else. We cannot afford to be bribed by the false concept that we can get something for nothing. To lose our freedom is to lose our individuality, our most valuable of all possessions. It is too this end we are preparing to take over. We have faith in America.

We ask you today to underwrite our faith by sacrificing your personal ambitions and proving that the public good is your supreme purpose.

Kent Leavitt, Every American Is Indebted to You for a Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal in recent weeks about some of the problems of agriculture. We have tried to deal with troublesome situations in the production of potatoes, cotton, peanuts, and so forth. It was not long ago that some of us were concerned with another outbreak of destructive floodwaters in the Middle West. In New York City and other parts of the country, problems of water supply are becoming more and more acute.

It is probably natural that we spend more time on the problems of agriculture and natural resources than we do on the successes. Apparently, some of the troubles now besetting us can be solved only by action of Congress. Even so, I think it is a hopeful sign, and a heartening one, when people of the country join forces to get an important job done without relying 100 percent on the Government. I think we ought to take notice of such things and encourage them. I think the leaders of such movements should be praised and encouraged.

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts is dedicated to the development of individual initiative, the exercise of local responsibility, and the accomplishment of constructive work in the conservation of soil and water resources. Its record of achievement has been almost phenomenal. Within a few years, this association has banded together the leaders of soil-conservation districts in all parts of the country to put strength, unity, and a voice of influence behind its principles and goals. This is not a Government organization, nor is it subsidized by the Government. It is made up almost entirely of plain dirt farmers and ranchers. They have joined together because they have a common interest—the conservation of soil and water through cooperative action under local control.

Their purpose, I take it, is shared by all of us. A large number of my distinguished colleagues here in the House have helped, I am happy to say, in the formation and strengthening of this organization. I know, too, that the interest in soil-conservation districts is growing steadily on all sides. Each year the accomplishments of these districts, in terms of land and water actually conserved, and in terms of improved understanding on the part of the people, has been increasing.

These things do not happen without reason. From the beginning, the districts have had the assistance of experienced technicians from the Soil Conservation Service. They have also had help in some places from the Bureau of

Reclamation, the Forest Service, and the State extension services. A great many local organizations have helped, too, including farm-equipment dealers, newspapers and radio stations, magazines, banks, chambers of commerce, and boards of trade.

In addition, soil-conservation districts have been blessed with vigorous, public-spirited leaders, recruited from within their own ranks. One of these men, an outstanding leader and champion of conservation, retired last month as president of the national association after more than 2 years of service, without pay in the public interest. His name, as many of you know, is Kent Leavitt. He is a dairy farmer living near Millbrook, N. Y. For his untiring efforts to build soil-conservation districts, I believe the Nation owes him a debt of real gratitude. He has helped, in his own way, to build a stronger America—one that is stronger by virtue of more protection for natural resources, and stronger also by virtue of greater numbers of Americans taking an active, responsible part in their own community affairs.

For the past several years I have followed the progress of soil-conservation work with a keen interest. I watched the work of Mr. Leavitt with admiration, and sometimes amazement. For weeks on end he traveled from one end of the country to the other, working with State associations of soil-conservation districts and with individual districts. On some occasions he was away from home for as much as 6 weeks at a time attending first hand to district business.

As far as I have been able to find out, Mr. Leavitt has traveled to every State in the country, and to some States many times, in the interest of building stronger and better districts, and in the process he has helped and encouraged other men—other farmers and ranchers—to take a larger part in conservation and district affairs. Probably more than any other one man, he is responsible for the rapid growth and wedding together of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. When he took over the post of president in September 1947, the association was a new and loosely constructed organization, still searching for the ways and means to make itself most useful. Today it is certainly a growing force in American agriculture and one to be reckoned with.

In his final letter to district supervisors, Mr. Leavitt summarized well.

Together, in these years—

He wrote—

we have built an association of landowners and operators covering the bulk of our agricultural land. We have built it as carefully as possible, under the circumstances, in the image of democracy. Although it has its faults and weaknesses, none of them is of such nature but that it can be corrected by a little hard work and sound thinking. In building our association, we have kept it free of partisan politics. We have made it independent of any one agency—public or private—although we have never refused any assistance which any cared to proffer. We have dedicated our efforts to the development and protection of independent soil-conservation districts and we have proven our ability and shown our willingness to fight for these objectives whenever necessary.

For his efforts of the past 2½ years, Mr. Leavitt can count among his rewards a wide personal friendship with thousands of farm and conservation leaders in every State and in Washington. He can take justifiable pride in the solid growth of the association, and he has had a unique opportunity to study and gain first-hand understanding of the Nation's conservation problems.

One can only hope that in relinquishing the presidency of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Kent Leavitt will not retire completely from public service.

Every American is indebted to Kent Leavitt for a job well done.

Employees in Internal Revenue Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of the number of employees in the Internal Revenue Bureau from 1940 through 1951:

Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue

	Number of employees on rolls [1]	Budget estimate	Amount appropriated
Fiscal year 1940:			
Dec. 31, 1939	22,462	$60,700,000	$59,877,500
June 30, 1940	23,082		
Fiscal year 1941:			
Dec. 31, 1940	25,107	66,667,760	66,006,860
June 30, 1941	28,061		
Fiscal year 1942:			
Dec. 31, 1941	27,771	80,527,975	77,725,421
June 30, 1942	30,927		
Fiscal year 1943:			
Dec. 31, 1942	30,550	103,309,400	103,109,680
June 30, 1943	40,348		
Fiscal year 1944:			
Dec. 31, 1943	41,713	135,094,065	133,821,735
June 30, 1944	47,843		
Fiscal year 1945:			
Dec. 31, 1944	49,200	149,200,000	146,900,000
June 30, 1945	49,814		
Fiscal year 1946:			
Dec. 31, 1945	52,623	179,740,000	176,650,000
June 30, 1946	59,693		
Fiscal year 1947:			
Dec. 31, 1946	57,731	208,417,400	204,417,400
June 30, 1947	52,830		
Fiscal year 1948:			
Dec. 31, 1947	49,119	208,000,000	188,000,000
June 30, 1948	52,143		
Fiscal year 1949:			
Dec. 31, 1948	51,381	233,323,000	210,859,000
June 30, 1949	52,266		
Fiscal year 1950:			
Dec. 31, 1949	54,239	[2] 237,768,000	226,300,000
June 30, 1950	[3] 56,495		
Fiscal year 1951:			
Dec. 31, 1950	[3] 59,358	253,000,000	
June 30, 1951	[3] 59,383		

[1] Includes temporary employees.
[2] Includes $5,000,000 estimated cost of authorized pay increases.
[3] Estimated.

America's Responsibility of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] before the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Easton, Pa., on March 31, 1950:

Like so many other words which can be used to convey different meanings to different people, the term democracy—and I mean with a small "d"—is frequently abused.

Personally, I prefer to use the word democracy as describing the principle and the process by which the people of this Nation govern their affairs.

That process, or method, is to arrive at our decisions by free discussion and majority consent. In all of my years in Congress from the black days of depression and bank closing, through the period of recovery and reform, the era of World War II and now the postwar chapter with its threat of a new war, I know of no decision on national policy which has been reached in any other manner.

Today we are in the midst of another great public discussion on grave issues confronting the United States, not only internally but affecting our relations with the rest of the world.

The situation today is without precedent. After the first World War we blithely resumed our peacetime preoccupations, rejected the League of Nations, and let the rest of the world go by. With the result that we had to fight another world war.

But this time we find no relaxation from the physical and emotional trials of the war years. The relief and the let-down all of us hoped for and expected cannot be ours. Instead, the strain and tension has continued.

We are just beginning to realize that it may continue for some years, and that we will have to learn to live with it. Because, the postwar period has brought us not peace, but uncertainty. Scarcely had we beaten down one threat to the security and stability of the world than we are faced with the threat of new aggression by a ruthless totalitarian force.

By the pressure of armies of occupation, by subversion and propaganda to create internal disunion, communism spread its police-state power across the face of Europe. One after another, small countries fell prey to subjugation.

The war-weakened nations of western Europe, just taking the first halting steps toward economic recovery under the Marshall plan, were hesitant and fearful to oppose the juggernaut. Not only was peace endangered; not only was our own security threatened, but the future of all western civilization hung in the balance.

Could America take the easy path? Could we appease communism?

One would think that the bitter lessons of two world wars had taught us, first, that when maddogs are astray in the world you must be well-armed and keep your powder dry. Secondly, that this Nation's freedom cannot exist, that its economy cannot thrive, under conditions imposed by an encroaching dictatorship seeking world domination.

In the forum of the United Nations, in occupied Germany, in Korea, and in all the

normal channels of diplomacy, Soviet Russia flouted its international obligations and agreements. Its whole record repudiates the practices of comity among nations.

Unfortunately, communism seems to understand no other language and recognizes no other warning sign than that of a superior armed force.

Thus, the inevitable course of destiny has thrust upon us the role of guardian of individual human liberty and of the way of life we cherish so dearly.

The responsibility of leadership of the free nations of the world is ours. We could not dodge it, we could not shun it. We could not ignore it—and we could not escape it.

The United States took the necessary steps to restore the morale of those who wavered in the struggle to save continental Europe from a new slavery. We pumped new strength into their economic life. We are supplying the material to restore their military strength, and we have taken steps to open up the normal channels of trade.

Under the program enacted at the first session of the present Congress, we are the strongest Nation on earth. We must remain so, because our very strength discourages any dictator or group of international gangsters from further aggressive action.

Now, all the steps we have taken to prevent a new war—the Marshall plan for European economic recovery, the North Atlantic Pact to unify the defenses of non-Communist nations, the military assistance program to supply them with arms—were consummated only after the fullest and freest discussions.

Not only in the Halls of Congress but in the newspapers, over the radio, and in public forums of every description, the issues were debated all over the land. The final decision was made by you, the people of this country. And the actions of your elected Representatives in Congress was an expression of that public will.

Since the policy has been fixed and it is now being carried out in accordance with specific laws laid down by the Congress, then what are all the current public discussions about? Do we want to change our policy in these matters? Are people weakening and faltering in the course they have laid down for themselves?

No. I do not think so. But our problems have not ended. Most public concern and questioning, I believe, centers around the cost of these commitments.

Some people are worried about taxes. They complain that the country is being ground between the millstones of mounting costs of Government at home and fulfilling our responsibilities abroad.

It is true that the costs are tremendous. But the job we have undertaken in the world is a momentous one. The price of freedom has always come high.

"But," the doubters ask, "where will it all end? Aren't we reaching the limit of our capacity to pay?"

Administrator Paul Hoffman, of ECA, pointed out the other day that if communism ever overruns Europe the cost will be even greater. We must reconcile ourselves to face that very realistic fact. There is no other alternative than to carry on.

And this brings me to the first answer to the questions of cost that have been raised. It lies within our own spirit and the will for the task—and, above all, in our faith in ourselves and our destiny.

Tom Paine had such a faith. In December 1776—when the cause of the American Colonies seemed almost lost—he wrote:

"'Tis the business of little minds to shrink; but he whose heart is firm and whose conscience approves his conduct, will pursue his principles unto death. * * * By perseverance and fortitude we have the prospect of a glorious issue; by cowardice and submission, a sad choice of a variety of evils—a ravaged country, a depopulated city, habitations without safety, and slavery without hope.

"Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. What we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Yes, the price is high, and even greater today. But America, too, is greater today and better equipped to guard the freedom of the world.

And there is a second answer to those of defeatist attitude who spread dire predictions. It is in our untapped natural wealth, the reservoir of human resources in our growing population—which has now passed one hundred and fifty millions—and in the ingenuity and the initiative of American know-how.

Dr. Harold G. Moulton, economist and president of the Brookings Institution, has just completed a study which those of little faith should take to heart.

It shows that the United States has the capacity and the technical knowledge to support a standard of living eight times as high as that enjoyed today for a population double the present size.

Does this sound as though this country has reached the end of its rope? Does this sound as if there are no new frontiers? Does this sound as though we are headed for national bankruptcy?

The fact that we enjoy the highest standard of living ever attained by any nation in the world does not necessarily mean that progress is at an end.

That standard is the highest because it is in comparison with that of other countries. But by the standards we have come to accept, and to expect, America's goals are still to be reached.

Do you know that the House and Senate Joint Committee on the Economic Report just last month issued the results of a study showing that nearly 10,000,000 families in the United States have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, that nearly 18,000,000 families have incomes of less than $3,000 a year?

Do you know that 27,000,000 Americans have no kitchen sink?

Do you realize that 40,000,000 Americans have neither bathtub nor shower in their homes?

In fact, one million need new homes this year.

Eighteen million Americans lack washing machines.

Twenty-five million Americans do not have vacuum cleaners.

Who can say, under these conditions, that opportunity in America is dead? That either our capacity to consume or to produce has reached its limit?

There is one businessman, of whom I read recently, who knows the score.

"Let's not talk about what we've got," he said, listing all those needs. "Let's be more concerned with what we haven't got. We must be concerned for two reasons: First, because these are human needs that should be met; and second, because these needs provide dramatic illustration of the fact that we have not finished anything—we're only beginning.

"There is enough urgent work on hand—" he said, "for every business now in existence—and for industries yet unborn—to keep busy for generations to come. In common sense, we have no excuse for a recession, let alone a depression."

All of this is not to deny that problems confront the Nation, but since when have Americans been licked by problems?

If the people of this country had always surrendered abjectly to difficulties, if we had customarily defaulted to obstacles, if we had always retreated in the face of fears, the United States would not exist today. Our glorious history is testimony of that fact.

I believe we need a revival of that unshakable fighting faith in ourselves that the late President Roosevelt displayed at the height of the banking crisis when he said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

And we need, too, to recapture the calm assurance of his message to Congress 10 years later when he said:

"The state of this Nation is good; the heart of this Nation is sound; the spirit of this Nation is strong; the faith of this Nation is eternal."

It seems to me the time has come to call a halt on our self-belittling, to take stock of our real situation, and to revise our outlook.

When that call for courage in the face of adversity was sounded in March 1933, only 36,000,000 of the labor force of the Nation was employed. Today more than 60,000,000 are at work.

Liquid savings of individuals amounted to only $43,700,000,000 at that time. Today these savings total $200,000,000,000. Personal income in 1933 amounted to only forty-six and six-tenths billions. Today it is two hundred and fifteen billions. And today's dollar buys twice as much as a 1933 dollar.

So what are we griping about?

True, our economy is not perfect. True, we have not reached the millenium in our social relations. But this only means, as Dr. Moulton has pointed out, that our potentialities have not been exhausted. It means we have room for improvement and expansion. It means that there is opportunity for enterprise, for invention, for research, for productive expansion.

The survival of a free world depends upon America's economic strength and continuous growth. To this every element—business, agriculture, labor, and the Government—must continuously contribute.

We are all equal partners and share in the obligation to discharge the duties imposed upon us by our heritage; and from which we must not shrink.

Only in this way can we hope to achieve, through humanity's long upward struggle, our ultimate goal of a peaceful and prosperous world, a true brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Non-Communist China Still Alive and Resisting Despite Repeated Premature Obituaries by American Officials and Leftist Writers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 20, 1950:

THE SUNGMEN RAID

The Nationalist Government of China cannot be written off as a dead loss. It has ground troops who will fight, with planes and ships to support them. It is able to execute the most difficult of maneuvers, a landing from the open sea on a hostile shore. This much must be conceded if we accept the assertion that Nationalist troops landed Saturday at Sungmen, 200 miles below Shang-

hai, and killed or drove off the Communist forces along that stretch of coast.

The communiqué given out at Nationalist headquarters on Formosa described this episode as a raid. Commentators in this part of the world were reminded of the Dieppe landing of August 1942, which preceded by nearly 2 years the successful invasion of Normandy. These comparisons are not worth much except as they suggest that a long continental coastline cannot be completely defended against attacks from concentrated enemies based on islands. To reconquer China 2 years—or any number of years—from now, the Nationalists would need vastly more men and material than they now possess. Or they would have to receive instant and effective support on landing from a population ready to rise against the Communist regime. These conditions will not be easy to meet.

Yet, Chiang Kai-shek, less than 3 weeks after resuming his office as president, has made himself felt. The Sungmen raid will have it echoes at Lake Success. It will encourage a wait-and-see policy on the part of some governments which might have been ready to recognize the Chinese Communists. It will influence popular sentiment, in ways hard to measure, throughout Asia.

What Nationalist China needed, beyond the essential tools and materials of war, was discipline, a willingness to fight and a faith in the future. The men who landed at Sungmen must have possessed these qualities; otherwise they would have fled or surrendered, as so many of their predecessors did, at the first Red volley. If there are a few thousand such men there may in time be many thousands. Famine stalks the mainland of Communist China. Disillusion must have overtaken multitudes who have waited in vain for long months the coming of the Communist heaven.

The tide may have turned. We do not know. But as long as there exist Chinese soldiers who will fight as well as the Sungmen raiders seem to have done the cause of Chinese freedom is not dead—not even with all the power of imperial Russia against it.

Centenary of the Sisters of St. Ann and Silver Jubilee of St. Jean de Baptiste School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I know that all my friends in Congress will want to join with me in extending greetings and best wishes on the centenary of the Sisters of St. Ann and the silver jubilee of St. Jean de Baptiste School.

There is a celebration at the parish of St. Jean de Baptiste in Ludlow that will continue through Easter. I know that Rev. J. Armand Silvain and all who are associated with the church, the order, and the school will be pleased to know that Members of Congress throughout the Nation are joining with them in spirit during this celebration.

I know you will all be pleased to join with me in extending our greetings and best wishes to them.

The Reckless Efforts of Republicans To Find Campaign Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side of the aisle are somewhat amusing at times in their strained efforts to drum up political issues on which to base their campaigns this year and in 1952.

Having nothing in the way of an affirmative Republican Party record to offer the voters of the country, they rush frantically from one question to another. From day to day they are attacking, denouncing, and hurling reckless charges without regard to facts. The consequences of their reckless utterances fall upon this Government and the Nation itself, rather than upon our Democratic Party.

Understand, what they give forth are not suggestions offered in a constructive spirit, but political sniping designed to gain widespread publicity for Republican propaganda, aimed at a Democratic administration.

Political speech making has its place in our American system. Their own party principles and party causes should be supported by the partisans of each party. That is the way we operate. And I am for it.

But when truth is distorted, when facts are twisted, we on this side of the aisle are going to nail those distortions. We are going to expose those misstatements of fact. We are going to let the people know the real motives and the truth behind these barrages of artificially created scandals.

One of those more recently cooked up by the GOP is the alleged invasion of individual rights of privacy by questions in the census relating to income.

Now, what are the facts on this situation?

Article I of the Constitution provides the foundation in law for United States censuses.

Acts of Congress from 1790 onward provided for each decennial census, and up through the 1920 census listed questions to be asked by the census takers.

President Herbert Hoover signed the act of June 18, 1929, passed by a Republican Congress. It provided for the 1930 census and subsequent decennial censuses. This act is the authority for the 1950 census. Section 4 of this act lists the subjects of population, agriculture, and unemployment among those concerning which inquiries are to be made and delegates to the Director of the Census the responsibility for determining the number, form, and subdivision of these inquiries, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce.

In determining the inquiries, to be made in the 1940 census, the Director of the Census consulted with leaders in business, industry, labor, education, and government. On their advice and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, questions on income were included in that census. The Census Director employed this same procedure in choosing the questions for the 1950 census and in conformity with the continuing demand for up-to-date information on incomes, to measure the geographical distribution of purchasing power, the income questions were retained for this census.

A census, if it is to be one worthy of the name and if its product is to be of any value, cannot be static. It must keep in step with the times. It must collect information of the most value to the most users within the limits of practicability.

The census collects information on the population and its social characteristics. Items such as age, sex, race, marital status, occupations, employment and unemployment, education, and citizenship are traditional parts of the census. Such information has been collected in some form during the last 100 years at every census.

Now is it proper for us to know these things about ourselves? Long since we have accepted these inquiries as a proper part of a national census. How much more valuable all this information becomes when we are able to relate it to information about our purchasing power, to information about our economic condition.

The census collects information about the Nation's manufacturing output.

The census collects information about the Nation's farm production.

The census collects information about the Nation's retail and wholesale distribution.

The census collects information about the Nation's consumers (population) of these goods and services.

Why should we not have information, too, on the distribution of the Nation's purchasing power? How is that purchasing power to be determined without collecting information on income?

This information is of the greatest value when all the various items are in focus as to time, to establish the relationship to each other in a complete picture of our Nation populationwise and economically.

The income inquiries in the 1950 census were not conceived as a new proposition for this time. The act of Congress providing for the 1937 census of unemployment directed that information on income also be obtained. The 1940 census of population also included questions on income and that information has been of great value during the last 10 years. Certainly there never was any complaint that this information was abused.

How could a true statistical measurement be made of the effect of unemployment without taking into account income loss?

How can a true picture of employment be painted without including in the colors the cardinal pigment that income represents? To omit that would be as foolish as a painter's attempt to complete a portrait with a dry brush.

Business wants this information. Business has been pleading with the Census Bureau for years to provide income information and purchasing power data. Thousands of letters pour into the Census Bureau each year from all sorts of users asking for this information. Let me quote the observation of one businessman who certainly knows of what he speaks. Dr. Vergil D. Reed, associate director of research of the J. Walter Thompson Co., the largest advertising agency in the world, has this to say in an address on April 1, 1950, before the 1950 annual convention of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, and I quote:

> This income data should prove extremely valuable, in fact the most valuable economic index yet available by all geographic areas.

And may I remind my colleagues, that Dr. Reed is a man who has worked on both sides of the street. During the 1940 census he served as acting director of the Census Bureau. Before and after, he was in business. Incidentally, he is a member of the Republican Party.

It should be noted that the 1930 census conducted during President Hoover's administration for the first time included a question on the value of home owned for owner-occupied units and the monthly rental paid for tenant-occupied units. The answers to these inquiries were collected under the same 1929 Census Act carrying the same penalty provisions covering the 1950 census. The legality of these questions was not challenged nor were they presumably contrary to the intent of the law as interpreted by the then Director of the Census and then Secretary of Commerce under President Hoover. Their legal justification was the same as is the legal justification for the 1950 income questions. In a report to the Congress of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government signed by ex-President Hoover in February 1949, there appears the following statement:

> Government policy depends upon much detailed knowledge about the Nation's employment, production, and purchasing power.

Income is certainly an important measurement of purchasing power.

All this being true, what other reason than political can there be for the Republican complaints at this late date? There was ample opportunity before the census began to revise the legislation. The list of questions to be used in the 1950 census of population were submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on February 28, 1949, and are printed in the hearings on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1950 on page 149 and following. Following the hearings the Congress appropriated the necessary funds for the conduct of the population and other censuses for fiscal year 1950.

There is a considerable demand on the part of business, labor, and Government agencies for family income statistics as distinguished from individual income statistics. The family, rather than the individual person, is the consumer unit for many consumer goods. For example, it is the family that is the consumer unit for consumer durable goods such as housing, automobiles, refrigerators, and the like. American business interested in the measurement of potential markets needs statistics showing the number of families in each of the various income classes. Moreover, the effect of unemployment, whether it be for a few days, weeks, or a prolonged period on family income provides a measure of the severity of unemployment as well as a measure of losses in purchasing power. Family income data for these and other purposes are not available from any other source.

Incidentally, I want to stress that those who have incomes over $10,000 do not have to furnish any other figure. They merely say their income is over $10,000.

Income statistics are needed by small geographic areas. The Census Bureau plans to publish the 1950 census income statistics for each city haveing 2,500 or more inhabitants, for each county, for the urban and rural-non-farm parts of counties, and for small statistical areas within our larger cities called census tracts averaging about 6,000 persons per tract. These data, too, are available from no other source.

Many persons with low incomes or with types of income not taxable are not required to file tax returns, or not required to report the nontaxable parts of their income. The Bureau of Internal Revenue statistics do not cover all the income of all the people. For 1948, for example, the Bureau of Internal Revenue received 52,500,000 returns. For the same year, information was collected by the Bureau of the Census in its sample current population survey which indicated that there were 70,100,000 income recipients.

The income information furnished to the Bureau of the Census is confidential and census enumerators are sworn not to reveal it to anyone. However, individuals who prefer not to give the income information to the census enumarator have an alternative course they may pursue. The census enumerator will provide the respondent with a special form which may be filled in by the individual and mailed direct to the Census Director in Washington.

The Census Bureau publishes the information only in statistical tables so designed that personal information relating to an individual is not revealed. Every possible safeguard for the individual's anonymity is observed.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from the seventeenth decennial proclamation issued on March 23, 1950, by President Truman:

> No person can be harmed in any way by furnishing the information required. Individual information collected under the seventeenth decennial census will not be used for the purposes of taxation, investigation, or regulation, or in connection with military or jury service, the compulsion of school attendance, the regulation of immigration, or with the enforcement of any National, State, or local law, or ordinance. There need be no fear that disclosure will be made regarding any individual person or his affairs. For the due protection of the rights and interests of the persons furnishing information, every employee of the Census Bureau is prohibited, under heavy penalty, from disclosing any information which may come to his knowledge by reason of his employment.
>
> Life and liberty in a free democracy entail a variety of cooperative actions for the common good. The prompt, complete, and accurate answering of all official inquiries made by census officials should be regarded as one of the requirements of good citizenship and exercise in fundamental democracy.

I include a fine article on the subject written by Lowell Mellett and appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Star:

THERE'S NO REASON TO BE ANNOYED BY QUESTIONS OF THE CENSUS TAKERS

(By Lowell Mellett)

Politics being politics, it is not surprising that an effort has been made to turn the census taking this year into something sinister. So certain Members of Congress who miss no opportunity to embarrass the administration, have been expressing concern over what they term an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of citizens.

One question to be asked by the 140,000 enumerators, when they start out Saturday, has to do with income. One individual in every five, aged 14 or over, will be asked to tell his annual income. In the census of 10 years ago the question was asked of every individual of that age group, but this time it is felt that an extensive sampling process is sufficient for the purposes of the Government and the people who have use for Government statistics.

MEASURING NEEDED

The users of the statistics are business houses, needing to measure their actual and potential markets, manufacturers wishing to determine the need for consumer goods; Federal, State and local agencies having policy decisions to make, and Congress with legislation to consider. The Census Bureau publishes the information only in statistical tables so designed that no information relating to an individual can be revealed. Any census employee violating this right of privacy is subject to a $1,000 fine and 2 years in prison.

These are the essential facts concerning this phase of the census, yet some politicians who profess to be the champions of business and industry and who decry what they call the hostility of the Government to business, have sought to make an issue of it. They blandly ignore the part that representative business organizations have had in setting up the questionnaires to be used by enumerators.

Among the things the census is expected to show is an unprecedented increase in the total number of married couples, a substantial increase in the number of households, and an upward turn in the average size of young families. Exact information with respect to such matters is important to manufacturers and distributors of household goods of all kinds. That goes for the makers of furniture, refrigerators, washing machines, and radios. It goes very much for the builders of baby buggies.

LINCOLN REMARK RECALLED

As Abraham Lincoln said, in justifying the general census, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better tell what to do and how to do it."

So, if the census taker wants to put down the kind of house you are living in, its condition, the number of rooms, the number of occupants, the water supply, the toilet facilities and provision for bathing, the year the house was built, the heating and cooking equipment, the refrigeration, electric lighting, radio and television installations; and, if you rent, the amount of your rent and any additional payments for electricity, gas, and water; or, if you are a farmer, the number of your horses, cattle, sheep, hogs, goats, chickens, turkeys; how much you receive from the sale of milk, eggs, and poultry; how many bees you keep, how much honey they produce, and how much you collect for same—you mustn't be annoyed.

He is not being nosey and is not prying into your personal affairs for the benefit of neighborhood gossip. The facts you give him will be just a few of the 15,000,000,000 facts that are gathered concerning the 151,000,000 of us and they will be lost, so far as personal identification is concerned, in a vast compilation of impersonal statistics.

Flood Control on Lower Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and informative articles on the status of flood-control works on the lower Mississippi River recently appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

The article is particularly timely in that it reviews these structures in the light of the tremendous quantity of water recently handled by the lower Mississippi and the Atchafalaya.

The author, Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., is the managing editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune. By virtue of background and training he is the best-informed writer in the United States on these problems. He served with distinction during the war as the director of the OWI.

The article follows in full:

GROUP TOURS FLOODWAY; SEES NEED FOR EARLY FINISH—CHECK OF MORGANZA POINTS UP URGENCY

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

A group of New Orleanians returned during the past week from an inspection of the Atchafalaya, Old, and lower Mississippi Rivers with definite impressions about the 1950 winter flood and its implications.

Among these impressions are:

1. That the Morganza floodway should be completed at the earliest possible moment.

2. That the 1950 flood, being passed safely to the Gulf of Mexico as this is written, was potentially the third most serious flood since 1844.

3. That this 1950 flood increased the proportion of water being carried to the Gulf of Mexico by the Atchafalaya River—in relation to the flow of the Mississippi River.

Members of the inspection group were guests of Brig. Gen. P. A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River commission; Brig. Gen. A. L. Culbertson and Dewitt Pyburn, members of the commission, and Col. Charles G. Holle, district engineer.

General Feringa assured the group that his commission is anxious to complete the Morganza floodway before another flood may require its use.

Guide levees of the floodway have been finished from Morganza, on the Mississippi River between Baton Rouge and Old River, to Morgan City. Flowage rights within the floodway have been purchased by the Federal Government. Utility crossings at Krotz Springs have been completed, and the Texas & Pacific Railroad crossing at Melville should be ready within 60 days.

ONLY NEED—MONEY

A highway and the Louisiana & Arkansas Railroad will be carried across the floodway at Morganza, on top of the weir structure which will control release of water into the floodway. Only the approaches for this structure have been built. Test piles have been driven, but the work of building the dam remains to be done.

"All we need to complete this work," says General Feringa, "is the money."

The general is hoping that current appropriations by the Congress will permit him to proceed with the final phases of the spillway work.

The first phase of this final work will be building of a foundation for the dam structure. Because extreme water pressure will be exerted against the dam during high-water periods, piling for the foundation will be driven at an angle to insure the greatest resistance to this pressure.

The second phase will be construction of the concrete dam itself; and the third phase will be the building of the highway and railroad crossings on top of the dam.

DIVERT A FLOOD

"We do not expect to perform these three tasks at three different times," General Feringa explained. "After advertising for the foundation work, probably before the end of the current fiscal year, we will advertise for bids for the other jobs. As the foundation work proceeds, building of the dam will be started. Then before the dam is complete, construction of the rail and highway crossings will be undertaken. If we waited until each job were done before starting the succeeding job, we couldn't finsh the floodway before January 1, 1953, when we hope it will be ready for efficient operation."

When it is ready for operation, the Morganza floodway will be capable of diverting 600,000 cubic feet of water each second from the Mississippi River.

Bonnet Carre spillway, operated in 1937, 1945, and this year, has a rated discharge of 250,000 cubic feet of water per second.

The Morganza Dam will be higher than but not as wide as the Bonnet Carre needle dam. More water will flow through the Morganza Dam than through the Bonnet Carre Dam because its height—or head—will be greater.

Whereas the engineers open and close the Bonnet Carre Dam by removing or replacing wooden needles in the dam structure, they will open and close the Morganza floodway by opening or closing steel gates.

Actually, Morganza would have been opened last month if its dam structure had been ready.

CARRYING MORE

At the peak of this winter's flood the Mississippi River carried 1,498,000 cubic feet of water per second past Morganza. The engineers feel that it should never carry more than 1,500,000 cubic feet of water per second, including 250,000 cubic feet which may be diverted into Lake Pontchartrain by way of the Bonnet Carre spillway.

Incidentally, the proportion of water carried by the Atchafalaya River to the Gulf continues to increase in relation to the volume being carried down the main stream.

In 1927 75 percent of the water originating above Old River moved to the Gulf down the main stream, and 25 percent moved down the Atchafalaya River.

In 1949 72 percent was going down the Mississippi River and 28 percent down the Atchafalaya.

This year, at the crest, 70.3 percent moved down the Mississippi and 29.7 percent down the Atchafalaya.

SHORTER ROUTE

The latter percentage is based on preliminary calculations by the United States engineers of discharge at the crest of this winter's flood. These calculations show that at the crest 1,498,000 cubic feet of water per second moved down the Mississippi and 633,000 cubic feet per second moved down the Atchafalaya.

The Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers have been connected for several centuries by Old River. Except on rare occasions, the direction of flow through Old River is into the Atchafalaya from the Mississippi. On these rare occasions Old River, fed by Red River, may flow into the Mississippi River when the latter is very low.

Because the Atchafalaya River route to the Gulf of Mexico is 163 miles shorter than the route via the main stream, water has a tendency to follow the Atchafalaya route. The only reason all water originating above Old River does not go down the Atchafalaya is that the channel of the Atchafalaya is not large enough to accommodate it.

Since sills at the head of the Atchafalaya River were washed out in 1927, the Atchafalaya has been enlarging. These sills, or sunken dams, were placed in the river late in the nineteenth century to halt its enlargement.

Recent enlargement of the Atchafalaya channel has not alarmed members of the Mississippi River Commission, although they acknowledge that ultimately the Atchafalaya could capture all the flow to the Gulf.

MAY NEED CONTROL

This capture, they believe, will be deferred by the completion of the Morganza floodway. Use of this floodway, about 20 miles south of Old River, would reduce the head of water flowing through Old River to the Atchafalaya at times of flood, consequently retarding enlargement of the Atchafalaya Channel.

Some day, the engineers concede, it may be necessary to control the flow of water from the Mississippi into the Atchafalaya to regulate its volume. That day, they believe, is not imminent.

Guests of General Feringa, who made the recent inspection trip, are convinced that the day for action on the Morganza floodway is today.

The Morganza floodway has been in the statutes and on the planning boards for 22 years, and work on the floodway has been under way 12 years.

SEEK FUNDS

World War II interrupted building of the floodway but other delays should be blamed on lack of money to prosecute the work.

C. C. Walther, president of the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, and other civic leaders are undertaking a campaign to insure that adequate appropriations will be made available to complete the floodway without further delay.

Walther was a member of the group which recently inspected the Atchafalaya, Old, and lower Mississippi Rivers with General Feringa. Others in the group were Robert L. Simpson, president of the dock board; Lester F. Alexander, president of the Tidewater Canal Association; Lloyd J. Cobb, president of International House; J. Lester White, director of the Louisiana Department of Public Works; H. A. Sawyer, member of the dock board and the city railroad terminal board; Ralph Nolan, member of the terminal board; Harold E. Meade, vice president of New Orleans Public Service, Inc., and this writer.

Election of the President and the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some comments of my own and certain letters that have been exchanged between myself and the editors of the

Washington Post, and two editorials which appeared in that publication.

I think even a casual reader will get a clearer insight into the mental barrel rolls, loop the loops, and tail spins of the editors of the Washington Post after reading the editorial, my letter concerning it, and the reply to it from Mr. Herbert Elliston who is identified as editor.

An examination of the second paragraph of Mr. Elliston's letter will disclose that he meets himself coming down the road. Any reader of the Post editorial would conclude from perusal of it that the Post favored the election of majority Presidents, as opposed to minority, since that is the usual interpretation of the word "minority" in connection with presidential elections.

Mr. Elliston cunningly attempts to find himself an escape clause by contending that the Post was talking about a different kind of minority President—one who gets less popular votes than his opponent. He admonishes me for writing an intemperate letter and accuses me of "itching for a petty controversy in semantics."

Thus, if Mr. Elliston represents the Post's viewpoint—and from the confused thought of his letter I can quite readily understand that he may well represent it—the Post is actually coming out in favor of the election of plurality Presidents, which is what the so-called democracies of Europe had before they fell one by one.

If the Post and Mr. Elliston eventually reach some conclusion about what they actually stand for, I will be glad to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but in the meantime I will have to content myself with pointing out that if the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution had been in effect in 1896 Bryan would have been elected over McKinley 221.3 electoral votes to 215.3 despite the fact that McKinley's popular vote was 7,035,638 to Bryan's 6,467,946.

The matter above referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 8, 1950]

MINORITY PRESIDENT

Senator TAFT finds himself in strange company in fighting the Lodge-Gossett resolution, for the most vehement opposition to date has come from the special pressure groups. These groups fear that if the electoral votes were distributed among the candidates for President and Vice President in proportion to the popular vote cast in each State, their opportunity for bringing pressure upon the major parties in the key States would be minimized. Senator TAFT fears that this proposed change in the Constitution would be fatal to the hope of electing a Republican President if the election is in any way close. Both complaints obviously reflect selfish interests that ought to be put aside in passing upon the merits of a proposal to correct a serious defect in our electoral system.

Mr. TAFT fears that, under the proposed system, the GOP would not gain enough electoral votes in the South to make up for its sharing of electoral votes in the big States of the North. This seems to us an unwarranted fear, for the reason that the Democratic Party, in order to win, must carry a number of large States in the East, Middle West, and West. And the unit system of counting electoral votes swings a big State to the Democrats on a small margin as easily as it does to the Republicans. In the close election of 1948, for example, the Democratic Party carried California, with 25 electoral votes; Illinois with 28; Massachusetts with 16, and Ohio with 25; but the Republicans carried Indiana, with 13 electoral votes; Michigan with 19; New Jersey with 16; New York with 47; and Pennsylvania with 35. The point is this: The net effect of the voting under the present system was to give Mr. Truman 303 electoral votes to 189 for Mr. Dewey; under the Lodge-Gossett resolution, the division would have been—Truman, 258; Dewey, 221.4.

What Senator TAFT seems to be complaining about is that, in unusual circumstances, the resolution might deprive the Republicans of the opportunity of putting a minority President into the White House. In presenting his proposal to the Senate, Mr. LODGE pointed out that a shift of about 30,000 popular votes in three States would have given the election to Governor Dewey, in spite of a plurality of nearly 2,000,000 popular votes for Mr. Truman. It is precisely this evil that the resolution is designed to prevent. Does Senator TAFT openly and candidly favor the election of minority Presidents? That certainly seems to be the implication of his opposition. We can think of few worse political disasters that may befall the country under the present system than to have a minority President. For that matter, the election of a man to this position without a popular majority behind him would be a calamity for the President himself and for the party which sponsored him.

It is true, of course, that the Lodge-Gossett resolution would not entirely eliminate the danger of electing a minority President. The fact that each State has two electoral votes (corresponding to its two Senators) which do not represent population would make it possible for a candidate to win with fewer popular votes than his rival even under the proposed amendment. But the greatest danger arising from the unit rule of counting electoral votes would be eliminated. We do not see how any man can oppose the amendment on this ground unless he is willing to admit that he favors the election of a minority President, if only his party can win. To us, this seems to be one of the strongest arguments for the change.

MARCH 8, 1950.

Mr. PHILIP L. GRAHAM,
President and Publisher,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDITOR GRAHAM: In your editorial today, Wednesday, March 8, 1950, titled "Minority President," you assert:

"We can think of few worse political disasters that may befall the country under the present (electoral college) system than to have a minority President. For that matter, the election of a man to this position without a popular majority behind him would be a calamity for the President himself and for the party which sponsored him."

There is scarcely a day goes by that the editorial writers of the Washington Post fail to bathe publicly in their own ignorance. I have felt called upon on several occasions to draw the attention of Washington Post readers to the fallacious reasoning, specious argument and misstatement of fact which persistently characterizes Washington Post editorials.

Why doesn't the Washington Post wake up? Political disaster has already befallen us. Calamity has already been visited upon the White House. We have a minority President in the White House at this very moment.

If the Washington Post editorial writers will take out their pencils and make a simple calculation, they will discover that Harry S. Truman received only 49.5 percent of the 1948 vote which elected him to office. Yet despite the elements of disaster and calamity which every thinking American knows exist in the President's neo-Socialist policies, the Washington Post supports 95 percent of them, minority President or not.

Sincerely yours,

W. KINGSLAND MACY.

THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1950.

Hon. W. KINGSLAND MACY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your intemperate letter of March 8, addressed to Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, has been referred to me. If you will read the editorial, Minority President, to which you refer so abusively, you will note that it makes no reference to Mr. Truman being a majority President or a minority President. It simply does not go into that subject, because it had no bearing on the point that the editorial was making.

In saying that we now have a minority President in the White House, however, you seem to rely upon a strained meaning of the word. Webster defines minority as the smaller number; the smaller in number of two aggregates. If Truman is to be regarded as a minority President, where is the majority? You couldn't possibly find any other majority than his in the 1948 election unless you should add the Wallaceites and the Dixiecrats to the Republican Party. Is that your reasoning?

It is obvious from the text of the editorial that our reference to a minority President was to one who gets fewer popular votes than does his nearest rival. I do not see how you could misunderstand that acceptable meaning of the word unless you were itching for a petty controversy in semantics.

We have never professed to be infallible, and no newspaper that I know of is more anxious than the Washington Post is to correct misstatements of fact when they are brought to its notice.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT ELLISTON.

MARCH 15, 1950.

Mr. HERBERT ELLISTON,
Editor, Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLISTON: Your letter of March 10 came up here to Albany where I am attending the monthly meeting of this board.

I regret that the facts I stated should have caused you so much mental indigestion.

It would seem to me that this controversy in all fairness might appropriately be tested with your readers.

Faithfully yours,

W. KINGSLAND MACY.

[From the Washington Post of March 18, 1950]

WHAT IS A MINORITY?

Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY takes exception to our editorial of March 8 about the Lodge-Gossett resolution in which we said:

"We can think of few worse political disasters that may befall the country under the present system than to have a minority President. For that matter, the election of a man to this position without a popular majority behind him would be a calamity for the President himself and for the party which sponsored him."

Mr. MACY's contention is:

"Political disaster has already befallen us. Calamity has already been visited upon the White House. We have a minority President in the White House at this very moment.

"If the Washington Post editorial writers will take out their pencils and make a simple calculation, they will discover that Harry S. Truman received only 49.5 percent of the

1948 vote which elected him to office. Despite the elements of disaster and calamity which every thinking American knows exist in the President's neo-Socialist policies, the Washington Post supports 95 percent of them, minority President or not."

There are, of course, several definitions of minority President. Webster defines minority as the smaller number. In a limited sense, Mr. Truman is a minority President because he did not receive a majority of the total vote cast, although the customary usage of the term is to designate a President who has fewer popular votes than his nearest rival but wins the office because the strategic location of his popular support gives him a majority of electoral votes. In this sense, of course, Mr. Truman is not a minority President. It seems plain from the context of the editorial that we were using the term in this sense. If Mr. Truman were to be regarded as a minority President, moreover, where would one find the man with the majority? While we never profess to be infallible, we cannot help thinking that Mr. MACY would make more progress toward converting his party into a majority if he gave more attention to building a constructive program and less to quibbling over a word.

Federal Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Record Stockman, the voice of the western livestock industry, is published at Denver, Colo. It covers the mountain and plains section of the United States very completely. Recently they have been conducting a nonpolitical poll asking the stockgrowers to express their sentiments on farm programs. The following results are interesting:

BULK OF STOCKMEN OPPOSE FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

Fifty-seven percent of the hundreds of stockmen voting in the Record Stockman farm-plan poll indicated that they do not want any Government farm program, tabulations of returns from 21 States indicated late Wednesday. Eleven percent of the ballots favored the Brannan farm plan; 16 percent favored the present farm program, and 16 percent supported some other type of farm plan.

Those who voted against all farm programs showed their sentiments in a write-in vote on the Record Stockman ballot published 2 weeks ago. No space was provided for a negative answer. Nevertheless, 57 percent of the stockgrower voters wrote their opposition to all farm programs into the blank space provided on the ballot for an outline of other type of farm plan.

Dozens of ballots were returned with attached sheets outlining proposed farm programs, expressing opposition to the Brannan plan or to any form of farm subsidy. Many of these statements declared that ranchers and farmers with livestock oppose controls, or want to return to the American way, or let us alone, or we can take of ourselves and our problems.

Ballots were returned from these 21 States: Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, Iowa, Montana, Minnesota, New York, Washington, Utah, Oklahoma, Kansas, California, Nevada, Illinois, Texas, Missouri, Maryland.

Returns by several States in percentage of votes:

	Percent
Colorado:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	12
Favor present farm plan	15
Favor some other farm plan	17
Oppose any Government farm plan	56
Wyoming:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	11
Favor present farm plan	5
Favor some other farm plan	21
Oppose any Government farm plan	63
Nebraska:	
Favor present farm plan	10
Favor other farm plan	20
Oppose any Government farm plan	70
New Mexico:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	17
Favor present farm plan	8
Favor some other farm plan	25
Oppose any Government farm plan	75
Montana:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	7
Favor present farm plan	27
Favor some other farm plan	7
Oppose any Government farm plan	64
Kansas:	
Favor the Brannan farm plan	14
Favor present farm plan	15
Favor some other farm plan	14
Oppose any Government farm plan	57

The Committee on Un-American Activities and Its Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago when the House had before it for consideration House Resolution 482 providing additional funds for the continuation of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I had hoped to make a brief statement in connection with the accomplishments of the committee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD]. Unfortunately, the House met at 11 a. m. on that day and I was engaged in an executive session of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia, this committee has become one of the most important and useful bodies in the House of Representatives. Chairman WOOD has worked diligently, without fanfare, and without notoriety. In doing so, however, in his quiet, statesmanlike manner, he has greatly expanded the constructive work of this committee and tremendously enhanced its reputation. He has also staffed the committee with competent personnel who are exposing all subversive activities in this country, whether coming from the left or the right. Recently the House of Representatives passed legislation strengthening the security laws of this country by extending the statute of limitations in espionage cases and by providing much greater safeguards for the protection of confidential Government documents and military and atomic installations. This legislation was largely the result of the constructive work of the gentleman from Georgia.

I shall not go into detail about the many investigations which have been conducted during the past 2 years. But they have been extensive and productive. The staff of the committee is at present engaged in the investigation of communism in Hawaii, the Ku Klux Klan, communism in labor unions, and other organizations, including Government departments. The committee is also investigating Fascist organizations in the United States.

The gentleman from Georgia fully understands that communism is an attack upon our free institutions and our way of life. He also understands that it attempts to infiltrate into honest reform movements and all branches of our society, particularly those devoted to humanitarian and similar purposes. Under his direction the committee has adopted a splendid program of education. Factual information on the Communist procedures and methods has been widely circulated. Unsuspecting loyal Americans have thus been acquainted with these devious methods and have consequently been able to meet the Communists on their grounds. We have thus seen the educational institutions, the unions, and many other groups moving on their own initiative to expel all Communists and their sympathizers from their respective organizations.

I believe that the Members of the Congress owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Georgia and his colleagues on the committee. I think the overwhelming vote of last Thursday, when only 12 members of the House of Representatives voted against providing adequate funds for the committee, is the finest testimonial that can be given to the chairman of this committee and his colleagues. I have served in the House of Representatives, with the exception of several years during the war period while in military service, since 1940 and I am quite certain that this is the largest vote of confidence that the committee has ever received. It indicates that the Members of the House of Representatives appreciate the time and effort and intelligence of our distinguished friend from Georgia.

Unfair Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. L. Shaner, editor in chief of Steel, titled "Unfair Attack." Being a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I feel that this is a fair appraisal of the hearings that were held, and quite

agree that Mr. Shaner's criticism of the methods used by the majority members of the committee is justifiable:

Careful examination of the majority report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on steel prices shows it to be unbelievably loaded with prejudice, vindictiveness, and deliberate misrepresentation.

Therefore, it is not surprising that six dissenting members of the committee, in a minority report, felt called upon to cite chapter and verse in a score or more of instances wherein the majority of eight displayed bias, usually by distorting or ignoring pertinent evidence. Nor is it surprising that Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, in an individual comment on the majority report, said: "I am sorry that the joint committee is putting out reports of this caliber and I find myself astonished that some of my respected associates on the committee have read it so carelessly that they are willing to sign it."

To these charges of unfairness we could well add our resentment that the author of the majority report lifted 13 words out of an article appearing in the December 26, 1949, issue of this publication and in so doing deliberately gave a false impression of the real meaning of our text.

After reading the majority report it is apparent what happened. When United States Steel raised prices, Senator O'MAHONEY burst out in immediate, hotheaded criticism. He was unimpressed by evidence presented at the hearings. Staff members who drafted the report very likely took their cue from the chairman and thus slanted it against the steel companies in shameful fashion. It is quite possible that some members of the committee who signed it were not aware of its bias.

The important point is that this type of malicious mud slinging is harmful to the Nation. As recently as last Friday in White Sulphur Springs, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer paid high tribute to private business. "To contemplate the collapse or even the weakening of this great institution," he declared, "is frightening." But, he warned, "If we magnify our differences and if each group guards jealously its prerogatives and withholds from others its good will and its assistance—America may go down in ruins."

Majority members of the joint committee may well reconsider the implications of their unfair attack lest they unwittingly become the architects of destruction.

Resolution of American Protestant Hospital Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN PROTESTANT
HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Evansville, Ind., March 31, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAURIELLO: May I bring to your attention the enclosed resolution adopted at the recent national meeting of the American Protestant Hospital Association? You will note it is the expression of an organization in which the several Protestant Church denominations of our country have combined their common interest in the field of service to the sick and injured men, women, and children of the United States.

As the studied expression of such a representative body, the resolution will, I hope, be of interest to you.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT G. HAHN,
Executive Director.

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association has just completed its twenty-ninth annual convention; and

Whereas for the first time in the history of protestantism in America the several Protestant Church denominations of our country have combined their common interests in the field of Christian eleemosynary service to the aged, the orphaned, and the sick in full realization of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the convention convey its thanks to the representatives of the Protestant denominations that have assisted in making this initial effort an enjoyable and profitable conference; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association by rising vote expresses its appreciation to Dr. L. B. Benson for the fine leadership that he has given us during his term of office; to Dr. and Mrs. Albert Hahn for their faithful and untiring efforts in the planning and promotion of the convention program; and to our officers and committees and those participating in the program for their part in contributing to the enrichment of our experience and the enlargement of our knowledge. To Dr. M. T. MacEachern, president-elect, we desire to pledge our affection and loyalty and to assure him of our sincere desire to cooperate with him in his plans for the next association year; and

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association has over the past years maintained friendly, cooperative, and cordial relationship with those other organizations so closely allied in interest to our own, to wit: The American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Hospital Administrators, and other allied organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association convey to each of these organizations its appreciation of these friendly relationships and expresses the hope that we may continue working together for the common good.

Whereas the American Protestant Hospital Association is deeply interested in providing adequate health services for all the men, women, and children of our Nation; and

Whereas most of our great hospitals and other charitable institutions have been brought into being through the voluntary support of philanthropically minded men and women; and

Whereas the large majority of American families have the resources to pay for adequate medical and hospital care; and

Whereas local government and local hospitals and the medical profession have always recognized their responsibility to those unable to care for themselves; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated by experience that government plans for individual health care in other countries have produced uncontrollable demands upon hospitals, doctors, and other health resources without the possibility of reasonable check and with resulting excessive cost to their people through taxation; and

Whereas medical-hospital related individual-health services in this country are now the best in the world, a system which has developed according to the best tradition of the American character: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Protestant Hospital Association reemphasize its approval of the action of its officers and representatives in their efforts to develop and extend the voluntary prepayment plans such as the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan for providing health care and authorize them to continue in their cooperation with other organizations and governmental departments providing care for indigents;

Resolved further, That the American Protestant Hospital Association restate its opposition to any system of compulsory health insurance which deprives the individual of free choice or free exercise of his own personal initiative in providing for his health care; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Senate of the United States, and to each Member of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That a commission be appointed by the president of the American Protestant Hospital Association and concurred by the trustees, to draft an expanded statement of the position of the American Protestant Hospital Association for publication and distribution.

Blow to Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow to Reorganization," which appeared in the Washington Star of Saturday last, which states that about 22,000 postmasters are appointed in Washington.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOW TO REORGANIZATION

The quiet death sentence which the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service apparently has ordered for the bill designed to take postmasterships out of politics should not be allowed to stand. There is every indication, however, that the bill will remain dead unless there is enough public demand to force its resurrection. Here is a challenge made to order for the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report and for all other advocates of governmental efficiency.

The bill in question would carry out the Hoover Commission's proposal that all postmasterships be placed on a career civil-service basis. It was inevitable that this sensible plan would run into strong political opposition, for it would end the patronage system which in the past has proved a means of rewarding the faithful in congressional districts. When it is considered that there are about 22,000 politically appointed postal employees, the interest shown by politicians in defeating any curtailment of these patronage opportunities is understandable.

But the Hoover Commission found that politics produces inefficiency and militates against the incentives of promotion. It blamed part of the postal deficit on the fact that the Post Office Department is laboring under the patronage handicap. The proposed legislation would eliminate the re-

quirement for Senate confirmation of postmaster appointments and would place these jobs on a regular merit basis, like other civil-service positions. The plan has the indorsement of President Truman, Postmaster General Donaldson, and numerous postal organizations. No serious opposition to the bill has been openly expressed. Yet, without explanation, the Senate committee has decided to defer action on the bill indefinitely. This is a high-handed procedure which will deny the Senate the right it has of passing on this important reorganization measure during the current session. The Senate will be dealing the postal-reform movement a crushing blow if it allows the postmastership bill to expire in a committee pigeonhole.

A Bill To Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me to extend my remarks, I want to insert an editorial from the Boston Globe of March 31, which offers excellent advice to the President. It clearly demonstrates that this influential newspaper recognizes the inevitable consequences of enacting this bill into law. We in New England, as well as in the Northeast, will be receiving natural gas in the not too distant future. I would like to emphasize one sentence which cannot be disputed:

The economic future of this region, already afflicted because of recessive trends in industrial activity, is directly involved.

A BILL TO VETO

A severe blow at New England's hopes for cheaper fuel and power supplies has been dealt by passage in the Senate of the Kerr bill, exempting so-called independent producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Only one New England Senator, STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, joined the supporters of this highly dubious piece of legislation.

This bill, and a similar one already passed in the House, now go to conference, and thence to the President for his approval or veto. It is to be hoped that Mr. Truman will disapprove of the legislation. Unless he does, nothing will stand between the interests of the consumers, not only in New England, but in other large areas in the Nation, and soaring costs for natural gas. Under the provisions of this bill, the so-called independents will be free to charge all the traffic will bear. Thirty-five of these companies, it was brought out in the Senate debate, are already paying between 20 and 47 percent of their stock. The estimated bill to the consuming public, according to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, will soar by between $300,000,000 and $500,000,000 a year. The only curb on price rises would be the sense of self-restraint felt by the producers—a safeguard hitherto found wanting wherever tried.

New England should see to it that the President is thoroughly informed as to the seriousness with which such a prospect is viewed hereabouts. The economic future of this region, already afflicted because of recessive trends in industrial activity, is directly involved. With it are involved the pocketbooks of millions of homemakers.

The Views of the First Iowa District, February 13 to March 31, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the 1950 campaign, I believe it is most important to all men in public life to know the views of the people regarding leading issues now before Congress. In order to secure first-hand and accurate information I planned a comprehensive survey of my district soon after this session of Congress started.

When President Truman presented his state of the Union address, his economic report, and his tax message to Congress, I drew up a list of 27 questions to submit to the people of my district and this questionnaire was mailed by me on February 11. I wrote no letter to accompany the questionnaire except the statement printed on the questionnaire itself. The following describes the list of names to whom the questionnaire was mailed.

Throughout my entire service in Congress I have periodically mailed out farmers' bulletin lists to all box holders on rural routes and star routes and in those post offices not having city delivery. We have kept a file of all requests for farm bulletins, and we used this list of the past 3 years together with all requests for agricultural yearbooks for the past 3 years. In other words, every such box holder had the same opportunity to request bulletins, and in doing so his name automatically was placed on our list. To this list was added an equal number of city and town residents because the population of the First Congressional District is almost equally divided between city and rural. We used the city directories of all cities that had recently published directories, and we used the telephone directories in those cities that did not have recently published directories. We took the name of every fifth householder or telephone subscriber.

Throughout my service in Congress we have followed the practice of sending baby books to the parents of all babies whose births are announced in the newspapers of the First District. We added the names of these parents to whom infant-care books had been sent over the past 3 years.

Altogether these lists totaled approximately 25,000 names. No other names were added and none of these names were deleted. After delivery of the questionnaires in the district, we received special requests for approximately 200 questionnaires and we mailed out these additional questionnaires when requested.

The post offices returned approximately 1,000 questionnaires that could not be delivered to the addressees. In response to the 24,000 questionnaires delivered, we received a total of 4,221 replies, or a return of approximately 17½ percent. This return was exceptionally gratifying, in view of Dr. George Gallup's estimate of half that number of replies. We received more than 1,000 letters with the questionnaires that were filled out and returned to us, and the discussions in these letters were very interesting and informative.

The replies were rather evenly spread throughout the last 2 weeks of February and the month of March and in my opinion they reflect rather accurately the thinking of the people of the First Congressional District for the period February 15 to March 31.

My office force made subtotals of the returns periodically over the period that the replies were coming in. The first subtotal was made after the count of the first 175 replies. The next one came at about 900 replies and thereafter subtotals were taken at about 1,500, 1,800, 2,300, 3,000, 3,600, 3,900, 4,100, and the final tabulation at 4,221. The amazing thing to me is that the percentage of "yes" and "no" replies on each of the 27 questions never varied much from the very first tabulation to the last and the percentages on the final tally sheet are very close to the percentages on each of the tally sheets from the very beginning. From this I believe the opinions throughout my district on these questions during the period covered by the poll are very consistent and dependable.

I am enclosing a tabulation of the replies which I believe will be of interest:

Questionnaire

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?	881	2,959
2. Do you favor socialized medicine?	575	3,409
3. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	2,466	1,444
4. Do you favor extending social security to people not now covered?	2,436	1,384
5. Do you favor increasing the social-security benefits?	1,985	1,858
6. Do you favor higher social-security taxes if they are necessary to make social-security insurance a sound insurance program?	2,518	1,210
7. Do you favor continuation of rent control?	1,621	2,249
8. Do you favor extending the system of drafting men for military service in peacetime?	1,743	2,210
9. Do you favor enacting a draft law to be held available only for use in emergency?	2,647	1,060
10. Should Marshall plan aid be continued?	2,135	1,401
11. Should Marshall plan aid be reduced?	2,992	549
12. Should arms aid to foreign countries be continued?	1,432	2,150
13. Should excise taxes be reduced?	2,959	943
14. Do you favor increasing corporate-income taxes?	1,727	1,979
15. Do you favor increasing personal-income taxes?	307	3,432
16. Are you in favor of the Brannan plan for agriculture?	809	2,755
17. Should the civil-rights program be adopted?	1,889	1,166
18. Do you favor cutting down Federal spending?	4,015	72
If so, on which of the following items:		
(a) Veterans' benefits?	1,575	564
(b) National defense?	646	934
(c) Foreign aid to civilians?	2,658	204
(d) Foreign arms aid?	2,657	287
(e) Farm subsidies?	2,930	182
(f) Social welfare, health and social security?	1,337	635
(g) Federal housing?	2,025	442
(h) Dams, airports, roads, Federal buildings and other public works?	1,617	522
(i) General expense of government?	3,697	88

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "I Have Found Freedom," published in the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of November 26, 1949, an article entitled "German Refugees Are Glad They Are Far From Munich," published in the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News, of June 10, 1949, and an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons," published in the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript, of May 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Holyoke, (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of November 26, 1949]

"I HAVE FOUND FREEDOM," A DISPLACED PERSON HERE SAYS

Edward Swiecicki, a native of Poland, came to America 3 months ago. He came from 4 years in a Displaced Persons camp, and from 6 years of slave labor in Nazi Germany.

Today, after almost a decade of hardship and misery he is a free man working for his living in a Holyoke grocery market, and residing in Easthampton. "I like America. It is a beautiful country," he says, gesturing with his arms, "The Polish people like their freedom and you know how conditions are in Poland today. There is no freedom. I have found freedom here. I am satisfied."

Eddie, as he is called by his friends, has a job with Stanley Wielgosz who operates a grocery and meat market on Lyman St. He calls himself an "all-around helper" at the store, stocking shelves, selling a little and doing various jobs. Mr. Wielgosz says he is a good worker.

Swiecicki was in the Polish army in Warsaw when the German blitzkrieg hit his country in September, 1939. He fought in the siege of Warsaw from September 6 to September 28. He remembers the dates exactly.

The Nazis threw him into a slave-labor camp near Hamburg, Germany. There he worked rebuilding railroads destroyed by Allied bombings. He shoveled coal, loaded freight, laid track and hauled cement and stone. Swiecicki got up from his chair and demonstrated how the prisoners drove the spikes into the rails, raising the heavy sledge hammer way above the head and bringing it down on the spike.

Swiecicki is 40 years old, blue-eyed, tall and muscular. He has a workman's hands, broad-palmed and calloused. He says of the slave labor: "It was so hard that I don't like to remember. I consider it hell. It would take a long time to tell what we suffered."

After the railroad labor he did such tasks as mason work, and setting up telegraph poles in wartime Germany. The camp at Hamburg was bombed by the British and the prisoners had to completely rebuild it.

Food at the German prison camps consisted of two meals a day. Tea and two slices of bread for breakfast would be followed by a supper meal of potato or turnip soup.

Swiecicki's prison camp was liberated by British troops. Four years he lived in DP camps in Germany. For 8 months he worked for UNNRA. He was with Polish and French DP's at this period. Later, in a DP camp in Bavaria he worked in a hotel for American occupation troops. He was a kind of treasurer, keeping accounts for the hotel laundry, barber and tailor shops.

He has a cousin living in Easthampton—Anna Szczygiel, of 109 Parsons Street.

He had never seen his cousin but had exchanged letters with her. Polish Catholic Action paid for his passage over to this country. DP's cannot come to the United States unless somebody here can give assurance that the DP will have a home and a job waiting for him.

"It was beautiful to meet for the first time the person who had given me assurance," declared Eddie.

He arrived in New York and called his cousin. She was unable to come down to the city to get him, so he took a train to Springfield, where he met her.

A displaced person coming to the United States is asked to rest for at least 8 days before starting work. Swiecicki waited 2 days, and then went to work on a tobacco farm in Amherst. He says he didn't want to be dependent on his cousin.

Swiecicki was born in the town of Cieszyn in Poland and went to Vienna at the age of 4. His father was a major in the Polish Army and was killed in the Battle of Warsaw in 1939. He wanted his son to be educated in Vienna, and Eddie went to school there until the age of 20, when he returned and went to a commercial school in Warsaw.

Because of his schooling in Vienna, and subsequent years in German prisons, Swiecicki has a strong German accent. He is taking a night-school course 2 nights a week at Holyoke's Lawrence School and enjoys it very much. Once a week he takes private lessons in English from a Smith College student in Northampton. He reads all the books and newspapers he can in order to better himself. He understands the written English fairly well, but still finds difficulty in speaking and understanding spoken English.

His mother still lives in Poland, and he sends her CARE packages regularly.

Ed has his first citizenship papers and hopes to become a citizen in 2 years. He likes life here in the United States and considers himself lucky to be here. He wishes more of his countrymen in the DP camps of Europe might have the same chance that was his.

[From the Fall River (Mass.) Herald News of June 10, 1949]

GERMAN REFUGEES ARE GLAD THEY ARE FAR FROM MUNICH

It's a long way from Munich, Germany, and there are two Germans in this city who are glad of it.

One is a Jewish master goldsmith who could have come to America sooner, but chose to wait until his non-Jewish wife could come too.

It is easier to come to America when you are a victim of fascism, he explained.

He waited because she loved him very much. Erich Ruben knew this, even before his wife, Charlotte, chose the terror of a Nazi concentration camp rather than divorce him, as she was ordered to.

But when the time came to make her choice, she, an Aryan, elected to stay married to a Jew in Nazi Germany and pledged anew her love.

Erich Ruben is a first cousin of Rolph, a local optometrist. They hadn't seen each other for many years, since they were kinder, children of 7 or 8 years of age, until yesterday at Commonwealth Pier, Boston.

But Rolph arranged to have the couple brought to America. How they managed to stay alive during the Nazi inquisition even they do not fully understand.

"We had gentile neighbors, good neighbors," Rolph Ruben translated. "When the Gestapo raided Jewish homes, they warned us. We jumped out of a window. We hid in their homes. The Nazis did not find us."

That is, at first they did not find them. But in January 1943 early in the morning all Jews were placed under arrest, and that included Erich and Charlotte Ruben.

"I am a veteran of the German Army in the First World War," Erich Ruben said in German. There was no pride in his voice.

"The Gestapo showed me favor because of this. But if the war lasted 15 days more I would have died, like my sister and her husband, my brother and his wife, another brother and their families died in the gas chamber."

Mrs. Ruben was ordered to work for a German construction company, breaking rocks on a road gang. Ruben too, was in a work gang but under Gestapo supervision.

The Rubens have a son. He is in England where he was sent at 13 years of age in 1938 by his parents when the political complexion of the New Germany began to show in earnest.

During the war, he worked with the United States Army in England. It was only a few months ago, just on the eve of a big Jewish holiday, when he walked into his parents' new home in Munich. It was the first time this adult son had seen his parents since they sent him away.

Ruben gives assurance he can do a day's work.

"I am a master goldsmith," he said, exhibiting samples of his work executed since his liberation. "I have my special tools. I can still work."

His cousin said the couple will do nothing their first few days in this city while their cousin plays host. Ruben's services have already been spoken for by a Providence manufacturing concern that can use his special skill.

As a kind of memento, the couple brought to America a cigaret lighter that belonged to a big-shot Nazi, and was used as a place of concealment for an ampule of suicide poison.

Another event which will be notable today in their adventure-filled lives is a birthday party.

It will be a party commemorating the birthday anniversaries of Erich, the refugee, and little Eric, the citizen, son of Rolph.

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript of May 25, 1949]

DISPLACED PERSONS

Even though it appears possible that Congress will act at this session to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act, the success or failure of the DP program will still remain largely in the hands of individual Americans.

This is because, even under the liberalized legislation that has been proposed this year, it is still required that every DP be guaranteed both housing and a job before admission to the United States. Upon the number of Americans able and willing to provide such guaranties depends the number of war victims who can be brought to these shores to start life anew and contribute their abilities and productiveness to this country.

We are indebted to the weekly bulletin of the First Congregational Church of Williamstown for the following information on displaced persons, which should certainly be of interest to many people who might be in a position to sponsor DP's but who, through lack of knowledge of the resettlement program, are still hesitant. The material was prepared by Rev. George E. Beilby, Jr., pastor of the Williamstown church.

"DP's are democratic. They are freedom-loving people. The suffering they have endured under totalitarian rule has reinforced their devotion to democratic ideals. They are most thoroughly screened by Government authorities (30 operations) as to their abilities, loyalties, and physical condition before they are granted visas to come to our shores.

"DP's are people with strong family ties. Having lost almost all other ties in the course

of the greatest adversity, displaced persons have clung to their most cherished possession, their family life.

"DP's are religious. In their camps they have constructed places of worship and have maintained their own religious leaders and services.

"DP's are physically and mentally healthy.

"DP's are industrious. They come from places where they were accustomed to work hard on the land, in the factories, and in commercial and professional enterprises.

"DP's have become self-sufficient. The 45,000 who have already been resettled in our country have rapidly become independent. A survey by the New York Times found that less than 100 of these persons who are able to work are in need of assistance.

"Today, displaced persons are like normal people anywhere in all ways save one—they have no home.

"There are trained workers in every trade and profession waiting for sponsors. A DP can help you, as well as your help to him."

Complete information on DP's and their sponsorship may be obtained from Church World Service, Displaced Persons Bureau, 214 East Twenty-first Street, New York 10, N. Y.

National and individual self-interest require that Americans in a position to do so help make the promise inherent in the country's DP program an actuality.

Pennsylvania Still Oil State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pennsylvania Still Oil State," published in the Oil City Derrick of March 31. I call the attention of Senators from the 28 States interested in the production of oil to the fact that over 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil have been produced in Pennsylvania, and that more than that amount still remains in the ground.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STILL OIL STATE

William S. Lytle, a State geologist, says that 50 percent of the Pennsylvania petroleum is still in the ground. Pennsylvania oil is still rated as the best lubricating oil in the world.

Lytle says that oil operators, most of them in western Pennsylvania, are still depending on secondary recovery for the big part of their current output. This involves flooding the underground oil sands with water and using a simple law of physics. About 80 percent of the Pennsylvania oil production is currently being recovered by artificial water flooding.

The geologist says that more than 1,122,584,000 barrels of oil have been produced in Pennsylvania since the birth of the industry a century ago. Lytle says that the future of the Pennsylvania oil industry depends on the wider application of water, air, or gas injection, interdrilling, selective plugging, and the successful field application of laboratory research. The pioneer work being carried on in the secondary recovery of Pennsylvania crude oil is vital to the continuation of the industry in Pennsylvania and to the future oil economy of our Nation.

The Case of Owen Lattimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

THE CASE OF OWEN LATTIMORE

If the Senate committee investigating Senator MCCARTHY's charges against the State Department wants to find out how the United States was induced to abandon China to the Communists it will have an excellent opportunity to go into that subject when Owen Lattimore is on the stand tomorrow.

Professor Lattimore was one of the far eastern experts upon whom leftists in the State Department relied for advice and propaganda support when they were working to withdraw American support from Chiang Kai-shek.

He first came into the policy picture when President Roosevelt appointed him American adviser to Chiang in 1941. Then during the war he served as Deputy Director of the Office of War Information, in charge of Pacific operations, when the OWI followed a line well to the left of the State Department on China policy.

Mr. Lattimore accompanied Henry Wallace on his mission to China in 1944, when Mr. Wallace returned with the report that we were "backing the wrong horse" in China—meaning that we ought to get behind the Chinese Communists. The State Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs has followed the Wallace- Lattimore line since that time on all matters relating to China.

Although he has enjoyed back-door privileges at the State Department the past 10 years, Mr. Lattimore, fortunately, hasn't been so successful in selling his ideas with respect to policy elsewhere in Asia or in Europe.

His books reveal that he regards the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey damaging to world peace.

The Marshall plan, he held, should have been channeled through the United Nations so that Russia and her satellites might have participated in the program.

In 1945, he urged the establishment of a government in Japan which would be "left of center and at least liberal enough to be friendly with Russia." In 1949 he foresaw "an inevitable demand" that Japan break away from America in order to come to terms with Communist China.

He apparently viewed this as a wholesome development. "By withholding raw iron ore and supplying Japan only with pig iron and other semiprocessed materials, China would have absolute power to cut off the revival of Japanese war industry," he remarked. He did not seem to be alarmed at the prospect that this might leave Japanese industry at the mercy of a satellite of the Soviet Union. Quite the contrary.

In China, he said "wherever the Communists have taken over they have increased food production, controlled distribution, and stabilized prices, successfully breaking the old cycle of recurring shortages and famines." That conclusion, published last year, is subject to modification now that 50,000,000 persons in Red China are confronted by one of the worst famines in the country's history.

Every Senator should read Mr. Lattimore's book the Situation in Asia, published in 1949. In it he found Asia turning to communism because the progress made by the Soviet republics of Asia has inspired awe and wonder. The same people, he inferred, were turning against the United States because they didn't want to be used as cannon fodder.

Uncle Joe couldn't have handled the subject better himself.

Confidential Files—J. Edgar Hoover's Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal-Transcript of March 31, 1950, entitled "The Confidential Files," and an editorial from the Peoria Star of March 31, 1950, entitled "J. Edgar Hoover's Statement":

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Transcript of March 31, 1950]

THE CONFIDENTIAL FILES

The Senate and President Truman are locked in a tight struggle over the confidential files of the Loyalty Board, with the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee demanding a look at the secret documents and the President instructing the Loyalty Board to refuse their release.

Issuance of subpenas by the Senate may eventually bring the matter to a decision, although final disposition of the case may take years and come long after the need for a look at the files has ended.

The sanctity of files classified as confidential by the executive department is a matter that has never been settled although it has been a subject for dispute as far back as 1796. In that year President Washington flatly rejected, as an unconstitutional encroachment on presidential prerogatives, a House request for papers on treaty negotiations. Andrew Jackson also resisted requests for a look at confidential papers.

In 1944, Jonathan Daniels, one of the executive assistants of President Roosevelt, refused to testify before a congressional committee on the grounds that he stood in a close confidential relationship to the President. When contempt proceedings were threatened, however, Daniels was ordered by Roosevelt to testify, thereby avoiding the test of congressional power which may come out of the present controversy.

Another test appeared possible in March 1948 when President Truman ordered Federal officials to reject "any subpena or demand" by Congress for the loyalty files. The House passed a resolution subjecting to fine or imprisonment any official who refused to furnish information demanded of him by majority vote of a congressional committee. Court test of the legislation was prevented when the Senate failed to take action on the House resolution.

If President Truman stands firm in the present case and if the Senate follows through on its demand for the files and cites officials refusing to produce them for contempt, the strange spectacle of the Department of Justice, part of the executive branch, prosecuting executive department official may be seen.

Regardless of the outcome of the struggle over the files, Mr. Truman's refusal to let the Senate committee see them puts him once again in the position of defending individuals accused of disloyalty and treason. He has previously been in that same situation, much to his embarrassment, when he

defended Alger Hiss who later was proved guilty, and in his harassments of the House Un-American Affairs Committee.

If the involved officials of his Government are innocent, it would be to his, as well as to their, advantage that he permit the files to be examined.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Star of March 31, 1950]

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S STATEMENT

We have read with great interest J. Edgar Hoover's statement explaining why FBI files could not be made available to a Senate subcommittee.

His reasons are divided into two main classes. The first may be entitled "security." The second is not so easy to classify.

Mr. Hoover's security reasons appear to be sound. To allow persons outside the FBI to examine FBI files would be to take the chance that such persons might reveal information on FBI methods, undercover personnel, and so on. Mr. Hoover assumes, as we understand it, that while the Department of Justice may be trusted to keep these secrets, members of a Senate subcommittee may not be so trusted.

Perhaps he is justified in this doubt. If so, the next question is, "Why can't the FBI process its material on the individuals in question, omitting data which refers to methods and undercover personnel, and giving nothing but a factual statement of the FBI's findings?"

The answer to that takes us into the second class of reasons why Mr. Hoover says the Senate subcommittee cannot obtain information from the FBI.

"I, for one," said Mr. Hoover, "would want no part of an investigative organization which had the power of discretion to decide what information would be reported and what would be omitted. An item of information which appears unimportant today may provide the solution of a case when considered with information received at a later date, or it may later establish the innocence of the accused."

To us this seems like muddled thinking unworthy of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It seems to say that the time never arrives when the evidence may be weighed. It seems to say that Mr. Hoover considers himself incapable of fairly interpreting the reports turned in by his agents. It seems to say that if a Government official is believed to be spying for another government, evidence of that spying may not be used if it reveals how the FBI got it.

In short, Mr. Hoover seems to say that no information in possession of the FBI may be used to expose a disloyal Government employee unless a Cabinet member, department head, or the President wishes to proceed against the suspect.

This simply means that Communists may remain in the State Department, if they are there, because the reluctance of President Truman and Secretary Acheson to believe that employees of this Department are disloyal is well known. Information about Alger Hiss was kicked around by top Washington officials for years and no move was made to remove him. Yet he was convicted of lying when he denied under oath certain acts which linked him with a confessed Communist spy. It took a committee of Congress to start proceedings against Hiss. And a committee of Congress is the only body qualified to proceed against alleged Communists now in the State Department. President Truman and Secretary Acheson disqualified themselves in the Hiss case. But no committee of Congress, says Mr. Hoover, may have any information from the FBI on suspected Government employees.

This topsy-turvy situation might have been lifted from the pages of Through the Looking Glass. It doesn't make sense. Neither does Mr. Hoover's explanation of it.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that President Truman wants to keep essential information from the Senate committee. If this were not true, certainly some commonsense way could be found to remove the barrier between information in possession of the FBI and the Senate committee, which is entitled to know the truth.

Mortgages for Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "FHA Says It Will Insure Mortgages for Cooperative Housing," published in the Wall Street Journal on March 30, 1950. It has reference to FHA's now insuring mortgages under the provisions of the laws as they now stand.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FHA SAYS IT WILL INSURE MORTGAGES FOR COOPERATIVE HOUSING—WILL GIVE GUARANTIES DESPITE CONGRESS DEFEAT OF BILL TO SET UP AGENCY FOR THAT PURPOSE

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Housing Administration made it clear that it intends to insure mortgages on cooperative housing ventures, despite Congress' refusal to provide special funds for such projects.

President Truman, in his middle-income housing bill, asked that the Treasury be allowed to put up $2,000,000,000 in funds for a Federal association that would back the sale of debentures for cooperative housing projects. This proposal was defeated in both the House and Senate.

FHA Commissioner Richards yesterday said he does not believe that Congress intended to disapprove cooperative ventures as such. He announced that his agency has agreed to insure a mortgage loan of $367,900, held by the National Life Insurance Co., on a project sponsored by the Mile High Housing Association which is composed primarily of faculty members of the Denver University.

This association plans to start building 32 homes involving a total outlay of more than $425,000. This would indicate that the cost per home will be something over $13,280.

FHA also notified the Ardmore Veterans Housing Corp., Ardmore, Okla., that it can get mortgage insurance on a project involving 126 homes built on a cooperative basis. The agency will insure up to $833,600, or about $6,611 per unit.

In still another move, the FHA revealed that it has agreed to insure a mortgage of $2,679,300 on 300 family units in the Bell Park Gardens, New York. This is a veterans' co-op, FHA said, which has completed 800 units, mortgaged by the Bowery Savings Bank of New York to the tune of $7,220,000. Besides insuring the initial construction, FHA has a commitment to cover $5,000,000 for 550 units in this project and the new commitment to insure $2,679,300 on 300 units. Thus the agency might eventually be guaranteeing mortgages totaling $14,901,500 for this one co-op alone.

Washington Post Continues To Oppose Legislation in Realm of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, April 3, 1950, in disapproval of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, which competently sums up the basis for the opposition to this misconceived legislation:

CLEAN MUNDT BILL

The new version of the Mundt Communist registration bill reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee has been cleaned up in several particulars. Even after the lavish applications of soap it has had, however, it still entails sweeping and arbitrary invasions of American liberties unwarranted by the acknowledged threat of subversion. Furthermore, it is dangerous on another count. Although its announced purpose is to force the Communists to operate in the open, its probable effect would be quite the opposite.

Like its predecessor, the new Mundt bill would set up a three-man Subversive Activities Control Board with tremendous powers to decide, without any definite criteria, whether groups were Communist political organizations or Communist-front organizations. All such organizations would be required to register with the Attorney General and maintain accurate lists of their membership; in the case of Communist political organizations the names of members would be made public.

The bill would, of course, prohibit members of Communist organizations from holding any Government job. In addition, it would deny use of the mails or radio broadcasting facilities to any registered group unless the material were plainly marked as coming from a Communist source. It would make it illegal for any member of a Communist political organization to apply for or use a passport. Finally, it would make it a crime for anyone knowingly to conspire "or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship." Curiously enough, under a new provision of the bill, membership in a Communist organization is not to be construed as a violation of this provision.

Many of the objections to this procedure are obvious. A Government board would have well-nigh absolute powers to tell private American citizens what groups they could join without inerasable stigma. The criminal provisions are so vague as to open the door to great abuse. What, precisely, is any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment of dictatorship? Could it be, to use a farfetched example, the one-party system in the South? Moreover, as the Department of Justice has pointed out in a letter to Chairman WOOD of the House Un-American Activities Committee:

"A world of difference exists, from the standpoint of sound policy and constitutional validity, between making, as the bill would, membership in an organization designated by the Attorney General a felony, and recognizing such membership, as does the employee loyalty program under Executive

Order 9835, as merely one piece of evidence pointing to possible disloyalty. The bill would brand the member of a listed organization a felon, no matter how innocent his membership; the loyalty program enables the member to respond to charges against him and to show, in a manner consistent with American concepts of justice and fairness, that his membership is innocent and does not reflect upon his loyalty."

Although the bill goes to great lengths to avoid the formal outlawing of the Communist Party, for practical purposes it would accomplish just that. It would make membership in Communist organizations without registration a crime. This is not the traditional American approach, which requires the commission of an overt act of subversion before a person can be adjudged guilty of subversion. It is reminiscent of the thought control which used to arouse such mirth among Americans when it was introduced in prewar Japan.

In another category the Mundt bill is of dubious constitutionality. If the conviction of the 11 Communists under the Smith Act, which makes it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Goverment by force or violence, is upheld in the forthcoming court test, then membership in the Communist Party will per se be evidence of such advocacy. In that case registration under the Mundt bill would amount to compulsory self-incrimination.

If the Mundt bill actually would accomplish the purpose of forcing the Communists into the open and protecting the integrity of the Government, that would be one thing; but should anyone in this day and age be deluded that the really dangerous Communists are those who go by that name and hold party cards? Surely the Kremlin's master minds are persons who shun party meetings and even are known as anti-Communists. The restrictive features of the Mundt bill would only serve to push beneath the surface the visible portion of the Communist Party, which, like an iceberg, is six-sevenths submerged anyhow. In this it would make inordinately more difficult the work of the FBI.

Change in Method of Electing President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Blanchard Randall giving some observations and comments on the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to change the method of electing the President and Vice President. I have submitted the article to the Government Printing Office for an estimate of the cost of printing it in the RECORD, and have received an estimate that the manuscript will make four pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $328.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHANGE THE METHOD OF ELECTING A PRESIDENT AND A VICE PRESIDENT

(By Blanchard Randall)

On February 1, 1950, the United States Senate passed a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States in respect of the election of a President and a Vice President. The resolution goes now to the House of Representatives, and if approved there, will be sent to the several States for ratification or disapproval. If approved by the legislatures of 36 States, three-quarters of the total, in the 7 years after House approval, the proposal will become an amendment to our Constitution.

The present system of choosing a President and a Vice President, as determined by the Constitution and by the twelfth amendment, which was ratified in 1804, and amplified by the twentieth amendment, ratified in 1933, differs from the proposed, new method chiefly in the following respects: (a) Presidential electors, as persons, and the electoral college, are done away with; although the electoral votes of each State are retained. That is each State will have one electoral vote for each Congressman and each Senator to which the State is entitled as in the past, but electors will never be named, and of course, will never meet. (b) Under the present system, the winning presidential candidate by popular vote in each State receives the entire electoral vote of that State no matter how large or how small may be his plurality over other opponents; under the proposed amendment, the electoral vote of each State would be prorated, or divided among all presidential candidates in proportion to the popular votes each received in that State. (c) Under the present law, a candidate to be elected must get a clear majority of all the electoral votes (at present, a winning candidate must get at least 266 of the 531 electoral votes). Under the proposed amendment, the candidate with the largest number of electoral votes would be the winner, so long as his total is at least 40 percent of the whole electoral vote. (d) Under the present law, if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral vote, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, and from the persons, not exceeding three, having the highest numbers on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose a President; in their voting the Congressmen from each State act as a unit with one vote; if a State's delegation is split, the majority determines for whom the one vote shall be cast. Under the proposed amendment, the election is thrown into the Congress if no candidate receives as many as 40 percent of the electoral votes, and from the two highest candidates the Congressmen and Senators voting as individuals choose a President. It is noteworthy, here in passing, that the proposed amendment is not precise or clear as to what would happen if two candidates should be tied in their electoral votes and both have more than 40 percent.

The declared purpose of this proposed amendment is to clarify and simplify the process of electing Chief Executives. The present system is not—it is said by proponents of the change—easily understood; and in particular it can result in the election of a man who is not the winner of the greatest number of actual votes, although he should receive a majority of electoral votes. There is danger of an election being thrown into the House of Representatives under the present system, and the proponents of change claim there is no essential virtue in having the election decided by Representatives voting as State units with one vote per State. The claim is made that when the entire electoral vote of a State is credited to the winner by popular vote in that State, no matter how large or small in his plurality, an injustice is done to voters which might result in thwarting the wish of the majority of voters taking the country as a whole; and it is also claimed that the present system is unfair to candidates.

There is much to agree with in many of the points raised by the proponents of this change. But there is also much to be said for the present, time-honored system. There is room for doubt that the proposed changes cure the evils against which they are directed, and there is room to question whether the proposed changes do not accentuate certain weaknesses of the present method and in fact create new and greater weaknesses than are contained in the present procedure.

To estimate properly how this new law would work in the future let us test it against the facts of previous elections and against some of the probabilities we may encounter in future elections. Let us also look back into our history to see whether the present method, with all its alleged draw-backs, has been unfair to candidates or damaging to the country.

At this point the writer wishes to state that the basic data used in analyzing each election was taken from the various issues of the World Almanac between 1898 and 1950, and that he has tried to exercise care and diligence in working up the results he submits. He has little doubt, however, that another mathematician or another historian might find other conclusions than some of his: in fact the proposed amendment itself says in one place that when a candidate would receive less than one one-thousandths part of one electoral vote in any State, this shall be disregarded. Unfortunately the proposed amendment does not say explicitly how one should treat the popular vote of the candidate whose infinitesimal electoral vote is to be so disregarded; nor does the law say to how many decimal points the division of electoral votes shall be carried; nor decree how the calculation is to be made or by whom audited. Perhaps the way is left open for the International Business Machines Corp., or some other company which deals in mechanical wizardy, to overcome man's shortcomings in being able to determine what it is man has tried to do. In any event, the present writer spent hours in calculating and checking the data he now gives you, imperfect though it may be.

Had the proposed amendment been in effect fifty-odd years ago, the place occupied by Mr. William Jennings Bryan in American history would have been very different. Mr. Bryan would have been elected President in 1896 by about 4¼ electoral votes over President McKinley and several minor candidates, although Bryan was given but 46.7 percent of the popular votes and McKinley received more than 51 percent of all votes cast. The minor candidates who in total got about 315,000 popular votes, and no electoral votes, historically, would have been credited under the amendment with over 10½ electoral votes. The 7,100,000 voters who favored McKinley would have been merely a disappointed majority.

Again, in 1900, history tells us President McKinley was reelected over William Jennings Bryan. McKinley received nearly seven and one-quarter million popular votes and 292 electoral votes against Bryan's six and one-third million popular and 155 electoral votes. However, had the proposed amendment been at work, the thrice-defeated Mr. Bryan would actually have been elected again, this time by about one-third of 1 electoral vote, despite the fact that Bryan carried only 17 of the then 45 States and despite the fact that about 8 voters out of every 15 said they wanted McKinley.

In 1908 William Howard Taft was elected President. His opponents were the ubiquitous Messrs. Bryan, Democrat; Debs, Socialist; and quite a few minor candidates. President Taft got over seven and five-eighths million votes, more than 51½ percent of all votes cast, while Bryan was given slightly over 43 percent, Debs slightly under 3 percent, and all other candidates combined about 2½ percent of the popular votes. History credits President Taft with 321 electoral votes, Bryan with 162. But under the proposed amendment Bryan would have come close, a third time, to accomplishing in theory what he never found possible in fact: He would have lost in 1908, but by only a nose in a photo finish. This writer's figures—under the proposed amendment—give Taft 229.476 electoral votes; Bryan 228.288; Debs 12.464; all other candidates 12.772.

In 1920 the country went Republican by a landslide; President Harding was elected with over 16,000,000 popular and 404 electoral votes to Governor Cox's slightly over 9,000,000 popular and 127 electoral votes. There were also several other candidates, including Mr. Debs, who are credited with a total of about one and three-eighths million popular votes and no electoral votes. But had the new amendment been in effect, President Harding would have had 103⅓ of his electoral votes taken from him, leaving him a surplus of but 29⅔ votes in excess of the 266 necessary to win: Cox would have been donated 80¾ of Harding's electoral votes and a galaxy of minor candidates would have been given over 27½ of the Republican's electoral votes. Stated another way: Harding, who was the choice of about 61 voters out of every 100 throughout the country, would have been in doubt for some time, while calculators worked feverishly, as to whether he would have enough electoral votes; and would have had to be content with a little over 55 percent of the whole electoral vote although he got about 61 percent of the popular vote. In fact, from causes to be touched on in a moment, it is quite evident that under the new amendment, unless a great many States unexpectedly change their populations and voting habits, Republican candidates must expect to suffer great reduction in their electoral votes as compared to popular votes, and can look forward to winning only when at least minor political landslides favor them in the length and breadth of the land.

In 1924 President Calvin Coolidge was reelected. He received over 55 percent of all popular votes cast. Mr. Davis, Democrat, was given about 29 percent of the popular votes and Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., was given about 16 percent. President Coolidge had 382 electoral votes, Davis 136, and La Follette 13. So much for history. Under the proposed amendment however—and without any change in the popular vote or popular wish so definitely stated by the whole country's voters—President Coolidge would have had to be content with election by a mere 49¼ percent of the electoral votes, because more than 57 of his historical votes would have been given to Mr. Davis, whose 29 percent of popular vote becomes 36 percent of the electoral vote; and because likewise more than 63 of the Coolidge votes would have been given La Follette to swell his total up to over 76 electoral votes.

The only reason why this election in 1924, that of 1908, and that of 1896, would not have ended in the Congress under the new proposed amendment, since in each case no contender would have received 50 percent of the whole electoral vote, is that the authors of the proposed constitutional amendment at the last minute accepted an amendment to their joint resolution which reduced from less than 50 percent to less than 40 percent the point at which an election has to be referred to the Senate and House for solution.

One more case history. In 1929 President Hoover was elected by an overwhelming popular vote; he was given nearly twenty-one and one-half million while Governor Smith polled slightly over 15,000,000. Minor candidates were given a total of less than 1 percent of all votes, that is, only slightly more than one-third of 1,000,000. President Hoover carried 40 States for a total of 444 electoral votes; he lost only Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Rhode Island and South Carolina to Governor Smith with a total of 37 electoral votes. Had the proposed amendment been in effect—eliminating this time the various minor candidates from our calculations—148.52 of Hoover's votes would have been diverted to Governor Smith, swelling the Governor's total to 235.52 and Hoover, like Harding in a similar landslide would have pulled through with less than 30 votes above the 50-percent mark. Hoover's 58¼ percent of popular vote would be represented by less than 55½ percent of electoral votes: Smith's 40¾ percent of popular vote would be represented by over 44½ percent of the electoral votes.

The question may readily be asked: Why are only Republican victories cited as case histories, with unpleasant or dire results to the Republican candidates if the proposed amendment had been in effect? Why are not cases of Democratic victory similarly cited? The answer is comparatively simple: The solid South; where with few exceptions there has really been single-party rule for the past three generations. In these States the Democratic Party wins, not only with regularity, but with overwhelming votes; the proportion of Democratic votes to all other votes generally being no lower than 3 to 2, and frequently being better than 10 to 1; that is 10 Democratic votes to 1 for all other candidates. Accordingly when the electoral vote is divided in proporation to the popular vote in each State, there are several States where the Democratic Party will receive from 60 percent to 95 percent of the electoral vote. In the remaining States of the Union, in average years, however, the opposing or Republican Party is the favorite in but few States by so large a percentage as 60 percent of the entire vote. As a result—if there is a general swing toward the Democratic Party these one-party Solid South States merely add to the pluralities of the Democrat and make them larger. When there is a Republican swing these one-party Solid South States detract from the Republican's victory in electoral vote even under the present system to a comparatively small extent: but under the new amendment, as indicated in previous paragraphs, this detraction can become a major factor in confusing the outcome or even for reversing a large majority of actual voters.

Two factors must be kept in mind for any mathematical analysis of the proposed amendment. One is that there is a great discrepancy between the number of people voting in the different States compared to the electoral votes of the States. For instance, South Carolina, Maryland, and Kansas have approximately similar-sized populations: each State has eight electoral votes; in an average election, however, South Carolina casts a total of around 96,000 votes or say 12,000 for each electoral vote; Maryland a total of around 600,000 or 75,000 for each electoral vote; and Kansas casts some 760,000 votes or 95,000 for each electoral vote.

The other factor relates to the smaller populated States which have but one or two Congressmen, but because of their two Senators, are entitled to 3 or 4 electoral votes respectively. Nevada, for instance, has a population of around 150,000 and 3 electoral votes, or 1 electoral vote for each 50,000 of population. Montana has a population of about 500,000 and 4 electoral votes, or 1 electoral vote for each 125,000 people. On the other hand a State like New York with 45 Congressmen and 2 Senators has 47 electoral votes for a population of around 14,500,000 or one electoral vote for each 310,000 population. Altogether the 48 States contain many wide differences in these fundamental factors of population, representatives, and voting strength.

Then there is the great difference between States in what might be called voting habits. For instance, in 1948, taking the country as a whole, the average popular vote for each electoral vote was about 91,500; but at one end of the list of States there were: South Carolina, Alabama, Nevada, Mississippi, Arkansas, Wyoming, Georgia, Virginia, Vermont, Louisiana, Tennessee, Delaware, New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas with less than 50,000 popular votes for 1 electoral vote. These 15 States had together 125 electoral votes and 4,623,000 total popular votes for an average of 37,000 popular votes for 1 electoral vote. Incidentally the votes of these States were much larger in 1948 than was usual because of the interest in the States' Rights Democratic ticket which obtained about 995,000 or 90 percent of its total vote in these States. But even with the States' Rights Democrat defection of nearly 1,000,000 voters the Democratic ticket polled more than 50 percent of the total votes cast in these States: That is, Democratic 50.4 percent, States' Rights Democrat 23 percent, Republican 26 percent, and all other candidates about one-half of 1 percent.

The next lowest group of States in votes per electoral vote in 1948 were Idaho, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, North Carolina, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Utah, Oklahoma, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Oregon, and Colorado. In each of these 16 States, while there was a much heavier vote for the average elector than in the first group, there was no vote as high as the 91,500 average of the country. In these States 102 electoral votes were cast for a popular vote in 1948 of 7,017,500 votes, or 68,200 average; Democrat 52 percent, Republican 44 percent, States' Rights Democrat 2.4 percent, Wallace 1.2 percent.

The upper middle group of States includes: West Virginia, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Washington, Connecticut, and Minnesota. These 10 States have a total of 126 electoral votes and they voted from 93,000 to 109,000 per electoral vote in each State. The total votes were Democrat 7,158,200, Republican 6,672,200, States' Rights Democrats about 100 votes, and Wallace 215,000 votes; about 50.9 percent Democrat, 47.5 percent Republican, and 1½ percent Wallace.

The highest group of States when considering popular votes for each electoral vote in 1948 were: Ohio, New Jersey, Indiana, New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, and California with a total of 170 electoral votes. Nearly half of all the popular votes of the entire country cast in 1948 were cast by these 7 States, the total for them being 22,660,000 votes. In the average more than 133,000 votes were cast by States in this group for 1 electoral vote. Here the Democrats received 10,997,300, 48½ percent; Republicans 43 percent; Wallace 3½ percent; and States' Rights Democrats nothing.

One mathematical fallacy in the proposed amendment becomes apparent when these differences between States are considered.

This proposed procedure is rather like the old gag that if you take one-half of one rabbit and one-half of one horse, mix and cook, you can claim that the product is one-half horse and one-half rabbit stew.

If electoral votes are to be distributed in each State in proportion to the popular vote given each candidate, then the candidate's electoral vote becomes merely an arbitrary factor (the State's total electoral vote) multi-

plied by a percentage; and the addition of these percentage factors in all the 48 States cannot be a reliable guide to the true percentage of each candidate's vote in the whole country.

The addition of these percentage factors would give a true percentage of the whole only when the number of popular votes cast for each electoral vote is identical in each State. That is, if in every State some 91,500 popular votes were recorded for each electoral vote, then and then only would the division of electoral votes among the candidates in each State according to the popular vote each received, give percentage factors which could be added to the similarly obtained percentage factors of the other 47 States and result in sums which would mathematically represent each candidate's total vote.

It was stated earlier that unless the population of States were to alter radically or the voting habits of the different States alter radically, Republican candidates could carry the country only with the aid of minor landslides. Under normal condition, Republican candidates for President would need over 55 percent of the popular vote under the proposed amendment in order to obtain 50 percent of the electoral votes; otherwise a Democratic President would be inaugurated despite the fact that, in this example, from three to five million more voters would have voted for the Republican than voted for the acclaimed winner. Can anything be better calculated to disturb the average citizen's belief in the sanctity of his ballot than to have the popular choice fail of election not because the other got more votes—not because of fraud in any election precinct—or other chicanery, which we are eternally trying to cure and prevent—but by a mathematically imperfect law, presumably well considered and put forward with the backing of Congress?

But this is perhaps not its only fault and shortcoming. A close election today frequently calls for recounts of the vote in some States. Suppose to this difficulty were added the question of correct division of votes among candidates into minute fractional parts of electoral votes. Think of the pressures which would naturally be exerted here and there, to gain one one-hundredth part of an electoral vote or even one one-thousandth part. Think, especially, of the lack of public faith and the amount of recrimination and argument which will necessarily flow in any close election and the delay in finally determining the winner to the highest post in the Nation. Think even a little further. The more candidates there would be in any election the more chance to disperse among them the electoral votes of each State. The law works for this end, provided each candidate gets at least one one-thousandth part of one electoral vote, and in South Carolina, that means getting only 13 votes in the entire State, in an average election; in California you qualify for one one-thousandth part of an electoral vote if you get 162 popular votes in an average election in the entire State. Will not the really smart campaign manager for candidate A try his utmost to get as many candidates as possible filed in each State who would be friendly to his candidate, under cover, in the hope each of these splinters would detract something from his main opponent, candidate B? Is this not an invitation on the other hand to every little candidate with perhaps some local repute to file for President of the United States, whether he has any kind of capacity, or political backing, or none, merely to gain as much personal publicity as possible and with the real assurance he will get at least a minor fraction of one electoral vote, some Nation-wide publicity for notoriety) and a great tale to tell his grandchildren.

Is not this the best way to break down our chief bulwark as a Republic? Heretofore we have determined that so far as we are able, we would use a method as fair as possible to all States and localities, but especially to give us a Government by a clear-cut majority. Because of the division of electoral votes among all candidates, whereas now electoral votes go only to those candidates who can carry one or more States, is not this proposal one which will inevitably lead to so many parties being represented, that no one party has a majority, and as a result we must have coalition or compromise Government? The lesson of a great Republic—France over the past 80 years should be example enough of the dangers which are inherent in this splitting up and splintering of political parties.

Look back into our history for a brief moment. For 160 years the present system has been in effect. It is true that the original concept of having electors chosen in each State and then meeting, as an electoral college to personally choose a President, has been followed by all electors only in the original choice of George Washington. It is true that since the second election, and increasingly through the years, electors were chosen, pledged to a given candidate, and that latterly their instructions have become so clear that the voting by electors has become perfunctory. It is true that electors have never—but once—been completely free to follow their own dictates, but have voted for a certain man in accord with the instruction given them by the popular votes of their States. But have we not all become quite used to this procedure, and have we not actually legalized this procedure by the amendments heretofore added to the Constitution and fortified this procedure through our various State election laws?

Has this time honored procedure we have followed for more than a century and a half worked harm on our country or has it worked unfair handicap on any presidential candidate? Look back through the records: On one occasion one candidate, Mr. Tilden appears to have received about one-quarter million votes more than did his opponent—President Hayes. But while looking at that incident recall the condition of a large part of the country, where reconstruction had just ended, and where rights of franchise and election laws were quite chaotic; where feeling naturally ran high. Recall, also, that this election did not have to be thrown into the House of Representatives, but was settled by the verdict of a special commission. Recall also that the public accepted the outcome unquestioningly. In every other election but one, 1888, since we have had two dominant political parties, the time-honored system put the stamp of authority on the man who received the largest popular vote. Only in 1888 and when there was unusual third party strength—Greenback in 1892 and Bull Moose in 1912 did the winner, by our present system, fail to obtain a majority of all votes cast.

One other great advantage we have enjoyed is allied to the present time-honored system of giving to the winning candidate in each State the total electoral vote of the State. It is the almost unbroken rule that a newly elected president is of the same party as the one in control of Congress. The reason this occurs is due largely to the fact that the prestige and the campaign of a winning presidential candidate carries along with him the candidates for Congress and the Senate who belong to his party and aid their election in those States which favor the head of the ticket. If the President carries enough States with enough electoral votes to elect himself, under the present system, history has shown that his party also elects in those States enough Congressmen and Senators so that his party controls Congress. His new administration is thus enabled to get the legislation from Congress to put his policies into effect. Nothing is more futile than a President who does not have his party in control of Congress. The proposed amendment will tend to increase the number of cases when this dilemma will occur. As already stated, the new amendment greatly increases the danger of a minority of voters electing the President; here is an added danger—the administration and Congress belonging to different political parties and pursuing divergent policies. The inevitable result must be coalition and compromise; too often, futility.

We have discussed several past elections. What could be expected in a future election. Here is table A showing 17 States which have a strong natural tendency to go Democratic. The first 6 have always in modern history clung to that party, 4 have failed but once to vote Democrat; 2 but twice, and the last 5 have voted at least two-thirds of the past 12 presidential elections in the Democrat column. In 1944 these States voted as shown in table A and all 163 electoral votes were of course, won for the Democratic candidate. Under the proposed amendment the votes would have been split, and eliminating all but the two major parties from calculations, the result would have given the Democratic candidate about 117.4 votes, the Republican candidate 45.6 votes.

This looks like a clear gain for the GOP. But what would the Republican Party have had to give up in the balance of the country in return for these 45.6 votes, if the new rule were applied?

Let us assume, since this is an estimate of what might happen in a future election, that all the other 31 States went Republican; let us assume also that the division of votes between the two major parties favored the Republican side by the best showing that party has made in each State in the past 30 years; that there were no minor candidates, and that the total votes in each State was equal to 1944. Look now at table B showing these 31 States, their electoral votes, the approximate total vote cast in 1944, and the division of electoral votes in proportion to the best showing made by the Republican Party in each State since 1920. This would give the Republicans 223.80 electoral votes; the Democrats would get 144.20 electoral votes. Add these to the figures of divided electoral votes in table A, and the total for the country is Republican 269.4, Democrat 261.6 electoral votes. The Republicans win by 3.9 votes over 50 percent.

But now look at the last two columns of table B, which shows how the 1944 popular vote would have to be divided between these two major parties in order to bring about this eyelash victory for the GOP. Look at the figures: Compared to Republican showings in recent presidential elections, they seem fantastic. They represent the best results the GOP obtained in each of these 31 States in this generation. In total nearly 25,000,000 people had to vote Republican in these States, against slightly more than 16,000,000 voting Democrat, in order to equalize the Democratic lead obtained by less than 6,750,000 total votes shown for the 17 States in table A. This is the cost of the 45-plus electoral votes the GOP gained by the new amendment in those generally Democratic States.

These two tables, looked at together, give the reason why the Republicans will need a landslide, or at least a near landslide, to bring about the election of their candidates under the proposed amendment.

This narrow margin in practice would be altered by whatever votes went to the minor

candidates. It would be easy to foresee times when the Democratic candidate might squeeze through and win by electoral votes, although his Republican opponent might actually receive a plurality measured by several million votes.

Think of one more set of simple figures. South Carolina generally votes about 90,000 for the Democrat, and around 5,000 for the Republican. The Democrats carry the State by about 85,000 and under the new amendment would get about 7½ electoral votes while the GOP would get about one-half of 1 electoral vote. Now look at New York with nearly 6,500,000 votes, and suppose the Republicans carry New York by 85,000 votes, just as the Democrats carry South Carolina by 85,000 votes. The new amendment would give the Republicans about 23¾ electoral votes in New York to 23¼ electoral votes for the Democrats. In other words, in New York the GOP wins a net of one-half an electoral vote for 85,000 plurality while in South Carolina the Democrats win a net of seven electoral votes for the same plurality of popular votes. If the new amendment is in effect, that is the same as saying that 1 vote in South Carolina is worth 14 votes in New York. This may be very gratifying to the man in South Carolina or in any similarly situated State where the vote is small in comparison to the electoral vote, but how well does such a theory of discounting votes appeal to the man in New York or Pennsylvania or Ohio or California or Iowa or Kansas or Illinois, or any State where there is a large population and a large turn-out of voters on election day and where the vote is heavy for each electoral vote?

There is now pending another constitutional amendment to limit the length of time a man may serve as President. It is the twenty-second amendment and was started on its journey by Congress in 1947. Up to July 1949 it had been ratified by 21 of the needed 36 States. If for no other reason, the proposed amendment, which is the subject of this article, should be delayed until final action has been taken on the twenty-second amendment, so that the people of the country need not be confused by having two proposals before them at once, effecting both the tenure and the method of electing a President.

But there are other good reasons also for urging the House of Representatives to vote down the proposed amendment relating to the method of electing a President.

The proposal is not a simplification of the present process. In fact it appears to complicate rather than simplify.

The proposal will not eliminate the chance of electing as President some candidate who gets fewer votes than a competitor; it makes the danger greater.

The proposal is based on bad mathematics and will be difficult to administer and will not appear convincing to the public.

The proposal will complicate elections and offers easy cover for election maneuvering, for possible chicanery, and double dealings.

The proposal invites splinter parties and many candidates, thus confusing issues and tending to hamstring national policy.

The proposal will tend to break down our greatest strength of two-party government.

The proposal will tend to bring the ballot into disrepute, because of the great chance of nullifying the electorate's expressed wishes in popular ballots and naming as President and Vice President those who have but a minority of votes.

The proposal should be defeated in Congress, now; and the whole question of clarifying elections carefully studied in detail from all points of view, with lengthy public hearings and discussions, before we attempt to draft new rules on this important question to take the place of those rules which have served us well throughout the years.

TABLE A.—*Pro forma votes*

[April 1944, actual in usually Democratic States]

State	Electoral vote	Approximate vote cast in 1944 for 2 leading parties		Division of electoral vote, proportionately between 2 leading candidates; (figured to nearest 1/20 of a vote) under proposed amendment	
		Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
Alabama	11	198,900	44,500	9	2
Arkansas	9	149,000	63,600	6.3	2.7
Georgia	12	268,200	56,500	9.9	2.1
Louisiana	10	281,600	67,800	8.05	1.95
Mississippi	9	158,500	3,700	8.8	.2
South Carolina	8	90,600	4,500	7.6	.4
Florida	8	339,400	143,200	5.65	2.35
North Carolina	14	527,400	263,100	9.35	4.65
Texas	23	821,600	191,400	18.65	4.35
Virginia	11	242,300	145,200	6.9	4.1
Kentucky	11	472,600	392,400	6	5
Tennessee	12	308,700	200,300	7.3	4.7
Arizona	4	80,900	56,300	2.35	1.65
Montana	4	112,600	93,200	2.2	1.8
Nevada	3	29,600	24,600	1.65	1.35
New Mexico	4	81,400	70,700	2.15	1.85
Oklahoma	10	401,500	319,400	5.55	4.45
Total	163	4,564,800	2,140,400	117.4	45.6

NOTE.—A straight over-all percentage would be: Democrat, 110.97; Republican, 52.03.

ADDITION OF TABLE A AND TABLE B

	State	Electoral vote	Popular votes		Proportionate division of electoral votes	
			Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
A	17	163	4,564,800	2,140,400	117.4	45.6
B	31	368	16,185,150	24,831,850	144.2	223.8
Total	48	531	20,749,950	26,972,250	261.6	269.4

NOTE.—A straight over-all percentage would be: Democrat, 230.88 Republican, 300.12.

If Republican Party should lose 3½ percent of its vote, evenly over these 31 States, to minor parties, it would reduce the popular majority of the GOP by some 850,000 votes, but would reduce the proportional electoral vote of the GOP by about 7⅞ votes and, in the country as a whole, make the Democratic candidate the winner by a fraction of 1 electoral vote although the GOP would have received nearly 55 percent of all popular votes cast.

TABLE B.—*Pro forma vote of States*

[1944 approximate vote; percentage of best showing for Republican Party in 25 years]

State	Electoral vote	Approximate total vote cast in 1944	Proportional division of electoral votes between Republicans and Democrats only (figured to nearest 1/20 of 1 vote) using as basis the most favorable election return in each State to Republican candidate in any election of past 28 years		Approximate division of popular 1944 vote which would be required in each State to warrant the electoral votes shown in previous columns	
			Democrat	Republican	Democrat	Republican
California	25	3,500,000	9	16	1,240,000	2,260,000
Colorado	6	510,000	2.1	3.9	1,785,000	3,315,000
Connecticut	8	824,000	3.7	4.3	381,000	443,000
Delaware	3	125,000	1.05	1.95	43,750	81,250
Idaho	4	210,000	1.4	2.6	73,500	136,500
Illinois	28	4,060,000	12	16	1,740,000	2,320,000
Indiana	13	1,664,000	5.2	7.8	665,600	998,400
Iowa	10	1,050,000	3.8	6.2	399,000	651,000
Kansas	8	736,000	2.2	5.8	202,400	533,600
Maine	5	300,000	1.55	3.45	93,000	207,000
Maryland	8	608,000	3.4	4.6	258,400	349,600
Massachusetts	16	1,906,000	6	10	735,000	1,225,000
Michigan	19	2,200,000	5.55	13.45	643,000	1,557,000
Minnesota	11	1,122,000	4.55	6.45	464,000	658,000
Missouri	15	1,575,000	6.6	8.4	693,000	882,000
Nebraska	6	564,000	2.15	3.85	202,000	362,000
New Hampshire	4	230,000	1.65	2.35	94,900	135,000
New Jersey	16	1,952,000	6.4	9.6	780,800	1,171,200
New York	47	6,298,000	22.9	24.1	3,068,000	3,230,000
North Dakota	4	220,000	1.75	2.25	96,250	123,750
Ohio	25	3,150,000	8.7	16.3	1,096,000	2,054,000
Oregon	6	480,000	2.1	3.9	168,000	312,000
Pennsylvania	35	3,780,000	12	23	1,296,000	2,484,000
Rhode Island	4	300,000	1.65	2.35	123,750	176,250
South Dakota	4	232,000	1.6	2.4	92,800	139,200
Utah	4	248,000	1.85	2.15	114,700	133,300
Vermont	3	126,000	1	2	42,000	84,000
Washington	8	848,000	2.55	5.45	270,300	577,700
West Virginia	8	716,000	3.3	4.7	295,400	420,600
Wisconsin	12	1,326,000	5.4	6.6	596,700	729,300
Wyoming	3	102,000	1.1	1.9	37,400	64,600
Total	368	41,016,000	144.20	223.80	16,185,150	24,831,850

Congress Has Shirked an Important Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of deep regret to me that the Congress has seen fit to strip the Federal Power Commission, by specific legislative fiat, of its power to serve the consumers of the Nation and protect them against a rapacious monopoly of natural resources.

The passage of H. R. 1758, and the adoption of the Senate amendments, have gone a long way toward vitiating the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as an instrument of protection for the consuming public.

WASTE AND INFLATED PRICES

I have been opposed to this bill per se, and I have also been very much opposed to some of its implications and the pressure used to move it through Congress.

I have also expressed my vigorous opinion against the use of legislative fiat to overthrow judicial decisions when the purpose of the legislation is not to better express the will of the people but only to serve a special interest. This is a device as old as parliamentary government, and just as shabby as its hoariness would suggest.

My fundamental objection to the bill remains however, its objective of narrowing the regulatory range of jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

PROPERTY OF THE WHOLE NATION

Natural gas is one of our great natural resources, the property of the whole Nation, and its private exploitation should be carried out as a national trust. Instead, we have had a humiliating spectacle over the last 70 years of wild wastefulness by private exploiters, the levying of charges just as high as the traffic would bear, and a constant pressure of lobbying for special concessions of all kinds, with the amendment of the natural-gas bill topping all the requests in its baldness and brusque disregard of public interest.

Despite the heavy investments required for transmission lines, the production and sale of natural gas is not an expensive process in terms of costs per thousand feet at the consumer's door, and the spotty reduction of consumer prices eulogized by some Members has little relevance to the issue.

Natural gas can be handled just like petroleum: It can be transmitted through pipe lines, or by tank car or tanker or even truck, or in cylinders under compression.

This enactment paves the way for new gouging of the user, whether commercial or household; it further reduces the direct potency of the Commission in preventing or discouraging wasteful practices; and it further encourages high-powered private pressure groups to seek special privilege through congressional tolerance.

THE BILL IS WITHOUT MERIT

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is without merit in any phase.

It is against public interest; it is grossly against consumer interest; it is not even properly in the interest of the private exploiters because, relieved of their fears of the restraining hand of the Federal Power Commission, these huge companies—and I find the claim that this bill is for the benefit of small independent firms tragically funny—are quite likely to destroy the gas industry in their frantic efforts to wring huge profits out of this basic fuel resource while they can.

The Congress has abdicated its proper duty in this action; and I fear that their votes on this measure will come back to haunt many Members when they face their constituents.

ECA Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I am including as part of these remarks an editorial entitled "ECA Competition" which appeared in the weekly of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, in its issue of March 17, 1950. I am also including in these remarks as being pertinent to this important subject an article entitled "Britain to Cut Dollar Imports" from the Washington Post for March 29, 1950, and a letter from the manager of Dant & Russell, Inc., a reputable lumber firm in my congressional district. These items follows:

[From Portland (Oreg.) Commerce, of March 17, 1950]

ECA COMPETITION

Canadian lumber piling into United States markets by train and shiploads may well be a sample of what will eventually happen in many other lines of production if the ECA program is successful. In other words, if European producers being loaned money and being instructed in American know-how can ultimately approach United States efficiency in certain lines, it is logical to expect that their products will in the end be in sharp competition with goods made in the United States.

Methods and techniques perfected in the United States have given producers in this country protection against foreign production in many fields. If these elements of protection vanish through European picking up our methods and techniques, then situations similar to that of Canadian lumber on United States markets are most assuredly to arise. When that time arrives, there will be others than Pacific Northwest lumber producers crying for relief. Perhaps, the day may not be so distant as some might think when even Walter Reuther's automobile unionists might be calling on Congress for protection of their jobs, wages, and standard of living.

Canadians start with an advantage of around 10 percent in dollar exchange. Then their lower wage rate, lower taxation, and freight rates pile the advantage up to where if nothing is done, the day is coming when many of our mills will be out of business.

There are those trying to seek a way out. It is probable that the question of a higher lumber tariff agreement will be put on the agenda for discussion with Canada next October. Your Washington representative has talked to one major administration Senator interested in lumber who thinks this may be possible.

In the meantime, lumber is coming down from British Columbia even into Florida. And the southern pine people are shooting their protests in to Washington likewise. There is some hope for relief, but probably not for several months.

Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, is digging into the case, and intends to explore any possible administrative steps that might be urged to effect some relief.

One step that could help not only the lumber producer but many others would be cutting of corporate income tax. It is estimated that buyers of General Motors cars last year paid an average of around $400 a car in taxes of this nature. A lot of people are quite unconscious of the amount of taxes they themselves are paying rather than the big wealthy corporation. The lumber industry with the competition it faces cannot pass on its taxes in higher prices.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 29, 1950]

BRITAIN TO CUT DOLLAR IMPORTS

LONDON, March 28.—Britain's Labor Government reaffirmed today its hope that the sterling area, by reducing dollar imports about one-fourth, will be able to cut its annual gold-dollar deficit in half by mid-1951.

Purchases from the United States and other dollar countries are to be slashed 25 percent in the period from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951.

Originally proposed to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation last January, the cuts were outlined in a Treasury white paper, Economic Survey for 1950, issued today.

The Government has said items on which dollar spending must be cut include bread grains, sugar, tobacco, petroleum products, steel, timber, and pulp and paper.

The white paper, bristling with "ifs," said the reduction from a dollar deficit of $1,531,000,000 for 1949 to one of $785,000,000 for 12 months ending June 30, 1951, can be accomplished under the following conditions:

1. Business continues good in the United States.
2. The lid is kept on wages, prices, and dividends in Britain.
3. British productivity goes on improving with no sharp increase in costs.
4. Exports to dollar markets increase sufficiently to offset the cut in the value of the pound last September from $4.03 to $2.80.
5. Gold earning exports to South Africa can be stepped up.
6. The dollar nations demonstrate readiness to accept imports.

DANT & RUSSELL, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., March 29, 1950.

Representative HOMER D. ANGELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: You will be interested in knowing that in February 1950 British Columbia shipped into the United States by water alone 58,713,584 board feet of lumber; this in a month when a great part of the Canadian production was closed down by bad weather, shortage of logs, etc.

This emphasizes the need for some means of protecting the American lumber industry and American labor against countries having low wages and depreciated currencies.

Yours very truly,

R. J. DARLING.

The Dairy Industry in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Thursday evening, I had the pleasure and privilege of addressing the Northeastern Dairy Conference, a gathering of representative dairy producers and others interested in dairy production, meeting in their fifteenth annual session. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Talking to dairymen about dairy problems is an interesting but not a novel experience for me. I have been talking to dairymen about dairy problems for the past 20 years. I think I have made some contributions to the welfare of that industry in New York State as a result of those discussions.

I must point out to begin with, that my acquaintance with dairy problems comes neither from having been a dairy farmer nor from having spent a summer in the country with a cow. I learned about the dairy industry and its problems the hard way, from tackling the tough and snarled problems of that industry in the period between 1928 and 1942 when I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor of New York.

When I was sworn in for the first time as Governor of New York in 1933, the dairy industry was held in the terrible grip of chaos and depression. The price of milk on the farm was 96 cents per hundredweight. Farmers were dumping their milk into the pig troughs. There were farm strikes in those days—in New York, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.

I do not think it is necessary, before this audience, to go into detail about the events of those days. We all remember the foreclosures, the glut of milk and other dairy products in the markets, and the terrible combination of apparent overproduction and low prices. And despite the low prices, the consumers, the city people, were still unable to buy the available supplies, even at the low prices then in effect. Low farm prices and high unemployment—a familiar pair. Sometimes we forget that they almost always go together. The price of milk was as low as 96 cents a hundredweight in New York and there were 15,000,000 unemployed in the Nation. The price of feed was low, too. Corn sold for a few cents a bushel. But that wasn't much comfort to the farmers nor to the city folks either. The price of feed was too low for the producers of feed and too high for the producers of dairy products. And milk that sold at retail for 11 cents a quart was still too high for people who did not have 11 cents.

I have not cited these figures nor taken this backward look merely for sentimental or nostalgic reasons. I certainly am not nostalgic about that part of our past. I am sure that none of you is either. No; I have cited these figures and recalled the dark circumstances of two decades ago because today, at this very moment, we are faced with a situation which could possibly lead to at least a trend in the direction of where we stood 20 years ago. The problems of today have that same familiar look, like an old trouble that turns up after a long respite.

I hasten to say that the measures which the Federal and the State Governments have taken since those chaotic days of 1930 have provided a number of essential safeguards against any sudden plunge back into the chaos of 20 years ago. Some of the steps we took in those days were designed to meet the immediate emergency problems. But we also moved to provide for the long-range welfare of the farmers of our State and of the Nation.

It was not enough then—and it is not enough now—to make vague and pious declarations about how the situation could be solved by the initiative and enterprise of the American farmer. The American farmer has, indeed, more than his share of initiative and enterprise. But at that time—20 years ago—we all knew that we were in the path of an avalanche. In the face of the forces which had assaulted us individual enterprise and initiative were meaningless. It took the combined efforts of the entire Nation—citizens and Government, farmers and workers—to deflect the onrushing disaster and to repair the damage which had been done. And today much the same kind of situation exists as far as our dairy farmers are concerned. The problem of the dairy industry cannot be solved by the individual efforts of any one of us. It is far too intricate for that.

The dairy industry is an essential part of the whole complex structure of American agriculture. What is done to help or to hinder the producer of grain helps or hinders the producer of dairy products. Within the framework of the dairy industry, itself, we know that what helps or hinders the producer of butter, helps or hinders the producer of fluid milk and of cheese.

And finally, in the largest framework of all—the framework of the entire American economy—we must recognize and accept as an axiom—as an incontrovertible fact—that the prosperity of the dairy farmer depends upon the prosperity of the worker in the city, of the small-business man, and of all the elements which make up the national economy. The national economy is one and indivisible. No one section of it can prosper at the expense of the other, or independently of the other. What is good for the Nation is good for the dairy farmer. What is good for the dairy farmer is good for the Nation.

Let me turn back for a moment to the steps which we took in 1933 and in the years following for the benefit of the dairy farmers of New York State, in order to illustrate what I mean.

In New York State we insisted that the farmer must have hard surfaced road outlets for his products—farm to market roads we called them—and we built those roads—3,000 miles of them.

We said that it was vital for the farmer to have the commercial advantage of electric power and we saw power lines go up along hundreds of rural roads which had never seen power lines before. We saw that the farmers needed better educational facilities, more adequate health facilities, and regional markets for more efficient food distribution. All these were needed to make of the farmer what he has a right to be—a citizen with the individual dignity and security which is our American birthright. We proceeded to construct rural schools, and to establish rural health programs and regional markets.

These were the general measures we took to benefit all farmers in New York State. For the immediate and particular benefit of the dairy industry we took additional steps to cure the economic ailments which had settled into the very bones of that industry.

In our undertaking to help the dairy industry we did not, however, try to do things for the dairy farmer. Instead we did things together with the dairy farmer. The major role in the milk program worked out in New York State was played by the milk producer himself. We worked out a milk marketing system in which the farmers and their own organizations were the chief movers. This program was and is the farmer's program. The New York milk marketing agreements showed the way, I am told, for the Federal agreements which followed.

Under the terms of the Federal Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, 33 marketing agreements blanketing all the main milk producing areas of the Nation were arrived at. The chief effect of these agreements was to establish a minimum price which the distributor had to pay to the farmer for his milk.

But while we were working on specific measures to aid the dairy industry and farmers generally—both in an immediate and in a long range sense—we also worked to raise the purchasing power of the general public. The entire structure of economic legislation designed to stimulate industrial production and to permit the industrial workers to raise their income and their standard of living was as essential for the welfare of the dairy farmer as for the welfare of the worker and businessman.

But we recognized—and still sadly recognize—that American agriculture presented a much more difficult problem than American industry. While it was essential for American agriculture that we abolish unemployment and raise the general standard of living in the cities, special additional measures had to be taken to protect the farmer against the special hazards of harvest, market, and price.

It was because of these factors that the various parity, conservation, and support-price programs were put into effect. While the reasons for these programs are quite clear to you gentlemen—however much some of you might disagree with some of the details of these programs—the basic reasons for these programs are much less clear to the general public. Least clear of all to the general public are the reasons for the support-price program which, as far as the dairy industry is concerned, is confined to manufactured and processed products.

Late in 1948 and early in 1949, when dairy prices began their decline, the Secretary of Agriculture began to invoke these price supports—for butterfat in February of 1949, for dried skim milk in April, and for cheese in July. Today the Federal Government owns some millions of pounds of these commodities.

I must say that the price-support program, even in association with the milk marketing agreements has certainly not been effective in holding up the price of dairy products. This is so true that some of our dairy farmers have been writing to me, petitioning for an abandonment or curtailment of the price-support program for feed grains, on the ground that dairy prices—and poultry and egg prices, too—have dropped out of sight of the price of feed grains.

I shall not tonight undertake a defense of the price-support program. Its defects are obvious to all. But neither these defects, nor any other defects in the farm program can be cured with a meat ax. Something better must be improvised to take its place.

The price-support program is so subject to abuses on the one hand and to public misunderstanding on the other that I, myself, feel strongly that some other formula must be developed. I cannot tonight propose or enunciate a better plan. I have studied and shall continue to study every proposal which has been or will be made to this end.

I know that whatever solution is worked out must be worked out in relation to the entire field of American agriculture. No solution which benefits one field of agriculture at the expense of another is acceptable. No solution which solves the problems of one sector of agriculture without regard to its effect upon the others is acceptable. And, finally, no solution which fails to take into full consideration the welfare and interests of the consumers, of the taxpayer, and of the whole national economy is feasible.

This does not mean, however, that we can dismiss the special problems of the dairy in-

dustry and postpone thinking about them or doing something about them until we have solved the whole problem of American agriculture. We here are especially concerned with the problems of the dairy industry. That industry has its special problems which can and must be attack insofar as they are special problems. I propose to discuss a few of them.

The special problems of this industry do not reside entirely in the decline in the price of milk and other dairy products. That decline is as much a symptom as it is a disease. One of the real ailments which besets the dairy industry is the decline in the consumption of fresh milk. Per capita consumption of milk has been dropping. In 1948—the last year for which I have figures—one-third of the families in the cities of America were consuming less than 1 pint of milk, in all its forms, per person per day. This is a threat not only to the dairy industry but to the health of the Nation. This circumstance again is as much a symptom as it is a disease. For many of the families to which I refer, the price of milk is higher than their capacity to pay. We must reverse this downward trend in consumption. The question is how to do it. One way in which that can be accomplished is through full industrial employment at good wages.

The price of milk has dropped 22 percent within the past 2 years. The price of the products which the farmer must buy has dropped only 4 percent. We must continue to exert every effort to halt and reverse that trend.

It has always seemed to me, that in any business, dairying or industrial, the way to increase gross and net income is to increase the volume of production while reducing the unit cost of production. In specific reference to the dairy industry I believe that a sound and practical approach is to encourage demand on the one hand and to work for an increase in the purchasing power of the consuming public on the other. We must work at the same time to decrease the cost of production through more efficient methods of production and distribution. Nor should the retail price reflect an excessive fraction of profit for the middle man.

I know that all this must sound like A B C to this audience. You have heard this general prescription time and again. Yet, for the long run, it is the only prescription for an industry confronted not only with declining prices but shrinking markets. The only question is how to adapt this formula to the special conditions of the dairy industry.

A few weeks ago, I received a very interesting letter from a professor at the New York State College of Agriculture. He wrote that "Farmers are becoming more and more critical of handlers and processors whose costs also continue high, but who receive an increasing proportion of the consumer's dollar, as the price level declines." I cite this observation as a sign post on the road which must be traveled.

I do not mean by all this that there is nothing which the Congress or your State legislatures can do to help you. There is much they can do. And there is much that they could undo.

Recently the Congress enacted legislation which, in my view, was a heavy blow at the dairy industry. I refer to the repeal of the taxes on colored oleomargarine. Paradoxically, I favored the repeal of those taxes because I disapprove, in principle, of excise taxes. I also felt that these excise taxes were not a proper method of accomplishing the objective that was sought. That objective was to protect the dairy industry against the inroads of competition based on pure imitation. I think that the dairy industry should be protected against unfair competition in this form. Therefore, I voted for the Gillette-Wiley amendment, prohibiting the shipment in interstate commerce of oleomargarine colored in exact imitation of butter. As I told my colleagues in the Senate, the ultimate consumer does not say "Please pass the oleo." He says, "Please pass the butter," whether it is butter or oleo. I think that oleo should make its own market and not move into the market on the basis of an exact market and not move into the market on the basis of an exact imitation of butter.

But my objection to the oleo legislation was based on still broader grounds than even this. I objected to this body blow at the butter industry without first measuring and meeting the harmful effect which would be and will be visited upon the dairy industry and upon the whole of American agriculture by the oleo legislation. I believe and still believe that these harmful effects will be much more extensive and much more serious than a simple reduction in the sales of butter. I believed and still believe that the consumer will not benefit in any major way from this action. I make this latter statement on the basis of the fact that the oleo industry is, to a large extent, a monopoly of a few manufacturing companies which can and will control the price for their own benefit to the detriment of the consumer.

As a Senator from New York, the largest consuming State in the Union, and deeply concerned with the interests of all our people, I feared that the effect of this legislation would be to exploit and not to benefit the consumers of my State.

At the same time, I felt that unless immediate steps were taken to adjust the dairy industry to the losses which the industry would inevitably suffer, great harm would be inflicted upon all of American agriculture and hence upon the entire national economy.

I therefore introduced into the Congress only last week two resolutions aimed at meeting these two situations. One resolution called for an investigation of the monopolistic nature of the oleo industry. That resolution calls upon the Justice Department to investigate the oleo industry and to take such steps under the antitrust and fair-trade practices laws as are merited. I can see no possible objection to the speedy approval of this resolution. I urge all of you here tonight to consider the advisability of indicating your support of that resolution.

My second resolution was a much broader one, aimed at measuring the effect upon the dairy industry and upon all of American agriculture of the anticipated decline in butter sales. The Department of Agriculture is asked, under the terms of this resolution, to make recommendations to the Congress of necessary measures to assist in the orderly adjustment of the dairy industry to the new conditions which it will face.

I consider this latter resolution to be addressed to the heart of the situation in which the dairy situation finds itself today. I believe that situation to be serious and deep-laid. The passage of the oleo legislation was merely the explosion of a long-smoldering fire. A study of the statistics discloses that the per capita consumption of butter has been dropping steadily during all the years since the end of the war. This decline in butter consumption since the prewar years is now estimated at about 8 pounds per person per year, a market drop of 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter, representing about 22,000,000,000 pounds of milk. The per capita consumption of oleo has meanwhile been increasing, despite the 10-cent excise tax which has been applicable. The consumption of butter has been going down, and the consumption of oleo has been going up. The recent oleo legislation will merely accentuate, to a major degree, a prevalent trend.

Let us not blind ourselves to the facts. Let us not pretend that these facts do not exist. Oleomargarine is here to stay and will be taking a greater and greater share of what used to be the butter market—unless we do something about it. I am not prepared to say just what can or should be done. I merely say that something must be done. Otherwise our national economy will suffer.

Perhaps the cost of production of butter can be reduced—without reducing the income to the farmer. Perhaps some new process can be developed for the utilization of surplus milk. I hope that the Department of Agriculture will give all these possibilities its full attention. I know that all of you will give this matter your most thoughtful study.

I have not come here tonight with a ready-made solution of your problems. I appear before you tonight as a friend and as a counselor, and as one who is deeply concerned with the conditions in your industry and with your welfare.

I can offer you some general advice. In the solution of your difficulties I would suggest that your efforts be directed toward the integration of your problems with those of the other sectors of the American economy. I would suggest that you keep in the forefront of your consciousness the interest and welfare of the consumer. He must be your friend as well as your customer.

I suggest that you closely identify your interests with those of the working people in the cities and towns and villages. Once we establish the fact that the interests of those who produce food and those who consume it—those who work on the farms and those who work in the cities—are one and the same, we will have cleared away much of the underbrush which prevents us from seeing a clear way to the common road leading to prosperity for all.

An economy based on scarcity is an economy poised on the brink of disaster. Production based on charging all that the market will bear is production based on insecure and insubstantial ground. While the immediate problems of the dairy industry call for immediate action, you must enlist in your long-range support the wholehearted aid and cooperation of the working and consuming public. They have as much a stake in the future of the dairy industry as you. Work with them to make them realize it. Their interest is your interest. Working together we will not fail.

A Program for the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand the text of a splendid address delivered by the distinguished chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Guy George Gabrielson, at a conference of midwestern and Rocky Mountain Republican State chairmen, in Salt Lake City, Utah, last Friday night, March 31. I believe that every Republican in the Nation will be interested in Chairman Gabrielson's comments, and that independent voters, too, will take heart in his rousing message of patriotic appeal.

We are all familiar with the fact that under Chairman Gabrielson and his executive director of the committee, Mr. Albert B. Hermann, there has been a revitalization of party spirit. It is essential that this occur, because we must have a dynamic two-party system in our

land. In my own State of Wisconsin, we have an outstanding Republican leader, in the form of Mr. Wayne Hood, of La Crosse, at the helm, and he is following in the splendid traditions of his able predecessors, and is doing a great job, not only for the Republican cause, but in the interest of good government in Wisconsin.

A strong Republican Party is indispensable to a strong America. A dynamic two-party system is indispensable to a vital America.

I was particularly interested in the statement by Chairman Gabrielson that to be successful, the machinery of a political party must make for a party of inclusion, not exclusion. He suggested that the Republican Party broaden its base, and I believe that if it does broaden its base, not only will we have a stronger America, but we will have a revitalized two-party system.

Throughout Wisconsin, this policy of broadening the base is fully underway. In every one of the 71 counties, alert county organizations are contacting voters, spreading the good word of the importance of public participation in the coming election struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Chairman Gabrielson's comments be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a very great pleasure to be here in Salt Lake City and to have the opportunity of addressing you chairmen of our western and midwestern State organizations. I believe that meeting here in Salt Lake City has an especial significance for the party, which I will mention a little later; and it gives me an especially good opportunity to discuss what I believe must be the basic theme of our party organization.

To be in the forefront of a battle with that objective is scarcely a novelty to a westerner. Those of you who are native to this region and this State know that from long and personal experience. The rest of us know it from our study of American history.

In those pages of history that were written here in this region of the West, the story of the struggle of the Mormon people and their achievement is one of the most inspiring that occurs in any history anywhere. The hardships visited on Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and Brigham Young and their followers in their movement from New York to Ohio to Missouri and Illinois and Iowa and, finally, to the valley of the Great Salt Lake here in Utah rival those that any group has had to suffer. The courage, the fortitude, and the faith they displayed during this period of tribulation has few peers in American annals—or those of any other nation.

They reached the new land of which Joseph Smith had spoken. It was arid land, a desert. They suffered hunger and deprivation. Frosts and crickets threatened the first scant crops. Even a bare existence required almost endless toil. But the Mormons persevered. They made the desert bloom. They established settlements which grew and prospered. They built Utah to Territorial status and eventually—after a great deal of trouble with a succession of Washington bureaucrats who apparently don't change much—achieved statehood.

To anyone acquainted with this story it is tremendously impressive for the indomitable courage, the determination, and the fixed purpose of the people who lived it. To me it exemplifies the qualities that went into the making of this Nation and the spirit that has made it great.

I believe it is appropriate—particularly so because of the approach of the annual conference—to pay sincere tribute to the Mormon people and the Church of the Latter Day Saints for their great achievements—material and spiritual. They represent a breed of which the United States, today, stands in sore need. We could use a lot more of the fortitude and the conviction that moved the great Mormon leader, Brigham Young, to tell Captain Van Vliet of the United States Army, in 1857, that he did not want to fight the United States "But if they drive us to it, we shall do the best we can; and I will tell you, as the Lord lives, we shall come off conquerors * * *."

That statement bespoke a moral determination and clarity of purpose that must find a resurgence if we Americans are to survive as a free people.

It is no secret to anyone in this country that the times in which we are living are of the most critical character. Not only do we have problems of dealing with Russia in a cold war, and those of an unsettled world generally; we have the additional difficulty of being forced to face these difficult problems in the chronic atmosphere of insecurity, antagonism, and disorder, which has been created by 17 years of Democratic administrations. With all the bombastic and misleading promises which the administration leaders have made about security, the fact is that what the administration has brought to us as a people is insecurity. We are living today in an era of greater individual insecurity, instability, and unrest than ever before in the peacetime history of our country.

For one thing, it is an open secret that business, whether big or small, has no real confidence in the administration, even though the pent-up demand of wartime is not yet filled and business activity is at a high level. And business has good reason to be hesitant and fearful. For years the principal stock in trade of the administration has consisted of attacks on business. Yet it is our system of business, based on free enterprise, which has produced the real wealth of this country, and given us the highest standard of living in the world.

In addition, the national debt is at unprecedented heights. The problems of managing it, and of paying the more than $5,000,000,000 a year interest on it, are alone tremendous problems. Yet, the arrogant attitude of administration leaders toward the national debt, and deficit financing, makes it perfectly plain that they have no real concern with the crushing load which the national debt is imposing on the American people. Indeed, it is common knowledge that the administration will, if not stopped by Republican leadership, indulge in deficit financing and so-called pump priming, indefinitely, in these times of high-business activity, as well as in bad times, until the inevitable day of reckoning for financial extravagance plunges all of the American people headlong into disaster.

It is also no secret that the tax load today is so high that everyone who works for a living has to devote a very substantial amount of his work to pay taxes. At the present time, the average workingman has to work 47 working days in the year—approximately one-sixth of his entire year's effort—simply to pay taxes.

And along with the crushing load of national debt and punitive taxation which the administration has brought us, we also find the administration catering to every pressure group in such manner as to raise the cost of living steadily. While the statements of the leaders of the administration attract attention to the increases in national income, they are significantly silent with respect to the increases in the cost of living for which they are directly responsible. Indeed, it is no secret at all that, in terms of practical purchasing power, the dollar today is worth only about one-half of what it was worth in 1939. But the administration apparently thinks the American people will not, sooner or later, realize that increases in the cost of living offset increases in income, and cut down our standard of living.

In addition, with the Government's unrelenting attacks on business, with the crushing tax load, increases in the cost of living, and the general atmosphere of instability, unrest, and insecurity, we also find that unemployment is rising. For an administration which talks about deficit financing and so-called pump priming in times of what they also describe as unparalleled prosperity, I shudder at what they would propose under less favorable conditions, or in any sort of business depression.

Moreover, in the field of foreign affairs, we now know that the administration deliberately sabotaged the bipartisan foreign policy, inaugurated by the Republicans, and which is essential to the continuity and effectiveness of the diplomacy of any country. As a direct result, we now clearly see the whole foreign policy of the United States plunged into a catastrophe of unparalleled magnitude. It is no secret that the policy of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department was formulated largely by impractical theorists, who were fundamentally sympathetic with the Communists in China. And it is no secret that, spearheaded by its Far Eastern Division, the State Department carried on a personal vendetta and campaign of sabotage against the Nationalist Government of China and its leaders, deliberately undermining our loyal and faithful ally of the war. Today finds the back door of Asia wide open to the Red menace and the enslavement of the Chinese nation of 450,000,000 people. Perhaps the most realistic way to sum this up is simply to say that the Communists now have China as a result of our policy. And our first line of defense has receded from the Orient to the water fronts of Seattle and San Francisco.

Also, with the sinister spearheads of communism now pushing out in all directions in the Orient, the entire East is seething with unrest and disorder. Nobody knows how far the evil red tide, now that its floodgates have been opened by our own State Department, will surge through the Orient. Even now, it is almost impossible to comprehend the full significance of this colossal disaster in foreign policy, the like of which our country has never experienced, and for which the Democrats are directly and solely responsible.

Now, these desperate conditions under which the administration is forcing us to live—and I call them desperate advisedly—have placed new burdens and new responsibilities on the leadership of our party—the Republican Party. I do not believe that we can ever reach sensible solutions to the problems which are facing this country, and which have in large part been created by the administration, except under Republican leadership. Our policies are designed to remedy these desperate conditions that I have described, and we can do that if our party can win.

Thus, we see the tremendous responsibility which the administration's policies have forced upon the leaders of the Republican Party. Now, as never before, there is a public need for leadership and victory by us. And this public need for a Republican victory brings me directly to the main point of my appearance here today, which has to do with the party organization.

Party organization is something which, to my way of thinking, is of prime importance to the future of our country. Every political party has its leaders and its principles, but

the fact that those leaders and principles exist does not mean that the public realizes that they are there, or senses their value. That is where party organization comes in; for it is the job of the party organization to sell its leaders and its principles to the public, to make the public aware of their importance, and of what, in the last analysis, the party has to contribute to this country. Without effective organization, the leaders of any political party always find themselves crying nearly alone in the wilderness.

Now, in order for a political party to sell what it has to the public, the machinery itself must be representative of the public and in close touch with it. To be successful, the organization of a political party must be a party of inclusion, not exclusion. It must use all the talent which is, as a practical matter, available to it, and it must build constantly. It must bring in and utilize all races, groups, creeds, and colors, and in particular it must make full use of all auxiliary groups such as Young Republicans and women's organizations, and give them adequate recognition. There must be room for everybody in the party. It must harmonize and organize all the segments of our support, gathering up all the basic driving forces which are available to us, into a single powerful organization which is articulate and which can make a genuine impact upon the public.

Moreover, we must realize that in this country we have people of very different temperaments and backgrounds, who live in very different geographical sections, and who have very different views and prejudices, at least on minor points. The purpose of the party organization is not to place these differences into conflict; but, through a spirit of fairness, friendly negotiation, and exchange of views, to compromise and consolidate these differences, to close ranks, and present a united front, and to do it with the enthusiasm which genuine cooperation and efficiency always promotes.

Coming now specifically to our party, I feel that at this very time we have an unusual chance to broaden our base. There are millions of Republicans all over the country who never participated in practical politics, but who believe enthusiastically in our basic Republican principles. A clear majority of the leaders in business and the professions are Republican in sentiment. Many of them can be harnessed and put to work. Above all, we must bring Republicans of outstanding ability into our party organization, whether they have ever previously participated in politics or not; and we must make them available as candidates wherever we can. That is a job which you State chairmen are particularly fitted to do. I hope that you will join with me in trying to put on a continual search for high-grade candidates, for every political office from dog catcher up, regardless of whether those candidates have ever before had any political experience. In this way we can build the party from the bottom up.

Also, I think we must remember that, in the last 50 years, the whole political horizon has changed. Fifty years ago the big city machine and paid political workers were prime factors in political parties in America. Today, all that has changed. With the constant betterment in education which we have had in this country over the last 50 years, the intelligence of the electorate and its knowledge of current events have steadily improved and increased. The foreign-born elements of our population have all become increasingly better assimilated and better educated in the principles and traditions of our country, and its system of government. With these changes voters have come to think for themselves; the big city machines have been steadily declining in effectiveness; and paid political workers have been decreasing in number.

Now, while every party needs paid political workers, it also needs volunteers. We have been finding, in recent years, that the public is taking a far greater interest in politics than ever before, and that as a result there are now vast potential numbers of volunteer Republican workers, available from the general ranks of the public. In broadening the base of our party, we must seek out and utilize them, harness them and organize them into that single, integrated Republican organization which I have tried to describe. A distinct vacuum has been created by the combined factors which I have mentioned, and that vacuum fortunately can be easily filled by this new factor, the increasing number of volunteer workers which are available.

Finally, I think we must remember that all elections are won at the local or precinct level. Only concrete activity at the precinct level, and the caliber of the candidates there presented, provide a clear measure of the strength of the party and its value to our country.

It is significant that this meeting is being held in Salt Lake City. For it was in Salt Lake City that the 1946 campaign had its kick-off, and you will recall, we won the congressional elections of 1946. Indeed, the results were startling. In 1944 we Republicans had only 20 of the 49 Representatives in Congress from the 11 Western States. In 1946 we elected 32. And while, in that area, we had only 5 Republican Senators in 1944, in 1946 we elected 10. We won in 1946 because the public was with us; because, one way or another, the base of the party had broadened enough to take in a majority of the American people.

So, I like to think, as we meet here today, in Salt Lake City, that this meeting forecasts the broadening of the base of our party, and is the harbinger of the Republican victories in 1950 and 1952, which I believe to be essential to the welfare of our country.

Democrats Sabotaged Bipartisan Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including an article by Mr. David Lawrence in which he fixes the responsibility for the crack-up in foreign policy. There never has been an honest attempt by the Democrats to establish a real bipartisan approach to a foreign policy as we saw in both the China and Formosa situations. It has always been bipartisan when it was favorable to Democratic Party policy.

DEMOCRATS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENDING BIPARTISAN POLICY

WASHINGTON.—A lot of holier-than-thou speeches are being made about how the Republicans are upsetting the bipartisan foreign policy, when the truth of the matter is that the Democrats are primarily responsible for destroying the fine spirit of cooperation which once prevailed.

It's all very well for former Secretary Stimson and others with short memories to denounce the Republicans for their attacks on foreign policy, but the principal damage was done last autumn when John Foster Dulles—who, with the exception of Senator VANDENBERG, was the strongest influence in the Senate for bipartisan cooperation—was pilloried by the Democratic Party's wrecking crew in the New York State campaign.

With Senator VANDENBERG in ill health, it was logical that Mr. Dulles would carry the ball for a bipartisan foreign policy at this session. But the heavy guns of the Democratic administration were trained on him just the same. This antagonized the Republicans in Congress, many of whom harbor to this day a bitter resentment against the tactics of the administration. John Foster Dulles himself has magnanimously chosen to ignore the episode and strive again for cooperation. Some of the Republicans in the Senate, however, say that it is all very well for a Republican to cooperate and help the Democrats muddle through a difficult situation, but his reward usually is a series of partisan reprisals the moment he runs for office.

DULLES DEFEAT COSTLY

With all due respect to former Governor LEHMAN, it was far more important for the country to have Mr. Dulles returned to the Senate. The term was only a year, and it would have been a great example of nonpartisanship if the Truman administration had come out in support of the Republican candidate. That would have made sense because it would have been an example of real patriotism on the part of the administration.

The usual cry by the exponents of hush-hush and suppression is that the potential enemy abroad will derive aid and comfort from criticism in the foreign-policy matters. This is an exaggeration. People in the foreign offices abroad know that the only time an administration can be removed from office in the United States is when a change in the Presidency occurs. A minority opposition viewpoint is thoroughly understood and has its constructive values.

Any national or international policy that cannot stand the light of constant criticism probably isn't worth defending in the first instance. Messrs. Attlee and Churchill didn't observe any bipartisan etiquette on foreign policy in their recent campaign.

Naturally if the Republicans overplay their hand by their criticism, they will hurt themselves, and the majority party and administration will be correspondingly strengthened instead of weakened. If the Republicans happen to be right in their criticism, the Democrats will be influenced to change their policies, which is all to the good.

The fight against Secretary Acheson arose not because of any personal antagonism against him in the first instance, but because he is a symbol of the administration, especially since the President appears to have delegated virtually complete responsibility for the making of foreign policy to his Secretary of State.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION IS OVER

In these dispatches last autumn attention was called to the way the administration was fighting John Foster Dulles, and the prediction was made then that far more than a Republican candidate was being destroyed. This has now come true. Except for a meaningless gesture now and then like the designation of former Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, to accompany the American delegation to London for the forthcoming meeting of the foreign ministers, the days of bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy as carried on heretofore are over. Republican Senators are no longer to feel muzzled to speak their thoughts in the Senate, and there are signs that the Democrats themselves are considerably relieved, too, to be able to accept the political challenge of their opponents whenever it is flung toward them.

The Navy and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Admiral S. E. McCarty, Supply Corps, United States Navy, at the thirty-third annual convention of the American Brush Manufacturers Association, at Atlantic City, N. J. Admiral McCarty gives an informative picture of how the Navy's business arm operates, as well as the importance of American business, big and small, to the defenses of our country. With it all is mixed a good deal of sound horse sense and good Americanism:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the American Brush Manufacturers Association, it is a real pleasure for me to be with you today. Yes, I know all speakers and guests say that on every occasion—but today I have the opportunity of discussing a business that is vital to the Navy, and talking it over with the people who are the real leaders in that business.

As a representative of the Navy Department and the Navy's business arm—the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—I want to make this session of as much benefit to me as to you. And that is my approach this morning.

Several weeks ago, when your president graciously invited me to be with you during this thirty-third annual convention, I seriously began to evaluate just how important your business is to the armed forces, and particularly to the Navy. Sure, many times a day I must have one of your products for my personal use—a toothbrush, shoe brush, clothes brush, hair brush, hand brush, etc., and it comes so natural that true appreciation as to the necessity in daily personal use is lost.

But it is more toward the industrial angle that I want to discuss, where you can help us and to the end that we understand each other. Just to place myself in this picture, it is my privilege to be in command of the biggest single purchasing activity in the armed forces, and I believe it is not an exaggeration to say it is either the biggest or near biggest single purchasing organization in the United States. While the primary mission of my organization, the Aviation Supply Office of the Navy, is aviation supply, yet as a part of our activity is the job of buying all items of common use for the Navy, such as metals, paper, tools, soap, light globes, and, of course, brushes—all told, a list of more than 5,000,000 items.

In the early days of the Navy, there was procured little material in a systematic purchasing system. Weapons were largely the sword, spear, and boarding pike. Salt horse, hardtack, and water could be procured at almost any port.

But the modern vessel, airplane, and weapons of naval warfare are intricate high-speed machines which soon become useless unless regularly provided with replacement parts. Just how fast we are expanding our needs in the Navy is best shown by the fact that in 1940 our needs could be filled by a quarter of a million individual items; now it requires more than 5,000,000 individual items, of which 80 percent are technical parts. And with this highly complex, closely integrated, and scientifically intricate status we find ourselves wholly dependent on the industrial output of the Nation. There is not a type of industry that does not play a part in our existence.

Any specialist, individual, or organization has an understandable tendency to regard his field as all important. You feel that way about brushes, and if you didn't, your value would soon be lost. We, in the Navy, believe we are justified in regarding our specialty, which is the protection of the national security by maintenance of strong and well-balanced military forces, as all important.

But we fully realize that the fulfillment of our mission is entirely dependent upon the existence of a well-molded and well-prepared industrial organization. Unless we can be assured of a constant flow of ready-for-use products from industry, we will fail. You members of the American Brush Manufacturers' Association represent a cross-section of the American industrial mechanism which has proved so valuable to the Navy in the past and which must continue to future operations. You, industry, are indispensable.

Through the ingenuity, cooperation, and resourcefulness of American industry, of people like you here assembled, the Navy maintained the greatest fleet the world has ever seen. The impact on industry, when the Navy really made its wants known, was beyond the wildest thought of prewar planning. You in industry withstood that impact, and you gave us what we had to have to bring victory. During the actual war period, the Navy purchased $67,000,000,000 worth of supplies. I mean by that, support supplies for our combatant forces. You gave us what we asked for and you gave us the vast store of support when we wanted it, where we wanted it, and in amounts we needed. And even in peace we are still in the big-business bracket. Right now, our procurement of brushes alone runs to several million dollars a year. You in the brush business have a special appreciation of world-wide operation. Industry supports our Navy on a global operation, for our ships are prone to travel to every part of the world. You brush manufacturers, on the other hand, must procure your products from world-wide fields. Your bristles come mainly from China, India, and Russia; horsehair from every continent except Africa; vegetable fibers from west Africa, Brazil, and Mexico; wood, metal, rubber, synthetics, and the other hundreds of items used come from outside the United States.

You brush manufacturers were successful in winning for your trade the respect of the armed forces, and I speak especially for the Navy. Your splendid record of production rates second to none in industry. And you accomplished this despite the many obstacles, including the difficulty of obtaining stores in war-ridden countries. Gen. Joe Stilwell, when flying the Hump out of China, made his famous inquiry to Washington: "Will someone please tell me what the hell we're doing flying pig bristles out of China, when there is a war on?" But without those pig bristles flown over the Hump we would have been in a bad way.

During the last war the Navy fought in many climates. For the first time in history, a large portion of our fighting was in the warm, humid areas of the Tropics. There we found a new enemy of gigantic proportion—rust. More than ever before we needed preservation. In the Tropics, metallic surfaces deteriorate rapidly if not fully protected. So we screamed loud for wire brushes to clean off rust, and paint brushes to put on paint. We needed paint for preservation and needed paint for camouflage. When you realize it takes as much as 400,000 pounds of paint for a single battleship, you can see our task. During the war, in the Pacific Ocean alone, the Navy used 50,000 carloads of paint. And believe me, you people had to produce a lot of brushes for that job alone. We used 3,000,000 brushes of tapered synthetic bristles to fight rust and apply deceptive camouflage alone.

As the aviation supply officer of the Navy, I am seriously interested in the support of our plans on a world-wide operation. We gave you one problem of import during the war, and you gave us the right answer. Great difficulty was experienced in the preparation of a positive metal-to-metal contact for the thousands of rivets that go into plane construction. It was absolutely essential to avoid sparking during flight, and our way was to clean the skin surface with steel wool—all a hand operation. You gave us a small, portable, power-driven end brush, constructed so that the operator could center it quickly in the rivet hole. By that one operation, you brush manufacturers increased airplane assembly 1,000 percent.

Your outstanding contribution to plane building was in the field of engines. At the start we manhandled the hundreds of parts that must be machined to provide flowing contours, highly polished surfaces, and microscopic tolerances. This was a long tedious job and not so accurate. You gave us power-brushing techniques that not only speeded up the production, but established mechanical standards never before obtainable.

The contribution of the brush industry to aircraft manufacturers cannot be measured in precise statistical terms, but the dependence of the aircraft industry upon brushes is well appreciated. You are an example of industrial cooperation which so significantly shows the interrelationship of American industries. You can well be proud of your war record and your peacetime support. We in the Navy know you will always be one of our mainstays.

The Navy desires to foster and improve the understanding, cooperation and good feeling which exist between American industry and the Navy Department. We are always anxious to discuss mutual problems. To this end, I would like to discuss Public Law 413, known as the Armed Services Procurement Act, and how it is now affecting our dealings with industry.

When this act was first passed by the Eightieth Congress, I do not believe industry fully appreciated its import. At that time a large number of commodities were still in the scarce class. But during the past year conditions have changed, and we now have a buyer's market, and this has progressed to such an extent that there have been created critical business areas, or "distressed areas."

The passage of the Armed Services Procurement Act, Public Law 413, appreciably changed the procurement policies and practices of the armed services. The basic concept of buying was changed. Where the wartime buying under the First War Powers Act allowed negotiated procurements in quantity, the Armed Services Procurement Act provided for procuring by public advertising all commodities in which competitive bidding could play a role. This was implemented immediately by the armed forces, and has, I am sure, resulted in procurements effected by real competitive bidding; by contracts being placed throughout the various industries; and by the armed forces obtaining products at a lower price.

For the armed services to procure at a lower price does not mean you in industry are being robbed. By quantity contracting you are able to plan your production, for in our buying we ask for staggered delivery. Then you eliminate a great mass of paper work, such as repeatedly submitting bids, your uncertainty of purchasing raw material, repeated billing, etc. It gives you an orderly program.

To vividly illustrate my thought on competition, I might point out that the bidders' list of the Aviation Supply Office contains the names of some 16,000 firms. Yours

being a most competitive industry, I don't think I need say more on that score.

Since the end of the war, with unification becoming a major issue, there has been developed single-service procurements. By this I mean the Navy purchases certain products for the Army and the Air Force; and the Air Force and the Army, in turn, purchase various products for the combined services. Single-service purchase is based upon a commodity versus a plant breakdown. I can best illustrate my point by examples of the two. By commodity breakdown I mean that the Navy purchases a commodity for three services. On the first day of January of this year the Navy began buying paint for all of the services. I choose this as a representative example because it is related to your industry. Conversely, the Air Force procures photographic material for the three services. This systemized buying is certainly advantageous to both the services and industry. For the services it will mean in the end more economic procurement. To you in industry it wil mean that you will be dealing with one contracting officer and one governmental agency for a specific commodity. Industry comments have been very favorable on this type of procurement. Now we turn to the other segment of so-called single-service procurement—and that is, literally, plant allocation to one service. Again, to illustrate my point, the Navy has been allocated the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of the United Aircraft Corp. This means that all Pratt & Whitney engines and engine parts will be purchased by the Navy for the Air Force, as well as for the Navy's requirements. Likewise the Air Force procures engines and engine parts of the Wright manufacture for the Navy, as well as for Air Force requirements. This again will, we think, produce economy in buying, and the contractor deals with one contracting officer. And this phase of industrial mobilization control is extending to all industry.

Just a word about this unification program. We have already gone a long way, particularly in the procurement field. I do not believe there ever was the intention of Congress for a merger as was so glibly brunted about at one time. I believe Congress intends that there must be an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force, all with definite missions to perform and each branch of the Department of Defense to have control of its logistic support. But those men up on Capitol Hill are well versed in the military set-up and they have decreed a plan of unification, such as procurement, medical administration, etc. And that plan is working to the benefit of the taxpayer. The present unification procedure is good because it is efficient and economical and because it is a benefit to industry and the armed forces.

The armed forces have developed specifications for a great majority of the items that we buy and that go into our supply system. In countless instances, these specifications have been developed with the aid of the affected industry. Industry has always appeared most cooperative in aiding the services in the development of specifications; I am sure that this will hold true in your own industry. We, at all times, invite industry's comments and criticisms on existing specifications, for these serve as the basis of our procurements.

At times we are greatly concerned as to whether the bidder is fully aware of all of the requirements of our specifications. This has been particularly true in our procurement of brushes for the past year. We have recently received comparatively low bids on various types of brushes—bids, which when compared to previous prices paid, are extremely low. It is our responsibility to assure ourselves and the bidder that these prices are correct, and that no error has been made in the computation of the bid. Yet, repeatedly, the reply from the low bidder has been that he will furnish the brushes according to the specifications and at the price bid. After much industry comment on this problem, the Navy decided to establish additional facilities to test the brushes under contract to insure that the brushes did meet specifications. This is a protection to the Navy, the users of the brushes, and to industry, the supplier.

The Navy has wholeheartedly supported the administration's attitude toward small-business men. For a while we mailed invitations to bid to every known source, and in addition sent bids to local chambers of commerce, etc. This led to considerable confusion, but also did a lot of good. Since the 1st of March, a more systematic way has been resolved. We now mail invitations to bid to all known and reputable firms in specialized manufacture and mail bids to regional offices of the Department of Commerce. There are 15 such districts in the United States.

The Navy welcomes new prospective suppliers. We have a list of more than 16,000 firms, but will be glad to add others if they can satisfy the Navy that they are legitimate dealers or manufacturers and able to produce according to our specifications.

The Navy has prepared two booklets that should be of interest to every firm represented at this convention. The first is Selling to the Navy and tells just what our procedures are in dealing with industry. The other booklet, How the Navy Buys, is a graphic description of the channels to be followed. These booklets can be procured for the asking. I am leaving a few here today, if any of you are interested.

Now I know I have talked quite a while, but with your indulgence, I would like to discuss another responsibility of your organization.

You people in industry have a very serious responsibility, added since the last war, to assure this country victory if we are forced into another armed conflict. You must recognize and combat the very strongly organized communistic movement aimed to weaken our inner structure. I am not appearing as a warmonger today, but am sure you partially realize that our situation is not good. Our only potential enemy has now a far greater military organization than the United States. This potential enemy has far more airplanes—and very good ones—than we have; it has far more submarines—and good ones; it has 10 times more men actually under arms than we have.

Where a year ago we had a security in the sole possession of the atomic bomb, now that security is lost because we know that Russia has actually proved their construction. While the hydrogen bomb is still not ready for actual use, yet we know that Russia has the knowledge of how to build one. Matching military strength as unit for unit and man for man, we are far in the minority.

But the real danger right now is the weakening of our national structure from within. In the fall of China to the Communists, the evaluation of factors gave the military but 30 percent of the credit and 70 percent to the political strength. Right today we are being subjected to exactly the same process. If an enemy can weaken us from within our structure, then it needs less destructive military power, and, of course, saves its own men and resources.

You brush manufacturers have beeen directly hit very recently. No longer do you get your bristle supply through China sources. You are being forced to deal with Russia, as since the Russian domination of China the bristle industry has been absorbed. You are already paying more and your costs will continue to increase. A prime thought for your consideration is that Russia can stop the bristle supply any time it wishes.

From a movement of mere propaganda a few years ago, the well-organized plan has developed into material conditions, such as your particular business has already felt. We have not taken this situation in a serious vein. We have been and now are too complacent. We have not made it a personal responsibility. I could talk for hours on this one subject because we in the military have considered what is happening.

You people of the brush industry can rightfully be proud of your past record. In our recent conflict there was no carrier-launched airplane, no torpedo fired from a submarine, no bluejacket fired a gun but what a large factor was the result of your product, the support from the American brush industry.

We will need that same support at all times. But the thought I want to leave with you this morning is that you people of industry, yes, collectively—but much more important, as an individual—must realize your responsibility to first keep our country strong from within. Destroy or weaken our political and economic strength and we are defeated before a need for a military support which by that time would be nonexistent.

We are doing our best to keep out of a shooting war. Yes, it is costing millions of dollars to support the Marshall plan, but if we did not have some such a system we would already be in a hot war and spending many billions of dollars and losing hundreds of thousands of precious American lives.

The United Nations is still the best thing offered to further world-wide peace. It is but a babe as yet and must grow to strength by help. But it has already had a big influence on world thinking.

I urge you as individuals to lend your unqualified help to the United Nations, to the Atlantic Pact, and to our foreign aid program. It is right now keeping us out of a shooting war.

You individuals must do your part now. You must individually fight just as hard to stop this communistic onrush in the United States as you did to stem the tide of the military in battle areas. You can stop it, for you do have the power to stop it if you act. Yes, you have that power, and my thought to you is to realize that you have that power and use it now.

Address of Hon. Eamonn L. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Eamonn L. Kennedy, first secretary, Irish Legation, Washington, at the annual banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Pittston, Pa., March 17, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, very reverend fathers, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, though I speak to you with some trepidation will you please let me say at the beginning how overcome you have made me feel with the warmth of your welcome, how delighted I have been with this exquisite banquet, and how happy I also am that my first speech in this community should be spoken in reply to the hallowed toast of Ireland. We in the Legation of Ireland in Washington are very deeply conscious of the nature of this annual gathering, we are conscious of the great respect and place of honor in which the Irish community of Pennsylvania and of this city have

always been held, and we are never likely to forget all that the people of Irish descent in Pennsylvania have done for the Irish cause in dark days gone by. I feel, therefore, a very great responsibility in representing the Irish Government and the Irish people at your banquet table this evening. It is a responsibility that is all the greater because I realize that I speak tonight in your society, perhaps for the first time in its history, for that new, independent, self-reliant, and sovereign Ireland which has grown to manhood in the past 28 years. That is the Ireland I have always known. I was born into a free nation and I grew up a freeman. I speak to you, therefore, for a new generation of Irishmen. It is a generation which can no longer think of Ireland as she has been thought of so often in the literature of our long and agonizing past, as a gray-haired old lady mourning in the shadows for the loss of all her sons, and waiting in vain for help to come across the waves. We turn instead tonight to a land which has become a nation once again and which has proudly taken her place among the nations of the earth. And from that land I bring to your society and to your table our warmest and our most respectful greeting.

And as I salute you on behalf of the new Ireland on this St. Patrick's night I bring you, too, a message of hope. Because there is a message of hope in this dark night which is rolling in from the East on the civilization and culture of Europe. Even as the fires of freedom and the lamps of learning and religion are quenched one after one and as the institutions which have guided mankind for more than a thousand years are pitilessly crushed into the dust before our very eyes, yet I repeat there is hope in the midst of all this gloom. For which one of us in this banquet hall cannot think of another St. Patrick's night in the dim and distant past when it seemed once again that the gates of hell might, indeed, prevail? Our minds hurry down the arches of the years to the twilit world after the fall of the Roman Empire. It was an age like our own when the barbarian hordes were rolling in from the East, burning, destroying, despoiling, and deporting the populations which had lived under the protection of the armed Eagles of Rome. The glory of the West had fallen from the skies and in the dark night of paganism which lay heavily on the world it seemed indeed as if the first light of dawning would never again be seen.

And then suddenly in the midst of this ominous darkness a fire is kindled, it quickly flares and it leaps up into flashing tongues which are reflected in the halls of the heathen king on the Hill of Tara. It is the fire kindled by St. Patrick on that first St. Patrick's night on the Hill of Slane. In defiance of the decrees of the pagan King of Tara. Patrick lit the Paschal Fire to proclaim the passing of paganism in Ireland and to claim our land for the empire of Our Saviour. Who has not heard with pride the story of the kindling of that fire on the Hill of Slane in the County Meath on the first St. Patrick's night and how it was the daring beginning of our national apostle's glorious work?

But make no mistake about it: That flame is no mere blaze on an Irish hillside. It marks the passing of a night of spiritual thraldom not merely for Ireland but for the world. It is not merely a fire on a hill in County Meath. It is a light of hope and of liberty to the peoples of Europe already overrun, enslaved, and despoiled by the barbarian hordes who were pouring down unceasingly on the last remnants of European civilization. In the midst of the moral collapse of the fifth century in Europe, the flame enkindled by St. Patrick on the Hill of Slane is a symbol of rebirth, a promise for the future, a fire which would leap across oceans and scale mountain peaks—a fire which would ultimately travel to the ends of the earth—bearing a message of the dignity of the human individual, a message of freedom, a message of no compromise—this was a fire which would never be extinguished.

From Ireland the flame fanned out to the ends of Europe, held aloft by the successors of St. Patrick. They laid the foundations of Christian civilization in England and Scotland. They penetrated into the forests of Germany. They built monasteries in the shadows of the Alps, in Switzerland and in Austria. They recarried their noble message into classical Italy down to the tip of Calabria. Their footprints are still revered in France, in Bohemia, and in Belgium. And to this day the Lithuanian word for peddlar is scotus or Irishman, because the Irish monks visited the shores of the Baltic, peddling Christ to the pagan tribes. And so it was that St. Patrick, the man from Gaul, who had been taken to Ireland as a prisoner in his youth, the first displaced person in our history, returned to the land which had enslaved him, and handed on a flame which has fanned out to the ends of the earth.

Could he himself have known, even for an instant, how successful his beloved Irish would be in carrying his sacred fire across the face of the earth? For the torch of faith and freedom was held aloft, not only by the missionaries who penetrated into the dark recess of Europe. It was held firmly too in the hands of those, who, rather than betray any part of their inheritance of faith and liberty, chose rather to be piled into the prison ships of later and darker days, and sent across the ocean to the West Indies and Australia. And when famine and oppression came with their pitiless scourge, and sent the heaving coffin ships with their human cargo across the seven seas, the Irish emigrant carried his faith and his hatred of oppression close to his breast.

Here, surely, ladies and gentlemen, was a victim nation, carrying the cross to a world-wide Calvary. In sorrow and in confusion, unwittingly and enforcedly, they carried the message of their faith and freedom beyond the frozen forests and across the burning sands to a universal Golgotha. Displaced persons, as St. Patrick was, driven from their homeland as prisoners, deportees, and emigrants, they spread over the face of the earth on a weeping, sobbing, world-wide way of the Cross, which passed through this country linking us every St. Patrick's Day in a world-wide ceremony of commemoration.

Surely there is a message of hope here for each one of us on this St. Patrick's night? Who knows that God may not be repeating the same process which began on the hill of Slane? As Europe once again lies in ruins, as its displaced persons, starving and freezing, once again wander across the face of the earth, and as hundreds of thousands are torn up from their ancestral homes and deported into the unknown regions behind the iron curtain, into a servitude which we thought was forever abolished—may not the Via Dolorosa of the Irish be now repeated with the same results? While we lament the inhumanity of the hour, while God-fearing men and women are uprooted and deported into the center of the Asiatic hinterland, may they not become, like the Irish, the leaven in the mass. They may be nucleus of a great Christianity and a new love of freedom in a new section of the world which will yearn and dream and pray as the displaced Irish prayed on far-flung foreign shores, raising in secrecy new altars under the stars, preaching and teaching a new way of life under God and in freedom, while their oppressors confidently trust to the power of brute force which has never yet stifled the spirits of men soaring to God and yearning for liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a message of hope, not of sadness, which I bring you tonight. And it is fitting, indeed, that a representative of the new Ireland should bring you a message of hope. Because slowly and surely, in the past 28 years, we have been realizing the aspirations and the hopes of those whose efforts and sacrifices won us our independence. How far we have progressed in the stormy 28 years of our history can only be fully appreciated by those who knew the old Ireland, a land of flocks and herds which had been bled white by misgovernment, which lost 5,000,000 of her people in less than 80 years, and a land in which the Irishman would become more rare (as the London Times once said) than the Red Indian on the shores of Manhattan. Our Nation was born after one great war, it grew up in the teeth of a world-wide depression, and attained manhood status in the midst of a second world upheavel. And yet in those uneasy 28 years the hopes on which our young nation was founded have already in great part been realized. Already the ranches and large estates have been divided into small economic holdings privately owned on which as many working families as possible have been settled. Already the nation's supply of essential foodstuffs has been made certain. Where 1 blade of wheat grew before we have grown, not 2 but 10—that is the astounding truth about our wheat acreage which was 39,000 in 1921 and is now over 400,000 acres. Already we mill our own flour, grow and refine our own sugar beet, make our own clothing, textiles, boots and shoes, furniture, and cement out of the natural resources which God has placed in the soil and in the minds and limbs of the people of Ireland. Hospitalization, social services, and slum clearance have changed the face of our land. Our winter nights are brightened and our new factories are driven by the electrical power from the flowing waters of the Shannon, Liffey, and Erne. And in the air the new air services of international civil aviation in which we take an active part have made Ireland a link of union between Europe and Great Britain on the one hand and the North American Continent on the other.

It is no wonder, ladies and gentlemen, that tonight I bring you hopeful greetings from a new Christian democracy, living under a free constitution of its own making, and dedicated to a code of conduct with which we, as a race, in every vicissitude of our fortune, have been identified at home and throughout the world for more than a thousand years.

Today we are moving on toward the realization of our destiny and to the fulfillment of the hopes of the men who laid down their lives with a smile so that my generation might live as free men and women. I wish I could conclude my reply to the hallowed toast of Ireland this evening by saying that all those hopes have been realized. Yet I cannot, for there still remains one more milestone on the long pilgrimage of our people. Ireland, which is one of the oldest motherlands in the whole of Europe, still prays for territory unity. This Christmas I was home in Ireland and I can speak as one who has seen and heard. There is no aspiration of our people on which there is greater agreement among all classes and creeds than the reunification of our country. We recognize partition for what it is—a grievous wrong imposed from outside on an ancient motherland whose boundaries were made by heaven and the sea until 1920. It is a grievous wrong and a crying injustice of this twentieth century because in three and one-half of the six partitioned counties, taken as a block, there is still a majority in favor of union with the rest of Ireland. Such a position is an outrage against which our people will never cease to cry out, wherever they be, across the width of the world. Indeed, ladies and gentlemen, it comes as a shock to us to realize that the places toward which our thoughts naturally turn tonight, the place where St. Patrick was en-

slaved in Ireland as a boy, the place where he landed when he returned to preach the Christian faith, the city where he established his primatial see—even the very spot where his body has been laid to rest—that all these places are partitioned away from free Ireland by a border which has its roots in no tradition, and is related to no considerations of economies, race, or religion.

I feel that I am not merely expressing my own hopes and prayers, ladies and gentlemen, or the hopes and prayers of the young nation I have the honor to represent here tonight, but the hopes and prayers of all of us here when I hope and pray that St. Patrick will bless the efforts of the Irish people to win back for their own those places which by the very name are sacred to the memory of the Irish people—at home and abroad. Let us tell those who are maintaining the barrier of partition that they are maintaining a barrier against themselves across the width of the world. And let us remember with pride that the tricolor of Ireland is a flag of green, white, and orange. The green is for the original inhabitants of the island. The orange is for the men across the border. The white represents the unity we wish to bring about and which would make our motherland an example to the world. That desire for unity will live as long as there are Irishmen who look forward to an undivided island with its boundaries set in the foaming sea.

We feel, ladies and gentlemen, that a great principle is at stake in Ireland: the principle of whether or not a small portion of a state can break up that nation and impose its desire for disunity on the rest of people. Your great Nation fought a terrible civil war to deny that destructive principle and even today we can hear the echo of the words of the gaunt rail-splitter from Springfield when he asked in Indianapolis in February 1861: "On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up a Nation and then coerce a proportionately larger subdivision of itself, in the most arbitrary way? What mysterious right to play tyrant is conferred on a district of a country, with its people, by merely calling it a State?"

We might indeed repeat Abraham Lincoln's rugged question today at a time when every dispatch and bulletin we read from Europe makes it imperative that the breaking down of artificial barriers be hastened in this hour of danger. The unification of Europe is in the air: it is the fashionable doctrine of the councils of Paris and Strasbourg: let us pray that the reunification of the oldest motherland of that continent will not be forgotten when the time comes to smash down the tyranny of artificial barriers. There is no worthier cause today because those who help to bring an end to the wrong of partition in Ireland are assisting in the great work of world peace. They are helping to remove the only existing barrier to a true and lasting friendship between Ireland and Great Britain.

I know that we can look to the people of the United States and especially to the people of Pennsylvania of every class and creed for support as we advance toward the national unity you have already so happily achieved. For there are not now and there never have been in the whole world any bonds of friendship between nations as close as those which bind Ireland and America today. At the end of this month our missions in each other's countries will be raised to the status of embassies and our representatives in Dublin and Washington will become ambassadors. That is a token of the esteem and friendship which have always existed between our two Republics—an esteem also symbolized in the treaty of friendship signed by your President and by ours just a month ago. But, ladies and gentlemen, our relations go deeper and warmer than the niceties of diplomatic intercourse and the signing of polite protocols. Our relations are those of blood and the Irish nation can have nothing but love and affection for this great land to which she sent so many of her sons in the past and which opened wide her mighty arms to receive them. The footsteps of Irishmen can be traced through every one of the original Thirteen Colonies. They blazed a trail of civilization along your great valleys, bringing in their hearts and minds their twin gifts of faith and freedom in the days when only men and women of willing hands and stout hearts could survive. The local histories of this country tell us how the Irish built the roads, bridged the rivers, hewed down the virgin forest and founded settlements in the clearings to which they gave the sweet-sounding names of their homeland.

But, ladies and gentlemen, surely the page of history shines no brighter with Irish names in those far-off days than it does in Pennsylvania? I can find no history of any town, city, or county of Pennsylvania that does not contain a large proportion of Irish names amongst those enumerated as pioneer settlers. In and around Philadelphia they came, into the counties of Bucks, Chester, Westmoreland, and Lancaster, up and down the beautitful Kittochinny and Cumberland Valleys they flocked in there by thousands. They were a hardy and resolute people with an undaunted spirit of adventure and as early as the first half of the seventeenth century they pressed on to the farthest outposts of western Pennsylvania and the Ohio, up and down the Allegheny and the Shenandoah, tilling clearings in every valley and forest from the Delaware River to the very frontiers of civilization. It was this stock that bore 9 signatories of the Declaration of Independence, 22 Members to the First American Congress of 1774, 7 commanders of brigades and regiments in the struggle for independence and an Irishman also stands in the unique position of Father of the American Navy.

Ladies and gentlemen, it would be impossible for me, even by merely listing all the great achievements of those of Irish descent in Pennsylvania, not to offend you by leaving something unsaid. And yet I cannot but mention with pride tonight the shining name of the Pennsylvania Line which covered itself with glory in the War of Independence. No wonder Gen. Henry Lee, afterward Governor of Virginia, said that they should properly be called the Line of Ireland, no wonder too that when Washington wished to cover his retreat from the disastrous defeat at Long Island in 1776 he chose four of the regiments of the Pennsylvania Line for that purpose—all of them commanded by native-born Irishmen. Yes, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, our people fought and bled in the beautiful valleys of your great State because they carried with them in their hearts a heritage of freedom, because they, in its grandest form, caught the vision splendid, the breath of unity, the soul of nationhood, the gleam of hope's new day.

Forgive me, Mr. President, if I speak with too much pride. The United States of America has meant so much to us in the long agony of our struggle that we like to think, even for a moment, of what we have been able to give in return. Forgive every Irishman if he is proud tonight of the full harvest our fathers sowed in this great land.

For you have always been our inspiration. As our people struck and struck again for their freedom in the nineteenth century they could hear afar off the shouts of the Liberty Boys at Bunker Hill; and on cold gray mornings as shots rang out they could faintly hear the thundering hoofs as Paul Revere rode fast with the stirring news of liberty. I am here to say tonight to everyone in Pennsylvania of every class and creed: Thank you heartily and eternally for all you were to us in tragic days gone by. Thank you eternally for all the times when you lifted up our people, held them to your heart, and wiped away all tears from their eyes. We are proud to think of you as our friends, as tonight the Irish Nation moves forward toward the unification of its territory and the realization of its destiny. We draw inspiration and hope from you as Thomas D'Arcy McGee did in days gone past when he looked around him in this great North American Continent and breathed forth the lines:

"And oh, it were a gallant deed
To show before mankind
How every race and every creed
Might be by love combined
Might be combined yet not forget
The fountains whence they rose
As fed by many a rivulet
The stately Shannon flows."

Orchids to Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain Emeritus of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the following remarks to a great Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

I am very sorry that I have delayed so long in paying to you, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain Emeritus of the House of Representatives, as my colleagues already have done so timely, this my belated tribute of appreciation for your great efforts before your retirement from active duties, but the truth of the matter is that like so many of the other better things which I have endeavored to do in life, it too seemed to be fated to be delayed needlessly and almost forgotten entirely. In this instance the delay was occasioned because I misplaced the things which I had written over a period of months concerning you, and have found them just recently.

You do not know me very well I am sure, but I have been privileged to know you, not as the publican of old from afar, but from a very short distance indeed. Since January 3, 1949, I have heard you in person, deliver many beautiful, heart-satisfying prayers and I want to tell you that I truly miss, very much, your splendid spiritual efforts.

Whether you realize it or not you did much, I am sure, for all of the Members of Congress and their aides and the Gallery guests of the House of Representatives who chanced to hear you.

As stated by another more rhetorically worthy than I am concerning the religious efforts of one of your brothers in the service of the Lord:

You showed them paths of wondrous spiritual dream,
You laid across Life's dark a silver gleam.

I want to observe also that it is my belief that the following revamped lines

of another fit splendidly into your fine life's pattern:

He serveth best who knoweth best,
God's things both great and small,
For the dear Lord who loveth us,
Who made and loveth all.

I hope that you will pardon my egotism in dedicating the following poor verses of mine to you during your lifetime, written bit by bit by me, in an attempt to partially reward you for your rich spiritual efforts in behalf of Him who is everywhere and with everyone.

GOD

I

He's surging with the oceans blue,
He's creeping with the restless tide,
He's coursing with the planets far,
And flashing where the meteors ride.

II

He's fleeing with the dark storm clouds,
He's shining with the blazing sun,
He's brooding with the calm twilight,
When the heartless, weary day is done.

III

He's sweeping with the rivers wide,
He's falling with the gentle rains,
He's waving with the woodlands drear,
He's growing with the ripening grain.

IV

He's marching with the zephyrs sweet,
He's rippling in the gentle rills,
He's blooming on the great prairies,
He's toiling in the busy mills.

V

He's with us in the bread and wine,
He shared with His apostles all,
And every faithless Judas can,
If will he would heed His sweet call.

VI

It's part of His most noble plan,
To know all things both great and small,
And note the most colossal things,
And also mark the sparrow's fall.

VII

He's with us ever, watching, guiding,
Through the waters, land, and boundless space,
Charting the endless course of time,
And ministering to the human race.

VIII

And if our God is everywhere,
As we so surely think he is,
He's in all things placed in our care,
As you best know dear child of his.

IX

When one world men scream out in hate,
And with just blood crimson the sod,
We grieve in deep perplexity,
For those who can't "There is no God."

X

Out of the bad the good he'll take,
Out of the good some bad will show,
If we but knew his perfect plan,
If we could only see and know!

XI

How long, how hard the way leads on,
Through life to what we call our end,
The scourge, the crown of thorns, the cross,
Into eternal life shall blend.

XII

Some day the mists will clear for us,
Some day we'll know the eternal plan,
Some day the most debased of us,
Will have a view of God's true man.

XIII

And when that day shall come my friend,
I hope we'll see you glorified,
And praise to that great scene shall lend,
Because you served the crucified.

Republican Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make available for reading by the membership a Republican farm plan.

Before you read it I would like you to note that on March 31, 1950, the Wall Street Journal, a publication that is not noted for supporting Democrats, had this to say editorially:

The outline seems to us to shape up into a proposition that the Republicans think perhaps the Brannan plan would be all right if it were not for Brannan.

I am not endorsing the Brannan plan, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is well to point out that much of the talk by our GOP friends is supercharged with politics; that they condemn a thing under one name and advocate it under another name.

And by the way it is a good example to us Democrats as to what we should not do.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 11, 1950]

GOP GROUP OFFERS NEW FARM PLAN

ELK POINT, S. DAK., March 10.—Axel J. Beck, chairman of the Republican National Committee's subcommittee on agriculture, today recommended a long-range farm plan which he said should be self-financing, provide for full parity prices and be farmer-administered.

In a report to his subcommittee, Beck said the objectives outlined in his recommendations should be submitted to Republican Congressmen as "suggestions for the basic farm policy of the Republican Party."

He said "negative philosophies of curtailed production" should be rejected.

Beck said the Republican Party must have a long-range farm plan if it expects to win the confidence of the farm-belt voters.

He listed these 10 proposals:

1. Administration by farmer-elected local committees and State directors, and a national board appointed by the President, a majority of which shall be State directors or persons who have held such positions.

2. Full parity on all cash nonperishable crops, restricted only by marketing quotas on each farm when on August 15 of any year the total estimated national supply of a commodity exceeds 150 percent of the predicted requirements for the next year.

3. Full parity on all feed nonperishable crops, limited only by acreage restrictions when the supply on December 1 of any year exceeds 150 percent of its assigned production.

4. Unrestricted livestock production, supported at full parity at market by Government purchases. Any losses from sales or accrued surplus would be financed by a $1 fee per 100 pounds imposed on the killing sale of all livestock. The fee could be increased up to $2 per hundredweight in event of a marketing emergency, or suspended when it is not required.

5. Support of egg and dairy products at full parity price levels by a fee on the products marketed under the same general plan as provided for livestock.

6. Maintenance of prices on semiperishable crops at full parity levels under a Government quota system.

7. Provision for on-farm storage facilities for nonperishable feed crops.

8. Provision for soil conservation.

9. Encouragement of research on new uses of agricultural products.

10. Establishment of a flexible tariff at parity level for all agricultural products.

Attention Chairman Buchanan, of the Select Committee Investigating Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the propaganda campaign which is now being conducted by the real-estate lobby against members of the Banking and Currency Committee who fought for a bill which would have ended the housing shortage and placed homes within the financial reach of the many families in the middle-income group.

This bill, which the Banking and Currency Committee reported out after extensive public hearings and which was opposed only by the real-estate lobby and the mortgage bankers, would have reduced the monthly shelter cost on a home now requiring a $90 payment to $64. It would not have cost the Government one cent. Certainly it lowered the interest rate, but if the bankers can afford to make CCC price-support loans to the farmers on a 3-percent interest, only one-half of which they receive, there is no reason under the sun why they cannot afford to make 3-percent loans to families buying homes, especially when all of the 3 percent would be kept by them.

Because the real-estate lobby is interested only in the continuance of the housing shortage, and has been able to block all legislation which promised an early end of the shortage, it is necessary to extend rent control unless we are willing to face the repercussions certain to follow the throwing of thousands of families onto the streets. As far as Chicago is concerned, I can assure the House that the end of rent control on June 30 of this year would do just that. The blame is on the real-estate lobby and the price is being paid by small landlords as well as by tenants.

I have received hundreds of letters from both small landlords and tenants taking to task the real-estate lobby for what it has been doing in preventing a return to normalcy in the housing situation. These letters have been signed by the good men and women who wrote them.

I also have been receiving a number of letters which were either anonymous or were signed with typewritten names with no address. Although they are mailed from widely separated States, the phraseology is so similiar as to suggest a common source of origin. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished and very able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] the chairman of

the select commitee investigating lobbying, that when the spokesmen for the real-estate lobby are summoned before his committee that the inquiry cover the subject of anonymous threats, all in substantially the same phraseology, which from widely separated States are now being sent through the mails to members of the Banking and Currency Committee who have been fighting for the families of America against the real-estate lobby.

Every Member of this body, Republican as well as Democratic, is glad to hear from his constituents, whether they are in agreement with him or contrariwise. When constituents take the time and trouble to write their Representatives in the Congress, it means that dimocracy is functioning at both ends. I am sure none of my colleagues could approve of any inspired resort to anonymous correspondence to muddy the proper, helpful, and legitimate exchange of viewpoints between the Representatives in the Congress and the people back home in the respective districts.

The language in the following letter, which is typewritten even to the name attached, which has no address and which the post office stamp indicates was not mailed from a postal zone in my district, is stubstantially the same as that in anonymous letters I have received from at least a dozen States far removed from Illinois:

Mr. BARRATT O'HARA,
Illinois.

DEAR SIR: When are you fellows going to stop pandering to the gimmie boys and return to the tenets of justice? Let's stop buying votes with the rights of those who have the guts to struggle and succeed.

Since when has it been the function of the Government to force part of the citizenry to support the more indigent members?

As you well know, rent control is the sale of justice for political expediency. Federal housing, as you also know, provides part of the citizenry with housing, schools, parks, etc., at the expense of the remaining stalwarts of private ownership.

We are going to fight this approach to socialism with every means at our disposal. You may join us in our march back to Americanism, or become the target of our initial attack. Make your choice. No fence riding.

I remain respectfully yours,
A VOTER
(Mrs. Helen Rogers).

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to turn to the correspondence from the people of Chicago who, when they write me, sign their names in their own handwriting and give me their addresses so that I may know them. They are as forthright with me as I am with them when on every roll call in the House I make public my position. There are hundreds of such letters on my desk. They all tell the same story of the critical housing shortage in Chicago and the certain tragedy which would follow the termination of rent control in Chicago on June 30. I pick the following letter at random:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 28, 1950.*
Representative O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a mother of three children I plead with you for some form of rent control for Chicago. The agent of the building in which I have rented an apartment for the past 8 years threatens us with eviction as soon as rent controls are lifted in Chicago or else they will raise the rents to such levels that we won't be able to pay.

This is not an idle threat I know, as there have been several vacancies in the building and all have been rented to people without children.

There is rental housing in the de luxe level (apartments at $125 per month and up) and I understand that even these will accept no children.

I am not the only person in this predicament as I know several families who had to store their furniture, separate their families among friends and relatives and occupy a bedroom in a rooming house sharing toilet facilities with five or more families with monthly rentals for these facilities as high as $80 and $85 per month.

Housing in Chicago for middle and lower income groups has never been plentiful, except perhaps for a short period in the thirties' depression when everything—office, factories, stores, and apartments were vacant as people were unable to secure work. Even 8 years ago, when I rented my present apartment I looked a long time for rental space as children were not accepted even then, when some apartments were available. So you see Mr. O'HARA how much we need your help.

God bless you and please help us.
Sincerely,
ESTHER DOMBROSKI
(Mrs. H. Dombroski).

A Chairman at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to set forth an article taken from the Washington Post of April 1, 1950, entitled "A Chairman at Last." It is as follows:

A CHAIRMAN AT LAST

After more than 15 months President Truman has found a man to fill the vacant chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board. The new appointee, Air Secretary W. Stuart Symington, will be looked upon to rescue the NSRB from its long period of aimless drift—drift at a time when this coordinating agency should rave been pushing manpower mobilization and civil defense plans. Mr. Symington has been one of the most vigorous executives of the Truman administration, and if we have frequently disagreed with him, we have never doubted his determination or capacity for decision. Whatever else may be said of the Air Force, it knows where it's going.

A similar sense of mission is the prime need of the Security Resources Board. This top-level agency has the job of arbiter between potential military and civilian demands on human and physical resources. Its responsibilities include the formuluation of an up-to-date mobilization plan readily translatable into component details, and the coordination of mobilization activities in the various Federal departments. It also, since last year, has been in charge of civil defense planning. But with only a part-time director in the person of Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman, the NSRB staff has been marking time and seemingly has been more concerned with internal administration than with positive accomplishments.

The need now is to get down to practical details—to provide guidance to the Munitions Board and other agencies on mobilization responsibilities, and to see that States and cities receive concrete help in training civilian defense cadres. The job is not one for scaremongering, but for steady, unflamboyant staff work. Mr. Symington has had plenty of experience, both as an industrialist and businessman as well as in Government. If he will use his abundant energies to restore direction to the NSRB, he will help meet an important national deficiency.

Midpoint Anniversary of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Secretary of State Dean Acheson and an address by Gen. G. C. Marshall. Both addresses were given today at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., at a program observing the midpoint anniversary of ECA. I was present at this historic occasion and invite attention to these two reports on ECA.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Two years ago the American people, acting through their Congress and the President, began a heroic adventure with the people of Europe. The phrase is not mine—it belongs to that valiant worker for peace, Senator VANDENBERG. I know his heart is with General Marshall, Mr. Hoffman, his colleagues of the Senate and House, and the men and women of the Economic Cooperation Administration in this celebration of the second anniversary of the program to which they have all made vital contributions.

Looking back, why did we begin this venture? The war had left the people of Europe nearly prostrate. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, for them to rise by their own efforts, and we in America knew that a peaceful and hopeful future could not be won for us or for them until Europe once more stood proudly on its own feet.

We did not limit the scope of our offer of cooperation.

The sufferings and the destruction left by the war were not confined to any one area. All over the continent people were longing to rebuild a useful and orderly existence after the long misery and violence of the war. They wanted to restore their homes and farms and workshops. They wanted to plan for the futures of themselves and their families; they wanted to move toward a more promising day, toward a world in which peace might endure.

We in America wanted this, too. And so General Marshall proposed that all European countries should participate in a joint recovery program, to which each would contribute in the measure of its ability. In this way and with our aid, we hoped that the weak and war-wracked organism of Europe could regain strength and health.

We were rebuffed by a small group of men who stood to profit from Europe's misery and who have never viewed the United States with anything but envy and hostility. More important, the principle of international cooperation was scorned. As a result

of an arbitrary and selfish attitude on the part of some, the program was limited to that half of Europe where men were at liberty to choose the path of cooperation.

Within that half of Europe, the recovery plan has now operated for 2 years under the direction of the European countries, working with Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Harriman and the splendid team they have organized and led. This combination has been unbeatable. This has been the kind of a constructive job that arouses the enthusiasm and spirit and devotion of freemen.

Great progress has been made in western Europe. Over-all industrial production in 1949 was 15 percent above the 1938 level. Coal production was 434,000,000 metric tons in 1949, in 1948 it was 398,000,000 tons. Steel output in 1949 was 46,000,000 metric tons, one-sixth more than in 1948. The production of bread grains has risen by more than half in the period from 1947 to 1949.

And these gains will continue, for the farmers and workers have more and better tools and machines. In 1949 the average factory worker produced 25 percent more than he did in 1947.

It would be incomplete if I spoke of European recovery as though it mattered only to that one continent. Western Europe is one of the world's great workshops and one of the world's great markets. The recovery which has been made there has extended its influence to many other countries—to the countries of South America, to Africa, and to southern Asia. It is greatly to the interest of all of us to have western Europe strong and healthy.

This illustrates what has been accomplished through the Marshall plan. This is the exciting record of recovery. These statistics are alive with hope.

The progress that has been made is a triumph of man's ingenuity, of man's will, of man's confidence in the power of free institutions. It is not a triumph for any one nation, or for any one class, but a triumph of cooperation.

We are proud of our contribution. We have supplied a great deal of assistance to this cooperative effort. But our contribution has been only the "something extra" that was needed. It has added the vital margin to the efforts and resources of the people of Europe themselves.

When the European recovery program began, the Communists filled the air with dire predictions that the European countries could not cooperate in this way without its ending in their domination by the United States. The experience of the European recovery program has shown how dishonest and insubstantial this propoganda was. No country has lost anything but poverty; no country has gained domination, but all have gained in self-respect and have won a new confidence and a strengthened independence. Meanwhile, the peoples of eastern Europe and China have learned that there is indeed a part of the world where the harvest of collaboration is a bitter fruit.

Now, as we look forward, what facts do we want to call to mind?

First of all, we must remind ourselves that the real test of stamina is how we do in the long middle stretch of the race. Here is where staying power has to come in to take over the initial enthusiasm. Eighteen countries are cooperating in the most exciting thing that is happening in the world.

Second, the recovery of production—which was the first great object of the program—was difficult and arduous, but it was easier in many ways than the recovery of trade—the second great object of the program. To restore satisfactory levels of trade, the European countries have to overcome maladjustments arising from the economic effects of two great wars and difficulties stemming from political and economic conditions deeply rooted in their history.

The revival of production was mainly a national problem, which required a great national effort and some outside assistance. The recovery of trade, however, is largely an international problem, requiring a high degree of cooperative give and take and difficult, even painful, adjustments. We are aware that it is difficult for the governments of the participating countries, faced with large needs and inadequate reserves, to risk in practice what their own self-interest commends.

We also recognize that trade is a two-way street, for us as well as for them, and that we bear a large responsibility for achieving a satisfactory balancing of our trade with Europe and the world. We are vigorously addressing ourselves to this problem, which is of vital interest to our farmers and workers and businessmen. Together with the participating countries, we have to lay solid foundations during the coming period for the future. We are going to have to continue to cooperate in many ways, to draw more closely together, to coordinate our economic policies, if we are to build a system that works.

Finally, we must remind ourselves that the answer to the forces opposing recovery is the same which we—the United States and the participating countries—gave in 1947, namely, to proceed confidently, seriously, deliberately to the constructive work at hand. Peace is what men make it and the only way to win it is to plug away at it.

The European recovery program lights a path to a future to which man can look with confidence for peace and order in a system based on freedom and justice. We in America continue to regret that the bright hope of progress along this path must be confined to half of Europe. We regret that it has not yet proved possible for all the peoples of Europe, to shake off the shackles of bitterness and violence and to join hands in the creation of a better world. We regret, but we do not despair, for the fear of a few will yet succumb to the hope and the strength and the determination of the many.

ADDRESS OF GEN. G. C. MARSHALL

I am very glad to participate in this gathering today because it celebrates a momentous occasion, the half-way point of the ECA. I never consider the European recovery program without recapturing in my mind the tragic state of western Europe in the late spring of 1947. The situation appeared almost hopeless and every plan we made seemed to be thwarted in advance by a vicious circle of conditions which were the product of war.

Frankly, in those days I thought of the rehabilitation of Europe more in terms of material reconstruction—harbors, buildings, communications, and similar matters. But slowly I learned that the most serious phase of rehabilitation was related to other considerations—political, moral, spiritual.

These were less tangible, but far more difficult to deal with. Not only had the trade and business relations of hundreds of years been completely obliterated, but with them had gone the faith and confidence in many of the key institutions of modern civilization. It was the rehabilitation of these that was by far the most difficult task, and one in which we are still engaged. It is in the meeting of these problems that I feel the European recovery program is making its greatest contribution to the world.

The debates on the question of continuing the program, it seems to me, are confused by a variety of motives. An appraisement of the requirements of the day is befogged by a failure to realize that we are now engaged in a great struggle. You here may not be in the same sort of physical danger as troops on the battlefield, but you are engaged in a contest with a foe who has designs no less deadly than those we have ever faced. Make no mistake about it, the chips are down. Winning this struggle is as vital to the peace and prosperity of the world as any military campaign in history. Indeed, unless we achieve victory our great military and financial sacrifices may have been largely in vain, I fear.

The nature of this struggle should be clearly understood. It seemed to me during the time I served as Secretary of State that at each meeting of the Foreign Ministers, assaults against the enactment or progress of the recovery program were timed to confuse the understanding of the negotiations in the minds of the public. They were directed at weakening the program by forcing expenditure of funds beyond our calculations and appropriations.

The opposition has not been confined to strikes and purely political manifestations. It has followed through in every conceivable manner, even to the point where I found myself within an hour of the event publicly accused over the radio of being the major planner in the assassination of an important and popular public figure in Bogota.

But despite these determined efforts to prevent the rehabilitation of western Europe on a basis which would permit a healthy revival of democratic processes, the plan has succeeded, thanks to the financial endorsement of our Congress, the leadership of the President and the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and the splendid work of you people of ECA here and abroad, under the able direction of Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Foster, and Ambassador Harriman.

But your job is only half done. I must emphasize the tremendous importance of carrying through on the scale planned. We must avoid proposals to emasculate and reduce ECA to a mere relief affair. At the same time, it seems clear to me that we cannot continue this sort of extraordinary aid indefinitely; therefore, the termination date of June 30, 1952, should be adhered to. I feel that if this date is settled and clear it will spur the work of the European leaders and people to accomplish the extremely difficult task ahead of lifting themselves above the need for our financial assistance. There will always be in this generation of men a need for our moral and spiritual backing.

To those who assert that our targets cannot be reached within the short span of two more years, I would say that perfection of accomplishment cannot always be expected. But we have seen a close approach to that perfection in these past 2 years.

It is true that for western Europe to get its economic house in such order that it can survive and prosper in this competitive modern world requires a tremendous final effort over the next 2 years. The erasing of old trade barriers and the construction of new channels, such as a clearing union for Europe's varied moneys, may require a miracle of cooperation.

But, looking again at the conditions prevalent in the spring of 1947, and again considering the situation at this moment, I can only feel that one near miracle has been accomplished. We must work for, and expect, another miracle.

Let me sum it up: We are engaged in a perilous struggle with an implacable foe; we must carry this battle to the finish; we must avoid the temptation to imperil the whole investment—and it is just that, an investment in saving all those previous articles of faith and ways of life we call democracy. It is an investment in preserving the freedoms of men in a clean and decent world.

Closing Valley Forge General Hospital a Blow at Our Disabled Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of acute distress to me to note that the administration, in defense of the closing of several military hospitals throughout the country, of which Valley Forge General Hospital, in my district, is one, gives forth with the pious statement, that, and I quote, "If we really want to make the income of the Government meet its expenditures, the only way it can be done is to cut off some expenditures." Those of us who are urging Federal economy could subscribe to that rather obvious rule were it not for the fact that almost simultaneously with that profound declaration we find the same administration laying down to the Congress a must on the adoption of a point 4 program which, during the next fiscal year will scatter abroad far more millions than will be saved by this curtailment of services to those who have fought their Nation's battles.

In a recent statement made in my presence the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs branded Valley Forge General Hospital as a firetrap, whereas that ill-considered observation was being made at the very time our Government had placed a number of its patients in ill-managed private sanitariums such as Belle Vista, outside of Philadelphia, where a disastrous fire last week caused the death of 10 patients, 2 of whom were veterans. Certainly a policy which condemns a fine hospital like Valley Forge and at the same time utilizes the questionable facilities of a firetrap like Belle Vista needs a drastic overhauling.

Appended hereto is the copy of a letter I have just dispatched to the VA Administrator urging him to reconsider his opposition in the light of this tragic loss of life:

Gen. CARL R. GRAY,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: The newspaper account of the recent tragic fire at the Belle Vista Sanitarium on the outskirts of Philadelphia raises the question as to why some 30 veterans should have been housed in such a firetrap when it is reported that Valley Forge General Hospital has a 300-bed neuropsychiatric section, the occupancy of which could have been arranged for these mentally disturbed wards of the Government under the contractual arrangements the Veterans' Administration already has with the Department of Defense.

In the light of a policy under which you entrust the care of our disabled to an uncertain fate in a private institution such as Belle Vista, I feel that your claim that Valley Forge is a firetrap falls completely flat. A casual inspection of this institution will reveal that the buildings are of concrete-block construction with brick facing, that a highly effective sprinkler system is in place, and that the detached arrangement of the various wards of itself is protection against fire.

May I respectfully suggest that your responsibility to our disabled dictates that you should recede from your present opposition to the taking over of Valley Forge so that veteran patients who are now housed in ill-managed firetraps can be moved without delay to comparative safety of this splendid Government hospital. I would also point out that lack of funds is hardly a valid excuse for inaction in this matter unless a deficiency request has been refused by Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. DAGUE,
Member of Congress.

Tough Job Assigned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the article taken from the Evening Star of Friday, March 31, 1950, entitled "Tough Job Assigned." This reads, as follows:

TOUGH JOB ASSIGNED—TRUMAN GIVES SYMINGTON HEAVY TASK OF SELLING INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

(By Doris Fleeson)

President Truman has assigned his most difficult selling job to the best salesman in Washington.

The phenomenally successful Secretary of Air, W. Stuart Symington, takes over the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board almost coincidentally with a declaration by General Eisenhower that the board's main task—industrial mobilization—is one of the most neglected and most important parts of national defense. The problem, he declared, requires earnest attention and won't cost a nickel.

Nevertheless, it will be a real test of Mr. Symington's mettle. The politician at the head of the Government and the 531 politicians on Capitol Hill are equally timid about real mobilization plans which must necessarily clamp an iron hand upon America in the event of war. Men like B. M. Baruch and General Eisenhower who have made the round trip to two wars may plead and propose, but the politicians will dispose.

CONGRESS MUST BE SOLD

NSRB is a Presidential agency. It must first sell the President, then in conjunction with him, the Congress. This is an election year; in two more years the Presidential campaign will be upon us.

Mr. Symington has shown courage and flair in the battle of Washington. The President first handed him the ticklish and perilous Surplus Property Administration from which he escaped intact. The intrepid maneuvering by which he has outflanked the older services—in one instance, the Secretary of Defense also—and firmly established the infant Air Force, is more recent history.

In his new job, he will still have the advantages of the President's confidence and his own talents. But his product will no longer be popular. Congress dotes on air power; it is the trend of the times and it spares them having to enact universal military training and a heavy draft of manpower. But congressional allergy even to stand-by powers to freeze wages, rents, prices, profits, jobs, and so forth, is natural and formidable.

DELAY UNDER ATTACK

The President has been under heavy attack for the year's delay in filling the NSRB chairmanship. The Symington appointment will be warmly greeted—and much expected from it.

It is understood that Mr. Symington had another preference. He wanted to succeed David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. AEC does not have the fun and kudos of the Air Force job; it more than makes that up with its aura of secrecy and power.

But AEC rates as a man-killer among Government posts which perhaps helps to account for the high turn-over among the Commissioners. Mr. Symington has wholly recovered from the delicate operation performed to cure high blood pressure, but his friends, including the President, are solicitous about his health.

The President also had the problem of finding a man acceptable to Congress among his intimate circle. The resources job is potentially so important Congress will not swallow the ordinary White House crony, as witness the Mon Wallgren turndown. But the NSRB chairman must work intimately with the President, who dislikes strangers.

Whether the President intends that NSRB shall fulfill its allotted functions from here on in only he knows. He now has a chairman who can carry on, if permitted.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article published in the Washington Post of April 3, 1950, by the Marine News, of New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—WHAT MR. HOOVER BELIEVES

In 1925, when Secretary of Commerce, former President Herbert Hoover said, in part, in an address that "the topography of our country, the present and future necessities of our population, the development we have already accomplished, and, above all, the goodness of providence in our natural water channels, clearly define for us two major inland waterway systems, the Mississippi system and the Great Lakes system. I visualize the Mississippi system as 9,000 miles of connected waterways—a transportation system of which some 3,100 miles are trunk lines and 6,000 miles of laterals. That is, a main north-south trunk line 1,500 miles in length, reaching from New Orleans to Chicago, and there connecting with the Great Lakes system, and, crossing this, a great east-west trunk line 1,600 miles in length, from above Pittsburgh through Cairo to Kansas City. Over a large part of these main stems we can maintain 9 feet of depth. In addition, we must diligently improve feeders through the Tennessee, Cumberland, Arkansas, upper Missouri, upper Mississippi, Monongahela, Allegheny, and other streams to workable depth for modern craft. It will serve the vast heart of American agriculture and will place great commercial and industrial cities with upward of 7,000,000 people

in the cheapest of communications with each other and cheapen transportation of agricultural and bulk commodities over a great hinterland of States. Diesel engines, improved steam appliances, and better loading and discharging devices have all advanced us a long distance from the old canal boats and the packet boat. But the fundamental for use of these appliances is that we shall have sufficient and reliable depths of water to make them possible for use. Modern forms of development have made water carriage the cheapest of all transportation for many types of goods. With greater depths and with the improvements in craft, it is possible to restore our waterways. Nor will this jeopardize the prosperity of our railways, as some predict." What Mr. Hoover believes to be good for the general welfare is a far cry from the clamor of those interests opposed to waterway competition.

MARINE NEWS,
New York, N. Y.
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

Communism

REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the current uproar over alleged Communist infiltration of the State Department is causing great concern among the American people. Whatever the truth or falsity of current charges it is obvious that the Republican Party is seeking to make a campaign issue of communism.

Such partisan attempts, however, are not justified in view of the Republican record in the case of Alger Hiss. Alger Hiss, the former State Department official, was convicted—mind you, not by the Republicans—but by the Truman administration. And let us not forget that. Let all of us remember that it was the capable, brilliant Bronx Democrat, Assistant United States Attorney Thomas F. Murphy, who prosecuted Alger Hiss and who succeeded in convincing a jury of 12 New Yorkers that Hiss had betrayed his high trust.

There was no coddling of communism in this case by the Democratic administration. But what is the Republican record in the case of Alger Hiss?

For my information I am drawing heavily from the pages of a brilliant new book, just published, on the Hiss-Chambers affair. The book is called Seeds of Treason, and its authors are Victor Lasky, a star reporter of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and Ralph de Toledano, an assistant editor of Newsweek magazine.

And may I just add parenthetically that aside from the importance of Seeds of Treason as a first-hand study of Communist espionage in operation, Seeds of Treason reads like a detective story. I sat up with it until 3 in the morning. I just could not put it down.

But what interested me, as a Democrat and loyal American, were the references in Seeds of Treason to the Republican role in backing Alger Hiss.

The book discloses that James Byrnes, a Democrat, had, as Secretary of State, "been growing increasingly suspicious of Alger Hiss." But the book adds that John Foster Dulles, who would have become the Republican Secretary of State, had Gov. Thomas E. Dewey been elected, ignored warnings concerning Alger Hiss' connections with communism.

Mr. Lasky and Mr. Toledano claim that despite these warnings Mr. Dulles placed Alger Hiss in the $20,000 a year post of president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

But before Hiss assumed his new office—

And I am quoting from Seeds of Treason—

Dulles received what should have been a disturbing letter from Larry S. Davidow, a Detroit lawyer who had served with the Republican policy maker at ecclesiastical conferences.

Mr. Davidow wrote Mr. Dulles, according to Seeds of Treason:

The information we have would indicate that Mr. Hiss has a provable Communist record. If you are interested in becoming more familiar with this situation reliable individuals in Washington will disclose it to you in full confidence.

And what did Mr. Dulles say in response? According to Seeds of Treason, Mr. Dulles replied on December 26, 1946:

I have heard of the reports which you refer to, but I am confident that there is no reason to doubt Mr. Hiss' complete loyalty to our American institutions. * * * I feel a little skeptical about information which seems inconsistent with all that I personally know.

And as the authors of Seeds of Treason point out Mr. Dulles "dismissed the evidence against Hiss even before he had learned what it was."

And, to repeat, Mr. Dulles would have been the Republican Secretary of State had Gov. Thomas E. Dewey won the Presidency in 1948.

Now what did Governor Dewey do when he heard of the charges against Alger Hiss during the 1944 campaign. The information was provided Governor Dewey by Isaac Don Levine, the anti-Communist journalist. According to Seeds of Treason, Governor Dewey "promised to raise the question in a speech—and then he attacked Adolf A. Berle as a fellow traveler."

Gentlemen, I need not go into the anti-Communist record of Mr. Berle, head of the New York State Liberal Party, and I think you will all agree that calling Mr. Berle a fellow traveler is somewhat ludicrous.

After all, according to Seeds of Treason, when Whittaker Chambers broke with the Communists he took his story to Mr. Berle, who immediately tightened up security in the State Department.

Another Republican leader, who was informed of the grave charges against Alger Hiss, was Senator Warren Austin. And I quote from Seeds of Treason:

Early in 1940, Don Levine went to a friend, Senator Warren Austin—later chief United States representative at the United Nations—with a "fairly comprehensive account" of the Soviet underworld in Washington. For some reason Austin did not feel it was up to him to carry the explosive information to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my statement that partisan attempts by the Republicans to make capital out of alleged Communist infiltration of the State Department are unjustified in the light of the Republican record in the serious case of Alger Hiss—a case in which the Democratic administration acted firmly and courageously.

Representation of China in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking actions since the founding of the United Nations is that taken by its Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, in trying to maneuver the unseating of one of its founders, the Government of China, and putting in its place the puppet Communist regime set up in Peking and openly proclaiming its subservience to the Soviet Union. As was predicted by those who were willing to study thoroughly the Chinese Communists and their doctrines instead of reading the propaganda of the Fairbanks, Lattimores, Edgar Snows, and the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, the Communists are in the process of making China a colony of the Kremlin. If the UN were to follow Lie's suggestions it would do more to wreck what ought to be the world's best hope for peace than any abstentions or other blackmail by the Kremlin could possibly do. How does it come that the chief official sworn to uphold the United Nations Charter should be engaged in efforts that would destroy confidence in it as an instrument of justice by making it a tool of the Soviet Union?

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter sent to Mr. Lie by Mr. Matthew Woll, president of the Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor, and a veteran fighter against Communist subversion. It is encouraging to observe that hard-headed labor leaders who have had first-hand experience with Communist tactics are not taken in by slogans or fatuous arguments and cut incisively to the heart of the matter as in this letter. Every American ought to read it.

FREE TRADE UNION COMMITTEE,
LABOR LEAGUE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS,
New York, N. Y., March 24, 1950.
His Excellency TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General,
The United Nations,
Lake Success, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The free trade union committee of the American Federation of Labor has given careful consideration to your memorandum of March 8, 1950, entitled "Legal Aspects of Problems of Representation in the United Nations."

You seek to reexamine the status of the legitimate government of China in the UN. It is our firm conviction that fundamental principles rather than formal procedure are

involved in the issue you have raised. We fully recognize the urgent desirability of overcoming or ending the continued boycott of UN sessions by Russia and its satellites. We can only applaud your desire to have the UN function most effectively as an instrument of and a force for just and harmonious international relations. It is precisely for these reasons that we reject any proposal which would admit, through the front entrance or through some back door, into the UN the Communist clique of usurpers who, with the aid of foreign funds and forces, have seized power in China.

We grant that the present boycott by the Russian bloc, like the Soviet's preceding unwarranted walk-outs and unscrupulous exercise of the veto power, hurts the efficacy of the UN. But we must warn against rushing into the adoption of some sort of "solution" of this difficulty which might inflict even graver damage on the UN and hurt it irreparably as an agency of international equity and peace. We solemnly warn against a cure which would be far more poisonous and infinitely more harmful to the body-politic of the UN than its present ailment. It is all good and well to seek the return of the Russian bloc, but let no one seek to purchase it at a price which would appease and foster aggression, facilitate and reward fifth column activities by one member nation against another, and thus seriously jeopardize world peace.

In your memorandum you stress that diplomatic recognition is not a prerequisite to admitting new members into the United Nations. Therefore, you would have the United States, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, and other countries stop considering their nonrecognition of the Mao Tse-tung dictatorship as an obstacle to admitting it into the UN. Thereby, all obstacles would be removed and the path would be finally cleared for slipping into the UN the Communist regime imposed on the Chinese people after years of Russian intrigue and intervention in flagrant violation of all international law and the UN Charter itself.

We cannot go along with your reasoning. We must strongly warn against the perilous consequences of any policy based on such reasoning. The analogy of Burma and Yemen whose admission as new members into the UN was voted for by countries which had not accorded them recognition does not at all hold for the present Chinese issue raised by Russia. In the case of China, we are not faced with the problem of seating a new member. Here blackmail and all sorts of pressure are being brought to bear by a distinct and obdurate minority to force the majority to unseat an old, a charter, member of the UN. The Chinese Nationalist Government, with which Russia itself had solemnly entered into a treaty of friendship, has from the very inception of the UN also served as a permanent member of the Security Council. Obviously, this is not a Burma-Yemen case.

Moreover, there is now pending before the Interim Assembly a complaint of the Chinese National Government, which was until recently recognized by all member nations of the UN as the sole legitimate authority in China. This complaint charges the Soviet Government with 455 specific acts of aggression. To eliminate the complainant on one excuse or another would be a brutally unjust and strictly totalitarian method of dealing with complaints. Such arbitrary procedure would be nothing else but rank prejudgment of the complaint.

If upon the bludgeoning demand of a stronger power, a complaining weaker state which put its trust in the UN for assuring it justice should be rewarded with expulsion, then the UN would cease to function and its Charter would be torn to shreds and placed on the scrap heap of history. We emphasize: The UN was conceived and dedicated not to the pampering and appeasing of the strong aggressors but to the protection of the weaker states against aggression.

On the very basis of your proposal to accept as a criterion for admission into the UN the provisions of article 4 of the Covenant, the Mao Tse-tung puppet regime is thoroughly disqualified for and unworthy of membership in the UN. It is still too early to conclude that Communist control of the mainland is solid and final. Over a million Chinese Nationalist guerrillas and well over 600,000 fighting Nationalist troops in Formosa, Hainan, and the coastal islands are yet to be reckoned with by the Peiping puppets. Besides, there is scarcely any economic or political stabilization and consolidation of the usurper regime. Economic collapse and famine are the order of the day in many parts of overrun China. Furthermore, Mao Tse-tung and company certainly have not demonstrated any desire or capacity, any willingness or ability, to carry out the obligations of membership in the United Nations.

In the brief but precarious and pernicious period of its existence, the Peiping regime has already outraged every elementary concept of human decency. It has displayed callous contempt for international obligations and human rights. We need but cite its brazen and brutal refusal to permit the departure of American citizens from Chinese territories which it has overrun. It has murdered in cold blood many of the ablest leaders of free trade unionism in China. Among these martyred heroes of free labor was Liu Sung-shan who was three times the Chinese workers' delegate to the ILO, a most vital agency of the UN.

We are amazed and distressed that anyone with authority and responsibility in the UN should strive for some formula or so-called compromise which would expel from the UN the legitimate Chinese State which has faithfully and consistently fulfilled all its obligations and replace it with a terroristic band of usurpers. We are utterly at a loss to understand why anyone should propose a policy which would penalize the legally constituted State authority of China and reward the usurpers of Chinese legal authority. We cannot believe that usurpation of authority is proof of responsibility and qualification for membership in the UN and its Security Council.

For the UN, directly or covertly, to recognize and reward usurpers as they arise would be fatal to the cause of peace and human progress. Such a course would make the UN itself unstable and uncertain and would make its decisions subject entirely to the fluctuations and machinations of sinister power politics and foreign intervention in the life of weaker nations. Such a policy would prevent the UN from playing the role of harmonizer and stabilizer. It would in effect turn the UN into a source of virulent instability and uncertainty. Such a course could only encourage domestic chaos and widespread fifth column operations. Such a course would remove every assurance of protection which the smaller nations have today in the UN. It would seriously hinder world recovery and gravely endanger the prospects for peace.

We deeply deplore the stubborn and studied boycott of the UN by the Russian bloc. We share with you the desire to end the deadlock. That is why we urge you to direct your appeal for ending this studied abstention to those who are responsible for the damaging deadlock. That is why we sincerely hope that in the interest of the unquestioned and unquestionable impartiality which your high office must have, you withdraw your memorandum of March 8, 1950. Such a withdrawal by you would be fully in line with article 100 of the Charter which provides that: "They [Secretary General and the staff] shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their positions as international officers responsible only to the Organization."

We are sure you share with us our firm faith in the UN and reject unreservedly any notion that this great body cannot function and is futile without active participation by Russia and its satellites. In fact, the UN has been able to do highly valuable work in many fields—without Russian participation. Though boycotted by Moscow, the UN specialized agencies have had a most creditable record. In recent months, the councils and commission of the UN have achieved real results despite Soviet abstentions. In handling the Kashmir case, the Security Council has certainly not been hampered by Russian absence. The Trusteeship Council in its preparation of the Somaliland agreement has not been stymied or strangled by Soviet abstention. Similarly, in its treatment of the problems of rendering financial and technical aid to underdeveloped regions, the ECOSOC has shown that it can get along without the Kremlin's contribution.

In sum, there is no cause for panic. There is not the slightest excuse for haste. While deplorable, the Russian abstention is not fatal. What would be fatal for the UN is for it to yield to bullying and threats by any big power. Indeed, the parallel and precedent of the present difficulty in the UN are not at all with the admission of Burma and Yemen. The present situation in the UN does, however, present a striking and appalling parallel with the crisis faced by the League of Nations in 1935-36 over the Italo-Ethiopian dispute. Then, in order to appease and please Mussolini, whose marauders overran Ethiopia, the League of Nations deprived the government of the momentarily, militarily defeated Emperor Haile Selassie of its credentials and its rights to have a delegation to the 1936 Assembly. That decision marked the death-knell of the League of Nations.

Let not the UN today—in order to appease and satisfy another totalitarian dictator, Stalin, who engineered his Communists' overrunning the Chinese mainland—unseat and expel from the UN the momentarily, militarily, defeated Chinese National Government and replace it with the criminal and foreign-financed Communist usurpers. For the UN to follow the disastrous precedent of the League of Nations would be tantamount to signing its own death warrant. And this time a death blow to the principal international agency and hope of world peace will be more disastrous than was the degrading demise of the League of Nations.

The hour is too grave for appeasement of aggression and injustice. The time is most propitious for a firm stand by the forces of freedom and peace—in the interest of freedom, peace and decency in international relations.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW WOLL,
President, Free Trade Union Committee of AFL.

False Pretenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the columns of the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of March 26, 1950:

FALSE PRETENSES

When Mr. Truman does his stumping this election year, the taxpayer will foot the bill.

The fact that it is an old story doesn't make disguise of political as public business any more palatable. It is a cynical procedure, this charging up of electioneering to the taxpayer. If the American people's sense of their own self-interest were really acute, to say nothing of their sense of what's right and proper on the part of their elected representatives, they would stop it.

Some weeks back, Mr. Truman mentioned to reporters that public business would probably call him on long trips before election day. He grinned when he said it, and the reporters knew what he meant. Public business would be just the pretext for political swings around the circle. Now at Key West he has enlarged upon his plans. In early May he will go out to the Pacific coast to dedicate the Grand Coulee Dam. Other Government projects may be visited. But there is no question about all the political speaking he will do along the route, from addressing a giant Democratic rally at Chicago on May 15, to haranguing any group gathered along the railroad right-of-way.

There ought to be a method of sizing up Presidential excursions like this, determining whether public or political business was the chief activity and letting the Democratic National Committee pick up just a few of the tabs for these cross-continental jaunts. It is a cinch that on the trip Mr. Truman is planning for May and the one he has in mind for next fall, his identity as President will be altogether swallowed up by his role as party leader out trying to make a lot of Democratic votes.

Atlantic Alliance Is an Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Christian Century for March 22, 1950:

FRANCE AN UNRELIABLE MILITARY ALLY

Ever since the Atlantic military alliance was launched General de Gaulle has been insisting that, from the standpoint of French security, it is worthless. Now the French National Assembly has done its best to prove correct this estimate of the pact's value, though from the American rather than the French point of view. The first shipments of American arms to France were to leave the United States early this month. Fifty planes were in fact taken aboard a French aircraft carrier at Norfolk. French Communists threatened to tie up ports in which these American arms might be unloaded in France, and other ports from which munitions might be shipped to the Indochina front. Premier Bidault countered by introducing a bill in the National Assembly which would impose life sentences on any persons convicted of such sabotage of military measures. The result was an uproar in Parliament which reduced proceedings to anarchy for almost a week, forced the police to charge in again and again to eject obstreperous Communist deputies, and finally brought from the Assembly's veteran President, Edouard Herriot, the plaintive admission, "I don't know whether this isn't the end of parliament in France." After 5 days of this Premier Bidault finally got his bill through the lower house, but its passage was immediately followed by an outbreak of strikes in utilities which covered most of the nation. The Government broke these only by reverting to the desperation measure of drafting the strikers into the army. In the light of this record, we again register our astonishment that the generals in the Pentagon or any other Americans, should see any value in the Atlantic Pact. Any nation inwardly at war as France has thus shown herself to be is worthless as a military ally. Considering the case purely from a military standpoint, these events in France show that the Atlantic alliance is an illusion. America's arming of a France thus inwardly riven has as little value in making western Europe secure as had our arming of Chiang Kai-shek in keeping China out of Communist hands.

Communism Versus Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I chanced to receive a small calendar card from a well-known religious society, upon which there appeared the following prayer to St. Francis:

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace—
Where there's hatred, let me sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where ignorance, light, or sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may strive
Rather to console than to be consoled;
To understand than to be understood—
To love than to be loved, for:
It is in giving that we receive—
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and
It is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

On the reverse side of the card there appeared this very proper reading matter under the title "Communism Versus Christianity":

Communism teaches hate, revenge, atheism, and materialism.

Socialism teaches cooperation and materialism.

Capitalism teaches selfishness, greed, and materialism.

Democracy teaches cooperation, equality, and responsibility.

Internationalism teaches cooperation, responsibility, friendship, and the four freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want.

Christianity teaches love—the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Divine rights are higher than human.

Human rights are above property rights.

Christianity has not failed—it has not been tried.

Communism is a result of failure—the failure of human beings, singly and together, to live the ideals of Christianity.

Communist danger is from within. It is a result of decay—economic, political, social, and religious decay.

Russians are not enemies—Communists are.

Communism is not Russian. It is worldwide. It has enslaved many countries, the largest, so far, being Russia.

When true Christianity is in the market place, the factory, the halls of legislation, the court, the home, the schools, the churches, and in the everyday living of men—then there will be no war, want, fear, or communism.

In time we must all, regardless of race, color, or creed, face up to the fact that, not something, but everything must be done in our Nation, particularly, and generally throughout the world, to combat this terrible menace of spawning and mushrooming communism.

I always wondered why the great Swedish-American humorist, Edgar Bergen, called his dummy by the surname of McCarthy, and I am told that his McCarthy originated in virgin tree form from the forests of Wisconsin, but of course California will immediately deny that I suppose. It is too bad indeed, that the good old name of McCarthy should become famous throughout this land and over the world as a dummy whose life is destined to be spent upon the knee of another to carry out the linguistic purposes of the fellow upon whose knee he is perched.

At this point I am urged to say to myself, let thy right hand with which thou art scribbling these lines, forget its cunning and proceed to introduce the excellent statement given by the Honorable James Green, chairman of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on March 23, 1950, in support of H. R. 7595 and H. R. 3903, which bills strike a patriotic blow against Communists and communism:

I am here as the designated representative of the National Commander of the American Legion. Commander Craig is grateful for your invitation to appear and present the attitude of the American Legion. He regrets that the pressure of his official duties prevents him from appearing in person. I appreciate this opportunity to appear in his stead as a representative of the American Legion.

For the record, I am, and since October 1946 have been, Chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion. I live in Omaha, Nebr., and am an attorney in general practice in that city.

At this late date an extended discussion of the constant position of the American Legion in opposition to communism and other traitorous activities and in support of legislation to curb and control them is not required. Thirty-one years of American Legion history is the most eloquent testimony of that fact. I ask this committee to take notice of that history, which is well known to you. For all of these 31 years this largest of all veterans' organizations has warned against the insidious danger of the amoral Communist conspiracy and has pressed energetically for effective legislative controls to curb and to outlaw it and to rip from it the harlequin mask of pretended political activity.

With its millions of members in every city, town, and county in the several States, representing as they do every walk of life, every creed, and every strata of society, the American Legion truly is one of the most representative organizations in the United States. No national organization reflects the thinking of the unspoken multitude of our population more accurately than does the American Legion.

Time and again at State and National conventions of the American Legion resolutions have been adopted demanding adequate legislation to prevent abuse of citizenship by those who have voluntarily given their

promise of loyalty to an alien power and thereby have become a menace to our national security. Of late years resolutions have been adopted specifically supporting measures of the type you are considering in principle.

Representatives of the American Legion have appeared before this committee and before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate to state the position of our organization. Specifically, I call your attention to the appearance before this committee of James F. O'Neil, later national commander, of John Thomas Taylor, and myself on the first day of this extended series of hearings in February of 1947. Later, as national commander of the American Legion, in 1948 James F. O'Neil testified again. In May of that same year Paul Griffith, past national commander of the American Legion and presently Assistant to the Secretary of National Defense, testified before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate in support of H. R. 5852, a forerunner of the present H. R. 7595. On yet another occasion Robert J. Webb, former chairman of the national Americanism commission of the American Legion, testified in support of similar legislation. Again, on May 4, 1949, I appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate in support of S. 1194 and S. 1196, the so-called Mundt and Ferguson bills.

All of that testimony, covering a period of three years, supports in principle the present legislation. If considered necessary or desirable, I request permission to have all of that testimony inserted in the record at this point. If in your judgment it is merely cumulative of other supporting testimony already contained in the record, then, of course, it need not be included.

In that testimony the other witnesses and myself carefully pointed out and argued that the Communist Party was and is the slavishly obedient, willing instrument of a foreign power; that its members and supporters were coldly scheming betrayers, bent upon a mission of liberty destruction, lured by a dream of personal power. We stated further that the Communist Party and its members are part and parcel of a foreign intelligence corps operating in the United States, always willing to obey and carry out the orders of their foreign master. We also called attention to the fact, as did others, that lying, treachery, stealing, any methods were all right according to the philosophy of communism, if they served to advance the Communist cause, and that Communists in government or in any position of trust in our national life were a dangerously weak link in our security. It seemed to us then, and it seems to us now, that it is foolhardy to pour billions of dollars of our national wealth into an effort to contain communism abroad, while blithely blinding ourselves to the danger at home. Why argue for legislation to build up a courageous corps of secret sentinels abroad, only to have Judith Coplon or others like her steal the records of their hidden identity and purpose and turn them over to Soviet Russia and her satellites. Not knowing of any such case, I cannot say that it is so, but wouldn't it weigh heavily on our national conscience to learn that a man serving abroad for his country was convicted abroad, not by evidence obtained abroad, but by evidence forwarded from the United States by American traitors?

Representatives of the American Legion have testified often and at length on this subject during the last 3 years. During all of that time our own research staff has been diligently watchful and quietly and efficiently assembling data. The danger is no less than it was 3 years ago. As our world has become smaller and the Communist-dominated world larger, it is more intense.

This committee and its opposite number in the Senate are deserving of compliment for the careful manner in which they have proceeded. Volumes of evidence have been accumulated. The weight and sufficiency of this evidence have been increased by specific, eminently fair prosecutions in courts of law against persons guilty of hateful acts of betrayal—which the American Legion and others warned might be expected because the only conscience of those who serve communism is in communism, and communism recognizes no conscience, for it recognizes no God.

Legislative findings based upon sufficient study and investigation will not be lightly overturned by courts. You have been careful. You have the facts. Now is the time for action. Americans have been seriously troubled by the full implications of a Soviet fifth column operating in our midst. They have been alarmed by the stark realization of betrayal at the hands of some native-born Americans. They want action and they want it now. To my mind, it is unfortunate that politics have entered this field of inquiry and action. The danger is to national security and, eventually, to national sovereignty. All who have taken an oath to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States" should join hands in rooting Red traitors from their hidden holes in our national life.

Act now. Please don't wait for court decisions which may not be handed down for many months. Time is precious. While we debate, our enemies act. At first blush, the request that Congress wait upon a decision yet to be handed down by one of our circuit courts of appeals, and not yet even on its course up to the Supreme Court of the United States, seems reasonable. But that request and that line of reasoning do not take into account the fact that few bills have been drafted with such scrupulous care for their constitutionality as have these, and that is particularly true of H. R. 7595, the Nixon bill. Outstanding attorneys in the field of constitutional law and the standing committee on the Bill of Rights of American Bar Association, in ably reasoned opinions, have expressed belief in the constitutionality of Senate bill 2311, a counterpart of H. R. 7595, and based as it is upon the earlier H. R. 5852. These abundantly qualified attorneys have supported their opinions with an exhaustive study of pertinent decisions.

We are never able to act with certainty. All this committee, or the Congress, or any of us as individuals can do is act with care, governed by our consciences and immutable principles of fundamental justice. Certainly no one can complain with even an infinitesimal degree of right that you have acted in haste or in passion. Haste, when 3 years have been consumed in the study and preparation, is the haste with which a mountain is worn away by the flutter of the tip of a bird's wing. It is haste of the type a small boy experiences in November while waiting for Santa Claus to appear on the 25th of December. Passion which would cause you to act in a fit of anger after three long years have elapsed would certainly be an abiding one. We have had too many of these specious and dilatory arguments. Now the people of America pray that you will act. So does the American Legion.

Legislative measures of this type are intended to expose. They are based upon a sound principle and solidly founded in substantial law. The Federal Government and the Congress have a duty, laid down by our Constitution, to protect the republican form of government to the States and to the ultimate sovereign, the people. This duty cannot be fulfilled if we are not protected against the intrigues of a foreign power carried into operation by its extended arm, the Communist Party.

The character of every act must be judged upon the circumstances under which it is done. Certainly, under existing world conditions and pressures, the acts of Communists and their party are legally criminal and morally wrong. They should be prevented from conspiring together to overthrow our Government. They should be prohibited from employment in our Government; they certainly have no right to it. They should be prevented from stealing and betraying our classified information, and punished if they succeed. They should be denied passports. It would not be wise to give free transport to them so they can exchange information. They should not be permitted to make a mockery of our mails and instrumentalities by using them as transmission belts for their propaganda. They should not be permitted to deduct from taxes funds donated to assist the process of breaking down and destroying liberty. The task to be done by this legislation too long has gone undone. That can be remedied by your thoughtful and patriotic action.

Break in Bipartisan Foreign Policy Held Fault of Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the March 30 issue of the Washington Evening Star relative to the break in the bipartisan foreign policy.

The article follows:

BREAK IN BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY HELD FAULT OF DEMOCRATS—FIGHT AGAINST DULLES IN SENATE RACE CITED AS TYPICAL REWARD

(By David Lawrence)

A lot of holier-than-thou speeches are being made about how the Republicans are upsetting the bipartisan foreign policy, when the truth of the matter is that the Democrats are primarily responsible for destroying the fine spirit of cooperation which once prevailed.

It's all very well for former Secretary Stimson and others with short memories to denounce the Republicans for their attacks on foreign policy, but the principal damage was done last autumn when John Foster Dulles—who, with the exception of Senator VANDENBERG, was the strongest influence in the Senate for bipartisan cooperation—was pilloried by the Democratic Party's wrecking crew in the New York State campaign.

With Senator VANDENBERG in ill health, it was logical that Mr. Dulles would carry the ball for a bipartisan foreign policy at this session. But the heavy guns of the Democratic administration were trained on him just the same. This antagonized the Republicans in Congress, many of whom harbor to this day a bitter resentment against the tactics of the administration.

Mr. Dulles has magnanimously chosen to ignore the episode and strive again for cooperation. Some of the Republicans in the Senate, however, say that it is all very well for a Republican to cooperate and help the Democrats muddle through a difficult situation, but his reward usually is a series of partisan reprisals the moment he runs for office.

CREDIT MINIMIZED

With all due respect to former Governor LEHMAN, it was far more important for the country to have Mr. Dulles returned to the

Senate. The term was only a year, and it would have been a great example of nonpartisanship if the Truman administration had come out in support of the Republican candidate. That would have made sense, because it would have been an example of real patriotism on the part of the administration.

Today the Republicans are aware that whatever credit is due them for their cooperation will be minimized, no matter how much they help, and also that they will have no opportunity to formulate policy, anyhow. For the Republicans were not consulted in the making of far-eastern policy.

The usual cry by the exponents of hush-hush and suppression is that the potential enemy abroad will derive aid and comfort from criticism in foreign-policy matters. This is an exaggeration. People in the foreign offices abroad know that the only time an administration can be removed from office in the United States is when a change in the presidency occurs. A minority opposition viewpoint is thoroughly understood and has its constructive values.

Any national or international policy that cannot stand the light of constant criticism probably isn't worth defending in the first instance. Prime Minister Attlee and Winston Churchill didn't observe any bipartisan etiquette on foreign policy in their recent campaign.

GOP CAN OVERPLAY

Naturally, if the Republicans overplay their hand by their criticism, they will hurt themselves, and the majority party and administration will be correspondingly strengthened instead of weakened. If the Republicans happen to be right in their criticism, the Democrats will be influenced to change their policies—which is all to the good.

The fight against Secretary of State Acheson arose not because of any personal antagonism against him in the first instance, but because he is a symbol of the administration, especially since the President appears to have delegated virtually complete responsibility for the making of foreign policy to his Secretary of State.

In these dispatches last autumn, attention was called to the way the administration was fighting Mr. Dulles, and the prediction was made then that far more than a Republican candidate was being destroyed. This has now come true. Except for a meaningless gesture now and then like the designation of former Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, to accompany the American delegation to London for the forthcoming meeting of the foreign ministers, the days of bipartisan "cooperation" on foreign policy as carried on heretofore are over.

Republican Senators are no longer to feel muzzled to speak their thoughts in the Senate, and there are signs that the Democrats themselves are considerably relieved, too, to be able to accept the political challenge of their opponents whenever it is flung toward them.

Public Supports McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOE MCCARTHY has the popular side of his controversy with the State Department. Already his action has flushed out homosexuals in that Department, and now the Commerce Department confesses to the same infliction. As part of my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent which appeared in the Sunday Star of yesterday:

MCCARTHY'S CHARGES EXPRESS PUBLIC VIEW—WRITER BELIEVES PEOPLE AGREE WITH SENATOR

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is contended that while Senator MCCARTHY has offered no real proof of either his blanket or specific charges of Communist saturation in the State Department, nevertheless, he is strongly supported by the public generally throughout the country.

This is the more significant as the great bulk of press and radio commentators and columnists have been vehemently critical, not to say denunciatory, of Senator MCCARTHY from the start. He has been denounced—and with considerable truth—as reckless and irresponsible; as having, without justification, assailed the character of eminent Americans, such as Dr. Owen Lattimore, Dr. Philip Jessup, Mrs. Dorothy Kenyon, and others; as having damaged the prestige of his country abroad in a time of acute crisis; as having inspired an attack upon Secretary of State Acheson well calculated to weaken our foreign policy, deeply disturbing our allies as well as heartening our potential enemy.

A storm of almost unprecedented violence has descended upon Mr. MCCARTHY'S head. Not since 1917, when the late Senator Robert M. La Follette opposed our entry into World War I, has any Member of Congress been as severely excoriated. A good deal of this has been deserved. How, then, in the absence of any genuine confirming evidence, is the public support for Senator MCCARTHY to be accounted for? Unemotionally analyzing the situation, detached men, most of whom feel that the forced resignation of Mr. Acheson would be a calamity, give what seems the only adequate answer: Briefly, it is this—a majority of the people believe (and believed before Mr. MCCARTHY raised his voice) that there is something rotten in the State Department.

The contention is that this belief is justified. Three years ago, it is pointed out, when Whittaker Chambers first told his fantastic story before the Un-American Activities Committee naming Alger Hiss and others, the committee was violently assailed. President Truman called the whole thing a "red herring." The State Department rushed valiantly to Mr. Hiss' defense and many conspicuous friends warmly espoused his cause. The "liberal" commentators who now denounce Mr. MCCARTHY were even more denunciatory then of Mr. Hiss' accusers. In the end, one of the men named by Mr. Chambers committed suicide by jumping out a window. Another—Julian Wadleigh—confessed under oath, claiming immunity because his traitorous acts were more than 10 years old. And, Mr. Hiss, after two concededly fair trials, was convicted. Considering these facts, it is not surprising that Mr. Acheson's two unfortunate Hiss statements should have been misconstrued by the public generally as another defense of Mr. Hiss—and should be resented.

While this feeling was still intense, Senator MCCARTHY burst forth with his charges. It is hardly strange that part of the public was not too much impressed with the denunciation and denials—nor stopped to consider that Mr. MCCARTHY had extremely little with which to back up his sensational allegations. The denunciations and denials could not fail to have a familiar ring. In the midst of all this, their confusion was increased and their resentment enhanced by the statement of Deputy Under Secretary of State Puerifoy that the Department had dismissed nearly 100 homosexual State Department employees as "bad security risks."

Revelation of this situation, which had not been charged by Senator MCCARTHY, came as a shock. Not much has been made of it in the press, but politicians generally agree that their constituents have been more revolted at this voluntary disclosure than by anything else. How, they ask, did there come to be so many of these unfortunate individuals in the employ of the Government and why is the concentration so heavy in the State Department? And how many more of them are there besides those enumerated by Mr. Peurifoy? There seems no adequate answers to these questions, but considering everything, it is not surprising that, regardless of his recklessness and irresponsibility, Senator MCCARTHY should have a large and sympathetic following in his fight.

Rev. Dr. Osmond H. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently an important event occurred in my home town of Buffalo, N. Y., which merits being brought to the attention of the Congress.

Dr. Osmond H. Brown, the rector of St. Philip's Church in Buffalo, is the first Negro priest to be appointed as an honorary canon in the 161-year history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dr. Brown has been a tireless worker for his church and community and his designation as honorary canon is indeed well deserved and has been well received.

In one of his first statements after receiving this appointment, Father Brown made a plea for the end of racial segregation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith inserting an article in this connection from the Buffalo Courier-Express of March 18, 1950:

FATHER BROWN ASKS END OF RACIAL SEGREGATION

(By Earl Williams)

A conviction that his new position as the first Negro priest to be appointed as honorary canon in the 161-year history of the Protestant Episcopal Church has world-wide significance was expressed yesterday by Dr. Osmond H. Brown, rector of St. Philip's Church, 166 Goodell Street.

Father Brown, who has been flooded with letters and telegrams of congratulations from all sections of the country since the high Anglican honor was bestowed upon him 2 weeks ago, interpreted the action of the Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife in naming him an honorary canon of the diocese of western New York as "a test case for the end of segregation in the Christian church."

"I believe," he said, "that the time is now ripe for the end of segregation, which is a curse to Christianity and an incongruity that makes our present democracy a lie.

"The whole world is now seething for respect of human freedom. In many parts of the world people have taken the wrong road to find this freedom."

MADE BY MAN

"The caste system in western civilization was made by man, not God. Unless our civilization is evaluated by Christian culture and not by economic standards, I am convinced that western civilization is doomed for destruction."

Charging that the church has lagged behind the fields of labor, art, and medicine in practicing human solidarity, the rector said he hopes his appointment will lead church people "to put forth before the world the dogma of civil rights and spiritual benefits for every creature of God regardless of creed, race, or previous conditions."

The stumbling block to the end of segregation of Protestant churches, he declared, has been the unwillingness of Christians "to pay the price of respect for human freedom." The true practice of the "law of love," he added, is an expense of our conscience and offers no social profit.

"No people," he continued, "can develop by themselves. There must be an interchange of racial groups and constant human contact to bring about an understanding one to another. Christianity is a fellowship, not a club. There is an urgent need of a better appreciation of respect of the human personality as given by the Supreme Ruler of the universe."

MUST ADJUST

The opening of the doors for assimilation of Negroes into American life," Dr. Brown said, "involves a tremendous racial responsibility to adjust ourselves in the spirit of humility and common sense that God may be able to use us as servants for all."

Besides his battle for the end of segregation, Father Brown is concerned that the lack of adequate religious training in education of the majority of Americans today is tending to develop a materialistic and godless nation.

News of the precedent-setting appointment of the Negro priest as an honorary canon, first published in the Courier-Express and carried by wire services throughout the country, has brought a total of 20 letters, 8 telegrams, and many cards of congratulations. Excerpts from one of the letters, sent by Dr. J. DaCosta Harewood, vicar of St. Philip's Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, follows:

"Bishop Scaife has conferred an honor, not only on you but he has honored all of us—the colored clergy of the United States. God bless him.

"May God continue to bless you and enable you to serve Him by serving humanity for many more years to come."

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with Father Brown. It is ironical that we here in America—where we consider all men to be equal—should have such a running sore as racial segregation. As an American who steadfastly believes in justice and the protection of human rights, I would be derelict in my sworn duty to the people I represent if I did not support the ideals and fundamentals on which our Nation is founded. Those ideals guarantee freedom, liberty, and equality to people of all races and creeds.

In an enlightened nation such as ours no longer can we continue to boast about our democratic principles and forsake these ideals in practice. Discrimination is a cancer in our society. All over the world, the Communists can point to it as proof of the fact that we do not practice what we preach.

I join with Father Brown and other clergymen throughout the country who have dedicated themselves to brotherhood under God and urge that efforts be continued to eliminate the disgraceful and abusive practices of discrimination and segregation.

Father Brown's appointment is another step in the right direction and I want to wish him good luck and continued success.

Reclamation at It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. WERDEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the following article which appeared on the editorial page of the San Francisco Chronicle of Thursday, March 23, 1950:

RECLAMATION AT IT AGAIN

In pursuance of its policy to aggrandize itself and to drive private enterprise out of water-power development, the Bureau of Reclamation is seeking to have the Federal Power Commission revoke the licenses it gave last November to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Fresno irrigation district for developments on Kings River.

Together, though as separate enterprises, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Fresno irrigation district, with 19 other irrigation districts joining it, propose to develop immediately 418,000 kilowatts with new power company dams greatly increasing irrigation storage on the Kings River.

But the Bureau of Reclamation says it wants to develop Kings River power itself, though its plan would produce only a quarter of the kilowattage proposed by the two present licensees. Incidentally, too, the Bureau proposes to spend $71,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for 101,500 kilowatts, though the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. figures it will get 274,000 kilowatts for $73,000,000.

When would the Bureau have this power ready for a waiting public? It proposes to take 12 years for construction. The P. G. & E. alone proposes to provide more than twice as much power in less than half that time.

The Bureau does not really know when it could turn on the power, if ever. The striking feature of this move by the Bureau is that it has no authorization from Congress for development on Kings River. It may never get one. It is merely trying to block private enterprise. And the grab-everything side of its attempt appears in the fact that one of the licenses it is trying to upset is for the 20 irrigation districts which are public enterprises.

A charge made at the hearing before the Federal Power Commission Tuesday is worth thinking about. It is that the Bureau seeks to grab all economic power sites for Government development and leave only the uneconomic ones for private enterprise. If the Bureau could do this and limit private enterprise to only the marginal undertakings, the private concerns might have to charge higher rates to the consumers. Thus consumers, while being taxed to build overcostly and sometimes unnecessary public plants, would also have to pay more for their electricity.

An example of unnecessary expenditure proposed by the Bureau was turned down by the House Appropriations Committee Tuesday. The committee struck out of the Central Valley project appropriation funds asked by the Bureau for a Delta steam plant and various transmission lines and switchyards. None of these are needed. The existing P. G. & E. facilities are ample, are now meeting all demands and can continue to do so, and, under a contract dictated by the Bureau, at costs which would not be lessened by the duplicate facilities the Bureau wants to spend millions for. Congress after Congress has refused these items, but the Bureau still persists.

The Federal Power Commission was right in November when it pronounced the Bureau of Reclamation's plans for Kings River inadequate and issued the licenses to the P. G. & E. and the Fresno irrigation district. It should not permit itself to be buffaloed by the Interior Department into a reversal.

The Census and the Questions To Be Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Walter Johnson, of Heathsville, Va.:

COUNTRY LAWYER

(By Walter Johnson, Heathsville, Va.)

The Constitution of the United States as so carefully written by the wise founding fathers and as ratified by the people, the Congress is authorized and directed to enumerate the people each 10 years. The purpose is to determine fair representation of the people in Congress on the basis of numbers.

That power to enumerate the people has shamefully been stretched by our Congress into power to impose on the people an enumeration or inventory of all the possessions of the people and of the earnings of the people.

At hand is a large sheet of paper with fine printing on both sides. In this printing are 334 questions, many of which have a number of subdivisions. It is called the agriculture questionnaire. The citizen is directed to answer the question and have it ready for the census taker.

Preparation of these questions was done in the dark dungeons of Washington bureaucracy. Congress did not prepare this monstrosity. But the Census Bureau would never dare impose such a thing on the people without authority of Congress.

That the Government of the United States can force the citizenry to give to it an inventory of possessions both on the farm and in the home is something never expected under the Stars and Stripes.

Government forces the citizen to tell if he has an electric water heater or electric washing machine but somehow it forgot to ask about electric clocks and blankets. Perhaps this information will be picked up by the census taker personally.

Only one Member of Congress has had the courage to raise his voice against this tyranny insofar as this writer has observed. He is CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio.

In years gone by enumerators have been hired from among ordinary intelligent people in the community to enumerate their neighbors. Not so this year. Now, to make it more expensive and complicated, they are conducting examinations for enumerators.

Among this writer's acquaintances three ladies were examined and rejected as unable to pass. These ladies were all leaders in church and civic affairs and generally recognized as well-informed. They wanted to earn a little pin money and as they thought have a few weeks of interesting employment.

Perhaps it is just as well they were rejected. I am sure they are not the kind who would enjoy propounding unpleasant questions to their neighbors.

This business of forcing the citizen to furnish the Government of the United States with an inventory of his possessions can only be properly described with the one word "tyranny." There is not one iota of authority for it in the Constitution of the United States nor can justification be found any place.

There is only one place to put the blame. That is on our Representatives in Congress. They have failed the people.

Each and every Member of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Members of the Senate will be up for reelection in November. All will want your vote for another term. All will tell you about the fine work they are doing. Let them explain about this inventory they are forcing on the people.

Men like Patrick Henry, George Mason, and Thomas Jefferson are needed today in these United States even more than in 1776. If the men who so carefully wrote the Constitution of the United States could see how the power to enumerate has been wrongfully stretched into the power to inventory possessions of the people those fine patriots would rise out of their graves in angry protest.

Farmers Want a Plan But Not Brannan's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Farm Journal has just rendered a real service to the people of the United States. A recent poll conducted by that leading farm magazine, indicates what farmers think should be a sound program for agriculture. On a six-point program the Brannan plan was sixth, or last, getting one vote out of every 12. This shows the common sense possessed by people who comprise the great farm business in this country. Complete information is in the April issue.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a letter to Congressmen and an article entitled "What Farm Journal Readers Voted On":

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: "Let livestock eat up most of our farm surpluses and replace a good bit of the rest."

That's the idea that most readers of Farm Journal prefer, judging by their vote on the 12 plans we asked them to choose from in our February issue.

Votes are still coming in, but an analysis of the first 2,000 showed the livestock solution easily first, with 23 percent of the total.

This plan, which Farm Journal has been vigorously promoting, makes sense to farmers. They point out that livestock cannot only eliminate most surpluses, but can at the same time improve the national diet, help conserve soil, provide more employment within agriculture, and return more of the consumer's food dollar to the farmer.

That's because a livestock feeder is not only a producer of raw products, but a processor.

Sure, they say, livestock farmers would have to have income support at some level, and in some fashion, but that the support might better be under livestock than under many things we support now.

Not that this would be the whole answer. It wouldn't solve everything for everybody, and it couldn't do it all at once, but these farmers say, it's the big goal.

Second place in the voting went to the flexible, sliding-scale price support urged mainly by the Farm Bureau.

Third place went to a plan to swap surpluses for scarce foreign materials.

"More research" came in fourth—research for new crops, and new uses for old crops.

Some kind of two-price system—a higher price for what we use at home, a lower price for exports—came fifth.

And in sixth place was the Brannan plan, getting one vote out of every 12.

These six plans accounted for four-fifths of all the ballots cast. One of every 11 voters had an idea of his own that he thought was better than any of the 12 ideas we described.

The mail brought us everything, from just the coupon at the end of the February article to a 19-page typewritten letter—single spaced. The opinions ranged from some too violent to print to such whimsical ideas as that Secretary Brannan use surplus potatoes as stoppers on more kerosene cans.

There you are, Mr. Congressman. This was no scientifically prepared poll. The sample consisted of anybody who felt moved to write us. But it could be a mighty significant straw in the wind.

One thing was too obvious to miss, as we read through these first 2,000 letters: farmers want farm income kept high in one way or another, but they want even more to stay out of the hands of bureaucrats in Washington, or, for that matter, bureaucrats nearer home.

They believe that if we look around a little, and don't get too hysterical, we can find ways to do both of these things. They expect to be in the farming business for a long time, and they're looking beyond the next few months.

WHAT FARM JOURNAL READERS VOTED ON—HERE ARE THE 12 FARM PLANS OUTLINED IN THE FEBRUARY ISSUE OF FARM JOURNAL, FOR WHICH FARM JOURNAL READERS CAST THEIR VOTES

1. Let livestock eat us out of trouble, as proposed by Farm Journal. Farm animals could easily do it—in fact could leave us short of nearly everything. This would mean more, and therefore cheaper, livestock. Hence farmers would have to cut costs in order to keep making money. But those costs can be cut, as Farm Journal's current series of cost-cutting articles shows.

While Government price supports would be necessary until livestock could get the job done, here is a long-time answer that would get farmers out of the hands of the politicians.

(Some people are suggesting subsidies on livestock to speed this up.)

2. The Brannan plan. Its main feature is to let prices follow the market, thus giving consumers cheap food while the Government makes up the farmers' incomes. What the cost in taxes would be, no one knows, except that it would be terrific. And farmers would have to keep coming back to Congress for huge new appropriations to pay the bill.

The Farmers' Union supports the Brannan plan in principle, but urges even higher levels of support.

3. A two-price system, run by a bipartisan farm board. Supplies for home consumption would be held to a level that would bring good prices; surpluses would be sold abroad at world prices. This board would also have the power to apply any other remedies needed, including marketing agreements, support prices, and, as a last resort, marketing quotas and acreage allotments. The National Grange supports this plan.

The National Milk Producers Federation also supports a two-price program, but would have it operate through farmer-controlled marketing pools.

4. Flexible, sliding-scale support prices, which would prevent prices from falling to bankruptcy levels, but which would not encourage farmers to overproduce. The American Farm Bureau Federation backs this scheme.

5. Food stamps and free school lunches: The Government would figure how much a proper diet would cost a person, and what share of its income any family should spend for food. Then any family that could not buy a proper diet for, say, 40 percent of its income would get stamps—as a gift from the Government—to make up the difference.

6. An international commodity clearinghouse which would handle sales between hard- and soft-money countries. The United States might sell for full price in soft money, or for a discount in hard money. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations proposed this, but the United States officially has turned thumbs down on it.

7. Straight sales to foreign countries, to be paid for in soft money, without any clearinghouse arrangement, and with the taxpayers taking any loss on the foreign currency.

8. Higher subsidies on exports, to lower the price to foreigners, with the United States donating the balance. Payments to us would be made in dollars.

9. Permission to the CCC to sell more of its holdings at a loss. (Not much different from No. 8.)

10. Making an outright gift of more of our food to hungry people overseas, forgetting about any payment.

11. Swapping farm products for scarce materials from abroad.

12. Finding new crops to take the place of surplus crops, and finding new uses for old crops through greatly expanded chemurgic research. (Admittedly this won't solve today's pressing problems, but it's got big possibilities for the long run, if we put up enough money for a real research job.)

Montana Wants Early CVA Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a copy of a resolution adopted February 26, 1950, by delegates to the Western Montana Conference for CVA, meeting at Polson, Mont. The meeting and the appended resolution are a strong manifestation of the impatience with the long delay in consideration of the CVA proposal:

That President Truman be commended for his perseverance in pressing for the enactment of the Columbia Valley Administration bill. We particularly commend his most recent action in advising the Bureau of the Budget that while development of the Columbia Basin must be continued for the time being under the joint Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation Plan, this is no substitute for the full-scale development under a CVA.

We urge the creation of a CVA because: The Army engineers-Reclamation Bureau plan is based on unproved engineering, a pious hope for cooperation between competing agencies, and a total neglect of the natural unity between land and water. A CVA, on the other hand, offers complete, unified, multipurpose development of the Columbia

Basin's varied resources through the efficient mechanism of a public corporation with headquarters in the region.

We recommend establishing an organization of all interested individuals and groups to promote CVA and its program. This must be done immediately to combat the deluge of misleading propaganda put out by well financed organizations fronting for the vested interests, and by well meaning, but misinformed, local groups.

We respectfully request that the congressional Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate hold public hearings throughout the region at the earliest practicable date.

Unanimously adopted by the committee on resolutions.

RAY KELLY,
Chairman, Lake County.
EUGENE FIKE,
Missoula County.
PETE RUDERMAN,
Missoula County.
MRS. RAY LOGAN,
Lake County.
L. J. CARTER,
Sanders County.
ROBERT WELLER,
Flathead County.
JEROME LOCKE,
Lewis and Clark County.

Not Too Little, Too Late

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a minority member of the subcommittee on appropriations for the armed services, on my own responsibility preliminary to what later I intend to say at some length if I am recognized to say anything under the program of procedure I understand is contemplated, I do wish to say now on the basis of 17 years' experience in this House as a member of the Military Affairs Committee and of the Appropriations Committee that this seems an appropriate time—before it is too late—to sound a warning to the Department of Defense and the Members of Congress against adopting the attitude of fetish with regard to the projected military budget of 13 billions.

This figure was agreed upon as one which would suffice for the needs of the hour. The hour, at the time it was enunciated, was January of this year. The planning and the basic agreement on 13 billions predated January by a substantial period.

That same basic agreement of 13 billions was not without some dissent and mental reservation. I have no doubt that there were far-seeing men among the professionals in the Department of Defense, who, while agreeing upon the 13-billion figure at the time, did so with crossed fingers and a murmured prayer.

Since that time the United States of America has been treated to a spectacle of further Russian expansion and the consolidation of aggressive gains by Russian satellites. Communist China is rattling the saber in the direction of the Western Powers, particularly the United States. Communist forces within still-free nations of southeast Asia are agitating against us.

Only a few days ago Communist-trained forces in Indochina touched off a street riot as a demonstration against a friendly visit by United States vessels at Saigon. In addition, shells were fired from mortars in the direction of our ships. American merchant ships have been barred from evacuating American Nationals including our diplomats from Shanghai.

In Europe, satellites of the Soviets have tried to limit our diplomatic privileges within satellite borders. Our freedom of movement within these countries has been hampered in a fashion which seeks to humiliate the prestige of the United States.

And, an American naval officer, traveling from his post in Rumania, was mysteriously killed. Chinese Communists still hold our Navy fliers prisoner, despite all protests.

Many of these things, these far-flung manifestations of unfriendliness and thinly masked aggression, have occurred since it was agreed among the military planners that 13 billions was the limit beyond which we should not go in financing our national defense for the next fiscal year.

From the planners themselves, there have come expressions of doubt as to the capability of our defense plan for 1951. The Navy has supported House moves towards the building of new ships. The Air Force has said it would like to have more planes, if the money could be had.

There are undoubtedly desirable improvements in our ground forces which could be made—if the money could be forthcoming.

I think it is time that we of the House—and the Congress—told our defense people that they need not feel irrevocably bound to the 13-billion budget projection. I think it is time we put them on notice to tell us promptly if this sum fails to provide for the adequate defense of this Nation. I think it is time we adopted an attitude which would be conducive to having them come to us, if need should indicate. For our own part, we should be ready to revise upwards our appropriations rather than be lacking in essential defense.

A large number of the Members of this House have been distressed to learn that within the projected budget for 1951, it will be impossible to maintain many shore installations.

Under the commendable policy of converting the available funds into maximum forces in being, such retrenchment is inevitable. I believe all of us here agree that we ought to have the strongest fighting muscles possible for the amount of money we spend. Therefore, to maintain this muscle, we must cut what amounts to fat.

But what is fat under the operating schedules projected for the ensuing fiscal year, might well be considered a part of the muscle, if larger operating forces were projected. It is an inexorable rule that shore installations of the Navy, for instance, are predicated on the support of forces afloat, and in the air. Therefore, when we cut the amounts available for forces in being, we also provide indirectly the necessity for cutting the shore and base establishment.

The same applies to other branches of the armed forces.

I do not mean to advocate here that we provide funds for greater forces in being without adequate investigation and testimony to back up the need. But, I do not believe, either, that we ought to freeze to a $13,000,000,000 defense budget simply because, when it was drawn, it was believed to be adequate.

The war plans of the United States shift with changes in conditions. The disposition of strategic strength moves accordingly. In concrete demonstration of this fact, we have witnessed the strengthening of our forces in the Pacific during recent months, and we have heard of plans to strengthen them further in months to come. All of this is being accomplished in the face of the requirement for over-all cuts.

In addition, our Navy has wisely given top priority to antisubmarine warfare preparations. To do this, money is going to have to be diverted from other objectives.

Cutting down on forces, and trying to fit one's needs within a figure, which might well turn out in the final analysis to be an arbitrary and inadequate one, is occupying a great deal of time in the Pentagon. Plans for the procurement of many things have had to be postponed. I have been asking myself whether we ought to take this risk.

The projected forces for 1951 have been described as a calculated risk. Under our system of government, we must take some risk. We cannot economically afford total defense. We cannot make a guns-or-butter choice for our citizens which the German people had made for them by Hitler. Stalin has made this same choice for the Russian people.

On the basis of my own investigation and knowledge I am convinced that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have tried to make all the economies they could, in good conscience. I know their military staffs have worked hard to bring them about, and to try and fit economies into the picture of necessary ready defense.

I believe it is for us, the Members of this House, to create a receptive atmosphere for their opinions, should they find that the proposed economy budget places too great an element of risk into their planning.

As I said before, I do not believe 13 billions ought to be allowed to become a fetish, or an idol, or an immovable figure which cannot be revised upward if need be. I am deeply appreciative of the efforts which have been made to budget our essential defense within this figure, and for my part, I would welcome the opinions of those who have to work with that budget, if they think it is too small.

Consumers Benefit From Prosperous Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of criticism of the Government farm price support program. A good deal of this criticism has probably been entirely justified.

Over the week end my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] took occasion to explain why it is vitally important to everyone, everywhere to maintain a prosperous farm economy. Speaking at a meeting of Midwest Republican chairmen at Salt Lake City, Utah, Mr. LOVRE pointed out the critical necessity of keeping farm income high. He declared that every dollar of gross farm production means $7 of national economy. He further asserted that when farm prices are low everyone suffers.

Mr. LOVRE also gave the Republicans some excellent political advice concerning the farm vote. He bluntly told the chairmen and party officials that they must do something more than criticize the Brannan scheme presented by the Democrats.

In the interests of the great congressional district which I represent—a district somewhat different from Mr. LOVRE's in that I represent more consumers than farmers—I am presenting his talk. It contains a message vital to wage earners, consumers, and businessmen. I recommend its reading to every Member of this body whether he be interested in agriculture or in the consumer's position in regard to food prices. This frank account deserves the attention of every American who wants to see this Nation remain prosperous and strong:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD O. LOVRE, REPUBLICAN, SOUTH DAKOTA, BEFORE A MEETING OF MIDWEST REPUBLICAN STATE CHAIRMAN, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MARCH 31, 1950

I am especially glad to be here for this meeting because I feel at home with you people. I was Republican State chairman of South Dakota for 2 years and in that capacity I was a member of your group. I understand the problems which you are facing. As a Republican and as a Congressman, I am vitally interested in your problems. They are the basic problems of the Republican Party.

When I, as State chairman, called county chairmen or party workers together, I always asked that everyone speak frankly.

I ask the same today.

The goal of a political organization, as we all know, is to give the people the kind of government that is believed to be right and proper. This can be accomplished only by election of its members to office. It is the responsibility of all of us—party officials, office holders, and all other members—to work for victory, so the principles of Republicanism will be most strongly felt in local, State and National Government.

You people are experts in politics and government. If this were not true, you would not be here today. It is not necessary for me to remind you that to win elections we must get the votes.

The 1948 fiasco supplied a good lesson. The outcome was a shock to me. But, after the shock had subsided, I sat down—as I suppose 140,000,000 other Americans did—and tried to figure out just why we lost. I suppose there was my answer and 140,000,000 others to the question.

My analysis resolved itself to just one simple fact. We lost the 1948 election because we, as a party, failed to live up to the expectations of our old stand-by—the honest-to-goodness dirt farmer. We can rationalize all we want and point to the tactics of the opposition, which maligned the Aiken-Hope law. The fact still remains: Had we carried the farm States we Republicans would have won.

Some say the Democrats tricked the Republican Eightieth Congress into passing the sliding scale law which the New Dealers knew would cost us votes. In reality, the Aiken-Hope law was nothing new. It was simply a carry-over of the New Deal philosophy of solving the farm problem by pouring out Federal funds to support the commodity market. Farmers didn't like it.

Quick to capitalize on the situation, the Democrats came out with a brazen political scheme, aimed at keeping the farm vote and wooing every other group into the fold. I'm speaking of the scheme of Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. Mr. Brannan's scheme—and I call it a scheme because that's all it is—promises high prices to the farmer. Out of the other side of his mouth, Mr. Brannan promises consumers low food costs. The only one left out in the cold is the taxpayer, the forgotten man—whether he be farmer or consumer—but who eventually must foot the bill. Mr. Brannan has been strangely and significantly silent on this score.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time condemning the Brannan scheme. I'm merely going to list a few of the many objections which I see.

First, the idea is fundamentally unsound. It is foolish to believe we can solve all problems by running to the Federal Treasury for a monetary hypodermic. In this case, it is through subsidies to keep farm prices high. The farmer is being sold on the Brannan scheme because of high price supports. Neither Mr. Brannan nor his hordes of Federal Agriculture Department employees tell the farmer that in return for a cash subsidy—which is nothing more than a dole—he will have to be subjected to rigid Federal controls and regulations.

They don't say that the farmer must obey the edicts of the Washington bureaucrats or lose his subsidy. They don't mention the fact that the farmer who doesn't obey these orders will end up with a stiff fine or jail sentence, or both.

Mr. Brannan, in his appearance before the House Agriculture Committee, spoke of protecting the family sized farmer. Actually, no bill embodying the Brannan philosophy yet reported to Congress makes specific provision for the small operator. The unit limitation which Mr. Brannan originally advocated was stricken from the scheme before it was presented to the House last session. With its provision for subsidy payments to farmers, think of the big operators—about 2 percent of the farm population—who produce 25 percent of the farm crops annually. They could, and would, reap riches at the taxpayers' expense.

The essence of the Brannan scheme is to provide a certain farm income. Let's say $26,000,000,000 annually. With sufficient controls and regulations, that farmers do not want, this could be possible. But suppose farm income on the market fell 20 percent. This would mean that the taxpayers would have to make up 20 percent deficit in farm income to assure the growers their $26,000,000,000 annual income. On the market, this produce would bring $20,800,000,000, leaving $5,200,000,000 to be made up from the Federal Treasury. This might satisfy the farmer, but what about the taxpayers? From what I've seen, I doubt if the farmers could convince the Congress, year after year, to provide this $5,200,000,000 appropriation. That is a grave risk to impose upon the farmer.

Now, let's look at the consumer. You'd expect him to get his food 20 percent cheaper under the Brannan scheme. This is impossible because the farmer gets only about half of what the consumer spends for food. The other half goes into marketing and transporting costs. Hence, the average reduction possible under the Brannan scheme is 10 percent.

For white bread the reduction is even less than that, not quite 3½ percent. Last week my wife paid 29 cents for two loaves of white bread—14½ cents each. Now the value of the wheat that goes into a pound loaf of bread was, according to the 1949 average, 2½ cents. A 20-percent drop in farm prices would reduce this wheat in a loaf of bread by half a cent (20 percent of 2.5 cents=0.5 cent). The retail value of the bread before the Brannan scheme: 14.5 cents. With the Brannan scheme: 14 cents (14.5 cents—0.5 cent=14 cents). The reduction to the consumer in this case is 3.4 percent.

At the same time, however, the consumer would be footing the tax bill to the tune of more than $5,000,000,000 per year, not counting the cost of the salaries of the thousands of employees necessary to administer and police the program.

Furthermore, the Brannan scheme would mean the rebirth of another OPA—on a scale much larger than ever before. Mr. Brannan's scheme would not only regulate the farmer but would of necessity regulate every person dealing with the transporting and marketing of farm produce. Every country grocery and pushcart operator would come under Government regimentation.

Assume for the sake of argument that the Brannan plan would mean 20 percent reduction in food costs. What will that do to the wholesalers, processors, transporters, and retailers of food? They would have to operate their businesses on 20 percent less money. Truck drivers, warehousemen, grocery clerks, country elevator operators, millers, bookkeepers, janitors—everyone connected with converting farm crops into food—would get paid on the basis of 80 cents where they now get a dollar. Uncle Sam would be able to tax them on the basis of only an 80-percent income.

Their income certainly would fall 20 percent. It is obvious what that would mean to the national economy. It would throw it completely out of kilter.

These few illustrations show the fallacy of the Brannan plan.

Despite this unhappy picture, however, there are two good arguments for Mr. Brannan's idea, as wild as it is. They are: (1) the mess into which the present law has put us (some people argue that anything would be better than what we have) and (2) the lack of a plan to substitute for the Brannan scheme.

As JOHN MCCORMACK, the House majority leader, said only last week on the floor of the House: "I call upon those who oppose the Brannan plan to offer a plan of their own." Even Mr. MCCORMACK said he did not know whether the Brannan plan was the correct one, but said one thing in defense of it. That was that Secretary Brannan had the courage to offer a plan.

That statement seems to me to be a direct challenge to our party.

I know that the Republican Party is truly and sincerely interested in the farmer and

his welfare, and I shall explain how we can show this devotion to principle.

Agriculture is the most sensitive and powerful part of a combination of factors influencing our Nation's economy. The farmer produces 65 percent of our raw materials, and the produce of the farm is the kind that moves rapidly on the market and quickly is transformed into buying power. Farm income is thus widely and swiftly distributed over the entire Nation. Hence, far more than the 20 percent of the population of the Nation engaged in farming is affected by any rise or fall in farm prices. As a matter of fact any rise or fall in farm prices affects our entire economy. Our national balance sheet is regulated by the volume of farm production and the price it brings on the market.

The record of the United States for 25 years proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that each $1 of gross farm production on the average generates $1 of factory pay rolls, $4 of retail sales volume and $7 of national income.

That is why stabilizing farm products at a proper price level automatically becomes a floor under our national income, our wage level, business profits, and the goods we consume.

History proves that farm income governs national income. The consumer suffers whenever farm income drops. When farm income drops, wages fall, and when wages fall the consumer must turn a greater percentage of his income to food. A national prosperity graph and a graph of farm income run parallel to each other. The years 1928 and 1932 tell a grim story. Farm production in each of those years was about the same. Yet the farm income in 1932 was just half of what it was in 1928. The national income dropped to less than half; automobile production fell from more than 4,000,000 units to 1,186,000, construction values fell even more sharply.

Another instance is what happened in the 2 years 1937–38. Farm income rose nearly $1,000,000,000 in 1937. National income went up approximately $7,000,000,000. But with a larger farm production in 1938, prices weakened and farm income dropped almost $1,000,000,000. National income fell almost $7,000,000,000, with the loss spread all along the line. Manufacturing, employment, wages and salaries, construction and transportation all suffered their proportionate cuts. All started to rise again with the upturn of farm income in 1939.

These facts demonstrate clearly that if industry wants profits, if labor wants high wages and many jobs, and if Government wants sufficient taxes to balance the budget and reduce the public debt, all of these groups should be among the first to insist on fair and proper prices for what the farmers produce.

The administration claimed the 1938 recession came because governmental spending had been reduced too soon. But governmental spending merely represented money borrowed from the store of capital already in existence. The actual reason was the failure to maintain the flow of new income. It had slackened at its source—on the farms—and consumer purchasing power fell accordingly.

Consumers do not gain from low farm prices. They always lose. At the bottom of the depression, although farm prices were disastrously low, the share of the consumers' total income required for food was the highest in a decade. This was because their total income was proportionately lower. In 1938, when farm prices dropped, consumers did not benefit from lower food prices. The shares of their income spent for food remained the same or was higher because their total income had declined in ratio with farm incomes. On the other hand, in 1943–44, although farm prices were at or above parity, the share of consumers' total income required for food was the lowest in history.

Despite Government supports, right now farm income is down compared with 2 years ago.

Farmers aren't happy about that either.

Consumers are angry when they see warehouses bulging with surpluses, which do not do anyone any good, bought with the taxpayer's dollar. There is even a movement on foot to stop price supports for farmers. Witness the unfavorable publicity which the farm program has received and the formation of the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Supports in New York City earlier this year.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Democrats are capitalizing on this dissatisfaction by saying it gives reason for repealing the present support law and forcing the Brannan scheme on the American people. I do not believe the present law is what it should be. But I don't believe the answer lies in Mr. Brannan's scheme.

These factors point to the opportunity which is knocking at the door of the Republican Party. The farm philosophy of the Democrats is as outmoded as the Model A Ford that was popular back in 1933 when the New Deal adopted the idea of solving the farm price problem with money out of the Federal Treasury. The approach to the farm problem which the Democrats have taken and are recommending under the Brannan scheme is the approach of the past—that is, subsidies again, but to make it palatable they promise lower food costs, with the loss to be made up out of the Federal Treasury, which means out of the pockets of the farmers and the consumers alike.

The Democrats are dealing with a 1950 problem by a 1933 approach. They want a 1950 automobile on a 1933 chassis.

It remains for the Republicans to come up with a modern 1950 solution to this 1950 problem.

Arriving at the answer we should remember that there is a great need for clear understanding of economic relationships between groups. Unless all groups are making sound and comparable progress there will be weakness in our national economy. It is vital to the welfare and security of the United States of America that the answer be found because a high level of farm income means a high national income and prosperity for all.

It is my opinion that any legislation which serves to stabilize farm prices is not legislation for agriculture alone. Instead, it is legislation which protects the economic welfare of every segment of our country. I say this because farm income governs our national income on a 1 to 7 ratio.

We cannot be blind to this basic fact. We as a political party must take a positive approach to the problem.

We must do more than poke holes in the Brannan scheme.

To attack without offering a constructive alternative is to say in effect that we as Republicans either do not believe in a farm program or that we recommend a return to the outmoded Government support philosophy on a 60 to 90 percent sliding scale which the voters repudiated in the 1948 elections.

The Republican Party is committed to a price program for agriculture. Our 1948 platform contained such a plank. We can't ignore that.

It is my firm conviction that the future success of the Republican Party lies in what we as a party do about the farm problem.

Axel Beck, national committeeman from South Dakota, and chairman of the Republican National Committee's Agriculture Subcommittee, has recommended a farm plan which I believe provides the answer to the Republican Party and to the farmers of America.

I also have been working on a plan which I submit for your consideration. There is no basic difference of opinion between Mr. Beck and me.

My plan establishes a pattern for a Republican victory in 1950 and again in 1952. It supplies the answer farmers and consumers are demanding.

It is a modern solution to a modern problem.

This proposal is self-financing, thus relieving the taxpayer of a heavy burden that he should not have to bear. It assures the farmer of full 100 percent of parity, thus protecting his income. This means a high national income for other elements of our society.

It uses the same procedure which any successful businessman follows—a two-price system, one price for the bulk of his produce and another price for his surplus.

The basic reason for a farm program is to protect the farmer, who now is the one person in our modern economic pattern who has little or nothing to say about the prices he receives. He has to take what he can get. To overcome this stumbling block of our complex modern economic structure there must be a farm program. I believe I have a plan that will effectively serve the farmer and his family and at the same time serve the best interests of the entire Nation.

In approaching any farm program we should strive for a solution that gives the highest degree of free enterprise and the fewest controls. It must be one that will react to the best interests of both producers and consumers. Furthermore, any farm program must be divorced from dependence upon the Federal Treasury for financing. Farmers don't like to be placed in this position and the howl that has gone up among consumers proves that they don't like it either. This resentment is proof of the dire necessity of a program free from the year-to-year whims of Congress and maneuvering by self-centered pressure groups.

As Joseph Davis, director of the food research institute of Stanford University, some time ago said, "America wants an agriculture that earns its way, instead of being continually and increasingly dependent on Government props, vulnerable to political shifts, and forced to accept the accompanying regimentation. It wants an agriculture that, proud of its strength, competes in domestic and foreign markets on the basis of efficiency and fair play."

I believe I have such a plan. It has as its objectives: (1) Full self-financing, thus ending the use of tax money for subsidies; (2) full parity prices at all times for normal domestic consumption; (3) administration by the farmers themselves through elected county, State, and National committees; (4) specific and real protection for the family-sized farmer; (5) a two-price level the same as any other business uses; (6) provision for distribution of food to needy people under a food-stamp plan; (7) encouragement of nonfood commercial uses for surplus crops; (8) exports on the world market coordinated with United States commitments; and (9) a coordinated soil-conservation program.

I visualize my plan to work in this manner:

Farmers would choose their own organizations, with elected county, State, and National committees directing the program from the farm level. Committees would work with the Secretary of Agriculture who would decide each year the normal domestic consumption of each farm product. This total would be divided among farmers. They would receive 100 percent of parity for produce marketed under these marketing quotas. If the farmer produced more than his quota and wanted to sell it, he could buy additional marketing quotas, paying enough for them to finance food stamps, exports, and new uses of the product. If moving the surplus did not cost the entire sum, the balance would be returned to the farmer through the local farm committee.

Thus, the farmer could control his own production and those who create surpluses would stand the losses. Marketing quota laws, as now provided, would go into effect only after a referendum in which the farmers gave their approval.

The plan would operate under the same sound principle as that under which a merchant or manufacturer determines a fair price for the bulk of his goods and then sells the remainder at a discount. For example: Suppose that the parity price of wheat is $2. Farmer Jones has a quota under which he may sell 5,000 bushels at full parity. But because of good growing conditions, he produces 6,000 bushels. He could market the additional 1,000 bushels only by buying an additional quota from his county committee for perhaps $1 per bushel. He would either sell the additional 1,000 bushels at full parity or obtain a full parity loan on them. Chances are, however, that under such circumstances he would store his surplus on his own farm in anticipation of his next year's quota, or as protection against a future disaster.

The $1 per bushel would go to the national committee (such as the Commodity Credit Corporation). That committee might issue food stamps, good for perhaps 75 cents on a bushel of wheat. Or it might export for $1.50 per bushel. Or it might subsidize plants at $1 per bushel for finding new uses for wheat. If, at the end of the year, it finds it has averaged $1.25 per bushel on sales of surplus wheat, Farmer Jones, who has sold surplus, would collect the additional 25 cents per bushel. Thus he would net $2 per bushel (full parity) on the 5,000 bushels in his regular quota, and $1.25 per bushel on the surplus. He would not be subjected to acreage controls. He would regulate his own production.

Obviously, if he continued producing surplus wheat, the amount that he would net for the surplus would decrease to the point where he would voluntarily reduce the acreage sown because he would get so little from it.

Calling loans or selling surplus when parity is exceeded would protect the consumer who certainly should expect to pay parity prices for food the same as for everything else he buys. The food-stamp provision of this plan would provide for the consumer who couldn't afford to feed himself properly. Consumer-taxpayers would not be stuck with financing the plan either.

Protection for the small operator would be assured by law and soil-conservation practices would be vigorously encouraged.

Chances are that this plan does not furnish all the answers, but, in my opinion, it is fundamentally sound and infinitely more practical than the Brannan scheme. Republicans cannot afford to ignore the fact that a sound and healthy farm economy means a sound and healthy and prosperous economy for the entire Nation.

I believe that this program of agriculture should be based around 100 percent of parity for the farmer.

Here is why:

Our economy can be compared to a large department store. If the store manager prices his products so low as, say, 75 percent of the needed price to operate properly (parity) he will land in the bankruptcy courts. In the same way, if the United States permits its price level to drop to 75 percent of parity, then we lose 25 percent of our ability to consume; we have 25-percent unemployment and national deficits which will eventually force us into bankruptcy. Such a course certainly is not consistent with Republican policy and not in line with your thinking of mine.

With about 26,000,000 persons on the Nation's farms today, and millions more whose living comes directly or indirectly from farm production, it is apparent that prices must be stabilized toward a continual flow of new income from farm production. Price stabilization on these crops will also stabilize our credit dollar and the purchasing power of the wage earner.

Whether or not we like large expenditures for foreign aid, defense, and domestic programs, we have to face the hard, cold fact that we must have a high national income to finance such expenditures. I have pointed out that farm income and national income are closely related by a seven-times turn. Therefore if we as a nation are to meet our obligations we must have a high farm income.

In these days of the cold war between the United States and Russia it is desperately important to maintain American prosperity.

Joe Stalin is patiently waiting for an economic bust in this country as the opening crack is our cold-war defense. In the interest of peace we must keep farm income and national income high.

To maintain farm prosperity the farmer must have 100 percent of parity. In other words, he must make enough money so that he can buy what he needs and wants. Give him less than 100 percent of parity (or buying power) and you give him that much less buying power.

It is my belief that no political party can operate the economy of the United States on a basis of full employment, a balanced national budget, and pay off the national debt unless an average of at least 100 percent of parity is maintained at the market place for agricultural production for domestic use.

A political party that has the courage to foster such legislation can show by this very action that it means business when its members say their party is a party of prosperity and plenty. A political party that can provide such a program for the Nation will naturally attract not only the farm vote but the vote of sound, thinking Americans everywhere.

To espouse any other philosophy than 100 percent of parity for the farmer is to threaten the very economic foundation of our whole economy.

It is also political suicide.

Any compromise or influence that reduces farm prices below 100 percent of parity in the market place will reflect the same percentage in the loss of busines volume and departure from full employment. The effect on the national income is just seven times what it is on farm income.

Full parity under my plan or under Mr. Beck's recommendations can be accomplished without Government subsidies or grants, and that is in line with the Republican philosophy of governmental economy. There certainly is no economy under a program that costs each American $30 per year to buy the surpluses which result from it. Today taxpayers have $4,000,000,000 tied up in surpluses alone. It costs $25,000 an hour just to store them.

The Nation's farmers told the Republican Party what was needed in the way of farm legislation at the Sioux City conference last fall. They stated that they recognized that the farm problem is a price problem, and that they insist on full parity which they believe they are justly entitled to in the market place. They also went on record clearly demanding the preservation of basic American freedoms.

Mr. Beck, showing an acute awareness of the necessity for legislation to protect the Nation and the farmer from economic collapse, not long ago advised a farm plan. It is not basically different from the one I am outlining to you today. His objectives are full parity, self-financing, freedom from Government controls, a soil-conservation program, encouraged livestock production, and an on-the-farm storage program.

Meetings—32 of them—to which I invited 85,000 South Dakota farmers last fall convinced me that the farmers want to turn the farm program back to the farmer. They also insist on getting full parity for their products without a Government subsidy.

Consumers approve of the plan because it lifts a heavy taxation burden from their backs.

I want to make it emphatically clear that I do not want to scrap the present farm program until we find something better. To do that would not only be foolhardy, but it would be dangerous to the entire Nation. We should strive to improve upon existing programs.

I believe the plan I have outlined establishes the means by which the Republican Party can regain the farm vote. It is definitely in line with Republican thinking and Republican principles.

The self-financing feature is consistent with the Republican pay-as-you-go idea of government.

The complete freedom from Government controls which the farmer would enjoy is a preservation of the Republican free-enterprize philosophy.

The guarantee of full parity to agriculture is simple forthright reassurance of the Republican pledge to the farmer.

The two-price system is a businesslike approach to a marketing problem which coincides with the Republican demands for greater efficiency in government.

The orderly disposal of surpluses so that produce from God's ground is used to feed God's people shows a willingness to meet a moral obligation.

By maintaining farm income, thus assuring a high national income, the Republican Party can demonstrate that it is a party of prosperity and plenty.

I frankly feel that active and vigorous promotion of this plan will bring a Republican victory in 1950 and again in 1952. In the interests of American agriculture and in the interests of the Republican Party I hope the GOP will get behind this or a similar proposal.

As a political party we are not discharging our obligations to the American people by blinding criticizing the Brannan scheme without offering something constructive in its place.

Furthermore we, who are interested in Republican gains at the polls, cannot expect to win the vote of the American farmer unless we offer him a plan that will solve his price problem and at the same time preserve his basic American freedoms.

I have spoken frankly but from the heart, and have appreciated your attention. I earnestly feel that unless we awake to the fact that there is a farm problem and present some constructive answer—I don't claim that my plan is the only one—that we will fail to fulfill the trust that the American people have placed in us as a political party.

Failure to deal with the problem in a forthright and constructive manner can mean the difference between prosperity and depression for the United States and victory and defeat for the Republican Party.

Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very informative article on the Colorado River controversy, written by one of the outstand-

ing citizens of Los Angeles, Mr. Marshall Stimson. Mr. Stimson is not only one of the pioneers of Los Angeles, but he has been active in support of the municipal-owned department of water and power which is so vitally interested in this controversy. He is always out in front in good government.

The article follows:

COLORADO RIVER CONTROVERSY

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

That the facts regarding the claims of the States of Arizona and California to the water of the Colorado River are not generally known, especially in the East, prompts me to make this statement.

In 1921 or 1922, when the question of a low or high dam was being considered, I was sent by the Los Angeles Water and Power Board to Washington to interview the then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover. It had been pretty well agreed that a low dam to control the flood waters of the river was a necessity. Regarding a high dam, there was opposition from two sources. The Southern California Edison Co. did not want the competition of public power, and the immense expense of a high dam caused strong opposition in Congress.

I was instructed to ask for Mr. Hoover's approval of a high-dam project and to assure him that in the event it was built, an aqueduct would be built to carry the water, and that power lines would be built to carry the power produced, except that which might be desired by Nevada or Arizona. Had it not been for that promise the dam would not have been built, because Congress would never have authorized it unless there was a chance of obtaining revenue that would pay the cost of the dam.

On March 24, 1922, the Colorado River compact was signed, whereby the upper States—Wyoming, Colorado, portions of New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona, known as the Upper Basin States—were to be allowed 7,500,000 acre-feet, and the Lower Basin States, composed of part of Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, were to have rights to 7,500,000 acre-feet. Arizona, alone, did not sign. However, California did, with the understanding that 4,400,000 acre-feet and one-half of the surplus would go to southern California.

Southern California immediately began work on its two projects, the aqueduct and the power-transmission lines, and it has completely fulfilled all obligations made to induce the building of the Hoover Dam.

Later, a treaty was made between the United States and Mexico, whereby 1,500,000 acre-feet of the river water were allocated to Mexico, and by the same treaty Mexico granted to the United States certain rights to Rio Grande water in Texas.

Largely, the same group in Congress that thus took away some of the water to which southern California was entitled, and gave it to Mexico, recently voted in the Senate to support the central Arizona project.

This undertaking involves an expenditure of over $700,000,000. It contemplates diversion of 1,200,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River into southern Arizona. This, of course, will come largely out of southern California's share.

Those who have studied the Arizona project say that the cost of the irrigation system can never be financed by the revenues derived from the lands upon which it is supposed to spread the water. It is estimated it would cost $1,750 per acre to bring this water to land in the Salt River Valley, and that the production therefrom will be largely in lines in which we now have an overproduction.

I read a rather pathetic story entitled, "Voices From the Purple Sage," by Harlan Trott, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. A Pima Indian was complaining of the loss of water which had been used by his people for many generations, by a diversion of irrigation water on lands outside the Indian reservation. It is to be noted, however, that it was the Arizona people who took this water from the Pima Indians, and not southern California.

Some parts of California, especially around San Diego, have faced a severe water shortage. That can be met only by use of Colorado River water.

On the basis of an estimate, an agreement was signed with the various California agencies, for the use of 5,362,000 acre feet by portions of southern California.

In a decision by the Supreme Court by Justice Stone, it was decided that the use of water by California was restricted to 5,484,580 acre feet annually.

The Metropolitan Water District in 1931 voted a bond issue of $220,000,000 to finance the aqueduct and, of course, bonded itself heavily to construct the power equipment.

It is understood that the negotiations have failed, arbitration is not feasible, and California contends that the matter should be settled by litigation before the United States Supreme Court.

This seems far more equitable than a political determination by Congress, when it is clearly apparent by the vote of the Senate that neither the justice of California's claim nor the consideration of the question of general public benefit, may be the basis for a decision in the House.

It is submitted that the results which might be obtained from the central Arizona project do not justify the expenditure of so great a sum as $700,000,000, and the possible severe loss to a community which made possible the building of the Hoover Dam.

The story which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of February 24, 1950, admits that the only way any substantial return can be made for the Government's investment in the central Arizona project is from revenue derived from the power purchased by Southern California.

It is of the utmost importance that the entire Nation understand these facts: That it was on account of Southern California's pledge that the Hoover Dam was built, and that practically all of the money advanced came from Southern California, and that they could further recognize that Southern California is expected to pay the greater portion of the expense of the central Arizona project.

Taking these facts into consideration, a detached observer, it would seem, would be justified in giving a conscientious opinion that Southern California was right in its position that the Supreme Court should first pass upon the respective water rights of both California and Arizona, then the feasibility of the central Arizona project could be considered on its merits and in the light of the water to which Arizona would be entitled.

MARSHALL STIMSON.

LOS ANGELES.

AMVETS To Urge Federal Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in all sections of our country, people in every walk of life are becoming more and more conscious of the need for economy in Government and reduction in taxes.

I was glad to note that at a recent meeting in Washington, D. C., of the AMVETS organization, a resolution was adopted calling upon Congress to reduce expenditures and to cut Government costs.

The resolution was introduced by Mr. Joseph S. Crespi, of Atlanta, Ga., vice president of the national service foundation of AMVETS.

I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Crespi for drawing and introducing the resolution and to congratulate the AMVETS upon their action in adopting it and going on record in favor of economy in Government and reduction in taxes.

Under leave previously granted, I insert herewith a newspaper item regarding this action, this being a clipping from the Atlanta Constitution of March 28, 1950:

AMVETS To URGE FEDERAL ECONOMY

The AMVETS will call upon Congress to be more reasonable in further taxation as well as expenditures.

A resolution to this effect was introduced by Joe Crespi, of Atlanta, national executive committeeman of AMVETS, at a meeting of the committee in Washington and passed unanimously by the group.

Back in Atlanta, Crespi said yesterday the committee would call the Appropriations Committee's attention to the fact that in 152 years, from 1789 to 1940, the Government spent $167,000,000,000, as compared with the $177,000,000,000 they spent between 1946 and 1949, excluding the cost of World War II, which runs into many more billions.

Crespi was elected vice president of the national service foundation of AMVETS at the meeting.

The Answer to Commodity Credit Corporation Defeatism—Use Farm Surplus To Spur Development of Nonfood Farm Product Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1950, Ralph S. Trigg, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, informed Congress that the American taxpayer has more than $4,000,000,000 invested in farm price supports. My people out in Nebraska find it difficult to grasp the enormity of this amount of money. I can sympathize with them. It is beyond the power of most of the Members of Congress to understand why such a sum is placed within the power of a single subdivision of one agency to administer. The only way I know of to explain what $4,000,000,000 represents is to compare it to some known quantity. $4,000,000,000 means approximately the sum of the total holdings of Ford, General Motors, and Standard Oil. $4,000,000,000 means an amount approximately two times as great

as all the deposits, loans, and investments of every bank in the State of Nebraska.

Over 2 weeks ago, on March 15, I included my observations on what the Commodity Credit Corporation could do with the vast surplus of farm products, some of which may now be rotting in their warehouses and elevators. My suggestion was this: Make available to the new industries which are engaged, or which will be engaged, in the manufacture of nonfood goods from farm crops those farm surpluses now stored by the CCC at a price which would stimulate the growth of such industries. The products of the farm to be used as food can be utilized by the American consuming public. Fair farm prices can be consistently maintained.

It is now necessary to emphasize a matter of timing.

I repeat that my remarks on the disposal of CCC surpluses through using them in the development of industries dependent for their raw materials on the farmer were included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 15.

The facts on which my remarks were based were requested through usual channels from Dr. G. E. Hilbert, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry, Department of Agriculture, around the middle of February.

Now, I want to call your attention to an article from the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 30, 1950. Note the date—2 weeks after my remarks appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article is an account of the Fifteenth Annual Chemurgic Conference:

(By N. S. Haseltine)

Development of surgical sponges which can safely be left in the patient's body was disclosed here yesterday by a Government scientist.

The surgical accessory is made from specially processed cornstarch which body tissues can readily absorb, said Dr. G. E. Hilbert, chief of the Agriculture Department's bureau of agricultural and industrial chemistry.

He displayed the new product at opening session of the fifteenth annual Chemurgic Conference, at Hotel Statler. Chemurgy is defined as the science of making new uses of agricultural products.

The 3-day conference convened formally at an opening luncheon session with a welcoming challenge by President Truman to put science to work to maintain good income levels for farmers and higher living standards for all.

RESEARCH FINANCING URGED

The challenge was met by Wheeler McMillen, president of the National Farm Chemurgic Council, of New York City, with a request for research financing similar to the $2,000,000,000 spent for the Manhattan project in developing the atom bomb.

Dr. Hilbert, in discussing the new uses of cornstarch, said the material is formed by boiling cornstarch to a paste, then freezing it, and finally thawing it and pressing out the water. "The sponge product," he said, "dries up hard and brittle."

"In clinical usage, in New York, the cornstarch sponges are proving as efficient as the rubber varieties now in use," Dr. Hilbert said. "They have been used with exceptionally good results in obstetrical cases involving profuse bleeding," he added.

The surgical sponge was only one of a number of recently-developed new products from agricultural crops. Others, modeled by Congressmen's daughters in an amateur fashion show, included raincoats of water-resistant cotton, linen-like cotton dresses, and a variety of clothing now being made from corn.

TRUMAN ENDORSES PROGRAM

President Truman in his message sent to the conference, urged the chemurgists to find new ways to use our increasing abundance so as to yield a good income for farmers and at the same time result in a higher standard of living for all our people.

McMillen, without direct reference to Truman's message, said that in the past 20 years the Government has spent $20,000,000,000 in agriculture subsidy (price support).

McMillen then advocated billions for research, and eventually not 1 cent for subsidies.

"What more splendid economy could be proposed than a 'Manhattan project' for the kind of creative research that experience has soundly proved could prevent agricultural surpluses (by new products and new uses for surplus crops), abolish the need for agricultural subsidies, and add the blessings of new wealth, new comforts, new abundance, and new hopes for all mankind?" he declared.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post article brings out—2 weeks after my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that President Truman is apparently in favor of putting science to work devising new means for producing nonfood goods out of raw materials from the farm. He favors such action but neglects to present any method by which the desired end might be attained. In the same article, Mr. Wheeler McMillen, president of the National Farm Chemurgic Council of New York City does suggest that research financing in this field be backed with $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to be spent in a way similar to that used in the Manhattan project for developing the atom bomb. two billion dollars is almost the exact amount that all the banks in Nebraska have as assets in the form of loans, investments, and deposits.

I think the Nebraska way is much fairer, much more practical and much more American than either a spending suggestion or no suggestion at all. My way—the Nebraska way—is to support farm prices for food crops at a just level; to dispose of American food crops, as food, both at home and abroad; and to make the vast CCC-held farm-product surpluses available to the manufacturers who have started or who will start nonfood agriculture product industries at such a price as give drive and encouragement to these industries which may well prove the key to a prosperous future for our beloved Republic.

New York State Municipal Utilities Oppose the Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the steadily growing opposition throughout the Nation to H. R. 934 and S. 75, the central Arizona project bill, is indicated in a telegram I shall submit here. The telegram opposing the Arizona project, which would cost the taxpayers of the country at least $1,500,000,000, was sent to a number of Congressmen on the committee.

The telegram follows:

Your strong opposition to central Arizona project as provided by terms of bill No. S. 75 and House No. 934 is sought on grounds that costs involved are exorbitant and allocations planned are most unjust. Provisions of bill would heavily and unjustifiably burden power costs with irrigation costs. Interested as we are and have been in public power development we cannot approve this type legislation. Even Federal Power Commission states that costs for irrigation would be so high that power could not possibly be low-cost power. In view of fact that this legislation would most certainly injure entire public-power program severely and expose same to attack by privately owned utilities we respectfully request and urge you to vote against the same.

NEW YORK STATE MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITIES ASSOCIATION,
HAROLD W. LAUDER, *President.*
B. N. SPARKS, *Executive Secretary.*

The Reserves—a Vital Element in Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the United States rests on the solid foundation of devotion to duty as expressed in many fields and by many groups. Two important elements of this strength were joined in an inspiring demonstration of patriotism on Saturday evening, April 1, at Akron, Ohio. There the Ohio Squadron of the Navy Club of the United States of America gathered in convention, and the principal speaker was a man with outstanding qualifications to discuss a subject of interest to the Navy clubs of the Nation as well as every other city in the land. The speaker was Rear Adm. Irving M. McQuiston, United States Naval Reserve, of Washington, D. C., who serves as adviser to the Deputy Chief for Naval Operations (Air) on Naval Air Reserve matters. Admiral McQuiston took for his subject the importance of the Reserve program in maintaining an adequate national defense, a subject in which he is completely informed due to a lifetime spent in the service and his present status as the only Reserve officer of flag rank in his field of duty.

Because there is Nation-wide interest in the role of reserve military forces, I am including in the RECORD, under permission granted, the text of Admiral McQuiston's address. It deserves the consideration of all Members of Congress as an important aid in charting the future course of our national defense policy:

It is a great pleasure or me to be able to speak to you tonight. At the outset I might

say that naval aviation is the one element of the National Defense Establishment in which I'm most interested.

I recognize among you, people whom I've known in all branches of the Navy, and I know that all of you are interested in what the Navy is doing today. I imagine that some of you are concerned and worried about recent reports of cut-back, censorship, and internal strife within the Defense Establishment. It is natural that any organization such as the Department of Defense must expect certain growing pains during its shake-down.

Just as a beginning I would like to point out that what has happened in the Department of Defense has not been a merger but instead unification. I think the difference is important. Merger implies that the various organizations lose their identity within the Department of Defense. Nothing could be further from the truth. Due to the fact that we are living in a shakily peaceful world, all branches of the defense forces of the United States have been required to conform to a budget which will give the country a maximum safety at a minimum cost to our economy. This is nothing unusual. During each demobilization period, we have gone through problems similar to those which the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are being confronted with today. During the war, when our enemies who could not match our military and productive power were being forced to their knees, we had a dangerous blank check. While we were certain of the outcome of the war, we expended all our efforts toward speeding up and cheapening that struggle in terms of human lives. That, of course, was most important because in terms of real value, it would have been far better to have saved one of those lives instead of saving a million dollars of our war budget.

I think it is worth while to look back through the past generation to see what has just happened to the art of war, particularly as it applies to the Navy. During World War I, the Battle of Jutland was almost the end of the era of the battleship, although very few of us could see it at that time. Except for comparatively minor incidents, Jutland represented the end of a development which had its origin in the Spanish-American War. Without realizing the implications of the development of the aircraft, we went ahead on the theory that the battleship was the center and most powerful weapon available to naval forces.

The United States, dedicated to the principles of the League of Nations and the Geneva Charter, hoped for a world of peaceful endeavor. Our hopes led us to a point where we of the military were forced to expend our limited funds, not in the maintenance of large forces, but instead, in the development of new weapons and techniques.

During this period I was concerned with the Naval Air Reserve as most of you know. We started the program on a shoestring, and a very frayed one at that. We begged, borrowed, and stole from various agencies of the First Naval District to get the minimum amount of equipment with which to establish the base I was concerned with, that at Squantum, Mass. I remember that Admiral Byrd, at that time a lieutenant, came to Boston under orders to find out whether it would be worth while to put in a training unit in that area. We took money from our own pockets to buy gasoline. We shoveled cinders provided by the commandant of the First Naval District to make a runway we could use. With the help of the one carpenter we had we repaired a war-weary hangar on the old submarine base at Squantum. Somehow we managed to keep two training-type seaplanes in good enough shape so that the aviators attached to the unit were able to fly.

That was the beginning of the program that I've seen grow into a very powerful yet very inexpensive part of our national defense structure. Within a very few years after the Air Reserve's beginning, Admiral Moffett, the first Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, was able to prove the need for a well-trained Air Reserve within the Navy. This was in spite of the lack of interest that the country had as a whole in matters concerning a future war. Hopefully, all of us believed that we would not have to fight again.

The Air Reserve expanded to an organization which broke the back of the Japanese aggressors in 1942. As I said before, I've been personally concerned with the Naval Air Reserve program since the First World War, and I have been active in it since 1930. We are proud of the fact that 90 percent of the naval aviators at the two crucial battles of the Navy in the Pacific war, namely, Midway and the Coral Sea, were Naval Air Reserves trained in the naval aviation cadet training program prior to the war. Without these young men and without the hundreds of thousands of reserves in other parts of the Naval Establishment, the United States might well have lost its greatest fight for its own freedom and the freedom of other peoples in the world.

We won that war 5 years ago. During the time since VJ-day, a unification act has been passed. This act has had its enemies and its friends. During World War II it frequently became evident that a more closely knit organization than we had then could have made many of our difficulties easier to settle. The question, of course, was how to achieve a unification among the services which would not destroy their individual abilities and responsibilities. During the period when this act was being considered, there was a lot of fear both within and outside of the Military Establishment as to whether the services would be merged and consequently would lose their individual identities and, more important, their own capabilities. As a matter of fact, the Navy fully supports unification and has been practicing it within its own family for 150 years.

Section 2 of the final act states that the services will retain their autonomy and guarantees the integrity of naval aviation and the Marine Corps. Just to keep the record straight, I quote from section 2 of the act:

"In enacting this legislation it is the intention of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide three military departments separately administered for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the Marine Corps), and the Air Force; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control of the Secretary of Defense, but not to merge them; to provide for unified control and for their integration into an effective team of land, naval, and air forces but not to establish a single chief of staff over the armed forces nor an armed forces general staff."

We've been living under this unification act now for several years. Under it, the Navy has been charged with responsibilities as important as any of the jobs it has done in the past. Frankly, I believe that many of them will be absolutely vital to the continuing safety of the United States. During these days of indefinite peace, cold war, and if necessary, hot water, the guaranty of the freedom of the seas and the Navy's traditional ability to give assistance to the other services will insure the safety and continued prosperity of all of us. In spite of the fact that some people think that the need for naval forces has ceased to exist, one of the great scientists of our time, Dr. Vannevar Bush, commented in his recent and extremely important book, Modern Arms and Freemen:

"The mission of the Navy in the future will be as important and as difficult as it ever has been in history. It will need to employ modern techniques to the utmost and in ample quantity. We are a power in the world and we intend to exert that power, if need be, far from our shores to support our friends and strike an enemy where he is more vulnerable. We shall still need to sweep enemy forces from the seas, whether they are under its surface or above it."

One of the greatest menaces our position as a sea power will be called upon to defeat is that of the submarine. The thin-skinned, slow-moving weapon of World War I grew into a vicious, powerful threat in World War II. In both wars it almost defeated us. In 1942 German submarines were sinking or severely damaging an average of over a half million tons of Allied shipping. At that rate we could not supply Great Britain to protect herself, to say nothing of mounting an offensive against "fortress Europe." We beat World War II's submarine, but by a slim margin. At the end of that war Germany had developed several new modifications which make it a far more vicious and dangerous threat to our security than there has ever been before. The snorkel, for example, makes the submarine almost immune to aircraft search. New engines and streamlining have made the submarine's increase in underwater speed difficult for any of our normal surface craft to follow. If we cannot guarantee freedom of our sea lanes for our merchant shipping we are going to be in great difficulty. So much of our vital raw material stocks comes from overseas that to lose our traditional freedom of the seas would cripple us severely.

Ever since the end of World War II this threat of submarine warfare has received full attention from the Navy. Just last week Admiral Momsen commented that we were approaching the position where the submarine would no longer have the advantage it has had since the development of the snorkel and other improvements. This is a great step forward for the Navy, because without the ability to control the seas on the surface, beneath the surface, and over it the Navy cannot do its job. Without the ability to bring our vital necessities to our ports and without the ability to take men and supplies to foreign shores we can do nothing to guarantee our freedom nor the freedom of other peoples in the world. Without the power of the Navy we would become an island of democracy in an ocean of dictatorship very shortly.

Today the Navy is a great power for the safety of the United States and the peace and freedom of the world. We in the United States have returned our Military Establishment to a peacetime budget based on certain requirements and with a calculated risk involved. Within this budget, we in the Navy have developed our forces along the following lines. We believe that for the present circumstances we must have a small, well-trained, up-to-date force in being, these are the operating forces. To go with these we have a research and development program which is charged with the responsibility for the development of new weapons and techniques for the art of sea warfare. Some of the greatest scientists in the world are involved in this program, and we know that their efforts continually contribute to the efficiency and potency of the Navy. The ships and men of our fleets are continually training and practicing with their weapons, both old and new, to guarantee maximum safety to all of us. During these days of trouble these same forces are appearing in threatened parts of the world as visible proof of our refusal to permit any free men to be subjugated against their will. It is an argument to give pause to any world power which tries to enslave any group of men.

Behind these operating forces and the research and development program comes our Reserve program, of which I am very proud.

Thinking back to the dark days of 1942, I'm amazed at the speed with which we were able to expand our entire Military Establishment. Our Reserve forces must give any potential aggressor a lot of worry. In connection with the Naval Air Reserve I like to think that the infant organization of my early days grew into a giant that helped to beat half the world in the last war. When we started out we had nothing; by 1940 we had 17 Air Reserve stations. We were training a considerable number of cadets every year. These were the young men who were the well-trained forces available when we needed them. After the disarmament of the 1920's and 1930's, and with the small number of men available to the military up until the expansion program of the late thirties, the Navy and naval aviation almost pulled themselves up by their boot straps to enter World War II with the power they did. Combined with the Reserve forces was the productive potential of American industry. No one nation in the world nor any conceivable group of nations can match that industry in its ability to flood the defense establishment with more than it can use. Our supplies of material produced by this great industrial Nation has done a tremendous amount to give our military forces the power they have and will have in any future conflict.

To get back to the Reserve forces, I think that any future aggressors should look carefully at the trained men and women who are available to the military forces in the United States in an emergency. In place of the two airplanes and the small group of men with which the Naval Air Reserve got started after World War I, we now have 12,000 officers and 47,000 well-trained men who can fit into a wartime organization immediately. These are modern minutemen. They are linked into our mobilization plans to be available practically overnight. They represent a potential force which can help to put back on the seas a fleet of carrier task forces which no combination of air, surface, or undersea fleets can stop. The potential aggressors of the world will find that they face a new up-to-date Navy which can move, in the same way that it did in World War II, where it wants to move and defeat almost any combination of military strength.

The Naval Air Reserve today is very important to naval aviation. We're flying off 27 air stations right now, and our efficiency and training is excellent. It isn't a paper organization either. Last year we sent most of our carrier aircraft squadrons back to sea. Note this was 4 years after the end of the war. There were new men in these squadrons, along with the combat-training veterans of World War II. We put them aboard carriers for the first time since the end of the war to conduct maneuvers and to practice the proven techniques of that war. Their performance exceeded all expectations. They had no accidents to speak of and their efficiency was so high that they drew praise from fleet commanders and from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

In addition to what I have just said, I would like to invite your attention to the fact that the Navy Department is exerting every effort to translate available appropriations into maximum fighting strength and mobilization potential. Savings made are generally available for increasing the state of readiness or authorized forces. Economies already effected have permitted increasing previously planned fleet strength by one large carrier and one cruiser, to provide additional equipment for antisubmarine warfare, and to augment general readiness. Planned economies are an important contributing factor in retaining two additional marine battalions. The Naval Reserve is included in this effort to provide for a ready and able force, and an example of that is that at present the Navy is studying the feasibility of establishing a lighter than air organized reserve squadron in the Akron area. This record speaks for itself.

Naval aviation and the Navy itself are made up of three parts: The operating forces, the research program, and the Reserve. Together, they are a powerful force for peace and a competent weapon in war. No one of them can exist alone; likewise, no one of the three military services can win a war. Under our present system and with an efficient military organization and a free research and development program, we in the Military Establishment make up a team which will do much to guarantee the peace of the world or defeat any enemies to freemen everywhere.

New Deal Propaganda in Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

NEW DEAL PROPAGANDA IN THE COLLEGES

To judge from the news report of the recent meeting of the American Association of University Professors in Cleveland, no delegate raised the question which ought to be agitating this group as it has never been stirred before. We refer, of course, to the efforts of the Federal Government to alter the curriculum and the methods of teaching of the social sciences in the colleges.

The charge is readily documented. Within the Federal Security Agency headed by Oscar Ewing there is an office of education and within it a division of higher education. Mr. Ewing recently issued a circular advertising for a man to head up his department of sociology in the division. He is offering a starting salary of $7,600, rising to $8,600, which is higher pay than all but a few sociologists receive. Mr. Ewing expects that this bait will land a man of consequence in the academic world, a man who commands the respect of university professors, because only such a man is likely to prove useful to Mr. Ewing in accomplishing the ends he has in view.

The advertisement starts out with a long paragraph listing the attributes of the man to be selected. He should know the place of sociology in the college curriculum, the nature of the courses taught, the textbooks, the need for education in the various branches of this subject, and "the characteristics of faculty personnel engaged in the teaching of sociology." We don't know what the quoted words were intended to mean, but they could mean that he should know who are the collectivists who will follow Mr. Ewing gladly, and who are the believers in liberty who can be expected to buck him.

Then follows another paragraph telling what the man is expected to accomplish. The language is mostly gobbledygook, but it comes down to this: Dr. $7,600 is to do all he can to persuade the faculties of sociology in the colleges and universities to amend their curricula and modify their teaching methods to accord with the notions of Mr. Ewing.

"More specifically," says the advertisement, "the specialist for sociology will be responsible for such activities as the following: * * * (f) promoting and stimulating cooperative experimental studies and demonstrations of improved practices in the teaching of sociology in colleges and universities; and (g) upon request, participating in surveys or evaluations of the programs of colleges and universities pertinent to the teaching of sociology."

The operative word in (f) is "promoting" and no great attention need be paid to "upon request" in (g) because Mr. Ewing has already said he is going to hire the kind of fellow who won't have trouble getting invitations to meddle.

If the National Association of Manufacturers were to advertise in any such terms, the Association of University Professors would throw a fit, and rightly. But Mr. Ewing gets away with it in spite of the fact that he speaks for the biggest of all businesses and in spite of the fact that no man in this country has as much advantage to gain as Mr. Ewing has from twisting the teaching of sociology to his and the New Deal's purposes.

Mr. Ewing wants compulsory medical insurance. He favors huge Federal grants for education and for expanded social services. He wishes the young people of this country to believe in the wisdom and goodness of his program and he will be helped in all of this if the professors of sociology propagandize for his causes. He is out to make New Deal votes and to indoctrinate in collectivism a crop of college-trained bureaucrats to serve in his offices and divisions. All these are plausible reasons for his trying to influence the teaching of sociology in the colleges, a matter in which the Federal Government has no legitimate excuse for meddling.

Apparently this is all to the good so far as the American Association of University Professors is concerned. Maybe they can't get sore at anybody who offers $7,600 salaries. But just what do they mean when they talk about resisting threats to academic freedom?

Partial Answer to Wheat Surplus in More-Flour Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent article by John Cipperly, Washington correspondent of the Northwestern Miller, and published in the March 28 issue of that publication, is of interest to everyone who is desirous of expanding outlets for farm products:

LEGISLATORS SAMPLE MORE-FLOUR BREAD—BREAD MADE WITH 16 PERCENT MORE FLOUR SHIPPED TO CAPITAL—WHEAT-STATE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES SPONSOR DISTRIBUTION—PARTIAL ANSWER TO WHEAT SURPLUS SEEN POSSIBLE IN NEW IDEA

(By John Cipperly)

WASHINGTON.—The House and Senate restaurants March 22 featured samples of the newly developed bread containing 16 percent more flour. Wheat-State Senators and Representatives sponsored the luncheon distribution of 500 loaves of the bread after it had been flown to the Nation's Capital from Hutchinson, Kans. Mounting wheat surpluses and the reported per capita decline in flour consumption in the United States whetted the interest of the wheat-State legislators, who hoped that part of the answer to these problems might be found in the new bread formula.

The idea was introduced recently in western Kansas by Morris Coover, Kinsley, Kans., business man, who accompanied the shipment to Washington. He has turned the

promotion of the project over to the Western Kansas Development Association, of which Robert Bird is executive secretary with headquarters at Garden City, Kans. The bread distributed here was baked by the bakery division of J. S. Dillon & Sons Co., Hutchinsan, Kans., chain store. The principal change in the more-flour formula is the inclusion of 110 pounds of white flour and 6 pounds of whole-wheat flour, compared with 100 pounds of white flour in the formula for the standard loaf.

On the surface Mr. Coover appeared to have provided a very simple answer to the wheat surplus problem: Put more flour in bread.

BREAD PALATABLE

The Dillon loaf, baked along the lines suggested by Mr. Coover, was palatable bread. It could be buttered generously without crumbling and then folded, sandwich style, for eating.

One Washington baker pointed out that the Coover idea could have been accomplished by the Dillon Bakery without the addition of 16 pounds more flour to the original bread formula. Rather than adding flour, this operator said all he needed to do was to reduce the water content.

It was also noted that the Coover formula, with the greater flour content in the dough mass, tends to reduce the shortening and milk and sugar content of the finished loaves, since no increase in these ingredients is provided to compensate for the increased amount of flour.

Should the Coover idea take hold it would unquestionably expand the use of flour considerably, a point which bakers and millers understand. The significant thing about the Coover idea is that it is another sign of private initiative's ability to explore new avenues of approach to existing problems. It indicates an awakening interest in the problem of disposing of our wheat surpluses. Each slight gain will lead others to attempt further experiments.

A SIMPLE IDEA

Mr. Coover's idea is a simple one. Sparked by a taste memory, possibly the most impelling factor in the sales of food products, Mr. Coover has tried to recapture the type of bread he remembers eating as a youth. He has bypassed the chemists' laboratories and the technician's control towers and asked only that more flour be put into a loaf of bread.

The advent of the more-flour bread comes at an auspicious time when Congress has been viewing the baking industry with a critical eye. This criticism has been directed at the alleged substitution of synthetic products for those of the farm by the baking industry. A Senate Agriculture Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator GUY GILLETTE (Democrat, Iowa) has already closely questioned baking industry leaders on their manufacturing practices and their profits. Other congressional leaders, particularly those from the wheat-producing States, sensing a ground swell of criticism of the farm price support programs from urban areas, are looking for a weapon to strike back and may be ready for an all-out attack on the processing industries which use agricultural commodities.

One baking industry leader after examining the Coover formula noted the percentage reduction of shortening, dried milk, and sugar in the individual loaves made from the Coover mix and expressed concern that a broad use of the Coover formula might provoke criticism from the shortening and dried milk industries, since the Coover plan indicated a reduction in the use of these farm products.

CONTROVERSY PROVOKED

Even if the Coover plan never expands beyond the borders of the State of Kansas it has the great virtue of provoking controversy which will lead others to try and try again to make a better loaf of bread. It also seems possible that the solution of the national farm program does not lie in congressional tinkering but the law of supply and demand and in the ingenuity and initiative of private enterprise in searching for broader markets and profits.

Businessmen in the food-processing and agricultural-distribution field see peril in the cure-alls of the farm price supporters to a point where they let their fears cloud their better judgments. There is reason to hope for a better day when consideration is given to such experiments as Mr. Coover's and the frozen-citrus-concentrate promotion, which saved the Florida citrus industry from the paralyzing effects of a Federal price-support program for that crop. Mr. Coover is pointing the way and inviting others to test their wits on one of the many national problems, the cures of which are too exclusively seen as legislative.

To the great credit of Mr. Coover he appears to have focussed the interest of a broad segment of the public and the baking industry on the use of wheat flour. He is a wheat farmer interested essentially in finding broader markets for that commodity. If his simple suggestion of using more flour in bread suceeds it is possible that the name "Coover" may become more widely and favorably known to wheat markets than those of Jim Patten and Leiter, of wheat-corner fame.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter writen by Mr. M. J. Molans, of Pittsburgh, Pa., addressed to the editor of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, published in the March 29, 1950, issue, endorsing statehood for Alaska:

Your feature articles and mighty editorials on Alaskan statehood are the most gratifying news so forcibly brought to the attention of your vast army of readers. These editorials together with the powerful cartoon by Burris Jenkins, Jr., not only stamps you as a great liberal and champion of true democracy but also as a modern Paul Revere. My sincere hope is, that every one of the 13 Senators you named will have read—and digested the arguments advanced for statehood, and having done so, open the door to our northern territory and welcome it into the family of our 48 States.

I am very familiar with Alaska's needs and problems. My son served with the engineers combat division which built the Alcan Highway and later transferred to the Aleutians, where he served on Attu, Kiska, Shemya, Adak, and Kodiak and during his reenlistment (1945–48) served on Ladd Field. I was in constant contact with conditions throughout Alaska as well as being informed through the pages of Alaska's leading paper (Jessen's Weekly) and through correspondence with Alaskan oldtimers who used to sum up their woes with "Give us statehood."

Back in October 1947, I sounded the alarm that Alaska may be our next Pearl Harbor. I cited the fortifications on Chukotskiy Peninsula, Siberia, a stone's throw from our territory across the Bering Strait, how American fishermen spotted the huge gun emplacements on the Russian side and reported their discovery to our officials at Ladd Field. That was in 1948. Imagine the progress Russia has made to date and how easily they can attack Pearl Harbor, Fairbanks, and all Alaska, if we don't strengthen our defenses there.

Alaskan statehood will unquestionably strengthen all of United States. Billy Mitchell warned "A strong Alaska means a strong America" so—what are we waiting for? If Patrick Henry were alive today, imagine what he would say right now.

Come, Senators, stop treating Alaska as a stepchild. Vote it State and make it a Gibraltar against any aggression from Russia, our potential enemy.

M. J. MOLANS.

What ECA Is Accomplishing in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond:

WHAT ECA IS ACCOMPLISHING IN EUROPE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.—The Congress of the United States shortly will be deciding one of the most important questions which will come before it this session—whether to approve the Economic Cooperation Administration request for a new appropriation of $2,900,000,000.

In making this decision, Congress undoubtedly will be responsive to American public opinion. As one who, for a period, is officially connected with ECA, it would not be proper for me to argue the case for the Marshall plan—and I will not do so. But I can offer a report on what is being accomplished in Europe and present the underlying facts as faithfully as I have been able to observe them at first hand during the past 8 months.

The prime task which Congress assigned to the ECA was to help the nations of western Europe achieve an economic recovery which would permit them to function without extraordinary outside aid. The purposes which motivated the Marshall plan were:

To rescue Europe from the brink of economic collapse to which the most destructive war in history had brought it.

To help rebuild a prospering and self-supporting Europe, without which a prospering and secure America would be jeopardized.

To bring about such improved social and political conditions as will enable free institutions to regain their strength and thereby resist the march of communism.

Measured in terms of the Marshall plan's basic objective and its central motives, what are the facts to report? Some of the principal facts are these:

It is accurate to say that the progress of the European recovery program—in production and trade, in expanding productive capacity, in restoring internal financial stability, and in slowly raising living standards—has exceeded the largest expectations of 2 years ago.

AGRICULTURE

When the Marshall plan started, millions of persons were going hungry. Today that menace has been removed. Today agricultural productivity as a whole has been brought nearly to the level of prewar, and, given favorable weather conditions, will reach the prewar level or exceed it during

the present crop year. This means an improving diet, but still a bare diet, since western Europe has 20,000,000 more persons to feed than before the war and is putting, by necessity, a very high percentage of its income into durable capital investment rather than consumer goods.

INDUSTRY

For the Marshall plan countries as a whole, industrial production has been raised one-third higher than it was in 1937. It took western Europe 7 years to regain its prewar level of production after World War I. Today, after 2 years of the Marshall plan and less than 5 years after the end of the far more destructive World War II, industrial production has been brought to 20 percent higher than 1938.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

Until the inflation which gripped the entirety of western Europe in 1946–47 was checked and brought under control, the nations could not even begin to rebuild their industrial plants. Today the governments have put their financial houses in better order. Prices generally are being held, and the outlook is encouraging.

Under the stimulus of sounder financial conditions and mounting production intra-European trade has improved. Total exports have risen 50 percent since 1947.

These are the facts which bear upon the question of whether a solid foundation of European recovery is being made.

Obviously, there are tough problems still to be met. To enable western Europe to close the dollar gap—or to bring it into manageable proportions—and to carry forward the essential economic unification needed to strengthen and secure the recovery already made are the two biggest jobs which face ECA during the next 2 years.

One question which frequently is asked officials of the ECA is whether the Marshall plan appropriations for the third year should not be substantially reduced, particularly in view of the need for governmental economy in the United States.

Facts rather than arguments are more useful in answering this question.

Marshall plan aid for western Europe for 1948–49 was about $5,800,000,000, including the special appropriation for Germany.

The appropriation for 1949–50 was about $4,200,000,000.

The ECA appropriation request which is now before Congress for 1950–51 is $2,900,000,000.

The Marshall plan is premised upon the principle of reducing the aid substantially every year, and the foregoing facts show wherein the ECA itself always has initiated these reductions rather than waiting for Congress to propose them.

What Is Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important task of the hour is a development of appreciation for the ideals of freedom and liberty we know as Americanism. Nowhere is the task more important or the results more encouraging than among the boys and girls in our schools. Elks' lodges across the Nation have been contributing to this valuable program by offering worth while cash prizes for the best essays on the subject written by students. Their essays have been uniformly able discussions of problems reflecting credit on themselves and the schools they are attending.

One of the most interesting essays, and winner of first place at Mount Carmel, Ill., High School, was written by Miss Barbara Van Ault, a senior, the editor of her high-school paper, and a member of the Future Teachers of America. Her essay makes good reading for every American, and offers a ray of encouraging hope for the manner in which today's young people are prepared to face their responsibilities in preserving representative government as we have known it in America. For these reasons, I am including the text of her essay under permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Each contestant included a short autobiographical sketch. Miss Van Ault's sketch and her prize-winning essay follow:

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

I was born in Princeton, Ind., July 14, 1932. My first 8 years of schooling were spent at the Count R. Lovellette grade school in Keensburg, after which I entered Mount Carmel high school, and will graduate from there this spring. In high school, I have been active in music, playing in the band, girls' orchestra, flute trio, singing in the glee club and a capella choir. I have been a contestant at both district and State music contests the last 3 years, and district debate contests this year. I am a member of the Future Teachers of America and editor of the high school newspaper.

BARBARA VAN AULT.

WHAT IS AMERICANISM?

Ask any true American for a definition of Americanism, and he will say that it is his faith in his country and Government, his respect and tribute to her traditions and ideals, his willingness to cooperate with others to fulfill her desires and commands.

It is the spirit of democracy that prevails throughout America, the essence of liberty held so dear in the heart of every American. The torch lifted high by the Statue of Liberty to spread its glow of freedom above our Nation's shores, the book of justice held firmly beneath her arm—these things are Americanism.

Stemming from our forefathers, who escaped from tyranny by sheer perseverance and belief in their dreams of freedom, Americanism, is our way of life, our democratic attributes. By virtue of their faith and constancy, their valiant struggles to gain a free life, we of this generation have been handed a firm foundation upon which to build and to keep as long as progress goes onward.

Americanism is the will of the people to build on that foundation, and to erect a structure that will last throughout the ages, a monument to the faith and deeds of the people who have strived through eras of prosperity, through times of despair and depression, to emerge from the mists of gloom to the sunshine of a Nation's wholeheartedness. It is the freedom of the people to carry out that will, to speak and write as they wish, without fear of depression by the Government.

It is this Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that makes Americanism what it is today—a realization of the hopes, fears and dreams of generations of American people, their abilities to live a life of happiness and freedom of spirit, as well as freedom of American principles.

Americanism is an indestructible quality of our Nation, a lasting quality that generations far into the future will still hold dear. It is through Americanism that any boy or girl can dream, and can make these dreams come true by working toward a higher goal of success.

The spirit that prompts our soldiers to offer their lives without thought of personal gain to defend our Nation's creed is Americanism, helping to spread our ideals in far-flung nations of the world.

It is the generosity of the American people, their willingness to devote countless time and effort to serve mankind diligently, their generous gifts to help their fellowman. The American Red Cross polio, tuberculosis, cancer, and heart-disease drives, the individual to struggle to help the unfortunate and crippled children are symbolic of the great devotion to Americanism in our country today.

The freedom to express our true faith in any religion that we choose is Americanism. Americans are free to worship in any church, at any time. They are not denied the privilege because of an overruling Government. Religion has been outlawed in some countries; in America, it is looked up to and praised for all to hear.

It is the right of the parent to chastise the child, to correct him when he has done wrong, without fear of an armed policeman saying, "You may not punish your own child—that is up to the government." It is this freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom from despair, freedom to say what we please when we please, freedom to put our thoughts in writing for the whole Nation to read, freedom to carry out our own individual plans, freedom to worship in the church of our choice, freedom to help ourselves on the road to success, that makes Americanism a truly great loyalty to a truly great Nation.

Yes, ask any American for his definition of Americanism. His ability and willingness to answer your question is Americanism.

BARBARA VAN AULT.

KEENSBURG, ILL.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, today a letter came to me from Commander Jack F. Jacobson, of the Department of Nebraska Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

With timely remarks in his letter Commander Jacobson included a very important editorial which appeared recently in the official publication of his organization. Because of its great importance, I include it with my remarks so that all Members may read it and that it be made part of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Everywhere nowadays seriously minded, mature people engage in conversation which concerns our Government and our national debt. From Maine to California, from our northern border to the Gulf, the average citizen manifests a deep and growing concern, and looks toward Washington for an answer.

Two important questions are upon the mind of the public, and an answer is sought. This matter of cold war and our national debt are now of long standing and of sufficient duration to become irksome and disquieting.

In this matter of cold war, conditions are drifting steadily toward a state of siege. Regulation, regimentation, and martial law are casting their shadow upon this free land of ours, unless the present drift is halted and some positive action is set in motion.

In 1917 America went to war. Many died in the mortal combat to rid this earth of militarism.

Only a few years ago, militarism, the scourge of civilization, was permitted to sprout and grow until its weight and might had to justify its existence and purpose. Aggressor nations were literally wiped out and thousands of Americans died in the cause to rid this world of aggression.

Militarism again is permitted to flourish, for no other purpose than to back with force the aggression now in progress. The method now used by this military power is—infiltrate—then conquer. This scheme and method has recurred with alarming regularity, and at this moment no frontiers are respected, at least not safe from infiltration.

Millions of Chinese will augment hostages and political prisoners in the slave camps scattered throughout the Siberias. All this power's efforts and energies are directed toward one accomplishment. The present number of military divisions under arms, the number of aircraft, and the astounding quantities of submarines in service, clearly show that this power intends to wage a global war.

Possessing all the natural resources required, and an abundance of manpower, the weapons of aggression only need more time to fashion and forge. When that time has elapsed, this country will be the major objective, because penetrating and overrunning the frontiers of many of our present United Nations will require only hours, and actual invasion of our own soil would soon begin.

Time is the most precious commodity—it is irreplaceable. So while there is still time, let the people of the United States mould the opinion, and shape a directive to this power that aggression must cease and that we the people will back this demand with force.

There cannot be any appeasement or any procrastination in this.

Such a policy calls for a prompt and realistic appraisal of our national debt. The national annual budget must be given corrective consideration. Along with all of our resources which must be guardedly preserved, our national wealth should and must receive a prime consideration. It must also be given high priority in the scheme of our national security and national defense.

Our present national debt is looked upon favorably by this aggressor. Our deficit spending may well be allied; be it in fact or only in theory to the supposition that the United States could not bridge a crisis, nor wage another war, and survive, with the national debt as it stands today. Solvency should stand high upon the agenda of our national defense.

The Case Against the Mills Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, while the new excise-tax reduction bill has not yet been unveiled, most of the Members of this body have heard rumors that it will contain provisions to speed up the collection of corporate taxes. This proposal was first offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 25 issue of Business Week, which, in my opinion, states valid reasons why this proposal should be thoroughly studied before enactment. The editorial follows:

[From Business Week of March 25, 1950]

THE CASE AGAINST THE MILLS BILL

There is something ominous about the way congressional discussion of tax reform keeps looping back to the idea of speeding up the collection of corporate taxes in 1951. It's ominous because it shows that Congress still won't face up to the hard facts of our fiscal situation.

Congress is understandably unhappy about the spot it is in. Even without badly needed tax reforms, President Truman's budget for fiscal 1951 will show a deficit of about $5,000,000,000. Any attempt to reform our painful and dangerously burdensome tax system will automatically increase that deficit—unless Congress can somehow bring itself to cut expenditures. And cutting expenditures in an election year is something that every Congressman tries to duck.

The speed-up idea—usually called the Mills bill because it was originally sponsored by Representative WILBUR MILLS—seems to offer an alluringly simply way out. On its face, it would boost revenues without increasing the tax burden. That's a neat trick if you can pull it off.

Under present law, corporations pay their taxes in four installments spread out through the year following the year to which the tax applies. This year, for instance, they will be paying up their 1949 liabilities. Next year they will start paying the taxes due on 1950 income.

The Mills plan would accelerate collections by requiring corporations to pay all their 1950 taxes in two installments in the first 6 months of 1951 instead of spreading payments over the whole year.

Over the long run this would make no difference in the total amount of taxes due. But in the year when the switch was made it would produce a big jump in government revenue. The Treasury would cram a year and a half of tax collections into a single 12-month period. In fiscal 1951, this would boost its take by something like $5,000,000,000.

It looks too good to be true—particularly to a Congressman who desperately wants a way of raising revenues without slapping on new taxes.

TRICKY BOOKKEEPING

It is too good to be true. Fundamentally, it's nothing but tricky bookkeeping. It wouldn't solve any of the Government's fiscal problems. It would merely permit Congress to duck them for another year.

When fiscal 1952 rolled around, revenue would drop back again. Congress would find itself right back where it is now—with another year of deficit financing and outsize expenditure programs behind it.

Financial window-dressing may be useful for a hole-in-the-wall operator who is trying to impress his creditors. But it's no way to handle government finances. If we have to run a deficit in fiscal 1951, we will be a great deal better off if we admit it frankly instead of trying to doctor the books to cover it up.

There's another good reason for turning thumbs down on the Mills bill or any variation on the same theme: It would exaggerate the unstabilizing effect that the Federal budget already has on business.

Even with its present methods of collection, the Government takes in most of its revenues during the first half of the calendar year. During this time it often runs tremendous surpluses. In the last 6 months of the year, it usually spends more than it collects.

All this puts a lot of artificial and unnecessary strain on the flow of income and credit through the economy. In the first half of the year, the Government is sopping up purchasing power from individuals and corporations. In the second half, it is pouring money back into the system, automatically boosting purchasing power.

The Mills bill would concentrate revenues even more heavily in the first half of the year—not only in 1951 but in all years after that. And it would increase the size of the deficit in the second half year.

In this respect, it would be a step in the wrong direction. We have enough unavoidable seasonal strains on the economy without introducing any artificial ones. One big object in fiscal planning should be to level Government receipts and expenditures as much as possible over the year. The Mills bill would work just the other way.

WHY PAY AS YOU GO?

There's one other point to be considered. Would there be any advantage in putting corporate taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis similar to individual income taxes? If so, the Mills bill could be a step in that direction.

Theoretically, pay-as-you-go is a good idea. It gears tax collections closely to the flow of income. It helps to keep the Government's fiscal policy from getting out of step with the rest of the economy.

But pay-as-you-go for corporations runs into some big practical objections. Corporate incomes fluctuate widely—much more than individual incomes. It's impossible to make any good advance estimate of what they will be. Hence, a true pay-as-you-go system for corporations would probably bog down almost as soon as it started.

Add all this up, and you come out with a strong case against the Mills bill. Its advantages are illusory; its drawbacks are real.

But rejecting the Mills bill doesn't solve the Government's financial problems. To make a start on that, Congress must also reject the whole idea behind the Mills bill—the idea that everything will be all right if somehow we can make the books show a year-to-year balance of receipts and expenditures.

Receipts and expenditures in any one year aren't the important thing. The real answer to the fiscal problem is to set up a well-planned, efficient tax system and then gear our expenditure programs to it. Until we do that, no amount of fancy bookkeeping can help us.

Positive Action Is Called for To Counter the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], meeting with Republican leaders in Salt Lake City, Utah, over the week end, gave the Midwest chairmen a frank and honest appraisal of what he feels is the most serious problem now facing the Republican Party. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], representing a great agricultural area, has been vitally interested in the problems of the American

farmer. My distinguished colleague is himself the author of a farm plan which he discussed with the Republican leadership out west. As a result of this forthright, straight-from-the-shoulder recommendation, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, on Sunday, April 2, carried the following editorial. Because of its significance to all Republicans and to the Nation, I submit it for the RECORD:

POSITIVE ACTION IS CALLED FOR TO COUNTER THE BRANNAN PLAN

HAROLD O. LOVRE, Republican Congressman from South Dakota, who was once his party's chairman in that State, came out from Washington Friday to talk agricultural turkey to the 19 Midwest and Rocky Mountain GOP State chairmen convened here under the chairmanship of Utah's Republican chief, Vernon Romney, to mull this year's campaign plans.

The party's national chairman, Guy Gabrielson, used the occasion as platform for a Nation-wide radio broadcast Saturday afternoon and was the Friday evening banquet's principal speaker, so he created most of the closely reported news.

But what Congressman LOVRE had to say made more than general sense. It deserves attention.

The main burden of his argument was designed to enlist support for a farm plan for which the Republican campaigners can go out and battle.

He suggested one which he has authored; or a similar anti-Brannan plan which has been submitted to the party by Axel Beck, South Dakota's GOP national committeeman and chairman of the national committee's agricultural subcommittee; or a combination of the Beck plan and his; or any Republican farm plan so contrived as to include these points:

(1) Full self-financing, so as to end the use of tax money for farm subsidies; (2) full parity farm prices at all times for normal domestic consumption; (3) administration of the plan by the farmers themselves through elected county, State, and National committees; (4) specific and real protection for the operator of the family size farm; (5) a two-price level which will make it possible to "remainder" surpluses in a way similar to general business practice; (6) provision for distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy under a food-stamp plan; (7) encouragement of chemurgical uses for farm surpluses; (8) exports on the world market geared to our international commitments; and (9) a coordinated soil-conservation program.

He offered that as something substantial, something specific, something positive to talk about, whether the party is willing to agree to all his points or not.

His point and argument was that the GOP needs some kind of positive farm plan, anyway.

The trouble with anti-Brannanism is that it is in action mostly emotional. It is no-no-ism, it is heaven-help-us-ism, it is for-great-gosh-goodness-sakes-ism—but it suggests nothing in the Brannan plan's stead.

That is, as Mr. LOVRE declared, the Brannan plan's strength.

Everyone knows that the ruling farm plan, the Aiken-Hope law, in operation, is a mess. At least politically and socially, the farmers it was written to help suffer most. The Nation's taxpayers who presently have $4,000,000,000 tied up in surpluses alone, with a running added cost of $25,000 an hour just to store them, are sick of it. And they should be.

The Brannan plan is as full of implicit economic and social vices as a Florida cracker's hound dog is full of ticks, and Mr. LOVRE counted them off. That is where most Brannan-plan critics stop.

When they are faced by the challenge that House Majority Leader MCCORMACK hurled a few days ago—"I call upon those who oppose the Brannan plan to offer a plan of their own"—they stop because they are stumped. Nobody has offered one. Nobody does.

The Brannan plan has one real virtue and it is great. That is, as Congressman LOVRE pointed out, that the Brannan plan is, it exists. Secretary Brannan had the energy to think a plan up, if not through all its implications; and the courage to present it, and the willingness to struggle for its adoption.

And the scheme's credentialed opponents have thus far no plan whatever of their own. That was Mr. LOVRE's argument, and it is as true as a well-tuned E-string. It should ring in the Republican Party's ears.

For the credentialed opponents of the Brannan plan are, by political definition as anti-Brannanism stands now, the Republicans. It is their bounden duty to draft a farm plan and fight for it.

If they don't come out with a plan in opposition to Mr. Brannan's, one they are willing to fight for and one that the farmers are willing to support positively, which means with votes—if they fail to do that, the Republicans will lose the farm States this year that they lost in '48—Mr. LOVRE is convinced and we are persuaded—and the loss of the farm States will mean the loss of another election.

The GOP elephant, if it expects to survive as an effective element in American affairs, cannot afford to lose much more skin off its nose.

Is There Room in the Poorhouse for 149,000,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest of January 1950:

IS THERE ROOM IN THE POORHOUSE FOR 149,000,000 PEOPLE?

In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Those words, important 17 years ago, have even greater significance today. Why? Because in every year since 1932 (with the exception of the two fiscal years immediately following the war) our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

In 1932 our Federal Government spent $4,500,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1950, it is estimated that our Federal Government will spend 10 times that amount—$45,000,000,000.

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year of 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today as it was in 1932 that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse?

Just what are you doing to end excessive spending by our Federal Government? Have you written your Congressman? Have you discussed the problem with your business associates, your friends, your employees?

Let's make sure our representatives in Government know how we at home feel about the continuance of a habit that means the poorhouse.

The time for action is now.

Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers and livestock producers of Kansas are opposed to the so-called Brannan plan. At the recent annual meeting of the Kansas Livestock Association held in Topeka on March 18, 1950, a strong resolution in opposition to the Brannan plan was adopted. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the same herewith:

BRANNAN PLAN

Whereas the farm program proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan to the Eighty-first Congress would promote low market prices for all agricultural products, would subsidize consumers, rich and poor alike, and would eventually necessitate Federal control of all agriculture; and

Whereas the livestock industry cannot be successfully operated by governmental bureaus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to the proposed program. We consider it unsound economically and entirely impractical, and we urge Congress to reject it.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from editorials concerning statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA IN NATIONAL INTEREST

More than 300 editorials collected this year point out overwhelming national support for statehood. Cross section of editorial support shown in following excerpts received since House voted for Alaska and Hawaii statehood the first week in March:

Los Angeles (Calif.) Mirror of March 8, 1950:

"The two Territories are increasingly important to our national economy and our national defense. They deserve the privileges as well as the responsibilities of statehood."

Chicago (Ill.) Herald American of March 14, 1950:

"Immediate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is urgently needed for the safety and welfare of the country, and approval of the pending measures is thus the most urgent duty of the Senate."

Indianapolis (Ind.) News of March 7, 1950:

"Hawaiians are busy framing a State constitution in advance of a congressional affirmative. They are politically, economically, and patriotically ready. Painstaking investigations have scotched charges of subversion for the falsehoods that they are. The most recent public-opinion poll reveals that the American people favor Hawaii statehood, 4 to 1."

Davenport (Iowa) Democrat of March 14, 1950:

"The findings of congressional committees which have studied the question carefully and at first hand fully support the view that these territories are entitled to stars in the Republic's flag."

Wichita (Kans.) Morning Eagle of March 11, 1950:

"If the Senate fears there will be a dictatorship in Hawaii, either of the right or the left, it shows little faith in principle of freely chosen governments. Probably the people of Hawaii can take care of either the business barons or Harry Bridges with their ballots. Anyhow, they are entitled to the right to try it."

Frankfort (Ky.) State Journal of March 10, 1950:

"Chief among arguments for statehood are that the territories are important and growing, that they have populations capable and desirous of sovereign government, and that the best interests of both the territories and the Nation would be served by giving Alaska and Hawaii statehood's economic and political advantages and closer ties with the Union."

Baton Rouge (La.) State Times of March 8, 1950:

"The time for dawdling is past. Alaska, important for its great natural wealth and its strategic location, might as well be accepted into the family. And so might Hawaii."

Great Falls (Mont.) Leader of March 11, 1950:

"Majority sentiment in Montana undoubtedly favors full citizenship for the people of both Hawaii and Alaska."

New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of March 9, 1950:

"In view of the capacity for self-government the Hawaiians have shown and their loyalty to the United States, statehood is due them, and the Senate should go along with the House in admitting both Hawaii and Alaska as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States of the Union."

Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 10, 1950:

"Both Hawaii and Alaska probably are better qualified for statehood than were many of the States on the continent when they were admitted. Although they are not located on the mainland, modern transportation has brought them close to Washington."

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of March 8, 1950:

"The better government it has, the less chance the Communists will have—and the United States has good reasons for wanting to keep control of Hawaii instead of letting it go to the Communists by default."

Grand Island (Nebr.) Daily Independent of March 10, 1950:

"It is an established principle in the United States that a Territory is to be admitted to statehood as soon as practical. If Hawaii was incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof, there is implicit in that treaty a promise of eventual statehood. Hawaii has formally applied 16 times in 53 years for the status of a State. It is entitled to that status."

Newark (N. J.) News of March 9, 1950:

"On all grounds of principle, fairness, and self-interest, Alaska and Hawaii should be relieved of their Territorial status and admitted to the Union as the equal partners of the other 48 States. Their admission would prove to the world that our devotion to the democratic idea has practical, present meaning."

Keene (N. H.) Sentinel of March 8, 1950:

"Hawaiians are Americans. They are just as loyal to the United States as we are. They can offer a great deal to the ideal of the United States. They have waited patiently for many years. Hawaii deserves statehood."

New York (N. Y.) Times of March 7, 1950:

"The people of these islands (Hawaii), like the people of Alaska, ask to be represented in the Government which taxes them and makes their laws. We on the mainland cannot reject this appeal without repudiating a basic principle of our own democracy."

Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer of March 5, 1950: "Our leaders continue to preach democracy to the rest of the world. It might make their preachments more convincing if Congress, at this session, were to practice democracy, in the case of Hawaii, and allow its half million people to enjoy the most elementary right of democracy: the right to be represented in the Government which taxes them."

Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of March 8, 1950: "Both Alaska and Hawaii are key bastions of America's defense system. They are closely linked with the mainland by trade and tradition.

"They pay millions of dollars in Federal taxes without representation in the Congress.

"They deserve something better than colonial status."

Stillwater (Okla.) News-Press of March 13, 1950: "Both Hawaii and Alaska are closer to statehood than they have been in some time. Their natural resources and determined citizens would certainly be a big help to this Nation."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of March 8, 1950: "Of course, the basic claim that Alaska and Hawaii have to statehood is the same which the original colonies pressed against Great Britain. As taxpaying members of a political community they want some voice in making the laws that govern them. Hawaii, which has no voting representation in Congress, pays more Federal income tax than any of 12 present States."

Providence (R. I.) Journal of March 11, 1950: "When Hawaii (in 1900) and Alaska (in 1912) were incorporated as United States Territories, the implication was that they would be admitted as States. It is up to this country to make good our implied pledge."

Madison (S. D.) Daily Leader of March 8, 1950: "Both Alaska and Hawaii are genuine parts of our Union. Both have been United States territory for many decades. They should be admitted as States, and given all the rights (and obligations) of statehood."

Jackson (Tenn.) Sun of March 12, 1950: "The people of the islands are being taxed and they have no representation in Congress, the body which imposes taxes. Taxation without representation was the battle cry of the colonists of this country who threw off the yoke of England."

San Antonio (Tex.) Express of March 9, 1950: "Off and on during the first half of this century, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, most emphatically Hawaii, have been pressing Congress for admission to the Union of States. Both are fully qualified, by the standards of some earlier statehood grants, and their admission would strengthen this Nation's economy, security, and political structures."

Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot of March 8, 1950: "Both parties are committed to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The House majority has done well in advancing the realization a step nearer."

Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of March 9, 1950: "The residents of these areas are taxed but have no voting representation at present. Likewise, they are not able to play a direct part in legislation directly relating to their welfare. Politically their vote is no more incongruous than that of Delaware or Rhode Island."

Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of March 13, 1950: "All in all, the advocates of statehood have made out strong cases for their respective Territories. The Senate would do well to follow the leadership of the House on this long-standing issue."

Reply by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, to President Truman's Attack on Senate Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to President Truman's attack on the Senate investigation, issued under date of March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman's bitter and prejudiced attack on Republicans in the Senate does not make sense. His assumption of Lattimore's innocence parallels his support of Alger Hiss, when the Un-American Activities Committee of the Republican House first brought out the facts, which finally proved that vital State Department documents were being supplied to Communist agents by high State Department officials.

The President tries to insult Senator McCARTHY by calling him a "Kremlin asset." He is a fighting Marine who risked his life to preserve the liberties of the United States. The greatest Kremlin asset in our history has been the pro-Communist group in the State Department who surrendered to every demand of Russia at Yalta and Potsdam, and promoted at every opportunity the Communist cause in China until today communism threatens to take over all of Asia. How can the Kremlin profit by criticism of those

who were responsible for these policies and by their removal from the State Department?

While Mr. Truman slanders Senator McCARTHY he absolutely refuses to let any representative of Congress look at the files in the State Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the FBI which may give the full records of those whose loyalty is in question. What is he afraid of? It was not the Republican Policy Committee but the Democratic Senate itself which passed a resolution directing the committee to make a full investigation and to obtain these files. Our policy committee has only urged that that investigation be fairly made and that the committee be given the means to make a real investigation, and not merely confined to a whitewash result. This committee should not conduct a smear trial of Senator McCARTHY.

As for sabotaging the bipartisan foreign policy Mr. Truman himself killed that policy from the date of his election in November of 1948. To be bipartisan there must be real consultation on policies before they are adopted with the responsible Representatives of the Republicans in Congress. It is not accomplished by the appointment of an individual Republican to executive office as a roving ambassador. There has been no such consultation since 1948. There never was any consultation regarding the policy in China or the Far East. In 1949 Mr. Truman permitted a bitter and unfair attack to be made on Senator Dulles who had done so much to make bipartisan policy work. "Bipartisan foreign policy" is being used by Mr. Truman as a slogan to condemn any Republican who disagrees with Mr. Truman's unilateral foreign policy secretly initiated and put into effect without any real consultation with Congress.

The Republican Party has acquiesced in many features of Mr. Truman's foreign policy. They have agreed with some and in some cases they have not desired to present a divided front to the world. They will continue to pursue this program, but Republicans would violate their constitutional oath if they did not oppose policies which they believe to threaten the future welfare or security of the Nation. Certainly the facts already proved about Hiss and Wadleigh in the State Department justify our support of an investigation unhampered by executive obstinacy and name calling.

Tribute to Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, by Mac Lowry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator LUCAS Plain Speaking Man and a Natural Leader," written by Mac Lowry, and published in the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LUCAS PLAIN-SPEAKING MAN AND A NATURAL LEADER

(By Mac Lowry)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Democrat SCOTT W. LUCAS, leader of the United States Senate, has returned to the Capital after making several campaign speeches in the interest of his reelection from Illinois.

The 58-year-old LUCAS is a plain-speaking man who loves politics, loves the wrangle as well as the horseplay, the dramatic flight as well as the picayune thrust.

But despite his habit of plain speaking, the senior Senator from Illinois does not have what could be called a simple temperament. Pundits have often attempted to sum him up in a phrase. They have used in this effort the things that stand out on the surface—good looks, a quick temper, double-breasted suits, party regularity, a worried face, among others.

The phrases are apt, but too easy. And even if one takes them all together they do not explain the fact on which the Capital now finds itself in general, and, to some, surprising agreement:

SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, is the natural choice of the Senate Democrats for both the position and the responsibilities of leadership, and the party would look in vain for an alternative. It is probably not necessary to add that no such search is being carried out.

Almost a year ago, when LUCAS had been majority leader only a few months, reporters trying to manufacture a story would ask the President whether he expected a change in the Senate leadership. The administration's civil-rights and labor proposals had effectively bogged down under the opposition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

First the President and then events themselves took care of the story. It was LUCAS who manipulated the events. He went on from the civil-rights and labor defeats to drive the Senate into its hardest peacetime session. Coming out of the hospital with a nervous stomach pretty well under control, he took a grip on his temper and stayed with the legislative program through heat and exhaustion.

It was as hard on the other Senators as it was on LUCAS. But when the session was finally adjourned in October LUCAS was its leader, even though walking toward his goals through splits and recombinations in both parties.

When the present session opened in January the heat was already on one big 1950 issue—deficit spending. Relations between LUCAS and Minority Leader WHERRY (Republican, Nebraska) were noticeably strained. LUCAS still shows his impatience at the length of time the Senate can drag out its business, but he is visibly more relaxed.

Through the long and often angry first session of the Eighty-first Congress, LUCAS forged the Senate Democratic policy committee into a new instrument, and he relies upon it heavily. Best indication of his success is the understanding tendered toward his position by the committee's two southern Democrats, RUSSELL, of Georgia, and HILL, of Alabama. FEPC will bring a knock-down and drag-out battle over cloture, and nobody has yet caught RUSSELL napping on anything that had to do with the calendar or the parliamentary situation. But RUSSELL obviously feels he knows and respects where LUCAS stands as each issue goes through the policy huddle.

It may be true that LUCAS' concern over his health last year taught him to relax, and he has gone on record to that effect himself. But the performance of his heavy duties day by day shows how inaedquate was the superficial impression of a quick-tempered man with nothing but a reputation as a regular. Such a man could not make the use of a policy committee LUCAS has demonstrated.

Riding herd on a divided party as it struggles with the huge Truman program almost in one lump, LUCAS often finds the knives pointing in his direction, as would any other man in the job. He can return the jabs, usually with real effect. But he bears no wounds and no malice. He has been long enough in the Senate to appreciate the pitfalls in the majority leader's position, and he saw every step in the widening Democratic separation of 1948.

What escapes some observers is that LUCAS takes almost everything intensely. It is easy for his face to look tragic, easy for him to work himself up to short speech, even off the floor. He detests making a long speech, frets over the facility with which the Senate drags out a debate and would love to have a rule of relevance which would bind Senators to the subject at hand.

Though the signs point to his victory in his reelection campaign this fall, LUCAS is taking nothing for granted in the race against former Representative Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, the Chicago Tribune's candidate.

His position as majority leader affects the race in two ways. In the first place it ties him in Washington for the most part, and his quick round of the hustings this week cannot be frequently repeated. In the second place, LUCAS himself believes that the loss of the Senate majority leader would be a heavy one to his party, that the Illinois election will be a kind of referendum on the Truman program.

One thing he won't have to worry about is his party's strong support. His freshman colleague, DOUGLAS, and the new Democratic Governor, Adlai Stevenson, are anxious to use their own efforts to offset the time LUCAS must spend in the Capital. Martin Kenelley, the Independent Democratic mayor of Chicago, after an initial coolness, has jumped on the bandwagon.

And the 3-day Democratic national conference scheduled for Chicago in May, with President Truman and the entire Cabinet on deck, was planned with one eye on the Lucas-Dirksen race.

LUCAS himself believes the Republican attack on him will center on the Truman foreign policy, deficit spending, alleged softness toward communism and Fair Deal socialism. He is anxious to battle Dirksen on the foreign-policy issue, given the latter's wavering course and his subjection to Colonel McCormick, and LUCAS' own record in that field has been consistent and strong. He supported lend-lease and the draft in 1941 in a State where "America first" had its stronghold.

LUCAS has his own answers to the "spending" and "socialism" cries, though his colleagues consider him more conservative than the orthodox Fair Dealers. He is ready to make hay with his civil-rights record in Chicago, and downstate he is at least as popular with the Farm Bureau—all powerful in Illinois—as is his opponent. There are reports that Brannan-plan sentiment in the State is growing, but Dirksen can get no help on this score.

The hardest fight LUCAS made as leader in the Eighty-first's first session was to eliminate the antistrike injunction from the Taft bill. Friends say he was bitterly disappointed when the amendment failed by the narrowest margin. Democrats here expect him to have labor's strong support. He voted for the original Taft bill in 1947, but to sustain the Truman veto of Taft-Hartley.

All in all, the Senate's majority leader should be more than a match for Dirksen, unless observers here completely underestimate dissatisfaction with the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in Illinois. As a referendum on this subject, Illinois is the key spot in 1950.

The son of a tenant farmer, LUCAS qualified for his support of the Roosevelt New Deal by an upward battle toward a successful law practice and his present position. He taught country school, played professional baseball for Bloomington in the Three-I league. He has the manners and the appearance of a man born to comfort, however, and without being social in the Washington sense, he is an accomplished golfer and clubman and looks it.

Some of his friends are said to be telling him he should cultivate the Illinois grass roots in the limited time he can spend in the State. They are thinking of the effectiveness Harry Truman showed there in 1948, and counting upon the affable, direct impression LUCAS can make upon a small group of people.

His friends have no fears about LUCAS' losing touch with his State even while Dirksen is running about making five and six speeches a week. Last month the senior Senator from Illinois got his millionth letter since he came to the upper House in 1938.

Before he was majority leader, LUCAS used to get 10,000 letters a month. Now the average is 37,000. They are coming in from everywhere since LUCAS moved from being a Representative from only one State to the man who has most to say about the Senate Calendar.

It is with these letters that LUCAS, along about 5 or 6 o'clock, sits down to take the pulse of things. He has already, in a typical day, been to two committee meetings, taken part in innumerable strategy huddles, launched the Senate session at noon, entertained visiting constituents, and kept on or near the Senate floor lest other Senators desert it.

It is a man-killing schedule for a Senator about to run for reelection in a popular State with every economic interest represented within its borders. LUCAS appears on top of it today, and the signs are multiplying that he will reap a rich harvest of credit on the morrow. To the Senator from Illinois, it must seem about time.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Washington Times-Herald today carries an editorial entitled "Truman's Pride, It Goeth Before Whose Fall?"

This editorial takes the position that most of the ills which confront the United States stem from the secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

In contrast with the President's statement that the American people can look with pride upon the foreign policy in effect for the last 5 years, the editorial cites the expansion of Soviet Russia's influence in that period and the steady loss of United States prestige.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S PRIDE, IT GOETH BEFORE WHOSE FALL?

President Truman says "The American people can look back with pride" on the foreign policy in effect for the past 5 years.

A FAIR TEST FOR TRUMAN'S POLICY

There is only one fair way to gage the value of any policy, and that is by the results. Does the policy leave the country stronger and safer and happier than it was before? Are the people paying less money in taxes and getting better government? Five years ago at this time would be April 4, 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States and Harry S. Truman was playing the piano, a Vice President of no great interest to anybody.

The country knew that the war against Germany, Italy, and Japan was roaring toward a finish and that settlement day between the United States of America, Britain, and Russia, as the three principal survivors, was drawing near.

Civilization's welfare depended upon the United States using its prestige and power as the financier, munitions maker, and major fighting force of the survivors, to determine a sound peace.

What the country did not know was that during the fatal meeting of February 4–11, 1945, at Yalta, the dying Roosevelt, with Alger Hiss at his elbow, had given civilization a terrible blow and Stalin a new start toward expansion of a Communist empire.

Such was the base for this foreign policy of which Truman is so proud. Let us see how it grew.

April 12, 1945: Roosevelt dead. Truman takes over.

April 25, 1945: United Nations begins organizing at San Francisco with Alger Hiss director of procedure.

July 26, 1945: Britain, surviving the war solely on United States funds and in hope of more of the same, elects a Socialist government sworn to destroy the kind of civilization that has made us what we are.

Truman undertakes elaborate campaign to give this Socialist outfit more United States billions, and succeeds.

August 2, 1945: At Potsdam palace in Berlin, Truman agrees that Stalin shall formally begin his conquest of Europe and Asia as the price of assisting the United States against Japan which is already collapsing and trying to get through to us a proposal of surrender.

Peace overtures sent by Japanese to Moscow for transmission to Washington are never passed on, for Stalin knows a sucker when he sees one.

August 6, 1945: The first full-sized atom bomb is dropped on Hiroshima. Thanks to Dr. Allan Nunn May and Dr. Klaus Fuchs, British spies for Russia and others in the United States of America, as yet not brought to justice, Stalin is already at work on short cuts to atom power.

August 8, 1945: Russia declares war on Japan, thus providing an excuse to begin formal conquest of China.

September 2, 1945: While Truman accepts the applause of his gang and the world celebrates at official surrender ceremonies aboard U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, Stalin announces Russia's recovery of strategic Kurile and Sakhalin island chain leading up from Japan to Alaska, thus shadowing events to come.

The foregoing are just a few of the significant dates in the first year of this five of which Truman says now we must all be so proud. What is the proved harvest of those episodes above cited?

Today Russia has China and threatens the rest of Asia. Also she has Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and the major food-producing areas of Germany. Menaces all Europe.

Today Socialist Britain is boldly suggesting neutrality in the event of a United States-Russian war.

Today the whole world holds its breath in wonder as to whether Russia has enough atom bombs, made from United States plans stolen by United States and British spies for Russia, to risk an open fight with us. The principal doubt of such a war rests in the logical question of why Stalin should fight as long as he wins such encounters as those of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

The consequences above cited from the first year of Truman's proud five are all of record before the world. Nobody can deny them. God only knows what will be revealed in time to come, as the Nation pries open the secrets of 1946–49.

And now come the Truman gang talking about a bipartisan foreign policy, so the Democrats can make the mistakes and the Republicans can share the blame. In that, Truman's pride goeth before whose fall?

Sporadic Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article written by two of the leading tax attorneys of Los Angeles, Mr. George T. Altman and Mr. Richard L. Rykoff, on the subject Sporadic Income. This is a matter about which not only the members of the Ways and Means Committee but all the Members of the House should be concerned, as it definitely describes a case of injustice.

The article follows:

SPORADIC INCOME: A SOLUTION

(By George T. Altman and Richard L. Rykoff, attorneys, Los Angeles)

Within recent years the creative artist has become more and more a lone orphan among taxpayers. The relative brevity and sporadic character of his productive life, and the long years of waiting and hoping, of rags, hamburgers, and rejection slips, of midnight oil but no heat, which are suffered and endured before even that questionable productivity begins—these are his trade-mark and often his boast, but they have found no sympathy in the tax collector.

Other situations of similar character have been accorded some relief under the revenue laws. A taxpayer who holds property for investment or speculation and derives gains from the sale of such property has throughout the years been allowed a low, flat rate on such gains, known as capital gains, largely on the theory that they accrued over the entire period of holding. But the creative artist, despite similar long periods of waiting, albeit not often with the specific product sold, has not been very successful in bringing his creations within that category. If he sells an interest in his product, such as the United States rights in a story, he is receiving royalties, not gain on a sale. If he sells the entire product—lock, stock, and barrel—he is, in the usual case, selling property held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business. In that event, also, he has ordinary income, not capital gain. Attempts have been made to accomplish capital-gain classification through the use of a corporate intermediary. But it is not often possible for the creative artist to carry out such a process to the satisfaction of the Treasury Department.

Again, a taxpayer who discovers oil or minerals and sells the property, or any interest in it, has always had the surtax on the gain limited in any event to 30 percent of the selling price. The purpose of the limitation was given by the Senate Finance Committee as follows:

"The prospector for * * * oil and gas frequently spends many years and much money in fruitless search. When he does locate a productive property and comes to settle, it seems unwise and unfair that his

profit be taxed at the maximum rate as if it were ordinary income attributable to the normal activities of a single year."

The creative artist is in the same position. He is in many senses a prospector for ideas and forms. In any event he, too, must ordinarily accept a long period of fruitless effort and struggle. Then, after he has finally found a market for his works, or his works have risen to a marketable level, the fruits are sporadic, at least as far as the larger amounts are concerns. In consequence, the income results of many years of effort and labor are piled up into the brackets of a single year. Yet for him there is no corresponding relief under the tax laws.

Not that fluctuation of income is unknown to other classes of taxpayers. Generally, however, that fluctuation is hinged to the rise and fall of the national income level. Relatively, that fluctuation is modest; it is wholly out of class with the delayed and sporadic character of the income of the artist. A painter may sell a picture or two this year, none the next, and every once in a while he may hit the jackpot with a particularly fortunate sale or series of sales in one year. Or, in the steadily shifting scenes of the motion-picture industry, a writer may have a contract for 20 weeks in one year, nothing the next, and then he may sell an "original" for a substantial price. The following income figures from the files of the Screen Writers Guild illustrate the point, and similar figures are undoubtedly obtainable from all fields among artists:

Individual	1949	1948	1947
A	0	$60,000	$6,250
B	$7,200	0	0
C	3,350	4,500	45,000
D	0	0	60,000
E	0	12,500	0
F	60,000	0	40,000
G	2,400	0	3,800

Of course, under the present code, the full, ordinary income rate is applicable in the year of payment. Thus, the artist with one good year in three must surrender the lion's share in taxes, while the following or preceding few or many years are spent in struggle for that one good year.

LIMITATIONS IN CODE SECTIONS 107 (A), (B)

Sections 107 (a) and (b) of the code are no answer to this problem except in a very few instances. Under those sections relief is available only where the particular work was done over a period of 36 months or more. Where the income is compensation for personal services, such services must have been rendered over a period of 36 months or more. Where the income is compensation for personal services, such services must have been rendered over a period of 36 months or more. Where the income is that derived from an artistic composition or product of the taxpayer, then the taxpayer's work in composing or producing it must have covered a period of 36 months or more. In the one case, the period must relate to the particular services for which the compensation is paid; in the other, it must relate to the particular artistic product from which the income involved is derived.

It is the rare case, however, in which such a period is involved. A writer, for example, may go from one idea to another, developing and shaping each into a story, working months or years on one and only weeks or days on another. Eventually he winds up with a story that makes the big time, and lo, and behold, that particular story took him only a week to write. The ideas may in part come out of other stories he has written, but he cannot trace them with sufficient clarity to satisfy the Treasury Department. Be it story, painting, song, or other artistic work, the particular work which turned out to be an income gusher may have taken only a few weeks to produce. The months and years of toil which preceded it may be brushed aside as experience.

The only solution is to generalize the income. Simplicity and justice also require that the relief be extended to income from personal services of any class. Such a provision could read somewhat as follows:

"If the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year (referred to in this subsection as the current year) is at least 80 percent of the aggregate adjusted gross income for any three consecutive taxable years including the current year, and at least 80 percent of such adjusted gross income for the current year is attributable to personal services, or to income or gains derived from property which is a product wholly of the personal efforts or labor of the taxpayer, then in that event the tax for the current year shall be limited to an amount computed as follows:

"(a) Divide the aggregate adjusted gross income for such three consecutive taxable years by three;

"(b) Determine the tax for each of such years by using the amount so computed as the adjusted gross income with all other factors unchanged;

"(c) Add together the increases resulting from such computation in the taxes for the two taxable years other than the current year; and

"(d) Add such amount to the tax so computed for the current year.

"The amount so resulting shall be the tax for the current year, not to exceed the amount computed without the benefit of this subsection. In the event a computation under this subsection results in a refund for the current year, no interest shall be paid on the amount of such refund."

ANNUALIZATION? RARELY!

Adjustment can be made by means of annualization if a year other than the current one is a year of less than 12 months. That, however, would indeed be a rare occurrence.

With a provision such as illustrated above there could be no complaint that here was not relief but a gift to a special group. The provision would be applicable to delayed or sporadic income attributable to any class of personal labor or efforts. The cost to the revenue would be slight. While instances of such income are many, the aggregate in dollars is not great. No other inequity has been so gross without ever having been resolved.

Communists in Our Foreign Policy Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in the Republican Eightieth Congress, Representatives MUNDT and NIXON, and other members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, carried out the investigation which disclosed the workings of a Communist cell in our foreign policy making. That led to the conviction of one high administration official for perjury about his associations with Communist espionage. The committee had to work with great care to get the proper legal evidence, while protecting our right to true freedom of speech and of association. This they did brilliantly, but nothing was done to rid us of the influence of other members of the ring. Now Senator MCCARTHY is asking bluntly why the administration does not act to rid us of all the Communist agents and Communist dupes influencing our Government policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article, from the Brooklyn Tablet, of April 1, 1950, which asks in vigorous fashion, "How long, O Lord, how long?":

KEEP THE ISSUE IN SIGHT

Arthur Krock, well-known journalist, and other Washington newspapermen, as well as Government officials, are surprised at the quantity and type of mail being received at the Capitol since Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY has made his charges against the State Department.

Mr. Krock, his colleagues and officials, think the Senator's charges are exaggerated, if not untrue, and maintain he has not as yet proven his pro-Red charges against even one State Department employee, or former employee; yet most of the mail from the American people seems to favor the Senator. They undoubtedly wonder why this is so.

The reason the American people either accept or are sympathetic with charges against the State Department is twofold. First, the people, by and large, believe the United States was betrayed or sold out in the recent war, and thereafter, to Russia. The people were led to believe they were brought into the conflict in behalf of liberty and democracy, to vindicate the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms and to maintain the freedom of small nations against aggressors, and they observe today that despite their tremendous sacrifice of life, blood, armaments, matériel, and wealth there is more slavery, more dictatorial rule, more tyranny, and a greater threat of war than before. They see in communism a greater threat than naziism, and observe that Russia has endeavored to fulfill to the letter her ideological promise of world revolution, destuction of liberty and all human rights, and international dictatorship.

Moreover, the American people know that at Quebec, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam millions of people, whole nations, and tremendous power, were given to Russia with the acquiescence of our representatives.

Americans then ask: Who betrayed our country, our principles, the cause for which we fought? The people reason either our State Department must have been hand-in-glove with Russia, either Communist spies or friends of the Soviet dictatorship sold us out, or else our representatives were too stupid to know what Russia was up to. In whichever case, they are waiting for the answer to this frightening situation of more tyranny and more war which now threatens civilization. Did spies sell us out or were our representatives just unbelievably stupid?

Secondly, the American people read about the Hiss case. They know how this seemingly sinister character, placed in the Government, then promoted to key positions and finally sitting alongside of the late President Roosevelt at Yalta and as former Secretary of State Stettinius' adviser at the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco, was convicted of perjury based upon his espionage activities. Finally the people know that the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, not only refused to move against Hiss when he was carrying on his espionage activities but even after his conviction the Secretary refused to repudiate him.

Why wouldn't the people have sympathy for Senator MCCARTHY'S charges? Why wouldn't they condemn the crowd that as-

serts "these charges injure the prestige of the State Department," and "the United States is injured abroad by such loose charges"? What gall. Moreover, is it strange that the people refuse to accept the frantic denials of criticized employees that they are not Communists—Hiss, Robeson, Chaplin, and the rest also deny the same charges—when they know that many of Soviet Russia's best friends here have no membership card in the Communist Party?

In the midst of the Senator's attack someone added an even worse charge than he, namely, that the State Department had acted as a home for a colony of degenerates. And the top security official of the State Department immediately stated that he had dismissed 91 of these perverts from the State Department. Whether or not he got rid of all of them we are unable to say, but police officials in Washington on Tuesday stated that the capital had 5,000 of these offenders and 4,000 of them hold Government jobs. What a shocking scandal; what a curse to put on the American people. What an insult to the morality and decency of our Government. What a threat to our security.

There is no reason to wonder at Senator McCARTHY'S charges—exaggerated, poorly presented, premature or not—being supported, for the people have never had explained to them why and how the Soviet was permitted to capture and enslave one-quarter of the world and seemingly with our acquiescence. The Tablet made a fair suggestion to President Truman when he assumed office in 1945. It urged that he repudiate the secret Yalta agreements—many of which neither he, nor anybody else, save Alger Hiss, knew about at the time—and take full responsibility for whatever went on thereafter. It then suggested that the President re-create the State Department and investigate everyone who had acted as a cat's-paw, if not an agent, of those who betrayed our Nation. This was not done, although later Henry Wallace was forced out. Neither was the proper action taken when Hiss was convicted, for then the President should have ordered an investigation and, if needs be, a trial for those who put Hiss in his posts, who built him up, who covered him up, and those with whom he associated, just as at present there should be an investigation of those responsible for giving government posts to degenerates.

The people have no confidence in the Tydings committee, or officials who consider Senator McCARTHY—a former marine—the principal menace to our Nation while they are trying to protect and hide those who were pro-Soviet in their deeds, words, and activities. What the American public wants to know is this:

Why was the United States sold out at Yalta and by whom?

Who put the likes of Hiss, Wadleigh, in our State Department, Judy Coplon in the Department of Justice and Harry Dexter White in the Department of the Treasury?

Who put the 91 degenerates into the State Department and who kept them there?

Who was responsible for the abandonment of China, the insane set-up in Germany and the loss of liberty to Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia?

Who decided Formosa has no strategic importance?

The exaggerations or misrepresentations—if they be such—of a Senator McCARTHY, or the ridiculing of his charges by officials, newspapers, and the radio, merely concern an effect. The administration and the administration alone can answer to the people for the vicious results of policies which imperil the world. Senator McCARTHY is but a side issue, an individual who is endeavoring to blow the lid off a malodorous situation. The threat to the United States is not so much the Soviet abroad as the pro-Soviet forces, and their defenders, in the United States.

Smearing World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malcolm Forbes from Forbes magazine:

SMEARING WORLD GOVERNMENT
(By Malcolm Forbes)

American businessmen, having demonstrated their ability, knowledge, and experience to build our present free-enterprise system to its present high level, should perhaps more than any other group in the country be aware of the dire need for a strengthened world organization capable of enforcing world peace. A number, including W. T. Holliday, chairman of Standard Oil of Ohio, and James K. Moffitt, chairman of Crocker First National Bank in San Francisco, have been active on behalf of the United World Federalists and other such organizations. To date 21 State legislatures have adopted resolutions in favor of world government; 110 Congressmen of both parties, including a majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, are sponsoring a world-government resolution in Washington.

But now that real progress is being made, various isolationists and some misguided patriots are attempting to smear all efforts toward a world government capable of enforcing world peace as "communistic." A silly charge, considering that from the beginning the bitterest opponent to world government has been Moscow. Reds know well that in any free assembly of the nations of the world the Communist nations would be outvoted on efforts to obstruct world peace as they are today in the UN. They prefer the present UN because their veto power can block any attempt to enforce UN majority decisions. In a strengthened world organization, Russian power to paralyze would be gone.

I doubt if responsible, thinking businessmen would be misled by isolationists and their strange bedfellows in this fight on world government, the Communists, who for opposite reasons fear the only course that offers hope of effectively outlawing war—a strengthened United Nations, with power to enforce peace.

Organization of American Overseas Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging fields for study in connection with the matter of reorganization of the executive branch is that of organization of American overseas activities. Leadership of the democratic nations of the world has brought with it heavy overseas and world responsibilities. To meet these responsibilities and to administer the occupation of enemy territory as well as the programs of assistance necessitated by economic conditions growing out of the late war, we have added first one agency and then another. There has been no over-all direction or planning to this growth of agencies and responsibilities. Four major departments and several independent agencies are now concerned with foreign policy and overseas administration.

The report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, more generally known as the Hoover Commission, effectively high lights the deficiencies and the inadequacies of our present overseas administration. The Commission report calls attention to divided responsibility, the assignment of duties to departments and agencies which are totally unrelated to its normal functions and the qualifications of the personnel normally employed by such departments and agencies. There is no suitable integration of the entire overseas administration field and many of the agencies are responsible but to the President.

Look for a moment if you will at the administration of occupied enemy territories. The formulation of policy is in the hands of the Department of State yet the administration and execution of that policy was assigned to the Department of the Army. If there is delay in the announcement of policy the Army must proceed to formulate its own policy. By its own admission the Army is ill-equipped to deal with problems of nonmilitary nature such as civil liberties, representative forms of government, democratic procedures, and the like.

Another instance of divided responsibility is involved in the administration of Marshall plan funds. The act creating the Economic Cooperation Administration provides merely that the Administrator and the Secretary of State shall keep each other fully and currently informed on matters, including prospective action, arising within the scope of their respective duties which are pertinent to the duties of the other. Should there be areas of disagreement between the Administrator and the Secretary of State it can readily be seen that these would be of serious consequence to our foreign policy and could only be resolved by referral to the President.

Among the departments having overseas duties assigned to them which are unrelated to, and incompatible with, their normal functions are the Navy Department and the Department of the Interior. The Navy Department has the administration of our trust territories of Guam and Samoa while the Department of the Interior administers our organized Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the like. Where there is a lack of definition and enumeration of the powers and duties of the administrative agency, as in

the case of the Division of Island Territories and Possessions in the Department of the Interior, it can readily be seen that conflict will arise.

Mr. Speaker, I need but to enumerate our major overseas functions, the administering department, commission, or agency, and the expenditures for the function involved, to show the complexity of the problem of reorganization and the need for a thorough study to the end that functions may be regrouped and administration may be integrated. I wish to read into the RECORD at this point a concise statement of the functions involved, the responsible agency, and the expenditure made therefor. The figures on the expenditures involved were furnished me by the staff of the Library of Congress and are for the year 1949.

Tabulation of overseas functions, responsible agencies, and expenditures therefor

1. Occupation of enemy territory (Departments of State and Army)	$1,348,385,558.51
2. Marshall plan aid (Economic Cooperation Administration)	4,637,266,717.90
3. Trust territories (Navy Department)	1,125,000.00
4. Non-self-governing territories, e. g., Guam (Navy)	1,861,019.92
5. Self-governing Territories, e. g., Alaska (Interior Department)	49,371,385.31
6. Office of Foreign Liquidation (State Department). (Figures not available.)	
7. American Battlefield Monuments Commission (an independent commission)	453,197.62
8. Philippine War Damage Commission (an independent commission)	170,305,667.67
9. Philippine Alien Property Administration (independent)	423,808.00
10. Panama Canal (Department of the Army)	24,877,687.51
11. Special missions (State Department—ECA). (None in 1949.)	
12. United States participation in international organizations	96,661,225.38
13. State Department expenditures over and above those heretofore enumerated	208,864,619.73
Total	6,539,595,887.55

If war and its aftermath have created problems beyond our power of anticipation at the time, that is no reason why we should longer delay a thorough investigation of our overseas activities and obligations with a view to regrouping of functions, a realinement of responsibility, and the reduction of administrative costs to a minimum. The Hoover Commission recognized the complexity of the problem faced and its sole recommendation with respect to overseas reorganizations was "that the Congress direct a comprehensive study to be made of the entire problem of overseas operation and administration."

I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 7554, to create a commission to make a study of the administration of the overseas activities of the Government and make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto. This bill, similar to one already passed by the Senate, would create a study commission composed of 12 members. Four members of the commission would be Members of the House of Representatives, four would be Members of the Senate, and four would be appointed from the executive branch of the Government. Such commission would be required to report to Congress not later than March 1, 1951, and would cease to exist on April 1, 1951. Members would serve without additional compensation.

With our present preeminent world position and with the prospects of continued conflict between the East and West, it seems unlikely that our world and overseas responsibilities will be greatly reduced. Expenditures in the categories I have listed above have decreased since 1949, but even now we are considering the institution of a program of technical assistance to backward nations. With the increasing use of economic aid as an instrument of policy, Congress, which controls the purse strings, should play an increasingly more important role in the administration of foreign affairs. It is altogether appropriate, therefore, that the study commission proposed by my bill should have able members from both Houses of Congress.

We should not longer delay enactment of legislation to expedite reorganization in the field of overseas administration. I am confident that the proposal contained in my bill will result in concrete and constructive recommendations for the organization and grouping of our overseas functions and their administration. I am confident that it will bring about, in time, reorganizations which will provide a maximum of efficiency in the handling of our overseas obligations with a minimum of cost. It may well lead to a reevaluation of our expenditures in this field and of their importance or lack of it. In view of the tremendous expenditures involved, this may well prove one of the most fruitful fields for savings by way of reorganization.

I thank you.

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., of Monday, April 3, 1950.

All of us are most hopeful that this committee of representative citizens and members of the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Lawrence will be able to assist in obtaining new industries for that community:

MOVE TOWARD SELF-HELP

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. is the answer to the spirit of defeatism which cripples any attempt to deal with a tough problem. As a nonprofit organization set up to foster general prosperity in this area, it is an affirmation of the principle of free enterprise, which, in the long run, has the horsepower to pull any economic load. All the theory in the world will accomplish no good unless it is tied in with hard-headed, intelligent aggressiveness capable of translating the blueprint into wood and stone, and finally, into whirling wheels and efficient production. Theoretically Greater Lawrence, with a vast reservoir of individual skills at its disposal, with the facilities for the accommodation of a broadened program of industrial development, will find its salvation in selling businessmen the idea of settling here. It is one thing to say it, or think it; it's another thing again to go to the trouble of doing something about it. The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. is no theorist's dream, but a practical piece of machinery designed to apply the right kind of leverage in the right places. And as Archimedes pointed out long ago, a big enough lever can pry anything out of the mire.

The kind of confidence we have in the future of Greater Lawrence, and New England generally, is all the more genuine because it stands pruned of any blind optimism. The facts and figures of recession are there to be scanned by any eye, and you can either recoil from them in terror as being harbingers of ultimate doom, or you can react with positive courage, face the facts, and then cast logically about for some means of pulling their fangs. In America this formula has been repeated over and over again. It is the Rx which settled and raised a plenteous yield right in the teeth of the most cantankerous agents of adversity—in the North, in the West, right here in Massachusetts when the Pilgrims stepped from Plymouth rock into the bleak embrace of an untamed land. The pioneer spirit has not atrophied; the qualities of courage, resourcefulness, pertinacity need only to be furbished up a bit to provide us with the sort of mainspring we need to power a new dynamism here, and all over New England. We are most certainly not going to abandon ship because there is a report of a thunderhead 500 miles off our starboard beam.

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. partakes of the nature of a pioneer enterprise because it is one of the first of its kind in New England. Because it aims to meet our collective problems squarely at the local level, without the solicitously paternal intervention of cluck-clucking Federal agencies, it can be greeted as an experiment in self-dependence in an age when there is too much of tendency to look outward, rather than inward, for help and sustenance. Lawrence has been in existence as a going concern for a good many years. She'll be around for a long time to come.

How Many of the People Does the State Department Think It Is Fooling?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following letter received from one of the justices of the Supreme Court of Minnesota. The real indictment of those responsible for conducting our foreign policy in the latter half of the war and in the 4½ years since its end is the incredible record they made of miscalculations regarding the nature, objectives, methods, strength, and determination of the Communist movement all around the world, especially in China and Asia. It is impossible to say how many and which of those responsible, or of their advisers, were actually members of the Communist Party. That is relatively unimportant. The indisputable facts are that what they did has consistently worked out to the interests of the Communist movement and the Soviet Union and against the interests of the United States and world order and peace. The letter follows with the signature of the justice omitted for obvious reasons.

THE SUPREME COURT OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, Minn.

HON. WALTER JUDD,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JUDD: I am very grateful to you for sending me the copy of your January speech in regard to China. The developments since that time have proved your predictions, as well as your conclusions, to have been wholly correct.

Our whole foreign policy in regard to Asia has been very stupid. Had the whole State Department been card-carrying members of the Communist Party they could not have done more for Russia than they have done. I do not see why we should concern ourselves about weeding out the few who are still there. In fact, the foreign policy of the United States, since war was first threatened in Europe, has been stupid in the extreme, it seems to me.

Now we find ourselves at the end of two world wars with no advantage resulting from the victory in either and at the same time saddled with the prospect of a third war and with the necessity of keeping up a tremendous military establishment because military might is the only argument that is persuasive with the Russians. Not only is that true, but we must be careful in our negotiations with them, if any, that they do not trade promises which they do not expect to keep for advantages which they do keep.

More power to you and best regards.

Yours sincerely.

False Suspicion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, March 28, 1950:

THE STAKES OF DEMOCRACY

"There is more at stake in this matter than the rise or fall of individuals," declares Mr. Henry L. Stimson in his forthright letter to the press, commenting on the Indian war dance that swirls around the Department of State in Washington.

Mr. Stimson, whose distinguished record in public office, both as Secretary of State and as Secretary of War, places him beyond the impeachment of small suspicions and above the tides of political factionalism, points an unerring finger at the danger about which the present Secretary of State and half a dozen other important spokesmen, in both major political parties, have already warned us.

Such goings on, Mr. Stimson remarks, dangerously impede the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Government. The procedure "creates abroad a feeling that we are frightened and suspicious of each other; it diverts our attention at home from the genuine and pressing problems of our foreign affairs; it requires of many high officials that they desert their proper duties in order to prepare and deliver * * * extensive replies. Not one of these effects would have resulted from a disinterested study of the loyalty of any suspected State Department employees."

This aspect of the present situation—its disabling consequences for our policy around the world—is pointed up by the press reaction already evident beyond the seas. "It is ridiculous as it is tragic," comments the influential Manchester Guardian in England, that the fate of Europe should wait upon American uncertainties. Whether the United States can, under such conditions, shape and carry on any rational foreign policy at all, is similarly questioned.

The same uneasy doubts pervade discussions in responsible organs of opinion from Norway to Turkey. And the alacrity with which the Russian press and radio have seized upon this new opportunity to sow distrust and impair confidence in American policy, throughout middle and southeast Asia, provides interesting testimony as to the acumen of the Kremlin's propagandists.

De Tocqueville, writing early in the nineteenth century, thought that it was a piece of great good fortune for the United States that it did not then need a foreign policy, thanks to aloofness from the rest of the world. Had circumstances forced our Nation into the struggle of world politics then, he opined, the consequences would have been disastrous to our survival because of the instability of our democracy. Time and history have borne witness to a greater inner strength and resourcefulness than the famous French critic conceded. Yet is is well to remember that the testing time he foresaw is now upon us.

If this country's position has altered irrevocably under pressure of the tides of history, if isolation has been demolished by science, by growth, by war, and by the shifting of economic and political centers of power, our responsibility for mature procedures in the formulation and administration of foreign policy has become inescapable. To disable that process, to scatter doubt and confusion, to balk and cripple it, is to play lightly with dangerous risks.

The weight of the innumerable charges upon the Department of State in the wide span of our Nation's interests and safety is, in itself, evidence sufficient to convince sane citizens on that point. In Indochina and the neighboring region the issue involves the security of the free peoples of the whole of southeast Asia as well as, eventually, ourselves. In India and Pakistan the riddle of the future freedom and independence of more than 380,000,000 persons is involved, as well as, ultimately, our own. In Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet where our policy effort is to fortify confidence and strength against tremendous pressures from the north, the destiny of the Middle East and Africa is at issue.

From the easternmost reaches of Turkey to the Italian peninsula, policy problems also swarm for America; and from Austria to the Baltic. Even this scant summary omits the vast riddle of Pacific Asia. To all, those who labor on our policy must address sober, informed, consistent attention. In each region they must endeavor to fuse practical program with constructive purpose, depending for support and useful criticism upon foreign understanding and an attentive, adult public opinion here at home.

Those who would toss monkey wrenches into this difficult undertaking display a sinister disregard for their country and our lives.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Penny-Wise and Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., Thursday, March 30, 1950:

RISKY CHEESE PARING

In Washington the House, in a rare mood of economy, has voted to cut the European recovery plan appropriation for next fiscal year by $250,000,000 from the $2,950,000,000 requested by President Truman and his advisers. That the House members were not very sure of their ground in this matter is shown by the small margin, 165 to 163, by which they voted the reduction.

When we look back over the past several years and see what has been accomplished by the Marshall plan European aid program, this $250,000,000 cheese paring as against a possible $250,000,000,000 expenditure for a third world war is false economy. When we see how the Marshall plan money has brought Italy and France back from the verge of communism 3 years ago to the point where they are now safely in the family of democratic nations, we think our investment has been small and the return upon it has been enormous.

Yesterday came the announcement from the Netherlands that the chiefs of staff of 11 Atlantic Pact nations have agreed unanimously on an integrated defense plan. The plan is based on the agreed strategic concept of the North Atlantic Pact countries of "all for one and one for all" against any threat of attack. Each nation solemnly pledges to participate with the maximum resources it can provide in assuring the continued security of the territories covered by the North Atlantic organization.

So today we have a unified western Europe ready to cooperate with us in repelling the common enemy of civilization, whereas 3 years ago we were in danger of being left alone in the world. It is more than possible that this western European alliance will soon include western Germany which we have also saved from communism by the Marshall plan aid. Former Prime Minister Winston Churchill in the House of Commons this week, while saying that he did not believe war was either imminent or inevitable, repeated his plea that the new German Republic should be taken in as an equal in this federation of western Europe. He said he could see no reason why the Germans should not aid in the defense of their own country; and, further, that there could be no hope of a united Europe without Germany, nor hope for Germany except in such a free and united Europe.

With such a federation of Europe, recovering economically as it is, we should in a year or two be able to substantially cut down the multi-billion-dollar defense bill we are now paying to fight the cold war. We should not endanger this objective by trying to save a couple of hundred millions now.

Why Coast Guard Needs Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of April 1, 1950:

WHY COAST GUARD NEEDS RESERVES

New Jersey has a special concern in the refusal of the House Appropriations Committee to provide funds for peacetime training of the United States Coast Guard Reserve. In view of the many key industrial plants located on bays and rivers along our extended coastline, their protection in an emergency becomes vital.

The security of seaports is the responsibility of the Coast Guard in wartime, when it becomes a part of the Navy. Adequate patrolling of harbors and piers, inspection of vessels, and protection against ships carrying A- or H-bombs would require tremendous expansion of the personnel of 22,000 this unit now possesses.

Those extra men can come only from a well-trained reserve. The special skills required for this service cannot be learned overnight. But the House committee has rejected the Budget Bureau's request for $4,100,000 for reserve training in the 1951 money bill. In this atomic and guided-missile age, when an innocent-looking freighter or lighter might blow up a harbor area, that may be short-sighted economy. Secretary Johnson and Admiral Sherman have testified to the need for these funds.

Representative CANFIELD, of Paterson, has offered an amendment for restoration of part of this money on the floor of the House. Support for what he proposes can be expressed in letters to members of the Jersey delegation on Capitol Hill, in care of the House Office Building for Representatives, and the Senate Office Building for our two Senators.

A Realistic Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, as a minority Member of the House I have been patiently waiting for the administration in power to initiate some new action in consideration of a more workable labor bill to rectify the inequities and objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nothing further has been done since both the administration's labor bills in the House and Senate were defeated last year. Responsibility for this inaction lies with the administration spokesmen who apparently are more interested in obtaining political advantage than in writing a law which is in the interests of all parties concerned and particularly in the interest of organized labor.

When I realized some time ago that the administration had given up on labor legislation for this Congress and was planning to dust off the issue of Taft-Hartley repeal for the coming elections, I set about writing my own bill to revise the Taft-Hartley law.

My labor bill constitutes an honest attempt to meet the legitimate objections which have been made to the Taft-Hartley law. In fact H. R. 7696 repeals the Taft-Hartley law and then incorporates the best features of our labor law as we have developed it over the past 15 years.

It retains all of the substantive guarantees of the Wagner Act. In the exact language of that law it protects labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to be free from discrimination.

It is regrettable to me that any law regulating labor-management relations should be so complicated as the several acts now on the books. We must realize, however, that as the intricacies of organization of both labor unions and employers increase, regulatory legislation must also increase and must become more intricate and involved. My colleagues, this bill, H. R. 7696 was written with the view in mind of eliminating inequities and unfairness of the present law of the land. It may be possible to simplify it considerably and if such is the case, I am heartily in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7696 embodies no less than 30 material changes in the present law governing labor-management relations. I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the complete list of changes to the Taft-Hartley law incorporated in my labor bill. They are are follows:

1. The definition of "supervisor" is revised so that no one may be exempted as a foreman unless he is actually a foreman. The words "assign" and "responsibility to direct" are eliminated (sec. 2 (11)).

2. The term "agency" is redefined to make it perfectly clear that a labor organization is only responsible for the acts of its authorized agents to the extent of other business concerns and is not responsible for the acts of any member of the union solely on the ground of membership (sec. 2 (13)).

3. The National Labor Relations Board's membership is increased from five to seven and made bipartisan (sec. 3 (a)).

4. The vote to authorize the union shop is eliminated although a vote to deauthorize a union shop is retained (sec. 8 (a) 3).

5. The closed shop is allowed in those States where the State law specifically legalizes the closed shop (sec. 8 (a) 3).

6. Unions may require the discharge of men expelled from the union for five additional reasons; engaging in Communist activities, wildcat strikes or any activity which subjects the union to civil fines or criminal penalties, disclosing confidential information of the union and conviction of a felony (sec. 8 (a) 3).

7. An employer may notify a labor organization of any vacancy and give it a reasonable opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such employment (sec. 8 (a) 3).

8. Consistent with the change in section 8 (a) 3, unions are permitted to demand that employers discharge men expelled from the union because they are Communists, fellow-travelers, and wildcat strikers (sec. 8 (b) 2).

9. "Struck-work" clauses in collective-bargaining contracts are specifically legalized allowing employees to refuse to work on orders being performed for the account of an employer whose own employees are engaged in a lawful strike (sec. 8 (b) 4).

10. Statements by employers shall be admissible in evidence before the NLRB in all cases where such statements would be admissible as evidence in a court of law (sec. 8 (c)).

11. The clause providing for 60 days' notice and a waiting period is retained, but corrected so that a strike is not illegal in case the contract is reopened in accordance with its terms. Also the penalty against employees engaging in a strike before the 60-day period is repealed (sec. 8 (d)).

12. Whenever a petition has been filed in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the NLRB the Board shall investigate such petition "immediately" and "forthwith" provide for a hearing upon "not more than 10 days' " notice (sec. 9 (c) 1 (b)).

13. Employees on strike will be eligible to vote, even if they are not entitled to reinstatement (sec. 9 (c) 3).

14. To protect employees against the possibility of being held in bondage in union shops they wish to terminate, there is provision for "deauthorization" elections when requested by 30 percent of the employees (sec. 9 (e) 1).

15. While unions are still required to file reports, the form of the report is greatly simplified (sec. 9 (f)).

16. Unions are allowed 120 days of grace after the end of their fiscal years within which to file financial reports (sec. 9 (f)).

17. The non-Communist oath is continued, but applied also to employers and their officers (sec. 9 (h)).

18. The statute of limitations on the filing of charges is increased from 6 months to 1 year (sec. 10 (b)).

19. The provision prohibiting the Board from reinstating an individual if he was suspended or discharged for cause is eliminated (sec. 10 (c)).

20. Language has been changed to carefully limit the cases in which injunctive relief can be sought against unions, and provides that, even in these limited cases, only an official of our Government can seek the injunction (sec. 10 (j)).

21. Section 10 (k), which placed great obstacles in the way of settling disputes over work assignments or conflicting jurisdictional claims of unions is eliminated.

22. Section 10 (l), which required the general counsel to seek an injunction in cases arising under sections 8 (b) 4A, B, and C is also eliminated.

23. As a saving provision, the NLRB is not permitted to continue processing violations of the Taft-Hartley Act that would not be violations of the new law (sec. 102).

24. In national emergency strikes the President is authorized to appoint a board of inquiry after an injunction issues, rather than before (sec. 207 (b)).

25. The period within which a board of inquiry is to report to the President after an injunction issues is extended from 60 to 80 days (sec. 207 (c)).

26. The vote of employees on the employer's last offer before an injunction against a strike expires is eliminated (sec. 207 (c)).

27. Rearrangement of Taft-Hartley clauses concerning the composition of boards of inquiry, their pay, and their powers (sec. 207 (c)).

28. While the provision regulating welfare funds is retained, it is no longer required that there be joint control if the employer does not desire it. Criminal liability is removed if the Secretary of Labor approves the

terms of the welfare fund. Other changes meet objections in the operation of the law (sec. 302 (a)).

29. Check-off limitations are modified to permit authorization to continue from year to year unless rejected (sec. 302 (c)).

30. Addition to the law relieving unions of liability for damages in court cases to the same extent that the "struck work" clause of section 8 (b) 4A would relieve them from proceedings under section 10.

Why ECA Authorizations Should Not Be Cut Further

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of Sunday, April 2, 1950:

THE ANTICS ARE OVER

Having gotten the clowning out of its system, the House settled down to business Friday and passed a European aid bill which is subject to but one valid criticism.

The absurd Irish partition amendment, adopted last week by a vote of 99 to 66, was knocked out of the bill when House Members who take their responsibility seriously got back on the job. The final vote on this provision was 226 to 60. Also deleted from the bill in its final form was the provision which would have earmarked $1,000,000,000 for use only in the purchase of farm products in the United States. This proposal, rather appealing on its face, might have had a seriously crippling effect on the ECA operation, and the House is to be commended for finally rejecting it.

What remains as a matter of serious concern is the $250,000,000 cut in the authorization for ECA. This cut was made partly in a spirit of misguided economy and partly in response to the preposterous appeal that since the Members had cut the pork-barrel rivers-and-harbors bill they could not go back home and face their constituents without also cutting the European-assistance program.

There are at least two reasons why there is no true economy in cutting ECA. One was set forth by Representative JUDD in arguing against a proposal for a $500,000,000 reduction. He said: "If I thought that this would save the taxpayers of America half a billion dollars I would vote for it, but I am convinced that it would not save them anything, and might, indeed, cost them a great deal. In fact, I am convinced that the Marshall plan has not actually cost the American taxpayers 1 dime. If we had not adopted it we would be deeper in debt and going further in the red in this year's budget than we are, because unquestionably we would have had to increase our defense expenditures by an amount larger than the cost of this program." The other reason lies in the demonstrated fact that Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, is not the kind of official who spends money simply because he has it in hand. Funds not needed in the current year's appropriation were not squandered; they were carried over. The estimate for next year represents a cut of 25 percent over the present year. In other words, Mr. Hoffman is adhering faithfully to the assurances that he has given.

In the Star's judgment, Mr. Hoffman should get the full authorization requested. He has carefully pruned his own estimates, and if they should be too high he has shown that he can be trusted to hold on to the unneeded money. On the other hand, an arbitrary cut of nearly 10 percent might well serve to break down the recovery program just when it is beginning to succeed. To invite that risk is not economy; it is foolishness. The Senate will have an opportunity to restore the cut, and it ought to do so.

Withholding Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News of March 23, 1950:

WITHHOLDING TAXES

Now that the income tax accounts are squared for another year, in a manner of speaking, it is interesting to note that the withholding tax is coming under heavier fire. Vivien Kellems, a New England industrialist, has been a rebel for some time. Now James F. Byrnes, the converted New Dealer, is training his guns on the system, contending it was adopted as a wartime emergency measure and should be dropped. "The system," says Byrnes, "was established on the theory that in wartime workers were constantly moving from place to place and it would be difficult to check their returns." But the practice continues, with the result that millions do not seem to realize they are paying taxes because the taxes are withheld from their pay envelopes. If the worker paid quarterly installments out of his take-home pay, there would be such a ruckus that the demand for reduction of Government expenditures would be irresistible. Byrnes suggests that employers not now doing so should insert in workers' pay envelopes a statement showing the total amount of pay and how much has been deducted for income taxes and social security. When a worker's wife gets the slip, she will think of the many things she could have bought with the money deducted and may be moved to write to her Congressman about Government expenditures. The idea has merit. Taxes and Government extravagance will not be reduced until a majority of the people demand reductions.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an essay by Gladys Huntington of 31 Washington Street, Lawrence, Mass., on the subject The American Way. This article was submitted in the contest sponsored by the National Wood Association. The writer of this article is one of the employees in the mending room of the Pacific Mills located in Lawrence, Mass., which recently celebrated its one hundredth anniversary of its organization.

This is the subject in which every man, woman, and child in this country should be vitally interested, and I personally feel that this essay is not only educational but most interesting.

We in the United States should and must be thankful for all of the privileges that we enjoy in our American way of life. This employee has in a very excellent way stated the facts concisely and truthfully:

THE AMERICAN WAY
(By Gladys K. Huntington)

Perhaps the paragraph most often quoted from our Declaration of Independence is the following:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Reviewing the early history of America, the thrilling story of struggle for existence and possession in a land rich with resources and opportunities seems almost fantastic when viewed in the light of present-day privileges and opportunities.

From those early years of struggle and hardship have come untold blessings to everyone fortunate enough to call America his home.

We have become so accustomed to the advantages and rights which are ours that we take them for granted.

It is only when we read and hear of what is taking place in other lands that we are truly cognizant of our great blessings.

In the last hundred years we have made steady progress toward a higher standard of working and living conditions. Revolutionary changes have taken place in our mode of life.

Where, but in America, do we find workers going to their jobs in automobiles?

Even those spoken of as in moderate circumstances come home to families where bathrooms, telephones, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, furnaces, and even television are commonplace fixtures.

There is also an abundance of staple food and good clothing.

Still many people in America are discontented. Our struggle is no longer one of physical hardship, but rather the obstacles to be overcome are mental and moral.

In a land rich with opportunity and privileges there is no place for oppression and inequality. When America became a free and independent Nation the thought was that all men should live together and work together, in peace and brotherhood.

This is still the American way.

Never for a moment should we forget that with "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" come duties and responsibilities, as well as privileges.

Perhaps first and foremost is our political duty.

To be well informed on civic and national affairs; to vote intelligently on every question presented; to study issues and candidates with open minds.

We have heard it said that "the most powerful enemies of a country are those from within." This is true of a man, as well as a nation, for it is out of the heart of man that first comes the thought that later developed into the act which will build or destroy all that we now hold dear and cherish as the American way.

United States Coast Guard Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in the United States Coast Guard Reserve, as is everyone who is at all familiar with the duties and responsibilities of that very important branch of the armed forces.

The item for the training of the Coast Guard Reserve has been deleted from the omnibus bill assertedly as an economy measure, and for no other reason.

The fact that no money has been appropriated for this organization in the past is no basis for argument that this legislation is not vital. The Coast Guard has been unable to secure this money due largely to a lack of appreciation by the Congress of the absolute necessity of maintaining a trained organization, to perform at a moment's notice, the many duties performed by the Coast Guard Reserve at the instant a national emergency is declared.

The Navy, Army, and Air Force are confronted largely with problems of expansion at the outset of hostilities while the Coast Guard must not only expand to seven times its peacetime size, but at the same instant, offer full scale police protection to all harbor areas in the United States and its possessions. The full-scale investigation of all who seek access to ships and water-front facilities, must begin immediately and cannot wait 6 months or 2 or 3 years while the reservists are again recruited and trained to perform this herculean task. In the city of Seattle, Wash., alone more than 50,000 persons were investigated and either given clearance or denied access to the very vulnerable, very vital harbor areas.

The loading of explosives must begin at once if the Army, Navy, and Air Force are to be expected to carry on a full-scale assault as even our largest battleships carry only enough ammunition for 24 hours of constant barrage.

The small-boat patrol of each harbor must begin and be maintained constantly day and night, requiring the use of thousands of men and motorboats.

The beach patrol must begin to function, furnishing enough trained men to patrol the entire coastal distance of the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf coast, and the Pacific coast. An assignment which taxes the imagination when one considers that all these men are in a reserve status, and have no nucleus to cling to but must develop and grow instantly from no personnel to many thousands of members.

The remark has been made that it is ridiculous to expect that the Coast Guard Reserve can train men to the proficiency required on one drill night a week—and that statement is very true so far as it goes—however, it must be understood that the Coast Guard Reserve does not intend nor expect to teach men these very complex skills in 2 hours per week. The fire-prevention personnel are drawn from the underwriters and the best talent the local fire departments have to offer—the Coast Guard Reserve intelligence men are from the very cream of the local police department.

Explosive loading personnel are developed around physicists, and chemists, and ballisticians, who need only military training. These experts who are now members of the Coast Guard Reserve, are all veterans of World War II, some of both World Wars I and II, are now and have been since October 1948, busily engaged in developing explosive loading personnel, beach patrol and intelligence personnel and the many other groups so necessary at the first sign of war.

This work has been purely voluntary and no money whatever has been given them to either furnish them with training equipment, or for pay purposes as is done with all other components of the Armed Forces.

Under Public Law 810, the Coast Guard Reserve is entitled to training on the same basis as the Army, Navy, Air Force, and all other military components and it is the only military organization in existence in this country today which fought and died together with all other services, and yet received no recognition insofar as training appropriations are concerned.

The majority of the House has insisted on economy, reduction in appropriations, and I believe we all feel that we have about reached the saturation point in taxation, but it cannot be shown that to completely ignore and turn our backs upon the most vulnerable, most vital link in our chain of defense, is either economy or sound judgment.

On Italy's Water Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks. I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the April 2d issue of Il Progresso.

Nothing which I may say will add to the article which is both revealing and enlightening. Those of us who one day hope to see Italy a member of the family of nations will be more fortified in that hope.

The editorial follows:

ON ITALY'S WATER FRONT

The riots and sabotage which have gripped the ports of France are spreading to Italy. These are lavishly financed, carefully prepared actions directed on a military basis by foreign military agents for a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of the Italian way of life and Italy's subjection to a totalitarian Communist dictatorship. These are not bona fide wage movements to better the conditions of Italy's dockers and seamen. These are solely actions instigated and organized by Russia in its drive to weaken Italy and the other democracies so as to conquer them the more easily in a war now being feverishly prepared by the Kremlin.

We repeat there are no Italian Communists. There are only Russian-dominated Communists in Italy who serve not their people but the enemies of the Italian Nation. This is treason and should be treated only as treason by the Government and people of Italy.

We are confident that the great mass of the Italian maritime workers are loyal to their country and devoted to democracy. Russian-paid-for saboteurs will more and more be finding it difficult to go through with their traitorous plans. Communist schemes for the sabotage of American arms shipments have already suffered some telling rebuffs. In Italy's second largest port, Naples, over 1,000 of 1,800 dockers voted to unload all cargoes, including American war material. Eight other southern Italian ports have followed the example of Naples. Among these are Bari, Brindisi, and Palermo in Sicily.

RUSSIAN HOOLIGANISM

All rowdyism, riots, and sabotage in the wake of these votes are only bought and paid for ruble performances. The Italian authorities will treat their instigators, we hope, just as ordinary spies and foreign saboteurs are treated. To allow criminal stool pigeons and ruble robots to hide behind the democratic legal system for the purpose of overthrowing it is as suicidal as it is unpardonably stupid. There is no rhyme or reason for permitting the Communist-controlled so-called labor federation to serve as an open Russian espionage agency. Such organizations and movements have nothing to do with the ideals and aspirations of trade-unionism. Such outfits are the worst enemies of free trade-unionism. Were such Communist bands are in power free trade-unionism does not exist. Government-controlled company unions have replaced the genuine trade-unions throughout Russia and its satellite areas. The first thing the Communists did when they seized Shanghai was to shoot the outstanding leaders of free labor in the Chinese metropolis.

The spring offensive of the Russian despots against Italian democracy is as much the concern of the American and all other liberty-loving peoples as was the historic electoral contests in Italy in April 1948. When the Communists were defeated then world democracy was greatly aided. Similarly, if the totalitarian tools of the Kremlin will be smashed in Italy's docks now, the forces of freedom will be vastly strengthened everywhere. And just as the democratic groups outside of Italy aided their Italian colleagues in April 1948, so they must aid their hard-pressed Italian colleagues in April 1950.

WE MUST ALL HELP

Americans of Italian origin were in the forefront of the assistance to the people of Italy 2 years ago. Il Progresso rendered distinguished and decisive service to the cause of democracy in Italy in April 1948. There is every reason to feel confident that all these forces will once again respond with enthusiasm and energy to help the fighters for freedom in Italy. Such help is indispensable. The Communists have at their disposal huge sums of Russian money for expenditures on fostering treason and sabotage in Italian ports. The democrats in Italy are themselves too poor to match this part of the giant Soviet military budget. They must, therefore, be helped from outside of Italy. This is living democratic solidarity. Without it, democracy cannot live, especially when it is under fire of Russia's heavy artillery and poison gas warriors.

Specifically and at the outset, the members of the unions on our American waterfronts in the cities where Italian ships dock should fraternize with and explain to the Italian seamen what is behind the Communist insur-

rectionary assault against the transfer of arms. There are many longshoremen and other transport workers in our midst who are of Italian extraction and who speak Italian. In general, the Italian seamen visiting our ports should be contacted, drawn into our social life and told the truth about the Communist fifth column operating in ports, like Genoa and Leghorn. Here such enlightenment can be engaged in freely. In the Italian ports, gangsters, paid by Moscow and operating behind the mask of Tovarish Di Vittorio's outfit, have succeeded in creating an atmosphere of terror and thereby preventing the workers from learning the truth.

In this connection, the International Transport Workers Federation should get into the picture and have an Italian representative here to establish an Italian seamen's center in the port of New York. This would provide immediate facilities for bringing together the membership and representatives of Italian and American transport workers' unions. The best way for promoting understanding and solidarity among the longshoremen and seamen of both countries would thus be provided. We are confident that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and its American affiliates, the A. F. of L. and the CIO, would do their share in the cementing of such Italian-American friendship and labor solidarity in the interest of world peace and freedom.

Ohio Oil, Coal, and Railroad Industries Injured by Heavy Imports of Petroleum and Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the import excise tax on petroleum, fuel oil, and other oil products. I shall, under leave to extend my remarks, append the bill to this statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing when imports of oil have increased to such proportions that our own oil output and our own employment is severely affected. It is two things when our production of coal is severely curtailed by the unrestricted importation of competing fuel, and it is three things when our railroads are required to lay off hundreds of workers who depend on the transportation of coal for their bread and butter.

When unrestricted imports of oil are brought across our borders and the supply exceeds the demand, what do we do? We reduce our domestic output. Some States curtail output by law and even require some wells to close.

What do we do about imports when the supply exceeds the demand? Do we apply the same formula to the foreign wells as we apply to our own? We do not. On the contrary administration leaders continue to go here and there about the country crying for still greater imports, pointedly ignoring the thousands upon thousands of oil and coal and transportation workers who are forced into idleness.

In the great State of Ohio the coal industry is very important, and transportation of coal is a major source of work and income for the railroads of that State. Now we find that the coal mines are closing down and the railroads have idle equipment and hundreds of unemployed workers. Many of them are rapidly discovering that free trade is not the best policy as applied to fuel products.

The administration's trade agreement program has degenerated into a giveaway program. Our diplomats pointedly ignore the cartels, the monopolies, the subsidies, the State trading and bilateral deals of other nations and continue to open wide our doors to products made by the cheap labor of foreign countries.

If the State of Ohio attempted to ship goods produced in mines or factories that paid starvation wages, exercised monopoly control, or engaged in other cutthroat and unfair labor practices, the Departments of Justice, Commerce, Labor and a number of Government commissions and committees would be investigating us within the hour. Many of the practices engaged in by our foreign competitors would not be permitted for 1 minute in this country and the products of those industries could not be sold on the domestic markets.

How is it then that we not only countenance those practices in foreign countries but we openly encourage them by freeing imports from all regulations. We have even been playing host to numbers of foreign salesmen invited here to learn more about how to capture our home markets.

The so-called escape clause in the trade agreements is a joke and is recognized as such by almost every industry. If there had existed such a thing as a true escape clause it would not have been necessary for me to introduce this bill. The Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission which administers this escape clause has specifically stated that increased imports and decreased domestic production were foreseen when the trade agreements were negotiated with the foreign countries. Not one of the applicants for aid under this ridiculous section were able to get any redress, even though injury was recognized by the Tariff Commission in some cases.

The independent oil producers asked for an investigation by the Tariff Commission and proved that rapidly increasing imports were followed by rapidly decreasing domestic production. They proved that upward of 25,000 oil workers were out of work. They proved that oil exploration was being abandoned and many domestic wells were being closed. Not one iota of encouragement or help was given, and none has been given to this day.

The coal miners, the railroad workers, and the producers of chinaware, pottery, glassware, and numerous other important items manufactured extensively in Ohio are joining the petroleum industry in the discovery that they have been sold down the river and that there is no such thing as "escape clauses." Congressional action is the only possible solution left, and that must run contrary to the commitments of our overzealous, free-trade State Department.

This great hullabaloo about closing the trade gap is a greatly exaggerated cry of "wolf, wolf." The tables are about to be reversed, and we will soon find that our shipment of dollars abroad is greatly exceeding the amount being returned. In the month of January we exported goods that were valued at about $112,000,000 more than our imports. That is the so-called trade gap. However, the Department of Commerce states that we send abroad more than $107,000,000 per month in the form of tourist expenditures, and sums sent abroad by private individuals and institutions. Actually that leaves only a little more than $5,000,000 as the true gap. This amounts to about $70,000,000 a year, and is a far cry from the three billion which the Government orators point to as the dollar gap.

For a long while more than half of the items imported by this country have been permitted to enter free of any duty. It must be remembered that if we are to increase imports by tariff reductions, then the blow must fall on a comparatively few industries. It has fallen on some, and more will soon feel it as have the oil, coal, and transportation industries already. Our shipment of dollars abroad is now almost balanced with the shipments of dollars into this country. Soon we will be in the embarrassing position of having most of our export markets closed to us and our home market wide open to all the goods of every other nation, including Russia and all her Communist-dominated satellites.

In introducing this bill I have paid close attention to the desires and attitudes of the people of my State and the district I represent. If a cancellation or moderate renegotiation of one or two trade agreements is necessary to prevent the unemployment of thousands more of our workers in the oil, coal, and railroad industries, then it is our duty to see that it is done.

Ohio wants all the international trade that is profitable, but it must, out of all fairness to our own workers, be based on equality. Wage rates, living conditions, fair-trade practices, and other factors that bear upon costs of production must be taken into consideration so that true equality at the borders of our country is the measuring stick for our import regulations.

The bill referred to follows:

A bill to increase the import excise tax on petroleum, fuel oil, and other petroleum derivatives

Be it enacted, etc., That, because of the large quantities of petroleum, fuel oil, and other petroleum derivatives entering the United States from foreign sources and the resulting drastic curtailment of domestic employment, and because of the serious effect of such large imports of fuel and other oil on the very important coal industry of this Nation, and because, as a result of the substantial curtailment in the production, transportation, and use of domestic coal, the railroads normally transporting that product are being severely injured, and because many thousands of workers producing and transporting oil and coal are being driven out

of work by excessive imports of oil, and because it is the sense of this Congress that a weakening of our domestic economy is dangerous to our security and should be mitigated wherever possible, it is therefore declared to be the policy of this Congress that some fair and economically sound methods be devised to increase the production, transportation, and use of domestic oil and coal.

SEC. 2. To implement the policy of this act section 3422 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"Crude petroleum, 2 cents per gallon; fuel oil derived from petroleum, gas oil derived from petroleum, and all liquid derivatives of crude petroleum, except lubricating oil and gasoline or other motor fuel, 2½ cents per gallon; gasoline or other motor fuel, 3 cents per gallon; lubricating oil, 4 cents per gallon; paraffin and other petroleum-wax products, 1 cent per pound. The tax on the articles described in this section shall apply only with respect to the importation of such articles."

SEC. 3. The President is hereby directed to immediately modify any foreign-trade agreements entered into under the authority granted him by Congress in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 which are affected by the passage of this act, and to proceed as soon thereafter as practicable to renegotiate such agreements. However, the taxes established by this act shall not hereafter be subject to changes under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

New Taxes Aren't Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Mercury:

NEW TAXES AREN'T NEEDED

Mr. Truman's most recent recommendations on taxation have met an extremely mixed reaction, both in Congress and throughout the country. His views on the wartime excise taxes provide a particularly good illustration of that.

The President advocates that these taxes, which are levied on a sizable list of commodities and services—including such luxuries as baby oil; commercial transportation for both passengers and freight, and long-distance telephone and telegraph charges—should be substantially reduced. However, he added this all-important proviso—that the loss in revenue must be offset by new taxes, and that he will not approve any bill which does not accomplish this plan.

The President is entitled to his views. However, the fact remains that the excise taxes—which manufacturers, retailers and others concerned say are a definite barrier to trade and employment—were strictly wartime measures which are still on the books many years after the war ended. It is also true that the goods and services they apply to are necessities in many cases, not luxuries. And it is further true that the only sound way to make up any loss of revenue their reduction or repeal would cause is to cut the cost of Government—not to pile more taxes on our overburdened individuals and businesses.

The present temper of Congress seems to be in favor of repeal of the excise taxes—even as it is against tax increases of any kind. That is the right attitude. The enormously impressive Hoover Commission reports have shown where the administrative cost of Government alone can be reduced by three or four billion a year. Congress could make no greater contribution to our economic stability and prosperity than by putting into effect a rigorous policy of economy for every Government activity and every bureau.

President Truman Fails To Handle Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, mismanagement and unsound policies are the cause of agricultural surpluses—not makeshift legislation as charged by the President. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the President by simple administrative action can set quotas and fees that in effect will stop the importation of agricultural products that are in surplus supply in this country. Why doesn't he act? Why should he continue the do-nothing policy that permits the stealing of our farmers' domestic market by foreign competition?

The Secretary of Agriculture can by present law request studies, and findings by the Tariff Commission of the effect of the importation on our domestic economy. So far he has not seen fit to act. The recent potato scandal is an example of the failure of the administration to carry out its duties and responsibilities to the American people when they permitted potatoes to be brought in from Canada while American potatoes were dumped or converted into cattle feed.

In the formulating of a price-support program for dairy products this year the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to ignore the recommendations of the industry and dairy farmers and long-established trade marketing practices. The result has been that the Government owned on February 28, 1950, 92,796,753 pounds of butter. I am informed that most of this butter would have remained in trade hands had the recommendations of the dairy industry been followed. The taxpayers however are saddled with a storage bill of approximately $5,000 a day on butter alone because of mismanagement and the efforts of the Secretary of Agriculture to discredit existing legislation in favor of his unsound promising Brannan plan.

The American people are entitled to know the real reasons for our agricultural surpluses. The American taxpayer should be relieved of the burden of unnecessary storage charges on agricultural stocks that have been hoarded by the administration. During a 6-month period, July to December 1949, the handling charges on stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation cost the taxpayers approximately $25,000 an hour and are unquestionably much higher now. The American people want and are demanding fundamental improvements—sound policies and sound management.

One Man's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in man's darkest hour he turns to prayer. Strong as we might be with the atom bomb in our possession, and with the knowledge of the hydrogen bomb, the world is still in a troubled state. One wonders about tomorrow. Will there be peace in our time—and in the time of our children? No one knows. But no one can deny that there is yet hope—so one prays.

Herve L'Heureux and his story of Prayers for Peace should give many of us pause. It is the story of a man and his belief in the efficacy of prayer. That this movement of prayers for peace which belongs to no one sect, no particular denomination has taken such hold of peoples everywhere is indeed inspiring and encouraging. In its simple fashion, it merely urges that one be conscious of our desire for peace, of our striving for peace; and that each of us devote a minute of prayer for peace in these troubled times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following article which appeared in March 19 issue of the Sunday Mirror:

MILLIONS EVERY DAY JOIN ONE MAN'S PRAYER

(By Francis Anthony)

In the hearts and in the minds of men of faith, the issues are clearly drawn: The power of the Almighty and of prayer versus the atom bomb and war, the hydrogen bomb and chaotic destruction.

In Washington each day at noon, a great, burly man bows his head in a minute of prayer for peace. He is joined, in spirit, by millions of his fellow men. Eighteen months ago he prayed alone. By his faith in a cause, his belief in an idea, he has built, single-handed, a movement that is gathering followers like an avalanche—prayers for peace.

Herve L'Heureux is no platitude-prating pacifist. A wounded veteran of World War I, he was one of the founders of the American Legion. As a career diplomat (now chief of the visa section of the State Department) with 20 years' foreign service, L'Heureux knows only too well the forces that threaten civilization today.

A famous atomic scientist who personally has endorsed prayers for peace states it this way: "It is scientifically sound to believe that the power which creates atomic energy is even greater than the product. I believe that power is faith, and that we should use

it to curb and control the destructive forces that have been revealed to men."

In October 1948, at an American Legion meeting in his home town of Manchester, N. H., Mr. L'Heureux spoke of his private custom of taking a minute each day to pray for divine guidance toward the goal of world peace. He invited fellow members to join in his prayer, wherever they might be. The result was a resolution, passed a few days later, pledging members of the organization to daily supplication—in whatever way their hearts and their religions indicated.

In the intervening months more than 500 veterans' groups have adopted similar resolutions. Nearly a hundred business firms, scores of fraternal societies, high school and college student bodies, unions and church organizations have joined the sweeping movement. The total of organizations is now more than 750, the number growing each day.

No contributions, no dues are solicited by Prayers for Peace. There is no fund-raising or publicity organization behind it. Neither is it incorporated. Prayers for Peace is Herve L'Heureux. All money expended in its propagation has come out of his pocket. In a year and a half L'Heureux has replied to more than 12,000 letters. He has typed each answer himself and paid for all postage. In fact, at Christmas, he requested and received postage stamps as gifts from his family.

Rejecting an offer of $15,000 to help promote the movement, L'Heureux told a generous friend: "You cannot buy the spirits of men. Prayers for peace must come from the heart, from the desire of Americans to show the world that we are God-loving people—rather than money-loving and materialistic."

A skeptic who finally became convinced summed it up in this one sentence: "Men have always prayed when they were in greatest trouble—and never has the race of men been in more trouble than now."

Benefits From Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Washington Post of April 4, 1950, by the Marine News of New York, entitled "Benefits From Waterways—the Great Lakes System":

BENEFITS FROM WATERWAYS—THE GREAT LAKES SYSTEM

One of the marvels of America is its amazing rate of growth. What are the greatest contributions to this growth? One of them is the unparalleled Great Lakes transportation system, making for the economical movement of iron ore, grain, coal, and lumber. Eighty-five percent of all steel made in America is from ore transported down the Lakes and through connecting channels made navigable by the Federal Government. Since 1855, approximately 2,500,000,000 tons have been delivered from upper Lake Superior points to steel mills along Lake Michigan and Lake Erie or to ports there for short transshipment by rail to inland mills. The average 1,000-mile haul costs about 1 mill per ton-mile—lowest cost transportation in all the world. It saves money for every taxpayer in America, and more than pays for the entire Great Lakes waterway system during every single year of normal operation. The improved St. Clair and Detroit Rivers carry more tonnage than any other channels on earth. Deeper channels for deeper draft vessels for still more economical operation will add to the already incalculable value of the Great Lakes system.

(Marine News, 26 Water Street, New York, N. Y., George H. Pamer, president and publisher.)

Is It "Loose Talk"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of April 1, 1950:

IS IT "LOOSE TALK"?

In 1948 President Truman called the congressional inquiry into the Hiss case a red herring. This year he says the GOP charge that misfits and Communists still hold jobs in his administration is loose talk and that it is an attempt to sabotage the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States.

But the President and his Secretary of State have already sabotaged the bipartisan foreign policy by refusing to allow any Republican leaders to help make policy as well as to vote for it. All of the new foreign programs have been drawn up by the administration and presented to Congress and the GOP as the final answer to everything. If that is bipartisanship it is a new way of describing it.

Toward the President's repeated assurances that he has cleaned out the rats' nests of Communists and perverts in the Government, the people have adopted that old Missouri attitude and are saying, "Show us." Since the Hiss case, the Coplon case, and the Fuchs case we can be less sure than ever that the President knows what he is talking about when he says he has chased all the Communists out.

The people know that hundreds of Communists and sexual perverts have been kicked out of Federal jobs. They also know that these people were hired while President Truman and President Roosevelt were in office. When they hear charges that the Government is still infested with Reds, when they hear the Commerce Department announce that 27 poor security risks are still in the Department although not allowed to see Government secrets and when they are given no proof that the charges are not true, why shouldn't they suspect Mr. Truman's assurances?

The President says that criticism of his State Department and charges of Communist infiltration are doing irreparable harm to his Government. They may be doing irreparable harm to the administration's future political hopes, but if the charges are true much more harm is being done to the best interests of the American people than the publicity Senator MCCARTHY has been receiving.

Let the President prove he is right, that the loose talk is really loose, and the people will breathe easier. Until he does, they will keep on wondering.

Address by T. R. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. T. R. Green, secretary-manager of the West Memphis (Ark.) Chamber of Commerce:

It's a real pleasure for me to be up here at the Tyronza Rotary Club today, and to have so many of our friends and visitors here from throughout this part of Arkansas: we have Mountain Home, we have Marked Tree, we have Trumann and two of our own good citizens from West Memphis. So when I talk about this last frontier, eastern Arkansas finds itself in a very unique position: the position of leadership, position of untold and untouched resources which tomorrow will develop one of the greatest outstanding sections of Arkansas. Surely we all will admit that Arkansas is really the opportunity land of America. You know, as we are sitting here, I can't help but realize what a wonderful thing it is for meetings of this kind, when we can get together and talk a little bit about a few things, and I want to tell you that there's only three things of which I am absolutely certain. One of them is that America is the greatest country in all the world, has been and will continue to be; that Arkansas is by far the greatest State in America; and the third thing of which I am certain is that at 1:10, when we adjourn, I will have finished any remarks I might have to make.

So we can relax a little bit and talk for just a few moments about Arkansas. You know, in the old days, we have overlooked one of the most important phases of our whole education, and that is, teaching ourselves a little bit more about this great State in which we live. Most of us have chosen to live here, not for any definite reason, but, because we thought that the opportunity for providing the security that we needed and sought would be greater than any other place. And yet as we go along we hear so much about our friends down south of us in Texas, yet anytime a man from Texas says any more than Texas is the largest State in the Union, he immediately brands himself as a liar. And then let us go to our good people down in Florida who have citrus groves, everglades, swamps and hurricanes. It's the only State where a man puts a little flag up, and what happens—everybody nails boards over their windows, stores, and the business houses so you can't possibly tell what's going on. What about our good friends in California, we've heard a lot about them, we find out that California is a State that has grown great through its sham, through its publicity and through its photography. You know, out there in California they don't have any rain at all, while we here in Arkansas are proud of the 51-and-some-odd inches that we have each year, equally divided throughout the year, with April and September being the two greatest months for water. While in California, the last time I was out there, the first 3 months they had 31 inches of dew, and believe me folks it's rather heavy. And so I say, that Arkansas can be proud, because the encyclopedias say that it's the only State, of all the 48, around which a fence might be built and

the same standard of living maintained throughout the years, without any encroachment from our neighbors or without any dependability upon them for any of the needs for a normal living. But, we don't want that kind of a living. You know I was thinking about two friends of mine the other day, they were discussing the fact of what an early season it was to have the flies coming in here, one of them had killed five flies, three males and two females. The other friend said to him, how do you know which were the males and which were the females? He told him that three of them were on a beer bottle and two of them were on a mirror. And so I tell you that as my friends alertness and vision were indications to him of the flies' sex, there are national indications today, if you will just stop long enough to analyze them, which are very definitely along a trend, that if we don't work out the problem that's confronting us we're going to have some difficulties in carrying out our program of continued development and growth along the American way of life.

And I say this as a chamber of commerce man, the chamber of commerce organization has been in existence for some 8 years prior to the writing of the Declaration of Independence, and that organization that was founded back there in 1768 is still in existence and has never stopped functioning for one moment. And so, as a chamber of commerce man, I'd like to tell you a little bit about America. To offset some of the "isms" we've heard about we'll talk for just a few moments about Arkansas. How many of us have stopped to realize, that over at Magnetcove, 12 miles from Hot Springs, we have 109 different minerals that are known at this time? How many of you have stopped to realize that down in Pike County, we have the only diamond mine on this hemisphere? And about those diamonds, they contributed much to the winning of the war, for the simple reason that those diamonds are commercial, they are not gem stones, but they are commercial stones. In winning the war you had to have tools and diamond dies and diamond points in the drill bits to reach a perfection where there was a very definite limitation in the tolerance that you could have in providing radar, the proximity fuze and some of the other outstanding developments of this past world war. Not to forget for one moment Bauxite and Benton, Ark., two little communities over here where, in the old days, we mined, and realized that we mined, 93 percent of all the aluminum that was mined on the Western Hemisphere. This aluminum was shipped to East St. Louis where it was pulverized and powdered into what is known as aluminum oxide, from there it traveled to Pittsburgh, Pa., to be placed into aluminum ingots. From Pittsburgh it was shipped back to Alcoa, Tenn., where it was made into sheet aluminum, and from there to the various factories that processed pots and pans. So we originated aluminum through bauxite ore and then we bought the finished products, pots and pans; and out of every dollar that we spent, 60 cents of it was for transportation. Then we got a little bit different approach to this situation and decided it was best to process bauxite in Arkansas and what happened, in World War II when Hurricane Creek and Jones Mill were formed—and they're still functioning under lease to the Reynolds Metal Co.—aluminum was processed directly, and the income per family in Arkansas in that one particular area, from that one industry, was greatly enhanced and trebled in value, due to the fact that the money made by manufacturing is in the processing and not in providing the raw material. And so everything in Arkansas is just that way, it's new and the boundaries are vast and unlimited, but we've got to remember one thing, and that's why I want to pause at this time and tell you about the friend that we've lost. And that's our good friend, George. If we're going to accomplish any purposes and any missions, developing our own area, developing our own State, keeping America American, we have to do so with our own efforts.

We've got to pull together and pull hard in order to provide the continued prosperity which we are entitled to as being the dominating factor in the world today, just merely carrying the prestige of the last great democracy isn't enough, in which to sit back and forget about the hardships that our forefathers went through in order to provide us with the standard of living that we have in our day. But coming along into the present days' centuries I want to pause for a moment and call your attention to two things: First, in the years 1900 to 1930, out of the average dollar that was earned by the workingman, 65 cents of it was spent upon food, clothing, and shelter; 15 cents of each dollar he earned was made available for pleasures, such as picture shows, automobiles, radios, etc.; 15 cents out of each dollar he had left over to provide him with the necessities, such as insurance, such as investments, such as improving his plant and working over his facilities, purchasing stocks and bonds, for an income and investment purpose; and 5 cents out of each dollar was to take care of the county, State, and National taxes. From 1930 to 1939, a 9-year span, 65 cents out of the workingman's dollar earned was still spent for food, clothing, and shelter, but instead of the 15 cents for pleasures and the nice things, automobiles, radios, etc., he's lost that; instead of the 15 cents for investments, insurance, maintenance, improvements of factories and building and business, he's lost most of that; the cost of government has gone from 5 cents, in the first 30 years of 1900, to 30 cents out of each dollar, almost half of what food, clothing, and shelter cost him. That leaves only a nickel for the normal investments and improvements, building up an estate and providing a means of security for his loved ones. And so the picture had radically changed, but that's not the worst picture of all, the worst picture can be brought along a little bit further when we take and compare the total expenditures of this great Nation from its inception back in 1776 where, 169 years, until 1945, we find that our Government spent some one-hundred-and-sixty-odd-billion dollars, this figure includes both World War I and Word War II, and from 1945 through 1949, this same Government of ours has spent $190,000,000,000; more in the last 4 years than in the first 169 years of our existence. And, so I say that, we as Americans have a right to know just what is happening to our money, why it's costing so much, and what we can do as individuals to prevent this continued trend toward increased expenditures in providing more government than is necessary to operate our great Nation. We can't help but realize that if we don't take this matter into our own hands and consider it as each an individual task, that it's going to be too late. I mentioned George a minute ago and I think that this is probably the most fitting time that we can deliver George's obituary and place him in the past, in the hall of fame with the heroes that have lived and have reigned supreme, remembering that he has contributed much to the American way of life.

But, you know, to offset George, we've got a fellow now by the name of Joe, we've got to keep our eye on Joe. Joe does nothing for you and I. If a job arises Joe takes advantage of George and he's been a friend of his. When George was getting along in years and getting a little old and couldn't do much, Joe would pat him on the back and say that's fine I'll help you, but Joe was helping himself, not helping you and I. He was helping himself to the things that we had fought and maintained by our fathers and by our forefathers and that same fight is going on and it's stronger than ever because now there is no George, he's dead. We only have Tom, Dick, and Harry and when we stay with those three men, and that's you and I and our friends, we have a task definitely assigned that we can't shirk. We must continue to plan our program of activity, to let our people know, we've got to take an interest in what's going on in Washington, we've got to take an interest in our own State legislature, we've got to take an interest in the quorum court of Poinsett County, if we don't take an interest how can they tell what we would like to have them do. As actual people and taxpayers, we are stockholders in each of these governments, our own county government, our State government, and our Federal Government. And as a taxpayer and a stockholder in big business, and, gentlemen, it is big business, all three of them, if we do not take an interest how can they tell what we would like for them to do in the way of establishing a program of activity. We've got to sit back and stop and let them know exactly what we are interested in, we've got to provide for them the means with which they might express the views of their constituency, we've got to also back them up when they take a stand that is just exactly the way we would like to have it. Now, in talking about George once again let me cite you the case of the individuals who sat back and didn't busy themselves about what was going on. A few years back, the Government thought it was necessary to move in and take over Muscle Shoals, by forming the Tennessee Valley Authority. And they went in there because they wanted to help the people in that area in a way that they couldn't be helped otherwise. And they had no intention of doing anything but going in there on a temporary basis, but after a very few short years it became a known fact that the Government had taken over all the utilities in the whole area, they had taken over all the appliance firms and operated other stores in direct competition to free enterprise and private business. In so doing they found that they had to expand, and constantly, their plea has been to the various legislatures, please give us more money in order to provide the service which these people are entitled to. They first bankrupt the competitor, which is private enterprise, and then turn right around and ask for private enterprise and the taxpayer to provide them with more money with which to compete with more private enterprise. Now they've asked for 54 million with which to construct the Johnsonville steam plant. That plant is to provide additional kilowatthours for the Tennessee Valley Authority; and it's to be built by, not private enterprise, but it's to be built by the taxpayers' money, the people living out in Oregon, Idaho, Washington and California, and in the State of Maine are just as much a part of that enterprise as if it were built in their own back yard. And yet the benefits are very limited in scope, its benefits are for a chosen few which isn't the pure American way of business.

And then let's talk a little bit about this socialized medicine that we've heard so much about. If you'll read your new issue of Reader's Digest you'll find the story about Granny Didn't Live. And that's the story about the old lady that went to the doctor because she was very sick. Critically ill, she went to the doctor and the doctor looked at her name and said, "I'm sorry, I don't have you on my list." Her kinfolks, who had taken her there, explained to the doctor

that she was critically ill and didn't know where she was to go. He said he couldn't help her in any way; he had his orders and he could hardly take care of his own people. And so, Granny went from doctor to doctor and found the same thing and finally she died, merely because her medicine was paid for out of taxpayers' money, but not provided, as it would have been provided, in a free-enterprise system. You can't regiment the people into a healthy situation any more than you can regiment their thinking by providing automatons and robots to go along the streets and the highways of this great Nation. Socialized medicine is not good for England, they know it today, socialized medicine is not good for America, and never will be; it's just another means of getting a toehold into the business which has been built through the hardships and the sweat and toil of the individual in providing 18 and 20 hours of service every day to the people in their communities and getting in return a great reward of thanks and appreciation from the people because of a more complete life. Whereas in socialized medicine, as a regimented national problem, national legislative deal, it is impossible for the individual to be provided with the type of medication and the type of service they're entitled to, and for which they are willing to pay to the private man who has spent his time in providing the education, background, and experience to justify his taking care of their needs. And so, again, there is another ism that we've got, crept into our system of government, that inalienable right of an American cannot be challenged by the isms, there's no place in our whole democracy for anything other than the way our grandfathers planned and prepared the basic background of this great Nation. Now you know, back in Washington's time, he threw a dollar across the river and the world is still talking about that little job, and yet today, Washington throws millions of dollars across the ocean and no one pays attention to it. Hasn't time changed, but it hasn't changed all that much, that we can completely disregard what is taking place in Washington.

If we are to eliminate the causes and the threats to our type of Government which jeopardize this last free democracy, then we must prepare to actively expose such things as the TVA, socialized medicine, and these other encroachments on private enterprise that cannot be and will not be tolerated when the final whistle blows. I've talked to you for quite a while here to tell you a little bit about some of these things, about Arkansas, about our own county and our own State, and I don't know of anything that can be more helpful than the fact that in carrying out these things, we have often talked about England, and we referred to her socialized medicine, a good friend of mine, Clayton Rand, called attention to the fact that England was known as the mother country, and was so known because she was always expecting. In her type of government she hasn't been able to get her budget balanced, and yet we continue to pour millions and billions into their hands and coffers so that they might go ahead with their form of government, entirely foreign and entirely opposed to that which we are trying to operate. And yet we sit here while all the other people criticize our type of Government with one hand and ask that the other be filled with coin and money in order to take care of their own needs because their type of government doesn't work. And so I say it's time for us to stop, look at that mirror in the morning when we get up and say, "Now listen, fella, let's look this day right square in the face," and walk down the street and do a little about what we need to do to take care of the demands upon our business and upon our way of life. You know our public relations throughout this Nation have just about gone to pot and it's all because we, as employers, will not stop long enough to talk to the employees and get acquainted with them, let them know a little bit about our business, tell them a little bit about the problems that we have and by so working together we have an opportunity of better understanding so that our problems could be worked out. If that employer knew the employee better, the employee knew the problems of employer, you'd have none of this strike business, you'd have no labor difference, you'd have a better understanding between management and labor and we'd be able to go ahead with terrific strides in carrying out the development of this great Nation. Now as it is, you walk through your plant, you look at a man over on one corner working over a machine and you say, "Giving me 15 minutes work for every hour I pay him." Isn't that a fine situation? You smile as you go by very nicely, and as he goes by your office to punch the time clock as he goes home, he grits his teeth and says, under his breath, "That's the guy that's trying to kill me, wear me out, without any understanding of what troubles I'm having." Now that isn't right, that isn't a healthy situation, and so, with this American opportunity program, now is the time to get better acquainted, now is the time when we can stop for a moment, pause, and take inventory and say, "Well, it's not too late and I wouldn't trade places with any other three people in this whole world." But it's time for us to also stop and take cognizance of the fact, we can't just go along, it just doesn't happen, we've got to give a little bit of our time and effort, we've got to divide a little bit of our thinking for the benefit of those who have thought before us.

Logic Instead of Emotions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Somerville (Mass.) Journal:

LOGIC INSTEAD OF EMOTIONS

When the Hoover Report was submitted to Congress, Herbert Hoover warned the American people that unless the people themselves demanded action on Federal reorganization, the report would just gather dust on some forgotten shelf.

He also warned of the danger of the report being killed by the grasshopper bites of those who say reorganization is fine for everyone else but don't disturb my agency.

Almost every proposal made by the Commission steps on the toes of some special interest group.

If the Commission's proposals were to be adjusted to take care of all special cases, nothing would be left of the Hoover reorganization program.

Perhaps no group or individual can find himself completely in agreement with every recommendation made by the Hoover Commission. Within the Commission itself there was disagreement in many areas.

Most individuals, however, find themselves substantially in agreement with all save a very few proposals.

Lately, however, serious misconceptions about some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have arisen in the field of veterans' affairs.

To leave these uncorrected would be unfair to the Hoover Commission. Incidentally, it would be unfair to the taxpayers, including millions of ex-service men and women. It would be equally unfair to veterans organizations which have often called for better and more economical management of Government.

Before we go so far as to say that the Hoover report would dismember or do away with the Veterans' Administration, let's read the actual recommendations.

At no place in the Commission's report can be found any recommendations for either the increase or curtailment of medical benefits or other services to veterans. The Commission stated that such policy decisions were outside its terms of reference and should be the subject of congressional determination.

The Commission's recommendations covered only the better management of existing programs.

It would seem logical and sensible to wait until specific legislation affecting veterans is introduced before allowing emotional thinking to wrap our view of the Hoover blueprint for a more economical management of our Government's business affairs.

It is terribly important that we achieve as much as possible of the program for which most Americans have waited so long.

Pageant of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, though I am not a member of the Nutley lodge of Elks, nonetheless as a brother Elk from Newark lodge, it is with a sense of fitting but modest pride that under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the March 31 issue of the Nutley Sun lauding the fine, charitable, and praiseworthy work of the Nutley lodge of Elks. This is indeed democracy at work:

A GENEROUS GESTURE

Nutley lodge of Elks, in a ceremony open to the public tonight, will inaugurate its Pageant of Charity which will be marked on its calendar each March hereafter. In a ceremonious fashion, the Elks will distribute $1,000 to all the churches in town, regardless of creed or color, to be used as each church sees fit in its own charity work.

The Elks gesture befits an organization with a splendid record of generosity and service to the town. Nutley lodge has but 348 members but with funds which it raises directly or through its minstrel show and other entertainments, it has financed its own work among crippled children, paraplegics, needy veterans as well as supporting the Red Cross, united drive, cancer and heart campaigns, March of Dimes, and seal sales.

Generosity is a virtue, but in times like these when one drive or campaign follows another, it behooves service clubs like householders and businessmen to budget their gifts to charity. The Elks, in setting up their Pageant of Charity under Mayor William J. Jernick as chairman, have shown a way.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the Common Cause, Inc., dinner which honored Federal Judge Harold R. Medina in absentia at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 14, 1950:

As some of you may know, it happens that I go to a great many dinners, nearly all of them honoring one preeminent guest of honor.

This, I think, is the most unusual dinner I have ever attended. Senator Dulles, Mrs. Paine, and the rest of us in making up the committee for this affair, had just one thought in mind—that this dinner would enable us—and you—to do honor to a brave and patient American judge. He was to have been our guest of honor. We had no sooner announced our plans and sent out the invitations than we received an avalanche of responses. They saw in this dinner a long-awaited chance to salute a man who represented all that we admired in a fine American, who had carried through a difficult job without fear or favor.

We did not presume to pass judgment on the legal points at issue in any case over which this judge has presided. But we did want to pay tribute to the character, courage, and patience he showed in doing his duty as he saw it. We did want to defend him from the vilification and smears heaped upon him by a powerful and well-organized pressure group which owes no allegiance to the American ideals of justice. We did want to show our support for the methods and safeguards of the American judicial process, in contrast to the terrible examples of totalitarian justice which are coming to us from across the sea. We felt that if American civil liberties rightly permit people to criticize our judges, certainly it is permissible for American citizens to defend them. As I said, the response to our invitation was terrific. One enthusiastic citizen wrote me that "if a dinner will give the judge some idea of how the citizens feel about his service to the country, we ought to give him one every month."

Well, here we are. And now we find that we have come together to pay honor, not so much to the man himself, but rather to the principles of American justice and decency and fair play for which he stands.

This is the way Judge Medina preferred us to do this. His withdrawal as our guest of honor was unquestionably one of the most difficult decisions he has ever had to make, and yet I am sure he was motivated by just one thought—he wanted to do what he felt was right.

The case so recently before him is still in the appellate courts, where it may remain for a long time. Until, therefore, that case comes to a final and binding decision our honored guest does not feel that he can appear publicly at an affair of this sort.

That decision does him nothing but honor and naturally we abide by it. In making it he has earned our still greater respect and admiration.

And so I say that this is an occasion unique in the history of dinners. Called to honor one man, the affair goes on in his voluntary absence and is dedicated instead to a principle which that man has exemplified. This, it seems to me, is something new and yet it is a distinctly American thing.

And so I think that it is especially important that we have met here tonight. Let us look briefly at the situation in which we meet.

It seems to me that for every eventuality there is either an old Spanish proverb, or that Confucius had something to say. This time the Chinese have a word—or rather an ideograph—for it. A Chinese friend of mine pointed out to me recently that the Chinese ideograph meaning crisis is actually a combination of two symbols—one meaning danger and another meaning opportunity.

I think that our Chinese friends have something here that merits our consideration.

That there is danger I am sure everyone of us here will agree, for we have only to look at any map to see the cost of apathy elsewhere. That this danger has lead to crisis is equally obvious. But what is most important for all Americans, and especially for those of us here, is the fact that inherent in this situation there is real and tangible opportunity.

What then are we going to do about it, the crisis and the danger and the opportunity?

We Americans have been in situations before where there was danger and crisis—and opportunity. It was so when we had to decide whether we would stand as free men or continue as tyrannized colonists. It was true when the issue was whether we could permit a power-drunk Kaiser to work his will with us on the high seas—and we have just emerged from the danger and the crisis which was Hitler, into the opportunity from which there may still be created a free world.

Now we find ourselves once more in danger, this time from an enemy more subtle, more ruthless, more fanatic than any we have ever faced. If our present situation has reached the point of crisis, it is because the time has come for Americans to challenge—wherever and whenever we find it, here or abroad—the aggressive, godless, and treasonable practices of totalitarian communism. If, once more, we have reached the point of danger and crisis, it is through no fault nor wish of the American people. It is because the masters of the politburo have exhausted both our patience and our hope that any moral and ethical relations between our nations can be possible under present conditions.

But let us remember that there is opportunity for us in this situation. One of the first, certainly one of the most vigorous and courageous groups to point out to us that opportunity is the organization which has sponsored this affair tonight—Common Cause, Inc. Ready and alert to take up the gage which aggressive communism has thrown down, Common Cause calls all Americans to battle stations. This does not mean that we want war. God forbid that it should come again. But it does mean that we dare no longer engage in wishful thinking or indifference to a very real and present danger. It does mean that we do not sleep through a crisis.

This freedom we Americans cherish—as individuals and as a Nation—was bought for us at Lexington and Gettysburg; at Chateau Thierry and Omaha Beach. We have tried vigilantly to maintain it, and the right to it of every man and woman. Nowhere was that more vividly shown than in the recent trials where every possible right was granted to the people accused of plotting the overthrow of the Government, whose privileges they demanded.

I need not recall the contrast of the tragic cases and forced confessions and mock trials on the other side of the world, where victims are held incommunicado for months, where they cannot even select their own lawyers and where there are neither free judges nor jury of any sort. Indeed some of the judges in recent totalitarian trials have been the same men who meted out Nazi justice on behalf of the Fascist governments which served Hitler. Today, thanks to such mounting evidence of the deadly danger of Soviet communism, the period of illusion and self-deception is over in America. We no longer hear Chinese Communists fatuously referred to as agrarians; we are becoming less patient with the kind of liberalism which is only a facade behind which moves the hand of the Kremlin. Thanks to the work of Common Cause, and of other fine organizations, Americans today can discern the red hue regardless of the other colors behind which it may be masked.

In spite of this awakening, it is true that this is a dark moment when things are going badly in the cold war. Liberation for the enslaved peoples looks further away than ever. Defeatism is rife, and there is a tendency now to exaggerate Soviet strength just as we used to underrate the danger. We have gone from one extreme to the other. But let us remember, as we read Churchill's book, that things looked just as black in 1940 after the battle of France, and again in 1941 after Pearl Harbor, and again a year later, until the victories of Stalingrad and El Alamein. The democracies came up off the floor to win. Even in this cold war we have won some great and unexpected victories. Think back to 1946. Stalin already had physical control of eastern Europe, of Manchuria, and much of Iran—Greece, Turkey, Italy, France, Norway, and above all, Berlin, were terribly threatened. Most of the experts had already written off western Europe. Remember what they said about the failure of the Truman doctrine in Greece even a year ago? But one of our speakers tonight will tell you how Greece looks now. Who believed in the success of the Berlin airlift in the early days, except perhaps General Clay? Each of these was a real and largely unexpected victory, and we have had another real victory of a negative sort in Yugoslavia.

In every one of these countries our position today is stronger than anyone who understood the Soviet danger dared to hope 4 years ago. Altogether these successes balance our defeat in China. In the minds of many Americans, we did not put up a real fight for China. We let the battle go by default. We really lost China when we signed away Manchuria, her only rich, industrialized province, at Yalta. Some American organizations, including Common Cause, warned against that course. We must see to it that we are not fooled again and we must increase our power to defend every foot of free territory we still hold.

Here, however, is opportunity once more. Here you good Americans have been willing to come and be counted, have wanted to signify by your presence your deep gratitude to one who has so splendidly manifested the highest American traditions. By coming here you have set your individual seal upon those American principles, of liberty, of loyalty, of decency, in which we all believe.

I believe that Common Cause places a continuing opportunity before you, and that with your help it will be enabled to go on, a constant and courageous challenge to those who would divide and undermine and betray us here. If I were to point out to you tonight the greatest opportunity which this evening offers you, it would be to ask you to lend a hand with Common Cause, and by aiding this fine organization, to do your part in flinging back into the teeth of traitors the ringing notice that we are awake, alert, and ready.

Lord Vansittart and Mr. Stimson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

LORD VANSITTART AND MR. STIMSON

On motion of Lord Vansittart, former permanent undersecretary of the British Foreign Office, the House of Lords has adopted a resolution calling for continuous and resolute precautions to protect Britain from Communist infiltration of the Government. Vansittart charged that Communists are entrenched in the public service, the schools, and the British Broadcasting Corporation, a government monopoly.

He mentioned 16 known Communists in the Department of Inland Revenue and said that others were in the Admiralty and War Office, and in the Ministries of Food, Education, and Health. The desirability of cleaning the Communists out of the British Government was as clear to his fellow peers as it was to Vansittart.

Now, let us make a comparison. There is a similar problem in the United States Government. The House Committee on Un-American Affairs has turned up Alger Hiss and numerous other traitors in Government service. Currently Senator MCCARTHY has charged that some 115 persons who are or have been in the State Department are Communists or have Communist sympathies or associations. What has been the reception of such charges in certain influential quarters?

CAREER PARALLELED LORD VANSITTART'S

Henry L. Stimson has occupied a place in recent American politics corresponding in some degree to that of Lord Vansittart. We do not have any position in the State Department which can be directly related to that of the British permanent Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Stimson, however, was Secretary of State. He was Mr. Roosevelt's Pearl Harbor Secretary of War. In influence and length of experience in Government, his station has been not unlike that of Lord Vansittart.

Mr. Stimson has come forward from retirement with a letter to the New York Times in which he attributes various mean motives to Senator MCCARTHY and prophesies various damaging effects because the Senator has made the same allegations against the American Government that Lord Vansittart has made against the British Government. Like Vansittart, Senator MCCARTHY says that there are Reds in the Government and that they should be driven out. His reward is a snide crack from Mr. Stimson: "The man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country."

Would Mr. Stimson say that similar motives govern Lord Vansittart? The British lord has had most of the honors and posts of responsibility within the grant of his country. He has a lifetime seat in the House of Lords. What more would he hope to gain by saying that there are Communists in the Government? Is it possible that Mr. Stimson would concede that Vansittart makes that charge only because he believes that Communists are injurious to the operations of government, and that he seeks to get rid of them? If Mr. Stimson will concede that to Lord Vansittart, why should he attempt to impute a different motive to a United States Senator?

DIDN'T ANSWER 176 QUESTIONS

On other occasions, Mr. Stimson was not quite so eager to volunteer his opinion or so voluble in expressing it. The congressional committee investigating Pearl Harbor sought him as a witness, for he had a very close association with the events at issue. Mr. Stimson pleaded illness and never came before the committee. He was sent 176 questions in writing by a member of the committee minority. He answered none of them. The same Senator addressed 61 additional questions to him. His answers, according to the minority, did not make up for the deficiencies in his earlier failure to respond.

Now, in upbraiding Senator MCCARTHY for what he implies is an improper way to conduct an investigation, Mr. Stimson says that the Senator should have relied on "the fully developed and tested procedure of the executive branch of the Government." That is, he should have let the executive branch render judgment on its own appointees through the Loyalty Review Board, appointed by Mr. Truman and presided over by Seth W. Richardson, general counsel of the Pearl Harbor investigation, which led to an administration whitewash.

Mr. Stimson may remember that the "fully developed and tested procedure" of the New Deal majority in the Pearl Harbor inquiry saved him embarrassment. The majority voted to deny itself access to his diary and made no effort to insist upon his answering the 176 questions which were highly pertinent to the inquiry.

Perhaps Senator MCCARTHY has not the same faith in the "tested procedures" that Mr. Stimson has.

Soil Conservation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Press of April 1, 1950:

SOIL CONSERVATION NEEDED

New dust storms sweeping priceless topsoil off unprotected farms in the western Great Plains lend a fresh urgency to calls for conservation.

A couple of years ago the Nation saw quite a flurry of books deploring in alarming tones the wasting of United States natural resources, particularly our best soils. They caused a big stir for a while, and then an almost inevitable reaction.

Critics, some of whom didn't like the gloomy mood of these books, sought to minimize the dangers. The fears were exaggerated, they said. American scientific ingenuity would keep us all in foodstuffs no matter what happened to our topsoil.

Some cited experiments indicating rich crops might be grown in the subsoil, the coarse layer lying beneath the fine topsoil so often washed or blown away. They suggested, too, that the expanding chemical age will turn up many new soil-enriching ingredients to add to present-day fertilizers. It was even hinted that subsoils thus built up would be better than the best topsoils.

It would be foolish to say these things will not happen. The chemical age is indeed producing many miracles, and tomorrow's discoveries might revolutionize agriculture speedily.

Yet the one thing all these rosy forecasts ignored was how much these possibly potent soil builders might cost. Farmers today are finding it expensive to doctor their lands with existing fertilizers on an increasing scale to offset mineral depletion caused by heavy cultivation through the war and postwar period. There's good reason to believe any new enriching elements might also prove costly.

The critics can't get away from the fact that good topsoil spread over the land to a depth of several inches is a tremendously valuable natural resource. If it is carried away by wind or water, its food-producing chemicals must be replaced or the stripped land becomes sterile and nonproductive.

None of the critics was able to refute the documented facts of soil depletion. On that point the conservationists quoted Government authorities with chapter and verse. Millions of tons of life-supporting soil lie useless today at the bottom of the oceans and bays where they were borne by silt-laden rivers. Other millions of tons have been caught up in swirling winds and deposited hundreds of miles away as worthless dust.

The dust storms of 1950 thus far are but a faint reminder of the tragic winds of the 1930's when thousands of farms were ruined. But maybe they'll help us to buckle down to the job of preserving the rich soil we still have. It's both cheaper and safer than counting on scientific wizardry to rescue us from folly.

Conservation of America's Soil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of this House is impressed with the importance of conservation of America's soil resources. I believe also that every Member who is familiar with the work of the Soil Conservation Service appreciates the significant task which this agency is performing in educating farmers and rendering technical assistance in preserving our Nation's irreplaceable topsoil.

A valued friend of mine and a sincere soil conservationist has furnished me with a copy of Chester W. Gee's Creed of the Soil Conservationist. I am pleased to insert a copy of that statement in the RECORD:

CREED OF THE SOIL CONSERVATIONIST
(By C. W. Gee)

As a soil conservationist, I believe God created the earth by His divine processes for the benefit of man, not one man, nor one generation, but mankind for all time.

I believe the Almighty gave man an inheritance of the earth, not to be hoarded as a miser guards his treasure, but to be used with wisdom and in the fullest for the perpetual benefit of all men.

I believe all of mankind, regardless of race or creed are entitled to a fair and equitable share of the earth's bounty commensurate with their own efforts. But in so believing, I hold the irrevocable conviction that man himself owes earth a debt of respect and fealty.

I believe that whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; that he who manages

his fields, pastures, woodlands, and streams with respect and wisdom shall reap the bountiful harvest and so shall his descendants, while he who uses them selfishly, thinking only of his own immediate gain, shall bring to grief his land, himself, and his children's children.

Holding these beliefs to be true, I dedicate myself to the task of helping my fellow men realize their own personal responsibility in conserving the earth for the generations which follow them. To this end I shall devote my best knowledge in guiding the efforts of those who till the soil so that the land which nurtures us shall be fruitful without end.

For truly, the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, but the responsibility for its stewardship is vested in man.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Federation of American Associations for Irish Independence on Sunday evening, April 2, 1950, in Philadelphia:

Thanks for inviting me to join you. We are here tonight because Irish blood flows in our veins. Our principal concern is to voice our objection to partition of Ireland. Our ancestors and present-day Irishmen and their friends have suffered and worked to achieve a fractional victory. We express our deep gratitude while we pledge our every effort to increase that fraction from twenty-six-thirty-seconds to thirty-two-thirty-seconds to make Ireland one. I say Irish blood flows in our veins. We could have other backgrounds and our hearts and our minds would be the same in this fight. If we believe in the right of small nations to self-determination—if we adhere to the principle that powers of government should be derived from the consent of the governed—then we might be Swedish or Czechoslovakian or Danish and we could take no stand other than the one we are advocating tonight.

We come as Americans who love our form of democracy. We bring a notable page from our history to show how our own Nation fought partition. It took 4 years of bloody civil war to fulfill Daniel Webster's words, "The Union will and must be preserved." The great Civil War President, Abraham Lincoln: "On what rightful principle may a State, being not more than one-fiftieth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the Nation and then coerce a proportionally larger subdivision of itself, in the most arbitrary way? What mysterious right to play tyrant is conferred on a district of a country, with its people, by merely calling it a State?"

There are some issues that can be compromised to the benefit of all. This is not one of them. At this time an American Congressman has every right to voice publicly, and for possible publication, his denunciation of partition. An Atlantic Pact has been formed, of which we are a member. It commits our blood and our treasure to the common defense against communism. One of its purposes is to make democracy look attractive to that portion of the world where majority rule is denied or where it is wavering. With us Great Britain is a member of that pact. She has before her our example of granting complete independence to the Philippines. So when Americans urge the same treatment for Ireland we are consistent. When a fellow pact member is less than that, our mutual cause is damaged before the world. We have every right to tell our partner that he is causing embarrassment to his fellow members.

To put it mildly, this whole history of partition reveals a lack of sincerity on the part of the British. It was first proposed by Prime Minister Herbert Asquith in 1912. His Liberal Party had introduced a home-rule bill for all Ireland which was withdrawn because of tory pressure. This took the form of threats of force and actual mutiny by British Army brass hats. A substitute was prepared which provided for cutting off four Ulster counties. Before this went into operation World War I occurred, and the legislation was tabled while Britain went to war to secure the freedom of small nations. In fact, Premier Asquith named that as the motive when he said in the House of Commons: "We are fighting to vindicate the principle that small nations are not to be crushed * * * by the arbitrary will of a stronger and overmastering power." Home rule was promised at the end of that war, one in which 300,000 Irishmen served and 50,000 gave their lives.

Partition came up again in 1916. The uprising was brutally crushed, and its leaders were executed. It was outside pressure, mainly from this country, which finally compelled Britain to seek some solution to the Irish question. Prime Minister Lloyd George persuaded the leaders of the Irish parliamentary party to accept a home-rule bill which excluded some Ulster counties. This, he assured them, would be temporary. But at that very time he wrote a letter to Sir Edward Carson, Belfast Tory leader, "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

So great was the popular reaction against partition that the proposal was abandoned and the Irish parliamentary party, which had accepted it, was defeated at the polls in the next general election of 1918. In their place the people elected representatives pledged to an independent and united Ireland. These democratically elected representatives of the Irish people met in Dublin in January 1919 and established (Dial Erin) Dail Eireann, the Parliament of Ireland. In the name of the Irish Nation they declared the independence of Ireland, just as a band of patriots once did for America but seven city blocks from where you are now sitting.

It took 2 years for the British to put partition into operation, 2 years after the Irish people had willed their complete independence at the polls. When the 1920 Government of Ireland Act, partitioning the country, passed Parliament, it did not receive the vote of any Irish Member of Commons, not even those who represented what is now called Northern Ireland.

That is the manner in which partition was accomplished. It has been continued by the British, in spite of the overwhelming majority verdict at the polls that has been expressed against it. It is not a very enticing sample to show the customers who are scrutinizing the Atlantic Pact member nations. It is more in the iron-curtain pattern than western democracy.

Most of us want to forget the mistakes of yesteryears. Everyone here tonight would like to see Ireland and Britain side by side and friendly. Each needs the other, but only when both are completely free. We would like to dismiss from our minds the old British foreign-affairs strategy of divide and conquer. As a boy I read of her sweet Christian intercession in India. The Hindus and the Mohammedans would fly at each other's necks the moment Britain withdrew her troops. Well, the regiments have been called home, and Pakistan and Hindustan are engrossed in building up home industries at a merry rate. Both are doing a pretty fair job at keeping the peace without any outside assistance.

I mention this because it illustrates how the British Foreign Office, on occasion, has put their nation in the light of peacemaker or averter of internal strife. So some peoples elsewhere have this impression: Ireland is a nation composed of Catholics, all of whom are in the South, and Protestants, all of whom are in the North. Kindly Britain keeps them from committing mass murders of one another. Were it not for their sweet neighbor, Ireland would be entirely depopulated after one March 17 and one July 12. No Irishman would survive to see what use was ever made of the H-bomb. Heaven would have an immediate and tremendous housing problem imposed upon it. But Britain, full of sweetness and light, prevents all this from coming to pass.

Of course we know there is no religious problem in Ireland, while the country is preponderantly Catholic, there is religious liberty in the 26 counties when men run for office there is ofttimes less attention given to their church affiliation than is sometimes accorded to candidates here in America. Through the centuries there have been many Protestant national leaders, and more than a few of the present-day topnotchers in political life are Protestants. Moreover, they want a united Ireland. If this sentiment for unity were not so prevalent, why does Britain have to resort to the most flagrant gerrymandering witnessed anywhere on the globe? This makes a complete farce of the election system, as practiced in a democracy, on a serious question like that of nationhood.

Of this Mr. De Valera said: "If they left it to be settled in the ordinary democratic way by a majority vote of the Irish people resident in our island home, it could be settled overnight. But British statesmen apparently do not like the settlement that would ensue. Our island has therefore to be gerrymandered and remain gerrymandered into two areas. The one designed to give in perpetuity the result that British statesmen desire, though it is in violation of every principle of justice and fair play.

"The crippling of our nation by the division of its people and its resources, and the frustration of its national will, are to be of no account. The integrity of the selected gerrymandered area is now to be formally guaranteed. The supporters of British policy concentrated in the neighborhood of Belfast, are to be assured a continuing domination over the majorities in Derry City, in the counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh, and in South Armagh, South Down, and East Down.

"Having contrived and left us with an intolerable situation, British statesmen are now trying to shuffle off their responsibility. But the Irish people will not cease to hold Britain responsible. Britain has created this position. Britain has maintained this position. She has sought to consolidate it. That design must be opposed by the Irish race, by every means that is effective and just."

Something of consequence to the discussion of partition happened a few days ago in Congress and something important is about to occur in the way of a new arrival. Whatever the effect of the Fogarty amendment on foreign aid in the House, it will serve to attract greater American interest on the subject of complete Irish independence. Then, too, we hear we are to have a visitor.

We can hail him as an individual while we detest everything he stands for in his official capacity. Who can criticize my old friend, the Mayor of New York, for not greeting him at the city hall? Press photog-

raphers would record the handshake and under the picture could appear copy which might infer Irish-American acceptance, or at least indifference. When he comes to Washington, you can depend upon it I will not even say "Hello" within camera shot. But, like you, I want him to visit America, and above all, I want him to talk. Let him discuss the Irish question that is uppermost in the American mind. Here is his grand opportunity to debate partition on the radio and television. Some of us will use what influence we have with the broadcasting chains to get him time, and plenty of it.

We have the men, in and out of public life, who can present our side of the controversy. If partition can stand the white glare of American public opinion, then our visitor should be eager to use every radio and television minute that is offered to him for fair debate. There can be no way quite so important of devoting his time in America. If his cause is just, the American listener will discern that.

For in the final analysis it is our public opinion which will determine how our goodwill (and I mean really good-will) toward Britain is headed. The two nations have a common destiny from here on out. We are playing for the high stakes of freedom and democracy. And the world we seek to win and to hold says that freedom and democracy, like charity, must begin at home.

Somehow, I have a feeling tonight that we are going into the late innings of the game. Too bad we cannot have with us all those who contributed so much to Irish freedom. But I cannot help believing that victory is within sight. This is a time that calls for vigilance and making our influence felt. It will mean genuine peace within our own western nations when Ireland can take her place amongst us with dignity. It will mean a common front against today's tremendous menace—communism.

Make no bones about it, when the chips are down, Britain fights beside us. We want good relations with her, but they can never be good while there is a partitioned Ireland. We say to her, "Clean your house so that the Atlantic pact can go before the world unsullied. Take one of your blackest pages and make it white as snow. The Irish are a forgiving and patient people. But there is a point at which patience ceases to be a virtue. Part with the past and face the future united and as friends. Everything in the Irish heritage demands it. Everything in the American heritage eagerly desires it."

No other country had her boundaries set for her by a provident creator. There she is, entirely surrounded by salt water, a natural entity if there ever was one. No man-made line should ever divide her. Please God, one day soon, none shall.

Acheson's Appointments of New Deal Republicans Won't Fool Those Who Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the President and his Secretary of State are making frantic efforts once more to play politics with the national interest and to attempt by subtle methods to squelch discussion of our national problems. They are trying to revive the so-called, miscalled bipartisan foreign policy, which proved to be a snare and a delusion to the people of this country in 1944 and in 1948 and will prove to be so again if the Republicans fall for this line of baloney.

The mere fact that Dean Acheson, friend of Alger Hiss, should name a former New Deal-voting Republican to a high Department of State assignment does not obligate me, or any other Republican in office, to follow Mr. Acheson down his trail to ruin for America.

Dean Acheson can appoint 1, 10, or 100 nominal Republicans—of the stripe he and the Fair Dealers find useful—to high-sounding but meaningless posts in the Department of State. That is his prerogative. But if he thinks that in so doing he is going to revive the so-called bipartisan foreign policy, which strangled the Republicans and left them gagged and helpless in 1948, he has another think coming.

Foreign policy and domestic policy are so closely interrelated today that it is impossible for a logical person to swallow the administration's foreign policy without swallowing the economic absurdities it preaches at home. The foreign policy moves—spending billions in Europe, literally pouring it down rat holes—causes higher taxes in America, makes prices go up, causes people to be strapped for money, and encourages them to think of moves of how to get their hands into the Federal Treasury. A dupe may argue that he supports all these overseas projects and yet is against socialism at home, but no informed and aware person can argue that way.

A foreign policy leads to something internationally. It also leads to something domestically. The British foreign policy, which never has been bipartisan regardless of how often you hear this lie repeated, has led to one thing for Great Britain—first, the development of great social differences—chasms of economic difference—and then, straight to socialism. The British people cannot vote against socialism any more. They already have socialism, whether Churchill wins, Attlee wins, or whoever wins over there. That is because Great Britain's foreign policy has denuded the taxpayers of Great Britain. It has sapped the nation's vitality. It has given rise to pressures that made socialism inevitable there, just as our foreign policy today is giving rise to pressures that, unless stopped, will make socialism inevitable in America.

I have consistently opposed the so-called bipartisan foreign policy since the late President Roosevelt cleverly unfolded it in anticipation of the political campaign of 1944. It served in that year as a gag on Thomas E. Dewey. But Dewey did not feel the strangling hands of this bipartisan ghost fully enough. He allowed himself to become gagged with the same fallacies in 1948. A great many Members of the Republican Party, many of them no longer with us, felt the same terrific results.

Every poll taken has shown the people are overwhelmingly opposed to these huge appropriations of American money to European nations. Every poll shows the people are opposed to Communists, would-be Communists, fellow travelers, or Russian-lovers in the Department of State. Yet, we have had a succession of these small men in the very highest posts. The stream of them never seems to end. One leaves and another takes his place. Again and again and again, America has been sold short.

Yet, we hear apparently intelligent men standing around telling one another that we must have a bipartisan foreign policy. That is sheer tommyrot, utter drivel, and pure political cant. It is so fallacious, so unreasoning, so deadening, so intellectually dishonest, I cannot understand how intelligent men can fall for it.

The Republican leadership has been foolish now for 20 years. In the past 6 months, there has been a reawakening among rank-and-file Republicans and citizens who believe in America, regardless of party. That reawakening has come in spite of commentators, do-gooders, and a veritable avalanche of propaganda. At long last, Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and company see their policies slipping out of public favor.

What is the first old strategem that occurs to them to get out of the closet, dust off, and use again? The so-called, miscalled bipartisan foreign policy. If the Republican leaders fall again for this drivel, the Republican elephant might as well lie down and die quietly.

Labor Dedicates Its Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an excerpt from the CIO Union News of Indianapolis, Ind.

Organized labor has had a very unique evolution in its dedicated efforts to sustain working conditions conducive to providing respect for the integrity of the human soul, healthful working conditions, collective bargaining, reasonable working hours, education, wholesome family life, security for the twilight years of life, and a fair remuneration for its part in creating the wealth of our Nation.

We, today, are a better and stronger Nation by virtue of organized labor. Its courageous and militant fight in behalf of the workingman has been no different from that of numerous other organized agencies given inception to preserve the rights of certain segments of our people. Organized labor was born of necessity to cope with many other agencies that too frequently were guilty of exploitation and slave labor.

By virtue of the fact that organized labor fully realizes what it has done in the way of promoting and protecting the rights of the working man and woman living in this, the greatest democracy in the world, it now proposes not to turn

back the wheels of time and partake further of the treatment netted it of the yesterdays. This fact is fully predicated by an excerpt from the CIO Union News of Indianapolis, Ind., entitled "A Word to the Wise," of which Neal W. Edwards, president of the Indiana CIO, is the author, and it reads as follows:

In labor's quest for a sound and logical solution to its social and economic problems, imposed on it by big business under the capitalistic system (free enterprise at its worst, if you please), we attempt to carefully consider and analyze the many and varied phases of the labor-versus management conflicts. On what battle front did these conflicts originate? What steps led up to the creation of these conflicts? What was the ultimate end, or was there an end?

Will there ever be an ending to this ages-old war between the two forces * * * one the producer and the other coupon clipper? I hardly think so, unless there is a complete turnabout in the present system practiced by the greedy monopolistic-minded lords of finance. Therefore, it behooves labor to strengthen its bailiwick to enforce their demands for their rightful portion of the goods they produce.

The first American workmen realized, as have those who followed in their wake, that if they were to realize even a bare subsistence from their labors, they must join hands and unite all the forces of labor under one banner. It becomes as increasingly and alarmingly apparent today (as it did to our forebears, that to get even a living wage or fair treatment from the employer can only be accomplished by the united efforts of many. It cannot be accomplished by a few or on an individual basis. Therefore, the first American workers had no alternative and the workers of today have no alternative but to band together into strong trade-unions.

LABOR AWAKENS TO ITS RIGHTS

Labor will never go back to industrial serfdom for labor realizes and justifiably so that it is the pulse of industrial might. Without labor, there would be no coal mined or Chryslers built. (Some few are beginning to realize that fact.) Labor planted the wheat and milled and made it into bread. There is nothing made by man of which labor had no part. While the du Ponts and their like have their fingers in every pie to pull the juicy plums, it must be remembered that labor made the pie and has a right to a fair portion of the pie. Without labor, there would be absolutely nothing.

Much was accomplished by the first trade-unions in solving part of their problems and many advancements that labor enjoys today were gained through the courageous and united efforts of these ancestors of the present-day American laborer, who out of sheer necessity and a strong urge to see their children enjoy more benefits and opportunities than they had realized, took the steps necessary to establish a beachhead. It took real courage in those days to buck the employer and his hirelings, coal and iron police, State militias, Pinkertons, and hired strikebreakers. Some of our large corporations spent a great deal of their profits to maintain highly organized and very efficient espionage systems. During the early thirties, the La Follette investigating committee proved beyond a doubt that many corporations were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for spies, finks, guns and ammunition, tear gas, etc. Despite all this, labor has advanced.

WHAT SOME WILL DO FOR MONEY

Much more could have been accomplished and far greater gains achieved had it not been for the traitors within labor's ranks who for personal gain, were willing to sell their fellow unionists out to the industrialists, for a few pieces of silver—blood money for the informers.

In their desire for personal gain and prestige, they were blinded and did not see the sweat dropping from the undernourished and half-naked bodies of men working long, strenuous hours under unbelievably rotten, revolting conditions. The tinkle of the silver in their hands and the promise of lucrative positions offering them further prestige, drowned out the anguished cries of the oppressed workers whose spilled blood denoted the supreme sacrifice they offered to the cause of labor. They failed to see the tears of the widows and orphans brought about by their being individuals devoid of principles. These traitorous stoolpigeons sold their souls, wrecked the unions and the lives of their neighbors and families.

A REAL UNION MAN

A real union man, whose sole interest is the betterment of mankind, wonders why anyone with the least semblance of morals or principles would stoop to this level. He knows by personal experience and his knowledge of the past history of the labor movement that his salvation and that of his children rests in his being a member of a strong union. He is aware that his everyday wants and needs will be forthcoming only when he participates jointly with his fellow workers in a valiant show of economic strength.

Loyalty to his union and the principles for which it stands are the uppermost thoughts in his mind. Little does he realize how easy it is to inflate the ego of certain individuals and how easy it is to appeal to the grasping natures of these same individuals.

The industrialist knows and uses this knowledge at every opportunity to weaken the union which he hopes to eventually break, usually by pitting one worker against another under the speed-up system, by showing favoritism with promises of job advancement, and the use of spies and finks to infiltrate labor's ranks.

THE SELL-OUT BOYS

And so it goes. When management feels labor is getting too strong economically or politically, they resort to practically the same methods, using the same type of individuals for their tools—the sell-out boys. For a few pieces of silver and the promise of political advancement, these individuals become willing tools in the hands of the financial lords. They forget their union and close their hearts and minds to the pleading from their friends and once fellow unionists, completely ignoring those who made it possible for them to be in their present position through zealous effort and smarting sacrifice, both morally and financially.

Such individuals, devoid of conscience yes, destitute of honor, little realize that should labor lose its political foothold and the advancements gained therewith, they, too, will lose their dubious position. They will be left alone with a newly awakened conscience to torment them. They will have lost the respect of their former labor associates. And the heartless industrialists who used them as tools against their own people will cast them aside as tools no longer needed.

Then these smart boys, self-esteemed shrewd politicians will learn the agonizing torment of a guilty conscience as did Benedict Arnold, the infamous traitor.

AS I SEE IT

I deem it neither advisable or necessary at this time to point the finger of guilt at any particular individual, but should it become necessary at some future date to successfully eliminate the possibilities of a complete breakdown or even the lessening of the tempo of our well-oiled machine, I certainly will not hesitate to expose them regardless of the consequence, or where the chips may fall.

We would like and do believe that the overwhelming majority of our members are honest, sincere, and militant. But in many instances each barrel, "due to pressure," has at least one bad apple. Let us not dispose of the entire barrel in order to get the one bad apple.

This is not a threat. It is a promise.

In the 1950 elections, we shall maintain our previous stand of being independent voters, owing our allegiance to neither political party. We will call on our CIO members to cast their vote accordingly, urging them and our friends to support candidates on their past record, or new political aspirants on their pledge to support liberal legislation regardless of party ties.

We have not, as some would have you believe, endorsed and supported candidates running on the Democratic ticket merely because they were Democrats. It was because ordinarily more liberals are running on the Democratic ticket than on the Republican. One needs only to check the voting records of State legislators or that of the United States Congress to find the source of the majority of our liberal votes. Despite the fact that we have a few liberal Republicans and quite a few reactionary Democrats, we will continue to toss bouquets to our friends and bricks at our enemies, either within or without our union.

Selection of Hon. Stuart Symington as Chairman of National Security Resources Board Brings Man of Proven Ability to One of Nation's Most Important Posts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by President Truman that he was calling upon his able and trusted aide, Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, to take over the Chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board has generally been greeted with approbation. Mr. Symington is an administrator of proven ability and through his dynamic personality and far-sighted vision has been of inestimable value in the welding of a great and unified defense force for our Nation. His elevation to the new post will give new impetus to one of the most important tasks in our national life and will further bring to our citizens the sense of security to be gained from the knowledge that the direction of our defense and security resources lies in good hands. The people of Tennessee and of the Fifth District of Tennessee hold Mr. Symington in high regard and I am pleased in this connection to ask consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a recent editorial from the Nashville Tennessean concerning Mr. Symington's appointment.

The editorial is as follows:

MAJOR TASK IN GOOD HANDS

President Truman's appointment of Secretary of Air W. Stuart Symington as chairman

of the National Security Resources Board can be taken as a sign that atomic-age civilian defense will now get the attention it deserves.

The country, we think, has been laggard in organizing to meet the different kind of war that will be experienced in the future. There has been a recognition of need for action, but a strange reluctance to face up to the job. In Washington there has been a prevailing fear that the peoples' nerves would be shaken by a candid approach to the need of preparing for atomic attacks.

Instead of being alarmed at evidence that this Nation-wide task will be undertaken without further delay, the national attitude actually should be one of approval.

As Secretary for Air since 1947, Mr. Symington has shown himself to be an efficient administrator. He has brought the Air Force up to a high standard of efficiency by the same qualities that will be helpful to the Security Resources Board.

With the ability to fuse new life into the Board, Mr. Symington can be expected to make rapid progress on an assignment that calls for understanding and administrative skill. Although his new role brings less monetary reward, it is unexcelled in importance to the security of civil and industrial life.

In all Washington circles, the new chairman enjoys the confidence that will encourage helpful cooperation. His standing with the civilian population also is of the highest, thereby paving the way to rapid progress in a field where any more delay could be extremely dangerous.

Attacks on the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Buffalo Evening News:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of March 30, 1950]

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS "CHARGES BY MCCARTHY SET NEIGHBOR AGAINST NEIGHBOR"

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Senator JOE MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has done enough damage to our Government and to its prestige and that of our Nation abroad in a very critical era by his wild and slanderous charges about persons in the State Department from behind the cloak of his congressional immunity.

But he has started something even more insidious and poisonous here at home. It affects the lives of people of probity and decency, their right to privacy and freedom from annoyance and persecution. And if it spreads, it could set neighbor against neighbor in a ghastly un-American fashion.

Because of the terrible significance of this modern witch hunt and because you may have overlooked what has happened here to people like yourselves—decent, law-abiding citizens, and their families—the experiences in two cases is recited, as they were told to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee investigating the McCarthy charges.

Speaking in the first instance, is Mrs. Esther Caulkin Brunauer, who has served faithfully in the State Department:

"In my household there are two small children and an elderly grandmother, besides myself and my huband. We are all upset and bewildered. Since March 13 (when MCCARTHY made his charges about her) we have received anonymous telephone calls at all hours of the day and night, accompanied by threats and profanity, with such advice as 'get out of this neighborhood, you Communists, or you will be carried out in a box.'

"All of you who have families will realize the effects this has on the atmosphere of a home. You know how much you would feel it if it was happening in your home. Senator MCCARTHY may have his own reasons for what he has done and the way he has done it, but I will never be able to understand them."

Speaking, in the second instance, is Haldore Hanson, Associated Press reporter during the China-Japanese war, who has been in the State Department for 4 years. He told how in the farm community in which he lives in nearby Virginia one neighbor had called him a "Russian spy" and "that Communist."

"My latest information of this kind," he said, "concerns a meeting of a county agricultural committee at Leesburg at which a Virginia State official from Richmond denounced the growing number of Communists in Government and named me as one of them."

Mr. Hanson challenged Senator MCCARTHY to say outside what he had said about him under his congressional immunity and he would sue the Senator. But the Senator does not accept the challenge, though he said in his speech in the Senate February 20, when he began making his charges about State Department personnel that "I will not say anything on the Senate floor which I will not say off the floor. On the day when I take advantage of the security we have on the Senate floor, on that day I will resign from the Senate. Anything I say on the floor of the Senate at any time will be repeated off the floor."

[From the Buffalo Evening News of March 28, 1950]

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS "GOP LIBERALS TAKE ISSUE WITH DRIVE ON ACHESON"

WASHINGTON, March 28.—The Senator JOE MCCARTHY Communists in the State Department flimflam has shoved the Republican Party into an obviously uncomfortable spot.

This was dramatized when one of the party's elder statesmen, Henry L. Stimson, took pen in hand to disclose the danger, both to the party and to the Nation, of the whole shabby episode in a staunch defense of Secretary of State Dean Acheson whom he commended for his "extraordinary record of able and distinguished public service." He warned his party against the little men who are seeking to make a political issue out of the attacks by the Wisconsin Republican Senator which Mr. Stimson frankly recognized as a political attack aimed at the present Secretary of State.

It was significant that his letter to the New York Times giving his views was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator IVES, Republican of New York, a close associate of Governor Dewey who heads the more progressive and international-minded wing of the party.

This issue seems to divide the party along familiar lines.

For it is the Midwest nationalist wing of the party that set up the hue and cry against Secretary Acheson, and is whipping up the McCarthy witch hunt. Noisiest is Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, Republican floor leader, while Senator TAFT of Ohio, chairman of the party's Senate Policy Committee, has given his support to the Wisconsin Senator's still fruitless search for Communists in the State Department by revealing he had urged his colleague to push the matter "and if one case doesn't work to bring up others." This, and his statement that the reaction to the McCarthy charges seems to be good on the whole, disturbed some of the Ohio Senator's friends because of the frank political connotation.

The progressive wing of the party apparently has taken sharp issue with such an attitude. It obviously shares the opinion of Mr. Stimson who concluded his letter by saying that "this is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks.

"This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed."

The nervousness of Republicans over the position in which Senator MCCARTHY has put them was best revealed in a Senate speech by Senator SMITH, Republican of New Jersey, who placed himself timidly on all sides of the issue. He did not want it in partisan politics. He said, on the one hand, that he is supporting Senator MCCARTHY; but, on the other, he regretted to see innocent people injured. Then he urged that the rest of the proceedings be in closed session.

Who, it might well be asked, put the matter in politics?

Mr. Stimson—though he never used JOE MCCARTHY'S name—seemed to understand easily enough, and he said that "the man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country." That would apply, of course, to others who are doing that. He also said:

"It is already obvious that in any test of public confidence the men of honor, in both parties, will choose to stand with the Secretary."

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American Public Power Association on March 30, 1950, passed the appended resolution commending the establishment of the President's Water Resources Commission. The association also joined in the principle of deferment of major changes in water resources legislation pending the report of the Commission in December 1950.

Resolution 2

President's Water Resources Policy Commission

Whereas on January 3, 1950, the President appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission of seven members, with major instructions as follows:

"The President's Water Resources Policy Commission shall study, and make recommendations to the President with respect to, Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes to the extent that they are directly concerned with water resources. The Commission shall give consideration in particular to (a) the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water-resources programs, (b) an appraisal of the priority of water-resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need, (c) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water-resources projects, and (d) desirable legislation or changes in existing

legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources"; and

Whereas the President directed the Commission to submit its report not later than December 1, 1950; and

Whereas in a covering letter January 3, 1950, to Chairman Morris L. Cooke, of the Commission, the President said:

"In many cases, piecemeal or partial approaches to a problem as broad as water resources development tend to confuse, rather than clarify, many of the basic, underlying issues. It is essential, in my judgment, that a comprehensive study and review be made of all existing water-resources legislation and policies and that recommendations be made in the full knowledge of national needs and objectives"; and

Whereas the President, in his budget message of January 1950, said, with respect to the Water Resources Policy Commission:

"Some changes in present Federal legislation can and should be made at this session of the Congress, but major changes should be deferred until the Commission's recommendations are available": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association commends the establishment of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and recommends that consideration of legislation making major changes in Federal water-resources legislation be deferred until the Commission shall have made its report and recommendations.

The president and executive committee of the American Public Power Association are directed to cooperate with the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and to designate committees or personnel for consultation with and assistance to the Commission.

Backing Up Our Statesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter appearing on the editorial page of the New York Times, published March 30, 1950. The letter is as follows:

BACKING UP OUR STATESMEN—LINCOLN'S REMARKS RECALLED REGARDING CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Most of us have our own petty problems and are engrossed with them. There are very few Americans who have the time, the energy, the experience, the poise, the perserverance, the intellect, the character, and the power to understand, grapple with, and solve the delicate international problems of tremendous moment which confront us today. The men responsible for reorienting our foreign policy and deciding upon national action need all of their capacities for the great work remaining before them.

Our world leadership, our national security, perhaps our existence as a powerful, prosperous, independent Nation, all require that the President and the Secretary of State devote their efforts to the uttermost to achieve and cherish just, lasting, and honorable peace with all nations. This is not a part-time task. If world government is the only alternative to world cataclysm we should decide and act before it is too late. The formulation of wise national policy requires calm, intense, deliberate thinking. Leadership, statesmanship, and vision of the highest order are indispensable lest we, leaderless like the swine described in the Bible, rush over the cliffs to destruction on the rocks and in the sea far below.

Democrats and Republicans alike have learned to relish Abraham Lincoln's quaint sayings and revere his homely but persuasive philosophy. When a congressional committee, a Senator, a Representative, an editor, indeed any man or woman, is moved hereafter to nag, badger, or attack our President and our Secretary of State solely for personal or political advantage or for any other selfish or unpatriotic motive let him pause and reflect. Let all of us heed what President Lincoln said to a committee which came to him with a complaint from the West:

"Gentlemen, suppose all the property you were worth was in gold and you had to put it in the hands of Blondin, to carry across the Niagara River on a rope. Would you shake the cable or keep shouting at him, 'Blondin, stand up a little straighter; Blondin, stoop a little more; go a little faster; lean a little more to the north; lean a little more to the south'? No, you would hold your breath as well as your tongue, and keep your hands off until he was safe over. The Government is carrying an enormous weight. Untold treasures are in their hands; they are doing the very best they can. Don't badger them. Keep silence, and we will get you safe across."

HAROLD J. BAILY.
BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 26, 1950.*

The Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership of the House, as well as the people I have the honor to represent in Congress, may understand my position in reference to the $250,000,000 cut in ECA funds, I should like to give my reasons for voting for this reduction.

In the first place, Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA program, reported to the House Committee on Appropriations that there was a balance of $150,000,000 from the amount appropriated for this work last year. In addition to that, we all know that many of the countries which are participants under the Marshall plan had abundant crops last year, and they have gone a long way toward rehabilitation of their war-torn countries and the need is not nearly so great as immediately after cessation of hostilities.

The Appropriations Committee has seen fit to cut appropriations all along the line, and I have been in favor of most of those curtailments. In many instances the reductions made by the committee were as much as 50 percent as was done in the appropriation for a survey and dredging of the Baltimore Harbor in my own State, the largest port of entry in the United States from a standpoint of tonnage handled. We have appropriated money under the technical cooperation program for every conceivable kind of assistance such as economic, engineering, medical, educational, agricultural, fishery, mineral and fiscal surveys, demonstration, training, and similar projects, in other words, assistance from the cradle to the grave.

I was fully in accord with the purposes of the Marshall plan in helping these stricken nations to get back on their feet economically, but I am not in favor of the American people footing the bill for the economic development for all the backward nations in the world. There must be an end to this kind of spending sometime.

I have talked with a great many people this year who were in various European countries last year. Without a single exception, they reported the people they saw were well dressed, apparently well fed, and that they encountered no shortage of food, clothing, or other necessities.

Mr. Speaker, if I am the only Member of the House who insists upon the tremendous appropriations for all kinds of hand-outs and subsidies being reduced to a point where we can balance our budget and get this country back on a sound economic basis, I intend to do it, but the vote on the $250,000,000 cut in ECA funds indicates there are many who agree with the position I have taken.

God Is Our Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Catholic Monitor, by Joseph Marchiselli:

"He who say I love God and hates his brother is a liar." 1 John 4: 20.

I am happy I am not a Negro. Not that I would be ashamed if I were, for no one should be ashamed of how God made him. I am happy I am not a Negro because I certainly would not like to be treated like they are.

An example of how the Negro is regarded in this country was recently typified by the manner in which the FEPC bill was handled in the United States Congress. That spectacle is an indictment on the American people that will never be lived down until the end of time. Like Caesar, that bill was assassinated not only by its sworn enemies, as represented by the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, but also by those representatives who shouted their approval of it, but like Brutus, assisted in its death by conveniently hiding behind the labyrinthical technicalities of parliamentary procedure.

The Fair Employment Practice Act is, or was, a measure to create a commission with power to see that discrimination in employment is not used against men or women because of their color or creed. It was not to be a law to grant special privileges, but to restore to the discriminated minorities, especially the Negroes, a right given them by God and taken away from them by men—the right to live.

There are 17,000,000 Negroes in this country and the biggest percentage of these hu-

man beings are Americans by many more generations than many of the other races that make up our heterogeneous population. The preamble to the Declaration of Independence included the Negroes, I'm sure, when it said: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Let us examine our hearts and conscience and see what these high-sounding phrases have meant to these people. The last to be hired and the first to be fired, their employment consists of mostly porters, charwomen, elevatormen, track walkers, red caps, coal stokers, waiters, and all such menial jobs. They are denied entrance in many colleges and universities, so that they could not even aspire to their educational and cultural ambitions.

By denying them of the right to live we have forced them into poverty, squalor; forced them to live with two and three families in one vermin-infested apartment, where they never breathe clean air.

What has come of this economic slavery of the Negroes? What could be expected but debauchery, crime, disease, prostitution, and sex perversion. Surely, if you treat a man like a beast he will react like a beast.

If we believe in God, we must accept His teaching that He created all living creatures; that He created the black as well as the white man; that He created the world for all men to have dominion over the fowls of the air, the fishes of the sea, the beasts of the forest, and the resources of the earth.

We went to Germany to destroy Hitler and his nazism, with its philosophy of the master race, only to find its personification right in America in the manner in which our minorities, particularly our fellow Negro Americans are treated. No man is qualified to judge as to which is the superior race. Man was created not to judge, but serve God.

All believers in God, regardless of what denomination, who hate and discriminate, come in the same category as the scribes of old, who occupied the high seats in the synagogue to be seen praying, and prayed out loud to be heard, and Christ said: "Hypocrites that you are. You occupy the high seats to be seen and pray out loud to be heard, but during the week you rob the widow's pension."

To all of you who discriminate, let these words of St. Paul sink into your hearts: "If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

"And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." 1 Paul 13: 1–2, Corinthians.

Mourn the Loss of Nate Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I note with real regret the death of my dear friend, Nathan W. Robertson, Washington correspondent for over 25 years. This is sad news indeed, for Nate was an exemplary newspaperman, devoted always to the public interest, diligent and painstaking in his efforts to become what he was, a good and conscientious reporter.

Recognition of his ability came to him in the form of a Nieman fellowship to Harvard University in 1944, as well as the American Newspaper Guild's Heywood Broun Memorial Prize. He was a charter member of the Washington Newspaper Guild and a former vice president of the American Newspaper Guild.

Nate was a well-known figure in the House Press Gallery as well as in other Federal agencies. I have known and respected him for many years, and grew to have an affectionate regard for him when he wrote the Washington column for Labor Press Associates.

His loss will be a shock to all newspaperdom.

Our condolences go to his parents, brothers, and to his wife and children.

Charges of Communistic Influence in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently the papers have been filled to overflowing with accounts of the wild statements and shotgun tactics being used by a Member of the upper body in connection with his charges of communistic influence in the State Department.

The matter in hand is supposed to do with the actual persons employed in our diplomatic service of the State Department. However, last week this Republican Senator brought up the Amerasia case of 1945.

Five years ago this case was tried in the courts under our democratic procedure and a grand jury held that insufficient evidence existed to warrant prosecution of John S. Service, who was charged with dealing in secret documents. The matter was supposed to have ended. Mr. Service was reinstated and is now consul general in Calcutta. In other words, Mr. Service was exonerated by a jury of his peers under our democratic judicial system.

Some Republicans took occasion to accuse a personal friend of mine of mishandling the Government's side in the Amerasia case. I refer to Robert M. Hitchcock, a Buffalo lawyer, who was formerly an assistant United States attorney and a special attorney for the Department of Justice during the war.

There were charges hurled at Mr. Hitchcock, insinuating that his present association with the firm of Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth, of Buffalo, was the result of Hitchcock's failing to prosecute Miss Kate Mitchell, one of the six defendants in the Amerasia case. Miss Mitchell's uncle, the late James M. Mitchell, was formerly a member of that law firm.

When questioned about this charge in Buffalo 2 or 3 days ago, Mr. Hitchcock replied that he had never met Mr. Mitchell until after he went with the firm in 1947 and that he was employed to help in the defense of the many portal-to-portal cases which were flooding the courts at that time.

Moreover, these same charges now being hurled with such abandon under the cloak of congressional immunity were brought up approximately 3 years ago. They were fully investigated at that time by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and Mr. Hitchcock's handling of the matter was fully vindicated by that subcommittee. The Congress under which that action was taken was the Eightieth Congress which was preponderantly Republican.

I have known Bob Hitchcock, personally, for many years and know him to be an able and conscientious lawyer. While with the Department of Justice, he rendered invaluable service to the Government including the prosecution of a number of cases dealing with espionage and notably the case of the Nazi spies who landed on the coast of Maine.

He is a man of integrity and fine character and, I know, is the last person to be influenced by outside pressure of any kind.

The firm with which he is now associated is an old Buffalo firm, highly respected and well thought of, not only in my home community but in legal circles throughout the country.

Certainly the attack on Mr. Hitchcock is but another degrading chapter in the Red hunt in which the Republican Party has engaged, because it has no constructive program to offer the people in this election year. Its objective is to defeat all social-reform measures by throwing suspicion on a "guilt by association" basis on all progressive groups and forward-looking citizens.

It is a shame that congressional immunity, so grossly abused by some members of the Republican Party, prevents redress to the people, such as Bob Hitchcock and others who have been smeared by such vicious name calling.

Such charges can do us a great deal of harm as it falls upon the ears of those gullible persons here at home and as it is relayed to nations abroad who look to the United States for leadership, but who have no way of learning that some members of the Republican Party are talking through their hats.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express of April 1, 1950, entitled "When Slander Strikes Home":

WHEN SLANDER STRIKES HOME

Perhaps it is just as well that the outrageous and absurd nature of Senator McCARTHY'S Red hunt has been brought home to Buffalo. Senator McCARTHY and Representative DONDERO, of Michigan (who seems to operate on a political level as low as McCARTHY'S own) have extended their smear-campaign to a Buffalo law firm which has numbered among its partners a President of the United States and many of the country's outstanding lawyers.

One of the junior partners in this firm is a former special attorney in the Department of Justice. Five years ago he prosecuted a case in which six persons were arrested on

charges of unlawful removal of State Department documents, allegedly in the interest of a magazine of left-wing tendencies. Among the magazine employees accused was the niece of a nationally eminent Buffalo lawyer, now dead, who was one of the principal partners in the firm mentioned. She voluntarily went before a Federal grand jury and told her story. The grand jury was convinced that she had no part in misuse of State Department documents and refused to indict her.

All this happened in 1945. Two years later, after having returned to private practice, the former Federal attorney was associated with the Buffalo firm in defending portal-to-portal lawsuits not connected in the most remote degree with the magazine case. Before the portal-to-portal litigation, the former Federal attorney had not even met the uncle of the young woman whom the grand jury cleared in the State Department documents inquiry.

Distorting such material into evidence of something or other supposedly sinister, Senator MCCARTHY continues on his silly, vicious, and slanderous course. President Truman spoke sharply, but not too sharply, when he described the Wisconsin Senator as the Kremlin's greatest asset in this country.

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, at the Maine Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at the Republican State convention in Portland, Maine, on March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is stimulating for a Republican to come to the rock-bound coast of Republican Maine from the stifling vapors of the Capitol City, the home of deals of all kinds which obscure a good deal of clear American vision. The State of Maine has exceptional representation in the United States Senate. OWEN BREWSTER and I went to law school together, and I have long had the highest regard for his ability and character. In MARGARET CHASE SMITH the State of Maine has a unique privilege. She has proved to the country that a woman Senator can be as effective and as able as any man.

This year, Maine, as usual, takes the lead. Here in this convention, you open the campaign in 1950 to elect the Eighty-second Congress. Few elections have been fraught with so much significance in the future of America. In 1948 President Truman was elected on a personal platform which, if carried out, would have established a labor-socialist government in this country similar to that of Great Britain. Fortunately, the people at the same time elected a Congress most of whom had never endorsed or approved the Truman program. The Eighty-first Congress, while much more radical than the Eightieth Congress, still refused to accept the dictates of President Truman, although by a narrow majority and after a violent battle. The election was indecisive because, I believe, the people did not clearly understand the issues.

But in 1952 the people must decide whether they will elect a Congress whose policies will be guided by the principles of liberty which guided this country for 150 years, or one which will accept the Socialist proposals of President Truman. The recent Republican statement of principles and objectives says that the basic domestic issue today is liberty against socialism. It goes on to define these terms. Liberty, it says, means a free people in constant control of their government. Socialism means an all-powerful Federal Government with unlimited power to tax and spend, to direct and operate our agriculture, industry, labor, and local communities, and the daily lives of our citizens.

In the past 4 months I have traveled through the 88 counties of Ohio and visited hundreds of cities and villages, schoolhouses, industrial plants, and farms. I am confident that the people of Ohio—and they are typical of the people of America—believe in liberty, and I think I know what the essential quality of that liberty is. It is the freedom of people in every walk of life and every form of activity to think their own thoughts and carry out their own ideas; the freedom of man to have his ideas taught to others if he can convince his teachers; freedom of the press; freedom of religion. It is the freedom of each community to determine how its own children shall be educated and its health, welfare, and other local activities conducted. In a country this size it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of local self-government if we are to maintain freedom at all, for the bureaus of a central government are never responsive to the will of any considerable number of the people of different sections of this great country.

It is the liberty of men and women to choose their own occupation, and to establish and operate their own business, if they so desire, as they feel it should be operated without interference from the Government, or from labor-union bosses so long as they themselves do not interfere with the rights of others. It is the liberty which encourages every boy and girl to feel that the world is open to their abilities and their efforts, in occupation, in local politics, and in public and private life throughout the Nation.

The results of that freedom have made this country the greatest and the happiest country in the world. An essential feature of liberty is freedom from the direction of government, and particularly a central government. We have a great system of education, probably the best in the world, and it is partly socialized in our public elementary and secondary schools, but it is free because there is no central power directing it. Power is diffused among thousands of school districts and between 48 States and between thousands of private schools and colleges. Many of these schools may have entirely erroneous ideas. Some may do harm rather than good, but the net result is a great system of education with more freedom than is given by any other country. It has resulted in millions of people developing their own ideas and a general opportunity to try them out to see whether they are worth while.

This kind of freedom made the American soldiers the greatest army in the world. Certainly it was not because they were better trained, because they were not, or better disciplined. Their discipline was poor according to military standards. But they outfought the leading military nations of the world because every man was able to think for himself to meet the situation as it occurred.

So, in the field of economic progress. In every industrial plant I have visited the managers think their plant has a peculiar excellence, a new product, better morale, better machines or better methods and production lines. We are ahead of other countries because of the tremendous advance in tools and machinery and the productivity of every workman resulting therefrom. The American farmer is just as far ahead in his methods and productivity.

We are ahead because of freedom, because there are millions of people stimulated to develop ideas and free to put those ideas into effect without some bureaucratic interference. We would be far behind today if Government had owned every little industrial plant in this country as Mr. Attlee desires to have the Government own them in England. Our system has led to a production so great that it gave the basis of victory in two World Wars. It has led to a standard of living in this country two and a half to three times that of Great Britain, or in Europe.

We happen to have today a very vivid comparison with the industrial system of England. The freedom of industry in England was abused, and the importance of freedom was never realized. Monopolies were encouraged rather than competition. Government control and assistance was sought and encouraged until today it is a matter of course. Neither workmen nor management had the interest in new machinery which complete liberty of ideas gave in this country. As a result today, the British workman is getting $20 a week and the American workman $55 a week. The very measures advertised as benefiting the workman have reduced him to a life of austerity. Government control and government taxation have removed any incentive to individuals to invest their money in new plants or new machinery or new methods. And England is unable to make goods cheaply enough, even with cheap labor, to compete with American goods and earn the dollars they need.

What is the greatest enemy of liberty and its accomplishments? Obviously in America today it is the concentration of power in Washington. It is the course of these mistaken individuals who cannot abide the scattered planlessness of liberty however excellent its results, and must establish a regulated order organized to carry out the particular ends they have in mind. Already we have created in our Federal Government the greatest monopoly in the world, an institution spending $46,000,000,000 in 12 months, one-sixth of all the activity in this great country. While the people have resisted many increases of power sought since 1939, spending has gone on until by its mere size and the weight of taxation the freedom of men is limited. If the Government takes from me 20 to 50 percent of my earnings, it is depriving me of liberty to spend that money for myself. It is saying to me that the Government will select the services that I shall receive, whether I want them or not. It removes the income by which men may experiment and carry out their own ideas, and also the incentive to spend their time and their money and their ability and their genius in further improvement.

Socialism is the taking over of human activity by government. Of course socialism is a relative term. Some activities have always been socialized like public schools and the post office in this country. A few Socialists will carry their program to the complete control of all individual activity. But it is not necessary to go so far to bring an effective end to liberty. There is a point at which the growth of government so weakens the effective operation of liberty that government is forced into still greater expansion. In England they have effectively ended economic liberty. They think they can do that and still maintain individual liberty, but I doubt if a real socialistic regime can be continued in force in the economic field for many years except under a dictatorship.

It is said that Harry Truman is no Socialist. That makes little difference if all his policies lead to socialism. We are in

danger of complete Government control not only because of his policies, but because the totalitarian philosophy has affected the thinking of a lot of other people in this country who ought to know better. There was a time when men expected to solve their own problems, when they were solved by cooperative effort and local effort. Today the first thought is to turn to Washington for money and action. The organization of pressure groups has been a dangerous factor in that movement. Every pressure group, whether from business or labor or professions, concentrate their interest on Washington activity. Their paid lobbyists find it much easier to seek a Federal statute than to go out and educate the people or even their own members, to achieve by their own efforts a solution of their problems.

We have been faced in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses with a detailed Truman program which would leave little freedom in the people and concentrate power in the Federal Government, greater even than that it exercised during the war. Every policy which Mr. Truman advocates means more power in Washington. Perhaps he does little realize the total effect of his own program, forced on him item by item by the political necessity of appeasing the CIO Political Action Committee.

In the first place he has been demanding the power of price-fixing, wage-fixing—in a very moderate way, of course—and allocation which means rationing. There was a time in the summer of 1947 when he referred to these powers as "police state controls." Since December 1947, he has continuously demanded these powers now spelled out in the Spence bill.

He demands the power for the Government to go into business. He supports the great expansion of government in the power business and incidental activities through Valley Authorities in every region of the United States.

He insists on the Brannan plan with subsidies to farmers and consumers and the power of government to direct in detail the operation of every farm, the number of acres to be planted to wheat, to corn, to cotton and other crops; the number of animals to be raised—hogs, beef cattle, dairy cattle, chickens.

These measures have been developed by those men who believe in economic planning, and Government control to order those plans to be carried out. They would mean a complete power in government to direct the detailed operation of industry, commerce, and agriculture. They would involve the control of labor and the allotment of jobs. If Harry Truman is not a socialist, then he simply does not understand the effect of the measures which he supports.

Then he advocates the socialization as well as the nationalization of medicine. Under his plan the Government would levy six or seven billion dollars of new taxes and put it all in the hands of a Federal bureau to set up a vast organization to employ all the doctors and hospitals in the United States to give free medical care to 150,000,000 people. All doctors would become employees of the Government and it would destroy the freedom of the medical profession which has contributed more than any other to the remedies against human illness.

Many other proposals before us extend the activities of so-called social insurance to other contingencies of life. Of course, it is not really insurance at all, but merely a plan of additional taxation to provide the cash for free handouts of all kinds of welfare service. This year's report of the Federal Security Agency says "The administration believes that comprehensive welfare services should in time be available to persons requesting them—whether needy or not—in all communities of the Nation."

Naturally enough, Mr. Truman has also advocated universal military training and is not at all fearful concerning a system which would take boys out of their education and occupations in time of peace and subject them for 12 months to the indoctrination of some bureau in the War Department.

As part of all this program, we have the necessary extension of spending and taxation. Already we are spending about 28 percent of our national income on Government. Every man works more than 1 day in 4 for Government and less than 3 days for himself. Taxes increase the price of every product the housewife buys by about 20 percent on the average so that this burden falls on millions who do not realize that they are paying taxes. It destroys the incentive of men to expand their business and their business activities and may soon leave voids which the Government will be urged to fill up with Government investment requiring more taxes. In Great Britain a tax burden of 40 percent of the national income has practically brought a stagnation of progress in industry. Even here there is doubt whether we can get the money necessary to keep up the growth of industry required to give a million new jobs every year to the young people entering the labor market and those displaced by technological improvement. Certainly, some rearrangement of taxes is required.

It is quite true that Mr. Truman does not present his program in its true light. In England the Socialists are proud of their program. They admit freely its cost in taxes and the limitation of freedom, but insist that it is worth the price. Mr. Truman's advisers despair of convincing the American people along that line. They try to play down the radical nature of the proposals they make. Powers are only to be stand-by powers to be occasionally used. The medical program is to retain the liberty of choosing your own doctor. Also, the people are not asked to pay the price. We have a deficit of $5,000,000,000 a year, and no new taxes are asked for. The people are urged to accept all the programs because they are not going to have to pay for them. They are to get something for nothing.

Each step in the past has been taken without warning of those to come. Now, at last, we have the whole program before us. We know that if Mr. Truman can elect a Congress subordinate to his will and that of the labor unions, it is not just a question of socialized medicine or economic control, it is the whole program of the hand-out state and the police state which a radical Eighty-second Congress can put into effect before the end of Mr. Truman's term.

It is important that the people be not fooled by Mr. Truman's occasional hesitations and his olive branches extended to the businessmen. There has been no repudiation of any of these policies. The only way to avoid a creeping socialism is to elect a Republican Congress in 1950 and a Republican President in 1952. The only way to get rid of the Communists in the State Department is to change the head of the Government. It can't be done with men in control who think they are only red herrings. The only way to get a judicial treatment of labor problems is to elect an impartial President. As long as Mr. Truman is there, he will sabotage whatever policy Congress may adopt as he has sabotaged the Taft-Hartley law.

The issue is clear. It is inconceivable to me that the American people would throw away a system at the very time that it has proved its ability to improve the condition of the great mass of the people to a standard of living far beyond anything the world has ever seen, and adopt a system which in Great Britain has failed to benefit the very workmen to which it promised utopia. The issue is, in fact, the issue between continued progress under liberty and a socialized state.

And liberty is the only key to real progress. The Republican Party believes that if we follow the same principles, we can secure the same improvement as in the past. There is no limit or frontier to the productive ability or the standards of living of our people. There is no reason why they should not constantly improve, providing we follow the same principles of freedom which have succeeded in the past. We are opposed to a planned economy through Federal regulation and control, but we support the policies which the Federal Government has pursued for 100 years. We insist on a sound fiscal policy to maintain the value of the American dollar and the savings and insurance policies of the people, a stability which is the base of full employment and prosperity. We favor Federal concern with every important problem—research, advice, and assistance to individuals and business and States and communities, and financial aid in those cases where the need is clearly shown and where the objective is clearly beyond the power of the State or community to achieve.

In the whole field of education, welfare, health, and housing the Federal Government must take that interest. These matters are primarily in the jurisdiction of the States and local communities, but that does not exclude an active interest on the part of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is specially concerned that there be equality of opportunity throughout this great country, particularly for every child who is born into an American family, no matter how poor the family or the community into which he may be born. I believe the American people are convinced that we are sufficiently wealthy so that we can provide a minimum decent standard of living for every family in the United States. This is the obligation recognized by most States and local communities, but all of them are not able to carry out that program, and financial help from the Federal Government can assist them in doing it.

Conclusive figures on illiteracy show that the poorer States in this Nation are not able to provide a minimum decent education for all their children after raising taxes for education in excess of the average throughout the Nation. Consequently, I favor a bill for Federal aid to education in the nature of an equalization fund to see that every child shall have a primary and secondary school education.

We have as good health as any nation in the world, and we have always undertaken to see that free medical care is furnished to those who cannot afford to pay for it, but Federal aid can make that service more complete in providing a sufficient number of hospitals and of doctors, and see that real insurance is available to those who desire to take advantage of it to spread the risk of every illness in 1 year.

I have regarded decent shelter as essential for providing minimum standards of living and supported the bill which will subsidize housing for those in the lowest income brackets.

In this whole field, it is most essential that we do not impose Federal control as a condition of Federal assistance. Administration must remain in the States and local communities. In general, the Federal Government should not be called in unless the need is clearly shown. I do not think the Federal Government should undertake any program to provide free services for those who are able to pay for them and that means the great bulk of the population. Above all, we cannot impose on Federal Government any more than on local government an excessive burden of taxation. The only way we can give free service or support to those who are not working is out of the earnings of those

Americans who are working. The burden on them must not be so great as to threaten their liberty or reduce the incentive and reward for hard work, ability, and daring.

Nor do we adopt any laissez faire principle. Federal action is often essential to maintain liberty itself in industry by preventing monopoly and unfair competition. Federal action can prevent economic oppression by setting a standard for a minimum wage. It can prevent economic inequality by some reasonable price-support program to prevent the destruction of agricultural purchasing power through forces far beyond the control of the individual or the united farmers.

Every proposal for Federal action, however, must be judged by its effect on the liberty of the individual, the family, the community, industry, and labor. Such liberty cannot be sacrificed to any theoretical improvement from Government control or Government spending.

I am convinced that the people of this country are strong believers in liberty and I have a complete faith in their decision in 1950 and 1952. That decision involves not only the future of America. Only if the American people convince themselves and convince the world that they believe in liberty can we hope to meet the aggressive ideology of communism. Communism has spread through the world because there has been no ideal to oppose it. Our leaders have been apologizing for America for 20 years. The time has come when we must spread the banners of liberty throughout the world as did our forefathers after 1776.

Address by Thomas M. Hennessey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I know all Members will be interested in some of the remarks of Thomas M. Hennessey before the Tuesday Club in Springfield on March 21. The address follows:

Last Friday was St. Patrick's Day—a day commemorated by Irishmen everywhere as the great day of their race.

Going back to the dark dawn of our human history we find far out in the Atlantic a little island which is set apart from the populous Continent of Europe. It was then, as it is now, free from Europe's bickering politics and was inhabited by a race called the Celts. They were a mixture of bloods that came long before, it seems, from Germany, from Scandinavia, and from Spain. They were pagans and their gods were the trees, the stars, and the moon. Yet they had achieved a culture and a civilization that is the wonder of historians.

Even before the coming of St. Patrick the old Irish were living under community laws and regulations that were far ahead of the known world. Their completeness and thoroughness surprise us even today when a new law gets drawn at almost the drop of a hat. They regulated the basic elements of human conduct and consequently, there were laws of property, of contract, of agency, of bankruptcy, and of crime.

Then, also, the lawyers were expected to know the law and to abide by it themselves. When they didn't, their fines were many times more severe than those imposed on ordinary men. It seems that even in those days the lawyers had buried their laws in obscure phrases and meaningless words—"whereas, the party of the second part, when, as and if, and so on." And so only the lawyers were able to understand it. Finally, King Conor, in great disgust, reprimanded the offending lawyers and ordered that henceforth the practice of law and pleading in court should be open to everybody.

And now let us look for awhile at St. Patrick. He is a misty figure—his clear outline lost in the distance of remote centuries. His birthday even, nobody knows; nor the country of his birth; but he was born in either Scotland or France about the year 375. His name Patrick is an abbreviated form of the Roman Patricius, which indicates that his father was of high rank in the Roman Army and in the Republic of Rome. The first certain fact we have about him is that he was kidnaped when a youth, 16 perhaps, from the shores of France and sold as a slave in Ireland. The next few years he spent as a shepherd for his Irish master, tending his flocks on the green hills and resolving to come some day to convert these lovable Irish people to Christianity—to his own God of gentleness and love.

So equipped, he returned to Ireland to undertake the work of his dreams. He failed to convert his former master, but he did succeed in enrolling his two sons. Then on he went to Tara, the palace of King Laoghaire, the most important of all the Irish kings.

I think St. Patrick must be the happiest man in heaven because the pious legends of Ireland have obviously stretched the truth to make him the greatest man that ever lived.

At last the preaching career of St. Patrick came to an end and he retired to the great cathedral he had built at Armagh. After writing his biographies which, typical of his humility, he called "confessions," and after helping the people of Ireland to combine their laws and their government, he died sometime in the fifth century, probably at the age of 87. And over his body there was held a great wake—12 days and nights during which, it is reported, the sun did not set. Some reports go so far as to say that the sun did not set for a whole year. These stories at least reflect his popularity. The people of Ireland had followed him and had come to love him almost to the point of worship. Few men in the history of the whole world have won such devotion and faith from their followers.

"Lives of great men all remind us," said Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, "we can make our lives sublime, and departing, leave behind us, footprints on the sands of time." Look for a little while at the marks St. Patrick left across the centuries. His chief work was religion. And that is why we look particularly upon the contributions he has made to the religious life of his time and the people who followed him.

The history of the religion we call Christian began with the ancient Jews. Yet if we follow its history down the ages, we find a period in early times when Christianity might have been lost except for Ireland. In the Middle Ages, teachers and priests went out from Ireland to every corner of Europe to bring back again the religion which St. Patrick had taught them generations before and which slumbering Europe seemed likely to forget all about. They faithfully kept alive the fire that Patrick had kindled. And so it is, that we find Irish teachers and Irish saints in so many countries—in Italy, in France, in Germany, in Scotland, and even in far off Iceland. They were bringing back again the faith and religion that Patrick had brought them before.

And with religion went learning. Explain it as we will—but throughout the history of the world, religion has been foster mother to education and learning. And for its great accomplishments in this field, Ireland has been sometimes termed the "land of saints and scholars." It was a proud and well-reserved title during the Middle Ages, for out from its quiet, busy monasteries went preachers to awaken the hearts of mankind, and teachers to keep their minds alive. St. Patrick made of Ireland a storehouse for learning and for Christianity. From it, during the Middle Ages, came the resources that stirred and developed the minds and hearts of men.

When we mention the hearts of men, we cannot help but think of the social and domestic virtues of the Irish. And here it is that the Irishman outstrips all his competitors. His hospitality is not only a habit—it is a principle. For the stranger, for the friendless, for the hungry, and for the thirsty—he quickly finds a channel to his heart and his billfold. And it is not merely this virtue but the manner of showing it which records the charm that runs through his conduct. There is a natural politeness and sincerity in his manner which no man can mistake.

But a great part of the work of St. Patrick was in building a nation. Ireland makes St. Patrick her hero. This year she celebrated perhaps her one thousand five hundredth St. Patrick's Day—we will celebrate our one hundred and seventy-fourth Fourth of July. By comparison our Nation is but a youngster.

The history of Ireland is largely one of warfare against oppression. Beginning with the heartbreaking misunderstandings between England and Ireland, with the religious revivals of the sixteenth century, and with the cruelties of Henry VIII and Cromwell and Queen Elizabeth, the people of Ireland were frequently in trouble. Yet they worked constantly for freedom and self-government. Their list of patriots is a long one—and every generation, it seemed, furnished a leader. There was Robert Emmet, who went cheerfully to be executed. There was Daniel O'Connell, who gained a seat in England's Parliament and who bargained as a skillful statesman to secure advantages for his people. There was the great Fenian movement that spread through the world among Irishmen in every country. (As we look back on the Fenian idea, however, it was the sheerest folly, to attempt to attack an empire with a plan so childish. But it was brave.) Then there was Terrence McSweeney, who undertook a hunger strike and gave up his life as a martyr to freedom. There was the rebellion of 1916, the leadership of Eamon DeValera, and finally the establishment of the Irish Republic now recognized, even though partitioned, as an independent nation completely outside the British Commonwealth.

Today Ireland is a good country to live in. It still has its wonderful climate which makes for perpetual delight. It has begun a program of industrial and power development which is making life easier for people who will always get their living from the farms. While there is little great wealth, there is also little of the mass of terrific poverty that is besetting so many of the nations of the world today. The people as well as the country are free. There is little government interference in private living, either through excessive taxation or overregulation. In short, the Irish in Ireland today are "doing all right, thank you."

And that's probably why, for the first time in centuries, there are more Irish coming to Ireland than leaving it. Emigration has always been one of Ireland's tragedies. Throughout the years she has seen her youngest, her pluckiest, and her healthiest leave the country to seek opportunities in different parts of the world. And they did find opportunities, especially here in America. America has been good to them as she has been good to all immigrant races who were honest and industrious. Irishmen and Irishmen's sons have gone far here. In industry, in the professions, in finance, and in government they have reached the top. And they have done it by the intelligent and indus-

trious application of the talents, skills, and virtues which originated in the teachings of St. Patrick. Now it is the responsibility of all of them to merit the confidence that others have placed in them, and by good example merit the priceless heritage that it has been their good fortune to receive.

So let us think of the great monuments we have in America—the right to think, the right to work, the right to worship. Let us expose those who believe the only monuments in this world are those to be found in the Red Square of Moscow. And finally, let us demonstrate our great sense of national loyalty and carry out to the fullest our self-imposed obligations to become still better men—to become still better Americans.

Keep Our Country Free and Independent—Go to the Polls and Vote—You May Lose a Few Minutes by Voting but You Could Lose a Lifetime of Happiness by Failing to Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address of Hon. Charles F. Sweeney, secretary of state of Ohio.

Charles F. Sweeney, Ohio's secretary of state, served four terms as a member of the General Assembly of Ohio. He attained a reputation as one of Ohio's aggressive, constructive, and progressive lawmakers. As a young man he served under Gen. John J. Pershing in Mexico, and in World War I was in the Army Secret Service checking espionage and sabotage.

As Ohio's secretary of state he has won the respect and confidence of our people by his efficient, industrious, and economical administration of that important office.

The address follows:

We are assembled here today in the spirit of good fellowship and brotherly love to celebrate a dream come true in dedicating a new home, to commend those who planned and labored long and hard to make this dream come true. It has been a long time since an idea was born by a small group of men gathered in a lumberyard, out of which grew one of the largest benevolent organizations in the world, the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Their benefits and charitable acts to those not so fortunate are many and varied. This is made possible only in a country where men are privileged to free speech and free assembly.

The task before us is clear. For our principles of action we must go back to our Constitution, to our Declaration of Independence, to our history, and to the example set by our national fathers.

As the chief election officer of the State of Ohio, I am responsible for the proper operation of the election machinery of the State and to see to it that elections are properly conducted in the various counties.

The office of secretary of state has channels of information that does not ordinarily get to the general public, and this in part is what I want to talk to you about.

I did not come here to frighten anybody; I merely want to pass along to you a few facts. People have become so complacent and have taken such a matter-of-fact attitude toward our democracy, that the danger signal is out as to just how long we can live as freemen.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the country's greatest authority on the Communist conspiracy, had this to say during an appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee:

"The size of the Communist Party is relatively unimportant because of the enthusiasm and iron-clad discipline under which they operate. In this connection it might be of interest to know that in 1917, when the Communists overthrew the Russian government, there was one Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is one Communist for every 1,814 persons in the country."

We have seen the White House picketed and our President debased when the policies of our form of government clashed with those of the Communist Party line, and this very thing happened to our Governor at the State house recently.

The forces of communism are running loose in the entire world today. These facts are proof of the necessity that every citizen of the United States must be depended upon to protect the interests of their families and children and to do everything possible to preserve our form of government and our great educational and religious institutions.

What can we do to combat these forces? I'll tell you what you can do. You can exercise your franchise, as the Constitution of the United States guarantees, the privilege of casting a free and secret ballot at election time.

It may be of interest to you to know that only a mere majority of the eligible voters take advantage of this privilege.

Why don't people vote? Some are too lax and indifferent. To those I say don't complain about how the Government is being run. You lost your right to criticize when you failed to exercise your right to vote. Others don't vote because they are afraid they might sometime be called for jury duty. All right, maybe you'd like it better in the Soviet Union, where they don't have any juries. If enough of you stay away from the polls we may have that system in the United States before long.

Another excuse for not voting is that there is no difference between the political parties, so what is the use. Maybe there would be a bigger difference between the parties and issues if you, who give that excuse, would vote, not only at the general elections but at the primaries, where the candidates are nominated.

Some people also have the idea that their vote won't count because there will be so many on the other side. If everybody felt that way there would be no reason for holding elections, and some dictator might as well appoint all the public officials. A lot of people consider themselves to be good citizens if they go to church, pay their taxes, live within their means, attend to their jobs, observe the laws, and don't get into fights with their neighbors. I don't believe that anyone who fails to vote can be regarded as having fulfilled all his duties of good citizenship.

A recent survey of some of the different classes shows among automobile dealers, whom you would expect to have a vital interest in political affairs, 37½ percent of them are either too busy or not interested enough to vote, and 21 percent of them were not even registered.

And here are the facts—members of the chambers of commerce, whom you would expect to be interested in maintaining our kind of government, that 24.57 percent were not sufficiently interested to exercise their franchise, and 19.35 percent of the members were not even registered voters.

The clergymen, who influence the majority of our population, 32 percent of them did not vote in the 1948 Presidential election, and 27½ percent weren't registered.

Independent grocers, who are the very grass roots of democracy, 37 percent of their members couldn't be bothered about voting, and 32 percent of all groups checked were not registered.

And the doctors, who are so perturbed about "socialized medicine," 20 percent stayed away from the polls, and 15.82 percent are not registered.

The Rotary and Kiwanis service clubs throughout the Nation have been outstanding in their work for civic betterment, yet 14 percent are not voting and 9.96 percent are not even registered.

Independent druggists, 26.67 percent are not voting and 23.53 percent are not registered.

And here's something startling—school teachers—here is a group which has the serious responsibility of leadership and of molding public opinion through the medium of education and enlightenment, yet 11.51 percent are not voting and 6.10 percent are not even registered.

It may be of interest to you to know that in the last general election a very small minority of those eligible to vote amended the constitution of the State of Ohio. When a thing like this can happen, in changing the constitution, it is time we wake up to the fact that something is wrong in our democracy.

The right to vote freely is the fundamental basis of a true democracy. Our best guaranty of keeping and preserving our country free and independent, is to guard every hour, the thing which made our country great, namely, the two-party system of government.

I am a firm believer in party politics—so much so, that in my opinion it would be a tragedy for the United States if either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party were to pass from the scene. There is a belief in some quarters that, with the radio and other kinds of high-pressure propaganda methods now available, the old type of political organization is bound for disuse or decay. Not to my way of thinking, and if it is true, the fact should be deplored by every thoughtful American citizen.

The great contribution of the political parties to our way of life is that it has allowed the United States to avoid the destructive blight of government by minority.

The two great political parties help to keep the United States a free Nation because they promote national unity. Without them, it is easy to see how a lot of geographical or sectional political movements might spring up.

If the party government, and especially the two-party system should crumble in this country, then the United States will be at the mercy of every organized minority, every ambitious demagogue, every radio spellbinder, and every political crackpot who comes along. They will spring up overnight and take over control of the Government, and when that happens, it will be a sorry day for the majority of wholesome and fair-dealing American citizens.

Under the two-party system of government we have done well for over 150 years. We are the freest, the best governed, the most prosperous country in the world and the two-party system made it so, and the two-party system will keep it so. It behooves all of us, who are eligible to vote, to exercise our franchise by voting at every election. This way—and this way only, can we be assured of maintaining our kind of government.

Any person able to say "I am an American" should be the proudest person in the world.

The privilege of being a citizen of the United States has been won for us by almost

175 years of suffering and blood. It has taken five great wars to establish the Government of the United States and to maintain it throughout the years.

Deep down in my heart there is this realization that we have a wonderful land, and I am trying to get my fellow Americans to study it a little bit and to understand it a little more and see if we haven't some responsibility as citizens of the greatest country in the world.

I would like to conclude by saying: What kind of an America would you like to live in tomorrow?

My friends, to keep our country free and independent, all you have to do is exercise your franchise, and go to the polls and vote. You may lose a few minutes time by voting, but you could lose a lifetime of happiness if you don't!

Labor Leader's Eulogy of Hon. Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in The Wash Line, official publication of Laundry Workers, Cleaners, and Dyers International Union, Local No. 284, of Essex and Hudson Counties, N. J., a splendid tribute to Hon. MARY T. NORTON, Representative from the Thirteenth District of New Jersey, is paid by Mr. Winfield S. Chasmar, president of the local. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am happy indeed, to append this expression of appreciation to Mrs. NORTON for the aid she has extended to labor throughout her long career in the House:

LOCAL 284 SALUTES MRS. MARY T. NORTON—RETIRING MEMBER OF CONGRESS HAILED AS "LABOR'S FRIEND"

(By Winfield S. Chasmar, president, local No. 284)

It was with a feeling of deep personal regret that I read the decision by MARY T. NORTON to climax her career as a Member of Congress. This means that Mrs. NORTON will not seek reelection in the Thirteenth District which she has served for 25 years.

In view of her long record of championing labor's cause in Congress, I feel that we should pay tribute to this grand lady through the medium of our union publication, the Wash Line.

I have known Mrs. NORTON for many years, and her long record of valuable service to the cause of organized labor, plus her admirable qualities of leadership, have made a lasting impression upon me. On many occasions I have received the cooperation and assistance of Mrs. NORTON in legislative matters affecting our own membership.

In endeavoring to heap praise upon Mrs. NORTON, I can think of no better tribute than to review her long record in Congress.

Through the years since labor first realized its potentialities and organized on a national basis, there has been in the opinion of many no better friend of labor and stancher supporter of its cause in the Halls of Congress than Representative MARY T. NORTON. Elected to the House of Representatives in 1924, Mrs. NORTON served on the Labor Committee as one of its outstanding members until 1937, when she was made its chairman, upon the death of Representative Connery.

As the new chairman of this important committee—which was one of the outstanding cogs in the legislative machinery of the Roosevelt administration—Representative NORTON found her first real opportunity to serve in a constructive way the cause of labor in which she believed so sincerely.

Both during his campaigns and following his election in 1932, President Roosevelt had advocated higher wages and shorter hours for the working men and women of our Nation. Representative NORTON was selected by the Democratic administration as the medium through which the campaign promises could be effectively realized. What an excellent job she did is one of the notable chapters in the history of labor's progress during 18 years.

BATTLE FOR STANDARDS ACT

Admitting that it is the outstanding act of her legislative career and the one in which she gained the greatest pleasure, Mrs. NORTON in 1937 sponsored the Fair Labor Standards Act, more familiarly known as the wage-and-hour law. Recommitted to the House on December 17 of that year, after a full week of discussion on the floor, from which Mrs. NORTON was never absent for a minute, the bill was, under her leadership, again considered by the Labor Committee and reported favorably to the House April 21, 1938. Blocked by the Rules Committee from bringing the bill to the floor of the House for consideration, Mrs. NORTON placed a petition on the Speaker's desk to discharge the measure from that committee.

Evidence of the support she gathered for the petition and her bill is shown by the fact that in only 2 hours and 22 minutes (record-breaking speed), the 218 signatures for the petition, which would permit the bill to again be considered in the House, were obtained.

The bill came up and the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in the House, May 24, 1938, by a vote of 314 to 97 approved, and the conference report (joint House and Senate) about 3 weeks later by a majority of 202.

This bill established a graduated minimum-wage scale of 25 to 40 cents per hour and a similarly graduated workweek of 44 to 40 hours.

Although Mrs. NORTON had encountered numerous discouragements during the consideration of the legislation, she kept uppermost labor's interests, believing that the time had arrived when the laborer in this country must be recognized and given an opportunity for a decent standard of living.

The morning after the bill was first recommitted, President Roosevelt called Mrs. NORTON and, believing she would be completely discouraged by the turn of events, inquired what she intended to do, to which the congresswoman replied, "Mr. President, I am going to give you a bill." She never wavered from that course and by her sponsorship of the Fair Labor Standards Act gained the gratitude of labor. President Roosevelt joined in calling her "Labor's Friend."

Known as labor's "Bible," the Fair Labor Standards Act placed a ceiling on hours and a floor on wages and all constructive labor legislation since that time has incorporated the basic principles of the act.

Labor assumes Mrs. NORTON's name will ever be associated with labor's first gains on a national basis.

PROTECTED ACT

Through all the years Mrs. NORTON has worked to protect the act, and, as chairman of the House Labor Committee from 1937 to 1947, she guarded zealously the gains made by labor. During that period numerous bills were introduced which would have weakened the law, but none was reported from the Labor Committee, and, finally, when any such measures were introduced in the House, they were so drafted by their authors so as to bypass the Labor Committee and referred to other committees of the House, where labor did not have so stanch a friend. Representative NORTON protested this action herself, declaring in the House that the Labor Committee had "honorably fought for legislation we considered to be for the best interests of the country" and asking that the House "deal with the Labor Committee as you would with any other committee of the House." Labor's enemies knew in the chairman of the House Labor Committee they had a foe whom they could not sway or conquer.

This woman's great work was not yet over.

Mrs. NORTON has been ever cognizant of the needs of the workers of the country, and believing that the 40 cents per hour minimum wage adopted in 1938 was far too small and completely out of line with rising living costs, Representative NORTON in subsequent Congresses introduced legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage to at least 75 cents, and in the Eighty-first Congress offered legislation that established the 75-cent rate.

As a member of the Labor Committee, she helped to sponsor the so-called "Magna Carta of Labor," the National Labor Relations Act, and later when amendments were offered in the House, to practically destroy the statute, Mrs. NORTON was almost alone responsible in blocking their passage. That the act remained intact through all her years as chairman of the Labor Committee is evidence of her keen leadership in behalf of labor.

HER OPINION OF HARTLEY

When, in 1946, the Republicans gained a majority of the Congress and Representative Fred Hartley assumed chairmanship of the Labor Committee, Mrs. NORTON resigned from the committee, stating that she "could not serve with a chairman for whom I have no respect." She further said that her reason for resigning was that "while I was chairman of the committee the gentleman who is now chairman and who talks about labor as if he knew something about it, attended exactly six meetings in 10 years."

When the Taft-Hartley bill was first considered in the House, Mrs. NORTON spoke out against it, deploring what she termed the attempt of Congress to strangle labor and accusing "labor baiters" and "labor haters" in the House of forgetting "the great war record of labor, without which it would have been impossible to win the war."

Mrs. NORTON was one of the first to remind other Members of the House of the great part which labor had played in victory. Feeling that all too few people realized that victory in 1945 would not have been possible without labor's devotion, Representative NORTON helped to lead the fight against the Taft-Hartley bill, voting against it herself and working among her colleagues, urging them to oppose it also. Terming it "a retreat—not just a step backward—but a wholesale retreat to the day when labor had no rights," she predicted on the floor of the House the defeat of the Congress which adopted the Taft-Hartley Act. How accurate was her prediction is a matter of record in political annals. A Democratic Congress was elected in 1946.

In the campaign of 1949 in her own congressional district and nationally, Representative NORTON advocated the Taft-Hartley Act repeal and promised to support legislation to abolish the act. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the "watered-down" Wood bill was introduced in the House which would have changed some provisions of Taft-Hartley, but would not have repealed it outright. Mrs. NORTON voted against the measure, feeling that the only solution to the "strait-jacket" in which labor found itself was entire repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. When the Wood bill failed of passage, she

voted to recommit the legislation to the Labor Committee.

The Taft-Hartley Act is still law. Its fate depends on the congressional election next November.

Untiring foe of compulsion and advocate of voluntary methods to settle labor disputes, Representative NORTON has taken a deep personal interest in legislation which would insure voluntary and free action in labor problems. For example, she sponsored in the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill which provided specifically for voluntary mediation of disputes in defense industries. She believes that labor is capable of solving its own problems intelligently without the compulsory features of the Taft-Hartley law.

Recognized as an authority on labor and its problems, Representative NORTON was appointed in 1945 by President Truman as an alternate delegate and adviser from the United States to the International Labor Organization in Paris. The outstanding part Mrs. NORTON played in these deliberations is well known and admired by those associated with her in this great movement.

The Congresswoman has always been an opponent of discrimination and has led the fight for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. Author of H. R. 2232 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which prohibited discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, and national origin, she has exerted every means within her power to have FEPC reestablished by legislative statute after the termination of the first Fair Employment Practices Commission created by Executive order. Stymied by the Rules Committee from bringing H. R. 2232 to the floor, she again introduced similar legislation in subsequent Congresses. She is untiring in her efforts to create a new FEPC, and has often hit the headlines with the scathing tongue-lashing she has given congressional opponents from the South.

Known as an advocate of tolerance in all fields, Representative NORTON has sought to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color, and national origin, not only in employment but in many phases of our national life. One of her outstanding acts of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress was her introduction of H. R. 3199, a bill which provides that the payment of a poll tax shall not be prerequisite for voting in a primary or other election for national officers. Her bill was adopted in the House July 26, 1949, by a vote of 273 to 116. If finally enacted into law, MARY NORTON will be regarded as responsible for an epic advance in the democratic processes of the Nation.

Chasing Chameleons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very important article by the noted writer, Freda Utley, which appears in the current issue of Human Events:

CHASING CHAMELEONS

(By Freda Utley)

The chameleon is a species of lizard which protects itself by its power to change the color of its skin so as to become indistinguishable from its environment. According to the dictionary, it also has a projectile tongue and moves slowly. Except for their demonstrated ability to move fast many of those whom Senator MCCARTHY is endeavoring to track down and prove to be Communists could very well meet the definition of chameleons. The Senator from Wisconsin, whose boldness is equaled only by his ignorance of the magnitude of the task he has set himself, must feel that he is in a nightmare in which his quarry continually eludes him, or changes its appearance as soon as he catches it.

Those who only yesterday were joining Communist fronts, advising the administration to place its trust in Stalin, telling the public in speeches, books, and articles that the Russian leader was an ever-loving friend of peace and democracy, and in general deluding the American people as to the nature of the Soviet regime, are today quite otherwise engaged. Either they are fighting a battle of words with the Soviet representatives in the United Nations, or giving advice as to how to contain communism, or shaking their fists at the Kremlin from behind their desks in the State Department. And if rude men like MCCARTHY press them concerning their records they can reply in Dorothy Kenyon's words:

"I do not deny that my name may have been used, even at times with my consent, in connection with organizations that later proved to be subversive but which, at the time, seemed to be engaged in activities or dedicated to objectives which I could and did approve."

And how can one deny the validity of this argument unless one is prepared to denounce, not only Roosevelt, Churchill, General Marshall, but all those who followed in their train? One should recall that the American people—whether Democrats or Republicans—almost all welcomed Stalin as an ally, and rushed to give aid and comfort to the Soviet Union in order to destroy Germany and Japan.

Until about 4 years ago friendship for Soviet Russia was all the rage. The most respectable people appeared on the mastheads or platforms of the multitude of organizations with democratic names founded to ensnare the gullible, the ignorant, and the vain. And many a rich and foolish man gave huge donations to Communist causes to pay for the privilege of being called a liberal.

It was also advantageous to be kind to Communists. During and immediately after the war the anti-Communist was often regarded as a potential, if not actual, Fascist; or at least as not quite nice to know, and dangerous to associate with if one hoped to get on in the world. Anyone in the State Department who took a dim view of the Soviet Union, or who questioned the popular assumption that the Chinese Communists were harmless agrarian reformers, had little hope of promotion, and his advice was disregarded by successive Presidents and Secretaries of State. Alger Hiss, whom Roosevelt chose to take with him to Yalta, in preference to the loyal experts on Russia in the State Department, would never have been singled out for rapid advancement had he not been pro-Soviet.

As regards most of the magazines, newspapers, radio programs, universities, and research associations (such as the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Foreign Policy Association), it was about as hard for an anti-Communist, or critic of the Soviet Government, to obtain a hearing as for the proverbial camel to pass through the eye of a needle. All in all it was profitable to be red, or at least pink; and unprincipled careerists are as responsible as Communist sympathizers for the dangerous situation in which America is now placed.

II

Today the political climate has changed. It is no longer possible to be a Russia-firster while also posing as a loyal American. Today it is as necessary for the time servers to denounce Stalin as it was formerly to praise him. So the political chameleons have suddenly discovered that Russia is ruled by a totalitarian tyranny as bad and as dangerous as Hitler's. One is reminded of the old English song about the Vicar of Bray who got preferment by changing his religion in each reign from the Stuarts to the Hanoverians. Its refrain runs:

"And this is law that I'll maintain
Until my dying day, sir,
That whotsoever King shall reign,
I'll be the Vicar of Bray, sir."

Many of those responsible for the disastrous course taken by American policy from Tehran to Potsdam and for a year or two afterward now cling together in preserving each others' reputations and denying their responsibility. They neither confess to, nor repent of, their past errors and sins. Moreover many of them still display a sneaking regard for communism, even while condemning Russia's aggressive policies. This is evidenced by the friendly attitude displayed toward Tito.

The real Communists are, of course, as adept in changing their outward color for protective purposes as the careerists. Indeed it can be surmised that if there is a "top Soviet espionage agent" in the State Department, as charged by MCCARTHY, he will have taken such care never to display his true colors that his name is not included in the list of suspects. Those Government employees who embraced communism out of conviction and openly displayed their sympathies, can no doubt count upon the discreet silence of the careerists who no longer follow the party line. And might not the threat of exposure be used by the Communists to blackmail those who formerly influenced, or implemented, American policy in accordance with Moscow's interests, but are now pretending that they have always been loyal Americans? Could be.

III

On the other hand those Government employees who have never been sympathetic to communism, or who have never gone along with the Communists in hope of preferment, and are in a position to know or suspect which of their colleagues are disloyal or security risks, cannot testify for fear of losing their jobs. This seems to me the most shocking aspect of the present senatorial investigation, yet it causes little or no comment. The newspapers are full of criticisms of the concept of guilt by association, and of the infringement of civil liberties entailed by loyalty investigations. But no one seems to view with alarm reports that loyal Government employees hesitate to testify against those whom they have reason to believe are Communists, for fear of being victimized by the administration. And the manner in which Senator TYDINGS has conducted the investigation, coupled with the Executive's reluctance to allow the Senate committee to see the files of those accused of subversive activities, suggests that the administration is more concerned to save face than to root out Communists in the Government service.

We must have gone further than we realize along the road which leads to totalitarian tyranny when it is assumed that the administration has the right to demand of Government employees that their first loyalty be to the party in power, not to their country or their conscience; and when Americans are willing to forego their inalienable rights under the Constitution rather than lose their jobs.

Our military government in Germany was instructed at the war's end to hold all Germans guilty of the crimes of the Nazis, and specifically to punish anyone who had been associated with, collaborated with, or been

related to the Nazis. Our law of liberation from national socialism, as the denazification decree was called, penalized not only all party members and their wives and children, but also all members of associations affiliated with the Nazi Party. In other words the principle of guilt by association was made the law of the conquered territory. I have yet to find a liberal commentator, or columnist, now insisting that no man should be suspected on account of his associations, whoever raised his voice to condemn the denazification decrees.

IV

It is the decline of ethical standards and of belief in universal principles of justice, together with the lack of moral courage, so evident today, which has allowed the Communist disease to spread, and which makes it so hard to cure. McCARTHY would achieve more positive results if he concentrated on proving that those who direct United States policy are poor security risks on account of their lack of integrity, their bad judgment, their ignorance, and their gullibility, as shown by the record. Those who directed American policy along the line most advantageous to Moscow, whatever their motives may have been, are far more dangerous than espionage agents. The harm done to the Republic by Alger Hiss at Yalta and San Francisco was incomparably greater than the activities which helped persuade the jury to convict him.

The difficulty is that a real inquiry into the causes for the disastrous policy toward Russia pursued by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman would require a quality of greatness in certain eminent Americans which they have so far not displayed. If General Marshall, for instance, were to testify before the Senate Committee would he admit his mistakes in China? Would he take responsibility for having prepared the way for Moscow to conquer China—by his policy of placing an embargo on arms to Chiang Kai-shek, and by pressing the Generalissimo to take the Communists into the Nationalist Government? Would he, at least, fix the responsibility on treacherous State Department advisers? Without such frank speaking, it is difficult to foresee real progress from loyalty investigations.

Basically the problem is up to the American people. They have the power to make an irresistible demand that the administration which they elected follow the courageous and honest path. Unless the people exert this power, their undoubted desire to defeat totalitarianism will be thwarted by the Vicars of Bray.

Tree Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a factual statement on tree farms and forestry, by W. D. Hagenstein, a prominent forest engineer in the Pacific Northwest region. I am sure the information presented by Mr. Hagenstein will be found extremely valuable by all Members of the House who are interested in forestry and the perpetuation of our forest resources.

The statement follows:

[From the Oregon Business Review, Eugene, Oreg., for February 1950]

TREE FARMS: A PACIFIC NORTHWEST BUSINESS ASSET

(By W. D. Hagenstein, forest engineer, Forest Conservation Committee of Pacific Northwest Forest Industries)

The first "tree farm" in the United States was dedicated in 1941 in Grays Harbor County, Wash. After an intensive forestry study, the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. set aside a 120,000-acre property for the permanent production of timber crops. The property was named the Clemons Tree Farm in memory of Charles Clemons, pioneer Grays Harbor County logger. The term "tree farm" implies business forest management.

Prior to the establishment of the Clemons Tree Farm, forest landowning companies in the Pacific Northwest had made a number of starts in forestry as far back as 1901. They soon learned that many serious obstacles beset them. Chief among these was the big gamble with forest enemy No. 1—fire. Because of the huge accumulations of highly inflammable debris in century-old forests and the frequent protracted droughts during July and August, the forest-fire problem in western Oregon and Washington was unparalleled elsewhere in the world.

To solve the fire problem, private-land owners in western Oregon and Washington organized a number of fire-protection associations over 40 years ago. Their early attempts emphasized safeguarding merchantable timber, logging facilities, and other property. The idea of protecting baby trees and saplings didn't enter the thinking of that period. Because of inadequate technical forestry knowledge and know-how of fire protection, results of the early protection efforts were hit and miss for nearly 20 years.

As the forestry profession developed in the region, its research was focused primarily on problems of fire prevention and control. An important discovery was that relative humidity, the amount of moisture in the air as compared with what it could hold at the saturation point, was the best indicator of impending fire danger. Following this discovery, private timber landowners, logging operators, and forest-protection organizations began to watch weather very closely. By 1933 the State forest-protection laws in Oregon and Washington had been modified in the light of operators' experience to provide a good basic code. But more was needed; fire records indicated that, despite good compliance with the forest-protection laws, the region was burning far too many young trees each dry summer.

Realization of this pointed the forestry efforts of a handful of private foresters toward the development of a system of forest management, which offered possibilities for overcoming the fire limitations to economically successful forest management. They termed the system "tree farming."

After studying the fire history on the property which was destined to become the Clemons Tree Farm, foresters determined that, if the company were to manage successfully its forest properties for continuing crops of wood, the fire problem would have to be approached on an entirely different basis than formerly. Their thesis was that a forest property must have protection commensurate with its worth. They established the worth of the company's Clemons property by determining the growing capacity of the land, the fire losses of second-growth trees on lands which had been harvested, and the replacement cost of such trees by artificial means. In this way they demonstrated how much could be spent for fire protection designed to keep within a predetermined maximum the loss on areas burned over annually. They found that the average annual expenditures for forest-fire protection had been about 8 cents per acre and that the acreage of young trees lost each year under this intensity of protection was costing the company a great deal more. To replace the trees lost would require many times the outlay for adequate fire protection. An immediate capital investment of about $1 per acre to provide satisfactory fire-protection roads, fire-detection facilities, a communication system, and modern mechanized fire equipment similar to that used for protection of urban property was recommended. An average annual expense of 25 to 30 cents per acre was estimated as necessary to complete the job.

The company, convinced of the business logic of these recommendations, undertook the type of fire protection suggested. The capital outlay and annual carrying charges for forest-fire protection appeared to be a reasonable insurance premium to assure the long-term investor, the tree farmer, that there would be a crop of ripe trees available when harvest time rolled around.

Basically, that is the genesis of the tree-farm program in America's Northwest corner, the Douglas-fir region. With a modest beginning on 120,000 acres as recent as 1941, the program has since spread throughout the Nation, and there are now over 20,000,000 acres of taxpaying forest lands certified as tree farms in 27 States.

Private foresters have been the leaders in spreading the tree-farm idea to privately owned forest lands, through their efforts to convince forest owners that money can be made in growing trees as well as converting them into forest products. Men conserve things of value; and, when they are shown that cut-over forest land is valuable for growing another crop of timber from which they can expect a reasonable return, nothing can stop them from practicing such forestry as will assure that return. The profit motive is the strongest impelling incentive to forest management, just as it is for good management of other renewable natural resources.

Nearly one-third or 3,270,692 acres of the taxpaying forest lands in western Oregon and Washington are now certified as tree farms. This is indicative of the magnitude of 9 years' progress since the Clemons Tree Farm of 120,000 acres was dedicated in 1941. Along with the increase in the acreage of certified tree farms in this region has come the continued increase in employment of professional foresters by private landowners. In the Douglas-fir region today there are 250 professionally trained foresters whose principal job is to provide efficient fire protection, grow timber, plan timber harvesting, and otherwise manage taxpaying lands for continuing forest crops. Foresters have become just as much a necessary and integral part of the forest-products business as sawmill managers, logging superintendents, salesmen, engineers, accountants, and lawyers. In addition to the tree farms in the western halves of these two States, there are also 1,344,779 acres of certified tree farms in eastern Oregon and Washington.

Tree farms are important business assets of the Pacific Northwest for many economic reasons. To demonstrate the economic impact of wood as a supplier of the wherewithal for the sustenance of the 4,000,000 people in Oregon and Washington, a few general statistics are pertinent.

Oregon and Washington furnish the people of the United States with more than one-fourth of their total annual forest-products needs in the form of lumber, wood pulp and paper, plywood and veneer, shingles, sash and doors, poles and piling, railroad ties, and a wide variety of refined products such as wood furniture, caskets, wood pipe and tanks, cooperage, ladders, crossarms, masts

and spars, and woodenware. Over 2,500 of Oregon and Washington's nearly 7,000 industrial establishments use wood as their basic raw material. The direct wage earners employed in 1948 by the wood-using industry was 170,000, more than the total employed in the use of any other single raw material. The direct wages earned by this large group of industrial workers was about $500,000,000. The value of forest products at Oregon and Washington wood-using plants in 1948 was just a few dollars shy of $1,500,000,000. This is $375 worth of forest products manufactured for every man, woman, and child resident in the two States. This is one-half again as much as agriculture contributes to the Northwest's economy; the 1948 value of the region's agricultural products, including price supports, was about $1,000,000,000.

In addition to the direct employment provided by the wood-using industry, the services and products of other Northwest employers should be considered in an appraisal of the effect of wood upon the region's economy. Fifty-eight percent of the 1948 revenue freight tonnage of class I steam railways originating in Oregon and Washington consisted of forest products. The number of railway employees affected directly by forest products is more than 20,000. Eighty percent of the entire revenue tonnage of water carriers originating in Oregon and Washington is forest products.

Another substantial pay roll directly attributable to the forest industry is the pay roll of the diversified manufacturing and distribution concerns which cater to its material, supply, and equipment needs. There are no reliable data available as to the number of people so employed, but the number has been estimated to be between 30,000 and 35,000.

As a source of taxes the forest industry undoubtedly is the principal regional contributor, though it is impossible to estimate the exact proportion of its contribution to the tax revenues of the two States.

The wage earners directly affected by the growing, harvesting, manufacturing, and marketing of forest products in the two Northwest States probably total about 250,000. It is obvious that the primary wage earners in the forest-products industry, whose average hourly earnings are as high as any group of heavy industrial workers in the world, contribute importantly to the economy of the Northwest's 4,000,000 people. The continuation of this contribution to the two States' well-being depends entirely upon how forest lands are managed to provide the region's principal industry with a continuing supply of raw material.

While a tree farmer's intent is to grow timber for harvest and use, local benefits to soil and water conservation, provision of a natural habitat for wildlife, and, to a limited extent, recreation opportunities will also accrue from the movement. But the recreation-seeking public must cooperate in the protection of private forest lands, especially during those portions of the year when the fire risk is high; one forest fire started during bad fire weather can completely obliterate 10 to 100 years of forest growth.

Tree farms are not just a public-relations stunt designed to convince the public that something is being done about forest management on taxpaying forest land. Tree farms are serious private timber-growing ventures ranging from just a few woodland acres of an enlightened farmer to managed industrial forest properties of 100,000 or more acres. Each in its own way is contributing to the regional and national wood pile through good forest management. The way this job is being done is by no means perfect as yet. But the transition from mere fire protection, and that not always effective, to forestry—in which the attainment of an annual balance between timber growth and timber harvest is the aim—is not something that can be accomplished in a few days, weeks, or years. It took Europe several centuries to attain its present intensity of managed forests. Forestry is only 50 years old in the Unietd States and younger than that in Oregon and Washington; but a substantial start has been made and the passing of each year shows discernible progress. In the Douglas-fir region today many of the best-managed forests are on private land.

Privately owned forests in western Oregon and Washington are certified as tree farms in the following manner:

1. An owner signifies his intentions to qualify as a certified tree farmer in a formal application to the forest conservation committee of the Pacific Northwest Forest Industries; he agrees (a) to maintain a specified area of forest land for growing forest crops; (b) to provide adequate protection from fire, insects, disease, and destructive grazing; (c) to conduct planned timber harvesting to assure reforestation; and (d) to supply information concerning his progress to the forest conservation committee.

2. The applicant is required to submit a plan of development for his property, covering fire protection, timber-harvesting practices, and plans for artificial reforestation, if necessary, for the first 5 years following date of his application.

3. After receipt of a formal application for certification of a private forest as a tree farm, a staff forester of the forest conservation committee examines the property on the ground to determine its suitability as a tree farm. The forester discusses with the owner the policy for his property. If satisfied that the owner sincerely desires to enter into timber growing as a long-term business venture and will agree to carry out the pledges covered in the application, the forester recommends to the forest conservation committee that the property be certified as a tree farm. At a regular meeting of the forest conservation committee the landowner appears to support his applications and is questioned concerning his plans and policy. Should the application and the recommendation of the staff forester not be acceptable to the forest conservation committee, the property is not certified as a tree farm.

Once a property has been certified, annual inspections are made to determine whether the landowner is living up to his pledges for constructive forest management. If it is found that the owner is not living up to the rules of the game, his certificate may be revoked. Four certificates for lands in western Oregon and Washington have been revoked; where violations of landowners' pledges are observed, certificates will continue to be revoked. The only kind of timber-growing program which means anything to the owner of the property so pledged is one which produces results. The Forest Conservation Committee does not condone the certification of taxpaying forests where the owner won't or can't do the job. The tree-farm program is not a philanthropic movement designed to do a fine job of forest management exclusively for public benefit; but, if it succeeds in doing a good job of forest management, the ultimate benefits will accrue to the public at large in the form of adequate timber supplies.

The Pacific Northwest's people have not been sufficiently acquainted with the tree-farm program to realize fully that a tree farm is not a forest property which has been badly treated in the past and is being reforested exclusively by artificial means. Actually, a tree farm may have old-growth timber which is ready for harvest now or in the next few years, natural second-growth trees which are too young for use, trees younger still which have developed naturally on lands from which the original forests have been harvested, lands which did not reforest naturally because of bad cutting or fire and which therefore need rehabilitation, and lands which have been harvested so recently that it is not certain yet whether they will reforest naturally or will require help from man. Present Douglas-fir tree farms have nearly one-half of their acreage occupied by mature timber ripe for harvest, and one-fourth is in natural second-growth trees too young and small for use; the balance consists of land recently harvested, hand-high seedlings, and areas needing rehabilitation.

Because of systematic reservation of seed-bearing timber on each harvest area and because of the subsequent fire protection provided, 90 percent of the lands currently being harvested in the Douglas-fir region are reforesting by natural means. The balance must be reforested artifically by planting of nursery-grown seedlings or by seeding by airplane or by hand.

When tree farms were begun in the Douglas-fir region, there was no source of nursery-grown seedlings for artificial reforestation of taxpaying lands; in 1942 the forest industry developed a cooperative forest-tree nursery for furnishing trees at cost for commercial reforestation by landowners in western Oregon and Washington. This nursery has supplied sufficient seedlings since it began operation 9 years ago to put nearly 60,000 idle acres back to work growing raw material. The nursery is a continuing project to provide artificial means of assuring seedling trees for reforestation wherever natural means fail or where hard luck is encountered in fire protection.

Forestry must not be confounded with tree planting, because tree planting makes up a very small part, although important, in its practice. Common-sense timber harvesting practices, where seed trees are reserved and good protection provided, will do the job of replacing 9 out of 10 trees cut. It is only for the tenth tree where nature fails that man must lend a hand. Tree farms do not mean planting trees. They do mean the management of taxpaying forest properties by wise cutting of mature timber; skillful reservation of seed-bearing trees to reforest the lands harvested; planting or seeding where nature fails; utilizing the raw material to the fullest extent possible; providing society with a continuing supply of needed forest products; assuring plentiful well-paying jobs in forest communities; maintaining a local tax base; and contributing to the happiness and welfare of the Nation.

In Oregon and Washington, where the public owns over 50 percent of the commercial forest land and where the balance is held by taxpayers, it is necessary that forest management become a part of our economic system. The public forests are managed under forestry principles which assure continuous production. The private forests, which to date have contributed more than 90 percent of the annual raw-material requirements of the region's principal industry, have not always been handled in the best possible manner, because of economic impediments and the uncertainty of the success of forest-fire protection efforts. Tree farms, which the wood-using industry is proud it sired, have already put nearly one-third of western Oregon and Washington's highly productive private forest land under permanent forest management by showing the way that timber growing can be made pay—through adequate fire protection, sound harvesting practices, artificial reforestation where needed, and full wood utilization. Promotion of tree farms on lands not so dedicated as yet is continuing each year; eventually the owners of most privately held forests will be practicing tree-farm management.

The tree farms which are already established in the region constitute an important business asset which helps assure a continued high standard of living for the citizens of the Pacific Northwest. The continued success and further development of tree farms will depend upon public support, particularly in the matter of fire prevention, and sympathetic understanding of the fact that timber growing is a long-term program, which must be made to pay its way as long as the American way is opportunity for private ownership and initiative.

Praise for the Late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, as part of my extension of remarks I append herewith article from the Grace Log for March and April 1950, commenting upon the career of the late lamented chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland. The tributes to Mr. Bland quoted in the article are more than deserved. He was one of the great Americans of his time and certainly the outstanding advocate in America of an adequate merchant marine. The tribute follows:

REPRESENTATIVE SCHUYLER O. BLAND

Representative Schuyler O. Bland, a senior Member of the lower House of Congress, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, died in mid-February.

At the age of 77, the sturdy advocate of a strong United States merchant marine, was in his thirty-second year a a Representative from Virginia. Mr. Bland's years of service in Congress were exceeded by only four other Members of the House of Representatives. Despite his years and recently uncertain health, he was active in the promotion of the welfare of the merchant marine.

A resident of Newport News, Mr. Bland continuously had represented the First District of Virginia since 1918. His personal integrity and dignity helped to make him one of the most respected Members of the great legislative body, and were responsible, in part, for the success of much of the legislation which he sponsored.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee for many years, he deserved much of the credit for strengthening United States shipping prior to World War II. Deeply concerned in the postwar years by the deteriorating position of coastwise shipping, the shipbuilding industry, and the merchant marine in general, at the time of his death, he was sponsoring a new long-range program for United States shipping.

Frequently called the "father" and "progenitor" of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, he steered that legislation to passage. Representative Bland maintained constant vigilance to see that its provisions were being followed.

In November of last year, all United States flag ships in New York harbor "dressed ship" as a tribute to Mr. Bland, who was the guest of honor that evening at a testimonial dinner attended by representatives of government, the shipping and shipbuilding industries.

Commenting on the death of Representative Bland, Mr. Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, declared, "The entire United States shipping industry, both management and labor, will sorely miss Schuyler Otis Bland, who is truly the father of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which made possible our present fleet of fine new ships. It is the most important piece of shipping legislation passed in the history of United States shipping. His long tenure as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was filled with other important contributions that aided not only shipping but the Nation as a whole. Every ship afloat in our new merchant marine is a monument to his memory."

Mr. Stanley Ferguson, in the New York Journal of Commerce, commented on Representative Bland's death. He said, "his death * * * removes from the national scene one of the best, most influential friends the United States merchant marine ever had in Congress, or, for that matter, anywhere else.

"* * * he will be remembered with equal admiration for the courage and perseverance with which he continued to fight for the cause of United States shipping in the face of failing health, as well as of political adversity, in the years following the war.

"Mr. Bland's dignity, simplicity, and personal integrity carried such weight in the House that at critical moments it was probably the deciding factor in the enactment of legislation of vital importance to the maritime industry."

Electric Power Restored in Tornado Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the rural electrification program criticized many times. Its enemies have invariably attempted to show that it is inefficient.

I want to call your attention to one of the greatest demonstrations of efficiency that I have ever known.

Several days ago a cyclone swept down on the town of Paden, in Tishomingo County, Miss. It destroyed a large number of homes, as well as public buildings, and left the entire area in darkness.

That county is served by the Tishomingo Electric Power Association, of which Mr. William J. Brinkley is the manager. As soon as the notice of the storm was given, Mr. Brinkley got busy and had electric service restored with a speed that certainly challenges everyone's admiration.

At this point I am inserting an article from the Iuka Vidette, which in plain terms tells the story of the efficiency of the Tishomingo Electric Power Association under the direction of Mr. Brinkley, in this trying situation.

The matter referred to follows:

NO LOSS OF TIME DUE TO RADIO SERVICE

Bill Brinkley said the local power company suffered losses up to $500 in the recent tornado at Midway and Paden. We were able to get power restored in the Midway area in about 2 hours, Bill said, and in about 6 hours at Paden.

The extent of the damage at Midway consisted of service wires broken by falling trees and houses being blown off foundations. At Paden, he said the 12,000-volt primary lines were torn down by trees and debris from demolished houses.

Due to facilities such as the two-way radio installed on the trucks and at the main office all the trouble was isolated and repairs were made in a total of about 8 hours. Without this service the same job would have taken fully 2 days. Due to the radio communication facilities we were able to investigate the damage throughout the entire county in a matter of a few minutes, Bill said, otherwise had we depended on telephone it would have taken hours as telephone lines were torn down by the storm.

Political Trends in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, I made a speech about "reckless minorities in Latin America" which is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1949. At that time there were some who thought me harsh in my description of the communistic tendencies of the present Guatemalan Government, both in its attitude toward American investors and toward attempts of the United States to bring concord and economic cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I have, therefore, been interested in recent revelations of how correct I was in my interpretations of events and my prophecies of trends in Guatemala.

Far from being harsh, I apparently understand the communistic influence in the Guatemalan Government and how much the United States should be concerned about its effect on our interests, including the recent threats on the life of Hon. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., our Ambassador to Guatemala. Recently a five-nation committee of inquiry including representatives of Uruguay, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Colombia, as well as our own State Department, officially found Guatemala among three nations that have deliberately disturbed the peace the United States has been trying to encourage in the Western Hemisphere. As reported in the Washington Post:

A five-nation committee of inquiry yesterday branded Cuba, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic as responsible for recent plots to stage revolutions, assassinations, and armed invasions in the Caribbean.

That corroborates exactly what I said in my speech a year ago, to wit:

Guatemala has made particular difficulty for the United States in all the attempts of the United States to bring concord and economic cooperation between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Members of the Guatemalan mission made difficulties at the Rio Conference. They also made difficulties in the Bogota Conference. They have undone a great deal of the efforts of better-intentioned Latin-American governments to bring a feeling of the feasibility of economic

cooperation between the United States and its sister Republics to the south.

In connection with my other charges of the Communist influence in the reckless minority ruling Guatemala, there was published in the Washington Post a short time ago, a long study of the nature of the present Guatemalan Government and its purposes by Mr. Fitzhugh Turner, a reporter of high reputation who made a long trip to Guatemala to learn the facts. In order that we may understand these dangerous symptoms in a country whose airfields dominate the Panama Canal, I am including the entire text of Mr. Fitzhugh Turner's study on Guatemala inserted in the RECORD.

This is an election year in Guatemala for a 6-year presidential term. The influences that have, as Mr. Turner says, brought Guatemala to its present state, are seeking to put themselves in power for at least 6 years and perhaps an indefinite period.

As part of that drive for power, we may expect over the next 6 months a maximum of Communist-inspired attacks on American business and upon American foreign policy such as the attack on American relations with Puerto Rico which occurred last month and the threats to Ambassador Patterson.

For that reason I hope that the people of this country will inform themselves from these articles of Mr. Turner's so that we may fully understand these anticipated attacks in their true significance as part of bigger plans of the Communists for the cold war everywhere.

Mr. Turner's article follows:

The United States, too, has a soft underbelly—Central America and the Caribbean—and trouble has developed there. While North America tries to combat communism in Europe and Asia, Latin communism bores in where it hurts.

Personal and ideological hatreds boil up among the presidents and dictators, small fights rock the area and a big explosion, some say, is on the way.

Others say that talk of an explosion is nonsense, that the State Department and the Organization of American States can deal with the danger. But diplomatic pressure has achieved nothing impressive to date.

Cuba and the Dominican Republic are engaged in a running quarrel, Haiti and the Dominican Republic are at each other's throats, Costa Rica and Nicaragua have tangled in wrath. And the self-styled rebellious child among the erstwhile good neighbors, the 110-year-old Republic of Guatemala, threatens to become more of a problem than ever.

LOOKS FURTHER LEFT

Guatemala is the volcano-studded little country which, with Cuba, harbors a private army, the Caribbean Legion, dedicated to the overthrow of nearby governments. In the geographic sense, it is the nearest to the United States of the six Central American Republics; in the political sense, it is halfway to Poland.

This reporter has just returned from an investigation into conditions there, a sort of sampling of what goes on. The conclusion: Communism exists in Guatemala (although it is not necessarily Russian communism nor the most virulent in the world) and the leftist government is about to leap farther left.

The situation is as senseless as it is dangerous. Guatemala has much, and could have everything.

There is a fertile, scenic plateau where the weather is spring the year around. Poinsettias grow tree high. Easter lilies reach quart size without urging. Mayan and Spanish ruins dot the landscape, along with mountains and big fresh-water lakes.

The area is a little less than that of North Carolina, the population (3,643,000) about the same as in that uncrowded State. About 60 percent of the people are Indians, colorful and primitive. Perhaps 200,000 persons of Spanish or other European descent form the property-holding, and normally, the ruling class.

The volcanic soil is incredibly rich. Coffee and bananas are sold to the United States for dollars, and the Guatemalan quetzal is as valuable as the dollar, with which it is freely interchangeable. Abundant production, good prices, and close ties with the North American economy have eliminated public debt.

DEVELOPERS REBUFFED

With all this, the country is virtually undeveloped. There is oil in the Peten, where Guatemala juts into the Yucatan Peninsula. American interests in the country would like to expand. New American interests would like to come in. President Truman's point 4 program could work as well there as anywhere in the world. But there is little atmosphere for development rather, suspicion, opposition, and rebuff.

Some important investors have pulled out of the country, others have abandoned millions of dollars' worth of improvement plans and still others have refused to come in.

At least part of the reason for this hostility lies in history. The country for 300 years was the seat of repressive Spanish rule in Central America, and for another 100 years of some of the most brutal dictatorships that have sprung up in a dictator-ridden corner of the world. American interests played ball with the dictators, and American diplomacy was hinged to the dollar until the good-neighbor policy came along.

It has been only 5 years since Guatemala became a democracy—near democracy would be a better term. It is understandable, perhaps, that a new government should turn violently against the past. An extreme turn to the left is less understandable. Except emotionally, no Guatemalan really would like to remove his country from the United States orbit, nor believes that it could be done.

President Juan Jose Arevalo's course has been one of cross purposes. He has improved the lot of Guatemala's ordinary people. He has introduced a labor law, has raised wages, has begun social security and has made a start against illiteracy. But he has attacked the sources of his country's wealth.

Economic development has lagged. Roads have deteriorated so much that the four-wheel drive jeep has become a necessary form of transportation. The government pecks at repairs and pleads lack of funds, yet it is spending $4,000,000 on a site of Central American Olympic games.

Marxist propaganda, meanwhile, is encouraged. "Wall Street imperialism" is denounced at every turn. American little business meets red tape, and big business is kicked around with gusto. The Government press gives free space and the government radio free time to leftist attacks on the gringo, and the Communist line, a faithful echo of Moscow, is heard loud in the land.

Spies are everywhere. The Government reads the telegrams and even the mail of those Americans (and Guatemalans) it distrusts. No outsider knows which waiters at hotels and restaurants are police ears.

President Arevalo employs his own agents out of his secret funds of $473,000 a year, and at least one cabinet minister employs agents to watch for signs of revolt. It may be a good idea; more than 20 revolutions have been plotted in the past few years.

There are other agencies at work against the Government. Nicaragua's Anastasio Somoza and the Dominican Republic's Leonidas Trujillo keep constant watch on Dr. Arevalo, who hates them, and on the Carribbean Legion, which is aimed primarily against their two dictatorships. Neighboring Honduras and El Salvador watch for agitators who try to spread Guatemalan ferment to their territories.

There is evidence that both the United States and the British keep an undercover eye on the situation. When a hot foreign issue becomes desirable, Dr. Arevalo whips up Guatemala's claim to adjoining British Honduras, and His Majesty's government maintains Irish troops at Belize to guard against an air-borne Caribbean Legion attack.

ONLY ONE FRIEND

Of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, Guatemala is on intimate terms with only one, Cuba, where there is also a left-wing regime. Relations with Panama, Costa Rica, Haiti, Honduras, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua range from suspicion to open break.

Relations with the United States have improved a little since Arevalo supplanted an open leftist with a more friendly Foreign Minister. But the new Minister, Ismael Gonzales Arevalo, has been heard to complain that he has been surrounded by Communists who attempt to thwart his work.

For many years Arevalo lived in self-imposed exile near Buenos Aires. There he obtained Argentine citizenship and acquired friends who turn up quite often now in Guatemala. Some of them have taken to communism in their dislike of the United States, or to dislike of the United States in their pursuit of communism, and sometimes Arevalo has given them Government jobs.

Anti-North American Communist sympathizers, as well, have been installed in important Government press and radio posts, and others have risen to power in the political parties and labor unions which give Arevalo his strength. Still others work with the President in his office, and still others have infiltrated the diplomatic service.

Some of these Communists, pro-Communists, Communist sympathizers, or whatever may be Soviet agents, this reporter does not pretend to know. Those to whom I talked denied it, or said they canont be Communists at all, since the constitution outlaws the party in Guatemala.

There is no Soviet espionage network in the country, so far as experts can tell. (There is nothing much for a Russian to spy on.) Nor is there, despite recent furor, a Russian submarine base on the coast. Nor does the Moscow radio concentrate on Guatemala.

A PECULIAR MIXTURE

Guatemalan leftism, it is a fair conclusion, is not Russian, but is largely of the peculiar Latin variety, earnest and befuddled rather than cynical, entangling Marxist ideology and Communist propaganda with antigringoism, with local nationalism and with the personal politicking traditional in the Latin world.

This does not mean there is no link to Moscow. The nearest Soviet Embassy to Guatemala is the one in Mexico City, which also is headquarters for Vicente Lombardo Toledano, the pro-Communist Latin labor leader. Guatemala's labor is allied with Toledano's pro-Communist federation, the CTAL, and through it with the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions.

When Soviet propaganda appears in Guatemala, it arrives in company with copies of the CTAL newspaper, and Toledano's agents move freely back and forth between Guatemala and Mexico. Some seem on intimate

terms with President Arevalo. One, for example, was appointed by Arevalo in 1948 to advise the Guatemalan delegation to the Bogota Conference.

A current visitor is Cesar Urrutia Godoy, an exiled Chilean Communist and one of Arevalo's old friends. Godoy passed 2 or 3 months in Guatemala last summer trying to organize a United Front for Democratic Liberation, to unseat Caribbean dictators.

Once when two visiting Americans of the CIO made speeches of friendship to the Guatemala railroad union, Godoy followed them to the stand and denounced them as imperialist agents.

"These people have autos and refrigerators and comfortable houses," Godoy declared. "How can they be on your side here?"

Godoy left Guatemala after that to organize the pro-Communist World Peace Congress held at Mexico City in September.

A BLONDE "WITCH"

Another old friend of the President, also a Chilean, is a plumpish, middle-aged blonde named Virginia Bravo Atelier. She formerly was a Chilean cultural attaché in Washington; some Americans who have encountered her at work in Guatemala call her "the witch of the coffee country."

President Arevalo gave this rather shrill lady a job in the Ministry of Education about a year and a half ago. She travels around the country lecturing to rural teachers, denounces American-sponsored teacher training as Yankee imperialism, and spreads the party line wherever she goes.

Most active Communist front outside the labor unions is the Democratic Youth Alliance, known by its Spanish language initials as AJDG. Composed largely of students and dupes, AJDG spreads the Communist line interspersed with cultural programs, has the backing of the government and is headed by Jose H. Zamora, a Salvadorean who holds a government job as the President's publicity chief.

MERELY LEFT WING

President Arevalo denies that he himself is a Communist, and the general opinion gives him the benefit of the doubt. Objective people, including some of his enemies, say he is a left-wing idealist with a flair for practical politics and with a sincere desire to achieve social progress in Guatemala.

He has included Communists among his supporters, they say, because he is anti-American, because his only real support comes from labor and the left and because he believes he can control them.

It is true that the President has curbed some excesses. With his term about over, however, and with more extreme leftists coming to the fore, it is not clear now whether he is clearly in control of his supporters.

FIVE THOUSAND ACRES DOOMED

One of the requirements of President Truman's point 4 program is a favorable climate for American investment. In Guatemala the Government not only has failed to create such a climate but has convinced existing interests that the aim is to drive them out of the country.

Some $250,000,000 is involved, most of it in three large companies.

United Fruit, with $100,000,000 invested, has abandoned a $10,000,000 development program because of the Government's attitude; this, by 1951, will return 5,000 acres of Atlantic coast land to jungle and will cost some 4,000 Guatemaltecos their jobs. Empesa Electrica, a $12,000,000 subsidy of Electric Bond & Share, is in danger of expropriation, and the International Railways of Central America, an $89,000,000 property, is engaged in a wage dispute which threatens to make it a losing financial proposition.

The companies, admittedly, have a history of exploitation. They throve in the time of dictators, and played more than a small part in Central American politics. They still operate under concessions dating to those times, and their contracts extend far into the future, granting low taxes in some cases and tax exemptions in others.

But they long since have changed their old ways. An additional requirement of point 4, the State Department says, is that American investors must exhibit statesmanship abroad.

The Guatemalan companies, then, would like to renegotiate their contracts to make them more acceptable.

United Fruit, for example, already has renegotiated in Honolulu and El Salvador, and has made overtures in Guatemala, only to be rebuffed. Guatemalan leaders have made it clear that renegotiation means huge cash payments, $11,000,000 in the case of the railroad. So the companies have determined to stick to their present contracts until discrimination against them ends.

PAY DISCRIMINATION

Meanwhile, the government and labor unions kick them around. Arevalo's labor law provided that agricultural concerns with more than 500 employees must pay time and a half for overtime, against time and a quarter for others, and must grant 10-day vacations, against 5 days for others. Agricultural concerns with more than 500 employees, in Guatemala, means principally the fruit company.

In most of the anti-American Communist-line propaganda in Guatemala, the three big companies are singled out for the harshest adjectives. Some clue to the reason may line in what Defense Minister Jacobo Arbenz told an American in a drinking moment. "You people are doing things for your workers that we won't be able to do for 50 years," he said. "That's why I hate you."

The fact is that the American companies pay by far the highest wages in the country, and take the best care of their employees. The railroad pays manual labor $1.67 per day; the Government pays 64 cents for equivalent work. United Fruit pays agricultural labor a minimum of $1.36 a day, as opposed to 40 cents paid on government coffee plantations. The fruit company maintains two central hospitals, two dozen infirmaries, 54 schools, recreation halls, commissaries, and the like, and even its critics concede its employee housing is the best in the country.

To develop Guatemala, Ismael Gonzales Arevalo, the pro-American Foreign Minister, talks of a World Bank loan for roads and electric power. If a loan is granted, it will be over the objection of United States Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr. He has told the Government he can recommend no loan until corrective action is taken against injustices to American interests.

A PRIVATE ARMY

Besides its Communists, Guatemala has the Caribbean legion mentioned earlier, a private army of exiles and adventurers with designs against neighboring governments. The legion had the use of Guatemalan planes, rifles, and ammunition in an attempted invasion of the Dominican Republic last year, and it is now assembling small boats at Puerto Barrios, on the Atlantic coast, for another expedition, presumably aimed either at the Dominican Republic or Nicaragua.

The legion, which has its headquarters in Cuba, is behind much of the uproar in the Caribbean, according to the Organization of American States. Considering its size, this is something of an achievement. For the legion, between invasions, consisted of no more than 25 to 100 persons, most of them broke.

A few are Communists, others are non-Communist leftists or moderates or rightists, and personal as well as ideological jealousies divide them. Most are Nicaraguans and Dominicans, or exiles from Honduras or El Salvador, although Guatemala, Cuba, Venezuela and even the United States and Britain are represented from time to time. What most have in common is this: that they are out.

Juan Rodriguez, a wealthy Dominican exile, put up most of the money for the attempt against Trujillo, and another Dominican exile, a tough, bearded soldier named Miguel Angel Ramirez, was commander at last account.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY ONE-THOUSANDTHS BATTING AVERAGE

Legion strategy once was full-dress invasion, but this is no longer possible. The force is not strong enough nor can hemisphere opinion be expected to countenance anything as blatant as that. The tactic, rather, is to plot rebellion within the country under attack and to move in simultaneously with the outbreak of revolt.

Results have been fairly dismal; the batting average only 0.250. Members first came together in 1947, in a large-scale attempt to invade the Dominican Republic from Cuba. The expedition included 11 bombers, 2 infantry landing boats, and about 1,100 men. Publicity, undercover United States intervention, and the cooperation of certain Cuban Government officers broke it up before it left Cuban soil.

Internal dissension helped. At least 10 separate participants, it developed, expected to be made Dominican President when Trujillo was dead.

In Guatemala City some months later, a group of the rebels hired a United States pilot, James Hurst, to kill General Somoza of Nicaragua from the air. Gen. Emiliano Chamorro, an exiled rightest revolutionary, was to become President. Hurst was ready to load the explosives when Chamorro objected to the choice of a leftist, Edelberto Torres, to be Vice President, and the plot fell through.

SHREWD DEFENSE

It was not until March 1948 that the exiles came into their own. Some of them joined with Jose Figueres, a Costa Rican planter, in an uprising against his Government. The revolt succeeded. The Caribbean Legion was officially organized, with a coat of arms, headquarters at San Jose, and a scheme to unseat General Somoza next door.

The canny Nicaraguan dictator acted first, however. He started a border fight which brought the Rio Pact into action, exposed the legion to publicity, and forced it again to disperse.

Last June's expedition was remarkable even in Central America for mismanagement and bad luck, although members of the Guatemalan Government helped and allowed Guatemala to be used as the main base of operations.

At least six planes loaded with men and arms took off from Guatemala. Some of the arms were from Guatemala stocks and two of the planes were Guatemalan Air Force DC-3's with their official markings, T-1 and T-2, only thinly disguised.

One plane crash-landed en route, three were detained when they landed in Mexico to refuel, one missed the rendezvous, and only a flying boat reached the goal at Luperon, on the Dominican north coast, on time. The three North Americans and eight Latins aboard found no revolutionaries to meet them, and a Trujillo force hunted them down in the hills and killed all except one, a Dominican.

The Guatemalan Government later denied that it participated in the Luperon affair. When this reporter asked a cabinet member why the Government harbors the legion, he replied that this is untrue. But people in and out of the Government have friends, he added, and if individuals wish to help in-

dividuals with food, transportation, or other things, that is their own affair.

ELECTION WORRIES

A presidential election is supposed to be held in Guatemala toward the end of this year, but the odds, probably, are no better than 50-50 that it will come off in peace. Most of the country believes that unless he is chosen as the Government candidate and is elected, Defense Minister Arbenz will attempt to seize power by force.

This could lead to much bloodshed. For besides Colonel Arbenz, the two strongest men in the country are pro-Communist labor leaders who have staked their futures on an election and many of whose followers are armed. The Government itself gave them rifles, some 2,000 or 3,000, during an attempted revolution last summer.

The labor leaders are Manuel Pinto Usaga and Victor Manuel Gutierrez. In recent weeks they have consolidated Guatemalan unions into a single federation, and have organized labor into a more or less solid national political action committee. They themselves disavow personal political ambitions but hope, they say, to install the candidate they favor in the Presidency. Their aim is to see that the new President continues the revolution and puts through agrarian reform.

If the labor candidate should win, the new regime would be even further left than the present government. Guatemala's neighbors fear that a government will emerge which will take orders from Moscow, and will seek to install communism in Honduras, El Salvador, and other countries. Further subversion of the labor movement in Latin America might follow, and, conceivably, destruction of the inter-American system.

These worries are traceable, in part, to fears of Pinto Usaga and Gutierrez. For both men are known Communist sympathizers and opponents of any except the tamest United States financial interests.

POWER IS ALL

A well-informed Guatemalan, himself a presidential possibility, believes, however, that Pinto Usaga and Gutierrez will disappear in short order if a strong man takes over. And since the election will be rigged by the Government, that strong man is likely to be Arbenz.

The Defense Minister, he says, professes leftist views only because he happens to be a member of a leftist Government, and he represents himself as a friend of labor for the same reason. What he really wants is power.

The colonel last summer began to be threatened by the rise to prominence of an old-time partner, Col. Francisco J. Arana, chief of the armed forces, a political moderate and friend of the United States. He was acquiring a large following in the army and among the people, and was talked of as a presidential candidate.

One July day Colonel Arana learned that Lieutenant Colonel Arbenz had been helping the Caribbean Legion, and that a quantity of Guatemalan Government arms had been cached by the legion at Lake Amatitlan. He drove off to investigate and was ambushed and killed with submachine guns.

The assassins neglected to kill Arana's driver, and the man escaped to name two of the gunmen. One, he said, was Mrs. Arbenz's chauffeur, and the other was Alfonso Martinez, business manager for Colonel Arbenz.

ARTILLERY BATTLE

The killing set off a revolution by some of Arana's army friends, and fighting raged for 2 days with weapons as heavy as 105-millimeter artillery. The Government won, the revolutionaries fled, and nobody bothered to bring the Arana assassins to justice. Rumor a few weeks ago was that Martinez, who is a prominent figure in Guatemala City, was about to be appointed chief of police.

In the army since then, Colonel Arbenz has entrenched himself by placing his supporters in key positions and by paying bonuses to officers. Guatemalan officers make from $50 to $250 a month, and favorites receive from $50 to $125 extra from the Defense Minister.

A new man, Maj. Carlos Paz-Tejada, has taken Colonel Arana's post; he refers to himself as "the unknown soldier," and so far at least has done nothing to threaten the Arbenz ambition.

Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1949, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, by unanimous vote, reported H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States. After many delays, a rule was finally granted and the proponents of this important bill were able to bring it to the floor for consideration and vote on March 15, 1950. I was more than glad to support this legislation, and I regret exceedingly that this bill was not passed long ago.

This bill was drafted by experts of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and the Central Intelligence, so that all of the intelligence units in the Government joined in a request to the Judiciary Committee and the House that this measure be passed.

The bill does not in any respect change the existing wire-tapping statutes. We all know, of course, that wire-tapping is not illegal and may be exercised under decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. However, information obtained by wire-tapping cannot be used as evidence in any court.

There are many gaps in our security laws and this bill goes a long way toward filling those gaps. Our military laws are adequate to deal with military personnel, but most of the violations of our military security laws are committed by civilians who are not covered by military law.

We have recently had the distressing case of a man in a high Government position accused and convicted of passing confidential Government information to agents of a foreign government. The espionage laws could not apply to that crime because the statute of limitations had run. The culprit was tried on a lesser charge of perjury and sentenced under the laws dealing with perjury. Is a few years in prison enough punishment for a highly intelligent man who betrays his country? Because so many Members of Congress thought not, this bill was reported to the House for a vote.

In general, this bill's section 1 compels persons having in their possession certain enumerated classes of items to surrender the same under penalty for refusal to do so. Presently, the law affords no adequate punishment. For example, there is no violation unless the specific person entitled by law to receive the documents makes the demand for their return. This bill extends the offense to persons who know the material entrusted to them has been illegally removed, lost, stolen, or destroyed and who fail to report the loss or theft promptly to their superior officer. The present penalties are increased in this bill for conspiracy to commit the forbidden acts from $10,000 or 5 years or both to 10 years or $10,000 or both. This increased penalty conforms to the general statute. It makes, in a word, the conspiracy to commit an offense as grave as the crime itself.

Section 2 in general increases the statute of limitation for espionage from 3 to 10 years.

Section 3 amends the Foreign Agents Registration Act so as to make failure to register a continuing offense.

Section 4 delegates to the Secretary of Defense the power to promulgate orders and regulations, the violations of which are made punishable by fine and imprisonment for the security of new military installations.

There may be some question as to whether this Congress has the right to delegate broad authority like that to the Secretary of National Defense and permit him to make regulations and rules concerning military installations and to prescribe penalties. The Supreme Court has frequently sustained that delegation of power to the executive branch.

The only criticism that the Supreme Court has offered is that there must be clearness and clarity in the writing of the statute so as to clearly and succinctly describe the limits of the grant of power.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to preserve the democracy that we all love so well, I believe it is necessary that we deal harshly with those who would betray our beloved country. This bill should act as a deterrent to those who would sell their birthright for a mess of pottage—or worse, for communism.

The High Cost of Food Prices—Why That Is So

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared in the Kenosha Evening News on the subject of some farm surplus costs. The information contained in that editorial is very pertinent to the whole question of farm surpluses:

SOME FARM SURPLUS COSTS

High cost of keeping food prices up under the administration's price support plan is itemized in a recent table printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On January 31 the

Government had the following quantities of agricultural products in storage—the total valued at nearly $4,000,000,000. Storage costs alone amount to $200,000,000 a year, or about $23,000 per hour.

	Quantity
Cotton, long staple----bales--	3,008
Cotton ----------do----	6,459,499
Cottonseed ----------tons--	118,922
Flax----------pounds--	178,145
Butter----------do----	100,736,962
Cheese ----------do----	25,307,469
Milk ----------do----	274,723,846
Linseed oil----------do----	411,943,603
Peanuts----------do----	246,974,902
Peanuts, shelled------do----	14,669,287
Fruits, dried----------do----	57,651,595
Potato starch----------do----	10,172,827
Potatoes----------do----	1,148,054,700
Barley----------bushels--	52,998,083
Beans----------pounds--	1,182,391,300
Corn ----------bushels--	627,480,162
Flaxseed----------do----	22,237,676
Grain sorghums----pounds--	4,237,623,000
Oats----------bushels--	41,698,990
Peas----------pounds--	55,842,100
Rice ----------do----	168,120,800
Rye ----------bushels--	1,563,618
Seeds (pasture)----pounds--	725,422
Soybeans ----------bushels--	13,102,695
Wheat----------do----	475,034,491
Wool ----------pounds--	51,378,140
Eggs, dried----------do----	75,918,088
Turkeys----------do----	1,017,105
Rosin ----------do----	391,164,467
Turpentine---------gallons--	5,107,213
Tobacco ----------pounds--	373,868,064

Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made by the Honorable J. Bracken Lee, Governor of the State of Utah, when he designated the week of March 19 to 25, 1950, as National Wildlife Restoration Week.

I realize this observance week has passed but I feel it is of sufficient importance to be inserted at this late date.

Governor Lee's statement follows:

One of the attractions that has made the West a center of scenic America has been its wildlife—from fish of mountain streams to the elk and moose of the remote hills. A century ago, the wildlife was a prime source of food for the pioneers and Indians who lived here. Today, the wildlife is largely a memory, to be preserved by this generation for the generations of tomorrow.

The strength of a nation is reflected in its natural resources. We have watched the rapid depletion of our forests, and have awakened to the need to provide for the future, through reforestation. Similarly, we have watched the near disappearance of our wildlife and have seen the need to restore and perpetuate them.

In recognition of this effort to preserve our resources and our wildlife, I am designating the period March 19 to 25, 1950, as National Wildlife Restoration Week in Utah, and I urge all citizens, sportsmen's organizations, civil and service clubs, schools and other organizations, to observe this week through appropriate ceremonies devoted to the restoration and preservation of our wildlife and other valuable natural resources.

J. BRACKEN LEE,
Governor.

MARCH 9, 1950.

Convincingly Logical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the distinguished Catholic writer, Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., which appeared in a recent edition of the Catholic Virginian:

THE LADY'S LOGIC

(Sursum Corda by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

Logic is considered—by a certain type of mind—something reprehensible.

In the mental world as in the moral world there are persons who think we should chuck all rules of thinking, make a blind choice of opinions, jump at conclusions and look upon as "reactionary" or "medieval," anyone who insists that thinking is an art which must be learned and practiced. That's all there is to logic. The logician holds that thought must proceed step by step in a straight line and not, like Stephen Leacock's young man, "ride off madly in all directions."

Perhaps the most reckless disdain for the rules of reason amongst our contemporaries is that of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. I look at her column only semioccasionally (or semi-demi-occasionally), but every time I become careless in the custody of my eyes and let them fall upon one of her daily effusions, I seem to happen upon a logical howler. One recent instance is not from her column but from a speech she gave at Iona State College at about the time the verdict in the Hiss case had been reached.

Mrs. Roosevelt is reported as saying: "A man who has professed innocence is involved by a man who by his own admission is a perjurer and a former Communist. It seems rather horrible to condemn someone on the word of someone else who admits to guilt."

Note the antithesis: one man has professed innocence; the other is, by his own admission, a perjurer. So it is horrible (at least rather horrible, whatever that may be) to condemn the professed innocent on the word of the confessed perjurer. The point, of course, is that the man who protested his innocence was just as much a liar and a perjurer as the man who admitted that he was a liar and a perjurer. Professing innocence didn't make Hiss innocent. The quick and careless reader, deceived by Mrs. Roosevelt's legerdemain, might jump to the conclusion—as she does—that an innocent man was condemned on the word of a guilty man. It's a trick.

In my first year in logic when, by way of diversion, we used to play with some false syllogisms, we had one that went thus: "Epimenides (quoted by St. Paul) said that all the Cretans were liars. But Epimenides himself was a Cretan. Therefore if he was telling the truth, he was a liar." Any fairly bright child in a grade school could pick the flaw in that syllogism. I can see the hands raised in class and hear a chorus of piping voices say, "Teacher, a liar may sometimes tell the truth." Mrs. Roosevelt doesn't seem to realize that Chambers who was sometimes a liar could and did on occasion tell the truth.

GUILTY ON EVIDENCE

Take the second part of her statement, "it seems rather horrible to condemn someone on the word of someone else who admits to guilt." The fact, of course, is that Hiss was not condemned on the word of Chambers. Three juries sat on the case; the grand jury which handed down the indictment, and the Federal juries, one of which voted 8 to 4 and the other 12 to zero that Hiss was guilty. They declared him guilty not on the word of Chambers but on the evidence produced in court.

Let's have another example of careless thinking reported in that same speech—or it may have been in an interview before or after the speech—at Iona State College. The lady want on to say: "If you had been disloyal and your conscience troubled you, the only way you could go scot free would be to accuse someone else of the things you were accused of."

But, dear lady, there is more than one way of "going scot free." You may go scot free in your own conscience, or you may go scot free before the law. You go scot free in conscience by repenting, confessing, and making amends. Such is the way ordained by God. The other way of going scot free is to confess to the civil authorities and turn state's evidence. Chambers did the latter. Perhaps he did the former also. We don't know. Only God knows. At any rate Chambers finally told the truth and stuck to it. Hiss kept on lying to the end. As between the two which was the more pardonable, the man who lied, repented, and atoned or the man who lied and lied and lied?

Mrs. Roosevelt's pity goes out to the unrepentant. In that she disagrees both with the State and God. And all because she has no concern for straight thinking, that is for logic.

National Holstein Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution designating the period beginning June 5 and ending June 10, 1950, as National Holstein Week, in recognition of the fine work done by the Holstein-Friesian Association of America in bringing about Nation-wide improvement in the dairy industry. The membership of the association, of more than 40,000, includes Holstein-Friesian cattle breeders in every one of the 48 States as well as the Territorial possessions and other countries of North America. The sixty-fifth annual convention of this association will be held in Syracuse, N. Y., during the week of June 5–10. We are all aware of the outstanding achievements of this organization, and I sincerely hope the Congress will adopt this resolution making it possible to designate the period of the convention as National Holstein Week.

Port Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are so concerned about the adequacy of our provision for national defense, it is alarming to discover that we have left a serious gap in our national defense. We have thus far completely neglected the security of our seaports in the event of an emergency. These ports are the bottlenecks through which our men and supplies must be moved in time of war. If they are damaged or destroyed by sabotage, accidental explosion, or fire, much of our other preparations for national defense for which we are spending billions of dollars, could become useless because of our inability to move our men and materials to the fighting fronts.

The protection of our ports, specifically port security, thus becomes a vital aspect of national defense. The problem of port security is one that is not generally realized. It was handled quietly and effectively by the Coast Guard during the recent war, and has received little publicity. Neither the important part which it played during World War II nor its even greater role in any future conflict are generally recognized. But the significance of port security can readily be seen when we stop to reflect on the known Communist infiltration into waterfront areas and organizations. The Russians recognize the vital importance of the ports, and vulnerability in those areas. It is imperative that we, too, recognize their importance now and make provision immediately for filling the gap in our national defense by providing for a trained Coast Guard Reserve which will assure the maximum security for the ports.

The part of our armed forces which is responsible for port security is the Coast Guard, but the Coast Guard must rely primarily on its Reserves for carrying out this responsibility. This is due both to the magnitude of the job as compared with its peacetime personnel and to the specialized training required for port security. The Coast Guard's peacetime strength of around 23,000 officers and men must be expanded about 7 times during war to fulfill its responsibilities. Then, too, while many of its wartime duties are expansions of its normal functions for which regular personnel are trained, the port security duties generally require highly specialized training in fields not normally within the scope of regular personnel training and experience.

In respect to the importance of port security, which is now being brought to the attention of many of us for the first time, let us look a little further into the subject and try to consider and answer some of the quetsions which I know have arisen.

The term "port security" refers to the protection of the ports from damage or destruction by sabotage, explosion of munitions or fire. The measures through which port security is achieved include the continuous use of antisabotage patrols and inspections, supervision of the handling and loading of explosives from freight car to pier and vessel, and the prevention and fighting of fire. All of these are highly specialized and technical duties requiring extensive training and constant instruction in modern developments in weapons, munitions, techniques, and other factors affecting them. This training must be provided in advance of an emergency in order that the personnel responsible for port security will be prepared to assume their duties within the shortest possible number of minutes or hours in the event of an emergency. If the port security specialists are not prepared to be on the job within a matter of minutes and hours, and if such an organization is not constantly alert, a crippling blow could be struck by the damaging or destruction of our ports in the earliest stages of any conflict.

During World War II we were fortunate in that there was no extensive and well organized enemy infiltration into our ports for sabotage. This, and the delay in getting our production and overseas movements of materials and men actively under way, provided time for the expansion and adequate training of the Coast Guard Reserve which had been created in 1941. We are not likely to be fortunate enough again to have so much time for organization and training at the last minute. Furthermore, those who were closest to the rush of last-minute preparations during World War II will tell you that it is anything but an effective, satisfactory or safe way to do the job. Our port security specialists must be highly trained in advance if they are to do us any good in any possible emergency. It is a matter of record that during World War II the Coast Guard, in addition to its participation in every major invasion, established port security organizations in over 75 ports in the United States, including every major port, and, as the war progressed, assumed those functions in our advance base ports overseas. It required a minimum of approximately 16,000 officers and men for these duties in the port of New York, 8,000 in Boston, 4,000 in Philadelphia, 4,000 in Norfolk, 1,200 in Chicago, 8,000 in San Francisco, 4,000 in Seattle, and 2,900 in Baltimore, to cite but a few examples. These port security specialists supervised the loading of about 29,000,000,000 pounds of explosives without a single explosion. This involved the enforcement of specified safety measures in handling explosives, supervision and approval of stowage areas and methods, determination and enforcement of limitations as to type of explosives and other dangerous cargoes which could be stowed together, or which must be separated by specified distances, stowed in specified locations aboard ship, and so forth.

In addition, the port security specialists were successful in detecting and preventing various acts of sabotage, they also discovered and brought under control literally hundreds of fires in ports which might otherwise have been disastrous, and in at least one instance played an important part in preventing the demolition of port facilities by the spread of a raging pier fire to an ammunition-loading area. These few examples of their activities in the last war will give some idea of a few of the vital functions of the port security specialists.

The present situation is one which is most alarming. Although charged with the responsibility for port security, and necessarily relying on its Reserve to fulfill that responsibility, the Coast Guard has been provided no funds with which to maintain the essential training of the Reserve or even to maintain the Reserve in the necessary organized form.

Following the war, the Coast Guard's Reserve officers were placed on inactive duty, retaining their commissions, while its enlisted reservists were discharged. Since then, a few enlisted reservists have returned, but the Coast Guard has had no funds for either the recruiting and organization or the training of a Reserve. The Reserve, therefore, is now simply a skeleton consisting of about 4,000 officers and a handful of enlisted men for whom the Coast Guard can provide none of the essential training. Some of these have been meeting voluntarily once a week for the past year and a half and trying to conduct refresher lectures themselves. This, of course, is not a satisfactory or effective approach and certainly does not fill the needs of national defense.

The question arises as to why the issue of Coast Guard Reserve training funds has not come before the Congress prior to this when you consider what the Reserve components of other services received from this body. Following the war, the Coast Guard, which operates under the Navy in time of war, continued to operate under the Navy until January 1946. This means that the needs of its Reserve, which was being rapidly demobilized, were included in the budget under Navy operations through the fiscal year 1947. Furthermore, the emphasis in all of the services at that time was on demobilization rather than training.

As world conditions became more precarious, however, the Coast Guard turned its attention again to the organization and training of its Reserve to meet responsibilities in the event of an emergency. Funds were requested through the Bureau of the Budget, but the approval of the Bureau was not received until a survey of the relationship of the Coast Guard Reserve to the Reserves of the other services was completed. Unfortunately, this survey was not completed until after the 1950 budget had already gone to the House, and consequently, the matter was not before the Treasury-Post Office appropriations subcommittee when its hearings were held. This subcommittee, however, indicated in its report that although it could take no action in view of the absence of a request, it would give such a request sympathetic attention and a hearing when it was received.

Following approval by the Bureau of the Budget of a request for $3,500,000,

this amount was requested in hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee, which disapproved it in view of the absence of prior House hearings. Strong statements favorable to such an appropriation were made by Members of the Senate when the appropriation bill reached the floor of that Chamber.

The President then, in the third deficiency bill, again requested the appropriation of $3,500,000 for Coast Guard Reserve training. Of the four Treasury Department items in that bill request for Coast Guard Reserve training funds was the only item not referred to a subcommittee for hearings, and consequently no action could be taken on the request which was never brought before the House for consideration.

When the third deficiency bill was considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee an amendment to provide $3,000,000 was approved to provide for Coast Guard Reserve training. This amendment was removed in conference and once again the item did not reach the House for consideration. After the removal of the amendment in conference, strong statements concerning the vital necessity of providing funds for the Coast Guard Reserve training in port security were made by Members of this body.

The proposed budget for 1951, for the Coast Guard, included a request for $4,100,000 for the training of the Reserve. This amount would provide for the training of 1,900 officers and 6,000 enlisted men. The increased amount represents only the effects of the pay increase bills which were passed last session. The request for Coast Guard Reserve training funds was not approved by the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee.

The importance of this request is borne out by Admiral Merlin O'Neill, Commandant of the Coast Guard, Secretary of Defense, and Admiral Forrest Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral O'Neill, testifying at the hearings, said:

> One of the most critical missions that we will have in time of national emergency is in regard to port security. And it is necessary in order to carry out that mission, that we have a force trained and ready for immediate mobilization and use to carry out that function.

The Secretary of Defense, in a letter of January 11, 1950, to the Secretary of the Treasury, said:

> The proposed reactivation of the Coast Guard Reserve is a matter of strong concern to the Department of Defense. Accordingly I desire to go on record as fully concurring with the request for the necessary funds for this purpose. * * * I am particularly perturbed about the security of our ports in the event of an emergency. It is vital to national defense that a modest but fully trained force be in being to detect sabotage, supervise explosives loading, prevent waterfront fires and explosions, control the identity of water front personnel, etc.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Sherman, in writing, stated:

> I feel that the interests of national defense will be well served by the establishment of a Coast Guard Reserve. That, of course, will require funds for the training of such a reserve at the present time. An annual appropriation of $4,100,000 is not excessive.
>
> In the event of mobilization it is contemplated that the Coast Guard will perform the following services: (1) Port security; (2) harbor-master duties at advance bases; (3) beach patrol duty; (4) reactivation and manning of high-frequency direction finding stations; and (5) harbor defense—inshore and offshore patrols in small craft.
>
> A reserve component of the Coast Guard should be trained to proficiency in the foregoing matters. Such training would not duplicate the training now being given the Naval Reserve.

It has been pointed out on several occasions that it is impossible to establish a balanced security system for the Nation as long as the Coast Guard Reserve remains inactive and without a training program. It is in no sense of the word economy to deny the Coast Guard Reserve the money necessary to train its reservists in their important duties, and if it is absolutely necessary to cut down the military expenditures it should be cut from somewhere else in the appropriations for the armed services, leaving the Coast Guard request for Reserve training funds intact.

The seriousness of failing to provide for the security of our ports by having trained personnel ready to step in immediately in the event of an emergency is attaining greater and greater recognition.

In view of the general lack of information in the past concerning the aspect of port security relative to our national defense, I have presented these facts. We have never had this matter before this House and, therefore, have not had the opportunity to learn of its importance or to express our opinions. Now that the facts are before us, I urge that we take immediate steps to appropriate funds for the training of the Coast Guard Reserve. Thus the gap in our national defense will be closed and our vital ports will have the protection against damage or destruction from sabotage, explosion or fire. The ports must be secured if we are to derive any benefit in time of emergency from the billions we are spending for other aspects of national defense for supplies and materials which must be funnelled through the ports.

Wisconsin Swiss Cheese Challenges Ohio Swiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a friendly spirit of rivalry the Ohio Swiss cheese industry has challenged that its product is superior to that of the Swiss cheese made in Wisconsin and in my congressional district. A very interesting article which appeared in the Monroe Evening Times of March 28 sets out the controversy better than I can do it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

MONROE ISSUES CHALLENGE—WISCONSIN CHEESE SNUB STIRS RUCKUS

The battle over the so-called merits of Ohio's Swiss cheese as compared with the better known Green County variety subsided this week, with deep silence from the Minneapolis end of the exchange.

It all started last month with receipt from Louis Orlove, Milwaukee, motion-picture firm representative, of a clipping from a column written by Will Jones in the Minneapolis Tribune.

Jones had made passing and slighting reference to Wisconsin cheese and before the ruckus quieted down this week, Minneapolis, Green County, Monroe, and Dover, Ohio, were all mixed up in claims and counter claims.

Jones, who had been vacationing in Dover at the time, published this reference in his column:

"Today I am thumbing my nose at Wisconsin and all its claims to cheesemaking fame.

"The best Swiss cheese available is made in Ohio."

There was more of the same, but that sample was sufficient to boost the blood pressures among the Cheese Day, Inc., board of directors and at the Evening Times which constantly spreads the word about Green County Swiss cheese to the world.

Jones—who is a native of Dover, it developed—commented on the short course in cheesemaking he had enjoyed and passed along tips on where Minneapolis cheese fans could find good Swiss—in Ohio, of course.

With 1950 Green County Cheese Day coming up September 9, the Times and the Cheese Day board decided to chide Jones a bit. After all, they felt that someone in the Twin Cities area might get the wrong impression about Swiss cheese and where to get it.

So a letter was written to Minneapolis. The reply bounced back immediately, from W. P. Steven, assistant executive editor, son of a New Glarus native and cousin of Arthur C. Benkert.

Columnist Jones also wrote a note, sticking to his guns and displaying none of the penitence for his sins which might be expected.

Anyhow, here's a portion of the Evening Times' letter, published on the editorial page of the Minneapolis Tribune (on St. Patrick's Day).

"We don't pretend to know what Jones' gripe is about Wisconsin but when he says 'the best Swiss * * * is made in Ohio' his gums were snapping like a rat trap.

"He certainly never stopped off in Green County where the only Swiss cheese in the world is made. He never was in Monroe nor did he ever sample Swiss cheese of the flavor and quality of Green County's Gold, which goes out of here by the trainload as compared with the few * * * wheels made in Tuscarawas County, Ohio.

"Jones tips his hand by drooling that he blistered the roof of his mouth eating that good Dover cheese. That must have been fine Swiss. That's the kind * * * we can for fish bait. We certainly don't feed it to our distinguished guests, or send it to the world's markets.

"If Jones, or anyone else in Minneapolis who thinks Wisconsin has lost the art of Swiss cheesemaking wants a little proof, they can come down here any time. Better still, they can show up September 9 at Monroe when the 1950 Cheese Day is held.

"We would appreciate hearing whether Will Jones' opinion of Wisconsin Swiss is shared by others in Minneapolis. If so, we invite them one and to come down for Cheese Day."

Jones' reply included this comment:

"I wasn't invited to your September 9 affair, but I may come down there anyway, under an assumed name. No sabotage intended. I'm a glutton when it comes to cheese, but Ohio is a long way to go for it.

So I'll maybe drop into Monroe to try some of your second-rate stuff."

Publication of the Monroe reply to Jones brought several letters from Minneapolis residents, applauding the verbal spanking and agreeing that Jones' opinions were strictly his own.

His boss also sent another missive this way, hinting that Jones' taste buds probably had been permanently damaged by an enforced diet during which he has lost 20 pounds.

Meanwhile, however, Jones has hinted that the Monroe letter was being rerouted to his hosts in Dover and that "I'm sure you'll hear plenty from that section of the country."

So far his prediction has not come true.

The silence from Dover has been a little disappointing.

Smear Artists Are Busy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the pinkish New Deal smear artists, who, especially here in Washington, are always busy smearing everyone who opposes measures advanced by the administration but which weaken America, are again on the job in an effort to cover up the dirt in the State Department, and the unsoundness in our foreign policy, which has lost all the advantages gained by those who fought, suffered, and many of whom died in World War II.

The answer to all their propaganda is found in today's piece by George Sokolsky, which reads as follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

Propaganda has been started and is gaining some momentum that the charges against Dean Acheson, Philip Jessup, Owen Lattimore, and the Communists and homosexuals in the State Department should be hushed because they undermine confidence in our public officials and make representation abroad difficult.

The propaganda is based upon a truth. Public confidence in the State Department has been shattered for many years. Long before Senator MCCARTHY made his charges, all but the most ardent supporters of the State Department, and particularly those who support British policy in the United States, wondered what has been going on in that department.

The Alger Hiss case, which President Truman called a "red herring," heightened the astonishment of a nation; the disclosure of the homosexual clique climaxed an unfortunate situation. The refusal to provide the Senate with such information as it is entitled to have, if it is to legislate adequately, surely challenges credulity.

To continue to be silent in the face not of charges, but of disclosures, already establishing scandal, is to serve America badly. In these times, there is always an emergency and a crisis and an international conference.

In fact, it was because of these and the war and the plea for unity that we now find ourselves in such a disgraceful situation, involving shameful accusations and no defense.

There must come a time of housecleaning, and that time might as well be now as ever. The trick of finding an obscure Republican ex-Senator, a one-termer, who often voted against his own party, to serve with the State Department in international conferences, does not reestablish a bipartisan foreign policy.

Even were a Republican more prominent than John Sherman Cooper appointed, it would not reestablish the bipartisan foreign policy.

That political apparatus was wrecked on the island of Formosa and it cannot be restored as long as the present top personnel remains in the State Department.

Actually, among the rank and file of the Republicans, any party leader who associates with Dean Acheson's entourage attracts suspicion to himself. It is unfortunate that it should be so, but the State Department created its own atmosphere.

In any other administration, men involved in such scandals would resign. This, too, is a new phenomenon, namely, that these officials feel that they have a vested interest in their job, and the White House supports the view that once a person is appointed to public office he is sacrosanct.

Naturally, any such conception is false and even impossible. It is a reflex to inferiority, coming down from the top. Only those who feel themselves inferior demand such recognition.

When Mr. Hoover was President of the United States, it was found that a young man in the State Department made free with its documents. He was dismissed, and devoted the ensuing years to smearing Mr. Hoover.

The Yardley law was passed because State Department data found their way out of the Department. Certainly Mr. Hoover could not be accused of harboring document thieves; but when he found them, he threw them out.

That is the point—bad appointments might be made, or good men might fall for temptation. What needs to be done is to throw them out whenever they are discovered.

When such men are protected, the protector, to whom they must be abhorrent, must have some ulterior motive. Certainly Harry Truman cannot like either Communists or homosexuals. Why does he protect them? Why does he fight for them?

The answer is in the record. During the New Deal and the war years, when the personnel of government was rapidly expanded, men and women were taken in on their specialized abilities. The FBI and the Civil Service made checks, but often they were made after the person was actually at work.

Those who found the atmosphere uncomfortable in one organ of government found a better berth elsewhere. The check never caught up with the worst of them.

Further, disloyalty involves a legally proved overt act, which makes any safeguards in advance almost impossible. Meanwhile, the subversive or doubtful wins a berth, does his work, and establishes a vested interest, which the President defends.

That is where the trouble lies—in the President's protection of the vested interest of anybody on the public pay roll.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that Mr. Truman, ever since he came to the Presidency, has all too often followed the methods of the corrupt Pendergast political machine of his native State.

Neither he nor the smear artists can convince the people that the State Department does not need a house cleaning.

All that American youth fought for has been given away by the Achesons, the Hisses, and their associates. Apparently, in an effort to save the present administration from political defeat, another war is in the making.

Let no one be deceived. The President is in control of the executive department of the Government. His party has an overwhelming majority in the Senate and in the House. They cannot shirk responsibility for the present situation—for the advancement of the Communists throughout the world, especially in China and the Far East.

Diversity and Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Review of Literature of April 1, 1950:

DIVERSITY AND UNION

The United States is in the midst of a struggle for peace. We are opposed by the efforts of a diabolically clever and well-organized Communist organization which is seeking to destroy our democracy. If we are to succeed in our struggle we must forego all partisanship and all political adventures.

If we are to succeed we must show to our friends in the free world that we are not divided in our counsels but that we are united in our determination to promote the cause of peace and to pursue the wisest policy which our united genius can devise.

There can be no gainsaying the force of the statements with which United States Ambassador-at-Large Philip Jessup repudiated the charge of Communist sympathy leveled against him by Senator MCCARTHY, nor any doubt that incalculable harm is done to America and the world by such irresponsible attacks. All the more reprehensible is the Senator's reckless conduct because at best the democratic process contains dangers inherent to itself in the front it exposes to other nations. In any land where speech is free and debate is open policy crystallizes through a series of often hotly contested exchanges of opinion, the stresses and strains of which can be misconstrued by those inclined to twist them to serve their own ill purposes. Day by day the Russian press and the press of the satellite nations so misrepresent American attitude and action, searching among the flotsam and jetsam of public discussion, seizing here upon a casual statement which falls in with its credo, there upon another which belies American professions, and drawing from minority or tentative or exploratory remarks a totally false picture of the mind of the Nation as a whole.

It is, to be sure, a danger, but it is also the essence of American democracy that it presents a diversity of outlook. The United States was born of diversity, of different peoples seeking new homes for different reasons, of diversity of climate and diversity of geographical nature and economic potentialities. Its culture was compounded of diversity, of the mingling of varied racial strains and variant traditions, of the superimposition of a civilization sprung of the frontier upon the accumulated habits and attitudes of mind of older countries. Its rugged individualism was diversity, its cracker-box philosophers airing his homespun philosophy before his fellows, who like as not howled him down when his generalizations were out of tune with their own independent views, its cowboys and railroad builders, and captains of industry. And

though the enormous mechanization of American civilization has seemed at times to threaten diversity, and the evolution of the radio and the motion picture to presage standardization, nonconformity is perhaps stronger in American today than at any time in its history.

Opinion has never been more fluid, party lines never less binding, social standards never less constricting than in the present. Two world wars and a major depression have shocked the American people into new standards of value. Though the United States has gone through no such social revolution and shift of fortunes as England, it, too, has changed its habits of living and its material outlook. High taxes have decreased great fortunes but high wages have expanded the standards of the working classes and widened the diversity of their interests. The greater latitude of opportunity for women has given them a voice not only in business, but in politics. The war experience of millions of young men has lent sanction to their expression of opinion on their world.

There is, indeed, an underlying sensitivity to conditions and problems of the time, frequently raucous when it is articulate, often floundering. It is this inchoate compound of feeling and opinion which seems so often at cross-purposes, which speaks with contradictory voices, whose meaning can so easily be misunderstood and distorted by the hostile. In it is all the diversity of America, and all of America. "Sweet are the uses of diversity," paraphrased Frederick Lewis Allen in a recent address. Yes, when properly channeled and directed. It is this direction which Mr. Jessup calls for when he says that if we are to succeed in our struggle for peace "we must show to the free world that we are not divided in our counsels, but that we are united in our determination * * * to pursue the wisest policy which our united genius can devise." To realize that direction, we need unpartisan leaders, not Senator McCarthys. We need men of imagination and vision, men of selflessness and courage. If we get them we may win the peace, for still the old slogans hold, "E Pluribus Unum," "In Union There Is Strength."

A. L.

Resolution of the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution has just been adopted by the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

Whereas Hans Schlange-Schoeninger has been appointed as the West German consul-general to New York City; and

Whereas under the occupation statute, the conduct of German foreign affairs is specifically reserved by and to the occupying powers; and

Whereas Hans Schlange-Schoeninger has a long record of hatred and vilification of the United States and helped pave the way for Nazi power during his leadership of the German National Party during the Weimar Republic; and

Whereas in his book, The Morning After, published in 1943, he expressed no regrets for Hitler's slave-labor measures and the slaughter of 6,000,000 Jews, but demanded a "forgive and forget" peace program with Europe dominated by German reaction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of New York, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America does herewith make strenuous protest to such appointment of this unrepentant pro-Nazi to such near-ambassadorial status and demands its immediate rescission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Congressional and Senatorial representatives of the State of New York, to the Governor of the State and the mayor of New York City; and be it further

Resolved, That the national executive committee of Jewish War Veterans be requested to register this protest with the President of the United States, the Secreary of State, and the High Commissioner for Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that our State Department will take action as recommended in this resolution.

The Insurance of Bank Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Insurance of Bank Deposits," which appeared in the American Metal Market, the market authority of the steel and metal industries, on Wednesday, March 22, 1950:

THE INSURANCE OF BANK DEPOSITS

Last week the Senate passed and sent to the House of Representatives a bill which, among other things, would increase insurance on individual bank deposits from $5,000 to $10,000 and reduce the amount of insurance premiums, paid by the insured banks, by an estimated 60 percent. The bill serves as a happy reminder of the valuable service which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has rendered the Nation since it was created in the dark days of 1933 and of the still greater contribution to national stability which it is capable of rendering in the future.

The very efficiency with which the FDIC has functioned has served to obscure its operations from the public eye. The sensational makes the headlines. Quiet efficiency becomes taken for granted. But for the average man, the security of his bank deposits has been a very great stabilizing influence. He may go to bed filled with perplexity over the sad state of the post-war world, and even apprehensive over the chances of surviving some imaginary atomic attack but, unlike his compartiots of two decades and more ago, anxiety over the safety and liquidity of the money he has in the bank is not, fortunately for him, a current worry.

Of course, this has been so ever since his deposits became insured after the creation of FDIC back in 1933. But confidence did not come at once. The skepticism with which the insurance of bank deposits was viewed by many, including no small percentage of the banking fraternity, and the gloomy forebodings (now forgotten) as to the workability of the law, which preceded its enactment, caused many to accept the innovation with reserve. The legislation has proved to be one of the truly great advances made during the last 20 years and, from the manner in which the affairs of the Corporation have been administered, it has achieved what is probably the greatest measure of success that is attainable—it is now taken for granted.

The bill pending in Congress is the first piece of major legislation undertaken since the FDIC was established. A unique feature of this Government corporation is that it does not constitute a drain on the National Treasury. It is an insurance company, in the legitimate sense of the phrase, which has been sustained and achieved its financial success through premiums remitted by the institutions whose deposits it protects. In the beginning, it is true, the initial capital of approximately $289,000,000 was contributed partly by the Treasury and partly by the Federal Reserve banks. This, however, was cleared up with a final payment to the Treasury at the end of last August and as of the end of 1949 the Corporation had accumulated a surplus of over $1,200,000,000. The legislation now pending stipulates that, in addition to the repayment of the original capital, already completed, the Treasury and the Reserve banks shall be paid simple interest at 2 percent, for the funds they advanced. There was no provision for interest in the original legislation, and this feature of the bill will mean a payment of $42,872,862 to the Treasury and $37,691,966 to the banks. However, when such payments are made, it should no longer be possible, even for the most meticulous, to quibble over the point of whether the Corporation has, or has not, fully repaid the advances it received, and now stands on its own feet.

It is symptomatic of the change in conditions since 1933 that it should now be considered expedient to consider increasing the maximum coverage from $5,000 to $10,000. That funds are more abundant is evident in the figures for deposits and for money in circulation, but the added risk and burden which the increase will place upon the reserves of the Corporation seems likely to prove more apparent than real. Aside from the fact that the number of persons likely to maintain cash deposits in excess of $5,000 is comparatively few, there has been nothing in the past to hinder one from obtaining almost unlimited coverage through the duplication of accounts, especially wherever there is duplication of banking facilities. It seems probable that in practice the principal effect of this new provision will be to enable small and remote institutions to retain some funds which might otherwise have taken refuge in more distant centers, once local facilities up to $5,000 were fully utilized.

For several years, as the surplus of the FDIC has risen steadily to such great heights, there has been increasing demand for an abatement in the amount of premium assessed against the insured banks. Large and strong institutions, with exceptional holdings of cash and Government obligations and comparatively little need for protection have been, understandably, among the most insistent that something should be done. The pending bill provides relief in a rather ingenious way. The old premium of one-twelfth of 1 perment of deposits is retained, but the bill provides that each year 60 percent of the assessment income remaining after operating costs and losses would be refunded. This method will obviate the need of changing the rate of assessment with changes in conditions and, under prevailing conditions, it is said to result in a reduction of about 55 percent in the amount member banks will pay in assessments.

The ability of the FDIC to grant this relief without impairing its ability to make good on its guaranties is illustrated by its year-end figures. During 1949, the Corporation collected from assessments and other sources a total of $145,514,301. Its losses were $641,183, and its expenses $6,781,331. There was

therefore, a balance for surplus of $138,091,786 and, after completing the repayment of the original capital of $289,000,000, the surplus still stood, as stated above, at $1,203,952,687. In addition, the law already allows the Corporation to borrow from the Treasury up to $3,000,000,000 at one time. This borrowing power has never been utilized.

Through curious contradictory conditions, which one might expect to encounter only in officialdom, this insuring agency is denied access to the records of the institutions it insures except, in the majority of cases, with the consent of other agencies. Member banks, so-called, are subject to examination by the Federal Reserve, and National banks are subject to the Controller of the Currency. This leaves only nonmember insured State banks subject to direct examination by FIDC without possible intervention by an intermediate Federal authority. The Controller of the Currency is, it is true, an ex officio member of the Board of FDIC making, after a fashion, an interlocking of direction so far as National banks are concerned. But, as regards those institutions which are subject to the direct supervision of the Federal Reserve, there exists a measure of conflict of interest not dissimiliar to that which has existed in other matters between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. Thanks to cooperation in the past, this overlapping of authority has caused no differences of importance, but there are many who consider it rather anomalous that an insuring agency should not enjoy, free from even possible technical impediment, the fullest access to the subject it is called upon to insure.

After the smooth sailing the pending measure has had in the Senate, it is expected to encounter no serious opposition in the House. The banks, we believe, are entitled to the relief that is now in prospect for them. And, whatever his other concerns, Mr. John Q. Public can see from the facts revealed by the hearings on the bill, that his ready money is well protected.

Do We Have to Vote for This? I Did Not!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the statements made in the following press report is characteristic of the extravagance and waste of public funds appropriated for European relief organizations. Instead of appropriating money to that wonderful relief organization, the Red Cross, and broadening its power to succor the distressed people of Europe. We were induced to set up a new organization, the UNNRA and appropriated billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to pay exorbitant salaries and employ incompetent and wasteful personnel. Now we are appropriating more of our taxpayers' money under similar conditions.

There is inserted herewith an illuminating article appearing in the April 2 edition of the New York Post:

ECA "FEUDAL BARONS" FEATHER THEIR NESTS IN VIENNA

(By Seymour Freidin)

VIENNA, April 1.—The cold war apparently has made no impression on Marshall plan officials here.

They have just spent $40,000 in counterpart funds refurnishing swank homes so they can rough it in an opulent roccoco style to which they have never been accustomed.

The three highest ECA executives in Austria contended today they had not exceeded the legal maximum Washington entitles them for allowances.

But the point they have overlooked in trying to act like feudal barons is that they are deep behind the iron curtain here, where the Marshall plan is subject to the closest scrutiny by the Russians.

Their insistence on gorgeous tapestries, oriental rugs, ornate swimming pools, and antique chairs certainly does not provide an effective reply locally to Communist charges that the Marshall plan is meant only to enhance American profits and comforts at the Europeans' expense.

John B. Wilson, trying to cover up for his superiors, declined to produce figures under administrative expenses which are drawn from counterpart funds. Wilson tried to slide out with "the figures are just like the loyalty files in Washington, they're secret."

The counterpart funds are derived from the local currencies which governments pay into a pool for Marshall plan goods. They are supposed to be used for reconstruction purposes, except for a small percentage allocated for Marshall plan administrative costs.

Under this, Deputy Administrator William Giblin spent the equivalent of $25,000 to redecorate a four-garage house. Top Administrator Clyde King used $9,000 for little end tables, and Mark Sanborn, another Deputy, took $6,000 for making his place a better cocktail rendezvous.

Giblin, whose previous service consisted of handing out Red Cross sandwiches to soldiers in Britain, said he intended to pay for the bedroom murals in his house. That's a nice gesture, but why he requires a swimming pool flanked by huge figures of water-spouting frogs to help his work should be examined by Congress.

For all this unnecessary expenditure the Marshall plan can only suffer. The funds could have been used for road building or for houses for crowded Austrian families.

Something should be done about such crass disregard of responsibility which is beginning to assume large proportions among many top Marshall plan echelons in Europe.

Role of Cooperatives in America—Address by Jerry Voorhis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by a former Member of this House, Jerry Voorhis, now executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., before the seventh annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

With characteristic ability, Mr. Voorhis has told of the role that cooperatives and cooperation play in our modern democracy. I agree wholeheartedly with my good friend that cooperatives are the most democratic way imaginable of conducting our business enterprises—for consumer is also owner, and he takes a direct interest in seeing that his business is run in his interest and in the interest of his community.

I commend this fine address to my colleagues:

SPEECH OF JERRY VOORHIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U. S. A., TO THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, MARCH 8, 1950

All through history the peoples of the earth have applied one basic method of meeting the problems and dangers that beset them. That method has been a joining together of many people to give mutual aid and assistance to one another. Upon that method were built the tribes, the clans, the city states of ancient times. Without it, no modern nation could exist, nor could civil peace be preserved. Mutual aid has always been the answer of the common people to oppression and exploitation by the few, to the danger of violence from those who would violate the law or break the peace, to the concentration of political, social, or economic power in mighty hands. Mutual aid runs through history like a golden thread. For it has been the greatest civilizing influence of all times.

By means of mutual aid the people have attempted to protect themselves against the worst ravages of war. By applying mutual aid broadly enough, courageously enough, and deeply enough, peace on earth could be made possible.

Another name for mutual aid is cooperation. Cooperatives as we know them, whether REA cooperatives or farm-supply cooperatives, or credit unions, or health or housing cooperatives, or cooperative stores—whatever particular kind they may be, cooperatives are simply the application in our times of the basic Christian principle of mutual aid to the everyday economic problems of the people.

The arm of the Lord was not shortened on the day that man dared to take the energy of the universe and fashion it into a weapon capable of wiping out human lives by the millions. Indeed we may be sure the moral law is as inexorable as it ever was. It is well that we remember these things.

For there are facts about our present situation that are more fraught with meaning for the future of man on this earth than we may like to realize.

The question before our generation is whether mankind will act in this crisis as lower forms of life have acted in ages past or whether man will prove that he is indeed God's greatest and highest work. Other forms of life have flourished mightily upon the earth only to disappear, leaving behind only fossil remains. Well, we have populated the earth; some say we are on the point of overpopulating it. And unless we can apply mutual aid to the organization of our life the world probably is overpopulated. Man has piled smartness on smartness, scientific discovery on scientific discovery until at last we stand on the threshold of the ultimate achievement of scientific smartness—the ability to destroy ourselves and the world as a place of habitation. Only a little way further down this road and man will have followed the dinosaurs, all-powerful rulers of the world in their day, down the way to oblivion.

But man need not do this, not if he uses the resources with which he has been blessed. For man was not born for self-destruction. He was given the insight and the knowledge of spiritual and moral powers which are sufficient to save himself and to harness his own powers and turn them to good. But this we shall not be able to do unless we use all of the best and deepest resources with which God has endowed us.

And by every bit of testimony of every great teacher humanity has ever known the basic resource man possesses to overcome his problems is the ability to work together, to apply mutual aid and cooperation to the dangers that beset us. Somehow, some way

we must organize the will to peace, the will to live of all the simple people around the world into institutions that will be powerful enough to control the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb and direct them not to war but to the keeping of the peace—indeed to the enforcement of peace over the will to war of any nation.

What has all this to do with the business of this meeting? A very great deal.

Let us ask why these terrible weapons have been created. They have not been created because the people have wanted war. They have been created because the people in certain nations have lacked the strength within themselves to be masters of their own fate. The people, lacking strength in themselves, have permitted all-powerful dictators to rule over them. That is why the very life of man is threatened today.

And so we must seek the only answer there can be to man's danger. That answer lies in building the strength of the people. But it cannot be built from the top down. It has to be built beginning in the communities of the world, especially the rural communities; and then on the basis of strong communities we can build a structure of peace and plenty for all mankind. This is why this meeting and every other cooperative meeting is a matter of such tremendous importance right now.

Now the way the strength of the people is torn down is when they lack responsibility for their own fate—either their personal fate or their political fate or their economic fate. It makes little difference whether it is an all-powerful dictator government that takes away the peoples' responsibility or whether it is a giant economic or financial monopoly that does it.

On the other hand the way the strength of the people is built up is when they have the will and the means and the method and the tools to take command of their own welfare, beginning with their basic economic welfare.

What we are fighting for is the right of the people to own, to operate, to be responsible for their own businesses, and their own institutions of every sort to bring about their own welfare and salvation.

We have just got through defending that right before the Ways and Means Committee. We are trying to defend it in a thousand communities all over this country today. That's what you have met for here in this great annual meeting. It is what the Cooperative League exists to do.

But it is not enough just to defend. We have got to have a position program of building broader and broader the strength of the people. That's the basic answer to communism and to fascism all around the world.

Well, a lot of wonderful progress has been made. No less than 10,000,000 American families are members of one kind of cooperative or another in this country today. They have found the middle way for the United States of America between dependence on private monopoly on the one hand and dependence on all-powerful Government on the other.

Cooperative organization of the people's own businesses restores ownership to the people who have lost it. It spreads ownership—and with ownership responsibility—to millions of citizens who can have that experience in no other way. Cooperation is the restoration of vital, vigorous, democracy in the communities where the people live.

Cooperatives are formed by the people for one purpose and only one—to supply some need for goods or services. Therefore they automatically solve the problem that has plagued every so-called free economy in the world, the problem of keeping supply and demand in balance. Cooperatives produce and distribute to meet needs. They produce for a market that already is assured and measured. The more fully they satisfy that market the greater their success. They can never be afraid of full production and full employment—because their only purpose is to meet the needs of people.

Where cooperatives are strong in an industry that whole industry must produce abundantly—to meet coop competition. This is the reason they can save freedom for everyone, including their competitors. An economy in which cooperatives are strong—where they do 15 percent or so of the business can be proof against depression.

Cooperatives have brought the practice of thrift and an abundance of credit to 5,000,000 American families—credit union members—who did not have it before.

Cooperatives have brought an abundance of electricity to over 3,000,000 farmers—who didn't have it before. They have brought that electricity at costs the farmers can afford. They have made American farming a modern industry and they have done it by preserving and strengthening the family-sized owner-operated farm.

Cooperatives have brought petroleum products and ownership of their own petroleum supplies to 1,500,000 families who otherwise would have suffered shortages and exorbitant costs.

Cooperatives have fed our soil with fertilizer which farmers could not have afforded had not their own cooperative businesses been doing 15 to 20 percent of the business in this field.

Cooperatives have brought hospitals and health care to hundreds of thousands of people who could have them no other way.

Cooperatives have enabled the people to insure themselves through their own insurance companies, to build their own financial institutions, and thus to control their own savings and begin to build their own financial security.

These things cooperatives—the middle way—have already accomplished.

They can and must do more.

Cooperatives can build houses just because people need homes, and they can build and maintain those homes at costs the people can afford. But to do this on a substantial scale, we need equal access to low-interest financing such as legislation now before the Congress would provide.

Cooperatives can build health centers where people need health centers.

Cooperatives can stop both inflation and deflation and restore to the people economic power over the flow of the supplies of the goods and services they need.

By returning to the people as patrons all margins between costs and selling prices, cooperatives can keep buying power always in balance with production. This can render depressions impossible. Applied to trade between nations, the patronage refund can keep international trade balances always even—can lift the burden of unpayable debt from poorer nations and can stop the flow of useless gold to creditor nations.

Here is the "Middle Way for the U. S. A." Even for the world of 1950 it offers a way of abundance and peace by restoring control of their own destinies and responsibility for their own destinies to the people once again.

Here is hope.

But only the people themselves can make that hope real. No small cooperative movement can meet the present desperate situation. Our job is to build our cooperatives to 6 or 8 times their present size, for then we the people will be able by the impact of our people's businesses, to make freedom, security, and abundance—all 3—possible for all America.

I have not picked this figure of a 7-fold growth out of the air. It is based on the fact that co-ops today are doing about 1½ percent to 2 percent of the Nation's business. But we know that in the lines like fertilizer, for example, where co-ops do 15 percent of the business in certain states you get a fine satisfying influence on the whole industry. Well 7 times 2 percent would be 14 percent.

This is no time, then, for us to be wondering whether or not we can succeed in our cooperative endeavors and enterprises. We can succeed simply because we must do so. The very chance for life of our children and our children's children depend upon it. And if we have a spark of religious faith—and I am sure most of us have much more than that—we must know that God does not leave mankind helpless, but that we are given powers of mind and spirit equal to our tasks, however difficult they may be.

Now as long as the peoples' business in their co-ops is a small affair no one complains about it very much. But just as soon as the people begin to develop real economic strength, then there starts an attack upon them. This has always been so, all through history.

To be more specific, as long as REA co-ops are dependent for their supply of power on the big power companies there isn't much complaint. The complaint and the attacks start up with vigor and sometimes with viciousness just as soon as the REA co-ops begin to generate their own power and thus make sure they can supply their members needs all the time and fully. So this is the real fight right now, as I see it, and you may be sure the Cooperative League will back you to the very limit all the way and work with you in every manner you suggest. Not that I'm suggesting that REA co-ops should generate all or even a major part of the power they use. But they must have the right to generate, and they must actually own enough generating capacity here and there to provide security for their members and to give to all America a yardstick of what that power ought to cost.

In other words, the REA co-ops must always have enough generating capacity to prove, and to prove over and over again, that the people can supply themselves wherever necessary. There is enough experience already to show that as long as REA co-ops are completely dependent on outside sources for power supply they will from time to time be told that there isn't enough juice and that they'd better sell out the whole farmers' REA system to the power company. That's going to happen more and more as the co-ops pay off their debt to the Government and own their system free and clear. The first co-op or two that sells out may get a fancy price. But if the farmers fall for these propositions, the price is going to go down and down. It will go down because the strength of the people has gone down.

The same can be said about the materials you need—like aluminum—where you have shown the courage and the foresight to make a contract to break the monopoly to bring down the price and to increase the supply—not only for your own benefit but for the benefit of the whole United States.

This is cooperation and mutual aid at its best.

Today the Congress has given a green light for the development of a real telephone system for rural America. It will be, in some respects, a harder job than rural electrification. It will require a substantial equity payment of the members, because telephone systems are service systems pure and simple and do not generate cash savings like electric systems can do. But all this and much more effort will be worth it if we can develop telephone systems and central facilities belonging to the people who need and use them and providing a real area coverage for our farm people. State cooperative councils, cooperative regional wholesales and the Cooperative League are more than ready to help in any way we can. Rural electrification is one great forward step. Good rural communication should be, and can be the next one.

Every co-op and every American today has to be concerned with a conspiracy—it can only be called that—to smash any business conducted for the direct benefit of the people, rather than for its own profit.

For many years your organization has stood side by side with all other cooperatives in a successful fight to expose and turn back a sinister racket known as NTEA. This outfit, financed largely by really big business, including utilities, has preyed on legitimate small-business men in an effort to smash the best friend that small-town merchants have—the farmers' cooperatives. Its propaganda has been plastered by the millions of dollars worth across the Nation, trying to blacken the business reputations of farm people.

Its co-op "buck" has been exposed as phony and suppressed by Treasury agents; a spotlight of publicity has been turned on the efforts of one of its officers to offer a $10,000 campaign fund to a United States Senator if he would do NTEA's bidding. He refused. Recently the House Small Business Committee presented conclusive evidence that this so-called small-business organization is no more nor less than a front for some of the biggest businesses in the Nation.

Still, thousands of small-business men all across our land continue to be duped by this sinister and unremitting propaganda—simply because they do not know where their friends are. We have not told them often enough nor loud enough nor in a united way.

Money is no object to the NTEA backers and those allied with them. Nearly every day we get new evidence of the vast extent of the conspiracy against the plain people of America who have the audacity to go into business for themselves.

Last month the NTEA started a campaign of using bankers to try to raise funds all over the Midwest to attack not only the co-ops but all nonprofit businesses competing with the banks. These letters named credit unions and PCA's and farm loan associations and mutual savings banks and building and loan associations, if you please. These shake-down letters are addressed to the very same small-town bankers who depend for their very livelihood on the savings and investments of the farmers and townsfolk who belong to these nonprofit associations.

Last week in this very hall spokesmen for the real-estate lobby had the nerve to get up and cry "socialism" at the efforts of the middle-income families of this Nation to get decent housing at a fair price the co-op way. These were the very same real-estate interests that themselves have gratefully, for many years, accepted Government guaranties through the FHA for their mortgage-lending and home-building operations.

But when the unions and the veterans and the religious bodies of this country dare to try to speak for their members in an effort to organize co-ops to take advantage of this very same type of credit guaranties—no, that is socialism.

It appears to make an awful lot of difference for whose benefit the peoples credit is used. And always remember the credit of the United States belongs to all the people.

You folks in the electric co-ops have had to take a lot of this abuse, too. First it was socialism when farmers went into the business of stringing power lines out into the country, using their own good credit made available to them through their Government and getting a lot less of it at that than big business got through the RFC. Then the power companies found it wasn't socialism, but pretty good business, to build lines out to the farmers. So they did. They built many lines and electrified many farms for the first time in their history. But they still fought the REA.

But pretty soon the power companies ran short of power. So you farmers started to build your own generating plants and transmission lines. What happens? The power companies start their propaganda mill all over again. They hire a firm of hot-shot public-relations people to spread the scare headlines across the Nation and to try to say that if farmers own and run their own businesses that is somehow socialistic. Actually, of course, it is just the opposite. But the propaganda mill says liberty is threatened.

Do they mean the liberty of people to crowd into two-room apartments, or milk by hand, or talk over a spluttering old hand-crank telephone, or market their grain at the price set by the big millers, or buy their feed at the big feed merchants' prices?

That's not the kind of American liberty we're talking about here in this meeting or in other co-op meetings. We are working to establish the full liberty of the American people to have a share in ownership of American enterprise, to take responsibility for it, to work out their own problems.

We in the co-ops have never attacked profit business. In fact we would be very foolish if we did not want profit business to make a fair profit in the housing field, or in the field of rural power, rural telephones, or feed, or fertilizer or credit or insurance. This is a big country. There are plenty of needs to be served. There is room for business of all kinds to serve those needs. All we want is to have a fair percentage of the business in the ownership of the people themselves, freely and voluntarily joined together.

And we do say that just as we want businessmen, small and large, to make a fair profit, so do we demand the right of people—on the farm and in the city—to run whatever businesses they choose without profit if they so desire.

And just as we grant the right of any business to seek loans from our Government if it so desires, so do we demand the right of the people to have the same right to their own credit for their non-profit businesses.

Our eyes are open now. We see that the attack is aimed squarely at the people and that every business that depends on the peoples' prosperity and earning power for its success—and that's most business—is also under attack.

That's the attack that we cooperators—all of us—face in the America of the 1950's. It is an insidious attack—now secret, now open—always well-financed, always well-coordinated, planned and directed. And it will only stop when cooperatives in America are so well-established that no one can hope any longer to destroy them.

What can we do to combat it? Our ranks are not closed as are the ranks of our enemies. In the rural communities we have a major story to tell. We have not told it. We need to tell the places where we live—yes, and our own members—what we have done to cut costs of power and credit and insurance; what we have done to bring better quality farm products to the people. We need to tell what we are doing to improve and extend telephone service for farmers; how we are trying to lick the housing shortage for millions of veterans and other middle-income people and their wives and children. Through State and local cooperative councils, through joint action of all the co-ops in each community we can get together our stories of how co-ops have built and will go on building the strength of the people and the strength of their local communities.

We need to stand together, we co-ops, right in our home town, where we do business and where we save money for our members so they can buy at home. We need to tell this story up and down every Main Street in America, with a voice so clear and so united that no one can miss it.

We are attacked together. We must stand together to fight back and to do more than fight back—to tell our story of the co-ops as the middle way for a better America and a better world.

Another Hitchhiker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Allegan Gazette, published at Allegan, Mich., on March 27, last, was a thought-provoking editorial which reads as follows:

ANOTHER HITCHHIKER

Settlement of the coal strike represents a victory for arson, dynamiting, kidnaping, assault and battery, political conspiracy, chicanery, and extortion.

While a timid and fearful Truman twiddled his thumbs in Washington, John L. Lewis and his coal miners stormed and captured the coal industry causing untold misery and damage to the public.

During the campaign against their own coal operators, the goon squads—with the aid of dynamite and the Molotov cocktail, threats and actual warfare—closed down the nonunion mine.

When Truman finally invoked the Taft-Hartley law Lewis blandly ordered the miners back to work. For the first time in history the union miners refused to follow Lewis, they refused to return to work and as a consequence the union was tried for contempt.

A New Deal judge listened to the evidence and it was held that the union was not in contempt and it is our conclusion that either a sympathetic Attorney General tried the case with his left hand and his tongue in his cheek or a sympathetic, politically minded judge decided the refusal of about 500,000 miners to return to work at the same time was 500,000 coincidences.

Then when the coal supply was reduced to about zero Lewis negotiated and delivered his ultimatum, either meet our terms or nationalize the coal industry.

The coal operators rather than surrender their mines to Truman, to be used by him and his bureaus as a vast social experiment, gave in.

Lewis and his union are destroying a free competitive coal industry. The are destroying employment in the coal industry. They are creating a situation where coal will be a drug on the market. Then our social planners will say that competitive, capitalistic system has failed and the Government will have to subsidize the coal industry and the miners.

It is a fight between those who work to earn their way through life and those who want to live without working.

Soon this country will have another parasite industry not pulling its share of the load, riding on the wagon instead of pulling in harness.

If the trend continues, everybody will be riding, but, gentlemen, we won't be going anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if, in addition to regular wages, to a right to unemployment compensation, the employees of more and more industries are to enjoy pensions, those pensions must be paid for by adding the cost thereof to the price of each unit produced and sold by such industry.

The flaw in the plan is that the cost must always be added to the price of the article sold, and, ultimately, that price may get so high, as it has in coal, that fewer people buy, and ultimately

the sales drop off, the market is destroyed, unemployment follows.

The point is that no individual, no group of individuals, can for always enjoy special privileges, special benefits, at the cost of the public, without eventually destroying the economic balance.

Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we are coming near the close of the debate on this ECA bill, which carries approximately $3,000,000,000 in aid, mostly to European countries, for the coming year. We expended during the first fiscal year almost $6,000,000,000, during the second year a little over $4,000,000,000, and this year it will be about $3,000,000,000.

From the beginning I have generally favored a program of giving the Marshall-plan countries a sufficient amount of help in this distress, but have advocated only giving them enough help to encourage them to extend their own efforts to the limit in rebuilding their countries. I have felt that if we were too liberal and give them too much they would depend upon us to too great an extent and would not put forth the individual effort required on their part.

In 1948 I offered an amendment to the bill to reduce it by $1,500,000,000. I felt at that time that we were appropriating too much. My amendment was voted down and the bill was finally passed. However, when we came to the end of the year and took up the 1949 bill we found that try as they would, we had appropriated so much money they could not spend the nearly $6,000,000,000 and they had left over almost $1,500,000,000. It appears that I was nearer right at that time than those who voted down the amendment thought.

In the 1949 bill many of us urged a greater reduction than was made. Again our amendments to reduce the bill were defeated.

Now again when we come to consider the 1950 bill we find that there is left over unspent from the 1949 appropriations, $150,000,000. That is a lot of money. I supported the motion to cover this $150,000,000 back into the Treasury but again we failed.

We have, however, made some progress in passing the Case amendment that has reduced the amount asked for by $250,000,000 and we have cut out of title III enough to reduce it to about $25,000,000.

Frankly, it is my opinion that the Vorys amendment offered by one of the ablest members of this committee to reduce the amount by $500,000,000 which was again defeated by the majority of the House should have been approved.

Mr. Speaker, my greatest opposition to this bill is title III, that bold new program suggested by the President in his inaugural speech on January 20, 1949. Title III in this bill should be stricken out. It has no place in this legislation. It seeks to get the foot in the door with a small appropriation that could, and likely will, develop into a never-ending world-wide WPA at the expense of the American Government and the American taxpayers.

It sets up a world-wide program of relief before we have finished the 4-year Marshall-plan program, which is the main purpose of this legislation. It appears that it is the initiation of another spending spree which can be developed in full force when the Marshall plan is discontinued. It is a dangerous undertaking. Why should we start another world-wide plan of relief to so-called backward nations until we have completed the Marshall-plan-relief 4-year program?

To give you some idea as to what is contemplated in this bold new plan to aid backward countries which is provided in title III, to which I object, let me read what the committee which drafted this bill states in its report to the House:

> A review of the Department of State's plans for the first-year program show the meaning of section 317 (2) more precisely. The plans include surveys, studies, scientific research, and joint management operations in the following fields: General economic development, agriculture and forestry, hydroelectric power and flood control, highways, transportation, health, social security, housing, communications, etc.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent over a billion dollars in building highways, roads, bridges, power plants, on irrigation and other projects in the European countries during the past 2 years. Now this new program would expand as you will note to any and all other backward nations of the world.

Our debt is so great now, and our budget is so out of balance that appropriations have been reduced for all flood control including power dams, et cetera, by 25 percent. The loss in my district alone from floods which, in high water, overflows hundreds of thousands of acres of land and causes damage to our farms, towns and cities along the Wabash River runs into millions of dollars. I have been urging that the Government spend about $6,000,000 in order to stop this annual waste and give the protection they need and desire to our own citizens. This is only one illustration of many throughout the Nation. I am opposed to adopting title III of this bill and to spending our taxpayers' money in foreign countries for the development of roads, hydroelectric power, flood control or other developments until our debt and taxes have been reduced to the point where we can take care of our own roads and flood-control projects in the interest of our own people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to strike out this title with the hope that the amendment will carry. If title III remains in the bill I shall reluctantly vote against the legislation on final passage.

My vote against this bill if title III remains in it will be to express my opposition to starting this new world-wide program before we have finished the first Marshall plan, and is not to express my opposition to the other provisions of the bill. When this bill comes back to the appropriations committee of the House and that committee has reconsidered the amount and recommends it to the Congress for a vote, I shall then support the measure to provide the funds necessary for the ECA program.

We have been able to reduce this third-year cost to a considerable extent. Marshall plan aid has become the fixed policy of our Government. Now in its third year we are in the position of having made our pledge to, and a contract with these countries to run 4 years. The word of the Government is pledged before the world and must be carried out.

Needed by 1955: 12,000,000 Jobs—Growing Labor Force Offsets Business Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the debate on the general appropriations bill, I pointed out the danger of our growing unemployment. In my opinion, its greatest threat lies in the fact that it does not hit us in the face all at once. It grows for a while, then contracts slightly, then creeps on again.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article that recently appeared in United States News and World Report, which points up the threat very clearly. Since this article appeared, we have learned that unemployment dropped over a half million from February to March. But this should not lull us into inaction—for we should not for a moment lose sight of the fact that at this very moment there are in our high schools 1,200,000 persons, and in our colleges and universities over 400,000 persons who will graduate in May and June and become job seekers. Economists are predicting that unemployment will hit the 5,000,000 mark in June.

As this excellent article points out, an expanding economy is the only answer to growing unemployment. In my opinion, it is the cardinal problem of our domestic policy today:

NEEDED BY 1955: 12,000,000 JOBS—GROWING LABOR FORCE OFFSETS BUSINESS RISE

Despite good times, nearly five million are out of work and the number is growing. Unemployment is beginning to look permanent.

Trouble is growth of the labor force. Jobs cannot open up fast enough to keep abreast, at present business levels.

How to meet the future is the problem. Public works, earlier and bigger pensions, shorter work week, all are suggested remedies.

Five years from now, unless business activity rises steadily from the present high level, there may be 12,000,000 unemployed in this country. If business should fail to

hold as high as it is now, the number of unemployed will go above the 12,000,000 mark.

The returning problem of unemployment may be here to stay. It is coming back because of two main factors: (1) the steady flow of new workers into the ranks of job seekers; and (2) the year-by-year gain in man-hour output as industry's huge postwar investment in new and more efficient plant and equipment pays off.

The resulting problem, essentially, is this:

Out of jobs and seeking jobs today are about 4,700,000 individuals. That is about 1,500,000 more than the number of unemployed a year ago. Number of unemployed will shrink seasonally in the period just ahead, but will be greater a year from now unless the general level of business activity rises.

New workers will add 2,900,000 people to the labor force in the years 1950 through 1954. That is the net increase to be expected after allowing for older workers who will drop out of the labor force. The rise in the labor force in this year alone will approach 700,000.

Jobs to be affected by more efficient use of labor total about 4,400,000 from 1950 through 1954. That assumes an annual increase of 2 to 2.5 percent in man-hour output—a gain that is in line with normal experience. Rising hourly wage rates add to pressure on management to find ways to reduce the use of labor.

Added up, as the chart on page 39 shows, the prospect is: 4,700,000 unemployed now, plus 2,900,000 to be added to the labor force, plus 4,400,000 to be displaced by improved efficiency—a total of 12,000,000. This number will be unable to find jobs in 1954 if business activity fails to rise above the present level and if efficiency in use of labor increases at the normal rate.

The 5-year solution to the problem of growing unemployment, if there is to be one, is this:

Total employment will have to climb from the present 57,000,000 civilian jobs to 67,000,000 jobs, if unemployment is to be held below 3,000,000.

Business activity—total spending, called gross product—will have to expand from the present level of $260,000,000,000 a year to $300,000,000,000 in 1954 to provide the needed additional jobs.

This is the total amount that will have to be spent for goods and services to keep the population fully employed. The $300,000,000,000 figure assumes that prices will stay where they are today. In that figure are the total outlays of consumers, home builders, business investors in plant and equipment, and Government spending at all levels, Federal, State and local.

This need for expansion is beginning to worry officials even now. Recent increases in unemployment are not due to a slackening of business activity but to a growth in the labor force. The number of people wanting jobs is increasing faster than the economy is expanding to provide those jobs. At the same time, output per hour is starting to rise again.

The experience of the last year shows what is happening. Total output today is almost as large as it was a year ago. Total civilian employment also is almost as large. The labor force, however, is larger by almost 1,500,000. Result is that unemployment increased by the amount that the labor force increased. At 4,700,000 unemployment is at a postwar high.

If this trend continues, unemployment will exceed 5,000,000 within a year. And unemployment at above 5,000,000 is recognized as a political problem.

Actually, there are only two developments that can prevent a rise in unemployment. Either private industry must expand, providing more jobs in factories, in construction, in trade and services, or the Government must move in.

Business expansion at the rate necessary to provide full employment appears to be a difficult task. High employment in all past periods has been sparked by a high level of investment in plant and equipment and in construction. At present, investment in new plant is falling off, although orders for new equipment recently have increased. The construction industry has been in a boom for 2 years and is headed for a third year of boom in 1950. It seems unlikely that this industry will expand much more.

Most other industries appear to be able to produce as much as people want. The automobile industry expects to meet most of the demand for new cars by the end of this year. There appears to be no urgent demand to expand output of such things as refrigerators, household appliances, or other hard goods. The soft-goods industries already have been producing surpluses. The steel industry apparently is able to satisfy all customers and the coal industry is plagued with too much capacity.

Moderate expansion can be expected through population growth and family growth. The population is likely to increase by 7,000,000 by 1954 and the number of families probably will grow by about 4,000,000. That will add to the demand for the products of industry, but, even with the probable growth ahead, the increase in job seekers may readily out pace that expansion. Any recession in business activity would result in rapid expansion in the number of unemployed.

To provide employment for ten to twelve million more workers by 1955—to reach a $300,000,000,000 output by that time—means that private business investment must continue at a higher rate than in 1949. That expansion also must be steady. In past periods, business expansion never has been steadily upward; its rise has been marked by periodic spurts and set-backs.

However, if private business expansion fails to check the rise in unemployment, political pressure will grow for a Government program to accomplish the same result. In fact, agitation for Government action can be expected if unemployment exceeds five million by this time next year.

The outline of a Government program already is beginning to take shape in official planning.

Public works expansion is under study now. The Federal Government is aiding States and cities with public works planning. On the shelf are Federal projects for river-valley developments, public-power expansion and land reclamation. President Truman's proposal for a New England power program is an example. New England is one of the areas hardest hit by current unemployment.

The experience of the New Deal suggests, however, that public works cannot provide the complete answer to the employment problem. It is unlikely that Mr. Truman's Fair Deal will be content with public works alone.

Higher old-age pensions are being offered as one way to draw older workers out of the labor force to make way for newcomers. Experience suggests, however, that, as jobs become harder to find, persons with jobs are reluctant to give them up. Union contracts, moreover, usually stress seniority that gives older workers a first claim on the jobs that are available.

A shorter workweek is another suggestion that is stirring in Government and union circles as a solution for unemployment. Agitation for a 30-hour week was intense in the early days of the New Deal, and a 40-hour week finally was established through the wage-and-hour law. A shorter workweek could be established by an amendment to the present law. That law already has been amended to push the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

Reduction of the standard workweek from 40 to 35 hours would mean a cutback of one-eighth in total hours of labor for one worker. Applied to a working force of 40,000,000, a 35-hour week would mean an additional 5,000,000 jobs to produce the same volume of output. The appeal of such a device could become important in a period of rising unemployment.

At present, proposals for treating unemployment are still in the discussion stage. The official hope is that the rising trend will be reversed in the months ahead and the problem may solve itself. But, if unemployment is higher a year from now, proposals for a shorter workweek promise to become a political issue.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Otto W. Glade, the alert editor of the East Orange (N. J.) Record, has made a thorough survey of the housing situation in that city. In the second of this most timely series of articles on the subject, appearing in the March 30 issue, Mr. Glade states there is no lack of apartments in the $75 to $180 a month bracket for two to five rooms, but that the shortage is still most acute for the great majority of tenants in need of four- or five-room apartments renting for between $55 to $65 a month. The pattern in East Orange is, of course, duplicated in other cities throughout the country, and I believe the editorial on the subject in the March 30 Record is deserving of the attention of all Members:

THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

How bad is the housing shortage in East Orange? Articles in the Record this week and last seem to point out that it isn't bad at all if you've got the money to pay more than $75 a month for an apartment. But if you haven't, you may have to live in a cellar somewhere.

George Seiler of East Orange, president of the New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, aptly describes the situation when he says "There's no shortage of roofs." He's right. If you have the money, there's no housing shortage. If you don't you're just another name on the long list at City Hall trying to get into one of the city-owned barracks. What's the answer?

One school of economics says it is up to the Federal, State, or city government to take care of the low-income families and provide housing for them. Another school says leave it up to private capital. They'll build enough homes and apartments. Most of them will be for upper-income families but as the upper-income group moves to new apartments their old housing will become available for those looking for homes at lower prices. In this way, they say, residents now living in East Orange's older apartments will move into newer structures, the people living in lower-priced apartments will move into the apartments just vacated, and the veterans now living in temporary barracks will move into that housing.

It sounds good on paper. But does it work that way? The answer is evidently

"No" here in East Orange. New apartments have been building at a rapid rate since the war, most of them in the high-rent brackets and they've been rented almost as fast as they've been built. But the housing shortage still exists. Most of the families moving into the new developments are from places other than East Orange, or if they are from the city, they formerly lived with in-laws or are just married and had no previous home. They aren't vacating premises that can be used by someone else. Those living in older apartments aren't moving into new developments because of the huge difference in rent between the Government-controlled figure they're paying and the noncontrolled figure 25 percent or more higher.

Those apartments which do become available in the lower brackets (and in East Orange that means $50 to $70) come as the result of families moving from apartments to homes that they have bought, usually farther out in the suburbs. Thus, all the new building means little relief for the person looking for lower-rent housing.

Rents seem likely to go up before they come down and if the day comes when rents do drop, incomes will probably drop along with them.

Private builders say they can't put up apartments in East Orange that will rent for less than about $25 a room. And they say in the same breath that the Government should stay out of the housing business and should not subsidize home building.

But the truth is that unless the city, or State, or the Federal Government provides homes for persons in the low- or lower-middle income groups, they won't be able to live in East Orange and the city will become a restricted community of upper-income families.

There's no question that the housing shortage still exists. It may not be as bad now as it was in the years just after the war but it is still with us. Families are still living in cellars and in crowded quarters with relatives, right here in East Orange. That shortage will end only when enough homes are provided for persons who need them and at a price they can afford to pay.

Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A pen and ink letter which a statesman might use for a dozen speeches comes from two of my constituents who hold no college degrees.

Let the wise planners, who know all about everything except hard work and thrift, read and profit.

The letter reads as follows:

PAW PAW, MICH., *March 9, 1950.*
Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to have Hoover Commission recommendations adopted.

We as taxpayers are wanting end of waste as we know you are by your letters to us. And we know you are doing all you can to help us, but feel you need to know how much we appreciate your work.

We do not want socialized medicine. There are claims made that people earning less than $3,000 cannot pay for proper medical care. We never had income that high, but have always paid our doctor, dentist, and hospital bills. We own our farm and have no debts. We do not want any type subsidies or plan to help farmers. When farmers are left to run their own business they do not produce to be destroyed then paid for by taxpayers.

If any individual run their business as bad as Government runs things, everyone would soon starve. Government seems to enjoy wasting everything and has, since 1932.

We never thought social security plan to help anyone but just a device to allow Government to snoop into everyone's business.

Most people getting old-age pension do not really need it and lie and cheat to get it.

We do not want DP's to come to the United States of America as we have many unemployed and needing homes.

Our worst trusts are labor unions, not A. & P. Grocery or Drug Co., and unions should pay tax on income same as any corporation. Also, co-ops should pay tax.

Hope no more money is sent to foreign countries either as gifts or loans.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN OTTEN.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid speech made by Joseph C. Duggan, of New Bedford, Mass., formerly special assistant to the Attorney General, and former first assistant United States attorney in Massachusetts, the evening of March 16, 1950, before the Robert Emmet Club, of New Bedford, Mass.:

It has been the custom, on occasions like the present to dwell at length on the glories and the miseries of Ireland in times past. Tales of saints and scholars have been embroidered with oratorical artistry—heroes have been orated into legends—and the beautiful isle of the west has been delineated beyond the point of exaggeration as an earthly paradise.

Fitting, indeed, have been these encomiums of Ireland and all things Irish. But as the Irish stock has been assimilated into the warp and woof of America, the tendency has been to look with nostalgia to the past, and to overlook entirely the emergence of the strong and vibrant democracy that is modern Ireland as a full-fledged member of the commonwealth of nations.

It is modern Ireland and her last problem that I would talk of with you tonight.

Recent events concerning Ireland and our own great Nation have emphasized Ireland's coming of age internationally. The raising of our mutual legations in Dublin and Washington to ambassadorial rank signifies the recognition of Ireland as an equal with other great powers in the eyes of our statesmen and diplomats. The successful negotiation of a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and the Republic of Ireland clearly indicates that Ireland has cut the last tie with the British crown, and that hereafter she shall conduct her own foreign relations as a fully independent sovereignty.

The fact which made these events possible was the effective promulgation of the Republic of Ireland Act on Easter Monday of 1949. To those whose memory goes back to 1916, I need not dwell upon the reason why that date was chosen for launching the Republic into international waters. The date last year does not signify the declaration of the Republic or its independence, for these had been most effectively taken care of on previous historic occasions.

An Irish Republic was first proclaimed as far back as 1798 by the united Irishmen. This first republican uprising, symbolically enough, originated in Belfast and was led mainly by Irish Presbyterians. That effort was not only the first republican movement, but it marked the clarion call for Catholic emancipation and freedom of conscience, thus laying the foundation for the absolute toleration which characterizes the present Irish Constitution.

On Easter Monday in 1916, the republic was again proclaimed and subsequently ratified by the will of the Irish people. It remained, however, for the recurrence of that date in 1949 for the Republic of Ireland to be internationally recognized as such.

Between these two dates, the voice of Ireland was not unheard in the council of world affairs. And it is safe to assert that if that voice had been heeded the world might have been spared the blood bath of the Second World War. For it was the Premier of Ireland, presiding over the old League of Nations, who cried out in vain for effective sanctions against Italian aggression in Ethiopia and Japanese barbarism in Manchuria.

De Valera then spoke from a bitter knowledge of the trials of a small nation. His words fell on deaf ears. America sat on the sidelines—and the Italian and Japanese delegates walked out. The testing grounds for a second world conflict had been chosen.

Ironically, Ireland is in a position today where her voice may not even be raised.

The veto of Godless Soviet Russia in the United Nations Organization bars Christian Ireland from the world parliament. And while that Assembly, without even the common sense to seek divine guidance, fumbles along in the icy heat of a cold war, the honor of Ireland prevents her inclusion into the Atlantic Pact because of the stupid perpetuation of a policy of partition by Great Britain in Northern Ireland.

It is this partition which is the last problem in Ireland. It cannot be viewed through other than Irish eyes.

The modern Irish Constitution, adopted in 1938, contains two significant phrases. It declares, first, that Ireland is a sovereign, independent, democratic state, and secondly, that the national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland, its islands, and the territorial seas.

Yet, within a month after the Republic of Ireland severed its last ties with British External Relations Office, in May of 1949, the British Parliament perpetrated its latest act of intrusion into the internal affairs of Ireland by passing the so-called "Ireland bill." It presumed to declare that "Northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's dominion and of the United Kingdom and affirms that in no event will Northern Ireland cease to be a part of His Majesty's dominion and of the United Kingdom without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland."

Thus, by solemn legislative act, Great Britain upholds the hand of its own creature which it foisted upon Ireland by the iniquitous Partition Act of 1920. A glance at any map of Ireland before that date 30 years ago will not disclose the division which exists today.

An artificial border was created, effected, and is now maintained by Great Britain. British customs operate that border. British troops occupy the area that has been cut

away. And British finances maintain the Belfast government. These are the realities of the situation—and no specious argument can rationalize them away.

After 12 generations of successive programs of confiscation, degradation, exile, and death the freedom and national integrity of the Irish people today extends to only 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland.

This partition has severed from the Irish Nation some of the most hallowed and cherished shrines erected during her age-long history:

The archbishopric of Armagh—the see of St. Patrick;

Downpatrick, where the great bishop and confessor is buried and where rests the remains of Brian, who drove the invader from Ireland at Clontarf;

Bangor, the site of one of Ireland's most famous and ancient schools;

The Derry of St. Columkille;

The Tyrone of the O'Neills;

Belfast itself, the birthplace of the united Irishmen;

MacArt's Fort, where Wolfe Tone took his oath never to cease his efforts for Irish independence.

These and a thousand other storied spots today do not and cannot fly the flag of the Republic of Ireland.

And to realize the loss, I ask you to try to imagine a United States of America without Philadelphia, Lexington, or Concord—and American catholicism without the primatial see of Baltimore.

There are those who argue that this division is both desired by the people and justifiable.

The facts indisputably prove the contrary to be true.

Long before the First World War the problem of national integrity for Ireland was well on the way to solution under the enlightened "home rule" policy of the Gladstone and Asquith governments. The "Unionist" faction of the Tory Party frustrated that policy, and then the war intervened.

The Irish attempt to solve the problem by the uprising of 1916 was abortive, but the national plebiscite of 1918 left no doubt as to the mind of the people. Before the elected representatives of those people could consolidate the program of unification, however, Lloyd George succeeded in passing the Partition Act through Parliament with the promise that it was a temporary expedient. The true attitude of his party, however, was clearly revealed in a letter to Sir Edward Carson, the Tory leader in Belfast, wherein he stated that: "We must make it clear that Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland."

Incidentally, it will be noted that the severed portion of Ireland is referred to as Ulster, and the impression is intended to be left that it corresponds to the ancient Irish province of that name.

The fact is, however, that the British Parliament and its puppet government in Belfast could not maintain its rigged majority if it included all of Ulster in the severance.

Only six of the counties in historic Ulster were cut off.

Three of Ulster's nine counties—Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan—had to be excluded from the operation of the act of partition so as not to endanger the dominant electoral position of the Unionist majority around Belfast.

Ironically, then, not only Ireland but Ulster itself was partitioned to constitute northeastern Ireland as a foreign outpost of England across the Irish Sea.

In addition, the six severed counties are so gerrymandered that Unionist majorities are guaranteed. I shall cite only three instances:

In County Tyrone, 60,000 Unionist voters can elect 16 members to the Parliament of Northern Ireland, while 74,000 Nationalist voters can elect only 11 members.

In County Fermanagh, 26,000 Unionist voters elect 13 members, while 33,000 Nationalist voters can return only 7 representatives.

In Derry City, the second largest municipality in the 6 counties, 27,000 Nationalist voters can elect only 8 members to the city council, while 18,000 Unionist voters can chose 12 members.

Over 22 instances of such electoral imbalance can be cited; yet, in spite of the rigged constituencies, Belfast itself elected 2 antipartitionist members and Queens University in that city elected 1.

If the Nationalist minority were allowed a true plebiscite in which the weight of its numbers was honestly counted, its total vote in 4 of the 6 partitioned counties would actually constitute a majority for reunion with the 26 counties of the Republic.

If the reason, therefore, for cutting off the 6 counties from the total of 32 is that a Unionist majority can be assured, then by the same logic, the four counties in which a Nationalist majority is possible should be cut off from the six.

Such reasoning and logic, of course, requires acceptance of the proposition that an actual minority in a whole nation has the right of secession when it happens to be a majority in a small area of that nation. In our own country, a tragic fratricidal war disproved that proposition as a political principle. It is the prayerful hope of the friends of Ireland and Great Britain alike that its fallacy will be realized by the Parliaments of Northern Ireland and Great Britain without resort to such a calamitous extremity.

If the democratic right to self-determination is to apply to any country, there is no country which fulfills the requisite conditions more clearly than Ireland. There are three well established tests:

1. The natural boundaries of the country. No country in the world can claim more absolutely defined natural boundaries than those marked by the seas surrounding Ireland.

2. A distinct national history. Few indeed are the nations which can claim a more clearly defined and age-long national history, dating back long before the days of St. Patrick.

3. A homogeneous people. The inhabitants of the whole island are of the same race, the same color, and speak the same language. True, there is disparity of religion, but if this is ground for partition, then Christian amity would be impossible, and every nation would be split into an infinite number of fragments.

Ireland complies with the three tests more completely than any nation on earth. She has the right, therefore, to be one solidified and integrated nation. Partition, then, is unnatural, unhistoric, and, particularly when imposed from without, completely unjustified.

No realist will dispute the fact that, from time immemorial, the primary concern of Britain with Ireland has been principally a matter of defense.

England has tenaciously clung to Irish territory as a western bastion of her own perimeter of defense.

By insisting upon the continuation of partition, Great Britain undoubtedly serves her own interest in this vital matter, but unfortunately, she also deprives all of the other Atlantic nations of the inestimable boon of a united and integrated Republic of Ireland as a full-fledged signatory to the Atlantic Pact.

The national honor of Ireland prohibits her inclusion while a part of her soil is garrisoned by foreign troops.

A truncated Ireland cannot consistently join in an agreement in which one of the principal pledges is the preservation of the national and territorial integrity of the agreeing parties.

The United States rejoices in her alliance with Great Britain in the noble attempt to achieve the reality of the defense of western civilization by means of the Atlantic Pact.

Our people, however, regret that the shortsighted Irish partition policy of that same ally also prevents the inclusion in the pact of the one country which both England and the United States concede to be of utmost strategic importance to the whole scheme of Atlantic defenses.

And most regrettable, is the fact that such policy blinds the British Government to the obvious conclusion that it would be far better to have the whole of Ireland as a cordial, cooperative partner rather than to hold a small segment of that nation in the face of the righteous resentment of the vast majority of her people.

Great Britain, who owes so much to both Ireland and the United States, now has the opportunity to display the greatest statesmanship of which the genius of her polity is capable.

The Ireland Act of 1949 should be repealed.

All of the people of Northern Ireland—without any electoral tampering—should be given an opportunity, under a neutral arbitration commission if necessary, to express their free choice on the question of national integrity by area-wide plebiscite instead of by gerrymandered districts.

The homogeneity of the Republic of Ireland should be permitted to become a political and territorial fact.

The principle of self-determination should be advocated for Ireland with the same vigor as it is claimed for the countries behind the iron curtain.

Britain's preachment of democracy should find its first practice in Ireland.

Partition in the Emerald Isle should be abolished forthwith so that the republic of a united Ireland may be voluntarily forged as a link of steel in the chain of free nations dedicated to the preservation of western culture and Christian civilization.

The concluding words of Robert Emmet's last public utterance were these:

"When my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written. I have done."

The country of which Emmet spoke was the historic Irish Nation and not merely a portion of it. The Ireland of his day knew no partition.

When the unnatural and artificial border erected by that partition is obliterated, his epitaph may be inscribed in few, simple, but glowing words:

"He died for a free and united Ireland."

The Cost of the Central Arizona Irrigation Project to the Taxpayers of Each State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the construction cost of the central Arizona project, as authorized by the

Senate—S. 75, Eighty-first Congress—is $1,258,780,000. This is made up of the initial project, $708,780,000, plus tunnels, authorized by section 1 of the act to be built at the discretion of the appropriation committees, to cost, with connecting aqueduct, $550,000,000 more.

Even if sales of power provide revenues to repay all this invested capital, the project provides no revenues which the Treasury may use to pay interest upon the national debt that the project creates; all interest money, paid by the power users, is dedicated to pay for irrigation works, as a subsidy to the irrigators. The result is that all interest upon the national debt represented by the construction cost of the project must be met by the Federal taxpayer for about a century, including the period of construction and development, as a concealed subsidy. The total amount of the subsidy to be paid by Federal taxpayers, including the nonreimbursable capital items in addition to this interest burden, is $1,173,000,000.

This national total is broken down by States, according to a standard formula used by tax experts, based on a pro rata of income and other Federal taxes, as follows:

Cost to Nation's taxpayers of central Arizona irrigation project by States

	Percent of total	Cost to taxpayers in interest and nonreimbursable subsidies [1]
Alabama	1.17	$13,724,000
Arizona	.37	4,340,000
Arkansas	.72	8,446,000
California	8.32	97,594,000
Colorado	.80	9,384,000
Connecticut	1.67	19,589,000
Delaware	.40	4,692,000
Florida	1.29	15,132,000
Georgia	1.40	16,422,000
Idaho	.32	3,754,000
Illinois	7.59	89,031,000
Indiana	2.29	26,862,000
Iowa	1.58	18,533,000
Kansas	1.15	13,490,000
Kentucky	1.20	14,076,000
Louisiana	1.22	14,311,000
Maine	.44	5,161,000
Maryland	1.68	19,706,000
Massachusetts	3.40	39,882,000
Michigan	4.71	55,248,000
Minnesota	1.86	21,818,000
Mississippi	.71	8,328,000
Missouri	2.53	29,677,000
Montana	.35	4,106,000
Nebraska	.86	10,088,000
Nevada	.13	1,525,000
New Hampshire	.29	3,402,000
New Jersey	3.29	38,592,000
New Mexico	.28	3,284,000
New York	14.67	172,079,000
North Carolina	1.59	18,651,000
North Dakota	.34	3,988,000
Ohio	5.78	67,799,000
Oklahoma	1.17	13,724,000
Oregon	1.04	12,199,000
Pennsylvania	7.62	89,382,000
Rhode Island	.56	6,569,000
South Carolina	.76	8,915,000
South Dakota	.36	4,223,000
Tennessee	1.37	16,070,000
Texas	4.38	51,377,000
Utah	.34	3,988,000
Vermont	.18	2,111,000
Virginia	1.49	17,478,000
Washington	1.65	19,354,000
West Virginia	.92	10,792,000
Wisconsin	2.10	24,633,000
Wyoming	.18	2,111,000
District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska	1.48	17,360,000
United States total	100.00	1,173,000,000

[1] Even if construction cost of $1,258,780,000 were repaid to Federal Treasury from power revenues.

Silent Meditation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following remarks, which I delivered over the facilities of Station WARL, on Sunday, April 2, 1950, in behalf of the Good Friday Observance Committee of the Greater Washington Area:

"We preach Christ and Him crucified" (First Corinthians 1:23).

Passion is a word of different meanings. The first meaning given in the dictionary is "to suffer." And everyone of us has experienced this type of passion in some form or other. To some it designates pain of body; and, for them, passion is a reminder of physical torture. Experience has taught them to cringe from bodily harm. If they still bear this suffering, then they must cultivate patience, which is the endurance of their torture. Still others are disturbed mentally. Their passion affects the mind; and oftentimes there is danger of mental derangement, because of the acuteness of the agony. They have difficulty in focusing their thought processes because their minds do not function properly.

In either of these cases of bodily or mental passion, there is real suffering. Hence the true meaning of the word is born out: "to suffer." The dictionary next tells us that passion is an intense or overpowering feeling, such as of love or of hate. This passion affects the mind, insofar as the emotion is so strong as to sway the one disturbed. The person undergoing this passion, swerving unsteadily from the path of right reason, often loses common sense. Self-control departs from the individual and passion reigns supreme.

Just a step away from the last kind of passion comes the third meaning of the word. Here passion means a strong impulse to give way to physical indulgence. This type of passion resides primarily in our lower or animal nature; it makes itself felt chiefly in the uprisings of the flesh. Like an untamed, wild and unruly beast, once this passion is unleashed it wreaks havoc upon the person who falls prey to its attack. And when this passion takes over to form an evil habit, then the unfortunate sufferer must endure the terrible physical toll taken by its demands. St. Paul rightly terms this passion as a terrifying "tribulation of the flesh."

Passion, meaning to suffer, is a common human lot. We all endure its pain. Every one of us must undergo its fearful demands. Hence, it behooves us to seek out a balm for our trials. The greatest consolation for our affliction is the passion that Jesus Christ endured for us. The saints, in their trials, took refuge in the wounds of Christ. When temptations of unruly passion assailed them, they had immediate recourse to the crucifix or to the sign of the cross. We make our mistake in not imitating them. We seek outlet from suffering and passion in every soothing sedative of distraction or even recreation. Yet we know that this course only postpones but does not solve our problem. If we would bear up under our passion, ultimately we must recur to the cross.

Good Friday, anniversary day of our Lord's suffering, is fast approaching. The 3 hours' agony will be commemorated in every church. Everyone of us must spend part of our time in prayer during those hours. Preferably, this should be in church. There the priest or minister will bring home to our minds the facts of Christ's passion. There we will find the solution to the mystery of our own passion. If the flesh beckons you on, the wounds of Christ will strengthen you against temptation. If sickness weighs you down, the blood-stained and pain-racked body of Christ will give you new courage. If mental trials beset you, the thorn-crowned head of Christ will lessen your own pain by comparison. This Friday will indeed be good for you if you spend it as you should, on your knees in church. If you are unable, then take your crucifix and study the lesson of patience in passion. He is the Master; you are the servant. The Master suffered; you must suffer. For: "The servant is not above the Master." On His Good Friday, pray Him to help you with the cross of your passion. He will then come to your assistance and take the greater part of your suffering. Go to church this Good Friday; take part in the Passion of Jesus Christ.

May the Lord bless thee, keep thee, and give thee peace.

Year After Tragic Hospital Fire, Effingham Ready To Erect New and Larger St. Anthony's Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago today, the Nation was shocked by a disaster at Effingham, Ill., in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. On that fateful day, the lives of 74 persons were taken as flames swept through St. Anthony's hospital with such devastating rapidity that the rescue of any was the result of the most extreme personal heroism.

Just 1 year later, the city of Effingham has accomplished the gigantic task of raising funds, drafting plans, and completing preparation to build a new and larger hospital, to be known as St. Anthony's Memorial in everlasting honor to those who lost their lives on that tragic morning just a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is courage in communities, as there is in individuals. The people of Effingham have shown courage, as well as great devotion to their community in laboring to overcome the countless obstacles in the path of an undertaking as large as the erection of a modern hospital. But they have overcome every obstacle and now the results are about to materialize in steel and stone. It is a source of satisfaction to know that the Federal Government itself is sharing in the program through the contribution of Federal funds, and the State of Illinois is doing likewise.

One of the newspapermen who went to the scene a year ago revisited it a few days before the first anniversary. He is

Bob Wright, of the editorial department of the Danville Commercial-News. His impression of the scene, 1 year later, is worthy of reading by all who recall the shock of the tragedy. Under permission granted, I am including his article as follows:

PEOPLE STOOD SILENT BESIDE SMOKING RUINS 1 YEAR AGO

(By Bob Wright)

It is doubtful if any resident of Effingham, Ill., noticed that capricious Nature was in one of her moods. Behind the smile of green grass and budding trees, ready to burst into leaf, was the cold, damp breath of winter.

But most of Effingham's 7,000 population stood silent and unmindful of the weather that spring day a year ago. For there was a deeper chill in their hearts that had nothing to do with the time of the year.

The day was April 5, 1949, more tragic in its personal implications for the little southern Illinois town than December 7, 1941.

Before midnight, a spark had flared within the darkened interior of St. Anthony's hospital. With terrifying speed, the spark became a flame, a roaring blaze that swept down corridors of the old, three-story building. And the night, which had begun quietly, became a hideous welter of sights and sounds—an inferno of fire whose yellow light sharply silhouetted the figures of those trapped within as they poised on window sills before leaping for their lives * * * or to their deaths.

By dawn, the strident clamor of the holocaust was stilled. Tired firemen from six departments in as many neighboring cities still played streams of water on stubborn pockets of flame. The blackened walls stood windowless and roofless and a grimmer work—that of removing the dead—was about to begin.

It was on this scene that I arrived later in the morning. National Guardsmen from Mattoon—part of Deanville's own One Hundred and Thirtieth Regiment—patrolled the grounds. The Red Cross with customary speed and efficiency, had flown in emergency medical supplies and was ministering to those who had escaped the fire. Every major press association and news photographic service was represented and a newsreel company crew set up a camera in the middle of the street fronting the hospital.

One of the favorite subjects of the cameramen was a niche in the second story wall, a niche containing a statue of St. Anthony. All around, the brick masonry was scarred and blackened by the flames. The figure of the saint was untouched.

Another much-photographed scene was the very center of the building. There, amidst a jumble of brick and wreckage from the fallen-in roof, was a large metal cylinder, an escape tower, still standing. Ironically, the doors to each floor were closed. In the panic of that awful night, was this comparatively recent safety device forgotton? Or did the flames move too fast, forming a fiery barrier?

At the rear of the hospital is a low, modern brick building, known as St. Joseph's Villa. In happier times, it was used as a recreation center. On that day, it had become a morgue. Before leaving, I counted 22 blanket-shrouded stretchers being carried within.

Later, when rescuers ceased poking amid the ruins, the list of dead was placed officially at 74. Between 30 and 40 had been saved.

I shall never forget the desolation of that scene nor the unnatural stillness of the people affected the most. I shall never forget, too that this tragedy, America's second most costly hospital fire touched off a Nation-wide campaign to strengthen fire precautions in institutions devoted to caring for the sick.

Seeds of Treason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editorial included in my remarks should be read by all Members. It appeared in the Washington News on yesterday.

SEEDS OF TREASON

More than 3,000,000 words of testimony were taken in the Alger Hiss case.

They were rushed into print on a day-to-day basis during the two trials and the congressional committee hearings at such a tempo and with such a conflict of interpretation and emphasis as to leave the public gasping.

Out of this welter of words—and smears—has come a book titled "Seeds of Treason," by two industrious reporters, Ralph de Toledano of Newsweek and Victor Lasky of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

The frightening thing about this book, beside which the paradox of Alger Hiss fades into insignificance, is the picture it presents of a government which so consistently rejected or tried to suppress evidence of the great Communist conspiracy against our way of life.

"Who is more guilty," the authors ask, "the man who passes documents to a Soviet spy ring, or the man who, for whatever reason, sponsors the culprit?"

Uncritical acceptance of Russia and the consequent immunity of Communists in our Government has been a cancerous growth in White House administrations since 1933. Just to cite one case, there is the Russian-born Nathan Gregory Silvermaster.

A Civil Service Commission report about him was quoted as saying that an "overwhelming amount of testimony indicates beyond reasonable doubt [he had] for years been a member and a leader of the Communist Party and very probably a secret agent for the OGPU."

Yet, from August 1935 until March 1946, he moved steadily up in Government service. Why? For one thing, he had a staunch friend in Lauchlin Currie, adviser to President Roosevelt. Silvermaster was never transferred from one job to another, which would have given the Civil Service Commission a chance to refuse him clearance, but was loaned instead.

The primary aim of Communists in those early days was infiltration and the influencing of public policy. Yet the Roosevelt and Truman administration persistently closed their eyes and showed no real determination to root the Communist elements out of the Government. Then when the Reds altered their objective to espionage for Russia they were entrenched.

The Amerasia stolen-documents affair was another case in point. The Justice Department seemed to drag its feet and there was never any public trial of the six persons arrested. And pro-Communist influence in the State Department's Far Eastern Division was never uprooted. Our subsequent China policy succeeded in turning over half of Asia to the Communists.

Such things, we agree, are the real meaning and message of the Hiss case.

And, as the authors summarize:

"Hiss is one man caught in a tragedy of arrogance and self-deception. But there are those who aided and abetted him in their blindness; and their name is legion. Instead of crushing the seeds of treason, they scattered them in the good American earth.

"The Hiss-Chambers drama can be a curtain-raiser of a new steadfastness. Or it can be the last whimper of a tired and demoralized world."

Jefferson Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the annual report of the Jefferson County (Ohio) Soil Conservation District for 1949. The soil-conservation district of Jefferson County, one of the counties in my congressional district, is doing an excellent job of conserving the greatest natural resource in the United States, the topsoil.

The report follows:

JEFFERSON SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT, 1949

The board of supervisors held 10 meetings during the year. The average attendance of supervisors was 4.1 out of 5. This figure does not include the attendance of the county agent and Soil Conservation Service personnel, which exceeded the preceding figure a few points. Assistance from the Soil Conservation Service and Extension Service personnel was and always has been helpful in every way possible.

Work accomplished this year was as follows:

Farm plans, 30; acreage included 5,734.

Farm plans to date, 199; acreage 29,451.

Farm plan applications, 32 during the year.

A large amount of this acreage is now in use under regular strip cropping, rotations, with full required use of lime, fertilizer, and trees. A separate report of this acreage according to farm practice is attached to this general report.

With the resignation of our regular conservation aide, we sought and found Gabriel Rozsa from local applicants to assist our regular conservationist in the work.

In January, Robert Gray and W. R. Scott were our representatives at the Ohio Federation of District Supervisors' meeting at Columbus, Ohio. Also arrangements were made for the Jefferson soil-conservation district annual meeting in March.

In February, the board completed arrangements for the annual meeting in March. Mr. T. C. Kennard, of the Soil Conservation Service, was the speaker at that meeting. Plans were made for the election of supervisors. At this meeting full support for group planning was agreed upon by the board of supervisors.

The annual meeting in March was one of great interest and success as an audience of 150 listened to Mr. T. C. Kennard's address and to the reports of the Jefferson soil-conservation district officers. At this meeting votes for two supervisors were counted and Robert Gray and Taylor Floyd were declared elected.

The meeting in June continued the planning of the supervisors for an investigation of the group plan. One group already in operation was declared very successful. Also, the air tour was reported very successful. We assisted the county agent in this. Eighty people were carried over the land that had been laid out under farm plans in part of the district.

Two entries were made in the B. & O. contest; one in each class. They were Flenniken and Charles Kirk & Son.

Delegates were sent to Mississippi Valley Association training session at Defiance, and to the State Federation of Soil Conservation Districts. Our chairman, Robert Gray, Jr., is chairman of the strip-mine committee of the State federation.

Our farm planner, Kenneth Thomas, became ill and was not able to carry on the work, and another man, Robert Jones, was provided by the Soil Conservation Service to replace him. With this change we started with all new personnel for the balance of the year.

In October we assisted the county agent with farm tours. Two trips of 1 day each were made. Attendance was excellent, and many farms were visited where farm plans were being carried out.

The Soil Conservation Service furnished a full-time farm planner and aide for the year. Also, 21,000 forest trees were furnished, together with part-time service of an engineer and forester.

Group farm planning was made, which was one of the chief aims of the District. The Soil Conservation Service furnished a man to assist in locating groups. Interest meetings were held with several groups, and one group was carried through a series of farm-planning meetings. Others are to follow at a later date.

The purchase of a large cut-out disk was considered, but was put off to a later date until similar tools were investigated.

In connection with the Extension Service and the agricultural committee of the chamber of commerce, plans were discussed for an educational program. A detailed review of this is to be made at the meeting in February 1950.

Much of the success of the district is due to the splendid aid and cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service and the extension service of the State, and the thanks due them are hereby expressed.

We have experienced difficulties during this year, but as has been said, "Difficulties are but opportunities to test our abilities."

So we close the year with full belief in the soil-conservation district program and its lasting benefit to the farmer and consumer. We are looking forward to new and better things for the coming year.

The Soil Conservation Service granted to the district a 6-foot terracer and rotary scraper. These will be very useful in the work in our territory.

ROBERT M. GRAY, Jr.,
Jefferson Soil Conservation District.
STEUBENVILLE, OHIO.

Other members of the board: Harold McCullough, Taylor W. Floyd, Charles Kirk, Reed Scott.

Jefferson Soil Conservation District annual report of conservation practices

	This year	To date
Agreements signed:		
Number	30	199
Acres	5,734	29,451
Amendments: Number	0	0
Agreements canceled:		
Number		18
Acres		2,379

Practice	Unit	Newly planned		Established	
		This year	To date	This year	To date
Cover cropping	Acres	635	1,503	19	54
Strip cropping	do	986	8,256	1,250	5,314
Pasture improvement	do	676	5,346	420	1,158
Seeding pasture	do	143	1,645	77	313
Woods management	do	0	491	0	73
Tree planting	do	18	183	21	76
Field diversions	Miles	0.3	7	0.17	1
Fence-row management	Linear feet	500	18,600	4,200	10,700
Prevention of fire and grazing	Acres	192	1,518	113	1,097
Lime cropland	do	739	8,283	1,134	5,627
Fertilize cropland	do	1,127	8,526	1,159	4,017
Constructed waterways	Linear feet	1,500	4,540	0	1,800

Jefferson Soil Conservation District annual report of receipts and expenditures, period Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949

RECEIPTS (BY SOURCE)

Balance brought forward	$98.26
Cooperators' fees and equipment rental	55.00
Total	153.26

EXPENDITURES (CLASSIFIED)

Annual meeting expens	46.38
Delegate to Mississippi Valley school	17.00
State association dues	5.00
National association dues	5.00
Affiliate membership dues	25.00
Total	98.38
Balance on hand	54.88

Questions and Answers on Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, farmers in Wisconsin are very interested in the Brannan plan. They want to know more about how it would work, and what it would mean to our important dairy industry in Wisconsin. Their questions often indicate that they like what they have heard about the Brannan plan, but that there is a great deal they do not understand about it.

I have sorted out the questions most frequently asked in Wisconsin about the Brannan plan, and sent them to Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan for first-hand answers. It is my thought that Secretary Brannan himself can best inform the farmers of Wisconsin and other dairy States about the Brannan plan and what it means to farmers.

My questions and his answers follow:

Question. What is the Brannan plan?

Answer. It is the name which has been given to the administration's farm-price-support proposals. These proposals do not really constitute a "plan" at all, but in reality are a series of suggested improvements in existing price-support legislation. Acting as spokesman of the administration, I presented these recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees on April 7, 1949. It would be more accurate to refer to these recommended changes as "the administration's farm-price-support proposals."

Question. What are the aims of the proposals?

Answer. If all the proposals were enacted, they would do two things for farmers: (1) Stop disastrous plunges in farm prices which have so often in the past caused so much suffering and hardship and (2) offer farmers a chance to earn a farm income with adequate purchasing power.

By doing these things the plan would offer the Nation protection against depression in a vital soft spot. Our depressions have often been farm-led and farm-fed; when farm prices hit the skids, unemployment soon shows up in cities and towns, and soon the whole economy is in trouble.

Question. Why do farmers need a price-support program?

Answer. Because farmers, unlike industry, cannot voluntarily adjust their production to the demand for their products. When more is produced than consumers can buy at fair prices, crop surpluses start piling up and farm prices are driven down. The prices of things farmers have to buy, however, stay about the same.

Question. What does the administration recommend that we do about farm income?

Answer. We start with this idea: There is a level below which it is not in the national interest to allow farm income to fall.

The administration recommends the average farm income of 1939–48—in real dollars—as the basic income standard for figuring support prices. This base, the first 10 of the last 12 years, would move forward each year, with an old year dropping out and a new year being added. This would keep the program modern and up to date, instead of chaining farm prices to the obsolete conditions of 40 years ago.

This income standard should provide farmers with the purchasing power they need to operate their farms, to care for their families, and to keep their land in shape. This income standard would be used as the basis for calculating price-support standards for different commodities.

Question. How does the administration's income standard compare with farm income in recent years?

Answer. If the income-support standard were in use this year, the income standard for 1950 would work out at about the farm income of 1942. Net farm income, now in its third year of decline, is expected to run about 10 percent less than in 1942. In other words, the income target would be about 10 percent higher than farm income is expected to be in 1950.

Question. What advantages do the administration's proposals offer Wisconsin farmers?

Answer. Any program supporting farm income is meaningless unless it supports the farm commodities which earn most or all of the Nation's farm income. The administration proposal meets this problem—first, by tying price supports to the income standard, and, second, by requiring the use of price supports for those commodities which earn most of the farm income.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 authorizes mandatory supports for products bringing in about 40 percent of the total farm income. This is an improvement over the provisions of the 1948 act that would have gone into effect if the act of 1949 had not been enacted.

The list of commodities getting mandatory support under the plan recommended by the administration includes products returning about 75 percent of the farm income. Among these commodities are meat, milk, poultry, and eggs, which are leading income producers in Wisconsin. The plan likewise could be extended, with the approval of Congress, to the leading fruits and vegetables.

The table below compares the commodities which are required to be supported by the Agricultural Act of 1949 with those which would be required to be supported under the new proposals.

Commodity	Percentage of total amount, United States farm income, 1948	Agricultural Act of 1949	Administration recommendation
Cotton lint	7.0	Yes	Yes.
Corn	3.7	Yes	Yes.
Wheat	7.8	Yes	Yes.
Tobacco	3.2	Yes	Yes.
Butterfat	14.5	Yes	Yes.
Milk		Yes	Yes.
Hogs	12.2	No	Yes.
Eggs	6.1	No	Yes.
Chickens, excluding broilers	1.8	No	Yes.
Cattle and calves	17.1	No	Yes.
Lambs (and sheep)	1.3	No	Yes.
Rice	.6	Yes	No.
Peanuts	.7	Yes	No.
Potatoes	1.9	Yes	No.
Wool [2]	(1)	Yes	No.
Tung nuts	(1)	Yes	No.
Mohair	(1)	Yes	No.
Honey	(1)	Yes	No.

[1] Less than 1/10 of 1 percent.
[2] Including pulled wool.

Question. How do the support prices proposed by the administration compare with what we have?

Answer. The best answer is to be found in the facts.

The following table compares in dollars and cents mandatory minimum support levels recommended by the administration, with those provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949, for important Wisconsin products:

Commodity	Unit	Agricultural Act of 1949 [1]	Recommended by Administration [2]
		Dollars	*Dollars*
Butterfat	Pounds	0.518	0.553
Milk	Hundred weight.	3.23	3.48
Hogs	do	(3)	15.70
Eggs	Dozen	(3)	.380
Chickens	Pounds	(3)	.240
Corn	Bushels	1.40	1.42
Potatoes	do	1.00	(3)
Beef cattle	Hundredweight.	(3)	14.20
Lambs	do	(3)	15.50

[1] Including consideration of transitional parity calculation.
[2] Support prices shown are bottom of discretionary range provided to allow adjustment to maintain desirable feed ratios.
[3] Support not mandatory.

Question. What will farmers have to do to qualify for price support under the administration's proposal?

Answer. The successful operation of any kind of price-support program, the present legislation and the administration's proposals included, requires the acceptance by farmers of responsibility for cooperating with each other to make whatever production adjustments that may be required. There is nothing new about the administration's proposals in this respect. The price-support program for farmers that has been developed over the past 17 years includes provision for democratically adopted (by a two-thirds favorable vote) production adjustment measures—acreage allotments and marketing quotas—as a means of keeping supplies in balance with genuine demand. The administration has recommended that authority for farmers to use acreage allotments and marketing quotas, as well as marketing agreements and marketing orders, be extended to all commodities, when needed. Used in conjunction with production payments, these production-adjustment measures would actually be needed less frequently. The production-payment system would operate to keep a larger volume of perishables moving through the market stream and into the hands of consumers, thus requiring less dependence upon production-adjustment measures.

The administration has also recommended that our soil-conservation efforts and expenditures should be more closely integrated with our price-support operations. The carrying out of a minimum of sound soil-conserving practives would be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Question. How will the administration proposals support perishable products?

Answer. The plan proposes to use production payments to support perishable commodities which can be stored only at heavy expense. These include milk, butterfat, poltry and eggs, meat animals, fruits and vegetables.

The term production payment, means exactly what it says—a payment to the farmer to go on producing to meet genuine consumer needs, rather than restricting output short of that need. Under this system, the farmer would be paid the difference between the support standard price for commodities which he sold and the average market price of such commodities. The payments would be made, of course, only when the market averaged below the support price for a given period.

Question. What are the advantages of the production payments recommended by the administration?

Answer. The payments would go directly to the farmer. It would be an efficient support operation, with every cent used to support farm prices, directly benefiting farmers. In a Government purchase operation, a considerable part of the cost is eaten up by processing and storage.

The production-payment method would eliminate these costs as well as any waste and spoilage which might occur in piling up unmarketable stocks of food. The entire volume of marketings would flow through regular channels of trade to the ultimate consumers to be used in improving their diets.

Farmers likewise could benefit to the extent that their own selling prices were higher than the market average. This means that farmers would have an incentive in dollars and cents to produce and market quality products and do a good job of bargaining.

Question. How much support will the administration proposals offer each farmer?

Answer. The program proposals recommend support protection for the quantity marketed, but no more than 1,800 units of price supported farm products. The maximum eligibility for any one farm would be 18,000 bushels of corn or its equivalent in other commodities. This amount is ample to cover the total marketings of all of the Nation's family farms, including those of our largest, most efficient family farms. Our national policy has long been designed to encourage, improve, and safeguard family farms. This principle has its rightful place in our support programs. If the proposed high point is not correctly placed for our largest and most efficient family farms, it should be reviewed. However, the topmost limit, in itself, is not designed to prohibit higher production.

Question. How much will the administration's price-support proposals cost?

Answer. The Government cost will be no more, and probably less, than present methods.

With high level employment and measures to maintain stable farm income, this cost can be kept at a minimum. If farm income is not maintained through some kind of support program, the full cost of economic maladjustment falls on farmers.

The purchase type programs authorized by the present price-support legislation involve two costs: Government expenditures and artificially high retail prices to consumers. The Government cost is dependent upon how far below support prices the accumulated inventories must be sold by the Government, and, for perishables, desirable outlets are increasingly difficult to find. These purchase programs also require the Government to pay buying, selling, grading, storage, processing, and transportation costs. An additional cost is paid by consumers who are required to pay retail prices reflecting the level of support prices.

Under the production payment method of support recommended by the administration, retail prices to consumers would be the same supply and demand price that would prevail if no support program were in operation. And the Government cost of making the production payments would be no more, and probably less, than the costs of direct Government purchases and the processing and handling charges involved.

The purchase type programs authorized by present legislation require nonfarmers to pay twice—once in taxes and again in higher retail prices. If production payments are used, the cost is assessed only once.

Valladolid Council, No. 70, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my remarks which I delivered at the annual communion and breakfast of Valladolid Council, No. 70, Knights of Columbus, of Lynn, Mass., which was held in the Lynn English High School on Sunday, April 2, 1950:

I want to begin by stating an obvious fact. You and I are human beings.

From this fundamental, it is but natural that we should be concerned primarily with our individual selves. Jobs, income, homes, children, progress—these are most important to us.

In living our lives in the company of others, however, we must think of them as well as ourselves. Even a recluse cannot live in an

absolute vacuum. He is still accountable to God.

But we are not hermits, or we wouldn't be here at this communion breakfast.

By virtue of a sacrament, we have just passed through a mystical experience that purifies and inspires. Once more, we are clean of heart, and are prepared to face the confusions of life with renewed strength, and devotion to the will of God who is the source of our being.

In this Catholic fraternity, we are properly concerned with what is going on outside our ranks in the different groupings that make up this world.

Action and reaction, this is the law of life. What we do is one thing. What others do has a bearing on us also, and we can ignore the latter only at our peril.

What is the state of our Nation then, and how does it fare in its relations with other national communities?

These are vast and complicated questions, which I can only touch on briefly.

With certain exceptions, conditions in the United States are generally good. There are more people employed and at higher purchasing-power wages than ever before.

Savings accounts and insurance policies in force are at an all-time high. Construction is booming. The Federal public housing program is eliminating our slums. One disconcerting note is the road block which the coalition in Congress placed in the way of stimulating the building of housing accommodations for middle-income families. This may well become an issue with the American people, for the industrious and thrifty middle class has heretofore been the very core of our strength. Doctors, lawyers, dentists, and school teachers, farmers, grocers, and every person who is trying to make a living from a small business, these are the people who have been neglected in our preoccupation with the rival claims of industry and organized labor.

It is significant that the Communists first try to destroy the middle class, knowing that it is the balance wheel of a free society. We must not permit this to happen in the United States. Legislation designed to extend and insure loans for small business enterprises is necessary to save us from the concentrated power of monopoly in any form. Competition and freedom go together. We must guard against the possibility that some day, a few men in Government or elsewhere, shall decide what commodities we shall produce and how much, and at what price. Tens of millions of Americans are now making the individual decisions which guide production and consumption of goods. We want to keep it that way.

One dark spot in the present picture is the number of unemployed, particularly in New England. To meet this challenge, the President is recommending that unemployment insurance compensation be extended and increased. We, in the Congress, are working for a program whereby Government contracts shall be channeled to distressed areas in order to pick up the slack in production and employment.

Inasmuch as the Federal Government spends billions of dollars each year for goods and services, it has the power and the responsibility to place these orders in labor-surplus areas.

At best, however, this provides temporary relief. In line with our traditions of independence and self-sufficiency, it is necessary that we do everything possible to help ourselves, rather than depend upon the Federal Government to bail us out of every difficulty. The line must be drawn somewhere, by ourselves, and as mature men who do not easily forfeit all sense of personal responsibility. The road to tyranny is opened up by ever-increasing reliance upon others. It is so easy to shift the burden, not realizing that with it we also surrender the right to control.

I am reminded of this by a statement from the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, pointing out the growth trends in the New England economy. Its message is that New England has been and continues to be an area which shows substantial and encouraging economic progress. Population, labor force, income, retail sales, and bank deposits are increasing. The three leading industries, in terms of growth, are electrical machinery, apparel and related products, printing and publishing.

But I also noticed that the three declining industries are textile-mill products, leather and leather products, lumber and timber products.

Some of our cities and towns are one-industry communities, and if that industry happens to be textiles or leather, the locality is faced with a serious problem.

This happened to Manchester and Nashua, N. H. At this critical pass public-spirited citizens of each community were forced to band together, form a municipal corporation, buy the vacated factories, and work with might and main to attract small industries that would provide diversification. Manchester and Nashua succeeded in making this adjustment after heroic efforts by local action. Other cities in the same category may have to do likewise in the future. Forewarned is forearmed, they say. But in how many of our one-industry communities do we find full-employment committees, working not only in conjunction with the United States Department of Commerce, but on their own, planning and working for the economic future of their home towns? Voluntary group action ahead of time is not only the way to save but to stimulate the well-being of our municipalities. This is where government of the people began. This is where it must continue to show imagination and leadership in order to cope with present problems, instead of depending in ever-greater measure upon the State and the National Governments.

Indeed, the resourcefulness which characterized other generations of Americans and which helped to build this great country is not dead. It is simply not being used to the fullest extent.

We know that there are certain functions which only the Federal Government can perform, but this cannot and must not be cited as an excuse to rely upon the Government at Washington for everything.

It is just like our approach to the menace of communism. While we must keep a strong Military Establishment to defend us, in view of the precarious world situation, this alone is not enough. Even military and economic aid to other free nations is not sufficient.

It is what we do within our Nation that will rally others to our side and convince Russia that democracy not only provides the material comforts of life in larger measure than other systems, but has the spirit to find a workable Christian solution to any problem.

I think that most Americans are unaware of the way in which the peoples of other nations keenly scrutinize everything that we do. We put everything into headlines which we take in stride. But just try to put yourselves into the shoes of a foreigner who reads of the sensational happenings in the United States. Very probably he gets the impression that we are hopelessly divided, and constantly fighting among ourselves on a score of social, political, and economic issues. And he is apt to lose faith in this Nation as a world leader because it cannot solve its own problems first.

If we face up to the fact that we are being watched and judged, we will become more responsible in what we say and do.

Out of our bounty we are spending much money to stem the tide of communism and bring peace to the world. But money alone will not do the trick, even if we could go on spending it lavishly, which we can't.

This is a contest for the minds of men.

To win the victory for freedom we must evidence moral leadership and prove that voluntary associations of our people cooperating with similar groups can build a better society without the heavy hand of government.

This puts the issue squarely up to us, as grown-up men, and not as those who would retreat into childhood and lean completely upon the paternalism of government.

This is the supreme challenge of the age in which we were born.

As Catholics we have faith in God and are obedient to His will.

As Americans, have we the steadfast purpose, in company with our fellow Americans, to further God's kingdom on earth?

I believe that we have; and that, animated by His spiritual grace, we shall go forth to work for a society composed, not of robots, but of men.

For a way of life in which He will be well pleased with the progress we make in His name.

Exportation of French Calfskins to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

APRIL 3, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: With further reference to our letter of March 24, in regard to the export of French calfskins to the United States, word has been received from Paris that the quota for the United States has been increased from 900 tons to 1,000 tons; 500 tons to be allocated during the first semester, and 500 tons during the second semester, in order to permit early buying without shock to the market.

For your information, we are enclosing a table prepared by the Department of Commerce showing the prewar exports of French calfskins for the years 1929 to 1939, inclusive. You will note that the calfskins shipped to the United States in the 11 prewar years average less than 12 percent of the total French exports. Under the quota of 1,000 tons, the United States would receive more than 30 percent of the contemplated exports.

Both the Departments of Commerce and State, as well as our ECA mission in Paris, are continuing their efforts to increase the United States quota still further on a basis of enabling France to earn more dollars.

In regard to allocations, it is our understanding that a meeting was held in Paris on March 29 by French Government officials with hide and skin exporters of that country. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the quantitative distribution to the United States by recipient firms and by licensing arrangements. Opportunity was to be given to the French exporters, most of whom act as representatives of American firms, to make suggestions and recommendations regarding the licensing procedures. At the moment we do not know the outcome of these discussions.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Deputy Administrator.

France: Exports of raw calfskins to foreign countries, 1929–39 (in metric tons)

[U. S. Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade]

Year	Total		United States		United Kingdom		Belgium-Luxemburg		Netherlands		Germany		Canada		All other countries	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1929	17,670	100	1,636	9	(1)	--------	4,652	26	1,928	11	8,646	49	(1)	--------	808	5
1930	14,956	100	996	7	209	1	2,726	18	2,093	14	8,465	57	(1)	--------	467	3
1931	14,716	100	2,157	15	166	1	2,570	17	2,218	15	6,712	46	(1)	--------	893	6
1932	16,800	100	2,142	13	236	1	3,896	23	1,873	11	5,904	36	244	1	2,505	15
1933	20,464	100	2,856	14	(1)	--------	4,674	23	2,374	12	7,683	37	(1)	--------	2,877	14
1934	24,606	100	1,851	8	361	1	5,184	21	2,829	11	11,096	45	(1)	--------	3,283	14
1935	22,646	100	1,979	9	1,133	5	2,875	13	2,985	13	10,064	45	(1)	--------	3,510	15
1936	19,725	100	2,541	13	2,087	11	3,152	16	3,831	19	5,467	28	(1)	--------	2,647	13
1937	20,176	100	2,367	12	3,161	18	2,883	14	3,211	16	6,043	30	(1)	--------	2,511	12
1938	20,963	100	2,970	14	4,354	21	3,864	18	3,299	16	4,797	23	(1)	--------	1,679	8
1939	14,560	100	2,060	14	5,206	36	2,329	16	1,872	13	1,939	13	(1)	--------	1,154	8
Yearly average, 1929–38	19,255	100	2,150	11	(1)	--------	3,648	19	,664	14	7,488	39	(1)	--------	----------	--------
Yearly average, 1930–39	18,944	100	2,192	12	(1)	--------	3,415	18	2,659	14	6,817	36	(1)	--------	----------	--------

[1] Not available.

Source: Official French Trade Statistics.

Increasing Antitrust Fines to $50,000—H. R. 7827 Carries Out Recommendations of House Small Business Committee—Increase to $50,000 Is Worth-While Complement to Recent Amendment Enlarging Civil Penalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee has ordered reported H. R. 7827, increasing antitrust fines to $50,000. This bill is virtually the same as H. R. 5139, introduced by me last year and unanimously approved by the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

I hope and trust that the Members of this House will act favorably on this bill.

It is not claimed that increasing antitrust fines will solve the greatest difficulties in antitrust enforcement, but it would help, and it will be a worth-while complement to the recent amendment making the maximum civil penalty of $5,000 applicable for each day of violation.

For the further information of the Members it is appropriate to include here pages 73 and 74 of the Progress Report—First Session, of the Select Committee on Small Business. These pages bear on the problem confronting our Federal judges when faced with the assessing adequate penalties upon persons and corporations convicted of violating the antitrust laws.

[Excerpts from Progress Report—First Session, Select Committee on Small Business]

The present fine of $5,000 is completely inconsequential in amount. The amount need only be compared with the vast profits which are made by violating the antitrust laws. This fine is prescribed for in the 60-year-old provision of the Sherman Act. The provision also permits imprisonment for not more than 1 year, in addition to the fine. However, to date, no businessman has been imprisoned for violating the antitrust laws. Therefore, the only punishment is a $5,000 fine—perhaps a few weeks' salary of a corporation official or 1 hour's profit of a corporation.

Firms engaged in violation of the antitrust laws are in a position to rob the public of millions and even billions of dollars. In 1948, to cite one year, 247 firms were charged with price fixing, and the products involved ranged from abrasives to milk, so that the pocketbooks of the entire public were affected. Yet, while the public forfeits huge sums to these price conspirators, what happens if they are convicted? They are fined $5,000 per count—little more than a slap on the wrist even to a medium-sized corporation, let alone one of our giant corporations.

The total inadequacy of the fine permissible under present law has been pointed out by judges of various courts and by Department of Justice representatives. What could be more frustrating to a prosecutor who has proved facts showing flagrant violations perpetrated by a corporation possessing incalculable resources than to have the corporation punished by a $5,000 fine? Federal Judge Simon Rifkind, of New York, stated on March 1, 1949, in imposing fines on six defendants, in *U. S.* v. *National Lead Company:*

"I cannot even go through the formula of looking the defendant in the eye and saying, 'Is there anything you wish to say before I pronounce sentence?' But I must confess that, these amounts being substantially the maximum allowed by the statute, there is very little I can do or very little reflection that I can give this matter except perhaps to make the inevitable comment that a violation of the antitrust laws which persisted from some time in the early twenties to the 1940's, with respect to which the criminal liability is discharged by the payment of $5,000 a count, hardly seems to me to be the nature of penalty which is likely to discourage violations of the antitrust laws as far as the criminal laws are concerned, but that is a problem for the Congress."

This committee agrees with the jurist. The meager fines which can now be imposed present a problem for the Congress. H. R. 5139 proposes that Congress authorize fines which will more adequately fit the magnitude of the offense.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, in testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations in January 1949, had this to say about the attitude of many concerns in regard to present fines:

"I think some of them just consider them license fees for doing business in an illegal way."

The inadequacy of the fines permitted by the present law is demonstrated by fines imposed upon some of the largest companies in the United States for violation of the antitrust laws during the last few years. A sample list is as follows:

Name of defendant	Amount of fine	Total fines of all defendants
Aluminum Co. of America	$15,000	$104,993
American Can Co	5,000	45,000
American Tobacco Co	15,000	312,000
E. I. du Pont de Nemours (3 different cases, 1943–45)	5,000 7,500 5,000	20,000 22,500 33,000
General Electric Co	20,000	56,000
General Motors Corp	5,000	40,000
Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. (3 different cases, 1941–46)	5,000 5,000 (1)	32,500 16,000 175,000
Kroger Grocery & Baking Co	5,000	20,000
Safeway Stores, Inc. (Md.)	10,000	40,000
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	5,000	50,000

[1] Fines of $5,000 or $10,000 were imposed on various A. & P. affiliates and on officers or principals.

The Congress has the problem of preserving small business in an era that not only has big business but needs the services of big business. To accomplish this purpose, Congress must set up laws which will deter management of big business from engaging in monopolistic enterprises which destroy competition. Punishment for violations of the antitrust laws must be stringent enough to serve as a real deterrent.

Enemy Under the Bed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material, I insert a speech made to various service clubs in Washington State by Frank H. Lamb, author, of Hoquiam, Wash.:

THE ENEMY UNDER THE BED
(By Frank H. Lamb)

We are so conditioned by a fear campaign that every night before retiring we look under

the bed to see if a commie is lurking there. We breathlessly listen to the radio and scan the press to learn the latest developments in the cold war. We are informed that the Russians now have the atom bomb, which since Hiroshima we hoped guaranteed a quick victory in the next war. The war experts now say that the Communists have guided missiles, supersonic jet planes, super U-boats, and other war machines superior to ours. We certainly cannot match the fighting men that the 300,000,000 people of the communistic nations now have under arms or could place in the field. It is significant that many of these disclosures of what is being done behind the iron curtain are timed to influence congressional action on appropriations and other legislation. When we recall that in the last war it was mainly American tanks, trucks, planes, munitions, and other matériel supplied to Russia that equipped her armies, we marvel that in four short years they have made such phenomenal technical and industrial progress.

War alarms and saber rattling is deliberately fostered by the astute masters of the Kremlin for two purposes. First, to keep their own people satisfied to resign their liberties, forego the benefits of their labors, and endure poverty and privation, while devoting their entire resources to arming for world conquest. Second, Stalin knows that more of the resources of his opponents are dissipated in preparation, the more financial and political chaos that can be created in enemy countries, less can be marshalled against the Red army in any armed conflict.

More immediate and more dangerous than the atom bomb or Red army is the political revolution foisted on us insidiously under such disguises as cooperation, security, socialism, centralization, statism, sovietism, fascism, collectivism, all only stepping stones to the goal of Marxian communism, the destruction of liberty and American institutions. This ideological invasion of foreign isms is no cold war. It is hot and is being waged on a thousand economic, political, and social fronts.

To promise prosperity, security, and everything wanted by everyone, many alluring baits are dangled before the voter. One of the most entrancing is unlimited Government spending. Despite a Federal debt of over $250,000,000,000 we blithely face a deficit of from five to ten billion dollars in the current year. From George Washington through 8 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt the Nation spent $179,620,113,645. In less than these last 5 years it has spent $191,081,394,191, over $11,000,000,000 more. The $46,500,000,000 of Federal expenditure, added to the $22,200,000,000 for the States and other local governments in the current year adds up to about a third of the national income. Benjamin Franklin in Poor Richard's Almanac said "It would be thought a hard government that should tax its people one-tenth part of their time, to be employed in its service." What would Poor Richard think of our tax today of one out of every three?

When taxation through graduated rates is used for a redistribution of wealth and earnings for the benefit of certain classes, freedom is endangered. The same tax power that can take over 80 percent of one's earnings can claim the whole, and higher taxes can socialize the taxpayer's two remaining free days out of three. All intangible wealth can be confiscated by debt, taxation, and debasement of the currency.

When a class numerous enough to swing elections through subsidies can benefit at the expense of the general welfare then democracy will no longer function. California old agers voted out the State constitution, appointed an administrator independent of legislature or governor and made the $200,000,000 annual cost for pensions a first lien on all State funds. We in Washington are struggling with initiative 172.

The blight of excessive taxation is more severe on the little man, the local merchant, the beginner in business or industry, than on the big corporation with the large capital and an organization that can pass the costs to the consumer. Monopolies are the half-breed offspring of high taxes and excessive regulation.

The nearly 26,000,000 persons now receiving annually $27,500,000,000 in Government benefits, subsidies, and salaries, with their dependent families, comprise nearly a third of the Nation's population. Among them are 3,000,000 farmers now obtaining price support and millions of more farmers' votes can be bought with promises of a subsidy for their products. Another nearly 10,000,000 of old age and welfare recipients will naturally support the party or candidate that promises larger and more liberal pensions. The 3,700,000 Government employees drawing salaries totaling $10,200,000,000 will vote for the salary increaser. Nearly 5,000,000 veterans will oppose any legislator that even hints there is a financial limit to the gratitude of the Nation. How can a sane fiscal policy be expected under such a wholesale purchase of votes? The check receivers will support the candidate or party that promises to increase the Government handout regardless of the general welfare.

The division of authority among 48 States and other local government units has been a serious handicap to the promoters of centralization. The gradual usurpation of State autonomy by the Federal Government through legislation and Supreme Court decisions is too slow for the plotters. More direct measures are proposed. The whole country would be divided into nine authorities similar to the Tennessee Valley experiment, each governed by three appointed directors with unlimited power over most of the economic and political rights of the people. Nine principalities with 27 czars would bypass the States and put the entire United States economy under socialistic government corporations, independent of Congress, amenable only to the President. The next step would be a single authority, then a dictator. In the Pacific Northwest three political appointees would have absolute control over power, irrigation, water, lands, forests, wildlife; practically the entire economy of the region.

Nineteen forested States have enacted progressive laws for the perpetuation of their forests. Washington forest land can be cut only under State permit and in accordance with State regulations to insure reproduction. We are doing a wonderful job in protecting our forests from fire and securing reforestation. Control of the privately owned forests has long been coveted by the Forest Service. A pending bill would give the Federal bureaucrats power to take over such regulation in any State where they decided State control was not satisfactory. To bait the State to sell its forest freedom the Government would pay half the cost of the forest administration. To browbeat the State hesitant to come under the Federal heel, many Federal appropriations could be withheld from that State.

Farmers are awakening to the fact that along with their crop support and subsidy checks will come the mailed fist of crop control. Without such controls the Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing capacity of $4,750,000,000 will be insufficient to buy up the excess 1950 production of United States basic crops. Storage facilities are inadequate; expensive conversion schemes, foreign gifts, and actual destruction fail to reduce the mountains of grains, potatoes, cotton, tobacco, from price-supported farms. Eighty-five million dollars worth of dried eggs that even hungry Greeks will not eat, are stored in a Kansas cavern. The taxpayers pay twice. Once for the subsidy, and again in higher cost of living.

Business cannot survive part free enterprise and part socialistic. The Government ventures are a growing cancer that will consume the free economy. The Britisher can obtain all the store teeth he wants but has difficulty finding something to use them on. France has long controlled rents and socialized the housing industry with the result that there has been no home building for decades. In both these socialistic countries private enterprise is dying a slow death. Out of despair the people are made ripe for communism.

From colonial days we have jealously retained local control of our schools. Academic freedom and home rule of education have been bulwarks of democracy. The collectivists are planning to get a foot inside the schoolhouse door by the bait of a few hundred millions of Federal aid, which would penalize the States with a high standard to build up those that are below the desired rating. With increasing subsidy will inevitably come greater control until local school boards will be little more than rubber stamps.

The railroads have been controlled so long and thoroughly that they are generally 20 years obsolete and unable to meet the competition of highway vehicles and air transportation. A proposed communication body would take over control of all transport by air, truck, stage, rail, and water, eliminate competition, and lay its blighting hand over further transportation progress.

There are now 50,000 Federal employees in the State of Washington. If these and other centralization plans now before Congress are enacted, Federal police and snoopers in the State will be increased several fold.

Three czars of 10,000,000 union members practically control all American industry through legislation which gives them the power to say who shall work, when and on what conditions. John L. Lewis, by merely frowning, can cut off the country's coal supply. A candidate can buy the labor vote at the cost of his independence and his oath to support the public welfare. Out of the taking over of an industry to stop a strike when other measures fail will come the socialization of the industry with the workers becoming Government employees prohibited from striking, and eventually as in all Communist countries losing the rights of free men.

Control credit, the foundation of business, and you control all. The manipulation of Federal finance now determines availability and quantity of private investment funds, credit, and the interest rate. Twenty-nine Federal agencies are directly engaged in loaning money and 12 in Government finance and credit. No one knows the enormous total of your money loaned to Tom, Dick, or Harry for this or that purpose. Why should the Government loan to a favorite $196,000,000, nearly a third of the RFC funds loaned to all business, mainly to engage in the highly competitive steel and auto industries? Another promoter with $1,000 personal investment controls a corporation that has been loaned $37,500,000, with $12,500,000 more required to attempt to build porcelain enamel steel houses.

More serious, however, is the progressive break-down of traditional American ideals. A church was one of the first provisions of every frontier settlement, and church attendance was enforced by custom and local opinion. Today the church is resigned to the kindergarten and women. The average man is indifferent, a nonbeliever, or a derider of religion. You men who shirk your church duties and attendance are contributing directly to the destruction of a bulwark of freedom which from the time of Nero to today in Czechoslovakia has been purchased at an enormous cost of lives and suffering.

Communism recognized the youth as the most fertile field for propaganda. We want our students to learn the facts regarding

communism and other social and political movements, but we have the right to insist that the instruction shall be objective and not the propaganda of supporters of any theory. No Communist or fellow traveler should be tolerated in the training of youth.

Communists have bored within several great industry-wide unions so successfully that they are now in absolute control. One great branch of unionism is now expelling its Red and leftist groups. Unionism and communism are antithical. Behind the iron curtain unions are only empty-shell satellites of the Communist Politburo. Russian labor has never known freedom or a living wage. The American unionist is enticed to give up his bargaining power, his rights to home and comforts, his freedom for a mess of British socialism that will end in the Russian brand of despotism.

The heaviest guns of all subversive elements are directed against business and profits. America cannot be socialized until its economy is wrecked. Under competitive free enterprise American business in a century and a half has transformed 4,000,000 into a Nation of a 150,000,000 with a higher standard of living, greater freedom and more security than is enjoyed by any other people. Business through taxation has supplied youth with more educational facilities, the people generally with more security against disease and want than the world has ever known. Out of its profits it has built great institutions of learning, churches, libraries, museums and parks for the enjoyment of a higher life. In two World Wars it has marshalled the marvelous production of food, ships, planes, munitions, that enabled our troops to conquer. In the last 10 years it has supplied $72,000,000,000 as gifts and aid overseas to help support many of the very people who are most loudly condemning business and impugning profits. We are paying the bill to enable socialized governments to abolish private business and profit.

Communism is a religion of immorality, Marx declared: "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding and concealing truth, we must and can unite in a language that sows among the masses hate, revolution, scorn and the like." The blighting immoral effects of subversive movements are felt in every club, church, school, lodge, party, union, and society.

The pollution has reached Rotary. You are lulled into forgetting that you are businessmen, selected representativs of your vocation, with obligations to advance its interest, influence and conduct. You are told that the object of business is some sort of fuzzy wuzzy service, that profits are immoral, and the stigma can only be removed by welfare work. A book by Rotary International costing $1 entitled "Service Is My Business," outlines a hazy conception of service to society as an antidote for the pollution of profits. Little in it inspires the businessman to sing with the poet:

"This is my work, my blessing, not my doom,
Of all who live, I am the one by whom
This work can best be done in the right way."

Not a word about the businessman's first duty whether:

"In field or forest, at the desk or loom,
In warring market place, or tranquil room."
—*Henry Van Dyke.*

to more efficiently supply society with its material and cultural needs.

Rotary has had the slogan, "He profits most who serves best," since 1911. It has walked the plank. The international directors with an ear to Rotarians in the socialist-governed countries seeking to abolish profits, have recently decided that the word "profit" might be misconstrued and the slogan was hard to translate. New members no longer receive a pretty copy of the code of ethics for framing on their office walls. Yes, the Rotary organization is apologetic of business and ashamed of profits.

It is not the avowed Communists that are dangerous. They are a noisy nuisance. It is the confused fuzzy-minded shallow thinkers and opportunists who fail to detect the subversive features in the schemes of the social revolutionists and the self-interest of those who are receiving the Government doles that have started as well on a toboggan slide to a fancied utopia. Bought by Government hand-outs, lured by the opiate of inflation, implemented by the destructive power of unlimited taxation, impelled by a gospel of defeatism, we are sacrificing one by one our liberties. A little farther down the road we will come to a fork leading to two despotisms, the right to fascism, the left to communism. Both are equally odious and destructive of all that has been gained in the upward progress of man.

This onrushing subversive invasion cannot be stemmed by a frontal attack, stopped by a Maginot line or bought off with dollars. The defense must come from the grass-root action of loyal Americans. The issues transcend all partisan considerations; they concern the very web and woof of the historic American way of life. No compromise with these enemies under our beds should guide our voting, prompt us to fulfill our duty to religion, clean the pinks and Reds out of our schools, purge our unions, control the conduct of our clubs, lodges, unions, and societies, and support all still uncorrupted servants and measures, if human freedom, integrity and moral standards are to survive in this country.

Resolution of Town of Watertown, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

WATERTOWN, MASS., *April 3, 1950.*
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The town of Watertown, Mass., is fully cognizant of the impending danger represented in a bill pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs."

The Hood Rubber Co., the largest industrial organization located in this community and one of the largest rubber-footwear manufacturers, is vitally concerned.

Any action that will tend to destroy and deteriorate this industry will materially affect the future of Watertown. Watertown cannot afford to have any damage done to its largest taxpayer.

In traditional New England style, the town of Watertown, in town meeting assembled on March 27, 1950, recognized the impending danger and adopted a resolution, which I herewith enclose at the direction of said meeting.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE B. WELLMAN,
Town Clerk.

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear; and

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries; and

Whereas any further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the town of Watertown at its annual town meeting held on March 27, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; United States Senator Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and United States Congresswoman, Mrs. Edith Nourse Rogers to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American Selling Price Principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; United States Senator Leverett Saltonstall, United States Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and all the New England Congressmen and that these resolutions be spread on the records of the town of Watertown, Mass.

H. HERBERT APPLIN,
WILFRED J. PAQUET,
ROY C. PAPALIA,
Board of Selectmen.

I, George B. Wellman, town clerk of Watertown, Mass., hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolution adopted by Town Meeting, duly called and held on March 27, 1950.

Attest:
GEORGE B. WELLMAN, *Town Clerk.*

Nuts From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on several recent occasions I have called the attention of the House to the fact that 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at $3,000,000, recently were imported into the United States from Russia.

Now, I find that canned crab is not the only Russian product being landed in the United States and sold to American consumers.

San Francisco newspapers recently carried a news item that 110,000 pounds of shelled Manchurian walnuts recently were landed in San Francisco. Manchuria is controlled by Russia.

The Manchurian nuts, although a 7½-cent-a-pound duty was paid on them, were offered for sale at 42 cents a pound, which was 20 cents a pound under the prevailing price for American nuts. The

news article stated that future shipments were being offered at 40 cents a pound, or 22 cents under the prevailing price for American walnuts.

At the same time these walnuts were being imported from Russian-controlled Manchuria the domestic supply of these nuts was so huge that, according to the San Francisco press dispatch, the United States Department of Agriculture was paying Pacific Coast nut producers 10 cents a pound to divert 5,000,000 pounds of their surplus supples of nuts from consumer markets to crushing plants.

Continued importation of walnuts from Soviet-controlled Manchuria will depress and create a chaotic price condition in the market for all nuts, almonds, filberts, pecans, and others that are sold in competition with walnuts.

Ruination of the nut-raising business of the United States by competition from products of Russia or Soviet-controlled countries would be a tragedy. It requires years to raise a nut orchard to a bearing stage.

Anything that injures the nut industry will injure the entire Pacific Coast, since all three States of Oregon, Washington, and California are heavy producers of nuts.

It does not make sense that we should be importing nuts from a Russian-controlled country while our own surplus is so huge that we are paying orchardists a subsidy to divert their nuts from the open market to crushing plants.

Emergency Cotton Allotments in Areas Infested by Green Bugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are 2,600,000 acres of wheat planted in Sixth and Seventh Districts of Oklahoma. There are 1,900,000 acres of wheat in Seventh District of Oklahoma alone. Forty percent of this acreage has been destroyed by green bugs and the drought and green-bug infestation is becoming increasingly worse.

I have today introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide emergency cotton allotments in areas which have been infested by green bugs

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall use not more than 500,000 acres (which shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment) for the purpose of making emergency cotton-acreage allotments to producers of farm commodities whose 1950 crops have been substantially destroyed by the insects known as green bugs. Such acreage shall be allocated under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, shall provide for a cotton allocation and marketing quota for the 1950 crop only, and shall not be considered as giving to any farm, county, or State any credit or history for the purposes of cotton allocations in any subsequent year: *Provided,* That in no event shall any farm be allotted more than 1 acre of cotton under the provisions of this section for each 1 acre of other crops which have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested aid for the area from the Disaster Loan Corporation and other agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the House Committee on Agriculture and its members, also the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and its members urging an immediate hearing and adoption of my bill.

I have also urged the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately report favorably on this measure.

I wish to read letters from representative counties in my district:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cordell, Okla., March 23, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of March 18, 1950, in which you requested information in regard to the greenbug infestation in Washita County.

We had a meeting of community committeemen yesterday in which all sections of the county were represented, and it was estimated, as of that date, that a minimum of 50 percent of the wheat in Washita County was damaged and would result in a loss of approximately 50,000 acres. If rain is not received in the next 10 days, the committeemen anticipated that from 60 percent to 80 percent of the entire crop would be lost.

If further information is needed, please call for same.

Very truly yours,

DON HARBESTON,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Altus, Okla., March 21, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: In complying with your letter of March 18, 1950, in reference to the greenbug infestation here in Jackson County as well as surrounding counties.

I was able to contact a farmer friend of yours by the name of Ben F. Murphy and I ask Ben to help me answer your letter pertaining to the increase in cotton acreage for the areas that have been substantially destroyed by the green bug.

I am quoting Mr. Murphy at this time: "The green-bug damage already done has been, I would say, 40 percent, but the total damage to be done is beyond anybody's guess. In my opinion, unless heavy rains occur, the damage in the next 2 or 3 weeks will be 90 percent. At the rate of the destruction to fields that were observed 3 or 4 days ago is now almost totally destroyed; yet it is hard to tell just what the destruction will be in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

"A lot of farmers at this time are harrowing their wheat as well as spraying, but with very little results with either. It is estimated that approximately 2,000 acres already or will be in the near future plowed and the ground prepared for other crops or summer fallowed."

Victor, I thought by contacting Mr. Murphy and getting his viewpoints, which is about the same as the other farmers, would be worth more to you than for me to write what I know about the green bugs.

Thank you very much for the conference report House Joint Resolution 398.

We wish you the best of luck in obtaining our full quota of these additional acres.

Yours very truly,

E. E. HAGAR,
Administrative Officer, PMA, Jackson County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Sayre, Okla., March 22, 1950.

Subject: 1950 cotton allotments and insects.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Congressman, Seventh District of Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of March 18, 1950, concerning additional cotton acreage and green-bug damage, I wish to advise you as follows:

At present time in southwestern Oklahoma there is an extreme drought on, especially in Beckham County. The wheat crop is in a very poor condition. Green bugs have been and are still increasing in great numbers among the wheat fields. I am of the opinion that if present conditions among the wheat does not change in the next 3 weeks that there will be very little wheat left for harvest. At the present time if we could obtain a good rain and warmer weather I think we would loose very little wheat. All indications point to fair and dry weather.

In regard to damage and the present condition of wheat, I would say that Beckham County wheat is probably damaged slightly more than in other southwestern counties due to the fact that we have received less moisture the past 5 months than surrounding counties.

I hope this gives you some idea of the situation here. I am sure that if wheat is totally destroyed that the producers would certainly appreciate any favors granted them in regard to cotton allotments since all land here is adapted to cotton.

We appreciate your interest and efforts devoted to agriculture.

Any time I can be of assistance to you, please advise me of such.

Very truly yours,

J. E. WILD,
County Administrative Officer, Beckham County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Frederick, Okla., March 23, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: It appears, at the present time, that Tillman County's prospect for a wheat crop has been reduced 60 percent due to green-bug damage.

We estimate that 2,000 acres of wheat has been plowed under and if we do not receive rain and warm weather within the next 10 days 20,000 more acres of wheat will be abandoned. Approximately one-third of this acreage would be put to cotton if permitted.

Wheat farmers of this county would appreciate any amount of cotton acreage to replace their destroyed wheat.

Yours very truly,

VERNON T. DUNCAN,
Administrative Officer, Tillman County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Hobart, Okla., March 21, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR VICTOR: This is in reply to your letter of March 18, 1950, which I read regarding the green-bug infestation in this county.

I, along with two members of our county committee made a tour of this county, covering some 60 or 70 miles in the eastern part, also Mr. LeBerge has been over most of the south part of the county, and Mr. Harris the northwest part. I have also talked to a number of grain men, including personnel of the Farmers Co-op of Hobart, Mountain View, and Roosevelt.

This is a summary of what we believe to be the condition of the wheat at this time.

There is approximately 230,000 acres of wheat seeded in Kiowa County. Of this acreage 20 percent is a total loss today. It appears at this time that it would be impossible to make more than 60 or 65 percent of a normal crop. Almost 100 percent of the wheat in the county is infested with green bugs at this time, and conditions can become more serious if the green bugs do not stop or if we do not receive much needed moisture.

I am sure anything that you can do to assist the farmers in any way will be greatly appreciated by them.

We will be glad to assist you in any way possible.

Very truly yours,

W. I. GEORGE,
County Administrative Officer,
Kiowa County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Arapaho, Okla., March 23, 1950.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE WICKERSHAM: Your letter of March 18 enclosing the conference report on House Joint Resolution 398, has been received. First, on behalf of the farmers of Custer County, we wish to thank you for your efforts in obtaining approval of this amendment and also for the additional cotton acreage to be allocated to wheat farms where the grain is destroyed by green bugs.

With reference to green-bug infestation in Custer County, I will say that at the present time only a few acres has been completely destroyed, but we have green bugs in all of our wheat and in large numbers, and unless something happens to check them such as warmer weather, hard rain, etc., there will be in the next 10 days or 2 weeks, hundreds of acres completely destroyed by this insect. The drought is helping the situation along since it retards the growth of the wheat which gives the green bugs time to complete the job. The weather at the present time is cool and ideal for green bugs and at the best, if it should start warming up now, we would have several hundred acres completely destroyed before the ladybugs and parasites could check them.

If the picture does not change soon, I am sure that we could use a sizable amount of this acreage.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL E. DILL,
County Administrative Officer.

Abduction of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a memorandum which has been prepared for me by Mr. A. Sarkissian of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on the important subject of the abduction of Greek children by the Communists. This memorandum contains information that might be of deep interest to many persons:

ABDUCTED GREEK CHILDREN IN IRON-CURTAIN COUNTRIES

In October of 1944 Greece was liberated, but there was no legal government to govern the country. The government-in-exile had just returned, but its authority was over a very limited area—only over a part of metropolitan Athens. The actual control of the country, the towns, the villages and the provinces, was in the hands of a resistance group known as EAM/ELAS. This group was led and remained under rigid Communist control. No sooner had the government-in-exile returned, than its authority and legality were challenged by the EAM/ELAS leaders. Thus a very embarrassing situation was created, but it was hoped that a satisfactory solution could be had by the union of the Government and the EAM/ELAS leaders. Negotiations lasting more than a month, however, convinced the Government (and also the British representatives) that a union with the resistance leaders was, short of complete submission to their wishes, impossible. British efforts at mediation also proved to be ineffective. Early in December civil war broke out. Fighting in and around Athens lasted more than a month. Then on January 11 of 1945 a truce was effected. EAM/ELAS forces were cleared out of Athens and its environs, and the first serious attempts of the Communists to seize power in Greece were frustrated.

Before and after the truce, while the EAM/ELAS forces were withdrawing from the Athens area, they carried some noncombatant inhabitants with them. How many innocent Greeks were thus driven away from their homes and taken to the mountain fastnesses of northern Greece, it would be impossible to say: and an estimate would probably be a poor guess. At the end of almost 5 years (December 1944–October 16, 1949) of civil war, it was reported that there were more than 700,000 homeless refugees in Greece,[1] and it is probable that many, if not most of these refugees, were held as hostages at one time or another by the Communist guerrillas. It is known that some hostages were treacherously murdered. Even during the first few weeks of fighting gangs of the EAM/ELAS group carried out mass executions, thereby shocking many of their sympathizers.[2] More shocking, however, was the abduction of children from their homes and their removal to iron-curtain countries.

This abominable and barbarous practice was not widespread at first, but by 1947 it had become a major objective of Communist guerrillas. It is reported that at a meeting held on February 10 of that year, in their mountain headquarters, the guerrilla leaders decided to make a registration of all children between the ages of 3 and 14 years in the area then under their control, in order to collect these children and send them into the neighboring Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia.[3] These countries promised to bring up these children and indoctrinate them in Communist ideology. For many months children were abducted and carried off, but in 1948 abductions took place on a large scale and in a systematic manner.

From then on guerrillas would take away children from their parents in many northern provinces. At the same time broadcasts from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia declared that parents were happily yielding their children to the care of democratic governments. According to the findings of the United Nations special committee on the Balkans there was no truth in these declarations. Actually the children were being abducted without the consent of their parents. To achieve their ends the Communists were obliged to imprison, to torture and to threaten the parents that they would continue this treatment until the children were handed over to them. Other means were also used to force the parents hands, such as burning the stock of food for the village, giving out false news such as that the National Army was preparing to bomb from the air with atomic bombs. In some cases the Communists obtained by such means written depositions from parents handing over the children to their care. Sometimes all the inhabitants of the village were removed with the children, but later the children were forcibly separated from the parents after they got to Albania, and never saw them again.[4]

The fate of these children was first brought to the attention of the United Nations Assembly by the Greek Government on February 27, 1948. Then the Greek Government charged that the guerrillas had earmarked about 60,000 children for abduction from Greece to be distributed in the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia were to receive 10,000 each, while the remaining 30,000 children were to go to Rumania, Hungary and Poland.[5] The Assembly asked the special committee to investigate these charges. In the course of its investigation the committee found that Greek children had been taken into Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland in March and April of 1948. A broadcast by the Free Greece radio on March 14, 1948 reported that 4,400 Greek children had been transferred from 59 villages in Greece to the northern countries. On April 9, 1948 Belgrade radio said that 7,000 Greek children had arrived in that city, and on April 12, 1948, it broadcast that 12,000 Greek children were expected to be divided among Albania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.[6] The committee also learned that this program of abduction was being carried out with the connivance and approval, and even with the assistance of the governments of these countries. The committee recommended that the Greek Government communicate concerning this matter with the governments of these countries. It also recommended that the Secretary-General dispatch copies of its report to the same governments, and urge them to discourage any further removal of children from Greek territory and to arrange for the prompt return to Greece of these children.[7] By this process of abduction northern Greece was being thinned out of its children, for the abduction of 60,000 or even 25,000 children constituted a large proportion of children in that thinly-populated area.

Early in June the Greek Government telegraphed communications to the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. The Polish Government categorically denied the presence of any Greek children in Poland. The Hungarian Government in a dispatch to the Secretary-General "acknowledged receiving Greek children on humanitarian grounds, stating that they had lost their parents as a result of military operations in Greece, and had not been torn from their families."[8] On July 19 the Albanian Government replied

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune, December 1, 1949.

[2] Woodhouse, C. M. Apple of Discord, p. 218.

[3] Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, p. 18.

[4] From a report prepared by A. S. Devan.

[5] Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, p. 18.

[6] Report, p. 19.

[7] Ibid., p. 20.

[8] Report, p. 20.

that there were no Greek children in Albania "who have been removed by force," adding that assistance given to Greek children was a "humanitarian act entirely in keeping with the principles of all civilized and peace-loving nations." [9] No other replies were received.

Then the UN Assembly tried to deal with this matter through the International Red Cross organizations. On November 27, 1948, the Assembly voted unanimously "for the return to their homeland of all such children who themselves ask to be returned or whose parents or close relatives, request their return (to Greece)." [10] This resolution also called for the cooperation of the National Red Cross organizations and the Red Crescent (of Turkey) "to assist in such repatriation measures." In January 1949 the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in a letter to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Greece, called their attention to the resolution.

On April 20 the International Red Cross announced that Yugoslavia was ready to permit a joint international committee of the Red Cross and League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies Mission to visit Yugoslavia "with respect to the repatriation of Greek children." [11] Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia had also indicated their willingness to cooperate with the International Red Cross organizations.

The International Red Cross organizations did better as far as investigation was concerned. They were permitted to visit three countries—Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia in carrying on their investigations. In Bulgaria they found 1,972 Greek children distributed in seven reception centers. These were cared for by the Bulgarian Red Cross. In Prague the work of the investigators was limited to a few meetings with the Czech authorities. The Czechs would not even admit the presence of Greek children in their country. However, in reply to a note addressed to the International Red Cross the Czech Red Cross admitted that there were 138 Greek children in the country. The investigators had better response in Yugoslavia. They found that there were 1,845 Greek children who were in homes of the Yugoslav Red Cross, "and 3,347 children who were living with their parents, or with refugee Greek families." [12] Greek Red Cross also carried on its own work of investigating and reported that in July of 1949, the total number of abducted Greek children was 24,701, distributed as follows: [13]

Albania	2,000
Bulgaria	2,660
Hungary	3,000
Rumania	3,801
Czechoslovakia	2,240
Yugoslavia	11,000

When the report of the International Red Cross Organization was submitted to the Assembly (in October of 1949), the Assembly again instructed the Secretary-General to pursue the matter further. In a resolution of November 3 the Assembly observed that the Greek children have not yet returned to their homes. The Assembly declared that the resolution—

"1. Instructs the Secretary-General to request the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies to continue their efforts in this humanitarian cause.

"2. Urges all the members of the United Nations and other states harboring the Greek children to make all necessary arrangements, in consultation and cooperation with the International Red Cross organizations, for the early return to their homes.

"3. Invites the International Red Cross organizations to report to the Secretary-General for the information of the members of the United Nations, on the progress being made in the implementation of the present resolution." [14]

But the early return (of abducted Greek children) to their homes is being delayed despite the almost united efforts of the entire civilized world. In a radio address on December 28 last, Queen Frederica of Greece made an appeal for the return of the 28,000 abducted Greek children. In her impassioned appeal she declared that she was pleading on behalf of the mothers of the abducted children, many of whom journeyed to Athens during this Christmas season of good-will to solicit her aid. * * * She asked that something be done to rouse the conscience of the world.[15] On the same day the Archbishop of Canterbury echoed the feelings of Queen Frederica and denounced the perpetrators of these abductions. He declared that by the hateful and deliberate practice of the Communist forces, many thousands of Greek children have been abducted from their homes, their villages, and their country, to an unknown fate.[16]

In January the Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church in this country appealed to President Truman. In reply to this appeal the President telegraphed as follows: "We pray that the governments of those countries harboring these children will be moved in a spirit of broad humanitarianism to cooperate in fulfilling the unanimous desire of the United Nations General Assembly that these children be promptly restored to their homes." [17] A report received on March 13 at Lake Success from the United Nations special committee on the Balkans stated that a survey group made a 600-mile tour of Greece's northern frontier and heard numerous pleas for the return of Greek children who had been removed to neighboring Communist countries.[18] A dispatch from the chairman of the committee, Mr. Samuel Atyeo, filed from Athens on March 14, stated that there is one thing that can be singled out as an obstacle to normal relations between Greece and her neighbors—it is the vexatious and terrible question of abducted children.[19]

In brief this is the story of Greek children abducted and forcibly kept by the new democratic governments in iron-curtain countries. Incidentally, this barbarous practice of abducting children is not new in the Balkans and in all parts of the former Ottoman Empire. The cream of the Ottoman armies, the fearless janissaries, were recruited in this manner; these were composed of abducted children from Christian families, brought up in Ottoman manners and in the Mohammedan religion. Many of these must have been Greek children; and in this sense the story of the abducted Greek children goes back to at least early sixteenth century. But in the days gone by these children were abducted by the enemies and conquerors of Greece, while in the present instance the abduction of 24,000, or 28,000, or 60,000 children was carried out by Greeks preaching another gospel—communism—and taking orders from the Kremlin in Moscow. (A. Sarkissian, Foreign Affairs Section.)

[9] Quoted in Greece and the United Nations, 1946–49, p. 30.
[10] United Nations Bulletin, December 15, 1948, p. 1017.
[11] Greece and the United Nations, 1946–49, p. 31.
[12] Essential Data Concerning Repatriation of Abducted Greek Children, pp. 6–7.
[13] Ibid., p. 11.
[14] Essential Data Concerning Repatriation of Abducted Greek Children, p. 5.
[15] New York Times, December 29.
[16] London Times, December 30.
[17] Quoted in New York Times, January 17.
[18] New York Times, March 14.
[19] New York Times, March 15.

Relations Between Puerto Rico and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and the Honorable Senator from Nebraska, Mr. BUTLER, have introduced into the Senate on March 31 a bill, S. 3336, a companion bill to H. R. 7674 which I introduced in the House March 13.

There are slight differences between the two bills but they are fundamentally aimed at the same objectives. Their provisions are almost identical.

I am grateful to both Senators for having so cordially received and sponsored legislation on what constitutes the present wishes of the people of Puerto Rico.

In connection with the Senate and House bills, I would like at this time to take up some pertinent considerations.

In 1900, soon after acquiring sovereignty over Puerto Rico through the Treaty of Paris, the United States Congress enacted the first Organic Act of Puerto Rico. It provided that "on and after the passage of this act, the same tariffs, customs, and duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which are required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries." It further provided that "in no event shall any duty be collected after the 1st day of March 1902 on merchandise and articles going into Puerto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Puerto Rico."

In other words, Congress established what might be described as a customs union between the United States and Puerto Rico. Other provisions concerning the retirement of Puerto Rico coins then in circulation and substituting the coins of the United States, and concerning the application of Federal laws in Puerto Rico, created not only a customs, but an economic and political, union.

The Puerto Rican community had been founded four centuries earlier. It had developed with the Spanish political and economic empire. The new pattern of political and economic relationships made it inescapable for Puerto Rico to reorient its economy. During the past 50 years we have created a new economy. The present economic relationships between Puerto Rico and the mainland are now the core of the economic life of Puerto Rico. Consequently, it is only natural and logical that while seeking democratic political advancement within the Union, we in Puerto Rico may be mindful of our basic economic and political relationships. We do not want to dissolve them, we do not want to disturb them, albeit we strive to perfect them.

In 1917, the people of Puerto Rico were declared to be citizens of the United States. In a republican system of gov-

ernment, we may not find the person of the king to symbolize a common loyalty. But we do find and cherish a great ideological and political symbol, common citizenship to which all owe loyalty. The extension of United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico unquestionably added great dignity to our union with the United States. Common citizenship symbolizes the common loyalty of free peoples engaged in a common way of life devoted to upholding their republican democratic institutions. Allow me then to say, as emphatically as I can that, unless the people of Puerto Rico should unmistakably express their desires and reasons for dissolving their union with the United States, which they have never done, it is unrepresentative and unfair, whatever the motives may be, to present before this body and in their behalf any proposition to the end that the people of Puerto Rico be thrown out of this Union. Neither the House bill nor the Senate bill would entertain any such proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the duty to represent the people of Puerto Rico in this august body. In the 1948 Puerto Rican elections, candidates were nominated for Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico by the Popular Democratic Party, the Statehood and Socialist Parties (in coalition), and the Independentist Party. As the candidate of the Popular Democratic Party, I polled 392,000 votes. I am speaking in rounded numbers. The candidate for the combined Statehood and Socialist Parties polled 180,000 votes. The candidate for the Independentist Party got 66,000 votes. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the combined opposition polled 246,000 votes as compared to the 392,000 votes I received. I had an absolute majority of 146,000 votes over all opposition.

In that same election the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marin ran for Governor on the same party ticket I did and he was elected by about the same majority I was. I believe a clearer mandate from the people for him or me could not anywhere be found. H. R. 7674 is an expression of that mandate.

The Statehood and Socialist coalition candidates campaigned on a platform of statehood for Puerto Rico; the Independentist Party campaigned on a platform of independence for Puerto Rico; the Popular Democratic Party stood on a platform calling for the preservation of present relations between Puerto Rico and the United States and, within such framework, for the adoption by the people of Puerto Rico of a constitution for the organization of our local government. This is not statehood, Mr. Speaker; nor is it independence. But it is American democracy on American soil.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is in absolute accord with the expressed wishes of the people of Puerto Rico that I have introduced H. R. 7674. It is in accordance with the wish of the people of Puerto Rico that the Senate bill has been introduced. Under these bills, the people of Puerto Rico will adopt their own constitution for their own local government within the existing pattern of political and economic relationships with the Federal Government.

The people of Puerto Rico today have a local government served by officials of their own selection. Under the present organic act, the officials of our government, including the governor, are chosen in free elections by popular vote. The people of Puerto Rico have a good government. May I point out that in his first message to the Legislature of Puerto Rico, Gov. Muñoz Marín, the first elected governor, specifically requested from the legislature authority to proceed with reorganization and streamlining of the government much in line with the procedure followed by the Federal Government. This reorganization which is now taking place is parallel to that now being undertaken by the Federal Government in accordance with the Hoover Commission recommendations. May I also point out that in his second annual message to the legislature the governor recently expressed views on government and economy and organization which have been widely praised by many distinguished students of government, including the Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, who recently addressed this House on the subject.

From an article by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, I should like to quote briefly. It was an address which he made before the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development last May. He said:

> Muñoz is, without doubt, a remarkable man and a distinguished political leader. Some keen observers are of the opinion that he may emerge as one of the very great world political leaders of our times. A recent issue of Time (May 2, 1949) carried an informative biographical sketch of Muñoz, and his state papers give a clear impression of the depth and penetration of his statesmanship.

He further stated:

> Rule in Puerto Rico is rule by consent, rule after the votes are freely cast. It is the hard way to achieve order in the processes of government, but the result gives confidence in resiliency and toughness. The Government of Puerto Rico under Muñoz will not be characterized by brittleness and caprice.

Mr. Ruml had this to say about honesty in Puerto Rico's Government:

> One further observation about the Government of Puerto Rico. I have taken particular pains to talk to American businessmen and newspapermen to determine whether corruption and graft played any significant part in getting things done in Puerto Rico. The testimony was unanimous that they had found neither "squeeze" nor "bite." I am not so unimaginative as to believe that some deals are not made with some people at some times under some circumstances that are expressions of special privilege for special consideration. But I do believe that there is no system of paying off or of buying rulings and immunities. The higher officials of the Puerto Rican Government are well aware that the program of the Government would be destroyed by corruption or by even the suspicion of corruption.

Puerto Rico is struggling to raise itself out of its present economic difficulties by its own efforts. In our endeavors to industrialize and create new jobs we are having the most helpful cooperation by the Federal Government.

I have said that as a counterpart to what we call our Operation Bootstrap we have an Operation Boost on the part of the Congress. I have included in such proposed Operation Boost the extension to Puerto Rico of public housing, social security, aid to education, coffee rehabilitation, increase of the sugar quota, and so forth. Public housing is already in Puerto Rico under a law passed by this Congress in its first session. Social security for Puerto Rico has already passed this body and is before the Senate. Aid to education has passed the Senate and is pending before the corresponding committee of this House, and I hope some form of agreement can be reached. A coordinated program of action has already been agreed upon by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Puerto Rico Department of Agriculture. Operation Bootstrap is developing well in Puerto Rico. Operation Boost is developing well in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I say we are not going to be deflected from this constructive course. We are not going to aim for objectives which would result in our undoing. We are not going to run after will-o'-the-wisp ideas however charitable the intentions of those who may dangle them before us. We will not jeopardize the whole basis of our economic life and freedom.

In the political sense, H. R. 7674 and S. 3336 are expressions of the same program of advancement which in an economic sense is embodied in our local industrialization program, Operation Bootstrap, and in the congressional counterpart, Operation Boost. H. R. 7674 and S. 3336 would perfect our democratic status within the framework of our union within the United States, in accordance with Puerto Rico's circumstances. I thank the Eightieth Congress for having recognized Puerto Rico's political maturity and having permitted us to elect our governor. I praise the people of Puerto Rico for the wise judgment they showed in electing their present governor. I praise the people of Puerto Rico for supporting our Governor in his present endeavors to streamline our government and industrialize the island. I thank this Congress for the generous consideration it has been giving to our problems and for the helping hand it is extending.

We are an old people with an old culture. San Juan, our capital, and San German, on the southern part of the island, are the two oldest cities under the American flag. San Juan was founded in 1508 and San German in 1511. Under the dome of the old San Juan Cathedral, to the left of the central nave, repose the remains of the first Christian bishop to set foot on New World soil. To the other side of the central nave repose the remains of Juan Ponce de Leon, the founder of San Juan and later the discoverer of Florida.

Ponce de Leon came to the New World from old Castile. He brought with him the pattern of organization of a Spanish medieval city of those days. Thus were San Juan and San German organized. He did not bring with him later-day absolutist Hapsburg or Bourbon ideas of government, as unfortunately befell Spain and consequently befell us in Puerto Rico with the subsequent installation in the Spanish throne of the Hapsburg and Bourbon dynasties. Ponce de Leon represented the old Castillian

ideas of individual freedom. He belonged to that type of sixteenth-century Spaniards whose motto was "To the King my life and tribute, but my honor is of the soul, and my soul belongs to God."

Alonso Manso, the first bishop in the New World, the first bishop of Puerto Rico, represented the Christian faith of the settlers, a faith we have maintained and will always maintain.

There in that cathedral is a symbol which allows us to understand two fundamental characteristics of the Puerto Rican people—the love of individual freedom and the practice of good Christian faith. This explains the fraternal attitude which the Puerto Ricans had for the United States Armies when they arrived in Puerto Rico in 1898. In the flag which they saw the soldiers carry they could see the symbol of that individual freedom with which they had started and which they lost through the three centuries of Hapsburg and Bourbon absolutism, a freedom they yearned to have again. And they knew that in that freedom their faith could flourish. The United States troops marched along a path of flowers through the streets of Ponce, flowers that were thrown by the people.

Because we are Christian we are hospitable; because we love freedom we are Americans. This explains our hospitality to our visitors. For those reasons we will never allow our love for freedom nor our Christian faith to diminish. Our belief in the dignity of man and our Christian faith will always become evident in the way we practice hospitality. We will always break our bread with those that come to visit us as envoys of good will.

On Thursday, March 30, a joint resolution endorsing H. R. 7674 was passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico. It had the endorsement of 18 votes out of 19 in the senate, with the 1 member not voting. In the house, where there are 39 members, 1 member abstained from voting. The other 38 members endorsed H. R. 7674.

Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a more eloquent expression of the wishes of the people, I am not aware of it.

I hope that H. R. 7674 may promptly be considered by this Congress and speedily, but with thorough consideration, be sent through the legislative machinery to early enactment into law.

Times on the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial, "Times on the TVA," which appeared in the Decatur Daily on Monday, April 3, 1950:

TIMES ON THE TVA

Recently when the sixteenth annual report of the Tennessee Valley Authority was made, it occasioned much comment up and down the country.

The report drew this comment from the New York Times, a great newspaper:

"By every measurable test the Tennessee Valley Authority continues to be a success. Its sixteenth annual report shows an annual production of nearly 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or about 10 times as much electricity as was available in its area in 1933. In 1933, 3 percent of the farms in the area were electrified; now the proportion is 66 percent and growing. The improved Tennessee last year carried 427,000,000 tons of freight, or 13 times the load it did in 1933. The TVA has taken the lead in conservation measures to protect soil, forests, and wild life; it has had a large share in the nearly complete elimination of malaria. Private business has flourished. The per capita income in TVA territory has gone up from $148 to $797 this year—still below the national average but increasing much more rapidly than the national average.

"TVA's great building period is nearly over. It has constructed 17 dams and operates a system of 27 major dams and reservoirs. To the installations on the Tennessee and its tributaries will be added dams being built by the Army on the Cumberland power from which will be distributed by TVA. By 1952 TVA expects to be turning out 22,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, for which a ready market will be found. All this has been done with much less mandatory legal power than most people outside of the Tennessee Valley suppose.

"The argument as to whether TVA is in unfair competition with the privately owned electrical industry may long continue. On the face of this report and other official documents it seems likely that TVA is paying sums in lieu of taxes and sums to the Federal Government out of its net profits that come close to being equivalent to the taxes it would have to pay if it were a private enterprise. In addition to these payments, municipalities which operate their own distribution plants are earning net incomes which, in effect, are a species of tax on the ultimate consumer. The real argument for the TVA principle remains substantially what it has always been; that the multiple-purpose development of a great river is too huge an enterprise to be entrusted to a private monopoly. What we can hope to get out of such enterprises, publicly owned and managed, is decentralized and democratic management and the least possible amount of interference with local communities and private businesses. We think that in these objectives TVA has set an admirable example."

Dupes of Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1950:

BULLITT SAYS DUPES IN STATE DEPARTMENT DO SOVIET AGENT JOB

A former ambassador to Russia charged last night that dupes of Soviet propaganda are doing the work of Russian agents in the State Department.

The critic was William C. Bullitt, who told a Georgetown University audience in Gaston Hall that the United States cannot expect to win its struggle for survival against Russia until the State Department rids itself of Communist sympathizers.

These naive Government officials entered the Department through improper screening during the war, Mr. Bullitt asserted. They remain there now, he said, because Secretary Acheson and his closest associates and friends have a vested interest in their own mistakes.

The former diplomat declared that the Secretary had been persuaded by his counselors, befuddled by Soviet psychological warfare, to cease economic and military aid to China. In any European parliamentary democracy, a minister of foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China into the hands of Stalin, would have been dismissed from his post, he added.

He said he regards Indochina as the most critical area in southeast Asia and urged the immediate dispatch of arms aid to that country. He also proposed increased American support of a western European federation and of resistance forces in satellite countries.

Turning his fire on President Truman, Mr. Bullitt said:

"Our President has not understood that an over-all plan for defense, not only of our own country, but also of those countries which still remain outside Stalin's domain, is essential. The President has not yet found within himself the intelligence and spirit to take the offensive effectively against Soviet expansionism."

Rent Controls

REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, approximately a week ago I pointed out when the deficiency appropriation bill was before the House that the $4,000,000 appropriation looked ultimately to the discontinuance of rent control for the future. I pointed out, also, at that time that the new appropriations bill contained no appropriation for the Office of Housing Expediter for the next year, which is as it should be, because there is no authorization. I requested at that time that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency hold hearings soon looking to the continuation of rent control.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Monthly Labor Review has just issued an article entitled "Rent Increases After Decontrol Actions," which is the result of a seven city survey of cities which have been decontrolled, and which shows that between one-third and three-fifths of all rental dwellings in those cities have been affected by rent increases in those dwelling units, and that the rents have been raised, ranging from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston.

The article reads as follows:

RENT INCREASES AFTER DECONTROL ACTIONS[1]

In an effort to find out what happened to rents in decontrolled areas, seven large cities—Knoxville, Dallas, Spokane, Salt Lake City, Jacksonville, Topeka, and Houston—where rents had been decontrolled from 1 to

[1] By Regina Beckhardt of the Bureau's Division of Prices and Cost of Living; and Torleif Meloe of the Office of Publications.

5 months, were recently surveyed. The survey was conducted by the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics, at the request of the Office of the Housing Expediter. Between a third and three-fifths of all rental dwelling units in these cities had been affected by rent increases. For those dwelling units for which rents had been raised, the increases ranged from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston. For all rental dwellings (i. e., including those which had no change in rent) rents on the average had increased from 6.6 to 16.7 percent.

In four of the cities for which family income data were also obtained, the greatest percentage rent increases were reported by families earning under $2,000 a year. Their rent increases ranged from about 8 percent in Salt Lake City and Topeka to 31 percent in Dallas. For families in the $4,000–$5,000 and over income group, the increases ranged from 4 to 9 percent.

The 34-city rent component of the Consumer's Price Index, which includes information for two cities recently decontrolled, increased only 1.3 percent from May to November, the approximate period of the survey.

FINDINGS IN SEVEN CITIES

Rents in the seven cities were all decontrolled between June 14, 1949, and October 19, 1949, under the decontrol provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949. Although the cities covered by the survey were chosen by the Expediter from among the largest cities where rents were decontrolled, they are not necessarily representative of all decontrolled areas throughout the country. In 1940, these cities had populations ranging from 68,000 to 385,000, although current estimates indicate considerable expansion.

Survey periods extended from about 2 months prior to the decontrol date to November 15, 1949. Rental data were obtained for each city from a sample of residential units, carefully selected to represent all sections and all types of structures in each of the 7 areas. Particular attention was given to adequate representation of both white and nonwhite neighborhoods and both heavily and sparsely populated blocks. Commercial rooming houses, hotels, trailers, and tourist courts were excluded.

In Dallas, Spokane, and Topeka, the surveys were conducted by personal visits to each of the sample units; in Houston, Jacksonville, Knoxville, and Salt Lake City, where the Bureau's regular samples were available, mail questionnaires were sent out in accordance with usual Bureau of Labor Statistics procedures.[2]

Rent increases for all units (including those reporting no change) ranged from 6.6 percent in Salt Lake City to 16.7 percent in Dallas. However, rents in dwelling units free to rise, which excludes units under lease and those decontrolled before general city decontrol, increased by 7.1 percent in Salt Lake City and by as much as 20.5 percent in Dallas, as shown in the following tabulation.

[2] For discussion, see Monthly Labor Review, January 1940 (p. 60).

City and percent increase for units free to rise	
Knoxville	15.8
Dallas	20.5
Spokane	8.2
Salt Lake City	7.1
Jacksonville	12.3
Topeka	10.5
Houston	10.7

If only those units reporting a change are considered, the percentage increase in their rents was much higher, ranging from 16 percent in Salt Lake City to 40 percent in Houston (see table 1).

Dwelling units renting for under $30 a month before decontrol, received the largest percent increase in each of the 7 cities. With the exception of Spokane, the largest proportion of units reporting increases was also concentrated in this group. Family income data obtained in four of the cities covered—Spokane, Dallas, Topeka, and Salt Lake City—showed that a greater proportion of the low-income families reported rent increases than higher income groups. Among the families with incomes under $2,000, from 48 to 71 percent reported rent increases. The rent increases for this income group ranged from 8 percent in Salt Lake City to 31.3 percent in Dallas. At the upper end of the income scale ($4,000 and over bracket), the number of dwelling units receiving increases ranged from 22 percent in Topeka to 37 percent in Dallas with the increase remaining below 9 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in residential rents, by rent and income group, all units, by city, 1949* [1]

[Rental dwellings with kitchen facilities]

Rent group	Percent increase for all rental units	Units reporting rent increases			Income group	Percent increase for all rental units	Units reporting rent increases		
		Percent of all units in rent groups	Average dollar amount	Average percent increase			Percent of all units in income groups	Average dollar amount	Average percent increase
Knoxville [2]	13.9	57	$6.83	25.7	Knoxville: Not available				
Under $30 a month	21.5	62	5.31	36.8					
$30–$49.99 a month	13.6	56	9.53	23.7					
$50 a month and over	4.3	41	6.08	10.3					
Dallas area [3]	16.7	59	13.96	36.1	Dallas area:				
Under $30 a month	41.4	75	10.99	55.6	Under $2,000 a year	31.3	71	$10.15	47.0
$30–$49.99 a month	21.6	58	14.27	36.7	$2,000–$2,999 a year	25.6	64	13.94	42.7
$50 a month and over	9.8	47	17.87	27.5	$3,000–$3,999 a year	14.3	48	14.92	32.9
					$4,000–$4,999 a year	9.3	43	13.77	25.6
					$5,000 a year and over	6.4	37	19.24	35.3
Spokane [4]	8.2	46	5.71	19.0	Spokane:				
Under $30 a month	11.9	45	4.89	28.7	Under $2,000 a year	12.1	49	5.40	20.6
$30–$49.99 a month	8.7	53	6.32	17.0	$2,000–$2,999 a year	7.1	40	6.48	18.3
$50 a month and over	2.3	27	6.25	10.5	$3,000–$3,999 a year	7.5	42	6.97	20.7
					$4,000 a year and over	5.0	33	7.50	18.2
Salt Lake City [5]	6.6	44	6.46	16.0	Salt Lake City:				
Under $30 a month	12.9	48	6.07	26.9	Under $2,000 a year	8.0	48	6.20	17.3
$30–$49.99 a month	7.8	47	6.66	16.7	$2,000–$2,999 a year	6.8	41	6.23	17.0
$50 a month and over	3.4	34	6.41	10.2	$3,000–$3,999 a year	6.9	42	7.15	16.4
					$4,000–$4,999 a year	8.2	49	7.97	18.9
					$5 000 a year and over	4.2	34	7.36	12.5
Jacksonville area [6]	10.9	52	6.59	25.8	Jacksonville area: Not available				
Under $30 a month	21.8	66	6.24	34.2					
$30–$49.99 a month	8.3	45	7.04	18.7					
$50 a month and over	1.0	5	12.75	24.4					
Topeka [7]	9.0	36	9.08	30.2	Topeka:				
Under $30 a month	18.1	46	7.09	37.7	Under $2,000 a year	9.1	48	9.13	35.6
$30–$49.99 a month	11.6	39	11.37	29.3	$2,000–$2,999 a year	9.9	31	9.04	31.0
$50 a month and over	−.4	11	8.12	13.8	$3,000–$3,999 a year	6.6	27	10.14	29.4
					$4,000 a year and over	9.0	22	6.06	15.6
Houston area [8]	10.5	33	12.03	40.0	Houston area: Not available				
Under $30 a month	20.3	46	9.97	45.1					
$30–$49.99 a month	12.0	32	14.21	38.5					
$50 a month and over	1.4	9	13.84	25.8					

[1] Rent increases on additional units were reported as follows, effective sometime after Nov. 15, 1949.

	Percent of units	Rent increase	
		Amount	Percent
Knoxville	1	$2.95	15.1
Dallas	3	9.40	16.1
Spokane	5	6.16	17.5
Salt Lake City	5	7.86	21.7
Jacksonville	1	10.00	44.9
Topeka	4	8.83	26.7
Houston	6	11.62	39.8

[2] Decontrolled June 14, 1949, by the city council; surveyed May 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[3] Decontrolled June 23, 1949, by the city council; surveyed Apr. 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[4] Decontrolled July 26, 1949, by the Housing Expediter; surveyed May 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[5] Decontrolled Aug. 5, 1949, by the city council; surveyed June 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[6] Decontrolled Aug. 5, 1949, by the city council; surveyed June 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[7] Decontrolled Sept. 14, 1949, by the city council; surveyed July 15–Nov. 15, 1949.
[8] Decontrolled Oct. 19, 1949, by State-wide action; surveyed Aug. 15–Nov. 15, 1949.

HOUSING NEED IN SEVEN CITIES

In all seven cities surveyed, the demand for available housing has been intensified by an extensive growth in population since 1940. Recent public and private estimates indicate that the population has increased by about 60 percent in Houston and has risen by about a fourth in Salt Lake City and Dallas. The average growth for the other cities is estimated at 30 to 50 percent.

Vacancy rates in these areas have remained low, according to available information. In Knoxville, a recent local survey indicates that vacancies had dropped below the 0.9-percent rate found in the November 1945 survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Dallas' vacancy rate for dwellings available for rent or sales dropped from about 6 percent in 1940 to 1.3 percent in 1949, according to a Bureau survey. In January 1949, only 0.8 percent of the dwellings were vacant and available for rent.[3] The rental vacancy rate in Spokane dropped from 13.2 percent in April 1940 to 1 percent in August 1946, according to the Bureau of the Census, but estimates at the end of 1949 indicate that this rate may have risen slightly.[4] In the Salt Lake City metropolitan district, the rental vacancy rate remained somewhat higher than in most cities. In 1940, the census showed that it was 6.4 percent for rental dwellings and, in 1947, it was still 2.8 percent. However, a recent local survey indicates a decline since 1947. Recent surveys show only a slight rise in the vacancy rate in Houston, since April 1947. At that time, according to Bureau of Census estimates, it was 1.8 percent; currently it is about 2 percent.

Over-all vacancy data are not available for Topeka and Houston. However, vacancies in FHA rental housing in Topeka which were created by the closing of the air base were filled within a few weeks, with no rent reductions.

Evidence of a continuing demand for low rental housing is available for four of the areas. The local public housing authority in each of these areas in its application for program reservation,[5] which it filed with the Public Housing Administration in Washington, listed the number of applications on file for low rental housing currently available as follows: Knoxville, 1,284; Dallas, 5,280; Jacksonville, 922; and Houston, 1,218.

RENT ACT OF 1949 [6]

The Housing and Rent Act of 1949, effective on April 1, 1949, placed primary responsibility for the decontrol of Federal rental areas upon the States and local municipal councils. Under its terms, an entire State or any portion thereof may be decontrolled either by legislative action or State control may be substituted for Federal control if the Governor certifies to the Housing Expediter that the State legislature has passed adequate rent-control measures to replace the Federal law. Furthermore, the governing bodies of any incorporated city, town, or village may, with the Governor's approval, terminate rent control within their jurisdiction. The Housing Expediter must then decontrol adjacent unincorporated areas if the incorporated place is a major portion of the rental area.

The general authority of the Housing Expediter to decontrol areas in which the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met is continued. Local rent advisory boards may, as under the 1947 and 1948 acts, recommend decontrol of the area under its authority. Unless adequately substantiated, the Housing Expediter can disapprove such recommendations. In appeals by the local board or interested parties, the final arbiter is the Emergency Court of Appeals.

Areas removed from rent control by the Housing Expediter after April 1, 1949, may be recontrolled by him under the provisions of the existing act. The recontrol of areas decontrolled prior to that date and areas never under control must first be recommended by the local board. These recontrol provisions cannot be invoked in areas decontrolled by local or State option.

No general rent adjustment is written into the existing act, but the Housing Expediter is authorized to increase rents individually to provide landlords with a fair net operating income. Under this formula, it was the intent of Congress that landlords should receive an income that is above their expenses by a fair amount Under the 1947 and 1948 acts, rent ceilings were increased only if the landlord showed that he incurred a financial loss or hardship in the operation of his rental units. Under these earlier acts, increases up to 15 percent were permitted under certain conditions.

The control of evictions was taken away from the local courts and given to the Housing Expediter by the 1949 legislation. He has also been authorized to apply for injunctions to force compliance with the law and to institute a treble damage suit against any person demanding or receiving rent in excess of that established by his office. As under the two earlier laws, the 1949 act continued the exemption of new construction from rent control.

EXTENT OF NATIONAL DECONTROL

About 3,000,000 registered dwelling units were removed from Federal rent control from July 1, 1947, through January 15, 1950, under the various decontrol provisions of the postwar housing and rent acts (see table 2). Some 11,700,000 units remained under control in 365 rental areas. More than 97 percent of the 3,000,000 units were decontrolled after April 1, 1949, under the liberalized decontrol provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

Total decontrol actions under the 1947 and 1948 acts affected only an estimated 80,111 dwelling units. These actions were, of course, all taken by the Housing Expediter, either upon his own initiative or upon recommendation of the local advisory boards, since the State- and local-option clauses were not included in any act previous to 1949.

TABLE 2.—*Area decontrol and decontrol actions by type of authority July 1, 1947–Jan. 15, 1950*

Item	Total number	Apr. 1, 1949, to Jan. 15, 1950	Apr. 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949	July 1, 1947, to Mar. 31, 1948
Number of rental areas completely decontrolled [1]	250	234	7	9
Total 1940 population in decontrolled areas	24,289,967	23,381,962	555,039	352,966
Total decontrol actions [2]	749	[3] 681	44	24
Estimated registered dwelling units in decontrolled areas	2,886,873	[3] 2,806,762	42,234	37,877
Housing Expediter—actions	514	469	39	6
Estimated units decontrolled	1,194,704	1,156,474	29,275	8,955
Local board recommendations—actions	28	5	5	18
Estimated units decontrolled	115,849	73,959	12,959	28,922
Local option—actions	201	201	----------	----------
Estimated units decontrolled	738,815	738,815	----------	----------
State option—actions [4]	6	6	----------	----------
Estimated units decontrolled	837,514	837,514	----------	----------

[1] The number of areas still under control is 365.
[2] Some decontrol actions affect only portions of areas.
[3] In 3 cases (Americus, Ga., Altoona-Johnstown, Pa., and Harrodsburg, Ky.) recontrol actions were taken involving 7,120 units.
[4] 4 States completely decontrolled and 1 placed under State rent control.

The importance of these local-option provisions in the 1949 law was great. For more than 56 percent of the total dwelling units decontrolled after April 1, 1949, the action was taken under State or local option. Two States (Texas and Nebraska) removed rent controls entirely by State option, while in Utah and Arizona they were removed completely by a combination of Expediter and local board actions. Wisconsin substituted a State law, which, in effect, allowed rents to be increased 15 percent for those tenants who had previously agreed to a 15-percent voluntary rise under the 1947 and 1948 Federal acts and 30 percent for those who had not signed such agreements. The Alabama Legislature voted to end controls on May 10, 1950.

Although 69 percent of the total decontrol actions from July 1, 1947, were taken by the Housing Expediter upon his own initiative, they were primarily in rural or sparsely populated places and involved only about 41 percent of the dwelling units decontrolled. Many of the actions after April 1, 1949, resulted from the decontrol of surrounding areas after a central city had been decontrolled by local option.

The number of rental units decontrolled by the Housing Expediter upon recommendation of the local advisory boards represents less than 4 percent of the total for the period ending January 15.

Insofar as rents have been decontrolled in cities included in the rent component of the Consumers' Price Index (1935–39=100), the effect is shown in the following tabulation.

Period and percent of increase (34 large cities) [1]

December 1942–June 1947	1.1
June 1947–April 1948	6.5
April 1948–April 1949	3.4
April 1949–December 1949	1.6

[1] Houston and Jacksonville are among the cities regularly included in the index.

Marked increases followed the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 on July 1, 1947. The 15-percent increases, permitted under lease agreements between landlords and tenants, accounted for a large part of the 10-percent rise in the index between June 1947 and April 1949. In contrast, the rise after the 1949 legislation took effect was relatively small due to the removal of the 15-percent increase provisions.

[3] The median monthly rental asked was $90 and most of the units were built in the last 6 months of 1948.

[4] Some of the projects constructed in Spokane under sec. 608 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act have found it necessary to reduce rents in order to maintain marketability.

[5] The first step in the procedure whereby a city, through its local housing authority, participates in the low-rent public-housing program.

[6] The Housing and Rent Act of 1949 (Public Law 31, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), approved March 30, 1949.

We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein several telegrams from my great friend, H. R. (Roy) Cullen of Houston, Tex. Also to include therein, an article by Ernest O. Hauser in the March 4, 1950, Saturday Evening Post, entitled "We Will Never Make Them Do It Our Way."

Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of this House, and we have 435 of them, they represent every human being from every district in the United States, 150,000,000 great Americans, knew Roy Cullen of Houston, Tex., and his great work as I do. There is no way to properly describe him, but to me he is one of the finest and one of the most unusual men I have ever known. I have never known such an unselfish human being in my life. When I think about all of the many things he has done to help humanity, to help our churches, our schools, white and colored—when I think about his great brain, his wonderful ability, his unlimited energy and his great understanding heart, I just want to get down on my knees and thank The Great, Good One for giving this Nation a man with the ability and foresight of Texas' own H. R. (Roy) Cullen. He not only does good in Texas, but he does good in every State in this Union, wherever he goes, he and his wonderful wife, who are such pals and who have raised such a wonderful family and who has done so much good in helping to develop one of the greatest cities on this earth, Houston, Tex., and who has visited us down in our great State of Alabama, where he visited all over my district, especially the beautiful Bellingrath Gardens at Mobile, Ala., where he went over our beautiful Mobile Bay, our Dauphin Island and where he is coming back this summer to have another visit with us, where he visited that great Grand Hotel at Point Clear—one of the unforgettable spots of this earth, an unforgettable spot that will never be forgotten by an unforgettable man. To know Roy Cullen and Mrs. Cullen is to love them—they have both just dedicated their lives to help Houston, to help Texas, and to help this Nation, and to do good everywhere they go, and to help keep our way of life.

The matter referred to above follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 22, 1950.*
Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building.

I sent the following telegram to Robert Fuoss, managing editor of the Saturday Evening Post:

"Mr. ROBERT FUOSS,
Managing Editor, the Saturday Evening Post, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa.:

"The most enlightening article in the Post March 4 issue entitled 'We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way,' by Ernest O. Hauser, should be sent to all of our Representatives in Congress so they will be able to cast an intelligent vote on foreign matters. The article also is a denial to the arguments used by Will Clayton's world union. I will be glad to pay all expenses that may be incurred.

"H. R. CULLEN,
"1710 City National Bank Building."

I received the following telegram in reply from the Saturday Evening Post:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 10.*
H. R. CULLEN:

Thanks for wire on Hauser article. We don't plan to circularize it but are glad to give you permission to reprint it intact with credit by special permission Saturday Evening Post copyright 1950 Curtis Publishing Co., for purpose you describe.

W. J. STEVENS., Jr.,
Assistant Managing Editor.

This is permission for you to reproduce article by Ernest O. Hauser in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article absolutely explodes the theory of Will Clayton's world union.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 24, 1950.*
Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please consider this telegram carefully in conjunction with Kerr-Thomas bill that is now pending. Figures quoted are those used in making our income-tax returns and relate to gas field in Calhoun County, Tex., where first-drilling operations were commenced in 1947.

My associates and I drilled two wildcat dry holes on an anticlinical nose at a total cost of $316,659.40. The third well which was drilled is capable of producing gas. A total of seven wells has been drilled, four being producers and three being dry holes. Total cost of all the wells is $932,275.75, resulting in average cost for each well of $133,182.25, or a cost of $233,068.94 for each productive well.

No gas has yet been sold, but negotiations have been consummated on a 10-year contract under which we are to receive an average of 8 cents per thousand cubic feet of gas.

Texas gas is now being sold in cities throughout the country to housewives at prices ranging from $1 to $1.50 per thousand cubic feet; so 92 cents to $1.42 per thousand cubic feet charged to the housewives is taken up by transportation and distribution charges. The gas producers are receiving at the well only 5 to 7 percent of the amount paid by the housewives.

Before deliveries are commenced under the contract previously referred to it will be necessary to expend additional sums for equipment. A gasoline extraction plant may be required at a possible cost in excess of $2,000,000. Under present conditions such plants are being operated at a loss. We are interested in such plant in Refugio County, Tex., which at present loses approximately $6,000 per month.

I have given you a true economic picture of a gas field and I am in position to know that other gas fields in this area have required similar expenditures for discovery and development.

It takes courage to risk such sums on so hazardous an investment under present conditions, but no one but a crazy man would take such risks unless the Kerr-Thomas bill is enacted.

A copy of this telegram is being air-mailed to each Member of the Senate.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 27, 1950.*
Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building:

Supplementing my telegram of March 24, wish to explain why the gas wells mentioned cost so much. Gas fields in this area that are now being found are usually very deep; from 9,000 to 12,000 feet with very high gas pressures and much faulting in the fields, so each well drilled within the field must be drilled as wildcat where much coring and testing is done and high-pressure casing and equipment must be used which alone on one well costs between forty and fifty thousand dollars. The Russian Government would give many billions of rubles to stop the exploration of oil in this country. To defeat the Kerr-Thomas bill which is now before your Senate would make Joe Stalin very happy.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *March 27, 1950.*
Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing my telegrams March 24 and 27. I hope I am not boring you with my telegrams, but I realize that much pressure is brought to bear on the Senate by pressure groups furnishing data of doubtful nature, and that you might like to have evidence that is supported by income-tax returns.

I have already given you a brief report on a gas field that my associates and I discovered in Calhoun County.

Now, I would like to give you the facts about a gas field that my associates and I discovered in Atascosa County in 1946. We drilled six wells at a total cost of $799,487.82, or an average cost of $133,247.97 per well. Three wells were producers and three wells were dry; thus, cost per productive well was $266,495.94. The producing wells have a pressure of 3,300 pounds on the Christmas tree, but sulfur and carbon-dioxide content is so high gas cannot be sold to the pipe line without being washed. Cost of building and operating a plant to wash the limited quantity of gas discovered is so great that it is not economically feasible at the present price of gas. We now have a large capital investment with slight chance of recovery.

This is another example of the great risk involved in exploring for gas. We can stay in business only if the returns from the good fields can offset the losses of poor ones. Government regulation coupled with the risks of discovery would make exploration impracticable. Passage of the Kerr-Thomas bill would assure availability of gas reserves in the event of a national emergency.

A copy of this telegram is being air mailed to each Member of the Senate.

H. R. CULLEN.

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 3, 1950.*
Hon. FRANK BOYKIN,
Representative from Alabama:

The commentator, Drew Pearson, whom both Roosevelt and Truman have termed a "liar," is again at his dirty work of asking the housewives to write President Truman not to sign the gas bill.

All those who are acquainted with the gas situation in the gas fields know that not to pass the gas bill would mean the stopping of drilling of gas wells wherever they may be and would result in terribly high gas prices all over the country. If our Congress and President do not protect the gas producer at the well from Government interference and taxation, then it is time for all of our Senators and Congressmen from the State of Texas to offer bills to tax every commodity at its source from a peanut in the field to a caterpillar in the factory. If you would offer bills to tax every commodity at its source in those States where their Congressmen and Senators are voting against the gas bill, we would get relief from persecution by those States.

This telegram is being sent to Senators CONNALLY, JOHNSON, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Representatives ALBERT THOMAS and FRANK BOYKIN, with copy to President Truman.

H. R. CULLEN.

We'll Never Make Them Do It Our Way

(By Ernest O. Hauser)

Paris.—American planners in Europe are up a tree. If the immediate aim of ERP was to give this war-struck Continent first aid, we're not doing badly. Throughout western Europe trains are running, currencies are stabilized, and the political situation is solid to the point where communism is no day-to-day menace. With this accomplished, the givers of aid suddenly find themselves confronted with the chronic ills of Europe.

Is it our job to cure these ills? Our planners, seeing that their time by Europe's bedside is nearly up, have begun to talk with greater urgency. Their objective, on the face of it, sound simple enough: Freer trade among European nations, abolition of import quotas and customs barriers, convertibility of Europe's many currencies—in short, the economic integration of Marshall-plan Europe. The word, it was noted, appeared 16 times in the hurry-up speech made by ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman in Paris on October 31, 1949.

Translated into action, this means trouble. Already Marshall planning has slipped into a second critical stage, not limited to giving aid. No longer sticking to our original purpose of curing Europe of the war, we're trying to cure her of * * * Europe. Watching this amazing effort from the vantage point of one who has seen this Continent come back, I feel that we've maneuvered ourselves astride a tiger.

For in analyzing some of the implications of Mr. Hoffman's objective, one finds that western Europe would have to undergo a full-blown revolution—technological, psychological, and social—in order to comply. She would have to take the butcher knife to a lot of ingrown habits and hallowed traditions. She would have to turn herself inside out.

And what if she won't? Making satellites is not an American custom—we have no Rokossovskys, no commissars to install in European capitals. Behind the tall windows of the Rothschild palace in Paris, ECA headquarters for Europe, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman is still trying to make Europeans do our bidding with a smile. "Soviet policy," he told me, "is to dominate others. American policy is to help others." Ask his associates what methods they're using, and they'll rattle off the known variations on the theme persuade: needle, wheedle, coax, suggest, urge, prevail upon, cajole, inveigle. The one verb not in their vocabulary is "compel."

Mere persuasion, from here on, just won't make it stick. Take a seemingly innocuous little nostrum—efficiency. To close her dollar gap at a reasonably high level of trade by 1952—the goal of ERP—Europe must export. To export, she must step up production; to step up production, she must produce more efficiently. Yet, in advising Europe's industrialists on what they should do, few Americans are aware of the fact that the word "efficiency" cannot be rendered accurately into European languages. And the trouble in getting it translated is as nothing compared to the trouble in getting it across.

A simple case: an ECA official in Rome used to tell Italian cotton manufacturers that once they stopped making several types of cloth in each plant and concentrated, instead, on one line—like we do at home—the result would be higher efficiency and higher profits.

"Just think," one Italian textile man said to me, "what would have happened if I'd taken his advice. We've always turned out 20 or 30 lines because we never had one large, solid market. If a customer said he liked this pattern, but he'd prefer it in blue, we made it in blue for him. Came the sterling devaluation, knocking out the best market we had for cotton goods. Why did I survive? Only because I was flexible enough to offer this type of cloth to the French, that to the Indians, and yet another to the Swedes—by now, I've opened up new markets and absorbed the shock."

An ECA man in Paris who had been looking at one of the largest French automobile plants came back scratching his head. "A workman finishes his castings—door hinges, say—puts them into a tote box and drags the box to the next machine. If it's a large piece, he drags the piece itself across the floor. Back home we use conveyors for that sort of thing. 'You could make more cars,' I say to the manufacturer, 'if you installed a chain hoist or something.' Says he, 'Why make more cars?' He isn't thinking about an ever-expanding market—first a car for the rich, then a car for the workers. All he's thinking of is how to retire at 60. 'Besides,' he tells me, 'if I gave my men a machine that does things faster, they wouldn't use it. Work themselves out of their jobs?' "

To make European managers and workers fall in love with American production methods, ECA is taking groups of them to the United States for a look-see. I talked with a French electrical engineer who had been a member of a group visiting, among other things, the Baldwin Locomotive Works near Philadelphia and the General Electric plant in Schenectady. The experience wasn't lost on him. "Yes, there are a number of things we'd do well to duplicate. For instance, standardization of design—you push the customer toward the standard product by charging him extra for special fixtures or a slight variation in style. Nothing wrong with that. And, another thing, you always worry about increasing your output. In the plants we saw, both managers and workers are encouraged to make suggestions, and they do—all the time. Everyone is constantly moving forward in the States." A trivial thing that had struck him: machine-mounted files were used in making the cutting edges of certain machine tools in Schenectady. "We have them here, too, but our workers won't touch them. They still prefer the slow, old-fashioned hand file, and, for that last polish, a stone." Smoother results? "No," he grinned, "but tell that to one of our old-timers."

Change, so desirable to the average American who firmly believes in progress, is something to be afraid of over here. Europeans are security-minded. The industrialist rocking along nicely with the machinery he installed 30 years ago will think twice before investing in new equipment. What if another war breaks out? What if the Russians are coming, after all? Won't cash be safer? And, if he mail-orders new equipment and doubles production, won't he work himself, quickly, first through his stock pile of raw materials, then through his stock pile of orders?

Likewise, a French workman, producing only one-fourth as much per man-hour as his American cousin and paid half the American wage, is easily convinced that higher living standards are waiting at the end of Efficiency Street. Yet he hesitates to go that way. Heir to tradition of craftsmanship, the European worker tends to think of himself as starting with a clump of clay and ending up with a graceful vase. Even when working in a steel mill, he still prides himself on being a craftsman. He has an investment in years of painful apprenticeship which he must protect. He's a little afraid of becoming a Stakhanovite at the assembly line. And he's much afraid of finishing any given job in half the time now used—meaning that either he or the fellow next to him will be fired come Friday. These are some deep-rooted attitudes our planners would have to change to make Europe more efficient. What seems a mere face-lifting job turns out to be a complete revamping of the old personality.

So much for efficiency. Now for the slightly larger order, economic integration. Said Mr. Hoffman in his hurry up speech: "The fact that we have in the United States a single market of 150,000,000 consumers has been indispensable to the strength and efficiency of our economy. The creation of a permanent, freely trading area comprising 270,000,000 consumers in western Europe would * * * set in motion a rapid growth in productivity. This would make it possible for Europe to improve its competitive position in the world and thus more nearly satisfy the * * * needs of its people. This is a vital objective."

"Get together, boys," snickered a Frenchman, "or you'll go to bed without supper." While many thinking people west of the iron curtain agree that Europeans must hang together if they don't want to hang separately, century-old traditions still make the concept of integration revolutionary. Whatever European country you visit today, the principal landmarks and sight-seeing objects bring to mind a militant nationalism, Europe's scourge for the last 150 years. Nelson atop a column in Trafalgar Square; Napolean atop a column in the Place Vendôme; Victory atop a column in Berlin; half the street names in every capital, and soldiers' graves lining the highways—echoes, everywhere, of neighbor A's victory over neighbor B in the not forgotten past.

How could it be otherwise? Crammed together, speaking different languages, and following traditions of their own, the people of Europe have always found quarreling the most natural pastime there was. Gradually, the economic structure was made to fit the map. Used to the idea of fighting one another every few years, everyone simply kept watering his plot, trying to raise his own crop of steel castings, biscuits, and uniform buttons. Hoping to change this system by persuasion is obviously unrealistic. Yet we're prodding Europeans to get together overnight.

"What I want to see over here," said one high-minded American, "is the kind of assembly-line economy we have in the United States—everybody makes what he's best at."

In Milan, the other day, I talked with the head of one of Italy's largest industrial concerns, employing 12,000 workers and turning out railroad cars, locomotives, and heavy machinery. What, I asked, would happen if customs barriers throughout western Europe were pulled up? The industrialist's parchment face began to glow. He had always been a rooter for the United States of Europe, and the sooner the better. What about his engineering works? The glow vanished. "Industries like ours were established merely because we didn't wish to depend on others. We have almost no iron ore or coal in this country. Without protective tariffs we'd be out of business overnight."

The entire industrial structure of Italy's Po Valley, one of Europe's great nerve centers, would collapse the minute Europe became one freely trading area. French, British, and German steel, Swedish and German paper, Dutch radios, Belgian glassware, all cheaper than Italians can make them, would pour across the Alps, wrecking industries now giving employment to several million workers. "We still could manufacture things * * * such as precision instruments or something."

The whole idea of this system is to protect the inefficient, high-cost producer against the efficient, low-cost producer across the border. In Italy today a standard typewriter costs $200 and a four-door sedan sets you back $2,350. Both are Italian-made and poor compared to the American equivalent, which would cost you $150 and $1,567, respectively, and which the law keeps you from bringing in. Everywhere trusts and monopoly concerns sit pat on articles whose

production they've been able to corner, refusing to improve the product, refusing to lower the price. "Go ahead with integration," they say, "and you'll get a Europe studded with ghost towns." Some 40,000 Norwegian textile workers, for example, would be out of job and home the minute cheap Swedish textiles came in across the border. Even the French wine growers have come crying to Mr. Harriman's office because the proposed French-Italian customs union would "throw them out of business."

"You mean to say," an incredulous American asked them, "your great French wines couldn't hold their own against Italian ones?"

"Certainly," smiled the French through their tears, "but it would force our prices down."

The resistance of protected groups whose survival in comfort is threatened by integration doesn't worry ECA men half as much as the recalcitrance of one essential partner—Great Britain. In urging Europeans from the start to get together and help themselves, we were quietly assuming that Britain would take the lead. There was reason for hope. It was Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin who first grabbed the ball tossed over the fence by Secretary of State George Marshall in his Harvard speech of June 5, 1947. Since then, however, those early hopes have wilted. You cannot talk with our planners here for more than 10 minutes without hearing them voice their bafflement at British aloofness.

American as well as continental critics, no longer concealing their disappointment, now openly accuse the British of dragging their feet. Already the impression that Britain is willfully holding back the economic unification of Europe has sent British prestige to an all-time low. "It makes you think that just as the veto in the United Nations comes from Russia," a middle-of-the-road Italian newspaper wrote the other day, "so it is Britain's exclusive role to exercise the veto in Europe, at least as things favorable to the Continent are concerned." Said a Frenchman, "They're going down themselves, and they want to pull the house down with them." Said an American, "Whenever the British attend a European recovery meeting, they come with sour faces. They simply do not want to see recovery on the Continent as long as they themselves are faced with economic catastrophe."

Here again it's tradition our impatient planners are up against—a tradition which it would take a sledge hammer to crush. As the inventors of an old game called the balance of power, the British have always been afraid of a united Continent facing them across the Channel, and they've fought a couple of wars to prevent such unity. It isn't easy for them to turn around and forget what amounts to a national attitude. Even today, in surrendering part of their individuality to European union, Britons are afraid they'd be losers—their own tradition of political continuity still seems preferable to the rapid succession of weak governments with which the Continent is cursed.

As Europe's leading nation for so long, is it hard to understand that Britain now finds it difficult to take her place in the queue? The very idea is intolerable. To fathom the British trauma you merely have to travel between London and Paris today. While the Continent faces forward, the British public remains imprisoned by memories of World War II, and the phrase, "when we stood alone," still echoes from every wall. The Continent bustles with a new life—Britain is held down by a cumbersome system of restrictions whose sum total spells poverty.

The resentment of the British tourist who crosses the Channel to find full shelves for those who can buy, ample meals for those who can pay, and an air of pulsating activity all the way from Dover to Naples, is the resentment of the uninvited looking in through the window and seeing the party in full swing. Out of tune with the rest of Europe, he goes back home to his misery, where, once again, he stands alone.

"We don't belong to Europe, we belong to the world," British ECA delegates insist, countering talk about European integration with talk about the British Commonwealth—the world's largest low-tariff area—with which the United Kingdom is doing more business than with the whole of western Europe. Unfortunately, from the ECA point of view, there's little difference between a Conservative and a Laborite when it comes to integration; while Tories are apt to chase the phantom ricksha of their evanescent Empire, Socialists worry about what would happen to their planned economy once Britain traded freely with her neighbors. A Frenchman told me of discussing integration with two British delegates to the 1949 Council of Europe meeting at Strasbourg.

"If I had to choose between the Commonwealth and Europe, I'd take the former," said the Conservative.

"If freer trade with the Continent would throw a single British worker out of his job, I'm against it," said the Laborite.

Not satisfied with the Labor Government's recent gesture in exempting one-half of Britain's private imports from the quota system without liberalizing foreign trade carried on by the Government itself, Marshall planners have frankly given up hoping for British leadership. "We can't hold up the whole convoy just because one of the ships refuses to get up speed," one ECA man said.

Many responsible Europeans feel the same way. "We've got to make a start, regardless," I was told by the French Premier, Georges Bidault.

Here, however, the question pops up at once: Without England, what have you got? Few people on this shrunken Continent are willing to go ahead and integrate without the British, for fear that such a solution would leave western Europe once again dominated by Germany, in more than just the economic sense. Consequently, the various regional integration schemes now half-heartedly sponsored by ECA for want of something better all leave a door open for the British to come on in. Some progress has been made in recent customs-union talks among the Fritalux nations—France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg. Taking it from there, the British themselves—"to please Mr. Hoffman"—have initiated talks for a British-Scandinavian economic union. At this moment, Fritalux as well as Uniscan is a long way from actual operation. It takes more than good will, more than persuasion, to level the walls built by narrow-minded generations.

No longer squeamish about Mr. Marshall's original warning, "The initiative, I think, must come from Europe," we have assumed a leadership no European nation was willing to assume. But though we now have the initiative, what can we do with it?

From the start, our aid was conditioned on performance. Having offered to help Europe if Europe was willing to help herself, we can remind the 17 recipients of our aid that performance is what we want to see, and we constantly do. Beyond that, there's little we can do to enforce our demands. The only instrument of coercion is provided in our bilateral agreements with the recipient governments, and it is a gentle instrument, at that. In selling ERP supplies, from coal to tractors, to the public, each government has agreed to place the proceeds from these sales in a special fund, known as the counterpart fund. Before spending any of the shillings, lire and francs in this fund, it must wait for Uncle Sam's nod. In as much as the counterpart fund makes up a large part of each government's budget, it is naturally anxious to get that nod in order to invest the money in such things as a new bridge or a new power plant. Just by not nodding, we can get a lot of cooperation.

It isn't blackmail exactly, but, combined with a casual reference to the patience of the American taxpayer, it does put a little starch into our suggestions. Nor does even this bashful effort to enforce our will always go down very smoothly.

"Some of the stuff I find on my desk in the morning," the head of one European government told me recently, "is so touchy, if the Communists ever got a peek at it, they'd splash it over the front page of every Red paper in Europe." He was referring to official communications—all in the "persuasion" class—addressed to him by the ECA administration in his capital. "Even so," he added, "the Americans are only trying to be helpful, and I oblige, I oblige."

A small example of what ECA can achieve with this technique is the French tax-reform measure which, with United States blessing, went into effect on January 1, 1949. Europe's archaic tax laws, Americans argue, are among the worst stumbling blocks to recovery. Roughly, Marshall-plan Europe can be divided into two parts—countries such as Britain, Holland, and Germany, where the tax collector gets his due; and countries such as France and Italy, where, for many years past, only fools have paid up. Rare indeed is the French or Italian businessmen who doesn't keep two sets of books.

Finding only poor men at home wherever it dropped in to collect, the French Government has long been trying to get its money by making manufacturers pay heavy taxes on the value of their production, and shopkeepers on their sales. It wasn't democratic—burdening the poor consumer with an enormous hidden tax bill included in the high price of things—but it left fewer loopholes. Even today, after the American-induced reform, a mere 15 percent of France's total tax income represents direct, or income, taxes—as against 75 percent in the United States. Nevertheless, a beginning has been made, and ECA men hope that little by little the burden will shift to the rich, and the easygoing Latins will move toward an American-type income tax. At this moment, tax collectors both here and in Italy are showing a new eagerness in making people render unto Caesar. "They don't put us into jail yet," an Italian businessmen told me, "but several people I know have been fined for doctoring their books."

Just how long this new eagerness will last is hard to say—"As long as the Americans stand over us," according to the cynics, who may be right. For, to make their decrees effective, those well-meaning governments would have to change the moral code of the rich man who finds nothing wrong with cheating society if he can get away with it. They'd have to give a new dignity to their civil servants—ragged, underfed, overworked men and women, drudging away in shabby, poorly lit, evil-smelling offices, living in crowded tenements without comforts, and not always above yielding to the temptation of a bribe.

"Double their pay," Americans urge.

"We know we ought to," say the French, "but it would wreck our budget."

It is a tall order, this second Marshall plan. Far from merely administering aid to Europe, far from helping her to help herself, our planners are now frankly sponsoring a complete transformation of her social and economic structure. In going beyond the original purpose of ERP, they're off on flights of fancy. What we want the 270,000,000 people of western Europe to do is

only this: Scrap a large part of their industries and find some new use for the equipment and labor employed in them; develop managerial attitudes and working habits now prevalent in the United States, though foreign to the established way of European thinking; open their hearts to a new social consciousness and adapt their tax laws to that new mentality. Above all, sink their old differences, even to the point of giving up a portion of their sovereignty, and become one great, homogeneous body where factories produce for one vast market, where people, goods, and money move freely back and forth.

Few inhabitants of the Old World, confronted with this grandiose concept, will deny that it has the earmarks of progress. Still, few are ready for it. Like the steel worker who believes that his hand file and stone are superior to the machine-mounted file that keeps going at a crazy pace, Europeans are attached to a way of life their fathers taught them. "You want us to eat, sleep, work, and die like Americans," one angry Frenchman said. He, and many with him, will resist to the last a process of Americanization which would leave western Europe more efficient, more industrious, more advanced, more comfortable, and no longer herself.

What, then, is the answer? Shoot a few French winegrowers? Place commissars in factories? Purge the saboteurs of European unity? Haul Sir Stafford Cripps before a people's court for anti-integrationism? Brute force might work, for a while. Napoleon tried it; Hitler tried it; and Stalin is trying it, not wholly unsuccessfully, in eastern Europe. But it isn't the kind of world we want, and our overenthusiastic planners would be the first to throw up their hands in horror at such a prospect.

Why not stick to our original plan—the first and only Marshall plan? Its clearly stated purpose was a 4-year program of blood transfusions to enable the patient to be up and about by 1952. Looking at the results of this thoroughly, realistic, and definitely limited project at the halfway mark, one finds no cause for despair. Western Europe has come a long way already, and there is good reason to believe that at the end of ERP 2 years from now, she'll have progressed to the point where a moderate influx of private United States capital can prevent a relapse. If we leave behind smoking chimneys, busy piers and markets, and governments freely chosen by their people, we'll have done what we set out to do. And we will, in the process, have created the climate for the kind of long-range planning Europe needs.

But this kind of planning can be done only by the Europeans themselves. If the people of this ancient continent have to change their way of life, they'll do the changing on their own hook. With a general rise in standards, and the richer development of the human personality that goes with it, they'll get around to working out their own salvation. No prompting will be required. It won't be tomorrow, and it won't be by 1952, but it's a pretty safe bet that, eventually, their own instinct will guide them toward some sort of unity—Mr. Hoffman's target for tonight. The result of their efforts won't be an Americanized Europe, nor indeed a Soviet Europe, but a Europe in which 270,000,000 proud and surprisingly hardy human beings will somehow make out. Far from being anybody's apes or satellites, they'll be our cheerful partners, building with us a safe and prosperous Western World under the steel umbrella of the Atlantic Pact. Rather than persuade them to pull up their socks would it not be wiser to limit ourselves to the first-aid job and let the Europeans take care of the rest—in their own time?

Father Hubbard's Opposition to Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on page A1835 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appears an insertion of an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and also an article quoted from the Los Angeles Examiner. These insertions were made by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and were undoubtedly based on what appeared to him to be reliable information. However, when the Reverend Bernard Hubbard, S. J., famed "glacier priest," heard of this insertion, he made another statement, which shows him to be definitely against statehood for Alaska at this time, and I have been requested to have his statement, appearing in the March 30 issue of the Seattle Times, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. His statement is therefore submitted herewith.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER HUBBARD STILL OPPOSES ALASKA STATE

The Reverend Bernard Hubbard, S.J., famed glacier priest of Alaska, sent word from Los Angeles to the Times today that he was misquoted in an article read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, and which represented him as favoring Alaska statehood.

The article appeared first in a Los Angeles newspaper after a representative of the newspaper interviewed Father Hubbard. The article then was inserted in the RECORD.

"A spurious set of quotations," Father Hubbard said today, "gave the reader the impression that I am for Alaskan statehood now, whereas I am absolutely opposed to it now for reasons that I have stated very clearly. This puts me in the position of reversing my opinions, which is entirely misleading to the American public and unfair to me."

LONG TIME AHEAD

"When Alaska is in a position to support itself, and when there are enough people and business interests in the vast stretches of Alaska to support it as a State, then we can intelligently consider statehood, but obviously that is a long time in the future.

"There has been much loose talk by the uninformed and by politicians with axes to grind about private industry's exploitation of Alaska, but the facts are that private enterprise and risk-capital investment have done wonders for the development of the Territory and its resources. It would be economically unwise and unsound to toss private enterprise into the maws of politicians under present conditions, which would work disaster for private enterprise, even if they would prove a bonanza to self-seeking politicians."

The priest said a lot of gullible people have been misled and cannot see the broad picture of economic and national-security dangers which lie behind the glamor of statehood.

ARGUMENTS FALLACIOUS

Father Hubbard added: "Arguments that Alaska statehood would be a move in the interests of national defense are spurious, superficial, and fallacious, as any agent of the Russian Government in his right mind knows in his heart.

"* * * Any change in Alaska's governmental set-up at any time in the foreseeable near future should be in the direction of a military government, rather than the impractical and suicidal direction of statehood."

Tribute to Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, by Alfred Mynders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part of the column of Alfred Mynders, editor of the Chattanooga Times, which appeared in the Times on April 1, paying well-deserved tribute to our colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. I certainly share the high estimate expressed in the column of this eminent and loyal American, and I wish to add that the record of the Senator from North Carolina in the Senate has been outstanding.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT TO THE NEWS
(By Alfred Mynders)

"Give me liberty to know, to think, to believe, and to utter freely, according to conscience, above all other liberties."—John Milton.

What is most detestable in the Russian type of Communist state is complete suppression of freedom of opinion. Just how far this country has drifted under the present wave of fear and hysteria toward that type of state may be determined in North Carolina's senatorial primary of May 27.

Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, former president of the University of North Carolina, is being opposed by Willis Smith, Raleigh corporation lawyer and a former president of the American Bar Association, and former Senator Robert R. Reynolds.

Mr. Smith defines the main issue as "communism and socialism."

Mr. Reynolds sides with Smith on those alleged issues (though neither is a legitimate issue in North Carolina) and "Buncombe Bob" adds a $100-a-month pension for all persons over 65 as a bait for voters.

The real issue is Senator GRAHAM's career of public service in which he has tried to work for all the people.

By inunendo or by direct charge, Mr. GRAHAM's opponents are trying to defeat him by linking him with Communists. This campaign has gone so far that Senator GRAHAM last week issued the following clear and unequivocal statement:

"I am opposed to communism; I am opposed to socialism. I am devoted to the American system of free enterprise for all the people.

"I have always fought, and will continue to fight, fascism, communism, nazism, and every other form of totalitarianism.

"I am, and always have been, a loyal Democrat. In fact, I might add that I have never scratched a Democratic ticket in my life.

"The basic assumption behind Nazi and Communist propaganda tricks is that if a falsehood is big enough and is repeated often enough, some people will start to believe it. Tonight I want to answer a falsehood that has been repeated over and over again about me.

"I have never been, am not now, and never will be a Communist or a Socialist, or a member or supporter of any organization known or suspected by me of being controlled by Communists or Socialists.

"I was never a member of any committee after it was placed on the Attorney General's list as a front organization. I recall having resigned from a committee several years before it was placed on the Attorney General's list."

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, addressing young Democrats in Senator GRAHAM'S home State, at Asheville, recently, said:

"The meanest man who walks the earth is the man who goes out and spreads unjustified fears and fills the people full of unhappiness and discontent and distrust."

But that type of Communist-Fascist technique has gone very far in every State in this country.

North Carolina will have a chance to halt that trend toward a totalitarian state in the May 27 primary. Mr. W. L. Lawrence, of the New York Times, has been making a survey of the political campaign in North Carolina and he says that there seems general agreement among observers at this point that Senator GRAHAM is out in front, with Mr. Smith running second and former Senator Reynolds trailing.

"Money Makes the Mare Go"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the pseudo economists who diagnosed our economic ills 16 years ago and tempted us to abandon sound redeemable currency for fiat money under the so-called system of managed currency were in the same class as the quack doctor who, having made a wrong diagnosis of his patient's illness, dopes him with every nostrum on the drugstore shelves.

During these 16 years of socialistic experimentation, the dollar and all fixed-dollar-value securities, including savings, pensions, and life insurance, have lost 63 percent of their value; we are burdened with a $255,000,000,000 debt; faced with a $5,000,000,000 deficit, and threatened with another world war.

Three years ago a 250-page committee report entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go" was printed by the Government Printing Office for the use of the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, which, in my opinion, correctly diagnosed our economic ills and offered a practical remedy that can be applied in a matter of a few months without cost to the American taxpayers and without economic disturbances of any kind.

It also offers a practical solution of the perplexing farm problem in a way that will stabilize and maintain farm prices and at the same time relieve the taxpayers of paying billions of dollars in farm subsidies. This book received national and international acclaim, and as a consequence the limited supply was soon exhausted, and thousands of requests for copies have been denied.

There are now pending before the House of Representatives five concurrent resolutions for the printing of additional copies to supply this demand, which can be distributed by the Congress or sold by the Government Printing Office at a price approximating the cost of printing—about 20 cents per copy.

I sincerely trust that, in this time of national emergency, the Congress will authorize the printing of this report which tells simply and effectively, in language anyone can understand, how to prevent wars and depressions and eliminate most of the social and economic ills that afflict our country and the world today. Appended are a few of the comments received by the author:

TELEGRAM FROM THE HONORABLE JESSIE SUMNER, OF ILLINOIS, BRILLIANT FORMER MEMBER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MILFORD, ILL., *November 14, 1947.*

JOHN MCBRIDE,
Clerk of Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives:

Your report is terrific. Congratulations.

JESSIE SUMNER.

LETTER FROM J. T. CULHANE, PRESIDENT, MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN EXCHANGE

MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN EXCHANGE,
Minneapolis, Minn., November 14, 1947.

Mr. JOHN MCBRIDE,
Clerk, Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCBRIDE: Thanks exceedingly for your fine letter of November 6 and for your kindness in sending me a copy of the report entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go." This was both interesting and heartening, and I am reading it in its entirety. It is my intention, also, to pass the booklet along to other officers and directors of this exchange.

Needless to say, I personally agree with the very practical solution of our present difficulties, as outlined in your letter and in the report.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. CULHANE, *President.*

LETTER FROM FRANCIS H. BROWNELL, CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO., 120 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO.,
New York, N. Y., November 14, 1947.

JOHN MCBRIDE, Esquire,
Clerk, Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCBRIDE: Thank you very much for sending me Money Makes the Mare Go, which I have read with much interest.

The pamphlet is scholarly, logical, and lucid. Even if the reader cannot agree with all the conclusions, he will at least have his thought greatly stimulated by such an excellent presentation.

I quite agree that Europe (and I might add Asia and Latin America) needs stabilization of currencies more than it needs our dollars. Perhaps most Americans will agree that requisite food to carry the western nations of Europe over the winter is preeminently necessary. Beyond that, it seems to me stabilization of currencies should be agreed upon before any large expenditure is made on any other theory. Without stabilization, resumption of multilateral trade under a free-enterprise system seems to be impossible. Unfortunately, the subject of currencies and of money is one that is little understood by the people at large and so has not the popular appeal embraced in the thought of "reconstruction." Nonetheless, it is the time when this subject should be given increasing thought and final action taken. Whether the United States should at once proceed alone, I seriously question. But I do believe that any reconstruction approach will ultimately break down unless the currency situation is at least contemporaneously settled.

Thank you for your expression of appreciation of articles written by me. I do not know whether you have seen copy of my Brief on Silver as Money, which I presented before the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund early this year, and of which I enclose a copy.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. BROWNELL.

LETTER BY THE REVEREND HENRY F. WOLFE, OF CHARLESTON, S. C., WHICH WAS CARRIED AS AN EDITORIAL IN THE CHARLESTON NEWS AND COURIER

SOUND MONEY: A CURB ON WAR

If it were possible to make a book on money a best seller so that everybody would be reading it and discussing it, wars and depressions would be eliminated. All wars are economic. All depressions are the result of unsound economic and monetary policies.

Until the administration repeals the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement, the Reciprocal Trade Act, and Public Law 84, all talk of stopping inflation will be so much eyewash. Public Law 84, enacted in 1945, depreciated the dollar 37½ percent, caused commodity prices to advance 60 percent, and is responsible for the vicious inflation and the resultant demand for higher wages.

It is a well-planned fifth column in our country that has blamed the free-enterprise system for our depression when it is the Government that is to blame.

High prices at home, economic chaos abroad, and threats of world war III can be attributed largely to the fact that we have permitted knaves and fools to so debauch our currency that in the short period of 13 years our dollar and all fixed-dollar-value securities have lost 63 percent of their value.

The world needs stabilization of currencies more than it needs our dollars. Sound money is the first requisite for peace and economic recovery. The United States alone has the power to give that stability by adopting a sound monetary system. This can be put into operation in 90 days and will cost us nothing.

Karl Marx said, and Lenin demonstrated, that the surest way to overturn the social order is to debauch the currency. It can be done in such a way that not one out of a million will see it.

It requires $2.71 to buy what could be bought for $1 prior to 1934. Your $10,000 life-insurance policy has a value equivalent to $3,687.50 prior to 1934. Your $50-per-month pension has a purchasing power equivalent to $18.43¾ prior to 1934. A $10 daily wage of today has a purchasing power equivalent to $3.68¾ prior to 1934.

Where have I gathered this information? From a book that could become a best seller, if our congressional leaders in Washington would appropriate moneys to put this book into the hands of every honest-to-God American. Inflation, depression, and world war III would disappear overnight. Russia, the

greatest hoax in all history, would be at an end. Russia knows her only "out" is to keep the United States busy with Europe so she can overrun Asia and seize the rich rubber, tin, and oil resources of Asia and the Middle East.

The name of this book is Money Makes the Mare Go, by John McBride, clerk of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, printed for the use of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, House of Representatives, United States Government Printing Office, just off the press.

When you write for this book you may be told only 1,000 copies were printed.

But you cut this letter out and send it to your congressional leader and ask him if he will not do all he can to get a printing so you can have a copy. After you read it you will be a red-hot American and you will do your best to get your congressional leaders to get this book published and placed in the hands of all Americans.

Rev. HENRY F. WOLFE,
Sacred Heart Parish.
CHARLESTON, S. C.

Fifteen Years of Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on February 17, 1950, Chester D. Davis, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis delivered an address, entitled "What We Have Learned in Fifteen Years of Farm Programs," before the Twelfth Annual National Farm Institute in Des Moines, Iowa. In view of the fact that the importance of the address was overshadowed by speeches in connection with the controversy between Secretary Brannan and Mr. Allen Kline, Mr. Davis' address did not receive the attention it so thoroughly deserves. For this reason, and because the over-all significance of Mr. Davis' address commends itself to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED IN 15 YEARS OF FARM PROGRAMS

The over-all theme of this institute—"What Price Plenty?"—is an inspiring one, but before getting on with my part in it, let me record serious misgivings as to my particular subject. For I'm not sure that we've learned anything from 15 years of farm programs. It seems to me there is much evidence to the contrary, but I hasten to acknowledge that lack of close familiarity with some of the programs of recent years, and perhaps the growth of elderly caution, may raise question as to the validity of my opinions.

The first task is to define terms. The program committee obviously wanted to open the institute with a review of the attempts that have been made since 1933 to relieve farm distress, support farm prices and income, and assist agriculture to make adjustments required by changing conditions at home and abroad. But that is only part of the story. In other areas than this, agriculture has learned a great deal in the last 15 years. Then, too, it is impossible to consider farm programs by themselves, the way you might fence off and cultivate a field. All of our interests are interwoven, in a tight, complicated, fast-moving economy. In the long run, conditions under which farmers raise and market their crops may be more seriously affected by developments entirely outside of agriculture than by what happens in their own field.

In the 1940 Yearbook of Agriculture I attempted to trace the development of agricultural policy since World War I, and took 30 pages for it. There is neither time nor reason for attempting it here. That chapter closed with the observation that if experience in this field teaches us anything of value, it is that a continuous thread runs through the evolution of an agricultural policy notwithstanding the manifest inconsistencies and contradictions that appear in it. Perhaps that is true, though I am less sure of it today. Some of the current farm programs and commitments, and particularly some of the proposals for tomorrow, leave me in the fix of the young Scandinavian who, becoming rich, commissioned a famous painter to do a portrait of his deceased father, with nothing to go on but the young man's description. At the unveiling, the son looked at the portrait from this side and that, and finally said, "Yes; that's him. That's the old geezer, all right. But, my goodness, how he's changed."

From the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 to now emphasis has steadily shifted from adjustment to price-fixing by law. I think that is leading us down the wrong track.

The major programs of the early AAA were set up to be self-financing. Throughout the twenties and early thirties, farm organizations, particularly of the North and West, insisted on that. Since 1936 the shift, of course, has been toward more and larger appropriations from the Treasury, a part of growing fiscal irresponsibility I am going to talk about later.

We have lost ground in cohesion among farm forces in planning and administering the farm programs compared with the situation we had throughout most of the thirties. Perhaps a certain amount of splitting up in opposing schools of thought was inevitable, but I am sure that most of us who have worked in agriculture in the past hate to see it.

There is no truth-divining rod or universally accepted standard that can be laid across programs of today or proposals for the future to determine with finality which features square with the lessons of experience, which do not. It is rather a matter of opinion and judgment and I can express only my own, not that of any group or organization.

This is not a suitable forum for splitting hairs or fussing over details, nor for a play-by-play recital of developments that are now history. What I aim to do before giving way to the heavy artillery—or should I say the gladiators—who are on this institute program, is to make some general observations, first about specific features of our farm programs, and finally about the pattern of public policy that appears to be emerging in this country, of which projected farm programs seem to be a part.

In the first category are the overemphasis and the increasing reliance on government price supports in postwar farm legislation. We should have learned by now that the bare enactment of a law doesn't make price supports effective at the prescribed level. The prices have to be worked out by shirt-sleeve operations on the farm, in the warehouse, or in the market place. For storable commodities there is a honeymoon period while government stocks are being built up by purchases or nonrecourse loans, until the load approaches its limits. After that, prices have to adjust in one way or another to the level at which the commodity will be consumed, unless war or some other catastrophe comes along to bail us out.

We cannot expect to adjust from one let alone two wars of world-wide scope and incalculable destructiveness without paying some penalties. Government price supports and high-level Government loans can help cushion the shock, but they cannot and should not be expected to avert the adjustments that need to be made. We are living in a fool's paradise if we think otherwise. A system of rigid, legislated price supports extended indefinitely into the future, and at levels higher than the over-all supply-demand situation will support, will have extremely undesirable consequences, including a great deal of harm to farmers themselves. There is a place, particularly through the transition period from which we have by no means emerged, for reasonable price supports, free from legislated requirements that prevent intelligent administration. But we cannot expect to ride them painlessly over the rough roads that still have to be traveled. Supports at wartime levels will lead in the all-too-soon future to tight acreage control, impossible-to-manage farm surpluses, and eventual price collapse. It does no good to lull us to sleep in 1950 if in so doing you insure we will have something worse than a headache when we wake up in 1952 or 1953 or 1954.

Next, I have the feeling that current programs of high price and income supports tend to freeze production patterns, to deemphasize adjustment as a goal of agricultural policy. One of the most important long-range factors at work on the farmer's side is the spectacular increase in our population at a rate that has made expert population forecasts of a few years back look as foolish as the election forecasts of October 1948 look now. By midsummer this year we will have doubled the Nation's population in 50 years—from 76,000,000 in 1900 to 152,000,000. We may be coming in sight of the time when rising living standards combined with population growth will put pressure on our ability to expand and maintain the needed production of milk and meat. I believe present farm programs fall short in encouragement to shifts that need to be made in land use to fit the demand pattern of tomorrow.

Now a word about our export commodities. As I look out at the world picture and the longer-range farm situation, I see many signs which remind me of the twenties and the thirties. I catch myself saying, "I've seen that; here's where we came in." In the twenties we faced real troubles with our major commodities when the United States stopped lending abroad to finance our exports and when our foreign customers ran out of dollars. The first war changed us from a debtor to a creditor nation, and before we had adjusted our thinking and our ways we entered the Second World War, which immeasurably accentuated the change. Adjustments are still ahead of us and they will be particularly severe in the wheat and cotton areas. They will face us as soon as we quit sending out the dollars with which to pay for our exports. Our postwar farm programs do not recognize that fact, right down to and including the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We have unquestionably gained ground in techniques of production, in increased use of capital per worker in the form of more efficient machines, better plant and animal strains, fertilization, etc. We have also made distinct progress in dissemination of know-how in use of land and water to conserve the soil and increase and safeguard its future productivity. Even here a lot of effectiveness is lost through interagency duplication, friction, and even downright conflict. The farmers have a right to better cooperation

than that among the agencies created to serve them. And notwithstanding the growth of technical understanding in this field, the pressure of wartime prices has led wide areas to disregard the warnings of the past, and so set the stage for the dust bowls of the future.

One of the bright sides of the farm picture is the prudent way farmers throughout the forties managed their wartime and postwar income. On the whole, they chose to reduce debt, rather than increase it as happened in the First World War. Public and private farm-credit agencies helped. But the lessons of the last 15 years teach us the need of some new techniques in farm credit, particularly to help finance long-term programs of farm improvements for better land use and conservation. Traditional short-term production loans won't do the job that needs to be done on a big scale throughout the United States.

A glance at your program for tomorrow will tell you why I do not discuss in greater detail the changes in our agricultural legislation advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture. It will be the subject of thorough debate then, but perhaps one or two observations are in order here to give you the direction of my thinking.

I do not agree with the idea that the Government can or should guarantee price supports fixed at a level that will yield farmers in the aggregate a cash income from marketings equal in purchasing power to the average cash income from marketings in the decade 1938–48, and year by year thereafter maintain a level equal to the average of the first 10 of the preceding 12 years. It just can't be done, and that promise along with the implied promise of low-priced food for consumers is the fundamental weakness in the Brannan plan.

I didn't like the idea of general food subsidies during the war, and I like them less now. There's no good reason why nonagricultural workers can't and shouldn't produce enough goods and services to pay for agriculture's production without help from the Treasury. Action to improve the diet of low-income families is quite another thing. That may be good national policy, but it isn't a farm program and shouldn't be called one. School lunches are social programs, not farm programs, and so in fact was the food-stamp plan.

But on the other hand, the device of carrying out Government price guaranties under certain conditions by the use of supplemental payments makes sense to me, if they are geared to moderate, attainable goals, and used with great restraint. If we are going to continue price supports on perishable commodities like potatoes and eggs, there isn't any other socially acceptable way to make them effective. As a matter of fact, supplemental payments were used with cotton in 1955 when the only alternative was a price-fixing loan at or above the market. I think it worked rather well; exports picked up, and the crop moved into consumption. The loudest complaints came from interests that were "long" in the cotton market.

I feel compelled to qualify that approval with a sober warning—don't let anyone tell you there is magic in this device by which to insure high wartime income to farmers on the one hand and cheap food to consumers on the other. The idea may have political sex appeal, but it won't work that well.

Now I want to comment on something I have observed through the years which, if understood, would surprise a lot of people in the cities. The most far-reaching and in an economic sense the most dangerously ambitious legislative proposals for agriculture are not those advanced by responsible farmers or farm organizations but by men who are honestly—and understandably—interested in farm votes. A well-meaning committee chairman may put the farm leaders on the spot by pushing a bill that promises the unattainable, but a farm leader frequently risks his official life if he opposes it. We must look with sympathy on the fix of the Congressmen who are up for election every other year. If given a choice, they tend to vote for the bill which on the face of it promises the highest support price in their part of the country. The Senators are a little better off. Their election comes every 6 years. The easy way out may seem to be merely to extend the wartime guaranties year by year, but sooner or later it will lead us out over our heads.

Before I drop the subject of price supports, I'll stick my head up over the breastworks to be shot at. I am convinced that if we had followed the lessons of the last 15 years—let's make it 25 years—we would have stuck to the long-range provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948. It impressed me as an attempt to apply experience to present-day problems. No doubt changes were needed, but in the main those long-range provisions would have relieved the Government of the impossible task of maintaining wartime prices in the face of mounting surpluses. They would have introduced administrative flexibility where rigidities still prevail.

Now that I have probably succeeded in ruffling some feelings on the subject of price support and agricultural adjustment, I should like to turn for the rest of my talk to the pattern of public policy we seem to be following in this country, which is more important to agriculture, in the long run, than the shorter-range questions I have touched on.

I mean the growing dependence on Government for direction and aid, and its twin, fiscal irresponsibility inside and outside of Government. Fiscal year 1949 was one of high income and employment and it closed with $1,800,000,000 deficit. The Government estimates $5,500,000,000 deficit this year and $5,100,000,000 for fiscal 1951 with continuation of high-level economic activity assumed. We are nearing the time when billions in savings bonds will mature, with no assurance that holders will reinvest their savings in Government bonds. I doubt if they will if they once get the idea that creeping inflation, continued whittling away of the dollar's buying power, are ahead of us. If the public doesn't take the bonds, the alternative will be more deficit financing at banks, more money not matched by production.

Thinking perhaps I might have a distorted view of the postwar drift, I wrote a friend and told him I was considering starting my talk here today on the question, "What we have learned," with the answer: "Nothing," and then proceed with qualifications and explanations much as I have done. You all know the man—he has held positions of high responsibility in Nation and State, for years in the Department of Agriculture. He replied the other day, and this is what he said in part:

"The only amendment I would make to your answer to the question 'What we have learned in 15 years of farm programs' is that I would say 'less than nothing.' In the current year agricultural prices are still averaging about parity, yet the appropriations proposed for agriculture are $2,500,000,000, plus additional borrowing authority. This is fantastic. We are, I fear, on the verge of losing all the values we have been working for, and the greatest single threat is a loose or reckless fiscal policy."

That is the background for a solemn warning. It will be nothing less than national disaster if the farmers join other groups who are saying in effect: "We can have prosperity, regardless of anything else, if the Government will back us and put up the money." It will also be a disaster if the full weight of farm opinion is not clearly and continuously used to promote policies by labor and industry that will yield the highest sustainable level of nonagricultural production.

Farmers in the main have done a better job than others in keeping on producing at capacity through bad times as well as good. The problem is how to get the others to march along with agriculture in full production. It is the only way the economy can be made to function at a high level. We need adjustments in agriculture, yes, but it will be a bad day for the farmers and for the Nation when we accept the philosophy that nonagricultural industry and labor can't or shouldn't be expected to produce enough to pay for the production of the farms without Treasury help.

Let me elaborate on that a little. Since 1920 the goal of developing agricultural policy has been expressed as the principle of parity of prices or of income for farmers as they exchange their products for the goods and services of nonagricultural industry and labor. Parity does not mean a fixed-price level; it relates rather to the purchasing power or exchange value of the products of one group when traded for the products or the labor of another group. The price level is very important to a farmer who is in debt, but in every other sense the most important consideration is not the dollar price of a product, but what it will bring when exchanged for other goods and services.

If then we think of all the farmers as one trading group, and all the rest of the economy as another trading group, there are two ways to hold the exchange value of the farm output high, or to increase it. One way would be to cut down the volume of farm production. The other way would be to increase the quantity of goods and services produced by the nonagricultural group. I favor the second way as being the better for the Nation, better for the farmers, and better for the world.

My answer to the question, "What price plenty?" would be this: Let the nonagricultural industries and labor find the way to keep working at full efficiency and capacity, turning out goods and services that can be absorbed by this country in a high standard of living—in better homes, equipment, electrification, refrigeration, sanitation, clothing, ad infinitum. With steady work and efficient production, prices could go down without cutting profits or wages. Real wages would rise, for the laborer is like the farmer—it isn't the number of dollars but what he can buy with his products or his labor that counts.

Under such conditions, the farmer could produce abundantly and still trade on good terms for what the other man makes; he could prosper at lower price levels. I think that really is the way out. The relation of agriculture to the rest of the economy is changing radically and further radical adjustments are ahead of us. When Lewis and Clark skirted the western border of Iowa, about 90 percent of the population of the then United States lived on farms, and those farms produced only enough surplus to feed the 10 percent who lived in town. At the peak of war production in 1943 and 1944, 15 percent of the Nation's labor force produced the all-time record crops which fed and clothed this Nation and its own and allied vast war machines. Not much more than one-fifth of our total population actually lives and works on the farms, although the percentage directly dependent on farming is much greater than that.

So you see that with so few producing so much to feed so many, the ability of the cities and towns to pay for and consume our farm products is an all-important consideration to the farmers. That ability in turn rests on the rate at which towns and cities, the mines and factories, keep busy and produce.

In view of the importance to the farmer of employment and production off the farms, what is the situation and what is the outlook today? I think the elements are present to support a high level of business activity for some time to come, if we can only overcome two great big "ifs" that confront us in industry-labor behavior.

We can keep going:

1. If labor leaders will make their followers realize that in the long run, higher wages depend on increased production. Without it, the wage increases are not real, and

2. If management will deliver lower prices as volume grows, and will share fairly with labor and consumer the benefits of increased productivity.

These are stubborn "if's," but they are very important. Perhaps you say there isn't much agriculture can do about these things. Perhaps you think this kind of talk doesn't fit a farm institute. But I tell you these issues are fundamental to farm welfare. Many farm and business and labor leaders have seen clearly the policy we must follow if our economy is to function. Teamwork in attaining and holding a high level of production is necessary if we are to develop the full economic life required of this Nation.

The annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in New Orleans in 1938 was devoted to this theme. It needs to be sounded "again and again and again." The forces of those who seem to believe we can make ourselves richer by producing less, with Government direction substituted for individual initiative, are numerous enough and loud enough without recruiting from the farms.

Now in conclusion: Along with many of you I have watched the full cycle of agricultural policy unfold since the First World War. Many mistakes have been made, but, on the other hand, many great miracles have been performed. We have demonstrated as a people that we can accomplish the impossible under the grim discipline of war, and I have full faith that, unless international anarchy prevents us, we will demonstrate the same capacity less spectacularly but no less surely in peace. There is no magic formula by which farmers can be insured prosperity as a class apart from others, but there are ways to achieve plenty with which to provide better living standards for all.

Full achievement in line with our capacities is impossible without farsighted, tolerant, and good-natured cooperation, founded on mutual understanding among leaders of agriculture, labor, industry, and government. This great national forum can contribute to that understanding, and I am proud to have a part in it.

Tribute to Judge Burnita Shelton Matthews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me in tribute to Judge Burnita Shelton Matthews, who has just been appointed a judge on the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the first woman to be so honored.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE BURNITA SHELTON MATTHEWS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

The naming of Burnita Shelton Matthews as the first woman in the United States to sit on a Federal district court was a fitting tribute to a woman who has dedicated herself to the advancement of women.

During the years of Burnita Matthews' professional life, women have gone ahead more rapidly than in any other similar period in history. They have won the right to vote over what seemed to be unsurmountable obstacles; they have had passed laws, too numerous to mention, by the Congress of the United States and the legislative bodies in the several States. Some of these laws have corrected wage differences, some have given women jury duty, some have removed discrimination between the sexes in such matters as property rights and guardianship matters.

Much of this unprecedented progress in the advancement of women is directly attributable to the brilliant leadership of Mrs. Matthews, who has given untiringly of her time, energy, and talents.

Many women have been appointed to high offices in the recent past, all of whom have been outstanding in their fields, but none of them is better qualified by temperament, ability, or integrity than Burnita Shelton Matthews.

Her past record stands and speaks for itself. Her future record will surpass it, for she is and will continue to be an outstanding credit to the women, the legal profession, and the judiciary of the United States.

The $300,000,000,000 "Hickonomy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point an article by Robert R. Young which appeared in the March 1950 issue of Railway Progress:

THE $300,000,000,000 "HICKONOMY"—TO ACHIEVE IT WE ARE BEGGARING OUR WHITE-COLLAR CLASS

(By Robert R. Young)

The increase in the standard of living under the New Deal is well illustrated by the decrease in the size of the houses. There is hardly anything one buys, today, that isn't a little shoddier. On top of it we have been made a nation of bookkeepers. By the year 2000, if the trend continues, there promises to be no other occupation left. It will all be as productive and as exhaustive as a game of canasta.

What good is a constantly rising level of wages if the hardware keeps getting tinnier, the beef dearer, and the net after taxes smaller? We are not such hicks as to sell even so cheap a thing as our vote for stage money.

Indeed, nothing could be more destructive of production than spiraling prices, for they destroy the incentive to save which is the source of all production—of Mr. Truman's much longed-for "business investment." And remember, the creditors, whom rising prices de-welfare, are not Mr. Morgan and Mr. Mellon, but the dependent and aged, the owners of savings accounts, insurance policies, and pension funds.

THE DELUSION

Rising wages and prices for a time may delude the worker or farmer into misplacing his vote and his trust, may temporarily make easier the servicing of the national debt, but like dope they are the resource of exploiters of human misery or the escape of weaklings and fools. To expect the system of private capital to meet frequent and radical wage and price changes and maintain previously existing employment is to expect the impossible. Stability of employment can only come through stability in prices. Nowhere is that better illustrated than by the railway passenger equipment industry. It withstood the subsidized competition of the bus and the airplane for several decades, but under the gaff of successive and drastic rounds of wage increases it folded up. Only two of our 132 class I railroads ordered any new passenger cars whatever in all of last year, although virtually the Nation's entire 28,000-car fleet is worn out or obsolete. These 28,000 cars were called upon to deliver as many passenger miles in 1949 as our much newer 45,000-car fleet delivered in 1926. In that year 1,500 cars were ordered, in 1949 only 85. In 10 of the past 12 months no new orders were placed by any railroad.

OTHER BUSINESSES

There are countless other businesses which will find it impossible to raise their revenues fast enough to meet these cost increases, hence, once wartime savings are gone, must fall by the wayside to add to the growing burden of unemployment relief. The white-collar class, representing a large part of our population, bears the brunt of this system of election bribery or pressure-group blackmail, however you wish to label it. It is ironical that the poor grandmother of the fairy tale, the school teachers and public employees, almost solidly liberal, are the very ones the wolf is eating up first. Their income since 1939 has increased even less than the 50-percent increase of the white-collar class, whereas we all must pay 100 percent more for food and 90 percent more for clothing, to say nothing of taxes. It is only with the help of such items as transportation, utilities, and shelter, where time lag, the confiscation of rate and rent control, and the waste of subsidy have temporarily concealed the true cost, that even the skilled laborer has held his own in terms of overall purchasing power, in spite of management's and labor's vast contribution to increased productivity.

In all the history of the world has there ever before been an "idle-ology" such as ours, in which the lazy man is encouraged by pay not to work? Indeed, it is being discovered that in many cases the more enterprising have been paid simultaneously for working and for not working. Is there any wonder that the burden of relief continues to increase even in cities that suffer from shortages of workers, that this decade promises to show nothing like the increase in the standard of living enjoyed by the decade of those liberal laughingstocks Harding and Coolidge, when taxes were reduced, prices gently eased off and Washington was just a pleasant place to go sightseeing? Employment and the standard of living are reduced, not increased, when Congress interposes its cancerous bureaus to give something for nothing, whether it is medicine, housing, the transportation of mail, highway usage, or a day's pay. With welfare, like water, the way to conserve it is to stop giving it away.

RADICAL MEASURES

All of us long for a genuine $300,000,000,000 economy, the hick removed. All of us want that honest-to-goodness $12,000 income and a lot sooner than the year 2000. To attain the "hickonomy," however, there are

certain other radical things being done which a Socialist or a Communist would find too radical to do. He would not, for example, pay bonuses and build storage for produce which the markets will not take when scarcity has driven prices of other produce so high as to cause privation. Yet it is this monstrous albatross which the Brannan plan schemes to fasten permanently about our necks. If this is where laissez faire in electioneering has brought us then, like Wall Street in 1929, Pennsylvania Avenue needs some new rules, our statute books some new crimes.

WASTED LAND

How long can we donate machinery and raw materials to low-wage, long-hour countries and admit their products to our markets duty-free? This, along with easy unemployment relief and the Brannan plan, can quickly make not only a $100,000,000,000 economy out of us but a wasted land.

There are so many radical things a liberal would not do that these strange servants of ours are doing, that grave doubt may be attached by posterity as to their sanity. Yet, there is one thing that runs true to pattern through all these damn fooleries: It is the expediency or the advantage of the moment, not for the electorate but for the elected. In other words, dear child, these grandsires of yours were not such damn fools as they looked. It was only we who were the fools, the weaklings, for taking it lying down—unworthy of our own grandsires.

One thing at least has become clear to me, day by day since 1933: That the New-Deal Democrat is more catholic in his love for mankind. He stands ready at any time to scatter his benefactions world-wide, whereas the Republicans and the conservative Democrat seek to limit them at home.

Judge Rifkind's Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of April 4, 1950, and which, in my opinion, very objectively and fully covers an important phase of our governmental activity. A financially independent judiciary insures a competent and impartial protection of the fundamental personal and property rights of our people.

JUDGE RIFKIND'S RESIGNATION

Judge Simon H. Rifkind has resigned from the Federal district bench because he says that the $15,000 a year which that position pays is insufficient for him to live in a manner fitting the position and at the same time to provide adequately for his family.

When he accepted the appointment, Judge Rifkind thought he was taking a life job. He had budgeted his savings to make this possible but rising living costs and higher taxes knocked that budget into a cocked hat.

Now he says he must return to private law practice and the Federal bench is losing one of its younger and most promising judges.

This is a high price to pay for information regarding a condition which should have been apparent to the budget makers in Washington. They are asking those on the district court bench to sacrifice an impossible amount of monetary reward for the honor and distinction such a post carries.

The salary of a Federal district judge becomes ridiculously low when contrasted with what the State and city pay New York's judiciary. A justice of the State's supreme court or of the county courts in New York City receives $28,000. A judge of the city court gets $20,000.

If the Federal bench is to continue as a goal for aspiring young lawyers, and if it is not to lose more of its able jurists, more adequate pay must be provided. This is especially true when the district to which they may be assigned means living in a high-cost urban area.

A Red Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article by Alfred Kohlberg that appeared in China Monthly several years ago. Members who are interested in the China affair should read it.

A RED DREAM

(By Alfred Kohlberg)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In January 1945, one month before Yalta, Alfred Kohlberg wrote down the following dream. On March 23, 1945, having Earl Browder as his guest at luncheon, he mentioned the dream, and that afternoon sent him a copy. On April 5, 1945, he mailed a copy to each Member of the House and Senate. While the course of events for the past 2 years has not in detail followed the pattern of the dream, the similarities to date are so striking that we believe it well worth publishing as food for thought.)

January 15, 1945, I dreamt that I was in Moscow and saw Joseph Stalin in a newspaper kiosk in the middle of the sidewalk selling pamphlets. I stood in line and bought one. It read as follows:

"MY DREAM OF WORLD HISTORY: 1945–1975

"(By Earl Browder)

"The year 1945 opened with the final stages of World War II plainly visible. The vile Nazi-Fascist conspiracy to enslave the world was being demolished on the battlefields of eastern Europe. The indomitable Peoples Army of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics having freed the holy soil of the Socialist fatherland of the Hitlerite invaders had already brought the democratic blessings of communism to the victims and satellites of the Fascists in the Balkans and eastern Europe. Throughout all eastern Europe the Socialist revolution was proceeding with the liquidation of all 'traitors to the people' and establishment of democratic dictatorships of the proletariat under the leadership of the brave Communist leaders who had come to the fore after the dastardly attack by the Hitlerite criminals on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. As stated by the noted non-Communist historian of the day, Edgar Snow, these 'traitors to the people' in all the liberated countries of Europe, as well as the defeated enemy nations, comprised all the large landowners, all large property owners, all officials of former governments, and all who would not cooperate in the new internal reforms of the patriotic Communist administrations.

"The liquidation of these Fascist, reactionary elements in Finland, Poland, the Baltic Soviet Republics, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria cleared the ground for the democratic development of people's governments in all these countries, headed by tried and true Communist leaders of the liberal forces. Many of the reactionaries who were adjudged 'traitors to the people' were leniently treated, being granted, with their families, free transport to the Siberian Soviet Socialist Republic where they were enabled to rehabilitate themselves as useful workers in the forests, mines, and industries.

"Popular elections were held, in which an average of 93.4 percent of the qualified electors voted. Delegates elected in these secret, popular elections then met in each of the capitals of these countries and without exception, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, self-determined themselves into the Soviet Union. This was in accordance with the principle stated by Foreign Commissar Molotov, October 31, 1939, as follows:

" 'We stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity and we declare that all nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs.'

"As the war against Hitlerite Germany proceeded to its close the Free Germany Committee, originally having headquarters in Moscow, moved to Koenigsberg and was recognized (with altered personnel) by the Soviet Union as the provisional government of the new Germany. In the last stages of the war against Hitlerite Germany, the newly recognized provisional government assisted the great mass of the German people to regain their democratic rights by purging all elements of 'traitors to the people' and installing democratic governments in all areas. Popular elections were held without delay and the newly elected delegates petitioned the Soviet Union to annex the Soviet German Republic as a free, self-governing unit in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"In this period, also, the Czechoslovak Republic repudiated the exile government of the capitalist reactionary Benes and petitioned for admission to the great Soviet Union. Meantime the bankrupt capitalist plutocratic empires of the United States and Britain failed to understand the wishes of the masses of the people in Greece, Italy, France, and Belgium, preferring to recognize the discredited exile reactionary regimes in these countries, where popular uprisings, taking their inspiration from the people's victories in eastern Europe, though not successful, succeeded in securing important positions in coalition regimes.

"By the end of 1945 all organized resistance in Germany and eastern Europe was ended, and there remained only the task of liquidating remaining pro-Fascist, reactionary guerrilla forces in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. The imperialist, plutocratic, capitalist empires of the United States of America and Britain meantime had not been able to bring their war against Japan to a successful conclusion and appealed to the Soviet Union for aid. In accordance with agreements previously made at Tehran in 1943, when Churchill and Roosevelt appealed to Stalin, the Soviet Union honored its promises and recognized the Chinese Soviet republic, headed by that great patriot, Mao Tse-tung, as the government of free China, disavowing the reactionary, pro-Fascist, pro-Japanese government headed by Chiang Kai-shek.

"The indomitable forces of the Red Army attacked the Japanese Fascist criminals in Manchuria and Korea, releasing this holy Russian soil from the invaders who had foully seized it in 1905. At the same time. Russian

forces advanced 300 miles from the borders of the Mongolian Soviet Republic to the capital of the Chinese Soviet Republic at Yenan, bringing supplies and reinforcements. After the freeing of Manchuria and Korea, people's elections were held and the new Soviet Republics resulting therefrom joined the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The invasion of Japan followed with the overthrow of the Mikado and the recognition by the Soviet Union of the Japanese People's Liberation Alliance, headed by the well-known Communist, Susuma Okano, as the provisional government of Japan.

"As the Soviet liberators advanced with the Chinese Communist brothers-in-arms south into the Yangtse Valley, reactionary publications in the United States of America, such as the New York Times and other capitalist papers, called on the government to oppose the advance of the Communist liberators beyond the so-called Chinese Curzon line of the Yellow River and charged a double cross of China. But the liberal, noncapitalist press, such as the Field newspapers, and the scholarly non-Communist research organizations, such as the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Foreign Policy Association, together with the Communist press, exposed the true character of the National Government of China as reactionary, pro-Fascist, and pro-Japanese. They exposed the false Chinese claim that they had been fighting the Japanese for 8 years. In disabusing the American public of the idea that China was its friend and proving that the true meaning of cooperation was acceding to Communist demands, many famous non-Communist Chinese experts and scholars were outstanding, particularly Agnes Smedley, Edgar Snow, Theodore White, Mark Gayn, Maxwell Stewart, L. K. Rosinger, T. A. Bisson, and Frederick V. Field. Thus, the American Government insisted that the Chungking Government negotiate directly with Moscow, and the United States of America refused to interfere in the internal affairs of China.

"During the years 1946–49, the Chinese Soviet Republic gradually extended its territories to include all of China and restored order throughout its realms by liquidating all traitors to the people. This liquidation was greatly aided by a popular questionnaire filled out by every Chinese reading:

"'1. Why have you not retreated with the Soviet Army in 1933?

"'2. What employment have you pursued under the Kuomintang?

"'3. What anti-Kuomintang sabotage have you done?

"'4. Name the accomplices.

"'5. Name three collaborators of the Kuomintang.'

"Thus did the Soviet Union bring the blessings of peace and true Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist democracy to the great farmer-worker masses of Europe and Asia, encompassing a population of 1,100,000,000 people.

"At this point one should mention the short-lived new League of Nations, often named Dumbarton Oaks after the now-forgotten hotel where it was first conceived. The charter for this organization was finally signed in 1945, but in the ensuing years it was often used as a sounding board for unfounded and idiotic complaints by reactionary exiles from member states of the great Soviet Union, falsely calling themselves governments, who sought to cast doubts on the great democratic victories of the Soviet Union. The great democratic movements organized in the United States under Sidney Hillman and other liberals, in England under Harry Pollitt, and in France under Maurice Thorez, did not hesitate, however, to expose these Fascist reactionary complaints.

"During the years after 1945 the great Soviet Union rebuilt the proletarian economy of the vast Eurasian lands, happily united under the people's dictatorship, with special emphasis on weapons of defense against the imperialist British, American, and French empires which looked with envious eyes at the great Socialist gains of the Soviet Union. The death in 1948 of Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose ability to cooperate with Marshal Stalin had brought about so many social and territorial gains for the world proletariat, ended a period of cooperation. Three years later the great democratic Soviet Union heeded the call of the submerged masses of India, crushed under the capitalist, reactionary dominion government headed by the pro-Fascist Nehru, and supplied arms and reinforcements for the Indian People's Liberation Alliance. The Dumbarton Oaks league wrote its own death sentence, when it stupidly passed resolutions of censure against the democratic actions of the Soviet Union in India.

"In the succeeding years other Dominions of the British Empire in southeast Asia followed the lead of India in setting up people's governments and joining the great democratic Soviet Union. In the Near East the former Turkish Republic followed reactionary leadership and sought military alliances with the capitalist empires, much against the wishes of the Turkish proletariat, who appealed to the Soviet Union for aid which was liberally given to establish a workers' Soviet Republic.

"Similar movements in British and French colonies in north Africa were ruthlessly suppressed by the reactionary governments. The patriotic leaders of these movements appealed to their brothers the great democratic classes of the Soviet Union, who could not turn a deaf ear to the call of their brothers in distress. Aid in the form of great air fleets was sent. The reactionary British and French Empires, idiotically chose to regard this as war and called on the Dumbarton Oaks League for sanctions against the great People's Republic of the Soviet Union. Fortunately for the cause of the people's liberation the United States voted against action. In this decision the great liberal movement in the United States took a leading part in explaining to the American masses that no pledges of the Dumbarton Oaks Charter could be perverted to require American boys to fight on foreign soil to maintain the undemocratic empires of Britain and France. As it later turned out the reactionary forces of Great Britain and France were overwhelmed in their homelands before the United States of America could have rearmed and come to their assistance in any case.

"Thus in 1957 the British and French Empires came to an inglorious end, but in their stead, France and Britain became truly democratic free Soviet Republics, no longer misled by such traitors to the people as large landowners, large property owners, former officials, bourgeoisie, and other reactionary intellectuals, all of whom were wiped away.

"After the close of this war which led to the freeing of the great French and British masses from the enslavement of their capitalist masters, freedom movements gained great strength in other countries, particularly in North and South America.

"The American Government, under the control of reactionary isolationists sought to cut itself off from the great movements for liberation all over the world. The freedom movement and the liberal element in the U. S. A. proclaimed that if the U. S. A. would only keep its armament to a minimum, thereby avoiding any threatening action, and liberalize its lands and industries by Government ownership and control, peace, a people's prosperity and great social gains would ensue. Unfortunately the reactionary isolationist government did not follow this farseeing program. It did reduce armament, thus removing incitement to war, but in 1962, it foolishly attempted by law to prohibit the free assembly of the Communist Political Association and all organizations affiliated with it; and other organizations engaged in building up American-Russian friendship and cultural relations. This reactionary law also canceled free-press privileges of the same organizations and organizations allied thereto. (For several years prior thereto difficulties had arisen between citizens of the Japanese Soviet Republic, enjoying their right of access to the fisheries of Alaska and reactionary American officials seeking to deny this people's right.)

"The Foreign Office of the Soviet Union filed formal diplomatic protests against this law, pointing out that it could not but be regarded as an unfriendly action. The State Department, in its answer, alleged that the Soviet Union did not permit criticism in its press or free assembly by friends of the U. S. A. This specious argument was demolished by the Soviet Foreign Office, which replied that freedom of assembly and freedom of the press were permitted in the Soviet Union and if it so happened that no one in the press or in assembly had anything good to say about the U. S. A. or its Government, that was because the citizens of the Soviet Union had such a superior proletarian Socialist society that they could not be so stupid as not to recognize its merits.

"To this frank and sincere statement the United States returned an obdurate reply. While the Soviet Foreign Office was giving careful consideration, public opinion in the Soviet Union was so wrought up by the plight of their proletarian brothers, enslaved in the capitalist U. S. A., that it was determined by the army that an expedition should be sent to restore their freedom.

"By early summer of 1963 the expedition was ready. It was decided to send the expedition by air. Marshal Nokisblockoff, supreme commander of the Soviet forces, decided not to use any of the later models of Soviet airplanes developed in the plants of the German Soviet Republic, but to keep them as reserves for unforeseen eventualities. While full information of the puny forces of the U. S. A. was available to the high command, nevertheless, with far-seeing vision, Nokisblockoff preferred to be ready for all possible surprises.

"Thus a fleet of 50,000 oil-burning transport and fighter planes took off after dark on the night of June 22, 1963, from France, England, Norway, Russia, Germany, Siberia, and Japan. None of the newer types of planes using rocket or atomic propulsion were used. All were of the older types brought to perfection in the early 1950's. The transports carried an average of 250 fully armed men, or equivalent weight in heavy artillery and rocket equipment, each.

"Flying a great circle route, some directly over the North Pole, this air force approached Boston, New York, Washington, Detroit, Chicago, Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, St. Louis, Atlanta, Birmingham, New Orleans, Omaha, Denver, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other points from the north at dawn, June 23, 1963. Less than half a million paratroopers dropped before dawn on the lighted airports, seized control, and the planes landed their 6,000,000 of the Soviet Union's best trained troops a few minutes later. Control of every vital point from the Atlantic to the Pacific was seized. The war was over almost before it started, but foolish forces of misguided guerrillas, operating in the hinterland, had to be hunted down piecemeal. The pacification was greatly aided by measures adopted by the high command, such as extermination of all towns and villages where guerrillas were suspected of having been harbored. Liquidation of all traitors to the people was successfully and thoroughly carried out and the free democratic American Soviet Republic was proclaimed. Popular elections were held in

which 93.2 percent of the qualified voters voted and the new Congress, so elected, petitioned unanimously to be taken into the Soviet Union.

"In the following few years, reactionary governments in other parts of North and South America attempted to destroy the rights of the people, but when the latter appealed to the great Soviet Union they were sympathetically listened to and Soviet arms aided the democratic masses in each country to seize power and form free democratic Soviet Republics.

"Thus was the fringe of the world brought into the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, democratically governed by the Supreme Soviet at Moscow, under the wise and unquestioned leadership of the great premier, Joseph Stalin, Jr. Thus has the horror of war between countries been abolished from the world, and the triumph of Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism been granted to a free and united world where all men are vouchsafed the great democratic right to think alike and vote alike."

As I awoke with a start, it took me some moments to realize that this was still 1945 and all the horrors of my nightmare hadn't happened. Whether too much mince pie, or too much reading of the Communist press, can be blamed for this dream, I leave to the reader, who should be aware that every extension of the Communist system, so realistically visualized in my dream, has been predicted in the Communist press.

Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following open letter to Congress which appeared in the March 1950 issue of Overture:

OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

MUSICIANS MUTUAL PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, LOCAL 47, A. F. OF M.,
Hollywood, Calif., March 3, 1950.

Honorable Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of 14,000 musician members of Local 47, A. F. of M., we are addressing this open letter to the Congress of the United States.

We have suffered since war's end from a discriminatory war-imposed tax, namely, the 20-percent cabaret tax. This tax was originally imposed for the twin purposes of raising revenue and discouraging industry nonessential to the winning of the war.

We are not informed as to the efficiency of this measure in discouraging amusement during the war. However, we are very well informed, indeed, as to its efficiency since the war in throwing hundreds of our members out of employment in hotels, night clubs, ballrooms, and similar places of amusement.

Such loss of employment comes either through the closing of such establishments or through their inability to continue a policy of live entertainment. This tax, gentlemen, affects only those establishments using live talent and, in effect, encourages the use of our mortal enemy, canned music.

As to the revenue-producing aspect of this situation, it would seem obvious that in every establishment which ceases to use live talent the tax revenue is cut in two ways. The change in policy means, of course, that no 20-percent tax is collected and as a corollary that the musicians, entertainers, and other employees cease to pay income taxes. The loss of revenue must be enormous from this source alone. This does not take into account the potential revenue from hundreds of establishments which would employ live talent if it were not for the tax. No tax revenue ever comes from the unemployed.

We pray, therefore, gentlemen, that you will give careful consideration to the proposals now before Congress for the repeal of this discriminatory, nonproductive, and unjust tax.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, LOCAL 47,
MAURY PAUL, *Recording Secretary.*

There is a third way in which Federal Government finances are adversely affected which is omitted from the letter, and that is that the unemployed not only pay no income taxes but receive unemployment insurance. Let us repeal these unfair, discriminatory taxes.

Importance of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on previous occasions on the Senate floor, I have commented on the vital question of the tremendously valuable role which farm cooperatives have played in United States agriculture. Co-ops have become so indispensable a part of Wisconsin and all American farming that it is unthinkable to me that the Congress should take any step which would harm them or hamstring their operations.

The Badger State is, of course, one of the leading cooperative centers of all America and we are proud of the invaluable accomplishments of Wisconsin co-ops in helping to increase and/or stabilize farm income. Recently, there have been very severe declines in this farm income, and without the aid of co-ops, those declines would have still been more severe.

One of the hardest hit groups in Wisconsin have been our fur farmers. Not only have they been affected adversely by the general postwar decline in income and sales, but the ruinous 20-percent excise tax on furs sold at retail has dealt a body blow to the fur industry all along the line.

It is now 14 months since I introduced my fur-tax and other excise-tax repeal bill, but still tax relief is unfortunately stalled over in the House of Representatives. Still another factor accounting for the disastrous conditions in Wisconsin fur farming has been the obstinate refusal of the President and his administration to recognize the terrible harm done to domestic fur farmers by the flood of cheap foreign imports. Time and again, I have appealed to the United States Tariff Commission, to the President, to the State Department, and to Congress, to take necessary actions to prevent complete chaos because of this foreign import flood; but we have always encountered a stone wall of opposition particularly to our efforts—which we are going to carry on nonetheless—to place import quotas on shipments of foreign-produced furs to the United States.

As I say, in spite of administration opposition, we will continue the battle along the line of fur-tax repeal and protection of domestic fur farmers.

I have in my hands now, Mr. President, an editorial from the March 1950 issue of the American National Fur and Market Journal published at Wausau, Wis. The fine magazine is issued by the American National Fur Breeders Association, a mutual nonprofit cooperative organization of American fur farmers. It is edited by Dr. L. J. O'Reilley, president of the ANFBA—a man whose broad background and experience in the industry well qualifies him as a spokesman for it.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial which discusses the importance of co-ops in the fur and other industries.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM COOPERATIVES

Agricultural cooperation in the United States has been molded by leaders emerging from a constantly increasing number of alert and progressive farmers. Expansion has continued since the experimental days of 1810.

In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed the Country Life Commission and started a train of events that greatly stimulated the movement. In transmitting to Congress the report of the Commission he said: "The cooperative plan is the best plan of organization wherever men have the right spirit to carry it out."

Early in 1920 farmers were given a new slogan: Orderly commodity marketing.

There are many definitions of a cooperative. Here is one found in the Report of the Inquiry on Cooperative Enterprise in Europe, published in 1937:

"A cooperative enterprise is one which belongs to the people who use its services, the control of which rests equally with all the members, and the gains of which are distributed to the members in proportion to the use they make of its services."

A cooperative society is voluntary and democratic. Generally speaking, cooperation means working together for a common purpose. An agricultural cooperative association is a business organization which operates for the mutual benefit of its members. It is a multiple partnership formed by farmers to provide services for themselves.

The American National Fur Breeders Association is a mutual, nonprofit cooperative organization of American fur farmers with over a quarter of a century of service to ranchers.

Through the years, that service has been rendered impartially to fur breeders, whether they had a few animals or thousands of animals. Every attempt has been made to help the fur farmers in solving the problems of disease, nutrition, genetics, ranch management, legislation, and marketing.

In times of depression as well as in times of prosperity—service has come first.

The production of the fur farm must be made available to the consumer. This involves marketing, and marketing has become a highly complex job.

The American National Cooperative Fur Auction, with its six sales a year in Milwaukee, is especially qualified to handle that complex job and to bring a stability to a market that sorely needs such stability.

Farmer cooperatives are part and parcel of the American economic system. They are set up to render service and increase farmers' profits.

Today, about two out of every three farmers belong to one or more agricultural cooperatives whose total memberships almost equal the number of farms in the United States.

Farmer cooperatives simply serve as agents of farmer members. In this way they give the farmer opportunities equal to those enjoyed by other businessmen engaged in the production of goods.

The American National is the fur farmers' cooperative.

Platform of Home Owners and Taxpayers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform of the Home Owners and Taxpayers Association adopted at Eureka, Calif., on January 30, 1950:

PLATFORM OF HOME OWNERS AND TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas taxation is approaching the state of confiscation of property and business, and hampering personal independence, and is fast coming to a point where democracy is in jeopardy of its survival, as has been and now is being demonstrated in Europe and Asia; and

Whereas business, labor, and the American citizens are being throttled by excess taxation, inordinate expenditure of tax moneys without regard to the source of income or the burden placed on the citizens and taxpayers, and for the perpetuation of political officers, commissions, bureaus, Government agencies, and county and city officers, by spending tax money without due regard to the benefits received by the people or stopping the leaks of tax moneys by collusion between officers and contractors and the actual giving away of tax moneys; and

Whereas the spirit of America of 1776 should be revived for the preservation of the liberty, freedom, independence, and opportunity to progress that our ancestors fought for, and should be recovered and preserved for ourselves and our posterity, we taxpayers have adopted a platform as follows:

1. We shall cooperate to preserve justice, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as given to us by our Creator and fought for by our ancestors of 1776, and to recover the opportunity to progress.

2. We shall watch and guard well to prevent the waste and useless expenditure of tax moneys.

3. We shall watch well all public contracts where tax moneys are expended and criticize useless waste of tax money.

4. We shall foster all legislation for expenditure of tax money well spent toward public benefit, without graft or waste of tax money.

5. We shall recommend legislation to eliminate needless bureaus, commissions, agencies, and other bodies being supported from public funds and serving no beneficial purpose to the people, but which purpose is for political strength at the expense of the taxpayers.

6. We shall endeavor to impress upon all citizens the obligation of registering and voting. Our ancestors fought to give us the best Government and greatest individual opportunity to promote individual progress, to the end that we may enjoy the results of private industry and enterprise, and, as a result, are now the leaders of the world. We shall endeavor to keep Government out of private business and to contest all legislation restricting freedom, both personal and business.

7. We shall publicize excessive expenditure of public funds for useless purpose and all other legislation tending to increase taxes without full benefits to the people, or which will curb the right of liberty, justice, and equal rights to all. Do all things to encourage initiative and protect the same for future generations.

8. We shall endeavor to perpetuate the principles established by our ancestors that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

9. We shall endeavor to regain the Bill of Rights.

10. We shall endeavor to present nonpartisan views on all political and economic issues that may arise and which are of importance to the people in general.

The above platform was duly adopted by the members of the Home Owners and Taxpayers Association, this 30th day of January, 1950, at Eureka, Calif.

HUGH TURNER, *President.*

Attest:

TERRY H. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

The President's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times:

NOT THE BRANNAN PLAN

When President Truman speaks in generalities, he talks the language of most Americans who are sincerely interested in setting government to work for the welfare of the greatest number. This applies to the economic field as much as any other.

In a special message transmitted to Congress yesterday, Mr. Truman voiced legitimate objections to the Nation's farm program, which has been patched here and tinkered with there, year after year. The result has been a program which approaches unworkability, which contains the worst features of successive plans, and which tends to cater more and more to the interests of special segments of the population.

The price to the taxpayer is represented by a steadily increasing outlay for farm-price supports and a mountainous stock of surplus commodities.

Under the circumstances, the Nation will applaud the President's admonition to Congress to avoid further makeshift legislation in the field and get on with fundamental improvements.

He says the farm program should be changed "to make it more efficient, less costly, and more conducive to abundant production of farm crops, yielding a fair return to farmers, and selling at prices consumers can afford."

These generalities sound fine. But then Mr. Truman says the Brannan plan fills the bill exactly. When he gets down to particulars, he doesn't sound so good.

The Brannan plan would set up a production-payment system under which farm commodities would be allowed to seek their own price level on the open market. If these prices fell below the support level, the Government would pay the farmer the difference.

In the farm bill he has just signed, Mr. Truman found fault with the provision dealing with peanuts because it sets up a two-price system which, in his words, is "subject to serious objections."

Yet the Brannan plan would set up a two-price system for all farm crops.

Mr. Truman can set goals we would all like to reach, but he sometimes loses his way in trying to attain them. Congress will not be likely to follow him into the Brannan plan.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the home-rule bill for the District of Columbia is, to my mind, a bill which deserves to be considered by the House, and I have signed the discharge petition to bring the subject before us on the floor. The Boston Herald editorial of March 16, 1950, which appears below, states a very strong case for home rule:

SQUARE DEAL FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Last June for the first time in 71 years a bill to restore home rule to the carpetbag city of Washington actually fought its way through one House of Congress. S. 1527, under the joint sponsorship of Senators KEFAUVER and TAFT, passed the Senate by voice vote and went over to the House for final action.

Unfortunately, it is still waiting for action in the House and, unless members of both parties make a real fight for it, it is likely to die in committee when this Congress ends.

The chief roadblock has been thrown up by die-hard Dixiecrats on the House District Committee. Despite the fact than an almost identical measure was favorably reported in the Eightieth Congress (to be lost in the rush for adjournment), the present committee members will not permit a House vote. The trouble of course is the large potential Negro vote in Washington. A handful of southern bourbons just can't swallow democracy even in the Nation's Capital.

But Republicans also share responsibility to some extent. Massachusetts' Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY, a Democrat, has filed a discharge petition for which he has now obtained 170 signatures. But 218 are needed. If the Republicans, who are the original authors of the home-rule movement for Washington, would throw their whole weight behind Mr. KENNEDY'S petition, it would go over with a rush.

Republicans are committed to the home-rule principle by their 1948 platform. The reform is in keeping with the whole Republican tradition. Let's not drop the ball on this one. Our District of Columbia fellow citizens deserve a break. And so does the reputation of the Republican Party.

Women in the United States Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think most of the gentlemen in both Houses of Congress—and certainly the gentlewomen—will be interested in reading an article on women in Congress and the influence they exert in our national legislative chambers.

The article, After 30 Years of Emancipation, was written by Murray Frank and was published in the March 1950 issue of the Pioneer Woman, a publication of Pioneer Women of America, which is a Labor Zionist organization of Jewish women in this country doing important relief work here and for Israel. The article is as follows:

AFTER 30 YEARS OF EMANCIPATION

(By Murray Frank)

This year marks the thirtieth anniversary since American women were granted the right of political suffrage. Ever since 1920 women have taken an active part in the political life of the country. They occupy responsible positions in the Government, sit in Congress, in the State legislatures and hold important judicial positions. But what is the sum total of the role women play in American political life? What influence do they exert toward the general welfare?

Frankly, the results to date have been disappointing. Three decades ago, it was hoped they would exploit their newly acquired power toward improvement of humanity—reforms, education, the maintenance of peace and better relations among the nations of the world. It was argued that since women stand to lose so much in war, they would constitute the strongest force for peace.

We are no nearer this goal today than a generation ago. This is partly due to the fact that women have not taken as great an interest in world problems as anticipated although since the end of the last war this had undergone gradual transformation. A case in point is the feminine representation in the United States Congress.

Members of Congress like to refer to it as the "greatest and most democratic legislative body in the world." Certainly it exerts a tremendous impact on American life and practically on the whole world. How many women sit in this all-important legislature? In the Senate, which consists of 96 members, there is only 1 woman; among the 435 Members of the House of Representatives there are 9 women. Thus, the entire feminine representation in the United States Congress does not exceed 10 out of a total of 531 members, or less than 2 percent.

Yet, some progress may be recorded. Three years ago there were only 7 women in the House of Representatives and none in the Senate. From all indications, next November may see the election of another woman Senator and possibly several more women in the House. Furthermore, some of the present Congresswomen are gradually reaching influential status as chairmen and ranking members of important committees. In view of these prospects, the role and influence of women in our Congress should be no less perhaps greater than in the parliaments of several other countries where women gained political suffrage later than in the United States.

BY WAY OF COMPARISON

Women have obtained a substantial representation in a number of post-war parliaments. In recent years, they had as many as 30 deputies in the French Chamber of Deputies, 25 in the British House of Commons, 38 in the Japanese Diet; women sit in considerable numbers in the parliaments of Italy, India, and other countries. Among the 120 members of the Israel Knesset, there are 11 women; this is equivalent to 9 percent of the Knesset's membership. Proportionately, therefore, the representation of women in Israel's Parliament is four and a half times greater than in the Congress of the world's greatest democracy.

The fact, however, should not be overlooked that women in Congress do not sit there solely as the representatives of their sex, but as the representatives of the citizenry of their respective districts. For the same reason, women do not cast their ballots as members of a particular sex, but as citizens of the land. Yet it leaves unanswered the question why women, who make up more than half of the adult citizen population in the country, do not have a larger representation in Congress.

One explanation is that politics is still a man's world in the United States, and the occasion is indeed rare where political leaders will go out of their way to nominate women for high office. Another is the indifference of women themselves. The average American woman keeps aloof from political problems, seldom participates directly in political struggles, and at best is satisfied merely to go to the polls. It may be due to the fact that women in this country enjoy greater freedom, independence and luxuries, while in other countries they must fight side by side with the men for the most elementary needs.

The group influence of women in the United States Congress is limited by their small number. As individuals, however, they constitute an interesting segment of our national legislature, where they serve as a leaven for greater practicality and guidance, each in her own way, through her own accomplishments and field of activity. Politically, they are divided exactly half and half—five Democrats and five Republicans. By way of introduction, we bring some brief facts about each of the women Members of Congress:

WHO IS WHO?

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH is the only woman in the Senate. A Republican from Maine, she formerly served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 9 years until she entered the Senate in January 1949. She was successively a teacher, business executive, and newspaper woman. When her husband was elected to Congress in 1936, she served as his secretary. After his death in 1940, she was elected to fill his term and has been a Member of Congress ever since.

During the war, Mrs. SMITH served on the House Naval Affairs Committee, and drew the official commendation of President Roosevelt for her work on its subcommittee on congested areas. In 1944, she was adviser to the United States delegation at the International Labor Conference in Philadelphia, and made an inspection trip of American bases in the Pacific. In 1947, she was assigned by the Armed Services Committee to investigate certain conditions in European countries. In the Senate, she is a member of the committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the District of Columbia. She also serves on the Republican Policy Committee.

The dean of the women members is Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, who was elected as a Democratic Representative from New Jersey in 1924 and was the first woman ever to become chairman of a congressional committee. She was chairman of the District of Columbia committee from 1930 to 1937, headed the House Labor Committee until the end of 1946, and was last year named chairman of the House Administration Committee. Before entering politics, Mrs. NORTON was active in welfare work for many years.

Mrs. NORTON'S greatest accomplishment in Congress was her sponsorship of the wage-and-hour law in 1938, which benefited millions of American workers. She has consistently supported and sponsored liberal and reform measures, including housing, minimum wage, civil rights, child welfare, labor, etc. Because of her broad knowledge of labor problems, she was appointed by President Truman as alternate delegate to the International Labor Conference in Paris in 1945.

Mrs. EDITH N. ROGERS, Republican of Massachusetts, was elected to Congress in June 1925 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, Representative John J. Rogers. She is now serving her 25th year in Congress. She was born in Maine, but was raised in Massachusetts. As a result of her overseas service in World War I, Mrs. ROGERS is primarily interested in the care of disabled veterans and the dependents of those who died in service. When the Republicans gained control during the 80th Congress, she became chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs; in the present Congress, she is ranking minority member of the committee.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican from Ohio, was born and raised in Cleveland, where she was active for many years in public-health nursing, education, and social work. In 1940 she was elected to fill the unexpired term of her husband, Mr. Chester C. Bolton, and has been a Member of Congress ever since. She serves on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and has traveled abroad on special assignments for the committee. Several years ago she visited King ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia and upon her return to the United States she espoused the Arab cause and made several damaging statements against the Jewish cause. She later regretted her stand and has recently taken a somewhat friendlier attitude toward Israel.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, wife of movie actor Melvyn Douglas and a famous actress in her own right, is without a doubt the most liberal of all women Members in Congress. She has continually fought for various reforms and civil-rights measures, including abolition of the poll tax, an antilynching law, a fair-employment law to abolish discrimination in employment, housing and slum clearance, rent control, minimum wages, etc. She was one of the staunchest supporters in Congress for a Jewish state in Palestine.

Born in New Jersey and educated in New York, she entered California politics in 1940 as a Democrat and was elected to Congress in 1944 and has been reelected twice since. She is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and served as United States Alternate Delegate to the United Nations Assembly. Recently, she announced her candidacy for the United States Senate and stands a good chance of election next November if she can win the nomination.

Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, is now completing her second term in Congress as Representative of the Twenty-ninth New York District, for many years the stronghold of reactionary isolationist Hamilton Fish. A wealthy business woman of Tuxedo Park, N. Y., she has been very active in the American Red Cross and in various educational and youth groups. In Congress, Mrs. ST. GEORGE is a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where she authored and supported legislation for pay raises for postal and Federal employees. She is also the author and sponsor of an amendment to the United States

Constitution to provide equal rights for women.

Canadian-born Mrs. CHASE G. WOODHOUSE (Connecticut Democrat) has combined a home career with a professional and political career. Besides having raised two children, she was professor of economics at several colleges, an expert on home economics with the Department of Agriculture, and a Democratic Party leader. She served one term in Congress in 1945 and 1946, was defeated for reelection, but succeeded in regaining her place in November 1948. She has written extensively on education and women's activities. Besides her political and administrative posts in this country, she served as expert on General Clay's staff in Germany. In Congress she is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. She has favored repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, liberalization of the displaced-persons law, low-cost housing, etc.

NEWCOMERS

The three newest Members of Congress or first termers are: REVA B. BOSONE, Democrat, of Utah; CECIL M. HARDEN, Republican, of Indiana; and EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, of New York.

Mrs. BOSONE is popularly referred to as Judge Bosone, having been municipal court judge at Salt Lake City for 12 years. She is the first woman elected to Congress from Utah and is a member of the Committee on Public Lands, which deals with irrigation, reclamation, territories and insular possessions, and Indian affairs. She was the first woman to preside over a court in Utah, where she made a great reputation for herself as an expert in traffic problems, introducing remedial measures regarding alcoholics and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents.

The Member from Indiana, Mrs. HARDEN, was a public school teacher who took an active interest in local and civic affairs. She began her political career in 1932 and was elected to Congress in November 1948. She is a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. KELLY is the newest Member of Congress, having been chosen at a special election last November. She is also the youngest woman Member at 42, the others all being over 50, with the exception of Mrs. DOUGLAS, who is 49. Mrs. KELLY, who represents the Tenth Congressional District in Brooklyn, N. Y., is the widow of the late City Court Justice, Edward L. Kelly. For the past 7 years she was research director for the Democratic Party in the New York State capital, Albany, where she gained valuable experience in legislation.

UNEXPLOITED STRENGTH

On the whole, the women Members of the United States Congress are an intelligent, industrious, courageous, and hard-working group. They take their work seriously, try to represent their constituents with loyalty and devotion, and make a valuable contribution to the Congress which is far in excess of their number. The women of America have reason to be proud of the women Members of Congress.

Ideologically, they are largely middle-of-the-roaders, the Democrats among them tapering off to the left of center and the Republicans to the right. With the sole exception of Mrs. BOLTON, the remainder have supported the Jewish cause for Israel during the political struggles of recent years.

Women could make great contributions to American political life if they would take a greater interest in national affairs. In critical times such as these, the American Congress is denied the balancing contribution of their viewpoints on many perplexing problems. It is illogical and inconsistent that in a country where women constitute the majority of eligible voters and where they are such an important factor in the home and in the cultural and social life of the community, they should have such a weak voice in making the laws of the land.

HOLC Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 14, 1950:

HOLC LIQUIDATION

As the Home Owners Loan Corporation approaches complete liquidation there is good reason to offer congratulations. The HOLC is the rescue agency which undertook in the dark days of 1933 to save thousands of American families from loss of their homes through foreclosure. Foreclosures were then running at the rate of more than 1,000 a day. The distress and discouragement resulting from so many domestic misfortunes of this type were a major factor in the gloom that then beset our economic life. To arrest this trend the HOLC made more than a million loans in an aggregate amount of nearly $3,500,000,000. Everyone seemed to assume that its losses would be heavy. Now, with the HOLC 95 percent liquidated, it is clearly evident that all its stock will be retired at par. Indeed, it has a present surplus of about $10,000,000.

Of course, this happy outcome is, in considerable measure, due to the rise in real-estate prices and to the sustained high level of incomes resulting from the war. Nevertheless, it is a notable record, as President Truman pointed out last week when the HOLC repaid $26,000,000 to the Treasury. In a striking manner it vindicates the judgment of HOLC officials, Members of Congress, and others who resisted premature liquidation of that agency when its situation was much less favorable than it is today. Those efforts to wind up the affairs of the HOLC and turn over its mortgages to private home finance agencies were begun in 1937 and continued for a good many years. This newspaper is proud to have had a hand in fighting these moves and in supporting the HOLC's plea that it be allowed gradually to wind up its own affairs.

In 1944 an especially formidable demand for prompt liquidation of the HOLC came to a head in Congress. The United States Savings and Loan League spearheaded the drive with substantial backing in both the House and Senate. One of the schemes advanced would have turned over to private mortgage companies the sound loans made by HOLC, leaving that agency holding the bag with only questionable loans. The Washington Post said at the time: "There is every reason to believe, moreover, that, given time to liquidate its holdings in the patient, orderly fashion originally prescribed by Congress, HOLC will be able to wind up its affairs without a single penny's cost to the American taxpayer."

Had the premature liquidation scheme been accepted, the Government would have suffered substantial losses instead of the profit that is now in prospect. The good judgment in leaving HOLC free to complete its work without undue haste matches the courage and foresight that went into its original creation.

Midsession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Tuesday, April 4, issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial sets off pretty well what has been accomplished during this second session of the Eighty-first Congress. After we complete consideration of the appropriations bill, which should be followed shortly by the tax bill, I feel confident that the majority of my constituents would recommend no further action by the Congress on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory health insurance, or the Brannan farm program. I am in great hopes that the tax bill will reduce the emergency excise taxes, which taxes the Republicans have been seeking to reduce for a long time. It is my understanding that these excise taxes are hurting New York State merchants to a greater degree than they are the merchants in any other State in the Union. It is high time the New York State representatives, both Republicans and Democrats, realize this fact and make a concentrated effort to bring relief to our own business interests.

The editorial follows:

MIDSESSION

With the second session of the Eighty-first Congress now 3 months old, the legislative record is singularly barren. If campaign-conscious Congressmen have their way, not more than another 3 months remain. Much will have to be accomplished in that time unless the favorite programs of the administration are to be frankly accepted as window dressing.

Mr. Truman's domestic leadership has been subject to notable rebuffs. Civil-rights legislation was narrowed down to a Fair Employment Practices Act and passed in the House in a form which scarcely conforms to Democratic promises. Even this version waits, and may wait indefinitely, in the Senate. The housing legislation on which Mr. Truman had particularly set his heart—the provision of Government-guaranteed loans for cooperative undertakings—was defeated in both Houses, despite the President's personal, last-minute intervention. The prospect of continued rent control is undermined by refusals in both Houses to provide sums necessary for enforcement; aid to education remains bogged down in the House; and even the long-awaited approval of the National Science Foundation was marred by security provisions which the administration considers highly objectionable. Meanwhile virtually nothing has been done on those famous administration standbys: Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory health insurance, and the Brannan farm program. Mr. Truman's latest appeal for over-all farm legislation sounds, indeed, more like a man whistling in the dark than like a confident leader marshaling his lieutenants.

To a Republican newspaper the failure of certain administration hopes is by no means unwelcome; yet the President must bear the blame for a defective and faltering leader-

ship which has brought good schemes to nought as well as bad schemes, and has presented necessary reforms in such extravagant and ambitious guise as to doom them from the start. Even more gravely, the President must stand open to the charge of insincerity. He has repeatedly beat the drum for measures which he has little expectation—and little desire—of seeing passed, but which he assumes will provide effective talking points on his whistle-stop tours. That Mr. Truman entertains no very serious hopes for his more grandiose legislative conceptions may do credit to his sanity; it does not do credit to his good faith as a leader or his integrity as a statesman.

Amending the National Transportation Act as Far as Natural or Artificial Gas Is Concerned

REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill seeking to amend paragraph 1 (b) of title 49 of the United States Code, which is a part of the National Transportation Act, by striking out of subsection (b) the words "except natural or artificial gas."

Heretofore because of the fact that artificial and natural gas pipe lines were pioneers in pipe-line transportation—were infant interstate common carriers in an experimental field, they were specifically exempted from the general law governing other common carriers in interstate commerce, such as railroads, trucking and bus companies, telephone and telegraph companies, and oil and gasoline pipe-line companies. Under existing law none of these last-named interstate companies could be owned by any person, firm, or corporation and devoted exclusively to the sole transportation of products owned by any such person, firm, or corporation. As illustrative of this fact you will recall perhaps the case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States which held that the Ford Motor Co., although it owned the railroad and all of its equipment outright, could not use that railroad for the exclusive transportation of its own iron ore from the Iron Mountain Range to its steel smelting and fabricating plants, but was obliged as an interstate common carrier to haul the freight of other persons, firms, and corporations also. One of the reasons behind this and other like decisions was because that very railroad was privileged to exercise the right of eminent domain, which is one of the attributes of sovereignty, and since it could exercise that right, it was a public and not a private railroad.

In the case of these natural and artificial gas pipe lines they are no longer an infant industry pioneering their way in a new venture. They have thrown off their swaddling clothes and have emerged forth as giants. They are dangerously powerful big business, big bankers, big financial dabblers at New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. They are the blood brothers of private power companies. They have outstripped the private power companies selfishness and greed and stand today serene and autocratic snapping their fingers at the Congress of the United States, and cracking their circus ringmasters' whips at recalcitrant Congressmen. Many people already hold them in awe and fearsomely cast sly glances in the general direction of the New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, and Chicago money marts.

They exercise the right of eminent domain.

Because of the present language of paragraph 1 (b) of title 49 of the United States Code, these natural gas pipe line companies transport in interstate commerce only their own natural gas and also occupy the unique position of an interstate common carrier and a wholesaler and a retailer of their own natural gas. It is indeed high time that this be changed. No one can sell their natural gas to them and I know because I have tried to do so. They transport and sell their own natural gas, and perhaps cut "financial melons" with their friends by buying natural gas from them at a higher price than is necessary. They can isolate and ruin any independent owner of a developed natural gas field. Other common carriers in all of their previous wickedness were but "babes in the woods" compared to them.

They have looked far into the future and are acquiring soft coal mines to manufacture gas and that is why the words "or artificial gas" are in the law.

Let us, before it is too late, strip them down now to the sole position of interstate common carriers of natural gas for hire. Common carriers for hire of everyone's natural or artificial gas. Let others be the shippers and owners. Let others be the wholesalers and retailers. Let us serve notice on them that the days of the gas Goliath hath past.

And before I conclude, I would also like to say that Nebraska and every other State in order to enjoy the full measure of natural gas competition needs to organize cooperative natural and artificial gas pipe lines to serve municipalities which should in the real public interest occupy the position of wholesaler and retailer.

I wish that my colleagues would study these suggestions and if I am correct about this amendment and the suggestions I have made, please lend me a helping hand unless your hands happen to be gas-locked.

Address by Hon. Frank Fellows, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Maine, Hon. FRANK FELLOWS, at the Republican State Convention:

Fellow Americans, my pride in being permitted to speak to you this afternoon comes from an appreciation of the honor you do me, and, through me, those citizens of the third district it has been my privilege to serve for the past 9 years. Your kindness encourages me to take a moment to confide to you that, for another and very personal reason, this opportunity means a great deal to me. To those of you who knew my father, Oscar Fellows, who served in our State legislature—both on the floor and as speaker of the house—I need not confess the enduring strength of the silken bonds of love that always bound us. This gavel which I shall use here is the one father wielded in behalf of a Republican house in Augusta almost half a century ago. I cannot hope to do him justice, but his presence seems a living thing here today. And so my gratitude for this opportunity.

At this Lenten season each year, every budding flower and blade of grass testifies that the awful waste of yesteryear makes fertile the fields of tomorrow * * * that Easter's promise is endorsed by spring. If evidence were needed that remorse is vain and foolish, the fragrance of new grass and the song of returning robins would furnish proof beyond all reasonable doubt that now is the time rather for repentance and reformation.

We meet today to assess our situation, marshal our forces, raise a standard and give new impetus to the unending battle for the preservation of our heritage—America, the home of free men.

We are not assembled as farmers or industrialists—as members of organized labor groups—or as veterans. We do not convene as Catholics, although many of that faith are here, nor as Protestants or Jews, numerous though we may be.

We are gathered here today as God-fearing and God-loving Americans, intent upon proving that a strong two-party system of constitutional representative democracy is not a great experiment but the established method of furnishing the greatest individual freedom to the greatest number. The Constitution guarantees a republican form of government, not a utopian democracy.

Socialism, in its simplest form, is the complete discarding of private property by converting it into public property and dividing the income equally among the people, says Britannica. Contemporary Russia is known not as a Communist state but as the U. S. S. R.—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Today to accuse a man of being the owner of property is to damn him. Call him a capitalist and he is shunned. Yet every owner of an insurance policy, automobile, home, or Government bond is a capitalist on a small scale. Every freckle-faced urchin chewing bubble gum and reading the funnies, whose dad picks potatoes, or works in the wood room of one of our pulp mills, is a potential capitalist. Our bank officials are the sons of yesterday's truckmen, farmers, mill hands, and insurance salesmen. This is still the land of opportunity.

It is easy to see why people who have nothing under their own system of government should be willing and anxious to try another. A system where the government owns everything may seem desirable to those people who have never known such a land of opportunity as ours, or to that man who suffers because he lacks faith in his ability to match effort and intelligence with the next man. But it is inconceivable that normal Americans should favor a Socialist system. When everyone owns everything, no one owns anything, and it is the most natural thing in the world to take pride in one's own possessions.

Little tots toddling about with red carts struggle, pull, and haul, shrilly crying, "It's mine." When an adult says, "My dad," it is a loving tribute to all the sacrifice and care that is symbolized in his person. Such sacrifice and care are the expression of one who acknowledges his duty to his own. Mothers are God's most perfect gift to a wicked and weary world, but unless each of us can each claim memory of one mother completely his or her own, we are like small children at a church Christmas tree whose names have been forgotten when the presents were handed out.

Defend capitalism? Our country glories in it. Communism and socialism do nothing for the individual. Capitalism recognizes his God-given dignity, gives him opportunity, and has fed and equipped the world, and has won two wars.

As citizens of the first State in the Union to see the rising sun, let us concern ourselves not at all now with the old slogan, "As goes Maine so goes the Nation." As loyal Americans, let us busy ourselves with proving of ourselves, and to the Grand Old Party of the other 47 States, that, as Maine Republicans, we are worthy of Maine's motto, "Dirigo"—"I guide; I lead"—for, unless we are ready and willing to admit that the future of America is more important than the future of any particular political party, we are not worthy of the citizenship we enjoy. Unless we are prepared to advocate, or oppose, every major proposal absolutely on the basis of whether it is good for the country, rather than whether it will gain votes for the Republican Party, we do not deserve to win an election.

Remorse is vain and foolish. Now is the time for repentance and reformation.

Firm in the conviction that "conquer we must, for our cause it is just," let us satisfy ourselves that, as we go, the rest of the Nation should go.

During a discussion in the Constitutional Convention in 1787, some delegates advocated half measures as more likely to meet with the approval of the people. George Washington said, "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

Whether or not it was desirable, it was inevitable that as this country grew from 13 to 48 States, ocean to ocean, inevitable also that it should grow in government. The adult human body is the result of the division and multiplication of a cell until full growth is accomplished. But the medical profession agree that, beyond a certain point, this process presents a serious problem. Abnormal growth, if not checked, is dangerous, whether in the physical body or the body politic. Just as our vital organs and cancer cannot long endure together, so with democracy and too much government. We have numerous laws today which would have been unthinkable 50 years ago. Whether we approve of some or all of them is not the question, for to try to get rid of them now would be as difficult as putting toothpaste back in a tube once it was squeezed.

But "enough is enough" (as our mothers would say)—if, indeed, it isn't altogether too much! If we are to retain any vestige of self-government, we must practice it. We must practice it in our towns and in our States.

Someone has said that heaven is so high, and the Czar so far away! Well, taxes too are high, and the city of Washington is so far away. The Federal Capital never did anything quicker, better, or cheaper than it could be done locally. And those giants in Washington so anxious to assume all the care and troubles of governing? Distance and propaganda have a way of magnifying both the persons and the deeds of little men.

History and experience are of little value if we read but fail to heed their lessons. Those Pilgrim Fathers who convenanted to erect here in America a substitute for monarchy and despotism were not like those who with ears hear not and who, though having eyes, see not. Liberty, to the Pilgrims, was worth sacrifice and hardship. Now, as then, retention of hard-earned freedom is dependent upon our willingness as individuals to keep awake to the necessity for watching its flame, and furnishing fuel to keep it burning bright. To ignore history and the awful ordeals of other countries is to deliberately court disaster with a view to marriage with calamity and ruin.

The American eagle symbolizes our great country. He was chosen because he has strength, speed, grace of motion and a sense of direction. This administration places emphasis on his left wing. We call them left-wingers. If too much pressure is applied on this eagle's left wing, one of two things occurs—he either turns bottom side up or he revolves in circles. If this eagle has that 'freedom from fear" and "freedom from want" promised by the New Deal, and if his initiative and responsibility for the future are thus removed, he becomes a parrot, either caged or chained to a perch. A parrot only simulates a man—laughs not because he is happy, but because he thinks a laugh is timely. He weeps not because he feels grief, but rather because it is good politics. He whistles because he knows from habit and experience that then somebody will bring him a cracker.

Those people whose ultimate and only concern are security and welfare are the frightened and the selfish. The boys and girls who fought our two World Wars, like the men whose blood ruddied the snows at Valley Forge, gave little thought to personal comfort or financial reward. Neither selfishness nor fear contributed to this country's growth. Justice is more vital than welfare, for without justice even the deserving suffer.

Those veterans handicapped by injury and disease acquired in the defense of our civilization deserve every consideration. And to accord with the American concept of reward, this consideration must find expression not in the form of charitable handouts, but, instead, as justice decrees and in the form of available opportunity.

Our forefathers sailed from Britain and Russia, from Sweden and France, from Germany and Italy, from Greece and all the Near East, with brave hearts and empty hands. Out of the comparative security of the known they came to face the unknown, asking only civil and religious liberty, and equal justice under law.

Do we deserve more?

It was our own Israel Washburn of Maine, who in 1854, said that "The new party should take the name 'Republican' and have for its purpose the welfare of the whole Union and the stainless honor of the American name."

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

The thought has been expressed that the Republican Party should be "humanized." There may be virtue in the suggestion, but, to humanize it we must be careful not to Trumanize it as well. To compromise principle, in an effort to appeal to the less admirable qualities of human nature, to obtain votes, is unworthy of the great founder of our Republican Party, and no compliment to the intelligence and integrity of the average voter.

No political party has cornered the market on virtue and ability. If our two-party system is to continue functioning, it would seem altogether desirable that each party make its aims so clear that no misunderstanding can exist in the minds of voters, and an honest choice be offered.

Which shall Maine Republicans offer the country?

Shall we offer an undignified scuffle for Trumanized welfare and regimentation—a pauperized paternalism?

Or shall we offer a crusade for self-government, individual initiative, intellectual honesty in government and respect for human dignity?

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

We hear much today of minority groups. The spokesmen for these groups are ever asking, "What are you going to do for us?" No one present but what could, given the disposition, identify himself or herself as one of a minority. If we judge by the numbers voting in recent years, a Republican too belongs to a minority group. When we consider that the most vocal groups labeling themselves minorities add up to more than 50 percent of our total population, armed with ballots, the whole furor becomes slightly ridiculous.

It ill befits the Republican Party to step out of character in a fruitless endeavor to attract the votes of such self-seekers. Should not men and women, whether white or colored, Republican or Democrat, think of themselves first as Americans, and make their query, What can we do for America? not What will the Government do for us?

When we say us let us mean all Americans, not any particular group.

"What care I for case or creed? It is the deed; it is the deed.
What for class or what for clan? It is the man; it is the man.
Heirs of love and joy and woe, Who is high, and who is low?
Mountain, valley, sky and sea, all are for humanity."

Why did six United States marines, under bitter enemy fire, scramble up the steep side of a volcano on Iwo Jima to stand on rocks and sandbags at the edge of a crater and raise there our country's flag? I will tell you why. They knew that flag represented to their comrades something worth fighting for—yes, worth dying for. It was and is a standard worthy of defense.

LET US RAISE SUCH A STANDARD

This country has long been considered Republican. During the past 18 years it has been in the hands of the opposition party, either because the Republicans themselves voted that way, or because they failed to vote at all. Certainly there is every reason to believe it has become the custom to contribute to the war chest of one party to hold one's Government contracts and contacts—and at the same time to give a lesser amount to the Republican Party, to hold one's membership. The 50 percent who failed to go to the polls in 1948 were largely in small communities, the Republican strongholds.

The New Deal had promised a continuance of practices under a new label, the Fair Deal.

The Republican Party promised to do all the New Deal promised, but indicated its conviction it could do those things better. Those who favored regulation and strangulation from Washington apparently felt that—having the disposition and the stomach for, as well as actual experience in such things—the New Deal should have the job.

Where was our two-party system then?

To the thousands of Americans genuinely disturbed and disgusted by the threat of annihilation of our free institutions by a constantly growing bureaucracy in Washington, no party and neither platform appealed in 1948. They did not bother to vote. Yet, notwithstanding all these things, with 22,-

000,000 votes our defeat could still have been victory had 30,000 of those votes been distributed differently.

We were fortunate to garner as many as we did.

Caution is not an offensive weapon. But, fighting an entrenched enemy, the Republican Party had to exercise caution not to step on the toes of some of their own party candidates, who ranged from those who would out-Truman Truman in Fair Dealism, to those who found Senator TAFT less conservative than they would have liked.

Party platforms are not platforms if they are made up of loose planks balanced precariously on a sawhorse of expediency where candidates can teeter until they and the voters are dizzy.

LET US RAISE A STANDARD TO WHICH THE WISE AND HONEST CAN REPAIR

Not a soul within the sound of my voice but in his secret heart knows that continuance of our present fiscal and foreign policy means national moral and economic bankruptcy and suicide.

In the legal profession, there is what is known as the rule of the last clear chance. There comes a time when a political party faces such a choice. Let us offer the voters a last chance to declare for what we all know to be right. If we do not, our descendants may well raise a monument to what was once the great party of Abraham Lincoln, and upon it engrave the words, "Wrecked on the rocks of expediency."

In the 11th chapter of Genesis, we read that the whole earth was of one language, and the descendants of Noah conceived the notion of building a tower reaching to heaven, and said, "Let us make us a name." The Lord disapproved the intrusion, descended to earth to confound their speech, and dispersed the crowd. God will not be mocked.

Political pygmies of both major parties, gluttonous for power, clothe themselves in the sackcloth of a concern for the common man and his welfare, but erect a bureaucracy of as monstrous proportions as that Tower of Babel.

LABOR

The record of organized labor in the State of Maine is one which might be studied with profit by industry and labor throughout the country. Cool heads and warm hearts, rather than hot heads and cold hearts, make this record possible. We like to believe that Maine men and women would not tolerate the kind of leadership which seeks for itself power and more power at the expense of union members and the general public. We like to believe the native intelligence of Maine men and women, whether employers or workers, is of too high a caliber to overlook the fact that the fortune of each is dependent upon the other. Whatever injures industry, whether reciprocal trade or high taxes, or both, injures labor, for when industry cannot operate at a profit employment ceases. And that which injures labor, whether high living costs, high taxes, sickness, or unwarranted strikes, injures industry. The recent strikes in the coal industry produced nothing but misery for producers, workers, and the public generally.

Any group that accepts the benefits of a law should be obliged to respect it, operate under its provisions, or forfeit the benefits.

The Taft-Hartley law was not designed to prevent strikes but to delay them and give time for consultation and compromise. The best law ever written is useless when the Chief Executive ridicules it, encourages defiance of it, refuses to enforce it, and finally invokes it belatedly with a threat to seize basic industry. Such action was no accident.

Power is a wonderful but dangerous thing. Nation-wide and industry-wide strikes abuse power, for with lack of wisdom in their use they present a constant threat to the general public. Like medicine, power should be used wisely or not at all. Neither Mr. Lewis nor Mr. Truman used his power wisely.

Unless industry and labor can learn to live together by the practice of self-discipline, the future of either is not bright. Hitler abolished labor unions. The British Labor Government does not permit a farm worker to change his employment. Labor decreases its opportunities for advantage when it operates on an industry-wide or Nation-wide scale by increasing the possibility of creation of national crises and punitive legislation.

Socialism, communism, or a totalitarian government of any kind has nothing to offer American labor. Labor's stake in our free enterprise system is fully as great, if not greater than industry's.

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

FARMERS

In Britain today the very school children on the farms are conscious that their parents are worried. Under their present government, the how, what, when, and where of planting is at the dictation of a central authority—the government. A farmer who plants more or less than he is ordered has his land assigned to someone who will do as he is told. Let us not forget it is happening here.

Mr. Attlee's Mr. Bevin gives warning: "American is following the footsteps of Britain."

"We will become economic galley slaves," declared former Secretary of State and Supreme Court Justice Honorable James Byrnes.

A Maine writer has said that cows are like folks. They like to be led, if at all, by happy companions, not by dudes with umbrellas or demagogs with pitchforks. They like, also, the path to be sunny, tuneful, fragrant: the weather—as it happens; the way—homeward.

Unlike cows, we have the ability to observe and choose. Coaxed with tempting stabilizing plans, we may mistake for happy companions the demagogs leading us down a road from which the ruts of uncertainty seem to have been smoothed, and then we find ourselves, brakes gone, on a steep downgrade which is neither sunny, tuneful, nor fragrant, and which leads—not homeward—but to a strict regimentation and control we have never known before. A dead man, remember, is safe, certain, and secure. But do Maine folks want that kind of security?

Under a Fair Deal administration, the State Department imports from Canada the farm surplus which wrecks the economy and leaves our farmer holding the bag The potato gets the unfavorable publicity—cotton and peanuts get the cash. And the Democratic Party offers as its pledge of security and welfare to patriotic American farmers the Brannan plan—a scheme whereby the producer receives top price, the consumer pays bottom price, and each makes up the difference to the other in taxes. The farm plan which saw us safely through the war years, with less unfriendly and unwise administration would have operated economically until such time as it became clear that a repetition of the earlier demand to feed the world would not soon again be made as we fight and lose the cold war.

Only salvation is free and in freedom this country has found its salvation.

As the British Labor Government acknowledges, under a similar system in Britain, farmers prefer to be tenants. If a British farmer does not satisfy the Government in the matter of production, his land is taken from him, and farm workers may leave their jobs, but are not permitted to take new ones outside agriculture. That is, indeed, security, for the farmer is not secured—he is chained.

WELFARE

There is not a man or woman in America who is not concerned with the public welfare, whether he be a so-called ultraliberal or ultraconservative. The ultraliberal's philosophy would return us to what our forefathers faced which necessitated their sitting down to write the first rules of human liberty.

The conservative believes in home rule and, although he does not attend the dinner for Mr. Jefferson, he does not discard the philosophy which holds that that country is governed best which is governed least—that you can carry on your farms, stores, employment, and professions better in the interest of public welfare at home than it can be done for you by a defunct college professor who sits in a chair in Washington.

The record of this administration has been one of stupidity and cynicism.

From amid a welter of mink, orchids, champagne, gold plate, and tickets at $100 per, we hear pious mouthings about the common man. It cynically assumes that everything and everyone has a price, and that salvation can be assured if sufficient money is expended. It has led us down the road to national socialism to a state called welfare. Britain followed the same course to financial, mental, and moral bankruptcy.

DISLOYALTY

If it was not deliberate trickery, it was colossal failure to recognize and evaluate the true situation at home, to direct all our attention abroad, when disloyalty was being permitted to invade and spread through the vital centers of the executive department of our own Government.

Communism is a way of life, but not our way. It is built on disillusion, skepticism, cynicism, and treachery. It is godless and ungodly. It is at once corrupt and corrupting. Like the graduates of the Pendergast machine, its converts and fellow travelers eventually will answer before the judgment seat, but en route they enjoy, while they abuse, the privileges of citizenship—go to jail—or get policy-making positions in Washington under the Fair Deal.

Our State Department admits it has but recently purged itself of some 90 moral perverts, and allowed some persons charged with disloyalty to slink away, unregretted—but also, alas—unhanged. And even such belated action came only after Congress had made public evidence resulting from an investigation which the Fair Deal labeled a "witch hunt" and a "red herring."

The Hiss and Fuchs cases are examples of the folly of expending all our energy and treasure fighting communism abroad. That same Hiss served as Department of State's adviser to President Roosevelt at Yalta, when Stalin was handed China, Poland, and eastern Europe. When Hiss' loyalty was questioned, he was placed where he could give aid to Russia in her China policy—then made secretary of the San Francisco United Nations Conference. And when he was indicted for perjury, a sense of propriety was so lacking in such Fair Dealers as the widow of President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Acheson, and two Justices of the Supreme Court, that they volunteered testimonials as to the good character of the culprit.

During the Battle of the Bulge, when America was fighting Germany and Japan for its very existence, and our boys in the Army were subject to 40 years at hard labor for overstaying their leaves, FBI recovered hundreds of documents which had been filched from the files of our State, War, and Navy Departments. Three State Department employees were arrested. Two were indicted and fined only $500 each, under a law which provided a penalty of 5 years in prison and a fine of $5,000 for theft of any one of those documents. The third man

went unscathed, and today holds a high position in the Department of State. A special prosecutor for the Attorney General of the United States stated in open court that the action of these defendants did not involve any element of disloyalty. How does that fit in with your ideas of loyalty?

Our fighting forces won the war. Our diplomacy has nullified their victory. A department which spends 50 percent of its time conditioning our own citizens for the defeat its policies make certain is at least a 50-percent detriment. The vital question is not the number of Communists in the State Department. It is whether stupidity and disloyalty are to be tolerated and condoned.

Webster defines "diplomacy" as "dexterity or artfulness in securing advantages without arousing hostility." Wherein has our State Department evidenced any of these abilities in behalf of our country?

Vindictive and vicious executives have undertaken purges of elected representatives of the people, and the products of corrupt political machines have not hesitated to enlist, or at least accept, the good offices of professional lawbreakers to steal and destroy ballot-box evidence of their misdeeds.

TAXES AND DEFICIT SPENDING

The Fair Deal has Trumanized Government expenditures, the national debt, and the budget. And these things are sanforized as well as Trumanized, because they have been treated to political processes which insure against shrinkage.

When we stop to consider that, if every life-insurance policy in force were cashed in—every city home and country farm with its equipment sold, and every industry converted into cash—the total receipts would run this Federal Government at its present rate of spending only 3 years, we get some idea why the same financial wizardry applied to a small haberdashery in the Middle West led its proprietor in accordance with the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, as amended, to seek other and more fertile fields for the exercise of financial genius.

An administration which has ceaselessly worked at increasing Government's power and enlarging the national debt has taken charge as well of the citizens' pay-envelopes. The value of the dollar has not been sanforized. It shrinks daily and hourly as Government spending and political manipulation of currency continues.

Thirty-two cents of every dollar of income goes for taxes. Based on Nation-wide averages, a man who receives $50 a month from the Government pays $16 of it over the counter in hidden taxes. We spend more on Government than on groceries; 13 times as much as on education; and 40 times what we contribute to our churches.

Seventy cents of every tax dollar goes to the Federal Government, which picks our pockets, and, to give it ever-increasing power over our persons and property, uses that loot to bribe the States into surrender of their power over activities which local government can administer better and more efficiently.

"Such an excess of stupidity is not in nature."

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

Writing to our own Henry Knox, 163 years ago this month, George Washington said, "It is among the evils, and perhaps is not the smallest, of democratical governments, that the people must feel, before they will see. When this happens, they are roused to action; hence it is that this form of government is so slow."

The people are beginning to feel.

The bite being inflicted upon the American taxpayer by the Federal Government is being felt by individuals and local and State governments. It is a hopeful indication that soon they will see as well—see the folly of allowing centralized government tap all the sources of taxation, leaving local and State officials and governments to beg for grants-in-aid to conduct local government activities.

The inanity of the administration's fiscal policy, so-called, is only equaled by the ineptitude of its alleged foreign policy.

It spends billions in Europe to contain communism there, while it harbors in its State and other Departments communistically inclined men and women whose loyalty has been questioned or found wanting, and protects and excused them while they write a policy for Asia which puts millions of souls behind the iron curtain, that shuts God out.

A chill of delayed comprehension and ominous apprehension follows the truth made public at the Hiss and Coplon trials here, and the Fuchs trial in London.

Our Fair Deal poses as the protector of the workingman by advocating a labor policy barring importation of cheap foreign labor on the one hand, and on the other, admits the products of that same labor to compete for our markets.

When a President of these United States took the novel position that a country that had promised to pay in gold could pay in any legal tender it chose, it was an indication of things to come—an era when the mode was to say one thing and mean another.

Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair, for certainly now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the country.

Cynicism has consorted with perversion of truth.

Intellectual honesty is one of the worst shortages from which we suffer. Playing on the emotions, coloring the news, embroidering the truth—all lead to only one end—confusion.

As our own David Barker once wrote:

"Go for error or for truth;
Go for darkness or for light;
Paint your flag and hang it out,
Be it black or be it white,
Ever.

"Never ape the tadpole, man;
Never swim around incog;
Off with tail or off with claws;
Be it polliwog or frog,
Ever."

We need a new appreciation of democracy.

We need a new dedication to higher standards of the conduct of public affairs.

We need, as has been held by authorities, stock piles of manganese, tin, and lead, to meet emergencies. But, even more, we need to renew our stock piles of spiritual values.

The Republican Party was called into being to save the Union. It saved the Union!

The Republican Party would deem it a high privilege, as well as its bounden duty to save the country now.

The Grand Old Party of Abraham Lincoln cannot deny responsibility merely by indicting the Fair Deal.

We must never underrate the intelligence and integrity of the average citizen.

We can give concrete evidence of our belief that indeed honesty is the best policy by frankly and fearlessly proclaiming our convictions, and by ceasing to dignify with the title of leaders mere political weathervanes that subject themselves to each passing breeze.

Lincoln believed that human liberty is like unto a coral isle—built from the deeps, built by the dying of the builders, until at last it greets the surface and the sun and he held steadfastly to his main purpose with the charm of a poet and fell, as only monuments can fall.

We would say—he preferred to go down to defeat with banners flying, rather than just go down to defeat—period. The question to be answered by this convention is, "Have we had our banners flying?"

If not, are we prepared now to raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair?

The Republican Party never had been too proud to fight! It must never fight for an unworthy cause!

Give us leaders—and let us fight for principles!

Men facetiously remark that women always have the last word. Without question that will be true in the coming election. They have the power to decide what the future shall hold for their children. Awake to the fact that the present foreign policy, deficit spending, increasing national debt, and a trend toward regimentation bid fair to enslave for generations those they love, the women of this Nation can be depended upon to turn the tide. We feel confident of that, for of each man here it may be said that, because of the memory of his own mother, "faith in womankind beats with his blood, and trust in all things high comes easy to him; and tho' he trip and fall, he shall not blind his soul with clay."

Here in Maine, a Republican executive and legislature, assisted in some instances by loyal and able members of the opposition party, have conducted our State affairs to the entire satisfaction of a large majority of our citizens. Safety, sanity, and solvency have been their goal, and the State's record remains, as always, one of which our Governor and legislature may be proud.

Your delegation in Washington, with such weapons as it could muster, has fought a rear-guard action to delay, when it could not halt, what has at times seemed the inevitable ruin of all that the architects and builders of our system have evolved.

This convention should present an outline of doctrine understandable and easily applied to any situation:

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

Our children—the Young Republicans—must fight for a return to local self-government, with power to tax and spend their own money. Such was our inheritance, but the exigencies of two World Wars and a world trend dissipated that legacy. We and they must recover and restore it for their children.

SOUND MONEY

Sound money, brought about by economy and thrift on local levels and a saving of the collection and disbursing fees of that greatest of all 10-percenters—the Federal Government. Cost of government must be cut. Deficit spending must stop.

RESPONSIBILITY

Recognition that projects, however worthy, should not be undertaken if we are either unable or unwilling to be taxed to pay for them.

INTELLECTUAL HONESTY

Intellectual honesty in Government and officials. For no man is better than his word, and "by their fruits ye shall know them."

LEADERS

Insistence upon men and women who, in ability and moral courage, loom above and beyond the trusting and timid, and by precept and example prove they stand for something more than their own election.

Our Father, at this vesper hour, we look backward in gratitude and forward in confidence, for we know that Thy laws are now and ever have been the supreme law—unchanged and unchanging—that truth, and truth alone, withstands the test of time.

As we onward walk the paths of duty, do Thou endow us with stout hearts, and open minds. Stimulate us with the faith that

greets the dawn rather than the setting sun; faith in Thee, in our fellow men, in our Republic, and in the ultimate triumph of all things right. Dismissing past regrets and future fears, send us forth on errands of mercy and good will; then we shall have the restful satisfaction that comes to those who have borne wisely and well their part. Fill us with large sympathies for others, and bless us with complete trust in Thy goodness, and Thine shall be the glory forever.

Need for Intelligent Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the well-known historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., appearing in the magazine section of the New York Times, Sunday, April 2, 1950. The article, entitled "The Need for an Intelligent Opposition," presents some sound advice pointing to the development of a truly conservative yet constructive Republican Party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR AN INTELLIGENT OPPOSITION

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The Republican Party, after due meditation in the wilderness, awhile ago came forth with a statement of principles. That statement, while forthright in its endorsement of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism, was less clear when it moved on to details. Thus it came out strongly for civil liberties, while at the same time it condemned the administration for its "soft" loyalty policy. It firmly favored the promotion of world trade, while with equal firmness it insisted on the principle of tariff protection. It demanded welfare programs, a strong national defense, and a balanced budget, while it denounced taxation and spending.

A leading Fair Dealer was soon after heard to remark, "What this country needs is an intelligent opposition." Now this wish should not be dismissed as a pious but insincere genuflection to the two-party system. The hard fact is that, while the Democrats may gain short-run benefits from the present absence of competition, thoughtful members of the party understand the long-run dangers from absence of competition. An essential function of a party in our system is to secure the concurrence in our political processes of that part of the community which it represents; and, if a party becomes so feeble and confused that it turns into an object of public pity or contempt, it can no longer assist in securing that concurrence. As a result our whole political fabric suffers; the party itself disappears; and there is no guaranty that any new party which rises in its place will have a basic respect for constitutional processes and public order.

A responsible liberal, in short, would rather have a healthy and intelligent conservative party, which might even win an election now and then, than a dull and hopeless conservative party, threatening at any moment to break into pieces and leave its members prey for Fascist-minded demagogues. Or, to put it in another way, a liberal must prefer a genuinely conservative party to a reactionary party because reaction, though it may be static and stupid for a time, can always, and easily, emerge as a dynamic and dangerous force.

There is a vital difference between a conservative and a reactionary. A true conservative believes that the processes of change are gradual and organic; that you cannot impose abstract ideas on the massive, glacial flow of society; that the comprehensive blueprint and the exclusive panacea are alike irrelevant to the stream of history. But he knows well that there is a stream of history, that change does come about, and that the recognition of the necessity of change is the best way of preventing it from disrupting society.

The reactionary, on the other hand, hates and fears all change—except that which promises to entrench him all the more firmly in his power and privilege. He is dedicated to the interests of his class—unlike the conservative, who has a sense of social and national responsibility which absorbs and sometimes overrides his loyalty to his class. The conservative believes in freedom under law for all and recognizes his obligation to make all citizens members of the community. He is a constitutionalist and therefore a libertarian, and a pluralist; and because he understands that constitutions live only as expressions of organic vitality, he is a believer in reciprocal obligations and social welfare. His gods are law, freedom, and social cohesion. His prophets are Burke and Disraeli, Alexander Hamilton, and John Quincy Adams.

The model of such responsible conservatism was the Tory democracy of Victorian Britain. Here, Disraeli, perceiving the necessity of social change, and recognizing, moreover, the obligation to make the new industrial masses feel themselves a part of the community, led the way in converting the two nations, which threatened destruction of the British community, into one. His success dulled the sharp edges of revolutionary discontent. It also transformed Toryism into a doctrine of at least partial social responsibility and thereby transformed Marxism into the amiable and peaceful creed of Fabianism. The result was that vital British sense of national community—of being, for better or worse, members of one great family—which saw Britain through the war and is overseeing today the experiment in socialism.

In our own country, conservatism began under affirmative and public-spirited auspices. At a time when the followers of Jefferson, fearing the establishment of national authority, supported a futile localism in politics and a static agrarianism in economics, it was the Federalists who demanded a strong Central Government and who projected a splendid vision of an industrial economy. Alexander Hamilton was indeed advancing class interests in his financial program, as Charles Beard has pointed out. But the Hamiltonian interpretation of the interests of the business community promoted the general welfare as well.

It can also be noted that Jefferson's views on politics and economics—I do not speak here of his views on education and on civil freedom—were just as much an expression of class interest—and of a class interest which, if dominant, would have gravely retarded our national development.

The Federalist Party had at the start a high sense of national obligation. But its flavor and its rhetoric were aristocratic in an increasingly democratic land, and it soon passed from the scene. Its nationalist heritage was taken over, however, by statesmen like Henry Clay, with his American system, and John Quincy Adams, with his call for national economic planning. Almost in the accents of a believer in the welfare state, the younger Adams as President could define the great object of government as the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed.

Yet, after Adams the decline of American conservatism set in. The administration of Andrew Jackson, with its vigorous exercise of the national power in the popular interest, set in motion the long process of weaning the Jeffersonians from antistatism. At the same time, the Whig Party rejected the truly conservative possibilities inherent in its own intellectual position. That party—as August Heckscher has argued in A Pattern of Politics—was founded on a recognition of the diverse interests in society. Its avowed end was the harmonizing of those interests in the service of a national unity; its cherished means was the positive action of government within a framework of constitutionalism. Yet it came to sacrifice the interests of society to the interests of the business community. It became, in Emerson's phrase, too much the shop-and-till party.

Later the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln momentarily recharged American conservatism with a passionate sense of the national interest. But class interests took over again in the next generation; the short-run interests of business became glibly identified with the long-run interests of the Nation.

Theodore Roosevelt made the final—and a vigorous—attempt to restore to American conservatism something of the spirit of the Tory democracy of Britain. "We Republicans [must] hold the just balance," he cried, "and set ourselves against improper corporate influence on the one hand as against demagogy and mob rule on the other." But those who controlled the Republican Party would not tolerate so detached an attitude toward the great corporations and, in 1912, they drove Roosevelt out of the party. With him went the last powerful impulse of true conservatism in the Republican Party.

True, there have been some authentic conservatives since Theodore Roosevelt—Henry L. Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Dwight Morrow, Wendell Willkie, for example. But it is chastening to note how few were ever used by a Republican administration, except in the field of foreign policy, or were politically acceptable to the Republican bosses. Indeed, such followers of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 as John G. Winant, Harold Ickes and Frank Knox eventually found a more congenial atmosphere in the liberal administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Generally, however, the conservative party in the United States has become, in a degree unimagined by Emerson, the "shop and till party."

"Conservatism belongs to society as a whole," Peter Viereck has written in Conservatism Revisited, "for its purpose is to conserve the values needed by society as a whole. Conservatism is betrayed when it becomes the exclusive property of a single social or economic minority." It is precisely this betrayal which has reduced American conservatism to its current fatuity. For the Republican Party as an organization has become in recent years so committed to the short-run interests of the business community that it has often tended to ignore what are clearly the long-run interests of the Nation.

A few examples will suffice to illustrate this conflict. High tariffs, for instance, protect the immediate advantages of certain industries. Yet every economist knows, and every politician should know, that we can maintain our tariff barriers and close our markets to foreign goods only at the expense of world economic stability. In the

long run, a protective tariff system will destroy the position of American business. But the magnetism of the short run is too great, and the Republican Party resists nearly every attempt at tariff reduction.

Similarly, in the field of social welfare it is obviously essential, if capitalism is to survive, to hold the loyalty of the masses to the existing economic system. And it is obviously impossible to hold that loyalty if the existing economic system fails to feed, house, and clothe all the people, to provide them decent medical care or adequate education. So the dictate of true conservatism would be to bribe the masses into loyalty, if you like, by assuring them the basic decencies of living.

As the British Tory Quintin Hogg has put it, "if you do not give the people social reform, they will give you social revolution." Yet the Republican Party, in proclaiming its crusade against the welfare state, is abandoning the working masses to the radicals—and all in the name of a lower tax rate. Again the short run triumphs over the long.

Similarly, in the field of foreign policy, the business community has no future except in a free and peaceful world. Yet again, under the banner of tax reduction, it demands cuts in our spending which threaten to dismantle vital parts of our Defense Establishment and of our foreign economic policy. The price of retirement in a world on the verge of war may well be national disaster.

Is American conservatism dead beyond recall? Has it become simply the political reflex of the fears and timidities of the leadership of business? One certainly sees no Disraeli leading the Republicans to an affirmative social policy at home; no Churchill calling for an adequate program to resist tyranny abroad.

Yet there are, I think, signs today that the true conservatives are attempting to rescue their party from the reactionaries with a vigor they have not shown since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. Young men like August Heckscher, Peter Viereck, and McGeorge Bundy have set forth for the first time in a generation a usable political philosophy for conservatism, and the activity of Senators like WAYNE MORSE and HENRY CABOT LODGE and Congressmen like JACOB JAVITS; of governors like Youngdahl, of Minnesota; Peterson, of Nebraska; and Driscoll, of New Jersey; as well as of younger politicians like Oren Root, Jr., and Philip Willkie, has suggested the main lines of an intelligent conservative policy.

It is not too hard to describe the positions a true conservatism should take. It must, in the first place, follow the example of Theodore Roosevelt and dedicate itself to the public interest as against the special interests of any single group. This position would have particular potency at a time when many citizens are becoming apprehensive over the power of organized labor. But it is not a position which Republicans can convincingly assume until they demonstrate that they have liberated themselves from a posture of entire subserviency before the business community.

In the second place, the conservative party must, like John Quincy Adams, commit itself to a program of social welfare. It can make its distinctive contribution to such a program by opposing the centralization of welfare services in the Federal Government. It can argue for the encouragement of private and voluntary initiatives; it can argue for the local and State administration of welfare policies. But again the Republicans cannot plausibly assume this position until they demonstrate that they are genuinely devoted to welfare objectives.

In the third place, the conservative party must, like Abraham Lincoln, assume a principled position on the question of civil rights. It must demand the speedy recognition of the equal rights of the Negro. And it must revive the ancient conservative respect for due process of law, especially as it affects the freedom of expression. It must follow Holmes and Hughes, not Mundt and Nixon; its best traditions, not its worst, on questions of political and intellectual liberty.

In the fourth place, the conservative party must, like Henry L. Stimson and Wendell Willkie, give unstinted support to foreign policies designed to assure national security. This means recognizing the dangers in the world and preparing to meet them. Nor do verbal blasts at communism or reckless demands for military adventures in Formosa constitute any substitute for the hard, exacting, costly job of constructing a foreign policy and appropriating the resources necessary to execute it.

Would such a four-point program be "metooism"? In the sense that this program admits to meeting the problems of the age of Truman, and not those of the age of Rutherford B. Hayes, it is no doubt guilty of that weird heresy. But in the sense that it represents an identity of program with the Fair Deal, surely not. The differences between the parties would remain great and significant.

By standing convincingly for the public interest, the Republicans could throw on the Democrats the onus of representing special and "selfish" groups. By standing convincingly for a program of decentralized welfare, the Republicans could throw on the Democrats the burden of explaining why everything must be run from Washington. Within the objectives of the twentieth century, an alternative program to the Fair Deal is entirely conceivable.

But to stand "convincingly" for these objectives, the Republicans must remember that conservatism is not the private property of the National Association of Manufacturers. It is not a device for increasing the short-run security of business. It is rather a profound sense of national continuity, stretching deep into the past and forward into the future, and providing a protective membrane for all the people of society.

"It is the people with a sense of injustice," Senator LODGE recently observed, "who become a target for Communist activity. The way to defeat the Communists is not by trying to shoot them, but by being just to our own people." This would be the essential doctrine of a responsible American conservatism and the only likely condition for its revival.

Low Brand of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., dated March 28, 1950, and entitled "Low Brand of Politics":

LOW BRAND OF POLITICS

It is unfortunate that an otherwise smart man like Secretary of State Dean Acheson should have been so neglectful of his public relations. Many a less able man has succeeded in public life because of a pleasing personality.

We believe that there is something more than loyalty to friends that has made President Truman announce that he is not going to fire Acheson in spite of the fact that it was hitherto generally reported that the President had enough of him and was letting him go. Apparently Acheson is to stay on the job indefinitely.

The foreign policies adopted by the Secretary of State are not his alone. They were worked out after many conferences with the Fresident and his other advisers. The policies are the coordinated conclusions of the national administration.

Acheson is not the sort of man to "make friends and influence people." No doubt this phase of his character is due to some youthful inhibitions that expressed themselves in a retiring nature, even an antagonistic attitude toward others. He retreated within himself and fought back only when molested. Being an introvert he devoted himself to study, and having a fine mind he accumulated a wide and well-coordinated lot of general knowledge.

Be sure Acheson was fully discussed before the President appointed him. A man was wanted who would put up an uncompromising front toward Stalin and at the same time would follow the rules of common sense. Thus far that is what Acheson has done and the policy is having marked effect on Soviet Russia.

Acheson started out with making himself unpopular with the press. Probably he was not warned against that which is the only mistake of consequence he has made thus far. No newspaper reporter has given him the worst of it, but at the same time few if any have taken the trouble to report the more favorable aspects. Some columnist once observed that you may be able to whip a reporter one day but that he can whip a man in public life every day by leaving him out of the paper. That is not vicious retaliation but mere disinterest.

The Secretary of State having built up his own poor press he was considered a vulnerable member of the national administration by the Republican leaders. They decided to concentrate their attack on him, even to try to run him out of office. They hoped for criticism of the public that might be brought to bear on the administration as a whole. That explains the vicious attack by Republican Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. Acheson was to be made the goat and MCCARTHY was to heap criticism upon him.

Now the better balanced Republican leaders regret that the plan was ever adopted. It has kicked back seriously. MCCARTHY has been making accusations that later proved to be groundless. He has been so hell-bent on getting something on the Democrats that he has been blasting with a blunderbuss, hoping that he might hit someone or something in his blind attack.

Time was when the Department of State was an inept, antiquated and ineffectual department, run by career men whose chief ability lay in retaining social connections. A lot has been done toward ridding the Department of this element and toward making it a modern, up-and-going department. Acheson, without any publicity, has accomplished much along these lines.

Acheson's chief value, however, has been in his handling of international relations and in this he seems to have employed a high type of intelligence.

On the other hand, MCCARTHY by his blind, vicious and violent attacks on the Department has put serious obstacles in the path of the Secretary and has served only to hurt our international standing and influence.

It is a pity that a man like MCCARTHY can be allowed to do such a disservice to his

country by employment of low political party devices in an effort to discredit a high member of the national administration.

For honor, patriotism, and intelligence there is no comparison between the two men.

Foreign Policy an Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the April 4 issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram relative to our foreign policy:

FOREIGN POLICY AN ISSUE

In the congressional elections to be held in the fall, United States voters are going to be much more concerned with candidates' records than with their personalities.

Major issues are beginning to shape up, and reports from over the Nation indicate that men and women are deeply interested in foreign policy. Already the Republican National Committee chief, Guy Gabrielson, has denounced the administration's policy in violent terms, asserting also that the Communists have China today, solely as the result of our policy.

President Truman left no doubt that foreign policy will be a major issue with him and his Fair Deal associates when he thundered against Senators WHERRY, BRIDGES, and MCCARTHY, calling them saboteurs of foreign policy and branding them as the greatest assets of the Kremlin.

Senator TAFT then, speaking to Maine Republicans, said the only thing that will keep us from being victims of creeping socialism is to elect a GOP Congress this year and a GOP President in 1952. This is the only way, he said, to get rid of Communists in the State Department. And the State Department is engaged directly in shaping and carrying out foreign policy. Its leading exponent is Secretary Acheson, champion of the policy which, his critics say, is sympathetic to the aims of Soviet Russia.

Not since the issue of the League of Nations issue following World War I have we had such interest in foreign affairs. The world situation today is much more inflammatory than it was then.

When the President brushed off the Communist problem with the now famous redherring expression he made campaign material for his foes. He said the inquiry initiated by the Republicans was designed only to detract public attention from the extra session of Congress he had summoned to curb inflation. On the same day Alger Hiss denied he ever had any connections with Communists. We know now all about him, and Julian Wadleigh, Judith Coplon, and we know that 91 depraved persons were ousted from the State Department because they were easy prey for the Soviet's ring of agents here. Also, an undisclosed number of persons were tossed out of the Department because they were found to be poor security risks.

There is more to come, lots more apparently. By the fall the American people will have been treated to such an abundance of name calling, political pyrotechnics, testimony, and possible convictions of spying, their votes will be cast largely on where a man stands on this paramount question of foreign policy.

Address on Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address on Abraham Lincoln, delivered on Sunday afternoon, February 12, 1950, at the Ford Theater, Washington, D. C. This is the very theater room and location where Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. The speech was delivered by a distinguished lawyer of the State of California Bar Association, to wit, Ralph G. Lindstrom. Mr. Lindstrom is recognized as one of the prominent men of our Nation; he has given much of his time and ability to a deep and consecrated study of the events surrounding the life of Abraham Lincoln, and had come to Washington again for the expressed purpose of doing some more research work in our great Congressional Library. He had not come to make this address on the occasion of the observance of Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I was privileged to introduce him, as I know him personally, as a distinguished, able member, of the California bar, at Los Angeles, Calif., and as I am president of the Abraham Lincoln group of Long Beach, Calif., and also a member of the board of directors of the Lincoln group of Washington, D. C., I considered it a privilege to preside at this meeting February 12, 1950.

In my introduction of the distinguished speaker, I remarked that Los Angeles was a suburb of my home city of Long Beach, and that I had been relieved of giving the main address on this occasion on the life of Abraham Lincoln, by reason of the fact that Attorney Lindstrom had come to Washington that very Saturday evening before. This explains Mr. Lindstrom's remarks contained in the first two paragraphs.

The address follows:

ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Congressman DOYLE, ladies and gentlemen, I, too, am in one of the main points of Los Angeles County as to residence. I live in Beverly Hills and Los Angeles is the suburb in which I have my office. We permit Long Beach to be another minor community attached to Beverly Hills.

Congressman DOYLE was at a disadvantage. You see, he had 24 hours in which to worry. I have only had 15 minutes, so I'll start worrying after I make this speech on the way back to the hotel after the meeting is over.

Because of the shortness of time after the invitation today to address you, when I walked over to Ford Theater from my hotel, I stopped across the street at the Petersen House and stood there a little while in the room where Abraham Lincoln expired after having been shot by Booth in this building. This thought came to me: What would Lincoln be saying to us now? Are we embalming him in beautiful, lifeless monuments, or are we letting all these lovely memorials speak to us the message that Abraham Lincoln lived and died to leave behind for us? Is Abraham Lincoln dead in America or does he live in our hearts and in our civic lives? Are we thinking in terms of that great Federal Union for which he gave his life?

He had one life purpose, just one. He never forgot that one purpose. He was vilified because he wouldn't forget it. Abraham Lincoln stood long under great vilification because he was waiting for the support of the people of the United States in carrying out that purpose and for the time in which to carry it out.

This one life purpose I should like to have you consider was a Federal plan of government, a government under which people could live in a large area with unity in diversity. He was for that Federal Union because he knew the only alternatives were either the anarchy of no law in interstate or national affairs, or an over-all unitary national tyranny which absorbed all of the States and local governments, instead of preserving them.

In this morning's New York Times there is a beautiful editorial and I'd like to use two short paragraphs as my text for this afternoon. The editorial was speaking of the Gettysburg Address and of what Mr. Lincoln went there to proclaim, and then says:

"Mr. Lincoln's mind went back to the beginning of the Republic. He knew that principles laid down in 1776 were not secure in 1863 unless men were still willing to give their lives for them as they had done at Gettysburg and unless the living were still willing to work for them. One birth of freedom was not sufficient. From generation to generation freedom had to be reborn.

"Mr. Lincoln had a deep reverence for George Washington. It could not have been in his mind that he himself would some day be as greatly revered as Washington and even more deeply loved. He turned back to Washington and Jefferson over what seemed to him a considerable length of time, looking to them for inspiration and justification. Now, in the same way over the same span of time we turn back to Lincoln. The great task is still unfinished. If freedom in his day was having its new birth on one continent, now it is struggling to survive on all continents. From the words and memories of Abraham Lincoln we here again take increased devotion after this new lapse of fourscore and 7 years to the ancient and undying cause."

There are two possible paths before mankind. It was the peril which Mr. Lincoln saw for a nation which is now a world peril from which, in the light of Mr. Lincoln's life and purpose, we must save the world.

It is the old question of how to avoid the anarchy of no law to govern the relations of men, and still also avoid the unitary tyranny which absorbs all into a general government. Stephen Douglas on July 9, 1858, at Chicago said, in effect:

This fellow Lincoln would destroy all the parts, all the States, all the local conditions and sovereignties. He'd have Congress regulating cranberry laws of Indiana and telling Louisiana to raise corn and Nebraska to raise cotton. Why, God has fixed all that.

The next July 10, 1858, Mr. Lincoln made his response. Think it over in the light of today's conditions in the world:

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

Don't you see he reached way back to the first chapter of Genesis for that one? God gave man dominion over all the earth and man has been busy prostituting that dominion into an effort to have domination over other men. Lincoln continued:

"Each community as a State, has a right to do exactly as it pleases with all the concerns within that State that interfere with the right of no other State; and that the General Government, upon principle, has no right to interfere with anything other than

that general class of things that does concern the whole."

There is a perfect definition of sovereignty as always internal to an area of law and government.

Douglas, you see, charged Lincoln with a purpose to establish throughout the nation dead uniformity. Mr. Lincoln went right back to the constitutional fathers for his answer. He said:

"The great variety of the local institutions in the States, springing from differences in the soil, differences in the face of the country, and in the climate, are bonds of union. They do not make 'a house divided against itself,' but they make a house united. If they produce in one section of the country what is called for by the wants of another section, and this other section can supply the wants of the first, they are not matters of discord, but bonds of union, true bonds of union."

In his House Divided Against Itself speech in 1858 when he announced his candidacy for the United States Senate, you remember he started out by saying:

"If we could but know where we are and whither we are tending, we could tell better what to do and how to do it."

Well, where are we today and whither are we tending?

America has been given an opportunity to take leadership in the world, moral and civic leadership, in establishing law in place of anarchy for world affairs. This cannot be done without strong support and understanding by the people of the United States. I know there is a developing ground-swell for the establishment of law for world affairs by making the United Nations an effective instrumentality for world order and peace. But democratic governments cannot get too far out ahead of the people. It is of no use for us to inveigh against either political party or the administration, unless we give that ground-swell of public opinion to sustain a course of action which makes it safe in a democracy for an administration to proceed. Listen to how Mr. Lincoln saw that, when he was faced with the crisis of a dividing union and two sections of the country ready to destroy each other. When he was en route to Washington at Indianapolis on February 11, 1861, he said this, and he is saying it to us today:

"When the people rise in mass in behalf of the Union and the liberties of this country, truly it may be said 'The gates of Hell cannot prevail against them.' * * * It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Oh, he labored, he thought, and, my friends, he prayed to save our Federal Union, our Federal plan. Now, was this for the United States alone and for its people alone? Let's turn to what Mr. Lincoln himself said so it will be no one's opinion about what he thought. When he responded to Douglas in Peoria in that great speech of October 1854, he said this:

"Let us readopt the Declaration of Independence and with it the practices and policies which harmonize with it. If we do this we shall not only have saved the Union, but we shall have so saved it as to make it and keep it forever worthy of saving. We shall have so saved it that the succeeding millions of free, happy people the world over shall rise up and call us blessed to the latest generation."

Again when he reached New Jersey on the same trip he referred to the struggles of Americans in the Revolutionary War, and then said:

"I am exceedingly anxious that that thing which they struggled for; that something even more than national independence; that something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come: I am exceeding anxious that this Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people shall be perpetuated in accordance with the original idea for which that struggle was made."

Then, at the very darkest hour of the Civil War, when his Cabinet wasn't sure that he should retain the war powers as Executive and when the Congress, in its Committee for the Conduct of War, was questioning everything he did, then Mr. Lincoln dipped his pen into his very heart and told Congress in his message of December 1, 1862:

"We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth."

Notice, he didn't say "last best hope of the United States" but "last best hope of earth." Then he went on referring to the Union, the Federal Union:

"Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless."

Well, whither are we tending? Now no one can seriously question today, that physically or conceptually, we are one world in time and space and in communications. We can fly to California from Washington in 9 hours. You can go to Europe overnight. It is one world physically. On that fact we cannot disagree; but in this one world physically we have two worlds, at least, politically.

One of these worlds or power groups is headed up, not by the Russian people, but by a dictatorship over the Russian people which seeks to be the head of a unitary world government with this Kremlin Politburo as a tyrannical totalitarian topkick. Oh, they don't say this. They deny it. But all their actions prove it.

On the other hand, the United States—and I fear unwittingly because of not taking the leadership in lawful world affairs—is rapidly establishing a unitary national government. This is not because of anyone's ideology, not because of anyone's politics, but primarily because in war or threat of war, the war power must be supreme. In the threat of war and in the conduct of war and in the backwash of war, power is siphoned from the States and local levels to the national level. It has done so, not only in this country, but is doing so in every nation threatened with or participating in world-wide war. In this country we are very largely substituting for our Federal plan, a unitary national government. Power flows to Washington. Its jurisdiction increases necessarily under the impulse to build a garrison police state to assure peace in a world area of no law or anarchy. We may find ourselves without peace, without a Federal Union, without liberty under a unitary, national, all-absorbing military government.

Again, whither are we tending? The people of the world stand mesmerized today before the hellishness of bacteriological weapons, an atom bomb, and a hydrogen bomb. They say to themselves, "Oh, we ought not use these but we must and so we will." Oh, I am not criticizing those in power who are developing these weapons. We cannot disarm unilaterally. We must be nationally strong until the United Nations has effective power to police the peace.

But the atomic monopoly is gone. The hydrogen bomb is no pure science secret. It apparently is only a question of technological development. Bacteriological horrors are beyond description as war weapons.

Well, then, what is the best hope of earth presently? Today our best hope is the United Nations. We must not sneer at it. We must not allow it to be frustrated out of existence by asking it to do what we do not give it the power to do. It is veto ridden. But we cannot and should not abolish the veto without safeguarding changes in the United Nations Charter.

It may be seriously questioned if Russia ever spiritually joined the United Nations. Today she is not participating at all. And when she does participate she stymies important action by the abuse of the veto.

The whole world is confronted with business dislocation and trade unbalance which makes, day by day, ever more serious problems in all parts of the world. In the United States we have an uneasy prosperity with a $260,000,000,000 national debt. Last year we had a $5,000,000,000 deficit, and this year we'll have another $5,000,000,000 deficit. We'll have a great deal of excitable debate about balancing the budget and reducing taxes, but as long as the present threat of war and an arms race with hydrogen bombs and other horrendous weapons continues, with 79 cents of every Federal tax dollar going to war, past, present, and future, there isn't much opportunity for reduction in that area of expenditure. We cannot much reduce that 79 cents per dollar until the nations of the world cease spending all their substance and give up all liberty in the stupid business of developing themselves into mutual extermination camps and competitive garrison police states.

I repeat, we cannot disarm unilaterally. We must develop a way under which it safely can be done.

The threat of inflation out of control is also the way we are tending. Speaking of inflation, I wonder if you have heard the anecdote which I recently learned. When in the Civil War the gold and silver stocks were shrinking rapidly and paper currency increasing, one member of the Cabinet said: "Mr. Lincoln, if we are going to have to print more of this paper money, let's at least take off this motto 'In God we trust.'" Mr. Lincoln thought a little while and then said: "Well, if you do take off that motto, we could print: 'Silver and gold have I none but such as I have give I thee.'"

We must also realize, I repeat, that Russia is deliberately the most isolationist nation in the world today. The Kremlin Politburo is striving for a unitary, single control, world government. Her concept of a world government would be a totalitarian tyranny, with the Kremlin Politburo at the top. Such a world government would absorb all sovereignties, all nations, all states, all cities, all school districts, all colleges and universities, all cultures and customs, all religions and rights. It would make our world the place of the living dead.

On the other hand, the United States unwittingly, I repeat, has gone farther down that same road than we realize. We do not in the United States seek a totalitarian world tyranny, but we are unwittingly changing our National Government into more of a unitary type than a Federal plan of government. Under the supremacy of the war power, it is idle to say that someone is deliberately doing this. It cannot be prevented, and if the cold war continues long enough and if we continue developing these mutual extermination camps and regiment this Nation of people to the extent necessary to police against hydrogen bombs, then, ladies and gentlemen, you are going to have a unitary National Government, no matter who is in power, because there is no alternative. And remember that power which continually flows to a unitary government seldom returns, not only because of the habit of power at the unitary level but also because the habit of the surrender of the exercise of local sovereignty and responsibility by the people and smaller units of government corrupts

independent self-reliance into supine dependence.

Oh, if we carelessly and through inertia change the Federal Government, to preserve which Abraham Lincoln gave his life, into a unitary National Government, even if we then won world war III, whether we fight it as a preventive war or as a defensive war, we will no longer be a nation of free men. We would have forgotten, I fear, America is adjured by her hymn: "* * * confirm my soul in self-control, thy liberty in law."

The United States, if it became the head of a unitary world government, would cease to be the instrumentality of freedom, of demonstrating liberty under federal law.

The American-tested federal plan of law for over-all affairs, but limited in jurisdiction to over-all affairs, is our only possible salvation from (1) world-wide destruction, (2) continued anarchy in world affairs until we return to barbarism, or (3) unitary and tyrannical world government. This federal plan is what American civic genius tested for the world. It is this federal plan for which Abraham Lincoln gave his life in this very building. This federal plan is the only possible alternative to unitary tyranny on the one hand or to anarchy between nations on the other hand. It is the only effective way to save the United States its internal sovereignty and way of life. It is the only safe and still effective way to save the UN. It is the only safe and still effective way to have a government for world affairs which will not be a threat to our Nation, our way of life.

In creating such a federal world government, as was true when we created our national federal government, by transforming, if we will, the UN into a government solely for world affairs, we will exercise our sovereignty. We will not surrender sovereignty. We surrender sovereignty by failing to use it. We will put law where anarchy now exists between nations. That is the only way of ever reducing the backbreaking expenditures which are making this and every other nation in the world insolvent today. Do not forget that in the most inflated economy of any nation in history which still retained any currency responsibility, we have not been able to reduce but rather have increased our national war debt. In 2 years we are adding $10,000,000,000. If the time came when we had a truly effective federal government for world affairs, and we were to spend $5,000,000,000 to support it, there would be, as against the nearly $15,000,000,000 we now spend on the current Military Establishment, an annual difference of $10,000,000,000. This saving could pay interest—$5,000,000,000—on our debt and amortize the debt at the annual rate of $5,000,000,000. What we now spend on debt interest could be used for a really helpful and much-needed tax reduction.

Also such a federal plan of government for world affairs would reverse the trend, the very dangerous trend, within the United States, toward a unitary, centralized government. It would permit us to carefully give Washington—and other nations can then give their national capitals—all the power, but only the power, essential in internal affairs in connection with their developing commerce and the closer association of people in daily life. At the same time it will enable us to retain our national sovereignty and existence, while at the same time we preserve local governments under local control. Thus we may also preserve the individual self-reliance which we so highly prize.

Sovereignty, as Mr. Lincoln conceived it, is an internal thing. It is internal to an area of law. It is internal to a government. It is internal self-control. Whenever you have a thing called external sovereignty, whether it be men with guns on their hips or nations with hydrogen bombs in their arsenals, to be used in an area without law, it is anarchy. External sovereignty is only a delusion. It is sheer anarchy. It is the anarchy which could spell the end of man.

When we save the UN by making it a federal world government for world affairs only, we will do it by creating an era of world liberty under world law where the anarchy of nonlaw now exists. This effective UN will be federal not unitary. Such an effective UN federation would not absorb national sovereignty but will preserve it. It will preserve nations and states and cities and cultures and religions and rights and freedoms and local laws. Yes, it will preserve, as our form of government has preserved, unity in diversity. That is humanhood's only way of governing a large area without the loss of liberty which is inevitable in a unitary over-all government.

Finally, the greatest blessing of such a federal concept of law for world affairs would be to challenge man to think in terms of people, in terms of men, and not in terms of nationals of despised enemy states. If man can commence to think in terms of man, there may again be peace on the earth and there may be brought out what Mr. Lincoln called in his first inaugural "the better angels of our nature."

I should like to close with what may be to some a presumptuous but slight paraphrase of a part of the Gettysburg Address. I am thinking of Mr. Lincoln whose conscious human life ended in this building. When he spoke at Gettysburg, referring to the dead there who gave their lives that our Federal Union might continue as our way of life, I think he was speaking to all men everywhere and for all time to come. Let Lincoln speak to us, here, now in our self-pledge to that great Unionist: "It is for us, the living, to be here dedicated, today and always, to the unfinished work which he who was assassinated in this building so nobly advanced. It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from our honored, assassinated President we take increased devotion to that cause for which he gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that our noble Lincoln shall not have died in vain; that the federal plan of government, under God, shall give birth to universal freedom from war; that federal government for world affairs—government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall be established upon earth so that men shall not perish from the earth."

Unjust Partition of the Republic of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter and resolution:

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS,
Somerville, Mass., April 3, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution passed unanimously by the Massachusetts State Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, at our last meeting is transmitted to you by direction of the State board.

I am sure it is not necessary for me to call to your attention the deep interest that true sons of Erin the world over have in eliminating the unjust partition of Ireland.

Your efforts in behalf of the Fogarty resolution (H. Res. 270) are earnestly requested.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. PHILLIPS,
State Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE BOARD OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS IN AMERICA

Whereas our membership, as American citizens of Irish birth or descent, are justly proud of the contributions, sacrifices, and efforts the Irish have always so unselfishly made for the preservation of the great American principles: freedom, liberty, and the unity for the people of the United States of America; and these same Irish contributions were made in every war to preserve these same principles for the peoples and nations of the world oppressed by totalitarian groups or governments through communistic or other un-American practices; and

Whereas the Republic of Ireland is the one country in the world free from communism and its liberty-destroying theories and practices which today threatens the United States of America and the whole world; and

Whereas the Government of Great Britain has been the recipient of financial gifts and grants from the American taxpayers, including some 30,000,000 taxpayers of Irish blood, and from this aid, Great Britain has supported a puppet government in the six northeast counties of the Republic of Ireland against the will and votes of the majority of the people of Ireland; and

Whereas Great Britain has recently given its governmental recognition to communism in another nation of the world; and

Whereas in the event of war between our United States of America and the forces of communism, the Republic of Ireland, united with its 32 counties free from the Great Britain-made partition, would be the United States of America's strongest bulwark in Europe against communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, in regular meeting assembled at Boston, Mass., urgently requests the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State Department of the United States of America, the Members of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives to take proper action to have the Government of Great Britain to remove this unjust partition of the Republic of Ireland immediately by the passage of the Fogarty bill now before the Legislature of the United States of America; and that copies of this petition be sent to the presiding officers of Government in Washington, D. C.

The Massachusetts State Board of the AOH: Rev. Michael J. Houlihan, Chaplain, Watertown; Paul E. Tierney, President, Somerville; William P. Sullivan, Vice President, Holyoke; Thomas C. Phillips, Secretary, Worcester; James P. McCarthy, Treasurer, Malden; Hugh P. Caffrey, Organizer, Brockton; Thomas H. Murray, Mission Chairman, Brighton; P. Frank Kean, Director, Brighton; Thomas F. Hall, Sr., Pittsfield; William J. Ronan, New Bedford; Joseph P. McKenna, Methuen; Daniel J. Clifford, Watertown; Daniel F. Slattery, Norwood; Richard Fitzmaurice, Brockton; Hugh A. Moriarty, Worcester.

House Resolution 270

Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919) third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the

form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas in the intervening 30 years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own. American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

The Effect of Present Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have made statements on the floor of this House and elsewhere concerning our burdensome Federal taxes and their effect upon individuals and small business. In doing so I have attempted to express my own views as well as those of Delawareans who have written or spoken to me on this subject.

Recently, however, I received a letter from a Delawarean which expresses with infinite clarity and thoughtfulness the views and impressions of a private citizen as to the serious and detrimental effects of existing Federal taxation. I was so thoroughly impressed by the content of this letter and the importance of the views set forth in it that I requested and obtained permission of its author to have it included as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in including this letter as a part of my remarks I urge all the Members to read it with care and to give fullest consideration to the statements contained in it. I especially direct attention to the fact that the day-to-day work of its author is the counseling of taxpayers and the preparation of business and personal income-tax returns. Through this experience she has, therefore, become particularly qualified to discuss the subject of the effect of Federal taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add that in my opinion this is one of the finest statements on this subject which it has been my pleasure to read. The letter follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *March 25, 1950.*

HON. CALEB BOGGS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your efforts in behalf of a more nearly balanced budget for Government expenditures, but, like most of the business and private individuals in our country today, I am much concerned about the shackling of business and private enterprise due to the already high taxes and am more concerned about any possibility of having them increased.

It happens that my line of work and my private business is advice and preparation of business and personal income-tax returns. This has given me a very sharp picture of the effect of our present system, not only of taxation but the methods of collecting same.

I am sure you have been besieged with letters on the subject of taxes and their crippling effect, first on business expansion, business existence, the security of people who have retired on what should be, at least, a comfortable living income, as well as the great army of young people who are starting out today. My remarks in connection with these are brief:

1. People in retirement (who are trying to live on what was considered to be an adequate pension, augmented, perhaps, by some additional income from stocks and bonds, or real-estate investments), due to taxation crippling their dividends, due to rent control crippling their income from real-estate investments, and to the extremely high cost of everything they buy (perhaps because of taxes or Government subsidies) are faced with the fact that they do not have a living income.

2. The young people today, due also to the high cost of everything, have been forced to obtain property for themselves, and their families, with a crippling debt. The amount they have each year to amortize their homes is so small that, after all taxes have been met, the debt remains at a figure they may never be able to clear. When a young couple having an income of say $4,000 must pay a direct income tax of approximately $600 or over, plus a State tax, plus another $200 or $300 hidden tax on everything they buy, they have practically nothing to save.

3. In considering small business concerns the past 2 years alone, when preparing income-tax returns, I have seen three out of every five small businesses go to the wall and give up because their capital, instead of building up against a few months of slackened business (or perhaps a year) has had to be milked to the last cent for income tax even though their net profits were comparatively small.

4. It is a self-evident fact that each large corporation is the goose that lays the golden egg. It is they who already pay millions to the Government for taxes; it is they who furnish employment to thousands and thousands of workers who, in turn, pay millions in taxes; it is they who pay dividends to individuals who, in turn, pay tax on the dividends. It is they who, because of their economy of organization made possible because of their size, can operate with lower overhead and furnish every product they make to the public at a lower cost, and they, too, who support the smaller business firms from whom they purchase supplies.

The above protests are all in favor of the individual citizen or organization that suffers from high taxes, but our legislators, I am sure, must analyze the tax problem also from the standpoint of annual income to the Government. From this standpoint it seems to me the same arguments are effective as for the above groups who are taxed, i. e., add, if you will, additional tax to corporations. They will pay lower dividends. The individual will pay less tax on those dividends. The corporation will pay lower salaries. The employees will pay less tax to the Government on a lowered salary. They will have to increase the cost of their product. Assume, for a moment, it is an automobile. Higher prices of cars, with lowered income for the individual, means less sales of cars, less sales means no excise tax on the unsold cars.

Every small company that goes out of business ceases to pay tax to the Government, while it is the high price of taxes in the beginning, to a great extent, that has squeezed them out; they, in turn, pay no employees. Those employees go on relief. The Government must use an equal amount of money to support them.

In the final analysis does increasing taxes increase Government income? Where, then, is the advantage to the Government of keeping crippling wartime taxes with a country not at war?

In considering the hardships of excessive taxation, there is one point which has been brought out to me in contacts with many taxpayers through my own business. They are a solid front on the standpoint that the Government should allow, at least, a fair living sum as exemption before start of taxation. This applies especially to young, single people, widows, and people well along in years yet below the 65-year limit. One thousand and two hundred dollars exemption as a living income, before taxation, is the very least that seems fair for the citizen, regardless of the Government's need for money.

May I call to your attention the fact that the auditors of the Internal Revenue Bureau in auditing an account that seems out of line and in which they cannot identify money used for the taxpayer's living expenses, always add as a minimum to their indebtedness for assessment from $1,200 to $3,000. If that is considered the minimum to be added for living expense of the taxpayer's money in a year for taxation, that should be the minimum used for the individual's exemption against taxation. In other words, when our Representatives in Congress come to the point of feeling that income taxes should be reduced, the fairest place to start is to allow more exemption for everybody. The reduced taxation in 1948, due to the recognition of community property rights with a split income for married people, relieved that class of people a great deal. It did nothing for thousands of individuals who have lost their mates, or who have never had one, or for the young people who are just starting out in life and must look forward to the necessity of saving if they are ever to establish themselves on a firm basis in the United States of America, the finest country in the world.

Apologizing for taking so much of your time, and congratulating you on every good move you have made in the interest of the citizens of the first State of the United States, whose deciding vote decided liberty, and with admiration for your representation of me in Congress, I am,

Most respectfully yours,
(Miss) LOUISE H. TATNALL.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, among the innumerable letters from constituents occasionally we receive one which contains an unusual amount of sound judgment relating to manifold problems of government. Such a one I have recently received from a constituent and take pleasure in including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

OSWEGO, N. Y.

HON. W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: While I realize that you are very busy I would like to tell you the kind of Government that I would like.

I would like a Government that is for all the people and not for this labor group or this farm group.

I am not a member of any labor union but I firmly believe in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

I believe they should accept the responsibility that goes with power and remember that a few labor unions in key industries should not rule the country.

Between 1900 and 1908 we curbed the power of the great trusts and it is as it should be.

I believe that labor unions should be subject to the same laws as any other body with great wealth and power. We cannot have one law for Joe Doakes and another for Tom Jones.

As for the Federal aid to schools, I do not want it or need it. In the first place I want church and state completely separate.

I am not in favor of $1 of public money going to any private school, religious or otherwise. If the Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, or any other group want a private school they should pay for it. I want the privilege of helping if I feel that it is good. I do not want it in my tax bill.

I am not in favor of Federal aid to anything that should be done on the local level.

I do not have a college degree in economics but from any angle that I can figure I can't see where it pays to send $3 to Washington to get from $1 to $2 back in Federal aid. In many cases the money raised on the local level would do the job without the aid.

Our county's last report said that the relief load was 56 percent of our budget, 80 percent being reimbursed by the State. The 20 percent that we raise locally would do the job if the State and Government would keep out and only those were on relief that should be.

Will you please tell me where I and millions of small fry like me can go for some relief from this kind of government, surely not the Democratic and Republican Parties as they now are.

If you have taken the trouble to read this I thank you. This letter is from one of your small-fry constituents who has never bothered you before. I am a World War I vet, having served in France with the Eighty-seventh Division and strange as it may seem I am not looking for a pension or any other hand-out, except the privilege of working and taking care of myself.

Respectfully yours,

GUY E. PETTIS.

Government Propaganda Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 28, 1950:

HOW TO WRITE PROPAGANDA

For young students of the art of writing political propaganda we recommend very highly a study of the Steel Report just issued by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The drafter of this report, whoever he may be, is an excellent craftsman. Eschewing the bludgeon, he shows what a master artisan can do using words with the sublety and finesse of a fencer.

The techniques used in the report are many, but perhaps one example will suffice to show the skill of the writer. One of the recommendations of the committee was made to read like this:

"With the express purpose of revealing the effect on free, competitive enterprise of present trends in the steel industry, a study should be authorized to examine the extent to which the steel industry has developed technological and economic similarity to public utilities and has acquired such strategic importance in war, peace, and the maintenance of high-level employment as to become uniquely affected with a public interest in order that Congress may determine what, if any, legislation should be adopted for the preservation of competition."

Now a cursory reading of this paragraph might persuade any man to endorse it. Seemingly it only calls for another of those studies that Congress habitually undertakes wholesale. Who could possibly object to a study of the steel industry?

But let us look more closely at what a skillful writer has done with the wording of this simple proposal.

The study's purpose, it will be noted, is not to determine whether present trends in the industry have effected free, competitive enterprise; its purpose is to reveal what the industry has done to free, competitive enterprise. And a revelation subtly predisposes the mind to presuppose there is something bad to reveal.

Again, the question is not whether the steel industry has become similar to a public utility or whether it is uniquely affected with public interest. The study is to determine the extent to which it has devolped these qualities. Again, you see, it is assumed in advance that the steel industry has acquired at least something of this peculiar status about which something ought to be done.

But what about that phrase "if any"? The Congress is to determine what, if any, legislation is to be adopted. Doesn't that leave the question unbiased and open to debate? Isn't the writer being eminently fair in not prejudging matters?

Well, Congress having revealed that the present trends in the steel industry are affecting free competition and having decided that the industry is uniquely affecting the public interest in everything from war to full employment, is to decide what, if any, legislation "should be adopted for the preservation of competition."

Consider this marvelous smoothness. Congress is not to decide whether legislation may be necessary or advisable; it is to determine what legislation should be adopted. And this legislation is for the preservation of competition—competition that is assumed to be endangered.

True, the wording does leave one avenue open. Congress could decide it isn't interested in preserving competition; it could decide it doesn't give a hoot-nanny about war preparedness, the maintenance of high level employment, or the public interest in general. In that case it might decide to have "not any" legislation.

The skill of this is that the word duellist has closed off every avenue of escape from his way except the one road he knows his antagonist will not take. For all practical purposes, the findings of fact, the conclusions and the recommendations are decided before the study even begins.

It is a beautiful piece of work, and this excellence of quality is, amazingly, sustained throughout the whole report. If there were a Pulitzer Prize now—as there may be some day—for outstanding work in dialectical propaganda, we should unhesitatingly recommend that it go to the nameless and unhonored creator of this work of art.

Natural-Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Buffalo News of March 31, 1950:

THOMAS L. STOKES SAYS DEMOCRAT-PASSED GAS BILL TO HAUNT TRUMAN ON TOUR

WASHINGTON, March 31.—President Truman may find himself embarrassed in attacking the special interests in his projected cross-country whistle-stop tour to begin early in May unless, meanwhile, he vetoes the Harris-Kerr-Thomas bill that frees independent natural gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

The measure, which would cost 40,000,000 natural gas consumers millions of dollars annually, soon will be placed on his desk for decision. It was sponsored by Democrats and put over in the Senate this week, as in the House last session, by Democratic votes in a Democratic Congress. A bill of similar purpose, though broader in scope, could not even get through that Eightieth Republican Congress, which the President denounced in 1948 as the worst in history.

This was, indeed, a special-interest coup. The result in the Senate is disturbing evidence of the weight now exerted by "big oil" in the Democratic Party. "Big oil" was behind the bill, which will benefit handsomely a handful of the Nation's major oil companies. They own the bulk of natural-gas reserves in the Southwest and will enjoy virtually a monopoly status if it becomes law.

On his way across the country the President will travel through States where consumers are vitally affected by this measure. A number of Republican Senators from that area, reflecting this consumer concern, fought bitterly against it and voted against it.

Republicans supplied the majority of votes against the bill in the Senate, with 16 Democrats voting with them. Twenty-eight Democrats voted for it, along with 16 Republicans.

At the western terminus of his tour, the President is to dedicate a great public power project, Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State. Incidentally, it was while on a visit to Grand Coulee on his transcontinental tour in June 1948 that the President made his crack about the Eightieth Republican Congress being the worst in history.

The Democratic Party's leadership in Congress plainly defaulted on this issue, though a minority of individual Democrats in the ranks fought it. President Truman, who openly opposed it in the last session of Congress, was represented about the lobbies of the Senate during its consideration as not accepting it, though this was denied by aides in Key West.

Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the administration's Senate leader, walked out completely on the fight. Leadership was assumed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois. So effective was his direction of the battle, with the able help of a number of Republicans and a few other Democrats, that the reported overwhelming majority claimed for it at the outset was whittled down to a very thin majority ultimately.

Originally, it was thought the debate would consume only 3 or 4 days. As public interest and pressure mounted, the debate continued for 2 weeks. During its course the bill was transformed from the routine matter that its

sponsors tried to make it into a full fledged national issue on which consumers far and wide were alerted.

The Democratic Party hasn't heard the last of this.

United States Can Save World From Communism Only by Unity at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune of January 29, 1950:

UNITED STATES CAN SAVE WORLD FROM COMMUNISM ONLY BY UNITY AT HOME AND ABROAD

Are we going to give Russia the world by default?

If the rejection of aid to Korea by the House Representatives is made to stick and represents a continuing attitude of the anti-administration bloc, Asia might as well be written off our slate. Europe, too, is threatened by a widening partisan split which may affect the Marshall plan.

Strategically, there may be little reason to try to hold Korea. Much of past expenditures there may have gone down the drain. The main thing about the congressional rebellion—stemming from a quarrel between the past and the present—is that it clouds our over-all foreign policy. "The issue in the Korean aid bill is whether the United States will honor a commitment made to the people of southern Korea and in the presence of the United Nations," says Walter Lippmann. "The question of honor is paramount." If the people of Asia, not yet gobbled up by communism, become convinced our policy is unstable, they will be quicker to turn to Russia. The Soviet, of course, is working through its fifth column and propaganda machine to drive us out of Asia. The "hate Americans" campaign is bolstered by the fact that Chiang Kai-shek remains on our back.

Two courses of action could alleviate our foreign policy crisis. Formation of a really bipartisan program (actually none has existed concerning Asia) and closer cooperation and consultation with other non-Communist countries are essential to salvage anything. This being an election year, it is perhaps naive to hope that any working arrangement can be made between the administration and the congressional rebels. Both sides are to blame for the current schism.

Having written off Nationalist China, the State Department is awaiting the report of Special Ambassador Jessup, currently touring the Far East, before launching a new policy. But time does not stand still. The India-Pakistan feud grows hotter while the Communists await an economic break-down to pave the way for them to take over. French Indochina is in peril from a domestic Communist revolution and possibly from an invasion by Chinese Reds. Civil war undermines Indonesia. Communist forces are on Tibet's frontier, and Burma's Government totters. The question of Japan and the need for a peace treaty is so highly complicated that discussion must wait for another day. Meantime, General MacArthur is occupation chief for the former allies, including Russia and Britain, which have recognized Red China, as well as the United States, which has not. Japan's economic future is closely tied to China.

Signing of agreements with eight Atlantic Pact partners under the military phase of the North Atlantic Defense Pact turns attention for the moment from Asia's misery to Europe. Our row with Bulgaria has brought suggestions that Congress act to revoke and repudiate the treaties with the Russian satellites which have been made meaningless. Secretary Acheson, reversing his policy toward the last survivor of the Fascist Axis, Spain's Franco, now proposes to restore full recognition, when and if the United Nations approves. (This indication of expediency and self-interest is similar to our plans for supporting Bao Dai in Indochina.)

The "little blockade" in Berlin is variously interpreted as a minor harassing tactic and a possible show-down which could bring war. Tension in the Saar, disagreement with Britain, and countless other mounting problems call for a definite and agreed over-all policy by the United States.

It is becoming increasingly clear that we cannot continue indefinitely to try to mold the kind of world we want with mere dollars. If the debacle in China did not prove that, our national deficit does. Even administration supporters admit we must limit our objectives to what we can afford, and to programs which can be carefully worked out. Thoughtful observers believe that much can be salvaged in southeast Asia, but only after consultation and cooperation with other governments having interests in the region, including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands. Point 4 help should go to countries which indicate they want it and show they can use it effectively.

Meanwhile, the door should not be shut tight against dealing some way with the Chinese. The Mao regime, like that of Tito in Yugoslavia, may find its interests clash with Moscow's.

The cold war will continue for some time. Failures may heap fuel upon isolationist fires and increase cynicism. Regardless of what we try to do the world is bound to remain in a mess for years. Our main hope is to build stability where possible. It can be done only if we achieve a measure of unity in our Government and with the friends we have left in the world.

Meanwhile, we should lend all support to efforts to strengthen the United Nations, leading eventually to some form of world government.

Profits of Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

1949 CORPORATION PROFITS ALMOST RECORD BREAKER

NEW YORK, March 11.—Profits of 565 representative American corporations last year almost equaled the all-time high record set in 1948. The total is only 2.6 percent under 1948 earnings of these same companies, making 1949 the second most profitable year in the history of the Nation's industry.

These companies earned 20 percent more than in 1947, and 70 percent more than in the postwar conversion year of 1946.

The figures are shown in a compilation by the Associated Press of earnings reports of typical corporations, large and small, in 26 major fields which to date have published balance sheets for last year.

The showing for 1949 is impressive because of the snap-back in business from the recession starting early in the year. At that time the profits barometer pointed downward, giving rise to a feeling that the big postwar boom was over.

But recovery progressed steadily thereafter with a pick-up in the profits picture becoming more evident in the final quarter of the year.

The 565 corporations reported dollar profits of $5,049,852,639, a decline of 2.6 percent from the 1948 total of $5,186,705,908. The total was a gain of 20 percent over the 1947 total of $4,218,702,007, and was 70 percent higher than the $2,971,939,076 reported by these corporations in 1946.

The earnings of the big automobile companies had a marked influence on the over-all totals. Total earnings of nine makers of autos and trucks were 44 percent higher than 1948 although five of the nine fell behind their 1948 totals. These companies not only made the biggest percentage advance but also contributed the largest number of dollars to total earnings.

Earnings of air lines and aircraft companies gained 41 percent over the previous year, but total dollar earnings were small compared with automobiles.

Agricultural-implement companies advanced 24 percent, cement makers were up 17 percent, and the manufacturers of drugs, cosmetics, and soap showed a 13-percent rise.

While automobiles were moving ahead in the profits column, the producers of motor-vehicle parts and accessories just managed to hold their own by making only five-tenths of 1 percent less than in 1948.

On the other side of the ledger are the companies whose 1949 profits were less than in 1948.

The oil group, with 24 companies, stands out. Last year the group headed the list of dollar earners (excluding utilities) even ahead of automobiles, but this year it slipped down to fifth place with total earnings 26 percent less than in 1948.

The biggest slide from 1948 was made by the textile group, off 54 percent.

Coal-mining companies, as might be expected because of strikes, backed down 43 percent from the previous year. Metal-mining companies were close behind with a total 42 percent under 1948. Paper and pulp makers were down 36 percent, and the machinery and tool manufacturers were 31 percent lower.

Altogether, 63 percent of the individual companies reporting had profits lower in 1949 than in 1948, while 37 percent advanced.

The railroad group of 27 lines, not included in the grand total of 565 companies, reported earnings of $334,032,560, a decline of 37 percent from 1948 and 11 percent from 1947. The total, however, was 70 percent higher than in 1946.

Val. J. Peter Named a Knight of St. Gregory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper article:

GERMANIC PUBLISHING CO.,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thought you would be interested in the news that Pope Pius XII has named Val. J. Peter, publisher of our newspaper, a knight of St. Gregory. Press clippings enclosed.

Mr. Peter comes to Buffalo often although he lives in Omaha, Nebr. The announcement of his appointment was made by Archbishop Gerald T. Bergen, of Omaha, upon advice of the papal delegate in Washington.

We, who have had the good fortune to be with him for many years, know the tremendous work he has done and is continuing to do toward the goal of Christian approach to the solution of world problems through his various newspapers from coast to coast.

We know that you and his many other friends join with us in extending our best wishes to him on the occasion of this honor.

With every good wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
BUFFALO VOLKSFREUND,
By HARRY B. SCHUNECHT,
General Manager.

[From the Omaha Morning World-Herald of March 31, 1950]

OMAHANS NEW PAPAL KNIGHTS—BERT MURPHY, VAL PETER TO BE INVESTED

Two prominent Omahans have been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan said Thursday the high Catholic Church layman honors were conferred by Pope Pius XII on Andrew Albert (Bert) Murphy, 75, car dealer; and Valentine Peter, 74, German-language newspaper publisher.

Word of the Pope's action came from the apostolic delegation in Washington, said Archbishop Bergan. The pontifical honor was conferred on the recommendation of the archbishop.

Public investiture of the two new knights will be after Easter, when official briefs are received from Rome.

The knighthood was established about 100 years ago by Pope Gregory XVI to honor Catholic laymen for exemplary lives and services for the church.

SIX OTHER KNIGHTS

Other Omaha knights are Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews, J. Francis McDermott, Dr. Adolph Sachs, J. E. Fitzpatrick, Edward F. Leary, and Charles W. Hamilton, Jr.

Archbishop Bergan said that Mr. Murphy "is held in the highest esteem by all citizens of Omaha and the Midwest irrespective of religious belief."

Mr. Murphy's business, Andrew Murphy & Son, last November marked its eightieth year in business in Omaha.

"Without any doubt," said Archbishop Bergan, "he would be considered Omaha's most beloved citizen. He has ever enjoyed the regard and respect of all the clergy and bishops of Omaha, including myself."

PETER'S DESCENT GERMAN

The archbishop lauded Mr. Peter as one of America's outstanding Catholics of German descent.

Born in Lower Franconia, Bavaria, Mr. Peter was brought to the United States when he was 14. His father died 2 years later. Mr. Peter taught school for two sessions, then got a job on a semiweekly language paper at Rock Island, Ill. Later he bought the paper at a sheriff's sale.

He now publishes papers from Baltimore to San Francisco and is believed to be the country's largest publisher of German-language newspapers. He has the Omaha Daily German Tribune in Omaha.

The Peters have 12 children.

Smear Campaign Threatens To Slow Down Movement To Build a Peaceful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REVA BECK BOSONE
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune of March 27, 1950:

SMEAR CAMPAIGN THREATENS TO SLOW DOWN MOVEMENT TO BUILD A PEACEFUL WORLD

The American people are genuinely concerned about the growing world tension and Congressmen's mail is being flooded with proposals for peace. Pressures for action have mounted since the administration decided to proceed with building of a hydrogen bomb, according to a Congressional Quarterly report.

In addition to organizations seeking world federation, disarmament, peace talks with Russia, or a revamping of the United Nations, church groups are emerging as strong backers of a moral crusade for peace.

Unfortunately, organizations disagree on ways to insure peace. Shaping up is a bitter-end show-down on the question of world federation versus national sovereignty. The controversy conceivably could become so bitter that it would balk any real movement toward a stronger global organization. However, more hopeful observers see an opportunity for working out a compromise between the various plans as the debate reaches a climactic stage.

Chief stimulant for the flood of letters to Congressmen, says the Congressional Quarterly, continues to be plans pending in Congress for a kind of Government which could legislate on the basic causes of present international frictions. Eleven major proposals are formally before Congress at present; 3 of them are jointly sponsored by 10 or more Senators. One is backed by more than 100 Representatives. All are aimed at peace, though varying in ways the sponsors feel it may best be secured. Most prominent among the proposals are plans to alter the United Nations and to achieve a federation of democracies by way of the UN. Leading proponents of various plans are United World Federalists, Federal Union, Inc.; American Association for the UN, Citizens' Committee for UN Reform, Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, American Legion, Society for the Prevention of World War III, and the Committee to Frame a World Constitution.

While plans for insuring peace have been multiplying and gaining converts, a counter-campaign has gained strength to balk any proposal which would abridge American sovereignty. This campaign has taken on such proportions in some sections that efforts are being made to smear the United World Federalists. In Georgia a world government resolution has been repealed. Maine's House of Representatives voted for repeal, but the senate stood by its world government resolution. Repeal motions are pending in New Jersey and Virginia.

Mary Hornaday reports in the Christian Science Monitor that the campaign against world government has been taken up by such right-wing organizations as the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, the National Society of New England Women, the Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America, the American Coalition, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A speaker before a group of women patriots told a congressional committee, "There is little difference between those who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States and those who advocate the surrender of the Government of the United States." Some critics have gone so far as to brand the UWF subversive. Some of the "dangerous left-wingers" interested in the movement include such patriotic and able persons as Dr. Albert Einstein, commentator Raymond Gram Swing, playwright Robert Sherwood, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, attorney Grenville Clark, historian Carl van Doren, and Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature. How ridiculous can smear campaigns get?

UWF policy adopted in October 1949, said federalists differ on how much power a world federal government should have at the start, but fully agreed that we should move as rapidly as possible to a world federal government with authority and power to legislate on basic causes of international friction. The group backs UN, but says it cannot prevent war as long as it remains a league of sovereign states.

The Atlantic union plan of Federal Union, Inc., calls for a union of the free democracies. It calls for immediate development of the North Atlantic treaty powers into a regional federation within the UN. It differs from world federation mainly in procedure. Other plans would revise the UN Charter and abolish the veto in the Security Council.

There is little hope for achieving real security as long as people are locked in a bitter fight over sovereignty as against world government. America will be unable to sell the idea of federation to the strongly nationalistic Europeans until its people demonstrate that they are willing to lend their support to an international authority to stop wars. The United States can hardly point the finger of scorn at "noncooperative" Russia if they cannot join in support of a plan calling for more than an international debating society.

Conservation and Development of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, there was held in my home town of Gadsden, Ala., an important meeting for the purpose of discussing ways and means for the conservation and development of the natural resources of our great State. Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Engineers, was the featured speaker at this meeting. I commend his address to the attention of the Members of Congress:

What I would like to talk about is the building of a greater America.

If you were going to start out today to lay out a blueprint for the building of a greater America, where would you start? If you were going to lay out a plan for the building of this great dam on the Coosa River that we

hope to start next year, what would you do? Well, I don't know what you'd do, but I'll tell you what if you didn't do, you'd be in a very bad way in a very short while. And that is, if you did not find the right kind of foundation before you started building on it.

Now, if you're going to build a greater America, what kind of foundation would you start with? As you build a great country you can't stop in the middle of the building and turn around and start all over again. Because it requires too much effort, too much money, and would disrupt too many things to try to rearrange the building of a great country every few years. So, to build a greater country than we are now and one which you and I both know is the greatest country in the world, you'd have to start on those things which would give you the firmest foundation. Those of which you have the most. Those which would last you longer than any other potential which you have. If you didn't, you'd be like the man memorialized in the Bible who built his house upon an unsecure foundation.

Now, in order to build a greater America, and we must build a greater America. We must build a greater United States. We must build on our greatest potentials. I've seen the Garden of Eden. I've seen where the Euphrates and Tigris come together. And I'll guarantee you that there's nothing left there but a little thin fringe of date palms on both sides of those two streams. And they're maintained because they take the water out of the Tigris River and run it around the rows of date palms in order to feed the roots with the proper amount of moisture to keep them going. For thousands of miles on each side there is nothing but sand, no trees, no grass—perhaps a little thistle. And that was the section of the country which at one time produced cities like Babylon. It was the center of the agricultural development of the known world at that time because that was memorialized as the area in which the Garden of Eden was located. We in the United States, know that we are a young country. We know that there is plenty of land right in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi and the other Southern States that have been worn out farming. A man told me not long ago that he had worn out three farms. Think about it—a man wearing out three farms during his own lifetime. It means that he actually did wear it out. He cultivated the land so that all the topsoil washed away. But, down in this part of the United States when you do wear out a farm, we can throw it out and let it lie idle for a number of years and it'll grow a crop of pine trees or hardwood. We can reclaim that land, but you can't reclaim such land in the West. Once it wears out and gets ground up into shale, it won't even grow grass. It's gone forever. It's bad land.

Therefore, if you were to lay out a blueprint for the United States you'd have to start with your land if you wanted to continue strong as an agricultural nation, and we must do that. God forgive us that day when we have to go abroad for our meat and bread. Meat and bread for whom? The present population? Or the population we're going to have in the next 50 years? You and I know that the population of the United States has doubled since 1900. You and I know that our population is increasing at the rate of 2,000,000 per year. You and I know that at the end of this present century—50 years hence—we're going to have a much larger population than we have now. And, certainly, in a hundred years from now, conceivably, we will have 300,000,000 people. Now, what does that mean?

It means that we cannot exist as a leading nation of the world by continuing to be just an agricultural nation. However, we must continue to be a strong agricultural nation. We must always try to raise enough meat and bread to take care of our own people.

We've already developed into one of the greatest industrial nations in the world. Can we rest on our laurels? If we come up in the year 2000 with 200,000,000 people we've got to have jobs for them. We've got to provide employment for them. We've got to keep those people busy, if we want to maintain our way of life. Therefore, we must continue to build industrially. We cannot afford to stop now because, as soon as we stop building in this great country of ours we'll start down. Think about the countries that have passed by the wayside during the time of written history. You can see that the civilization has drifted from the Middle East on to the west. We have just inherited the leadership in the world, although that leadership is being challenged. We must not allow the challenge to disturb our going forward. We must not allow anything to disturb us from going forward. But we've got to do it wisely.

I've told you about one of the great potentials. The other is water. It means that we've got to have sufficient water to meet the needs of the people of the United States in carrying out the rebuilding of a greater America. The building of a greater United States. We've got to have the water. In my estimation there is no limit to that building of a great America. There isn't but one thing that will limit that building of a great United States or greater United States. That one thing is not land, but it's water—water. Our Nation, less than 200 years old under our presently constituted government and, yet on Saturday night, I was sitting in a hotel restaurant in New York and the man came around and said, "Will you have a glass of water?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You know if you want water in New York you have to ask for it." They are not serving water on the restaurant and dining room tables in New York now.

Think about it. Think about it. They discovered gold in California in 1849. In that 100 years the boundary of the United States has been shifted from the Mississippi River to the California coast. All of that happened in such a short time. Most of it happened since the Civil War. We've got States in the United States that are only 34 years old. We are a young and prosperous Nation. We must continue to be a young and prosperous Nation because the young men will build this country. The young men will build it. The young men must take up the burden as they come around to take over the jobs from us older people. They are the men with vision to go ahead with the building of this great country. Industrially we've been able to build up rapidly because we had such a vast storehouse of natural potentials in the form of mineral resources in this country. You and I know that those mineral resources have been used up at a rapid rate. You and I know that the backbone of all of this great development in the United States has centered around that load of iron ore on the Iron Range in Minnesota and Wisconsin. You and I both know today that's running out. And you and I know that it wouldn't be wise to take all of that out of the ground before you found a new source.

You have to provide cheap transportation if you want to continue as a great industrial nation. That is absolutely true. We must provide the cheapest transportation that is possible, because what have we got to do? We've got to continue as a great industrial Nation. That means we can always produce more than necessary to meet our home consumption. We've got to send some abroad to the far corners of the world. Now we can go into the far corners of the world, and get the natural mineral ores and raw products that we need if we bring them here by employing cheap transportation. And get it to the areas in which they can be worked up, processed, and then sell the finished product to our own people and export the rest of it to the far corners of the world. But we cannot do that and at the same time go out and have to bring in our meat and bread. We have seen countries fall by the wayside because they tried just that system of doing things. England today is in a terrible fix because she's trying to carry on an industrial development and, at the same time, bring in the raw materials and also bring in the food. It can't be done.

We've got the highest standard of living in the world. We've got to guard that, jealously so. Therefore, we've got to do everything as cheaply as possible. And, remember, that we've got the two potentials to work on—our land and water. We can take care of the land. The people of the United States, our Government, our Congress, are all conscious of that fact and working toward that development. It necessarily must come slow because it is such a vast undertaking. But tremendous progress is being made on it. But, if we've got an industrialist development in the United States now that balances off to take care of 152,000,000 people, we've got to have a greater industrial development later on to take care of those people that are coming along to increase our population. The one thing that stops industrial development in any area is the lack of water. New York is short of water now. They can get some more water, but there is a limit to that which they can get. They will increase their supply up there. They are already working to increase it. But that will take care of them for 15—not more than 20—years because they've had to rebuild their system on an average of every 10 to 15 years. Philadelphia, Jersey City, Baltimore—they all know exactly how much water they have available to them now, and that must last them from now on.

See where you get your water supply. See where it comes from. See how much you've got to work, not only for the next 25 years but 50, 75, 100, and 500 years from now. That's all the water you've got. You're blessed here in the Tennessee Basin because there has been a great and wonderful development out here to conserve the water in this area. You could pipe water from the Tennessee River up here and some day you may have to do it. But there are a lot of areas in the United States that can't do that. I know places in the United States—great industrial areas—that you couldn't put one more industrial establishment because they don't have the water. I know areas in the United States where they are running salt water through some of their industrial processing plants because they have no fresh water and it's costing them very dearly to be using salt water because the corrosion is terrific. We can't continue on that basis so we've got to conserve the water in all of our stream basins in the United States because we need it.

Industry will be distributed all over the United States. You've heard a lot said that that is necessary from a national-defense standpoint. That no doubt is entirely true, if we understand what's going on in the world today. But I will tell you that there are going to be industries distributed all over the United States whether we have potential peace or not. That's bound to come because of a lack of water. The Corps of Engineers, under its charge from the Congress, is vitally concerned with and responsible for the conservation of water and the destruction of floods and the providing of navigation channels all over the United States. This organization has been doing this work for the Congress for 125 years. They have been engaged in engineering work for 175 years. Today we are working on over 200 stream basins in the United States. We've done a lot to help in large areas in the

United States to develop the water resources in those States. The Missouri Basin, for instance, 530,000 square miles of territory, is being actively worked on today, to stop the destruction and put the water to work for the people.

I've looked at this area down in the South and, if you want to see a magic area, you look at the area from the Savannah River watershed on around through Alabama over into Mississippi and down to the Pearl River. There is a territory that has been settled a long time that used the waterways to the maximum. They came in here. And then they left the waterways alone. That was the thing to do because the transportation facilities required were much faster than those that could be afforded on the waterways. The waterways in their natural state would not serve the people. We needed a network of railroads, we needed a network of highways and now we've got the air lines we certainly need. We've seen this area develop, we've seen the possibilities of developing the resources to provide the wherewithal to carry on a greater industrial development. And, in this area, there are vast resources of minerals that will stand us in good stead for many years to come. And I understand there may be oil here in Alabama and Mississippi, perhaps in Florida and Georgia. That will be grand, but all of those will go by the wayside. I've seen great areas in Kansas where the oil derricks were just as thick as these tables around here when you stand off and look at them at a distance. And yet I've seen them where they have pulled the pumpers out and I've seen the farmers planting their wheat, last year, right up to the old site of the pump. They pumped all the oil out and have gone. But they're still growing wheat out there and that is where we produce all of our surplus wheat in the United States. The minerals are gone.

The minerals will go from this area down here, in time. But there is a vast store of them here yet to encourage the development of a great industrial area down here. I call it the magic area. About 2,000,000 kilowatts of power is possible in the area I am telling you about. You've got the transportation facilities here—land, rail, and highway and air. You have the possibilities of bringing those rivers right into the heart of the area where that power is possible. You impound the water and you have plenty of fresh water in that area. It's remained dormant, almost, for years so far as the water is concerned. But it's needed now and, if the people want that water developed down here, if the people want to see a great industrial development in this section, they are going to have it. The Congress is developing those sections of the country like the Central Basin of California, the Missouri Basin, vast territories in Texas and Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona and the Columbia Basin. Up the Mississippi Basin, they are developing those great areas because the people want them developed. I'm positive that the Congress wants to see this area developed down here because they've authorized a survey and it'll prove the project and they've started appropriating the funds.

The United States steel people now expect to bring in within 3 years of the port of Mobile to start out with 3,000,000 tons of rich iron ore, even richer than that on the iron range in the central part of the United States. Even richer—67 percent iron. They are going to start by bringing 3,000,000 tons into the Birmingham area. Why? Not because they need it all now but they don't want to take it all out of the ground. Obviously they haven't told me that but I know that's true. We can go all over the world and get the raw products and bring them in here. We can expand our industries. We can develop jobs for the thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of people that are to come on later.

But we've got to have the water. When the water is impounded, it should be used over and over and over as many times as we possibly can to get all of the benefits out of it before we turn it into the sea. We must prevent the destruction caused by floods. We must provide depth to the water in the rivers so that towboats can come up there and bring these raw products in from ports like Savannah, Jacksonville, Mobile, New Orleans; so they can bring it into the areas where it can be processed. And we ought to have an exit from this area to the central part of the United States. We ought to have a connection from the Tombigbee and the Warrior system down there with the Tennessee River so that those finished products could be distributed in our own country. I've seen people in India die by the thousands because they couldn't distribute the needed bread from one state to another because they have no means of transportation. You've got to have transportation from the great industrial areas down in Alabama and Georgia and Mississippi and Florida to get it to the central part of the United States. There is a little gap here between the Tennessee River and the Tombigbee River. If that were cut through (it is entirely feasible and not too costly) you would be able to ship the products from the Birmingham area, from this industrial area, and from the Coosa River where you just built that great paper mill. You can send paper from the paper mill right here on the Coosa River to one of the owners of that mill by barge through the waterways that exist today except for that little narrow gap between the Tennessee River and the Warrior River down there. You can ship in slack water to the Tennessee and up the Ohio to the Pittsburgh area. You can ship it to St. Louis, you can ship it to Chicago, you can ship it to Minneapolis and St. Paul. You can ship it on up the Missouri River as far as it goes. It is approved now 800 miles up the Missouri River. You can ship it to Corpus Christi, Tex., or Brownsville, Tex., or you can ship it up the Atlantic seaboard all the way up to New Jersey.

Transportation—cheap transportation—it can't be too cheap. You say that takes revenue away from the other forms of transportation that we have got to keep up. No. In this area right here, if you doubled the industrial development in this that I call the magic area, you'll have to rebuild the railroads to haul what they will be called upon to haul out of here. The power companies—I don't care who distributes the power, I don't care who gets the money for it. All I want to do is see us not destroy any of the power possibilities here. I know that if you develop a large amount of power in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia, it will be for the benefit of the people. And the Congress and the Federal Power Commission have never had any trouble in working out satisfactory rates so that the people would get those benefits. So let's not worry about who is going to get what. Who does what and who is going to get the $2. Let us develop the country. We can work out these things on an equity basis. If we do not start out right you can change it. But if you destroy any of the potentials on any of these waterways or if you destroy the possibilities of using the water in these streams to the maximum, then you are doing something that cannot be easily undone. Let us get all out of our water we can.

Gentlemen, you have got to have water for people to drink. You have got to have water to carry on industrial development. It takes 300 gallons of water to make a pound of synthetic rubber. It takes 33 gallons of water to make a pound of steel. It takes a tremendous amount of water for one of our newest industries—air conditioning. It takes water for every industrial processing that we know of and the more you have the more water it is going to take. But, listen, don't ever let anybody get you to invest a lot of money in a scheme where they are going to get cooling water from the ground. Because, gentlemen, that is only a very, very temporary source. You can't make it in this country by trying to get the water out of the ground. I know States now that have found that out. Let that water stay in the ground and figure on using the annual run-off by conserving all of our streams in this country, and we will perpetuate the United States as a great Nation for thousands of years to come.

How to Achieve Total Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following recent article by George Sokolsky. It recites once more some of the record of Mr. Dean Acheson which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for either Americans or foreign nations to have the confidence in our Department of State which it must command if we are to have at home and abroad the strength and unity necessary to meet the perils of this hour. Mr. Acheson rightly says we need total diplomacy. Some of us have urged that for 3 years. But the fact is that Mr. Acheson's own record makes it impossible for him to command the confidence necessary to achieve total diplomacy.

(By George Sokolsky)

Dean Acheson is now a convert to reality. After a career of error, beginning in 1941 and ending a week ago, he has finally come to a realization of the errors, but not to a recognition of his responsibility for them. His last gamble with destiny was a bad throw; he had fantastically assumed that reality was at fault and he played to lose on Mao Tse-tung.

In any country other than ours, any man who had been so consistently and obstinately wrong would have been driven from public life. He would long since have been forced to resign.

All he seems to do here is to announce a change of policy, not even confessing his errors, and we are expected to accept his conversion without scrutiny or even wonder.

Acheson asks us all to unite in a total diplomacy against Soviet Russia, but how can we unite with him? From 1941 until last week, he and his teammate Alger Hiss, were responsible for the appeasement of Russian policy. The record is clear.

Dean Acheson, graduate of the Harvard law school, like so many others of the confused employees of our Government, entered upon his career in the Treasury, where he did not agree with Mr. Roosevelt's fantastic fiscal conceptions and was dropped.

In 1941, he entered the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State; then he became Under Secretary of State, a position he held until 1947 when he resigned. He returned as Secretary of State in 1949.

The Acheson influence in the State Department has been enormous. He was the

smart man. His principal adjutant was Alger Hiss.

Alger's brother, Donald, became a partner in Acheson's law firm, which specialized in representing foreign countries in Washington, particularly such as had special relations with the State and Treasury Departments: Colombia, Greece, Iran, Denmark, Pakistan, and Soviet Poland.

We must now go back a step to the Harold Ware Communist cell organized in 1934. That cell was organized to penetrate high levels of administration and it is clear from the evidence at both Hiss trials that Alger Hiss was of this cell.

At any rate, in 1939, Dr. J. B. Matthews of the Dies committee gave to the Department of Justice the names of the members of the Ware cell. Among those names was that of Alger Hiss. Matthews showed me the list at the time.

Also in that year, Whittaker Chambers and Isaac Don Levine discussed most of the evidence that was brought out at both Hiss trials with Adolf A. Berle, then of the State Department.

Berle has testified under oath that as early as 1941, he had warned Acheson that the loyalty of both Alger and Donald Hiss was doubtful. In 1944, Berle, then security officer of the State Department, warned Acheson and others in the State Department that their pro-Russian policy was wrong.

The Acheson group, with Alger Hiss as Acheson's principal assistant, fought Berle, had him transferred to Brazil and as Berle said: "That ended my diplomatic career."

Subsequent to Berle's reports on Alger Hiss, Acheson had his friend transferred from the Far Eastern Affairs Division, where he had no business to be as he knew nothing about the subject, to the Office of Special Political Affairs which Acheson ran and which had to do with all the peace efforts of the Government.

This was no place for a man whose loyalty was in doubt and who could have an affiliation with a foreign government that might imperil the negotiating power of the United States.

Acheson cannot plead that he did not know about Hiss; he can only say that he did not believe what he was told. But in his position, could he risk a doubtful personality as executive secretary of Dumbarton Oaks or as President Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta, or as secretary-general of the San Francisco Conference setting up the United Nations?

Dean Acheson succeeded Joseph C. Grew as Under Secretary of State after Grew insisted upon prosecuting the spies in the Amerasia case. What power in our Government drove Grew out and put Acheson in his place?

Are We Heading for Financial Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Are We Heading for Financial Disaster?" delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the American Retail Federation, on April 4, 1950, together with a statement prepared by me to precede the address.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. GURNEY

Mr. President, last evening I attended the annual dinner of the delegates to the American Retail Federation convention. This is the parent organization representing many national and State retail trade organizations—representing therefore a very fine and large group; a real cross-section of America.

The address was delivered by an honored Member of the Senate of the United States, the senior Senator from the State of Ohio, Mr. TAFT. His address, entitled "Are We Heading for Financial Disaster," is a subject about which many of us in the Senate are deeply concerned and about which the people of our country are rightly worried.

This very serious financial situation our country is now in was described in such a concise and logical manner that I should like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues who did not hear the address. I commend it to all Senators and urge all Senators to read it.

ARE WE HEADING FOR FINANCIAL DISASTER?

It is a great privilege to be invited to address the American Retail Federation in their annual convention. The Retailers of America number more than half of the people who are engaged in operating their own business. They, therefore, contribute to the independent thinking and the free system of the American economy. They carry out to the limit the theory of competition and, as a general rule, the larger the company the narrower the spread on which it does business. We have no problem here as I see it in preventing the growth of monopoly. Rather, the danger is an occasional excessive use of unfair methods of competition.

The retailers, I believe, are a real bulwark against the steady trend toward socialism which has been so apparent in our recent history. They believe in liberty, as the cause of our success, and as the basis for hoping that the American people may constantly improve in their knowledge, their ideals, their production and their standard of living. They can be the leaders of American thought in the right direction.

I spoke last week of the necessarily socialistic effect of the program presented to the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses by the Administration in power in the demand for economic planning to be carried out by complete bureaucratic control of commerce, industry and agriculture; in the demand for free Federal services in every field of education and welfare; in the attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and purge those who dared to limit the special privileges of labor union officials. In that policy we find a program almost exactly like that of the labor-socialist government of Great Britain, urged upon us in homeopathic doses. It adds up to a complete concentration of power in Washington.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Tonight I want to deal with another policy of the Government which can lead just as certainly to the same end—the policy of Government spending unlimited by any necessity of raising taxes to pay for the spending—deficit spending in time of peace. Every citizen of this country should be tremendously disturbed and alarmed at the present fiscal program.

The first year of the Eightieth Congress we had a surplus of more than $8,000,000,000, the second year a deficit of one billion eight. To end of the first year of the Eighty-first Congress will see a deficit of $6,000,000,000, and the budget message submitted by the President contemplates another deficit for the year ending July 1, 1951, of more than $5,000,000,000. In 3 years the expenses of the Government have increased from $34,000,000,000 to $43,000,000,000, of which only about $2,500,000,000 is in foreign spending, perhaps justified by the cold war against Russia. The President's budget and tax messages gave a slight lip service to the principle of a balanced budget. It is suggested that taxes at the present rate will ultimately yield more because there will be an increase in prosperity. It is suggested that the veterans' education program and the aid to foreign countries will taper off. Nothing is said, however, about the additional expenses recommended in the Brannan plan, direct Government loans for housing, universal military training, socialized medicine, and increases in other welfare services, all recommended by the President and amounting to far more than any possible saving in the items which he mentions. The President blames the deficit on the Republicans because they enacted a decrease in the war income-tax rates, but he nullifies his own argument by recommending against a restoration of those taxes. In fact, the essence of his fiscal policy appears to be that Government deficit spending is desirable in order to prime the pump of increased prosperity which will then produce more taxes to balance the budget. This is the old fallacy that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. I do not think there is any respectable economic authority, right or left, who favors an unbalanced budget at the present time. There are some economists who feel that we should not attempt to balance the budget in depression years—but they would balance the deficit in such years with surpluses in more prosperous times. Today we are not below normal, and even their theory that the budget need only be balanced over a reasonable number of years would not justify a deficit.

We have a huge debt of $256,000,000,000. It is hard to carry today and dangerous indeed if we have to face the financing required by another war. If we increase it at the rate of five billion a year, it is difficult to see how we can do any war financing without destructive inflation.

Even without war, such a deficit means a resumption of the inflationary spiral. It creates purchasing power with no production to balance it. It means, therefore, a further rise in prices, stimulating further increases in wages and a steady depreciation in the value of a dollar. It is, in effect, a form of bankruptcy. The Government is repudiating a portion of its own debt, including savings bonds now being sold, by pursuing a policy which will enable it to pay that debt off in cheap dollars far below the real value of the dollars which it borrows.

The deficit spending policy is demoralizing to Congress. If any Congress ever accepts the philosophy that money can be spent in peacetime without any necessity of levying taxes to provide the money, there is no limit to what Congress can spend. We have projects before us for many billions of dollars, many of them worthy projects if we could afford them. Take away the necessity of enacting unpopular taxes and our deficit will be closer to fifteen billion than five. The policy is demoralizing to the people and an easy road to socialism. In effect, it says to the people that they can get something for nothing. Of course the fact is they will pay double for the spending projects through the inflation of prices. The principle of deficit spending makes socialism easier to achieve. The British are at least frank with their people. "Here is socialism," they say, "and here is the bill for it. True, it is expensive, but it is worth it." The British Government balances its budget. But our deficit spending policy is an attempt to tell the people that they can have all these free services without 1 cent of cost.

GREATER TAXATION IS DANGEROUS

If we wish to escape the national calamity contained in such a policy, we have only two alternative—either we must increase taxes, or we must reduce expenses. The increase of taxes seems to me also a very dangerous policy, because I believe that taxes are already so high as to threaten the success of a free economy. In the next fiscal year, we intend to raise $38,000,000,000 in direct Federal taxes, another $6,000,000,000 in pay-roll taxes and perhaps $16,000,000,000 in State and local taxes. This is a total of $60,000,000,000 or 28 percent of our national income—about 24 percent of our gross product. Unquestionably, there is some limit beyond which taxes cannot go and still expect the free system to operate or even produce the taxes we are trying to collect.

In the first place, such a tax burden directly reduces the standard of living of the people, including those who think they do not pay a cent of tax. Most taxes are passed on to the consumer. Certainly, the real estate tax appears in rent, the pay-roll and withholding and excise taxes in the price of the products bought. I think it is conservative to estimate that probably 20 percent of the price paid for food and clothing and other necessities of life represents taxes passed on by those who pay them directly. Taxes, therefore, have already become a serious limitation on the liberty of the people. We have been asked by the administration where we have lost any liberty up to this time. Here is the place. The Government tells us all that we cannot keep the proceeds of our own labor and spend it as we desire to spend it. It will take from 20 to 50 percent of our income and will spend it as the Government sees fit, instead of leaving us free to do our own spending. It proposes to spend our income on services which we may or may not get, and which we may or may not want. Obviously, if this percentage is increased, we have less and less freedom. If we reach 80 or 90 percent, we have a complete socialist state in which the Government conducts all our activities and our spending for us.

Furthermore, excessive taxation can kill the goose that lays the golden egg and prevent the operation of a free economy. I fully agree with President Truman when he said in his message "taxes can and do have an important effect upon business conditions and economic activity. It should be our constant objective to improve our tax system so that the required revenues can be obtained without impairing the private initiative and enterprise essential to continued economic growth." Remember, we cannot stand still. We must provide about a million new jobs a year to provide for the young people coming into the labor market and those displaced by technological improvements. Perhaps the present system can be improved, but even our present weight of taxes today has cut down the money available for risk enterprise. There is little investment money for common stocks in large or small companies. There is little money for new businesses, except very small ones which can be financed by one man and his family. The reason is very clear. Any man who invests in any business finds a tax of 38 percent on corporation profits, and a high personal income-tax rate on any money which is distributed to him. If he loses, he loses his own money—and two-thirds of new businesses are said to fail—if he hits a profit-making enterprise, the Government takes most of his profits away from him. "Heads you win, tails I lose."

As I say, we can perhaps improve this condition at our present level of taxation by devising some means of reducing the double taxation on risk enterprise and directing the large savings from lower-income groups into industry rather than into institutions which can only lend money. One thing is certain to my mind, however; we cannot safely increase the present tax burden. In Great Britain they have raised taxes to a point where they are taking 40 percent of the national income. Most men have a hard time keeping enough money to pay their living expenses, and few have any money to invest in industrial expansion and improvement. The result has been stagnation in such development, and austerity for the British workmen.

In our States and localities, we have constitutional and statutory tax limitations. Since we have none in the Federal Government, the people have come to believe that the Federal Treasury is an inexhaustible grab bag. As a matter of fact, we have a practical limitation on Federal taxation beyond which we cannot go without destroying the very proceeds we are trying to reach and in the process destroying our free industrial system. We have reached that practical limit.

THE ONLY REMEDY IS TO REDUCE EXPENSES

It seems clear to me, therefore, that Government spending has reached a point beyond that which we can maintain and still hope to retain the liberty of a free people and the success of a free economy. Those expenses must be reduced if we do not intend to go steadily down the road toward socialistic controls and the all-powerful state. The increase of expenses from fiscal 1948 to fiscal 1950 is $9,500,000,000. Of this increase, about six billion is in domestic expenditures, more than two and one-half billion in foreign. I believe the statement made by Senators BYRD and GEORGE asserting that six billion can be cut from the budget is a practical program, perhaps not for the coming fiscal year, but certainly for the following year. A good many of the programs cannot be cut off over night, and so I would be willing to accept some smaller deficit for the year 1951 if we can see a balance in 1952.

At the present moment, I do not feel that we can afford to cut the national defense forces. I believe that Mr. Johnson has done a good job in eliminating unnecessary duplications and perhaps something more can be done in that line, but if so the money can well be used for strengthening the weak spots pointed out by General Eisenhower.

The President has expressed the view that our aid to foreign countries will decrease. I have supported the ECA because I felt that as an emergency matter to meet the crisis growing out of the war we could block communism in Europe by aiding western nations to come back to normal much more rapidly than they could do without our aid. Their production today is back to normal, and the problems they have to solve are long-range problems which basically they must solve for themselves. I believe the ECA should be rapidly tapered off, as originally contemplated, and that aid to foreign countries within 2 years should be reduced by $3,500,000,000. If we had not had a large surplus I doubt if such aid should ever have been undertaken. No other nation in the world has ever contemplated such a program. No doubt, there will always be some expenditures where the value is so great as to justify the taxing of our people for the benefit of other nations, but the aid should be confined to matters clearly beneficial both to us and to the nation assisted, and I should hope that even that burden might be taken over gradually by private capital seeking investment.

In the domestic field, however, we have been led into many programs which have assumed an expense far beyond the figures which were at first suggested. It seems to me that the time has come to make a completely impartial, nonpartisan study of this whole problem of Government spending. A nonpartisan Commission of leading citizens should be appointed by the President and Congress, containing representatives of the executive and legislative branches, to study and report on the long-range spending programs of the Federal Government with reference to their relative importance, and also on the burden of taxation which a free economy can stand and still exist. We have not understood, as a rule, the tremendous expense involved when the Government attempts to benefit directly millions of its citizens instead of confining itself to operations in research, education, advice, and assistance. Thus, the veterans' expense of more than $6,000,000,000 has to reach 20,000,000 veterans. That makes it necessary that the program be scrutinized with critical care.

During the current year we are paying out more than $12,000,000,000 under various programs direct to individuals whose contributions, if any, have been made in past years. At the moment they are getting something for nothing. In addition to the veterans' program, we are paying $2,600,000,000 in dividends on life-insurance policies, more than $1,100,000,000 for public assistance, more than $1,100,000,000 for retirement pensions of different kinds, more than $2,000,000,000 for unemployment compensation. We have been led into many of these on the theory that they cost nothing to the taxpayer and do not directly affect the budget. Nevertheless, they all add to the burden of taxation and cut the taxes which can be safely levied to meet other expenses. Pay-roll taxes for unemployment compensation, Federal old-age and survivors insurance, railroad retirement funds, are just as much taxes though levied for a special purpose.

A complete restudy should be made at once of the agricultural program from the point of view of the long-range expense to which we have found ourselves suddenly committed. Farm programs like the McNary-Haugen bill and the export debenture plan never contemplated any subsidy out of the Treasury. The farmer himself took the loss involved in disposing of the surplus. The price-support program as originally conceived did not involve the Government in loss, but only the carrying of surpluses from good years to bad and in general the maintenance of a fair price which would also be fair to the consumer, and enable any products purchased to be disposed of in most cases without loss.

Nor did the GI housing program originally propose to draw any cash out of the Treasury, but only to guarantee loans. Yet today it is taking more than a billion dollars a year to buy the GI mortgages.

The function of such a commission as I have suggested is much broader than the Hoover Commission. Substantial savings can be made if the Hoover report is accepted, but that report after all deals only with the reorganization rather than with changes in policy, and the matter so far submitted by the President, except in the case of the armed forces, hardly promises any financial saving.

It is strange indeed that in an administration devoted to the principle of economic planning no real over-all plan has been made. I believe the reason is that the economic planners for the most part like the idea of a Socialist state. That is what their planning thoughts are directed toward, and not toward the successful operation of a free economy. Consequently, they are more than pleased with a policy of drift and feel no restraint about unlimited spending, excessive taxation, and huge deficits. It may be that only the people at the polls rather than a scientific commission can introduce sound planning into Government.

At the present time great pressure is being brought to bear for the armed forces and foreign spending. It is possible that the danger of a crisis is being exaggerated somewhat at the time when appropriations are

being sought. On the other hand, I may be wrong and Congress may determine that huge foreign expenditures will have to continue because of the cold war waged against us by Russia. If the administration and Congress determine that present-level foreign spending shall be continued, it can only be justified by the real existence of a tremendous national emergency very similar to war. Under those circumstances, we should balance the budget by postponing many expenditures at home just as we did during the Second World War.

Public works are highly desirable, but they can be postponed for a few years. Improvement in public welfare is one of the purposes of our Republic, but the liberty and the security of the Republic is of still greater importance. The very cold war crisis which would justify continued foreign spending demands a sound fiscal foundation against the possibility of a shooting war. I am personally in favor of many welfare measures and most of the public works program. But if final decision is that foreign spending is necessary for national security, then I would be willing to postpone even those programs in which I have the greatest interest.

There is some tendency to say that the cold war justifies a deficit. I do not agree. If we could have financed the Second World War out of taxes, we should have done so. Failure to do so raised the cost of living by 70 percent and cut the value of a dollar almost in half. But the sums which had to be spent there were so huge no one could devise a tax system to meet them without the greatest injustice to millions of our people and hardship to many. This cold war, no matter how serious, can be financed by taxes if we are willing to postpone a few of the things which we would like to enjoy.

The purpose of our foreign policy is primarily to maintain the liberty of the American people. For that purpose, I am willing to spend money which is proved to be necessary, but it makes no sense to spend vast sums abroad to maintain that liberty, and then at home pursue a policy of deficit spending or excessive taxation which would bring to an end here the very liberty which we are trying to maintain.

The Pony Express

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech by Congressman PHIL J. WELCH, of Missouri, at the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express, which was printed in the St. Joseph News-Press of April 3, 1950:

Honorable Mayor Allison, Mr. Redmond, distinguished guests, friends; we tread historic ground here today.

At this very spot just 90 years ago a brave and colorful undertaking—the historic Pony Express—started.

The Pony Express, as daring an adventure as features the pages of our history, did more than merely deliver letters between the East and West.

The Pony Express aided an imperiled government, helped to pacify and retain in the Union the giant commonwealth of California. It showed the practicability of building a transcontinental railroad, and keeping it open for traffic regardless of winter blizzards and snows.

It bound together the East and the West at a time when overland travel was slow and cumbersome, when a great national crisis—the even then impending Civil War—made the rapid communication of news between the East and the West an imperative necessity.

Had it not been for the Pony Express this Nation might today be two countries—one western, one eastern. The Pony Express played the titanic role of lessening the distance of plain and desert that 90 years ago separated this Nation into two segments only sparsely connected.

True, the Pony Express failed financially, but it served the Nation faithfully and well, not only during the comparative brief months of its existence but on through the years.

Thus it is most fitting that we are gathered here at the site of the Pony Express Stables to join in a celebration of the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express with our sister city on the west coast, the capital of California, Sacramento, the western terminus of the Pony Express.

Just as we stand here today so 90 years ago did our forefathers stand on this very ground to witness the start of what then, as now, was a courageous example of American enterprise.

Many of us in this crowd today are direct descendants of the stalwart people who stood here that April 3, 1860, evening as the first Pony Express rider dashed away into the gloom with his precious load of mail.

We are gathered this afternoon to dedicate the Pony Express Stables which the Goetz Pony Express Foundation will this year restore as a perpetual historic shrine and museum. Today these stables are in disrepair. But already the work of reconstruction has begun.

When completed it will stand as a monument to the glorious history of our State and the Old West. It will draw visitors from all corners of the United States to St. Joseph and the Midland Empire. Yes, the restoration of the Pony Express Stables will be a great civic asset a great Midland Empire asset, and a fitting tribute in reverence and honor to the men of vision who dreamed up the idea of a Pony Express and the intrepid young riders who carried that dream to glorious fulfillment.

As you know, I was not supposed to be the speaker here today. But as a St. Joseph man I naturally was interested in the Pony Express and the celebration planned for today. This is why I availed myself of the greatest source of information in the world, the Library of Congress in Washington, to increase my knowledge of the Pony Express.

James Buchanan was President of the United States when the Pony Express started. Twenty-one years before this county had been named in his honor. That was, of course, long before he became President. The county was named in his honor because of his great and outstanding service as United States Ambassador to Russia.

The population of St. Joseph when the Pony Express started was 8,891. Here let me digress a few seconds. Two of those 8,891 were my grandfather and my grandmother.

Our city today is approximately 10 times as large. The population of our Nation is approximately five times as large as the 31,443,321 inhabitants totaled in the 1860 census.

The total expenditures of the United States Government for the fiscal year that included the latter half of 1860 and the first 6 months of 1861 was $58,579,780. That included interest on the public debt.

Today, our national budget is past the $40,000,000,000 figure.

Missouri, which now has 13 Congressmen, had 8 in 1860. The district of which St. Joseph was a part, the fourth in those days, was represented by the Honorable James Craig, many of whose descendants, including the Garth family, still reside in St. Joseph and are active in the affairs of the community.

It is most reassuring to have the Pony Express stables restored. We here in the Middle West are often too careless with our historic buildings and landmarks. Many a building that would in the East be regarded as outstanding because of its historical significance has been allowed to go before the wreckers' hammer thoughtlessly in this part of the country. We in the Middle West have a great and colorful heritage. We should do everything we can to see that that heritage and our history is preserved. Steps such as this preservation work undertaken by the Goetz Foundation are of immense value to a community and we cannot commend too highly those behind this and similar movements.

The operation of the Pony Express was a supreme achievement of physical endurance on the part of man and his ever faithful companion, the horse. It has been said that the history of the Pony Express should be a lasting monument to the physical sacrifice of man and beast in an effort to accomplish something worthwhile. It should be added that its history also should be an enduring tribute to American courage and American organizing genius.

Probably more than anything else, the Pony Express accurately portrays the kind of men who made possible the winning of the West. Its riders were youngsters who daily took their lives in their hands, youths who delighted in daring and who disregarded the suffering so often occasioned by their duties. Their idea was to get the mail through, regardless of cold, Indians, treacherous mountain paths, or desert. And they did just that. They were not to be halted. Those five words tell in full how our people won the West.

The men who operated the Pony Express were blunt. They made no attempt to hide the risks the riders would face. Proof of that is the advertisements they ran to secure riders.

Those advertisements boldly proclaimed that orphans were preferred as riders. The intent was clear. There would be no families to mourn their passing if ever-lurking ill fate befell them while on duty.

Your Pony Express Rodeo Band, the western attire which so many of you are wearing today, even the 10-gallon hat which you folks have so graciously presented to me, indicate the glamour the Pony Express holds for all of us. And no wonder. The Pony Express recounts the most thrilling chapter in the story of the Old West.

I can vividly recall my childhood days when Buffalo Bill would come to St. Joseph with his circus. I can still see him riding down Felix Street in a stagecoach in the parade of his circus, his long white hair touching his shoulders. I can recall the buckskin clothing he wore, the very way he waved his hat to his cheering admirers.

And why did Buffalo Bill thrill us?

Buffalo Bill had been a Pony Express rider. He had gone through with his mail despite Indian arrows and bullets. To us he was all that was great and glamorous. He was a Pony Express rider.

We went home thrilled and exhausted. For days there was no playing of cops and robbers. The game was Indians and Pony Express riders and the fellow who could prove he was toughest got the much desired role of Buffalo Bill in our game.

Our live-wire St. Joseph Junior Chamber of Commerce has offered $100 for the person who can present documentary evidence to prove the identity of the chap who swung his leg across a pony here in St. Joseph and took the Pony Express mail on the first run west.

I do not have much documentary evidence, but I feel certain that the first rider was Johnny Fry. I say that because when I was a boy I never heard anyone but Johnny Fry mentioned as being the first rider. I know that the late Josiah B. Moss, a talking history book of St. Joseph, always said that Johnny Fry was the first rider. And Mr. Moss was among those who stood at this very spot that day as the Pony Express started.

Yes—that was a long time back. It was the spring that Abraham Lincoln was making his campaign for the nomination for the Presidency. But the memory of Mr. Moss, who died only a few years ago, was remarkable, and I want to go along with him and my youthful playmates in the belief that Johnny Fry was the first rider.

Let us in mind's eye reconstruct what happened 90 years ago.

A crowd, as gay as that with us today, was gathered to witness the start. Mail from the East destined for the first run had been placed on the old Hannibal and St. Joseph Railroad at Hannibal. That was the first railroad west of the Mississippi and today it is part of the Burlington lines.

That day the wood-burning locomotive had a bad time. It was late arriving in St. Joseph, but the crowd at this spot waited. The mail was taken from the train to the post office, sorted, transferred to a mail pouch, and delivered to the first rider. Then there was the dash of the rider to the ferry, the bump as the ferryboat touched Kansas soil, and then the rider disappearing into the darkness as his mount started thundering along the first stretches of the long path across then bloody Kansas.

What happened that day was repeated over and over during the 79 weeks the Pony Express continued in operation. The management, although losing money, tried its best to improve the service and to shorten the time. It did and it cut the cost of sending mail.

Although the Pony Express was such a great factor in the California crisis and in assisting the Government in retaining the Pacific coast, it was the irony of fate that Congress should never give any direct relief or financial assistance to that mail service.

It was a private enterprise that did not rely on the Government. It paid its own way and more. One of its major expenses was the $75,000 it spent for protecting its interests in the war waged by the Utes and allied tribes. Undoubtedly that protection should have been furnished by the Government or the State or Territorial militia. It wasn't though. The Pony Express bore the brunt of that Indian outbreak and paid for it out of its own coffers.

When Edward Creighton, on October 24, 1861, completed the Pacific telegraph and began sending messages by wire from coast to coast, the doom of the Pony Express was sounded. The people of the far West were ardent supporters of the Pony Express by that time, and, records in the Library of Congress show, strongly protested against the eliminating of the Pony Express service.

For a glorious year and a half the Pony Express operated. The advance of civilization ended its operation, but did not mar its luster as one of the great, daring projects of the Nation. The names of the towns and the stations along the Pony Express Overland Route read like a litany of Old West lore—Elwood, Troy, Kennekuk, Seneca, Marysville, Big Sandy, Fort Kearney, North Platte, Fort Laramie, Casper, Salt Lake City, Carson City, Placerville, Sacramento, and the most famous of them all—St. Joseph, Mo., where the great adventure started.

Today I want to congratulate the people of St. Joseph, its excellent junior chamber of commerce, Mr. G. I. Zwick, president of the State Historical Society of Missouri; Bartlett Boder, president of the St. Joseph Historical Society; Floyd Shoemaker, executive secretary of the State Historical Society; St. Joseph's newspapers and radio stations, and all the other civic groups and organizations which have cooperated in this all-day celebration on the nineteenth anniversary of the Pony Express. To Sacramento and San Francisco may I also extend the greetings of this city.

And to the Goetz Pony Express Foundation I want to extend an especial congratulation. Because of this foundation, work on the reconstruction of the stables has already begun. And so, after 90 years, St. Joseph and the Midland Empire can say to the dauntless pony riders of yesteryear—to Johnny Fry, Pony Bob Haslem, Buffalo Bill Cody, Billy Richardson, and all the rest:

"Ride your ghost ponies back to St. Joseph. The doors of the Pony Express stables are open once more."

Gadsden, Ala., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the surplus airport program initiated by the Congress, whereby airport properties were transferred to municipalities for use and development, has in my home town of Gadsden, Ala., been an outstanding success. Much of the credit for the successful development of this airport is attributable to the outstanding mayor of Gadsden, the Honorable J. Herbert Meighan.

Recently, Mr. W. Russell Graham, Jr., a representative of the CAA in Washington, inspected the airport property at Gadsden, and issued a very fine report on the development and operation of the Gadsden Airport. I attach herewith excerpts from his report, as follows:

Purpose of assignment: To analyze the administrative and financial operations of the Gadsden Airport; to survey the use of the airport properties which had been transferred to the city under the provisions of Public Law 289; and to evaluate the relative success of these operations, together with the city's use and management of the revenues received from such properties.

GENERAL

At the beginning of this report, it should be stated that the city of Gadsden has given us an outstanding demonstration of what can be accomplished with surplus properties when they are taken over and managed by public officials who have the will, initiative, and imagination to make such properties produce revenues to support, finance, and advance the local development of civil aviation.

Approximately 2 years ago, this city assumed the ownership and management of three very substantial bases which had been declared surplus to the needs of the military. At the time of their transfer from the War Assets Administration, many of the buildings were in a deplorable condition of repair. The city has spent some considerable sums of money in rehabilitating these buildings and other facilities. It has rented many of the buildings on long-term leases to tenants who are engaged in a variety of commercial enterprises. It has encouraged and persuaded these tenants to make substantial installations of equipment, and to spend sums on extensive repairs, rehabilitation, and maintenance.

As a result of these efforts, the city will earn revenues during the current year which are sufficient to repay all of its expenditures to date, and, in addition, will create a sizable reserve which will be used for major improvements of its airport. Within the near future, the city contemplates the following major improvements to its airport all of which, it is anticipated, will be financed from the revenues derived from these facilities.

1. Installation of new runway lighting system. The contract for this work has already been awarded at an estimated cost of $16,400.
2. Clean and reseal all expansion joints in the concrete runways and apron.
3. Stabilize the drainage area adjacent to the landing strips.
4. Construct a new access road.
5. Construct a new terminal building and control tower.
6. Construct new civil-aviation building.

CONCLUSION

In view of the very splendid job which is being accomplished in the management of these properties by Mayor J. H. Meighan, Mr. W. B. Mills, Jr., Mr. Cary Graham, and other city officials, this writer felt that he had no advice or suggestions to offer.

Know Your Waterways—Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit copy of an article published in the Washington Post, of even date, signed by the Marine News, of New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—FLOOD CONTROL

Should our rivers flow down to the seas carrying away fertile topsoil from countless upland acres and wreckage from flood desolation, rather than a large part of the Nation's commerce? It is estimated that the Mississippi deposits more than 400,000,000 tons of fertile soil (silt) into the Gulf of Mexico every year, and the Columbia more than 100,000,000 tons into the Pacific. This tremendous loss of one of the Nation's most valuable assets, its land, is ominous. Should upcountry floodwater be dumped on unprotected regions below? Overflows from as widely separated areas as Montana and New York State finally reach the Gulf through the Mississippi and its tributaries. No State can take care of its floodwaters within its own borders. Should the tremendous power in our rivers run wild, disrupting industry and transportation, destroying wealth rather than creating it? When unimproved and uncontrolled, rivers are idlers and destroyers; when controlled and improved, they are servants and producers.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Emory R. Johnson and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the special subcommittee on Panama Canal tolls, under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress, of which I am chairman, and Representatives TOM B. FUGATE and EDWARD T. MILLER are members, started upon its investigation of the financial operation of the Panama Canal in the first session of the present Congress.

In conducting our studies we consulted the celebrated works on Panama Canal Tolls by Prof. Emory R. Johnson, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission for Exploration—1899–1900—and author of the toll system of the Panama Canal. His studies and conclusions on this subject, in the main, are still applicable today and were important reference sources reflected in our first interim report, House Report No. 1304, Eighty-first Congress. The subcommittee also corresponded with Dr. Johnson during the course of its studies.

It was with deep regret, therefore, that I read about the death of this eminent authority, which occurred on March 6, 1950, closing a career of rare distinction.

As the greatest work of his life centered around the Panama Canal, it is most fitting that the account of his career as published in the Panama Star and Herald of March 15, 1950—the fine newspaper which has served the Isthmus since its founding in 1849—should be made available to the Congress and the Nation.

Under appropriate leave, I am extending my remarks to include its full text:

DR. JOHNSON, TOLLS EXPERT, DIED MARCH 6—TRANSPORTATION SPECIALIST SERVED WITH SEVERAL ZONE COMMITTEES

Dr. Emory R. Johnson died March 6, according to information received on the Isthmus recently. He was 86 years old.

As a widely known expert in the field of transportation research and economics, he exercised considerable influence on the development of the Panama Canal from the earliest days of the American canal effort.

From 1899 to 1904, he was a member of a special commission on the Isthmian Canal. In 1911, he was appointed special commissioner on traffic and tolls for the Isthmian Canal Commission. In 1936 and 1937, he served as chairman of a special Presidential committee on Panama Canal tolls and vessels measurement rules which resulted in the establishment of the single system of measurement on the Panama Canal.

Dr. Johnson visited the Isthmus twice, the first time in connection with his service as a special commissioner for the Isthmian Canal Commission and again at the time he was chairman of the special committee on tolls.

Among his many books on economics and transportation were these concerning the Canal: The Report to the Isthmian Canal Commission on Industrial and Commercial Value, Isthmian Canal, 1901; Panama Canal Traffic and Tolls, 1912; Measurement of Vessels for the Panama Canal, 1913; and The Panama Canal and Commerce, 1916.

Dr. Johnson was born in Wautun, Wis. He served for several years as economics instructor at Haverford College before assuming the same position at the University of Pennsylvania in 1893. He remained at the university for many years and from 1919 to 1933 served as dean of the Wharton School of Business and Finance.

Throughout his long career as educator and economist his services were utilized by many government and private agencies inside and outside the United States, but were directed primarily to rail and water transportation.

Private Business Has Many Reasons for Supporting the International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Winthrop G. Brown, Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State, on January 11, 1950, before the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, New York, N. Y.:

WHY PRIVATE BUSINESS SHOULD SUPPORT THE ITO

You have asked me to come here today to tell you why you as American businessmen and as leaders in the chemical industry should support the International Trade Organization. I can give you the answer very simply. You should support it because you are believers in the private-enterprise system and in the United States. You have a great stake in the private-enterprise system and in the prosperity of the United States. Therefore, you should support any agreement or organization which will serve to promote those two great interests. It is my conviction that the International Trade Organization will materially advance the interests of the private-enterprise system and the interests of the United States, and I propose to try to tell you why.

Let us look first at the problem and at the facts which we face. We can then judge better as to whether the means adopted to deal with them are appropriate.

Most of the countries of the world emerged from World War II with their economies seriously disturbed. Their normal trade channels had been cut off, their business connections disrupted, their productive facilities destroyed, many of the means of earning their way lost. At the same time, with the experience of the economic warfare of the interwar period and the necessities of war itself, governments had developed a whole variety of new and improved techniques for the control of the domestic and foreign trade of their citizens. In wartime it was absolutely essential to have those controls, so that the full strength of the Nation could be focused on the matter of winning the war. But after the cessation of hostilities, countries still faced tremendous difficulties and these instruments of control were available to help deal with them. This was true in our own country as well as in others.

In our international trade we deal with a very large number of countries. They are in all stages of economic development and they have widely different political and economic attitudes. Some believe in capitalism, others believe in socialism, others use a mixture. In some countries government imposes only mild controls over certain parts of trade; in other countries the government actually does the trading in whole or in part itself. This is true of the United States as well as of other countries.

We don't believe in socialism; we don't want to have it in this country. Other people do believe in socialism and do want to have it in their countries. These are facts. We can't change them. The waves did not stand still simply because King Canute told them to.

Almost all countries are vitally interested in international trade. In a country like New Zealand, for example, 85 percent of its national income comes from international trade. In the United States, international trade accounts for perhaps 10 or 12 percent of our national income. But that 10 or 12 percent in 1949 amounted to something over $20,000,000,000, so it is not hay.

Because of the importance of trade and because of the shortages and dislocations which arose out of the war, countries have been deeply concerned to use their own resources to the best advantage and to get the things they needed from other countries. Because the things that were needed were for the most part in short supply, their distribution had to be controlled so that it could be most effectively used and grave inequities and injustices avoided. You will recall vividly last winter, for example, the outcry which went up in the United States against the export of oil to other countries because we were short in this country. There was great demand for the Government to step in and keep oil in this country. The people who made that outcry apparently did not think that the private-enterprise system adequately met their needs in this particular case.

Most countries in the world are short of dollars. Therefore, they cannot permit their citizens to use the few dollars which they do have at will. They have to limit their purchases from the dollar area to be sure that they get the things that they can't do without, just as a man with a limited income has to limit his family's purchases so as to be sure they get their food and pay their rent.

Now these techniques of control and Government interference with the flow of trade can be used for necessary and legitimate purposes such as the budgeting of foreign exchange to which I have just referred, or they can be used for straight protection, or they can be used for economic warfare, or they can be used for political advantage, or they can be used to promote bilateralism.

Faced with such a world and such conditions, what then is the wise and sensible course to pursue? Should we just let things drift? Should we leave each country free to use all of these techniques for any purpose it desires without restraint, without the possibility of complaint or redress? Shall we follow the policy of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost? The statement of the question almost states the answer.

This brings me to the reason why I think that everyone who believes in the private-enterprise system and in the American way should support the ITO charter. For the ITO charter is essentially a limitation upon the power of governments to use these restrictive and controlling devices. The charter gives no powers of control or intervention to governments which they do not now possess and which they are now not free to exercise at will, except in the few cases where they are limited by specific agreements. The charter limits the operations of governments when they are in business them-

selves and it limits their rights to interfere with the operation of private business. It also limits the right of private businessmen to interfere with the trade of other private businessmen by cartel combinations.

This is important, and I want to repeat it. The charter gives no new powers to governments to interfere with business. It limits the powers which governments now have and which they are using to interfere with business.

I stress this point because critics of the charter have so often implied that the charter gives governments permission to use new devices, that it sanctions new interference and new discrimination. I think what these critics are thinking about and have misunderstood is the fact that the charter limitations upon the powers of governments are not all-embracing; they do not require the abandonment of every use of all of these control devices. Obviously, they cannot. If it were possible today to secure the abolition of all government controls over international trade, there would be no need for a charter or for any international agreements in the field of trade. But just because you can't get agreement to eliminate all government restrictions and interferences with trade is no reason not to get agreement to eliminate or reduce as many as you can. And that is what the charter does.

Let me illustrate. The core of the charter, so far as the United States is concerned, is the chapter on commercial policy. The first article commits member countries to give general most-favored-nation treatment. This is good United States policy. We follow it for everybody except Cuba and the Philippines, where we have long-established preferential systems. It did not seem to us sensible to abandon a world commitment not to discriminate in tariff treatment simply because we and the British could not overnight eliminate long-established trading relationships with certain countries, even though we were willing to undertake the commitment to negotiate for their elimination.

Another article in this chapter limits the powers of governments to use internal taxes and regulations as a discrimination against imports. It did not seem to us sensible to throw away this world-wide commitment to limit a governmental interference with trade used against us much more than by us simply because we could not and would not give up our mixing regulations designed to protect our synthetic rubber industry.

Article 20 provides for general elimination of quotas, the worst of all restrictive devices. It did not seem to us sensible to give up a world-wide commitment against the use of this restrictive device simply because exchange shortages required even a large number of countries to use the device until their exchange reserves were restored or because we would not abandon our agricultural price-support programs.

The recognition in the charter of this fact that it is permissible to use quotas and to discriminate because of the shortages of foreign exchange has been the central basis for one of the main objections to the charter—namely, that it allows discrimination against the United States. It is said that since the United States and possibly Switzerland are almost the only countries in the world which aren't in balance-of-payments difficulties, this is in some way unfair to the United States and Switzerland. Gentlemen, the other countries of the world are spending every dollar that they have in the United States, and every dollar that they can get. They are doing everything they possibly can to get more dollars and to cease this discrimination against the United States, if it be in any colloquial sense a discrimination. But I don't think it's any more a discrimination against the United States than it is a discrimination against Cartier's when I don't buy my wife a diamond bracelet there. I can't afford it. When I make enough money so that I can afford it, then I will buy the bracelet and cease the discrimination.

It is also said that because the charter permits this type of discrimination it prevents the United States from retaliating, and that this is unfair. What would our retaliation be? It would be to impose some barrier or quota to imports from the countries that are not buying from us. And, gentlemen, all that would do would be to decrease the amount of dollars they have and to increase their need to discriminate against us.

Another set of articles in this chapter limits the activities of state trading enterprises by requiring that they be guided by commercial considerations, that they give private and public enterprises of other countries opportunity under normal business terms to bid for their business, and requires them to negotiate for the reduction of protective margins in their operations. It did not seem to us sensible to give up a commitment to restrict the operations of state trading enterprises simply because we could not get agreement to eliminate state trading. The United States, of course, could not agree to abandon state trading.

The chapter also deals with subsidies, limiting their use. The whole set of articles dealing with the invisible tariff of customs regulations is designed to prevent and limit arbitrary interferences with trade through the use of these regulations.

The chapter on cartels establishes the first international mechanism for limiting the operations of international private cartels. The chapter on commodity agreements, which has been described as sanctioning government cartels, is a limitation upon the occasions on which such agreements can be entered into and the nature of the agreement when it is entered into. At present governments are free to make commodity agreements. I am willing to make the flat prediction that they will make commodity agreements when the needs of their people impel them to do so. Now they can make them when they will, without consultation, if they will, and in any form that they want, without regard to their consequences to others and to us. Under the charter they can only make them under certain circumstances which are specified. If they do make them we have to be consulted. As the largest consumer of almost everything, we would have to be represented. The consuming countries would have to have an equal voice with the producing countries. And we intend to submit any agreement which we may negotiate under this chapter to the Congress for its approval.

At the present time other countries are free, except in a few cases where we have treaties with them on the subject, to impose any requirements or limitation that they choose, arbitrary or otherwise, upon the admission of our capital to their borders or upon the treatment of our capital now invested there. Under the charter they cannot do this. Under the charter, members are required to provide adequate security for existing and future investments, and any requirements that they do impose must be just and reasonable. If the United States should consider that any regulations or requirements are arbitrary, oppressive, unreasonable, or unjust, we would under the charter have a basis for protest, first to the Organization, and, if necessary or if we wished it, to the International Court of Justice. We have none of this now. Moreover, the charter expressly recognizes that this is a minimum requirement and obligates members on request to negotiate for more detailed arrangements, such as the type of commercial treaty which we have recently signed with Italy and with Uruguay. Both of these countries, incidentally, were at Habana and their representatives concurred in the text of the charter.

One further point on this matter of investment: and that is that an effort was made to introduce into the charter the principle that compensation in the case of expropriation would be in local currencies. This effort was unequivocally and flatly rejected. I agree that it would have been fine if we could have got agreement on, say, the terms of the Uruguay Treaty as part of this charter, but it seems to me foolish to throw away what we did get simply because we couldn't get all that we may have wanted.

There is one other subject dealt with in the charter which I think would be of interest to this audience. That is the subject of the tariff. Certain members of this group have expressed the opinion that the charter condemns the use of tariffs and that it takes the tariff-making power out of the hands of the United States and gives it to the Organization. I might add that I have gathered that there are certain members of this association who think that the present administration in Washington condemns the use of the tariff and thinks that any tariff is ipso facto bad. Since I have, during the course of my connection with the State Department, been in charge of the Department's work on tariffs and chairman of the interdepartmental organization which administers the Trade Agreements Act, I believe I am qualified to speak on both these points.

Let me make two things explicitly clear. The charter does not condemn the use of the tariff. The charter does not not affect the complete control of the United States Government over its tariff policy.

What the charter does is to commit the other countries of the world to the policy which the United States has been following since 1934 of standing ready to negotiate with other countries for the selective reduction of tariffs on a mutually advantageous basis.

There is a very important distinction in the charter between tariffs and certain other forms of trade restrictions. For example, the quota is to be abolished. Negotiations about preferences are to be directed toward their elimination. With respect to tariffs, any negotiations that take place are for their reduction. Negotiations about tariffs must be on a mutually advantageous basis. No country is required to reduce the tariff on any particular product. No country is required to make any concessions unless it receives satisfactory concessions in return. That is the commitment which this country would accept under the charter, to continue to do what it has done for 15 years.

Not a word as to the administration's attitude toward the tariff. We do not think that tariffs per se are bad. We agree with Dr. Killheffer that they are far less objectionable obstacles to trade than the quota, because if you pay the tariff and the demand is there, you can get your product into the country, whereas the quota is an absolute bar. But we think that the Smoot-Hawley tariff established many rates which were unnecessarily high. We believe that in many cases a tariff can be an embargo just as effectively as a quota, and we don't believe in embargoes. Like you, gentlemen, we believe in competition.

We believe that we should not deal with any tariff rate without consultation with people in labor or agriculture or industry whose interests may be affected. We do consult them. And we pay attention to the case which they present. We, of course, do not always agree with it. If we did, the rates would all have stayed just where they were in 1930, because the normal attitude of those who come down to tariff hearings is that

any reduction of any kind in the tariff rate at present existing on their product will be ruinous.

But we do pay the most careful attention and give the greatest weight to the facts and figures presented in the briefs and testimony, and I submit that any dispassionate study of the tariff schedules of the agreements which have been negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act will show the influence which the facts presented by various industries have had upon the final outcome of the negotiations.

Under the charter each country is the judge of what tariff concessions it will make. Each country is the judge of how it will handle the negotiations and what procedures it will follow. And the Organization has no power whatsoever to order or direct any country to alter those judgments.

One more point before I summarize. I understand that many of you are concerned about the fact that the United States will have only one vote in this Organization. You are concerned lest we be perpetually in a minority and be outvoted on important questions affecting our interests. I am not worried about this. Let me tell you why.

This fear of our being ganged up on and outvoted is based upon several false assumptions. It assumes, first, that the influence of a country in international councils is measured only by its numerical vote. That is, of course, not true. Everywhere I go in international meetings and in international negotiations, the main question on every important problem is, "What is the attitude of the United States? What is the United States going to do?" Our predominant position in the world obviously gives us an influence far greater than that of smaller countries, if for no other reason than that our support and cooperation are essential for the accomplishment of most important international measures.

Secondly, this fear assumes that the interests of the other fifty or so countries will be the same and predominantly adverse to that of the United States. This, again, is a false assumption. On any particular issue that comes up there will be a diversity of attitudes among the other countries. In any case of trade restriction, for example, there will almost always be a substantial number of other countries who are in the same position as the United States either as producers or consumers of the product involved, or as producers or consumers of other products which they might not like to see restricted in the future.

More important, perhaps, this fear assumes bad faith on the part of the other countries in accepting the commitments of the charter, or stupidity and incompetence on the part of the representatives of the United States in presentation the United States' case. It even goes so far as to assume bias on the part of the International Court of Justice, to which under the charter we have recourse in any case where we feel that its provisions have been improperly interpreted by the Organization. I don't accept the assumption of bad faith on the part of other governments. If I did, I would not recommend entering into the charter or any other international organization. I do not accept the assumption of incompetence on the part of our representatives. My personal experience in Wall Street, in Washington, and in international negotiations has been that our representatives compare favorably in both competence and negotiating ability with men in other walks of life in this country and with the representatives of foreign countries. Moreover, actual experience in the United Nations and in the meetings of the contracting parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, in both of which we have only one vote, has demonstrated that we are not ganged up on and outvoted, but are normally in the overwhelming majority. So I am not afraid to go into a meeting representing the United States even though I have only one vote.

Well, gentlemen, what does this add up to? It adds up to the fact that we are confronted with the amazing and unprecedented achievement of having secured agreement between the representatives of some 54 nations, representing every stage of economic development and a wide variety of political philosophies, on a code of rules to guide their international trade which embodies fundamentally the United States philosophy of the maximum amount of competition and the minimum of government control.

Under this agreement even governments themselves when in business will be required to be guided by commercial considerations. This agreement does not attempt to have every country adopt the same form of government or the same political or economic system. It provides a means whereby countries with different political and economic systems can trade together in an orderly way. It commits them to the obligation to consult with each other before they take action which will adversely affect each other's interests. It is essentially a limitation on the power of governments to interfere with trade. It does not abolish all interferences. Of course not. But it does abolish some, it reduces others, and it limits still others to precisely defined areas.

What is the alternative? Governments are in the international trade picture more than ever before. At their disposal are new, highly effective and ingenious devices for the control of trade. The circumstances in which many countries find themselves create powerful demands for the use of these techniques for narrow, short-run, selfish interests. If the rules of the ITO are not accepted, countries will be free to use these techniques, not only in the cases not prohibited by the charter but in all other cases not specifically covered by treaty or agreement.

Where does the private trader stand in such a world? And where does his government stand when he comes to it and asks it to protect on his behalf against the arbitrary action of some other government which injures his business? We can say to the other government that we don't like what it is doing and that its action hurts our citizens. This often produces results. If this fails, in extreme cases we might impose counterrestrictions on their trade. But this is self-defeating. Restriction breeds restriction, and before long the government is controlling the destinies of private business. With the ITO we will be able to say to that other government that we are protesting what it has done not only because it hurts our citizens, but also because it violates an obligation which it has assumed not only to us but to other governments as well. Moreover, if necessary, we will be in a position to call that government to account before the other ITO members, before the International Court of Justice, and before the public opinion of the world. I submit to you that the choice is clear.

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an article which appeared in the January 1950 issue of the Master, Mate, and Pilot, the official publication of the National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America.

An international conference to establish a new democratic world labor federation opened in London on November 23, 1949. Delegations from Britain, western Europe, Scandinavia, the Middle East, the Far East, and Latin America, as well as United States and Canadian delegates from the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the United Mine Workers were in attendance. It was estimated that a membership of over 48,000,000 workers in 53 countries were represented. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions was organized as a result of the conference, and Mr. Jacobus Hendrik Oldenbroek, of the International Transport Workers Federation, was elected by acclamation as the first secretary general.

The article to which I refer, describing the career and accomplishments of Mr. Oldenbroek, follows:

REVIEWING THE CAREER OF JACOBUS H. OLDENBROEK

(By John Herling)

A stubborn Dutch boy, you remember, once stuck his finger in a dike and thereby kept back the threatening sea until help came. He saved his country from the floods.

Today, a twentieth century edition of that storybook hero is a very determined, not-to-be kidded Dutchman. He is Jacobus Hendrik Oldenbroek. Recently he was elected, by acclamation, as secretary general of the newly organized International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, with thirty-five to forty million members in about 50 countries.

This merely makes official what a lot of people already knew—that ruddy-faced 52-year-old Oldenbroek is one of the outstanding labor leaders of our time.

MULTILINGUAL

He has had no career outside the labor movement and has merely equipped himself to do a bang-up job as a labor official. He speaks a dozen languages.

As a young man, he became the assistant to the late Edo Fimmen, the Dutch longshore leader, who was secretary general of the International Transport Workers Federation. Mr. Fimmen was a man in the craggy mold of Andrew Furuseth, the leader of American sailors. Under him, Mr. Oldenbroek was taught that there was more to labor organization than direct job considerations. He also learned how not to get lost in the labyrinth of labor movement machinery.

During the war he took general charge of underground activities and the restoration of trade-unions on the Continent. His main job was to keep together the organizational pieces and personnel of the European trade-union movement.

Both Nazis and Communists knew him as a vigorous opponent. When the Nazis began overrunning Europe, it was Mr. Oldenbroek, as acting secretary general of the International Transport Workers Federation, who began at once to organize a detailed plan of sabotage.

WORK AGAINST NAZIS

As a Dutchman, he was especially keen on seeing to it that the Nazis would have a very difficult time. He kept his labor contacts warm through an intricate system of communications—from Norway to Italy. He was able to engineer strategic strikes wherever

and whenever it would make the Nazis scream the loudest. They didn't like him.

But neither did the Communists, Soviets or otherwise.

For years before 1939 the Communists were very anxious indeed to work their way into the Transport Workers, which is the international union of all the railroad workers, sailors, longshoremen. Logistically speaking, anybody who controls or even influences such an organization has a terrific leverage on the world's economy. But in fair weather and foul, the Commies were kept out.

Then came the Nazi-Soviet Pact, and Mr. Oldenbroek's work began in grim earnest.

The Transport Workers Federation, the great mobile unit of what was left of the international labor movement, had its work cut out for it. Both the Nazis and the Communists were the combined enemy, right out in the open.

The totalitarian influence ranged all over the world. In the port of New York, Communists were trying to get Norwegian and Dutch sailors to jump ship, and so interfere with the flow of munitions and goods to Britain, which was the jumping-off place for all of beleaguered Europe.

It was a tough time, requiring enormous skill, and a full knowledge of ships, road systems, and manpower. Oldenbroek was one of the chief organizers of the labor base for the antitotalitarian cause. He was a coordinator, if there ever was one.

NOT HOODWINKED

But when the Soviets were pushed into the war by the Nazi attack, and the whole world lost its mind and memory, Oldenbroek kept his twinkling, but disenchanted blue eyes wide open. He knew that many of the most gallant trade-union leaders on the Continent, especially in France, had been exterminated by the Nazis, with the Commies often acting as the finger-men.

That was why the Communist leadership suddenly zoomed in importance in the resistance movements. They had survived at the expense of honest men. Now they were ready to shed crocodile tears of remorse and take over the labor movements they had tried to undermine.

After the war they hoped to get control of world labor through the World Federation of Trade Unions, which was set up in 1945.

There was one organization the Commies were particularly anxious to get into the world federation, the International Transport Workers Federation, of course. The pressure on Mr. Oldenbroek became tremendous. If the transport workers yielded to become a subordinate part of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, others would have to follow suit.

But Mr. Oldenbroek said no. Privately he made it clear he thought that the WFTU could not be long for this world, since the Communists are what they are. He found important help in the 19 United States railroad brotherhoods. They joined the International Transport Workers Federation. And at the same time, without saying so, they made it clear they had no intention of joining the Communist-dominated WFTU through any back door.

There no longer was any doubt of the Communist postwar intentions. In the face of the Soviet and Communist attack on the Marshall plan, he and the transport workers put their full strength behind the economic rehabilitation of Europe.

Mr. Oldenbroek was able to take his finger out of the dike and lead the counteroffensive against the Communist aggression. He built up the ITF's strength through branch offices in New York, Rome, Bombay, and, most recently, Habana.

By last year the WFTU began to disintegrate under the impact of possible alternatives. Through careful handling Mr. Oldenbroek was able to save face for the British and CIO, who had to retire in good order from the WFTU they had help set up.

So a new International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has been launched. Mr. Oldenbroek will be able to talk directly to all the leaders without the services of an interpreter.

Fort Harrison Veterans' Hospital

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] in calling to the attention of the House the deplorable situation which exists at the Fort Harrison, Mont., veterans' facility at the present time. Fort Harrison is not taking in the veterans as they come because it has neither the necessary funds nor personnel. This is not due to any fault of the manager at Fort Harrison who has done an extremely good job, but because cuts have been made recently which have made it impossible to operate this hospital as it should be operated. I am hopeful that the Veterans' Administration under General Gray will take cognizance of the pleas of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] and myself and do something about the Fort Harrison hospital to the end that Montana veterans can be taken over, our nurses not be overworked, and our doctors at the fort given the aid and assistance which they must have. The fine work done by the staff at Fort Harrison should be encouraged and not hindered.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following communications I have received and the answers thereto on this subject:

CHRISTIAN RURAL OVERSEAS PROGRAM
Helena, Mont., March 23, 1950.

DEAR MIKE: The plight of the veterans' hospital at Fort Harrison was called to my attention yesterday. I am acquainted with some of the staff and have attempted to assist in obtaining some highly trained technicians for it.

The recent cut in the hospital's staff, as a result of budget cuts, would not have been serious if the staff had been up where it should have been, for an institution its size. Coming as it did the situation is really serious.

As of yesterday the waiting list was 40, 2 cancer in its early stages. Four nurses resigned recently because of overwork, caused by a small number trying to take care of the patients. Surgeons did 50 major operations in 15 days last month.

I hope you will contact the Veterans' Administration, get the facts concerning this institution, and see if some relief can be obtained.

With kindest regards, I remain

Yours very truly,

ALBERT H. KRUSE.

MARCH 27, 1950.

Gen. CARL GRAY,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: I am enclosing herewith letter I have received from Albert H. Kruse relative to the situation at Fort Harrison.

I would appreciate your looking into this matter to see what might be done to alleviate the situation. May I hear from you, and please return the enclosure with your reply.

Thanking you and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MARCH 27, 1950.

Mr. ALBERT H. KRUSE,
Helena, Mont.

DEAR ALBERT: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 23 which I have read with much interest.

I am immediately looking into the situation at Fort Harrison and you may be assured that I will do all I can to be of assistance on this.

Must close now but assuring you of my deep interest in this and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

MARCH 31, 1950.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter to the Administrator, dated March 27, 1950, with attached letter from Mr. Albert Kruse, 1051 Breckenridge, Helena, Mont., has been referred to this office for reply. I appreciate your concern over the reduction in medical and allied staffs with its possible impairment of service.

It became necessary to effect a reduction of employees in hospitals and regional office medical divisions in order to stay within the funds available to us in the fiscal year 1950 appropriation and proposed fiscal year 1951 appropriation. The reductions were not based on a State-to-State comparison, but were apportioned to each hospital and regional office medical division based on the following factors: (a) number of beds, patients, or out-patient work load; (b) research and training programs; (c) special activities; and (d) type of construction in the case of hospitals.

Complete reports from hospitals and regional offices on the effects of the reductions are being reviewed at this time with the objective of making adjustments where appropriate. It is planned to continue with our staffing of new hospitals as they are completed. Every effort will be made to transfer to new hospitals doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technical personnel who may be declared surplus at various hospitals and regional offices.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director.

HELENA, MONT., *April 5, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Your immediate help is urgently needed. Fort Harrison officials faced with early decision concerning reduction in bed capacity in the loss of hospital medical personnel. Veterans' Administration contemplated order for reduction we believe discriminates against Fort Harrison. In discussing matter with Meredith, manager VA center, he advised that since the number of professional medical-service personnel authorized at Fort Harrison was so far below the allocation of similar personnel at other VA hospitals of comparable size he expects allocation of additional medical personnel which has not as yet materialized. Senator MURRAY familiar with recent criticism lodged by several patients, not against the physicians, and in our opinion criticism if justified is traceable to lack of supporting medical personnel. We

want to retain the present bed capacity of 264 if possible, which is only 1 bed for every 295 veterans. This is entirely inadequate. This cannot be done unless an increased allocation in personnel is made.

E. J. CALLAGHAN,
Veterans' Welfare Commission of Montana.
HERBERT KIBLER,
Department Adjutant,
American Legion of Montana.

APRIL 6, 1950.

Mr. E. J. CALLAGHAN,
Veterans' Welfare Commission.
HERBERT KIBLER,
Department Adjutant,
American Legion, Helena, Mont.

DEAR GENE AND HERB: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 5 which I have just received and read with much interest.

Just recently I contacted the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration relative to the reduction in medical and allied staffs at Fort Harrison. On March 31, I received a letter from Paul B. Magnuson, chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration, which read:

"It became necessary to effect a reduction of employees in hospitals and regional office medical divisions in order to stay within the funds available to us in the fiscal year 1950 appropriation and proposed fiscal year 1951 appropriation. The reductions were not based on a State-to-State comparison, but were apportioned to each hospital and regional office medical division based on the following factors: (a) Number of beds, patients, or out-patient work load; (b) research and training programs; (c) special activities; and (d) type of construction in the case of hospitals.

"Complete reports from hospitals and regional offices on the effects of the reductions are being reviewed at this time with the objective of making adjustments where appropriate. It is planned to continue with our staffing of new hospitals as they are completed. Every effort will be made to transfer to new hospitals, doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technical personnel who may be declared surplus at various hospitals and regional offices."

You may be certain that this matter is receiving my best attention and that I will do all I can to be of assistance.

Must close now, but thanking you for your telegram and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copies of two editorials which have recently appeared in San Francisco newspapers regarding the central Arizona project, which has been approved in the Senate in S. 75 and which the House will presently consider.

The first editorial appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle of February 27, 1950, and is entitled "Dreamy Central Arizona Project." The second is from the San Francisco Examiner under the title "The Need and the Right." The editorials follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of February 27, 1950]

DREAMY CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Arizona's Senators have scored a preliminary victory in their long battle to start a huge project tapping Colorado River water for the irrigation of 725,000 acres of central Arizona and New Mexico farm land. The Senate last week authorized $708,000,000 to dam the Colorado at Bridge Canyon, above Hoover Dam, and to build reservoirs, tunnels, canals, and pumping plants to carry the water 315 miles to the cotton, grain, and hay farms, for which it is almost exclusively intended.

This project is premature in a number of senses. In the first place, it is subject to doubt whether Arizona even has the right to take 1,200,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water each year, as proposed. That is a question very much in dispute.

In a bill passed by the Senate along with the central Arizona project authorization, California is given permission to file suit in the Supreme Court for the determination of the Colorado water rights controversy. So until the Court rules, any expenditures on the project would be unwarranted, and indeed the Court may entitle Arizona to so small a part of the 1,200,000 acre-feet sought that the project would be washed up right there.

It is well that the Senate has put the issue on the way to settlement, and we call on the House to ratify this permission to bring suit. But, in obligation to the whole American people, the House ought not to ratify the central Arizona project.

Persuasive testimony shows it to be uneconomic and therefore indefensible at this time—premature again. Its high cost would not justify the purpose of irrigating low-cost crops. It is charged by Senator DOWNEY, of California, that the project will cost ultimately at least $1,250,000,000 or, in other words, $1,750 for every benefited acre. Yet, as he says, the land when irrigated will be worth only $300 an acre. The Department of Agriculture has an illuminating comment on this point:

"The first and most important question that must be asked about any proposed public work is: Will the total benefits produced equal or exceed the total costs? Frankly, we were unable to determine."

The Department of Agriculture charges that the Bureau of Reclamation's methods of estimating benefits are not valid. It speaks of procedural error and asks for the correction of these errors before giving its opinion on the worth of the venture.

In short, the Bureau of Reclamation has been exposed in a palpable effort to make the project look good. This is no surprise, for the Bureau is always glad to accommodate with estimates of a rosy character.

If, as we suspect, the Senate authorized this huge works as a barrel of pork for the Southwest, we can only say it is outrageously expensive pork. The last time President Truman was heard on the subject, a year ago, he advised that it was not in accord with his program at this time. To protect his already large budget from further inroads he should exert his leadership to get the central Arizona project quashed in the House.

[From the San Francisco Examiner]

THE NEED AND THE RIGHT

The Colorado River forms part of the southeast boundary of California, and by natural riparian rights, this State is entitled to its full share of the waters of that river. That is the right.

The need for that water by southern California cities and farming communities is imperative.

But both the right and the need are in jeopardy in Congress, where there is pending a bill to grant Arizona a Federal gift of a billion-dollar water project.

There is no question of Arizona's right to its share of Colorado River water. There must be no question of California's right to its share.

The United States Senate on February 21 passed a bill to make the billion-dollar grant to the Arizona project. The measure is now pending in the House of Representatives, and there the fate of much of California is at stake.

It might be noted that if the Arizona project billion-dollar bill passes, California, with its high income-tax payments, will have to meet more than $100,000,000 of the cost. That is, California would have to pay $100,000,000 so that its area could be deprived of essential water.

All of California's 23 Representatives in Congress are united in defending the State's rights, irrespective of party lines and of sectional lines. All these California Congressmen have introduced identical bills calling for settlement by the United States Supreme Court of the interstate dispute over the water.

That is, the California Congressmen want the question settled on a fair, legal basis. They do not ask for a grab by their State. They are confident in California's legal rights to its share of the water, and they want the matter adjusted fairly, legally, not as a matter of political expediency.

Now the people of California can do their part by assuring all California Congressmen that they have universal State support in their fight.

In particular, northern and central California citizens should write or wire their Congressmen they are back of them in this desperate fight for a fair allotment of water.

As a matter of justice alone no Californian wants to see southern California dispossessed of water needed for present and future needs.

Let each one of the 23 California Congressmen know that their people are behind them in their tough fight against the Arizona project grab.

Resurvey of the Warrior-Tombigbee River System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a statement made by my friend and constituent, Mr. W. I. McElroy, of Mobile, Ala., regarding the resurvey of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system from Mobile to Birmingham, Ala. I consider this, Mr. Speaker, one of the most intelligent statements I have ever read, and I know thousands of people from one end of the State of Alabama to the other will be interested in reading the facts as presented by Mr. W. I. McElroy.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON THE RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE RESURVEY OF THE WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE RIVER SYSTEM BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS, PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE, ON APRIL 3, 1950

My name is W. I. McElroy. I am superintendent of operations of the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co., Chickasaw, Ala. The purpose of my appearance here is to emphasize the necessity of securing approval of a resolution to authorize the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to conduct a resurvey of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system from Port Birmingham to Mobile, Ala., to consider the justification of a modernization program. The Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. is a contract carrier operating a fleet of modern Diesel towboats and barges between Port Birmingham and Mobile on the Warrior-Tombigbee system and from Mobile east to Tampa, Fla., and west to Corpus Christi, Tex., on the Intracoastal Waterway.

The Warrior-Tombigbee River system is one of the oldest commercially navigable streams in the country, the first project for its improvement having been authorized by the Congress March 3, 1875. Realizing the potential value of this waterway to the southeastern region, Congress continued to authorize improvements until 1915, when the last of some 17 navigation locks were completed, providing a navigable channel from Mobile to Port Birmingham on the Locust Fork and to Cordova, Ala., on the Mulberry Fork, 419 and 439 miles, respectively, above Mobile.

The subsequent historic development of this region is a matter of record. The city of Birmingham has become a most important industrial and manufacturing center in the South and the port of Mobile is now ranked the sixth most important port in the Nation by the United States Department of Commerce. The Birmingham district bears a striking resemblance to the Pittsburgh district, not only in the matter of steel production, but likewise in the fact that Birmingham has a river connection with the seaport of Mobile which might be compared with the Monongahela, Ohio and Mississippi River system serving the Pittsburgh district. Our big advantage lies in the shorter distance from Birmingham to Mobile as compared with the distance from Pittsburgh to New Orleans.

Approximately 22 years after the river was canalized, the Congress apparently recognizing the importance of this waterway as a transportation artery authorized a complete survey to determine the possible need of improvement and modernization. Acting on the direction of Congress, an exhaustive study was made by the district engineer, who recommended a complete modernization program to be effected in three phases, House Document 56, Seventy-third Congress, first session. The district engineer, on the occasion of this survey based his findings on the potential increase of commerce which would justify the improvements and he further advised that a number of the locks and dams were in such a deteriorated condition that they would have to be replaced in relatively short time in order to avoid heavy continuing maintenance. The study of the waterway embraced, in addition to navigation, the subject of water power, flood control, and irrigation. He found that the development of hydroelectric power and flood control was not justified. Some of the improvements originally recommended have been completed, such as improvement to dam No. 17, the Sunflower Bend cut-off, and a new lock and dam built at Tuscaloosa, Ala., to replace three obsolete locks and dams which were over 40 years old. After the building of the Tuscaloosa lock, no further improvements were made, principally because of the outbreak of World War II. In the meantime, the existing old structures on the river have been held together as best as could be accomplished by more or less temporary repairs. In one instance, a blow-out occurred in one of these antiquated wooden dams which necessitated unwatering a section of the dam by use of sheet steel piling in order to make repairs. This occurred at lock No. 8 and attached photographs (exhibit A) clearly show the deplorable condition of the dam. This condition is typical of the eight remaining wooden dams and we consider ourselves fortunate in that the blow-out was discovered in time to make repairs before a complete failure of the entire structure. Such an occurrence is quite possible at any of these dams and we are thus faced with an impending disaster which would close the waterway down for an extended period.

In another instance, a blow-out occurred in the wooden floor of the chamber of lock No. 6 which brought about a serious delay to traffic. Photographs of this blow-out are attached and the seriousness of the situation is clearly pictured. The river was closed to navigation for a period of 10 days during the repairs to this lock.

All of the existing locks, with the exception of the Tuscaloosa lock, are equipped with antiquated hand-operated gates and valves which make the lockage of vessels and barges a very slow and laborious process. Further, these locks are provided with lock chambers 52 feet wide by 286 feet long as compared with the standard Ohio River lock of 110 feet by 600 feet. Under the circumstances, it is necessary to break our standard tows up into three segments and thus make three separate lockages while tows of a similar size and even larger may lock in one operation through an Ohio River lock. Time lost on the Warrior-Tombigbee, including the breaking up of the tow, the lockage operations and the reassembling of the tow will approximate 3 hours at each lock as compared to approximately 20 to 30 minutes on the Ohio River. Photographs of one of our tows approaching and locking through lock No. 1 are attached (exhibit D). The restricted size of the lock chamber and the antiquated method of operating the gates are clearly shown. Large tows making a round trip from Mobile to Port Birmingham and return lose approximately 3½ days due wholly to the antiquated and outmoded system of locks. With a lesser number of modern Ohio River type locks which could be spaced further apart by reason of higher dams, it is conservatively estimated that time lost due to lockage operations could be reduced to 1 day, a saving of 2½ days per trip. The total saving in time which would be afforded by such a system of locks would be the equivalent of five round trips per year. On the basis of an existing schedule of 24 trips per year per vessel, an increase in cargo handling capacity of 21 percent would be effected. The only additional cost involved in the handling of the extra 21 percent of freight would be the actual fuel, lubricating oil and miscellaneous deck supplies consumed during the extra five voyages, plus a small amount of additional maintenance expense. Vessel expense such as wages of crew, depreciation, taxes, insurance, etc., is an annual expense continuing throughout the year and naturally if additional trips can be made, this cost will be spread over a greater tonnage, thereby resulting in further savings.

Construction of the existing locks during the early 1900's took place as the need arose to extend the navigable channel to accommodate the commerce offered. They were designed to meet the needs of the shallow draft paddle wheel vessels then in use and consequently were comparatively low in height which permitted the use of wooden timbers in their construction. The result was the building of a large number of low lift locks, the average being about 10 feet. These low lift locks created a series of shallow pools which are characterized by an extremely narrow and winding channel. In many reaches of the river, especially between Demopolis and Tuscaloosa, Ala., the channel is barely 150 feet in width and 7 to 8 feet in depth. Serious delays to traffic have occurred because of the grounding of tows in the shallow reaches of the river. In May of 1949, three of our vessels towing a total of 25 loaded barges were delayed for 6 days between mile 182 and 206 in the Tombigbee River. Several other vessels and tows of other operators were likewise delayed at this point. Modern high lift locks and dams which provide wide deep pools would allow operators to increase appreciably the size of tows handled.

This company has recently placed into service on the river, two new powerful towboats capable of towing 11 barges with an aggregate tonnage of 6,000 or an increase of 3 barges over the standard tow of 8 barges. Since there have been only comparatively minor increases in water freight rates, the only recourse open to operators today to meet mounting operating costs, is to increase the size of the pay load on each tow. With this thought in mind, we attempted to increase our tows to 11 barges, but our experience in the restricted channels of the river soon led us to return to the 8-barge tow, due to so much loss of time resulting from groundings in the narrow bends and shoals.

In spite of the operating handicaps, the river today is handling more commerce than ever before and we come before you with the earnest request that you authorize a resurvey of the river as we are convinced that such a survey will disclose the urgent need of a modernization program to keep this important waterway in step with the vast amount of development that has taken place in the section of the country which it serves. Since the last survey made during 1927, improvements have been made in the art of waterpower development and it is now entirely possible that a program for the production of power will be found to be practical. With the relationship which exists between power development and flood control, the latter will be automatically taken care of with the installation of power development facilities.

According to standard and accepted accounting practice with regard to depreciation and amortization of capital equipment, all of the locks on this waterway, except the Tuscaloosa lock should have been completely amortized and written off some years ago. Four of the locks are 45 or more years old; six locks 40 or more; and four locks 35 or more years old. (See exhibit E attached.) These structures have long since become obsolete and presently do not provide the efficient capacity needed to accommodate the traffic. These original facilities, however, have forcefully indicated the wisdom of early Congresses in allocating funds for their construction and the rapidly growing commerce which has been experienced during the past several years and the prospect of continued expansion, accentuates the need for modernization to bring this artery of transportation to a peak of efficiency.

We believe that the proposed survey will develop potential tonnage for the waterway that was entirely unheard of in the era when the last survey was made. It is also our belief that this system of rivers has served a very valuable purpose and that unless a program of modernization is shortly reinstated we will continue to be faced with an impending disaster by failure of one or more of the antiquated and obsolete structures. We are sure that the Army engineers have been carrying a very heavy burden to forego such a possibility. In view of the physical

condition and age of some of the dams and locks it seems to be questionable as to how much longer the use of hay bale wire and strings may serve to keep these structures functioning. Without a thorough resurvey, the important facts can hardly be developed.

In spite of the fact that the river, under present conditions offers many handicaps to economical operation, nevertheless, as indicated by the steady increase in tonnage there is definite proof that it has an important attraction to commerce. With much needed improvement and modernization to the stream we anticipate rapid growth in tonnage volume and we hold the conviction that benefits to the territory served, will be widespread and abundant.

The tonnage handled on the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers has grown from 407,245 short tons in 1915, the year the entire system was opened to navigation, to a total of 2,058,504 in 1948. Fluctuations in tonnage handled were comparatively light. Exhibit E containing tonnage record from 1915 to date is attached hereto and submitted as part of this statement. This record was compiled from figures shown in the annual reports of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army. A steady increase was recorded from 1915 to 1942 with the exception of the depression years, 1930, 1931, and 1932. Even during this period, the waterway enjoyed a substantial flow of commerce as may be noted from the exhibit. The river, in 1933, began to regain its depression era losses and this trend continued through 1942. During the period from 1943 to 1946 commerce was adversely affected as a result of the adjustments made during and subsequent to World War II. It is apparent that the traffic on this river system is not subject to violent fluctuations, but provides a sustained large volume of tonnage. The principal commodities transported which constitute more than 90 percent of the total traffic are: iron ore, manganese ore, petroleum products, coal, logs, pulpwood, sand and gravel, sulfur, iron and steel. Tonnage figures for 1949 are not yet available, however, indications are that the 1949 traffic will show an appreciable increase over that for 1948. The increase in tons handled by the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. from 329,779 in 1948 to 422,371 in 1949, or slightly more than 27 percent will substantiate this statement.

The upward trend of traffic on the Warrior-Tombigbee system is reflected in tonnage figures of the Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co. Attached hereto, as a part of this statement is exhibit G showing the tons handled by years from 1929 to date. The consistent increase, year by year, since 1944 clearly indicates the growing importance of the Warrior-Tombigbee system to the continued development of the southeastern and southwestern regions. Tonnage handled in 1947 more than doubled that moved in 1944 and the 1944 figure was almost tripled in 1948. A similar increase was recorded in 1949 when 422,371 tons were handled. Movements and existing commitments thus far in 1950 indicate that we will transport more than 500,000 tons this year. Both the 1948 and 1949 volumes were the largest handled in the history of the company. A substantial part of this tonnage was imported high-grade iron ore which is vitally needed to supplement comparatively low-grade native ores. Its importance is particularly apparent in view of the most urgent need for increased steel production and of the fact that steel is one of the most essential materials, both in time of peace and war.

The Warrior-Tombigbee River system is an important artery for the distribution of bulk petroleum products, the volume of which runs between 200,000 and 300,000 tons per year. This commodity is of great significance to the economy of the areas served by the river system, and based on the increasing public demand, there is every possibility that its transportation by barge will experience a substantial increase. It is essential that such a widely used commodity must have the advantage of modern inland waterway routes.

Quite recently oil has been discovered in south Alabama within a short distance of the river. A new field is now in production and shipments of crude petroleum by barge to a refinery in Tuscaloosa have been in progress for some time. Geological reports indicate that this section of the country is destined to become a leading petroleum producing center. This commodity was not of course in the picture on the occasion of the last survey and the transportation of the greater volume of production of this field by barge both upstream to Tuscaloosa and downstream to the seaport of Mobile is a foregone conclusion.

It should be pointed out that a majority of the commerce transported on this river are bulk commodities which are particularly suited to water transportation. There is in prospect today, the movement of a substantial quantity of coal from the Warrior coal field to Mobile, thence by intracoastal waterway to Houston, Tex., for consumption in Houston's new steel industry. Here is a clear-cut example of recent industrial developments that have taken place in the Gulf coast area which will directly influence expansion of river commerce beyond the estimates given in the last survey made around 1927.

It is interesting to note that in his survey, the district engineer, estimated in 1930 that commerce would increase to 4,545,000 tons by 1950 provided the plan of improvements recommended were carried out by this time. The general plan of improvements recommended included construction of six new locks and the enlargement of the lock chambers and raising of the dams at six existing locks. Of this plan, the only item completed thus far is the construction of one new lock at Tuscaloosa. A study of traffic statistics reveal that as early as 1941 tonnage had risen from 1,581,974 in 1930 to 2,296,562, an increase of 45 percent. This increase was made in spite of the fact that less than 15 percent of the recommended plan of improvement has been completed. Under the circumstances, it is not unreasonable to conclude that had the entire program of modernization been carried out as scheduled, the present traffic on the waterway would far exceed the original estimate of the district engineer.

It is now public knowledge that the production of high-grade iron ores in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota will almost disappear within the next 20 to 25 years. Realizing the seriousness of this situation, the United States Steel Corp., after spending millions of dollars in the exploration of world ore reserves, located vast deposits of high-grade iron ore in Venezuela. Plans are already under way to commence shipment of some 2,000,000 tons annually from this field to the Birmingham district, all of which is scheduled to move through the port of Mobile. The rich Venezuelan ore (over 60-percent iron) will be mixed with native low-grade ores, and on the basis of experiments made by the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. in their blast furnaces in Birmingham, will result in an increased steel production of 15 percent with the existing facilities. Obviously the movement of such a large volume of bulk ore must be done as cheaply as possible in order to make its use economical in Birmingham. This cannot be accomplished with locks built more than 40 years ago whose narrow and obsolete size require multiple lockages of tows, restricts the passage of larger tows that are in use today, and will further restrict the desirable larger units and tows that could be employed with increased movements of huge quantities of bulk commodities. A reduction in the number of dams and the enlargement of lock chambers so as to permit the passing of tows intact will result in lowered transportation cost and assure the movement of this commodity over the river.

The value of the new iron-ore discoveries in Venezuela and its movement by water to the steel mills in Birmingham cannot be overemphasized from the standpoint of national defense as well as peacetime production. Should this country be faced with another war of similar proportions to the last, our ability to produce a war machine capable of defending the country is open to question in view of our present depleted iron-ore reserves. The movement to the mills of a large volume of foreign high-grade iron ore by the use of a modern waterway will supplement our diminishing ore reserves and provide a margin of safety in time of war. We have information that the United States Steel Corp. by 1955 will be shipping upward of 2,000,000 tons of imported iron ore annually to its Birmingham mills. It is urgent that the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers be resumed at the earliest possible date in order that this ore may be transported economically.

Our company has operated on this system of rivers for approximately 22 years. We are fully cognizant of the handicaps and of the impending risk to continuing our operations due to the bad physical condition of the major part of the navigational structures. We have been compelled to assume that this critical situation continues to prevail because of a lack of understanding by the Congress, who alone has the authority to correct the deficiencies. It is principally this thought which suggests to us the matter of resurvey of the facilities. It should be obvious that in no other way can the facts be made known to the proper authorities. With this in mind, the foregoing information is respectfully submitted.

EXHIBIT E.—*Data pertaining to locks and dams on the Warrior-Tombigbee River system*

Lock and dam No.	Miles above Mobile	Type of construction	Inside dimensions of lock chambers	Date of completions	Actual cost of lock and dam
1	111	Concrete	281.9 by 52 feet	1909	$560,290.02
2	182	Timber	286 by 52 feet	1915	560,114.09
3	205	do	286 by 52 feet	1915	609,622.80
4	231	do	285.6 by 52 feet	1908	479,000.00
5	246	do	285.6 by 52 feet	1908	501,000.00
6	267	do	285.6 by 52 feet	1908	443,000.00
7	282	do	284.7 by 52 feet	1903	225,600.00
8	298	do	284.7 by 51.65 feet	1903	212,400.00
9	315	do	284.7 by 52 feet	1902	202,440.00
10 [1]	362	do	286.6 by 52 feet	1895	244,500.00
11 [1]	362	do	286 by 52 feet	1895	170,000.00
12 [1]	363	do	286.2 by 52 feet	1895	160,500.00
13	370	do	285.5 by 52 feet	1905	203,700.00
14	373	Concrete	282.1 by 52 feet	1910	414,714.89
15	380	do	282.1 by 52 feet	1910	430,233.87
16	387	do	285.5 by 52 feet	1915	520,853.68
17	388	do	285.5 by 52 feet	1915	[2] 3,174,070.00

[1] Original locks 10, 11, and 12 were replaced by a new lock 10 which was constructed in 1939. Size of the new lock 10 is 95 by 460 feet, with a lift of 30 feet. Cost of the new lock 10 was $4,450,873.50.
[2] Estimated.

EXHIBIT F.—*Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala.—Comparative statement of traffic*

Year:	Total tons
1915	407,245
1916	466,812
1917	580,778
1918	671,405
1919	601,068
1920	599,522
1921	784,967
1922	973,419
1923	954,181
1924	1,105,260
1925	1,383,712
1926	1,292,098
1927	1,467,515
1928	1,758,358
1929	1,938,773
1930	1,581,947
1931	1,692,647
1932	958,337
1933	1,122,823
1934	1,067,442
1935	1,131,366
1936	1,432,293
1937	1,825,568
1938	1,851,972
1939	1,928,221
1940	1,890,399
1941	2,296,562
1942	2,187,277
1943	1,653,157
1944	1,440,432
1945	1,492,496
1946	1,371,841
1947	1,848,417
1948	2,058,504

EXHIBIT G.—*Tonnage record*

Year:	
1929	311,337
1930	262,947
1931	252,150
1932	101,865
1933	150,433
1934	119,360
1935	146,360
1936	237,824
1937	305,438
1938	262,417
1939	284,332
1940	278,186
1941	213,088
1942	168,570
1943	163,255
1944	124,812
1945	158,192
1946	156,388
1947	257,914
1948	329,779
1949	422,371
1950 (estimated)	500,000

Recommendations of the President on Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, although the State of California is one of the largest and most critical areas of unemployment in the country, the specter of unemployment is of national concern. Nearly a year ago, shortly after the President submitted his midyear economic report, on July 12, 1949, I introduced a bill to strengthen the Federal unemployment insurance system by establishing minimum benefit standards for all parts of the country and by broadening coverage.

My bill would have established a Federal reinsurance fund for greater protection of those States threatened with a prolonged period of substantial unemployment.

I am fully convinced that the great natural resources of the West will enable us fully and productively to employ the talents of the large increase in population since the beginning of the war. During the period of adjustment while new enterprises are being established and getting into large-scale production, however, a more adequate system of unemployment insurance is essential. I am gratified that the President has gone beyond the proposals contained in my bill, and I shall do everything that I can to obtain early consideration of his recommendations by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include a letter recently published in the New York Times, which letter was signed by persons prominent in the field of education and public service, on the subject of Federal aid to schools.

Since the views expressed by these prominent figures coincide with my own and because these views so clearly present what to me is the major premise upon which I think Congress ought to consider this issue, I am making this article available to those who hold views on this same basic principle. To me, I feel any action by Congress that includes any other factors will be a mistake that will do permanent and lasting harm to the cause of education as well as democracy.

Those signing this letter are taking an active part in the affairs of the committee for Federal aid to public schools.

The letter follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Foremost among the unfinished business of the Eighty-first Congress is the enactment of a bill providing Federal aid to public education. Few can doubt the need for Federal assistance to the States to meet the present educational crisis. In the wealthiest Nation in the world vast numbers of children receive no elementary education at all or at best a seriously substandard education. In the Second World War 12 percent of the men found unfit for service were rejected solely for educational deficiencies. The United States Census Bureau estimates that for the year 1947 about 4,000,000 children between 5 and 17 attended no school at all. More than 10 percent of teachers in public schools are serving under emergency or substandard certificates.

We believe that a bill for Federal aid to education which can unite the forward-looking forces and thus insure its enactment must possess the following minimum essentials:

EXPENDITURES CONTRASTED

1. Basically it must be an equalization measure. The educational situation is far more critical in some sections of the country than in others, since the country's wealth is unequally distributed among the States. Income per capita in the United States ranges from $659 in Mississippi to $1,781 in New York (1947 averages), and this geographic maldistribution of wealth and income manifests itself in a tragic maldistribution of educational opportunity. During the school year of 1944–45, New Jersey expended $198.33 for each child in its public schools, while Mississippi spent no more than $44.80. The amount spent for each child in New York was $194.47, while in Arkansas it was only $60.25. The average teacher's salary in New York was $2,783, while in Arkansas it was only $918. That this discrepancy is not caused by a greater concern for education in New York than in Arkansas is proved by the fact that Arkansas spent a greater percentage of its income for its schools than did New York. Inequality of educational opportunity is the result of economic inequality, not of inequality of will.

Hence, while a nominal allocation may be made to every State, the bulk of the appropriation must be distributed among the States in accordance with need.

2. The bill must contain adequate safeguards against discriminatory treatment of Negro and other minority groups. According to the United States Office of Education, States having segregated school systems expend an average of almost twice as much for the education of a white child as for a Negro child. The existence of racially segregated schools is itself a blot upon the American public school system which must in time be eliminated. Any measure which forward-looking forces can support must provide effective means to prevent discriminatory application of Federal funds. Such discrimination is inequitable and unconstitutional.

3. It should be an educational measure dealing only with educational services. Federal aid for health and other necessary welfare services must be met in legislation apart from a law to equalize educational opportunities.

RECIPIENTS OF BENEFITS

4. The educational benefits of a Federal aid bill must be limited to tax-supported and publicly controlled educational institutions, whether or not State constitutions or laws permit use of State funds for sectarian educational institutions.

5. The bill must contain adequate safeguards to prevent violation of these principles. Provision must be made for judicial review of its administration so as to insure against unlawful diversion of Federal funds for sectarian purposes.

A bill containing the essential elements outlined in this letter could, we are convinced, unite the forward-looking forces of our country in a determined and successful campaign to equalize educational opportunities while maintaining the integrity of our nonsectarian public-school system.

John L. Childs, John Dewey, Frederick May Eliot, Harry Emerson Fosdick, John Haynes Holmes, Bryn J. Hovde, Alvin Johnson, Horace M. Kallen, Frank E. Karelsen, Jr., William H. Kilpatrick, Irving Miller, Jerome Nathanson, John K. Norton, G. Bromley Oxnam, Leo Pfeffer, Harold Taylor, V. T. Thayer.

NEW YORK, *January 4, 1950.*

Witch Hunting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial in the Long Beach Independent about Senator McCARTHY and communism. The Long Beach Independent is a daily newspaper printed in my home city of Long Beach, Calif. I have the pleasure of calling to your attention an editorial therein, under date of Friday, March 31, 1950, as it specifically mentions the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the President, and the State Department. Too, I feel it especially appropriate that you have the benefit of reading it. It described the charges of the Senator as "his wild charges of Communists in the State Department." The editor says:

We have no use for the McCarthy tactics. The Republican Party leaders who fail to speak out against them are doing themselves a great injustice.

We Members of Congress should take note of the editor's observations when he says:

There is danger of allowing irresponsible Senators to go through a man's entire life records.

Mr. Speaker, the editor's comment just quoted by me, causes me to remark that on February 13, 1950, in this House of Representatives, I again vigorously spoke out to the end that we not be irresponsible as Members of Congress in what we say on the floor of the House.

I firmly agree with the editor when he says, "We need vigilance" and "we must not have 'witch hunts' destroying reputations over rumors for hungry politicians" and that "we want common sense and a sense of decency that is lacking at present."

At the time I said:

This, under the circumstances of the present world situation, does clearly add to confusion; to fear; to suspicion; to ill will; to national and even international misunderstanding as to what the facts really are. For, I say to my colleagues, that the distinguished gentleman uttered his intemperate words without basis in law or fact to substantiate his untimely and unwarranted remarks. And so it goes.

Granting that we have congressional immunity in what we say; granting that we are free to say what we wish on the floor of this Congress as Members of Congress without fear of libel or slander, this does not justify us in being any less diligent in sticking to the facts and the law and the truth than we would have our own constituents be in our own respective congressional districts; does it? Why should we take liberties on the floor of this House in speaking of any matter when it is only sounds and rumor and gossip and "political dishwater"? Yes, even though most of us are candidates for reelection, even though the two-party system thrives and lives, partially, at least, on account of the desire of those in the majority to stay in the majority, and those in the minority party to become the majority party, this does not justify members of either party in relating as facts or truth anything which is known to them to not yet be established as facts or as the truth.

Gentlemen of this House, let us by our daily words and conduct add to the sum total of our privilege and obligation which we especially have to strengthen the sinews of our American way of life. As democracy depends on an intelligent and well-informed participating electorate at the grass roots, so the American electorate depends upon us, as Members of Congress, both the House and the Senate, to be consciously temperate, truthful, accurate, and of careful and considerate speech in everything we say.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this editorial in one of my home city newspapers, is very timely. I commend your reading it:

WITCH HUNTING

Senator McCARTHY with his wild charges of Communists in the State Department is not helping the chances of Congressman NIXON who is running for the Senate from California. NIXON did a wonderful job when Alger Hiss was brought to justice. It was NIXON and the un-American Activities Committee who forced the trial of Hiss over the apathy or opposition of the President and the State Department. It was the President who referred to the case as a "red herring."

It was hoped that the spectacular "Pumpkin Papers" and Judith Coplon conviction would carry NIXON along on a popular wave of Americanism versus Communism. Now the burlesque ballyhoo of Senator McCARTHY with his unproven smears of many people has made the people cautious. The cry of Communist against a hundred or more mythical public employees has dulled the people's appetite.

We have no use for the McCarthy tactics. The Republican Party leaders who fail to speak out against them are doing themselves a great injustice. The people are now not in sympathy with the demand for the loyalty files. They feel confidential information concerning individuals could not be entrusted to men like McCARTHY. The great disservice McCARTHY has done his cause is that the people now turn to the other extreme. They may allow the President to suppress much information the people should be given.

TLere is danger of allowing irresponsible Senators to go through a man's entire life records. There are few of us who do not have a skeleton hidden somewhere in our closet. At some time in the life of most of us we have done something we would suffer greatly from if it were later disclosed. We may have corrected our fault, and no one was ever hurt, but to publicize it at this late day would cause great suffering to ourselves and others who are innocent. In other words, such information would be valuable to a blackmailer or an irresponsible Senator, with his immunity from libel damages.

In this city are men who 25 years ago were prominent members of the local Ku Klux Klan. These men would pay dearly today to keep that from being published. They joined with a lot of other fellows in what seemed to them a good cause. They soon became thoroughly disgusted and quit. They and their families would be sick at heart if their friends of today knew of what they now consider their gullibility.

The same situation is undoubtedly true of many people who have been members of the Communist Party. We have many known examples of men who have resigned and turned against all its teaching. One of the heroes, in our estimation, is Whittaker Chambers. He has lost his job and placed his life in jeopardy to repay the debt he owes for his membership.

We need vigilance and an uncompromising policy against Communists in public employment. There are still disloyal people working in vital spots. But we must not have witch hunts destroying reputations over rumors and for publicity-hungry politicians. The Republican Party has a lot to live down because of its McCARTHY's, just as the Democrats do their Huey Long's, Bilbo's, and Talmadge's. We want no tolerance toward Communists. But we want common sense and a sense of decency that is lacking at present. Candidate NIXON might well speak out against the irresponsibility of McCARTHY if he hopes to hold the interest of his listeners when he talks of un-American activities.—L. A. C.

Members of Congress and Their Families Will Visit New York City April 28, 29, and 30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the annual congressional visit to New York City will take place Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, April 28, 29, and 30.

For the information of those interested I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my letter to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1950.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is my pleasure to inform you that the Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, has again invited Members of Congress and their families to visit New York City, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, April 28, 29, and 30, 1950.

The mayor has arranged a most interesting schedule of events which will include a sightseeing tour of New York, boat trip around Long Island Sound, Hell Gate Rapids, and New York Harbor, Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island, Maritime Academy at Kings Point, Coney Island, Jones Beach, United Nations at Lake Success, Radio City and Rockefeller Center, International Airport, the line-up at metropolitan police headquarters, tickets for radio and television stage shows, a personal welcome to the city by Mayor O'Dwyer at New York City Hall.

The trip from Washington to New York and return will be made by special train via the Pennsylvania Railroad, leaving Washington at 12:55 p. m. Friday, April 28, returning leave New York 5:25 p. m., eastern daylight-saving time (note daylight time Sunday), arriving in Washington 9:25 p. m., eastern daylight-saving time. Our headquarters in New York will be the Hotel New Yorker.

The total cost of this trip will be $30 per person. It will include your round-trip railroad ticket, two nights at the New Yorker Hotel, all meals, baggage transfers, tips, and entertainment.

The mayor of the city of New York has designated Hon. EMANUEL CELLER as chairman of the reception committee while the group is in New York City, and myself as chairman of the committee on arrangements for the congressional group.

In view of the great expense to be incurred by the Department of Commerce of New York City and the time required for arrangements it shall be appreciated if you will promptly indicate your interest by returning

the enclosed card or calling my office, extension 366.

Those of you who made the trip with us last year will never forget the royal welcome extended to our party.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Chairman, Committee on Arrangements.

What Is Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most promising signs for the future well-being of our Republic is the heightened appreciation among the young people of the land for the true significance of Americanism. Nowhere is this better demonstrated than in the essay contests being conducted currently among high-school students under the sponsorship of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

I have read with great interest the first prize essay in the contest conducted in Lawrence County, one of the 11 counties in the Twenty-third Illinois District which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. The winning essay was chosen as the best among 123 entered in the competition, and as an indication of growing interest it should be pointed out that a year ago, in similar contest, only 31 students competed.

The winning essay was written by Miss Noretta Koertge, a junior in Bridgeport Township High School. Active in student affairs, she is the feature editor of the Portonian, Bridgeport High School's newspaper, as well as a member of the school band and a consistent honor student. Her grasp of the deep meaning of Americanism reflects great credit not only on herself but on the high caliber of the school in which she is a student. Under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am including the text of her prize-winning essay:

WHAT IS AMERICANISM?

(By Noretta Koertge)

If we ask ourselves, "What is Americanism?" our simple reply is, "Americanism is the belief in American ideals and the American way of life." But that is not very complete. What are these ideals? Are they absolute and unchanging? Laws passed now to promote the general welfare would have been considered destructive of individual liberty in the early days of our country. The old policy of America for Americans and hands off Europe is quite different from the Marshall plan. The influence that our huge Government wields over the world and the individual is rapidly increasing, making this an opportune time to learn more of our great American ideals that do not change although the method of expressing and attaining them does change as our civilization becomes more complex. Every new and untried plan for human betterment should receive serious thought. We should ask ourselves, "Will this plan actually work? Will it destroy our American heritage of freedom?"

We believe in the dignity of man. We believe that everyone should have an opportunity for training or education, have the right to choose his own profession, and to work where he desires. The situation in Britain at the present time where workers are forbidden to change jobs seems repulsive to us. We believe in individual initiative. Ever since the time of Horace Greely, who said, "Go west, young man," American youth have gone wherever a new frontier of opportunity is found. Our national economy is built on the success of individuals. The American efficiency that is world known is a result of competition between energetic individuals. Our standard of living is the highest in the world. This shows that democracy is not an impractical ideal but is much more successful in the actual working than any form of statism, such as communism or socialism.

We believe in political liberty for the individual. Ever since the days of Magna Carta English speaking people have fought for equality before the law, freedom of speech, the privilege of invoking habeas corpus, self-taxation, protection against unlawful seizure of person or property, and many other rights. Our history rings with statements like, "No taxation without representation," and "A man's house is his castle." Today, when freedom of speech is extinct in many countries, we should be especially thankful for our free press and radio. We should be grateful for our right of assembly also. Some freedoms are curtailed in wartime but with the consent of the people, and not a permanent condition as in a police state.

We believe in religious liberty. Everyone may worship as he pleases, or not worship if he so desires. However, the fact that all sessions of Congress are opened with prayer for guidance shows that we are a godly Nation. Our recognition of the importance of the individual is akin to Christ's interest in every single soul. An example of this is the story of an aircraft carrier in the last war. Although the ship was in dangerous waters, it turned on its lights making it a perfect target, so that a few airplanes might land. This would never have happened in an atheistic state.

What is Americanism? As a midtwentieth century "teenager" basing my reply on a study of history, current events, and actual experience, it seems that it is belief in every individual being developed by education and training to live a happy, useful life so that he can work where he feels opportunity is greatest, under a democratic form of government that protects his life, civic liberty, and religious freedom.

Today's youth can face the challenge that the history of America offers. Let America still be the land of opportunity—that is security enough. Any promise of security that is not based on the energy and efforts of individuals seems to be an illusionary pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow. I believe in Americanism, the American way of life.

The Kerr Bill Is of Democratic Paternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 4, 1950, the three Republican Members from Connecticut addressed to the President a statement requesting that he veto the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill. Cognizant of our responsibilities to the general public, Representatives SADLAK and LODGE and I are tremendously concerned over the effect this legislation will have if signed into law. President Truman has consistently assailed special interests without identifying those groups. It can be specifically charged that failure to veto this measure will be recognized as complete capitulation by the President and the Democratic Party to special interests.

The people of New England will not endorse the action of this Congress in passing the Kerr bill. They will realize that it was motivated by a greedy group of producers seeking carte blanche to gouge the consumer. The bill was pushed through Congress by Democratic leaders to pay off past political debts, and to assure that financial support will be forthcoming in the future. This baby is on the Democratic doorstep, and that party cannot deny paternity.

The Waterbury (Conn.) Republican and American, in editorials on April 4, point out the fact that the public is the scapegoat in this matter. The letter requesting Presidential veto is also inserted.

The matters follow:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of April 4, 1950]

VETO THE KERR BILL

To Connecticut and to other New England States it is particularly important that President Truman veto the legislation which exempts the so-called independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation.

If New England is to remain a good location for industries, one of the advantages the section must be able to offer is a reliable supply of low-cost fuel.

What with rising transport costs, mine strikes, and the other numerous factors which make our usual fuels more expensive and their supply less certain, natural gas has looked like a better and better possibility.

But just as New England utilities concerns were beginning seriously to consider arrangements and contracts for the distribution of natural gas piped here from oil fields in Texas and Oklahoma, the big oil companies which own the sources of natural gas turned tremendous pressure on Congress and on the administration to make natural gas one natural resource that isn't regarded as a public utility by the Government.

In the Eightieth Congress an attempt to exempt nearly all of the natural gas industry from any Federal regulation over prices and practices was defeated by a narrow margin. The Fair Deal used its successful fight against this legislation as campaign material in the 1948 Presidential battle.

The natural-gas interests were back again in the Eighty-first Congress, however, and succeeded in lining up a number of Dixiecrats and such Republicans as Senators WHERRY, CAPEHART, HICKENLOOPER, and MCCARTHY to put through another version in the Kerr bill. This, although it doesn't exempt quite all of the industry from the kind of regulation which would enable the Government to keep prices from becoming extortionate, is almost as bad a measure as the one that was defeated in the Eightieth Congress.

Senator DOUGLAS, one of the leaders of the opposition to the Kerr bill when it was in the Senate this year, has estimated that unless the President vetoes it the consumers of natural gas will pay up to half a billion dollars more a year in fuel charges.

Connecticut's Senators and Representatives were unanimous in their opposition to the Kerr legislation, and rightly so. They

were thus allied with most other legislators from New England and the progressive-minded legislators from all parts of the country. It was a misfortune that by the slenderest of majorities this sell-out to greedy interests and their lobbyists was passed in both Houses.

President Truman, with the utmost of justification, can veto the Kerr bill. He should do so without hesitation.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American of April 4, 1950]

RIDDLE FOR TRUMAN

Staunch loyalty to his friends has been one of President Truman's outstanding traits. He has shown it, sometimes, even toward friends who evidently didn't deserve it. There was Edwin S. Pauley, for instance. There was Gen. Harry H. Vaughan.

Maybe, now, Senator ROBERT S. KERR is going to fit into the same category. He has been a good friend to the President. He supported Mr. Truman 2 years ago, in his candidacy for nomination to succeed himself in the White House, when many prominent Democrats were opposing it. He is supposed to have contributed liberally to the Democratic Party's national campaign fund.

In the present session of Congress, Senator KERR has sponsored a measure to exempt so-called independent producers of natural gas from control by the Federal Power Commission. Both Chambers have approved it. Mr. Truman accordingly has to decide whether to let it go or to veto it. It he turns it down, his good friend Senator KERR surely is going to be chagrined.

Perhaps it may bother Mr. Truman particularly to have in mind that if he signs this bill he will be putting himself on the same side with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. Senator TAFT spoke for it and voted for it. In general, he has been the President's severest critic.

There is still another point about the bill that may worry Mr. Truman. He may foresee that by signing it he would be handing his Republican opponents a means of annoying him in the congressional election campaign this year. In 1948 he condemned Republican leaders of the Eightieth Congress for sponsoring the Moore-Rizley bill. It would have exempted almost all of the natural-gas industry from Federal control. It failed by a small margin. The Kerr bill would exempt about 85 percent of the industry, including 34 of the biggest producers.

With the aid of advice from expert legal technicians, Mr. Truman might be able to figure out a way to reconcile opposition to the Moore-Rizley bill, Republican, with assent to the Kerr bill, Democratic. But it would be a difficult stunt. Many people certainly would be unable to see through it. They would be haunted by a deep suspicion that the President was faking.

APRIL 4, 1950.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This request is addressed to you on behalf of the American public generally, and the citizens of Connecticut specifically. The House of Representatives, on Friday, March 31, endorsed prior Senate action with reference to the Natural Gas Act by passage of H. R. 1758. The fate of this legislation and the responsibility for its effects rests with you.

It is the sincere desire of this group that you exercise your Presidential prerogative by vetoing this measure, which we believe not to be in the public interest.

The bill as enacted leaves natural gas without the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission until such time as it enters interstate commerce. A very plausible case has been presented by proponents to the effect that such regulation would be an infringement upon the rights of producers engaged in free enterprise. Nothing could be further from the truth, as natural gas sold to consumers will be in the nature of a virtual monopoly, and should be treated as such.

We unanimously concur in the opinion that natural gas be made available in Connecticut and throughout New England. Should H. R. 1758 be enacted into law, the consuming public would be completely unprotected as to the ultimate cost. It is obvious that a commodity without regulation at the source cannot be successfully regulated in transit or at its end use. No honest analogy can be drawn with other fuels—as coal and oil sell in competitive markets subject to public demand and public choice. Should H. R. 1758 become law, the general public will be at the mercy of the producers, as a single entity will control the distribution of natural gas from the point of the original arms-length sale.

New England is presently facing economic hardship through loss of industries to areas where fuel is available at lower cost. Should natural gas be made available to New England users in the immediate future, and this step is contemplated, prices of this fuel, if unregulated, would be so high as to severely limit its potential value. The danger of this course to our Nation is of serious consequence.

For the reasons stated, we respectfully request that you, as the President of the United States, seriously consider the harmful effects of this legislation, and exercise the power of veto to protect the public from the unregulated sale of natural gas.

Very respectfully yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
ANTONI N. SADLAK,
JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
Members of Congress.

Industrial Expansion in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the State of California and the entire Pacific coast are now experiencing a tremendous expansion of population and of industrial activity. The war and postwar years have brought an influx of new permanent residents, the exact extent of which can only be estimated at present, but which the census now being taken will definitely determine. These people have been attracted to California and the coast by the outstanding natural advantages of climate and scenic beauty, and by the unrivaled opportunities for economic and social development which that region enjoys. However, in order to support the presently swollen population and the future growth which seems inevitable, it is absolutely necessary that the Pacific coast be freed of economic fetters which now restrict the natural industrial expansion which should and must accompany an increased population. I wish to call the attention of this House to a news article recently published in a San Francisco newspaper which high lights one of the most noxious conditions now hampering the development of west-coast industries. I refer to the viciously inequitable system of freight rates now existing, which stifles the flow of goods from West to East and prevents freely competitive trade by Californa and west-coast industries with eastern markets. This system of inequities is a relic of our economic past which perpetuates freight differentials now completely anachronistic in the light of present transportation facilities and economic conditions, and must be revised in order that natural industrial growth may be uninhibited.

The news article brings out a further situation which bears investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. I speak now of practices indulged in by eastern manufacturers endeavoring to capitalize on the justly deserved reputation of the California clothing industry for quality and style of product. Labeling of New York products as "Styled in California" and inclusion of the designation "California" or "Hollywood" in the names of New York manufacturing concerns is surely the type of misrepresentation and misbranding which that body was set up to prevent and which it has strongly condemned in the past.

I ask that the news article to which I have referred be printed in full in the RECORD and that immediate consideration be given to methods of correcting these abusive situations. For that purpose I now submit the article:

"MADE IN CALIFORNIA" LABEL STOLEN BY NEW YORK MANUFACTURERS

SACRAMENTO.—New York garment makers have appropriated the "Made in California" label, Governor Warren was informed yesterday.

He was also told that high freight rates threaten further expansion of the clothing industry in California.

The Governor met for 3 hours with representatives of California garment makers and then promised:

"You have an ally in me as far as freight rates are concerned. I want to help you and I will help you."

Adolph Schuman, San Francisco, told the Governor that he can ship woolen fabric from New York to London to San Francisco and save one-third over the New York to California rate.

"Our transportation rates are a relic of the Golden West days," held Charles Fleischman, San Francisco. Asked Dan Gertsman, Los Angeles: "Why can't we ship goods east at least on an equitable basis?"

The accusation against the New Yorkers came from Dorothy Handelman, Los Angeles. She said New York garment factory racks are full of items labeled "Styled in California." She urged protection of the "Made in California" label to assure buyers they are getting California design, California style, California color, and California comfort.

Mathew K. de la Vallade, Los Angeles, said he once looked into a New York telephone directory and found 3½ columns of clothing firms with names beginning with "California" or "Hollywood."

This recommendation on shipping was given the Governor by Fleischman:

"California is now the second State and unless California, politically, throws its weight around on the freight rates nothing is going to happen."

Henry Hyman, Los Angeles, told of his shipping problem. He said he has been mailing brassieres east by parcel post. Stamps, he found, cost less than freight rates. But now, complained Hyman, there is a bill before Congress limiting the size of packages which can be mailed.

Unions Are Not Monopolies—Play Important Role in Maintaining Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the misinformation currently being spread about labor unions, their power and their practices, I want to bring to your attention a recent lecture delivered at Wayne University at Detroit, February 2, 1950, by Edwin E. Witte, the distinguished chairman of the department of economics at the University of Wisconsin.

Titled "The Role of Unions in Contemporary Society," it is an effective and detailed refutation of those who claim unions have monopolistic power in our society. It would be well if more Members of the House understood what Professor Witte says in his closing statement:

Free trade-unions can exist only where there is a democratic government and, vice versa, I believe, the survival of democratic government, under present-day conditions, is dependent upon the continuance of a strong trade-union movement.

The matter follows:

ROLE OF UNIONS IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY—THEY ARE NOT MONOPOLIES

That unions have attained a very important position in the United States of today is known to everyone. On occasions people who do not like unions still talk about the small percentage of all workers who are members of unions. Some 62,000,000 Americans are in the labor force and only 15,000,000 are in labor unions. But much more frequently, nowadays, these people who do not like unions talk, alarmingly, about the monopolistic power of the unions. Only this week, General Counsel Denham of the National Labor Relations Board painted the teamsters' union as having such vast power that it could bring our entire economy to a standstill within a few days through a Nation-wide strike.

Quite a few academic writers on industrial relations have expressed similar views. A recent book, Unions and Capitalism, by Charles E. Lindbloom, a Yale University economist of theoretical bent, has attracted wide attention, not only in academic but also in nonacademic circles. In this book, Lindbloom is greatly worried about the growing monopolistic power of the unions. "Unionism," as he sees it, "is destroying the competitive price system" and leads to the "systematic disorganization of markets and persistent undercutting of managerial authority." Unions are undermining capitalism and are rapidly converting our entire economy into a syndicalist society. In less alarmist tones, one of the foremost of American economists, Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard, has long been talking about a laboristic society, which, he thinks, the United States has now become.

Quite naturally, these interpretations of the role of unions in our contemporary society by economists of unquestioned repute and objectivity have eagerly been seized upon by people who would like to see the unions cut down to size, if not destroyed. In all the vast propaganda now being carried on against the unions, their alleged monopolistic position and enormous power is stressed. At the same time, however, there often creeps into this propaganda the completely inconsistent claim that the unions, after all, have the support only of a small minority of the workers.

NO MONOPOLY CONTROL

As I see the position of the unions in the contemporary United States, neither of these contradictory claims is supported by the facts. The American unions have, indeed, made great progress and have attained a degree of strength which no one thought possible less than two decades ago. They do not have, however, monopolistic control of wages or other conditions of employment, to say nothing about production, prices, or profits. They do not control Government and, acting alone, have little prospect of gaining such control in the forseeable future. Unionism is not a single centrally controlled movement, but is split into two major federations, plus numerous unaffiliated unions. The federations are constituted of several hundred international unions, which are themselves composed of more than 50,000 local unions. In dealing with employers and in substantially everything else, the unions of this country never act as a unit. Nearly everywhere, the organized workers, including their families, are only a minority in the population, and even their leaders are socially unacceptable in the so-called best circles. Our society is "laboristic" only in the sense that unionism has made great gains and is beginning to challenge the dominance of our great corporations. But they have neither monopoly control over industry nor the main say in public affairs in the contemporary United States.

Unionism in this country is almost as old as is the Nation. There were strikes and short-lived unions in the last years of the eighteenth century. The first city centrals were organized in the 1820's, and at that time also the first independent labor party was launched. The first national federation of unions was organized in the 1830's; the first of the still existing international unions, the typographical union, early in the 1850's. We now have some local unions which have had a continuous history of more than 100 years. By the time of the Civil War we had a truly national labor movement, with some unions in all or nearly all Northern States. By the 1880's we had a much greater labor movement centering in the Knights of Labor. In the second half of that decade the Knights were challenged by the newly organized American Federation of Labor, which soon replaced them as the central organization in the labor movement. Thereafter unionism had ups and downs, periods of increasing and decreasing membership. But at least since the 1880's unionism has always been of real importance in our American society.

The great growth of unionism in this country, however, has occurred during the last 15 years. At the beginning of the New Deal period unionism was at a low point, after a continuous decline in membership during the prosperous twenties. The total union membership was only 3,000,000, contrasted with over 5,000,000 in 1920. Even at this low point, the building trades and the printing and garment industries, and some skilled occupations, were reasonably well organized. But in the great mass-production industries the unions were almost nonexistent. Much of American industry was militantly antiunion and was practically unrestrained in the methods it could use to keep out the unions.

NEW DEAL HELPED

The depression made the American workers more receptive to unionism and the New Deal brought a political climate favorable to its growth. Law restricted the employers in the methods they might employ to keep out and destroy unionism and made it their legal duty to bargain collectively with unions representing a majority of their employees. While Government never directly aided the organization of workers, as it has long aided the formation of cooperatives among farmers, it looked with favor upon unionism and encouraged collective bargaining.

Under these favorable conditions, but primarily because there was a real need for unionism, as well as aggressive leadership, the unions grew in membership and power. This growth started in 1933 but made real headway in the mass production industries only after the organization of the CIO in 1936 and the decisions of the United States in 1937 upholding and giving broad application to the Wagner Act. From under 3,000,000 members in 1933, union membership increased to 7,400,000 in 1937 and 8,500,000 in 1940. In the last years of the thirties, the unions won recognition and their first contracts from many of our greatest corporations. Gains in union membership continued at a rapid pace during the war years, reaching a peak of 13,750,000 in 1944, despite the fact that 3,000,000 union members were in our armed forces. In the period of great labor troubles immediately following the war, the unions made some further, although smaller, advances. The Taft-Hartley Act passed by Congress in 1947, further slowed union growth in a period of increasing employment, but the unions at least held their own. It is probable that there has been some decline in total union membership during the last year of decreasing total employment. Probably the 15,000,000 figure usually given for the present total union membership in this country is an overstatement, if only dues-paying members in good standing are counted, but an underestimate of the total number of Americans who regard themselves as union members. The number of workers employed in establishments in which conditions of employment are, in part, governed by collective bargaining agreements is slightly larger. There are quite a few union members in industries and plants where agreements are not sought or in which the unions have not gained recognition. These are somewhat more than offset by nonunion workers included within the bargaining units in which there are union agreements. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that at the end of 1946 there were 14,800,000 workers in this country working under collective bargaining agreements, compared with 13,800,000 union members. Since then there have been no official estimates of either union membership or the number of workers under collective bargaining agreements, but both totals probably, are now somewhat greater, although not very much.

The growth of unionism in the last two decades has been very great in absolute numbers and still greater percentagewise. There has been a fivefold growth in union membership since 1933 and more than a 75-percent increase in the last decade. The increase in the number of workers covered by collective-bargaining agreements has been even greater.

FIFTEEN MILLION UNION MEMBERS

The total present labor force of this country is above 62,000,000. As there are only 15,000,000 union members, the statement is often made that the organized labor movement represents less than one-fourth of the country's workers. But the total for the labor force includes the noncorporate employers, the farmers, the urban self-employed, and even the men and women in the armed forces, as well as all employees. The employees include the managers and other executives and supervisors in our corporate enterprises, all clerical and white-collar workers, as well as the production employees. While there are above 62,000,000 persons in the labor force of the United States, only around 40,000,000 are workers in employments in which there is any appreciable organization. But even so the organized workers constitute less than 40 percent of all

the workers in such employments and less than one-third of all employees, exclusive of executives and supervisors.

These totals obscure much higher percentages of organization in many major industries. In all manufacturing industries combined an estimated 70 percent of the production workers are employed under collective-bargaining agreements. This percentage is even higher in mining, construction, and transportation, but is less than 60 percent in public utilites, less than 40 percent in service industries, and less than 20 percent in trade, finance, Government, and agriculture. In particular industries and occupations within these broad classifications there are higher percentages of union organization, but there are few industries or classes of workers in which there is approximately 100 percent of union organization. This may be true of such small employments as photoengravers, pattern makers, window-glass cutters, and a few others, but even in coal mining there is today a considerable volume of nonunion production and a not negligible rival union which is working while the United Mine Workers are on strike.

The alarmist outcries about the monopolistic position which unions have attained seem least warranted when comparison is made between the strength of our unions and that of our great corporations. In many respects the labor union is the counterpart of the corporation. Both are associations, with an entity and existence distinct from that of their members.

There are something like 500,000 active corporations in this country—10 times the number of our labor unions. Collectively, they do two-thirds of the business of all kinds in the United States of today. In manufacturing they have well in excess of 95 percent of the total production and even higher percentages in the finance, public utility, and transportation fields.

The great majority of the corporations differ from individual and partnership enterprises only in having a corporate existence district from their members and limited liability for their owners. They are individually or family owned and do not represent large aggregations of economic power and resources.

CORPORATION WEALTH, POWER

While corporations of this sort greatly outnumber the large corporations, the latter have vastly greater wealth and power than all the small corporations combined. The TNEC investigation on the eve of World War II disclosed that the 780 corporations—each of which owned assets of $50,000,000 or more—represented but two-tenths of all corporations but owned 52 percent of the total assets of all corporations. Thirty corporations had assets of more than $1,000,000,000 each. The two largest of these immense corporations each had assets greater than the combined wealth of all the people in 38 of the 48 States of the Union. Since this report was made, 10 years ago, moreover, the great corporations have grown immensely and almost certainly control a greater percentage of the production and wealth of the Nation.

In contrast with the great wealth of the large corporations, the resources of the labor unions of today are but puny. A recent study of the financial resources of 50 international unions, whose combined membership was nearly 12,000,000—four-fifths of the entire union membership of the country—reported their total net worth to be $339,000,000, including all their insurance funds. Only one union, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, had assets of as much as $50,000,000, while, already 10 years ago, as has been noted, 780 corporations had assets of above this amount. Only 28 of the international unions had a net worth of as much as $1,000,000. The resources of each of the two great labor federations, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations only slightly exceed this figure of $1,000,000. No similar study has been made of local union funds and only estimates are available regarding the total resources of all our unions. A very recent estimate by Dr. Alexander S. Lipsett, of Floyd L. Carlisle, Inc., public relations consultants for business organizations, is that all our unions at all levels today have total assets of between three and four billion dollars—a figure exceeded by each of more than a half dozen of our large corporations.

In other respects also, the great corporations are much more powerful than our largest unions or all unions combined. In many large corporations the stockholders outnumber the employees, which is significant because these corporations get almost unanimous support from their stockholders when they get into labor difficulties. The great corporations also have far more extensive propaganda facilities and generally get much more favorable publicity through regular news channels. Corporation managers and executives are the best paid of all people in our present-day society. They are socially acceptable everywhere and command much attention whenever they express their views on any subject. In contrast, our labor leaders are outcasts in social circles, and are suspect by a large part of the general public.

LABOR IN POLITICS

Much alarm has been expressed about the growing political consciousness of labor. But labor people seldom are elected to top offices anywhere in the United States. Probably, no other large element in our country is proportionately more under-represented among our office holders than are the production workers in industry. In this connection it is important to bear in mind that in nearly all States, the production workers and their families constitute only a minority of the population and the organized workers are only a minority of all production workers. Moreover, seldom, if ever, have all union men voted together. If labor is to succeed politically, it must get strong support from other groups. Certain it is that it is still far from dominating the political scene or our Government on any level.

What all this comes to is that the United States is today far more of a managerial than a laboristic society. Industry is our main source of income and managers run industry, or at least large industry. A majority of our great corporations are management controlled, in that, normally the management selects the directors. Managers are very much the leaders in our society and, as such, have great influence upon all our institutions.

To some degree, unionism represents a challenge to absolutism on the part of management. When the union enters, the management ceases to have a completely free hand in many matters affecting conditions of employment. What these are varies from union to union and from time to time. Speaking generally, there has been a tendency for unions to concern themselves about more and more matters. This has led to the outcry about the invasion of management rights by the unions and to claim that what labor is after is to usurp the powers of management or, at least, to demand an equal voice with the representatives of the stockholders in management.

GREAT VARIETY OF UNIONS

Among the 50,000 labor unions of the country, examples can be found of almost everything. There are as great variations among unions as among corporations, with respect to organization and structure, size and power, objectives and methods. The smallest international union has only 100 members, the largest above a million. There are a few unions which are profit-making business organizations; some others that are cooperatives; and a few which are really medieval guilds, constituted of both masters and journeymen. A few unions have brought disrepute upon the labor movement by employing racketeering methods and others by resort to terrorism and violence. There are unions which seem to have as their primary objective service to foreign ideologies and nations. On the other hand, there are company unions, whose real purpose is to undermine genuine unionism and to fool the workers, in the interests of employers.

The labor movement is too large and too varied to be fully and accurately described in a few brief sentences. The sort of unions mentioned, however, are not typical. There have been crooks in the labor movement, but not more than in other strata of society. Unions and union men have sometimes employed lawless methods, but what group has not done so? With the passing of the years, violence in labor disputes has become much less common than it was earlier. Unionism has suffered from the infiltration of Communists and their attempts to use the union movement to advance party interests. But no one has done so much to keep the Communists from making real headway in this country as have the unions. A vigorous union movement is the best safeguard we have against the possibility that our workers may fall for the false promises of those who would undermine our economy and Government.

When it comes to generalizing about unionism in this country, one of the few characteristics which applies to all unions is that they are organizations of workers formed for their benefit. They are more than social clubs, although they do afford workers an opportunity for meetings with their fellows outside of the shop and on terms of social equality and often sponsor very worth while social gatherings for the families as well as the members. They are not educational organizations, although unions are devoting increasing attention to union education and the training of their officials and representatives. They are not propaganda organizations, although they have come to recognize the great importance of getting their message to the public in a favorable light. They are not occupational organizations whose purpose is to improve the skills of their members and their efficiency as producers, although wise leaders recognize that continuous large advances in real wages are possible only if there is increased production. Neither are unions primarily service organizations, although they render a multitude of services for their members, many of them not directly related to their work.

Services of this kind have grown apace in recent years and are an essential function of present-day unions, but they are only incidental to the main purpose for which unions were organized. Unions, also, are not business organizations, which seek to maximize the earnings of their members, as individual entrepreneurs and corporations seek to maximize their profits. While wages are a matter of much concern to all unions, they are by no means all that matters to them. The continued existence of the union often is of greater importance than what the members may get out of it at the moment. Finally, unions are not political organizations in the sense of party organizations or political clubs. It has become fashionable, even among friends of labor, to say that they are essentially political organizations. But this is true only in the sense that the union leaders must satisfy their members and pay heed to their wishes or suffer the penalty of defeat in elections.

UNION BENEFITS

Unions in this country have traditionally functioned primarily in the economic sphere.

This is still the major field of activity of substantially all unions. Their best-known objective is to increase the return to their members from their productive efforts. Many new union members look upon their unions as something akin to a slot machine, in which they put in a few dollars and expect to make a killing. This has led unions to overemphasize wage rates, especially in their early years, but increasingly union members and the unions they control have come to recognize that the largest possible return to the workers involves more than increases in rates per hour. So they have become concerned with wage-rate inequalities and wage-rate structures, incentives and production standards, down time and call-in time, overtime and holiday pay, vacations, sick leave, and, this year, to a greatly augmented degree, retirement pensions, group insurance, and health and welfare funds. Just around the corner, perhaps, is a real drive for guaranties of employment or wages and severance pay.

Less well known to outsiders but not less important to the members are the efforts made by unions to protect their members from arbitrary action by management and to insure that they will be treated in the shop with fairness and in accord with human dignity. This is involved in many grievances, to which all unions devote a great deal of attention. It is also the basis of seniority rules and of review of discharges and other disciplinary action.

But more important to the dyed-in-the-wool unionists and the far-seeing union leaders than any of these is the preservation of the union and the strengthening of its position when its existence seems to be threatened. This is the reason why real union people are not much impressed by the propaganda, which makes its appearance in every serious strike, to the effect that the strikers are losing far more in wages than they can possibly recoup in many years through wage increases they may win. One of the most important aspects of unionism in contemporary America is the intense loyalty the unions arouse among their active members.

To attain these objectives unions in their dealings with management have placed main reliance upon collective bargaining, contracts with employers and machinery for grievance adjustment. Not until the 1880's were these procedures utilized and not until the present century can they be said to have become the standard practices of unions. Despite splits in the labor movement and controversies on many issues among rival unions, all unions now operate in this manner.

UNIONS ALWAYS IN POLITICS

On the part of the general public there is a widespread belief that unions in recent years have changed their tactics to gain their objectives through politics. Unions are more active in politics now than they ever before have been. But it is erroneous that they previously were indifferent to politics. From its very beginning American unions often took part in politics and on many occasions formed independent political parties. The American Federation of Labor from its inception gave much attention to lobbying and at each of its conventions adopted resolutions dealing with general public issues. For nearly 50 years it has pursued the policy of "reward your friends and punish your enemies" in elections. What is new in the present situation is an issue which has united all labor—repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. In the past also organized labor has been most aroused politically when it felt that the unions and their economic activities were being threatened by the Government. There is on the part of some influential labor leaders an appreciation that the unions have attained a position in our society which requires that they must concern themselves with major public questions of general import. Further the change in the attitude of the United States Supreme Court on protective labor legislation has made it possible to attain some of the objectives of organized labor through legislation. But I see the present activities of unions in politics, not as a fundamental change in concepts and policies but as an intensification of tactics they have always employed, brought about primarily by the fact that their economic freedom of action has been restricted by the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The leading living interpreter of the labor movement among academicians, my colleague at Wisconsin, Prof. Selig Perlman, has termed the economic objectives of American unionism and the methods it employs to attain these objectives, "job control." The strength our unionism has attained, he attributes to this earthy objective, distinguishing it from the revolutionary aim of establishing some form of a socialistic society, which has been the objective of most European labor movements and which not a few intellectuals in this country have wanted our labor movement to adopt.

As Professor Perlman has also pointed out, job control as practiced by unions in this country does not deprive management of any of its function. Rather it is a program for giving labor a voice in determining conditions of employment. It limits absolutism on the part of management, but does not sovietize industry or change our system of free enterprise into one of syndicalism.

RECOGNIZE MANAGEMENT RIGHTS

Labor's attitude on management rights was fully disclosed in the National Labor-Management Conference of 1945. In that conference, the management members, among whom were many of the leading industrialists of the country, wanted labor to agree that a long list of subjects, including even safety in the workshop, were matters of management rights with which labor would not concern itself. The labor representatives both AFL and CIO refused to go along. Their position was not that there are no management rights or even no matters about which the unions would not concern themselves, but that no enumeration of such rights could be applicable under all conditions, and at all times. They recognized that management is necessary for the successful conduct of industry and stated positively that labor does not wish to take over management or even to share it. What labor seeks is a voice for the workers in determining their conditions of employment.

There is nothing revolutionary in this aim. Both the CIO and the AFL have repeatedly declared that they favor the continuance of our system of free enterprise. Labor can properly claim that it more sincerely favors free enterprise than do many of those who try to pin the charge of monopoly on it. What labor insists upon is that human beings are more than commodities and that the welfare of the workers should not be determined solely by market considerations. It challenges absolutism on the part of management in dealing with workers, not free enterprise. Rather it is the strongest bulwark we have against the replacement of free enterprise by some form of socialism or communism.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN UNIONISM

Having now dealt with the position unionism has attained in the contemporary American scene and its objectives and methods, I want to conclude by a brief recital of what it has accomplished to date.

American unions have not been successful in everything they have undertaken and everything they have done has not been in the public interest. But viewed as a whole, the record of the American labor movement has been one of substantial accomplishments for its members and of benefit for our entire society. Its record has been at least as good as that of any other labor movement in the world and its contributions to the general welfare of our country as valuable as those of any other group in our society.

On the value of unions to their members the first question which arises is whether the unions increase rates of pay and earnings. Most union members have no doubt that they do; in fact, that is why most workers first join unions. But spokesmen for anti-union employers often say that the unions get no wage increases which they would not have gotten anyhow, or, if they do that the higher wages are at the expense of reduced employment. At other times, and sometimes almost in the same breath, they say that the unions have been responsible for price increases which were rendered necessary by wage increases forced upon industry by the unions. These claims of people who do not like unions have considerable support from theoretical economists and a little support in bona fide statistics. The most impressive statistical data supporting the view that unions have not done very much to increase wages or, at least, real earnings is that relating to the total percentage of the national income going to labor. This shows that the percentage of the total income going to labor has not gone up very much since unionism became powerful. But what this proves is not certain. Labor in all such statistics includes management and all types of workers, organized and unorganized. Data on the share of the total income of given industries going to the production workers alone is scant; moreover, there is no way of knowing what would have been their share had they remained totally unorganized. With the aggregate capital invested in industry ever increasing, there might well have occurred a decided reduction in the share of income going to the workers but for the spread of union organization.

Besides such data relating to the share of labor (including management) in the total income, there have been some analyses of the increase in the earnings of organized workers with those of unorganized workers. How those come out seems to depend upon the particular groups compared and the years used in the comparisons. Quite clearly, the organized tend to shoot ahead of the unorganized most rapidly in their first contracts. Further gains are slower and smaller and may even be reversed. But conclusions drawn from such statistics are also doubtful. The spread of unionism has benefited the unorganized, as well as the organized. No one can prove statistically what wage rates and earnings would have been had there been no unionism.

HIGHER PAY

In the absence of conclusive statistical proof, we must fall back upon every day observations. Very generally, organized workers get higher pay than unorganized workers. Workers know this and so do employers. Both act accordingly and there is little doubt about the facts, theoretical reasoning and statistical manipulation to the contrary notwithstanding.

But all intelligent unionists know that there is a limit to possible wage increases at a given time. That limit is set by the fact that industry must meet all costs and normally must yield a profit. Some wage increases are possible without price increases, but large continuous increases can be gotten only if there is increased production and productivity.

Increased wage rates and higher earnings are by no means all the gains unions have brought their members. There have been innumerable other improvements in conditions of employment. Among these are such material, although intangible, matters as vacations, paid holidays, benefit funds, and many others. Such advances cannot be

measured in exact monetary terms, but collectively have added a great deal to the economic gains unionism has brought to its members. Prof. Joseph Shister of the University of Buffalo, an economist who inclines to the view that the long-run influence of unionism on wage rates is likely not to be very great, in a paper at the recent New York meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, has pointed out that such nonmarket gains to workers and society are not automatic but need the stimulus of unionism. It is his conclusion that the rapid progress in these respects is attributable, mainly if not entirely, to unionism and the threat of its spread.

HUMAN DIGNITY

Beyond all economic gains are noneconomic values, perhaps even more important to the workers. These relate to treatment of working men and women in accordance with human dignity and the freeing of the workers from a terrible fear of insecurity. By no means all managements and supervisors before unionism or even a majority of them treated the ordinary workers as inferiors or as mere cogs in production. But there can be no doubt that with the coming of the unions conditions in these respects improved greatly in many shops. Similarly, the unions restricted arbitrary discharges and other disciplinary action and afforded considerable protection to the jobs of their members. Through such policies the unions have greatly improved the position and psychological satisfactions of the workers—their status in their own eyes and that of their fellows as men and women.

Unionism has afforded opportunities to many workers for growth as men which they probably would not have had otherwise. Citing another address made at the recent meeting of American Economic Association, this one by Professor Spengler of Duke University, it was Professor Spengler's observation that, increasingly, management is recruited from the colleges, not from the rank and file of the workers. Whether this is or is not true, certain it is that many workers have found in their unions opportunities to grow and rise to positions of esteem among their fellows. While union leaders are often looked down upon by management and the public, these positions are eagerly sought by many workers; in fact, if public opinion polls are to be trusted, more than advancement to the ranks of management.

The benefits of unionism have not been confined to the union members, but have accrued to all workers. When unions become the exclusive collective bargaining representatives of all workers, they are obligated by law to fairly represent the nonmembers in the plant or company, in the same way as the members. Generally the nonmembers get the benefit of the same wage increases and all other improvements in working conditions provided for in union contracts. Unorganized workers in plants where there is no unionism at all also have benefited greatly from unionism. Wage increases are often made to keep out the union and when unionized plants get increases, the nonunion plants also make increases—usually later and often in somewhat lesser amounts, but something at least. With the spread of unionism, grievance machinery and fairer treatment of workers has also developed in many unorganized plants. Further, the unorganized workers have been the principal beneficiaries of protective labor legislation, whose most powerful supporter has been organized labor. Protective labor standards—the increase to the 75 cents per hour minimum recently effective under the amended Fair Labor Standards Act, for which organized labor fought so hard, for instance—directly benefit many, if any, union members but means higher pay and few unorganized workers.

UNIONISM HELPS MANAGEMENT

Unionism also has had many values for management. This is a thesis often developed by Sumner Slichter. He starts with the fact that unionism tends to increase wages and labor costs. This makes management more alert to technological improvements and steps up to the tempo of progress. Slichter credits unionism with operating to put management on its toes, to the benefit of the entire public. Joseph Shister, in the address previously referred to, notes that the nonmarket values of unionism tend to improve employee morale, which is of direct benefit to management and the stockholders.

Certain it is that in the last decade in which unionism has been powerful, corporation profits have reached all-time highs. A Federal Trade Commission survey of the profits of 528 manufacturing corporations in 25 major industries disclosed that in all these industries the total profits were greater in 1948 than in 1940. In all but two of the 25 industries, also, the rate of return on investment was greater. An average return of 10 percent on investment in 1940 became 20 percent in 1948. I doubt whether there is much of a casual connection between the growth of unionism and the great prosperity of industry. But strong unionism, very certainly, has not resulted in financial ruin for industry. Strong unionism has coincided with increased production, higher salaries to management, larger dividends, heavy reinvestment of profits in plant modernization and expansion, and general prosperity.

Unionism has also benefited the general public. The economic gains won by the unions for the workers have not been at the expense of other major elements in our society. Higher wages to workers have meant a great purchasing power, which has benefited all groups. Treatment of workers in accordance with human dignity costs nothing but raises our entire social level. The advances made by the workers in industry have aroused many jealousies, but, at least to date, other groups have prospered along with the workers and have benefited from their economic advances.

For the public, also, there are values in unionism going beyond monetary gains. Sumner H. Slichter has very truly remarked: "Industry produces men as well as goods and the kind of men which a democratic community needs may not be produced in shops which are small oriental despotisms." The survival of our democracy depends to a very great degree upon the quality of our citizens. The close relations between industrial and political democracy is indicated by the fact that every totalitarian government on earth, whether of the right or the left, has always suppressed free trade-unionism and has remade the unions into mere organs of the party or the government. Free trade-unions can exist only where there is a democratic government, and vice versa, I believe, the survival of democratic government, under present-day conditions, is dependent upon the continuance of a strong trade-union movement.

Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, according to the Washington Post today the mayors of 18 big cities yesterday joined in a telegraphic request to President Truman strongly urging him to veto the Kerr natural-gas bill "on behalf of the millions of consumers in our cities." Those signing the telegram were the mayors of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Cincinnati, Denver, Toledo, Birmingham, Akron, and St. Paul.

I cannot help but believe that when the full import of this legislation, which was passed last week by the House only after several Members changed their votes, is realized by other mayors, especially those in the New York-New Jersey area, they, too, will urge a Presidential veto in behalf of the consuming public they represent.

Why Not a Subsidy on Rockers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter from a clever constituent of mine from southern Indiana. Coming from one of the most down-to-earth sections of the country, this tongue-in-cheek communication tickled me, though the situation it points up is anything but funny:

SEYMOUR, IND., *March 25, 1950.*

DEAR MR. WILSON: I am in the furniture business and am writing this letter to request that you obtain for me a subsidy on our platform rockers. We are now making about a thousand a year and are eager to step this production up to 50,000 as soon as possible. With so many people in the country getting rockin'-chair money, we feel that the market is unlimited for our product. Since you are voting money for potatoes, cotton, tobacco, railroads, aviation, and many other industries, I see no reason why we in the furniture business should be slighted.

Now, we would like a guaranteed price of $50 each for these rockers. In the event we are unable to sell all of them, we will arrange to burn them right here at the factory rather than go to the expense of shipping them somewhere else to be destroyed. I notice that you paid $2.90 a bag for potatoes in Maine and then shipped them to Chicago, which raised the cost to $4 a bag, and then sold them to farmers for 1 cent a bag. That sort of thing is pretty expensive, so we will gladly arrange to destroy any surplus of our rockers right at the factory.

It should be an easy matter for you to get the above-mentioned program through Congress, since I see that last year you boys voted to spend $29,000,000,000 without even a roll call. Perhaps you can get one of Harry's boys to enter our rocker program in the budget. I realize that it will be small potatoes to the billion-dollar programs that you are accustomed to, but perhaps you can start a new bureau or something to raise the ante and get it in the billion-dollar bracket. I certainly cannot see that I am asking anything unreasonable, as I have paid taxes all my life and have never received a check from my Government. You paid some of the boys in Maine as much as $450,000 for raising potatoes which the Nation could not possibly

consume, so why not a few bucks for the underfed furniture business?

We are in a position to provide some pretty expensive lobbyist with a pocket full of money to spend on the program if you think that is necessary. There must be some secret to getting those big spending programs which benefit a particular group through Congress, and we are eager to obtain the secret. Any information regarding the same will be gratefully appreciated.

Please let me hear from you as soon as possible regarding the above-mentioned rocker program, as we are eager to get the Government checks started rolling in.

Yours most respectfully,

HARRY BOLLING.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane on the "Justice for Poland" radio program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress and the introductory remarks made by Attorney Paul P. Flak, of Springfield, Mass.

It is refreshing to note that the cause of Poland has not been and never will be abandoned.

Despite weak-kneed appeasers, soft-thinking internationalists and tyrannical Communist persecution, there are many of us in this Nation who will never cease our activity until the betrayals of Yalta and Tehran have been renounced, until Poland shall be liberated from the bondage of godless enemies of democracy and freedom.

I congratulate my valued friends upon their efforts, urge their continued activity and pledge them my unyielding loyal support for this great cause.

The address follows:

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS OF ATTORNEY PAUL P. FLAK

The Poles have been the warmest friends that the United States had in Europe. To retain this valuable friendship, so essential in the present unsettled condition of the world, justice must be accorded to Poland because she was brutally betrayed by her western allies. For this reason in a series of addresses the speakers who have appeared on these programs have delved on stimulating interest in the tragic fate of Poland and have shown the necessity of the repudiation of the Yalta agreements that opened the gates for the imperialistic expansion of the Soviets. It was at Yalta that we violated the noble pronouncements of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. As a result of Yalta, Soviets became a threat to our American security and forced us to spend billions on the Marshall plan and other preventative measures. We are beginning to see some ray of light appearing, for recently Congressman ROBERT HALE, of Maine, introduced a resolution stating that the agreements at Yalta are not binding, for they were violated by the Russians. The Secretary of State in his California speech has brought out among the seven points needed to achieve peace and end the cold war "to withdraw Russian military and police forces from present satellite nations and let them choose their own form of government." This is the first time since Yalta that the countries behind the iron curtain, now enslaved by the Soviets, received encouragement and some evidence of sympathy against oppressors. Another topic that our speakers have brought to the attention of our fellow Americans was a grave warning against the spread of communism in the United States. I shall read you an editorial from the Times Leader, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., presenting the remarks of the head of our organization and also the editorial comment:

"Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress and of the Polish National Alliance, speaking at a benefit dinner for displaced persons in Chicago last week, said among other things: Let us clean up the Communist scum in America. Communist propaganda should be banned. No red professors should be permitted to teach in our universities. Communists should be treated the way every criminal is treated. Let us show them no mercy. They are traitors and should be treated as such. Every foreign-born Communist should be thrown out of America. Every native-born Communist should be placed behind prison bars. This great country of ours should belong only to loyal Americans. In plain words, let us destroy communism in this country. If we don't, it will destroy us. It is a case of their neck or ours."

That is language that can be understood by Americans everywhere. It makes sense in Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Rozmarek's home town, as well as in Chicago, the city of his adoption. It might even be understood in Washington, but Mr. Rozmarek would not be too sure of that in the light of his experience with the Roosevelt administration and the double-cross of Poland and the cause of freedom at Yalta. The sentiments Mr. Rozmarek expresses in his Palmer House address were those of a loyal American. It was not the first time he raised his voice in warning on the threat of communism. He has the foresight to detect the designs of Soviet Russia on the land of his forefathers, but the wartime administration in Washington played Stalin's game with disastrous results. The fate that befell Poland now menaces America.

Mr. Rozmarek is justifiably alarmed and he makes himself unmistakably clear in sounding a call to arm for his fellow countrymen. True, the measures he proposes are drastic in a land like ours, but it is well to bear in mind that we are facing a ruthless foe who plays according to his own rules and with whom anything goes if his purpose can be accomplished. We dare not to be too squeamish without inviting the fate that inevitably will overtake us unless we secure ourselves on the home front. Mr. Rozmarek's proposal that all foreign-born Communists be deported is sound. If they don't like the American way of life, they don't belong here. Why are they here, anyway, if it is not to stir up strife and undermine our liberties? They are enemies of the United States as much as the Nazis and Japs ever were. In a sense, they are worse, for they take advantage of our hospitality and bore from within. Why not round up all these alien reds and replace them with homeless soldiers and exiles of Poland and other lands who fought for our cause and who sacrificed everything except their lives, which they offered to preserve the ideals of America? It is easy to agree with Mr. Rozmarek that the time for pussy-footing on communism is passed. He is right when he indicates it is a case of survival. The suggestion that communism and democracy can live side by side in this world is the bunk. The record of recent years speaks for itself.

Our speaker today is Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane who resigned as Ambassador to Poland and terminated what President Truman called "a long and distinguished career in the American foreign service." He began his diplomatic service in 1916, the year he was graduated from Yale, as a private secretary to the United States Ambassador to Italy. Some of his other assignments have included secretary to the United States delegation to the Supreme Council at Paris, Chief of the Division of Mexican Affairs, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Yugoslavia, minister to Costa Rica, and Ambassador to Colombia.

The difficult Polish assignment began in 1944 when Mr. Lane was appointed Ambassador to the Polish Government in exile in London and later as Ambassador to Poland's regime. Mr. Lane was at Warsaw to enforce the Yalta and Potsdam mandates stipulating that the Polish election be free and unfettered. Once the election was held, in his letter of resignation to the President, he charged the Polish Government with cynical disregard for the international obligations. He caused an international stir by his decision to gain the freedom of a private citizen by resigning his diplomatic post so he could speak openly to the American people on the subject of the betrayal of Poland. It is a pleasure that I now present the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane.

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR BLISS LANE

As one who has twice served in Poland as a member of the American Foreign Service and who has accordingly acquired the highest admiration and the deepest affection for the Polish race, I feel greatly privileged to speak on the Justice for Poland radio program of the Polish-American Congress.

No people has suffered greater injustices, physical, and mental hardships. In addition, the Nation has twice lost its liberty—once to the Nazis and then to the Communists.

And the terrible admission which we Americans must make is that Poland's present plight today—being subjected to a regime of persecution where none of the "four freedoms" exists—is due in part to the attitude of the United States at the conferences of Tehran and Yalta. Whether this betrayal of a faithful ally was deliberate or unwitting, the fact is that in acquiescing to the cession of Polish territory to the Soviet Union we ourselves violated the principles of the Atlantic Charter for which we had supposedly been fighting the war. We thereby cleared the way for the setting up of the Communist Government in Poland. Contrary to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, we did not consult the Polish Government in exile in London, which we then recognized as the legal Polish Government, regarding the cession of 60,000 square miles of Polish territory, nor did we consult the Polish people. Anyone who knows the Polish people knows that they have no sympathy for communism. They are one of the most religious peoples in Europe and certainly would not wish to be ruled by a government which is openly atheistic.

Many explanations have been made as to why it was necessary for the United States at Tehran and Yalta to agree to the imposition on Poland of Communist domination. Some claim that if we had not agreed, Stalin would have made a separate peace with Hitler. Others claim that Stalin's participation in the Japanese war was essential for the United States and would save countless American lives by shortening the war. In any case, it is clear at this point in our history that we renounced the principles to which we had solemnly subscribed and which we persuaded other members of the United Nations to subscribe, including Poland and the Soviet Union.

By renouncing solemn principles involving our international integrity, not only was our prestige greatly lowered by our unwittingly encouraging the Soviet Union to proceed in Poland and in all the other countries of eastern Europe as well, to disregard the promises which it and its satellite countries had made regarding the holding of free elections.

Our Government has on many occasions denounced the violation of the Yalta agreement by the Soviet Government and by its satellites. Our protests have had no effect whatever, for the Soviet Government well understood that short of war there was no action which we could take to remedy the situation. But we as a Nation should do far more than protest the violations of Yalta. We should denounce Yalta. Not only is Yalta unconstitutional, never having been ratified by the United States Senate, but as a violation of the Atlantic Charter it should be denounced and repudiated as being contrary to the principles of our expressed foreign policy. Only a few weeks ago Dean Rusk of the Department of State, in referring to the possibility of a meeting between President Truman and Stalin, said: "We are not prepared * * * to sit down in a corner with another great power and dispose of the basic interest of other governments or peoples behind their backs." And yet that is exactly what we did at Tehran and Yalta.

Some may accuse me of being destructive in my criticism. But if we are to build a new world we must tear down the false foundations on which certain conceptions of our foreign policy are based. And the American people can use their democratic processes so that the United States will take constructive action. The step which I propose that the American people should take is indeed simple and will cost no appropriation by Congress. It is merely that the Congress of the United States should be urged by the people to declare that Yalta is no longer binding on the United States, for the reasons which I have given. This step is more than an academic one. It would have far-reaching effects. First, it would show the Soviet Union that the people's representatives in the United States are warning the Soviet Union that it can go no further in its policy of aggression. Second, it would tell the peoples behind the iron curtain, through the Voice of America, that we are thinking of them and that their day of liberation is still a possibility despite present-day oppression. Thirdly, we would be putting ourselves on record as having reverted to the principles of international morality which we so righteously proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter. If we are to regain the international respect which has traditionally been ours for years, we must base our foreign policy on principles and not on expediency.

All of you can and must help to accomplish this ideal.

National Security Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, since September 1949, I have been calling attention to the fact that the all-important National Security Resources Board has been without a permanent Chairman and its acting head, Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, was too busy with other duties to provide proper leadership.

This week in describing to the House the chapter in the omnibus appropriation bill dealing with the National Defense Establishment, our able colleague, Representative MAHON, of Texas, agreed with me that it had been most unfortunate that the National Security Resources Board had been leaderless for so many months during the so-called cold war. Both of us hail last week's selection of W. Stuart Symington, Air Force Secretary, as the Board's permanent Chairman and we are mindful of the tough job he has ahead.

Mr. Drew Pearson in today's Washington Merry-go-Round has some pungent words to say in the situation. They follow:

HEADLESS BUREAU

When hard-driving, imaginative Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington changes desks to run the National Security Resources Board, he will find an outfit about as full of snap as a worn-out spring. On the books, the NSRB has the vital job of blueprinting civil defense, relocating industries, finding the most effective use of resources, and planning for regulating production, manpower, and Government facilities in time of emergency.

But this all-important Board has been both leaderless and kicked around by agencies that should be obeying its orders.

The Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

No writer likes to keep everlastingly on one subject, trying the patience of his readers—and his own—but I know that the suppressed Amerasia case is the key to all this miserable quarrel over the State Department.

Two raids were made on that magazine—one by the OSS; the other by the FBI. In this piece I shall discuss the suppressed OSS investigation.

An unimportant report on Thailand appeared as an article in the magazine Amerasia. While the article itself did not matter, obviously, the OSS, which was a very secret arm of the Government under the direction of Gen. William Donovan, was deeply concerned, for it led to a leak in its own organization. It meant that the OSS, which dealt with espionage, was itself the subject of espionage.

Thereupon an investigation ensued under the direction of Frank Brooks Bielaski, ordered by A. Van Beuren, security officer of OSS. It was found that about 30 persons in various departments of the Government had access to this document and each name was known.

It was decided to visit the offices of the magazine. It took the investigating crew about a week, from March 3 to 10, 1945, to get into the premises because someone was always working there late at night.

Five persons entered the premises at midnight of March 11, one a mechanic. The reason for the late hour was that the office was in use all day Sunday until 5 p. m.

This magazine then had a circulation of 1,700—a fact which is important because, while the publication itself could not have amounted to anything, its premises seemed very busy. In it was located a large photocopy room with an unusual amount of equipment. Such equipment could not have been needed to produce this small magazine.

In the rear of the office suite were three principal rooms—the office of Kate Mitchell, the office of Philip Jaffe, and a large library which contained hundreds of volumes relating to the Far East.

On the library table was an envelope containing secret documents, across the top of each of which was written the name of one of America's most important novelists, whose name I am not giving now. In that envelope were found six documents, hastily copied on a typewriter from original Navy documents, all marked "top secret." I have in my possession a general description of these documents.

In Philip Jaffe's office were found a bellows-type suitcase and two brief cases suitable for carrying documents. The suitcase was marked "P. J. J." Scores of secret documents were found in these three receptacles.

They were from the State Department, Naval Intelligence, Army Intelligence, and the OSS. Some were original documents; some typewritten copies, with three or four carbon copies. There were also photostats of State Department documents.

The raiders actually took some of these documents as samples. All the OSS documents were stamped with a declaration to the effect that possession of such articles by an unauthorized person constituted a violation of the Espionage Act. One of the photostats, from the State Department, showed the complete distribution of all groups in the Chinese Army, the places where located, under whose command, naming units division by division, and showing their strength.

Four agents saw all the documents and are therefore witnesses to the transaction. They have never been called in any investigation, although 5 years have passed and the statute of limitations has been permitted to run.

All this was duly reported and the documents delivered to the OSS security officer, A. Van Beuren. Undoubtedly this was given to Gen. William Donovan, who has never been called to testify concerning a case of major espionage, involving hundreds of documents.

The original officers of the Amerasia magazine were:

Editorial board, Frederick W. Field, chairman; Philip J. Jaffe, managing editor; Lilian Peffer, assistant editor; Harriet Levine, secretary; T. A. Bisson, Ch'ao Ting-chit, Kenneth W. Colegrove, Owen Lattimore, William W. Lockwood, Cyrus H. Peake, David H. Popper, William T. Stone. (From issue of August 1938, vol. 11, No. 6.)

To this subject I shall refer again.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Sandusky (Ohio) Register-Star-News:

HOME RULE FOR CAPITAL DENIED VOTERS BECAUSE OF RACE ISSUE

Of all the burdens saddled upon Congress, acting as a city council for Washington seems the silliest. Long hours are devoted to details of municipal government that are admittedly tiresome to most of the lawmakers involved.

Actually, no one likes the arrangement. Washington's residents want to govern themselves just as do citizens everywhere else. Officials of the District of Columbia, who run the city under the thumb of Congress, plead for more authority.

Both major parties went on record in their 1948 platforms as favoring home rule for the Capital.

Despite all this action on home rule legislation is stymied. Last year the Senate passed a bill by Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee Democrat, to give Washingtonians the right to vote for a city council and to provide for a reorganized District government. But the House District Committee sat on the measure.

That's the situation today, except that a petition is being circulated among House Members to discharge the committee from further study of the bill. The discharge petition, the only way a measure can be brought to the floor over the adverse vote of a committee, now lacks but 49 of the 218 signatures to become effective.

Why has the home-rule proposal been blocked when so many appear to favor it?

The answer is simple. Between a fourth and a third of the Capital's population is Negro. There is fear in certain quarters that to enfranchise Washington voters will mean to give this minority more than its proportionate strength at the polls.

Obviously there can be no defense of such a viewpoint in this country. Forward-looking elements in the South have been slowly but surely winning the Negro his rightful status at the polls after decades of disfranchisement. And there the problem has, of course, been most acute.

Certainly Washington is the last place democratic America should wish to see barriers raised against use of the voting privilege. It may be pointed out that the Capital is in a ticklish spot, on the borderline between North and South. But the possibilities for conflict are probably no more explosive than in, let's say, Detroit or Chicago, where the growth of Negro minorities is pressing hard on a limited housing supply.

The fact is Washington is a Capital first and a border city second. As the Nation's Capital, it must reflect in daily practice the country's loftiest ideals. How can a city symbolize democracy if it doesn't live it?

This Odious So-Called Kerr Natural-Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received many reports from the Second Nebraska Congressional District, which I represent in the Congress of the United States, asking me to not only oppose this thoroughly bad measure but to endeavor to induce President Truman to veto same.

As illustrative of these missives, I wish to now set forth a letter which I received from Greenville P. North, Esq., a prominent Omaha attorney, who has devoted much of his time in the interests of the people, which letter expresses so well the thoughts of the persons who, as under-contract consumers, are now relegated to the natural gas rate-raising clutches of the natural-gas companies, if the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill is not vetoed by the President:

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 4, 1950.*

Hon. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENE: As I expected, you are on what appeared to me to be the right side of the Kerr bill.

I cannot but believe that the President would veto this bill if he knew the very great fear of thousands of the people (and by that I mean only of this district as I am not familiar with others) that the taking away of the jurisdiction to regulate the prices at the point of delivery to the pipe lines would not only result in an enormous increase in price to the users of gas but would also result in an enormous increase in the price of coal and fuel oil and all related commodities. To the great majority of wage earners in this district this would so reduce their incomes as to seriously affect the entire economy of the district, and I assume that the same conditions are true in many other localities.

Of course, I realize that I have not the same perspective as either you or the President concerning this matter and there may be some other material matter that would necessitate the approval of this bill, but I have been unable to learn of such necessity from any source.

You know that I have always been a great admirer and friend and defender of the President, even to the extent that I always considered his friendship for the late Mr. Pendergast a great virtue and not, as many Republicans and some Democrats in this district claimed to have considered, as a vice. Of course, you know that no matter what his final decision will be, I have the utmost confidence that it will be based upon what he believes to be right.

I have not discussed this letter with anyone nor has anyone requested me to write or telegraph you, but it is being sent only in the thought that it might help you to present the feelings of a great many people in this district. I am sure that if the President does not veto the bill it will cost him literally thousands of Democratic votes in this district. Of course, if he has information that he feels would justify him in approving the bill he would have to do it no matter whether it cost the votes or not, but I think you have a right to know what I think the attitude of the people is and as your friend and as a friend of the President, I am writing this and sending it air mail, special delivery.

So that Mr. North and my other constituents may be advised correctly about what I am doing in the premises, I now set forth a copy of a telegram which I sent today to President Truman:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 6, 1950.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Key West, Fla.:

Please pardon me for doing a JOHN W. HESELTON and telegraphing you about vetoing the Kerr natural-gas bill. Have received many letters and telegrams from my district from little and big consumers and Democrats generally who feel that this measure is a special-interest one and I hope you will pardon me for urging you to veto the bill.

EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Second Nebraska District.

The Fuchs Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., by Lester Allen:

FUCHS CASE DID LOT FOR REDS—MADE UNITED STATES AND BRITISH SECURITY SERVICES APPEAR SILLY AND CAUSED ATOMIC RIFT

(By Lester Allen)

Beside the name of one Klaus Emil Julius Fuchs, Ph. D., in the notebook of a Soviet agent seized in Canada, was the Russian word for "ours" and never was an ownership more complete, for the Soviet Union owned him body and soul, used him to extract the most carefully guarded atomic secrets, used him to drive an almost irreparable wedge between the United States and Great Britain and destroyed one of the world's great theoretical physicists in the process.

What befell Dr. Klaus Fuchs is contained in his confession, a document which may never become part of a public record because of the appalling amount of information it contains, not only about atomic secrets he betrayed to the Russians, but also the fantastic carelessness with which Fuchs was blithely admitted to the innermost councils of the top physicists working on atomic development.

Those few who have seen the confession declare that it is one of the most tragic documents they have ever read, to be compared with Oscar Wilde's De Profundis in describing the deterioration of a man's soul under the handling of Soviet agents. They took Klaus Fuchs, the ideological zealot, and turned him into a thief stealing secrets for miserable pay. The treachery he undertook out of a burning belief in the Communist cause was deliberately turned into petty larceny by Soviet agents who schemed and plotted to make Fuchs accept a miserable pittance in payment for his treason.

PLAN MISFIRED

No better illustration of the sinister and inhuman attitude of the Soviet plan for world domination could be found than the Fuchs case. There is good reason now to suspect that the exposure of the Soviet spy ring in Canada, which entrapped only the smallest of small fry, was staged for the purpose of driving a wedge of suspicion between the United States and Great Britain.

It is unreasonable to suppose that a Soviet agent would be in circulation in Canada carrying an incriminating list of men working for the Soviet Union which included names of men as highly placed as Klaus Fuchs in atomic research. The notebook containing Fuchs' name now looks very much like a plant. He was being thrown to the wolves for the purpose of setting up distrust between the United States and Great Britain. It appears to have been the aim to compel the United States, out of self-interest and for security, to deny the sharing of any further atomic information with Great Britain.

The plan misfired, however, because nothing was done about Fuchs' name found in the Soviet agent's notebook. It is astounding but true that not only was it ignored by M15 section of the British Home Office intelligence, but by the M16 section of the British Foreign Office—the latter a secret intelligence operation of vaunted skill in espionage and evaluation. The Department of Justice in the United States ignored the Fuchs notation as well for several years, for so long, indeed, that Fuchs was chosen chief of the theoretical physics branch of Britain's secret Harwell atomic research center.

DID IT FOR MONEY

It was 2 years before anything was done about Fuchs and then it was done only because the Soviet Union dropped another hint that Fuchs was their creature and in their pay.

Never was a jurist more mistaken than Lord Goddard when, in sentencing Fuchs at Old Bailey to 14 years' penal servitude, he said that Fuchs had done irreparable and incalculable harm to Britain and the United States merely to further a political creed. The man in the dock knew differently, knew how base had been his motives after he was launched on his career of treachery. He had done it for paltry sums of money, even though he had been willing to do it for nothing.

Fuchs clarified something that had always puzzled the intelligence agents of the democracies. Soviet spying operations had been carried out in a large measure by rabid Communist zealots who believed they were aiding a great cause in spying for the Soviet Union. Yet in almost every instance where the spy became important or achieved access to important information the Russians insisted upon making payment for service rendered.

COMPLETELY DESTROYED HIM

Perhaps the most puzzling element in the Hiss case was the presentation to Hiss of an oriental rug which could easily be traced back to the donor. It was so simple that its very simplicity made Hiss appear to be an innocent dupe. Fuchs made it clear that the purpose of such payments was the destruction of a man's inner integrity and faith in his own zeal—to make a miserable thief out of him and deprive him of the consolation of assuaging pangs of conscience with the belief that what had been done was done of high faith and zeal for a cause.

Not a small part of the rage and frustration of the American Communists who were exposed by Department of Justice agents who had infiltrated their ranks was their chagrin at not having compromised the infiltrating operatives so that their testimony would have been invalidated.

Fuchs was given the full treatment. A mousy, myopic, and absorbed scientist whose chief interest was his work, they turned him into a loathsome thief who could have no respect for himself. But they went further. They involved him in shady and clandestine affairs with women and completed the job of destroying him.

FEAR HUMILIATION

The Fuchs case accomplished a great deal for the Russians. It made the vaunted skill of the British secret service look silly, and did the same for American security safeguards. It caused a rift between the two countries on atomic matters which only the most courageous and farsighted judgments of high-policy-level individuals can overcome. It created an atmosphere of "What next?" among the scientists of first rank working on American and British atomic developments and made the imperative task of securing the top men in theoretical physics for the atomic program much more difficult. It added fuel to the heat of suspicion, unfounded and otherwise, and virtually guaranteed more and more witch hunts for possible traitors.

There's only one positive safeguard against leakage of atomic secrets and that is utter secrecy. Scientists hold that such complete secrecy makes rapid research into atomic problems impossible because of the fact that they are operating in a realm of science where even the merest clue unearthed by some independent researcher may provide the link they need to complete a chain of scientific evidence.

Frankly there are all too few top scientists who will take the risk of going to work for the Atomic Energy Commission today because they would never know when they might have to run the gauntlet of a loyalty review, a congressional hearing, or a guilt-by-association proceeding.

Most of the top scientists know or have exchanged information of a scientific nature with professed Communist sympathizers in their own fields. Many of them are unwilling to bury their careers without acclaim and without recognition in a secret program that will bring them nothing but a very modest salary and the possibility of humiliation.

WHAT REDS WANTED

This was precisely what was in the minds of the Soviet spy masters when they threw Fuchs to the wolves. That's the way they planned it. They wanted distrust, fear, unfounded suspicion, faltering confidence. And it looks as if they got what they were after.

The one means that the Atomic Energy Commission had of setting up a research program that might have bypassed the reluctance of established scientists to continue their efforts was denied them. It had been planned to select brilliant young graduates of American universities whose background had been cleared by all the security tests necessary to insure complete loyalty and give them research fellowships. The money was not appropriated, however, and the funds available had to go into projects which had high priority.

Had the Fuchs case happened in Russia it would not have been nearly as damaging to the Russians. The Soviet Union is a total police state. Klaus Fuchs would merely have disappeared and no mention would have been made of his fate. But Anglo-Saxon justice does not work that way. Fuchs had to take his medicine in public.

AGENTS NEVER RETURN

Just how total the police state is in Russia may be determined by the fact that no intelligence service in the world, except the Soviet service, knows for certain where any of the Soviet atomic energy plants are located, much less what they are doing. There is a grim joke among the operatives in the intelligence services of the western nations. They say: "We have effected a saving on our operations in the Soviet Union. We now buy only one-way ticket to Russia." The inference is, of course, that agents who get behind the iron curtain never return.

The one real service Klaus Fuchs performed for the United States and Great Britain, particularly the latter, is his exposure of the incredible stupidity and ineptitude of the counterintelligence services. It was established that the British secret service wasn't even aware that Klaus Fuchs was a Communist, yet, as his defense counsel, Derek Curtiss-Bennett, declared, he had never pretended to be anything else. That seems to be carrying the theory that a man's political beliefs are his own personal concern a little bit too far.

Klaus Fuchs' confession, only parts of which were read to the court at Old Bailey, may never become public. What is more likely is that the impounded document will disappear after a generation or so. But if it does become public within the next few months it will be plain indication to the Russians that we have some new secrets—and they will have to find another Fuchs.

Columbiana Soil Conservation District Annual Report, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the 1949 annual report of the Columbiana County, Ohio, soil-conservation district. It was my privilege to address the members of this district at their annual meeting at Lisbon on March 10, and I found that they are enthusiastically working to preserve one of the greatest assets this country has, its topsoil.

The report follows:

COLUMBIANA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT, 1949

The matter of first importance in the annual report of a year's work of a soil conservation district should be the amount of work done. The Columbiana Soil Conservation District of Ohio can take some pride in its accomplishments in 1949. Details of this, as to figures, will be found tabulated later in the report. It can be stated briefly that the work accomplished, in such important fields as watercourses constructed, contour strip cropping, and cropland limed, amounted to more in the past year by 10 to 25 percent, than was completed for the previous year.

The work done fell somewhat short of the amount that the Soil Conservation Service personnel thought could be done, and there is always the great amount that should be done in the county, but the district supervisors feel that 1949 was a good year.

Confining most of the concrete accomplishments to tables, the narrative part of the report will concern some of the actions and opinions of the district supervisors.

It was a fairly active year for both supervisors and Soil Conservation Service personnel, with somebody representing the county at practically every meeting or event important to soil-conservation work. It should be reported that in our county there is excellent cooperation with other agencies in the farm field. The president of our board is a member of the county PMA committee. Our meetings usually have in attendance both the county agricultural extension agent and the area forestry extension agent, both of whom take an active interest. Public acceptance of the program seems fairly general.

A tour was sponsored for farmers of the county to the Soil Conservation Service Hydrological Laboratory at Coshocton, Ohio, and it was considered a successful event. Clyde Freeman attended the annual meeting of the Ohio Federation of Soil Conservation Districts.

Two persons, district conservationist Pendry, and supervisor Rupert, accompanied the tour of area farmers to the Regional Pasture Laboratory at State College, Pa.

A tour of a good farm was conducted by the Soil Conservation Service Farm Planner for the benefit of rural ministers, just prior to the national rural life Sunday.

It should be pointed out that the Extension Service was active in arranging the details of some of these tours, as well as helping in the organizing of neighborhood study groups.

During the year our personnel gave more attention to group work, as a means of reaching more people with educational material,

and with the idea of cutting down work of the farm planner to some extent, by equipping cooperators to do more of their own planning. While it is perhaps too early to judge the results of the 1949 schools, Farm Planner Reuter has been commended for his work along this line.

Three county farms received honorable mention in awards of the Cleveland Farmers Club for good farming practices. We had no entrants in the B. & O. contest, although several folks were asked by mail if they would care to enter. The minutes for the board meeting, September 28, 1949, include the following statement: "The idea was expressed that the prizes in this contest are not very large for the amount of labor that is usually expended in preparing the applications, and technical personnel was instructed to do no more work for the contest unless some of the persons approached asked for help to enter."

During the year a letter was sent out asking for association fund membership money, and several farmers responded to this. Enough was sent in to secure an affiliate membership to the national federation.

Supervisors started a plan of each man visiting a cooperator's farm to study the application of the farm plan on the land. Reports from these trips served to help supervisors understand problems involved, and perhaps be of some help to the planners through the discussions that were held. Many shortcomings were found in actual working of the plan, but the supervisors heard very little criticism of the program on the original plans.

The annual meeting of the district was well attended (240 present), and James Chapman, farm-program director of radio station WTAM, Cleveland, was the speaker.

The district supervisors and Soil Conservation Service personnel helped at the Apple Creek Field Day.

A tour to the Bromfield farm was held and was well attended (150 present).

As indicated in the 1948 report, the board did not attempt any general field day during the year, but planting of forage crops were made, which might serve as exhibits for such a field day in 1950. Plans for this were discussed at various times during the year.

The State representative was asked to use his influence to get a larger number of trees from the State nursery for actual farm planting. It was pointed out at the board meeting that many strip-mine spoilbank plantings in the county show clearly that a large percentage of the trees allotted for spoilbank reclaiming are wasted because of failure to grow.

Personnel were instructed to start arrangements for an air tour in 1950, so that farm people could see erosion and control work from overhead.

The board was perhaps a little more critical in accepting work during 1949. Not many requests were refused, but a few very large farms were at least postponed because the board felt there was no assurance, in view of past history and people involved, that the work planned would be completed. Likewise, a few small places were refused, in cases where farming was not the primary interest and where it was felt that the applicant was not interested in a complete plan for his land.

The supervisors wish to thank all cooperating agencies—the Soil Conservation Service for furnishing full time of a farm planner and aide, also an extra aide to work on follow-up with our 400 cooperators; the Extension Service for help in our educational program; and all others.

Statistics concerning the condition of the district follow.

CLYDE FREEMAN,
Chairman, Columbiana Soil Conservation District, Lisbon, Ohio.

Other members of the board: James Huston, Elden Groves, Don Rupert, Edwin Copeland.

Annual report of receipts and expenditures, period Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949

Receipts (by source):	
Balance brought forward	$185.48
Cooperators fees	30.00
Affiliate membership contributions	62.00
Rental of equipment	23.60
Annual meeting (donations and sale of food)	51.38
Check No. 18 (was outstanding)	2.50
Total	354.96
Expenditures (classified):	
Repair of plow	4.60
Postage, stamps, post cards, etc.	20.83
Annual meeting (speaker, food, etc.)	59.13
Service charge	.25
Lyle printing	2.85
Advertise, election	4.38
Tags, field day	.75
National association dues	10.00
State association dues	10.00
Affiliate membership dues	50.00
Mileage, Mr. Walton	36.40
Mileage, Mr. Hays	25.50
Total	224.69
Total receipts	354.96
Total expenditures	224.69
Balance on hand	130.27

Annual report of conservation practices

	This year	To date
Farms planned:		
Number	45	431
Acres	5,637	46,540

Practice	Newly planned		Established	
	This year	To date	This year	To date
Contour farming—acres	56	99	35	68
Cover cropping—do	440	522	253	307
Strip cropping—do	1,430	16,634	1,289	13,181
Pasture improvement—acres	1,247	6,869	454	2,900
Seeding pasture—do	1,131	4,703	227	1,378
Woods management—do	402	975	0	55
Tree planting—do	132	597	38	193
Terraces—miles	19	67	3	29
Farm ponds—each	12	50	6	16
Field diversions—miles	7	47	3	30
Farm drainage—acres	29	264	18	162
Farm drainage—linear feet	13,600	266,145	6,300	159,495
Lime cropland—acres	3,235	23,326	2,882	16,792
Fertilize cropland—do	2,812	23,678	2,557	19,840
Constructed waterways—linear feet	22,625	105,632	8,725	54,600
Prevention of fire and grazing—acres	653	2,670	611	2,259
Fence row management—linear feet	47,400	74,900	13,000	25,050

Operation Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to spread upon the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce with reference to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

It will be recalled that the members of this fine organization recently came to Washington in furtherance of its support for the Hoover Commission program.

I believe that this group is performing a fine public service by bringing to the attention of the general public the many savings which can be made by adoption of these proposals:

WATERBURY JUNIOR CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Waterbury, Conn., March 21, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATTERSON: We are enclosing herewith the text of a resolution adopted by the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc., at a meeting March 20 in the Elton. We respectfully urge you that serious consideration and wholehearted support be given to this resolution:

"Whereas the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce has called attention to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report through its program of education and petitioning known as Operation Economy; and

"Whereas the Connecticut Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce have assisted in this No. 1 civic project since last fall: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That it be known that the Waterbury Junior Chamber of Commerce is on record for urging the Congress for the adoption of all the recommendations as set forth in the Hoover Commission report and as presented to the Congress by President Truman."

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD A. JONES,
President.

JOHN DELDONNO,
Chairman, Committee for Support of the Hoover Report.

Maintenance of an American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one will question that the maintenance of an American merchant marine is an absolute essential to an integrated American economy in time of peace. In time of war the necessity of a developed and efficiently operating domestic shipping industry is multiplied a thousandfold. That fact has been demonstrated through the harsh lessons of the last two wars, to our great cost in terms of money and human lives. We are now faced with a situation which, God forbid, may result in a third repetition of that same harsh lesson. It is with the view of forestalling to some extent the cruel consequences of an unintelligent lack of ability to profit by the lessons of the past that I address the House today.

H. R. 7786, the omnibus appropriation bill which we are now considering, contains in chapter VIII, pages 301 to 309, an appropriation for the United States

Maritime Commission. That appropriation includes a total amount of $46,749,000 in new appropriations and funds from various existing accounts for operating-differential subsidies to American-flag ships as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. I have no quarrel at this time with the amount of that appropriation. However, on page 304, lines 5 to 10, of the bill there appears a proviso which can only serve to cripple an already seriously menaced American shipping industry. That proviso reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships receiving such subsidy as of January 1, 1950.

I have before me an information release from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, dated March 27, 1950, which explains in detail the very serious consequences which will almost inevitably result should we permit that proviso to remain in the bill as finally passed. Freezing of operating-differential subsidies to the number of vessels receiving such subsidies as of January 1, 1950, can serve no useful purpose. The total amount of funds appropriated is an effective limitation on the cost of the subsidy program. The restrictive proviso cannot, therefore, be defended as an economy measure. Its sole purpose is to handicap presently unsubsidized operators, now voluntarily assuming operating-differential costs, in favor of the owners now receiving and enjoying the benefits of Government subsidies. Its sure result will be a reduction in the total number of American-flag vessels in the face of reduced freight rates, cargo shrinkages, increased operating costs, and increased foreign competition.

May I ask that every Member of the House read and seriously consider the information release which will accompany these remarks in the RECORD so that when chapter VIII comes up for consideration this iniquitous proviso may be stricken out? The matter referred to follows:

The House Appropriations Committee has included in the general appropriation bill, 1951, a provision which is intended to freeze the number of subsidized vessels to the aggregate number of vessels actually receiving subsidy on January 1, 1950. The action was taken without a full presentation of all the facts, which are as follows:

1. According to the reports of the American Bureau of Shipping, there were a total of 856 American-flag, dry-cargo, and combination-cargo and passenger vessels operating in the foreign trade during the calendar year 1949 (March 1950 bulletin). According to the Maritime Commission testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, there were only 235 subsidized vessels operating during the calendar year 1949. The effect of the House action is to prohibit the extension of Government aid to any of the 621 vessels which operated in 1949 without Government subsidy.

2. The operators of the 621 unsubsidized vessels who have been trying to run without Government aid are penalized by the House action, whereas the owners of the vessels which actually received subsidy in 1949 are protected. Therefore the legislation is outrageously unfair (obviously unintentionally so) to that group of operators who are deserving of maximum Government support and encouragement because of their willingness to operate in the past without seeking Government aid, as contrasted with other companies which have operated only with the protection of millions of dollars of Government subsidy.

3. The companies which have been operating without subsidy in the past are not in a position to continue indefinitely to operate without subsidy in the future. There have been substantial reductions in freight rates during the past year. There has also been a shrinkage in cargo and increased foreign-flag competition, as a result of which the space utilization per vessel has been reduced. To an increasing extent, foreign-flag competitors, in view of their lower costs, are in a position to cut rates below the break-even point for American-flag vessels, thus driving American-flag vessels out of business unless their cost differential is equalized by the Government. Based on subsidy payments by the Maritime Commission, it would appear that the cost advantage of the foreign-flag operator is $50,000 to $75,000 per voyage. That is the amount of handicap which the unsubsidized operators have been voluntarily assuming in the past, but which they will probably be unable to assume in the future.

4. It appears that the House Appropriations Committee is proceeding on the erroneous assumption that additional subsidy payments are synonymous with an expanding American-flag merchant marine, notwithstanding a contracting world-wide trade. There is no question but that the total American-flag merchant marine engaged in foreign trade will contract, perhaps substantially, thereby reducing the total number of vessels engaged in the foreign trade from 856 (1949 average) to a substantially lower figure. This is regrettable, but apparently inevitable. However, even the reduced number of vessels will be unable to operate unless a larger number of vessels are subsidized. There is nothing inconsistent between increasing the number of subsidized vessels on the one hand and reducing the total number of vessels in the foreign trade on the other hand. We may end up with a subsidized merchant marine of 500 vessels, which would result in approximately doubling the amount of operating subsidy. However, on the assumption that vessels cannot operate in the foreign trade without subsidy, this will mean a reduction in the total foreign-trade fleet from 856 to 500 vessels, or approximately 30 percent. If the confusion between the total number of vessels engaged in the foreign trade as against the total number receiving subsidy is cleared up, we are confident that the Appropriations Committee will realize that it is erroneous to assume that an expanding number of subsidized vessels is inconsistent with a reduced number of vessels in the foreign trade under the American flag.

5. The total participation in the foreign trade by American-flag vessels in the aggregate during 1949 was less than 50 percent. This includes participation of both subsidized and unsubsidized vessels. A substantial reduction in the number of vessels operating in the foreign trade will result in a further reduction in the American-flag participation in the foreign trade.

6. The action of the Appropriations Committee creates a very disturbing precedent. It in effect repeals the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, except as to persons who have already been fortunate enough to secure its benefits, and does so without advice or consultation with the legislative committees which are primarily concerned with the merchant-marine policy of the United States. It also requires dismissal of proceedings now pending before the Maritime Commission based on applications for subsidy which have been carried on for the past several months with the expenditure of considerable amounts of time and money in an attempt to make a case for subsidy under the provisions of the act. The precedent will likewise destroy any hope of further building commitments from applicants, since companies making commitments for purchase or construction of vessels will be required to gamble on the action of the Appropriations Committee in connection with annual budget requests emanating from the Maritime Commission.

In view of these considerations, we hope that the House Appropriations Committee will reconsider its action and refer the matter to the legislative committees for further consideration. In that connection, the President's plan for the reoganization of the Maritime Commission may be taken into account, since it apparently delegates to the Secretary of Commerce authority to make over-all policy determinations regarding our subsidy program, which would presumably include determinations as to the size and scope of our subsidized merchant marine.

Federal Assistance to School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I will deliver over radio station WJR on Friday, April 7, 1950, at Detroit, Mich.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, my broadcast to you a month ago pointed out what happens to a community when a large Federal installation, such as an airfield or a large plant manufacturing airplanes for war purposes is established, and thousands of additional workers are brought to the area to man the installation. I pointed out that Federal activities of this type had affected hundreds of communities during the war and that such activities as reclamation and flood control projects, Atomic Energy Commission projects, and other peacetime activities of the Federal Government, had accentuated this problem since the war. Our own area here in Detroit, many times referred to as the "arsenal of democracy" was particularly affected during the war period as hundreds of thousands of new workers and their families moved in to man the factories producing materials for the war.

In that talk I further pointed out that the Congress had set up during the war a program of assistance to communities, particularly school districts affected by Federal activities, and had continued that program since the cessation of hostilities on a restricted basis, because the affected school districts still had a critical problem. In fact, the problem has become so acute that a dozen different Federal agencies have been given the authority by the Congress to provide Federal assistance to school districts affected by their activities. This legislative authority is not uniform from one agency to another. There is some duplication and there are some gaps not covered by any authority to provide assistance. This entire matter was considered by the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am chairman, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and it was determined to appoint a subcommittee to study this problem and bring back recommendations for a solution early in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. As a matter of fact, two dif-

ferent subcommittees were appointed to study this problem and also to investigate some labor problems. Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, was chairman of one subcommittee, and the members were Congressmen IRVING from Missouri, STEED from Oklahoma, MORTON from Kentucky, and NIXON from California. The other subcommittee, under the chairman of THOMAS H. BURKE of Ohio, included Congressmen PERKINS of Kentucky, WIER of Minnesota, MCCONNELL of Pennsylvania, and WERDEL of California. These two subcommittees held extensive hearings throughout the Nation receiving testimony from over 600 witnesses in 23 locations in 17 States. The material presented before those subcommittees in those hearings have been printed in two volumes, constituting approximately 2,700 pages, filled with factual information showing how the Federal Government has seriously affected the ability of school districts in which its projects are located to finance school services.

These two subcommittees supplemented their field investigations by statistical data reported by affected school districts which show the total number of children involved, the number of school districts affected, and the degree to which these Federal activities have affected school services in the communities. This mass of information conclusively shows that Uncle Sam, when he becomes a citizen in a community by owning land, by building and renting houses, and by operating industrial or commercial activities without paying taxes, creates a financial burden on the community which it cannot solve without Federal assistance. These Federal activities affect school districts principally in two ways. The Federal Government acquires property, removing it from the tax rolls, and thus the school districts lose the revenue that otherwise would have been received, because federally owned property is not taxable. It brings in a large influx of population to man the installations built on this property creating an additional financial burden on the remaining taxpayers in the community. In some cases people live on the Federal property and attend the adjacent school districts. In other districts they live in the community but work at the tax-free installation. The evidence collected by the committee shows that there are 600 or 700 school districts that have been so seriously affected by these Federal activities that they cannot finance normal school services without Federal help. There are 1,500,000 children living in these school districts who will be deprived of normal school services unless Federal assistance is provided. They need additional funds to pay current operating expenses, and they need Federal assistance to provide additional school buildings.

The two subcommittees have been meeting each day for the past 3 weeks to develop legislation that will meet this problem created by the Federal Government on a fair and equitable basis. They have completed action on the bill which will provide assistance for current operating expenses. The bill for current operating expenses was introduced March 30, of the present year, and the number is H. R. 7940.

Briefly, the bill provides that the Federal assistance shall be extended in such a manner that it will meet only the Federal responsibility and will not relieve the school districts or the State of their normal responsibility of providing school services. It assumes that the Federal Government should be responsible for making a payment equivalent to the reduction in school revenues by removal of land from the tax rolls so that all school districts which have suffered a Federal impact because of a reduction of school revenues from Federal acquisition of property will receive a payment on this basis. The bill then provides that in addition the Federal Government will make a payment for those additional children brought to the school district as the result of Federal activities. The amount of the payment will be based on the extent of the Federal burden placed on the school district. For children living on Federal property for which no tax is received by the school district, the Federal Government will pay an amount equivalent to the local share of the cost of current operating expenses per child. For children whose parents work at nontaxable property located in the school district, the Federal Government will pay a smaller amount per child, and the final category is that group where there has been a very sudden and substantial impact of additional children without a commensurate increase in tax valuations. For this group the Federal Government will pay an amount determined by the Commissioner of Education to be necessary to provide normal educational services for the additional children. Assistance in this last category is to be continued only for a 3-year period, because it is expected that the communities will have been able to make the financial adjustments necessary to handle this impact of additional children at the end of that period.

Provision also is made in the bill to assist for a limited period of time those school districts that have experienced a severe impact during the war period because of Federal activities and still have a heavy financial burden caused by this Federal impact. The amount of this assistance will be based on the extent of this past impact and the burden it still places on the district. There are safeguards in the bill to restrict Federal assistance only to the amount necessary to meet Federal-caused needs and to prevent any Federal interference or control over local educational matters. The provisions of the bill also assure that Federal funds will not be used to pay those costs that should be borne by State and local governments. It is truly a bill to meet the Federal responsibility created when Uncle Sam becomes a citizen of a community.

It is the intention of the subcommittee to report out in the very near future a bill that will provide Federal assistance for construction of additional school-plant facilities made necessary by the increased number of children in the district caused by Federal activities.

I am unable at this time to give you any details of the bill that will be proposed to provide assistance for construction of additional school facilities because the subcommittees have just started work on that phase. I am informed by the subcommittee members, however, that they intend to develop a bill that will meet the responsibility of the Federal Government for additional school facilities which its activities have created.

Now let us look for a moment at what the bill already introduced will do for the State of Michigan. Statistical data reported to the subcommittees by the school districts do not show the extent to which school districts would be eligible for assistance because of reduction of revenues resulting from Federal ownership of land. They do show, however, the extent to which districts would be eligible because of an impact of additional children. There are 16 seriously impacted school districts that reported information which was sufficiently complete to include in the subcommittees' tabulation. This is not the entire number in the State that may benefit from this proposed legislation, but includes only those on which the subcommittee now has necessary information.

It appears from the data these 16 districts reported that each of these would be eligible for assistance under the terms of H. R. 7940 as proposed by the subcommittee. Six of them would be eligible to receive payments because they have children living on nontaxable Federally owned property. An additional 4 school districts appear to be eligible for assistance because they have children whose parents are employed at Federally owned nontaxable property located in the school district; and 11 of the 16 districts appear to be eligible because of a sudden and substantial impact of additional children resulting from activities of the Federal Government not accompanied by Federal ownership of property. Those districts on which the data are now complete are: Erin Township No. 6, Erin and Warren No. 2, Fraser Public Erin No. 1, Livonia Township District, Madison No. 10, Mount Clemens No. 1, Muskegon Township No. 1, Romulus Township, Roseville No. 5, Royal Oak Township No. 1, Warren Consolidated No. 1, Wayne District, Ypsilanti Township District No. 1, Dearborn Township, Grosse Ile Township, Warren Township. These figures must be regarded as tentative and may change next year, but based upon the data reported by the school districts, the categories as outlined above will apply.

It is not possible to tell you from the data now available the amount these districts would receive, because that will be determined by taking the actual figures for the school year in which the payment is to be made. However, it does appear that this bill, if passed by the Congress, will give substantial assistance to those critically overburdened areas in our State, many of them in and around Detroit, which have for the past 8 or 10 years been carrying added financial responsibilities placed on them by the Federal Government.

My sincere thanks to WJR, the good-will station, for the opportunity to speak this evening over their facilities.

Thank you and good night.

Two Great Omahans Honored by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Omaha World-Herald there appeared the following article which announced to the reading public that two great Omahans had been signally honored by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, by having been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

I wish to congratulate these two outstanding citizens of Omaha, Nebr., for having received this great honor, and in passing may I also observe that I am sure that every Nebraskan will join with me in stating that these two fine gentlemen richly deserved the signal recognition which they have received.

The newspaper article is as follows:

OMAHANS NEW PAPAL KNIGHTS—BERT MURPHY, VAL PETER TO BE INVESTED

Two prominent Omahans have been made Knights of St. Gregory the Great.

Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan said Thursday the high Catholic Church layman honors were conferred by Pope Pius XII on Andrew Albert (Bert) Murphy, 75, car dealer, and Valentine Peter, 74, German language newspaper publisher.

Word of the Pope's action came from the apostolic delegation in Washington, said Archbishop Bergan. The pontifical honor was conferred on the recommendation of the archbishop.

Public investiture of the two new knights will be after Easter, when official briefs are received from Rome.

The knighthood was established about 100 years ago by Pope Gregory XVI to honor Catholic laymen for exemplary lives and services for the church.

SIX OTHER KNIGHTS

Other Omaha knights are Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews, J. Francis McDermott, Dr. Adolph Sachs, J. E. Fitzpatrick, Edward F. Leary, and Charles W. Hamilton, Jr.

Archbishop Bergan said that Mr. Murphy "is held in the highest esteem by all citizens of Omaha and the Midwest irrespective of religious belief."

Mr. Murphy's business, Andrew Murphy & Son, last November marked its eightieth year in business in Omaha.

"Without any doubt," said Archbishop Bergan, "he would be considered Omaha's most beloved citizen. He has ever enjoyed the regard and respect of all the clergy and bishops of Omaha including myself."

PETER'S DESCENT GERMAN

The archbishop lauded Mr. Peter as "one of America's outstanding Catholics of German descent."

Born in Lower Franconia, Bavaria, Mr. Peter was brought to the United States when he was 14. His father died 2 years later. Mr. Peter taught school for two sessions, then got a job on a semiweekly language paper at Rock Island, Ill. Later he bought the paper at a sheriff's sale.

He now publishes papers from Baltimore to San Francisco and is believed to be the country's largest publisher of German language newspapers. He has the Omaha Daily German Tribune in Omaha.

The Peters have 12 children.

Appropriations Spent Quarterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, over and above the annual appropriations made by the Congress, there are in addition deficiency and urgent appropriations amounting to more than $15,000,000,000 for the fiscal years covering 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, all going to the bureaus and oftentimes spent by the bureaucrats without regard to waste, authorization, and the intent of Congress.

Now the Congress is asked to authorize the spending of "what we don't have"—to spend nearly $6,000,000,000 more money than the Treasury will collect as income, even in face of the Government now being in debt for nearly $260,000,000,000.

Will the Congress again authorize the spending of billions more than income at the request of the executive branch of the Government?

Is it any wonder that the bureaucrats waste and spend other than authorized, spend and give away for purposes not intended by the Congress?—for the whole annual appropriation is made available to the bureaucrats in a lump sum, all at one time, and with nothing to worry them for another year.

Each bureau spends as it desires, often regardless of the intent of Congress, and then makes its excuse the following year. For the report of irregularities and abuses come from the Comptroller General only after the money is gone from the Treasury. It is the same pattern and practice each year with little done—not even the proverbial "locking the barn door after the horse is stolen"—the door is open each year for the same abuses, waste and misspending. And after the money is gone little investigation or none at all.

While hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been lost to the Government by the spending of these bureaucrats, yet many pass over such conduct by facetiously saying it is simply "Yankee shrewdness doing business with saps in the bureaus."

Let us stop this year-after-year waste and spending of funds by not waiting until the moneys are actually gone, by not permitting the same people in the Government to waste the taxpayers' money, and release no further appropriations to such people in the bureaus. I do not believe that appropriations should be paid and given to the bureaus for spending in an annual lump sum. Private business would be bankrupt if it gave millions of dollars for a year's operation and paid no further attention to the moneys expended until the following year. It seems that much of the abuse, misspending, and waste of taxpayers' money, might be stopped by only paying and releasing it to the bureaucrats in quarterly installments. And if the bureau does not justify its spending in the previous quarter, the next quarterly installment should be reduced and the personnel responsible separated from the Government. By such procedure waste and misspending of the taxpayers' money might be stopped, for under the present system the bureau can spend all that is appropriated and sometimes overspend.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the quarterly release and payment of appropriations would save hundreds of millions of dollars and would be a greater saving to the taxpayers rather than investigation after the money is gone. I have introduced the following bill to make appropriations available in quarterly installments:

A bill relating to the checking, spending, and quarterly payment of appropriations for the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That all appropriations for the executive branch of the Government shall be available for payment and spending only in four quarterly installments, and in such amounts as the Senate and the House of Representatives through their Appropriations Committees shall approve within 30 days previous to the 1st day of July, October, January, and April, beginning on the 1st day of July 1950, and thereafter.

SEC. 2. And such quarterly release and payment of moneys for spending shall be only after appearance, justification, and report to the House Committee on Appropriations detailing the payment and spending of the previous quarter by each department of the executive branch of the Government and the Treasurer of the United States shall release only such sums as shall be so determined jointly by the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

Appropriate Appropriations for VA Medical Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, INC.,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, Mass., April 5, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At the meeting of the Department Executive Committee held April 1 at the Parker House, Boston, it was unanimously voted to adopt the enclosed resolutions and to forward a copy to each of our Senators and Representatives.

I know your interest in the veterans who have served our Nation in time of peril and I trust that you will consider favorably the legislation which is now under discussion.

I shall appreciate hearing from you at your convenience on either or both of the resolutions enclosed.

Cordially yours,
ADELAIDE L. FITZGERALD,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Resolution 1

Whereas the Hoover Commission created under Public Law 162 expended $2,000,000 of the taxpayer's money in preparing their report for reorganization of various Federal departments; and

Whereas this report recommended that five Federal agencies of the Government take over the work of the Veterans' Administration which now handles all veterans' affairs and which was recommended by President Hoover in 1929 for both efficiency and economy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the department executive committee of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Massachusetts, Inc., endorse the action of the American Legion in opposing those recommendations of the Hoover Report insofar as they affect veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That we advise the Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen of our interest in economy in Government, but that we believe economy and efficiency can be best achieved through the handling of all veterans' affairs under the one branch known as the Veterans' Administration.

Resolution 2

Whereas the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration has ordered a cut of over 7,500 personnel in the Veterans' Administration, many of whom are in the Medical Division who are caring for the men and women who served during both World Wars; and

Whereas this cut in personnel was required because of the failure to provide the necessary funds as recommended by the Veterans' Administrator in his supplementary appropriation request last October: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the department executive committee of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Massachusetts, Inc., notify the Senators and Congressmen of Massachusetts that we believe immediate action should be taken to provide the necessary appropriation to cover present needs.

Peanuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with that inimitable columnist, George Dixon, that peanuts are no longer "peanuts." Peanuts are now dollar conscious.

Mr. Dixon and I approach the goober problem from different directions.

Peanuts, to me, are an important food—a source of protein as every mother has learned. Their food value is high. A good case could be made for peanut butter—a convenient and ready item of diet for children.

Alas, peanut butter—as all mothers in the medium to lower income brackets know—has been priced out of the market.

Peanut butter has been priced out of the market because an artificial demand has been created for other peanut products in the nonedible field made possible because we have supported peanuts at too high a level.

Peanut growers, peanut speculators and peanut brokers have made many a quick dollar. They have made it because Uncle Sam has kept his good right arm around them in the form of high subsidy prices thus assisting in the creation of an artificial shortage.

I think the peanut group are as "nuts" as their product. They had the chance to build a steady, ever expanding market for peanut butter—a market that would have consumed more and more of the crop each year, a dependable market that would have returned them good profits. They tossed all that away for a "quickie" profit in peanut oil.

They ignored a firm market in which they had no other comparable competing item to enter a field already overcrowded with sesame, tung, palm, flax, fish, coconut and other sources of fatty oil.

Oh, well, when support prices are curtailed—and they will be—the peanut growers may return to the days when peanuts again mean small change.

Here is George Dixon's little chitchat:

WASHINGTON SCENE

PEANUTS ARE NOT "PEANUTS" NOW

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—I don't know whether you have given this the thought it merits, but Baldy Brannan, the eroded noggin of agriculture, is knocking the very foundations from under our American language.

The Secretary of Agriculture has made a grim mockery of many of our most cherished expressions. To sing "Potatoes are cheaper—tomatoes are cheaper—now's the time to fall in love," would elicit only hollow laughter these days, and you would probably be strung from the nearest tree if you said, "And that ain't hay," to a stock raiser.

But the expression Brannan has made the biggest bum out of is: "That's peanuts."

"That's peanuts," we used to say, with a blithe snap of the fingers. We meant it didn't amount to a hill of beans. What am I saying? A hill of beans runs into money.

"That's peanuts." If it's an expression you're in the habit of using, I think I can cure you of it.

Peanuts are costing you a fortune, and I'm not handing you any spinach.

I couldn't afford to hand you any spinach anyway. It's too expensive.

"That's peanuts." The Government today is purchasing more than a quarter of all the peanuts grown in this country, under the support program. Uncle Sam, using your hard-earned dough, my little pets, bought $62,864,000 worth of peanuts last year.

The total peanut crop brought $225,000,000 to the growers. But even that represents only a fraction of the peanut money, according to men who know their onions.

Under the support program, beloved of the rutabaga economist, the Department of Agriculture bought 367,000,000 pounds of shelled peanuts last year, and 74,000,000 pounds of unshelled. It looks to buy even more this year.

"That's peanuts." Peanuts represent a fabulous amount of money. That $225,000,000 we mentioned a moment ago represents only payments to growers. But think how this pyramids through middlemen, jobbers, and so forth, down to the white-coated fellow at the ball park who sells you a bag with eighteen or so peanuts for 10 cents.

"That's peanuts?" Nuts.

"That's peanuts" is a billion-dollar business.

Imports of Foreign Fish Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me by the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of the Pacific calling my attention to the injurious effects of imports of foreign fish products upon domestic fisheries industry. Lowered tariffs upon imports of foreign products produced with low-paid labor can ultimately destroy many American industries unless some quota is placed upon those imports.

The letter follows:

DEEP SEA FISHERMEN'S UNION
OF THE PACIFIC,
March 31, 1950.

Hon. THOR TOLLEFSON,
House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Deep Sea Fishermen's Union of Seattle, we are writing you in connection with proposed hearings in your committee relating to regulations of quotas on the import of fish liver oils into the United States.

As you are no doubt aware, our State Department has issued a directive removing all quotas on oils containing vitamin A. This has resulted in a large import of Japanese oils into the United States, resulting in a tremendous drop in the price of soupfin shark livers, and dogfish livers, the source of such oils. This has resulted in a great hardship on the fishing industry in the Northwest.

Our union has some 2,000 men who are employed on fishing vessels out of Seattle and Northwest points. The principal product of these vessels during the winter months are shark, dogfish, and other bottom fish from which the livers are obtained and processed for the vitamin A oil content. As all crew members share in the catch, the price received has a direct relation to the earnings of the men on these vessels. Up to the time that these quotas were removed, $8 to $12 per pound was paid for soupfin shark livers of high vitamin A potency. Today, as a result primarily of foreign imports, the price is around $2.50 to $3 per pound. Fishing in the small boats in the open sea is an extremely arduous and hazardous occupation. The price of $8 to $12 per pound for the soupfin shark livers is only a fair compensation for this work, by the present day standards. In addition, there is a great risk of loss and damage to equipment in fishing for shark, and such risks will not be undertaken by the owners of the vessels unless the price received for the product is commensurate with the risk involved.

Not only is there a direct risk on the vessel in fishing in North Pacific waters during the winter months, but there is a particularly great risk on the equipment and nets used in shark fishing. Shark nets have an initial cost of $6,000 to $10,000 for their construction, their combined sections are frequently as much as 18,000 feet in length. Sudden storms and normal ocean hazards will frequently cause their loss or destruction. With such a high mortality on equipment, insurance rates thereon are prohibitive.

In 1946 there were about 100 vessels employed in shark fishing during the winter months. Each vessel employed an average of seven men. Today with the price approximately $2.50 to $3 per pound by reason of the imports of Japanese oils, there are only about 20 or 25 vessels engaged in such operation. The price of dogfish liver has been so depressed by these imports that today not one single boat in the Puget Sound area is engaged in fishing for dogfish, against a normal operation of 75 or 80 boats working in the winter months for this product. This has resulted in a substantial unemployment among our members.

The figures as to the increase of liver oil imports are published by the United States Bureau of Customs. According to the customs records, there has been a substantial increase in the imports of various liver oils, principally from Japan and South Africa. In 1947 over 1,159,000 pounds of such oils were imported for a declared value of $4,591,000. In 1948, 3,743,000 pounds of shark liver oil was imported with a declared value of $6,429,000, and the first 11 months of 1949, 3,296,000 pounds of shark liver oils were imported with a declared value of $2,996,000. No shark liver oils were imported in 1947. In addition to the shark liver oil many millions of pounds of other oils were imported, their sources being cod livers, dogfish, etc. The price has now dropped to about $2.50 per pound for high potency shark livers caught by United States vessels and crews.

On the other hand since 1946 there has been a very sharp increase in the cost of equipment and gear both for the vessels and the men employed on the vessels. As the price received for the catch has dropped, fishing expectations are no longer profitable for ships and crews, and the vessels remain tied up in the ports.

We can readily understand the desire of the State Department to assist other countries to get on their feet by encouraging export of their products and sale in the United States. However, such imports of foreign products should not be permitted if their results would be to reduce the standard of living of American workmen and result in

widespread unemployment. It is, of course, impossible for American workmen to compete with foreign standards of living. When prices are further depressed by devalued currency their impact on American workmen who produce the same products result in great hardships to these workmen.

We feel that the problem of foreign aid can be met without placing the greatest burden on the particular group of American workmen affected by the import of cheap foreign products supported and subsidized by American dollars. This problem can be met by establishing reasonable quotas on the imports of fish liver oils. We feel that a customs duty should be placed upon this product which is realistic and bears some relation to the problems of protecting American products from such competition.

We urge that this committee give full consideration to this problem not only with relation to the specific items involved, to wit, fish liver oils, but with relation to all fish products. Not only are the members of our union affected but there are many thousands of men in allied unions who have a direct interest in this problem. We feel sure you will give your sincere consideration in view of the direct relationship to the welfare of our own members and the commercial fishermen. We shall, of course, follow your progress in this problem with deep interest.

Respectfully submitted.

H. GROTLE, *Secretary.*

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Rothwell Brown appearing in the New York Evening Journal April 5, 1950:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—Secretary Acheson's statement that he didn't think he had ever met Owen Lattimore, immediate target of the McCarthy charges, is in itself a remarkable revelation of the slipshod methods by which our State Department is being conducted.

The Secretary of State obviously is either mistaken about his acquaintance with Lattimore or he is guilty of the grossest negligence in not getting acquainted with a man who is already engaged, for the United Nations, in secret work under President Truman's point 4 program—before that program has even been approved by Congress.

There is an obscurity about the presence of Mr. Lattimore in Afghanistan, as an agent of the United Nations, on a mission to pick out some key economic projects for that country, which might provide the basis of long-term assistance under the point 4 plan, which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should probe with complete thoroughness.

Senator MCCARTHY tore quite a hole in the curtain of secrecy enveloping the machinations of the State Department, in its secret schemes to extend the New Deal "squanderbund" to the international scene, when his allegations suddenly had the effect of revealing the presence of Mr. Lattimore in the heart of Asia.

Lattimore was there, the State Department insisted, not as a representative of the State Department.

Acheson followed with his disavowal of even knowing Lattimore.

Yet at this very time Acheson was appearing before Congress urging speedy approval of a measure that would commit the United States to an initial expenditure of $45,000,000 as a starter for the point 4 program.

Mr. Acheson made this appearance before Congress not as the representative of the United Nations but as the spokesman for the State Department.

Yet we know, as a result of Senator MCCARTHY's revelations, that already the United Nations had taken over point 4.

The same day Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was disclosing in some pretty blunt language that he had already determined in his own mind that the United Nations would have to be eliminated from participation in the point 4 program.

This outburst by the Texan occurred at a committee hearing, in the presence of Acheson, on the morning of March 30.

MCCARTHY's disclosure, on the authority of the Library of Congress, that Lattimore was in Afghanistan, cooking up a point 4 operation for the United Nations, was made to the Senate in the late afternoon of the same day.

Obviously CONNALLY's suspicions had been previously aroused. He described the United Nations as a "chiseling spending agency"—which it has been from the day it was launched at San Francisco in 1945.

"It seems to me," said CONNALLY, an administration Democrat, "that about all we would do would be to furnish the money and have them mess it up. It also looks like a plan to create a lot of new jobs and have us pay for them."

Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, testified that UN already had done much work on point 4, and had several projects ready.

So here we have Mr. Acheson asking for a huge appropriation for the State Department which was to be spent by the United Nations.

And here we have, already as busy as a bee in Afghanistan, getting ready to blow in a wad of American tax money, Mr. Owen Lattimore, a gentleman with whom Mr. Acheson was unacquainted.

If that's the way the State Department is being run, the quicker it is reorganized from top to bottom the better.

Union in Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement of the so-called Truman doctrine in Greece in 1947 a considerable number of the Members of the Congress have actively sponsored the movement for European union.

It will be recalled that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and I joined in introducing a United States of Europe resolution.

Since then the need for unification has been universally recognized.

A forceful editorial on the subject was recently written by Mr. M. F. Everett, of Catholic Action of the South.

I am pleased to include the editorial in the RECORD.

SEEING THINGS—UNION IN WESTERN EUROPE

(By M. F. Everett)

There was a weak spot in the fence, and I knew it. But I put off repairing it. So one day a hog found it and pushed through. The whole herd immediately got out. I had to round them up and repair the fence. Then, because they had learned they could get out once and tried it over and over again, I had to do a lot more work on the fence than if I had fixed it in the first place.

Most of us act as I did when a farm boy. We know that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," but we still don't get busy until we are forced to do so or until long experience has convinced us that the ounce of prevention is the wiser course.

I was thinking of this as I conned news reports of various moves toward union in western Europe. There is serious need for economic and political, or at least ideological, unity among these countries. The Old World set-up has been shattered, and they are being forced to act together or be blotted out, one by one, behind the iron curtain. A number of moves have been made toward union, but whether the peoples as a whole realize the need sufficiently to forget old animosities and work together remains to be seen.

Dr. Austin J. App, a professor at LaSalle college, Philadelphia, and, if I remember correctly, an active worker in the Catholic Association for International Peace, asserted in a recent address that America will soon either permit a strong Christian Germany or see a strong communistic Europe. He said that the present United States-British-French policy of trying to make Germany democratic but to keep her weak in military force, industry, and commerce is calculated to soften up what is left of Germany for a strong Bolshevism. He fears that, as in Hungary and other Red satellite nations, Germany and other free European nations will be betrayed to communism, with the liquidation of Christian leaders, Bishops, priests, scholars, and all the most decent people.

Konrad Adenauer, German Chancellor, boldly offered to France this month a complete union of the two countries as a means of settling all differences over the Saar and other problems and to lay a cornerstone for a United States of Europe. But France fears Germany with a terror born of frequent conquest, and this fear is not allayed by the fact that western Germany is becoming more Catholic and Christian as expellees from territory taken over by Poland settle there.

Winston Churchill offered France a similar union in the recent war. But England has been ruled for several years by a labor party that is interested in setting up a socialistic state. France does not know how far England will go now in cooperating to achieve political and economic unity in western Europe. Its doubt is strong enough that President Auriol of France made a plea for British cooperation the basis for a recent talk before the British Parliament, a most unusual move.

He told the Parliament that the former Anglo-French military alliance was not enough to counter present dangers. The two countries should cooperate in all spheres and both should cooperate on the same basis with all of western Europe. "Why wait for disaster?" he asked. "It is we, the English and the French, whom a new war would once again place in the forefront of peril."

These incidents dramatize the need for unity. They also show that leaders are aware of the desperate necessity for joint action. Other signs are favorable. The discussions over military supplies in the Atlantic pact, the consultative assembly at Strasbourg, the economic unions of several nations in Benelux and Fritilux, the Franco-Italian parleys for economic union—these show that western Europe has gone further on the road to unity in the past 2 years than in the previous past 2 centuries. We hope the various moves coalesce into a successful union while there is still time.

The Coast Guard Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the Seattle Times on April 3, 1950, dealing with a subject which should have the attention of Members of Congress. The Coast Guard Reserve program should have our best consideration. The editorial follows:

ENTITLED TO THE SAME AS OTHER RESERVISTS

In Seattle there is disappointment that Congress again has made no provision for the training program of the United States Coast Guard Volunteer Reserve. The House Appropriations Committee has slashed some $20,000,000 from the Coast Guard's 1951 budget, including more than $13,000,000 for construction and improvements, $2,000,000 for operation expenses, and $4,000,000 for the Reserve program.

The committee, perhaps wisely, declined to increase the size of the Coast Guard's air arm, though we in this region are familiar with the work that branch of the Coast Guard performs in rescuing survivors of ship and plane disasters. The committee said it is in sympathy with the arguments favoring a training program for the Coast Guard Reserve, but feels that the Treasury is in such condition that it cannot sanction the initiation of new programs.

The Coast Guard has asked for $4,100,000 to provide training for 1,900 officers and 6,000 enlisted men of the Coast Guard Volunteer Reserve. That organization exists only with volunteer status. The Reserve units of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps all are entitled at least to a minimum of yearly training, to keep prepared for a call to duty, but the volunteer reservists of the Coast Guard enjoy no such advantages. The lack would leave the harbors and waterways of the United States and its possessions without any "force in being" trained to be called into immediate action in an emergency.

During World War II, the Coast Guard supervised the safe handling of no less than 12,000,000,000 pounds of explosives at ports of this State alone. It is from the Reserves that the Coast Guard must draw the personnel to perform such expert services in an emergency.

This is the third year that Congress has denied funds for the Coast Guard Reserve training program. It is a shortsighted policy. Seattle Coast Guard volunteer reservists are justified in their determination to fight to have the relatively small appropriation for their organization restored.

British Ask: "When Does the Roman Circus Close in the United States?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by William H. Stringer, chief, London News Bureau, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1950:

BRITISH ASK: "WHEN DOES THE ROMAN CIRCUS CLOSE IN THE UNITED STATES?"

(By William H. Stringer)

LONDON.—Several times in the past week friends in the British Government or the press have asked me anxiously whether a reaction of sanity had set in yet in Washington.

Frankly, the British and a good many other Europeans are worried and dumbfounded at the Roman circus of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY in Washington and at the incredible collaboration of some Republican Senators and some of the American press.

Dumbfounded, yes, and disheartened. Because to them it has looked as though the United States Government, on which the west places vast reliance for leadership and strength in the struggle to counter Russian expansionism, was coming apart at the seams. American prestige abroad has been dangerously debased at a serious moment in postwar history.

ACHESON SUPPORTED IN BRITAIN

Maybe the United States is big enough not to care what other nations or peoples think about it. And maybe not. Maybe you don't care whether foreigners think well of your Secretary of State. But you may as well know that Dean Acheson, now under a barrage of denunciation from Senators MCCARTHY, WHERRY, and BRIDGES, is regarded in Britain as an individual of the highest talents and statesmanship. People over here think you should be thanking your lucky stars that you have found a man of such integrity, intellect, and unswerving purpose to succeed Gen. George C. Marshall.

The Times of London, for instance, declares: "When Mr. Acheson was chosen to succeed Mr. Marshall, the choice was felt to be singularly happy and likely not only to shed luster on the administration but also to provide international leadership of a high order."

EMPHASIS PUT ON RESOLUTE ACTION

One might say cynically: Yes, of course, Mr. Acheson favors Marshall aid, so why shouldn't Europe support him? But for you to come to that conclusion is, to use Winston Churchill's recent phrase, falling below the level of events. It is failing to see that the world is in a truly tough spot right now. And that the situation has to be met, not by ousting a couple of fellow travelers from some Washington bureau—if such can be found—but by resolute action along the whole perimeter of the West's physical and political ramparts.

"Quarrels between Republicans and Democrats are, of course, for Americans alone to determine," says the responsible London Economist. "But so long as the rest of the free world depends for its existence upon American wisdom and strength, it has a right to express its horror at the lengths to which partisan levity is being carried in Washington. It is not by such leadership that freedom will be saved."

Of course, the British Government itself has not been vigorously enunciating foreign policy lately. And when Mr. Churchill has raised problems of deep urgency in the House of Commons he has been more than once criticized by Government spokesmen as being irresponsible or mischievous. But British hesitancy to take bold steps stems partially from American indecision—the kind of indecision that is prolonged when responsible officials must spend half of their time preparing replies and defenses against vicious attacks.

NO ROMAN FORUMS FOR BRITAIN

Over here when there is suspicion of misconduct in office, the immediate impulse is to set up a commission of able men of great integrity to investigate, but not a Roman forum with klieg-light publicity. Maybe there is another difference, too, in that the British—and I mean those who really are awake to the Communist menace—never seem to get so all-fired excited over communism as some Americans do.

After all, Russian communism is not some dreadful contagion which cannot be halted. It is a shrewd despotism which can be beaten to a standstill by resolute action—the very kind of action which Mr. Acheson has been proposing in his recent California speeches.

There is wide awareness, even from this distance, that the main purpose of the attack on the State Department is political. And, personally, I would be willing to bet the same crowd is peddling the attack which sought, unsuccessfully, to find a diabolical plot in the Pearl Harbor disaster—the same slick radio commentators expounding the daily grist of charges and the same behind-the-scenes operators.

Britons are not being self-righteous when they comment that such unsubstantiated charges as have been made in the United States Senate would not get very far in Britain. Few members of Parliament would dare use their parliamentary immunity to make such guilt-by-association accusations.

And why? Because the British public, with its strong sense of fair play, would almost certainly ostracize such behavior from public life. Maybe it's high time for the American public, with its equally well-publicized sense of fair play, to come to the rescue of Mr. Acheson.

Galveston Engineer District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for many years, my home town of Galveston, has been the Texas district headquarters of the United States Army engineers. More recently, a good deal of flood-control work has developed in the interior of the State. A few months ago, in the course of a continuing Nation-wide study of the engineers' activities, it was reported to the Chief of Engineers that economy of money and effort could be attained by moving the administrative offices concerned with flood control to a point located closer to the geographic center of those activities.

For a time, it was considered that the entire district headquarters including

not only flood-control work in the interior, but rivers and harbors development and maintenance adjacent to the coast, should be moved inland and away from Galveston.

Further studies indicated that it would not be economically justifiable to remove the rivers and harbors headquarters away from its theater of operation on the coast. Therefore it was concluded that a new district should be established in the interior, and that personnel pertinent to inland flood control should be removed from Galveston to that office.

A move of this kind is something that no Member of Congress could like. However, the Corps of Engineers, with the utmost consideration for me and respect for the fight I had made in behalf of Galveston, kept me fully informed as to the course of their surveys and when the decision was finally made to remove a part of my people, I was left without any factual data on which to base an argument.

Subsequently public and civic officials of Galveston appeared before General Pick in person. Last Monday there was a further conference between the division engineer and the Galveston people held in that city. The outcome is set forth in an article from the Galveston News of April 4, which follows.

I wish to invite especial attention to the final reaction of the Galveston civic leaders. Their acceptance of the move was no easier for them than it was for me, but they did accept it as being best for the greatest number and as an economy move which, as they expressed it, might well "become contagious in other Federal operations":

GALVESTON ENGINEER DISTRICT WILL REMAIN ONE OF LARGEST

Galveston district of the United States Corps of Engineers will remain one of the largest in the country, both in money appropriated to its projects and in actual area, Col. Louis W. Prentiss, division engineer at Dallas, informed officers of the chamber of commerce Monday.

He told the officers at a conference here over the split of the Galveston district, that this district will grow in activity in the future as big drainage projects are begun.

Under the split of the local office, a district office will be opened in Fort Worth to supervise flood-control work. The Galveston district will remain in charge of river and harbor work, Colonel Prentiss explained.

Among the future projects for the local office as explained by the division engineer are downstream locks and dams on rivers flowing into the Gulf.

After the conference David C. Leavell, president of the chamber of commerce, said, "On the basis of the figures and other data submitted by Colonel Prentiss, the action is justified from an economy angle as well as from that of securing increased efficiency in the flood-control program."

Colonel Prentiss told the local officials that with eight large dams and reservoir projects under construction in north Texas, it is impossible for the district engineer and his assistants to cover all the territory and still do an effective job with river and harbor work.

With the division of the district, the personnel in Galveston can concentrate on the Texas Gulf coast which is the biggest river and harbor engineer district in the United States.

"Nine important harbors are located in the local district," Colonel Prentiss added.

A survey was begun in September of last year as to the advisability of splitting the district, Prentiss explained. A long and careful study of all angles of the proposed division was made before any definite decision was reached, he said.

In explaining the personnel situation, Prentiss said 328 employees in the Galveston office will remain here.

Besides these, 14 persons from the Houston real-estate office of engineers will be transferred to Galveston. This will make a total of 342 persons remaining in the local office, Prentiss added.

In addition to the transfer of 200 employees to the new Fort Worth office, 66 local employees will be relieved from duty, the division engineer said.

HOUSTON OFFICE CLOSED

The Houston real-estate office will be closed under this division plan with the transfer of 90 employees from that office to Fort Worth, Prentiss added.

Personnel transfers will begin the week of April 17 and will move in relays over a 3-month period, he explained.

Removal of fixtures and equipment from the local office will begin April 14, Colonel Prentiss said.

Present plans call for the completion of all moving, both of personnel and equipment by July, he said.

PLEASED BY ECONOMY

Leavell in continuing his comment after the conference, said:

"While we are unhappy over losing any members of the Galveston district office, still we are pleased to see that an honest effort is being made by a Federal service to achieve efficiency at a lower cost.

"It is to be hoped that such a program of thinking becomes contagious in other Federal operations, and that it reaches clear up to Washington, including the President."

"Our position in the Galveston-Fort Worth matter has always been of keeping the present district intact unless real money could be saved in the action, and we now have a feeling that such a saving can be made."

NO OBSTRUCTIONISTS

The chamber of commerce president continued his comments by saying, "We positively would not want to obstruct a program of saving the taxpayers' money."

Those attending the conference, in addition to Prentiss and Leavell, were Dr. D. B. Calvin, chamber of commerce first vice president; Alvin Kelso, second vice president; A. J. Peterson, treasurer; E. S. Holliday, general manager; and Lt Col. Ellsworth I. Davis, Galveston district engineer.

These officers of the chamber of commerce will report their findings of the conference to their board of directors Friday morning.

Praise for Representative Phil J. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Hon. PHIL J. WELCH which was made in St. Joseph, Mo., at the celebration which commemorated the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning of the Pony Express. The speech showed much preparation and thought. It was filled with historical data, as well as being timely and interesting. The St. Joseph News-Press is one of our finest daily publications in Missouri. The day following Mr. WELCH's address this publication wrote an editorial commending the Representative of Missouri's Third Congressional District.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the same is herewith inserted:

A SPEECH TO PRESERVE

Congressman PHIL J. WELCH added a laurel to his crown today. To accommodate citizens who were to be disappointed because of the sudden illness of Lt. Gov. James T. Blair, scheduled Pony Express speaker, the Congressman filled in today at the celebration of the ninetieth anniversary of the start of the Pony Express.

It was 3 p. m. yesterday when Congressman WELCH was told the lieutenant governor could not be here. Could he speak? He could.

The Pony Express speech of Congressman WELCH is reproduced in its entirety. It is given because we believe it is an important contribution to the archives in what is probably St. Joseph's most illustrious—certainly its most romantic—historic episode.

A native of St. Joseph, PHIL J. WELCH as a boy loved the Pony Express heritage that is ours. As mayor he often stood on the stone parapet of the civic center. There he gazed at that re-creation in bronze of the first rider.

What more natural than in Washington, with the Library of Congress available, he spent many nights poring over tomes on this St. Joseph to Sacramento early day means of transportation.

We regret the inability of the lieutenant governor to be present, but his illness was a blessing in disguise, for the St. Joseph Historical Society now has for its records a speech that well deserves to be preserved for posterity.

Congratulations to the Junior Chamber of Commerce for its initiative and ingenuity in thinking of PHIL WELCH. Some pinch hitter.

Shall the People's Congress Be Ignored?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a statement by me entitled, "Shall the People's Congress Be Ignored?"

The statement is as follows:

By an unholy alliance between the New Deal Party and certain labor leaders, the Wagner Act became law.

What happened? We had an immediate outburst of industrial strife. Strikes and violence became rampant. Law and order were set aside, except where the new monopoly itself established its own brand of police power. It ignored the local police power and the regularly constituted law-enforcement agencies. Instead, in labor cases, it became the police power, the prosecutor, and the court, able to carry out its own will.

Under the Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Board itself investigated complaints of abuses by management. It left labor entirely free from investigation or prosecution. The same Board also tried the

case and rendered judgment against management. It was, therefore, investigator, prosecutor, and court. Its decisions followed the Russian pattern of the one-party system, using the court to enforce purposes and policies of the party in power. Its decisions were one-sided. Its fundamental purpose was to weaken and destroy the opposition. It worked just as the Supreme Court of the United States would work if it investigated and prosecuted and then rendered its decision according to party prejudice or purpose, on the evidence it chose to present to itself.

As a result the people's Congress rose up in its might, and passed the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. Under it, the National Labor Relations Board was to be truly a court of impartial men, to be selected by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to decide fairly disputes between employers and employees. The court was no longer permitted to investigate and prosecute. Those functions and powers were specifically lodged in an independent general counsel. His relation to the Board was somewhat like that of the United States Attorney General's to the United States courts.

Under this procedure law and order have been more nearly restored. Strikes and violence have been greatly reduced, in spite of the President's deliberate and continuous attempts to sabotage the law. He first tried to prevent passage of the bill. Then he vetoed it. Then he promised to repeal it. Defeated in all this by the votes of both parties in Congress, he still threatens to "rip the Taft-Hartley Act out of the statute books."

CONDONING BREACHES OF THE PEACE

Prior to the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board was as arbitrary and unreasonable in the encouragement of violence in strikes, in picketing, and boycotting, as the worst advocates of class war. There were cases, in fact, of active participation of Board employees in the attempted use of force and intimidation. It became a scandalous fact that the Board and its staff were recruited from intellectuals who had written for or represented labor unions, of the parties in the disputes. This same Board was continued under the Taft-Hartley Act, with the addition of two new Board members.

Even today, with the separation of functions which the new law provides, the slant of the Board is already indicated by such decisions as the Horne Manufacturing Co. case (83-NLRB-1177), in the testimony before the Senate. A striker threw a hammer through the car window of a nonstriker going to work. The company refused to reemploy the striker. The Board ordered the employer to take him back, saying "We find that the striker's conduct, although objectionable, was not so extreme as to render him unfit for further service, and to justify his exclusion from the reinstatement order."

In the Kelco Company case (79-NLRB-759) the United States Circuit Court for the Fourth Circuit refused to enforce a Board order to reinstate five strikers who, the Board admitted, had engaged in "brutal violence and intimidation of a serious character, ganging up on a nonstriking employee and chasing him home in one case, knocking down an employee and beating him publicly in another."

Here is a case where the local court had issued an injunction in order to restore order and peace, through the machinery of local government, which is the responsible center of enforcement of law and order, yet the National Labor Relations Board, sitting in Washington, set aside the enforcement of the peace by the local authorities, and superseded them by invoking a Federal law which condones branches of the peace by certain classes in society.

In the third case, the Kansas Milling Co., a striker was found guilty of deliberately ramming and damaging the car of a nonstriker, and fined $50 by a local court. The Board granted him reinstatement and back pay.

No matter what provocation labor union members might have met with in the past, from extra-legal activities of employers of the old type, it is no advantage to labor for either the Board or the courts to tolerate violence. The workers of this country cannot gain by setting up defiance of the peace in their turn, or seeking to be made the kind of privileged group or estate that the dictators set up to fool the workers of Europe. It is more important to workers to be sure the laws are enforced, and that they have all the protection of the police power, than it is to the employers themselves.

These acts of the Board show that it is still of the same mind as under the Wagner Act, that it is committed, at the present time, with the New Deal's approval, to violate the specific language of the Taft-Hartley Act, which says that it is an unfair labor practice for a union or any of its agents to restrain or coerce employees in the right, guaranteed by the act, to join or not join a union.

In the light of our experience with the National Labor Relations Board from its inception in 1935 down to the present hour, we dare not expose our country to a Board which not only refuses to investigate and prosecute violators on both sides, but is incapable of being a judicial body, so long as it is also investigator and prosecutor.

Executive dictatorial orders lead to the kind of police power that is exempt from judicial control for a special class or group which polices itself and enforces its own arbitrary law. Congress has relied on the police power that is subject to orderly, impartial, judicial review. That alone can lead to equal justice for all.

CHALLENGE TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE LEGISLATIVE POWER

The people of the United States face squarely the question whether they want the law to be made by their elected Representatives or by Presidential usurpation of legislative power. Congress has three times affirmed the Taft-Hartley law—first in its original passage, then in its passage over the veto of the President, and then in their refusal in 1949 to adopt a substitute.

The Board is at present operating in a political climate of opinion which blithely assumes that the Taft-Hartley Act is going to be rescinded and the Wagner Act reinstated after the next election when the President will have a Congress subservient to his will. Such a travesty of "law enforcement" is a total violation of the Constitution which gives to the Congress the legislative power and does not permit nor imply in any way that the Executive can remake or reshape the law to suit its own purposes.

The President's false representation to the people that his plan No. 12 for the elimination of the general counsel under the National Labor Relations Act, is in keeping with the recommendations in the Hoover report, has been roundly exposed by a telegram read in the hearings of the Senate yesterday, from the former President himself. He said that the Commission never even considered the matter and certainly never made any such recommendations. The Hoover report did what President Truman should do, strictly avoid all pretense of solving by Executive order problems which belong to the legislative responsibilities of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact that originally the Congress granted the reorganization power to the President of the United States as an administrative power to clarify and strengthen the innumerable functions of the administrative agencies, and never with the thought that the President would use that power to legislate in violation of the express will of the Congress. At that time the Congress granted to him the right to support reorganization measures as a step to simple efficiency. This plan will go into effect within 60 days, unless a constitutional majority, which in the House means 218 Members present and voting, has acted adversely on his recommendation. Gentlemen, this is a test not of your views with respect to labor legislation, but of whether or not any Member of Congress is going to betray the constitutional power of this Congress of the United States. This is a nonpartisan, constitutional issue which requires a prompt and overwhelming rejection of the President's position, not by 218 Members, but by every Member of the House of Representatives who is true to his oath of office.

If the President wins in his contention, he will set up an arbitrary, personal police court that will literally become the most powerful court in our whole Government. He will have a life-or-death authority over all business. He will have a personal arm of government that can be bent entirely to his will. From his decisions there will be no appeal. This is in truth a step to the police state in all of its evil manifestations—even in America with all its traditions and its history of constitutional law.

If Congress wins in this contest it will assert that there shall be no police power except the power that is subject to impartial judicial review. The law shall be no personal law, no administrative order, no dictator's decree.

A Young American Speaks Out on Foreign Policy, Peace, and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting herewith for your attention a communication received by me from one of the younger generation of Americans. He is a very successful young man in his own right and it is with his express permission, in response to my inquiry, that I have the privilege of sharing its important text with you. I am also forwarding the same to our State Department.

Certainly it is true that only by an exchange of considered opinions can there be enduring progress in a democracy.

I would welcome receiving any comments from you, my colleagues, about Tom Shields' communication to me.

The communication follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *February 18, 1950.*
Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLYDE: I want to pass along a few ideas about world peace for your consideration and comment. You may be ahead of me on these items as I realize that "a safe and sound America in a world of peace"

has been a very real objective of yours for years.

Our program for peace, as I understand it, might be considered under two points—

1. To make the United States and western democracies strong;

2. To promote international understanding and good will.

Point 1 avoids the mistakes of prewar pacifism and disarmament, which programs proved so ineffectual. And we have certainly learned that any form of appeasement and any evidence of weakness would be fatal. It is to be hoped that the present Congress will not make any unwarranted cuts in defense or foreign aid appropriations. In some respects present expenditures for these programs may be inadequate.

But point 1 above, necessary as it is, cannot succeed alone. It is essentially negative. The more positive aspect of our foreign policy, point 2 above, is equally important. It seems to me that it could be strengthened further by various positive steps toward better understanding with peoples behind the iron curtain.

One of our foremost problems is to sell our friendship and peaceful intentions to the peoples of Communist-dominated countries. Events of recent years have shown that, absolute as a dictatorship may be, it cannot afford to disregard entirely the opinions of its citizens. Hence the stupendous propaganda and espionage efforts. Hence also the fanatical desire to isolate its people from all factual knowledge of the Western World. It is doubtful that the members of the Politburo can be changed by anything short of rebellion and of popular demand for international friendship on the part of their peoples which would be too overwhelming to be purged.

Admittedly this is a big order. But also admittedly other courses of action are not completely successful. Time may be running short. It would seem that this approach has enough merit to justify its use in conjunction with our other policies. I am convinced that it could be conducted in such a way as to be thoroughly consistent with our point 1 of adequate strength.

Now as to ways and means. If this approach is worth trying at all, it is worth our best efforts. President Truman might appoint a commission including businessmen, labor leaders, advertising executives, clergymen, educators, newsmen, and representatives of Congress and the State Department—top caliber men all of them. The commission members might be put through a few seminars in Washington to brief them on the problem and significant background information. They might then be asked to work on the problem and bring in recommendations as soon as possible. The same results could be secured in a more quiet, informal manner if that seemed preferable.

This aspect of our foreign policy has been discussed recently by a few Government officials and private citizens. It seems to have many facets worthy of consideration, a few of which are—

1. Expand the Voice of America, and seek to open all other possible avenues of information and influence.

2. Make an offer to iron-curtain countries of certain consumer goods, including food, on condition that the recipients are told of the source of the commodities. If the offer is not acepted, publicize the facts to the people of those countries.

3. Attempt to have the Christian churches within Communist-dominated countries convey our friendly intentions to the people.

4. Investigate all feasible methods of sending leaflets, soap, and American trinkets of various kinds to these peoples.

5. Encourage Americans with friends and relatives in these countries to correspond with them regularly and pass along information which they might otherwise miss.

6. Utilize services and contacts of political refugees and exiles from iron-curtain countries where feasible.

7. Have representatives of American labor unions work with cooperative European labor union members to undermine Communist influence within European trade-unionism.

8. Propose exchange arrangements for students, professors, and clergymen.

9. Have our Central Intelligence Agency on the alert for any underground movements which we could help, and for anti-American trends which we might counteract.

The cost of such a program would be comparatively small and the potential return on the investment would be high, so I hope we would be willing to give it every dollar that could be effectively used.

A particularly significant feature of such a program is that it would give us an opportunity to prove just how Christian we are as a nation, and whether we believe in the brotherhood of man as we profess to do. Fine as the Marshall plan is, it involves giving to our friends—this program would mean giving to those who are at least potentially our enemies. While we would be doing it because it would contribute to our own survival, it would nonetheless contribute to the eventual well-being of millions of people now in the rankest type of servitude.

It may be that because we as Christians have failed to practice the Sermon on the Mount for the advantage of those less fortunate than we, we are now to be forced to do so for our own survival.

The Kremlin is peddling a diabolical product—communism—with an all-out campaign of intensive and extensive propaganda, subversion, falsification, and hate. I believe that American ingenuity can sell an infinitely superior product—democracy—with an equally vigorous program of information, counter-subversion, truth, and good will.

I would like to see a program similar to the one discussed above developed and carried forward as though our very lives depended upon it. They may.

Sincerely,

THOMAS K. SHIELDS.

Aesop's Fable and McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial, Aesop's Fable and McCARTHY, from the Milwaukee Journal, dated April 4, 1950:

AESOP'S FABLE AND McCARTHY

A great many Americans have been saying that Senator McCARTHY is playing directly into the hands of the Communists by the way he has carried on his current Red hunt.

The Nation's leading newspapers, Republican and Democrat, have been pointing this out for several weeks. So have columnists and radio commentators. President Truman touched this note last week when he said that McCARTHY is "the Kremlin's greatest asset" in this country.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, Republican member of the committee investigating the McCarthy charges, joined the chorus this week. Pointing out that not one of McCARTHY's charges had been proved, he explained that a charge made in this shotgun manner, and investigated openly by Congress, "often besmirches the character of innocent persons, weakens the position of the United States before the world, and fails to find the really dangerous individuals."

Congressman RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, the member of the House Un-American Activities Committee who is given credit for digging out the Alger Hiss case, criticized the McCarthy system on a television program Sunday night. He said, in effect, that smearing the innocent for political purposes is no way to expose the guilty. Walter Reuther, the labor leader, in another such program, declared that McCARTHY's charges should have been given to the FBI or other authorities and not spread publicly. He said McCARTHY did exactly what Stalin "would want him to do."

Probably the best explanation of the damage that Senator McCARTHY is doing was given in Milwaukee last week by Father John F. Cronin, S. S. Father Cronin is assistant director of the social action committee of the National Catholic Welfare Committee. He has studied communism in this country for 10 years and is considered one of the Nation's authorities on Communist infestation and infiltration.

Father Cronin said that Senator McCARTHY had made charges that he couldn't prove, that he had not evaluated his information properly, that he had been badly briefed, and that it was unfortunate he had gone to such extremes.

Referring to the most sensational of McCARTHY's charges—the one that there are 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department—Father Cronin declared that his investigation had shown that there is not one known Communist Party member in that Department.

The McCarthy technique is remindful of that of the shepherd's boy in Aesop's fables. This lad cried out "Wolf, wolf" erroneously several times, and fooled the villagers. When the wolf finally did appear, and the boy cried out, the villagers thought he was merely deceiving them again and nobody came to help him.

People are beginning to put McCARTHY's shoutings in the "Wolf, wolf" class. This is a situation made to order for Stalin's stooges. For years they have used the red-herring cry as a shield when attention was directed their way. Now they may have a new shield. Anyone who points out a real Communist, and may have proof to back his charges, may be accused of applying the McCarthy smirch—another name for a witch hunt or a phony smear campaign.

It is this that worries men like Father Cronin, the President, Senator Lodge, Representative Nixon, and others who know the Communists and all their tricks. If McCARTHY falls on his face in this campaign, as now seems so likely, it is going to be harder and harder to dig out the Communists wherever they are embedded.

World Health Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is World Health Day. It marks

the second anniversary of the functioning of the World Health Organization, that remarkably successful specialized agency of the United Nations. It is also a day of dedication to the improvement of the health of people everywhere.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements by Federal Security Administrator Oscar W. Ewing and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service:

STATEMENT BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR OSCAR R. EWING

In this year's observance of World Health Day people everywhere can look to international teamwork for real progress in improving human health and welfare.

When I was in Europe recently, nothing impressed me more than the increasing emphasis on cooperation among many nations in attacking these common problems. In country after country I found a growing confidence that by working together we can control and wipe out preventable diseases.

This confidence is based on experience. At the headquarters of the World Health Organization, in Geneva, Switzerland, I heard heartening reports of what has been accomplished for health on a broad international front. To take only one example, I learned in Italy that malaria, responsible for more than half a million deaths in 1945, has now been practically eradicated. In Sardinia a similar program has met with sensational success. Such concerted attacks upon diseases are paying real dividends, not only in human life but in opening new possibilities for economic development.

The United States faces a great obligation and a great opportunity for leadership in health and welfare. The experience of the Federal Security Agency in dealing here at home with problems of health, education, and social security is being drawn upon more and more frequently in the international relations of the United States. During the past year the Agency's Office of International Relations has worked closely with the State Department, with many of the United Nations agencies, and with other organizations. From every part of the Federal Security Agency—the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Social Security Administration, including the Children's Bureau, and others—we are contributing technical assistance to this international effort.

One of the most important of these activities is the planning of the "bold new program" set forth by the President. This includes projects for public health and sanitation, looking especially toward the control of such diseases as malaria, which interfere with economic development in many parts of the world.

As the constitution of the World Health Organization affirms, the health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security. The Federal Security Agency is proud to help in this world-wide partnership dedicated to health and welfare. It welcomes this opportunity to join in observing World Health Day and in pledging its continuing concern for health as one of the foundations of democracy.

STATEMENT BY DR. LEONARD A. SCHEELE, SURGEON GENERAL, UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

As we pass the halfway mark in the twentieth century we in America can be proud of our progress in public health. In the past 50 years we have made important gains in building a healthier Nation. We have learned that scientific research can produce new knowledge and better methods of improving health. We have increased our efforts to advance medical science and to apply it wisely. We have expanded our health services and hospitals. As individuals seeking health we have learned to use our services more frequently and more efficiently than our forefathers.

We have also learned that if our desire for peace is to triumph, we must help all peace-loving peoples to conquer misery and disease. The world's health is everybody's business. In the underdeveloped parts of the world there are vast areas where the average man does not live beyond his twenties, where at least one person in every family will be ill at all times, and where poverty holds the benefits of medical science from those who need it most.

As we begin the second half of the century, therefore, we look forward to new world health action. The World Health Organization may well be proud of the vigorous international program for better health which it already has under way. We hope that this program can be further expanded under the President's proposal for cooperative technical assistance programs to aid the peoples of the world's underdeveloped areas.

With all the peace-loving nations of the world working together we can at last begin to bridge the gap between the people of these poverty-stricken but naturally rich areas and their more fortunate fellowmen. Certainly the project is potentially one of the most beneficial that the world has ever seen.

It is with these objectives in mind that the United States joins with the other nations of the world in the observance of World Health Day at the beginning of the second half of the century.

If a Law Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Independence (Iowa) Bulletin-Journal urging favorable action on my bill to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from acting as character witnesses in criminal trials in the Federal courts:

IF A LAW IS NEEDED

From a number of angles, there is much to be said for the bill introduced by Representative KEATING, of New York, to bar any member of the United States Supreme Court from appearing as character witness in a lower court.

The measure, of course, was prompted by the testimony given by Justices Frankfurter and Reed in the case of Alger Hiss.

The case quite likely will end in an appeal to the Supreme Court. These two members by their activity in the trial will be automatically barred from passing on the case. That means a depleted bench.

For another thing, it isn't very becoming of a member of the highest tribunal to go traipsing around the country using the prestige of his position to help a friend.

Personal taste should dictate this decision. But in cases where it doesn't, there should be protection by law.

China's "People's Democracy" Makes a Mockery of Democratic Freedom and Slaves of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on conditions in Shanghai under the Communists who, according to leftist propaganda, were liberating China from its allegedly feudal war lords in order to bring in utopia. This report is from the CAT Bulletin, the little paper put out monthly by the officials and employees, American and Chinese, of Civil Air Transport, the air line established and operated in Asia by Gen. Claire Chennault and a group of Americans and Chinese.

The article follows:

CHINA'S "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY" MAKES A MOCKERY OF DEMOCRATIC FREEDOM AND SLAVES OF THE PEOPLE

The October 17 issue of Life carries an exclusive report on Communist Shanghai. In it Correspondent Robert Doyle gives a graphic picture of the creeping economic paralysis spreading over the once great port city of China. He left on the steamship *General Gordon* in late September.

Since the *Gordon*, several ships have arrived in Hongkong with passengers from Shanghai. Most of these evacuees agree that within the few weeks since the Life story was written, conditions have become much worse, particularly for foreigners who wish to do business in the city. Instead of trying to ease the economic coma into which the city has fallen by encouraging foreign trade, present policies of the powerful Military Control Commission are moving in the opposite direction.

It is explained that the main weapon of the Military Control Commission in its fight to destroy foreign interests is the labor union. However, these unions are not organizations in the accepted sense of the word but are completely under the control of the MCC. They are told when to strike, whom to strike, and how much to strike for. Workers have no voice in union policy but serve as pawns in the hands of mysterious minions of the Communist Party under the MCC.

The case of a certain American business firm in Shanghai is cited as an instance of this abuse of power and authority. A man appeared one morning in the office of the manager of the American firm and asked to be taken on as an employee. The manager replied that, under present conditions, he was laying off men, not hiring them. The stranger insisted that he be employed but was again refused. He then left. The next morning he turned up in the factory of the American firm armed with a pistol and proceeded to beat up the Chinese factory foreman. The American manager was then accused of having refused employment to the stranger and, at the insistence of the labor union, was haled before a "people's court." No news has been received on the outcome of this trial.

Employees of foreign firms who were dismissed years ago for one reason or another are returning to the office or factory of firms which once employed them, demanding back

pay and reinstatement. Employers realize this is not the doing of the workers, but that they are merely carrying out orders from above. The case is cited by one recent arrival of a man who a year ago had been working for a certain firm and had been caught and convicted on a petty thieving charge. After the Reds took over, this individual was released from jail. In October, with the backing of the labor union, he approached his old firm demanding back pay, bonus, and reinstatement.

Under terroristic policies such as these it is said that numerous small firms are approaching bankruptcy and going out of business. No matter how hard they strive, businessmen are constantly in hot water with the labor unions. Larger firms are under the same political pressures but, backed by their home offices and bigger capital investments, will be able to hold out longer providing outright confiscation of property is not resorted to.

A representative of one of the larger foreign firms in Shanghai has openly announced to the Communist authorities that if they enforce present tax policies and continue to obstruct production through the labor union, he cannot stay in business longer than a few more months. He has candidly asked them what their pleasure is.

Recent passengers from Shanghai hold out little hope for any improvement but expect that the situation will deteriorate further. One of the inexplicable features which the businessman faces is the fact that even when he decides he can no longer continue in business, he is not permitted to leave. This refusal on the part of the Communists to allow businessmen and factory owners to sell out or leave Shanghai has aroused a deep sense of uncertainty and many are now fearful for their lives.

In this connection it is realiably reported that there are 223 foreigners in Shanghai who probably will not be allowed to leave the city but will be held as hostages against any possible economic measures which might not be favorable to the labor unions.

More startling than this is the report which insists that before the year is out, Russian commissars will take over the top police jobs and political sections of the city government. If this should materialize it is feared that present policies will become more terroristic than ever. Even now under Mayor Chen Yi's administration people no longer can trust their own servants. Private letters are being opened, files examined and pilfered by domestics who obviously are acting on orders from above.

The daily movements of prominent businessmen are being watched and reported on by secret operatives of the police. Individual dossiers are being compiled and no one is certain when he will be called up for questioning, accused of being an agent for a foreign power or sabotaging the "people's livelihood."

The pattern of terrorism now becoming vogue in Shanghai has strong resemblances to other countries under the Soviet Russian yoke. What they will become, if and when Russian functionaries actually take over the police department in Shanghai, is anyone's guess. The point has already been reached when few people wish to discuss politics and even a word or two exchanged is done with a look over the shoulder.

It is reported that living costs have risen 5 times since the Communists moved into Shanghai. A car license often costs as much as US$50 per month. Public utilities are beginning to break down, and electric power shortages have developed without explanation. People in the larger apartment buildings often find they have no elevator service and must walk up.

The feeling of never knowing what to expect next has discouraged new business and enterprise. Instead, most everyone seems to be waiting—waiting for the next turn of the screw. Who will be the next victim to be haled into court on trumped-up charges, or barricaded in his office by MCC-dominated labor unions? Who will be the next man to be beaten for some minor dispute with a stevedore or ricksha coolie? Every possible excuse is being used to intimidate and terrorize the upper and middle classes among the Chinese and foreigners in general. It is said that even among the poorer people of Shanghai, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek has never been so popular as he is now. They see in Chiang the only possible savior from their present torment.

A popular dream or vision which is being repeated and claimed by many Chinese revolves around the number 3. Some people who report this dream say they see three people, or three candles, or three Buddhas in a room. In one corner the candle (or Buddha) represents Mao Tze-tung, in another corner Chiang Kai-shek, but in the third corner a mysterious stranger sits whom no one can quite identify. Word of mouth report has this third stranger representing a new figure in Chinese politics who will oust the Communists and bring back an orderly and decent regime to China. Those who describe this dream explain that it reflects a deep-seated desire for a miracle to happen which would destroy communism.

Much is heard about the mammoth parades which are being staged in liberated cities. In Shanghai it is said that these parades, far from being spontaneous or voluntary, are organized from the top by the Communists with great attention to detail and propaganda effects. Every shop has to furnish one man and every school must turn out its pupils for the demonstration or suffer a penalty. Prominent Chinese businessmen, obviously feeling like idiots have been observed in these parades, wearing false mustaches and poor clothing to look like lao pohsing and coolies.

One foreign businessman who recently arrived from Shanghai definitely believes it will be impossible for any foreigner, other than Communist, to do business with Red China where his business has anything to do with Chinese labor. There is no assurance, he states, that conditions will remain favorable one week to the next regardless of permissions granted by the authorities.

Communist planners have been placed in charge of economic policies over which they have no knowledge or experience. Without realizing, or perhaps without wishing to realize, they are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs in Shanghai and have made an economic shambles of this once great center of trade and commerce.

Well-Merited Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle endorsing legislation to prevent Federal officials, including Members of Congress, from profiting through their own wrongdoing, by receiving pension benefits after they have demonstrated faithlessness to their trust:

WELL-MERITED LEGISLATION

The scheduled introduction today of a bill by Congressman KEATING, of New York, to cut off pension annuities for any Federal employee convicted of a felony, committed in connection with his Government service, brings to three the number of House proposals which would withhold retirement benefits from Congressmen jailed for serious crimes.

Actuated by the May and Thomas convictions, the bills have obvious merit, and it is to be hoped that one will be made into law during the present session.

Former Representative May, Kentucky Democrat, is drawing retirement benefits while serving an 8-month to 2-year term on a bribery conviction in connection with wartime Government contracts. Former Representative Thomas, New Jersey Republican, now serving a jail sentence for accepting salary kick-backs from an employee on his congressional pay roll, will be eligible for retirement benefits when he reaches the age of 62.

These men violated their oath of office as well as the criminal code and should reasonably be subject to deprivation of the right to receive bounty from a Government whose laws they have flouted, besides having disgraced their high office.

Such a law as that proposed would unquestionably serve as a sizable deterrent to any others on the public pay roll of similarly stunted moral stature.

Constitutional, Economic, and Political Relations Between the United States and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, delivered an interesting and educational address before the International Club of Fordham University. Being myself a graduate of Fordham University, class of 1915, and having recently returned from a visit to Puerto Rico, this address by Dr. FERNÓS caught my pointed attention.

Since this body is responsible for passing on many legislative matters which affect Puerto Rico, and more especially because there are pending before the Congress two bills, H. R. 7674 and S. 3336, which provide for the organization of a constitutional government for Puerto Rico, I believe every Member should read this address.

This being Pan-American Day, it is worthy of the notice of all countries and communities of Spanish heritage that Puerto Rico, itself a community of American citizens of Spanish-American origin, is marching rapidly along the road of democracy toward more and more self-government.

The United States has consistently and willingly recognized the aspirations of Puerto Rico's people for greater and greater equality, thus according Puerto Rico a respected and dignified station within the United States system.

The address follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

Constitutional, economic, and political relations between the United States and Puerto Rico began with the Treaty of Paris, which was signed the tenth day of December 1898. Puerto Rico, up to that time, had been a province in the Spanish Kingdom, with a provincial government and full representation in the Spanish Parliament. Since 1897 it had attained the status of a dominion, while still retaining parliamentary representation in Madrid. The Treaty of Paris re-established peace between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain, which had engaged during that year in what is known as the Spanish-American War. Under the terms of the treaty, Spain relinquished sovereignty over Cuba, which had been the cause of the war, and ceded to the United States the island of Puerto Rico and other islands then under Spanish sovereignty—the island of Guam and the Philippines.

Under article VIII of the treaty, Spain ceded in Puerto Rico, together with sovereignty, all immovable property which, under law, belonged to the public domain, and, as such, to the Crown of Spain. It was stated, however, in the second paragraph of the same article, that this stipulation did not impair property or rights which by law belonged to the peaceful possession of property of all kinds, of the province, or of municipalities, public or private establishments, ecclesiastical or civic bodies, or any other associations having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the renounced or ceded territories, or of private individuals, of whatsoever nationality such individuals might be.

In accordance with article IX, the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories ceded to the United States were to be determined by Congress.

Under Article X, the inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquished her sovereignty were declared to be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

The status of Puerto Rico within the United States political system stems from this treaty, and is determined by Congress, subject to the terms of the treaty and obviously to applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States. It is plain that Puerto Rico, in itself, was not ceded as property. The Crown and its government ceded what it had in Puerto Rico: paramount political authority, sovereignty, and, in addition, Crown property. Moreover, it was plain that the United States was not making war against the people of Puerto Rico. General Miles, upon landing at Ponce, issued the following proclamation:

"To the Inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

"In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours, and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence, the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release of your former political relations, and it is hoped a cheerful acceptance of the Government of the United States. The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation. We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people so long as they conform to the rules of military administration, of order and justice. This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

"NELSON A. MILES,
"Major General,
"Commanding, United States Army."

After ratification of the treaty, on the 11th day of April 1899, Puerto Rico was placed under military government. On August 15, 1899, General Davis, the military governor, issued a circular or general order in which it was explained to the people of Puerto Rico, the general features of the policy he was pursuing (and intended to pursue) touching the affairs of government in the island. From this circular letter, I quote:

"Under the American Constitution, the whole theory of Government is based on the principle that the people, themselves, are to make and enforce their own laws. As Congress has as yet taken no measures or action respecting Puerto Rico, the supreme government is, under the Constitution, vested in the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He (the President) has designated a general officer to represent him and to perform the functions of civil government. Several important orders have been issued of great import. Among those relating to superior administration and the judiciary are:

"1. The announcement by General Brooks on October 18, 1898, that the laws of the land, not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, would be enforced.

"2. * * *

"3. Continuation of the council of secretaries as constituted October 18, 1898—order by General Brooks. (This referred to the council of secretaries or cabinet as established under the self-government constitution granted by Spain in 1897.)

"5. Dissolution of the council of secretaries by General Henry. (Thus, it was through a general order issued by former Military Governor Henry that the self-government constitution of Puerto Rico, granted by Spain, was suspended.)

"6. Appointment of heads of departments in the civil government by General Henry.

"The effect of the orders issued and changes resulting from these orders tend directly toward harmonizing the existing system and that to come with territorial autonomy, if such might be enacted by Congress. * * * The Governor would have a legislature, senate, and house of representatives, to regulate his actions, to make laws for the people, and to control expenditures. * * *

"It results from the foregoing that the necessity ceases for retaining the separate departments which have been presided over by able officers collectively called the cabinet; and it follows that the department organization should cease to exist, and announcement to the effect is now made."

Following this general order, General Davis established a secretary for civil affairs and entrusted all former departments to Army officers.

With the enactment of the first organic act and the inauguration of civil government, Puerto Rico ceased to be under the War Department. Nine years later Puerto Rico was again placed under the War Department, although civil government was continued. From 1909 to 1934, Puerto Rican affairs, at the Washington end, were in the charge of the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the War Department. From 1934 to the present time, they have been under the Department of the Interior.

Under the first Organic Act of Puerto Rico, the inhabitants of Puerto Rico, formerly defined as Spaniards, were to be deemed to be "citizens of Puerto Rico" and as such "entitled to the protection of the United States." They, together with citizens of the United States residing in Puerto Rico, were collectively organized into a body politic to be known as the people of Puerto Rico with powers of government as stated in the organic act and with power to sue and be sued. Later it was interpreted by the Supreme Court that Puerto Rico was appurtenant to, but did not form a part of, the United States. It has been held also by the Supreme Court in the case of *Balzac v. The People of Puerto Rico* (1922) that the conferring of United States citizenship upon the people of Puerto Rico did not incorporate Puerto Rico into the United States. To this day, Puerto Rico remains an unincorporated territory, subject to the sovereignty and protection of the United States. Such sovereignty takes the place of that of the Spanish King and his government, as formerly exercised under the Spanish Constitution and so ceded to the United States.

Under the 1900 act, it was provided that the same tariffs, customs, and duties should be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico from ports other than those of the United States which were required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries. And it was also provided that in no event should any duties be collected after the 1st day of March 1902 on merchandise and articles going into Puerto Rico from the United States or coming into the United States from Puerto Rico. Under these two provisions of the first organic act which are still in effect there was established what amounts to a customs union between the United States and Puerto Rico. Other provisions made it an economic and political union as well. For instance:

Section 2 provided for the retirement of the Puerto Rican coins then in circulation and the substituting of the coins of the United States.

Section 14 stated: "The statutory laws of the United States not locally inapplicable, except as hereinbefore or hereinafter otherwise provided, shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States." These provisions were continued or reenacted by the 1917 Organic Act.

Within this framework of economic and political affiliation, a local government was to be established. The structure of government was spelled out in the 1900 act. It was a disappointment to Puerto Rico.

It was liberalized under the 1917 act. It has been gradually democraticized through subsequent amendments to the organic act. But to begin with, the government created in 1900 was composed of a governor, six heads of departments, and a supreme court, all to be appointed by the President of the United States. There was also a legislature composed of two houses, the upper to be appointed by the President of the United States, the house of delegates to be elected by the people. The six heads of departments were to be ex officio members of the executive council which was the upper

house. The five additional members without portfolio were Puerto Ricans. The governor appointed all officials in the district courts with the advice and consent of the executive council.

The 1917 act substituted the executive council with an elective senate and provided that four of the six department heads were to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. However, the attorney general and the commissioner of education were still appointed by the President of the United States.

In 1947, a great step forward, in the direction of full local self-government, took place. The organic act was so amended so that the governor appoints all heads of departments. The governor, himself, is elected by the people. The supreme court judges and the auditor of the island, however, are still appointed by the President.

The fundamental provisions regarding the application of Federal laws and regarding economic relationships were not changed.

It should be noted that in accordance with section 12 of the first organic act and section 6 of the 1917 act, all expenses incurred on account of the government of Puerto Rico for salaries of officials and the conduct of their offices and departments, and all expenses and obligations contracted for the internal improvement, or development of the island, are paid by the treasurer of Puerto Rico out of the revenue in his custody. The United States Government pays only for Federal establishments and services.

Federal tax laws do not apply to Puerto Rico. All taxes paid in Puerto Rico are covered into the insular treasury. Therefore, Puerto Rico, participating in Federal Government matters only through its Resident Commissioner, is not burdened with taxation without representation.

The President may exempt Puerto Rico from Federal laws which, because of local conditions, he finds inapplicable, provided they have not been made specifically applicable by the Congress.

Since 1900, Puerto Rico has elected a Resident Commissioner to the United States. Upon presentation to the Department of State of a certificate of election from the Governor of Puerto Rico, he is entitled to official recognition as such Commissioner by all departments of the Government of the United States. In 1904, the House of Representatives voted to extend all privileges of congressional membership to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. As a result, the Commissioner has ever since had a dual capacity—that of a Commissioner before all executive departments of the Government (especially before the Department of the Interior in charge of insular matters) and that of a Delegate in Congress. A Delegate is a Congressman without a vote.

Under section 11 of the organic act, the President is authorized to place all matters pertaining to the Government of Puerto Rico within the jurisdiction of an executive department of the Federal Government to be designated by him. The Department of the Interior has been so designated.

Under the Elective Governor Act of 1947, the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States are to be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

As aforesaid, tariff duties in Puerto Rico must be the same as in the United States. But, since it is the policy of Congress not to tax Puerto Rico, collections from customs are covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico for use by the Government of Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact, the officials in charge of the customs are paid out of the revenues collected by them. They are not on the pay roll of the United States.

Puerto Rico makes its own internal revenue laws. However, it is provided by the organic act that merchandise shipped from the mainland to Puerto Rico shall not be discriminated against and shall be subject to equal internal revenue laws as domestic merchandise consumed in Puerto Rico. Merchandise shipped from Puerto Rico to the mainland is not subject to United States internal revenue laws, but it is subject to a tax equal to that imposed upon the like domestic articles in the United States. Collections under this tax are also covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico.

This provision has led to a great deal of confusion. It is generally stated that moneys collected under United States internal revenue laws on Puerto Rican merchandise shipped to the mainland are paid back to Puerto Rico. As a matter of fact, such collections never find their way into the United States Treasury. They are collected in Puerto Rico. They are covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico. They are collected under the law of 1900, not under United States internal revenue laws. By establishing the provision, Congress reconciled: (1) The principle of no taxation without representation, with (2) free trade, and (3) the necessary imposition of an equal tax burden on merchandise selling at either market, regardless of origin.

What is the present political status of Puerto Rico? To say that it is unincorporated territory is to put the question in the negative. It is not incorporated territory. But to say what it isn't is not to say what it is. Perhaps the best way to express it, is to say that the island of Puerto Rico is a dependency of the United States. It has a treaty status, akin to a protectorate, as a result of congressional determination. The United States exercises paramount political authority over Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico constitute a body politic. They form a community of citizens with such rights and privileges as have been recognized by the Congress. They are United States citizens. They have the fundamental rights and privileges of United States citizens. But they are United States citizens living outside the United States, in a Territory under the sovereignty of the United States. Because of the democratic structure of the government that Congress has given them, because of the rights and privileges the Puerto Rican people exercise and practice, they live in a manner comparable to that of the inhabitants of any State. However, the relationships between the island and the Federal Government are not the same as those between the Federal Government and a State. In the United States political system, the status of a State is determined by the Constitution of the United States; the status of Puerto Rico, on the other hand, follows congressional determinations, implementing a treaty. Paramount political authority over Puerto Rico rests with the United States, subject to the terms of the treaty and applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

On March 13, 1950, I introduced H. R. 7674, It is a bill calling for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico, within such terms as provided by said act. It begins with the statement that the Congress of the United States, by a series of enactments, has progressively recognized the right of self-government of the people of Puerto Rico. It points out that under the terms of these congressional enactments, an increasingly large measure of self-government has been achieved and that, fully recognizing the principle of government by consent, this act is now adopted in the nature of a compact, so that the people of Puerto Rico under its terms, may organize a government pursuant to the constitution of their own adoption.

The people of Puerto Rico, under the bill, are free to express their acceptance of the act if they see fit. Having accepted its terms, they may proceed, within them, to adopt a constitution in accordance with procedures to be prescribed by the laws of Puerto Rico. The constitution, once adopted, would be transmitted to the President of the United States. If the President finds that the Puerto Rican Constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of the act and with applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States he is authorized to transmit the constitution to the Congress. The Congress might approve or disapprove the constitution the Puerto Rican people may have agreed upon. If Congress should adjourn without having acted during the session when it was transmitted, the constitution would be considered to have the approval of Congress.

The Puerto Rican Constitution would create a government republican in form and would include a bill of rights. Upon its becoming effective, such sections of the present Organic Act as create the local government in Puerto Rico would be superseded by the Constitution of Puerto Rico, and, therefore, repealed. On the other hand, such sections of the organic act as are not thus repealed would be continued. They would thereafter be known as the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, which would continue present economic relations and the application of Federal laws as heretofore. The section establishing the fact that the Government of Puerto Rico would be maintained by local taxes would also be continued. Puerto Ricans, of course, would continue to be citizens of the United States. The paramount political authority of the United States under the treaty, and in accordance with the United States Constitution, would continue undisturbed.

This act, calling for a local constitution for Puerto Rico, would have the effect of elevating such provisions of law as create the present political and economic relationships between Puerto Rico and the United States to the nature of a compact between a community of United States citizens and their Federal Government, very much in the way the old Northwest Ordinance created the first territorial government and relationships between the Federal Government and the inhabitants of the Territories. The people of Puerto Rico would have accepted such relationships of their own free will and would proceed to organize their local Government within the terms of such relationships as so accepted. The rights and privileges which the people of Puerto Rico would exercise in the organization of their Government would stem not from a law of Congress, but from a constitution which they, themselves, would have shaped, framed, and agreed upon. This is basic in the American philosophy of government.

Again, they would have consented to the terms of relationship with the United States, as established by Congress, and therefore to the application of the Federal Relations Act, much as a new State accepts the terms of an enabling act for its admission into the Union. A new form of federation would have been created. The inhabitants of Puerto Rico, unincorporated territory, would organize themselves politically in accordance with what would be comparable with a State constitution within a federative structure similar to, but not the same as, that created by the United States Constitution, for member States of the Union.

The Federal Relations Act would take the place of such provisions of the Constitution of the United States as establish the relationship between a State and the Federal Government, which do not apply in the case of Puerto Rico. Fundamental provisions of the Constitution of the United States would apply equally in both cases. From the status

of a dependency and protectorate, or, as it is worse called at present, a possession, Puerto Rico would ascend to the position of a federated commonwealth, albeit not federated on the same basis as a State.

The two fundamental differences between the status of Puerto Rico and that of a State, both stemming out of the fact that Puerto Rico is not incorporated, would be (1) that Puerto Rico would not be equally represented in Congress nor would it participate in national elections; (2) that Puerto Rico, although included within the customs and economic union, would not be subject to Federal taxation.

Although we would thus escape taxation without representation, it could be held that there would continue the situation of legislation without representation. To a certain extent, this is true. With a few exceptions, Federal laws would apply to Puerto Rico, in most instances equally as in the States, despite the fact that the people of Puerto Rico are not equally represented in Congress as are the people of the States. But it could not be claimed that Puerto Rico is not represented at all in Congress. The Resident Commissioner is a Member of the House of Representatives. He serves in committees. He introduces bills, and he may engage in debate.

On the other hand, the President is authorized to declare inapplicable to Puerto Rico, at the request of the Government of Puerto Rico, any Federal law not specifically made applicable to Puerto Rico by Congress, which he may deem inapplicable by reason of local conditions. Some laws, such as internal revenue laws, are declared inapplicable by the organic act itself. Thus, the area of legislation without representation is not as broad or significant as it might at first appear. To this area of application of Federal laws, Puerto Rico would have consented on accepting the act.

Puerto Rico has developed an economy based on such relationships with the United States as have existed for 50 years. To separate itself from the United States, to organize itself as an independent republic, would mean pulling the rug out from under our feet. It would mean the collapse of the economy of Puerto Rico. To attain statehood and to bear the burden of Federal taxation would deprive Puerto Rico of all means of maintaining its State government. It would mean the quick collapse of that State government and a severe reduction in available resources for much-needed development.

The two solutions for the problem of Puerto Rico is status which for 50 years has been the theme for academic discussion in Puerto Rico, are both unsuited to present circumstances of Puerto Rico. To insist on either, exclusively and for anything but the possibility of either in the indeterminate future, in view of the unsurmountable obstacles which either one would meet now, would simply mean the indefinite postponement of Puerto Rico's democratic development.

With H. R. 7674, we have found a new approach—an approach which allows for the democratic development of Puerto Rico within its present relationships, simultaneously with Puerto Rico's advancement to a higher level within the Union and assured economic stability and progress.

Moreover, such a proposition would be consistent with the declaration entered into by the United States upon its ratification of the Charter of the United Nations. I quote from the Charter:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end: (a) * * * (b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of its peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory, and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

H. R. 7674 is the answer to such a challenge in the case of Puerto Rico, under present circumstances. In their development from a colonial status to full political maturity within a monarchial system, such as the British Empire, or as it was with Spain, self-government without separation may be attained by former colonies when they ascend to dominion status on the basis of a common loyalty to the person of the king. Within a republican system, such as that of the United States, self-governing peoples may not maintain union among themselves through the symbol of a common loyalty to the person of a king. There are no kings in our Republic. But there is citizenship, our common United States citizenship. And there are other things: our common loyalty to our citizenship; our common devotion to our republican institutions and principles, under the Federal Constitution; our common devotion to the security of this great federation, of which we are all a part; our obedience to laws enacted by our freely chosen representatives or freely accepted by the people at the time they accept their terms of relationship.

Thus, under H. R. 7674, our present political and economic relations are continued and reaffirmed while government by consent, both at home and at the Federal level, is attained. In that way, we may occupy a dignified station within the Union, in a manner suitable to our circumstances. Thus, we shall continue to be united in common loyalty to our institutions, to our citizenship, and to our Christian way of life, under our local constitution and our Federal Constitution.

Investigation of the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the magazine America:

INVESTIGATE COAL

Recent reports from Washington indicate that Congress is losing its enthusiasm for an investigation of the coal industry. Having worked themselves up to a high pitch of excitement during the coal strike, the legislators appear to be suffering the inevitable reaction. With the miners back on the job and operations again normal, they welcome the repose that nature decrees after conflict and crisis. The solons are the more disposed to postpone serious endeavor because both the United Mine Workers and the coal operators have made known their opposition to any investigation of their sick industry. In fact, the operators deny with great vehemence that the industry is sick at all. (A decade ago, before the war brought artificial prosperity to the coal fields, they whistled a different tune.)

We trust that the Congress will not be turned aside from its plain duty either by its own indolence or by the opposition of self-interested men who deserve small consideration. Though there is peace of sorts in the industry, the law of supply and demand continues to operate to its undoing. On a 5-day schedule, the miners can produce weekly 3,500,000 more tons of coal than the country can consume. At that rate, stock piles depleted during the strike will be rebuilt within 6 months. Then what?

Are we destined to undergo again the old cycle of cutthroat competition, bankruptcies, and mounting unemployment? The Federal Power Commission reports that 13,000,000 homes and factories are now using natural and mixed gas and that the number is constantly growing. The conversion of the railroads—traditionally one of the largest users of coal—from steam to Diesel engines is in full swing and will not be reversed. The economic plight of the coal industry is certain to become much worse before there is any sign of improvement. If Congress remembers that our reserves of oil and natural gas are limited, that coal remains our most abundant source of power, it will not delay an investigation which has great significance for our future security.

What the So-Called Kerr Natural-Gas Bill Does to the Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the use of my colleagues and the reading public the following enlightening and timely article sent to me by the Honorable Charles Rhyne, executive secretary and general counsel of the National Institute of Municipal Law Offices, 730 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

It presents succintly the views of the municipalities of the Nation in regard to the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill and the baneful results which may be expected to follow the permitting of same to be enacted as a part of the law of the land.

The article follows:

A VETO OF THE KERR BILL PLEASE, MR. PRESIDENT

I want to talk about the Kerr bill which passed this House 176 to 174 last Friday night.

In opening my discussion of this important matter I would first like to get clearly before the House an identification of the parties to the issue which you just decided. On one side we have the natural gas producers of an estimated 86 percent of the natural gas in the United States. All of these natural-gas producers (since they do not own pipe lines) are exempted by this bill from the power conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 to set aside unreasonable rates charged consumers of natural gas. The great oil companies of the Nation, like Standard Oil, Phillips Petroleum et al., are the chief beneficiaries of this bill because it is estimated that around 35 of the large

companies control nearly 70 percent of the natural gas which will be exempted from all control by this bill.

On the other side of the issue here involved the only clearly identified party is the consumer or user of natural gas. It is estimated that some 50,000,000 consumers will soon have the benefits of this very wonderful product—and there can be no doubt but what natural gas is the cleanest, best fuel available for the purposes to which it is adapted. The opposition of the consumers to the Kerr bill, outside Congress, was voiced chiefly by city officials. These city officials have no possible personal benefit to gain by opposing the Kerr bill—except that their voters may possibly give them a stronger support in their next election because of their opposition to the unjust enrichment of natural-gas producers at the expense of these consumer-user-voters.

HOW CITIES GOT INTO THIS FIGHT

From very ancient times cities have been looked upon as the proper party to protect their residents against matters which affect the whole number of these residents. This has been especially true in the case of utilities and businesses affected with a public interest. Early examples are found in the instances of city regulation of the rates charged by ferries. Private persons would construct ferries across rivers, all roads would lead to them and then when the people were entirely dependent upon the ferry the owner thereof would start raising his price. They would often charge unreasonable rates and charge different rates to different persons. Cities stepped in to regulate these ferry rates and prevent such practices by fixing reasonable rates, yet rates which assured the ferry operator of a fair return on his investment. The courts sustained cities in their regulation of the reasonableness of rates of ferries and their regulation prohibiting discrimination.

From the very beginning of local government in the United States the cities have fulfilled this traditional role as protectors of the people against unreasonable charges of businesses affected with a public interest. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly recognized that cities are the "proper persons" to perform this function. In the case of *In Re Englehard,* 231 U. S. 646, the Supreme Court of the United States in 1914 stated that the city of Louisville "was the proper party" in a telephone rate case "as representative of all interested," and in fact held that the city should be the exclusive representative of all subscribers in a case involving a contest over telephone rates, so that an individual could not intervene for the purpose of representing other subscribers.

In the case of *O'Connell* v. *Pacific Gas & Light Company* (19 Fed. (2d) 460) the Court again holding that the city was the exclusive representative of consumers in rate litigation, said, in part, "The appellant (consumer) is represented in the litigation by the city and county of San Francisco, as are all other consumers of gas whose rights are involved. * * *"

In the case of *Wright* v. *Central Kentucky Natural Gas Company* (297 U. S. 537) the Supreme Court of the United States held that all consumers were represented by the city of Louisville in settling certain rate litigation, the Court holding:

"In making the rate settlement as well as in making the original franchise contract, the consumers are represented by the city."

The cases are legion to the same effect both in the Supreme Court of the United States and other jurisdictions. The law and the practice is certainly well established that cities are the legal and normal representatives of their residents in utility matters.

CITIES WERE AMONG THE CHIEF SPONSORS OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT OF 1938

The Natural Gas Act of 1938 was a direct result of the lack of jurisdiction in State utility commissions to control unreasonable rates charged for natural gas shipped in interstate commerce. Chief advocates of the bill were former Mayors Miller of Louisville, Ky., Smith of Detroit, Mich., Scully of Pittsburgh, Hoan of Milwaukee, and Burton (present Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States) of Cleveland. Ohio cities, including Cleveland, Dayton, Akron, and Columbus, were then among the first cities to file petitions before the Federal Power Commission to reduce unreasonable rates for gas shipped to them in interstate commerce. Missouri, Michigan, and other cities filed similar petitions at about the same time. More than 100 cities have appeared in rate litigation of various kinds before the Federal Power Commission since 1938 and the rate reductions to consumers in those cities exceed $50,000,000 per year. The Kerr bill would of course scuttle the power of the Federal Power Commission to make such reductions and would assure gas producers of a return of much of this $50,000,000, even though the pipe-line companies are also involved and those pipe-line companies are not affected by this bill.

City officials are the best informed public officials in the country on natural gas and the facts of the Kerr bill because they have worked in this field over a long period of time and their experts are fully informed upon all the technical ramifications of this extremely technical subject. Is it any wonder that these cities would like to retain in the Federal Power Commission the jurisdiction conferred to prevent unreasonable prices for natural gas rather than leave the fixing of prices to the gas producers themselves?

HOW CITIES HAVE OPPOSED THE KERR BILL

City attorneys are the city officials who have appeared for cities in utility rate regulation cases. Most of the experts of cities on utility maters are either the city attorney or one of his assistants. In the larger cities of the Nation, their law departments usually contain several attorneys who have devoted their lives to utility litigation as representatives of users and consumers within the municipalities. These people are experts and are in a position to evaluate the effect of all proposals of utilities and they have spent years in representing cities on such proposals. Utility regulation is so technical that most city officials are not informed as to this subject and they naturally rely upon these experts who are informed by experience and training in this field. It was these attorneys who represented cities in securing the rate reductions under the Natural Gas Act and it is these attorneys who have represented and who are representing cities in connection with the tremendous expansion through new pipe lines of the use of natural gas all over the United States.

It cannot justly be said that these attorneys are prejudiced except in the public interest, and they are certainly most sincere when they advise city officials that the Kerr bill is not in the public interest because it would increase natural-gas rates tremendously. I therefore believe that the motives of these city officials are above reproach and that you, Mr. President, should listen most carefully to the advice they give.

At the hearings on the Moore-Rizley bill and on the Kerr bill cities were represented chiefly by Miss Anne X. Alpern, city solicitor of Pittsburgh, Pa., David A. Proctor, city counselor of Kansas City, Mo., and Jerome M. Joffee, special utilities and legislative counsel of the city of Kansas City, Mo. These people are among the best informed in the United States on natural gas and its problems, and you will find their testimony set forth in full in the hearings most interesting and helpful in your consideration of this bill.

WILL THE KERR BILL INCREASE THE PRICE OF NATURAL GAS?

My attention has been called to a letter signed by Emby Kaye of Tulsa, Okla., which appears on page 10 of the March 16, 1950, edition of the Washington Post. In that letter Mr. Kaye quite correctly points out that the Federal Power Commission has never exercised its right to control the price at which gas in the field is sold. He also points out that while the price of natural gas has formerly been 3 to 4 cents per thousand cubic feet, it has recently risen to 10 cents and I might add I am informed that in some instances it has gone up to 13 cents and above and will go even higher under escalator clauses contained in nearly every contract for the sale of natural gas. (Under the usual escalator clause the producer will automatically get the highest new price paid any producer in this area. The effect of this is obvious.)

These price increases described by Mr. Kaye have come since World War II, and after pipelines have been run into California, New York, and throughout the South, West, and Midwest, with cities changing over from manfactured gas to natural gas at an expense of millions of dollars to consumers. All of this tremendous expansion came about because of the price of natural gas has been low in the past.

The producers of natural gas who are under Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, according to reliable public records at the Federal Power Commission, are practically guaranteed at least 6 percent and many of them have made much more than 20 percent on their investment under the present law which the Kerr bill emasculates. That natural-gas producers are making a lot of money and anxious to sell their gas is evidenced by the tremendous increase in applications to serve new cities just referred to. There is no lack of gas available to serve these cities, but now that these cities have either secured or will soon secure natural gas, it is quite obvious that the producers, through the Kerr bill, want to raise the price by getting out from under control of the price they will charge. This action is inequitable, to say the least, and just as in the case of the ferry operator referred to above, these natural-gas producers have city natural-gas users at their mercy. The only hope for the consumer is some over-all national control of natural-gas prices as local and State control cannot be effective under our Federal Constitution.

The users can only buy gas from the pipelines, who have in turn purchased it from the natural gas producers. They cannot go down to the corner filling station or any other place and buy natural gas. It must come through the pipelines, and must come from the only people who have it—the people who would be exempted from control by the Kerr bill.

It has not been necessary in the past for the Federal Power Commission to exercise the jurisdiction it has had under the Natural Gas Act to cut down on the prices charged by those now classified for propaganda purposes as "independent" gas producers under the Kerr bill, because, as Mr. Kaye pointed out in his letter, the price up until recent months has been most reasonable, and it is only now that the demand has been tremendously increased that the price has doubled and tripled.

The Federal Power Commission has moved in to investigate the doubling of the price of natural gas by Phillips Petroleum Co. to the city of Detroit, and to certain Wisconsin cities, including Milwaukee and Madison. This Phillips case will be the first test of the Commission's jurisdiction to roll back

to a reasonable level the charges made by the so-called "independent" Phillips Co.—one of the largest producers of natural gas in the United States. Since this case is still pending and will not be heard until May 1, 1950, it seems that at least, Mr. President, you should veto the Kerr bill so as to delay action until we find out just what the Commission will and can do in the Phillips case. Perhaps we will need to strengthen the Commission's jurisdiction when that case is over. If you sign the Kerr bill, of course, the Phillips case is ended. Was that one of the big reasons for the tremendous hurry on this bill?

NATURAL GAS IS A COMMODITY AFFECTED WITH A PUBLIC INTEREST AND SUBJECT TO PUBLIC CONTROL

I do not think it can be successfully argued that regulation of the price of natural gas is the regulation of a business which is not "affected with a public interest." The Kansas Public Utility Commission has stepped in to fix minimum prices of natural gas at 8 cents recently on the theory that the price is affected with a public interest and subject to public control. I do not think anyone will question the legal conclusion that since natural gas producers enjoy a monopoly under public protection in that they have an assured market and a guaranteed reasonable rate of return it is a business affected with a public interest. No one can, without a certificate from the Federal Power Commission step into a particular city and sell natural gas. If it were not for the privilege flowing from this monopoly certificate granted by the Federal Government these producers would not be in the unique position they enjoy. There are not several natural-gas mains laid in one city with each pleading with the householder "Please buy from me." There is only one line serving each user and that company has a monopoly for that service. The user must buy from him or do without natural gas.

A natural-gas company will thus know that all of the natural gas it can produce will come to Washington or New York or whatever market the pipe-line company to which it sells serves. There can be no competition in Washington or New York between natural-gas producers, because only one pipe-line company and only one local utility company is available to a particular user. Certainly, as already stated, on the local distribution level, the consumer cannot pick and choose between utilities to serve him natural gas. So the natural-gas producers have a monopoly and an assured market.

To try to camouflage the issue before you, Mr. President, by referring to natural gas as "local production" and terming the jurisdiction to roll back unreasonable prices as an "interference with local business" is to torture words out of their natural meaning and circumstances where they have no application. The natural-gas producers, therefore, unlike the usual private businessman has an obligation to the consumer who must use his product growing out of this monopoly and assured market, and perhaps you on the other hand have an obligation to prevent the consumer from getting natural gas too cheaply at the expense of the producer, while at the same time carrying out your obligation to prevent the producer from charging too high a price to the consumer. The only way this balancing of interests of the producer and consumer can be brought about is through the exercise of our lawmaking jurisdiction under the Federal Constitution as we have done under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which I have already referred to. There must be some impartial public body to resolve in a fair manner the conflicting interest between users and producers and that must be a Federal agency because of the Nation-wide operations in this field. If you withdraw the protecting cloak of Federal regulation to prevent unreasonable natural-gas prices, consumers are defenseless. Surely such a result cannot be allowed in good conscience. And there is no ducking this issue, Mr. President. Regardless of how many Democrats and how many Republicans voted for or against this bill, that is past now and the entire responsibility is yours. It is to you that the consumers of the Nation now look for protection. You either protect them or you let them down. There is no middle course, as everyone knows the bill cannot be passed over your veto.

THE TAX LOOPHOLE AND THE KERR BILL

Recently you recommended that the loophole in the income-tax law whereby oil millionaires are exempted from income taxes be plugged. In your message you demonstrated, for example, how these oil millionaires escape nearly all taxes on the millions they are now making. In fact, it is obvious that the only way one can become a millionaire in the United States today is through the ownership of oil and gas wells through this tax loophole.

My attention has been called to a report filed by one of the smaller gas-producing companies which gives its gross earnings, income taxes, and net income, as follows:

	Gross income	Income taxes	Net income
1949	$14, 930, 150	$6, 949	$1, 218, 627
1948	12, 538, 058	29, 053	1, 366, 464
1947	8, 095, 635	15, 000	344, 903
1946	6, 206, 101	200	106, 298
1945	7, 029, 622	406, 500	1, 113, 051

It seems to me that the people of the United States are already giving such a tremendous subsidy to oil and gas producers through the income-tax loophole that they should not be asked to contribute a further subsidy in the form of the estimated $200,000,000 to $500,000,000 per year which the Kerr bill would cost.

There can be argument about the amount of the increase, as it is based upon a guess by experts about how much the increase will be in the wholesale rate. As Mr. Kaye pointed out above, the wholesale rate has increased from 3 and 4 cents to more than 10 cents since the war, and it seems reasonable that the increase from the Kerr bill, brought about by the removal of all possible control of the wholesale rate paid to 86 percent of the producers will be at least 5 cents per thousand cubic feet. It is certainly arguable that the increase will be double 5 cents or even higher. At 5 cents the increase would amount to the $200,000,000 per year, and the higher increases would amount to increases accordingly.

I have already pointed out that oil and gas companies are making what many businesses would consider an excessive rate of return on their investment now. They have a guaranteed market and cannot possibly lose any money because when they drill a dry hole the expense of that is taken off of their all-too-low income tax as a business loss. It would seem to me to be a good idea that this Kerr bill be discussed at the time we consider the elimination of the tax loophole now enjoyed by these gas and oil companies. A veto would enable that joint consideration.

There simply must be a limit to the subsidy which a particular industry receives—especially an industry which is based upon nature's bounty which was put here for the benefit of all the people rather than the enrichment of a few.

I therefore most earnestly suggest that the Kerr bill should be vetoed as it is unjustified, unjust, and unreasonable in the extreme. I do not think that these oil and gas producers who have led cities on by the hope of receiving this wonderful commodity for a reasonable price should be allowed now to change their story, escape all possible regulation now that they have city users at their mercy and charge whatever prices the traffic will bear. I urge you to make a careful survey of the reaction of the users, or soon to be users, of natural gas to this bill. You will certainly hear from those users in the future if you sign this bill. Oil and gas producers are receiving more than fair treatment under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and consumers are entitled to the same consideration—we have millions of consumers and only a very, very few gas companies. I do not mean to suggest that the millions should profit at the expense of the few. Each should be assured of fair treatment by the only device known to our constitutional system of government under the law, that is, the right to reasonable rates determined after notice and hearing by an impartial public agency such as we now have under the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

Please, Mr. President, I know that you have always thought of the little defenseless consumer, rather than the special interests back of the Kerr bill. You were elected by these little people. You are their man—not the man the oil millionaires would have elected. Your veto of the Kerr bill, I think, will tell these little people that you are still their man.

Employment for Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to offer some additional economic and statistical data to support the resolution I introduced on February 15, 1950, House Resolution 473, in which I asked that a select committee be created by this body to study the problems of the aging.

Employment for older people is one of the fundamental problems of aging. Continuance on a job gives the older person status or recognition among his fellows, provides financial security for him—or her—and his wife, enables him to maintain his home and preserve his health for a longer period of time, gives him something to do and opportunity to be with other people. From society's point of view, the employed older person is an economic asset, is a producer of goods or services needed by society, and is a more contented individual.

The question of employment for older people is complex. It is receiving a good deal of attention at the present time. Recognition of the problem is bringing about a reversal of the opinion that older workers should retire at an arbitrary age such as 60 or 65. There are, however, many problems to be solved before the trend in employment of older persons begins to rise.

One of these problems is the attitude, opinion, or superstition that older workers are less satisfactory than younger ones. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee has made thoroughgoing studies and lists five reasons why

employers refuse to hire older workers. These are:

1. A widespread belief among employers, but denied by many authorities, that workmen's compensation rates go up when the elderly are employed.

2. A widespread belief, denied by authoritative studies, that older workers are subject to higher accident rates and endanger other workers.

3. A widespread belief, unsupported as yet by facts, that the public prefers younger workers for jobs requiring public contacts, such as waitresses, clerks, office workers, salesmen, etc.

4. A widespread belief, repudiated by surveys made by our committee, that the elderly cannot produce as profitably as younger workers. Our committee found that when employers studied the matter three out of four agreed that elderly workers produce as much as younger workers, that they are absent less than younger workers.

5. A widespread belief that it is unprofitable to invest in the training of an older worker. Since the man of 65 has over a decade more of life today, it behooves industry to reexamine this belief.

All in all, our committee insists that many of these notions that militate against the hiring of older workers have no basis in fact, others are based on grossly exaggerated situations, and all could be combated successfully by progressive personnel measures.

Compulsory retirement based on chronological age rather than functional age—ability to do the job—is one of the most vicious factors in the life of older workers. Since there is coming to be a tendency to stigmatize organizations that have compulsory retirement programs, it is difficult to get reliable information about policies. Quasi-scientific surveys, conducted by managerial groups, have shown low proportions of firms with such requirements. A more rigorous survey by the New York State Committee showed, however, that 60 percent of all firms with a pension plan and 30 percent of all other firms had a mandatory "get-out" rule based on chronological age. About 80 percent of the firms with retirement policies set the age at 65. The National Industrial Conference Board studied 200 firms and found 65-year retirement policies in effect in 62 percent of them.

Perhaps even more vicious is the reluctance to hire older persons who become unemployed or who wish to change jobs. Discrimination often begins at 35 years of age. This low upper-age limit is said to be particularly widespread in California at the present time.

One way of measuring the effects of age discrimination is to study the distribution of unemployed who, at any one time, have exhausted their 26 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits. During a typical month in one employment office area, only 9 percent of those who had exhausted their benefits were under 45 years of age. Ninety-one percent were 45 or more and 54 percent were 65. The older worker has a very hard time getting back.

Unemployment insurance data show in general that—

(a) Older persons stay unemployed longer than younger persons.

(b) The "exhaustion rate" of unemployment insurance benefits increases as the age group rises.

(c) There is a sharp rise in the exhaustion rate for men 55 or over as compared with younger men.

(d) There is a marked increase in the unemployment period of women 35 and over as compared with younger women.

Yet the New York State committee was forced to conclude as follows:

Our committee is convinced that the rampant prejudice which bars many of our elderly workers from employment is sending many of our oldtimers to their graves before their time. We are permitting the rust of valuable skills and the loss of valuable judgment and advice. And we are removing from our productive forces some of our most brilliant and capable men and women.

The committee found—

In the survey conducted by our staff, 39 percent of the firms responding admitted they had formal age barriers, and that these obstacles to employment of the elderly ran from as low as 35 years of age to a high of 75 years of age. Public utilities, banks, and metal concerns ranked prominent among those having formal age barriers. The bulk of the companies with age barriers were large business firms. It is interesting, in this connection, to note that it was the public utilities that first adopted pension systems in this country and today virtually all public utilities have retirement programs.

Anthony Monaco, 49, was arrested on June 25, 1948, for holding up the Guttenberg Bank & Trust Co., in New Jersey. When captured, he said, "I was disgusted with everything. I could not get a job because employers do not want men who are over 40." Fortunately, most of our citizens are law abiding and will not resort to crime, but the menace that age barriers can be lies not only in the loss of production, not only in the human tragedies produced, but also in the threat to the stability of our society.

The widespread reluctance to employ older people exists despite evidence that it is an unreasonable reluctance or based on a foolish superstition. The late Edsel Ford said, during World War II:

As long as a man has judgment and ability to drive an automobile, he has the judgment and ability to operate an industrial machine. It may be true that older men are not so fast nor so strong as those in the 20–30 group, but this is more than offset by their experience, their cooler, more mature thinking, and their accuracy.

Industry must make up its mind now that it is going to emphasize the employment of those persons in the 40-and-upward group, or else the younger people will have to support their elders and themselves. That merely will aggravate the situation, for it will mean that persons will be marrying later in life and be in their middle years before the period of accumulation occurs.

Economically, it is more sound to keep able-bodied men and women earning incomes and buying goods than to place arbitrary age barriers and permit them to lapse, beyond these barriers, into senility and inaction, which is not only unfortunate but economically costly. As a matter of fact, men grow old not so much by the passage of time as by the shadow of hopelessness, the conviction of uselessness. Those who look forward to tomorrow's constructive activity have no time to grow feeble. Courage is not a matter of age or physical condition.

The Institute of Industrial Medicine at New York University-Bellevue Medical Center interviewed a number of business executives and came up with the conclusion that—

Almost invariably it was found that the worker 45 or older had a definite advantage over the younger worker in conscientiousness, actual ability, and attendance.

The eminent student of the problems of the aging, Dr. Edward J. Stieglitz, has said:

The changes which come (with age) are not all decline. I think there's a general opinion that it's all downhill. Speed of reaction does diminish, but endurance increases in certain capacities. It is not without significance that the records for all the sprints are held by youngsters, but the marathon records are held by men 38 to 45 and have been for many years. Endurance of a certain type, for the long, slow grind, the continuous type of labor situation increases. As speed declines skill is increased with practice, and as strength declines judgment increases. The mental changes are not all decline either. There is some depreciation in the ability to learn but it is extraordinarily less than the average individual assumes.

An outstanding industrial executive, Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, points out that—

Our society has been quite illogical and inconsistent in its attitude toward the older worker. On the one hand it is apparent that we have no objection to electing and appointing older individuals to positions of the greatest responsibility in government, business, and the professions. And yet on the other hand, as far as the rank and file of workers is concerned, we have no objection to the imposition of blind, and unselective compulsory retirement rules which automatically eliminate those in the ranks who have reached the same age regardless of their fitness, ability, and contribution to the group for which they labor.

Senator Desmond—New York State—says that—

Even if some of the objections raised by industry to the employment of older workers are valid, the oldsters offer compensatory advantages over the younger employees. They have more experience which eliminates waste motions; they are less inclined toward outside distractions; they have greater conscientiousness arising from longer service and more mature attitudes.

The following are excerpts from the findings and recommendations of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging—Legislative Document No. 32, 1949:

NEVER TOO OLD TO WORK

THE PLIGHT OF OUR ELDERLY

Many of our elderly are barred from employment by age barriers which bear no relation to ability. Others, beneficiaries of industry's billion-dollar-a-year pension systems, find themselves emotionally unfit or unprepared for retirement and as a result decay mentally and physically at a rapid rate.

Our hospitals lack adequate facilities for the chronically ill. Our nursing homes, which range from ill-kept boarding houses to admirably staffed and maintained domiciles, are unsupervised. Private homes for the elderly have huge waiting lists, but often the oldster cannot wait; he needs a home now. Many of our public housing projects bar older couples and single oldsters.

Old-age-assistance spending rises steadily but is far from adequate in providing a decent level of living to our unfortunate oldsters. Our old-age-insurance program still reaches only a small proportion of our senior

citizens. And our country has not yet made up its mind whether it wishes to continue our dual insurance-assistance program of financial aid to the elderly or substitute a single pension system.

Our mental hospitals are jammed with senile oldsters who in many instances do not need the high-cost care of prison-like institutions but only the occasional supervision of a nurse or housekeeper. Our communities provide practically no facilities where the emotionally distressed senior citizen can obtain psychiatric help which might prevent his being institutionalized (p. 5).

* * * * *

The significance of such population trends was indicated in our first report. Social scientists foresaw an increase in the political influence of the elderly, the development of new types of consumer goods aimed at the old-age market, the redesigning of homes, and other changes.

The strength of pro-pension movements was high lighted by the fact that whereas in 1940, persons 50 and over comprised 32 percent of our voting population, in 1980 this age group will constitute 42 percent of the voters (p. 8).

* * * * *

Successful retirement is one of the most difficult achievements of a lifetime. Retirement, improperly handled, can shorten your life, turn you into a nervous wreck or unexpectedly thrust you on relief rolls. Yet few of our 26,000,000 Americans who are 45 to 64 years old are prepared for the hazards of retirement. The myth that retirement from useful activity is desirable must be exploded.

State Health Commissioner Herman E. Hilleboe has emphasized that the provision of pensions is all very well, but nothing is done to lessen the psychological shock and fear that comes when one is, so to say, thrown on the economic scrap heap. Geriatricians are virtually unanimous that premature retirement while still vigorous can be a major disease. Our own committee believes that no healthy man should retire until he is fit not only economically but also emotionally to retire.

America must learn a new concept of retirement. If this retirement period is not to become one of pain and disease, it must be one of useful activity, if not of useful hobbies then of continuation of work, perhaps on a more moderate level, perhaps involving part-time employment.

Industry would be wise to review its retirement policies now, so that they can be considered in an atmosphere of quiet cooperation rather than wait until later when sharp disputes may arise around this issue.

In "birthdays don't count," we cited the views of various authorities on this problem. The consensus was that retirement, poorly executed, can become a major disease and cause death, just as certainly as can cancer, and that—

1. There is no chronological age that should predetermine retirement.

2. You should retire only when you can afford to, have to, or want to, due to inability to continue, and then be certain you don't merely vegetate, but retire to some worthwhile activity (p. 15).

* * * * *

Our committee urges that the Federal Social Security Administration utilize its vast facilities not only for the payment of insurance checks to our aging population, but to educate the recipients in their health needs, and the need for keeping active and useful in retirement. In other words, our committee believes the Social Security Administration has a tremendous opportunity to serve not merely as a retirement-check mailing medium, but also as a channel for distribution of needed health literature (p. 22).

Frontiers in World Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and the gentlemen of this House are all aware of the significance of World Health Day which is being celebrated this week on April 7. There is no other one thing more important to the economic development and to the encouragement of democracy in all the peace-loving nations of the world than freedom from disease and disability. Sick men cannot work, and therefore cannot contribute to their country's economic betterment. Sick men are unhappy men, and therefore are the most susceptible to the hyprocritical promises of better conditions under totalitarian regimes. It is not only humanitarian to do everything in our power to help better the health of the peoples of the world, it is an intrinsic weapon we can use in our battle to protect and extend democracy to all corners of the globe.

Much has already been done to combat disease throughout the world. The United States has played a leading part in this successful fight. But there is still much more to do, much more that can be done, by working with and strengthening existing organizations, by helping individual countries directly, and by carrying out President Truman's magnificent proposal—his point 4 program—to share our own knowledge and techniques with the less privileged areas of the world.

Dr. Leonard Scheele, the surgeon general of the United States Public Health Service, recently made an address ably presenting the public-health problems that confront us, the encouraging counterattacks that have already been made against disease, and the tasks that lie ahead in advancing the frontiers in world health.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FRONTIERS IN WORLD HEALTH

(Address by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, February 23, 1950, at the Round Table Club, New Orleans, La.)

Tonight I want to talk to you about the aggressive world counterattack against disease, which I believe is one of the most encouraging recent developments on the international scene.

This counterattack is urgently needed. Today at least two-thirds of the people of the world live in areas in which they are the daily prey of preventable disease. Last year, for example, at least one and one-half billion people of the world's total population of two and two-thirds billion were afflicted with illness. These ill people—notably concentrated in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—are in desperate need of more adequate health services.

Millions of them die needlessly each year. Hundreds of millions have their energies sapped by debilitating diseases which make it impossible for them to better their way of life.

Disease, moreover, is on the march. In Africa, for example, where close to 4,500,000 square miles are already rendered relatively uninhabitable by sleeping sickness, additional areas are now threatened.

FIGHT INFECTIOUS DISEASES EVERYWHERE

The health problems of the people of the economically underdeveloped areas are the common concern of the United States and the other nations of the world. Our interest is not only humanitarian. The United States, for example, has an immediate direct concern in the attack on infectious diseases at their source. Since the beginning of this century it has been increasingly recognized that the only long-range defense against the spread of disease across national boundaries is the eradication of epidemic diseases on a global basis.

We are also urgently interested in aiding the people of the underdeveloped areas to meet their health problems because improvement in their health will spur their economic development.

The people in these regions have been stirred recently by a powerful desire for a better life. If we leave them unable to fulfill their reasonable aspirations, their poverty and ill-health make them fertile for any ideology—however false—which holds out to them the promise of a fuller life.

ECONOMIC INEQUALITIES ARE DANGEROUS

Democratic ideals cannot survive in a world in which the present dangerous economic inequalities are continued and further accentuated. In terms of nations, we have learned that there is considerable truth in the old saying that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Back in 1939—before we had embarked on the tremendous war-induced program of industrial expansion—our per capita income was $554. In that period the average citizen of one of the less-developed countries earned about $40 a year. By 1947, however, the per capita income of the United States had more than doubled, reaching the figure of $1,400, while the lot of the people of the underdeveloped areas had not improved, and in many cases had actually declined.

Thus, the glaring inequalities in the world division of the essentials of life have become progressively more apparent in the past decade. There is little doubt that one of the fundamental objectives of communism is to seize upon the misery of people of the underdeveloped areas to create suspicion and distrust of the more-favored nations.

Technical assistance to the people of the underdeveloped areas in health and other fields offers a unique opportunity to counteract what Prime Minister Nehru, of India, has called the "apathy of despair." By offering these people a tangible hope for the future we shall be giving the world an on-the-spot demonstration of democracy in action and the creative power of a free-enterprise economy.

Today it is axiomatic that economic development and public health go hand in hand. The economic development of the large areas whose population is constantly afflicted with endemic diseases is impossible without broad-scale action in the medical field. The existence of disease and disease-carrying pests has, in fact, made it impossible to open up valuable resources in many regions. It has been demonstrated that an effective public-health program will benefit all phases of a nation's life. The elimination of an endemic disease has in some cases, for example, enabled farmers to double their food production.

GREAT ADVANCES IN PUBLIC HEALTH

Fortunately, modern science has made available the means to control and conquer some of the most stubborn diseases that plague mankind. In well-developed areas, such as the United States, this half century's great progress in preventing communicable

diseases is well known. However, the application of much of this new medical knowledge is still limited to the better developed areas. The lack of modern water and sewerage systems, for instance, is largely responsible for the existing high rates of typhoid fever, dysenteries, cholera, hookworm, and other diseases in wide areas. The use of even rudimentary sanitary methods in water supply and waste disposal can substantially control these diseases as crucial health problems.

Other diseases, such as malaria, the venereal diseases, and tuberculosis, are also highly vulnerable to planned attack. World health experts have concluded, for example, that if an effective campaign were waged against malaria in all of the malarious areas concurrently, human malaria would totally disappear in a few years.

Each year malaria is being dramatically conquered in one area after another through the use of the new insecticides, such as DDT. Nevertheless, the disease still causes hundreds of millions of preventable cases and millions of needless deaths. In India, close to two million deaths have been recorded as caused by malaria in 1 year, and the problem is equally grave in many other countries.

MALARIA CONTROL VITALLY IMPORTANT

The World Health Organization has given malaria control a high priority because the serious loss in working efficiency among malaria-ridden populations contributes greatly to the desperate shortage of food in many areas. Today, with the population of the world increasing at a rate estimated at 25 millions a year—greater than ever before—and the world food shortage becoming more critical, the urgency of malaria control as an economic measure alone is evident.

Striking examples of the economic advancement which is made possible by successful campaigns against malaria, cholera, typhus, and other diseases are afforded by recent attacks on these health problems.

Until recently, for example, Greece had been one of the most heavily infested malaria areas in the world. In 1946 UNRRA introduced the modern method of malaria control and began a campaign which has since been carried on by the United States Public Health Service personnel in the ECA mission to Greece in cooperation with the Greek Government. Principal reliance has been placed in residual spraying of homes and stables, although DDT spraying from planes has also been conducted in a few malaria areas.

SIGNIFICANT ECONOMIC ADVANCES

Today we are able to see the results. Whereas in 1942 there were at least 2,000,000 cases of malaria in Greece, in 1949 the incidence of the disease had been reduced below 50,000, and the greater part of the country is now free of malaria and no longer needs spraying. It is reliably estimated that from thirty to sixty million man-workdays a year have been saved by the operation. This would be equivalent to adding several hundred thousand workers to the nation's productive force—without the addition of more mouths to feed.

Similar results have been achieved by the campaigns against malaria in Brazil, Egypt, the Philippines, Haiti, and other areas.

In 1930 the deadly Anopheles gambaie mosquito, the world's most efficient malaria vector, was introduced into Brazil from its home in the African tropical belt. The disease spread from Natal and brought death and crippling illness to a 12,000-mile area in an epidemic which reached its peak in 1939 when 114,000 persons were treated for the disease. A 2-year campaign by the Brazilian Government, conducted with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation, brought the disease under control and made possible the resumption of the economic development of the region.

EGYPT CONQUERS MALARIA

In 1942, this same mosquito started another invasion, this time northward through the Nile Valley, pushing its attack to within 200 miles of Cairo and causing the worst epidemic in Egypt's history. In some areas as many as 90 percent of the people were ill at one time. Health authorities estimated that about 135,000 people died from malaria in that region in 1942 and 1943.

Commencing in 1944, the Egyptian Government with the advice of only four American malaria experts, had by February 1945, completely eradicated the gambiae mosquito in the infested areas and it has not since reappeared.

Some indication of the economic loss caused by the disease is given by the fact that one Egyptian plantation alone suffered a monetary loss in 2 years of about $600,000—representing among other things the loss of one-half the wheat crop and one-third the sugar crop.

CHOLERA AND TYPHUS FOUGHT

Equally effective campaigns have been conducted against such diseases as cholera and typhus. In 1947, for example, the economic life of lower Egypt was disorganized as the result of the rapid spread of cholera which suddenly appeared in that area. The World Health Organization was called on for help. Vaccines were flown in immediately from New York, then from many other areas and cholera experts were dispatched from various countries. Despite the violence of the outbreak, the disease was brought under control in less than 2 months.

Hookworm is a disease which also seriously interferes with the economic life of many areas. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs has assisted in a cooperative campaign against this disease in one area of Peru which has resulted in the reduction in the number of school children infected with the parasite from 59 to 38 percent.

The great work done in the Southern States of the United States in the sharp reduction of hookworm must also be recognized as contributing greatly to the economic potential of the people.

I have cited these instances of successful control programs against various diseases to illustrate the fact that we have the scientific knowledge and techniques at hand to embark on a broad program of technical assistance in the health field for the people of the underdeveloped areas.

POINT 4 PROGRAM IMPORTANT

President Truman vividly summarized the possibilities inherent in our American know-how in the fields of health, agriculture, and industry when he proposed his now world-famous point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. "For the first time in history," the President said, "humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the sufferings of these people."

The various inter-American health programs in which the United States has played a leading role have developed tested procedures and practical methods for meeting health problems on a cooperative basis.

The United States Public Health Service has cooperated closely for a number of years with the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, now also serving as the regional office for WHO in the Western Hemisphere. Under the programs sponsored by the Bureau, United States experts have been detailed on scores of assignments to other American republics and hundreds of Latin Americans have been given training in this country. These activities over the past 40 years have aided materially in strengthening and expanding national health services in Latin America.

Through these multilateral programs we have developed the practical procedures which will undoubtedly constitute a basic guide for the proposed health projects under point 4. In that sense, therefore, point 4 is not a new concept in the health field. However, point 4 is both bold and new in the sense that for the first time all world agencies will be directed toward a common end in a coordinated effort to raise the health and living standards of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

WORLD HEALTH PROGRAM IMPORTANT

We are now entering the second half of the twentieth century. The first half of this century has been one of the most eventful periods of man's history. On the debit side of the ledger it has been a period of disastrous wars that have threatened the very fabric of our existence. But it has also been a period of the most amazing scientific progress. We have probably added more to our scientific knowledge in the past 50 years than in any previous 200-year period. And the pace of our conquest of the fundamental secrets of nature and life at an ever-accelerating pace.

We have it within our power to use this knowledge for the creation of a stable and healthy world. We also have the potential power to destroy not only our civilization but all mankind. The world today is in the process of making the choice.

In this critical period we need to start a chain reaction which will create rather than destroy. I believe that in the proposal of expanded technical assistance to help all the world's people better their lives, we have the ingredients necessary to inspire such a creative chain reaction.

As a matter of fact, I venture to predict that when future historians assess the events of our time they shall recognize the beginning of the world program of health betterment which we are now witnessing as one of the most dynamic and far-reaching actions of our era.

Our Help in Ages Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald:

OUR HELP IN AGES PAST

Following President Truman's announcement that this country will manufacture the superpowerful hydrogen bomb, correspondents in the National Capital queried various legislators as to their reactions.

And all of them—with one exception—expressed views on the matter that came from military or political standpoints, or both.

The one exception was Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, N. Y., who expressed the conviction that, with such a weapon in the hands of mortals, the only hope for the salvation of the world would be through prayer.

"The President's decision emphasizes the imperative need for men and women of good will the world over to unite in a vast peace crusade before it is too late," declared the Congressman.

"Only on our knees, each praying to the one God according to the dictates of his own faith, can we hope to save the world from a fate too horrible to contemplate."

He is right, of course.

But he doesn't mean that we should discard the means—every possible means—of national protection.

Representative KEATING knows as well as anyone else that if it were possible for men and women of good will all over the world to unite in a vast peace crusade the tension under which the human race now is laboring would be lifted almost overnight.

The trouble is, of course, that the people who exist under ruthless dictatorships are not able to unite with those of other nations in such a crusade.

Their rulers, who will adopt every method—including wholesale murder—to maintain their power, will cut off all means of outside communication, and will delude them that the very people who are desirous of peace and who are the champions of a democratic regime of freedom for the individual are conniving to make war upon them and enslave them.

The Russian people, the rank and file of the people, want peace just as ardently as do those of any other country.

But the "menace" of "imperialist America" continually is being drilled into their consciousness. They have come to look upon this country as a natural and relentless enemy; and the little group of conscienceless men in Moscow, to further their own ambitions and strengthen their grip of power, will see to it that such an attitude is maintained.

Before there can be world peace, the Russian people must see the light.

How that will come about must remain to be seen, but miracles have happened before, and miracles will happen again.

In the meantime, we who believe in the dignity of man and sanctity of individual freedom, may well remember the observation of Representative KEATING, that "only on our knees, each praying to the one God according to the dictates of his own faith, can we hope to save the world from a fate too horrible to contemplate."

Congressional Greetings to Young America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district of Illinois which I have the honor to represent is located the Harvard School for Boys. It is a private school of high standing in a community noted for its educational institutions. This week a delegation of young men from this school are visting Washington and as they sit in the galleries above us, watching perhaps for the first time the functioning of our democracy in this greatest legislative body in the world, I know that my colleagues would wish to join with me in an expression of welcome. We are happy that they are with us and especially at this time when a great and a historic debate is being staged in this Chamber which has been the theater of action of so many of the immortals of American history. The debate to which they are listening, I might say to these young men from the Harvard School for Boys in the Second District of Illinois, is historic in that the bill under discussion is the omnibus appropriation bill and this is the first time in the history of the Congress that all the appropriations of the Federal money for the many necessary purposes of our Government, upon which the stability of the entire world rests, are covered in one bill instead of a number of bills as was the custom during the years. Combining all the appropriations in one bill, and providing for all the expenditures of the richest and most powerful country in all recorded history, it is, of course, the largest appropriation bill ever considered in any legislative body. We are glad to have the young men from the Harvard School for Boys with us at this time and to pause for the moment in the very serious business before us to give them a word of welcome.

The young men are William Aronson, Robert Daskal, James Droege, Leon Fein, Joel Goldberg, Peter Handler, Andrew Karzas, Allan Kulp, Edward Lang, James Leven, James Lindsay, Robert Propp, Lester Senechalle, Michael Vick, and Stebbins Younger.

Their chaperone is Miss Yvonne Marie Arnold.

Unpartisan—Not Bipartisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the United States News and World Report of April 7, 1950. It is well known that our so-called bipartisan foreign policy has never been truly bipartisan. Although it has been generally supported by the Republicans, it has long been my feeling that both major parties should also have a share in initiating major policy decisions. The article by Mr. Lawrence offers constructive thinking with respect to bipartisan policy, and I commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress. It is as follows:

UNPARTISAN—NOT BIPARTISAN
(By David Lawrence)

The term "bipartisan" has been loosely used in recent months to describe procedures that actually have never been followed.

The general impression is that Republicans and Democrats sit down together in the Department of State regularly, discuss all the available facts and then decide jointly on a major policy. This has never been true.

Day-by-day decisions on policies of a far-reaching nature are made only by the Secretary of State and his assistants. Members of either party in Congress rarely learn about the inside of these matters.

Sometimes Republicans are invited by the administration to participate as members of international conferences abroad. This is done to win minority votes in Congress on a few measures on which commitments have already been made and which require ratification or the appropriation of funds.

The making of foreign policy in a large sense, however, is an executive function. Strictly speaking, under our Constitution, there is and can be no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. The people must be able to hold a President or his party in Congress accountable at the polls for failure to adopt constructive policies that can lead to peace in the world or for bungling policies that can lead to a world war. There must be no place for the bipartisan alibi which seeks to anesthetize political opposition or shift the blame for mistakes made.

It is one of the weaknesses of our system and one of the strong points of the parliamentary system that the power to make foreign policy is concentrated solely in the Executive in this country, as contrasted with England and the various British commonwealths where foreign policy is made by the legislative leadership which wields the executive power but can be checked instantly by the people in elections that can be ordered at any time.

In America, no matter how many outside consultants or Republican Members of Congress are taken along on trips to international conferences or are occasionally invited to the office of the Secretary of State for discussion, policy making remains the responsibility of the majority party. This was made clear by Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, in an interview appearing in our March 31 issue, when he said:

"I don't think the minority can initiate or control foreign policy. But you can, of course, criticize this or that policy. We can't reverse a foreign policy, for it's in the hands of the President of the United States. We can't shape foreign policy at all. All we can do is to act as an effective brake on some of these bad tendencies. And, of course, individuals may express individual views of what they would do."

The minority party, therefore, must remain free to criticize the international as well as national policies of an administration. To hold otherwise is to advocate a conformity and oneness of view which is contrary to the basic philosophy of our republican form of government.

The specious argument is often made nevertheless that, since a nation must present a united front as against other powers, it gives an impression of division if criticism is voiced in Congress or elsewhere. This confuses discussion with action. Freedom of debate should be encouraged so that when a substantial majority—composed of both Republicans and Democrats—finally votes for a given policy, it is revealed as a free choice and not an imposed will.

What is needed, of course, is a foreign policy developed as a result of an unpartisan approach. This means that not only Republicans must refrain from asserting views merely for the sake of partisanship but that Democrats, too—including the President in this instance—must refrain from seeking political credit at the polls for measures made possible by Republican votes in Congress.

It is important also that Democrats should not, as a smokescreen to cloud free discussion, cry out that critics of the administration's policies are giving aid and comfort to Russia. It is, of course, illogical for the Republicans to characterize as Communists those officials in the Department of State who blundered in forsaking the Nationalists as the Communists rose to power in China. But it is equally illogical for President Truman or anyone else in the administration to declare that efforts by the Republicans to crusade against Communist influence inside our Government are of aid to the Kremlin. There is far more aid and comfort for Stalin when he sees in America the beginnings of a vindication of his doctrine of one-party totalitarianism—as witnessed in the attempts being made currently to denounce criticism as unpatriotic—than when he reads that the minority in Congress is concerning itself with measures to rid our Government of Communist sympathizers.

Let us recognize that, while both parties cannot participate in the formulation of international policy, the two parties can, by freedom of debate and an unpartisan examination of the issues, create the public opinion needed to reject an unwise, or to support a wise, policy in international affairs.

The Yalta Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book review of Roosevelt and the Russians, the report by Edward R. Stettinius of his observations as Secretary of State. The review is from the New Leader and was written by Felix Wittmer, an anti-Nazi German persecuted by Hitler and now teaching at Montclair (N. J.) Teachers College. Since most of our troubles today stem from the incredible mistakes of judgment and violations of principle made at the Yalta Conference, it is important to our future that we better understand our past:

THE YALTA CONFERENCE

(Roosevelt and the Russians, by Edward R. Stettinius, edited by Walter Johnson. Reviewed by Felix Wittmer)

This book offers ample evidence that Stalin and Molotov, at the Yalta Conference, were determined to obtain 10 main objectives:

1. Weaken Germany through dismemberment so thoroughly that she could never be turned into a bulwark against communism.

2. Have the west agree to the most crushing amount of German reparations possible.

3. Push Poland much farther west than seemed reasonable to Churchill and Roosevelt.

4. Replace basically the Polish Government in exile by the Soviet-sponsored so-called Lublin government.

5. Obtain spheres of influence in the Balkans.

6. Prevent setting up of definte machinery for free elections in the east European countries.

7. Postpone participation in the war with Japan to the last moment, but make certain to get into the fracas.

8. Act as if the Soviet Union needed to be coaxed into far-eastern military operations and, through such deception, strike a bargain.

9. Make efficiency of future United Nations Organization, as an instrument to prevent war, illusory.

10. Put every bit of western concessions down in clear terms, but leave any point of disagreement vague and wide open.

Even though Mr. Stettinius attempts to whitewash our tragic failure at Yalta, his book proves that Stalin and Molotov have scored on every one of the 10 principal issues. Yet, Mr. Stettinius—to the delight and everlasting gratitude of the Politburo and the Pravda boys—assures us (p. 6) that "the Soviet Union made more concessions to the United States and Great Britain than were made to the Soviet Union by either the United States or Great Britain." Let us look at the facts and data, as conceded by the former Secretary of State himself.

Point 1: We readily agreed with the Russians on German zones for we did not dare adopt the long Soviet view of the final conflict between proletarian Communist world revolution and the parliamentarian-imperialist-capitalist-bourgeois-etc. nations. We banned from our mind even the shadow of the thought that the total weakening of Germany might turn out to be a political triumph of Stalinoid world revolution.

Point 2: No matter how hard we tried to convince the Russian negotiators that reparations perpetuate chaotic conditions, we agreed to have the sum of $20,000,000,000 for German reparations mentioned in the—supposedly secret—protocol, as a basis for discussion.

Point 3: Without the consent of the Polish Government in London, we agreed to the cession of eastern Poland to Russia. Our hope that we might at least save the city of Lwow for Poland was frustrated. Since the Russians wanted Poland's western frontiers far nearer to Berlin than seemed good to us, it was decided that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the peace conference.

Point 4: When Russia would not even listen to any discussion about recognizing the widely representative Polish Government-in-Exile as the basis of Poland's future government, we capitulated. All talk about changing the term "enlargement" of the Lublin Government into "reorganization" is so much piffle. Ingenuously, Mr. Stettinius explains, "As a result of this military situation, it was not a question of what Great Britain and the United States would permit Russia to do in Poland, but what the two countries could persuade the Soviet Union to accept" (p. 301). In other words, in the friendly cooperative atmosphere of Yalta, which the author vaunts, we yielded to force.

Point 5: The actual though not nominal division of the Balkans into spheres of influence, which led to Soviet absorption of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, was arranged by Mr. Churchill with Roosevelt's approval of "a 3-months' trial." That after a few months' operation of the Communist secret police our game would be lost, is not mentioned in the ex-Secretary's book. The author does admit that President Roosevelt acted "without consulting the State Department" (p. 12).

Throughout the book it becomes manifest that in intricate matters, often misnamed "purely military," President Roosevelt, either alone, or through Harry Hopkins, negotiated directly with Stalin, without informing the State Department, i. e., Secretary Stettinius. The author urbanely calls that the "faulty liaison between the White House and the Department of State."

Point 6: While earlier drafts of the paragraphs on Poland emphasize the "responsibility" of our western ministers in regard to free elections, the final draft of the Protocol is sufficiently watered down merely to refer to "ambassadors by whose reports the respective governments will be kept informed about the situation in Poland." Whatever was worked out concerning Yugoslavia was clothed in the form of a recommendation only.

Points 7 and 8: It has apparently never entered the mind of Mr. Stettinius that in the light of 2,200 years of Chinese history, the basic realities of Leninism-Stalinism, and the most elementary information on ideological warfare, we should have done everything in our power to prevent the Soviet Union from participating in the war against Japan. From every bit of evidence, the author is still today unacquainted with these primary matters. Thus, he tells us that "President Roosevelt and the War Department had assigned Harriman the task of discovering (sic!) what was necessary to bring Russia into the far eastern war."

Although in more than 2,000 years of history China again and again was conquered by those who possessed themselves of the northern provinces of the nation, we gave the Soviet Union a hold on Port Arthur and the Manchurian railroads, and threw in the strategically important Kurile Islands for good measure. Although any far-eastern expert who is not politically color blind could know as early as 1927 that the Chinese Communist leaders were trained, financed, and controlled by Moscow, we opened the door to world revolution.

It is of course true, as we know from Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy (On Active Service in Peace and War) that our military authorities, even as late as July, 1945, urged Russian military cooperation against Japan. However, to subordinate long-term political requirements to military operations indicates absence of statesmanship. There is no evidence that anyone in the State Department warned our President against the coming far-eastern disaster. Mr. Roosevelt listened to the generals, Harry Hopkins, and his inner voice; Mr. Stettinius practiced rigorous silence.

Point 9: To have the United Nations veto excluded from procedural discussions was no fundamental gain on our part. Essentially, the veto power, in concerns of economic and military sanctions, is the blatant expression of the cleavage between the Communist world and ours. No attempt was made on either side to bring about enforcement guaranties of peace. The United Nations Organization was outlined as a facade, just as Mr. Stettinius served as a facade for the President.

Point 10: Whenever the Russian negotiators could not have their way, Molotov, according to the author, "could not go any further." Thus, Poland's western frontier was not determined. Everyone of our wishes regarding Iran was shelved. Vital matters concerning Yugoslavia, Italy, Bulgaria, and Austria were left to "future consideration."

What did we gain in what Mr. Stettinius euphemistically named a "compromise"? Was it really such a great concession on the part of the Soviet Union to permit France a seat on the Allied Control Commission of Germany? Was it any political victory of ours to have only 3 instead of 16 Soviet Russian republics represented in the General Assembly? Had not primary security already been lost through the establishment of the veto power?

Yet, Mr. Stettinius goes on record agreeing with his superior that "the Soviet Union had decided to take its place in the United Nations family as a good citizen." (Reporting to Getulio Vargas, p. 307.) Like the equally well-meaning and personally pleasant nonexpert James F. Byrnes he put his trust in unity through compromise. He might have done well to recall (or learn about) Plekhanov who once said that "Lenin desires unity as a man desires unity with a piece of bread: he swallows it." Stalin does not admit a single instance where he would deviate from the gospel truth of Lenin strategy and tactics.

In the humble opinion of this reviewer, only the appendix of Roosevelt and the Russians is of any positive value: it contains the otherwise unavailable official documents of the Yalta Conference. The book itself—some 330 pages—offers 300 pages of dreary, semi-official description of surface matters, and 30 pages of faulty, shallow, naive, and incredible apologia.

Carefully, the author has avoided any probing of the preponderant and basal issues. He has regaled us with a pageant of externals, such as the custom-built elevator of the Sacred Cow, Stalin's large black Packard limousine, Churchill's freshly-lit 8-inch cigar, and a Russian dinner consisting of 8 courses and 45 toasts.

Mexican Oil Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent to me for a long time that the State Department is not in favor of a loan to Mexico to improve or expand its facilities for developing its oil reserves. This is difficult to understand in view of the mutual benefits that would result to both Mexico and the United States. It is particularly difficult to understand our State Department policy in this matter in view of the generally recognized interest of President Truman which, on more than one occasion, has seemed to indicate his favorable attitude.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House at the present time is conducting a series of hearings on the question of a petroleum policy for the United States. Yesterday it had the privilege of hearing testimony given by Willard Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State. During his testimony it was developed that our State Department had submitted to the Government of Mexico an aide-memoire on the subject of a possible loan to Mexico by our Government and that it contained two or more conditions or suggestions to be met or at least considered preliminary to any favorable action by our Government. It further appeared that these suggestions had been very displeasing to the Mexican Government and as a result all negotiations had been discontinued. The questions and answers during the examination of Mr. Thorp were very illuminating and at times approached what may be termed as "double talk."

Without going into all of these matters at this time I am including in my remarks the following portion of the record of the hearing which gives in a summary way an analysis of the situation:

Mr. WOLVERTON. We have made loans right along to Britain that we never expect to get paid back, or we have made advances to them.

What I want to know, and the time is getting short—what I am getting at is this, this committee started its investigation of the fuel problem in 1947 when there was a very distinct shortage in this country. We had before us the leading representatives of large companies. The question was, Where can we get oil? There was not a single witness out of the number who appeared who made any reference whatsoever to Mexico as a possible source of supply. Of course, the Near East was mentioned, and Venezuela was mentioned, but never Mexico. Without any previous thought on the subject it seemed to me significant, and I merely asked the question, What about Mexico as a source of supply? Well, there was a degree of consternation when I wanted to consider Mexico.

That led me to make some study of the subject, and I have read very considerable upon it, and I came to the conclusion that there was a very definite policy on the part of some companies, and which I regret seemed to have been carried out by the State Department, so that obstacles were thrown in the way of developing the oil resources of Mexico.

This undoubtedly grew out of the expropriation in 1938, but whatever may have been the cause, they insisted that there was a lack of desire to consider Mexico as a possible source of supply.

From that time to this there has been an ever-accumulating amount of evidence, so far as I have been able to observe, of effort on the part of the State Department to stop any real consideration of Mexico as a source of supply.

Now, I will tell you why I thought that the State Department should have been more interested in it than it was. There are two reasons. First, at that time, the economic stability of Mexico was not as stable as some would have liked to have seen it. The peso was dropping in value, and oil was an asset that they could have utilized to advantage. The other was the military consideration, having in mind that in the case of emergency, as you have stated in your statement today, we would not have sufficient oil in the United States, and would have to get it from the outside, and there was no place where we could get it with greater assurance than from Mexico, because with the use of pipe lines the tanker situation could be eliminated. Furthermore, if tankers were used, they could operate across the Atlantic from one side of Mexico, and they could operate across the Pacific on the other side, so that it had a very strategic military value.

It seems to me from an economic and from a military standpoint that favorable consideration should be given to a country which makes application for a loan, not a gift, but a loan where any businessman would be willing to recognize its value.

Mexico has paid its other loans that it got either from private or public sources, and there is no doubt in anybody's mind, as far as I have heard, and no one has raised the question that this would not be paid back.

Now, it comes down to the point where application was made to our committee, after our visit to Mexico, by the Cromwell firm, through an appointment made by Mr. Allen Dulles, not John Dulles, who is his brother—in fact they are both in the same firm.

Mr. HARRIS. You are speaking of John Foster Dulles?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes, that is his full name. Instead of Mr. Allen Dulles appearing he sent Mr. Miller, who is now Secretary or Assistant Secretary in charge of Latin-American Affairs in the State Department. He wanted us to put in our report the very same suggestion that now appears in the aide-memoire. We refused to do it, thinking we were not a collection agency.

It then appears that after our committee refused to do it application was made to the State Department. That would be in the spring of 1949.

Now, from that time to this there has been nothing done except that after Mr. Miller had presented the claim, or Cromwell & Sullivan had presented the claim, to the State Department, he was appointed Assistant Secretary on the 28th of May, and on the 28th of June he was confirmed, and within 10 days after his confirmation this aide-memoire went to Mexico, with that claim in it that attention should be given to a large claim.

Subsequently to that, as you must be aware, or, if not, I hope that you will refresh your mind upon it, you will find that the Mexican Government objected to the conditions or suggestions, whichever you wish to term them, that had been laid down in the aide memoire, and that closed negotiations.

It then became the subject matter of a conference that the President held with newspapermen, and the question was asked time and again, have negotiations ceased? The President at all times indicated his interest in the matter, and I have all of those news reports before me right here if your mind needs refreshing. He indicated his interest in the loan to Mexico, and said negotiations would be carried on.

Now, here we are in April of 1950. Eight months have elapsed since the President said that the negotiations would be inaugurated or reestablished, and nothing more has been done than was done at this time a year ago before Mr. Miller went into the Department. Now, are negotiations going on or are they not? If they are going on, is the President aware of the fact that in the aide memoire some conditions particularly were laid down that were offensive to the Mexican Government; one, a suggestion about basic policy, which I think you will find in their answer, meant a change of their laws, and another, a reference to this blackjack method of settlement of claims in a matter that had no relationship to it whatever.

What I would like to know is this. You say that conferences were held, three of them, by the Secretary of State and the President. You think two of them were before the aide memoire and one must have been subsequent. Under those circumstances, it might be inferred that the Sabalo matter was spoken of to the President. I wish you would refresh your mind on that, as to whether the President ever saw the aide-memoire.

I think I can discern from the statements that have been made by the President on his visit to Mexico, which improved our relationship considerably—as well as the visit of the President of Mexico to this country—and from the interest that the President has displayed in this matter, something that has led me to the conclusion—and if I am wrong, I am glad to be corrected and to know what the situation really is—but I am of the opinion that, notwithstanding the President's interest in this matter, the State Department has been sabotaging his effort all the way along. We are just spending time running around on this matter. The chairman of this committee, Mr. CROSSER, made innumerable visits to the State Department and to the White House, and yet nothing has been done, notwithstanding what seemed to be favorable opinions that were expressed. I am just unable to understand anything other than that the State Department is using double talk.

I am interested in this from the standpoint of having a friendly neighbor to the south, as we have one to the north. We are spending billions of dollars abroad; and I have supported those programs. We are spending that money to head off communism and collapse of governments on the other side. If we can do it abroad, I cannot see why it is not far more important to do it on this side of the water, in connection with a country that is a neighbor of ours, so that we may have friendly neighbors on the north and on the south of us. I do not believe the matter has had the serious consideration that its importance entitles it to have.

Now, I have a hundred more questions I would like to ask. May I inquire whether Mr. Thorp, after he has refreshed his mind on some of these matters, will be back or not? What I am trying to get is this: What is the policy of the State Department with reference to oil? Is it to advance one? Is it to thrust down another? Is it to help here and to refuse to help elsewhere? Are we playing favorites in this game? I see now that Argentina is coming into the picture, and there is this situation that you have referred to about the British, and so on.

It seems that we are considering everybody except our nearest neighbor. I think it is time that we began to think of the Western Hemispere as well as any other hemisphere in this world of ours, from the standpoint of any emergency that might happen.

May I say, before I finish, that I would recommend as reading to the State Department the speeches and the statements that

were made by President Roosevelt dealing with petroleum in Mexico. I would suggest particularly that you read the book published under the title "Shirt Sleeve Diplomat, Josephus Daniels, Ambassador to Mexico, 1933–42." It is one of the finest expositions of what, in my opinion, should be the good-neighbor policy, that I have read. I wish the State Department would make itself familiar with the viewpoint of that great Ambassador from this country.

There is another book, a very small one, called Mexican Oil: A Symbol of Recent Trends in International Relations, written by Harlow S. Pearson, Ph. D., which refers to the background, and so forth, of the settlement that was made on the expropriation claims for damages, and see what our Secretary of State had to say in that connection about the rights of Mexico, and so forth.

It seems to me that it would be good reading, and it would be helpful reading, in formulating a good-neighbor policy which, it seems to me, we are in a good way to wreck if we continue on the course we are now pursuing. And if you run out of reading, I can give you the names of a few more books.

Mr. HESELTON. I might suggest that we read the gentleman's [Mr. WOLVERTON] speech.

Mr. HARRIS. Gentlemen, I promised Mr. Thorp that we would adjourn this meeting shortly after 12 o'clock, because he had a funeral that he had to attend. Of course, our good friend and distinguished colleague, for whom we have the greatest admiration, has taken about 20 minutes with his remarks without having given the witness an opportunity to answer. I realize that the gentleman has questions that he wants the witness to answer, but it is obvious that we will have to conclude the hearings for today. I know there are other members of the committee who have some questions in their mind that they want to ask in connection with your statement here today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for having taken so much time. I certainly appreciate the opportunity that you gave me in making a lengthy statement, without asking questions; it was with the idea of giving the witness some inkling of what was in my mind, and of giving him the opportunity to be prepared when he returns as a witness.

The thing I am interested in is this: Is the President of the United States familiar with the aide-memoire? You have said he was. I would like to hear somebody in a position to say that. I have my doubts.

Mr. HARRIS. In all fairness to the witness before us, he had advised that so far as he knows, the President has been kept advised of these matters in connection with the Mexican Government. Perhaps the question, in all fairness to the witness, should be directed to another source. Nevertheless, these matters are of great importance in maintaining a consistent policy of our Government on international business, wherever it takes place, in connection with our own national security and making available ample supplies of petroleum to help improve the economic condition of our country. These questions are of tremendous importance to the members of the committee, and we realize that they involve fundamental policies on which there might be divergencies of opinion.

I assume that Mr. Thorp will be glad to return at some convenient time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I would not want the chairman to think that my only interest is Mexico. I have made a study of this from the standpoint of Venezuela and some of these other countries as well, including far-eastern countries. Mexico is not the only country in which I am interested.

Mr. HARRIS. Everyone knows of the interest that the gentleman from New Jersey has in the subject of petroleum, and in the economic stability of our friendly neighbors and other nations of the world, as well as our own economic stability. We know of the great amount of work the gentleman has done on this problem as it affects our own relationships with Mexico and other nations of the world. I think the committee and the Congress and the country are very fortunate in having a man with the ability and experience of our distinguished colleague here on this committee. At the same time, and with all due deference, there is the question of the State Department carrying on this matter in the usual way, taking into consideration the relationship of this country with other countries, having in mind our own free-enterprise system and the opportunity of our own capital to expand, wherever it might be helpful to us. This is a broad, serious policy question, and one that deserves every possible consideration.

Mr. THORP. Mr. Chairman, may I say just two sentences to complete the record on one point?

Mr. HARRIS. Very well.

Mr. THORP. Namely, that when Mr. Miller was appointed Assistant Secretary in the State Department, he immediately disqualified himself from all matters relating to the Mexican petroleum situation; and he has not participated in any way in those matters since he came into the State Department.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Did he participate in the State Department discussions before he went into the Department?

Mr. THORP. No, sir.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Who did on behalf of Cromwell & Sullivan?

Mr. THORP. As far as I am concerned, I only recall seeing Mr. Dulles.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Allen Dulles?

Mr. THORP. Allen Dulles.

Mr. HARRIS. It may be that after the memorandum on this particular claim is presented, which you have stated you would present, the matter will be cleared up. Thank you very much, Mr. Thorp. The committee now stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

Centennial of Clinton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include two excerpts from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item containing the remarks, in part, of the Honorable Paul A. Dever, Governor, and the Honorable Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the centennial banquet of my home town of Clinton on March 14.

The excerpts follow:

"The city of Cambridge is famous for many things. In education particularly has this great city achieved noteworthy and world-wide repute," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, toastmaster, in introducing Gov. Paul A. Dever.

"But Cambridge is also famous as the city of governors. The most recent of these leading citizens of University City honors us with his presence tonight. He has many warm friends here. He comes as the esteemed chief executive of our beloved Commonwealth.

"His career eloquently symbolizes the opportunity the Nation affords to those possessed of the will and capacity to forge ahead despite the handicaps which humble beginnings so frequently impose.

"Endowed with great ability, vigorous and energetic, outstanding before the bar, seasoned legislator in the general court, former distinguished Attorney-General of the Commonwealth, uncompromising advocate of the cause of labor, able and humane, his record is one of brilliant achievement and service.

"I am happy, honored, and proud to present to respond to the toast, 'Clinton and our Commonwealth,' our great Governor—the Hon. Paul A. Dever."

Gov. Paul A. Dever, responding to the toast, "Massachusetts," said:

"There is one thing of which I am reasonably certain, tonight. I am about to extend a greeting to the town of Clinton to which I feel sure she will never be able to reciprocate in kind. A one hundredth birthday is truly an occasion to observe. I congratulate Clinton, and I extend to her the sincere greetings of the Commonwealth.

"Tonight, I feel that I am among friends, and it is a pleasant feeling. Clinton has been very kind to me. Even during those times when fate did not lend its smile to my political aspirations, the people of Clinton stood by me—and what is better evidence of a real friend?

"So it is needless for me to say I enjoy being with you, tonight. I will always enjoy being with you.

"Last year, with the help of people like you, I was honored with the highest privilege obtainable by a citizen of this Commonwealth. I became your Governor; and as such I became charged with the solemn responsibility of managing your affairs in our State government."

PROMOTING THE COMMON GOOD

"I have worked hard since that time to warrant the confidence you were so kind to impose in me. Goaded by the desire to reward that confidence with good works, I have taken into consideration the probable effects of my program on the people as a whole. It has been my sincere desire to make fairness my guiding principle, and the public welfare my goal. Within the powers which Providence has allowed me, I have exerted my every energy to put into action those principles of government which are inherent in my philosophy, a philosophy which dictates that government must not be stagnant, but must rather through affirmative action promote the common good.

"In these days of conflicting thought, when the very fiber of our democratic existence is being put to a most crucial test, it is imperative that we adjust our mode of government to the conditions which surround us. The strength of democracy lies in its flexibility. We are no longer a country with a wide frontier to take up the slack of limited opportunity. The frontier vanished in 1890. Our new frontier must of necessity be found in the legislative chambers of our Federal, State, and local governments. It is their responsibility to mold into its proper form the pattern of society which will offer to all our citizens the equality of opportunity which is so commendable an objective of American democracy.

"To strive toward that objective has been my constant aim. * * *"

* * * * *

"Our acomplishments during the past year have been many. They are doubly significant when we consider the forces which have worked against them. There are those in our society to whom Congress is odious.

"The status quo is to them an idol to be worshiped, for under it they are able to continue their grabbing ways and realize their selfish ambitions. To them personal gain

transcends governmental obligations. To them a twisted mind, or a hungry belly, or a substandard home is something to be tolerated but not to be remedied.

"In their narrowness they lose sight of their own welfare and feed those forces which would harass and subdue us. Blinded by ignorance and poisoned by an unconscious urge to degrade, they sow the seeds of discontent. They are the disciples of discord, who would stifle our initiative, not knowing that by their actions they are furthering the cause of our enemies abroad."

WE MUST NOT REST

"These inimical forces, whose greatest fault is their own gullibility, do not rest. If we are to combat them successfully, we must not rest either.

"We must remain constantly alert so that through lack of sedulity we shall not play into those hands which are eager to destroy the way of life so dear to all of us.

"As Governor of this great Commonwealth I give you my pledge that my tenure of office will witness no let-up in this battle against reaction. We cannot afford to relinquish that fight. I am determined that we will not.

"Once again, my heartiest congratulations to the town of Clinton on its one hundredth anniversary. May you continue to prosper for centuries to come."

* * * * *

"The history of Clinton is like a miniature history of the United States. Although if we are to measure a town's age by her corporate existence, she is only a century old, actually the story of Clinton's ingenuity and love of freedom is centuries older. History records that nearly three centuries ago white men were tilling her soil and engaging her valuable waterpower. The sagacious and enterprising John Prescott, realizing that she offered no broad meadows to invite the husbandmen, was among the first to see in Clinton's physiognomy her potentialities as a manufacturing town and established the Prescott Mills.

"His was not the first in a long list of manufacturing enterprises which led to the eventual separation of Clinton in 1850 from the agricultural community of Lancaster, of which, as Clintonville, she had been a part. As a manufacturing center she grew until she listed among her manufactures the variety of commodities so indicative of her versatility and so characteristic of her history.

"Her loyalty to principle stands unchallenged over the centuries. When the rallying cry, 'Taxation without representation is tyranny,' rang through the land, the forebears of Clinton were among the first to organize to answer the call to arms.

"According to the Honorable Henry S. Nourse, whose comments on Clinton are considered to bear the weight of authenticity, 'When the political champions of slavery treasonably sought to break up the Federal Union, nowhere did the spirit of patriotism, so fervent everywhere in Massachusetts, flame forth sooner, or with more genuine fire, than in Clinton.'

"In the two great world struggles, the later of which we have only recently concluded, the town of Clinton contributed its share to the armies of young men who have risked their lives in the successful prosecution of those blood-spending conflicts.

"To those phases of her history Clinton can surely point with justifiable pride. She has been a model of both patriotism and progress. I feel honored to have been able to include among my most admired personal friends one of her most renowned citizens, one who gave to the governorship of our Commonwealth and the Senate of the United States the wealth of energy and accomplishment which stand as a lasting tribute to the town from which he sprang. I refer, of course, to one of your greatest sons, the late Senator David I. Walsh."

* * * * *

"The heart of the Commonwealth, the great city of Worcester has given us many splendid public men. None of these has excelled the next speaker in his steady advance from the ranks to an exalted position in the government of our beloved Commonwealth," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, toastmaster, in introducing Lt. Gov. Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, of Worcester.

"Former mayor of his native city, experienced legislator, zealous champion of any cause he espouses, able and distinguished in the affairs of state, I am pleased indeed to present to respond to the toast, Tribute to Our Neighbors, the genial, friendly and capable lieutenant governor of the Commonwealth, his honor the Honorable Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, of Worcester."

Lt. Gov. Charles F. (Jeff) Sullivan, of Worcester, responding to the toast, "Tribute to Our Neighbors," said:

"Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Dever, reverend clergy, and honored citizens, friends, and neighbors, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I respond to the gracious toast of our able and eloquent toastmaster, Congressman PHIL PHILBIN. It is with pride that I see my home city of Worcester called 'neighbor and friend' to such a splendid community as is Clinton. It is with pleasure that I think of myself not only as a son of Worcester, but almost as a man of dual allegiance to Clinton as well as Worcester. Indeed this is so because so many of my friends and relatives who call Clinton their home have entertained me that Clinton is a second home. Any man would be glad to call Clinton his home.

"Consider for a brief moment its proud history. The early settlers of Clinton came from many different races: Irish, German, Italian, Polish, Scotch, and English. They worked long and hard. They were honest, industrious, and religious. Their children truly typify the melting pot of America. They inherited their parents' sturdy characteristics as was easily seen when the depression of the thirties closed the major mills in the town. The people of Clinton showed their inherited fighting qualities. They organized and with determination brought new industries into the town, so that today Clinton is one of the outstanding, prosperous towns of our Commonwealth.

"These same early ancestors of present-day Clintonites would indeed be proud of the outstanding men that Clinton has sent into the world. Merely reciting their names is enough to bring to the mind of every person here the extraordinary leadership of the late Congressman Kenney, of New Jersey; ex-Congressman Joseph E. Casey; Presidential Secretary Matt Connelly; our capable and conscientious toastmaster, Congressman Phil Philbin; and the late Senator David I. Walsh and many others who have served with distinction in both houses of the Massachusetts Legislature.

"Clinton's outstanding citizens have not been solely in public service. The large number of clergymen it has sent into the world to spread the word of God is an eternal tribute to the deeply religious nature of Clinton's citizens. The outstanding members of the judiciary who call Clinton their home bear eloquent testimony of the high regard and deep esteem that all residents of Clinton have for the American concept of law and order—Judge O'Toole, Judge Kittredge, and Judge Jaquith, of district court; Judge O'Malley, of Springfield District Court; and Judge Buttrick, of Massachusetts Superior Court.

"I could go on indefinitely reciting the leading figures in all walks of life who come from Clinton, but the names of all are as well known to you as they are to me.

"It is no mere chance that a community of the size of Clinton has made such a large contribution to the progress of Massachusetts. It is rather the result of a careful, conscientious citizenry who have, down through many generations, established, improved, and enlarged their public institutions, particularly the school systems, both public and parochial. It is to the credit of the high standards of the schools that Clinton has developed so many leaders in all fields, and the schools in turn are the product of the ambitious, hard-working, and religious fathers and mothers of this splendid community.

"Truly Clinton typifies all that we strive for in our American way of life. It is because she is such a splendid example of our American community that I close as I opened my brief response to our toastmaster, Congressman PHIL PHILBIN, by reaffirming how proud I am, and what pleasure I take in saying to him, that Clinton and Clinton's citizens say a most gracious and sincere thank you for such a moving and eloquent toast to them."

Harvard Law Professor Raises Strong Objection to Mundt-Nixon Bill—Old Laws Viewed Sufficient to Hold Communists Down

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Langdell professor at Harvard University Law School, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1950:

HARVARD LAW PROFESSOR RAISES STRONG OBJECTION TO MUNDT-NIXON BILL—OLD LAWS VIEWED SUFFICIENT TO HOLD COMMUNISTS DOWN

(By Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Langdell professor at Harvard University Law School)

I am one of the large number of old-fashioned Americans, trying to do their own job as well as they can, who care a good deal about our Bill of Rights and about maintaining American traditions of freedom and tolerance. We like the kind of country in which we grew up, and we want it to stay that kind of country for our children and our grandchildren.

Because we detest totalitarianism, we are greatly disturbed by proposals, such as the Mundt-Nixon bill, to copy any of the methods which totalitarian nations use for keeping a tight control over the thoughts and expressions of individuals, over their political activities when they do not meet the approval of officials, and over the exchange of views among individuals in publications and meetings.

My main objection to this bill is that I see very little evidence to support the recital that the world Communist movement presents "a clear and present danger * * * to the existence of free American institutions." Let me begin by reviewing the acts of Congress which now protect our Government and institutions from attacks through violence or other unlawful action.

First, a statute enacted in 1861 (U. S. C., new title 18, sec. 2384) punishes conspiracy "to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, * * * or to oppose by force the

authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States."

EFFECTIVE STATUTES

This was considered adequate to protect the Government when the Confederate Army was within 100 miles of Washington. In 1867 it was supplemented by another statute punishing conspiracy to commit any offense against the Government with any overt act, no force being required (U. S. C., new title 18, sec. 371).

These two statutes kept us safe from any serious consequences of internal disaffection in time of peace for three-quarters of a century. Without any sedition act, we came through the panic of 1873, the panic of 1893, the panic of 1907, and the great depression of 1929–33. The absence of any prosecutions against revolutionists under either of these laws demonstrates that the sky has been clear of forcible revolution for a good many years.

Still, in 1940 Congress wanted more than the old conspiracy statutes. So it created two new types of criminal offenses in the Alien Registration Act.

To begin with, it made the Espionage Act of 1917 applicable in time of peace, so as to punish anybody who advocated insubordination, disloyalty, and so forth, in the armed forces. (U. S. C., new title 18, sec. 2387.) This measure was urged as essential to protect the Army and Navy from Communist organizations.

Yet the only reported case under it was the abortive prosecution of about 30 Fascists and anti-Semites in Washington in 1944. The fact that there is no reported case under this statute against a Communist proves one of two things.

QUERY POSED

Either Communist activities to demoralize the armed forces never have amounted to much, in which event there seems to be no need for more legislation for the same purpose; or else the 1940 statute has been very successful in putting a stop to such Communist activities, and if so why do we have to have a new law to safeguard soldiers and sailors?

The other part of the 1940 statute, commonly distinguished as the Smith Act (new title 18, sec. 2385), makes it a serious crime to advocate the overthrow of any government in the United States by force, or to be an organizer or a member of any group of persons which advocates such overthrow.

This is the first Federal peacetime sedition law since the ill-fated Sedition Act of 1798. It goes very far toward reaching anybody who belongs to what the new bills define as a "Communist political organization."

If there were really a clear and present danger in this country from world-wide communism, anybody would naturally expect that this Smith Act would have been invoked again and again during recent years. On the contrary we find just three prosecutions. The first was several years ago, *Dunne v. United States* (138 Fed. 2d. 137 (1943)).

OUTLAW LABOR UNION

Although there was a good deal of wild talk by the men who were convicted in this case, their organization amounted to little more than a small outlaw labor union and being Trotskyites, they were about as far removed as possible from the Communist dictatorship of the Soviet Union, which is described in the pending bill as the fountainhead of danger to our own country.

The second was the abortive Washington prosecution of Fascists, already mentioned. Surely Stalin's influences over American citizens could not have created an overwhelming peril to our Nation when the Smith Act lay dormant for 8 years before any of Stalin's admirers were thought worth prosecuting.

At last, 11 leaders of the Communist Party of America were indicted. They were convicted last autumn in New York City. The Government's case at this trial enables us to get a pretty good idea whether these 11 men and their organization have put our country in deadly danger.

NO ALARM SEEN

Nobody was the least bit scared. Nor did I see alarm expressed by a single editorial or a single letter to the editor of a newspaper. It was about the least exciting news of the day.

Consequently, I see no need for supplementing the drastic penalties of the Smith Act by another and much more sweeping sedition law.

Some have argued that Communist spies make this bill necessary. Yet the Criminal Code already contains comprehensive legislation against espionage (new title 17, secs. 701–797).

If the present statutes against spying are thought to be defective, the proper remedy lies in amending those statutes so as to aim directly at spies, and not in roaming all over the lot against thousands of people, most of whom would never dream of being spies.

Finally, in connection with the registration provisions in this bill, it is important that we now have two statutes requiring registration in particularly serious situations.

Anybody who acts as the agent of a foreign government must register (except diplomats, consuls, etc.) and any organization subject to foreign control must register if it is engaged in political activity or if it aims to control, seize, or overthrow the Government of the United States by force. (22 U. S. Code, secs. 233–233g; new title 18, sec. 2386.)

Anybody within these two statutes who fails to register before acting incurs severe criminal penalties. Now, if the Communist Party of America or any other group in this country really satisfied definition of a "Communist political organization" (sec. 3 (3) in H. R. 7595), then there is no need of a new law to make it register.

It can be compelled to do so any day under the existing statutes just mentioned. The fact that these two statutes have not been enforced against the Communist Party or its leaders indicates that all the talk in section 2 of the bill about American Communists creating a clear and present danger of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States is like the reports of Mark Twain's death—grossly exaggerated.

SURVEY SUMMED UP

To sum up in two sentences this survey of the present United States Code:

If American Communists and fellow-travelers are as dangerous as the supporters of this bill make out, then there is enough legislation already with teeth in it to take care of these people; so no new law is needed.

If, on the contrary, existing statutes are not violated by what these people are saying or doing, then they can't be very dangerous; so no new law is needed.

I fully recognize that the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia was a danger to the freedom of Czechoslovakia, and the same is probably true of Italy and some other countries.

It does not follow that the inclusion of less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of our population in a Communist Party here is a real danger to our institutions and our freedom under the very different conditions in this country.

We have a very strong Government equipped with existing legislation and efficient Federal police. Our Government does not need any such novel bill as this in order to deal effectively with any actual conspiracy against its existence or any actual effort toward violent revolution.

Where inside this country are the facts which justify the establishment of unheard-of regulatory machinery, the expenditure of large sums of money in its operation, and the severe punishment of American citizens because somebody or other has not filled out a piece of paper?

It is now nearly 30 years since my work as a student of freedom of speech led me to pay considerable attention to the activities of Communists in this country.

Although they are as detestable as ever, it is my considered opinion that they are far less dangerous today than they were in 1919–20, soon after the Russian revolution.

The spiritual health of the Nation is far better than in 1919. We have a much greater immunity to revolutionary radicalism.

Sometimes I wonder whether the supporters of measures like this bill have been worrying so much about Communists that they have forgotten what freedom-loving Americans are like.

The only possibility of communistic control of this country, leaving out the chance of foreign conquest, would come, I believe, from the destruction of this confidence which the great mass of our citizens now have in their own future and that of their children's future.

FURTHER OBJECTION

Imagine a prolonged period of enormous unemployment; the dollar buying what a dime buys now, and perhaps worth a nickel next week, who knows; ever-mounting taxes; the national revenue heavily mortgaged for decades by unwise commitments to groups of the aged at the expense of active men and women and their children; voters hating and despising the men they themselves have put in office because they had nobody better to choose from.

The safeguard against communism and any other sort of disloyalty is to keep on working hard to make this a better country to live in.

A further objection to the pending bill is that, while it purports to be necessary to preserve "free American institutions," it gravely impairs some of the most precious of those institutions—freedom of speech and press and assembly, which our ancestors put at the very head of our Bill of Rights.

Without bothering you with an extensive discussion of the meaning of those freedoms, I merely point out that the American tradition of freedom of speech and press and assembly is that words as such shall not be punished or restricted, however objectionable the ideas they express.

Peaceable language should be left alone by law, for the proper remedy for it is peaceable language on the other side. An especially strong claim to immunity is possessed by speeches and publications concerning political issues and candidates for office, because they are an essential part of the process of self-government.

The only words which may properly be made unlawful are either (1) immediately injurious, like libel and obscenity; or (2) closely connected with commonly recognized wrongful acts, e. g., an incitement to murder or to desert from the armed forces.

The present bill is not limited to the two exceptional situations just mentioned. Let me run through it rapidly to bring out this point.

Section 4 punishes any person who agrees with another to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship.

There is no requirement of the use of force or other unlawful methods at any time. The act may be wholly peaceable. It may be one of the commonest political activities, like nominating a candidate for office who is pledged to the specified policy.

Section 6 keeps a man within this country because of his association with men of specified political views, with no consideration

of his own unfitness to travel abroad and with no reference to any unlawful act. The denial of a passport may amount to a severe penalty on a person with bona fide reasons for going abroad.

All the registration provisions relating to a Communist political organization restrict normal political processes without regard to any unlawful act.

NEXT OBJECTION

The registration provisions for Communist-front organizations have no relation to any unlawful act, but are imposed because of the expression and exchange of opinions.

My next objection is drawn from the past experience of the Nation. This is not the first time when fears of the infiltration of revolutionary radicalism from Europe has led earnest men to demand drastic laws against speeches and publications.

A hundred and fifty years ago patriots, terrified of the French Revolution, got your predecessors to enact the Sedition Act of 1798. It is commonly regarded as one of the greatest follies in our history. Happily it expired in 2 years by its own terms.

Again, after the First World War, Congress was repeatedly urged to pass a new peacetime sedition law.

Revolutionary groups were much more vocal than now. Violent acts occurred, like a bomb exploded near the house of the Attorney General. Still Congress refused to do anything, and nobody now regrets that refusal.

The years that followed proved that the law which eminent men said was indispensable to save the country was not needed at all. The names of the men who supported the bills of 1798 and 1919–20 have long ago slipped into oblivion, but we remember Jefferson, Holmes, Hughes, and Al Smith for their courageous insistence that we must trust open discussion to bring us safely through.

That courage, we are now told by proponents of a bill like this, is out of date. The United States never had to face Stalin before. But in 1798–1801 it had to face the French Revolution and Napoleon. And in 1919–20 it had to face Lenin. His army was not so big as Stalin's, but he was a far abler master of revolutionary tactics.

The lawyers who drafted the Sedition Act of 1798 and the judges who enforced that law were firmly convinced that they were stamping out a foreign menace fully as dangerous as the foreign menace which confronts us today.

Indeed, they used much the same arguments as those urged for these bills now, with France the villain instead of Russia and Switzerland replacing Czechoslovakia as the victim, to forecast the fate of our own Republic if we do not save ourselves by passing a sedition law.

We are going through such a settling-down process today. It is particularly difficult for all sorts of causes—the magnitude of the devastation, the delay in the peace treaties, the diverse character of the victorious nations, the unprecedented formation of a world-wide permanent union, and so on.

We have plenty of real worries, and it is quite natural that they should be reflected in some false worries as well. All the more reason for keeping our heads.

I have read a good many regrets that particular sedition laws were passed. Never, given the lapse of 2 or 3 years, have I known anybody to regret that a sedition law was rejected.

The principles which Jefferson used to allay apprehensions in his time are equally valid in our time. Meet unlawful action with action; proceed against real spies and real plotters as he prosecuted Aaron Burr and approved the dismissal of Genet. Meet objectionable ideas from abroad by living up to our own ideas—give increased drawing power to our great traditions of democracy and freedom.

FINAL POINT

My final point is very important. Its enactment would disastrously impair our influence over other freedom-loving peoples.

If we leave aside military considerations, the best way to combat the spread of communism in western Europe and elsewhere is to give increased drawing power to the great traditions of democracy and freedom.

These war-torn countries want more than weapons, more than food and machinery. They are eager for ideals to strengthen the spirit and make life worth living. Communism, we are told, operates like a religion; it is presented as the vision of a better world.

Yet, Jefferson and Lincoln had a great vision. During the nineteenth century it possessed the appeal of a religion to bring millions to our shores.

In order to hearten the discouraged peoples of the twentieth century, we must keep that vision bright—not, this time, to attract them to America but to enable them to build their lives in their own homes, so that the freedom which Jefferson and Lincoln did so much to give us will be a reality in many parts of the world.

MORE THAN WORDS

More than words is needed. Unless our acts show that we believe in our democratic ideals, we lessen the chance of winning wavering men to democracy.

In my experience with foreigners in the United Nations, I have been constantly impressed by the way our prevailing adherence to the ideals of our Bill of Rights helps to close up the ranks of freedom-loving countries in opposition to undesirable measures.

On the other hand, I have seen how much harm is done whenever we conspicuously depart from our professed basic principles. It lays us open to damaging charges of hypocrisy and pretense which are hard to meet.

There is no doubt that such attacks based on concrete facts do impress men from many countries whose support we need, and sometimes they are thus pried apart from the United States delegation on critical votes.

Now, freedom of information is one of the big issues in the United Nations at the present time. A treaty of great value to facilitate the work of foreign correspondents, which was originally projected by our State Department, has been put in final form by the General Assembly.

Over and above this, freedom of speech and press is an American ideal which means a very great deal to the citizens of countries where censorship and every sort of gross suppression have prevailed in recent years.

So the way we maintain freedom of speech and press or the way we depart from it is bound to have tremendous effect, for good or bad, upon delegates from countries like Holland, Norway, India, and Australia.

GREAT HARM FORESEEN

Consequently, if we enact a new sedition law like this bill, it will do us great harm among our natural friends in the United Nations. They know well how much suppression is made possible by the vague definitions in this bill.

We just can't defend such a sedition law against the bitter attacks of our opponents, and still less against the distrust of our friends. Our professions of love for open discussion will ring hollow in their ears.

And matters will be much worse when enforcement starts, with numerous inquisitions by the Subversive Activities Control Board, mail opened, nonregistrants prosecuted, lists gone through with a fine-toothed comb, and all the rest of it.

Frenchmen, Belgians, Dutchmen, Norwegians, Danes have had years of experience with that sort of thing under totalitarian occupations and it leaves a stench in their nostrils.

The way for us to spread abroad freedom of speech is to live up to it ourselves. The rejection of this bill will be a telling demonstration that we are governed by the principles of Thomas Jefferson.

Economy (?) at Expense of South Jersey Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a situation has arisen in south Jersey that adversely affects the veterans of that area. On the basis of lack of funds, the Veterans' Administration has closed the Camden office that heretofore has given medical and dental service to veterans.

As usual, when departments of Government squander or, through inefficient administration, are faced with a deficiency of funds, they close down facilities on the basis that Congress has not provided sufficient funds. Thus, in this case the Veterans' Administration, in a release issued March 10, 1950, announced "that State-wide cuts in personnel would be made within the next month in order to meet current budgetary restrictions." The release continues "that in order to maintain top medical services in other clinics throughout the State it would be necessary to discontinue the limited medical facilities at the Camden VA office. To do otherwise would result in the reduction of the other clinics to a limited basis of operations."

The truth of the matter is that Congress allowed and approved the full amount asked by the Veterans' Administration for medical treatment. The Appropriations Committee of the House, in its report, stated:

> The reductions in this item arise principally from reduced needs in all programs other than medical and hospital care which are provided for in full as proposed in the estimates. The total cost of the medical program is $566,666,400. The committee has not reduced this sum by one penny and directs the Administrator not to reduce it.

General Gray has been before both the House and the Senate committees twice since this bill was considered, once in the last session and once early in this session. No mention was made of the fact that they were short of money or that they would be obliged to discharge employees connected with and needed in hospitals and medical services.

There should be economy in the Veterans' Administration and in all other Federal departments, but it should be true economy brought about by eliminating needless employees who serve little or no purpose.

It is not economy and not the desire of Congress to curtail or disrupt the medical services provided for veterans.

I am of the opinion that the order to close the Camden office was issued without any careful study or survey. The fact that all of the counties of south Jersey are left without any of the facilities previously afforded by the Camden office is evidence of an absolute disregard of the best interests of the veterans resident in this large area. It means that all the veterans of this area must now travel to the Trenton office if they wish the same services previously provided by the Camden office, or carry on correspondence, with all the red tape and delay incident thereto, in order to get authorization for local medical service through private doctors. It is unjustified and unfair to require some veterans in this area to travel as much as 125 miles to visit the Trenton office.

At a recent meeting of representative veterans from the south Jersey counties strong resentment was expressed for the action taken by the Veterans' Administration in closing the Camden office. A resolution was passed demanding that the order be repealed. Widespread opposition has developed throughout south Jersey upon the part of others than veteran organizations, as is evidenced by the strong editorial appearing in the Courier-Post newspapers, Camden, N. J., in the issue of April 5, 1950, and which I herewith include as a part of my remarks:

VA ECONOMY AT EXPENSE OF SOUTH JERSEY VETS

South Jersey has long been accustomed to being treated as a stepchild in State affairs, even if it has never been happy about it and is growing more insistent on equal recognition of its rights.

But it certainly will not look with complacency on the Federal Government also treating it as an orphan.

And that is exactly what veterans and their organizations think Washington has done by eliminating Veterans' Administration medical and dental clinics in Camden, while retaining all others upstate, of which the nearest are in Trenton.

Hence last week's mass protest rally here, a few hours after shut-down of the VA offices on orders from the National Capital.

Joseph O'Hearn, VA manager at Newark, and Dr. Salvatore Rainino, chief medical officer at Newark, asserted that the Camden closing was necessitated by economy orders.

But Congressman WOLVERTON, addressing the protest rally, discounted the economy motive and pointed out that National Administrator Carl Gray had made no reply to his suggestion that if VA is in dire straits for funds, it should present a deficiency appropriation request to Congress, and that a favorable congressional reaction would be almost certain.

"I admit there is a drive for economy," WOLVERTON said, "but Congress has never been moved to economize at the expense of the veterans. The excuse of a budgetary necessity cannot be laid at the door of Congress, since Administrator Gray never has come before us and intimated the necessity of more funds to keep these clinics open."

Over and above the question of economy, however, is the question why, if the VA was forced to retrench in this State, it had to do so solely at the expense of south Jersey, closing down the only clinics in this end of the State and forcing our veterans to travel to Trenton for the service to which they are entitled.

It is true that the Camden office is not the only one in which retrenchment is taking place. Fourteen employees are being laid off here, 4 at Trenton, 13 at Union City, and 33 at Newark.

But the Camden clinics are the only ones being closed completely.

And while Camden is closed and the clinics at Trenton now must handle a vastly increased load as a result, north Jersey will continue to be served by two offices as close together as Newark and Union City. The lack of geographical balance and the injustice to south Jersey vets ought to be obvious.

At the close of last week's protest meeting, a committee of south Jersey veterans' organization officials was named by Albert J. Gifford, VFW county commander, who presided at this meeting. This committee will go to Washington and, with WOLVERTON cooperating, will protest against the Camden closing.

The VA has bungled in closing the Camden clinics without examining the situation more thoroughly. It will be bungling even more badly if it does not give the protest committee a sympathetic hearing and reverse a move that may mean a trifling economy—but an economy effected at the expense of south Jersey veterans.

I call upon General Gray, as Veterans' Administrator, to make a personal study of the situation, repeal the order that has been made, and, if necessary apply to the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency appropriation that will enable the Camden office to be reopened. The thousands of veterans residing in south Jersey are entitled to this consideration.

Flexible Depreciation Would Aid Small Business and the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a statement made by Ralph A. Fletcher, vice president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, at a meeting, here in Washington, on March 27, between representatives of the association and the members of the New England congressional delegation.

Mr. Fletcher is a consulting engineer and manufacturer of long experience and proven ability. He gave a lucid and impressive explanation, to the group, of the manner in which the small-business man is handicapped by the present operation of our depreciation tax regulations. He pointed out it is manifestly unjust to expect the small-business man to contest Treasury Department decisions by appeal to the courts since they have neither the money nor the legal assistance possessed by the large corporations.

Mr. Fletcher's plea for the adoption of his flexible depreciation recommendations is worthy of serious consideration and the complete text follows:

Mr. Chairman, honorable congressional delegation, ladies and gentlemen, as vice president and chairman of the membership committee of the Smaller Business Association of New England it is an honor and a privilege for me to present on behalf of our association a brief discussion of the need of small business for flexible depreciation.

I must preface my remarks with a statement that I am an engineer by training, a quarryman and manufacturer by experience. I am not an attorney, accountant, nor a tax expert. I can only present this problem as it appears to the fellow who is earnestly and sincerely trying to produce more and more goods under constantly improved working conditions with lowering costs and prices, and endeavoring to increase wages and stabilize employment.

I believe this to be a fair statement of some of the objectives of the smaller producer, and it goes without saying that to the extent he is able to achieve these ends he expects some reward beyond that of a task well done.

FIRST, WHAT IS DEPRECIATION TAXWISE?

Under Internal Revenue Code, section 23, deductions from gross income, we find the following:

"In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

"(1) Depreciation: A reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) (1) of property used in the trade or business, or (2) of property held for the production of income."

This seems to be a simple, clear, and straightforward statement. However, bulletin F (revised January 1942) of the United States Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, contains over 90 pages of printed matter on the subject, but cautions taxpayers against relying solely on information contained therein.

This creates a situation which may be all right for big business equipped as it is with staffs of highly paid attorneys and expert accountants, many of whom have been trained in the Government services. They can and do negotiate with the Treasury regarding depreciation allowances on more or less even terms. On the contrary, the small-business man is not, and in the nature of things, never can be equipped to do more than accept whatever depreciation allowances the Bureau of Internal Revenue may grant him, whether or not he feels them to be reasonable and just.

His only recourse now, in the final analysis, is an appeal to the courts and he has neither the time, nor the money for this. The Treasury understands this just as well as the small-business man and so a most difficult situation is created for him. Flexible depreciation would cure this inequity.

SECOND, WHAT IS FLEXIBLE DEPRECIATION

If the word "reasonable" is deleted from the law as stated above and if the words "as determined by the taxpayer" are inserted, so that the law would then read as follows:

"In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

"(1) Depreciation: An allowance, as determined by the taxpayer, for the exhaustion, wear, and tear (including an allowance for obsolescence) (1) of property used in the trade or business, or (2) of property held for the production of income."

And flexible depreciation rates would result.

WHY DOES SMALL BUSINESS NEED FLEXIBLE DEPRECIATION RATES?

Let us assume a hypothetical case to illustrate a common condition.

Imagine, if you will, a small manufacturing concern: It probably had a hard time through the great depression, but weathered it; a rough time again during the war, but with the help of the Smaller War Plants Corporation managed to convert to war production and make a nice contribution to the national defense. In the postwar period it realizes that its equipment and methods have become obsolete, but it is caught in a

working capital shortage due to higher general price levels.

At this stage, its employees who also know the equipment is worn out and obsolete and not worth repairing become dissatisfied with the situation. They think the old man has lost his grip, gone by, etc. Finally they send a delegation in to see him with a proposition. They have it all figured out. If he'll get them some decent tools to work with, and better the working conditions, which they figure can be done for about $10,000, they, in time, will guarantee to produce enough more than currently to pay for it all in 1 year and they think that the new stuff should be good for about 10 years. Let us say that their recommendations involve some special heat-treating equipment, precision controls, and air-conditioning emb lying techniques developed during the late war years, which are matters of general knowledge now, but which do require special engineering for adaptation to each industrial application and have little, if any, resale or market value.

To the employees this looks like a pretty good proposition and they sort of think that after the stuff is paid for that there should be something in the way of a division of the spoils—perhaps a raise or a bonus for them. A better product and a somewhat lower price for the customers, an increased market demand, more sales, steadier work, and perhaps a job for a son or brother who is coming along in school and whom they would like to get placed.

We believe this is the way things should be and that under flexible depreciation the proposition could be put over, but let's see just how it is now, and what a tough and disagreeable job our small-business man has ahead of him to try to explain to a group of practical, sensible workingmen why he can't get the money to go ahead with it even though he agrees wholeheartedly with their idea.

First, let us consider the number of times which the new equipment must earn its cost in order to provide enough dollars to repay the money borrowed or invested for its purchase.

Under the present tax system this could be from twice to three or more times the initial cost, depending on the type of ownership and the amount of other income.

If our recommendation for flexible depreciation is adopted it would only be necessary to earn the amount of the cost one time, in order to repay the investment regardless of the type of ownership or amount of other income.

Now, let us see what possible sources there are for the needed capital and what chance there is of getting it under the present tax system, and the conditions which would exist if flexible depreciation were adopted.

SOURCES AND AVAILABILITY OF CAPITAL

Under present tax system	*Under flexible depreciation*
1. Own capital (past savings): Not available now.	Would tend to become available out of future earnings.
2. Current or anticipated earnings: Insufficient now after taxes.	Definitely available if estimated gain is correct.
3. Venture or risk capital. Not available now.	Would tend to become more available.
4. Borrowed capital:	
(a) Long term: Not available.	(a) Not needed.
(b) Short term: Not safe to use for such purposes.	(b) Would probably be available and safe to use.
(c) Installment purchase: Availability subject to marketability and quite restricted now.	(c) Use would probably be considerably broadened.
Conclusion: Not available.	Available.

What this all amounts to is that the taxpayer and his employees would only have to earn the cost of the equipment once, in order to have the use of this income-producing improvement. However, he still must pay local property taxes on it during its life, and income taxes on the revenue that it produces so long as it is used. Also, if sold at any future time the entire proceeds would be subject to capital gains, taxes, and, in the case of an individual taxpayer's death, to estate taxes.

The taxpayer gets 100 percent depreciation under the present system providing he lives long enough. What we propose is that he should get 100 percent depreciation at the time he considers most advantageous to his business. The result is the same, he only gets it once, but the timing is different and he get it when he can use it.

There can be no question but that the tools of production should be as readily obtainable as possible for the greatest good since it is only from production that we get goods and services.

That we have in recent years instituted a system of taxation which operates to prevent the acquisition of these tools has been a matter of increasing concern to many thinking people.

Short of actual conquest, it is hard to see how an enemy could devise a better method for hamstringing productivity, discouraging enterprise and removing incentives for growth and improvement, than the tax straitjacket we have imposed upon the small producer here in the United States of America. It does not operate overnight, but is like a lingering deadly disease, a cancerous consumption causing a wasting away of health in the economic structure of our country.

In closing, I wish to thank you on behalf of our association for this opportunity to present to you our need for flexible depreciation as one of the ways by which you can help small business to increase production and employment to grow and prosper and become a strong and healthy segment of our national economy.

Reversing Red Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a long time it has been the contention of the liberals in Congress that the way to overcome Communist propaganda is not by torpedoing the Bill of Rights—nor by the passage of sedition laws, which was tried once in the early history of our country during a period of great hysteria and subsequently repealed when the Nation regained its sanity. We have opposed the Mundt, Nixon, Ferguson, Hobbs, and Smith bills, because they all aim directly or indirectly to shackle or manacle the Bill of Rights and those great privileges that are enjoyed only by the American people. In winning the fight for these rights, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison warned the citizens to be eternally vigilant against those people who would in devious ways try to destroy these rights.

The proper way to beat communism and communistic propaganda is to show to the people of the world that our system is better. The constructive arguments on our side are overwhelming. We must look hysterically foolish to the people of the world when we brandish the atomic and hydrogen bombs and make wild accusations of communism against teachers, professors, scientists, writers, and public officials.

By taking the side of the common people, the downtrodden, the landless, the jobless, and the hungry, as we have just recently done in Greece; by showing and proving the advantages of a free democratic economy, as against that of totalitarian; is the proper way to fight Communist propaganda.

The following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor and written by Neal Stanford, gives an illustration of the proper way to fight Communist propaganda:

REVERSING RED PROPAGANDA

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—There are signs that the American Government is slowly learning the difficult—and dangerous—art of counterpropaganda.

For a long time Uncle Sam seemed satisfied to stand on his record, ignoring the verbal tomatoes and rotten eggs thrown at him by the Kremlin's propaganda machine.

But as the Communist attacks on American policy have increased and their distortions of the American way of life become more vicious, the State Department sometimes has gingerly faced the need of answering these misrepresentations.

It has learned to its surprise—and dismay—that not inconsiderable bits of Moscow's anti-American propaganda, which floods not only Russia but Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world, in time tend to be accepted by peoples with no first-hand knowledge of America, where they get no contrary explanation of the United States.

One of the latest efforts to meet Soviet propaganda relates to the Kremlin's sudden intensive campaign to make its own people as well as others (particularly in Europe and Asia) believe that living conditions and costs in the U. S. S. R. are utopian compared to the situation in the United States—where inflation, unemployment, strikes, military costs are pictured as reducing America to near-chaos.

Last February, the Kremlin announced with great fanfare that it was revaluing the ruble—whereas the capitalist world was devaluing its currencies; that it was cutting the prices of consumer goods, whereas in capitalist states—the United States, for example—living costs were rising steadily and sharply.

For a month, the Kremlin has played this theme fortissimo on its government-run information organs, working 24 hours a day to sell it to the Russians, the Poles, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, the Arabs, Indians, Frenchmen, Italians.

The American rejoinder has now come in the form of a note to the Soviet Government—a note ostensibly directed at getting the Kremlin to let the American Embassy in Moscow continue to buy rubles at the special "diplomatic" rate of 12½ cents instead of the new rate of 25 cents a ruble.

But the request was embroidered with plenty of counterpropaganda material the

Department is now sending over its Voice of America to those parts of the world which have been blanketed with Moscow's version of Soviet bliss versus American chaos.

This Soviet anti-American propaganda has taken two directions: that with announced price cuts the Soviet worker or Moscovite is much better off than his American or Washington counterpart; that living costs are constantly rising in the United States to the detriment of the United States worker.

As for the first charge, Washington notified the Soviet foreign office and is now broadcasting all over the world that:

Even at the new "official" rate for the ruble of four to the dollar (which is a "purely fictitious" rate since the ruble is not an internationally traded currency) food is considerably cheaper in Washington than in Moscow. White bread costs 11.8 cents a pound here but 63.6 cents in Moscow; butter, 69 cents a pound here to between $3.90 and $5.01 a pound in the Soviet capital; granulated sugar, 10 cents a pound here to $1.30 a pound there; potatoes, 3.6 cents a pound here to 14 cents a pound there; vegetable oil, 64.5 cents a quart here to $8.76 a quart there; dressed chicken, 42 cents a pound here to $2.24 a pound in Moscow, etc.

It is further explained that there can be no comparison between Moscow and Washington costs for black bread—a Russian's basic food—because nothing like it is eaten here; but that a Russian pays about a quarter for a pound of this black bread—a price which, incidentally, is just twice what it was 3 years ago. The mere recitation of these comparative figures of Russian and American prices pulls the rug out completely from Moscow's propagandists.

The second point the Soviet propagandists have been trying to make is that the buying power of the United States dollar is steadily declining. To this the American note answers with this counterpropaganda now being directed all over the world:

An index of the cost of living in the United States prepared by the United Nations—not the United States—shows that the cost of living here is the same now as 2 years ago.

The American counterpropaganda does not ask its listeners to believe what the UN is saying as contrasted to what Moscow claims—it only points out the discrepancy. The thought is that nothing will so undermine what respect or attention is given Soviet broadcasts as just comparing them with studies of UN agencies and other recognized authorities.

Compliance With Robinson-Patman Act Urged—Food Brokers' President Cautions Against Misuse of the Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Watson Rogers, president of the National Food Brokers Association, recently addressed a meeting of association members in Los Angeles. Mr. Rogers pointed out the protection which the Robinson-Patman Act extends to the buyer and urged sales tactics which would not in any way weaken the act by creating ill-will for it. In effect, Mr. Rogers stated that buyers sometimes get the wrong impression from suppliers who indicate to the buyers that they would like to do something for you, but the act forbids it.

This—

Mr. Rogers said—

is the wrong approach. Instead, the buyer should be shown how dangerous it would be to him if any preferential prices were granted. He should be advised of the fact that there would not be any limit to the spread of such discrimination, very quickly placing him under great disadvantage. Actually, the act is of the greatest importance to the great majority of buyers, protecting them from unfair price discrimination.

The report of Mr. Rogers' remarks as they appeared in the Journal of Commerce, March 27, follows in full:

PATMAN ACT HELD AN AID TO BUYER—ROGERS CAUTIONS TRADE ON WEAKENING STATUTE—CITES SALES PROBLEM

LOS ANGELES, March 26.—Some of the strongest supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act are unconsciously creating ill will for the act by giving some buyers the wrong impression, Watson Rogers, president of the National Food Brokers Association, told a meeting of food brokers here at the week end. Speaking before a luncheon gathering of the Los Angeles Food Brokers Club, he said that the guilty parties included food brokers' and manufacturers' own sales staffs.

"What such sales people do is to take the easy way out. They use the Robinson-Patman Act as an excuse for not trying to secure special price discriminations from the manufacturers. 'I would like to do it for you,' they say, 'but the act forbids it.' They give the wholesale buyer the impression that if not for the act he would get such discriminations, when actually that is not the case. Instead, the buyer should be shown how dangerous it would be to him if any preferential prices were granted. He should be advised of the fact that there would not be any limit to the spread of such discrimination, very quickly placing him at a great disadvantage," the speaker declared. "Actually, the act is of the greatest importance to the great majority of buyers, protecting them from unfair price discrimination."

CITES MARKETING CHANGE

Turning to a discussion of the constantly changing pattern of wholesale food distribution, Mr. Rogers told the Los Angeles food brokers that their market was typical of most areas experiencing this evolutionary adjustment. "Back in the old days the manufacturer could expect the wholesalers' salesmen to get almost 100 percent distribution for him. With the great change that has taken place in food distribution, that is not possible any more in many markets.

"Further, most wholesalers are operating a streamlined business and have eliminated a number of activities. This means that the manufacturer must himself see to the handling of some of the functions previously done for him by the wholesaler. This is true whether he sells through the food broker or his own sales force."

NEW FUNCTIONS ADDED

"As a result, the manufacturer who sells through food brokers frequently puts pressure on the brokers to perform a lot of these functions. Where the latter is the case it puts an added expense burden on the food broker. Many manufacturers have realized this and are making adjustments accordingly."

The fact that sales expenses are greatly on the increase is one of the reasons why many manufacturers who did not formerly use food brokers are turning to them now, Mr. Rogers said. "Today the manufacturer needs aggressive on-the-spot selling in the market at all times to maintain a program of balanced distribution. Although vanity makes us want to feel that the food broker's ability is the only reason for this change to food brokers, we must admit that an equally strong reason is their realization that their own sales organization is a terrific overhead expense. They can best beat this overhead by using food brokers."

Leadership for Peace—An Intimate Message From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Josephine Ripley that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor:

LEADERSHIP FOR PEACE—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—Americans are always writing to their Congressmen, but when more than 6,500 recently set off a landslide of mail applauding the McMahon peace plan, it was news.

It was news because it indicated the troubled thoughts of thousands of American citizens over present world conditions, and the eagerness with which they are ready to grasp at any ray of hope for a new approach to peace.

The Soviet press chose to interpret this as an indication that the American people want their leaders to come to terms with the Russians. But it was not a plea for appeasement. It was not a suggestion of peace without honor, or peace at any price.

What Americans want, from their letters, is a strong, aggressive leadership. They want to know that the United States is doing something more to insure peace than building bigger bombs than the other fellow.

What they need is to know what is going on—on all fronts—in the cold war; what the status of American foreign policy is, and all about it.

They can get it piecemeal, here and there in the newspapers, from public statements of various officials. But they need to have it put together in a concise, frank statement from the one they naturally look to in such a crisis—the President.

They haven't had such an explanation. Instead, they have been reading day after day, of the grim potentialities of the hydrogen bomb. First, the warning of Professor Einstein that explosion of an H-bomb might mean "general annihilation." Then the cheerful little contribution of the atomic scientist, Dr. Urey, that "there will be no place to hide." Not to be outdone, four atomic scientists combined in a dark prediction to end all dark predictions—that an H-bomb could pack enough radioactive dynamite to wipe out the world's entire population.

On top of this came word that top secret atomic information had been leaking to Russia by way of German-born Klaus Fuchs, who had been working with the British atomic scientists.

It is not surprising that thousands of Americans burst into spontaneous applause over the proposal of Senator MCMAHON, chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee,

for another approach to agreement with Russia. It was the first plan for peace by other means than bigger bomb-making to be put forward after the President's terse announcement that the United States would go ahead with H-bomb development.

Senator McMAHON's plan does not call for any backtracking with Russia. What it proposes is a 5-year $50,000,000,000 "global Marshall plan" to include Russia and its satellites.

But to qualify for this largess, Russia would have to accept an effective program for international control of atomic energy and an agreement * * * enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of * * * present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends.

Now Senator McMAHON has followed up this bold step with another, calling for an Atlantic council parley to plan atomic peace, and challenging Russia to be host to a Town Meeting of the World to discuss this plan.

He has offered these proposals as examples of the bold steps which the Soviet atomic explosion, the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, and the pyramiding arms race should persuade us to consider.

This is the kind of action—even if it proves futile—that Americans were waiting for. It is the kind of gesture which they can understand, even if they don't comprehend all the fine points of foreign policy. It is the kind of leadership they want.

They have said as much:

"We need the leadership of people like you."

"We believe this country must take the lead, and at once, in developing a constructive, aggressive program for peace."

"We are cheered by your proposal that the United States should assume leadership for peace through economic means."

These writers were not crying peace, peace where there is no peace. Rather, they echoed a plea for leadership, for strong, spiritual, statesmanlike leadership in this grim crisis in world affairs, the kind of leadership which the President himself is usually expected to provide.

Power, Not Vacillation, Will Earn Freedom and Respect for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

POWER, NOT VACILLATION, WILL EARN FREEDOM AND RESPECT FOR AMERICA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Now that its plebiscite has demonstrated the total enslavement of the Soviet peoples, the Kremlin is peddling the hint that it would be willing to talk peace with the United States.

This is not surprising. The Soviet Union has conquered China. During the time needed for digestion, it would like to quiet its opponents. This is exactly the tactics followed successfully by Adolf Hitler during the 1930's when after each successive grab he announced that it was definitely the last.

That is why Stalin is hinting at a new meeting with Americans at which he could expect some new concession—perhaps Indochina or control of Germany or recognition of the Chinese Communists by Washington—as the price of peace.

Surprising is the number of faint-hearted or soft-headed Americans who seem eager to fall into so visible a trap. The mere repetition by Soviet speakers that "communism and capitalism can coexist" starts them cooing about a "return to the spirit of Yalta."

Too bad that they did not look further into these Soviet pronouncements. Communist leaders have always maintained that the two regimes could continue to coexist peacefully provided that the Communist area grows and the free area shrinks. In his electoral speech of March 10, Vyacheslav Molotov repeated this hoary come-on.

SOVIET LACKS CONFIDENCE

But the Deputy Chairman of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers also explained why the Soviet Union wants peace at the present moment. Mr. Molotov told his hearers that capitalism is declining. In the capitalist countries, according to him, the number of unemployed and semiemployed has reached almost 45,000,000 people. He then proceeded to let the cat out of the bag.

"Under such circumstances," he said textually, "it becomes understandable that the Soviet Union and the people's democracies [the satellite governments] are in favor of a peaceful competition between the socialist and the capitalist systems at a time when in the camp of imperialism [meaning us] a spirit of gloomy imperialism and warlike adventures is reigning. Each of these efforts under conditions of peace serves the consolidation of the position of such states as the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, which cannot be said of the capitalist states."

In other words, the Soviet Union is frightened. The Russians want time for economic consolidation of their conquests. Therefore they are talking of some new compromise where Stalin can obtain a new extension of Soviet power or communism as the price of peace.

The Russian plan is—as I said—just part of the Soviet game. What the American people have to decide is whether we are going to fall for this sort of soft soaping or whether we are going to understand that no matter what they say, all Communists aim at the total destruction of the United States.

FAINT HEART NE'ER WON

Once we accept this, we shall cease listening either to the siren voices from Moscow or to those faint-hearted and soft-headed Americans who would do almost anything to end the cold war.

Our real job is not to strengthen Soviet Communist economies by providing otherwise unobtainable supplies but to weaken it by withholding those supplies. It is not to recognize the Chinese Communists as the Government of China. It is to make clear to Moscow and to Secretary General Trygve Lie of the UN that so long as one nationalist Chinese anywhere is fighting communism, we shall continue to recognize that fighting Chinese as the Chinese Government. It is to inform the Russians and their trained satellite seals that if they walk out of any more UN bodies, we shall urge those bodies to continue the current business without them. It is to inform the impertinent little men of Sofia and Budapest who are arresting and imprisoning United States citizens on invented charges of espionage that one day the United States of America will make them pay for such outrages. It is to follow Senator BRIEN McMAHON, of Connecticut and step up the Voice of America 10 times so that it can reach the Russian people despite the 200 radio stations that the frightened Bolsheviks are now using to jam our messages. It is to encourage every form of anticommunism in Russia itself—to urge the Ukrainians to secede (which they have a right to do according to the Soviet Constitution). It is to urge the captive Azerbaijani of Russia to join the freer Azerbaijani of Iran. It is to bolster Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia and bring about the overthrow of the tottering tyranny of Enver Hoxja in Albania. It is not merely to help Bao Dai in Indochina but to make sure that Communist Ho Chi-minh cannot win.

PEACE BY THE SWORD

In short, it is to understand that the free peoples of the world do not respect the United States because of our kind hearts but because of our power. They will come to our side when they see that we can and will protect them—and not before, and when they believe that further armed expansion by the Soviet Union means war.

Does all this preclude any sincere move for peace by the United States?

Certainly not. This is the only basis upon which we can hope to obtain peace. Speaking in Tashkent on March 11, Soviet Minister Lazar Kaganovitch said to his voting sheep: "The U. S. S. R. is mighty and we will not permit anyone to shove his imperialist snout into our Soviet kitchen garden."

Once we have created a free kitchen garden of our own in which no Soviet agent can successfully shove his snout, the Kremlin may be ready to talk international understanding on a reciprocal basis. Not before.

The Unknown General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the United States Air Force was struck a severe and damaging blow by the recent passing of Gen. Muir S. Fairchild. This great man was a most respected figure in national-defense circles and his loss will be keenly felt.

The people of the State of Washington particularly mourn the passing of General Fairchild. We recognize the outstanding service he so unstintingly gave to the Nation, but more poignantly we feel in our hearts the loss of a native son. The general was born in Bellingham, Wash., September 2, 1894, and began his distinguished career as an enlisted man in our State guard. The Nation has lost a great servant, Washington an eminent citizen of its State.

Although the Members of this House are familiar with General Fairchild's contribution since coming to Washington, and although some few Members have enjoyed his brilliant and thorough presentations before committee hearings, many are perhaps unfamiliar with his earlier activities. Therefore, I include in the RECORD the article by that noted columnist, Peter Edson, from the Washington News of March 21, 1950:

THE UNKNOWN GENERAL

(By Peter Edson)

He was an Air Force general whom few people knew. When wires carried the news that Gen. Muir S. Fairchild had died of a heart seizure, even many officers and men in the Air Force may have had to knit their

brows and ask, "Who?" For here was no strutting, be-medaled, publicity-seeking martinet.

He was a four-star general—the No. 2 man in the Air Force. He was buried today in a simple grave at Arlington National Cemetery, with full military honors. All the big brass came out to do him honor, for he was a general's general. But such was his passion for anonymity that he was practically unknown, outside of his own small circle.

Arnold, Spaatz, Doolittle, Kenney, Vandenberg and the others won the battles and the headlines. General Fairchild had been assigned to stay home—a Pentagon general who stayed home and worked on plans.

If, suddenly, tomorrow, the United States should be attacked by an air raid that dropped an A-bomb, there would be an instant retaliation. It would be aimed at immobilizing the enemy until the United States and its allies could mobilize for counterattack. The plans are all made and this general nature of their content is common knowledge.

If these plans worked, one of the men to whom top credit should go would be General Fairchild. For the past 2 years that has been his job. He has been general administrator of the Air Force. It has been his responsibility to see that plans came to life.

Because he was such an excellent planner, General Fairchild had been picked for this job 2 years ago. He had been jumped from a two-star to a four-star general, over the heads of many another who had been his senior. But that was only one of the many surprises in the career of this unknown general.

He was an old man, the way Air Force generals go. He was 55. What's more, he was not a West Pointer. He came up the hard way. He enlisted as a private in 1917, and he came up through the Washington State National Guard.

In World War I he was a bomber pilot attached to the French Air Force and he flew on a number of missions over the Rhine. He stayed in the Army after the war and got the usual run of assignments. He was a test pilot for a time, and he flew one of the old bombers on the Pan-American good-will flight of 1926. He went to a lot of service schools, including the War College, but when World War II broke, he was only a lieutenant colonel.

They grabbed him quick, though, promoted him to brigadier general and put him in the War Plans Division at Air Force headquarters. He was one of three officers on the Joint Strategic Survey Committee. He sweated out most of the war there, with an Army general and a Navy admiral, constantly reviewing, constantly planning.

They hung a Legion of Merit and a Distinguished Service Medal on General Fairchild when the war was over, but he still wasn't famous. Then in 1946 he came up with an idea that will make him long remembered in the Air Force. It was a plan for the Air University.

General Fairchild had never graduated from college himself. The First World War had broken off his own formal education, and he never went back to finish. It was not the least surprising of this unknown general's achievements, therefore, that he should become best known as an educator. He was more celebrated in the educational world than in the military.

They told him to go ahead with his air-university idea and put him in command of it. His headquarters were at Maxwell Field, Ala., but his campus was scattered all over the South. He pulled together the Air War College, the Air Command and Staff School, the Air Tactical School, and the School of Aviation Medicine. He worked out a plan whereby every Air Force officer now gets an educational rejuvenation every 7 years or oftener.

Again—One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a phase of the foreign-assistance program which has always given me especial concern is that we provide aid in general measure, and many other benefits, without getting much consideration for it.

The article appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer on March 28, 1950, and written by the well-known columnist, Ivan H. Peterman, illuminates this problem, and should be called to the attention of the House. The article follows:

UNITED STATES EXPENDS AID WITHOUT GUARANTIES

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

Senator VANDENBERG's call for unpartisan handling of the cold war's problems could become a cornerstone in some sort of breakwater against the economic erosion of America, through continuing foreign-aid grants. Sooner or later a substitute must be evolved for giving away the Nation's substance in return for rented security.

For "rented" seems to be the word, judging from recurring Red disturbances. Under the present loose system of distribution, Marshall-plan billions are buying no guaranteed loyalties anywhere; any or all of the participating countries can suddenly vote in a Communist parliament, or permit infiltration, to create another Czech-style coup.

It is almost 2 years since an exasperated member of the United States Foreign Service expressed serious misgivings on our give-away policies in Europe and the Middle East. We were driving to a Big Three ministers' meeting in Paris, sharing a diplomatic car to a press briefing.

"I've never believed in handing over money, goods, or anything substantial without it being a two-way bargain," the party said. "I've been too long in this Service not to know that most people prefer it that way. They don't respect outright donations. They like to think it's a deal, whether it really is or not. Call it mass psychology, pride, or face, but it's there. It exists today as it did centuries ago, too. Ours is a sucker's game, and in the end we may be despised for it."

This week Congress is debating the new ECA appropriations, hoping to whittle the sum under the Senate committee's recommended $2,950,000,000 and still remain adequate to the tasks in Europe. Since April of 1948 the United States has spread close to ten billions around Europe, reestablishing it economically. France in that time has received almost as much as the present plan calls for.

Yet France just lately has gone through a series of unpleasant Communist disorders, involving port riots, transport and utility strikes, and disgraceful rowbottoms in the Chamber of Deputies itself. For a time the Government seemed to verge on collapse. All in spite of 2 years unstinted aid, with a concentrated program of education and orientation to democratic principles, with special emphasis upon French workers and peasants through the efforts of American labor leaders.

Italy also is having some of the nastiest civil disorder. Six weeks ago in Milan, I was astonished at the prevalence of Communist propaganda plastered over that huge city. There were 10 Red posters to 1 for our side. In southern Italy armed Reds were able to take a whole town, San Severo.

What is lacking in the Marshall plan that such conditions still prevail? It is no wonder some authorities think the plan has failed. With this any visitor to Europe must disagree, but he will also admit our united western front should be tighter.

One of the answers, as any unpartisan board will soon discover, is the lack of important conditions attached to ECA grants. We have assumed too much, and have underestimated the come-back qualities of communism. This could be a first study of any nonpolitical group wishing to appraise Marshall-plan results.

Had the United States insisted that Italy's land reform program be pushed, Commies would not have ready-made fields to exploit. Increasing the Italian police force doesn't offset the effect of 2,000,000 unemployed in a nation's 18,000,000 working populace. Nor is it encouraging to know that many Italians work two jobs to piece out a living, because wages are so miserable.

The Reds would still be there, of course, were all things beyond reproach. This also seems due for readjustment. So long as armed thugs masquerade as politicians, Europe—and Asia and Africa too—remain bad security risks. When you lay out billions expressly for peace promotion, it seems peculiar to have permitted your enemy within to continue his tricks and his threats.

Granting we want none of the police state tyrannies, but there might be a happy medium. A guaranty that at least prevents Red rioters from ranging loose with weapons as if they, not American taxpayers, had been badly done by.

But we have asked for no such guaranties. One wonders if, as with lend-lease to Russia, we even bothered to get receipts.

Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this is a year in which the traditional American concept of freedom is facing challenge from many directions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address by Col. Rudolph Habermann, of Battle Creek which deals with the subject "Economy and taxes":

Good evening. You and I, as American citizens, have some inalienable rights which are expressed in our Constitution.

One of these, contained in the thirteenth amendment, states that we shall not be reduced to slavery or involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime.

I am sure you cherish that right, as I do; that you would rise up against any tyrant who threatened to enslave you.

Perhaps you feel quite secure in that freedom. If you do, it may startle you to learn that you have 14 months of servitude to your Federal Government hanging over you, in the form of the national debt.

By spending more than it has collected—and it is still doing it—the Government has run up a debt of $258,000,000,000. Now, that may not sound alarming. You may regard the Federal debt as an impersonal, complicated set of figures which has very little meaning to your way of life. So look at it this way: Our total national income in America amounts to $221,000,000,000 a year.

In other words, all the money that you and every other person and every company earns in 14 months would be required to pay the Federal debt. Your part of that debt is 14 months of your productive effort—14 months of work.

You may think you will escape the 14 months of servitude already charged up against you. Probably you will escape most of it. But your children and their children will inherit that part of your debt which you do not pay. They will have to work to help square accounts.

In this fiscal year the Government expects to go another $5,000,000,000 in the red. That means an additional $5,000,000,000 piled on the debt. In terms of labor on the part of taxpayers, figured at the $221,000,000,000 annual income rate, it means that 8 more days are being added to the 14 months of servitude to which our Federal Government has committed us. So at the end of this fiscal year you will owe 14 months and 8 days of your labor.

That is what the Federal debt means to you. It has a direct bearing on your freedom, and your children's freedom.

Apply that same line of thought to taxes and you will find that you are actually working 1 day out of every 5 to pay your Federal taxes. That is what it amounts to—20 percent of your earnings go to support the Federal Government. If you work a 5-day week, 50 weeks of the year, you are working for the Government 50 days a year. That is servitude you cannot escape.

A billion dollars is easy to say but hard to comprehend. Measured in human effort it means this: If 1,000 men had been employed at $10 a day in the year 1676—100 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence—and had labored every day from then on, Sundays included, it would take them up to this year—1950—to earn a billion dollars. A thousand men laboring for 274 years at $10 a day.

Well, what's to be done about it? What can be done?

Several things.

The basic issue is the question of higher taxes or deeper debt against reductions in spending.

Congress has tried to tackle the problem but gets blocked out of the play by the weight and confusion of the whole host of Government bureaus and agencies, each scrambling for more authority and funds with never a thought of whether there's enough money to go around.

So the pressure on Uncle Sam's pocketbook—your pocketbook—builds up and up, and you wonder why it doesn't collapse completely.

Now I'll grant you that there are some very essential services of government that cannot be cut.

The most notable thing about a Federal department is the urge to spend money. Somebody else's money! The first symptom is a request for more funds than are needed. Then the strategy is to swarm all over Congress in support of these padded requests. Congressmen try to cut them down, but they can never accurately know just how much is real and how much is padding. And since there's no logical pattern to the Federal budget, it becomes a matter of first authorizing the spending and then waking up to face the hang-over of where to get the money. And that's where you come in again with your taxes.

The only logical answer to this dilemma is for Congress to revamp its appropriations machinery.

First, all requests for money should be in a single package, so that Congress can know the relation of the grand total to the amount of money actually on hand.

Congress has already taken the first step to correct this. There's no reason why all spending bills shouldn't be consolidated into one and examined in the light of probable income. Let your Representatives and Senators know you're behind this very sensible move toward economy.

But that's not the only method of saving some of your money. Let's see some of the others.

Do you think it's necessary to have more than 2,000,000 people working for the Government? Two million civilians, I mean. I'm not speaking of our armed forces at all here. I'm talking of the increase in civilian Government workers from 900,000 in 1939 to a little more than 2,000,000 today.

The Hoover Commission doesn't think they're all needed. That's the Commission, you know, headed by former President Hoover, which made a 2-year investigation of the entire Federal Government structure. It found incredible examples of waste, inefficiency, duplication of effort, and a complete lack of understanding of even the most elementary rules of sound business.

For instance, the general practice is for all supervisors to get more and more people working under them. If you are in the Government, that's the way to get yourself a raise. It doesn't matter what you are doing or what these people who work for you do. All that's necessary to get a raise is to get some friend in the personnel office to assign more people under your direction. That does it, and you can see where that leads to. If it works today, it will work again next year. So you just keep at it. No wonder there isn't office space in Washington to house all the people on Uncle Sam's pay roll.

Most of us have some contact with the Veterans' Administration, keeping up GI insurance, and the like. Well, did you know that the average work load for a Veterans' Administration employee is 450 insurance policies as compared with more than 1,700 for an employee of a private company? It takes about 90 days for the Veterans' Administration to handle a claim as compared with about 15 days for a private insurance company. That's four times as much work in one-sixth the time. How do you like that for efficiency?

That is just an inkling of what goes on. The Hoover Commission found literally hundreds of situations just as alarming in all the other bureaus.

I cannot urge you too strongly to acquaint yourself with these Hoover reports. There are several important bills now under consideration, and if they are enacted it can mean a saving of untold dollars—your tax dollars. It's a multi-million-dollar opportunity you just can't afford to pass up.

Now let's look at the other side of the picture and see what the Congress itself can do.

They work for you, too, you know. And you have every right—in fact a duty—to inquire into the ways they serve you.

Every Congressman has his own district to worry about. He wants to see it prosper, and he wants to do all he can for the people he is elected to represent.

That's fine, and we believe in that basic principle of representative government. It is the best system yet devised by man for handling his affairs of government.

Yet, with his responsibility to his own particular constituents, each Member of Congress has a broader duty to the whole Nation, and that is what I want to talk about now.

Let's assume that in your district there is a chance to put up a big Federal dam or power project that will automatically bring money and employment into the area and keep it there as long as the project continues. It sounds wonderful. It seems good for the community. It seems good for local business. It looks like the type of thing to give your civic pride a real boost.

And since it looks good to you, it appeals to your Congressman. So he sets out to get the project approved for the home folks. Now that's a very laudable thing, but we only ask that he do one thing more, and that you people and the people in each of the 435 local election districts in the country do that one thing more with him. Ask yourself honestly and carefully—is it good for the whole country? Does the whole country not have a stake in what we do here, just as we have a stake in what the rest of the people do? Will we help ourselves at the expense of others? Is there no other way to get this particular thing done? Must it be done by Government? What's its effect going to be on the over-all picture?

That is a tough assignment, I know. But you can see what it means if every Member of Congress, under prodding from the folks at home in trying to get some kind of a federally financed project, thought only of his own district. You would soon have every community competing with every other community to find out who gets the most Federal money and who can spend it fastest.

You couldn't coin money fast enough to keep pouring it around that way. And it's the same money as all the other Government money. Your tax money.

So there you have what may be the toughest assignment of all. You, I, all of us—our Congressmen included—must face up to this issue squarely. We must decide whether we are going to close our eyes to the Nation's welfare and bury ourselves in the selfishness of our own immediate local gain.

You can see it takes a lot of fortitude to do what you know to be right in a case like this one. The temptation is strong. Yet we ask our Congressman to exercise that same degree of fortitude in facing up to problems of great national and international significance. The least we can do is support him and tell him we're behind him in this one great effort to cooperate personally, actively, locally, in the wise use of Federal money—again, your own tax money.

Next, there's a point very closely tied in with the responsibility of every Congressman to subordinate purely local interests to national considerations. I'm thinking of the great tendency of organized groups, farmers, teachers, workers, businessmen, and their associations to pressure Congress for more and greater bounties, subsidies, and hand-outs of all kinds.

Each individual, and every group, and each segment of our population must do a little soul-searching when faced with the temptation to reach in and grab. Tough as it sounds and difficult as it is to do, we must face the issue squarely. If it isn't good for the country, it isn't good for us.

And now I'll add one more point that goes to the very heart of the whole problem. It's a point of trouble which, if properly attended to, could do more than any other single factor toward reversing the present trend and help correct the current tendency to spend ourselves into national bankruptcy.

Now that Federal expenditures are higher than ever, the persistent planners contend that taxes must be kept as high as possible. They argue that new and greater spending is in and of itself a good thing. They are trying desperately to get Congress to accept that view.

They never seriously ask themselves the significance of that type of thinking. They say simply spend, spend, spend. They ignore the relation of spending to the simple proposition that there must first be money—your tax money.

How much simpler and how much more sensible would it be to take a good, long look around to see how much we have available, and then decide how it can be spent to the best advantage of all of us.

It all boils down to that. There's no sense in tossing around a lot of very high-sounding technical words and trying to confuse the issue so no one can understand it. That's

the tactic of those who can't face the simple facts of life on this question. They're afraid to reduce it to its bare essentials. They're afraid to tell the truth.

Yet, you know only too well that you can't run your own home without examining what you need in the light of what you have to spend on it. You do the same with your business. A good, efficient government must follow the same course.

So why not your Government?

It is your Government, but it won't remain your Government forever unless you take an active part in its affairs.

We cannot afford to let it get away from us, but that's exactly what we're doing when we ignore the question of money—the very heart of Government operations. Radio station WBCK or the Battle Creek Chamber of Commerce will gladly give you a brochure at no cost on economy and taxes so that you may be well posted.

With an election coming up, those who oppose this reckless spending and the complete disregard for our own ability to support it, will be damned as "reactionaries" and accused of having some kind of "special interest."

Well, it is high time to react. It is high time to show your special interest. It is time to react to your own interests, the special interest of 150,000,000 Americans, and the only hope of the world—the soundness, the stability, and the continuation of these United States as a solvent going concern.

New England Smaller Business Association's Program of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 27, a very timely and mutually valuable conference took place, here in the Capitol, between the Members of the New England congressional delegation and representatives of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

At this meeting, Mr. Russell Maintain, chairman of the association's public relations committee gave an excellent summarized presentation of the group's general objectives and operations. The program of action was outlined as follows:

PROGRAM OF ACTION

I. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

To speak for small business in New England.

To inform small business of its importance in the preservation of our free-enterprise system.

To preserve free private competitive incentive enterprise.

II. SPEAKERS' BUREAU

Speakers' clinics have been enlarged to include many individual businessmen who are not active as officers or directors of the association.

Meets periodically to discuss association viewpoints, policies and procedures, objectives (e. g., association is not an "anti" group), and to enable speakers to discuss and develop their talks and receive constructive criticism.

To provide speakers for service clubs, veterans' groups, radio programs, civic affairs, fraternity meetings, business panels, schools, churches, colleges, and other associations.

May send several speakers a year to the same organizations to talk on various subjects.

Over 100 addresses during the year.

III. NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE PUBLICITY

Handled through Newsome & Co.

Produces approximately 1,000 column inches of small business and association news per week.

Releases go out at least weekly to 106 daily newspapers and 314 weekly newspapers; also wire services Associated Press, United Press, and International News Service.

IV. RADIO PROGRAM

One-half hour Sundays over Columbia outlet in New England, WEEI in Boston.

Estimated audience over half a million.

Round-table discussions by not only small-business men themselves but also by authorities on labor, education, politics, world affairs, and other subjects of importance to small business.

Includes also each week a 5-minute news summary on important events of the week pertaining to small business.

V. MONTHLY BULLETIN OF SMALL BUSINESS

Summarizes association activities and plans and other matters of importance.

Goes to all members as well as to men of importance in government, education, associations, business, and clergy.

Emphasizes and expresses free enterprise economic facts of life.

VI. REGIONAL MEETINGS

Held periodically in principal community centers throughout New England.

Aim is to hold one meeting yearly in each congressional district.

Meetings in April will be held in Keene, N. H., and Portland, Maine, under direction of William J. Jamieson, executive secretary.

RUSS MAINTAIN,
Chairman.

Our Freedom of Religion Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents.

IS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM POSSIBLE IF ECONOMIC FREEDOM IS LOST?

Many Christians believe we can advocate compulsion in our economic life, and still keep our freedom in the religious realm. But how long will religious freedom last if we go Socialist?

Perhaps you doubt that leaders of Christian religious groups advocate the use of force. If so, you should study closely the literature on social and economic action published by some of our church bodies. They openly reject economic freedom as anti-Christian. Adam Smith, who led the Western World to the full enjoyment of economic freedom, is placed in the same category with Karl Marx, who sired the brutal force called socialism, that is, communism.

Whatever the members of our denominational groups may think, their spokesmen often publish statements that are masterpieces of Socialist dialectics. They say, "There can be no Christian sanction for one-sided support of either economic individualism or economic collectivism." This is the pose of neutrality, but it is neutrality as between the robber and his victim. They would destroy every economic gain that has made the people of this country freer and more kindly than the people of any other country. They argue for a middle way, a clever trap which must bring forth the answer, "socialism."

Many of our clergymen, like many of our teachers, have been drawn into support of socialism because they believed, without careful analysis, that it would benefit the wage-workers and the poor. For generations, the advocates of socialism have been living in a dream world, surrounded by subjective feelings that they were warmer, kinder, more generous, than other men. That dream lasted while the world was prosperous and peaceful, and governments could not interfere with those who were trying to better themselves. The dream now has to face a cold reality—where the Socialist dreamers were able to get possession or control, and remake the world by force; their new world soon became one great concentration camp. The poor were poorer, the downtrodden were more cruelly trodden upon; the classes were more fiercely at war with each other. The ruling group could keep its privileges only by setting up a police state. The people worked at what and wherever they were told, at whatever wages and in whatever value of money was fixed by the state.

Suppose our Socialist ministers are successful in their efforts to use our churches as transmission belts for state control of income and wages. What will happen to our churches? If political leaders in government own or control all the income of the people, how long will our churches remain free? What will happen to men in the pulpit who dare to challenge the decisions of the political managers of our wordly goods? People will still be able to think as they like, of course, but what religious actions will they be allowed to take? What financial support will they be able to give to church education, or press, or church building? How long can church and state remain really separate?

We know that men lost their religious freedom in Germany and in Russia when the government took or controlled their economic resources. But we think America is different. Is it?

He who controls our economic well-being controls every aspect of our life. Men dependent on government for their subsistence are no longer free in anything. They are slaves, and like slaves, they must obey. In a planned economy, the church must be planned too.

As the state takes a larger and larger share of our production, it plays a larger and larger part in our lives, until it manages all of our lives. When it can tell people what kind of potatoes they may eat and how much they must pay, it will soon tell the preacher what he may say, and how much he can be paid.

Freedom is indivisible. Without freedom to keep and use the products we

create, we cannot insist on freedom of speech or of action. Without freedom of speech and of action, there is no freedom. We cannot serve two masters—force and freedom. Force does not compromise. Those who believe in religious freedom have no choice but to demand economic freedom.

Freedom is Christian. It is the rule of conscience, not of force. A free economy is a Christian economy, the only possible Christian economy.

Remember Father Cronin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to study Washington and to see how long it takes for many people of the country to become aware of what is happening within their Government.

More than 3 years ago, a nationally known Catholic priest, Father John F. Cronin, a member of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, issued a blast against the Communists and fellow travelers in the Department of State. The charge was promptly and most vehemently denied by the high officials of the Department. Newspapers from one end of the country to the other carried editorials ridiculing the Catholic father.

Since that date the Republicans came into power in Congress for a brief 2 years. In that short time the Congress uncovered enough evidence to prove that Father Cronin knew of what he had charged. Alger Hiss has been convicted as a traitor, Judith Coplon has been caught and convicted, and many other employees of the State Department have been permitted to resign while under investigation as security risks.

Recently, Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has made similar charges. Again, certain newspapers whose editors apparently do not know what is happening in the Nation's Capital, take the accuser to task. But, it would be a good bet that within a year or so they will learn that additional security risks have been allowed to resign.

Critics of Senator McCARTHY ask, where are the spies and weak security risks that he talks about?

The reply might well be, why did all of those fellow travelers and security risks resign while under investigation before? If they were filled with sweetness and light and loyalty, why did they run for the cover of private life as soon as they were threatened with investigation?

It would be well for critics of Senator McCARTHY to bear in mind, when his charges are being debated, that the Department of State was just as vehement in its denials of Father Cronin's charges, 3 years ago, as it has been in its denials of the Senator's charges.

Resolution of the New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature with respect to the unemployment-insurance taxes levied on pay rolls for a specific purpose and used, to a large extent, for purposes entirely different. The memorializing resolution points out that the Federal Government has collected $150,000,000 more than it has returned to New York State for administration of the unemployment-insurance program, thus seriously endangering the State program. This unjustified diversion of funds from all the States amounts now to a billion dollars.

This practice of using funds collected for one specific purpose for other programs of the Government should stop. It finds a parallel in the Government's use of social-security funds. Such practices in private business would land the perpetrators in serious trouble. No amount of juggling of the figures can disguise the fact that this money was collected in the State of New York, belongs to the State, and should be made available for immediate use.

The resolution follows:

Concurrent Resolution 209

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly proposing that the Congress of the United States be memorialized respecting the earmarking of funds collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to each State to be used in the administration of the unemployment insurance law

Whereas under existing law, the several States of the Union bear the responsibility for the administration of the unemployment insurance and employment service programs; and

Whereas the Federal Government levies a pay-roll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent on employers of eight or more persons to pay the administrative cost of such programs by the States; and

Whereas each State has no control over the amount it receives for the administration of such program and must accept whatever amount is allowed to it by the Federal Government; and

Whereas since the inception of unemployment insurance and employment service program, the Federal Government has collected from the employers of this State for the administration of this program $150,000,000 more than has been returned to the State for this purpose, and the amounts so returned to the State of New York have been consistently and grossly inadequate; and

Whereas it was never intended that the Federal Government should divert the proceeds of this tax for its own general purposes, which it has done to the extent of $1,000,000,000; and

Whereas the continued inadequacy of operating moneys and personnel makes the detection of improper and fraudulent benefits claims exceedingly difficult and impedes efforts to cope with tax evasions; and

Whereas the failure to make adequate moneys available for efficient administration, to the extent that it weakens control over disbursements from the unemployment insurance fund, jeopardizes the effectiveness and stability of the entire program and brings it into disrepute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation which will—

1. Earmark the taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to assure adequate funds for administration by each State of the unemployment insurance and employment service program.

2. Transfer any excess over the amounts allocated by the Federal administrative agencies to the States for use in the unemployment insurance and employment service program with full responsibility resting on each State for the proper use thereof free from Federal control;

3. Make reasonable provisions assuring all States equitable participation in such allotment; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each Member of the Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 20, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:
WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

Cardinal Mooney on School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit News of April 2, 1950, by Edward Cardinal Mooney, archbishop of Detroit:

MOONEY TELLS CATHOLIC STAND ON SCHOOL AID

It seems to me that, to keep the record straight, some observations are pertinent in the aftermath of the protracted discussions on proposed bills for Federal aid to education.

The general intent of these bills is entirely commendable in view of the low standards of education that prevail in many parts of the country and in view of the legitimate interest of the Federal Government in the attainment of fairly equal educational opportunities for all United States citizens. The questions they raise will never be solved by incrimination and recrimination but only by clear thinking and calm, frank discussion.

In the religious controversy which the question of Federal aid to education has unfortunately aroused, assertions or implications have been repeatedly made which

hinder rather than help calm and clear discussion.

DOES NOT AGREE

As one who is deeply interested in the welfare of 125,000 pupils in Catholic schools in southeastern Michigan, I cannot agree with the assertion that the point at issue in the present apparent stalemate on Federal-aid bills under consideration—the provision of welfare services for all American children in schools they legally attend—has anything to do with the American doctrine of separation of church and state.

I do not say that all Americans are agreed on what is the American doctrine of separation of church and state. That doctrine can be defined only on the basis of the first amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

There has been, especially in more recent years, sharp controversy about the exact meaning of the first amendment. It was only in 1947 that the Supreme Court gave a comprehensive definition of the establishment of religion clause in that amendment, interpreting it to prohibit all aid to religion or religious institutions—even when no discrimination is involved.

WIDELY CHALLENGED

That definition has been widely challenged on the grounds of logic, history, and accepted norms of legal interpretation. That challenge was voiced by the Journal of the American Bar Association and by eminent authorities in constitutional law.

It was taken up by a group of prominent non-Catholic religious leaders, and made their own by the Catholic bishops of the United States in their annual statement of November 21, 1948—in which they attributed this novel definition to the influence of secularist theories of public education and law. That definition stands now as a practical norm of procedure though it is by no means irreversible, as the history of the Supreme Court shows.

But this controversy on the first amendment, which is real and of far-reaching import, has nothing to do with the point at issue in the pending bills on Federal aid to education.

For the very first ruling handed down by the Supreme Court under its ominously extensive and utterly secularist definition of the American doctrine of separation of church and state explicitly upheld the legality of giving tax-supported welfare services—and in so many words, bus transportation—to the children of parochial as well as of public schools.

That patent fact ought to remove the issue of separation of church and state from the present discussion on Federal aid to education which centers precisely on the point of making the Federal-aid bill help to provide welfare services to all American school children.

TAX FUNDS QUESTIONED

Those who are interested in the health and safety of parochial school children cannot agree with the assertion that "State or Federal funds derived from taxes on the public for the benefit of school children should in principle be expended only through public schools."

We would agree if they said that these funds should be expended only through schools that serve a public purpose. For parochial and private schools which are recognized by law as fulfilling the requirements of compulsory school attendance do serve a public purpose and the people who exercise their constitutional right of educating their children in recognized church-related schools are part of the public who pay the taxes.

We do not agree with the assertion—or the implication—that legislators, or anybody else, may legitimately resent the interest of church groups in the way those legislators vote on questions that affect members of church groups as citizens. These same legislators do not seem to resent the interest of business groups in the way they vote, or of labor groups, or race groups, or secularist-minded groups like the National Educational Association.

CALLS ON LEGISLATORS

Why, by implication, should members of church groups be disqualified as citizens in the defense of their natural and legal rights, when the exercise or suppression of those rights is to be decided by vote? Certainly we do not want to see church lines and political lines run parallel in the United States. The one sure way to prevent that is for legislators to see that those lines are not drawn parallel in the legislation they propose.

It is sound Americanism to hold that what is good for religion—with no discrimination in favor of or against any church group in comparison with others—is good for responsible citizenship; and no American who cherishes his religion as a personal and a civic asset can, in good conscience, fail to make the only means he has at his disposal—his vote and his voice—count in the determination of American policy.

That is the stand which our Catholic principles support, as applied to church and society in the conditions that obtain in our country, and I hope that the Catholics of this diocese will maintain that stand in never-failing good will and fairness to their fellow citizens.

Tax Adjustments Are Vitally Needed by Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting between representatives of the Smaller Business Association of New England and the Members of Congress from the New England area, on March 27, 1950, Mr. Charles W. Proctor, an outstanding attorney from my home city of Worcester, Mass., outlined an excellent analysis of the vital need for equitable tax adjustments in order for small business and private enterprise to survive in this country.

Mr. Proctor's very able presentation merits serious study and attention. I earnestly hope that every Member of this House will take the time to read his recommendations on this important subject:

NEED OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR TAX ADJUSTMENTS

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate and Congress of the United States from New England, I am here as a representative of the Smaller Business Association of New England. My name is Charles W. Proctor. I am a Worcester lawyer, a former law-school teacher, and am chairman of the association's committee on taxation. This association comprises about 1,000 members, all of whom are employers; no one is eligible to join the association who employs over 50 people, although a few memberships have been renewed where the number of employees has slightly exceeded that amount. Roughly speaking, its membership employs 35,000 to 40,000 persons.

I want at the outset, if I can, to tell you what that means in regard to the status of most of the members.

When a man has first incorporated his business, his own personality and his own success are projected into corporate form, but it still is essentially a one-man enterprise, and rarely, if at all, do more than two or three men share in the establishment or the early stages of the running and conducting a business such as these.

That means that whether the business is mirrored in corporate form or otherwise, from its very nature it must grow to a size where it can support executive assistants and technical experts and others at the executive level, if it is to prosper, or even if it is to continue after the personal incapacity, death, or failure of its originators.

If we go back to early economic history this was the picture of all American business, and it was not until assistance was awarded, by tariffs on imports, by special grants to railroads, and other methods, that growth was stimulated, and we arrived at the point where we saw business multiply in our manufacturing and commerce in the hands of a self-perpetuating group, into which admittance was easy for a new man showing proper qualifications, and thence resulted in the dollar sustaining the social welfare of the entire world.

Most of us are old enough now to remember the man who started his own business and made it thrive. I have in my mind recollection of the origin of the Norton Co., of Worcester, a concern now selling its products all over the world and employing 8,000 to 12,000 persons. In its origin, it was started in a back yard by two instructors at Worcester Polytechnic Institute who had to continue teaching to support it, until they brought it along to its present, or nearly its present, high state of efficiency. Both of them died millionaires many times over.

Not so today. My clients do not expect any return to Government assistance or Government nursing, but are only asking to be relieved from Government amputation of their profits, that might properly be used to build up and make grow something for the future benefit of all mankind.

Speaking more specifically about House bill 4431, this is a bill to exempt corporations from paying taxes on the first $25,000 of their income while still in the hands of the corporate entity. If, as would be expected, it was paid out in dividends, the dividends would still be taxed. If it was distributed in unreasonably high salaries, the salaries would still be taxed, and if, as is our desire to make possible, it was returned to the corporation for the purpose of enlarging, developing, buying new machinery and other processes in business growth, the taxation might be delayed a little, but the net profits in the forms of taxation would, we think, be beneficial because the larger your tax base the more money can be collected, even on a smaller rate of taxation.

At the present time the businessman who has progressed no further than my clients, is sadly handicapped to finance capital expenditures as it is beyond his power to have the income to purchase them. The banks do not want him, except on terms of very short loans, and if he goes to the private lender for a long-term loan, the charges of interest that he must pay make it almost impossible for him to do business at all advantageously. He wants the privilege of answering his own capital needs by his own economy. Today he does not have it.

Most of you know what the first $25,000 on corporate income is taxed; that is 15 percent on the first $5,000; 17 percent on the next $15,000; 19 percent on the next $5,000; and on the next $25,000 he is taxed 31 percent, a higher tax than he pays in any other bracket

and apparently with the thought in mind of reaching back to the original $25,000, and leveling it off to a point where the total income tax of the smaller fellow will approximate the 24 percent demanded from the great incomes of corporate wealth.

No corporation is going to last indefinitely. The places of those of Nation-wide importance must be taken by the growing up of business and industry that is now in its infancy, and unless they are allowed to use their own money for development, that growth becomes stunted, and in many instances impossible, and in many more results in its actually dying out.

Forty-eight percent of the people employed in the United States are now employed by smaller businesses. The throwing of 5, 10, or 15 men out of employment by the failure of a small-business man is hardly noticeable. However, 98 percent of the businessmen in the country qualify as small-business men, and the failure of this 98 percent would provoke a major panic. The failure of any appreciable number thereof would destroy our economic security. I am not a raven croaking about hard times, but we need only to look across the water to see that our economy at the moment is bolstered up by the needs of Europe and Asia. When the time comes that they have returned to normal, unless the inhibitions now placed on the small-business men are removed to some extent at least, his growth will inevitably become stunted and in all probability will cease, and the free competition that has made our country great will be stifled, and we will become a country of cartels, where the business is firmly held in the hands of a few families, a condition toward which we are moving more rapidly than we realize. It is later than you think.

The question is often asked, "Assuming we remove this income from taxation, what have we to take its place?"

We believe that we have plenty to take its place, in the passage of H. R. 5064, or similar legislation. When Congress enacted the Internal Revenue Code, it, out of its wisdom, and we think properly, exempted charitable, educational, and religious institutions and cooperatives from liability to the income tax.

We do not quarrel at all from exempting from taxation of income derived by charitable, religious, and educational institutions from the conduct of their proper activities, and the plowing back of that income into the continuance and the extension of such work. We do object most vigorously to paying so large a tax to support the share that these corporations should pay when they invade the field of private business and are acting in competition with the ordinary business activities of the community. For example, Yale University recently purchased two of our largest buildings in the city of Worcester. The first building and the land on which it rests has an assessment of $70,000; and the second building and the land on which it rests has an assessment of $540,500. If we regarded the assessment value as the fair market value, which it is not, and the income therefrom as 5 percent, which is about fair, we would have a withdrawal from taxation of $30,525 a year on these two buildings alone. The chances are that these buildings are worth much nearer $1,000,000 taken together than the assessed value, and if that is true, it is safe to say that $50,000 a year net income is received from them, and is not taxed at all.

This illustration might be multiplied many times, and you have heard so much about it that I will not enlarge on it, except to say that every man who is familiar with real estate in his own community can point out at least a few illustrations of it nearly everywhere in the country, and it is not confined to real estate, but charitable corporations so-called are engaged in manufacturing, merchandising, and every business under the sun, which they never intended to enter at the time of their inception, but have encroached upon from the time the Internal Revenue Code made it attractive to them to engage in this form of enterprise.

In Massachusetts, property has been dealt with, we think wisely by providing an exemption for personal property as follows:

"Personal property of literary, benevolent, charitable, and scientific institutions and of temperance societies incorporated in the Commonwealth, the real estate owned and occupied by them or their officers for the purposes for which they are incorporated, and the real estate purchased by them with the purpose of removal thereto, shall be exempt from taxation."

Again, "Houses of religious worship owned by, or held in trust for the use of, any religious organization, and the pews and furniture, and, to an amount not exceeding $5,000 for each parsonage, parsonage so owned or held; but such exemption shall not, except as herein provided, extend to any portion of any such house of religious worship appropriated for purposes other than religious worship or instruction."

If a similar provision is made in the Internal Revenue Code and if cooperatives, which are really business corporations, are taxed as other corporations, we believe the loss of income derived from the tax on the first $25,000 of corporate profits will be more than compensated.

We also believe that the taxation of freight charges has imposed a tremendous burden on small industry without any corresponding benefit to the Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States and the Federal Trade Commission have held in no uncertain terms, that it is the duty of the manufacturer to use all its customers alike, and that under the Federal Trade Commission Act, this means that he must charge his customers the same amount of money for his product, and that the test is not what each pays, but the net amount the seller receives from each, and if the product is transported from the manufacturer to the buyer, the cost of transportation must either be paid by the buyer, or must be billed to the buyer after the manufacturer has paid it. (See *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. p. 683)).

This means that there must be no leveling of prices in different parts of the country. Also we have seen horizontal freight increases allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission from about 1914 to the present time. In heavy industry particularly, and in all industries to some extent the freight charges of the raw material to the manufacturer and freight charges of the finished product to the customer are becoming more and more an important part of charges to the customer, and with these increases the market of the manufacturer is becoming more and more circumscribed, and he can no longer meet competition from a manufacturer who is located more closely to either the place where the raw material is produced or to the place where the product is sold. In New England this fact is becoming more and more acute, and as the New England manufacturer can ship only to the west and southwest, freight rates alone are resulting in the curtailment of production as the local market is already well supplied, and additional cost for the purpose of taxation on the transportation means an additional cost of bookkeeping in small items to the shipper or customer as well as an additional cost in the freight bill itself.

We believe that if competition is to be kept alive our industries must be given a chance to compete and that this unnecessary and pernicious restriction on their orbit of obtaining raw materials and their outlets for sale should in justice and equity be removed.

Thank you.

You'd Discharge an Administration as Foolish as Your Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, now that the staggering one-package appropriation bill is before the House for debate, it would be helpful if every Member of Congress would read an editorial published recently in the Danville, Ill., Commercial-News, the largest newspaper in the Twenty-third Congressional District. The Commercial-News is one of the Gannett group of newspapers, all of them outstanding in their devotion to community service and the public welfare. In recent weeks they have performed a great public service in organizing what has come to be called the legion of obstinate men and women, dedicated to the task of halting the steadily mounting burden of Government expenditures.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of the Commercial-News editorial, as follows:

YOU'D DISCHARGE AN ADMINISTRATION AS FOOLISH AS YOUR GOVERNMENT

If you had so much money you had to have somebody handle it for you, and he ran through your pile, keeping you in debt and taking on more new long-range obligations, what would you do?

Well, you'd fire him if you found it out before it was too late.

Don't be surprised, you are such a person.

Whatever you do for a living and however much you earn, the Government handles one-fourth of your money. It takes a certain amount in withholding and income tax. The rest is collected from you by your grocer, butcher, and anyone else with whom you do business.

The Federal Government is running through it like an administrator who ought to be fired. It is keeping you in debt. The wage-earner of every average-size family owes $8,000 of it. It is increasing at a national rate of $5,500,000,000 a year.

And it is trying with all the wiles of artful propaganda to commit you to new long-range obligations of, Senator MCCLELLAN says, another $25,000,000,000 a year.

Isn't it time to be as obstinate with government as you would be with an administrator who handled it all?

Some people profess to think that what they spend is their money and what the Government spends is some other kind of money—the Government's.

But the Government has no money. All it can have is what it takes from you. It spends exactly the same kind of money that you do. And what it spends, you don't.

Whatever the combined efforts of everybody produce—industry, agriculture, business and labor—is all there is. That's the only place wealth can come from. And that's where Government has to go to get what it wants.

A year ago President Truman in his budget message told Congress:

"In a period of high prosperity it is not sound public policy for Government to operate at a deficit. A Government surplus at this time is vitally important."

But this year somebody—and another mammoth deficit—got to him. The spender's argument that he repeated goes something like this:

If American industry keeps on growing at the rate it has grown and no more by the year 2000 we'll have a trillion dollar national income and what would these debts in mere billions be then? So what are we afraid of?

Because this is the most if-studded fantasy ever dreamed up.

American industry has grown because it was free to plow back its earnings, and Americans were free to accumulate enough capital to start new businesses. Government spending has cut these freedoms to the bone.

That's only one if. The others are if we can achieve peace and sustain it, if we have no depression, if we don't have to support large areas of the world indefinitely, if, if, if.

Or conversely, if the national debt continues to grow at its present rate it will be $535,000,000,000 by the year 2000—more than $16,000 for every wage earner of an average-size family.

And what would the dollar be worth then? Well, it came down to 59 cents in running up the first $256,000,000,000 of the debt.

At that rate it would be lucky to be worth a dime by the year 2000.

The fact is that what Mr. Truman argued a year ago is the eternal truth today. With the highest rate of national income, the highest level of taxes, the burden of the largest debt, the most serious threat to our democracy, it is high time to balance the budget and return to sound financial footings.

Famine in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 26, 1950:

FAMINE IN CHINA

There seems little doubt now that famine in China this year will be catastrophic. There is reason to believe, on the basis of fragmentary reports, that the situation will be more critical than at any other time in a half century. What the people of the United States should do and how they should go about doing it, will be questions of the gravest import that will have to be answered shortly. It is necessary, therefore, that our thinking be clear and our courses of action sound and straightforward.

The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of China. They have been, and are, our good friends to the extent that their rulers will allow. Every humane instinct urges that we do what we can to alleviate their misery. That misery is very little of their own choosing. The Communist conquest of China is a relatively small factor in the causes of famine, although it has undoubtedly contributed. Recruiting of farmers and continuing shipments of foodstuffs to the Soviet Union certainly do not help the situation.

But the individual Chinese who will suffer hunger and die of starvation have had very little to do with the Communist conquest. We cannot make ourselves deaf to their appeal merely because we are at odds with the Government that has put itself into power over them. We should like to help, if we can.

The actions of the Communist Government, however, have cut us off from the normal channels of access to the people. Those actions have likewise made us mistrustful of the motives and methods of the Government itself. We cannot, therefore, simply give famine relief aid to the Chinese Communist Government with any confidence that it will reach the persons whom we desire to help. We certainly do not want to start feeding the Chinese Communist Army. And, by the same token, we do not want to put into the hands of that army and its political overlords a weapon that will be used for military and political purposes.

Unhappily, our previous experiences with aid to peoples in the Soviet-dominated sphere have taught us what to expect. We have no assurance that our help will extend to the points where it is needed, and we have reason to believe that any materials we supply will be relabeled and used for propaganda purposes and their origin concealed or falsified. We wish, in a spirit of entire friendliness, to help feed the Chinese, but we certainly have a right to expect that this friendliness be made known to them and not distorted to our own permanent disadvantage.

This situation suggests its own solution. We can give famine relief in China, provided the Chinese Communist Government agrees that it be administered and distributed by Americans on the ground. They could be nonmilitary Americans—teachers, doctors, missionaries, and businessmen who could be called into that service. They could be persons whose basic attachment to the Chinese people was well established. Their function would be to see that food got to persons who really needed it and that they knew from whose hands the food came. If the Chinese Communist Government is really devoted to the welfare of the people it will readily accept such a proposal.

Clyde Doyle, Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth District of California, Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at all times the people who elect us in our respective congressional districts, should be kept as fully informed as possible, as to what we as their representatives in Congress are doing on the job. But the Eighteenth District of California, in Los Angeles County, which I have now represented for nearly 4 years, as I am serving my second term, is about 3,000 miles from Washington, D. C. Relatively few of these people ever travel here. And the cost of travel to me personally, by plane, to my congressional district, is at least $325, round trip, from Washington, D. C.

Another primary election comes in my native State of California on June 6, 1950. Cross filing is in vogue there. I receive many requests for information about my work here. Constituents write and ask about the work and duties and services of a Representative in Congress. They want to know. That is good for America. Only an informed democracy will endure. Also, those who are not in office, but want to be elected, naturally, are not in any position to know what the actual facts are, or what has been done by a Member of Congress during his term. Neither can the news channels, 3,000 miles away, be expected to publish the full text of a report of a Member of Congress. So, the only practical way to let the people really know is to make adequate report and see that as many as possible thus have opportunity to know the facts and truth.

Mr. Speaker, I have abiding faith and confidence in the sound judgment and patriotism of the people of the Eighteenth District and of all America, if and when they are in possession of the material facts.

The record shows that Members of this great Congress, in both political parties, for many years have regularly printed, at their own expense, and have forwarded to their constituents a report of their work. I am now doing so at my personal expense. I also made such report during my first term of 2 years as a Member of this great House of Representatives. In that report, amongst other things, I then said, and I now repeat:

Only an informed democracy can act intelligently, and only an intelligently acting democracy will endure.

I trust the following facts will help the people of the Eighteenth District, all of whom I have had the honor to represent for nearly 4 years in this Congress, to be much better informed about the work, labor, and services of their Congressman. Also, to be better informed about the functioning of Congress itself. Manifestly, time and space both limit me in these remarks and report:

To the voters of the Eighteenth Congressional District, California, I respectfully state:

1. Your Representative's offices at Washington, D. C., have been open daily, excepting Sunday and legal holidays, from 8:30 a. m. until at least 5:30 p. m., excepting a very few Saturday afternoons. Frequently it is open as late at 7:30 p. m., and sometimes later. I have four capable secretaries, two of whom are residents of Long Beach.

My district office in the post-office building in my home city of Long Beach has also been open regular hours daily, and I have also had a field secretary in the Eighteenth District in order to more promptly and adequately meet the service needs of the district. My wife has also worked right along with me at Washington, but is not on the Government pay roll.

2. Heavy daily mail received. It averages 75 to 150 first-class letters daily, all of which I have and do read. I have had this habit ever since I was first elected. I also try to personally answer every first-class letter.

I receive from 25 to 50 second- and third-class pieces of mail daily; from 10 to 25 newspapers and periodicals daily; from 8 to 30 printed reports, resolutions, petitions, circular letters, foreign periodicals, departmental announcements, etc.

3. I am a member of important Armed Services Committee. Upon the Eighty-first Congress opening, I was promptly elected a member of the House Armed Services Committee. Hon. Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, is the distinguished chairman of the committee. During my first term in Congress I was a member of the important Rivers and Harbors Committee. So I have had a great privilege in my committee

work. In my first term I was a subcommittee member on Invalid Pensions, Patents, Claims, Erosion, etc. In this Eighty-first Congress my subcommittees are: Military Reserve Components, Radar Fence, Wind Tunnels, Armories, Central Intelligence, Military Establishment, Reports to Congress, etc.

4. I am a member of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. I am one of seven Members only, of all the House of Representatives, to be appointed to the Select Lobbying Committee. Congress first gave us $40,000 for our committee staff, investigators, and hearings. We have already had several public hearings and will have more. One of our duties will be to recommend ways and means, by which the Federal Lobbying Act should be amended and altered. In my first term in Congress I helped enact this Lobbying Act. I am now further studying its operations, as a member of this committee, which has such important Nationwide attention and interest. It is here regarded as an honor and responsibility to be chosen 1 of 7 members out of 435, to serve upon this committee. Witnesses of national reputation have already testified before us. It is a fact-finding policy committee.

5. I am a member of the special subcommittee on Military Hospitals. I was named as one of six members of the entire Armed Services Committee membership, both Democrats and Republicans, to make a bi-partisan field survey and report. This subcommittee made inspections and held public hearings in 10 of the congressional districts, where military hospitals are located. Some were represented in Congress by Republicans and some were represented by Democrats. Congress does not play "party politics" with the health or suffering of veterans or military dependents. This subcommittee, was authorized by the unanimous approval of the Armed Services Committee; both Democrats and Republicans. We were directed to travel by plane to Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts and have public hearings and make on-the-spot studies and gather pertinent facts for Congress to consider in the realm of military hospitals. I was honored by being asked to preside as chairman at the hearings at Long Beach and Oceanside, Calif.

6. I keep daily diary on floor of Congress. As in my first term, I have again kept a brief but interesting and important diary of unusual and significant events on the floor of the House. I make record of valuable data you do not find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Majority Leader MCCORMACK and Speaker SAM RAYBURN and others on both sides of the political aisle have commended me for it. They say it is the only one of its sort in existence. It takes work, of course. But it is valuable work.

7. I have appeared before several congressional committees. Each congressional committee acts essentially as a jury in a civil court. It hears testimony; receives documentary evidence; interrogates witnesses; makes findings and recommendations; files both majority and minority reports if there are both. Some of the appearances I have made before committees are as follows:

Ways and Means: To argue for removal of certain war-time excise taxes; as on transportation, telegrams, and so forth.

Appropriations: To argue for the Whittier Narrows Dam. Four million dollars were secured and is now actually available for this important flood protection to the Eighteenth District, which I represent.

Post Office and Civil Service: To argue for certain increases in pay to post-office clerks and for benefits to post-office clerks who were in the military services, H. R. 87; and also for the post-office supervisory positions bill, H. R. 4678, etc.

Judiciary: Tidelands oil bill. It was stipulated before the committee, that the testimony previously given in the other session of Congress should be considered as having been given again. So none of the California Congressmen were asked to, or did orally testify before the House committee of this Eighty-first Congress. But the Doyle bill, H. R. 1212, supporting the claims of the city of Long Beach and the State of California, was filed by me on January 10, 1949, only 7 days after this Eighty-first Congress convened.

Also, I personally interviewed the members of the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee, and furnished them photographs and charts promptly furnished me by the Long Beach Harbor Department and the city attorney's office. The judiciary subcommittee unanimously approved the theory of the bill approved by Long Beach city attorney and the attorney general of California. I have done all, and more than I have been asked to do by the city or the State. I also filed the first bill for the city and State in my first term in Congress and the California bill only had 11 votes against it in the House. The facts reveal that I, during my first term in Congress, discovered and forthwith reported to the city and State the jeopardy to its tidelands. I have continued to work diligently for both the city and State in this my second term in Congress. I have received a written commendation from the attorney general of California for my work for this bill.

I also personally appeared and argued before a judiciary subcommittee for the issuance of a national charter by Congress to the American Blue Star Mothers, Inc.; and also for a national charter for the Army and Navy Union.

Labor and Education Subcommittee: To invite the subcommittee studying the effect of Federal installations in school districts of the Nation, on the local public-school attendance and maintenance costs, etc., to come to Long Beach and hold one of its few public hearings. It did so. It also honored Long Beach by making the Wilton Hotel its headquarters at my request and invitation. At my invitation an appropriate and very fine public dinner was held in honor of this subcommittee of Congress at the Lafayette Hotel, Long Beach, Calif., through the splendid cooperation of school and other groups of interested citizens.

8. I have debated and spoken in Congress. I have either spoken or participated in debate, or extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more than 90 times. They can be easily found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your public library, high school, chamber of commerce, college library, where I have had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD forwarded, so the most people could have access to it.

9. I have filed bills to help. A Congressman cannot always file a bill, for all the many objects he is asked to by well-meaning constituents. The legislative counsel is necessarily consulted first. Not all needs of constituents can be met by merely filing a bill. But it has been my pleasure to file and start through the complicated processes of department, subcommittee, committee, House, Senate subcommittee, Senate committee, Senate, President, more than 40 bills. They cover a wide variety of subjects. Some of the public bills I have filed are as follows:

H. R. 1212: To protect California tidelands for State ownership and control.

H. R. 1828: To incorporate Army and Navy Union.

House Joint Resolution 107: Adjudication of claims of waters of the Colorado River in the Supreme Court.

H. R. 2171: Slum clearance.

H. R. 2172: To amend the act to reclassify the salaries of postal employees, and to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, etc.

H. R. 2173: Incorporate Blue Star Mothers.

H. R. 2292: Retired pay for Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve of World Wars I and II.

House Joint Resolution 155: For relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas.

H. R. 2542: Extension of veterans' benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of benefit rights earned for service prior to World War II.

H. R. 2543: Repeal tax on transportation of persons and property.

H. R. 2544: Amend veterans' regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities.

H. R. 2545: Reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in postal field service.

H. R. 2644: Promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of Post Office Department.

H. R. 2676: Authorize demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water, etc., to increase national water resources.

H. R. 2939: Federal aid to education.

H. R. 3276: Exempt persons who served in wartime merchant marine from induction into armed services under Selective Service Act of 1948.

H. R. 4296: Give effect to the convention between the United States and Mexico for the scientific investigation of tuna.

House Concurrent Resolution 92: To strengthen and support the United Nations.

H. R. 5228: Give effect to the convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

House Joint Resolution 277: Establish a National Children's Day.

H. R. 5758: Return to California copies of original documents and maps (Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers) deposited in National Archives.

H. R. 5786: Provide automobiles for veteran amputees.

H. R. 6058: Improve procedure relating to determination and priority of combat connection of disabilities, injuries or diseases.

H. R. 7097: Extension of pensions to widows and children of deceased World War II veterans to equal pensions extended to widows and children of World War I deceased veterans.

H. R. 7495: Terminate war excise tax on theater tickets, amusements, and recreation.

I have filed more than 10 bills for the benefit and relief of individuals who make claim against the Government as a result of injuries to person or to property or other losses or damage or detriment suffered by said individuals without their being at fault.

I want to report that, even though the law has to be necessarily strict—sometimes it seems supertechnical—even Uncle Sam has a heart. Remember the incident in March 1944, when two lovely girls were shot to death by a crazy soldier in uniform at Riverside Army base? Admittedly, he was not on duty when he killed them. Admittedly their behavior had been as perfect ladies. But, both had fond parents who had a right to expect that of their lovely daughters. So, one of my bills for the relief of the parents of these girls has been approved by the Budget for about $6,700 in one case and about $6,400 in the other.

But the ways of a private bill in Congress are long. Many times it takes attention in more than one session of Congress to obtain the relief asked for. Many times no relief can be had.

The Doyle resolution, House Joint Resolution 277, to establish a National Children's Day, is an illustration of opportunity for a Congressman to file a bill in a worthy cause. This arose from the activities of the people of Lynwood and South Gate, through their Kiwanis Club at Lynwood and the leadership of Rev. James Roberts, of Lynwood. The International Kiwanis Convention last

year approved Doyle, House Joint Resolution 277. Other Nation-wide and State-wide groups have approved it. Also, at least 20 other Members of the House have already filed exactly the same bill at my request. The Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency is interested in the subject matter, too. A subcommittee now has it before it.

10. I have had personal conferences with the President and Cabinet members. My duties as your Representative have made it necessary for me to have several conferences with the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Department of State, Secretary of Navy, Secretary of Army, Secretary of Air Force, Surgeons General, Director of the Budget, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Postmaster General, Secretary of Agriculture, Attorney General of the United States, Maritime Commission, FHA, RFC, Federal Security Agency, Children's Bureau, Secretary of Labor, etc., etc.

These high officials and department administrators do not have their offices on the Hill where Congress meets. They are all either uptown or at the Pentagon Building; from 10 to 20 minutes by auto from my office. As Congress meets daily at 12 noon, we have to try to see these executive and administrative officers in between 9 a. m. and 12 noon; in addition to attending various committee meetings which occur almost daily, beginning at 9:30 or 10 a. m. and lasting until 12 noon.

11. The records show that I did all that could be done to keep the Long Beach shipyard in active status. A very, very brief account, and only a partial list of the important steps I took as your Congressman in this connection are as follows:

A. Within a few weeks after I took my seat as your Representative, I discovered that "the subsidence" or sinking condition at the navy yard had for several years previously worried the Navy very definitely—especially since the Harris engineers' report on subsidence to the Navy and the city dated 1945.

B. Had conferences with Bureau of Ships, Naval Operations, Secretary of Navy, regarding subsidence as relating to employment and operations level as a result of subsidence.

C. April 4, 1949, telegraphed official, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, etc., as follows:

"Have just studied report of Bureau of Yards and Docks on subsidence, LB Naval Shipyard, February 1949. Please advise the earliest possible date whether or not board of harbor commissioners satisfied with present status of subsidence, studies, and survey, especially with reference to possible implications re LB Naval Shipyard availability, use and permanency. Also advise if local interests continuing employment of Stanford Survey.

"CLYDE DOYLE, *Member of Congress.*"

D. On April 21, 1949, received letter from Chief of Bureau of Ships, Washington, answering mine of prior date, which letter also said:

"In addition to this situation a problem exists which concerns the Long Beach shipyard alone. The land upon which this shipyard is built has been sinking at the rate of about a foot a year. Unless remedial action, for which funds are not now available, is taken within the near future certain areas and facilities of the yard will be unusable. Even after funds are made available and the planned bulkheads around the docks and piers are constructed there will result a decreased efficiency of operation. The planned reduced level of operations at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard takes these conditions into consideration."

And on May 12, 1949, I received further statement from the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, which letter also said:

"Last, but by no means least, the sinking phenomenon now occurring at Long Beach was given consideration. The Navy is extremely concerned with the sinkage at that yard. The fact that sinkage exists is real and cannot be ignored when the problem of work distribution is being considered. Without doubt this factor has adversely affected the employment at Long Beach, and will continue to affect the employment at that yard until the situation concerning sinkage is cleared up. Sinkage considerations do not affect the other yards."

E. I personally paid for and immediately mailed 5,000 copies of these letters to me dated April 21 and May 12; which letters included the language set forth in the above quotations.

F. Also telegraphed, telephoned, etc., Long Beach officials, community leaders, etc., warning of danger of subsidence.

G. Promptly obtained allocation of $4,500,000 to begin constructing dikes, walls, etc., to protect shipyard installations from damage or destruction by salt water resulting from subsidence condition.

H. Flew to Long Beach after Washington made arrangements for me to meet chairman of the on-the-site survey, Navy, re subsidence; I met with him in executive session; conferred with Admiral Klein and Navy engineers re subsidence.

I. Immediately met Long Beach Harbor Board, mayor, and city councilmen, and the city attorney on subsidence, etc.

J. Arranged another visit to Long Beach re subsidence at naval yard with Under Secretary of Navy Kimball; we met with harbor board and city councilmen.

K. Again traveled to Long Beach and met with harbor board and city officials re subsidence and Navy Yard Harris Report, Stanford Report, etc.

L. Obtained waiver dated September 30, 1949, by Attorney General of the United States to Navy, permitting volunteer reduction of oil production up to 30 percent by Wilmington-Long Beach area oil producers for the purpose of testing whether oil production principal cause of subsidence and immediately furnished oil producers and official Long Beach copies thereof.

M. Sent every oil producer in Wilmington oil field personally signed letter as Congressman, asking immediate cooperation in test by curtailing production because of subsidence. Harris Report on Navy had long previously advised major cause of subsidence was rate of extraction of oil.

N. Arranged personal inspection Long Beach Navy Yard by Secretary of Navy Matthews and again flew to Long Beach to be personally present.

O. Vigorously and vigilantly undertook to obtain maximum cooperation by official Long Beach and other oil producers to make test by voluntary reduction of oil production, up to 30 percent, to establish whether oil extraction was major cause of subsidence as claimed by Navy and the Harris Report dated 1945.

P. In every way cooperated with all persons or groups seeking retention of Long Beach Navy Shipyard as active yard and to obtain cooperation of city and other oil producers in testing cause of subsidence.

Q. Vigorously, continuously pressed claims of Long Beach Navy Shipyard for remaining "active status" to attention executive and administrative departments of Government, Washington, from very early date I first discovered that "subsidence" had been established and well-known as a hazard to the shipyard.

R. Helped arrange conference between Long Beach representatives and office of President of the United States at Washington, for presentation of Long Beach shipyard claims against making it reserve yard.

S. February 7, 1950, received final decision, Secretary of Navy, which, in part, said:

"Subsidence has affected vital areas of the yard. The rate of subsidence has not changed significantly within recent months and, in some important areas, the rate has accelerated somewhat.

"Due to the subsidence, dikes must be constructed around the piers, drydocks, and quay walls to protect the Government's investment for mobilization purposes. The initial construction of these dikes is to begin early in February 1950. Continued subsidence will require the extension of these dikes in later years. Despite the construction of dikes, however, subsidence may possibly continue to the point where no use could be made of the facilities in the event of mobilization, and the shipyard would have to be abandoned. * * *

"Please accept my assurance that only the necessity of irremediable circumstances has forced our reluctant decision."

T. Col. H. E. Hedger, chief engineer, Los Angeles County Flood Control District, on February 24, 1950, testified here in Washington before a congressional committee:

"The extensive subsidence which has occurred in the Long Beach Harbor area has resulted in a lowering in elevation of levees and bridges in the lower Los Angeles River channel near its outlet by as much as 4 feet and has reduced its flood carrying capacity by an estimated 25 percent. Consequently, the protection provided by the flood-control work constructed in the past by the United States Government and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District on this reach of the channel has been substantially diminished. * * * It justifies work in the amount of $1,000,000."

Thus you will see that the Honorable Secretary of the Navy, in his final decision to your Congressman, dated February 7, 1950, gave the same cause for inactivating the Long Beach Naval Shipyard as the distinguished Los Angeles flood-control engineer gave for asking $1,000,000 to correct a condition which has developed immediately adjacent to Terminal Island, on which the shipyard is located, and which condition was described as "the extensive subsidence."

U. I, personally, spent hundreds of dollars in transportation, communication, and other expenses in my effort to keep the yard in active status.

I have not been advised by any person, as to any manner in which a Congressman can keep Terminal Island from sinking. Nor have I been informed of any highly reputed or nationally known engineer who has yet signed his name to a report on subsidence declaring that the Harris Report of 1945 was wrong; or, that the Secretary of the Navy's final opinion, dated February 7, 1950, to me as your Congressman, was ill-founded.

12. I have served the Eighteenth Congressional District well. Every request for information, for service to local committees or local city officials, chambers of commerce, Red Cross, labor organizations, schools, colleges, trade organizations, veterans organizations, patriotic societies and groups, civic groups of all types, professional and business interest groups, fraternal lodges and groups, manufacturing concerns, etc., has been promptly attended to and serviced as far as I know. No person or group, has been denied my service on account of political affiliation, or, on account of race, creed or color. My privilege and honor is to represent the interests of all the people of the Eighteenth District of California, for this, my second term.

13. I have given weekly, nonpartisan, public-service radio broadcasts. At my own expense, each week for several months, through the courtesy of stations KFOX and KNOB, Long Beach, I have conducted a public service radio broadcast by "platter" from the radio room here at your Nation's Capital. The stations have not charged me one cent; but, I have personally paid the cost of the radio "platter" and air express which is about $5 for each "platter" each week.

The fact that both Long Beach radio stations informed me that they had received no complaint about anything I had said on their public service broadcasts, for the first period of 3 months and then both invited me to take another 3 months free time, gave evidence that I had not imposed upon their invitation to talk nonpartisanly.

And, because I am to continue my nonpartisan public service talks over KNOB for a few weeks yet, I list those dates here, KNOB, dial 103.1, FM station channel 276: Friday nights, May 5 and 19, 7:15 p. m.; June 2, 16 and 30, 7:15 p. m.

14. I have competitive examinations for candidates for both Academies. As in my first term as your Represenative, I have again required a civil-service competitive examination be taken by all applicants for either Annapolis or West Point. These examinations are strictly competitive and open to all qualified lads, regardless of race, creed, or color, and also regardless of the political registration of their parents, relatives, or sponsors. I also require a written statement of about 2,000 words by each applicant as to why he chooses a military career. I notify all applicants and their parents that I will not authorize any lad to take the competitive examination unless he has previously declared his intention to make the military his career. This, I believe fair to the taxpayers. I believe it not fair for a lad to get his 4 years of free schooling and then promptly resign, without giving value received to the taxpayers and to his country.

15. My attendance in Congress and committees is prompt. My attendance and work record on both my committees and in Congress will speak up that I have been on the job for you. During official absences from the floor of Congress on account of my subcommittee work, I have directed and authorized pairs as far as possible. This is the only procedure provided in Congress. There is no vote by proxy in Congress; although there is in committee. Absences on quorum calls do not affect or relate to voting, if a Member is present to vote. Many times, Members continue their executive or public hearing attendance in committee, even though the bells ring for a quorum. Sometimes a quorum call is made by some Member who, at the moment, is tempermental. Also, quorum calls are often made to filibuster for time. No bill is being voted upon as a result of a quorum call. A quorum is not a call to vote. It is not a roll call vote.

Sometimes, the quorum call is a matter of political party stalling for time; or, it may be that they do not want any vote on the particular bill or amendment thereto until the next day or so. Thus, on Tuesday, April 4, when the Special Subcommittee on Military Hospitals, of which I am a member, was at Murphy General Hospital in Massachusetts, holding public hearings and making a survey and study upon the unanimous instruction and direction of the entire Armed Services Committee of the House, the same as we had done previously at Long Beach Navy Hospital and others in Mare Island, Calif., Oceanside, Calif., Corpus Christi, Tex., Jacksonville, Fla., Augusta, Ga., etc., the New York Times' Washington special correspondent for Wednesday, April 5, in writing about the general debate on the omnibus appropriation bill said:

"It was 2:15 p. m. before debate got under way today as business of the House was slowed down by three quorum calls; all sought by Republicans and each of which took 25 minutes."

These three quorum calls happened while we were busy on official congressional assignment in Massachusetts. We did not miss actual votes. We only missed quorum calls—which had no connection with votes; there were no roll-call votes. The hospitals subcommittee had planned to hurry to Pennsylvania and Massachusetts the week before; but we remained in Washington so as not to miss any vote in connection with ECA.

This illustrates, how impossible it is for important subcommittees of Congress to promptly function without missing some quorum calls; and also, it is likewise impossible without missing a few actual votes if Congress calls them. But there is no other way provided.

When the same hospitals subcommittee left Congress for Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, the members resultingly missed some votes; but under such circumstances, Congressmen on official subcommittee assignments, cannot be two places at once.

But, it is not here considered a neglect of congressional duties for Members of Congress to fulfill necessary official committee assignments on subcommittees; even if it results in the members of that subcommittee being personally absent when some votes are called for. Members are not absent unnecessarily.

16. I write Your Congressman Reports, a Washington newsletter. As during my first 2 years as your Representative, I have again personally written the text of my Washington newsletter, Your Congressman Reports. In it I have again endeavored to give you friends at home, glimpses and information about Washington and the Nation not likely to be had otherwise. Many folks write in and ask me to put their names on the free mailing list to receive it whenever I write it. There is no charge for it to anybody. I personally pay for its printing and send it out every 2 or 3 months. It is not a political or partisan letter.

17. I fought for California against Arizona, for Colorado River water for California. I early filed House Joint Resolution 107, the Doyle bill. It asks for adjudication in the United States Supreme Court of the legal differences between California and Arizona on the important subject of diversion of waters from the Colorado River between California and Arizona. I have worked diligently with my colleagues from California, regardless of political party, for the protection of California's share of this vital water. I have also worked with the official representatives of the State of California and of the metropolitan water district, Colorado River Association and all agencies and committees with this common objective. I have received much commendation for my activities in this regard.

18. I was bipartisanly selected by my colleagues from California on the West Coast Committee representing California, Oregon, and Washington in the matter of maritime matters and west coast shipbuilding. Also, I was named as one of the Congressmen from California, bipartisanly, to represent the interests of California and other Western States at the time of the freeze in southern California, Nevada, and other Western States, for the purpose of devising ways and means of aid, if necessary, in relief to the farmers and agriculturalists in these Western States.

19. The record clearly shows I did everything possible to keep the Long Beach naval hospital open (as a military, or as a veterans', or as a joint-use hospital), but the Congress, in which I am your Representative, is only the legislative branch of government. It does not have jurisdiction or control of the executive branch, under which the Department of the Secretary of Defense is classified. It was this Department of administrative government, which issued the order closing the Long Beach Naval Hospital and several other military hospitals in whole or in part, scattered over the States of Michigan, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Hampshire. Our great American Constitution, expressly provides for the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of Government. Furthermore, Members of Congress could not possibly either qualify or find time, with their legislative duties, to try to also administer the many laws which they find it necessary to enact.

Long Beach Naval Hospital was only one of several similarly included in the closing or inactivation order by the Secretary of Defense. I immediately protested on the meritorious grounds that there was not yet any showing that the order was either economical or in the best interests of national defense. Promptly, the Secretary of Defense communicated to me his claimed justification. Promptly, I refused to accept it as sufficient justification. Promptly, several of my colleagues, both Republican and Democratic Members of the House Armed Services Committee, joined me in asking for appointment of a subcommittee to investigate the effects of the closing order. The hospitals involved were in congressional districts represented about equally by Republicans and Democrats.

The House Armed Services Committee unanimously authorized appointment of the subcommittee of which I have been serving as a member and with which I came to Long Beach, where there was held public hearings at the hospital and at the Long Beach City Hall. The subcommittee had first gone to Michigan, represented by a Republican Member of Congress and then to Mare Island, Calif., another district represented by another Republican Member of Congress. It is a bipartisan committee, with equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats on it.

During our survey and public hearings, we have been excused from attendance of committees of Congress. There is no other way provided whereby congressional committees can function, excepting that they be excused from their Washington duties temporarily and gather the facts and make report back as early as practical. Within 24 hours, after the closing order was announced I conferred with the Defense Department, the Secretary of Navy, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration; the Bureau of the Budget, the Surgeons General of the Army and the Navy.

Through the courtesy of Representative RIVERS, South Carolina, subcommittee chairman, I was named to act as presiding subcommittee chairman at the public hearings at Long Beach and at Oceanside, Calif. This subcommittee, was charged with ascertaining the facts and making findings, conclusions, and recommendations with regard to what the congressional policy should be in matters of military hospitalization. At this writing, the future use of Long Beach Navy Hospital is not fully determined by the administrative departments of the Federal Government concerned with its possible use.

I have vigorously and vigilantly opposed the closing on the following grounds, amongst others:

A. It would compel military personnel dependents who needed general hospitalization to travel too far at their own expense to make it practical for them to obtain prompt, adequate, reasonable hospitalization.

B. It would force too many military personnel dependents into private hospitals—whereas, all private hospitals in the Long Beach area are already overcrowded and the additional expense would also be prohibitive.

C. It would reduce the number of available beds for veterans in the immediate Los Angeles-Long Beach area, and there is already a shortage of such beds.

D. It would remove the general hospitalization too far away from the retired military personnel in the Long Beach area, and many hundreds of retired military personnel have admittedly purchased homes, or, are now buying homes in the Long Beach area, in order to take advantage of the Navy hospital.

E. It breaks faith with "inducements" frequently made by the enlisting officers of the

military, in representing that their dependents would have necessary hospitalization.

F. It removes many patients from the fireproof, modern portion of the Long Beach Navy hospital at Oceanside, Calif., and other hospital facilities which are not fireproof.

These are just a few of my reasons for vigorous opposition to this administrative order.

20. I have kept faith with the electors of the Eighteenth Congressional District. I am a registered Democrat. I was such at the time of my first election, and again for my second term. This fact was adequately publicized. I was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention from the State of California. I voted for the national platform of the Democratic Party at the national convention. I supported President Truman and Vice President Barkley for election and campaigned for them. The publicity for me specified that I was a registered Democrat. I then frequently stated, and I again state that I think the cross-filing system in the State of California dissipates and materially weakens the obligation of political party responsibility. My record as your representative clearly shows that I have voted to support the principles enunciated in the National Democratic Party platform. I had frequently declared that I considered the platform of a political party something to fight for after election as well as something to speak for during a political campaign.

21. I have promptly supplied every request for printed material or information about Government wherever possible. I had CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, Government pamphlets, directories, and reports placed in public libraries, public colleges, high school libraries, etc., for people's use because I realize that many more people wanted access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressional Directory, and other Government pamphlets and booklets than just a few who could be supplied by mail. I had forwarded to the public libraries and public colleges and high school libraries, in some cases regularly and in other cases as often as possible, copies of this valuable reference, documents, and books. This applies to the libraries in the communities of the Eighteenth Congressional District which I represent. Also, I have had mailed direct to as many people in the Eighteenth Congressional District as I had supply for the valuable publications of the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and the Children's Bureau, the Department of State, etc., so that the maximum number of citizens could be better informed about the operations and functioning of the Federal Government.

The Congress annually appropriates money for the printing of such documents and pamphlets and booklets for experience has proven by the demand of the people of the country that they find this printed material of value and practical use to them. For instance, every Congress for more than 20 years has appropriated money for the printing of valuable booklets, commonly described as the "baby books." This applies to both the Republican and Democratic sessions of Congress.

No free seeds have been furnished to Members of Congress for distribution from the Department of Agriculture, or otherwise, since the year 1923.

Literally thousands of requests for specific governmental pamphlets, bills, reports, resolutions, and publications have been received from residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District. These have been promptly attended to and promptly complied with wherever the printed material was available. My Washington office is so organized that request for such information is promptly dispatched. I have also forwarded to high schools and colleges in the District governmental pamphlets on such subjects as the history of the flag, history of our Government, the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, etc.

22. My comprehensive voting record speaks clearly of my work and votes as your Representative. The following is a list of my votes on many of the major issues of the Eighty-first Congress to the date of this report, to wit: April 5, 1950:

On the following bills relating to international affairs, I voted "aye":

S. 1209: Authorizes continuance of Marshall plan (Public Law 47).

H. R. 4830: Finances European recovery program; aid to Greece and Turkey, and relief of occupied areas (Public Law 327).

H. R. 1211: Restores and extends reciprocal trade agreements (Public Law 307).

H. R. 4567: Amends Displaced Persons Act to remove discriminatory provisions.

Senate Joint Resolution 36: Special contribution of $16,000,000 to the UN to aid DP's in Palestine War (Public Law 25).

H. R. 5895 (S. 2388): Military aid to western Europe (Public Law 329).

H. R. 5594, H. R. 5615, S. 2197: Point 4 program; technical and industrial aid to underdeveloped countries.

S. 1250. Extends Institute of Inter-American Affairs to continue cooperative health, education, agriculture, and other projects to improve living standards (Public Law 283).

S. 2093, H. R. 4708: Revises UN Participation Act to authorize appointment of Deputy United States Representative; fixes salaries of representatives and gives them ambassador status (Public Law 341).

H. R. 4406: International Claims Settlement Act. Establishes machinery within Department of State to carry out terms of settlements with former enemies. Yugoslavia, $17,000,000 (Public Law 455).

H. R. 2785: Extends for 1-year period for use of United States contribution to International Children's Emergency Fund. Makes available until June 30, 1950, $17,300,000 balance of $57,700,000 total United States contribution (Public Law 170).

H. R. 4332: Permits National and State banks in Federal Reserve System to deal in securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Public Law 142).

Senate Joint Resolution 3: Provides for use of World War I debt payments by Finland for educational and technical instruction and training in United States for citizens of Finland (Public Law 265).

H. R. 7797: Foreign Economic Assistance (the roll-call vote in the House was—yeas 287 to nays 86).

On the following bills relating to national defense and internal security, I voted "aye":

H. R. 5632 and S. 1843: Unification of Armed Services. Defines powers of Secretary of Defense (Public Law 216).

H. R. 2216: Creates post of Under Secretary of Defense to relieve Secretary of administrative burdens (Public Law 36).

H. R. 2663: Defines authority and powers of Central Intelligence Agency and improves its administration and operation (Public Law 110).

H. R. 1437: Fixes the composition and strength of Army and Air Force.

H. R. 5007: Military pay increases. $303,000,000 (Public Law 351).

H. R. 2546: Authorizes construction of radar air-warning and control installations (Public Law 30).

H. R. 1741: Authorizes establishment of guided missile proving ground for testing rockets, etc. $75,000,000 (Public Law 60).

H. R. 3434 and S. 1267: Authorizes construction of supersonic wind tunnel (Public Law 415).

H. R. 4007 and S. 1505: Experimental submarine program (Public Law 213).

H. R. 4080 and S. 857: Establishes uniform code of military justice for all branches of the Armed Services and Coast Guard.

On the following bills relating to governmental reorganization, I voted "aye":

H. R. 2361 and S. 526: Authorizes President to reorganize Executive Departments in line with Hoover Commission Report re Welfare Department, Labor Department, Post Office Department, National Security Council, Civil Service Commission, Maritime Commission, Commerce Department, unification of Armed Services (Public Law 109).

S. 1704: Authorizes reorganization of State Department (Public Law 73).

H. R. 4754: Establishes the General Services Administration including Federal Works Agency; Bureau of Federal Supply and the Office of Contract Settlement from Treasury; War Assets Administration and Archives (Public Law 152).

H. R. 1689 and S. 498: Salary increases for Government executives (Public Law 359).

On the following bills relating to national economy, I voted "aye":

H. R. 1731: Extends rent control for 15 months from March 31, 1949 (Public Law 31).

H. R. 1660 and S. 547: Extends to September 30, 1949, the President's authority to make voluntary agreements affecting transportation, inventory control, speculative trading in commodities affecting cost of living, and for allocation of key materials in short supply (Public Law 6).

H. R. 1661: Extends to June 30, 1951, the President's authority to control exports (Public Law 11).

H. R. 3662: Authorizes $40,000,000 appropriation for sites and planning for new Federal public buildings, and $30,000,000 for modernization of existing structures (Public Law 105).

S. 2116 and H. R. 5739: Authorizes Federal aid to States and local governments for advance planning of public works (Public Law 352).

H. R. 1161: Permits national banks to become State banks.

H. R. 2734: Tightens antitrust laws to prohibit acquisitions or mergers which lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

On the following bill relating to national economy, I voted "no":

H. R. 2222 and S. 1008: Legalizes basing point price system when not in conflict with antitrust laws.

On the following bills relating to social security, health, and welfare, I voted "aye":

S. 1070: Housing Act; $1,000,000,000 in loans and $500,000,000 in grants to State and local authorities for slum clearance; $300,000,000 in Federal aid to farmers for construction and repair of farm dwellings; research program to stimulate home construction and cut building costs; 810,000 public housing units to be built in 6 years (Public Law 171).

House Joint Resolution 228: Authorizes expenditure of $75,000 to President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week (Public Law 162).

House Joint Resolution 212: Appropriates $1,500,000 emergency funds for crippled children, in addition to regular annual grants to States (Public Law 42).

H. R. 5208, S. 1407: Authorizes 10-year program for rehabilitation of Navajo-Hopi Indian Tribes. Ninety million dollars. (Vetoed October 17, 1949.)

S. 1184: Permits private industry to construct rental housing on or near military installations and authorizes insurance of $500,000,000 additional mortgages (Public Law 211).

H. R. 4846, S. 247: Establishes National Science Foundation.

H. R 3829: Continues for 1 year Federal aid for schools with war-swelled populations and for education of children on Federal reservations (Public Law 306).

Senate Joint Resolution 109: Extends for 60 days authority to insure loans for repairs, renovation and low-cost housing, and authority to insure mortgages on multiple dwelling projects; increases by $500,000,000 insurance authority under title II of National Housing Act (Public Law 278).

On the following bills relating to agriculture, I voted "aye":

H. R. 5345, S. 1971: Revises price-support system (Public Law 439).

H. R. 3699: Improves and makes more effective the Federal Land Bank system to aid farmers (Public Law 433).

H. R. 2682, S. 900: Revises charter of Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate crop storage facilities and for exchange of surplus commodities for strategic and critical materials (Public Law 85).

H. R. 2101, S. 913: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make production disaster loans to farmers from $44,000,000 revolving fund balance of the Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation, which was abolished (Public Law 38).

House Joint Resolution 112, House Joint Resolution 136: Emergency appropriations for relief loans to farmers whose crops were destroyed in western blizzard (Public Laws 3 and 5).

H. R. 2960: Authorizes the REA to make loans for construction of rural telephone lines (Public Law 460).

H. R. 5738, S. 1962: Provides for national marketing quota and acreage allotment for cotton production (Public Law 272).

H. R. 2514: Authorizes loans by Farmers Home Administration to homestead entrymen (Public Law 361).

House Joint Resolution 327: Appropriates $1,750,000 for control of pests and plant disease (Public Law 215).

H. R. 5856, S. 653: Increase minimum wage to 75 cents an hour (Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949) (Public Law 393).

H. R. 3191, S. 1287: Liberalizes compensation benefits to Government employees injured or killed in line of duty (Public Law 357).

H. R. 3005, S. 352: Increases travel allowance for civilian Government employees (Public Law 92).

H. R. 858: Clarifies overtime-pay provisions of Fair Labor Standards Act, and outlaws retroactive claims (Public Law 177).

H. R. 2032 (on Wood substitute, May 3, 1949, voted "nay"): Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, on a motion to recommit the Wood substitute (H. R. 3228) voted "aye."

On the following bills relating to veterans, I voted "aye":

H. R. 4617: Liberalizes pensions to veterans, widows, and children; $67,000,000.

S. 2115: Provides automobiles for crippled veterans; $16,000,000 (Pocket vetoed, Oct. 31, 1949).

S. 266: Permits payment to veterans of retroactive benefits withheld during hospitalization (Public Law 194).

S. 811: Extends time for filing in certain cases, for pensions and compensation (Publice Law 195).

H. R. 5598: Raises from 75 percent to 100 percent the rates of payment for presumed service-connected disabilities (Public Law 339).

H. R. 4692: Extends term of certain patents of persons who served in World War II.

On the following bills relating to civil rights, I voted "aye":

H. R. 4453: Establishes a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

H. R. 3199, S. 97, S. 1727: Bars poll tax as qualification for voting.

H. R. 4963: Strengthens administration of justice by creating new Federal judgeships (Public Law 205).

H. Res. 298: Creates a select committee to investigate and regulate lobbying activities.

On the following bills relating to natural resources, I voted "aye":

H. R. 5472: Authorizes improvements to rivers and harbors and the construction of flood-control projects.

H. R. 165: Expands Folsom Dam project as step in development of American River Basin, Calif. (Public Law 356).

S. 790: Gives Federal approval to compact between States along Colorado River (Public Law 37).

H. R. 163: Authorizes construction of irrigation canals to serve 250,000 acres in Sacramento Valley as part of Central Valley project, Calif.

H. R. 4151: Gives Federal approval to compact between States along Arkansas River (Public Law 82).

H. R. 3615, S. 851: Encourages construction of public and private housing in Alaska by making available $15,000,000 through FHA (Public Law 52).

S. 855: Authorizes 5-year program of public works for development of Alaska. $70,000,000 (Public Law 264).

H. R. 2296: Increases Federal aid to States in cooperative programs for forest fire prevention (Public Law 392).

H. R. 1694: Limits Federal outlay for irrigation maintenance to self-liquidating projects (Public Law 335).

On the following bill relating to natural resources, I voted "no":

H. R. 1758: Clarifies the Natural Gas Act to exempt independent producers and gatherers from regulation by Federal Power Commission.

On S. 2246: Housing for moderate income families, I was paired "aye". I was absent from the floor on account of official subcommittee inspection of military hospitals.

At this date, April 6, 1950, the omnibus appropriation bill is being debated on the floor of Congress. We have already taken about 4 days for such debate and indications are that there will be further debate upon our return to Congress after the House Easter recess. This is the first time in the history of Congress that there has been an omnibus appropriation bill. The sincere effort has been to coordinate all departmental budget estimates and place them before Congress in one bill.

As I write this report to you, I have in my hands House Document No. 405, Eighty-first Congress, second session, entitled "The Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951." This volume consists of 1,198 printed pages of statistical tables of finances relating to this omnibus budget, with explanations thereof.

Answering the many inquiries which have come to me about the budget dollar for the year 1951. I report to you that this budget dollar comes from the following sources of income: Direct taxes on individuals, 41 cents; direct taxes on corporations, 23 cents; new taxes and borrowing, 12 cents; excise taxes, 18 cents; customs and other taxes, 6 cents. And this same budget dollar for 1951 will go, as follows: National defense, 32 cents; veterans, 15 cents; international, 11 cents; interest on debt, 13 cents; social welfare, health, security, 6 cents; other, 23 cents.

Of the $13,500,000,000 total for national defense, $4,100,000,000 will be spent for Army; $4,100,000,000 for the Navy; and $4,400,000,000 for the Air Force; $900,000,000 for various activities supporting defense, including primarily the strategic stock pile costing $650,000,000.

The expenditures for international programs in 1951 will be at least $1,300,000,000 less than the expenditures of 1950.

The 6 cents to be spent for social welfare, health, and security amounts to $2,700,000,000 and is divided as follows: Assistance to the aged, the blind, dependent children (to 2,700,000 old-age survivors insurance trust fund participants, etc.; the average public-assistance benefits for the aged are $45 a month, whereas, old-age insurance benefits are about $26 per month), $1,401,000. Railroad retirement payments to trust account (this now amounts to nearly $2,500,000,000 from which about 365,000 people will draw $350,000,000 in retirement benefits during 1951), $594,000,000. Promotion of public health (causes and cure of cancer, tuberculosis, arthritis, communicable disease, hospital construction, financial help to State and local governments) $432,000,000. Crime control and correction (FBI, narcotics control, United States district attorney offices, Federal prisons, etc.), $99,000,000. School lunch program (to about 7,000,000 American school children), $83,000,000. All others, including health, education, and welfare services to Indians and grants to States for rehabilitation of physically handicapped, etc., $105,000,000.

The 32 cents of each tax dollar spent for national defense totals 71 percent of each tax dollar and includes $6,100,000,000 for veterans; $5,600,000,000 interest on the public debt, which largely arises out of past or future war problems; and $4,700,000,000 for international relations, including $91,000,000 assistance to the Philippines, $239,000,000 for conducting foreign affairs, $81,000,000 foreign economic development, $645,000,000 for foreign military assistance.

So that only 29 percent of every tax dollar remains available for all other governmental expenses and obligations, including natural resources, agriculture, education, housing, transportation and communication, commerce and industry, labor and finance, general government, social welfare.

The 23 cents of each tax dollar to be expended includes all costs of general government, such as legislative and judicial functions, $81,000,000; weather bureau, immigration control, etc., $170,000,000; interest on refunds of receipts $100,000,000, etc.

23. The reorganization of Government plans are progressing. The commonly named Hoover Commission recommendations on organization of the executive branch of government, established by Public Law 162 as a bipartisan report, looking to more efficiency and less expense, is making real progress. The final report of the Commission was filed on June 12, 1949. More than 150 bills relating to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were introduced during the first session of this Eighty-first Congress; it included only bills of fairly general application.

Fifteen of these bills were enacted into law. Seven passed either the House or the Senate. Nine more were reported out from committee. The new laws relating to and arising out of reports of the Hoover Commission are as follows: two as to general management; five as to personnel management; two as to the Office of General Services; two, National Security Organization; one each to Foreign Affairs, Post Office Department, Labor Department, Interior Department.

A most significant new law is the Reorganization Act of 1949, which granted the President of the United States power to resubmit reorganization plans to the Congress, which plans, however, were subject to disapproval by either House within 60 days. Six out of the seven presidential recommended reorganization plans submitted to the first session of this Eighty-first Congress were put into law and effect. It is now estimated that at least 25 percent of the actions required under these six reorganization plans put into law have been accomplished. The Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government estimated in early October 1949 that at that time about 20 percent of the Hoover Commission's recommendations had then been accomplished. I have voted for these reorganization plans to date, as recommended by the President of the United States, who continues to submit reorganization plans to Congress in fairly prompt and regular fashion.

24. I have rendered important personal service to hundreds of individuals upon their request. Requests for aid or assistance of many sorts come to my office daily from present and former members of the armed services; civilian employees of the Government

in connection with Government retirement, employees compensation, applications for new employment or for transfers of employment; persons requesting assistance in locating missing relatives and persons; immigration and passport problems; requests for assistance in presenting hearings on appeal in Government matters; assistance to business and industry in making contacts with appropriate governmental departments for information or opportunities to submit bids and offers for supply of materials in competitive bidding, etc., etc.

I have handled more than 500 cases of personal service to individuals who have applied for and need help in relation to their problems with Government departments. I have facilitated and obtained more than $150,000 for more than 80 applicants for Government retirement refunds, employees compensation, and other claims of the Government.

25. I have been pleased to receive calls and visits at my office of many California residents. Even though my congressional office is more than 3,000 miles away from the Eighteenth Congressional District, hardly a week has gone by but that one or more residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District have honored me by their personal call upon me and visit to their Congressman's office. On many occasions it has been the pleasure of Mrs. Doyle to show them around the Capitol and the Washington area because I find it impossible to do so when Congress is in session on account of my heavy committee and floor work. But every visitor has been most gracious and is most welcome. I cordially invite anyone from the Eighteenth District to favor me by calling upon me whenever you come to the Washington area. Mrs. Doyle and my secretaries and I will all be happy to see you. More than 750 visitors have thus honored my office during this Eighty-first Congress.

I shall visit the people of my congressional district when possible. I have not been able to return and visit my relatives at Long Beach excepting during the short congressional recess. The distance of 3,000 miles and the expense of traveling frequently makes it prohibitive. Furthermore, even in a campaign year, your Congressman feels it is his first duty to be on the job at Washington. Of course, old, experienced Members of Congress say that if you are not reelected, you can't serve your people and the district. Besides I believe it important that the voters have opportunity to see and hear candidates discuss the campaign issues of the day and pronounce their political beliefs and platforms. This is the American way. It is the best way known to man. It is the reaffirming of the democratic processes. It injects strength and virility into our American way of life. It energizes considered opinion. It activates thinking and analysis of individual, group, and national destiny.

In addition to the factual information I have given you in this report, I have endeavored to so write it that you would therefrom obtain at least some glimpse or look at some of the steps taken and problems met by your own Congressman. I pay for the printing of this report to you. It is, of course, true that Congress votes your destiny; but you, as individual Americans, vote for your respective Representative in Congress. Therefore, the voters of America shape their own destiny when they vote for Members of Congress.

I respectfully reaffirm and restate my belief and position as your Representative in Congress, to-wit: That all patriotic Americans must vigorously cooperate in vigilant endeavor for a safe and sound America in a world at peace.

I have the honor to be

Your Representative in Congress,

CLYDE DOYLE.

The Short and Long of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD IRVING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include a speech in reply to the earlier oration of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], that I would have delivered on the floor of the House today, April 6, had it been possible for me, at that late hour, to secure time to do so:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words to the Members of this august body. I do not pretend to have any halos shining over my head nor any wings sprouting from my shoulders, nor can I boast of any fraternity keys or pins, nor any degrees from well-known American colleges or universities, neither do I possess any from the many famous schools of Europe. Neither do I assume the pious role of a moralist that many pretend to cast themselves in and do not live up to. Therefore it was with some temerity that I sought permission to speak out of order this afternoon as did the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I might say, the first time since having been a Member that I have made such a request. Although it is a continuous practice that some Members seem to indulge in. And, might I say, Mr. Speaker, that is about the only way they speak, that is, out of order, hardly do they ever have anything to say or any contribution to make relative to the business before the House at the time of their escapades into the realm of poetry, history, or other various unrelated subjects. The important matters before the House which the taxpayers are paying good money to its representatives and lawmakers to handle as expeditiously and efficiently as possible, are far from their minds. Sometimes methinks their minds are so open that each gust of wind blows clear through them. Somehow I think the spirits must move these people to make such oratorical exhibitions. Many of them have very agile minds and nimble tongues. Makes me think that if their feet and legs were as agile and nimble as their minds and tongues, they would compete nicely with the mountain goat.

Now, of course, I naturally want to refer to the vulgar and dastardly attack the gentleman from Galena, Mo., has seen fit to make upon the city of Kansas City and our great President, Harry Truman. I do not do so because I think that I have to defend Mr. Truman because it has been my observation that he does a pretty good job of defending himself. In fact, as you well know, he usually cracks out with an offensive that has his enemies on the defensive most of the time, much to their displeasure and embarrassment.

However, I think it is pretty cowardly and unprincipled to attempt, by innuendo and insinuation and deceit, to connect the President with the matter the gentleman has so cunningly referred to. Does he not remember Big Bill Thompson of Chicago, its racketeers, gangsters, and killings of a few years back? Has he forgotten the latest exposé of the activities of a nefarious Republican machine operating in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our Constitution, the corruption thereby uncovered, and headlining the newspapers? Can the gentleman remember the stench that arose from the scandals of the Republican Harding regime? Yes, I could go on for hours digging up the ghosts and bones of the past. Let us think of any major city or even a smaller one that does not have a skeleton in its city hall closet. That quite often is one of the stages of our American political life, and so the remarks that I am about to make about the city of Joplin should not be taken as critical of its present citizens or administration, because I know very little about the current situation, nor do I subscribe to the idea that any one period of a particular city's history is very different from that of any other city that has found itself at some period or other in the sooty web of circumstances. Ever in such cases has decency in our public-spirited citizens created a movement of reform so strong and backed by an aroused public opinion, as to banish these evils from their midst. Does he not remember the notorious reputation of the only large city in his district? Can he recall during the days of prohibition that it was a mecca for sinners, an oasis in the desert for those of the tri-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, where even some of the youth of the city were so contaminated that they would borrow the hearse (the sacred vehicle of the dead) to steal and haul beer and whisky for their orgies? I have a little verse which the gentleman might like to memorize as he does so often:

"With oil of tender mercy
The tide of your censure stem;
Has Joplin no scarlet sinnings
Need for itself in winning
The sweetest words the Nazarene ever spoke,
Neither do I condemn."

Does the gentleman fail to perceive the beam in his own eye and that of his city of Joplin while seeing it so plainly in others?

Now, I don't condone lawlessness, not even the feuds of the Ozarks where men take the law into their own hands and shoot each other, much as was done in the case the gentleman describes.

Some of the people the gentleman mentioned I knew not, others I was barely acquainted with, but what concerns me more is the vicious attack he has made upon the President of this great Nation, and for the purpose of correcting this low attack I would like permission to include in my remarks part of a lengthy article that appeared 1 year ago in the Kansas City Star, which gives a brief summation of Mr. Truman's virtues. That was written by one who is considered by many experts as one of the ablest and best newsmen in this country, Mr. Roy Roberts. He spent many years in Washington during the early part of his career, and therefore knows the political situation well, and was, no doubt, intimately acquainted with many Presidents and other high political figures. Mr. Roberts is of the Republican faith, I believe, and could not too well be accused of being biased or prejudiced in Mr. Truman's favor. Thereupon I base my observation that in this article his approach is impartial and honest, as good reporting should be:

"SURE OF COURSE—TRUMAN HAS CONFIDENCE IN HIMSELF AND FEELS THAT PEOPLE ARE SUPPORTING HIM—HOLDS TO HOME TRAITS—RUMORS THAT PRESIDENT HAD TAKEN ON NEW AIRS AFTER ELECTION ARE DISPELLED—LOOK TO NEXT ELECTION—BOTH MAJOR PARTIES ARE PLANNING STRATEGY FOR THE 1950 CONGRESSIONAL RACES

"(By Roy A. Roberts)

"No; there isn't a new Truman sitting in the White House now. Fundamentally he is the same old Harry of back-home days. But there is a new confidence and self-reliance now that he is President in his own right after a miraculous one-man election victory.

That assuredness stands out and it is only natural that it should.

"When the writer was back East—in New York and Washington—for the first time since the election, he sought to get a line on how the President was functioning and how Congress and folks generally were reacting to him. Whispers that he had become cocky and had a bit of swelling in the head are bosh.

"TASK IN STRIDE

"It isn't that at all. Rather, it is a feeling that he is on top of the job, can handle it, and that the people are behind him. There is more assurance in his approach to things. Yet down underneath it is my guess he reacts fundamentally in his decisions and conduct exactly as he did when he was a long-shot possibility for election, at the best.

"You sense a bit of increased dignity, possibly, and a feeling that he is going to take a place in history of some rank yet to be determined. Whatever it is, he wants it to be his own making. In a few words, this is now a Truman administration.

"Physically, the President looks great. His physician says he couldn't be in better shape. Truman went through the most grueling campaign any candidate ever made for the Presidency. He appeared tired and burned out. The two short rests at Key West under the sun brought him right back. He is trim and has a healthy color.

"STILL SHOW STRAIN

"Many of those around him, even though they have had the same rest the President had, are still worn; they haven't bounced back. But not so the President. He has the ability to sleep and relax completely, and that he does. He is still first up in the morning, and wants his walk before most have even begun to think of starting the day.

"While the Blair House is much smaller and not so formal as the White House, the Trumans are said to like it very much and are as comfortable as can be in it, while the White House awaits complete rebuilding."

In conclusion, may I say that, as a new Member who has never before and not long now lived at the expense of the taxpayers, I wish to show due deference and respect to my distinguished colleague, who has been here so long a time, and it is with hesitancy that I suggest that he remember the old saying about "He that casts the first stones," "Glass houses," "The pot calling the kettle black," etc.—a suggestion that it might be wiser and more in the public interests to shine up all the pots and kettles and keep them clean. I feel the gentleman does not want to appear as a cantankerous individual nor as a crusading moral and social reformer, as he might appear, by his castigation of the people of the State of which he claims to be so proud.

Cooperation of Volunteer Firemen Highly Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as you and the other Members of this House know, I have frequently expressed my very deep interest in the volunteer firemen of this country and my personal appreciation of their devotion to duty and unselfish sacrifices on behalf of others.

In the Eightieth Congress and in the present one I have introduced legislation on behalf of volunteer fire companies, and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge again at this point that early and favorable consideration be given to H. R. 1822, which has been referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means and which provides that contributions to volunteer fire companies shall be deductible by the donors for income-tax purposes.

I have before me at this time, Mr. Speaker, an article from the April 5, 1950, issue of the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News. This article was written by my good friend, Mr. William P. Frank, the very able columnist of the Morning News, who is better known throughout Delaware as Bill Frank.

In this column Mr. Frank has written eloquently concerning the importance of volunteer fire companies and stressing their splendid cooperation with the professional paid fire companies. The cooperation which exists between professional and volunteer fire companies and the high regard and real respect which each group has for the other has too frequently been overlooked. Bill Frank has effectively directed attention to this spirit of mutual cooperation and respect which is of such vital importance to the lives and property of those who live in adjoining urban and rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to include as a part of my remarks the splendid article by Mr. Frank, which follows:

FRANKLY SPEAKING

(By Bill Frank)

Operations: Volunteer fire fighting cooperation.

My thoughts this morning are about the volunteer firemen of New Castle County districts who responded to the general alarm in Wilmington on Sunday.

As a resident of a rural area north of Wilmington, I experience a great pride in the contribution the men of the rural districts made to Wilmington.

I also pass along the lavish praise from Fire Chief Morgan, of Wilmington, to the scores of volunteers who dashed away from their homes on that very springlike afternoon—some of them returning home well past midnight, some not until 4 or 5 o'clock Monday morning—and not a few of them drenched to the skin, tired, begrimed with smoke and soot.

And all in the interest of their neighbors in Wilmington.

Actually, at this moment, I feel like getting up and making a speech about rural firemen and their contributions to better living.

And I certainly hope that someone keeps this story in mind when the general assembly meets again and a bill is presented for ample support for volunteer fire companies.

But getting back to Sunday's story—

There seems to be a prearranged agreement between Wilmington and the rural fire companies about what is to be done when and if a general alarm is struck.

As the third alarm is sounded, the telephone operator in the police and fire department begins calling all rural fire companies.

They immediately respond with at least one piece of rolling apparatus and as many men as can be summoned.

Also, according to a prearranged plan, each rural fire company is to go to a certain fire station in Wilmington, there to stand ready in the event another fire of any magnitude develops in any other part of the city.

The plan gets more and more detailed based on any contingency—such as a fire breaking out in a rural area, or another major fire within the city.

Chief Morgan keeps in close touch with the entire situation throughout this very critical period.

Nothing is left to chance and nothing is taken for granted.

So on Sunday afternoon, when the third alarm was sounded, rural fire companies in the immediate vicinity were called.

I hope I haven't omitted any, but as far as I can check there were Claymont, Talleyville, Five Points, Wilmington Manor, Hockessin, Elsmere, Holloway Terrace, Brandywine Hundred, Minquadale, and Newport.

And then there was the Second Alarmers Association of Willow Grove, Pa., that rushed down here with coffee and doughnuts for the firemen. They had heard about the fire on their radio.

Chief Morgan gives a conservative estimate that from 150 to 200 volunteers came into Wilmington—most of them assigned to the fire scene while the others took their posts in the various stations of the city.

For example, one rural fire company sent three pieces of apparatus to Wilmington with a total of 38 men.

On their way to their assigned station, the men passed as close to the fire as possible. Immediately sizing up the crisis, two of the apparatus swung into the fire area while the third kept on going to its prearranged station in another part of Wilmington.

As soon as these volunteers appear at a major fire in Wilmington, they report to the fire department official in charge. On Sunday he was Chief Morgan.

The fire official immediately assigns them to a post and the volunteers do the best they can in getting helmets (if they have left them behind) and other equipment.

They work alongside the Wilmington firemen and willingly subject themselves to the same discipline the Wilmington men are under.

Each man has a sincere admiration and respect for the other. They are both on the scene to do a job—and in the case of last Sunday, they worked together as if they had been drilled as teams for months.

But this city-rural volunteer fire company cooperation is not a one-way proposition.

There is a similar understanding in case a major fire develops in a rural town or district. The Wilmington firemen respond—and they at once put themselves at the service of the chief in charge of fighting a rural blaze.

A friend of mine whose memory goes back a long time says that Sunday's response on the part of the rural firemen was the greatest he has ever known.

And now that the excitement has died down, we may ask ourselves, "Why? What sends a man from his home—from his personal comfort—into an area that's choked with smoke, alive with embers—into a veritable furnace?"

Cynics may say that many rural firemen are just kids at heart—anxious to see a fire.

But I for one refuse to accept that viewpoint. Fun is fun—up to a certain point. When civilians will risk their lives in a volunteer job so that someone else might have a home or so that someone's business might be saved, then it seems to me there is certainly a more lofty drive.

That's why I, as a rural resident, living in a comparatively sparsely settled village in Brandywine Hundred, feel safe because I know there are men all around the countryside ready to help me—if my home is on fire.

Program of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress—Letter From the President of the United States and Address by Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States, dated March 7, 1950, to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 7, 1950.

To the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

It gives me great pleasure to send greetings and congratulations to the fortieth convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The work which you are doing has increased in importance ever since it began at the turn of this century. As our country has grown in material possessions as well as in world leadership, your organization's program has kept pace with our national needs.

The sound development of our land and water resources is a critically important factor in insuring the over-all health and strength of our country. By your work in this vital field you are making an important contribution to the strength of America and the peace of the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the letter of the President, there be printed an address I made to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on Friday, March 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

(Address of Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, to the fortieth convention, Friday, March 24, 1950)

Delegates to the convention, ladies and gentlemen, it now becomes my pleasure and my pleasant duty as your president to make a report, and I shall try to make it comparatively brief, concerning the activities of the Congress during the year since we last met in this room on April 8 and 9, 1949, for our thirty-ninth annual convention. During that time we have witnessed some progress toward our objectives, but, in all fairness, I cannot say that we are speeding toward the attainment of our goals. We have been laboring, and we shall have to continue our efforts, under the handicaps of constantly increasing operating costs of Government, and possibly with declining revenues, and at present at least under a deficit-spending program on the part of our Government.

Now so long as this condition exists we may expect our river resources development program to be retarded. Under these conditions it is highly improbable, if not impossible, that we can soon accelerate the speed of appropriations for construction commensurate with the needs for improvements already developed and those that are now in process and are yet to be authorized by the Congress.

At our last convention we had a number of subjects on our agenda for consideration. Those same subjects are problems for us yet to consider and I shall now enumerate some of those that I consider most important so that we may keep them in mind during our deliberations in this meeting.

(1) Report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

If I may digress from this report, I may say, having served as a member of the Hoover Commission, I think it did a considerable amount of very valuable and constructive work. I did not agree with all of its recommendations. With some, I rather violently disagreed; but that report, insofar as it relates to this rivers and harbors development, flood-control program, according to my judgment, and I believe according to yours, is not constructive but, instead, it is devastating.

That report and the recommendations of the majority of the Commission as related to reorganizations affecting river resources development is of vital importance because in the judgment of your president, who was a member of the Commission and who filed a dissenting report to the majority's findings and recommendations, its proposals would reorganize into disorganization—in fact, would emasculate the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers and do irreparable harm to both our flood control, navigation, and rivers and harbors program and to the Nation.

(2) Federal, regional, or Valley Authority bills introduced in the Eighty-first Congress—which are still pending and which have administration support for their enactment into law.

(3) Ownership of submerged or tidelands;

(4) The necessity, if any, for adoption of a Federal power policy properly recognizing and protecting the interests, rights, and responsibilities of State governments in the field of water resources and power development;

(5) Other water and land development problems such as (a) soil conservation; (b) legislative programs, including the necessary appropriations therefor.

There were others on the agenda at the last session and others at this session of the Congress but I consider those that I have referred to as of the greater importance.

The scorecard on the two legislative proposals in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress affecting rivers and harbors and flood control is about as follows:

1. The civil functions appropriation bill (H. R. 3734) for flood control and rivers and harbors finally approved in the conference report of the two Houses and as approved by the President on October 13, 1949, contained for—

Rivers and harbors	$197,489,690
Flood control	436,930,400
Total	634,420,090

2. Omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill (H. R. 5472), and this is the authorization bill, passed the House August 22, authorizing for—

Rivers and harbors	$119,539,975
Flood Control	995,000,000

This is the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

On October 7 the Senate Public Works Committee after extended hearings on the bill reported the bill to the Senate, recommending the addition of 28 rivers and harbors projects, totaling $108,699,650, and 21 additional flood-control projects in the amount of $338,529,000. On October 17 the Senate approved all of those amendments that had been proposed by the Senate Public Works Committee, but deferred action on final passage of the bill until Congress should reconvene in January of this year.

That bill is still on the calendar of the Senate. I believe we have assurances, at least it is expected that, immediately after the passage of the pending bill, the pending business in the Senate at the present, a bill (I do not have the number of it) known as the Kerr gas bill, as soon as that is disposed of, I understand, our flood control and rivers and harbors authorization bill will be the next matter of business in the Senate, and I am very hopeful that nothing else will intervene. Action on the bill has been delayed for various reasons and we are all very hopeful that nothing will intervene to further delay the final enactment of this measure.

The bill as amended and on the Senate Calendar contains authorizations as follows:

For rivers and harbors	$228,169,625
For flood control	1,336,645,200
Grand total	1,564,814,825

The people of this Nation are apparently becoming more conscious of the need of increasing the tempo of Federal activity in this field of public improvements.

I can testify to that because I am a member of both the Public Works Committee of the Senate, that has jurisdiction over authorization bills of this character, and also a member of the Appropriations Committee where we hear testimony and vote with reference to the immediate need and, in many instances, an emergency need for various projects throughout the Nation. Last year—and the same thing is being repeated this year—there appeared before these committees, before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, many citizens from all over the country, from practically every State in the Union, urging the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to include many projects that are not recommended by the budget but for which they are able to make a convincing case, not only of the immediate need but of their soundness with respect to economy and with respect to the necessity of them, to protect both property and human lives.

To all those who have worked unceasingly for greater development and control of our water resources, we have reason for much encouragement in our efforts. However, while the President's budget recommendations for the 1951 fiscal year are in some respects quite satisfactory, in others they are very disappointing.

The President recommended appropriations for 1951 as follows: For flood control, $556,752,000; rivers and harbors, $240,714,000; or a total of $797,466,000. Those are substantial sums and we are very appreciative and grateful to the President for having the wisdom, in the meeting of his responsibilities to this Nation in the position he occupies, having recognized this need, he has been willing, notwithstanding the fiscal conditions of our Government, to recommend an increase this year over that of last; but it must be borne in mind by all of us that this program has been tremendously retarded for, during the war years it was impossible to carry it on and practically all work of this character was suspended and, therefore, we failed in that period of time, utterly failed, by the very inability to do so, to keep pace with the increasing needs for improvement of this character.

Thus, the President, too, recognizes the growing need and urgency for completion of projects that are now in the course of construction but, in view of fiscal difficulties that have arisen which reflect an operating deficit of $5,500,000,000 for the present fiscal year 1950, and a correspondingly anticipated deficit for 1951 of five billion or more, the

President felt constrained to withhold from his budget any recommendations for appropriations to start construction of new projects that have long been authorized and the need for many of which, are actually in an emergency category.

I know we would like to have those projects constructed. I have a number in my area that are ready and badly needed, but I want to emphasize this morning that we are confronted with a condition with reference to the fiscal affairs of this Government that cannot be disregarded and, with respect to this recommendation, I commend the President for his effort in that instance, at least, to try to hold expenditures down so that we might not run such a heavy deficit. I only wish that he had gone as far in some other directions to reduce expenditures, because I believe it would have contributed to a very much closer balanced budget.

It is perfectly apparent that if this condition continues, this deficit spending, this living beyond our national income, if this continues for another 2 or 3 years, our water resources development programs will suffer greatly and could possibly be indefinitely postponed.

I say that in all seriousness, because there is a feeling in the hearts and the minds of the people of this Nation now that it is dangerous for this Government, in this critical period, to adopt what may become and can easily become a fixed policy of deficit spending.

No one is more aware of the urgent need for economy in Federal expenditures than are the officers of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and I am sure that applies to every delegate here. Your president, as a Member of the United States Senate, is among that group of Congressman and Senators who are often publicly maligned and ridiculed and termed reactionary, because we favor sound fiscal policies on the part of the Federal Government and insist that it should operate under a balanced budget. And as I see the picture, a balanced budget is essential to the carrying on of our public-improvements program because our entire program is subjected to attack when the Federal Government operates by deficit spending. It is, therefore, imperative and in the interest of progress toward our goal that the Congress eliminate every nonessential expenditure possible from the operating cost of the Government and only make expenditures for the most needed essentials. If this is not done, river and harbor and flood-control programs will become the victims of such a policy and will be materially impeded to the extent that desirable and essential progress in this field will be harmfully if not disastrously retarded. It is still our firm conviction that it is true economy and a wise, sound business investment for the Federal Government to spend an adequate amount of public funds in developing the Nation's natural resources and in providing the means to effectively combat the floods that are constantly destroying life and property each year in the various parts of the country, and to construct river projects that enhance the economic opportunities of our people and build a stronger nation in conserved and utilized resources and in productive capacity.

It should be remembered and the people should be made conscious that all such Federal projects authorized by the Congress provide public benefits exceeding their cost. It is well known that the Corps of Army Engineers, in their capacity as consulting engineers for the Congress, definitely lean to the side of conservatism in estimating those benefits and costs and do not include many auxiliary benefits that necessarily flow from such developments which could and should properly be taken into account in arriving at cost-ratio benefits.

REGIONAL OR VALLEY AUTHORITIES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has repeatedly expressed its opposition to legislation creating Federal regional or valley authorities and has supported the program of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and Department of Agriculture for the development of our water and land resources.

We have registered and reaffirmed our opposition to the creation of Federal regional or valley authorities either by legislative act or by Executive order.

We have urged the extension of comprehensive basin-wide research and planning similar to the Pick-Sloan plan now operating in the Missouri Basin to other major basins which present similar problems and opportunities, respecting at all times the rights and desires of each State located in such basin as they may appear.

IRRIGATION-RECLAMATION

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has commended the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior for the progress it has made in reclaiming the arid and semiarid land in the 17 Western States and emphasized the necessity for continued effort. There is increasing need there for additional Federal projects for irrigation to bring all cultivatable lands for which water is available into production for the increasing population of the Western States and to meet our extensive commitments abroad. Adequate funds to provide the many facilities for the varied irrigation needs must be available in consistent annual amounts to enable rapid progress to be made and we have urged that the Congress provide them.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We believe that the prevention of soil erosion as a responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and the closely related major drainage and channel improvement program now conducted by the Corps of Engineers should be accelerated as a beneficial and most important feature in the development and preservation of our natural resources. These programs must outpace the devastation and soil erosion now visiting our fertile slopes and the resulting detrimental effect on the efficiency of our commerce-laden streams. Only then can we be assured of maximum returns from the soil which helped to create this Nation.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

In promoting the orderly development of our land and water resources the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been steadfast in its position that hydroelectric power development at Federal dams should be economically justified and consistent with the necessity for such power. Our position is and has been that such development should be confined, however, to projects located in shortage areas and then only when feasible and as a supplement to existing private supply. Supplemental power from steam plants is questioned as being inconsistent with the "private enterprise" policy which has made our Nation the envy of the world. Unrestricted and unwarranted competition with private power facilities will continue to be opposed.

TIDELANDS

We believe the title to the submerged lands of our Nation should be vested in the States through adequate legislation designed to reserve such submerged lands and the resources therein to the respective States and their people. However, any legislation for this purpose should preserve to the United States the paramount right to continue with improvements for national defense, navigation, flood control, and allied purposes as now authorized and as may be authorized in the future.

REORGANIZATION

Since it was organized at Johns Hopkins University in October 1901, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has never deviated from the position that development and improvement of our rivers, harbors, and water resources can best be planned and executed by the nonpolitical, experienced, conservative Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The Congress has consistently opposed the many efforts which have been made through the years to turn these functions over to a civilian organization, whether it be called a department of public works, a public works administration, or a so-called regional or valley authority.

The latest assault upon the Corps of Army Engineers as the agency of the Congress entrusted with the responsibility and duty of making surveys, estimates, and legislative recommendations, stems from the recommendations of a majority of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. A majority of that Commission recommended that all of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers be transferred to the Department of the Interior. That means that the Bureau of Reclamation would become the prime surveying, investigating, recommending, constructing, and operating agency of the Congress and the Government for all river and harbor, navigation, and flood-control projects throughout this Nation. This recommendation violates the tradition and established practices of the Congress and the Federal Government which have continued for more than 125 years. It disregards and discards all wisdom gained by experience of the most competent, efficient, and constructive agency of the Federal Government. It is purely a grab for power—an attempt to concentrate in one single agency an unprecedented power, both economic and political. This is a vicious proposal. It is the dream of theorists. It is the plotting of planners. It has neither supporting data, statistics, experience, judgment, improved efficiency, economy, nor anything else of merit to recommend it.

This attempt to emasculate the Corps of Engineers and to disorganize the construction and operations of this tremendously vital public-improvement program should be defeated, and I hope you will let your representatives in Congress know that you feel that this proposal, if enacted into law, will result in tremendous harm, not only to your communities where you have a vital stake, but to this great Nation of ours, not only in the destiny of our own lives but in the destiny of civilization.

Much false propaganda is being disseminated by those who have designs upon this important service and function of the Federal Government. I believe there is definitely an organized campaign of false propaganda being disseminated among the people of this Nation in the name of so-called economy and efficiency, to transfer all of the construction functions of the Government into one single agency. We talk about concentration of power. You give to one agency the power over a tremendous part of the purse strings of this Nation and you take both economical and political risks that are not safe in any democracy.

Those of us who are dedicated to the development and conservation of our great natural water resources so that their utilization may be available for the benefit of all of our citizens must get into this fight and refute, repudiate, and counteract the false and deceptive propaganda that is now being disseminated with the premeditated and calculated intent to deceive and mislead the American people for the purpose of consolidating into one agency of Government unprecedented economic, social, and political power.

If the American people can be sufficiently informed of the dangers inherent in this proposal they will demand that such a plan and scheme be rejected.

A bill has already been introduced in the Senate (S. 2833) to carry out the recommendations of the Commission to transfer these functions to the Department of the Interior. That bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman. I wish to give assurances to you and to the people of this Nation that I shall do all in my power to defeat that measure. I give the same assurances with reference to any reorganization plan that the President may submit to the Congress which may have the same objective.

This is not my fight alone, nor that of the Congress alone. It is not just another battle looming in the Congress. It is the fight of the people of this Nation to protect their natural resources against those who would sacrifice efficient service in the interest of the national welfare solely for the purpose of gaining control within themselves of the most vital public-improvement program within the activities of the Federal Government solely in order that there may be concentrated in them and at their disposal unprecedented and dangerous economic and political power.

Congressman PRIEST, in his remarks a while ago, referred to the total expenditures that this Government has made for all time for river and harbor works and their maintenance and for flood control. He gave you the figures with reference to these, but I give you the figures that we have spent for construction only. He included maintenance. For rivers and harbors throughout all time this Government has spent $2,245,000,000. A conservative estimate of the benefits that have flowed from those improvements to the people, economic benefits, throughout the 20 years from 1929 through 1948 is $5,478,000,000, or in that 20-year period the people of this Nation received in economic benefits $2.20 for every dollar the Federal Government has spent in construction of these projects. The same is true in flood control. For all time the Federal Government has spent $2,710,000,000 for the construction of flood-control projects. Estimated benefits, a conservative estimate of benefits, up to 1948 through the same 20-year period amount to $5,600,000,000, or for every dollar the Federal Government has expended for the construction of flood-control projects the people in return have benefited $2.07.

Bear in mind that all these projects are of comparatively new life. They will continue to exist. They will continue to provide these benefits throughout the years. That is my answer to those who charge that this program has failed, that it is inefficient, that it isn't justified. That is my answer to the enemies of this organization and every other group in this Nation who say that this work has not contributed to the building of a stronger Nation.

This does not take into account thousands upon thousands of human lives that have been saved. May I say this to you, that the enemies of this program, those who are demanding today the crucifixion of the Corps of Engineers and the turning over of all of this authority and power to another agency, are not responsible for this progress. That progress was made by people like you, who are willing to give your time, to come to meetings like this, originate programs, try to see that they are sound and get the Congress to authorize them and appropriate money for their construction.

Yes, that is the answer. Do we want to discontinue it? Are you ready to continue to fight for it? I invite you, in your deliberations here, and when you return to your respective communities, bear in mind that there are two dangers today to this internal development program. One is a policy of deficit spending on the part of the Federal Government; as evidence of that see what the House committee did to the President's budget recommended for this purpose. It made an over-all cut the other day of 4 percent on the President's budget, but singled out this program and cut it 25 percent. There is one danger to this program, one of the greatest, for this Government to continue to operate by deficit spending.

And the other is the disorganization of the efficient system that we have built up, and the transferring of these functions to less competent, less experienced hands.

Let us fight to retain this program. I have been charged with being a lobbyist for this group. Well, I am. I am going to lobby on the floor of the Senate; I am going to lobby to the people of this Nation, if by lobbying you mean standing for my convictions and fighting for a program that I believe to be constructive and that will build this Nation strong and powerful to meet the contingencies that arise in the future. Thank you. [Applause.]

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Jackson County Medical Society Weekly Bulletin, Kansas City, Mo., March 11, 1950, entitled "Keep on Calling It What It Is, Doc—It's Socialized Medicine."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP ON CALLING IT WHAT IT IS, DOC—IT'S SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Recently at lunch with a lawyer friend (who gets around and rates in the upper Democrat echelons), the writer was amazed to hear him make this statement.

He explained that in his opinion the American people would never buy socialized medicine, if you doctors will only keep on calling it by its right name. In this respect, our friend agrees with the philosophy expressed by Henry Wallace a good many years ago.

Wallace is reported to have said that neither socialism nor communism will ever come to America unless it arrives under a different label. Many have retorted that Wallace ought to know, as an expert. For he has advocated many measures, somewhat pinko, under other names.

But, for the purposes of this writing, let us not get confused with any side issues. Probably nothing has stung the administration spokesmen to the core more poignantly than the just and accurate accusation that they are sponsoring the socialization of medical care in the United States.

Almost invariably, from the top-drawer mouthpiece on down to the ward heeler, they have vehemently denied this allegation. And, by the same token, it is the truth which hurts them.

Without any attempt to enter the puerile practice of bantering such as: "My dad can lick yours. No; he can't. Yes; he can. No; he can't," we insist on the right and privilege of calling an issue exactly as it is.

When the administration demands a comprehensive health-insurance plan for all our people, that identifies the proposition as a collectivist, regimentation technique. And, if all our banks, all our railroads, all our coal mines, or all our anything, is lumped into a gigantic scheme, it is then socialization, pure and simple.

We have talked with many people, as individuals and in groups, and there is something inherently frightening about the phrase "socialized medicine" which causes the average American a feeling of revulsion. They don't want any part of it. Now (reasons our opponents) if we but pretty up this basic concept, if we but sugar-coat it, and call it "national health insurance," it doesn't sound so bad.

It is on this play of words that the proponents of socialized medicine are staking their claim for effectiveness. They know quite well that the American public is not ready to buy socialized medicine. And, as our lawyer friend advised us, it is necessary as physicians to label it correctly in the eyes and the minds of the American public. It is our duty to keep on calling it what it is: socialized medicine.

Reorganization Plan No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times regarding President Truman's Rorganization Plan No. 1, and a statement prepared in opposition to the plan.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1950]

OPPOSE ABOLITION OF COMPTROLLER—BANKS OF NATION ARE RALLYING AGAINST REORGANIZATION PLAN THAT SPELLS VIRTUAL DOOM—INDEPENDENCE SEEN STAKE—STATE SUPERVISORS JOIN ABA, OTHER ASSOCIATIONS IN FIGHT—HEARINGS DUE THIS WEEK

(By George A. Mooney)

Banks throughout the country are rallying in opposition to President Truman's Reorganization Plan No. 1 which would virtually abolish the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it was learned yesterday. Although the proposal primarily affects national banks, the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, it is understood, has joined with the American Bankers Association, State banking associations and other interested groups in an effort to arouse resistance.

The drive will reach its peak intensity on Tuesday and Wednesday this week when hearings are scheduled to be held before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. Last week the Senate Banking Committee voted to oppose the shift. Also it was reported that Senators H. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Ho-

MER CAPEHART, of Indiana, have both introduced resolutions requesting that the proposal be defeated and the resolutions will be presented at the hearings.

Although this action might have been expected to allay concern, bankers are not relaxing the fight, at least not in this area. Despite the resolutions by the Senators, Arthur T. Roth, president of the Franklin National Bank, of Franklin Square, Long Island, mailed out a 7-page statement to all national banks in an attempt to arouse grassroots opposition to the plan. Urging the banks to make their views known to Congress promptly, Mr. Roth pointed out that unless a legal majority of 49 Senators approves the resolution, the plan will automatically become effective May 11.

During the week also, the New York State Bankers Association issued a broadside to its member banks throughout the State, asking immediate action.

"The American Bankers Association in Washington is exerting every influence at its command to save the independence of the Comptroller's office," the State association wrote. "The ABA adds that it is of grave concern to all banking—this move in Washington is a direct challenge to an independent banking system."

URGED BY HOOVER GROUP

Reorganization Plan No. 1, ostensibly an adaptation of a recommendation of the Hoover Commission, was one of 21 Government reorganization plans which President Truman sent to Congress on March 13. Submitted under the Reorganization Act of 1949, the plan would (a) vest in the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other department officers, employees, and offices; (b) authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to delegate functions to any officer, employee, or office of the Department; (c) establish an administrative Assistant Secretary in the Department.

As presently established, the Comptroller's office has a semi-independent status. Although under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller now reports directly to Congress and the office makes its own recommendations to that body. The Comptroller also enjoys a position of prestige on the same level as the heads of other supervisory authorities, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

There are approximately 5,000 national banks in this country, representing more than 56 percent of all the commercial banking resources of the Nation, and the Comptroller serves as the sponsor of these banks in Washington. Thus, the banks are most anxious that the Comptroller's office be maintained intact. They are not concerned that Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder might absorb the office if given the power, but they are afraid that some future holder of the office might do so.

VIEWS OF SECRETARY

The Secretary, incidentally, when questioned on his views last week was quoted as saying that he did not need any legislation to help him run the Treasury. He added that he "had no further comment at this time."

Perhaps the major concern of the bankers, however, is the fear that the reorganization plan would be a further step toward breaking down the dual banking system, and another move nearer to nationalization. The plan, it is held, might be only the forerunner of an additional reorganization plan which would transfer either to the Board of Governors, or the FDIC, the examining, statistical, and other functions of the Comptroller.

But while presumably intended to permit economies of operation in Government, the plan would not eliminate any of the demands on the public purse, the bankers point out. Actually, the Comptroller's office is entirely self-sustaining and dependent in no way upon appropriations made by Congress or funds supplied by the Treasury Department. Expenses of the office are defrayed exclusively by the assessment on national banks for examinations made by it. The plan, moreover, would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer the funds of the office as well as its records, property and personnel, to carry out other functions of the Treasury Department.

The foregoing are only a sampling of the variety of reasons in opposition to the plan advanced by the bankers. They hasten to explain that they are in full accord with all plans which would reduce Federal expenditures and promote economy, provided they are consistent with efficient operation of the Government. The bankers add, however, that there are many activities, especially those developed in recent years, in which economies can be readily effected. But the Comptroller's office, they assert, has performed an effective function in its semi-independent status for 86 years.

MEMORANDUM: REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 AS APPLIED TO OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The principal powers and functions which would be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury under the plan would be:

Chartering of national banks.

Approval of branch offices.

Approval of consolidations between National banks or State and National banks.

Approval of conversions of State banks into National banks.

Approval of recapitalizations and reorganizations.

Examination and supervision of national banks.

Power to examine nonbanking affiliates of national banks.

Promulgation of rules and regulations relating to investment securities of national banks. (State member banks are also subject to these regulations.)

Interpretation, application, and administration of laws relating to lending and investment powers of national banks.

Power to initiate proceedings to remove officers and directors of national banks for violation of law or continuance of unsafe and unsound banking practices.

Power to initiate court proceedings to forfeit charter of national bank for violation of law.

Power to publish bank's reports of examination in newspaper if bank refuses to conduct sound banking.

Power to levy assessments against shareholders of national banks to restore impairment of capital.

Power to assess fees against national banks for the purpose of covering costs of examinations and to determine the amount thereof.

Control over funds of the Comptroller's office obtained through assessments against national banks for expenses of examination; this would be transferred to the Secretary to be used as he deems appropriate.

Power to determine insolvency of national banks and to appoint a receiver therefor.

Power to appoint a conservator of a national bank.

Duty of Comptroller to serve as a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Many of these powers and functions can, in their exercise, be far reaching in their effect on our economy and must be exercised with sound judgment and caution, free from political pressures.

When Congress, 87 years ago, created the national banking system and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it recognized that such office, clothed with quasi-judicial functions, must be independent. Fresh in the mind of all was the country's experience with the United States Bank, politically dominated, bestowing its favors on some and ruin on others.

Congress, therefore, in order to make the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency a nonpolitical office and to remove it as far as practicable from the influences incident to the quadrennial changes in party or political administration of the Federal Government, fixed the term of the Comptroller at 5 years, and he was required to report annually direct to Congress, instead of to the Secretary of the Treasury, as other department-bureau officers are required to do.

The purpose of this latter requirement was to enable the Comptroller to present to Congress for consideration his independent views and recommendations in regard to the conditions and necessities of the banking interests and currency needs of the country, free from censorship by his official superior, the Secretary of the Treasury.

Thus, Congress made the Comptroller of the Currency somewhat akin to an arm of Congress, just as it did in latter years with the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States.

It is, of course, true that the Comptroller is under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, but a glance at the Comptroller's powers or functions will clearly demonstrate the responsibility placed in him and him alone. Moreover, his office is financed exclusively by fees and charges paid by national banks and not by appropriated funds and if he should be dismissed by the President, the reasons must be reported to the Senate.

Further evidence of the policy of Congress to make the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency independent of the Secretary of the Treasury, even in recent years, can be found in the fact that while originally the Comptroller was appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, Congress in 1935 eliminated the provision for the Secretary's recommendation.

The independence of this office is well illustrated by the opinion rendered to President Taft in 1912 by Attorney General Wickersham when he said: "While the Comptroller is performing quasi-judicial functions, his discretion cannot be controlled by you * * * even though with respect to other duties he acts under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

These safeguards of independence which Congress has for 87 years thrown around the Office of the Comptroller to insure the impartial exercise of the great powers and functions lodged in that office would disappear if Reorganization Plan No. 1 becomes law.

The power of life and death over about 5,000 banks holding more than 50 percent of the banking resources of this country would pass into other less independent hands. Likewise would pass the general supervision and examination of the banks with power to control and shape credit policies which could lead to political domination and control of the money and credit of this country, the business lifeblood of all our communities and citizens.

The potentialities presented should be the concern of all, whether Democrat or Republican, even though one cannot be apprehensive of the actions of the present Secretary of the Treasury if vested with such powers and

functions. But the use of such powers by a future Secretary in such a way as not to be conducive to sound banking or for the general public welfare cannot be assumed. Political considerations are often demanding and the urge to exercise power hard to resist.

A Secretary of the Treasury confronted with the necessity of floating the public debt and clothed with the enumerated powers now vested in the Comptroller of the Currency could enforce a demand for contraction of credit in loans and the heavy investment in Government securities or as was done during the day of the United States Bank, the withdrawal of credit in a section of the country, to its ruin, where its votes were not deemed to be properly cast.

The reorganization plan is not the so-called Hoover plan. It was designed by the Budget Bureau. As applied to the Comptroller of the Currency's office, it can only be assumed that they know not what they do. Certainly none of the five objections for which Congress directed the Commission to submit plans, is involved. There is no limiting of Federal expenditures, since appropriated funds are not expended in carrying on the functions of such office. Likewise, no nonessential or duplicated services are involved or are any executive functions limited. On the contrary, the plan, if put into execution, could lead to confusion, nonefficient and cumbersome administration.

Congress has by grants of final authority and concentration of responsibility placed in one office the supervision of the national banking system.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 inevitably would destroy this invaluable service rendered by the Office of the Comptroller. A Secretary of the Treasury who was so inclined could delegate any of the functions now performed by the Comptroller of the Currency to any other agency or employee of the Department, however ill-equipped or unsuited to perform the particular functions. National bankers who had problems confronting them could rarely discuss them with the Secretary of the Treasury, who would have final authority in making the decisions, because as a Cabinet officer he has so many duties to which he must devote time and attention. The Secretary's complex duties at the present time are such as to prohibit him from giving his personal attention to problems of individual banks. He must confine his activities to making decisions on broad national policies, and there can be no doubt that successful bank supervision demands the closest personal attention of those who are charged with its administration.

A Secretary of the Treasury might distribute the functions of the Comptroller's Office to a number of persons with diverse and even conflicting policies. For example, he could vest the chartering power in one employee, the power to grant branches in another, and different segments of supervision in others, thereby losing the consistency and harmony of policies which have long been dominant factors in molding the national banking system and improving its strength and efficiency.

The national banking system could not long exist on its present high level in the absence of a bureau with the degree of autonomy, authority, and responsibility, the singleness of purpose and the general objectives now embodied in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. That Bureau is the very heart and core of the national banking system, having created all of its units and supervised their growth.

The national bankers of this country look to this compact, single-purposed organization for guidance and leadership, and such a change in its status as would be made by Reorganization Plan No. 1 would cause irreparable damage not only to the national banking system but to all American banking generally. Without that independent bureau around which national banking is built, the unit banks would lose the organization which now binds them into the kind of a system intended by Congress to serve the people and stand as a model for the various State systems.

Furthermore, Reorganization Plan No. 1 would vest in the Secretary of the Treasury the power to take over the funds of the Comptroller's office derived from assessments against national banks and to use them for other purposes. It is assumed that the other purposes would have to be related purposes, but even so, it is highly questionable that funds derived from examination fees paid by national banks should be used for any purposes other than the administration and supervision of the national banking system by an independent agency having the sole responsibility.

At the present time competition between the national banking system and the various State banking systems is on a high plane chiefly because of the relationship between the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the respective State bank supervisory authorities, as well as the relationship between the Comptroller and the other two Federal bank supervisory agencies. All of these relationships would be destroyed because every other agency would assume that the Comptroller could not speak authoritatively with respect to either the national banking system or the functions and policies of his office, since the Secretary of the Treasury would always be in a position (if he had not already delegated the functions to some other employee of the Department) to overrule his positions. Furthermore, these relationships would be seriously impaired by destroying the prestige and authority of the Comptroller and they could not be rebuilt by the Secretary of the Treasury because of the difference between his position as a Cabinet officer and the position of the respective State and Federal bank supervisor authorities.

Since one of the functions of the Comptroller is to serve as a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Secretary would—under this reorganization plan—be a director and vice chairman of that Corporation. By virtue of the prestige of his Cabinet position, he would effectively control the Corporation. Hence, control of two of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies would be concentrated in the hands of the Secretary. Under these circumstances, it is questionable whether the third supervisory agency—the Federal Reserve System—could long remain undominated, if a Secretary of the Treasury were inclined toward complete consolidation, a possibility which is alarming to all of our bankers.

As previously pointed out, the intent of Congress, as indicated by legislation from Lincoln's administration to Franklin D. Roosevelt's, has been to keep the Comptroller's office free from political influence, and up to this time that intent of Congress has been faithfully carried out. It should not now be changed.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum compiled by the staff of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, providing for reorganization of the Department of the Treasury.

As will be noted from the memorandum, resolutions of disapproval have been introduced by Senators ROBERTSON (S. Res. 246) and CAPEHART (S. Res. 247), and hearings are scheduled before the committee beginning tomorrow, April 11.

This memorandum has been prepared with a view to providing Senators who may be interested in this proposal with advance information relative to its provisions and the points at issue. It also indicates the material which was omitted in the reprint of an earlier staff memorandum on plans 1 through 6, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A4243.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
April 7, 1950.

(Staff Memorandum No. 81-2-49)

Subject: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, providing for reorganization within the Department of the Treasury.

This memorandum supplements Staff Memorandum 81-2-40 which discussed plans 1 through 6 as a whole. These six plans centralize scattered functions by transferring to individual department heads "all functions of all other officers of (the department) and all functions of all agencies and employees of such department," except those of hearing examiners, and a few specified Government corporations and boards. The plans tackle "the first and essential step in the search for efficiency and economy by eliminating the present diffusion of authority and confusion of responsibility" in line with the four following numbered recommendations in Hoover Commission Report No. 1 on General Management:

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

"14. Under the President, the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down through every step of the organization and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior.

"16. Department heads must have adequate staff assistance if they are to achieve efficiency and economy in departmental operations.

"18. Each department head should receive from the Congress administrative authority to organize his department. * * *

"20. We recommend that the department head should be given authority to determine the organization within his department."[1]

PROVISIONS AND EFFECT OF PLAN NO. 1

This memorandum develops further those considerations particularly related to plan No. 1, as to which two resolutions of disapproval were introduced on March 31, 1950, by Senators ROBERTSON (S. Res. 246) and CAPEHART (S. Res. 247).

Hearings will be held on these two resolutions on April 11 and 12, 1950. Witnesses will include Senators ROBERTSON and CAPEHART, the Director of the Bureau of the

[1] The information up to this point was included in Staff Memorandum 81-2-40 discussing plans 1-6, but was inadvertently omitted by the printer in the reprint of that memorandum in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. A2443).

Budget, the American Bankers Association, and representatives of other banking groups.

Section 1 of plan No. 1 transfers to the Secretary all functions scattered throughout the Department of the Treasury, except the functions of hearing examiners and except the operations of the Coast Guard which becomes a part of the Navy in time of war or when the President so directs. The three other sections of plan No. 1 authorize the Secretary to delegate functions; to appoint an Administrative Assistant Secretary, with the approval of the President, under the classified civil service at an annual salary of $14,000; and to make those transfers of records, property, personnel, and funds which are required to carry out this plan.

The statutes controlling the Treasury Department lodge most of the departmental functions in its major operating units, and, hence, plan No. 1 would shift to the Secretary the powers now scattered among the (1) Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, (2) Bureau of Internal Revenue, (3) Bureau of Customs, (4) Bureau of Narcotics, (5) Bureau of the Mint, (6) Bureau of Engraving and Printing, (7) Fiscal Service, (8) United States Secret Service, and (9) United States Coast Guard.

Since the opposition to plan No. 1 has centered on the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the following legal citations are limited to the statutory provisions governing his activities, as amended to date (title 12, U. S. Code):

"SECTION 1. There shall be in the Department of the Treasury a bureau charged with the execution of all laws passed by Congress relating to the issue and regulation of a national currency secured by United States bonds and, under the general supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, of all Federal Reserve notes, the chief officer of which bureau shall be called the Comptroller of the Currency, and shall perform his duties under the general directions of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 2. The Comptroller of the Currency shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold office for a term of 5 years unless sooner removed by the President, upon reasons to be communicated by him to the Senate; and he shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 a year." (The provisions of the 1864 statute dealing with Comptroller appointments, also required the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury; this provision was eliminated in 1935.)

VIEWS ON PLAN NO. 1

A total of 547 communications from 39 States dealing with plan No. 1, has been received to date, all except one being in opposition to the plan.

A letter has been received setting forth the views of the Secretary of the Treasury, and will be submitted for the record at the hearing.

The American Banker, banking newspaper, is opposing centralization of Treasury functions because it would detract from the prestige and authority of the self-supporting Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. This old office supervises and controls national banks, especially through regular examinations, meets with the FDIC, and reports to Congress. The newspaper states that few bankers will question the present Secretary of the Treasury * * * since he was, at one time, a national bank examiner [but] future Secretaries of the Treasury might, in effect, virtually end the Office's time-honored functions, and adds that the merger of Treasury and Comptroller legal divisions under Mr. Morgenthau's regime in effect, ended the assumed independence of the Comptroller.

With respect to the latter merger of the legal divisions, of the Treasury Department and of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, it is stated that the establishment of the new Office of General Counsel in the Treasury in 1934 did not change the legal work performed by the Legal Division of the Comptroller's Office. A possible exception to this statement would be that, whereas the legality of all considerations pertinent to the operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency were handled by the legal division of that agency prior to 1934, the statute passed in the latter year would require joint legal work on legal questions of a department-wide scope.

CONCLUSIONS

The basic question before the committee is whether ultimate authority over all Treasury Department functions should be centralized in the Secretary, as is proposed in general in plans 1 to 6. In connection with plan No. 1, however, consideration must also be given to two somewhat conflicting statutory provisions. On the one hand, the statutes specifically authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue general directions to the Comptroller of the Currency. On the other hand, since 1935, they have given the Comptroller the more independent status usually associated with a Presidential appointee; in that year a legislative amendment eliminated the long-time requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury must make recommendations in connection with appointments of Comptrollers.

HERMAN C. LOEFFLER,
Professional Staff Member.

Approved: WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

Cost of the Chrysler Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an Associated Press article from the Washington Post, April 8, 1950, relative to the losses due to the strike at the Chrysler plants. The figures show that today it costs all told better than a billion dollars.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLION IS COST OF CHRYSLER STRIKE TO DATE

DETROIT, April 7.—Direct losses due to the Chrysler strike will pass the $1,000,000,000 mark Monday, April 10, Automotive News asserted today.

The various Chrysler plants have been idle since January 25. The trade paper said that regardless of the outcome of current negotiations it would be impossible for them to reopen next Monday.

Automotive News estimates that through Saturday direct losses growing out of the shut-down will total $994,509,680. Another $20,000,000 it adds, will be lost Monday.

Itemizing the losses, the paper says:

"The $934,509,680 includes the following components: $700,000,000 representing average value of the 350,000 lost cars and trucks; $212,000,000 in lost purchases to Chrysler's 6,500 suppliers; $61,509,680 in lost wages to the 89,000 Chrysler workers, and $21,000,000 in lost wages to the 50,000 idled supplier employees (after unemployment-compensation benefits).

"The $1,000,000,000 Chrysler loss is not an automotive strike record. That distinction is held by the General Motors strike of 1945–46, which lasted for 16 weeks and 1 day and cost directly affected parties $1,457,400,000."

The crucial point is still the method of financing $100-a-month pensions, including Federal social security, for Chrysler workers at age 65 after 25 years of service.

The Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Natural Gas Bill," published in the New York Times on Sunday, April 9. I believe that it is one of the most penetrating discussions I have read of the natural gas bill. It concludes with:

We therefore believe that President Truman should veto the Kerr bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Within a very few days President Truman must decide whether to veto the Kerr bill amending the Natural Gas Act of 1938. This amendment would exempt prices charged by so-called independent producers of natural gas from control of the Federal Power Commission. The practical effect of the bill would be clearly to forestall Federal regulation of companies which by 1952 will produce some 80 percent of the natural gas sold in the United States and which dominate an even higher percentage of America's natural gas reserves.

Congress through the Natural Gas Act of 1933 granted the Federal Power Commission the right, which no one now seriously disputes, to regulate rates charged by pipe-line companies engaged in interstate transportation of natural gas and also in its production. Whether this law permitted the FPC to go one step further back and to regulate independent producers—those who did not engage in transportation of gas—is open to argument. The Supreme Court has said it has that right, but the FPC has disavowed any intention of interpreting the act in so broad a manner. However, this was an administrative decision which can always be revoked. It seems, in fact, likely to be revoked; and it is precisely to forestall such a move that the Kerr bill has been brought forward.

Proponents of the Kerr measure insist that it would do nothing more than reaffirm the original intention of Congress as expressed in the Natural Gas Act. But what Congress may have intended in 1938 is less important than what the facts demand today.

The principal producers of gas are now not the pipe-line companies but the very independents whom the Kerr bill would take out from under any possible Federal control. Who are these independents? There are a few thousand of them, but a mere dozen—including some of the biggest names in the oil business—will soon be producing about half the total amount of natural gas transported from the southwestern fields, where the bulk of the Nation's supply is concentrated.

The crucial point is whether these independents, large or small, are so important and so closely linked with that part of the natural-gas industry which already is indisputably subject to regulation that Federal rate control will become meaningless unless they, too, are regulated. To state the problem in this way is almost to answer it. For under conditions as they actually exist in the industry, once a pipe line (the only practicable cheap method of transporting natural gas) is laid to a field, competition at the source virtually ceases. Pipe lines are too expensive to be laid down and picked up at will, so that a field and the line which it feeds are rather permanently joined. Since it has been found necessary for the Government to regulate rates of the pipe-line companies, it seems inescapable that the Government also be at least in a position to control the rates on gas production with which the pipe lines are indissolubly linked. Dominating the Nation's output as they do, obviously the independents must be subject to Federal regulation if there is to be any effective Federal regulation at all. We therefore believe that President Truman should veto the Kerr bill.

No Excuses for the Kerr Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Excuses for the Kerr Bill," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo., on April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO EXCUSES FOR THE KERR BILL

Supporters for the Kerr natural gas bill think President Truman will sign the gas grab into law. Edward A. Harris reports from Washington that these Congressmen expect the President to offer five explanations for this jolt to the consuming public:

1. Mr. Truman could say the Kerr bill differs from the Moore-Rizley bill which he bitterly opposed. The Moore bill would have allowed rate increases for the entire gas-producing industry, while the Kerr bill would permit increases for producers who control 85 percent of the gas reserves. The distinction is between letting the gas industry cut a whole pie or most of it.

2. The President could note that the Kerr bill was amended to let the Federal Power Commission study gas-production prices. Rate regulation by studies is obvious nonsense.

3. Mr. Truman could stress that gas prices have not risen as have prices of other fuels. Natural gas is a relatively new industry and its efforts at major price increases date only to 1947. But Senator DOUGLAS reported that these prices have doubled or tripled in many recent instances. Shall they continue upward?

4. Mr. Truman could promise new regulatory legislation if gas prices do go up as a result of the Kerr bill. The common phrase for this is locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

5. The President would sign the Kerr bill reluctantly. It would make more sense if he were so reluctant to sign that he would veto the bill instead. The Kerr bill is just the kind of special-interest legislation which the Fair Deal is pledged to oppose. There is no way to excuse it.

Pricing Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which was published in the New York Times of April 10, 1950, under the heading of "Pricing natural gas—Kerr bill said to aid consumer by fostering competition."

The letter was addressed to the editor of the New York Times by Roland F. Beers, head of the department of fuel resources of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N. Y.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICING NATURAL GAS—KERR BILL SAID TO AID CONSUMER BY FOSTERING COMPETITION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is evident that much confusion abounds as to the real meaning of the Kerr amendment to the Natural Gas Act now before the President for signing. It has been reported in the New York Times that the bill passed the Senate and then the House with a majority of but two votes. Since the action by Congress it has been predicted by various sources that the people are to be robbed of their money to pay for the increased prices of gas, that the rich are gouging the poor, and that a few interests have succeeded in putting over a nefarious plot to fill their coffers at the expense of the general public. It may be helpful to point out the factual situation and to quiet the fears of those who may be alarmed.

It is assumed that the purpose of desirable legislation is to encourage the production of abundant quantities of natural gas for long periods of time at prices favorable to those offered by other fuels—e. g., coal and oil. It is the writer's belief that the Kerr bill will accomplish this result.

In order to maintain low consumer prices for natural gas there must be adequate and continuing supplies. The history of the oil and gas industry shows, as a matter of record, that when prices for these commodities are favorable in relation to costs, exploration effort arises which maintains supplies at levels consistent with a satisfactory price structure. So long as there is an adequate reward for the risks of exploration, drilling, production, and recovery, there will be found the venture funds to carry on these hazardous undertakings.

SUBJECT TO REGULATIONS

If the Federal Power Commission assumes control over the price of natural gas at the wellhead, the commodity will, in effect, be subject to two, possibly three, separate sets of regulations: FPC commodity price-control, FPC pipe line rates and State public utility rate controls. It is probable that FPC price control would be based on the net return after taxes, not more than approximately 6 percent, on the computed cost of acquisition. This is the general plan upon which pipe line rates are determined today. The range of acquisition costs is very great.

At the present time the price of natural gas at the wellhead is at an index of 88.3, compared with coal at 108 and oil at 192. It is well to note that the low price for natural gas prevails in the complete absence of price control at this time, and with a market demand many times that of the available supply. If there were adequate supplies of gas at the consuming markets of the Northeast, it is safe to say that gas would quadruple its present volume of consumption in competition with other fuels.

The gas industry is well aware of the possibilities of this great market, and the planning of pipe lines costing hundreds of millions of dollars, operated under the strict regulation of the Federal Power Commission, is contemplated in the face of strong competition of oil and coal. Therefore, the gas industry recognizes full well that these large outlays of capital funds can earn adequate return only on the basis of maintaining a healthy competitive price structure.

Considering these factors together, there is but one logical conclusion as to future practices of gas producers in respect to price. The lack of Federal regulation will not cause them to raise their wellhead prices indiscriminately. If they yield to such temptation, they will sooner or later lose their markets. The natural competition of 5,500 independent gas producers among themselves is the best guarantee in this Nation that consumers will not be gouged of money to fill the pockets of the rich. We cannot say as much for Federal price regulation of other commodities.

DWINDLING RESERVES

Although we now have 180,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas reserves, enough for 30 years at the present rate of consumption, this huge amount will dwindle to 9 years' supply in 1955, when our markets will take 20,000,000,000,000 cubic feet per year. Meanwhile, under the incentive of a fair return on exploration and production costs, programs of exploration will be organized to maintain the Nation's gas reserves at safe levels. It is important to note that the oil industry has kept approximately 13 years' supplies in sight for more than 20 years, due to operation of economic laws involving balance of supply and demand in a competitive field.

There seems slight justification for regulation of the price of mineral fuels at this time unless we wish to go all-out for the specialized state. It is surprising to note the loud clamor of people who imagine the threat of domination by the interests to be at their very doors. If we desire abundant quantities of natural gas at competitive prices, the Kerr bill should become law. It is as simple as that.

ROLAND F. BEERS,
Head, Department of Fuel Resources, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.
TROY, N. Y., *April 5, 1950.*

Way to Cheap Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Way to Cheap Gas," published in the Chicago Daily News of April 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAY TO CHEAP GAS

The Natural Gas Rate Exemption Act passed by Congress and now awaiting action by President Truman offered a prime invitation to demagogy, and its opponents have made the most of it. They have skillfully created the impression that this is a brash grab by greedy interests at the consumers' pocket.

The fact is that the act merely continues the present condition in which the Federal Power Commission does not regulate the price of natural gas sold by independent producers to the pipe-line companies. The FPC had tentatively reached for such authority, and the new law was enacted to clarify the present Natural Gas Act.

Under the present unregulated market, the Bureau of Mines has reported, the price of a million units of heat bought in the form of gas has dropped appreciably in the last 10 years. Bought as coal or oil, the cost of those units has increased sharply. There is good reason to believe that Federal regulation would not, as its advocates assert, cut the price of gas, but, on the contrary, would boost it.

The reason for this is that the independent producers of gas do not have to sell it to the pipeline companies. They have a vast market in concerns which convert natural gas to high octane gasoline and other hydrocarbon products.

Furthermore, the standard regulatory practice of allowing a rate that will return 6 percent on investment is not sufficient to promote the extensive exploration that is required if supplies are to be increased. It is abundant supply that cuts prices.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS was the most voluble and effective spokesman against the bill, which was sponsored by Senator KERR (who happens to be a millionaire gas producer). Senator DOUGLAS likes Government regulation on principle, be it of rents, farm prices, or gas wells.

He made the point that the independent gas producers hold the relation toward the pipe-line companies that the railroads occupy in relation to shippers. That is to say, "Once the railroads are built, local shippers are at their mercy."

The analogy is good, but it doesn't come out as Senator DOUGLAS intended. He is right about the theory of rail regulation. But it overlooks the competition they have by air, highway and water. The plight of the railroads from the character of this regulation is apparent.

Gas, too, must meet competition. Consumers are not going to install gas furnaces unless it makes a clear saving over oil or coal. Senator DOUGLAS made a tearful plea for "12,000,000 housewives who pay for cooking gas with scanty pocketbooks" cowing before the onrush of the octopus.

These housewives might be glad to know that 4 cents would be a generous estimate of the field price of the gas they use in a month's cooking. They might also be glad of the reassurance of Speaker RAYBURN, who is at least as well informed on the subject as Senator DOUGLAS, that the Kerr bill would not increase the price of gas by one red cent.

The Daily News is for low gas prices. We are convinced that the way to have them is to encourage producers to find more gas and to sell it to the pipe lines. Transmission costs drop as volume increases, and the more high-priced manufactured gas that is displaced by natural gas, the greater the saving.

The clamor for regulation has put President Truman in a delicate spot. If he signs the bill he will appear to be siding against bogus, self-annointed "champions of the consumer" within his own party. It is a hard choice for a man who is professionally on the side of more regulation of everything.

He realizes, however, that his Defense Department has approved the Kerr bill, knowing that incentives are required for the exploration that will add to the existing reserves. He realizes, also, that rent control is not producing housing, any more than price control of men's shirts and toilet paper produced those articles, but merely turned manufacture into other items that would yield a profit.

Gas interests are probably no more and no less greedy than any other segment of business. There might be a drive also to exempt from rate regulation those gas supplies which are owned by the pipe-line companies. If it comes it should be defeated. There must be regulation of self-dealing by a public utility.

Finally, the Kerr bill permits the FPC to carry on a continuing investigation of gas prices. If some combination of collusive practices should result in excessive prices, the legislative remedy is at hand.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Could Stronger States Solve Problem?" from the issue of March 16, 1950, of the Northampton Times, published at Cape Charles, Va.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD STRONGER STATES SOLVE PROBLEM?

Without attempting to solve the present political problems facing the people of this country as they contemplate the increasing cost of Government or to decide where Government spending should stop, we call attention to the dangerous practice of deficit spending in times of relatively great prosperity.

If the United States Government cannot reduce its national debt, in the midst of a prosperous era, one wonders whether the debt will ever be reduced. It may be, of course, that the growing wealth of the Nation will enable it, in future years to carry the burden without too much strain. Nevertheless, if the cost of Government continues to go up and governmental expenditures are financed by deficit spending, no one can predict the end.

It is quite apparent, however, that if such a course is pursued by the United States—the kind of government we will have hitherto known—the Government will take over more and more of the responsibility that has formerly attached to individuals. Those with wealth of any kind will be taxed more and more to provide equality of everything for those who have not, for various reasons, earned such equality.

While we are not wise enough to say when such a thing would occur, it is obvious that, at some point, the Government would dominate a completely regimented society.

Discussing this general problem recently, Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, urged a decrease of Federal grants to the States, asserting that if this trend is not discontinued, the States will gradually give up all of their responsibilities and the Federal Government will absorb them. This process has been going on for many years and, in the end, the result will be the one Mr. Farley predicts unless some intelligent effort is made to strengthen the financial position of the States and other local governing units.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there appeared in the Baltimore Sun of this morning the first of a series of four articles by Miss Helen Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine. I am convinced that the story unfolded in this and succeeding articles will be of such vital interest not only to the Members of the Congress, but to the people at large that they should be given the widest possible attention.

Hearings conducted by our Subcommittee on Maritime and Merchant Marine have disclosed a pitiful condition in this once great segment of our national economy. To all intents and purposes the American merchant marine, as the testimony and available data reveal, is rapidly passing from the world scene. Only immediate remedial action along different lines proposed, including S. 2786, which I introduced to interest private capital in the construction and operation of merchant and passenger ships, will save the situation, and assure the ships and the ship workers which our country would need badly in case of a future emergency.

I ask unanimous consent that this morning's article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 10, 1950]

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHT SHIPS IN MERCHANT MARINE; FIVE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN IN 1946

(The following article is the first of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

The American merchant marine—one of the most controversial subjects in Washington and United States seaports for the last 5 years—today consists of 1,208 active ships with a total deadweight tonnage of 14,000,000.

On June 30, 1946, there were 5,387 ships with a deadweight tonnage of 55,100,000 flying the American flag.

In the prewar period, on September 1, 1939, the Stars and Strips waved from 1,379 ships totaling 11,700,000 tons. More than 1,200 of these were active. At that time the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided for the construction of 50 new ships a year, both to replace obsolete ones and to add to the fleet for a 10-year period.

NOTHING DONE TO HALT DECREASE

Today, while the American merchant marine steadily declines—4, 6, 10 ships a month—nothing is being done to halt the decrease.

A Senate subcommittee on maritime matters, headed by Senator O'CONOR and Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington, has been conducting hearings on the status of the merchant marine in conjunction with a long-range bill they have proposed to alleviate the plight of the industry.

They are also attempting to get $25,000,000 in a separate appropriation for the immediate repair of 134 merchant ships, considered to be of the necessary military auxiliary type, in the laid-up fleet.

NO MARITIME BLOC

Neither of these bills is expected to meet with congressional approval unless action to awaken the lawmakers is taken at once, both Senators have said.

One of the principal reasons why the American merchant marine issue has been tossed from pillar to post in the Capitol is that the maritime States do not have—and, apparently, are not interested in—any solid front, such as the silver bloc and the farm bloc, to present and push their case.

The nearest to solid support for the maritime cause comes from the Washington State representatives, all of whom are diligent to get some action. From Maryland, Senator O'CONOR appears to be doing more than the other seven Congressmen combined. Yet the maritime industry is as important to this State as to the northwestern one.

DESIRABILITY WIDELY AGREED

It is agreed that any world power must have an adequate merchant marine. Besides its war usefulness, a merchant fleet is important to the peacetime commerce and economic stability of its nation, as well as playing an important role in international finance, foreign relations, and foreign economics.

Despite this, the number of laid-up ships—in deteriorated condition—in the American national defense reserve fleet has increased to 2,180. Seventy-five others are laid up at piers and temporary anchorages by the lack of cargoes.

Special requests by the Maritime Commission and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to have some of these ships in the reserve fleet in absolute readiness to meet an emergency have gone unheeded.

When the laid-up fleets were designated by Congress at the end of the war, the legislators also ordered that these "dead" ships should be maintained. Not only have they failed to comply with their own mandate but they are refusing to allot the requested $25,000,000 to save $268,000,000 worth of ships—the cost of building only 134.

Not included in the 2,180 figure are 86 ships which this country lent to Russia under the lend-lease program and which have never been returned or accounted for since. With the exception of France, which still has one such craft, Russia is the only nation still charged with lend-lease steamers.

American passenger ships, essential for troop transports, now number 39 privately owned craft with a total gross tonnage of 342,000.

In 1939 there were 117 of 877,300 gross tons.

PASSENGER SHIPS BEING BUILT

Under construction are the United States Lines superliner, two American Export Lines liners for the Mediterranean service, and three for the American President Line to serve round the world.

In prospect are a Diesel-propelled passenger liner for the Mississippi Shipping Co. and two combination passenger-trailer ships for the Los Angeles-San Francisco run.

Arnold Bernstein has requested Maritime Commission permission to buy two P-2 transports and convert them to passenger ships for the New York-Amsterdam-Rotterdam run, not now covered by an American-flag ship. The Commission has authorized issuance of bids to determine the cost of these.

A method of replacing the Moore-McCormack Lines Good Neighbor ships to South America must be worked out by October when their charter on the Government-owned vessels expires.

COASTAL AND INTERCOASTAL

Another phase of the industry sharply affected is the once-important coastwise and intercoastal dry cargo fleets—those which saw the United States through the early days of both world wars. Today they employ 75 to 100 ships. Before the last war there were 409 dry-cargo ships there.

Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, chairman of the Maritime Commission, describes the intercoastal situation as a matter of grave concern.

"We need a domestic fleet to handle a large peacetime volume of coastwise and intercoastal trade," the chairman believes. "In two World Wars, our home fleet has also provided the solid core of vessels operating in our own waters that we required for national security. Let us not forget that it was domestic fleets, transferred to military use, which plugged the gap in 1917 and held the line after Pearl Harbor until we could build a bridge of ships."

WAGES AND CANAL TOLLS

The intercoastal business is affected by seamen's high wages, the high Panama Canal tolls (which the President has proposed to raise even higher) and expensive stevedoring costs.

The average freighter plying between Baltimore and Los Angeles pays $7,000 each time it goes through the Canal. Studies are under way to attempt to lessen the burden of loading and discharging ships.

The status of the American merchant marine is reflected sharply in the shipbuilding and ship-repair yards, whose existence virtually depends on American shipping.

Nine ship-construction and repair yards dating back to the prewar period have had to close down completely because there is no prospect of new building. Repairing has hit rock bottom with the foreign ships having all of their major work done at home.

FOUR YARDS SWITCH JOBS

Four other prominent yards have switched to manufacturing oil-refinery machinery, offset printing presses, paper-making machinery, spinning machines, hydraulic turbines, crushing (ice) and beverage (the coin type) machines.

The beverage-machine manufacturer is the Bath (Maine) Iron Works, a shipyard whose construction history dates back to 1839.

J. M. Willis, head of Baltimore's Bethlehem Steel division, who has been in the business 52 years, calls the situation a "crisis" and describes it as "the most extreme the American shipping world has ever faced."

The Shipbuilders Council of America said the United States must have an absolute minimum of 35,000 to 40,000 men in the private shipbuilding industry to face any emergency.

Today, there are less than 20,000 actually taking checks home each week. Sparrows Point, still the leader in the number of new ships in process and on order, last week ordered an average of 2,600 skilled production workers daily.

A committee appointed by President Truman in 1947 to study the situation declared, "It will be a matter of national concern if the number of men actually engaged in the construction of vessels in private and naval shipyards should drop below 60,000. Every practicable effort should be made so to schedule shipbuilding that the work load in the shipyards may be maintained at a reasonably uniform level."

NUMBER EXPECTED TO DROP

The number of skilled men engaged in private and naval shipyard construction—actual production workers—today is approximately 35,000.

This number is expected to begin dropping more sharply within 2 months and continue until all of the 32 ships now under construction are finished. The last one slated for delivery is the 48,000-ton superliner in April 1952. All the others will be in the hands of their owners by April 1951.

In the ship-repair field, it is recommended that an equal number of skilled repair men be available as new builders.

Commercial ship-repair yards are working about 10,000 production workers a day right now.

COMPARISON WITH 1933 EBB

In Baltimore, considered one of the most important ship-repairing points in the Nation, less than 1,800 men actually worked in the production end the week of March 12.

In 1933, described by the President's committee as the "low ebb of shipbuilding activity," the over-all employment for shipbuilding and repair was about 56,000, of which 34,000 were employed in private yards, both repair and building.

Some 75,000 shipyard workers, who had become skilled and planned to make their livelihood in the yards, have turned to whatever else promises steady work or are drawing unemployment compensation.

DRAFTSMEN TURN ELSEWHERE

Their fear of taking a chance in order to wait for a revival in the shipyard business is illustrated by the 100 draftsmen who were released, but on call, at the Sparrows Point plant about 6 weeks ago.

A week later when Bethlehem needed a number back to help with its own Venezuelan ore-trade building project, only three skilled draftsmen returned. The others had found jobs in more certain industries and were not willing to face a dim future. Sparrows Point shipbuilding is scheduled for a complete shutdown by next March.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936—which enacted the 10-year-50-ships-a-year program and its subsidies—boosted employment in private shipyards to 67,700 in 1939; 97,500 in 1940, and 307,700 in October 1941.

WAR FORCE BUILT ABOUT NUCLEUS

When the shipyards were expanded before and during World War II, they were built around a small skilled nucleus of immigrant workers brought here in the 1920's under relaxed immigration laws from Scotland and England. Most of these men today are retired or dead. One is president of the CIO shipyard workers union.

No nucleus will be available in another year or two at the present rate of decline. Ten years are needed to train a shipyard worker properly.

Besides the unemployed shipyard workers, longshoremen are affected. Also there are some 40,000 seamen on the beaches around the United States waiting for their turn to ship out. Many feel lucky if they receive one trip a year now.

A large number are drawing unemployment compensation.

WORLD TONNAGE 102,007,200

The present world tonnage of vessels over 1,000 gross tons consists of 12,765 ships of 102,007,200 deadweight tons. With 10,000,000 tons on order and allowing for losses and scrapping, the world picture will remain at above 100,000,000 tons. Before the war, it was about 80,600,000.

The United States owns one-third of that tonnage. But the United States has two-thirds of its tonnage laid up in nine "graveyards" along the coasts.

Therefore, the United States—the country which supplied 5,500,000 tons of merchant ships to the Allies during the war in return for 715,000 from them—operates only 9 percent of the world's ships.

No other country has a comparable inactive fleet.

UNITED STATES RATIO TO TOTAL

In 1890, the United States had 8.2 percent of the world's total; 1914, 6.8 percent; 1919–20, 22.2 percent; 1939, 13.9 percent; 1940, 14.1 percent, and 1946, 49.8 percent.

Only 3.1 percent of the present United States fleet consists of ships of 10,000 gross tons or more. The British have 21.8 percent in this category.

Besides facing competition from such traditional maritime nations as Sweden, Norway, Italy, and Great Britain, the United States is being challenged by countries previously possessing little or no shipping.

For instance, Argentina has 225 percent more ships over 1,000 gross tons than in 1939; Brazil, 68; Mexico, 381; Poland, 121; Uruguay, 643. Eire, Iceland, and Switzerland, which had no seagoing fleets in 1939, have a combined fleet of 150,000 deadweight tons.

ALLOWED GERMAN RECOVERY

Germany has been permitted to regain 40 percent of her prewar ship construction capacity. This means she will return practically to her full commercial construction, because before the war 50 percent of her shipbuilding was for navy and defense purposes. Her new ships are limited in speed and to a 7,000-ton capacity.

Right now three German shipping officials are in this country trying to charter larger ships so they might carry their own ECA goods to that country.

Under its program to aid Japan, the United States is spending more than $22,000,000 to build 20 to 30 ships of transocean carriage which will fly the Rising Sun flag.

American builders and operators do not believe that the large vessels will be held just to operations between the Japanese islands. They fear competition on the Pacific sea lanes.

TANKERS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

Of 33 tankers completed in American shipyards last year, 30 are sailing under foreign flags. These are the most modern tankers in the world.

The number of ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet may seem large to an outsider, but many are considered obsolete and too expensive to operate. They were built to fill an emergency.

Of the 46 new passenger ships recommended by President Truman's committee in 1947 as essential to put the American merchant marine up to date and keep the shipbuilding industry alive, 34 are not yet even under consideration. Six are under construction. Six others are in the talking stage.

Socialism as a Threat to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Socialism Held Threat to United States by Whittemore," appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, March 28, 1950. Mr. Whittemore is an outstanding Democrat and businessman and what he has to say has particular significance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALISM HELD THREAT TO UNITED STATES BY WHITTEMORE—HEAD OF BROWN CO. SEES WEALTH OUTPUT ASSAILED

Americans have come to understand in greater numbers that their liberties do not maintain themselves, but must be defended through day-to-day actions, Lawrence F. Whittemore, president of Brown Co., told the forty-seventh annual convention of the National Paper Trade Association at the Waldorf-Astoria yesterday.

Nevertheless, Mr. Whittemore said, a trend toward socialism is continuing in this country which, if intensified, could result in a dictatorship. "You will say there is no danger of this sort of thing in the United States, and I will agree with you as long as business is good, but the minute the economic picture changes, the danger is very great," he declared.

Mr. Whittemore said an attack on wealth production was one of the disturbing phases of the socialistic trend, otherwise illustrated by the growth of government and various measures through which individuals have traded their rights for immediate gain or promises of security. He called the antitrust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. an instance of the war on wealth production, saying that our system was based on competition with freedom of individuals and companies to grow as large and prosperous as was reasonable as long as the public is not penalized.

The approximately 1,000 paper merchants and millmen registered for the paper-trade convention will deal principally at their work sessions with problems of increasing costs which have made it increasingly difficult to handle small orders, William G. Leathers, the association's executive secretary, declared in an interview.

Mr. Leathers said small orders that once could be handled at a profit were now showing a loss and that, unfortunately, these represented a substantial percentage of the merchants' and millmen's total orders. To combat this, the paper trades are giving closer attention to more efficient selling methods, reduction of office work where possible, and the elimination of operations that fail to sell goods or help to control sales.

Volume of business for the trades represented was off in 1949 about 10 percent in dollars from sales achieved in the previous year. This year's business for the paper merchants will probably not be as great as either 1947 or 1948, but generally the prospects are good, according to Mr. Leathers. The industry is sharing with others in serving the needs of a population that has increased markedly in recent years, he pointed out. Paper consumption has risen particularly as a result of new developments in packaging, he said.

Social Security for Hired Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, much interest is being shown among farm organizations and throughout the agricultural States in the question of social-security coverage for hired farm workers. It is interesting that in the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, which have just been concluded, all the major farm organizations appeared to advocate coverage for agricultural labor, as well as spokesmen for many of the agricultural States. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the Farmers Union, and the National Farm Labor Union of the A. F. of L., have all endorsed such coverage.

In view of the interest in this subject, which will soon be before the Senate in connection with consideration of H. R. 6000, I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a series of questions and answers entitled "Social Security for Hired Farm Workers," prepared by the American Public Welfare Association.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HIRED FARM WORKERS
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is the present social-security situation with respect to hired farm workers?

At present agricultural workers, like self-employed farmers, are excluded from the contributory Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. This is the part of social security under which most industrial and commercial workers are now assured cash retirement benefits after 65 or survivors benefits to their dependents if they die. These payments are made to insured persons as a matter of equity right from an insurance fund built up by contributions from covered workers and their employers in contrast to assistance which is paid on an individual means tests basis from general tax funds. Since farm workers have no insurance rights a disproportionate number find themselves in need when they are no longer able to work and must turn to assistance. This is usually satisfactory neither to the worker, who is apt to resent the invasion of his privacy implicit in a means test, nor to the agricultural community which must carry a heavier assistance burden than its urban counterpart.

2. Is there any general recognition that farm workers need the protection of the insurance program?

Coverage of farm workers has been recommended by most authorities who have studied the problem. In particular, the Advisory Council on Social Security appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance, in its report to that committee in 1948, recommended that they be covered. In the words of the advisory council, "the social desirability of extending coverage to these workers has long been a matter of common agreement, and it is now evident that administrative considerations no longer constitute an important barrier to their receiving the protection of the system." Coverage of farm workers has also been recommended by all the major national farm organizations including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the Farmer's Union, and the National Farm Labor Union of the American Federation of Labor.

3. What would be the effect of H. R. 6000, the social-security bill now under consideration in the Congress, on farm workers?

H. R. 6000, the bill to liberalize and extend social security passed by the House last year, greatly increases the social insurance benefit payments, adds permanent and total disability benefits to the program and extends coverage to 11,000,000 workers, but these do not

include farm workers (except for certain border-line workers employed in processing farm products off the farm). The Senate Finance Committee, however, which is now studying H. R. 6000 has heard much testimony urging that they add farm workers to those covered by the bill. The higher benefit level and protection against permanent disability for those covered has tended to sharpen the sense of discriminatory treatment on the part of those excluded, and has therefore increased the demands for broader coverage.

4. Why should farm workers be covered under this insurance program?

Farm workers need social insurance protection as much as any other group; they are just as likely to grow old, to become disabled, or to die and leave their families with no earning power. Because their earnings are generally lower than those of other groups, they are even less able to provide individually for their own security. Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that over 85 percent of all farm workers earned cash wages of less than $1,000 during 1947; and that almost 95 percent earned less than $1,400 in cash. Almost 85 percent of all male employees who worked only on farms earned cash wages of less than $1,400. Moreover, farm workers do not have effective means of providing security for themselves as a group. The employer and union pension plans which are now developing for the industrial worker cannot, of course, be applied to people engaged in farm work. The typical farm worker nowadays has no recourse in time of need but to go on the assistance rolls, which for this very reason must carry an especially heavy burden in rural communities.

5. Is it true that farm workers could be covered without imposing troublesome requirements on the workers and their employers?

The Social Security Administration has indicated that farm workers could be covered without any difficulty. One of the ways this could be done is through the use of the stamp plan. Under this plan the worker would be provided with a stamp book, in which his employer would place special social-security stamps indicating the amount of wages paid. The employer would buy the stamps from the post office or rural mail carrier, and would deduct half the cost of the stamps from the worker's earnings as his share of the contribution. The money value of noncash wages, such as meals and lodging, would be included in the wages reported. The stamp book would be sent to the Social Security Administration, which would credit the worker with the amount of the wages reported.

6. In view of the low wages which farm workers receive, could they afford to pay for old-age and survivors insurance protection?

They cannot afford not to. Contributions are related to earnings, so that ability to pay is taken into account. While benefits are also related to earnings, they are so computed that the lower-paid workers receive greater benefits in proportion to their contributions than do higher-paid workers. In addition, benefits are payable to the dependents of workers, and farm families are customarily larger than city families. It must be remembered, too, that there is no other effective way for farm workers to provide security for themselves. A further point is that from one-third to one-half of all farm workers spend a part of their lives in employment that is now covered under the program. In 1947 about one-quarter of all employees who did farm work also had some nonfarm work. If farm employment is not covered, many of these workers will never become insured despite the contributions they have paid; others will be insured, but the benefits payable to them or to their families will be inadequate because their wages for farm work will not be included in computing the benefit amounts.

7. How much would farm employees pay for this insurance protection?

If farm workers were covered under H. R. 6000, they would pay 2 percent of their annual net earnings during the years 1951 through 1959; farm employers would pay a like amount. Thus a worker earning, say, $1,200 a year would pay $24—or $2 a month—for the next 10 years, for a total of $240 over the 10-year period. After that the rates would increase gradually to a maximum of 3¼ percent in 1970; at that rate the farm worker earning $1,200 would pay $39 a year, or $3.25 a month.

8. What protection would the farm worker get for these contributions?

If he lived to age 65, he would receive a retirement benefit each month; his wife would also receive a monthly benefit at that age; and if there were children under 18 they, too, would get benefits. If the worker died prematurely, a lump sum would be paid to his widow or to the person who paid the funeral expenses, and the widow and young children, or aged dependent parents, would get monthly benefits. H. R. 6000 would also provide for the payment of monthly ins rance benefits to permanently and totally disabled workers, so that the farm worker would receive benefits before age 65 if permanently unable to work. Benefits would not be paid for any month in which the beneficiary earned as much as $50 for covered work.

9. How large would these insurance benefits be?

Under H. R. 6000, if the worker has been covered for 10 years at $1,200 a year he would be eligible at age 65 for benefits of $52 a month. When his wife became 65 the family would get $79 a month. If the worker died after 10 years of coverage at $1,200 and left a widow and one child under 18, the family would receive $79 a month. If there were a child but no widow, the monthly benefit amount would be $39; if there were two children, $65. Benefits would stop when the youngest child attained age 18, but the widow would again be entitled to benefits at $39 a month when she reached 65. In addition, a lump sum amounting to $156 would be paid.

10. How long would the farm worker have to contribute to the insurance program in order to get benefits?

He would be insured for survivor benefits after he had been covered for a year and a half. Under H. R. 6000, he would have to be covered for at least 5 years in most instances before he could get retirement or disability benefits; however, under the "new start" proposal of the Advisory Council he would be insured for retirement benefits after only a year and a half. Where a farm worker has already spent some time in covered employment, this employment will shorten the time he needs to work in the future to become eligible for benefits.

11. Would it be possible to cover migratory workers, tenant farmers, or share croppers under social insurance?

Migratory workers could readily be covered under the stamp-plan method described above. Tenant farmers or share croppers could either be covered as farm workers or self-employed farmers depending on the nature of their arrangement with the farm owner.

12. Does the exclusion of farm workers discriminate against agricultural States?

Yes; because at least a part of the cost of social security for industrial workers is a charge against the cost of production of the things the farm worker buys. Moreover, in agricultural States the major governmental provision for the aged must be made under old-age assistance which is a charge against State and local, as well as Federal tax funds. Thus the farm worker pays for the social security of urban people in the price of things he buys and for rural people in his taxes; the more heavily agricultural the State the greater the pressure on its old-age-assistance program and the greater its economic handicap. There is a parity factor in social security exactly as there is in the question of current income for the farmer or farm worker in his producing years.

Flow of American Secrets to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 30, 1950, inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JORDAN'S TESTIMONY IS VINDICATED

The accumulating evidence substantiating the testimony of Maj. George Racey Jordan concerning the flow of American secrets to Soviet Russia through the base at Great Falls, Mont., makes positively ridiculous the slurs of those wiseacres who tried to discredit this testimony when it was first given.

The latest and most convincing evidence comes from Victor A. Kravchenko, author of I Chose Freedom. Kravchenko was a member of the wartime Soviet Purchasing Commission in the United States, and in that position, he says he packed some of the secret information sent to Russia, such as maps, charts, photostats, and blueprints, into diplomatic pouches for shipment by sea and air. He told the House Un-American Activities Committee that the purchasing commission had orders from Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Mikoyan to find all secret information about the industry of the United States and especially the military industry, including such matters as bombs and other weapons.

Every Soviet diplomat, Kravchenko said, whether Malik in the United Nations or Panyushkin in Washington, has received extensive training along these lines and has had wide experience in such matters. He added further (and this is most important of all) that it was no wonder that they got what they wanted when the administration attitude in Washington was: "Who cares what the Russians get?"

Leon Blum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story

special to the New York Times under date line of Paris, March 30, concerning the death of Leon Blum, former Premier of France. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial from the New York Times dated March 31, an editorial from the Washington Star dated April 2, and an editorial from the Washington Post dated April 1.

Many times during the past year the Republican leadership has accused the European social democrats of being neo-Communists. I believe that the story of the life of Leon Blum is adequate refutation to the political irresponsibility of the Republican leadership. Europe has known no greater defender of the democratic way of life than Leon Blum. The world has had few men in the history of the twentieth century who more valiantly and vigorously battled against Communists and communism than the Socialist leader, Leon Blum. His record of devotion to democratic ideals and principles, his untiring efforts in behalf of human freedom should put at rest for once and for all the false dogma and political misrepresentation of Mr. Guy Gabrielson and his political lieutenants. Every lover of human freedcm should pay silent tribute to the noble work and efforts of this beloved man of France who had the courage to fight against totalitarianism where the battle was hot and militant and the issue was sharply drawn.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

LEON BLUM IS DEAD OF A HEART ATTACK—FORMER PREMIER OF FRANCE, VETERAN SOCIALIST LEADER, STRICKEN IN HIS HOME—AT NATION'S HELM THREE TIMES—FIRST IN OFFICE IN 1936, WHEN POPULAR FRONT WON ELECTION—FOSTERED LABOR GAINS

PARIS, March 30.—Leon Blum, former Premier of France and veteran Socialist leader, died today of a heart attack. He would have been 78 on April 9.

He was stricken in his old country cottage near a hamlet called Jouy-en-Josas, 15 miles from Paris. The cottage stands on a small unfrequented road. From the long oak table he used as a desk, M. Blum had looked over a sloping field, fruit trees and bushes lately bursting into blossom.

In failing strength, he had spent in this quiet retreat, under the constant care of his wife, most of the time since his return from German captivity in 1944.

Though in delicate health, notably since an operation a year ago, M. Blum remained a political leader to the last. He was among the Socialists who met in Paris yesterday to celebrate the progress of the Socialist newspaper, Le Populaire, of which he had remained directeur politique. He telephoned to the newspaper office this morning to ask the latest political news.

In recent months, M. Blum's major task was to hold the Socialist Party together despite an internal split, and in this role he may well prove irreplaceable.

NOTABLES PAY THEIR RESPECT

Soon after M. Blum's death, President Vincent Auriol drove to Jouy-en-Josas to pay his respects, as did Edouard Hérriot, President of the National Assembly; Gaston Monnerville, President of the Advisory Council of the Republic, and other officials and Socialist leaders.

Upon receipt of the news, Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister, informed the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the European nations meeting in Strasbourg, which sent a message to Mme. Blum.

Just before the French National Assembly adjourned as a mark of respect, M. Herriot made a speech in which he said that the quality of M. Blum's mind and the extent of his erudition recalled Jean Léon Jaurès, Socialist leader of the latter part of the last century, who was shot in 1914. Leaders of the other parties also paid tribute to M. Blum—except the Communists, whose official manifestoes had called him a traitor.

In March 1946 M. Blum went to Washington and negotiated credits aggregating $1,400,000,000, the largest France has received at one time since the war, not excluding those under the Marshall plan.

M. Blum's political fame rests chiefly on the improvement of the wage earners' lot through collective bargaining, paid holidays, and the 40-hour week during his premiership in 1936. The last article he wrote for Le Populaire contended that wages were too low in France because industry was badly organized.

Those who knew M. Blum will think of him as an exponent of a revolutionary philosophy who remained moderate and tenaciously democratic in its application. In him were combined a brilliant intellect and a passion for social justice. Both were expressed in his newspaper articles, written in the most lucid of styles. His gentle temperament and his quiet appeal to reason differentiated him more and more sharply from some Socialists, and especially from the Communists, who were his political allies in 1936.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS PAYS TRIBUTE

STRASBOURG, France, March 30.—The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe suspended its meeting here for half an hour today on receipt of news of the death of M. Blum. The Ministers paid homage to the memory of M. Blum and dispatched a message of sympathy to his family before resuming their work.

SOCIAL JUSTICE HIS PASSION

Leon Blum was a great idealist in French politics. His passion for social justice took him from the Paris literary salons in the 1890's to become Socialist Premier of France and prime mover of one of the most controversial social experiments of all time.

In 1936 M. Blum headed the first popular front government of Radicals, Socialists, and Communists. Supporters of the ideals of this movement said that it carried forward the will of the French people for long-overdue social reforms. Its antagonists said that it paralyzed French industry, fostered communism, and ruined France's arms production and morale at a moment when Hitler was mustering a united and toiling Germany to launch the blow that laid France low in 1940.

M. Blum's honest idealism never was questioned. His good judgment was challenged frequently, even after his courageous conduct during the Second World War had reinstated him in the hearts of all but a handful of his political enemies.

Leon Blum was born in Paris on April 9, 1872, in a quarter that still echoed with the bloody Communard uprising of a year earlier. He was the son of a well-to-do Jewish lace and ribbon merchant, and grew up much under the influence of a grandmother whose revolutionary fervor was such as to acquire for her the nickname of "La Communarde."

He associated with such brilliant literary figures as Marcel Proust, Pierre Louys, and Anatole France and contributed to the little advance-guard magazines. He was an inveterate first nighter and a bit of a dandy, and his dramatic criticisms were regarded as among the best of the time.

M. Blum was a Socialist when he was 17. His liberalism was tempered in the fires of the Dreyfus affair. Jean Jures, the Socialist leader who was assassinated at the outbreak of the First World War, was the greatest influence in his life after his militant grandmother.

During part of the First World War, M. Blum was executive secretary to Marcel Sembat, Socialist leader and Minister of Public Works. In 1919 M. Blum was elected chairman of the executive board of the Socialist Party and successfully stood for the Chamber of Deputies from a Paris division.

In 1921 he was leader of the dissident group of the Socialist Party—the group opposing affiliation with the Third International. The militant "right" was the most powerful force in French politics. Organizations of uniformed men such as the Croix de Feu sought to dominate the streets and the various elements of the "left" began to draw together for their protection.

On February 12, 1924, M. Blum and his one-time enemy, Marcel Cachin, Communist leader, spoke from the same platform, and the "popular front" was born. The hatred of the "right" extremists for M. Blum mounted, and on February 13, 1935, the scholarly intellectual was attacked and badly beaten by "rightist" hoodlums.

VICTORY FOR "POPULAR FRONT"

The "left" won an overwhelming victory on April 26 and May 3, 1936, in the general elections. The Communists held 82 seats in the new Chamber of Deputies as against 10 in the previous Chamber, and the Radicals, who had lost some strength, could contribute 159 seats. The regular Socialist group of M. Blum, together with various Socialist splinter groups, gave the "popular front" 334 seats out of 618, with scattered support among other groups of the moderate "left." The parties making up the "popular front" never had anything approaching a clear majority of the popular vote, however.

Leon Blum became Premier on June 4, and by the end of the month 12,142 sit-down strikes, involving 1,830,936 strikers, were on record. A new flag, the French tricolors with a red field and the hammer and sickle, appeared over some struck factories.

M. Blum laid before the Chamber of Deputies bills prescribing the 40-hour week, vacations with pay, the nationalization of the armament industries, the reform of the Bank of France, and the establishment of a board to control bread prices, and many other sweeping reforms.

The proposals were almost all approved, and the basis of an entirely new social structure was enacted into law in a few days. M. Blum insisted that he sought to reform the capitalist system without destroying it. This alienated his Communist supporters, who wanted the capitalist system liquidated at once.

The first Popular Front Government foundered on the rocks of finance, just like many French Governments before and since. M. Blum had consented to a devaluation of the franc on October 1, 1936, somewhat against his will, and on June 21, 1937, he was forced to go before the senate to seek authority to set up a financial dictatorship, which was refused. In the early morning hours of June 21, M. Blum resigned, and the first Popular Front Government came to an end.

The ensuing Government of Camille Chautemps was called a Popular Front Government, and M. Blum took part in it and was again called to form a government on March 13, 1938. This time his government lasted less than a month, and he was succeeded by the government of Edouard Daladier, Radical.

During his terms as Premier, M. Blum tried to steer a neutral course in the Spanish Civil

War, which began in July 1936. He withheld open French aid to the Spanish Government, and when this Government was defeated, M. Blum was severely criticized by many who had supported him in the Popular Front.

ON TRIAL BY VICHYITES

M. Blum was placed on trial by the Vichy Government at Riom on February 19, 1942, on charges of "betrayal of the duties of his charges." On trial with him were M. Daladier, Gen. Maurice Gustave Gamelin, Guy La Chambre, Minister for Air in M. Daladier's cabinet, and Pierre Jacomet, General Secretary of the War Ministry under M. Daladier.

M. Blum was a prisoner in Germany when the war was drawing toward a close, and was freed by the Eighty-third Division of the United States Army.

Factionalism had greatly weakened the French Socialist Party. Many of its left-wing members had gone over to the Communists, while a considerable number of its more conservative adherents had joined the ranks of the Popular Republican Party or another of the moderate groups.

On December 12, 1946, M. Blum became Premier for the third time. It was understood that his government was to be an interim affair, and on January 27, 1947, he retired in favor of Paul Ramadier, another old-line Socialist. In November 1947 he narrowly missed being Premier once more. He lost by a handful of votes when the Communists refused to support him.

[From the New York Times of March 31, 1950]

LEON BLUM

Leon Blum was a figure whose great career dealt so closely with modern events that one cannot think of a period since the First World War in which he did not play a prominent part. It was inevitable that his role should have been controversial and that it should have had its ups and downs, its strengths and weaknesses. Historians will have a rich field for study and comment. The inter-war period was not M. Blum's best because it saw him forced to compromise his beliefs and ideals in order to play a positive role in coalition governments. It was Leon Blum's popular front government that joined the British in the nonintervention policy which spelled the doom of the Spanish Loyalists in the Civil War. However, it was also Leon Blum, who stood up so bravely against the victorious Germans at the Riom trial, and in subsequent internment during the Second World War.

His record since the war ended was a wholly admirable one of wise statesmanship and moderation. That France has been able to keep the middle road in these desperate years was due as much to M. Blum as to any French statesman. The best measure of his greatness is that he now leaves a void that cannot be filled. France has suffered a real loss in his passing.

[From the Washington Star of April 2, 1950]

LEON BLUM

Leon Blum became a politician by accident. At the start of the Dreyfus affair in the autumn of 1894 he was a young boulevard literary man without an ideal of any sort in his head unless it was that of writing French attractively. But his Jewish ancestry was a force in his nature, and it drove him into active defense of a fellow-Jew attacked by anti-Semites. The struggle ending in Dreyfus' vindication taught the future premier much. It brought him into close association with Jean Jaures, and that contact made him a Socialist.

But the variety of socialism which he adopted was a philosopher's brand. M. Blum tried to be a rational revolutionary. The Marxist doctrine was too rigid for him to accept without reservation. He attempted a middle-of-the-road course. This endeavor inevitably involved him in difficulties with both the extreme left and the extreme right. By 1924 he was head of his own party, editor of its paper, and the spokesman in those positions of millions of French workers. To gain control of the government he joined with Marcel Cachin, the Communist, in developing the first popular front. The union was unrealistic and lasted little more than a year. But momentarily it did turn France upside down. The good and the evil it accomplished probably will be debated for decades. If it actually democratized French industry, it also weakened the national security of France. The number of sit-down strikes in 1936 reached a total exceeding 12,000.

Twice subsequently M. Blum was called to head a national administration. He was Premier for a few weeks in 1938 and again in 1946. Meanwhile, he had been tried by the Vichy regime at Rion, where his eloquent defense of himself embarrassed both Petain and Hitler and in consequence he was neither convicted nor acquitted but merely held a prisoner. On the eve of his death at 77 he was once more a literary man, writing beautiful French. Washington remembers him as it saw him 4 years ago—a scholar striving to be dynamic, a patriot trying to be rationalistic, a European desperately hoping to survive as such in an age seemingly moving toward universal mediocrity and frustration. He had contributed to the debacle, but so had practically every other leader of his generation.

[From the Washington Post of April 1, 1950]

LEON BLUM

The great figures of the Third Republic combined the profession of letters with that of politics, and Leon Blum, dead at 77, was one of the most glittering stars of the constellation. A boulevardier in his youth, with an ample private income at his disposal, he wrote poetry, dramatic criticism, essays, and books, and seems at the same time to have held down a job as a civil servant. Withal, he flitted from salon to salon clad wholly in black, from his broad-brimmed hat and loose-string tie, and contributed to the bohemian circles of Paris a conversation that is said to have sparkled with wit and to have been couched in a language as pure as any in France.

It seems to have been the Dreyfus case at the end of the nineteenth century that thrust Blum into public affairs. He felt the case as a humanitarian even more than as a Jew, and his polemics rate high in the literature of that celebrated episode. Having taken the plunge, he found his place in public life by the side of Jean Jaures, the father of the Socialist Party, and he led that party through the split with communism, then into collaboration in two prewar popular-front cabinets. He put through social reforms, but at the expense of total neglect of France's defense; yet Blum redeemed his reputation while he was a prisoner in Germany and by his brilliant conduct of his defense at the Riom trials.

Blum was a man of thought more than a man of action, and his spiritual home, as Lania says in his Nine Lives of Europe, would have been in a two and one-half international, or one between the second and third internationals. This effort to reconcile the irreconcilable reappeared in his postwar advocacy of a third force. By that time the world issue had become not one between capitalism and communism, but between freedom and slavery, and there is no middle ground between these two. Yet the cause to which Blum of recent times gave his powerful talents was clear-cut and authentic; he was one of the stalwarts of the European movement. In this respect he had little kinship with the nationalism of more doctrinaire socialists in Britain, but then, there was nothing provincial or narrow-minded in Leon Blum. He had a cosmopolitan culture, a fealty to the European system, and a fierce loyalty to moral values which made him a great humanist.

Acceptance of New Mundt Bill Shows Public Understands Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acceptance of New Mundt Bill Shows Public Understands Reds," published in the Omaha World-Herald of recent date. The editorial gives the reasons why the so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Johnson bill to control subversive activities, should be reported for favorable action by the United States Senate at an early date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE OF NEW MUNDT BILL SHOWS PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS REDS

Two years ago the Mundt-Nixon bill was a burning issue.

New Dealers and the pinkish fringe were opposed to this anti-Communist legislation almost to a man. So were a number of other people who wanted communism curbed but thought the Mundt-Nixon bill was unworkable or unwise. Governor Dewey and Harold Stassen debated it publicly, Mr. Dewey making a formidable defense of the then fairly popular view that special legislation to expose Communists was unnecessary.

The bill had passed the House, 319 to 58, when the controversy reached fever pitch. It died in the Senate, never came to a vote.

TODAY IT'S DIFFERENT

Today the attitude is different.

The Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill to register Communists is much like the Mundt-Nixon bill. Senator MUNDT has held tenaciously to his purpose, argued steadily for his bill, revised it. tempered it, and finally won over the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously except for Senator LANGER, the North Dakota maverick. The new Mundt bill, backed almost solidly by Senate Republicans and by a cross section of Democrats that includes New Dealers KEFAUVER, GRAHAM, and KILGORE, is conceded an excellent chance of becoming law.

Some of the credit is due to the persistence and the persuasive powers of Mr. MUNDT. However, circumstances have helped a great deal. The Communist conspiracy trials, the Hiss and Coplon cases have convinced most Americans that communism can be fought successfully in the courts. And they are now aware that good, reasonable, enforceable laws are needed to counter the Communist conspiracy. The improved Mundt bill has the makings of such a law.

The purpose of the Mundt bill is exposure. It would recognize frankly that the Com-

munist Party is not a political party like the Republicans or the Democrats or even the Socialists, but an agency of Soviet Russia. Communists would have to register with the Attorney General. Communists would be barred from appointive Federal jobs and denied passports for foreign travel.

COMMUNISTS APART

If it is argued that the Mundt bill sets the Communists apart, it can be argued equally that the Communist has set himself apart by joining a world-wide conspiracy that threatens free American institutions. The Mundt bill would not outlaw the Communist Party and it would prohibit none of the lawful political activity which the Communists claim is their only purpose. But it would make it more difficult for Communists to carry on their conspiracy. It would provide the courts with a useful tool.

The fact that the new Mundt bill has made so much progress with so little fanfare shows how American thinking has changed since 1948. It is evidence that the people and their representatives in Congress do not propose to sit idly by while the Communist conspiracy, masquerading as a harmless political party, tries to undermine and destroy.

New York County Lawyers' Association Opposes H. R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my own opposition, the strong minority report filed by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the equally adverse attitude of the American Jewish Congress and of the leading immigration lawyers to H. R. 10, a bill which would permit the Attorney General to imprison aliens for no crime and without court proceeding and would take the Immigration and Naturalization Service out from under the Administrative Procedure Act, are all well known.

You can imagine my gratification, therefore, when I received in the mail a communication from Mr. W. Houston Kenyon, Jr., chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the New York County Lawyers' Association, informing me that the committee on American citizenship had adversely reported H. R. 10 after due consideration.

This is tantamount to adverse recommendation by the association and in all probability reflects the opinion of all the principal lawyers' associations in metropolitan New York.

Under leave, and in the hope that the adverse resolution will come to the attention of all Members, I am inserting the letter from Mr. Kenyon and the resolution in the RECORD.

NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find copy of report adopted by the committee on American citizenship of the New York County Lawyers' Association.

Very truly yours,
W. HOUSTON KENYON, Jr.,
Chairman of Committee on Federal Legislation.

HOUSE BILL 10

NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION,
February 17, 1950.

The committee on American citizenship having considered H. R. 10 respectfully reports as follows:

The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. SAM HOBBS of Alabama on January 3, 1949, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The salient features of the bill are: (1) to permit the deportation of an alien to any nation which is willing to accept such alien into its territory; (2) pending final determination of the deportability of any alien taken into custody under warrant of the Attorney General, such alien may be continued in custody; (3) pending actual deportation, any alien may be transported to a place of detention designated by the Attorney General and there detained, though not at hard labor; (4) should any alien who has previously departed from the United States pursuant to this law, return unlawfully to the United States, the original warrant of deportation is to be considered reinstated and he is to be proceeded against without the commencement of new deportation proceedings; (5) the validity of detention may be inquired into by writ of habeas corpus; and (6) making inapplicable certain provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1004 et seq.) and the Declaratory Judgment Act of 1934, as amended (28 U. S. C. 400) to the provsions of this act or to any law relating to the immigration, exclusion, expulsion or regisration of aliens, or to the nationality or naturalization laws of the United States; nor should the provisions of section 503 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (8 U. S. C. 903) be applicable in any case which involves a determination of the right of a person to be admitted or to remain in the United States under the provisions of any of the immediately foregoing described laws.

On August 4, 1949, a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably on this legislation and recommended that the bill do pass (Rept. No. 1192). Minority views, however, were recorded by Congressman CELLER and GORSKI. The majority of the Committee on the Judiciary struck out the bill as advocated by Mr. HOBBS and rewrote same with amendments. There appears to be no material change in the rewritten bill, with the exception that a provision has been inserted depriving any court of jurisdiction to release on bond or otherwise any alien detained under any provision of law relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens at any time prior to a decision of a court in his favor which is not subject to further judicial reviews.

Your committee has adopted the views expressed in the minority report. However, the said minority report makes no mention of subdivision (g) of section 4 which was inserted by the committee. As stated above, this subdivision ousts any court of jurisdiction to release on bond or otherwise any alien detained under any provision of law relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens at any time prior to a decision of a court in his favor which is not subject to further judicial reviews. This means that it may be only the Supreme Court of the United States, on appeal, that would have final authority to release an alien from detention, under the proposed legislation, in a habeas corpus proceeding. This is the only proceeding available to an alien, because other remedies that he may now have under any of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, Declaratory Judgment Act, or under the Nationality Act would not be available to him. Your committee deplores that fact that it is sought to take out the Immigration and Naturalization Service from the classes of agencies within the scope of the Administrative Procedure Act. The author of this act, Senator MCCARRAN, referred to it as "a comprehensive charter of private liberty and solemn undertaking of official fairness." It was entitled "An act to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure." It was widely acclaimed as an advance in democratic government. Its main features were separation of powers in adjudicatory matters, procedural requirements in regard to hearings and decisions, and for judicial review. All of these are done away with under the proposed legislation. If this proposed legislation is enacted into law, there will be lodged with the officers in the Immigration and Naturalization Service autocratic power over aliens without the judicial branch of the Government to act as a check on its activities, save the meager relief of an inquiry by habeas corpus, which reviews the legality of detention and not the merits of the case.

Any law which denies to an alien any right to the type of hearing and judicial review contemplated by the Administrative Procedure Act and any law which may deny an alien his liberty until the Supreme Court has spoken, is repugnant to our concept of due process, particularly when we consider that the average alien has not the financial means to take his cause to the highest Court. Moreover, there is no reason to deprive an alien, whose liberty is at stake, from the benefits of the Administrative Procedure Act and other remedial legislation, when such benefits are available where property rights are involved.

For the foregoing reasons, your committee respectfully reports that it opposes the enactment of H. R. 10 as it now stands.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

Dr. Charles R. Drew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 1 Dr. Charles Drew, an outstanding Negro physician and a member of our District of Columbia community, was killed in an automobile accident. Dr. Drew was a pioneer in the field of blood plasma and as a result of his brilliant research in that field saved thousands of British and American lives during the war. In 1943 he won the Spingarn medal for "the highest and noblest achievement by an American Negro." In 1940 he was awarded a doctorate in medical science by Columbia University and was most recently professor of surgery at Howard University and chief surgeon at Freedmen's Hospital.

Dr. Drew's tragic accident is a profound loss to the whole American community. It is fitting that we in the Senate of the United States give his achievements due recognition and express to

his family, to his friends and to the members of the Negro race our sorrow at the loss of this great American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Dr. Drew which appeared in the Washington Post for April 6, 1950, as well as the obituary notice of his death, which appeared in the April 2 issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 6, 1950]

CHARLES R. DREW

Dr. Charles R. Drew, whose life was snuffed out in its early maturity by an automobile accident on Saturday, was among the most gifted of American surgeons. He chose to devote his gifts to the advancement of medicine rather than to the advancement of a personal career or to winning the monetary rewards that were easily within his reach. In particular, he devoted his gifts to the training of young Negro surgeons desperately needed for the medical care of their race. It is said that more than half of the Negro surgeons who have been certified by the American Board of Surgery were trained by Dr. Drew, himself the first Negro to serve as an examiner on the board.

A native of Washington and a graduate of Amherst College and of the McGill University Medical School at Montreal, he came to Howard University as an instructor in pathology and an assistant in surgery in 1935. Subsequently, he was awarded a Rockefeller fellowship in surgery at Columbia University. Since 1941, he has been professor of surgery at Howard and for several years past has served also as chief surgeon at Freedmen's Hospital. The Spingarn Medal was awarded to him in 1943 for the highest and noblest achievement by an American Negro during the preceding year or years. He worked ardently to enlarge the meager opportunities for Negro doctors to receive training in American medical schools and hospitals. He will be missed, however, not alone by his own race but by his whole profession and by men everywhere who value scientific devotion and integrity.

[From the New York Times of April 2, 1950]

Born in Washington, D. C., Dr. Drew was graduated from Amherst in 1926, the year in which he won the National Junior Amateur Athletic Union championship in the high hurdles. At McGill University, Montreal, where he received the degrees of M. D. and Master of Surgery in 1933, he not only won first prize in physiological anatomy and obtained the Rosenwald Fellowship in medicine but was the all-time high scorer in Canadian intercollegiate track competition.

After an interval on the faculty of Howard University he studied at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, at the same time serving as a resident in surgery at the Presbyterian Hospital and in 1940 was awarded a Doctorate in Medical Science.

Early in the Second World War, when it was decided by the Blood Transfusion Association to investigate the possibility of aiding the Allies by shipping plasma to Europe, a planning committee was formed, consisting of Dr. E. H. L. Corwin, Dr. John Scudder, and Dr. Drew, who had already done brilliant research in blood plasma with Dr. Scudder at the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

On October 1, 1940, in answer to the urgent call from the British Dr. Drew was appointed full-time medical director of the plasma project for Great Britain. This project, which functioned at the Presbyterian Hospital, ended in 1941. The American Red Cross then decided to set up blood-donor stations to collect plasma for the American armed forces. Dr. Drew was appointed the first director of the new project and set up the first collection unit. Three months later, when the work was in successful operation, he resigned to take the chair of surgery at Howard University.

Unbiased Investigation Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H., entitled "Unbiased Investigation Necessary," written by Mr. James P. Lynch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNBIASED INVESTIGATION NECESSARY

(By James P. Lynch)

What a price we have to pay for plain stupidity. This great Nation of ours, due to our political clowns, has been turned into the laughing stock of the world practically overnight. We boast of leadership yet by our very actions we lack it. We have seen leadership transformed from greatness to confusion and misgiving.

If ever in the history of the United States there was a dire need for leaders in Washington, then it is today. By our performances we have proven to the world that the mad scramble for political control is jeopardizing the future security of the Nation.

This is no time for business leaders to sit back and watch the men of Washington act like circus performers. This is the time for the executives of industry to be willing to sacrifice personal gains in private business and take a foothold in running the affairs of the Nation. They must come out of the shell of private enterprise and plan the destiny of a greater America.

Many of the politicians at the Nation's Capitol have proven that they are not capable of the position entrusted in them by the people of the Nation. It is time the people voted them out of office so the country will not be subjected to a continuance of such foolish tactics.

We pay our servants in Washington good salaries. Yet today, in actual dollars and cents, the results of our expenditures for such representation is a disgrace to the people of the Nation. Our dollar is worth a trifle of what it was worth years ago. By the same token we are not receiving full value from our politicians. In fact, our return from these public servants is so low that it resembles a bankrupt dollar.

How much longer will the people tolerate these stupid actions? This fall, some office holders will be retired for the good of the Nation. They will retire on a pension fund that they voted for themselves. But the fall is still many months away. The continuance of such unforgivable representation will only tend to lower the degree of respect other nations have for us.

How does one expect the people of foreign nations to understand our political maneuverings in Washington when the people of the United States have a difficult time figuring them out.

We feel that such a committee would serve the people better because the Democrats have proven by their actions on Monday in the Senate that they prefer to prevent any outright probe. For example, our senior Senator attempted to gain the floor to deliver a speech shortly after the Senate convened at noon. It was nearly 7 o'clock before he was able to accomplish this. Even when BRIDGES tried to address this body after being attacked by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, he was denied the opportunity.

BRIDGES denounced such tactics by stating: "It is rather unheard of that a Senator cannot obtain the floor to speak on a situation of that kind. I have been in the Senate nearly 14 years, and I expect to be here many more years, and I do not intend to be walked on, trod on, jumped on, or imposed upon. In the weeks, months, and years to come we are going to have fair play, or many in this body are going to know the reason why."

He continued: "I believe it is time that someone stands up in this Chamber and asks some questions. They are questions which are formed by the lips of the vast majority of the people of the United States."

BRIDGES denounced the actions of Acheson. He described the latter as playing on the fervent yearning of our people for peace.

Our Senator showed that there is a dire need for an investigation of the State Department.

"Our Department of State," BRIDGES remarked, "has fallen into a condition unparalleled in the Nation's history. That all of us in the Chamber know. But we are not alone in that knowledge. Stalin knows it. And, thank God, the American people know it."

He explained that is the reason why the various Senators are receiving letters demanding that the State Department be liberated from the Communists, and the commie sympathizers, the fellow travelers, the Socialists, the homosexuals, and the just plain incompetents who have brought it so low in the Nation's esteem.

BRIDGES emphasized: "The public is alarmed, and rightly alarmed. After all, confessed and proved spies and traitors have been found in the high policy-making echelons on the State Department."

He pointed out how by the Department's own count, some 91 homosexuals, every one a logical target for exploitation and blackmail by spies, have been caught. "Even by the half-hearted and self-serving investigations the Department has been conducting of itself in the very recent past, these perverts were exposed," stated the Senator.

BRIDGES condemned the tactics being used. Referring to the Senate resolution in regard to loyalty in the State Department, he uttered: "The resolution does not say slap together a quick hearing, discredit the testimony of one witness, call on him to prove single-handed, that which it is the duty of the Department of State and the Department of Justice and the Central Intelligence Agency to act upon, without even being told to do so.

"It does not say," he continued, "to set up a sounding board from which Senators can run for reelection. It does not say to find excuses for covering up that which the country knows good and well to be true."

BRIDGES was quite critical throughout his address of the State Department. If his questions are answered sincerely it will be beneficial to the country.

If one doubts the threat of communism it might be well to look over the figures recently given out by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen in

a radio broadcast. The noted priest stated: Communism which in January 1945 enslaved only 190,000,000 people, today enslaves 800,000,000.

One cannot overlook these threats. An enlightened America will help bring victory in the cold war.

Doctor Raps AMA—Shows Health Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, since a great deal of false and misleading propaganda on the subject of Government health activities is circulated by the American Medical Association, I was delighted to find an excellent statement by a doctor on the need for more Government aid to medicine. I think everyone who is sincerely interested in understanding the medical picture in this country will find the following articles, by Dr. Ira D. McCoy of Bad Axe, Mich., most helpful.

Dr. McCoy's articles are a spontaneous effort, having their origin in his many years of medical service to two Michigan communities, Bad Axe and Port Austin. Dr. McCoy graduated from the University of Michigan Medical School. He has since completed studies at Harvard University and the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn. He served as a captain in the Army Medical Corps in World War II.

DOCTOR RAPS AMA—SHOWS HEALTH NEED

(By Ira Dean McCoy, M. D.)

(First of two articles)

WASHINGTON.—The American Medical Association, at enormous cost, has bombarded the American public with a flag-waving, red, white, and blue propaganda leaflet explaining the proposed Federal-health-insurance legislation.

Every member of the AMA was assessed $25 in order that one of the Nation's top publicity agencies might be employed to frighten the American public by untruthfully calling the proposed legislation socialism, statism, and paternalism.

Often in the heat of argument or in criticizing another's belief, the words paternalism and statism are too indiscriminately used and the users forget or lose sight of exactly the form of Government we have in these United States.

APATHY DANGEROUS

The Government is composed of men like ourselves whom the majority of us elect to govern us and it is always within our power to change the political complexion of our National Government every 2 years if we so choose. Far, far more dangerous to the welfare of our country than statism or paternalism is our apathy toward our duties as citizens. It is everyone's duty to be actively inquisitive and interested in Government; and it is the sacred privilege as well as our duty and obligation to cast our ballot at every opportunity. The more active and interested we, as a people, become in Government, the better will be our Government and the safer will be our liberties.

I firmly believe in the system of free enterprise and our capitalistic way of life; but in a complex nation the size of ours, government simply must take over the education and health of our people to a greater extent in the future.

If the handling of atomic energy is too complex and too big for private industry, certainly the health and education of our people is too great and pressing a problem to be allowed to drift much longer. There can be no solution but more and more Government aid and control. After all, isn't good government, "One for all and all for one?" But let's get back to Federal health insurance.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DIE UNNECESSARILY

Over 300,000 of our people, men, women, and children, will die this year because they cannot afford medical care. That isn't all the sad truth: This year, too, America will lose 4,300,000 man-years of work because of bad health. And this year, too, $27,000,000,000 in national wealth will be lost—lost because of sickness and disability.

On the basis of selective-service experience at least 40 percent of our men of military age—between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 men—are unfit for military duty. On any one day, at least 7,000,000 people in the United States suffer some illness. As many as 23,000,000 persons have a chronic or disabling disease. Sickness and accidents cost the Nation at least $8,000,000,000 a year.

Our health services and facilities are wholly inadequate. Forty percent of our counties do not have even a full-time local public health officer. Hospitals are needed—areas of our country with an aggregate population of 15,000,000 people do not have a single recognized general hospital. Pure shortages of doctors, nurses, dentists, psychiatrists, and other trained health personnel are so great that many persons are forced to forego medical care. In 1944, 553 counties had less than 1 active physician per 3,000 population, the danger line. And numerous counties had no active doctor at all.

STAGGERING STATISTICS

If we had adequate services available for mothers and children, we could prevent at least half of the deaths of mothers who die in childbirth, and one-third of the deaths of the young babies. Our State health agencies have, on their waiting lists, thousands of crippled children who require and cannot get proper attention because of the lack of facilities and personnel, and over half a million children with rheumatic fever fail to receive good medical care.

Staggering statistics, aren't they? But more shocking is the simple fact that we have the knowledge to prevent these needless deaths and this tragic waste. We have the highly trained personnel capable of applying that knowledge. The one essential ingredient lacking is the assurance that people needing that knowledge can have it when they need it.

But before we project the solution, let's look more searchingly at the problem. Can the average American family pay for modern medical care? Can you?

At least 2 out of every 3 Americans—that means 97,000,000 people—cannot, and this figure comes straight from the American Medical Association's Bureau of Medical Economics. If your family has an annual income of $5,000 or less per year, you are in this group. You cannot afford adequate medical care.

PUT OFF CARE

Most Americans avoid seeking prompt medical attention at the first sign of complaint. They tend to put off going to the doctor in the hope that the pain or illness will right itself. They delay mainly because of fear of medical costs.

Such delay is often serious, and sometimes fatal, as in tuberculosis and cancer. We doctors know that 30 percent of cancer is curable if caught in its very early stages. We know that the disabling effects of many other chronic diseases can be halted or even prevented entirely, if caught in time.

There is an endless amount of data to prove that the relation between money and life—between wealth and health—is direct and deadly.

The problem, from which we can no longer run, is simply this: How can we remove this major economic barrier which blocks better health for the Nation and assure everyone who needs it adequate medical care regardless of economic status?

DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

The democratic solution is: National health insurance. By broadening the scope of our compulsory social security program to include a system of national health insurance, by utilizing the proven, successful method of pay-roll deductions to which employers and employees would contribute equal shares—the costs of physicians and hospital care could be prepaid, guaranteeing both availability of care to all who need it and adequate payment to doctors, hospitals, and others who supply the services.

For a long time, the AMA fought even voluntary health insurance plans. It still fights them today, unless it can control them. It supports voluntary health insurance today in a frenzied rear-guard action to head off national health insurance. The AMA has long been several steps behind the march of events and the needs of the American people.

Voluntary health insurance plans, while often excellent in the limited spheres in which most of them operate, cannot and will not be able to do the necessary job because:

1. Benefits are inadequate. The plans which provide anything approximating comprehensive insurance protection reach relatively few persons—actually less than 3 percent of the population—because they have been held back by the opposition of medical societies. The plans sponsored by medical societies provide only very limited services.

2. Voluntary plans have no sliding scales of payments to match incomes. They charge a flat rate, usually high, for limited benefits that cover only a fraction of the population. It is hardly likely that they could broaden their benefits without pricing themselves out of reach of many present subscribers.

3. Many of them offer only cash payments instead of actual medical services, and these payments cover only part of the costs of care.

4. They have the smallest coverage where the need is greatest—in rural areas and among lower income groups.

DOCTOR DISPELS FOG ON INSURANCE PLAN

(By Ira Dean McCoy, M. D.)

(Second of two articles)

WASHINGTON.—A continuous smoke screen has been laid down by special interests to befog the public's mind on what national health insurance is and what it would mean to the doctor and the patient.

Proponents of national health insurance cherish the freedom and intimacy of the doctor-patient relationship as much as our die-hard opponents. Patients, as now, would select their own doctors; doctors, as now, would accept or reject patients. National health insurance is just a method of paying for medical care.

The only change proposed by advocates of national health insurance is that, instead of the patient paying when and if he has money available, the doctor or the hospital of his choice would be paid by the insurance system at a rate and by a method to which the doctor had agreed.

Those who support national health insurance are keenly aware that our Nation has fewer physicians and hospital beds than we

need, and these so poorly distributed that in some rural counties there are no resident physicians at all and little or no hospitalization accessible.

UNREALISTIC TO DELAY

Nevertheless, it is unrealistic to argue that national health insurance should be delayed for the years required to train many more doctors and build many more hospitals. The supply of medical personnel and facilities will expand only when, through insurance, the money to pay for them is guaranteed. This demand depends on families' purchasing power for medical care. This is the simple principle of supply and demand which operates throughout our economy.

Opponents claim that national health insurance will cost too much, that national expenditure for medical and health services would be greater under this plan, and that administrative costs would be excessive.

The first answer to this objection is that the Nation needs to spend more for health. Too many of us have been doing without for too long. Moreover, a large part of the expenditures under national health insurance would not be new or added expenditures. Money now expended in direct payments for medical care by sick persons would be distributed under the plan in small regular payments from all people. Consequently, the costs of sickness—ordinarily concentrated upon a small part of the population in any given year—would be spread over the whole year and over all the people.

As for administrative costs, it is worth noting that expenses of voluntary, nonprofit plans run to 12 percent or more in comparison with the premiums collected. An important part of these administrative expenses is the cost of soliciting and retaining members, a task that would be eliminated by national health insurance.

OTHER COSTS ELIMINATED

Many other costs would also be eliminated by national health insurance. It might at this time be interesting to note that the Blue Cross of Michigan has approximately 1,500,000 policyholders, or subscribers, as they choose to call the people who are buying Blue Cross insurance.

From January 1 until June 30, 1949, the Blue Cross of Michigan had a total earned income of $12,399,566.37. But during that same period of time their operating expense was $1,135,477.46. Of that $1,135,477.46 are some interesting items of expense: $711,990.07 was paid out in salaries; $47,547.09 was paid out in travel and other expenses; and $79,783.54 was paid out in "sundry" expenses (of which no explanation is made).

By these few figures I have given, it is very plain to be seen that the administrative costs of the Michigan Blue Cross are tremendous in comparison to the amount of money collected from their policyholders. It is, however, a nonprofit corporation. A great many patrons who are using the Blue Cross learn to their sorrow its services are limited. This could be due to the huge expenses I have already cited.

As a result of the very cunning, insidious, and extremely expensive propaganda campaign carried on by the medical lobby, the American Medical Association and its National Physicians' Committee, most people think that all doctors, or nearly all, unqualifiedly follow the AMA "party line" in opposition to national health insurance.

The dictatorial, undemocratic rule of the AMA's house of delegates imposes its policies practically by fiat on a hapless and helpless membership. Serious disagreement by an individual doctor with the policies laid down by the house of delegates or by his local medical society may result in unpleasant economic and professional consequences for that doctor. Few doctors dare risk these consequences.

REACTION AGAINST AMA

But opposition to AMA reaction has been growing and has expressed itself in several organizations of doctors who are in favor of national health insurance and who say so openly. These organizations—the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, the Physician's Forum, and the Committee for the Nation's Health, composed of both laymen and doctors—are becoming growing spearheads of opposition to the entrenched leaders of the AMA.

The American Medical Association has been spoon-feeding the American people a terrific amount of propaganda against national health insurance; but I can cite the bill itself and tell you as well as anyone just what it is and what it will do for you.

STEP-BY-STEP ANALYSIS

1. It would make available to you and all other employed and self-employed persons (with few exceptions) all the care you need from physicians, both family doctors and specialists, hospital, laboratory, and X-ray services, unusually expensive medicines, eyeglasses, and appliances; and dental care and home nursing to a limited degree.

2. It would also cover the dependent members of your family.

3. You would be free to choose your own doctor, hospital, etc., and to change your selection. Actually, countless individuals would have greater freedom of choice than they have now, because the prepaid plan of health insurance would help assure a better supply of physicians in many areas where there are not now enough doctors, and because the prepayment plan would enable millions who cannot now pay, to have the services of a doctor of their choice for the first time.

4. Your doctor's professional freedom would be fully protected. He would not become a Government employee. He would remain a practitioner, free to accept or reject patients, to locate wherever he wishes, to participate in, or stay outside, the insurance plan. He would be paid by the insurance funds in amounts and methods which he or his own representatives would negotiate.

5. It would cost you 1½ percent of your earnings (up to $4,800 of income). Your employer would pay an equal amount. You would pay 3 percent (up to $4,800) if you are self-employed.

6. If you are a member of a voluntary health insurance plan that meets minimum standards, this plan could continue to provide you with services and your premiums would be paid from the national insurance fund.

7. Health insurance would not be run from Washington. It would be managed by local areas under a plan adopted by each State.

In view of the above-mentioned facts it is almost impossible to understand the American Medical Association's bitter opposition especially when the AMA House of Delegates in 1916 petitioned the Congress to spread a universal health insurance over all the American people. This petition was recalled or withdrawn in 1920.

Many of us fear the threat of communism but do we all realize the best way to combat the scourge of communism is to increase the opportunities of the ordinary individual? America is great enough and rich enough that we should have no slums, we should have equal opportunity insofar as public-school education is concerned in this country for all our children whatever their color or creed. All children have a right in this great country of ours to healthy and sound bodies insofar as our medical science can give it to them.

These are not visionary ideals. We can and must find a way for their fulfillment. "He stands straight who stoops to help a child."

House Concurrent Resolution 64

REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of an obvious misunderstanding in certain areas of the purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 64 I wish to present on behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and myself a clarifying statement on the meaning of the resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Arkansas. What we are recognizing is that the United Nations in its present form is not operating in the way that the people of the world had hoped. When an instrument does not operate properly, the thing to do is not to discard it but to try to improve it. The purpose of the resolution is to discover what is wrong and to do whatever is necessary to strengthen that Organization which is still one of the world's best hopes for peace.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And to define the long-range objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I stand strongly behind the world federation resolution. It does not commit us to any particular formula for a world legal order. It does not commit us to changes in the present United Nations that are not specifically ratified by the United States Congress and by the people after they are drafted and submitted for ratification. It does not commit us to the creation of any organization outside of or parallel to the United Nations. It does not commit us to any plan for a broad-powered world government with control of trade, currency, immigration, taxes, and individual civil rights. It does not place us in the position of abandoning all hope for peace by fairly negotiated agreements. Above all, it does not commit us to appeasement or unilateral disarmament while other nations remain armed.

The resolution means just what it says. It expresses full support for the United Nations. It defines more clearly than existing legislation certain objectives of our foreign policy. It is based on the conviction that another world war is not inevitable. It declares that we are for true law and order in international affairs instead of anarchy. It declares that we favor vesting in a strengthened United Nations adequate power and force to enable it to prevent aggression by any country against any other. It declares that the United States has no plans for aggressive war and that it is willing, if other nations do likewise, to confer upon the United Nations authority to outlaw those weapons which

would cause total destruction. We favor only those measures which are adopted in strict conformity to constitutional requirements.

The resolution should be promptly considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee and action taken to fortify the faith of the American people in a system of world law. It will be an historical milestone for the United States and the world.

The Veterans Present Their Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of Congress, I have been receiving expressions of opinion from many veterans of the armed forces who are gravely concerned over possible changes affecting adversely those who are in greatest need of hospital treatment and medical care. Under permission granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including communications from two groups of veterans in the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois.

The Crawford County Council of the American Legion "strongly objects" to the portion of the Hoover Commission report which would disturb benefits to veterans under existing law. The American Legion post at St. Peter, Ill., desires to go on record in opposition to socialized medicine proposals as contrary to the best interests of veterans. The communications follow:

ERNEST M. COULTER POST, No. 69,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Robinson, Ill.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: Attached to this letter is a report of the action taken by the Crawford County Council, American Legion, Crawford County, Ill., concerning the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission proposals for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government, especially affecting veterans' benefits and administration of veterans' hospitals and facilities.

We cannot help but believe that you, as a veteran, will agree with your friends here at home, that economy at the expense of our sick and disabled comrades, the widows and orphans of our deceased servicemen, is not the desire of the great majority of our people.

We appeal to you in their behalf.

Sincerely, in comradeship,
LEROY G. HAMILTON,
Commander, Crawford County Council, American Legion.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENISON: Determined opposition to the recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission report pertaining to veterans' laws and the Veterans' Administration, was strongly voiced at the all-county meeting of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary, in a joint session, at Flat Rock, Ill.

By a unanimous vote, the county commander was directed to appoint a committee, representing all American Legion posts and auxiliary units of Crawford County, Ill., with an approximate membership strength of 3,000, to prepare and forward to you this statement: "Strongly objecting to the legislative proposals specified in the Hoover Commission report, which would disturb any benefits of existing veterans' laws."

We earnestly request that you give this matter due consideration in voicing our objections to this Hoover Commission proposal.

Sincerely,

H. L. Thompson, Past Commander, Post 69, Robinson; Past Commander, Crawford County; Past Commander, Twenty-third District, Ill.; Mrs. Beatrice Rogers, President, American Legion Auxiliary 219, Oblong; Mrs. Gwendolyn Meeker, Past President, Auxiliary, Robinson, Ill.; Leroy Littlejohn, Past Commander, American Legion, Oblong, Post 219; Fifth Division Chairman Medal Awards, Illinois; W. Weger Allison, Past Commander, American Legion, Flat Rock, Ill.; H. L. Thompson; Beatrice Rogers; Gwendolyn Meeker; Leroy Littlejohn; W. Weger Allison, Committee.

WODTKA-ROTHE-REISS POST, No. 380,
St. Peter, Ill.

Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENISON: Whereas the American veteran in two World Wars has defended the American free-enterprise system, which had made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas, having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which it is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of employed veterans, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wodtka-Rothe-Reiss Post, No. 380, of the American Legion does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and our District Representative from the State of Illinois, and that said Senators and Representative be and are respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

ADOLPH C. MEYER,
Commander.
ARTHUR A. BOYE,
Adjutant.

Small-Business Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio discussion between the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, regarding small-business loans.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO DISCUSSION ON S. 2947 (SMALL-BUSINESS LOANS) BETWEEN HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, OF ILLINOIS, AND GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. BURGER. I have studied carefully the splendid statement you made on the floor of the Senate on January 30 when you introduced your bill, S. 2947, to encourage loans to independent small-business enterprises through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In the first instance, I like the simplicity of your proposed bill. It is not loaded with a lot of long-sounding words, but keeps to its direct objective. I am also pleased, and I know the Nation's independent small-business men are pleased, that in your remarks in the Senate you emphasized again the statement made by the President in the state of the Union message when he said that our antimonopoly laws must be strengthened in the interest of small business and for encouraging the growth of new enterprises.

Senator, in my opinion this must be done by Congress at the earliest possible moment. Strong antimonopoly laws are necessary if small independent business enterprises in America are to survive. I liked that part of your message where you stated that the Corporation in making funds available under your bill is authorized to give management skills, past-earning records, and prospective earnings consideration over collateral security. We who own and operate establishments realize the importance of this recommendation.

If the Congress sets out such a policy and the RFC puts it into effect, I am sure the independent business enterprises of America will be grateful, and in return will set an admirable record in repaying these loans.

Before coming to the questions that I would like to ask you, Senator, I want to say that I was pleased that you placed on the record in clear and understandable words the following statement. I quote your words: "I want to make it clear at the outset that this bill is not being introduced to offer aid to unsound, inefficient or fly-by-night business enterprises, but is being offered to give capital assistance to efficient businessmen at times when such assistance may be urgently needed."

You are to be complimented on making this fact clear to your colleagues in the Senate.

Now, I would like to have you explain in more detail your statement on the floor of the Senate that the guaranty provisions of your bill utilize the present procedures of the RFC but increases the amount of the guaranty up to 90 percent.

Senator LUCAS. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation today is authorized to make business loans in cooperation with private banks. I do not wish to change that practice, but rather I want to encourage more of these loans. Under the present law the private bank makes a loan to a business enterprise and the RFC at the same time agrees to take a certain portion of the loan off the hands of the private bank upon request.

The amount of the loan that the RFC may take off the hands of a private bank is now limited to 70 percent. My bill would increase this to 90 percent. The fact that under my bill private banks would be able to call upon the RFC to reimburse them up to 90 percent of the amount of these private loans should be a real encouragement to private banks in making loans to independent small-business enterprises.

Mr. BURGER. Isn't it also true, Senator, that many independent small-business enterprises which today are unable to obtain loans from any source will be able to get assistance under your bill?

Senator LUCAS. That is very true. Today private lending institutions and the RFC, as a general rule, will not lend money to anyone unless the borrower has property that can be mortgaged. In other words, a loan will not be made to a small enterprise today unless that enterprise can put up enough collateral security to assure its repayment.

My bill permits the private bank and the RFC to place larger emphasis upon management skills and prospective earnings and less emphasis upon the security that a borrower can offer. This should mean that a person about to start a new business or the operator of an existing business enterprise will be able to get a loan without putting on the line every last dollar's worth of his property.

Mr. BURGER. You stated earlier that you hope to encourage loans through private banks. Isn't it possible that cases may arise where private banks will refuse to make loans even with this 90-percent guaranty? If such cases should arise, does your bill make any provision to meet this situation?

Senator LUCAS. It is my firm belief that private banks will cooperate, and that borrowers will be able to obtain loans directly from their local banker. I have looked into this matter quite closely, and the Federal Reserve, the RFC, and FDIC advise me they have been unable to discover any banking regulations which would prevent private banks from making loans such as I propose even though they are not fully backed with collateral security.

Private banks would be taking very little risk. In the first place, the bank can always get back 90 cents on the dollar from the RFC. Also, collateral security will not be dispensed with entirely, and in addition to that, the loans will be made only to those enterprises which will be well managed and which have a promising future. I should expect that the private lending institution will be very happy to cooperate in this program. On the other hand, in those unusual cases where the private bank will not make the loan, the borrower can apply directly to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. BURGER. As I understand your bill, Senator, it is designed to make long-term capital available to established businesses which certainly are in need of such aid.

Senator LUCAS. That is correct.

By long-term capital we mean loans which can be paid back over a long period of time. Banks and other private lending institutions which are willing to make loans to independent small-business enterprises usually require that these loans be paid back over a short period.

My bill directs the RFC to encourage private banks to make loans for periods longer than 10 years. This should be a real benefit to many small-business men.

Mr. BURGER. Your bill, Senator, will also make capital available for new enterprises, will it not?

Senator LUCAS. Yes, it will.

This bill is intended to serve a threefold purpose. It will make long-term capital available to established business enterprises. It will provide a source of loans for the establishment of new enterprises, and it will assist those newly established business ventures which have such a difficult struggle to survive during their early stages.

Mr. BURGER. I agree with you that new business enterprises during their infancy need considerable help. Twenty-six percent of all new businesses undertaken each year are discontinued before the year is over.

Senator LUCAS. On that same point, surveys by the Department of Commerce have shown that just about as many business enterprises fail each year as are started. In other words, the total number of business enterprises in America is standing still.

If we could succeed in cutting the number of these failures in half, we would double the total number of business enterprises in the United States within a period of 20 years. It seems to me that this would be a worthwhile goal; our population has doubled in the last 50 years, our business activity must keep pace. In my opinion this is the way to attain full employment, and this is the way to attain a sound Government fiscal policy and at the same time lower taxes.

Mr. BURGER. Senator, a matter which is of serious concern to independent businessmen in the United States is the tendency for large business firms to grow larger while small independent business enterprises are rapidly disappearing. If this tendency keeps up, we may someday find that there is no place left for the small independent businessman.

Senator LUCAS. I would say, Mr. Burger, that the disappearance of independent small businesses in America would be the last thing that any of us would want to see happen.

We never want to arrive at the point when an ambitious young man or woman cannot start his own business with a fair chance of succeeding. One of the main reasons why small business enterprises are having a difficult struggle while larger businesses are growing even larger is the fact that the little independent businessman is unable to get adequate financial help in times of need.

Under my bill the small-business man who would otherwise sell out his business to a larger firm will be able to get financial aid. Also under this bill the number of healthy independent small-business enterprises in America would steadily mount as financial aid would be given in time to prevent the failure of many new enterprises during their early stages of development.

Mr. BURGER. In conclusion, Senator, I think we could say then that your bill will strengthen existing business enterprises and will encourage the creation of new ones. Rather than burdening the taxpayers, it will stimulate employment and business activity which in the end will substantially benefit everybody.

Soviet Expansionism in Europe and Asia Since 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a lecture delivered by William C. Bullitt at Georgetown University on March 31, 1950, entitled "Soviet Expansionism in Europe and Asia Since 1939."

Mr. Bullitt has had a long and honorable association with the Department of State. During his many years as a representative of this Government in the State Department he has held the following positions: Assistant in Department of State from 1917 to 1918; Attaché to American Commission to Negotiate Peace from 1918 to 1919; chief of special mission to Russia in 1919; special assistant to Secretary of State in 1933; member of American delegation to World Monetary and Economic Conference in 1933; Ambassador to Russia from 1933 to 1936; Ambassador to France from 1936 to 1941; Ambassador at large from November 1941 to April 1942.

Ambassador Bullitt has spent considerable time in China and is considered one of America's best authorities on Chinese conditions and political trends. Bullitt is a good Democrat and was a close associate of President Roosevelt during most of his first three terms. Unfortunately, however, it seems Mr. Bullitt's counsel is neither sought nor welcomed by the Truman-Acheson high command.

Mr. President, I have received from the Public Printer an estimate saying the address will cover two and three-quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET EXPANSIONISM IN EUROPE AND ASIA SINCE 1939

Soviet expansionism springs from the Communist creed: The Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed which denies God and claims to be based on science. It attributes all evil to private ownership of the means of production. It teaches that the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production will end all war and so improve the nature of all men in all nations that the state will wither away, and all men will live without a state in perfect freedom and happiness. This is the utterly unscientific faith which, in the name of science, Communist-controlled governments teach as absolute truth to the children they control. They prepare the children to live and, if need be, to die for it. A large percentage of the children, having no other faith taught them, become believers in the Communist creed, and, as Communist believers, offer their lives for their faith as gallantly as did the early Christians. They believe that they are fighting for the emancipation of all humanity from all evil. They think they serve eternal truth. The Communist Party, to them, is a union of the faithful. Their old testament contains the books of Marx and Engels; their new testament, the works of Lenin and Stalin. Since the highest moral goal, according to their creed, is to achieve the destruction of the state following the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth, the highest moral duty of man is to promote such dictatorship. This supreme moral end, they believe, justifies all means for its achievement, including the pledged work given and broken, character assassination, torture, murder, and war. In the words of Lenin: "It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth. * * * It is inconceivable

that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

The dynamo of Soviet expansionism is the Communist creed. Many older Communists become skeptical and disillusioned. But they do not dare to express disbelief. The penalties are too terrible. So the old, however skeptical, render lip service. But the young believe. And while the old die off, the young come on forever. In consequence, so long as mighty races and resources are controlled by Communists, there will be no peace in this world. The aim of the Soviet Government and the other Communist-controlled governments will continue to be the conquest of the world for communism. The Communists will not stop. They can only be stopped.

Stalin sits in the Kremlin with members of the Politburo, who compose his planning staff for the conquest of the world. He prepares his attacks on a world scale as carefully as the commander in chief of an army prepares plans for his advances. He decides when and where to strike, and what forces will be needed to seize his objective. He is a careful and crafty leader who never takes great chances. He always remembers that the physical strength of the Soviet Union is the most important factor in the spread of communism, and he does not risk destruction of that primary source of strength.

In 1939, Stalin controlled about 170,000,000 persons. Today he directs about 800,000,000. The chief methods which he has employed in making this extraordinary advance toward control of the entire human race have been the following:

First. Easy war. For example, 17 days after Hitler had attacked Poland in 1939, when the Polish armies had been disrupted, Stalin attacked Poland, and seized all eastern Poland. Similarly, in the Far East, after we had pulverized the military resistance of Japan, Stalin, only 4 days before Japan surrendered, declared war on Japan and seized Manchuria.

Second. Occupation by the Red army and gradual imposition of absolute Soviet rule. This was the method employed from 1945 onward in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and, with slight variations, in Czechoslovakia. Its effectiveness is demonstrated by the simple fact that Stalin has now been able to install as commander in chief of the Polish Army a marshal of the Soviet Union.

Third. The method of the camel's nose. You all remember the old story of the camel who was cold one night in the desert and put his nose under his master's tent and persuaded his master to let him keep it there. Soon afterward, the camel was inside the tent and his owner was out in the cold. That method in 1940 was used by Stalin in taking over Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. First, under threats of war and promises of peace, he persuaded the governments of those three little Baltic countries to accept the presence of Soviet garrisons at certain strategic points. The Soviet soldiers behaved themselves well, and many Balts believed their prospects for survival were good. However, when Stalin considered that the moment had come to close his hand on those countries, he closed it. He murdered or deported to death at slave labor his political opponents of all classes. He finally reduced his victims to a terrorized mass of despairing individuals whom he then compelled to go to booths and vote for Soviet-chosen candidates under penalty of losing their bread cards which were nothing more or less than permits to live.

Fourth. Use of local Communist movements in areas where Communists have been strong enough to organize armed resistance to existing governments. The foremost example of the success of this method is, of course, China. By turning over to the Chinese Communists all the arms captured from the Japanese Army in Manchuria; by sending a few generals who were masters of strategy and tactics to plan the attacks of the Chinese Communists, Stalin succeeded in bringing the whole of continental China under Communist control. When he attempted to use the same method in Iran and Greece he met such determined opposition from the United States that he allowed his local agents to be defeated—temporarily at least.

Fifth. Communist control or infiltration of nationalist independence movements in colonial countries. At the present moment, Stalin is advancing by this method in Indochina and at other points in southeast Asia.

Sixth. Psychological warfare.

Under this heading must be included two different methods of deceiving victims.

A. The pledged word of the Soviet Union given and broken. Stalin lulls his prospective victims to sleep by entering into all sorts of pacts and agreements with them—and breaks the agreements as soon as it becomes convenient for him to do so. Stalin's violations of the most solemn international agreements have exceeded in number similar violations by Hitler.

B. The deception of naive government officials in all countries. We do not have to go further than our own country to observe Stalin's notable achievements in this domain. Quite aside from Soviet agents in our Government departments and atomic-energy organization, we have had in Washington and throughout the world a number of Government officials who were not Soviet agents but served the Soviet Government as effectively as if they had been Soviet agents. You will all recall that from 1942 until 1947 our Department of State was bamboozled into treating the Soviet Union as a peace-loving democracy. Officials of our Government so described the Soviet Union in a long series of documents.

The Yalta agreements—including the secret one by which we promised Stalin control of the great Manchurian ports of Dairen and Port Arthur and the Chinese Eastern Railroad—were signed during that period. They were one of the greatest triumphs of Soviet psychological warfare. Had we acted in accord with the national interests of the United States and of our faithful ally China, we would have done everything in our power to prevent the Soviet Union from entering the war against Japan. But our leaders had been bamboozled into believing that the Soviet Union would work with us cordially to produce a world of liberty and peace, and in addition had been fooled into believing that we would need Soviet help to defeat Japan. So we secretly sponsored Soviet domination of Manchuria and enabled Stalin to arm the Chinese Communists with the vast armaments of the Japanese armies.

You will recall that officials of our Department of State had also been persuaded by Soviet propaganda to believe that the Chinese Communists were "mere agrarian reformers who had no connection with Moscow." Our Government, acting on their advice, attempted to compel the Chinese Government to take Communists into the Government, and when Chiang Kai-shek refused to do this, cut off all military supplies to him for a period of nearly 2 years. You will remember that we refused his repeated pleas for a top-rank American general to organize the defense of China in the same manner that top Soviet generals were organizing the attack on Chinese independence. Thus we allowed China to slide into Stalin's hands.

Similarly the Yalta agreement with regard to Poland resulted in the present absolute control of Poland by the Soviet Government.

Much ink has been used by apologists for the Yalta agreements in an attempt to prove that what was wrong was not the agreements themselves but the fact that the Soviet Union did not carry out the agreements. This is as if a banker who had been appointed trustee of the fortune of a child should place the funds entrusted to his care in a Ponzi get-rich-quick scheme, and then when the money was lost plead that the trouble was not with the trustees—who accepted Mr. Ponzi's promise to pay 200 percent per year—but with Ponzi's failure to carry out the agreement. The people of the United States hire officials to work in the Department of State because they need experts to handle complex world questions. The officials of that Department are trustees of the vital interests of the American people, and the most contemptible excuse that can be offered by or for them is that they meant well, but were "played for suckers."

There is a great moral difference between traitors and Soviet dupes. It is the same difference that is recognized in law between a man guilty of murder and a man guilty of manslaughter. In the case of manslaughter there is no intention to commit the crime. But in both cases the victim ends up dead. Soviet dupes may do as great harm to the United States as Soviet agents.

Seventh. Infiltration of respected organizations: One of Stalin's most effective weapons to reduce resistance to his attack is, of course, infiltration of educational institutions, scientific societies, welfare organizations, and trade-unions by Soviet agents. He managed to use this weapon so effectively in both France and Italy that leadership of the great trade-unions of both of these countries was seized by the Communists and for a time it seemed that both countries might be hopelessly paralyzed by Communist-led strikes. At the present moment the non-Communist members of the trade-unions in France and Italy have set up their own organizations, but the Communist-led unions are still able to organize strikes of huge dimensions for purely political purposes. Fortunately for our own country, although for a time some of our labor leaders were as deceived as was our Government with regard to the Communists, our great trade-unions have either purged their ranks of Communists or are in the process of purging them. Stalin is having little success in our trade-unions, and I think we should congratulate ourselves on the patriotic qualities of our top labor leaders. I wish I could say as much about our professors, some of whom appear to be too educated for their brains.

Eighth. The final weapon employed by Stalin to disintegrate opposition to Communist advance is fear. Now that Stalin has atomic bombs and plenty of bombers to deliver them to any spot in Europe, Asia, or North America; now that he has China as an ally and is increasing his military power much faster than we are increasing ours; his propaganda has taken a new line—the line of warning his opponents of all classes in Europe and in Asia that power is on his side and that time is on his side, and that unless they desire to meet the fate which he accords to defeated opponents, they had better leave the camp of the United States and join the Soviet side.

The fear which he is thus able to engender has been vastly increased by revelation of the methods which are now used by the Communists to break down and destroy human personality. You have all read recently in the newspapers Shipkov's statement of the relatively simple methods used to break him down and force him to make a false confession to the Bulgarian Communist authorities. Far more sinister and horrible pressures are used when the individual presents more resistance. The final method is that of narcohypnosis. The victim in that case receives quantities of drugs until he can be hypnotized so deeply that he can be deprived of all memory of the actual facts of his past life and made to believe in a new set of facts invented by his hypnotizer. Human

personality can thus be totally changed. No man can any longer say that he is master of his fate or of his own actions and thoughts. If he falls into the hands of the Communists, he can be reduced to a puppet with a new personality invented by his hypnotizer. This is a final horror—an unexampled triumph of satanism. To die in battle is nothing compared to the living death of personality under narcohypnosis. Recently a French lady said to me: "We are all of us enjoying ourselves as much as possible in Paris since we know that within a few years we shall either be destroyed by Soviet atomic bombs, or raped, or hypnotized into new personalities." That is the state of mind which is growing in western Europe.

We have now glanced at the Communist creed which underlies Soviet expansionism, and at some of the methods employed by Stalin to achieve world conquest. Let us now look briefly at the attacks which armed Communists are making at the present moment.

As we have already noted, they are advancing by open warfare in Indochina, or—to be exact—in the eastern portion of Indochino which is known as Vietnam. The war in Vietnam is one of the saddest that has ever been fought, for three-fourths of the troops of Ho Chi Minh, the Moscow-trained leader of the Annamites, who are fighting the French and the forces of the Emperor Bao Dai, are not Communists but simple patriots who believe that they can achieve complete independence only by throwing the French and Bao Dai into the sea. Yet, in truth, the only result of such a victory would be that the Annamites would exchange the yoke of France, which has now become relatively light, for the terrible yoke of Stalin.

The French, 3 years late, have given Vietnam "independence within the French Empire," retaining for themselves control over foreign relations and military affairs. To us, this seems a limited, almost nonexistent form of independence. Yet, if the French were to withdraw now from Vietnam, the country would collapse at once into the hands of the Communists. This is so because of the failure of the French to train Annamites for high administrative and military posts. The French reserved those posts for themselves. They never built up in Vietnam a native civil service comparable to the civil service which the British built up in India. In consequence, Bao Dai, if left to his own resources, could not find the man to staff efficiently the military and administrative services of his country.

For a period, the Annamites, who are highly intelligent as well as patriotic people, will be obliged to rely on the advice and assistance of foreigners of some sort. They would like to have Americans instead of French running their army and their administration, but no American speaks their language. The secondary language of Vietnam is French, and so few Americans of first-rate quality speak French adequately that it is hopeless to expect that thousands of efficient, French-speaking Americans can be found to go to Vietnam. The Annamites would also like to have American troops replace the 130,000 French troops now resisting the forces of Ho Chi Minh. Quite aside from other considerations, we have no such number of troops to spare. And we should be thankful that the French Army is fighting Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam. They will probably have to meet stronger attacks in the near future. For the Chinese Communists have now reached the borders of Vietnam and are passing arms and munitions to Ho Chi Minh.

In consequence, unless Indochina is to fall into the hands of Stalin, we shall have to work with and through both Bao Dai and the French. If we fail to do so because some State Department dupe of Soviet psychological warfare takes the position that we must not give help to Vietnam until all the French shall have left, we shall merely be handing the country by default to the Communists.

If we let Indochina fall, Burma, Siam, and British Malaya—with its vast production of rubber and tin—will also fall. Then it will be India's turn.

At another point, the Communists are making small attacks preparatory to a great attack. The Chinese Communists for some time have been attempting to seize small islands on the way to the great strategic island of Formosa. Formosa is still being held by the Chinese Nationalist Army which, just 2 weeks ago, gave proof of its good morale by seizing a port on the mainland. If the Chinese Communists should capture Formosa, Stalin's forces would be within 250 miles of the northern Philippines. It was from Formosa that Japan attacked and captured the Philippines. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff, headed by General Bradley, pleaded with President Truman to send munitions and equipment, as well as economic aid to Formosa, and a few American officers to advise regarding defense. Secretary of State Acheson opposed our military leaders, and persuaded President Truman to decide that we would continue to give no support to the Nationalists, do nothing toward preventing the fall of Formosa. That is our present policy. For the Philippines, the Department of State is preparing another Bataan.

Recently Secretary Acheson announced that we must wage total diplomacy. And in San Francisco he intimated that if the Chinese Communists should commit aggressions against the countries of southeast Asia, they would find themselves in trouble with us. But his total diplomacy does not include Formosa. He and his closest associates and friends have a vested interest in their own mistakes with regard to China. In any European parliamentary democracy, a minister for foreign affairs who had tossed a great ally like China into the hands of Stalin would have been dismissed from his post. Mr. Acheson retains his office and turns his back on Formosa.

In the Near East, Iran, with its huge oil production which plays such a large part in British economic life, is again threatened by Soviet-directed revolutionaries of the Tudeh Party. They have a fertile field in which to work. The poverty among the peasants of Iran is so grinding that they are close to revolt. Unless the Government of the United States moves rapidly to alleviate the suffering in Iran, Stalin may soon add that ancient country to his long list of satellites.

These, for the moment, are the areas in Asia where Stalin is pressing his advance strongly. But we cannot congratulate ourselves that even the situation in western Europe is satisfactory.

In Italy, more than 20 percent of the workmen are unemployed, and the Communists, who gathered one-third of the votes at the last elections, are gaining in strength.

In France, the Government is far weaker than any French Government before the Second World War, and its entire apparatus is riddled with Communists. Even the head of French atomic research is a Communist.

Great Britain is staggering toward another financial and economic crisis. In 1945 the British voted themselves a higher standard of living than, under existing world conditions, they could possibly earn. Today they can neither feed themselves nor defend themselves.

Western Germany, under the pressure of unemployment, is beginning to listen to the Soviet propaganda which says: Side with the United States and you will have unemployment, underfeeding, shortage of raw materials, a divided country, and, finally, Soviet atomic bombs on your cities; side with the Soviet Union and you will have all the wheat and raw materials you want, no unemployment, and a united Germany including the part that is momentarily Polish. Pastor Niemoeller, much admired by Americans, has now declared himself in favor of a united Germany even at the price of Communist rule.

Moreover, the whole of western Europe is without defense, and everyone in western Europe knows it. Its cities cannot be protected against Soviet atomic bombs except by our Air Force, which today is not strong enough for the task. To oppose the 125 Soviet divisions, the French have 6, the British say they can furnish 1, the Belgians 1. To have a chance to stop the Red army for a few months, the European democracies would need from 50 to 60 divisions. Modern equipment for such a number of divisions would cost from $10,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000. And most military authorities agree that no western European defense system can be effective unless both the western Germans and the Spaniards are included in it.

When we began to give Marshall-plan aid, and when we signed the Atlantic Pact, our object was to make western Europe a strong ally. We have succeeded only in keeping alive 17 picturesque, competing countries which cannot feed or defend themselves. If they would unite their economies by entering a European federation, they would be on the path to strength. But their governments refuse to take any serious steps toward federation and our Government is making no effective effort to move them toward federation. They feel confident that, even after 1952, we will not stop our doles to them. And, indeed, we do not dare to stop for fear that they will all collapse into the hands of Stalin and be organized as Soviet satellites for his final attack on us.

When will such an attack come? To that question I can, of course, give no definite answer. But I can give you my own opinion and the reasons for it.

Today Stalin has atomic bombs and at least 35 long-range bombers capable of carrying them to any spot in the United States. We have no radar warning net to detect the approach of his planes. We have only a fraction of the number of pursuit planes needed to make effective use of a warning net. The authoritative Finletter Commission in 1948 recommended as a minimum for national security 70 air groups. We have 44. Stalin's total air force outnumbers ours by about 3 to 1. His annual production of war planes is about three to our one. He has 125 army divisions to our 10—among them, 30 armored divisions to our 1. In addition, he has approximately 270 submarines—about 30 of the latest type against which we have not yet produced effective counterweapons. Furthermore, thanks to his agent Fuchs who transmitted to him all our secrets for production of both A-bombs and hydrogen bombs, he may be ahead of us in production of H-bombs.

Some officials in Washington who have access to most secret information believe that Stalin will attack us this year. They argue that by August 1950 he will probably have 50 A-bombs, enough to destroy our great cities and our atomic production plant, and thus prevent effective American counterattack. But my opinion is that Stalin will not launch a shooting war until he is certain that he can defeat us easily. As I have said before, he is a cautious and crafty leader, who strikes only when he feels sure of quick victory. This year his first surprise attack might not be successful. We might be able to strike back effectively. Therefore it seems likely that he will not start bombing in the near future, but will go on increasing his military strength faster than we are adding to ours, and seize more peoples, resources, and strategic areas, until he feels that his power is irresistible. We are allowing time to run on his side, and he knows it.

What then is the real state of our defenses against Soviet expansionism? Our own military strength is falling behind the growing military strength of Stalin. Asia is slipping into Stalin's hands; the Near East is threatened; Europe is defenseless. The Soviet atomic bomb threat to our homes, our families, and our country is increasing each day. The Communists are advancing; we are retreating. They are on the offensive; we are on the defensive. And no war, hot or cold, was ever won by forces which remained on the defensive.

Why are we doing so badly? Because our Government has never faced the fact that Stalin will not stop, but can only be stopped. Our President has not understood that an over-all plan for defense not only of our own country but also of those countries which still remain outside Stalin's domain is essential. Not so long ago he said, "I like old Joe." In consequence the systematic advances of the Communists, executed by carefully planned attacks, have been met for the most part either by American retreats or spasmodic and inadequate defensive efforts.

Time is running against us; but at the present moment our Government is behaving exactly as the French Government behaved from 1936 to 1939. In that period, when the Nazis were preparing for war and working 60 hours a week, the French cut their working hours to 40 a week. When the Germans were producing 700 to 800 planes a month, the French cut their plane production to 50 a month. They did this for much the same reason that we are now reducing our expenditures for our military forces and for support of our friends throughout the world. The people of France, like all other peoples, wanted a higher standard of living and leisure. They did not realize that a higher standard of living would soon give them a higher rate of dying. In 1940, Hitler destroyed the independence of France.

Today we should be living hard, as our forefathers lived hard in the days of Valley Forge. We are living soft. Our President has staked his political future on a program of hand-outs for crop support, housing, education, and other projects which appeal to groups of voters. To get more tax money for the hand-out program which produces votes, he has cut down the defense program which might produce survival. Our tax money is being used to buy surplus potatoes instead of jet planes.

In consequence, the balance of power in the world is swinging rapidly in favor of the Soviet Union. And our President, who is an entirely patriotic American, has not yet found within himself the intelligence and the spirit to take the offensive effectively against Soviet expansionism. Unless he will take the offensive, unless we—the American people—will let him know that we do not want to hear from him what we can get from our country, but do want to hear from him what we can give to our country, we shall suffer the fate that France suffered in 1940.

We restored the independence of France. There is no nation standing behind us to restore our independence.

Is it too much to hope that we will find within ourselves the courage and the will to save our country and our Christian civilization? It is not too much. It is late—very late. It is not too late. We can begin today to take the offensive. We can increase vastly our expenditures for national defense and cut our expenditures for hand-outs. We can take action to prevent Communist conquest of Formosa. We can help the Annamites and the French throw the Communists completely out of Indochina—as we helped the Greeks throw them out of Greece. We can achieve the federation of western Europe and make that federation a strong ally. We can give effective economic aid to Iran. We can help the Albanian exiles to rescue Albania from the Communists and thus give new spirit to all the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. We can give far greater aid than we have been giving to the resistance forces in all the Soviet satellite countries. We can stand up with force to the threat of the Communists in eastern Germany who have had the effrontery to announce that on May 28 they intend to arrange an invasion of west Berlin by Communist-led bands from east Berlin.

Those Americans who are still befuddled by Soviet psychological warfare will argue that such a course of action would produce an unbridgeable chasm between the free world and the Communist world. That chasm already exists. It was dug by the Communists. There is no bridge, and there will be no bridge. We face today, not a struggle for security, but a struggle for survival. However much we all wish and pray for peace, this is the hard fact which we cannot get rid of by wishful thinking. We can stop Stalin only by keeping him constantly confronted by superior force and by daring to use that force whenever and wherever he commits direct or indirect aggression. Today we are the last strong power on the side of liberty and Christian civilization. We have to find within ourselves the same courage and will that our forefathers found at Lexington and Concord. We have to be ready once more to give all that we have and all that we are to save the greatest adventure in human freedom that this earth has known—our America.

Our Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of April 1, 1950, be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR OLDER WORKERS

Just as a matter of fair play, men and women who remain in the labor market after they have attained 65 years of age should be relieved of paying the 1½-percent tax for old-age and survivors Federal insurance. Bills to bring this about have been introduced by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and Congressman ANGIER L. GOODWIN, of Melrose.

The subject grows increasingly important as the percentage of aged persons able and willing to work grows in this country. It would be an incentive to them to continue to give their services and also to employers, who would also be relieved of the tax, to hire them.

At present a worker over 65 who earns more than $14.99 a month has his benefits suspended. Later when he does give up work his social-security payments are increased by what he has earned after 65. Congress, in considering the legislation, should make certain the untaxed earnings are credited. The change would then be 100-percent meritorious.

AMA Lobbyist Prefers Charity to Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jonathan Stout which appeared in the March 11 issue of the New Leader:

AMA LOBBYIST PREFERS CHARITY TO SECURITY

(By Jonathan Stout)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—There appears to be an overproduction of representatives in Washington. Representatives of the people are not confined solely to Congressmen. There are other representatives, but most people do not realize that.

For instance, last week three gentlemen came to Washington. They said they were representatives of the 144,000 physicians who belong to the American Medical Association; and they told a visibly impressed group of important Senators what kind of legislation the people of America ought to have.

The occasion was a hearing before the Senate Finance Committee on the proposed bill to improve the social-security law.

One wondered why the American Medical Association and its three medical spokesmen should interest themselves in the nonmedical question of social security. But the answer was soon forthcoming. The bill before the Senate includes a new social-security provision to establish what amounts to pension payments for people who, through fate or accident, become totally disabled and can never work again or earn a living. Essentially, this is an extension of the idea that old age is an unavoidable disease all of us eventually catch—if we live that long; that it prevents many people from earning an independent livelihood; and that it makes many old people burdens on their families if not, indeed, wards of charity.

The point of the logic is that old age is not only the only disease that disables wage earners and leaves them helpless. Some diseases—unlike age—do not wait until we are old before they incapacitate people permanently. There is, for instance, the person who contracts an incurable cancer. If such a person is past 65 he can get an old-age pension to help him meet his problems with self-respect.

But what if such a person is only 35? Should he be shrugged off because he is unable to meet the only acceptable criterion of unemployability—old age?

President Truman wants to improve the social-security laws to provide pensions for persons who become permanently disabled at any age, by treating them the same way as if they already had reached the retirement age of 65. The three doctors from the American Medical Association came to Washington last week to tell the senatorial committee that they don't think such a provision would be good for the American people.

One of the three was Dr. R. L. Sensenich, of South Bend, Ind., who is the immediate past president of the American Medical Association. Whether the general public would approve what he said is a moot point; but more pertinent is the question whether the 144,000 physicians in the AMA will think Dr. Sensenich expressed their views.

Dr. Sensenich said the board of trustees of the AMA was against permanent-disability

insurance. "Total and permanent disability," he maintained, "is often a condition over which the individual who is disabled and his physician may exercise control. This subjective control which may be exercised by the individual multiplies the opportunity for malingering."

Now this sounds very much as if Dr. Sensenich were implying that doctors and their patients might go into cahoots on a widespread scale to do a lot of cheating—which is a startling implication for an AMA leader to make. The implication is also left that the board of trustees of the AMA—or, at least, their official spokesman—have a low opinion of people generally, including the 144,000 physicians they claim to represent.

Still another thought is expressed in Dr. Sensenich's statement. According to him, it seems to be the AMA view that, rather than let one malingerer get away with anything, it is prepared to let honest men suffering from some permanent disability to go unaided through the physical and spiritual miseries of their helplessness.

It made some of us wonder not only what kind of doctors these are, but what kind of people they are. It seemed incredible that this could really be the opinions of the 144,000 physicians for whom Dr. Sensenich claimed to speak.

Dr. Sensenich later undertook to answer the questions he had raised. The result was hardly fortunate. Dr. Sensenich warned about what he called the high additional percentage of national income to be committed to social programs by the enactment of the extensions in the social-security bill. Dr. Sensenich, in short, was expressing concern over his pocketbook.

One might have accepted medical objections from Dr. Sensenich. But he wasn't really expressing medical objections at all. What he said might have come from a typical representative of a group of manufacturers, brokers, bankers, or any well-to-do group.

Once that became apparent, a lot more became clear. For instance, at another point Dr. Sensenich said:

"The American Medical Association recognizes the need for assistance to the disabled needy, and feels that this aid should always be administered on a local level. Financial assistance to the locality should only be advanced from State or Federal sources when a need can be clearly shown."

The Senators listening to him asked Dr. Sensenich what he meant by that. Dr. Sensenich explained:

"With reference to the complaint that in those areas where medical care is provided by a governmental agency the need must be demonstrated, that seems to be a very painful matter to a certain group who constantly say that it should be set up in such a way that it is a matter of right, and that the matter of determination of need is a very painful and undesirable thing. * * * I am not so much concerned about this need definition. I don't think it should be embarrassing to the individual and in any way harmful."

In plain words, it is not going to embarrass Dr. Sensenich if a worker becomes a charity patient.

Dr. Sensenich and his colleagues came to Washington last week, speaking officially for the American Medical Association, to tell us that he and his fellow fat cats disagree with the idea that social security is a right, not a form of charity. They don't seem to think it important to preserve the self-respect of people. So they see nothing wrong with requiring people to declare themselves paupers and proving their need before they can get help.

The Plea of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Hon. Luis A. Ferre, vice president, Ponce Cement Corp., and Porto Rico Iron Works, Inc., which was read at a public hearing of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives held at Ponce, P. R., on the 23d of November 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLEA OF PUERTO RICO

(By Luis A. Ferre, vice president, Ponce Cement Corp. and Porto Rico Iron Works, Inc.)

Gentlemen, as a member of the Puerto Rico Statehood Party, who polled 180,000 votes during the last election as candidate for the post of Resident Commissioner in Washington, I have followed with great interest your experiences in Puerto Rico during the last few days and have noted your statements of surprise as to the dire need in which more than 2,000,000 American citizens find themselves in Puerto Rico, and your repeated assurances that you intend to do everything you can to help us out of this situation. As a representative of my party I wish to express to you our sincere appreciation for your generous interest in our problems.

However, it is necessary that we point out to you that our problem is one that requires more than a kind interest on your part and that of Congress to extend to us this or that measure of help, in a generous spirit of fair deal, which is typical of America. The root of our problem goes deeper and requires an equal deal for the American citizens of Puerto Rico which will give us the equality of opportunity to which every American citizen is entitled, to be able to solve his own problems by his own effort and through his own enterprise under American principles of government.

The Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marin, has indicated that Puerto Rico has recently changed its attitude from Operation Lament to Operation Bootstrap. I believe—and your statements seem to show that you have arrived at a similar conclusion—that we, American citizens of Puerto Rico, have been doing an honest effort to improve our lot with the limited resources at our command. But you will agree with me that we cannot hope to go very far in solving our problems if we are to be restricted to pulling ourselves up by our own bootstrap. You all are practical men and are familiar with the physical impossibility of such a feat. What we must be given is the opportunity to start Operation Equal Deal, which will give us the same opportunities as are enjoyed by the American citizens of the 48 States of the Union to solve our own problems.

The true reason for the great misery you have seen around in Puerto Rico is twofold.

In the first place, Puerto Rico was a poor island when in 1898 is was transferred from Spain to the United States. At that time total island exports and imports amounted to $8,500,000 and $9,000,000 respectively, and the exchange of currency from Spanish pesos to American dollars amounted to $3,077,485 in 1900. In the year 1948–49, exports to continental United States were $195,000,000 and imports from continental United States were $326,000,000—a total trade of over $520,000,000, while bank deposits amounted to $270,000,000 in June 1949.

Of the above imports amounting to $326,000,000, $15,000,000 were automobiles, which came from the State of Michigan, here represented by the chairman of the committee, Congressman JOHN LESINSKI; $10,600,000 were pork products and $8,500,000 lard, coming from the State of Illinois, here represented by Congressman H. VELDE; $13,700,000 were dairy products from the States of Illinois and Iowa; $20,500,000 were building materials coming substantially from the State of Pennsylvania, here represented by Congressmen A. B. KELLEY and CARROLL D. KEARNS, and $8,600,000 corresponded to gasoline imports from corporations operating mostly in the State of New Jersey, here represented by Congressman CHARLES R. HOWELL.

In relative terms American citizens of Puerto Rico have made a great progress in 50 years under the American flag and for this opportunity they are happy and grateful to the people of continental United States. But how do we still compare in the development of our economy with the 48 States of the Union? In this respect we are still way behind the poorest State of the Union, Mississippi, since our per capita income is approximately $250, while Mississippi's was $555 in 1946 and the average for the Nation is over $1,200. Of course, you have had first-hand information of this condition by your direct observation of our slums.

The explanation to this discrepancy in income gives the clue to the second reason for our undeveloped condition. The fact that our economy has been completely integrated with the economy of the United States to the extent that 95 percent of our commerce is with continental United States, while its development has been subjected to the arbitrary though benevolent regulation of Congress, without the rightful means to protect our interest when in conflict with other regional interest, gives the explanation for our inability to expand our economy to raise the standards of living of our 2,200,000 American citizens to the general average of the Nation. Members of Congress have been at times very kind and have always—as in your present case—been very receptive when they have had first-hand information of our problems. But in the give and take of congressional everyday business we have had no opportunity to protect our economy in the global manner it needs protection. And our economy and our progress have been stifled accordingly.

In this respect, a number of misconceptions have been paramount. Congress has felt satisfied because it has not extended the Federal income-tax law to the American citizens of Puerto Rico, and because Federal excise taxes from rum and other items shipped from Puerto Rico to continental United States, including customs receipts in Puerto Rico, are returned to the insular treasury. Congress has felt that these concessions are an economic aid to the island and they are justly so. However, how much do we lose in exchange for this advantage?

We do not receive full benefits of social security, nor do we participate in the proportion we would participate if we were a State of the Union, of Federal legislation such as rural electrification, rural roads, main roads, rivers and harbors, farm-support legislation, etc. Nor is the area of Puerto Rico included in the Federal blueprint for admin-

istering Federal aid in proportion to the unemployment situation under Mr. John L. Steelman's new program. Under this program it is proposed to funnel military and other Federal expenditures into areas where unemployment is in excess of the 6 percent national average, such as New Bedford, and Worcester, Mass., Philadelphia, and Scranton, Pa., San José, etc. Instead the Navy has just announced that two air bases in Puerto Rico will be shut down without considering that unemployment in the island is over 15 percent.

I am giving you below a tabulation of economic advantages and disadvantages of our present status and you will see that we are the direct losers.

TABLE A

Economic advantages under present status	$36,000,000
1. Federal income tax on $100,000,000 net taxable income	20,000,000
2. Custom receipts in Puerto Rico	3,000,000
3. Excise tax on rum shipments to continental United States	5,000,000
4. Excise tax on local rum and cigarette consumption	8,000,000
Disadvantages	40,000,000
1. Social security and benefits	28,000,000
2. Rural electrification	3,000,000
3. Secondary roads (1949 Federal budget $128,000,000)	3,000,000
4. First-class road (net direct loss $4,000,000)	4,000,000
5. Others	2,000,000

(If the Barden bill for Federal aid to education had become law we would then have lost an additional $14,000,000.)

During fiscal years 1946–47 and 1947–48 Federal aid to various States was as follows:

Florida, 2,300,000 inhabitants	$30,200,000
Oklahoma, 2,200,000 inhabitants	65,600,000
Louisiana, 2,500,000 inhabitants	30,124,000
Washington, 2,254,000 inhabitants	34,048,000
Illinois, 8,000,000 inhabitants	55,500,000
Pennsylvania, 10,000,000 inhabitants	86,500,000
Michigan, 5,200,000 inhabitants	25,592,000
Massachusetts, 4,600,000 inhabitants	47,190,000
Indirect loss of gross income:	
Price differential on 1,000,000 tons raw sugar from $6 to $9	60,000,000
500,000 tons quota limitation at $180	90,000,000
Limitation on sugar refinding	30,000,000
Insufficient tariff protection on needlework, etc	90,000,000
Insufficient tariff protection on pineapples, tobacco, coconuts, citron, etc	30,000,000
Total	300,000,000

Furthermore, though the American citizens of Puerto Rico do not contribute directly in the form of Federal income and excise taxes to the general fund of the United States Treasury from which social-security benefits and other appropriations are made, they do contribute indirectly, since by purchasing manufactured and farm products from producers in continental United States we pay in higher prices to maintain a fair return on their investments after paying Federal income tax and contributions to social security through pay-roll increases, while we have to sell our products in continental United States at prices that do not allow us to pay similar high wages.

You will point out that you are considering to correct this situation in part by extending social security to the American citizens of Puerto Rico and that you will do your best to see that we get a fair percentage of other future Federal appropriations, and we appreciate and thank you for your expressions of good will. But what guaranty do we have that a few years hence, when other men take your places in Congress, they will not, through lack of familiarity with the problems which you yourselves have observed, let things slide back so that the American citizens of Puerto Rico will not receive their due proportion of Federal aid?

Such a dependence on a paternalistic attitude from kind-hearted men is not the American way of doing things. Americans believe in a government of law, not a government of men, that is, in obtaining what is due them under a system of legal government that guarantees equal opportunities to all.

Furthermore, will the help that we can receive through this legislation be enough to solve our problems? We may receive from social security $28,000,000 a year. This amount is far from the minimum requirements of Puerto Rico to meet its many problems. According to the Columbia University report just published, $65,000,000 a year are required to give the minimum educational facilities to our 600,000 children of school age, of which number 300,000 are out of school, while $50,000,000 is the minimum required to supply the necessary building facilities. Our appropriation for education is $21,000,000 out of a general budget of $73,000,000. Furthermore, our housing problem requires about 50,000 homes with a total outlay of $200,000,000. And our industrial development needs investments of at least $500,000,000 to really make a difference.

Indeed, what is being considered now is simply a drop in the bucket and certainly justifies the expression "operation boot strap" which the Governor has used.

What must be done instead? I contend that the problem of the American citizens of Puerto Rico must be met with a massive attack, with courage, determination, and honesty. If we are American citizens, then we must be given the tools that our fellow American citizens in continental United States have to solve their problems; and these tools are equal rights under statehood. Why?

Our economy is principally dependent on sugar. Sugar means to us 60 percent of our income, and yet sugar is the only staple under the American flag whose production is limited, and whose price has been arbitrarily maintained below the average rise of the cost-of-living index.

Consider what would happen to the State of Michigan if its automobile production were reduced to 60 percent of its present output; or to Illinois if a similar reduction were ordered in its meat industry. And yet, none of those two activities loom as important in the economy of these two States as sugar does in the economy of Puerto Rico.

You will contend that sugar quotas also limit the production of sugar in the States. To this we answer that, in the first place, sugar is only 1.5 percent of the wealth production of Louisiana, 1 percent of Utah, 1 percent of Florida, 3 percent of the wealth production of Colorado, and that furthermore the quotas allocated to the sugar-producing States are such that they do not in fact limit their production because they have never been able to fill them. In the case of Puerto Rico, our shipping quota is 910,000 tons, while Cuba, a foreign country, has a quota of 2,229,000 tons, though our potential production capacity for export is 1,500,000 tons. A ton of sugar sells for $120. An additional sugar production of 500,000 tons would mean $60,000,000 additional yearly income to the island. Instead, we are forced to carry over this year 96,000 tons of sugar from the 1949 crop into 1950 with the resulting economic loss entailed.

By contrast the potato farmers of Maine obtained a subsidy of $61,000,000 for their excess potato crop last year, later sold at a nominal price to the alcohol distilleries. And Maine is a State with a total population of 847,000 as against 2,200,000 for Puerto Rico.

In addition, the price of sugar before price controls were released, was $4.20. When sugar was removed from price controls, Congress passed the Sugar Act ordering the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain the sugar consumption quota at a figure that would maintain the proper relation of the $4.20 price of sugar with the index of consumption increase after OPA was released. The index has gone up to 2¼ while sugar price today is $6. In accordance with the spirit of the law it should be $9. The proper increase in the price of 1,500,000 tons of sugar from $6 to $9 per qq. would mean an added income to the island of $90,000,000 per year.

Furthermore, we are restricted in the refining of our sugar to 110,000 tons. If we were allowed to refine all our sugar our income would increase by $30,000,000 a year.

This change in the sugar economy of the island would mean an additional yearly income of $180,000,000. With such an increase in production, the sugar industry could mechanize and could certainly meet the minimum wage of 75 cents which has just become law besides taking care of Federal income tax and of social-security contributions.

The above-described situation exists also in the needlework industry. We cannot pay the 75 cents minimum in this industry because reciprocal trade agreements have been negotiated with China, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, the Philippines and other countries, reducing the tariff protection on such things as handkerchiefs, gloves, etc., in such a manner that to meet such competition we can only pay 20 or 25 cents per hour to our needleworkers. Are you surprised that we have slums now instead of the decent homes our workers could have if they worked in an industry that was able to offer them decent wages? The needlework industry which amounts today to about $30,000,000 a year could certainly increase to $120,000,000 if it were duly protected.

You may go through the rest of our farm and industrial products and you would find a similar condition with pineapples, tobacco, citron, etc.

What then is necessary to increase the income of the island by at least $600,000,000 a year in order to increase the average per capita income to $550?

We believe that an equal deal for the American citizens of Puerto Rico, so that they can protect their economic interests in that very place—Congress—where economic policies are established, is not only necessary but indispensable to the solution of its problems.

Only by having two Senators and six Congressmen who can be on the alert all the time and who have the power to protect our interests, can the American citizens of Puerto Rico give their economy the necessary impetus to solve their problems.

This was the right which the States of Delaware and New Jersey fought for during the Constitutional Convention in 1787, and it is the right which the States from which you gentlemen come fought for later, for all you

realized that only by having equal opportunities could you protect the interests of your people.

As to the fear which has been voiced in the continental United States of the possible migration of industries to Puerto Rico to the detriment of the interests and welfare of other States, the simple realization of the fact that the total labor force of Puerto Rico is only 600,000 workers while the number of gainfully employed persons in continental United States is approximately 60,000,000 proves the fallacy of such a statement. What risk of any substantial industrial migration is there to give employment to maybe 100,000 unemployed persons in Puerto Rico? Contrariwise, the gainful employment of the unemployed American citizens of Puerto Rico and the general increase in their wage rates, would mean greater purchasing power to buy automobiles from Detroit, pork products from Chicago, and manufactured products from New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The constructive and fair solution of the problems of Puerto Rico, will, as it has always happened when the wealth of other States has increased, reflect itself in more opportunities for work throughout the Nation.

On behalf of 2,200,000 American citizens of Puerto Rico, I request that you help Puerto Rico to receive not only the benefits of social security and other similar Federal legislation, but in addition the "equal deal" of statehood, with all its rights and all its responsibilities.

Medical Care for Needy Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we hear so much about controversy and disagreement in matters affecting health legislation that it is particularly impressive when all major health organizations join in urging on Congress that provision be made under the Social Security Act to provide medical care for needy persons.

Last summer the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, American Nurses' Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Public Welfare Association joined together to form the Inter-Association Committee on Health for consideration of mutual problems. Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association, in behalf of the Inter-Association Committee, released a statement regarding the committee action on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Inter-Association Committee on Health which met in New York on Saturday March 25, made public today a statement in regard to medical care for the needy. The Inter-Association Committee on Health is made up of representatives from the American Dental Society, the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the American Nursing Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Public Welfare Association. The statement which follows has been approved by the parent associations of all members of the committee:

"It is recognized that public-welfare departments are now handicapped in carrying out their existing responsibility to assure medical care, when needed and not otherwise available, to recipients of federally aided public assistance by the inadequate financial provision of the Social Security Act and its requirement that all aid be extended in the form of cash payments to the recipient. It is therefore recommended that the latter restriction be eliminated and that the agency administering assistance be authorized to finance the purchase of medical care in behalf of assistance recipients. In order to assure the quality of medical care thus purchased for assistance recipients and relate it to their individual needs, it is also recommended that its financing be accomplished through funds earmarked for that purpose rather than charged against the funds available for cash payments to individuals. The further view is expressed that any provision to finance medical care for assistance recipients should permit the administration of the medical aspects of such care by public-health departments and that such arrangements should have the support of these six organizations.

"Wherever the term 'medical care' is used in this statement, it is understood to include dental, nursing, hospital, and other health care as well as physicians' services."

Agricultural Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food Allotment Program," delivered by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at the Northeast Dairy Conference held in Washington, D. C., on March 31, 1950. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Dairy Products and the Agricultural Surplus," delivered by Dr. John D. Black at the conference on March 30, 1950. I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript of Dr. Black's address will make 2⅔ pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $218.67.

The addresses of Senator AIKEN and Dr. Black are an interesting and fruitful contribution to the general subject of our agricultural policy.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOOD ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont)

For the last two decades, with the exception of a few years, the United States has been severely plagued by the twin problems of surplus food and malnutrition.

I don't use the words starvation or hunger because those are scare words and, as a matter of fact, the number of people suffering from actual hunger is only a small percentage of the whole.

On the other hand, the percentage of people suffering from malnutrition or underconsumption of foods necessary to an adequate diet is far larger than one would think.

While there is no way of actually determining the number of people in the United States who suffer from lack of a proper diet, yet we do have some figures that give an idea as to how many there may be.

During the month of December 1949 assistance was given to 2,700,000 persons through old-age assistance and survivors insurance.

Two million one hundred thousand were living in families where aid to dependent children was given.

One hundred thousand received aid to the blind and 1,300,000 were participating in general assistance programs, including State relief.

Therefore, this group receiving direct assistance of some kind totaled 6,200,000 persons.

We are also informed by the Census Bureau that in 1948 13,000,000 persons were living in broken families, with 54 percent of these families having an income of less than $2,500 a year.

Assuming some duplication by the groups receiving direct assistance and the broken family group, we can still safely assume that 10,000,000 people in the two groups do not have enough purchasing power to buy the foods necessary to maintain good health.

These two groups mentioned, however, are far from representing the total number of Americans whose income would indicate that they could not afford an adequate diet.

We can add to this number at least part of over a million disabled veterans or their families drawing pensions or disability compensation. There are possibly 200,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State, and municipal employees and an unknown number of other persons living on fixed incomes which have depreciated in purchasing value during recent years. Besides those groups there are doubtless several million other low-income persons who are unable to buy the food they need.

It is indeed paradoxical that the number of persons who lack the means to buy nutritious food seems to increase proportionately as surplus foods pile up on the farms or are taken from the market by Government in order to maintain a living price for the farmer.

Of course, if the purchasing power of the farmer falls, the number of unemployed people in the cities becomes greater and the number of people who are unable to buy health-giving foods increases.

We have been trying and are trying now to maintain a healthy national economy through a farm price-support program. We are already finding out that support prices if held too high reduce farm income through necessitating sharp cuts in production.

We also know that when farm prices are held high and there is much less than full employment among consumers, there is more than a corresponding drop in consumption which, in turn, necessitates a still greater reduction in production on the farm.

We have also learned from experience that unemployment and lack of purchasing power in our industrial areas diverts the purchase of food from the high quality animal protein commodities, such as milk, butter, cheese, poultry and meats, to the lower cost commodities, particularly cereal products, thus creating still further unemployment among processing, transportation and distribution groups, as well as diminishing the market for grain.

At the present time, there is little indication that the problems of surplus foods and unemployment are getting any less acute. In fact, the only reason that they have not reached the critical stage before this has been the foreign assistance programs of our Government.

Most of us have favored aid to other nations, particularly the western European na-

tions. Now, we have reached the point where western Europe does not need our surplus food so much by reason of becoming more self-sufficient each year. We may look forward to a reduced export outlet for farm surpluses from now on.

We may look forward to a greater degree of unemployment and diminishing purchasing power in our industrial areas unless steps are taken soon to prevent it.

I have frequently stated that full employment for industry is a legitimate farm objective and conversely high purchasing power on the farm is an industrial necessity.

I have also held, and I do so now, that the farm problems of today cannot be solved on the farm.

What the cost of our efforts to maintain farm income through a price-support program may be is difficult to determine.

I would say that when all the cards are placed face up on the table it will be found that it is costing a billion dollars a year right now.

We are told that the number of unemployed in the United States has now reached a total of about five million.

It has been suggested that a solution lies in letting all our farm output go on the market at a low price level and then reimburse the farmer for the difference between the average price received and a high support level.

While this proposal might work in the case of certain commodities, at certain times, it would not be workable as a general policy for the simple reason that the cost of the program would fall heavily upon the taxpayers, and the most important and by far the largest source of tax revenue is the working people of America. Neither could we be sure that the commodities produced in heavy surplus would be the kinds most needed by consumers.

With mounting surpluses and increasing unemployment, there is no time to be lost in meeting the challenge head on.

We have learned several ways how not to meet the problem. We can no longer depend upon dumping surpluses overseas. We can no longer rely upon the destruction of food supplies to do the job, particularly in view of the rising tempo of consumer wrath. Finally, we have found that a severe restriction of production on the farm will only aggravate rather than alleviate our troubles.

There is, however, right at our front door, the solution we seek if we can only find a way to reach it.

That large element of our population that I mentioned in the beginning, the low income people of America, would prove to be an outlet for most of our surplus production if we can find a means of getting badly needed food into their homes.

Probably the dairy producers of America are more keenly aware of the possibilities of this outlet than almost any other group.

The milk producer remembers all too well those cruel days of the thirties when food spoiled on the farm and prices collapsed in the market place while untold millions of American citizens walked the streets in search of jobs and went hungry.

The dairyman remembers full well the start of the penny milk program which was the result of a desperate effort to find an outlet for milk which at one time reached the wholesale price of less than 2 cents a quart.

From that humble beginning, the penny milk program has been developed into the highly successful school-lunch program which today furnishes nourishing lunches to nearly 8,000,000 school children and in fiscal 1949 utilized among other commodities 245,000,000 quarts of milk served for drinking and 170,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent served in the form of cheese, butter, and evaporated milk having a value of $80,000,000.

The school-lunch program is now well on the way toward meeting its need in all parts of the country. Not all school children are included as yet and in some sections not even milk is available for school lunches.

But the achievements of this great health-giving program from the early days of the penny milk sales have been little short of miraculous in improving the health of our children as well as providing an additional outlet for the products of our dairies.

It was the results obtained from the school-lunch program, more than anything else, which drew the attention of some of us a few years ago to the possibility of expanding the consumption of food not only among children, but among the low-income adult population of the country.

The question which arose in our minds was the manner in which this could best be done.

There was no question as to the benefits to be derived in the form of better health and improved markets.

Back in the late thirties, when the Government was still groping for more satisfactory methods of assisting needy people, it initiated on an experimental basis what was called the stamp plan of that day.

Through this plan, certain areas were selected where stamps to be used for food purchases were provided to low-income people to enable them to enjoy a better and more healthful life. This stamp-plan program was probably the most successful and satisfactory of all the assistance programs attempted during the decade of the thirties.

It was not entirely satisfactory, however, and many mistakes were made in its application.

Therefore, in 1943, when Senator LaFollette and I, realizing that there were still a great many people in America who didn't have enough to eat and foreseeing the day when surplus foods would again be with us, introduced the first food allotment bill.

We drew heavily upon the experience and knowledge of those who had been concerned with the operations of the stamp plan of the late thirties.

The bill we offered at that time was, in my opinion, a vast improvement on the stamp plan.

Since 1943, I have seen to it that a food allotment bill has been introduced in each session of Congress, making changes in the text and provisions of the bill as such improvements have been deemed advisable.

The proposed food allotment program has received a good deal of support of a sporadic nature. Some farm groups, some consumer groups, and some commercial people have evidenced a great deal of interest in it.

I have not felt that the time was propitious for asking Congress to act upon this proposed legislation until pressure for its enactment became more widespread and better organized.

Although from the start we had cooperation of Department of Agriculture people in the preparation of the bill, it was not until 1948 that Secretary of Agriculture CLINTON ANDERSON formally endorsed it.

The food allotment bill is based on the conviction that adequate diets for all families and better markets for farmers are in the national interest and that it is a national responsibility to achieve those ends as far as possible.

Primarily, the objective sought is a better dietary level, but when this is attained, we will have an automatic broadening of the market for the products of the farm.

The basic principles of the food allotment program are simple.

The first step is to determine scientifically the level of nutrition needed to keep an average person strong and healthy, and to translate that nutrition level into actual amounts of lower-cost foods.

The second step is to determine the value of the low-cost adequate diet periodically at current retail food prices. This cost on a yearly basis would be known as the food allotment.

The third step is to supplement the buying power of families that are not able to afford low-cost adequate diets.

In carrying out the third step, needless red tape that would limit the effectiveness of the program must be avoided.

At the same time, Federal funds must be used in the most effective way to raise levels of nutrition and improve farm markets.

To meet these difficulties the food allotment program utilizes the fact that on the average, lower-income families in the past have spent about 40 percent of their income on food.

Under the proposed program, participating families would continue their normal spending for food. The amount contributed by the Government would be used to buy additional food or better food.

Here is an example of the way the program would work:

Suppose the retail cost of the food allotment per person was $15 a month and for a family of four was $60. If the family had an income of $100 a month, it could get the $60 worth of coupons by paying 40 percent of its income, or $40.

If the family income was $125, it could buy the same number of coupons for $50.

But if its income were $150 the family would have to pay $60 for $60 worth of coupons, and, therefore, would find no advantage in participating.

A family of five with an income of $150, however, would gain benefit by buying $75 worth of coupons for $60.

Thus, the Government's contribution would largely represent a net increase in family food consumption.

Operation of the program could be relatively simple.

It would not in any sense be a relief program; no means test or long investigations by welfare agencies would be necessary. A simple declaration of income, similar to that required in connection with the Federal income tax, would be sufficient.

Any family would be eligible to buy coupons by paying the required percentage of its income. This would be in marked contrast to the food stamp plan, which in almost every area was limited to families receiving public assistance. Participation would not be limited to people in cities and towns. Many farm families are poorly nourished, too. Some them, of course, could best help themselves by raising more family food.

The food-allotment bill has special provisions for taking home-grown food into account.

This allotment has attracted a great deal of favorable attention among grocers, market men, and others engaged in the normal channels of trade.

These people remember all too well that period in the thirties when there was a great deal of political distribution of food which added to the troubles of already greatly harassed tradesmen.

The program I propose provides for the expenditure of food coupons at the store where the recipient usually does his trading.

The market man puts them in the bank along with his regular deposit.

It is highly essential that in attempting to alleviate distress among one group of people that we do not increase the trials and tribulations of another.

The cost of the food-allotment program would be determined by the extent to which it were used. However, if used to the maximum practicable extent, I doubt if the cost would be much, if any, more than what we are now spending in keeping food off the market.

Whereas the money we spend for food to be destroyed or kept off the market actually reduces employment, the same amount of money spent in enabling low-income persons to purchase food would have a salutary effect in enhancing the national economy through furnishing greater employment as well as improving the health of the Nation.

What the direct effect upon the dairy industry would be is also problematical, although it goes without saying that it would be very beneficial.

Recent surveys by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics indicate that families with incomes from $3,000 to $5,000 consume more products than families with less than $2,000 income in the following percentages:

	Percent
Dairy products other than butter	35
Butter	57
Meat	26
Eggs	15

If only 10 percent of the people of the Nation participated in a food allotment program, this would mean an increased total consumption of—

	Percent
Butter	5.7
Other dairy products	3.5
Meat	2.6
Pork	5.0
Eggs	1.5

Inasmuch as Government purchases of butter, nonfat milk solids, cheese, and evaporated milk in 1949 amounted to between 3 and 4 percent of our total milk production, it can be seen that had the food allotment program been in effect last year, no Government purchases of dairy products would have been necessary and we would not now have on hand 200,000,000 pounds of powdered milk and 100,000,000 pounds of butter that we can't dispose of.

In discussing the advantages of a food allotment program, I am not unaware of the probability that the bill which I am sponsoring is far from perfect.

I am also fully aware of the probability that a program such as I am sponsoring might encounter obstacles in its application.

For that reason, I have hoped that Congress might authorize it on an experimental basis before we get to the point where it may be urgently needed.

By trying it out in selected areas, both urban and rural, in different sections of the country, we could learn how it would work and take the kinks out of it before it becomes necessary to apply it on a broad scale.

The cost of trial programs would be very small in proportion to the value of the knowledge acquired.

Inasmuch as the dairy producers themselves would probably benefit from such a program more than any other agricultural group, I hope that this organization will give the matter serious study and use its influence to create and promote a wider interest in one possible solution to our economic ills.

Dairy Products and the Agricultural Surplus

(By John D. Black)

As I get into this paper, you will discover how fortunate I am in having had Senator Aiken come before me and outline his thinking on how not to have any surpluses of dairy products and his program for bringing this to pass. The question as he has analyzed it is not one of how to dispose of excess stocks of dairy products that accumulate under the kind of mismanagement that we have under our present agricultural programs, but one of preventing such stocks from ever accumulating by keeping them moving freely into consumption. My thinking and Senator Aiken's run exactly parallel. If it is exceptional to find an economist and a Member of Congress thinking closely alike on a subject, you will have to blame the exception in this case on Senator Aiken—it is because he is thinking like an economist and not because I am thinking like a Senator.

It is true that the Commodity Credit Corporation now has some nonfat milk solids, butter and cheese and other dairy products on hand, but the amounts are small and of little consequence. The reason that the CCC is doing little to dispose of them is because the amounts are so small. If the Government stocks were 10 times what they are, disposal action would be more urgent, and probably would be taken. For, after all, getting more dairy products consumed is relatively simple. None of them, like potatoes, is costly to transport and store, or like potatoes is pressing hard on all potential uses. I say this even though around 100,000,000 pounds of butter have been allowed to accumulate.

The important aspect of the subject in hand is of another nature. It is simply this: If dairy products were substituted, as they easily could be in the food consumption of the United States, for potatoes and wheat and other cereals, this would help greatly in preventing food surpluses in general. Also if considerable rolling land now in cotton in the South were shifted to dairy production and the resulting dairy products consumed in the South where they are much needed in the diets, this would help greatly with our cotton surpluses. Combine with these possible shifts in land use and consumption the possible parallel shifts to more meat and poultry production and consumption and we have almost the whole solution of the agricultural surplus problem.

Let us see some of the evidence in support of this:

Assuming potato yields of 180 bushels per acre, the substitution of dairy production for production of 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and substitution in our diets at the same time of the resulting dairy-product calories for potato calories would provide a use for 4,000,000 surplus acres of land. That is, it would take 4,000,000 acres to produce the calories in the form of dairy products now provided by the 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes being produced on 560,000 acres.

A parallel shifting to dairy production of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, and substituting the resulting dairy-product calories for white-flour calories, if we assume a yield of 15 bushels per acre, would provide a use for 18,000,000 present wheat acres. In other words, it would take 18,000,000 more acres than the 7,000,000 now being used to produce this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat to produce as many calories in dairy products as are provided by this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in the form of white flour.

A parallel shifting to dairy production of 2,000,000 bales of cotton grown on rolling land of the South would provide a use in dairy farming, assuming a cotton yield of 200 pounds per acre, for 5,000,000 present cotton acres. This would mean additional dairy products to consume in the South at the rate of 40,000 calories per person per year, equivalent to 60 quarts of milk. All of this needs to be consumed in the South, where fluid-milk consumption is little more than half what it is in the North.

The increased dairy output from these 4 plus 18 plus 5 equals 27,000,000 more acres of land devoted to dairy production would equal the equivalent of only two-fifths of a quart of milk per person per day in the United States. Distributed among consumption uses in the usual proportions in this country, this would mean, per capita annually, 90 quarts of whole milk, plus 5 pounds of butter, plus 4 pounds of cheese, plus 10 pounds of evaporated milk, plus 2 pounds of nonfat milk solids.

If diversion of 27,000,000 surplus acres of land to dairy production in this way did not prove enough to prevent agricultural surpluses, many more million acres or so of potatoes, wheat, and cotton land could be handled in the same way. Or, if our people preferred it instead, as they probably would, they could divert another 27,000,000 acres or so to the production of beef, pork, eggs, or poultry meat, or preferably some balanced combination of these. Pork production uses four times as much land per million calories as potatoes, and 2.2 times as much as wheat. Poultry production uses 15 times as much land as potatoes, and 8 times as much land as wheat. The corresponding figures for beef production are 40 and 25. Poultry and meat production thus use up land much faster even than dairy production.

We are, of course, concerned with the amount of farm labor used as well as with the amount of land. Dairy production uses less labor per acre than potato and cotton production, but more than wheat production. The general effect of diverting to dairy production the 27,000,000 acres now in potatoes, wheat, and cotton, in the proportions indicated above, would be to increase the employment of farm labor by 80,000 workers. This results from the fact that so large a part of the diversion is out of wheat. If the level of our national diet were raised presently by adding more dairy and other livestock products than produced on these 27,000,000 acres, plus whatever more is needed to prevent agricultural surpluses, we should then be employing still more labor. Dairy production uses 5 times as much labor per 1,000,000 calories as potato production, and 20 times as much as wheat production. Future population growth will contribute to the same effect.

Now let us consider the dietary significance of such a program. If the additional dairy production was consumed in this way, it would add 700,000,000 pounds annually of animal protein to the diets of our people, of which much more than half would be replacement of poorer plant proteins. It would increase the per capita intake of calcium by 20 percent, and of vitamins by 5 percent.

If the additional dairy output were used all as whole milk, it would mean only 2.8 quarts more per person per week. This would add 1,700,000,000 pounds of animal protein per year, or 14 grams per person per day. The increase in calcium intake would be from 1 to 1.4 grams per day.

Few of us need to be told how much better the land of this country would be conserved if 30,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres of it now in potatoes, cotton, and other row crops, or in wheat or sorghum in the Great Plains, were diverted to hay crops and pasture to be used as dairy and cattle feed.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing is that all this country needs in the way of a surplus program is a program for getting consumed the dairy and other livestock products that would be produced on 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres of land now in potatoes, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and a few other crops. The farmers will need some credit and other help in shifting their production over to livestock, but this will be easy to provide and will cost very little.

Once such a program is in full operation, there will be no more need for acreage allotments or marketing quotas. They may be needed in some situations while the program is getting under way, but not after it is in full swing.

The place to begin is with legislation to set up programs that will bring about the increased consumption of dairy and related livestock products. It is at this end that all programs should begin. Shifts in production to dairy and other livestock products should follow the shifts in consumption, and come only as fast as the expansion

of consumption provides a demand for the additional dairy, poultry, and meat production.

Such legislation should, however, presently guarantee to every producer of dairy products a market for all that he produces at a return per unit of product which multiplied by the national dairy output per capita of the national population of that year will give to the dairy producers of this country the same level of income measured in purchasing power as received by them in some near-at-hand reasonable base period. This proposal, you will note, is for a parity-income standard. The essence of any true parity-income standard is that it will take account of increases in output, resulting from higher yields, improved technology, or other related causes, as well as of changes in prices. It needs also to allow, moreover, for the expansion of any line of production as demand increases with growth of the national population. The base period chosen as a standard should be recent so that the base will be in terms of current technology. It must, however, be one in which agricultural prices and incomes are in general in that relation to other prices and incomes as can be expected with reasonably full employment and normal exports and imports of farm products.

The returns thus guarantied should be very largely obtained in the market place. Some use of production payments to supplement market receipts may be made to advantage at the start of such a program. They should not be needed after it is in full swing. The objective of the whole program should be to raise consumption to a point that no supplements to market prices will be needed and no acreage or market quotas.

What form should a consumption expansion program take? First, a doubling or trebling of the present school-feeding program. As Senator AIKEN stated, we are just well started with this program. If for just one generation all the school children in the United States had really adequate diets, with all the dairy and other livestock products, vegetables, and fruits in them required for proper growth and bodily functioning, and formed the habits of eating such foods, malnutrition in this country would become history only. The cost of a full-scale school-feeding program is a small amount to pay for such an accomplishment. The present school-feeding program is deficient in some other respects, but these can be corrected in the legislation. There must be more assurance that the children are getting the right foods.

Second, the Aiken national food allotment program exactly as Senator AIKEN has presented it today. This plan is carefully designed to spend the public money on exactly those groups in the population who will expand their food consumption most with a given amount of aid in the form of what amounts to lower prices. Under it the great bulk of low-income families will, in effect, be able to buy their dairy and poultry foods and meats at half price or close to it, and another large group of them at around two-thirds prices. It might be wisest to start this program with families on relief of the types listed by Senator AIKEN, and bring in other low-income families later. I was glad to hear him include the families receiving social-security payments and the unemployed. Social-security payments are far below what families need, and to make food available to them at low prices is the most effective way to supplement the small payments. At the start, I would favor going further in limiting the foods to foods of livestock origin than Senator AIKEN proposes.

Why these programs rather than the Brannan program for letting prices of farm prices fall to whatever level they will have to to move supplies and making up the differences in production payments? A chart on page 51 in the 1950 Outlook Chartbook on Rural Family Living of the United States Department of Agriculture shows that for families with an income below $4,000 per year, the consumption of dairy products expressed in quarts of milk increases at the rate of 2.9 quarts per week for each additional thousand dollars of annual income after taxes. Above $4,000, the comparable increase is only at the rate of six-tenths of a quart for each $1,000 of additional income, or one-fifth as much. This indicates that, other things being the same, a sum of money spent on expanding the dairy products consumption of families with incomes below $4,000 would go much further than if spent on higher-income families—possibly as much as five times further. It probably would not do this at once—it takes time for families to adapt their consumption practices to make full use of particular foods as they become cheaper. But there is little reason to doubt that large responses would occur within a year or two, and that they would be much greater with low-income families than with high-income families.

The reader may be interested in figures for some other food products comparable to the five for milk included in the same chart:

Meats: Low-income groups two times that for higher-income groups.

Eggs: Low-income groups two and seven-tenths times that for higher-income groups.

Citrus and tomatoes: Low-income groups one and four-tenths times that for higher-priced groups.

Other vegetables: Low-income groups three times that for higher-income groups.

Thus for all these foods, any expenditures designed to support farm prices and incomes by expanding consumption will be much more effective if designed to expand the consumption of the lower-income groups; and money spent making foods cheaper for the higher-income groups causes very little increase in their consumption. It is much to be doubted that the Congress will ever be liberal enough in its appropriations to expand the consumption of food to warrant spending much of it on the higher-income groups.

As further support of the foregoing, Senator AIKEN told you that the low-income families of the United States spend 40 percent of their incomes for food. The comparable figure for the average family in the United States reported in the last Agricultural Outlook Charts was only 24 percent.

A program such as just outlined seems clear and obvious enough. Then what are we waiting for? The answer is equally obvious. The organized dairy and other livestock producer groups have not given Senator AIKEN and his kind enough support for such a program to make him believe that it was worth his effort to press for it hard in Congress. He has, in fact, just told us this in his own words. As a result, the producer groups and their Congressmen who want high support prices at almost any cost have been allowed to carry the ball most of the time in the last two Congresses.

Why have the dairy and related producer groups not pushed hard for such a program? One principal answer is probably that they have not understood the situation and realized the value to them of such a program. I hope I have done something in this paper to remedy this situation.

Perhaps a stronger reason has been fear that any program of this sort might expand production faster than consumption. This fear must be met in the two ways I have outlined, by providing for the expansion of consumption first, and a firm assurance of income supports in the event of such a mishap.

As the situation now stands, the dairy groups are in the key position. There is no real escape from the stinking mess that our agricultural programs have become but to begin at the consumption end and expand the use of the products that will use our land most freely and thus reduce our large surplus of acres in wheat, cotton, and potatoes. I have shown that expansion of dairy production consumption for families with less than $4,000 of income is the most effective way of increasing food consumption. Why, then, do not the dairy groups step into this situation and save the day for the agriculture of the Nation as well as for themselves? The poultry and other livestock groups would surely want to join in if the dairy groups would lead the way.

Most of the foregoing has been written from the point of view mainly of solving the Nation's agricultural surplus problem. Fortunately, the diets of our people could be improved greatly at the same time. The dairy industry has another opportunity to improve the national diet. This one will reduce no surpluses except that of the nonfat dry solids. This is by getting the important food values in skim milk and whey into human food. The simplest way of getting skim milk and whey thus used is to get it included in bread and other foods in the form of powder. The commercial bread sold in this country averages only around 3 percent of milk in all forms. Twice or three times this amount could be used to good advantage both from the standpoint of quality of the loaf and nutritive value. Millers and bakers generally, however, do not seem willing to incur this extra cost. It has been calculated that a subsidy of about half the price of skim-milk powder, or around 6 cents per pound, is needed to offset this extra cost to the bakers. This would add little if any to the receipts of dairy farmers. Present prices of such powder do little more than cover the cost of assembling the skim milk and processing it. But the people of the United States would be getting in their staff-of-life a food containing the particular proteins that are most essential to health. Nonfat milk powder contains about all the proteins that are vital to health in about the proportions needed.

The production of skim-milk powder reached a level of 900,000,000 pounds in 1949. Of this, 475,000,000 pounds was used in domestic foods. The rest was handled by the Government or exported. Production should be doubled in the next 5 years, with all the increase going into bread and other foodstuffs, the expansion of production in this case, too, following that of the expansion of consumption. Some very simple legislation giving specific instruction to the Commodity Credit Corporation would meet the immediate needs of this situation. Apparently this will be required if it is going to be done. The present law permits this, but the present administration of the Department of Agriculture apparently prefers to give its stocks of skim-milk powder to Europe to feed its livestock.

In place of a bold stroke such as instructing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available to millers and makers at, say, 5 cents per pound, all the nonfat milk powder that they will use in flour, bread, and other bakery goods, the dairy groups in this country are fussing around over what to do with the 125,000,000 pounds surplus of it now left to be distributed. No doubt, it was what to do with this, and comparable amounts of butter and cheese, that you folks expected me to discuss today. I am altogether too busy a person to spend my time over such piddling questions. As I said at the outset, the only reason that we are not doing something really significant with dairy surpluses is that we do not have enough of them to make it worth while.

At the end of one protracted discussion of long-range agricultural policy in which I participated not long after the end of the war, I came out of it with the conclusion that no Congress of the United States would enact any legislation in the next few years that would really meet the situation, and

that probably no farm organization would accept such a proposal; that the situation was one in which what needs to be done will not be done so long as the country and its agriculture are getting along after a fashion—in other words, things must get a lot worse than they were before any action of the necessary sort would be taken. Today, I have to report to you that things are still not bad enough, that they must still get worse than they are now. However, we are clearly headed toward such a state of affairs. For full action of the sort needed, we may even have to wait for a general business depression. You may say that then it will be too late. It is true that earlier action would be twice as effective. But, constituted the way we are, we cannot get such action now. Hence we have to do it the only way available. Senator AIKEN has told us that we have no time to lose. I am pretty certain, Senator AIKEN, that we are going to keep on losing it for awhile—at least until after the next congressional election.

In particular, it may be needful to clarify the present confusion on two points before any real progress can be made. One of these relates to the level of support of agricultural income. Secretary Brannan in his original statement presented a parity income standard that meant prices averaging within a few percent of full 100 percent parity on the 1910–14 base. The administration also waged its last presidential campaign in language that implied close to a full parity standard, and there is much to indicate that it has similar intentions for this summer and fall. I have just read a report in the Wall Street Journal to the effect that a strong group in the Republican leadership is favoring a campaign promising a level of prices higher than the Democrats ever have thus far dared to promise. Thus we may have a campaign in which the two parties may strive to outdo themselves with impossible promises.

In actual fact, Secretary Brannan is now administering an act of 1949 which sets something like 90 percent of revised parity standard as a base, with adjustment for the size of crop (except in the case of tobacco) beginning next year, for the six basic crops, and 75 to 90 percent of such parity for dairy products, and gives him still wider discretion for everything else except wool and sugar. Exercising such discretion, he has set a level of around 79 percent for dairy products, 75 percent for eggs, and 60 percent for potatoes. He is demonstrating under this act plenty of ability to recognize that setting a price too high means accumulating large surplus stocks, and there are reports that his economic advisers are figuring in terms of production payments, if his program were accepted, far below what he set up in his original announcement. His recent presentation in favor of production payments for potatoes seems to have taken $1 per bushel, or 60 percent of parity, as the level for determining production payments.

Now, if Secretary Brannan has in mind price and income levels, such as he is now prescribing under the present act, as the levels to be used under a production payment plan, or only as much higher than these as he thinks he can get Congress to appropriate the money for, as would seem to be indicated by his statement on potatoes, by all means the helpful thing for him to do is to announce this publicly. Then there need not be any competitive out-promising the others in the coming campaign.

This raises the whole question as to the level that this country really can be expected to support. Much wild talk is being made on this subject. A chart on page 17 of the same Outlook Chart Book on Rural Family Living, that I cited before, shows that rural farm-family incomes rose 39 percent from 1945 to 1947, and urban-family incomes only 11 percent. Now all of us have to admit that farmers were doing pretty well in 1943–45, but still we are having a lot of loud talking about how far farm prices have fallen since 1947 while urban wages are still rising. The sharp break upward in prices of farm products in 1945–47 was highly abnormal and cannot properly be used as a basis for judging reasonable farm-price levels.

Another of the Department of Agriculture series shows that the farm population is now less than 19 percent of the Nation's population as compared with about 26 percent in 1925–29, and that its share of the national income was virtually the same in 1949 as in 1925–29. This represents a gain for agriculture of 26 percent. Another USDA series shows that in terms of income per capita of the farm and nonfarm population, the parity ratio in 1949 was 129 in favor of agriculture on the 1910–14 base, and 128 on the 1925–29 base.

Agricultural output has increased 67 percent in this country since 1910–14. This larger output is being produced with 10 percent fewer workers in the farm labor force. Hence the increase in output per worker in agriculture has been much larger—in fact, 86 percent.

Here are two figures that are very much worth while comparing—129 on the 1910–14 base as the figure for gain to 1949 in per capita farm income, and 186 as the figure for gain to 1949 in physical output per worker in agriculture. The 29 out of the 86 is the measure of about the extent to which agriculture was itself benefiting in 1949 from its improvements in technology. The remaining 57 had been passed on to consumers. At 1947 levels of prices for farm products farm folks would have been getting 64 out of the 86.

Figures of this kind do not of course take account, on the one hand of the improvements in transportation (the automobile and roads, for example), in communication (the telephone, rural mail service, and the radio, for example), in housing, in the reduction of the physical strain of hard labor, and a score of other things, that have probably added more to farm living than to urban living since 1910; nor, on the other hand, of the larger reduction in working hours of urban than of farm workers. After all, it is the living that a people gets out of its work that counts and cash income, or so-called purchasing power, or what is sometimes called real income, may be a poor measure indeed of the actual living obtained.

It would seem probable from the foregoing, nevertheless that if agricultural incomes go much below present levels, agricultural folks will not be sharing as they should in the gains in technology that they are making. We therefore need to bestir ourselves to find ways of keeping them from doing so. But it is important that the ways chosen will really achieve the ends desired. Trying to hold prices up on stilts by simple direct price-support measures, supported by storage and marketing quotas, we should have learned by this time, is largely a waste of effort except for a few products taken at a time for a few years at a time. The only really effective methods are those that get to the heart of the problem and adjust consumption and production, as outlined in this paper.

There is of course another kind of tactics that farm folk could try; that is, yelling loudly for much more than they have any right to expect. This is what labor does when it gets ready to enter into a new contract with employers. But agriculture is trying to work out its problem in collaboration with Government, and Government is not the employer of agriculture. It is instead the representatives of the public. As such it must seek with agriculture to find out what is agriculture's contribution to the national dividend and due reward.

The other subject on which there is much confusion is that of the cost of the different programs. Senator AIKEN has told you that the present program is costing the country $1,000,000,000 a year if everything is counted in. This is a very good estimate. The cost will run fully as high next year and afterward in spite of the flexible pricing arrangements for the basic crops. After all, they represent only a minor fraction of the total. Furthermore, they will be kept at this level only by extending marketing quotas to more and more of the nonbasic crops and managing somehow to enforce them. Senator AIKEN says that the same amount of money employed as he proposes would finance his program. I agree with him. It would, in addition, in due time make acreage and market quotas largely if not wholly unnecessary.

What the Brannan proposal would cost depends entirely upon the level of production payments. To achieve the same level of income, prices plus production payments, with no acreage or market quotas, as would be obtained under Senator AIKEN's proposal and mine would probably cost at least two billions a year, and probably more. This is because so much would be spent under his plan in lowering the prices for the higher-income groups which buy little more as prices are lowered.

Those favoring the Brannan plan over the Aiken plan sometimes draw comparisons between the Aiken plan and the old prewar stamp plan. No comparisons of this sort have any meaning. The prewar stamp plan was conducted on the basis of disposing of the particular goods that were in surplus. Often these were bulky foods that could not find an outlet in the same territory and were often stored for months and shipped long distances, often under refrigeration. The Aiken plan would lead to the production largely of foods of livestock origin that are not bulky and costly to store and transport, and the major portion would move into nearby consumption. They would be far less in bulk than the foods they would replace, and cost less to move through the channels of trade. Moreover, they would move through the regular channels of trade.

Cultural Interchange Promotes Inter-American Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Miss Ellen Collins, a graduate of St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and a master of arts of Columbia University, on the occasion of the annual celebration of Pan American Day at St. John's University. It was in connection with this event that Miss Collins was awarded the university's gold medal voted each year to the citizen who has done the most for the cause of inter-American understanding.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CULTURAL INTERCHANGE PROMOTES INTER-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

(By Ellen Collins, associate editor of World Affairs)

Not long ago, a Latin-American girl, visiting in Texas, remarked that, prior to her experience in the United States, she had been led to believe that all Americans chewed gum, were always in a hurry, and had too much money. After a few months in this country, however, the young lady from South America discovered that there were many of our people who eschew the product of the chicle, who know the uses of leisure enough to putter around a garden, and who, in most instances, do not have enough American dollars. First-hand, eyewitness, day-to-day knowledge of the United States made the difference.

Almost every student from the other American Republics can report similar revelations. Although, for some of the Latin boys, it is a shock to find that every North American girl is not a Betty Grable, the young men from Hispanic America soon adjust themselves to an environment where chaperones, or duennas, are not even considered a necessary evil, whether asleep or awake. They are quick to realize that living in a country is a sure bridge of friendship.

When university study deepens the relationship, the boy or girl goes back to his or her own people an apostle of international understanding. Politicians may come and politicians may go; but the student, girl or boy, is an eternal phenomenon. Not only the college or university remains for the scholar a cherished mother; the country, too, continues an alma mater.

One of my most vivid recollections of study at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru, revolves around a conversation with a young man of that nation who described the mere thought of a scholarship in the United States of America as his "sueño dorado." It was easy to see that the simple possibility of some academic sojourn in the land of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln gave inspiration and meaning to the work he was doing in his own country. The fact that intellectual achievement had brought cultural fortune to other boys and girls kept him at his books and in his laboratories when others, less thoughtful, were devoting their afternoons and evenings to idle pleasures. This happened before the invention of the card game Canasta. It is pleasant to record that the young man from San Marcos won his chance to specialize in engineering at a United States institution of learning and that, today, he is superintending the operation of airports in the Republic of Peru. Among his fellow citizens there is no more enthusiastic promoter of inter-American good will.

Another case is equally illuminating. While engaged in the Cultural Relations Department of the United States Embassy in Quito, Ecuador, I was approached by two religious of the Order of St. Dominic. One was the mother superior of the convent in Cuenca, a city notable for culture throughout the Republic of Ecuador. The other was the mother superior's assistant. Both had as their most cherished ambition the desire to study hospital administration and educational methods in North America. Thanks to Rev. Mother M. Gerald, O. P., prioress general of the Dominican Sisters of Siena Heights College, Adrian, Mich., it was possible to translate the dream of the Ecuadoran nuns into golden reality. When the expert on hospital administration and the specialist on educational methods returned to Cuenca, they carried back with them an abiding affection for the people of the United States. Their influence in Ecuador today extends over an entire region as well as throughout an important religious community.

Not long after this adventure in inter-American cooperation, Mother Gerald, who had become fired with the desire to expand the Dominican tradition of cultural interchange, founded a college for girls in Ciudad Trujillo, the Dominican Republic. The establishment has been a brilliant success. As a token of appreciation and, still more, of understanding the four-centuries-old University of Santo Domingo, last year, conferred upon the prioress general of the Dominican Sisters of Adrian, Mich., the degree of doctor of philosophy, honoris causa. It was the first time in the history of the institution that an honorary degree had been awarded to a woman. Naturally the whole Dominican family in the United States looks upon this gesture as another precious tie in the inter-American system. Educational links are more important than, and, often enough, rise superior to political agreements, or disagreements.

It is interesting to note that a South American as prominent as President Galo Plaza of Ecuador has long been active in this sphere of cultural interchange. When Señor Plaza was serving his country as Ambassador in Washington, he constantly found time to consult with, and, if necessary, to extend help to, Ecuadoran students who had come to North America in search of education. One case I recall with special interest was that of Alejandro Villavicencio, the son of a famous Quito physician. This young South American, whose father had died before the son could visit the United States, discovered in Ambassador Plaza, himself a product of American education, a second father. Although Alejandro came to this country determined to study medicine, he was advised in the Embassy that the real need of his own countrymen was for farmers and engineers. Consequently, Alejandro, with the good counsel and encouragement of Ecuador's representative in Washington, took up these subjects at the University of Notre Dame. Prior to the conclusion of his studies, he waxed so enthusiastic about the United States that he persuaded his mother, sisters, cousins, and other relatives to make extended visits to North America.

Now the family is reunited in Quito, where the Villavicencios are ardent admirers of American democracy. Furthermore, Ambassador Plaza, as Candidate Plaza, gave Ecuador its first taste of a political campaign without partisan politics. Running as the head of a new group, the National Civic Movement, free from any dependence upon the old-line conservatives and liberals. As a result, the Republic of Ecuador, despite stratagems and plots, is enjoying a period of genuine representative government, under a President who studied in two United States institutions—the University of California and the University of Maryland. Perhaps the day will come when a President of the United States of America may boast that he went to school in Quito, or Lima, or Rio de Janeiro, or Port-au-Prince. Such an event would mark the dawn of a new era in inter-American understanding.

Another Ecuadorian who can be cited as a worker in the cause of truth in inter-American affairs is Dr. Miguel Albornoz. The latter, after a 2-year course in journalism in the Pulitzer School, Columbia University, effected an immense improvement in the make-up and content of the leading Quito newspaper, El Comercio. This organ, prior to the United States educational experience of Dr. Albornoz, had been almost violently anti-United States of America. Fortunately, the change I mentioned took place during the war when we needed exponents of the true facts in every capital of South and Central America. Dr. Albornoz, patriotic Ecuadorian to the core, insisted upon objective presentation of the news at a critical moment in history. It was no accident that Dr. Benjamin Cohen, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations in charge of Public Information, invited Dr. Albornoz to join his staff at Lake Success, where he continues to put his inter-American principles into daily operation.

In view of the imminent visit of His Excellency President Gabriel González Videla, of the Republic of Chile, it is useful to recall that a United States citizen, Dr. Gustave Weigel, acted for many years as dean of the faculty of theology in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution in Santiago de Chile. In this post, Dr. Weigel distinguished himself by his mastery of the Spanish language and by his familiarity with every phase of Chile's culture. Unlike many another North American resident in a South American capital, he understood that his vocation required that he know and like the Chileans, not simply the socially conscious members of the English-speaking colony in his community.

Dr. Weigel became an adopted son of the Republic. Moreover, when World War II broke out, he was able to serve the broad cause of hemisphere defense by a lecture tour which took him to many important Latin American centers. Both by his personality and by the breadth of his ideas he contributed to victory in South America. Although now on the faculty of Woodstock College, Md., he is known as an honorary Chilean and an active figure in the inter-American movement. It was about 1 year ago that Dr. Weigel was awarded the Order of Merit of the Republic of Chile. No North American ever did more to deserve the honor. And President González Videla, whose friend he is, would be the first to acknowledge this fact.

It may be added that Father Weigel was big enough to recognize the United States intellectual who was the first recipient of the gold medal awarded by the Pi Alpha Sigma Fraternity. As dean of the faculty of theology, Dr. Weigel recommended Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, founder of the Inter-American Seminars in the University of Habana, the University of San Marcos, and the Nation University of Mexico for the first honorary doctor of divinity degree ever granted to a North American by the Pontifical University of Chile. Since your own distinguished chairman of the department of romance languages in St. John's University, Dr. Nick Sallese, is a friend and coworker of Dr. Thorning, he no doubt could relate much more about the wartime service of this apostle of the good-neighbor policy. I myself, as a product of the Inter-American Seminars and subsequently director of the Seminar in the University of Mexico, can testify to the respect in which Dr. Thorning is held in all cultural and religious centers in the other American Republics.

It is with a sense of joyful privilege, therefore, that I accept the Our Lady of Guadelupe Medal for 1950. Relatively insignificant as my contributions have been, they have brought me to the attention of Pi Alpha Sigma. Consequently, your decision and your award may serve as an encouragement to young people throughout the Western Hemisphere who look to our universities and colleges for Christian principles and ideals of public service. As a graduate of Mother Elizabeth Seton's College, St. Joseph's, Emmitsburg, Md., and one who has been a beneficiary of the spirituality and culture of the Fathers of the Mission as well as of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, a saint well beloved throughout Latin America, I am happy to be with you today in your pan-American festivities, and to accept from the hands of your officers the accolade of Our Heavenly Mother, Our Lady of Guadelupe, whose Son is the Christ of the Andes.

The Ferguson-Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Why the Ferguson-Mundt-Nixon Proposal Should Be Defeated by the Congress," which I delivered last night, and which was broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE FERGUSON-MUNDT-NIXON PROPOSAL SHOULD BE DEFEATED BY THE CONGRESS

Not long ago President Truman took occasion to compare the national hysteria prevalent in our country with that which prevailed at another time in our history which we all recall with shame. He indicated that the hysteria reminded him of the time in 1798 when the infamous alien and sedition laws were enacted (press conference, June 16, 1949). For a time those laws blotted out freedom in our land. What caused the enactment of these unconstitutional laws?

Why, France had gone through a revolution. The Federalist Party, then in power in the United States said the French Government was spreading revolutionary propaganda in America through paid agents, just as they say Russia is doing today. To meet these alleged dangers they passed these laws.

The Alien Act gave the President power to expel from the country any alien he believed to be plotting against the Government. The Sedition Act forbade the publication of any false, scandalous or malicious writing with intent to incite sedition, defame the Government, or aid any hostile design of any nation.

Whom do you suppose the Federalists prosecuted and sent to jail?

All of the prosecutions under these repressive laws were against Republicans. The accused included a Republican Member of Congress and the proprietors, editors, and chief writers of the Republican press.

It was Thomas Jefferson and James Madison who led the battle to wipe out those laws. Both declared the Sedition Act to be unconstitutional, and therefore null and void. In the election of 1800 this act was the major issue. Jefferson was overwhelmingly elected President. The Federalist Party was destroyed, never to reappear again. Those imprisoned were released. Their fines were remitted. The alien and sedition laws were ignored as null and void.

In his inaugural address March 4, 1801, Thomas Jefferson said, "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

The principle thus stated so eloquently lives to this day in our law. The Supreme Court has said, "The very purpose of the first amendment is to preclude public authority from assuming a guardianship of the public's mind through regulating press, speech, and religion. In this field every person must be his own watchman for truth, because the forefathers did not want any government to separate the truth from the false for us." (*Thomas* v. *Collins* (323 U. S. 511, 545).) And Mr. Justice Jackson in an opinion, made it clear that freedom of thought is a substantial right. He said, "Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order." (*Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624, 642).)

This principle of freedom of speech and press from governmental interference is the very foundation of democratic government. This is true because the people can only govern themselves, if they can get all the facts. You cannot make up your mind what you want of your Government unless you can first hear every point of view. You cannot get your Government and Representatives in Congress to know what your will is unless you are free to speak your mind; and associate together with others of like mind to further your common will.

I regret to say that these great American principles are more threatened today than at any time in our history. A bill has been reported favorably to the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee (with myself alone dissenting) which, if enacted, would undermine dangerously or entirely destroy the substance of freedom of speech, press, and association in the United States.

I, WILLIAM LANGER, alone, wrote a minority dissenting opinion. It is a good one. If you wish a copy write me here at Washington.

Like the alien and sedition laws these bills are the product of hysteria, of frantic, unthinking fear of ideas. Like those bills they merit the vigorous opposition of all of you who cherish liberty.

Under the guise of protecting our democratic institutions against an alleged threat of subversion from foreign agents who seek to overthrow our Government by coercive means, it is proposed by this bill to regiment the thinking of the American people and to impair or prevent the free exercise of constitutionally guaranteed rights.

It is proposed to confer on a politically appointed board vague and, therefore, unrestricted power to outlaw associations of citizens whose views and policies are considered by it to be dangerous.

If this political board of three members considered that a group of citizens or an organization supported some policies which were similar to policies supported by Communists; or they included some Communists in their group, or they failed to disclose information about themselves, they would have to register with the Attorney General as Communist organizations. The bill defines such organizations as conspiratorial agents of Moscow seeking to overthrow our Government by coercive means, and to set up in its place a totalitarian dictatorship controlled by Moscow. Obviously no group could continue to exist with that label pinned on it. Its members would be hounded and cast out as outlaws. Who would employ members of groups hounded by the Government in that way? The victims would have little chance of earning a living after their names were registered.

Yet, it is not necessary under the bill to prove that the organization or any of its members, ever did a single thing to overthrow our Government, or establish any kind of a dictatorship here, or ever had any such idea in their minds. Moreover, these people, good American citizens, likely often veterans of World Wars I and II, could suffer these awful penalties, without ever having a trial before a court or jury. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt according to our American judicial standards would also be dispensed with.

Just think of that. Talk about a bill conferring arbitrary power. Here we have it. In North Dakota, if they do not like the Nonpartisan League, they could bar it. Many people do not like the Nonpartisan League because we were successful in promoting measures whereby the State owns its own bank, writes its own insurance, and owns its own State mill and elevator, and has operated all of them successfully for 30 years, it can be readily understood why certain people do not like a political organization of that kind. Here it is proposed to give the political board power to outlaw the Nonpartisan League.

Under these vague powers trade-unions and other organizations which may seek to alter the status quo or oppose this or that governmental policy, by lawful means, with no evil intent, could be branded as traitorous agents of foreign governments or movements. Their members could be relegated to the position of second-class citizens—made subject to economic and social outlawry.

In the effort to avoid obliteration, voluntary associations of citizens would be compelled to conduct witch hunts to determine the views and associations of their members—to fear to express their views on any controversial questions, to encourage their members to spy and inform on each other.

It is proposed to punish as a crime mere membership in an organization which has failed to destroy itself by registering when ordered to do so.

It is proposed to make criminal the agreement to do any act, however innocent and lawful, which a court might find would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship.

Who can say with any certainty what agreement or act might be held to substantially contribute to a totalitarian dictatorship?

Would an unbalanced budget, compulsory health insurance, Federal low-rent housing, or the Brannan farm-subsidy bill substantially contribute to the establishment of such a dictatorship?

If some group opposes the peacetime draft or the North Atlantic Pact or huge military appropriations, can a court which considers these measures necessary for the defense of our country against alleged Russian designs, hold that such opposition substantially contributes to the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States?

What about peaceful advocacy of socialism? Would an American still have the right to be a Socialist if he wanted to be one?

How would a court answer these questions? No one can tell. The answer would actually rest to a large extent on political opinion. Our courts would soon lose the respect they now enjoy if judges decided cases on such a basis. And, under our Constitution, all accused persons are entitled to due process of law. When men must guess at the meaning of a law—if they cannot know with reasonable certainty the conduct it would punish, they are clearly denied that due process.

It is for such reasons as these that I have concluded that the American tradition of freedom could only suffocate and die in the atmosphere these bills would create.

Attempts to overthrow the Government, sabotage, espionage, treason, armed civilian groups must be stopped, and proven foreign agents should be required to register. Any forcible resistance to law should be punished. Attempts to undermine the loyalty, discipline, or morale of the armed forces should be a crime. But all of these are now punishable as crimes, or required under existing law.

No emergency can be pointed to as a justification for this departure from our great heritage of freedom. By honoring that heritage we have met all threats to our national security. While preserving liberty, we have become the strongest nation on earth. We can never hope to maintain our democracy

by resorting to measures which strike at its very foundations.

In these troubled times only a people vigilant and active in the cause of liberty can hope to maintain their freedom. The alien and sedition laws were canceled because the people met the challenge. They showed how they cherished liberty by joining the good fight. May history repeat itself, and now, in time to stop the enactment of these bills.

I fervently hope that reason will prevail over hysteria in the Congress of the United States when the time comes to vote on these measures. In that case, I am confident that these repressive measures will meet the resounding repudiation they deserve.

ECA's New Strategy for a New Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, which appeared in This Week magazine on April 2, 1950, having special reference to the second anniversary of ECA. I commented on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago that ECA had "perhaps the most brilliant leadership of any operating department of our Government." I was, of course, referring to Mr. Hoffman and the many outstanding men, both here and abroad, which he and his deputy, Mr. William Foster, have brought into the administration of the ECA.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA'S NEW STRATEGY FOR A UNITED EUROPE

(The Marshall plan is 2 years old tomorrow. With two more years to go, its Administrator sets forth a new policy. Up to now ECA has helped nations to their feet; now it will get them all to join hands.)

(By Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator)

WASHINGTON.—After 2½ years in the struggle for European recovery against a cold war of mounting fury, we are, this week, halfway through the Marshall plan. Can we foresee final victory on June 30, 1952? Or, as ominous headlines sometimes seem to indicate, are we being drawn into an unending battle against communism of which no man can predict the outcome?

I am not a prophet, but I know that we can see the shape of our problem far more clearly than was possible 2 years ago when we opened our first ECA "office" in my room at the Statler Hotel here in Washington.

The vortex of today's struggle is in western Europe, where the Kremlin is attempting to wreck European recovery and to set back the European self-generated movement toward unity. Moscow knows that if it can halt recovery and gain control of western Europe piecemeal, its schemes for world domination will be given terrible impetus. Moscow also knows that failure to halt European recovery and win western Europe will block its ambition to dominate the world.

"A NEAR MIRACLE"

At the halfway mark we can look back on the strategy by which we have made progress so far and outline the somewhat different strategy necessary from now until 1952.

The first half of the Marshall plan was necessarily devoted to overcoming economic collapse within each nation, raising production and restoring the financial stability of each government. We had to start with existing economic modes and machinery.

And what has been accomplished, largely on a country-by-country basis within 2½ years, has been spectacular.

The recovery of European industry, literally built up from the rubble of World War II, has been a near miracle. Less than 5 years after the end of the war, industrial production has been lifted 20 percent above its prewar level. In contrast, after World War I in which the destruction was not nearly so bad, Europe needed 7 years just to regain her prewar level.

Hard-coal production is up 17 percent above prewar, steel, 52 percent; electric power, 21 percent; cement, 58 percent; and cotton yarn, 31 percent. Farm production has lagged somewhat behind but is now almost back to prewar levels.

Now that production is restored about as far as it can be within the existing economic framework of western Europe, we are ready to go beyond this opening stage of the struggle.

Congress has stated it to be the policy of the people of the United States "to encourage the unification of Europe." As the program has gone forward during its first 2 years, we have come to appreciate more and more the wisdom of our Congress in emphasizing the importance of this goal.

A united Europe means an economically stronger Europe. Against a strong, united Europe, Stalin and his Russian cohorts will not march.

BACKGROUND TO CHAOS

What are the basic causes of European disunity? To see the roots of chaos in western Europe we must look back even beyond the First World War.

In 1900, the American worker and the western European worker produced and lived about on the same scale. But since 1900, the United States has been growing because of our one big market and free competition across State lines. We have seen the dawn of the highway age.

Western Europe meanwhile slipped into narrow compartments. Fifty years of wars and preparation for wars, cartels, tariffs, import quotas, exchange controls and other devices of economic nationalism have choked free competition at its source—and made mass production for a big market impossible.

Last year, the United States, with 150,000,000 people, turned out a gross national product of about $260,000,000,000. Western Europe, with its 270,000,000 people, had a gross national product of $160,000,000,000.

If European per capita output had been on a par with ours, their gross national product would have been $470,000,000,000 instead of $160,000,000,000. Of course Europe hasn't the raw materials, horsepower, or other resources for production at this level. But she doesn't need to equal American per capita production, in order to get an expanding standard of living which will lift her people above the threat and wiles of aggressive communism.

The obvious need is for Europe to develop her own program for taking fuller advantage of the great potentialities for prosperity and security that lie in closer cooperation. Unless she does move in this direction, and move fast, the recovery so far achieved within the individual nations cannot stick.

STEPPING OFF ON THE RIGHT FOOT

Marshall plan countries were the first to recognize that Europe has got to attain a broad, freely trading market so it can take advantage of large-scale, low-cost production. Also, they know such economic integration will provide the means to bring the new German Republic fully into the western European family of nations—an essential condition for a peaceful and prosperous western Europe.

Integration has already started. Since last fall, the participating countries have removed quota restrictions from 50 percent of their trade which had previously been restricted. They are working to reduce these restrictions still further and have made some progress toward ending dual pricing—the system of charging one price for goods on the domestic market and up to 40 percent more to a neighbor. They took a vital step in naming Dr. Dirk Stikker, the able Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, to a new high-level post within the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) to help speed the necessary political decisions that must accompany economic policy.

Thus, the OEEC, originally formed as a means to determine how to divide American economic aid, gives promise of evolving into a permanent force for European integration. And from now until June 30, 1952, the Marshall plan will be helping Europe unify herself more rapidly. Accordingly, there will be some changes in the ECA operation.

Early in the Marshall plan, an intra-European payments plan was worked out which operated on the principle of "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors."

Norway, for example, had a terrible housing shortage because the retreating Germans had blown up thousands of homes. She had the lumber for new construction but lacked the nails. Belgium had the nails—but Norway was out of francs.

Marshall plan credits were therefore extended to Belgium on condition that she extend an equivalent credit in francs to Norway. The Norwegians bought the nails and built the houses by last Christmas.

A BOOST OVER THE FENCE

But this plan, even with some modifications to increase the flow of intra-European trade, still left the existing currency barriers about where they were. It gave a boost over the fence but did not tear it down.

Marshall-plan countries are now negotiating a new European Payments Union which, with the help of the Economic Cooperation Administration, will help tear down this fence.

The new payments union will act as a clearinghouse for the nations of western Europe in settling their debts with each other and also, to some extent, as a bank to finance a deficit country—so long as that country is making every effort to put its financial house in order and increase exports to its neighbors.

Henceforth, each country will receive a pro rata allotment of Marshall-plan funds based on the previous divisions of aid.

We plan to withhold at the start not less than $600,000,000 from the total 1950–51 ECA appropriation, which can be available to the payments union to encourage the program of liberalized trade. Only as an effective payments union is put into operation will the full amount of the 1950–51 appropriation be made available to all the participating countries.

The United States is asking a great deal of western Europe. The steps we are asking amount to forcing in 25 months a process which might normally take 25 years. But I am not discouraged because I believe that the job can be done and is beginning to be done.

Meanwhile, there are some adjustments we shall have to make ourselves.

MORE DOLLARS NOW

In financial terms, it was the dollar gap which was Europe's trouble in 1947, when Gen. George C. Marshall first proposed the plan which bears his name. Europe simply

didn't have the dollars to buy the essential things she needed for survival, and she had no way to earn those dollars.

The dollar gap between Europe and America has been narrowed from about $7,500,000,000 in 1947 to some $4,000,000,000 in 1949–50.

The dollar gap actually has a long history, and unless we take steps on our side of the water, it may persist after June 30, 1952, with results very damaging to the cause of freedom. In every single year from 1914 to the present, part of western Europe's trade with the United States has been on the cuff.

AMERICANS PAID

We have sold more abroad than we bought in return, and the American taxpayers have paid for most of the difference through a long series of peacetime loans and grants amounting to some $52,000,000,000.

I don't think the dollar gap can be completely closed by June 30, 1951, but I believe that with strenuous efforts in Europe, and if Americans are willing to take more imports, we can reduce it to manageable proportions.

Most of the gap can be closed with noncompetitive goods and services—American tourist travel to Europe, materials for national defense, noncompetitive luxuries which enrich our own lives. Yet there will have to be some competitive imports if we are going to close the gap.

Perhaps by 1953 Europe will be in a position to sell us close to a billion and a quarter dollars' worth of goods competitive with our own.

DROP IN THE BUCKET

Accepting these imports—which will be only a drop in the bucket compared with our own production in this country—will be essential to our strategy for total victory. By enabling a strong, united Europe to earn dollars to pay for what she buys we can help Europeans raise their own living standards. Thereby we can defeat communism on its home and neighboring grounds.

In buying more from free Europe we strengthen ourselves, and eventually reduce and eliminate the need for our staggering load of armaments.

If we are willing to lead the world along the better way of expanding living standards and free institutions, we can end the threat of communism.

Slavery behind the iron curtain must eventually break down as democracy in free Europe proves its greater benefits to the average man. If we are determined and unafraid, we can answer our questions about the hazardous future after June 30, 1952.

A Free Press as First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our First Line of Defense: A Free Press," delivered by Martha Rountree, director of the Meet the Press radio program, at the twentieth annual joint luncheon of the Alliance of Business and Professional Women of Chicago, and Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, held in Chicago on March 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE: A FREE PRESS

I feel very honored to be here today—I really mean it. I think you have paid me a great compliment and I hope I live up to your expectations. My invitation came from a most charming and persuasive lady. When she asked what my subject would be, the very first thing that came to mind was a free press, which I consider America's main line of defense. That, to me, is the most important issue in the United States today.

Spending as much time in Washington as I do as producer of a news program and working as an editor of a national magazine—I have become very conscious of our free press, of the importance of a free press and the dangers to it. Without a free press, the magazine I work for could not exist, because the American Mercury magazine is a magazine of opinion which never hesitates to speak out against those in power; without a free press the radio program to which I devote a great deal of my time and energy could not exist. On Meet the Press top figures in the news accept the challenge of four trained and top newspaper reporters each week in an unrehearsed, probing, on the record press conference.

The press conference is an American institution. Meet the Press brings it to the whole Nation. It is in the press conference that men in public life have the opportunity to advance their ideas informally and to champion their activities. Here also newsmen have an opportunity to exercise their right to information. They question searchingly. From these free exchanges the public gets a better insight into leaders in public life and the course they pursue.

From the center of the news front, in Washington, Meet the Press brings these exchanges to millions of listeners throughout America. Nothing is off the record. The newsmen in their questioning do not always indicate their opinions. They take different ways of digging for information. They explore the criticism others have voiced. The people being interviewed speak extemporaneously, replying to unrestricted questions. They are courageous men, ready to meet the challenge of a free press and free radio.

Through sharp questioning and unprepared answers we try to get the story behind the story—to uncover hidden facts and information for the American public. Usually we succeed in getting a story or some aspect of a story which has not yet been told. Most frequently we come up with a story that clarifies the news—which is our main objective—and on many occasions we come up with a story that makes sensational news. For example, when we interviewed Senator Bilbo some years ago, the whole country was shocked when he boldly admitted under the persistent questioning of the newsmen participating on Meet the Press that night, that he was a member of the Ku Klux Klan. His admission was largely responsible for the senatorial investigation to unseat him.

It was on Meet the Press that Whittaker Chambers accepted Alger Hiss' challenge to call him a Communist without congressional immunity. As a result of this broadcast Alger Hiss sued Whittaker Chambers for libel. The rest of the story you know—the pumpkin papers, the indictment for perjury, and finally Hiss' conviction.

I could go on citing many other instances where Meet the Press has served to bring before the public the true facts. One of the most interesting aspects of the program is the kind of mail we receive. We get thousands of letters from people in all walks of life and from all parts of the country. Among these there are hundreds which could be summarized this way, "Meet the Press is democracy in action." That, to me, shows how vividly alive the American public is to the importance of ungarnished news. Where else in the world will a man subject himself to questioning by leading newsmen, experts in their own fields? Where else can we sit down and listen to this give and take and be permitted to arrive at our own conclusions? But Meet the Press is only one small facet of our great press in the United States. And it is not my purpose to talk about my own work exclusively. But because of my work it has been brought home to me that a free press is not just a natural occurrence—not something that can be taken for granted. It is something for which we have to fight now as our forefathers fought throughout the years. At the very roots of our union lie the struggles and victories of the men who formulated our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Today we are apt to look upon the habeas corpus law, trial by jury, the Magna Carta, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, as things that grew on trees and our natural right and forget that they have had to be fought for every inch of the way and that this fight is by no means over. There are many forces at work which will whittle away and destroy these hard-won rights if we don't exercise constant vigilance.

No tradition is more sacred in this country than that of the free press. The very first of the original 10 amendments to the Constitution deals with the free press. Even before the Constitution was adopted, virtually all Americans agreed with Jefferson when he said, "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost." Virtually all Americans agree today with what Jefferson said. Yet few things have been taken more for granted. All through history attempts have been made by powerful forces to curtail that freedom.

In the earliest years of this country, the greatest danger to a free press came from the newspaper profession itself. The American press of a hundred years ago was, with very few exceptions, unspeakably shrill and vulgar. It was chauvinistic and libelous. By its excesses, it came close to digging its own grave. But fortunately, as the country matured, the press matured with it, and developed a sense of responsibility.

The American press not only cured itself, it surmounted the threat of domination by special interests. Anyone who doubts that has only to look at a newsstand or turn on the radio. He will speedily find that no opinions are excluded. Everyone, including the avowed enemies of our form of government, has the opportunity to state his case. Liberals and conservatives, Fascists, and Communists, are all permitted to speak out and to be heard. There can be no question about it: the American press is the freest as well as the ablest in the world. It does a magnificent job in gathering and sifting the news and in presenting it to you in a way that makes the most sense. But let's not get smug about that. The press is in real danger today—in greater danger, it seems to me, than ever before. And that danger comes from the very people whose job it is to protect it: our Government officials—our powerful bureaucracy that believes it knows best what should and should not be told to the people.

Just the other day I read that there are approximately 48,000 propagandists on our Federal pay roll—a great many of these are known in Washington as PR's, in other words, public-relations experts. No matter what you call them, propagandists or public-relation experts, I do not believe the American people need 48,000 interpreters to manipulate the news and tell them what to think. The press is dependent upon that bureaucracy for a great deal of information. No one can compete with the Federal Government when it comes to accumulating information. Every American embassy throughout the world, the FBI, the agents of every department are constantly sending on-the-

spot reports of importance. Too often, however, these reports are kept secret, are doctored, or released at the wrong time. That information belongs to the American people. It should be available ungarnished, unadorned by public relations experts. To delay it, to twist it, to make it more or less palatable depending upon the purpose to be served, is to exercise a subtle and dangerous censorship. And that, unfortunately, has been happening in Washington for a great many years.

On May 6, 1949, the United Press reported that the President had instructed Government officials to notify the Democratic National Committee whenever they planned to make a speech. Just what was the purpose of that? When the question was asked, the answer was that no censorship was involved, just exploitation. But why should a speech on foreign policy by the Secretary of State be put on the same level with an address to a political rally? Why should a report by the Secretary of Defense to the Nation on our defense policy be made to serve the purposes of the Democratic National Committee? All things must have a beginning—political manipulation of information is a beginning, but a party line may be the end. And a party line is a threat to free democratic institutions in America whether it be a Communist Party line, a Fascist Party line a Democratic Party line, or a Republican Party line. There is no excuse for that kind of exploitation by any political party, of information that rightfully belongs to the American people. It has been demonstrated too often that it is a short step between exploiting a speech for political purposes and censoring or twisting it for the same reason.

There was some excuse for controlling information at the source during the war. There is no excuse for it today.

Let us examine in detail the major issues of national defense. Do we know what our strength is today? Are we told exactly wherein we are weak? One day Secretary of Defense Johnson says we are prepared "to lick the hell out of Joe Stalin"—the country is in grand shape militarily. The clear implication is that we have nothing to worry about, that it is unnecessary to increase our military budget. But almost the very next day, Secretary of the Air Symington says Russia "has the world's largest army, the world's largest air force, and the largest submarine force"—and we have no sure defense if that enemy should launch a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

Both men can't be right. One of two things must be true: Either someone knows the truth and is hiding it from the American people, or those in charge of our defenses are incompetent and should be replaced. The press, of course, can only report the opinion of those who have access to the facts—and it cannot say whether the facts thus reported are accurate and complete. In this instance, someone, for reasons best known to himself is obviously withholding some facts. It is no excuse to say that we cannot tell the American people the truth because we want to keep it from the enemy. If the enemy has been successful in stealing our atomic secrets, surely he has been smart enough to spy out the state of our defense. How simple the problem would be if those who knew told us the whole truth—told us how strong the enemy is—how weak or strong we are. Once the American people knew that, they would do what was necessary to place the Nation in an impregnable position. But they cannot make a sensible decision on the basis of conflicting opinions—especially when they suspect that some of these opinions are influenced by political considerations.

Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free—know the truth and the truth shall keep you free.

The problem of getting information from those who know it is by no means a new problem. It has long been with us—when we fail to solve it the results are always serious and sometimes disastrous.

In December 1941 we suffered a catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. That, and our state of unpreparedness, can be traced directly to those who were running our Government. By 1936, as we know now, our embassies and private informants told our leaders that Germany was preparing for war. They knew that Hitler was building the most powerful war machine in history. They knew that this war machine was to be directed first against Europe, and later against the rest of the world. They knew from every fact that was available to them that this country was in great danger. But they kept the information to themselves. They never gave us the facts—they gave us only opinions about the facts—often contradictory opinions, as they are doing now. While their sources from all over the world sent in a steady stream of warnings, they continued to talk out of both sides of their mouth. When President Roosevelt delivered his famous "Quarantine the aggressors" speech in 1937, it was pretty late to set the record straight. The American people had been led to believe that Europe was not our problem, that we could stay out of the mess. And when, as was to be expected, we did not react as he hoped to his speech—the administration returned to the cheerful optimism of the early thirties. The facts continued to be the exclusive property of a small group in the administration.

It is interesting, in retrospect, to look at the 1940 Presidential campaign in this country. In the course of that campaign, Wendell Willkie said: "Freedom of the press is the staff of life for any vital democracy." President Roosevelt matched this when he said that all of our freedoms "would be nullified should freedom of the press ever be successfully challenged." But both of these leaders were guilty of deceiving the people—both of them ran on a platform to keep the peace. Both of them pretended that this country could be kept out of the war. Both of them knew that it could not.

We never would have been so unprepared if the experts at the top had taken the public into their confidence, had given them facts rather than opinions, had confirmed what so many journalists had been shouting for years. We know what happened when the American people finally did learn the truth at Pearl Harbor. Their doubts and confusions were dispelled overnight, and they reacted, as they always have, with intelligence, determination, and courage.

When Germany and Japan had been defeated, however, the bureaucrats reverted to type. They once again withheld from the American people the most important information about our national security.

In this case, they withheld information about Soviet Russia. We were again allowed to develop a false sense of security. During the war and for more than a year after the end of the war, our Government fed us on a diet of pious optimism concerning Russia. Here again, the men at the top knew the facts. They knew that Stalin was not demobilizing his army; they knew that he was creating a war machine even mightier than Hitler's. More to the point, they knew that he was dealing with us as a potential enemy, not as a friend and ally. And yet, those who ran our Government fed us propaganda about the Russians, made us believe in spite of what many of our newspapers said, that we were on the road to one democratic world.

And what was the result of this deception? One result was the cry to "bring our boys home" immediately. The cry was certainly a natural one under the circumstances. We are not an aggressive Nation; we would be perfectly happy if we never had to keep a single tank in operation. And so we broke up the mightiest army and the mightiest air force the world had ever seen. We weakened our defenses to the point of near disaster. Once again, a bureaucracy had placed the Nation in danger by withholding important information and feeding us misinformation.

It seems to me that our free press, and our democracy, have reached something of a crisis. In each decade, our Government grows bigger and bigger. It has acquired facilities which no private concern can hope to match. It is the biggest employer in the country, the biggest producer, and the biggest spender. And it is also the biggest news gatherer in the country. No publisher has such a tremendous staff of experts to lean on. No publisher has such highly organized sources of inside information all over the world.

That information belongs to the American people. It should be made available to the American press, uncut and unedited by public relations experts. Withholding and editing such information is a subtle and dangerous censorship. And those officials who condone such practices have no understanding of democracy—or the dangerous game they play.

One more example of the bureaucratic censorship of important news, with its disastrous results: Consider the history of our policy in China. For years Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists were our friends. We praised their courage and their high resolve. We helped them in their uphill fight against the Japanese. When we entered the war, they were our allies. President Roosevelt made an address in which he said: "China likewise expresses the magnificent will of plain people to resist the dismemberment of their nation. China, and General Chiang Kai-shek asks our help. America has said that China shall have our help." When he returned from the Cairo conference, President Roosevelt said in a speech, "Today we and the Republic of China are closer together than ever before in deep friendship and in unity of purpose." We recognized China under the generalissimo's leadership as one of the five great powers, gave China a permanent seat in the Security Council. Was that the whole truth about our relationship with China? Not by any means. We discovered too late to do anything about it that a secret agreement had been made at Yalta by which China was sold down the river to Stalin. From that point on, conditions grew worse and worse for the nationalist government and better for the Chinese Communists. The full force of our official propaganda turned on Chiang Kai-shek after our attempt to get him to work with the Chinese Communists. Clearly the American people were officially told a series of lies about China and the Chinese Communists, while the situation deteriorated to a point where it could not be saved. China was lost to our camp—and our State Department issued a white paper—or rather a whitewash paper. Had the people been told the truth about China, had they known what was actually happening there, they would have insisted on the kind of action that kept Greece from falling into the hands of the Communists—of that I am sure. If the Government had spoken up, if it had released the documented truth about the Chinese Communists, the whole ghastly mess might have been avoided. The American people would have recognized the Chinese Communists for what they were, and would have insisted that steps be taken to prevent their enormous conquests. Our Government kept us in the dark, and Stalin has won another great victory in the cold war.

This bureaucratic policy of censoring news at the source makes freedom of the press pretty much of a mockery. How can the

American people make intelligent decisions on any policy when the Government withholds the necessary information? The answer is that they cannot. Slowly but surely we seem to be moving into an era of government by administrators. James Burnham called this phenomenon "the managerial revolution," a phrase which refers to the making of high Government policy by an elite group of administrative experts. Whatever you call it, it presents a grave danger to American democracy.

What I have been saying adds up to this: Our security and our future happiness are threatened by censorship that is hard to recognize and difficult to deal with. This censorship withholds vital information from the American people when they need it most. Until we master this problem of censorship at the source, our press cannot be truly free—our people cannot be accurately informed—our democracy cannot function effectively.

Displaced Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, editorial expressions from various newspapers throughout the country seem to give general approval to the final action taken by the Senate on the displaced persons legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from the editorial of the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 6, together with an editorial on the same subject from the New York Times of April 7.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 6, 1950]

TO ADMIT MORE DP'S

Thanks to Senator O'CONOR, Senator KILGORE and Senator FERGUSON, who led yesterday's fight in the Senate for a liberalized DP bill, one of the most shamefully petty policies in recent years will soon be corrected. That is the narrow and discriminatory displaced persons law we have had since 1948. * * *

In more than 13 hours of steady work, these 3 Senators led a bipartisan majority successfully through voting on a series of amendments designed to kill any fair and honorable program and finally secured the adoption of a bill that corrects most of the inequities in the old one. Gone are the provisions that worked to exclude large numbers of Catholics and Jews. Also dropped are certain exclusive claims given to Balts and agricultural workers that had the effect of defeating the purposes of the DP program.

The time limit is properly extended from June of this year to June of next year. * * * Some 200,000 more people will be eligible under the new bill, including a selected group of expellees—ethnic Germans forced out of their homes in eastern Europe—and 20,000 war orphans.

These are all reasonable and desirable corrections, and it seems incredible that they could not have been accepted long before this. * * * At issue were such fundamental questions as these: Was this country to lay itself open to a charge of inconsistency, cooperating with other nations of the world in major policies and refusing to go along in some minor ones? Was this country to lay itself open to a charge of aloof charity, giving billions in material foreign aid and declining to help actively in the desirable relocation of DP's? Were we to abandon even a gesture to an honored policy of providing haven for those who needed it? And were we to permit a small group of prejudiced and narrow men to impose their pettiness upon the majority?

Fortunately, the answer has now been given. Those who helped to clear the record deserve a vote of thanks, from Americans as well as from the DPs who will now be able to enter.

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1950]

THE DP BILL

For the first time since the question of displaced persons arose to plague the world at the close of the war, the United States is to have adequate legislation to deal with this terrible problem. It has been a hard struggle, waged against prejudice, parochialism, and ignorance, as well as against honest confusion. But with the Senate's action Wedensday night in approving the Kilgore bill, the battle has to all intents and purposes been won. The differences between Senator KILGORE'S measure as it passed the Senate and H. R. 4567, which the House adopted over 10 months ago, are not of great importance, and no difficulty is anticipated in reaching a conference agreement.

The most important features of the legislation are these: (1) It increases by 139,000 the number of DP's who may enter this country, and makes a year's extension of the time within which they can be admitted; (2) it eliminates the requirements that 40 percent of the DP's be Balts and that 30 percent have agricultural experience; (3) it shifts from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949, the date by which DP's must have arrived in the western occupied zones. Many more thousands of victims of religious and political persecution will now at least be eligible.

Equally important, perhaps, is what the Senate did not do. It rejected the attempt to wreck the entire program by indiscriminately opening it to the German ethnics. It also apparently refused to take too seriously the wild and irresponsible charges flung in the direction of the Displaced Persons Commission, which actually has been doing a capable and conscientious job in the face of serious difficulties. And of course it must be remembered that the employment, housing and security guaranties of existing law are all retained, even in some respects strengthened.

Certain features of both the House and Senate versions are open to criticism. But the bills are on the whole very satisfactory; and we congratulate the devoted legislators who have finally succeeded in redeeming on this question the honor and good faith of the United States.

Informational Media Guaranties Program of the Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a result of some observations I offered yesterday about Time magazine a number of my colleagues have indicated that they are desirous of securing additional information to cover the status of information media guaranties which have been issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration. I ask unanimous consent that an ECA statement on the subject, together with an annex which provides the names of applicants and the sum of guaranties issued up to December 31, 1949, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It will be noted that applications which were pending for magazine projects as of January 31, 1950, amounted to $1,380,555. Time magazine has applications pending for $248,500 out of this sum.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—STATUS OF THE INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTIES PROGRAM AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1949

1. Guaranties issued: Up to December 31, 1949, 90 guaranty contracts (including renewals) had been made for informational media projects. The aggregate face amount of these guaranties was $2,823,291, divided among types of projects as follows:

Magazine projects	$753,765
Book projects	692,047
Motion-picture projects	1,163,539
Newspaper and news agency projects	213,940
Total	2,823,291

Contracts made in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, accounted for $1,867,004 of this total; those made in the 6 months ended December 31, 1949, accounted for the balance, $956,287.

A detailed summary of the guaranties made up to December 31, 1949, is given in Annex A. Approximately 90 percent of the total was for projects in western Germany, where there is both a large demand for American informational media and also an acute need for assistance in effecting dollar transfers.

The dollar conversions actually made by the ECA up to December 31, 1949, under all informational media guaranties, amounted to $525,421. There is naturally a substantial time lag between the making of each guaranty and the completion of all sales, collection of receipts in foreign currency, and actual conversion.

2. Applications denied: Six applications in the aggregate amount of $485,120 had been denied up to December 31, 1949.

3. Applications pending (as of January 31, 1950): Applications pending as of January 31, 1950 aggregated $10,308,152, calculated on the basis of estimated requirements for a 12-month period of operations in each case. The total of pending applications was divided among types of projects as follows:

Magazine projects	$1,380,555
Book projects	1,220,471
Motion-picture projects	7,661,626
Newspaper and news agency projects	45,500
Total	10,308,152

While it is difficult to estimate the exact amount of the guaranties which may be made on the basis of these pending applications, it is believed that the total will probably not exceed $5,500,000, allowing for a 12-month period of operation for each project. The total would include about $3,500,000 for motion-picture projects in western Germany and about $1,500,000 for book and magazine projects in western Germany, the Netherlands, and certain other countries. It is possible that a major portion of the total may be issued before June 30, 1950.

Informational media guaranties issued up to Dec. 31, 1949

Applicant	Media to be distributed	Face amount of guaranties issued					
		Western Germany	Netherlands	Austria	Norway	Italy	Total
A. MAGAZINE PROJECTS							
McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.	22 technical, industrial, and trade periodicals	$30,000					$30,000
The Crowell-Collier Publishing Co.	Collier's, American Magazine, and Woman's Home Companion.	36,640	$4,460	$2,400			43,500
The Curtis Publishing Co.	Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, and Holiday.	28,000	20,800			$7,500	56,300
The Reader's Digest Association Inc.	English or German edition or both	202,600	3,620	22,950	$3,000	3,670	235,840
The Yorke Publishing Co., Inc.	American Journal of Surgery, American Journal of Medicine.	3,000					3,000
Time, Inc.	International edition of Life or Time or both	243,900	34,300	21,000	44,600		343,800
Weekly Publications, Inc.	International edition of Newsweek	41,325					41,325
Subtotal		585,465	63,180	46,350	47,600	11,170	753,765
B. BOOK PROJECTS							
Academic Press, Inc.	Any books published (scientific and technical)		3,400				3,400
Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.	Any books published	9,000					9,000
Atlas Publishing Co., Inc.	World Markets Directory, World's Waste Trade Directory, World Chemical Directory (also subscriptions to World Markets, a weekly trade newspaper).	5,000					5,000
Bantam Books, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25¢ reprints).	21,500	9,800			5,000	36,300
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc.	Any books published	4,000					4,000
D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.	Any books published (mainly technical)	28,000					28,000
Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc.	Any books published	9,000					9,000
Harper & Bros.	do	28,000					28,000
Harvard University Press	do	11,000					11,000
Institute for Research in Biography, Inc.	World Biography, a 2-volume reference work	930		542		1,875	3,347
Interscience Publishers, Inc.	Any books published (scientific and technical)		6,700				6,700
John Wiley & Sons, Inc.	do		8,400				8,400
Nassau Distributing Co., Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (mainly scientific and technical).	200,000					200,000
Paul B. Hoeber, Inc.	Any books published (medical)	6,000					6,000
Pocket Books, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25-cent reprints).	100,000	12,500			12,500	125,000
Princeton University Press	Any books published	8,000					8,000
Reinhold Publishing Corp.	Any books published (scientific and technical)		3,400				3,400
Silver Burdett Co.	Any books published (texthooks)	1,200					1,200
Stechert-Hafner, Inc.	Any books published by the Macmillan Co.	40,000					40,000
The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.	List of books specially selected by applicant (25- and 35-cent reprints).	100,000	22,500			16,000	138,500
The Viking Press	Any books published	16,500					16,500
W. B. Saunders Co.	Any books published (medical)		1,300				1,300
Subtotal		588,130	68,000	542		35,375	692,047
C. MOTION-PICTURE PROJECTS							
Bookfilm International Corp.	Prints of Snow White, Fantasia, and 12 Walt Disney short subjects.	70,000					70,000
Motion Picture Export Association (Germany), Inc.	Prints of about 87 feature films and about 26 short subjects, as approved by military government.	1,093,539					1,093,539
Subtotal		1,163,539					1,163,539
D. NEWSPAPER AND NEWS AGENCY PROJECTS							
New York Herald Tribune, Inc.	European edition	160,000		7,000			167,000
Overseas News Agency, Inc.	News service in German language	31,040					31,040
The Journal of Commerce Corp.	The Journal of Commerce, Weekly Report on U. S. Business, and Import Bulletin.	5,500					5,500
The Progressive Publishing Association, Inc.	Neue Volkszeitung, a weekly newspaper published in New York.	10,400					10,400
Subtotal		206,940		7,000			213,940
Total		2,544,074	131,180	53,892	47,600	46,545	2,823,291

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the first two of a series of three articles entitled "When Congress Fumbles for Facts," written by Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University, and published in the New York Herald Tribune on Wednesday, March 29 and Thursday, March 30, 1950. I think they are worthy of consideration by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN CONGRESS FUMBLES FOR FACTS

SENATOR M'CARTHY'S CHARGES SUGGEST NEED FOR EXPERT COURSES OF INVESTIGATION

(By Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University)

I

Once more public opinion is shocked by grotesque proceedings before a congressional investigating committee. Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, makes loud but vague charges of Communist infiltration in the State Department. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee listens to his allegations, and, when it endeavors to find out what supporting evidence he has, Senator MCCARTHY cries out that the Senators on the Democratic side who interrogate him are tools of the State Department and are endeavoring to cover up.

The Senator demands that the President permit the inspection of the Department's loyalty files and thus risk the smearing of persons whose probity has been fully established. If the President refuses, Senator MCCARTHY can claim that his charges are not disproved. If the President agrees and the charges blow up, Senator MCCARTHY can boast that he, single-handed, has won a victory in a battle that Congress has consistently lost since its defeat by the first President, George Washington: right of access to executive papers when the President thinks that their disclosure would be incompatible with the public interest.

A spectacle such as this, unfortunate under any circumstances, becomes appalling at a moment when the State Department, facing tasks as delicate and important as ever before in its history, needs the full support of American public opinion, the complete confidence of friendly states and the healthy respect of the Communist bloc. Moreover, when the subcommittee concludes its investigation, any report that it makes is not likely to be unanimous. Representatives and Senators, though they pose as judges, are still politicians who are mindful of advantages for themselves and their

political parties. If, after a committee has affrighted underlings and angered persons in high places, it reports that all the smoke came from a very small fire, some will suspect political whitewash. If a committee ferrets out and proclaims wrongdoing, some will refuse to believe that there was no more and some will cry "foul."

The plain fact is that congressional investigations do not command public confidence. They are indispensable in the absence of something better, but something better should take their place. This is not only because investigations are partisan but because they are incompetent. By insisting on their right to compel disclosures by executive departments and by citizens, Anglo-Saxon legislatures have been less craven and have proved more vigorous protectors of the public weal than their European counterparts, like, say, the Chamber of Deputies under the Third Republic or the Weimar Reichstag. It is the legislature which, in Woodrow Wilson's phrase, must demand the examination of "corners suspected to be dirty" even though to draw the public eye it must "magnify and intensify the scandal." Congress must not shirk its duty. When the reasons seem to it to be good and sufficient, it must demand and secure complete disclosures.

But the business of inquiring into dark corners is not a simple one, and part-time amateurs cannot handle it successfully. Investigations must be speedy so that witnesses have less time to plan dissimulations. Inquisitors must deal with masses of factual detail so complicated that their mastery requires not only conscious thought in the hearing room but subconscious thought in moments of leisure. Cross-examination must be carefully prepared and ruthlessly conducted. "The many possible deficiencies, suppressions, sources of error, and untrustworthiness which lie underneath the bare untested assertion of a witness may be best brought to light and exposed by cross-examination," wrote John H. Wigmore, the authority on the law of evidence. "Cross-examination is beyond doubt the greatest legal engine ever invented for the discovery of truth."

How can Senators or Representatives be efficient inquisitors when, save exceptionally, they are able to devote only parts of mornings to the job and then must turn to legislative tasks and constituents' entreaties? They never have the time to master the detail of any but the simplest kind of case, and hence with rare exceptions cross-examination is ludicrously feeble. In the five-percenter inquiry, for example, the committee allowed counsel to do most of the questioning of the less prominent witnesses. He had not had sufficient time to prepare himself fully, but so long as Senators did not interrupt, his cross-examination was workmanlike. When Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, the President's military aide, was the witness, larger headlines were naturally in prospect. Counsel was told to take a rest, and six Senators questioned General Vaughan extemporaneously and repetitiously. At one point Senator MCCARTHY said that it was unfair to the other members of the committee for him to take up so much time. He had planned on asking the junior and senior lady in the Senate to take over before (Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine). "I think we will continue to rotate," said Senator HOEY, the chairman, "and see if anybody on this side [that is, the Democratic side] wants to ask questions."

What a way to conduct an inquiry. And what a lack of dignity to disclose to witnesses and to the public the chief interest—that is, publicity—of at least some of those whom the Congress permits to conduct in its name investigations into matters of urgent public importance. The day following his examination of General Vaughan, Senator MCCARTHY had to apologize for addressing him as Mr. Maragon. The Senator also said he had mixed up two different distillers corporations. "It was not done purposely," he explained to the committee. "I just have an inexcusable habit while I am cross-examining the witness of concentrating all my thoughts and my thoughts apparently sometimes get ahead of my tongue, which is bad."

It was the House Committee on Un-American Activities, first chaired by Martin Dies, and later by J. Parnell Thomas (both happily no longer in Congress), that raised serious questions as to whether congressional inquisitors were not too disdainful of private rights. Responsible Senators and Representatives have been uneasy. The press has been critical. Bar associations have discussed improved procedures. Bills seeking to protect those whom committee members may acccuse have been introduced in Congress. Reforms of procedure are certainly desirable, but my point is that even if congressional inquisitors never allowed their consciences to be subservient to their cravings for headlines and to release them from the obligations of procedures prescribed by law, Congress should still wonder whether, when it acts as a high court through the agency of a committee, it is playing this role with the sureness and competence that are essential.

For many years Senators and Representatives insisted that they were competent to draft the laws Congress passed. "I am unwilling to make the admission," cried a Representative only 25 years ago, "that if I have a piece of legislation that I think ought to become the law that I am incapacitated, that the people who are elected in other districts are incapacitated, to do their own thinking and prepare their own bills. I am unwilling to make the admission that the House of Representatives must have an expert legislative bill drafter to whom to go to draft bills."

But even the lawyers in Congress began to realize that drafting required a particular kind of competence. At first Congress was willing to authorize only a skeleton staff, whose senior members had to be trained in the Columbia University legislative drafting bureau by my colleague, Prof. Joseph P. Chamberlain. Now the National Legislature is well served by draftsmen and no Senator or Representative would dream of trusting his own skill in preparing any important bill that he hoped to have enacted into law.

Congress should now decide that it wishes investigations handled more competently. In determining the kind of agency it deems best suited for the purpose, it should look at practices in Albany and London, which never witness the abuses that are complained of in Washington. Moreover, New York's Moreland Commissioner and the British Tribunal of Inquiry are able to convince the public that they are reporting accurately on what they have found in the dark corners that they investigate.

The Moreland commissionerships have worked sucessfully since 1907. The British substituted tribunals of inquiry for select committees of the House of Commons after there was general criticism of the investigation of the Marconi scandal. In 1912 there were allegations that members of the Liberal Cabinet had speculated in shares of the Marconi Co., which was expected to profit from a contract that the Government was negotiating with it. The House of Commons appointed a select committee to investigate, but its procedure and reports were subject to criticism. Members of the committee were partisan—they protected and attacked when they questioned witnesses. There were majority and minority reports. The public was not satisfied.

Neither the Moreland commissionership nor the British Tribunal of Inquiry is a plant which would thrive in Washington's political climate. But by taking heed of the procedures used in Albany and in London, Congress should be able to determine on an agency in which it would have confidence and which would fit smoothly into the Federal framework of government.

WHEN CONGRESS FUMBLES FOR FACTS

HOW THE PROBLEM OF EXPERT INVESTIGATION IS MANAGED IN NEW YORK AND GREAT BRITAIN

(By Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University)

II

Only rarely do the citizens of New York State have the spectacle of a legislature investigating committee fighting to peer into dark corners of an executive department, crying that there is wrongdoing, calling for resignations and demanding information that the Governor refuses to give them. This is not because there are no situations which make the legislature wish for disclosures, or because the matters in question are unimportant. The chief reason is section 8 of the executive law commonly known as the Moreland Act.

This empowers the governor, whenever he so desires, to appoint a commissioner or commissioners "to examine and investigate the management and affairs of any department, board, bureau, or commission of the State." The commissioner can subpena persons and records and swear witnesses. He can employ counsel and investigators. The legislature assures the governor a free hand by making continuing appropriations for the payment of the commissioners and the experses they incur. Reports go to the governor for submission to the legislature.

Since 1907, when the act was passed, there have been more than 70 commissions issued to more than 60 different persons (some served as commissioner more than once). Rarely, if ever, has the legislature been able to charge that the governor selected as commissioner a partisan or a nonentity to criticize the methods of investigation or to maintain that a report did not carry conviction. Practically all of the commissioners have been men who had reputations that they wished to preserve. They have been judges like Frederick E. Crane and John V. McEvoy; journalists and educators like John H. Finley, Henry L. Stoddard and Edward Lee Thorndike; lawyers like George W. Alger and George Gordon Battle, and public servants like Robert Moses and John H. Delaney. Such men were careful to provide themselves with efficient investigators and counsel and did not seek headlines.

Hostility on the part of the legislature has been rare. Indeed, there have been cases when legislative committees which had already started to probe matters yielded the field to a Moreland commissioner. The "absurdities and difficulties which inhere in a race to subpena witnesses and documents," said the assembly speaker on one occasion, "require us to restrict our activity." This forebearance no one appreciated more than myself, for I was then (1928) a Moreland commissioner investigating widely publicized charges of fraud in the Bureau of Workmen's Compensation. If there were a Federal Moreland Act, Senators and Representatives might in time be willing to restrain themselves in the same fashion and to wait for a report. But Congress is not likely to want a Federal Moreland Act. Nor is it likely to copy the British Tribunal of Inquiry, which I describe by recounting the circumstances under which it was last used.

During the summer of 1948 rumors began to circulate in Great Britain that ministers of the crown and other government servants had received or had been offered bribes in respect of withdrawals of prosecutions and the granting of various licenses. As soon as Parliament met in October, the Prime Minister moved that the matter be referred to a tribunal of inquiry which, under an act passed in 1921, can be called into existence by a resolution of both houses of Parliament and then has "all such powers, rights

and privileges as are vested in the high court." The House of Commons acted promptly and in a manner that will seem incredible to Senators and Representatives—without partisan debate. The leader of the Conservative opposition, Winston Churchill, counseled that until the tribunal had finished its investigation and made its report members of the House should abstain from gossip.

The home secretary appointed a judge of the high court as chairman of the tribunal and associated with him two well known barristers. Precedent was followed when the treasury solicitor put his services at the disposal of the tribunal to take such steps as they may direct him to take for the purpose of bringing before the tribunal all the evidence which the tribunal think is relevant to the inquiry. The attorney general (with two learned friends) acted as counsel, called the witnesses and cross-examined them. Statements were taken from all prospective witnesses before determining whether they should be called. The attorney general led the witnesess through their statements (which were available to the tribunal) and then conducted his cross-examination. Nineteen different counsel representing witnesses were permitted to cross-examine on evidence directly affecting their clients.

After its first (organization) meeting the tribunal adjourned for a fortnight. It did not wish to hear any witnesses until all of them had made statements and counsel had his case prepared and knew what he hoped to bring out. Following the fortnight of preparation the tribunal sat for 26 days between November 5 and December 21. Four days were allowed counsel for their arguments. One month later the tribunal made its report.

In introducing his resolution in the House of Commons, Mr. Attlee said that the Government's attention had been drawn to four specific matters but that he desired the tribunal to have wide terms of reference. Hence the resolution instructed it to inquire whether there is any justification for allegations that payments, rewards or other considerations have been sought, offered, promised, made or received by or to ministers of the Crown or other public servants in connection with licenses or permissions required under any enactment, regulation or order, or in connection with the withdrawal of any prosecution, and if so, in what circumstances the transactions took place and what persons were involved therein.

The tribunal's report—it is hardly necessary to say it was unanimous—was a document of 80 pages that made a detailed analysis of the evidence and in measured words inculpated some officials and exculpated others. The case the tribunal had heard was tawdry but fascinating. Some Labor politicians had been moving in moneyed circles that were unfamiliar to them. State controls were pervasive and irked or even threatened disaster to merchants and builders. Hospitality and presents might accelerate and influence departmental decisions when there were reasonable grounds for the use of discretion. But the story is pertinent here only to the extent that it discloses how a British Tribunal of Inquiry can carry conviction when it announces what in its view merits the attention of the public prosecutor; what for holders of public office or civil servants has been culpable conduct; and what actions have been innocently indiscreet or entirely blameless.

In the tribunal's view, two individuals who had given presents to the parliamentary secretary to the board of trade had done so without corrupt motive. A liquor merchant had made presents of wine and spirits "for the purpose of securing favorable and expeditious treatment by the board of trade for his applications for a license to import sherry casks"; and the parliamentary secretary had received these gifts "knowing the purpose for which they were made and in return for these gifts intervened to secure the grant of the licenses." From the most prominent figure in the case—an undischarged bankrupt who had gone under several names and who was subject to a deportation order—the parliamentary secretary had accepted a gold cigarette case, a suit of clothes, and much hospitality, knowing that the benefactions had been made "for the purpose of securing expeditious and favorable consideration" of applications made by any person whom the donor might introduce.

A prominent trade-union official who had become a director of the Bank of England had been offered the chairmanship of a proposed new company as a consideration to induce him "as a public servant to assist in obtaining from the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the capital issues committee, permission for a public issue of the shares of the new company." "We are satisfied," said the tribunal, "that the person in question did this in the hope of material advantages to himself, although in fact all that he received, apart from some trivial gifts, was a present of a suit of clothes." In respect of other ministers and certain civil servants who testified, the tribunal, after reviewing the evidence affecting them, expressed itself as "satisfied that there is no foundation" for allegations or suggestions of wrongdoing.

The parliamentary secretary resigned without waiting for the report of the tribunal and vacated his seat in the House of Commons. The director of the Bank of England resigned. Moreover (there may be no connection), two men whom the tribunal cleared and who were reelected to the House of Commons were dropped from the Labor government when Mr. Attlee reorganized it after the February election. The men who were blamed by the tribunal did not like its report, but there was no criticism of its proceedings or its findings from any other quarter. An efficient body had inquired into a dark corner of British politics and had closed the door on it.

What should Congress do to make its investigations more efficient and conclusive?

Support for the Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter by Mr. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, which appeared in the New York Times last week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL SUPPORT OF ECA URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

What a magnificent tonic to all Americans Senator VANDENBERG has provided in his timely and masterly letter of March 25 to Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of ECA. The Senator said exactly what needed to be said at this time when irrationality, irresponsibility, and ignorance are guiding much of the comment on all of our foreign policy.

Whatever fair criticism there may be of the handling of our foreign affairs, there can be no question of the desirability of "going down the line" for the ECA program. As Mr. VANDENBERG emphasizes, that program (of which he was the major architect) was conceived, formulated, and has been carried out as an unpartisan enterprise. The ills at which it was directed are, in large measure, on the way to being cured as a result of the soundness of the remedy and the skillful administration of ECA. Surely it is a wise course to follow through with his suggestion that the same careful studies which preceded ECA be initiated now to map the policies which will be needed when ECA comes to an end in 1952.

But right now it is urgent to keep on with appropriations for ECA which will not hamstring its efforts. Those who are advocating cuts in the proposal submitted by Mr. Hoffman should pause, for they will effect no real savings by such cuts. Any diminution in the effectiveness of the ECA program, which has been our most successful weapon in the cold war, will cost us more than the illusory savings of the proposed cut in the appropriation. Nothing could be more welcome to the Soviet Politburo than a weakened ECA.

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Representative, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1950.*

John Crown's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to a veteran, John Crown, by Howard A. Rusk, M. D.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN CROWN'S LEGACY—VETERAN LEAVES AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND A PLEA THAT LOVE SUPPLANT GREED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

(In 1946 a letter was published in this column from a young veteran in Halloran Hospital, a letter created by suffering, anguish and bewilderment. Last week, after 4 years of struggle, the writer, John Crown, died. His legacy to the world was an example of courage and a philosophy of life which, in these troubled and uncertain days, plead even more eloquently for the necessity of understanding than the day on which his letter was written.

(In this era of precocious technology, hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and all the additions to the horrors of war that have caused an epidemic of anxiety and tension throughout the world, this pain-wracked boy's prescription for peace among men merits thoughtful rereading.)

My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles. Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profit, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, junior wants more spending money. To these, I say, is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains?

Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the Nation and of the world.

As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops hogging the road with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world. If man wishes peace again, he must return to the great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God."

Jim Farley's Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Philosophy," which was carried in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat of March 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY'S PHILOSOPHY

It was a pleasure indeed, to read extracts of the address James A. Farley delivered before the Atlanta, Ga., Rotary Club. He is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

We have always considered Jim Farley to be one of the best informed, most reliable, and conservative of Americans, whether in the role of statesman or business man, in both of which he fits to perfection.

We can hardly forget the recipe he gave some years back for taming Stalin and the Russians. "Give them not vodka, but Coca-Cola to drink," he declared. In view of past events we fear "Uncle Joe" and his fellow Commies failed to take this sage advice.

In his Atlanta talk Mr. Farley observed that the economic prospect for 1950 was very good, and he sees no reason for any change in his optimism. He held that free trade was the key to peace, declaring that goods made in the United States are found in all parts of the world.

And, he emphasized, "American goods abroad everywhere carry with them a feeling of integrity and good faith." Giving a strong endorsement to the Marshall plan, Mr. Farley declared, "It is doubtful whether without American aid, this world reconstruction could take place at all. When the announcement was made more than 2 years ago that this Nation was considering the Marshall plan, it was 'like turning on a light all over Europe.'"

Turning to Russian communism, Mr. Farley said the threat of the spread of this ideology may be fought with words, the atom bomb, or with trade.

The first is insufficient, the second is repulsive to us, but the third is the middle way and the one that should ultimately be successful, he declared. "Trade leads," he contended, "to an intermingling, interdependence, and understanding between peoples."

Looking toward this end, Mr. Farley concluded, this Nation should promote world trade continuously and as fully as possible, "for where American products go, understanding of what they stand for will not be very far behind."

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the first of a series of four articles on the American merchant marine appearing in the Baltimore Morning Sun under the authorship of Miss Helen Delich.

So vital is it, I believe, that our people be made aware of the situation confronting the merchant marine today, that I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the second article of the series, which appeared in today's Baltimore Morning Sun paper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 11, 1950]

SHIP-SUBSIDY BACKERS CITE FARM AID, TARIFF—AMERICAN WAGES AND TAXES NOTED AS BASIS OF NEED, RECAPTURE RULE AS UNIQUE SAFEGUARD

(The following article is the second of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

American shipowners and operators are seeking additional Federal subsidies to keep them on a par with foreign competitors and to salvage the American merchant marine.

Otherwise, they say, "We will soon have a merchant marine without ships to sail." This description first was offered at the Senate subcommittee's maritime hearings by John Green, president of the CIO shipyard workers.

The increasing disparity between American and foreign costs has widened the difference between American and foreign merchant marines.

American ships cost more to operate because of higher wages, higher safety standards demanded by the Government, and taxes collected by the Federal Government.

SEAMEN'S WAGES COMPARED

American seamen's wages are the highest in the world. An American able-bodied seaman receives $226.01 basic pay a month; Canadian, $170 (before devaluation); British, $76.80 now; Norwegian, $74.59; Danish, $46.67; and French, $39.78. The overtime and penalty pay, and even a war bonus of $2.50 a day in some areas, paid to Americans are not received by the foreign seamen.

On a round trip from the United States to France via the northern route on a ship of the same size, an American operator would pay $24,201 in total wages; a Frenchman, $7,626; Greek, $7,352; Swede, $6,680; Dane, $8,190; British, $5,868; Norwegian, $5,263; and Italian, $5,647.

In shipyards the average English worker receives $14 a week.

The average American shipyard workers draw $59 a week, if he works 5 days.

American shipyard owners, however, have stated that they approve of their employees living according to the same standard as other wage earners in this country today.

ONLY ONES WITH RECAPTURE

Because ship owners must compete with foreign companies continuously, subsidies to American shipping serve the same purpose as protective tariffs do to many of our domestic industries.

However, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, if a shipping line earns more than 10 percent profit, one-half of such excess must be returned to the Government up to the whole amount of the subsidy.

Thus ship owners are the only recipients of Federal subsidies subject to recapture.

The Maritime Commission reports that two-thirds of the operating differential subsidies have been repaid to the Government. Five of the 13 subsidized lines have paid back in full. The others are still in the process.

Last year the Maritime Commission turned over to the Treasury of the United States $330,920,330.21 obtained from subsidized lines, ship-chartering proceeds, and the sale of war-built and Government ships.

Altogether, the Maritime Commission on its war surplus has showed an average return of 65 cents for every $1 spent on a ship. The War Assets Administration returned only 12 to 13 cents per dollar.

RATIO OF ALL SUBSIDIES

The National Federation of American Shipping says that the total net operating differential subsidy payments to American ship owners have been less than seventeen-one hundredths of 1 percent of all Federal subsidies paid to business and farmers from 1934 to 1948.

From 1936 to 1946, the total subsidy payments to shipping, including construction and operating payments, was $297,018,000.

There are about 250 modern ships in the American merchant marine to show for this subsidy. All can be requisitioned by the Government at any time.

The Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation from 1934 to 1946 paid out subsidies of $9,713,012,114 to farmers.

FARM-MORTGAGE SUBSIDIES

The Treasury provided subsidies of $334,151,000 from 1934 to 1946 to banks and lending institutions which lost money on farm mortgages.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation allowed subsidies of $3,266,729,000 to businesses from 1941 to 1946.

In 1947 Norway spent $150 in operating aid to its merchant ships for every $1,000,000 of its national income; in 1949 Spain spent $26 of every $1,000,000 on operating aid; the United Kingdom spent $1.90; the United States spent 6.6 cents out of every $1,000,000 of national income on operating aid for its merchant ships.

Sweden, in computing taxes, does not limit the amount of depreciation on a ship. It can be as high as 100 percent the first year a ship begins operating.

ITALIAN AID TO SHIPPING

Italy, using a counterpart of $12,600,000 of ECA funds allotted to aid Italian merchant-ship construction, has a new law making direct contributions and direct subsidies for materials and amortization not in excess of 33 percent of the cost of the vessel.

In addition, the Italian Government guarantees 40 percent of the cost of the ship. This 73-percent total means the shipowner is required to provide only 27 percent of the cost of a ship directly. Italy also exempts from taxation all earnings from ships for the first 3 years.

The Italian luxury liner, Conte Biancamano, which arrived in New York recently, was reconstructed with $3,500,000 of ECA money. The 650-foot 25-year-old liner will operate on a run in competition with American lines receiving some subsidy assistance.

BRITISH TAX ALLOWANCES

Great Britain recently increased the depreciation allowance on ships from 20 to 40 percent in the first year of operation. On taxes, British shipowners also may carry losses forward for 6 years, so they can average good times with bad.

Denmark allows a 50 percent depreciation on a ship the first year and 25 percent thereafter.

The United States permits amortization of 4 to 5 percent per year and taxes are paid by shipowners on the same basis as any other corporation.

To give an insight into what the merchant marine means to the United States Government in tax revenue, the National Federation recently hired a special tax-accounting firm.

ESTIMATE OF TAX RETURNS

They used as a basis the nonsubsidized owners who operate 4,700,000 tons of shipping today. To keep this shipping at peak efficiency, it would be necessary to replace 235,000 tons annually for 20 years at a cost of $70,500,000.

The shipbuilding costs each year would be $64,091,000.

The following taxes would be derived only from the shipbuilding activities: On shipbuilders' profits, $2,435,000; income taxes from shipyard labor, $923,000; social-security taxes, $923,000; taxes on material, men and subcontractors' profits on materials, $1,151,000; income taxes by recipients of wages and salaries at subcontractors and suppliers, $436,000; social security on these, $436,000, and taxes on small business supported by wage earners, $1,495,000.

These tax recoupments would be $7,799,000 annually for 20 years under present conditions from the shipbuilding end.

ITEMS NOT INCLUDED

They do not include the taxes the shipowners pay from profits in operating their ships.

The accountants also point out that they do not include various other transactions which would be generated by the construction program and which would provide "substantial" Federal income taxes. For example, neither taxes on the wages of employees of suppliers of items purchased by wage earners nor taxes on profits of manufacturers and middlemen supplying the retail stores are included.

"We also made no provision for State taxes, Federal amusement, transportation taxes, Federal incomes on dividends paid by corporations benefiting from the above, or savings in unemployment benefits which result from work."

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Maritime Commission in 1947 requested $50,000,000 to repair 258 of the best ships in the inactive fleet to be held ready to meet an emergency.

REDUCED REQUEST FAILS

After that request was denied, they pared their costs to cover a bare minimum of 134 vessels they considered essential. Last year they failed to get the $25,000,000 asked from Congress. The issue is up again.

The predicament of the merchant marine today is a repetition of past history.

Back in the Civil War days, many ships shifted to foreign registry to lessen the war hazards and to avoid the exorbitant insurance rates. They were not permitted to return to United States registry later.

When the steel-hull steam-propelled ships were developed, the United States took a back seat in comparison with England because Great Britain was able to produce the vessels cheaper. Industrialization was advanced in England at that time and products were cheaper there.

The higher operating costs in this country did not attract private capital to shipping and the American merchant marine declined in 1913–14 to a level at which only 9 percent of our foreign commerce moved in American bottoms.

As soon as World War I broke out in Europe and the foreign nations pulled their ships home, American ports found themselves jammed with export cargo and no ships to move it.

The Shipping Act of 1916, providing aid for private construction, finally was passed, but the United States was in the war before the program was started. The ships were too late to be effective for that conflict, but the American merchant marine did grow from 8 percent of the world's total to 22.2 percent in 1920.

Various methods were used to sell the war-built ships, primarily to private American operators.

ACT OF 1936 AND WAR

However, the foreign competition was al most too much and American ships became less and less evident on the high seas. In 1939, 3 years after the passage of the act of 1936 to save the industry, this country had only 13.9 percent of the world's ships on the seas.

The 1936 legislation provided for the construction of 50 ships a year over a period of 10 years to rehabilitate the dry-cargo tonnage of the merchant marine through various subsidies.

From 1939 to 1946, American shipyards built 5,600 ships, 60 percent of the world's total. These were built at excessive costs and still were not enough to handle the war needs.

PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE

On August 20, 1949, President Truman wrote the Maritime Commission:

"An adequate appreciation of the importance of the merchant marine to the Nation is lacking and is much needed today. Not enough of our people seem to realize the United States is a maritime Nation. I hope the Commission will take the lead in a program to correct this situation."

Despite this statement, it was pointed out at the recent Senate hearings, Mr. Truman appeared to disapprove of the requested operating-subsidy allowance of $90,000,000 to cover a 3-year period (subject to recapture through profits above 10 percent) because it was so much higher than the prewar level.

At the same time, he is recommending that the Maritime Commission—the only independent agency the merchant marine has to fight for it—be absorbed into the Department of Commerce.

Brand Names Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

N THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand the text of an outstanding address delivered by one of our foremost American citizens, Mr. Louis B. Mayer, vice president of Loews, Inc., on the occasion of the celebration of Brand Names Day at a luncheon in the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York. I am happy to call this address to the attention of my colleagues and of the American people, because not only are Mr. Mayer's comments on the subject of motion pictures of tremendous interest, particularly in these days of the cold propaganda war throughout the world, but because the organization which he addressed—the Brand Names Foundation—is one of the most vital elements in the American system of private enterprise.

This twentieth century is an age of brands, not only in the field of motion pictures, but in practically every field of production and consumption. The stability of entire industries, the continuance of millions of jobs, of hundreds of thousands of small retail and wholesale businesses, depend on the protection of brand names.

I ask unanimous consent that a few observations which I have prepared regarding both this eminent American and the noble organization to whom he spoke be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY ON BRAND NAMES DAY PROGRAM

Mr. President, the Brand Names Foundation is a nonprofit educational organization whose membership constitutes a roster of great American industries, newspapers, radio stations, magazines, and other enterprises. Looking down the membership list I was happy to see a long series of fine Wisconsin companies whose names denote quality not only in the Badger State but throughout the Nation.

Brand names day is an annual affair, and this year the occasion affords a splendid opportunity for more than 1,000 business leaders, who have, like the rest of us, a stake in the brand system, to exchange ideas and discuss mutual problems. Since 1943 the foundation has dramatized the brand story to consumers and distributors at national and community levels through a broad public-relations program.

COMBATING COLLECTIVIST POISON

The foundation combats the collectivists in our country who would like to destroy trade-marks, who would like to destroy the brand-name system. Why?

WHY THESE COLLECTIVIST PLANS?

In order to regiment American industry into producing uniform items with uniform packaging and qualities based on the whims and the phony slide-rule notions of some bureaucratic alleged "master minds."

IMPORTANCE OF TRADE-MARKS

I am delighted that the foundation has carried on this public-relations program, because I know from my experience as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-marks, and Copyright Laws, how crucial the trade-mark protective statutes are to this Nation. Without those statutes a tiny minority of business pirates could steal the fruits of hard-won brand loyalties which honest, industrious Americans have put a lifetime of work and effort to build up.

ROSTER OF BRAND NAMES FOUNDATION

To indicate the broad basis on which the Brand Names Foundation is built, I should just like to include at this point the names

of the 1949–50 officers and their companies which read as follows:

Officers

Chairman of the board, Donald B. Douglas, vice president, the Quaker Oats Co.: president, Henry E. Abt; treasurer, Gavin K. MacBain, treasurer, Bristol-Myers Co.; vice chairmen of the board, Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, vice president, the New York Times; W. T. Holliday, president, the Standard Oil Co. (Ohio); chairman of the executive committee, John W. Hubbell, vice president, Simmons Co.

I should like to follow that list with the distinguished board of directors of the foundation—names which are readily identifiable as being among the civic leaders of this entire nation:

Board of directors

Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, vice president the New York Times, New York, N. Y.; Frank Braucher, president Periodical Publishers Association of America, New York, N. Y.; A. O. Buckingham, vice president Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.; John R. Christie, Dan B. Miner Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Donald B. Douglas, vice president the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.; Frank M. Folsom, president Radio Corp. of America, New York, N. Y.; George E. Frazer, president National Transitads, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Robert M. Ganger, vice president Geyer, Newell & Ganger, Inc., New York, N. Y.; W. T. Holliday, president the Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), Cleveland, Ohio; John W. Hubbell, vice president Simmons Co., New York, N. Y.; Charles T. Lawson, vice president Nash-Kelvinator Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Richard H. Lippincott, vice president Holeproof Hosiery Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; George S. McMillan, vice president Bristol-Myers Co., New York, N. Y.; Theophil H. Mueller, president Julius Kayser & Co., New York, N. Y.; Roy W. Peet, manager Association of American Soap & Glycerine Producers, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Edward S. Rogers, chairman of the board Sterling Drug Inc., New York, N. Y.; Donovan B. Stetler, vice president Standard Brands, Inc., New York, N. Y.; W. W. Wachtel, president Calvert Distillers Corp., New York, N. Y.; William G. Werner, manager division of public relations the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Paul West, president Association of National Advertisers, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Paul S. Willis, president Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Mark Woods, president American Broadcasting Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

NEW YORK PROCLAMATION

I am glad to say that the mayor of the Nation's largest city, New York, more than fully appreciated the significance of April 5 as brand names day, and he issued a special proclamation of invitation and greetings which I should like to have reproduced in the RECORD at this point:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y.

Proclamation

Whereas the American standard of living is recognized as the highest in the world, and is due, in great part, to the abundance and high quality of the products of our free competitive enterprise system and their forthright and responsible identification by trade-marks submitted to the choice of the consuming public; and

Whereas the city of New York, because of its pool of highly skilled workers and technicians and unsurpassed manufacturing and distribution facilities, provides a great share of our Nation's products; and

Whereas New York welcomes the representatives of the firms associated with the educational organization known as Brand Names Foundation, Inc., whose members are dedicating their conference to the furtherance of our traditional free enterprise and brand competition system;

Now, therefore, I, William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, April 5, 1950, as brand names day, and urge all residents of this city to support the aspirations of this vital division of our industrial life, the success of which will guarantee greater employment here and throughout the Nation.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 28th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor.
WILLIAM J. DONOGHUE,
Secretary to the Mayor.

VARIED APRIL 5 PROGRAM

I wish that it might have been my opportunity and the opportunity of Members of this great body to be on hand at the April 5 luncheon. The committee for brand names day was headed by the regional manager of Hearst Advertising Service, Mr. H. James Gediman. He received able assistance from the following business leaders: Harry B. Carpenter, vice president, Young & Rubicam, Inc.; George Fotis, director of sales promotion, Remington Rand, Inc.; Ivor Kenway, vice president, American Broadcasting Co., Inc.; Albert L. Morse, vice president, Goodall-Sanford, Inc.; H. Ford Perine, director of merchandising, Time, Inc.

Of course, there were so many memorable features of the program that to mention any one might be to slight unintentionally the others. Suffice it to say, however, that one of our great American scientists, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, of the California Institute of Technology, addressed the assembly and there were many other fine and enjoyable parts of the program.

ADDRESS BY L. B. MAYER

Without, however, detracting in the slightest from those other phases, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to what observers consider to have been probably the outstanding occasion of an outstanding day, the address by the vice president of Loew's, Inc., Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

This great citizen certainly needs no commendation in detail on my part because his contributions to the American free-enterprise system and because his very life itself are parts of an epic even greater than any of the cinema epics which his world-famous company has produced. Here is an American whose biography is the Horatio Alger sort that would inspire any American youngster. Here is a man who has literally pioneered in the creation and development of one of our greatest industries—motion pictures. His service to that industry alone merits warm praise and appreciation of the movie-going American people, because he initiated a whole host of motion-picture techniques and programs which have since become the accepted standards and, indeed, the ideals of the industry. But, over and above his contributions to that industry, a look at the record will show that he has always more than fulfilled his patriotic obligations as an American, as has the industry itself.

These are no mere empty words of passing tribute; I assure you they are my sincere convictions which I offer publicly in justified endorsement of this splendid American.

Since the memorable day in 1907 when Louis B. Mayer opened his first nickelodeon in Haverhill, Mass., he has been the acknowledged pacemaker in a pacemaking industry. For 25 of those 43 subsequent years he has been the production head of the consistently successful Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Corp., the film producing subsidiary of Loew's, Inc.

Naturally the major elements in Mr. Mayer's comments were devoted to the crucial role of motion pictures in the twentieth century world. But I think that any American will also profit from reading Mr. Mayer's sage comments on the trade-mark system in general, because certainly, the head of the company which offers Leo the Lion—an international symbol of cinema quality—has more than an ordinary right to speak on the importance of brand names.

I also invite attention to Mr. Mayer's other comments on such subjects as the sterling American patriot, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Sr., and on such themes as the present crushing burden of Federal taxes and related matters.

Motion pictures to quote Mr. Mayer are "The most powerful ambassador of Americanism we could have." And, it is men like Mr. Mayer who are in themselves great ambassadors of the American system.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MAYER

I have in my hand the text of a very fine letter that was addressed by the chairman of the committee for brand names day, Mr. H. James Gediman, to Brig. Gen. Julius Klein. Mr. Gediman stated that thanks to General Klein's untiring efforts the annual affair acquired even more than the customary significance because of Mr. Mayer's presence. I should like to quote at this point Mr. Gediman's letter because I think that it eloquently bespeaks the admiration which his audience rightly had for Mr. Mayer.

HEARST ADVERTISING SERVICE,
New York, N. Y., April 6, 1950.

Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
Public Relations, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I can now understand the depth of your regard for Mr. Mayer. He is a wonderful person.

It was a real privilege to meet him because he exemplifies a favorite notion of mine that "the bigger they are—the nicer they are."

His address is the talk of the town. He had one of the most sophisticated and distinguished audiences I have seen in a long time and he held them absolutely spellbound.

While the Brand Names Foundation was outstandingly the chief beneficiary of Mr. Mayer's visit, may I say that in my opinion the whole occasion reflected very constructively on Mr. Mayer personally and on Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

We are all deeply indebted to you.

Sincerely yours,
H. JAMES GEDIMAN.

Mr. WILEY. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mayer's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND MOTION PICTURES

Mr. Chairman, members of the Brand Names Foundation, it is not only a genuine privilege to be invited to join with you today, but I am honored, indeed, to be on the same dias with this great American, Dr. Millikan.

The presence here of the learned Dr. Millikan brings promptly to mind the great debt we owe to our American scientists. Surely, there is scarcely a moment in our everyday lives that is not made more comfortable, efficient, and happier, by their achievements.

But let us not forget, that without the enterprise of the manufacturer, and the creation of markets for new products by advertising, much of the advancement offered by science would remain hidden within the confines of the laboratory.

Yes, Mr. Abt; I am very aware of the value of brand names. I recall that shortly after Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer had become established as a successful studio, I made a trip

to Europe. I met all kinds of people, on the trains, waiters in the hotels, businessmen.

But they didn't seem very impressed by the name of Mayer when I was introduced. Then somebody would mention something about my connection with American films.

"Herr Mayer of the cinema?" they would repeat. "Oh yes, the Lion pictures!"

That, gentlemen, is how we became famous. We started out with a trade-mark people the world over remembered.

Yes; we of the motion-picture industry are in a brand-name business too. We have our brand names, in our trade-marks, and also in the names of our stars. These are the products we have to sell. Let us suppose, for example, that we were to advertise a picture starring Spangler Arlington Brugh, Judy Gumm, and Jeanette Morrison. I doubt if we would sell any tickets. But give these stars their brand-name identifications, Robert Taylor, Judy Garland, and Janet Leigh, and the box office would do very well, indeed.

There was a time, some of you may recall, when motion picture actors had no identity. Their names never appeared on the films Those were the days when feature pictures were only a few hundred feet long. You saw five or six subjects in an hour. Today's single feature runs an hour and a half or more. As motion pictures developed, so did the curiosity of the public. They wanted to know who the players were. And so our box office names were born. Today it is not infrequent that the title of the picture itself is of secondary importance. How often have you been asked a question like, "Have you seen the new Lana Turner picture?"

In 1924 when Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer came into being through the merger of three separate producing companies, we determined to make our trade-mark really stand for something, to be the first in motion-picture entertainment to produce the best pictures humanly possible, and to live up to our advertising. We have tried, very conscientiously, to fulfill that promise.

We know, as you do, that popular demand must be created for any product. Public appetite must be stimulated. There are, of course, popular favorites in commercial products as well as in motion-picture stars. I could not tell you why one person will walk up to a counter and ask for one brand of tooth paste while a second customer demands a different kind. And I cannot tell you why a theatergoer will walk past one box office and pay his money at another down the street. We are a people of free choice, and thank God that it should be so. And I know of no greater illustration of our system of free enterprise than that there exists such competition for the choice of the individual, be it for a brand of mattress, a motion picture, or a candidate for the Presidency.

There is a certain psychology about the brand names. I want to confess that I am a victim of this phenomenon. If you advertise a product successfully, I find myself buying it, and liking it. Some other product might be just as good, might be exactly the same, but the special brand psychology has convinced me that product is the best. Nothing else could taste as good to me.

In the motion-picture industry we believe in advertising. We spend many millions every year to advertise our pictures. We know as you do that a fine product is not enough. It must be merchandised and advertised so attractively and cleverly that it develops its own brand-name appeal.

Our problem of advertising and merchandising is made difficult as no two pictures are alike. Every picture is a fresh creation.

In most businesses when you gentlemen originate and establish a brand-name product, that merchandise is set. Your package, your ingredients, will be the same tomorrow as they are today.

To create and then introduce to the public hundreds of new and different products each year is a formidable task indeed.

But necessity is the mother of invention and our sales and advertising departments have met the challenge.

It has been said that everybody has two businesses, his own and motion pictures. Motion pictures are our business but they are really yours, too. For I am certain that no medium has been so instrumental in popularizing commercial products as has the screen. Wherever our films are shown, there are also demonstrated the products of American industry. I suspect this may be why you invited me here today.

I recall that shortly after the merger that created Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, I went to Italy to look after the production of Ben Hur which we had inherited. Upon my return to this country I stopped in Washington to see my very dear friend, then the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Herbert Hoover. He had requested my report on a question he asked before I went to Italy, could so gigantic a production be successfully made, far from its home base of supply, under the social and economic conditions existing under the Fascist regime. I had to report that it could not, that we were bringing the company back to Culver City to finish the picture.

Mr. Hoover took me to see the President. I felt very sentimental about visiting President Coolidge, especially since he was from Massachusetts, where I began my career. I was flattered, too, that anything I might have to say should interest the President of the United States. I was surprised how important he considered motion pictures. Mr. Hoover told him, "Mr. President, our commerce used to follow the ships carrying the American flag into foreign ports. Today it follows our motion pictures."

He told the President how the fad of bobbed hair, popularized in our films, had spread throughout Europe, how the styles in clothing, the many comforts and conveniences of American life, household appliances and kitchen utilities were being demanded in foreign markets following their introduction through our motion pictures.

Some 20 years ago our gifted art director, Cedric Gibbons, tried a startling idea in home design for the settings used in Our Dancing Daughters. He called it moderne, simple, clean of line, functional, beautiful, and comfortable. Certainly a far cry from the stuffy, dust-catching type of much home decoration. Well, you know how popular moderne has become. You see its influence on every hand today. A little later, Gibbons introduced another vogue, the charming early American farmhouse sets for When Ladies Meet. I could not begin to tell you how many people wrote in for plans or how many times this particular set was copied in real life. You can scarcely go through any American community without finding a counterpart in design.

Such influence on the living and purchasing habits of people throughout the world is beyond estimate. If a motion-picture scene shows a refrigerator, washing machine, a new type of furniture, a spring style, a trinket, novelty, something new in electric razors, or whatever the product may be, the resultant demand, the appetite and desire to possess is overwhelming. You advertise. We dramatize.

We were made very aware of this screen potency when Clark Gable and Claudette Colbert made It Happened One Night. There was a scene, you may recall, where Clark Gable removed his shirt. You probably do not recall, however, that when he took his shirt off his torso remained bare. No undershirt. Well, it wasn't long before we heard the screams of the underwear manufacturers. It seems that male America was following the no-undershirt style inspired by Mr. Gable. Let me assure you gentlemen, particularly those who may be associated with the manufacture of undershirts, Mr. Gable has kept his on ever since.

Then there was our young Dr. Kildare, who discovered that goat's milk had caused undulant fever in one of his patients. We heard from the Goat Milk Producers Association. Believe me, gentlemen, I had no idea of how many thousands of people there are in this country who raise goats.

This far-reaching influence of the screen is not entirely appreciated in certain countries. There has been, in recent years, an intensified resistance in some foreign nations. Barriers have been set up against us. Must stop the showing of American pictures, they say, or their people will become too Americanized. That would be a tragedy, now wouldn't it?

Russia is not the only place where our films are barred. There are other countries, too, that do not want their people to see the happiness and prosperity of America. They want to keep their people in ignorance, so that the lies and misconceptions our enemies tell about us can be believed. The United States spends billions of dollars to help the economy of the nations of people who are still free. But what is more important than to bring them enlightenment, information, the truth about the freedom of our democracy, so that they, too, shall not yield to pressure and become enslaved.

Our newspapers, magazines, and radio do not enter these countries to a sufficient degree. But, even so, the language is foreign to them. But for our foreign markets, we see that our motion pictures speak the language of every country they are shown in. Think what it can mean to show these people how our American workers live, the automobiles they drive, their sons and daughters attending our institutions of higher education, all the benefits and opportunities that exist in our paradise of democracy. Yet our Government allows barriers to be erected against us.

Yes; it would be good business for the motion-picture industry if these foreign markets were all open to us—yes; and it would be good business for all American industry as well—but, most important of all, it is the best way to show to the people of the world what America stands for and has to offer. Our motion pictures, gentlemen, are the most powerful ambassadors of Americanism we could have. I believe it is the responsibility of our Government to send them into every nation on earth if, for no other reason, than that there are countries who want to keep them out.

I don't have to tell you of the great part our motion pictures played in the war. Ask General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz. Ask any of our soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, what motion pictures meant to them behind the battlefronts, on the ships, in the jungles, wherever they served. We are very proud of this record, grateful for the privilege to have served our country. Let me ask you this, what do you suppose any other nation would give to have a motion-picture industry like ours?

Gentlemen, the industries you represent here today are the backbone of our Nation's economic life. We have built together, prospered together. We have much to be grateful for, much to be proud of, and much to protect, and I cannot help but think we should take time out right now, that we put aside for the moment thoughts of business gain, and devote ourselves to fortifying the foundations of our democracy with new cement and new steel. Let us profit by the lessons of yesterday. Let us not wait too long. Let us not leave it to others. Most of all, let us think.

You remember how prohibition came about. We all laughed at it. It couldn't happen here. But while we were busy with our jobs, it did happen.

We didn't take Hitler too seriously at first either. And I am mindful of the indifference

that greeted the first warnings against communism sounded by my dear friend, a truly great American, William Randolph Hearst. He had the foresight, the courage, the patriotism. Most people thought him an alarmist, didn't pay very much attention to what he had to say about this menace to our freedom. There are many today who wish they had given more heed.

It is difficult, of course, to understand that there could be those who call themselves Americans and yet would destroy everything for which it stands. We know of children who have a beautiful new toy, how they worship it for a moment, and then tear it apart to find out how it works and to see if they can't make it better, only to find they've destroyed their prized possession. But those are children. We never had any idea there could be grown men who could do that to their country. Thank God for the vigilance of the American press and radio, that they awakened us, I hope, before it was too late.

Yes, my friends, this is a time for thought and deliberation. We must make certain our ship of state is headed on the right course, sailing in safe waters. We have seen how helpless is the mightiest of battleships once she veers from the straight channel and mires on a shoal.

Another great danger we must all face realistically is taxation. There are Government taxes, State taxes, county taxes, city taxes and taxes on practically everything that is purchased—yes—even death and inheritance taxes. The tax situation is a problem, and a very great problem, to all of us. We need the help of the press and radio to give the people the truth about who is really paying these taxes, that it is not only big business and those in the high income brackets, but everyone.

How many housewives do you think know how much of the price of a loaf of bread goes for taxes. We must show them just where, and how, and for what, this tax money is spent.

The cry today is to balance the budget by raising taxes. Keep raising taxes. I haven't heard very much about balancing the budget by not spending so much. By not wasting so much. What if a wife told her husband she couldn't do anything about balancing her household budget, unless he went out and made a lot more money? What would that husband be likely to say—or do?

We are a very fortunate people. There are few countries left in this world where exist such opportunities to be enjoyed. Only under a system of free enterprise, such as ours, could there be the constructive spirit of competition, that has provided the incentive which is responsible for our incomparable productivity. Let us guard this well, let us protect it with all our strength. Let us not be too occupied with our own individual interests that we have no time to look out for the perilous shoals ahead. It may be later than we think.

I thank you.

Radio Program for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11, 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast over the American Forum of the Air on March 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, which today starts its 22d consecutive year and comes to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Before we present our moderator, Theodore Granik, here is Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, chairman of the United States Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Senator JOHNSON.

Senator JOHNSON. I have had the pleasure of appearing many times on the American Forum of the Air as a participant. Today I am here to speak not on the Forum, but about the Forum and its moderator, Ted Granik.

This program and its founder today observe their 22d year of service to the American people, and what a service.

In 22 years the Forum has presented speakers on every conceivable issue of national and international importance to American homes through the medium of radio and now through the scientific wonder of this age, television. I wish it were in the power of the Congress of the United States to award an Oscar, an award for democracy, an award to my friend, Ted Granik, and to this program which has brought speakers of all political persuasions squarely before the citizens of our Nation for public inspection of their views.

The April 1 issue of Collier's magazine salutes and pays tribute to the American Forum of the Air in an article entitled "It's a Radio Program for Democracy," written by the distinguished journalist and dean of radio reporters, Ben Gross, of the New York Daily News. My congressional colleagues and I join with this noted editor in calling the American Forum of the Air our unofficial Congress. It typifies to me the very best example of democracy in action. It is truly a tragedy that there are nations of this world where such a program could not exist today.

President Truman some time ago said: "Mr. Granik's program, the oldest forum on the air, has been outstanding in its field. In the finest American tradition of freedom of speech, week in and week out, it has presented to the American people discussions of vital concern."

Thus spoke the President.

To Ted Granik and to the National Broadcasting Co., which makes this program possible, I would like to convey the congratulations and thanks of my colleagues, and I feel most certainly of the American people, for a program which continues to serve the highest interests of the public after 22 exciting and eventful years.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you ever so much, Senator JOHNSON, for your very kind and generous remarks. On behalf of my wonderful staff and my grand NBC colleagues, all of whom cooperate so heartily in planning, arranging, and producing these programs, and who worry with me each week, we are all very deeply grateful to you and to the other distinguished speakers who have participated in these forums.

[From Collier's magazine for April 1, 1950]

IT'S A RADIO PROGRAM FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Ben Gross)

Several weeks before VJ-day Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air, scheduled a debate on the subject What Should We Do With Japan After We Win the War? Setting August 14 as the date for the broadcast, Granik called the State Department to see if it would furnish one of the debaters.

Less than an hour later Under Secretary of State Joseph Clark Grew telephoned Granik and asked him to come to his office at once. "If that program goes on," Grew confided, "you might embarrass certain negotiations now in progress. It would be particularly bad if one of your speakers offended the Japanese Emperor."

Granik, of course, promptly canceled the debate. At the same time, he became privy to one of the greatest bits of inside information of the time: That negotiations were under way for Japan's surrender, and that with the surrender Hirohito would remain on his throne.

This is not the only occasion on which Granik, a genial, balding 6-footer with a perennially naive expression, has been a party to Washington's top secrets. His forum, oldest show of its kind on the air, now heard and seen weekly on the NBC radio and television networks, has regularly floated trial balloons for critical changes in administration policy and has provided both "ins" and "outs" with a sounding board on which to test public sentiment on major issues.

Thus, it was that Marvin McIntyre, secretary to President Roosevelt, phoned Granik to suggest "an interesting show"—a discussion of the possibility of swapping some old United States destroyers for British bases. Granik complied with this suggestion, which was made before Roosevelt formally presented his destroyers-for-bases proposal to Congress, and the thousands of letters which poured in from listeners added to F. D. R.'s assurance that most Americans would favor the swap.

Because more than 90 percent of the membership of Congress has appeared on the forum, it is known on Capitol Hill as "the unofficial Congress of the United States." It is the only broadcast reprinted each week in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Cabinet members have also appeared on the program, as have leaders of industry and labor, President Roosevelt when he was New York Governor, and President Truman while he was Senator.

In the forum's 22 years, the transcripts of its debates have piled up into a lively political history of the times. From the Hoover-Smith campaign to the Truman administration, hardly an issue of public controversy has gone unaired on the program. In 1928 forum debaters were threshing out "Should We Have Joined the League of Nations?" In the early thirties, "Is the NRA a Menace?"; several years later, "Is Appeasement the Right Policy?"; in 1944, "What To Do With Germany;" and, by last year, "The Welfare State."

The American Forum of the Air came into being accidentally. In 1925, Granik, Brooklyn-born son of a dry-goods store owner, was attending City College and at the same time working as secretary to Lee Adam Gimbel, vice president of Gimbel's Department Store. On the store's eighth floor the Gimbels had set up a small radio station, WGBS, mainly as a curiosity to lure customers to the piano department hard by. Ted was soon spending more of his time at the studio than at his secretarial duties, writing minstrel shows and filling in with Bible reading when a performer failed to show up.

While still at WGBS, he began to study law at night at St. John's University. His mind torn between Blackstone and Marconi, he finally persuaded members of the St. John's faculty to launch a weekly program called Law for the Layman, a discussion of legal topics in popular language, over the Gimbel station. The program was set up with the young law student as moderator, and such was its success that when WGBS was sold, Granik was invited to bring his show over to WOR.

At that time the repeal of prohibition was one of the most bitterly contested issues of the day. Granik invited Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, to discuss the legal

aspects of the problem. Mrs. Ella Boole, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, read an announcement of this in the papers and immediately demanded air time to answer. "Why don't you put her on with us?" Ted suggested to WOR executives. "It might make a hot show."

It was then almost unheard of to permit a speaker on a controversial issue to go before a microphone without a carefully censored script. But Granik's was an ad-lib program.

After considerable argument, and despite Mrs. Boole's reputation for rhetorical vitriol, the station's bosses agreed.

The youthful moderator strove mightily to preserve some semblance of order, but a rough-and-tumble soon ensued. Mrs. Boole grew so excited that when she reached for a glass of water her hands trembled and she drenched herself. Madder than a wet hen, she let go with an astounding charge. She informed her listeners that some of the highest Government officials in Washington were such scofflaws they had built subterranean passages between their offices and nearby speakeasies.

Mrs. Boole's accusation hit the front pages and inspired hundreds of editorials. With the blessing of WOR, Granik's program became a regular forum for the presentation of both sides of public issues.

DEFICITS MET FROM LAW PRACTICE

Granik estimates that during the past 22 years he has dug into his own pocket for more than $250,000 to carry on his show, pointing out that the weekly stipend paid him for the program has not sufficed to meet expenses. He has been in a position to foot the difference because of the handsome yearly income he nets from his law practice, with which he kept up during the years that the forum was advancing to national fame.

From 1934 to 1937, Granik served as assistant district attorney to New York County and from 1937 to 1941 as counsel of the United States Housing Authority. In 1941 he was civilian aide to Maj. Gen. Lewis Hershey, head of the draft, served as special adviser to Donald Nelson on the War Production Board, and after the war contributed his services to the Belgian Government. Through his contacts with Washington officialdom, he was able to cut red tape and rush relief to that distressed nation, for which he recently received one of its highest awards.

Today Granik has law offices in both Washington and New York, acting as legal adviser on Government matters to banks, steel companies, steamship lines, and other large industrial and financial outfits. But the forum remains the major interest of his life. He and a staff of secretaries, researchers and clerks devote as many as 50 hours a week to planning the program.

Granik's preparations for his show also include the buttonholing of Senators and Congressmen in the Capitol dining rooms regarding topics to be discussed. He entertains them on his yacht on the Potomac and relentlessly pursues them via long-distance telephone to all parts of the country and sometimes even to Europe.

Granik, whose long-distance bills average around $2,000 a month, is regarded as such a good customer of the telephone company that once last year, when he was abed with pneumonia, a Washington phone supervisor called in great concern, saying: "We're worried about you. Two days have passed and you haven't made a single long-distance call."

Despite the financial licking Granik has taken in his broadcasting activities, he has been amply compensated in other ways. His show is a past winner of the George Foster Peabody award, regarded as the Pulitzer prize of radio. And Harry S. Truman himself, while Vice President, in 1945 paid tribute to the forum for its adherence to the finest traditions of American free speech.

It was in 1937, when Granik moved the broadcast from New York to Washington, that it began to attract national attention. Many Congressmen and Senators were at first reluctant to appear, fearing the program's ad-lib format and off-the-cuff debate, which permitted no prepared script save for each speaker's 1-minute opening statement.

But when word got around of the surprisingly large mail response received by Congressmen who had ventured onto the show, Capitol Hill hesitancy vanished. First a mere trickle of legislative eloquence flowed into the National Press Club auditorium and later to the Shoreham Hotel, where the broadcasts were staged. Then it became a flood. By 1941 all doubts had disappeared. In that year, a debate on lend-lease, in which Senator C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, argued for the negative, brought him 18,000 letters.

Today, the forum broadcast and telecast stems from the Wardman Park Hotel, and draws an audience comprised in good part of Government officials. The procedure of the program is simple: Each debater delivers a brief prepared statement. From then on it's give and take. Next come questions by the audience, and finally 1-minute summaries by the participants.

On the whole, Granik has successfully maintained decorum during the frequently torrid discussions. Sometimes, however, the partisan or personal emotions of the participants prevail.

During the Roosevelt era, for instance, Senator Sherman Minton of Indiana, now on the Supreme Court, debated the rights of labor with Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the heat of debate, HOFFMAN resorted to name calling. Minton became so enraged that he lifted his opponent from the floor and was about to hurl him into the audience. With frantic cries of "Shay, Shay" (the Justice's nickname) Granik managed to stop him.

The late Gen. Hugh Johnson, NRA boss and a man of easily aroused temper, lost patience with his forum opponent, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida. The fiery soldier, no longer willing to rely merely on his corrosive vocabulary seized the mike and tempted to hit PEPPER on the head. Granik again played referee and the discussion proceeded to an orderly end.

Such sensational outbursts are, of course, the exception. Usually the forum debate runs a lively but dignified course.

Government leaders, aware of this, often use the forum to tee off headline news on major changes in policy. January 1949 provided such an instance. The night before President Truman delivered his state of the Union message to Congress, one of its most important points was revealed to forum listeners by J. Howard McGrath, then chairman of the Democratic National Committee, during the debate with Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. McGrath made it plain that the President would ask authority for stand-by price controls and allocation of scarce materials.

Occasionally, top officials go out of their way to seek debate with more caustic opponents of the administration. Not so long ago Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer had Granik book him against Henry A. Wallace to argue on How Can We Keep America Prosperous?

Wallace refused to speak in any place which barred Negroes, and so the broadcast took place in the Department of Commerce auditorium. The debate was a tense one. The climax came, when, according to the transcript, Wallace said "* * * the reason I am on this program is to try to needle this depression—needle this administration—into taking action which will prevent that depression."

Sawyer snapped, "You were right the first time."

Wallace angrily demanded the withdrawal of that remark. Sawyer deliberately removed his glasses and pugnaciously announced he wasn't taking anything back. "The guilty flee where no man pursueth," he added.

Once during the Presidential campaign year of 1948 an unexpected news development forced Granik to change a topic already booked for airing. As on other occasions, he was thereby tipped off to a big "secret." But, this time, like most Washingtonians, he did not take much stock in the accuracy of the tipster's information.

AN UNWISE CHOICE OF TOPIC

At the suggestion of Congressman HUGH SCOTT, then chairman of the Republican National Committee, Granik had lined up for the week after election a discussion on "What Will Be Dewey's Policies?" He telephoned Democratic Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY in his home State of Wyoming, asking him to participate in the program. O'MAHONEY refused. "I'll be glad to go on your show, Ted," he said, "but not with that topic. There are some strange winds blowing out here, and I tell you right now that the election is going to surprise a lot of people."

O'MAHONEY did appear on the scheduled date—to discuss the meaning of the surprising political upset.

The GOP chairman, on the other hand, had a melancholy look as he reported for the broadcast. Calling O'MAHONEY aside, he said, "Just before coming here, I stopped at my headquarters for a few minutes. The boys and girls up there are so gloomy that even the china elephant on my desk is dropping his tail between his legs."

O'MAHONEY offered the proper condolences and SCOTT continued: "Do me a favor, will you? Don't become offended if tonight I become overaggressive. I want to use this broadcast as a pep talk to my fellow Republicans."

As Granik recalls it, "We had a humdinger of a show."

One of the virtues on which Granik prides himself is his absolute impartiality as a moderator. "Naturally, I have my own opinions," he says, "but I challenge anyone to know what these are from my conduct on the air. I bend backward to assure both of my speakers an equal hearing.

"The importance of this was impressed on me during my early years in Washington. One evening, Marion Martin, then assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, came to our studio with a stop watch, a pencil, and a pad. She used these all during the early portion of our broadcast. Later, she told me that she had suspected me of partiality for the Democrats. But she soon quit her checking up when she found that during the first portion of the program she, as Republican spokesman, had actually consumed more time than her Democratic opponent. Of course, this was evened up during the latter part of the show."

One of the most important ways to preserve impartiality, according to Granik, is to match speakers of equal debating ability. Often a certain Congressman or Senator will suggest that he would like to debate another. But Granik never pits them against each other, unless he's certain they're in the same class as speakers.

Sometimes a public orator has a poorer opinion of his abilities than Granik has. Some years ago, Martin Dies, of Texas, then chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was scheduled for a debate with Morris Ernst, the New York lawyer representing the American Civil Liberties Union. Although Ernst has a reputation as a formidable antagonist, Granik felt that Dies could make a good showing.

On the evening of the broadcast, Congressman Dies sent a substitute speaker. His excuse was that he had a communicable illness. The sub proved no match for Ernst.

The next evening, as Granik tells it, he ran into Dies at a party. "Thought you were in quarantine," said Ted.

"I fooled you!" Dies winked, and confessed that he had decided it was the better part of valor to forgo a session with Ernst.

"It's the only time a congressional speaker has ever run out on me," Ted says.

MRS. LUCE WAXES EMOTIONAL

One of the most troublesome problems of a moderator is the speaker who insists on interrupting the opposition. Former Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce, during an argument with the Communist leader, William Z. Foster, on "Communism Versus Democracy," was so eager to rebut his statements that she broke into almost every sentence he uttered. She waxed so emotional that Granik had to grasp her gesticulating arm in order to bring her under control.

"But Clare is a wonderful speaker to have on a forum," Ted adds. "She has such zest—and what an ad-libber." He recalls a debate in which she was paired with William B. Ziff, the publisher, against Admiral Jerry Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and J. Carter Forte, general counsel of the American Association of Railroads. The Connecticut Congresswoman brought down the house with her crack to Ziff: "You take the Land, Bill, and I'll hold the Forte."

Granik frowns on his debaters smoking during the broadcast. Not that he has any prejudice against tobacco. It's just that he remembers what happened to Congressman SAM HOBBS.

"A crackajack speaker," says Ted, "but he lost out in one debate because of his deliberate manner while smoking. His opponent would fire a question at him and before Sam could remove his pipe from his mouth, his antagonist had already started answering the questions he himself had asked."

Some of the most dramatic developments in the program's long history have been the several occasions when forum speakers have actually converted their opponents while the program is on the air. Clarence Streit, head of the Union Now movement, had the satisfaction of converting an isolationist Congressman during a broadcast. On another occasion, Mrs. Irving Berlin argued a woman opponent into resigning from the America First Committee.

His 22 years of experience with nationally famous political figures have given Granik some emphatic ideas about public speakers and their complex art. Basing his judgments on the showings they have made on the forum, he names among the best debaters of these times Norman Thomas, the Socialist leader; Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, CLAUDE PEPPER, and OWEN BREWSTER; Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. "Senator TAFT is not only an outstanding debater," Ted says, "but, contrary to general impression, also a talented ad-libber."

The famous names which have appeared on the Granik show have provided him with a unique file of historical footnotes on oratorial mannerisms.

TRUMAN THE PERSISTENT ONE

Of President Truman, Granik reveals, "The one quality I recall about him as a forum speaker is a certain bulldog-like plodding ahead despite opposition. As a Senator 11 years ago he debated on America's railroad problem speaking on behalf of a bill he had sponsored with Senator Burton K. Wheeler to reorganize railroads in financial difficulties. And he simply refused to budge in his arguments.

"Incidentally, when Mr. Truman was Vice President, I phoned him one Sunday afternoon. He was his usual homey self. He said, 'Ted, what are you doing? The Mrs. and Margaret have gone out. I'm sitting here in my dressing robe; so why don't you come over and we'll "schmoose" awhile?'

"President Roosevelt, who spoke on our program while he was Governor of New York, impressed us with his ease of manner and the way he marshaled his facts into line. His written script for his formal opening statement on the forum taught me many things. For example, I noticed that he placed just one thought on each page and that his words were underlined for emphasis and for pauses.

"Mayor LaGuardia of New York City was one of the most vivid speakers our show has ever presented. He had quick, lightning-like movements and grimaced without inhibition."

Granik has formulated his own commandments for public speakers. He advises making speeches short, using down-to-earth language, translating abstract arguments into terms of common experience, avoiding statistics as much as possible, and, above all, keeping your temper regardless of how much your opponent needles you.

Granik confesses that although he has been on the air for 22 years, he himself has yet to master all these precepts.

But for a boy from Brooklyn, he has done all right nonetheless. In the swank Westchester Apartments, near the Washington Cathedral, where he lives with his wife and two children, William, 12, and Marion, 8, virtually every householder is a Senator, Congressman, Cabinet Member, or other high Government official. Granik hobnobs with them and has become a Washington celebrity in his own right.

Recently he invested $50,000 in an FM radio station, WHMB, representing the initials of his wife and youngsters. But it is safe to say that the forum will remain the great love of his life. Granik devoutly feels that the show furthers the democratic way of life because it brings to the public the livest topics of the day discussed by leading legislators and enables the people in the studio audiences to question them face to face.

"It give me," he happily confides, "the consciousness of participating in the making of history."

Shadow of the Censor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shadow of the Censor," which was published in the Washington Post of today. The editorial relates to radio broadcasting.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHADOW OF THE CENSOR

A hearing of great importance to the radio industry and the public has recessed in California. It involves charges of bias and news-slanting against George A. Richards, the owner of KMPC in Los Angeles and two other powerful radio stations. Three former employees of Mr. Richards charge that he ordered them to distort and color the news so as to discredit some individuals and groups and to reflect credit upon others. Since the Federal Communications Commission has no powers of censorship, the issue boils down to whether or not the licensee is a fit person to operate radio facilities subject to regulation in the public interest.

Of course, no broadcaster is free to operate his station, using public facilities, solely as he may see fit. In the broad sense of the word he must serve the public interest or give way to someone else who can. But the public interest thus to be served necessarily has a very broad meaning. The FCC is not at liberty to put a broadcaster off the air because it may disagree with his viewpoint or because he may fall short of perfection in the management of his broadcasts. The history of broadcasting in this country shows relatively few abuses of the freedom that Congress has granted to the licensees in shaping their own programs. That record is not such as to warrant the disciplining of broadcasters by the back-door method of finding them unfit persons to operate a radio station, unless their activities fall hopelessly below the minimum standards of public service.

If the Silver Shirts, the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan, or a gang of outlaws were operating a broadcasting station to further their own interests, there would be no question about the necessity of withdrawing their license. But these are extreme cases. It would be a very different matter for the FCC to undertake to discipline a broadcaster because of the manner in which he "played" the news. If Mr. Richards should be put off the air for trying to slant the news against the persons and groups that are anathema to him, where would such a policy end? To be consistent the Commission would then have to withdraw the licenses of stations slanting the news against other political figures and organizations. We do not believe that the Commission has any standards that would be a safe guide in such a venture, and if it did, the enforcement of such a policy would go seriously against the grain of our traditions.

Every decision as to what shall go on the air and how it shall be "played" is likely to be influenced by the broadcaster's or the newscaster's prejudices. The best radio stations and the best newspapers hold these prejudices in check, struggling for fair and unbiased presentation of the facts. But it is common knowledge that slanted newspapers flourish, presumably because the people wish to read them. Would it be feasible for the Commission to put off the air a broadcaster catering to prejudices that were common with big metropolitan dailies in the same city? To be sure, the number of broadcasting channels is limited, but so are the opportunities for publication of a daily newspaper. We doubt that the FCC can apply stricter policies in the regulation of broadcasting than the press generally applies without taking upon itself an unmanageable problem of censorship. The public interest demands a wide range of freedom on the air as well as in the press. The danger of the FCC embarking upon a policy of censorship seems to us much greater than the occasional abuse of freedom by licensees whose prejudices color their judgment.

The National Hymn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed by several young people from Indianapolis regarding a proposed change in the name of the national hymn.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *March 30, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Our fifth grade class, room 24, school 70, Indianapolis, Ind., would like to have our national hymn, not our national anthem, but our national hymn, changed from America to America the Beautiful.

America is originally an English tune, God Save the King.

America the Beautiful describes our Nation very well. If you could see Warner Bros. picture America the Beautiful I think you would agree.

Many other Americans feel just the same as we do.

You, as our Senator, could give this idea a great boost.

Sincerely,

Tom Reilly, Harry Jennings, Alice Broadbent, Tom Osborne, Barbara Shook, Nancy Fowler, John Brennan, Douglas Branch, Charles Allen, Jim P., Douglas Burns, Gary Williams, Jimmy Fiege.

Here Is an Accomplished Fact—Not Hope, but History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, statistics are not always dull and uninteresting. Some tabulations which I want to furnish herein contain a thrilling story of man's conquest of nature in converting deserts into gardens. Since my great interest and duty in national legislation is to promote the cause of reclamation, it might be assumed that I have in mind at this moment some future reclamation project. Not so. Just now I want to tell you very briefly in recorded statistics the last 10-year story of one of the oldest reclamation projects in the West. In other words, this is what happened in Yuma County, Ariz., instead of what we might hope will happen.

More than a third of a century ago enterprising farmers in Yuma County, Ariz., began to develop farm lands along the Arizona portion of the Yuma Valley below the town of Yuma, extending southward to the Mexican border. The United States Bureau of Reclamation developed their project. The Laguna diversion dam was built on the Colorado River a few miles above Yuma, and water for the project was diverted from the Laguna Dam and carried in a canal on the California side of the river, because the physical obstructions were less on the west side at that point than on the Arizona side. The canal came down opposite the city of Yuma and was brought under the Colorado River through an inverted siphon. In this way, water was brought to about 45,000 acres of desert land in the extreme southwestern corner of the State of Arizona in Yuma County. The project is known as the Yuma Valley project and is one of two Federal reclamation projects in Arizona which have been very successfully functioning more than a third of a century.

According to official reports, the average gross crop value per acre on this project has been greater than any other project in the entire Pacific Southwest. To illustrate, in the year 1948 the average gross crop production per acre on that project was a little over $300. While I do not have the record on this project for 1949, it is known to be correspondingly high. What is the reason for this phenomenal yield? Undoubtedly it was because of a fortunate combination of rich soil, plenty of water, and, above all, a climate furnishing the very best possible growing season throughout 12 months of the year. It happens that specialty crops, not of a competitive nature, are grown in this area. Such crops as may be said to be moderately competitive, as, for instance, head lettuce, are carefully timed for the produce to be ready for the market on a time schedule that will not bring such produce into competition either with the Imperial Valley in California or the Salt River Valley in Arizona. Thus, these three great garden spots in the Pacific Southwest grow their produce almost by the stop watch so that the produce is not harvested simultaneously from the three, but harvested tandemlike, in order that the market demand will be greatest.

Another reason why the gross crop production is so remarkably high is that this area is a veritable hothouse or sun parlor, not glassed in. During the six cooler months which are called winter, valuable seed is grown and harvested early in time to produce quantities of seed for seed markets to be used in other areas during the following 6 months. Perhaps no equal area in the country produces such great quantities of seed as does the Yuma Valley. Naturally, such seed brings higher prices than could otherwise be obtained. Below is a tabulation showing cultivated acreage, gross crop value, gross crop value per acre, and the gross crop value annually per acre-foot of water used:

Data on Yuma Valley, Ariz.

Year	Cultivated acreage	Gross crop value	Gross crop value per acre	Gross crop value per acre-foot of water
1939	44,493.00	$2,014,952.00	$45.29	$10.48
1940	44,445.00	1,971,604.00	44.36	10.49
1941	45,627.00	3,385,280.00	74.19	19.17
1942	45,567.00	5,646,638.00	124.41	29.48
1943	45,662.00	8,487,639.00	185.88	42.93
1944	45,077.00	6,682,266.00	148.24	36.51
1945	44,763.00	6,811,119.00	152.16	36.14
1946	45,700.00	10,379,312.00	227.12	49.92
1947	45,435.00	12,600,027.00	277.32	56.94
1948	46,265.00	13,971,371.00	301.99	59.56
Total	453,034.00	71,950,208.00	1,580.96	351.62
Average	45,303.40	7,195,020.80	158.10	35.16

I cannot study this tabulation and view the amount of wealth created by a given quantity of Colorado River water without extreme regret that about 40 times that amount of water during the same 10-year period flowed past Yuma, Ariz., without being used and was wasted in the Gulf of California. Was that tragic fact because there was no other land on which the water could have been used? No; that was not the cause. There were 10 times that many acres of just the same kind of land in the State of Arizona that might have produced the same aggregate wealth if 10 times that amount of water had been put upon such land—but why speculate? It is useless to cry over spilled milk. However, it is not necessary to spill some more milk because some has already been spilled. The thing I want to emphasize is the sobering fact that 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 acre-feet of water have been flowing, are now flowing, and may continue to flow for a good many years to come, past this very spot without being used, only to be wasted in the Gulf of California unless Congress wisely acts.

The Road to Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the March 18, 1950, issue of America, a national Catholic weekly review, entitled "The Road to Nowhere." This article presents an analysis of the book entitled "The Road Ahead" by John T. Flynn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO NOWHERE

A physician has sent us a paper-covered edition of John T. Flynn's book, the Road Ahead. He probably got a mailing from the Committee for Constitutional Government, according to official report the second most expensive lobby in Washington.

Its mailing of February 9, for example, To All Dentists—A Call for Action Now, urged the immediate distribution of five enclosed postcards entitled "If You Want To Stop Socialism in U. S. A." If you want to stop socialism (most good people do) you will buy, preferably in bulk orders, John T. Flynn's book at the special February-March introductory price of 50 cents per copy on orders of two or more from the Committee for Constitutional Government. Hundreds of doctors have purchased as many as 25, 50, and 100 copies, some 5,000 in all. One Indiana surgeon bought 1,100 copies. * * * The Oregon State Medical Association purchased 8,000 copies for distribution to individuals across the State.

The Road Ahead, a book whose significance has been compared to the written Word of God, has a chapter on the "Kingdom of God" (quotes are Mr. Flynn's, presumably as evidence of his sense of irony). Protesting, too much, that "this is not an attack on religion or on any organized church," he sets himself to expose the organization of a clique of Christian ministers and laymen to poison the minds of the Christian churches in America with the principles of radical socialism.

Mr. Flynn fearlessly supplies immediate identification of this portentous camarilla. It is the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, described five pages further on in the same book as "the greatest religious lay body in America," an organization of 25 Protestant denominations, representing 142,354 local congregations with a membership of 27,000,000.

Mr. Flynn disapproves to use a euphemism—of the pronouncements of the Council on social and economic questions. He really disapproves of the effrontery of any religious group in impugning the sanctity of the uncontrolled capitalism he advocates. His explicit indictment is tamer and slicker than that, of course. The Federal Council is beguiling simple pious Protestants into socialism. Mr. Flynn documents his case—in part by a quotation from the Council's Social Creed of the Churches that is simply not in the document. The author of The Road Ahead courteously acknowledges in a footnote that he took the nonexistent quotation from a book by Carl McIntire, the unfrocked Presbyterian minister, a promoter of the superfundamentalist American Council of Christian Churches, who went to Amsterdam to steal the headlines from the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches and to Bangkok to disrupt the International Missionary Council Conference.

Such fervid advocacy is pure Blanshardism. There is the same pretense of impressive documentation, the same astute selectivity of sources, the same ill-concealed resentment of any expression of the social role of religion. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Council, is prepared to supply on request (address: 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City, 10) a detailed answer to the "misunderstandings, misrepresentations, and falsities" in Mr. Flynn's chapter. Dr. Cavert's conviction that Mr. Flynn's background unfits him to write "about a field with which he is wholly unfamiliar" should serve as a caution to Protestants gulled by Paul Blanshard's seeming knowledge of catholicism.

Mr. Flynn's genial lumping together of England and Russia as equally socialist, his insistence that we must stop spending money on "What we are told is a 'cold war,'" manifests a mentality confidently awaiting word of McKinley's election. Mr. Flynn is hardly to be thanked that he strangely omitted quotations from Catholic sources on economic and social problems of the day. Perhaps he anticipated the judgment, say, of the Rev. George G. Higgins, assistant director of NCWC's social action department, who tagged The Road Ahead as "the most emotional, illogical, inaccurate, and probably even libelous book which we have ever been foolish enough to purchase."

Policies of the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a businessman in Indiana which appears to me to be a masterpiece of satire on the foolish policies pursued by the Department of Agriculture in its destruction of perishable foodstuffs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEYMOUR, IND., *March 25, 1950.*

The Honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENNER: I am in the furniture business and am writing this letter to request that you obtain for me a subsidy on our platform rockers. We are now making about a thousand a year and are eager to step this production up to 50,000 as soon as possible. With so many people in the country getting rockin'-chair money we feel that the market is unlimited for our product. Since you are voting money for potatoes, cotton, tobacco, railroads, aviation, and many other industries I see no reason why we in the furniture business should be slighted. Now we would like a guaranteed price of $50 each for these rockers. In the event we are unable to sell all of them we will arrange to burn them right here at the factory rather than go to the expense of shipping them somewhere else to be destroyed. I notice that you paid $2.90 a bag for potatoes in Maine and then shipped them to Chicago which raised the cost to $4 a bag, then sold them to farmers for 1 cent a bag. That sort of thing is pretty expensive so we will gladly arrange to destroy any surplus of our rockers right at the factory.

It should be an easy matter for you to get the above-mentioned program through Congress since I see that last year you boys voted to spend twenty-nine billion without even a roll call. Perhaps you can get one of Harry's boys to enter our rocker program in the budget. I realize that it will be small potatoes to the billion-dollar programs you are accustomed to, but perhaps you can start a new bureau or something to raise the ante and get it in the billion-dollar bracket. I certainly cannot see that I am asking anything unreasonable as I have paid taxes all my life and have never received a check from my Government. You paid some of the boys in Maine as much as $450,000 for raising potatoes which the Nation could not possibly consume, so why not a few bucks for the underfed furniture business.

We are in a position to provide some pretty expensive lobbyists with a pocket full of money to spend on the program if you think that is necessary. There must be some secret to getting those big spending programs, which benefit a particular group, through Congress, and we are eager to obtain the secret. Any information regarding the same will be gratefully appreciated.

Please let me hear from you as soon as possible regarding the above-mentioned rocker program as we are eager to get the Government checks started rolling in.

Yours most respectfully,

HARRY BOLING.

National Cancer Drive—Addresses by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, and Award to Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made on April 2, 1950, in New York, when the national cancer drive was inaugurated. On that occasion I had the honor to present, as I have on other occasions, the Clement Cleveland medal, which is a medal presented by the American Cancer Society for outstanding work in cancer research during the previous year. The medal was awarded to Mr. Walter Winchell, the noted columnist, for his work in connection with the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund. At the banquet Mr. Winchell donated to the American Cancer Society a quarter of a million dollars to start the drive. I made some remarks in presenting the medal to Mr. Winchell, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, at the same meeting to which I have referred I delivered an address on the problem of cancer. I should like to have that inserted in the RECORD also.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR MAGNUSON IN CONNECTION WITH CLEMENT CLEVELAND AWARD TO WALTER WINCHELL, APRIL 2, 1950

No history books that I can recall ever referred to the 1880's in America as "the dark ages," but regarding the problem of cancer, that term may well apply.

For it was only 67 years ago, here in New York, that Mrs. John Jacob Astor offered to add a wing to the Women's Hospital in New York, stipulating only that it be called the Cancer Pavilion. The hospital's answer, astonishingly enough was a resounding "No"—one of the few cases on record where a hospital, no matter how wealthy, ever turned down a gift of money.

The hospital's reasoning was this: "We couldn't get a patient to enter a section of the hospital with such a dismal name."

Fortunately, Mrs. Astor consulted a physician who was doing tremendous work as a cancer specialist—Dr. Clement Cleveland. He persuaded her to build a whole new hospital and call it frankly the New York Cancer Hospital. But, Dr. Cleveland was a little ahead of his time—the hush-hush attitude toward cancer was not to be broken down that easily. The New York Cancer Hospital was forced to change its name to stay in business.

Such experiences made a lasting impression on Dr. Cleveland's daughter, Elsie. Over and over again she heard her father and other doctors say: "If the patient would have just come to us a little earlier—last year, last month, last week—we could have saved his life." She realized that doctors alone could not win this battle. The people themselves must learn to face cancer facts squarely and openly. It was Dr. Cleveland and his daughter—then Mrs. Robert G. Mead—who brought together top professional and lay leaders in 1913 in a historical meeting which saw the birth of the American Society for the Control of Cancer—now the American Cancer Society.

In 1913, the society operated on a budget of $10,000. Last year the public contributed $14,000,000 to the cancer crusade. Through every medium of public communication we see and hear the word "cancer," and learn the facts which can save lives. Cancer control is a reality—a tribute to such pioneers as Dr. Clement Cleveland.

Dr. Cleveland died in 1934. Three years later the New York City Cancer Committee established in his memory the annual Clement Cleveland Medal for outstanding work in the campaign to control cancer.

Year after year this award has gone to outstanding men and women—research scientists, administrators, physicians, lay-

men—who have dedicated themselves to the all-out fight to lick cancer.

The New York City Cancer Committee has chosen as the recipient of the Clement Cleveland Medal for 1949 a man who has probably done more than any other single human to drive home to the people of the world the meaning of the word "cancer," and the necessity of sparing no effort in seeking out its cause and cure. In the memory of a friend, whose life cancer took, he launched the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund for cancer research, and we all have seen what this great voluntary effort has achieved. Now in its fourth year, the fund has spurred some $3,000,000 in contributions from the public, and in turn has put this money to work through grants to 77 institutions in 35 States. It has worked hand in hand with the American Cancer Society and its local affiliate, the New York City Cancer Committee, in giving to science the equipment and the manpower this fight against cancer demands.

As a great molder of public opinion, he has aroused a whole Nation to action. He has helped influence Government, as well as private spending, in a great coordinated fight against cancer.

It is my pleasure to award to Walter Winchell the New York City Cancer Committee's Clement Cleveland Medal for 1949.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

If any of you like old stories, you will relish this one. It made the rounds over and over again during the war, but I still like it. Perhaps some of you saw the signs that were posted in the offices of the military establishment's top-secret experimental laboratories. "The difficult we do immediately," said the signs, "the impossible takes a little longer." Similar signs could be posted today in laboratories throughout the country where top-flight researchers are fighting another war—the one against cancer.

Not too long ago an open discussion of cancer would have appalled you because so little was known about it and because people had an aversion to the very word cancer. Today we have been able to erase from our minds much of the false stigma attached to this disease and we know a great deal about cancer—that early detection and early treatment can cure many cases.

This has come about principally because of the American Cancer Society, an organization of laymen and doctors who are devoted to stamping out cancer as a major killer among the diseases of mankind.

Research

The search for new knowledge in the medical sciences is being expended daily. American investments in research have produced a body of knowledge which if fully applied, would advance human health immeasurably. The health care of the American people cannot and must not become a monopoly—either of governments, private enterprise or charitable institutions. Each of these have made great contributions to American health. Each must grow and endure in wisdom, strength and efficiency; and all must work together.

The crisis in America's professional schools is most serious. Many medical and other professional schools have fallen into serious financial straits. Present high standards must be maintained and raised as rapidly as possible. Expansion of educational facilities is essential if the demand for trained personnel is to be met.

During the last 5 years, the American Cancer Society, having recognized the importance of intensified investigative efforts through its 61 chartered divisions and more than 2,600 county branches, has allocated over $13,000,000 for research from the money contributed by the American people. The society spends 25 percent of its income in the support of studies in the field of growth and in the training of young scientists to carry it forward.

Control of cancer eventually will come through an understanding of cancer's causes, the means of prevention, and effective treatment methods. This knowledge waits on research. The path of research is long and hard. Cancer is as mysterious as life itself. Scientists may have to uncover the secret of growth in the individual cell before they can learn why and how it starts, how it grows, and what will stop it.

As time is measured in research, we are progressing rapidly. Each year more progress is made in organizing cancer research than during any previous year, but none can tell how long a time must pass before cancer is beaten. But the search goes on. Thousands of substances are under test to find one powerful enough to destroy cancer without harming normal cells.

Progress has been made in the standard methods of treating cancer. Surgery and radiation. New antibiotics, like penicillin. Improved anesthesia and surgical techniques enable us to excise cancer from parts of the body that were formerly inaccessible.

X-rays are being directed with increasing success at hidden cancers, and radium focused upon many tumors. And the possibilities of radio-active isotopes—byproducts of atomic energy are being explored. Noteworthy among the research advances made in 1949 were several facts:

1. New evidence relating to changes in blood serum in cancer patients, opening up the possible development of a practical blood test for cancer.

2. Evaluation of antifolic acid compounds as a treatment of definite but limited benefit in treating acute leukemia.

3. Discovery of the vast potentialities of the hormones, ACTH and cortisone, in treatment of rheumatism and other diseases, and preliminary testing of these drugs in cancer, particularly leukemia.

4. Discovery that a new chemical compound—guanazolo—will inhibit the growth of certain types of cancer in mice without apparent toxic effects to the animal.

5. Further evidence that chemical agents which produce environmental cancer also cause changes in the hereditary pattern of the body's cells.

Research gets 25 cents of each dollar to hire laboratory technicians, buy centrifuges, electronic microscopes, experimental animals, and other equipment needed to track down and destroy the disease. Modern research, bit by bit, is exposing cancer's secrets. It is learning slowly but surely the relationship between cancer and the hormones our glands secrete, the food we eat, the rays of the sun, the biochemical reactions in our body and the chemicals in our environment. The research program of the American Cancer Society with its interest and money may make it possible to beat cancer in our time. The once narrow horizon of the scientists who worked on cancer has been broadened beyond belief.

During the current fiscal year the American Cancer Society has financed research projects by more than 240 scientists and teams of scientists. It has financed additional work by other hundreds of scientists with grants to 26 large research institutions in 20 States throughout the Nation. The total expended on cancer research by the Society for the year is more than $3,500,000. It can be said truly that never in history has an investment brought a greater return. The threat of cancer is worth the mobilized effort of our scientists, for after all, cancer costs more American lives than combat exacted during the most destructive years of World War II. It's up to us, the citizenry, to get behind our scientists to give them the time, manpower, equipment and the experimental materials they need to find the cause and cure of cancer. In 1913, the American Cancer Society operated on a budget of $10,000. Last year, the public contributed $13,600,000. Today cancer control is big business. It has to be in order to curb the disease that is one of our most serious and most baffling national medical problems.

With painstaking care, scientists are tracing the basic biological processes of life—to determine where they vary in people with and without cancer. And in this maze of biochemical and physiolcgical reactions they are finding threads of evidence which eventually may indicate the origins of cancer. Certain patterns of hormone production are proving peculiar to some kinds of cancer. Enzymes, those substances whose presence are essential to normal cell chemistry—the building and break-down of living tissue and the generation of energy—have been found to have bearing upon the development of cancer. Even the B-complex vitamins in the food we eat are now known to have some influence on the disease.

The physicists have discovered that ultraviolet rays can cause cancer—even habitual overexposure to the rays of the sun. Geneticists are trying to determine how much of a part inheritance plays in susceptibility and resistance to cancer.

In a hundred strategic sectors, the counterattack against cancer is being perfected. These points, of course, are laboratories in universities and hospitals where our greatest research scientists work. The weapons they forge against this disease are made available to all of us—everywhere. The hormones found in Boston to help breast cancer patients are being used in Butte and San Diego. Substances used in Berkeley are being tried in Kansas City and New York. New methods of detecting cancer in body fluids are developed in Portland, Oreg., and used in Portland, Maine. Surgical techniques perfected in New Orleans are saving lives in Washington and Wisconsin. A day after a Chicago scientist announced a possible blood test for early cancer, hospitals from Bangor to Seattle and Miami to Los Angeles were clamoring for the information. The scientists who learns in a laboratory at the University of Washington that certain drugs may cause cancer and the scientist who works in a massive, marble building in New York on chemicals that kill cancer are working for us—each one of us right here. They are trying to find out how to prevent our getting cancer or—in case it should happen—how to cure us.

Whether we like it or not—whether we choose to be or not—we are in this cancer fight—every last one of us. Our lives and the lives of our loved ones are at stake. We cannot dodge the cancer draft. We cannot go AWOL from the cancer fight.

Now that we are in this cancer war, let's fight it with all we have, and let's win it. This year the scientists who equip us with weapons against cancer are working with the $3,500,000 we gave them through the American Cancer Society. They could use at least twice that amount. They need at least twice that amount. They need it for research beds which cost as much as $12,000 a year, so they can study the effect on humans of promising experimental chemicals. They need as much as $25,000 for electron microscopes which enlarge the cells 300,000 times and enable them to study viruses which may cause some cancers. They need countless rats and mice and guinea pigs for experiments with new compounds—to find one which may save our lives. They need massive and delicate instruments, like the mass spectrometer costing $15,000, which can tear apart and identify the fragments of infinitely small bits of matter.

Many of us here tonight are familiar with the work of Dr. Vannevar Bush and the organization he directed during the war.

The Office of Scientific Research and Development gave us the atom bomb, the proximity fuse, rockets, and guided missiles. I had the good fortune to meet with Dr. Bush and one of his aides, Mr. Teeter, at the close of the last war. Out of that meeting, I sponsored a National Science Foundation

bill, which has now passed both Houses of Congress.

National Science Foundation

The primary purpose of the establishment of a National Science Foundation is to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences and correlate its scientific research programs with those undertaken by public and private research groups. The institutes of health are concerned with health and man in the field of applied science. The National Science Foundation is concerned only with basic medicine. The National Science Foundation will only implement programs already going and in no way restrict the activities of institutes of health. All agencies will and can cooperate together.

The Division of Medicine of the National Science Foundation will be the medical scientists' right arm in wrestling with the basic problems of medicine. It will seek solutions through basic research in the hope that by pushing back this frontier the answer to specific diseases will be revealed. From the National Science Foundation it is hoped will come ideas to nurture and provide life blood to institutes of health and the American Cancer Society.

Cancer will be more difficult to solve than the atomic bomb was to build. We know the basic science of the bomb. We do not know the secret of growth in man. However mechanical we men may seem to the ladies, we are not so easy to understand as a machine. Machines are built by men and we inherit human beings by accident of birth. The complicated mechanism of man is not entirely understood. The female of the species is never understood.

American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund

Incorporated in the spring of 1947, the Runyon Fund, largely through the efforts of Mr. Winchell, its treasurer, and his associates, Dan Parker and Leonard Lyons, has raised over $3,000,000 for cancer research. All of these funds are allocated for cancer research, including fellowships. Some $2,700,000 has been allocated to 70 institutions in 35 States, a substantial portion of which is for research in New York City where you fortunately have outstanding facilities.

The relationship between the Damon Runyon Fund and the American Cancer Society is a superb example of two partners working together for a common goal. The American Cancer Society carefully screen research projects, the money for which is provided from funds which you volunteers raise which go not only for research, but for the education of the physicians and the individual, and service to cancer sufferers. The Damon Runyon Fund provides additional funds so that the Nation's cancer research program may go on without interruption and without lagging.

I could not close without paying tribute to you who are here, who are dedicated to the proposition that no problem, not even cancer, is too difficult to tackle.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Food for Thought, delivered by me on April 6, 1950, at New Orleans, La., before members of the Council of the Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Today, April 6, marks the thirty-third anniversary of our entry into World War I. When President Wilson in April 1917 asked Congress for a declaration of war, so that we might join our friends in that great struggle, he said:

"The world must be made safe for democracy."

And so, it came to pass, that we did dedicate our lives, our fortunes and all that was near and dear to us, so that our way of life could be preserved—or may I say, so that democracy might live. America had chosen to spend her blood and exert her might for the principles that gave her birth and for the preservation of the unbounded freedom she has always enjoyed.

Less than a quarter of a century later we were forced into another cruel conflict, World War II. Here again we dedicated our lives, our fortunes and all that was near and dear to us, so as to save a great and precious form of Government for ourselves and for the world. A few days after Congress declared war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

"We covenant with each other before all the world, that having taken up arms in the defense of liberty, we will not lay them down before liberty is once again secure in the world we live in. For that security we pray; for that security we act—now and ever more."

We risked our lives, we dissipated our God-given natural resources in those two devastating wars, so that our country could continue to protect and preserve our cherished liberty. As a free people we have developed a matchless private enterprise system that provides us with a standard of living unequaled, in fact, far superior to that of any other country on earth. That I know, for I have learned it from actual observation and experience.

Under that system we were able to create almost overnight the greatest war machine that was ever assembled to give battle; to direct it across two oceans and through almost 4 years of grueling war, and to drive it to ultimate and unconditional victory. Last, but not least, we have been able to produce ample food and manufacture sufficient industrial equipment to materially assist a war-torn world to get back on its feet.

We were willing to sacrifice our all so that we could continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom. And yet, today, we have certain elements in our scheme of society that are advocating plans—and some are actively sponsoring legislation—that bid fair to destroy our way of life. Others are openly defying the law and are getting by with it. Need I emphasize that law and order must be maintained at all cost—political expediency notwithstanding—lest we may be subjected to mob rule.

Our system of private enterprise has become most complex during the past generation. There has developed an unhealthy amount of antagonism between labor and capital. I am not entirely satisfied with the existing method of handling labor-management disputes. The cause should be explored. There is room for improvement. The Senate adopted several amendments to the existing law but the House of Representatives has failed to follow through as a result of pressure from labor czars. If only the labor leaders would cooperate with the Congress, our task would be greatly simplified. Instead, they are advocating a return to the lopsided Wagner Act. Thus far they have met with little success. In passing, may I point out that not very long ago it was management that was in control and labor suffered considerably. It was management that defied Congress at that time and as a result the one-sided Wagner Act was passed. If management had then cooperated with the Congress the Wagner Act would never have become law in its present form. Today both sides have had their fling and it is to be hoped that more cooperation will be forthcoming between the two groups constituting our private enterprise system. I firmly believe that labor and management should be kept in balance and that neither should be given an advantage over the other.

The rights of our sovereign States, those rights that played such an important part in the formation of our Union, are being increasingly circumscribed by a bureaucracy that believes in a powerful centralized government. The Tidelands question, with which all of you are familiar, is a good example of that trend. The big arm of the Federal Government is reaching out to control the vast oil and gas resources lying beneath our coastal waters, all in contradiction to established customs and well-settled jurisprudence. Next will come Federal control of our fisheries and other resources of the sea.

Only last week it was necessary for Congress to act in order to prevent power-crazed bureaucrats from usurping the States' jurisdiction over the production and gathering of natural gas. Not content with the power to regulate the sale of gas when it is transported in interstate commerce, these bureaucrats sought the authority to regulate the exploration and the drilling for gas in a sovereign State. Not only that, but they also sought to regulate the extraction of butane, gasoline, and other byproducts of natural gas, notwithstanding the fact that those operations are performed entirely within the confines of a sovereign State.

I could dwell on other phases of the plan, such as socialized medicine, the classification of jobs in industry, and the fixing of wages beginning with the minimum established by law, all of which I have opposed. Time will not permit me to discuss all of them.

I should like to now discuss briefly some of the iniquitous civil-rights bills advocated by the President. This attack upon constitutional government has been fostered by both of the great political parties and for purely political reasons. The head of the Democratic Party is bending every effort to beat the Republicans to the draw, and the South has been forced to wage a strenuous fight to uphold the Constitution and to maintain its traditions and customs. The civil-rights legislation is a disguised attempt to create a central bureaucracy, in which the traditional and constitutional rights, both of the States and of the people, could be disregarded at the whim of an all-powerful Chief Executive.

We in Louisiana dislike the poll tax. As a former member of the Louisiana Legislature I helped to pass a law to abolish it as a prerequisite for voting. Other States have done likewise until today the poll tax exists in only seven States. Repeal movements are now under way in those States, and within 4 or 5 years the poll tax will be a thing of the past. In spite of this, however, the civil-rights advocates would have the Congress usurp a State's constitutional authority to establish the qualifications of its voters.

We of the South condemn lynching for what it is—murder. We are dealing with lynching through State police systems, through education, and through other methods. We are coping with it most effectively. There is no offense in the history of criminology that is more on the way out than is lynching. It is almost extinct. Let the civil-rights advocates desire legislation enacted to make lynching a Federal crime, so that the Federal authorities could go into any sovereign State where a lynching is sus-

pected, supplant the local officers, prosecute those officers, and even bring civil suits for damages against the local government itself. Such a law would invade the domain of powers reserved to the States by the United States Constitution. Antilynching legislation could not possibly be enforced and I fear that it would do serious harm to the very people it is designed to help—the southern Negroes. Its enactment would set off a chain of violent reaction toward them.

I now come to the most far-reaching and dangerous of the civil-rights proposals, commonly referred to as the FEPC bill. It is my understanding that every effort will be made to push that nefarious piece of legislation through the Congress. I propose to speak against its enactment as long as God gives me breath.

The FEPC proposal would establish a vast Federal bureaucracy, with regional, State, and local officers to supervise the daily operations of every sizable business in the United States, dictating to every employer whom he can hire, fire, transfer, or promote. Should the day ever come when the Federal Government can interfere with an employer's free judgment in the selection and maintenance of an efficient force of employees, we might as well hang black crepe on the doors of private enterprise.

The bill is a serious and indefensible denial of the liberty to contract. It substitutes governmental judgment for personal judgment as to the qualifications and desirability of persons for employment and for advancement. It imposes arbitrary restraints on freedom of association.

The bill attempts to create a civil right which is beyond the scope of Congress. Such a right has not been delegated to the United States, but has been specifically retained in the States.

Aside from its unconstitutionality, the legislation ignores social patterns. Legislation cannot create tolerance and good feeling. Nor can it erase differences in attitude, outlook, or human behavior. The bill ignores established social patterns based on law and customs. Its operation would inevitably tend to undermine those local patterns, thereby setting the stage for untold strife, dissension, and fierce resistance to enforcement of the law.

Whether segregation is right or wrong has no place in the argument. Segregation exists. Mark Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, is well known for his liberal views. While a member of the wartime Fair Employment Practices Commission, he said this:

"There is no power in the world—not even in all the mechanized armies of the earth, Allied and Axis—which could now force the southern white people to the abandonment of the principle of segregation."

Such a law would be a tremendous step in the direction of governmental control not only of private management but also of every phase of human endeavor and human relationship. It would eventually destroy the cherished liberty which we fought two Global Wars to preserve.

I should like your indulgence for a few more minutes to discuss a problem that is undermining our financial structure and eating into the strength and vitality of our National Government. Unless checked, it will destroy our democracy, by leading us straight into national impoverishment. I refer to deficit spending. Whenever a nation, like a person or a corporation, goes on, year after year, living beyond its means, it can only end in bankruptcy. I ask: If the United States Government cannot balance its budget even in these times of relative prosperity, what is going to happen if and when hard times come along? During this period of prosperity we should be not only paying our way, but also cutting down on our national debt. Instead, we are adding to it at the rate of $5,000,000,000 per year. Deficit spending must come to an end, and soon. We must balance the budget, and steer away from the perilous tendency now prevalent among our Government planners, that of spending more money than the Federal Treasury takes in. Each and every departmental head should be instructed by the Chief Executive to effect substantial economies in the interest of national solvency.

As the spokesmen of our international policies, members of the State Department in particular might well heed my words in this respect. As chairman of a special Senate Appropriations Fact-Finding Subcommittee, I made a round-the-world trip last fall; I visited most of the nations that are now receiving American aid, or are looking to us for help. I was amazed to find that the leaders of those countries believe that we live in a land of unlimited milk and honey, and that our resources are inexhaustible. They believe, too, that we should open our treasury to them to prevent the Communists from taking over their countries. I can assure you, that however backward they might be in other respects, they are not backward in asking for financial assistance from their generous Uncle Sam.

The State Department should brief our representatives abroad as to our financial condition, and in turn have them enlighten these people on the cold facts. If that were done, I am certain that the demands upon us might be tempered with reason. The State Department should tell our friends across the seas that every dollar we give them or lend them is borrowed money; that in order to assist them we are placing ourselves deeper in debt. In other words, if our representatives would present a realistic version of our economy—talk po'mouf as we say in the South—instead of presenting the lush picture that is usually painted of America, we might find these dependent nations less aggressive in their demands.

When I was abroad recently, I told the rulers of several governments in the Middle East and Far East about our debt situation. I informed them that the interest of our national debt amounted to more than was required to run our Government in 1934 and 1935. They could not believe that we had permitted our country to drift into such a situation. All of them were laboring under the impression that our Goverment can spare with ease all the goods and moneys we are handing out. In most cases, after I made known our financial condition, the response was unanimous that America must conserve its resources and remain strong financially in order to prevent the further spread of communism throughout the world.

Need I further emphasize to you that unless the trend that now prevails in Washington is arrested, we are apt to lose our way of life—a way that has enabled America to achieve undisputed world leadership. It would be a sad paradox if, in order to avert communism among our friends, we should exhaust and impoverish ourselves and in so doing invite communism to our own shores.

It is necessary that our people interest themselves in government and keep abreast of what is going on and make every effort to stem the tide lest it engulf us. So long as Americans keep awake, so long as they are vigilant, so long as they remain on guard for the preservation of their individual liberties, I have no fear of the consequences. A story I heard recently might better illustrate what I am trying to emphasize.

There was once a minister of the gospel who had engaged sea passage from England to Norway, and having never traveled by sea before, he was somewhat apprehensive of the perils of ocean travel. He asked the ticket agent if there were any danger in his crossing, and the agent told him that so long as the sailors were a-fussin' and a-cussin' they were not frightened; it was only when they were too afraid to fuss and cuss that the ship would be in serious trouble.

While they were in midpassage a terrible storm hit the ship, and it began to pitch and roll. The minister peeped out of his cabin, and the sailors on deck were fussing and cussing, so he went back relieved. The storm grew worse, and again the minister peeped out. Sure enough, the sailors were fussin' and cussin' above the roar of the winds. A little while later the minister again listened, fearful that the severity of the storm had finally frightened the seamen, but they were still fussin' and cussin'. The clergyman retired to his room, but he had lost confidence somewhat in the ticket agent's admonitions, and he felt that he had best resort to prayer. He knelt on the rolling deck of his stateroom and prayed, "O Lord, if in your infinite wisdom you must keep this tempest howling outside and this ship pitching and tossing, just please, O Lord, also keep those sailors fussin' and cussin'."

So long as we as Americans can keep a-cussin' and a-fussin' we shall be able to exercise our freedom to speak, our freedom to complain, and our freedom to choose. It is when the gloom of discouragement settles over us that we will no longer assert ourselves. Then either we will no longer care to preserve our personal liberties, or we will realize too late that they have been lost forever.

Let us make every effort to maintain ourselves free—free of foreign "isms," and as well, free of the creeping tentacles of an omnipotent Federal bureaucracy. I shall continue to fight against both. Perhaps I am old fashioned, but I believe that it is old-fashioned Americanism that our country has been built upon and stands for today. Only by fighting for our system of free incentive and free enterprise can we hope to preserve it against the onslaughts of those who would tear it down and subject our people to the oppression of complete state control. In closing I ask only that each of you go forth determined to promote the resurgence of the Americanism that has made our country the finest, the strongest, the most prosperous land in the world.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on the Occasion of the Presentation to Him of the Annual Award of Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods in New York on April 9, 1950. I was deeply moved by the scroll which was presented to our eminent and world-famous colleague. I am sure the Senate as a whole will respond similarly to it. It pays high and deserved tribute in the following eloquent words:

TO HERBERT H. LEHMAN, first man of our people, Governor of our State, and Senator, you have wielded the power of high office for the betterment of mankind. Because of your striving toward the brotherhood of man,

its goal approaches near to reality. You have honored and glorified the name of Israel.

On this Passover, day of memorial for the deliverance of our people, we remember that you, too, are blessed, like Abraham of old, who withheld not his son from the altar of freedom but gave him, your own heart's blood, in supreme sacrifice for human liberty. When the evil was overthrown, you, one of the driven and oppressed, were chosen, as by an act of God, to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, shelter the homeless, and comfort the distressed among all peoples. May the days of your years exceed the fourscore and ten, with the grace of God and the love of all men.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel honored and proud to be invited here this evening to accept this scroll—the annual award of the Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods. At the same time I feel a deep humility, because I know that whatever small contribution I might have made to my fellow men is insignificant in the face of the terrible problems that confront us today.

There has been much talk in recent years about a return to God—a return to belief in basic values and basic concepts. I hope and pray that this is more than talk. The need for a true moral revival has never been greater than it is today. In a world where an atomic bomb or a hydrogen bomb can destroy a life or a civilization, we must reinvigorate our spiritual values if we are to avert total catastrophe. This is the only sound course for all mankind.

We here in the United States, of all faiths and all religions, must show the way. Here in the fresh climate of freedom and democracy, man can turn to his God without fear.

So while our faith in God must be revitalized, our faith in our own democratic institutions, too, must be renewed and strengthened. If our democratic institutions are permitted to fail by our own indifference, we cannot hope to retain the freedom which those institutions are designed to serve. And where there is no freedom there is no God.

In the final analysis the outcome in the struggle for peace lies in the hands of every one of us as individuals. We must strive increasingly to maintain the climate in which democracy can survive and grow.

And democracy must stand up to the critical task of providing greater security for all people while defending without compromise the rights of the individual.

There is one major obstacle to our winning this struggle which is not presented by either the Communists on the left or the reactionaries of the right. It is not that obstacle that is in our own hearts and minds. It is fear. We must overcome our sense of personal fear which is today impeding our efforts to keep democracy a living and dynamic force here at home and throughout the world.

Our fear takes many forms. The most prevalent is our fear and suspicion of each other. This fear leads us to question the sincerity and the morality of all our fellow citizens.

It is a good thing for men to be temperate in their judgments. There is also the danger, however, that we will be restrained in our actions not through judgment but through fear. There is a growing tendency to be restrained by the fear that what we are going to say is going to make the wrong impression on somebody else. Our reticence can easily become a mark of cowardice as well as of wisdom.

It takes courage to live fully in these times and to speak out against those who are assailing the character and patriotism of our neighbors. It takes courage to overcome our complacency in the face of economic and social injustices and demand equality and freedom for all our fellow men, not for just some of them.

In spite of the obvious disappointments and discouragement which today beset us, I believe with all my heart that world security and a lasting peace can be provided if we show enough patience, good will, and understanding. In a democracy it is the responsibility of the individual to work toward this end. While collectively we have a great blessing in our wealth and freedom, individually we have a great responsibility for the outcome of the ideological conflict which today divides the world.

In many other nations this idea of individualism has never taken root. But we in America should never forget that the rights which we call inalienable can only be preserved by the most unceasing vigilance on the part of each and all of us. We must hold to our faith in freedom even in the valley of fear through which we now walk. We must confront and defeat the forces of fear and evil which press hard for our surrender.

To overcome our fear we must bulwark our faith: our faith in God, in our own capacities, and in our fellow man.

But even democracy is mere form without content, unless it bears at its center an inner faith in the goodness of God, in the sanctity of the human soul, and in the brotherhood of man under God. First we must be loyal to these concepts, or our devotion to democracy is tinsel and dross. If our spiritual faith is weakened, we will not prevail in the struggles ahead.

If we let down our defenses in our democratic practices, if we permit the rights of some of our people to be denied or withheld, for any reason, if we deny equal justice to any in our midst—even to those who would deny it to us—if we do any of these things, we invite defeat and disaster. The fortress of democracy is only as strong as its weakest point. Our Nation is weakest where its democracy is weakest—in the partial denial of rights and privileges to racial minorities, and in the withholding of full social justice from vast numbers of the underprivileged.

Democracy, like religion, is an expression of faith, a call to duty from which no man may draw back. Democracy must be supported by a militant faith, and by a willingness to crusade for that faith, and to abide by it in all ways and in all relationships. Democracy is not a habit to be worn only on fair days. Sometimes democracy is awkward, and uncomfortable. Sometimes it involves danger. But if it is good at all, it is good all the time.

So, in accepting this award today, I accept it as an honor, but also as a challenge. It is a challenge to me personally, and to all of us who are gathered here tonight. Let us demonstrate that faith which has made our religion a symbol of survival through the centuries of persecution and disaster. Let us strive for the concrete manifestations of brotherhood to which this great temple is dedicated. Let us hold fast to our faith and cherish each other, not in fear but in love.

Let us emerge from the shadows of doubt into the light of confidence and courage. We are strong in our ideals, and our strength is multiplied tenfold by tolerance and understanding.

In this green and pleasant land of ours, let us show the world that love and devotion are our watchwords. Under these brave banners, we will prevail.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD program No. 22 in my broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania on Happenings in Washington. This broadcast was on April 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 22)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

I want to talk to you about social security. This is one of the most important of all subjects to millions of our workers, to millions of their dependents, and to those past the age of 65 who have retired to live on the benefits.

The Federal social security law came into being in 1935. Naturally, as with any new law, the test of time and operation pointed out its weaknesses and strong points. Some glaring weaknesses were shown up. Some drastic changes were indicated. Today we are working on the first major revision since 1939.

Last year the House of Representatives, by an overwhelming vote of 333 to 14, passed a bill to amend the old Social Security Act.

The new bill would extend social-security coverages to about 11,000,000 people not now covered. It offers coverage to millions of self-employed men and women in certain classifications who were not provided for in the original act. It provides an average increase of 70 percent to present beneficiaries and a new category to cover total and permanently disabled persons regardless of age.

Other new provisions would give a wage credit to veterans of World War II for time spent in service. It would include State and local government employees on a voluntary basis. Also it would increase the total annual earnings on which contributions are made by employees and employers from $3,000 to $3,600.

At the very end of the 1949 session the bill was sent to the Senate. Early this year the Senate Finance Committee—of which I am a member—went to work on the bill.

We held almost daily hearings for 9 weeks. Two hundred and seventy-five witnesses appeared before us. They presented a great variety of views and opinions. Many were experts on various subjects. They included representatives of State governments and officials of State and national organizations. Many citizens testified as individuals, offering their own ideas on social security. Our committee heard them all.

In addition, we received for study and consideration about 250 briefs and statements, and thousands of letters from all parts of the country. So, you see, this matter is receiving deep and detailed consideration from the Senate Finance Committee.

We have finished our hearings. Now we are meeting regularly in executive session to study the vast mass of information, and to consider such changes as the committee

members believe would make the bill stronger and better.

As I have stated before, I believe in social-security legislation for our older citizens and to protect the surviving widows and dependent children of workers.

So naturally I am for the principle of the law and will vote for the measure as finally drafted.

But, in the meantime, it is my intention to fight—and fight hard—to make this the strongest and soundest possible system.

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, will be a tough battle. And I am afraid it will be a losing battle. For I believe that Congress will refuse to take the all-out step necessary to make our social-security system basically sound.

Let me tell you now what I think is wrong with the system and what should be done to rebuild it on a firmer foundation.

First, I want to point out the difference between the Federal system and the kind operated by the great insurance companies in which many of you have policies.

When you take out an insurance policy, the company puts your money to work in productive enterprise—let me repeat—productive enterprise. It also sets up a reserve fund to meet emergencies and to guarantee enough cash to pay out benefits to you in the form of an annuity, an endowment, or to your survivors if you die. In general the payments made by the policyholders each year are sufficient to cover the needs of that year and to build protection for the future.

But this does not happen under the Federal social-security system. The money taken from your weekly pay envelope and the money paid by your employer, is not handled that way by Washington.

Instead, this is what happens. Your money, out of your pay roll, goes to the Social Security Board. Then Uncle Sam dips his hand into the till, takes the money out, and spends it for the high-priced business of running the Government.

He leaves an I O U in the till. It is a bond, paying 2½ percent annually. At present, about $10,000,000,000 of your money has been removed and the 2½ percent I O U's left behind.

Well, you might say, that sounds like a good, sound investment—2½ percent on our money from the Government. But first, consider this:

Where will Uncle Sam get the 2½ percent interest? The same place he gets all of his money—by taxing you and the other citizens of this country, including those who are not covered under the social-security law.

Keep in mind that when you pay your money into an insurance company it is invested so as to produce earnings. But Uncle Sam has no earning capacity. He can use only what he takes from the people in taxes or borrows from your savings.

Now a lot of people start reaching age 65. They have paid into the fund for years. They want their social-security benefits. How do they get them?

Well, remember that the bureaucrats in Washington have spent the pay-roll contributions. Nothing is left in the till but IOU's. So your Government has to get the money to pay your social-security benefits by levying taxes against all the people.

The man who is over 65 and is no longer employed is taxed to pay part of the cost of the social-security benefits he thought he was paying for during his younger working years.

The man under 65, making his own social-security payments, is also taxed to pay part of the older man's benefits. Both categories, are in fact, paying twice for their social security. They were promised by their Government that they would only pay once. But tney are paying twice.

I believe that system is wrong, unfair, and unsound. We can and we should put our social-security system on a sound, solid basis.

And I say this emphatically—most emphatically—if our Federal social security system is to survive, sooner or later we must put it on a sounder basis than it is today.

Let me explain that. Today about 35,000,000 active workers pay contributions into the fund in an average week. About 2,700,000 are receiving benefits.

That means much more money is going into the fund than is coming out each year. So there is plenty left over for Uncle Sam to take from the till—leaving behind those IOU's.

But this picture is changing.

More and more of our people are reaching the age 65—the age at which social-security benefits begin—and are living on for many years afterward. In 1935 when the social-security law was passed, there were only 7,800,000 persons over 65 in the United States and none of them was entitled to a nickel of benefits.

Today there are 11,500,000. By 1975, according to the Government statisticians, there will be 19,000,000 persons over 65 living in the United States and most of them will be on social security.

That means that more and more must be paid out until the amount going out will exceed the amount coming in. The Social Security Administration statisticians have estimated that 50 years from now—in the year 2000—the annual benefit payments will run from over $13,000,000,000 to twenty billion and a half. Nongovernmental experts, also estimating the cost for the year 2000, say these figures are ultraconservative. The nongovernment experts say they will go over thirty billions a year.

Well, the system will be in trouble long before that. Billions a year must be paid out and there'll be nothing in the cash drawer but those I O U's. So billions of dollars in new taxes will have to be levied on the American people each year to meet the cost of the payments. After a time these taxes will become oppressively heavy.

Then and there the system will break down.

So, I repeat, we must have the best possible social-security system. We must have a sound system, one that will survive. Such a system must have real reserves and real money at real work.

I believe that a system—actuarily sound and on a pay-as-you-go basis—should be created for managing the money paid into the Federal security system.

Otherwise there is grave danger that this social-security system will not be able to keep its promise to pay to you and your children in your old age.

Yes, I am for social security, and I want our system to be made as sound and solid as can be done.

At the beginning of my talk I mentioned to you that the Senate Finance Committee heard the testimony of 275 witnesses. Some of them represented the splendid retirement funds maintained by school teachers, policemen, firemen, and other groups of State and municipal employees.

You will be interested in what they testified.

The bill which passed the House of Representatives provides that all State and local employees may voluntarily come under the Federal social-security system.

Let me assure you that these groups want no part of the system—and for the reason I have mentioned above. You see, most of these firemen, policemen, and school-teacher funds are set up on an actuarial basis. Their retirement systems are built up upon soundly invested funds.

They fear that political pressure in their home States might force them to get into the Federal system. So they came to us. They urged and begged our committee to eliminate from the bill the language which might result in forcing them into what they say is an unsound pension system.

For many years I have been fighting for national solvency as the best and strongest defense of the American system of government.

A government that is not sound financially can give no assurance that its citizens will enjoy any kind of security.

Freedom of the individual cannot be maintained in a nation which spends beyond its income year after year.

The Government's promise of security is of no value whatsoever if those in charge of its affairs take a wasteful, spendthrift course which must end in national bankruptcy.

If we are to have a strong, sound, social-security system we must first return to strong, sound fiscal policies. That means we must put an end to deficit financing. We must balance the budget. We must put an end to wasteful and extravagant spending that means higher taxes and bigger debt.

Above all, we must stand firm in opposition to every socialistic scheme that promises something for nothing.

I ask you to join in the fight for those objectives because they mean so much to your security, your children, and to the future of the American Republic.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third of a series of three articles entitled "When Congress Fumbles for Facts," written by Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University, and published in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, March 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN CONGRESS FUMBLES FOR FACTS

THE SUGGESTED REMEDY IS AN INVESTIGATING COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(By Lindsay Rogers, Burgess professor of public law, Columbia University)

III

Neither the New York State nor the British method of conducting investigations would be satisfactory to the Congress of the United States. In New York State the initial responsibility is largely the Governor's, but I can recall no instance of his refusing to act when the legislature wished him to. In Great Britain, while it is Parliament that calls a tribunal into being, the executive appoints its members and the law officers of the Crown place themselves at its service. Congress is too distrustful of the President to consent to either arrangement. I think that Congress is probably too suspicious. A President would surely realize the risk of losing public esteem by appointments which Congress (and the country) could not applaud, and that if he did make such appointments, Congress would be able to humiliate him. Congress, however, takes a different view of the matter. What, then, is possible?

I suggest a statute modeled in part on the British Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act of 1921 insofar as concerns the powers to be given an investigating body. The statute could provide that whenever Congress by a concurrent resolution (which does not require Presidential approval) declared that it wished an inquiry into a matter that the resolution defined, a congressional investigating commission should come into being having all the powers, rights, and privileges that are vested in a district court of the United States. I say concurrent resolution because the commission should be the representative of Congress and not of a single branch. Senate and House committees sometimes investigate the same scandals concurrently and even compete with each other to subpena witnesses first. But if the investigating process were handed over to a servant of Congress, it is not likely that either House would refuse to consent to the appointment of a commission that the other House thought necessary.

A congressional investigating commission should have the power to enforce the attendance of witnesses, examine them on oath and compel the production of documents. If witnesses refused to attend or produce documents, or answer any question to which the commission could legally require an answer, or if they did any other thing which would, were the commission a court of law having power to commit for contempt, be contempt of court, the commission would initiate contempt proceedings. Witnesses would have the same privileges as witnesses in the district court—that is, they could not be sued for defamation.

The commission should meet in public unless it thought that because of the subject matter to be inquired into, or the nature of certain evidence to be given, it should meet in private. It would authorize representation by counsel of any person appearing to them to be entitled to counsel, or it could refuse such representation. There should be no controversy over the necessary powers of a congressional investigating commission. They should be as complete as possible.

But how should the members of a commission be appointed? Congress is too suspicious of the President to give him the responsibility the British Executive has. Appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate? That was the arrangement when Congress had no confidence that the Department of Justice (Harry M. Daugherty was then Attorney General) would prosecute fearlessly persons involved in the Teapot Dome scandals. Congress passed a statute under which the President appointed Owen J. Roberts and Attlee Pomerene as special prosecutors, and the Senate confirmed them. But the necessity of Senatorial confirmation would probably make service on a congressional investigating commission unpalatable to some men who had no real desire to serve but who were willing to undertake a public duty if it seemed to them that they should.

Why could not the members of a congressional investigating commission be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States? It could be left to the commission to determine what counsel and other assistance it needed. The fees to be paid persons who served on commissions or to counsel could be stipulated in the law on a per diem basis or could be subject to approval by the Chief Justice or by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. Commissioners would be under an obligation to leave their private undertakings for the duration of investigations and to report to Congress. What possible objection can there be to such a proposal? Its advantages are many.

Senators and Representatives would be freed from tasks that reduce the amount of time available for their legislative work, which is always in arrears. During the present session of Congress the Senate has authorized 15 committee or subcommittee investigations and the House has authorized 20. Funds currently available to the investigators amount to more than $1,500,000. To be sure, some of these investigations are directly connected with the preparation of legislation that is under consideration. In large part, however, they are inquiries into administrative practices and performances and into large problems—for example, crime (interstate and in the District of Columbia), lobbying, the Immigration Service—which congressional committees are not always competent to explore. It should be remembered that the Moreland Act has been used to inquire into controversial questions of public policy. For example, Commissioner Robert M. Benjamin's report on administrative adjudication in the State of New York (1942) is a more informing document than all the committee reports on the many bills introduced in Congress to regulate procedure before Federal administrative tribunals, and the New York Legislature accepted the Benjamin report as authoritative. Many Senators and Representatives would sigh with relief if they did not have to spend wearisome hours in hearing rooms listening to discursive discussions of matters in which they had no real interest.

Few more than the publicity seekers in Congress relish the sensational aspects of inquisitions into alleged wrongdoing, and for this kind of inquiry, as I have already said, thoughtful Congressmen have been endeavoring to devise better procedural safeguards. Thus Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and majority leader in the Senate, wants a person under attack before a congressional committee given the right (a) to appear personally before the committee; (b) to compel the committee to subpena up to four persons to testify in his defense; (c) to cross-examine witnesses personally or through counsel; and (d) to secure stenographic transcripts of testimony at cost. All these safeguards would automatically spring into being if Congress handed over its investigating power to congressional investigating commissions and there would be a complete elimination of an evil which will exist so long as congressional committees function and which no legislation can eradicate: the committee accusers later become committee judges.

There was one British tribunal of inquiry which found itself embarrassed by the necessity of seeming hostile to the witnesses who appeared before it. In 1936 budget secrets leaked (the "Jimmy" Thomas case) and it was alleged that some friends of the Minister had insured themselves against losses as a result of tax increases which the Cabinet contemplated but which had not been announced. A tribunal was appointed and felt it necessary to proceed very quickly. In its report it lamented the fact that because there had been no counsel to prepare the case, "the testing of the witnesses' stories by way of cross-examination or otherwise has necessarily been undertaken by the members of the tribunal themselves, with the resultant possibility of creating the impression that they were from the start hostile to some of the witnesses who appeared before them."

Moreover, because the outlines of the case were not known in advance, "it happened that persons whose conduct was the subject of the closest scrutiny were not represented before the tribunal until some days had elapsed," and counsel "who appeared to represent such persons were hampered by their inability to object to the reception of evidence in the nature of hearsay and prevented from presenting the case of their clients in the manner in which they would ordinarily have presented it before a court of law in this country." No legislation that Senator LUCAS can devise will prevent a congressional investigating committee from being the accuser before it becomes the judge and from receiving evidence which it would not wish to receive were its character known in advance.

Most discussions of the way in which Congress uses its inquisitorial powers stress unfairness to innocent persons and obscene hungering for newspaper headlines. These discussions have point, but my principal point is that Congress, when it acts through investigating committees, acts incompetently and frequently fails in its important task of compelling disclosures. It fails completely in convincing the public that the disclosures are complete. Hence Congress should employ competent agencies to investigate and should not delay doing this as long as it delayed employing competent people to do its legislative drafting.

Baylor University Browning Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at Baylor University, in Waco, Tex., there has been established what is known as a Browning Library, a unique undertaking, which has been growing over the years. Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong, who is chairman of the department of English at the university, has been a prime mover in this project, which is now approaching completion.

I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Douglas Hammond, of Ensley, Ala., addressed to me, with respect to Dr. Armstrong and his achievements. I know Dr. Armstrong personally, and have known him for a great many years. He is a very distinguished English scholar, and has attracted international attention. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Hammond, in the form of a tribute to Dr. Armstrong, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: At Christmas time 1948, in his annual Christmas message, Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong said: "After long years in the land of dreams, the Baylor Browning Library is gradually becoming a beautiful reality. The war has delayed our project, but now the war has ended and the campaign has been given new impetus. The end is in sight. Our present plans are tremendously more ambitious than our first ideas. Today we are building for eternity. The actual foundation is being laid; the concrete is pouring into the wide, deep hole that is soon to rise as the long cherished Browning Library. Just a little more of that long pull, strong pull, and pull all together and the financing will be completed. Are you listening, friend"?

Baylor University, Waco, Tex., with its modest income and even more modest endowment could never have built the Baylor Browning Library. The love that Dr. Armstrong, chairman of the department of Eng-

lish, has for Baylor University, Texas, and the world, has raised this magnificent monument. The Baylor Browning Library, which is to be completed this year, bears a message of such import and majesty that it should of a certainty be the epicenter of this Nation's eyes as those eyes with hesitency turn toward the enigmatic future. Here, in this majestic, magnificent temple of beauty, a cloistered retreat, students will be invited to a place of quiet meditation; to stimulate creative thinking on intellectual and spiritual objectives * * * a retreat of such compelling beauty that reverence and prayer shall ever, consciously or subconsciously, abide in the souls of those who enter here.

The Browning Library is the fulfillment of the dream of one man: A. Joseph Armstrong. As early as 1935 Lilian Whiting credited this visionary man with creating the most magnificant outward memorial of a poet that the world has known. Through his indefatigable efforts and undaunted purpose these treasures of priceless Browningiana are housed in an exquisite library whose beauty and service pay lasting tribute to the poet Robert Browning.

As a young professor in 1912, Dr. A. Joseph Armstrong returned to head Baylor University's English department, where he had formerly served 1 year as an interim professor. Behind him was an enviable record of scholarship and literary contacts: bachelor of arts degree from Wabash College in 1902, followed by a master of arts in 1904; doctor of philosophy from the University of Pennsylvania in 1908, where he won the friendship of the great Shakespearean scholar Felix E. Schelling; a student at the British Museum, 1909–10.

For 30 years Dr. Armstrong has allowed his imagination to build up a glorious shrine in the form of a library and museum dedicated to Robert Browning. All through these years he has added valuable material to the collection until it stands now the greatest and largest collection of Browningiana in the world. His travels have carried him around the world more than a dozen times, and always his foremost thought was "will I be able to find something for the Browning Library? And, if I find it, will I have enough money to purchase it?" Often the material was found, but his own personal savings had been depleted time and time again in purchasing Browningiana, and pleas had to be issued to former students, friends, students in his current classes, and ever so often funds from his own meager store. All he had was a pocket full of dreams, a pocket which had been bulging for years, and a firm belief that all honest labor will be rewarded. And it was rewarded. Each year saw continuous contributions from friends the world over, and each year saw the addition of more priceless works of art, literature, etc., to the Browning collection.

In order to get money for the Browning Library, Dr. Armstrong brought, at his own expense, many brilliant artists, lecturers, authors, poets, musicians, actors, world travelers, and explorers, to Baylor University, and the visits of such notables as Carl Sandburg, John Erskine, Katharine Cornell, Edwin Markham, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Robert Frost, Helen Hayes, Alfred Noyes, Amy Lowell, William Lyon Phelps, Prince William of Sweden, Tagore, John Masefield, Vachel Lindsay, and so many, many others, laid the foundation of the Browning collection.

At the ceremony held to lay the cornerstone on February 25, 1950, many noted Texans took part, and were present to pay tribute to this outstanding achievement. Dr. Pat M. Neff, former Governor of Texas and a past president of the university, Dr. William R. White, president of Baylor University, and many other prominent Texans were present. Miss Frances Winwar (Mrs. Francis Lazenby) of New York and Chicago, noted biographer of literary folk, presented the original manuscript of her latest biography, The Immortal Lovers, depicting the lives of the Brownings, which is to be released by Harper & Bros., New York, on April 26 next.

The Browning collection now includes first editions of all of the poet's works and copies of nearly every article and book that has ever been written on Browning or his poems. His writings alone fill 500 volumes. Books which Browning or his family owned will be included. Other treasures in the collection are the bronze model of the clasped hands of Browning and his wife; 160 portraits of Browning, including the seven originals done when he was alive; original letters written by the author to famous contemporaries; the clock which chimed through three generations of the Browning family; a gold brooch, his gift to his wife on their first anniversary; flowers picked by Browning, some of which were enclosed in his love letters, over 600 pieces of music inspired by Browning or his wife; his snuff box; silver and china used by the poets; two of his passports; a New Testament given the writer by his Aunt Arabella; a shawl worn by his wife; and a lock of Browning's hair taken after his death. These, and many other valuable collector's items are to be included in the Browningiana to be placed in the library.

Today, Dr. Armstrong holds court as he likes to call it, in his office on the third floor of Pat Neff Hall, and looks across the campus and sees the naked girders of his dream being covered with white Indiana limestone. The long, hard years of effort are as nothing to him, and he has said, "If we can create * * * a place where young people can meditate on great thoughts, and by that means give the world * * * another Dante, another Shakespeare, another Browning—we will count the cost a bargain."

World renowned scholar and a friend of the famous—authors and nobility the world over—he most certainly would say with Wordsworth: "If I am remembered, it must be as a teacher."

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HAMMOND.

Endorsement of Secretary of State Acheson by the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the face of the many irresponsible attacks that have been made upon the Secretary of State, it is most important that expressions of confidence in him by representative groups of American citizens be noted and entered upon the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., expressing confidence in, and support of Mr. Acheson, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, has with great distinction and ability been furthering the democratic way of life throughout the world and has been steadfastly upholding the interests of the western democracies in general and of the United States in particular in the so-called cold war with Soviet Russia; and

Whereas Secretary Acheson and his administration of the Department of State have been unjustly maligned by certain members of the minority party in Congress and by the opposition press with unfounded and irresponsible charges of disloyalty in the Department, which charges are advanced for reasons of political opportunism and which tend to create an hysteria which hinders the work of the Department in its conduct of our foreign relations and threatens our democratic processes and civil rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., hereby condemns the utterly irresponsible attacks presently being made for reasons solely political upon the Honorable Dean Acheson, our Secretary of State, and hereby expresses its continuing confidence in and support of Mr. Acheson in his administration of the Department of State and his conduct of the foreign relations of this country.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the third of the series of articles by Miss Helen Delich, of the staff of the Baltimore Morning Sun, published this morning, deals with the effect upon the United States merchant marine of the transfer of vessels to Panamanian registry, or to registries of other nations. It is a matter of great concern to many people, and I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1950]

FOREIGN REGISTRY CUTS UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE—AMERICANS OWN 52.8 PERCENT OF SHIPS SAILING UNDER PANAMANIAN FLAG

(The following article is the third of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

The Panamanian merchant fleet cannot be overlooked in any discussion of the American merchant marine, since 52.8 percent of that foreign fleet is owned by Americans.

Such unorthodox foreign registry is not limited to Panama, for lately the Liberia flag has been hoisted over new tankers built in Baltimore and Norfolk. In addition, the largest portion of the 75 ships registered in Honduras is owned by Americans.

RAISED TO SEVENTH PLACE

The American-owned craft have boosted Panama up to seventh place in the world's merchant marines on the basis of ships of

1,000 gross tons or more. The nations ahead of it are the United States, United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Netherlands, and France. Panama has more large merchant ships than Russia, Spain, Italy, or Denmark.

Labor unions the world over have threatened to boycott these Panamanian, Honduran, and Liberian ships, contending such registration is designed to avoid taxes, high wages, and safety standards, and has put many seamen out of work.

In connection with this threatened boycott the International Labor Organization conducted an investigation into the Panamanian fleet.

In a recent report the ILO committee made the following disclosures:

1. No authority from Panama ever inspects the ships as to conditions aboard, because most of these vessels never touch their country of registry.

2. Panamanian ships have no regulations to give effect to the safety of life at sea convention and the loadline convention.

3. There are no regulations concerning crew accommodations, manning requirements, hours of work and overtime in sea transport, food and catering on board ship, certification of ships' cooks, and inspection of seafarers' conditions of work. There are no remedies for enabling seafarers to recover arrears of wages and no provision for the maintenance of seafarers when repatriated.

LEGISLATION NOT BEING ENFORCED

4. What legislation exists is not being enforced due to the lack of consuls and because the owners and masters frequently are not aware of the provisions of Panamanian law and of their application to the seafarer under the law.

5. Wages and other conditions of employment on Panamanian ships are very diverse and in several cases well below international or good national standards.

Two years ago an official of the National Federation of American Shipping credited the doubling of the Panamanian-Honduran fleets since prewar days to the sale and transfers of American ships.

"The growth of these fleets has been a result of world forces," he said. "In international enterprises, such as shipping, it is often difficult to identify all the national interests involved. The nationality of a corporation, the nationality of its officers, and the nationality course of the capital involved may differ widely in any particular enterprise.

"Within the limits of these difficulties, it is clear that Greek money has been far and away the largest elements in financing private transfers of American vessels, and that several other European maritime nations have also participated."

BUILD AT SPARROWS POINT

Most of the tankers built recently at Sparrows Point are owned by foreign companies in New York. They sail under Panamanian, Liberian, or Honduran flags.

The most recent to leave Baltimore was the *Olympic Flame*, owned by a Greek who is an Argentine citizen with offices in New York, registered in Honduras, and manned with a German crew.

The Standard Oil Co. is one of the largest American concerns to operate tankers under the Panamanian flag in the name of its subsidiary company.

The transfer to Panamanian, Honduran, and Liberian flags is serious, but not as serious as the continuing drop in the American-flag fleet, the NFAS executive said when the United States tonnage was 28,000,000 deadweight tons. Today it is 14,000,000.

BLOW TO NATIONAL INTEREST SEEN

Predicting a drop in the American merchant marine to a size only slightly more than the prewar fleet, he declared:

"This drop in the size of our fleet carries serious consequences for the shipping industry, for labor, and for the national interest as a whole. Already the job opportunities in our industry have dropped from the peak of 250,000 to the present level of 140,000 and we appear to be heading for the prewar level of only 60,000 job opportunities."

L. R. Sanford, in behalf of the Shipbuilders Council of America, claims that continued and reasonably steady ship construction is necessary if the United States is to continue as a first-class maritime power with vessels at least equal to, if not better than, those of other maritime nations.

"VITAL ELEMENT OF SEA POWER

"History demonstrates that no world power can continue as such without sea power and an adequate merchant marine is one vital element of that sea power.

"Navies, armies, and even air forces are helpless and circumscribed without a supporting merchant marine. World trade cannot be achieved and maintained without an adequate merchant marine. It would be foolhardy to rely upon foreign merchant marines to operate in the interest of our foreign trade and commerce without the restraining influence of a vigorous competition by United States-flag ships.

"I should like to add another warning which naturally follows as a sequel to the last statement made. There is a school of thought, at present somewhat articulate, on the part of some of those in high places in this Government, which maintains that a merchant marine under the United States flag is not necessary in the interest of national security."

DOUBTS FOREIGN INTENT

"The State Department appears to take the position that there is no justifiable reason for the maintenance by this country of a merchant marine when foreign-flag ships, operating at lower cost, are available and could carry our exports and imports more cheaply.

"Possibly they could, but would they? Could we rely upon them to safeguard our interests? Any affirmative answer to that question would be naive indeed.

"The State Department's apparent policy is to bargain for alleged concessions from foreign countries by eliminating shipping subsidies, United States participation in ECA cargoes, and other like items which irk foreign nations. The State Department appears to think that the trading off of our merchant marine will promote the negotiation of treaties and their other ideas abroad. Experience has shown that we usually come out second best in such trades."

LUCKENBACH CITES EXPERIENCE

J. Lewis Luckenbach, chairman of the board of the American Bureau of Shipping, points out that past experience should be enough for this Nation to realize the necessity of keeping alive the industry with the employment of the men in yards to build more ships when needed and the employment of crews to operate the ships.

Both groups require more time for training than is needed for the building of a ship.

"Let us not blind ourselves with the thought that we may look to others for help in a national emergency," Luckenbach said, "as in the past that type of thinking has cost us many dollars and much human sacrifice, which cannot be expressed in dollars. Remember the old adage—'God helps them that help themselves.'"

There Are Two Worlds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "There Are Two Worlds," which was published in the April issue of the magazine Eagle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE ARE TWO WORLDS

Wendell Willkie wrote a book, and called it, "One World." It was a good book, but it had a very misleading title.

The tragic truth is that there are, and have been always, two worlds. Not only in the sense of the present gulf that divides the free world from the Kremlin-dominated areas of the world's surface. For there are also two worlds within every country, in every community, and inside every single human soul.

Mahatma Gandhi, the strange little man from India with his Christlike faith in love and nonviolence, said it best when he wrote,

"The human body is the battlefield where the eternal duel between right and wrong goes on * * *. Who is there who has not experienced within himself the daily conflict between the forces of evil and the forces of good?"

This Hindu who lived in the spirit of the Galilean saw the roots of violence in every human being and began his crusade for truth within himself. Whatever aspect of his life you study, you find it lived as a never-ending struggle to strengthen the good and subdue the bad within himself. The great mass movement that brought freedom to a half-starved, demoralized people began as a personal influence. He taught others, only by precept and example, to honor truth, to love their fellow man, and never to resort to evil means even for an intended good.

With his learning to weave and his homespun garments, he showed others that, even without great factories, they need not go naked. His going to the sea to distill a handful of salt from the ocean was stronger than a sermon to teach that God intended to provide for all. By receiving the "untouchables" into his home, and performing menial tasks for them, he demonstrated his belief that no man was so humble that he should be harmed. His fasts and imprisonments gave pride and character to the poor and demoralized for whom he was willing to suffer. Without a regiment or an atomic bomb, by the power of personal example and the force of shared faith, he helped his people free themselves and help themselves.

No wonder the Vatican newspaper said, when an assassin's bullet laid him low, "He imitated Christ in his own way. He said, 'Blessed are the peaceful,' and he was blessed in being so." For he was the one great man of our times to tell us that the struggle for a better world begins within ourselves. The world may need a new roof but its foundation will always be the quality of the people that live in it. To change the world, begin with yourself. The old Chinese Christian said it well, when he prayed, "O Lord, make my church better, and begin with me."

The Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in a few days we are to be called upon to consider the foreign-aid program. One of the titles of this program is that dynamic undertaking commonly called point 4. A very excellent and penetrating analysis of the point 4 program, and some of the reasons why the point 4 program is important, was recently distributed by the North American Newspaper Alliance. The article was written by Mr. Paul Manning, of New York. I commend this article to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION GROWS, FOOD SOURCES DWINDLE, KEEP UP WAR PRESSURES, CONSERVATIONIST STRESSES: THUS TRUMAN'S POINT 4 BECOMES KEY PROGRAM, PROJECTING WORLD PEACE

(By Paul Manning)

NEW YORK, April 6.—The $45,000,000 asked of Congress by President Truman to supply technical aid to undeveloped areas of the world today was called a meritorious bit of legislation by Fairfield Osborn, president of the conservation foundation, assuming a considerable amount of these funds will be directed to the improvement of agricultural methods.

Mr. Osborn, one of America's authorities on the subject of world food, water, soil and timber conservation, remarked that the United States certainly cannot feed the world. But any money granted, such as the $45,000,000, to teach backward areas and countries how to produce more food for themselves is money well spent.

"The world today is faced with a basic problem of land depletion in the face of increasing population pressure," Mr. Osborn pointed out. "This must be corrected if a balance between natural resources and growing population is to be achieved."

The growth of the world's population in the last 300 years, from 400,000,000 people to about 2,250,000,000, is a fact which causes deep concern to conservation-minded leaders like Mr. Osborn.

In the crowded communities of the world such as Italy, many of the South American countries, and certainly India and China, the inability to produce food for booming populations without destroying the productive land areas, which are being cultivated under forced draft and by methods that destroy fertility, leads to tensions which can explode into war.

The old cry of "lebensraum"—living space—was one of the reasons advanced by Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo for embarking on military adventures which ultimately plunged most of the world into armed conflict. But, however specious the excuse, it was and continues to be a fact that dense populations which are crowded into fallow regions absorb the tensions of mass congestion and sooner or later follow any leader who promises more food and a better life.

For example, it is this problem which confronts Italy today. Neither war nor the uneasy peace of today has solved her basic difficulty; that of 47,000,000 people and an annual net population increase of 400,000 packed onto land which cannot support them all in reasonable decency.

This is the problem which has plagued economic recovery program experts in Italy from the very beginning of the Marshall plan. Their efforts even to institute land reforms have thus far failed, and as long as success eludes them in this matter alone Italy will always be ripe for communism.

The need for food also confronts Germany, a fact which the Soviet Union further aggravates by flooding the American, British, and French zones with countless refugees. United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy estimates that the saturation point has just about been reached in his zone, yet more than 1,000 refugees a day continue to stream into the western zones looking for food and a better life.

In northern China as well it has been Soviet policy to intensify local problems by draining off food surpluses to the U. S. S. R. This is the Russian strategy of mass attrition as practiced in all world areas they control. For Soviet leaders are convinced that any population which continues to live at a semistarvation level will come to regard war without disfavor. People of satellite areas who have known better days are now beginning to echo this philosophy as they declare: "War couldn't be much worse than the way we live now; and in war it is always possible to seize vast productive areas and perhaps live well again."

It is this reasoning which, if it spreads too thoroughly through the tension spots of eastern Europe, could cause a third world war. Conrad Adenauer, Chancelor of the new German Republic at Bonn, states that the way to avoid war is to convince the Kremlin that their reasoning in this respect is faulty; that the lands of western Europe would not contribute to a better life for the peoples of the East.

A new type of diplomacy might eventually change Soviet thinking. But as of today, and as long as a military vacuum exists in western Europe, the lands which stretch from the Baltic to the Mediterranean constitute a glittering prize. And now, with vast populations being convinced that only war would lead to more food and better land, the Soviets control a weapon of human desire as explosive as any hydrogen bomb.

There's no easy answer to this grave problem. The development of backward areas with United States money and technical specialists may eventually remove some trouble spots from the tensions that can lead to war.

But, as Fairfield Osborn observes, "the world will continue to be confronted with the problem of balancing supply with an increasing demand. Unless the world tackles this dilemma with more effort and greater scientific detachment or, in turn, with better conservation methods and with recognition of the effects of population pressures, the conditions that lead to wars will still exist."

The Texas Wheat Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the past several years bountiful wheat harvests have been produced in the rich grain-growing lands of the Texas Panhandle and South Plains areas.

This great region in the northwestern part of Texas has lived long on borrowed time, insofar as its supply of adequate rainfall is concerned. Citizens of the area have been acutely aware of this and have shown commendable interest in developing water-conservation programs to fit the immediate and future needs of the region.

As yet, these programs have not advanced much beyond the planning stage. There is much more work to be done and people of the Panhandle are energetically laboring on the task they have undertaken.

Indicative of the constant threat that overshadows the economic life of the Panhandle is a comprehensive survey printed in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram Sunday, reporting the dire need for rain to save the wheat crop this year. I ask unanimous consent that this survey by the Fort Worth Star-Telegram be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS WHEAT OUTLOOK BAD, BUT SOAKING RAIN STILL CAN SAVE CROP

The Texas wheat outlook is dark but not hopeless.

Farmers say that rain within the next 2 weeks may change the picture as it exists today.

And by rain nothing short of from 3 to 4 inches is meant since the hot, blowing winds this spring have not only taken away what surface moisture there was but have reached into the subsoil.

A survey by the Star-Telegram through county agents in the principal wheat-growing counties brought almost unanimous agreement that:

GREEN BUGS ARE BAD

Green bugs are doing as much damage as the dry weather.

Summer fallowed land is withstanding the dry weather better than that which wasn't fallowed.

Irrigation brings good growth to wheat but also brings on the bugs.

If rains do not come within 2 weeks hundreds of thousands of acres sowed to wheat will be either grazed over or plowed. And if the latter practice is followed one of the largest grain sorghum crops in the history of the State may be the result.

None of the county agents would so much as hazard a guess on the probable yield of wheat, because the condition of the crop is such that there is no way of estimating.

The large infestation by green bugs, brown mites, and red spiders is due to the mild winter. The cold weather has lasted for only a day or two at a time. No snow has fallen in the Panhandle or South Plains areas during the winter, contrasted to the 1948–49 season, when most of the upper tier of counties was blanketed for 4 weeks.

Many countries report no appreciable rain since last October. Others report the last good rain—of an inch or more—in February.

The situation is not yet one of despair but is marked by a lot of finger-crossing hope for rain.

WHAT AGENTS REPORT

Reports by counties from county agents:

Armstrong: Charles O. Reed, 120,000 acres seeded, no appreciable rain in 6 months, green bugs rampant, fields too dry to plow, none abandoned so far. Rain by April 15

will save some of the grain. About 5,000 acres irrigated, but green bugs are hurting here, too.

Baylor: Roy McClung, 75,000 acres planted, fair to poor condition. Late planting in fair shape. All taken off grazing. Northwest part of county in good shape. East side of county hurt worst. Good subsoil moisture and good rain in 10 days would assure fair crop.

Briscoe: Leo White, 70,000 acres seeded, green bugs hurting, with 60 percent damaged. Could make fair yield with rain in 2 weeks, 7,000 irrigated acres in fair shape. Last substantial moisture in October.

Carson: H. M. Nichols, 150,000 acres seeded. Recent showers brought in bugs but many farmers still optimistic and believe rain by April 10 will help. Some fields plowed.

WINDS DRY SUBSOIL

Childress: Vernon Hefner, 60,000 acres planted. Had 2-inch rain February 17 but high dry winds recently taking out subsoil moisture. Ten percent damage from green bugs, about 1,000 acres abandoned and will be more if rain doesn't come soon.

Collin: Jack McCullough, 30,000 acres seeded. Topsoil dry but good subsoil. Not suffering yet. Good rain would get rid of green bugs which have caused some damage.

Cooke: B. T. Hawes, 50,000 acres planted. Have some second infestation of green bugs. If get rain soon will make fair grain crop.

Cottle: G. J. Lane, 33,000 acres seeded. Dry weather worse than green bugs. Some fields being grazed out. Three- or four-inch rain would change picture.

Crosby: W. R. Kimbrough, 81,000 acres planted with about 10,000 abandoned to grazing and plowing. The 5,000 irrigated acres of wheat in good shape. Very few green bugs in county. Need 2- or 3-inch rain in 10 days or 2 weeks.

Castro: Raymond King, 200,000 acres planted, of which 25,000 irrigated. Green bugs and dry weather about equal in causing extreme damage. Green bugs damaging irrigated wheat. Good rain would help some.

Denton: Ed McKay, 40,000 acres seeded. Green bugs getting most of wheat. Fields very dry.

Deaf Smith: H. L. Clearman, 310,000 acres seeded. If lucky will harvest 25 percent. Green bugs leaving dry land and infesting irrigated. Most of irrigated will be planted to sorghums and dry land will be summer fallowed.

Donley: H. M. Breedlove, 30,000 acres. Some green bugs damage but dry weather hurting more. Last good rain in October. Year before snow on ground 4 weeks. No snow this year. If no rain fields will be grazed and plowed.

Floyd: Robert H. Gibson, 213,000 acres. No rain since last October of half inch or more. Two-thirds destroyed, with green bugs causing greatest damage. Farmers plan to plow and put in row crops if rain doesn't come soon. Doubtful whether rain would help much now.

DRY-WEATHER DAMAGE

Foard: Joe Burkett, 77,500 acres seeded. Forty percent damage due to dry weather and green bugs. In west part of county some wheat heading prematurely. Rain would help in other sections.

Gray: Ralph Thomas, 120,000 acres planted. Some subsoil moisture. Green bugs all over county, about one-third of acreage browning over.

Grayson: Ben Cook, 53,000 acres planted. Bugs done more damage than lack of moisture. Few fields have been plowed. Moisture of substantial nature would help.

Hale: Ollie Liner, 165,000 acres planted. Dry and riddled by green bugs. Estimated 65,000 acres abandoned mostly by grazing out. The 30,000 to 40,000 irrigated acres of wheat not stooling out as it should. Didn't get rainfall when needed.

Hartley: E. L. Dysart, 112,000 acres. No green bugs, wheat not up enough but fields have greened up last 2 weeks. No appreciable moisture since last summer. Only two-one-hundredths of an inch moisture from snow this winter. Even rain now would not help much.

Hansford: Jack Jaggers, 265,000 acres seeded. Green bugs, brown mites, and red spiders. None abandoned, but picture will be different unless get rain in 10 days.

Haskell: Frank Martin, 80,000 acres planted. Fair to poor condition. Number of farmers turned stock back in for grazing. Rain would help late planted wheat, estimated at about two-thirds of total.

Hemphill: Walter Grist, 50,000 acres. "Nothing wrong that a good rain wouldn't straighten out." Ladybugs killing green bugs. Ten thousand acres abandoned, to be put in legumes, clover, and barley. Very few green bugs.

CROPS ARE SPOTTED

Jones: William H. Lehmerg, 80,000 acres planted, slightly over allotment. Northeast and northwest sections of county still in good shape. Central part of the crop gone. Some premature heading and few green bugs, spiders and aphids. Very small part of acreage abandoned.

Lamb: David Eaton, 30,000 acres seeded, including 10,000 irrigated. Green bugs damaging irrigated wheat, dry land holding its own. Not much blowing. Rain would still help.

Lipscomb: Martin Gossett, 150,000 acres. Situation "looks rough." Only four-tenths of an inch rain in February, first since last October. Fifty percent of acreage hurt by green bugs and dry weather. About 10,000 in summer fallow would be helped by rain in 10 days.

McCulloch: A. R. Grote, 30,000 acres. Some green bugs. Might make average crop if get rain in 10 days. However, farmers already plowing up some wheat.

Ochiltree: Hood Wills, 260,000 acres. Good subsoil moisture although no rain since October and no snow during winter. Bugs doing more damage than dry weather. None abandoned so far.

Oldham: Roy Ivy, 80,000 acres. Dry land wheat about gone. Fifty percent of acreage would make wheat if rains come in 10 days.

Parmer: Joe Jones, 190,000 acres planted. Green bugs hurting irrigated wheat. Some has been grazed out. Last rain in August. Fallow-land wheat looks good.

Roberts: Victory Joyner, 50,000 acres. Green bugs have hit pretty hard. Rain wouldn't help much.

Sherman: E. Goule, 230,000 acres seeded. No green bugs except nuisance. One-third of acreage planted didn't come up. Only 150,000 acres have any prospects of making anything. If don't get rain by April 10 will be plowed and put to row crops. Summer fallow land in good shape. Driest wheat season in 52 years.

HALF ABANDONED

Swisher: C. D. Holcomb, 223,000 acres. Estimated over half been abandoned, of which 50 percent be summer fallowed and rest put to grain sorghums. Very little irrigated because of green bugs.

Taylor: Horace Stanley, 83,000 acres. Very little abandoned, only about 5,000 grazed. Had only 1.43 inches rain this year. Good rain by Easter would make from 5 to 10 bushels. Very few bugs.

Throckmorton: George Blackburn, 38,000 acres. Some wheat looks good but moisture needed. Late planted grain hasn't suffered too much. Some early wheat heading. Some been overgrazed. Rain soon would help.

Tom Green: Paul Newton, assistant, 5,000 acres. Burning from dry weather. If no rain in 2 weeks most will be plowed and put to row crops.

Young: R. O. Dunkle, 60,000 acres. Dry weather and bugs hurting. Could make 35 percent of normal on late planted wheat if rain within week. Rest of wheat almost beyond help.

Wichita: Max Carpenter, 79,000 acres. Wheat good along Red River Valley. Rest suffering. East part green bug damage heavy. Estimated one-eighth being grazed or plowed. Northwest section of county got 3-inch rain February 12.

Wilbarger: Frank Wendt, 85,000 acres. Green bugs stunted growth. Rain still would insure average crop of 12½ bushels.

Wise: Tom Roof, 18,000 acres. None abandoned. Very few green bugs. Farmers plan to wait 2 or 3 weeks for moisture, then will graze rather than plow. Some will be seeded to hay.

Natural Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding the bill recently passed relating to the production of natural gas. The editorial is entitled "CROSSER and YOUNG Lack Faith in Free Enterprise," and is from the Cleveland News of April 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROSSER AND YOUNG LACK FAITH IN FREE ENTERPRISE

Sometimes our Democratic friends in Congress get their signals mixed and come up with mighty strange formations.

For instance, it was a bit difficult for Ohio's Congressman STEPHEN M. YOUNG to maintain his argument that the Kerr natural gas bill is a "billion dollar steal" when a principal advocate of the measure was his Democratic leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Congressman YOUNG professed to believe that, if the bill passed by both Houses becomes law, consumers will pay through the nose to the extent of $100,000,000 a year.

Speaker RAYBURN followed Mr. YOUNG to the floor to remind Congressmen of his long record on behalf of Fair-New Deal legislation. Then he appealed successfully for passage of the bill, asserting flatly that "this will not raise the price of natural gas to any consumer in the United States one red penny."

You can take your choice of RAYBURN or YOUNG. We don't think a Speaker of the House would be caught out on a limb without complete assurance that it wouldn't crack under him.

The "billion dollar steal" cry had no more basis than the imagination of Congressman YOUNG and his associates. They had nothing to base it on except their own mistrust of the traditional free-enterprise system. They just prefer Government regulation to free competitive operation.

Speaker RAYBURN put his finger on their real objective when he said in reference to the position of another Clevelander:

"If I felt, as my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] has indicated he feels, that the Federal Government should own and control all the natural resources of this country, then my position on this and much other legislation certainly would be changed."

But Speaker RAYBURN hasn't let his affection for the New Deal send him scurrying to embrace every move toward nationalization that turns up. That is what inspired opposition to the Kerr bill, we believe. That's what Congressman YOUNG was suggesting in arguing that "the Almighty has given this (gas supply) to us for the benefit and general welfare of all our citizens."

An awful lot of bunk was written and said about the Kerr bill steal. You didn't hear as much about its recommendation by the Department of Defense, that the effect of the bill should be to encourage the development of oil and gas resources and thus to benefit the national security.

No; most of what you heard were the shrill cries that the wicked gas producers would rob the consumers without a shred of evidence to support the charge.

Actually the Kerr bill provides for continuing study to see that such a thing doesn't happen. If the producers were short-sighted enough to take such a course, they have had ample warning that Congress will consider the situation again.

Job for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which I am inserting as a part of my remarks appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, April 10, 1950, entitled "Job for Everyone." It ought to challenge the thinking of the businessmen of this country.

If the representative form of Republican government is to survive each citizen who is a sovereign in his own right will have to make use of the ballot which is the instrument which places in the citizen the power to govern. Too long the public has been under the seductive influence and the resulting stupor which, like the lotus eaters, dulled the effect of the drug of excessive spending. Great segments of society have been bribed with their own money until now the bureaucrats are spending as they see fit the hard-earned money of the taxpayers. The businessmen, along with others, have been getting their hand-outs, including the magazines and the press. Now we see the representatives of the people who have been responsible for excessive spending rushing into the headlines as the champions of economy.

It is time for everybody to get down to earth and realize that this Government cannot spend itself into solvency. I have had my share of criticism because I have opposed the boondoggling spending both here and abroad. I was chairman of the National Debt Policy Committee, made up of some of the most conservative men in the House, which made a report in 1939 predicting accurately what the result of this spending program would be on our economy. In the wild and reckless era of spending under the Roosevelt and Truman regimes such a report as this committee made was not considered, and therefore, its praises were unheralded and unsung.

I am glad to see men like Mr. Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., and also president of the Edison Electric Institute, make the forthright statement which is mentioned in the editorial which I am inserting as part of my remarks, under unanimous leave to extend, heretofore granted:

JOB FOR EVERYONE

All those people alarmed by the idea of a Socialist state agree on one thing: They'd like to halt this country's trend in that direction. For most of them, however, the problem is how to do it.

In Cleveland the other day one businessman, who obviously has been doing some thinking about that problem, offered some specific proposals. He is Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. and also president of the Edison Electric Institute.

Said Mr. Lindseth: "The American people are being sold the socialistic furore by one of the most skillful sales campaigns ever conducted. While we on the other side are doing a great job selling the products of our factories and in raising the standards of living of our people, we are shamefully neglecting the obvious job of selling the system that makes it all possible."

Many advocates of the hand-out state are living comfortably in Washington on taxpayer money. Some of them are in positions where they can devote their full energy to plotting an economic revolution.

"By contrast," as Mr. Lindseth emphasizes, "most of us (businessmen) devote a pitifully small share of time to combating the forces we despise or selling the public on our ideals."

A part of this can be explained by the fact that businessmen are busy men. But part of it is due to the strangeness of the job of selling free enterprise, or freedom. So Mr. Lindseth proposes a six-point plan of action.

1. Get informed on the free American economic and political system so you can explain it clearly.

2. Recognize that many reform proposals stem from real human problems. The desire for a fuller life and more security is very strong, so we must sell to it.

3. Be for progress and change. Stress the better standard of living, security, independence, and freedom that our system has brought—but stress, too, that it can and will be improved.

4. Spread the story of the superiority of the American system, in terms everyone can understand.

5. Take a more alert personal interest in government.

6. Deserve the confidence of the people in business.

Those are Mr. Lindseth's six points. We'd like to add one of our own: Assume that the vast majority of the American people are on the free-enterprise side but need weapons to battle the social propagandists.

As the Cleveland utility man says, there are people everywhere to listen to the story. Customers, employees, and just plain friends are among them. Almost any business firm has many mediums of communication; employee publications, worker meetings, foremen's sessions are some.

The important thing: Don't sit idly by and "let Joe do it." This is a job for everyone. Otherwise, as Mr. Lindseth says: "We shall awaken one morning and find socialism is an accomplished fact."

Let Us Study This Opposition From Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 8, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, very few bills have met with such bitter opposition as has S. 75, the central Arizona project. It has been a determined opposition, obviously well financed and very cleverly conducted. Somebody has a powerful interest in attempting to defeat this measure. Who is it and why? What are some ostensible objections broadcast against it so freely by the opposition? Could there be other reasons, hidden but nonetheless real, prompting the opposition? Well, let us look at some of the reasons expressed.

California men have voiced opposition to Senate bill 75 on several grounds, one of which is their claim that it would take 1,200,000 acre-feet of water into Arizona which is needed in Los Angeles and other southern California cities containing a total population of 5,000,000 souls. This, whether true or not, is one of their most telling and effective points of argument in opposition, because it has human appeal. While I emphatically declare that it is Arizona's water asked for in the bill, I will lay aside for a moment the question of who has the legal right to use that 1,200,000 acre-feet annually and ask that we consider the question whether that water would be taken away from Los Angeles if diverted into Arizona. I deny that Los Angeles would be deprived of one bucketful if the diversion into Arizona were made under Senate bill 75.

The reason for my statement is the fact that Los Angeles has not been using even a fifth of her quota of water out of the Colorado River during the past 9 years which she might have used. The metropolitan water district has built an aqueduct large enough to carry this same quantity of water to Los Angeles and neighboring cities from the Colorado River, that is, about 1,000,000,000 gallons daily, but that aqueduct has been very slightly used—only to the extent of 7 percent—during the 9 years of its existence. The water has been in Lake Havasu on the Colorado and might have been drawn on had there been imperative need of it in the west coast cities. Therefore, it is plainly a mathematical fact that there is little present need of Colorado River water in Los Angeles and any propaganda to that effect does not square with the facts. It is quite clear that S. 75 does not seek to take any presently used water needed today by Los Angeles or the metropolitan water district. Any claim to the contrary is highly deceptive and misleading. Most protests against this legislation, the central Arizona project, on the ground that it would take water away from Los Angeles come from individuals who have been misinformed on this matter.

Could it be, as they say, a future need of water that it threatens? That idea I emphatically deny. The best engineers have shown conclusively that Los Angeles and the surrounding area have sufficient total water resources, including, first, local supply; second, Owens River Aqueduct supply; and third, Colorado River aqueduct supply, adequate to maintain a population for a larger city than any to be found in the world today and for a larger population than Los Angeles can possibly be expected to have in the foreseeable future. This presupposes, what is a fact, that the present Colorado River aqueduct can furnish about 1,000,000,000 gallons daily from Lake Havasu on the Colorado River. The water for such a supply is unquestionably in the Colorado River physically and legally, and will be there even after S. 75 is enacted and 1,200,000 acre-feet, the quantity called for from Lake Havasu, is diverted into Arizona. Therefore the present facilities and water supply of Los Angeles are not jeopardized by this legislation.

How about any possible future need of Los Angeles for the Colorado River waters beyond the billion gallons daily? I do not believe that the time will ever come in this or any following century when Los Angeles will need more water out of the Colorado River than the present metropolitan aqueduct will carry. I have never heard any responsible official in California speak of building another aqueduct as large or larger than the existing metropolitan aqueduct. Since it has been built now a decade and has been used to only 7 percent of its capacity, obviously it is going to be many years in the future before the one now built will be needed to its full capacity. To build another one like it today would cost a half a billion dollars and call for such great quantities of operating power that the need would have to be very great indeed any time in the indefinite future to justify the thought of another such aqueduct. Why is the need for operating power so great? Because every drop of water going to Los Angeles from the Colorado River in the present aqueduct has to be lifted more than 1,600 feet in that aqueduct. This tremendous pump lift, nearly four times the height of the Washington Monument, makes it very improbable that Los Angeles even though it were four times as large as New York City would get its water supply from the Colorado River.

If, however, it eventually used its present big aqueduct to the full capacity and drew a billion gallons daily from the Colorado River and then years hence felt the need of building a second such aqueduct, to carry an additional billion gallons daily from the Colorado River, even then the metropolitan water district would be consuming only half of the water in the Colorado River allotted by law to California without any legal question raised by Arizona. No, it is preposterous to assume that the Los Angeles city water supply at the present time or in any foreseeable future would be cut short by diverting water into Arizona under the terms of S. 75. To tell the truth, I just do not believe that Los Angeles is putting up this fight because of any danger to her present or future water supply. There must be another reason.

What other reason could there be? Senator MCFARLAND with penetrating insight summed it up when he said:

> Mr. President, what is this argument all about? It has become abundantly clear during the course of this debate. It is simply a question of whether southern California power users shall receive cheaper power or whether the people of Arizona will be able to survive. If proof was needed, it was revealed this afternoon by the introduction of a power company telegram. They admit they are willing to construct the power end of the project. They say, "Just take the irrigation off, and we are willing to let it go. Let our power users in California have cheaper power."

Undoubtedly, the real opposition put up by the propaganda machines in Los Angeles to Senate bill 75, is because if this measure is enacted and the project is carried out, there will be less hydroelectric power for southern California and any available will not be so cheap as some of the power which Los Angeles is getting from other dams on the Colorado River. Why will that be the case? Because the central Arizona project calls for a third of any power to be produced at the power plant at the Bridge Canyon Dam to be used for Arizona's purpose in pumping water for this diversion and therefore there would be only two-thirds of the total production of power available to anyone for commercial purposes. Incidentally, the Arizona Power Authority has made application for all of the commercial power to be produced there and is willing to contract for the other two-thirds of the power so that there need not be a kilowatt from the Bridge Canyon Dam go out of Arizona. They do not like that in Los Angeles, for they would like to get all such power and want it at the cheapest possible rates.

Why would any commercial power that might be available to Los Angeles at the Bridge Canyon Dam under S. 75 not be as cheap as some of the power the, are presently getting from the Colorado River? This is why. Under the terms of S. 75, power is called on to subsidize irrigation to a reasonable extent which is also true today of every other big project in the West. In this bill, the subsidy for irrigation has been computed by the Bureau at seventy-two one-hundredths of a mill, which is much less of a subsidy than is being computed in many other irrigation projects. Now, obviously, if there were no irrigation for Arizona tied to this project the commercial power might be available at a somewhat cheaper rate.

Los Angeles needs more hydroelectric power and they want very cheap power so as to attract industry. That is the crux of their opposition to S. 75. If we do not subsidize irrigation and specialized food production in Arizona with power produced at the Bridge Canyon Dam, we would surely be subsidizing the building up of industry at or near Los Angeles. Is that what Congress wants to do in the complete development of the Colorado River?

Holifield Attacks Waste and Red Tape in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Government reorganization for greater economy and greater efficiency has become a watchword of the American people. They want Uncle Sam to put his house in order.

The Federal Government is big business—the biggest of its kind on the face of the earth. The American people as taxpayers, as stockholders in that business, want it to be well run. They demand that modern businesslike techniques of management be applied. They insist that the structure of Government be simplified and that lines of authority be clearly drawn, so that we can hold our public servants fully accountable for their actions.

In other words, they want an all-out attack on inefficiency, waste, and red tape in their Government. Beset with heavy taxes and a national budget deficit, the American people are right in making these demands. There is no excuse for a government structure that is too sprawling and cumbersome to be well managed. There is no excuse for wasteful duplication of agencies and activities.

I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress is alert to the problem. Without fanfare, without headlines, we are moving steadily forward in reorganizing the executive branch of the Government under the guiding hand of the Hoover Commission recommendations. Uncle Sam is taking firm steps to put his house in order. Mr. Hoover himself recently testified before a Senate committee that "astonishing progress" has been made. Experts say that we have accomplished more in the past year than in any like period in our history.

As the ranking member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which handles all the President's reorganization plans and a major part of the legislation growing out of the Hoover Commission reports, I am privileged to take part in this vital task. Particularly as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I have made careful and extensive studies of the various reorganization plans and bills. With pardonable pride I can say, Mr. Speaker, that a primary part of my legislative work is directed to making our Federal Government less costly and better managed.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, which I sponsored and which was unanimously approved by the Congress, has been called one of the greatest consolidations of government agencies in history. This law provides the framework for sweeping improvements in the so-called housekeeping activities of Government—the

purchase, storage, use and disposal of property, the keeping of records, the management of Government buildings, and the like. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report estimates that $250,000,000 yearly will be saved, when this act is fully in operation.

With the administrative tools provided by the new Federal property law, the Government will be able to search out waste and inefficiency in every corner of the Federal establishment. It will cut down the huge inventory—estimated at $27,000,000,000—of goods now stocked in Government warehouses throughout the land. It will reduce costly paper work and the multitude of forms now used in buying small items. It will catalog the millions of items now bought by the Government, so that one agency knows what the other is buying, and can take advantage of the best price. It will assure that Government buildings and property are put to full use. It will, in short, make its operations more efficient and businesslike, more understandable to the average citizen, and more economical for the taxpayer.

Speaking as a legislator who has served his district continuously for 8 years, as a businessman with 25 years of successful experience, and as an individual citizen who wants his Government to be sound and strong and prepared to meet the problems of the atomic age, I sincerely believe that thoroughgoing Government reorganization along the lines proposed by the Hoover Commission, ranks as one of the crucial problems. We must solve it; we will solve it, as our progress today demonstrates. In so doing, we must rise above narrow partisan or private interest; good government comes first.

Those of us who are concerned about our country's welfare realize how important is the need for overhauling the machinery of Government. We cannot travel the modern highway to peace and prosperity with a vehicle handed down from the horse-and-buggy days.

Democracy faces the challenge of a totalitarian ideology. To resist it successfully, our Government must be streamlined and organized to render efficient service. Every ounce of fat must be trimmed off. Its muscles and sinews must be strong.

Our Department of Defense is now vigorously engaged in the process of trimming the fat. The military unification law passed by the present Congress has given Secretary Johnson the administrative weapons to mop up pockets of inefficiency, to clean out superfluous activities and idle personnel. With our military services spending almost one-third of the total Federal budget, large economies can be expected in this field. Secretary Johnson estimates that $1,500,000,000 can be saved through military reorganization during the current fiscal year.

Of course, in putting our great departments of Government on a diet of expenditures, we must take care not to injure their body health. We want the most security and the most service we can get for each tax dollar; but we do not want our security to be weakened, nor the essential services of Government to be curtailed.

When our work of Government reorganization—now at the halfway mark—comes close to fulfillment—possibly three or four billion dollars in yearly savings will result. This will do away with a substantial part of the budget deficit. It will bring within reach the goal of a balanced budget. More than that, it will mean a better Government and a healthier democracy.

Mr. Speaker, 21 Presidential reorganization plans and many important legislative proposals are now before our committee. Every member of the Committee on Executive Expenditures is pledged to the task of eliminating the waste and inefficiency in our Federal Government.

I predict that over 90 percent of the Hoover Commission recommendations will be found worthy of acceptance, and the economies resulting therefrom will be reflected in lower taxes.

World Federation Resolution Would Strengthen United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 22, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was my privilege to give consideration last fall to the world federation resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 64. Because of the pressure of immediate legislative items such as ECA extension, the committee has not yet reported the world federation resolution. I hope that it can be reported favorably within the very near future.

The gravest problem which confronts us all today is the problem of how to avoid war and promote freedom and security. I believe that we can avoid war, but to do so will take the combined wisdom and efforts of all of us. It will take, too, a combination of many different actions and programs. There is no single solution or panacea for the complex and dangerously explosive situation in which we find ourselves.

It is crucial, however, in our search for the right programs and policies for our Nation to follow, that we have an over-all objective in which we believe, in which we have faith, and in which the other peoples of the world can have faith. It is not enough to say, "We want peace with freedom." The Soviets say this, too. It is not enough to say, "We believe in the United Nations." The Soviet says this, too, although I think it is perfectly clear that Soviet actions belie Soviet professions and protestations. We must be sure that United States actions are actually in keeping with our professions; we must be sure that we have a well-defined goal which offers some promise of peace, a goal toward which our every interim action can be directed, a goal which can win the support of other peace- and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

I believe that the time has come when it is necessary for the United States to reaffirm its determination to make the UN the core of our program for peace, and to state our determination to work for its development into the kind of peace-keeping organization which the nations of all the world can confidently entrust with the responsibility for assuring their security from aggression.

For this reason I support House Concurrent Resolution 64 as a step toward the crystallization of United States support for a stronger and more effective UN.

Soviet Control of United States Fur Markets Blow to Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Fred Niendorff appearing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer calling attention to the fact that imports of raw furs from Russia are destroying Pacific Northwest fur business. Most certainly this calls for some action by the Department of Commerce.

SOVIET CONTROL OF UNITED STATES FUR MARKETS BLOW TO NORTHWEST

Of more than 200 fox fur farms doing a thriving business in the State of Washington a few years ago only three are left.

Four hundred mink farmers still are struggling on, but they cannot be sure for how long.

In Alaska, wild fur trapping has shrunk to a mere shadow of its former robust self.

In brief, the once lusty Pacific Northwest fur industry, wild and domestic, is sick.

Hope that the wartime excise tax on retail furs might be cut or removed has had its influence recently on retail sales.

But the real villain in the piece is Soviet Russia.

She has gone on a wild fur export spree and today dominates the raw fur markets of the United States.

The authority for that statement is the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. It includes the Puget Sound Fur Farmers Association, the Northwest Fur Farmers Association and the Inland Empire Fur Breeders Association.

The national board has devoted months to investigating what has happened to American fur growers since the war. And according to Michael Dederer, president of the Seattle Fur Exchange, it is now prepared to insist upon defensive tariff action.

Its investigation disclosed that United States imports of furs have expanded from an annual average of $51,000,000 before the war to $167,000,000 since the war.

Russian imports increased 800 percent, those from all other countries, 300 percent. By contributing 30 percent to the import total, the Soviets in fact, the board contends, control the United States raw fur market.

The board makes this finding, which it is submitting in its plea for a tariff wall:

"Domination and control of the American raw fur market by the Soviet Union is crushing the American fur producer and is also causing hardships to other friendly countries which have, for years, depended on our market for sale of their furs."

Sixteen countries getting American Marshall plan aid have not been able to increase their fur exports to the United States, the board found.

In fact, the board asserts, the Marshall plan countries, in order to compete with Russian prices, "have had to place into operation export subsidies, compensation rebates, dollar discounts, barter programs, and every other device known to international trade."

How, the board challenges, is the open door to Soviet furs contributing to the economic stability of Marshall plan countries in the fur trade? It asserts the very opposite is true and that their only recourse is "to sell their furs to the United States at a loss and ask for more Marshall plan aid."

"Russia knows that by reason of her slave labor and state-trading program she can undersell every country in our free market," the relief petition asserts.

It goes further:

"While we (the United States) have been drifting on 'no look, hands off' policy, Russia has successfully demoralized our own industry and taken control of the raw fur market."

Dederer, who knows more about furs than the animals they grow on, contends that unless tariff relief is forthcoming the Pacific Northwest fur growing and fur trapping industry faces extinction under the heel of the red bear—total extinction, that is.

Condition of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the serious plight of the United States merchant marine warrants and demands the immediate attention of the Congress. In the Baltimore Sun of this morning the fourth and concluding article of a series on this present-day problem is published and is well worth the reading and attention of the Congress and the American public. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of April 13, 1950]

PORT OF BALTIMORE FEELING SLUMP IN MERCHANT MARINE

(The following is the final article of a series of four by Miss Delich on the condition of the American merchant marine.)

(By Helen Delich)

The steady decline of the American merchant marine is reflected clearly in the vessel-arrival figures in the port of Baltimore, the Nation's second foreign-tonnage seaport.

Last year 1,374 American ships in foreign trade visited this port, as against 1,898 foreign-flag craft.

In 1940 there were 1,272 foreign, 1,644 American. In 1946 the figures were 685 foreign and 1,644 American; 1947 showed 1,416 foreign and 1,728 American, and in 1948 there were 1,476 foreign and 1,500 American.

EFFECTS ON CITY

The sharp contrast between 1948 and 1949 in foreign and American shipping arrivals has affected the port—and, therefore, the city—as follows:

1. About 5,000 seamen are "on the beach."

2. About 3,000 longshoremen and shipyard workers are drawing unemployment compensation. Another 3,000 are working only 1 and 2 days a week.

3. The steamship agency which had the largest operating force in Baltimore had to cut its staff in half and return nine chartered vessels to the Government because cargoes were not available. This also means that 333 seamen, most of them Baltimoreans, were put out of work.

4. A typical ship-maintenance company that deals exclusively with American ships dropped 123 employees last year and decreased its pay roll $255,000. Many of the present 256 employees work only 1 or 2 days a week.

REPAIR YARDS LAY OFF MEN

5. Ship-repair yards have reduced until they work only about 1,800 men a day and still are cutting their pay-roll forces. Some of the men laid off have had from 10 to 25 years' experience.

6. The Sparrows Point shipbuilding yard faces a complete shutdown early next year.

7. A paint concern, one of the many industries not thought of normally in connection with the maritime world, cut its staff 25 percent because orders had dropped that much.

8. A stevedoring concern that deals exclusively with American deep-sea ships reported its pay roll for the first 9 weeks of 1950 was $30,000 less than in the comparable period in 1948.

9. Baltimore no longer has a single ocean shipping line with headquarters here, the Baltimore Mail Line and the Merchants and Miners being among the firms never recovering from the war.

(The ships owned by these companies were among those diverted to the British for use in supplying their troops in the battle against General Rommel in Africa.)

SHOWS IN COASTWISE LINE

10. The intercoastal and coastwise decline is indicated by the Quaker Line, which has cut its staff in half and runs only two ships a month from here instead of its prewar weekly service.

11. Although the number of foreign-trade ships in port in 1949 exceeded the number for 1948, the money spent was considerably less because foreign vessels cannot receive extensive repairs in this country, nor do they buy many of their supplies here.

The 5,000 seamen "on the beach" in Baltimore are a segment of the 40,000 lying idle around the Nation waiting for their turn to ship out. Some are drawing unemployment compensation; others are working at odd jobs a day or two a week when such jobs are available.

AFFECTED BY NATIONAL FIGURE

The national figure for men on the beaches affects Marylanders more than the 5,000 in Baltimore, as the unions estimate about 18 percent of all seamen come from this area. Seamen ship from the port they believe will give them the best opportunity to get a trip.

The ship-repair and building industry is one of the saddest in the entire merchant-marine picture, as the skilled men are turning to jobs with more security.

The CIO Shipyard Workers Union said that now is one of the times when the seniority privilege has backfired somewhat, as the first men to lose their jobs—the younger ones—were able to get located within a short period of time.

However, today, the older men—ranging in age from 35 to 45 and holding experience ratings of 10 to 25 years—are having difficulty finding other work because jobs are scarcer and older men are not wanted by new companies, the union said.

FEARS LACK OF SKILLED MEN

J. M. Willis, general manager of the Bethlehem Steel Baltimore shipbuilding division, fears for the industry's future because of the lack of skilled workmen.

"When we built the night boats New York and Boston back in the 1920's, we imported English and Scotch skilled workers under the more lax immigration laws," Mr. Willis said. "We didn't have many American workers left over from the first war, as the merchant marine then also was permitted to decline. These immigrants, many of whom are now dead or retired, served as the nucleus in the last war.

"There's nothing today to entice a young man to enter the industry. I've spent 52 years in this business, but I'm not going to permit my grandson to enter the business. There's no future here.

"It's no longer an industry which is passed on down from generation to generation in America. They're still doing it abroad, though, because they know the importance of a merchant marine."

CALLS CRISIS EXTREME

"We've had our ups and downs before, but there has always been hope ahead. This is the most pessimistic I've ever been, as the crisis is more extreme than any the American shipping world has ever faced."

At Sparrows Point each time one of the tankers—for foreign interests—is finished another crew of workmen is laid off. This tanker program will be completed next year, when the yard is slated to be shut down because American shipbuilding does not even appear promising.

The world monetary situation struck Sparrows Point directly when contracts for the construction of two 25,000-ton ore ships were canceled and transferred to England. After deflation abroad, Republic Steel figured it could build the ore ships in that country, pay the 40 percent duty charged by the United States and still save $2,000,000 per vessel.

NOTED IN PORT SURVEY

The importance of the shipbuilding and ship-repair business to the port of Baltimore, listed as the city's chief asset, was cited in the recent port survey as follows:

"Baltimore's extensive shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities have made this port one of the leading marine construction and repair centers of the world, and, because of the excellence of the repair services offered, have been influential in establishing Baltimore as an important port of call for the vessels of many of the world's leading shipping lines."

Besides the paint industry, the decline in marine repair and building work affects leather, wood, glass, glue, canvas, gear manufacturers, boiler producers, to mention a few.

The stevedoring company said that if this port did not have the bulk cargoes provided by the chemical plants in Curtis Bay, its pay roll would have dropped considerably more than the $30,000 for the 9-week period.

MONEY IN GENERAL CARGOES

"There isn't any money in bulk cargoes," the president said, "but it gives us something to do. The money is in the general cargo, which is going more and more to foreign vessels."

One American steamship company, which operates both coastwise and foreign-trade ships, reported that it didn't take it long

after the war to learn it couldn't compete with the foreign-flag ships and had to retrench its activities on those lines.

However, that firm is carrying considerable cargo coastwise—of the 292,000 tons it handled last year, 178,000 was for the domestic service. What it lost in the foreign trade it gained in coastwise cargoes. It is the only company operating between United States ports to claim a gain.

The Bull Line never replaced its coastwise service. Others which are operating, but to a lesser extent than before the war, include Pope & Talbot and Calmar.

AFFECTED BY DOLLAR SHORTAGE

The dollar shortage in South America has had its mark on shipments from Baltimore to South America. In outbound general cargo, the Moore-McCormack Lines dropped 39 percent from 1939 to 1949.

But there are more foreign lines operating out of Baltimore to South America today than in 1939.

On the European end, the Moore-McCormack Lines showed a 199 percent increase in the 10-year comparison because of the Marshall-plan consignment. These lines, imports from Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and Poland declined 40 percent.

Ore importation to Baltimore from Brazil, Norway, and Sweden had held up the inward tonnage, for it jumped 100 percent from 1939 to 1949.

MORE DOLLARS FOR CITY

An American ship in port means more to the city in dollars than a foreign ship, because the latter is not permitted to obtain extensive repairs here nor to purchase other than necessary supplies. Foreign ships also do not pay their crews off here.

Where a 10,000-ton American ship loading grain for Germany recently spent $43,000 in port, a foreign-flag ship under similar circumstances spent less than $20,000.

The American expenditures included: Pilotage, tugboats, watchmen, crew payoff, food for 60 days, deck and engine stores, fuel bunkers, fresh water, incidental supplies, stevedoring, voyage repair bill, custom-house fee, line handling, consul's fee, doctor for crew, supplies, labor, underwriter's fee, and agent's fee.

Not included in the $43,000 is the money spent for the grain, nor the amount earned by the railroads for the grain's transportation.

Indirectly almost every type of business in the city received a certain portion of that $43,000, as well as of the $20,000.

East Texas Chamber of Commerce Silver Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the silver jubilee of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. President, today and tomorrow, April 13 and 14, members of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce are meeting in Tyler, Tex., to celebrate the silver jubilee of their organization.

The East Texas Chamber of Commerce has for 25 years effectively represented the determined spirit of Texans who have developed one great new industry and re-created older industries. Within the span of the chamber of commerce's life this region has become the oil capital of the Western Hemisphere. Its very name is synonymous with oil. More than 5,000,000,000 barrels of petroleum has come out of the ground of east Texas since the discovery of the Spindletop gusher half a century ago.

The combined efforts of many outstanding Texans, directed and inspired by one of the South's outstanding citizens, Ernest Kurth, of Lufkin, has helped convert the bountiful pine forests of east Texas into a major source of wealth. Each year a $135,000,000 cash crop of lumber is harvested in the more than 10,000,000 acres of east Texas timber lands. In addition, 47,000 Texans are employed in the woods and mills and factories which process the timber and produce famous east Texas newsprint.

Since the end of World War II, industry has focused its attention more and more on this rich and growing region. More than 1,000 new industrial plants have been started within the last 5 years in east Texas. More plants are still to come.

All this is quite a different picture from the east Texas of the early 1930's. In those days the region was poor, hampered by a one-crop economy, threatened by worn-out soil, slowed down by incredibly bad roads, and suffering from the lack of hope. Wise leadership of native east Texans has brought the region out of the mud, literally as well as figuratively. There are now more than 10,000 miles of good hard surface roads and highways through the piney woods of east Texas, more than 3,061 miles of this total in farm-to-market roads, so badly needed for so long by east Texas farmers. There is still much to do, of course, but east Texans can be justifiably proud of what they have done for themselves and for their State.

The East Texas Chamber of Commerce members and leaders deserve a great deal of the credit for the advancement that this region has made. This organization, perhaps more than any other, has kept initiative alive when spirits sag. It has directed capable talents into productive channels. It has wisely endeavored to develop the whole region.

I congratulate the East Texas Chamber of Commerce and its president, Mr. Henry Bell, of Tyler, on this twenty-fifth anniversary. I sincerely hope that the organization will continue its tireless labors for the progress of east Texas.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release from the office of the junior Senator from Nevada, relative to excise taxes.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 12, 1950.—"'Soak the poor,' is the principle of our wartime nuisance taxes," United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, declared today in a statement demanding that Congress immediately eliminate nuisance taxes.

"The low-income groups are the ones hardest hit by the excise or nuisance taxes," the Nevada Senator said, "because these taxes represent a proportionately bigger part of their cost of living." To illustrate this, Senator MALONE said, "To a rich family the nuisance tax on a can of baby powder does Senator MALONE said, "To a rich family the extra pennies must be counted. Uncle Sam exacts his 20 percent, and this, on top of all the hidden taxes, makes a 29-cent can of baby powder cost 47 cents."

Continuing, Senator MALONE said: "If a member of a family lies dying and a telegram or a phone message must be sent to a relative, Uncle Sam taxes that message 25 percent, calling it a luxury. If a trip must be made and pennies counted in order to get together train fare, Uncle Sam demands a tax of 15 percent.

"If a man must buy an automobile in order to keep his job or for the well-being of his family for a price of, say, $1,500, $105 must be scraped up for Uncle Sam before he takes possession. In every family budget, particularly those of low income, movies is an item. A luxury, you say? Who is to say what is a luxury and what is a necessity? When the poor family sets aside money for the movies, they must add 20 percent for Uncle Sam's excise tax.

"The imposition of nuisance taxes and the increase of former excise taxes, falling hardest on the poor, was a wartime measure, to be withdrawn when the war ceased. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of pledges to remove the nuisance at the end of the war.

"The chief purpose of the excise taxes was not for revenue, so we were told, they were to cut down consumption. Are we still trying to cut down consumption?

"To correct the unfair burden imposed by nuisance taxes, I introduced a bill, S. 2751, in October 1949. The bill was referred to the Committee on Finance. While it lies in committee, the American people are clamoring for us to act now—not at some distant date in the future.

"I doubt the sincerity of those who say that this legislation to eliminate wartime excises should be made part of an over-all tax reform. When we imposed these hastily put together wartime nuisance taxes, with apologies to the people, did we say we would withdraw them only when we could substitute other taxes? Did we say they would be withdrawn some indefinite time after the war when we could all get together on the general reorganization of our tax structure? We did not. We said the nuisance would be withdrawn at the end of the war.

"Let us pass the Malone bill, S. 2751, and keep our promise to the people. The alternative is to do nothing and continue to 'soak the poor.'"

Justice Roberts Urges Union To Prevent War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Justice Roberts Urges Union

To Prevent War," by Daniel A. Poling, published in the Philadelphia Bulletin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE ROBERTS URGES UNION TO PREVENT WAR

(By Daniel A. Poling)

The American people wait now for constructive, practical, and dynamic plans for peace. They are ready and eager to listen to their leaders. The proposal of United States Senator BRIEN MCMAHON even though it involves a possible $50,000,000,000, receives their serious attention. Perhaps nothing that Secretary of State Acheson has said since he assumed the responsibilities of his office has been so favorably received as his realistic comments on accords with Russia.

REDS ARE UNITED

Equally impressive and to some of us, even more convincing, were words spoken by former Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts when he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee. "The only united world today," he said, "is the Communist world." And he added, "Among the democracies each nation behaves as though it were a world unto itself." Mr. Roberts is President of the Atlantic Union Committee. Right now he is pouring his great talents with energies to match them into the forward-looking program of this committee. He believes in a federal union of Atlantic democracies with a common foreign policy, a common currency, a common defense force, and with free movements of peoples and goods. Speaking to the Senators he declared that this union "is the surest, cheapest, strongest way to stop war, stop communism, and create prosperity."

A GOOD ARGUMENT

It is difficult to meet the argument of this man that democratic unity now can prevent world war III. Also he believes that it could have prevented World Wars I and II had it been effective before 1914. There is an Atlantic union resolution before both the Senate and the House. This resolution would allow President Truman to call the democracies together that initiated the Atlantic Pact.

Justice Roberts believes that these democracies are ready to explore the possibilities of forming the federal union. Also he believes that all they need is the leadership of the United States of America. Actually the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact are the beginnings of just such a federal union which would strengthen, not weaken, the United Nations. These and other programs need the continuing, supporting strength of such a union.

Again and again mankind has been overwhelmed because of an insidious "too little and too late." Justice Roberts and his associates have something better for the world.

One Hundred and Fifty Thousand German Troops Organized by Russians in Eastern Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "One Hundred Fifty Thousand German Troops Organized by Russians in Eastern Zone," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND GERMAN TROOPS ORGANIZED BY RUSSIANS IN EASTERN ZONE

(By Constantine Brown)

The new German Army organized by the Russians in the eastern occupation zone is estimated conservatively at 150,000 well-trained men equipped with the latest types of small arms, some artillery and tanks, but no aviation.

A portion of this force is expected to parade in full war paraphernalia in Berlin during Whitsun week next month. The size of the parading contingent depends on how strong a force the western powers concentrate in the former German capital.

If our present forces are strengthened considerably it is probable that the eastern people's army will be held to a mere parade group, designed to bolster national feeling and the self-confidence of the Germans under Soviet rule. If we fail to reinforce the meager allied detachments in Berlin, it is likely that the demonstration troops from the east will be of considerable number—probably 45,000 men.

FORMER SS MEMBERS

The new German Army, strictly controlled by the Russians, is commanded by Gen. Wilhelm Zeiser, a former German Regular Army officer who went to China after World War I and later headed the Stahlhelm, a patriotic German officers' association.

It is believed that during his stay in China he came into contact with and was converted to militant communism. Anyway his name is found again in the files of Western Intelligence Services as a commander of a Spanish Loyalist contingent under the assumed name of General Gomez.

Zeiser's deputies are reported to be a General Markgraff and a General Steiner. Both saw active service in Hitler's Wehrmacht. Markgraff at one time was head of police in the eastern sector of Berlin. He disappeared about a year ago and it was rumored then that he had been purged. Instead he appears now as one of the principal lieutenants of Zeiser. Steiner is the son-in-law of Wilhelm Pieck, puppet President of the Eastern German Republic.

The various divisions and brigades are commanded by majors and colonels in Hitler's army, including former members of the SS. All of them have been carefully screened by the Soviet MVD not for their adherence to the Communist doctrines but for their nationalism and devotion to the cause of Germany's revival as a strong military power on Russia's side.

COMPETENT OFFICERS

There is no dearth of competent officer material. Many who lived a hand-to-mouth existence in the western zones are said to be eager now to offer their services to the new "people's army."

This is understandable. While the "people's republic," that is to say, the U. S. S. R., pays as much as 2,000 marks ($500) a month to officers of the new force, former members of the Wehrmacht are starving in the western zones, particularly if they have not been denazified. The Western German Government does not pay pensions to former officers, and with relatively few exceptions, all the employment former Wehrmacht officers can find is as day laborers, domestics, or other menial workers.

These former members of the German armed forces naturally are attracted by substantial offers of good pay, special food, and other privileges which they receive from the east, provided they are in good health and have a good record in the Kaiser's or Hitler's armies.

According to reports from Eastern Germany, several units of the new forces have been sent to Hungary, where they form the nucleus of a force which may be used at a given time against Yugoslavia. These detachments have not been incorporated into the Russian divisions now stationed there, but form the shock troops which the Russians may throw against Marshal Tito when they decide the time has come to punish him.

Comparison of Benefits and Pay-Roll Taxes Under Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have introduced in the RECORD comparisons of the respective benefits and pay roll tax rates under the present Social Security Act, H. R. 6000, which is the proposed Social Security Act, and the present Railroad Retirement Act. I now have exhibit F for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD which makes a further comparison of certain benefits under these acts.

I want to explain that I am presenting these comparisons purely for the information of the Senate and at the request of a group of railroad men interested in the pension question. I do not claim to know the answers to all the problems involved, but I am in hope that these comparisons may shed some light on the questions with which we are confronted.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT F.—*Social security versus railroad retirement: Wage credits after age 65 if worker continues in employment, or returns to employment after receipt of old-age retirement annuity* [1]

Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security, proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Wages count toward benefits regardless of the worker's age. Benefits may be computed or recomputed at periodic intervals to assure the highest possible retirement or survivor benefits.		No wage credits count toward retirement benefits after age 65. Upon return to railroad employment, or to last employer, after annuity has begun to accrue, it shall not be subject to recomputation.

[1] In either event, worker continues to pay tax.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

The above exhibit F has been submitted to Senator HUGH BUTLER, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, with the request that same be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of information in connection with previous exhibits A, B, C, D, and E. It was prepared by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), April 1950.

Program for Action on China Policy Adopted by United Front Action Conference on China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter dated March 1, 1949, on the letterhead of the Communist Party of New York State, the first paragraph reading:

Enclosed please find Program for Action on China Policy, as voted upon by a united-front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

I ask that the entire letter, plus the Program for Action on China Policy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I call attention of the Senate especially to the No. 1 objective of the program, being to attack the so-called China lobby.

There being no objection, the letter and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST PARTY
OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.

To All Sections and Counties.

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find Program for Action on China Policy, as voted upon by a united front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative, but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the National Education Committee on Communist Policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,
Assistant Organization Secretary.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION ON CHINA POLICY AS SUGGESTED BY THE ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1949

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation—

A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington. One of the largest spending foreign influences in our capital; not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy—

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

IMMEDIATE STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Get your organization immediately to pass a resolution on China policy. (Use the enclosed January conference resolution for suggestions.)

Send copies of your organization's resolution to your Senators and your Congressmen; give it publicity in your organization's publication and elsewhere; send a copy to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

2. Make use of the "political ammunition" of facts: The American people, if they know, will act.

A. Make a drive to get readers and subscribers to Far East Spotlight, the committee's monthly magazine. This is the indispensable tool for every fighter for a new and friendly policy toward China. Previous sources of reliable information about China and the Far East now have an NAM slant; only Far East Spotlight gives you the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction, and keeps you up-to-date about Washington's evil plans to go on backing reaction in China and the Far East. Subscription: $2 a year. Introductory offer: $1 for 8 months. Members of the CDFEP get this free.

B. Push the sale and reading of Anna Louise Strong's Tomorrow's China. Paper bound, 65 cents; cloth bound, $2. Organizational orders for 5 or more: 25 percent discount.

C. Have meetings on the China policy issue—

(a) The committee can furnish speakers: In the New York City area: Telephone the speaker's bureau of the committee any afternoon, BRyant 9-6343. In California, the San Francisco area: Contact Mr. William Kerner, 1841 Ellis Street, San Francisco. Los Angeles area: Contact Mrs. Jeannette Orel, 362 South Columbia Avenue, Los Angeles.

(b) Send your organization's own speakers to the briefing session on China. First session: Friday night February 18, 7:30 sharp. Telephone the committee for registration blanks; BRyant 9-6342. No fee.

You can't fight without facts. Far East Spotlight is your basic source of information. Meetings on China will bring facts to hundreds of others.

3. See to it that the President and the Members of Congress hear from hundreds of individuals on China policy right now. Order prepared postcards from the Committee—1 cent each. Write your own messages. Make calls—in person and by telephone—on your Senators and Congressmen.

4. Have your organization make an immediate contribution to the work of the committee or plan to give a regular (monthly, quarterly, or yearly) contribution.

5. Support the committee for a democratic Far Eastern policy.

A. By becoming members and by getting your friends to join. Membership includes subscription to Far East Spotlight.

B. By securing individual contributions for the committee. Your own; your friends; throw a party for the committee.

C. By doing volunteer work at the committee's office; 111 West Forty-second Street, fifth floor—any time, any day. Every Tuesday night the staff is at home to friends who come to help.

The Chinese people are defeating the American reactionaries. So can we.

China policy reveals the over-all character of Washington's foreign policy—it harms the American people.

China policy is directly related to our domestic struggle for homes, for more consumption goods, for lower prices for increased social security, for healthy international trade, for freedom from depression and militarism.

China shows up the weak spot in our reactionaries' program.

Let's fight on China policy and take advantage of the blow the Chinese people have dealt the American reactionaries.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC
FAR EASTERN POLICY,
111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

ACTION CONFERENCE ON CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK, JANUARY 29, 1949—RESOLUTION ON CHINA POLICY

This Action Conference on China Policy, meeting in New York City on January 29, 1949, and attended by 182 registered delegates and observers from 80 organizations and including 48 individual participants, voted to send to every member of the Eighty-first Congress, through the Committee for a Democratic Far-Eastern Policy under whose auspices the conference was held, the following resolution:

In view of the following facts:

1. That our Government since VJ-day has violated both the democratic objective of World War II and the Charter of the United Nations in giving support to the antidemocratic and dictatorial Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek;

2. That our Government since VJ-day has made available to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek over $6,000,000,000 worth of the resources of the American people for use in civil war against the people of China, who are our historic friends and allies in the task of building a peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world;

3. That American guns, bullets, airplanes, bombs, poison gas, gasoline jelly, and flame throwers have brought suffering, death, and destruction to millions of people in China, thus threatening the alienation of 1,500,000,000 people of Asia, who are our natural allies in a democratic world;

4. That we Americans whose resources have been wasted and misused in China are still waiting for adequate and decent housing, for lower prices on consumption goods and food, for increased social security, for mutually beneficial trade relations between our two countries as a factor in preventing a depression, and for freedom from militarism and for the security which only peaceful and cooperative relations among nations can give;

5. That our Government's policy toward China is causing frictions and misunderstandings that can easily lead to conflicts and even to war;

6. That the people of China have decisively demonstrated their purpose and power to rid themselves of the callous, cruel, antidemocratic and outworn feudal regime which for the past years has existed only with outside (American) support and have shown their power to negate all the military advice, training, and equipment given by the United States to the Kuomintang regime of Chiang Kai-shek, and are now establishing a functioning government of their own creating.

7. That there are nationally prominent American political, military, and publishing figures openly and secretly advocating and working for continued and intensified intervention in the internal affairs of China against the Chinese people;

8. That a strong Chinese lobby is at work in Washington (one of the biggest money-spending foreign influences in our Capital but not registered as a foreign agent) trying to influence our Government authorities to continue support of the antidemocratic and unpopular Kuomintang elements;

9. That the very Chinese officials and individuals who are urging more pouring out of the American people's money in China are known to have accumulated billions of dollars (wrung from the suffering people of China and stolen from the pockets of the American taxpayers) and now stowed away

in American banks and investments: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we go on record as demanding—

1. That there be a congressional investigation—

A. Into the activities of the Chinese lobby in this country; and

B. Into the private wealth which Chinese officials and individuals have stowed away in American banks and investments.

2. That there be an immediate end to all forms of American intervention in China including an end to any dealings with any elements or remnants of the Kuomintang regime, recognizing the right of the Chinese people to make decisions about their country free of all pressure or interference on the part of our Government.

3. That our Government prepare to recognize the government which the Chinese people are now establishing for themselves and that our authorities begin planning for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with that government, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

Retirement of Admiral Lewis L. Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the end of this week Admiral Lewis L. Strauss will retire from membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. Admiral Strauss, a close friend of mine, is a distinguished citizen of New York, of whose public service his State is proud. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on Mr. Strauss entitled "A Job Well Done," from this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOB WELL DONE

The retirement at the end of this week of Lewis L. Strauss from membership on the Atomic Energy Commission will bring at least to a temporary halt a distinguished career of public service. Mr. Strauss was one of the original quintet appointed by President Truman to the AEC when that agency was organized in 1947. Before that, and following a successful career in private business, he had spent the war years in the service of the Navy, where he rose to the rank of rear admiral and received the Legion of Merit for his substantial aid in helping to build American seapower up to its wartime strength. Thus, for nearly a decade he has been almost continuously in the service of his country.

The Atomic Energy Commission operates for the most part behind a veil of secrecy, for reasons which are obvious and necessary, and the contribution made individually to its debates and to its work by the various commissioners is only infrequently a matter of public record. There is good cause, however, to believe that Mr. Strauss has been one of the most useful members of the original group of five; that the influence which he has exerted has been a steadying and constructive force, and that this vast experimental project, pushing its frontiers into new, hazardous, and vitally important territory, has gained greatly from his broad experience, his alertness, his perseverance, and his level-headed judgment. As he prepares to take leave of public office we salute him on a job well done.

What ECA Is Accomplishing in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What ECA Is Accomplishing in Europe," by Roscoe Drummond.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF EUROPE—WHAT ECA IS ACCOMPLISHING IN EUROPE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.—The Congress of the United States shortly will be deciding one of the most important questions which will come before it this session—whether to approve the Economic Cooperation Administration request for a new appropriation of $2,900,000,000.

In making this decision, Congress undoubtedly will be responsive to American public opinion. As one who, for a period, is officially connected with ECA, it would not be proper for me to argue the case for the Marshall plan—and I will not do so. But I can offer a report on what is being accomplished in Europe and present the underlying facts as faithfully as I have been able to observe them at first hand during the past 8 months.

The prime task which Congress assigned to the ECA was to help the nations of western Europe achieve an economic recovery which would permit them to function without extraordinary outside aid. The purposes which motivated the Marshall plan were:

To rescue Europe from the brink of economic collapse to which the most destructive war in history had brought it.

To help rebuild a prospering and self-supporting Europe, without which a prospering and secure America would be jeopardized.

To bring about such improved social and political conditions as will enable free institutions to regain their strength and thereby resist the march of communism.

Measured in terms of the Marshall plan's basic objective and its central motives, what are the facts to report? Some of the principal facts are these:

It is accurate to say that the progress of the European recovery program—in production and trade, in expanding productive capacity, in restoring internal financial stability, and in slowly raising living standards—has exceeded the largest expectations of 2 years ago.

AGRICULTURE

When the Marshall plan started, millions of persons were going hungry. Today that menace has been removed. Today agricultural productivity as a whole has been brought nearly to the level of prewar, and, given favorable weather conditions, will reach the prewar level or exceed it during the present crop year. This means an improving diet, but still a bare diet, since western Europe has 20,000,000 more persons to feed than before the war and is putting, by necessity, a very high percentage of its income into durable capital investment rather than consumer goods.

INDUSTRY

For the Marshall plan countries as a whole, industrial production has been raised one-third higher than it was in 1937. It took western Europe 7 years to regain its prewar level of production after World War I. Today, after 2 years of the Marshall plan and less than 5 years after the end of the far more destructive World War II, industrial production has been brought to 20 percent higher than 1938.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

Until the inflation which gripped the entirety of western Europe in 1946–47 was checked and brought under control, the nations could not even begin to rebuild their industrial plants. Today the governments have put their financial houses in better order. Prices generally are being held, and the outlook is encouraging.

Under the stimulus of sounder financial conditions and mounting production, intra-European trade has improved. Total exports have risen 50 percent since 1947.

These are the facts which bear upon the question of whether a solid foundation of European recovery is being made.

Obviously, there are tough problems still to be met. To enable western Europe to close the dollar gap—or to bring it into manageable proportions—and to carry forward the essential economic unification needed to strengthen and secure the recovery already made are the two biggest jobs which face ECA during the next 2 years.

One question which frequently is asked officials of the ECA is whether the Marshall plan appropriations for the third year should not be substantially reduced, particularly in view of the need for governmental economy in the United States.

Facts rather than arguments are more useful in answering this question.

Marshall-plan aid for western Europe for 1948–49 was about $5,800,000,000, including the special appropriation for Germany.

The appropriation for 1949–50 was about $4,200,000,000.

The ECA appropriation request which is now before Congress for 1950–51 is $2,900,000,000.

The Marshall plan is premised upon the principle of reducing the aid substantially every year, and the foregoing facts show wherein the ECA itself always has initiated these reductions rather than waiting for Congress to propose them.

A Marshall Plan of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received yesterday from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, an organization not without influence in my State of Connecticut. I read this letter this morning to the National Commission for UNESCO, which is opening its annual 3-day meeting here in Washington. The letter, in my judgment, is not only a tribute to Mr. Murray but to the intelligent and constructive interest which the great labor organizations are taking in the field of foreign policy. I had considerable background when I served as

Assistant Secretary of State with labor's development of this interest, and there are no more effective spokesmen abroad for the United States and our democratic ideals than our outstanding labor-union leaders such as Mr. Murray and many of his associates.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM BENTON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: I have read with a great deal of interest the speech which you delivered in the Senate on March 22 proposing a Marshall plan of ideas.

You are to be heartily congratulated for taking the leadership in introducing your resolution setting forth a six-point program.

We cannot weaken our military power or our diplomatic influence but both could be significantly implemented by the suggestions which you make. In a world such as ours, we cannot underestimate the necessity for strength. But, unfortunately, we have been strengthening only our military power when we should also be strengthening the desire and the demand for peace in the minds and loyalties of men.

You can be assured of my personal support, as well as the support of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, for your proposals to extend freedom of information and to strengthen the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and to encourage further exchanges of scholars, students, and workers.

Sincerely,

PHILIP MURRAY, *President.*

Communists Act To Drive Public Mind Into Reaction and Intellectual Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Communists Act To Drive Public Mind Into Reaction and Intellectual Fear," written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD—COMMUNISTS ACT TO DRIVE PUBLIC MIND INTO REACTION AND INTELLECTUAL FEAR

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Everywhere, the activities of the Communists have the same deplorable effect. They tend to drive their opponents, and the public mind, into extreme reaction and intellectual timidity, thus paralyzing all vigorous and constructive social and political thinking on either domestic or foreign policy. The extreme left and the extreme right are everywhere natural allies—consciously so on the part of the Communists, unconsciously on the part of the rightists.

It is extremely important to understand this. For the struggle against communism is futile as a struggle against isolated personalities. It is a political struggle that must be waged by political means.

MAIN TARGET OF REDS

The main target of the Communists in every country is the so-called social Fascists, those who, recognizing the dynamics of history, wish to bring about social and political reforms. If Communists cannot infiltrate to control these movements they cooperate with anybody to destroy them.

Nowhere was that clearer than in pre-Hitler Germany. In 1932, the year before Hitler came to power, a tacit alliance existed between the Nazis and the Communists. Both had the same objective: the disintegration of the republic, and the elimination of the middle.

Up until the day Hitler became chancelor, the Communist press was denouncing, in the first line, not nazism but the social democracy. They joined the transport strike staged by the Nazis in 1932 and refused to join a general strike, which the Social-Democrats wanted to call in protest against Hitler's chancelorship. And both tried to penetrate and disrupt the trade union movement.

SAME THING SEEN AGAIN

Today, in Germany, we see the same thing. Who in Germany favors a military alliance with Russia and an antiwestern orientation? Communists, of course, plus many ex-Nazis including former police spies, some former diplomats, generals bitten by the bug of the old Bismarck policy, while extreme rightists do everything possible to paralyze the Bonn government.

And we see exactly the same thing here. The anti-Communists drive is conducted by unreconstructed isolationists, enemies of all social reform, anti-trade unionists, opponents of Marshall aid, and economic imperialists who want to use Marshall aid for subsidized dumping of American products to embarrass and paralyze the administration, despite the fact that willy-nilly it must govern for another two extremely critical years.

The tragedy of our times has been a whole series of false alliances and false divisions, all of which play into the hands of those who wish, above all, paralysis of democratic government.

Rotating Internship for Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, all of us who are members of the legal profession are interested in means whereby the high character of the profession may be preserved and promoted. Mr. Edward L. Bryant, whom I have known personally for many years as a member of the Detroit and Michigan bar, has devoted himself over a long period of years to improvement of the profession by the training of young lawyers in the field. He has evolved a program known as a rotating internship for lawyers, and I ask unanimous consent that an article by him on that subject which appeared in the Journal of the American Judicature Society for February 1950 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROTATING INTERNSHIP FOR LAWYERS

(By Edward L. Bryant)

Even after several years of law school training and after passing of State bar examinations and admission to the bar, the young lawyer is not prepared to render services to either employers or clients.

It must be conceded that law schools cannot train students in this important phase of preparation. Law schools are doing excellent work in most cases, but after the admission to the bar, the profession must take charge of the young lawyer who wishes to engage in active practice of the law, and a rotating internship seems to be the best manner for preparing these persons.

A student of the law cannot get more than a smattering of practical experience before graduation. It is absolutely necessary to tie up the law school and the law office. There is much need for supervised activities after the admission to the bar.

The intern is more likely to become a successful practitioner if there is supervision for his first year and if the integrated bar provides a systematic and progressive program for experiences in practice work and if the progress is followed carefully until the license to practice law is granted.

What can be accomplished? Many of these things and more can be accomplished by having a rotating internship for lawyers for 1 year after admission to the bar. Some of the suggestions are:

1. Elimination of unemployment during the first year of admission.

2. Practical training in courts, departments, bureaus, offices, commissions, and penal institutions.

3. Reducing of exploitation by older lawyers and organizations because the intern and his supervisors have had a year to appraise and evaluate.

4. Eliminating those lawyers who are not likely to succeed as practicing attorneys through the aid of counseling and assistance; the intern could not be eliminated, of course, without his written consent.

5. Practical experiences in briefing, pleading, law-office management, trial work, office accounting, purchases, and abstracting.

6. Training and practical education so that sucker lists and sucker schemes would be avoided and unnecessary law books would not be purchased or contracted for and the intern would not join clubs indiscriminately. He might even be taught how to deal with insurance lawyers instead of insurance adjusters.

7. Substantial reduction of the trial-and-error system.

8. Reducing the overcrowding of lawyers in many counties and circuits.

9. Training in the manner of charging and thereby reducing failures from undercharging as well as overcharging. Also training regarding attorney-and-client relations.

10. Reducing of grievance-committee work.

11. Providing systematic opportunities to contribute articles to publications and reviews.

12. Providing of an outline in manual form with full instructions and rules and schedules similar to that used by medical interns in an accredited hospital.

13. Increase the opportunities for older lawyers and younger lawyers to become better acquainted so that successful practice would be better established after the internship.

14. Practical training in corporation and financial affairs, labor management, and special types of practice such as admiralty, tax, patent law, and workmen's compensation.

15. Elimination of all evidence of supervisory control and governing influences except by rules of the State bar and the courts, promptly upon completion of the internship.

THE PLAN FOR ROTATING INTERNSHIP FOR LAWYERS

1. When and where to begin; for how long; membership: At the time the student is informed that he has passed the State bar examination, he would file his application with the Supreme Court if he desired to become actively engaged in the practice of the law. He would then promptly become an intern for a period of 1 year. Upon completing this period of training, he would be certified as a practicing attorney.

This plan will not in any way interfere with the inactive class of membership in the State bar, such as is provided for in volume 273 of Michigan Reports for the State Bar of Michigan.

2. Headquarters: The main intern headquarters will be the headquarters of the State bar and living quarters may be established for the interns at designated places.

Administrative branches may be established in every county and circuit in the State.

3. Supervision: The State bar organization shall have complete supervision with the Supreme Court over all certified interns, and rules will be established and books of instructions prepared; the committees of the State bar shall have full authority to perform duties in connection with the supervision of the interns.

4. Compensation: Each intern would be compensated in an amount comparable to that of the first-year intern in accredited hospitals.

5. Living headquarters for the intern: These will be established and dignified and supervised by the State bar in such places as it may designate. All interns will live in these quarters for at least the first 4 months' period of the internship. The remaining period of 8 months would follow that plan used by accredited hospitals.

6. How the intern would be trained:

(a) He would first receive his manual of instructions and rules. He would be presented with a standard file, list of general conveyancing forms, and schedule of assignments. He would immediately begin active training for the practice of law by being instructed in the operation of a model law office established at the headquarters.

(b) He would actively appear in all courts in the county where the State capital is located, and he would alternate with the attorneys for the plaintiff, then the defendant or petitioner and respondent or complainant.

(c) He would work in or get active experience in the many State departments such as the attorney general's office, the corporation and securities commission, the public utilities commission, the insurance department, and all such other State offices and departments as would be designated by the State bar.

(d) He would attend legislative sessions, if possible, and learn the practical operations of both houses as to rules and procedures and the manner of drafting bills and public acts.

(e) He would actively appear in the Federal courts, including the court of the master in chancery, the bankruptcy court, the United States commissioner's court; his assignments would be alternated so that he would act for the plaintiff at one time and for the defendant in the next case.

(f) He would be assigned to agencies and offices such as penal institutions, immigration offices, the legal aid bureau, the friend of the court, and the probation departments. He would attend lectures and receive instructions on the operations of these offices.

(g) He would actively participate before the workmen's compensation court and the circuit court commissioner on reference cases.

(h) He would be practically instructed regarding the operation of bodies politic, municipal corporations, and the many departments such as the corporation counsel and the prosecuting attorney, and we would actually assist in the briefing and preparation, including the investigation, of many types of cases as well as trials.

(i) He would receive constant, intelligent instruction and hear lectures by practicing attorneys, judges, and officials.

7. How busy would the intern be? He would be busier than he was in law school and about as busy as the medical interns who are on duty from 12 to 24 hours per day.

8. What would the intern do after the opening periods of training including the period of training at the capital city, and at the largest city in the State other than the capital city of the State if he wished to train somewhere else in the State? (NOTE.—Some young men would like to go with their fathers or other relatives or in a particular office.)

(a) The intern will first select his location after getting full information from the supervisors as to the number of lawyers and the population of the county which he selects. He may go into any one of the counties of the State he wishes but only after he has had the opening periods of training, including the period of training at the capital city and 2 months in the largest city in the State other than the capital city of the State.[1]

(b) Of course, if he wishes to locate permanently in either of the cities where the training is given, he will continue his practice training in these places.

(c) If he selects a county other than the county in which he is being trained, supervision will be identical and he will still be under the Supreme Court and the State bar. The rules will be the same in all counties and his manual or guide book of instructions will be unchanged and his training and duties will be similar.

(d) In the new location his working headquarters will be those approved or established by the State bar. He will operate from the county building and he will be supervised also by the presiding judge in this circuit.

(e) He may even be allowed to work with a responsible and paying mentor, sponsor, or preceptor, or to enter where there appears to be permanent employment for him if approval is given by the State bar and the standards meet full approval.

(f) He will still continue to accept and perform all assignments, and all remuneration which is paid from any source for his work will go to the common fund of the State bar for interns.

(g) He will continue to make general monthly reports of his accomplishments and activities to the State bar as the other interns will have to do on forms provided by the integrated bar.

(h) His income will be the same as he received in the cities where he first began his training and he will receive his certificate to practice at the same time the rest of his class is so honored.

9. Money. How the internship plan would be financed: All funds would be controlled by the State bar. Funds would have to come regularly from every county and every circuit and the State bar. Some of the sources from which money could come are as follows:

(a) Increased dues of the full bar membership. [NOTE.—This will be cheap for all of the bar members in the end because of the great benefit to be derived.]

(b) Increased suit fees in all courts of record in all counties.

(c) Increased fees for defaults, decrees, and judgment orders.

(d) Salaries paid for work done by the interns.

(e) Appraiser and referee fees, administrator and executor fees, trustee and receivership fees.

(f) For briefing and other assignments of his work.

(g) From donations and wills and trophy awards (similar to the Ross trophy now competed for).

(h) From foundations.

(i) From sources similar to those which benefit hospital interns, including work at official agencies and bureaus.

(j) From intern fees paid by opposing litigants in trial work in the amount of a dollar a day each.

(k) Grand jury investigation work.

(l) Abstracting.

(m) For services rendered as public defender or amicus curiae.

There are many other sources which can be listed, of course, and which can be contemplated. To illustrate the effectiveness of increased membership dues, in Michigan there are over 6,000 lawyers who would contribute through dues.

As an example of the possibilities where the interns can earn compensation, Wayne County, Mich., has started and completed an average of 20,000 cases every year since 1940 in the circuit court alone. There have been thousands of circuit court commissioner cases, common pleas cases, criminal cases, Federal cases, and bankruptcy cases in Wayne County alone, and the total number of cases in other counties would more than double these totals. For performing many of the duties connected with cases such as these, the interns would be paid and this money would go to the common fund. Many assignments would be earmarked for the interns by the courts and department heads. The court reporters and clerks are paid large salaries. Since no one asks where the entry fee, decree fees, or the judgment or sheriff fees go, why would there be any trouble in getting these funds for the interns, which would be adequate to pay them the compensation comparable to that paid to medical interns in accredited hospitals?

10. Purpose: The purpose of this rotating internship is to have the first-year interns rotate work in as many courts and departments as possible so that they would be well equipped to enter private, ethical practice in any kind of a law office. The further purpose is to help establish a rotating internship for every practicing lawyer in the United States.

11. Will the plan succeed, and has the plan been tried? This plan will succeed. Experience has actually been had with more than 25 young lawyers who had practiced less than 3 years.

Under the supervision of the supreme court and the State bar and the judges, the interns would be very well trained and supervised. They would have their manuals and their standard files, their practice training and their lectures and abstracting work. They would have a chance to evaluate. They would be better acquainted. They would be very busy. They would not learn by trial and error alone. They would learn to try lawsuits and they would learn of the benefits of the conciliation and pretrial dockets. They certainly would be better lawyers. They would have permanent friendships. They would perhaps learn about cooperative offices and neighborhood offices and

[1] This plan is drafted with a State like Michigan, Illinois, or Louisiana in mind, when there is one big metropolitan city and a State capital located elsewhere. Adaptations would be necessary in a State like Indiana, where the two are combined, or in other States with differing circumstances.

they would make the profession almost a fraternity. They would be serious about their profession instead of just trying to get a job, and they would not be just trying to get something to do. They would all have a connection or an office at the end of the year, and they certainly would be happier.

They could now give their clients a square deal.

12. What benefit would all of this be to the State bar? The bar would be definitely improved. The law school and the office would be tied up for the first time in our history. The junior bar associations would be more powerful. The State bars would be more active and more respected. The youth would now be experienced. The judges and the lawyers as well as the teachers would all have assisted in the training of the intern so his training would be complete.

13. Conclusions:

(a) Will the rotating internship be a success? Yes, definitely, for it has been successfully tried, on a small but definite scale.

(b) Is it necessary? Yes, because there is a great need for it and most lawyers agree that an internship is necessary or, at least, that there must be some practice training after graduation.

(c) Is the period too long? No. Most lawyers flounder and waste their first year.

(d) Is this plan complete? No. Remember, the first automobile gasoline motor operated on a table before it was put on wheels, and now it travels at over 100 miles an hour. It will take a long while to establish this internship plan properly.

(e) Will it help the young lawyer's social contacts and better living? It cannot help but do so because he will fraternize with the older lawyers in a practical manner.

(f) Is it paternalistic? No, because it is an impartial, supervised training of beginners in a highly respected profession and it terminates at the end of 1 year.

(g) Will it adversely affect early establishment in special fields? No, it will broaden the specialists.

(h) Can it be comparable to the fine training young medics get? Yes, because the law profession has more courts, departments, and commissions at its disposal than the medical profession has hospitals and clinics at its disposal, and the training would be supervised by the State bar associations, the supreme courts, and judges of courts in all counties.

(i) Can we finance it? Why not? The medics do, and the young doctors survive on their compensation.

(j) Will young interns be prevented from going in offices of their choice? No, but they won't be hurried. They can now have time to appraise and to be appraised and so there will be fewer disappointments and failures and their work will be supervised constantly. They can specialize in admiralty if they wish but they must be prepared and have diversification first.

k. Are things unsatisfactory for the young lawyer now? It is apparent that they are.

l. Would this apply to all new lawyers? It certainly would, regardless of school grades, connections, or age.

14. Finally: The legal profession must be improved. The way to do it is to train the young. The experiences must not be along one line; they must be rotated. We must not leave this training to sponsors, mentors, preceptors, or professors. The State bar must tie in the law school and the law office.

The great work done at Duke University, Western Reserve, and in the great States of New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont, the plan of the Legal Aid Society of New York, the operation of the Pennsylvania plan, the reports made by the Russell Sage Foundations, the establishment of the European precedent to clerkship, the mentor system of Cleveland, and the valuable guide published by Prof. John Tracy, of the University of Michigan Law School, all make valuable contributions but these are not enough, as the bar surveys have shown. The man who elects to practice law should be trained by practical men and the work must be supervised. The student is trained in law school by excellent pedagogues. When his school work is over, the State bar should take over in earnest for a period of 1 year. The training must be standardized the same as it is in law school, only it must be from a practical standpoint, of course.

Let us protect our young lawyers. Let us improve this wonderful old profession so that the general public will no longer sneeringly say "Lawyer? Did you say 'liar'?", or "A lawyer and an honest man; there must be two men in that grave."

15. Authority to establish the plan: These ideas and the plan are not copyrighted or patented. You can, in all probability, suggest something better or perhaps you can improve on these generalities. This is just a start. Fortunately, there is power to go ahead at once with a plan for rotating internship without legislation. Most State bar organizations have the power under rules or statutes to aid in the promotion of improvements in the administration of justice and the advancement of the science of jurisprudence, in the improvement of the relations between the profession and the public, and in promotion of the interests of the legal profession.

Kerr Gas Bill Only Affirms Present Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Kerr Gas Bill Only Affirms Present Law," published in the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, of April 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KERR GAS BILL ONLY AFFIRMS PRESENT LAW

Never within his memory, said Representative TYLE, of Texas, during House debate on the Kerr natural gas bill, has a measure been so falsely, maliciously, and deliberately misrepresented. This widespread campaign of distortion and misstatement continues while the bill is before President Truman for his approval or veto, matched only by the vicious personal attacks directed at sponsors of the legislation, and especially its author, Senator KERR, of Oklahoma.

Chief among the misleading statements made about the bill are that its effect would be to triple the price of gas to the consumer (mainly those in northern States), unjustifiably enrich the independent producers of natural gas, and create a monopoly in that field. This it would do, according to the intemperate opponents of the bill, by killing the Federal Power Commission's rate-fixing authority over independent producers who sell g s to interstate pipe line companies.

The measure would do none of these things, as anyone ought to know who has given the bill even a cursory reading and who has even the most elementary knowledge of the natural-gas business.

As a matter of fact, the bill, if it is signed into law by the President, will not take away an iota of the authority the FPC has claimed or exercised since the original Natural Gas Act was passed in 1938. The FPC does not and never has controlled or regulated the rates at which gas is sold at the well. The Commission controls, and would continue to control, the interstate pipeline transportation of gas and its sale for wholesale purposes. State regulatory bodies control, and would continue to control, the price at which gas is sold to the consumers.

In 1947 the FPC specifically disclaimed any right to regulate the sale of gas at the well and approved passage of a bill almost identical with the present one. That proposed legislation also was approved by the Department of Defense, which said its enactment would "remove uncertainties now existing as to the extent of the application of the Natural Gas Act" and that the effect should be increased development of oil and gas resources of benefit to national security.

The uncertainties spoken of by the Defense Department were created by a decision of the United States Supreme Court which seemed to some to indicate—although it did not say so plainly—that the original Natural Gas Act gave the FPC jurisdiction over the price of gas at the well. Since then there have been signs of intent by the Commission to assert that shadowy authority. The newly passed measure would merely reassert and clarify the original intent of Congress by specifically stating that the FPC has no such authority.

That Congress never intended for the powers of the FPC to extend that far is evidenced by the legislative history of the act and the flat statement of the chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, then Representative Lea of California, at the time of its passage. In response to a direct question on the floor of the House, he stated: "The bill does not apply to the production and gathering of gas."

Any fear that the price paid by the consumer for gas would triple, or even go up at all as a result of passage of the Kerr bill, is contrary to all reason and all experience. Especially preposterous are the extravagant and unsupported statements that consumers would find their gas bills increased anywhere from $100,000,000 to $500,000,000 a year. The bill does nothing more than to provide that the same conditions which have been in effect for the last 12 years shall remain in effect. And during that time, while there has been some advance in the price paid to gas producers in the Southwest, the price paid by consumers of this fuel has declined by an average of 12 percent.

The reason for the advance in the price of gas at the well is the widened market that has been created for it by construction of pipe lines from the Southwest to Northern and Eastern States. The reason the price to the consumer has declined, in spite of the increased cost in the field, is that wider markets and greater demand for gas has made it possible to deliver a higher volume at a lower price.

That process can be expected to continue if the Kerr bill becomes law, since the volume of gas transported by pipe line has more to do with its price at the point of delivery than does the cost at the well. On the other hand, failure of the bill to become law would subject producers to such rigid regulation as to discourage the expensive search for new gas sources. This is by reason of the fact that, under FPC regulation, each independent producer would be in the class of a public utility, restricted to a fixed rate of return applying only to those wells which produce gas and making no allowance for the cost of drilling dry holes and for other exploratory expense.

Thus, instead of being penalized, the consumer stands to receive a more plentiful, dependable supply of gas at lower cost if the bill becomes law. The assertion that gas producers and holders of gas reserves would be enriched by hundreds of millions of dollars a year is exploded by figures showing that total sales of the product by the Nation's independent producers for movement in interstate commerce amount to only $75,000,000 a year.

The selling of gas has developed into a competitive business. Producers of natural gas number more than 5,000. The nearly 100 pipe lines authorized in the last 8 years have contracts with thousands of producers and gatherers of gas at different prices in different fields and even within the same field. Most of these producers are bound by long-term contracts to deliver gas at a fixed price. That is just the opposite of monopolistic ability to sell gas at whatever price they choose.

The threat of Federal control from which the Kerr bill would deliver the independent producer of gas is a matter affecting not only the gas producer but all producers. No raw product is now under Federal price control in the hands of the producer. But if the price of gas at the well were brought under Federal regulation, it would be only a short and inevitable step to Federal regulation of oil, since in many cases the production of oil and gas are inseparable.

That is the foot-in-the-door method of starting with Government control of one small segment of industry and gradually extending it to include others. The ultimate result could be complete destruction of the American system of free enterprise.

The Kerr bill is fair, honest, constructive, and consistent, and will be the means of insuring an unlimited supply of cheap gas in the future. The President, in signing it, will be rendering a service to the consumers of gas and preserving the principle of free enterprise. If by any chance it should work out to anybody's detriment, a safeguard has been written into the bill in the form of an amendment which gives the President the final say.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defend the Marshall Plan," from the Christian Science Monitor for March 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEND THE MARSHALL PLAN

The cheapest wars to win are those that don't begin. The United States has been fighting such a war for 2 years now, and winning it.

Yes; we are talking about the Marshall plan. But we are not talking about it at this moment because of its tremendous achievements. These are generally recognized. We are talking about it because, despite its accomplishments for European well-being and American security, the European recovery program is in immediate danger.

It is endangered not by any swing of majority opinion against it in the United States. The threats come from several different minority interests.

They come from Members of both Houses of Congress who know the American people are weary of many of the Government's spending policies, but who are not too courageous about tackling spending where their constituents can feel it. These legislators look on European aid as providing a field in which savings can be made without the voters feeling it, at any rate without feeling it this side of new troubles with communism involving stepped-up military preparations or maybe war.

The Marshall plan is also endangered by interests who are determined to make aid to Europe aid to themselves first. They are producers of crops and other goods in which surpluses are expected to be more burdensome in the near future.

They want more and more strings attached to the Marshall plan, strings that will force Europeans to buy certain products in American markets. These interests would, whether intentionally or not, insist on new provisions in Marshall plan legislation which would tend to perpetuate the dollar gap between Europe and the United States instead of closing it.

There is also a move afoot to alter the form of the aid from grants to repayable loans. This would intensify the European dollar problem, since the recipients of aid would have to find dollars to pay back on principal and interest, and there is no way for them to get dollars except by selling goods to the United States.

Which brings us to another less direct danger to the Marshall plan.

Now that the sellers' market is disappearing in the United States, the demand for protection against European competition could frustrate some of the important aims of the Marshall plan.

We do not believe the American people are willing to risk a failure in so important a field of their foreign policy to satisfy sectional demands for drastic cuts in money aid to Europe or for special benefits from that aid to certain American producers.

These attacks on the Marshall plan would cut severely into America's peace program just as the Soviet Union is embarking on what promises to be an unprecedented peace offensive. In the battle for men's minds one of the most important influences on world opinion will be the ability of the United States to stick to its aims. To seem to back away from the Marshall program just as it reaches half-way house can be neither good statesmanship nor sound economy. But it may take the voices of an enlightened citizenry to convince the politicians of this fact.

Oil and Gas: Curse or Blessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Oil and Gas: A Curse or Blessing?" published in Time magazine of the issue of April 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL AND GAS: CURSE OR BLESSING?

In a hullabaloo of argument, President Truman tried to make up his mind last week whether he should sign or veto the Kerr gas bill. The bill's opponents loudly damned it as the biggest raid by "special interests" since Teapot Dome. Just as warmly, the bill's backers called it indispensable for the further growth of the natural-gas industry.

The big oil and gas companies, who had championed oil-rich Senator ROBERT KERR'S bill for all they were worth, marshaled some potent arguments on their side. Despite all the political uproar, they pointed out that the bill, which exempts "independent" gas producers from the price-fixing control of the Federal Power Commission, merely repeats and clarifies a previous congressional action. The 1938 Natural Gas Act, in their opinion, had specifically exempted the independents (i. e., those gas producers and gatherers not affiliated with interstate pipe-line companies) from FPC's jurisdiction. The United States Supreme Court had disagreed in 1947, when it ordered Lousiana's Interstate Natural Gas Co. to rebate nearly $600,000 on consumers' gas bills. It thereby virtually wrote a blank check for FPC to regulate the price of gas in the field whenever the gas crossed a State line for resale.

Instead of welcoming this power, FPC Commissioners urged Congress to pass a bill once more exempting the independents. Even the then Commissioner Leland Olds, a zealot for regulation, approved FPC's stand that it would not "assert such jurisdiction." Less than a year later, Olds and the Commission changed their minds. In October 1948 they started proceedings against the natural-gas affiliate of Phillips Petroleum Co., which has the biggest gas reserves of any independent gas producer, to test their power to fix the price of gas in the field.

CAPPED WELLS

Phillips and the other oil companies feared the threat to fix their gas prices, but what they feared more was that FPC would use the authority it won over gas as a lever to try to declare the whole oil industry a public utility—and thus control oil prices and profits also. (Since gas is a byproduct of oil development, the big oil companies are also big gas producers.) The result was that many of the big producers refused to sell gas to the interstate pipe lines. They pumped the gas back into the ground, sold it only within the State, or let it go to waste.

Although State authorities have tried to stop the waste, Oklahoma oilmen were still blowing off great quantities of gas last week rather than run what one oilman called the "tremendous risk" of FPC regulation. For the same reason, hundreds of gas wells have been capped, and new pipe-line operators have found it hard to line up contracts for sufficient gas. The majority of those who did had to agree that the contracts would be canceled if FPC got control over gas prices. One result: out of the 5,700,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas produced in the Southwest in 1948, only 1,200,000,000,000 feet went through the interstate pipe lines.

CAPPED PRICES?

Opponents of the bill, notably Illinois Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, argued that the lack of regulation would send gas prices soaring and boost consumers' bills $100,000,000 a year. In answer, oilmen pointed to the record. In the last 10 years the price of gas in the field has risen, in some cases quintupled (the price had been so low 10 years ago that gas had virtually been given away). Yet, the average price of natural gas to residential users had dropped from 70.9 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in 1939 to 63.5

cents in 1948. Even if the Kerr bill becomes law, the rates charged by transmission companies and utilities will still be regulated by FPC or State utility commissions.

Charles I. Francis, vice president of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., pooh-poohed the talk of immediate price rises. Said he: "The public will benefit by lower gas prices."

As long as the current gas surplus exists, oilmen contended that gas prices, even in the field, would not rise much. Eventually, they probably would. Said Gordon W. Reed, chairman of small-sized Texas Gulf Producing Co.: "Where the price of gas will end, no one can predict right now, but it is definitely going to reach its economic level. Prices to producers in the Southwest could go up another 5 cents or 6 cents a thousand cubic feet (roughly 55 percent) without affecting consumers' prices in the North."

Address by Hon. William Benton to the United States National Commission for UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered this morning by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] to keynote the 3-day meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. The Senate may recall that it was the Senator from Connecticut who, as Assistant Secretary of State, sponsored the legislation which authorized our joining UNESCO, and he tells me that the pen with which the President signed the act decorates his office at the headquarters of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The Senator handled the London Conference of 1945 for the State Department, at which the UNESCO charter was written; and he was chairman of the United States delegation at the first two general conferences of UNESCO—in Paris in 1946, and in Mexico City in 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Stoddard and fellow members of the National Commission, this will be a political talk. In my first six words, I want once more to register the fact that UNESCO is a political instrument.

The United States National Commission is a political body and the future of the United States, and the whole free world is now balanced on crucial, political decisions which will determine the fate of mankind.

There are those deeply interested in UNESCO who sincerely believe that it is better for UNESCO to remain aloof from what they regard as the sordid fingers of world politics. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, who represented the United States at the UNESCO meeting on German education in Paris last August, writes me that he thinks UNESCO's hesitancy on the subject of Germany is due to what he calls rather fantastic notions about the importance of the Czech and Polish adhesion to UNESCO. This is of course, politics, and let us at least recognize it for what it is.

Too many among UNESCO's constituents still cling to the idea of UNESCO as a society of intellectuals, not to be degraded by the vulgar forces of raw power. Many would have us remain, so to speak, above the battles and the bombs.

With this view I emphatically take issue, as I have so often in the past.

For what is UNESCO all about if it is not a part—and a vital part—of the world-wide struggle for survival? Show me the line today which divides culture from politics, education from foreign policy or science from war and the threat of war. At least there is no such line in the mind of Congress when it appropriates money for UNESCO. Was it not Hitler's anthropologists who showed us how to corrupt science and scientists for the political ends of a pseudo-master race. Stalin's artists are disciplined to sway elections in two hemispheres with their posters. The great Russian male choruses are trained to give an impression of immense power and vitality to the audiences in Prague and Budapest.

What is the answer of our free society to the slave cultures of the totalitarian masters? Is it not in part the dissemination of the truth by all available means?

Is not the search for truth the most democratic of all pursuits? Is not the expression of truth the ultimate goal of all art and all science? And is it not truth to which we must cling as the key to real understanding among free men and free nations?

The dissemination of truth is the counter weapon, the only counter weapon capable of fending off and neutralizing the lies and distortions of totalitarian propaganda. The dissemination of truth is the supreme weapon in the battle for the hearts and minds of men—the political battle which is engulfing the world.

How far can UNESCO reach in this struggle? Is it willing to reach? And how far? Where is the infantry of the arts and sciences marching? Is it indeed marching at all?

I have been asked to lead off on our subject: How far can UNESCO reach? I fear I shall give some of the skeptics plenty to shoot at. My answer to our subject is a double negative. First, and negatively, UNESCO can reach no further than its willingness boldly to face up to the great political issues of our times. Who was it who once said that bold generals are sometimes lucky—but that no general is ever lucky unless he is bold? Unless UNESCO boldly faces up to the political issues of war and peace, I fear that it is doomed to the ineffectuality of the Arab scribes of the middle ages.

Secondly, and still negatively, UNESCO can reach no further than we in the United States will encourage it; and support it; and help it. In this sense UNESCO's future is up to us. This is the assumption we must make. If the United States National Commission does not help provide the leadership, and does not counsel the State Department to provide the leadership—from whence will the leadership come?

This is a very heavy responsibility for you who are here today. With each passing hour, as the world moves from crisis to crisis, the responsibility grows heavier.

Both of my negative answers were implicit in the very first report issued by this Commission. This was the report of the Commission's initial meeting, held in September 1946. I want to read one of the closing paragraphs of our report to Secretary of State Byrnes:

"The responsibility of UNESCO in this present crisis is so great and so pressing that the organization should not hesitate to employ any proper means, however novel or however costly, which gives promise of success. The organization itself is a new agency, daring in purpose and novel in structure. The means it employs should be appropriate to its nature. It must serve as the cutting edge for international action. If annual military expenditures of $13,000,000,000 for the defense of the people of the United States against attack are justified, 10 percent of that amount, and far more than 10 percent, might well and wisely be expended to remove or greatly to reduce the danger of attack. It would be cheap insurance * * * The National Commission believes that a budget in the amount of a billion or a billion and a half dollars, or even more, might well be justified."

That declaration called upon the United States to measure its support of UNESCO in bold terms and in military terms. Military terms are power terms; they are political terms. Note that this declaration did not necessarily call upon the other member states of UNESCO to match 10 percent of the United States military expenditures with three to four billion dollars, on a 38 percent for 62-percent basis, or a 33–67 basis. This declaration quite properly recognized UNESCO as a potentially important instrument through which the United States can develop its foreign policy. So also is the United Nations. As I have said again and again, the United States opportunity through UNESCO is to help provide effective leadership and bold plans by which the forces of education, and science, and culture can be marshalled on a world-wide basis in the cause of peace. They are means to an end only. They are not ends in themselves. The ends of our foreign policy are peace and security.

Now I am not going to try to spell out the specific troubles UNESCO has experienced in the past 4½ years. Many of them were foreseen from the start. Many are being overcome. As George Stoddard says, "UNESCO is looking up." UNESCO has a splendid leader in Dr. Torres Bodet. We no longer have to say as one university president once put it, "We cannot allow ourselves to be discouraged about UNESCO."

In Cleveland last year I asked Sir John Maud which he would abolish, UNESCO or Oxford, if he had to make the choice—judged wholly by the present and potential contribution of either to understanding among peoples and to the cause of peace. This proved to be a tough enough question to make an Oxford man wince and duck.

Manifestly UNESCO can never equal Oxford in the things that great universities do best. It should not try to. But if UNESCO were carried forward on a scale equal to its conception, it should carry a direct impact on the issue of peace or war a hundredfold and five hundredfold greater than any single university could. The universities help tell UNESCO what to say and do. It is UNESCO's task to say it and do it, not by slow seepage from an intellectual elite down to the masses of the people, but directly and by any proper means, however novel or costly.

Perhaps we can agree that the National Commission's declaration of 1946 was at the time primarily a declaration of faith in an idea, a deliberately provocative declaration rather than the expression of a realistic hope. Yet the timing was interesting, in view of a subsequent and parallel development. It was made 9 months before Secretary Marshall's famous speech at Harvard. Within a year after our National Commission's declaration the Nation was seriously debating whether to spend $15,000,000,000 for a European recovery program—a figure which would have seemed, in September of 1946, visionary and fantastic for any international economic program. Since then we have not only created and successfully carried on a European recovery program; we

have earmarked more billions for a program of military assistance to other nations. Now we are debating President Truman's Point 4 program for economic aid to underdeveloped lands.

The people of the United States have proven themselves ready to invest heavily in such foreign programs. They have become convinced that it is our national self-interest to do so.

The American people have not yet been asked to consider whether an investment in peace by communication and by education is remotely in a class with military and economic investments. The voices in the field have been few and weak. I have much evidence which satisfies me that the Congress and the people will respond to the idea that the national defense of the United States is closely tied up with better communication and better education on a world-wide scale. Those who believe this should now step forward and provide the leadership the country and the Congress need. Is there a nation in the world that has greater faith in the power of education on a mass basis for all its people? That faith in education, if it is fortified further with the demonstration of its close relation to national defense, is valid abroad as it is at home.

I have several times urged upon this group the consideration of a world-wide broadcasting network, with time provided for UNESCO if it can learn how to do the programming job so urgently needed by the peoples of the world. Don't be alarmed: I shall not go into that again now. But I have pointed out that, if there is to be a broadcasting network for UNESCO there now seems no way of financing its construction unless the United States is willing to do it. This principle has many possible ramifications. If it is in the national interest of the United States that UNESCO become a powerful force in the world—as I believe it is—then we should not hesitate to finance it if it has the leadership and the projects with sufficient promise. It is we of the United States who have the faith in UNESCO. And it is only we who have the resources.

Now I am aware that UNESCO is sensitive to any sign of what loosely is called American cultural imperialism, and indeed this is quite right and as it should be. And I would not propose that the United States increase its proportionate contributions to the basic operating or administrative budget of UNESCO. My suggestion is that the United States offers to finance, in whole or in large part, certain extraordinary UNESCO projects which UNESCO would wish to carry forward if it had the resources and which the United States would like to see carried out. If the leadership and the projects hold promise, and great promise—let us not assume in advance that Congress will not appropriate the money.

As Secretary Barrett has pointed out, there is no conflict between UNESCO policy and basic foreign policy of the United States. More than that, UNESCO's goal of advancing, through better human communications, human freedom, human dignity and human rights, is identical with the foreign policy of the United States. For UNESCO, this is an end. For the United States, it is both a means and an end. We have been altogether too sensitive to the possible allegation that the United States might be accused of being self-seeking in strengthening UNESCO. Two weeks ago I met with the International Relations Committee of the Connecticut Council of Churches. They plied me with questions about world government, about world federation, about union now. I replied that these were all worthy objectives and that the process of discussing them was a valuable process of civic education. But I asked that they devote themselves also to problems we can do something about—ourselves—now. What I am suggesting here is something we can at least try to get done—ourselves—and now.

There is plenty of precedent for a cooperative international enterprise in which one nation bears more than a proportionate share of the cost. UNRRA was such a case. The Emergency Children's Fund of the United Nations is another. ECA is another. So also is the military-assistance program. Now comes the technical-assistance program under point 4. This is to be administered partly by the United States, bilaterally, and partly through UN. UNESCO seems delighted that it will have 14 percent of the UN funds for point 4.

I understand that Dr. Torres Bodet has asked that the Florence Conference debate the question whether UNESCO can officially ignore and remain silent on the issues in the present international crisis. My hat is off to him.

Mr. Barrett has asked me to serve on the delegation, which unhappily I cannot do as nothing in the world interests me more than the future of those activities to which UNESCO is dedicated. But I shall fly over with him for a few days if I can. I'd like to participate in that debate. I don't want to receive a cablegram from Florence reading: "Flash: UNESCO voted today (with 12 nations abstaining) that there is a world and we are in it."

I agree that there can be no conflict between UNESCO policy and the policy of the enslaved nations if there are no UNESCO policies. But who is better equipped to enunciate the hope and the policy of free men and of the free world than those who understand freedom best, and the necessity of freedom to all forms of progress—the forces of science, education, and culture?

Let me give you a single example of the kind of role UNESCO might assume which would raise it to the stature it deserves and bring it to vivid life in the eyes of the world.

The State Department has asked for $18,500,000 for fiscal 1951 for reorientation work in the American zone of Germany. This is nearly two-thirds of the total budget High Commissioner McCloy is requesting for his organization in Germany. Testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee last month, Mr. McCloy described this reorientation work, among his three major activities, as "in many ways the one which may offer the greatest hope for long-range success. * * * This is the program of education designed to assist, advise, and persuade the German Government and people to take the democratic road. * * * Everything depends, the whole concept of western Europe, depends on that. * * * This effort is of overriding political and psychological importance." Mr. McCloy further said, "We probably could spend $100,000,000 in this effort and still not match the resources of the Soviets, but our methods are different and our objectives are different." (Let me say parenthetically that we should perhaps be matching the Soviet $100,000,000, and that Mr. McCloy, when he was Assistant Secretary of War, would not have agreed to any such ratio if it were a matter of comparative air forces. Let me also parenthetically read the following paragraph from a letter I received from a friend of mine in the British Foreign Office in London, with whom I became well acquainted at the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information in 1948: "Certainly everything that has happened since then has brought more into focus the priorities of the ideological struggle we talked of at that time. I thought the leakage of what Vishinsky said to the German Communist hierarchy in Berlin recently was most significant: 'We shall conquer the world, not with atom bombs but with something the Americans cannot produce—with our ideas, our brains, our doctrines'."

Now I ask whether UNESCO, rather than assuming a minor and facilitative role in Germany, cannot take maximum responsibility? Dr. Nieubuhr asks me to explore the whole possibility of turning the whole German education program over to UNESCO. If UNESCO cannot do a better job than the United States, or England, or France can alone—it, of course, can operate in all three zones, not just in one—why can't it? If it can, then in this one project alone it would gain the stature it needs.

I have mentioned President Truman's point 4. Is it not now time—and way past time—for us to recognize the need for a companion point 5? I urge point 5 upon you today and upon the State Department. Point 5 of our foreign policy would recognize that the central issue of our time is intellectual and spiritual, and that the heart of the present conflict is a struggle for the minds and loyalties of mankind. It would create a program on a scale commensurate with the problem. And it would not have a terminal date in 1952. The problem is perpetual and only the means vary. We sensed the need in our 1946 declaration, although, as so often happens among intellectuals, we were more interested in being right than in fixing responsibility for action and in seeing to it that action followed decision. Are we now ready to act?—and to bring point 5 alive?

Three weeks ago I spoke for an hour on the floor of the Senate on this general subject, and introduced a resolution through which I hoped I might focus the attention of the Congress on a grossly neglected area of supreme national importance. I believe George Stoddard has sent each of you the text of my remarks, and a copy of the resolution. The New York Times said in its editorial, "It was to be expected that Senator BENTON in his first speech in the Senate, should return to a theme he has developed before many other audiences." I quote this because you are one of the long-suffering audiences the Times refers to; and here I am again.

My resolution was sponsored by 13 Senators. I do not know how many more Senators might have joined me as sponsors if I had described it to more of them. I talked mostly with my old friends and did not seek a large number of sponsors. I did not make a point of asking the members of the Foreign Relations or Appropriations Committees because they, I hope, will consider the resolution. I have received only a single unfavorable reaction in the Senate, and I have received many expressions of enthusiasm—from very unexpected sources. My moral is that a bold program—a program that promises to make an important contribution to an important problem—a bold program has a chance of winning enthusiastic support and of succeeding; a timid program has none. I fear that some of us in UNESCO and in the secretariat of the National Commission tend to become amateur experts on what the public will accept, and on what is politically feasible, rather than concentrating on our true vocation, the discovery and projection of what is right and necessary. In so doing we underrate both the public and the politicians.

Those of you who read my resolution may recall that one of its six points calls for acceleration of the work of UNESCO to the point where, with effective leadership, it has a chance to make a significant, perhaps decisive contribution to peace. What I'd like to emphasize here is that each of the other five points could also be carried out by UNESCO, and often carried out better by UNESCO than by the United States.

Point one in the resolution calls for an intensified effort in behalf of worldwide freedom of information. This is obviously a UNESCO objective, and I hope UNESCO will do far more in this field. Point two deals with UNESCO. Point three calls for a comprehensive world-wide program of documen-

tary and educational motion pictures, for the creation of a world broadcasting network capable ultimately of reaching every receiver in the world, for an immediate expansion of our program of bringing foreign students to the United States, and for efforts to penetrate the iron curtain. Point four calls for promotion of democratic education abroad, notably in Germany and Japan. Point five proposes a conference looking toward a joint effort in the information field by the free nations; and point six invokes the cooperation of nongovernmental groups and agencies. Although I had the interests of the United States primarily in mind, there is not one of these six points that does not coincide with UNESCO's aims and program.

My final point about Senate Resolution No. 243—I trust you'll become familiar with that number—is that it is a beginning only. Many, many months may pass before it can be adopted; years may be required to put it into effect. You and the organizations you represent can do far more in its behalf than I can. But a resolution, even if it is adopted, is not a congressional authorization. And an authorization is not a plan and a program; these must be developed by the State Department and this Commission and by UNESCO itself. A plan and a program are not an appropriation. And an appropriation is not an organization or an operation.

This helps show that the road is long. It is unending. My own best role for the present—indeed the only productive role I can have at present—is with my colleagues on the Hill. Fortunately many are friends of long standing. For those of you who subscribe to Senate Resolution 243—and it is in substantial part a distillate of what I learned from you, and what I learned with you. I want to close by repeating something I said in welcoming the first group of members to the first meeting of the national commission in September of 1946:

"If we who profess a belief in education really believe the words which we so often use, namely that understanding among peoples is necessary to the maintenance of peace, then we who are responsible for this national commission face a challenge that is terrifying. But we must not admit that the challenge is beyond our group. * * * Many demands will be made upon our time and energy. I dedicate you here to hard work."

Seemingly I am here today at a rededication—to more work, harder work, the work of an age and a planet. But what task is there today which can compare with this one, the survival of freedom and the development of the spirit and the soul of mankind?

Disability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Disability Insurance," from the Washington Post of January 27, 1950, and with it an article on the same subject which recently was published by the American Public Welfare Association.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1950]

DISABILITY INSURANCE

Senate approval of the bill passed by the House expanding the coverage and increasing the benefits payable under the old-age insurance system is confidently anticipated, although the Senate may make some changes in detail. However, there is likely to be a battle royal over the proposal to pension insured workers who become permanently and totally disabled before reaching retirement age. For some Members of Congress claim that it would open the way for introduction of national compulsory health insurance.

In our opinion, that assumption is quite untenable. As a matter of fact that proposal would not involve any fundamental change in the old-age insurance system. It merely recognizes the need for a more flexible retirement system providing pensions for workers forced by circumstances beyond their control to withdraw prematurely from active life. Then, too, as the Ways and Means Committee report on the social-insurance bill points out: "The worker who has paid social-insurance contributions for a number of years—perhaps over much of his working lifetime—has a real stake in the system which deserves to be recognized. He should not be required to show need to become entitled to benefits."

Yet, under the present law disabled workers who may have made regular and substantial contributions to the Federal old-age insurance system are not entitled to receive benefits until they are 65 years of age. Unless they have independent means, they are forced to rely for subsistence on public aid or private charity. Moreover, the amount of benefits to which they can lay claim eventually, if death does not overtake them before they reach retirement age, steadily declines during the intervening years of enforced idleness. This shrinkage is due to the methods employed in the computation of their average monthly wages which in turn are used to compute the amount of their annuities.

While employees disabled on the job may benefit from State workmen's compensation laws, only 5 percent or thereabouts of all permanent and total disability cases are work-connected. Consequently, the vast majority of workers have no protection against loss of earning power caused by disability. In justice to helpless men and women who have earned the right to pension protection by contributing to the old-age insurance fund and who have the added misfortune of being disabled, this gap in the insurance system should be closed.

Objections to pensions for the totally disabled based on considerations of cost ignore the fact that such pensions would reduce the pressure for public aid. Nor is there any reason to fear that malingering would be encouraged by pensioning the disabled, in view of the severely limited benefits provided under the House bill, plus the requirement of a 6-month waiting period before payments would begin. Moreover, if a pensioner is tempted to sham illness, the examining physician can usually be trusted to discover the fraud.

It is conceivable that disability pensions, once introduced, might be progressively liberalized until eventually full-fledged compulsory health insurance might be brought in by the back door. But in view of the fact that the administration is already openly working for a national health-insurance program it seems absurd to assume that the outcome of the struggle over disability pensions will influence action on the health program.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 1950.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is meant by disability insurance?

Disability insurance means cash payments to insured persons which partially compensate them for loss of earnings due to illness or disability. Public disability insurance programs (other than workmen's compensation programs which compensate solely for work-connected injuries) are of two kinds: Insurance against temporary disability, now provided by five States and [1] which is limited to illness of less than 6 months duration and so-called permanent and total disability insurance which compensates individuals suffering extended disability lasting beyond 6 months. In neither case is the problem of medical care, health insurance, or so-called socialized medicine involved.

2. What would be done under proposals for permanent and total disability insurance now pending in Congress?

H. R. 6000, the social-security bill passed last year by the House of Representatives and now pending in the Senate Finance Committee, would add insurance against permanent and total disability to the present Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. That program, administered by the Federal Government, provides cash benefits related to previous earnings for retired persons over 65 years of age and their families, and for the widows and orphans of deceased workers, out of an insurance fund built up by contributions from covered workers and their employers. Under H. R. 6000 a worker forced by extended disability to retire before 65 would draw the same primary OASI benefit payment to which he would have been entitled were he 65.

3. Who would be covered by permanent and total disability insurance?

All those workers included in the program of old-age and survivors insurance would likewise be protected against premature retirement due to extended total disability. Under the provisions of H. R. 6000 this would include virtually all working people except farm operators, farm workers, part-time domestic workers, and certain self-employed professional groups such as doctors, dentists, and lawyers. However, the advisory council on social security, appointed to advise the Senate Finance Committee in 1947–48, has recommended that all these groups be included in the social-insurance program and hence covered against loss of income due to protracted disability. This wider coverage will undoubtedly receive careful consideration in the Senate Finance Committee.

4. What kind of disability would entitle a covered worker to disability benefits?

An insured worker, to qualify for permanent and total disability benefits must be stricken with a medically demonstrable illness, injury, or other physical or mental impairment which makes it impossible for him to continue any substantial gainful activity or must be blind. The disability must have existed for 6 months before any benefit can be paid and must be presumed to be permanent by medical diagnosis. The Advisory Council recommended a somewhat more liberal concept of permanence in disability.

5. What benefit would a disabled worker receive?

Under H. R. 6000, the beneficiary of disability insurance would receive the primary benefit to which his past earning record would have entitled him on retirement, but no dependents' benefits. Thus a worker with an average earning of $2,400 a year would receive a basic benefit of $60 a month plus an additional one-half of 1 percent for each year

[1] New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, California, and Washington.

he had worked in covered employment. The minimum primary benefit would be $25 a month; the average around $50. If the disablement were one of the relatively few covered by workmen's compensation he would receive his social security disability benefit reduced by an amount equal to one-half of whichever of the two benefits was smaller.

6. Is there a real need for protection against permanent and total disability?

Prolonged total disability is one of the chief causes of poverty in the United States. When a father is so seriously disabled that he can no longer work his children and his wife are almost always threatened with destitution. He may require considerable care, and doctor bills inevitably pile up. The mother must try to find work; perhaps older children must quit school and look for jobs. Savings and hope for the future rapidly disappear.

Moreover, it is not the individual alone who bears the burden of disablement. Over three-fourths of a million persons on the Federally aided public assistance rolls are there because of disability. An additional one-third of a million persons receive State and locally financed general assistance because the person who would normally support them is disabled. About 89,000 needy blind persons receive public aid, and private charities and relatives care for uncounted thousands more who are in need because disabilities keep them from working. It is estimated that well over 2,000,000 potential workers have been totally disabled for more than 6 months, and that only a few have sufficient resources to be self-supporting.

7. Can't workers provide protection for themselves against loss of income on account of disability?

The large majority of working people have no means of protecting themselves against income loss when they become permanently and totally disabled. Private insurance policies providing cash benefits for long-term disability are not available to most people, either because of cost or because the individuals are not first-class risks. Some union contracts include limited provisions for disability protection, and a few private employers have plans providing disability benefits, but most of the latter require many years of service before the employee is eligible. Under certain circumstances, veterans, railroad employees, and some employees in State or Federal Government work can draw cash bnefits if they become totally disabled. Most workers who are injured on the job or suffer work-connected illnesses can draw benefits under State workmen's compensation laws, but work-connected illnesses and injuries make up only about 5 percent of all total disabilities. For most workers, serious disablement means loss of savings and other assets, and, if the disability is prolonged, an eventual resort to public aid.

8. Would disability insurance be a desirable way of meeting this problem, or is it better to take care of disabled persons through public assistance?

Contributory social insurance is the best primary means of meeting the major causes of income loss both from the point of view of the individual and of economic and social factors. This view has been expressed by most people who have studied the problem. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in its report on H. R. 6000, summarized its agreement with this view in the following words:

"The time has come to reaffirm the basic principle that a contributory system of social insurance in which workers share directly in meeting the cost of the protection afforded is the most satisfactory way of preventing dependency. A contributory system, in which both contributions and benefits are directly related to the individual's own productive efforts, prevents insecurity while preserving self-reliance and initiative. * * * The contributory system of old-age and survivors insurance * * * should continue to be the basic method for preventing dependency. Insurance against wage loss due to permanent and total disability will round out the protection of the insurance system."

Similarly, the Advisory Council on Social Security, in its report to the Senate Finance Committee in 1948, indicated that it was "strongly impressed with the seriousness of the problems created by permanent and total disability and with the social disadvantages of compelling the victims of this misfortune to depend upon public assistance. * * * The Council believes that the permanently and totally disabled worker—as well as the aged worker or the dependent survivors of a deceased worker—should not be required to reduce himself to virtual destitution before he can become eligible for benefits. Certainly there is as great a need to protect the resources, the self-reliance, dignity, and self-respect of disabled workers as of any other group. The protection of the material and spiritual resources of the disabled worker is an important part of preserving his will to work and plays a positive role in his rehabilitation." There is, of course, need for assistance to meet, on an individual basis, basic requirements not covered by an insurance approach, and provision is made in H. R. 6000 for Federal aid to State programs of assistance to needy persons suffering permanent and total disability. These two programs are complementary and neither can be considered a satisfactory substitute for the other.

9. If the individual paid for his benefits, wouldn't he regard them as a right, and wouldn't this encourage malingering?

A disability-insurance program administered by the Government would have adequate safeguards against malingering, including safeguards not available to private insurance. Under H. R. 6000, benefits would be paid only to persons who are dependent on regular earnings; in order to qualify, the individual would have to work for at least 5 years and to have substantial employment just prior to his disablement. Since the benefits would be considerably lower than the individual's regular earnings, there would be a financial inducement for him to return to work, and his earnings would be checked automatically through employer tax returns and income-tax reports.

Beneficiaries would be carefully examined by competent doctors and would be reexamined at frequent intervals. An individual's condition would be followed by local field offices through personal contacts and reports from local agencies. Where it appeared that the beneficiary might be retrained for work, he would be encouraged to undertake such rehabilitation; and if he refused without good cause, he would be removed from the benefit rolls.

10. Is it true that the payment of disability benefits would encourage rehabilitation?

Disability insurance and rehabilitation work hand in hand. The insurance benefits would help to lessen the worries and discouragement which usually accompany serious disability. With a small steady income a worker would be in a better frame of mind to try to fit himself for a new job. The benefits would provide basic security, but they would be low enough so that there would always be an incentive for a disabled person to try to improve his condition.

It would be possible to provide that the costs of rehabilitation would be paid out of the social-insurance trust fund, and thus the insurance would not only provide current income, but would also be used to pay for services which would fit the individual to return to work. Successful rehabilitation of disabled persons would, of course, reduce the burden on the trust fund and add to the productive capacity of the Nation. A provision of this sort was recommended by the Senate Advisory Council and was included in H. R. 2893, the social-security bill recommended by the President. However, H. R. 6000 omits the provision and leaves rehabilitation to existing State-Federal programs.

11. Would disability insurance be difficult or costly to administer?

Disability benefits have been successfully administered for years by governmental agencies, including the Veterans' Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, Federal and State retirement systems, workmen's compensation agencies and the social insurance programs of 40 nations of the world. The machinery for administering the present old-age and survivors insurance program—including the network of almost 500 field offices for taking claims can be used to take on the job of paying benefits to disabled persons. Medical examinations would be made by local doctors, who would be paid their usual fee for such work; the arrangements between doctors and the Government would be similar to those between doctors and private insurance companies. There is no reason to believe that the program could not be administered successfully.

For More Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For More Democracy," which deals with the Mundt-Nixon-Ferguson bill, published in the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, of April 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR MORE DEMOCRACY

The American Civil Liberties Union came up yesterday with worth-while comment on the Mundt-Nixon antisubversive bill.

Arthur Garfield Hays, the union's counsel, criticized sections of the bill calling for registration of Communists and Communist-front organizations.

He said that the inevitable effect of this provision would be to smear and probably endanger the effectiveness of good reform movements. The danger lies in the Commies' tactics, which are to worm into any and all possible worthy crusades in order to mislead the public and pervert the crusade to their own ends.

The facade of reform hides their real intentions.

They can, of course, take credit for the reform if it succeeds in spite of them, or have an instrument for propaganda and converts if it doesn't, which they prefer.

They invariably try to destroy the effectiveness of a reform movement, because they'd rather preserve social ills than have reforms within a social structure other than Communist dictatorship.

If they are found out in an organization and are thrown out, their classic gambit then is to try to wreck the organization.

Over and over again Commies have demonstrated that they are really for nothing that will help make our society work.

And time and time again they have proved themselves skillful camouflagers of their real intent.

All this is old hat, of course, but it's worth repeating constantly.

Therefore there is much in what Mr. Hays says; that there is danger of destroying the usefulness of innocent organizations and members by labeling them as subversive because of the Commies machinations.

One way of not having needed reforms at all is to make it impossible for reformers to reform. And that's one sure way of playing into the Commies' hands.

Says Mr. Hays:

"If it be true that our American institutions are threatened by advocacy of totalitarianism alien to our tradition, we must meet the threat not by direct or indirect repression, but by the free political discussion which is the very cornerstone of democracy. * * * It must be remembered that it was Czarist Russia in which repressive measures were first taken against Communists—and that it was Czarist Russia in which communism scored its first victory. Police state tactics will not destroy communism. Only counterpropaganda and more democracy will."

Senator Myers' Report to the People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my biweekly newsletter, dated April 6, on the general subject of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

APRIL 6, 1950.

Peace-making programs will cost us an estimated $4,700,000,000 in the coming year—an average of about $30 per American. This is our investment in the survival and growth of personal liberty and free institutions in the world. Two world wars have taught us that our security is directly linked to that of the free world.

Economic assistance, military aid, and participation in world organizations are the tools being used to fashion the peace, and apply in two great areas—Europe and the Far East.

In Europe, the Marshall plan has stopped Communist expansion. "A near miracle" is Paul G. Hoffman's description of ECA progress in the past 2 years. Starvation has been converted into a diet adequate to grow and work on. Unemployment, in most countries, has been changed into nearly full employment. Industrial production is 20 percent above prewar. Agricultural output (after disastrous decline in war years) has been brought almost to prewar levels and is due to rise steadily. And most important—despair has been replaced by hope, and the Communists have been repudiated at election after election in the ECA countries during the past 2 years.

The 1949 Atlantic Pact signifies that the nations of the North Atlantic community will stand together against any aggressor that threatens their independence and freedom.

The military-assistance program, enacted by Congress last year to aid the North Atlantic democracies in bolstering their defenses, will give new meaning to the Atlantic Pact. This program is an extension of the 1947 Truman doctrine which furnished military assistance to Greece, enabling her to stamp out the Communist-inspired guerrilla warfare, and which, at the same time, helped Turkey fortify herself against Russian threats.

But Europe's headaches aren't over yet—and $3,000,000,000 of our expenditures are earmarked for Marshall-plan aid in the coming year. This is a big reduction over the cost of ECA last year and reflects the progress already made. However, if Europe's economy is to be put on a self-supporting basis, there can be no reduction in present efforts, because serious unemployment still exists in Italy, Belgium, and western Germany; trade barriers still hamper the flow of goods between the European countries and much more needs to be done to unite the European democracies economically; productive efficiency is very low by American standards, and much can be done through passing along technical assistance and our productive know-how; the dollar-gap, though closing, still exists, and further steps are needed to balance European exports with the things she buys from America.

In the Far East the point 4 program and military aid to countries outside the Communist orbit are the first steps to stability in Asia. Point 4—which will bring technical know-how and private investment to economically underdeveloped nations—can do much to stamp out starvation and raise living standards. This is the way to prove that democracy, not communism, is the only system which can meet and solve problems of social and economic distress.

These programs point the way to peace. ECA, the Atlantic Pact, and the military-assistance programs have halted the Russian practice of knocking off the European countries one at a time. By strengthening the economic foundations, improving the defenses, raising the living standards, and expanding trade, the democracies are daily growing stronger against Communist threats from within and without. These tested and proven methods will be extended to the economically backward countries of Asia under legislation now pending in Congress.

Peace is more than the absence of war. The ultimate success of democracy will result from proving what we in America already know—that freemen, working together, can solve the world's problems far better than any dictator. The costs of peace are great—but less than $5,000,000,000 yearly is far cheaper than a third world war when we stop to recall that the direct costs of World War II to America were more than $300,000,000,000.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Columbia Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Regional Authority Idea Was Born in Republican, Not Socialist, Brain," by Lowell Mellett, from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—REGIONAL AUTHORITY IDEA WAS BORN IN REPUBLICAN, NOT SOCIALIST, BRAIN

(By Lowell Mellett)

One of the President's pet projects bogged down for the time being is the Columbia Valley Authority, for which he asked in his state of the Union message and in a later special message to Congress. Any hope for progress on this great enterprise depends on the President's ability to activate the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House. Both have held some hearings on bills introduced last year, but the consideration given them has been desultory at best. Now it has been agreed to hold up further consideration until a joint subcommittee can hold hearings "in the field" and this junket is not to be undertaken until the rivers and harbors bill has been disposed of by the Senate.

The rivers and harbors bill, commonly called the pork barrel bill, was passed by the House last year, carrying a cost of nearly $1,200,000,000. As reported out by the Senate committee it contains projects with a total cost of $1,564,000,000. It is now at the top of the Senate calendar and may soon be disposed of.

POWER PROPAGANDA DRIVE

The foot-dragging on the CVA proposal coincides with an extensive propaganda drive by the country's private power companies against all such undertakings. By institutional advertising and other means the companies are spreading the Republican "liberty versus socialism" bugaboo far and wide, tying it directly to the public power issue. Just announced is a breakfast for Washington correspondents to be given by the National Association of Electric Companies next Wednesday morning. Purcell Smith, $60,000-a-year president of the association and popularly known as the town's best-paid lobbyist, has suggested to the correspondents that they bring along their editors or other friends who may be here for the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Opposition to all regional authorities is voiced in the platform adopted at Republican Chairman Gabrielson's February meeting. This has caused Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League and probably Washington's worst-paid lobbyist, to dig up some almost ancient history. He finds that the real father of the regional authority idea was Senator Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, one of the great Republican stalwarts of his day, a conservative.

KILLED STATES' RIGHTS JOKER

It was Senator Burton, Mr. King recalls, who, as chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, killed a State's rights joker in a bill granting a private company the right to develop water power at Muscle Shoals. Burton's action protected the precedent of Federal authority over the rivers and made possible the later development of Muscle Shoals into the Tennessee Valley Authority. That was in 1898.

Ten years later, Senator Burton as chairman of the Inland Waterways Commission in a report to President Theodore Roosevelt, recommended the development of the Mississippi from mouth to source, with provision for flood control, land reclamation, reforestation and water power, all coordinated. The projects, he said, should be planned, built, and managed by an independent commission, exclusive of established agencies. There was the valley authority idea in its infancy.

Not at all the child of European socialism as alleged in the GOP February platform.

Mr. King also recalls that one of the stoutest supporters of Senator George W. Norris in his long battle to save Muscle Shoals for the American people was Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1940.

Address by Hon. Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, on Anniversary of Birth of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], before the Sons of the American Revolution, commemorating the two hundred and sixth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Sons of the American Revolution, ladies and gentlemen, April 13, 1743, Thomas Jefferson was born; April 12, 1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt died. With the birth of Jefferson began the life of one of the greatest Democrats and humanitarians and with the death of Roosevelt ended the life of one of the greatest Democrats and humanitarians of modern history. It was a source of deep satisfaction to Roosevelt that, as President, he sponsored the building of this beautiful memorial of the life and service of Thomas Jefferson.

I speak here this afternoon as the representative of a State, which at historic Halifax, N. C., April 12, 1776, was the first of all the colonies to authorize its delegates to join in the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia, which in Jefferson's immortal words has since made July 4 one of the great birthdays of human liberty.

COMPARISONS

Along with Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson, in competent opinions, is one of the five greatest Presidents of the United States. The Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Jefferson Memorial have commemorated these three, whom history has chosen as belonging to the great of all ages. With Benjamin Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt, Jefferson is one of the three most strenuous, intellectually curious, and versatile public leaders in American history. With Lincoln and Wilson, he is one of the three greatest masters of English prose. With Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was the consummate politician whose politics became high statesmanship. With Washington and Lincoln, he was the most reviled of Presidents. With Andrew Jackson, who carried forward to the people and embodied for the people his democracy, Jefferson has given his name to an era and a quality of democracy. Both of the great political parties have claimed him as their actual or spiritual founder. Sympathetically with James Madison and oppositely with Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall, Thomas Jefferson was the author of principles of government which have been synthesized in the American system of freedom and union, local, State, and national democracy.

UNIVERSALITY

Thomas Jefferson, son of the frontiersman, Peter Jefferson, and of the gentlewoman, Jane Randolph, was a Democrat, a humanitarian, an educational philosopher, an agriculturist, a scientist, an architect, an individualist, a champion of States' right, a nationalist, an internationalist, and a humanist, who became a universalist in the catholicity of his mind, the sweep of his humane spirit, the depth of his spiritual faith, and the immortality of his influence.

DEMOCRAT AND EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHER

He was a Democrat who had enduring faith in the capacity of the people for self-government. While deeply sensible of the dangers to free government lurking in the ignorance of large bodies of people, he feared their ignorance less than he feared the tyranny of the privileged power of the few. He wrote the immortal words, "All men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" and that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." A scientific farmer, his greatest faith was in those who worked in the earth. He fought for and achieved the abolition of the laws of primogeniture and entail which had become the artificial basis for an American aristocracy of birth and privilege.

His very faith in the people, when informed, charged him with a passion for a system of public education open to all, with screening for higher talent in successive stages from the primary grades through the university. Self government of the people carried with it for him the obligation for public self-education of the people. His ordinance prepared in 1784 was the forerunner of the great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 which set aside land for the public schools. He designed, laid out the grounds and buildings, framed the curriculum, selected the faculty, championed its freedom and founded the University of Virginia. His spirit still haunts the serpentine walls and classic halls of the gracious lawn of the University of Virginia, an American temple of human freedom. He still lives as "Mr. Jefferson" to all the loyal sons of his university whose fatherhood he placed in highest honor along with the authorship of the Declaration of Independence and the Statute of Religious Freedom for Virginia. The freedom of the mind, human dignity, the education of the people, and government of the people, based on the consent of the governed, are the principles of the Western World's first preeminent democrat and still unsurpassed champion of the rule of the people.

His democratic Americanism was by his enemies called Jacobinism. He was, himself, often falsely called a Jacobin. The Americanism of his democracy, while watered from distant springs in the best English tradition of John Milton, John Locke, and the Bill of Rights of 1689, was yet self grown on the American frontier and from grass roots in the American soil.

The American Declaration of Independence has long been the bugle call of democracy to the peoples of the earth whether to the people of France in 1789, the Latin-American and European peoples in the first half of the nineteenth century, the people of Asia in the twentieth century, and the peoples of Indonesia today. Perhaps Jefferson's principles of human freedom and dignity and the consent of the governed will, with new meaning and democratic power, yet reach through the iron curtain which now hides the prison walls of the police state.

HUMANITARIAN

As part of his democracy, Thomas Jefferson, was a humanitarian, who was concerned with the welfare of Hessian prisoners of war; who fought to end the slave trade; who freed his own slaves; and who often, at the very thought of human slavery, trembled for the future of the Nation which he helped to organize with humane hopes of its meaning for the freedom of all mankind. With his strong strain of humanitarianism, went an insistence on balancing the budget and the liquidation of the national debt, as the basis of freedom and security.

INDIVIDUALIST

Thomas Jefferson was not only a humanitarian democrat with an abiding faith in the masses of the people, he was also a great individualist. He stood for the free individual with a bill of rights against the tyranny of a majority, or religious intolerance, or vested privilege, or centralized Federal power. He valiantly fought for the right of the individual to think, speak, publish, worship, and be a free person as the supreme fact and concern of democracy. He wrote the Statute of Religious Freedom for Virginia. He worked for and helped to achieve the incorporation of the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. He swore upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

STATES' RIGHTS MAN

In the interest of the freedom of the individual, Thomas Jefferson was a States' rights man. He believed in the functional value of the freedom and responsibility of the locality, the States and the Nation, whose composite federalism was a guaranty against the development of the centralized power of a totalitarian state. His theory of States' rights, however, was not an end in itself, but an instrument of freedom to keep the Government close and responsible to the people.

In Jefferson's day over three-fourths of the things by which men worked and lived were produced in their own household economy and local community. The capacity and authority of local self-government and the State were sufficient for the needs of the household industry and local agrarian economy. The freedom of the individual, the freedom of speech, publication and assembly were threatened by the tyranny of the Federal Government and its alien and sedition laws. The Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, inspired by Thomas Jefferson, were assertions of the rights of the States in behalf of the freedom of the individual to speak his mind and publish his views to the people. He would not use States rights in behalf of the intrenchment of the financial power of the few or the political power of slave holders or the economic power of privilege or corporate monopoly. Nor do we believe he would advise the use of the compulsory power of the Federal Government to abolish prejudice in human relations far ahead of what is in the minds and hearts of the people in the States. A States rights man and an educational philosopher, he would wait upon the more enduring ways of education and the humane spirit of the people in the States, rather than resort to Federal coercion which would cause set-backs in the clear progress in the relation of races based on deeper religion, broader education, and wider opportunities.

NATIONALIST

A States-rights man, he was yet also a nationalist in his outlook and influence. His

stream of letters to leaders in all the States helped to unite the 13 States into a combined struggle for national independence. His vast correspondence, his genius for practical organization, his democratic idealism, and his commitment to leadership of the people against the privilege and power of the few, made him the founder of the first enduring National Party. This party was the last bond which held the Union together in bitter decades. When this party split the Union was broken and war began. This reunited party has been a strong force for nationalism to this hour.

Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana, making its wide lands a responsibility of the whole Nation, was the act of a nationalist and a force for nationalism. Reaching across the frontier of America, the vast Territory of Louisiana was a bond which bound the Nation together with common lands from the Gulf to the Great Lakes.

INTERNATIONALIST

Jefferson was a nationalist who was also an internationalist. Excepting Benjamin Franklin, no American public leader has been more cosmopolitan than Thomas Jefferson. Steeped in the classical heritage of the Greeks and Romans, the political philosophy of the British, the enlightenment of the French encyclopedists, his correspondence included some of the choicest spirits of the old world and the new. Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations and Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence both came in 1776 as the birth cries of economic individualism and political freedom in Europe and America.

His Summary View of the Rights of British America prophetically envisaged the present British Commonwealth as an international union of free peoples. When he sensed that the dictatorship of Napoleon might threaten the freedom and integrity of America by his possible possession of the Louisiana Territory he declared, in that event, we would marry ourselves to the British Fleet and thus join two great federations of peoples against the threats of imperial power. One hundred and fifty years ago when the north African pirates preyed upon the commerce of nations, Thomas Jefferson proposed the cooperation of nations to enforce safety and peace upon the seas. Ahead of his times, Jefferson resorted to economic boycott instead of war against the great powers, prophetic of the sanctions for peace yet to come among the nations of the world.

THE MEANING OF AMERICA

We are grateful to the Sons of the American Revolution for reminding us today of the life and work of Thomas Jefferson, born on this day 207 years ago. The Sons of the great American Revolution will not let us in our day become the fathers of a great American reaction. We must not allow the shibboleths of human liberty, which came flaming from the soul of Thomas Jefferson in behalf of the freedom of forgotten people in the eighteenth century, to be turned in reverse against the freedom of forgotten millions in the twentieth century.

As we see these men of the United States Navy and the veterans of the world war here this afternoon, we need to remember that within the decade past the freedom for which Jefferson stood was renounced or crushed in almost half the world. The Axis powers reached in conquering might from the top of Norway to the Bay of Biscay, across Europe to the Volga and across North Africa to the gates of Alexandria; from the islands off Alaska to the islands off Australia and across Asia almost to the gates of India.

In such a world, darkening with Fascist tyranny, the allied forces bravely held on in grim desperation. The youth of America went into these embattled lines and turned the tides at last upon the seas and lands on all the farthest fronts to save freedom on this imperiled earth. As we remember Thomas Jefferson, we also remember our comrades who died that we might be free. "Lord God of host, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget."

In the remembrance of our heroic dead may we have a deeper sense of the meaning of America. This strategic land of vast resources, stored up and saved for thousands of years for the development by the fresh people of the west, of an abundance undreamed of even by modern man, cannot, without losing its own soul, withhold the hopes of food and freedom from the broken and bewildered peoples of the earth. This blessed America, heir of all region and races, colors, and creeds, the haven of heretics and refugees in the years of its weakness, must not become the stronghold of bigots in the days of its power. We must not scorn or hate less fortunate people, but even while strongly guarding against totalitarian tyranny and aggression, we must have compassion for people in wide lands where dictatorships became not a transition to freedom and peace, but an inevitably cruel fixation for increasing tyranny and power.

America must be made safe for both democracy and differences, we must have compassion for people in wide lands where dictatorships became not a transition to freedom and peace, but an inevitably cruel fixation for increasing tyranny and power.

America must be made safe for both democracy and differences, where the answer to error is not terror; where democracy is achieved without vulgarity and excellence without arrogance; where the majority is without tyranny, the minority without fear, and all people have hope.

On this day and in this place may we take this commemoration of Thomas Jefferson a rededication of ourselves to carry forward the spirit of the American Revolution for that human freedom and equal opportunity to which he gave his dedicated life. As we look across the river into the historic commonwealth which gave him to the Nation and to the world, we see in our mind's eyes a tall reddish-sandy haired, sunny faced young man come down from the Virginia hills to take up his lifelong struggle for human liberty, the self government of the people, and international cooperation for justice and peace in the world.

In the face of monstrous Fascist and Communist totalitarian tyrannies, which in our day have threatened, and still threaten, to destroy the freedom and degrade the dignity of individual human beings, let us, as loyal Sons of the American Revolution, swear with him on the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the body, the mind, and the spirit of man. While we guard our freedom against the conspiracies, infiltrations, and aggressions of fanatical international communism, we must not, ourselves, go totalitarian and lose our own historic liberties. Freedom must resume again its upward human pilgrimage of the centuries of struggle and faith.

Jefferson still lives. America carries on. Totalitarian tyranny must sometime begin to give way to human freedom now enslaved behind the iron curtain, but never dead within the human spirit. The light of liberty will yet shine through the iron curtain of men's minds. The warmth of human brotherhood will yet melt away the iron curtain of men's hearts. The peoples' hopes of freedom and peace still fly their flags high in the western world and across the eastern seas, where people this last Sunday looked up in prayer to the Easter morning of their aspirations for one free and federated world neighborhood of human brotherhood, we all pray God in our time.

Auto Liability Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Auto Liability Insurance," which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on April 6.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTO LIABILITY INSURANCE

(By Eleanor Morehead)

Most American motorists are driving more carefully than ever before, according to accident records.

But the 15-to-24 age group has racked up so bad a driving record since the end of World War II that most auto liability insurance firms have sharply boosted the premium rates for drivers under 25.

Youthful recklessness at the wheel of a stripped-down "hot rod" or decrepit jalopy has raised this age group's postwar auto accident death rate to 31.2 persons per 100,000—an 86 percent increase over the 1923–27 rate.

On the other hand, the Nation's traffic death rate as a whole has been cut 41 percent in the last 3 years, according to the President's Highway Safety Conference.

It dropped last year to 7.1 deaths for each 100,000,000 miles of highway travel, the lowest in automotive history. Nevertheless, 31,500 persons died in traffic accidents last year.

RESPONSIBILITY LAWS

Because grave social problems often are involved in these accidents if a driver is unable to compensate financially for the damage he has caused, 45 of the States have adopted laws on financial responsibility for auto accidents. Pennsylvania's law went into effect on February 1.

Massachusetts is the only State with a compulsory-insurance law. Connecticut, in addition to a financial-responsibility law, requires insurance of vehicles operated by drivers between the ages of 16 and 18. Texas requires financial responsibility only of operators of commercial vehicles.

Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina are the only States without financial-responsibility laws.

In general, such laws call for the deposit of security and/or proof of future responsibility in the event of an accident, or upon conviction and judgment arising from an accident, or both. If these provisions are not met, the driving privilege is suspended.

INSURANCE COMPANIES OPPOSED

However, compulsory insurance is opposed by the occasional driver and by the careful driver. These complain that they are penalized for the sins of the careless driver.

It is opposed also by the insurance companies. They argue that it leads to an enormous increase in litigation; that juries are much more apt to be generous when an insurance company foots the bill; and that compulsory insurance promotes fraud and racketeering in claims.

The companies charge also that it is unfair to require them to insure drivers with bad accident records.

Because wartime gasoline rationing limited motoring, insurance rates were reduced during the war. They were quickly revised upward for all age groups after the war.

The Kerr-Thomas Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Kerr-Thomas Gas Bill," which was published in the Montgomery Advertiser for April 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KERR-THOMAS GAS BILL

It seems to us that, purely as a matter of tentative policy that could be changed, President Truman should sign the Kerr-Thomas bill which exempts natural gas producers from Federal price control.

It is a complex question because of the difficulty in determining whether there is enough true competition among producers to regulate prices. That cannot now be answered yes or no.

The situation is this. The country is going to natural gas. The gas is transported from the Southwest by pipe lines. But those that own the pipe lines are not the producers of the gas. They buy their gas and transport it across the country for sale to consumers.

The question is whether to exempt the producers' gas prices to the pipe liners. For if the producers run the price of the gas up, the pipe liners will of course pass the increases on to the public.

In the United States system, we accept the principle of controlling prices where a monopoly exists, as in the case of railroads and power companies. These controls are imposed in place of the controls that operate on prices through competition.

There is a fine point as to whether pipe lines are monopolies like a railroad. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, chief opponent of the Kerr-Thomas bill, contends that pipe lines are monopolistic. He points out that they are extremely costly and an owner can go around taking them up from connection with one producer and laying them down to another with a lower price on gas.

DOUGLAS holds that it is a question of whether "the great gifts of nature, placed here we believe by divine power, are to be appropriated by the few or be administered as a trusteeship for the people of the Nation when these resources are essential to consumers but do not lend themselves to competitive methods of sales and distribution."

The proponents of the bill counter that there will be competition to restrain profiteering because there are 2,300 producers. DOUGLAS responds that this is deceptive because 3 percent of these sold 70 percent of the gas in 1947.

There is evidence to support DOUGLAS' contention that producers will get around to charging all the traffic will bear. One increase now pending would cost the consumers of four States $5,000,000 yearly.

Nevertheless, the case is not proved and wherever it is possible to avoid adding a Government control and adding a regiment of enforcement officials, it should be done. There is a provision in the Kerr bill that directs the Federal Power Commission to make a continuing study of producer prices and report to the President and Congress. If this surveillance reveals unreasonable price rises, gas production can, and should, then be placed under control.

Communists in the Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Hamilton Fish, a former Member of the House of Representatives, regarding the inquiry being made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with an editorial entitled "Cut Out Politics: Get Facts on Reds!" from the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 11, 1950.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was shocked but not surprised by the callous and unfounded statement of Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, that our foreign relations "could not be in hands more capable or more trustworthy" than those of Secretary of State Acheson.

I was responsible for the appointment of Mr. Patterson from my congressional district, as a Federal judge, in the closing days of the Hoover administration. At that time he was a stanch Republican. He later joined the Roosevelt administration as Under Secretary of War, and became one of its foremost supporters on foreign and domestic issues. He supported Roosevelt openly, and ceased to enroll as a Republican in Putnam County, N. Y. In the 1948 election he told numerous friends that he intended to vote for Harry Truman for President. Not long ago, Robert Patterson wrote a similar letter of endorsement of Alger Hiss.

I in no way question his right to express his views on Dean Acheson's "keen insight and clear understanding of the aims and purposes of the Russian Government." However, I do question his right to speak as a Republican. Furthermore, Dean Acheson has been so tragically wrong on China, Germany, and Spain that he should be removed without delay. In any other country he would have been ousted long before, because of his record of blunders that will plague us for years to come. Dean Acheson has outlived his usefulness.

I doubt if there will be, or can be any unity behind his so-called bipartisan foreign policies, no matter how many Republicans are appointed to bolster his dismal failures, and also friendship for Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury, and virtually of disloyalty. There is something very rotten in the State Department. In the last 4 years 134 Communists and subversives and 91 homosexuals have been dismissed from the State Department.

Who is responsible for their appointment, and for the appointment of Alger Hiss, and Julian Wadleigh, self-admitted spy, to key positions in the State Department? The American people have a right to know. They look to you, Senator, to continue your fight to present these facts to the public, and to compel the reopening of the Amerasia case that smells to high heaven, and, if fully exposed would dwarf the Hiss conviction.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,
HAMILTON FISH.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 14, 1950]

CUT OUT POLITICS: GET FACTS ON REDS

By adopting an obvious politics-first approach to the serious charges against the State Department made by Senator Joseph McCarthy, President Truman, and Senator Millard E. Tydings have diminished the likelihood that the public will soon learn the whole truth about this vitally important matter.

Instead of pressing vigorously for a thorough, impartial sifting of the charges, both the President and TYDINGS have chosen to treat the whole affair as a partisan game.

And instead of getting a satisfactory, thorough, let-the-chips-fall-where-they-may report on the presence or absence of Communists in the State Department, the public is liable to witness another display of election-year politics and not much more.

This newspaper has criticized Senator McCARTHY'S failure to back up his sensational charges with evidence and his irresponsible use of smear tactics which can have a grave effect on both the revival of bipartisan foreign policy and on our prestige abroad.

But the very seriousness of the charges, and the fact, backed up by evidence in the Alger Hiss trial, that there have been Communist agents in the State Department, makes it inexcusable for the administration to fail to get to the bottom of them and let the public know what is found.

Public confidence in the State Department won't be restored by a President who, after quite properly refusing to disclose confidential files, proceeds to join in a political row with wisecracks aimed at McCARTHY.

Nor will it be enhanced by a chairman of the committee investigating the charges who shows more interest in the possible political gain that might accrue to an investigator, than to the man's fitness to do a fair, deep digging, honest, job of getting the facts.

That appears to be the position of TYDINGS, head of the Senate subcommittee probing McCARTHY'S charges. He at first blocked and now has withdrawn his objection to the appointment of Frederick Ayer, Jr., of Massachusetts, as a member of the investigative staff. His objection was based on the fact that Ayer is a candidate for the Republican nomination for attorney general of his home State.

Who isn't candidate, among all those connected with the probe? Senators McMAHON and HICKENLOOPER of the committee are, and so, for that matter, is TYDINGS himself.

This was more than a slap at Senator LODGE, who nominated Ayer. LODGE'S refusal to engage in extreme partisanship, and his insistence on facts, instead of unsupported charges, have been commendable and, moreover, merit better treatment from the committee chairman. As far as the record shows, Ayer shares LODGE'S repugnance to harming innocent persons through unsubstantiated charges.

But TYDINGS should realize that the President's refusal to turn over his secret files makes it all the more important that the committee's own investigation be exhaustive, effective, and free from any suspicion of partisanship. A staff of able investigators,

drawn from both parties, is essential to such a probe.

It is encouraging that widespread criticism, coupled with LODGE'S own angry blast, has led TYDINGS to change his mind about Ayer. We hope Ayer, or someone else fully qualified, takes the job and starts digging for any facts behind MCCARTHY'S accusations.

It would be more encouraging if President Truman recognized the intense public interest—and public stake—in the situation in the State Department, and aided the investigation in every way possible, instead of regarding it as simply the springboard into a political free-for-all. That recalls his now discredited "red herring" approach.

Obviously there is politics on both sides in this investigation. But the public has every right to demand that politics not be permitted to go so far as to prevent a fair and factual determination of the loyalties of the men responsible for our foreign policy.

Both sides should cut down on politics in this inquiry. Get the facts on any Communists in the State Department.

Resolution of Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., on Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a tremendous amount of discussion on the subject of the surplus potato problem. In the course of that discussion there has, unfortunately, been a considerable amount of unjustified criticism of the potato growers—the little fellows working on small family size farms trying to cover their costs and to meet the consumer's needs for good spuds at fair prices.

Recently a survey was made among the potato growers in Wisconsin as to whether or not they want continued supports for Irish potatoes. The results showed that two-thirds of the growers oppose potato supports.

I believe that this grass-roots survey will indeed be of interest to my colleagues and to the American public. Among the many things that are clear from this survey is the fact that the Wisconsin potato farmer believes steadfastly in the free-enterprise system and that he, like other people in our population, is deeply skeptical about Government controls.

All of us are naturally interested in a sound, healthy, prosperous agriculture, but we are similarly interested in a free agriculture and a free America.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of a press release which I received from Mr. Cliff Hutchinson, executive secretary of Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., together with the resolution adopted by that organization.

There being no objection, the release and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN POTATO PRICE-SUPPORT STORY

Basing their action on the results of a survey recently completed among potato growers in the State, the board of directors of the Potato Growers of Wisconsin, a Statewide association of potato producers, passed unanimously a resolution demanding that the Secretary of Agriculture abandon potato price supports in any form in the State of Wisconsin for Irish potatoes.

In the survey, ballots were sent to 1,500 growers in the State asking them if they were for or against the Government program of supporting prices on potatoes and nearly two-thirds of the growers voted in opposition to the measure.

Edward Okray, of Stevens Point, president of the association, stated that Wisconsin growers were satisfied that price supports, as an incentive for production of food during the war were necessary and that they accomplished their purpose in providing an adequate supply of potatoes for the war effort. "The war is over now," Okray said, "and it's time that we farmers got back on our own feet and paid some attention to sound principles of farming such as supply and demand. We're making a great mistake in depending upon artificial programs such as price support set up by the Government at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers."

At present Wisconsin is set up in a four-State marketing agreement with North Dakota, Minnesota, and Michigan. Efforts to withdraw from this group have been made by Wisconsin farmers as far back as 1948, but to date the Department of Agriculture seems reluctant to let them go it alone. State growers want to withdraw and operate their marketing under a local board of control whereby the potatoes can be disposed of to the consumer on a free and competitive basis without any cost to the Government and at a reasonable profit to the producer. The association has hundreds of signatures of growers on petitions asking the Secretary to allow Wisconsin to withdraw. The signatures represent thousands of acres of potatoes, but the Agriculture officials say that unless the other three States vote to allow Wisconsin to get out that it can't be done.

With the big markets so close to Wisconsin potato fields, growers here find it a great disadvantage when competing with the other States. However, when a Federal regulation is issued it automatically applies to all four States and thus Wisconsin growers are often placed in a bad position.

Most State growers are now satisfied that there is no substitute for free enterprise and that if they are to continue to operate efficiently under a system of supply and demand that the Government should now step out of the potato business and let the farmer operate his own farm.

The parade of States grows longer each day in which growers are demanding that the Government allow the farmer to carry on by himself. Resolutions asking that price support be abandoned have been passed by groups in Pennsylvania, Idaho, Florida, California, Indiana, Colorado, Nebraska, and now Wisconsin has joined the list. There are rumblings in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Michigan but the latter three States have taken no definite action as yet.

The resolution passed by the Wisconsin association board will be forwarded to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. The text follows:

"RESOLUTION PASSED MARCH 31 BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE POTATO GROWERS OF WISCONSIN, INC., AT STEVENS POINT

"The Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., an association of potato growers in the State of Wisconsin, on this date, through its officers and board of directors, unanimously passed the following resolution: Be it

"Resolved, That the Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc., go on record as being opposed to the continuance of the price-support program in any form for Irish potatoes in the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

"Resolved, That we also oppose the continuance of regulation and regimentation of potato producers by marketing agreements, marketing quotas, and other governmental controls; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, all Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen, and to the daily newspapers in Wisconsin and the Middle West.

"This action was decided upon after establishment of the following facts:

"1. That nearly two-thirds of Wisconsin growers voted against price supports.

"2. That the past and present potato programs set up by the Government in Wisconsin tend to place the grower under complete subservience to the Government.

"3. The present Government program gives an advantage to the inefficient grower and penalizes the efficient producer.

"4. The program has increased consumer resistance to potato purchases.

"5. The program has reduced Wisconsin's potato acreage to the alarmingly low figure of 33,900 acres.

"6. In nonwar periods, an artificial economy as typified by price support is a tremendous and unnecessary waste of the tax money.

"7. In spite of several years' trial of Government programs the crop surplus has increased each year to a point where the industry is in actual danger of destruction.

"8. The Government programs have encouraged abuses and violations that do not exist under a system of free enterprise.

"CLIFF HUTCHINSON,
"Executive Secretary, Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc."

Equality for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, entitled "Separate but Equal," under date of April 12, 1950.

There is such a contrast between the tone and sentiments expressed in this editorial and the attitude of the Department of Justice in going out of its way to appear before the Supreme Court in an effort to upset a decision of another branch of the Government, the Interstate Commerce Commission, because of its violent difference of opinion with the tenor of that decision. The duty of the Attorney General was to support the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to seek to make effective its judgment and decree.

Any fair-minded and unprejudiced person will see the force of the reasoning contained in this editorial and in the wisdom of the position taken by the Christian Science Monitor, which is in striking contrast to the political expediency course of the Department of Justice in response to the demand of pressure groups. After a while it may yet dawn upon the extreme advocates of antisegregation by compulsory statutes

that it is not even good politics, much less good patriotism.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SEPARATE BUT EQUAL"

How can the American Negro be helped from what he terms "second class" citizenship to a status where equality of opportunity has genuine meaning? Opportunity is not equal when his available schooling is not. It is not equal when his advancement in job or profession depends less on merit than on racial attitudes. It is not equal where labyrinths of the law prevent him from casting his ballot in behalf of his own rights and interests.

That equality of opportunity is the goal, and that these are the chief obstacles, the majority of Americans, including, we believe, a majority in the South, will agree. The "how" represents the problem. And a most difficult and delicate problem it is:

How to approach the goal gradually enough so that the compulsions of legislation do not too far outrun emotional attachments to deep-rooted custom lest moderates be driven into the arms of the reactionaries, the flouting or evasion of law acquire social acceptance, and extremists of either side fan hatreds which only serve to turn back the clock.

How to press toward that goal fast enough so that those who have a vested interest in white supremacy in all its ancient and ugliest connotations cannot further intrench an old order against a changing world; fast enough, also, so that no militant fringe can exploit the Negro's understandable feelings of frustration to the point of irrational words and acts. That could bring the very explosive divisions among Americans that their enemies hope for.

The Supreme Court, in its disposal of three cases now before it, can either strengthen this delicate equilibrium or upset it. All three suits involve the now-famous doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities for whites and Negroes. Two involve education in State universities (Oklahoma and Texas); the third, the seating of a Negro Government official in a dining car while traveling through a Jim Crow State.

The pertinent precedents go back to 1896, when the High Court ruled that if the facilities provided were equal, the fact that they were separate did not violate the Constitution. This view was reaffirmed in a District of Columbia school case just 2 months ago. But it is contended in the three pending cases that segregation in practice makes equality impossible, and that segregation per se does violate the Constitution.

No one could establish, to be sure, that segregated facilities since the 1896 decision have been equal—far from it. But of late years lower courts have been insisting that facilities must be reasonably equal if they are to remain separate.

The effect of this has been encouraging. And the movement for regional universities and professional schools for Negroes gives hope that equality in education at the level where it is most difficult to achieve is a practical possibility.

We subscribe to no ideological or theological rationalization of segregation (some have been advanced in connection with cases now before the Supreme Court). We are concerned only that Americans may find the soundest and most workable means toward an end which needs no justification—equality of opportunity.

And it seems wise to us to leave the legal picture as it is: Permit States to maintain separate facilities if they are equal. But require that this equality be made real.

To throw out segregation bodily within States that still desire it would run all the dangers we have listed where law presses custom too fast and hard. To demand equality as the price for separateness, on the other hand, promises steady and peaceful progress.

This is, frankly, the course of gradualism. Some are always irked by the slowness of its workings. But in a social issue so intertwined with subconscious attitudes and convictions of right and wrong it is the only course which can build without destroying.

Socialism in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to socialism in Great Britain, written by George Weller, and published in the Washington Evening Star of last night.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITONS TELL US TO STOP GIBES AT SOCIALISM AND LOOK AT UNITED STATES ECONOMY

(By George Weller)

LONDON, April 13.—Britons wish Americans would stop scolding them about socialism and take a look at their own economy. If they did so, the British think, Americans would discover that the economic systems of the two nations are getting more alike daily.

Americans, without admitting it, are getting more socialist and the British are getting more capitalist.

Americans criticize the British for socialist measures like food subsidy. The British report: "Certainly we subsidize food prices, because we must to buy food abroad. But food subsidy in Britain is aimed to lower food costs, not increase them. Now you Americans subsidize dried milk, potatoes, peanuts, eggs, and fats. But you subsidize to keep prices high, and take an extra cut out of the consumer-taxpayer.

"Who has the more tyrannical form of state interference: You who subsidize to keep the cost of living up, or we who subsidize to keep it down?"

TO KEEP BALLOON TIED DOWN

Britain, like the United States, has a boom-or-bust economy that is producing far more than before the war. The Government's struggle is to keep the balloon, inflated to bursting size with easy dollars from the Marshall plan, from breaking away.

Yet, the British attitude toward the boom is the more conservative. The Americans keep on accumulating deficits and spending more. But Britain, which Americans assail for socialist free spending, has a budget surplus of nearly $2,000,000,000—one-third a gift of the Marshall plan—and is soberly paying off its debts.

Even the theme of the open door and the land of opportunity are reversed. The British have no unemployed and London's windows are full of "help wanted" signs. The British cannot get enough hands to run the big new productive plant.

The United States, however, has nearly 4,000,000 unemployed. Yet in London today, full of French, Irish, and Scandinavian new hands, you hear more foreign accents than in New York.

LOADED WITH CAPITAL

British banks are loaded with loose investment capital. The Government won't let the owners of the money put it into new business because American aid and British gumption have already built the productive plant to swollen size.

"But before you pity us for the restraints of socialism," say the British, "have a bash at the red tape hampering new investment in your own country. We are no tighter over here than your own Federal boards on securities. And at least we don't preach about an expanding economy, while tying it down with unnecessary red tape."

The British get an ironic kick out of Marshall aid being used to pay off the British debt. "If paying off our debt pushes us toward conservativism and away from socialism," they say, "you are leading us to the right. But what about yourselves?"

DEFLATIONARY IN BRITAIN

The Marshall plan, inflationary in the United States where it adds to the national debt, is deflationary in Britain where it reduces it.

A Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have had many requests for the report of the National Debt Policy Committee, of which I was chairman. This report, which was unanimously approved by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, May 16, 1939, accurately prophesied where this excessive spending program of the New Deal administration—Fair Deal and Raw Deal—would land this country.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am inserting the report of the National Debt Policy Committee:

During the 6 years of the New Deal, the public debt of the United States has more than doubled. The revenue of the Federal Government increased from $3,115,554,000 in 1934 to an estimated $5,669,000,000 in 1939. During the same period, expenditures of the Federal Government increased from $7,105,050,000 in 1934 to an estimated $8,995,000,000 in 1939. The annual deficits have resulted in a total deficit of $20,889,000,000 during the 6 years and a corresponding increase in the public debt. It is, therefore, not surprising that the per capita public debt of the United States has more than doubled during the course of 8 years, increasing from $131 in 1931 to $305 in 1939.

Despite this tremendous increase in the public debt, each year a larger and larger proportion of the total national income is being devoted to paying the cost of Government. In 1913 only 6.4 percent of the total national income went for Federal, State, and local taxes. In 1930, 14.2 percent went for the payment of such taxes, and in 1938, 23.6 percent of the total income of the American people was turned over to tax collectors. The share of the national income taken by the Federal Government has been increasing more rapidly than the share taken by the States and their political subdivisions. In 1913 only 1.9 percent of the total national income went for Federal taxes. In 1930, 4.8 percent was devoted to the payment of Federal taxes, and by 1938 it had increased to 10.9 percent. State and local taxes in 1913

took 4.5 percent of the total national income, 9.5 percent in 1930, and 12.7 percent in 1938.

The increase of the Federal public debt from $20,937,000,000 on March 4, 1933, to approximately $41,000,000,000 as of June 30, 1939, does not reveal the total increase of the Federal debt. A number of Government-owned corporations have the capacity to issue bonds that are fully guaranteed by the Federal Government both as to principal and interest. In addition to this increase in the direct public debt of the United States, the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government have increased by more than $5,416,000,000. When the New Deal commenced, there were no contingent liabilities of the Federal Government in the hands of the public. As of February 15, 1939, the total contingent liabilities of the Federal Government guaranteed by it both as to principal and interest and in the hands of the public were as follows:

	Outstanding Feb. 15, 1939
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$819,100,000
Commodity Credit Corporation	206,200,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,387,800,000
Federal Housing Administration	1,700,000
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,887,600,000
U. S. Housing Authority	114,150,000
Total	5,416,600,000

Thus, by June 30, 1939, the total debt of the United States, including these contingent liabilities, will be in excess of $46,000,000,000.

The present debt limit of the United States (not including contingent liabilities) was set by Congress in 1935 at $45,000,000,000. Of this amount, not more than $30,000,000,000 can be in bonds, and the remainder must be in short-term notes and certificates. The bill now before the House of Representatives would permit the entire $45,000,000,000 of the direct public debt of the United States to be in the form of long-term bonds. Before this statutory limitation is reached another $4,000,000,000 of direct indebtedness can be incurred after June 30, 1939.

It should also be remembered that a number of Government-owned corporations can, under existing authorization from Congress, issue additional bonds that will be fully guaranteed both as to principal and interest by the Federal Government, and that these bonds are not included in the above debt limitation. Inasmuch as a number of these Government corporations are not subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in the case of their nonadministrative expenditures, it is always possible that some of the money raised through the issuance of bonds by them could be used for purposes not contemplated by Congress. These corporations have the power, as yet unexercised, to issue more than $9,483,000,000 of such guaranteed obligations. Such authorizations and the unused balances are as follows:

	Total authorized	Authorized but unissued
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$3,750,000,000	$2,930,400,000
Commodities Credit Corporation	500,000,000	293,800,000
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000,000,000	612,200,000
Federal Housing Administration	3,000,000,000	2,998,300,000
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	4,750,000,000	1,862,400,000
U. S. Housing Authority	800,000,000	685,850,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	100,000,000	100,000,000
Total	14,900,000,000	9,483,400,000

Furthermore, in 1934 Congress set up an exchange-stabilization fund of $2,000,000,000, and the money in this fund can be expended by the President as he sees fit without audit by the General Accounting Office. The President could utilize the money in this fund to meet the current expenses of the Federal Government if Congress should not authorize an increase in the debt limit.

In addition, and with even more dangerous potentialities, the President has been vested by Congress with authority to resort to various inflationary devices whereby he can issue fiat money that can be used to meet the day-to-day expenditures of the Government if Congress should not authorize any additional increase in the debt. Under the Thomas amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933, the President can issue at any time $3,000,000,000 of United States notes secured only by the promise of the Federal Government to pay. It also authorized the Federal Reserve banks, at the request of the President, to purchase up to $3,000,000,000 of Treasury bills. Thus, in reality, the President can issue $6,000,000,000 of printing-press money that could be used by the Government to meet its day-to-day obligations if Congress should not increase the debt limit. If the Government should resort to the issuance of such paper money, widespread and devastating inflation would be the consequence.

Congress has vested in the President certain monetary powers relative to gold and silver which can be exercised in such a way as to result in a profit to the Government out of which the day-to-day deficits of the Government could be met. For example, if the President should exercise his power to devalue the dollar to 50 percent of its previous value or by the full amount authorized by statute, the profit on the increased gold stocks would be $2,762,000,000 in addition to the profit already realized in 1934.

Relative to silver the President is given the power to monetize our present silver stocks at $1.29 an ounce. If this should be done on our present holdings of over two and one-half billion ounces, the profits over the purchase price would be $1,612,000,000. Of course the President can also devalue the silver dollar to the same extent that he devalues the gold dollar. If he should devalue silver to 59 percent and then monetize it, a profit of $2,394,000,000 would result. The Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934, directs the President to purchase silver, both domestic and foreign, until the silver stocks shall equal one-fourth of the total monetary value of both the silver and gold stock of the country. If we should ever completely comply with this law, our total silver stock would amount to three and three-fourth billion ounces. Then, if the silver dollar were devalued to 50 percent of its present value and the entire silver stock thus acquired were monetized at $2.58 an ounce, this would result in an issuance of $9,600,000,000 of silver certificates which would be a clear profit to the Treasury at the ultimate expense of the people. Thus it appears that out of silver the Government can make a profit varying from $1,612,000,000 to $9,600,000,000, depending upon the circumstances and the extent of devaluation, and there is no question that the inflationary effects of this would be ruinous.

In summary, through direct inflationary means, the President has the following potential sources of funds which could be used to meet current expenditures of the Government: (1) $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks; (2) $3,000,000,000 of Treasury bills secured only by Government bonds; (3) a profit of $2,762,000,000 that could result from the further devaluation of the gold dollar; and (4) a profit of not less than $1,612,000,000 that could result from the monetization of the present silver stocks of the Government without devaluation.

II

The public-debt problem outlined above has resulted from varied New Deal attempts to promote a quick recovery by spending billions of borrowed money. In fact, spending, whether it is known as priming the pump, compensatory spending, or investment for the future, has been the center of New Deal thought and action ever since June 16, 1933. On that date the President approved the National Industrial Recovery Act, title II of which provided for the appropriation of $3,300,000,000 for a pump-priming program.

While this was the beginning of the world's greatest spending spree, the date has additional significance. It was also the date on which President Roosevelt repudiated his party's campaign pledge to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government and the date on which he washed his hands of his own solemn pledge and promise to stop the deficits and to force a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income.

Why he changed his views no one knows, but this much is certain: When President Roosevelt believed in a balanced budget he had faith in the future of American enterprise, but when he became a spender, he accepted the collectivist attitude that our economic system could no longer expand along former lines, and that unemployment and relief were permanent problems. To this he added the belief that future progress would come only through governmental action.

We have now had 6 years' experience with the New Deal pump-priming or spending theory. We believe that this is sufficient time to test any theory, especially a theory the validity of which has always been questioned, and which, if invalid, can result in economic disaster. As a result of a careful and thorough study of all factors, we reach the conclusion that a spending program, as such, has no place in a well-grounded and general recovery plan. Our condemnation is complete and emphatic.

The best proof that spending has failed to promote recovery is the fact that eleven to twelve million unemployed American workers are looking for jobs. In the face of this alone it is folly to contend that spending has worked, for in the words of the President; "to put people back to work" was the one purpose of the first spending bill as well as every bill that has since been passed.

It is equally evident that the stimulation of consumption-goods spending has not led to a revival of capital-goods spending. While there is no doubt that some stimulation of capital expenditures may be accomplished in this way, whatever amount has occurred has not been sufficient to promote a sustained recovery. Statistics contained in a study published recently by the National Bureau of Economic Research indicate that while total expenditures for durable goods and for private construction dropped from about $14,500,000,000 in 1929 to $3,300,000,000 in 1933, that they increased to only $6,000,000,000 by 1935, after 2 years of heavy spending. The figures in this study only go through 1935, but if one allows for a further increase of capital-goods spending from 1936 to 1938, it is clear that the total still remains far short of the amount spent before the depression.

In this connection it must be remembered that consumer spending has not always provided the original impetus for great periods of industrial expansion. For example, the railroads, automobiles, the telegraph and telephone, motion pictures, and radio, among countless other new products and facilities, were not the result of current spending. They happened because, as one economist has stated, "bold and enterprising men have had faith that future spending could be stimulated and that profits could be derived from such expansion."

The New Deal administration claims that the depression beginning in 1937 resulted from a curtailment in public spending, and that the soundness of the spending theory was thus proven.

The contrary is the fact. There is no better proof than the depression which began in 1937 that the spending theory is unsound because after 3½ years of spending the only result was a lopsided recovery. It was dependent on consumption-goods buying and lacked the support of capital-goods buying, without which a full and sustained recovery cannot be achieved.

Our examination reveals weaknesses in the theory itself as well as practical reasons explaining the failure of spending to produce the desired results. An analysis of the 6 years' experience reveals one bold, stark fact—that it is impossible to put men to work on Public Works jobs with sufficient speed to maximize the effectiveness of a given amount of expenditure. Another administrative difficulty involves the determination of when to spend. Since the spending theory assumes that public spending will be increased when private spending falls off, it is necessary to know accurately whether any given decline in private spending is temporary or whether the decline is to be prolonged and pronounced. It is questionable whether the art of economic forecasting has reached this highly developed stage. Furthermore, just as the spending theory involves the determination of when to spend, equally important is the determination of when to stop. Public spending, according to the theory, should be reduced when private spending is resumed. Work on large construction projects, however, cannot be stopped at will.

In addition to the above there are economic reasons why the theory failed. To a great extent these are psychological, but real, nonetheless. When the Federal Government set out to spend it fostered the rise of pressure groups, which in time have become imbued with the single objective of obtaining more and more aid. The claims of one group, if satisfied, are incitements for the claims of other groups.

As a result Federal expenditures have increased year after year; and since tax revenues failed to make up for the ever-increasing expenditures, the Budget has remained continually out of balance. Continuing deficits have made businessmen and others, especially those with funds to invest, distrustful of the future. As private spenders became fearful of the future they refused to invest, and the effectiveness of additional public spending was thereby reduced.

There were other so-called "depressents" to a resumption in public or business spending. As spending and the deficits increased, the attempt was made to lessen the size of the deficits by increasing revenues from taxation. As businessmen and others felt the increased burden of those taxes, their attention was fixed not only upon the present burden but also upon the ultimate burden of taxation as well. No one can view this situation with anything short of alarm, for business stagnates in an atmosphere of uncertainty and governmental competition and oppression.

Equally important but more difficult to overlook is the fact that other New Deal activities reduced any positive results that might have flower from spending as such. While the plan assumed that capital expansion would follow, other New Deal policies and acts have prevented this from occuring. For example, the New Deal enacted many tax measures which took money out of the worker's pocket and thus decreased his power to buy, even though the objective in the first instance was to increase consumer purchasing power. For these and other reasons we find it difficult to appraise the spending program apart from New Deal policy as a whole. We stress this fact in our report to you.

III

So far we have discussed the program only from the standpoint of how it worked and why, and have left until last our discussion of the long-term effects that will inevitably follow if we continue to spend more than we collect in taxes. We approach this particular phase with a deep sense of its seriousness, for we believe that the future of the Nation depends upon a clear understanding of these vital facts by every man and woman in this country.

We refer here to the threat of inflation. The administration earnestly professes to promote the welfare of all, but at the same time adopts a program which has always, without fail, led to enslavement and to moral and financial bankruptcy. Our study convinces us that there is no essential difference in our current financial situation and that which finally led to run-away inflation in postwar Europe. Inflation in every instance that we have examined has been the result of a government spending more than it collected in taxes, and this is true whether the inflation was generated by a currency or credit expansion.

Inherent in the very nature of inflation is its irresistible tendency to burst the bounds of all control through public panic.

We are further convinced that there are no greater hardships to be suffered by a people than those induced by such inflation. If we continue following the line of least resistance, we shall reach the limit of our credit. When this happens, all will fall before us. Savings, big and little, will lose most of their value. Insurance companies and banks will go to the wall. The endowments of our charitable, fraternal, social, religious, and educational institutions, endowments which have taken years to create, will be reduced to a mere pittance. The increase in the cost of living will put even the essentials of life—adequate food, clothing, and shelter—beyond the reach of a majority of the population. Even those yet unborn will pay the price for our folly.

No person or group of persons will escape. Wage earners will see the purchasing power of their pay envelopes shrink as inflation brings a ruinous rise in prices. As a result, the worker's standard of living will be reduced to the barest subsistence level. Salary workers will be hit even more quickly, for salaries are relatively fixed and adjustments are not made as rapidly. Those who live on pensions, annuities, or interest from lifetime savings will meet a like fate. Farmers will suffer even more than other groups, for though they might seem to gain temporarily while prices are moving up, this in the end will be an illusive gain. Recall that the source of present farm problems lies in war inflation. Should we embark upon a similar inflation, the farmer can look forward to only more of the same troubles he has been fighting for 20 years.

Furthermore it is doubtful if our system of free government and free private enterprise could withstand this shock. In this respect we call your attention to the fact that dictators now rule the peoples in Europe where government spending and inflation first ran their course. As President Roosevelt recognized in his economy message to Congress in March 1933, "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy." The profound truth is that a government cannot endure if through unsound financial policies and legislation it brings the nation to economic ruin. Such a condition produces all too often a man or group of men to whom the people in their despair may be persuaded to turn on the promise that economic security will be provided in exchange for their liberties.

Our present financial situation is serious. No one knows what the limit of Government credit is or when this limit will be reached. There is no exact figure for the limit depends upon circumstances and varies with conditions. Ultimately Government credit rests solely on the confidence of lenders in the taxing power and policies of the Government. There is no way to measure public confidence.

While the New Deal has been able to finance its spending at low-interest rates and without apparent difficulties to date such excessively low-interest rates are not a sign of financial stability but the sign of economic ill health.

Furthermore, the New Deal deficits have been covered principally by borrowing in the financial markets, by the process of selling bonds and short-term Treasury obligations to the banks. The process of financing deficits by the creation of new deposit credits is potentially inflationary. The fact that this process has not resulted in actual inflation is no guaranty that it will not, or that it can be controlled once it comes. Regardless of this, the New Deal has created approximately $9,000,000,000 of credit for the purchase of Government obligations and the financing of its deficits. The very fact that the banks have absorbed so large a proportion of the increased public debt has put them on a treadmill, for they must continue buying to support the market, and the more they buy the more vulnerable they become.

Also of vital importance is the question of financial preparedness, in event of emergency. The spending plan assumes that public indebtedness will be reduced during the period of prosperity that follows spending, but what happens if prosperity does not follow? In that event, or if a sufficient period of prosperity does not ensue during which the debt can be appreciably reduced, we will enter the next emergency, perhaps war, with the odds heavily against us. Wars are costly, and should we enter a great war with an impaired credit, there would be the threat of inflation to contend with from the very start. Thus a sound fiscal policy is necessary for an adequate national defense.

Unless spending is reduced our only hope is that national income will increase so that taxes will provide sufficient income with which to balance the budget. But this in itself is an utterly futile hope because under the New Deal we are relying upon spending to produce an increase in national income and spending has not worked that way, nor will it; it served only to make matters worse. It is for this reason that the monetary powers discussed earlier assume great importance, for as, if, and when it becomes impossible to force more Government securities into the banking system, currency inflation will follow. Thus, it becomes evident that sound policy involves not only a balanced budget but revocation of the monetary powers of the President.

IV

If we are to prevent the disastrous conditions that may develop as a consequence of spending more than we collect in taxes, it is imperative that Congress adopt a well-rounded program of Government action along the lines set forth below. A piecemeal program will not solve the problem. To have a maximum effect on the national welfare, all the elements herein suggested must be adopted. Above all the budget must be balanced.

(1) To accomplish this, Congress and the Government must adopt every possible means to increase the real national income. If the real income of the Nation increases, Government revenue will also increase and at the same time the alleged need for Government spending will disappear. The hindrances to production resulting from Government regulation, burdensome taxation and fear for the future have all contributed to hindering the increase in the real income of the American people.

A recent publication of the Brookings Institution has observed:

"The vital problem is to secure a great increase in national production and income. The central issue, with respect to public finance, is whether such an expansion of production can best be stimulated by extravagant Federal expenditures, increasing deficits, and heavier taxes, or by some modifications of taxes and a reduction of Federal expenditures—within the limits set by essential requirements. * * *

"Unless we can promptly secure a substantial increase in the national income it will be necessary to conclude that the United States has already reached the danger point in the growth of public indebtedness." (Taxation and Capital Investment, pp. 19 and 21.)

Real recovery in the United States will solve the problem of the public debt, but real recovery in practically every way depends upon sound Government policies.

(2) In addition, it is highly desirable that a thoroughgoing and intensive study of how the national budget can be balanced should be undertaken immediately. The budget cannot be balanced by a mere pruning of expenditures here and there. To accomplish real reductions in Government expenditures it is necessary to evaluate the functions now being performed by the Federal Government and to determine how those functions which are desirable can be most advantageously performed at the most reasonable cost. Some present functions could probably be eliminated, and other functions could be performed in a much less expensive manner.

(3) As previously pointed out, the President has been vested by Congress with the power through various inflationary devices to secure added funds to meet with the ordinary expenditures of the Government without incurring additional debt. The results of the use of such inflationary devices would be disastrous to the national well-being.

Lump-sum debt limit increases are as vicious in principle as lump-sum appropriations and blank checks.

Lump-sum debt increases offer the temptation to a gigantic political bureaucracy to spend up to the limit and ask for more.

Submitted unanimously by the Republican Conference Committee on National Debt Policy.

Daniel A. Reed, New York, chairman; Dewey Short, Missouri, Edward H. Rees, Kansas, Albert E. Carter, California, Albert J. Engel, Michigan, Albert G. Rutherford, Pennsylvania, Albert E. Austin, Connecticut, Albert L. Vreeland, New Jersey, L. L. Marshall, Ohio, Frank O. Horton, Wyoming, Charles Haws, Jr., Wisconsin.

The So-Called Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called equal-rights amendment is now pending before the Congress. I think all organized labor, the League of Women Voters, and numerous other organizations are bitterly opposed. The National Woman's Party and a number of other organizations favor this constitutional amendment.

It is conceded if the amendment were adopted, many State laws would necessarily be changed. I am in receipt of a statement from the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor concerning the laws of my State of Michigan, which is informative and pertinent to this issue. Pursuant to the permission granted by the House, I am including that statement, which is as follows:

STATE LAWS OF SPECIAL VALUE TO WOMEN

MICHIGAN

I. For wives and mothers

The primary duty of the husband to support his family (common law).

Admission of the wife's testimony without consent of the husband in desertion and nonsupport cases (sec. 17115–166).

Wife's freedom in disposing of her property by will without regard to provision for her husband (constitution, article XVI, sec. 8, Comp. Laws, secs. 13057, 13478).

Legal age of consent to marriage lower for females (secs. 12690, 12704, 12717).

Protects wife's dower (or its substitute) when the husband conveys his lands by his sole deed or mortgage, without providing a similar protection to the husband as to his wife's property (sec. 13072).

II. For widows

One year's residence, rent free, in husband's home; also 1 year's support from the estate, and an allowance up to $200 value in house furnishings and personal property (secs. 13090, 15726; 1939 Laws, act 288).

Right to select, according to the resulting best advantage to her, (1) the provision for her by the husband's will, (2) her legal share of his estate, or (3) her dower (if she is entitled to dower) (1935 Supp., sec. 13085).

Inheritance advantage in cases provided for by statute (sec. 15726).

III. For workingwomen

Hours of work: 9 a day, 54 a week (sec. 8324; department of labor and industry, regulations affecting employment of females and minors).

Meal and rest period. (The granting of definite rest periods of 15 minutes' duration, morning and afternoon or on swing shifts, etc., is a recommendation of the State labor department.)

Lifting or carrying. (The department of labor and industry, regulations on employment of women.)

Equal pay (Public Acts, 1931, act 328, sec. 556, reenacting act 239 of Public Acts of 1919).

Industrial home work (sec. 8337).

(Source: 1929 Compiled Laws and Supplements.)

A Bill To Reduce the Debt Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when drastic action will have to be taken by the Congress if this country is to avert the worst calamity it has ever faced during its entire history up to this time. The wild, reckless, and insane spending of the people's money, resulting in crushing taxation, must be stopped.

To this end I am inserting, under leave heretofore granted, a release as follows:

Following is a joint statement by seven Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee—Representative DANIEL A. REED, New York; Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; Representative ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; Representative CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska:

We have come to the conclusion that the surest way to force the Truman administration to come to its senses financially is to lower the limit on the national debt. When the House meets next week, we will introduce bills to reduce the debt limit from the present $275,000,000,000 to 257,000,000,000. On March 31, 1950, the debt was $255,622,574,315.

The Truman administration has embarked on a nonstop spending spree that can end only in disaster unless it is checked. Between March 31, 1949, and March 31, 1950, the Federal debt rose by $4,048,041,374. For the year July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, President Truman submitted a budget that would push up the debt by an additional $5,133,000,000.

Already the debt is equal to $6,768 for every family of four persons in the country. The interest alone comes to $152 a year for every family, and this interest is paid only out of the taxpayers' sweat.

President Truman has not demonstrated that he has even the slightest intention of ever putting the Government's house in order. He prefers the easy alternative of spend-and-borrow, hoping that he will be safely out of the White House before bankruptcy strikes. His lieutenants in Congress have shown the same unwillingness to face the cold facts of life and they have gone along with his spend-and-borrow policy.

Where there should be strong leadership on the part of the administration, there is a vacuum. Therefore, Republican Members of Congress have a responsibility to step in and force some sanity on the administration. A reduction in the debt limit would be a step in that direction.

If the measure is adopted, the Treasury will still have a margin of almost $1,500,000,000 in borrowing power to take care of unforeseen emergencies. At the same time the Government will finally be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Rights of Government Employees Transferred Under Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have received numerous inquiries about Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and have heard objections by employees in the custodial services of the Post Office Department that loss in pay or accrued leave rights would result from a possible transfer of such employees to the General Services Administration.

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, upon the call of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], held a conference in executive session on March 27, 1950, with representatives of the Government agencies primarily affected by Reorganization Plan No. 18. In a public release of the

same date our chairman listed those persons participating in the conference and summarized its achievement as follows:

It was developed during the executive session that arrangements within the executive branch are being made to safeguard the interests of the employees affected by this transfer of personnel. Assurances were made in the testimony by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Post Office Department, and the General Services Administration that, under proposed arrangements, transferred employees would not be reduced in salary, would receive lump-sum payments for accumulated annual leave. It was further developed that, in the case of postal employees so affected, by virtue of this transfer to the General Services Administration, they would be eligible for the more liberal annual and sick leave allowances now provided under the Classification Act of 1949 for civil service employees.

Notwithstanding this explanation, resolutions—House Resolution 539 and House Resolution 541—proposing a rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 18 were introduced on April 5. Of course, the committee will give due consideration to these resolutions and make a report to the House. In the meantime I believe it will be helpful to the Members to have a detailed summary of this problem and of the action taken following the conference held by our committee.

SALARY STATUS UPON TRANSFER

The present salaries received by all employees transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18 will be protected.

Under the Classification Act of 1949 the Civil Service Commission is authorized to determine what pay adjustments shall be made for employees coming within the classified system for the first time by transfer. Accordingly, on Saturday, April 1, 1950, the Civil Service Commission published in the Federal Register a regulation—reproduced at the conclusion of these remarks—which insures that present salaries will be protected for all employees transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18.

A perusal of this regulation indicates that in two kinds of cases, transferred employees might actually receive higher pay: (a) if their basic compensation was less than the minimum scheduled rate of the grade in which they are placed; (b) if their basic compensation fell within the salary range of the grade in which they are placed, but not at one of the rates prescribed therein. Upon transfer, those under the minimum would receive the minimum rate; those within the salary range of a given grade but not getting a prescribed rate would receive the next higher rate.

There will be also some employees whose maximum rate for a given grade under the postal-pay system is somewhat higher than that payable under the Classification Act of 1949. Although they will retain their rates upon transfer, for such employees the long-term salary ceiling will be limited to a lower rate in the General Services Administration.

ANNUAL SALARY INCREASES

Under the postal-pay acts all employees are entitled to an annual raise of $100 provided their service has been satisfactory during the preceding year. Under the Classification Act, however, the amount of the annual salary increases varies from $60 to $125 on an annual basis, depending on the grade. Under the Classification Act, in the higher grades, the employees receive a $200 or more salary increase every 18 months. There is no comparable provision in the postal pay system. This will mean that in some cases employees transferred will receive smaller annual increases. In other cases they will receive larger annual increases than are possible under the postal-pay schedule.

ANNUAL LEAVE

All employees of the postal field service receive 15 days annual leave a year. Upon transfer to General Services Administration they will receive annual leave at the rate of 26 days a year, which may be accumulated up to 60 days. All annual leave that postal employees have to their credit on the date of any transfers made to the General Services Administration will be paid for in cash by the Post Office Department. This will be done in accordance with section 3 of Public Law 525 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which section reads as follows:

SEC. 3. That all accumulated and current accrued leave be liquidated by a lump-sum payment to any civilian officer or employee of the Federal Government or the Government of the District of Columbia in cases involving transfer to agencies under different leave systems. Such lump-sum payment shall equal the compensation that such employee would have received had he not been transferred until the expiration of the period of such leave: *Provided*, That the lump-sum payment herein authorized shall not be regarded, except for purposes of taxation, as salary or compensation and shall not be subject to retirement reductions.

SICK LEAVE

Employees of the postal field service receive 10 days sick leave a year with no limit on accumulation. They will receive sick leave, upon transfer to General Services Administration, at the rate of 15 days a year, which may be accumulated up to 90 days. Not to exceed 90 days of accumulated sick leave will be transferred from the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration under the authority of a regulation of the Civil Service Commission published in the Federal Register on Wednesday, April 5, 1950. This regulation is reproduced at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to set forth the available facts which bear upon the status of employees to be transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18. A representative from the General Services Administration has told the committee that the GSA is anxious to have the rights of transferred employees fully protected, because of that agency's interest in maintaining an efficient and satisfied work force. I believe that the arrangements which have been worked out for the protection of these rights of transferred employees are reasonable and equitable, considering all the factors involved.

PURPOSE OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 18

Reorganization Plan No. 18 conforms to a recommendation of the Hoover Commission in its report, Office of General Services: Supply Activities—pages 10–11—that the operation and maintenance of public buildings, including allotment of space, be centralized in the one administrative agency concerned with general services and supply activities. By Public Law 152 of the past session, this agency was created and titled the General Services Administration. At the present time its responsibility with respect to public buildings management is largely confined to the District of Columbia. Reorganization Plan No. 18 would broaden this responsibility, in keeping with the principles laid down in this law, by including the administration of Government office buildings in the field. The President stated in his accompanying message—House Document No. 523, Eighty-first Congress, second session:

The transfers made by this plan will promote more economical leasing, better utilization of building space, and more efficient operation of Government-controlled office buildings.

In bringing together under one responsible head the functions relating to the acquisition and control of building space, now divided in the field among a number of agencies, Reorganization Plan No. 18 specifically excludes buildings at military and defense installations and space in hospitals, laboratories, factories, and other special-purpose buildings. Also, the present leasing authority of the Post Office Department is left untouched, as well as its space assignment authority in portions of post-office buildings occupied by the Department. These exceptions accord generally with the provisos in the report of the Hoover Commission.

Because the Members are interested in the relationship between Reorganization Plan No. 18 and the Post Office Department, it is well to set forth the pertinent part of the President's accompanying message:

Also, the plan excludes the Post Office Department from the transfer of leasing authority since the Department has a highly developed organization for this purpose, and it limits the transfer of space assignment authority in post-office buildings to the space not occupied by the Department. Further, it gives the needs of the Post Office Department priority in the assignment of space in post-office buildings. Thus, the plan amply safeguards the interests of the Post Office Department while making it possible to include the general office space in post-office buildings in any given city with other similar space under Federal control in planning and executing an efficient program for housing Government agencies in that area.

The Post Office Department operates 3,300 buildings, most of which are devoted exclusively to postal purposes. Buildings so used would not be affected by the reorganization plan. In the larger cities about 250 buildings are so-called multiple-use buildings, with a relatively small percentage of space used for postal purposes. These buildings, according to Mr. Burke, employ a custodial force of approximately 10,000 persons, about half the total custodial work force employed by the Post Office Department. Although no definite allocations of buildings and personnel to be transferred have been made as yet, these 250 multiple-use buildings with their 10,000 custodial employees represent, in Mr. Burke's opinion, the maximum possible transfer under the reorganization plan.

It will be necessary to make careful studies, building by building, to determine exactly which ones are to be finally transferred. The Budget Bureau representative, Mr. Joseph E. Winslow, who acts as personnel adviser to the Bureau, estimated that possibly between 2,000 and 4,000 employees would be transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 18.

The Deputy Postmaster General, in emphasizing his approval of the reorganization plan, pointed out that it would relieve the Post Office Department from operating and maintenance outlays for buildings not primarily utilized for post-office work, thus affording a more accurate picture of Post Office Department operating expenses.

The plan would also provide a central clearinghouse for space in large cities, putting an end to the divided function and divided responsibility between the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration.

At this point I will include the texts of the Civil Service Commission regulations, printed in the Federal Register, to which reference is made in these remarks:

PART 25. FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY REGULATIONS

SUBPART B—GENERAL COMPENSATION RULES

1. Effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register, section 25.103 of this subpart is amended by the addition of paragraph (d) as set out below.

"Section 25.103. General provisions:

* * * * *

"(d) Where an employee occupies a position not subject to the Classification Act, and the employee together with his position is initially brought under the Classification Act of 1949 pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1949 or other legislation, an Executive order of the President, or decision of the Civil Service Commission under section 203 of the Classification Act of 1949, the provisions of section 25.104 (b) (1) to (5), inclusive, shall apply in determining the employee's initial rate of basic compensation. This provision shall apply only so long as the employee continues to occupy the same position.

"(1) The rate of basic compensation of a subsequent appointee to such position shall be fixed in accordance with the other applicable provisions in this subpart."

2. Section 25.104 of this subpart is amended by deleting "802" from the first sentence of paragraph (b). This change is retroactively effective as of the first day of the first pay period following enactment of the Classification Act of 1949. As amended, paragraph (b) reads as follows:

"Section 25.104. Special provisions:

* * * * *

"(b) Under the authority of sections 1101 and 1105 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, establishment of initial salary rates of basic compensation for employees who on an effective date specified by the Commission under section 1105 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949 occupy positions under that act which immediately prior to October 28, 1949, were exempt from the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (including positions in grade 9 of the professional and scientific service or in grade 16 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service referred to in section 13 of such act), shall be as follows:

"(1) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation less than the minimum scheduled rate of the grade in which his position is placed, his compensation shall be increased to the minimum rate.

"(2) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation within the range of salary prescribed for the grade in which his position is placed, at one of the rates fixed therein, no change shall be made in his existing rate.

"(3) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation within the range of salary prescribed for the grade in which his position is placed, but not at one of the rates fixed therein, his compensation shall be increased to the next higher rate.

"(4) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate for the grade in which his position is initially placed, no change shall be made in his existing rate.

"(5) After salary rates have been initially established, an employee may subsequently receive an increase in compensation by reason of the operation of titles V and VII, section 802 (b) of title VIII or title X. An employee whose salary was initially established under the foregoing provisions in a position which is later changed to a lower grade without material change of duties and responsibilities, shall be paid at the rate he received immediately prior to the date his position became subject to the act, or at a higher rate authorized by the provisions of section 25.103.

"(6) The rate of basic compensation of a subsequent appointee to such position shall be fixed in accordance with the other applicable provisions in this subpart." (Sec. 1101, Public Law 429, 81st Cong.)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

[F. R. Doc. 50-2730; filed, March 31, 1950; 8:56 a. m.]

PART 30. ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE REGULATIONS

TRANSFER FROM POSITION NOT WITHIN PURVIEW OF LEAVE ACTS TO POSITION WITHIN PURVIEW OF LEAVE ACTS

Effective 30 days after publication in the Federal Register, section 30.410 is amended by the addition of paragraph (d) as follows:

"Section 30.410. Transfer from position not within purview of leave acts to position within purview of leave acts:

* * * * *

"(d) Whenever any employee in the postal service or in any other agency or position whose sick leave is not governed by the regulations in this part is transferred to any agency or position which is subject to the regulations in this part and the transfer of such employee is an incident to a transfer of function made by or under authority of law, there shall be transferred with the employee the accumulated and current accrued sick leave standing to the credit of such employee at the time of transfer. The amount of any sick leave so transferred shall not exceed 90 days." (Sec. 7, 49 Stat. 1162; 5 U. S. C. 30e. E. O. 9414, Jan. 13, 1944, 9 F. R. 623, 3 CFR, 1944 Supp.)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] HARRY B. MITCHELL, *Chairman.*

[F. R. Doc. 50-2820; filed, Apr. 4, 1950; 8:52 a. m.]

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] before a student convocation at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., on April 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, it is always a pleasure to visit one of Pennsylvania's great centers of higher education.

This is particularly true of Lafayette College because here, for a century and a quarter, patriotic Americans have upheld the sacred ideals of freedom.

A great procession of young men has gone forth from its halls, imbued with the spirit of a free school, a free church, and of a Nation which recognizes freedom of the individual as a blessing bestowed by God.

It is also a pleasure to come to Lafayette because your president is a devoted Christian, an outstanding scholar, and a courageous patriot. Pennsylvania is proud of Dr. Ralph Cooper Hutchison. He has served his church, his State, and the Nation faithfully and well, as every real American should.

Here at Lafayette you are preparing to share in the unlimited opportunities that our land of freedom offers to all its sons under the American plan of government.

Equally important, or even more important, is your preparation to meet the great responsibilities of citizenship in a Republic where the people rule.

The future of the United States depends upon the spirit with which the young men and women now in our schools and colleges accept those responsibilities.

The welfare and progress of our people depends upon the moral strength and the leadership that is developed here at Lafayette and upon every other college campus in the United States.

It will be your duty to preserve and strengthen those qualities which are the foundation of American greatness.

You must take your places in the battle lines to defend and safeguard America from those, at home and abroad, who would undermine and destroy our most precious possession, freedom of the individual.

With those thoughts in mind, let us consider some American principles and some of the dangers which confront us as a nation.

First, let us take note of our individual and collective responsibilities to our country and to each other.

It can be summed up briefly as follows:

To preserve for all time the divine endowment of freedom of the individual and to hand down untarnished to future generations our rich heritage of liberty and independence.

Those words are not mere rhetoric to be spoken on occasions like this. They comprise a living precept by which every right-thinking God-fearing American should be guided in his everyday life.

They are the essence of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. Those sacred documents were conceived and drafted by men who prized liberty above life itself. They were men of deep religious conviction. They sought the truth in the teachings of the Holy Bible.

One of the great teachings of religion is "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Therefore, for a moment, let us look at the real truth.

Our fathers established this powerful Nation of freedom by sweat, tears, and blood. The Republic they created has advanced, in less than 200 years, from a dense wilderness to the most powerful country in all history.

Other lands have had richer natural resources. Other nations had greater population. But through its plan of equal opportunity and the God-given freedom of the individual, the United States has produced

the highest living standard, the most advanced cultural position, and the greatest spiritual attainments of all time.

What made this unparalleled progress possible?

The answer is found in that God-given freedom of opportunity, placed in the basic law of our country, and proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence in these words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That made our advancement possible.

Please note that the founding fathers, in enumerating the sacred rights of mankind, placed emphasis on the pursuit of happiness.

They did not attempt to guarantee happiness. They recognized the truth that no government since the world began has ever succeeded in giving happiness.

The founders of our Republic upheld the right of every citizen to enjoy the rewards of his initiative, hard work, sacrifice, and persistence. Our Constitution is not only a great charter of human rights but it also protects property rights. The right to possess property is one of the greatest of human rights. It creates incentive by giving the individual the benefit of his labors.

That incentive caused the pioneers of American expansion to move westward. It inspired them to found homes, schools, and churches, and to build communities where they might improve living and raise the cultural and spiritual standards.

That incentive caused men to cross mountains, rivers, and prairies to discover natural resources, which, through God-guided talent, were converted into useful things for the improvement of mankind.

This forward movement took courage, initiative and sacrifice but it finally established a country from one ocean to the other. It carved out a new civilization.

These men did not ask the Government for security. They only asked for an opportunity. They had the self-reliant spirit that comes from faith in God, faith in each other and faith in the future of the United States.

Unfortunately in recent years there has been a great change in the thinking of so many of our people. They have been misled into believing that the Government can provide security from the cradle to the grave.

They have accepted the false promise of demagogues who seek to strengthen and perpetuate their power by pretending to be the friends and benefactors of the people.

Attracted by the hope of security, the people forget the cost. They forget that it is a part of the socialistic philosophy which teaches that all powerful central government can manage the people's lives better than they can for themselves.

They forget that wherever the people looked to the Government for security individual freedom was lost.

Wherever the people abandoned initiative and self-reliance for the glamorous promise of security from the government the result has been enslavement to the government.

Without freedom there can be no security.

As early as 1755 Benjamin Franklin said, and I quote:

"They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

There is a stern lesson in Dr. Franklin's warning.

Security will not be achieved by taxing more and more of the workers' earnings.

It will not be gained by going deeper and deeper into debt or by spending ourselves into national bankruptcy.

It will not be attained through fiscal policies which deprive industry of investment capital and destroy incentive for the expansion of our productive capacity.

Real security can be created only in an atmosphere of freedom, giving encouragement to a high rate of national production.

Increased production is the result of better machinery, better living standards, better management, improved health and educational facilities, more skill among craftsmen and higher spiritual standards.

None of these things are developed where the socialistic system wipes out desire to succeed. Every socialized state has reduced the standard of living and finally made all the people poor.

The difference between individual freedom and socialism is shown by a comparison of what a week's wages will buy.

Let us compare the buying power of a Russian workingman with that of an American worker.

An American worker with his week's wages can buy 394 loaves of bread against the Russian's 32. He can buy 276 quarts of milk and the Russian can buy only 15. The American can buy 82 pounds of beef and the Russian only 8.

The time has come when Americans should wake up to the situation into which we are drifting.

We are living in a time of aggressive and confusing propaganda. Much of it emanates from men in political activity who want to be known as progressives, liberals, forward looking friends of the common man, and other names which seem to have popular appeal.

But in many cases these fine sounding titles are merely political disguises. They serve as vote-getting cloaks to cover reckless and extravagant spending schemes, and to support tricky political promises of so-called social-welfare reforms.

The free spender of other people's money is always popular, but his wasteful, spendthrift course means higher taxes, more deficit financing, and bigger debt. In the end it means national bankruptcy, the loss of individual freedom, and the slavery of the Socialist state.

Let us consider the national debt which has reached the unbelievable sum of of $256,000,000,000 and is being increased at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year.

That huge debt is not just a bookkeeping item. It represents money that has been borrowed and spent. It must be repaid, together with interest at the rate of $5,500,000,000 a year.

The Federal debt today is $1,700 for every man, woman, and child in the United States or $5,800 for the average family of four. It means that when you go out to earn a living you will start with a mortgage of at least $1,700 against you. That is a most dangerous situation. It strikes at the foundation of our freedom.

Let us look at some other startling facts.

In 20 years the cost of Government has multiplied eight times. We pay almost one-fourth of our total income just to govern ourselves. We pay 13 times as much for Government as we spend for education and 40 times as much as we contribute to the church. We pay more for Government than we pay for food.

In 20 years the number of job holders on the Government pay roll has multiplied four times. In 1929 Uncle Sam had less than 600,000 civilian employees. Today there are nearly 2,000,000. In the same period the number of bureaus, commissions, and agencies of the Government were increased from 400 to more than 1,800.

The three levels of Government are sending out checks at regular intervals to more than 20,000,000 Americans. How long can that be continued before there will be no one on the paying side of the ledger?

Where does all this money come from? The answer is obvious. It is taken in direct and hidden taxes from the earnings of every man and every woman who works for a living.

Less than half of the Federal revenues are produced by the income tax. Over 50 percent of the income tax is paid by people earning less than $6,000 a year.

The greater part of Federal revenue is derived from taxes concealed in the selling prices of goods and services.

Those are the hidden taxes. No matter whether you pay an income tax in the higher brackets or no tax at all, you are affected by the hidden taxes that are included in the purchase price of everything you buy. They are a staggering burden on the poor, even though they pay no direct tax.

All of these facts and figures mean that government has grown too big, too complex, and too expensive.

It has been truly said: "That nation is best governed which is least governed."

Right now we need to think of America as it was really intended by the founders. It was not intended to be socialistic. It was not intended to be paternalistic. It was not intended to direct and control our lives. It was intended to give freedom and to protect opportunity.

Most of the problems that trouble us today are not the result of a break-down in the system upon which our Government was established. They have come upon us because of the weakening of the moral fiber of the people.

The destructive blight now corrupting American morality is the false hope of something for nothing.

We want security. We want our investments guaranteed. We want to borrow money from the Government. We want to sell our products at Government-supported prices. We demand new projects and new services from the Government whether we can afford them or not.

There has never been a time in the history of the United States when there was a greater need for a return to the principles of real Americanism.

The creeping paralysis of socialism is spreading through our Government. The danger of national bankruptcy hangs over our heads. Oppressive taxation and a growing mountain of debt threatens our progress and our standard of living.

To save America we must return to the fundamentals of the American way of life.

We must reestablish honesty, industry, self-reliance, thrift, tolerance, and the love of God as sacred principles to guide our daily conduct.

We must think more of the spiritual welfare of our country and less about the material things of life.

As I said earlier in my remarks, you young men must take your places in the battle lines to defend and safeguard America.

I would like to suggest some issues that are worth fighting for. They are:

1. Americanism against socialism.
2. Freedom against regimentation.
3. Free enterprise against a planned economy.
4. Solvency against deficit financing.
5. A national economy based on justice for agriculture, labor, and industry with the rights of the public paramount over all.

We must fight for these things in the political arena. The kind of government we have is decided at the ballot box.

It is a tragic fact that too many of our people take too little interest in government. They avoid participation in political affairs. Nearly one-third of our people do not even take the trouble to vote.

Remember always it is your Government. In a republic the people are the government. The share you take in government is the measure of your citizenship.

There is a great truth inscribed on the wall of the Library of Congress, from which I quote:

"Enlighten the people generally and tyranny and oppression * * * will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

Let us tell the people that living standards can only be improved by increasing earning power. This means greater skills, better management, and less Government interference.

Let us all demand that government at all levels, local, State, and Federal, avoid deficit financing, high taxes, and unbalanced budgets.

Let us tell the people that taxes are not paid by politicians who are always shedding briny tears for the ordinary man but are paid by the sweat of those who work.

Our freedom is a sacred heritage. Our forefathers fought for this freedom on the frozen battlegrounds of the Revolution. Other generations have fought to extend that freedom by bloody battles on land, on sea, and in the air.

Americans of every generation have firmly stood in legislative halls, in the courthouses, and in the pulpits to maintain our precious freedoms.

The air is now filled with new battle cries. There are men who would tear down the walls of freedom. They would raise a new flag in place of the Stars and Stripes. They would substitute a police state for our individual freedom. They would exchange the pure air of America for the unholy ideology which pretends it can plan better than God.

We must now fight to retain our God-given freedoms. We must fight against those who would centralize our government, regulate our lives, and regiment us by telling us where to work, how to work, and when to work.

We must rearm ourselves with high moral and spiritual courage, and join the men and women who are waging war for individual freedom against the socialistic police state.

Again I say the battleground is in the arena of politics.

The orders are being issued. The lines are being drawn.

Our mission is to preserve the God-given freedom of the individual.

Let us join in the fight now.

American Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the subject of who is wrong in Chinese policy, by Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING

WHO'S WRONG?

On the day the press described Japanese women weeping before the gates of the Communist embassy in Tokyo, crying for their husbands, sons, or brothers held in prison work camps, the day when Douglas MacArthur denounced Russia's slave pits where more than 300,000 Japanese prisoners of war are held illegally—if they are still alive—the Michigan Christian Advocate honored me with an editorial, You're Wrong, Dr. Poling, Fifty-nine Missionaries Say So.

I am "wrong" because I advocate all-out aid to our ally, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, who is a devout Christian, a Methodist. Wrong because as the Advocate sees it, I advocate outmoded methods for the new era into which the world has moved. This slashing editorial which affirms that 59 missionaries say I'm wrong does admit rather casually toward its close that not all missionaries are in complete accord.

I stand and will stand with the rest of those all.

There are two and only two dominant methods in the world today. One is anti-individual freedom, antidemocracy, anti-God. This method is communism. The other is proindividual freedom, prodemocracy, pro-God. If Michigan Christian Advocate thinks these latter are outmoded—I do not.

I stand with those who realistically strive on to defend, enrich, and perfect these. I stand with the overwhelming majority of all Christian missionaries in China and at home who disagree with the 59. I stand with Generalissimo Chiang and Madame Chiang and many other Methodists in China, as well as with the considerable number of the bishops of Chiang's church. I stand with those of my own blood who have given a total of more than 200 years to Christian missions in China.

I stand with Methodist Bishop Arthur J. Moore, who writing in the Wesleyan Advocate from Formosa, in December, has this to say: "Why America would fail to support him (Chiang) as he struggles against atheistic communism and thus allow the Soviets to overrun all of China is a question to which I have no answer. To fight communism in Europe and give it no opposition in Asia looks to me like stupidity. Democracy and Christianity will have to fight for their very existence in Russia if allowed to consolidate her gains in China. I came back to our boat wishing desperately that even yet England and America might be more realistic about affairs in China."

At two points I agree with the Michigan Christian Advocate editorial. I agree that "communism cannot be beaten by military might" and that "the only way to defeat it is to remove the conditions that foster its growth." I give a 100-percent yes to all that.

Then how?

By withdrawing before the military might of communism? By standing in silence before the slave camps of communism? By failing to denounce the liquidation of Christian populations in the Baltic countries by communism? By issuing a white paper which betrayed a faithful ally to communism?

And how may we remove conditions which foster communism? If by weakness, then Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the rest should be now the most democratic and Christian countries in the world.

"But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?"

Imagine New York, Chicago, or San Francisco without a police force or less than an adequate force. The world today without the comprehensive strength of America, including military might, would be a Communist world, a totalitarian world, a slave world, an atheist world.

At the moment we have lost both the moral and political battle in China. Now, immediately, and against whatever odds, we must make the defenses of freedom in the Far East impregnable. How? The answer is still a MacArthur plan for the Far East.

I am for peace—I know war. I am for peace, the peace of Christ which is the peace of freedom, democracy, brotherhood, and sacrifical love. By all these tests communism has within itself the seed of death. That seed germinates. It needs only time. The realistic formula for this peace of Christ is strength with patience.

Here alone lies man's justified hope for world security. Here and here only is the promise that war shall not come again.

Here then I stand, so help me God.

DANIEL A. POLING,
Editor of Christian Herald.

Method of Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD an item published in today's Washington Post which treats with the Lodge-Gossett joint resolution for the reform of the electoral college system. This item is a two-column communication to the Washington Post from Prof. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton University. It proves convincingly to my mind that the electoral reform proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and which is still pending before the House, has as its underlying principle the principle of proportional representation. At the time of the debate in this body I stated this view affirmatively, and offered clear logic to support it. The Senator from Massachusetts did not agree with me. I am pleased, therefore, to offer for the RECORD today further confirmation of the point I made. This proof should substantially contribute to the House consideration of this electoral reform measure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE LODGE-GOSSETT AMENDMENT

(By Lucius Wilmerding, Jr.)

Senator LODGE has recently taken me to task for asserting that the Lodge-Gossett amendment, changing the mode of electing the President and Vice President, is based on the principle of proportional representation. He says: "The proposed constitutional amendment has no relation whatever to 'proportional representation.' It could not have * * *. Proportional representation cannot be applied to the election of a single official. It is impossible to take one man and divide him up proportionately—or otherwise—and expect him to live."

My answer to this statement is brief. I have never accused Senator LODGE of proposing to divide up the President, proportionately or otherwise. When I say that he proposes to apply the principle of proportional representation to the electoral voting system, I mean that he proposes to divide up the 531 electoral votes according to that system. In this I am saying no more than was said by Messrs. Hoag and Hallett of the Proportional Representation League in their book Proportional Representation. Under the caption, "How proportional representation should be applied to the presidency," they write: "Obviously we cannot have proportional representation in the Presidency because it is a single office, but we can have it in the electoral college or in the distribution of the electoral vote."

Now I submit that Senator LODGE's proposal is to have proportional representation in the distribution of the electoral vote. His amendment provides that in electing the President and Vice President the electoral vote of each State shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. Take a State with 16 electoral votes and assume that there are four candidates for President, A, B, C, and D. A gets 40 percent of the popular vote; B gets 30 percent, C gets 20 percent and D, 10 percent. Under the Lodge amendment A, B, C, and D would be credited with 6.4, 4.8, 3.2, and 1.6 electoral votes, respectively.

What principle is this if it is not the principle of proportional representation? Let us suppose that the congressional delegation of this same State were to be elected by the list system of proportional representation and that the popular vote followed the same pattern for Congressmen as for President. The number of seats to be distributed would be 14 instead of 16, since each State has two less Representatives than it has electoral votes. Do the arithmetic and you will find that the four parties would be entitled to 5.6, 4.2, 2.8, and 1.4 seats, respectively. Since fractional seats and fractional votes are unknown in the House of Representatives you might give the two seats represented by the sum of the decimals to parties A and C, since they have the two highest fractions. The final result would be that parties A, B, C, and D would be allotted 6, 4, 3, and 1 seat respectively.

Anyone who thinks about this will see that the Lodge formula is the same, both mathematically and in design, as the formula of proportional representation; in each State the popular vote for candidate A is to the total popular vote as the electoral vote for candidate A is to the total electoral vote; in each State the popular vote for party A is to the total popular vote as the representation in Congress for party A is to the total representation in Congress. The mere fact that in one case you find the answer integers while in the other you figure three places of decimals can hardly be thought to affect the principle.

I might add that the principle advocated by Senator LODGE for counting the electoral votes has for many years been identified with the principle of proportional representation. If you trace the proportional features of the Lodge amendment backward through history you come eventually to the Maish amendment of 1877. This amendment was described by one of its sponsors (Senator Buckalew) in the North American Review for July 1877, under three heads of remarks: "First, it provides for a direct vote by the people for President and Vice President; second, it retains electoral votes as at present, while dispensing with electors and electoral colleges; and third, it assigns to candidates electoral votes from each State in proportion to popular votes received by them therein."

The only difference between the Maish proposal and the Lodge proposal is that Maish would have awarded the votes represented by the sum of the decimal to the candidate having the largest fractions—that is to say, he would have made an integral distribution of the electoral vote. In the same year an exact counterpart of the Lodge proposal, even to the three places of decimals, was contained in an amendment introduced by Representative Cravens. In 1878 a similar proposal was reported by a committee of the House of Representatives.

The Maish amendment was described by J. Hampden Dougherty in his book on the Electoral System (a work to which Representative GOSSETT is much indebted) as embodying some of the principles of the Hare plan for minority representation. H. V. Ames, in his Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, praises this same amendment as an application of the system of proportional representation to the election of President and Vice President.

But let us come down to more recent times. The immediate predecessor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment is the Lea-Walsh amendment of 1928 and subsequent years. According to Representative GOSSETT, "Mr. Lea is really the father of the particular proposal under consideration." The Lea amendment was indorsed time and again by the Proportional Representation League as an application of proportional representation to Presidential elections. Nor was Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, cosponsor of the amendment, in any doubt as to its true nature. Pending a change in the Constitution he called upon the Senate to adopt proportional representation in the electoral colleges of their own volition. On May 29, 1928, he introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 which read in part as follows: "Whereas, proportional representation * * * has proved to be easily workable, satisfactory to the voters, and just to all parties. * * * *Resolved*, * * * that the legislatures of the several States should establish by appropriate legislation proportional representation in the choosing of Presidential electors."

Finally I would call Senator LODGE's attention to the June 1948 issue of the National Municipal Review. In its department called proportional representation the progress of the Lodge and Gossett resolutions in Congress is reported under the caption "Proportional representation for Presidential electoral votes advances."

It seems to me therefore that it is by no means a play on words to use the term "proportional representation" in connection with Senator LODGE's proposal. When two principles are exactly the same, why not call them by a single name? The real difference between Senator LODGE and myself is not one of terminology but of opinion. I think that the application of his principle (by whatever name he calls it) to the distribution of the States' electoral votes would increase the likelihood of the same principle being applied to the representation of the States in Congress. Senator LODGE thinks otherwise.

PRINCETON, N. J.

A Timely Revised Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a 1950 version of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, whose author is unknown but which was forwarded to me by Mr. Barry Yutzi and Mr. Eugene Wollaston, students at the University of Delaware.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIMELY REVISED GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

One score and sixteen years ago our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are fair game.

Now we are engaged in a great mass of calculations testing whether that taxpayer or any taxpayer so confused and so impoverished can long endure. We are met on form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who spend their lives that they may spend our money (politicians).

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here, have gone far beyond our power to add and subtract.

Our creditors will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here. It is for us the taxpayers rather to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanished dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher income tax bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions, and that taxation of the people, by the Congress, for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish.

Texas Tech Studies Dust Storms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the April 16, 1950, edition of the Lubbock Avalanche.

This interesting article by Avalanche reporter, Kenneth May, tells of the work now being carried on at Texas Technological College in Lubbock studying the dust storms which are again blowing over the western half of Texas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECH STUDY SHOWS TONS OF DUST CARRIED IN MORE INTENSE BLOWS

(By Kenneth May)

A half million tons of sand is a lot of dirt, but that much can pass over Lubbock within an hour's time during an intensive dust storm, experiments at Texas Tech have indicated.

G. Frederick Warn, associate professer of geology, and William C. Irvin, instructor, directing the research, said that an estimated 500,000 tons of dirt will blow over the area of Lubbock within 60 minutes when the wind velocity is 45 miles per hour or faster.

Such, at least, are the indications of the Tech project. So far as Warn knows this is the first time such an estimation has been attempted in the Lubbock area.

STUDENTS COOPERATE

Four students of geology, physics, and biology are cooperating in the experiments, which include different phases of research ranging from a study of conditions generating dust storms to a determination of the harmful bacterial content of the dust particles.

Wind turbulence, or vertical movement, and the air moisture, as well as the horizontal wind velocity, have a bearing upon

dust storms and their intensity, Warn said. Low relative humidity prevailing in the South Plains area recently reached an all-time low of 6 percent on March 25, he said, the same day the barometric pressure here reached a record low of 26.05.

Until now most of the experimentation and writing done concerning dusters has been directed toward the phase of soil erosion. Although the current Tech research is studying that side of the question, laboratory tests delving into possible disease-spreading aspects of the high winds are being undertaken also.

NO RESULTS YET

Warn said the tests along that line have not progressed sufficiently to report any results. Germs picked up by the wind from human or animal wastes would be the most likely to be found in dust particles, he said.

Recent storms in west Texas have sent dust spiraling to a maximum height of 17,500 feet (about 3 miles above sea level) and over an area of 85,520 square miles during the early stages. Winds up to 70 miles per hour have whipped the dust, which ultimately reached as far northeastward as the Great Lakes, Warn asserted.

Generally, most of the dust which whips along close to the ground has been picked up locally, the geology professor said, while a larger percentage of that high in the air comes from greater distances. A high percentage of South Plains storms, especially the more intense, have their beginning in New Mexico, he said, where unploughed and uncovered wastelands lie as easy prey to rollicking winds.

TRAPS DUST PARTICLES

In carrying out the Tech experiments a boxlike contraption with baffle plates to trap dust particles has been erected 60 feet above the surface. Additional tests are to be made with the trap only 5 feet above the ground, Warn said. The trapped dust not only gives an indication of the amount of dirt in the air, but provides particles for laboratory analysis.

Particles twenty-five one hundredths of a millimeter in size have been caught 60 feet above ground, and about 1 percent of the particles included were organic matter such as leaves, straw, or grass, according to undetailed analysis. Warn said a more minute study will probably reveal a much higher organic matter content not immediately visible.

Is there ever any good generated by a dust storm? "Not that I can see," says Warn. He conceded that a particular farm might have dust carrying beneficial organic matter or fertilizing properties, come to rest on it and thus be enriched, but he hastened to point out that alkali dust might also settle on the farm, as well as the seed of infectious weeds.

A determination of the size and amounts of particles which will probably be carried by the wind at a given velocity is another aspect of the Tech experiments. No conclusive results have been reached along that line as yet, according to the geology prof, but so far tests show correlations between particle size and wind velocity and direction have run true to form.

There is little possibility that minerals carried along by the dust will lose any of their chemical characteristics, Warn said, but it is quite likely that physical wear and destruction will occur. Through the tests underway at Tech, students hope to determine pretty closely what the mineral composition of the sand will be when blowing from a given direction.

GIVE PREVENTIONS

About the only preventions Warn could give for the dusters were deep listing of ground, sowing of cover crops, and artificial rain making. The latter feat must be accomplished when temperature and moisture content of the air are in rain making condition, he said, however, and such a condition has existed very few times over the South Plains during the last 6 months of drouth.

Students carrying on the experiments are enrolled in a meteorology and sedimentation course at the college. Included are William B. Cox of Monahans, a graduate student in geology studying eolian sedimentation and weather conditions associated with sand storms; Dewain Cox, of Monahans, a physics student studying weather conditions on the South Plains and the use of recording instruments; Jack Pales, a physics student from Lawton, Okla., studying special types of fronts and storms; and John C. Porter of Lubbock, graduate student in biology, running culture studies on air-borne particles.

Study of dust storms was first undertaken at Tech in 1935 and 1936 under direction of Dr. Raymond Sidwell, now head of the geology department. Warn and Irvin said that need for such studies is evidenced by the fact that an estimated 850,000,000 tons of southwestern dirt passes over the Mississippi River during an average year. Many of the small lakes formed on farms in the South Plains region owe their existence largely to wind erosion, they added.

The Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD lines by one of my constituents, the eminent historian, Mr. James T. Shotwell, published in a recent issue of the Saturday Review of Literature. I commend this poem to the reading of all those who delight in fine and meaningful poetry.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY

(By James T. Shotwell)

I

Harp of the wild old ages, of the music of the spheres,
Strummed for the dance the worlds began when they circled their first careers,
O harp of the world! What visions appear as we stoop to play
Seeking the mystic rhythms, the spirit of song for aye.
The echoes of mighty masters on the strings are vibrant still,
Homer and Dante and Milton, and those whose touch can thrill,
With the drama of human passion and the lyric's birdlike flight.
Let not the vulgar touch profane, where these have greatly wrought
The lasting harmonies of life, or, by creative thought,
Have opened the ways of the universe to follow questing light,
Or plumbed the depths of the atom beyond the range of sight.
Thine is the cosmic note that lies in all enduring song,
Whether in choral harmony, solemn and vast and strong,
Or the still, small voice, when the spirit wakes from life's enthralling dream,
To find that it and the world are one, with one enduring theme,
And that the hands of mortals can touch eternal strings
When the mind, triumphant, beats its way through all opposing things,
Measuring space and mastering time, forcing matter to yield
The mysteries of the starry way and the force in the atom congealed.
Yet, as at last with godlike power we move through matter and mind,
Darkly we grope on the ways of death for ourselves and all mankind.
Here is the greater challenge, the greatest and the last,
To bring the variant breeds of men out of their variant past,
Holding secure the heritage of the things they richly prize,
But seeing the future through the light of justice's unbound eyes,
With war and violence banished; it can and it must be done.
For the world itself will not endure unless mankind is one.

II

The past is more than prologue to the drama of human fate,
The ice-age minds are with us still, with their iron claws of hate,
But the sword of the Lord and Gideon their forces can withstand
Until we build Jerusalem in every pleasant land.
For, rising through sorrow and suffering, the central theme grows clear,
Welding peace and justice, freedom from want and fear.
Not by wishful thinking can the task be carried through,
Nations have still to learn their part that never freedom knew;
Not by a code of rigid law, enforced by a world police,
With nations surrendering freedom in the search for lasting peace.
The key to the plot was given on a sunlit mount by a sea
The only guidance the world has yet to make men safe and free.
Not to Caesar alone we turn to meet the threat of war,
His militant scepter cannot reach where the springs of action are;
But the mind that has ranged the universe must now itself control.
For the force in the mighty atom is less than the human soul;
And simpler than any equation are the words forever true:
Do ye unto others as ye would they do by you.
This is the missing fulcrum for Archimedes' pry
To lift the weight of ancient hate, so the peoples that pass by
May reach together the shining goal which none can reach alone,
Helping each other along the way that each can make its own,
By joint consent surrendering the ancient right of war,
Alert to thwart betrayal, aware where dangers are
That lie in differing loyalties, where bickering conflicts run,
But offering charity to all, with malice toward none.
Then undismayed by the powers we wield, steady we stand and strong,
As the harp of the world keeps measure to life's triumphant song.

Local Control of Valley Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Utah Senator Proposes a Plan for Local Control of Valley Projects," from the Salt Lake Telegram of April 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH SENATOR PROPOSES A PLAN FOR LOCAL CONTROL OF VALLEY PROJECTS

Utah's Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS has offered a bill, and elaborated upon it in a lengthy speech on the Senate floor, which would authorize large-scale regional water and power projects with grass-roots management rather than tight Federal control.

Senator WATKINS' bill is in answer to the admitted problem of constructing great river development projects in the face of the artificial limitations imposed by State lines. The answer proposed by the administration to this problem is the creation of regional valley authorities like the Tennessee Valley Authority, with broad powers affecting not only irrigation, flood control, navigation, and electric power production but also including such things as manufacture and distribution of fertilizer, building parks and playgrounds, fish culture, etc.

Most of the activities undertaken by these valley authorities are legitimate governmental tasks, but the imposition of a new supergovernmental system under tight Federal control on top of the State system is a matter which has aroused grave concern in America among Americans of both parties.

Many thoughtful students of the question see the proposed development of the entire Nation into a series of valley authorities crossing State lines as the beginning of the end for local government and the kind of local responsibility which is the essence of our democracy. They see this encroaching Federal control over so many aspects of our economic life as a long stride in the direction of nationalized industry and state socialism.

Whether or not this fear is entirely justified, the fact that there is such fear warrants careful study of any alternative plan which promises to accomplish the admitted good of great regional water and power developments without risking a socialistic Federal domination over our lives.

Senator WATKINS thinks he has the answer. He says he recognizes that from here on western reclamation development is largely a program of giant projects on interstate streams, such as, for example, the Colorado development in which Utah is so much interested. He wants to build these projects but without creating a giant Federal utility bureaucracy. He believes the answer is a scheme for a combination of Federal aid and local automony. He would have the United States Bureau of Reclamation plan and build the projects, but an interstate agency retaining local control would operate and maintain the projects once they were constructed and sell the power and water.

The bill proposed by Senator WATKINS goes into much more detail, but the fundamental point is the substitution of a locally controlled regional agency to operate these huge projects for the federally controlled agency set up under the valley authority idea.

We do not know whether Senator WATKINS' scheme will work. We do agree with him, however, that some means for regional development on a broad basis is necessary if there is to be further progress in the fullest utilization of the basic land and water resources of this Nation. We also believe that the more government can be kept close to the people the better. City government run by the people of a city is better than city government run from a State capitol. Utah government is better run by Utahans than by bureaucrats in Washington. Likewise regional governmental activities will be better if they can be kept under control of the people of the region.

If it will work, it's a good scheme. We hope the Congress gives Senator WATKINS' proposal the most careful consideration.

French Ask Fusion of Atlantic Aims in a High Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the most constructive and worthwhile suggestions I have seen from any of the officials of this country or of the nations with which we are associated, for uniting our efforts among the North Atlantic nations comes from French Foreign Minister George Bidault in a speech which he recently delivered at Lyon. The speech is carried in an article published in the New York Times of today, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH ASK FUSION OF ATLANTIC AIMS IN A HIGH COUNCIL—BIDAULT URGES STUDY OF PLAN TO KNIT TREATY POWERS IN ECONOMICS AND POLITICS—HOPES FOR A REPORT SOON—PREMIER TO SEEK LONDON ACTION IN MAY—PROPOSAL IS HELD RESULT OF BRADLEY TALK

(By Harold Callender)

PARIS, April 16.—Creation by the North Atlantic Treaty nations of an Atlantic High Council to coordinate their strategic, economic, and political policies was urged today by George Bidault, Premier of France.

M. Bidault, speaking in Lyon, asked the nations concerned to study this French proposal for knitting together the Atlantic community in more than a merely military sense. He said he hoped that when they met in London May 8, the Foreign Ministers of the Western powers would name a committee to report by a fixed date on the composition, powers and functioning of such a council.

The Premier suggested that the proposed council should deal first with two fields of activity, defense, and economic relations, which he described as corresponding to two dangers—aggression and depression, as he said Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, had defined them. But he added the hope that before long the council could deal also with the political problems of the Atlantic coalition.

SEES NO MONOPOLY ON PEACE

M. Bidault suggested that the council be entitled "Atlantic High Council for Peace," so as to forestall perverse interpretations. He said there was no reason to let the term "peace" be monopolized by "those who have annexed it, among other things, and who call us the camp of aggression."

Referring to Secretary of State Dean Acheson's decision a few days ago to create a stratgic committee to coordinate United States foreign policy in the diplomatic and economic spheres, M. Bidault explained that the French proposal was to create a similar executive organism on the scale of the Atlantic alliance.

Discussion not only of some new central mechanism for the Atlantic Treaty but of giving it greater and broader content as the nucleus of a more closely linked western world has taken place privately here ever since Foreign Minister Robert Schuman dropped a cryptic hint of the new French proposal. M. Schuman did this in a speech on March 27 to the national committee of the Popular Republican Party, to which he and M. Bidault belong. All he said was that the Atlantic community might deprive the Atlantic Pact of its exclusively military character.

COST CONCERNS FRENCH LEADERS

Those who sought elaboration of this phrase discovered that high French officials were greatly concerned by the enormous cost of the defense of western Europe, as contemplated by the defense committee under the Atlantic Treaty, since neither France nor any other continental country could begin to finance its share.

The French and other continental leaders were likewise disturbed by the effect that this rearmament might have upon economic recovery since it would entail additional budget expenditure and a diversion of productive resources to uneconomic ends.

It was therefore thought necessary for the Atlantic Treaty nations as a whole to consider not only the division of responsibility for defense but the division of the economic burden involved in defense. This burden was calculated by some experts as likely to reach proportions comparable to those of the dollar aid under the Marshall plan. The conclusion reached was that only by further United States economic aid could western Europe provide anything like the defenses called for in the blueprints of the military leaders.

There was much speculation in western Europe whether the United States would extend substantial aid to Europe after the end of the Marshall plan in 1952. Encouragement was found in President Truman's appointment of Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, to study what the United States could do after that portentous date and in the apparently growing conviction that, as General Bradley expressed it in Chicago on Friday, the "American people have decided to hold and save western Europe for the free world."

PLAN CALLED LOGICAL EXTENSION

The assumption that General Bradley's statement is correct is the basis for the carefully considered French proposal put forth by M. Bidault today.

M. Bidault said that this proposal was "the logical extension and linking" of what had gone before—the Brussels Treaty, the organization of Europe, and the foundation of the Atlantic community. M. Bidault added that "Europe is still in the process of gestation" but that this process could be favorably affected only by "the broadening of the prospect to Atlantic dimensions."

The Premier therefore explained that the French Government's new proposal was not meant to dissolve the united Europe that awaited birth but to enable it to fit into the wider unity "while retaining its originality and its integrity."

For the benefit of those who fear that Europe's originality and integrity might be endangered by being merged in a wider community, M. Bidault added that the Atlantic

consolidation should leave no room for any fear of dependence or of ingratitude—the first fear being in Europe, the second in the United States.

The economic cooperation on an Atlantic scale should, he said, exclude the idea of displacement and the fear of exploitation. By the first of these two phrases, M. Bidault apparently meant the displacement of national economic interests by other interests.

The Premier said that if each nation tried to build its own defenses in isolation, the machinery of security would break down and liberty and peace would find defeat in the ruined countries.

In view of the probable assumption in some quarters that the motive for the French proposal is simply to get more United States economic aid, it is no more than objective to point out that the French Government has had a hard time selling the Atlantic Treaty to the French people, many of whom still wonder just what good it will do them in terms of defense against an invasion of their soil. This question has been asked more frequently since the United States apparently ceased to have a monopoly of the atomic bomb. These doubts have been engendered not by the Communists, who have adroitly exploited them, but by the strategic circumstances.

Black Land Experiment Station in Central Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an Associated Press article, date line April 8, reporting on the valuable work being carried by the Black Land Experiment Station in central Texas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPLE, April 8.—What good is a gully-washing rain? Plenty, you soon may be saying, all because of tests made at the Black Land Experiment Station near here.

The tests, if black-land soil farmers are guided by them, may mean that topsoil stops washing, crops roots will have plenty of moisture through the dry summers, water wells will fill again and long-dormant springs bubble.

There's no reason why 7 or 8 inches of rain within an hour can't be kept in black-land soils, the experiment indicate. It's moisture that has been running off but which should be stored in the ground and used by crops during hot summer months when growth is most important.

If black-land farmers use the new information, you'll quit calling them downpour gully washers. The rain will soak into the soil, with no surface run-off.

The Temple Telegram, reporting on the Black Land Station experiments, indicates how these heavy rains can be harnessed.

The newspaper reports that in Austin clay soil, which had been in continuous cultivation for the past 70 years, only .0004 inch of rain can be absorbed in an hour. The rest runs off, generally taking topsoil with it. And that figure applies only to the first 4 inches of soil. The soil between 8 and 10 inches absorbs no water at all. Houston clay soil up to 4 inches absorbs .73 inches of rain an hour, and, like the Austin clay, absorbs none on the 8- to 10-inch level.

Land continuous in cotton does a little better. Austin clay will absorb .32 inches of rain in an hour, at both the 4-inch and the 8–10-inch level.

It hasn't always been that way. Experiment-station workers found that native meadow which never has gone under the plow absorbs 5.5 inches of rain an hour for the first 4 inches. But absorption slows down sharply when the 8–10-inch level is reached. Only 0.29 inch an hour is taken up at that level.

Dr. J. R. Johnson of the experiment station, believe recent tests point the way to making the dream of an abundant moisture supply come true.

Suppose a gully washer of 6 or 7 inches of rain an hour—an extremely heavy rainfall almost anywhere—struck these soils. Most of it would run off, carrying topsoil with it.

But the experiment station started rotating cotton and Madrid clover. And the scientists found that Austin clay soil rotated with these crops will absorb rainfall at the rate of 7.54 inches an hour. Houston clay soaks up 4.9 inches of rain an hour.

That is, the first 4 inches absorb that much.

What about that vital layer at the 8–10-inch level? Grass and Madrid clover roots rarely go below 4 inches. And it's the growth of the roots that loosens the land and makes it porous.

To answer the 8–10-inch level question, Doctor Johnston points to a big picture on his desk, showing the root system of an evergreen clover plant. The roots of this plant reach deep into the soil, going beyond 36 inches.

This may solve the problem of getting rain to soak all the way into the soil with no run-off? Rotation of grass and Madrid clover would loosen the top 4 inches. Fitting evergreen clover into the rotation might crack that crucial 8–10-inch layer.

This, the experimenters believe, will take care of all the water from just about as heavy a rain as ever falls in central Texas. It would leave the rainwater down in the ground where crop roots could use it during the dry summer months.

The Temple Telegram brings up the possibility that there will be other benefits. "How about these wells which are going dry all over central Texas?" asks the newspaper. "Isn't it possible that putting all of our rainfall into the soil would bring them back? Isn't it possible that we might build up our supply of ground water to the point where springs which once bubbled out hundreds of gallons a minute would flow again?"

The Murders in Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very recent editorial entitled "Fetters on the FBI," from the St. Louis Star-Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FETTERS ON THE FBI

Presidential Press Secretary Charles Ross says that the Star-Times' copyrighted story Saturday about how, shortly before he was murdered, gangster Charles Binaggio tried to make a political deal with President Harry Truman is a "lot of hooey."

Several previous discrepancies between Mr. Ross' statements and the facts could be cited. A recent example occurred last week. As Drew Pearson points out in his column on this page, Ross denied that John Foster Dulles was appointed to the State Department even though the appointment was already a fact and was announced the next day. Incidentally, in the Binaggio case, Ross was denying a scoop by the Star-Times over his old employer, the Post-Dispatch.

In 1934 Harry Truman was hand-picked for Senator by Boss Tom Pendergast in much the same way that Harry Truman is now trying to hand-pick Emery W. Allison.

When Maurice M. Milligan, United States district attorney at Kansas City, probed the vote frauds and sent Boss Tom to jail, he made an implacable enemy of Harry Truman. When Mr. Truman was Senator in 1938, first he tried to smear Milligan's reputation. Then he opposed, unsuccessfully, his reappointment for another term.

Early in 1945 when "Boss Tom" died, Vice President Truman flew to his funeral in Kansas City. A few months later Harry Truman successfully used all the influence of his high office to block the reappointment of Milligan.

One year later President Harry Truman tried to handpick Enos Axtell for the House. Axtell won in the primary but lost in the general election. Proof of widespread frauds in the primary voting was uncovered. In sharp contrast to the energy with which Maurice Milligan had pushed the probe against Tom Pendergast, in this instance the FBI moved very slowly. Finally, one night in May 1947, the safe in which the evidence was being held was blown and the evidence was stolen. The frauds had taken place in the districts controlled by Charley Binaggio. One of Binaggio's lieutenants, Henry McKissick, was indicted, but, thanks to the theft of evidence, not convicted.

On the night of May 27–28, 1947, President Truman was sleeping several blocks from the courthouse where the theft occurred. The area must have teemed with Secret Service agents. The leads were many. No fewer than 17 men had keys to the vault room. Yet the usually swift and brilliant FBI has let the sands of time run nearly out without exposing the guilty parties. One of the key witnesses, Joseph Falco, died in July 1947. Charley Binaggio was another key witness. Unless the FBI solves the case within the next 45 days, the statute of limitations will intervene.

Now the same pattern seems being repeated in the Binaggio and Gargotta murders. The Binaggio machine opposed the Pendergast machine as revived by James Pendergast. Harry Truman is trying to get Emery W. Allison nominated as United States Senator. Charley Binaggio opposed the nomination of Allison.

In several ways Charley Binaggio was put on the spot. He had persuaded various gangsters and gamblers to support the candidacy of Forrest Smith for Governor with the promise that Missouri would be opened up to them. He failed to produce. Then last September a Federal grand jury began to investigate organized crime and gambling in Kansas City. Immediately it involved Binaggio and his crew. The Government began looking into Binaggio's income taxes.

When Binaggio and Gargotta were murdered Gov. Forrest Smith, who had been supported by Binaggio, immediately wired the FBI for "all-out assistance."

Yet, yesterday, 5 days after the request, the Attorney General's office told the Star Times it had not found any legal authority as yet for Federal participation in solving the murders.

Binaggio and Gargotta had both been witnesses before the Federal grand jury, and one

theory of their killing is that they were "rubbed out" to keep them from giving information. Binaggio's Federal income-tax returns were being checked. On February 15, 1950, both President Truman and Attorney General McGrath had promised to throw the weight of the Federal Government behind community drives against organized crime, particularly gambling. Yet, while the trail in Kansas City gets cold, Attorney General McGrath can find no legal authority for ordering the FBI to pick it up.

The highly trained agents of the FBI, their scientific methods, their vast Nation-wide resources are being held in leash. Why?

Fair Play in Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 28, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting, with one minor excision out of deference to comity between the Houses of Congress, an editorial from the Washington Post of April 11, 1950, on the subject of procedures in congressional committees in regard to investigations and hearings where adverse testimony may be produced against a third party.

Obviously, the whole question of committee procedures can be examined critically with advantage to the public interest; perhaps the present lack of delimitation can be successfully defended in the forum of public debate, and perhaps it can be found that the respective Houses should lay down some definite lines of demarcation.

When it comes to privileged defamation of individuals there can be no question of the glaring faults which accompany the anarchical device of giving each chairman just as much latitude as he cares to take. I should like to remind the House that I have pending H. R. 3443, which has as its purpose the amendment of the Legislative Reorganization Act to provide a fair procedure in investigation. I am also including the text of that bill in my remarks.

RULE OF FAIR PLAY

Creeping progress is being made toward the establishment of a fair code of procedure for congressional investigators. The Labor-Management Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which Senator MURRAY is chairman, has adopted a set of rules to govern all its future hearings. It is the third congressional group to take such action since our Turning on the Light series of editorials 2 years ago. The first was in the Bender subcommittee of the House during the Eightieth Congress and the second the Senate Investigations Committee, then under Senator FERGUSON'S chairmanship.

The new rules of the Murray subcommittee, like those previously adopted by other groups, are admittedly a compromise. Sworn testimony may not be taken by staff members unless at least one member of the subcommittee is present. All hearings will be public except that the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may authorize the subcommittee to hear public officials in executive session when the public interest warrants such a deviation from the normal course. At least two committeemen and a staff member must be present for any examination of witnesses behind closed doors. Recorded testimony must be made public when any part of such testimony has been released by the subcommittee or when it has been made the basis of a report by members of the subcommittee. Witnesses may obtain a transcript of their testimony at nominal fees.

Every witness will have the right to file a sworn statement for the record and to read a summary of it before the subcommittee. Other persons believing that their reputations have been adversely affected by testimony before the subcommittee may also file sworn statements for the record, the subcommittee reserving the right to decide whether such statements are relevant and to require conciseness. All witnesses may be accompanied by counsel. The subcommittee may not publish any report until it has been approved by a majority of a quorum present at a duly called meeting.

We do not suppose that these rules are an absolute guaranty against abuses even in the subcommittee to which they apply. But they are a long step in the right direction. The difficulty with this piecemeal adoption of rules is that the committees needing them most are left free to continue operating without rules or any sense of self-restraint. Another powerful argument for the adoption of a general code of fair procedure is to be found in the decision of the Supreme Court yesterday not to review the conviction of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo for contempt of Congress. That ruling confirms the power of Congress to compel a witness to testify whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party. We think the ruling is right. But it throws upon Congress a tremendous responsibility to prevent the abuse of its sweeping investigative powers by setting up rules of fair conduct by which all its committees would have to abide.

H. R. 3443

A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by adopting principles of procedure in investigations by committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 134 of title I of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601 of the 79th Cong.) is amended by adding a new section reading as follows:

"(d) (1) The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned shall be clearly stated before the commencement of any hearings, and the evidence sought to be elicited shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated. In cases of special investigations authorized by congressional resolution, the subject of the investigation shall be so stated in the resolution and, in the case of investigations initiated by the committee, the subject shall be so stated by the committee and announced before the commencement of the hearings.

"(2) Any witness summoned at a private hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before a private hearing, shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

"(3) Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a written or oral statement, which shall be made a part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with regard to which he has previously been examined.

"(4) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel; and if given in public session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof if he so requests, and if given in executive session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

"(5) No photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying.

"(6) Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified and who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affects his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

"(i) To file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

"(ii) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

"(iii) To have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel; but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any one witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period.

"(iv) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

"(7) These principles shall apply to investigations by all committees of either House of Congress, including standing committees, select and special committees, or joint committees of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing."

Secret of the Continuous Vitality of Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, all the Members of the Senate have received a letter from Vrest Orton, secretary of the Vermont Guild of Oldtime Crafts and Industries, Inc., of Weston, Vt., which explains the magic of the continuous vitality and eagerness of our distinguished colleague the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. We have received, also, samples of the product which the Senator's good health so highly recommends. We trust that it may be as beneficial to us as it has been to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT GUILD OF OLDTIME
CRAFTS & INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Weston, Vt.

DEAR SENATOR: Some years ago your distinguished colleague and my good friend RALPH E. FLANDERS, established the Vermont

Guild of Crafts and Industries in this Vermont hill village, the chief exhibit being a 150-year old stone grist mill turned by waterpower.

Knowing you must have admired the constant and ever increasing vitality of our good friend the junior Senator from Vermont and assuming you will be glad to have the secret of his power, I am now revealing that the Senator eats Vermont Guild wholegrains.

Since for some years during the late war I observed for the War Department the hearings of your eminent body on the hill and was therefore in a position to know what extraordinary strength a Senator has to have, I have now concluded that it is my bounden duty to make some slight contribution to the well-being and vitality of the Senate.

It is therefore with extreme pleasure and honor that I am sending you today, with the compliments of Senator FLANDERS, a gift of a wholegrain sampler which I trust you and your good wife will relish and enjoy.

With every good wish, I am,

Cordially,

VREST ORTON.

Dealing With Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 5, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, although most business reports point to another good year, nevertheless, it is a fact that unemployment has made itself felt in many homes. Those people past 45 years of age, and those young folks recently graduated from colleges are the ones having difficulty finding employment. From everywhere come reports that good-paying jobs are scarce. Labor leaders and Congressmen representing industrial districts are anxiously looking for means to prevent any large or serious unemployment situation.

In normal times, before the war, we would export about 10 percent of our production. Today if friendly arrangements for trade and commerce and the exchange of credit could be worked out, the United States would enjoy an export-import trade of boom proportions. This, in turn, would mean millions of well-paying new jobs and new sources of profit for industry, and additional revenue for the United States Treasury.

According to recent reports, foreign markets are being supplied more and more by German, Japanese, and English goods. There are many United States items which could not be labelled as war material, and yet cannot be sold for export, because of licensing restrictions. At the same time we learn that the same goods and material is being manufactured and sold by Germany, Japan, England, and other nations to our former allies and former customers. Our export business has degenerated into a free hand-out, Santa Claus affair. The only export business we have today is on those goods which are going out under the Marshall plan. If we were to stop taking money from the United States Treasury to buy these Marshall-plan goods which we give away for free, we would have practically no export business whatsoever.

A healthy and genuine export-import program is vital to the welfare of the Nation. It is one of the programs that must be developed if we wish to provide full employment for our people.

At this point I wish to include an article written by Maurice J. Tobin which appeared in the American Federationist dealing with unemployment:

DEALING WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor)

The problem of unemployment is one of the Nation's foremost problems.

The Nation's employment in 1949 continued to be very high, averaging close to the 59,000,000 average of 1948. But this past February, at a seasonal peak of unemployment, there were almost 4,700,000 unemployed.

The Nation's labor force has been expanding more rapidly than our economy. The problem we are confronted with is: How are we going to get more jobs—more jobs for those who are unemployed and for the new entrants into the labor market?

As a result of accumulated information concerning the seriousness of local problems of unemployment, both from the standpoint of the effect of joblessness on communities and the national economy, I recently asked all governors of States to take the lead in establishing State-wide and local maximum employment committees.

I urged that organized labor, management, civic groups, and local government sit down in the local communities and plan action which would alleviate unemployment. My reasoning was and is that here in America we have a long heritage of working out our problems in a spirit of fruitful cooperation.

It seems obvious to me that action to solve unemployment—especially in those areas which now have high unemployment ratios—should start in the local communities themselves.

A majority of the governors responded favorably. There are now State-wide committees in 14 States and 1 Territory. Local committees have been established in many communities, according to reports to the Bureau of Employment Security, and are attacking community unemployment problems with varying degrees of success.

State and local full employment committees offer trade unionists an exceptional opportunity for participation and leadership in State and community employment planning. These State and local committees need not be only temporary or emergency bodies. They might well be continuing bodies to explore and plan new ways to expand economic activity and employment. I can well imagine that the very existence of such committees and the wide knowledge of such plans would challenge entire communities to make greater contributions in the building of a better America.

One way we can demonstrate our devotion to the democratic ideal is to throw the vast resources of our States and our communities into the common effort to find productive and rewarding jobs for all workers.

It is poor business to wait until the local economy becomes so disorganized that workers lose their skills and subsistence relief is necessary for workers' families before positive community action is taken.

I feel sure that governors and mayors will welcome the participation of State federations of labor and central trades and labor councils in the work of full employment committees already established or which may be organized.

I am also sure that State and local offices of the State employment services will be glad to furnish economic facts concerning communities in which unemployment is currently high or is a threat. The local offices of the employment service usually maintain data concerning economic trends and the size and availability of the local labor force, as well as the occupational characteristics of unemployed men and women.

Just what can community full-employment committees do? The activities of community committees already at work include studies of means to expand existing industry, attraction of new industry, financial assistance to industry, public works, vocational training and retraining, placement of workers, and other projects. Committees should be sure to have basic information about the community, its workers, its trade and industry, its employment trends, its resources, and its economic potential.

One community found that a public-works program would not correct unemployment, because the unemployed were factory workers and not construction workers. On the other hand, a construction program might be the need in another locality.

It would be unwise to encourage the bringing into a community of a new firm which would employ chiefly women when the unemployed for the most part are men.

But experience shows that training, experience, and availability of workers are not the only factors to be considered in a community full-employment program. It is also necessary to consider what can be done through business or industrial expansion which will iron out seasonal fluctuations of employment and otherwise stabilize employment—at high levels.

As I have indicated, the primary responsibility for solving local unemployment problems rests in the beginning, at least, with the community. Of course, there may be limitations to what a community may do, since its principal markets may lie outside its boundaries or its unemployment may be due in part to national business conditions.

Even so, the community can make a start by finding out what its own resources are and what help it may need. Where community efforts cannot alone solve local unemployment, it may become necessary for more comprehensive measures to be taken.

At the present time the Federal Government is doing what it can to help areas of substantial unemployment. For example, it is encouraging business firms in such areas to bid on Government contracts. This help is often of limited nature, however, since the Federal Government is required by law to award contracts to the lowest bidder.

I am confident that we can and will ward off the threat of Nation-wide unemployment—that full employment and a high standard of living can and will be maintained. But the solution of unemployment is everyone's business. It is the responsibility of everyone, including responsible organized labor such as the American Federation of Labor.

Some people believe that all American frontiers have been crossed and that our future progress will be limited. Probably not very many of our citizens believe that. I am sure that such a man as Samuel Gompers, if he were alive today, would not believe it. He would undoubtedly believe that the pioneering American spirit in which he played such an important part still has the vitality and the courage upon which to expand community and Nation-wide business and industrial activity for many generations to come.

Today there are forces loose in the world, as A. F. of L. members well know, which would destroy our democracy and our free labor movement. We must constantly be on guard against those forces. We must be on guard at the grass roots—in the local community.

It is there that the cure for unemployment must be sought first.

Need for Legislative Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an article by Mr. Albert L. Warner, which appeared in the March 1950 issue of Harper's magazine.

Members of the Senate will recall that on January 11 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter signed by Mr. Robert Heller on behalf of the National Committee for the Strengthening of Congress suggesting a program for further legislative reorganization. At that time I announced that I was planning to introduce legislation toward that end. I hope very soon, Mr. President, to have a resolution prepared and introduced to establish a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

THE CHAOS OF CONGRESS

(By Albert L. Warner)

Three and a half years ago a congressional reorganization law "modernized and streamlined" Congress. Now it is all too easy to see that nothing was done to improve either chassis or engine. Some chromium and a couple of bug-eyed headlights may have been superimposed, but it is still the same old model-T rattletrap.

One might almost say that the only tangible result of the congressional reorganization act was to raise the pay of Congressmen and to provide retirement pensions for them. In all fairness, certain improvements and reforms were made; but they are less conspicuous than the creaking and swaying of the lumbering congressional vehicle.

Take, for instance, the utter lack of financial responsibility in Congress. The last session demonstrated it appallingly. So complete was the financial chaos that the average Congressman in the week before adjournment had no idea how much of a Government-spending program he was voting, or whether the deficit would be two or twelve billion dollars.

The reorganization law of 1946 had attempted to set up a legislative budget. It directed that the appropriating and tax-raising committees in Congress were to estimate on February 15 of each year the total projected expenditures for the next fiscal year and the total expected revenue. In 1947 and 1948 a Republican Congress gave this provision of the law a half-hearted and disdainful recognition. The Democrats of the Eighty-first Congress threw it in the ashcan. They considered it unworkable, and perhaps it was, in part; but at any rate even the spirit of the law was flouted.

Appropriation bills came along by fits and starts. A chamber would economize one day and go on a spending spree the next. It would cut out $3,000,000 for a fair in the District of Columbia to celebrate the sesquicentennial of the Capital City, and then authorize $40,000,000 for the construction of new post offices or Federal buildings in every Congressman's district, whether needed or not. And the scales were so loaded against economy that the friends of the District fair could come back three times to the House of Representatives—and make the grade the third time. The House reversed itself and gave the money.

The old back-slapping process, you-help-me-and-I'll-help-you, operated without hindrance on the time-honored pork-barrel bill for rivers and harbors and flood control. The House approved a generous appropriation of $593,000,000; then the Members of the House rushed over to the other side of the Capitol to join their Senators at committee hearings and urge still bigger appropriations, till when the bill passed the Senate it had reached $751,000,000.

The old congressional system of first authorizing a program entailing the spending of money, and then in separate action making the appropriation, lent itself to confusion as usual and played into the hands of the spendthrift. Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, sought to stop an appropriation for drawing up plans for a small dam at Gavins Point on the Missouri River. The dam, he said, should not be built for 13 years and might never be needed—depending on the effectiveness of other dams under construction. But the House is always sensitive to local projects, and the theory that it was already committed to this one carried the day; the blueprinting of the dam was upheld.

It would have been reasonable to expect all the appropriation bills for the new fiscal year to pass before it began, on July 1. But so dilatory was Congress that it had to adopt five stop-gap resolutions to allow Government pay rolls to be met while it continued to fumble over bills for weeks after the deadline. On October 1, when a quarter of the fiscal year had elapsed, five appropriation bills were still stuck in the works; and not until October 17 was the vital defense appropriation bill passed—more than 3½ months late!

Not only did the average legislator during the session have no idea of what the appropriations were totaling—according to Representative MIKE MONRONEY, the able Oklahoma Democrat who fathered the reorganization law—but when the session was over even the financial leaders of Congress differed as to what they had done. Representative CANNON, House Appropriations chairman, and Representative JOHN TABER, ranking Republican Member of the committee, were about $2,000,000,000 apart on the total of the appropriations they said had been voted.

It is evident that in fiscal matters Congress at the outset of a session doesn't know where it is headed, during the session doesn't know where it is, and at the end doesn't know where it has been.

II

It was the optimistic thought of the sponsors of the reorganization law that they were improving the committee system of Congress. It is true that they reduced the number of standing committees, equipped them with professional staffs, and put a brake on the creation of special committees. But consider the duplication and confusion that still remain.

The duplication of testimony before congressional committees is an indecent waste of time and of officials' energy. The House Foreign Affairs Committee holds hearings on the bill to extend the Marshall plan for another year. Then the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hears the same men and raises the same questions. Next the House Appropriations Committee, and after it the Senate Appropriations Committee, go over the same well-beaten ground. The joint Congressional Watchdog Committee delves into the same operations. Paul Hoffman, the administrator of the Marshall plan, spent 9 days before the Senate Appropriations Committee alone, being heckled about every export detail from brooms to wigs; and during the past session Louis Johnson, the Secretary of Defense, had to testify before 10 different committees or subcommittees of Congress. In 1 month he made no less than 15 appearances.

Compounding confusion, the Appropriations Committees are beginning to take over the making of policy also. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate was willing to go along with the State Department on policies affecting Franco Spain; but Senator PAT MCCARRAN, as chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, said to the Secretary of State, "I am not in favor of your policy with reference to Spain and until that policy is changed I am going to examine your appropriations with a fine-tooth comb." And the influence of Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, exercised through the Senate Appropriations Committee, held up the pay of Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus for 5 months because the Senator did not like Mr. Straus' policies.

For all the virtues of the reorganization bill, it left untouched the biggest evil of the present committee system: the hoary system of seniority that sits upon the committees like an old man of the sea. The chairmen of committees are those who have grown old coming from safe districts. Ability, effectiveness, knowledge, even political shrewdness—which is sometimes needed to get things done—have nothing to do with the selection of a committee chairman. The oldest man in point of service gets the job.

A committee chairman appoints the personnel of subcommittees. He sets the dates for meetings. He directs what bills are to be considered and when. Because of the traditional deference to him he can practically smother legislation which fails to meet with his personal approval.

The result is that several of the most important committees of Congress have been kept in a state of disorganization. Chairman JOHN LESINSKI, of the House Committee on Education, and Labor began the past session by trying to install a committee counsel whom not even his Democratic colleagues on the committee would swallow. Later the administration's effort to repeal or drastically modify the Taft-Hartley Act saved face only by sending the measures back to committee. The bill for Federal aid to education, handled so smoothly by the Senate that it passed with scarcely a ripple, was allowed to fall into a needlessly bitter row in this House committee, and was stranded there, its friends unable to muster a committee majority to consider it. Finally, the chairman used his arbitrary power to abolish several subcommittees. Representative ANDREW JACOBS, Indiana, Democrat, bitterly protesting, spent the last 3 weeks of the session trying to have the full committee called together. The chairman by seniority said "No." In the nondemocratic committee system of Congress, a chairman's "No" is effective.

Then there is Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN, of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee—chairman, of course, by virtue of seniority. After giving his committee members only a few minutes to look over a new version of a bill to cost $125,000,000,000 for veterans' pensions, he railroaded it to the floor of the House over the shrieks of protesting Democrats. It took not only good sense but considerable political fortitude for the House to send the bill back to committee, because it is considered political suicide to vote against anything for veterans.

At the other end of the Capitol, Senator MCCARRAN, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, secure in his seniority, defied his own party leadership and a majority of both parties of the Senate for one entire session over the bill to revise the displaced-persons law. He did so by just prolonging indefinitely public hearings on the bill. The Senate, always deferential to committee chairmen, had authorized $135,000 for immi-

gration inquiries, which gave scope to protracted study.

III

Much of the unedifying spectacle of congressional dawdling, fumbling, and obstructionism is caused by slow motion in the Senate, and this results from the rule of unlimited debate and the rule of unanimous consent. One dissenter holds up action; and, because there is no requirement that speeches be germane to the issue before the Senate, the discussion of a housing program may be stalled for 4 hours by a speech on milk for Hottentots. There is value in deliberation and full debate, but the result of such latitude is boredom and a snail's pace. In the past session it was only when summer had crept into fall and the House had taken a conspicuous vacation that the Senate finished what could easily have been completed 3 months earlier.

During last winter and spring it became standard practice for the Senate to spend 2 or 3 weeks on every major bill. Any reasonable men, untrammeled by the habits of the Senate, could have resolved each of those issues in 4 days with full discussion.

Real filibusters are not frequent, but there are always long, long speeches carried well beyond the point of weariness. While one or two men harry a point for days, the rest of the Senators are working in their offices or off home for a visit. Sometimes the speeches are a form of political blackmail. Just to get rid of the talks, the Senate accepts what they demand.

In the midst of the debate over a change in the Senate rules last year, up rose Senator HARRY CAIN, the Washington Republican, and delivered himself for 6½ hours of his low opinion of Mon Wallgren, whom the President was trying to appoint as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The Senator brought along an extra pair of shoes for the talkathon, changing from one to the other to relieve weary feet. The bored listeners got no such attention.

Incidentally, in the House a roll call takes 40 minutes; in the Senate, 15. Electrical voting equipment would eliminate this droning ritual. But Congress will have none of it.

IV

Some of the causes of congressional inefficiency appear to be insoluble. For instance, the greatest source of distraction to Congressmen in the efficient conduct of their legislative work is their individual constituents. The nonlegislative workload of errands and chores takes 80 percent of the time of some Members of Congress. The gamut of these worries runs from jobs, pension troubles, railroad retirement and social security cases, veterans' affairs, and RFC loans, to defense installations and river and harbor projects for their home districts.

Mr. MONRONEY recalls that someone ironically suggested that half of Congress should be legislators and half should be representatives of the districts. The only trouble is that the representatives of the districts would be the ones reelected.

As if it were not enough that Congressmen should be laden with errands for their districts, they are also imposing upon themselves a new load of publicity activity. They are writing weekly columns for their local newspapers and weekly radio talks by transcription to their local radio stations. And new Congressman GERALD R. FORD, Michigan, Republican, is setting what may become a ghastly precedent. He has become the actor-star in a Washington travelog to be sent to clubs and schools back home, a movie full of the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, the Potomac, the chambers of Congress, and Congressman FORD. God alone knows what the demands of television will be.

Perhaps there is no way of curbing such outside activity on the part of our legislators. But some of the other scandalous conditions that I have been discussing can be remedied.

1. The chaos in finances. There is at least a faint hope that this situation will be bettered in the present session by the introduction of a single, comprehensive appropriation bill, lumping together all appropriations. This will give Congressmen a chance to look at the total of what they are voting to spend. The appropriations of the previous year will be set in juxtaposition to the omnibus measure, and the same accounting plan will be used for each year. This plan, pushed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia, Democrat, could at least show Congress what it is doing.

To let Congress cope with the administrative departments on more even terms, the Appropriations Committees need a professional staff of perhaps a hundred members—accountants and budgetary experts delving into operations as the budget is made up.

2. The demoralizing rule of congressional committees by seniority. It would be a relatively simple change to have the committee chairman chosen either by the elected majority leaders of the Senate and the House or by the members of the committees. All that is needed is enough nerve on the part of enough legislators to push through the change; the country would applaud.

3. The rules of the Senate which provide for unlimited debate and unanimous consent. Even a mild limitation of debate, invokable only in extremities, and a standing requirement that speeches must be germane to the subject before the Senate, would bring improvement.

The old model T was a good car but the roads are slicker now and the traffic fast and heavy. The ancient congressional jalopy needs some fundamental rebuilding.

The Basing-Point Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April issue of the National Independent which vigorously opposes Senate bill 1008, the so-called basing-point bill. This publication represents the independent tire dealers and tire rebuilders, and is another instance of small business opposing Senate bill 1008.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASING-POINT BILL MUST BE KILLED

The basing-point bill, S. 1008, which threatens to rip the very guts out of the Robinson-Patman Act, is dangerously close to becoming law.

This is a very bad bill. It must not pass.

It must not pass because it will destroy the antiprice discrimination provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. It will weaken the very antitrust laws which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, to enforce and strengthen.

It must not pass because it will sacrifice small and independent businessmen on the altar of giant, monopoly business. It will injure mortally small and independent businessmen whose interests both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, to protect and advance.

It must not pass because it will bless the operations and expansion of monopolies. It will increase monopoly domination of American business, something which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, they would oppose firmly.

It must not pass because it will, in furthering the interests of monopolies, drive our Nation down the road away from freedom toward the slave state. It will speed us on the road to socialism, fascism, or communism (three birds of a feather), which both major political parties swore solemnly, during their 1948 election-year campaigns, they would battle.

It must not pass because it is not honest. The bill will not, as its sponsors claim, benefit small and independent businessmen—rather it will injure them. The bill is not being sponsored by small and independent businessmen on their own initiative—rather it is being sponsored by small and independent businessmen completely misled by giant, monopoly industry interests.

It must not pass because it has not been given the thorough airing all legislation should receive. Senate and House sponsors of the bill have refused to hear in committees charged with considering S. 1008 the objections of small and independent businessmen to the measure. This is a practice more characteristic of the Communist slave state than of free America.

What can we do about this?

We can do three things. First, write now to President Truman, explaining our objections, and demanding that he veto S. 1008. Second, write now to our Senators, explaining our objections, and demanding that they vote against S. 1008 when it comes up for passage and in support of a Presidential veto. Third, write now to our Representative, demanding that he vote to support a Presidential veto.

Farm Rule of Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Alfred D. Stedman entitled "Farm Rule of Reason," which appeared in a recent issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM RULE OF REASON
(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Due allowances are to be made for tendencies in the writing craft, as among other folk, to go a little loony in the spring. And since the fussing and fuming are now about the Federal farm-price program, there's a better-than-usual excuse. For the potato-and-egg mess isn't imaginary. The wheat and corn surpluses do exist. The four billions of tax money tied up in products ain't hay. And the job of press and radio is to drag such things into daylight. So the democratic process of full and free reporting must go on.

Nevertheless there still are such things as facts and the rule of reason. It is with

them that the current spring writing rage plays havoc. An aim to stir a public stampede against the farm program is avowed by two magazines and reflected by others. These two expressly adopt the Mencken view, that while the average American is too dumb to understand much of anything, he can easily be scared. So the word is out to give the farm program the works. Alarm the people into killing it. That's the idea, and, boy, are the word wizards doing it up brown.

Exhibit A on the extreme side is the article that the April Reader's Digest reprints from Fortune, these magazines being the Mencken slant twins. Fortune's original title was "The Farmers versus the People." Maybe because that seemed to label the producers of this Nation's food as inferior creatures, not people, the Digest changed it a bit. The new title is "Farm Politics versus the People." But the general theme remains.

The magazines condemn the farm program for seeking to increase agriculture's share of the national income "regardless of the group's contribution to that income"—exactly the opposite of its aim. They compare it with John L. Lewis, to his advantage. They call it inflationary, though farm prices are our most deflationary factor. They see grand scale Federal buying of pork, though pork meats have not been bought. They talk of a mounting wheat surplus in another wet cycle year, though the Plains really are swept by drought, dust storms and crop loss.

Other exhibits almost as extreme could fill out the alphabet. A Life magazine writer described the huge food reserves under the program as a curse. But a Louisville paper denounced the program for promoting artificial scarcity. A NANA columnist interpreted that wheat planting will run 40,000,000 bushels above 1949 and corn planting as much as 200,000,000 bushels higher thus maybe sinking the price supports—whatever the heck bushels of plantings might mean. People read about "Cadillac farmers" rolling in wealth, whereas income per farmer averages about half the income of nonfarmers. Repeatedly the epithet socialistic is applied to Government financing of self help for those who are really this country's most individual people. And not content with reasonable criticism of granting $8 per diem pay to farm committeemen attending the St. Paul meeting April 4, a Minneapolis newspaper editorial publishes a comparison of around 4,500 committeemen who have been elected by vote of Minnesota farmers to the long malodorous Pendergast outfit, saying that PMA stands for "Pendergast Machine in Agriculture."

On runs the gamut of denunciation, carrying small hint of Government aid to anybody except the farmer, until his head is bloody and bowed.

Certainly the farm program's costs and surpluses need scaling down, the potato-and-egg mess needs to be cleaned up, and a lot more soil conservation needs to be injected into the program. But do not other facts call for consideration before killing it off entirely?

One such fact is that the program's reserves of wheat and corn, through embarrassingly large in other respects, are also a backlog of human food that, in event of war or drought, could be vital. In opposing the program, a Minneapolis editorial belittles even this preparedness value, although on the same theory a hospital or fire-fighting or insurance plan could be derided as relying for success on the occurrence of trouble. The wheat reserve is obviously protective now in view of the Plains drought that already has slashed the official wheat estimate a drastic 120,000,000 bushels. Also the corn reserve is protective at a time when corn belt subsoil moisture is very low. These reserves are food—bread, milk and meat in storable form. Hostile words cannot take away their value of protection against possible emergencies.

Another such fact is that while the organized farm groups are denounced for upholding the program, all except one are fighting for more moderate and more flexible price supports. The dairy group is taking the lead in asking Congress for restoration of the self-financing feature that first President Coolidge and then the United States Supreme Court, with business backing, knocked out of the farm program. And while verbally opposed to the program's flexible price support feature, Secretary Brannan has officially and repeatedly used that feature to lower price supports on potatoes, eggs, flax, dairy and other products. So even the politics of the program are being misrepresented to the country.

A final fact is that not within agriculture but outside of it originate the conditions that are forcing farm price protection. Between big business and tightly organized professions on one side and big labor on the other side are the competing millions of mostly small farming units. So in postwar times, farm prices have invariably slumped much faster than other prices. Past experience tells clearly that the result of failure to guard against this is a crash and spreading disaster. Isn't there something to be said for choosing to iron out the bad spots from the farm program instead of going through another such postwar collapse? Facts and the rule of reason seem to say so. And maybe those, when the pen-and-ink brigade's present spell of spring fever passes, will for a change get a play.

The Financial Solvency of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., leader of the minority of the House of Representatives, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner Club, at the William Penn Hotel, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 15, last.

Later I hope to have the opportunity to place in the RECORD an address delivered at the same dinner by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, fellow Americans, I am honored by your kind invitation to address the Amen Corner.

Standing before taxpayers who help pay the bills for the Washington spenders, I speak to you tonight somewhat in the manner of the referee in bankruptcy—I can't repair all the damage—but I can tell you where the money went.

We are at the crossroads in Washington today. The thinking members of both political parties realize this, and I think it is a tribute to the greatness of our Nation that these men place patriotism above partisanship and act in the best interests of our country.

When we speak of the financial solvency of Government we are speaking about a situation that affects us far more than the stability of our currency or the value of our bonds or the condition of our Treasury. When we consider that we now have a mountainous debt and that we are operating on a deficit basis, then it is clear to anyone that our very national security is at stake.

We sometimes forget that the Federal budget has only been in balance once in a generation of endless deficit spending.

We sometimes forget that taxes have only been reduced once in a generation of ever-increasing taxes.

We sometimes forget that our national debt has been reduced only once in a generation of ever mounting national debt.

Only in the years of 1947 and 1948 was the budget in balance. Only in those years was there an application made toward retirement of the debt. Only in those years—and it took 2 years and the survival of three presidential vetoes to do it—was there a reduction in taxes.

Those years—1947 and 1948—were the years of the late and much abused Eightieth Congress. Yes, the Republicans were in control in 1947 and 1948, but the task performed by that Congress would never have been achieved without the aid of patriotic and sincere Democrats who firmly believed then and believe now that the solvency of America is vital not only to the American people but to the world.

Of course, times change—in fact, they changed rather abruptly for my party in November 1948. Things are a bit different since that momentous date.

Spending has been resumed at an enormous rate. Where the Treasury showed a surplus of more than $8,000,000,000 when the books were closed on the fiscal year 1948, the books for the fiscal year 1950 will show a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000.

The budget for 1951 is based on another deficit of $5,500,000,000.

In brief, the Federal spenders will have run up a total deficit for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951—of almost $13,000,000,000.

And this at a time when Federal tax collections are running approximately $40,000,000,000 a year.

I repeat, the battle for solvency—the great battle of this year 1950—may well determine the future, not only of our own country, but of the entire free world.

Because this struggle is of such overshadowing importance, we must have the united support of all our people—Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike.

Let all patriots, regardless of party, join in this great crusade to end the era of red ink and red herring. Let us elect to office only men and women who will keep the American faith.

The world tide of public opinion is marked clearly in the recent elections in New Zealand, Australia, and England. Spendthrift socialism has been tested in the work-a-day world—and it is not the answer to the progressive needs of this twentieth century world. It has not brought to the people either peace, security, progress, or sustained prosperity.

Our crusade today is to save constitutional government. We must preserve the freedom of the American people. We must fight off a new threat of slavery—slavery to government and to crushing, crippling debt.

If I may interpose a personal note, let me remind you, fellow Americans, that it was exactly 85 years ago this day that the immortal Abraham Lincoln departed this earth.

Many times have I walked past that historic old brick house on Tenth Street, in Washington, where Lincoln had lain in agony all night long, after the fateful attack of the assassin in Ford's Theater, across the street. History tells us that a cold, driving rain fell in Washington on that Saturday morning of April 15, 1865. At 20 minutes after 7 in the morning there was a sudden stir and bustle

in the crowd which had kept its prayerful vigil through the night. At that moment, John Hay, Lincoln's secretary, emerged from the dark, brooding house to announce the death of Father Abraham.

Let this day remind us, then, that the battle against human slavery is never finished. The battle for freedom is unending.

Today we face the threat of yet another form of slavery—indenture to debt—and ours is the solemn charge to stand like bold men and proclaim to all the world: "It shall not come to pass."

Let us dare to hold high the sacred torch of freedom, lest the darkness of tyranny fall again upon all mankind.

Sickening to the patriot's heart is the orgy of waste, extravagance, and plain bad management encountered on every hand in Washington today—shocking waste—sinful waste—demoralizing waste of the people's substance.

Only a month ago we had a report from the Federal Supply Service telling of the tremendous inventories of equipment and supplies on hand in some of the executive departments. I want to read some of the figures to you—they tell the whole story of the kind of administration we are paying for today.

One agency had on hand enough fluorescent light tubes to last it for 93 years.

The same agency had on hand, as routine inventory, sufficient ruled paper to last it for 168 years.

It also carried as inventory enough tracing cloth to last for 9 years—and enough loose-leaf binders to last it for 247 years.

That's the kind of government a nation always gets when one party remains too long in power.

The bureaucrats grow fat, lazy, arrogant, indifferent, careless. They spend just for the sake of giving someone an order.

First, they become callous to the cries and pleas of the taxpayers—and then, as time goes on, these callous moods harden into attitudes of utter contempt for the people. That's when government begins to push the people around. And that's exactly where we stand today—one short step removed from the police state of compulsion.

Give this sort of government just one more vote of confidence—just one more term of security for the bureaucrats—and you will find them so deeply entrenched in their spending and give-away programs that there will be no uprooting them, ever.

The longer bureaucrats remain in power, the more money they spend. And the more they spend, the more powerful and far-reaching becomes their propaganda to crush and snuff out every voice of criticism and opposition.

High, wide, and handsome is the spending sway today. Only last month the Appropriations Committee of the House examined some detailed bills for new furniture for one office in the Federal Power Commission. The bill came to $2,189—for one office. Here are some of the items:

"Two walnut wastebaskets, at $13 each; and two ashtrays, at $5 each."

There you have the picture of today's spendthrift bureaucracy freewheeling with the people's money.

That's how they got their favorite campaign slogan, "Tax and tax, spend and spend."

Only a few sentences are needed to summarize this alarming trend in Washington today.

The Federal budget in 1928 was $4,000,000,000. By 1938 it was $8,000,000,000. By 1948 it was $40,000,000,000.

In 1928 we had 400 Federal agencies in the budget. In 1938 we had 1,000. And today we have 1,800 Federal units in Government. In 1928 the per capita debt was $146. In 1938 it was $286. And in 1948 it was $1,759.

In 1928 we had 500,000 Federal employees in all departments. By 1938 we had a million civil employees. And by 1948 we had a few more than 2,000,000, not counting any military personnel, officers, or enlisted men.

The Federal debt today is an unseen mortgage of more than $7,000 on every family in America.

The spenders have mortgaged the lives, not only of your children and your grandchildren but of their grandchildren for generations almost unnumbered.

I call as a witness against this reckless course another noted Missourian, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Commenting on the Federal budget for 1951, Chairman CANNON told the House on January 9 this year:

"From every technical and statistical point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime history of the Republic."

I could read to you tonight for hours from the splendid reports submitted last year by the Hoover Commission. Those 19 reports cataloged waste, extravagance, and overlap and duplication in every department and agency of the Government—page after page of such items as I have cited from this year's appropriations hearings.

Yet the powerful administration propaganda machine only sneers and jeers at the people's cry for real economy in Government and lower taxes. They make no real effort to cut down the spending.

But the day is fast approaching when the Government can no longer live on I O U's. The day is approaching when they must tell the people what has become of the social-security trust funds. Today the social-security till is empty. The social-security taxes for 15 years were spent for routine Government operations, as fast as they came in. The trust fund is a pile of Federal I O U's.

When the day of accounting comes—as surely it must—we will find the master spenders grouped on the White House steps responding to the assembled multitudes:

"Let 'em eat powdered eggs."

Or:

"Let 'em eat dried milk—there are whole caves full of these spoiling foods available in Kansas."

Or perhaps they might offer us a few potatoes.

No, fellow Americans, we dare not stand idly by and see such a band of reckless, irresponsible, and desperate men steer this mighty land into the shoals of economic disaster.

Ours is the solemn duty and the sacred responsibility to demand a house cleaning in Washington—now.

One of the great myths in Washington today is this thing called Federal aid.

"Taxes must remain high," the spenders tell us, "because Washington is sending so much money back to the States to help build roads, hospitals, airports, and other public works, and to sustain vital welfare programs."

But what is the truth about Federal aid:

Every dollar sent back to the States from Washington comes from the States in the first place. Every State except one is taxed more for these services than it gets back.

Look at the figures for your own great State of Pennsylvania. In the fiscal year 1948 Pennsylvania paid into the Federal Treasury in all forms of taxation the astonishing total of $3,223,000,000.

And Pennsylvania got back in all forms of Federal aids and grants only $359,000,000.

In other words, every time Pennsylvania pays in a dollar for Federal taxes, she gets back 11 cents.

Yet the thinkers and planners down there tell you it is the State-aid programs which keeps taxes so high.

Pennsylvania pays in a dollar and gets back a dime.

Given her own Federal revenues each year, Pennsylvania could do for herself everything that Washington is doing for her today in the way of Federal aids and grants—and save millions upon millions a year in the bargain. Isn't that worth doing something about?

Federal aid is a myth. The bureaucratic brokerage is terrific. Any State or any city—yes, any citizen—can spend this money at home more wisely than the Washington planners can spend it for us.

The spenders tell us that everything is going to be lovely. They tell us that in 50 years every family will have an income of $12,000 a year.

And that is another cruel and heartless myth.

The President was very careful not to predict what the American dollar would be worth in the year 2000.

He knows that today's dollar buys only 60 cents' worth of goods, as measured in 1939 purchasing power—and less than 30 cents' worth of goods, as measured in the purchasing power of the year 1900.

If the purchasing power of the American dollar falls off as much during the next 50 years as it has in the last 50, the dollar will be worth exactly 18 cents, in that great year of promise, A. D. 2000.

Then the $12,000 family income so glibly promised by today's tax-eaters would represent a yearly purchasing power of $2,160 in terms of 1939 dollars—less than today's average income per family.

So this whole theory and program is only a gigantic hoax on all the people—a political shot-in-the-arm to lull them to complacency for a few more years of irresponsible tax extraction.

And this gigantic hoax is reared upon the contemptuous official opinion in Washington that the American people do not catch the difference between the 100-cent dollar, a 60-cent dollar, and an 18-cent dollar.

Such callous trafficking in human destiny is without parallel in modern history.

I predict that the American people, once aroused, will soundly reject and repudiate the power grasping mob which seriously sponsors such economic nonsense. There is a job for all of us. We must all unite in seeing that the American people are fully informed. They must know the facts. When they do, they will make an intelligent decision.

What this country needs is a good five-point program for American revival, security, and progress.

We must get rid of the wartime excise taxes and other punitive taxation.

We must create tax incentive for small business.

We must balance the budget and reduce the debt.

We must administer the tariff program more carefully, to protect American jobs.

We must remove the threat of socialization which hangs like a pall over the spirit of American thrift and industry.

We must stop this pump-priming for disaster.

And we must drive the Reds, subversives, spies, and saboteurs from the structure of the Federal Government. Our policies must be supervised by men and women whose first loyalty is to the United States.

Let us band together like good Americans to end the era of the red herring, and secret government.

Every time a committee of the House or Senate digs up a new name of a Communist sympathizer on the Federal pay roll, that's more red herring.

The official record demonstrates that our State Department has been harboring in recent years, by their own admission, people who never had any moral right to any position of power or influence in public affairs.

But may the American people look at these records?

Oh, no. They are confidential. They are secret. They must be held under lock and key. No official of any department may release these records to Congress save upon personal order of the President.

That order is denied.

Our highest defense secrets have been stolen.

Our policies have been betrayed.

Our security has been undermined by spies and saboteurs.

But the records are sealed from the American people. Why?

Yet I feel confident that an overwhelming majority of the American people support our proposition that we must root out the Communists and fellow-travelers in every department and every branch of our Government. The people want action—not excuses. They know that the Stalinites have outwitted us, and they want the stables cleaned.

We must rid ourselves of those wobblies who now frustrate and obstruct and sabotage operations within the very structure of government itself.

There is no place in our Government for these spies, traitors, and saboteurs.

It is a profound fact of history that the secrets of the pumpkin papers were first disclosed to an Assistant Secretary of State as long ago as 1939. But the American people did not hear of these black deeds until the summer of 1948.

We face difficult times as we grope for progress and prosperity at home and peace abroad. These two problems go hand in hand. Without a strong and solvent America we cannot have good times and be sure of the preservation of our rights and progress. Without a strong America we cannot meet the great challenge to America to preserve the liberties and freedoms of the people and to exert a powerful influence for peace. We must not waste and squander our liberties. We must be strong financially and we must be strong in a military sense. Only through a strong army and navy and an all powerful air force can we make sure of peace. New ventures and new experiments in government must be delayed while we build our air forces as a mighty impetus for peace. My countrymen, only through self-denial and sacrifice and unselfishness can we meet this great challenge. We must go forward united; class, racial, and religious differences must be subordinated to the common good. We are one people, all with a common destiny. We will go forward together or we will sink together; united we can meet successfully, fairly, and justly the economic problems of our time. With tolerance and patience we can build a better America for all. We can build a stronger America that will bring peace, happiness, and progress, not only for our own people but the people of all the world.

We must not fail in this God-given opportunity to serve our day and generation. Our duty to civilization demands we shall not fail.

How To Regain Lost Water Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Regain Lost Water Rights," published in the Los Angeles Times of April 12, 1950. The editorial comments on Senate bill 3376, which I introduced a week ago Monday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows :

HOW TO REGAIN LOST WATER RIGHTS

Sudden realization throughout the West of the bold attempt of the Bureau of Reclamation to take over internal water and power rights in the various States, has led to a revolt at last.

This awakening has been late. But it is not too late.

Congress finally has been asked to act on a comprehensive plan to rescue many water and power projects which have been taken over by the Bureau of Reclamation on an apparently permanent basis in its policy of seize and control. The proposed legislation would restore to the people the local rights and legal privileges which have been wrested from them by the Bureau.

WATKINS, OF UTAH

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, is the spokesman for local rights who has stepped forward with specific legislation. His bill is described as an effort to provide grass-root management of multipurpose reclamation projects—that is, where irrigation and power development both are involved.

The so-called basin projects include those in which the Bureau, by long-planned and devious steps has succeeded in supplanting local control and has substituted its own costly and extravagant management from Washington. The Colorado River and the Columbia River and the Central Valley project in California are examples of the Bureau's continuous and growing encroachment.

Only by some such plan as that put forward by Senator WATKINS can this Federal domination, resulting eventually in full economic and political control by the bureau planners in Washington, be forestalled.

THE BANKER TAKES ALL

Simply framed, Senator WATKINS' bill would provide the legal machinery for enlargement of local operational groups to care for the big water and power developments. This would fit in perfectly with the aims of many aroused groups throughout California which now are seeking to take back control of the vast Central Valley project from the Bureau of Reclamation. The Central Valley story is unfolding day by day as the Bureau through many maneuvers seeks to tighten its hold, and the local groups, fighting hard at last, move to block the loss of their remaining rights and to regain their lost ones.

A point which Senator WATKINS makes is so important that it is difficult to understand how it has been overlooked so often. This is that in every instance the local citizens are paying for the water and power developments, yet full control is sought by Washington merely because it has provided the basic loan or financing. It is as if a bank, making a home loan, should demand the right to dictate what kind of a house a man is going to build and also seek title to the house even after the borrower has paid off the loan.

Entire objective of the Watkins bill is to move back toward the original purposes of the Reclamation Act of 1902. This act has been perverted flagrantly by the Department of the Interior and the Reclamation Bureau in their efforts to foist a strangling Federal domination upon the West.

ALL MUST JOIN FRAY

In the Central Valley project of California, particularly, some aid is needed immediately to restore local rights. The Bureau at the moment is seeking by every means at its command to take over the hydroelectric rights of the Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River in defiance of Congress, the Federal Power Commission, precedent, and the rights of the owners of the water. This effort merely is an extension and a support of previous attempts to force the 1,000,000-acre Kings River Water Users Association into the Central Valley project against its will.

The united and fighting efforts of organizations throughout the State are needed now to crystallize the sentiment of local farmers and other citizens to fight the Bureau at every turn. Support of Senator WATKINS' bill is one segment of this struggle; positive backing should be given the bill in Congress by every Californian interested in preserving his State from outside domination.

Southern California's $550,000,000 stake in the Hoover Dam-Colorado River development is a vital reason for this section to be active in aiding all efforts to block the Bureau from permanent control. Local taxpayers are footing the bill every day; they should know that their investment is to be secure.

Sometimes it takes a good while for a realization of the enormity of the seize-and-rule schemes such as those exemplified by the Bureau of Reclamation. Now that the realization has begun to make itself apparent, there should be no let-up in the fight.

The Bureau is in the wrong. It can be defeated. It must be.

Chinese Representation in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, Professor Owen Lattimore has publicly suggested that the United States representatives to the United Nations so act as to bring about the expulsion of the Chinese Nationalist delegates which would lead inevitably to the seating of the Communists, sent here by the Peiping regime, the collaborators of Russia. I consider it would be a grave mistake for the United States to follow Dr. Lattimore's article. In my opinion the views he here expressed are not shared by the great majority of Americans. It is to be hoped that the State Department will ignore his counsel. Not only would we be repudiating the friendly representatives of China who have cooperated with the freedom-loving nations at Lake Success but we would be giving aid and comfort to communism by any manifestation of attitude which will hasten the seating of representatives of the Peiping regime.

Furthermore, if our Nation follows this advice of Professor Lattimore we will merely assure another certain "veto" in any deliberations of the United Nations where democratic interests are in-

volved. Why invite into our midst a group of Communists, all of whom are looking for the opportunity, and biding their time, to help in the overthrow of our free institutions? Certainly Moscow would rejoice over having scored another major victory if we assist in any way in the seating of the Chinese Communist delegation, which I hope we will never do. It would give Russia two of the Big Five votes to thwart any action looking toward the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The New York Times has expressed its well-considered views in an editorial entitled "The View of Dr. Lattimore." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIEWS OF DR. LATTIMORE

Prof. Owen Lattimore has a right to his opinions and a right to express them. They may be wrong, sometimes, but to challenge them is not to challenge his integrity. Since he has that right, others have the right to disagree with him without being accused of having joined a smear campaign.

Since his views have been brought conspicuously into the limelight by present circumstances, it is prudent to weigh them carefully, not to see if they are subversive but to see if they fit the facts sufficiently well to inspire confidence. He is a specialist on the Far East, and our policies in respect to that area are much in debate. Whether his advice should be followed is germane to that debate.

In Philadelphia on Saturday night Dr. Lattimore advised members of the American Academy of Political and Social Science that the United States should disavow the Nationalist Government of China by "allowing those members of the United Nations who wished to do so to vote to unseat the old Chinese delegation to the United Nations and seat a new one." We submit that this is bad advice because it is based on a false presumption and is therefore thoroughly misleading in respect to the United States and its relations to the United Nations.

The assumption that the United States could and should "allow" other nations to take courses of action is false, since it implies that the United States thus far has not so "allowed." The United States, exactly contrary to this assumption, made it plain 2 months ago that it would abide by a majority decision on China in the Security Council. Dr. Lattimore is urging the United States to do something it has already done.

The disadvantageous and dangerous aspect of this advice lies in its equally false implication that it is the refusal of the United States to "allow" a vote in the United Nations that is causing the present stalemate in the international organization. That record must be kept straight. The United Nations is in difficulty at present, not because the United States does not recognize the Communist regime in Peiping or welcome it into the United Nations but because of the blackmailing boycott of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The issue is not one of recognition or representation. The issue is merely whether the Soviet Union can force the United Nations to be obedient to its dictation by a policy of walk-outs. When Dr. Lattimore beclouds that issue he is putting his Government in the wrong light and hindering the important business of getting the facts in the case and getting them straight.

The Atlantic Community Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Atlantic Community Looks Ahead," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY LOOKS AHEAD

(By Walter Lippmann)

The principal Atlantic allies—Britain, France, and the United States—have been carrying on friendly but difficult discussions which turn finally on the question of what is to happen 2 years hence, when the Marshall plan ends. Mr. Hoffman's campaign for European integration and the European Payments Union, Sir Stafford Cripps' reluctance to commit Great Britain to these schemes, and now M. Bidault's proposal to set up an Atlantic High Council all stem from a realization that the end of the Marshall plan is in sight.

The ERP program, to be sure, has been in operation for only 2 of its 4 years. But Congress is about to vote on the third installment, and after that there will be only one more. When Congress meets next January it will have to go to work on the fourth and terminating installment. Thus, while in operation the ERP has run only half its course, from the point of view of the Governments the great decisions of policy about what is to follow are close at hand.

The attitude of the three governments is inspired and defined now by what each thinks could or should happen after ERP ends.

Mr. Hoffman, adhering loyally to the mandate of Congress, is in effect saying for the United States that if the Marshall countries are to become substantially independent of an American subsidy by 1952, they must now integrate—that is to say, they must agree on measures to develop a greater volume of trade among themselves and their own dependencies. Mr. Hoffman is trying to induce the Marshall countries to unite in order that the Marshall plan may end with its main legal objectives attained.

But the consideration which inspires him to put pressure on Great Britain inspires Sir Stafford Cripps to resist the pressure. The British view, I think it is fair to say, is that Britain has a better chance of achieving financial independence if it has a relatively free hand to make its own bargains and arrangements than if it is integrated—that is, tied very closely to the European continent. Mr. Hoffman has no way of guaranteeing the British that if integration with the continent proves to be a costly burden on the British reserves, the United States will underwrite the losses.

On the assumption that American aid is to end in 1952, Mr. Hoffman has no conclusive bargaining power today which can induce or compel the British to do what they regard as disadvantageous and dangerous. Though the British will probably make compromises to avoid a serious quarrel, we must not think that we can buy a commitment from them which extends beyond 1952 because there are still two installments of the ERP subsidy to be voted.

These installments have in fact been discounted. The British know and we know that in the critical condition of the cold war, the subsidy is not likely to be withheld. They know and we know, moreover, that if it were withheld Britain could, nevertheless, survive. There would be hardship. But the British can and will endure hardship when their national independence is at stake.

M. Bidault's proposal, judging from what is known of it, is designed to be a framework of mutual aid for the period which comes after the end of the Marshall plan. His fundamental assumption is quite evidently that large American contributions to the Atlantic community should not and cannot end in 1952. He is proposing to create an institution and, thereby, an implied commitment not to terminate the American subsidies at the end of the Marshall plan.

It is fair to say that if the British could know and could believe that 1952 would not see the end of American dollar aid to the Atlantic community, that somehow or other we would make it our national policy to finance the dollar gap at a high level of international trade and domestic employment, they would soon be leading the procession, rather than "dragging their feet" toward large schemes of cooperation and multilateralism and convertible currencies.

But it is not possible for Mr. Truman, Mr. Mr. Acheson, and Mr. Hoffman to make convincing American commitments after 1952. They cannot speak now for the Eighty-second Congress which is to be elected in the autumn, must less for the next President and the Eighty-third Congress.

But while they cannot commit the Congress to action in the future, they can still do something substantial and important. They can recognize the fact, which no one will be able to deny, that, though the Marshall plan ends, it will still be an American vital interest to see that the dollar gap is closed—not through deflation and unemployment from a contraction of exports, but by the maintenance of a high level of trade and investment. Though they cannot commit the Government to voting subsidies, and should not try, they can lead the American people to an understanding of their own interests.

They can, then, lay the foundations of American policy after 1952 not on the principle of subsidies to needy but deserving and valuable allies but on the stability and prosperity of the American economy. They can adhere to the idea that 1952 is to mark the end of direct subsidies by the United States to Great Britain certainly, and one may hope to our other principal allies as well. They can take the view that after 1952 we shall deal with Britain not as the recipient of our subsidy but as the manager of a great trading community—the sterling area—with which the dollar area must find profitable relations.

In the larger view, which transcends questions of money and trade and embraces the political future of western civilization, we should look forward hopefully to 1952 and to the end of our ERP relations with Great Britain. The subsidy has been necessary. It has served a useful purpose. But it must be ended because, were it to be anything but a temporary arrangement, it would demoralize the Anglo-American partnership on which the future of the Atlantic community depends.

That partnership cannot be satisfactory if Britain is not truly independent. Britain is not independent when every spring it has to justify itself to all the committees and to both Houses of the United States Congress. At whatever cost and inconvenience, Britain must cease to be our client and be free again to be our equal ally.

The British would not be the great ally they are if they did not hate this relationship and were not determined, however unpopular it makes them in Europe and over here, to get free of it.

Soviet Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Sante Fe New Mexican. I do so at the request of a constituent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGGER THAN THE H-BOMB

The nonchalant American, who can be aroused only by Bunker Hill, Fort Sumter, the battleship *Maine*, or Pearl Harbor, may soon be aroused more than ever before, without so much as the dropping of an old model-T A-bomb. In the humble opinion of this oldest newspaper in the West, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics may shortly:

1. Denounce the United Nations as a Jim Crow cartel for world dominion by white colonial imperialism;
2. Resign from the United Nations;
3. Declare that the U. S. S. R. is not and never has been a European, white, colonial, or imperial power;
4. Withdraw Soviet troops from all occupied countries;
5. Proclaim that the U. S. S. R. is and always has been an Asiatic power, of, by, and for Asiatics;
6. Point to a democratic federation for the advancement of Asiatic and other downtrodden peoples, concurrently formed in some pliant capital of the Indochinese or Malayan Balkans;
7. Proudly accept membership in this incipiently largest of the parliaments of man;
8. Donate to the new federation twice as much money for twice as big a skyscraper as Uncle Sam built the United Nations;
9. Then sit back and laugh; and
10. While our radio and newspaper commentators grope to explain why the dirty Russians didn't attack us honestly and fairly with an H-bomb, so we could retaliate.

Veterans' Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 31, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement issued by the Veterans' Administration which I am sure will be of interest to every Member of Congress, as well as to the veterans throughout the country.

The matter referred to follows:

The deadline for most veterans for starting a course of education and training under the GI bill is 15 months away—on July 25, 1951.

A Veterans' Administration regulation, issued today, states that the majority of veterans will not be permitted to begin GI bill courses after that date. An exception has been made for those discharged after July 25, 1947, and those who enlisted or reenlisted under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act.

July 25, 1951, however, is not important to veterans who have started and actually are pursuing GI bill training on that date, as they have the right to continue their courses.

The VA regulation explains that a veteran who has started a course and who has continued in it will be considered to be in training, even though he has temporarily interrupted the course for the summer vacation or for other reasons beyond his control.

Once a veteran completes or discontinues his program of GI bill training after the 1951 date, he may not start another course.

The GI bill provides that generally training must be initiated by July 25, 1951, or 4 years after a veteran's discharge, whichever is later, and it must be completed by July 25, 1956.

Most veterans are subject to the 1951 and 1956 cut-off dates. But there are the following exceptions:

1. Veterans discharged after July 25, 1947, have 4 years from date of discharge in which to begin GI bill training. However, they must finish by July 25, 1956.

2. Veterans who enlisted or reenlisted under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act (between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946) are not bound by either dead line. Instead, they have 4 years from the end of that enlistment or reenlistment period in which to start, and 9 years from that time in which to complete their course of training.

A veteran in either of these two categories actually must be in training when his individual entrance dead line comes around, in order to continue afterward.

The VA regulation outlines requirements that veterans in training after the entrance cut-off date will have to meet.

They will be expected to pursue their training continuously until completion, except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

They may change their educational objectives only while in training and then for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator.

According to the regulations, satisfactory reasons for change are these:

1. When the veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present course and the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application.

2. When the course to which he desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude, previous education, training, or other such pertinent factors.

3. When the course to which he wants to change is a normal progression from his current course and will help him attain his educational or vocational objective.

No additional changes of course will be approved, the regulation states, except for the most cogent reasons.

The VA regulation defines a course of education or training as a "curriculum, program of study or training, or combination of subjects as are prescribed by the institution as constituting a course."

The following do not constitute a change of course: a change of one or more subjects within an elected curriculum or program; the dropping of a subject without replacing it with another; the adding of a subject; change in the sequence in which subjects are taken, or advancement from a basic or preparatory phase to an advanced phase of a course.

VA explained that it is issuing its regulations on dead-line dates at this time in order to give veterans ample opportunity to make their plans for the future.

McCarthy Gets Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOE MCCARTHY has achieved a great deal in his charges against poor security risks in the State Department. Mr. George Sokolsky has recently called attention to some of his accomplishments to date. I am including his article as part of my remarks which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The attack on Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, so far, seems to be focused upon one point: He is being accused not of saying too much but of being ill-mannered, loud, and exaggerative. He is being accused of overstatement, of employing such a term as "top spy" when nobody can know actually who the "top spy" ever is.

Maybe so. JOE MCCARTHY, I am sure, would not advertise himself as a delicate powderpuff. He is both Irish and a marine and that involves a man in a pattern of life.

My old friend, Smedley Butler, was a Quaker; yet he became a marine general. I once heard him deliver an address to his marines which would, had they known about it, have made our State Department lulus not only blush but positively crimson.

Now, let us see what Senator JOE MCCARTHY's noise has so far accomplished:

1. It forced Deputy Undersecretary Peurifoy to admit that the State Department had become a nest of homosexuals and that he had fired 91 of them—all subject, because of their vice, to blackmail. Mr. Peurifoy can probably in truth say that he did it before he heard JOE'S bellow, but he kept whatever he did strictly to himself and nobody has yet assured us that these unfortunates have not got jobs elsewhere in the Government;

2. He established, through the Washington, D. C., police force, that this is only a segment of the colony of perverts in Government.

3. He reopened interest in the Amerasia case, which is the key to espionage in the State, Treasury, Army, Navy Departments and the OSS.

4. He established the fact beyond doubt, that the administration protects Communists, pro-Communists, fellow travelers and stooges by objecting to a full, impartial, bipartisan investigation into the perils of espionage at a time when espionage has been proved in the Alger Hiss and the Fuchs cases.

5. He exposed Senator TYDINGS as capable of misquoting J. Edgar Hoover, and of giving a false impression that the FBI clears persons as though it were a court and not a police department.

6. He blew the top off the State Department far eastern policy. In this regard:

A. He forced Owen Lattimore to give publicity to his own recommendations which many Americans, including myself, will regard as harmful to the United States.

B. He frightened Dean Acheson into a publicity campaign to separate himself from Lattimore.

C. He reopened interest in the Institute of Pacific Relations.

D. He reopened interest in the Pacific story, a series of 181 NBC broadcasts to our troops during and after the war.

E. He ended the trickery of the Bangkok Conference by which the State Department sought a way to recognize Soviet China by indirection.

F. He knocked the spots out of the smart trick of bringing Soviet China into the United Nations by majority vote.

Much of this Senator JOE MCCARTHY accomplished by indirection, just as he had nothing to do personally with Dean Acheson's attempt to restore the bipartisan foreign policy by having the obscure John Sherman Cooper and the Deweyite John Foster Dulles taken into the State Department.

To the rank and file of the Republican Party, Cooper is wholly unknown and when they check his voting record during his one term in the Senate, it does not look Republican. As for John Foster Dulles, this act surely ends his political career as a Republican.

For any man is entitled once to such a mistake as recommending Alger Hiss to the Carnegie endowment, but when to that is added an effort to throw a protective wall around the current administration of the State Department, it is indicative of political cloudiness. Besides, the Dewey group seems to be abandoning participation in national Republican leadership.

The point is that the State Department would not have begged Senator VANDENBERG and Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey to help them put up a false facade of bipartisanship had not Senator MCCARTHY'S excitement proved that there never has been a Republican-Democratic bipartisan foreign policy on the most vital issues. Policy has been made by little people in key jobs.

It sometimes takes unusual means to bring out the truth—but the truth will come out.

Import of Czechoslovak Women's Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following release of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, regarding the import of women's Czechoslovak shoes, which matter is now being investigated by the Treasury Department in order to determine whether or not these imports are in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921:

[From the New England Shoe and Leather Association Shoe News of April 11, 1950]

FEBRUARY IMPORTS OF CZECHOSLOVAK WOMEN'S SHOES TOTAL 153,436 PAIRS—THREE TIMES JANUARY IMPORTS

Imports of women's shoes from Czechoslovakia during February 1950 totaled 153,436 pairs, valued at $146,644, according to the New England Shoe and Leather Association, based on official data released by the United States Department of Commerce. "This amount is three times the January imports of Czech shoes of 58,018 pairs, valued at $47,064. Furthermore, the combined imports for January-February of 211,454 pairs valued at $193,708 is fully 112.5 percent greater than imports for the full year of 1949, which equaled 99,491 pairs, valued at $101,413," stated Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the association.

"Equally as interesting as the heavy increase in imports is the fact that the average price of these women's casual shoes, based on the declared values stated on the import manifests, is only 95 cents per pair," declared Mr. Field. These facts substantiate our association's previous claims that over a million pairs of Czech shoes will be imported into the United States this year, and that the declared price constituted a suspicion of dumping in violation of the antidumping Act of the 1921. The Customs Bureau of the United States Treasury Department is presently reviewing this situation to determine whether a formal investigation should be undertaken under this law," Mr. Field pointed out.

An Iowa Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the March 31 issue of the Iowa Development Bulletin contains a brief but highly interesting account of the boyhood of the world-renowned Wright Brothers, the first men to fly heavier-than-air machines. The setting is Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in my district; the time, 1878. The original source of the story is the official biography of the Wright Brothers, written by Fred C. Kelly and authorized by Orville Wright. My State is proud to have sheltered these great men in their youth, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include their story, which is a part of Iowa's lore:

THE WRIGHT BROTHERS IN IOWA

In June 1878, when Orville was 7 years old and Wilbur was 11, the Wright family left Dayton, Ohio, because the work of the father, who had been made a bishop of the United Brethren Church, was shifted to Cedar Rapids, Iowa. And it was in a house on Adams Street, in Cedar Rapids, not long after their arrival there, that an event occurred which was to have much influence on the lives of Wilbur and Orville—as well as to have its effect on the whole human race.

Bishop Wright had returned from a short trip on church business, bringing with him a little present for his two younger sons.

"Look here, boys!" he said to Wilbur and Orville, holding out his hands with something hidden between them. Then he tossed the gift toward them. But instead of falling at once to the floor or into their hands, as they expected, it went to the ceiling where it fluttered briefly before it fell. It was a flying machine, a helicopter, the invention of a Frenchman, Alphonse Penaud. Made of cork, bamboo, and thin paper, the device weighed so little that twisted rubber bands provided all the power needed to send it aloft for a few seconds. As the brothers were to learn later, Penaud, an invalid during most of his short life, had not only invented, as early as 1871, various kinds of toy flying-machines, both the helicopter type and others that flew horizontally, but was the originator of the use of rubber bands for motive power. Simple as was this helicopter—they called it the "bat"—Wilbur and Orville felt great admiration for its ingenuity. Though it soon went the way of all fragile toys, the impression it left on their minds never faded.

Not long afterward Wilbur tried to build an improvement on the toy helicopter. If so small a device could fly, why not make a bigger one that could fly longer and higher? Orville was still too young to contribute much to the actual building of larger models, but he was keenly interested as Wilbur made several, each larger than the one preceding. To the brothers' astonishment, they discovered that the bigger the machine, the less it would fly; and if it was much bigger than the original toy, it wouldn't fly at all. They did not yet understand that a machine of only twice the linear dimensions of another would require eight times the power.

While in Cedar Rapids, Orville showed enterprise in another direction. He had enough intellectual curiosity to study lessons that the teacher had not assigned. When a little more than 8 years old he told his father that he was tired of the Second Reader they were still studying at school and wished he had a Third Reader.

One morning, not long after that, at the middle of the school year, the principal came to the room Orville was in and announced that any pupils who showed enough proficiency in reading might be promoted at once, without waiting until the end of the year, and begin the Third Reader. The more promising members of the class, selected by the teacher, then stood toeing a chalk mark, up front, as was commonly done, and took turns at reading. In his alarm lest he might not do himself full justice, Orville, someone told him later, held his book upside down. That did not prevent him from reading accurately, as he knew the book by heart, and he was promoted.

"I'm now in the Third Reader class," he proudly announced when he reached home that noon.

"Well, that's a strange thing," said his father. "Just this morning I bought the Third Reader you asked for. But," he added, "you won't be able to use it today, because you're going to miss school this afternoon. I have arranged for you and Wilbur to go to the photographer's and have your pictures taken."

Orville's picture thus commemorated what had seemed to him an important event in his life.

American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join with my friend, Peter Tali Coleman, of American Samoa, who is now a student in one of our Washington universities, in calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fiftieth anniversary of the flag raising on American Samoa which anniversary occurred yesterday, April 17, 1950.

It has been my great privilege to visit and to personally meet the present leaders of the American Samoans in Tutuila, as well as the Samoans living under the New Zealand flag on the islands of Savaii and Upolu.

American Samoa, a group of islands same 900 miles south of the equator, were acquired by the United States during the

period 1889–99 through agreement between Britain, the United States, and Germany. At that time the great Samoan race was split by this agreement without their consent and approval. These three great powers simply made a division of the territory which suited their convenience and ideas. During all of these years American Samoa has made great progress. These people are as magnificent in character and intelligence and loyal and as ambitious as any people you could find in colonial life. In all of the colonial possessions of the earth there could be found no finer people. In stature, in general appearance, cleanliness, and sincerity they are par excellence. In American Samoa you find no poor people, rich, or so-called middle-class people of consequence. The economy of the islands is operated under the Matai or chieftain system with high talking chiefs, talking chiefs, and other chiefs. The Matai and the chiefs see that all of their clansmen or tribesmen—the very young, the teenagers, the middle-aged, and the old—are all properly fed, clothed, and housed. They are ambitious from the standpoint of education and of striving toward obtaining a full and complete life as sought by the American people. The American Samoans and other parts of their race which are now under the control primarily of New Zealand—Germany having lost this territory to New Zealand following World War I—look forward to the day when the machinery of the Trustee Council of the United Nations, together with the Congress of the United States will bring the whole Samoan race back together under the protection of the United States. Shortly our Congress will be called upon to consider the approval of an organic act setting up a civilian form of government for American Samoa—they having been under our Navy rule for the past several decades—and this act, when approved, will unquestionably offer American citizenship to the Samoans, giving them a bill of rights and set them up as a possession but not as an organized territory subject to becoming a State at some future date.

Under permission granted, I submit for the RECORD the following statement prepared by Mr. Peter Coleman:

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FLAG-RAISING DAY IN AMERICAN SAMOA, APRIL 17, 1950

(By Peter Tali Coleman of American Samoa)

Fifty years ago today, the American flag was raised in Tutuila, the main island of the American Samoa group. It was for the first time the United States of America deviated from its then established foreign policy of nonintervention. It was on this day that the high chiefs of Tutuila, without any solicitation, ceded the islands of Tutuila and Aunu'u to the Government of the United States "for the promotion of the peace and welfare of the people of said islands, for the establishment of a good and sound government, and for the preservation of the rights and property of the inhabitants of said islands, the chiefs, rulers, and people thereof are desirous of granting unto the said Government of the United States full power and authority to enact proper legislation for and to control the said islands, and are further desirous of removing all disabilities that may be existing in connection therewith, and to ratify and to confirm the grant of the rule of said islands heretofore granted on the 2d (sic) day of April 1900." Commander B. F. Tilley, commandant of the naval station, Tutuila, hoisted the American flag. The deed of cessation was signed by Leoso in the presence of and at the request of the chiefs and representatives of the division of Fofo and Aitulagi and by Pele in the presence of and at the request of the chiefs and representatives of the division of Sua and Vaifanua in Tutuila in conformity with Samoan custom.

Now, the day of democracy is dawning in the vast, once turbulent Pacific. Hawaii, the adult, is ready, willing, and able to shoulder the responsibilities demanded of a member of our society of States. Guam, the child, is taking its first step toward the fulfillment of a nurtured hope for self-government. Samoa, the embryo, is awaiting further developments that will bring about its government of the people.

In World War II this American possession joined readily in the war effort. Samoans participated in this global effort together with the rest of the American boys in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps. Some made the supreme sacrifice for that cause which this flag represents. Thus, today, the Samoan stands as an American, believing in the fundamental principle of "In God we trust," as a common denominator of the Christian world.

In the near future, Samoa will be afforded an opportunity to participate in a representative form of government. It should be no challenge to its traditional system, for the representative form of government is only a modification, and both are founded on the same principle that the life of the land is preserved in its righteousness. As Americans, we can all feel proud of this little island. It may be a molehill in our country of States, but it is a towering mountain proclaiming to the eyes of the freedom-seeking people in the Pacific and Asia the recognition of one of God's greatest endowments to man—his natural rights.

Memorial Address by William H. McIntyre, National Vice President, the Society of American Legion Founders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a recent address by Mr. William H. McIntyre, national vice president of the Society of American Legion Founders and a past national officer of three prominent veterans' organizations in this country. He is, also, at the present time, New York department chairman of graves registration of the American Legion:

The address follows:

The debt to the living and dead can be discharged by deeds, by building a secure nation in a world which never again will turn to war.

Some of us were present on that cool gray morning 31 years ago when the bugle sounded "cease firing," others at a later date in 1945 in both the European and Pacific theaters when cessation of hostilities happened.

Once again we meet to honor our dead. Your speaker had the privilege to be present when the first of our heroic dead were exhumed at St. Laurent Cemetery, Normandy, France, in September 1947, and has met every funeral ship arriving in the port of New York and attended services at the pier. Over 107,000 have been returned to date.

Nothing I might say here can minimize the great loss nor alleviate the suffering of their families. These dead stand in an unbroken line of patriots who dared to die that freedom might live and increase its blessings. Freedom lives and through it they live in a way that humbles the undertakings of most men.

The debt to the living and dead can be discharged by deeds, yes, by building a secure nation in a world which never again will turn to war. Perhaps atomic energy will prevent further conflicts; however, we should be prepared, keep our powder dry and in sufficient quantity.

At this time it would be unfaithful not to recognize the evils which exist. However, I do wish to bring to your attention and think it proper and fitting, the fact, that there are too many doctrines being preached and tolerated in this great country of ours.

The only ism that we are interested in is that of Americanism. Only a short time ago many of us saw marching in and around different parts of our State those who would tear apart and rend asunder the structures of happiness and contentment. While it is true that our Constitution guarantees free speech and tolerance, bear in mind that law and order are fundamental and liberty must not be taken for license.

The persons that I have seen parading should be taught a love for America. Love for America should be inculcated in the families of foreigners, especially those who desire to become citizens. Never in the history of our country has there been a greater need for emphasizing the principles of American citizenship.

If, in our schools we had a respect for God and an adherence and practice of some religion, we need never fear any ism that would sow the seeds of discontent, and mob rule would have no place in America. Respect for authority is the greatest responsibility of the citizens of this country.

Children of immature age cannot understand, let alone discuss the doctrines that are being preached. We grant these children may be curious, but why in common sense should we let the little school house of our youth be torn apart by propaganda from people living beyond the iron curtain?

There are definite and decent limitations for individuals' expressions, therefore, we should interest ourselves in what is taking place in our community. Don't stand idle; with the unrest that is rampant in the world today it behooves all to be on their guard to respect and obey the law, to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America and continue to love, honor and enjoy our independence and freedom.

Mr. Facing-Both-Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article by William Henry Chamberlin,

which appeared in the Wall Street Journal recently:

MR. FACING-BOTH-WAYS—SPIRIT OF BUNYAN'S FABULOUS CHARACTER HAS BEEN PRESENT IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Recent criticisms of the State Department have elicited a storm of countercriticism. The men who have censured the present Secretary of State and some of his aides have been accused of being factious isolationists, guilty of weakening American foreign policy at a critical moment.

But there are stronger elements in the mood of popular distrust which lies behind current criticism than the thick-and-thin defenders of Mr. Acheson and the Department which he heads recognize. One of the symbolic characters in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress is Mr. Facing-Both-Ways. There has been too much of the spirit of Mr. Facing-Both-Ways in the records of the Roosevelt and Truman administration. Here is the explanation for the attitude of mistrust which has recently come into the open.

There are, for instance, the implications of Mr. Acheson's aggressive assertion of friendship for Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury in connection with his denial that he turned over a considerable number of State Department confidential documents to a Soviet spy ring. Mr. A. A. Berle, a State Department colleague of Acheson, has testified that in 1941 he communicated to Acheson information suggesting that Hiss' loyalty was under some question. Acheson brushed this aside and Hiss went from one high wartime assignment to another. He was one of the small number of American diplomatic representatives at Yalta and he played a prominent role in the organization of the United Nations.

MR. ACHESON'S IDEAS HAVE CHANGED

One may sympathize with the chivalry of Mr. Acheson's refusal to turn his back on a friend who had apparently gone wrong and yet feel that there is a certain inconsistency between what might fairly be called a substantial error of judgment in the Hiss case and the Secretary's recent trumpet call for total diplomacy.

Mr. Acheson's recent state papers on the state of American-Soviet relations have been excellent. They have been well reasoned and realistic. But here again the shadow of "Mr. Facing-Both-Ways" obtrudes. Mr. Acheson did not always cherish such views.

As late as November 1945 he was the State Department representative at a Council of American-Soviet Friendship meeting in honor of the notorious "red dean" of Canterbury, who rather grotesquely combines his clerical office with insistent preaching of the glories of Stalin's atheistic tyranny. This organization was subsequently placed on the Attorney General's subversive list.

At this meeting Mr. Acheson assured the enthusiastic audience that never in the past, present, or future has there been any place in the globe where the interests of the American and Russian people clashed or were antagonistic. This was at a time when sharp American-Soviet differences of opinion had developed on a number of issues, on Poland, the Balkans, Iran, the peace treaty procedures, among others. At any rate the jump from this assurance of eternal harmony to the present doctrine of eternal discord is substantial and is not calculated to clear up public opinion.

One of the Secretary's recent seven points for peace with Moscow was the freeing of the satellite countries and the withdrawal of Soviet troops and police within Soviet frontiers. But in 1946 Acheson was influential in getting an American credit of $90,000,000 for a Polish Government which was Communist-dominated and which was violating all the conditions for the "free unfettered elections" which had been promised at Yalta. The grant of this credit was against the advice of Arthur Bliss Lane, American Ambassador to Poland, who wanted to see some free elections and a few elementary civil liberties first.

POOR JUDGMENT ON CHINA POLICY

Consistently opposing proposals for large-scale aid to Nationalist China, Acheson assured the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 20, 1947: "The Chinese Government * * * is not threatened by defeat by the Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years."

This was not a very perspicacious judgment, as the rapid collapse in 1949 would soon show. Nor was the sting of the debacle of American policy in China drawn by the following sentence in the letter to the President which served as a preface to the white paper on China:

"The unfortunate but inescapable fact is that the ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the Government of the United States."

If the "ominous" outlook had been clearly recognized in 1947, it is at least conceivable that something more might have been done, both on the Chinese side and on the American. It would, of course, be unfair to saddle Mr. Acheson with responsibility for the collapse in China.

But he has been unfortunate, to say the least, in his China policy, if indeed there has been a policy, apart from waiting for the dust to settle. The world isolationist is often hurled in reproach at critics of any phase of the Roosevelt and Truman foreign policies.

But the course of events has made us isolationists in China, whether we like it or not. The Communist regime in China has proved impossible to deal with; it has forced us in self-respect to withdraw our diplomatic and consular personnel. At the same time we have done everything to cold shoulder continued Nationalist resistance on Formosa.

When there are fewer inconsistencies, when the spirit of "Mr. Facing-Both-Ways" disappears, there will be a more united and confident public opinion behind American foreign policy.

Something Is Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very interesting letter. It is from a man who says "I am just an ordinary citizen." His theme is reckless Government spending and he finds support in statements made by important people. His point is well made. I include all of his letter at this point:

APRIL 11, 1950.

DEAR SIR: I am just an ordinary citizen, but it appears to me that something is wrong:

(a) Because Senator PAUL DOUGLAS says, "We must reverse the trend whereby everyone is taking a quick grab at the Public Treasury. Folks have got to be sold in letting up—or we will be in trouble."

(b) Because Dr. Vannevar Bush says, "A people bent on a soft security, surrendering their birthright of individual self-reliance for favors, voting themselves into Eden from a supposedly inexhaustible public purse, supporting everyone by soaking a fast-disappearing rich * * * will not measure up to competition with a tough dictatorship."

(c) Because the Honorable James F. Byrnes says, "Our real trouble is debt and taxes. We cannot cure it by more debt and more taxes."

(d) Because Dr. Edwin C. Nourse says, "I am not happy when I see Government slipping back into deficits as a way of life in a period when production and employment are high, instead of putting its fiscal house in order and husbanding reserves to support the economy if less prosperous times overtake us."

(e) Because Mr. Bernard Baruch says that among the most important developments of the first half of the twentieth century is man's loss of confidence in himself and turning too much to the state instead of himself.

(f) And, finally, because our national deficit of $6,000,000,000 this year means that we are spending $16,000,000 more each day than we are taking in.

Don't you think that we should get on, and stay on, a pay-as-you-go basis? Is there any good reason why my children and grandchildren should pay for my social and welfare benefits?

Why wouldn't one solution be to restrict the benefits of the Government's social and welfare legislation to those who need it?

I am writing you, because it seems to me that you are in a position to do something about it. My name is Charles R. Petticrew, 304 West Forty-sixth Street, Indianapolis, Ind., 34 years old, with wife and four children, veteran (5½ years in service), and modest income. (Driving 1947 Dodge and is busy paying mortgage on house.)

If the above facts are in error, I would appreciate your writing me and pointing out what is incorrect.

Sincerely,

C. R. PETTICREW.

1950 Battle Line—David Against Goliath—Edwin Arthur Hall Versus the Binghamton Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, to my friends back home who want to see American Government prevail, I am issuing the call to resist the Red Fascists in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District as you have never done before.

The anti-Hall propaganda, circulated by these venal wretches for so many years, challenges every decent man and woman in the counties of Broome, Chenango and Madison and at long last must compel all of you to stand fearlessly on the side of truth.

Foremost and practically the only real perpetrator of hate toward the six-times elected Representative of this district stands the Binghamton Press, the greatest mud slinging Gargantua in the Nation today.

In company with the Press and bringing up the unhappy rear, follows an ugly assortment of pasty-faced sycophants, entirely subservient to their master but as bloodthirsty to get at your Congressman as the Press itself.

These are the poison-peddlers, who employ their every working hour with one unholy pastime, besmirching the name of EDWIN ARTHUR HALL from every street corner and cracker barrel and to every unsuspecting citizen in our district.

For 11 years, this mighty dirt dissemination has persisted, and is now reaching its foul crescendo.

Responsibility for such un-American defiance of the people's will to elect their own Representative during all these years rests mainly upon the shoulders of the Binghamton Press.

Suffice it to say, with all its open avowed intentions to overthrow the American electoral system, with all its honesty of sinister purpose to destroy Members of Congress, the Communist Daily Worker is a piker compared to the Binghamton Press.

Because the Press assumes to play the role of something it is not, the apotheosis of American respectability. The pseudo-intellectuals, who cling to its pay rolls as editorial writers actually are nothing more than literary punks devoted to the lousy profession of character assassination.

Their hate-filled minds have one obsession, and this has long since reached a perverted stage, to plunge their quivering quills into the back of your Congressman, while he is facing our Nation's Capitol, fighting the battle of the people.

Under the protection of the oft-abused freedom of the press, these zealots of avarice have ridden long roughshod over the reason and sensibilities of the voters of this district, sniping, spearing, harpooning all the forthright attempts of your Congressman in the interests of orderly legislative action.

I repeat, the Communist Daily Worker is not more dangerous than the Binghamton Press to the preservation of a free American electoral system in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

Sadly enough, due to their being tolerated, these monkeys have become so commonplace in our decent society hereabouts, they appear as proper and harmless as Pope's subject in his "Essay on Man."

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
> As to be hated needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Their nefarious work in the Binghamton area has produced a master plot for smearing public officials. Their supposed function, news gathering, went out the window when they got their first taste of blood some years back.

Of course, the target which they have shot at most consistently of all their sordid below-the-belt schemes is your Congressman.

Just as Stalin knows America stands in his path for world domination, so is the Binghamton Press fully aware that EDWIN ARTHUR HALL is the only obstacle in her way for complete political power in New York's southern tier.

They are sworn to remove this only barrier by any and all means at their command.

In spite of their tremendous circulation in Congressman HALL'S district and their day-by-day defaming of him, they still have a long way to go before they can eliminate him, and they know it.

Their plan is this: Cut the ground from under HALL'S feet, soften up his support by continuing their limitless smears; then get behind an innocent-looking candidate and use him to try to finish HALL off.

My undying objective between now and August 22 will be to throw the withering spotlight of public exposure upon these rats and foil their plot.

I do not know whether the political blueprint now being followed by the Binghamton Press is in use throughout the fast-growing Gannett newspapers, but if it is, I am certain this group is bent upon complete political domination of the Northeast.

I do know this, that I am fighting for my political life against a giddy Goliath, already drunk with power, and if I am to survive, I will have to use all the pebbles in my slingshot, which are no bigger than David's when he faced the giant.

I presume it was jumbled journalism like that practiced by the Binghamton Press which caused no less an American statesman than Thomas Jefferson to say:

> A man who never looks in a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them; inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer to the truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors. (Source: UE News, November 28, 1949, p. 7.)

So the battle lines are drawn in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District: it is David against Goliath, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL versus the Binghamton Press.

The galaxy of candidates arrayed against me is of no consequence. The Press will knock out all of them before the time for filing arrives except the one made to order for the Press.

It would be foolhardy to deal with the candidates when the only opponent is the Binghamton Press.

The Press would have you think that HALL is the only one who has enemies. The thousands of letters I have received condemning the Binghamton Press for their 11 years' smear campaign against a man of the people proves the Press has a host of them.

The struggle is between the Press and me. The Press is so far out on the limb it cannot now retreat. The lines are drawn. There is no other issue from now on. Either the Press beats me, or it must retire from political dominance once and for all in our southern tier.

Let them call forth all the anti-HALL forces in this district. Let them encourage the large Communist cell which has operated without their interference for a long time in the triple cities.

Let them bring forth their greatest gobs of smear because they will need it.

I believe the decent, respectable, upstanding Americans of our section are still in the majority and that they will back me up in this, my Armageddon.

Essential Unity of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by John Griffin from the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., April 16, 1950:

CROSS-COUNTRY TRIP REVEALS THAT WE CAN HAVE GREAT FAITH IN OUR LAND—REAL VOICE OF AMERICA IS ITS BUSY MACHINES AND ROLLING REAPERS—PRODUCTION POWER AMAZING

(By John Griffin)

Last week we flew from New York to Los Angeles on a quick trip which gave us a couple of days in California and a couple in Arizona and permitted us to be home before the week was out. It left us with a lot of awe for the majesty of America.

An American Airlines DC-6 coach service coast-to-coast was being inaugurated on Easter Sunday and a group of newspapermen were taken along on a preinaugural flight. We are not plugging for American Airlines, but we wish everyone could take such a trip.

It inspires a pride in America and a feeling for the country which cannot be had sitting at a desk. In the space of a few hours the might of the industrial East passes beneath, and the broad reaches of the Middle West, the great granary of America, are succeeded by the grandeur of the Rockies and then come the incredible areas of southern California.

You do a lot of thinking as you travel along at 300 miles an hour. You wonder at the ignorance and arrogance of the Communists and the pinkos who have the colossal gall to believe they can upset a nation of such magnitude and such potential.

Then you move around in California and the Southwest and talk to people in all walks of life, and you begin to wonder whether Washington has any conception of the way people are thinking.

FREEDOM A VITAL PART

You think of the things that might be wrong about America, the poverty that exists in certain areas, the political connivance that sometimes mars our national existence, and then you begin to realize that all these things are bound to fade away in the face of the great facts and the great possibilities that are in this country.

You sense most of all the freedom that is a vital part of America, where people travel about without ever a thought of State lines or any other boundaries in their realization that it is all one big country, full of power and majesty.

You talk to a movie director in Hollywood and a farmer in Arizona, a storekeeper in Chicago, and a mechanic in Detroit and you find that despite all the efforts of those who would destroy our form of government, they are making less progress than the headlines would indicate.

You wish that some of the people in the other nations of the world could come here, and that instead of groups going over to study Germany and other occupied areas, that Germans and others, particularly the influential people in the countries that border on the iron curtain, could be taken on a tour of the United States.

The Voice of America can never convey the stature of America. The best it can do is counteract some of the propaganda that is

directed against the United States. The only way the real feeling of America can be transmitted abroad in an influential way is through people who see and know America.

REAL VOICE OF AMERICA

Rex Smith, vice president of American Airlines, has suggested in Washington that such a program of seeing America be provided for business and governmental and professional leaders of European countries. It would, we are convinced, do more to show our advantages than 100 Voices of America.

Because the Voice of America is not the voice of some script writer in Washington sent out over the air to foreign lands. The voice of America can be heard in the humming machinery of the industrial areas, in the clank of the reapers that cut through the vast wheat fields of the Midwest, in the thump of the pumps that bring water up from the earth to irrigate the farms and ranches of the Southwest.

It can be heard in the traffic noises on the highways of the Nation; in the busy roar of the big airports; in the streets of a thousand small towns. It can be felt by anyone who is attuned to it, and it forms a sound that inspires and quickens the spirit.

But even before people are brought from other lands to hear it, Americans should pay it more attention. Many Americans do not know their own country. Not everyone, of course, has the time and the means to travel, but as time goes on most people are having more opportunity for leisure, and perhaps it won't be long before the average person gets to know his own country.

Then the industrial worker of the East will know something about the man in the Midwest who owns his own land and works it, and the farmer of the West will appreciate the problems of his fellow countrymen whose way of making a living is different from his own.

CONFIDENCE IN FUTURE

Then there will be less fear in this country and more confidence in its future. The fear that too many politicians are fostering nowadays develops from lack of confidence in our own country. If we listened to the cries out of the Capital, the conflicting voices of the scientists and the politicians, and had no other information and no sense of what America really is, we would easily become prey to unreasonable hysteria.

It is impossible to cross the country and talk to people in other areas without obtaining a renewal of faith and a bolstering of confidence. You can't be in California for breakfast and in New York for dinner the same day without realizing the essential unity of America.

The Communists and the pinks can spout from the forums and do their utmost, but, fortunately, they are only a trifle in the Nation that reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific across areas that, in every respect, hold unlimited possibilities for the future.

We intend to keep on hammering at Communists and deceitful politicians, but we have a new and unshakable faith in the greatness of this country as it stands and its limitless possibilities for the future.

Veterans' Hospital Facilities in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of this body some recent communications that have come to my office on the deplorable veterans' hospital situation in California.

In addition to many letters from individual veterans, I have received communications from veterans' organizations, from local chambers of commerce, from other interested public and private groups urging reconsideration of the present policy of closing service facilities, in view of the probable drastic effects on veterans in need of medical care, on the personnel of the hospitals, and on the communities involved.

I should like to submit here only the communications from organizations. The first, from the American Veterans Committee, is on the general hospital situation. The other seven are similar resolutions protesting against the closing of the Van Nuys Birmingham Hospital and the removal of patients—including veterans—and staff to the naval hospital at Long Beach. These communications are from, first, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, San Fernando; second, San Fernando Chamber of Commerce; third, Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce; fourth, Woodland Hills Chamber of Commerce; fifth, Woodland Hills Men's Club; sixth, Council of the City of San Fernando; seventh, Kiwanis Club of Sepulveda.

Inasmuch as the resolutions in every case are practically identical, I give it below as it came to me from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The signatories on the other resolutions are given in the order listed above.

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1950.

The Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: The wholesale closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals, and those of the Army and Navy, has taken a particularly heavy toll in southern California. Our chapters of the American Veterans' Committee (AVC) in and around Los Angeles are greatly disturbed by the serious shortage of hospital beds for veterans in southern California, by the delay in getting new hospital construction under way, and by the closing of Army and Navy hospitals which had contracted to treat VA patients.

The closing of the Army's McCormack General Hospital and the Navy's Corona hospital has deprived California veterans of 325 hospital beds. The announced closing of the Navy's Long Beach and Mare Island hospitals will slash beds available another 550. This is the falsest sort of economy.

In fact, the number of veterans in California is steadily increasing as more and more people are moving to that State. To meet the needs of this growing veteran population, more hospital beds are needed, and needed now.

There are literally hundreds of veterans waiting to be admitted to southern California hospitals, particularly veterans who are mentally sick or tuberculous.

AVC wholeheartedly supports your effort, and that of your fellow southern California Congressmen, to get authority that will permit the VA to take over Army and Navy hospitals that have been closed, or are about to be closed.

We are united in our insistence that America's disabled, sick, and mentally ill veterans must get an even break. Indiscriminately closing hospitals to achieve a dollar saving of a few millions, while the loss in suffering and human waste mounts steadily, will in the end prove very costly to our country.

Sincerely,

LOUIS C. PAKISER,
Executive Director.

Resolution concerning the contemplated closing of the Van Nuys Birmingham Hospital, and the moving of patients and staff to the naval hospital at Long Beach

Whereas the transfer of the Birmingham Hospital and its facilities would seriously impair treatment now provided veterans in this area, for the reason that most of the doctors, specialists now involved in research work at nearby medical schools, would not move with it; and

Whereas the Birmingham Hospital in its present location represents a greater convenience to the veterans of the populous Los Angeles area who require treatment and regular visitation by relatives than if such a facility were located at some point outside the area of population concentration; and

Whereas the laboratory at the Birmingham Hospital, one of the largest and best equipped in the United States, is three or four times the size of the laboratory facilities available for research and treatment purposes in Long Beach; and

Whereas the cancer research program carried out here as well as the paraplegic rehabilitation program is likewise not equaled by a governmental hospital anywhere in the United States; and

Whereas more than $850,000 has already been provided local paraplegic veteran patients under Public Law 702 for 85 new homes built and occupied in this area with special features, ramps, low cupboards, shelves, fixtures, etc., for the convenience of those confined to wheel chairs, but of little use to normal individuals, a property investment on which the veteran as well as the Government would suffer loss in the event of resale; and

Whereas the climate of the San Fernando Valley, with its comparatively light rainfall, freedom from cold, fogs, and smog, and even climate bordering on that found in desert areas, is more conducive to the well-being of the 455 patients suffering from tuberculosis and other respiratory ailments at the Birmingham Hospital, than the climate to be found at Long Beach, adjacent to the ocean; and

Whereas it would require a 20-percent increase in personnel to staff the Long Beach Hospital because of its inconvenient ward arrangements, resulting in more than $1,000,000 a year added cost for veteran patient care; and

Whereas more than 60 percent of the employees, doctors, laboratory workers, hospital attendants, nurses, and their families are veterans who have bought homes near the hospital, an investment on which they would sustain a loss if the hospital is moved elsewhere; and

Whereas the closing of the Birmingham Hospital with its $5,500,000 a year pay roll would be a serious blow to the economy of the metropolitan and San Fernando Valley areas, a source of prosperity upon which business establishments have long expected they might depend: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Captain Frank L. Muller Post, No. 2829, Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States Veterans' Administration Hospital, San Fernando, Calif., does hereby register its objection to the proposed move, and further recommends that the Birmingham Hospital be established by the Veterans' Administration on a permanent basis, both with respect to buildings and all other facilities.

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Captain Frank Muller Post, No. 2829, San Fernando, Calif., Norman R. Zeller, Commander, Edmond J. O'Brien, Adjutant; San Fernando Chamber of

Commerce, San Fernando, Calif., J. W. Flynn, President, Harold R. Allen; Sun Valley Chamber of Commerce, Sun Valley, Calif., S. F. Muhlitner, President, George D. Hildebrandt, Secretary; Woodland Hills Chamber of Comerce, Woodland Hills, Calif., C. C. Livingston, President; Woodland Hills Men's Club, Woodland Hills, Calif., Richard William Hutchings, President; Council of the City of San Fernando, San Fernando, Calif., Bryce Schnurr, mayor, Ray A. Woods, City Clerk; Kiwanis Club of Sepulveda, Sepulveda, Calif., Gordon W. McKay, President, C. Benjamin Bemis.

Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very excellent editorial that appeared in the April 13, 1950, edition of the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.

This article contains a great deal of constructive thought and most worthwhile suggestion. No doubt, it is a step in the right direction, and I am sure a most progressive step for the community of Greater Lawrence, Mass.:

WHAT IS YOUR FUTURE?

The formation of the Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. is, to me, an indication of reborn confidence and faith in Greater Lawrence. I believe the other nine incorporators of the corporation feel as I do.

The object of this new corporation is to stimulate the promotion of the economic and industrial welfare of the people of Greater Lawrence, to maintain and increase opportunities for employment.

Ten incorporators cannot do this alone. The program, to be effective, needs the help and cooperation of everyone.

I am not an alarmist, nor am I wearing rose-colored glasses. I am, however, a businessman, and use, I think, a business approach to most problems. We, here in Greater Lawrence, do have a problem. We have groups which have diagnosed the ills as deadly with no hope of survival; others, as minor irritations that will clear up in time. Both are right—minor now, but deadly, if we neglect them.

I refer to the migration of New England industries to other parts of the country and the curtailment of activity by the inability of our mills to meet competitive bids for orders because of higher production costs and higher taxes than in other sections and which also handicap us in attracting new industries. I have in mind the present unemployment conditions in our local industries caused by the lack of orders. I also have in mind the resultant financial stress of some of our families even now, and the lack of spending money which will eventually be reflected in retail business and, as the cycle completes itself, will be felt by the manufacturers whose production is governed by demand.

These conditions exist not only in Lawrence, they prevail in many cities and towns throughout New England and particularly in Massachusetts. Textile cities like Lawrence, in false confidence in the future, did nothing about revaluating and readjusting their positions after the boom, war days.

Since accepting the presidency of the Greater Lawrence Industrial Corp. on March 30, I have made a personal survey of diversified Nation-wide industries which, I hoped, might be interested in coming to this community. But, at the suggestion of locating here, the answer was emphatically "No," not only as far as Lawrence is concerned, but Massachusetts as well.

The reasons?

First, the penalty of State legislation on corporations. I learned that in 1941, business paid, throughout the 48 States, an average of 14½ percent of all State tax collections with the exception of property, sales, and certain license and privilege taxes. At that time, Massachusetts business paid to this State just about the average, 14.3 percent of all tax collections. In 1948, however, Massachusetts business paid the highest percentage of any State, 33.6 percent, the average for the country being 18.1 percent. In 7 years the picture has changed sharply in this State, from an average experience to one where business is taxed nearly twice as much as in the average State. I also learned that in Massachusetts, $100,000 of plant property pays $20,200 per year in taxes, whereas in Illinois, for example, this same property would pay only $8,450. How can we compete with this?

The other reason was the lack of employee cooperation and lower production per worker in comparison to similar industries in other sections of the country. I, personally, feel that workers, seeking what is their just due, should receive every help from management, but, it is also my conviction that local conditions and the plant's ability to meet demands must receive the serious consideration of employees for the preservation of their jobs.

It is encouraging to learn that some communities are waking up to the threat to their existence and that they and State authorities throughout the region are taking more direct action to solve problems of plant, space, financing, and taxation, in order to improve prospects for industry and jobs in New England. Programs are taking a variety of forms. In Maine, a Development Credit Corporation, pooling a small part of resources of Maine banks and other financial institutions, has opened its doors to make capital available to promising enterprises. Civic programs, along the idea of our Greater Lawrence Industrial Corporation, are being organized throughout New England. The State of Rhode Island moved to relieve one major complaint of its manufacturers by ordering an average cut of 24.5 percent in compulsory workmen's compensation rates. In Massachusetts, a special commission on taxation has inaugurated a study of the tax structure of the Commonwealth, with special emphasis on the burden of taxation in industry, and will present the most urgent problems to the 1950 legislature.

All these are steps in the right direction, but we, here in Greater Lawrence, also need local and more direct action.

I believe we are letting Greater Lawrence down. All of us, by sitting around, wringing our hands and moaning, or waving our arms in alarm, but actually doing nothing. I do not believe that being labeled a distress area and waiting for orders to be channeled through is going to solve our problem. It might afford minor, temporary relief, and our legislators should see to it that activities are channeled to Lawrence to help alleviate conditions until a more permanent and secure solution can be worked out. We want Lawrence to get orders, lots of them, not because Lawrence can't keep up in the race, but because Lawrence can produce more efficiently, more harmoniously, than any other city.

Greater Lawrence is a closely knit community as we have proved in the past by the big and small projects that we have "put over." In this kind of unity there is strength and, if we approach this problem, united, there is no reason why we can't surmount it. If we are serious and sincere about improving conditions in our area, we must forget personal gains, and all work together. Your future, as well as that of each and every one of the 124,849 people in Greater Lawrence, is at stake.

The solution depends upon us; but, we do need the wholehearted cooperation of all groups from all segments of the community, city government, management, labor, big and small business owners, public organizations, and even the fellow who works for a weekly pay check.

Why can't we have a meeting of men representative of these groups and find out what, and how much, can be done before it is too late?

Mayor James P. Meehan, will you call such a meeting by inviting representatives from these various groups?

Perhaps we have made mistakes in the past, but let's forget them now and really put our shoulders to the wheel to insure a brighter and better future for all in Greater Lawrence.

We must, we can, and we will succeed.

IRVING E. ROGERS,
Publisher.

What Is the Government Deficit and Who Will Pay It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to some of my constituents and have found the interest therein so great that I have decided to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may have a wider distribution:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1950.

WHO WILL PAY THE GOVERNMENT DEFICIT?

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: We will all pay for this deficit spending program, and we should not kid ourselves that it will be otherwise. Everyone pays taxes. The cost of Government is being paid by each one of us, either directly in personal income and consumer excise taxes, or property taxes, or indirectly in the inflation of prices which result from the imposition of income and excise taxes upon the corporations which produce the commodities we buy. Therefore, every one of us should be deeply concerned about the fact that we are spending more money than we are taking in.

Most people think that Government finances are so complex and intricate, and the figures involved are so astronomical, that they as laymen cannot understand them. But let me say, as a certified public accountant, that the same principles are involved whether the business be large or small, and the net results are identical. In other words, a successful executive of a large corporation wants the picture of his operation reduced to the smallest component part. Therefore, I am going to try to analyze the administration's budget by reducing it at a ratio to compare to the average man's problems.

Exact figures presented by the Bureau of the Budget in its statement to Congress:

National defense	$13,500,000,000
Veterans	6,100,000,000
Interest on public debt	5,600,000,000
International program	4,700,000,000
Social welfare, health, security	2,700,000,000
Natural resources	2,200,000,000
Agriculture	2,200,000,000
Housing, education	1,800,000,000
Transportation, communication	1,700,000,000
General Government	1,300,000,000
Labor, finance, commerce, and industry	500,000,000
To be spent	42,300,000,000
Estimated budget receipts (take-in)	37,300,000,000
Deficit (loss)	5,000,000,000

Let us translate these figures at the same ratio into a budget we will assume as our own.

PERSONAL BUDGET

What does it mean?

We know we are going to spend $4,230 (Federal budget, $42,300,000,000).

We think we will earn $3,730 (estimated Federal receipts, $37,300,000,000).

We will have a shortage of $500 (estimated Federal deficit, $5,000,000,000).

Where are we going to get that $500? Naturally we are going to have to borrow it. But we must not forget that we are already in debt in the amount of $25,593. (Federal debt as of March 22, 1950, $255,931,000,000.) It is also alarming to note that the interest we will have to pay on our debt is $560 (Federal interest, $5,600,000,000) and next year it will be even more because we are increasing our debt.

Our earnings

We are sure we are going to spend $4,230, but we are not sure that we are going to earn $3,730. In fact, business is not quite so good as it was when we made our budget, and it looks as though our earnings will be less, which means our deficit will be greater. Also, shouldn't we consider the fact that we are going into debt in boom times? What would we do in the event of some emergency?

Analysis of spending

We are going to spend $470 (Federal budget, $4,700,000,000 for international program) to help our neighbors who are just recovering from a big disaster which has also hit us and which is partly responsible for our debt, at least the biggest portion of our debt. Don't you think that our personal financial condition is just as important as theirs? In other words, must we not remain in good financial condition if we are going to continue to help them, as we know they expect us to do? Frankly, our own family does not have all it needs at present (unemployment today, imports in competition with our own products, etc.). To be specific, we know that our neighbors can't help us. Therefore, we had better not get into a financial position which will put us in trouble.

Also, bear in mind that the money which we are giving these neighbors they are using to pay off their internal debts, paying their own relatives what they owe them, while we are building up the same type of debt and have no one to help us pay ours off. Furthermore, they are not using this money as it was intended, to rehabilitate themselves, build homes, etc.

What will you do about it?

I think you will take care of your own family first, and then judiciously assist your neighbors. I firmly believe our family welfare (the United States) should come first, not from a selfish standpoint but from the standpoint of self-preservation and good economics.

RETURN TO FEDERAL BUDGET

Interest on public debt

Let us take a look at the amount of interest the Government is paying on its huge debt of $255,900,000,000. Of course, we cannot eliminate the interest item but we certainly can reduce it. This interest amounts to more than what we are spending on housing, education, social welfare, health, security, labor, finance, commerce, and industry combined.

Do you realize that this interest is costing the taxpayers $15,000,000 a day and, in addition, that the interest on the deficit which we are creating this year will cost us $375,000 a day, at the 2.7 percent average interest rate which the Government pays? Take your pencils and figure it out. Inasmuch as this is a growing item during good times, shouldn't we be concerned about reducing it now?

Agriculture

Then, too, you should know that, under our present Government program, agriculture is going to cost more than shown in the budget, because the losses are not shown which the Commodity Credit Corporation is bound to take on the $4,000,000,000 worth of commodities which they had as of January 31, 1950. We have a billion dollars worth of cotton (1 year's supply) on hand now, and yet Congress has foolishly increased the cotton acreage by 1,200,000 acres for this year. (I voted against it.)

"We owe it to ourselves"

The proponents of this deficit-spending program say: What difference does it make since we owe this money to ourselves? Surely this is a silly philosophy because we know that not everyone owns the Government bonds which comprise this debt. However, we all pay taxes, part of which is used to pay the interest on these bonds. Furthermore, the integrity of the Nation is tied up in the promise to pay off these bonds with interest.

Government's ultimate "out"

If this deficit spending continues, the Government will either have to take over and wipe out all the debts, or else change the value of the currency. The first alternative I know 90 percent of us are opposed to. As to the "funny money" idea, too few people realize that such a move would be as costly as refinancing their automobile.

Budget can be cut

The President's budget can be cut. All it takes is the will to cut it, and the cooperation of the President, the various bureaus, and Congress, and the people throughout the country who must quit demanding increased acreages, increased subsidies, and increased profits. As Henry Hazlitt said in Newsweek of January 2: "The hand-out state will last * * * until the voter sees that he is being bribed with his own money."

Where there is a will there is a way. We proved it in the last war. We proved it in the last Congress. That Eightieth Congress, which President Truman described as the worst in the Nation's history, hired their own experts and found a way not only to balance the budget but to pay off $17,000,000,000 of the public debt, which of course reduced interest proportionately. Yes, the propaganda machines of the bureaucratic departments raised a howl. But, I ask you, which is the more important: satisfying their demands or saving the Nation?

This present Eighty-first Congress is going to add about $10,000,000,000 at the minimum to the public debt. Need I say more?

Illustrations

Just to show you that there is room for economy, here are a few simple illustrations taken from testimony at the current hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine asked funds for 63 new automobiles. Committee investigators reported that the Bureau's Denver office, with 35 persons, had 217 automobiles. In the first 4 months of 1949, 194 of the Denver cars were unused and the Denver office has 80 cars for which it contemplated no future use.

During the campaign to kill grasshoppers last year, the Bureau rented one airplane at $100 per hour. The $100-an-hour plane cost the owner $6,600, but the Department paid a rental of $27,000 in 2 weeks.

A DC–3 plane was rented at $450 an hour. One of the larger air lines told the committee investigators that they would rent a similar plane with pilot, copilot and stewardess at $150 an hour and make a 25-percent profit.

Investigators located an airplane owned by the Bureau in a Macon, Ga., hangar. They said that in 2 years and 3 months it made flights totaling 30 hours.

Testimony brought out that the Bureau miscalculated on the number of grasshoppers per yard and not enough spray was used, and it had to be done over again.

Investigators learned that the Bureau sent one-half of a truck unit to Florida, the other half to Texas, in order to prevent another agency of the Department from using it.

In November 1949, a division of the Bureau declared 9,064 pencils surplus. They had been on hand since 1942.

More enlightenment from Agriculture Department: A Department announcement solemnly says: "About a fourth of the families living in open-country areas own a piece of tarpaulin and about twice as many farm families own a piece as nonfarm families in the same area, according to the result of a personal interview survey made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in May and June 1949. Of those who own them, about one out of every three has more than one piece." (And think what that investigation cost the taxpayer.)

Just spend it, it's only taxpayer's money: Testimony of Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services, before the Appropriations subcommittee, revealed that one Government agency had a supply of the following articles:

Fluorescent light bulbs to last for 93 years.
Ruled filler paper to last for 168 years.
Looseleaf binders to last for 247 years.
Tracing cloth to last for 9 years.

Selling the ECA: The Economic Cooperation Administration shortly will request $2,950,000,000 to finance the Marshall plan for another year. In connection with this, ECA has just hired five new press agents at a cost of $39,450 a year and engaged a magazine "consultant" at the rate of $50 a day when consulted. ECA also reveals it is looking for additional magazine and newspaper writers to act as press agents. The appropriation for publicity for ECA in this country is $285,000 for the fiscal year.

Your responsibility

Again I remind you that each of you has a responsibility and you should make your demands known to your elected officials. The best way to do this is at election time.

Sincerely yours,

NORRIS POULSON,
Member of Congress.

Lattimore and Russian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Owen Lattimore. the target for JOE

McCARTHY's pot shots has made his own record on communism. It has been in print for some time and the Senator has rendered a real public service by turning some light on Lattimore's views. I am including an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 6 which cites chapter and verse on this State Department's Far East expert. It is fair to imply after reading the editorial that Lattimore loves the U. S. S. R. more than the United States of America. He should be removed immediately from any connection with our foreign policy anywhere in the world.

LATTIMORE'S VISION OF DESTINY

Owen Lattimore, accused by Senator McCARTHY as a Soviet agent who is or has been a member of the Communist Party, is to appear today before a Senate investigating committee. Denials will occasion no surprise. But if Mr. Lattimore is not what Senator McCARTHY says he is, then what is he?

By his own representations and in the belief of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Mr. Lattimore is an authority on Asia. Senator McCARTHY asserts that the State Department considers him the outstanding authority. Mr. Lattimore is further described as the architect of America's far eastern policy—a policy which everywhere has led to American retreat while Russia has been advancing.

Mr. Lattimore has written widely on these matters. If there are any salient points in his doctrine, they may be reduced to these general propositions:

1. That Soviet Russia is a young and vital nation, producing leaders who are "men of destiny," and that the Russian rise to power is fated. On the other hand, America and the west produce mediocrities as leaders, western thought is no longer dynamic, and western nations, however good in intention, are helpless in action.

2. That Russia stands for democracy, prosperity, progress, security, and freedom in the eyes of Asiatics, but that the West has exhausted its powers of creativeness, has become old and rigid, and, in Asiatic minds, is associated with discredited imperialism.

3. That Russia, through inevitable historic force, exercises an irresistible power of attraction over the people of all adjacent territories; that this cannot be called Red imperialism; that it signifies "hope" to the peoples of Asia; and that Soviet methods of expansion deserve careful and respectful study.

4. Finally, that there is nothing that we can do about Russia's winning of Asia; that we must keep hands off; that nothing succeeds like success; and that "to be progressive in politics means to be on the side of that which is going up and against that which is going down."

Mr. Lattimore's outlook may be buttressed by citations from his own works. For example, on point 1:

"Russia appears to be the only nation of the modern world that is 'young' enough to have 'men of destiny.' It creates its Lenin and its Stalin; they follow each other with the certainty of fate. Russia, more than China and more than any nation of the West, is launched on a career of growth, and grow it will, irrespective of the leader. Russia, of all countries, is the one of which it can be said not only that something new may happen, but that something new is bound to happen." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 294.)

"* * * It cannot be said of American or British politics of the present day that a Harding, a Coolidge, a Hoover, or a Lloyd George, a Baldwin, or a MacDonald, are 'men of destiny.' * * * Our modern tendency to create commissions and delegate committees is a confession of subconscious loss of confidence in the inevitability of our leaders." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, pp. 293–294.)

"The specific internationalism of the West, with its characteristics of good will in intention and helplessness in action, is an index of the fact that the civilizations of the West no longer guide the civilization which they created. Yet the old western passion for individualism, responsibility, and assertive control lives on; our leaders only last so long as they can keep up the illusion of controlling the uncontrollable." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 293.)

Point 2:

"To all of these peoples (Asiatics bordering on Russia) the Russians and the Soviet Union have a great power of attraction. In their eyes—rather doubtfully in the eyes of the older generation, more and more clearly in the eyes of the younger generation—the Soviet Union stands for strategic security, economic prosperity, technological progress, miraculous medicine, free education, equality of opportunity, and democracy; a powerful combina'ion." (Solution in Asia, p. 139.)

"The truth is that the Russian model of civilization is not built up so high above its foundations that to adapt it to local requirements need postulate extensive sacrifice of essential structural elements. Thus it can offer to any population a model which, while Russian in action, is largely local in structure—whereas both the western and the Chinese models have been so specialized in the course of their own evolution that they are old and rigid, and must handle new material more inconsiderately in order to adapt it to their own requirements. Russian action can therefore more easily accomplish its effects by the dynamic use of converted minorities." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 245.)

"There seems to be no conclusion but that the west has exhausted its powers of creativeness." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, p. 293.)

"All of the peoples of Asia, each in its degree—the subject colonial peoples and the people of China whose liberty had been encroached on, though not destroyed, by nineteenth century imperialism—were startled into hope, expectation, or political daydreaming by the Russian revolution." (Solution in Asia, p. 68.)

"The age of imperialism, though not dead, is withering. The decades of drift are over. We must now set a course. Have we any idea what course to set?" (Solution in Asia, p. 55.)

Point 3:

"Granted the inevitable historic force of the Russian attraction toward the Pacific; granted their reluctance to cooperate with Chinese under Chinese rule, but their proved talent for combination with all kinds of alien elements under their own rule; granted their ability to settle on the land itself, and their superior talent for modernization without corollary subordination to the west—it is difficult not to foresee a steady increase of Russian influence in the region roughly bounded on the south by the Chinese Eastern Railway. It is possible even to foresee actual Russian occupation to an indefinite depth south of the Amur." (Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict, pp. 252–253.)

This "cannot fairly be called Red imperialism." (The Situation in Asia.)

"Throughout Asia today there prevails an atmosphere of hope, not of despair. * * * What they see opening up before them is a limitless horizon of hope—the hope of peaceful, constructive activities in free countries, and peaceful cooperation among free peoples." (The Situation in Asia, p. 238.)

Stalin's formula "is so electrifyingly exact that it should be studied with cautious respect." (The Situation in Asia.) "It certainly establishes a standard with which other nations must compete if they wish to practice a policy of attraction in Asia. Russo-Mongol relations in Asia, like Russo-Czechoslovak relations in Europe, deserve careful and respectful study." (Same volume.)

Point 4:

"Clearly the Communist acendancy had become so decisive that it could not be reversed." (The Situation in Asia, p. 151.)

"We must also abandon the stubbornly lingering delusion that we can somehow maintain footholds by supporting rump territories or rump government somewhere south of the Yangtze, or on the coast, or in Formosa." (The Situation in Asia, p. 179.) This was written when the Chinese Communists were north of the Yangtze and controlled only one-third of China.

"To be progressive in politics means to be on the side of that which is going up and against that which is going down." (The Situation in Asia.)

Senator McCARTHY suggested that this last statement explains Mr. Lattimore. By his every account, Soviet Russia and communism are bound to triumph. It is historically inevitable—the Marxian view. So, said the Senator, Mr. Lattimore has chosen his side.

If the investigating committee finds that Mr. Lattimore is not what Senator McCARTHY says he is, will it kindly tell the American people just what he is?

The Budget and the Spending Program of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters, and include a newspaper article dealing with the budget and the spending program of the Government. One of the letters is from an old friend in Texas; the other from an outstanding constituent, giving the views of a chamber of commerce in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I was home during the 10-day recess. I find people more and more disturbed about the big spending by the Federal Government. It seems that your party has adopted deficit spending as a way of life. People are beginning to realize that their dollar is buying less and less. Indeed the Government may find considerable difficulty in selling their bonds, unless the people can be assured that the dollar they put in such savings will be worth a dollar when it is drawn out. It seems to me that the first obligation of government is that of guaranteeing sound money to its people. The Government, the banks, insurance and trust companies are unofficial custodians of the people's money. We just cannot have sound money when we continue to spend more than we take in.

Mr. Speaker, your party, with a majority of 91 in the House, now controls all legislation, and it seems incumbent upon you and your party to take the lead in cutting the fat out of the Federal

budget and bring it into balance with our income.

APRIL 17, 1950.

Dr. A. L. MILLER,
Congressman, Fourth District, Nebraska.

DEAR DOCTOR: I have been reading a lot in the last few months about the wild spending of Harry Truman, backed by the Democratic wing of our legislators. I feel that you are of my opinion—that we are on the road to destroying our American way of life.

With a national debt of $256,000,000,000 and interest of over $5,000,000,000 a year, our economic resources are overloaded. Today I cut the enclosed clipping from the McAllen Monitor, a valley daily paper. After you have read it I would like to know if what is stated here is the truth: If it is only half true, it is the biggest piece of racketeering one could think of in a country which is not at war. Our Government bonds cannot possibly bring par and the income tax and other internal revenues will not pay the bill.

Much has been written and said in justification of the Marshall plan, but you know, and I know that you cannot buy democracy or prosperity with any kind of money.

Is not there some way to stop this wild spending and balance our budget to include a liberal payment on our debts?

In this article it says that the Government will have to borrow $9,000,000,000 in the next year to pay the millions of Government employees and carry out Truman's planned expenditures. I have some Liberty bonds in my box at the bank, and am seriously thinking of cashing them for what I can get as, in my opinion, they will not be worth 50 cents on the dollar in a short time. What do you think? The clipping is from the April 7, 1950, paper.

I would be glad if you'd take this up with LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Jr., our Representative from the valley, and with others you may wish to contact, as something has to be done, and it is only through our Congress, in my opinion, that any headway can be made.

Would be glad if you'd also interview our Representatives from Texas and see if you can't get their help. I am not in the habit of asking favors of our Congressmen or Senators, but this is too serious a matter to stand quietly by and not express an opinion. You have known me for many years, and know I am inclined to be optimistic. With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely.

[From the McAllen (Tex.) Monitor of April 7, 1950]

GOVERNMENT TO START BORROWING MORE MONEY

WASHINGTON.—The Government, expected to overspend its income by more than $9,000,000,000 in the next 15 months, will start borrowing new money next week to make ends meet.

That will add considerably to the Government's debts, which already total nearly $256,000,000,000.

The first step in the new borrowing program, as announced by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder Thursday night, will take this form:

The Treasury owes about $900,000,000 in 91-day bills falling due April 13. It will sell $1,000,000,000 in new 91-day bills that day to pay off the due debt and leave it $100,000,000 extra cash.

Except in scale, the transaction will be the same as that of a man who has a $900 note falling due at the bank next Thursday and takes care of it by giving a new note for $1,000.

MORE FALLING DUE

The Treasury will have a chance to pick up an extra $100,000,000 in each of the two succeeding weeks by identical transactions, for it has $900,000,000 issues of 91-day bills also falling due April 20 and 27.

Next week will mark the first time in 7 months that the Treasury has sought to borrow extra funds in the public money market, made up mostly of banks.

Since last September it has been paying off securities falling due by selling practically identical amounts of new securities.

It has not, however, been heavily pressed for cash in that time, partly because the Government has run only about $1,370,000,000 in the red since the 1950 fiscal year started last July 1.

Also, it could stall along by using cash on hand, borrowing from Government trust funds (particularly the social security fund), and looking forward to heavy income tax collections in March.

As it turned out, income tax receipts proved disappointingly low, raising a threat that the Government income may fall short of expenses by more than the $5,533,000,000 total President Truman figured for this fiscal year.

Worse still, nearly $4,200,000,000 of that deficit will be piled up between now and the fiscal year's end June 30, and the President has estimated that income will fall $5,100,000,000 short of spending in the following 12 months fiscal 1951.

PAYING INTEREST

The Treasury already is paying out more than $5,700,000,000 a year to cover interest charges on the old and climbing debt.

Right now, the Treasury has around $5,650,000,000 in cash on hand, some of which can be used in taking care of the coming deficit costs.

Much of it, however, must be kept on hand as a sort of reserve against emergencies, in view of the billions in back debt on which payment could be demanded any time and in view of the scale of Government outlays.

The practice is to keep at least $3,000,000,000 in cash on hand at all times, and borrowing to meet cash needs in excess of that minimum balance.

In the borrowing operation, funds will be obtained not only from banks and other lending institutions but also from the trust funds and from the individual sales of savings bonds.

APRIL 10, 1950.

Representative A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives (Nebraska), Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In behalf of a chamber of commerce and community in Nebraska and to add my personal feelings, I would like to add a voice to the many letters you must receive on the state of the Union as it now exists.

There is an incessant demand on the streets of this city for more economy in our Government affairs. On April 18 the House will be voting on the $29,000,000,000 single-package bill. The over-all total of Government expenditures must be cut in all events. In order to satisfy the political demands of the Nation, the bill should be sent back to the Appropriations Committee with order to distribute cuts among the various agencies and departments. Our solicitations to you are almost in the nature of a demand that your vote be on the side of economy at every opportunity. Unless cuts are made, the public is about ready to question the financial status of the Government. On the streets I hear questions raised on the Government bonds themselves. If the Nation gets fearful of the credit of the United States and they commence cashing their bonds in wholesale fashion, this Nation will resound with cries of anguish from all quarters. Whenever the public becomes fearful of its Government, we are on the road to complete ruin. I believe that the people in this community are in a state of unrest because of the fiscal policy of the United States Government. The people still want their little dole, but they are slowly wakening to what is going on. It is for you and me to comprehend this situation and to make our complaints in the form of a demand with all the strength and power that we possess.

I find myself personally advising crowds at the sale of real estate to get the money out of the banks and cash their bonds because of the fiscal policy of the Government. This letter is a warning as best I can compose the same that great trouble lies ahead unless you boys put up a stronger fight than has been manifest heretofore. Our people are getting tired of the lip service of their Congressmen and the lack of action on the part of Congress. TAFT has hit a good line when he states that the only way to change this policy of our Government is to have a change of administration. That statement is taking hold of the public mind. The gang war in Kansas City is linked directly to the President's door. The Congress should be urged to look deeply into gang warfare. It is more deeply connected with Government than we are willing to admit. I believe nothing constructive will be done until Congress itself awakens to the peril of this country.

In fairness this community would like to know why there is such little progress in enacting many of the Hoover Commission recommendations. The recommendations are the heart and the over-all demand of this Nation for economy measures. Your office is varied in its duties, but instead of answering this letter, this community asks you to not give up the fight and do more than you have done, even though you think you have done your best. The best you have done is not good enough. It is time to do more.

With kind personal regards.

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, has earned for himself the reputation in the State of Minnesota as one of the most outstanding of our citizens. His writings on international affairs demonstrate an objectivity, coupled with a firm dedication to democratic principles, which make him, in my opinion, one of the most valuable writers in American journalism. He has been observing, reporting, and analyzing major news developments throughout the world ever since he graduated from Harvard in 1916. In 1922 he joined the Chicago Daily News. As foreign correspondent, and later as foreign editor and director of that newspaper's foreign service, Carroll Binder reported the rise of fascism in Italy, nazism in Germany, and communism in Russia. He became editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune in 1945, and we have been grateful to welcome him as our neighbor and fellow Minnesotan. During World War II Mr. Binder covered the war in the Pacific and in Europe, and following the war was present in San Francisco for the formation of the United Nations.

Most recently Mr. Binder made a trip to western Europe. With 14 other editors he spent 3 weeks studying the operation of the Economic Recovery Program. He then spent 2 more weeks investigating other problems of western Europe, particularly as they affect American foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles entitled "Carroll Binder Reports From Europe."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BINDER SEES HOPE DIM FOR WEST UNITY—RULING ELEMENTS CLING TO NATIONALIST PRIDE, TOURING WRITER FINDS

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—If you expect the nations of western Europe to scrap their separate nationalisms shortly, and form a United States of Europe in return for the billions put up by American taxpayers, you're in for a big disappointment.

I have heard much talk about integration in each of the four countries I have visited during the past 5 weeks.

I found many individuals who share the belief of many Americans that the European democracies cannot survive politically or economically if they persist in trying to remain independent and in trying to become self-sufficient.

NOT READY TO YIELD

But I found no evidence that ruling elements in any country soon will be ready to give up their national sovereignties for the purpose of changing Europe into one big market of 270,000,000 people.

This change is what Paul Hoffman and other American spokesmen are asking for when they advocate integration.

"The only real Europeans are the Americans," hard-bitten west German Socialist leader Kurt Schumacher said in reply to my inquiry about the prospects for European integration.

Schumacher voiced disgust at the intense nationalism rampant in Europe, particularly among his fellow Socialists in other countries.

He justifies his own intense nationalism by the lack of camaraderie he finds in British and French socialism.

JUSTIFIES STAND

The only possibility of political and economic union Schumacher sees is between western Germany and Austria.

Since the Marshall plan emphasizes American interest in uniting Europe and since integration has become to many Americans a measure of the success or failure of our aid to Europe, this adherence of western Europeans to nationalism is of major significance.

To one unfamiliar with European history, economics, politics, traditions, and temperament this resistance to integration may seem stupid, perverse, and unappreciative of American aid and advice.

To one familiar with the power accumulating on the other side of the iron curtain—750,000,000 people scattered over 15,000,000 square miles and great natural resources at the command of the most ruthless and purposeful dictatorship in history—the persistence of separate western European nationalisms and the failure to integrate may seem suicidal.

THINKING NOT CLEAR

This series of articles is more of a report on things as they are and appear likely to be several years hence than a discussion of what should be done.

It may not be amiss to say that a study of talk about integration is likely to leave one less clear as to what Congress and ECA spokesmen mean when they urge integration upon western Europeans.

It also is likely to create serious doubts as to whether political integration of western Eurrope outside of both the American and Soviet systems is desirable from the standpoint of the United States.

There could not be the sort of economic integration we urge without some political integration.

This is not to imply that western Europe can survive in its present divided condition but to say that our own concepts of integration at present are too confused and unrealistic to warrant our attaching so much importance to such a formula.

Something more sound and more apt to endure seems to be necessary.

The American people probably will have to show more willingness to integrate with Europe before they can prevail upon Europeans to integrate with each other.

Europeans would be more impressed if Americans integrated their talks about integration.

There is a tremendous spread between what Americans urge Europeans to do—sometimes the same Americans.

At times our spokesmen seem to be insisting that tariff walls be abolished, fiscal policies be coordinated and currencies be made interchangeable to the extent that only a United States of Europe could achieve.

At other times our spokesmen seem to have in mind only small regional tariff groupings, abolition of quota restrictions on intra-European trade and aiming at the general reduction of tariff barriers.

Vested interests in each country naturally fight any modification of existing national barriers which seem essential to continuance of their profits, jobs, prestige, or influence.

French wine growers don't want to have to compete with Italian wines and Italian automobile manufacturers don't want to have to compete with British cars in the domestic markets.

Workers in other countries oppose the admission of Italy's surplus workers for any except poorly paid or exceptionally arduous work such as farm labor or mining. European steel production already promises to exceed present annual consumption by about 8,000,000 tons.

Nevertheless each government would like to make itself independent of others in steel and other key production.

But resistance to early and far-reaching lowering of national barriers is not confined to self-centered special interest. A sudden lowering of long-existing barriers in such an unbalanced area as western Europe would create economic and social problems graver than those it is desired to solve.

Every government must think about the welfare of its own people as well as the general welfare. It is normal that prudent governments should be cautious about exposing their people to unemployment and other economic dislocation which might result from giving free rein to less prudent governments of other countries.

A Swedish leader had this in mind when he said his people would not consent to linking their fortunes too closely with "Frenchmen and Italians who are addicted to tax evasion and blackmarketing"—practices frowned upon in his country.

A Dutchman who has seen how much more luxuriously Italians doing the kind of work he does are able to live in Italy's "free" economy balks at pooling his country's frugal economy with Italy's. The Dutch limit their families and share their limited resources to keep their national house in order. The Italians go on reproducing at their traditional rate despite a chronic overpopulation of 2,000,000 for which at present there is neither employment nor a home abroad.

It is difficult to integrate economies such as those of Britain, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia (planned along Socialist lines) with relatively unplanned economies such as those of France and Belgium. Such fundamental differences exist between neighboring Belgium and the Netherlands that Benelux, the pioneer European project for elimination of customs barriers, has yet to be implemented.

The three Scandinavian countries have as good a basis for union as can be found anywhere. But, despite common institutions and other integrating forces, differences in wealth and conflicts between industries thus far have prevented implementation of the long-discussed customs union.

Sudden abolition of barriers would throw about 50,000 Norwegian women textile workers out of employment. Their product couldn't compete with the more efficient Swedish textile industry. But the Norwegian women could not be moved elsewhere because their husbands are engaged in fishing. The families must remain near the sea, and the mills have gone to fishing towns to obtain this available female labor. If Sweden would buy Norway's chemicals, Norway could buy Sweden's textiles, but Sweden developed its own chemical industry as a defense measure.

Even in the case of Belgium and Luxemburg, there are constant rows over joint trade agreements with other countries. Luxemburg is primarily dependent on its steel industry. Belgium has a steel industry, but its textiles are more important. When Belgolux negotiates a trade agreement with Norway, the Belgians insist on disposing of a lot of textiles, while the Luxemburgers insist on Norway taking a large part of its payment in steel.

Such experiences with limited forms of integration and such moods in western Europe lead Prof. Gottfried Haberler, of Harvard, to believe that only a dictator or the imminent danger of being taken over by Soviet aggressors could induce the various countries to abandon their separate national sovereignties and become one sovereignty.

Haberler believes that collapse of the dictatorship or subsidence of the crisis would lead to the quick disintegration of such a forced western European union. He thinks the planned and the unplanned societies would each try to go their own ways rather than remain united. Less comprehensive cooperation is possible, however, in Haberler's opinion, and should be fostered.

EUROPE LAYS RECOVERY LAG TO BRITAIN—BINDER WARNS UNITED STATES MUST NOT TURN BACK ON DEPENDABLE ALLY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—When a man makes a quiet getaway in France—whether from jail or from a social situation—they say he scrammed in the English fashion. In England they describe such behavior as taking French leave.

These popular expressions reflect states of mind about each other which have developed in centuries of contact between peoples separated by wide cultural, political, and temperamental differences as well as by the English Channel.

It thus comes naturally for Frenchmen and other Europeans to blame the British for failure to make appreciable headway toward European cooperation. And it is not surprising that Americans, in and out of the Economic Cooperation Administration, accuse the British of dragging their feet.

ROIL AMERICANS, TOO

Europeans who do not wish to have their own countries' failure to take real steps to-

ward integration examined too closely join with anti-British groups in attributing lack of progress to the British, who are playing their usual selfish game.

The British are doing some things which certainly are not conducive to integration. They sometimes rub Americans as well as Europeans the wrong way.

But attempts to saddle all the blame on the British can only obscure more important stumbling blocks to the recovery and peace of Europe.

Also, it would be a great injustice to the British, whose stand with us in time of stress is the chief hope of preserving free institutions.

ONLY DEPENDABLE ALLY

When all things are considered Great Britain is the one ally in this part of the world upon whom we can count unreservedly for thick-and-thin cooperation for the common defense.

Such a dependable and capable ally is entitled to hold aloof from any project which it fears may weaken, rather than strengthen, its ability to survive in freedom and relative well-being.

Its stubborn standoffishness may prove less difficult to cope with than the pretended cooperation of nations not so wholeheartedly dedicated to freedom.

The British refuse to put all their eggs into the western European basket because they are not convinced such a political and economic entity can stand up to the Soviet challenge or remain a going concern.

They have two other relationships which they consider more vital than their continental relationships. One is with the British commonwealth. The other is with the United States.

BRITISH DETERMINED

The British are determined to preserve their ability to deal directly with both the United States and the other members of the British commonwealth, regardless of urging by high-placed Americans to identify themselves more unreservedly with Europe.

Although the commonwealth and other parts of the world constituting the sterling bloc no longer offer the economic and political advantages they once did, this integration of 250,000,000 people and a quarter of the world's trade is a bird in hand.

The British deem it worth more than the bird in the European bush.

If Europe continues to be a collection of would-be self-sufficient nations, Britain wants the sterling bloc and commonwealth aces in the hole. Britain believes that the United States will make arrangements with it which it is not yet prepared to make with western Europeans individually or collectively.

The monetary talks last autumn in Washington confirm that British estimate. Britain may be persuaded to conduct its sterling and United States relationships in a more constructive manner as regards European cooperation, but it cannot be bullied out of them any more than the United States can be induced to forfeit values it cherishes for dubious values about which little can be ascertained.

Britain's participation in the European integration movement is also conditioned by ideological and other factors spelled out in the second article in this series.

Britain is not willing to expose its full employment policies to the forces operative in the relatively free economies of France, Italy, and Belgium. It is not willing to again subject its critically low gold and dollar reserve to Belgian and other attempts to gather a still larger dollar and gold strength through convertible currencies.

Conservative leader Anthony Eden is no more willing to discard currency controls than the Laborites.

There are some other potent factors in British policy. Unlike the Italians and the Germans, who take it for granted that the United States should and will continue to help them indefinitely or the French who assume that the United States can always be counted upon to come to their rescue if they face disaster, the British are determined to try to get off the back of the United States at the earliest possible moment.

They resent being dependent on American aid and deliberately go without most of the good things of life in the hope of working their own passage again.

How Britain can stand on its own feet economically is hard to see. Some experts consider it impossible of attainment. But Britain's effort to become independent deserves more respect than the sycophancy of Europeans who expect to be supported in return for their lip service to European unity.

Key personalities in the Labor regime are motivated by other considerations. They want to be able to carry on (in even more austere fashion if necessary but independently) if the United States decides to shut off aid because of disappointment with results of ERP or displeasure with British Socialist policies. Some British measures arise out of that attempt to insure against an unfavorable turn of events.

This preoccupation with British survival and with cherished domestic measures has led to certain British practices such as dual pricing which ECA officials feel to be highly unfair and dangerous.

It is estimated that Britain is making a profit of about $50,000,000 a year by imposing an extra charge of £1 a ton on coal exported to other Marshall plan countries.

Sir Stafford Cripps and conservative businessmen justify this practice on the grounds that coal always has been sold abroad at the price that can be gotten and that the United States and other countries have more than one price for the same commodity when they can get away with it.

ECA accuses the Labor government of taking advantage of scarcity abroad to make the nationalized coal industry show a profit which otherwise would not be possible with high costs of production and subsidized domestic prices.

There can be no economic integration if each country being helped takes its little advantage at the expense of other countries which are being helped.

While the practice may help a given country to make a temporary gain, none will benefit in the end because Sweden, overcharged for British coal, is likely to overcharge some other country for its iron ore and soft wood. France will have an excuse to overcharge for its phosphates, Italy for its hemp, and Norway for its whale oil. Instead of being enlarged, trade thereby would be contracted.

An ECA official, whom I know well enough to feel certain that he is fundamentally friendly to Britain, likens Britain's present behavior toward European integration to the London policeman he observed during one of the worst blitzes busily trying to put out a gaslight which, according to regulations should not have been on.

Across the street the blaze of one of the largest buildings of London afforded enemy raiders an illumination 10,000 times brighter than the offending gaslight.

My friend fears that Britain's preoccupation with its own survival overlooks the burning building across the street which is Soviet designs on free Europe.

He thinks Britain could not survive in freedom if western Europe is taken over by the Soviets and that western Europe cannot save itself without the wholehearted cooperation of Britain.

How Your Tax Bill Grew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Pathfinder for March 8, 1950:

HOW YOUR TAX BILL GREW

Sometime before midnight, Wednesday, March 15, 53,000,000 Americans will pay an average income tax of a dollar a day for the privilege of being governed.

This dollar-a-day levy will provide $19,000,000,000 of the $43,300,000,000 needed to run the Federal Government this year—or about 43 cents of every $1 the Government collects.

Moreover, these same Americans and their families will pay through taxes on their whiskies, cigarettes, Easter presents and Christmas gifts, movie tickets, and corporations another $18,000,000,000.

When it's all in, the Treasury will need $5,500,000,000 more to meet the bills.

To make up the shortage, these same Americans will lend their Government this $5,500,000,000, indirectly, through their banks; directly, by buying Government bonds.

By then the Government will owe about $260,000,000,000, nearly $1,750 for each man, woman, and child.

In the light of these six harsh facts there was little wonder that few taxpayers were happy as they turned over their Forms 1040 to internal-revenue collectors this week.

Equally cheerless are these other facts, probably less well known than the dreary six:

Income-taxpaying citizens will pay 15 times as much this year as they did in 1930.

By the end of this year the national debt will be 10 times larger than it was at the close of World War I.

The total cost of running the Federal Government this year will be nearly 13 times more than it was 2 decades ago.

This year's Federal deficit alone will be $2,100,000,000 more than the cost of all Federal activities in 1930.

The question of greatest interest to individual taxpayers was, of course, omitted from the short forms and long forms.

Why has the cost of Government skyrocketed so in the last 20 years?

Part of the answer, but not all of it, comes from these specifics:

In 1930 the Federal Government was composed of 38 major departments and agencies. Today there are 61.

In 1930 the Federal Government employed 600,000 workers. Today it employs 2,100,000.

In 1930 the United States taxpayer supported the Government of one nation, his own. Today he helps support more than 20 governments, including his own.

In 1930 the population of the United States was about 123,000,000. Today a Government which serves 150,000,000 is necessarily larger.

These partial answers point to the vast expansion of the functions of Government since 1930. Then, a citizen's chief contacts with his Government came during presidential or congressional elections; or when he ordered a pamphlet from the Agriculture Department.

But when, early in the thirties, the Government tried to end the depression by hiring everyone who was out of work, its functions mushroomed. So did its costs.

In 1938 the Government's income, which had been mounting steadily because of

greater national income and more taxpayers, had passed the $5,000,000,000 mark. But the same year Federal spending pushed $8,000,000,000. This deficit, plus earlier debts, put the Government in the red for some $37,000,000,000.

Then came World War II. When it was over the Nation staggered out of its far-flung foxholes with a gaping wound in its budgetary side—a national debt of $269,000,000,000.

COSTLY ITEMS

And, since VJ-day, taxpayers' hopes for a return "to the good old days" have been frozen stiff in the cold war. Rather than be caught flat-footed again, as they had been twice within a generation, the taxpayers' representatives face this year:

The spending of $13,500,000,000 for military defenses—nearly as much as the total cost of Government in 1941.

Care of veterans of all wars at a cost of $6,000,000,000—nearly six times what it was 20 years ago.

Help to friendly nations through independent loans, Marshall plan aid and the North Atlantic Pact at a cost of nearly $5,000,000,000.

These, plus the interest of $5,600,000,000 on old debts, add up to three-fourths of the $42,400,000,000 1951 budget President Truman submitted to Congress last January. The President deplored the deficit, but made it clear that he regarded paper solvency of less importance than his Fair Deal program—which cannot help but create more debt.

Stuyvesant Town's Threat to Our Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is preparing to consider the constitutionality of a decision handed down by the highest court of New York in which it upheld the right of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to restrict its huge housing development, known as Stuyvesant Town, to "whites only." The effort to reverse that decision has significance which goes beyond the field of housing or even the problem of racial discrimination. Unless the decision is reversed, it may set a precedent which in time may prove ominous to our whole American pattern of democratic government.

A study on this subject appeared in the November 1949 issue of Commentary. It is written by Charles Abrams, a leading authority in the field of housing, who himself played an important role as counsel in the legal fight to abolish racial discrimination in Stuyvesant Town. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

STUYVESANT TOWN'S THREAT TO OUR LIBERTIES—GOVERNMENT WAIVES THE CONSTITUTION FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Charles Abrams)

(New York State's highest court has upheld the right of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to restrict "to whites only" its huge housing development on New York's East Side, near the United Nations site, built with the public aid of the city of New York; now the Supreme Court of the United States is preparing to consider the constitutionality of this decision. The struggle to reverse the decision, Charles Abrams argues here, has significance beyond the housing area, or even the broader field of racial discrimination, important as both are. It is necessary to void a precedent, Mr. Abrams suggests, that may have the most ominous consequences for our whole American democratic pattern of government. Mr. Abrams, a leading authority in the field of housing, is an attorney, and was until recently housing analyst for the New York Post Home News. He himself played a prominent role, as counsel, in the legal fight to abolish racial discrimination in Stuyvesant Town. He is the author of The Future of Housing and Revolution in Land. His article The Segregation Threat in Housing appeared in the February 1949 Commentary.)

Last July, New York's highest court, by a 4 to 3 decision, upheld the right of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. to bar Negroes from its Stuyvesant Town housing project. (*Dorsey* v. *Stuyvesant Town Corporation* (299 N. Y. 512).) Though the decision received Nation-wide mention in the press, the general impression was that it concerned only another attempt, perhaps new in its form, to ban Negroes from white neighborhoods. But when the court's majority and dissenting opinions appeared in the law journals, the issue emerged in its full gravity: the case reached down to the very roots of American freedom.

It was not merely that minorities living in slums could now, with the help of city and State governments, be ousted from their homes to make way for restricted private developments. Far more important was the fact that an ominous device for circumventing the constitutional safeguards against arbitrary government had received judicial sanction. Public enterprises in private hands were held free to segregate, discriminate, and be above the law. Private corporations, the court held, may now be lawfully handed the powers and funds of government and use them unhindered by constitutional restraint.

It is not hard to see why dissenting Judge Stanley Fuld characterized the majority opinion as "perplexing." Where power is unlimited, tyranny begins. For centuries the safeguards against abuse of public power have been protected and reinforced. Its release into private hands opens a new chapter in political science. "It is impossible to balance the essence of democracy against fireproof buildings, and well-kept lawns," wrote Judge Fuld. "The Constitutions, Federal and State, forbid our putting the former into the judicial scales, just as they forbade the city officials from putting it upon the bargaining table * * * this undertaking was a governmentally conceived, governmentally aided, and governmentally regulated project * * * Stuyvesant Town in its role as chosen instrument for this public purpose may not escape the obligations that accompany the privileges."

But Stuyvesant Town has escaped those obligations. Judge Fuld's opinion is not the law. The law is that the precious powers of Government may now be used to create "private baronies." Indeed, with the recent passage of a Federal urban redevelopment law, dozens of them are already in the blueprint stage all over the country.

Never before in American history has such a unique liaison between Government and private enterprise been authorized. But the surrender of public powers to nonrepresentative private groups—always in the name of "social reform"—is not a phenomenon entirely strange to the modern world. It was one of the unique characteristics of the "corporate states" which have weighed like massive incubi on the prostrate body politic of Europe. The judicial approval of Stuyvesant Town represents an ominous relaxation of democratic controls when reinforcement is more essential than ever.

The Stuyvesant Town "barony" consists of 18 square city blocks and lies in the heart of New York City's East Side facing the East River between Fourteenth and Twentieth Streets. It cost $93,000,000 to build and houses some 25,000 people. It was conceived and sponsored by Park Commissioner Robert Moses as an alternative to public housing. That it is a sound investment for its owner, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., is due to a huge grant of tax exemption by the city totaling more than $55,000,000, or more than three times the cost of the land. The city also turned over to the company public streets amounting to a fifth of the area; these streets are now closed to the public and no one but the city's comptroller may tread on them without the company's consent. The city also condemned the land, ousting some 10,000 low-income tenants from their homes, as well as a host of storekeepers, churches, schools—and even another publicly regulated housing project. There are no public playgrounds or schools inside the Stuyvesant Town area, for it was feared by Metropolitan's chairman of the board that Negro children might attend. Negro tenants were to be barred, too, he said, because "Negroes and whites don't mix. A hundred years from now, maybe they will." The company openly admits its intention to discriminate against Negroes, claiming it as a constitutional right.

The law which authorized this singular undertaking was specially tailored to suit this $9,000,000,000 company. The ostensible public purpose behind these vast gifts of public moneys and powers is called urban redevelopment, described by the law with the novel term, "superior public use"—which means superior to schools and playgrounds, which are legally only ordinary public uses. The novel legal jargon, however, only inadquately conceals a more familiar process. Urban redevelopment is but the latest of a succession of devices conceived originally to improve housing and neighborhoods, but which have been perverted to keep minorities in their place.

Since minorities are most frequently contained in slum areas and cannot easily break out directly into better neighborhoods, they tend to infiltrate family by family where they can. A first device to prevent this infiltration was municipal zoning ordinances forbidding occupancy by certain races. These were soon held unconstitutional on the theory that an ordinance is State action, and therefore violates the fourteenth amendment, which prohibits States and public agencies from enforcing laws that deny equal protection to citizens. A second device aiming to keep minorities in their places, the racial restrictive covenant, was recently held unenforceable by the courts on the ground that courts are instruments of States and, therefore, court enforcement would violate the fourteenth amendment.[1]

But urban redevelopment is something new and different, the implications of its perversion far more sinister. The racial zoning ordinances and restrictive covenants aim only to bar minorities from coming into certain areas. Urban redevelopment, however, authorizes cities to root them out of areas in which they already live, all in the name of slum clearance. Because slum clearance is a recognized public purpose, the land on which they live and the homes they own may now be taken from them by forced sale.

Further, after acquiring the land for the private developer, the city may then turn it over to him without restrictions, according to the Stuyvesant Town decision. Cities are authorized to sell it for less than cost,

[1] See Charles Abrams, Homes for Aryans Only, Commentary, May 1947, and The Segregation Threat in Housing, Commentary, February 1949.

with taxpayers, Negro and white, Jew and Gentile, footing the bill. Yet while benefiting from these powers and subsidies emanating from all the people, the developer is free to discriminate in the renting of dwelling units. The theoretical justification for this is that once the property is in private hands the discrimination is no longer State action. The program thus grants equality of the laws during the process of eviction, i. e., no favorites are played and all are turned out into the streets with an even hand; but there is no equality in the sharing of the dividends of urban redevelopment. The minority is thus assured equality in the burdens, but never in the fruits. Slum clearance, which was intended to be the preliminary to decent housing, may now become the prelude to mass homelessness.

This is no academic matter, nor is it an isolated bogey inflated by alarmists. Twenty-five States have already passed urban redevelopment laws, and since Congress has now authorized huge Federal subsidies for urban redevelopment, mass shifts of minorities from one slum to another worse one, may soon begin. The proportion of the overcrowding in housing occupied by nonwhites is already four times as great as that of whites, the proportion of substandard housing is six times as high. These houses are the ones now most often scheduled for demolition and redevelopment. The evicted minorities find other areas barred to them while the new private redevelopment projects with few exceptions intend to follow the Stuyvesant Town exclusion policies.

The cost in human suffering may be imagined. But the evil of the program lies not only in its brutal imposition upon various minorities, but also, and perhaps primarily, in the fact that States and cities are now permitted by law to become partners to discrimination and injustice—a partnership now sanctioned by an influential court as constitutional. As racial zoning and the restrictive covenant proved, discriminatory practices are epidemic. We are thus witnessing the establishment of a legal precedent which may yet upset the safeguards of 150 years of freedom and split the structure of constitutional government.

Awakening to the dangers inherent in such urban redevelopment, minority groups have attempted to write antibias clauses into the enabling legislation. But their efforts have, to date, been thwarted. One obstacle in the fight has been the glee with which certain legislators—Senators BRICKER, of Ohio, and CAIN, of Washington, deserve special mention—have used civil-rights amendments as political footballs; the strategy is to tack anti-discrimination amendments on to social legislation in the hope of alienating enough Southern votes to kill the entire Fair Deal program. (CAIN, it might be noted, led the filibuster which defeated the administration's civil-rights program.) Unfortunately, some representatives of minority groups fell into the trap, and supported such amendments regardless of motives. A more apt phrase would have been "regardless of political realities," for the amendment as drawn almost defeated the public housing program which offered the only hope for housing some of the evicted minorities.

At the same time, Federal housing officials, who might have been expected to further the fight against discrimination in urban redevelopment, have remained indifferent. So much so, that when an amendment passed the House giving displaced tenants priority in the new urban redevelopment projects, it was smothered in conference because Housing Administrator Raymond M. Foley failed to give it administration approval.

Progress on the local front is only slightly more hopeful. Of all the State urban redevelopment laws now in effect, only Pennsylvania's bars racial discrimination. In New York City a local ordinance forbids granting tax exemption to housing projects which discriminate (but it does not apply to Stuyvesant Town, which was authorized before the ordinance passed). San Francisco is the only other city outlawing discrimination in urban redevelopment; Chicago and other cities have refused to go along, claiming that private investment would be discouraged. Experience with New York City's law, however, should dissipate Chicago's fears. More than $30,000,000 is now being invested by lending institutions in nondiscriminating urban redevelopment projects, and another $16,000,000 is being advanced for limited dividend projects.

Among the institutions making loans under the city's antibias ordinance are the Bowery Savings Bank, whose board chairman, Henry Bruere, once opposed the ordinance, but has since informed the writer that he is aware of the new social habits and that his approach in making these loans on nondiscriminating undertakings is entirely pragmatic. The Bowery has a total of $13,500,000 invested in such projects at as little as 3½ percent interest. Another New York project, Queensview Houses, a cooperative, headed by Louis Pink and financed by an 80-percent loan of $6,000,000 by the Mutual Life Insurance Co. at 4 percent, has sold almost all of its apartments to middle-income families, although 10 of the cooperators will be Negroes.

Yet, all that has been done in New York City has failed to offset the example of Stuyvesant Town and the implications of its victory in the courts. It is Stuyvesant Town the precedent, rather than Stuyvesant Town the project, that looms so large as a threat to the American way of life.

Throughout America's history rigid restrictions have been imposed upon the Government's use of the eminent domain, tax, and police powers—powers which the New York court has held may now be used for private developers who are free from such restrictions. These three powers constitute the working tools of any government, be it capitalist, Fascist, or Socialist. When abused, these are the powers that threaten life, liberty, and property.

The power to regulate, for example, is also the power to regulate out of existence; the American system has therefore always required that the courts stand guard to see that it is exercised reasonably. The power of eminent domain is the power to take another man's property; it may therefore be exercised only for a public use and upon payment of just compensation. The power to tax carries with it the obligation to use the proceeds for public purposes and not for private or class use.

One of the salient differences between democratic and totalitarian governments is that in the latter these powers are subject to the whim of a single dictator, while in a democracy their arbitrary exercise is effectively checked. The whole system of checks and balances which make up the American Republic was erected to prevent the abuse of these powers, or their subordination to private advantage.

In recent years, however, America has veered to what is euphemistically called the welfare state, and it is here that the Stuyvesant Town decision becomes the judicial authorization for a menacing liaison between private and public enterprises.

We are, to be sure, far from embarking upon any Fascist ideology or upon any conscious imitation of fascism's racist aberrations. But political systems have an inherent dynamic of their own; it is not the personal motives of politicians or businessmen which shape the ultimate pattern in the relationship between the State and the individual.

Freedom is an ethic but it is also the by-product of economic institutions. That it has flourished in America is due not only to the scheme of separation of powers but to the separation of government from business as well. In the American system up to now, enjoyment of both property and personal freedom have been inextricably linked. The linkage survived the great shift from the free-hold economy to the modern corporate system, when it continued to be to the interest of the propertied and entrepreneurial classes to oppose government expansion so as to keep taxes low and regulation minimal.

With the release of the welfare and spending powers, however, the competition for government aid has taken a new turn. The insulation of business from government is ended and as the Government has now become the main functionary in the economic milieu, the driving forces of enterprise are being headed toward the Nation's Capital. The trader and tycoon are rising to the occasion to manipulate Government policies for their own ends, to influence legislation, and to harness the public official in the private interest.

In consequence, the welfare state as it is beginning to emerge in America bids fair to be a far cry from the pure and simple dispensing of benefits to America's common man, as was the intent of its initial sponsors. Under the guidance of certain business interests—as shortsighted as they are powerful—there is, at least in part, emerging a business welfare state in which the Government is being called upon to pump the funds authorized under the newly expanded welfare programs into certain private pipe lines. The common men are to become, as it were, the residual legatees, instead of being the direct beneficiaries; their benefits will be enjoyed at a second or third remove.

In the name of such public purposes as defense, housing betterment, encouragement of infant as well as senile industries, economic pump priming during slumps, protection of savings, home-ownership encouragement, and a growing list of other high-sounding goals, we are stumbling blindly in several directions, one of which is a subsidies-to-business economy. In the name of social reforms the Government is called upon also to loan to business at low rates, to socialize business losses when necessary, to remove risk from private enterprise by Federal insurance. In the process, these protected enterprises insist, of course, upon the same immunity from regulation they enjoyed before they drew upon the Government purse and the Government's powers.

The majority opinion of Judge Bruce Bromley in the Stuyvesant Town case justifies this immunity thus: "The increasing and fruitful participation of Government, both State and Federal, in the industrial and economic life of the Nation—by subsidy and control analogous to that found in this case—suggests the grave and delicate problem in defining the scope of the constitutional inhibitions which would be posed if we were to characterize the rental policy of respondents as governmental action."

Discrimination against minorities is no sudden, accidental byproduct of this emerging business-welfare state. On the contrary, discrimination in older phases of the housing program, wherever the business-Government liaison has been in effect, points to an intrinsic relationship and suggests the dangers of its extension into other fields.

It was, for example, in the Federal Housing Administration that the racial restrictive covenant received its greatest impetus. For years, and in fact during the entire period of the New Deal, this Government agency recommended the exclusion of minorities from newly developed areas, refused to insure mortgages on property if minorities were allowed to enter, and in an official manual drew up the very racial covenants that private developers were to use if they were to be eligible for FHA insurance.

The Government manual warned against such "adverse influences" as "unharmonious

racial groups." It said that "if a neighborhood is to retain stability it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes." The "model" covenant it recommended provided that "no person of any race other than (race to be inserted) shall use or occupy any building or any lot, except that this covenant shall not prevent occupancy by domestic servants of a different race domiciled with an owner or tenant." In the face of vigorous protest, this manual was finally modified; but there is all too little evidence of any genuine change of heart.

Similar tendencies were noted in the liquidation operations of the Home Owners Loan Corporation. So too with urban redevelopment.

A 1944 Federal memorandum on the subject (for internal use only) states: "It is unfortunately true that, with but few exceptions, a displacement of neighborhood population by a new group results in an immediate lowering of the neighborhood level; that is, when higher groups leave, their places are taken by lower groups, four people drive out five people, rather than the other way around." The lower groups or four people are then listed as Negroes and Jews, and examples of decline in values as a result of the "travel of Jewish groups from an original semighetto" are cited.

The report goes on: "It is, of course, substantially impossible under our present social and economic system to effectively control people's movements. There is no way, nor is it necessarily socially desirable that there be a way to keep people where they are. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to prevent the encroachment upon other neighborhoods of people of unharmonious economic, social, national, and racial groups. The problem must be approached indirectly and, therefore, with poor efficiency and with only partial result."

Three indirect methods to contain neighborhoods and to keep out the undesirables were then proposed, including restrictive covenants which were recommended as "a rallying point around which neighborhood residents could gather to fight encroachment."

To stamp out discrimination in one or a few Government agencies, worth while as this is, does not affect the disease itself but only dabs at the more irritating symptoms. For the evil of discrimination in housing is not localized; nor is it due to the personal prejudice of officials; it flows from the Government-business relationship itself.

Democratic government and democratic business act under almost opposite sets of ethics and principles. Private business may, in certain respects, discriminate if it wishes to; democratic government is bound to the principle of nondiscrimination and the equal protection of the laws. According to the ideal of free enterprise, the entrepreneur may be single minded in his quest for profit, employ whomsoever he chooses, rent his product to whom he selects, do business with whom he wants. Minority and majority alike compete with their time, money, and talents. To be sure, abstractly speaking, the dominance of the profit motive in the economic system is supposed to be an assurance of egalitarianism, of the hiring of the most efficient employee and the catering to the source of profit, regardless of the race or ancestry of the worker or customer. But the real, working economic system under which we live deviates from the ideal model of the laissez-faire economists in a few important areas; economic motives do not always govern personal prejudice, and this is especially true when it touches upon the subject of housing: a man's home is his castle and an impassable moat still separates the elite from the unwanted in American neighborhoods. Exclusion practices function also in other fields in which employers as well as employees may be the participants.

In the private-enterprise economy, however, Government's role is that of keeper of the democratic morals, and it often sees that free enterprise remains truly free—a cash transaction in the open market—and is not subordinated to monopolistic restraints or racial dogmas. Any aberration in the state's activities in the direction of discrimination is subject to check by the courts, while simultaneously Government is drawn toward imposing its higher standards upon private enterprise when the latter forsakes the cash-nexus for the racial-nexus. Thus, hotels and restaurants are occasionally forbidden to discriminate though they are private businesses; courts refuse to enforce contracts that are against public policy, such as restrictive covenants. Employers may be forbidden to discriminate in carrying out public contracts, even in private employment. So, too, unions may be kept in line with the constitutional ethic, when they are beneficiaries of Government aid or power. The free-enterprise society, regulated by democratic government against abuse, has produced one of the great historical demonstrations of a tolerant society.

But in the establishment of the new government-business liaison, the ethics of the entrepreneur are not elevated to the governmental level. On the contrary, the tendency has been for Government agencies to lower their own standards to those of the illiberal self-seeking entrepreneurs who find catering to prejudice easier or lucrative. This is so—and must be so—because the establishment of the joint venture imposes a responsibility upon the administrators to make the joint venture function efficiently. Thus, for example, when the subsidized builder promises his home-buying prospect a restricted neighborhood, FHA tends to acquiesce or even encourage the policy.

This should be no surprise, for FHA depends for its success upon gretting a sufficient volume of housing-insurance business to make its actuarial formulas work. If this public agency made its aid to builders conditional upon nondiscrimination by the latter, it might not get enough mortgage insurance to justify its existence. The same is true in joint ventures such as urban redevelopment. Not the assurance of equality in the market place nor the inauguration of experiments in interracial harmony, but the financial success of the joint enterprise becomes the primary concern of the public administrators. Thus the Government attitudes becomes conditioned by the privileged private needs and interests, and soon private prejudices become part of the public policy.

A second reason for the degradation of democratic values is that the public agencies become dependent upon their private beneficiaries for lobby support in Congress. This is no secret in Washington today. The agencies best accommodated by Congress are those with an active private lobby campaigning for them. It is inevitable, therefore, that the agency officials will tend to yield to the pressures, prejudices, and customs of the beneficiary, and will close their eyes to the traditional ethical code for Government behavior.

Still another reason is that few Federal administrators who enact regulations are anxious to set them according to the relatively higher standard of racial tolerance in the North. They are apt to be practical and make their rules so they can function in the South as well. What may therefore be a localized discriminatory custom tends to become the common denominator in racial policy, and it is usually less than the standard set by the Bill of Rights.

Thus it is that inalienable rights may be diluted, governmental standards undermined, and safeguards of freedom whittled down, until racism is not only acquiesced in but becomes part of the customs and ultimately of the law of the land.

The strong dissenting opinion of Judge Fuld, the sharply divided court, and the crucial nature of the issue, however, all give hope that the Supreme Court of the United States will accept review of the case and perhaps reverse the holding.

This court has not been unaware of the implications of the growth of private governments, and since the days of the New Deal has rendered a series of decisions bringing them within the fold of the Constitution.

The Democratic Party of Texas, declared to be a private voluntary corporation by State laws, was enjoined from refusing a Negro a Democratic ballot. It was held to be "an agency of the State insofar as it determines the participants in a primary election" (*Smith* v. *Allright* (321 U. S. 629, 1944)).

When a Negro railroad employee sued to enjoin discrimination against him by a labor union which was the exclusive bargaining representative under the Railway Labor Act, the Court described the union as "clothed with power not unlike a legislature which is subject to constitutional limitations on its power to deny, restrict, destroy, or discriminate against the rights of those for whom it legislates and which is also under an affirmative constitutional duty to protect those rights" (*Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.* (323 U. S. 192, 1944)).

A company town that refused to allow a member of Jehovah's Witnesses to use its streets for the distribution of religious literature was enjoined by the court, which said that "the State urges in effect that the corporation's right to control the inhabitants of Chickasaw is coextensive with the right of a home owner to regulate the conduct of his guests. We cannot accept that contention. Ownership does not always mean absolute dominion. * * * Since these facilities are built and operated primarily to benefit the public and since their operation is essentially a public function, it is subject to State regulation." (*Marsh* v. *Alabama* (326 U. S. 501, 1946).)

A Federal district court in West Virginia found that a renting of a municipally built swimming pool to a private company did not authorize discrimination since "the voice is Jacob's voice even though 'the hands are the hands of Esau.'" (*Lawrence* v. *Hancock* (76 Fed. Sup. 1004, 1948).)

But while these cases have indicated an alertness on the part of the courts to the menace to civil rights inherent in the new "quasi-public" corporations,[2] the majority opinion in the Stuyvesant Town case has held to the view that the constitutional prohibition against racial discrimination is a prohibition against the State and that Stuyvesant Town as such is not a "state." It holds that the cases cited above are not controlling.

The dissenting judges, on the other hand, insisted: "The concept of 'state action' has been vitalized and expanded; the definition of 'private' conduct in this context has been tightened and restricted. * * * The construction and operation of Stuyvesant Town are not matters of 'merely private concern.' * * * Everywhere in evidence are the voice and authority of the State and city. * * * Stuyvesant is in no sense an ordinary private landlord. * * * The argument overlooks that the constitutional rights of American citizens are involved and that such rights may not be used as pawns in driving bargains. * * * The mandate that there be equal protection of the laws, designed as a basic safeguard for all, binds us and respondents as well to put an end to this discrimination."

In Stuyvesant Town, the issue of private government versus the Constitution is clearly

[2] After the city of New York had continuously taken the position that Stuyvesant Town was private, it issued a report on housing shortly after the Stuyvesant Town decision calling it quasi-public housing.

drawn. The crucial question is whether a 1789 Constitution, devised for a private-enterprise system and a democratic government, can safely serve as a basis for a business-welfare state. Unless the challenge is clearly seen in its full portent, and unless shaken principles and safeguards are retrieved and reaffirmed, the stage may be set in the years to come for a dangerous innovation on the American political scene.

What Should Be Expected of Advertising Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most timely and intelligent address delivered by Philip Liebmann, president of Liebmann Breweries, Inc., before the meeting of the Association of National Advertisers held at Hot Springs, Va., Wednesday, March 29, 1950. Mr. Liebmann, representing as he does one of the large industries of Brooklyn, has brought to his speech the full experience of one who has studiously and constructively devoted most of his public life in the field of advertising. The Liebmann Rheingold Brewery in Brooklyn is world famous, much of it due to its arresting advertising programs which have been developed under the management and inspirational leadership of Philip Liebmann.

I have been asked to address you today on a subject which I think puts the emphasis in the wrong place. The title which has been chosen for me is "What I Expect of Advertising Today." I think what is more important is what should be expected of advertising today, not by me, but by you, by every advertising man and every company that advertises, and, most important of all, by the public as a whole.

For years the advertising men have asked to be accepted as a very important part of business. For years they fought the good fight to establish advertising on a level with the manufacturing and selling functions. This fight has been more or less won in many enlightened companies.

I say more or less because advertising men still insist that their specialty is not looked upon as an exact science; that, in too many companies, the advertising approach is still a matter of opinion, of whim; that it is not regarded in the same businesslike way as manufacturing and salesmanship.

In those companies where this is the case, the people who direct advertising, quite properly, think that they are very vulnerable. Of course, in this vulnerability they have a certain advantage, and it is this: While everyone can recognize a good advertising man, as well as a good manufacturing-production man, and a good sales manager, it is possible to get away far longer with being a bad advertising man. Because where advertising is a matter of unscientific opinion, rather than factual measurement, the abilities of the man who directs the advertising are also a matter of opinion.

And what, in my opinion, is a bad advertising director? Today, he is a man who has not grown up and matured with his profession. He is a man who has leveled criticism at those in his company who are responsible for product development and sales management for not recognizing advertising as being just as important as these other functions. And yet, because he does not recognize his responsibilities toward these other management problems, his own criticisms can today be properly leveled at him.

The fact is—and we all know—that no matter how good a sales force is, it cannot sell goods and services which are not worth what people are asked to pay for them and which don't stack up competitively. We know that a good sales force also needs very competent advertising backing.

No matter how good a product is, it must be properly sold both in personal contact by salesmen and by a proper advertising program. Even the finest product and the finest selling force needs good advertising to produce the proper results.

All this is elementary, of course. But is it? Certainly it explains why those in management responsible for manufacturing take an active interest in the sales manager and his staff, and in the advertising director and what he produces. Certainly it explains why the sales manager is always going back to the men in charge of production with suggestions, why he has such a great interest in advertising. What it doesn't explain is why some advertising men, having argued and cajoled and pleaded for so long for the recognition of their importance, should be willing to live in a world of their own and not really function as a part of the whole except for occasional giving of criticism and frequent dodging of criticism.

The first, and in many ways the most important, role of an advertising director is to ascertain the advertising needs of his company, to understand the products, the services, and public-relations activities which must be carried out in order to achieve the goals set by top management of the company.

The second function of the advertising director is to present properly to top management the role that advertising plays and must play in the company's problems. He must be able to interpret to top management the needs and responsibilities of the advertising department.

The third function of the advertising director is to sell the role which his department plays to the entire organization of the company. And this means not only convincing the sales force of the importance of advertising as a tool, but from the point of view of good public relations, the entire advertising program should be sold to all employees of the company.

In order to decide and guide advertising policy, the advertising director should make a study of all the problems involved in the manufacture, the selling and the merchandising of the products of his company.

It is necessary to study dealer attitudes, consumer attitudes and the basic merits—and sometimes the demerits—of the products and services of the company. I believe that, in the ultimate approach, not only the specific copy, not only the specific slogans and headlines, but the whole of the advertising approach should be to sell by direction and indirection, by word and picture—the very special advantages which this company may have in the merchandising of its product. Thus, if quality is the primary thing which is to be sold, all the advertising of the company must bear that over-all impression. If economy is the major factor, this must, of course, be stressed all the way through the entire campaign. If convenience, or some unique patent feature is what will probably bring the best results, then this should be the theme of all advertising efforts.

Most important of all, the advertising director must know where to go for the best possible guidance. If the company sells directly, as our company does, then the entire sales organization can serve as a veritable radar screen to bring to the advertising management all kinds of valuable information on consumer and dealer reaction which will aid in determining methods and policies.

And, of course, I think all of us feel that the selection of an advertising agency should be based entirely on merit and suitability for the job to be performed. And here again an advertising director can perform a great service for his company. He can be an effective liaison man between top management of the company and the advertising agency. Many advertising managers make the mistake of leaning too heavily on the agency, of not giving the agency the sort of direction it needs to do a good job. It certainly is an important part of the advertising director's function to make the best use of his agency's talents.

All necessary market research, copy research, and other research facilities should be used so that the net result of the thinking is based not on whim, not on prejudice, but upon sound analysis of the problems to be faced, the course which will help solve them and the results which are hoped for. It is only after this exploratory effort has been made, after basic budget recommendations, media, and copy plans have been made, that the task of accomplishing a well-rounded advertising program can be begun.

To me, advertising is the voice of our business, any business. The plant, the production, and the quality of the product are the body of a company. Sales and production management are the mind. Advertising is the voice.

The history of our company, while not exactly like the history of other companies, has followed the times in which it has been in existence. Our company has grown slowly down through more than 100 years of metamorphosis—from the earliest days of the industrial revolution to the present time. When a business such as ours started, the first problems were simply to produce a good product, and sell to a limited number of outlets which were well known to the management. Then, as the business became larger, the problems were not only those of producing a better product but of producing more. And finally, in the last phase, before advertising became of age, the problem was to organize a competent sales force to convince an ever-expanding number of retailers of the merits and qualities of our product—together with the services which our company could render to the retailer.

Now, in an era when production has grown to so much greater importance, we can no longer stop at this stage. Our salesmen and our organization can only go so far, but no further. We must reach out not only to the dealers but we must also go beyond them to the consumer, to create a desire for our product, and to sell those same consumers the very ideas which the sales organization must sell to the dealers. The complexities of our economy today require this because the dealer handles so many items that he cannot sell their individual merits to his customers and they must be, to a great extent, presold before they enter his establishment.

Since I have talked so frankly about the faults of some advertising men, I think I have a right to criticize some managements. One of the greatest fallacies of management is that it, in many cases, grew up before advertising had come of age and still looks on advertising with a jaundiced eye.

In many respects, advertising has not come of age. In a great many companies, instead of being a full partner, it is considered an expensive and perhaps unnecessary luxury. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Managements which take this point of view are very apt to end up on the losing side.

There is no need to dwell on this point, because the old story of the soap that stopped advertising and other similar stories are too well known to you.

But despite this evidence, it is unfortunately the truth that occasionally advertising is regarded as a sort of auxiliary. This is a dangerous belief for anyone to have. As I said before, I believe the three cornerstones of the structure of any modern business are management from the point of view of production, management from the point of view of sales, and advertising from the point of view of doing full justice to the manufacturing and selling aspects of the business. And I believe, actually, that I have named these three cornerstones in the order of their importance.

In view of this, I simply cannot understand why there are still a number of advertising people who consistently irritate the other members of the management team by taking the point of view that all you need is a wonderful advertising campaign and the salesmen will just become order-takers, and that it doesn't matter what kind of a product you produce. This, in reverse, is just as ridiculous a point of view as the attitude of a management that does not understand advertising. An advertising director, or an advertising department which makes this serious error will certainly not be able to educate top management in the proper use and evaluation of advertising but will instead so irritate the other executives responsible for the success of the business that they will close their eyes and ears and minds to an intelligent point of view about advertising.

When I look through the advertising trade journals, I often ask myself why so many of the men who write for them, who influence the advertising profession to a very great extent, often pay so much more attention to the advertising embroidery, rather than to the pattern of an entire business of which the advertising is only a part. I understand, of course, that people who read advertising trade journals are, naturally, interested in advertising. This does not explain why an advertising trade journal, when it tells the story of the success of a business, will give the major—if not all the credit—to the advertising history of that company, ignoring the part that the product and sales force must play in any success story.

I say this in the kindliest spirit possible. Surely no one has said nicer things about the advertising of my own company than the trade journals. And I am proud of the advertising job our company has been able to do.

But I must insist that, in the last analysis, all advertising can hope to accomplish is to create an attitude on the part of the buying public in respect to the company and its product and to get the public to try the product; that if the product is not satisfactory, the public will not continue to buy it regardless of the advertising; and if the sales organization does not achieve proper distribution, then the public will not be able to obtain the product.

The point I wish to make here is this—that, as a man who resents the fact that some companies look upon advertising as a stepchild, I think I have a right to speak frankly to those members of the advertising profession who look upon advertising as the sole power behind the throne.

I do not care how good the advertising of a company is—if the sales organization doesn't have the good will of the retail trade, its efforts can be killed off even before the advertising starts to work. You can create all the demand you want. If people have never tried the product, they may ask for it, but they will not insist on it, and unless it is available and distribution is complete, you will lose many an advertising dollar. Most important of all is the quality of the product. No matter how effective your advertising is all it can do is to get people to try your product; if they don't like the product once they have tried it, all the advertising in the world will not make them buy it again.

These facts may seem so simple you may wonder why I take your time telling you about them. But, unfortunately, neither top business management nor top advertising management seems to have thought them important enough to look at the forest instead of the trees. That is why, when advertising people outside our organization are so very flattering to our advertising, and insist upon attributing so much of the success of our company to the advertising, it bothers me. And that is because it is not a true picture of our company and its operations and of the reasons for its success.

In our company, after we have determined on the correct course of advertising budget, media, and copy recommendations, after we have sold the top management and the board of directors of our company on the wisdom of our policies, we are not through. We may still have a good product, we may have planned a fine advertising program, and yet we are still missing one of the most important keys in any advertising or business operation.

Unless we are able to sell our ideas and plans and product to our sales organization so that they not only will become more enthusiastic in their selling, more confident not only of the quality of the product, but also of the way in which all their potential customers are being made aware of the quality of the product—unless we do these things, we will not have our sales force taking full advantage of all the work that has been done. They will not be as enthusiastic as they should be and if they are not enthusiastic, our dealers will not be enthusiastic either. And if our dealers are not enthusiastic, even though a good sales organization improperly indoctrinated may still be able to get the product on the shelves, they will lack that spark, that ignition when the gas is pushed into the cylinder, which will make for a bang-up success, rather than mediocre results.

In other words, good management and a good sales force and a good advertising program can create fair success but a really sensational success can only be achieved if these things can be tied together through proper indoctrination.

Now, you may ask, What is proper indoctrination? I do not believe proper indoctrination is to hold a great big convention of your entire sales organization at which a lot of stuffed shirts from the front office get up and cram something down the throats of 200 salesmen. Nobody could possibly be enthusiastic about that kind of a program.

First of all, we should realize that our salesmen (and here, of course, I am speaking more directly of a company like our own, which maintains somewhere over 200 men on its sales force, who contact the retail trade directly)—we should realize that these men can act as radar screens, as I said before. Not only can we give them information, but they can give us information. They are out there 300 and some days a year, contacting the retail trade, getting the reaction not only to our product and our advertising, but to general trade conditions and to the products and advertising of our competitors. I would be the last one to say that we can or even should adopt most of the policies which they will recommend, because, naturally, each one of them, dealing with a particular type of retailer and with a particular section or territory, amplifies, in his own mind, the special local problems with which he comes in contact, and which, while they may be important to him, are not so important from an over-all point of view. We must collect all this material, and evaluate it from this larger point of view. But the sum total of the collective material can be very valuable to us in developing our own plans and projects.

Naturally, salesmen are prejudiced; they are very heavily prejudiced in favor of what the dealer wants and often what the dealer wants is not in the best interests of the operation, from the point of view of the manufacturer in reaching the consumer.

Having received this information from our salesmen, and evaluated it, we not only receive something which is of value to us, but we let our organization know that their desires and their thoughts are important to us and are carefully considered in the formulation of our plans. This information cannot be garnered in large meetings, and it has always been my practice and that of the other men in the advertising department of our company, to continually talk with the salesmen, with the district managers and with the supervisors daily; to meet with them at least every few weeks in small groups, that is to say, different divisions of the company both product-wise and area-wise; to sit down with 6 or 8 or even as many as 15 men, and let them talk and answer their questions constructively. I do not believe a day passes that I do not talk with a number of men in our sales organization, and I think my associates, Mr. Graham and Mr. Grau, talk with at least as many men themselves each day. As a result, our department has daily contact with a large segment of our sales organization.

This has now achieved two purposes. This continuous contact not only sells our men on the product which we manufacture, but also on the ways in which we are trying to help them to do their work, to enable them to make more money. We further contact them through a company house organ, through special bulletins from the advertising department to the sales organization, which we try to issue at least once a month, and through additional written material such as booklets, reprints of all our advertising material, broadsides—not covering a whole year, but every few months on forthcoming advertising projects, et cetera. Once a year, or so, we do have one of these great big get-togethers which I have described before, but this is done simply to try to wrap the whole thing up into a package and present it to the men in a very brief and informal form. It is a bit of showmanship to add a little glamor to the daily routine, but there is no easy road, no huge once-a-year meeting, that will give constant information to the sales force and get constant information from them for the use of the advertising organization. It is just a matter of plugging day in and day out, of working closely together, to achieve the maximum results.

These daily or weekly "bull sessions" in groups and individually will build an organization with the kind of comradeship and spirit of cooperation which will make advertising not only respected but appreciated by both management and the sales organization.

As a last obligation I believe the advertising director should have a very clear view of the social philosophy of advertising. He must be very conscious of the necessity to convince both the stockholders and the directors of his company. As I have mentioned, many people look upon advertising as a luxury. This is sheer nonsense, just as ridiculous as the attitude of the businessman who thinks he should spend a lot of money on advertising because business is wonderful and he is making a lot of money and doesn't know what else to do with it. The same man, as soon as things get a little tough, says, "Well, I guess we will have to cut the budget." I don't know which of these points of view is more ridiculous. Advertising is not something on which you spend money because you don't know what else to do with it, nor is it something you can dispense with

as things get tough. Actually when things get tough is the time when advertising is needed more than ever because the smaller the melon gets the bigger the slice that is needed for each individual company which is trying to get a piece of that melon in order to stay in the black. The stockholders don't make more money when advertising is cut; they risk their whole investment.

But our most important obligation is to the consumer. And what does the consumer say? He says, "Here you are spending a lot of money for advertising. If you didn't couldn't you sell me better products for less?"

The consumer should be told in every way possible how socially beneficial advertising can be to him. Most important of all, it preserves freedom of choice. In many other countries there is very little freedom of choice—in some cases because of unrestricted cartelization and, in others, because of government restrictions both on products and on price. In my opinion, despite all that has been said on this subject, our country has the greatest economic democracy of all. And our advertising preserves the freedom of choice encouraged by our free system. If advertising did not tell American consumers of the qualities and services of the products made available by our companies, then they would have nothing to guide them in choosing. Accordingly, they would purchase what they were allowed to purchase. The dealers would stock only a few items, and so nobody would insist on any particular product; consumers would have to be satisfied with what they could get, because they would find the same situation more or less at all dealers.

Only because we have created a demand for a larger number of different products and different brands, will dealers carry all these products, and the consumer may vote each day at the ballot box for that product which he prefers.

This makes for another special protection of the consumer. For any company that spends the large amount of money over the years that is spent in advertising of well-known brands would not take the chance of throwing away this entire expenditure by tampering with the quality of the product, and risking the refusal of the public to buy. Thus, advertising acts, in a very important way, as a strict quality control.

There is a third benefit to the consumer. The advertising cost per unit of almost any type of product is actually infinitesimal. If the advertising were eliminated, the saving would be fictitious because lower volume and higher distribution costs could immediately increase and not decrease the price the consumer is asked to pay. So, in actuality, advertising not only costs the public nothing but saves the public money.

How about the dealer? Couldn't the dealer say, "Why don't you let me make a little more money? If you cut your advertising budget, couldn't I get a higher profit?" Of course, this is sheer nonsense. Advertising makes it easier for the dealer to handle a multiplicity of items, turn them over fast, do more business, and lower the cost of distribution because he does not have to sell each of his customers on each particular brand of merchandise—the customer has already been presold for him. Thus, he is able to do a larger volume of business at less expense, benefiting both himself and his customers. And also he is able to eliminate the inventory risk of being stuck with merchandise for which there is no consumer demand.

And what about the salesman who works for your company? Couldn't he say, "If you cut your advertising, why couldn't you give me a little more salary?" This is a completely false assumption. Advertising builds up the security of the salesman's job, as well as the security of every employee of the company, because an advertised product is, naturally, a more secure product when it comes to maintaining a constant level of production and employment.

Yes, advertising offers security to stockholders, to the management of the company, to all the employees of the company, to dealers and to consumers. In addition, it makes possible the preservation of a free press, a free radio and television; it pays almost the entire cost of our wonderful organs of information. Advertising plays a real role in the creation of a true economic democracy in the fields of public communication.

I am not falling into my own trap here. I am not saying that advertising brings us all the benefits of our free economy any more than I say that advertising could possibly deserve the sole credit for the success of any business. Advertising is not all-important but it is important. The practitioners of advertising must at all times realize that, in any company, quality of production, economy of production, personnel, and dealer relations are paramount; that these are the foundations on which advertising can function efficiently and well; that the sales organization is another structure which will be built upon the same foundations. Manufacturing, selling, and advertising are a team; each must respect the prerogatives and special interests of the others. Each must be willing to work in harmony, to achieve the same goal. I believe that if advertising men play their part properly; if they not only create good advertising but sell the social and economic benefits of advertising to their fellow workers, to their top management, to their sales organization, if they realize and give credit to the equal importance of the other functions of our economic democracy, then they will receive their proper share of the credit. They will benefit the firms for which they work, and all the people connected with them and they will render greater service to a greater community, whether it be city, State, or country—or even to the world as a whole.

Advertising is not only the voice, it is the free speech of business. It doesn't stand by itself, but it is a vital and integral part of the merchandising evolution of which we are a part.

In the understanding of this I believe we can go forward, into a rising standard of living tomorrow, providing more goods and better goods at lower prices to more people than ever before.

This is what should be expected of advertising today.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, on United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United Jewish Appeal is currently conducting its 1950 campaign to carry out a threefold humanitarian program: First, immigration and settlement of large numbers of Jews in Israel where they will no longer be homeless; second, relief and rehabilitation to the depleted Jewish communities in Europe, and to the Jews in north Africa who are suffering untold misery; third, adjustment and integration of refugees arriving in this country under the displaced-persons law. Because of its activities on such a wide scale, the United Jewish Appeal is often described as an instrument of human reconstruction.

The United Jewish Appeal drive is now going on in some 3,500 communities throughout the United States. In many of these, our non-Jewish friends are lending a helping hand and are making possible the success of these drives.

The campaign in the Nation's Capital began on April 12. I am certain many of you will find extremely interesting the remarks on that occasion by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, who has long been associated with every type of humanitarian work. His address was as follows:

History is moving at such a rapid pace that we rarely find the opportunity to study its significance or assay our own role in events that are changing the entire face of civilization.

In our concern with current problems we often lose perspective. We are either so preoccupied with our work or with the critical necessities of the moment that we do not have the time to look around to see the direction in which we are going.

In the year 1950 we are confronted with many serious problems. All of us are keenly aware of the importance of the United Jewish Appeal. Yet relatively few of us know, except in some vague, intuitive way, why this is a crucial year, why we are again called upon to act in a spirit of sacrifice.

I have been associated with the tasks of aiding Jews in distress for many years. For a third of a century I have been affiliated in an active capacity with the Joint Distribution Committee, one of the three constituent organizations of the United Jewish Appeal. I can fully appreciate the sentiments of those who say that they are tired, of those who year after year keep asking, "How long is this going to continue? How much longer must we expend all this energy and give these vast sums of money?"

But these questions are justified only where we fail to grasp the meaning of the momentous developments of recent years, and where we fail to see that the ultimate goal is almost within our reach.

In point of time, the recent past, the present, and the future can most easily be summed up in three words, achievement, crises, and fulfillment.

Let us take achievement first. I believe that American Jewry has a great deal to be proud of. I believe that in the historic accomplishments which American Jews have made possible in the rescue and rehabilitation of their coreligionists, they have not merely added stature to their spiritual and communal life as Jews. They have enriched their Americanism with a devotion to human ideals that is without parallel in modern civilization.

In a matter of days Israel will celebrate the second anniversary of its independence. The establishment of Israel as an independent nation gave the people of Israel their freedom, the Jews of the rest of the world—the homeless and distressed—the right to find a new home—and to the Jews of the United States a high sense of achievement in the program of building a better future for the Jewish people.

Let us not forget that independence did not come easily for the Jews of Israel, any more than it did for the people of these United States. They paid a heavy price in blood and tears. And they fought and many died not merely for their own survival, but to open the doors of the Jewish homeland to victims of persecution and homelessness. The victory they won was not merely recorded as a triumph on the battlefield. The victory they won is being reaffirmed every

day in the great influx of new immigrants. The fact that 400,000 Jewish refugees have been brought into Israel during the past 2 years eloquently demonstrates that its people did not merely fight a war for independence but that they actually fought and won a war for Jewish survival and Jewish rescue. To the great extent that you and other members of the Jewish community of Washington and the Jewish communities of other parts of the United States contributed to the United Jewish Appeal to keep the doors open to this unprecedented immigration you had a decisive role in the war for Jewish survival.

As long as there are large numbers of Jews who must find a new home in Israel, mass immigration cannot be separated from the existence of Israel as an independent state. In that respect, one may very well say that the crisis which Israel now faces in receiving and absorbing tens of thousands of new immigrants is directly related to the victory that made the open door possible.

The shooting war in Israel is over. But the Jewish State still has a long way to travel to achieve peace. Armistice agreements exist. But the Arab States are doing more than just talking of a second round. There is a great deal of evidence to prove that they are preparing for another war. This is a matter which should be of the gravest concern not merely to American Jews but to the American Government as well. The possibility of another conflict in the Middle East is not merely a threat to the existence of Israel. It is a danger to world peace. I firmly believe that it is the responsibility of our Government, which is keenly interested in preserving world peace, to take a firm stand in speeding a peace settlement in the Middle East. It seems to me one of the first steps in achieving permanent peace in that part of the world is to discourage all preparations for war and to prevent the large-scale rearming of Egypt and other Arab countries.

Israel wants peace. Israel needs peace to cope with the overwhelming tasks of immigration and economic development. In the 2 years of its existence, Israel has emerged as a vital and progressive democracy. In the interests of peace, in the interests of aiding this young democratic Nation, the United States Government should extend continued aid for its economic development.

We have come a long way since the days of mass murder in Europe, since the days when the doors of Israel were open only to a trickle of immigration, and when there were 250,000 survivors of Nazi oppression waiting in the DP camps of Germany.

But we have not yet reached the point where we can regard crisis and emergency as things of the past. Not while oppression and poverty endanger the status of 900,000 Jews in north Africa and other Moslem areas. Not while 35,000 Jews are still waiting in the DP centers for a new home in Israel and the United States. Not while many thousands of others must be gotten out of eastern Europe before the doors of rescue are closed.

It is this urgent situation that makes so vital the continuation of large immigration into Israel. It is this urgent need that makes it imperative for us to support the transfer and absorption of at least 150,000 this year.

As you know, Mrs. Lehman and I visited Israel a year ago. We saw at first hand the miraculous accomplishments of the Jewish pioneers and builders. We also saw the misery and heartbreak of the transit immigrant camps, the indescribable hardships which so many thousands have had to endure in the miserable tents and barracks. And there are 90,000 new immigrants in these camps today, still waiting for the fulfillment of the promise of a new home in the Promised Land.

Under these circumstances, it is no exaggeration to say that the critical problems which Israel is facing today are just as great as when its heroic people had to fight a war of survival against the invading armies of six Arab countries.

You will recall that we have never questioned the fundamental fact that the problem of the displaced and distressed Jews in Europe and elsewhere was the responsibility of the Jews of the United States and the rest of the world. The fact that these displaced Jews have been transferred to Israel does not in any way reduce our responsibility. How can we say that the DP problem is solved, if it is merely transplanted to the soil of Israel?

The burden of receiving and caring for refugees who are entering Israel at the rate of more than 12,000 a month involves many overwhelming problems. There is the need of providing homes and making these people productive citizens of the new democracy. There is the problem of integrating into its economic and social structure men and women coming from 30 countries, from highly varied environments, speaking many different languages. All these superhuman tasks cannot possibly be borne by the people of Israel alone.

And I know that it was never our intention that the Jews of Israel should have to face this situation alone. When we prayed for the days of their deliverance, for the hour when Israel would be able to receive tens of thousand and hundreds of thousands of inmmigrants, we, you and I, and the rest of American Jewry, firmly pledged our fullest material and moral aid to achieve a resettlement of such enormous proportions. Surely we have not forgotten. Surely we must recognize that we now have the opportunity as well as the obligation to fulfill these solemn pledges.

I have full confidence in your understanding and your sense of generosity. I know that there is no question about your readiness to do what is expected of you in this year's United Jewish Appeal campaign. The record of the past decade has proved that where there is need you respond and that you do so in the measure required to meet that need.

The only thing we have to fear is that we underestimate the need, that we minimize the critical aspects of the present situation.

There are many critical problems still confronting us in many corners of the world. I have referred to deadlines on emigration out of eastern Europe. It is estimated that 20,000 Jews can be brought out of Poland to Israel. But this migration project must be completed before the end of September when Poland will close her doors.

In other parts of eastern Europe, as in Hungary and Rumania, limited opportunities for imigration exist, but there is the constant danger that the policies will be changed, and many will lose the chance to start life anew in Israel.

There is also great urgency in the plight of large numbers of Jews in the Moslem countries. The speed with which we get them out may spell the difference between life and death.

I am not at liberty to go into details concerning the situation, but I can tell you that Jews are coming out in increasing numbers. We cannot, we dare not permit lack of funds to stem that flood of emigration, to halt the escape of men and women fleeing from persecution and fear. One fact I can divulge: Operation Magic Carpet, that twentieth century miracle which has brought more than 45,000 Jews out of medieval Yomen into the sunlight and hope of Israel, is nearing an end. We can take great pride in the fact that through the United Jewish Appeal we have carried out one of the greatest rescue efforts in history.

As many as can be moved must be gotten out of the Moslem lands. But we must also provide for the great numbers who will remain behind and who are in desperate need of assistance. In truth, the problem of poverty, disease, discrimination in these lands is so great that only the most superhuman efforts can adequately meet the problem.

We are making encouraging progress in caring for the children in these countries, the youngsters who have had only a 50–50 chance of living beyond their thirteenth year. A network of medical installations has been established, schools have been set up, clothing is being provided, and food is being given to tens of thousands of children and adults, for whom it represents the only barrier against literal starvation.

In some parts of Europe, the situation is a happier one. As a result of the great constructive work of the Joint Distribution Committee since the end of the war, a very substantial section of European Jewry is well on the road to self-support and independence. This is indeed an accomplishment in which we can rejoice—particularly when we recall the pitiful survivors who remained when the Nazi blight was lifted from the continent.

Yet, even in western Europe, there remain many thousands who will require our continued aid for some time to come.

And there is still another front. All of you, I am sure, are familiar with the DP legislation which has for many months been pending in Congress. The great majority of the Members of Congress are very anxious that our country should continue to play its traditional part in receiving and aiding those who need haven and refuge. Happily after a long and hard struggle a liberalized DP bill has been enacted by the Congress only a few days ago.

I hope that under this act a substantial number of refugees can enter this country in 1950 if we provide the necessary homes, jobs, and other assistance. The refugees whom we have enabled to come to the United States in the past 10 or 15 years have, by their contribution to our economy and our way of life proved themselves an outstanding asset to our country and its democratic ideals. Those who still wait anxiously for an opportunity to settle here also merit our help and our confidence.

How can we relax our efforts in the face of these global needs? How can we relax when the state of Israel faces a most serious crisis? How can we relax when hundreds of thousands of Jews are still running for their lives—still fleeing from terror and homelessness? How can we relax when there is so much that still must be done to finish the job of rehabilitation for the surviving victims of Hitlerism?

Believe me when I say that the needs of the United Jewish Appeal are greater today than ever before. Everything that we have built up through decades of devotion and sacrifice hangs in the balance of the outcome of this year's campaign.

We have to our credit great and unforgettable achievements in the reconstruction of our coreligionists, in the inspiring rebuilding of Israel and in the revival of Jewish life elsewhere. But these achievements are not yet secure. The crucial needs of 1950 still call for the most strenuous effort and the greatest service that it is in our power to give.

Let us be guided by the knowledge that we are capable of meeting the challenge of history. Our generation was blessed with the privilege and the opportunity to rescue our coreligionists from destruction and to bring new meaning and disgnity to Jews throughout the world.

I am confident that you, the leaders of the Jewish community of Washington, will understand your responsibility as you al-

ways have over the years. I am confident that through your action tonight on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal, you will set an example of leadership that will inspire Jewish communities throughout the Nation. I am sure that the greatness of this hour will find all of us big enough to live up to the highest expectations of humanity.

United Negro College Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in all the activities which we are pursuing at home and abroad we must remember that the solid foundation is an informed and effective people. The enormous human resources available from the 32 private Negro colleges have a great contribution to make to the pool of skill and ability which we have in our country. It is a campaign which should draw its support from every truly American community. I append hereto an article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 13, 1950, signaling the opening of this drive:

UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND OPENS DRIVE

NEW YORK.—The United Negro College fund has begun its seventh annual Nationwide campaign to gain support for 32 private Negro colleges and universities.

It seeks $1,400,000, the critical 10 percent that assures effective use of the other 90 percent of member institutions' combined budgets, according to fund officials.

These colleges make up the "avant garde of a democracy that we can really achieve," said Dr. Ira deA. Reid, vice chairman of the 1950 campaign, during opening ceremonies April 12 at the Rainbow Room of the RCA building.

URGENTLY NECESSARY

"Until we have completely integrated and implemented our democratic principles and practices in American public and private life, they are going to continue to be necessary to provide meaning for people our culture has disinherited," said Dr. Reid, chairman of the department of sociology, Haverford College, Pa.

More than 25,000 students from 43 States and Washington attend the 32 institutions in 13 States. The average student pays 50 percent of the cost of his education, according to the fund.

Each year, the fund has raised approximately $1,000,000. Alumni and other Negroes have contributed about 12 percent of the total in each campaign, besides giving increasingly to the colleges' endowment and building needs, officials estimate.

BENEFITS CITED

They point out that money raised by the fund enables the institutions to provide for necessary additions to faculty to meet increased enrollment and for more nearly adequate teaching salaries; provide scholarship aid for deserving students; provide for a reasonable expenditure for the operation and maintenance of the collective physical plant; and provide for additional laboratory and teaching equipment and improved library service.

At the campaign opening, Brig Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, urged support of the drive and said, "We mustn't shift the burden of education to Government."

He called for "more education in politics and less politics in education."

Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chairman of the Greater New York men's division of the fund, saw the colleges as a means of expanding training for leadership which we have not developed as we should have for 10 percent of our population.

Roland Hayes, noted concert artist and alumnus of Fisk University, a fund college, sang for the 400 persons assembled. Thomas I. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States and national chairman of the 1950 campaign, presided.

Cost of National Government in Sixth Iowa District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, herewith is a compilation of the burden of Federal expenses on the people of the 15 counties in the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa:

I. Share of national debt owed by people of 6th District of Iowa, Mar. 31, 1950

County	Population (in thousands)	Share of national debt on basis of population	1950 taxable valuation	Share of 1951 Federal budget	Millage equivalent
Boone	32.9	$57,285,000	$42,465,797	$9,595,462	$225.96
Carroll	23.7	41,430,000	41,047,563	7,336,266	178.73
Calhoun	17.2	29,921,000	40,693,921	5,665,388	139.22
Crawford	20.1	35,036,000	39,178,086	6,617,138	168.90
Emmet	13.0	22,505,000	27,127,174	4,319,279	159.22
Greene	14.8	25,830,000	36,630,610	5,348,031	146.00
Hamilton	20.1	35,036,000	43,554,870	6,418,669	147.37
Hancock	15.6	27,364,000	32,465,650	4,962,370	152.85
Humboldt	12.9	22,505,000	27,722,602	4,336,355	156.42
Kossuth	26.7	46,544,000	57,350,522	8,579,919	149.60
Palo Alto	15.9	27,620,000	29,560,720	5,209,812	176.24
Pocahontas	15.6	27,108,000	35,640,894	5,240,742	147.04
Webster	43.4	75,698,000	66,164,159	13,377,651	202.19
Winnebago	13.5	23,784,000	22,128,898	4,501,638	203.43
Wright	19.1	33,246,000	21,395,327	6,456,043	301.75
Total for district	304.5	530,912,000			

Source: Library of Congress. Iowa Taxpayers Association, Des Moines, Iowa.

II. Share of the 6th District of Iowa in current costs of the Federal debt and deficit

County	Percent of United States population	Share in daily interest in Federal debt total [1]	Share in estimated annual deficit on basis of population [2]	Share in daily interest on Federal deficit	Share in annual interest on Federal deficit
Boone	0.0224	$3,513	$1,239,477	$74.67	$27,256
Carroll	.0162	2,541	896,407	54.01	19,712
Calhoun	.0117	1,835	647,405	39.00	14,236
Crawford	.0137	2,149	758,073	45.67	16,670
Emmet	.0088	1,380	486,937	29.34	10,708
Greene	.0101	1,584	558,871	33.67	12,290
Hamilton	.0137	2,149	758,073	45.67	16,670
Hancock	.0107	1,678	592,071	35.67	13,020
Humboldt	.0088	1,380	486,937	29.34	10,708
Kossuth	.0182	2,855	1,007,075	60.67	22,146
Palo Alto	.0108	1,694	597,605	36.00	13,141
Pocahontas	.0106	1,663	586,538	35.34	12,898
Webster	.0296	4,643	1,637,880	98.68	36,017
Winnebago	.0093	1,459	514,604	31.00	11,316
Wright	.0130	2,039	719,339	43.34	15,818
Total for district	.208	32,625	11,509,425	693.40	253,092

[1] The Treasury Department estimates that interest paid on the national debt during fiscal 1950 will amount to $5,725,000,000.
[2] The Treasury Department estimates that the deficit during fiscal 1950 will amount to $5,533,377,244.

Source: Library of Congress.

Strengthening of Free Enterprise Through Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a most informative and inspiring address has been delivered by Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, which ought to be carefully read by the businessmen of America who believe in the effectiveness of advertising as a means of molding public opinion. This is the time of all times when the fundamental principles of free enterprise should be sold to the American people. The address of Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, which I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under unanimous consent, deals with this important subject. It follows:

STRENGTHENING OF FREE ENTERPRISE THROUGH ADVERTISING

Our Nation is the wealthiest and the most powerful in peace or war ever known on the

face of this earth, in spite of the fact that our national debt exceeds the total national debt of all the nations we are trying to support. We are told that we are engaged in a cold war with Russia because of her determination to attain world domination. Even though our working hours are nearly 50 percent lower than the Russian standard, our current productive capacity is more than four times greater, and Russia is dissipating one-fourth of her smaller capacity in an attempt to build a war machine. Russia cannot conduct a successful war against us until she accumulates vast quantities of strategic and critical materials, which are not now available and which cannot be accumulated in any short space of time. Russia would not have the atom bomb today if it had not been for the treachery in high places in our Government, which has finally been brought out into the open. The cold war is not an imminent threat. High military recognition of these facts was rendered when General Eisenhower recently said that national bankruptcy is more to be feared than the atom bomb.

Most great nations in history have met disaster through internal dissension and disorder. In Durant's history of Rome we read:

"All the white man's world looked to Rome as the center of the universe, the omnipotent and eternal city. Never had there been such wealth, such splendor or such power.

"Nevertheless, amid the prosperity that made Rome brilliant in the second century, all the seeds were germinating for the crisis that was to bring her ruin in the third century. Private and local independence, initiative, and pride withered as the power of the state increased. The wealth of the nation was drained away by ever-rising taxation to support a self-multiplying bureaucracy. Government expenditures and doles exhausted the treasury and debased the currency."

But the Romans had learned nothing from the experience of Athens, where Pericles had practiced the purchase of votes by subsidies to citizens until that great state had collapsed. And who knows how many states had risen to power through industry before Athens and Rome, only to disappear in dust when demagogues deluded and deceived the people into believing they could buy happiness by trading in their personal liberty. It has been said that Rome fell when Roman citizens lost their individual pride in their contributions to their government and became dependents on it.

The greatest threat to our high position is not the cold war with Russia, but the cold war in our own country between politicians seeking power and the business interests which have produced its wealth. Our national debt far exceeds the total assessed value of all of our taxable property. Our local, State, and Federal Governments are taking more than 30 percent of our national income, and demanding still higher taxes to meet increasing deficits. One out of every six adult Americans (or 16,000,000 people) are receiving regular pay checks from the Federal Government; and several million more are employed by State and local governments. Not content with this vast burden on business, politicians are planning even greater expenditures. All of these threats to our very existence were foreseen by the framers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, but we are urged to forget their warnings, to discard their theories of government, and to adopt a new way of life. Our educational system has been a dismal failure if we do not perceive that the proposed way has been tried and found wanting time after time in the course of history.

Every effort is being made to convince us that the welfare state is not a socialistic state, but it is impossible for the proponents to conceal the basic scheme, which is a redistribution of wealth and income to assure the maximum number of votes for the planners.

The founding fathers were deeply religious men who accepted the teachings of the Bible and, therefore, could not embrace either communism or socialism. They accepted the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal"; and the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's possessions." Surely if it is sinful to covet the property or income of your neighbor, it is no less sinful to vote for a government which plainly states that it will take property and income from some for the purpose of redistributing it to others.

No Christian should have any doubts about the approval of the capitalistic system or the rights to a profit after he reads the Parable of the Talents. He will not only discover that profits are commended, but that, on the other hand, punishment is recommended for anyone who willfully fails to produce. The two servants who were given custody of their master's capital while he went into a far country were rewarded when they met him on his return and were able to return the capital with 100-percent profit. To each he said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou has been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things." But when the unfaithful servant told the master, "I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewn; and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, there thou hast that is thine," the master told him that he was wicked and slothful and that the least he could have done was to put the money out at interest and then return him the money with interest. The talent was taken from the disloyal and disrespectful servant who had buried it, and given to the servant who had made the most profit. And the master said, "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." And finally in contrast to National Labor Relations Board edicts, the master said, "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness," which should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that Christian principles are not compatible with the Socialist commandment that each shall produce according to his ability and each shall receive according to his need. History has demonstrated that a dictator is needed when one man's production is confiscated to provide for another who merely desires it.

When it was suggested to Washington and Jefferson that any new form of government should provide security for its people, Jefferson said:

"It is an idle dream * * * to redeem man from the original sentence of his Maker: In the sweat of his brow shall he eat his bread." And Jefferson could have added that St. Paul told the Thessalonians, "If any would not work, neither should he eat."

Political apologists for a welfare state claim they have developed a modernized Jeffersonian democracy. That the very word "democracy" was anathema to the constitutional founders is demonstrated by this quotation from James Madison in the Federalist (1787):

"Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

The founding fathers only sought to guarantee us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and warned us that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is astounding when you stop to think of it, that politicians throughout our modern world have made some people believe that Government cannot only support us but can guarantee us security without the effort required to pursue it. All such demagogues ask is surrender of personal freedom in exchange for greater power to them to plan and order our existence.

The statement that "human rights come before property rights" has a pious sound, but simple analysis shows that it is merely a pandering appeal to unthinking people. There has never been a community in which property rights were denied where human rights were upheld. President Washington pointed out our need to depend on religion to assure security for our property rights when he said in his Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, 'Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?' "

The Russian kulaks died by the millions rather than surrender their little farms in exchange for the benefits of the great welfare state of communism. Many of the Jews in Germany were given opportunity to escape with their lives from Hitlerism by forfeiting their property, but many chose to risk their lives, and almost inevitably lost both property and life. Washington placed security for property first; security for reputation second; and security for life third, in that farewell message.

Some may be puzzled as to just when we took the initial step away from the religious and moral paths defined in our Constitution. Future historians will point out that we took that final fatal step in 1913, the step which has removed our right to privacy and our rights to property, and may eventually deny us every form of personal liberty and security.

In 1913 the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution was ratified, which granted Congress the power to lay and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived. That gave the politicians the power to tax, which you cannot deny is the power to destroy; and, although you were assured that the Government would never take as much as 5 percent or 10 percent of any man's or any group's earned income, you have seen that Government take 70 percent from many, and more than 100 percent from a few. Their tax bills take one-third of your income—more than enough to guarantee security to the lowest paid if they could keep it—and all we have in return is a pathetically puerile political promise of security based on the insecurity of a government which cannot live within its income when business is producing a new top in taxable income. They promised to save your money, because you were imprudent; but they have spent all they collected to date and have run up a national debt exceeding 100 percent of the assessed value of your total physical assets; and, to provide more doles, they demand increased taxes on inheritances and gifts, or the confiscation of the widow's and orphan's mite. You know it is un-American and anti-American; it is immoral and unmoral; it is irreligious and sacriliegious.

The people have been deceived into believing that only the rich and prosperous pay the taxes; but, in 1949, the Federal Government alone took $55,000,000,000, which is 25 percent of the national income and exceeds the entire national income for the year of 1932, or the year of 1933, or the year of 1934. Federal, State, and local govern-

ments have pay rolls exceeding $20,000,000,000, with over 7,500,000 employees—or nearly one in every eight workers in the entire country; and, with a new high of 5,000,000 unemployed, only government pay rolls are still rising. In the last 5 years, this Government has spent more than all previous Federal Governments spent from 1780 to 1940—or 160 years.

Although 46,000 people pay out 75 percent of their income in direct taxes and many millions pay no direct taxes, every family receiving less than $5,000 a year loses a large part of that income through hidden taxes collected in Federal corporation income taxes as a part of the price of every necessity of life which they buy.

It was just a little direct tax on tea which started the flames of the American Revolution; and, sooner or later, most people will discover that they are paying the taxes to support the vast bureaucracy which, even now, plans to multiply itself, and even now demands more and more taxes. Howls of the manufacturers and labor unions protesting the tax burden on luxuries have produced strange results—the ruling politicians promise to remove these taxes, paid mostly by the well-to-do, but propose that a similar amount be recovered by higher corporation taxes, which are paid in larger proportion by the people in the lowest-income classes.

Politicians constantly attack business profits and distort both the amount and the necessity for them. Dr. Robinson's Opinion Research Poll covering industrial employees' opinions on profits shows that industrial workers believe that average corporation profits are about 25 percent, and that 10-percent profit would be fair enough. Now the Government's own reports for 1948 show that industry averaged only 5.9 percent on investment, which equaled only 2.9 percent on sales; and Professor Slichter, of Harvard, says that these profits are overstated by at least 25 percent because of higher cost of replacement inventory and insufficient allowance for depreciation of plant and facilities. The Government's attitude is never logical. A recent congressional committee report states that profits of big steel companies are entirely too high, but complains that small producers cannot show any profit. Producing steel and producing wheat are both businesses, and why there should be great difference in fair-profit standards is impossible to see, unless you follow the political viewpoint that higher profits should be allowed only when they produce more votes. The Secretary of Agriculture says that wheat producers in the Pacific Northwest have a cost of 95 cents a bushel, which includes labor, cash outlay, seed, and machinery costs, and charge for the land. He says the average Government support price in that area is $1.90, which means that the Government taxes both the employees and stockholders of the steel companies in order to insure 100-percent profit to the wheat grower. A 6-percent profit on steel sales is condemned, while 100-percent profit on wheat sales is commended; and the main difference can only be in the number of votes garnered.

Throwing aside all consideration of profits, the safety of this Nation cannot be assured unless we continue to lead the world industrially. With 7 percent of the world's population, industry has provided, and our people are in possession of, more than half the automobiles, bathtubs, telephones, radios, washing machines, and other such labor saving and luxury items existing in the whole world. General von Hindenburg was considered the greatest military expert of the First World War, and he attributed his defeat chiefly to the industrial production of the United States. In the Second World War, Russia, who must share the blame with Hitler for starting it, was finally made the victim of Germany's aggression, and its western territory was so thoroughly devastated that Russia was impotent to attack Germany until furnished with American trucks, tanks, airplanes, and the necessary petroleum products to operate them. Every military expert admits that American industrial power turned the tide of battle to victory in both world wars, in spite of which our politicians lost the First World War's objective, which was to establish world-wide peace, and are rapidly losing all of the benefits which should have been derived from our great victories of the Second World War on land, sea, and in the air. The very people who have failed so completely in dealing with our allies and enemies demand the right to control American industry, and the people of this country just cannot afford to let that happen.

The problem of retaining or returning to Washington's form of government is a personal problem for every citizen. We businessmen can no longer escape our duty to our customers, our employees, our stockholders, and our dependents. If silence means consent, we must protest vociferously. We have faith in the judgment of the American citizen when he has the facts presented to him; and we believe that management must spend part of its income—and, if necessary, all of its income—to protect the rights of these people, who, when you get through enumerating them, are all the people in the country, even the short-sighted, self-seeking, political job holders.

Along about the time of the Flanders committee hearings in January 1949, the management and directors of the Standard Steel Spring Co. decided no more time should be lost and we must employ the weapon of advertising in a militant crusade against this growing menace of political infringement upon our priceless heritage of liberty and personal dignity. We have always had a solid conviction that our citizens are not stupid. They have been exposed to one-way political propaganda, and we felt that ignorance of the facts concerning American business constitutes the greatest single menace to our system and to our way of life.

During 1949, we published 12 full-page advertisements at intervals of approximately 3 weeks, in 61 daily newspapers in 43 cities throughout the country. We selected newspapers because we thought they had the maximum mass penetration and news impact. So far as the market survey is concerned for this particular undertaking, we regard the American public as being divided into four groups: (1) the comparatively small segment of indoctrinated and very active voters on the extreme left; (2) a somewhat larger group of well-informed voters at the extreme right, who are traditionally conservative and, therefore, not too vocal; (3) the great mass of American voters between these two groups, who are misinformed or uninformed, confused, or uninterested, either on the fence or passive in their reactions to political and social trends, and (4) a vast group of 45,000,000 pathetically apathetic citizens of voting age who failed to vote in the last election.

Of course, we were told in the beginning that newspaper advertising would never reach the very class of voters who have been most misled by the political propaganda. Some predicted our plan would present another illustration of business inanely talking to itself. But we proceeded, because we felt that a simplified but aggressive explanation of the historical fundamental functions of our American business system would be welcome to open-minded Americans, and now we know it.

When our first advertisements received almost universal approval, business friends requested a résumé of the results. We, too, wanted to check results as accurately as possible, so we employed the accepted methods of testing readership commonly used in the publishing and advertising business. Nationally recognized Daniel Starch and staff are employed to tell newspapers how effective advertising is, and we found they had surveyed the New York World-Telegram of June 9, which carried our full-page story. You know the Starch organization interviews an equal number of men and women, 18 years of age and over, who have read a particular paper, within 24 hours after issue, over the entire area of distribution, in direct proportion to the circulation break-down of the newspaper. Each interview covers the entire newspaper to determine how many have seen the advertisement, how many have read it and associate it with the product or advertiser, and how many have read it thoroughly. Our position was not so good: two-thirds of the way back in the newspaper. In this particular issue, the average observation of all national ads was 10 percent among men and 16 percent among women (women, of course, looking for advertised bargains). The observation of the Standard Steel Spring Co.'s advertisement was 40 percent among men, and 33 percent among women. The average thorough readership of all national ads of this issue was 4 percent among men, and 6 percent among women. The thorough readership of the Standard Steel Spring advertisement was 23 percent among men, and 12 percent among women. On July 28, over 1 month later, the Starch organization surveyed another advertisement in the New York Sun. The average observation of all ads in the issue was 16 percent for men, 19 percent for women. The Standard Steel ad was 56 percent for men, 42 percent for women, indicating cumulative interest in the series. The average thorough readership was 31 percent for men, 15 percent for women. These readership figures by all known standards of measure appeared so optimistic that we requested the Starch organization to compare readership of our advertising with the highest rated advertisements in all issues they had studied from January to the end of July, of the New York World-Telegram and the New York Sun.

From the standpoint of thorough readership in the New York World-Telegram among men readers, we tied with one other advertiser for first place among all the advertisements in the seven months. Among women readers, we rated highest in the entire seven-month period. And in the New York Sun for the same period, in thorough readership, we received the highest total among all advertisements of both men and women readers. I would like to emphasize again that thorough readership means reading from top to bottom.

Remembering the Literary Digest and Gallup polls, these reports aroused skepticism on such surprising readership figures, so we decided to make our own readership study during the week of July 25 in 9 cities: Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco. We instructed our interviewers to stay down among the lower income groups and to get an adequate cross section of labor union workers, housewives, proprietors, clerks, and so forth. This 9-city survey confirmed the Starch figures. We came up with an observation rating of 49 percent among men and 33 percent among women, and thorough readership of 34 percent among men and 17 percent among women. Such thorough readership figures are virtually unheard of in any type of advertising.

In answer to the question, "Who is reading these ads?" a study of circulation figures proves that there are not enough white collar workers or stuffed shirts in any of these cities, or in this whole country, to add up to such totals. It is impossible to cover here the extent and contents of the mail that we received spontaneously from all classes of citizens throughout the world. We read and

analyzed every letter received, and 98 percent of them have been favorable and enthusiastic. Two percent have been unfavorable, and, as you might suspect, most of such were not signed. We received mail from 45 States and Canada, India, Cuba, Mexico, Australia, Hawaii, Sweden, Germany, England, New Zealand, and so forth.

During the summer, British General Critchley, whom some of you met during the war, asked us to send proofs of these ads to members of Parliament and important business executives in England. Of course, we sent them. We had very favorable replies. General Critchley wrote us, and said: "Thank you very much indeed for sending these reprints. * * * These ads state the case against socialism clearer than anything we have yet seen on this side, and your firm is to be highly congratulated in making the layout so very definite and readable."

Comment on these new-type ads followed almost in an avalanche. The usual statements run to this effect: "You're doing a great job; why don't other corporations do the same thing?" and "Please don't stop." I will read you one that we received from a Diesel Workers' Union. It says:

"DEAR SIRS: We have 12 bulletin boards in this plant, and we would like the cost on 12 copies No. 1, 12 copies No. 2"—and so on.

"Also we would like to know the cost of just one of each of the 10. Please send your reply to the Diesel Workers' Union, attention of Dan Ramsdell, and I thank you and hope to hear from you."

Of course we sent them, and he replies as follows:

"Received the advertising you sent and want to thank you very much. It's companies like yours that keep labor on the up and up. Again we say thank you."

We have received so many requests from businesses of all types for numbers of reprints that we decided to query 36 of them to find out how they were being used. Wilson & Co. and J. I. Case distributed them to their branch managers and posted them in the factories. Torrington Manufacturing Co. distributed reprints to every employee in the shop. Eddie Rickenbacker's Eastern Airline Co. asked for 7,500 and distributed one to every employee in his pay envelope, which may indicate the methods which keep this air-transport company in the black. Wolverine Oil said: "We are a small oil company with 80 members and service-station dealers. Think your ad is wonderful propaganda for our form of government"—probably meaning the form of government we did have.

General Foods: "Posted ads on all company bulletin boards." Peavy Elevators—that's grain elevators—"Distributed reprints to 225 country elevators in Minnesota, North and South Dakota." The response from educational institutions has been one of the most amazing, interesting reactions to these ads. To date, 39.4 percent of all Americans of voting age have had no experience politically with anything but New Deal and Fair Deal administrations; and the teenagers of today are the voters of tomorrow. They represent a very fertile field, which has been insidiously cultivated by the proponents of socialistic and communistic thinking. So, you may understand with what gratification we have received letters from teachers, professors, and university students, presidents, and hundreds of public-school teachers and students.

It seemed important to us to get back to some of these people and get their reactions, so we interviewed 1,762 small retailers in 27 cities where these ads had been published. We simply showed them the proofs, asked them if they had seen and read the advertising, and what they thought of it. Eighty-two percent of this nearly 2,000 retailers reported that they had seen the ads, 64 percent that they read them. Eighty-seven percent of those who read our ads expressed the opinion that other companies should do a similar job. The typical comment of the small retailer could be summarized in the statement of a small jewelry store operator in Los Angeles who said: "Well done. It's about time the big companies helped the little ones." Or a musical instrument dealer in Cleveland who said: "A big boon to small business who cannot afford the same publicity."

The campaign was barely started before the editorial departments picked it up and put the story into editorials. Such newspapers as the Cincinnati Enquirer, Boston Traveler, Memphis Commercial Appeal, Chicago Daily News, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and so on, had editorials on the subject. Many of them quoted in part or in whole, and most gave definite credit to Standard Steel Spring Co. One of the most interesting and serious editorial efforts was that of the Pittsburgh Courier, which some of you may know has the largest circulation and is a leading Negro newspaper in this country. This publisher not only printed editorials, but, at his own expense, reprinted the eight ads that we first put out and mailed them to 2,500 leading colored citizens, teachers, preachers, etc., throughout the country.

Typical of spontaneous letters received is a statement from the publisher of the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald:

"If not at this juncture, just when should private enterprise state its case in positive, dynamic fashion? Surely not after the whole damned horse is stolen. Accordingly, if you will pardon my vehemence, this was the right time for enterprise to speak up. Tomorrow is still the right time. Day after tomorrow may be too late." Possibly he was hoping public sentiment might shorten the bitter coal strike. The publisher of the Canton (Ill.) Daily Ledger says: "Personally, in my almost 30 years in the newspaper and advertising field, I have never seen a better prepared campaign, nor more forceful copy than this. More copy of this nature should have been around in this country several years ago." I think he meant 17 years ago.

The publisher of the San Francisco Examiner made this comment. "This is the first time in my many years in any formal publication I have seen the basic principles and factors of economic and political philosophy so simply, so effectively expressed, and so forcibly presented."

Many small businesses wrote for permission to publish our ads in their own newspapers at their own expense. In Lancaster, Pa., for example, a newspaper published the entire series over their own name. And a number of English manufacturers published them in England, with footnotes to remind the reader that these ads originated in the United States of America and represent an American view of what is going on over there. The advertisement on socialism was displayed or quoted on the front page of a number of English newspapers, and the Glasgow (Scotland) Daily News. When the Scots take notice, you know you have hit pay dirt.

It would be next to impossible to tell you how many house organs throughout the country have picked up these ads and published them. The Bell Telephone, Standard Oil of New Jersey, General Motors, a number of the biggest companies, and many of the smallest.

Now, naturally, there were people who said when we were advertising in such papers as the New York Times we were wasting our time and money. Our advertising people thought we weren't, and I feel the best answer came from some of the people who have picked up our program from the New York Times, resulting in radio comment which has been surprisingly helpful and significant. Arthur Godfrey has an audience estimated at 3,650,000, which, of course, includes the stay-at-homes, the hospitalized, the housewives, and many who cannot read and others who are temporarily unable to read. On June 7, he read one of these ads to this vast morning coast-to-coast assembly. He devoted 6 minutes out of his 30-minute Chesterfield program to this advertisement. But there was one great comment he made which shows you what ads can do to arouse our people by reminding prominent speakers of our current dangers.

Godfrey said: "I would like to quote a statement of significance by Thomas Jefferson:

"'I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest danger to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

"'We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts we must be taxed in our meats and in our drink, in our necessities and in our conveniences, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

"'We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of our Government.'

"And," said Mr. Godfrey, "wouldn't it have been wonderful if we had followed his advice?" How can anyone claim that Jefferson would endorse any political platform presented to the voters in our 1948 presidential election? They should give complete credit to General Coxey, who said our Government should print money and distribute it to the poor.

Baukhage, the top ABC commentator, also quoted from our current advertising. Kate Smith, of Moon Over the Mountain fame, made reference to our advertising and added force and facts to our story.

This, for the Standard Steel Spring Co., has been a major effort in terms of dollars spent. It has cost nearly a million dollars, but it has produced amazing results. Of course, as a Congressman from Texas pointed out, some of that expenditure reduced tax income for the Government, for which we're awfully sorry, but we believe the money was used for the benefit of every American, while tax money sometimes arms the magistrate with a patronage of money, just as Jefferson prophesied, "to corrupt the principle of our Government."

So far as this experiment in combining public education with institutional advertising has gone, it has registered in a manner beyond our greatest expectations. As I have said, I am deeply concerned about the future of business in this country and the future of this country's way of life, and many of you share in that concern. But now we have proof positive that the American citizen does think straight and will act decisively if he is given the straight facts about any public policy. This advertising experience proves the existence in the people of our country of keen desire to acquire facts affecting the economics of business—facts which do enable them to refute the planned-economy propaganda and to exert themselves to recover the political powers they surrendered in 1913. This experience has proved to us, if it has proved nothing else, that there is in the minds of the American people (including the minds of so-called small business throughout this country), a latent respect and admiration for the great American accomplishments which the "Farewell State" advocates have labeled, libeled, and criticized as big, bad business. There is still time, in our opinion, for business leaders, large and small, to employ their courage and vision to discharge their obligation to their fellow citizens—openly and factually to pro-

tect, defend, and advance our competitive free enterprise system.

American business had led the world in advertising and sales promotion of its products. It has altered and improved the living habits of the American people and most other civilized nations. But American business has failed miserably in selling 150,000,000 Americans on the fact that our competitive free enterprise business system is the secret and source of our success; that the return to, or resort to, repudiated and reprehensible political panaceas is a frightful threat, not only to business and employment but to the American way of living—the envy of 2,000,000,000 people on this earth who do not share it.

Closed Door for Price Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, at the St. Louis meeting of the Zinc Institute, Director Boyd, of the United States Bureau of Mines, said:

It has become obvious to all but the most blind that our reserves have not been developed at the desired rate. The door is virtually closed for price support and production subsidies. The need for encouraging exploration must become more fully recognized.

If the point is made clear to the Government and the public, and not clouded by extraneous issues and the problems of individual operators, there is some hope for constructive action.

This appears to me to be a statement of utter futility.

No Government agency did more to close this door than the Interior Department itself. What mining company of ordinary size can afford to participate in exploration programs which, if successful, would most likely find ore which cannot be produced profitably now or in the reasonably foreseeable future? This leaves the exploration field pretty much to large companies and the Government itself, not at all a happy situation.

As to the "problems of the individual operators"—and does that not mean those of the numerical majority of those in the mining industry?—Mr. Boyd no doubt long since has noted they rapidly are solving themselves like the problems of those 10 little Indians who died 1 by 1.

This Is Not Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and reproduced in the Melrose (Mass.) Free Press:

THIS IS NOT FICTION

(From Cleveland Plain Dealer)

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $25,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year."

"Hmmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious?

But the banker gives allowance for unforeseen circumstances. So he asks Mr. Truman, "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "he's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year, will they?"

"No, but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel a piece, but I give the man an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $2 for each one they sell. Besides, my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below his income, seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

The Kerr Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House Members to the attached editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune in connection with the so-called Kerr natural gas bill. This issue has held tremendous interest in Congress and the Nation recently and will, I believe, continue to be one of growing interest as time goes on despite the veto death of this bill last week.

My purpose in placing this editorial of record is because this article so completely and clearly points out the real facts at issue. Now that this effort to protect the developers of our natural-gas reserves has failed, the consumers will need have no doubt as to who is really to blame when their gas bills begin to increase in the months and years ahead. All those who have a clear knowledge of the oil and gas producing industry know that gas prices to the consumer are going to go up. Opponents of the Kerr bill put so much emphasis on their love for the gas consumer that I feel the information here will make interesting reading for these consumers when they find themselves faced with higher gas costs.

By placing this editorial on file for future reference, the day is not far off when these consumers will be enabled to discover who really had the consumers' best interests at heart in this fight.

The editorial follows:

Mr. Dowling's cartoon today illustrates the practical problem President Truman is supposed to be up against in determining whether to sign the Kerr natural-gas bill or veto it. But the picture doesn't tell the whole story. Maybe there's no use trying to tell the whole story to people who refuse to look beyond their noses. But we'll try, once more.

There is a natural-gas reserve of 180,000,000,000,000 cubic feet. This would last 30 years at the present rate of consumption. But more miles of pipe line and more consumers are being added every day to the Nation's gas system. By 1955 the present reserve will be equal to only 9 years' supply at the accelerated rate of burning.

Heretofore the gas business has largely been a byproduct of the oil exploration and production business. Hereafter it will be big business and stand on its own legs. Until now, being a byproduct, gas has sold at unsteady prices at the wellhead. Some has been blown in the air because it would cost more to connect it to a pipe line than it would bring in a reasonable length of time at prevailing prices. The price at the wellhead even in the light of today's growing demand is only at an index of 88.3 compared with coal at 108.

However, and this is what Mr. Dowling doesn't recognize, the natural-gas business can only remain big business if there is assurance that the supply will be kept in line with the demand. This will take exploration and drilling, with the usual risks that attend mining enterprises, such as unproductive wells. The so-called independent producer will have to drill these speculative wells. The interstate pipe liners are in the business of transporting and selling gas, not drilling for it, except in a few instances.

Clearly, then, the driller can't be put under the same rule book as the transporter. The Natural Gas Act regulates the latter, holding him to something like 6-percent profit after taxes on his investment. That's eminently proper, for he has a mortal cinch—if the gas supply holds out.

The Kerr amendment merely takes the driller out of the regulatory set-up, where it was never intended he should be in the first instance. Out of a strait-jacket, he is free to drill a second well if his first one is a failure, and charge enough for the gas he gets from it to cover his costs of both wells and his profit. Kept in the traces, he'll never drill the second and subsequent wells that are necessary if the whole new natural-gas structure is not to collapse.

Cartoonist Dowling's big city consumers ought to be able to see that an abnormally low gas price for a year or two isn't going to do them any good if it halts the search for new reserves. The reserves will be exhausted before they can amortize the costs of their new furnaces with their savings over coal, unless the producers are sweetened up to continue the venturesome business of exploring, drilling, and recovering. Naturally as the reserve dwindled the wellhead price would rise until it touched a figure equal to the value of coal plus the worth of the convenience of gas.

Cartoonist Dowling's complaining voters are not the real victims of the new deal in natural gas. They would be lucky to get gas at twice the price they have to pay today. The real unfortunates in this revolutionary change that John L. Lewis has brought about by shutting down the coal industry until he has sent its prices sky high are the people of Oklahoma and Texas.

We had a century's supply of natural gas at fair prices for all concerned until the interstate pipe liners came along to blow it out from under our feet. Now we have no more gas than the people at the other end of the longest line—Milwaukee or Pittsburgh.

When the supply is exhausted for one it will be gone for all. Milwaukee then will still have its lake upon which to float in coal cheaply. Pittsburgh will still have its nearby coal mines which operate at low costs, relatively speaking. Oklahoma will have only high-cost and low-grade domestic coal. Texas will have—exactly nothing to burn but what is left of its oil and mesquite.

Farm Message Lures Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to obscure and confuse the people regarding the costly result of his action in signing the cotton- and peanut-acreage allotment bill, President Truman dragged into his message another plea for his pet vote snarer, the Brannan plan. The President recognized the bad features of the bill he signed. His message shows that.

This bill and the Kerr-Thomas natural-gas bill illustrate the hybrid legislation which results from the strange alliance which composes the present-day majority party.

The Milwaukee Journal, Wisconsin's largest newspaper, commented on the President's farm message in an editorial which pierces the veil surrounding his statement. I commend it to my colleagues:

FARM MESSAGE LURES VOTERS

The reluctance with which the President says he signed the potato-cotton-peanut farm bill is perfectly understandable. The bill was a makeshift, patchwork measure.

The bad features of the measure and the extra outlays that will be required, which the President discusses in detail in his message, at least come close to offsetting the promise of stricter control of potato surpluses. The legislation falls far short, as the President says, of any sound solution for the potato problem. It isn't even the beginning of a sounder program for coping with farm prices and surpluses.

The President neglects to mention, however, that much of the responsibility for the muddling and waste and colossal expense in the present farm program rests upon him and the Democratic majority in Congress. He takes undue credit if he implies that he or his party have been wiser or more consistent than the Republicans; or any less prone to play farm politics with tax billions.

All that the President says about need for better farm legislation to protect agricultural, consumer, and taxpayer welfare is trite and scarcely open to argument.

There is plenty of room for argument about the Brannan plan, which the President again urges Congress to adopt. The merits and costs of the Brannan plan are speculative. There is no evidence of marked agreement in Congress, in farm circles or the country at large as to whether the plan would work better than present legislation in the case of perishable farm products, or any particular product.

At present, there appears no strong probability that Congress will even give serious consideration to the Brannan plan before the fall congressional elections.

The President's farm bill message, therefore, sounds very much like political thunder for the coming political campaign. He can cite it as evidence that he has demanded something "far better" in the way of farm legislation. He can call for the election of Democrats to Congress to help him achieve that goal.

That may be good for some votes next fall.

Address of John B. Trevor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, John B. Trevor, president of the American Coalition, on April 13, delivered one of the soundest, most sensible, most far-seeingly patriotic addresses that has come to my attention in many months.

Mr. Trevor, during the First World War, was in command of military intelligence in the entire New York area. For many years he has devoted his time and efforts to the elimination of all subversive elements within our population and has stood and worked for those principles which would perpetuate the Constitution of the United States and all it stands for.

Under unanimous consent, I include the splendid speech to which I have referred:

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the honor of the invitation extended to me to address this distinguished body. The name of the society arouses memories of the greatest tradition in our history, that is, the founding of our Republic. You trace your ancestry to the patriots who made this great Nation possible, so it seems to me not out of place to suggest that membership in the Order of Founders and Patriots carries with it a grave responsibility to defend aggressively, and to the last ditch, the magnificent heritage handed down to you by your forefathers.

We are faced as everyone throughout the land knows by a deceitful and ruthless enemy abroad, and within we are confronted by not only the agents of this enemy who have penetrated every organism of our body politic, but also by a multitude of groups led by persons of prominence in the community, which, consciously or unconsciously, are undermining that patriotic fervor which impels men to die for their country on the battlefield.

I do not question for a moment the sincerity of these leaders in the cause of peace—God knows we all want peace—but with all respect to the accomplishments of these men in various fields of endeavor which they thoroughly understand, I challenge their knowledge of the world they seek to reorganize.

The sounds of battle had barely ceased in 1945, when Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, said to be well-known as an author, philosopher, and psychologist, proclaimed from a platform in the auditorium of Notre Dame College, in Cleveland, Ohio—"We must do everything we can to abolish the United States." The reason the speaker gave for this pronouncement is summed up in one short paragraph: "The only answer to the threat of atomic war is world government—complete relinquishment of United States and all other national sovereignties."

A much more distinguished citizen, former Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States, gave the impression to the audience at a recent hearing before the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, that he was ready to join with Senator THOMAS, chairman of that subcommittee, in pulling down the Stars and Stripes from the Capitol in pursuance of a desire to create a world government. Also, and specifically, Justice Roberts said, and I quote: "What is there in nationalism that so poisons the ability to be broad and to see the other fellow's point of view?"

On an earlier occasion, that is, as far back as 1943, Justice Roberts declared, "An international government, with police power over every individual citizen in the nations belonging to it—instead of over merely the national governments as such—is the only way to keep the peace."

Now let me call your attention to the beliefs, purposes, and policies of the United World Federalists, Inc. I quote from one of their leaflets, dated October 29, 1949: "The world federal government should include the following basic organs: (a) A world legislature to enact all laws necessary to carry out the functions delegated to the world federal government; (b) a world executive agency to administer and enforce the laws; (c) world courts to interpret the constitution and laws, and to try and to sentence lawbreakers." Let me slip down to

No. 4, of their principles, which reads: "World law should be enforceable directly upon individuals"; and, the seventh principle declares: "The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a carefully defined and limited but direct taxing power independent of national taxation."

Up to this point the proponents of world government are united. They want to abolish the United States as it now is. They want to abolish the national sovereignty of all States, and they want to focus the loyalty of all the people of all the world upon the world government of a superstate. Furthermore, they want this superstate to have the right to enforce its laws upon the individual citizen of the world state in its own courts, and, finally, they want to confer upon the superstate the right to tax directly the individual citizen of the superstate regardless of whatever national taxation he may be required to pay. But when it comes to actually drafting a constitution, the proponents of world government are one and all floundering in a morass of philosophical speculation on how to devise an acceptable system for the selection of delegates to the legislature of the all-embracing power they seek to create.

Let us analyze this situation objectively. We are up against a real and very serious problem. The United World Federalists, to mention only one society, have spent $291,672 to lobby their plan for the development of the United Nations into a world federation through Congress, and they have plenty to show for their money.

House Resolution No. 64 was sponsored by at least 119 Representatives, and its counterpart, Senate Resolution No. 56, is supported by 17 Senators. There are a whole flock of other resolutions, varying in scope and variously sponsored. In addition, the legislatures of 22 States have approved resolutions for world government. This thing is not a joke, at least not in the United States.

In a discussion of world government by the State Department, in Publication 3712, released in January of this year, appear the following comments:

"The absence of universal identity of purpose and principle among nations is as marked now as it was at San Francisco, and the conflict between national aims and ambitions is in some cases much sharper. To establish any type of world government would mean that individual States would have to be prepared to carry out the decisions of that body even when they ran counter to established national policies. It would also mean that the world government would itself have the means to force a recalcitrant State into line.

"Under present circumstances—when what appears as essential to the welfare of the people of one state is so often diametrically opposed to the apparent interests of another—there is little indication that nations are now generally disposed to surrender their sovereign rights to this extent.

"There is hardly reason to believe that a proposal to establish a world government would receive the support of a substantial number of the nations of the world, or that these nations would be willing to delegate the necessary powers to such a superstate. There is, in fact, some danger that efforts toward this end, if pressed too far, too fast, may impede rather than encourage international cooperation."

Right here in these comments of the State Department upon world government, the thought is expressed in no uncertain terms that there is at the moment no identity of purpose and principle among the nations of the world. Furthermore, the State Department specifically sets forth the fact that the conflict between national aims and ambitions is even now more pronounced than at the time the United Nations emerged in concrete form from the conference at San Francisco.

The State Department also makes clear, what really is self-evident, that a world government must have power to bring a recalcitrant state into line. Well, gentlemen, that, of course, is merely another way of saying that war would be a necessity in order to bring about the perfect union of which the proponents of world government dream. That thought is in conformity with our own experience. It was the very lack of identity of purpose and the wide divergence of economic interests that made our Civil War inevitable. There is, therefore, no guaranty of peace in the attempt to amalgamate in a superstate a mass of nations and people who differ widely in their interests, their culture, their civilization, and their race. In fact, I think the very attempt to bring together these utterly divergent interests might be the best way to precipitate a conflict.

As I have already said, a federal union is no guaranty of peace, and while the United States has been involved in only 12 wars, our Government has engaged in over 170 distinct military campaigns. As I have stated before, I do not question for one moment the idealism of the proponents of world government, but I definitely challenge their ability to appreciate the realities of the situation which confronts the world in this day and age.

Let us now take a brief look at the population of the world which is estimated to be composed of approximately 2,250,000,000 souls. This 2,250,000,000 people represent 29 distinct types, ranging from the Bushmen of South Africa, the Dravidians of India, the Patagonians of South America, and the Eskimos of the Arctic to the northern and western Europeans from whom the founders and patriots of 1789 were descended. These 29 types, described by the great anthropologist Deniker, subdivide into hundreds of linguistic groups or races of which our Bureau of Immigration has recognized 45 as coming to the United States. Thirty-six of these races or peoples are indigenous to Europe. From this heterogeneous mass of humanity there are in our population, according to the United States census of 1940, 106,795,732 native whites; 12,865,518 Negroes; and 11,419,133 foreign-born.

Gentlemen, I suggest that you consider these statistics and figure out for yourselves what our influence would be in a world legislature recruited by popular suffrage, and give a thought to what that legislature would be like. Also, let me ask, How long do you suppose any limitations on taxation would last which might be incorporated in the new constitution of the world. If we objected, our power to resist would be gone, and our right to secede is specifically denied in the program.

In a very interesting article which appeared not long ago in the magazine American Affairs, it was estimated that we had about 6 percent of the world's population, and approximately 36 percent of the world's income. You will readily see that on a share-the-wealth basis the present-day American would have to cut his living standard to one-sixth of what it is now, when the socialist government of the superstate really got going. As a matter of fact, the administration now in power in Washington has an international agreement before the Senate to merge all the trade of the world under the control of an international body in which we would have 1 vote out of 58; in other words, our influence in this international association would be on a par with Luxemburg or Siam. In plain English, our whole economic system is at the moment in imminent peril of destruction at the hands of our socialistic internationalists.

This peril is no fantasy of the imagination. Look at the platform of the present government now in control of England. It differs only in minor details from the economic philosophy of the Politburo of Soviet Russia; and, let me say, the same comment may fairly be made in varying degrees upon virtually every government of continental Europe, except possibly Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal.

So I say to you, gentlemen, even if Soviet Russia is left out of the picture, and it cannot be logically done, we Americans would face utter and complete ruin if we become involved in any form of world government which would be dominated by the Marxian Socialists of western Europe. Let us not forget, that it is governments controlled by these Socialists that the American taxpayer is now supporting by paying the deficits in the economy of their nations. That is the picture. Take a good look at it. In saying this, bear in mind, that I have not even mentioned the fact that if a representative system of government is conceivable for a world government, and I do not believe it is, the people of Asia alone could outvote all the nations of the earth, and her civilization, such as it is, would be supreme. The alternative is some sort of a Fascist regime which no American should tolerate.

Now, for a last word—the leaders of the Russian Revolution declared in their constitution for the Soviet Union in 1923 that they had taken "a new decisive step along the path of the union of the workers of all countries in a World Socialist Soviet Republic." To be sure, this union is now composed of only 182 nationalities, speaking 149 different languages or dialects. It also has ten to fifteen million of its citizens in jails or concentration camps, and its firing squads are never idle.

It will not do, gentlemen, for anyone to assert that the Russian system is beyond a reasonable conception of what may happen here. Mr. Beveridge, the English economist, whose plan had wide publicity in the United States, frankly admitted that his scheme for industrial reform would be unworkable unless force were used to make all persons subject to it comply with the orders of the directing authority. That, of course, is despotism, and there is nothing more despotic in theory now in operation under the Russian regime.

I, personally, have no use for the Soviet system, or any Fascist form of government, but, as I have seen the world and lived abroad among some of its strange peoples, I think the Russians have devised the only form of world government which will work, and so far as it goes, although it is utterly detestable, it does work.

It would, of course, be silly to suppose that the present promoters of world government have any connection with the Communist movement in the United States. I would be the last to suggest the thought, but if patriotism is destroyed by advocacy of loyalty to a superstate and we let our Government drift much further into socialism, I fear that a communistic Frankenstein, as bad as Russia, may be created which will engulf the great heritage handed down to us by the founders of the Republic.

Ex-Justice Hyman Rayfiel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of

April 5, 1950, the subject of which, former Justice Hyman Rayfiel, was for many years a distinguished resident of my district and whose career will long remain an inspiration for the youth of that community and of Brooklyn. He served his borough and city most creditably and possessed all those fine and rare attributes that make for a most successful judicial career. His distinguished son and former colleague, Leo Rayfiel, now United States district judge of the eastern district of New York has been inspired by his father. We who knew him mourn his passing.

EX-JUSTICE HYMAN RAYFIEL

Hyman Rayfiel, former special sessions justice who died at the age of 89, had a long and interesting life. The father of Federal Judge Leo Rayfiel came here from Austria at the age of 16, got a job as court interpreter, studied diligently and passed his regent examinations without a day of formal high-school education. He went to law school at night, was named chief clerk of the New Jersey Avenue police court, was appointed a magistrate and later was moved up to special sessions court. After 37 years in the courts, he retired to take up once more the art career he dropped when he decided to become a lawyer. In the course of his long life Justice Rayfiel made countless friends who mourn his passing.

Lyndon Johnson and the Kerr Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very fine editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on April 9, 1950.

This editorial recognized the important role the junior Senator from Texas, LYNDON JOHNSON, had in the recent debate on the Kerr gas bill.

No one worked more tirelessly than Senator JOHNSON to make certain that the bill, passed by both Houses, would not make any change in the existing Federal Power Commission practices. Senator JOHNSON with great patience and with painstaking effort made certain that the bill would not have an adverse effect on the consuming public and that it would provide justice and fair play for producers.

The Senator from Texas served as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee which rewrote the original Kerr bill.

It was a tribute to his leadership and to his fairness that the subcommittee unanimously voted to report the bill.

He maintained his fairness and objectivity throughout the long debate on this bill.

LYNDON JOHNSON AND THE KERR GAS BILL

Leslie Carpenter of the Star-Telegram's Washington bureau has called attention to the important part played by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, in the passage of the Kerr natural gas bill by the Senate.

"The 44 to 38 victory of the bill in the Senate," Mr. Carpenter reports, "can be laid to a large extent to the long and hard work of Senator JOHNSON of Texas. When some of the best-informed observers around the Senate predicted certain defeat for the bill, Senator JOHNSON labored even harder. When the votes were counted, the bill won."

Mr. Carpenter was simply giving credit where credit is due. As a matter of fact, the legislative history of this measure indicates it might properly have been designated the Johnson-Kerr bill.

The need for amendments to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 to clarify certain court decisions arose in 1947. A measure known as the Moore-Rizley bill was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and was passed by the House but never cleared the Senate.

Early in the Eighty-first Congress measures similar to the Moore-Rizley bill were introduced in the Senate by Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, who had succeeded Senator Moore of that State, and by Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas. A modified version of the Harris bill passed the House last year and went on to the Senate where, like the Moore-Rizley bill, it was not acted upon.

Meanwhile the Kerr bill (S. 1498) had been referred to a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, of which Senator JOHNSON of Texas, was chairman. After extended hearings by the subcommittee in May of last year, Senator JOHNSON revised the Kerr bill to meet administration objections.

The revised bill retained its original number and the name of its original sponsor, however, and it is proper that this was the case. Senator KERR, although serving his first term in the Senate, was floor manager of the measure and handled the debate on it with the skill of a veteran legislator.

There were substantial differences between the measure passed by the Senate and the Harris bill which had been passed by the House last year. Instead of sending the two measures to a conference committee to work out the differences, the House accepted the bill without change as it had passed the Senate. It thus paid Senators JOHNSON and KERR an unusual compliment.

All who voted for the bill deserve commendation because its enactment was a distinct victory for States' rights.

Technically, the purpose of the bill is to clarify the Federal Power Commission's scope of jurisdiction over the production and gathering of natural gas, by confirming the exempt status of independent producers.

Actually, as Speaker of the House RAYBURN put it, "The purpose of the bill is to see that the little producer (of gas) is not hauled up to Washington to be regulated."

Heretofore regulation of oil and gas production has been a State function. Congress now has said in no uncertain terms that this business should continue to be subject to State regulations, and not to Federal control.

By exerting himself on behalf of this measure Senator JOHNSON also demonstrated that he is fully aware of the best interests of his home State. It is estimated that Texas has 55 percent of the natural-gas reserves of the United States. But this great natural resource has little value to Texas or to the Nation unless it can be produced and utilized. Enactment of S. 1498 should stabilize and preserve a system which is making this cheapest, cleanest, and best of all fuels available to American homes and industries, and at the same time providing producers in Texas and other Southwestern States with a market for their gas at a fair price.

Stopping Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, all over America our people are thinking, thinking of the unspeakable horrors of an atomic war, thinking of the crushing cost of another great conflict, thinking of the necessity of an understanding with Russia before that war comes.

Evidence of that thinking is indicated by a communication received by me from an instructor in the State university, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., Arthur W. Munk. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that letter:

STOPPING COMMUNISM

GRAND FORKS.—We are all interested in stopping communism. Thus far, however, the methods which our Government has used have been crude, clumsy, and ineffective. You cannot stop communism with military force. Foolish blusterings like those of Secretary Johnson, when he said we could knock the hell out of Russia in 90 minutes, will not stop it.

The Truman doctrine, the North Atlantic Pact, and the Marshall plan have also proven ineffective. Why? Because all three are based on the futile faith in force, and are part of the foolish cold war. All three have stimulated Russia to intensify her efforts. In fact, now that Russia has the atom bomb (and she may beat us to the hydrogen bomb), the Truman doctrine, the North Atlantic Pact, and the Marshall plan are hopelessly obsolete. We must evolve a better strategy.

How can we stop communism? By doing four things. First, we must convince the world that we are really for peace. The time has come for us to take the lead in a great world-wide peace offensive. Witness how the British people rallied to Winston Churchill when he insisted that the time had come for another attempt at a peaceful solution of the differences which divide the east and the west. The neutral nations know that we cannot defend them, now that Russia has the atom bomb. Yet they would certainly rally to our side if we took the lead in launching a great peace offensive. Even Russia would eventually have to fall in line or lose face; and Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, and Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, have actually suggested such a strategy.

Second, we must convince both the rulers and the people of Russia that our intentions are good; that we mean to be friendly. Nearly everything that we have done so far has served to arouse their suspicions. Third, we must give minority groups within our own land their rights and treat them with respect like human beings. How can we preach democracy abroad when we refuse to practice it at home?

Fourth, a serious effort must be made through the United Nations and otherwise to feed the world. Hunger makes Communists. We could stop communism at the borders of India if we would. Instead of forcing our farmers to reduce production we ought to be encouraging them to produce to capacity, even if we have to subsidize them. Then let us make our surpluses

available to the people of India and other hungry people. Even if we have to give them vast quantities of food—this would be far cheaper than an arms race and a war.

ARTHUR W. MUNK.

Mr. Truman Takes the Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of April 14, 1950:

MR. TRUMAN TAKES THE CREDIT

The President of the United States told his news conference Thursday a rather amazing thing. He said he expects to take credit for the nation's prosperous condition "despite claims by some parts of the press that these conditions would exist even if a moron were in the White House."

Mr. Truman seems to carry a chip on his shoulders these days when he meets newspapermen. It's a far cry from April 1945, when Vice President Truman nervously told some reporters, "If any of you boys ever pray, please pray for me now."

That was when he stepped into the place made vacant by the death of President Roosevelt.

Since his election victory, Mr. Truman has become a very much changed man. He appears to forget that as President, he represents all the American people, not just those who voted for him.

Maybe it was because of his recent challenging attitude toward the public and the press that he took credit for the Nation's present good condition. Perhaps it was because as a politician, he knew that he could be blamed for it if the Nation were in bad condition.

But, as a matter of judgment, his statement appears in poor light.

For one thing, the American system was not set up, nor is it even now, to be so dependent upon one man that he can determine its whole course. Yet, the last two Presidents appear to have operated, and to be operating, upon that premise.

For another thing, if the President takes credit for prosperity, he may be asked to show what he has done to bring this about.

A frank appraisal of our country today must lead one inevitably to the conclusion that our national prosperity such as we have is in spite of the President's programs, none of which offers the least aid to progress or prosperity.

Newspapermen often are severe critics of the Government and the administration because their work requires them to watch the actions of their President and Government more carefully than the average American.

A perusal of the record fails to show specifically what Mr. Truman has done to bring about national prosperity, which has been created despite Government efforts to depress it through tax and regulation. Prosperity is created by the doers, the workers, the planners, the Americans who produce.

The greatest boon the American Government was intended to give was freedom to produce.

That freedom has been dwindling year by year, through the joint efforts of President, radical advisers, and often a Congress itself which has lost sight of American freedom.

The daily record shows that Mr. Truman's every effort appears to be aimed politically.

Senator BYRD threw him a challenge the other night that Mr. Truman can be expected to ignore. The Virginia Senator asked the President to show proof that he does not favor socialism.

It is exceedingly tiresome to have our elected officials constantly making patriotic statements about our American freedom and then in the next breath proposing programs that are the very antithesis of Americanism.

Politicians generally are looking too hopefully toward the socialistic welfare state ideas as a vote getter.

The idea will probably offer temptations both to officeholders and public—until the public becomes informed—and takes the trouble to do so.

Never in the history of government has there been one that could give out to the people more than they pay into it.

To the contrary, every welfare state shows by its record that the people—the poor people, the common people—pay in taxes far more than they derive in benefits. If the money taken from them in taxes were to be applied to private pension or insurance funds, their benefits would be far more than they receive by government.

But what Mr. Truman and other socialistic planners propose is to force the people to accept social welfare programs for which they pay in taxes and for which they also pay the extravagantly high extra cost of government's inefficient administration.

In Britain, for example, the poor people, averaging $1,200 to $1,500 a year, pay an average of $9 to $10 weekly in taxes, but their benefits—that is, those they can claim—never total more than an average $8 a week.

American progress will cease when the time comes that our prosperity must depend upon a President, rather than upon the individual initiative and ability of the American people.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan at United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Charle F. Brannan was one of the major speakers at the conference of the national Christian committee of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., last Sunday, April 16. I commend his remarks, which follow, to the attention of my colleagues:

There is an old saying that the best way to keep good acts in memory is to refresh them with new ones. Evidently this is being applied here today.

You people have come here from many parts of the country with enthusiasm and determination to carry on a magnificent program of cooperation and brotherhood in action.

I consider it not only a pleasure, not merely an honor, but a true privilege to have some part with so many other Americans in this work.

It is only about 2 years since the modern State of Israel came into existence as an independent entity. I wonder if there was ever a time when a fledgling nation found the going tougher than today.

Here are some of Israel's problems as they have been presented to me.

In 2 years' time, 400,000 immigrants have poured into that land. Penniless and without resources, from more than 20 countries, and speaking almost as many different languages, they have come to this new nation as to a long-promised home.

This is almost as many immigrants as we admitted to our own land in the entire decade of the 1930's. And the population of Israel, even after all this influx of new residents, is not much more than a million persons.

Our own land has been a melting pot in which multitudes of men and women from abroad have been fused into a democratic, freedom-loving society. We know that this peaceful and healthy assimilation was made possible by the opportunity immigrants found here—jobs in industry and land to settle and cultivate.

Our own experience demonstrates that the peaceful assimilation of so many immigrants into so small a country as Israel is a task to stagger the imagination. Last year alone this small country took within its borders as many immigrants as our own Nation took from the end of the Revolutionary War to 1820.

For me, that one fact does more than anything else to illustrate the kind of problem Israel and its immigrants are facing.

It is a tremendous accomplishment that already three-fourths of these 400,000 newcomers of the past 2 years have found homes and a beginning of economic opportunity.

This is an accomplishment in which many factors played their parts; but one of the biggest, and one of the indispensable factors has been the success of the United Jewish Appeal in raising funds to provide for these needy people.

It takes millions of dollars to pay transportation costs—and these costs are an important part of the UJA budget.

It takes more millions to provide for the maintenance of immigrants until they can earn their own way. I am told that there are still some 90,000 persons in Israel living in tents and barracks in temporary reception camps. Even at an average of 50 cents a day for food—even a minimum cost for other necessities—it still takes a lot of millions to keep 90,000 persons going.

And 150,000 additional immigrants are expected this year.

It takes even more millions to build homes and agricultural settlements for so many newcomers.

I am given to understand that most of this year's budget will go for such purposes as I have just mentioned.

The great endeavor, of course, must be to help the immigrants to become self-supporting as rapidly as possible. One of the most pressing problems is that of expanding agricultural production in Israel to provide enough food. I appreciate the fact that the agriculture of Israel is being developed by competent technicians. The work in research, pest control, irrigation projects, and other phases of agriculture is of a very high order. I hope that the time will soon come when we shall have an effective point 4 program that will enable us to cooperate with Israel along agricultural lines to the mutual benefit of both nations.

Recently a new type of agricultural settlement called the workers village has been developed. I understand that immigrants will be able to live in these new-type agricultural settlements and to find work in shops, factories, and building projects while they are getting themselves settled on farm units.

Now, I suspect that the question has arisen in your minds, as it did in mine, whether the assimilation of the new population would not be much easier if the flow of immigrants could be reduced for a few years. Undoubtedly it would, but the question unfortunately

is not very practical. Some of the countries from which these people are coming have set dead lines for getting out. In Poland, for example, the dead line for some 20,000 Jews who are planning to leave is October 1, 1950. After that, the doors may close and then in sober truth those left behind would be without a country.

Even apart from the persecution, discrimination, and threat of physical violence to which these unfortunate people are subjected, they would have to face the hard fact that adjusting to life in Russian-dominated areas is tremendously difficult. Many of these persons were formerly shopkeepers or were engaged in other forms of small business or the professions. But throughout the Russian-dominated area private enterprise of this kind is being obliterated.

There is, then, no time to lose.

That is why this appeal aims at a high goal. That is why Jewish and non-Jewish people alike are making this year a greater effort to meet the goal than ever before.

A year ago, when I spoke to you, I mentioned that a schedule had been set up "for the ingathering of some 250,000 homeless Jews" during 1949. I hope you will pardon me for saying that I had some doubts that the job could be done.

It was done. The problem of the displaced Jews of Europe is almost solved today—largely because of the work done by the agencies of the United Jewish Appeal. Two years ago there were more than a quarter of a million Jews in the DP camps. Today there are no more than 40,000, and almost all of those who have left have gone to Israel.

Those who remain represent mostly the "hard core" of the DP problem—the sick, the disabled, the aged, those whom no country has welcomed to its shores.

Yet even these unfortunates will now be enabled to go to Israel. Under a special program developed by the agencies of the UJA, in cooperation with the Government of Israel, 4,000 of these most difficult cases, together with more than 5,000 dependents, will go to Israel during the months ahead. There they will have special care and special aid in rehabilitation.

In addition to the projects I have mentioned, the United Jewish Appeal has programs of medical and welfare services for impoverished Jews who will remain in Europe, or north Africa, or in other areas. The UJA will also assist some 25,000 Jewish refugees who are expected to come to our own country this year.

I want to congratulate all of you on your part in these inspiring programs. And I should like to recall to all our minds that whatever good we do benefits you and me as well as those unfortunates who receive our aid. Anything done for another is done also for oneself, for as George Eliot expressed it: "Our deeds determine us, as much as we determine our deeds."

I say sincerely: May the Almighty bless this work and help us make it a great influence for peace and for justice.

District Sesquicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for Mr. Jesse C. Suter, of the Washington Sunday Star, and those who have followed his writings about the District of Columbia will soon be in agreement with me on that point.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include his newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on April 16, 1950, regarding the opening feature of the sesquicentennial celebration:

BEGINNING OF PAGEANT OF AMERICA; PATRIOTS' DAY EVENTS RECALLED

(By Jesse C. Suter)

DISTRICT SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION BEGAN YESTERDAY

The opening feature of the sesquicentennial of the permanent seat of the Government of the United States was held on the Capitol Plaza in the forenoon of yesterday. While the celebration is in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment here in what is now the District of Columbia of the seat of the Government, the first feature commemorates the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the laying on April 15, 1791, of the first cornerstone at the south corner of the original "10 miles square." The exact location of this stone is at Jones Point, on the Potomac River, below Alexandria, and since the retrocession of the Virginia portion of the District to Virginia, it is now located within that State.

It is recalled that on April 15, 1941, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the event was picturesquely celebrated under the auspices of a joint committee of the Masonic Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District, the Alexandria-Washington Lodge, of which George Washington was at one time the worshipful master, and officers from the Washington Board of Trade. Among the speakers at this triple-featured celebration were the mayor of Alexandria, William T. Wilkins; District Commissioners John Russell Young and David McCoach, Jr.; the president of the Washington Society of Alexandria, John B. Gordon; Ara M. Daniels, grand master of Masons in the District of Columbia; and others.

The most interesting feature of the occasion was the arrival of a procession led by the master and members of the Washington-Alexandria Lodge, the officers attired in colonial costumes and impersonating members who had participated in the ceremonies of 1791. The officers of the lodge so costumed reenacted the laying of the cornerstone.

It is related in the records of the lodge that when they returned to the place from whence they came, a number of toasts were drunk and the following was delivered by the master of the lodge, Dr. Cullen Dick, and was received with every token of approbation:

"May jealousy, that 'green-eyed monster,' be buried deep under the work which we have this day completed, never to rise again within the Federal district."

The theme of the sesquicentennial celebration is freedom and colorful pageantry throughout the sesquicentennial year will recreate America's 150 years of progress through freedom.

In thus celebrating the anniversary of the establishment here of the permanent seat of Government of the United States of America it is most interesting that here at the very heart of this, the greatest republic which the world has ever known, the most important and fundamental freedom is denied those Americans who permanently reside here, who owe no allegiance to any State, but solely to the United States of America.

That freedom which they are denied is the right and privilege to be represented in both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to vote for the President and the Vice President, and thus to participate in the government of their country by which they are taxed and for which they are required to bear all of the burdens which are common to the Americans of all of the sovereign States.

No feature of this sesquicentennial celebration could be more appropriate than for the Congress to take affirmative action on one of the proposed amendments of the Constitution under which the voteless and unrepresented American citizens of the District of Columbia would be enabled to gain this important freedom of which they are now so unjustly deprived.

PATRIOTS' DAY LESSON—REVERE, LEXINGTON, AND CONCORD

Next Wednesday will mark the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the stirring events of April 19, 1775. Paul Revere at midnight of the 18th began his famous ride to warn the people "of every Middlesex village and town" of the approach by land of the British soldiers. It was on April 19 that the Minutemen on the village green at Lexington were fired upon by the Redcoats for failing to comply with the British officer's order to disperse. The fight at Lexington has been depicted in the historic painting entitled "The First Blow for Freedom."

While Patriot's Day is observed annually in some parts of New England, its only regular observance in Washington is by the opening on that date of the annual sessions of the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

It is of present interest that supporters of the Kefauver bill pending in Congress to grant so-called home rule to the District of Columbia are planning an observance on April 18, 1950, of the ride of Paul Revere. This is a publicity stunt and fund-raising enterprise. Promoters will have a character representing Paul Revere, attired in colonial costume and astride a horse, ride through downtown streets bearing a slogan, "Taxation without representation is still tyranny."

The real point in Paul Revere's ride and the memorable events of April 19 was not a protest against some form of local government but against an overriding powerful government of foreigners over all of the Colonies. The "taxation without representation" which they considered tyranny was taxation by a foreign power in whose Parliament the American colonists were not represented by those of their own choosing. Such a demonstration would be definitely appropriate in support of a constitutional amendment which would give the people of the District of Columbia voting representation in the Congress which exercises an overriding authority over the people of the District of Columbia without their consent.

In these days of hustle and bustle, heavy taxation, deficit spending, and mounting public debt, there are those who tell us that fundamental Americanism was all right in its day, but now there are trends which cannot be ignored. Now one might ask, is our great America no longer to be the land of opportunity where the poor boy may become king? And must private enterprise and individual freedom give way to a welfare state?

These are important vital questions of the day and may be amplified to an alarming degree. Are there any among the people of this broad land of ours who are more vitally interested in and affected by the solution of these problems enumerated above than are the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia?

These important questions threaten our life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and, in fact, the very existence of the Republic. Are we of this great Capital of the greatest Republic on earth to be denied our rightful participation in the Government of our country?

We read frequently in the press of large classes in naturalization getting their final

citizenship papers from the courts. To the voteless and unrepresented Washingtonian this presents a disgusting situation, which has been so aptly put by the late Philander Johnson in rhyme:

"Two American voters
Met here by chance.
One came from Russia
And one came from France.
With pride in their franchise
They learned with regret
That a man from right here
Isn't naturalized yet."

RECENT ACTIONS BY THE CITIZEN GROUPS SUMMARIZED

Citizen group meetings during the past 2 weeks indicate a lively interest in both neighborhood and District-wide problems. Press reports of the meetings of 23 affiliates of the Federation of Citizens' Associations were reviewed.

The chief interest was in the petition of the Capital Transit Co. for an increased fare and abandonment of the weekly pass. The associations rather generally registered their opposition to an increase.

Continuance of segregated swimming pools and the position taken by the Recreation Board in declining to take over the pools from the Interior Department under a nonsegregated requirement are supported generally. Construction of a stadium and indoor pool at Coolidge High School has wide support and some groups would provide the stadium with floodlights for night use.

Most associations have favored summer daylight time and one raised serious objection to using the police for a poll of the people on the daylight question.

The demand for the repeal of the individual personal property tax law of the District is receiving some attention. Other actions include demand for 100 more policemen, 5-day week for policemen, establishment of a junior college and reduction in the number of places licensed to sell liquor.

The Columbia Heights Citizens' Association has announced that its May meeting will be Central High School night.

The North Washington Council passed resolutions giving specific reasons for its opposition to the transfer of Central High School and urging the Board of Education to rescind its action,

Guilt by Association—Who Started Persecuting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal, an outstanding independent newspaper, has published a series of editorial commentaries on the charges of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach two of these distinguished editorials, titled "Guilt by Association" and "Who Started Persecuting?" The first was published March 19, the second, April 14:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 19, 1950]

GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

The technique that Senator MCCARTHY has used to date in trying to prove his sensational charges of communism in the State Department is known as indictment by association.

This means that a person is held guilty of a crime, or error, or disloyalty, or whatever someone may charge him with—not on the basis of facts, but because of associations or contacts, close or remote, that he may have or may have had.

Marquis Childs, highly respected and cautious, moderate columnist, has pointed out that this technique is out of place in this country. We have always been devoted to the Anglo-Saxon concept of equal justice and fair trial under law.

The indictment-by-association technique, Childs explains, is that of the revolutionary tribunal. Thus the so-called courts of revolutionary France sent thousands to the guillotine because they were found to have had some contact with aristocrats. The contact might have been extremely limited and of years past. But this made no difference. The purge trials in Nazi Germany and in Soviet Russia operated along this same line.

What are the possibilities of this technique?

Persons who belonged to or had any association with groups containing Communists, before it was known the groups were Communist fronts, could be called disloyal or unsafe Americans.

Anyone who ever wrote a friendly word about Soviet Russia, or communism, or Communists anywhere, could be termed "soft" on communism.

Anyone who ever spoke, accidentally, before a meeting at which Communists were in attendance would fall in a like category.

Anyone who belonged to a group which later fell under Communist control could be considered tainted.

An individual who, even in the united-front days of the war, joined movements to send clothes to Russian children, could be splashed with MCCARTHY'S red paint.

Operating under this technique, thousands of Milwaukeeans could be labeled as "soft" on communism, because during and following the war (when we were counting on a bright new world of peace) they worked in friendship groups which later become Communist fronts. These Milwaukeeans have worked, in the past, oftentimes unknowingly, alongside Communists in war activities, politics, civic movements, welfare groups, labor unions, and other movements.

This indictment by association can became a fantastic thing. A doctrine like this is repulsive to a free people. Certainly Americans, when they think it through, will repudiate it.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of April 14, 1950]

WHO STARTED PERSECUTING?

They are trying MCCARTHY, say Senator TAFT and the chairman of the Wisconsin Republican organization. They are persecuting MCCARTHY, wails the McCormick-Hearst press. They are smearing MCCARTHY with epithets and vituperation, moans a Milwaukee veterans' group.

Whoa, now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Who started this business, anyhow?

Who said, back in February, that the State Department was ridden with Communists—205, 57, 85, or 4 of them? Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who said, but recently, that he would rest his entire case against the State Department on one name, and then named an individual who has no direct connection whatever with the State Department? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who has charged a whole string of American citizens with being disloyal and traitorous, blackening their names and imperiling their careers? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who has had 2 months, almost to the day, to prove these grave charges, and has not so far proved a single, solitary one? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who has accused the President of the United States of endangering the Nation's security? Who has accused a fellow Senator of lying? Who has accused another fellow Senator of being a "tool" of the State Department? JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

Who proclaimed on the Senate floor that he would never hide behind congressional immunity but would say off the Senate floor anything he said on it, and face the possibility of libel suits?

And who has bobbed like the dodger in a carnival booth to avoid saying off the Senate floor what he said on it?

Of course, Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

It is MCCARTHY who is trying people—on the most serious charges, probably, that an American citizen can be faced with—and he is apparently doing it, at least so far, without evidence to prove his charges. It is Senator MCCARTHY who is "persecuting" people. It is MCCARTHY who has led the way in the unrestrained use of "epithets and vituperation.".

MCCARTHY being tried? MCCARTHY being smeared and persecuted? MCCARTHY the victim of "epithets and vituperation"? That must bring a bitter laugh, indeed, from the many individuals whom Senator MCCARTHY has spattered with his whirling red brush—no matter what, if any, charges he may ever substantiate.

Potato Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Pathfinder News magazine by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, recently reproduced in the Wakefield (Mass.) Item:

POTATO MESS

(By Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Pathfinder News magazine)

How did our Government manage to get itself into this mess with potatoes? Here boils a pot of absurdities such as one could not believe if the clownish, costly facts did not stand out so plain.

First of all, the Government started out to do some good. The original idea was to protect the country against farm price disasters. The one 20 years ago not only busted farmers but closed factories and hurt everyone. So the idea was, roughly, to pass a law to keep farm prices from falling too low.

Then, politically, it seemed like a good idea to pass laws to make farm prices high. Since—if that were done for cotton or wheat—corn, peanuts, potatoes and spinach would yell that they were victims of outrageous discrimination, the law had to guarantee a percentage of parity for about every crop.

Assured high prices naturally encourage more production, so acreage allotments had to be tried. That inspired farmers to farm their restricted acres better. (If they do not know how, the Government shows them how.)

A good farmer, with the kinds of seed, fertilizer and cultural practices recommended by the Government can push his potato yields pretty high. There are many good potato farmers.

So now the Government, in the course of trying to do some good, finds itself paying to a farmer $1.46 a hundredweight for his potatoes, then selling them back to him for 1 cent.

It finds itself dyeing good potatoes blue so no one will eat them. It finds itself giving potatoes away and talking of burning them up. It finds itself taxing everybody to keep everybody's potatoes expensive. It finds that somebody can and does buy Canadian potatoes, even along the Gulf of Mexico, for less than it permits United States potatoes to be sold.

The critics of the potato situation are many and loud. But are they fair?

After all, the Government has only been trying to do some good. Is that wrong?

History has made it quite plain for a few thousand years that government efforts to do good beyond its basic services have generally robbed the people and wrecked the country. But is that any sign? Are we not smarter than anybody ever has been before?

It's wonderful to do good. Especially with other people's money.

Dr. Lowdermilk To Advise Israel on Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading soil-conservation experts in the United States, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, has become a special adviser to the Israel Government to aid that country solve its soil-conservation problems. Dr. Lowdermilk has long been known as an ardent champion of a plan to establish a Jordan Valley Authority to develop the water and power resources of that region.

I believe many Members of this House will be interested in the two brief articles dealing with Dr. Lowdermilk and with his JVA plan, which were published in Israel Speaks, March 24, 1950. They are as follows:

DR. LOWDERMILK, WHO DRAFTED TVA FOR ISRAEL, TO BECOME GOVERNMENT ADVISER

TEL AVIV.—Eleven years ago, when Jewish hopes for Palestine had just received the staggering blow of the British white paper, closing most of the country to further Jewish colonization, the achievements and plans of the pioneers suddenly found an unexpected and powerful non-Jewish champion.

In that year, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, top American soil conservation expert, was making a survey of Palestine by air. As he flew over lands made barren by centuries of neglect, he was struck by the special opportunity presented by the extraordinary difference in altitude between the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea (1,300 feet below sea level) and the Mediterranean, only a few tens of miles away.

What followed was Dr. Lowdermilk's concept of a Jordan Valley Authority, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority of the United States in scope and function, which would provide both water and power for reclamation and enable Palestine to support a population of at least 5,000,000.

Dr. Lowdermilk's bold ideas—coupled with a warm-hearted description of the reclamation efforts already under way—were later described in his classic book, Palestine—Land of Promise. In turn it became an important weapon in the battle to persuade the world that the Jews should be given a fair opportunity in Palestine.

Toward the end of World War II, Dr. Lowdermilk was associated with a group of leading American authorities in the further development of the Jordan Valley Authority plan. Under the auspices of this group, another American engineer, James B. Hays (formerly project manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority) spent nearly a year carrying out detailed field surveys.

The result was the Hays scheme, blueprinting the full utilization of the country's water resources. This remains the basis of Israel's thinking on the over-all planning of its land and water resources.

After 11 years, Dr. Lowdermilk, accompanied by his wife, has come to this country again—this time as the guest of the government of a Jewish state which it would have seemed crazy to prophesy in 1939.

With a scientist's impatience at the way politics can snarl up progress, Dr. Lowdermilk told newsmen he deplored the lack of cooperation from the neighboring Arab States to make the full Jordan Valley Authority possible, and stressed the great benefits it would bring to them, as well as to Israel.

Certain phases of the Hays scheme can, however, be brought into operation even before peace is reached with our neighbors. Now that Dr. Lowdermilk has accepted the post of special adviser on soil conservation to the Israel Government, it may be expected that he will turn his attention to these when he comes to Israel again in October, to remain for a year.

But, apart from the tremendous value of his technical advice, Dr. Lowdermilk is doubly welcome in Israel—he makes us feel good because he believes in what we are trying to do.

DETAILS OF THE HAYS-LOWDERMILK PLAN

The Jordan Valley Authority, as envisioned by Dr. Lowdermilk and developed by Mr. Hays, would supply Palestine's two chief economic needs, water for irrigated agriculture and power for industrial development. It would divert the sweet waters of the upper Jordan and its tributaries into a network of irrigation canals and, in order to keep the Dead Sea at its present level, would introduce sea water from the Mediterranean by means of a canal originating near Haifa. As this sea water dropped into the Jordan depression, there would be almost 1,300 feet of effective fall for the development of hydroelectric power. The plan is based on a unified Palestine, and its complete execution is at present dependent on the settlement of several outstanding political questions.

A brief summary of the eight stages of the original Hays scheme is given below:

Stage 1 provides for developing underground water sources, resulting in the recovery of 618,000,000 cubic meters per year, of which 518,000,000 would be utilized to irrigate some 176,000 acres (1 cubic meter = 264.17 gallons). Its second aspect is construction of a power project, including a dam, on the Hasbani River in Lebanon. The latter aspect would require agreement with Lebanon.

Stage 2 proposes to channel the summer flow of the upper Jordan and its tributaries, together with spring waters in northern Galilee, into a gravity canal. These waters would be available for irrigation in the northeast and be released also in the Emek Jezreel.

Stage 3 would utilize the waters of the Yarmuk to prevent a lowering of the level of Lake Tiberias as a result of the diversion of upper Jordan waters projected in stage 2. A dam would be built to provide a new mouth at Lake Tiberias for the Yarmuk, which now enters the Jordan from the east about 12 miles below the lake. Half the river's annual flow would be allocated to Transjordan and would enable the irrigation of about 37,500 acres of good land on its side of the border.

Stage 4 calls for the dramatic step of replenishing the Dead Sea with salt water from the Mediterranean to make up for the diversion of the Jordan waters. A good deal of the territory the sea water canal would have to cross, including the sites of the two principal power plants, is now held by the Arabs. No other route is possible because of the mountains, which bisect Palestine except in the Emek region.

Stage 5 is a continuation of stage 2 and provides for the construction of a large storage reservoir at Sahl el Battauf, a wide flat valley north of Nazareth. It is proposed to recover and store here the winter flow of all streams, wadis, and springs of the upper Jordan.

Stage 6 calls for the long-proposed reclamation of Lake Huleh and its surrounding marshes.

Stage 7 concerns irrigation in the lower Jordan Valley, as far down as the Plain of Jericho. This territory is now in Arab hands.

Stage 8 contemplates the storage and recovery of winter waters from all the principal wadis draining into the Mediterranean. This supply would then be conveyed to the Negev and released for irrigation by means of the main canal running south through territory almost entirely within Israel's borders. In the neighborhood of Dorot a pumping plant would pick up the winter surplus flow of the canal and pump it into a large regulating reservoir. In summer, during peak demand, the pumping plant would pump water from the reservoir back into the canal.

Cost of the Jordan Valley Authority, as estimated by Dr. Lowdermilk and Mr. Hays, is approximately $250,000,000. It is believed it would take 10 years to build, and would be self-liquidating in a 50-year period—a standard considered quite satisfactory for American reclamation projects.

Essex County Training School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excellent article by Steve Walsh, who is very familiar with the workings of the Essex County Training School situation at Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. Walsh, due to his position with the attendance departments, Lynn public schools, in the city of Lynn, Mass., has over the years had much experience with the conduct of these institutions and the amount of constructive work accomplished by the superintendents, past and present.

Mr. Walsh knows whereof he speaks, and I offer this interesting article for the Members for their thought and consideration:

Most of you know the city of Lawrence as a woolen and worsted center. And we have

often taken a ride up to that locality to also know that tourists have commented on the nearby Bodwell's Falls and the flowing Merrimack. But for a long, long time the writer has linked this bustling community as being the place where the Essex County Training School stands. There are many reasons for my having such a keen interest in its welfare, and whenever I hear of the unusual happening up that way, it is quite natural that I lift what is known as an eyebrow. For anything good that comes to this school brings satisfaction because I know its worth.

EVEN SUCH IS TIME

One of the first things which the presiding judge of southern Essex did after his appointment to the bench was to take a trip to the afore-mentioned school. And the Honorable William J. Landergan had a purpose in his quest. And not having the temerity of thinking that I can speak for him, I do feel that I can openly praise him without restraint. That is because I liked what he did.

The records will show that Judge Landergan was the only man who has worn the black robe of justice in this district who found the time to pay a visit to the school that harbors certain boys and girls, teaches them the need of becoming proper members of society, and sends them back into the world with a far different understanding than what they had when they came to this 60-year-old institution.

It has been my privilege to be affiliated with the last three superintendents of the school and all of them made the position a public trust—the late Grant Fancher; former State Senator Robert J. Tetler, who was buried a month ago; and the present director, George A. Baker, who has been on the job for the last 2 years. And Mr. Baker was the man whom Judge Landergan had his talk with.

A careful analysis of the school will also interest any citizen because of the vast amount of good it performs. Here, then, could have been the scope of thought that passed between the two men; information which I have known for a long time, and feel is of vital importance for others to possess. For this is one answer to juvenile delinquency and a formidable one, if you will.

Such an Essex County program was created by an act of the State legislature and approved by the county commissioners in 1891, under the name of the Essex County Truant School. This name was changed in 1906 to that of the Essex County Training School, a better word being supplemented to avoid any form of stigma that might be in the way of a boy or girl as they advanced through life.

THAT TAKES IN TRUST

Teaching means the imparting of knowledge whereas training implies not merely the imparting of knowledge but also inspires to repeated action which results in the formation of habits, or making use of the knowledge acquired. Essex County Training School is thus in a community by itself, undistricted by city or town life, situated on a slope overlooking the Merrimack River.

The physical make-up of the school consists of some 50 acres of land upon which stand many fine buildings of modern construction; the most important of them being academic hall, containing classrooms, auditorium, gymnasium, and a swimming pool. Nearby is an administration hall, housing the office and the superintendent's quarters. Adjacent to this are the Bates and Wings halls.

In the last two are kitchens, dining rooms, laundry, tailor shop, recreation room, dentist office, library, instructor's quarters, locker and shower rooms, and three large dormitories where the students are segregated chronologically. Three classes of maladjusted children are assigned to the school—the habitual truant, the habitual absentee, and the habitual school offender.

Just why they come there can be traced to various reasons but their delinquencies are not an aggressive reaction but are really the opposite; consisting of flight from unpleasant situations rather than attacks upon them. Schools, to the delinquent, are a place where they come in contact with unsatisfactory, unsuccessful, unhappy and extremely frustrating situations.

School is the first organized society with which the pupil comes in contact and in which he does not have any part in formulating the rules governing the conduct of the group. Prescribed regulations are met which often are in conflict with his developed ways of behaving. If the student is not socialized properly by his teachers, he is on the road to becoming a delinquent.

There are four basic factors for living together—security, love, recognition, and a new activity which allows a proper outlet of the adventurous urge. Training school officials remember these four factors and see that they are placed at the disposal of each and every individual regardless of age. When one or a combination of these four factors are denied, delinquency has its birth.

OUR YOUTH, OUR JOYS

This school of training affords the cities and towns of Essex County a community of learning and cooperative living. Its program is designed to help students develop those appreciations, habits, and skills which are so necessary for satisfying and creative experience. Regular academic training, as prescribed by the State board of education is carried out to the letter.

This school of training emphasizes the adjustment of the course of study to the individual student. Recognizing that each student has his own individual needs, encouragement is made possible for him to go ahead in each subject as fast as he is able. A daily trade-training is another feature that is distinctive, and a valuable element is the experiment of preparing the child.

Each student receives 2 hours of trade training daily. This means that periodically they will be found gaining additional training in the woodworking shop, laundry, kitchen, dairy, poultry houses, piggery, greenhouse on the truck farm. Physical development, vocational significance habit-forming, and proper attitude are the benefits accrued from this program.

Instructors at this school are selected for their capabilities to fit into the atmosphere confronting them. They are expected to guide youngsters by responsive, flexible, adaptable means which entails a quiet, humorous, understandable manner than that of the threatening and domineering demand. Social and personal needs must always be considered and the ECTS staff carry these out to perfection.

Religious influence is constantly encouraged, and alertness is maintained to see that the trainee takes regular advantage of this perquisite. Thus Catholic students attend mass each Sunday and Holy Day of Obligation, go to confession and Holy Communion monthly as well as attending religious classes as prescribed by law. Protestant children attend their church on Sunday as well as the religious classes.

An important contribution to the social treatment of delinquent juveniles is the athletic program. This school conducts a modified interscholastic scheme that emphasizes the value of team play and also that of the individual. Ample facilities are provided for intramural sports—football, soccer, swimming, basketball, hockey, baseball, and track. Such activities provide pleasure in leisurable hours.

OUR ALL WE HAVE

When the youngsters are first brought to this training school they are given a thorough physical examination to determine their physical condition. From this finding can be determined what kind of treatment is needed to bring about a well-developed body, because no child can do good work of any kind unless he feels well. A study is made of his needs and these are provided as quickly as possible.

Physical ailments being corrected, a child with a good healthy body is ready for training and guidance. The future health of the student body is cared for by a staff of competent doctors who advise the means needed to control the undernourished body and physical ailments such as faulty teeth, eyes, ears, nose, tonsils, and adenoids. Then, too, the facilities of the Lawrence General Hospital are always available.

Despite the spiral prices for foodstuffs and commodities in these days, the feeding of the youngsters doesn't create an excessive cost. This is brought about because of the good husbandry that prevails at the ECTC—the raising and producing milk, eggs, butter, vegetables, pork, ham, bacon, and chickens; all of which with other edibles keep the cost of operation at a minimum.

Each city and town of Essex County pays their proportional share of maintaining this training school. This is based on the valuation of each city and town. Lynn with its valuation of $151,194,710 pays 21.05 percent of the costs. In addition to this, each city and town pays to Essex County the sum of $2 weekly toward the support of each youngster enrolled from their district.

This, therefore, is a thumbnail sketch of the Essex County Training School in Lawrence. It has been within my province to pay frequent visits to its environs on many occasions. No place of its kind that I know of has greater efficiency in its plant, or more humane understanding for the wants of the children therein. It is a model to look up to; it is a credit to Essex County in its entirety.

Youngsters who never got a chance in the beginning of life emerge from its portals ready and willing to meet life anew. Impressive records have been compiled of what they have performed since leaving the school on the banks of the Merrimack. Supt. George A. Baker is doing a well-planned and efficient job as its leader. Anyone who knows of what I say will gladly substantiate that statement. That is why I was very pleased to hear that Judge William J. Landergan took time out from his work to see for himself. For he is a valuable ally for the youngster of today and tomorrow, who only asks for a chance.

RINGING THE BELL

The Essex County Training School will conduct its annual graduation exercises in June just as it has for the last 60 years. It is always a memorable occasion because it shows just how effective the training school has been in producing adjusted future citizens. Statistics compiled over the years bear this statement out. Hundreds of youngsters have left Lawrence and have made their mark in the world. Over 70 percent who have returned to the society of which they were a part have made creditable names for themselves. Isolated cases verify this such as the Andover boy who went out to become a respected member of a large law firm in the State of Florida; a Lynn boy, who furthered his education in a large eastern college and now is a member of the faculty of a prominent preparatory school; a Haverhill boy who has been assigned to the United States Air Corps to deal with the secrets of atomic energy; another Lynn boy who braved the perils and the hardships of the South Pacific with the last expedition of Admiral Byrd. Such is the proud boast of the ECTS.

"Another War Means Wholesale Destruction," Says Senator Westberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on House Joint Resolution 64 someone said "No peace without law, no law without government."

Without stating the problem so cogently I believe I am correct in saying that this was the thought which led the State of Washington Legislature to adopt a memorial asking the Congress "to take all possible steps to strengthen the present form of the United Nations so that it shall possess the means and legal authority to preserve world peace."

Certainly it was with this general thought in mind that I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to urge action on House Joint Resolution 64 as a first step of many which this Nation should take to maintain its leadership in the striving for peace.

To the committee, I stated in part, as follows:

The world is groping for methods and institutions capable of preventing another war, a war that could easily leave this globe in shambles. Nations seek a moral leadership that offers the promise of a peaceful, plentiful future. The United States stands in a position to accept that challenge with a policy that far outshines the hollow promises of world communism.

In the past we have put our faith in military strength and defensive alliances. This alone can never be a panacea. For a new age we must develop new systems of social and political implementation. This is tragically evident in international affairs today.

It is in this spirit that we must take this big step forward and supply law and order where none have ever existed.

That the desire to do something constructive to aid future peace prospects is widespread is nowhere better illustrated than by the activity on the part of the young men and women of the United World Federalist organization in Seattle.

No one better exemplifies this spirit than the president of the Seattle UWF chapter, the Honorable Alfred J. Westberg. Mr. Westberg, a Republican, represents the thirty-seventh legislative district in the State senate.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include President Westberg's speech made at the First Baptist Church in Seattle March 12, in the RECORD:

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

Ladies and gentlemen, as a representative of the Seattle chapter of the United World Federalists, I want to preface my remarks on the subject of world government by a brief statement to you about the United World Federalists.

It is an organization, Nation-wide in scope, of about 40,000 members. In the State of Washington there are about 400 active members divided into chapters in the larger cities and members at large in smaller communities where chapters have not yet been organized. Nationally, the membership of the organization is widely representative of all groups of citizens of all political points of view and various ages, representing a fair cross-section of American citizenship. It is significant that a large proportion of the membership is made up of veterans of World War II. Cord Meyer, Jr., who was the first president of the national organization, and served as president until this year, is a veteran who suffered serious injuries during the war and was veteran adviser to Harold Stassen at the San Francisco conference where the Charter of the United Nations was drafted. Numbered among the national leaders of the organization are the chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co., of Ohio, leading bankers and educators, as well as numerous citizens who have been leaders in their communities and in national affairs. Leaders in church organizations are active in the United World Federalists, both nationally and locally. One of our most active members in Seattle is Mr. Stephen F. Chadwick, former national commander of the American Legion. The people who are active in the world federalist movement in the United States are patriotic Americans who are convinced that our country has a responsibility to the whole world to lead the way toward ultimate and permanent solution of the problems of international relations and that without the leadership and cooperation of the United States no movement toward that end can be successful.

Based upon the horrible experience of the last war, in which it was clearly demonstrated that armies and navies cannot defend their countries from attack but can only attack the enemy countries and that wars cannot result in anything greater than victory and destruction, we are convinced that there is not much time in which to act if we are to avoid future catastrophes. The rapid development of the atom bomb and the threat of the use of the new H-bomb have convinced us that, if another war comes about, it will result only in wholesale destruction of cities and civilian populations beyond the power of any army, navy, or air force to prevent, and can end only in a victory for that side which becomes paralyzed and exhausted last.

Likewise we are concerned with the state of our country's finances. The cost of paying for past and future wars is becoming an intolerable burden upon the economic structure not only of our country but of the world as a whole. Our country cannot long continue to assume the obligations to defend with military power and to support the agricultural and industrial requirements of the entire world. Every day that goes by our country goes further in debt and the dollars we have in the bank and in our pockets are worth less and less in food and clothing and the other things we want to buy. To continue on such a course leads us only and inevitably into the necessities of a rigidly planned and Government-controlled economy. This will mean that our wages, our prices, and every activity of our lives will be controlled to support the vast military establishment which must grow if we are to contain our enemies. In this way we will lose our freedom while doing our utmost to defend it.

To this grim prospect we see only one alternative, that is, the establishment of a world government with power to pass laws prohibiting the development and possession of the materials for war and with power to enforce its laws against individuals wherever they may be located. Such a world government would naturally possess some military force, otherwise its laws would be as unenforcible as our laws would here without a police force to arrest and without courts to punish individuals who violate them. However, if such a world government were established, its powers must be limited to the field of international relations. It should not have any right to decide the economic structure of our country, the rights and privileges and freedoms of our citizens, or those of any other country. The United States must recognize likewise that it will not have control of such a world government. If we seek a world government over which we have control we are seeking only an American empire. We have no greater right to impose our will upon the entire world than Russia has to impose her will upon the entire world. However, if all nations of the world, or even only those substantial military powers that now exist, agree to surrender their military power and to submit to the rules adopted by a world government, we could not fear any aggressor.

I am satisfied that the people of the world like the people of the United States want peace. However, I am also satisfied that the actions of our Government and the comments made in our Congress and before our congressional committees with reference to the manufacturing of atom bombs, the increases in the size of our Air Force, the bases being built all over the world, must look to any other country as the actions of an aggressive or warlike people. We also interpret the acts of the Russian Government, in constantly seeking to expand its sphere of influence and to bring within its control greater and greater areas, as imperialistic and aggressive. Until we offer to the Russians and to the rest of the world a proposal to abandon the frantic arms race in which we are now engaged and to submit with them to a world government in which we all participate, we cannot expect that they will be more anxious than we are to surrender their sovereignty or abandon their efforts as they see them to defend themselves from the threat of American imperialism. The Russian Government has not looked with favor upon the World Federalist movement within the United States and Pravda has publicly described the leadership of the United World Federalists as the fig leaf of American imperialism. So it seems that the two great contenders for world power, our country and Russia, are at this time caught in a dilemma which can lead only to one of two results. Either we and they will continue on the path toward total mobilization, grinding burdens for the support of military establishment, and loss of all individual freedom of action, or we will join in a movement toward government of the world by law and not by force with a machinery within the framework of the United Nations strong enough to prevent war and insure peace.

Naturally, we recognize that until a world government is set up which will protect us as well as all others from the aggressive acts of other nations or individuals we cannot surrender our program of self-defense. No World Federalist advocates the scrapping of our Army, Navy, or Air Force in advance of the creation of an effective structure of world government. No one nation can offer to enter into a world government except upon the condition that other nations will simultaneously do so. It is obvious that no world government will meet the purposes we have outlined unless it includes both the United States and Russia but we can set up the framework of a world government and announce our readiness to enter into it, reserving our right to defend ourselves from attack until all of our potential enemies, whoever they may be, likewise join the world government.

Proposals for world government have some substantial support in official circles in the United States. Over 100 Members of the House of Representatives and 20 Members of the Senate have endorsed resolutions which, if adopted, would direct that the purpose of American foreign policy will be toward the strengthening of the United Nations so that it may become a world government of limited powers with sufficient authority to prevent war and insure peace.

In six States the people themselves or their legislatures have called upon Congress

to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending our American Constitution so that this country may enter into a world government when such a world government is set up and when such a government meets with the approval of the Congress. In this State the local chapter of the United World Federalists is sponsoring an initiative for the purpose of having the people vote at next November's election on whether or not they would approve of the State of Washington likewise asking Congress to call such a convention. The approval of such a measure, of course, is only a very first preliminary step and does not commit the United States toward any particular form of world government or surrender one whit of our right to defend ourselves or to examine carefully the structure of any world government that is proposed and determine for ourselves whether we wish to join it. But such a movement, supported by the people of this country, could not help but have a healthy effect on the attitude of people all over the world. Likewise, it should strengthen the United Nations because we have in the recent past gone outside the structure of the United Nations in dealing with other powers.

It is our view that the United Nations deserves the active support of the United States and the use of the facilities that it now provides for the settlement of international problems. Only through use of the facilities that are given us will the possibilities of strengthening them and making them more secure be realized. I hope all of you will become fully familiar with the facts and the arguments with reference to proposals for world government. They offer to mankind the achievement of greater freedoms and unlimited benefits by permitting us to use our economic and industrial development for the benefit of our people rather than for the support of military organizations and to pay for the cost of destruction, loss of life and limb in warfare. Without that burden, there is no limit to the benefits which American enterprise, ingenuity, and resources can achieve, and they will be achieved on that basis for all of the people of our country.

The Real Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to include an editorial which appeared in the Chattanooga Times for Wednesday, April 12, 1950, entitled "The Real Tragedy."

I agree with this editorial that it is truly tragic that men in positions of high responsibility should accept the shrieking tantrums of a John T. Flynn—and may I add of the "copycat" sermon of the minister in Tennessee—as a substitute for thinking our way out of our problems.

The editorial follows:

THE REAL TRAGEDY

We were glad to reprint yesterday the article by Hodding Carter protesting against the widely distributed sermon by a Nashville minister. We shall not go into the points of the dispute again. Mr. Carter, we think, gave the sermon a more decent burial than it deserved.

But the tragedy of the present hysteria in which so much of the country has joined is that men and women from whom we have a right to expect sane and fair thinking have abdicated that role. It is tragic that men in positions of high responsibility should accept the shrieking tantrums of a John T. Flynn as a substitute for thinking our way out of the problems before us, and should believe they find salvation in the gospel according to "St." Flynn.

We have had propagandists of this kind before in this country. Some of the early political pamphleteers were their intellectual forebears. But in these days of mass communication and reprints by the millions, the machinery of propaganda is more ponderous in size, and more frightening. And we have reason to fear for reason itself when we look in the mail in the morning and discover that men who should know better are distributing the shoddy wares broadcast.

How can it be that straight-thinking Americans do not recognize the hysterical writing of such people for what it is? There is plenty to criticize in our Government and in our ways of life, and some solid arguments can be made against men and policies now to the fore. But one discards good American common sense in putting the case for pleading in the hands of men whose logic, whose respect for the truth and the simple rules of evidence qualify them for jobs only on such newspapers as Izvestia and Pravda, the organs of the Communist tribe.

It is tragic, again, that the wild stuff of Stalin and his kind should have led us to think that the way to combat the Communist menace is to produce stuff just as nauseating on the other side. Our democracy, our justified faith in freedom and free enterprise, in the sacredness and dignity of the humblest individual, call for the simple truth simply told.

It is not a bad idea, when someone asks you to defray the expense of sending out a reprint of the Nashville sermon, of a Flynn article, of a Senator MCCARTHY outburst, or something of the kind, to reread the Gettysburg Address. It is good mental medicine, one likely to cure mild cases of hysteria. Some cases, we know, are hopeless.

Four Billions Not Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 14, 1950:

FOUR BILLIONS NOT SAVED

If the present national administration desired to manage Government affairs economically and efficiently, the tools to do so are at its disposal. A nonpartisan commission, created by Congress in 1947 and headed by Herbert Hoover, studied Government organization, functions, and methods for 2 years and had come up with plans for reorganization which would have saved at least a billion dollars a year, while improving the quality of work that was done.

The Hoover Commission was no muckraking group seeking to make capital for a political party and gain publicity for ambitious politicians. Neither was it an undertaking of academicians without practical experience in the affairs of Government and business.

COMMISSION WELL QUALIFIED

Four members of the Hoover Commission were appointed by the President, two of whom were high-ranking officers in his administration and two from private life. Four members of the Commission were appointed by the Speaker of the House, two being able Congressmen, one from each party, and two from private life.

One of the latter was Mr. Hoover. The four members to round out the 12 were appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, who named two able Senators, one from each party, and two non-Government men.

The Commission was the best qualified group ever created to seek improvement in Government and reduce costs of administration. It went about the job with great intelligence and drive. Three hundred experts were employed and assigned to 24 committees, each dealing with a specific function, area, or group of problems.

The research reports were reviewed by the Commission and made the basis of comprehensive plans for eliminating duplication of work, cutting red tape, and revising administrative methods.

The Commission did not concern itself with the billions spent by the Government on activities which could well be eliminated. It found ways of saving $4,000,000,000 without eliminating any Government functions.

For the citizen who wants to inform himself about the economies the Hoover Commission pointed out, there is a little book entitled "A Hook in Leviathan," by Bradley D. Nash and Cornelius Lynde.

A wise and able President would have utilized the enthusiastic popular reception of the Hoover report to put it into effect in its entirety. But that is not what Mr. Truman did. What he saw in the Hoover plan was backing for petty moves of advantage to himself.

The Commission proposed that the salary of the President be increased from $75,000 to $100,000, and that, in addition, he be paid $50,000 a year of tax-exempt money. Mr. Hoover himself appeared before a congressional committee to approve this.

That had Mr. Truman's complete endorsement and a bill was rushed through Congress so that the President could get the extra money from the beginning of his second administration.

Mr. Truman also was happy to have the authority of the Hoover Commission back of a transfer of the public employment offices and the unemployment compensation machinery from the Social Security Board to the Department of Labor.

Congress had on three occasions vetoed his request for the transfer. This was a move dear to the heart of the President because he owed something to Secretary of Labor Tobin, who took the Secretaryship in 1948 when no one else would.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DELAYED

After dawdling a year and a half, while the Government went into the red five or six billion dollars, Mr. Truman on March 13 sent to Congress a batch of 21 plans for administrative changes. One of the plans called for abolishing the Office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, as proposed by the unions. This was not a part of the Hoover plan at all. It had never even been discussed by the Hoover Commission.

Other plans have been so long belated that opposition has been allowed to develop which may prevent their acceptance by Congress. Mr. Truman has used the Hoover report when possible to serve his personal and political ends and otherwise has reduced its effectiveness. Even at this late date he admits he has done nothing about half of the things suggested.

If anyone ever supposed that the Truman administration was interested in economy, a

look at a recent report of the Armed Services Committee of the House would correct the impression. It mentions:

"A budget request is pending for a new $18,000,000 veterans' hospital in the Los Angeles area, while the Navy is closing the 1,500-bed Long Beach Naval Hospital in the same area.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is being built in Philadelphia, while the Army is closing the 2,000-bed Valley Forge Hospital 20 miles away.

"The veterans' agency plans to build 1,000-bed hospitals in Boston and at Brockton, Mass., while the Army is closing Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

"The Veterans' Administration wants to build a 500-bed hospital in Atlanta, while the Army is closing Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is planned at Ann Arbor, Mich., while the Army is closing the 1,600-bed Jones Hospital at Battle Creek."

There won't be any Government economy until there is a different kind of a man in the White House.

Address by Secretary Chapman at United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the conference of the national Christian committee of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., last Sunday, April 16, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman delivered an important address which deserves wide attention. The full text of his address is as follows:

I consider it a privilege to come here this morning to lend all the support I can to the United Jewish Appeal, and to the work to be done under its auspices. The needs it must serve are urgent, and during 1950 they will be greater than ever before.

In this critical year of the world's mid-century, it is imperative for Jews and Christians alike that the democratic nations be strengthened in every way we can devise. We can assume that our citizens will give strong support to the appeal because of their admiration for the courageous efforts of the people of Israel and because of their almost traditional warm response to the needs of those who undergo hardship and suffering. There is something else at stake this time. We as American citizens are beginning to recognize that if our own country is to remain strong and secure in the ways of democracy, we must make sure that the light of democracy is not extinguished anywhere on the globe.

The new nation of Israel is a democracy that has sprung up in an area of the world where its fruits are badly needed. It was established by a relatively small group of determined and idealistic people, many of whom had endured untold suffering and misery in the mass persecution under Hitler, but who still possessed the courage to build a land of hope for themselves and their brothers in other parts of the world.

Their remarkable achievement has been an inspiration to all of those who are concerned with the progress of democracy. The establishment of Israel on the foundations of human liberty in the face of overwhelming odds is a welcome reassurance to mankind in its search for better understanding and lasting peace. Like our own forefathers the founders of Israel are striving to secure the fundamental principles of democracy that we and other nations enjoy.

Next Saturday we celebrate the second anniversary of Israel's declaration of independence. Within these 2 years, the accomplishments of this new nation have been much more fruitful than the world had anticipated.

Since the establishment of Israel, its 660,000 Jews have welcomed nearly 400,000 more, increasing the nation's population nearly 60 percent. I am told that, through the United Jewish Appeal and other sources, 250,000 immigrants were brought to Israel in 1949, that 80,000 were helped to emmigrate from Moslem lands, and that only 40,000 Jews remain in displaced-persons camps. I am advised also that over 31,000 housing units were completed in 1949, and that 174 new settlements have been established.

Many of you know more forcefully than I do that these things have meant a refuge for life itself to thousands of men, women, and children. They have meant for thousands more a breathing once again of the air of freedom. For untold numbers of children and youths the opportunities and aspirations possible in a free land are present for the first time in their lives. And for the people of this and other countries throughout the world, Israel is a symbol of a strengthening spirit and determination in man that refuse to bow to the forces of degradation and repression that press inward from so many sides today.

For this new nation's own security, for the very continuance of the lives of its people, for the growing strength of decency on earth, for the peace of the world—Israel must not be weakened in its determination to provide this kind of salvation for men. All of the people of our country must be told the story of Israel's work, and they must come to understand its meaning for America and for the world.

It is imperative that Israel succeed in this great crusade upon which it is embarked in the name of humanity. Its paramount concern for unlimited immigration, resulting in its record influx of refugees, has created situations in living and rehabilitation that must be met, and met soon.

The thousands of people still living in tents and shacks must be housed in decency and security. Sanitation must be provided. New settlements must be established, and newcomers must find work they are fitted to do. Israel has to build schools and hospitals. It has to reclaim much more of its land to produce food in sufficient quantity to nourish the people who keep on coming. I am told that, while Israel's citizens are engaged in this herculean task during 1950, a minimum of 150,000 additional immigrants must be accepted as permanent residents.

Israel will win this heroic struggle to establish a sound economy, just as it won the war for its freedom. Right now, in 1950, its people must have help as they wrestle with problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction on a scale never undertaken by a small nation. The progress Israel makes this year will be in a real sense the measure of Israel's own future. The effort must not be allowed to fail.

In addition to this vital work of human reconstruction in Israel, the United Jewish Appeal has before it other activites in rebuilding and readjusting the lives of victims of homelessness and persecution overseas. Aid must be provided for hundreds of thousands of Jews in European lands and for the adjustment of refugees who find a haven in the United States. The United Jewish Appeal offers to the people of America, Jew and Christian alike, opportunity to associate themselves with this humanitarian effort to bring the blessings of brotherhood and warm affection to those upon whom the tortures of war inflicted their greatest and most dreadful toll.

This is the great year of Israel's need, and it is also the year during which millions of the world's people will choose some way of life which they believe can promise them security for the future. The democratic system of government is undergoing the severest test in its history, and men and women in far-flung areas of the earth's surface are looking for leadership that will guide them from the darkness of fear into the light of peace.

We have long ago determined that the democracies of Europe shall not be undermined. America cannot afford to let the democracy of Israel disappear from the world. Regardless of religious affiliation, we remember vividly, as one people, the death and suffering visited upon Jews under the brutal lashings of the dictators. We remember that we promised ourselves to erase such things from the world forever.

The people of Israel ask help, not for themselves, but for others. This means that contributions to the United Jewish appeal declares to the world that the people of the United States have not forgotten, and that they do not intend to forget.

Our contribution will also mean that the United States stands behind the efforts of people everywhere to establish and strengthen the democratic way of life, and that the aid given to the democracies by our Government is strongly supported by the people themselves.

I am glad to represent the Department of the Interior at a meeting like this, for the work of reclaiming natural resources with which we are charged stirs our close sympathy with the Israelis as they move forward to reclaim their land. We know the importance of watering the desert that it may bloom like the rose, and we have learned how living can achieve serenity and peace when life-giving waters bring arid land into fruitfulness.

As a citizen of the most-favored nation on earth, I know, too, what the air of freedom and the climate of peace and abundance can give to men who share them. Israel's people have a homeland which holds a deep promise for the future. And as they grow in security and abundance, that homeland will become a lasting beacon of democracy that shines throughout the world.

Whatever the citizens of America contribute today to build the strength and hope of Israel will be yielded back to them many times over, for Israel will remain on the side of humanity in its battle for a lasting peace.

Address of Dr. George W. Cox Before United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech delivered by Dr. George W. Cox, State health officer of Texas, before a meeting of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association in Chihuahua, Mexico. Dr. Cox is president of this very worth-while association which was organized for the purpose of promoting health and sani-

tation along both sides of the border from Brownsville, Tex., to San Diego, Calif.

Members of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association, my good friends of both Mexico and the United States, ladies and gentlemen, the time has arrived when we find ourselves again assembled in this, the eighth annual convention of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association. For me, this is indeed a happy and honorable occasion, and I acknowledge with humility the privilege of serving as your president for the past year. While I would like to personally thank each of you individually for your splendid cooperation, I hope you will accept instead my simple expression of gratitude at this time.

Meeting in this beautiful city of Chihuahua and observing its physical charm, its culture, tradition, and national life, brings back to me treasured memories of years gone by—and my active medical practice along the border when my friends and patrons were equally divided by the Rio Grande. I recall those years with pride and satisfaction—and without a single regret. Those were years of personal service to mankind, and to humanity, on the basis of mutual understanding. In the field of service in which I am now engaged, I regret to say I have discovered that the greatest single obstacle we face is the difficulty in establishing mutual understanding. In order to surmount this obstacle, we must realize first, that man fears those things he does not understand.

A meager knowledge of the people in other lands has frequently been to our disadvantage; however, I am fully conviced that when adequate ways and means are provided for people to assemble and discuss with one another their different problems, they will achieve understanding in the end—and finally realize that our objectives are all the same. That is the purpose of this association; and these meetings should teach us to understand other people better, so that we may view their shortcomings with charity, their virtues with appreciation, and their kindness to us with gratitude. Peace and understanding in our time, and for all time, must be brought through a greater measure of international understanding.

My friends of the business world tell me that every well-managed business compiles an inventory at regular intervals. Over a period of many years, this custom has proved to be helpful in determining the existence of obsolete stock and the need for its replacement. An orderly establishment of these facts allows us to develop plans for the future upon a sound basis, and while I know that in both our professional lives and in business not all our goals are achieved, we at least are able to direct our efforts in an orderly manner toward the objectives we set for ourselves. Public health, while primarily a profession, is nonetheless a business too, and it would perhaps be well for us, as members of this profession, to pause, and, like good businessmen, also take inventory to determine if we are keeping pace with modern trends.

At this time I am conscious, as you are, that we are at the beginning of a new half century—a new year—a year of great promise, but also of grave significance. Great events seldom develop in a single year; they cast their shadows before, and the world lives in the aftermath. Events that will change and direct our future are constantly developing, and are about us today. No doubt the quiet day-by-day living of the early part of this century is gone forever.

The first change we notice is in the map of the world. It is different to the extent that geographical boundary lines have passed on into history, and we cannot help but realize at the same time that great empires which have existed for centuries have substantially relinquished colonial possession and authority. Millions of people have moved from one place to another, all of which is vastly significant.

The next noticeable sphere of change is in the field of science—with its new discoveries and inventions. They have arrived rapidly, and the interval of time between discovery and production, to actual use, is incredibly short. Science, in just the last few years, has produced radar, electronics, atomic energy, new metals, chemicals, wonder drugs—and we are advised that more discoveries will be presented in the immediate future. In medicine, our doctors feel they are very near the answer to disease that has ravaged mankind since history began.

The next change that appears imminent, and may actually be in evidence, is the philosophy that would change and control our ideas and beliefs about people, about governments, about life. In a world that feels the tragic potentials of atomic implications, mankind undoubtedly faces a critical and urgent choice, whether or not we on this planet should learn to live together or cease to exist. There is one way to live together, and that is according to the Golden Rule, which means doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. Unfortunately, there are some nations not willing to abide by this rule in their international obligations. The fundamental question of our time is whether or not our system of living will be forcefully superseded by some order that we do not want. There is only one practical answer to this problem, and that is found in the very preamble or formula of self-preservation. Our formula for self-preservation can best be established by maintaining and improving good health; by being strong in our industry; strong in our finances; strong in our purpose. Now you ask, What is purpose? Whereupon we must define and accept the definition for the word. The word "purpose" is all-inclusive of the policies we adopt and the procedures we follow; our public relations, our international relations, which are essentially and in substance the expression of faith and confidence and the will to do by agreement.

This organization has gone far beyond treaty and agreement. This organization has set an international precedent for professional-scientific cooperation, understanding, friendship, good will, faith, and confidence—all of which can be nothing less than the common denominator in the affairs of public health. I am glad to express my highest regard for my friends in Mexico who are members of this organization for their sincerity of purpose; for their accomplishments; for their high quality of attainment in the medical and scientific world.

This is the kind of goal that can be achieved, only if we place our emphasis on the human element instead of concentrating on the economic and political factors of life. While this organization developed its original plan and objective on a rather local, restricted basis, intending to give attention and concern especially to those public health problems that arose on either side of the Rio Grande, I am confident that a great deal more progress has been made than we are able to enumerate or point out as visible physical accomplishments.

My own efforts in this joint program have not gone as far as I would have liked, I must admit; however, I can assure my friends in this organization that as time and circumstances permit, we will do our part. Latent and active factors have developed as a result of this public health organization that we must not forget, and in the course of time I am sure we will appreciate them more. To know one another, and to know the problems and difficulties of each other on a personal basis, can only accurately determine the human equation that establishes mutual friendship.

In this connection I cannot fail to mention a generous offer of assistance from Dr. Rafael P. Gamboa, secretary of the Mexican Department of Health and Sanitation, when he proposed to me the services of his personnel to help complete a vaccination program during a smallpox epidemic in three southern counties of Texas. I wish to acknowledge in grateful appreciation this fine expression of cooperation on the part of Dr. Gamboa and his epidemiologist, Dr. Calderon. Their efforts as well as those of the health officers of Tamulipas and Reynosa and other cities are largely responsible for the control of this disease on the Mexican side of the border.

Compliments are due officials at Nuevo Laredo for their public health program. I am aware that this good-neighbor city has a first-class water-treatment plant, modern swimming pool, a new market, and modern schools. It is reassuring to know of the continued typhus-control program and the fine mutual interest manifested by joint attendance at the Laredo Insect Control School. The joint monthly waterworks meetings, carried on bilingually, should be a source of pride to both Mexico and the United States. The interchange of morbidity reports continues to prove helpful.

The fine building at Juarez stands as a monument to an expanded health program, and it has given impetus to general public health service in that area. It is gratifying to observe the close cooperation at El Paso between the two health departments, evidenced by the interchange of laboratory service, in-service training, and inspection facilities.

It should be pleasing to note that public opinion in the Matamoros area is beginning to swing strongly toward the desire for mosquito-control activity. Here, as in Laredo, morbidity reports are exchanged on a weekly basis.

The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, now directed by Dr. Soper, is rendering a vital service, with the limited resources that it has available, in putting public health on a firm basis. The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau has been recognized as an integral part of the World Health Organization, which, as you know, is laying the foundation now for solid philosophy with principles designed by and for all mankind.

I especially wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the work that was initiated by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs—work of a most practical nature. The record reveals the fact that the Institute of Inter-American Affairs has about 600 projects, on a cooperative basis in 10 American Republics under its general jurisdiction, in which general sanitation and other programs are given consideration. Our National Congress unanimously approved the work of the institute and made a moderate appropriation to assist in the continuation of this program for the next 5 years. Doubtless this program is contributing much in public-health improvement.

Likewise it is interesting to review overall progress that has been made these last 7 years along the border. In the field of sanitation we find a number of improvements have been made to the border water supplies. Operators of water plants have been trained and surveys of railroad-coach waters and tourist-court waters have been completed. Several sewage-treatment plants have been constructed, and in other instances waste has been removed from the common boundary stream and used advantageously for crop production. Ratproofing, as well as typhus-control programs have been initiated in several boundary communities, while malaria control has been stimulated in several other communities. Food sanitation has received more attention in a number of localities. Model market houses and slaughtering establishments have been constructed.

Venereal-disease control has received major emphasis in almost every community on both sides of the border. It is my understanding that other speakers at our meeting here will review the progress made in the control of these diseases and make some pertinent observations. Considerable educational material was distributed relative to tuberculosis control. We were successful in making X-ray chest examinations of all the counties along the Texas border; and our State has seen fit to locate a tuberculosis sanatorium in Hidalgo County. The health officers from the other States will, undoubtedly, report on the activities in their States on tuberculosis control.

Incidentally, in my opinion, probably the finest thing that has come out of this organization is the fine fellowship that is created. Public health speaks but one language—public health is the foundation on which to erect the pillars of good government. It appeals to all creeds, and it is free of all "isms." It appeals to all strata of society, and offers great reward by paying dividends in the way of prosperity, well-being, and contentment.

Although we have made a creditable showing by first approaching our major public-health problems along the border, there is still much left undone, especially in the environmental sanitation field. We should here rededicate our efforts to enlarge our activities in the fields mentioned and eventually increase the scope of our horizon. I feel very much encouraged when statesmen of the caliber of Gov. Fernado Noglio Miramontes, and other administrative officials of Mexico, come to a meeting of this nature, give their time, and indicate such sincere interest in this growing humanitarian service.

The attendance at this conference which includes a great number of the outstanding leaders in the fields of government and public health is an inspiration to me, and the quality of the program as well as the multitude of details related to the success of our annual meeting is a tribute to the organizational ability and patience of our secretary, Dr. M. F. Haralson. We all realize that Dr. Haralson has expended great effort in helping to make this our eighth annual meeting such a wonderful success, and I wish at this time to extend my personal thanks and the gratitude of the entire membership for his competent and faithful service.

I wish also to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the city officials of Chihuahua, to the various committees and individuals, who have contributed so generously of their time and interest toward making this annual conference such an outstanding success.

The Rio Grande—the border—with its rich historical background, its beautiful natural environment, its romantic heritage, will undoubtedly attract many more visitors in the future. We can see that this border lends itself to the development of a health resort, a playground and recreational center; and furthermore, we, through our association, can set the pattern for other nations to live in peace, and enjoy the fullness of life together. We have touched off the spark, which I hope will kindle the imagination of other nations to eventually build a world nation without discord in the harmonious program in which we have thus far been successful.

This, then, is my inventory of conditions as they exist today. There is room for vast improvement in partically every phase of an international public health program, which is too great for any single nation, state, agency, or individual; it demands the concerted effort of everyone.

United in our thinking, united in purpose, and united in our efforts, may we all as members of the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association face this midpoint of the twentieth century with a spirit of mutual understanding, and rededicate ourselves to a concept of service through public health to a world where all mankind can live, work, and walk with the dignity of a civilized being in full, physical, mental, and moral health.

Thank you.

The Lattimore Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, reveals the general opinion of everybody who I talked to when I was home during the Easter recess. Republicans also feel that National Republican Chairman Gabrielson and other leaders made a mistake in approving the McCarthy fiasco:

SENATOR MCCARTHY FALLS FLAT ON HIS FACE OVER CHARGES

Senator MCCARTHY'S probe of the State Department and particularly his charge that Owen Lattimore is a Communist and a spy fell on its face because MCCARTHY was relying on rumor rather than fact. It is true that Lattimore has been regarded as a radical by some but there is nothing in his record or his writings to prove he is or was a Communist.

The Post-Tribune has published many of Lattimore's writings and not a Communist tinge has appeared in any of them. With some of his viewpoints we have not agreed but that he is an authority on the Orient we have no doubt. MCCARTHY took a chance of making political hay out of the Communist issue. And despite his failure he may have succeeded.

The reason for this curious possibility lies in the mistakes of the State Department and the growing antagonism in America to communism. MCCARTHY voiced some of the rumors that have been rampant and so may be regarded as a fighter against this foreign "ism" despite his failure to make good his charges.

The popularity of his attack is based in the knowledge that at one time the State Department was infested with Communist ideas and with sex perverts and Americans look upon the record with wonder and disgust. How, they ask, could men of the caliber of Acheson and the other higher-ups in the Department countenance such goings-on?

And if he did countenance such a situation has he changed enough so that Americans may have full confidence in his present position? If it is true he led the Russian contingent in the Department how is it possible to have confidence in his judgment now? Had MCCARTHY put his emphasis on the known record he might have made more of an impression on thinking Americans.

However, MCCARTHY preferred to rest his case on the sensational charge that a Russian Communist spy was determining State Department policy. This was absurd. Whatever the State Department has done in the past there can be no doubt about the forthwith policy Acheson recently announced. Precisely what he means by total diplomacy is not clear but that it indicates a change from a defensive to an offsenve policy is certain.

Unquestionably Acheson has made serious mistakes in relation to Russia but he has unquestionably turned completely around and is now intent on stopping further aggression. He is an able man and capable of developing and carrying on an effective attack against our enemies. Therefore, despite his somewhat soiled record we prefer to let him alone rather than risk another Truman appointment.

Don't Disturb Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, evidence is accumulating that obstacles are going to be put in the way of adoption of some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission by reason of an outpouring of letters from constituents who assure us that while they believe in economy they are constrained to oppose certain of the plans. In most of these cases it is not difficult to deduce that those who are doing the objecting have a personal interest either direct or indirect. Pertinent to this subject is the following editorial from a recent issue of the Medford (Mass.) Mercury:

"DON'T DISTURB US"

When the Hoover Report was submitted to Congress Herbert Hoover warned the American people that unless the people themselves demanded action on Federal reorganization the report would just gather dust on some forgotten shelf.

He also warned of the danger of the report being killed by the "grasshopper bites" of those who say "reorganization is fine for everybody else but don't disturb my agency."

Almost every proposal made by the Commission steps on the toes of some special-interest group.

If the Commission's proposals were to be adjusted to take care of all special cases, nothing would be left of the Hoover reorganization program.

Perhaps no group or individual can find himself completely in agreement with every recommendation made by the Hoover Commission. Within the Commission itself, there was disagreement in many areas.

Most individuals, however, find themselves substantially in agreement with all save a very few proposals.

Lately, however, serious misconceptions about some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations have arisen in the field of veterans' affairs.

To leave these uncorrected would be unfair to the Hoover Commission. Incidentally it would be unfair to the taxpayers, including millions of ex-service men and women. It would be equally unfair to veterans' organizations which have often called for better and more economical management of government.

Before we go so far as to say that the Hoover report would dismember or do away with the Veterans' Administration let's read the actual recommendations.

At no place in the Commission's report can be found any recommendations for either the increase or curtailment of medical benefits or other services, to veterans. The Commission stated that such policy decisions were outside its terms of reference

and should be the subject of congressional determination.

The Commission's recommendations covered only the better management of existing programs.

It would seem logical and sensible to wait until specific legislation affecting veterans is introduced before allowing emotional thinking to warp our view of the Hoover blueprint for a more economical management of our Government's business affairs.

It is terribly important that we achieve as much as possible of the program for which most Americans have waited so long.

Lobbying Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately about the investigation of lobbying. Every legislative body ought to check this matter carefully at regular intervals. One of the greatest and most dangerous lobbying groups exists within the Government agencies—the "Federal lobby." The trend toward too much government and too much centralization of that government has grown alarmingly. The great urge of bureaucracy is to expand, and the agencies have thousands of tax-supported public-relations agents to drum up the false need for more and bigger agencies.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Buchanan committee will not consider its work completed until it has thoroughly investigated the tactics used by Government agencies to propagandize their own programs. The Harness subcommittee of the Eightieth Congress made a notable contribution on that score. Much remains to be done.

Apropos of this need, I submit a forceful editorial which appeared recently in the Wisconsin State Journal, a fine objective newspaper published in Wisconsin's capital city:

THOSE WHO WILL NOT BE TOUCHED

There is one area of lobbying that really would bear some investigation, and subsequent regulation.

But there will be little investigation in this direction, and no strict regulation.

We refer here to the pressure tactics and propagandizing by Government agencies in behalf of their own programs.

According to Congressman JOHN VORYS, of Ohio, our Federal publicity and public relations activities now cost taxpayers more than $100,000,000 a year.

This tax-supported lobby works unceasingly for Federal housing, Federal power, socialized medicine, more valley authorities, and more Federal control of everything.

There are more than 3,500 Federal employees—who cost taxpayers more than a million dollars a month—engaged in selling and lobbying for and stirring up support for the programs wanted—not by the people—but by department heads and Mr. Truman. The Department of Agriculture now has 525 information specialists boosting the Brannan plan, Congressman VORYS points out. Five different agencies are lobbying and publicizing Federal housing, while over the past 10 years the Federal Security Agencies' bureaus have spent more than $20,000,000 in a campaign for socialized medicine.

Congressman VORYS points out one great danger in this tax-supported Federal lobby:

"Whether the immediate purpose of Government propaganda is good or bad, the fact remains that individual liberty and free institutions cannot long survive when the vast power of government may be marshaled against the people to perpetuate a given policy or a particular group of officeholders."

Some of these tax-paid lobbyists work directly—even arrogantly—upon our Congressmen and Senators. Others work indirectly, stirring up the demand for more and more Government services out in the provinces.

Now here, in our opinion, is a lobby that should be investigated—thoroughly and completely.

Here are lobbyists who constitute an immediate threat to the taxpayer—to his freedom, his way of life, and his pocketbook.

And the not-so-funny part of it is that the taxpayer, unwillingly and unknowingly, is financing the very menace from which he now has no protection.

Will Congress do anything about this tax-supported Federal lobby?

We'll bet against it, for a very good reason:

The tax-supported lobbyists now are beating their brains out, working in behalf of and stirring up a demand for Dr. Truman's political patent medicines.

Indian Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that several bills designed to bring equality and justice to America's Indian citizens are soon to come before the Congress, I am placing this editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune in the RECORD in the hope it will aid House Members in becoming better informed on some of these issues and problems.

The editorial follows:

STATUS OF THE INDIANS

Last week's prediction from Representative TOBY MORRIS, of the Sixth Oklahoma District, that the House of Representatives, at least, will approve claims of members of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians against the Government for more than $10,000,000 sent reporters digging into Indian statistics. One of them Sunday came up with an estimate that the claims our red brothers have on file in Washington total more than half a billion dollars. All are based on treaties, guardianships, and the other trappings of dealings between separate peoples.

This must puzzle many people who remember that in 1924 Congress conferred citizenship on all United States Indians. The act was half in earnest and half out of the emotion that arose from the action of so many tribesmen in volunteering for service in World War I. They were not liable under the draft, but they went to training camp by the battalions and fought with conspicuous bravery in Europe.

The courts attached strings to the congressional enactment almost immediately, holding that citizenship is not incompatible with either tribal existence or continued guardianship. Pulling these strings, the Indian Bureau seems to have been able to tighten its grip on Indian affairs. It is a notable, and most Indians say, a tragic fact that in the last 17 years, or since it was proposed by the Bureau in 1937 that 29 tribes would be released from Federal supervision over a 10-year period, fewer Indians have escaped from the Bureau into full citizenship than had done so during any period of like length in the past 100 years.

How is the Bureau able to survive all these promises and years and get huge biennial appropriations to keep large staffs in the field and an army of white chiefs and helpers in Washington? Probably by never actually settling its disputes with the tribes, or pushing the Indian Claims Commission to do so. The same desire to hold onto jobs with the Commission undoubtedly impels workers there to take their time about winding up any case.

Should the $10,000,000 appropriation for the Five Civilized Tribes clear both Houses of Congress and be approved by the President, a new push to clear the docket of claims might follow. Senator HUGH BUTLER, of Nebraska, found considerable favor Nation-wide when he said a few years ago:

"The Government of the United States should determine definitely what its debt to the Indians amounts to—individually and collectively—pay such debts and allow them to take their places in the communities of this Nation on an even basis with other citizens—they have been on probation long enough."

Don Eddy, for the American Magazine, made a 9,000-mile tour to ask the Indians what they thought about the situation. He came up with the conclusion that restitution for past wrongs is not so important to present-day Indians as the right to be treated as equal citizens.

Thoughtful Oklahomans will agree with Senator BUTLER. Since it is proposed to cut all special ties between the Indian and the Federal Government finally, and transfer the Indian to the jurisdiction of State and local governments. Oklahoma will want them to come in as well prepared financially to hold up their ends as is possible and just.

More than a third of all American Indians live in this State, by order of Uncle Sam. As with any other large segment of our population some are well-to-do and some are necessarily objects of charity. If any of the latter are due sums from the Government, Oklahomans will want them to colect and be self-supporting at the time of terminating Federal wardships.

Address by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on the occasion of the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action, held here in Washington on April 1, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt delivered a fine and thoughtful address, stressing the truth

that we must have the courage of our convictions and the freedom to express them, if our democracy is to survive. As always, Mrs. Roosevelt spoke from the depths of her great wisdom and her profound belief in our way of life. I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Roosevelt's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it's a very inspiring thing these days to come to a meeting such as this and find so many people coming together to discuss and make plans for an organization devoted to obtaining in our country as good a government as we can have. This organization is made up of both Democrats and Republicans.

I was amused the other night to have a young boy at a meeting where we were discussing good government say, "Mrs. Roosevelt, you've talked about the liberals, but if you really have conservative convictions, what should you do?" I think the thing that makes one happy about ADA is that it really has convictions. And the people who belong, belong because they want to find a way to put those convictions to work. They recognize—everyone in this room at this meeting knows—that our democracy is not perfect. But they also know that it's working to improve democracy. That is the important thing. Those who are satisfied—those who feel that there is nothing they can do—they are the people who will do harm to the Government and the citizenship in the United States.

We live in a time when every single one of us must realize that what actually is important in a democracy is that sense of individual responsibility. And there are certain things here in our country that I think we must watch very carefully. It is true, as has been said, that there is a sense of insecurity—I might almost say a sense of fear—among many people in this country of ours. With some people it's a fear of the possibility of war; with others it's a fear of what the new weapons of war may mean if we should come to war; with others it's a fear of what may happen to them personally if by chance they offend in any way. That is the fear that bothers me most—the fear of people who are afraid to be themselves, to hold convictions, to stand up for them—because that fear, I think, is the fear which can really hurt our democracy more than any other.

This is a time when it takes courage to live. It takes the kind of courage that it took in the earliest days of our history. I'm quite sure that George Washington and his men must have had moments when they wondered how on earth the United States was ever going to exist. And I'm sure that there have been other times in our history which have looked black indeed to the citizens of the country and its leaders. But at present we need all the courage that our forefathers had and perhaps a little more, because we have a job to do at home and a job to do in the world.

The job at home has to be done, and has to be done first. We have to be unafraid. And we have to realize that here is where we as individuals have to fulfill our belief in democracy. If we cannot prove here that we believe in freedom, in the ability of people to govern themselves, if we cannot have confidence in each other, if we cannot feel that fundamentally we are all trying to retain the best in our democracy and improve it, if we cannot find some basic unity even in peace, then we are never going to be able to lead the world. This is the problem that is before us today. If we do not lead the world, who is going to lead it? We have to accept the fact that it's what we do here that makes us fit to lead the world. So every day in our daily lives as citizens we are building our world leadership.

Our great struggle today is to prove to the world that democracy has more to offer than communism. You can't just say that anyone who understands communism must be against it. You have to face the fact that this is a struggle, and a very great struggle. If we want to win the cold war, if we want to reach a greater security—I think it's going to take us a long time, and I think we have to develop a courage and a stanchness that perhaps we have never had. If we want to achieve it, then we must prove to the world what we can offer. That means we have to take certain definite steps. We have, for instance, to make sure that we have civil rights in this country. There was time when we could look on that question as a purely domestic one—that we could take all the time we wanted to educate ourselves to solve the problem. It isn't any longer a domestic question—it's an international question. It is perhaps the question which may decide whether democracy or communism wins out in the world.

I sit in the United Nations; have sat in the General Assembly since 1946, and I sit in the Human Rights Commission. Over and over again the failures of democracy are pointed out to me in terms of specific instances of things that have happened in our country. I don't try to say they didn't happen, because usually I know that they did. All I can say is that we know about them, and those of us who really care, work to improve our democracy. Therefore, we must actually look at ourselves with more critical eyes than we have in the past.

Where do we fail, and how hard do we try to live up to the things we've given lip service to? It's not a domestic question; it's a question that perhaps is one of the most important factors in the winning of the struggle. Of course, economic questions enter into this struggle, too. We cannot be complacent about unemployment in our country—about injustices. Not long ago I remember hearing in a certain city that the papers actually printed what certain rather well-paid officials would have as pensions in an industry, and yet when it came to the point of pensions to the workers, that was too heavy a burden for the industry. Well now, I'm not a Socialist. I'm a very practical capitalist, I'm sure. But if we want to keep capitalism, we in this country have got to learn that there must be a real sharing, a real understanding, between management and labor. They must plan together because their interests are really identical. But both sides must realize it.

Now, the answer to unemployment, I didn't get an answer when I asked some of our Democratic Senators the other day, "What is the answer to unemployment?" I doubt if many people know. I think it's one of the things that perhaps we need to experiment, and perhaps it may be tied up, too, with some of our decisions in the realm of foreign affairs. Perhaps backing the United Nations with our own four-point program, seeing what can be done through them, to work with other nations in the world, that may have some tie with unemployment. There may be other things that I know nothing about, but I never like to feel that we don't face problems and that we don't set people to work on finding the answers. There's no reason why we shouldn't say we don't know the answer now; there's every reason why we shouldn't say we're not trying to find out. It is essential, I think, to our winning this struggle that we actually find answers, because in this economic area communism has a program. And democracy has to have a better one. If it doesn't, we're being judged before the bar of the world, and we have to win. We have to win because we have a conviction that democracy does offer people something that no other form of government and no other way of life can offer.

There's one thing that always strikes me, and that is that the Communist representatives in the United Nations never talk about liberty; they never mention it. On one occasion when Mr. Vishinsky was forced to do so, he said that was a foolish thing to talk about because no one could have liberty. Well, you and I know quite well that everyone's liberty is conditioned by the rights of other people. But we must think about liberty, because that is really one of the basic reasons why we prefer democracy to communism. And somehow we must keep ourselves free from fear and suspicion of each other. I sit with people who are representatives of Communist countries, and to sit with them is a lesson in what fear can do. Fear can take away from you all the courage to be an individual. You become a mouthpiece for the ideas which you have been told you must give forth. I have no feeling of real antagonism toward these representatives because, poor things, they can do no other. They must do that; their lives depend on it.

Now, it seems to me that the ADA is an organization that has thinking people in it, and we must preserve the right to think and to differ in the United States. We must be able to disagree with people, and to consider new ideas, and not to be afraid. The day that I am afraid to sit down in a room with people that I do not know because perhaps 5 years from now, someone will say, "You sat in the room and five people were Communists, and so you are a Communist," that day will be a bad day for democracy. We must be sure enough of ourselves, of our own convictions, to sit down with anyone and not be afraid of listening to what they have to say, and not be afraid to contamination by association. It's true that the company you keep may say something about what you are. But to be able to meet with people and argue your own point of view, and to meet with people whom you do not have screened beforehand to be sure they are safe to meet with—that must be a part of the freedom of every citizen in the United States.

So I'm grateful that ADA prods us to think, that it has an opportunity to bring before us the ideas that seem important, that it also has the opportunity of backing people in elections who promise to be good public servants. I'm grateful that it is representative of people in both political parties, and I'm grateful for the numbers that have come today. I think it shows that we as a Nation are waking up to the need to preserve our basic ideals in our Republic, that we are taking up to the fact that we have to live those ideals, and that we have to improve our democracy by the way we live. To do that we must come together, and consult together, and get other people to help us where we need help. There must be no one who fights the battle of good government, of freedom of thought, of real democracy, with a sense of doing it alone. That is the value of ADA—you do not have to be alone.

I was speaking to a little group of college students the other day who had started an organization where they tried to live the ideals of democracy, and one of them said to me, "I graduate this year. What do I do when I go home?" And I said, "You find people who feel as you do." He said, "I don't know any, where I live." Now, that shouldn't happen to any young person, because they should be sure that if they were really trying to live their convictions they would find support in their community. That's why I stress that it is in our own communities that we must fight this struggle, not only the struggle against communism but the struggle for peace.

We will have on a world-wide scale, a human rights convention, probably before the General Assembly next autumn at the United Nations, and then before our Senate, a ratification. That's part of our struggle. If we don't ratify, who else will ratify in the world? And yet human rights are basic to establishing peace. A common understanding throughout the world of human rights—of the value of human personality and freedom—that understanding, spread throughout the world, is one of the cornerstones on which we must build for peace.

Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me protesting the order of the Postmaster General curtailing mail deliveries and making other changes in the postal rules.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO WITHDRAW OUTRAGEOUS POSTAL-SERVICE CUTS

I urge my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives to take immediate action and request a withdrawal of the outrageous order just issued by the Postmaster General curtailing mail deliveries to residential sections and making other changes in postal rules.

I believe that there is a deep suspicion among the American people that this drastic Postmaster General edict has been timed with Congress' review of the 1951 fiscal year budget—as a means of putting pressure on the Congress. Fifty million tired taxpayers have been hit in the mail box by this ruling, and I, for one, think it is disgusting because, from reports which I have received from my people, there is need for more mail service rather than less mail service.

I think it is outrageous to make wholesale changes in postal rules and regulations before the Congress has acted on the Hoover Commission reports dealing with the reorganization of the Post Office Department. While there are some controversial elements in those reports, I believe that we can effect considerable savings through them, and that in particular, the budget and accounting system of the Post Office Department which is so hopelessly obsolete that it must be revised. In addition, there are many items in the Post Office budget (which contribute to the present size of the deficit) which should be removed from that budget, and thus the deficit will shrink. Over 2 years ago, I suggested that Congress take out the air-mail subsidy and the Government and congressional free-mail subsidy from the Post Office Department budget, because those should be allocated to the budgets of the respective agencies and to the Congress rather than to the Post Office Department.

It is absurd that the same administration which has just soaked and socked the American taxpayer with:

1. A $1,250,000,000 rat-hole appropriation for a few land owners in Arizona (a bill which has passed the Senate).

2. A wasteful $200,000,000 subsidy to peanut and cotton growers in the South to increase their already surplus acreage.

3. A $1,500,000,000 pork-barrel rivers and harbors bill.

That this same administration should suddenly become so interested in "economy" that it tries to save some money by firing a few $40-a-week substitute postal workers—most of whom are veterans. This order hits the little fellows in the Post Office Department, but what is far worse, it hits every user of the mail.

The Senate and House Appropriations Committees and the Senate and House Post Office Committees should indicate their extreme displeasure with Postmaster General Donaldson's ruling and they should take action immediately to have this unjustified ruling rescinded.

The International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The ITO Charter Should Be Ratified," from Business Week for February 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ITO CHARTER SHOULD BE RATIFIED

The International Trade Organization is coming before Congress for the third time. Backers and critics agree that this time it will either be floated or left on the shoals as a monument to a vast amount of frustrated international negotiating.

American business itself is sharply divided. The National Association of Manufacturers, the National Foreign Trade Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and others have lined up against it. The Committee for Economic Development, the National Planning Association and the National Council of Importers are among those backing it.

The impressive array of organizations on both sides of the question is ample testimony to the complexity of the problem. After careful study, we line up with those who are supporting the charter.

In spite of its weaknesses, the charter is demonstrably useful in economic terms. And we think that ratification is important to preserve America's leadership in world trade and to strengthen the forces promoting free trade.

DISAPPOINTING

Admittedly the charter has major weaknesses. American business will get little benefit from ITO in the immediate future.

The charter provision outlawing import quotas has been made meaningless by a score of amendments and exceptions. For example, a special provision permits use of quotas to limit imports from countries whose currency is scarce. Since the United States makes less use of import quotas than any other major country, and since dollars are short, this provision has the effect of permitting discrimination against our goods.

The charter will also disappoint Americans looking for guaranties on foreign investments. It offers no more than a general declaration favoring fair treatment of foreign capital. Investors may well feel that the United States will have to obtain strong additional guaranties by diplomatic negotiation.

Even so far as the charter goes, ITO will have only powers of persuasion. The charter contains no enforcement provisions. It is difficult to see how the clause outlawing cartels, for example, can be enforced effectively through persuasion alone.

Beyond these specific points, many critics point out that the charter does little to restore unrestricted free trade. It does not sweep away resrictions; it accepts them and tries to limit their use.

Finally, the charter is riddled with loopholes and is so complicated that it is difficult to say what many points mean.

BEST WE CAN GET

The question is: Could we get a better agreement by starting fresh, from scratch?

The thing to remember is that the United States is virtually the only country pushing for unrestricted multilateral trade. And even the United States has written into the charter several restrictions designed to protect particular American interests. Considering that most major countries do want restrictions, the charter on the whole goes a long way in the direction of American thinking.

Actually, the charter probably could not be stronger; it is unlikely that the major nations would give an international body any greater control than this over their domestic policies. At this stage, it seems, few international organizations can be more than sounding boards or, at best, arbitrators.

POSITIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In spite of all its weaknesses, we think that the charter can help knock down the trade barriers between nations—and so, in the end, benefit American business. Several provisions have positive, immediate value:

1. The charter outlaws discriminatory two-nation trading deals. Countries with government trading organizations would have to compete in world markets just as the free enterprise countries do. This is very important to American business and agriculture.

2. Dumping goods in foreign markets at prices below domestic levels is prohibited, except for farm commodities (an exception put in by the United States).

3. Tariff negotiations would be conducted selectively on the "most favored nation" principle—a basic point in United States tariff policy since 1934.

4. Existing tariff preferences (such as our agreement with the Philippines) are to be honored—but preferences are not to be increased. The charter permits customs unions and mutual tariff reductions by neighboring countries.

5. The charter outlaws a multitude of practices now widely used to limit imports.

All these are highly desirable objectives.

Now, what about the political questions involved?

First, and most important, is that the United States may lose its leadership in international trade affairs if it rejects the charter. We proposed the idea. We have supplied much of the effort behind it. Our approval of the charter would give confidence to the countries that now fear the United States may return to economic isolationism. Our approval in itself would strengthen the drive for freer world trade. And it would give us a foundation on which we could continue to promote free trade.

If the United States stays out, however, there is little reason to believe that the world can make any great progress toward freer trade. The time is not ripe for a stronger agreement. Past experience makes it doubtful whether much could be done through bilateral treaties.

Recognizing all the weaknesses, we believe ITO must be given its chance.

Tariff Rates on Imports of Canvas and Waterproof Rubber Footwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1950.
Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIGGLESWORTH:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR, APRIL 5, 1950

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling-price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear; and

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries; and

Whereas and further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls, and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor at its monthly meeting, held Wednesday, April 5, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and all Senators and Congressmen from the New England States, to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American selling-price principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and Senators and Congressmen from the New England States.

Respectfully yours,
HENRY J. BRIDES,
President.
KENNETH J. KELLEY,
Secretary-Treasurer, Legislative Agent.

Address by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., at United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., who is the general chairman of the United Jewish Appeal drive for the fourth consecutive year, delivered an important address at the national conference of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., on April 15. I am glad to bring his remarks to the attention of my colleagues. The text of his address is as follows:

This conference is a unique symbol of American unity. As the campaigns throughout the country approach the decisive phase, it should be a source of greatest encouragement to all of us that many distinguished American leaders have joined together under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as chairman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Robert A. Taft as honorary chairmen in forming the National Christian Committee and in convening this national conference.

The National Christian Committee has already made very substantial progress. The fact that Americans of all faiths have not merely demonstrated their sympathy but are actively participating in this 1950 campaign must serve notice to the entire world that the American people are solidly behind the people of Israel in the building of a new democracy and in rescuing their fellow Jews from homelessness and oppression.

We have two very good reasons for taking stock. In the first place, as I have indicated, we are now entering the crucial stage of the 1950 United Jewish Appeal. What happens in the next 30 days will tell the story of American Jewry's response to the needs in Israel and the needs of Jews in other parts of the world.

Secondly, we are assembled here a week prior to the official celebration of the second anniversary of the state of Israel. Two years have passed since the proclamation of independence was signed in the midst of war and trial—2 years in which many miraculous achievements were recorded—2 years in which we, the Jews of the United States, played a truly decisive role through the United Jewish Appeal—2 years of glorious fulfillment and 2 years of bitter struggle against superhuman difficulties.

There will be many celebrations in various parts of the country. And there is a great deal to celebrate. We can rejoice in the fact that Jews everywhere have achieved a new dignity as a result of the establishment of the state of Israel. The young men and women of Israel performed incredible feats of heroism in time of war. But we must not forget that the people of Israel as a whole have given no less a glorious account of themselves in coming to grips with the problems and the responsibilities that followed that victory.

Let this be our celebration here but let it be the kind of celebration that will not merely herald an historic event with resolutions and hallelujahs. Let us mark this occasion with a solemn pledge of continued devotion and with the kind of concrete action that will demonstrate to Israel that we are as firmly behind them today as we were in the darkest period of their fight for life 2 years ago.

It is easy to give expression to sentiment. But our deepest sentiments will have very little meaning unless they are reflected in concrete action to meet the critical problems facing Israel today.

I am sure that all of you are interested in the status of the campaign thus far. The progress chart, as I see it, looks good. In fact, the reports from key cities in various parts of the country are highly encouraging. I am happy to be able to report that the campaign is doing better than last year. And that is a tribute not to the leadership of the United Jewish Appeal, but to everyone of the leaders and volunteers in the local communities who are working very hard to achieve the best results.

Since January 1, 1950, we have received a considerable amount of cash. This is good. But not good enough to meet the urgent needs that confront us every day.

Believe me, the financial position of the United Jewish Appeal is very serious. We cannot meet the emergency requests that come to us from the United Palestine Appeal and the Jewish Agency. There are still 90,000 immigrants in the camps in Israel. Right now, one of the most difficult problems is to maintain them and try to give them a decent home.

In the past several weeks two things have happened to underscore the emergency character of the 1950 campaign.

The Government of Iraq has voted to permit the Jews who have been living in that country under the shadow of persecution, to leave and emigrate to Israel. There are about 130,000 Jews in Iraq. Most of them want to go to Israel. But this emigration, like the emigration from eastern Europe, has a deadline attached to it. The Jews have only 1 year in which to move out. This means that we must provide for the transfer and absorption of a minimum of 90,000 Iraqi Jews before the end of 1950. Shall we say that we didn't include these Jews in our campaign figures—that we can't provide for more than the immigration of 150,000 Jews in 1950 that we pledged ourselves to help at the beginning of the year?

The second event of major importance in the work of the United Jewish appeal was the beginning of the transfer of the hard-core cases—the old and the sick among the Jewish DP's still left in Germany—and the arrival of the first group in Israel earlier this month. These are the people who suffered most and waited longest to leave the soil that was the scene of the destruction of millions of their fellow Jews. Israel has decided to take them and try to rebuild their lives or give them the chance to spend the years that are left to them in freedom among their own people. But this program cannot be carried on unless the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal receive the funds they need to fulfill their share of the project that is being carried on together with the Government of Israel.

Make no mistake about it. Israel is still fighting to save the lives of many sections of the Jewish people. And it is still fighting for its own existence.

I am not going to discuss the military and political situation. But we must not underestimate the developments in Cairo and the machinations of the Arab League. There are various ways of making war. The Arab States are intensifying their economic war against Israel. They are counting on us to get tired. They are hoping that the United Jewish Appeal will fail. And they are waiting and hoping that the world and the Jews of the United States will turn to other things and cut down their support to the Jewish State.

When he independence of Israel was proclaimed we pledged ourselves to help realize the dream of the return of the homeless and oppressed Jews of the world. Israel is doing more than her share. Her people are achieveing the impossible in developing a new democracy in the face of the most difficult problems.

I have said it before, and I must repeat it now. The crisis Israel is facing in immigration, in doing the job that is as much our responsibility as hers, is as grave as was the crisis of her war for survival.

For this reason we must be prepared to make sacrifices. For this reason we should feel greatly heartened by the conference that is taking place here this weekend—a conference that demonstrates that all Americans are vitally interested in the preservation of Israel as a new hope for democracy and as a major achievement in the redemption of large sections of the Jewish people.

As Israel stands on the threshold of its third year, let us give its people the firm assurance that we understand her needs and that we are ready to meet our obligations through the 1950 United Jewish Appeal.

Truman "Prosperity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 15, 1950:

TRUMAN "PROSPERITY"

We wonder if people are really as happy about Mr. Truman's prosperity as he seems to think they are. Not long ago he was calling a very similar situation Republican inflation. It may be prosperity, but it is inflation too, and we are rather inclined to the view that if there is partisanship in the inflation it is more Democratic than Republican.

Is it really prosperity when the Federal Government is running at a five to six billion dollar annual deficit; when excise taxes are at wartime levels; when more taxes are being taken from the workers than at any time except at the height of the recent war? We trust that when the President goes across the country on his forthcoming trip he will listen as well as talk. And we mean listen to persons other than those who are looking for Federal jobs or already have them.

In Kansas, for example, he might run into some of the 600 Kansas stockmen who recently adopted a resolution which said:

"There impends today a stupendous threat which so menacingly overshadows the future of our country that we Kansas stockmen, of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms. This threat lies in the fact that our country—without opportunity for conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly drifting toward the consummation of a false concept, contemptible to free men—the socialized state.

"Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of a wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation, designed in large part to redistribute the wealth of the people; the ridiculous attempt—by dictating wages, hours of labor, prices, etc., and by innumerable other false expedients—to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the State of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to the life, labor, infirmity, and old age of all—hazards which must be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, in denial of the obvious fact that their interests are identical and can be logically promoted only by application of the Golden Rule; and numerous other kindred concepts, similarly inspired and equally false.

"Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive policies except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labor. The present semblance of prosperity is only the byproduct of the most terrible and destructive war that ever afflicted the world and is now maintained only by artifice implemented by folly, fear and dire forebodings.

"The course our government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, will inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we all become mere numbers in a completely socialized state."

We think those Kansans were very discerning men. We hope Mr. Truman takes the time to fathom their thinking before he makes more sport of the slogan, "liberty versus socialism." Or brags about prosperity.

Our Citizens Are Becoming More Aware of the Problems of Wildlife Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the Spring Mills Game and Fish Association, Spring Mills, Pa., on April 14, 1950.

Some 150 central Pennsylvania sportsmen were on hand for the monthly meeting of this wide-awake organization.

My remarks to this group of outstanding sportsmen were as follows:

The great problem of wildlife management is one of maintaining a balance between the needs of man on one hand and the needs of wild creatures on the other. The balance is constantly being lost as man uses up the forests, pollutes the rivers, or makes inroads on animal populations through excessive hunting. Then again, the balance is upset when animal populations increase out of proportion to the amount of food available.

As our citizens are becoming more aware of the problems of wildlife management, professional conservationists are in turn able to work more effectively to solve those problems. Americans, fortunately, are placing more emphasis on conservation. The recognition of the importance of soil conservation in agriculture, for instance, has enabled wildlife experts to point out that the populations of wild animals on a farm are also directly related to the land's fertility and inherent carrying capacity.

We are slowly making people aware of the fact that "habitat" means "living quarters." Americans are learning that wide open spaces and plenty of green brush do not necessarily make good living quarters for animals. Consequently, more farmers are planting hedgerows and border strips of food-producing plants. A wide sympathy toward the conservation philosophy by our citizens, who investigate for themselves the relationship between the wise use of soil, water, and plant life and the national welfare, is making the task easier.

Other aspects of unfavorable environment are being recognized by our citizens. Such activities as marsh drainage, admission of salt water into fresh-water marshes, diversion of rivers, industrial pollution of streams, and the general advance of industrial and urban settlements into wilderness areas constantly reduce the amount of land suitable for wildlife occupancy. Our efforts to oppose these unfavorable influences must continue without abatement.

In many phases of wildlife management we have gone far beyond the stage of indiscriminate efforts to build up the populations of animals. Some of our big game animals—most notably the white-tailed deer—have increased to such numbers that they threaten their own existence by overbrowsing their ranges. While some of this increase in populations of white-tail is the result of the animals' natural ability to adapt themselves to living in densely populated farm areas, the main factor is the failure to take doe deer as well as bucks during the hunting season. Many of the States are moving toward open season on does.

In the realm of wildlife management, research has also received a great deal of attention. Definite progress in obtaining answers and solutions to serious wildlife problems are being made in the fields of land management, waterfowl management, protection of wildlife in relation to insect control, rodent control, and predator control, and in the ecology of wild fur animals and bird migrations. The continued interest and support of the public in these research activities assure us of eventually obtaining the answers to our wildlife problems.

Not only is wildlife worth billions of dollars to us in cash, it is worth immeasurably more as a source of recreation, good living, and as a morale builder for the continual fight which we must wage in a world of insecurity and competition. In line with this thought is another: By the wise exploitation of the people's natural interest in wildlife we can foster interest in the need for soil conservation, rehabilitation of our watersheds, and the cleansing of our polluted streams. Not only would we then be building habitat for wildlife, we would be serving ourselves and our neighbors in maintaining a high standard of living and security, which must come inevitably from the land.

Many writers and scientists are reporting the sad state of resource exploitation in the world today, but the United States is one country that is pushing efforts at conservation—especially in the categories of fisheries and wildlife.

In maintaining populations of salmon, for instance, there is progress in rehabilitation of the runs of Atlantic salmon in the Northeastern States, a number of streams have been surveyed by the Fish and Wildlife Service and areas capable of supporting new runs have been found.

On the west coast, experiments are continuing in methods of guiding salmon fingerlings around dams and away from water-use diversions. Such experiments are employing chemical, temperature, and sonic stimuli to urge fish to go where they are supposed to go.

The increased construction of dams and irrigation projects make it essential for the continuation of salmon runs, that ways and means be found to preserve the spawning salmon and the fingerling returning to the sea.

Off the Florida west coast a Fish and Wildlife Service vessel, the 60-foot *Pompano* has been engaged in research to determine the causes of the "red tide," which killed millions of valuable food fish in 1947. In its study of oceanography, planktology, and the chemical constituents of the coastal waters, the Fish and Wildlife Service is working in cooperation with the University of Miami's marine laboratory and the Florida Department of Conservation.

The organism responsible for the plague is known, but the causes for its sudden increased abundance—as many as 60,000,000 in a quart of water at the height of the scourge—and possibilities for predicting and controlling future outbreaks are being studied.

Other research vessels engaged in study of the commercial fisheries are the *Black Douglas* off the west coast, and *Albatross III*, which has been making a census of total fish populations off the great North Atlantic fishing banks.

In addition, fishery research projects having to do with blue crabs, clams, and oysters are under way. In the Gulf, research is directed toward control of the most serious

oyster pest, a drilling snail, the possibilities in the culture of oyster beds off Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is also being surveyed.

The sea lamprey, which threatens both sport and commercial fishing in the Great Lakes, has received a good deal of attention. The eel-like parasite, which sucks the blood of fish, leaving them either dead or so badly scarred as to be unmarketable, has practically destroyed lake trout fishing in Lake Huron and has cut the take of lake trout in Lake Michigan to one-sixth of the normal 6,000,000 pounds.

The increased fishing pressure on other lakes and species due to this decline of lake trout is also very serious. Studies concerning the control of sea lamprey are underway at Ann Arbor, Mich., but a more comprehensive research program is planned to develop methods of control of the lamprey.

Fisheries research has many phases, extending into better methods of fish culture, the effects of insecticides on fish, and the control of water pollution by industry.

Since my election to Congress in 1938, I have transmitted several thousand fish applications from this congressional district to the Fish and Wildlife Service for the purpose of restocking local streams.

The demands for stocking Pennsylvania waters with legal-sized trout and warm-water fishes have increased greatly during the postwar period. In close cooperation with the Pennsylvania Board of Fish Commissioners, the Fish and Wildlife Service has endeavored to meet the increased demands for fishes for stocking Pennsylvania waters from the production of the nearby Lamar Hatchery.

Unfortunately, construction of the Lamar Hatchery was not completed at the time of establishment and the production of both trout and warm-water fishes has been limited by the lack of adequate rearing facilities, refrigeration, and equipment for the proper handling of fish food, housing, etc.

The distribution area of the Lamar Hatchery comprises most of Pennsylvania and in addition, warm-water species are distributed to southwestern New York and northern New Jersey. The demands for fishes for stocking waters in this large heavily populated area cannot be met with the rearing facilities presently available at the Lamar Hatchery. In the calendar year 1949, 230,550 warm-water fishes and 383,160 trout were produced and distributed by the Lamar Hatchery.

A development program was started in 1949 to complete the Lamar Hatchery and funds in the amount of $40,000 were provided for the construction of a holding house and trout raceways in that year. During the present fiscal year (1950), $30,000 has been provided for the construction of a cold-storage and food preparation building. It will require an additional $170,000 to complete the Lamar Hatchery into a well-balanced unit capable of producing a large number of legal-sized trout and fingerling warm-water fishes.

In the budget for the fiscal year 1951, as presented to Congress by the President, there is an item of $95,000 for continuing the development program for the Lamar Hatchery.

What Is the Bill of Rights Saying to "We, the People"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 last I inserted in the RECORD an editorial by E. F. Hutton. In my judgment, a second editorial by Mr. Hutton appearing in the Palm Beach Daily News of Florida entitled "What Is the Bill of Rights Saying to 'We, the People' "? is even a more important commentary on the situation confronting the people of our country today that it also should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that Miss Elizabeth Bentley, in her testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House testified that while she was a graduate of one of the best universities of the country, never in all of her school career was she taught a proper course in the history of the United States. Miss Bentley admitted that she had joined the Communist Party and, worse yet, she admitted that she had entered into a conspiracy to filch secret documents out of various departments of our Government for transmittal to Russian emissaries. Her conduct shows conclusively that there is something very definitely lacking in our educational system. It seems to me that our public schools and our State universities should embark on a realistic program that would sell not only the students but all the people the great blessings of liberty which the common people enjoy under our system of Government. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Mr. Hutton's editorial is most timely.

I therefore, under unanimous consent, insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial by Mr. Hutton which appeared in the Palm Beach Daily News on March 18 last:

WHAT IS THE BILL OF RIGHTS SAYING TO "WE, THE PEOPLE"?

(By E. F. Hutton)

It is a potent symbol of something that should be as dear to all Americans as life, itself. It carries restatement of our heritage to the peoples of the 48 States.

Everything that men and women have hoped, prayed, and fought for since the dawn of history.

Why?

Because it all boils down to you—and is all about you.

Actually, that document is saying: "What is life without liberty?"

And the answer is echoed in your own soul. It is slavery.

Our Bill of Rights was conceived and started with the Magna Carta granted by King John 732 years ago. Then, in 1620, a band of Pilgrims, en route to America, made a compact, on board their frail ship the *Mayflower*.

Then, in 1776, the great-grandchildren of early settlers signed, sealed, and fought to make good a Declaration of Independence.

Then came that miracle called the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We are now living in a tough world.

Freedom is on the auction block in many lands. So, why all the "to-do" about Freedom? Because we are in great danger of forgetting what we have and why we have it. That would be the first step toward the loss of freedom.

Our way of life is not perfect. No one is perfect.

Our Government is not perfect.

No labor union is perfect.

Our profit and loss and competitive system is not perfect. Nothing will ever reach perfection in any land in the entire world.

But America has spent 171 years developing the truest Republic on all of God's green earth in all known history.

We have established rules and regulations in which American institutions find perpetuity in constant modification and changes.

We have accorded to all such freedoms as man never before knew.

We have accomplished the highest standards of living, the greatest tolerance, materially and spiritually.

They are the steps in the ladder of the rise of man.

Isn't that what you want?

Freedom of worship; freedom of speech; freedom of action; opportunity to make progress; chance to expand; right to earn and save; right to vote; sanctity of home and family; right to work where and when you please; right to change jobs, without asking permission; right to live without control over your thoughts, your beliefs, your actions? Don't you want the right to exercise human ambitions?

You have them. But only "we, the people" of America have all of them, because of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

That's what we started with. Let us be sure we do not end by trading them, the most precious possessions ever had by any people anywhere.

Let not "we, the people" permit the change of our Declaration of Independence into the Declaration of Dependence.

All of our documents of freedoms are written and printed papers.

You can see these pieces of paper in the Library of Congress in Washington. They dignify your progress, and the progress of the whole world from darkness to light, from slavery to freedom. You can see the Mayflower Compact. You can see the Declaration of Independence—you can see the Constitution, a charter of, and for, the government of a welded 13 States.

You can see and read your Bill of Rights, the breath of life, the very soul of the Constitution.

In 1791, our Constitution, and the Bill Rights was the charter of freedom for 3,000,000 people living in 13 weak States.

We had no world industry, no world commerce, and no world power.

We were a company of dangerous dreamers, so the foreign lands thought; we believed in the rights of man.

Kings and princes—emperors and despots either ridiculed or hated us.

From 3,000,000 of nobodies, with liberty, freedom and rights of human ambitions and 13 weak States, in no time flat we became top world power in less than 171 years.

Now we have only 7 percent of the world's people, only 6 percent of the world's land area, and yet we have 35 percent of the world's railroads, 70 percent of the world's telephones, 80 percent of the world's automobiles, 66 percent of the world's wealth, and more.

By mass production—the industrial know-how—we have converted luxuries into staples within reach of the vast majority of our people. Such luxuries cannot even be found in foreign lands.

Now, how did we get all this? Are we superior beings? Not at all.

We, the people of America, have no more brains, but liberty gave us the right to exercise our brains—no better souls nor bodies than other people.

Neither race, creed, or color has had anything to do with our getting what we have and being what we are.

We had the rights of human ambitions. That made us what we are.

We have simply lived under a system that gives us the rights, the privileges, the liberty, and the freedom that every man, woman, and child should have.

We have these, because of the thoughts, the deeds, the plans, and the progress of man.

There is no such thing in this country as the common man. He is the most uncommon of all. He is what he is and has

what he has because he is an American citizen.

He has liberty.

When we, the people, lose that, we become not common men but common slaves. This so-called common man may be washing windows, cleaning streets, driving a truck, or working in a coal mine. That does not make him common.

Why?

Because no one has told him he must accept such occupation—not yet. Our uncommon man represents 75 percent of our jury system. Our uncommon man is our peer when judging whether we are guilty or not, before the law.

The jury system has never been smeared or belittled. It has done a good job. Yes; there have been some errors in decisions but then nothing will ever reach perfection.

The uncommon man holds the fate of our Nation in the palm of his hands. As he thinks he votes, strikes, and works.

There are facts he should have before him—facts of our social, economic, political, and public questions. Only industrial leadership can give him such facts. Some are doing it. More should be doing it.

Please, God, forbid the authority of any man to state: "My tongue is the law." When and if that becomes a fact America falls to the laws of the jungle. Let us keep the rights of freedom in America which, step by step, have been taken away in other countries.

There are many people in our country who have reached success. Many of them came here as immigrants because only under our Bill of Rights could they use their brains freely and their talents without fear.

But everyone here owns a share in the Constitution and Bill of Rights—everybody.

If we fail to grasp the significance of what these pieces of paper, which you can see in the Library of Congress, really mean to all of us, then we are scheduled for the dust heap of fallen nations. We have failed miserably to live up to the liberty and the freedom that has been handed to us on a platter by our two-fisted, God-fearing ancestors.

If there is a Godly way of life on earth, you have it.

Your right to escape controls and dictations. My right to make this statement. Your right to read it. Your right to throw it in the wastebasket.

Every single right you exercise from morning to night. Every safety you have all the night through, can be found in the Library of Congress.

The only enemies you have in the whole world are two in number.

One is the enemy who wants you to exchange your Americanism for some foreign ism and to take your liberty away from you by making this a planned-economy, police-governed autocracy.

The other enemy is you—too complacent, too careless, too indifferent, to protect what you have.

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death!"

Or, is it easier to say: "Master, here I am. Put on the ball and chain. Enslave me. I am thy good and chattel. I am nothing. You, the state, is all there is." Liberty isn't merely a heritage but a fresh conquest for every generation. We were once a weak nation having nothing but freedom and liberty. We were "short" on everything but the right to exercise human ambitions, our own initiative and enterprise.

But under our documents of freedom, we have become a beacon to the world. The right to enter America is now considered something like a passport to heaven by all who are not here.

Show us.

Where on the face of this earth has there been a country or a form of government by which communism, collectivism, socialism, has given the people more happiness, bigger pay checks, less hours of work, more comforts, more luxuries, better foods, better entertainment and greater opportunity than given by America under the American system.

Show us.

Not by arguments, dreams, blueprints, or imaginary figures, but the facts.

Show us.

Give us concrete evidence. Prove it by example, prove that any other system is better than ours.

Prove that the system, founded on our Constitution, gives less life, less liberty, less opportunity, and less freedom, than any other system.

Without a single political purpose, without a single hasty charge, without pointing a single finger of scorn, at any other system, let us review what we have; appraise, judge, evaluate, and know what we have before we trade it for any other form of government or bow to any other as being superior to ours.

Benjamin Hill stated: "The Constitution is my only client, its preservation is the only fee I ask." That is my credo. I ask no fee for my effort to preserve freedoms for "we, the people."

Budget Bureau Report on Panama Canal Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include as part of these remarks an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin under date of March 15, 1950, entitled "Budget Bureau Report on Panama Tolls Errs in Not Recognizing Defense Value of Canal."

The editorial follows:

SERIOUS FAILURE—BUDGET BUREAU REPORT ON PANAMA TOLLS ERRS IN NOT RECOGNIZING DEFENSE VALUE OF CANAL

Pursuant to studies looking toward a revision of Panama Canal toll charges, the United States Budget Bureau issued a report and recommendations concerning Canal tolls.

In most of its aspects, the report has been greeted favorably by shipping interests.

However, the report is seriously defective in one respect, from the standpoint of west coast shipping, and is open to criticism on this point.

As the National Federation of American Shipping has pointed out, in analyzing the report, the Budget Bureau has failed to take into consideration the national-defense value and function of the Canal.

Under its recommendations, the entire capital investment of the Canal would be included in the base for computation of toll charges.

What this means, of course, is that shipping operators in the intercoastal or international trade would still be required to pay, in tolls, for a national-defense project.

This is manifestly unfair to private shipping operators, for it requires them to pay for something which is essentially a Government function and which should be paid for by the Government.

Such an arrangement, naturally, makes for higher tolls—which have an adverse effect on the shipping of San Francisco and other west-coast ports.

Shipping interests and labor, civic and business groups on this coast have been exerting themselves to combat this viewpoint, and in any final action on Canal tolls Congress should give heed to their side of the question.

The cost of national defense—and the cost of the Canal very largely represents a national-defense item—should not be thrown on the shipping operators.

Even the Budget Bureau's report concedes that the Canal was built for purposes of defense as well as commerce, and that it would be difficult to determine now which purpose was primary.

The report has recommended a division between the Government and the commercial functions of the Canal.

The former would be placed in the newly created Canal Zone Government; the latter would be assigned to the Panama Railroad Company, to be known as the Panama Canal Company.

"A logical, businesslike way" to give adequate recognition to the national-defense value of the Canal in toll computations, the Pacific American Steamship Association observed, would be "to reduce the capital cost of the newly proposed Canal company so that interest will be charged to commercial Canal users only on the basis of the Canal's commercial value."

In any final formulation of policy regarding Canal toll charges, Congress should insist that this be done.

Otherwise, shipping operators will have to bear an unfair share of Canal costs, imposed through unjustly high toll charges, and the maritime commerce of our port and others of this coast will suffer in consequence.

Inspections by Representatives of the Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received copy of a letter written by the president of Row, Peterson & Co. which gives so vivid a picture of methods that have been permitted to creep into our industrial methods that can never be often enough brought to the fore of the consciousness of the membership of this House and the people of the United States. We are constantly insisting ours is still a free economy. This letter presents certain doubts which I submit should give us pause:

ROW, PETERSON & CO.,
Evanston, Ill., March 20, 1950.

MR. MAURICE J. TOBIN,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last Thursday I returned from an out-of-town trip to find one of your official representatives in the office inspecting almost everything. From Thursday morning to Monday night he bothered our office manager, annoyed our treasurer and bookkeeper, irritated me a little bit, and contrived to take up the useful time of 15 or 20 other people out of a small office of 70 or so persons.

He was pleasant enough and shall be nameless because after all he was but a minor vassal of the slave state, and I expect his counterpart is in every nook and cranny of the land. I gather, however, that all of the people he interviewed were divided between amusement and irritation and had somewhat

of an urge to throw him out the door "—— over teakettle" to use the language of one of my favorite boatswain mate friends.

He uncovered some crimes, too:

1. By diligent questioning he discovered that one of our editors had taken a manuscript home over the weekend and had done some work on it. She wasn't paid overtime either. In fact, until adroitly sweated out of her, no one had previously been aware of this alarming condition.

2. Another editor had been guilty of repeatedly working overtime for some period because she wanted to get two extra weeks' vacation to extend her trip to Europe. This she was alarmed to discover, is contrary to section something or other which says that all overtime must be paid for in the week committed.

3. The third and most serious crime is in process of commission. Your minion left a directive to the effect that some kind of a time clock, or book, or other watch dog must be kept on all of our editorial personnel. This involves some difficulty. I do not intend to personally check them in and out and besides, I am out of town a good bit. I certainly would not want to impose on one of the editors the task of checking on the balance, and to ask each editor to keep track of his or her own time, while it might be a logical procedure, would certainly break down at the end of the first week. As a matter of fact, consider the utter futility of any such registration scheme unless it were accompanied by guards at the front and back doors to search everyone leaving and entering the premises (refer to crime 1). What, also, is to be done about the most valuable part of an editor's work; namely, the idea which comes to one who wakes up between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning? Is this to be overlooked?

We will freely admit that our combination scheme of a small drawing account with a split-up of the profits at the year's end does not fit the Federal statutes. We will be glad to pay any one of our people in accordance with the Federal statutes quite rigorously (if he or she will keep his own time), and we will be glad to include in the overtime the Sunday morning hour soaking the feet after the Saturday night dance should any one of our people express a desire to be paid in this fashion instead of in accordance with our present scheme. I doubt if this will eventuate because no signs of feeble mindedness have yet been apparent in our staff.

I am impelled to write you this letter and send copies to the Members of Congress because I have heard rumors from almost everyone to whom I talk that the thing most urgently needed in the Federal Government is a radical cut in expenditures. Since anyone can get the kind of government that your department is promoting very simply by going straight to Russia, it seems unnecessary to develop it here, and the implications are that Congressmen could find room for a large initial saving in expenses by sharply chopping the funds of the Department of Labor.

Very truly,

GORDON M. JONES, *President.*

Depletion or Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles D. Fogle, of Marietta, Ohio:

DEPLETION OR DESTRUCTION

(By Charles D. Fogle, of Fogle & Fogle, lawyers, Marietta, Ohio, general counsel for Ohio Oil and Gas Association)

At first impression, it might seem that a discussion of the 27½-percent-depletion allowance in favor of the oil and gas industry and reasons for its continuation would be a highly technical one. A casual hearer might assume that it is a matter of concern to a relatively small group.

Actually, it involves two things of direct concern to every American—oil and gas and income taxes. In our highly industrialized society, we cannot live without these natural resources. In our Nation of highly developed government, we cannot survive without income taxes. Oil and gas producers are completely willing to pay their share of income taxes. But the tax must be fair if they are to continue to be income-producing.

An argument for retention of the depletion allowance is an argument for a fair income tax. It is not an attempt by a special group to avoid or duck fair taxes. It is not a new idea. What is new, or fairly new, is the theory that the industry should suddenly be deprived of a consideration under the income-tax law it has enjoyed for a quarter century.

The industry is not asking that it be permitted to pay less than its fair share of the tax burden. It is only asking that it not be taxed out of business.

The theory of an income tax in the United States dates back to Civil War days.

We are constantly being told that the major part of the Federal Government's income goes to pay for past wars and to prevent new ones. That was as true in the time of the Civil War as it is today in the cold war. The first Federal income-tax law was passed by Congress to pay for the Civil War. That was in 1861.

Although this was the first income-tax law, no taxes were actually collected under it. It was superseded by a law which became effective December 1, 1862. This law was further changed and amended and an income tax was in effect until 1872, when the act of 1870 expired by its own terms.

Then 24 years later came a Federal income-tax law on net income. The rate was a flat 2 percent upon all income above $4,000.

Reviewing the controversy that preceded the enactment of this 2-percent tax law we can smile—and we might well smile. Certain political factions in those days were all out in favor of the new Federal income tax. Others opposed it on the grounds that it was socialistic to levy such a tax in times of peace. Advocates of it were found mainly among the Populists and Democrats of the West. But the East fought it and fought it bitterly, even though the rate was, as stated, 2 percent.

Then in 1895, the United States Supreme Court when asked to review the income-tax question ruled by a split decision that the income-tax law was unconstitutional. Four judges dissented. The Court's reason for ruling it unconstitutional was that it was a direct tax and not apportioned.

The die was cast. It was evident by this time that the Nation favored the income tax. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution empowered Congress to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, and no consideration was given to apportionment or to any census or enumeration. It was passed by Congress in 1909 and ratified by three-fourths of the States in February 1913.

After ratification of the amendment the Congress enacted a net income tax law in 1913. The rates were graduated from 1 to 7 percent.

In this very first income-tax law a careful distinction is made between taxation of income and taxation of capital. Congress worked on the proper theory that it is unconstitutional to tax capital by way of income tax.

A special provision was written into this first income-tax law which would protect producers of oil and gas from being taxed on their capital. That provision came to be known as the depletion allowance. Actually, it is a type of deduction. The first depletion allowance was a deduction of 5 percent of the value of the production at the mouth of the well.

So we see that the depletion allowance is not only not a new idea, but that it dates back to the time of the original income-tax law.

The depletion allowance for producers is an essential part of the income-tax law. It is as basic and fundamental part of the theory of income tax as is the principle of depreciation in real estate.

The new income tax was only 5 years old when it was found that the depletion allowance as written in the first law was inadequate. It had not accomplished what it was designed to do; namely, prevent producers from being taxed on their capital. What had happened was that taxing a producer on 95 percent of the production from a lease, was, in effect, a tax on his capital.

To correct this the revenue laws were revised in 1918 and the principle of depletion allowance was broadened.

This revision marked the introduction of a new idea—the principle of fair market value. The new enactment said:

"Where the taxpayer on or after March 1, 1913, has discovered an oil and gas property and where the fair market value of the property is materially in excess of cost, the allowance for depletion shall be based upon the fair market value of the property at the date of discovery or within 30 days thereafter."

A further revision came in 1921 when Congress limited the allowance to the net income from the property computed before deducting the depletion. This was to prevent the allowance for discovery depletion from exceeding the income from the property. In 1924 it was limited to 50 percent of the net income of the property and in 1926 the law which is still in effect today was written, namely, 27½ percent of the gross or 50 percent of the net.

What the 1926 revision did was to substitute percentage allowance for discovery allowance. The discovery allowance was good in theory, but it presented so many administrative difficulties as to make it practically unworkable. In practice it also proved to be unfair and discriminatory.

So the 27½-percent depletion allowance was decided upon in 1926 and has remained in effect until the present time. How so arbitrary a figure as 27½ came to be agreed upon deserves a word of explanation.

Both theory of percentage depletion and the size of the percentage were arrived at by Congress after careful study. The Government made a survey of oil-production operations from the years 1918 to 1925. That survey showed that the annual average depletion of capital invested by producers in finding oil and producing it was between 32 and 33 percent. The House of Representatives passed a bill providing for a percentage-depletion allowance on gross income from a producing property of 30 percent in figuring taxes. The Senate passed a similar measure but setting the percentage at 25. The figure 27½ percent represents a compromise between these two.

I have outlined the history of the depletion allowance merely to show that the principle of percent ge depletion has been long recognized in this country as a fair one. The history also shows that the amount

decided upon is not a figure snatched from the thin air, but an amount agreed upon on the basis of long study.

Depletion has been defined many ways, but most simply put, it is an allowance for the year-to-year decrease in value of property by withdrawal of minerals.

As Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, has said:

"The theory of depletion is that a reductio. from current income should be allowed in order to compensate for capital invested in a natural resource which is exhausted by production; or putting it another way, an allowance for exhausting capital or something that cannot be replaced, as oil or gas."

The percentage allowance is the only fair and reasonable method for figuring tax on the most unpredictable and capricious industry in the country.

Depletion allowance is not a tax loophole. If it be a tax loophole, the hole should be closed, not simply made smaller as is being recommended by some so-called tax experts.

Contrary to being a tax loophole, the depletion allowance spells the difference to many small operators between survival and failure. To others it means the difference between making a fair profit and getting by by the skin of their teeth.

The threat of removing or reducing the depletion allowance for oil and gas producers is the unfair result of a frenzied search for more tax dollars. Under pressure the administration is frantically reviewing the traditional tax sources to see where it can gouge a little deeper. To disturb the depletion allowance to oil and gas producers would be really a masterpiece of illogical thinking. It would be literally killing the goose that lays the golden egg. It makes no more sense than breaking up an old rosewood table for kindling because the shed is temporarily out of firewood.

It would plug the gap to be sure. Today's crisis would be solved, but what of tomorrow? What of the industry? It would mean taxing the capital of the members of a basic industry. That is always a deadly and dangerous policy for any nation to pursue.

In time it would have the effect of eliminating the independent producer. That in itself would be criminal. Of course, taxing any man out of business could never be considered a democratic practice. But aside from the personal tragedies of these thousands what would it mean to the Nation?

In the first place, it would encourage monopolies. Monopolies would be the inevitable result because only the very large could survive under such a crushing burden.

Second, it would mean a serious curtailment of the Nation's oil and gas production.

Third, it would have the unmistakable effect of discouraging exploration. The search for oil and gas is an immensely risky business. There is no way of eliminating that risk. The opening of a dry well is an all too frequent experience of many operators. The romantic tale of getting rich overnight on oil cuts a fine swath on the movie screen but the real-life facts tell a much grimmer story.

As was once said by Chief Justice Matthew J. Kane, of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma:

"To undertake to tax an oil or gas lease is to undertake to impose a tax upon the illimitable vista of hope."

Depletion is a recognition of the risky nature of the oil and gas industry. Costs of exploration and development are fantastic. The original purpose of percentage depletion was to permit the tax-free return of capital. It is this margin which permits the operator to discover and develop new wells. New discoveries are essential to the industry and they are essential to the Nation. In a time when we hear so much about the development of our natural resources it seems very strange, indeed, to be also contemplating a tax increase which will have the effect of discouraging discovery.

Only one wildcat in five finds production. Of all wells drilled in 1949—wildcats and development wells—more than one in three was dry. And this is not the whole story. Added to this woe is the fact that the costs of drilling increase geometrically as depths increase. In other words, a 10,000-foot hole costs 10 times as much as one of 2,500 feet.

It should be noted in connection with consideration of the high cost of exploration that it has been estimated by the Government that from 75 to 90 percent of the wildcat wells and new discoveries in the Nation have been drilled by independent operators.

Yet this is the group that would suffer the most by any tampering with the depletion allowance.

And new discoveries are not the only manner in which the small fellow would be hurt. Reduction or removal of the depletion allowance would cause many stripper wells to be abandoned and it would discourage secondary recovery operations. Although the output for stripper wells is small that output is needed to help swell the Nation's total oil output.

In days when we are struggling to build a strong defense and live in the constant threat of war it is no time to be talking about producing less oil.

Depletion is not a tax loophole, it is not a special privilege allowed the oil industry alone. Depletion allowances are allowed in the following industries: coal, 5 percent; iron ore, lead, zinc and more than 20 other minerals, 15 percent; sulfur, 23 percent; and other mines including precious stones and salt, discovery limited to 50 percent of net.

Finally, the threat of removal or reduction of the depletion allowance is a financial threat not only to the oil and gas industry but to the Nation as a whole. The industry controls 5 percent of our national wealth, enjoys 2½ percent of our national income—but—the petroleum industry and its products pays 12 percent of all our taxes, national and State and local.

In one year alone—1948—the industry paid out $1,200,000,000 in oil and gas royalties, and lease bonuses and rentals.

Thirty-seven States, 28 of them oil and gas producing, benefited from this expenditure. This means jobs and it means purchasing power. It helped not only men in the industry but the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker in all 37 States.

It is impossible to estimate the disastrous effect upon American business if oil and gas production is seriously curtailed. And curtailed it will be if depletion is not allowed thousands of small producers.

The industry is ready and willing to bear its fair share of the tax burden. It always has. It is not asking special favors. It is merely asking to be permitted to stay in business. To stay in business, incidentally, so it will be on hand 10, 20 and 30 years from now when the income tax man comes around. The same Federal treasury which would be bulging this year if it ravaged the oil and gas industry might well be rattling in years to come.

The 27½ percent of receipts limited to 50 percent of net income from oil and gas properties is a tax exemption and not a depletion income. It is a deserved tax exemption. To take the exemption away would be asset confiscation, to reduce the exemption would be partial asset confiscation. Neither is justified. Removal or reduction will cripple. A tax crippled industry can't produce. It is depletion exemption at 27½ percent or industry destruction.

Woman of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. MARSALIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article entitled "Woman of the Week" by Glad Morath, which appeared in the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph on Saturday, April 1, 1950. It pertains to the life and activities of Mrs. Lillian H. Kerr, a resident of Colorado Springs, Colo., for many years, who has been nationally prominent in connection with the equal rights for women movement. She was one of the three women who composed the present proposed equal-rights amendment in 1923 at Colorado Springs.

Since this amendment has already passed the Senate and a discharge petition for its consideration by the House is now pending, I believe it most pertinent that the article be brought to the attention of the Members of this body. The National Woman's Party has also requested that it be inserted in the RECORD.

Mrs. Kerr has been most outstanding in civic and political affairs, and I feel certain that the Members will enjoy reading this brief résumé of her history and activities.

The article follows:

WOMAN OF THE WEEK

(By Glad Morath)

When the suffrage amendment was added to the Constitution of the United States in 1920, most of us believed that women had been given complete equality with men, and that nothing more was to be desired in the way of women's rights. On the contrary, most State laws still deny to women many rights enjoyed by men. In 1923, right here in the city of sunshine, three women composed the text of a proposed equal-rights amendment, which would supersede State laws and give all women of the country equal rights and privileges with men under the law. One of these women was Mrs. Lillian H. Kerr, whose name for 50 years has been synonymous with any cause she believes to be beneficial to women. For 27 years Mrs. Kerr has worked personally, through the National Women's Party, and by writing letters to Congressmen, Senators, and members of the Judiciary Committee to get this amendment before Congress. In the welter of H-bomb and crime news, few of us noticed that on January 25, the amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 63 to 16.

The text of the amendment reads:

"Equal rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have the power, within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification."

A few minutes before the vote was taken, a crippling and limiting rider, known as the Hayden rider, was attached, which Mrs. Kerr and members of the Women's Party feel almost nullifies the power of the amendment. It reads:

"The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or

exemptions now or hereafter conferred on persons of the female sex."

Naturally Mrs. Kerr will go on with her personal protests and will seek support for the passage of the original amendment, sans the rider, through clubs and individuals, and by supporting further action by the National Women's Party, which she helped to organize and of which she is an officer. She is also a member of the World Woman's Party.

"We are the political descendants of Susan B. Anthony," declares Mrs. Kerr. "It took 75 years to get suffrage, and it has taken 27 years to get the equal-rights amendment before Congress.

"There are only two rights for women that are nationally assured. One is the right to vote and the other is the right to choose citizenship when marrying an alien. All other rights are matters of State law. Colorado has the best State laws for women in the whole country."

The fact that Mrs. Kerr has devoted a large part of the 50 years of her residence in Colorado to politics no doubt has much to do with the good fortune of Colorado women.

"Peace is the most important problem of all," observes Mrs. Kerr. "Without peace nothing else matters. My second concern is always for the advancement of women. I glory in the things women are doing and the wonderful careers they are building for themselves. For the second time in 30 years the National Women's Party is conducting research in each State to uncover laws that are discriminatory to women.

"In some States," declares Mrs. Kerr, "a man can take a woman's salary. In others she can have no legal say about her children—her husband has their sole legal custody."

Mrs. Kerr, who lived in Texas before coming to Colorado, was the first feminine notary public in the Panhandle.

"I think I may have been the first in the whole State of Texas," she says. "Some people would not accept my seal because of my sex. I once sold property there, and could not close the deal without my husband's signature."

In 1918 Mrs. Kerr started the movement in Colorado Springs for municipal ownership of utilities, presenting to the city council on November 1, 1918, a petition signed by 600 citizens. Her efforts were not fully rewarded until 1925, when municipal ownership took effect. During the intervening years she and her helpers wrote to other cities, getting all the available information possible as to the differences in consumer costs.

Mrs. Kerr is the widow of the late Robert Kerr, former county judge, who passed away in 1928. She was born in Independence, Iowa, in 1867, and was 83 years old on her last birthday. While her activities are curtailed because of her advancing age her mind and her thoughts are young and sharp from constructive usage. She is still the "power behind the throne" in many activities of women's organizations in Colorado Springs. A brief review of her activities gives a clear picture of her determination to work for the benefit of humanity in general and women in particular.

Mrs. Kerr organized, and was the first president of the Colorado Springs Woman's Club. For many years she conducted classes in parliamentary law and current events, enabling club women to learn smooth and businesslike rules for presiding at meetings and to keep informed on national and international events. Her pupils were outstanding women in all professions and lines of business, as well as those who conducted more or less social groups.

A member of the Zebulon Pike Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, she served as State parliamentarian for the organization for 3 years. She is a member of the north end WCTU, and has always been an active exponent of the temperance cause, and is a member of the First Congregational Church.

She was originally a Republican but supported Theodore Roosevelt when he broke from the party. She served as a delegate to the Bull Moose Convention which nominated him in Chicago. Later, she became a Democrat, and in 1924 ran for Congress.

At one time she served as chairman of the civil service committee of the State Federation of Women's Clubs, because of her strong belief in the merit system. During World War I she served as a Red Cross worker at headquarters, and was a member of the speakers' bureau of El Paso County for the Liberty Loan drives. Later, she went to Washington, D. C., serving in the department of compensations and claims, in the War Risk Bureau. After the war, she took the field for ratification of the suffrage amendment, working in Colorado, Oklahoma, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Washington. These five States were among the first 36 to ratify the amendment.

She was long active in YWCA work, and was organizer of the women's auxiliary of the YMCA. For 10 years she was a member of the faculty of the Labor College of Colorado Springs. She was active in the Business and Professional Women's Club, and was named an honorary member of Alpha Iota, a young business women's sorority, which she helped organize years ago. In the days when disarmament seemed to spell world peace, Mrs. Kerr was appointed from Washington as chairman of the women's committee for world disarmament, an emergency committee to push the Borah resolution for a world conference on disarmament. She is a member of the Peoples' Mandate for Peace, an organization primarily interested in Pan American affairs where women are concerned.

She was a charter member of the Drama League, from which grew the Civic Players, and was president of the organization at the time the Fine Arts Center was opened to the organization. She was occasionally seen in dramatic parts, displaying histrionic ability as well as political finesse.

Mrs. Kerr had an exceptionally happy and successful married life, and is far from being a manhater, or a masculine-type suffragette, but she strongly believes that men have forfeited the right to govern, and that women will have to take over if there is to be any lasting peace in the world.

"Men have ruled the world for thousands of years," she observes. "And what have they accomplished? Wars and more wars. Now we don't dare to have another war, or the human race will be destroyed. So it's high time women took the reins. Things can't go on this way. The women can stop it, and they will. I'm very optimistic on this point."

When the women of the United States go to the polls to vote, they forget that that privilege is a comparatively new one. Few, if any know or remember the struggle women like Mrs. Kerr endured to bring about this privilege. Some of the severest critics of the suffrage movement were women, and it was quite the thing to ridicule and caricature those who pioneered in the campaign. But, as always in a successful crusade, the pioneers seldom receive the credit they deserve, and the fruits of their labors are enjoyed even by her critics.

No doubt, an equal-rights amendment in some form will eventually be passed, again through the efforts of a far-sighted few. And, if and when the history of the progress of women is written, Mrs. Kerr will deserve a place in the local, State, national, and international picture. She has unwaveringly followed what she believes to be the rigid path of duty, and few statesmen or public officials, have done as much for the general good of either sex. Regardless of her age or present limited activity, Mrs. Kerr will continue to be a firebrand for the rights of her sex, and she is respectfully designated "woman of the week."

Tribute to Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, in the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very splendid tribute which has been paid to our senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in the editorial pages of the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle in the March 25, 1950, issue of this important publication.

The editor pointed out the Senator's splendid services in many humanitarian causes. I believe that this editorial will be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans of all faiths, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ENLIGHTENED STATESMANSHIP

The Chronicle has always hewed to a nonpartisan line in politics. We have steered clear of any alliances or entanglements with any party, and we have never endorsed any candidate or politician, however worthy may have been his record. We have believed that party and personality was a choice which our readers were sufficiently intelligent to determine for themselves.

It is, therefore, somewhat of a rarity that these editorial columns should single out Senator ALEXANDER WILEY for particular praise, but we find that the senior Wisconsin Senator has been most conspicuous of recent months in his earnest advocacy of affairs which deal with matters most humanitarian in their context. He has been sympathetic and understanding in legislation dealing with human rights, and he has exhibited a keen interest and assumed a forward position in the espousal of causes relating to international justice for Israel.

We commend Senator WILEY for his attitude and fight in behalf of the liberalized DP legislation before the Senate; for his strength and fortitude in advancing the adoption by the United States of the Genocide Convention, and for his deep concern with the disturbing signs of renewed hostility in the Far East, and his urgings upon the State Department that the latter express to Great Britain its anxiety concerning the tremendous shipments of arms being sent to the Arabs.

We are mindful that Senator WILEY will be a candidate to succeed himself this fall, and we therefore hasten to add that this is not intended to serve as an endorsement of Senator WILEY. We merely believe that credit should be given where it is due, and Senator WILEY has manifested qualities of enlightened statesmanship in several worthwhile directions.

Expenditure of Government Funds for Purpose of Hearing Discussion of Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond News-Leader.

It appears to me that the propaganda machine of the Federal Government has reached a new low when it uses Government funds for the purpose of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture explain the Brannan plan.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHT DOLLARS A DAY TO LISTEN TO MR. BRANNAN

Farmers who have been paid by the Government for fertilizing their land, raising legumes to improve their land, planting trees to keep their land from eroding, turning under green crops to increase the value of their land, and growing anything they like on it later whether there is any market for it or not, are now being paid by the Government to attend political meetings, at which the Government pays the speakers to speak to them.

This latest example of prodigal squandering of public money was disclosed at St. Paul, Minn., on April 4, when Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who is being paid $15,000 a year to attend to legislative duties in the United States Senate, and Secretary Charles W. Brannan, who receives $22,500 a year to administer the Department of Agriculture, traveled at Government expense to St. Paul. They went there to urge support of the Brannan plan to a group of farmers, all of whom had been paid $8 a day and traveling expenses to come from all over Minnesota to hear them. So far as can be learned, the meeting of 5,000 community committeemen, summoned by the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture, had no other purpose than to afford the committeemen an opportunity to see and to hear our Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan. "We feel," the official PMA letter announcing the meeting stated, "it is extremely important for you to have this chance to hear your Secretary, who is making a terrific fight to maintain some measure of economic stability for farmers."

To make it worth the committeemen's time to come, they were told their expenses to and from St. Paul would be paid and per diem of $8 would be allowed for 1 or 2 days. In per diem alone, this meeting cost the taxpayers more than $40,000—there is no way of estimating how much more it cost them in traveling expenses—Mr. Brannan's expenses for the trip, including an entourage of seven which he took with him, have been estimated at $15,000; anything between $75,000 and $100,000 is a reasonable estimate of the total cost of this one meeting to the taxpayers. And at the meeting, Mr. Brannan was quoted as saying that it was one of several that are being held throughout the country.

According to all press and other accounts, Mr. Brannan divided his speech between an impassioned appeal for support of the Brannan plan and an attack on the present Agricultural Act, during which he frequently assailed Allen B. Klein, the head of the American Farm Bureau, who supports it. Now Mr. Brannan may not like the Agricultural Act of 1949, but it is the law of the land; Mr. Brannan is charged with administering it and has sworn to do so. Under any circumstances, the propriety of his denouncing it throughout the country and lobbying for passage of his own bill, would be questionable. There is no question at all whether public money should be used to pay audiences to hear him do so. Clearly it should not. If no worse can be said for it, this constitutes a shocking extravagance in the use of public funds, the more outrageous and indefensible in that it occurs at a time when the Nation is running a deficit of $5,000,000,000 a year.

Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deficit Grows—and Still Congress Votes Spending," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIT GROWS—AND STILL CONGRESS VOTES SPENDING

It is not necessary to accept as final the estimate of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue that the deficit this fiscal year will reach $6,700,000,000 to recognize that red-ink spending is still a top national problem.

Yet by its vote authorizing the spending of $1,500,000,000 for navigation aids and flood-control projects in various sections of the country, the Senate has afforded alarming signs that it is still following a head-in-the-sand policy when it comes to dealing with the deficit situation.

And unfortunately, the Senate is not alone in this. The House passed a similar waterways bill, allowing for spending $1,117,000,000. The Senate simply raised the amount—and for projects which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS rightly termed "flagrant examples of pork."

This is the kind of legislation that breeds deficits. Worse than that, it reflects the custom of Congressmen, especially in election years, of putting politics before any obligation to face the responsibility for the financial stability of the Federal Government. Sectional interests and vote swapping combine to build up a costly list of a flood-control project here, a dredging project there, until the Government is committeed to spend billions it doesn't have.

Such reckless voting has brought us to a situation where the deficit, according to the joint committee staff, will be $1,200,000,000 more than forecast by President Truman. The staff may be wrong, but its record is at least as good as the President's in these matters.

Mr. Truman cannot escape his own responsibility for this situation. He has presented huge budgets without apparent concern for the fact that they can't be financed out of current revenue. But even his inflated budgets didn't include an appropriation for the waterways projects this year.

Congress should face the financial facts and refuse to vote the waterways appropriations—still necessary before this additional drain on the Treasury can become a reality. If the deficit menace is to be ended Congress will have to do more. It will have to stop committing the Government to present or future spending unless it has made sure that the revenue will be enough to pay the bills.

My Dear Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "My Dear Mr. Truman," published in the Sussex Countian, of Georgetown, Del., on April 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. TRUMAN

With your vast national and international interests, you are not cognizant of the fact, probably, that there is a little county in Delaware by the name of Sussex. There was, however, an important news story coming out of our northernmost border town of Milford last week that you should have read. It had to do with jobless benefits. This story appeared in the Wilmington papers the same day that you asked Congress to hike unemployment compensation to $30 a week, plus additional pay for dependents. Here's the Milford story:

This small town in Delaware decided to offer jobs to 10 men who were receiving unemployment compensation. What happened? Of the 10 notified to report for work, 5 failed to show up and were automatically dropped from relief rolls. The sixth man immediately obtained a job in private industry. He was dropped from relief, as well as another man who worked only 1 day and quit. Seventy-five percent of the loafers were weeded out.

Mr. Truman, don't you know—all the rest of us do—that what is the case in Milford is true in your home town in Missouri as well as in the great cities of this vast country. Seventy-five percent of those receiving Uncle Sam's dole are not deserving of it. You are going on the false assumption that all men are industrious and want to work. You know human nature better than that. If you keep on increasing the amount paid to the unemployed, you are making this Nation a land of loafers. You'll get more votes next election, but you are "selling the United States down the river," and making a lot of hardworking citizens support a lot of lazy people.

Try the Milford "work-relief" plan throughout this country. You will find out, as quickly as Milford did, that you and Uncle Sam are being taken for a ride; that billions of dollars are being wasted that could go for defense. If you keep on, you are going to take the incentive to work away from all of us. If compensations go up to $30 a week, plus additional pay for dependents, why most of the citizens will do better by themselves if they quit work. Why should we lift when we get better pay if we lean. Please, Mr. Truman, check the Milford plan.

A Review and a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Review and a Warning," published in the bulletin of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, of March 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REVIEW AND A WARNING

The metal trades department is again compelled to call to the attention of all, the shameful imposition being practiced upon the navy yard employee by the United States Department of Defense.

We cannot accept lightly the discarding of the rights of the civilian navy yard worker. Not only his right to work; not only the forced abandonment of his home; not only the necessity of his seeking employment in sections of the country far distant from the community in which he has established roots, but the crowning assault has been made upon him and upon all American labor, to have forced, captive, and lesser-paid labor perform the work for which the navy yard civilian worker is traditionally called upon to perform. This is work for which his training eminently fits him, work which a statute of the United States says he shall perform.

We refer to the ever-expanding use by the Department of the Navy of enlisted personnel in the naval shipyards and their replacement of the civilian worker.

This charge is frequently denied by the officials of the Department of Defense, but denials do not change the facts. The files and records of the metal-trades department are replete with cases, including the nature of the work performed, the location, the dates, and all other information pertinent.

Members of Congress have protested to no avail. Regrettable as it may seem, unbelievable as it may sound, Congressmen protesting have been given the same run-around as has the navy-yard worker. Quite true, letters answering Congressmen's protests, bearing the signature of the top official down through to lesser officials, have been sent denying that enlisted personnel are replacing civilians. These replies all attempt at justification of the Navy Department's practices, rather than an acceptance of the issue, or a denial, or admittance that they are in violation of the intent or spirit of the statute of 1912, which statute prescribes limitations on work which the enlisted personnel shall perform.

It is also interesting to note that, although these letters to the Congressmen bear different signatures, the replies are so alike in each instance that, to say the least, they challenge the theory of coincidence.

To emphasize the position of the Department of Defense, it is best to reprint two orders issued by the Secretary which speak for themselves. The first was issued October 14, 1949.

"The Department of Defense is responsible for the security of our country. Civilian employees share fully in that responsibility. Use of civilian employees affords abilities not otherwise available, assures continuity of administration and operation, and provides a nucleus of trained personnel necessary for expansion in any emergency. Because civilian employees free military personnel for primarily military duties, they will be utilized in all positions which do not require military skills or military incumbents for reasons of training, security, or discipline.

"The establishment of a work environment in which civilian employees will be able to contribute most effectively shall be the responsibility of every person who plans or directs the work of others. Supervisors will provide progressive and constructive leadership to individual employees and shall endeavor to create sound management-employee relationships. They will insure that every employee understands what is expected of him, to whom he is responsible, and his work relationships with his fellow workers. Productive efficiency can be built only upon a recognition of the individual as the basis of the organization and through application of sound principles of human relations.

"The following principles will guide the conduct of human relations in the Department of Defense:

"1. There shall be no discrimination because of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, lawful political affiliation, or physical handicap.

"2. Employees shall be placed in jobs for which they are best fitted and shall be given opportunities for advancement.

"3. Training necessary to insure improved performance and individual development shall be provided.

"4. Appraisal of work performance shall be made fairly and objectively on a continuing basis and such appraisal shall be discussed with employees.

"5. Within whatever compensation schedule is applicable, employees shall receive equal pay for work of equal difficulty and responsibility.

"6. Working conditions shall be made safe and healthful as possible.

"7. Recognizing that a well-informed work force is a productive work force, employees shall be informed, insofar as possible, of plans and policies affecting them and their work.

"8. Employees shall be encouraged to express themselves concerning improvement of work method and working conditions.

"9. Employees shall have the right, without interference, coercion, restraint, or reprisal, to join or refrain from joining any lawful employee organization or association.

"10. Any employees having a grievance shall be accorded a fair and prompt discussion with the supervisor immediately concerned and, failing prompt and statisfactory adjustment, he shall have a right to appeal, under established grievance procedure. In presenting a grievance, an employee shall be free from interference, restraint, or reprisal, and he may designate a representative of his own choice to assist him.

"Maintenance of sound management-employee relations is not the responsibility of management alone. The Department of Defense recognizes its obligations to its employees. In return, it makes reasonable demands of employees to discharge conscientiously their assigned duties in the most effective manner possible, to respect administrative authority of those directing their work, and to observe the spirit as well as the letter of the laws and regulations governing their official conduct.

"This policy is applicable throughout the Department of Defense. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will assure that it is made effective within their respective departments.

"LOUIS JOHNSON."

The metal trades department and its constituent organizations can, and do subscribe to this statement.

But, what happened? Either the statement was contrary to the practices being carried on, or someone was responsible for the Secretary making another one on the same subject.

The first release could not have been much more than circulated when the second appeared within a period of 60 days—December 14, 1949. The high-sounding pronunciations of October 14, of human relations were forgotten.

In their place were apologies for, and denials of intent of the October 14 statement, evasion of the issue and the magnifying of training, inconsistency, and finally, the mailed military fist. We quote this statement:

"Memorandum for the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force

"The over-all statement of personnel policy for civilian employees in the Department of Defense, released on October 14, 1949, contained the following sentence:

" 'Because civilian employees free military personnel for primarily military duties, they will be utilized in all positions which do not require military skills or military incumbents for reasons of training, security, or discipline.'

"The question has been raised as to whether this statement of policy would require that civilian employees be hired to perform necessary repair and maintenance work on military equipment or facilities, even though military personnel are available to perform the work because, temporarily, they are not required for primarily military duties.

"The quoted statement of policy recognizes that certain positions will require the use of military personnel for reasons of training. This is particularly true of operations involving the necessary repair and maintenance of military equipment or facilities, in view of the requirement that military personnel be able to carry on these operations under conditions which preclude the use of civilian personnel. However, aside from the question of training, it is not my intention that this policy statement be construed so as to require the employment of civilians when military personnel are temporarily available for these operations, since any such construction would cause unnecessary expenditures of public funds and would prevent the realization of the economics in operations for which we must constantly strive. Therefore this statement must be construed to mean that whenever military personnel are available because, temporarily, they are not required for primarily military duties they shall be utilized, in the interest of economy, to perform necessary repair and maintenance operations on militay equipment or facilities.

"This will not, of course, change the original intent of the policy statement and authorize the use on a continuing basis of military personnel on jobs which are primarily civilian in character and where the factors of training, security, or discipline are not present.

"LOUIS JOHNSON."

We cannot accept the thesis of this December 14 declaration and remain or hope to remain very long free American workmen.

It becomes more and more apparent that the last one to profit by experience is the United States Government, and in this instance, the United States Navy Department.

So the record may be complete, let us review briefly the navy-yard worker and his accomplishments.

First, there was a tremendous expansion in shore facilities prior to the emergency preceding World War II. It reached its peak somewhere in 1945. Thousands of skilled men, responding to the call of their Government, moved into naval shipyard areas and went to work, in many instances, at much lower rates of pay than they could have received in most other industries. Many

of these skilled mechanics subjected themselves to additional training to fit them for navy-yard work. This training came from association with and benefiting by the experience of the skilled navy-yard men who had made naval shipyard work their career. Many of these navy-yard workers had never worked anywhere else. They had learned their trade there and were accepted as being the highest type of mechanic. They were part of the community in which the shore facilities were located. They purchased homes. Their children attended school in the same area, and in many instances, aspired to succeed their fathers in navy-yard work. At least all of these people were dependent upon navy-yard employment in one form or another. They were an essential part of the economy of the section in which they lived.

Among the many thousands of new employes in the yards were some not so highly skilled as the regular navy-yard worker or the journeyman mechanic. Thousands of navy-yard employees, following the same course of employees in private industry, became either inducted or enlisted in some branch of the armed forces. These navy-yard employees were very carefully screened by those responsible for the production of naval vessels however, with the result that deferment was forced upon those considered more essential. Therefore, even though the employee may have wished to enter one of the military services, he could not.

As a result of this, and with the passage of the Veterans' Preference Act, we have a great many veteran navy-yard workers, some with at least 20 years of seniority, being replaced by navy yard employees of a year. In some instances, sons have replaced fathers. But, even with the inequities of the Veterans' Preference Act, which has caused great hardship among some navy yard workers, it is still something tangible. It is also the law and can be corrected through legislative channels if found necessary or advisable.

However, the latest challenge to the navy-yard worker is something else. It is something which is being fostered and carried out by some who are either not aware of the traditional practices of the Navy Department in its relation with civilian employees, or who do not care. The new practices are alleged to result in economies of operation and to effect economy of Government spending.

We assert that present practices, in substituting enlisted personnel, are neither economical, sound strategically, nor fair to the trained navy-shipyard personnel. Any economies which may result from pay-roll reduction of civilian personnel are more than balanced by the numbers required to perform like work from other sources.

So there may be no misunderstanding about labor's attitude toward the enlisted sailor, let us say we offer no criticism of him whatever. We have the highest admiration for him. He represents the finest type of young American manhood. The vast majority are the sons of workers. Large numbers are the sons of men who are dependent upon work in the naval shipyards for their livelihood. True to their oath to their Nation, if ordered they are compelled to carry out the orders given them, dissatisfied as they may be. We would not have them do otherwise.

Further, make no mistake about it, we all favor economy in the administration of our Government, regardless of its branch, and who it may affect. But we submit that it is not economy, nor is it just, that military personnel, enlisted for military duty, with the attendant benefits and obligations, be used to replace Government employees at lower rates of pay, and yet at higher aggregate costs—that compulsory guaranteed labor be used to replace free labor. This is totalitarianism in its initial stages.

There is still another aspect to this invasion of civilian rights which must be apparent to those charged with the administration of national defense.

Present practices create the possibility that workers in the future, if they are recruited for naval-shipyard work, will request rates of wages comparable to those they could obtain in private, commercial employment. The attraction of working in the navy yard will be dissipated by the knowledge that as soon as enlisted sailors are available and not needed for the purpose for which they enlisted, they will take the mechanics' job. Surely this is not a very inviting prospect for the mechanic or the recruiting of one.

In addition to the previous comments, it is evident that attention should be focused upon another phase of current developments which may well transcend in importance any other question which has been raised.

We refer to the gradual usurping by the military of functions which are essentially civilian. We agree that full and complete defense measures are necessary to protect our Nation, its people and our way of life. In accepting this premise, American people must never forget that our Government is one of laws, one of representatives chosen by the people of the Nation in free elections; a Government responsive to the wish of the majority of the people, or as it has been so aptly expressed, "of, for and by the people."

Under such a form of government it is difficult to foresee any possibility of that government being challenged from within.

However, we assert that today there exists a challenge to the rights of civilians. This is evident in the gradual assumption by the Department of Defense in the replacement of free labor by enlisted, military personnel.

It is not difficult to envisage military dictatorship, without military personnel under military control and conditions carrying out every phase of defense operations, including those civilian in character.

In the formation of our Government it was never proposed that the military branches should be a law or body unto themselves. The Constitution provides for a civilian commander in chief in the person of the President of the United States. This principle has been further carried out by the selection of civilians to be the chiefs of the various departments of defense. This system has proved eminently satisfactory in the past. Perhaps not to those whose horizon is clouded with visions of an entire nation's economy and people being subjected to the efficiency, precision, and obeisance of a marching army, but we must accept the fact that under civilian control, we as a nation, have managed to get the job done for a century and three quarters. Comparison with the history of other nations of the world, who have moved from monarchies to pseudo-democracies, to dictatorships, proves the wisdom of continuing civilian control of all branches and agencies of our Government.

But we must submit that with the complex, scientific, highly technical development of defense mechanisms, a temptation is offered to military administrators to bypass the civilian and to become an agency apart and free from the everyday, not too efficient seeming, administration of a real functioning democracy such as our own.

The Nation expects its civilian administrators to protect it against any movement which might destroy or tend to destroy its essential civilian character. We want to believe that this basic cornerstone of our freedom will be as zealously guarded in the future as it has been in the past.

We believe the principle must be practiced, not on the basis of economy of operation in terms of dollars and cents, as is professed at the present time in the use of enlisted personnel and the discharge of civilians, but on the basis of the preservation of an ideal.

Billions of dollars have been spent in the past to preserve our democracy. Billions are being spent now. Billions will be spent in the future. Great sacrifices have been made in devastating wars. We do not propose to permit this most cherished possession of the people of our Nation to be undermined and menaced under the guise of economy or ambition.

And, we further submit, that we have every right to expect that work traditionally performed by civilians continue to be performed by them, and that any move away from traditional civilian administration in any branch of our Government be halted.

Bonnie Mae Mathews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, radio station WWL, New Orleans, is Louisiana's only clear channel radio station. WWL has been a willing public servant ever since its beginning in 1922. With its clear channel on 870 kilocycles it is able to extend its service from the immediate environs of New Orleans to remote sections of Louisiana and nearby States to give some folks the only radio service they are able to enjoy and to others a choice of programs which would otherwise not be possible.

I think it is interesting to note a recent public service of WWL which is typical of that station's dedication to the good will and well-being of the folks in the deep South. Without further comment I hereby ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD this brief article in response to an American Red Cross appeal for aid to a child suffering from the dreaded disease, nephritis.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New Orleans WWL 50,000-watt clear-channel station teamed up with the American Red Cross, Pan American World Airways, and Mid-Continent Airlines recently to save the life of 8-year-old Bonnie Mae Mathews, of Coushatta, La.

Watermelons, which are out of season, were desperately needed for use in the treatment of nephritis, which Bonnie Mae had contracted.

The American Red Cross' appeal for the hard-to-get melons was aired over WWL, and within 24 hours melons flown up by PAA from Balboa, C. Z., were being fed to the child victim.

Pan American officials have assured the Red Cross and WWL that they will continue to supply the watermelons as needed for an indefinite period.

The melons were received in New Orleans by George Shannon, WWL's farm-service director and flown to Coushatta by Mid-Continent Airlines.

Meantime Bonnie Mae is beginning to show improvement on her diet of melons, which is a must if she is to overcome the dread nephritis.

Texas City Booms Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring stories of community initiative in our national history is the heroic story of Texas City.

Three years ago this month this city on the Gulf coast of Texas was virtually destroyed by a gigantic explosion which killed 500 of the city's citizens and injured 2,000 more.

Today the scars of that terrible moment remain only in the hearts of Texas City residents. On the surface the city shows no marks of the violence which tore out its heart in 1947.

All Texans are very proud of the city which bears the name of the State. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD today an article from Business Week magazine of April 15, 1950, reporting on the amazing progress made in rebuilding Texas City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three years ago, on a warm April morning, the freighter *Grandcamp* was burning alongside a pier at Texas City. It blew up. In the train of explosions that followed, over 500 people were killed, 2,000 injured. Much of the town was left in wreckage.

This week, on the third anniversary of the holocaust, Texas City claims it's the shiniest city in America—and very likely is. Its industries have not only been rebuilt; they are setting new production records. By 1948, chemical and petroleum refineries in the Texas City area were valued at $129,000,000, and some $15,000,000 of new construction have been added since then. All together, these plants turn out some $500,000,000 worth of products a year. Pay rolls of the 500 firms in the area come to $23,000,000.

Signs of Texas City's rebirth can be seen everywhere. Along the city's streets rise rows of new houses and buildings. Texas City has a new high school and elementary school, two new department stores, and a host of smaller ones. Not including industrial plants, over $1,700,000 worth of building permits were issued in Texas City in 1949.

Texas City has more people, too. Population was 18,000 in 1946, is 27,000 now. In recent months, homes for about 1,000 families have been put up. On the outskirts of town new subdivisions have sprouted, complete with streets and utility lines. Even so, 42 percent of the people who work in Texas City must still live in other towns. "If we could just build fast enough," said one enthusiastic citizen, "we'd have a population of 50,000 today."

It took more than an explosion to overcome Texas City's favorable location. It has always been a transportation center. Five railroad trunk lines serve the city; it has water shipping; it's near Texas' oil fields. Before the disaster, Texas City ranked as eleventh largest port in the United States. It hasn't regained this spot yet, for debris is still being removed from the burned docks. But even now, new docks are being planned for handling grain, sugar, potash, and other cargoes.

Seatrains are making two calls a week at the city, handling about 15,000 loaded railroad cars in and out of the port annually. Another 31,000 cars a year are handled by direct-rail connections.

Of the industrial plants flattened by the blast, Monsanto Chemical Co.'s suffered most. Its polystyrene unit, finished just 3 months before, was ripped to shreds. Some 145 Monsanto employees were killed. But less than a week afterward Monsanto's president, William M. Rand, stoutly affirmed his company's intentions of rebuilding. Within a year's time a new styrene plant was already in operation (BW, April 17, 1948, p. 48).

Today the Monsanto plant is back on its feet, bigger and better than ever. From its original 45 acres the plant area has grown to 60. Total cost of the new plant is about $16,000,000.

The other chemical and petroleum companies, which were not as hard hit as Monsanto, have also gone doggedly ahead with reconstruction and expansion plans.

Pan American Refining Co. was far enough from the explosion to escape serious damage. But 12 employees were killed and the company's dock area suffered $750,000 in damages. Today the refinery, which turns out aviation gasoline, motor and industrial fuels, has a capacity of 100,000 barrels of crude a day. The company recently finished a desalting unit and has several more under construction. The company's pay roll in 1949 came to $8,500,000.

Carbon & Carbide's plant, which was 2 miles from the blast, suffered little damage except some broken window panes. The company's recent building program is estimated at upward of $15,000,000. This week several large units for producing vinyl resins and methanol were just about ready to go into operation. The plant, which was originally built in 1938, turns out some 35 organic chemicals.

Republic Oil Refining Co. suffered heavy losses in both personnel and plant from the blast. Its $2,500,000 refinery was destroyed; its docks were a total loss; some 80 storage tanks were ruined. Today the refinery has been almost completely rebuilt. A polymerization unit was added in 1949. The present capacity of the plant is 36,000 barrels of crude oil a day.

Tin Processing Corp.'s Longhorn Tin Smelter has just finished a $2,700,000 hydrochloric acid recovery plant. The smelter employs around 800 and turned out 37,000 tons of tin in 1949.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest newspapermen and one of the best editorial writers in the northeastern section of our country is Mr. James Morgan. In the Boston Sunday Globe of March 26, 1950, Mr. Morgan has written an excellent article on Senate Joint Resolution 2 and House Joint Resolution 2, now currently referred to as the Lodge-Gossett amendment. I commend Mr. Morgan's discussion to the serious attention of the Members of the House. Such article follows:

A HOAX IN THE CONSTITUTION?
(By James Morgan)

Once I had a question that I thought would stump the now late and widely lamented Information Please, but I neglected to send it in. Here is the riddle: What American college has awarded diplomas to many distinguished men, perhaps to more of them than any other college in the land has graduated, and yet it has neither a campus nor a classroom, nor a faculty, nor any habitation whatsoever? Answer: The electoral college.

Franklin P. Adams, John Kieran, and their companion experts now are off the air, more's the pity. Even the electoral college itself may vanish if and whenever the House of Representatives is permitted to consider and decide whether to concur with the Senate in submitting to the States a proposal to remove that vermiform appendix of Uncle Sam.

Thanks to Senator LODGE, who since World War II has been less inclined than formerly to narrow his mind and give up to party what was meant for mankind, this question has not become ensnarled in partisan politics. The Massachusetts Senator associated himself with Congressman GOSSETT, a Texas Democrat, in a joint sponsorship of the amendment. He hitched up also a strong bipartisan team of cosponsors in the Senate, with Republicans and Democrats, southerners, easterners, and westerners all pulling together.

A CONSTITUTIONAL HOAX?

An experience of a century and two-thirds justifies Gladstone's tribute to the American Constitution as the most remarkable work * * * in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect at a single stroke. Nevertheless, the wise fathers of the Republic fumbled badly the problem of electing a chief of state in a then world of hereditary rulers. Two changes already have been made in order to correct their mistakes.

The twelfth amendment was necessary to prevent a repetition of the deadlock in 1801, when the country came perilously near having Aaron Burr in the Presidency instead of Thomas Jefferson. The twentieth or lame-duck amendment shortened the interregnum between the election and installation of a new President after we had come dangerously close to being left without an effective Government in critical periods of the Civil War and the two world wars.

The nicely laid plan for an electoral college never did work except in the two elections when George Washington was acclaimed the unanimous choice of public opinion. Since his retirement, it has remained for 150 years a rubber stamp of the parties, a puppet show.

The idea that the electors, sitting apart in their respective States on the same day without an opportunity for a meeting of minds, could ever give a majority to anyone, is so fantastic that the men who wrote the provision in the Constitution cannot have believed that it would function. Many members of the Philadelphia convention were in favor of having Congress choose the Chief Executives. It is only fair to their common sense to assume that they contrived this plan as a disguise for their real design, which was to throw the election into the House of Representatives in the inevitable failure of the electors to produce a majority. The scheme looks very like a hoax, perpetrated on the Constitution.

THIS NEW PLAN

Men more wise did those planners surprise. They did not foresee the rise of political parties which now have had a firm grip

on the electors for 125 years. No one of them has presumed to exercise his constitutional right to vote his own individual choice, except a lone Tennesseean in 1948, who was elected on the Truman ticket but cast his ballot for Thurmond, the Dixiecrat candidate. The pending twenty-second amendment would remove the ever present danger of a sufficient number of electors taking it into their heads to reverse a Presidential election.

The amendment would abolish the electors while retaining the electoral vote. Each State would continue to have the same number of votes that it has Senators and Representatives in Congress. That is the basic compromise of the Constitution between the larger and the smaller States. These latter would not have sacrificed their independence and entered the Union in the first place had they not been guaranteed an equality in the Senate.

PRO AND CON

That equality is reflected in the electoral votes, where Nevada and New York alike each have two to correspond with their two Senators. If the proposed amendment had not retained that compromise, it could not have commanded the necessary support of two-thirds of the Senators. Nor would it have a chance to be ratified by the required three-fourths of the legislatures. Twelve of the lesser States hold an effective vote on any change in the Constitution.

Another provision of the Lodge-Gossett amendment drops the majority rule in the election of a President. Like all other elective officials in the country, he would need only a plurality. Now, if no one has received more electoral votes than all his opponents, the election is thrown into the House, which chooses from the three highest names on the poll. The amendment provides that if there be a tie only the names of the two candidates who have the same number of votes would be submitted to Congress, where not the House alone but a joint session of Senate and House would elect. Nor would the vote be by States, as now, with each State casting one vote. Senators and Representatives would vote individually, and a majority of the whole assembly would choose between the two candidates.

The most controversial feature of the amendment provides that a winning candidate for President in any State should no longer be credited with the entire vote of that State. The winner would not take all, but would have to share electoral votes with the other candidates in the proportion of the popular vote received by each. For example, the total electoral vote of New York would not have been awarded to Dewey in 1948, who carried the State by a plurality of 61,000, and Truman's plurality of only 7,000 in Ohio would not have given him the whole electoral vote of that State.

EVIL OF DOUBTFUL STATES

This provision has raised the cry that it would encourage the growth of splinter parties, which are the plague of France, Italy, and other European countries. Senator LODGE and his cosponsors accepted a qualifying provision that a candidate must have 40 percent of the total popular vote in order to be elected.

The electoral vote undoubtedly has done the country the service of maintaining the two-party system. There have been as many as 70 parties which succeeded in breaking into Congress, but only 11 have won any electoral votes. After that experience most of the losers went out of business.

The potential danger of splinter parties is to be weighed in the scale with the certain advantage of making every vote in every State count in a presidential election. This would cure the evil of one-party States and of safe States, where the ballots of a minority are lost. The Democrats would campaign in Maine and Vermont and the Republicans in Georgia and Alabama. That would widen the participation in voting, and our total vote would not be put to shame in comparison with that of every other free country.

A counterproposal by Congressman COUDERT, of New York, would retain the electors and avoid proportional voting by breaking up the electoral vote of a State into congressional districts. Under the Coudert plan, only the two electors that correspond to the two Senators would be chosen on a Statewide ballot and the rest would be elected by districts. That would not crack the solid South. Neither would it open up some safe States and many safe districts in the North to hopeful contests by the minority.

Moreover, it is notorious that congressional districts are fearfully and wonderfully made for the unfair advantage of the party in control of the redistricting. This is such an old, recognized American custom that we have a word for it. If a President should be chosen by districts there would be an added incentive to gerrymander them even worse than they are, if that be possible.

The Lodge-Gossett amendment would cure the most serious evil of all in presidential elections, the centering of campaigns and campaign funds on pivotal States. These coquettish sisters in the family would be cut down to size, not only in elections but also in the bargaining of nominating conventions and in the distribution of patronage. There would be less truth than there is in the saying that some men are born great, some achieve greatness, and some come from doubtful States.

A Vote for Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Vote for Integrity," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal of April 18, 1950. The editorial deals with the President's plan for reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. It rebukes the President for seeking to "gain by guile what he knew he never could obtain by honest and forthright action."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOTE FOR INTEGRITY

By a majority of 9 to 4, the seven Democrats and six Republicans comprising the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department have called on the Senate to veto the President's plan for a reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. This is at once a vote for integrity in government and a stinging rebuke to a President who sought to gain by guile what he knew he never could obtain by honest and forthright action.

The Truman proposal, now stymied, and it is hoped, forever dead, would abolish the office of Robert N. Denham, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and thus leave the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act at the complete mercy of its enemies. Its acceptance would have virtually given Mr. Truman what he has been seeking all along, the repeal or at least nullification of the act. The vigorous support which organized labor mustered in behalf of the President's plan is the best proof that this would have been the result.

The part which Mr. Truman played in this shady performance is thoroughly discreditable. He had pretended, and even stated publicly with a great show of virtue designed to deceive the unthinking, that he was merely carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on governmental reorganization. That was not so. The Commission never advocated any course of this sort.

Fortunately the Senate committee has seen through this effort to mislead the Nation. The whole Senate, we trust, will be no less determined to strike a blow for straightforward dealing.

John M. Clayton, Famous Delawarean and Outstanding American Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Delaware State Society of the District of Columbia, it has just been my privilege to place a wreath upon the statue here in the Capitol of John M. Clayton.

In the commemorative ceremony which marks the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, I said:

Born in Sussex County, Delaware, John M. Clayton achieved outstanding success and international prominence, and rose to one of the highest public offices in this country, that of Secretary of State.

The career of John M. Clayton is an inspirational story of a great American. He was renowned and respected as a lawyer, legislator, jurist, United States Senator, statesman, diplomat, and outstanding citizen of his State and Nation.

It is appropriate that this commemorative ceremony be held at this time for it marks the one hundredth anniversary of John M. Clayton's greatest achievement, the signing of the historical Clayton-Bulwer Treaty between the United States and Great Britain.

As Delawareans we have every reason to express our pride in John M. Clayton, whose ability and achievements brought great honor to Delaware, the first State.

Mr. Speaker, a very fine piece of reporting concerning the facts and the historical significance of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty has been done by my good friend, William P. Frank, of the News-Journal Co., in Wilmington, Del. Therefore, as a part of my remarks it is a pleasure to include Mr. Frank's article on this

subject, which was published in the Wilmington Morning News on April 10, 1950. That article follows:

CENTURY-OLD CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY WILL BE CELEBRATED

(By William P. Frank)

Exactly a hundred years ago next week—April 19—a Delaware-born statesman and a skilled British diplomat signed their names to a treaty that was to become one of the most controversial documents in American history.

Even to this day, historians are debating whether John M. Clayton, of Delaware, outmaneuvered Sir Henry Bulwer-Lytton or whether the Englishman outwitted the Delawarean—in in the drafting of what has come to be known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

While the treaty ended a cold war of nerves between the United States and Great Britain over Central American territory, it also made Clayton the target of personal attacks that branded him everything from a coward to un-American.

Because the treaty involved British-American control of any canal built in Central America, American land speculators, and expansionists sneeringly declared that Clayton deserved British knighthood.

PREVENTED WAR

But the more intelligent verdict of historians is that Clayton in 1850, as Secretary of State under President Zachary Taylor, prevented the possibilities of a war with Great Britain at a time when the United States couldn't afford to go to war.

Also, the general opinion of modern critics of the treaty is that it was executed at a time when the United States was a far weaker maritime power than England, and that it was a triumph for American diplomacy because it ended all risk of British expansion in Central America.

The treaty was signed on April 19, 1850, and ratified by the Senate on July 4 of that year. Five days later, President Taylor died and Secretary of State Clayton returned to private life at his home, Buena Vista, near Wilmington—now the home of a descendant, the former United States Senator Clayton Douglass Buck.

TREATY ATTACKED

Almost immediately, Clayton's political opponents began a campaign of attack upon him and the treaty. Joining the hue and cry were schemers and speculators who didn't like the treaty because it restricted them from land-grabbing in Central America.

The attack became so vicious and so personal that the Delaware General Assembly, split between the Democrats and Whigs, disregarded politics and elected Clayton to the United States Senate so that he could more advantageously refute his critics and enemies in Washington.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which continued under fire for more than 50 years, was finally superceded by the Hay-Paunceforte treaty which paved the way for the American construction of the Panama Canal.

A heroic statue of Clayton is in the Capitol in Washington and plans are being made for a brief ceremony there through the Delaware State Society in Washington on the anniversary of the treaty.

In his day, Clayton was one of the best-known Delawareans, having entered the legal profession and politics at an early age. He was born in Dagsboro and educated in Sussex County, was graduated from Yale, and began his law practice in Georgetown. He was first elected to the United States Senate in 1839, at the age of 33, then the youngest Senator.

OUTSTANDING JURIST

He took part in the revision of the State constitution, became chief justice of Delaware at the age of 41, and when he left the bench was hailed as one of the outstanding jurists of the State.

He became an ardent admirer of Gen. Zachary Taylor and, in fact, he named his home south of Wilmington Buena Vista after the great battle won by General Taylor in the Mexican War.

Politics was the great field in which Clayton played an important role and when Taylor became President, Clayton was selected as his Secretary of State.

Almost as soon as Clayton took over the post, he was confronted not only with the problems of North versus South in the United States, but also the very acute question of what to do about Great Britain in Central America.

Gold had been discovered in California, and it was important to find the shortest route to the west coast. The Isthmus of Panama afforded the possibilities for such a route. Sensing that the United States would soon be interested in a ship canal across the Isthmus, Great Britain began taking over territory in that area on various pretexts, particularly in the vicinity of British Honduras.

JOCKEY FOR POSITION

But as Great Britain moved to protect her interests in Central America, the United States also moved in the same direction—both countries jockeying for advantageous position in reference to a possible canal through the isthmus.

It became a war of nerves. Strained relations developed between the two governments. Each nation assured the other that its interests were not selfish.

There was talk of the possibilities of war, or an armed collision. And at that point, Sir Henry came to Washington to negotiate a treaty with Clayton.

The treaty—which eventually stirred up such a conflict within the Nation and the Senate—provided that the two countries would jointly control and protect any canal built across the isthmus. The treaty also stated that neither country would occupy or fortify any part of Central America.

ANOTHER DISPUTE

But even as the treaty was ratified in the summer of 1850, another dispute developed over the interpretation of the treaty. The United States said the treaty was retroactive, that Great Britain would have to give up Central American territory. England said the opposite. Again war threatened but finally Great Britain withdrew from the disputed Central American areas in 1858.

Many attempts were subsequently made in the Senate to abrogate the treaty because of the way it restricted the United States, but these efforts failed until 1902 when a new treaty was effected—and then came the Panama Canal.

Allan Nevins in his Ordeal of the Union writes, "The accusation that Clayton permitted himself to be outwitted by slippery diplomatists had no truth. He made a fair, and for the period, a profitable agreement."

Another authority states that while the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, by taking Great Britain into American partnership in controlling the proposed canal, violated the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, it should be noted that the United States forced the British to give up long-existing territorial claims—a unique triumph for the Monroe Doctrine.

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the Appendix of yesterday's RECORD there appeared two reports written by Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial writer of the Minneapolis Tribune. The reports relate to conditions in Europe as found by Mr. Binder. I now present two more articles in the series of articles by Mr. Binder, and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST EUROPE BACKS PHONY INTEGRATION—CYNICAL REFUSE TO ABANDON SOVEREIGNTY FOR ECONOMIC UNITY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—Since Congress and a section of the American public think integration will cure Europe's ills, certain cynical western Europeans are prepared to go through the motions of pretending to take the cure.

More concerned with keeping up the flow of American aid than with laying a base for enduring security, Europeans of this ilk give lip service to integration without any intention of trying to make it a reality. They show no inclination to give up their national sovereignties for the purpose of changing Europe into one big market of 270,000,000 people.

SINGLE LEADER SOUGHT

This state of mind was behind much of the European support for roving Ambassador Averell Harriman's attempt to make Paul-Henri Spaak, of Belgium, the political leader of the European Marshall plan council.

Harriman wanted to deal with one European leader who, in turn, would deal with the various governments receiving aid.

He thought Spaak, out of office in Belgium and active in movements for European unity, would fill the bill.

A number of governments, which do not care much for Spaak and would prefer to deal directly with the chief ECA representative in Europe, supported Harriman's efforts to have Spaak accepted as his deputy and as a super-European spokesman.

They thought they could create the impression in the United States that western Europeans are integrating without surrendering any real sovereignty or foregoing the right to make direct approaches to American aid distributors.

BRITISH VETO MOVE

The British scotched this move. They would have none of Spaak. They are being severely criticized for torpedoing an attempt at integration.

The British attitude toward integration, which will be discussed later, played a part in their veto of Spaak.

Belgium, a hard-currency country, has made the going especially tough for the soft-currency countries. Hence Britain and other soft-currency countries objected to the former Premier of Belgium being placed in a position where he might create greater difficulties for them.

PEEVED AT SPAAK

The Labor Government of Britain was also peeved at Spaak, a fellow Socialist, for a speech and an article in which he criticized British behavior toward Europe.

Still other Europeans didn't like the idea of trying to fool the American public with such a phony sort of integration.

They knew that, in the present mood of Europe, Spaak really would not have functioned as Americans were given to understand he would function. They rightly believed that European-American relations will not thrive permanently in such an atmosphere of petty deception.

They believed a sounder basis for collaboration is for Americans to become acquainted with European realities and vice versa.

Designation of Foreign Minister Stikker, of the Netherlands, as a political conciliator of the European Marshall plan council is a more honest move.

His duties have yet to be defined and probably will not amount to much. But at least his provisional appointment and the other provisional moves toward integration do not give Americans or Europeans the impression that barriers are being lowered when they remain as high as ever.

Foreign Minister Sforza, of Italy, who launched the idea of an economic union between Italy and France in 1947 and is as ardent a worker for real unity in Europe as I have found, urges Americans not to be discouraged by the slowness of the movement for integration.

"I want free Europe to be united," Sforza said, "but I do not believe in miracles. Where there is power such as America possesses there is responsibility. The United States has a responsibility to work for integration despite the opposition of commercial, emotional, or other elements in individual countries."

Sforza, who has been in diplomacy and politics for a half century, is better acquainted with both the United States and Europe than most Europeans. He takes a dim view of the ability of Italy, France, or Britain separately to resist the rise of another leader in Germany who might again attempt to impose Germany's will on Europe.

He believes only a united free Europe can successfully resist Soviet imperialism. He gave the impression that he does not despair of such eventual cooperation.

Meantime the preoccupation of each Marshall plan country with its own narrow economic interests and preservation of its full freedom of action makes a greater impact on the American than the prospects for lowered barriers.

It is not merely difficult to get individual countries to abandon uneconomic industries being nursed along for reasons of prestige, security, or make-work. Attempts to prevent building up steel, oil, and other key production facilities beyond reasonable needs are being frustrated by hog deals between interested countries. Western Europe already has facilities for making 8,000,000 more tons of steel a year than it is expected to consume. Yet the Dutch are being allowed to build an uneconomical steel mill although neighboring Belgium and Luxemburg cannot find markets for all their present steel output and neighboring Germany has excess steel mills. The Dutch got this sanction because they supported a French project for expanding the steel plants of Lorraine.

The urge to be self-sufficient and give fullest possible employment is always present in intra-European attempts to jointly regulate investment programs.

Since our money is being used and our security and prosperity also are at stake, we have a right to criticize these European shortcomings. We have a right to press for better and more prompt performance as Paul Hoffman and other ECA spokesmen do incessantly.

But it might not be amiss for us to admit to ourselves that we sometimes have been a long time fulfilling our own precepts. There is considerable discrepancy between what we tell Europeans to do and what we ourselves do.

That does not excuse Europeans but it should make us more tolerant and patient.

The American Union did not start with 48 States. It took years for the 13 colonies to agree on a basis of union and it took a great civil war to preserve the union.

If the United States were willing to identify its fortunes as closely with western Europe as it urges western Europeans to identify their fortunes with each other, integration would proceed far more rapidly.

If we were willing to modify our sovereignty in an American-European union as we propose that Europeans modify theirs in a European union, a union of the free might take form more rapidly.

Western Europeans proceed cautiously for substantially the same reasons that we proceed cautiously in such unfamiliar paths. There is danger that we all may do too little too late. This is a report on the way things are rather than on the way they ought to be.

EUROPE AID STALLS RUSS, BINDER FINDS—WAR NOT INEVITABLE, BUT TENSION WILL CONTINUE, HE SAYS

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—What is there to show for the $8,000,000,000 the American people have invested in the Marshall plan and the additional $12,000,000,000 worth of assistance they have given Europe since the end of the war?

What can the American people hope to gain by investing an additional $3,000,000,000 in the European recovery program for the year beginning next June 30 and another $2,000,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1952?

I have sought the answer to these and related questions in a 5-week study of conditions in four of the principal beneficiaries of this American aid—Britain, Germany, Italy, and France.

I have talked with leading personalities in the Governments of those four countries. I have talked with leaders of the opposition. I have talked with farmers, workingmen, labor leaders, and journalists as well as with businessmen and statesmen. I have visited farms, factories, slums, the homes of the rich, eating places of the very poor, and the ritzy restaurants where the best food and service is enjoyed by those well-enough heeled to pay the high prices charged.

I have talked off the record with American diplomats, Marshall-plan executives, and military men closely identified with administration of American aid to Europe and the safeguarding of American interests.

I have checked my impressions and what I have been told with the estimates of old friends who have been covering Europe for the American press for many years and know how to distinguish the real from the phony.

I have known one of these countries—France—for 32 years, having spent 2 years in the French war zone in World War I. My first-hand acquaintance with the other three countries is of more than 23 years standing. I have lived in each of them for prolonged periods.

This is my second visit to western Europe since the end of the war.

My impressions will be set forth in greater detail and with more specific reservations in subsequent articles. In this first article on the state of western Europe, 57 months after the cessation of hostilities and at the halfway point of the Marshall plan, they may be summarized thus:

A shooting war with Russia does not appear to be either imminent or inevitable.

A lasting settlement between the Soviet power and the western democracies does not appear to be achievable in the near future.

Therefore the cold war seems more likely to last for decades than to degenerate into a shooting war or to be ended on a mutually satisfactory basis.

The Marshall plan has frustrated, at least temporarily, Communist chances of taking over France, Italy, and possibly some other western European countries.

American aid to western Europe has given a priceless breathing spell in which to create such social stability here that the Communists cannot come to power through disaffection of large sections of the public.

American aid has permitted western Europeans to acquire goods and services essential to quick economic recovery which could not otherwise have been acquired because of low dollar purchasing power.

Thanks to this dollar aid and their own efforts, western Europeans have made far more rapid strides toward recovery than they made in a comparable period after the First World War. Industrial production in many lines is well ahead of what it was in 1938. Agricultural production is almost up to prewar level.

The recovery program has halted inflationary forces which otherwise might have caused profound social dislocations and paved the way for dictatorships of the extreme right or left, such as happened after World War I.

By providing jobs, food, clothing, and other means of survival at a critical juncture, the recovery program has given hope and vigor to peoples who otherwise might have been lost to our side of the struggle between Russia and the free world.

The skills, industrial establishments, resources, military potential, and strategic positions of western Europe are one of the greatest prizes in that struggle. If they remain securely on our side, we shall have to spend only a fraction of what we should have to spend for national defense if they fall into Soviet hands.

American aid to Europe has provided markets for American agricultural and industrial production. Thus, it has provided profits and wages which otherwise would not have been available because of severely limited European dollar purchasing power.

While particular regions and industries have gotten the direct benefits of this spending, the American economy as a whole has enjoyed a higher level of prosperity than otherwise would have been likely.

These are oversimplifications, for the sake of brevity. This summary would not be complete without mention of things not accomplished by the Marshall plan and important to be borne in mind as Congress debates recovery programs and appropriations:

While the recovery program has provided jobs and certain goods, it has not yet resulted in far-reaching social betterment in such critically situated countries as France and Italy. The working classes in both of these countries still have such poor standards of living and such a disaffected mood that they may yet fall a prey to communism if their lot is not greatly improved. The same is true of the land-hungry peasants in Italy.

I saw relatively little evidence that either the governments or the privileged classes of Italy and France are sufficiently aware of the urgent need for social reform or the hazards of prevailing social inequalities.

Communism, in other words, remains a profound threat and there is no reason to believe it will have disappeared when Marshall aid ends in 1952. In some respects

Marshall plan aid appears to have intensified the feeling between the classes.

The special interest—industrialists, businessmen, and agriculturalists whose products go into the general market—still influence production, distribution, and prices for their own special benefit and without thought of the general welfare. That means continuation of restrictions and other barriers to the free flow of goods and persons—barriers the Marshall plan was designed to reduce or eliminate.

Little appreciable progress toward real economic or political integration of western Europe is likely to be made by 1952.

Extremely self-centered nationalism remains the dominant mood of western Europeans. There are wide differences between the countries believing in planned economies and those with relatively free economies. The recovery program tends to bring to light rather than sublimate these differences.

Despite the impressive increase in production, inter-European trade and increases in exports to the dollar area, western Europe as a whole will have a dollar deficit of at least $2,250,000,000 annually after 1952. The United States will have to deal with this deficit either in continued subsidies, long-term investment, or other devices, if it wishes to keep western Europe in business and dispose of certain surpluses in the European market.

Some sounder approach to the problem than keeping western Europe a permanent pensioner of the United States will have to be found if western civilization is to survive and continue to flower.

Covering Up for the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman said that the charge that there were Communists in the State Department was just a red herring drawn across the trail by Republicans for political purposes, he did not inaugurate any new policy of the New or Fair Dealers.

The activities of the Dies committee, engaged as it was in ferreting out and exposing Communists in executive departments, were opposed most vigorously by a small group in the House and by the administration then in power.

Part of their activities are disclosed in a news story written by Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune, and published in the Washington Times-Herald on February 10. Edwards is a factual writer and the story for the 10th reads as follows:

REDS HAD WHITE HOUSE ENTRY FROM 1935, OFFICIAL PAPERS SHOW—REPRESENTATIVE O'CONNOR PURGED AFTER WARNING F. D. R. ABOUT COMMUNIST INFILTRATION

(By Willard Edwards)

Representative John J. O'Connor, New York Democrat, chairman of the House Rules Committee, hustled to the White House one day in 1936 to impart information of a startling nature to President Roosevelt.

"Mr. President," he said breathlessly, "do you know that one of your own stenographers is a card-carrying member of the Communist Party?"

"The only response I got," said O'Connor, telling the story years later, "was that well-known raising of the chin and blinking of the eyelids. So far as I know the woman is still there."

WEDGE TO O'CONNOR PURGE

The incident started a coolness between the Democratic leader and his chief which resulted 2 years later in a successful purge of O'Connor from the political scene. Mr. Roosevelt personally engaged in the campaign to defeat O'Connor for reelection.

From 1935 on, official records make it clear, Communists and Red sympathizers held White House jobs. In 1941, according to an official report just 2 months before Pearl Harbor, there were nine employees in the executive office of the President who were members of subversive organizations under Communist control. There were no dismissals.

In 1947, the case of Helene Yuhas was made public. She had been employed as a White House clerk from 1939 to 1944, handling the correspondence of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. In May 1944, she went to work for the Soviet Embassy, writing editorials for the Russian propaganda magazine, the Soviet information bulletin.

CLAYTON'S SECRETARY

After 7 months in the Soviet embassy, Miss Yuhas decided to return to Government work. The shift was accomplished with ease. The State Department hired her and she became secretary to Under Secretary of State Clayton. Finally, late in 1947, the State Department requested her resignation and, after some protests, she left.

Lauchlin Currie, a White House administrative assistant, was named in 1948 by Elizabeth Bentley, admitted Soviet spy, as an informant for a spy ring. He vehemently denied the charge. Shortly thereafter, this story was unfolded before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Nathan G. Silvermaster, $10,000 a year Government official, had been under FBI investigation, by his own admission, soon after he entered Government employment in 1935.

Born in Russia, Silvermaster entered the United States at San Francisco in 1915 and became a naturalized citizen in 1927. He had been an associate of Harry Bridges and well-known Communists on the west coast. But he had no difficulty in securing a job in the Resettlement Administration under Rexford Guy Tugwell, later shifting to the Farm Security Administration under Agriculture Secretary Henry A. Wallace.

DENOUNCED BY FBI

In 1942, Silvermaster applied for a transfer to the Board of Economic Warfare. The FBI reported that he was a known Communist, a probable agent of the Russian police, and should not be given a post in a war agency where he would have access to confidential information.

Silvermaster immediately sought out Currie, the White House aide. He complained angrily that the Communist charge against him was "an insult and a smear." He also appealed to another friend, C. B. Baldwin, of the Farm Security Administration, who last year refused to tell a Senate committee whether he was a Communist.

As a result of these appeals, War Secretary Patterson was induced to write a letter to the Civil Service Commission which completely exonerated Silvermaster of all charges against him. He was given a key war post in which he served until he resigned in March 1946.

Silvermaster was named as a leader of the Communist cell in Washington which furnished secret documents to Miss Bentley which were photographed in the basement of his home.

BROWDER MET WITH F. D.

The history of Communist influence in the White House is lengthy and detailed. When Earl Browder was head of the Communist Party in the United States in 1944, he held secret meetings there with Mr. Roosevelt, according to the testimony of a former Communist Party official.

Louis Adamic, Yugoslav-born Communist propagandist who has 30 Communist-front connections listed in official records, was a frequent visitor at the White House during the war years. Adamic is given credit for the major shift in American policy in the Balkans which resulted in the desertion of Gen. Mihailovich's Chetnika in Yugoslavia and indorsement of Marshal Tito's Soviet-dominated partisans.

Joseph Lash, protege of Mrs. Roosevelt, former leader of the Communist-controlled American student union, was another who spent many nights under the White House roof. Lash was drafted in 1942 after he had been turned down as unqualified for a Navy commission despite the intercession of Mrs. Roosevelt. In 1944, he was rejected as a candidate for officer candidate school.

STIMSON AIDED LASH

On the day he was turned down, December 29, 1944, President Roosevelt sent a telegram ordering Lash to the candidate school. The wire specifically stated that "objections arising from his (Lash's) civil activities" should not be considered.

Mr. Roosevelt died before Lash was commissioned in May 1945. War Secretary Stimson wrote Mrs. Roosevelt that to deny officer rank to Lash would be an insult to the memory of her sainted husband.

The White House record of opposition to investigation of communism in the Government is unbroken from 1935 to the present date. Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, in August 1948, reviewed the record, suggesting it called for curbing Presidential arrogance by the impeachment process.

Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, he noted, had refused to permit Congress to see files bearing on the loyaly of Government employees.

"There has long been an increasing tendency on the part of the executive branch to conduct their affairs in secret," he told the Senate. "It began with the voting of grants of power and great sums of money to the President simply because somebody had to act and act quickly.

"A political-military hierarchy was built up, an entirely new bureaucracy centering in the White House, the State Department, and the military. The Bureau of the Budget, shifted to the White House, became a master planner.

"An ever-increasing number of confidential agents, of whom Harry Hopkins was the chief, made their headquarters in the White House. All their activities were secret. When Mr. Roosevelt died Mr. Truman became the willing prisoner and mouthpiece of this power clique.

"In sum, the President claims the right to don the cloak of absolute executive immunity whenever he desires to do so. If he carries this claim to unconscionable extremes, the Constitution says that Congress can dispose of him by impeachment proceedings."

WHITEWASH OF 1943

Both Presidents initiated "loyalty probes" which accomplished little or nothing. Mr. Roosevelt's five-man interdepartmental committee to pass on complaints of subversive activities by Federal employees was established in 1943. It reported proudly that

there were practically no Communists in the Government. Four years later a Civil Service Commission official admitted there were more than 4,000 Communists on the pay roll in the war years.

In his 1942 veto of the Communist-registration bill Mr. Roosevelt issued what was termed in Congress a virtual invitation to the Soviet Government to spy. Registration of Communists, he wrote, might be "onerous in respect to the representatives of friendly nations who are constantly coming to and from the United States to cooperate with us."

It was in 1942, subsequent events disclosed, that the Soviet Government ordered its spies into the United States to steal the secrets of the atomic-bomb experiments.

Any thought that McCARTHY might get away unsmeared, unvilified, when he made his more recent charges against the Communists, was an idle one. The President was quick to charge that McCARTHY was Stalin's best asset; to charge that two other Republican Senators—WHERRY and BRIDGES—with McCARTHY, were aiding Stalin's cause.

President Truman has evidently learned that the public recognizes his statement as being silly and ridiculous and hence has just called this week for the aid of Senator BRIDGES.

Brought up as a member of a corrupt political machine, the President often gets on slippery ground. His administration needs not only a thoroughgoing house cleaning, but a complete disinfecting job in a tank of sheep dip.

While cleaning out the Communists he would do well to get rid of the homosexuals. Several hundred of them, it is not denied, are in executive departments.

M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the month of April is being observed as Cancer Control Month. In Texas we are proud that one of the outstanding cancer-research centers in the Nation is the University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research at Houston, Texas.

This center has grown rapidly in recent years, with both private and public support. The contributions this hospital is making and will continue to make to the fight against cancer will be a tribute to the capacity and determination of the Texas medical educators who have given so much of their time and talent to the advancement of this important institution.

Recently Dr. R. Lee Clark, Jr., director and surgeon in chief of the M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research, authored a most interesting article on the status of today's cancer treatment. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a University of Texas news service release on Dr. Clark's article.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today's tools, if properly applied, can bring about a momentous improvement in the diagnosis and treatment of cancer.

That is the opinion of Dr. R. Lee Clark, Jr., director and surgeon in chief of the University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital for Cancer Research.

Writing in Postgraduate Medicine, a professional publication, Dr. Clark declares the promise for the future development of adequate tools for early diagnosis and treatment is excellent, but even more important is the constant evaluation of methods in common use which have promise of great improvement.

"As intriguing as it is to speculate upon the possibilities to be offered by research and clinical investigation, we have a responsibility to examine the results of present-day therapy and to use available means to greater immediate advantage," Dr. Clark writes.

Summarizing a review of today's status of cancer treatment, he concludes it is apparent that if available means for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer were adequately used a great saving of lives could be effected.

The successful use of these means are, however, dependent upon several interwoven factors, which Dr. Clark outlines as follows:

First, exact knowledge should be disseminated to the public at the community and individual level.

Second, the individual, once awakened by education, should realize the need for immediate action, and go to a physician if he has a persistent aberration from normal in his body economy.

Third, every physician's office is an actual and potential cancer detection center, where a high degree of suspicion must be maintained, and where all lumps, bleeding orifices, or other persistent abnormalities must be examined, and explained.

Fourth, the primary treatment given must be adequate and radical, if necessary, but never a compromise

Fifth, the availability of the cancer team to the patient must become general. In no field is group opinion any more necessary. This is so well recognized now, that individual physicians should be able to obtain it through general tumor-clinic sessions. The combined opinions of the pathologist, internist, roentgenologist, and surgeon will assure the patient of a far better over-all primary therapy.

Sixth, all tissue removed should be examined by the pathologist.

And seventh, and most important, we should hold the progress that has been made and the progress that is to be made by assuming personal responsibility, together with every physician, for being alert to, and conscious of, what to seek as signs of early cancer among our patients.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a vast majority of the serious students of government and of the political scientists of this country are strongly in favor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment.

Dr. Hugh A. Bone, professor of political science at the University of Washington, wrote an excellent letter to the New York Herald Tribune on March 14 in which he discusses the relative merits of the so-called Coudert amendment with the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment. Professor Bone's letter is offered herewith for the consideration of those interested in this subject:

MARCH 14, 1950.
EDITOR, NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Readers are indebted to the Herald Tribune for carrying the articles by Walter Lippmann on the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment to the Constitution to provide a fairer method of electing a president. Lippmann sees the district plan as proposed by Representative COUDERT as superior to the Lodge proposal. A strong case can be made for the Coudert substitute but there is one problem which needs serious consideration in connection with it—how and by whom will the districts be drawn?

The simplest solution is to use existing congressional districts as drawn by the State legislatures. Partisan and other reasons led the legislatures during the nineteenth century to employ the technique of gerrymandering, that is, the practice of the party in control of the legislature to concentrate opposing party strength into a few districts (sometimes all in one) and to spread their own strength over many districts. The ruling party, therefore, was assured a lion's share of the seats in Congress and also in the State legislature. Legislatures dominated by rural interests found this helpful in keeping the urban areas from getting a fair share of the seats in legislative bodies. Congress became concerned enough with this practice that it passed numerous laws requiring the State legislatures to draw congressional-district boundary lines so that representatives would be elected from contiguous and compact territory. None of these equalization statutes made any provision for enforcement by Congress. A 1929 Federal law, moreover, left the matter open and the practical effect is to leave the legislatures free to district according to custom and usage. Many of the old-time shoestring- and horseshoe-shaped districts have disappeared but gerrymandering in one degree or another has persisted.

Many districts today are compact and contiguous but show adroit gerrymandering by the concentration or dispersion of bloc voters (ethnic and class) or by extreme inequities in size. The First Congressional District of the State of Washington, according to the last census, has a population of 413,000 while the Fourth District has 245,000, a discrepancy of 168,000. This is mild compared to Ohio where the difference between the largest and smallest district is 535,000. Although the differences are not so sharp, New York and New Jersey districts show substantial variation. A study made about a decade ago (Schmeckebier, Congressional Apportionment) found substantially defective districting in 26 States.

Though the total vote for Democratic Representatives slightly exceeded that for the Republican nominees in Washington in 1948, the Republicans captured four out of six seats. In Illinois the total Democratic congressional vote exceeded that of the Republicans by over 175,000 yet the Democrats captured 12 out of 26 seats. This suggests that if congressional districts are to be used as a basis for presidential electoral contests, a perverted electoral result is possible. In smaller States the two electors chosen from the State at

large would help to balance up such inequities but in the larger States this is more doubtful. Until we can evolve a plan for preventing unfair districting in the States, the Lodge proposal promises to reflect the wishes of the voters of a given State more accurately. Proponents of the Coudert substitute can strengthen their case by offering suggestions for the troublesome problem of districting.

Some of the proposals for correcting the inequities are (1) districting by the State executive with the assistance of an expert nonpartisan commission; (2) denial of seats in Congress to those States failing to conform to a minimum standard laid down by Congress; (3) districting by Congress where a satisfactory State law is not provided. Each of these has defects and would have serious opposition. In the final analysis any plan to minimize gerrymandering will be effective only if it will be backed up by an aggressive and alert public opinion that will force the State legislatures and Congress to take proper action.

Finally, Republicans may wish to ponder whether the Coudert system will be of any help in adding to their electoral-vote strength in the South. In 1948 for example, the Lodge plan would have given Governor Dewey four and a fraction votes while under the district system the Governor would have had virtually no chance of even picking up one electoral vote. In this instance at least, it is debatable whether Mr. Lippmann is correct in saying the Coudert plan "would cure all the evils of the present system quite as well as the Lodge-Gossett amendment."

Sincerely,

HUGH A. BONE,
Professor of Political Science,
University of Washington.

(Writer was formerly professor at Queens College, Flushing.)

China as Viewed Through the Eyes of Republican National Committeeman Guy G. Gabrielson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Christian Science Monitor of April 17 last, I read an article written by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, chief of the Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor dealing with the state of the Nation through political eyes and one part of same dealing with the question as to whether China was lost or not, as so many people now claim, impressed me very much.

The part of the article in question is as follows:

A simple truth to be borne in mind today, and in months to come, is that it is seldom in the interest of any politician to present the state of our affairs in their true shape.

An example of this distortion on one side of the political fence is Mr. Gabrielson's declaration that the Truman administration has, among other things, lost the cold war in China.

The word "lost" is a very final one. Mr. Gabrielson takes the gloomiest possible view of the situation in China when he says that it has been lost. Perhaps China has been lost to the West irretrievably, and for all time. But to say that China has been lost at this stage is to assume the worst and ignore history. Some Americans thought China was lost to Communists back in 1926 when Chiang Kai-shek accepted Russian advisers and entrusted to Communists the planning of his victorious march northward. We were nearly as afraid of the same Chiang Kai-shek then, and for the same reason, as we are of his opponents of today.

But in 1927 Chiang suddenly turned our way, and it was the Russians and the Communists who lost that battle for China. Now they have won the latest round in China. And we will strive to reverse this decision, just as the Russians strove to reverse the decision of 23 years ago. We have no more certainly lost the cold war in China, yet, than we lost the real war in the Pacific with the fall of Corregidor, Singapore, and the Dutch East Indies. We have lost a battle, but we hardly assume yet that we have lost the campaign.

The Smear Artists Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Senator MCCARTHY's charges that the administration was harboring Communists were scarcely given publicity before the small group of smear artists, administration bootlickers and self-styled intellectuals brought out their stinkpots and proceeded to attempt to do a job on the Senator.

When Senator MCCARTHY named Judge Dorothy Kenyon as one who has associated with Communist organizations, that group not only belittled but intimated that his statements were downright falsehoods, and that the Senator knew them to be false when he made them.

Judge Dorothy Kenyon rushed to Washington, appeared before a Senate committee and branded the charges as completely without foundation and said that Senator MCCARTHY was a liar.

Not long after, in her conceit, Dorothy appeared before three reporters on a radio broadcast.

George Sokolsky gives a brief account of what happened there. It reads as follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

A meeting of the Ancient Order of Red-Baiters gathered in the home of Dr. J. B. Matthews for three purposes: 1. To eat his wonderful curry which he learned to cook in Java, while he was translating hymns into Malaya. 2. To celebrate the publication of Seeds of Treason by De Toledano and Lasky. 3. To listen, on the radio, to Meet the Press.

When it came time to listen to Meet the Press, we foregathered about the radio, with daggers up our sleeves, to await Miss Dorothy Kenyon, who reminds one of Eleanor Roosevelt before her voice was cured of its falsetto.

The first voice, after the interlocutor, to come over was that of an honored member of the Ancient Order of Red-Baiters, Frank Waldrop of the Washington Times-Herald. And his first question was sharply pointed. He asked:

"Judge Kenyon, do you know one Alger Hiss?"

That did it. They all got into the situation and literally tore her apart, for the lady admitted that she only knew what appeared in the New York Times. Her exact words were, "I'm as well informed as any other reader of the New York Times * * *." So Waldrop said, "Can you tell us about Hiss?"

Mae Craig, of the Portland Press-Herald tried to get a word in to ask how many front organizations Miss Kenyon belonged to. Senator MCCARTHY had said 28; Miss Kenyon said 4 or 5. So at the soiree of the Red-Baiters we tried to figure it out. We got to a figure of 31. Maybe that was high, but we had been eating Dr. Matthew's curry.

While all this was going on, Mae Craig started this colloquy:

Craig, "Well, when you found that your name was being used without your permission, or after you had withdrawn, did you take any legal means to stop it? You're a lawyer, so I presume——"

Kenyon, "Oh, yes, yes."

Craig, "What did you do legally to stop it?"

Kenyon, "Well, when I decided that I no longer wanted to be associated with those organizations, no longer wanted to be a sponsor, I told them so. I told them that I was withdrawing."

Craig, "But that didn't quite answer the question. Did you do or take legal means to prevent it?"

One of the newspapermen on this quiz show is Larry Spivak, who can be a bad egg when he wants to. At any rate, on this particular occasion he asked some of the very worst questions which could be asked of a lady lawyer. I thought Larry was very unkind, because he stripped the lady of the last vestige of an excuse. Look at this question by Larry Spivak:

"Miss Kenyon, in your testimony before the Senate you said, and I quote, 'I challenge and defy anyone to prove that I ever joined or sponsored or continued to identify myself with any organization or individuals I knew or had reason to believe were subversive.'

"Now, the out word there was 'I knew.' That's out, but shouldn't you have known? Is it enough for someone like you simply to say 'I didn't know the gun was loaded?'"

The lady could not answer. She swirled and fished and wove, but she could not answer. She got all excited and wanted to slap Frank Waldrop. But Mae Craig brought her up to October 1949; that is, long after the cold war started.

Then Miss Kenyon faced Spivak again, which should not happen to an "artful dodger." Read this:

Spivak: "Well, now, you said that you knew about them, that you didn't join them carelessly, that you knew all about them when you joined."

Kenyon: "That's right. That's right. The ones that I did join, and I'm telling you that there were only four or five of those, and that those were all in the early 1930's."

Spivak: "Well, now, you said that you knew about them, that you didn't join them carelessly, that you knew all about them when you joined."

Kenyon: "Well, I wish, I wish you could tell me, I'd like to know, Mr. Spivak, I'd be very happy to know."

Spivak: "Well, mine didn't get on any list; why did yours?"

It is just possible that Judge Dorothy Kenyon has overlooked the Hiss, the Christoffel, and the Harry Bridges cases.

The latter two were convicted of perjury when they denied association with Communists. Hiss was convicted of perjury because of false testimony given a congressional committee.

It is just possible that Judge Kenyon does not appreciate the significance of her membership in or the use of her name by organizations classed as Communist-dominated; that she does not understand the significance of McCARTHY's charges.

The columnists and radio commentators who have been branding McCARTHY as a falsifier have often been careless with the facts and their interpretation of the facts.

Just why, when a Red is caught, or an administration employee is charged with being a Communist or sympathetic toward Communists, this little group of commentators and columnists should feel called upon to rush to their defense, has never been explained.

Certain it is, however, that their influence is rapidly growing less. They are becoming known as professional mudslingers.

A Salute to the Glory That Is Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "A Salute to the Glory That Is Greece," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the March 24, 1950 issue of the New York Journal American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO THE GLORY THAT IS GREECE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Hail, O, hail, O glorious Greece, on the one-hundredth and twenty-ninth anniversary of your Independence Day.

We cheer your unconquerable soul. We salute the glory that is Greece.

Your past is unrivaled in intellectual richness. Your past is filled with the meaning of justice and beauty. Your past is studded with every form of human achievement. Your past is kindled with the eternal love of human liberty.

No tyrant has ever been able to crush you. No tyrant ever will.

You have ever held aloft the torch of liberty and freedom to light the pathway of civilization.

Your love of freedom, and your love of music and the arts; your love of the finest impulses of the human heart and mind, flourished and blossomed with such rich fertility during the age of Pericles that they have never been exceeded in history.

Like that of your Olympian god, your polished brow was ranked above the contending forces that surged below. Like Aristotle, Socrates, and Plato of old, you have kept your eyes focused on the stars.

You have demonstrated in the most terrible of wars that you possess the flame which made your ancestors transcendent examples of what the human spirit can achieve.

You have never surrendered your convictions or ideals. You have emerged triumphant through every test of fire and sword. You have manifested in blood and suffering the invincible spirit of your martyred heroes who fought and died for liberty.

You have preferred to die on your feet rather than live on your knees. You were our ally in war, you are our ally in peace.

Spring has come again to the golden land of Hellas. We can feel the warm breezes playing gently over her pastoral Arcadia. We can see the red poppies of Attica bloom beneath the gray green olive trees. We can see the branches, heavy with buds, in the Thessalonian orchards. We can see the Greek dances and hear the Greek music.

Today mother Greece is mourning for her 28,000 children held behind the iron curtain by their Communist abductors.

In the name of Him who is full of compassion for little children, let us lift our voices against this blackest crime against humanity.

Let us denounce this mass outrage at the bar of civilization. Let us demand the return of these helpless children to their grieving parents.

This is a challenge to American leadership. This is a challenge to American fortitude.

This is a spiritual challenge.

America will, America must respond to the cry of mother Greece.

From the lamps of Acropolis, from the tragedies of Euripides, from the songs of Menander, from the poems of Palamis, from the thought of Aristotle, from the science of Archimedes, the light of liberty will never be extinguished.

Hail to the land of Hellas—one nation, one language, one history, one greatness.

Long live liberty. Long live Greece.

Life Insurance Is Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the Union Labor Life Insurance group:

LIFE INSURANCE IS INTERSTATE COMMERCE

I am indeed pleased to have this opportunity to give some of my views on the vital subject of insurance to a group like the union-labor life insurance group. A group such as yours understands more clearly than the lay public the dramatic impact that the business of life insurance has upon the economy of the Nation.

For many, many years a legal myth existed that insurance was intrastate business, and hence not subject to Federal regulation. It was not until 1944 in the United States against Southeastern Underwriters case that the Supreme Court held decisively that insurance is interstate commerce. Thus was exploded a myth that had no, and never did have any, basis in fact. In all the business operations of life-insurance companies, there is such a crossing and recrossing of State lines that to think of insurance as merely operating in a localized area of activity is absurd on the face of it.

Life-insurance investment carries it into almost every phase of our economy, and it is this significant investment problem that must be the concern of an aware and informed public. It is a group such as yours that constitute the nub of such a public.

The admitted assets, according to Dunne's International Insurance Reports, as of December 31, 1947, of the Big Five insurance companies, were: Metropolitan, $8,548,422,601; Prudential, $7,321,468,722; Equitable Life Insurance, $4,504,971,753; New York Life, $4,234,184,598; and Mutual Life of New York, $1,942,722,247. Since 1947, the figures have gone considerably higher.

Total assets of all insurance companies are somewhere in the neighborhood of $59,000,000,000, and these assets are increasing daily. When we view the staggering fact that between the end of 1939 and the end of 1949, assets of life-insurance firms jumped from $29,243,000,000 to $59,280,000,000, we have before us a rate of increase that must ultimately bring to the life-insurance companies a control over the economy of the Nation greater than any other segment in private enterprise.

The life-insurance companies have more than twice the volume of the mortgages they held 10 years ago; they hold three times the amount of Government security they did 10 years ago. They have nearly trebled their holdings in bonds and stocks.

As a consequence the insurance companies are involved in numerous types of business. They construct housing projects; they build commercial and industrial structures and rent them for short or long periods. They are in the banking business and make loans to all manner and kinds of business. There is neither floor nor ceiling to their financial activities, save that they may only invest in capital stock to a limited degree.

Now we learn that the insurance companies will purchase freight cars and lease them to the railroads. The Atlantic Coast Line Railroad has rented 1,300 freight cars to cost about $7,500,000 especially built for the Equitable Life Insurance Co. by the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co. We learn also that the New York Central Railroad will similarly rent 1,500 boxcars from the Equitable Life Insurance Co.

Most significantly, the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power, which is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman, has made some preliminary investigations on the disposition of the vast assets in the hands of the life insurance companies. We found that the larger of these life insurance companies are practically laws unto themselves. Their combined power is incalculable. It is not too difficult to foresee, for example, another of the insurance companies buying and renting locomotives or Diesel engines, and another passenger cars, and still another parlor cars, and a fifth one proposing to electrify railroads. These railroads need help, and the insurance companies are a source of much needed money's supply. However, where can this sort of practice end—in the complete control of railroads by insurance companies? This is by no means an improbable conclusion, I predict that this kind of practice will spread like wildfire. I see a long queue of railroads at the offices of the big five life insurance companies—insurance companies which are faced with a necessity of investing their billions of dollars of assets which keep increasing. Why not? Officials of railroads would be foolish, indeed, not to take advantage of these offers by insurance companies. They

can deduct the rents of the cars from their income taxes and get much needed good equipment for bad.

Now the point I wish to make is that I am not condemning this practice as such. That it holds implications of danger is apparent. The railroad financial situation is not of the soundest, and we must, therefore, question how secure are these investments for the company, the policyholder, and the public, but I do believe there is a more fundamental issue involved and that is the lack of proper supervision over life insurance companies' business operations.

In the last 2 years, according to some evidence submitted to me, private loans placed by life insurance companies have practically doubled. It has been estimated that between the years 1945 to 1947, these private loans have risen from five and one-half billion dollars to ten and one-half billions. I understand that these figures have been challenged, others placing it at six billion and some placing it at ten billion. Whatever the figure, the bold fact is that these loans are being made without supervision by entities like the SEC, the Federal Reserve Board or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, entities which supervise loans made by banks, underwriters and investment outfits. Certainly, there should be some protective guidance to safeguard the interests of the stockholders, the policyholders and the public with reference to life insurance. These loans are usually negotiated between the insurance companies and the borrower without benefit of any intermediary, with no registration with State or Federal entities. These loans are of an investment character requiring far closer supervision and inspection than can possibly be given by any local State superintendent of insurance.

I am personally convinced that Federal regulation is necessary. There is presently no State supervision of life insurance companies (although there is a pretense of one), and even when there is, as for example in New York, the supervisor is made a year later when the insurance companies make their reports. Then that which is already done becomes an almost impossible and involved job to undo. Frankly, in most of the States, the regulated have already become the regulators, with few exceptions, so that there is no public reckoning.

I re-emphasize that Federal regulation is imperative. It is not, of course, my thought to superimpose Federal regulations upon State regulations which would result in 49 regulatory bodies. But it is my belief that the solution lies in Federal regulation which would govern in any conflict between State and Federal law.

In the preliminary discussions before the Monopoly Subcommittee, two very vital facts were presented: (1) that insurance with smaller companies is just as safe as with larger companies, and (2) that the premiums paid for insurance are no higher with a smaller company.

These two facts contain within themselves most interesting implications, particularly with reference to the size of insurance companies—size that carries with it a power almost as great as Government itself. I think that there is a need to explore these facts further and to relate them to both the question of size and Federal regulation of life insurance companies.

I know that you are alive to these problems, and I present them because I believe that a healthy, vigorous, and critical examination by groups such as yours will in the end produce the best answers in the interest of the people and the country.

A Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an excerpt from the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item. This excellent article is the work of Mr. Orra L. Stone, editor of the Item, an authority on the history of Clinton:

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS

When Erastus Brigham Bigelow touched off the spark that fixed Clinton in the industrial firmament as the mid-nineteenth-century center of the manufacture of carpets, ginghams, and wire cloth and probably influenced, more than any other American, the development of the textile art, neither he nor his associates envisaged that within a century the plants that rose Phoenixlike to provide thousands with their living would, with one exception, wither or be removed from Factory Village in a little over three-quarters of a century.

But such is history and in place of three local enterprises that grew out of his inventions only one remains today. The original companies have been succeeded by approximately 35 smaller industrial establishments employing more than 3,200 workers to whom are being paid, in wages, approximately $6,000,000 annually, in the year that Clinton observes its centennial year.

One hundred years old today the great and General Court of Masachusetts passed the act that gave birth to the town and during that period its sons and daughters have passed through many trying years, none more seemingly disastrous than the early thirties of the present century when the Lancaster Mills liquidated and the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. closed its local plant and removed its machinery to Thompsonville, Conn., and Amsterdam, N. Y.

These events from the economic point of view seemed to herald the end of Clinton as a manufacturing town and to spell bankruptcy to its merchants as the former weekly pay rolls of $130,000 melted into approximately $15,000 every six working days.

Every resident faced a crisis such as has befallen few Bay State towns and cities, but the courage, initiative, and business acumen of a group of 33 leading citizens were drawn upon in forming the Clinton Industries Corp. and a campaign was immediately launched which resulted in the acquisition of the idle plants and, aided by the chamber of commerce, concerns were lured from their former locations, vacant plants were filled with machinery, and the town again resumed its industrial march with diversified products shipped to all world areas.

It was the second time that Clinton's growth and prosperity had been adversely affected as, in 1895, the expansion of homes and manufacturing plants to the south part of the town was halted when the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board seized 17 percent of the territory of this municipality, at that time the smallest town in Worcester County, in area, save Hopedale.

But, on the 5.2 square miles that constitute the geographical limits of Clinton, approximately 13,000 souls today confidently look forward to the continued influence of the town in the halls of statesmanship, education, industry, and all walks of life.

From time immemorial the go-getters have been the people who have run the world. Their souls have been awake and after all it is the soul that counts, not the body, not brawn and bone and blood and muscle, avoirdupois, and athletics.

A sleeve may carry a stump and a leg may go with a limp, but the soul that is regnant and determined will arise and overcome all difficulties as has been amply demonstrated by Clintonians since the natal day of its existence.

Nothing can block the way for the dauntless spirit that says: "It shall be done."

Like all towns Clinton has had those who never found themselves, those who have never gotten into action, others who were creatures of circumstance and easily diverted to the line of least resistance.

Some have been spineless and visionless, quickly subsiding without an ounce of steam in the throttle, a pound of coal in the bunker or a spark of fire in the furnace and have wondered why they failed.

But the human personalities that have made Clinton what it is today were dynamos of power, Niagaras running to waste and reservoirs of energy merely waiting to be tapped. Men have failed not because they lacked education, or equipment, or opportunity, but because they lacked pep and failed to demonstrate driving power.

The switch was never thrown, the will never asserted itself. That type failed to become a go-getter but fortunately the army of men and women who devoted themselves to the upbuilding of Clinton has been and today is awake and numerous and cannot be halted.

It is a far cry from the few dusty and ofttimes muddy highways that served Clinton in 1850, to the 35 miles of paved streets that Clintonians traverse daily while the primitive cesspools of that year have given way to 34 miles of sewers.

No longer must residents go to the expense of locating and digging wells as was the case in 1850, for today they are served by 45 miles of water mains on every street in town, providing them, by the simple turn of a tap, with a daily capacity of 925,000 gallons of the purest water enjoyed by any Bay State municipality with the right to pump 500,000,000 gallons a year from Wachusett Reservoir in times of emergency and with the Wekepeke reservoirs holding 235,000,000 gallons of water which flow, by gravity, to Clinton, without the aid of pumps and with the value of the waterworks system set at $1,000,000.

In 1850, residents enjoyed illumination from kerosene lights or candles while today electricity flows through 4,200 meters installed in all dwellings and public and private buildings.

One hundred years ago the busy Clinton housewife prepared the meals for her family on a range fed with wood while today at least 2,200 dwellings are equipped with gas meters supplying fuel, through modern ranges, that require only a thumb to turn the flow off and on and many more homes are equipped with electric ranges.

In 1850, if a Clinton resident wanted to talk with a relative or neighbor it was necessary to journey to where they lived but, today, by simply uncradling a receiver from a mechanical instrument in 4,039 homes or places of business he can almost instantaneously make his voice heard in any town or city between the Atlantic and the Pacific or in the far corners of the globe.

No longer is it necessary to hide one's money in a stocking at home or journey to the mother town to place it on interest as was the case when Clinton was incorporated, but he finds safe depositories in either the Clinton Trust Co., the Clinton Savings

Bank, or the John Prescott Cooperative Bank, the three financial institutions possessing total assets exceeding $16,330,000.

Four years before Clinton was incorporated the first newspaper, the Lancaster Courant, was established, later to become the Clinton Courant and 7 years before the town celebrated its semicentennial the late William J. Coulter launched the Clinton Daily Item.

When Clinton came into being residents were dependent for home reading on such volumes as they purchased or obtained at the limited library established by the Bigelow Mechanics Institute, in Clintonville, just prior to the incorporation of the town, but today they are served by the Bigelow Free Public Library, housed in a building erected largely by the philanthropy of the late Andrew Carnegie and now containing on its shelves more than 53,000 volumes in its circulating department and approximately 44,000 in the children's department.

The religious life of Clintonians is cared for by 15 churches, including three Roman Catholic parishes, and edifices housing the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Free Methodist, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Lutheran, United Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Christian Science denominations.

Through the generosity of the late Frank T. Holder and his wife, Clinton, although the youngest of Lancaster's daughters, boasts a historical building that is second to none in the Commonwealth and serves as a center for many civic activities.

The boys of 1850 showed their athletic prowess on vacant sandlots, but the youth of 1950 is served by three playgrounds; Fuller Field, with a seating capacity of 3,000, and four public parks with the old common providing a beautiful centerpiece for the many public and private buildings surrounding its four sides.

In 1850 the residents of the little town enjoyed only a few stores with meager stocks, but 100 years later more than 125 wholesale and retail establishments, including some of the leading national chains, are visited daily by thousands of customers in their ultramodern interiors where are dispensed every article catering to human needs at prices on a par with the big department marts in the larger cities.

Notable indeed are the recently enlarged enterprises of the F. W. Woolworth Co., and the J. J. Newberry Co.

The retail enterprises cater to a consuming population of more than 25,000 persons within a shopping radius of 8 or 10 miles.

While the horse and buggy served the denizens of Clinton, in 1850, today more than 3,000 locally owned automobiles and trucks traverse Clinton streets daily speeding their owners and passengers to the shopping center and to towns and cities where many Clintonians are employed.

Of the 2,088 dwellings in Clinton, more than 505 are one-apartment houses and are owned and occupied by the owners. During the period of the last depression from 1929 to 1940, the longest in the history of the Nation, few new houses were erected but in 1949, approximately 50 were constructed at an estimated cost of $256,000, to partially relieve the acute housing conditions, and in this centennial year the town's first State-sponsored housing development will be completed and dedicated at a cost of $300,000.

In 1850, all new arrivals were ushered into the world at the homes of their parents but today, 99 percent of all infants born to local and vicinity families see the first light of day at the Clinton Hospital now a little more than a half a century old and the centennial year will witness the dedication of a $1,000,000 fireproof brick structure bearing the name of its founder, the late Dr. Walter P. Bowers, which with its maternity ward, will accommodate 117 beds.

Out of Clinton have gone, especially in the last half century, sons who were products of Clinton High School to take their places in the halls of statecraft. A decade ago Clinton boasted, in a single year, a State representative, a State senator, a United States Congressman, and a United States Senator, and previously a Lieutenant Governor and a Governor as well as candidates for Attorney General and Lieutenant Governor. The town has furnished two United States Congressmen within the past 10 years.

Clinton High School probably has graduated more young men who went on to win national and world fame in many fields than any other institution of its type in a town the size of Clinton in this or any other State.

Included in the long list are such notables as former lieutenant governor, governor, and United States Senator, Hon. David I. Walsh, the late Congressman Edward Kenny, of New Jersey, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, former Congressman Joseph E. Casey, Matthew J. Connelly, Secretary to President Harry S. Truman for the past 5 years, associate justice of the Superior Court John W. Corcoran, who also was honored by Democratic Party nominations, successively, as attorney general and lieutenant governor and only a few years ago it looked to many people as if Clinton might be the home of both Massachusetts United States Senators when the late Senator Walsh was serving, as the senior representative of the Commonwealth in the upper branch of Congress and Congressman Casey was nominated, by his party, for the junior senatorship.

Hon. John A. Roche served as the reform mayor of the great city of Chicago from 1887 to 1889, while the late Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, born in the house now owned by Dr. Edward H. Mackay, led the greatest moral, social, and political upheaval that has occurred in the United States in the past century when he attacked Tammany Hall, in the Nation's metropolis and was given the support of the newspapers and of all civic groups of the largest city of the country.

Adwin Lassiter Bynner, author of the novel Agnes Surriage, won laurels in the field of literature and Arthur F. Bowers, brother of the late Dr. Walter P. Bowers exerted great influences in the fourth estate, in New York City where he served as editor of the New York Tribune.

David M. Cheney, of 130 Prescott Street, has authored several historical novels in recent years that have enjoyed large sales and is at work on an epic contribution to American literature at the present time, while pertinent contributions to the life of the era frequently appear in the Saturday Evening Post, from the pen of Richard F. Attridge, of 37 Hammond Street. The writer of this editorial is the author of a 4-volume history of Massachusetts industries which appeared in 1930.

Cause and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the membership of the Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a very timely editorial written by the Honorable James E. Lawrence, editor of the Lincoln Star, published at Lincoln, Nebr., which editorial appeared in the issue of Tuesday, April 11, 1950.

All Democrats and Republicans whose political faiths have not been fashioned in the loom of un-Americanism by the interweaving of the warp of extreme left wingism and the woof of the extreme right wingism will, I am sure, appreciate reading this editorial.

Mr. Lawrence has for many years been one of the outstanding, faithful Democrats of Nebraska, and has always pursued his journalistic labors in an effort to be helpful to people of Nebraska and the Nation. He has been a firm believer in, and advocate of, the great Jeffersonian principle reiterated by Abraham Lincoln that the citizens of our Republic are entitled to have "a Government of the people, by the people and for the people" instead of a Government, State and national, of selfish big business, by selfish big business and for selfish big business.

In passing, I might also observe that the Lincoln Daily Star is the leading Democratic newspaper in Nebraska, and but for the efforts of this newspaper and its sister Republican newspaper, the Lincoln Daily Journal, all political faith in Nebraska would have been less potent today than it is now. True, there are a number of other great Democratic and Republican newspapers in Nebraska which have less circulation than these two fine newspapers and they, too, are entitled to their full measure of praise for the great good they have accomplished. Concerning all of these fine publications it might well be stated "Glorious it is to wear the crown of a pure and well-deserved success."

Of course, it should be the desire of everyone to reduce taxes if possible, but when doing so we should remember that we are not living in an era of peacetime economy where we can freely cut expenditures to the bone and pay off the national debt. On the contrary, we are living perhaps in the most disturbed era which our country has ever known.

We are endeavoring to successfully fight the cold war through ECA appropriations and in other ways, and many people think the time is not far distant when we shall be engaged in world war III, and if that be a fact, then our watchword should not be "economy," but on the contrary should be "preparedness." We should not be induced to follow the reactionary pattern which was in vogue before Pearl Harbor and which almost brought about our defeat—but we should profit by the experiences of the past and do everything possible to protect our Nation and save its people and its Government which is not only our hope but the last ray of hope to the peoples of the world who desire freedom and lasting peace.

I now will set forth the editorial which I have mentioned herein with a few slight changes by way of deleting from the text the name of the person mentioned therein:

CAUSE AND CURE

One of the Nebraska Representatives "in Congress is quite certain that he has located

the cause of a Nebraska ailment. Unfortunately in setting forth his views, nothing that he says even slightly resembles a cure for the disease he has discovered."

He "told a staff member of the Washington bureau of the Omaha World-Herald that a small-town banker in southeastern Nebraska had written him that his institution had made out 304 income-tax returns for taxpayers who also filed returns in 1948 and the tax paid for 1949 was approximately 50 percent of what they paid in 1948. Then he added:

"The root of the trouble is an economically unsound tax system that destroys savings and discourages new business. Continuation of the present heavy wartime tax load certainly is one of the basic problems in the national as well as the farm-income drop for excessive taxation is not conducive to expanded enterprise either in the city or on the farm."

There is a germ of truth in what he says. Certainly excessive taxation destroys savings. Whether it robs individuals of incentive is open to argument. There is no evidence to support it in Nebraska. The farmers of this State continue to plow and plant, to cultivate and to harvest. In the towns and the cities, business and industry look forward to new physical plants, to increased production, to greater efficiency, and to more successful operation.

We have yet to talk to a single individual, who actually has decided to seek an easy chair, or to sit with folded hands, lazily gazing at the skies. The tax burden is heavy. The amount of each dollar of earnings that goes to the support of Government at all levels, takes a surprisingly large chunk of every dollar of the individual's earnings. But in spite of it we see no loss of creative thinking by Americans. They work, plan, and actually, they complain surprisingly little. They dream of homes, of comforts and necessities, and they do continue to practice thrift.

We're inclined to think most of them are realists enough to recognize that if there is to be national security, it will prove costly; that if America is to fulfill foreign commitments, that will take huge chunks of money; that if the single item of interest on the national debt is to be met, it alone will call for an annual tax burden equal to an approximate 40 percent of the total Federal budget in the early thirties.

It does not take a smart man to recognize that the present tax load is punishing. It does call for a miracle man to figure out how America can cut its present expenditures substantially—cut them enough to make the economies reflect themselves in the individual's tax burden.

He has been a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, where tax legislation originates in Congress. There's where he should try his cure if he can convince his associates that he has one.

Address by President Truman Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by President Truman today before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is an honor and privilege to insert an address which refers to my resolution, Senate Resolution 243, now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and which brings to its objectives such eloquent and powerful support.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I am happy to be here today with this group of editors. You and I have a great many important problems in common, and one of the most important of these is the responsibility we share in helping to make the foreign policy of the United States of America. That is why I am going to take this opportunity to discuss with you some aspects of that policy.

No group of men in this country is of greater importance to our foreign policy than the group your society represents.

In a democracy, foreign policy is based on the decisions of the people.

One vital function of a free press is to present the facts on which the citizens of a democracy can base their decisions. You are a link between the American people and world affairs. If you inform the people well and completely, their decisions will be good. If you misinform them, their decisions will be bad; our country will suffer and the world will suffer.

You cannot make up people's minds for them. What you can do is to give them the facts they need to make up their own minds. This is a tremendous responsibility.

Most of you are meeting that responsibility well—but I am sorry to say a few are meeting it badly. Foreign policy is not a matter for partisan presentation. The facts about Europe or Asia should not be twisted to conform to one side or the other of a political dispute. Twisting the facts might change the course of an election at home, but it would certainly damage our country's program abroad.

In many other countries today, the papers print about foreign affairs only what their governments tell them to print. They can't add anything, or cut anything. In the democracies, the papers have a free hand. Only in a democracy is there such mutual trust and confidence among citizens that a private group is given such an all-important role in determining what the Nation as a whole shall do. There is too much nonsense about striped trousers in foreign affairs. Far more influence is exerted by the baggy pants of the managing editor.

There has never been a time in our history when there was so great a need for our citizens to be informed and to understand what is happening in the world.

The cause of freedom is being challenged throughout the world today by the forces of imperialistic communism. This is a struggle, above all else, for the minds of men. Propaganda is one of the most powerful weapons the Communists have in this struggle. Deceit, distortion, and lies are systematically used by them as a matter of deliberate policy.

This propaganda can be overcome by truth—plain, simple, unvarnished truth—presented by newspapers, radio, and other sources that the people trust. If the people are not told the truth, or if they do not have confidence in the accuracy and fairness of the press, they have no defense against falsehoods. But if they are given the true facts, these falsehoods become laughable instead of dangerous.

We can have confidence that the free press of the United States and most of the other free nations will keep us from being deceived by Communist propaganda. But in other parts of the world the struggle between falsehood and truth is far more intense and dangerous.

Communist propaganda is so false, so crude, so blatant, that we wonder how men can be swayed by it. We forget that most of the people to whom it is directed do not have free access to accurate information. We forget that they do not hear our broadcasts or read impartial newspapers. We forget that they do not have a chance to learn the truth by traveling abroad or by talking freely to travelers in their own countries.

All too often the people who are subject to Communist propaganda do not know Americans, or citizens of the other free nations, as we really are. They do not know us as farmers or as workers. They do not know us as people having hopes and problems like their own. Our way of life is something strange to them. They do not even know what we mean when we say "democracy."

This presents one of the greatest tasks facing the free nations today. That task is nothing less than to meet false propaganda with truth all around the globe. Everywhere that the propaganda of Communist totalitarianism is spread, we must meet it and overcome it with honest information about freedom and democracy.

In recent years, there has been tremendous progress all over the world in education and the exchange of ideas. This progress has stirred men everywhere to new desires and new ambitions. They want greater knowledge, they want better lives, they want to be masters of their own affairs. We have helped and encouraged these people, but the Communists have seized upon their desires and ambitions and are seeking to exploit them for their own selfish purposes.

In the Far East, for example, millions are restlessly seeking to break away from the conditions of poverty and misery that have surrounded them in the past. The Communists understand this situation very well. They are trying to move in and take advantage of these aspirations. They are making glittering promises about the benefits of communism. They reach directly to the peasant or the villager in these vast areas, and talk to him directly in his own tongue about the things he has learned to desire. They say that they can get these things for him. And too often he hears no voice from our side to dispute them.

We know how false these Communist promises are. But it is not enough for us to know this. Unless we get the real story across to people in other countries, we will lose the battle for men's minds by default.

The Communist propaganda portrays the Soviet Union as the world's foremost advocate of peace and the protector of defenseless peoples. The contradiction between what the Communist leaders have promised and what they have actually done is so startling that we are amazed that anyone can be deceived. In Berlin, in Czechoslovakia, in the Balkans, in the Far East, they have proved, time after time, that their talk about peace is only a cloak for imperialism.

But their intended victims will not learn these facts from Soviet propaganda. We are the ones who must make sure that the truth about communism is known everywhere.

At the same time, we must overcome the constant stream of slander and vilification that the Communists pour out in an effort to discredit the United States and other free nations.

Soviet propaganda constantly reviles the United States as a nation of war mongers and imperialists. You and I know how absurd that is. We know that the United States is wholly dedicated to the cause of peace. We have no purpose of going to war except in defense of freedom. Our actions demonstrate that we mean exactly what we say. But when men throughout the world are making their choice between communism and democracy, the important thing is not what we know about our purposes and our actions—the important thing is what they know.

Communist propaganda also seeks to destroy our influence in the world by saying the American economy is weak and about to collapse. We know this is preposterous. The industrial production of the United States is equal to that of the rest of the world combined. Our agricultural production is more than adequate for our needs. Our people enjoy the highest standard of living in the world's history. Our economic strength is the bulwark of the free world.

From every standpoint, our free way of life is vastly superior to the system of oppression which the Communists seek to impose upon mankind. In many parts of the world, however, where men must choose between freedom and communism, the true story is being untold.

We cannot run the risk that nations may be lost to the cause of freedom because their people do not know the facts.

I am convinced that we should greatly extend and strengthen our efforts for making the truth known to people in all the world.

Most of us have recognized for years, of course, how important it is to spread the truth about freedom and democracy. We are already doing some very good work, through the Voice of America and the United States information offices and libraries in many parts of the world, through the exchange of students, through the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, and in other ways. But events have shown, I believe, that we need to do much more, both ourselves and in collaboration with the other free nations. We must use every means at our command, private as well as governmental, to get the truth to other peoples.

Private groups and organizations have an important part to play. Our labor unions have already done fine work in communicating with labor in Europe, in Latin America, and elsewhere. The story of free American labor, told by American trade unionists, is a better weapon against Communist propaganda among workers in other countries than any number of speeches by Government officials.

The same principle applies to other groups. The best way for farmers in other countries to find out about us is to talk directly with our own farmers. Our businessmen can speak directly to businessmen abroad. We need to promote much more direct contact between our people and those of other countries.

We should encourage many more people from other countries to visit us here, to see for themselves what is true and what is not true about our country. We should find more opportunities for foreign students to study in our schools and universities. They will learn here the skills and techniques needed in their own countries. They will also see at first hand the rights and duties of citizens in our land of democratic institutions.

Our colleges should train more Americans to go abroad as teachers, especially to teach modern methods of farming, industry, and public health—and, by example, to teach our concepts of democracy. The notable record of our many charitable and religious organizations who send teachers abroad is proof of what can be done.

Another major part of our effort must be carried out through our great public information channels—newspapers and magazines, radio, and motion pictures. We must strive constantly to break down or leap over barriers to free communication wherever they exist. We must make full use of every effective means of communicating information, in simple, understandable form, to people whose backgrounds and cultures are different from ours.

This poses an enormous challenge to groups such as yours, a challenge which can be met only by extraordinary inventiveness and enterprise. I am confident that the American press can and will make a tremendously useful contribution toward finding new solutions.

The Government's programs for telling the truth about the United States to the peoples of the world also need constant improvement. Our present overseas information and educational exchange program is getting results. For example, the Voice of America has been carrying to people behind the iron curtain the true story of world events. It has been so successful that the Soviet Government is using a vast amount of costly equipment in an attempt to drown out our broadcasts by jamming. We must devise ways to break through that jamming and get our message across. And we must improve and strengthen our whole range of information and educational services.

This is not a conclusion reached by Government officials alone. We have had the valuable aid of the United States Advisory Commission on Information created by the Congress. Your own society is ably represented on that Commission by Mr. Mark Ethridge and Mr. Erwin D. Canham. The members of the Commission have given intensive study to the overseas information program and have made repeated recommendations that it be substantially expanded. Similar recommendations for the exchange program have been made by the Advisory Commission on Education, headed by Dr. Harvie Branscomb. I have been glad to see that many Members of the Congress have urged an improved and expanded program in these fields, as shown, for example, by the resolution introduced recently by Senator BENTON for himself and a number of his colleagues.

Because of the pressing need to increase our efforts along this line, I have directed the Secretary of State to plan a strengthened and more effective national effort to use the great power of truth in working for peace. This effort will require the imagination and energies of private individuals and groups throughout the country. We shall need to use fully all the private and governmental means that have proved successful so far—and to discover and employ new ones.

Our task is to present the truth to the millions of people who are uninformed or misinformed or unconvinced. Our task is to reach them in their daily lives, as they work and learn. We must be alert, ingenious, and diligent in reaching peoples of other countries, whatever their educational and cultural backgrounds may be. Our task is to show them that freedom is the way to economic and social advancement, the way to political independence, the way to strength, happiness, and peace.

This task is not separate and distinct from other elements of our foreign policy. It is a necessary part of all we are doing to build a peaceful world. It is as important as armed strength or economic aid. The Marshall Plan, military aid, point 4—these and other programs depend for their success on the understanding and support of our own citizens and those of other countries.

We must make ourselves known as we really are, not as Communist propaganda pictures us. We must pool our efforts with those of the other free peoples in a sustained, intensified program to promote the cause of freedom against the propaganda of slavery. We must make ourselves heard round the world in a great campaign of truth.

We have tremendous advantages in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties. We have truth and freedom on our side. The appeal of free institutions and self-government springs from the deepest and noblest aspirations of mankind. It is based on every man's desire for liberty and opportunity. It is based on every man's wish to be self-reliant and to shape his own destiny.

As we go forward with our campaign of truth, we will make lasting progress toward the kind of world we seek—a world in which men and nations live not as enemies but as brothers.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Dinner of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last Saturday by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at Pittsburgh, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is appropriate on occasions such as this, when sincere, loyal Americans meet to consider the welfare of our country, to recall the warning contained in the familiar quotation:

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

It is likewise appropriate to recall the words of Daniel Webster, who said:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

When we reflect upon those profound truths it is incumbent upon each of us to search his soul and to ask:

"Have we been eternally vigilant in the protection of our liberties?"

"Have we been always ready to guard and defend the freedom that God has granted us?"

My friends, because we cannot, in good conscience, reply in the affirmative, we live in a world of unrest and confusion, a time when our precious liberties are in grave peril.

There are many dangers in the world today. The air is filled with strange philosophies and fantastic slogans.

On all sides we are bombarded by propaganda that the plan of free government by free men, established by the founders of our Republic, is outmoded and should be thrown on the junk pile.

Loud voices have been raised telling us that it should be replaced by a socialistic

ideology with an all-powerful central government promising comfort, ease, and security from the cradle to the grave.

But they do not tell us that the price of the system they advocate is surrender of all individual freedom.

They do not tell us that its inevitable result would be enslavement of the people to the government under rigid controls, regulation, and regimentation.

They do not tell us that the socialistic plan has brought disaster to every nation where it gained control and that it dragged the people down to poverty and misery.

Under its plan of individual freedom, the United States, throughout its history, has been a bright beacon of peace, good will, and liberty in the world.

In less than 200 years we have made greater progress than any other people on earth. We have produced the highest living standards and most advanced cultural and spiritual attainments of all time.

Yet we are not free from danger. There are those, jealous of our unparalleled success as a nation and a people, who would destroy us.

There are those who would discard our system of free enterprise and would substitute a planned economy to direct our lives and our activities.

We have those who are striving to array one class against another and one section against the other to create dissension and distrust among our people.

These are some of the elements of the national peril which threaten freedom of the individual and freedom of opportunity—the firm foundation of American greatness.

But we are exposed today to a greater and more menacing source of danger.

The greatest threat to American freedom is the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy caused by excessive taxation and reckless, extravagant Government spending.

One of the most shocking developments in American history is the rapid increase in the cost of Government and the heavily increased burden of taxation and debt.

In recent years we have witnessed radical changes in the philosophy of government and dangerous departures from the traditional American course.

We have seen a vast increase in the size and complexity of the Federal Government. We have seen its power encroaching more and more upon the functions and authority of State and local government.

We have seen the cost of Government multiplied eightfold in 20 years. We have seen excessive direct and hidden taxes drain away the earnings of the worker, the farmer, and the resources of industry.

We have witnessed the tragic spectacle of an administration unaware of the danger of national bankruptcy and the threat to American freedom that is inherent in a national debt exceeding a quarter of a trillion dollars.

We have witnessed the wildest spending spree in our Nation's history. This year alone it may add $6,000,000,000 to our present crushing burden of debt.

The cost of government at all three levels, local, State, and Federal, has increased until it has reached $65,000,000,000 a year.

Government costs 13 times as much as education. We pay for government 40 times as much as we contribute to our churches of every denomination. We spend more for government than for food.

Thirty cents out of every dollar earned by every one of us—worker, farmer, preacher, lawyer, doctor, and businessman—goes for government.

Government is taking so much from the earnings of the people that the men and women who have supported the churches, hospitals, charitable institutions, research foundations, and colleges will no longer have the means to continue their support.

These institutions will be forced to make increased demands for governmental aid and finally will become totally dependent upon government for their existence.

They will no longer be free institutions. They will be controlled and directed by political overlords with the power of life or death, according to the whims of political fortune.

With these critical conditions confronting us there are important questions which must be answered.

How much of the national income can be taken in taxes and still leave enough to continue high employment and operate industry at full capacity?

How far can we go without everyone getting hurt in the tax squeeze?

How far can we allow taxes to consume the substance of the people and still maintain our high living standards?

If we reduce taxes more people will have more money to spend for automobiles, homes, household appliances, and the necessities of life. That is the way real income should be increased, not by inflation through government spending of borrowed money.

Under the socialistic government of Great Britain the people pay even a higher tax than we pay here in the United States. As a result living conditions for the worker have been reduced to a poverty level and opportunities to improve health and education have been ignored.

High taxes ruined Germany. They were "goose stepped" into regimentation and all freedoms were lost. The same happened to Italy and Russia and to every other nation which followed this plan.

History teaches us that one of the causes of the fall of the great Roman Empire was the steady trend toward turning citizens into pensioners. When the Roman masses got their minds firmly fixed on free bread and circuses, they soon became indifferent to liberty and freedom.

In modern times we see the same abuses in the constantly increasing pressure and demand upon the government for support of destructive programs that reach into every activity of our daily lives.

When Government control goes far enough into medicine, education, agriculture, labor and business, the freedoms which made us a great Nation will be lost.

Security is the desire of every right-thinking man; but never in the history of the world has it been attained by a governmental formula.

Real security must be bought and paid for by work and sweat, individual thrift and sacrifice. It is the reward of enterprise, initiative and prudence.

Security cannot be achieved by the simple method of having the earnings of the people spent, not by themselves, but by a spendthrift Government bureaucracy.

Is there one individual in all our broad land who will say:

"I no longer want freedom."

Is there one with soul so small or vision so limited that he will say:

"Give me security and I will surrender into other hands God's gift of liberty."

If there is he has ceased to be an American. He has forfeited the rights and privileges of American citizenship.

Real Americans can serve their country by working and fighting for sound fiscal policies and economical, business-like administration of the public funds.

A bankrupt America cannot stop communism at home or abroad.

A system of taxation that destroys initiative and incentive and prevents the production of new wealth can destroy the United States.

Our first line of defense must be a strong, dynamic, solvent America.

I repeat:

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Renewal of Radio Station Licenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the FCC hearings on renewal of radio-station licenses.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on March 30 I introduced into the RECORD a statement with reference to the present Federal Communications Commission hearings in connection with the Commission's attempt to not renew the licenses of radio stations KMPC in Los Angeles, WGAR in Cleveland, and WJR in Detroit.

I am this morning in receipt of a copy of a statement relative to this matter, issued by Mr. Hugh Fulton who is the chief trial counsel for these radio stations. His statement is as follows:

"I am amazed that the Federal Communications Commission would attempt to destroy an excellent station like KMPC and its right to its license on the basis of testimony of witnesses such as those relied upon by the Commission.

"With the exception of a very few whose testimony if accepted 100 percent would not justify any attack upon the license of KMPC, they were all disgruntled former employees who had been fired for laziness or incompetence. Very obviously they nursed grudges against KMPC and against Mr. Richards (principal owner of the stations) and have endeavored for years to damage and injure the station.

"Testimony was replete with obvious exaggeration and emphasis on everything which they conceived might be stretched into something unfavorable. Wherever they thought they could do harm they purported to have marvelous recollections but on cross-examination constantly sought refuge in 'I don't remember.'

"On their own testimony it was clear that most of them were committing perjury and some of them also admitted facts establishing theft of files from the station and participation in ventures under investigation by the district attorney for fraud. One openly asserted on the stand that he had deliberately lied in a prior statement.

"The amazing thing is that the Federal Communications Commission should have vouched for the credibility of witnesses such as these and should rely on that kind of evidence in an attempt to destroy great radio stations which have for so many years furnished such excellent service to tens of millions of listeners.

"In all that time the Federal Communications Commission put in evidence only one solitary complaint from a listener and referred to two or three other complaints which its witnesses said they had received in the course of 11 years, but which they had not kept, despite the fact that one of its leading witnesses testified that he had carefully preserved for 7 years all the material which he thought might be injurious to the station.

"The Federal Communications Commission counsel fought desperately to prevent the authentication of the actual scripts that had been used in broadcasts by KMPC, and even went so far as to try to prevent the authen-

tication of the scripts for use on cross-examination. This attempt of the Commission to get away from the criterion of what was actually broadcast, taken together with the absence of complaint and complete satisfaction of the listening public with KMPC and its programs, is most significant.

"The Commission's only claim of right to examine into the matter at all is on the theory that the public needs to be protected. The public itself is the best judge and the verdict of the public with respect to all three stations based on years of listening by tens of millions of persons was rendered in favor of the stations many years ago.

"These proceedings have already cost the taxpayers and the radio stations, and through the radio stations the public, a vast sum of money, and have diverted time and attention that otherwise would have been devoted to still further improving the excellent service rendered to the public by these fine stations.

"Despite the fact that none of the Commission's witnesses could show anything broadcast that was false or that deceived the public, the Commission apparently thinks it proper to engage in this kind of proceeding on the testimony of these disgruntled former employees, most of which was to the effect that Mr. Richards dared to have political views different from those of the administration in Washington, and particularly that he dared to state over the radio true facts which such witnesses characterized as unfavorable to the administration and to various persons connected with it, particularly the Roosevelt family.

"Clearly, this is an attempt to censor what goes over the radio in violation of the Constitution and of the ban by Congress against censorship, and all this is in the face of the admission in Washington by the chief counsel of the Commission that the Commission has no investigation pending against any radio stations owned by Democrats or labor unions that have expressly stated their intention to purge and drive from office Republican Senators and Congressmen who support the Taft-Hartley Act."

Mr. President, I am sure that no Member of this Congress—either Republican or Democrat—can question the integrity of Mr. Fulton. Many Members of the Congress will recall that Mr. Fulton was chief counsel for the War Investigating Committee during the period when President Truman was chairman of that committee. They will recall the fine reputation which Mr. Fulton made for himself at that time and the many tributes paid to him, both by the President and other members of the committee. The fact that Mr. Fulton is a Democrat and is in this case defending the right of Mr. Richards, an avowed Republican who has been a foe of the administration privately, to voice his private opinion lends even greater support to my belief in Mr. Fulton's intellectual honesty. It is because of this very fact that I believe that the members of this Senate should carefully examine the statements by Mr. Fulton which I have placed in the RECORD today.

Hidden Billions—United States Ignores Assets of ERP Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Herman A. Lowe, appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Thursday, March 30, 1950. I recommend this article to the careful consideration of all Senators, since it is based upon careful research by Delaware's most efficient and capable Representative BOGGS, who calls our attention to the unknown billions of dollars' worth of assets in the 16 European nations now receiving aid from this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIDDEN BILLIONS—UNITED STATES IGNORES ASSETS OF ERP NATIONS

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Delaware's able Congressman, J. CALEB BOGGS, has turned a spotlight on this Nation's most prominent anatomical peculiarity—its heart is bigger than its head.

At a time when Congress is beginning to think about what kind of policy should succeed the European recovery program which expires in 1952, BOGGS has asked leaders of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to:

1. Try to find out the value of the foreign assets of the 16 ERP nations.

2. Determine whether some of these assets should not be liquidated to pay for a portion of the goods being supplied to them by the heavily burdened American taxpayers.

In the course of digging for information, BOGGS has verified that the 16 ERP countries and their citizens own billions of dollars worth of assets in the United States and other countries—but that our Government has only a notion of how many billions.

Yet, without bothering to learn the answers, our Government lays billions of dollars in taxes upon the American public and adds other billions to the national debt, to aid the ERP countries.

So far as BOGGS is concerned, that is a very unrealistic way of operating. He thinks maybe we ought to be governed by some of these facts as well as by our generous emotions.

In his letter to the Republican and Democratic leaders of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, BOGGS said:

"It seems very proper at this time to ask for an over-all statement of such overseas assets as may now be owned by the 16 ERP countries. It is known that large investments by European governments and private citizens have taken place in the United States during the five postwar years.

"It is most surprising and remarkable that we have never been given a comprehensive report of the assets owned by the 16 ERP countries in areas where we have spent money for off-shore procurement on behalf of Europe under the Marshall plan."

That second paragraph holds the crux of BOGGS' idea for having the ECA countries pay for part of the aid. A substantial part of the food and other materials which ECA has bought with American money has been in other countries. BOGGS says it amounts to $2,700,000,000 worth. He thinks that some of the assets of the 16 beneficiaries in those other countries should be liquidated to pay for future commodities there—instead of the burden all falling on the American taxpayer. He does not urge at this time that any of the beneficiary country assets in the United States be liquidated. He does, however, suggest that we find out what these assets amount to.

The latest figure on ECA country assets in the United States was released by the United States Department of Commerce in 1947. It set the total at about $11,000,000,000. BOGGS took this up the other day with the State Department which pointed out that many of the figures in the big total were compiled in 1941 and that no recapitulation had been made since.

State Department threw up its hands vaguely, explaining that: "Any estimates derived from the original census become more and more unreliable as the years go by, and consequently it is not believed that a reliable estimate can be made today." State admitted that, so far as it was concerned, it just did not know how much was around.

On the question of what assets the ECA countries had in other foreign nations, the State Department had even less to offer.

"To our knowledge," it informed BOGGS, "such information is available only in isolated cases and not on any comprehensive basis."

State went on to explain that it was "the understanding" of the Department that the balances had been reduced. However, no real efforts have been made to find out.

And there you have the situation. Billions have been spent for ECA aid by the United States. Yet our Government has never obtained any figures to determine whether the spending was all necessary, or whether our people could have been spared some.

BOGGS thinks we ought to insist upon getting all the facts before we shape up a new program which will doubtless cost us additional billions.

Patriots' Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Lexington, Mass., on April 19, 1950, to commemorate the one hundred and seventy-sixth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord:

Mr. Chairman, the immortal heroes of the battle of Lexington, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and all my friends, the most outstanding and significant factor in all history is that from Wednesday dawn, April 19, 1775, this Nation, conceived in freedom and born on this immortal spot of earth, still exists and has steadily progressed, enduring many national catastrophes, two world wars, and threatening enslaving philosophies of government, until now, this Wednesday dawn, 175 years later, it is the most modern, God-fearing, the most powerful Nation on earth—depended upon by free nations everywhere this United States of America holds within its power and strength the freedom of mankind throughout the world.

Here on this precious soil little did the heroic men of that momentous dawn know the meaning of their stand against the overwhelming force of British Regulars. Little did they know the destiny of the colonies their valor cemented together into a new Nation dedicated to freedom and equal justice under law. Little did they know this new Nation under a new concept of government would some day extend for 3,000 miles across the Great Plains, the fertile valleys, and majestic mountains to the Pacific Ocean. Little did they know their heroism that Wednesday morning was the beginning of the United States of America

which has twice saved the great British nation and twice saved the free nations of the world from enslavement and the loss of their lands, their people, their culture, and their civilization. Little did they know their fearless gallantry set the example, molded the pattern, and breathed the indomitable spirit of life into the Nation which has become the most powerful on earth and which can, if necessary, assemble twenty-five — yes, thirty — millions fully equipped for the defense of its freedom. Every patriotic American knows that freedom is the most valuable asset of mankind and that once gained and experienced, death is preferable to its loss. Let no nation—no dictator—no group of greedy world-power schemers—ever again make the mistake of attacking the free people of this powerful America, for if they do they will experience the mighty fury and full devastation of this power.

It is not easy for any trained soldier of a great modern army of this time and day to go forth to meet the full storm of the enemy. When he does, however, he is assured by the fact he possesses the finest equipment industrial science has developed. In the breast of every soldier is the courage to meet the test. More than courage, however, flourished in the hearts of the 60 patriots who assembled here on this honored green under the leadership of Capt. John Parker. These men possessed the spirit of self-sacrifice. They were ready and willing to sacrifice their lives to save freedom for those who survived and those who would follow.

No modern equipment had they. Theirs was powder, ball, and musket. In the last great war America possessed many generals completely able to lead our armies to victory just as efficiently as the leadership which did, but here on the green of Lexington there was only one Capt. John Parker. His order to his men that momentous Wednesday morning still stands today as one of the most inspiring and decisive military commands ever given by any field commander. "Don't fire unless you are fired on but if they want war, let them begin it here." This command now is an American principle. America does not desire to make war on any country. America does not desire to engage in war but if any country fires on America they will receive the full weight of our might in return.

On this Wednesday, 175 years after Lexington and Concord, America is in trouble. Since the conclusion of the war there has been a gradual disintegration of national and moral unity largely accomplished by the spread of communism. Russian communism is organized. It's objective is world domination. On a number of occasions the Soviet leaders have expressed their conclusion that our system of free government and free enterprise cannot exist in the same world with communism. In five short years we have seen communism take over eastern Europe and constantly threaten the western European nations. It is spreading over Asia, having gained control of China, and moving south to Siam, Burma, and India. But for the European-aid program, organized and operated by our own Government, Soviet communism at this very hour would be in control of all Europe and moving across the Mediterranean into Africa. The only power which stands across the path of world domination by Russia blocking the spread of communism is the United States of America. This country stands for a free world and a world of free people. Because we believe this to be right we must be adequately prepared to meet successfully the Russian challenge of communism. We must go on keeping the flag of freedom flying amid all the winds that blow.

Under our Government we possess many freedoms we now accept as routine in our day-to-day living. Freedom of speech permits us to express our views regarding political issues, the Government, and activities of our fellowmen. This cannot be done in Russia under communism. Freedom of the press permits all sides of an issue to be presented to the people for their determination of that which is false and that which is right. This is not permitted in Russia under communism. Freedom of religion gives us the right to worship God in our own way. This is not permitted in Russia under communism. The heart of our strength as a Nation is our faith in God. This faith represents one of our cardinal differences with communism, for communism neither believes nor accepts a higher authority. The government is all-powerful in itself and is in no sense subject to the higher authority of God. If you believe in communism then communism must be your God for you cannot look to any other. This is the creed of the Communists and this is the reason it is impossible to bridge the gulf between these two ways of life.

Our national unity is only so strong as the spirit of patriotism is alive and burning in the hearts of the people. For 283 years prior to April 19, 1775, the American Colonies welcomed to their free soil the oppressed peoples of Europe. As these people came to this new land they quickly adapted themselves to their new life and were proud to be Americans. During the 175 years that have followed Lexington and Concord people from every country in the world have streamed into America seeking the freedom and opportunities making for a happier life. After becoming an American citizen it is the duty of every new American to give to his new country his complete loyalty and cooperation. If he is not willing to do this the right to remain should abruptly cease. Just recently I have been informed that in the event of an open conflict with Russian communism many of our workers, on which the Nation would greatly depend, plan to resort to sabotage and do everything they can to assist and promote the communistic cause, hoping for a communistic victory. Not for one moment do I believe this to be true. I have complete confidence in the workers of America. I believe them to be loyal, patriotic Americans. They have proved their loyalty many times. In case of an attack on their country they would be among the very first to see that every man and woman did their duty. Once having experienced freedom, it is most illogical and most difficult to believe that anyone would seek a life of limitation and enslavement by decrees of dictators and the atheism of communism.

Without a doubt, there are many agents of communism and Soviet Russia here in America. Without a doubt, some are citizens—yes, native-born citizens. Without a doubt, some have worked themselves into high and important positions in our Government. Regardless of the political consequences, the American people should arise to this underhanded challenge to our country and demand that they should be expunged from the Government and denied the right of citizenship, just as the patriots of Lexington made their stand against the challenge to their freedom. I cannot find within my heart and conscience any desire to close the door on this great issue until America—your country and mine—is free of the cancerous scourage of communism. It is our duty—our precious duty—to do everything we can to strengthen our national unity and to protect the spirit of America, for if we do not we are no longer worthy of the bravery of Capt. John Parker and his men and no longer worthy of freedom. It is well to remember:

> "Freedom's battle once begun
> Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son
> Though baffled aft is ever won."

The dramatic event which fate determined to happen on this immortal spot is the most significant since Calvary. And like Calvary it will command the heart and spirit throughout the history of mankind. Lexington was the beginning of a new world. Lexington brought to an end serfdom and slavery and replaced it with freedom for millions. Because of Capt. John Parker and his 60 minutemen patriots a new concept of government was born—government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Lexington was the beginning of this great free Nation—the United States of America. I am so proud, so deeply proud to represent it in the Congress of the United States.

In this troubled time of our Nation's life, our solemn duty orders us to hold fast and to protect all they gained for us the living and to measure every act and deed, for we cannot fail to meet successfully the test of our generation. It is your duty to constantly try and my duty to constantly try—and try we will.

In every part of America and throughout the world free men are turning their eyes and attention to Lexington during these hours of celebration. They, like those of us here, again give thanks to Capt. John Parker and thanks to his noble men.

Promoting Democracy Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a few days ago bipartisan sponsorship was given to the resolution introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], calling for an enlarged program for promoting democracy abroad. The proposal has brought forth much favorable editorial comment, and I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Promoting Democracy Abroad," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 24, 1950; an editorial entitled "On Selling Freedom," published in the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of March 24, 1950; an editorial entitled "Global Sales Campaign," published in the Meriden (Conn.) Journal of March 24, 1950; and an editorial entitled "A Constructive Plan," published in the Hamden (Conn.) Chronicle of March 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 24, 1950]

PROMOTING DEMOCRACY ABROAD

At a time when most Congressmen are engrossed with the economic and political intricacies of budget slashing, including the State Department's information budget, Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, has had

the vision and the wisdom to issue a call for a greatly expanded information and cultural program to promote democratic ideals through the diplomacy of public opinion.

He was joined by 10 other Senators, members of both parties, in sponsoring a resolution calling for a six-point program to close the mental gap between ourselves and the peoples of the world.

The extent and urgency of the need, Senator BENTON knows full well from his service as director of the State Department's information program abroad. The Russian Army, he pointed out, is only the reserve in the cold war. The front line at present is manned by propaganda.

Each of his six points is sorely needed and could accomplish much good if prosecuted with sufficient vigor. They include: increased pressure for world-wide freedom of information; acceleration of the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; expansion of the State Department's information and education programs; promotion of democratic education abroad, especially in Germany and Japan where our efforts have been no more than halting in this field thus far; coordination of the information programs of all non-Communist nations, and encouragement of the efforts of private citizens who are trying to attain these goals through nongovernmental channels.

The United States has been lagging badly in one of its most urgent and important tasks. It needs to encourage the development of democracy in the world. Here is a way to do it, at relatively small cost.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of March 24, 1950]

ON SELLING FREEDOM

Speaking from a background of public relations, Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, proposes that the United States organize a world-wide "campaign of ideas" against communism. He argues that the free nations so far have been losing the propaganda battle with the Soviet Union. He urges that they now coordinate their efforts and employ every resource of communication to spread the gospel of democracy. There is a good deal to be said for the Senator's proposition. It has the support of a sizable Democratic and Republican group in the Senate.

Communist propaganda for years has been highly centralized. Much of it may appear to emanate from the Communist parties of various nations. But it is all dictated from Moscow and a great part of it obviously is financed by the Soviet Government. The intended victims of this propaganda, on the other hand, have fought it singly. They have moved to concert their military, economic, and even political policies, without doing anything of a common-defense nature in the realm of ideas.

It may be objected at once that actions speak louder than words. They do. If the western democracies are to win the support, say, of the peoples of southern Asia or eastern Europe, they must themselves demonstrate the practical superiority of freedom to any authoritarian order, and they must show that they are not merely paying lip service to the ideals they profess. But in the face of a vigorous propaganda offensive against them, using every technique of distortion and misrepresentation, that is no longer enough.

We cannot wait for the truth to prevail by its own inherent virtue in some distant future—if, indeed, under modern conditions it can ever hope to prevail in competition with the censorship, deliberate lying and terrorism as practiced by a dictatorship. The time would seem ripe for a massive counterattack by the free nations at the informational level. Not only is the need self-evident but the Communists are becoming increasingly vulnerable in the very field of propaganda which they have been exploiting so actively.

Day by day the Soviet Union is emerging, in the words of an old-line German Communist, not as the liberator of oppressed peoples but as the inheritor of the political ambitions of Czarist Russia. The imperialistic ambitions of the Kremlin are becoming obvious even to the eyes of non-Russian Communists. The successful Tito revolt against domination from Moscow has created a rich opportunity for exposing the gigantic hypocrisy of the Soviet Government.

That hypocrisy must be underscored and placed in vivid contrast to a program of dynamic democracy. No one nation is in a position to do this alone. By the leading governments of the non-Communist world can—and should—do it on a cooperative basis.

They now have a chance to make themselves the salesmen of freedom, and, provided they can prove the article they are selling is as advertised and unadulterated, a master plan of democratic propaganda of the type Senator BENTON recommends ought to be invaluable.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Journal of March 24, 1950]

GLOBAL SALES CAMPAIGN

Freshman Senator BENTON's proposal of a global sales campaign in behalf of democracy should be taken seriously, for it comes from a source which has produced some of the most successful sales ideas ever launched into the world of advertising. After all, the production of sentiment favorable to democratic systems of government does not differ fundamentally from any other advertising job. It's merely bigger. And no job of promotion has ever been too big for BILL BENTON.

Sizing up the competition, it doesn't seem that the obstacles are insuperable. Those men in the Kremlin turn out terrible stuff. Their copy is amateurish. The claims made for their product—communism—are simply absurd, and would never stand up under a sampling test. That such advertising has pulled in droves of customers may be laid to the fact that it is directed to a market controlled by fear.

There's where the Benton plan faces a major difficulty. He can't make people listen, and he wouldn't want to, if he could. He can't even be sure of reaching his sales prospects while Russia is jamming up the air waves. But we'd bet that, given a free hand to perfect his organization, he'd find ways and means.

After all, Senator BENTON has learned a lot since he was teamed up with Chester Bowles in one of the slickest combinations that ever made a nation clamor for the stuff it was boosting. He has had other experience that counts: much of it under his present boss—Uncle Sam. He knows what the State Department is like on the inside. He raised the Voice of America from a feeble squeak into a clear and powerful organ for good.

The genius of the Senator is in his ability to organize: to lay out a plan and put it across. He has demonstrated that genius again and again. In his maiden speech in the Senate, he showed that his mind is still teeming with the stuff which won him his first success. He presented a solid, practical scheme. One of the best things about it is that it doesn't contemplate giving anything away. In many respects, it parallels the proved methods of commercial advertising.

First, there would be the sales conference—to be made up of representatives of non-Communist countries. Next, the business of establishing a world broadcasting network, arranging for time on this network, turning out movies with a selling punch for democracy, planting educational programs in the right spots—wrinkles which Mr. BENTON knows from A to Z.

Of course there's the possibility of a hitch. The Senator must first convince his colleagues, who are also, in a way, his clients. Many a good advertising scheme has come to naught before the board of directors. But BILL BENTON has had considerable success, too, in softening up hard-minded boards. Here's his first opportunity to show that his talents are not wasted in his present job. We shall see what we shall see.

[From the Hamden (Conn.) Chronicle of March 30, 1950]

A CONSTRUCTIVE PLAN

Senator BENTON has rung the bell in a speech before the Senate calling for a Marshall plan of ideas to promote the cause of democracy throughout the world.

The junior Senator from Connecticut has followed up his talk by introducing a resolution cosponsored by Senator MCMAHON in addition to 11 other Senators, calling for the United States to take the initiative and vigorously prosecute a greatly expanded program of information and education among all the peoples of the world with a view toward closing that mental gulf that separates the United States from other peoples and blockades hopes for freedom and peace.

Senator BENTON's proposal is akin to a bell of peace resounding over the roar of war drums. His suggestion for the United States taking the initiative is a welcome relief from our perennial defensive maneuvers of dashing to and fro to plug leaks in the dike against the steadily rising tide of communism.

It is a constructive program which we hope his colleagues in the Senate will give the serious consideration it deserves. Certainly it cannot, or should not be cast aside as another impractical plan born of desperation to end the cold war.

The Senator points out that we have the advantage in such a propaganda campaign in that we don't need to lie. We might add to this priceless asset of having the world's best salesmen who are convinced of the superiority of their product.

Contribution of Imports to Business Activity and Full Employment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is, on the part of all economic groups in this country, a growing interest in import problems. Those charged with carrying out our foreign policy have indicated that it is imperative that this country buy more from other countries in order to make it possible for those countries to get back on their feet, and and thus eventually permit a reduction of our foreign economic assistance. We have heard, however, in the last few

weeks, some growing resentment on the part of some on the ground that imports are hurting us, that they are increasing unemployment in this country, and that we should reexamine our whole tariff policy. I have been impressed by an article on this subject in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of April 13, 1950, by Maurice Heyne, Belgian minister and commercial counselor, titled "Contribution of Imports to Business Activity and Employment." I ask unanimous consent to include a portion of Mr. Heyne's article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRIBUTION OF IMPORTS TO BUSINESS ACTIVITY AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By Maurice Heyne, Belgian Minister and commercial counselor)

* * * * *

Now we might as well face the fact that there is considerable resistance to imports here in your country and abroad. In fact, in almost every country exports are considered its meat, imports its poison. As long as this situation exists world trade will continue to be jeopardized.

* * * * *

By reason of their interdependence one upon the other, imports and exports alike contribute to the well-being within a country. It can hardly be said that one creates business activity and employment and that the other detracts from it. A high level of domestic activity and full employment is always accompanied by a similar level in world trade. The opposite is also true.

* * * * *

In your country a double-barreled effect lends force to the resistance to imports. It must seem to the American people as if it should be enough to pay the bill for ECA in an all-out effort to put Marshall plan countries back on their feet. They are now being asked to turn around and buy what they have helped other countries to produce, in order to keep the ball rolling. Why, they ask, should they be required to accept foreign merchandise which may be in competition with domestic products, or which may be imported in such quantities as to cause dislocation in certain industries?

This is important, because the attitude toward imports is a major factor in selling them. The very publicity necessary to develop a market is likely to increase resistance in proportion to the aggressiveness with which imports are promoted.

Yours is a country which has built an enormous and dynamic productive machine. It accounts for half the world's output. Because of the dominant position of the United States, what happens here, and the policies you adopt, penetrate every nook and cranny of world trade.

The world needs what America produces. It does not have enough dollars to pay for it, however, unless you, in turn, buy enough of what the world has to sell. Despite the eminent success of the Marshall plan and the able administration of ECA, the dollar gap is still of such proportions that items such as shipping, tourism, investments, and loans that help to make up the international balance sheet, cannot possibly be expanded to achieve the necessary trade balance. This can be accomplished only by closing what Mr. Radcliffe has called the merchandise gap.

Thus, the attention of almost every country is focused on the United States as a market.

In spite of the rich bounty with which your country is blessed, imports are important to you. You recognize that fact. For in 1948, 60 percent of your imports were free of duty. Only 40 percent were considered in protection of American industry.

The major share of duty-free imports is, of course, in raw materials and commodities. These are either not available in the United States, or supplement domestic supply. Your country uses about half of the raw materials which enter into international trade.

The automotive and allied industries, a source of employment in many centers in the United States, import materials from all over the world. "Thirty countries furnished this room" was the caption of a recent advertisement in your magazines.

Almost half of your imports in 1948 were in crude foods and materials. Another quarter was in semi-manufactures, a total of over 70 percent imported for further fabrication. Without such imports, many of your industries would have to close down entirely, or greatly restrict production.

EXPORTS PROVIDE 5,000,000

Let us turn this over and look at the export picture. It is estimated that the rate of your current exports provides some five million jobs. In 1947, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly half of these were engaged directly or indirectly in nonagricultural industries in the production of goods for export. In the durable goods industries, in mining, and especially in capital goods, export workers accounted for 14 percent of the employment.

This is borne out when we consider the character of your exports. In 1948, only 22 percent of all United States exports were in crude foods and materials; 11 percent in semi-manufactures, and 67 percent in manufactured foodstuffs and finished goods. In other words, two-thirds of your exports were the product of a high content of American labor. If we include semi-manufactures, the proportion rises to over 75 percent.

Normally, 7 to 10 percent of your output is exported. Averages, however, fail to reveal the degree of dependence of the American economy on its export trade.

American cotton represents 45 percent of the international trade in this commodity; American tobacco 42 percent. Although your production of rice is only a small percentage of world production, your exports since the war have accounted for almost 16 percent of all rice moving in international trade.

In 1948, 25 percent of your production of machine tools, 20 percent of agricultural machinery, 15 percent of motor trucks were exported. These percentages are not out of line with the proportion of production exported before the war.

Because your economy is geared to your mass-production industry, any sharp cutbacks in exports of these industries would be felt, not only in the labor market directly affected, but in the entire economy. A considerable drop in production would mean higher unit costs, less profit to industry, price fluctuations at the consumer level, and unemployment in both agriculture and industry.

Moreover, the size and complexity of American industry and production, and its importance in world trade, are such that repercussions from any curtailment are felt all over the world. We are all too familiar with the effect of the comparatively mild recession in 1949 for me to enlarge on this point.

But I do want to call your attention to a report published by the OEEC early in March. The New York Times had this to say: "Decisive measures to narrow the dollar gap are apparently being taken on the dollar side, where drastic cuts in exports from the United States and Canada are expected to account for more than 57 percent of the anticipated reduction of the deficit." As the flow of the Marshall Plan aid diminishes, the report continues, exports from these two countries will be confined to the rigid requirements of basic foods and raw materials.

The significant point here is that decreases in your exports are likely to be in semi-manufactures and finished goods—in effect, in the product of American labor.

* * * * *

According to the economist, Robert L. Gulick, in representative years before the war, strictly consumer goods, other than foodstuffs, comprised around 6 percent of total imports. In 1948, all imported finished goods going into your industrial and consumer markets, including foods, were less than one-third of your total imports. These represent merchandise with a high content of the labor of other countries. In contrast, two-thirds of your exports represented a high content of your labor.

Imports of raw materials and semi-manufactures contribute to the manufacturing processes of industry. They thereby provide employment in many industries which otherwise could not exist at their present levels.

Employment thus created or sustained means purchasing power for other products of domestic manufacture—in the same way that purchasing power is provided by those 5,000,000 jobs in export industries.

Moreover, as raw materials, commodities, semi and finished goods for industrial and consumer use, move through the channels of trade, they create employment in the distributive trades. They increase demands for insurance and services, they add to the activity at parts of entry, they are warehoused, and shipped to their destinations. Even though they may displace in competitive selling American goods of a similar nature, they still have to be handled in transit. Therefore, in distribution channels, they cannot be said to displace labor.

DISLOCATIONS ALWAYS OCCURRING

Certain imports may cause some dislocations in the manufacturing fields. But dislocations are occurring at all times in a world where nothing is certain but change. Substitute materials, or new products growing out of changed conditions, outmode or replace those long established. A factory moves to a new location, or a machine is invented which displaces labor. But such is man's resourcefulness and inventiveness that another factory replaces the old one, or a new invention is the start of an entirely new industry or group of industries.

I am not minimizing the distressing effects of these dislocations. They are very real to the people and industries involved. How to cope with these situations as they arise constitutes a domestic problem of utmost concern in my country as well as in yours. In a time of growing social consciousness, however, we most surely can—and must—arrive at an equable solution.

The dislocation caused by the volume sale of an imported product tends to be offset by two factors. One we have already mentioned—employment in the distribution and service trades.

The other is that the more a product—whether domestic or foreign—is promoted, the wider its sale. This sale is not entirely at the expense of customers of competitive products, but—if I understand rightly the thesis of American selling—the whole base of the market is broadened to take in new customers. Thus the luxuries of yesterday have become the necessities of today.

But, you say, wage scales abroad are lower than in the United States. Imports not only compete for the consumer dollar, but undersell the comparable American product.

Unfortunately, the spotlight turned on imports produced by excessively cheap labor

tars all imports with the same brush. The postwar problem of the majority of foreign exporters to the United States is how to get their prices sufficiently low to compete in your market.

It is also true that other countries with lower wage scales erect tariff and other trade barriers to protect their workers against the low American wage cost per unit.

Now, I want to ask you a question:

Do the people of Michigan say to the people of Mississippi: "We will buy your raw cotton for our automobiles, and you, in turn, buy our automobiles. But we do not want to buy your paper or canned goods, because we process those things too, and our wage scale is higher than yours."

AN INTEGRATED MARKET

The answer is an obvious "No." Why? Because you have here in America an integrated market, as Mr. Hoffman calls it, a market of 160,000,000 people, the same kind of market that he is advocating for Europe.

Full employment in a given industry or locality increases the purchasing power for necessities and luxuries alike, whether they are produced in the same area or elsewhere. By the same token, unemployment decreases that purchasing power.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that New York's share of all goods entering the country by ship was 20 percent, compared to 33 percent in 1941. Part of this slump was due to competition with other ports, but a major cause was the interruption in the full flow of trade, when ships had to sail only partially loaded, or with empty bottoms. One out of every ten persons employed in the New York metropolitan area is in some way dependent on port activity and foreign trade. Where is the purchasing power of these people who may be thrown out of employment?

If your exports are sharply curtailed—I refer particularly to finished manufactures and consumer goods—the effect on employment will be felt in key industries, in key localities, at ports of entry, and in all distributive trades. It will be far greater than any possible dislocation caused by an increase in imports—particularly so, because such imports are diffused over large areas of population.

Therefore, is it the increased imports of the product of labor of other countries, or the decreased exports of the product of domestic labor which constitutes the real threat to full employment?

In spite of the unprecedented demand for materials and products of United States manufacture following the war, the total volume of your exports today is not abnormally high in relation to national income and production.

In contrast, the ECA commerce mission, headed by Mr. Wayne Chatfield Taylor, who is with us today, pointed out that had the prewar relationship between imports and the gross national product been maintained, ECA countries alone, in 1948, could have sold to you $2,000,000,000 more than they did.

* * * * *

In closing, I should like to quote a few remarks made by Dr. Amos E. Taylor, who is also with us today. As you know, he was for many years director of your Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and is now director of Economic and Social Affairs for the Pan American Union. In a brochure prepared for the Committee on International Economic Policy, Dr. Taylor says:

"Not only does a substantial part of United States imports consist of raw materials and semifinished products essential to American industry, but certain other imported commodities are in increasing demand when the level of national income rises. * * * In order to avoid the mistakes of the past, we need to remove the traditional fears relative to imports. In a world of full employment, specialized production, and a high standard of living, imports should be viewed as benefits, not dangers to the economy. * * * Employment is not solely a national problem. It is an international problem, the solution of which can be found only in an expansion of world trade and economic cooperation. The modern interdependent world must do business with itself if peace and prosperity are to be more than an empty hope."

Investigation of Interstate Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent editorials which have to do with the prosecution of former Representative Roger C. Slaughter, in which there is reason to believe the Department of Justice has been used by the administration as an instrument of political controversy.

One of the editorials is from the Washington Evening Star of April 19 and is entitled "A Political Prosecution." The other editorial is from the Washington Times-Herald of April 20 and is entitled "The Lobby Fraud."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 11, 1950]

A POLITICAL PROSECUTION

The Department of Justice has nothing to be proud of in its prosecution of former Congressman Roger C. Slaughter on charges of violating the Lobbying Act. On the contrary, the responsible officials should be ashamed of forcing a man to stand trial on the basis of evidence such as that produced against Mr. Slaughter.

This case had its inception more than 18 months ago, when the Justice Department was headed by Tom Clark, now a member of the Supreme Court. It came on the heels of a political fight between the President and Mr. Slaughter, who was a Member of the House from Kansas City. The President was determined to purge his fellow Missourian. The fraudulent voting in that contest, in which Mr. Slaughter was beaten, was investigated by the Department of Justice, but it can hardly be said that the investigation was conducted with vigor and determination.

Naturally, after that discreditable episode, there was some lifting of eyebrows when Mr. Slaughter was indicted. It looked then like a political prosecution. And that is what it looks like now.

A motion to dismiss the indictment was rejected several weeks ago by Judge Schweinhaut. But it was clear, from the language of his memorandum opinion, that he refused to dismiss because he had been led to believe the Government would produce evidence at the trial to support its contention that Mr. Slaughter had not acted merely as an attorney, but also as a lobbyist in the ordinary sense of that term.

When the case came to trial before Judge Holtzoff, however, the Government made a miserable showing. It produced nothing which could be called evidence to support its charge of lobbying. As evidence of lobbying, the prosecution offered to show that Mr. Slaughter had made telephone calls to Members of Congress which were paid for by some of his clients. But the Government attorneys admitted they did not know what had been said in any of these conversations.

In other words, they were willing to convict a man of a crime on the basis of sheer conjecture. Judge Holtzoff quite properly refused to accept such evidence as that and promptly found Mr. Slaughter not guilty.

On the record of this case, Mr. Slaughter seems amply justified in his contention that the charges against him were politically inspired. And it seems to the Star that Judge Holtzoff's verdict of acquittal amply demonstrates the wisdom of the founding fathers in removing our Federal judges as far as possible from the influence of partisan politics.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 20, 1950]

THE LOBBY FRAUD

The Truman gang's cruel and reckless use of the criminal law to abuse people they do not like politically, was illustrated in clear detail here 3 days ago, in the case of one Roger C. Slaughter of Kansas City.

This case equally well shows up the fraudulent and hypocritical nature of the laws restraining the ancient right of petition, now commonly called lobbying.

Here is a summary of facts about Slaughter and why he was brought to court charged with a crime that could have sent him to prison.

Slaughter is a Democrat who was elected to Congress in 1942 and defeated in 1946 because, as a member of the House Rules Committee, he refused to let the Truman gang dictate the way he should vote.

His independence was particularly offensive to the gang because he was, of all things, the representative from Truman's own home congressional district. For the crime of acting on his own, Slaughter became Truman's target No. 1 for 1946.

"If Slaughter is right," he said, "I am wrong." Truer words were never spoken, though the proving cost Slaughter and his family 4 years of expense and suffering.

Kansas City, being the Truman gang's headquarters, the boss' will on Slaughter in 1946 was naturally their command and so he lost at the polls.

As defeated Members of Congress have been doing for 150 years, Slaughter then looked around for a new job that could make use of his talents and knowledge of Government. He undertook to work here for people in the grain business, natural enough considering the part of the country from which he comes.

But the gang wasn't satisfied just to kick him out of Congress. The boss wanted Slaughter crushed to death. So, on November 23, 1948, he was indicted by a District of Columbia grand jury on two counts, charged with failure to register as a lobbyist.

ON TRIAL 1 HOUR

His case came on for trial here Monday, April 17, 1950, before Judge Alexander Holtzoff, who threw the case out of court within an hour after it started.

This says something not only about the integrity of the judge, the innocence of Slaughter and the black-hearted willfulness of the Truman gang, but also about the way the Government uses grand juries and about the laws on lobbying both as to their nature and their enforcement.

The Constitution of the United States says in article I of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The grain men who hired Slaughter were following that guarantee of right. They had a grievance and they hired a man to explain it.

But their right of petition was abridged and denied because they hired the wrong man.

And if you want to understand that well, follow the proceedings of the House committee right now carrying on one of the perennial lobby investigations.

This investigation is headed by Representative BUCHANAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. If it wants to do anything about lobbying, why doesn't it point the finger at the way the executive branch of the Government uses its power to force congressional action? Why doesn't it tell the candid truth, that no influence can be exerted on legislation, except with the willing compliance of the legislators?

The place to clean up lobbying is obviously inside, not outside, the Federal establishment.

Protest Against Federal Hand-Outs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hero Rebels at Hand-Outs," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick on April 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERO REBELS AT HAND-OUTS

Recently the Governor of Connecticut addressed a State-wide audience in which he made a plea for greater Federal aid for his State.

As the Governor finished his address, a 24-year-old war veteran, hero of Guadalcanal and winner of the Purple Heart, walked to the platform and asked permission to say a few words. He was permitted to speak and speak he did:

"There is no such thing as Federal aid. It is all money taken from the people. In 1948 the Federal Government took $665,000,000 out of Connecticut in the form of taxes. And the Federal Government can never send back anywhere near the amount they took out because of the tremendous overhead.

"The growing popularity of Federal aid in States and large cities is becoming more and more contemptible due to the political cowardice of governors and mayors who are determined to stay in office come hell or high water.

"And they do this by making their administrations look less and less expensive to promote their own selfish craving madness for money and power regardless of cost. This is played right into the hands of the New Dealers, whose sole objective requires that the power of States be weakened and that State institutions be made dependent upon Washington hand-outs.

"Our dear old uncle is handing out the money with one hand while holding a club behind his back with the other, if you should fail to behave. A few States have been able to resist the rule of the three golden balls that ornament the Washington front porch."

Think it over.

Presidential Visits to Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "No Gettysburg Address?—Mr. Truman Just Too Busy," written by John M. Cummings and published in today's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO GETTYSBURG ADDRESS?—MR. TRUMAN JUST TOO BUSY

(By John M. Cummings)

One of the great, decisive battles of the world was fought at Gettysburg in Pennsylvania's Adams County. Here the high tide of rebellion was checked. In the national cemetery on this battlefield rest the bones of many men who died in the bloody conflict.

President Lincoln dedicated the cemetery November 19, 1863. It was then he delivered what has since become known as the Gettysburg Address. "We are met on a great battlefield of that (Civil) war. We are met to dedicate a portion of that field as the final resting place of the men who here gave their lives that that Nation (the United States) might live."

In an unbroken line since the days of Theodore Roosevelt our Presidents have been proud to deliver the Memorial Day speech at Gettysburg. In more than 40 years Harry Truman is the only President to reject every invitation to attend the memorial exercises to the honored dead.

Five times since he became President on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman has found an excuse for sending regrets. The latest, of course, was his rejection of an invitation to deliver the Memorial Day address next May 30.

Theodore Roosevelt, twice, once after he left the presidency, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin Roosevelt, all have been at this national shrine on Memorial Day. Franklin Roosevelt also spoke there when the Eternal Light Peace Memorial was dedicated in 1938.

James F. Lind, the Democratic Congressman from the district in which the national cemetery is located; Francis J. Myers, the Democratic United States Senator; Pittsburgh's Mayor David L. Lawrence, a member of the Democratic National Committee, all importuned the President to attend the exercises next month.

"The President finds he must again decline this year," one of the Truman secretariat wrote Representative LIND. "His calendar for the month of May is already very crowded."

Of course he has a crowded calendar. Mr. Truman leaves early in May on a nonpolitical tour of the West. He will visit many towns and deliver many speeches in which he is expected to make nonpolitical appeals for the election of a Democratic Congress in the fall. And he'll cap the tour by attending the mid-month sessions of the Democratic National Committee in Chicago. Here, more likely than not, he will lay down the law for the conduct of the Democratic campaign.

Long before Memorial Day Mr. Truman will be back in Washington. No doubt he has other stints scheduled. Inquiry at the White House, however, elicited the information he has no fixed engagements for that day.

In the absence of anything definite, you can only speculate on the reason for President Truman's year-by-year rejection of the invitation to speak at Gettysburg. Certainly he must know the Civil War is over, that men who wore the gray of the South have visited the battlefield on which the hopes of the Confederacy were shattered.

Only a few days ago a grandson of Grant and a great-grandson of Lee met at Appomattox, where the last rite of the war was performed. Let's have the lowdown, Harry.

Carroll Binder Reports From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD an additional report written by Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune, relating to conditions in Europe. This is the fifth report by Mr. Binder which I have had printed in the RECORD. Two appeared in the RECORD of Tuesday, April 18, and two in the RECORD of Wednesday, April 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALT OF AID TO CUT JOBS IN AMERICA—1952 WILL THREATEN UNITED STATES WITH DEFLATION, EUROPE WITH POVERTY

(By Carroll Binder)

PARIS, FRANCE.—The American people and western Europeans have a rendezvous with destiny in mid-1952.

By that date the United States will have completed spending an estimated $15,000,000,000 to help western Europe get on its feet so securely that it can resist Soviet pressure and get along without further American subsidies.

What will be the shape of things on June 30, 1952, when Marshall aid has ended?

Five weeks' study of conditions in the 4 principal western European countries and talks with people familiar with the 14 other Marshall-plan countries leave me with a very strong impression. It is that the situation in mid-1952 is going to be much less satisfactory and potentially more critical than most Americans will be prepared for.

NONE ARE READY

None of the countries we are helping is in sight of self-sufficiency. The British, Scandinavian, and low countries hope that they will be able to maintain the present level of existence or at least tolerable standards if no further American aid is forthcoming.

But they will only be able to do so by the greatest austerity.

They will absorb far fewer American farm, factory, and mine products than they have been absorbing under the Marshall plan.

Some careful students of the post-1952 prospects doubt that even austerity and rigorous controls will enable all of those countries to keep their heads above water without continued American aid.

One of the greatest economists in England told me he knows of no official who in his heart believes there is the faintest chance of balancing accounts by the time dollar-aid runs out.

Belgium is a case apart but the fate of western Europe will not be determined by that little country's dollar balances. Because of its high agricultural productivity and other factors France probably can manage, if need be, without further dollar aid except when crops fail or the mines are tied up by strikes.

Austria and Greece will have to have continued assistance from the United States to keep going after 1952. So, it is generally assumed, will Italy and western Germany.

Nor will the impact of the end of Marshall-plan expenditures be confined to western European beneficiaries. Many Americans, few of whom realize they are beneficiaries of the European recovery program, seem destined to experience unpleasant jolts in the form of lost markets, lowered prices, and reduced employment.

DEFLATION INEVITABLE

That is, unless Uncle Sam finds quick ways of taking up the slack bound to result when he no longer gives western Europeans dollars with which to buy cotton, tobacco, cereals, metals, chemicals, and machinery.

Deflation seems inevitable unless the United States spends at home at least as much as it has been spending abroad to provide the purchasing power created by our postwar exports.

Western Europe will be no less receptive to such exports after 1952.

Without some of them unemployment will increase and standards of living again will decline. Europe will still need food and raw materials obtainable only through dollar purchasing power. It will not have recovered to such an extent that it can provide full employment and the necessaries of life to its increased population.

The United States cannot maintain exports at the current $12,000,000,000 level unless it imports much more than the present $7,000,000,000 level or gives western Europe dollar purchasing power by some post-Marshall plan of gifts, loans, or long-term investments.

Two-thirds of United States exports to western Europe are being financed by Marshall-plan funds at present. That represents a foreign market for $2,800,000,000 worth of American goods and services which otherwise would not have existed. For certain industries and regions of the United States it has meant the difference between good and poor prices, profit and loss, employment and unemployment.

But the Marshall-plan council has just issued a report estimating that under the most favorable circumstances western Europe will have a dollar deficit of $2,250,000,000 when the plan ends.

This estimate assumes that the level of business activity in the United States will remain at least as high as it was at the end of 1949. "Even small set-backs" in the United States economy would have disproportionately large consequences for western Europe, whose reserves are not great enough to sustain much strain, the council points out.

Whatever individual countries may do to get along without American aid after 1952, the "dollar gap" for western Europe as a whole will remain at least $2,250,000,000 and may go much higher if world economic conditions take a turn for the worse.

The discontinuance of Marshall-plan assistance thus seems certain to have a deflationary influence upon both the western European and the American economies. So did the discontinuance of American aid and investments in 1920–21 and 1931–31.

Was the Marshall plan then a mistake? Is our investment of $8,000,000,000 to date and $7,000,000,000 projected for the next 2 years money thrown down the drain?

Not unless we and the countries we are helping fail to build wisely on the foundations so hopefully laid.

We have bought time with which to try to save western civilization from eclipse. We still have an opportunity to save those political, cultural, and economic institutions to which we owe our present well-being and which are the only hope of the future. We have a chance to save them by less costly means than a shooting war for survival. But the methods have yet to be agreed upon.

We shall be called upon for more fateful decisions than any we thus far have had to make—Americans as well as western Europeans.

We Americans are like investors who have poured enormous sums into a concern threatened with bankruptcy which still is far from getting on its feet. Unless we make further investments all the $20,000,000,000 we have put up so far will be wasted and we shall be weaker than ever.

Our investments should not be primarily in further gifts, though aid to Greece and Austria cannot take any other rational form. We shall have to invest much more than we have been doing thus far in things Europe has to sell us or in the exports of countries which in turn buy from Europe. ECA is doing its best to prepare Europe to make things which can be sold to Americans and to prepare Americans to buy more in order that Europe in turn can buy more from us.

Paul Hoffman's goal of 1 to 1½ billion dollars worth of competitive imports is small when compared with our $250,000,000,000 gross national product. But makers of watches object to the entry of watches and dairy interests object to the entry of competing European products. It will not be easy to get quotas and tariffs down on those items in which any group of voters has a special interest and it is those which Europe usually is best situated to offer.

Nor will it be easy to get European manufacturers and exporters to make the extra effort required to penetrate the dollar market so long as they can sell without effort and at higher prices in soft currency countries. The rigidities of the European price structure, the distaste for the free competitive methods which are the life of a vigorous capitalistic system, the cartels and other restrictive agreements against which we crusade are so deeply ingrained in European practice that they are not going to disappear by 1952.

So long as any investment made in western Europe is subject to total loss if the Communists take over, so long as there is unfair competition from nationalized industries and hamstringing regulations, so long as profits remain subject to exorbitant taxation and not assuredly convertible into dollars there will be no large scale private investment to help bridge the dollar gap.

Paul Hoffman calculates that ever since World War I we have spent about 1 percent of our income for foreign aid in one form or another. That, of course, includes the loans we made in the twenties which were never repaid, as well as our gifts. Hoffman expects that we will continue to devote at least 1 percent of our income to maintaining conditions we deem essential to our security.

But spending is not enough. As I conclude this report on things present and likely to come in Europe I am impressed anew by the limitations of any program which is based on the United States trying to remain in one compartment and sending aid out to friendly nations living in other compartments.

Even if we should succeed in getting those nations into one compartment without ourselves joining them it is doubtful if the two compartments indefinitely could separately resist all the pressures to which they would be subjected by the Soviet power whose compartment grows ever larger.

This logically leads to a thesis long advanced by Clarence Streit and other advocates of a union of the free. It is advanced in a recent issue of Fortune: "Agreements, pacts, and alliances are no substitutes for efforts toward political union; subsidies and balances of payments are no substitutes for economic union." And no such union can succeed without United States participation.

A Legal Analysis of Unconstitutionality of Proposed Licensing of Motion Pictures

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 15, I commented on the Senate floor, that following a rapid review of legislation introduced the day before by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to license the motion-picture industry, it was my opinion that his bill was completely unconstitutional. I have a deep affection and admiration for my colleague, and yet, without any further reference to personalities or individuals, I must regretfully differ strongly with him.

I want to point out, Mr. President, that when I entered upon the office of Senator and when other Senators entered office, we swore an oath "to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." It seems to me that I, for one—particularly as ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee—cannot protect and defend the Constitution if I, or anyone else, stand silently by while legislation that is unconstitutional is introduced and is dignified by hearings. It seems to me, too, that it has always been incumbent upon the Congress to kill bad bills just as it is incumbent upon Congress to pass good bills.

I will not take up the time of the Senate to analyze in great detail this issue

on the floor. I do, however, want to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief memorandum I have prepared on this subject as well as a legal analysis of the bill's unconstitutionality. While the latter item is rather lengthy, I humbly feel that its over-all legal implications are so significant, insofar as freedom of the press is concerned, that the analysis makes for constructive reading. Following that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a few editorials which have been carried in the newspapers of my State opposing the licensing bill. I could add to these editorials almost indefinitely by quoting from hundreds of other messages throughout the Nation, but I do not believe that this is necessary and I will not take the space in the RECORD to do so.

Yes, some folks may ask why I take the time to take this obviously unconstitutional bill seriously and to make an extensive legal analysis of it. I want to point out, however, that when the day comes when we in the Congress regard with mere smugness unconstitutional legislation, then that will indeed be a black day for our country.

There being no objection, the memorandum, analysis, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR WILEY OPPOSING LICENSING BILL

Mr. President, with around 12,000 bills pending before the Congress, with literally hundreds of crucial problems presented to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee as well as to the 40 other odd Committees of the Senate and House, I am indeed sorry that major hearings have been scheduled by the Interstate Commerce Committee on this issue of proposed regimentation of the motion-picture industry of America.

I, for one, have never attempted to interfere in the jurisdiction of any other Senator. I am not a member of the Commerce Committee, but I respectfully submit to its distinguished and able chairman and to the membership of that committee that there are many issues to which the committee might better devote its attention than this licensing proposal.

HEARING SHOULD BE CANCELED

I earnestly suggest, therefore, that this hearing be canceled, and that the motion-picture industry be given the opportunity to work out on a voluntary basis its own solutions to this problem.

MY COMMENTS SHOULD NOT BE MISUNDERSTOOD

Let me reiterate my objections to setting up a gestapo over the American motion-picture industry are based primarily on legal and constitutional grounds and that: (a) I definitely would not want my comments to be misunderstood as condoning in the slightest the disgusting breaking of the moral law—the code of God and man—by a few individuals connected with films or by any other individuals.

(b) That my comments are not in any way meant to condone the appalling commercialization of sin that has occasionally marred Hollywood advertising (or for that matter, other business advertising that has violated good taste).

(c) And lastly, that my comments are not designed to condone in the slightest any other tendency which would serve to weaken the moral fiber of American people.

FLITGUN NOT SHOTGUN SHOULD BE USED

However, I stated on March 15, and I repeat, that Congress should not attempt to use a 100-barrel shotgun when an industry-used flitgun would more than suffice. Congress should not pillory a whole industry because of isolated misconduct of a few individuals.

PAST LICENSING PROPOSALS

I want to point out, Mr. President, too, that the suggestion for licensing made by the Senator from Colorado is not the first such unsound suggestion. A search which I have made shows that all the way back in the Sixty-third Congress, on March 21, 1914, Congressman Hughes, of Georgia, introduced bill H. R. 14895, which would have created a Federal Motion Picture Commission to analyze the problem of "obscene, indecent, immoral, inhuman pictures." The bill was reported upon but no action was taken.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress Congressman Hughes again introduced a bill on which hearings were held in January 1916. Then, on May 8, 1916, Mr. Hughes introduced still another bill along this very same line.

In the Sixty-ninth Congress Mr. Swoope introduced what was called a Motion Picture Regulation Act, H. R. 4094, on which hearings were held in April and May of 1926.

In 1925 Mr. Upshaw introduced bill H. R. 6233, which was referred to the House Education Committee. It, too, would have created a Federal Motion Picture Commission. Among its provisions, one would have banned the movement of film in interstate commerce unless a license had been granted by the whim of the Commission. Hearings were held on that issue, too, in April and May 1926, but nothing was done.

The years passed, and on June 12, 1933, Congressman PATMAN introduced bill H. R. 6097, designed for licensing films. Hearings were held by the Interstate Commerce Committee in March 1934, but nothing came of this legislation.

And so, Mr. President, the story of would-be efforts to regiment the industry goes. Through these many years as the motion-picture industry has grown from its swaddling clothes, we see that there have been repeated efforts, perhaps well-intentioned but nonetheless ill-advised, to establish a czar, a Kremlin-type dictator, over the industry. But always the good common sense of the Congress and of the American people has defeated these attempts, and I am sure that this will occur right now.

AMERICA'S MORALS NEED NO POLICE-STATE MONSTER

Surely, America's morals are not so weak; surely, our churches are not so defenseless that we need a police-state monster to safeguard our people. Let there be a spontaneous moral crusade among our people—led by our great churches, assisted by all the devout people in the cinema themselves, and let this voluntary crusade be the answer to the problem of immorality in Hollywood or anywhere else.

WHY RUN TO UNCLE SAM FOR ANSWER?

I am deeply sorry that there is in our land an affliction which we might call "governmentitis" which makes some few individuals run to the Federal Government every time they see some problem which they think ought to be corrected. Why must individuals always ask Uncle Sam to set up some new bureaucratic agency in order to handle problems which can be better handled by private industry? The Motion Picture Association of America, and organizations of independent producers and exhibitors are more than qualified under their present leadership to meet this problem.

I know that Mr. Eric Johnston of the MPA, a great patriotic American, is equally concerned with Senator JOHNSON in encouraging the finest possible motion pictures on the highest possible level and the finest possible advertising on the highest possible level for the industry.

Why, then, should hearings be held on this gestapo idea?

PICTURES CRUCIAL FOR COLD WAR VICTORY

Let me as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee point out that we are fighting a cold war throughout the world in order to save ourselves from a hot war—a war of blood and death. Motion pictures are a vital element in our winning that cold war.

The motion-picture industry in this connection has made preparations to assist in a gigantic peace-bond drive next month. Why should we attempt to cripple an industry which is one of the spearheads of our international crusade for peace and freedom?

Let no Senator be silent against this regimentation menace. There are no major motion-picture production companies in Wisconsin, or for that matter, in most of the other States. But this is a national issue, not a State issue. We are United States Senators, not State senators. Our concern is with freedom in all 48 States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, now let the legal analysis of this bill, S. 3237, speak for itself. This analysis demonstrates that the bill violates the first, fifth, and sixth amendments to the Constitution. It violates due process of law. It constitutes both a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law—both specifically banned by our Constitution.

Moreover, this legislation violates, I believe, the provisions of the Constitution relating to freedom of the press. The Supreme Court in 1948 held that "We have no doubt that motion pictures like newspapers and radios are included in the press, whose freedom is guaranteed by the first amendment."

Let us strike a lasting blow for freedom which future generations will not forget. Let us reject before it gets started unsound, unwise licensing legislation.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 3237, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The first question to be answered with reference to this bill is whether or not the subject matter thereof is one within the legislative power of the Congress.

As the Constitution of the United States does not grant the Congress any general police powers, the same having been expressly reserved to the States by the tenth amendment, *Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries and Warehouse Co.* ((1919) 251 U. S. 146); *United States* v. *Benken* ((WDSC) (1944) 55 F. Supp. 1, aff'd. 147 F. 2d 905, cert. den. 326 U. S. 374), the regulations of the motion picture industry proposed in this bill must be predicated upon the commerce clause (art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3). The power emanating from this clause is complete in itself and as an incident to it, Congress may adopt not only means necessary, but means convenient to its exercise and these means may be of the quality of police regulations. *United States* v. *Hall* ((1879) 98 U. S. 343); *Ex parte Curtis* ((1883) 106 U. S. 371); *Caminetti* v. *United States* ((1917) 242 U. S. 470); *United States* v. *Hill* ((1919) 248 U. S. 420); *United States* v. *Simpson* ((1920) 252 U. S. 465); *Brooks* v. *United States* ((1925) 267 U. S. 432); *Doherty* v. *United States* ((1938) 94 F. 2d 495, cert. den. 308 U. S. 658); *United States* v. *Parker* ((1939) 103 F. 2d 857, cert. den., 307 U. S. 642); *United States* v. *Darby* ((1941) 312 U. S. 100); and *United States* v. *Reginelli* ((1943) 1933 F. (2d) 595, cert. den., 318 U. S. 783).

While the rights of private individuals must give way to the authority of Congress to legislate in matters pertaining to interstate commerce and for the good of all the people, *Hollingsworth et al.* v. *Federal Min. & Smelting Co.* ((1947) 74 F. Supp. 1009), Congress cannot vest in bureaus and officials charged with the duty of regulating business activities of citizens inquisitorial powers that are not subject to the beneficent provisions of the so-called Federal Bill of Rights contained in the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution. *United States* v. *Goodner* ((1940) 35 F. Supp. 286, 291).

I will develop seriatim now that the constitutional rights and guaranties of the fifth, sixth, and first amendments and the first article are violated by the provisions of S. 3237.

VIOLATION OF FIFTH AMENDMENT

Due process

Section 3 (a) of the bill provides:

"The Secretary of Commerce shall, upon written application, issue to any eligible individual, (1) upon payment of a fee of $1, a license authorizing such individual to appear as an actor or actress in any motion picture, or (2) upon payment of a fee of $100, a license authorizing such individual to produce any motion picture. Such application shall set forth such facts as the Secretary may require for the purpose of determining whether such individual is eligible for such license under the provisions of subsection (b), and shall be signed by the applicant under oath or affirmation."

These provisions clearly impose upon an individual the necessity of obtaining a license to engage in the vocation of acting or to engage in the vocation of producing motion pictures. Assuming, although the section does not specifically so provide, that the provisions are only applicable to persons who are engaged in these activities in connection with the production of motion pictures to become products of interstate commerce, the provisions still would deny due process of law as required by the fifth amendment. *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* ((1824) 9 Wheat. 1, 196); *Monongahela Navigation Co.* v. *United States* ((1893) 148 U. S. 312, 336); *Lottery Case* ((1903) 188 U. S. 321, 362); *United States* v. *Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pac. R. R. Co.* ((1931) 282 U. S. 311, 327); *Railroad Retirement Board* v. *Alton Railroad Co.* ((1935) 295 U. S. 330, 347).

The right of a citizen to engage in a legitimate occupation is a property right of which he may not be deprived except by due process of law. *Barn Ballroom Co.* v. *Ainsworth* ((1946) 67 F. Supp. 299). An attorney's calling or profession is property within the true sense and meaning of the Constitution. *Ex parte Wall* ((1883) 107 U. S. 265, 289). The right to earn a living is property within this clause. *Dotson* v. *International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Emp. and Moving Picture Mach. Operators of U. S. and Canada, Local 162* (Cal. App. (1948) 191 P. 2d 778). Membership in a trade union is a property right within this clause which the courts will protect. *DeMille* v. *American Federation of Radio Artists* ((1947) 187 P. 2d 769, 31 Cal. 2d 139, cert. den. 333 U. S. 876). The operation of a travel bureau for the purpose of bringing together persons who on their own responsibility may enter into agreements to make an automobile trip together, is legitimate and any attempt to eliminate it by regulation is unconstitutional. *Garland* v. *Brown* ((1943) 52 F. Supp. 401). The proposed statute, without providing for a hearing and without providing for an investigation of the character of the applicant but solely upon his former conviction or his forced admission of having committed a certain type of act (which act need not necessarily be a crime), takes away from the applicant his right to earn a living in his chosen profession.

Self-incrimination

The words, "or who admits committing acts constituting the essential elements of a crime involving moral turpitude," contained in section 3 (b), when read in conjunction with the provision of section 3 (a) to the effect that the application for a license "shall be signed by the applicant under oath or affirmation," require self-incrimination. The clause prohibiting compulsory self-incrimination must be construed to secure immunity from every kind of self-accusation (*Counselman* v. *Hitchcock* ((1892) 142 U. S. 562)); *In re Nachman* ((1902) 114 Fed. 995); to comprehend compulsion which subjects a citizen to some important disadvantage in order to extract the desired evidence from him (*United States* v. *Bell, C. C. Tenn.* ((1897) 81 F. 830)); to protect a person from being forced to produce and authenticate any personal documents that might incriminate him (*United States* v. *White* ((1944) 322 U. S. 694)); and to afford the constitutional guaranty of a fundamental right long regarded as a safeguard of civil liberty (*In re Grae* ((1940) 26 N. E. 2d 963); *Harris* v. *United States* ((1945) 151 F. 2d 837, aff'd. 331 U. S. 145, rehearing denied 331 U. S. 867)).

If a bankrupt need not answer incriminating questions (*Arndstein* v. *McCarthy* ((1920) 254 U. S. 71)); if a person accused of importing an alien unlawfully need not be a witness against himself (*Lees* v. *United States* ((1893) 150 U. S. 476, 480)); if in a suit for forfeiture of property under the customs laws a person need not be a witness against himself (*Boyd* v. *United States* ((1886) 116 U. S. 616, 634)); and if an attorney need not swear he has not borne arms against the United States (*In re Shorter* ((1865) 22 Fed. Cas. No. 12,811)). See also *Matter of Baxter* ((1866) 2 Fed. Cas. No. 1,118) a fortiori, a person need not answer under oath that he has committed an act involving the essential elements of moral turpitude.

Under the terms of the proposed provisions a person would be refused a license if he refused to apply and answer under oath as to whether or not he had ever been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude or whether or not he had ever committed an act which involved the essential elements of moral turpitude. The refusal to issue a license on the basis that he did not so swear would in effect be equivalent to drawing an inference from his silence that he had been convicted of such a crime or that he had committed an act involving the essential elements of such a crime. Such an inference, and a refusal to issue a license on the basis of such an inference, would be violative of the prohibition against compelling self-incrimination. See *United States ex rel. Vajtauer* v. *Commissioner of Immigration* ((1927) 273 U. S. 103, 112).

VIOLATION OF SIXTH AMENDMENT

The provisions of section 3 which require an actor or producer to obtain a license for which he is ineligible unless he swears he has not committed any act containing an essential element of a crime involving moral turpitude, and the provisions of section 9 which impose a penalty of $1,000 for willfully accepting or continuing employment without a license, are violative of amendment 6 of the United States Constitution.

Generally speaking the definitions of this bill are so indefinite and vague that it is impossible to me as an attorney to conceive that it would be held valid under the fifth and sixth amendments of the Constitution. A new statutory offense must be defined in language understood by the common mind, and the prohibited act or acts must be described in reasonably explicit language. Although the language of the proposed bill requiring a license is explicit enough, the language describing the action which an applicant must swear or affirm he has not committed to obtain a license is not specific enough. See *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey* ((1939) 306 U. S. 451, 453). For example:

"SEC. 2. (3) The term 'actor or actress' means an individual who appears in a speaking role in any motion picture, and who receives compensation for such appearance."

This definition is not limited to motion pictures intended for interstate commerce, and is not applicable to nonspeaking actors. As pantomime can be salacious, is the classification justified?

"SEC. 2. (5) The term 'distributor' means the person having primary responsibility for the leasing, rental, or sale for exhibition in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, of any motion-picture film."

What is the meaning of "primary responsibility"?

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall, upon written application, issue to any eligible individual, (1) upon payment of a fee of $1, a license authorizing such individual to appear as an actor or actress in any motion picture, or (2) upon payment of a fee of $100, a license authorizing such individual to produce any motion picture. Such application shall set forth such facts as the Secretary may require for the purpose of determining whether such individual is eligible for such license under the provisions of subsection (b), and shall be signed by the applicant under oath or affirmation."

This definition refers to eligible individuals, and eligible individuals under subsection (b), but there is no definition of an eligible individual. Subsection (b) does not state who is an eligible individual but states two classes of persons who are not eligible.

"SEC. 4. (b) No motion-picture film made or produced in whole or in part in the United States, its Territories, or possessions shall be eligible for licensing unless the Secretary shall find (1) that all persons appearing as actors or actresses in such film possess, or, if deceased, possessed at time of death, unrevoked licenses issued under section 3 (a) (1); (2) that the individuals producing such film, who are required under this act to obtain licenses, possess, or, if deceased, possessed at time of death, unrevoked licenses issued under section 3 (a) (2); (3) that such film cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to juvenile delinquency; and (4) that such film is not reasonably calculated to encourage a contempt for law, or public or private morality."

What are the standards by which (3) and (4) of this subsection are to be controlled?

"SEC. 4. (c) No motion-picture film wholly made or produced outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions shall be eligible for licensing unless the Secretary shall find (1) that such film cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to juvenile delinquency, (2) that such film is not reasonably calculated to encourage a contempt for law, or public or private morality, and (3) that the producers of, and actors or actresses in, such motion picture are not criminals or persons of ill repute."

What are the standards for establishing that a person is one of ill repute?

"SEC. 4. (d) * * * Public notice of the issuance of any such license shall be given in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe, and a copy thereof furnished to any interested person upon his application."

Who is required to supply the copy that is to be furnished to anyone interested?

Indefinite nature of "moral turpitude" term

The indefinite and loose wording of the act and particularly the reference to moral

turpitude reinforce my belief that the act is unconstitutional. The term "moral turpitude" has been defined any number of times, but all the definitions state more or less that moral turpitude is a vague and indefinite term which imports an act of baseness, vileness, or depravity in the private and social duties which a man owes to his fellow man or to society in general. *Neibling* v. *Terry* (177 S. W. 2d 502); *In re Pontarelli* (66 N. E. 2d 83); *U. S. ex rel. Manzella* v. *Zimmerman* ((1947) 71 F. Supp. 534, 537); *United States ex rel. Berlandi* v. *Reimer* ((1939) 30 F. Supp. 767). Crimes involving moral turpitude do not depend upon individual judgment but upon the commonly accepted mores, current at the time. *United States* v. *Francioso* ((1947) 164 F. 2d 163).

A statute which either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application, is violative of due process. *Winters* v. *New York* ((1948) 333 U. S. 507, 515). A statute creating an offense must set up ascertainable standards of guilt. *United States* v. *L. Cohen Grocery Co.* ((1921) 255 U. S. 81, 89); *Smith* v. *Cahoon* ((1931) 283 U. S. 553, 564); *Champlin Refining Co.* v. *Corporation Commission* ((1932) 286 U. S. 210, 242).

From the foregoing it can be readily seen that it is almost too much to expect a person to swear to a statement that he has not committed an act which might contain an essential element of moral turpitude when the definition of moral turpitude is so indefinite and subject to change with the change in the moral conscience. It, therefore, may be asserted that the definition of this term is violative of the definiteness needed in criminal statutes in order not to violate amendments five and six of the Constitution. *United States* v. *Reese* ((1876) 92 U. S. 214, 320); *United States* v. *Brewer* ((1891) 139 U. S. 278, 288); *Connally* v. *General Construction Company* ((1926) 269 U. S. 385, 391).

Further, as stated in the case of *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey* ((1939) 306 U. S. 451, 453):

"If on its face the challenged provision is repugnant to the due-process clause, specification of details of the offense intended to be charged would not serve to validate it. Cf. *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 221); *Czarra* v. *Board of Medical Supervisors* (25 App. D. C. 443, 453). It is the statute, not the accusation under it, that prescribes the rule to govern conduct and warns against transgression. See *Stromberg* v. *California* (283 U. S. 359, 368); *Lovell* v. *Griffin* (303 U. S. 444). No one may be required at peril of life, liberty, or property to speculate as to the meaning of penal statutes. All are entitled to be informed as to what the State commands or forbids. The applicable rule is stated in *Connally* v. *General Construction Co.* (269 U. S. 385, 39): 'That the terms of a penal statute creating a new offense must be sufficiently explicit to inform those who are subject to it what conduct on their part will render them liable to its penalties, is a well-recognized requirement, consonant alike with ordinary notions of fair play and the settled rules of law.' "

VIOLATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT

Freedom of the press

The censorship provisions of the bill are included in section 4 (b), which reads:

"No motion-picture film made or produced in whole or in part in the United States, its Territories, or possessions shall be eligible for licensing unless the Secretary shall find * * * (3) that such film cannot reasonably be expected to contribute to juvenile delinquency; and (4) that such film is not reasonably calculated to encourage a contempt for law, or public or private morality."

These provisions would seem to be violative of the first amendment of the Constitution. Although the Supreme Court in 1915 in the case of *Mutual Film Corporation* v. *Industrial Commission of Ohio* ((1915) 236 U. S. 230), held that motion pictures could not be brought into a practical and legal similitude to a free press and liberty of opinion, it is of interest to note that the Supreme Court in 1946 in the case of *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures* ((1948) 334 U. S. 131, 166), stated, "We have no doubt that motion pictures, like newspapers and radios are included in the press whose freedom is guaranteed by the first amendment." It is not contended that this latter statement of the Supreme Court overrules the Mutual Film Corporation case, but as stated in *RDDR Corporation* v. *Smith*, decided March 6, 1950, by Judge Andrews in U. S. D. C., N. Ga. (18 LW 2435), the question appears to need reexamination in view of the statements made by the Supreme Court in *Gitlow* v. *New York* ((1925) 268 U. S. 652); *Winters* v. *New York* ((1948) 333 U. S. 507); and *Terminiello* v. *Chicago* ((1949) 337 U. S. 1). And, as stated in *Near* v. *Minnesota* ((1931) 283 U. S. 697, 713), the essence of censorship is whether a statute authorizing such proceedings in restraint of publication is consistent with the conception of the liberty of the press as historically conceived and guaranteed. In determining the extent of the constitutional protection, it has been generally, if not universally, considered that it is the chief purpose of the guaranty to prevent previous restraints upon publication. The struggle in England, directed against the legislative power of the licensor, resulted in renunciation of the censorship of the press.

As stated in *Schenck* v. *United States* ((1919) 249 U. S. 47, 52):

"The question in every case is whether the words are used in such circumstances and are of such nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent."

The censorship provisions of this section use the expressions "that cannot reasonably be expected to contribute" and "not reasonably calculated to encourage." These are rather broad standards by which to judge whether or not the film should be barred from distribution. In fact, under such wording, it would appear to be absolutely discretionary with the Secretary of Commerce to determine whether or not the picture was one to be shown. This is censorship of the most vicious type.

VIOLATION OF ARTICLE I

Article I, section 9, clause 3, provides:

"No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed" by Congress.

The bill is in the nature of a bill of attainder and is also an ex post facto law.

Bills of attainder

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our forefathers had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to liberty to exist in the nation of freemen they envisioned. And so they rightly proscribed bills of attainder. *United States* v. *Lovett* ((1946) 328 U. S. 303, 317). They knew the danger inherent in special legislative acts which take away the life, liberty, or property of particular-named persons or classes of persons because the legislature thinks them guilty of conduct which deserves punishment. *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku* ((1946) 327 U. S. 304). This clause precludes specific acts imposing punishment upon particular persons or classes of persons by legislative authority. See *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall 277); *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333); *Drehman* v. *Stifle* (8 Wall. 595); *Pierce* v. *Carskadon* (16 Wall. 234); *Fletcher* v. *Peck* (6 Cr. 87); *Ogden* v. *Saunders* (12 Wheat. 213, 260); *Klinger* v. *Missouri* (13 Wall. 257). In the very recent case, *United States* v. *Lovett* ((1946) 328 U. S. 317), the Court stated inter alia:

"Neither of these cases (*Cummings* v. *Missouri, supra* or *Ex parte Garland, supra*) have ever been overruled. They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution."

The proposed statute, just as the statute in the former cases mentioned, "operates as a legislative decree of perpetual exclusion" from a chosen vocation and just like those statutes is violative of this article.

Ex post facto

This bill imposes an additional penalty on a person who has been convicted and served his sentence for a crime involving moral turpitude and it also imposes a penalty, where none existed before, on a person who has committed an act which involves the essential elements of a crime of moral turpitude. An ex post facto law is one which imposes a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed or imposes a punishment in addition to that prescribed at the time of the commission of the act (*United States* v. *Hall* ((1810) 6 Cr. 171); *Burgess* v. *Salmon* (97 U. S. 381, 384)); or alters the situation of the accused to his disadvantage (*Kring* v. *Missouri* ((1883) 107 U. S. 221, 228); *Medley, Petitioner* ((1890) 134 U. S. 160, 171); *United States* v. *Great Northern R. R. Co.* ((1907) 157 Fed. 288, error dismissed 214 U. S. 530); *Cases* v. *United States* ((1942) 131 F. (2d), cert. den. 319 U. S. 770, rehearing den., 324 U. S. 889)). And the ex post facto effect of the law cannot be evaded by giving a civil form to that which is essentially criminal. *Burgess* v. *Salmon, supra.* In *Cummings* v. *Missouri* ((1867) 4 Wall. 277, 323), the provision of the Missouri Reconstruction Constitution which required persons to take an oath of loyalty as a prerequisite to practicing a profession was invalidated because it constituted a bill of attainder and because it had an ex post facto operation. On the same day in *Ex parte Garland* ((1867) 4 Wall. 333), the Court invalidated on the same grounds an act of Congress which required attorneys practicing before the Supreme Court to take a similar oath. An accused must be clearly informed of the charge against him, the law which he is charged with violating must have been passed before he committed the act charged, and even after conviction no cruel and unusual punishment can be inflicted upon him. See *Chambers* v. *Florida* (309 U. S. 227, 235–238).

CONCLUSION

There are many other legally objectionable features of this bill, but it is believed that the above evidence amply supports my thesis of the bill's unconstitutionality.

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSIN PRESS EDITORIALS

[From the Racine Journal-Times of March 23, 1950]

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, of Colorado, is so worked up over the antics of movie actors, actresses, and producers that he proposes to set up a Government licensing system to govern the motion-picture industry. Many persons will agree that the recent use of the sordid Bergman-Rossellini affair to promote the dull Stromboli at the box office was an attempt to exploit the immoral escapades of the film stars.

But however repugnant these escapades may be to our sense of morality, the Johnson proposal is not the answer. It would impose a governmental censorship that is just as repugnant to our system of personal freedom and liberty.

No one is forced to go to a movie. If an individual chooses to boycott films of the actors and actresses whose private lives do not meet his standards of morality, or for any other reason, the customer is free to do so. That, after all, would be the most effective deterrent. If Americans refused to attend films, producers would be quick to change their tactics.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of March 16, 1950]

As for Senator JOHNSON'S actor-licensing proposal, the whole thing strikes us as ridiculous. This is carrying Government supervision of individual morals to the extreme.

RKO may have engaged in nauseating commercial opportunism by its shameless exploitation of Stromboli, but Senator JOHNSON doesn't have to go see the picture, nor does anyone else.

How do Miss Bergman's morals compare with the behavior of Alger Hiss, or General Vaughan, or John Maragon? Is Miss Bergman a greater sinner than J. Parnell Thomas or Congressman Andrew May?

There is a Judge that will decide these things. We doubt if He needs any help from a licensing system established by the Congress of the United States.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of March 19, 1950]

HITLER PURGE FOR HOLLYWOOD?

For fantastic suggestions to improve the moral tone of Hollywood and its films, Senator JOHNSON of Colorado deserves an Oscar.

His proposal that the Federal Government license actors, producers, and films got the lambasting it deserved from other Senators. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, did as telling a job as any.

Senator WILEY said that he was as shocked as anyone over the scandalous affair of Roberto Rossellini, a love pirate, and Miss Ingrid Bergman; also by the way Hollywood exploited their illicit conduct to promote patronage for their film Stromboli. But Senator WILEY went on to condemn the Johnson cure as unconstitutional and a police-state measure. It would open the way, he said, to an entire train of dictatorial legislation. Where it would end, no man could foresee.

One Hollywood comment hit that nail right on the head. What about a measure to control the moral conduct of United States Senators?

As Senator WILEY pointed out, those of us who are disgusted when Hollywood exploits scandal have effective remedies now within our grasp. He put it this way:

"When Hollywood learns that the American people will not patronize pictures featuring a particular individual, that individual quickly leaves the Hollywood scene."

The Land-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by President John A. Hannah of Michigan State College, at the annual convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. I should like to point out that Dr. Arthur S. Adams, president of the University of New Hampshire, who is also president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, has inserted in this address in parentheses figures which are applicable only to the University of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that this address will make approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOR LOSE THE COMMON TOUCH

We meet today—presidents, deans, and directors of the land-grant colleges and universities—as persons with a wide diversity of special interests, reflected in the programs we are to enjoy during the next few days. But we have a great common interest, too, and it is about that common interest I want to talk with you this morning.

I would have you recall that we all share a tremendous responsibility to the people of this Nation because we are the conservators of one of the best of America's great traditions.

We know it as the land-grant-college tradition, and we describe it generally as the conception that there should be equality of educational opportunity for every American, that higher education should be practical in the sense that it should fit students to live satisfying and useful lives, and that higher education has the responsibility to train young men and women to be effective citizens of this great democracy.

We who serve the land-grant-college system of America believe that we are in a manner of speaking disciples of Milton, who gave us a good definition of education in these words:

"I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."

Nearly as eloquent was the Michigan farmer who led the campaign which culminated nearly a century ago in the establishment of the first agricultural college in America. After describing the practical studies of the ideal curriculum for the college to be, Bela Hubbard added:

"Nor should the claims of literature and the fine arts be wholly neglected, as tending to polish the mind and manner, and add greater luster and dignity to life."

Much more recently, the president of a great eastern university, which has antecedents wholly unrelated to those of the institutions we represent, wrote something which might well be taken as a succinct expression of the philosophy which motivates, or at least should motivate, the institutions we represent. In General Education in a Free Society, President James Bryant Conant, of Harvard, wrote:

"The primary concern of American education today is not the development of the appreciation of the good life in young gentlemen born to the purple. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest number of our future citizens an appreciation both of the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and free."

To that sentiment each of us can subscribe, and Senator Morrill and President Lincoln would have applauded had a university president of their day expressed as well the idea which led to the establishment of the land-grant-college system of America.

Of course, we are not alone in our guardianship of the tradition of higher education at public expense in the best interests of the Nation. Many great universities and colleges share the trust. But I think that our friends in the State universities outside our own land-grant association would grant that passage of the Morrill Act was one of the most significant events in the entire history of this Nation in that it brought higher education out of the cloisters of the past and made it available to the people at large in the solution of their everyday problems.

Few thinking men question that the system of higher education growing out of the Morrill Act has been a powerful factor in the development of the American democratic system.

The introductory section of the annual statistical report of the Federal Security Agency put it neatly when it said:

"It is not easy to appraise in brief space the services of these land-grant institutions. They have broadened the base of higher education, bringing it within the interest and attainment of vastly larger numbers of people than would otherwise have been reached. They have spread widely the concept that higher education is something in which all the people have a stake. They have, therefore, a place of deep affection in the hearts of the people. They are growing in strength and influence with each passing decade."

How pleasant it would be to relax in the warmth of that praise from an impartial Government bureau and to take comfort in the contemplation of deeds well done.

But the statistical tables immediately following that very page of praise raise a sign of danger which we will be blind if we do not see, and derelict if we do not heed. It says, indirectly but plainly enough to make the message clear, that higher education in the United States as represented by all publicly supported institutions, and the land-grant colleges and universities in particular, is face to face with a serious financial crisis.

To understand the danger signals, we must keep in mind the special characteristics of the land-grant system. One of the important characteristics is that our land-grant colleges and universities are peculiarly creatures of the several States and Territories. True, they were established for the most part under the benevolence of the Federal Government, but through the decades each has been supported largely by the tax dollars of the State or Territory it represents, and each has served the special interests of its State or Territory.

A second characteristic is that these institutions have been devoted to the education of the agricultural and industrial classes—that is to say, those who labor with their hands and minds in the production of tangible goods and services. For that reason, these are known as practical institutions, although I prefer the phrases of a neighboring Canadian educator who refers to them as being established on the democratic, rather than the aristocratic, pattern.

A third important characteristic is that, of and by reason of their genesis and tradition, they are dedicated to the proposition that there shall be equality of educational opportunity, as nearly as equality can be achieved in a nation with as great a diversity of people and interests as our own.

As we near the midpoint of this difficult twentieth century, let us take a little time to see how we measure up to the standards set for us by those who preceded us as president, deans, and directors. Do our institutions continue to be the favored children of our individual States, cherished and nourished by the deep affection of the people? Are we still devoted to the service of the industrial and agricultural classes, seeking to improve their lots in life? Have we accomplished much by way of equality of educational opportunity for all classes of our citizens?

I would not presume to claim to have the complete answers to those three questions, but this would be a wasted opportunity if some of the evidence were not called to your attention on this occasion.

First, as to the matter of State support. The annual statistical report of the Federal Security Agency to which I referred indicates that we are losing, not gaining, assistance from our individual States, which are supposed to be the strong supporters of the land-grant colleges and universities. This is no place to quote tables of statistics, when they have been published for your reading and examination. But in support of my contention let me point out that while enrollments in all land-grant colleges and universities increased by 68.7 percent (New Hampshire 81 percent) from the 1945–46 school year through the 1947–48 school year, income from State appropriations increased a little less—65.6 percent (New Hampshire 57.9 percent). But most significant is the fact that income from student fees increased by 279 percent (New Hampshire 378 percent) in the same period, while total income was increasing by 746 percent (New Hampshire 98.6 percent).

Or put another way, the States contributed 42.5 percent (New Hampshire 30.4 percent) of the total income of all the land-grant colleges and universities in 1945–46, and only 40.3 percent (New Hampshire 24.2) last year. Meanwhile, the percentage of contribution to total income from student fees increased from 12.3 (New Hampshire 12.8) in 1945–46 to 30.4 (New Hampshire 31) last year. That was a relative increase of 147 percent (New Hampshire 142 percent) in the contribution from fees, and a decrease of 5.1 percent (New Hampshire 20.3 percent) in the contribution by the several States.

This merely substantiates, of course, the findings of the President's Commission on Higher Education that the percentage of educational costs being contributed by students has been creeping upwards for years, and has reached the point at which it endangers the whole program of public education in this country.

What many of us may have failed to realize, however, is the gradual disinclination or inability of State governments to support higher education on the accustomed scale is responsible for placing ever-growing burdens on students and their families.

This is true of both the land-grant colleges and universities and the other State-supported institutions as well. A recent study by the University of Michigan, which I am privileged to quote, found that enrollments in State-supported colleges and universities in 20 selected States have increased by 154 percent (New Hampshire 141 percent) in the 20 years since 1929, and that while appropriations in gross have increased at a slightly faster rate—162 percent (New Hampshire 160 percent)—appropriations per student in terms of 1948 dollars have declined by 14 percent (New Hampshire increased 8 per cent).

Of course, the record varies from State to State. For example, appropriations per student in terms of 1948 dollars increased in 5 of the 20 selected States, and decreased in the other 15. It may explain some of my concern that the decrease in Michigan has been 35 percent, compared with the average decrease of 14 percent.

To illustrate the importance of fees in our financial structure, one need but think where our land-grant institutions would have been without the $56,000,000 (New Hampshire, $624,318.41) in fees received from the Veterans' Administration in 1946–47, or the $85,000,000 (New Hampshire, $885,632.54) received last year. Last year, for example, VA fee receipts were almost twice what it cost to operate and maintain our physical plants (New Hampshire, $577,631.84); they were equivalent to more than 53 percent (New Hampshire, 87.7 percent) of the cost of resident instruction (New Hampshire, $1,008,-912.64) in all our institutions.

Is any one of us so naive as to think that our State governments would have footed the whole bill if there had been no millions forthcoming in the form of veterans' fees?

And who will foot the bill when this source of funds dries up, as it is beginning to dry up?

Let us leave this disturbing topic for a moment, and consider how we have fared in our mission to provide equality of educational opportunity. Again, there is no need to quote figures and percentages, for the report of the President's Commission has made it abundantly and painfully clear that every year our high schools graduate thousands upon thousands of talented and capable young men and women for whom a college education is out of the question, simply because it is too costly for them. Most of them, beyond doubt, are from the families in the "industrial classes" our institutions were created to serve specifically. The recent studies in the State of New York bear out earlier findings that not only does parental income pretty much determine whether boys and girls go on to college but also the level of parental income tends to determine the curriculum to be followed by the youngster who is lucky enough to get into college. That, of course, means that the well-to-do parent can make a lawyer or a doctor of his son, and the less well-to-do parent will have to restrict his son's ambitions to the less remunerative fields of teaching, commerce, and the industrial trades.

Is here the revival of the social stratification which the founders of the land-grant college system sought to destroy by broadening the base of higher education? Their weapon, you recall, was inexpensive education, education practically free to all who qualified to receive it. Is the weapon to be broken in the hands of those who hold it now?

Prospects that the trend can be reversed are not encouraging, but reversed it must be, or the land-grant colleges which have been the pride, and in many respects the glory, of America, will lose their character and become merely institutions where those with means are welcome, and those without resources and special social qualifications are told to keep away. The people of this country rejected that kind of higher education 87 years ago, and I am convinced that they will not choose to return to it—if they have a free, enlightened choice.

The next questions follow naturally: What can be done to reverse this trend, to put higher education back within the grasp of the great majority of our young men and women? How can we continue to operate the great physical plants our colleges and universities have come to be? How can we pay the great teachers and scientists who make up our faculties when our incomes from fees begin to shrink?

The answer of the short-sighted and those who do not understand the value of a democratic society of a well-educated young citizenry will be to raise student fees to make up the difference. For us, this must be the last resort, if resort it be at all. Our efforts must be expended in reducing the cost of education for the individual student, not in finding ways to drain away more of his family resources.

The next most obvious answer is to increase public appropriations for higher education. This, of course, will be far easier said than done. Throughout the country this year there was evidence of great reluctance on the part of State legislatures to spent tax money in what fair-minded persons would say were adequate amounts for the support of institutions of higher learning. Experience varied from State to State, and by and large we have all been treated fairly well. But I wonder what the story will be next year, and the year after, when the veterans have finished their schooling, and the flow of comparatively easy money from the Veterans' Administration dribbles to a stop. What chance have we to compensate for the loss of income? Our chance is not a very good one, I fear, when we consider the competition for the taxpayers' dollars.

The competition is formidable. The most serious competition is in the field of social welfare, where there are a great many persons with a sizable stake. They far outnumber all our students and alumni, and all others who might be friendly to our cause.

Let me take my own State as an example. Back in 1937, when we were far less prosperous than now, the State of Michigan expended a little more than $7,500,000 (New Hampshire: $896,741.98) on a higher education out of a total budget of a little more than $160,000,000 (New Hampshire: $20,789,-237.95), or 4.8 percent (New Hampshire: 4.3 percent). Ten years later—the fiscal year ending in 1948—it spent $22,000,000 (New Hampshire: $1,734,822.37) on higher education, out of a total expenditure of $461,-666,667 (New Hampshire: $47,090,838.31), or 4.76 percent (New Hampshire: 3.7 percent).

Now, had enrollments remained the same, or even increased in ratio with the population, higher education would have fared comparatively well. But enrollments in our State-supported universities and colleges and increased by 25,750 (New Hampshire: 2,159), or 72 percent (New Hampshire: 118 percent), and it took $171 in 1948 to buy what $100 had bought in 1937.

Meanwhile, higher educations' competitors for State support had gained ground at an astonishing speed. State expenditures for public welfare, for example, jumped from $1,500,000 (New Hampshire: $1,363,050.13) to $14,333,334 (New Hampshire: $5,046,965.53), payments to local units of government for public welfare programs leaped from $21,750,00 to $69,333,334; payments for primary and secondary education increased from $38,500,000 (New Hampshire: $704,526.86) to $107,500,000 (New Hampshire: $3,292,044.37). Here is competition indeed.

In the face of facts such as these—and the situation is probably comparable in other States—we must begin to consider where the cuts are to be made when the current grumbling against high taxes swells into a roar which our legislators must hear. Will they reduce payments for old-age pensions, or for the care of crippled children, or for primary and secondary schools, or for the economic unfortunate who must subsist on a dole? Higher education is much more vulnerable, considering that those other recipients of governmental support represent far larger blocks of voting strength.

The land-grant system was established, and public support of higher education was strongest, in the pioneering era of America. Certainly, it was the demand for trained farmers and engineers and teachers in an expanding economy which was the great impetus for the land-grant-college movement. Perhaps we have reached the point at which we are turning away from the philosophy that there should be opportunities for every American to accomplish as much as his own ability and ambition enable him to accomplish. Perhaps we are turning toward the philosophy that a minimum standard of safety and security should be guaranteed for everyone, regardless of ability and effort. I should hate to think that the latter philosophy has the upper hand in America, for

under such circumstances the minimum has a way of becoming the maximum, and everyone lives on a humdrum level.

All that aside, we must recognize that advocates of public support for higher education in the future will have to work harder than ever before and develop better arguments, if they are to convince those who spend the tax dollars that they are the champions of one function of Government in which everyone has vital stake.

Amid these gloomy predictions there is at least one ray of light. It is that American parents still want the best possible educations for their children and are still sold on the notion that a college education is something every American boy and girl should have. We have all sensed that fact, I believe, but the recent Fortune survey produced facts and figures to substantiate our belief. That survey is worthy of the close study I am sure it has received from all of us. The thousands of words and figures are neatly and adequately summed up on the cover of the supplement:

"Americans want all (the higher education) they can get for their young people, and where they cannot foot the bill they think the Government should help out."

Despite all the critical things that can be said truthfully about higher education in the United States, the fact remains that the people themselves still believe in its value, and will slave and sacrifice to buy a college education for their children. On that foundation we must build our plans to meet the crisis which now confronts us.

I have no sure-fire plan for solving the financial problems of higher education. To a degree, I imagine that we will have to do more of what each of us has to do in his own university or academic school or extension service or experiment station—contrive, revise, adapt, compromise, combine, and struggle—to try to make $1 do the work of two. There never has been all the money that could be spent usefully and profitably, and the only safe prediction is that there never will be.

Financial aid from the Federal Government may be the solution; I do not profess to know. I recognize the dangers in such an approach. But I am not as alarmed as some educators, for I recall that the land-grant colleges have been working in fairly comfortable partnership with the Federal Government for many decades, and if a single one of them has surrendered its institutional individuality and accepted political dictation from Washington, I have yet to hear of it.

This I do know—if the tax-supported institutions of higher learning do have to turn to the Federal Government for succor, it will be because they have not received their just deserts at the hands of the State governments whose proper wards they are.

I am sure that hit-or-miss individual attacks on this program will not be enough. Some things we must do in concert, because as the current guardians of a great public trust, we must act together to protect the interest of the American people whom we serve.

It seems to me that any program of action must fall into the area of publicity and performance, just as do any good programs to improve public relations. By publicity I do not mean press agentry, but rather a program of information for the enlightenment of the people of this country. Publicly supported education needs spokesmen; it needs advocates, with a deep conviction in their souls and the energy to carry the great story they have to tell to the far corners of every State.

For example, the story of the land-grant movement needs to be written, not in the exact but tedious language of the historian interested only in the bare bones of facts, but by someone who can describe in readable, vivid language the great adventure which has brought our institutions to prominence and influence in this country. We need to have people understand that philosophy that gives a special sort of animation to the land-grant colleges and universities, and to have them appreciate the great things that have been wrought in their behalf in the years since 1862. There is a best-seller in that idea for some great writer.

Incidentally, the story of the land-grant college movement needs to be told over and over again on our own campuses, too. I fear that too many of our own faculty and staff members fail to understand why our institutions, came into being, and why they proved successful. Somehow, we must rekindle the enthusiasm for a practical ideal which marked those who had the land-grant colleges and universities in their charge in former years. Certainly there is no finer and no more inspiring tradition to claim the loyalty of the teachers of young Americans.

We need to make it clear beyond misunderstanding that the support contributed by the State and Federal Governments does not pay all the bills for college students. We should hammer it home in our State capitols that for every dollar in taxpayers' money spent on giving a young man or woman college training, the student spends at least $2 of his own, because the expense of living away from home—board, room, clothing, and incidentals—costs far more than instruction itself.

We need to destroy the false notion that current enrollments will soon drop back to prewar levels, and the pressure eased accordingly.

We need to hammer home the solid fact that for every penny of tax money spent on agricultural research, each State receives many dollars in return.

We need to tell over and over again the story of the agricultural extension service, what it has done to improve farming as a profession and farming as a way of life, and what it can do in the future if given the support it deserves.

I sincerely believe that we as administrators need to go personally to industry and say: We are training your engineers, your chemists, your salesmen, your executives—give us the active support we deserve. We must go to the primary and secondary schools and say: We are training your teachers for you—give us the support we deserve. We need to awaken the great learned professions to the necessity for maintaining universities fully equipped and staffed to train the lawyers and doctors and other professional people of the future.

And at this particular juncture, we just answer those who are attempting to mislead the people into the belief that publicly supported higher education is somehow unclean, and that high-minded education, free from political taint, is to be found only within the walls of the private colleges. My friend David B. Henry, president of Wayne University, answered those critics effectively in School and Society in the issue of September 3; I recommend it to your careful attention for what he has to say is sound and sensible, and worthy of wide quotation.

Probably all the things mentioned would be of some help to us, but it seems to be beyond question that they would not be enough. Certainly we cannot content ourselves with merely stating our case, and then sitting back to await a miracle. The gods help them that help themselves, as truly now as in Aesop's day.

At least some of our institutions are going to be called upon to reduce our costs wherever possible. In some cases, it may be possible to eliminate or reduce services, although experience has taught most of us that while the public will applaud the theory of reducing expenses in that way, the same public will be highly indignant if it is attempted.

It is probable that a more effective way of cutting costs will be found in the examination of teaching methods. It is doubtful that we have yet achieved the ultimate of efficiency in the transfer of knowledge, and if more efficient methods are capable of development, it is the inherent responsibility of the university and the college to develop them.

It is probable, for example, that even more effective visual aids to teaching could be developed with a considerable saving in teaching costs. We are only on the verge of the television era, and we may find before too many years have passed that it is possible for a great scientist or a great humanist to teach thousands of students by television where today he teaches hundreds, or possibly only scores. I am sure that television holds exciting possibilities for the agricultural extension service as well as for classroom teaching, and for the whole field of adult education.

One of the great foundations could render a tremendous service to higher education if it would sponsor and finance a study of the educational possibilities of television. Let me add that I sincerely hope that we do not miss as many opportunities in this exciting new medium as we did in radio.

It seems to me that there would be far more research within our own schools in the direction of developing better teaching methods. There has been some excellent work, but there must be more if we are to face the critics of the cost of higher education and say honestly, "We have done everything we can do."

It seems to me that we should give some serious consideration to the oft-repeated charge that our colleges and universities have grown too large. Much of their expansion to their present sizes has been forced expansion in response to public demands. Are we sure that a large, complex institution can operate more cheaply and teach more effectively than two or three smaller institutions? Certainly the point of diminishing returns must be reached sometime, but where is that point, and will we know when we have reached it? Are there graduate students in some of our institutions who can develop some facts by research into this problem?

Perhaps such a study would help each of us uncover some of the flaws which must have developed as we recruited staffs to meet the postwar demands for teaching services. I know, for example, that we found it possible to eliminate more than 60 teaching positions from the Michigan State College faculty this year, in the face of increasing enrollments, and no one was hurt seriously.

It would be embarrassing if unkindly critics detected any padding of faculty or administrative staffs, and it would be far better to eliminate the excess ourselves, rather than have it done for us, painfully.

But these too are but mechanical devices which can do little more than make a dent in prospective deficits. It seems to me that the greatest and most beneficial exercise in which we could engage would be some candid soul-searching, some quiet contemplation of the far distant and the more recent histories of our institutions.

It seems to me that we should consider seriously whether these great land-grant colleges and universities, which had the most humble of beginnings, have grown fat and proud and worldly with success. I wonder sometimes whether those who brought this great system of higher education into being would be as concerned as we are today with degrees, and accreditation, and the size of

our graduate schools, and research for the sake of research, instead of research for the sake of knowledge of value to the common people.

It is time to ask ourselves whether our institutions have lost a share of the public esteem and affection in which they used to be held, not because the people have grown away from us, but because we have grown away from them. It seems to me that we cannot hope to regain the unwavering support that the people once gave their land-grant colleges unless we concern ourselves far more with the wants and needs of the people themselves—what they say they want, instead of what we think they should have.

To determine those wants and needs accurately, our staff and faculty members must come into more intimate association with the people. There is no room for remote ivory towers on the campus of a land-grant college, and no place on its faculty for those who disdain to accept responsibilities outside their narrow fields of academic interest. Sometimes some of our staff people tend to look down their noses at some of the very vocational classes we are obligated to serve, and to avoid any contact with them. This is an attitude we dare not tolerate if we are to be the people's universities.

We must remember that not every student can absorb or usefully employ a 4-year college education. For many of them, 1 or 2 years would be enough to equip them to live useful, happy, and effective lives. But we do not have much time for those youngsters; we count our accomplishments in terms of degrees granted, not in terms of effective citizens trained, as we should.

And at the other end of the scale, it is not particularly to the credit of the land-grant universities and the State universities that are not land-grant institutions; that despite the tremendous growth in the population of the United States and the increased public interest in health and medicine, place was made for only 548 more medical students in 1947–48 than in 1936–37, and that the number of students of dentistry increased only 446 in the same period of time. Can it be said that our universities are fully responsive to the demands of the public when the records tell that story?

I am convinced that if the progress of the land-grant colleges and universities in the next decade is to compare at all favorably with the record since their establishment, they will have to be guided by the same philosophy as they were in those past years. We must remember that what has been done is interesting, but not very important. What will be done in the 13 years between now and the centennial year will loom far larger in the people's minds than what has been done in the past 87 years.

Our charter is so broad that it needs no amendment to make it effective in even an atomic age. We are charged with promoting the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

Methods and techniques, tools, and personalities, administrations and social outlooks, all may change, but our objectives remain the same: The training of enlightened citizens capable of performing their day-to-day tasks capably and efficiently so that each may win from life something of the beauty and happiness and satisfaction the Creator certainly meant each man to have.

And if we truly believe that the ultimate wisdom lies in the people, let us learn from them that we may be better teachers; let us follow them that we may be better leaders; let us accept their loyalty humbly that we may serve them better. There can be no other course for institutions created to serve the common people. In no other way can we deserve their deep affection and their trust.

The Government's Farm Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the April 1950 edition of the Reader's Digest:

FARM POLITICS VERSUS THE PEOPLE

(Condensed From Fortune)

The time has come for a sensible, honest, radically new agricultural act. The Government's farm price-support program, after 17 years, is coming full circle to its logical, preposterous conclusion.

It has erected a false work of bogus values under the whole farm economy, which would collapse into ruin if the support were suddenly removed. It is forcing farmers to produce wildly in excess of any reasonable American capacity to consume. It is responsible for most of the $1,800,000,000 deficit in the last fiscal year and at least one-fourth of the larger current deficit. It is one of the most potent of inflationary influences.

Almost everybody has heard how the Government lost $204,000,000, by destroying potatoes or selling them for less than the price of their bags; how it fed millions of dollars' worth of California raisins to hogs. Such incidents may sometimes be exaggerated, but they are not fictitious. They are a fair illustration of what happens when the Government helps a special group maintain or increase its share of the national income regardless of the group's contribution to that income. John L. Lewis is trying to do the same thing for the coal-mining industry. But, at least, Lewis hasn't forced the Government to buy up surplus coal and give it away as railway ballast or burn it up in huge bonfires.

The Government's Commodity Credit Corporation has a current investment of close to $3,000,000,000 in loans, in products acquired when loans were called, in purchases and in agreements to purchase. Last year it actually took over 21 percent of the wheat and 26 percent of the cotton crops. It has managed to dispose of only relatively small amounts, mostly to occupied countries, ECA, charitable outfits, and organizations furnishing free lunches for school children. Thus, besides its loans, it is left with a fantastic $2,000,000,000 inventory:

Nearly 5,000,000 bales of cotton, worth about $750,000,000—about a 7-months' supply for the Nation's cotton mills.

Nearly 400,000,000 bushels of wheat costing around $900,000,000—enough wheat to give everyone in the United States more than one loaf of bread a week throughout a full year.

Nearly 600,000,000 bushels of corn worth around $900,000,000—one-fourth as much corn as was fed to United States livestock and poultry last year.

More than 70,000,000 pounds of dried eggs costing close to $100,000,000—enough to last United States bakers 5 years.

More than 100,000,000 pounds of butter costing more than $60,000,000—probably more than Russia's annual output.

About a quarter of a billion pounds of dried milk worth over $30,000,000—three-quarters of a year's supply for the United States.

This by no means exhausts the list. Huge stocks of tobacco, dried fruit, turpentine and rosin, wool, soybeans, turkeys, and peanuts are also piling up. This immense store could obviously supply food and clothing for millions of poor people, were it not that CCC is forced by statute to price the products so high that the poor cannot possibly buy them.

There is little hope that CCC's colossal inventory will melt away. On the contrary, present form policies are bound to increase it. The 1949 corn crop turned out so well that nearly 600,000,000 bushels will probably be put under loan. (The Government loans money on the crops as security; both parties know the farmer intends to keep the money and let the Government have the crop.) Prices of hogs are at 3-year lows, and CCC may soon have to buy pork on a grand scale. The western plains are enjoying another year in the "wet cycle," and another billion-bushel wheat crop is in sight. CCC may well exhaust its disbursing limit of five and a half billion dollars by next summer, and will need even more money in the fiscal year 1950–51. (In January, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan asked two billions more for crop purchases.)

What can the Government do under the present law? The Government is worried, not only by the sheer size of cost of the inventory but also by the lack of storage space. Commodities are being stored in oil tanks, hangars, gymnasiums, schoolrooms, and laid-up ships. This fiscal year at leat $80,000,000 is being invested in additional space.

The planners talk of selling the surplus cheap—i. e., of dumping it abroad at a loss, and cutting prices in the open markets (the complaint of competitors and the trade policy of the State Department notwithstanding), or bartering their surplus for foreign strategic products. The only sizable deal in sight, however, is a scheme whereby the United States would advance India a million tons of wheat against future delivery of strategic materials like mica and manganese. But even this Himalaya of wheat amounts to less than 10 percent of CCC's interest.

The Department of Agriculture's other solution is to limit output. The Department has asked farmers to cut acreage of wheat, cotton, potatoes, peanuts, and tobacco, but whether this will cut production is another thing. Better seed and more fertilizer may well maintain output despite somewhat smaller acreage. And acreage taken out of restricted crops will be shifted to other crops, causing new gluts, new purchase, and price pegs.

And even if acreage controls could restrict output considerably they would probably restrict it the wrong way. If there is one thing every so-called expert is agreed on, it is that production should be shifted somewhat from cereals and grain to livestock, that no fewer than 35,000,000 acres now planted in wheat, cotton, and perhaps corn, should be converted to hay and pasture. The domestic market for grain is strictly limited; that for competitively priced livestock and dairy products is immensely expansible. But politics will not let the Department of Agriculture allow commodities to find their own prices. Instead, it is pegging prices high by restricting production.

The time has come, to repeat, for a radically new farm act that will gradually ease the price-control falsework from under the farm economy, expose it to the genuine incentives of the open market, and get rid of the growing multitude of bureaucrats and hangers-on in the Government.

The prospects for this are not so bad as they may seem. The notion that the Government should maintain or increase the farmer's share of the national income regardless of his contribution to that income is

fortunately running into trouble. The reason was once put rather cruelly by H. L. Mencken, who remarked that it is a terrific job to ram even the most elemental idea into the average man but it is always easy to scare him. For the best part of 15 years the injustices and absurdities of price support were expounded and criticized by the experts and the press. The average taxpayer, far from being alarmed, was bored if not mystified by the intricacies of the arguments. He also suffered from the notion that all farmers were as poor as a few once were. Thus the only real pressure on Congress was the pressure on the farmers, who knew what they wanted.

In the past year, however, surpluses have grown so fast, the payments so large, the prospects of disposing of excess products so dim, that even the most indifferent citizen would have to be a dunce indeed not to be alarmed. The time has plainly come for the politicians to pay attention not only to the bureaucrats and to the farm organizations, but to the rest of the people as well.

Defense of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article by Bill Watson, a senior at St. Ann's High School in West Palm Beach, Fla. The article is a product of a recent American Legion oratorical contest and received first place. I thought this such a fine article that I wanted it placed in the RECORD so that everyone might read it. The article is as follows:

DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Voices echoed throughout the typically colonial room of Independence Hall. At quick intervals men rose from their chairs to make proposals which showed strenuous thought and true feeling of heart. For each gesture, thought, and word was governed by recollections of the dreadful price, paid in brutality, hunger, utter destruction, devastation, and death before such words "of freemen" could be spoken. Here the scholarly James Madison, the lawyer Edmund Randolph, the aged but humorous Benjamin Franklin, the youthful Hamilton (and nearly 50 other patriots) argued, compromised, and decided. At the head of them sat their great, beloved countryman, George Washington, giving thanks to be able to share in and be a part of the ultimate climax for which his gallant soldiers left their blood-stained footprints indented upon the snow-clad fields of Valley Forge. Such was the birthplace of a new guardian and protector of our God-given rights, the Constitution of the United States of America.

It was a time for the patriotic colonists to rejoice, for those who had fought hard for freedom; like Hiram Jones who served as a rifleman in the war. His father had been dragged from his own home and imprisoned by order of the King. Now Hiram need no longer fear tyrannical kings. Under the new Constitution bills of attainder were abolished. Now men must be tried only by jury. At last the power to govern was seized from monarchism and placed into the worthy hands of the people. From this precious power, we the people of the United States must never loosen our grasp, no matter what the cost. We should live up to the Constitution and in time of peril go forth to defend our Guardian of Human Rights.

The need for such defense arose on a universal basis in 1917 when the threat of hostility swept from the German Nation, striking against the massive sides of our boulder-like Constitution. Alarm was sounded, and farmers laid down their plows; office workers left their desks; laborers let fall their tools; and young men flipped closed the pages of their books as all joined hands and fought to protect what was theirs—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Throughout generations many wars have been fought against opposing elements and forces, contrary to the ideas and ideals of freemen. Men whose families or who they themselves had witnessed tyranny, fascism, and other poisonous elements were glad to defend the Constitution. Like Mario Ferrari, whose parents were barred from going to the church of their faith, fought so that he, his wife, and children could continue to worship as they pleased. Mario was in the same convoy of the American troopship which sank to the bottom of the Atlantic, laden with soldiers of all religions in whose midst were a Jewish rabbi, a Protestant minister, and a Catholic priest. Our Constitution grants to all men freedom of religion. With Mario men fought to live for their country; to live free from ex post facto laws which menaced their ancestors by depriving them of the protection entitled to them in times of conviction; to defend, such writs of habeas corpus which protect them from being put into prison without formal charge and left there without hearing or trial.

After taking the same oath as all our great Presidents, "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will, to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States," President Abraham Lincoln said, "Half the country cannot remain free and the other half slave." These words were taken to heart by many of the colonial patriots. Not long afterward the defense of human rights and strengthening of the Constitution was begun in what climaxed the Civil War. Guns roared, blood was spilled, starvation prevailed, buildings burned to the ground, but from then onward people of every color, creed, and race were able to enjoy the blessings of the American Constitution.

Lincoln's message should be renewed in our minds today with a slight change of wording—half the world cannot remain free and the other half slave. This means the unfortunate countries upon which are cast the shadow of the hammer and sickle, symbolic of Soviet Russia bursting forth with infiltrations of communism. These are delicate times; even more trying than our ancestors have ever witnessed. We the people of the United States must be on guard more than ever before in defense of our Constitution. This defense is not accomplished only on the battlefield, but to a great degree can be accomplished here in our own home towns and communities. We the people should exercise our right to vote for local and national officers. And in doing so should be extremely cautious by electing only those who live up to their constitutional oaths and are free from any ties whatsoever with opposing forces of communism and the like. For these forces are aimed only at tearing apart and destroying that which was paid for by the courage and lives of young boys and men at Bataan, Normandy, Bastogne, Iwo Jima, and the tears of mothers and wives waiting, praying, and hoping here at home. When asked to serve on a jury, we should call to mind the not to distant years when courts lacked such juries of the people. We should consider it an honor to be chosen to fulfill the duty, in defense of the Constitution in seeing to it that the innocent are acquitted and the guilty convicted. We must take an active interest in Government affairs so that when undesirable bills and proposals arise in the Nation's Capital we can personally call it to the attention of fellow citizens and raise petition against them to our Congressman. In this manner we the people of the United States are defending our Constitution from enactments contradicting the basic principles of free men, upon which our Government was founded.

Alien hostilities, foreign systems, and fanatic powers have attempted to stampede the rights of our forefathers, but always our fellow countrymen's faith in what was theirs, a constitution of the people, held these destructful forces back. In this age of mechanical brains and atomic bombs and the threat of communistic rule, we the citizens of the United States must stand alert, willing, and able to defend what has in past years been defended for us—a free nation under a constitution of the people. We owe it to our posterity to defend the protector and guardian of human rights whose fruits of freedom and liberty have been enjoyed by us so that our Nation's citizens of the future need never fear tyrannical dictators who determine the right to live or die—nor live in constant dread that members of their own families will be dragged from their own homes to suffer punishment because of their race, color, or creed—nor ever weep for their children who have been snatched by the government to be molded into tyrants—nor need they fear death for expressing their own ideas openly. Through our efforts as citizens of the United States, let our Constitution always be triumphant in standing for the rights, ideas, and ideals of freemen. And let its principles be raised on high to serve as an inspiration for all oppressed men throughout the world to enjoy the rights for which our forefathers so gallantly fought.

Investigation by Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the challenge to so many good Americans today is to hold the balance between the exposure and punishment of those who would subvert our institutions from within and the protection of the freedom of the innocent individuals whose names may come up in such investigations, for which we have so long fought. I am convinced that both these objectives are essential to our victory in the cold war and I am also convinced they are entirely consistent and can be attained. One of the great tests is in the activities of congressional investigating committees—a power which must be sustained and implemented—yet which must be safeguarded against abuse by unreasonable jeopardy of the reputations and means of livelihood of innocent individuals. The appended editorial of the New York Times of April 12, 1950 calls attention to this problem and to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 introduced by Senator

LUCAS dealing with it; my own resolution along substantially the same lines being House Joint Resolution 20, introduced January 3, 1949:

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE

By declining to review the cases, the Supreme Court has now, in effect, upheld the convictions of two Hollywood film writers and the chairman of an allegedly subversive organization for contempt of Congress. The two writers (and eight other writers and directors) had refused to state before the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether they were members of the Communist Party. The official of the suspect organization had declined to produce its records at the demand of the same committee.

Without going into the merits of these particular cases, it is clear that the power to investigate is one of the most fundamental and one of the most necessary powers of Congress. In a recent article in this newspaper, Senator LUCAS has called it, without exaggeration, "an essential part of the legislative process," without which "Congress simply could not discharge its obligation." If this be so, then it follows that the congressional committee, as an investigatory arm of Congress, must also have broad powers that will enable it to obtain all the facts that have any bearing on any particular question. The power of subpena is essential, and so, it seems to us, is the power to cite for contempt. Without such powers, any congressional investigation could be rendered meaningless.

What does not follow from all this is that congressional committees have unrestricted rights of persecution. The courts have held that the Un-American Activities Committee was within its powers in the cases mentioned above; but all too often this same committee—and, unfortunately, it is by no means the only one—has clearly gone very much further than could conceivably be justifiable or necessary in trespassing on the rights of the individual. Long ago Senator LUCAS introduced a resolution looking toward a code of fair practice for committees, and only a few days ago a Senate subcommittee made news by adopting, of its own accord, rules for the protection of witnesses and for orderly procedure. Congress must give serious attention to this problem, if the respect of the public is to be retained for the system of investigation by committee.

Menace of Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Ernest H. Gaunt, general manager, Andover-Gaunt Textiles, Inc., Lawrence, Mass., which is a reprint from the Annual Wool Review appearing in a recent issue of the New York Journal of Commerce:

INDEMNITIES FOR LOSSES DUE TO IMPORTS URGED FOR WOOLEN INDUSTRY

(By Ernest H. Gaunt, general manager, Andover-Gaunt Textiles, Inc.)

Today our United States tariffs are being lowered, and face further lowerings in the name of world welfare by our own authoritarian State Department which is isolated from the people.

Formerly, tariffs were lowered or raised in the name of American general welfare by our own elected Congress which is close to the people.

Whether the general welfare of the world actually will be benefited by sacrificing certain American industries which are of the greatest importance as providers of employment and of vital strategic importance in wartime has been far from proved by our ivory-tower State Department.

MENACE IS REAL

To those industries selected to be sacrificed, the menace of imports is very real and immediate. It is no cry of "wolf." The proverbial last straw may soon break the camel's back in a number of industries vital to this Nation's general welfare. In the watch industry the "camel's back" has already been broken.

Bargains for American consumers in imports from foreign countries with low-wage, sweatshop or even slave labor may become boomerangs before the end of 1950. Within the United States, traffic between States in child labor, sweatshop products, is not allowed on moral grounds. And Europe does not have the high minimum wages enforced here. Is it not strange reasoning to allow such unfair competition in international trade?

LINCOLN'S VIEW

Abraham Lincoln was for tariff protection for our domestic industries on the ground that by trading with ourselves we had both the goods and the money ourselves.

It is doubtful that if he were alive today, he would think it was world humanitarianism for us to let our own house be pulled down to help foreigners to build their houses. Rather would he confine our help as a Nation to aiding foreign nations to rebuild their own houses, i. e., the Marshall plan, but not the tearing-down plan of our State Department low-tariff theorists.

In the present cold war with Russia these intellectualistic State Departmentists lack the common horse sense practically to be able to see the domestic effects of their world-scale planning.

Without sharing fully the current suspicion of possible Communists and present or "reformed" fellow travelers on the State Department staff, it seems clear that leftists as well as rightists in positions of power are everywhere and always authoritarian in their thinking; and their judgment is warped outside their own specialty, as demonstrated recently in the case of the brilliant British scientist, Dr. Fuchs. Such narrow specialists are highly dangerous in administrative positions because of their lack of sound over-all judgment.

IDEALISTS ARE IMPATIENT

Pearl Buck has written that the once idealistic, socialistic, intellectualistic humanitarians of Lenin-Stalin Russia grew impatient with the stupidity of the common herd. Harry Hopkins is reported to have said of our own American people that "they are too damn dumb to understand." These "superior people" in Russia assumed the attitude of papa knows best, and turned to the more and more cruel methods in the belief that these methods must be used for the Russian general welfare.

And the American counterparts in our State Department, also regarding themselves as superior people, are joined, in some degree, by those hard-headed American industrialists who want foreign trade for their own industries.

It is not without significance that Paul Hoffman, a splendid and able man personally, and a business liberal, but whose great business success was entirely with automobiles, is inclined to belittle the claims for indemnification from American industries hurt by tariff lowering.

Automobile manufacturers were once protectionists until the domestic market became saturated and they looked abroad for new fields to conquer.

Mr. Hoffman is reported to have said that such indemnification to injured American industries would be no more logical than if indemnities had been paid to buggy manufacturers who were displaced by automobiles. However, such reasoning is not parallel. The woolen-worsted, watch, glassware, pottery, and other American industries definitely already hurt by importations from foreign countries with lower wages and living standards—are being hurt by their own United States Government. The transition from buggy to automobiles was not caused by Government.

GOVERNMENT CAN BE WRONG

It is not true that the Government can do no wrong. No government, Russian or Nazi or Fascist or Falangist, British or American, is more just or wise than the men who control and operate it. And, if elementary and traditional Anglo-Saxon justice has for centuries required local governments to indemnify citizens who are injured by destruction of their real property for general welfare projects such as public highways—it is no less a requirement of elemental justice that Federal, National Government should also indenify the citizens whose jobs or property it injures or destroys.

The remoteness of a National Government from its citizens, as compared with the closeness of local governments, does not remove the requirements of human justice and moral responsibility. Errors or injustices by any government are errors and injustices done by persons.

It is a most dangerous fiction that by calling political governments or private corporations impersonal, they can be considered outside the area where moral distinctions, moral obligations, or responsibilities are applicable.

If Congress is convinced that our American general welfare at this time is best protected by saving the world, Congress must reassume the responsibility for tariff-making which it delegated to our State Department. Congress must enact laws at once to prevent further damage to domestic industries by any further lowering of tariffs, and provide for prompt and adequate indemnification by Government for damage already done by Government, and for future possible damage by our Government to American displaced workers and factory owners and stockholders.

For stockholders in the automobile or other industries helped by lower tariffs, to label such just indemnities as subsidies—is to evade the moral responsibility of one class of citizens to other classes of citizens, and to encourage the Government of us all to be likewise irresponsible for moral and economic results.

SUBSIDIES NOT NEW

Our American Government throughout its whole history, in honest pursuit of the general welfare, has run almost the whole gamut of subsidies to special economic interests or classes or groups, as banks, railroads, union labor, farmers.

These subsidies have always had a money-content whether by direct cash or grants of public property or by exemption from taxes or exemptions from laws.

In fact our American Government has become a subsidy state. But the theory, and mostly the honest attempt, has been to balance one subsidy against the other, for the general welfare.

The so-called welfare state is a subsidization of the numerically largest economic group of citizens, the consumers. Whether in Russia, Britain or the United States, consumers as such can be subsidized (or bribed) successfully in the long run, only if the general welfare is promoted.

OWNERS INDEMNIFIED

In Britain the Anglo-Saxon concept of justice has been at least partially implemented by indemnities or subsidies paid to those hurt by nationalization of industries. Government stock has been given to owners of private industries which have been nationalized; but Government stock cannot honestly pay dividends unless Government control or operation is in the black.

So far, as shown in a recent issue of Business Week, British Government control, regulation, and operation has not been successful except in one industry, and that one can go into the red if the British Government grants too great subsidies to the consumer in the form of too low prices.

In our new American role of Atlas sustaining the world we shall surely come to an internal break-down if we undermine our own national American economic health and general welfare by a weakening of such vital industries as woolen-worsteds, by unwise or too-rapid lowering of tariffs while seeking world general welfare.

INDEMNITIES NEEDED

Wherever our Government, wisely or unwisely, deems it necessary to sacrifice certain domestic industries to advance world welfare to keep us and the whole world out of war, or build up allies in case of war—it must, if it is to remain American, indemnify the workers, owners, and stockholders in those sacrificed industries.

Steps already taken in that direction must be pushed and strengthened and additional steps taken at once. The legislative steps already taken include House Resolutions 198, 199, and 200, April 29, 1949.

Indemnification to owners and stockholders should be provided for at once for concerns which have been shutting down or which have permanently gone out of business due to the tariff lowering already established under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Provision must now be also made by Congress for indemnification for future damages resulting from still further tariff lowering under ITO or in any other manner.

RATES SUGGESTED

In the woolen-worsted industry the following suggestions should be studied and soon acted upon as a means to such indemnification:

Beginning with January 1, 1949, indemnifying all woolen-worsted cloth manufacturers for all lost production from normal, the year 1946 being taken as a standard of normal volume of production, at the following rates of indemnification: 50 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $5 per yard or over; 40 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $4 to $5 per yard; 30 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $3 to $4 per yard; 20 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $2 to $3 per yard; 10 cents per yard of lost production for goods which sold in 1946 or 1947 at the mill price of $1 to $2 per yard.

These indemnification payments to woolen-worsted cloth producing concerns should be continued so long as production of such goods in the United States continues to be lost, due to the imports of cloth of the sorts which have been, are being, and can be, manufactured here in the United States of America.

Indemnification should be paid to wage-workers and white-collar workers and other workers in the woolen-worsted industries for one year's wages retroactive to January 1, 1949—to allow them to retrain and readjust to jobs in other United States of America industries which the low-tariff and free-trade people say will absorb all workers now being sacrificed and about to be sacrificed by the export of their jobs to England and Europe, under the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements.

The payment of these indemnification wages should be retroactive to January 1, 1949, although unemployment in the woolen-worsted industries started before then, directly due to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements would be extended and tariffs lowered still further.

EXPORTERS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE

Indemnification loss payments by the Government to woolen-worsted wage workers, and owners and stockholders of woolen-worsted companies, should be at least partially recovered from those United States exporters who will benefit financially from the suffering and damage to the woolen-worsted industries' wage workers and owners and stockholders.

Those United States exporters who will thus benefit financially from the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement and from further lowering of our tariffs under ITO, are chiefly the manufacturers of automobiles, other machinery, and grain and cotton growers.

The indemnification losses paid by the Government should be apportioned to these United States exporters by means of special excess profits taxes applying only to such exporters: or by export taxes high enough to balance the payments of indemnification losses to those United States citizens who suffer by reason of those exports.

Mail Deliveries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C. April 18, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: We are seriously alarmed over the instructions contained in the Postal Bulletin of Tuesday, April 18. Having spent the greater part of our lives in the postal service and representing 102,000 letter carriers, we feel that the orders contained in the Postal Bulletin of April 18 will result in irreparable damage and the destruction of our fine postal system. It will make the great postal service—the Government function closest to the lives of the American people—a second-rate inferior Government agency.

We have always been mighty proud of the fact that the postal service rendered excellent necessary service. The service ideal is assassinated by the orders issued by the Post Office Department. Delivery of mail Nationwide is restricted to one delivery a day in residential districts and service is greatly reduced in business districts. Parcel-post deliveries are to be cut in half in business areas. Weekly magazines, such as Time, United States News, Newsweek, and all others that have become an important part of American life will no longer receive expeditious handling. The prompt mail delivery that the American people have been receiving will not be available.

Postmasters have been ordered to discontinue directory service on all ordinary mail other than perishable matter and parcels of obvious value. This order contains many other provisions, every one of them seriously restricting the fine delivery now being afforded the American people and imperiling the postal service itself.

These orders will result in tremendous money losses to American business and great inconvenience to the general public. Postal employees—particularly low-paid substitutes—will suffer greatly because of the reduction in the number of trips. All this despite the following statement of Postmaster General Donaldson, which appears in the infamous order:

"Splendid progress has been made and the productive effort of the employees has been increased as indicated by the accomplishments in the fiscal year 1949, compared with the fiscal year 1939. During that period, the revenues increased more than 110.72 percent, the number of pieces handled increased 64.70 percent, the weight of the mails increased more than 104.73 percent while the increase in the number of employees was less than 48.43 percent."

We appeal to you as a Member of Congress to take immediate corrective action against this devastating, ill-advised, and unnecessary order issued by the Post Office Department under date of Tuesday, April 18.

Sincerely,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
D. R. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

Let's Learn a Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Polish-American Journal:

LET'S LEARN A LESSON

Last week throughout the world persons of Irish descent observed St. Patrick's Day.

In this country there were huge celebrations, with parades, dinners, and other affairs.

And during these observances while people of Irish extraction were honoring their patron saint, they extolled the virtues and greatness of their heritage. Speakers lauded the sons of Ireland—their great statesmen, their great soldiers, their great poets, writers, and composers. They told of the contributions Ireland has made in the development of America.

Americans of Irish descent are proud of their ancestry, and well they might be. They are a fine people with an honored history.

They have done much to make this Nation what it is today.

Some persons of Polish descent might take a lesson from those of Irish extraction. Some persons of Polish heritage have inferiority complexes because their ancestors or they themselves came from Poland. Some are ashamed of the land from which they came.

Such an attitude on the part of anyone, no matter what his racial origin, is of course, ridiculous. All races have contributed their talents to make America great.

Persons of Polish ancestry can well be proud of their native land and the accomplishments of those of their race. Poland traditionally has always opposed oppression, tyranny, and subjugation. It has always fought gallantly on the side of justice and freedom. It is a country which has given the world great music, great poetry, great science. Copernicus, Madame Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, Sienkiewicz, are but a few names known to everyone.

And Americans of Polish extraction might well be proud of their history here. From the days of Pulaski and Kosciusko to the present, they have added their measure to that of their brothers of other races in the building of this Nation.

Let us not, then, be ashamed of our origin. Rather we should heed the words of Henry Cabot Lodge, who said: "Let every man honor the land of his birth and the race from which he springs. It is a pious and honorable duty."

Economic Jiu-Jitsu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the speech made by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., New York City, and chairman, National St. Lawrence Project Conference at seventeenth annual meeting, Southeastern Electric Exchange, Greenbrier Hotel, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., April 12, 1950:

ECONOMIC JIU-JITSU

As a member of an industry diagnosed as ailing by that master physician of Washington, I welcome the opportunity to meet with the southern leaders of another industry, one which has long enjoyed the envy, as well as the solicitude, of politicians. Here is involved no hazard of guilt by association but rather is contained certainty of invigorating influence. In fact, I have already been invigorated by the words of your president, Mr. McMeekin, and those of Elmer L. Lindseth and Charles E. Wilson.

The aggressive attitude which the private electric-power companies have taken augments hope for the preservation of a free society. Opposition to your industry has been the vehicle on which many demagogs and phonies have ridden into political office. However, the broad program of dissemination of the truth, in which your industry is now engaged, is bound to reverse that trend.

The public-power boys resemble the professional drys of old. They are so much like those zealots, with the same disregard for facts, the same furtive cunning, the same technique of smear. And, like those professionals, they have but one test of a candidate for office, scalawag or what not, and that is, does he lisp their refrain. The result is that we have men in Congress, in other places of public life, whose only claim to the office is that they are against the electric-utility industry, for public power. This is the sole subject on which they can articulate; the one tune to which they dance. But make no mistake about it, those evangelists are numerically and politically strong. The carnival medicine men, vendors of swamp-root drugs, longer life guaranteed in every bottle, were angels as compared with these modern racketeers, babbling behind the banner of public and cheaper power.

After all, why not call a spade a spade in speaking of these fraudulent soul-savers of politics, from the late George W. Norris, up or down. I come up with a feeling of loathing, disgust, at tirades against the so-called Power Trust and mention of its alleged machinations against the public weal. The most ruthless, selfish lobby today, barring none, is that of public power, composed of certain labor bosses, ambitious bureaucrats, parlor pings, meditative Socialists, leftists, plain Reds, "lame duck" politicians, and mush-headed intellectuals; a power-thirsty crew. Their gall is monumental. Imagine a crowd prating about the Government giving the people cheaper power by bookkeeping gymnastics, when that Government is taxing them at an all-time high.

Every branch of American business should not only acclaim but also aid and abet the program of your industry to expose the insidious propaganda calculated to fix you in the public mind as the entrepreneurs of some sort of con game and unworthy of attention in public affairs. The public-power apostles have worked assiduously, and to some extent successfully, in making the private operators synonomous with greed, while those apostles appear as benefactors of mankind, workers in the vineyard of humanity. I was amazed that flags were not flown at half-mast when that selfless public servant, Leland Olds, was turned down by the Senate last year. The selfish interests got him, moaned Mrs. Roosevelt in her column, along with the leftist and pinko writers of the syndicated press—got this man who had saved millions of dollars to the users of electrical energy. The reason this national calamity was soon forgotten may have been due to the fact that citizens, having one-fourth of their earnings taken from them, could not bring themselves to an appreciation of the alleged savings.

However, there are some who fear it may be premature to celebrate the political demise of Mr. Olds, for he has been appointed to the Water Resources Policy Commission. It wouldn't be surprising if he soon bobbed up in New England, with his pencil and pad, intent upon harnessing all the rills and brooks and tying them to Passamaquoddy, the rapids of the St. Lawrence, and the falls of the Niagara to furnish another and an unwanted TVA.

The avowed mistreatment of public servants such as Mr. Olds calls to mind the experience of a public power Lochinvar out in Pennsylvania, back in the thirties. In the political upheaval of those days, he was elected to Congress. His highest annual income had been $3,500. Sensing that the district would go back to normal 2 years later, he became a bold foe of the so-called Power Trust; all the while loudly voicing the conviction that he was signing his political death warrant because that ogrelike trust would get him. So effective was public-power propaganda that he grew to tremendous stature as a sacrificer and won the sympathy of all people against sin everywhere. Well, he was "got" in the next election. To the best of my knowledge, no power company lifted its voice; the people of his district disposed of him. But in the great game of buncombe practiced upon the people, he had a good knowledge of the cards; to wit, the leftists made him a trustee of a utility-holding company which had been thrown into bankruptcy—and he took over at $40,000 a year.

Indeed, Americans should rejoice that you do not cow before your traducers, not one of them able to claim a single constructive accomplishment. You are now speaking up and are being heard. You were among the very first to sound alarm at the socialistic trend of our Government, and many of your fellow members in the chamber of commerce thought you were idly crying "wolf." Why shouldn't we, your fellow chamber members asked, take this bit of Government bounty for a local power project? That's not socialism, it's simply getting in on the Government gravy train, they pleaded. That's what they thought. We have seen this thing grow. Witness the fight of the doctors to head off socialized medicine. Read the Hoover Commission Report that the Federal Government owns or has investments in over 100 kinds of business, totaling approximately $20,000,000,000, with congressional authorization for over $14,000,000,000 more. And the end is not in sight.

The presentation this morning of What Can One Man Do? by Elmer Lindseth, was inspiring. In this audience I see former associates of Wendell Willkie. They remember how one man fought, what one man did, in the late thirties. Conversely, I emphasize the evil that one man can do. Practice of opportunism by a business executive makes mockery of solemn resolutions of the civic organization which he heads. More than that, it breeds widespread cynicism. It explains intellectual pessimism. Again, on the score of the evil one man can do, a certain cross-country supposedly nonpolitical trip in May should be watched closely, and for every blast directed at you, two bigger and better ones should be returned.

Approaching the subject from another angle, we were told by H. S. Rausenbush, back in the twenties, "One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, in a Government department, can do more to perfect the technique of control of industry than a hundred men outside." Shortly Mr. Rausenbush found for himself a vital spot in Interior and proceeded to promote his program of encroaching control, which he predicted would gradually socialize the power industry. At that time, only 3 percent of the industry was under political management, as against the present figure of 20 percent under Government ownership or political management. Whatever the word used by our sophisticated conservatives who profess to see no danger in this trend, Mr. Webster calls it socialism. Because there are so many enemies of the free-enterprise system, working in divers and devious ways, with your industry the principal target, America must be alerted. The revolution by nibbling, as Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, called it a few days ago, is taking a frightful toll. Power seekers, in and out of Government, are hacking away at personal and business freedom, with disastrous results.

Since the days of Rausenbush—and before, for that matter—the collectivists have relied on processes which I choose to label economic jiu jitsu, to assure the destruction, economically, politically, and spiritually, of freedom. I label them economic jiu jitsu because they make our own strength work against us and are effective, whereas a straight-out conflict would be hopeless. The American people, even today, far down

the road as we have gone, if asked to adopt socialism frankly recognized as such would unequivocally reject the proposition. Recourse, therefore, has been had to a variety of devices designed to accomplish by indirection the end desired by the collectivists.

Without a too close pursuit of this analogue, I would say that a principal device for the destruction of liberty in this country, which pioneered political institutions planned to assure personal freedom under the aegis of its Constitution, has been to create an obsessing fear of various isms and preoccupation with plans ostensibly for protection against them, so that our strength should be made to fight against us. This is no new thing. A score of years ago it was bruited about that the country would go communistic if we didn't throw out the then incumbent rascals. Whether rascally or not, they were ousted; and then we were told that this, that, or the other enterprise by the State was necessary in order to prevent the loss of our four freedoms to socialism. We demonetized our currency; we set up a so-called social security, and we plunged the country into the horrors of a managed economy under the short-lived NRA; all in order that we might preserve our way of life.

We have gone a long distance beyond what in the thirties we used to call the middle way. Authoritarian proposals are daily made and set forth in the press, on the platform, in the halls of our legislative bodies. The shock is not so much that they can be made but that they are received as a matter of course; that there is not a flaming outburst of editorial denunciation of the very proposal of these infractions of human liberty. Can it be that the Washington planners are proceeding on the premise that the people are disposed to entertain a proposition to swap their birthright for a mess of pottage? I am not cynical enough to believe that all the advocates of these myriad devices for reducing man to mathematical formulas are consciously trying to wreck our Government. On the other hand, I am not naive enough to believe that every last one of our social planners is innocent of an ulterior purpose to do just that. It is sufficient to say that, whatsoever the motivation, the end result of a managed economy cannot be other than the removal of volition from the people and the substitution of authority vested in little bureaucrats or omnipotent commissars—call them by whatsoever name.

Local communities and individual business concerns, various categories in the population have evinced an eagerness to accept class or special legislation, subsidy or protective preferential treatment by quasi-public bodies in order to gain material benefits; when it must be as clear as day that acceptance of those benefits implies, as always does the taking of the King's shilling, a subordination to a master.

There is only one way to avoid this sort of thing and that is to oppose, with all one's strength, the specious individual proposals, one by one, as they arise; to scrutinize every Government undertaking and determine whether it is a necessary and legitimate function of a Government of a free people. On every count, the St. Lawrence waterway and power project fails to meet this test. It would be another step along the road to socialism; which, according to Harold J. Gallagher, president of the American Bar Association, is the same as the road to communism.

Lately, we have heard a great deal about the necessity for the navigation features and the power capacity of the St. Lawrence project as instruments of national defense. It seems that all one has to do in order to justify increased taxes, swollen national debt and usurpation of enterprise by bureaucracy is to talk of the necessity for national defense. Anyway, it appears to placate the peasantry. I'd like to spend a few minutes on the power aspect, analyzing with you its value as a defense instrument. I am of the opinion that the St. Lawrence development is substantially worthless for that purpose, and that what is said with reference to power can also be said with reference to navigation.

There is no need to stress with you the fact that 570,000 kilowatts of firm power which could be developed on the American side of the river would be scarcely a drop in the bucket; certainly not the indispensable thing for national defense that has been pictured by the more ardent of the advocates. Again, there's no need to point out that, small though the St. Lawrence development would be in the total picture, it would, nonetheless, represent an ideal objective of aerial warfare, particularly when combined with the bottleneck features of transportation to and from the Great Lakes Basin. The St. Lawrence proponents cheerfully pass up the hundreds of millions of dollars of defense installation and the thousands on thousands of defense personnel necessary to guard this concentrated facility against attack from the air, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence—even from the upper St. Lawrence River itself. It may be trite to note that one well-placed bomb would wreck the entire project. Army engineers have stated that one bomb could destroy the Panama Canal. The St. Lawrence is a more accessible target.

What I wish to accentuate is that there is only one way to provide power capacity for national defense beyond what would be created by the natural operation of economic process. That way is to create the capacity and hold it idle against the day when more power may be needed than can be dug up by conversion of industry and by operation on a three-shift basis. As a hard-headed, practical matter, if we must have idle capacity in preparation for war, the best way to have it is as extra reserve capacity in the diversified power plants scattered throughout the country, reasonably close to the munition industries. Even the advocates of the St. Lawrence seem to recognize the fact that the project would not create idle power capacity, since, in their enthusiasm for a really good story, they envisage a managed economy whereunder industry would be brought to the region from less-subsidized parts of the country, and all the capacity, both firm and infirm, utilized right up to the hilt under a preferential process of definitely socialistic character, and this quite regardless of defense needs. We have then an interesting device whereby, in the guise of equipping us to fight a war for freedom, an additional collectivist undertaking is advanced.

Of the three devices which I have described and defined as economic jiu jitsu, two are most practical in their operations—the one which professedly pertains to protection against "isms" and the other which concerns subsidy and preferential treatment. The third is more real and more devastating, though less apparent. It could lead to such a thorough loss of individual freedom that it would become of little point to strive further toward warding off collectivism. If we can be persuaded to lock up any of our resources by foolish expenditure, to that extent we weaken our economic means of defense. Remember the Maginot line. No nation—not even ours—has a fund of resources beyond its needs. What we squander must come out of what we should usefully employ. What we waste on a fictitious defense must be at the expense of our real ability to take care of ourselves or must mean adoption of a lower standard of living. Every capital expenditure put into the hands of Government is, with the personnel related to it, just so much of our strength frozen into the rigidity of superorganization.

There is new, startling evidence of economic jiu jitsu in the Southwestern Power Administration, an offshoot of the United States Department of the Interior, commissioned to operate in 10 of your States. This is setting out to be an empire of power, both electrical and political.

The electric power prospects are described by the newly appointed Administrator as over a million kilowatts of federally generated power by the end of 1955, and double that amount a little later. He boasted that these Government power plants in the 10 States will probably be linked with a web of federally owned transmission lines.

The political power prospects are more important but less obvious to the general public. They result from both the outpouring of Federal funds for construction and the manipulation of the federally subsidized power supply. Such activities have already been found handy by the ruling political clique in buying public support here and there. They are being counted upon in this case as one means of turning people away from that strong element of political leadership in the South which is not sympathetic with the leftists in Washington.

I hear talk within your industry that the thing to do is to come to an understanding with the Federal Government as to where its activities will stop and where the industry can operate in peace. In my opinion, any hope of such an arrangement is utterly unrealistic. Less than a couple of years have elapsed since the famous Alatoona contract between one of your companies and the Department of the Interior. That contract seemed to do just that. But the policies of the Interior Department have already moved far beyond the Alatcona contract. More recently, the stipulated preference for public agencies and rural-electric cooperatives, contained in Federal laws, has been interpreted by the Interior Department as a prohibition against any long-term sales of firm power to utility companies—even by State agencies. I refer to the correspondence between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of South Dakota.

For helpful suggestions that I might pass on to you, I inquired of an old friend of yours and mine, Tom Martin, of Birmingham. His one suggestion is, "express your convictions." In the light of many years of work having to do with politics, of having to know the mechanics of politics, I am convinced, gentlemen, that no appeasement program can stop this public power gang. They are bent on complete collectivization of electric power supply and they are confident they can get it. Only the votes of the citizens of this country can stop them. Only public appreciation of the superior services your companies render, public respect for enterprises that are competent, self-supporting taxpayers, and public disfavor for agencies that waste public resources in unjustifiable projects can produce those votes. To that end, I know you are dedicating your all-out efforts. The extent to which those and like efforts bear fruit will be a determining factor in the destiny of this land.

Address of Hon. Katharine St. George, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix

of the RECORD, I am inserting an address made by my friend and colleague, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, at the dinner of the Republican Activities Committee in honor of William Davis, chairman of the Republican Town Committee of Manchester, Conn.

I take particular pleasure in inserting this eloquent speech because I believe that it is a notable example of the conscientious and distinguished service which our colleague Mrs. ST. GEORGE has been rendering in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

The address follows:

We are gathered here this evening to honor the town chairman of Manchester, Mr. William S. Davis, a good Republican. I know enough about these chairmanships to know that you have to be an unselfish and high-minded idealist to take the job of Republican chairman, sir, in this day and age.

The reason for this is that our party has little or no patronage to offer and the Republican chairman can only hold his workers and the citizens together through sheer personality, hard work and conviction. The chairman himself never gets any reward. I know this because for a few years I was chairman of my county committee.

When you win elections, it is always the successful candidate who gets the bows and take the applause but when you lose, it is always because the chairman was a knave or a fool, or both.

So, I am happy that the Republicans of this great State have seen fit to honor one of their town chairmen and I am most happy to be here with them on this most pleasant occasion to join in paying my tribute to one whose fine services to our party are being fittingly recognized.

Now, this brings me to the subject I have come here to discuss with you tonight and that subject is how to win elections. That is the one question to which we Republicans must find an answer and, in my humble opinion, we must find it now or we may well find that our days are numbered and worse even than that, that the two-party system has died in America and the world.

First, the Republican Party has got to have convictions worth fighting for. They have got to be positive and they have got to be bold in their approach. Then let them get out and fight. Never look back and never be afraid of being licked.

The first requisite for a politician, the most necessary qualification is: can he or she stand up to defeat? It is a good thing for us all to be defeated in our political battles occasionally, just to show the stuff we are really made of. No one has proved this better in our day than President Hoover. As a result, he has grown immeasurably in the hearts of his countrymen. If ever a man had a just cause to be bitter and angry at the smear campaign leveled at him in 1932, it was Mr. Hoover, but he rose above it and continued to devote his life to the service of his country, culminating in his tremendous work in heading up the Hoover Commission and carrying the work of this Commission through to a successful end. Why did he do this? Because he had strong beliefs and convictions that made it possible for him to rise above pettiness in defeat and to continue his labor for causes he loved and for his country which he put ahead of all personal considerations.

No, if defeat is going to stop us we had better give up at once. At this time in the country's history we need people who do not fear defeat and, above all, people who will not sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

The Republican Party is the party of reform. It was so conceived and it was born into the world for that purpose. It first saved the Union and abolished slavery. In its best days it was the party of the farmer, the small-business man, in short, the party of the individual American. By its name the Republican Party typifies American ideals and philosophy. Our country was founded as a Republic, not a Democracy, and it is well to remember that Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the modern Democratic Party for whom all these $100 tax-free dinners are given, always called himself a Republican. Later in our country's history it was our party, the Republican Party, that reformed big business which had become arrogant and proud and said: "The public be damned!" Yes, it was the Republican Party that fostered the antitrust laws that prevented big business from over-reaching itself and controlling not only our economy but our political life as well.

We are now once again in an era when reforms are needed and are long overdue. We need first of all to reform our Government, to clean and purge it thoroughly and completely. There is only one way to do this: It is by turning the present party in power out and putting the Republican Party, the party of reform, in.

The United States is suffering at home and abroad from lack of confidence in our Government agencies and in many of the heads of these agencies. This is notably true of the State Department.

The American people are shocked beyond measure at the revelation of moral corruption and perversion revealed in the testimony of Mr. John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, that the State Department had had to get rid of 91 employees as bad security risks and Mr. Peurifoy adds that they were all homosexuals.

Now I for one, have always believed, and still believe, that a person's private life and morals are no concern of any political opponent and are matters that concern his own conscience. As one who lived through the noble experiment of prohibition, I also know that you cannot make people good by legislation, however well intentioned. But, these unfortunate people are a grave security risk. They are preys to the blackmailers and spies, in fact, it is well known that General Cannarsis, one of the heads of the German Intelligence under Hitler, had a list of the homo-sexuals in our Government and what information could be obtained from each and everyone of them. It is well also to remember that the Germans and Russians were Allies up to the year 1941 and that they pooled their information up to that year. So these people are a very real menace and have already done grave harm to our country at home and abroad, in fact, they have in very truth been traitors to the Nation they have sworn to serve.

How and why anyone should feel that they are being unjustly treated is inconceivable. They should be held up to scorn and the Department heads should hang their heads in shame at having only cleaned up part of the mess, when they were forced to do so by congressional committees, spurred on by public indignation.

This is not a time for the Republican Party to stand aside and be squeamish. This is not a time to hold one's nose and pass on, on the other side of the street. This is rather the time for the Republican Party to take up the challenge and once again to play its part as the Party of Reform.

And today the matter in hand will be the reform of the United States Government. The people are ahead of the Congress in this and in many other matters, so no Republican need be afraid to carry the story to them. The people of the United States are sick of platitudes and well-chosen words. They are looking for someone to lead them out of the wilderness of corruption, waste and extravagance in which they know this country is floundering.

One of the big reforms that is long overdue is: The complete over-hauling of the financial and tax structure of the Nation. Thomas Jefferson said: "I place economy among the first and most important of Republican virtues and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."

One wonders what Thomas Jefferson would say today if he could see this Nation in an era of peace and prosperity with a national debt of two-hundred and fifty-eight and a half billions and a deficit budget of between five and eight billions for the present fiscal year. Some will say: "Oh, but we are far bigger and far richer; our income is more, and therefore our debt and our expenses must be greater."

This would be true if the income and expenses had kept pace with each other, but, unfortunately, that is far from being the case. Here are the figures: Since 1939 the national income of the United States has more than trebled, but the national debt has gone from forty and a half billions in 1939 to two hundred and fifty eight and a half billions in 1950, or a jump of over six times the 1939 amount.

Then we have the food prices and the surpluses and when we look into that we can only paraphrase the words of your own great citizen, Clare Boothe Luce, and say that the Department of Agriculture must be a lunatic asylum run by the inmates.

From July through December, Canada sent 1,587,000 dozen shell eggs to the United States; during the same period Communist China shipped 1,746,000 pounds of dried eggs to the United States; 283,000 pounds of frozen eggs also were received in the United States; the Government stock pile of eggs on December 31 totaled more than 73,500,000 pounds of dried eggs, and the Department was still buying them at the rate of more than 2,000,000 pounds a week.

Again, to quote that great Republican, Thomas Jefferson: "Nothing betrays imbecility so much as being insensible to it."

Art Wardner, a Minnesota farmer, sold 160,000 pounds of potatoes to the Government at $1.46 a hundredweight, and immediately bought them back for 1 cent per 100 pounds. Wardner never lost possession of the potatoes in the deal. He simply received a Federal check and then wrote out one of his own checks to buy back the potatoes.

As this Government bureaucracy grows, business (and especially small business) declines. We know that unemployment is on the increase. Government has grown to the extent that it is the biggest single enterprise in the United States today. People in 21 States get more money from Federal, State, and local governments than they receive from industrial pay rolls. In 15 other States payments are more than half as big as the wages paid by manufacturers. Payments by Government to individuals total about twenty eight billions a year. The manufacturing industry has payments totaling about forty six billions a year.

It is estimated that nearly 6,000,000 civilians depend upon some form of government activity for their livelihood. They form about one-tenth of the total number of all employed. In addition, several million farm owners receive price support and conservation funds from the United States Government. Still many other millions are receiving pensions, relief payments and other forms of Government aid. Only in heavily industrialized States are the factory pay rolls larger than Government payments as a source of

income. In California, Government payments exceed factory pay rolls and in New York State they are 60 percent as large. Government payments approximate 14 percent of the income received by individuals. This is constantly growing and has already exceeded the farm income.

In the face of all this we get this kind of extravagant nonsense paid for with the taxpayers' money. The Department of the Interior has put out quantities of the following pamphlets:

"Determination of Age in Fishes"

"Concerning Mortality of Soft Clams at Essex, Mass."

"Biology of the Atlantic Mackerel; Early Life History"

Of course, we can count on several more volumes on the middle and later life of the mackerel. These things may be interesting and even of a certain value to a few of our people, but they are a criminal extravagance when the country is running a deficit of over 5 billions annually. It was President Roosevelt who said, in his first campaign:

"Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. Our workers may never see a tax bill but they pay in reduction from wages and increased cost of what they buy."

And on that I must agree with him, but he certainly got over that idea very quickly after his election.

So now, after 16 long years going from extravagance to greater extravagance and from deficit to ever greater deficits, we must have a change of leadership if this Republic is to survive.

Pray God that the Republican Party may be ready and able for that leadership, because if it is not, some leader will arise—someone with a delightful voice and agreeable personality who will promise the people these reforms if they will but surrender the power of the state to him. That has happended all over the world. It can happen here. Remember Hitler and Mussolini, both gave the people honest and efficient government with all the most advanced social services such as agrarian reforms, social security, old-age insurance and pensions, socialized medicine, but at the same time they took their liberty.

"We shall banish want. We shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. National socialism is the revolution of the common man. National socialism means a new day of abundance at home and a better world abroad."

Those are the words of Adolph Hitler. They have rather sickening familiar ring. That is one of the cures for corrupt government—dictatorship. The other solution, the solution of free men and women, is to turn the corrupt administration out and put the reformers to work.

To do this the Republicans must be aggressive. We must point out corruption in Government wherever it is and let the chips fall where they may. This year every congressional district must elect a representative. You will find that you are going to hear all the old familiar catchwords and all the alerts and emergency calls for help trotted out once again. We are beginning once more to hear that war is nearer than we think and soon you will hear that we must not change horses in mid-stream.

I would like to remind you that here again it should never be forgotten that war solves many problems. It puts an end to all criticism of the administration in power. It permits unlimited spending and extravagance. It puts an end to unemployment, even if that end is the grave.

War also puts an end to the freedom of the individual. Instead, it regiments and leads him regardless of his own will. War and freedom cannot long endure together. We would do well to pause and remember that we have had two world wars under the leadership of the Democrat Party and that on both occasions we were told we were fighting for freedom and to promote a free world.

What has happened? There is less freedom in the world today than since the Dark Ages. There is more nationalism and less free interchange of goods and ideas than at any time in modern history. And finally, there is more isolationism in the world today than ever before. At this very minute 800,000,000 people are dominated by the Soviet Union and isolated behind the iron curtain and that isolated area of the world is pushing forward slowly but surely every day.

That is what has happened in these last 16 years. Don't you think we need a change?

To get this change we must have teamwork. The Republicans in the Congress are making the Republican record and it is this record that the national candidates, both this year and in 1952, must stand on. Therefore, we must be forthright and even though we may disagree on minor isues, we must stand together on the big fundamental ones, and above all, on the main issue: Can a republic of free men endure in the modern world? The answer to that question must be given soon or our two-party system will disappear and when that happens, the Republic will collapse because the two-party system is the cornerstone of the building.

The plans to scrap this Republic are well advanced. There are two bills now pending that are being gently pushed by the administration. When they pass, they will put an end to individual rights and freedom in this country. One is S. 1971, introduced by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma—the bill embodying the so-called Brannan plan. This measure consists of 86 pages, 15 of which are a list of penalties that the American farmer will be subject to if he disobeys any of the regulations and provisions embodied in the act. He will be liable to fines, imprisonment, or both if he does not fill out all the forms and if he does not sow and reap according to the regulations of an all-seeing Government bureaucracy. Thomas Jefferson surely must have been looking at this country with a prophet's eye when he said: "If we were to be told from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we would soon starve." The Secretary of Agriculture says he has no idea of the cost of this program and its enforcement, but obviously it will be tremendous and the American farmer will be nothing but a Government employee at best, or a slave of the State at worst.

The other bill that will finish the work of regulating the lives of the American people is the Spence bill, H. R. 2756, introduced by Congressman SPENCE, of Kentucky. This measure, which would practically give complete power to the executive branch of the Government, caused so much indignation when it was first revealed to an astonished Congress that it is being carefully held in abeyance for the present and will not be brought up for consideration at the present session of Congress. If the Democrats win many more congressional seats this year, you may be sure that both these measures will be introduced and probably passed by the Eighty-second Congress.

These measures would spell the end of the two-party system in this country because the vast majority of the people would be directly beholden to the executive branch of the Government for their living. The Congress would be a rather second-rate debating society whose highest function would be to act as a go-between for constituents and the all-powerful Government departments.

Such a government would, of course, be upheld by the modern police-state methods and, mark you, that is something that no one has yet found a way to overthrow—the modern police state.

My friends, you may think I am an alarmist, but I submit to you that many great nations have gone this way and we must look ahead. Hindsight never pays.

These reasons are the reasons why we Republicans must go forth this year bravely and without compromise and fight the good fight, with confidence that right will triumph, with conviction and belief in our cause and its justice. We must tell the people the truth. We must be honest with ourselves first and with those to whom we are going to preach the gospel of the Republic. In Maxwell Anderson's play, Valley Forge, George Washington says:

"This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies for it."

Yes; we take all this for granted. We forget those who died for liberty. But we have come to the time in our history when liberty will perish from the earth if no one will fight to preserve her.

We Republicans are the only ones today who can make that fight. Let us march on with courage and humility to victory, freedom, and peace.

Four Billions Not Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 14, 1950:

FOUR BILLIONS NOT SAVED

If the present national administration desired to manage Government affairs economically and efficiently, the tools to do so are at its disposal. A non-Partisan Commission, created by Congress in 1947 and headed by Herbert Hoover, studied Government organization, functions, and methods for 2 years and had come up with plans for reorganization which would have saved at least a billion dollars a year, while improving the quality of work that was done.

The Hoover Commission was no muckracking group seeking to make capital for a political party and gain publicity for ambitious politicians. Neither was it an undertaking of academicians without practical experience in the affairs of Government and business.

COMMISSION WELL QUALIFIED

Four members of the Hoover Commission were appointed by the President, two of whom were high-ranking officers in his administration and two from private life. Four members of the Commission were appointed by the Speaker of the House, two being able Congressmen, one from each party, and two from private life.

One of the latter was Mr. Hoover. The four members to round out the 12 were appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, who named two able Senators, one from each party, and two non-Government men.

The Commission was the best qualified group ever created to seek improvement in

Government and reduce costs of administration. It went about the job with great intelligence and drive. Three hundred experts were employed and assigned to 24 committees, each dealing with a specific function, area, or group of problems.

The research reports were review by the Commission and made the basis of comprehensive plans for eliminating duplication of work, cutting red tape, and revising administrative methods.

The commission did not concern itself with the billions spent by the Government on activities which could well be eliminated. It found ways of saving $4,000,000,000 without eliminating any Government functions.

For the citizen who wants to inform himself about the economies the Hoover Commission pointed out, there is a little book entitled "A Hook in Leviathan," by Bradley D. Nash and Cornelious Lynde.

A wise and able President would have utilized the enthusiastic popular reception of the Hoover report to put it into effect in its entirety. But that is not what Mr. Truman did. What he saw in the Hoover plan was backing for petty moves of advantage to himself.

The Commission proposed that the salary of the President be increased from $75,000 to $100,000 and that, in addition, he be paid $50,000 a year of tax-exempt money. Mr. Hoover himself appeared before a congressional committee to approve this.

That had Mr. Truman's complete endorsement and a bill was rushed through Congress so that the President could get the extra money from the beginning of his second administration.

Mr. Truman also was happy to have the authority of the Hoover Commission back of a transfer of the public employment offices and the unemployment compensation machinery from the social security board to the Department of Labor.

RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DELAYED

Congress had on three occasions vetoed his request for the transfer. This was a move dear to the heart of the President because he owed something to Secretary of Labor Tobin, who took the secretaryship in 1948 when no one else would.

After dwadling a year and a half, while the Government went into the red 5 or 6 billion dollars, Mr. Truman on March 13 sent to Congress a batch of 21 plans for administrative changes. One of the plans called for abolishing the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, as proposed by the unions. This was not a part of the Hoover plan at all. It had never even been discussed by the Hoover Commission.

Other plans have been so long belated that opposition has been allowed to develop which may prevent their acceptance by Congress. Mr. Truman has used the Hoover report when possible to serve his personal and political ends and otherwise has reduced its effectiveness. Even at this late date he admits he has done nothing about half of the things suggested.

If anyone ever supposed that the Truman administration was interested in economy, a look at a recent report of the Armed Services Committee of the House would correct the impression. It mentions:

"A budget request is pending for a new $18,000,000 veterans' hospital in the Los Angeles area, while the Navy is closing the 1,500-bed Long Branch naval hospital in the same area.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is being built in Philadelphia, while the Army is closing the 2,000-bed Valley Forge hospital 20 miles away.

"The Veterans' agency plans to build 1,000-bed hospitals in Boston and at Brockton, Mass., while the Army is closing Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass.

"The Veterans' Administration wants to build a 500-bed hospital in Atlanta, while the Army is closing Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga.

"A 500-bed veterans' hospital is planned at Ann Arbor, Mich., while the Army is closing the 1,600-bed Jones Hospital at Battle Creek."

There won't be any Government economy until there is a different kind of a man in the White House.

Safety Rally at the Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be able to accept the invitation of Rear Adm. Paul B. Nibecker, commander of the New York naval shipyard, to attend a safety rally at the yard on April 6, 1950. We who live in Brooklyn, of course, always call it the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The officers and enlisted men, together with the entire civilian personnel, are to be congratulated for their very fine safety record. I believe it can well be held out to the entire country as an excellent example of what men and women can accomplish when they set their minds to it.

The over-all yard record was 77 days without a single lost-time accident. That is exceptional in the light of the tremendous number of men and women working there under all sorts of conditions.

The record of the three top shops is particularly outstanding. The pattern shop did not have a lost-time accident in 2,923 days; the sail and flag loft did not have one in 1,510 days; and the electronics shop, none in 746 days.

Admiral Nibecker has every reason to be proud of these fine accomplishments.

Truth on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truth on Civil Rights" which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of yesterday, April 19.

It is high time that the American people know the truth about the Democratic Party's position on the civil-rights program. The truth is that the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Truman, has no real intention whatever of advancing the program. As the editorial so well points out, the administration is engaging in a lot of double talk in an attempt to deceive the people.

Let me remind you that the Democratic Party has been in power around 18 years with substantial and overwhelming majorities in Congress. In all these years not a single major civil-rights measure has been enacted. In this Eighty-first Congress the Democratic Party has a substantial majority in both the House and the Senate, but to date the civil-rights program has received little more than lip-service from the Democrats. While they profess great interest in civil rights, the Democratic leadership in the Congress repeatedly postpones consideration of the program.

Abraham Lincoln once said to a caller at the White House:

If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all the time.

The editorial follows:

TRUTH ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Democratic Senate Policy Committee has announced that consideration of the civil-rights program, and particularly of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, has been indefinitely deferred in favor of more urgent matters.

To members of racial and religious groups who take the professions of Mr. Truman's party at face value, we commend the following remarks of Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, a stalwart Truman Fair Dealer, made in a radio speech April 12 to his constituents:

"I tell you it is the power and influence of your Senators and Congressmen that has made possible defeat of FEPC and other so-called civil-rights bills. They hold this power and influence as members of the Democratic Party.

"The anti-poll-tax bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee. Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Democrat, Mississippi, is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were a member of the Dixiecrat splinter party, he could not be chairman and could have little influence in the fight against civil-rights bills.

"The general civil rights bill (containing a combination of the controversial programs) is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator JOHN EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi, is chairman of this committee. If he were not a Democrat, he could not be chairman of this or any other committee."

ONLY FOR HOME CONSUMPTION

"As a Democrat, I hold a place on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I led the fight in committee against the FEPC bill, and the committee dropped it like a foundling on the Senate's doorstep—without a word in its favor." (The committee reported the bill to the Senate Calendar without recommendation.) "If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party. I also warn that the Republicans are committed to civil rights."

When Senator HILL was asked how these statements were to be matched with the Democratic Party's claim that it is a party of tolerance, abhorring racial and religious prejudices, he made the classic response:

"I was speaking to the people of Alabama."

In other words, the Truman party shows one face and speaks with one voice when it is seeking the white supremacy vote in the South, and it shows the opposite side of the face and speaks with an entirely different voice when it is appealing to the vote of minorities in the North. Senator HILL has exposed the trick.

Has Mr. Truman the guts to pull out his party's supposed passion to institute a civil rights program once again in the fall congressional election as a means of wooing the minorities? If so, he must think the gullibility of the people is beyond exaggeration.

Postage Stamp in Honor of the Late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1950, I introduced H. R. 8053, for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, who was killed in Israel on June 10, 1948.

The bill authorizes the Postmaster General to issue the special stamp within 1 year after enactment of the measure. The stamp is to bear a likeness of Colonel Marcus and its denomination is to be determined by the Post Office Department. In view of the fact that Marcus was a resident of Brooklyn, I suggested in my bill that the stamp be placed on sale in Brooklyn 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

Colonel Marcus, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1924, had gone to Israel to help lead its forces in the struggle for independence after the Arab states invaded it in 1948. He instilled a spirit of modern warfare among Israel's forces and planned its military strategy. He is one of the great Jewish heroes to emerge from Israel's modern war for independence.

David Marcus was born on New York's East Side. After his graduation from West Point, he served as a lieutenant in the infantry until 1926. He attended Brooklyn Law School, passed the bar examination in 1927 and received a doctor's degree from the same law school in 1928. He then served successively as assistant district attorney, as assistant United States attorney, and commissioner of correction in New York City under Mayor LaGuardia.

Marcus remained in the Army Reserve throughout his civic activities. During World War II, he went back into service as a lieutenant colonel, first as a Judge Advocate and later as a provost marshal in the Twenty-seventh Division. He parachuted into Normandy on D-day and was with American troops during the fighting in Sicily.

Liability Insurance for Private Plane Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, recently at a hearing of a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I was disturbed to learn that a serious gap exists in our aviation laws. Upon questioning a responsible official of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, I discovered that not many private planes carry insurance to cover injuries they may do to persons and damage to property.

Since there are more than 90,000 private planes in this country today, and since no law requires their owners to show they are financially responsible for any damage they may cause, it is time that Congress ends this current state of irresponsibility. In recent months several planes have crashed in residential and business areas. In the months ahead we may expect more.

Americans are home owners and many of them invest their life savings in their homes. Unless the home owner carries comprehensive insurance, and not too many do, a freak airplane accident may wipe out his security and well-being.

The chances of a private plane being involved in an air mishap are certainly greater than for a commercial plane, which must meet strict safety standards. Commercial planes carry liability insurance. Many States require car owners to carry liability insurance to protect individual life and property. There is no reason why private aircraft should be treated differently.

For this reason, I have today introduced H. R. 8126, which will require all planes to furnish proof of their financial responsibility in case of accident. Officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, who will prescribe the standards of financial responsibility when this bill is enacted into law, are agreed as to its essentiality. With 90,000 private planes in the air, we are past the age of curiosity and experimentation. We have a responsibility to all property owners in the United States and to all parents to lessen the danger and fear of air mishaps.

Address of Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1950, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States held their fifty-fifth anniversary dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. The guest of honor on this noteworthy occasion was Mr. Louis B. Mayer. Mr. Charles H. Silver, a distinguished citizen, well known in civic, philanthropic, and business affairs in the city of New York, served as chairman. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address delivered by Mr. Silver to the guests assembled:

I consider it a distinguished honor to be chairman of the fifty-fifth anniversary dinner of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. It is more than half a century since soldiers of the Jewish faith formed an organization and, while vast changes have been wrought in the life of our Nation during the intervening years, the spirit which animated the founders has never changed—the spirit of Americanism and brotherhood.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were cradled in the American way of life. When they came to maturity they grew in stature and influence because they were rooted in genuine American ideals. They are part and parcel of a system of society that has made this Nation great and glorious and that will never be changed by those who would try to tear down this system.

The boys of Jewish blood who stood beside their Christian comrades in the foxholes never asked those with whom they fought to what religion they belonged and they, in turn, were never questioned about their faith. The men in the foxholes had a common religion—Democracy. Yet each worshiped God in his own way.

The Jewish war veterans who have emerged from the slime and dirt and heartbreak of the battlefields have now taken their place in the forums of peace. It is worth mentioning and repeating from time to time that these men who fought so valiantly so that Democracy might survive are now engaged in another monumental struggle—the fight to create a peace that will banish the fear of the atom bomb and make the hearts of men and women glad that there is no longer any prospect of wanton and needless slaughter.

At this time I should like to say a word about this organization which has become a permanent part of the general pattern of American Democracy. Over in Europe, for centuries Jews were not permitted to volunteer to fight for their country. And in this country Asser Levy, the Dutch Jew, was denied permission by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant to participate in the defense of the colony of New Amsterdam.

Of course Peter Stuyvesant was merely reflecting the prejudice that colored the minds of European sovereigns. Levy had to plead with Stuyvesant to be allowed to risk his life in the common defense of the colony before he was accepted for service.

All this changed when America was born. It was one of the few countries that permitted Jews to wear the uniform of their country as honorable volunteers. And it is very interesting to note, my friends, that among the Jews who fought in the Civil War were immigrants who would have been denied the right to volunteer for military service in the countries of their origin. More than 10,000 Jews fought in the contending armies of the Civil War. Seven of these men were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

My friends, I could go on and on giving you the record of the Jews and it is a story replete with deeds of heroism and sacrifice. I could give you figures that would astound

you but they need no praise from me. But I would like to point out that some 250,000 Jews saw service in World War I and more than 550,000—over half a million—served in World War II.

Among them were those who had recently become citizens. Many of these were the descendants of those who were forced to wear the Yellow Star of David under German and Russian tyrants and who emerged from the war wearing the Purple Heart for wounds received in the service of democracy.

I think that all of us—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—may well be proud of this splendid record. For what they have done is more than a tribute to these men of the Jewish faith; it is a reflection of the splendid faith which we of all races and creeds have in the strength and nobility of American democracy. It is democracy as we practice it in this country that has been a springboard for the vast strides that we made in so short a time and will continue to remain the motivating factors of our daily lives.

What the Jewish veterans have done in the past is now part of the history of this country. What about the present? What are they doing now? What are the problems they face and how are they trying to solve them? Again, I say I could quote figures and statistics which would amaze you. But I want to briefly tell you about their vast program in the field of human relations. In the present state of the world human relationships have become a very vital part in the planning for a permanent peace.

This organization, my friends, is now engaged in fighting every form of tyranny, bigotry, and intolerance. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were among the very first to speak out boldly against Hungary's persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and the oppression visited on the Protestant clergies in central Europe. They have been assailed by the Communists as a tool of big-business interests on the one hand and by Gerald L. K. Smith's anti-Semitic cross and flag on the other hand.

What has been the answer to these attacks? A program of action in the field of human relations. They have worked with the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans, and other major veterans' organizations. They are reminding 18,000,000 exservicemen in America that racial and religious disunity can be just as harmful and menacing to the country's welfare in peace as it would have been in war.

Let those who would cast slurs on our way of life remember this very important fact. The Jewish War Veterans' service program, staffed by hundreds of professional and voluntary counselors, serves more than 110,000 veterans and veterans' dependents of all faiths. More than 30 percent of those who have been aided are non-Jewish. There, my friends, you have American democracy in action—action that is unfettered by any consideration of race, color, or creed. That is something that is worth fighting for and keeping so that we and our children and our children's children may enjoy the blessings of our glorious way of life.

If I have been enthusiastic about the past achievements and present status of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, you will understand why; I have attempted to give you a rather quick picture of an organization that has never faltered in its efforts to obtain its noble objectives.

We are engaged today in a struggle for the minds of men. We are trying to show those who do not share our philosophy of life that it is only in a democracy that man attains his full dignity as a human being. It is a tremendous undertaking. It is, I believe, too great for any individual to direct; what is required is a harmonious working of all forces striving in various directions to create a peaceful world.

There are many organizations in this country which are trying to coordinate these efforts for world peace. All of them should be encouraged. That is why it is important that we should give our support and sympathetic cooperation to the Jewish War Veterans of America in the general plan that is slowly being evolved to bring the peoples of the world together. Organizations like the Jewish War Veterans must play a very vital role.

We are indeed honored this evening by the presence of one of the great spiritual leaders of our times, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. It has been my good fortune to be associated with him in his untiring labors in behalf of a great hospital in this city. To know him is to grasp a true understandng of what is meant by the word charity. For to him, charity means friendship, compassion, tolerance, and help for those who suffer or are in need. His philosophy is as broad as the philosophy of humanity in its noblest sense. He holds in his heart love for people of all races and creeds. I have been very fortunate in having the pleasure of his comradeship, his advice, and wisdom.

Tonight the Jewish War Veterans of the United States are honoring one who is known throughout the land as a great patriot and who has earned the respect and admiration of his fellow citizens for his achievements as a worker in behalf of many worthy causes—Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

He has done much to bring about a world understanding of American ideals and principles and that, to my mind, is as important a job as any man can do these trying days. It is especially for this that we honor him this evening, an honor that has been well earned. And I want to take this opportunity to add my word of tribute to those of the other speakers whom you will hear this evening.

So I close by saluting the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. May the coming years bring them greater strength to follow through with their plans for peace and brotherhood.

Nice Showing for Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Helena (Ark.) World:

NICE SHOWING FOR ARKANSAS

Arkansas, in 1949, ranked seventh in cash income from livestock among the 15 Southern States. Our farmers got something over $155,000,000 from this source, putting them out in front of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, North and South Carolina, and West Virginia.

That's a mighty nice rating. It would be a happier one, of course, if we stood higher, but our livestock industry is pretty much a recent development. It was largely a "depression baby," taken up by many of our farmers in that harsh time of the 1930's.

In the States which lead Arkansas livestock has been an important part of their farming for a long time. These States are Texas (really three or four States in one), Oklahoma, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, Georgia, and Maryland. And the last two are ahead of Arkansas by only a few million dollars each.

Now, a lot of our farmers have the "know how" with livestock. They have much idle land, a chunk of it taken from restricted cotton and rice crops, to find use for. And good blood for improving livestock herds is available in the many fine breeding herds now established in the State.

So Arkansas might well expand its livestock farming and step up a notch or two in the State's rank. The income from this source could be doubled, possibly tripled, over a period of years if all the resources were fully used.

Our towns and cities would benefit greatly from such an advance. Farmers would have more money to spend in them, and they would get a lot more of the processing plants which prepare livestock and its products for the consumer. The present sprinkling of these plants adds millions of dollars annually to the farm value of the livestock output.

Here is one of our real opportunities.

Development and Maintenance of American Flag Shipping on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
April 18, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to the direction of the Common Council of this city, I am enclosing herewith copy of Resolution No. 108 relative to introductory bill, H. R. 7520, "to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes," which resolution was passed at the council session of April 4, 1950.

Very truly yours,
Dr. JOSEPH J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

No. 108

ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, Member of Congress, re introductory bill H. R. 7520, to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes and for other purposes

Mr. Rybka moved that the petition be received and filed and that it is hereby resolved that the Common Council of the City of Buffalo hereby approves introductory bill H. R. 7520 amending the Ship Sales Act to permit lakes operators to purchase vessels for conversion for services as package freight and/or passenger ships for exclusive operation on the Lakes and to aid the development and maintenance of American-flag shipping on the Great Lakes and that the Members of Congress representing districts including the city of Buffalo as part of its territory be and they hereby are urged to support said bill to the end that it may be enacted into law, and that the city clerk be and hereby is directed to forward copies of this resolution to such Senators and Congressmen.

Passed:

Ayes, 15; noes, none.

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman's Address to the United Jewish Appeal Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues a heart-warming address delivered by Mrs. J. Borden Harriman at the national conference of the Christian Committee of the United Jewish Appeal, held in Washington, D. C., April 16. Mrs. Harriman, who is a former American Minister to Norway, is now chairman of the women's division of the United Jewish Appeal Christian Committee, in which capacity she is particularly interested in aiding homeless Jewish orphans overseas and bringing them to Israel, where they will find a home.

Mrs. Harriman's address is as follows:

Shalom!

I greet you today with the salutation of the people of Israel. I greet you with the one word—"Peace!"—which I think symbolizes the ideal for which Israel is striving, the ideal which motivates you who have come to this conference to plan assistance for your fellowmen.

When I speak of peace, I mean more than the absence of war between nations, although that is the most important meaning of the word. I am thinking rather of that inner peace and security, that feeling of being loved and wanted and living among friends, which is the greatest possession of any free man or woman.

I imagine that the absence of this feeling of security has been among the most tragic experiences of those who suffered through the long years of war and oppressions that have marred our times. In the concentration camps, and later in the DP camps, the individual must have felt completely alone and forsaken.

It has been a slow and difficult task to help these people return to normal living. So deep are the scars they bear, that many of them require the most devoted and prolonged care to restore their faith in human nature.

This to me has been Israel's most important achievement. This work of human redemption has drawn me to active participation in the campaign of the United Jewish Appeal. I think it is this aspect of your activities which means the most to the people of America, for it is in the tradition of our country to place the highest worth on human values.

I have read with interest the statistics of the work performed by the United Jewish Appeal. The figures are impressive—many hundreds of thousands brought to Israel, great numbers in other lands receiving our help. And most important of all, many hundreds and thousands of others still facing danger, still fleeing from persecution.

But it seems to me that the human aspect is too often lost when we become immersed in statistics. To me, they assume real meaning only when I think in terms of the individuals whom we are trying to help.

As a woman, it is heartening to me to know that the thousands of children who were the remnants of Hitler's war are being given a chance in the postwar world. For as we know, childhood experiences determine in a large part what kind of adults will shape the future of mankind. A bitter, frustrated, and cynical youth can only result in a hard, calculating, and hopeless adult.

Certainly, European youth was headed for just such a future. We all read and saw pictures of the wild children of Europe, boys and girls who knew all the wrong answers much too early in life. The Jewish youth of Europe was particularly affected. They spent most of their formative years behind the barbed wires of concentration camps, next to the incinerators which devoured their mothers and fathers. They lived in forests, basements, closets—hiding from the Nazi monsters. They were the disinherited.

Now these children are being given a chance. More than 20,000 orphans have come to Israel since the proclamation of the Jewish State. Their rightful heritage is being restored to them. Some of them don't know quite how to accept this bounty of enough to eat, a place to sleep, and an education. The simplest things are miracles to them, miracles which you, in your generosity and understanding, have made possible.

But much remains to be done. We must still care for thousands of orphaned children who are being kept in child-care centers, hospitals, and rest homes. What would happen to these youngsters if you were not supporting them? They might be roaming the streets, friendless, homeless, drifting along on the tides of fortune, taking what charity and chance offered them. Without you they would constitute a pitiful, lost generation. And there are thousands of others who are being given a new chance through a special foster home program.

It is particularly heartening to think of the miraculous work being done for the children and young people in Israel. But we must not close our eyes to the needs of those great numbers of children who have not yet benefited adequately from our aid. Thousands of immigrant children still live in the reception camps in conditions which are unsuitable for even a vigorous adult. Their situation must be remedied. We cannot permit these youngsters to spend any more time in camps and temporary installations. They are entitled to normal lives in normal home surroundings—and the United Jewish Appeal must receive the money to give them what they need.

I have spoken about the children whom we are helping, because they are so close to my heart. But our work for the adults, for the aged, the sick, and the disabled, must be carried on with equal vigor. All of them—the men, women and children who have been hunted and hated and persecuted—must be given their chance to live again.

These people have suffered greatly through no fault of their own. You or I—any of us here today—might have been in their place but for the grace of God. Helping them is a challenge and a responsibility that all of us, I feel, must gladly assume.

And when I say all of us, I mean Americans of all faiths—Christians as well as Jews. I am proud of the great number of my fellow Christians who are taking part in this great work of the United Jewish Appeal. I am particularly gratified by the response that Christian women in all parts of the country have shown to the formation of our women's division.

It is perhaps tactless of me to say this before an audience consisting mainly of men, but I feel that the women of America can contribute something to the drive of the United Jewish Appeal that is frequently lacking in our charitable efforts. I refer particularly to the quality of heart and an understanding of the needs of human beings. Men are not incapable of showing these qualities, but I think it takes the woman's touch to breathe real humanity into a philanthropic campaign—even one of such scope and importance as this one.

As a Christian, I am deeply moved by the opportunity for service which the UJA drive offers me. To feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to provide hope for the downtrodden and homes for the dispossessed—these are consonant with the highest traditions of Christianity. These principles are part of the Jewish tradition as well, and mark another one of those many areas in which our religions have a common heritage.

Our joint effort for the United Jewish Appeal brings that basic harmony into the realm of practical, everyday life. And nothing can be more practical than the job we have undertaken. For the UJA program of immigration and reconstruction is playing a key role in repairing the damage wrought by the horrors of the past decade.

We have a big job to do in 1950. I need not itemize the tasks to be done—you know them as well as I do. I look forward to great things as a result of this conference. And I think you know that, in all your work, the women of America will give you the fullest support.

A Notable Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, of Richmond, Va., which pays a well-merited tribute to Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, who recently resigned as a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

Admiral Strauss was a boyhood companion of mine and our friendship has grown through the years. I have followed his brilliant career with interest and admiration. During World War I he served as private secretary to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, United States Food Administrator. Following the war he assisted Mr. Hoover in his American Relief Administration and peace-conference activities. When these duties were completed he returned to private life as a partner of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York. This connection gave him an opportunity to display his unusual talents and he soon became one of the leading young businessmen of America.

During World War II, Admiral Strauss entered the Navy and became the first Reserve officer to attain the high rank of rear admiral. He served as Navy member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board; Inter-departmental Committee on Atomic Energy; and as a special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy.

Admiral Strauss has been awarded the Legion of Merit and Gold Star by the Navy; Oak Leaf Cluster by the Army; Legion of Honor by France, and decorations from other governments.

When the Atomic Energy Commission was created, Admiral Strauss was appointed by President Truman as a member of that highly important agency of

the Government. He is a pioneer in the field of nuclear energy where his achievements will stand as an enduring monument to his outstanding abilities and services. Virginia is proud of the record he has made and extends to him her best wishes in his future undertakings.

The editorial referred to follows:

A NOTABLE VIRGINIAN

Lewis L. Strauss, one of the most distinguished of living Virginians, is entitled to resign his membership on the Atomic Energy Commission, after undergoing more than 3 years of strain and overwork as a member of that body. His service there followed 5 years in the Navy, where he rose to the rank of rear admiral.

President Truman's decision to proceed with the manufacture of the H-bomb apparently was in part due to the urging of AEC member Strauss. This is only the latest example of the remarkable public service performed by this remarkable man, who is still only 54.

He attended the public schools in Richmond, and although he did not go to college, he was elected last year to the presidency of the world-famous Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J. He is one of the Nation's leading bankers, having risen to a partnership in the New York firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. at the age of 33. He left Richmond in May 1917, at the age of 21, for Washington, and soon became secretary to Herbert Hoover. He remained Mr. Hoover's secretary during the period when the President-to-be was directing relief activities for multitudes of starving peoples overseas.

His services in the recent war were so conspicuous that he was awarded various decorations and citations by both the Army and the Navy. He was already the recipient of decorations from half a dozen foreign governments.

It was his physics textbook at old John Marshall High School, when he was a student there, which aroused the interest of Lewis Strauss in science. As a result, he was instrumental years later in the construction of a laboratory at California Institute of Technology for research in the field of atomic energy. His appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission by President Truman was the natural outgrowth of his long-time interest in the latest atomic developments.

Mr. Strauss has also been preeminent as a lay religious leader, having been president of Congregation Emanu-El, in New York. He is likewise a foremost patron of music and the arts, and is a director both of the Metropolitan Opera, in New York, and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, in Richmond.

Although he is hale and vigorous, and apparently a long way from retirement, Mr. Strauss' admirers and friends in Virginia are glad to note that he has a country estate near Brandy Station, Culpeper County. If he doesn't retire eventually to his old home town of Richmond, Richmonders will count on him to settle no farther away than Culpeper.

Promoting International Understanding for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of the members a very timely and informative article by Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, entitled "UNESCO and Agreement of Men's Minds," which appeared in the April 15, 1950 issue of the weekly review, America.

This lucid explanation of what the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization is trying to do to win men's minds toward international understanding is excellently presented and deserves wide reading. The article follows:

UNESCO AND AGREEMENT OF MEN'S MINDS

When UNESCO began its career in 1946 it was the victim of a gentle pun, often quoted. "What is it," people asked, "a tea biscuit?" The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is 4 years old now. Most of its critics would agree that it is less like a tea biscuit than like the K-rations of war days—too dry to be immediately tempting but potentially too valuable to discard.

As an organization affiliated to the United Nations, UNESCO has for its special concern the areas of education, science, and culture in their relationship to international peace. "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed," says the preamble of UNESCO's charter, a product of the versatile pens of Etienne Gilson and Archibald MacLeish. These intellectual leaders, like the others who joined with them in the creation of UNESCO, were convinced, apparently, that the road to peace was not one trod solely by politicians and statesmen. They found common cause among many groups in the determination to use every avenue to achieve the goal of international understanding, and to build peace upon the dignity of the human person.

Such an idea was not entirely new. Out of the shambles of World War I had come a similar organization that was related to the League of Nations but never earnestly or completely supported by the League. This organization, the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, did bring together important leaders in the cultural and educational fields who worked hard at the task of bringing about an international understanding of and sympathy for divergent cultures. The distinguished Ambassador of France to the United States, M. Henri Bonnet, was the executive director of the Institute. It is no discredit to him to report that the organization was not very successful.

The program of the Institute, and similar ideas, were all laid aside during the early and middle periods of World War II. But in the late days of the war a movement began in the United States to establish a new kind of International Office of Education that would promote knowledge and understanding among the nations looking toward the final goal of world peace. Similar undertakings were reported from France and England. Finally, our own Government began private talks with leading educators designed to produce a charter for such an international organization. The movement was given impetus by the inclusion of education among the items considered at the Charter Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco, April to June 1945, and came into its own in London in November 1945, when UNESCO was formally launched.

If the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation failed to achieve its desired ends, that failure was ascribed in large part to the inability of the Institute to interest a large cross section of people in member nations. UNESCO, determined not to make the same mistake, provided in its constitution for the creation of national cooperating bodies or national commissions which would enlist the support of as many cultural groups as possible.

In the United States the United States National Commission was relatively successful from the very beginning. Sixty important national organizations named delegates to its meetings, while many more clamored for the right to be associated with the work. Forty individuals were added, as representatives of national, State, and local government, to bring the membership in the national commission to 100. Meetings have been held twice yearly. Plenary sessions have been scheduled in Washington, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland. Despite the large number of individuals and organizations participating and regardless of the attention given to the United States National Commission in the daily press and in many periodicals, the parent organization and the Commission remain largely unknown in the United States, especially along the eastern seaboard. In Kansas and in certain other Western States there are State-wide, county-wide, and city-wide UNESCO units dedicated to bringing the message of peace and understanding to the man in the street in terms he can understand and cooperate with. Despite these special efforts, however, UNESCO and the National Commission remain for the most part a mystery to most people.

This apparent neglect of UNESCO might derive from any number of causes. The average citizen may distrust his own ability to make a contribution to peace, regarding the problem as the affair of statesmen. Or he may distrust the intellectuals and the program they envision under UNESCO, dismissing it as an idea of dreamers who are tinkering with social problems in an ineffectual, harmless way. Yet it should never be imagined that the citizen is not interested in peace or the ways of achieving it. Perhaps there is just enough cynicism about the United Nations to create a distrust of any organization that is affiliated with it. Those who attack UNESCO directly do so because they dislike the program or some of the individuals who are responsible for its execution or administration. Despite external criticism and internal tensions UNESCO has a fair record of accomplishment to mark its 4-year history.

HEADQUARTERS AND STAFF

The international headquarters of UNESCO is Maison UNESCO in Paris, once the Hotel Majestic, where now the clatter of typewriters and the buzz of conferences and debates has succeeded the click of hard-heeled Nazi boots that once echoed through these same corridors during the days of German occupation. It seems fitting that UNESCO has accomplished a sort of metamorphosis from peace to war in its historic headquarters. There are those who regard this change as presaging what UNESCO can do in the realization of peace and understanding.

The staff at UNESCO House who shape the program and guide it throughout the year depend for their directives on UNESCO's Executive Committee and on the annual General Conference. Four conferences have been held, two at Paris, one at Mexico City, one at Beirut; a fifth conference at Florence is now in preparation and is expected to convene about May 18 and conclude June 20, 1950. Fifty-four member nations will assemble at Florence for 16 plenary sessions and about 84 working meetings which will be needed to analyze and develop UNESCO's seven-point program. Resolutions and directives will be worked out for specific programs in the field of educational reconstruction for war-devastated countries, education, national science, social science, philosophy and humanistic study, cultural activities, and communication. The activities in all these fields must be geared to a limited budget and to a stimulation of programs that will in a much larger way become the ultimate responsibility of the independent member states rather than of UNESCO itself.

To demonstrate that the stimulating function of UNESCO is deemed to be its most important role one has only to look at the quite modest budget of $8,000,000 that is earmarked for the execution of the annual program. Directives adopted at the third conference in Beirut required the limitation of program and policy to approved projects, and placed the emphasis of an enlarged program on international governmental and nongovernmental organizations pursuing in specialized fields ends similar to or relative to those of UNESCO.

OPERATION

How does UNESCO operate in the seven above-mentioned fields? In various ways. For example, consider education. In 1950 UNESCO was directed to work more closely with the International Bureau of Education to determine problems involved in making free compulsory primary education more nearly universal and of longer duration throughout the world. Among the educational projects to be undertaken were the direction by UNESCO of two international seminars, one on the teaching of geography and the second on the improvement of textbooks, particularly history textbooks.

In natural science UNESCO is instructed to carry on the activities of a world center of scientific liaison. These include such tasks as promoting the exchange of scientists and the facilitation of their movements across frontiers, the exchange of information about films on scientific research, abstracting, rationalization, and other aspects of scientific documentation. An attempt is being made to establish a world registry of scientific institutions and scientists.

The present program of UNESCO in philosophy and humanistic studies calls for the increase of international cooperation in the field of philosophy and humanistic studies by grants-in-aid on contracts for financial assistance to the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, and for the organization of round-table discussions dealing with philosophical concepts that have special concern for UNESCO's purposes.

UNESCO has complied with one of its directives in the field of human rights by publishing in 1949, a symposium on this subject, with an introduction by Jacques Maritain, containing 32 essays by distinguished philosophers.

Space prohibits more detail in describing the program but one cannot conclude without at least a passing reference to the UNESCO book-coupon scheme that permits soft-currency countries to profit by an exchange with hard-currency countries, or the UNESCO-CARE book program that has made it possible to distribute books valued at more than $50,000 to 17 countries and territories.

Despite a fair number of contributions to the cause of international understanding UNESCO has not fared well at the hands of its international critics. The first broadside launched against it resulted from the choice of Julian Huxley as Director General. His naturalistic philosophy made him the target of sharp criticism by philosophers and idealists. Later, when he seemed ready to plunge the organization into an administrative morass, it was hinted that matters were saved only by the organizing genius of the deputy director, Walter Laves, of the United States.

When it began its work UNESCO almost sank under its own weight because the program was loaded down with the hobby-horses of private as well as public interests instead of workable projects that could be realized at an early date. A certain amount of internal strife within the organization itself slowed it down. Human nature being what it is, this particular difficulty was a predictable one. The seven interests represented on the program began to vie for major portions of the budget and for a large place in the over-all plan. With the advent of Torres Bodet as Director General in 1949, order began to emerge. Although natural rivalries may be expected to continue, the program should now begin to take on a definite pattern with proper emphasis on the major areas to be studied and reported.

At home, the United States National Commission has fared much better in most areas than has the parent organization. During its first 3 years it enjoyed the magnificent leadership of Milton Eisenhower, whose administrative ability, vision, and general good sense were the delight of all who were privileged to work with him. Although the American press failed to perceive it at the time, the National Commission was also fortunate in having WILLIAM BENTON, and later George Allen, as Assistant Secretaries of State for Public Affairs. Senator BENTON, in his recent speech proposing a Marshall plan of ideas, has justified the promise he showed in his early work with the Commission. Many thoughtful persons would agree that the United States must close the mental gap between its citizens and the rest of the world, while yet avoiding, if it can, the charge of cultural imperialism. The Benton resolution (S. Res. 243), now before the Senate, calls for, among other things, the acceleration of the work of UNESCO to the point where, with effective leadership, it has a chance to make a significant, perhaps decisive, contribution to world peace.

Religious leaders have been and are fearful that UNESCO and the National Commission may ficunder on the rocks of secularism, since the program of UNESCO has paid little attention to the fact that peace must be established by transforming man from the interior and not merely by erecting external structures. Lecomte du Noüy has reiterated for us a position that religious leaders have been insisting upon: The source of all wars, the source of all evil, lies within us. Outside protection will not suffice if we allow the enemy in our heart to live. Noüy is paraphrasing the Holy Father when he says that there is only one method by which it is possible to establish peace.

"First, to reestablish the cult of historic truth, by feeding the youth of the entire world with the same substance, thus establishing a basis for mutual understanding. This is a preliminary step and it can be taken immediately. Next, to strive to establish the cult of individual human dignity and to improve man by stifling his archaic instinct. This will be the work of centuries to come."

Negative criticism alone, however, will accomplish little for the UNESCO ideal. Men with profound religious convictions must establish the truth that love and justice among men are not only the purpose but the connective tissue of international society.

The Popes Point the Way to Social Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, two of the great social documents of modern times are the Rerum Novarum of Pope Leo XIII and the Quadragesimo Anno of Pope Pius XI. Despite the 40 years which separate their publication, they are remarkably similar pleas for social reform. And although almost 20 more years have ensued since the publication of the second, both contain remarkable applications to the problems of our time.

Dr. Philip Taft, chairman of the department of economics of Brown University, has written a sound analysis of these two papal encyclicals in the April 22 issue of the magazine America. Titled, "The Popes Point the Way to Social Justice," the article is a reminder that the two documents hold important meanings for Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a copy of the article:

THE POPES POINT THE WAY TO SOCIAL JUSTICE

(By Philip Taft)

The modern world is continually faced with the need of deciding basic economic policy. Not only must we evolve institutions that will assure equity and justice; we must here and now avoid anything that looks like a major depression. Serious industrial dislocation and wide unemployment would not only cause great distress but would weaken and perhaps even destroy our power to resist infiltration by totalitarian groups.

While the present generation faces the grim task of defending society and its traditions against corrosion from within and attack from without, the problems themselves are not new, and guidance on these questions can still be found by non-Catholics as well as Catholics in the papal encyclicals, Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno. Despite their age, these documents have a vitality and freshness absent in many contemporary pronouncements on social issues. Not only do they accurately diagnose the economic maladies of our time, but the remedies prescribed have been found effective in the past and are sufficiently potent to be helpful in the present.

RERUM NOVARUM

Rerum Novarum appeared in 1891, soon after the modern Socialist movement had established itself upon an international basis and was for the first time attracting to its standards large masses of industrial workers in continental countries. The spread of Socialist ideas could be primarily traced neither to the attractiveness of its doctrine nor the logical cogency of its arguments, but to the unbearable burdens imposed upon the wage earner by aggressive and expanding capitalism.

While modern industrialism raised living standards, it also encouraged sprawling city slums, overwork, and the brutal exploitation of the young and the weak. These conditions were justified by a theory of laissez faire whose tenets received an unenthusiastic reception among industrial workers. Instead they began to turn toward socialism. Germany witnessed the formation of the first modern Socialist Party in 1863, inspired by Ferdinand Lassalle, who outlined his program in his Open Letter. Within the next 20 years, Socialist parties were functioning in every European country that allowed free political activity.

The causes for the spread of radical doctrine among the industrial population were clearly perceived by the Catholic Bishop of Mainz, William Emanuel von Ketteler, who recognized the evils of modern industrialism and insisted that the church take the lead in eradicating them. His Christianity and the Labor Question not only attacked evils but prescribed remedies. The view that society should leave economic problems to the free play of economic law was challenged, and the theory that nothing could be done to mitigate the hardship of the worker rejected. Bishop Von Ketteler's work was carried further in Germany, and similar movements

were inaugurated in other European countries. All were founded on a belief that unregulated industrialism was not only guilty of inhuman treatment of the worker but, by its excesses, it was driving the worker into the arms of the revolutionary legions clamorously appealing for support.

Out of this awakening among Catholic social pioneers grew Pope Leo XIII's Rerum Novarum. It addressed itself to the social and economic problems raised by a laissez-faire capitalism, and prescribed a broad program for their solution. The encyclical showed that between the demands of the rugged individualist for no interference with the working of economic law and the revolutionary theorist for complete government control over economic resources, a third road was available, one of orderly, gradual adaptation to change.

One notices this feature of Rerum Novarum: it is a reformist and not a revolutionary document. Its approach to social problems is pragmatic, not doctrinaire, simple and direct rather than devious and complicated. Evils exist, a remedy is presented. Although the encyclical is almost 60 years old, it reads today like a current document, for our world has learned at the price of much suffering that complete and one-shot remedies for complex social problems are an illusion, that man is too limited, fallible and stubborn to find an easy, complete answer to the problems that beset him.

The tone of Rerum Novarum should be described as reformist, in the sense that it is more concerned with the eradication of evils than the transforming of institutions. The Pope sees the modern worker exposed to many evils and oppressions. He rejects the remedies offered by the Socialists of his time. He suggests as an alternative a program of reform, of guaranteeing the worker the right to organize, of placing a floor under wages, a ceiling upon the hours of labor, of protecting the young and weak against exploitation. He is intent on applying ethical principles, but to the existing order.

In examining the economic system of his time, Leo XIII did not deal with abstractions, as do the Marxists and the economic liberals, but with the impact of the new industrialism on individual men and women. He insists that the poor, who contribute by their labor to the welfare of the community, must not be neglected; that the prizes must not be monopolized by the strong and powerful, Rerum Novarum emphasized, therefore, the necessity of establishing those legal safeguards for the worker which have since been partially or entirely adopted in western Europe and the United States. "Government policy," said the Pope, "must be so arranged as to produce * * * public well-being and private prosperity."

The argument in behalf of such measures is based upon the inequality of bargaining power between employer and employee. The right of workers to form associations for the advancement of their interests is affirmed, and every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals, and not to make unreasonable regulations under the pretense of public benefits. This warning directed against governments controlled or influenced by the wealthy classes is even more applicable to the contemporary totalitarian regimes, which in the name of public interest either subordinate or destroy every expression of individual or group independence. Rerum Norvarum outlined the methods by which the workers' welfare and dignity could be protected. It also chastised those who accepted the then dominant belief that an overweening lust for gain was a high social virtue.

The view that economic activity must be the servant and not the master of man was a blow at both the insatiable demand for ever greater profits, and the theorists who insisted that society and the great variety of its institutions only reflected the changing aspects of economic activity.

QUADRAGESIMO ANNO

The 40-year period between the publication of Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno witnessed the expansion of the labor movement, and the introduction of many reforms envisaged in the earlier encyclical. It also saw a division of world socialism, with the extreme wing setting up a movement of its own under the name of communism. Quadragesimo Anno was issued when the doctrine of laissez-faire in economic affairs had lost most of its appeal, and when the economies of Europe and the United States were in the throes of a severe crisis. The automatic adjustments and the optimum distribution of capital and labor by the market had failed to solve the severe difficulties engulfing most of the world.

Whatever the explanation may be, the greater significance of trade-unions and of government in economic life could not be denied. Limitations on the use and even ownership of property had taken place in virtually all parts of the world. The subordination of property rights to the needs of society had been increasingly accepted. Control upon the use of wealth in behalf of the community was no longer regarded as interference with the legitimate rights of property, a view excellently expressed in Quadragesimo Anno:

"However, when civil authority adjusts ownership to meet the needs of public good it acts not as an enemy, but as a friend of private owners; for thus it effectively prevents the possession of private property * * * from creating intolerable burdens and so rushing to its own destruction."

Reform is justified not only on moral grounds, but as the most effective protector of the institution itself. Certainly the New Deal and Fair Deal programs are based upon similar assumptions. Inferentially the encyclical recognizes that the institution of private property is in danger not only from those who would overthrow it, but from those who insist upon continuing the injustices that arise as a result of unrestricted use.

The pronouncements with respect to labor are more explicit in Quadragesimo Anno than in Rerum Novarum, owing to the changes that had taken place in the interval between their publication. The latter was in a real sense a pioneer statement of a more sure if less spectacular road to social and economic progress than the one offered by extremist doctrinaires.

Quadragesimo Anno advocates a wage policy that will allow the worker to earn a sufficient amount for the proper support of his family. However, the wage policy must be sufficiently flexible to take into account the position of the single enterprise so that wages, considering also the basic needs of the worker, will not be so high as to cause unemployment. The Pope recognized that while such decisions can be made only by examining particular conditions, a policy that leads to unemployment is not merely harmful to the individual but socially dangerous as well. No specific wage policy is laid down, and the great diversity in the condition of individual business is recognized.

The test of a wage policy, in addition to minimum levels, must be its effect on employment—a good modern view. Severe unemployment, said Pius XI, is a dreadful scourge; it causes misery and temptation to the laborer, ruins the prosperity of nations, and endangers public order, peace, and tranquillity the world over. In a few simple lines, the dangers inherent in widespread unemployment are eloquently expressed. In the discussion of wages, the emphasis is on common good rather than on individual or group advantage. While minimum wage standards should be observed, the Pope recognized that the rates paid for different occupations and grades of work must be related. Otherwise there is not only a tendency for some groups to profit, but distortions in the wage structure may cause unemployment.

The Pope shows an awareness of changes in corporate organization, and his view—that "immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure"—might have been taken out of the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. The concentration of economic power is not only a threat to domestic order but to international peace. Few secular documents contain as sharp an assault upon free competition, nor is it often stated in language as direct and simple.

In dealing with socialism the Pope recognized the changes that had taken place since the 1890's, and some of his observations foreshadow the evolution of the third force which has played an important role in stemming the Communist tide after World War II. After World War I the Socialist movement became divided into hostile factions. The seeds of this division had long existed, for in the Socialist camp were found extreme revolutionaries as well as moderate reformers. The victory of bolshevism in Russia in 1917 ended the artificial unity. Extreme Socialists began to call themselves Communists, while the moderate Socialists retained their old name.

From the beginning the Socialists opposed dictatorship, the one-party state and suppression of minorities. Moreover Pope Pius XII recognized that their emphases upon human dignity and moderate reform rather than revolution "often strikingly approach the just demands of Christian social reformers." While still critical of some of the doctrines advocated by Socialists, the Pope saw the reasonableness and the utility of many of their demands. "For it is rightly contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the state, since they carry with the man opportunity of domination too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large." While specific criteria are not laid down, the Pope states that same types of industry might have to be nationalized. The test in this instance is not that nationalization is in itself desirable, but that private controls over some areas of economic life allow some people too much power over others.

CONCLUSION

Both Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno show a keen insight into the problems of their time. Both encyclicals stress reform by moderate means. While they denounce the doctrines of laissez-faire, they see great evils in the complete subordination of the individual to an all-powerful state. The method of achieving improvement in economic relations is through groups such as trade-unions, and laws directed against specific evils. There are no all-embracing panaceas, but readers of the encyclicals, irrespective of religion, can find there eloquent appeals in behalf of justice and human dignity. In Quadragesimo Anno the Pope sensed the crucial issue of the century: Whether men are to remain free or be swallowed up in a new slavery. He extended the hand of fellowship to all men desirous of correcting the evils of our industrial society and at the same time holding fast to the traditions of human liberty.

Will Americans Be Enslaved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a radio address delivered by me over WJR, Detroit, Mich., April 14:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my belief that you, as free men and women under the Constitution, have awakened to what is being done to our liberties and our free institutions by political freebooters; a group of men who have stultified the principles of their political party; a group of men who would enslave us all under the dead hand of socialism, while continuing to protest a tender regard for our social and economic welfare.

Most of you have lived through the period in which Soviet Russia has pursued a policy of Communist expansionism which today threatens to engulf the entire world in a new total war. Many of you will recall that before the end of the First World War the Russian Czar fell before the onslaught of men who called themselves Socialists. You may recall that these men set up a revolutionary government which they called a Socialist government.

You may recall, too, that the necessities of the Socialist state led on, within a few years, to the Communist state, with its excesses of summary arrest, torture, and imprisonment without recourse to courts of law, forced labor in political slave camps, and a general reign of terror.

The history of Russia since the fall of the czars has proved to all the world that socialism is merely the last stage on the road to communism. We have seen how the Labor Socialist Government of Great Britain has led that once great nation to the brink of political, social, and economic disaster.

But here in the United States we have still in power a political party whose aims have been prostituted by the gang in control of it. We have a left-wing administration which is dead set toward imposing upon the American people exactly the same socialism which has come near to destroying the British Nation and which led to communism in Russia. Many things now going on in Washington offer proof positive that this is so.

Most significant of these proofs—to my mind at least—is the fact that known Communists and hordes of Communist fellow travelers have been, and are now, harbored in various executive departments and agencies of the Government. Not only these, but hundreds of men whose unmentionable crime against the social order render them easy prey to blackmailing Communist spies, both in and out of the Government.

None of you, I trust, has forgotten the Alger Hiss case, nor the so-called Amerasia case, in which the FBI seized hundreds of top-secret Government documents connected with national security, which had been stolen and transmitted to the New York offices of the left-wing magazine called Amerasia. The editor and owner of that publication escaped with a small fine; others escaped scot free. But it looks now as if the Amerasia case will be reopened, with frightening revelations to be expected.

Neither, I trust, has any one forgotten the Fuchs case, wherein an American scientist in England gave the hydrogen bomb secret to the Russians and was imprisoned for a term of 15 years in a British prison.

Yet, the President has talked about "political red herrings." He has refused to dismiss Secretary of State Acheson after Acheson lost the confidence of the American people by his post-trial support of Alger Hiss.

The President has refused point-blank to permit the FBI, the State Department, and the Departments of Army and Navy, to open their security files to the Senate committee now investigating open subversion, to say nothing of perversion, in the State Department. It is just as if, in a criminal court trial, the defense were permitted to impound and conceal the evidence, and defy the prosecution to prove its case.

The President and his friends cry out that disclosures by Senator MCCARTHY discredit this country abroad. They should have thought of that long ago, when they were permitting Communist infiltration of the Government departments and agencies.

At the beginning of this broadcast I made the assertion that the gang in control of the Democratic Party, and hence of the Government, seeks to impose socialism upon the American people. This raises the question of how they are going about it. The answer, of course, is not difficult. They propose to do it by means of what they call the welfare state. The poorhouse state is a better name.

The welfare state is touted as pure democracy—pie right out of the sky for the labor unionist and his forgotten white-collar brother. As a matter of fact, it is pure socialism, of the Fabian English variety. The welfare state is a state of regimentation for everyone. The welfare state is a state of slavery in the long run, because it is the precursor of communism.

Now the technique whereby it is sought to impose welfare statism upon the American people has two parts. The first part consists of persuading the people that the Federal Government can do better for them the things they always have done for themselves as freemen. This doing consists of subsidies for industry and business, pensions for everybody, free medical care, more and more pay for less and less work by Federal law, Federal grants to municipalities and States in lieu of the money from tax sources the Federal Government has taken away from them.

The second part of this technique consists of more and more taxes—you get the point; more and more pay with which to pay more and more taxes. Less and less work, of course, means fewer and fewer things people can have to enjoy. Taxes now take nearly 37 percent of all individual incomes, and at least an equal amount of corporate incomes. When the tax take exceeds 40 percent, economists point out, people will not have enough income left to pay for a decent standard of living without Federal Government help.

We see these things going on all about us. We all know about the subsidies, the pensions, the grants-in-aid; and we hear about the proposals for free medicine, Federal aid to education, vastly increased social-security coverage. We know that the country today is staggering under a well-nigh insupportable burden of taxation; and we know how the Fair Dealers fight against Republican proposals to reduce excise taxes. We hear the President's demands for higher income taxes with which to pay the prospective costs of his Fair Deal program.

In the light of these things, do you have any doubt that Fair Deal welfare state-ers plan eventually to pauperize the people, to reduce them to helpless dependence upon the state? Have you any doubt that they plan to render the people willing to depend upon the state by telling them that Uncle Sam's purse is inexhaustible and that the bureaucrats are good-hearted fellows who seek only to make life easy for the populace? I hope—I believe—you are not fooled by the talk about the welfare state. It would be a poorhouse state, indeed.

It is my conviction, too, that all of us now understand that when the Federal Government takes in taxes, the money people need for every day living, when the Federal Government takes in taxes the money needed by business and industry for their ordinary operations, then economic chaos results. Then the time comes, as certainly as night after day, that the Government takes over all capital, all means of production, all personal property, all real estate, everything, in order to keep the national economy running.

This means socialism, pure and unadulterated. Americans no longer would be free. No man is free when his earnings are confiscated, and the ordinary necessities of life are obtainable only through the favor of bureaucratic officeholders.

Some of my listeners may disagree with me as to the excessive tax burden. Let me point to the undeniable fact that the average wage earner, with a family of four to support and earning $1,800 a year, now works from January 1 to April 28, just to pay his Federal taxes. Only after that is he free to turn a hand for himself and his family. It takes an average of another month's earnings to pay State and local taxes.

Nearly 5 months' earnings go to the tax collectors. But even then, the earner is not entirely free of taxes. Hidden taxes, excises on goods and services, and the like, take about 18 cents out of every dollar he has left. Small wonder so many people in this high-wage era find it hard to get by, debt free at the end of the year.

Yet in the face of this, President Truman submitted to the Congress a 1951 budget totaling $42,500,000,000, or approximately $5,200,000,000 more than the estimated Government income of $37,300,000,000 for the year. Then in addition—and this is something few people have been told about—his budget included $9,200,000,000 in so-called contract authorizations. These are authorizations for such Federal agencies as the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau to spend in advance of congressional appropriations. The money is spent in the same sense that each of you spends $2,000 or more when he contracts to buy a new automobile. You do not have to pay all of it today, but you surely will have to pay it over a number of tomorrows. You cannot use the money for anything else.

On this basis, next year's deficit might have reached $14,400,000,000, if Congress had not acted to cut down the total. The present year's Government deficit will be in excess of $5,000,000,000, in spite of the budget cutting done last year.

Now it is worth while to consider the impact of the "squandermania" of the Fair Deal; to consider where it is most severe. You, Mrs. Housewife, know where that is. The inflationary spending of the Fair Deal hits hardest at your household expense fund. You know that New Deal and Fair Deal spending, even more than the war itself, have cut the buying power of the dollar in half. A dollar buys today little more than half as much in food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and amusements as it did only a few years ago.

Do you think, perhaps, that things are going to get better? If you do, you are mistaken, so long as the present spending policies are continued. This spending, in largest part, is made possible by the taxes you pay without knowing about them, at the grocery store, the meat shop, the drug store, and everywhere else you go on your shopping tours.

Of course, there is a way to correct these evils. The Republican Eightieth Congress

set up the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government. The Commission recommended the changes that should be made for economy and efficiency in government, and for the preservation of our freedoms. But has the Fair Deal administration given anything more than lip-service to the Hoover program? It has not. The President's effort to hamstring the Taft-Hartley Act, the true magna carta of American labor, by putting all National Labor Relations Board power in the hands of a single Presidential appointee, is an example. This was because Congress had refused to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Congress knew that the act, in truth, is not a slave-labor law but is a law which sets labor free to run its own business, without the dictatorship of dishonest labor leaders or dishonest industrial management, in those instances where they exist.

So there you have it. The Fair Deal plays footsie with Communists, and defends and supports Communist stooges in the Government. The Fair Deal would impose socialism upon the American people, first by pauperizing them and then by rendering them wholly dependent on the Federal Government. The Fair Deal refuses honestly to put the Hoover recommendations into effect, because that would prevent realization of the Fair Deal's socialistic aims.

A national election was won in this country, once upon a time, with a slogan which said: "Toss the rascals out." Possibly that should be the campaign slogan of the American people this year and in 1952.

Dr. John C. Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay my humble tribute to one of the finest Christian leaders I have ever known, Dr. John C. Ball, pastor emeritus of the Metropolitan Baptist Church, here in Washington, who passed away last night, at the age of 87.

I have known Dr. Ball intimately for a long time, and my admiration for him has grown with the passing years.

He was converted by, and for a long time associated with, Dr. Russell H. Conwill, one of the most outstanding evangelists this country has ever known, whose famous lecture "Acres of Diamonds" will ring down the centuries.

I realize that owing to his extreme age, Dr. Ball's passing was not unexpected, but it will be difficult indeed, if not impossible, to ever replace him.

Many years ago, I was rambling through the Georgetown Cemetery, here in Washington, when I came across the tomb of Howard Payne, the author of Home Sweet Home. On it was a little verse which, to my mind, applies to Dr. Ball.

It went something like this:

Lo, when his blessed spirit fled
To realms beyond the azure dome,
With outstretched arms God's angels said
"Welcome to Heaven's Home Sweet Home."

The Great Need: An Informed Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Lester Markel, Sunday editor of New York Times, entitled "The Great Need—An Informed Opinion," which appeared in the New York Times magazine on Easter Sunday, April 9.

As Mr. Markel points out, the problems and issues with which America, as the leader of free nations, is confronted, are more complex and difficult of solution than ever before in our history. Mr. Markel deals here primarily with international problems, but our domestic affairs are no less complicated.

Here in Washington it is at least possible to get hold of a good many pieces of the puzzle of world affairs, and to put a few of them together. Even then, the picture is far from complete or clear.

The picture is portrayed to the Nation primarily through our daily newspapers, which, often of necessity, chop it up into small pieces, which are displayed irregularly. The bright colors of the spy scares and the crimes are made most prominent, while the more drab details of the picture—which may be more important to an understanding of the whole picture—are often cast aside or shoved off into a corner.

Very properly, Mr. Markel picks out Members of Congress as one group which can and should bring to the citizens of America a picture of the problems they must consider in which at least some of the pieces have been put together so as to be intelligible. I believe that the American people want, need, and deserve leadership. During the summer months, every Member of this Congress will be seeing and talking to great numbers of Americans. I hope that we will all heed the lesson of this article. I hope that we will all take the facts of the world and the national situation back to our constituents.

THE GREAT NEED: AN INFORMED OPINION—WE HAVE ALL THE EQUIPMENT AT HAND FOR GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP, BUT WE MUST PUT IT TO USE NOW

(By Lester Markel)

In the year 1 of the hydrogen age, Washington is beset by uncertainties. It is unsure about the world; it is unsure about the Nation; most of all, it is unsure about itself.

This indecision is not unique to Washington; it is characteristic of the age. From the beginning of history, man has been largely preoccupied with the task of controlling nature. Now, long before that task has been completed, he is confronted with another and even more difficult one—the task of controlling man.

Everywhere there is this uncertainty. Even in Russia. At midnight in the Kremlin, the 13 stern, secretive men must have their misgivings and their doubts, too. But Washington's indecision is far more meaningful than the indecisions of other capitals, because it is the capital of the free world, representing power such as history has never before known and making judgments that will reach far into the future.

Washington's mood is a reflection of the mood of the Nation; its indecision means that the Nation, too, is unsure. The Capital tries to discover and to anticipate the wishes of the voters. Now it feels it has no clear directives and it gropes for them.

But the Nation does not have, in the vital area of foreign policy, either the information or the compulsion to give clear directives. There are disturbing reports: that about 3 out of 10 voters are unaware of almost every effort in American foreign affairs; that only 25 out of every 100 voters are reasonably well informed. This means that the Nation is likely to move by emotion rather than by intelligence; by prejudice rather than by conviction; that it may be deceived into wrestling with bogies rather than grappling with facts.

It becomes clear that the great need is the education of American public opinion; it becomes clear, also, that Washington is required to lead, not merely to follow; to search out the minds, not solely the votes, of the Nation.

The atmosphere of the Capital today impresses on the visitor the proportions of the task.

I. THE POLITICAL SHADOWS

Washington is unique among the great capitals of the world. London suggests the black and gray of empire—Paris echoes with the memories of the Sun King—Rome is both an imperial city and a religious city. These capitals dominate government. But in Washington Government dominates the city; there the political rather than the global view is apt to prevail.

At no time has this preoccupation with politics been more apparent than it is today. The elections of 1950 and 1952 are casting their murky shadows before; the politicians are searching feverishly for paramount issues.

The capital is a vast listening post, straining its ears and nerves to catch every whisper throughout the land. It has devised a large assortment of apparatus, scientific and otherwise, to tune in on the men in the streets—polls, overt and covert; personal pipe lines; correspondence with constituents; conversations over fences in process of being mended. In view of the vastness and diversity of the currents that run through the Nation one wonders how effective is all this activity. Nevertheless Congress has distilled its samplings into certain basic beliefs.

On the domestic side, three predominate: beliefs in the pocketbook vote, in the pork barrel and in the balanced budget. Congress is likely to cut any international fund in favor of a domestic bounty, even though it may be more than half convinced of the dangers of such a cut. In the deep recesses of the pork barrel the balanced budget concept is often lost.

In foreign affairs, also, there are certain cardinal credos: an instinctive suspicion of foreign lands and foreign peoples; a belief that the Europeans play us for suckers; a deep concern about China—a reflection of a sentiment that echoes back to our missionary days and to our special role in the Pacific war. Russia evokes both vast distrust and vast anxiety; as a result there are st rtling ranges of sentiment, from demands for atomic intervention to proposals for quick appeasement.

Congress has much more assurance about domestic affairs than about foreign; there-

fore it has always looked with some suspicion on the State Department. Moreover, the Congressman has always been inclined to view State Department personnel as outsiders—foreigners dealing in foreign affairs; "cookie pushers," "long-haired boys," certainly not folks. There has been also a feeling that Congress was being disregarded—"sncoted" is the word on Capitol Hill.

Now there is inquiry—searching, unrelenting inquiry—into the ideology and morals of the Department. At a moment when our most momentous international decisions face us, foreign policy has become a focal point in the political struggle. The overtones and the undertones of that struggle are clearly heard at the current hearings.

The observer, attending one of these sessions, has the curious feeling that he is sitting in at the production of a television show, rather than at an inquiry. The newsreel men and the photographers seem to dominate the proceedings, moving freely about the chamber, exploding their bulbs with complete extroversion. The cameras hum at the sensational moments; in periods of calm refutation they are likely to be silent.

You wonder whether the answers ever catch up with the charges; whether any of the accused, no matter how convincing the defense and how complete the vindication, will ever again be fully clear of smirch. You ask why any man should seek public office if he is likely to be subjected to this ordeal by fire, ink, and film. These may be part of the processes and the rumbling of democracy, but you understand why there are demands for curbing such licenses, especially in time of emergency.

Emergency? Many in Congress do not seem to recognize it through the mists of politics. But in the sensitive departments of the Government, the observer comes upon problems and questions that give the word sharp impact.

II. THE VITAL TRIAD

In foreign affairs, this is Washington's vital triad: State, defense, and ECA—diplomacy, arms, and economics. The three are closely related; action cannot be taken in one area without affecting the others.

The men who head up the three departments provide three absorbing studies. If, in painting your Washington portraits, you are not bothered about oversimplification, you might characterize the three this way: Acheson, the intellectual man; Johnson, the political man; Hoffman, the businessman.

In Mr. Acheson the visitor feels a deep conviction about our international role. It is, he holds, a tremendous responsibility; the rest of the free world depends on us, is sustained by us; a weakening on our part is likely to bring down all the others. The Russians see this clearly and try their utmost to create confusions and fears among us. We must see it just as clearly. He quotes Donne; never was it more true that if the bell tolls for one it tolls for all men.

You soon discover in the Secretary his quick intelligence. You suspect this gets him into trouble, because though he may not mean to condescend, he seems often to be condescending. Perhaps statesmen should learn to hide their brightnesses under bushels lest their light dazzle those with whom they deal and so lead to accusations of superiority.

These are trying days for State and for Mr. Acheson personally. This is not the kind of fight he has ever had to make before, this sheer, unashamed onslaught. Yet, he seems to be facing up to it squarely and without flinching. The question is whether he can communicate to the Congress and to the country the feeling that his manner masks.

Secretary Johnson, the political man, would have less difficulty in countering this kind of barrage. He has been brought up in the rough-and-tumble of the political ring and he is accustomed to this kind of ruction.

The diplomatic operation is, to be sure, one much more delicate than the defense operation; the ingrained discipline of the military cannot be expected of State. But, as Mr. Johnson emphasizes, they are both part of the same over-all strategy; the military problem cannot be separated from the diplomatic or economic. It is one team, he says, and it is working as one.

Mr. Johnson expresses complete confidence; he is, he says, a born and insurable optimist and you believe it. He holds that our defenses are good and that unification is being achieved.

Yet the visitor is conscious of the large problems that concern the Pentagon. How much shall we spend on defense? What sort of defense shall it be? Again the observer realizes that there are many more questions than answers in Washington.

Some of the toughest of these questions are put to Paul Hoffman, who has moved so amazingly from big business into big diplomacy. When you call Mr. Hoffman the businessman in government, the phrase should be carefully defined. He has always been a leader in the most enlightened group in industry. He has always believed and continues to believe in enterprise as unfettered as possible, but he holds that this freedom cannot be maintained at the expense of other freedoms and that business must be ready to make sacrifices, for its own and for the public good.

The first of the ECA assignments is to work out an economy for Europe and so save it from communism. The Marshall plan has succeeded beyond all expectations, but as Mr. Hoffman is the first to point out, many dangers remain. The great shadow is the year 1952 when Marshall-plan aid will end, even though the need will continue. So there is now a second assignment of equal importance: to persuade the American people and especially American business that our economic isolation, like our political isolation, is forever ended.

There is no complacency in these key departments. As there is no complacency in any part of a world groping in a new kind of darkness.

III. THE BASIC ISSUES

To these makers of our foreign policies you put this question: If the American people were really informed, if they were reaching sound decisions, what would their conclusions be? These are the answers you get:

Atomic weapons?

The H-bomb cannot win for us. We cannot gain a real or a lasting victory through force. We can gain it only through ideas. We are involved, as Mr. Acheson puts it, in a basic moral conflict, a conflict of the human spirit that must go on until it is settled.

War with Russia?

This kind of struggle does not mean hot war with Russia. The Russians, cut off as they may be from the world, must realize how great is our industrial machine and how quickly it can be mobilized; the lesson that Hitler learned is surely not lost on Stalin. But this does not mean peace. We must prepare our defenses unstintingly and we must exert what Mr. Acheson calls total diplomacy, total effort in the political, the economic and the psychological fields, until the Russians recognize our firmness of purpose and come to terms.

Help for the world?

We must be ready to pay, with money and in energy, for world peace. The cold war is economic rather than political or military; communism prevails only where conditions are such that men turn to it as a last resort. Thus we must be prepared to provide aid to Europe beyond 1952 and to give generous support to point 4, which means help for the rest of the democratic or potentially democratic world, especially the Far East. We must realize that these appropriations are not charity for others but insurance for us. And, as Mr. Hoffman will point out, they are relatively inexpensive programs; for example, the cost of ECA, designed to prevent war, is about $850,000 a day; in 1945 World War II was costing us two hundred and seventy millions a day.

Our economy?

We must be watchful of our economy, for this is our basic defense. Russia counts on the "inevitable decline" of capitalism, rather than on military marches. There is danger (and Mr. Johnson emphasizes this) that the military budgets will become so large that our economy will be thrown out of kilter. The delicate balance must and can be maintained; we must not allow the Russians to stampede us either into overspending or cajole us into underspending.

And tariffs?

We have to learn the economic facts of life; that we cannot exist in economic isolation; that we cannot sell without buying; that tariffs may become hazards instead of protections. Mr. Hoffman urges that we take more of the products of Europe. That does not mean any great expenditure; it is estimated that to close the dollar gap we need to increase our imports by only a billion dollars—which is less than four-tenths of 1 percent of our national production. The real solution lies not in restrictions on trade but in opening up new markets (in brief, by the application of point 4).

Our attitude?

We must learn to be humble, to walk softly even though we carry a big stick and possess 60 percent of the world's gold. Agreed that our democracy is the best form of government yet devised, nevertheless it is not yet perfect. Even though we believe we are right and, more, that we are righteous, a good part of the world is still suspicious of our motives—and we must do our utmost to dissipate that suspicion.

The cold war?

Above all, we must avoid hysteria in our conduct at home and in our dealings abroad. We must not make the Nation fearful and suspicious through witchhunts, either ideological or political. We must have a genuinely unpartisan foreign policy; we must make our international decisions calmly and convincingly. Cold war calls for cool heads.

To the listener, impressed with the conviction with which they are given, these analyses and these injunctions seem right and almost obvious. Why then, he asks, does not the Nation recognize and accept them? Or at least why does not the Nation debate them in these terms, without emotion and without prejudice?

Is it because the people are apathetic as well as poorly informed? Or is it because the issues have not been made clear to them? There are many signs that this last is true, that the people are seeking facts; that, if they had them, they would eagerly respond; and that, in instinct, even now they are ahead of their leaders.

It may well be, therefore, that the essential problem confronting us is the problem of leadership.

IV. THE LEADERS

These are the three great educating forces in public opinion: Government, press, and citizen groups. They are like streams moving in to form a river; individually they are weak; united they are potent.

In the formulation and explanation of foreign policy, the President obviously is the prime figure. Because of the development of mass communication, he has attained great power, for good or for evil. If he can speak eloquently and convincingly to the Nation, he will win full support.

The Secretary of State likewise can exert a wide influence. To his desk each day are channeled reports from all over the world; he, more than anyone else, has the opportunity of acquiring the global view. If his is a strong personality, his advice will be the main mold of the President's international decisions. And he, too, has ready access to the presses and the microphones.

Lately there have been signs in both White House and State that the need for educating opinion is having increased attention. It is being recognized that, without public support, the best of programs can be too easily scuttled.

In the State Department especially the effort is noticeable. That is as it needs to be, for the State Department—our Foreign Office (as Mr. Acheson is likely to call it), the GHQ of our international forces—is responsible for the day-by-day formulation of foreign policy and for the decisions as to how much of it shall be made known to the country and when and in what form it shall be published.

The State Department has always been inclined to regard itself as largely outside the congressional purview and beyond the public gaze. The white-shuttered doors in the old baroque structure opposite the White House were almost symbolic—combinations of iron curtain and Victorian barrier. When State, some 3 years ago, moved to its present building—a khaki home built for the Army—those doors were figuratively moved with it.

Only now, after long years and under steady pressure, the passion for secrecy is slowly yielding. Mr. Acheson believes, too, that the great problem is to make the people aware. He has begun a series of talks to explain foreign policy to the Nation. In this effort, he says, he feels at times like a man standing on a dock with an oar, trying to make the dock move. Perhaps he exaggerates the task, but it is surely a formidable one.

Because of the size and complexity of the problem, there is a strong feeling in many quarters in Washington that the opinion operation must be more extensive, that it must be infused with larger elements of system and continuity.

The suggestion is made that the fireside chat formula be revived. It is argued that, with the country as uncertain as it is, these reports to the Nation are as urgent now as in the time of Franklin Roosevelt. It is proposed further that the Government supply to the media of mass communication a full measure of information—which means the facts plus the background needed for understanding. This would be done through press conferences and generally through a news policy as liberal as the requirements of diplomacy permit. Certainly the press should not be regarded as an imposter sanctioned by the Bill of Rights, but as an agent of the people and as a reporter to the people.

The Members of Congress can also make their contributions, through speeches and through explanations to constituents. Some of them do. But too many are engaged only in the vote-hunt. They talk as though they are moving to the lofty realms of leadership, but they never raise their ears from the ground. It is a neat trick if it can be done.

There is much, then, that Government can do to inform and to lead. But even if it speaks frankly to the Nation, even if it briefs the press fully, it cannot do all of the job or nearly all of it. The enlistment of the other agencies of illumination in the effort is vital.

Education, it is contended, should be linked more closely with the outside world so that the present will be made as intelligible as the past and that the future will not be blackness. World affairs should have a definite, not a casual, place in the curricula of our schools and colleges. Adult education should join in the operation; and the citizen groups also—the public forums, the women's clubs, study groups of various kinds.

The newspaper has an especially important role. We have a free press, but we have yet to develop a fully responsible one. Too many newspapers are preoccupied with entertainment and lose sight of the basic reason for their being, as disseminators of the news. The smaller newspapers, daily and weekly, can be a much more effective factor in opinion if they will undertake to interpret programs such as the Marshall plan and Point Four in terms of the Main Streets they cover, instead of depending for such interpretation on the cosmic columnists.

Radio and television, too, have assignments to fulfill. True, they are primarily entertainment media (in contrast with the newspapers), but they also are endowed with public service aspects and so they, too, are required to maintain high standards of objectivity and responsibility.

The task, then, that confronts us is a gigantic task of education, almost a crusade, requiring the mobilization of all the forces of potential enlightenment—Government, mass media, schools, the instruments of adult teaching.

This means, basically, that in all these fields leadership is essential. It is important that we define clearly what leadership means. What, emphatically, it does not mean is the fuehrer principle. In a dictatorship there is the word and then the march; fiats are substituted for public opinion. In a democracy there must be understanding and conviction; there will not be blind support of a policy proclaimed from above.

The real leader explains and persuades. And he inspires. He does not wait to be forced onward from behind; he chooses the course which, in his judgment, is right and he holds to that course, no matter what the politicians and the commentators shout.

V. THE WHITE FAITH

There must be leadership, but there must be response to leadership also. In time of actual hostilities, when dangers and fears are concrete and immediate, the citizen will answer the summons. The cold war may not be as dramatic as the hot war, but it is surely as fateful; it requires of the citizen an effort as unstinting as that of 1917 or 1941.

There is the story of Michael Shipkov, employee of our legation in Sofia; he was captured by the Communists; he was then released to spy in the legation, instead he prepared a statement describing his imprisonment, to be published if he were captured again, he was captured again and now he has vanished into the darkness of a Communist cell.

In that statement Shipkov wrote of those who questioned and tortured him: "They are disciples and fervent followers of the dogma. Not much imagination, nor quick brains nor much intellectual baggage nor sensitivity—but undeviating loyalty to their creed, fanatic belief in their own cause, fanatic hatred and mistrust of anything else."

"Fanatic belief in their own cause"—there is the challenge. We must feel as strongly about democracy, about our cause, as these Communists feel about theirs; we must build a white faith to counter the dark one that confronts us.

There is a basic strength, and a basic unity in the Nation. In the long run our decisions have been right; we have come through in the crises. If there is leadership, and response to leadership, there are no reasons for doubt now.

"One person with a belief," wrote John Stuart Mill, "is a power equal to 99 who have only interests."

Belief is the key word—the belief that derives from conviction and from courage; the faith that alone dispels fear and indecision.

Closing of Army and Navy Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr Speaker, on the 15th of February, the Secretary of Defense announced the imminent closing of a number of Army and Navy hospitals and medical facilities, and the reduction of others. According to the press release, and statements of officials, the purpose of this move was to save money by inactivating installations no longer required for military personnel, veterans, and other authorized patients, and the consolidation, where practicable, of other facilities. Claims of large savings in cost were made on behalf of this move.

Like many other administrative actions, this important step was directed without any prior notice or consultation with the Representatives in Congress, even those on the Armed Services Committee, who are supposed to represent the people in formulating the policies of the Military Establishment. The chairman of our committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, has remarked at length on certain matters concerning the functions and responsibilities of the Congress. In this case, he appointed a special subcommittee, headed by Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Caroline, to inquire into this proposed action. Meanwhile, he requested the Secretary of Defense to defer carrying out this measure until the committee had examined into the matter and made a report. Secretary of Defense Johnson was unwilling to defer action on this proposal, but did agree that none of the equipment and properties at the hospitals to be closed would be transferred, pending the outcome of the investigation.

I am, of course, in full accord with any proposal which will achieve real economy in the operation of our Government and save money for the taxpayers. However, as soon as the committee began its investigation, the amount of savings to be made began to shrink. It has now practically disappeared. What savings are achieved will apparently be made at the expense of medical care afforded our service men and women, their depend-

ents, and the facilities available for the treatment of disabled veterans of World War I and World War II. This is an odd, and I think, an inappropriate place to begin saving, especially after the House has so recently approved expenditures of nearly $3,000,000,000 in foreign aid for the next fiscal year. Apparently, there is ample money to rehabilitate the factories, oil refineries, transportation systems, and tourist hotels in Europe; there are funds to rehabilitate the economy of Japan; there is ample cash to develop the so-called backward areas; and there is no shortage of credit or aid for the Koreans, the Chinese, the Iranians, or any other group—except for the defenders of our country, their dependents, and the veterans of World Wars I and II. This is not a partisan issue, and I do not desire to approach it on that basis; but I am totally unable to comprehend the reason or justification for seeking an illusory and unreal economy in this field.

The hearings of the subcommittee held in Washington developed conclusively that the reduction in medical facilities and care had been directed without any prior consultation with the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, or with Admiral Boone, whose distinguished record and outstanding capabilities were evident when he testified before our subcommittee. The best that can be said for this closing order is that it was hastily conceived, on the basis of inaccurate data and incorrect or outmoded statistics. While some mistakes and errors of judgment are inevitable during the course of war, or in time of emergency, this present program is a piece of stupidity, with no necessity or justification, 5 years after the end of the shooting war.

The subcommittee which I mentioned has also made two trips, one to the Middle West, the Pacific coast and the South, and a second to Pennsylvania and New England. While I was not able to go on the first trip, I did visit Valley Forge General Hospital, near Phoenixville, Pa., and Murphy General Hospital, near Waltham, Mass. At the latter point, we also heard representatives from the United States Naval Hospital at Portsmouth, N. H.

VALLEY FORGE GENERAL HOSPITAL

On April 3, the subcommittee talked with the commanding officer and staff of this hospital, and had the benefit of hearing several eminent physicians and surgeons who serve as consultants in various fields for this hospital. These men testified that Valley Forge General Hospital has been a major facility for ophthamologic—eye—surgery, and plastic surgery for the Army and the Air Force. I need not remind you that such work requires the highest degree of professional skill and competence and requires hospitalization for an extended period. In addition, Valley Forge General Hospital has been preeminent throughout the Nation in the conduct of the controlled research on infectious hepatitis. This disease, commonly known as yellow jaundice, resulted in over 400,000 cases during World War II. Operations in the Southwest Pacific, especially New Guinea and Guadalcanal, were at one time seriously handicapped by the numbers of men disabled by this disease. I am told that at the peak one division had 7,000 men sick from this condition. In Italy, during the fall and winter of 1943, yellow jaundice was a major problem of our forces, and resulted in more hospitalization than battle casualties. According to the testimony of the eminent physicians who appeared before our committee, the period of hospitalization is from 30 to 60 days. It is obvious, in view of our numerous cases during World War II and the extended time during which victims were unable to perform duty, that the control and conquest of this disease is of major military importance. Some progress in the research necessary to its control has been made; but the Surgeon General of the Army and the consultants at Valley Forge General Hospital both assured the committee that the problem is not yet solved. In view of this, and the emphasis which is being placed on research and development in other fields, it seems incredible that the Department of Defense would close the only institution where advanced work of this type is being carried on for the Army and the Air Force, with the sponsorship of the National Research Council.

So far as the buildings and facilities at Valley Forge General Hospital are concerned, it may be noted that this institution was built during the latter part of 1942 and opened in March 1943. Construction is generally of brick facing, on concrete- or cinder-block base. At a rate of 100 square feet per patient, the capacity is 1,700 beds. On the basis of 72 square feet per patient, it is 2,000 beds, and with the use of some temporary shelter it could care for a wartime patient load of over 2,500. Prior to the order of February 15, Valley Forge General Hospital had an authorized operating capacity of 1,650 beds. When it was built in 1942–43, this hospital cost a little over $10,000,000; to replace it now would probably cost two or three times that amount. Since the end of hostilities of World War II, Valley Forge General Hospital has been thoroughly overhauled and reconditioned. During the period July 1949 through January 1950—just 6 weeks before it was ordered closed—$635,000 had been spent on the plant. New roofs have been placed on several buildings, copper water lines have been installed, a new diet kitchen has been built at a cost of $100,000, and the interiors of the ward buildings have been redecorated at the cost of another $100,000. In addition, application has been submitted, through the Department of the Army, for the approval of a FHA housing project, under Public Law 211 of this Eighty-first Congress—known as the Wherry Act—to provide essential accommodations for military and civilian staff. Projects of this type are limited to those on or in the vicinity of permanent installations; and so far as anyone knew, Valley Forge General Hospital is in that category.

As to the work this hospital is performing, there were 1,460 patients on January 31 of this year. Nine hundred and sixty-two of these are Army and Air Force personnel on active duty, 4 were retired, 163 were veterans, for whom the Department of the Army was reimbursed, and 70 were dependents of military personnel. Of the above number 233 were neuropsychiatric patients, of whom over 175 were in closed wards for the protection of themselves or other people. Most of these psychiatric cases are ultimately transferred to the Veterans' Administration, but that agency has inadequate facilities now in Pennsylvania to take care of such cases and it is compelled to contract out to private mental hospitals and sanatoriums for care of numerous veterans. Two veterans with service-connected mental disorders were recently burned to death at the tragic fire at the Bella Vista Hospital, near Philadelphia, where nine patients lost their lives.

As I stated before, there are no facilities to take care of many of these patients at the present time, either by the Army or by the Veterans' Administration. The committee also inquired as to the possibility of institutions in Philadelphia providing necessary hospital care for servicemen and dependents. We were told by well-informed civilian physicians and surgeons that the Philadelphia hospitals are now overcrowded, and that doctors wait up to 3 weeks before patients can be admitted for ward care and up to 3 months before private or semiprivate rooms are available. Even if such facilities were available, the dependents of enlisted men, many of whom receive salaries of $100–$150 per month, would be unable to pay the cost of such hospitalization.

Finally, in considering the effect of closing Valley Forge General Hospital, it is necessary to consider the impact on the training program of the Medical Corps of the Army and Air Force. If that organization is to furnish first-class care to individual service men and women, it must attract able graduates of medical schools. This can only be done by affording adequate opportunities for professional training and experience. Located, as it is, upon the outskirts of Philadelphia, where there are three outstanding medical colleges, Valley Forge General Hospital was very favorably situated to obtain the services and instruction of highly-qualified physicians and staff doctors for teaching purposes. As of the end of February, there were 27 interns participating in residency training programs, in some six special fields at Valley Forge General Hospital. In addition, there was a rotating internship program, with 11 Army interns and 4 Air Force interns. The effect of terminating such training programs cannot be other than adverse with respect to the recruitment of medical officers for our armed services.

In summary, any savings effected by the closing of Valley Forge General Hospital will be at the cost of medical care furnished our service men and women, research in vitally important fields, reduction in the limited care now available to veterans, and curtailment of the recruiting and training program of medical

officers. I cannot believe that this is the proper area in which to begin Government economy.

MURPHY GENERAL HOSPITAL

The situation at Murphy General Hospital is much the same, while Murphy General Hospital is an institution with the bed capacity of only 471, is similar in that it is situated on the outskirts of Boston, and has available the professional services of eminent doctors on the faculties and staff of the medical schools in that metropolitan center.

Murphy General Hospital is the only institution of its type operated by the Army or Air Force in the entire New England area, where there are 19,000 service personnel on active duty. In addition, there are substantial numbers of dependents and retired personnel, and during the summer large numbers of Reserve and civilian component personnel on active duty. The work of this hospital has been largely in orthopedic surgery, particularly that involving or requiring the use and fitting of special footwear. Boston is, of course, the logical center for such work, and many cases have been transferred there from other hospitals.

During the past 2 years the Surgeon General of the Army in an effort to develop plans for more efficient utilization of our personnel resources in time of war has conducted at Murphy General Hospital a program of utilizing members of the Women's Army Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps to the maximum extent practicable in replacing male personnel. When one considers the shortage of military manpower which developed in this country during the last war, and the terrible requirements which we would face if we became engaged in another conflict, the importance and significance of such tests and management studies become apparent. The results to date have been very satisfactory, and had this hospital remained open it is likely that the information and data obtained could have been used as the basis or pattern for operations elsewhere in time of war.

The buildings at Murphy General Hospital are of brick facing, on a concrete, or cinder block base, and are in excellent state of repair. The plant has been thoroughly overhauled and modernized in the last 4 years, and is well equipped to meet the needs of that area for a military hospital. It was constructed in 1942, at a cost of about 2½ million dollars; and to replace it at today's costs would probably take at least 5 million dollars. In place of that modern, well-equipped facility located on the outskirts of Boston, with ready access to eminent consultants, transportation facilities, and so forth, it is proposed to rehabilitate and reoccupy several vacant buildings at the former Lovell General Hospital at Fort Devens, Mass. This latter is a wartime, temporary wooden barracks-type installation, built in 1941 and 1942 to last 5 years. Some facilities are now operated there, for 100 patients from that post. Even with a much smaller number, the cost of heating the wards and the buildings there exceeds that of Murphy General Hospital. It is difficult to see where there is any economy in abandoning a modern, well-equipped permanent-type hospital and attempting to rehabilitate worn-out, temporary facilities suitable only for wartime use. Furthermore, it must be noted that the location of Fort Devens, while suitable for a wartime mobilization center, will increase the cost of transporting patients and greatly hinder if not entirely preclude the procurement of consultants from the distinguished medical colleges and hospitals in the Boston area.

So far as the situation with respect to dependents of military personnel is concerned, the situation here is much the same as in the vicinity of Philadelphia. Civilian hospitals are greatly overcrowded; and even where available, the rate for ward care is from $10 to $12 per day, or a private from from $14 to $30 per day, in addition to the other costs and charges involved.

Here again it appears that whatever economies are achieved—and they are very doubtful, if not illusory—will be at the expense of adequate medical care for servicemen and women, retired personnel of the armed services, and their dependents.

In conclusion, we must remember that we are not yet at peace. The present condition has been called a cold war but it is nonetheless a real and bitter struggle against a determined enemy who will not hesitate to use any means at his disposal if assured of success. The President announced some months ago that Russia had apparently solved the basic problems of an atomic bomb. Subsequent disclosures, such as the trial of Dr. Fuchs in England, have clearly shown that the Russians received valuable information and assistance in this line. While I sincerely hope that we shall not be thrown into the horrors of an atomic war, we must, during this period, make our preparations meet such a contingency. During World War II, the Philadelphia area was a major war production center accounting for approximately 10 percent of our total military output, and far exceeding New York City which is principally a shipping and distribution area. A war production center of this importance will certainly be a target in any future war. Distinguished civilian doctors who testified before our subcommittee stated that practically all the hospitals in Philadelphia were in the downtown metropolitan area, or so close that they would in all likelihood be seriously damaged, if not destroyed, by any atomic bomb exploding in that vicinity. Such a condition would call for greatly augmented medical and hospital facilities, outside the bomb damaged area. Under these circumstances, it would appear the part of ordinary prudence, under the present conditions, to retain in operation the only large modern, well-equipped facility able to meet some portion of the heavy load in the event of an attack upon Philadelphia. Valley Forge General Hospital, located some 10 miles from that city, is favorably situated in this regard; and for this reason alone should, in my opinion, be kept in operating condition until our foreign relations are in far better condition than exists today.

The Balance Sheet in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Robert P. Patterson before the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City on Monday, April 10, 1950:

It is indeed a pleasure to be with you at this meeting of the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants.

I have called this talk the Balance Sheet in Foreign Affairs. Since the world is lining up into two opposing camps, the balance sheet could just as well be entitled "Freedom Versus Communism," or even more specifically "United States Versus Russia."

The purpose of the foreign policy Americans believe in and stand for can be summed up, I submit, in the words "maintenance of peace without surrender of freedom." Peace can, of course, be achieved at the price of submission to foreign dictatorship, but it would be the peace of the prison or the graveyard. Life under that kind of peace would be a surrender of civilization itself and hardly worth living. Peace, yes, but not at any price.

If we go back a few years, we recall the hopes held almost universally by Americans at the close of World War II. The menace of Germany and Japan was a thing of the past. The San Francisco Charter had just been signed and the United Nations was on its way. Here was the bright promise of organized world peace. The pledges were firm—the pledge of saving future generations from the scourge of war, the pledge of living together as good neighbors, the pledge of taking united measures to remove threats to the peace. Higher pledges were never put down on paper. The ways and means of performing those pledges were also agreed on by common consent, through the Security Council and General Assembly of United Nations and through provision for combined forces to support the decisions of the United Nations. All nations, large and small, signed up. There would be no more aggression by the strong against the weak, no more armament races, no more balance of power. The sky was blue. It remained only for nations or those in control of nations to live up to their engagements.

We recall how quickly our hopes for achieving a system of peace through collective world action faded, how soon the blue in the sky was followed by an overcast sky. It was only a matter of months when the proof began to pile up that the men in charge of Russia's destinies were not minded to work with free nations for removal of threats to the peace. The record of Soviet obstruction is a dreary one and there is no need to dwell long on it—Soviet resistance to control of atomic energy, Soviet opposition to ending the war against Greece, Soviet aggression against the countries of eastern Europe, Soviet ambitions in China and Korea, Soviet maneuvers to push us out of Berlin, Soviet

efforts to defeat economic recovery in western Europe, Soviet fifth-column sabotage in the free countries—to say nothing of the monotonous Soviet vetoes and walk-outs in the United Nations—to say nothing of the charges that come monotonously from Moscow of American war-mongering, American imperialism, American encirclement. In that hostile and threatening behavior of the men in the Kremlin we suffered a defeat of our foreign policy, the preservation of peace through United Nations. It was a defeat that no amount of skill and diplomacy on the part of our Government could have avoided, a defeat shared by the other nations that subscribed to collective efforts to prevent war by means of United Nations.

That hostility by the 14 rulers of Soviet Russia is the most tragic fact we face as of today in the second half of the twentieth century. It has brought about the indefinite postponement of attaining peace by united world action. If war is to be avoided, it must be by other means and other measures.

Appeasement, like collaboration, is a word with a bad reputation, and deservedly so. By bitter lessons, the world has been taught that appeasement settles nothing in dealing with restless dictators; it is taken as a sign of weakness and merely serves to sharpen their appetite for more of the same. While the word appeasement is not used, there nevertheless is still a feeling in some quarters that our differences with Soviet Russia are merely due to misunderstandings, each side being actuated by good faith, and that the differences could readily be cleared up if the President would only invite Stalin to sit down with him at a table and candidly talk things over. The good-natured people who hold that opinion close their eyes to the proof that it is not the policy of Stalin, any more than it was the policy of Hitler, to have friendly relations with the United States. There are many Americans, too, who feel that somewhere there must be a fairly easy answer to the Russian problem, many who hope that before long someone in the Government will hit on it.

The answer is simple, but it is not easy.

The plain fact is that the free nations, this one included, are face to face with a set of men who control the resources of a powerful country, who are fired with the ambition to rule the world out of Moscow, who have no scruples on the means of gaining their goal. Covenants, engagements, and commitments are made only for the purpose of deceiving the other side. A twist is given to words as familiar as democracy and freedom, a twist that utterly perverts their meaning. The aim is not merely world communism; from the case of Tito and Yugoslavia we know that in all other countries the communism must be a puppet communism, directed and operated through strings that run straight to the Kremlin. Any phase of our foreign policy that fails to recognize that Moscow respects nothing but the facts of force is foredoomed to failure. At Potsdam, when Stalin, on mention of a statement by the Pope, inquired "How many divisions has the Pope?" he summed up his entire foreign policy in those six words.

There is nothing new in that, except for the scale of it. Plutarch, in his life of Theseus, wrote of a band of outlaws in ancient Greece:

"All respect for others, all justice, they thought, all equity and humanity in no way concerned those who were strong enough to win for themselves."

Little as we like it, we must conform our conduct to the truth that there is no easy answer, that a meeting across the table will not give us a swift ending of the cold war, that the road ahead will not be a smooth one, that the most solid assurance for preservation of peace will consist of the strength of our resources.

For quick assets we have the Military Establishment—Army, Navy, Air. No matter how well conceived our diplomatic measures may be, the record will finally be written in red ink unless those measures are backed up by the presence of armed strength.

If polls are still of any value, public opinion is all but unanimous on the necessity of armed strength. Americans from Maine to California are in accord that our expenditures in maintenance of the national defense should be as large as is consistent with our economic health; beyond that point no one would care to go under present conditions.

As for organization, we have the unified Department of Defense, in place of the old, out-dated structure of separate departments. We have a single team under single leadership, instead of the divided effort inherent in the system of independent services under independent departments. The new plan is logical, and it is working well. There are officers, it is true, who have found it hard to adapt their ideas to the principle of combined command. They are few, however, and becoming fewer day by day.

The differences of opinion that exist have to do with the composition of the Military Establishment. It is a waste of effort, I submit, to try to be strong everywhere, a waste that we cannot afford. The most effective deterrent to an aggressor, it would seem plain, is the ability to strike deep at his vitals. Until the day of push-button warfare, a day in the far distant future, that cannot be done save by long-range air power. Atom bombs, and hydrogen bombs, too, if they come, are utterly useless without the means of delivering them at the targets. We have no means unless we rely on air power. If these premises are sound, we will speak less about maintaining "balanced forces" and about spending one-third of our funds for national defense on each of the three arms, as if each had an equal claim on the country. Instead, we will put the emphasis—heavy emphasis—on our air strength. While it happens that my military career was confined to the infantry, I trust that I am not deserting the cause of the foot soldier by stating it as my conviction that our future security lies in air power. American air power in the twentieth century, if made unmistakably predominant, can have the same sobering effect on disturbers of the peace that British sea power had in the nineteenth century. As matters stand today, we are not devoting to the air branch the proportion of our total effort that the situation calls for.

A second asset for maintenance of peace that is under our own control is the enactment of industrial mobilization measures now, to be put into operation any time later by joint resolution of Congress. Mr. Baruch last week made a powerful appeal for action to cover this need. I subscribe to everything he said on the value of making prompt provision for priority powers, price controls, wage controls, industrial and manpower controls. In World War II we endured the wasteful experience of makeshift devices. We did win our way to mobilization of the industrial plant, through requisitioning powers, the authority to place compulsory orders on industry, and control of profits through contract renegotiation. We never did succeed in getting manpower mobilization, though almost every other nation at war lost no time in adopting a program of that character. Instead, we had the mortifying spectacle of shortages of workers in war industries and in other vital activities when there were plenty of people in unessential pursuits who were allowed to take a free ride for the war. To those who had responsibilities for keeping the men in the fighting forces equipped and supplied, the failure of Congress to pass a work-or-fight law was our greatest shortcoming on the home front.

The third asset is directly in the field of foreign relations. It consists of strengthening the forces of freedom in nations overseas. Plainly, if by assistance to people in western Europe and elsewhere who have the same devotion to the principles of free government that we have, we can help them to preserve their freedom, the risk of a march out of Moscow is reduced. Aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Defense Pact, and the Military Assistance Law were steps taken in pursuit of this policy, and they have been attended with success.

We cannot say as much for the Far East. China has been overrun by the Communists and for the time being at least has become a Russian satellite, managed by Moscow. There is no denying that this stands as an accrued liability in the balance sheet of our foreign affairs. We have not won every time.

In the performance of its task in these difficult times the State Department, I submit, is entitled to have the full confidence of the American people. Without that confidence it cannot manage its activities to the advantage of the Nation. Surely, the unproved charges that have been made so recklessly from the immunity of the floor of the Senate must not be allowed to impair that confidence. Our foreign relations, we may be certain, could not be in hands more capable or more trustworthy than those of Secretary Acheson. He has shown keen insight and clear understanding of the aims and purposes of the Russian Government. His political nonpartisanship in the conduct of foreign affairs, consistent all along, has been further attested by the appointment of two eminent statesmen of the other party to posts of high authority in the Department.

The balance sheet in foreign affairs is one that cannot carry dollar values. On the liability side we have the single item, the risk of war with Soviet Russia, and it is a risk that should not be minimized. The risk of war is always present when an ambitious dictatorship has the resources of a powerful nation under its thumb.

On the asset side we have our military forces in being. We have the priceless asset of a productive economy, with an industrial plant far beyond anything that Soviet Russia can hope for, and the priceless asset of political institutions that put up no barriers against the vigor, energy, and enterprise of men and women. Those assets, provided we manage them with a clear vision of what we are up against in world affairs, should give us a fair margin over the liability side in the days ahead. But we will not manage them wisely if we have any fuzziness in our thinking about the present and future hostility of the Soviet dictatorship. It is a hostility that no amount of argument on our part will dispel. The price we will pay for that kind of fuzziness might well be the loss of our existence as a free people.

The chances for peace will vary directly with the world-mindedness of the people of this country. The day of isolationism, we trust, is past. We cannot afford to lose sight of the position of the United States as a bulwark in the struggle for freedom.

How long will the war of nerves continue? How long must we keep on with the policy of building our military strength? The answer depends on how long the enslavement of the Russian people lasts.

From history we know that all tyrannies have finally collapsed. One day the censorship of information, the suppression of freedom in Russia will break down. One day the Politburo will no longer be able to control the destiny of 200,000,000 Russians by wish or whim. When that time comes, the world will be able to go ahead with disarmament. Not until then will the threat to peace disappear.

Russian Crab Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of the House to the fact that during recent months 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at $3,000,000, have been imported into the United States. Also, I have said that the Russians probably have another 400,000 cases of this canned crab which they will dump into this country unless steps are taken by our executive departments to ban these imports.

The laws of this country say definitely that the Secretary of the Treasury may ban imports from foreign countries where the imported goods are produced by forced labor, and forced labor in that law is defined to mean involuntary labor.

It is common knowledge that much of the labor employed in Russia is slave or forced labor, on the ground because it is involuntary. I have urged Secretary of the Treasury Snyder to enforce this law against Russian canned crab and thereby bar further Russian crab imports and thus save our prosperous crabbing industry from destruction by Russian slave-labor competition.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include with this speech a column, Inside Labor, by Victor Riesel. This column has appeared in 154 American newspapers having a total circulation of many millions. Mr. Riesel's column follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

In any one of a hundred restaurants you don't have to rub a magic lamp and wish for a genii in order to be served by some remote slave. Just order crab meat. It will have come from a slave's hands. It will have been packed by a slave's frozen fingers. It will have been speared out of frigid waters by iron hooks held in a slave's cramped fist.

No fairy tale this. Just the story of Soviet slave labor in icy camps, dumping millions of pounds of fish for your dainty cocktail forks each month—and so beginning to kill off a multi-million dollar American fishing industry, canneries, boatbuilding and gear production.

All of which means lots fewer jobs for the average American Joe.

Within the past few months, exactly $3,000,000 worth of this fancily canned crab meat has come into the United States via Seattle and Boston—some of it direct from Russia's forced-labor fishing camps. This slave-packed food for America's tables arrived in 59,000 cases, 15,000 of which entered Seattle right from Siberia.

So that those who deal in this slave-speared crab meat shall know where it comes from—I put in the record the fact that there are 17 such slave fishing camps, stretching from Murmansk to the Sakhalin Islands. And it's easy to get into any one of them. I have before me the official Soviet Corrective Labor Code, which the State Department can have for a nickel phone call. The code (drawn up by the MVD secret police) reports that "The task of the penal policy of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is the defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Socialist construction carried out by it, against encroachments by class-hostile elements and infringements not only on the part of déclassé elements but also of unstable elements among the workers."

To make certain of this, the secret police must put the condemned in conditions which debar them from the possibility of committing acts which inflict harm on Socialist construction.

This harm, according to the official code before me, can mean coming late to work, attempting to change jobs without permission, griping to the plant foremen out loud so that the other workers can hear, and taking too many days off from the job.

For any of these crimes, you can be sent to any one of several hundred camps run by the secret police. In some, you cut lumber. In others, you help mine 80 percent of Russia's gold. And in some, you fish—for crab meat, among other delectable items, for the world's gourmets. And, since the MVD doesn't exactly set up a pay-roll window every Friday, the crab meat can be sold in America at a price far less than it costs to fish up and can in the United States. So, the more crab meat from Russia, the fewer jobs for the United States.

And that's just what's been happening at a moment when we're thinking of setting up a CCC to care for millions of unemployed youngsters and retiring older workers.

For example, of the 59,000 cases of Soviet crab meat, about 15,000 went through Seattle and 44,000 via Boston. This second shipment came from England. When some of our business people and their Congressmen complained to ECA Chief Paul Hoffman, he revealed that the British had told him that England was forced to buy 80,000 cases of canned crab if London wanted to buy salmon, which her people needed desperately. In exchange for the vital salmon, the British send Russia woolens and cloth.

The British then start a price-cutting war with American crab fishers and packers to get something out of the deal. The English sell for $2 a case less than the American firms do, and when the Americans slash their price to meet the British competition, the British simply cut down by another $2.

There you see an American industry, with thousands of jobs, being threatened by Soviet MVD prison-camp labor. And when it was pointed out to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder that a 1930 law on our books gave him power to ban importation of goods made by forced labor ("for which the worker doesn't offer himself voluntarily," the law states specifically), Mr. Snyder apparently was too busy to reply.

All right, you don't eat crab meat. Maybe you eat nuts. Well, the other day 110,000 pounds of walnuts were unloaded in San Francisco, direct from Soviet-controlled Manchuria, and sold for 20 cents a pound less than our growers can put the stuff on the market. If it's not fish, it's nuts, or gold, or furs, or ships, or any one of a hundred items.

It's just beginning. Soon we'll have lots more to crab about than crab meat.